UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 86th CONGRESS
FIRST SESSION

VOLUME 105—PART 3

FEBRUARY 25, 1959, TO MARCH 16, 1959
(PAGES 2919 TO 4342)

UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE, WASHINGTON, 1959

DEPOSITED BY THE
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Congressional Record

United States of America

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 86th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 25, 1959

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Ecclesiastes 8: 12: *I know that it shall be well with them that fear God.*

Eternal God, our Father, who art the gracious benefactor of all mankind, we beseech Thee to impart unto us that divine wisdom and strength which will enable us to see our duties and responsibilities more clearly, understand them more wisely, and perform them more faithfully.

Grant that our President, our Speaker, and all the Members of this legislative body may be blessed with clear minds and courageous hearts, making them equal to the desperate needs of our day and generation.

Bless our beloved country and all the nations with whom we are united in the great task of defending the sacred heritage of freedom and in maintaining the peace of the world.

Hear us in the name of the Prince of Peace. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

ACCURACY IN NEWSPAPER REPORTING

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I should like to raise one voice in opposition to this great self-righteous crusade which the press of the country has taken upon itself to conduct against the House of Representatives in the past couple of weeks concerning relatives and alleged relatives on the payroll. I think there are many things to be considered. If the press really wants to do some work on the subject of nepotism, I suggest that they put in a little legwork in the various Federal bureaus, agencies, and departments.

As an example of how careless and inefficient has been the type of reporting on this particular issue, in a story which was published yesterday under a headline indicating that 65 Members of the House have relatives on their payroll, they listed a young lady who is employed in my office whose maiden name happens to be Smith but who, unfortunately, is not related to me. I wish she were, especially in election years, because she belongs to a family that is highly regarded in my district. But that particular error could have been corrected in 30 seconds by a telephone call to my office. In fact, several newspapers and news services which have a regard for the truth did correct the error. Unfortunately the Associated Press indicated no regard for accuracy in the story they filed. They acted on the assumption that because two people in one office happened to be named Smith they were related.

I should be glad to claim kinship with all the Smiths in the country, especially those in my district, but I hope the press of the country will find more vital matters on which to report in Washington.

RESIGNATION FROM COMMITTEES

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following resignation from committees:

FEBRUARY 25, 1959.

Hon. SAM RAYBURN,
Speaker of the House,
U.S. Capitol, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I herewith offer my resignation from the Committee on Education and Labor and the Committee on the Judiciary.

It has been a privilege and a pleasure to work with the members of these committees, and I regret that I must discontinue this association.

Sincerely yours,

ALBERT H. BOSCH,
Member of Congress.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resignation will be accepted.

There was no objection.

ELECTION TO COMMITTEE

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 183) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That ALBERT H. BOSCH, New York, be, and he is hereby, elected a member of the standing Committee of the House of Representatives on Ways and Means.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

INTERPARLIAMENTARY UNION

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina.

There was no objection.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, on account of the illness of our distinguished and beloved colleague, the Honorable Daniel Reed, of New York, the annual meeting of the American group of the Interparliamentary Union was postponed and has not yet been held. As one of the vice presidents of the American group I am calling a meeting of the American group of the Interparliamentary Union for 10 o'clock Friday morning. The meeting will be held in the Vandenberg Room at the other end of the Capitol. All Members of both Houses of Congress are members of the American group and all Members of Congress interested in the work and programs of the Interparliamentary Union are urged to attend this meeting on Friday morning. At the meeting officers will be elected and other matters of importance will be considered.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. Will the gentleman in connection with his remarks give us information as to how the members of that organization are selected?

Mr. COOLEY. I would be very glad to do that. I would suggest that anyone interested in the work of the Interparliamentary Union might very well read Dan Reed's last extension of remarks, which I had inserted in the RECORD on the day before he died. It is his annual report.

Mr. HALLECK. I make this suggestion because many Members have spoken to me of their interest in it, and particularly their desire to attend some of the meetings. So far I have not been able to learn very much about it.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Reed's report contains full information concerning the Interparliamentary Union; and I suggest that anyone interested read the report. If the Vandenberg Room is not large enough to accommodate the Members attending the meeting, another room will be made available and someone will be at the door of the Vandenberg Room to direct Members to the place of the meeting. I hope that the meeting will be well attended.

UNEMPLOYMENT

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, like so many other Members of the House and so many millions throughout the land, I am increasingly concerned about the growth and volume of mass unemployment.

When a country like ours has approximately 5 million workers unemployed then it is time to do something—do something more than prattle bright predictions that things are going to be better by and by.

It is all very well for bureaucrats and economists to take the long view and console themselves with self-serving observations that before the end of the year things are going to better—but the man out of work is concerned with the here—and now. The head of a family cannot maintain his household on statistics no matter how they are twisted for political purposes.

Mr. Speaker, I feel I can speak with some authority on this subject, not because I am an economist, but rather, because I am living with the problem. Right in my own own district in nearby Maryland, many thousands are unemployed. There are hard realities there that will not bend to theorizing—these are able-bodied, willing workers who ask not for relief or Government benefits but only the chance for a job so they can support their families and maintain themselves in self-respect.

I am seriously concerned about the welfare and the well-being of these idle workers, for themselves and for their families, and I am also concerned as to what their enforced idleness means to our national defense and our national economy.

As I am not an economist, neither am I a military strategist, but my commonsense tells me that when we are faced with a threat like the Soviet military machine and aggressive policies form, then I know we cannot in safety afford to have millions of unemployed in our great land.

To my way of thinking we must be equally concerned with policies and programs to put the jobless back to work as we are with missiles and submarines and other instruments of defense. In order to support the kind of a defense program we need for national safety and survival, we need a strong economy, with full employment. It has been said time and time again that the Nation's military strength can only be as strong as the homefront.

Mr. Speaker, right in my home district, in Hagerstown, in fact, we have just witnessed a large cutback in the operating force of an airplane manufacturer. This unpleasant development is made all the more serious, to my mind, owing to the fact that it was brought about because of Government policy.

It is not my intention at this moment to go into a discussion of the comparative merits of one plane over another, nor am I going to pose as an expert in materiel. I do feel justified, however, in saying that it would appear to me to be prudent policy, in the conduct of our military procurement, to give due regard to the status of a company, its backlog in orders, the economic climate of its community, and other related matters. I say it is good business and wise provision for our Government to spread its procurement so that efficient facilities can be maintained in operation, that going concerns be kept in business, that orders be placed so as to sustain a high level of economic activity in all sections of the Nation and in all sectors of the economy. And especially when the product is of demonstrated proficiency, fulfills a needed requirement, and is the lifeline of the manufacturing operation.

In any event, Mr. Speaker, we are in serious economic trouble in my district and I say that to allow this condition to continue is highly injurious not only to us but also to the national welfare. We, of course, have no monopoly on this problem. Unfortunately, scores and scores of communities and regions throughout the United States are sorely afflicted with unemployment, and many of them have been so troubled for a long time.

It is in the best interests of all our people everywhere that these sore spots be cured. They can ultimately injure the economic health of the Nation grievously. This continuing and growing problem of joblessness makes a poor exhibit in Uncle Sam's showcase as we are engaged in global competition with the police state economics of the Communist empire. Not only are we greatly injuring ourselves at home by the continued neglect of this problem, but with every uncommitted country in the world we are making a poor showing for our capitalistic system. Every dictate of sound economics, provident leadership, and international competition demands that we get on with the task of solving this menacing problem of unemployment.

Mr. Speaker, it is downright foolhardy for us to go into the arena against the totalitarian opponent with one hand tied behind our back, and that's exactly what we are doing when we drift along with upward of 5 million of our available workers unemployed. This is not the American system: this is not the American way—we can do better, so let us tackle this challenging problem head on without any further delay.

With this in mind, Mr. Speaker, I have the privilege of introducing a bill embracing constructive proposals for area redevelopment a companion bill to H.R. 3466, introduced by Congressman FLOOD, and I urge that it be given the speedy consideration that is warranted in view of the growing proportions of the unemployment problem.

ESTHER WHEELER, OF MASSACHUSETTS

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, it is with a heavy heart that I rise to address the House on this occasion. Yesterday there passed into the Great Beyond one of the finest characters I have ever known and one of the finest and most loyal of friends I have ever possessed.

Yesterday afternoon, in Malden, Mass., died all that could die of Mrs. Esther Wheeler, after an extremely painful illness. Although this unrelenting disease of cancer claimed the body of Esther Wheeler, her noble and beautiful spirit will live on in the memory of her friends and associates forever.

Because of her interest in Government, her enthusiasm of work and association, and her knowledge of the science and art of politics, I am anxious to bring her life and contributions to the attention of my colleagues here in the House at this time.

Esther Wheeler was a New England Republican. For many years she was extremely active and worked unselfishly in the interest of the Republican Party. She was loyal to her party, but also fair in her dealings with the Democratic Party. Esther Wheeler knew that the stability of American government depended upon a healthy two-party system. Although she worked hard for her own party, the Republican Party, she knew others had a right to believe in their party likewise, and that the Democratic Party was necessary just as much as was the Republican Party in American political life.

In her work in the Republican Party, Esther Wheeler brought kindness and courtesy, enthusiasm and spirit to the Republican cause. Republicans throughout the United States could profit very well by her example. Within her gentleness and her enthusiasm was also to be found a rare sense of humor and the ability of the light touch which greatly helped during those moments when situations became tried and difficult.

Throughout Massachusetts, Esther Wheeler was identified with many civic activities. She was always ready to join in any activity that might prove beneficial to her community as well as the Commonwealth of Massachusetts. Because of her attractiveness, her fineness, and her ability, people were anxious to work with her and found it easy to cooperate with her in various activities.

In 1953, Esther Wheeler served as Republican National Committee member for Massachusetts. Her service on the national committee brought her into contact with many Republicans as well as Democratic political leaders all over the United States. She became well known througout the country and was highly respected for her ability, her integrity, her courtesy, and gentleness. Tirelessly and selflessly, she worked during the campaigns and when the heat of the campaigns was over, she continued her efforts to strengthen those areas where her party needed strengthening. She was versatile and a person possessing constructive suggestions. She was always ready to help the candidates seeking election on the Republican ticket whether they were seeking major or minor public office.

Esther Wheeler was a leader. But above all, I can truly and honorably say, she was a great American. She was one

of those great and rare persons that because of their life on earth, they have made life for their contemporaries and those who follow fuller, finer, and richer.

Because of her and all that she accomplished, I thank God for permitting her to live during these times. In her own way she made her contribution to this period of American political life. She has carved her place in Massachusetts political history as well as in that of the Nation. As a friend, I mourn with the hundreds who were her friends. May her soul rest in peace.

CBS TELEVISION

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, probably many of my colleagues in the House saw and heard the Old Vic Players in "Hamlet" last night on Columbia Broadcasting System from 9:30 until 11.

This was one of the highlights of the video winter season. I can think of no program in recent years which was better done from a cultural standpoint. We need more of this on TV.

Members of Congress and the FCC are interested in better programing. I feel sure that the networks have been trying to improve programing as time has passed, but we still have a long way to go. One of the ways to keep pay TV out of the picture is a constantly improved program for the major networks.

Congratulations to Dr. Stanton at CBS. This was a great production last night, and well-deserved congratulations are in order.

COMMISSION ON COUNTRY LIFE

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation which, if enacted, would establish a Commission on Country Life.

It just might be that, at first glance, Members of this body—who are called upon daily to study proposals and programs of major importance to our country—might be tempted to postpone consideration of this bill on the grounds that it is just another academic and scholastic appraisal of country living.

The fact is that the need for this Commission is of a top-priority nature—and that far from being an "ivory tower" study group, this Commission would come to grips with the very real problems confronting a large and important segment of our people.

I suppose that there are three very graphic reasons for the formation of this Commission.

These reasons might well be called the past, the present, and the future.

The past amply illustrates the need for this Commission. Fifty-one years ago, there were people who were convinced that President Theodore Roosevelt was appointing just another impractical study group when he assigned a group of people to the first Commission on Country Life.

But the fact remains that from the recommendations of this first Commission came the impetus for many modern rural programs which we today accept as commonplace. The fact remains that the first Commission performed an enormous service to our country by outlining the necessary steps for our country to take in order to close the gaps in social and economic development between the country and the city.

The Country Life Commission of 1908 faced up to the challenge which the 20th century was imposing not only on agriculture, but on all the people who lived outside the environs of the metropolitan community.

And so from the Commission came the impelling force for the great farm cooperatives and organizations which have played such a conspicuous part in rural development. From that Commission came the 4–H movement which has trained so many young people for roles of leadership in life on the land.

In short, the lesson we have from the past is that such a Commission has produced and can again produce a necessary blueprint for progressive rural living.

The present produces widespread evidence for a new Commission. Probably there is no better assessment of the needs of the present in rural living than what has been compiled by the American Country Life Association, which has advocated a Commission on Country Life.

In an initial proposal which it has advanced, the association says:

> Through the years many problems have been solved or at least greatly reduced. This has been brought about by the willingness of rural areas to work together in developing and supporting self-help agencies and organizations.
>
> But in a changing society, there is no permanent answer. In a society such as ours which believes so strongly in the idea of progress, disequilibriums are the natural outcome. The whole does not move forward or respond to the stresses and strains in the same degree as some of its parts. This is particularly characteristic of a society where people are geared to the idea of freedom of thought and action.
>
> Because of this, it seems wise from time to time to engage in a major stocktaking effort. The time is already here when a kind of general balance sheet for country living would be of use in all the major efforts being made to maximize satisfactions of people who are country residents.
>
> The appointment of a body of highly skilled scholars, leaders, and spokesmen for country interests, charged with the responsibility of giving meaning to the forces directing country living today, would seem to be a practical action.
>
> If such a group would do nothing else but come up with some insights on how the technological revolution will alter the concept of agricultural production by family units, it would have served its purpose well.

And what of the future? The ability of rural citizens—those on the farms, in the small communities and in the suburbs—to solve their own problems depends on the tools which only concentrated study and examination can give them today.

We all know the value of research—because in a scientific and technological nature this has been brought home to us with telling effect. The study and blueprint drawing today gear directly into tomorrow. We cannot afford to coast into tomorrow without adequate preparation, without the tools to meet tomorrow's problems.

These, then, are—it seems to me—the most effective arguments for a Commission on Country Life. The record of past accomplishments, the need of today, and the forthcoming challenges of tomorrow.

Now, what of the machinery of this Commission? The bill I am introducing today starts off with a declaration of purpose, and cites the five readily apparent reasons for its introduction—stemming from profound economic changes affecting all phases of human life and endeavor in country communities; the need for greater awareness on the part of all people concerning the interrelatedness of rural and urban forces shaping the country community; the need for a critical and thoughtful appraisal of the forces shaping the country community by rural organizations; the preservation of opportunity for individual and local community initiative in a time of great economic adjustment; and the necessity for the Nation to have a body of objective facts, thoughtful appraisal, and a basis of value to enable our people to make wise decisions in the area of country living.

To implement these goals, a Commission would be appointed to study economic changes in rural living during a period of 2 years. The Commission would be composed of 15 members. Nine of these would be appointed by the President of the United States—but not more than six of this number would be of the same political party.

Three members would be appointed by the President of the Senate, two from the majority party and one from the minority party.

Three members would be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives, two from the majority party and one from the minority party.

The members of the Commission would then select a Chairman from the membership and on completion of its study within the 2-year period, would submit to the President and Congress its final report, including recommendations for legislative action.

This, in brief, and without significant omission, would be the framework of the Commission and a guide to its operation.

There is nothing more for me to say other than to underscore, as forcefully as I can, the nonpartisan and objective nature of this Commission. Last year I was honored to share the authorship of a bill calling for a Commission on Country Life with a man I profoundly admire, the then Democratic Congressman from Arkansas, Brooks Hays.

Mr. Hays is no longer in this House, but I have met with him, and I can assure my

colleagues that he is intensely interested in the welfare of this bill. Both of us agree—as I am sure an overwhelming majority of Members in this body agree—that the need for the Commission is evident.

This year I am privileged to share the authorship with a distinguished member of the majority group in this body, Congressman CLARK THOMPSON, of Texas. Mr. THOMPSON is, as you know, the chairman of the Family Farm Subcommittee of the House Committee on Agriculture and is a man who is thoroughly familiar with the work the Commission would pursue.

I hope that this Congress will give the bill the attention it deserves, because there are few things we can do today which will be of greater service to the future of our rural areas.

LABOR REFORM

Mr. MUMMA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and include a letter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. MUMMA. Mr. Speaker, the labor situation in our country seems to be a very pertinent matter in these times. I was much surprised to receive a letter yesterday from one of the biggest contractors in my district opposing the cutting down of this prehire time. It is now 30 days that a man has the privilege of working and then deciding whether or not he wants to join a labor union. Two of the biggest jobs in my district in the last couple of years were hired under those conditions. I remember one were the contractors from Pittsburgh, Booth & Flynn, who are very big people, and when they started to have the men sent down whom they had to employ they raised an objection and said, "We have 30 days to do this and let the men find out whether they want and like the job, and we should also have the same respect for us to see whether we like him." This letter explains this situation more fully.

The letter is as follows:

H. B. ALEXANDER & SON, INC.,
Harrisburg, Pa., February 18, 1959.

The Honorable WALTER M. MUMMA,
Sixteenth Congressional District, Pennsylvania, House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR "PAPPY": We are in favor of an effective labor reform bill without amendments which would weaken the Taft-Hartley law.

We are opposed to the so-called prehire provisions of S. 505 and the provisions of S. 748, which would legalize secondary boycotts in construction. In our area the 30-day period of employment has worked satisfactorily, and feel sure that a shorter period would not benefit the local building trades union or ourselves. Thirty days gives both the union, ourselves, and the employee being hired a chance to understand the terms and benefits of collective bargaining.

I am particularly concerned with S. 748 and the claim of organized labor that the construction industry considers the secondary boycott amendments as noncontroversial. In our area the building trades unions continually "police" us with much more vim and vigor than they try to organize our competition that plagues us today.

I thought you might like to know that we have written a similar letter to members of the Senate Labor Committee. Your support of fair legislation will be appreciated.

Sincerely and with best wishes,
WALLACE H. ALEXANDER.

DR. CHARLES A. HUFNAGEL

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include a statement.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, on February 22—which also happened to be designated as "Heart Sunday"—the Indiana Society of Washington met to pay honor to a native Hoosier. Appropriately enough, this man—Dr. Charles A. Hufnagel—is known particularly for his work in the field of heart surgery. He has developed a plastic valve which can be surgically inserted into the heart and has already saved many lives as a result of the 350 operations of this sort Dr. Hufnagel has performed.

Although the Surgeon General of the United States, Dr. L. E. Burney, himself a Hoosier, was ill, he had prepared introductory remarks which were read in his behalf on this occasion. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, that Dr. Burney's remarks may be included at this point in the RECORD. We Hoosiers are proud of Dr. Hufnagel and the work that he has done to benefit mankind.

REMARKS BY L. E. BURNEY, M.D., SURGEON GENERAL, PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE, DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

It gives me great pleasure and pride, as a fellow Hoosier and fellow worker in the field of health, to salute the achievements of Dr. Charles A. Hufnagel on the occasion of his being named "Hoosier of the Year."

The State of Indiana may well be proud, and the Nation is most fortunate, that Dr. Hufnagel has chosen to devote his extraordinary abilities to pioneering in the saving of human lives. To my mind, there can be no greater challenge and no higher purpose.

As all of you know, Dr. Hufnagel is a graduate of Notre Dame University, and received his medical degree at Harvard. He has taught at Harvard and at Georgetown University here in Washington. Since 1954 he has been professor of surgery and director of Georgetown's laboratory of experimental medicine. His particular specialization is in the field of heart surgery.

By following this specialty, Dr. Hufnagel has taken his place among the leaders in one of the Nation's most exciting crusades—the attack on our greatest health problem. Every year, more than twice as many Americans die of diseases associated with the heart and circulatory system than from any other cause. At the same time, however, more and more Americans every year are literally being given a new lease on life, thanks to Dr. Hufnagel and his fellow pioneers. Heart conditions considered hopeless 10 years ago are being treated successfully, even routinely, in today's hospitals.

This past Thursday I took part in a meeting here in Washington celebrating a decade of progress against cardiovascular disease. One of the participants, Dr. Michael E. DeBakey of the Baylor University College of Medicine, stated that advancements in heart surgery in the past decade far surpass all previous efforts in this field, and credited this success to what he called "the bold ingenuity and aggressive approach characterizing the surgical attack on these grave diseases."

Dr. Hufnagel's recent contribution in devising a plastic valve for surgical treatment of the condition known as aortic insufficiency is typical of this progress and this approach. This condition, most frequently caused by rheumatic heart disease and syphilis, results in serious overworking of the heart and may cause heart failure. In Dr. Hufnagel's operation, a plastic valve, 1½ inches long, is inserted in the aorta. The artificial valve corrects aortic insufficiency by preventing blood from flowing back into the heart. Already it has saved many lives, and it will save many more.

Dr. DeBakey concluded his talk Thursday morning with a prophecy. "The tremendous strides that have been made in the past decade portend other advances of even greater importance," he said. "The future of cardiovascular surgery is brighter than ever."

I am confident that this prophecy will come true, and that our Hoosier of the Year, who has made brilliant contributions to our present progress, will contribute no less brilliantly to this brighter future.

COMMITTEE ON NONESSENTIAL FEDERAL EXPENDITURES

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of section 601, Public Law 250, 77th Congress, the Chair appoints as a member of the Committee To Investigate Nonessential Federal Expeditures to fill the existing vacancy thereon, the following member of the Committee on Ways and Means: Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania.

CLERK HIRE FOR MEMBERS OF CONGRESS

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, in view of the interest displayed by some Members of Congress on the question of how the money allocated to Congressmen for clerical assistance has been expended, so far as is recalled, never, except with one exception has all the money allocated to the Member from the Fourth District of Michigan been used. That was due to the fact that two of the office employees were seriously ill at the same time and for 2 months all the money available was used. Otherwise there has always been a balance left in the account and to use by the U.S. Treasury.

Two members of my family have been employed by me on occasion, and it is my purpose to keep them on and if possible increase their compensation as time goes on and as they earn additional money. Both are graduates of the University of Michigan. One is also a very competent stenographer. She is doing a more than worthwhile job. A grandson was able and fortunate enough to get another very fine girl to accept his offer of marriage. They both are very good analysts.

Having tried jury cases for something like 30 years, bitter experience taught me that thoroughness was essential; that facts were all important; conclusions, while helpful, not to be relied upon.

For each of the employees referred to, I have subscribed to and out of my own funds paid for publications like the Chicago Tribune, an independent advocate of constitutional government; the News-Palladium and the Herald-Press, of Benton Harbor and St. Joseph; five other dailies published in the district; the U.S. News & World Report; local weekly papers, and several additional national publications.

Copies of these publications go to the home address of the two employees. They are read, their contents evaluated, clipped and classified under the system patterned after that of the West Publishing Co. which publishes, analyzes, and classifies, under many different heads, court decisions written by the U.S. courts, from the State supreme courts on through the list of Federal courts.

Through the activity of these two employees—and their work includes classification of my own statements as published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—I am able from day to day, with the assistance of my very competent office force here, to put my hand on material which is relevant to discussions occurring on the floor; to proposed legislation coming to the committees and the floor of the House.

Because of this work and its preservation over the last 25 years, it has been my privilege frequently to furnish others information which they sought. The service is invaluable to me in carrying on my duties as the people's representative.

As stated, both the son and the grandson were extremely fortunate to be favored by these two most estimable and capable women. Excuse a personal observation—I likewise have been lucky, as was my father and grandfather, to be looked upon with favor by typical American women—housewives, bless your heart—who were not only good cooks, but intelligent up-to-the-day women, who not only possessed their share of good sense but with sound economic views.

Think I have told you before that for some reason to this day unexplained, I was enabled to induce the belle of the town in which I opened my law office at the advanced age of 21 years, though I had no visible income, to accept my proposal, and, to the wonder of our mutual friends, she has been able for 59 years—plus a few months—to put up with the situation.

So as you, my colleagues, pat yourselves on the back because your kind-heartedness has enabled you to tolerate me for some 20-odd years, just remember that the good wife somehow has been able to survive a similar situation for twice that long.

No apology is offered because of employment of these, by marriage, relatives. Each is doing the work assigned her; each is earning every penny of the money she receives. My only regret is that some Members seem to think that an apology is necessary if a relative, either by blood or marriage, is on the congressional payroll.

In view of the fact that a former Speaker of this House—that grand old man of Texas—John Garner—of whose wife it might, with but little, if any exaggeration, be said, was a major part of the partnership, saw fit to take advantage of the opportunity for able and faithful service, there is no reason why Members of less responsibility or years of service should not employ relatives who earn whatever is paid to them.

It perhaps is unfortunate that the press did not list the employees of other Members of the House where the surnames of employees were not the same as that of the Member. The press published the names of but 60-odd Congressmen. Undoubtedly, in fact I know of Members of Congress whose names were not given, who have relatives on the payroll.

Must confess that, once upon a time, in 1957, there was a 14-year-old young American, Thomas A. Schultz, Jr., on my payroll. He was the son of Marine Lt. Thomas A. Schultz, who died on Saipan in World War II when the boy was but 6 months old. The son was privileged to receive the Navy Cross posthumously awarded his father.

His mother came to the office when her own Congressman ceased to serve. She was employed by me, and the boy, after school hours and on Saturdays, was put to work in the office by other employees. Seeing him busy about the office, doing necessary chores and, naturally, believing that the laborer is worthy of his hire—even though no relationship could be figured out—he was put on the payroll at a nominal sum.

I may even, for all I know, have violated the minimum wage, Walsh-Healey, Bacon-Davis, and some other acts by giving the boy a job. But he enjoyed the work, earned his money—and just who and why should anyone object?

I know, too, of some instances where the wife renders a service at least as valuable to the people of the Congressman's district as does the Congressman himself. My only suggestion is, "Let your conscience be your guide" and do not worry.

ELECTION OF MEMBER TO COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privilege resolution (H. Res. 184) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That JOHN H. RAY, New York, be, and he is hereby, elected a member of the standing Committee of the House of Representatives on the Judiciary.

The resolution was agreed to.

COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking and Currency may have permission to sit today during general debate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

EXPENSES OF COMMITTEE ON LEGISLATIVE OVERSIGHT

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. FRIEDEL].

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration I submit a privileged resolution (H. Res. 181) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That House Resolution 136, Eighty-sixth Congress, agreed to January 29, 1959, is hereby amended by striking "$125,000" and inserting "$475,000".

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRIEDEL. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Let us have a little explanation of what is going on here.

Mr. FRIEDEL. I think the gentleman is entitled to an explanation. I am glad that the chairman of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee is here, my distinguished colleague from Arkansas [Mr. HARRIS]. I am sure he will give the gentleman an explanation.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I shall be glad to explain to the gentleman. The purpose of this resolution is the appropriation of $350,000 for an investigating committee, $200,000 of which is budgeted for carrying out the program as recommended in the report of the Legislative Oversight Committee of the last Congress, in making the study and investigation of those items which the committee found badly needed investigating.

One hundred and fifty thousand dollars is to make a special study which everyone who is familiar with it feels should be made on the utilization and the allocation of the spectrum in connection with our communications facilities.

Mr. GROSS. How much did you get last year? How much increase are you asking—$350,000?

Mr. HARRIS. No. We are asking for the $350,000—yes; so far as the increase is concerned, but I do not believe that would be correct if he is relating it to last year's expenditures.

Mr. GROSS. Is this in addition to moneys already appropriated to the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee?

Mr. HARRIS. It is in addition to the money which was provided for the committee a few days ago for the regular work of the committee. This is for special studies.

Mr. GROSS. How much does it total?

Mr. HARRIS. In total it amounts to $475,000.

Mr. GROSS. This is a lot of money, does not the gentleman think so?

Mr. HARRIS. Yes; and it is a lot of work.

Mr. GROSS. Do you see any Goldfine cases on the horizon?

Mr. HARRIS. No; I do not at the moment. I did not see the other one when we started out 2 years ago.

Mr. GROSS. It seems to me this is a lot of money to provide one committee. I do compliment the gentleman and his committee on the job it did in the Goldfine case.

Mr. HARRIS. Thank you very much. I assure the gentleman it will be the intention of the committee to carry out its responsibilities toward the objectives we started out on last year.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRIEDEL. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. The gentleman held some very helpful hearings last year, one especially helpful to the people of the Fourth District of Michigan. Undoubtedly the chairman will recall, however, that in one hearing the committee records were taken from the files and carted over to Drew Pearson's office. Has anything been done to prevent a repetition of that procedure?

Mr. HARRIS. In the first place, the gentleman is slightly incorrect. On that very important evening the records, or many of the files, were taken out of the office and carried around over town, but they were not, as far as I know, carted to Mr. Drew Pearson's office; they went to the apartment of another person.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I stand corrected, but it was an employee of Drew Pearson who did some of the carting around. Jack Anderson is the gentleman I am talking about.

Mr. HARRIS. He was with the other person, yes.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. My question is whether any steps have been taken to prevent a repetition.

Mr. HARRIS. The committee took steps. It was contrary to present law and was in violation of the criminal law, and we made recommendations to the Department of Justice to act accordingly.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Did you get any suggestion out of those who were doing the carting, or out of Pearson that they would not do it any more?

Mr. HARRIS. No; we did not get that promise.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Did you get any prosecution?

Mr. HARRIS. Not yet.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Will you?

Mr. HARRIS. We made the recommendation and we are urging the Department to act. We sent a report down.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I think it would be well to follow up action of that kind.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ISTHMIAN CANAL POLICIES—A CHALLENGE TO THE CONGRESS

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, in previous addresses to the House on the Panama Canal, I have dealt at length with interoceanic canal problems, especially the diplomatic and juridical, following the Suez crisis of 1956. Two recent events have again attracted world attention to the Isthmus.

The first was a Panamanian enactment signed by President Ernesto de la Guardia on December 18, 1958, which declared the extension of Panama's territorial waters from the internationally recognized 3-mile limit to a 12-mile limit; the second, the refusal of the Panama National Assembly to reconsider this action as requested on January 9, 1959 in a note by the U.S. Government. The first was treated by me in an address to the House, also on January 9, 1959.

Certainly, a matter so charged with serious implications as control of the approaches of the Panama Canal, which are essential for its successful operation and protection, cannot remain unchallenged and unclarified. They require a further statement so that the people and the Congress of the United States, all maritime nations, and various interests that use the canal, may be better informed.

In approaching this complicated subject, I wish to stress that the issues are fundamental, and challenge the right of the United States to meet its treaty obligations. Thus, they transcend all personal or political considerations and must be considered on the highest plane of statesmanship. Also, I desire to emphasize that, as regards the Republic of Panama and its people, I hold both in the highest esteem, and count many Panamanian citizens as valued friends of many years standing.

To this task of clarification, I now address myself.

UNITED STATES REACTED PROMPTLY

When reacting to the ex parte action of Panama allegedly extending its maritime jurisdiction surrounding the Canal Zone, what position did the U.S. Government take?

The note delivered on January 9 by our Ambassador to Panama contained the following significant points:

First. Stated that the United States considers the action of the Republic of Panama regrettable in view of a forthcoming international conference to consider the width of territorial seas.

Second. Expressed the view that there is no basis in international law for claims to territorial seas in excess of 3 nautical miles, and that there is no obligation on the part of States adhering to the 3-mile limit to recognize claims of other States for greater widths.

Third. Requested the Government of Panama to reconsider its action and reserved its rights in the area affected by the Panamanian enactment.

Fourth. Based the rights of the United States on article XXIV of the 1903 Hay-Bunau-Varilla Treaty.

Because of the importance of this provision, I shall quote it:

> No change either in the Government or in the laws and treaties of the Republic of Panama shall, without the consent of the United States, affect any right of the United States under the present convention, or under any treaty stipulation between the two countries that now exists or may hereafter exist touching the subject matter of this convention.

The meaning of this treaty provision is clear and unambiguous. It should preclude application through unilateral action by Panama derogating in any manner the rights, power, and authority of the United States and world shipping with respect to the Panama Canal and Canal Zone. But it does not protect against agitations revealed as conforming to a worldwide conspiratorial program of Communist origin against the United States.

As could be expected, Mr. Speaker, by anyone adequately familiar with Isthmian diplomatic history, a formal request by the United States in a matter so vital could only lead to acrimonious and futile international debate. It is, indeed, significant that Panama quickly distributed copies of its action to all legislative bodies of the world in an effort to gain worldwide support for its unjustifiable attempt at boundary revision.

Most certainly, Mr. Speaker, the questions involved, which are covered by basic treaties, should not be permitted to become topics for debate. This can be prevented only by a clear-cut, unequivocal declaration by the Congress of the United States reasserting our historic and practiced Isthmian Canal policies.

PANAMA NATIONAL ASSEMBLY'S REFUSAL

Specifically, in response to the request of the United States, what did the Panama National Assembly actually do? It voted on January 13, 1959, after receipt of the U.S. protest, not to reconsider, for any reason whatever, the currently attempted extension of its maritime domain to the 12-mile limit. The prime purpose for this effort is obvious: encirclement of the Canal Zone with 9 miles of alleged Panamanian waters at each end, in effect, making the zone another Berlin.

It called upon all friendly nations to support the Panamanian pronouncement and directed that copies of the resolution be transmitted to all legislative bodies of the world. It castigated this speaker [Mr. FLOOD] as being public enemy No. 1 of Panama. It hurled numerous invectives that will receive no attention from him except to say that he has always been, and is, a true and realistic friend of Panama and its people; and that he will not be deflected from the proper discharge of his duty as a Member of the Congress of the United States by what must seem to those who view the situation objectively as the heedless, if not childish, actions of leaders in the Panama National Assembly.

Especially noteworthy, however, was the failure of the national assembly or its leaders to meet adequately the historical, diplomatic, and juridical objections that have been repeatedly made on the floor of the House and published in the press of Panama. Rather, they have ignored or attempted to confuse these statements of facts.

UNDERLYING PANAMANIAN OBJECTIVES REVEALED

Of far greater significance, Mr. Speaker, than either the formal actions or failures of the National Assembly on the indicated occasion, was the revelation, in the heat of the 4-hour full dress debate preceding adoption of its resolution, of the principal underlying political aims of certain Panamanian leaders.

Deputy Aquilino Boyd, a former Foreign Minister of Panama, and now a candidate for President, made the following points:

First. Demanded that Panama receive half of the gross revenues of the Panama Canal.

Second. Asserted that the Panama Canal is now surrounded by 9 miles of exclusively Panamanian waters in which Panama can exercise definite acts of sovereignty.

Third. Enumerated these alleged acts of sovereignty as follows:

(a) Requiring the display of the Panama flag on vessels entering Panamanian waters.

(b) Exercising of vigilance over shipping to maintain internal security.

(c) Regulating fishing activities.

(d) Trying of persons for offenses committed on board ships in Panamanian waters.

(e) Requiring foreign war vessels to comply with Panamanian navigation rules.

(f) Enforcing customs, fiscal and sanitation regulations.

Imagine sanitation regulations to be enforced by Panama. God help the Canal Zone—God help Panama—God help everybody. You will have yellow fever and malaria once more devastating Panama and Central America and the southern United States. We want to help these people with our foreign-aid programs and with our point 4 programs. That is one criticism I have had of our foreign aid program and point 4 programs—every dollar of which I have supported from the very beginning. Not enough goes to Central and South America and to the Caribbean. It should be better handled and more should go to them. Let us teach these people how to help themselves so that they can handle their sanitation problems for their own welfare and for the welfare of the world. But, they are not yet ready. This is not paternalism—this is true friendship to our neighbors to the south. My heart is with them. My heart is with them but not with this cheap demagoguery. Why the best way in the world to be elected justice of the peace in Panama City is to stand up and to say, "The canal is ours. Give us the canal." How can you lose?

Deputy Alfredo Aleman, Jr., though less definite than Boyd, suggested that Panama may, first, charge vessels entering Panamanian waters for costs of aids to navigation; and, second, enforce Panamanian labor laws on Panama-flag vessels entering Panamanian waters.

Is that not a nice way to destroy the American merchant marine? That is the way to get elected, Mr. Speaker. I need not tell you, but if you have any doubt, read this.

These are some of the many requirements that Panama probably would impose if the validity of its enactment were ever conceded. Their significance is readily apparent to the ship operators of all nations as it is to all who are informed on the problems of the Panama Canal.

Should Candidate Boyd's insistence on 50 percent of the gross annual canal revenues for Panama, which would approximate $43 million as compared to $3,800,000 for present net revenues, ever prevail, the resulting deficit of approximately $40 million would have to be borne by the overburdened American taxpayer or world shipping, with possible liquidation of the entire canal enterprise. This factor alone clearly illustrates how reckless politicians sometimes can involve themselves in proposals that are absolutely ridiculous and absurd.

Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, in view of the assertions and demands listed above and facts elsewhere developed in this address, I submit that if Panama has any enemy No. 1, he is not in the United States, but among its own radical leaders who, for political advantage, seem willing to bring their country to the brink of disaster.

PANAMA CANAL, A MANDATE FOR CIVILIZATION

Mr. Speaker, for a number of years I have served on the Committee on Appropriations with assignments to subcommittees for the Department of Defense, the Department of Commerce, and related agencies. The last includes the Panama Canal Company and the Canal Zone Government. Hence, I have lived with the canal situation over a long period of time. Visiting the Canal Zone on official duty on a number of occasions and reading widely in isthmian history, I have made a number of predictions in the past.

It is indeed a sterile satisfaction to me that all my fears have been justified in what has been a progressive deterioration and piecemeal liquidation of U.S. rights with respect to the Panama Canal.

Often have I pondered why such conditions as now prevail should ever have been allowed to develop at this crossroads of world shipping. I have come to the very definite conclusion that they are not accidental, but the result of a sustained effort in a long-range program in which the United States has unfortunately failed over a long period to meet its treaty obligations in safeguarding some essential features in management of the great waterway.

We undertook this tremendous task, Mr. Speaker, as a "mandate for civilization." It is up to us to measure up to that trust and not fail in it.

ATTEMPTED ENCIRCLEMENT VIOLATES TREATY

The principal historical and juridical facts that I have previously endeavored to present to the Congress with extensive documentation are: That the Panama Canal is an artery for world commerce; that its construction was undertaken by the United States at its own expense pursuant to international agreements, the 1901 Hay-Pauncefote Treaty, and the 1903 Hay-Bunau-Varilla Treaty; that the Canal Zone is constitutionally acquired domain of the United States in perpetuity for canal purposes; that the grant of this territory, "rights, power, and authority" within the Zone, and its "auxiliary lands and waters," is to the "entire exclusion of the exercise by the Republic of Panama of any such sovereign rights, power, or authority"; and that the treaty set up provides likewise for exclusive U.S. control over the maritime approaches from one high sea to the other as essential for free and open navigation and for efficient canal operation.

In 1903, when the Hay-Bunau-Varilla Treaty was ratified by Panama and the United States, the limits of the territorial waters of the Republic of Panama and Canal Zone were coterminus. No subsequent international agreement has changed those limits. To be valid, any change in them must be authorized in treaty or other convention in which all affected parties participate. Moreover, even if Panama could, by legislative action, extend its jurisdiction over the sea approaches to the canal, immediately the provisions of articles II and III of the 1903 treaty would become operative and apply to these approaches, which would become portions of the Canal Zone with exclusive jurisdiction for canal purposes vested in the United States.

At this point, I quote text of the indicated articles II and III of the 1903 Hay-Bunau-Varilla Treaty, which are commended for careful study:

ARTICLE II

The Republic of Panama grants to the United States in perpetuity the use, occupation and control of a zone of land and land under water for the construction, maintenance, operation, sanitation, and protection of said canal of the width of 10 miles extending to the distance of 5 miles on each side of the center line of the route of the canal to be constructed; the said zone beginning in the Caribbean Sea 3 marine miles from mean low water mark and extending to and across the Isthmus of Panama into the Pacific Ocean to a distance of 3 marine miles from mean low water mark with the proviso that the cities of Panama and Colon and the harbors adjacent to said cities, which are included within the boundaries of the zone above described, shall not be included within this grant. The Republic of Panama further grants to the United States in perpetuity the use, occupation and control of any other lands and waters outside of the zone above described which may be necessary and convenient for the construction, maintenance, operation, sanitation, and protection of the said canal or of any auxiliary canals or other works necessary and convenient for the construction, maintenance, operation, sanitation and protection of the said enterprise.

The Republic of Panama further grants in like manner to the United States in perpetuity all islands within the limits of the zone above described and in addition thereto the group of small islands in the Bay of Panama, named Perico, Naos, Culebra, and Flamenco.

ARTICLE III

The Republic of Panama grants to the United States all the rights, power, and authority within the zone mentioned and described in article II of this agreement and within the limits of all auxiliary lands and waters mentioned and described in said article II which the United States would possess and exercise if it were the sovereign of the territory within which said lands and waters

are located to the entire exclusion of the exercise by the Republic of Panama of any such sovereign rights, power, or authority.

Special attention is directed to the last sentence of the first paragraph of article II.

Thus, Mr. Speaker, the recently attempted surrounding of the Panama Canal by Panama is not only a violation of international law but a clear transgression of existing treaties that must not be countenanced. Therefore, the problem is one of juridical character in which the rights of the United States and world shipping must be protected. The Department of State acted wisely in its note on January 9, 1959, refusing to recognize the claim of Panama to a "greater width of territorial sea."

SOVEREIGNTY ISSUE FELLED, EMBALMED, AND BURIED

More than half a century has passed since acquisition in 1904 of the Canal Zone. The key figures in that historic event have passed away and none with comparable knowledge or experience have taken their places. The canal enterprise has long been accepted by our people as a solved problem, with resulting lack of public interest.

Hence, it is not surprising that few persons realize that the central issue in the current canal situation, that of titular sovereignty, is not new. Rather it is an old one in a new guise.

In 1904, this issue was felled by Gov. George W. Davis and Secretary of State Hay. In 1905–06 and 1909, it was embalmed by Secretary of War and President-Elect Taft, respectively. In 1923, it was buried by Secretary of State Hughes.

So what do we actually have: The exhumed corpse of a dead issue—a veritable political zombie.

VIEWS OF SECRETARIES HAY AND HUGHES

The diplomatic history of the sovereignty question is too long and complicated to be comprehensively covered here. But I do wish to quote Secretary Hughes, who, in 1923, when facing a comparable situation, handled it effectively.

In a conversation with the then Minister of Panama to the United States, Mr. Hughes, on December 15, 1923, declared with a refreshing degree of candor and vigor that the United States "would never recede from the position which it had taken in the note of Secretary Hay in 1904. This Government could not, and would not, enter into any discussion affecting its full right to deal with the Canal Zone under article III of the treaty of 1903 as if it were sovereign of the Canal Zone and to the entire exclusion of any sovereign rights or authority on the part of Panama"—Foreign Relations, 1923, volume III, page 684.

To this Secretary Hughes added:

It was an absolute futility for the Panamanian Government to expect any American administration, no matter what it was, and President or any Secretary of State, ever to surrender any part of these rights which the United States had acquired under the treaty of 1903.

That, Mr. Speaker, is the type of incisive treatment required today. We must not sit back and let evil triumph through our own indifference.

MARITIME-DEFENSE INTERESTS RECOGNIZE DANGERS

The inherent dangers in the situation at Panama, though not generally recognized yet in the United States, seem better understood in other maritime nations. In addition to the United States, other great maritime nations have addressed notes of protest to Panama: The United Kingdom, Japan, and France.

But far more alert to these problems than peoples and governments have been various shipping interests of the United States and other nations that use the canal and pay tolls. Moreover, our defense agencies are fully aware of the hazards and strongly oppose further weakening of our position in the isthmian area. All these interests look to the Congress for leadership in protecting the Panama Canal enterprise, for they know that to yield in principle will be fatal.

Another important consideration that should be kept in mind is that the extremely radical agitation hostile to the United States which obtains in Panama may be well calculated to induce among Panamanians, employed in the Panama Canal and United States defense organizations on the isthmus, a like hostility. Where will all this lead? Conceivably out of the large number of Panamanians employed under the recent treaty stipulations some might be brought to a similar viewpoint with resulting injury to the United States. If, for instance, any such Panamanians with communistic leanings, should decide to sabotage the canal on defense installations, the United States would be in a large measure powerless to prevent it.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, how important it is that Panama as well as the United States should undertake no decisive step affecting their mutual relations except with advance notice and full discussions. The action of Panama in undertaking, in the absence of such notice, to extend in arbitrary fashion its sea limits is certainly not to be commended anywhere at any time—especially so where the welfare and destiny of nations are involved.

"MILK COW" DIPLOMACY STARTED AT PANAMA

When viewing the tremendous foreign aid programs of the United States today, many have wondered when and where they started. They were not launched with the Marshall plan in 1947, at Yalta in 1945, nor at Teheran in 1943, but for Panama in 1936.

On March 2 in that year, with the signing of the Hull-Alfaro Treaty, was started a process of isthmian surrenders by our Government that has not yet been officially ended. It was further advanced in the 1955 Eisenhower-Remon Treaty, ratified by the United States without adequate public discussion and debate.

The results of the ensuing relinquishments have been withdrawal of important canal activities to the limits of the Canal Zone and impairment of some of them in it, but without surrender of the fundamental principle of exclusive Canal Zone sovereignty.

Perhaps the most notorious treaty action was that concerning the strategically important Panama Railroad, which, without authority of the Congress, was slated for liquidation.

As one who participated in blocking that effort, I speak with the background of personal knowledge. Imagine this, Mr. Speaker. While the treaty power was giving away the highly valuable terminal yards and passenger stations of that railroad, the Congress was saving its main line from abandonment. Now we are going to have a rail link without its adequately planned terminals. Can you imagine anything more ridiculously inept?

Altogether, events at Panama bring to mind the fact that in the times prior to the secession of Panama in 1903 from Colombia that Panama, because of its transcontinental railroad and resulting income, was long looked upon as the "milk cow" of Colombia.

Conditions have now changed. The Panama Canal, through our diplomatic failures, has become the "milk cow" of Panama; and the United States, the "milk cow" of the world.

PANAMA CANAL NOT A RELIEF AGENCY

Among the striking evidences of our extremely generous policy in Panama were the 1955 treaty provisions for donations of valuable properties (more than $25 million) in the cities of Colon and Panama to the Republic, without any but token consideration, also for raising the annuity supposed to be paid by the Panama Canal Company from $430,000 to $1,930,000.

The impact of these and other gifts on the operation of the Panama Canal will be felt for many years. In a diplomatic sense they mean that the canal enterprise, an interoceanic commercial undertaking, has been used as an international relief agency. This confusion of a vast business project with foreign relief is unbelievable, for business and foreign aid are separate functions and should be kept so.

Fortunately, the Congress has taken the first step toward correcting this error, with legislation transferring responsibility for the additional $1,500,000 to the annuity from the Panama Canal Company to the Department of State, which was responsible for it. This transfer, though just so far as the Department of State is concerned, remains a charge against the United States and must be borne by our taxpayers.

As an independent interoceanic public utility under the President, the Panama Canal operations must not be confused and weakened through ill-considered policies of placation, for it is not a local project for local political exploitation. Instead, it is one required by law, pursuant to treaty, to be self-sustaining with tolls that are "just and equitable" for the transit of vessels of all nations on terms of equality.

These, Mr. Speaker, are prime responsibilities of the United States for the implementation of which the Congress is the final authority.

PANAMA NO LONGER POSSESSES MONOPOLY OF CANAL ROUTES

Many explanations for the extreme and radical demands concerning the Panama Canal, emanating from the isthmus and elsewhere, may be given. But one of the most potent factors underlying them is the erroneous assumption in Panama that no other location exists for another Isthmian Canal—an assumption that is responsible for the bold, radical, and ever-increasing demands put forth in behalf of Panama.

During the crucial years of Panama Canal history, 1902–06, when the great decisions as to the choice of route and type of canal were made, Panama was undoubtedly the best choice from every controlling point of view, especially operations, engineering, and economy. Without question, the proper decisions were made, and many years of successful operations fully justify them.

But limitations that then applied, especially in engineering, no longer hold. All major engineering problems were solved long ago and now there are other routes competitive with the Panama route for major increase of interoceanic transit capacity.

Made even more competitive by the effects of the 1936 and 1955 treaty factors at Panama, together with extreme demands and actions in that country, some of these routes may be passing the Panama route in desirability from several important standpoints, including a more satisfactory political climate—a determining factor, other things being equal.

At this moment, Mr. Speaker, pursuant to authorization of the House of Representatives, a distinguished Board of Consultants under the direction of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries is delving into the question of a canal at another location to take care of the greatly increased Isthmian traffic of the future. These unjustifiable occurrences in Panama will doubtless cause this Board to search, with the utmost zeal, for another route.

To say the least, the current absurd and reckless demands under radical leadership at Panama may well force the United States to the alternative of another trans-isthmian waterway in preference to submission to the prohibitive costs inevitably involved in these demands.

UNITED STATES NOT THE "COMMON ENEMY" OF PANAMA

Among the most gratifying of my experiences in connection with the canal question are the many assurances of support, from various parts of the nation and from the isthmus. I am especially happy to state also that much of this support comes from thoughtful Panamanians, among whom the United States has many understanding friends. They very definitely do not approve of the extreme agitations and unrealistic demands affecting the Panama Canal that have been made since the 1956 Suez crisis. They know the history of their country and that their independence grew out of the canal enterprise. They appreciate that their nation's welfare depends on the efficient operation and management of the Panama Canal under the control of the United States. They also know that the United States is not their "common enemy" but their true and tested friend.

Unfortunately, the actions of some of their heedless leaders and agitators seem more determined to follow the example of Egypt in the Suez crisis and Communist leads rather than the real interests of their country. Their official actions present grave questions for the United States that must be adequately met.

RADICAL DEMANDS FOSTER DRIVES FOR INTERNATIONALIZATION

The vast majority of the North American and Panamanian people look upon the Panama Canal as an ageless institution. But this is not true. Those who know its history understand that were the United States ever to withdraw from the Panama Canal, the results would, indeed, be tragic for Panama and world commerce.

Attacks on U.S. jurisdiction are not new. They trace back to discussions in 1917 in Petrograd between the Red Guard and John Reed, a notorious American Communist newspaper reporter now buried in the Kremlin. During recent years an important factor in the agitations and disorders that have occurred on the isthmus has been their communistic pattern and design. In fact, international communism in 1956, following the Suez crisis, opened its agitational campaign aimed at wresting control of the Canal Zone from the United States by means of agents trained at the State College for Political and Social Science at Prague, Czechoslovakia.

Indeed, it is most extraordinary that a few U.S. citizens, including several in high stations in life, have, since 1956, urged internationalization, a proposal that conforms to the long-range Soviet program that is so hostile to the United States. It is significant, however, that these leaders have never advocated nationalization by Panama. I hope that they and all others with similar views will study the isthmian question in all its phases. Then they should be able to form judgments based upon political realities and not idealistic theory or wishful thinking.

The great mass of the American people, especially those who have served with the Panama Canal organization or in the Armed Forces in the isthmian area and know the problems at firsthand, undoubtedly favor continued U.S. control. The radical demands in Panama hence cannot in any way serve to benefit that country, but they do aid and abet proposals for internationalization now being strenuously agitated from Communist sources. Such event, I know from a large correspondence, thoughtful Panamanians and Americans do not wish to occur. Significantly, it may be added, there have been no Communist proposals for nationalization of the canal by Panama.

Hence, all these radical and impossible demands in Panama can have but one result, that of helping to dig the grave of the Panamanian Republic. The retirement of the United States from control of the canal would certainly be fatal to Panama—fatal not only to its economy but also to its independence. It must be obvious, Mr. Speaker, to all thoughtful Panamanians, as well as North Americans, that though radical elements may be planning murder, they are actually preparing for suicide.

MUTUAL UNDERSTANDING NOT A ONE-WAY PROCESS

Mr. Speaker, when the 1955 treaty with Panama was concluded, the people of the United States assumed that it would demonstrate the mutual understanding and cooperation of the two countries for many years to come. This was accompanied by the specific provision that neither the 1903 nor 1936 treaties with Panama, nor the 1955 treaty, may be modified except by mutual consent.

How generously the United States has met its isthmian obligations is a matter of record. Some of them have been authorized by law; for example, the $20 million bridge across the canal at Balboa. This project, for which bids were to be opened on February 11, if built, should improve economic conditions at Panama during construction and later serve the hinterland of the Republic.

But how well have certain Panamanian leaders, some of whom are in high stations, met the basic treaty obligation of mutual understanding and cooperation? The answer to this, Mr. Speaker, is also a matter of record—hostile agitations and propaganda against the United States, which has been repeatedly presented to the Congress in documentary form. Yet so far, the United States has taken no adequate action.

This treaty of 1955, Mr. Speaker, was designed to compose the economic and other relationships between the United States and Panama for the foreseeable future. Undoubtedly, this was the intention of the treatymakers of both countries. Yet as soon as the United States implemented the treaty provisions, these radical demands in Panama arose and the recent assembly action was taken. By the same token, we can certainly expect that, if all the radical demands in Panama are granted, even greater and more peremptory ones are to be expected. This is certainly not the process of mutual understanding contemplated in the 1955 treaty.

In view of all this, will not the questions arise in the minds of U.S. taxpayers:

First. Who must bear the ultimate cost made necessary by that treaty, including the $20 million bridge at Balboa, where an adequate free ferry provided by the United States has long been satisfactorily functioning?

Second. Why should we be taxed to meet these costs when they fail to achieve the intended purpose of good will and mutual understanding on which they were based?

In this connection, I may say, that my correspondence voices strong demands that the Balboa bridge project be suspended until the attempted incirclement of the Canal Zone by Panama is rescinded.

ISTHMIAN CANAL POLICIES A CHALLENGE TO THE CONGRESS

Mr. Speaker, from what has been said here today, it is clear that the isthmian question is headed toward even graver developments than have so far transpired. These are not the words of a prophet, but deductions enabled by close observation and study, and the realization of what occurred in 1958 when riots, taking place during student demonstrations against the Panamanian Government, were responsible for the deaths of many Panamanians. Current reports of expected revolt in Panama, coupled with finding of arms caches in that Republic, and other recent revolutionary events in the Caribbean, presage future grave incidents which, in tragic consequences, may make those of May 1958 appear insignificant.

The history of the isthmus is complicated and not understood as it should be, either in Panama or the United States. Its problems are grave; and they can be surmounted only if dealt with promptly and effectively.

Mr. Speaker, the situation with respect to the Panama Canal is, indeed, of the gravest character. Those in charge of the Communist movement in Latin America, and especially in the Caribbean area, have undoubtedly focused their conspiratorial activities on the Panama Canal with the purpose of causing the destruction of amicable relations between the United States and Panama, with complete liquidation of U.S. controls over the canal itself.

While I would not charge that the Government of Panama is one of communistic character, yet it is undoubtedly true that overall Communist purpose is to subvert any Government where situations present themselves as fertile fields for communistic endeavors. They are always fishing in troubled waters and, with the devil's cunning, are usually able to capitalize on situations thus created. Therefore, it is but natural that the Soviet Government should properly "recognize" the ex parte territorial declaration by Panama touching the matter of sea approaches to the Canal. So far as I know, Panama made no appeal or gave any notice to any international body or to the great maritime nations using the canal as to its intention to take the gravely important step involved. This certainly did not serve the purpose of "mutual understanding and cooperation" that should prevail. Small wonder that it has met with Soviet approval.

Commenting further on Soviet influence in the Caribbean area, we must recall that in 1958 in Venezuela and just now in Cuba, occurred the overthrow of two Latin American Governments, with daily reports of summary executions in the latter country that were shocking to the people of all lands of constitutional liberty. Only governments of law can bring peace and prosperity.

We may well expect other convulsions in the Caribbean area, especially in the littoral nations of the American isthmus, and this regardless of whether there are any basic justifications. The obvious Communist objective is the maritime separation of the two coasts of the United States by Communist controlled countries, as illustrated by the recent Communist effort in Guatemala.

To meet these situations, it is necessary to understand the issues in their broadest sense and that they are exceptional. Their handling requires men of exceptional qualifications. The past failures in some important isthmian policies are frightening. In every sense, they constitute a serious challenge to the Congress.

As to the basic question of future major increases of transit capacity, as previously stated, an inquiry into that is underway by men of the highest professional attainments and independence. In regard to discussions of sovereignty and jurisdiction over the Canal Zone and Panama Canal, that matter is now before the Congress in House Concurrent Resolution 33, 86th Congress. This measure would reaffirm our long-established and practiced isthmian policies, serve notice that this Nation will continue its control over the Panama Canal, and counter the movements now converging on the Isthmus of Panama.

Mr. Speaker, the United States, in some of its policies, has played the part of "Uncle Sap" long enough. The time has come to resume its historic role of "Uncle Sam"—a role, though generous in its policies, was firm in the protection of the Nation's just interests.

As partial documentation upon which some of the foregoing remarks are based, under leave accorded, I include a copy of House Concurrent Resolution 33, 86th Congress and a number of statements published in the United States and Panama, commended for perusal, especially by committees of the Congress that deal with interoceanic canal questions.

Among the statements quoted, special attention is invited to that of former President Harmodio Arias, who presents the Panamanian viewpoint, which I believe, are fully answered in this and previous addresses I have made on the subject.

The resolution and statements follow:

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 33

Whereas there is now being strongly urged in certain quarters of the world the surrender, by the United States, without reimbursement, of the Panama Canal, to the United Nations or to some other international organization for the ownership and operation of the canal; and

Whereas the United States, at the expense of its taxpayers and under, and fully relying on, treaty agreements, constructed the canal, and since its completion, at large expenditure, has maintained and operated it and provided for its protection and defense; and

Whereas the United States, following the construction of the canal, has since maintained, operated, and protected it in strict conformity with treaty requirements and agreements, and has thus made it free, without restriction or qualification, for the shipping of the entire world; and, in consequence of which, with respect to the canal and the Canal Zone, every just and equitable consideration favors the continuance of the United States in the exercise of all the rights and authority by treaty provided, and in the discharge of the duties by treaty imposed: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That (1) it is the sense and judgment of the Congress that the United States should not, in any wise, surrender to any other government or authority its jurisdiction over, and control of, the Canal Zone, and its ownership, control, management, maintenance, operation, and protection of the Panama Canal, in accordance with existing treaty provisions; and that (2) it is to the best interests—not only of the United States, but, as well, of all nations and peoples—that all the powers, duties, authority, and obligations of the United States in the premises be continued in accordance with existing treaty provisions.

[Department of State press release, Jan. 10, 1959]

UNITED STATES DELIVERS NOTE TO PANAMA ON 12-MILE TERRITORIAL SEA LAW

Our Ambassador to Panama delivered on January 9 a note to the Panamanian Government in which the United States stated its nonrecognition of the provisions of the recently enacted Panamanian law providing for a 12-mile territorial sea and reserved all of its rights in the area which is the subject of the law. The text of the U.S. note is as follows:

"EXCELLENCY: I have the honor to refer to your note No. 1096, dated December 23, 1958, transmitting a copy of Republic of Panama Law No. 58, of December 18, 1958, which has as its purpose the extension of the territorial sea of the Republic of Panama to a distance of 12 miles from the coast.

"I have been instructed to state that the U.S. Government considers this action of the Republic of Panama is regrettable in view of the recent action of the United Nations General Assembly in voting overwhelmingly to call an international conference to consider the breadth of the territorial sea and fishery matters.

"It is the view of my Government, as expressed at the United Nations Law of the Sea Conference and on previous occasions, that no basis exists in international law for claims to a territorial sea in excess of 3 nautical miles from the baseline which is normally the low-water mark on the coast. Furthermore, in the U.S. view there is no obligation on the part of states adhering to the 3-mile rule to recognize claims on the part of other states to a greater breadth of territorial sea.

"My Government hopes that the Government of Panama will find it possible to reconsider its action and awaits the further consideration of the question of the breadth of the territorial sea by the international community. In the meantime the Government of the United States reserves all of its rights in the area which is the subject of Republic of Panama Law No. 58 of December 18, 1958.

"Accept, Excellency, the renewed assurances of my highest consideration."

The Department wishes to point out, in view of the many inquiries, that this new Panamanian law cannot affect the rights of the United States with respect to the Panama Canal. Article XXIV of the convention of 1903 between the United States and Panama, relating to the canal, provides:

"No change either in the Government or in the laws and treaties of the Republic of Panama shall, without the consent of the United States, affect any right of the United States under the present convention, or under any treaty stipulation between the two countries that now exists or may hereafter exist touching the subject matter of this convention."

[From Congressional Information Bureau, Washington, D.C., Feb. 4, 1959]

Following today's session of the House Merchant Marine Committee, Chairman BONNER announced that the following are some of the matters that should be looked into:

"1. Trans-Isthmian Canal study: Over a year ago the committee, recognizing a trend

toward the obsolescence of the present Panama Canal and the early prospect of congested traffic conditions due to the increase in numbers and size of ships transiting the canal, initiated a broad study into the need for modernization of existing facilities and the possible need for additional or alternative facilities. In this connection the committee secured the services of a group of the foremost engineers in the United States to examine the situation and make recommendations for future action, either by way of improvement of the existing canal, the construction of a new one, or both. During the past Congress these engineers, as a board of consultants to the committee, have examined existing engineering data on the 30-odd routes proposed at various times for a canal crossing at various places in the Central American isthmus. The board of consultants has visited and inspected the present canal and familiarized themselves with the construction and operating problems involved. A preliminary report was submitted to the committee after the adjournment of the last Congress, covering recommended immediate improvements required to continue the efficient operation of the canal, pending a complete study.

"During this session the board must make further studies of the Panama Canal and of the canal route heretofore proposed through the Republic of Nicaragua. It is anticipated that their final report will be received sometime about the middle of this year.

"The importance of the work of this board cannot be overestimated since it has been predicted that the present canal will be unable to handle the volume of traffic expected by 1970. In view of the time required for engineering and construction work of the magnitude involved here, it is essential that the Congress be provided with workable ideas for future expansion in the earliest possible time."

[From Economic Council Papers, Sept. 1, 1953]

IT STARTED AT PANAMA—WHERE WILL IT STOP?

(By Earl Harding, vice president, National Economic Council, New York, N.Y.)

The great American giveaway series did not start with the Marshall plan in 1947, nor with Yalta in 1945, nor with Teheran in 1943.

The first game of the series was played with Panama in 1936, and the kickoff of another session with the same team is scheduled for the political stadium in Washington on September 10, when Panama's representatives will begin negotiating for more concessions.

It was "in furtherance of the good-neighbor policy" that Quarterback Franklin Delano Roosevelt on March 2, 1936, dropkicked into the arms of the Panama politicians our priceless treaty rights to defense bases outside of our 10-mile-wide Panama Canal Zone.

That planned fumble cost American taxpayers much more than the million-plus dollars in rental paid to the Panama Government during World War II for permission to plant our guns, build our roads, landing fields, bomber bases, and nearly 400 buildings on Panama's pasturelands and in her swamps and jungles adjacent to the Canal Zone.

WORSE THAN PROFLIGACY

It took endless negotiating to obtain the permission—where we formerly had the right under the 1903 treaty which F. D. R. abrogated—to use Panamanian territory for defense purposes. Finally our Army was forced to withdraw in 1948 and abandon buildings and improvements which had cost well over another million dollars to create.

The giveaway of money to Panama was in the pattern of national profligacy set by F. D. R. and not yet abandoned. But giving away our treaty rights to protect the lifeline of our national defense was in the pattern F. D. R. set when, without consulting them, he gave away the territories and liberties of Poland and China.

And now, if Panama's desire for still further concessions is not satisfied, pressure in behalf of Panama such as Alger Hiss in 1946 brought to bear through the United Nations, may take the form of demanding internationalization of the Panama Canal.

Just as Communists have infiltrated inside and outside the Canal Zone, so have exaggerated ideas of supernationalism taken hold in Panama. Since the United States created the Republic of Panama in 1903, a generation of Panamanians has been schooled to believe in the fiction that their "founding fathers" actually won the independence.

Of course, Panama history books haven't told Panamanian youth that only a handful of conspirators, most of them employees of the Panama Railroad, then owned by the French Panama Canal Company, knew that a revolution was planned.

A DELUDED GENERATION

If there is to be straight thinking on the coming agitation for more concessions to the Republic of Panama, some of the forgotten or half-told history should be recalled now. It will be needed to offset the screams of "aggression" and "infringement of sovereignty" which will be turned on again, as they were in 1947 when rioting students terrorized the Panama Legislature to vote down an extension of U.S. leases on defense bases.

Panama, formerly a province of Colombia, was created in name, and in name only, an independent nation by acts of the United States. Our responsibility was officially denied until the truth was uncovered. Then Theodore Roosevelt admitted "I took Panama and let Congress debate."

Concealed documents, uncovered in Panama in 1909, disclosed that preliminary financing had been arranged in a New York bank and that American warships were to be on both sides of the isthmus. American Marines prevented the landing of Colombian troops. The total casualties of Panama's soul-stirring war for independence were one Chinese onlooker and one donkey.

After the blow was struck, native politicians were sent under U.S. Navy escort to interior towns of the Province of Panama to notify them of then unexpected—and then unwanted—independence. Such was the status of the Republic of Panama—a creature of the United States.

All through the 10 years of canal construction and intermittently ever since, administrative and defense problems have been fraught with continual annoyance and needless expense. Time and again American authorities have had to supervise Panamanian elections and supersede or supplant Panamanian police and sanitation administrations. Friction is inevitable in any vital spot where there is dual or overlapping sovereignty.

When earlier treaty negotiations were with the mother country, Colombia refused to include the cities of Panama and Colon in the proposed Canal Zone. Both lie entirely within the 10-mile-wide strip. Then, after T. R. resorted to taking Panama, anything the United States proposed could have been obtained, but no one in authority had the foresight to include the terminal cities. The plan of the Panama conspirators was to declare the independence of only the canal strip and the terminal cities, which were to be brought under the protection of the United States without reference to the rest of the Province.

FORESIGHT CAME LATER

The need for a wide zone to include the entire watershed of the canal was recognized in a report to Congress by General Edwards, in command at Panama in 1916, but nothing was done.

Unofficial warnings of future needs were recorded earlier by the author of this council paper. (See World's Work, October 1913, and text of address before Latin American Conference, Clark University, in Journal of Race Development, vol. 4, No. 4, April 1914.) He then advocated:

1. Anticipating future needs and taking them, as permitted by the Hay-Bunau Varilla treaty of 1903 as convenient and necessary, a Canal Zone 50 to 60 miles wide.

2. Including the terminal cities of Panama and Colon to avoid the frictions which have existed ever since.

3. Inducing the Republic of Panama to establish its capital in the western highlands of the Province.

4. Returning the eastern end of the Province to Colombia as a gesture sentimentally more effective than the cash indemnity of $25 million which the United States finally paid to Colombia in 1922.

It was suggested that acquisition of territory for future defense could not be regarded as aggression—unless delayed until a new generation of Panamanians came to believe their sovereignty an inalienable right. They believe it now.

BUT APPEASEMENT HASN'T WORKED

Administrative friction, political agitation and never-ending diplomatic discussions continued. On March 2, 1936, Franklin D. Roosevelt approved the abrogation of practically everything in the 1903 treaty to which the Panamanian politicians objected.

Senate opposition delayed our ratification of the 1936 treaty until July 1939. This treaty gave Panama an entirely new status.

Article I of the 1903 treaty was eliminated. It read: "The United States guarantees and will maintain the independence of the Republic of Panama."

The old treaty granted to the United States "in perpetuity the use, occupation and control" not only of the Canal Zone but also of "any other lands and waters outside of the zone which may be necessary and convenient for the construction, maintenance, operation, sanitation and protection of the said enterprise."

And further, under the old treaty, Panama granted to the United States "all the rights, power and authority within the zone * * * and within the limits of all auxiliary lands and waters * * * which the United States would possess if it were the sovereign of the territory within which said lands and waters are located, to the exclusion of the exercise by the Republic of Panama of any such sovereign rights, power or authority."

All that was abrogated in the following clause of the 1936 treaty, which is still in force:

"The United States of America hereby renounces the grant made to it in perpetuity by the Republic of Panama of the use, occupation and control of lands and waters, in addition to those now under the jurisdiction of the United States of America outside the zone * * * which may be necessary and convenient for the construction, maintenance, operation, sanitation, and protection of the Panama Canal or of any auxiliary canals or other works necessary and convenient for the construction, maintenance, operation, sanitation, and protection of the said enterprise."

Then, having abandoned our rights to defense bases outside the Canal Zone, the United States agreed with Panama, in article II of the 1936 treaty, that "if, in the event of some now unforeseen contingency" land outside the Canal Zone should be needed, the two Governments "will agree upon such measures as it may be necessary to take in order to insure the maintenance, sanitation, efficient operation and effective protection of

the canal, in which the two countries are jointly and vitally interested."

The U.S. Government's right of eminent domain in acquiring property within the cities of Panama and Colón which might be needed for canal operation was renounced.

Also eliminated was the right of the United States to maintain public order in Panama if the Panamanian Government couldn't do so.

And the annuity of $250,000 paid by the United States for use of the canal strip was increased to $430,000—on account of the Roosevelt devaluation of the dollar.

The 1936 treaty made many other concessions to Panama. It restricted residence in the Canal Zone to American civilian and military personnel, established corridors within the zone for Panamanian convenience, and prohibited new private enterprises in the Canal Zone.

The effect of the 1936 treaty's ratification in July 1939 was summarized in such headlines as "The United States in Panama Pact Quits as Guardian, Becomes Neighbor—New Treaty Ends the Right of Intervention, Substituting Bilateral Cooperation."

WAR MULTIPLIES ANNOYANCES

Acquisition of bases for defense of the canal became imperative when war in Europe started in September 1939. Thereupon administrative annoyances multiplied. Communist infiltration as well as Nazi influences in Panama came to the surface.

Labor union organizers flocked in from Mexico and from the United States. Most of the Panamanian employees on the canal are now represented in collective bargaining agreements with the CIO. Many of them are children of West Indian laborers who were imported to help build the canal and who have become Panamanian citizens. Most of the skilled employees, citizens of the United States, have been unionized by the A.F. of L.

Red unionism, under the Latin American leadership of Vicente Lombardo Toledano, of Mexico, has had its toehold in Panama since Lombardo and the late Philip Murray of the CIO were photographed together for their joint promotion pamphlet "Labor's Good Neighbor Policy."

U.S. Army and Navy and canal authorities were necessarily tightlipped about the annoyances attending their use of more than 130 defense sites. Obtaining access wasn't always painless, but responsible Panama officials were generally cooperative. The big question was "How much?"

A defense sites agreement was not finally signed in Panama until May 18, 1942. It granted to the United States only "temporary use for defense purposes of the lands referred to in the attached memorandum." Details were kept secret.

The agreement stipulated that "The Republic of Panama retains its sovereignty over the areas" and that all buildings "shall become the property of the Republic of Panama upon the termination of their use by the United States." The bases were to be evacuated 1 year after ratification of a definitive treaty of peace—not just after a cease-fire.

Some of the 130-odd defense sites were small areas for observation towers, searchlight or gun emplacements. Others were outlying uninhabited islands; some mere broad pastures or cleared jungle made into landing fields. The total area amounted to many thousands of acres.

Most of the land and water had little monetary value except in the minds of some Panamanian politicians who emphasized its international importance and suggested rental as high as $1,600 per acre per year.

ANTI-AMERICAN CLAMOR

But neither protection of the canal and their own country nor the gravy flowing into their treasury silenced the anti-American elements. Clamor against "yanqui aggression" was popular even during the war, and was intensified immediately after V–J Day.

On September 2, 1946, the Panama Assembly unanimously demanded that the United States evacuate all defense sites immediately.

On the same day it was announced in Washington that 65 of the defense sites covering more than 10,000 acres had been relinquished, and that defense site rentals of $975,587 had been paid up to June 30, 1945.

And on the following day Panama's President Enrique Jiménez announced that occupation of future defense sites wouldn't even be discussed until all had been returned.

Thereupon U.S. Ambassador Frank T. Hines left for Washington, and on September 12, 1946, a joint statement of the two Governments announced that defense-base problems would be resolved by friendly negotiations.

But agitation continued. President Jiménez was quoted as demanding that the United States revise its whole attitude toward his country and make the 1936 treaty more effective in terms of benefits for Panama.

Panama has had four—or has it been five?—Presidents since 1948. The hope of the administration in Washington is that the present President of Panama, Jose Antonio Remon, formerly its chief of police, may be able to stay in office throughout his 4-year term which started October 1, 1952. Also that solution of Panama's economic problems through its people working harder and producing more food which our Canal Zone administration is willing to buy, may at last bring a measure of stability to our little neighbor.

THE VOICE OF MOSCOW—THE HAND OF ALGER HISS

Whether the voice of Moscow, resounding in the U.N., can stir up more discord in Panama is still a point to be watched.

In November 1946 the Soviet made a furious attack in the U.N. on the United States, charging that its defense bases around the world are evidence of aggression.

Alger Hiss, then head of the Office of Political Affairs of the State Department, without consulting or advising Spruille Braden, Assistant Secretary of State for Latin America, sent to the U.N. (largely Hiss' brainchild) a list of America's occupied territories and included in it Panama.

That gave Panama a text. Ricardo J. Alfaro, then Panama's Foreign Minister and chairman of its U.N. delegation, in a speech before the Trusteeship Committee of U.N., declared that Panama retains its sovereignty over the Canal Zone and that the State Department's report should be corrected.

Newspaper headlines gave the Assistant Secretary of State for Latin America his first inkling that such a report had been issued. Hiss could not be found that day to recall it. Mr. Braden demanded a showdown, because he was responsible for negotiations in behalf of our military authorities, who insisted that we still needed the bases in Panama. The Hiss report strengthened opposition of the Panamanian politicians while Mr. Braden was assuring the Pentagon of State Department support to get the bases under the terms of the 1936 treaty.

But Dean Acheson, then Acting Secretary of State, backed up Hiss.

"I was infuriated by the stupidity—which I then thought it was—of putting Panama in the category of occupied territories," said Mr. Braden the day before this Council Paper went to press. "But I did not realize its full significance as a play into Russian hands until after Hiss' other activities were exposed."

Mr. Braden now recalls that immediately following the assist by Hiss a dispatch from London reported Parliament's being told by its very left Labor member, Zilliacus, that the United States should turn over control of the Panama Canal to the U.N. and that Britain should do likewise with Gibraltar and Suez.

On December 9, 1947, Dr. Alfaro resigned as Foreign Minister in protest against his Government's agreeing to consider extending the leases on 13 bases, the most important ones, which were then still occupied by us.

Following his lead, the Panama Assembly on December 23, 1947, unanimously rejected lease extension. Anti-American mobs surrounded the legislature vowing to lynch any member voting for the leases, and students and teachers threatened to call a general strike.

So the United States, in January 1948, abandoned the 13 defense sites and retreated within its Canal Zone. It is understood that future defense will be entirely from within the zone limits.

How much farther the American giveaway policy will be stretched to satisfy demands of the Panama politicians, commencing on September 10, remains to be seen. Panama's negotiators are to be Ambassador Roberto M. Heurtematte, who is stationed in Washington; Dr. Octavio Fábrega, former Minister of Foreign Relations, and Carlos Sucre, former Minister of Government.

Will Panama try to follow today's example at Suez? And when will American taxpayers stop the worldwide game of American giveaway?

[From the Washington Evening Star, Sept. 13, 1956]

RED PLOT SEEN AGAINST UNITED STATES ON PANAMA CANAL

(By Omer Anderson)

BONN, September 13.—International communism has opened an agitation campaign in Latin America against the Panama Canal, coinciding with meetings on internationalization of the Suez Canal.

The campaign is directed from Prague. It aims at stirring Latin American nationalism against control of the Panama Canal Zone.

Communist leaders feel that the Panama Canal—in the present troubled international situation—is a made-to-order Red propaganda target.

The campaign has these twin objectives:

1. To put the United States on the defensive in the Suez dispute.

2. To use the Panama Canal issue as a vehicle to infuse fresh vigor into Latin American anti-U.S. feeling.

TRAINED IN PRAGUE

Agitators have been dispatched, it is reported, from the so-called State College for Political and Economic Science, the big Communist oversea propaganda training center in Prague.

This institution specializes in agitation in the underdeveloped areas of the world.

The Communists reportedly hope to get backing from the political foes of Panamanian President Ricardo Arias. Elsewhere in Latin America, the campaign is being tied to local anti-United States and British issues.

Communist strength in Latin America, although not manifest recently, is strong. There is close contact between international communism's clearinghouse in Prague and local Latin American Communist movements.

The Panama Canal is a durable whipping boy of Communist agitation in Latin America. It is also a volcanic issue of Panamanian politics—long dormant, then suddenly erupting.

The Suez conference, according to reports from Prague, will be used by the Soviets as a forum for a wide-ranging discussion of Western imperialism. There is just enough similarity between the Suez and Panama Canals to give the Soviets an opening.

OLD COMMUNIST THEME

The Panama Canal "grab" by President Theodore Roosevelt's administration in 1901 is a treasured theme of Communist propaganda for Latin America.

Russia also is reported planning to move to the fore certain other Latin American controversies. These include Britain's ownership of British Honduras, disputed by Honduras, and of the Falkland Islands, disputed by Argentina.

One of the minds behind the pending campaign is reported to be Jacobo Arbenz Guzman, ousted as Guatemala's President by the Castilla Armas coup in 1954. Arbenz fled with his family to Switzerland.

He was brought to Prague last autumn, and is said to be a principal adviser to international communism of Central American affairs.

[From the Saturday Evening Post, Oct. 25, 1958]

THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA CANNOT SURRENDER ITS RIGHTS IN THE PANAMA CANAL

Agitation in the Republic of Panama over the status of the Canal Zone features two claims: (1) "The canal is ours" and (2) Panama and the United States are equal partners in the canal, and should therefore split its gross revenues 50–50 while we meet all expenses.

In this country, some voices, notably Mr. James Warburg's, have been raised to suggest that we should internationalize the canal, to set a good example to Colonel Nasser.

None of these proposals makes sense. There is no legitimate comparison between the position of the American Government at Panama and that of the Suez Company in Egypt. As Congressman FLOOD, Democrat, of Pennsylvania, has pointed out in several speeches, the Canal Zone is "constitutionally acquired territory of the United States." While the British Government owned 43.75 percent of the Suez Company, and its administration was largely French, the company was an Egyptian enterprise, operating on a 100-year lease, when Nasser expropriated it.

Our treaty of 1903 with the Republic of Panama gave us sovereign rights over a strip of land 10 miles wide across the isthmus. The stated purpose of the grant was that we might build, maintain, operate, and defend an interoceanic canal, and the grant was perpetual.

We undertook to pay the Republic of Panama $10 million in 1903, and an annuity thereafter. The payments have been increased several times, and now stand at about $1,900,000. It is conceivable that this will be increased but the notion that Panama can rightfully claim a half share of the tolls is ridiculous. Yet it was put forward by the Deputy Foreign Minister of Panama, who now occupies a professor's chair at the University of Panama, where he instructs students in the fancied rights for which they riot periodically.

Charles Evans Hughes, Secretary of State in 1923, made this statement to the Minister from Panama when he raised the question of sovereignty in the Canal Zone: "It is an absolute futility for the Panamanian Government to expect any American administration, no matter what it is, any President or any Secretary of State, ever to surrender any part of those rights which the United States has acquired under the treaty of 1903."

Considerations of international law and hemisphere security make the Hughes declaration of 1923 even more valid today.

[From the Panama American, Dec. 21, 1958]

PATRIOTISM, PROFITS, AND CONTRABAND

SIR: Panama's politicians, whose patriotism extends no further than their own interests, in 1946 helped set Panama's financial status back 10 years by saying "Not 1 inch more of our land" and fostering the idea that the United States was the common enemy of all Panamanians. It is true that we must defend our country. But, on the other hand, why make it hard for 300, just to keep 6 in a favored position?

What have we done in Rio Hato since the Americans were forced to abandon the airfield there?

(a) We showed the world we were filled with patriotism.

(b) We went 10 years backward financially.

(c) Thousands of Panamanian citizens were left jobless.

(d) Housing problems for the poor increased since the U.S. Government abandoned all local-rate housing projects, thereby enabling property owners to rent apartments in Caledonia and Guachapali for $50 or $60.

(e) Servants can again be exploited for $15 a month to wash, cook, and clean the house. During the war and before the Rio Hato base problem this was impossible.

Somehow we Panamanians managed to survive the 10-year step backward in our financial standing. As the years went by the merchants found they did not have enough cash for a new Cadillac every year, as their profits were not exorbitant. So they began thinking of how and who to cry to. Their cries were heard because unfortunately, they are big taxpayers. They crowded the late President Remon, and talked him into using the wrong approach.

When Dr. Harmodio Arias wanted to change the treaty in 1936 he did not need any public demonstrations. He simply went ahead and used his brains. I do not know Dr. Arias personally but I was old enough at that time to know he was working to improve the conditions of all Panamanians. During his administration he brought the country out of chaos without too many loans.

It is a pity that he is old now, but Dr. Gilberto Arias, his son, could and should do us some good under his father's tutoring.

Would Dr. Harmodio Arias have handled the 1955 treaty in the manner President Remon instructed him to? Heck, no. He would have worked through letters and personal contacts with the U.S. Government. I am quite certain he would not have used the "Cita con la Patria" method. With none of the noise and public demonstrations, Dr. Harmodio Arias could have obtained—

(a) Equal pay for equal work; and

(b) A much greater increase in the annuity than was obtained.

These are the two issues of most direct benefit to the Panamanian pueblo.

I would like to say something about contraband. I know contrabanding is wrong, and should be punished. But did contraband from the Canal Zone affect the exorbitant profits of the merchants of Panama during the war years? They were so busy counting their profits they had no time to cry about the commissaries, then.

Who was benefited by the closing of the commissaries, and who was harmed?

The merchants, who thought that their sales would increase and profits with them, were disappointed.

Everyone was harmed, including the merchants. The Canal Company was forced to lay off many of its staff, and those who stayed on working became more careful in their spending.

The commissary will continue to make profits simply because if sales fall employees will be laid off to bring down expenses accordingly.

Let me give a small example of how the merchants of Panama exploit the pueblo. They know that even the very poor try to have a merry Christmas, and brighten up the home with such small things as new curtains. What did the merchants do this year to help these people have a merry Christmas? Not much. Curtain material such as damask was sold at 75 cents a yard up to the first week in December. As the Caja de Ahorros started to pay out the Christmas savings, the price went up to $1.25 a yard. This is only one example.

Do these merchants believe people are still spending their money without thinking? It is true that we buy toys for our children, but why are the toys so expensive? Most of them are from Japan or Hong Kong, and we know the cost price of such merchandise. Is it just for the exploiting merchants to try to make a whole year's profit in 1 month?

They think that without our commissary privileges we will be forced to buy from them at any price. If they were established here back in the thirties they will remember when men bought empty flour sacks to make trousers. We can surely go back to those days.

The real price control office in Panama is the competition offered by the zone's commissaries. So let us real Panamanians stop biting the hand that protects us.

Let us spend money industrializing our own country, and let us attract foreign capital here. But let no one string us along with talk of a common enemy, be it the United States or the national guard. Hitler used the common enemy gimmick to distract the Germans' attention from what he was really up to.

POOR, SENSIBLE PANAMANIAN.

[From the New York Times, Jan. 10, 1959]

UNITED STATES WEIGHS STEP ON PANAMA ACTION—EXTENSION OF THE TERRITORIAL WATERS LIMIT TO 12 MILES STIRS SHIPPING CIRCLES

PANAMA, REPUBLIC OF PANAMA, January 9.—It is believed here that the United States may soon send to the Foreign Ministry of the Republic of Panama a note concerning the latter's recent extension of territorial waters from 3 miles to a total of 12 miles.

The geographic configuration of the isthmus is such that a rigid interpretation of the new law could box in both entrances of the Panama Canal. This would require international shipping seeking transit to traverse 9 miles of Panama waters each portal from high seas to reach the 3-mile limit off Canal Zone shores specifically granted by Panama to the United States in the basic treaty of 1903.

It is understood that two other maritime nations, Japan and Britain, have already directed notes to Panama's Foreign Minister, Miguel J. Moreno, Jr., concerning the possible embarrassment to ships flying their flags. Merchant fleets of both countries rank high in canal transits.

The measure unanimously passed December 13 by the national assembly and signed December 15 by President Ernesto de La Guardia, Jr., provides that Panama's President will administer the law under certain conditions. These are in accordance with the constitution, existing treaties, commitments of the United Nations conference on rights of the sea held in Geneva in 1958, and Panama's historic position regarding special rights in the somewhat landlocked Gulf of Panama.

PRESIDENT MUST RULE

The law leaves implementation in the President's hands. He will determine the boundaries of the new territorial waters. No regulations have as yet been set forth on enforcement nor are the new boundaries charted.

The latter fact supports the hope among envoys here of the world's maritime nations that boundaries may yet be so delineated as to leave assured access to the high seas to canal portals since protection of Panama's fishing rights is understood to have been one of the major motivations behind the law.

A preamble to the law as introduced on behalf of a group of deputies representing all political factions would have extended the territorial waters without prejudice to commitment in international treaties in force for innocent passage of foreign ships which use the Panama Canal international navigation lane. This disappeared from the measure before passage.

U.S. officials and others were surprised by Panama's enactment of the measure, which had the backing of her delegation at the Geneva Conference. It was thought participating nations would take no overt steps extending the territory until another sea conference had been held.

The bill on which Panama acted was sparked by Deputy Aquilino Boyd, who recently resigned as Ambassador to Mexico. He is considered an active candidate for the 1960 presidential elections.

NEWSPAPERS COMMENT

Newspapers controlled by several of more nationalist political factions have been publicizing the possibilities of the rights Panama allegedly gained by claiming waters beyond the canal portals. One paper observed that ships and crews entering might be subject to Panama's immigration law. Another remarked that ships traversing the territory most now fly the Panama flag. A third noted customs launches stationed at an offshore Pacific island within 12 miles could stop canal-bound vessels and send inspectors aboard.

The United States is understood to be basing its remarks to Panama partly on article XXIV of the 1903 treaty providing that no change either in the government or the laws of Panama shall, without U.S. consent, affect any U.S. right under the convention or under any treaty stipulation then or later.

Various other international commitments are reportedly considered pertinent in the issue.

NO TROUBLE LIKELY NOW

Shipping men whose vessels use the Panama Canal said they were not disturbed about any immediate prospect of trouble in the new territorial waters of the Republic of Panama.

However, they noted that most of the nations were firmly opposed to a unilateral decision by any nation to extend its sovereign rights at sea.

Technically, they said, the law gives Panama the right to control shipping crossing the 9-mile stretch while approaching or leaving the canal, at either end. A country with such a law might impose, for instance, transit fees. They might apply regulations calling for superfluous pilotage, for revenue purposes. They could control fishing in the area. They might, if they so chose for whatever reason, close the waters.

Unidentified official Washington sources have been quoted in connection with the new Panama law as contending that the United States-Panama Treaty of 1903 would still guarantee free and unlimited access to the canal. Nevertheless, the mere presence of the new territorial delineation is a source of anxiety, on principle.

The extent of territorial waters is a major international problem. Most nations recognize a 3-mile limit. A world conference on sea law in Geneva last year attempted to solve it. Another effort will be made in 1960, under authorization voted by the General Assembly of the United Nations last month.

[From the Washington Sunday Star, Jan. 11, 1959]

PANAMA NOTIFIED UNITED STATES REJECTS ITS 12-MILE LIMIT

The State Department announced yesterday it has notified Panama the United States refuses to recognize the new Panamanian law providing for a 12-mile territorial sea limit.

The note said passage of the law "is regrettable in view of the recent action of the United Nations General Assembly in voting overwhelmingly to call an international conference to consider the breadth of the territorial sea and fishery matters."

The United States asked Panama to reconsider its action.

Officials said the Panamanian action "cannot affect the rights of the United States with respect to the Panama Canal," under a 1903 agreement. The agreement provides that Panama may not upset U.S. rights by any means "without the consent of the United States."

[From the Panama American, Jan. 12, 1959]

PANAMA WILL REJECT FOREIGN PROTESTS ON 12-MILE LIMIT

The Panama Government plans to reject all protests over the extension of Panama's territorial waters limit from 3 to 12 miles, it was learned today from informed sources.

These sources revealed that in addition to the official U.S. protest received by the Panama Government last Friday, Japan has also sent an official note signifying its intention not to recognize the new territorial water limit.

It was also understood that Great Britain and France also intend to make known their official views in notes to the Panama Government.

According to the sources, Panama will reject all suggestions that the law extending territorial seas be reconsidered, as suggested in the note from the U.S. State Department.

In a formal note to Panama last week, the United States said the action was regrettable.

Furthermore, the U.S. note said, there was no obligation on the part of other nations to recognize the 12-mile Pan-American limit.

The note said:

"EXCELLENCY: I have the honor to refer to your note No. 1096 dated December 23, 1958, transmitting a copy of Republic of Panama law No. 58 of December 18, 1958, which has as it purpose extension of the territorial sea of the Republic of Panama to a distance of 12 miles from the coast.

"I have been instructed to state that the U.S. Government considers this action of the Republic of Panama is regrettable in view of the recent action of the United Nations General Assembly in voting overwhelmingly to call an international conference to consider the breadth of the territorial sea and fishery matters.

"It is the view of my Government, as expressed at the United Nations Law of the Sea Conference and on previous occasions, that no basis exists in international law for claims to a territorial sea in excess of 3 nautical miles from the baseline which is normally the low-water mark on the coast.

"Furthermore, in the U.S. view there is no obligation on the part of states adhering to the 3-mile rule to recognize claims on the part of other states to a greater breadth of territorial sea.

"My Government hopes that the Government of Panama will find it possible to reconsider its action and await the further consideration of the question of the breadth of the territorial sea by the international community. In the meantime the Government of the United States reserves all of its right in the area which is the subject of Republic of Panama law No. 58 of December 18, 1958."

The State Department, in answer to questions, said the new Panamanian law cannot affect rights of the United States with respect to the Panama Canal.

The Department pointed out that article 24 of the Panama Canal Convention of 1903 provides:

"No change either in the Government or in the laws and treaties of the Republic of Panama shall, without the consent of the United States, affect any right of the United States under the present convention, or under any treaty, stipulation between the two countries that now exists or may hereafter exist touching the subject matter of this convention."

[From the Panama American, Jan. 12, 1959]

MORE BRIDGE PLANS READY—FOURTH OF JULY DUE TO BECOME FOUR-LANE BOULEVARD

Plans and specifications are ready for distribution to prospective bidders on the construction of the east approach to the new Balboa bridge across the canal.

This is one of five major contract jobs of the $20 million project.

Bids are to be opened February 11 at Balboa Heights for this work which will include the widening of Fourth of July Avenue into a four-lane boulevard.

Other major features of the work will be the construction of cuts and fills involving about 350,000 cubic yards of material; the relocation or construction of various facilities; and construction of the embankment upon which four roadways will be built later to tie in with Fourth of July Avenue and the street system in Panamá City.

It is estimated the east approach work will cost over $1 million, being far more extensive than the work required in building the bridge approach on the west side of the canal.

A contract for the west approach at a cost of $385,000 was awarded last month to Louis Sommer.

The contractor for the east approach work will have 440 days for completion of the job. This time limit will cover two dry seasons which will be needed for the proper construction and compaction of the extensive fills.

The bid forms, which were issued Friday by the Engineering and Construction Bureau, list 70 individual bid items.

These include 212,500 cubic yards of roadway excavation; the handling of over 100,000 cubic yards of rock or other borrow material; installation of over 2 miles of drains and culverts; placing over 20,000 square yards of street and sidewalk paving; construction of retaining walls; replacements of various facilities such as sewer and water lines, electric cables, and the small buildings; and installation of 1,600 linear feet of fencing and 900 feet of guard rail.

The embankment, over which the new roadway will connect the street systems at the limits with the bridge, crosses the mudflats between the Balboa tank farm and the Gavilan residential area.

It will pass immediately south of the houses in the Gavilan area.

Some sections of the embankment will be about 50 feet high with most of the fill material being taken from the cut required in Chorrillo Hill near the limits and from Albrook and Curundu borrow areas.

The two approach roads to connect with Avenida de los Poetas in Panama City will be built to the boundary line, approximately 500 feet from the end of that street.

The bridge connections with Fourth of July Avenue and Balboa Road at the limits will be at the existing grade level.

A new connecting link is to be built from Balboa Road to the bridge approach. This will be a short, curving roadway to permit merging traffic from Fourth of July Avenue or Balboa to move onto the bridge approach.

Because of the variety and extent of the work involved, the plans being issued contain no time schedules for the contractor other than the 440-day time limit for completion. The contractor will, however, be required to submit a general plan of operations and a time schedule for approval before beginning the work.

[From the Panama Star and Herald, Jan. 13, 1959]

REPRESENTATIVE FLOOD BRANDED REPUBLIC OF PANAMA'S NO. 1 ENEMY

Representative DANIEL J. FLOOD yesterday was denounced in the Panama National Assembly as Panama's No. 1 gratuitous enemy.

The denunciation was made by Deputy Alfredo Aleman, Jr., in connection with FLOOD's remarks in Congress last week that Panama's decision to extend its territorial seas to 12 miles means another Berlin in the Canal Zone.

Both Aleman and Deputy Aquilino Boyd submitted a motion setting aside this afternoon's assembly debate for a reply to FLOOD. The motion was carried.

Aleman said yesterday that FLOOD rises in Congress to criticize bitterly the position of Panamanians who defend their country's rights stemming from relations with the United States. He added that just as FLOOD speaks unofficially, he also would speak as a representative of the people to protest FLOOD's assertions.

The National Assembly last month approved overwhelmingly the extension of Panama's territorial seas to 12 miles. The bill was signed into law by President Ernesto de la Guardia, Jr.

Over the week end, the U.S. State Department disclosed it had officially notified Panama that the United States does not recognize the 12-mile sea limit. It asked Panama to reconsider its action.

Official sources in Panama declined to comment for publication on the State Department announcement, but indicated that Panama will turn down the Washington request for reconsideration. It was understood that an official statement will be issued this week on the matter.

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Jan. 13, 1959]

PANAMA EXTENDS CLAIM TO CANAL APPROACHES

WASHINGTON.—The Panama Canal may assume the status of a junior grade West Berlin issue, now that the Panama Government has officially extended its territorial limits 12 miles to sea.

Under existing treaties, the United States has rights only 3 miles seaward from the entrances to the great waterway.

Traffic through the Panama Canal might be harried if not demoralized if Panama should attempt to stop ships passing through its territorial waters approaching the waterway for customs or maritime formalities. This possibility has been hinted at.

The principal difficulty to the American authorities at the Canal Zone would be the delays to shipping which would inevitably ensue. Ship arrivals are pinpointed 24 hours in advance. Transit schedules are stated in terms of minutes to make maximum utilization of the facilities of the canal.

Unannounced stops of ships by Panamanian authorities could ruin the plans of marine comptrollers and dispatchers at the ocean shortcut.

CAREFUL PLANNING NEEDED

Transiting of the present heavy traffic through the Panama Canal requires careful planning. The canal organization is proud of the exemplary service to shipping it has been rendering for 44 years. Any interference would impair the usefulness of the Panama Canal and blot the reputation for efficiency it has won in the world of shipping.

It may result in reduced revenues for Uncle Sam, for the Panama Canal is not only maintained without cost to the American taxpayer but actually pays dividends to the Treasury annually.

Panamanian legislation extending the watery jurisdiction mentioned that the additional 9 miles embraces an area rich in fish. This is seen by observers to be a diversionary tactic.

Real purpose of the legislation is to provide a big stick to wallop Uncle Sam into revising the treaty with Panama to get the Panama Canal jurisdiction extended to 12 miles seaward, local observers believe.

BENEFITS CITED

The record shows that Panama receives major considerations with each treaty signed with the United States. The 1955 Remon-Eisenhower Treaty brought Panama about $40 million in lands, buildings, and other benefits.

In Panama, it is seen likely that a treaty could be arranged granting the United States jurisdiction 12 miles from the entrances of the Panama Canal. The only question is the price tag attached.

Panama quoted action by Egypt, the Soviet Union, and Saudi Arabia, among others, as precedent for the local legislation. Egyptian nationalization of the Suez Canal touched off a flame for nationalization here which has been kept ablaze by politicos (who admit privately that it would be impracticable).

Saudi Arabian participation in revenues from oil exploitation there has been the model for ever-increasing Panama demands on the United States for exploitation of Panama's natural resource, the strategic location of the land granted for construction of the Panama Canal.

DEMANDS INCREASING

Panamanian demands on the United States are not new, but they are increasing in size and frequency. With a fine disregard for the facts, politicians here tell the people that the United States has not lived up to its obligations; that it has mistreated Panama.

This has brought about a condition where anything which the United States may give to Panama in the form of technical assistance, direct grants of financial or other aid, long-term loans, etc., is often not received with gratitude and friendship, but as partial payment on a debt long outstanding.

The new legislation was introduced by presidential aspirant Aquilino Boyd, who until May had been Foreign Minister in the present administration.

[From the Panama American, Jan. 13, 1959]

REPUBLIC OF PANAMA HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS OK 12-MILE LIMIT

Panama high school students were in agreement today that the Panama Foreign Office should energetically reject a recent note from U.S. Secretary of State John Foster Dulles protesting the extension of Panama's territorial waters limit to 12 miles.

In a communique issued yesterday by the Union of High School Students (UEU), the students said they would be behind any move taken by the Government to "demand respect for the sovereign rights of the Republic."

Meanwhile, press dispatches from London indicate that Britain is considering what action to take against Panama's extension of the limit of her territorial waters.

Britain has been informed of the Panamanian decision by her envoy in Panama, a British Foreign Office spokesman was quoted as saying.

The spokesman added that Britain was now considering whether to protest against the Panamanian move, but no decision so far has been taken in London.

France has also signified its intention of expressing its views on Panama's action.

Up to now, only Japan and the United States have officially protested the extension of the territorial waters limit.

Meanwhile, the National Assembly will consider a pronouncement against remarks made by U.S. Representative DANIEL J. FLOOD regarding Panama's action, as the first item on the agenda of today's session.

This was the result of a proposal by Assemblyman Aquilino Boyd, who introduced the territorial extension bill into the Assembly, and his colleague, Alfredo Aleman, Jr.

Some sources declared that the Assembly will issue a "solemn oath" to uphold Panama's rights in exercising its sovereignty within the 12-mile territorial water limit.

FLOOD last week protested the extension and said it would convert the Canal Zone into a maritime enclave—"another Berlin."

The U.S. Congressman recommended that Congress pass a resolution refusing to recognize "the attempted stranglehold encirclement of the Canal Zone."

[From the Panama Star and Herald, Jan. 14, 1959]

ASSEMBLY AFFIRMS REPUBLIC OF PANAMA RIGHT TO 12-MILE SEA—VOTE AGAINST RECONSIDERING LAW UNANIMOUS—FORMER FOREIGN MINISTER BOYD CALLS FOR NATIONAL SUPPORT OF DEMAND FOR HALF OF PANAMA CANAL GROSS REVENUE

The Panama National Assembly last night voted unanimously not to reconsider—for any reason whatever—the extension of Panama's territorial seas to 12 miles.

The reconsideration had been requested by the U.S. State Department last week in a formal note to the Panamanian Foreign Office. A bill providing for the extension of Panama's territorial seas from 3 to 12 miles was passed by the Assembly on December 18 and was signed into law 2 days later by President Ernesto de la Guardia, Jr.

In the course of the 4-hour debate that preceded approval of the resolution, former Foreign Minister Aquilino Boyd, who is now in the Assembly, called for national support of a demand for half the gross revenue of the Panama Canal as Panama's fair share of the benefits from the waterway.

Boyd said the United States-Panama partnership over the canal involves one partner who is too rich and one partner who is too poor—and this must come to an end.

The Assembly's full-dress debate on the territorial seas question was provoked by last week's remarks in Congress by Representative DANIEL FLOOD, Democrat, of Pennsylvania, who said that Panama's action had created another Berlin by surrounding the Panama Canal entrances, under U.S. jurisdiction, with waters over which Panama claims sovereignty. The U.S. jurisdiction over the Panama Canal Zone extends 3 miles out to sea.

The Assembly's resolution castigated FLOOD as Panama's "Public Enemy No. 1" and presented him to the rest of the hemisphere nations as the personification of the bad faith which has contributed and still contributes to bring about disunity and ill will among countries which because of their destiny should treat each other as brothers.

Supporting the resolution which he helped draft, Boyd said last night: "Let not Mr. FLOOD doubt for a minute that the entrances to the Panama Canal are now surrounded by 9 miles of exclusively Panamanian waters in which Panama can exercise definite acts of sovereignty."

Boyd enumerated these acts as follows: The raising of the Panamanian flag on ships which enter Panamanian waters, as is the international custom; exercising vigilance over shipping, in order to maintain internal security; regulating fishing activities; trying persons for offenses committed aboard ships within Panamanian waters; requiring foreign warships to comply with Panamanian navigation regulations; enforcing customs, fiscal and sanitation regulations.

Deputy Alfredo Alemán, Jr., who also participated in the debate, declared that what really is behind the protest of the United States and others against Panama's action is

the fear that Panama will charge ships entering its waters for the cost of aids to navigation (lights, buoys, etc.) and that it will enforce observance of Panamanian labor laws aboard Panama-flag ships entering Panamanian waters.

The Assembly's resolution called upon friendly nations to support Panama's pronouncement and "to extend to the Republic all the considerations and courtesies consecrated by international law." A copy of the resolution is being sent to all legislative bodies in the world.

Both the text of the resolution and the remarks by the various deputies stressed one point: That Panama acted in exercise of its sovereign rights in extending its territorial seas.

At the opening of the session, Deputy Harmodio Arosemena Forte, of the Liberal opposition, submitted a draft resolution, condemning FLOOD's "ignorance and bad faith." Arosemena and a Liberal colleague, Mario de Obaldía, spoke in support of the resolution, both attacking as ridiculous FLOOD's assertion that in extending the nation's territorial areas, the Assembly had been under Communist influence.

Then Alemán took the floor to submit another draft resolution, reasserting Panama's extension of its territorial waters and condemning FLOOD. Alemán repeated his previous refutations of FLOOD's frequent anti-Panama pronouncements in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, saying the Pennsylvania Congressman is completely unaware of the historical, juridicial, and political truth of relations between Panama and the United States.

Alemán digressed to discuss Panama's complaints over the application of the 1955 treaty legislation, asserting that "what was approved in good faith, is being applied in bad faith." He cited one example in support of his charge that in the application on the new uniform wage scale regulations, Panamanians were being downgraded to keep them from attaining jobs paid at U.S. wages. The example involved a Panamanian he said, with 20 years service, who was downgraded from warehouse lead foreman to lead stockman.

"Not a step backward," Alemán exhorted assemblymen as he called for the reassertion of Panama's rights on the question of the sea.

Boyd was the next speaker. He pointed out that while there was no agreement at the 1958 Geneva Conference on the law of the sea as to the extension of territorial waters, there was agreement that a 12-mile limit did not violate the provisions of international law.

The former Foreign Minister suggested that one reason for Panama's move at this time was the threat by the major powers of the world to call another conference at which present territorial waters would be frozen.

Boyd declared that while henceforth both entrances of the Panamanian waters, Panama is on record that it recognizes the right of innocent passage by ships using the Panama Canal.

But, he added, Panama has full rights to carry out the acts of sovereignty he had enumerated earlier.

Boyd repeated the official Panamanian stand that the Canal Zone is Panamanian territory in which the United States has been granted limited rights.

"When our neighbors go beyond those limited rights," Boyd said, "it is up to us to tell them: 'Here and no further.'"

Brushing aside FLOOD's comparison of the situation here as another Berlin as a scare attempt, Boyd went into a discussion of Panama's relationship with the United States over the Panama Canal.

It is true, he said, that Panama has derived benefits from the Canal which place it among the most advanced nations of the hemisphere. But these benefits, he added, are not in proportion to what Panama has contributed to the canal enterprise and from which the United States has profited. He compared the United States-Panama relationship as being ruled by the law of the funnel—the wide part for them, the narrow part for us.

There must be an effort made to create a national conscience, Boyd declared, in support of the demand that Panama is entitled to one-half the gross revenue of the Panama Canal.

When one partner gets more than $100 million and the other only $1,900,000, the partnership is not doing well, Boyd commented. Mr. FLOOD is right when he says that things are going from bad to worse—and they will keep like that until there is a fair distribution of benefits.

Boyd pointed out that Panama Canal transit tolls have not been increased since the waterway opened, despite the higher costs of every other activity. This, which he blamed on the shipping lobby in Congress, is tantamount to a subsidy to the American merchant marine—at the expense of Panama, Boyd declared. He noted that the Canal Company is one of the few Federal agencies that operates at a profit.

The assemblyman stressed that Panama was not asking for participation in the administration of the canal, but for 50 percent of the gross revenue. Boyd concluded that if Panama strives tenaciously for this demand and seeks the help of its sister nations of Latin America, it will achieve success.

After remarks by another deputy, Jorge Turner, in support of the extension of the territorial waters, Assembly President Elig Crepo called a recess and named a special committee, composed of those who had spoken during the debate, to draft a new resolution which combines the texts of the two proposals submitted at the start of the debate.

This was accomplished and when the new draft resolution was put to a vote, it was approved unanimously.

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald, Jan. 15, 1959]

PANAMA STANDS FIRM ON NEW 12-MILE LIMITS

PANAMA, January 14.—The National Assembly unanimously rejected last night a United States request for reconsideration of its laws extending Panama's territorial waters. The extension to 12 miles boxes in the Panama Canal entrances.

An assembly resolution asked friendly nations to support the extension from the previous 3-mile limit. The law passed last month promised free passage to innocent shipping.

During a debate on the United States request, former Foreign Minister Acquilino Boyd called for Panama to receive half of the gross revenue from the canal, which is operated by the United States under long-term treaty.

Boyd asserted that the United States makes $100 million from the canal while paying Panama only $1,900,000 a year. He said Panama was not seeking a voice in canal administration.

The Panama Canal Co. reported that in the year ended last July 1 it collected nearly $43 million in tolls and made a net profit of $2,656,000. The United States pays Panama $1,930,000 a year for use of the 10-mile-wide canal strip, which includes 3 miles of the water off each end.

Other assemblymen criticized U.S. Representative DANIEL FLOOD, Democrat, of Pennsylvania, who touched off the debate by telling Congress the territorial waters extension created another Berlin.

[From the Panama American, Jan. 15, 1959]

ARMY CONCERNED BY 12-MILE LIMIT—BRUCKER ASSURES FLOOD UNITED STATES DOESN'T RECOGNIZE CHANGE

WASHINGTON, January 15.—Army Secretary Wilber M. Brucker said in a letter today that the United States does not recognize the law imposing a 12-mile sovereignty on Panamanian waters. In any case, he said the law cannot, by treaty, affect approaches to the Panama Canal.

The letter was written to Democratic Rep. DANIEL J. FLOOD, and made public by FLOOD's office.

It was in reply to a letter FLOOD wrote Brucker, expressing concern over the 12-mile law passed by the Panamanian legislature.

Brucker said his office had been concerned also.

"In addition to the terms of the legislation then under consideration, the published comments of individual members of the National Assembly and others gave rise to concern as to the anticipated application of the legislation with particular reference to the possible impairment of free access to the Panama Canal by vessels of the world arriving at the isthmus to use the canal under existing treaty commitments," he wrote.

He said it appears that under the 1903 treaty the legislation in question "cannot adversely affect the interests of the United States in operation of the canal."

Brucker said article 24 "clearly precludes application of unilateral action by the Republic of Panama extending its coastal waters to derogate in any manner from the rights and privileges of the United States in reference to the canal."

"In any event I have been advised that the State Department has informed the government of Panama that the United States does not recognize the Panamanian law designed to extend the breadth of Panamanian territorial waters to a distance of 12 miles.

"I appreciate your interest and am glad to have this opportunity to assure you that I will continue to give the matter the closest scrutiny and to take all available measures to protect the interests of the United States Government in this vital area.

[From the Panama American, Jan. 15, 1959]

REPUBLIC OF PANAMA STUDENTS HURL CHARGES UNITED STATES HURTS PANAMA'S DIGNITY

The Panama Students Federation yesterday resolved to denounce the brazen attempt by the United States against the dignity of Panama.

The resolution issued by the federation's executive council also gave support to a proposal by former Vice Foreign Minister Ernesto Castillero to ratify the conventions approved at the Geneva Conference on Rights of the Sea, and publish the minutes of the foreign relations committee of the Assembly and other pertinent documents in the form of a white paper.

A warning to the United States that its policies only created hate and rancor was also contained in the resolution.

Other points in the resolution said the students would:

Organize brigades to defend our sovereignty.

Request local and foreign student organizations to support the stand of the federation.

Demand a flat and energetic pronouncement from the government against "Yankee arrogance."

Request that this new aggression by the Yankee collosus against one of the weakest nations be denounced before the proper international organizations.

[From the Panama American, Jan. 16, 1959]

SHIPPERS EYE REPUBLIC OF PANAMA WATERS—SPECULATE ABOUT CONVENIENCE FLAG REPRISALS HERE

NEW YORK, January 16.—Shipping industry sources, eyeing the current flags of convenience dispute, today speculated that Panama may try to close its newly-extended territorial waters to flags of countries opposing the use of the Panamanian flag in world shipping.

Such a move, they said, would be sure to touch off a serious international dispute. However, Panama has not indicated it plans any such action.

The United States, which operates the Panama Canal under a treaty with Panama, would be put in an embarrassing spot if Panama were to place any restrictions on foreign shipping, maritime lawyers said.

The United States, Japan, and France have already sent protests to Panama about the extension of territorial waters from 3 to 12 miles, thus sealing off the Canal Zone from the open sea.

(The protests are under consideration by a special committee of Panama's Council of Foreign Relations. The committee is composed of Drs. Harmodio Arias, Ricardo J. Alfaro, Octavio Fábrega and Carlos Sucre).

It seems that the fight over the use of flags of convenience has opened a Pandora's box.

The fight has turned into a real nightmare for diplomats.

The battle started when traditional maritime nations such as Britain and Norway and labor unions protested against the growing use of Panamanian, Honduran, Liberian, and Costa Rican flags.

The argument put forth was that ship operators were turning to these flags of convenience to avoid paying taxes and meeting other restrictions as to safety and crews' living conditions.

In December, labor unions around the world tried to boycott ships flying these flags, but it was only partially successful.

Ship operators contended they had to turn to these flags of convenience to avoid stringent regulations and general redtape which was forcing them out of business.

The countries involved fought the move to boycott their vessels. Liberia and Panama were the most outspoken, charging the older maritime nations with trying to force ship owners to use only certain flags.

There were some rumblings in the oil industry, a major user of flags of necessity, that oil companies might boycott British and Norwegian ships in their operations.

[From the Panama Star and Herald, Jan. 22, 1959]

REPUBLIC OF PANAMA REJECTS PROTESTS ON 12-MILE SEA

The Panama Government yesterday officially rejected protests by the United States, France, and Japan against this country's extension of its territorial waters to 12 miles. In almost identical notes, Panama reminded all three nations that they had approved a United Nations report setting 12 miles as the limit—under international law—for territorial waters.

In the case of the U.S. protest, Panama said there is no ground for heeding the suggestion that Panama reconsider its action.

The United States and France, which had served notice that they reserved all their rights in the 12-mile zone, also were told that Panama would appeal to international courts in the event its sovereignty or territorial integrity is violated in the extended zone.

The notes were delivered yesterday to Julian F. Harrington and Lionel Vasse, Ambassadors of the United States and France, respectively, and Ken Ninomiya, Minister of Japan. All three notes were signed by Foreign Minister Miguel Moreno, Jr.

The three protesting nations had called to attention that the U.N. General Assembly only recently agreed to call an international conference to discuss the breadth of international waters. Panama replied that this was no ground to maintain that the nations which had agreed to the calling of the conference should abstain from affirming their sovereign rights over territorial waters in keeping with acknowledged principles of international law. The Panamanian note pointed out that it was impossible to foresee how long it would take to attain an international treaty on the question and noted that the U.N. Conference on the Law of the Sea, held in Geneva in 1958 had rejected a motion providing specifically for such abstention.

Panama argued also that the old doctrine of a 3-mile limit never had as foundation any universal international treaty. It emphasized that at present, of 71 countries with seacoasts, only 18 still adhere to the 3-mile limit.

Moreno's note quoted from a U.N. report on the law of the sea by the Commission on International Law which held that international law does not authorize the extension of the territorial sea beyond 12 miles. It was this report, Moreno recalled, that was approved by the United States, France, and Japan, as well as Panama.

The note to the United States added:

"With regard to the statement by Your Excellency that your government 'reserves all its rights in the area covered by Law 58 of December 18, 1958' (which provides for the 12-mile extension), my government, deeming that the old area of 3 miles is not a matter of divergence between the two governments, must understand that 'reservation of rights' as referring solely to the area that has been extended, namely, the additional 9 miles to the old area of 3 miles. And, in that understanding, my government deems that this additional area of 9 miles being not only under Panamanian sovereignty but also under the exclusive jurisdiction of Panama, neither the United States of America nor any other State may reserve any right whatsoever over that area. My government hopes that this unjustified 'reservation of rights' shall not manifest itself through facts or situations which Panama would have to deem as violating its sovereignty or its territorial integrity, and therefore, international law and the charter of the United Nations, and which would entitle Panama to utilize the resources authorized by international law, including that of recourse to the proper organs of international justice."

The Foreign Minister's reply to the United States, France, and Japan followed recommendations made by the National Council of Foreign Relations, an advisory body composed of the nation's top international jurists. The protest notes had been referred to the council for recommendations on the reply.

The Foreign Ministry's official reply followed the emphatic stand by the National Assembly earlier this month against revising the law providing for the 12-mile seas "for any reason whatsoever." That stand was taken on a unanimous vote after the State Department in Washington disclosed it had protested to Panama and had requested that Panama revise its action.

A National University student group is organizing a public rally Saturday afternoon at Santa Ana plaza as a reaffirmation of the country's right to extend its territorial seas to 12 miles and of its sovereign rights in the Canal Zone.

[From the Panama American, Jan. 24, 1959]

OPERATION SOVEREIGNTY GROUP TO MARCH DOWN CENTRAL AVENUE

At 5 p.m. today the May 2 university group which was responsible for last year's Operation Sovereignty will gather at Plaza Porras and march down Central Avenue to Plaza Santa Ana.

There a rally will be held to reaffirm Panama's sovereignty claims. The demonstration will be specifically in connection with Panama's extension of its territorial waters to 12 miles. Panama has officially rejected protests by the United States, France, and Japan.

Speakers will include former Foreign Minister Aquilino Boyd, representing the National Patriotic Coalition, and Carlos Arellano Lennox, who was president of the university students union at the time of the flag-planting Operation Sovereignty.

Former President Arnulfo Arias, who arrived yesterday from his Boquete coffee plantation, has been invited to speak at the rally, but it is not certain that he will.

[From the Panama Sunday American, Jan. 24, 1959]

STUDENT LEADER BLASTS STATE DEPARTMENT AND U.S. ARMY

The U.S. State Department and the Department of the Army were branded as racketeers last night by student leader Carlos Arellano Lennox to climax a sovereignty rally which got under way several hours late.

The rally, organized by the Dos de Mayo Movement, a faction of the Panama University Students Union led by Arellano, had been scheduled to get under way at 5 p.m., with a parade from the Legislative Palace along Central Avenue up to Santa Ana Plaza.

The parade was apparently called off owing to the small number of demonstrators who showed up. However, the organizers managed to get a group estimated at about 150 to gather at Santa Ana Plaza more than 2 hours later to hear five of the seven scheduled speakers.

In addition to Arellano, the speakers were Assemblyman Aquilino Boyd, Ramon Pereira, Jose M. Quiros y Quiros and Julio Sosa Lennox. Two others, Dr. Diogenes Arosemena, secretary general of the university, and former Ambassador to London Cesar Guillen, were not present.

The crowd swelled to about 250 to 300 by the time the meeting ended at 9:15 p.m.

Arellano also blamed Wall Street for the attitude of the United States toward the recent extension of Panama's territorial water limit to 12 miles, and asked:

"Why didn't the United States protest when strong countries like Peru extended their territorial waters to 200 miles?"

Arellano said it was because the extension did not affect the interests of Wall Street.

The student leader, who is a science professor in a Catholic private school, argued that the United States claims rights in the Gulf of Mexico and now wants to deny Panama's right in Panama Bay.

Referring to U.S. Representative DANIEL J. FLOOD, Democrat, of Pennsylvania, Arellano said he wished he was here to see if there were any political demagogs among the speakers.

He insisted that Panamanians are a democratic people who are well aware of the dangers of communism, adding:

"Although we are democrats we are not disposed to die of hunger because Wall Street wills it so."

Following this remark, Arellano thanked his listeners and the meeting ended.

[From the Panama American, Jan. 26, 1959]

RICARDO ARIAS TERMS SEA LIMIT "JUST AND LEGAL"

Panama's Ambassador to Washington, ex-President Ricardo Arias who arrived here early today is quoted as saying that Panama is within her sovereign rights on the 12-mile territorial water limit.

"Panama's attitude on this issue is just and legal," he added.

Arias said Panama has accepted the idea of holding a conference next year to discuss this touchy situation.

Arias reportedly returned to Panama for a series of political conferences.

He was greeted at the airport by a large gathering of influential political and personal friends.

[From the Panama American, Jan. 27, 1959]

PLOTS, GUNS IN ABUNDANCE—REPUBLIC OF PANAMA COPS POUNCE IN RIO ABAJO, CHIRIQUI, TOCUMEN

Three men and a woman are being held today by the Panama secret police following the discovery of a $20,000 arms cache, including several machineguns and 40,000 rounds of ammunition, in a cottage in Rio Abajo.

One of the arrested men, Armando Aguilar, who lived in the cottage, has reportedly confessed that the weapons were to be used in a plot to overthrow the government of President Ernesto de la Guardia, Jr.

Meanwhile 16 persons were arrested in the Cerro Pando region of Chiriqui, also charged with a subversive plot against the government. The 16 include Jose Gaitan Miranda, who has been nicknamed the "Fidel Castro of Chiriqui" for his association with the arms cache found on the Los Cerritos farm of former deputy David Anguizola.

At the weekend 101 revolvers were found by customs inspectors at Tocumen airport.

Under arrest along with Aguilar in the Rio Abajo arms find is Ruben Rosas, manager of the recently reopened El Rancho Garden, Aguilar's wife Margarita, and a Chinese resident whose name has not been revealed.

Rosas was arrested at Tocumen today when about to board a plane for Costa Rica. He is believed to have been implicated by Aguilar, who is also said to have implicated several others.

The cache found in the attic of the Aguilar cottage at Seventh Street, Rio Abajo, included 4 machineguns, 9 submachineguns, 16 rifles, 31 revolvers, and 40,000 rounds of ammunition.

The 16 persons, including both men and women, picked up in Cerro Pando, have only one gun between them, a .22 rifle. Equipped with knapsacks and campaign cots, they claimed to have been searching for Indian huacas.

National Guardsmen confiscated their equipment.

Miranda is thought to have fled to the Chiriqui hills at the time of the arms discovery last October on the Anguizola farm. He was arrested later, but freed later under an amnesty declared by de la Guardia.

The .38 caliber revolvers found at Tocumen were hidden in bundles of clothing, shoes, and other merchandise were understood to be in transit from El Salvador to Colombia, addressed to one Antonio Arango. Inspectors opened the packages after they remained unclaimed from December 14. Police have found no trace of Arango.

The shipment originated in Miami.

[From the Panama Star and Herald, Jan. 27, 1959]

LARGE ARMS CACHE FOUND IN PANAMA CITY—MACHINEGUNS INCLUDED IN HAUL BY POLICE—30,000 ROUNDS OF AMMUNITION SEIZED; SPECULATION IS THAT SHIPMENT WAS SMUGGLED VIA COSTA RICA

A large arms cache which included 14 machineguns and about 30,000 rounds of ammunition was discovered by the Panama secret police yesterday morning in a house in Rio Abajo. So far, two men have been arrested.

The arms were concealed in burlap bags which had been hidden in the ceiling.

Most of the weapons were loaded, it was reported.

The lot included four .30-caliber tripod machineguns, three M-3 submachineguns of the type used by parachutists in World War II, and seven .45-caliber Thompson submachineguns. In addition, searchers located 13 .45- and .38-caliber pistols and revolvers, 13 Springfield and three Winchester .30-caliber rifles.

One of the men under arrest, it was learned, is Armando Aguilar, who lives in House 25-34, Seventh Street, Rio Abajo, where the arms find was made at 10 a.m. Aguilar was identified as a former minor employee of the Immigration Department of the Panama Foreign Office.

Investigators were reported to have found also a letter to Aguilar signed by a Costa Rican border official who is a former resident of Panama. This immediately started speculation that the arms were smuggled into Panama by way of the border with Costa Rica.

The arms were not new. They were wrapped in sheets of the New York Post of November 6, 1958, and other U.S. newspapers.

Investigators declined to reveal the name of the second man under arrest.

Some of the bags in which the weapons were concealed bore the penciled word "MAYO" (May). This was the month in 1958 when bloody clashes occurred on the streets of Panama City between the National Guard and students. The government said the clashes were inspired by the opposition.

This is the second lot of arms uncovered by Panamanian authorities in less than a week. Over the weekend, officials found that a shipment which had arrived in Tocumen Airport marked as wearing apparel, actually contained brand new revolvers. Investigators confiscated 101 of them.

There were indications that the revolvers, which were shipped out of Miami, were in transit to Colombia, consigned to one Antonio Arango. The shipment arrived at Tocumen last December.

[From the Panama Star and Herald, Jan. 27, 1959]

"DICKY" ARIAS SAYS LOGICAL HE SHOULD RUN—THOUSANDS GREET PANAMA'S ENVOY TO UNITED STATES ON HIS ARRIVAL HERE

Panama's Ambassador to the United States, Ricardo Arias, said yesterday "it is only logical" that his name should be mentioned among the 1960 presidential candidates of the National Patriotic Coalition. Arias returned to Panama City for 2 weeks of consultation with government officials.

The Coalition is the administration party.

Arias said the party has many members who meet all qualifications of honesty, capability, and service to the people for running for President. When he was asked if he would be a presidential candidate, Arias replied the Coalition is a democratic party and it's only logical that his name should be included among those party members who are qualified to run for the country's highest office.

Arias served as Acting President from 1955 to 1958.

Thousands of friends welcomed him at the airport. The Ambassador returned with his wife, Mrs. Olga Arias.

Arias said there is no problem between the United States and Panama over this country's recent extension of its territorial seas from 3 to 12 miles. The Ambassador said Representative DANIEL FLOOD, whose criticism of Panama's action aroused resentment here, is only 1 among 430 Members of the House of Representatives. One man's opinion, he said, no matter how respected he may be, is not the opinion of the United States. Arias added that FLOOD was entitled to voice his opinion, just as much as Panamanians have a right to express their opinion.

[From the Houston Chronicle, Feb. 4, 1959]

LATIN AMERICA—CANAL OFFICIALS CONVENE

(By Marshall Bannell)

BALBOA, C.Z.—The Board of Directors of the Panama Company, U.S. Government-owned corporation which operates the Panama Canal, flew from Washington and other points to the Canal Zone this week and is meeting in private sessions.

A major point on the agenda is believed to be the problem posed by Panama's recent extension of the Republic's territorial waters to 12 miles off both the Caribbean and Pacific coast lines. Previously it claimed only to a limit of 3 miles.

The U.S. State Department protested and asked that the matter be reconsidered. Panama rejected the protest.

THEORETICAL RIGHTS

Through its treaty with Panama, which gives, for all practical purposes, the United States title to the 10-mile wide, 50-mile-long strip of land from ocean to ocean that makes up the Canal Zone, the United States has offshore rights only to the 3-mile limit.

Once a vessel passes this point it will be in Panamanian territory and theoretically Panama has the right to stop any vessel in its waters. In fact, in speeches in the Panamanian National Assembly last week, this was proposed "to make sure all ships passing through our waters are observing our laws."

To back up the new territorial claims, a mass demonstration was held in downtown Panama City and speakers endorsing the program were wildly cheered.

Aquilino Boyd, a member of the National Assembly, stressed in his speech that Panama still holds sovereign rights to the Canal Zone and said Panama is entitled to half of its annual gross income. He estimated this would amount to about $50 million a year for Panama. At present Panama receives slightly under $2 million a year from the United States, plus many indirect benefits.

SCOFF AT PROPOSAL

Privately, U.S. officials term the proposal as "ridiculous" and point out that last year the canal's net profit was under $4 million.

Unquestionably, observers here agree, the 12-mile offshore territorial claims by the government have full public support in Panama. The proposal has been passed by the National Assembly and signed by President Ernesto de la Guardia.

The flaw in the claims, observers point out, is that Panama has no coast guard, navy or patrol boats and is hardly in a position to detain any vessel. However, it is reported that Panama is negotiating with Norway for the purchase of several patrol boats.

[From the Panama American, Feb. 17, 1959]

BEARDS' VISIT SHAVED?—REPUBLIC OF PANAMA GROUPS ALLEGE FIDELISTAS UNDER GOVERNMENT WRAPS HERE

Student and labor groups complained today that the Panama Foreign Office has arranged the program for delegation of Cuban revolutionary soldiers to keep them from mixing too freely with non-government groups.

The delegation of eight men and two women soldiers who participated in Fidel Castro's successful revolt to overthrow Dictator Fulgencio Batista arrived here this afternoon as official guests of the Panama Government.

The groups complained that the official program mapped out by the Foreign Office took no cognizance of the activities planned beforehand by a number of private organizations and civic groups.

The official program includes a press conference tonight at the Cuban Embassy here, and Thursday a meeting with labor leaders, followed by a mass meeting in the Olympic Stadium.

One student leader argued that there is a widespread desire to have the "barbudos" (bearded ones) address the people of Panama from Santa Ana Plaza today.

Today's program also included a tour through Panama City about 4:30 p.m., starting at Via España, up along Central Avenue, and returning via Avenue B and Justo Arosemena Avenue to Hotel El Panama.

Meanwhile, in Havana the Cuban Cabinet, with new Premier Castro presiding, voted early today to slash its salaries 50 percent.

The decree reducing cabinet pay, one of nine approved at an all night cabinet session, also ordered the suspension of all government secret funds.

Other decrees approved at the meeting provided for:

Establishment of a national institute for saving and housing, replacing the traditional lottery, which will regulate gambling in Havana's multi-million-dollar casinos.

A maritime promotion office to seek to build up the tourist trade.

Civil service security for government workers, who in future may be dismissed only for "high convenience of the government," with 3 months' severance pay. Top officials appointed by ousted ex-President Fulgencio Batista were exempted from the provisions of this decree.

Ratification of all acts committed by the rebels during their 2 years in the Sierra Maestra and cancellation of all prison sentences resulting from their acts.

Castro, who at 32 is the youngest man ever to hold the post of Premier, had said earlier that he expects his new job to be "the toughest test of my life."

[From the Panama American, Feb. 18, 1959]

FIDELISTA BRANDS UNIFRUCO AS HUGE FOREIGN MONOPOLY

The spokesman of the Cuban rebel delegation which arrived in Panama yesterday singled out the United Fruit Co. as one of the huge foreign monopolies which naturally feel hurt over the fall of Dictator Fulgencio Batista.

Slickly fielding questions at a press conference at the Cuban Embassy here last night, Cuban rebel Capt. Jorge E. Mendoza rejected the idea that there was a widespread plot to discredit the revolutionary government of Fidel Castro in Cuba.

Mendoza emphasized that the rebel movement is not anti-Yankee, but he blamed a press campaign against the rebels on those large foreign concerns which he said used to dispossess farmers from their lands at will with the aid of Batista officials.

This morning, Mendoza and the rest of the delegation attended a wreath-laying ceremony at the bust of the late President Manuel Amador in Cathedral Plaza.

They are scheduled to meet with student groups this afternoon at 5 p.m. and attend a dinner tonight as guests of the Panama Lions Club.

Questioned about granting permission to the Cuban Communists to organize politically, the bearded, long-haired Mendoza said last night:

"We decided it was better to know who they are than to have them operating underground."

The delegation of one woman and eight men, including Catholic Chaplain Guillermo Sardiñas, arrived at Tocumen Airport about 2:30 yesterday afternoon.

They were met by an official government reception committee and a crowd of about 2,000 persons who insisted that the rebel delegation turn its back on the official welcome.

The Fidelistas solved the problem by dividing themselves in two groups: Mendoza, Lt. Rafael San Martin, and Pvt. Francisco L. Viera staying with the reception committee and visiting President Ernesto de la Guardia, Jr., at the Presidencia, while the remainder went with the crowd and drove through Panama City in a 250-car motorcade.

The rest of the delegation includes Capt. Mario Hidalgo, Lt. Orlando Benitez, Lt. Violeta Casals (a TV star who joined the rebels), and Pvts. Ricardo Valladares and Cesar Fonseca.

At the end of the motorcade, the group were guests over a local radio station.

In answer to another question, Mendoza said the new Cuban Government hoped to solve the problem of the millions of dollars stolen from the Cuban treasury by those who fled the country with the fall of Batista by devaluating all Cuban pesos now stashed away in foreign banks.

A possible disturbance was averted by Mendoza's companions during the press conference when a crowd of about 500 persons who had gathered outside the Embassy started clamoring for them to come out.

The press conference was interrupted briefly when two of the rebels intervened in a brief clash between the national guardsmen who were guarding the half closed door to the Embassy and two student leaders.

One of the bearded rebels and Miss Casals mounted at the base of a pillar and asked the crowd to emulate the discipline which had resulted in the victory of their cause by dispersing and going to their homes.

The crowd paid some heed and by the time the press conference was over late last night only a handful remained outside to cheer the group as they went back to Hotel El Panama where they are staying as guests of the Panama Government.

Meanwhile, UPI reports from Havana said Maj. Jesus Sosa Blanco, Cuba's twice-convicted war criminal No. 1 was executed early today by a firing squad to which he gave the order for his own death.

Sosa was shot at 2:16 a.m. in the dry moat surrounding Havana's Cabaña fortress prison.

Reports from the scene said he faced the firing squad bravely.

"I forgive you, and I hope you forgive me," he said in a clear, steady voice, and a moment later spoke his last word:

"Fire."

The regular commander of the firing squad administered the coup de grace, firing a .45 caliber bullet into Sosa's head to make certain he was dead.

FIVE THOUSAND SEIZE PANAMA'S CITY HALL—JUNTA SET UP IN ROW OVER USE OF FUNDS—MEMBER OF COUNCIL ACCUSED OF ATTACK IN RADIO STATION

PANAMA, February 19.—Several thousand demonstrators seized city hall in the Panamanian capital last night after the beating of a radio commentator who had charged municipal funds were being mishandled.

The crowd—which swelled to 5,000—demanded the ouster of the 15 city councilors and set up a rump council to run municipal affairs.

They kept control of the building until President Ernesto de la Guardia, Jr., pledged that the regular councilors would be barred from their offices pending an investigation.

The President ordered the national guard to leave the demonstrators alone.

JUNTA TAKES CHARGE

The self-described "Revolutionary Municipal Junta" announced it was taking over administration of municipal affairs until the present council was replaced. The group is headed by Guillermo Marquez Briceno, a lawyer who gained national prominence in 1957 for successfully defending seven persons charged with the assassination of President Jose Antonio Remon.

The municipal junta began issuing sweeping ordinances, but there was no indication how they would carry them out.

The march on city hall was led by Ramon Pereira, a young radio commentator who had denounced the councilors at a rally Tuesday night. Bleeding from a head wound, he charged that Councilman Mario Velasquez and five men invaded his radio station yesterday afternoon, fired revolvers, blackjacked him, and attacked his wife and daughters. Radio listeners heard the sounds of the fight and gunfire.

BROTHER ARRESTED

A brother of Mr. Velasquez has been arrested on a charge of assaulting Mr. Pereira, but the councilman is immune from arrest while holding office. Marion Velasquez and 11 other councilmen issued a statement that they were not resigning. They were elected in 1956 for 4-year terms.

The municipal building was deserted when the crowd reached it, the working day having ended. The demonstration was orderly, but many store owners, fearing violence, shuttered their windows as the excitement built up.

Most of the crowd went home before midnight, but the leaders said they would carry on their campaign until their demands are met.

[From the Panama Star and Herald, Feb. 19, 1959]

DEMONSTRATORS TAKE OVER CITY HALL HERE—MOVE FOLLOWS ARMED ATTACK ON RADIO MAN—COUNCILMAN BEATS UP COMMENTATOR OVER CHARGES ON HANDLING OF CITY FUNDS; "JUNTA" SET UP

Thousands of demonstrators took over the city hall building in Panama City yesterday in the aftermath to an armed attack upon a popular radio commentator who denounced mishandling of city funds.

The crowd, which at its peak numbered about 4,000 men and women, started a vigil in Cathedral Plaza, opposite city hall, at 2 p.m. It was still on watch at midnight and leaders said the vigil would be kept indefinitely.

The en masse removal of the 15 incumbent members of the municipal council was the avowed purpose of the demonstrators.

A revolutionary municipal junta announced it was taking over municipal affairs, pending the replacement of the present council membership. The junta is headed by Guillermo Marquez Briceño, a local attorney. Briceño gained national prominence as defense counsel in the trial of the defendants who were charged with the assassination of President Jose A. Remon. The defendants were acquitted.

The junta issued a series of sweeping ordinances, among them one suspending all unfinished municipal contracts and another ordering the closing today of municipal offices.

The only concrete result of the demonstration was an official pledge that, pending a decision on the ouster, none of the incumbent councilmen will be allowed to enter the municipal headquarters. The pledge was first made by Attorney General Hermogenes de la Rosa and was confirmed later by President Ernesto de la Guardia, Jr.

The president also sent word that the national guard would not be ordered out to interfere with the demonstration. He was visited by a committee from the revolutionary municipal junta. The presidential palace is 2 blocks from the city hall.

The demonstrators rallied to the support of Ramon Pereira, a young radio station proprietor, who was attacked in his office in Radio Mia shortly after 1 p.m. Pereira named among his attackers Councilman Mario Velasquez, and the latter's brother, Homero.

Pereira, his face smeared with blood from a head injury, stood on the city hall balcony and told the crowd he was threatened at gunpoint and beaten with a blackjack. He punctuated his remarks with a blackjack he said he wrested from one of the Velasquez brothers.

Pereira's wife, who tried to defend her husband, also was dealt some blackjack blows. Their daughter was threatened at gunpoint, Pereira reported.

The attack appeared to have been motivated by Pereira's scathing denunciation of Velasquez, among other councilmen, at a public meeting Tuesday night at Santa Ana Plaza protesting alleged mishandling of municipal funds.

Pereira said the assailants stormed into his office and fired shots. As the men fled after beating him up, Pereira said he pulled out his own gun and fired at the assailants' car.

Some of the scuffle in Radio Mia's office was heard over the station's microphones.

Immediately after the attack, Pereira went on the air to call his supporters to a march on the city hall. Pereira's station operates a listeners' club, with about 1,000 dues-paying members. The dues—50 cents a month—entitle members to certain services.

The demonstration, initially small in numbers, reached the city hall at 2 p.m. By that time municipal employees had quit work and the building was empty. The crowd grew rapidly in numbers.

The demonstrators' mood was one of violence at the start. But Pereira's repeated urging and pleading for order were heeded and sticks which had been freely brandished, quickly disappeared from view. The only poster visible among the crowd was a large piece of cardboard inscribed: "For the rats of the municipal council—the noose." A hangman's noose hung from the poster. By Pereira's order, the crowd was kept from storming the city hall. He and other leaders, however, took over the council offices.

As the demonstration built up, steel shutters and heavy wire screens went over the glass windows and entrances of stores along Central Avenue.

The national guard, which performs police duties, quickly withdrew its personnel from the streets, apparently to eliminate any possibility of incidents with the demonstrators.

During the time that the crowd was gathered in front of the city hall, it was harangued by many speakers, including leaders of the student federation which fought a bloody action on the streets with the national guard in May 1958.

Apparently in an effort to satisfy the crowd's clamor for sweeping away the council's present membership, leaders of the movement—which was termed an open town meeting—formed a citizens committee and named a new slate of councilmen. The appointed councilmen were for the most part the leaders of yesterday's movement.

But nothing was said on how or when or by what authority the newly named council members would take office.

The main legal obstacle to the immediate removal of the councilmen seemed to be that, having been elected to office by popular vote, there is no legal authority to oust them by executive action, as was demanded last night. Most observers agreed that a judicial indictment on specific charges would be needed before any action could be taken against one or more councilmen.

Meanwhile, twelve of the incumbent councilmen, meeting at a private residence, issued a statement last night saying they were determined to retain their posts. They called the demonstration yesterday a grotesque comedy. They said there was no justification for arousing public passions over a personal incident. They declared they had never opposed the current investigation into the handling of city funds.

The councilmen also scored the attorney general for his announcement that, pending the solution of the issue of the removal of the city fathers, none of them will be allowed access to the city hall. They called the order arbitrary.

The councilmen's statement was signed by Jose Rogelio Arias, Jr., Carmen Arosemena, Luis Branca, Luis Del Rio, Ricardo Gaitán, Samuel Lewis Galindo, Rene Luciani, Juan M. Martinez, Hernando Martiz, Germinal Sarasqueta, Eduardo Stagg, Jr., and Mario Velasquez.

The last named councilman was the one whom Pereira identified as one of his assailants. Earlier Attorney General de la Rosa had announced arrest orders were issued against the assailants. Only Velasquez's brother, Mario, was under arrest last night, however. It was pointed out that councilmen are immune from arrest while holding office.

Three councilmen did not sign the statement. They are Manuel de J. Espinosa, Carlos Pretelt, and Mario de la Guardia.

[From the Washington Evening Star, Feb. 20, 1959]

CROWD INSTALLS OWN PANAMA CITY COUNCIL—OLD COUNCILMEN, BARRED FROM HALL, REFUSE TO RESIGN

PANAMA, February 20.—An orderly crowd of thousands early today defied President Ernesto de la Guardia, Jr., and installed 11 new city councilmen for the Panamanian capital.

The crowd had seized control of city hall Wednesday after the blackjacking of a radio commentator who accused the council of mishandling city funds. The council refused to resign and the President said he had no legal power to remove it since the councilmen's elected 4-year terms do not end until next year.

The President had appealed for the people to wait until an investigation could be made of the financial charges. It was not known what he would do about the worsening situation, but early today he had not ordered troops into action.

STRIKE THREATENED

Leaders of the popular movement announced a general strike would be called in Panama City today if necessary to put the new council in full control.

The march on the municipal building Wednesday came after office hours. All offices were deserted, and there was no violence. Leaders of the demonstration constituted themselves as a revolutionary municipal junta and said they would run the city until the council was replaced.

Throughout yesterday the crowd around city hall alternately diminished and grew, but remained orderly. All municipal offices except the courts stayed shut. A special detail of demonstrators prevented access to the building.

PRESIDENT CITES LAW

Mr. De la Guardia, meanwhile, told the junta he had been unable to obtain the resignations of the 12 council members from his own Government Party. Nor was there any capitulation by the other three council members—two from opposition parties and an independent.

The President said his legal staff unanimously had advised him he could not remove the council legally by decree. Mr. De la Guardia insisted he would not go against the law.

The crowd around city hall numbered about 5,000 at midnight, when the junta announced it had selected a panel of 25 citizens from which it would choose a new council. Amid loud cheers, the list was read over the radio, and loudspeaker cars helped to spread the word.

CHAIRMAN ELECTED

By 1 a.m., 11 men from the list had answered the call. A municipal judge swore them into office and they went into session in city hall, electing Carlos Enrique Adames, a lawyer, their chairman.

The next move apparently was up to the President.

Mr. De la Guardia had trouble on another front, too. The University of Panama canceled its annual commencement—scheduled for tonight after student leaders warned they would not be responsible if the President showed up to make the traditional presentation of diplomas. The university authorities replied that they could not accept impositions from within or without and called off the ceremony.

[From the New York Times, Feb. 21, 1959]

STRIKE IN PANAMA CONDEMNS GRAFT—BUSINESS HALTED BY PROTEST ON CORRUPTION—PRESIDENT INSISTS COUNCIL QUIT

(By Paul P. Kennedy)

PANAMA, February 20.—Retail and wholesale business came to a standstill here this morning in a near-general strike in protest against the alleged corruption of the city council.

President Ernesto de la Guardia made a nationwide emergency broadcast in the midst of the shutdown of business, appealing for calm and demanding that the city council resign.

While the President was speaking, his mother, Isabel Navarro de la Guardia, died of a heart attack in the Panama Hospital. She was visiting the President's father, who has been ill in the hospital for some time.

COUNCIL REFUSES TO QUIT

President de la Guardia acknowledged that he did not have the power to make the council resign. He asked privately last night for the resignation of all council members, but they refused. The President said today that he would be "attacking the very foundation of the republic" if he forced their resignation.

The difficulty began Wednesday when a councilman attacked Ramon Pereira, owner of a radio station, with a blackjack, while the councilman's brother held a pistol on him. Senor Pereira's station had been attacking the city council for alleged corruption in construction contracts and payroll padding.

Following the attack, Senor Pereira appealed on the radio for a mass meeting and several thousand citizens responded. The city hall was taken over by the citizens emergency committee, which has held it since.

RIVAL COUNCIL FORMED

A new council was to be sworn in soon, headed by Carlos Enrique Adames, president of the National Bar Association. But a spokesman for President de la Guardia said he could not recognize it as constitutional.

The old council, after an all-afternoon meeting, agreed to ask a 90-day leave of absence pending an investigation of the charges against it. Luis A. Branca, one of the councilmen, said the action was not a renunciation of legal rights and that the new council could not be considered legal.

The discontent is directed as much against the national administration as against the city council. The virtual certainty that Ricardo M. Arias Espinosa will succeed Senor de la Guardia in the Presidency has set off a wave of resentment. Senor Arias, who was President before Senor de la Guardia, is a member of the set that has ruled Panama since she won her independence from Colombia.

The strike was particularly harmful to business because Panama depends largely on tourist trade.

[From the Washington Evening Star, Feb. 21, 1959]

PANAMA EASES AFTER CHANGE IN CITY COUNCIL

PANAMA, February 21.—The national government ordered out armed troops today to enforce its appointment of a new council for this capital city, and appeared to have the upper hand in a 4-day municipal revolt.

Troops in battle array surrounded the Cathedral Plaza opposite city hall and closed a radio station the revolutionary municipal junta had been using to rally the populace.

There was no violence and crowds, which had numbered several thousand, dwindled to about 100 persons.

Leaders of the movement, who indicated last night they would defy the government, decided to move out of the city hall. They had occupied it since Wednesday.

The government stepped into the crisis early today by naming a new city council after the old councilmen, whose removal was demanded by the junta, agreed to step aside. The old council was accused by the junta and its supporters of mishandling municipal funds.

The government announced that a new mayor and a new municipal treasurer also will be appointed.

The announcement was made by Government Minister Max Heurtematte, who said the former councilmen were "separated" from their posts. There was no immediate explanation of that term, but earlier an official source said the councilmen requested a leave of absence.

Six members of the new city council were among a panel which was chosen yesterday by the junta to install its own council.

The government acted after a popular demonstration against municipal maladministration had paralyzed the capital with a general strike. Businesses and public transport shut down tight yesterday afternoon.

[From the New York Times, Feb. 22, 1959]

TROOPS IN PANAMA BAR ANGRY CROWD—ACT IN RIOT THREAT NEAR CITY HALL—STRIKE CONTINUES

(By Paul P. Kennedy)

PANAMA, February 21.—The Panamanian National Guard was brought out in force today to prevent threatened rioting near city hall.

Several truckloads of armed troops sealed off city hall plaza, where a new city council had been sworn in last night by a Citizens Emergency Committee. It attempted to meet today.

The committee, which had held city hall since Thursday, was evicted by the National Guard.

Still another city council was sworn in today. This one was selected hurriedly by Provincial Governor José Cajar Escala. It became the third body to contend that it was the legal council.

Charges of corruption against the original council were the cause of unrest since Thursday, and a near-general strike yesterday. Last night this council told the Governor that it would take a 90-day leave of absence while the charges against it were investigated.

Several thousand persons gathered at two points downtown this morning. At times it appeared that the crowd would attempt to rush the troops. At one point, officers pointed their pistols at the crowd.

The site of most tension was a block from city hall plaza. Soldiers on foot, backed up by mounted troops, held back about 1,500 persons there.

The crowd would surge to within a few feet of the troops, then fall back. After considerable haranguing by speakers, the crowd would move forward again.

The tension eased when the citizens committee left city hall. Led by Guillermo Marquez Briceno, the crowd marched uptown to Santana Plaza, where loudspeakers were set up and a meeting took place.

THREE BANKERS ON COUNCIL

The new council includes three bankers, a physician, the head of the National Nursing Association, two college professors, and several merchants.

One of the bankers is Ruben Dario Carles, Jr., general manager of the Chase Manhattan Bank here and former minister of finance.

He said the first he knew of being on the council was when he read about it in the morning newspapers. He characterized the new group as "caretaker council" to run the city until a permanent council is installed.

Meanwhile, a citywide strike continued. All retail stores except grocery were closed yesterday and remained so today. Banks were closed yesterday because of the strike, but remained closed today because of national mourning for the mother of President Ernesto de la Guardia, Jr. She died yesterday.

[Translation]

EX-PRESIDENT OF PANAMA'S SOBER COMMENTS ON OPINION OF U.S. CONGRESSMAN—DR. HARMODIO ARIAS DEFENDS THE NEW LAW ON TERRITORIAL WATERS

PANAMA.—Harmodio Arias, ex-President of the Republic, director of Panama-América, and one of the most prominent jurists of the continent, commented in an editorial of his newspaper on the views advanced by Representative FLOOD in the following terms:

"Once again, Mr. FLOOD is firing his charges against the Republic of Panama. This time his pretext is the measure by which the National Assembly has, as a just affirmation of sovereignty, extended the mileage of the territorial waters to 12 miles. Mr. FLOOD denounced this measure as part of a Communist plot designed to isolate or lock off the Canal Zone, and the canal itself, and to convert it, he said, into another Berlin. And he adds, among [other] threats, that the President of the Republic would have vetoed the measure if he had not been prevented from doing so by insuperable pressure from the radical groups dominant in Panama.

"We do not deny the right of Mr. FLOOD, as Representative of the people, to freely express in the Congress of his country whatever views he may have. As we do not deny the right of our Assembly to burst out, when feeling justly hurt by Mr. FLOOD'S constant attacks against Panama, in strong criticism against him, even going so far as to call him Public Enemy No. 1 of our country. All these are natural phenomena in democracies where there is freedom of speech and where it happens that, in the heat of passion, reason, logic, and serenity do not always exercise the moderating force which they should.

"But this is not, so far as we are concerned, the most important aspect of this new incident created by Mr. FLOOD. We deem it of greater importance to analyze very thoroughly the stubborn attitude of the North American Congressman, with a view to deriving conclusions, from such analysis, which will prove constructive for the good relations between the two countries.

"And if Mr. FLOOD would care to change his course of action and address his impetuousness to constructive action, I wish he would, first of all think over the unfair lack of equilibrium existing between Panama and the United States of America in the distribution of profits resulting from the operation of the canal; I wish he would ponder, for example, over the pitifully small annual allowance which Panama receives, which is less than half of what a private banana company pays whose concession seems modest, almost insignificant, as compared with the enormously large canal concession. And, following this course, he might stop to look with amazement at the series of injustices perpetrated by the United States against Panama.

"We should presume that Mr. FLOOD, as a citizen and representative of the people, would want his country to have the highest possible advantages; and that, in the matter of foreign relations, he would want to see those advantages crystallized in the existence of firm and cordial relations with the nations of this continent, especially with the Republic of Panama. And if that is so, the gentleman would then have to be told what history repeats with constant illustrations: that a befuddled, impassioned, blind, extremist, unrelenting patriot may—even if his intentions are the best—do as much damage to his country as the cynical or unworthy citizen who betrays it deliberately. Still recent [fresh in our memories] is the case of Senator McCarthy who, for many thinking North Americans, was one of the reasons why the United States could not be prepared in the field of science at the proper time in order to meet the terrifying Soviet progress in the conquest of outer space.

"If Representative FLOOD really wanted better and more cordial relations between Panama and the United States he would take a closer look at the causes for the deterioration of those relations; he would scrutinize the facts which speak for themselves and point to where the sources of trouble, resentment, and protests of the Panamanians are lodged, and would try to do something about eliminating them.

"I wish he would see how, while a treaty clearly gives Panama commercial benefits [privileges] in the market of the zone, that same zone imports meat from Australia and engages in all sorts of legerdemain in violation of the letter and the spirit of the treaty.

"I wish he would see how the equality of wages and job opportunities, agreed upon by treaty over 20 years ago, suffers setbacks, procrastinations, and infringements to a point where, irrespective of what had been agreed upon, this equality is operated, in essence, on the basis of local wages for Panamanians and U.S. wages for North Americans, despite the diffuse language of the rules and regulations which have been issued. And inequality of wages is translated, of course, into inequality of retirement or pension payments, which depend on those wages.

"I wish he would see how the [equality of] job opportunities [is] are being ridiculed by way of rules and regulations which pad and extend in a terrifying manner, far beyond the agreements, the concept of security jobs, so as to reserve these exclusively for the North Americans.

"I wish he would see how in the Canal Zone the duty-free import of diamonds and jewelry is continuing; and how, upon our protests, a U.S. diplomatic officer has gone so far as to say—no doubt with inaudible sarcasm, under his breath—that diamonds contribute to maintaining soldier morale.

"I wish he would see how the moving of the railroad station, the deadline for which has long since passed, continues to be stymied by artificial procrastinations and controversies.

"I wish he would see how, notwithstanding that the treaties state that both countries have 'a joint and vital interest' in the canal, Panama is denied flying its flag, together with the U.S. flag, in the zone, despite the reservation of Panama's sovereignty over the Canal Zone.

"So as not to overdo it: I wish Mr. FLOOD would consider and act on these and other important questions which have a fundamental effect on the now openly deteriorating relations between the two countries. He

would thus do a constructive and positive piece of work—instead of wasting time by hurling abuses against our country; instead of continuing to use the boastful, ridiculous and absurd McCarthyist chant that there is a Communist plot here [in Panama] dominating everything; instead of offending the President of the Republic by stating that deep in his heart he was harboring the unpatriotic desire to veto the 12-mile bill, but that he would not dare to do so because he was afraid of radical and pro-Communist elements; and—which is even worse—instead of devoting himself to hurling open or veiled threats against our Republic, which, in our world of today, don't scare anybody any more."

(Source: Diario de las Américas, January 22, 1959.)

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLOOD. To my colleague upon the Subcommittee on Appropriations having jurisdiction over the Panama Canal and the Panama Canal Government, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow], I am happy to yield.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted that the gentleman has seen fit to yield at this time, for I must leave the floor in a minute to attend a meeting of the Committee on Appropriations. But I wanted to commend the gentleman for bringing this important matter to the attention of the House and of the country. As to the statement that he has been declared public enemy No. 1 in Panama, I think the people in Panama some day will find out that the action which he has taken and the position which he takes will prove that he is the best friend that Panama ever had in this Congress.

If these things to which the gentleman is referring should develop, then Panama would suffer irreparable damage. I support the gentleman in his position on this matter, to keep the Panama Canal free, and under the treaty rights this country has entered into, we would keep the way clear to the canal at all times. The extension of the limits would create a real hazard.

If the gentleman from Pennsylvania will permit, may I at this time pay a tribute to a very fine Governor of the Panama Canal, Mr. Potter, who I believe has been doing an excellent job not only in the maintenance of the canal but in the work with the people around the canal and in connection with the projects for the future.

Mr. FLOOD. I am very grateful to my distinguished colleague from Ohio, because no one is better versed on this problem and the potential hazards than the gentleman from Ohio. I appreciate his very kind remarks with reference to my position on this subject. Certainly I concur in his tribute to the distinguished Governor, representing the United States in the Canal Zone.

Mr. MUMMA. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLOOD. I yield to my neighbor and colleague from the great State of Pennsylvania.

Mr. MUMMA. I want a little information. Where does this 3 miles start now? As I remember, on the Pacific side there are a lot of islands off the mainland. Some of them may be over 3 or 5 miles away. Was that the reason they may have taken this action? I am looking for a reason why they may have taken this action.

Mr. FLOOD. The reason they did this, in my opinion, is that there is no question of a pronounced infiltration of the Red Communist cause all through the Caribbean and Central and South America, and it is becoming progressively worse. The pattern for this was raised by Soviet Russia in unilaterally declaring, in violation of all international principles, a 12-mile zone in the Baltic Sea, regardless of the shore rights or the island rights at the point of extension. This is an example, and they are using that as exhibit A. There is no question of where it begins. There is no rhyme or justification for this. It is a clear pattern of aggrandizement, and nothing else.

Mr. MUMMA. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include certain articles and newspaper editorials and reports.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

THE NATIONAL DEBT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. IKARD] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, at the request of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. IKARD] I ask unanimous consent that I be recognized in his place at this time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, our national debt stands today at $283 billion. In the new fiscal year we shall be paying $8,100,000,000 in interest. This means that approximately 11 cents out of every tax dollar goes to pay the interest on the public debt without reducing that debt by so much as 1 penny.

The trend toward higher interest indicates clearly that the Government soon will be paying 3½ percent on all its obligations, or a total annual interest of $9.8 billion, assuming that the total debt remains unchanged and is not raised again. This means that if things go along exactly as they have been going, without any more increases in the national debt and without still another jump in the interest rates, in 28 years we shall have paid the total amount of the debt and still owe every penny of it.

Now, this is a tremendous burden for the American people to assume in interest payments for which our Government gets nothing in return. It is the price we are paying simply for the privilege of maintaining this huge debt. Of course as long as we have the debt the carrying charges have to be paid. There is no alternative unless we were to mimic the Soviet Government and repudiate our debts to those of our citizens who have loaned their money to the Government. That, of course, would be unthinkable. It shames us even to mention it.

Interest charges have grown so large that they constitute today an immense burden upon the taxpayers of our Nation, simply to keep the debt current, and not to reduce it by any amount whatsoever. As we struggle this year to strike precarious balances with rising costs, high taxes, and our national needs, everybody should be able to think of a thousand beneficial uses for this $9,800 million annually which is going to pay the interest on this enormous national debt.

Two weeks ago last Monday, I introduced a concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that the national debt should be systematically retired and instructing the Secretary of the Treasury to include along with interest payments in his budget submissions an annual amount sufficient to pay off not less than 1 percent of the total national debt now outstanding.

The response of many of my colleagues has been greatly encouraging. After consultation with the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MILLS], my colleague from Texas [Mr. IKARD] and I have introduced identical bills which would set up such payments in statutory law and would provide that no budget could be considered as balanced in the absence of such payments.

At the time of the original introduction I knew to my own complete satisfaction that this was the right course for the Nation to follow. I believed that the public would approve and accept such a program.

PUBLIC REACTION

If I had at the time entertained any doubts or reservations as to this latter assumption, any such misgivings would have been fully dispelled by the extremely heartening public response which has greeted this proposal.

In the past 2 weeks I have received letters from citizens of 14 different States. These have contained spontaneously written expressions inspired by the relatively small amount of news coverage which the introduction of the resolution generated. Without a single exception, each of the many letters I have received on the subject during this time has consisted of an enthusiastic endorsal of the suggestion.

Quite fully aware that responsible government cannot be conducted by an applause meter, I mention this unusually enthusiastic public reaction because I think in this particular instance it is crucial. I mention it because I have the distinct feeling that many of our colleagues have long been convinced of the fundamental rightness of such a plan as this but have seriously wondered whether the American people would be prepared to assume the sacrifices and minor inconveniences necessary to make it a reality.

CHEAPER TO PAY THAN TO OWE

Let me point out, Mr. Speaker, that if we can demonstrate the self-discipline necessary to carry out such a program, it would enable us to reach the point in 29 years at which we shall have reduced

the debt to a level where we would be paying no more in both principal and interest on the unpaid balance than we are now paying upon the interest alone.

In 100 years we could completely retire the debt by paying $495 billion in interest and $283 billion of principal, or a total of $778 billion. But if we pay nothing on the debt itself, the interest alone for 100 years will be $980 billion, and we will still owe the debt of $283 billion, or a total of $1.263 trillion.

These figures reveal amazingly that, if we were to embark on this course and follow it undeviatingly, paying only 1 percent of the debt every year, in the hundred years' time required for the complete retirement of the debt under this minimum proposal we would pay a total of $485 billion less in principal and interest than we would pay if we simply were to drift along as at present and pay interest alone on this total amount of obligation for a hundred years, at the end of which time we still would owe the entire obligation.

No attempt has been made to disguise the fact that such a program of debt repayment would in the first few years necessitate some sacrifices. The repayment of debt almost always involves sacrifices. The public is wholly conscious of this fact. With the wisdom born of personal experience, the average American knows that debt is seldom ever repaid unless these sacrifices are frankly faced and frankly assumed, and an orderly, systematic plan of payments established and carried out with an undeviating regularity.

In the long run it will be much less expensive to the Nation and to the economy. In the long run it will result in a directly measurable saving of some $485 billion if we redeem this debt no more rapidly than at the minimum rate herein stipulated. In the medium run it will be less burdensome to pay the approximately $2.8 billion of principal while still paying interest on the unpaid balance than it now is to pay the exorbitantly high amount of annual interest alone on this enormous continuing obligation.

But these are savings and benefits which will inure largely to our children and our grandchildren. In the beginning it will be burdensome and it may at times be difficult, although surely not unbearable. The public knows this.

The public knows that to balance the budget annually and make payments of some $2.8 billion on the national debt will require us to do one of two things. Either we must forego a few of the services to which we might otherwise aspire and scale down the cost of government accordingly, or we must raise the necessary revenues to make debt payments possible over and above the current cost of doing business.

It be would presumptuous in the extreme for me to attempt to foresee the situation 5 years or even 1 year from now and to predict exactly what the Congress in its wisdom might at that time deem dispensable in the interest of debt reduction. Yet I am certain that, unless we positively resolve to do this thing, face the issue once and for all and chart our course accordingly, we shall never find it convenient or expedient when gaged in the crisis of the moment to assign a top priority to debt retirement.

Unless we have already crossed that bridge and resolutely set our feet in the path of regular annual payments, we shall never find a good time to pay off the debt. To expect some vague future Utopia in which it will somehow be easy to reduce this obligation suddenly and dramatically would be to live in a fool's paradise.

Mr. IKARD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WRIGHT. I yield with pleasure to my colleague from Texas who is a coauthor and cosponsor of this legislation.

Mr. IKARD. I thank the gentleman for yielding to me and wish to state that I am happy to be associated with my very able colleague from Texas in sponsoring this legislation. As has been pointed out, this would require a budgetary item of 1 percent of the national debt as of the date of the enactment of the bill which could be not less than $2,800 million. It would be much the same approach to the problem as that most of us face when we pay for the homes we purchase, in that we amortize the loan by paying a portion of principal along with the interest.

We need reflect only a moment, I think, to know what would happen if each year we paid only the interest and nothing on the principal, it would reach the point where the principal would never be paid off. One hundred years, as my distinguished colleague has pointed out, is a long time. It is something that we sometimes hate to think of. But this is a large debt. I sometimes believe that we accomplish little by talking about who is responsible for it. The truth of the matter is that most of the debt was accumulated during World War II, accumulated at a time when we were fighting to preserve our liberty and our system of government. It was accumulated and built up at a time when our great concern was our safety and freedom.

That time, thankfully to some degree, has passed, even though I would not minimize in any way the current world situation.

The point is during these days, in our judgment, we should make some sensible plan for the amortization of this great public debt. The method suggested is not one that is new, and certainly neither of us or anyone else in this House deserves any great credit for coming up with some astounding new idea.

It goes back, in fact, as far as modern times are concerned, to the days of Sir Robert Walpole in England. The Pitts also used it during their tenure. It was used down through the revolutionary days when the various colonies used sinking funds and different plans not too dissimilar to this one. Before the Civil War, in 1862, we had an act which the Congress passed providing for a similar plan. The war debts under the then economic conditions became so critical that the operation of the 1862 act was suspended until 1869. After that time is became operative and was successful.

I was amused in reading a note in a lighter vein. A post Civil War Secretary of the Treasury had been operating under the 1862 act and some commentator of that time, obviously no friend of the Secretary, said he, the Secretary, did not know what he was doing, probably did not think it up himself, but, at any rate, the country benefited by it.

So we to some degree are in the identical position of the Secretary of Treasury of that time. We did not first think of this, it is not original, but we do feel it is something the whole country will benefit by.

Shortly after World War I, in 1919, we had a similar piece of legislation which was restricted to the amortization of the Liberty Loan Bonds issued under that act and subsequently was made applicable to all the public debt. The operation of that 1919 act was suspended in the midthirties, but until that time something over $7 billion had been paid under it on retirement of the public debt. While $7 billion is not as much as the interest on the current public debt, relatively speaking it was a considerable sum of money in those days, and, of course, to all of us today still is.

The point is that these things have accomplished their purpose. This would not be in any way a restriction or a matter that would retard the planning or operation of the executive branch of the Government. The bills H.R. 4587 and 4586, which are the bills the gentleman from Texas, Mr. WRIGHT, and I introduced, would simply require that in preparing the budget there be included in the budget a sum of money not less than 1 percent of the national debt as of the date of the enactment of the act, and that a budget could not be considered balanced unless such an amount were included.

It would simply mean that if we were to have a balanced budget, our outgo must be at least $2.8 billion less than our income, and if that is not the case, then it could not be said under any circumstances that our budget was balanced. We feel that such an act as this would bring into public focus what real deficit financing is and what it really means to have fiscal responsibility.

Without taking more time here, I would simply like to repeat that we commend this to the study of all the Members of the House. Certainly, the most critical domestic problem facing us, even though there are many, is this management of the public debt and the maintenance of our free economy, because I do not have to tell you, as many of you know better than I, that if our economy fails, if we are the victims of inflation, or if for some reason our domestic economy fails, then as a practical matter, if that should occur, it really would not make much difference how many missiles we had or how large our armed services were. So, I am hopeful that the House will give serious consideration to this proposal and that it may be enacted into law and that the results may be most fruitful.

Mr. WRIGHT. I should like to commend the gentleman from Texas [Mr.

IKARD], and to thank him not only for these remarks but for his very able and constructive cooperation with me in the presentation of these bills.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WRIGHT. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona, who I know has been interested deeply in this matter of debt retirement.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I would like to state my interest in this particular matter. As a matter of fact, I introduced a bill in the 84th Congress, in the 85th Congress, and again in this Congress to accomplish substantially the results which the two gentlemen from Texas have outlined. My bill, H.R. 1337, 86th Congress, would make it obligatory that there be a budgetary item each fiscal year of at least $2 billion for the retirement of the national debt. This would be an amendment to the Budget and Accounting Act of 1921. Of course, as the gentleman from Texas very ably pointed out, it is absolutely necessary that we do reduce this national debt. In my opinion, any budget which does not have some payment on the national debt is not truly balanced, any more than my personal budget would be balanced if I chose to ignore the principal of my debt and paid only the interest each month. To me it is absolutely essential, not only for fiscal soundness but also for the morale, morals, and welfare of the future generations of our people that we make a start, even though, as the gentleman says, it may be a modest start, on the payment of this huge national debt. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. WRIGHT. I thank the gentleman from Arizona for his well-reasoned remarks.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WRIGHT. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Florida.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WRIGHT], and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. IKARD], for presenting this proposal, and I am privileged to join in trying to start a plan to bring about a reduction of our national debt on a logical basis.

Mr. Speaker, in supporting this legislation for the gradual payment of our national debt, it was interesting to make a study of this problem, and I would commend the thoughts that have been set forth on this subject in the following publications for those who are interested: "National Debt and the New Economics," by Seymour E. Harris; "Government Finance," by John F. Due—revised; "Government Financing," by Harold M. Groves—fourth edition; and "The National Debt Series," by the Committee on Public Debt Policy.

Having listened with much interest to this discussion today, I cannot help but compare our present approach to the existing public debt with a situation that could not possibly exist in private enterprise.

Suppose that you or I, or any person in this Chamber, went to a bank to borrow $10,000. Suppose also that the terms set forth in the loan agreement made provision for interest payments on the loan to be paid at regular intervals but made no provision for repayment of the actual loan. Do we need a financial wizard to tell us that such a state of affairs could never exist in our well-ordered private business world? I think not.

Just such a situation as I have mentioned does exist in the largest business of them all—the business of government.

The dilemma to which I refer is the existing public debt. The fault lies not in the fact that we have created such a Frankenstein—it lies in our continued failure to face up to our creation.

Many take the attitude that it is hopeless concerning the possibility of reducing the public debt. Therefore, the problem has been, to a great extent, ignored. Certainly it has not been properly met. The time has come for action—in fact, it is far past due.

To be sure, the debt was created in large measure by the great global wars we have had to finance since the turn of the century. The Korean conflict, periods of internal crisis, and our efforts to achieve global supremacy in th space age have added no small amount to the total. And the end is not in sight. But we must conceive of some method of debt retirement. The pending proposal would provide an orderly, systematic plan for reducing the debt, which is desirable in view of the constant temptation of Government to find new ways of spending and to put off debt payments until some more "convenient" time in the future. History shows us that it is quite impossible to predict what will happen tomorrow. Such a "convenient" time may never materialize.

Permit me to call attention to certain facets of the debt which might be of historical interest.

In 1790, the debt could have been wiped out had each living inhabitant of the United States paid in $19 to the National Treasury. After the end of the War of 1812, each person would have had to pay in $15. Just after the Civil War, the figure rose to $78; after World War I, to $240. In 1946, to extinguish the debt, each one of us—man, woman, and child would have had to pay about $2,000 to the Government over and above the amounts collected each year to keep the Government running.

In the 27 years immediately following the Civil War, two-thirds of the Federal debt outstanding was repaid.

Over a period of 11 years after World War I, the Federal Government reduced more than one-third of the amount outstanding.

By 1949, almost $18 billion of the World War II debt had been redeemed.

Surely, history shows us that it is in the American tradition to repay debts.

The payment of the principal of a debt tends neither to impoverish a nation, nor to retard its material development; but on the other hand, the maintenance of the principal and the constant payment of accruing interest tend to cripple the productive capacity of any people.

The President has told us that in the current fiscal year the Government will pay almost $8 billion in interest on the debt. This item alone is more than the total peacetime expenditures of the Government for all purposes in any year prior to 1934.

During the peak year of 1946, the amount of interest paid on the debt constituted 3.5 percent of our total national income.

The burden of heavy interest obligations is not the only feature we have to consider. The size of the debt and its service reduced the action of the Treasury and the Federal Reserve System in their credit policy. The debt enhances the danger to the country of wrong policies; it is one thing to make mistakes in handling a small debt, but far more serious and costly when the debt is a large one.

I do not suggest for a moment that we sacrifice national security for fiscal solvency—on the contrary, if we do not maintain an adequate national defense, fiscal solvency has a hollow meaning. However, the larger the debt and interest load currently, the less room there will be for the Government to finance readily and soundly some future emergency.

There is no reason why national defense and fiscal solvency cannot go hand in hand. The plan we are discussing would help to achieve fiscal stability, while at the same time it would provide adequately where our defense needs are concerned. If we choose, by proper planning, we can accomplish both. Another strong reason that should impel us to give favorable consideration to this legislation is that money paid out in debt retirement could well serve as a stimulus to business. Of the amounts paid to individuals and financial institutions, a limited sum may be held in idle balance, but the bulk of the money will be reinvested, thus helping to shore up a flagging economy in times of recession.

On the whole, there is substantial merit in a program of gradual retirement of the Federal debt. The advantages to be realized are: First, that it results in a saving in governmental expenditures for interest; second, that it strengthens the credit of the Government so that it can better meet an emergency; third, that in time of inflation, it may serve as a tool to cope with excessive spending.

We cannot afford to ignore these advantages. We cannot afford to ignore the ever-increasing pleas for fiscal stability. We must remember that throughout our history the greatest obstacles to national financial strength, and the most acute dangers to fiscal collapse, have never been the results of inadequate or failing resources, but always consequences of weak financial policies. This proposal is one step on the way back to fiscal and political responsibility.

The Congress of the United States, in good conscience, should not let it pass unheeded.

Mr. WRIGHT. I am grateful to my colleague from Florida for his extremely timely remarks and for his service in this Chamber, which all of us have noted with much approbation.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WRIGHT. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I assume the gentleman's basic objective is to actually get a reduction in the amount of our debt. It is not just limited to some bookkeeping transaction of including it as an item of the budget?

Mr. WRIGHT. Most assuredly it is not. The only objective would be to reduce the debt.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I would suggest to the gentleman that he certainly realizes that debt is the result of spending beyond the revenue. I have not heard the gentleman discuss what his proposal is to get this spending program down to a point below the revenues which we can anticipate, nor have I heard him suggest that we ought to take the other alternative of increasing the revenue so that it would exceed the item of expense. I would hope that the gentleman and those who have spoken on his side today would join with those of us who are concerned with a balanced budget and attaining the objective of living within our income. That is something I think we must direct our attention to in the first instance. I would hope that the gentleman during this session with his votes on the various proposals that will come before us will join us in attempting to keep the expenditures down to within the terms of the present revenues anticipated.

Mr. WRIGHT. I thank the gentleman for his cogent contribution.

In all frankness and in all sincerity, I think it must be acknowledged that in order to pay amounts of this magnitude on the retirement of the national debt the American people are going to have to face the necessity that it will require, as I said earlier, sacrifices in the early years of the program until we can reduce the principal to a point at which both principal and interest payments will be less than mere interest payments are today.

Either we must curtail the expenditures required by things to which we otherwise might aspire in the way of Government services, or we must find some means of raising additional revenues—or conceivably in certain future years we must place debt retirement at a premium above immediate tax reduction. I think the American public is fully aware of that, and in this instance I am convinced that, unless I am badly mistaken, the American public is ahead of the politicians. I do not think they desire to continue in this present path indefinitely of building up and maintaining an ever higher debt.

The American public does not expect to continue in this path indefinitely. Our people do not wish to mortgage their children's future in such an irresponsible manner. They would prefer to exercise the self-discipline required to begin now these payments which ultimately will free us of the burden of deadweight in interest charges which today are exacting tribute to the tune of 11 percent of our entire national budget.

The American people do not have to be pandered to and spoon fed. They are above that. They will applaud the leadership of this Congress if we call upon them for the honest sacrifices necessary to meet our honest obligations. They will be disappointed in us if we fail.

To fail or refuse on the grounds that they cannot bear to look these facts in the eye would be to sell the American public short. This Nation has proved in times of crises that it responds with enduring magnificence when called to greatness, not when called to comfort.

Mr. COAD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WRIGHT. I yield to my colleague from Iowa.

Mr. COAD. Mr. Speaker, I wish to extend my congratulations and to associate myself with the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WRIGHT] and also the gentleman from Texas [Mr. IKARD] for I, too, have initiated action both by resolution and I will do so by a bill in the same manner as has been indicated here today. Certainly, I think that the repayment of the public debt is a very vital problem currently facing the American people. It is a problem in American politics. It is a problem in American Government and, by its direct effect, it is a problem of every American citizen. The repayment of the debt at the rate of 1 percent per year is a way whereby we can get at fiscal responsibility immediately. I am sure that not all of the fiscal problems of the Federal Government will be solved by this action which is proposed, but at least these are steps in the right direction. There is no one individual who would ever, in his personal business, believe that he could go on and on, even past the duration of his own lifetime without paying any more than interest on whatever his obligations may be. We must look at this matter of fiscal responsibility. We need certainly to have a reduction of our indebtedness. We need then also to go to the second step, in line with our Federal expenditures, to have some program and some goal in mind by which we would not merely be paying off our indebtedness with borrowed dollars. I, for one, and I believe there are others, am in favor of keeping the Congress in session each year until such time as we have balanced the budget with income, and with firm income and not with borrowed dollars. Whatever the expenditures are, they ought to be paid out of the income of the Treasury of the United States. Anything less than that is merely an indebtedness bookkeeping transaction. I believe we must have a balanced budget, which is balanced in reality. I think it ought to include a payment on our indebtedness. Let us look at the proposed 1960 budget. Here is a ready example. It ought to be more than merely a bookkeeping matter of saying, "It will be a balanced budget—if there are certain taxes that are raised"; the taxes which the President requests are taxes that are almost impossible to enact. The public does not want more gasoline tax and higher postage rates on first-class letters. This is the proposition which we have before us for the budget that has been proposed for 1960. We should plug existing tax loopholes and enact new taxes which are just and proper. Then we can go on to the second step not only of paying the interest on the national debt but also 1 percent or whatever the percentage may be on the principal of national indebtedness.

I believe it is short changing America to say that we have to always cut down and to reduce our Federal expenditures. This is a dynamic and a growing country. We should never get lavish. We should never go beyond that which is for the fundamental needs and welfare of the American people, but we ought to have fiscal responsibility not only in paying off our indebtedness but it is necessary to meet and to match the times and needs of our people with programs for the general basic good.

Mr. Speaker, finally I wish to further commend the gentleman from Texas. I think here he is leading in a gallant cause, a cause which is not the exclusive domain of any one political party, and I am glad that there are those on both sides of the aisle joining in this effort.

Mr. WRIGHT. I thank the gentleman, both for his valuable contribution to this discussion and for his cosponsorship of this legislation with us. I yield to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. BENNETT].

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I commend the gentleman from Texas on his splendid fight to reduce our national debt, which hangs like a millstone around the American taxpayer's neck. The gentleman deserves great credit for the ingenuity of his plan for systematic debt reduction. As the gentleman has pointed out, during our lifetime, we would see the day when the total payment on both interest and principal would only be as great as the amount we now pay in interest alone. During our children's lifetime, the total annual principal and interest payments would be much less than present annual interest payments, and during the lifetime of our grandchildren the national debt would be paid off completely.

Why should we care whether the national debt is $280 billion, half that, or twice that? There are several reasons why we should care. First, we all fervently desire that taxes be reduced, because we would justifiably like to have the money to spend on our own personal needs.

As the gentleman from Texas has pointed out, 11 cents of every dollar an American pays in taxes goes for interest on the national debt. The only way to reduce this outgo is to reduce the national debt. In addition, the larger the national debt, the more vulnerable our economy is to inflation. The Government, along with every other economic entity, must pay more for what it buys. This inevitably results in further tax increases.

Second. We should care about the national debt because America's financial strength in this era of costly warfare is an element in its military strength. During World War II, the financial strength of our country made it possible for it to marshal resources of neutral nations

and of nations which were only nominally on our side. A lower national debt would make our country stronger to meet any such national emergency which might arise in the future.

Third. We should care about the size of the national debt from the standpoint of social justice. A large national debt leads to inflation. Inflation enriches those who are more skillful in financial matters and who are generally the wealthiest at the expense of those who are less adept in such matters and who are usually the poorest. It works a hardship upon those who invest to care for their old age. It brings about many types of economic maladjustments and social injustices.

So, I say to the gentleman from Texas, "More power to you," and I offer my full assistance on the fine work he is doing in this field.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WRIGHT. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. PELLY. I had the pleasure of being on the floor at the time the gentleman first announced he was introducing this legislation. Subsequently I read his remarks in the RECORD and I subscribe to his sentiments, and I fully support the objectives of the gentleman and his interest in this matter.

Last Sunday on "Meet the Press" I listened to a very well known economist state that the United States should offset the loss of purchasing power in Government bonds by increasing their interest rate. I thought at this point that such planned inflation would be expensive. Increasing the interest rate to an average of 3½ percent on the national debt would not require $8 billion in the budget but it would be $9 billion; and the $8 billion today that is in that budget represents $138 for every family in America. Therefore, the interest each year on the national debt, as it increases, would increase the burden that the American people are called upon to pay on this national debt.

I want to say to the gentleman from Texas that I will be very happy to support his legislation in any way that I can, and be consistent about it, too. I intend to support this year any efforts that are made toward reducing the debt and toward balancing the budget.

Mr. WRIGHT. I am grateful to the gentleman for his expressions.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. I, too, want to commend the gentleman, but the gentleman's proposal is not sufficient. Why not join with me in H.R. 144, which provides for a balanced budget, plus 2 percent retirement of the debt in the first year, and up to 5 percent in the fourth year? Why spend a hundred years to retire this debt when my bill would do the job in 44 years? Let us do something effective; let us make a real beginning.

I would like to say that I welcome to the ranks of the economy bloc in the House the many new recruits who have taken the floor today.

Mr. WRIGHT. I thank the gentleman for his remarks. I would not quarrel with him over accelerating the rate of repayment which he proposes. It is a matter of hope to me that we might reach some figure that this House and the other body could agree upon and chart a path that might be followed, and then follow it with undeviating regularity. I would not shy from the 2 percent figure nor from the 5 percent figure proposed by the gentleman from Iowa, but I would like to suggest that the figure proposed by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. IKARD] and by me is one which we assumed would be most likely of acceptance by Members of this body and the other body. One hundred years in the life of a nation probably is not too long. Assuredly, though, it is too long to wait to start repaying our obligations.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WRIGHT. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I would like to return to the matter that we were speaking about before. The really important question of what Congress does in the matter of voting bigger expenditures and bigger authorizations? I would hope that the gentleman might save some of his speech for use in the next couple of weeks when we will have a housing bill that goes beyond the recommendation of the President by over a billion dollars and further unbalances the budget.

We will also have an airport bill that goes beyond the expenditures recommended in the President's budget. It goes beyond it to the extent of several hundreds of millions of dollars a year. It would seem to me that these would be appropriate occasions to express our great concern over economy and then fortify our position by our action on the legislation. It is here that we are going to balance or unbalance the budget. Whether or not we have a balanced budget and are able to make a payment on the debt will depend upon what we do with respect to the authorization bills, expenditure bills, and appropriations.

Mr. WRIGHT. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. IKARD] and I have been very careful in the presentation of this proposal that it be not regarded as a partisan proposal. It has been our hope that we could provide here a program in which Members on both sides of the aisle could earnestly adopt and follow as a fiscally responsible policy of government. I shall not, for that reason, deviate from the basic premise that we must pay the debt and that unless we face the reality that it will require sacrifices of one kind or another to pay the debt, we cannot get started. I shall not deviate into the tempting bypaths of partisan discussion of other matters.

I should like to point out that there are Members on both sides of the aisle who have striven and endeavored to the best of their ability to be fiscally responsible. I should like to point out that even in a Democratic administration there was some rather substantial debt retirement, under President Truman, of some $16 billion at one time. I should like to point out further that this Congress, far from exceeding the overall spending requests of the Chief Executive in the past 6 years, has, in effect, reduced those requests by a rather substantial amount. This I point out, not as a partisan accomplishment, but, rather, as the accomplishment of a Congress composed of dedicated and sincere people on both sides of the aisle, Democrats and Republicans alike.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. WRIGHT. I yield to my colleague.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. It is only because I want to keep it out of the partisan area that I am not going to comment on the statement that the gentleman made with respect to budgets that have been submitted by the President in the last 6 years; but I think the gentleman will admit that that is an item in controversy between the membership on his side of the aisle and the membership on my side of the aisle.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield briefly?

Mr. WRIGHT. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. PATMAN. I am in accord with the gentleman's views. I certainly think we have waited too long to have a planned program to reduce the national debt. I think the national debt is in competition with progress in our country.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, to revise and extend my remarks at the end of the remarks of the gentleman from Texas.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. CASEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WRIGHT. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. CASEY. I wish to join the gentleman in this effort to reduce this tremendous debt. I wish we might get some of the interest off our backs.

I, like many Members in this House, had previous experience in local government. I have just finished an 8-year term as county judge in one of the most, if not the most, populous county in the State of Texas, and one of the most populous cities in the whole Southwest. I was the chief of the administrative body setting the county budget, and we did not consider a budget was balanced until we had cut down all of our expenditures to within our anticipated revenues, including payment on our debt.

Ours was a bonded indebtedness. The national debt, of course, is in our savings certificates, Government obligations of various denominations, on which no payments are being made, resulting in just a renewal of this $8 billion plus interest charge.

I want to commend the gentleman for this effort that he is making in the way of a start on a non-partisan basis to bring our country to an orderly retirement of its obligations.

Mr. WRIGHT. I am grateful to my colleague from Texas, whose distinguished service in the short time he has been among us has been noted by all of us.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who comment on this matter may have permission to revise and extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore [Mr. ALBERT]. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARGIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WRIGHT. I yield with pleasure to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. HARGIS. Mr. Speaker, I have studied with great interest the plan offered by my distinguished colleagues from Texas, the Honorable JIM WRIGHT and FRANK IKARD, for a systematic, long-range program of national debt reduction.

I am firmly convinced that this is a sound and workable approach to a problem that demands attention. I think that the plan deserves top priority for maximum effort to get it across to the people and get their reactions immediately. Certainly, nothing could be more timely in the face of widespread accusations that the new Congress is off on a wild spending spree and giving no thought to the Nation's future financial security.

I was particularly impressed by Mr. WRIGHT'S earlier remarks to the effect that the amount of interest now required on the public debt is just so much dead weight, with which the country is burdened at a time when there are so many useful projects necessary to improve neglected districts, restore employment to a high level in distressed areas, and help put some very fine people back on their feet by rescuing them from their present desperate circumstances. As a random example from my own district in southeast Kansas, the annual interest charges on this indebtedness are almost 2 million times the amount my district now urgently needs to get a construction started on a vital reservoir project at Elk City—and I have been informed that the half million dollars that should have been included in the new budget is not available, and very unlikely to become available.

It is definitely time to do something toward debt reduction—and if the administration and its spokesmen are so concerned with the precarious state of the budget, as they now assert, I feel that they should also join us in taking immediate steps to correct the existing debt situation, which is one that cannot help but distress and agitate any clear-thinking citizen concerned not only by his own share of the burden, but by the ever-growing share that may well be faced by his children and his children's children.

As Mr. WRIGHT, Mr. IKARD, and his friend Mr. Shade from Tulsa, Okla., have calculated, this may well take a hundred years to accomplish. But, whether it takes a hundred years or a thousand, it is worth working for. You and I will not be here to see it, but I do not believe there are any of us who do not take pride and pleasure in visualizing a debt-free and prosperous America a hundred years hence. I earnestly hope that we all live long enough to take equal pride and pleasure in feeling that we helped give the country a sensible and very worthwhile start on the long road back to a sound and healthy economy.

Mr. WRIGHT. I thank the gentleman for his remarks. From every account I have heard, he is making a splendid beginning in his service here in the Congress, and I know that the people of Kansas are justifiably proud of him.

Mr. FLYNT. Mr. Speaker, will the genleman yield?

Mr. WRIGHT. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. FLYNT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas for yielding to me at this point. I congratulate him and I commend him upon his approach to this very important problem of cutting down the size of the national debt with which we are presently confronted. I think the gentleman will realize that this problem cannot be met by one approach alone; that it must take a combination of a number of consistent attitudes to reduce the ever-increasing deficit spending with which we are confronted. The gentleman will recall that during calendar 1958 there were two measures presented to ratify and approve previous deficit appropriations and expenditures in the amount of some $13 billion over the real and anticipated revenues for that same calendar year. Early in the 2d session of the 85th Congress we were presented with a $5 billion extension of the national debt. Later on during that same session we were presented with another, this time an $8 billion proposed extension of the national debt. The number of members who voted to reject this total of $13 billion extension was a relatively small number of the Members of the House of Representatives. If we had been able to muster a majority on either of those occasions, we would at that time have reduced it by substantially more during calendar 1957 than the gentleman proposes to do with his one percent proposal here. There have also been many, many occasions when certain economy-minded Members of the House have sought to amend certain appropriations bills by an aggregate sum which would have rendered unnecessary the $13 billion addition to the national debt which was put on during calendar 1958.

I wonder if the gentleman from Texas will join those of us who feel that the so-called back door approaches to Treasury raids should also be given careful and thorough consideration during this session in a line of thought which I believe is entirely consistent with the approach which has been outlined by the gentleman today.

Mr. WRIGHT. I thank the gentleman for his comments and agree that all these approaches to Government spending must indeed be given very careful scrutiny. It would be presumptuous of me or of any one of us, I think, to attempt to say in precisely what manner we are going to achieve this objective each year. For me to outline a course and to presume that the Members of the Congress would follow my specific suggestions—for instance, vote against this bill and that bill and the other bill—would be presumptuous in the extreme.

What I envision and what my colleague, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. IKARD] envisions in our setting ourselves unyieldingly and undeviatingly to a course which will place alongside these obligatory interest payments enough money to meet a one percent debt reduction. Now, how, over the 100-year period, in their wisdom at a particular moment and in consideration of the crises with which they individually will be faced, future Congresses might decide to do this, whether by reduction of expenditures, increase of taxation, or postponement of tax reduction, will be for them to say, for I cannot foresee 5 years ahead or even 1 year ahead. But, I will say to the gentleman that history clearly shows that if we do not establish an orderly, systematic method of repayment, it is not going to be done. If we simply sit back waiting in the expectation of the dawning of some future Utopia, in which it will be convenient or easy for us to make a substantial payment on our national debt, we are living in a fool's paradise.

Should we want any more vivid proof of that than the experience of the last few years, since World War II, for example? These have been years of unprecedented national prosperity. In retrospect, looking back at it, we would have to say that there has never been a better time in history for our Nation to pay its debts than in these years immediately behind us. Yet with the exception of $16.6 billion paid on the debt during the Truman administration, we have not done it. Can anyone realistically anticipate that it will be easier in the future?

What it comes down to is the fact that we are borrowing upon the future. We are shunting off to a future generation the responsibility of paying for those things which we are enjoying today. Many of these things, notably the implements of war, have already been used up and worn out. Obsolescence has taken its toll. The benefits our present economy enjoys from the impact of Government services will long since have been dissipated and forgotten when it comes time for our grandchildren to pay for them.

During the past 4 years we have 3 times extended the temporary debt ceiling and once increased the permanent ceiling. Since the end of World War II, there has only been one brief period—during the Truman administration—when our Government has made any reduction whatever in the national debt.

Yet these years have been years of comparative national prosperity. If it has not been possible for Congress during these years to reduce the indebtedness, we must wonder seriously if ever in the future we shall find it either expedient or even possible to do so without a definite commitment to some systematic plan.

We have had emergencies during this period, to be sure. But can anyone honestly contend that there exists any realistic prospect for the lessening of these tensions and critical demands in the foreseeable future?

Our Nation is engaged with Russia in a titanic competition which may not be resolved for a generation or more. And we fully intend and expect to be in business as a Nation after this period of recurrent crises and ideological conflicts shall have ended.

Mr. FLYNT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a further question?

Mr. WRIGHT. Surely.

Mr. FLYNT. Does the gentleman's plan envisage including a proposal to keep our obligated and appropriated expenditures within the actual revenues in addition to the 1 percent which he would place in the budget to retire the national debt each year?

Mr. WRIGHT. Indeed. Without this anticipation there would be no need or purpose for a program of debt retirement.

Mr. FLYNT. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WRIGHT. With pleasure I yield to my colleague from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Does the gentleman suppose that we could get the British to pay the $4 billion they owe us and use that $4 billion for our debt retirement?

Mr. WRIGHT. I would say to the gentleman that I would be delighted at the receipt of any such payment for this purpose from any source.

Mr. GROSS. I was just wondering, maybe we have overlooked something; maybe we ought to include this in our bills on this subject, for the British to pay us the $4 billion, which we could apply to retire our debt.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WRIGHT. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, may I say that Great Britain is in good financial standing with our country and all her payments are being made on time. They are now, with the extension of the loan which was passed by the last Congress. So that our relations with Britain are fine on the financial basis, and I do not think we should be demanding the money before it is due.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. I am glad the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON] mentioned the extension. That is another one of the things we do here out of the goodness of our hearts and our openhandedness, extend to the year 2008 the payment of the debt that was due us—interest and principal—2 years ago.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have permission to extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. WRIGHT. Why, then, does it not make sense to gear ourselves to the long pull and begin facing in earnest the challenge of true fiscal responsibility which seems so clearly to demand such a course?

It would be a demonstration of our faith that this Nation expects to continue in operation for at least 100 years and are conducting our business with no other end in view.

It should provide a good example of resolution and sound economy to the families of our Nation who must of necessity make plans for the eventual retirement of their private debts. And 100 years in the life of a nation is not so long as it may seem.

Such a plan should have a salutary effect upon the inflationary spiral of cheap money and increasing indebtedness. It should revive confidence both in our own land and throughout the world in the stability of our dollar.

Perhaps more basic than any of this, however, it would constitute a simple act of good faith with those generations of Americans yet to come.

This is a challenge to our vision and to our statesmanship. It will require discipline and self-restraint of both the Congress and the American public. But I believe the American Nation is equal to it. Let it not be said that the Congress lacks the courage or the faith to put it to the test.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to say this in closing:

The American people do not have to be pandered to and spoon fed. The necessity for honest payment of debt does not have to be sugar coated for them. If we assume that they are unable to bear honestly the cost of paying off these debts I think we are selling the American people short.

The condition of the world today is testing whether a free society, which depends upon public support for its policies, can endure the stresses and strains of rapid change in a world grown small and keenly demanding. Walter Lippmann has spoken of this is his book, "The Public Philosophy."

Since governments began, there has been a tendency among those in official position to shield the public from bad news. The temptation on the part of political leaders has been to counsel the pleasanter, easier, more comfortable course. But this is unworthy of our Nation and our people.

If democracy is to survive, we must demonstrate our faith in the willingness and the ability of the American people to rise to the challenges of the time. Tell them the truth, and they will respond. Rely on their good citizenship, and they will not fail us. Call forth their patriotism to honest responsibility, and it will be forthcoming. Let us provide this kind of leadership, and the American people both present and future, will be proud of us.

Mr. CASEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. CASEY. Mr. Speaker, with further reference to my distinguished colleague, Mr. WRIGHT's proposal for an orderly reduction of the national debt of not less than 1 percent per annum of the total now outstanding, let me state that this proposal, in my opinion, is one of the most forward steps that this Congress could take. I wish to point out that even though my tenure of office has been less than 2 months, I feel that my background of public service in serving the citizens of Harris County, Tex., has given me an intimate knowledge of their desires and wants with reference to their Government.

I have received a tremendous volume of mail and many of my constituents are quite concerned with the tremendous public debt and the lack of effort to reduce it.

These letters are not just from big businessmen, but are from salaried workers, housewives, and retired individuals who are dependent upon pensions for their existence.

Most of these people feel as I do that the tremendous public debt which requires over $8 billion in interest this year, has contributed to the devaluation of our dollar as well as the retention of so-called temporary taxes levied for the financing of the last Great War.

There has been submitted to this Congress a budget which has been labeled a balanced budget. I used the word "labeled" because, in my opinion, the budget submitted to this Congress is not balanced. In my experience as administrative head of Harris County, Tex., it was one of my duties, along with my fellow members of commissioners' court, to prepare a budget for the operation of the county government. We did not consider our budget balanced until we had pared our expenditures down to stay within the anticipated revenue of the county, which included a payment on our bonded indebtedness. Such budgets were not dependent upon an increase in taxes.

The budget submitted to this Congress makes no provision for any debt retirement. On the contrary, it would increase the national debt unless there is levied additional gasoline taxes and an increase in postal rates as requested by the President. Even with these two additions, it is questionable that the budget would balance should it be adopted without change.

I, for one, am opposed to any increase in the gasoline tax or the postal rates as submitted by the President in his budget request.

The executive department should show leadership in the reduction of expenditures and in the reduction of the national debt. This leadership was not shown in the budget submitted. There was no effort made toward reduction of the national debt, and no leadership shown in the reduction of expenditures.

On the contrary, the cost of the operation of the executive department has continued to rise annually, and I am informed that the increase this year will be approximately $30 million.

In the absence of leadership on the part of the executive department, someone must step into the breach, and I am very proud that the man who has come forward and has shown this leadership is from my State of Texas, in the person of Mr. WRIGHT.

Mr. Speaker, an orderly method of reducing our national debt must be devised. It has been pointed out that in a matter of approximately 29 years we shall have paid in interest alone the amount of our present national debt and still owe this debt. This is poor business and one which would not be tolerated by any normal banking institution. The bankers in this instance are the citizens and taxpayers of the United States and they too are not going to tolerate this condition to exist. They too want some payment on the principal in order to keep our credit good and our dollar sound.

I, and the people that I represent, have learned to live with the threat of the intercontinental ballistic missile. I, and the people I represent, have learned to live with the threat of communism. We have learned to live with these two threats because we know that our Government is making strong efforts and strong defenses against these two threats.

But, Mr. Speaker, I and the people I represent have not learned to live with the threat of uncontrolled inflation and the havoc that it brings. We have not learned to live with this threat because our Government is not preparing its defenses against this quiet, creeping enemy.

Mr. WRIGHT's proposal will be a first step toward stopping this enemy from within which has been steadily, but quietly, gnawing and eroding the purchasing power of the retired individual's pension, and has slowly, but surely reduced the standard of living of the salaried individual and which has, like a storm-swollen stream, eaten away the foundations of the best laid insurance plans and trust funds.

Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure, and I also deem it an honor, to join with my distinguished colleague in urging other Members of this Congress to press for the passage of this resolution, and thus show the peoples of these United States that this Congress intends to be a businesslike Congress, and one that is capable of meeting the challenge of these times.

COMMONSENSE WAYS TO REDUCE THE NATIONAL DEBT

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, my colleagues who have given us this discussion of why we should have a program to reduce the Federal debt are doing a tremendous public service. By bringing up this resolution, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WRIGHT] has filled a breach where all other leadership has been failing.

Certainly a definite program calling for a deliberate and determined effort to reduce the national debt is long overdue. I am in complete and enthusiastic accord with the purposes of the resolution.

No one would anticipate, I think, that we can have an ironclad rule by which we can reduce the national debt by some specific amount in each and every year. In fact, it would not be realistic to think that we can make any reduction during each and every year that rolls by. In some years there will necessarily be increases.

It is now a widely accepted theory that the Federal budget should be used to some extent to counteract the ups and downs in business cycles. The theory is that we should have deficits in bad years and have surpluses in good years when there is full employment. This means that we should add to the Federal debt in bad years and then pay off an equal or greater portion of the Federal debt in good years. Obviously, over the long run we should reduce the debt more than we add to it; otherwise the tremendous debt which was accumulated during the war years will never be paid off.

HOW TO KEEP OUR SIGHTS ON THE TARGET

It is now practice as well as theory to have Federal deficits in the bad years. It ought to be practice as well as theory to have surpluses and pay off substantial amounts of the debt in good years. Consequently, it seems to me that we ought to have this definite target which the concurrent resolution proposes as a firm long-range objective. It ought to be an average reduction in the debt which we will make, taking account of the fact that in some years there will be increases in the debt and in some years decreases in the debt.

More than this, we ought to have a formal procedure whereby decisions will be reached to vary from the target in individual years. At present we have a formal procedure for considering the Nation's total economic budget. This is required by the Employment Act of 1946. At the beginning of each year the President submits to Congress his economic report, as well as the Federal budget, for the year. The Congress then considers very carefully what the business and employment trends are, what level of economic activity is in prospect for the year ahead, and how the Federal budget affects and fits into this prospect. The Joint Economic Committee goes over these matters very carefully and reports to the whole Congress. This is all part of the procedure for trying to carry out the national policy declared in the Employment Act of 1946, which is that the Federal Government will "use all practical means and coordinate and utilize all its plans, functions, and resources to promote maximum employment, production, and purchasing power."

I am in favor of the resolution. It can be adopted and should be adopted without awaiting the additional step which I think should also be taken. But I believe that we should go a step further than the resolution and set up by law a formal procedure that will have to be met to justify any variation from the general target in any specific year. At least there should be a justification for failing in any year to make the minimum reduction in the debt which the target calls for.

Perhaps a good procedure would be one that would require the Secretary of the Treasury and other administration officials to come to Congress and obtain a specific enactment giving advance permission for failing in any year, to make the minimum reduction called for by this resolution. This procedure would work in the same way as the statutory limit on the Federal debt, and it would have the same beneficial effects.

The reason for having a law specifying the maximum Federal debt that can be outstanding at any one time is, as I see it, to require particular care and consideration in going beyond that limit. Administration officials have to come to Congress and give the justification for increasing the debt, and this focuses attention of both Congress and the general public on the matter. Under these circumstances there is a strong tendency to prevent willy-nilly increases in the statutory limit. The same should apply to our failures to reduce the national debt in any year by the amount of the stated objective.

Let me add now two specific suggestions which will be tremendously helpful in reducing the national debt and in keeping it reduced.

REDUCE THE INTEREST COST ON THE DEBT

First, the tremendous interest costs which are now being paid on the debt should be reduced. The Congress can, furthermore, quite simply bring about a reduction in these costs.

In fiscal 1958, the interest charges on the debt came to $7.7 billion. These costs have more than doubled since 1945 on a debt of the same size. Just since 1953 they have gone up approximately $1 billion a year on a debt of a comparable size. This is because of increased interest rates.

In future years, unless interest rates are reduced, these charges will increase a great deal more. The Treasury is constantly refunding the debt, paying off maturing securities which bear relatively low interest rate and issuing new securities which bear high interest rates.

On the other hand, if Congress takes action to bring interest rates down, then this refunding will take place at lower rates. If we brought interest rates down to the 1953 level, and certainly that was a very high level, we would save about $1 billion a year in interest charges on the old debt, not to mention other savings on the amount of the recent debt increase.

What can the Congress do about interest rates?

All that would be needed is a concurrent resolution expressing a large and firm desire on the part of Congress that the rates be brought down.

The Federal Reserve System determines the level of interest rates. The Federal Reserve System, furthermore, is an agency of Congress and it is operating on a delegation of congressional powers. If Congress asks the Federal Reserve authorities in clear and firm tones to lower interest rates, the rates will be lowered.

In fact, Chairman Martin of the Federal Reserve Board acknowledged to the joint economic committee just this month that the Federal Reserve is, indeed, operating on Congress' powers to issue money and regulate the value of money; and he said that the Federal system would comply with any mandate Congress might give.

THE FEDERAL RESERVE'S VETO POWER OVER SPENDING MEASURES

True, bringing interest rates down would upset the Federal Reserves' present plans for the level of economic activity we are to have in this country. It

would cause the Federal Reserve to open somewhat the damper it is now holding over the System. And this would be good in every respect. Not only would this allow the unemployed—now 6 percent of the labor force—to go back to work, it would allow the business system to start growing again. And the increased employment and increased incomes which would result from the steps taken to reduce interest rates would do a great deal more toward paying off the debt than even the savings on direct interest costs. At present tax rates, the Treasury would have a large surplus this year instead of a great deficit and a great increase in the national debt.

Incidentally, as we consider here, and in the committees, legislative programs and spending measures which have been proposed for stimulating business and putting the unemployed back to work, let us not overlook this fact: Congress might pass spending measures without end, and the President might sign them and put them into effect, but they would not increase employment by so much as one man—unless and except to the extent that the Federal Reserve authorities chose to allow employment to increase. The Federal Reserve—specifically the Open Market Committee—holds a second veto power over any spending measure Congress might pass. The President, of course, holds the first veto power. But beyond that, there is a second veto power in the hands of the Open Market Committee insofar as the questions whether, and to what extent, spending measures, or any other measures, will have any effect on the level of business and the level of employment in this country.

This is not intended to suggest that the Federal Reserve can cause a business boom at any and all times it might wish to. It cannot. But it can do the reverse. It can pull on the Nation's purse strings to hold demand and employment down; but it cannot very effectively push on the purse strings. This is one of those times when the demand is present and the business confidence is present, but the Federal Reserve is pulling on the purse strings.

HOW TO AVOID GIVEAWAYS OF GOVERNMENT BONDS

My second proposal has been worked out in more definite and specific details. It is also more important and more fundamental. It is a proposal for stopping the present unwarranted and idiotic practice of allowing commercial banks to create money with which to buy and hold interest-bearing securities of the U.S. Government and tax-exempt bonds of the State and local governments.

Only last year—the calendar year 1958—the Government of the United States delegated to private commercial banks sufficient amounts of its money-creating powers to allow these banks to acquire $10.4 billion of Government securities. This was a free gift of $10.4 billion from the Government of the United States to the private banks which cost the banks absolutely nothing. It was a gift which will cost the taxpayers about $350 million each year in unnecessary and unearned interest charges. I explained this gift and how it arose at some length in my remarks last week. They appear at page 2772 of the RECORD for Thursday, February 19.

The proposal for stopping these tremendous giveaways is a very simple one. It rests on the fact that both the Federal Reserve System and the private commercial banks have powers for creating money. Both are operating on a delegation of the money-creating powers of the Congress.

ONLY THE MONEY TO BE CREATED ANYWAY SHOULD BE CREATED BY THE FEDERAL RESERVE

Consequently, to the extent that new money is created for the purpose of purchasing securities of the United States Government, the money ought to be created by the Federal Reserve System, and the securities ought to be acquired and held by the Federal Reserve System. The Federal Reserve System is owned by the Government and its income from interest on Government securities flows back into the Treasury of the United States, just as does its income from other sources.

Now one point should be emphasized, because it is the point on which those who opposed this commonsense proposal like to misunderstand. The point to be emphasized is this: Whenever Government securities are issued they should, to the maximum extent possible, be paid for out of savings. In other words, they should be sold to individuals and to institutions that do not create money. They should be sold to such institutions as savings banks, life insurance companies, industrial corporations, investment trusts, and so on. None of these institutions has any power for creating money. They hold savings, and any securities they purchase are purchased with savings.

There are reasons why new money should be created at times, but these have to do with the growth and the needs of our economic system. New money should not be created merely for the convenience of the Government in financing its operations.

But when money is going to be created anyway for the purpose of buying Government securities, that money should be created by the Federal Reserve and not by the private banks, thereby saving the taxpayers the interest charges.

This proposal is no offhand and unconsidered idea. It has been something of a campaign of mine, and I have gone into the matter most thoroughly.

At the beginning of World War II—even before Pearl Harbor—I went before the Ways and Means Committee and suggested then that these steps be taken to avoid building up huge accumulations of Government securities in the hands of the private banks. It seemed clear then, as now, that if this happened, the result would be a tremendous inflation as well as a huge burden of interest charges on the taxpayers, continuing almost indefinitely.

At that time, in 1941, the Ways and Means Committee was considering the Public Debt Act of 1941. The total public debt then was about $44 billion.

Similarly, I urged this proposal in Congress in 1942 and again in 1943. The first bill in the new Congress of 1943, H.R. 1, was a bill to bring about an end to this giving away of Government securities to the private banks. By February of 1943 the Ways and Means Committee was then considering raising the debt limit to $210 billion. I happen to have here a press release which I issued on February 6, 1943, which summarizes a proposal that was then made. It is brief and I would like to read it.

HEARING ON H.R. 1 GRANTED BY WAYS AND MEANS COMMITTEE

The Ways and Means Committee of the House will give me a public hearing on my proposal embodied in H.R. 1, to finance a large part of the national debt without interest payments, commencing either next Friday, the 12th, or not later than Saturday morning, the 13th, at 10 o'clock.

This proposal is directly connected with and germane to the bill now under consideration by the Ways and Means Committee to raise the debt limit to $210 billion.

It is my belief that we should sell all of the Government bonds we can to individuals and corporations having money to pay for them, but it is absolutely wrong and an unnecessary burden on the taxpayers for generations to come to sell Government bonds to commercial banks, accepting deposits, which create the money with which they buy them on the Government's credit and perform no service other than a bookkeeping transaction in the creation of the money to buy them.

We are still paying on a debt that was contracted in the War Between the States in 1861–1865 and have paid $4 and $5 interest on every $1 borrowed. Our debt after this war will be so large that it is likely to mean perpetual bondage to the people, because the taxpayers will not be able to pay more than enough each year to cover the interest and nothing on the principal.

The debt can be paid in 40 years, if financed by the Federal Reserve banks without interest, as contemplated in H.R. 1.

PRIVATE BANKERS GIVEN $53 BILLION OF GOVERNMENT SECURITIES SINCE 1941

In my appearance before the Ways and Means Committee in February of 1943, I predicted that before the war was over the national debt would rise to $300 billion. Obviously, I am not a clairvoyant in such matters, but coincidentally the debt did go to almost exactly that amount. It was in the face of some such prospect as this that I then urged again a plan for avoiding loading up the commercial banks with Government securities and a plan for a definite reduction in the debt each year as soon as the war was over. If I may, I would like to quote briefly from my testimony for the Ways and Means Committee on February 13, 1943, as follows:

It is my considered opinion that not only can a large part—in fact, the greater part—of this interest burden be saved but the method pursued in saving it will enable our Government to pay the entire national debt in 40 years even if it should reach $300 billion before this war is over. In addition, the plan proposed will retire a definite

amount of the debt each year, thereby reducing annually any inflationary condition that has been brought about because of the war, and more effectively retard inflation than the present system.

Inflation is our greatest danger.

The thing which obviously needed to be done then was not done. The bankers were in violent opposition to any idea that the Federal Reserve should create such money as was to be created to buy securities. The bankers wanted the banks to do that.

The results speak for themselves. The inflation took place, and the devalued dollar is with us today.

Consider also these facts. At the beginning of 1941, the private commercial banks of the country held interest-bearing securities of the U.S. Government amounting to about $14 billion. At the end of January 1959, they held such securities amounting to $67 billion.

In the meantime, in the years 1942 through 1957, the U.S. Government and the taxpayers have paid more than $19 billion to the private commercial banks in interest charges on these securities, all of which could have been avoided. This $19 billion could have been used for reducing the Federal debt. We would be at least $19 billion better off today than we are, in addition to the savings on interest that has been paid annually. Actually, we would be a great deal better off than that, because the taxpayers will continue to pay interest on this $19 billion for many years to come.

MAKING THE BANKS FREEHOLDERS OF GOVERNMENT SECURITIES HAS NOT STRENGTHENED THE BANKING FUNCTION

Now there is another point to be considered in this matter.

All this loading up the commercial banks with free gifts of Government securities has not really strengthened the banks to carry on the function of banking; nor has it helped the local communities.

The commercial bankers have allowed themselves to depend more and more on holdings of Government securities for income, and to depend less and less on making local loans to accommodate local people. So this policy has been injurious to the banks themselves. The policy should be stopped before the commercial banks come to depend entirely upon Government and other riskless securities for their income, and thus reach the point where they render no credit service to local people at all.

If we adopt the suggestion I propose, which is to permit and require the Federal Reserve banks to buy all Government securities that the Federal Government is unable to sell to individuals and institutions having the money to pay for them, the interest on such securities would, as I have indicated, flow back into the U.S. Treasury and help the taxpayers. But more than that, there would then be a demand from bankers, financiers and others for the Government to pay off these bonds as quickly as possible. And in making these demands, these groups would have the help of the newspapers and other organs of opinion making. They would whip up a hurricane of public opinion for reducing the national debt.

As long as Government securities are issued at higher and ever higher rates of interest, there is no effective voice raised in support of a planned program to retire the national debt. The holders of these riskless securities do not want them paid off.

Why should smalltown bankers bother to deal with the local people on their business credit and personal loan problems when these bankers can create the credit to buy U.S. Government securities and tax exempt school and road district bonds in quantities of 7 to 10 times their banking reserves? Many of them do, of course, continue to render local service because of their devotion to their communities and to their public trusts. In other words, local pride and interest in helping local people will continue, but the temptation for these bankers to lessen their burdens and responsibilities grows ever greater.

The best bankers are those who must use the money-creating powers, if they use them at all—to meet the business and personal credit needs of their communities.

RATIONAL DEBT MANAGEMENT IS STILL NEEDED

Shall we continue to make the same mistakes of the last several years? Shall we allow the Federal Government to make the private banks a gift of another $10 billion or so this year, as it did last year? I sincerely hope not.

It seems to me that now is the best time to do something to avoid these mistakes in the future. The bankers will, of course, oppose anything we propose. The Federal Reserve authorities will likewise oppose it. The Federal Reserve people will oppose it for the reason that the bankers do not like it and they will oppose it also for the reason that the Federal Reserve authorities do not trust the Congress to behave in a rational way. These authorities fear that once a precedent is set for the Federal Reserve to buy securities directly from the Treasury, Congress will see in this an easy way of increasing the national debt without incurring interest costs and will thus let its appetite for appropriating moneys get out of bounds. But as for my part, I cannot agree to a principle that Government must do everything the hard way and the expensive way. That only compounds the problem. I do not agree with the Indian medicine man who advised his people to hit themselves over the head with tomahawks, because it would feel so good when they stopped hitting themselves. The Government is here to stay; this business of Government is a continuing business. We should insist that it be a rational business.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, I should like to join with my colleagues in commending the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WRIGHT], in leading this discussion today. I take pride that the gentleman conferred with me during the time he was formulating his proposal to begin a responsible and systematic program of paying off our national mortgage, and I am glad to be a cosponsor of this idea.

As some of the participants in this discussion today have suggested, our national debt is, strictly speaking, an unpaid bill from two world wars. On the budget front our two political parties have fought a rough draw since demobilization in 1946. President Truman had three overbalanced budgets with a surplus of nearly $13 billion; and his four deficit budgets totaled over $18 billion. President Eisenhower has made a $3 billion debt payment in 2 surplus years; and his 4 deficit years have increased the debt nearly $23 billion.

Most people have the idea that since the end of World War II our national debt has been mounting rapidly. However, in relative terms our Federal debt has been stable. In fact, considering that our economy has almost doubled since 1945, the national debt is actually smaller and more manageable today, and hence easier to pay off if the people will support a systematic annual debt-retirement plan.

Another fact that has been missed by many critics of Federal spending is that since 1945, while Federal debt has grown roughly 10 percent, the outstanding debt of all State and local governments increased more than 350 percent to a total of $55 billion. In other words, the Federal Government has actually done a sounder job of debt management than State and local governments during the postwar period.

During the new fiscal year, out of every dollar paid in Federal taxes approximately 11 cents—$8.1 billion—is earmarked to pay the interest charge on the debt. In other words, if the debt remains about the same and we follow current debt policies, by 1987 we will have paid out in interest the total amount of the debt—but we will still owe the debt.

What is the reason our Presidents—and Congresses—have never put forward a debt retirement program? Why have we given so little attention to this problem?

The answer, I believe, is imbedded in our political habits and the attitudes of our citizens which influence public men. For instance, some Congressmen—and citizens—argue that the only way to hold down expenditures is to cut taxes—a philosophy which in practice means a perpetually unbalanced budget. Then there are those—a majority perhaps—who believe that it is smart politics to cut taxes as soon as a budget surplus appears—preferably just before the next election. Then there is constituent pressure for an unbalanced budget by, for example, the type of citizens who write their Congressmen to warn them that the tax rate is confiscatory. Naturally, this pressure plays on the politician's fear of advocating higher taxes, and results in noisy applause for any officeholder who stands up for the taxpayer and demands lower taxes.

The formula is simple: Only overbalanced budgets pay off debt. It is plain, then, that debt reduction is keyed to courageous political leadership that is willing to call for austerity and higher taxes.

Perhaps this all adds up to the conclusion that, for the present at least, it is impossible from a political standpoint to sell the American people on a

debt reduction program. In my opinion the trouble with this conclusion is that it misjudges the temper of the American people and assumes that they are soft and self-indulgent.

One final point should be made in connection with this debt reduction plan. The only anti-inflation weapon which has not really had a tryout is an overbalanced budget in times when the economy is strong.

It is my personal feeling that the people are far ahead of their elected representatives on this whole issue. Moreover, I believe they would respond if there were national leadership on this question. For one, I am not only an advocate of debt retirement, but would vote for higher taxes if such a step were necessary to carry out the plan embodied in the idea we have discussed today.

FARMWORKERS—AMERICA'S "FORGOTTEN PEOPLE"

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. ROOSEVELT] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, it is with a deep sense of sorrow and some embarrassment that I call attention to America's so-called forgotten people—the two million people who harvest and handle our food and fiber. Their tragedy has been hidden behind our own iron curtain of ignorance and neglect. I feel sure that the facts now seeping out will outrage the sense of decency of my colleagues here and the American people. We are just beginning to become aware of the real price of our food and clothing.

The basic facts of the decay underlying American agriculture apply to all farmworkers, but the plight of the one million migrant workers is especially heartrending. I say heartrending because this condition is economically inexcusable as well as morally wrong.

I have introduced legislation which is aimed at doing what should have been done 20 years ago. It will provide wage-hour protection for our farmworkers, bring them into the American community and end the exploitation of children on our giant farms. I will now explain why this legislation is so urgently necessary.

The average migrant worker in 1957 earned what amounted to $16.52 a week. Sixteen and a half dollars a week in 1957! And yet, putting it this way states his condition favorably. Because, according to the Department of Labor, the average migrant was employed only 131 days in 1957. His total annual wage came to $859, including nonfarm earnings.

If we can but imagine the existence of such a man and his family: working when and where he can find work, at wages of 40 and 50 cents an hour; working only one-third of the year; his family plagued with ill health, carrying tuberculosis or other diseases around the country; his children, undernourished and semiliterate, destined for the same type of life; his self-respect and dignity as a worker and father destroyed.

This is why I was pleased to see that Secretary of Labor Mitchell recently called for wage-hour protection of farm workers. I trust and hope the administration will back up its Secretary of Labor on this matter. Secretary Mitchell, who, I think we can agree, is the best-informed Cabinet officer on this problem, recently described the migrant worker's existence in these words:

> His daily lot is back-breaking work in the fields, poor sanitation, bad quarters, dangerous transportation, dysentery, and not enough food.

Secretary Mitchell also spoke with authority when he declared:

> Agriculture violates the child labor provisions more than any other industry.

In my own State of California, according to an excellent article in the January 22 issue of the Reporter magazine, there have been over 1,000 serious injuries to children under 16 working on farms in the 1950–57 period. And California is the only State which gathers such statistics. It was also pointed out that agriculture runs behind mining and construction in fatalities, though agriculture assumed the unenviable position of the Nation's most dangerous industry for 1956.

How did agriculture employment slide into such a cesspool of human misery? The reasons are complex, but the main points are these: While we nurtured the image of Grandma Moses' family farm, with its leisurely setting of neatly plowed fields and a few contented cows standing around, a quiet revolution in ownership, technology, and management was taking place on the land. Corporation farms mushroomed in a rapid trend toward fewer and bigger farms.

At the same time, foreign farm workers imported during the wartime emergency became a permanent feature of our landscape. This strangest of all imports—the importation of human beings—has grown to the astonishing figure of close to 450,000 a year. The great majority come from Mexico, while the remainder are brought in by private arrangement from Japan, the Bahamas, the British West Indies, and Puerto Rico. We are undoubtedly fooling ourselves more than our friends in Latin America by this excessive importation of their unemployed. As the President's Commission on Migratory Labor said in its report in 1951:

> We depend on misfortune to build up our force of migratory workers and when the supply is low because there is not enough misfortune at home, we rely on misfortune abroad to replenish the supply.

Now, what can be done about this economic and moral sickness in our land? A few weeks ago here in Washington, a conference on farm labor brought together a number of people and organizations which have vowed united action on this problem. It was at this conference that I had the pleasure of hearing Labor Secretary Mitchell reiterate his concern about this problem in these strong words:

> It is intolerable and indecent for a society to produce by overworking and underpaying human beings. Even if the product may cost more, we in this country usually accept the difference in cost because it is the man that counts—not the thing.

It was also at this conference that we heard a leading farm employer describe to us his concrete experience with a high farm wage and how it increased his efficiency and actually reduced prices while raising wages. John Seabrook, president of the 54,000-acre Seabrook Farms of New Jersey, Delaware, and Pennsylvania, called for a Federal farm minimum wage that would rise in annual steps to full parity with the industrial minimum. His own employees average well over $1.50 an hour. Seabrook said the effect of higher wages was much greater productivity. In the past 5 years, he said, his farm wage rates have gone up 35 percent while frozen food prices have declined by 15 percent. His gross annual sales volume reached a record $35 million. Farm employers, merely in their own self-interest, should support a decent wage, he added.

I am sure there are many decent and forward looking farm employers around the country who would support wage-hour protection for their workers and so lay the foundation for a stable and productive work force.

I hope these remarks have helped shed more light on this tragic problem. The imaginative leadership of Seabrook Farms has shown how the corporation farms can operate more efficiently and profitably as they match industrial standards of pay and security for their workers. And, in the Pacific Northwest, as was described at the farm labor conference here, long reliance on foreign farm workers was proved fictitious. An annual worker plan annually meshes the employers' seasonal need for efficient domestic farm workers and the latter's need for stable employment with good pay and conditions, entirely eliminating the use of foreign farm workers.

America cannot pose as a model of democracy before the newly emerged nations of Asia, Africa, and the Middle East as long as 2 million people who work on our factory farms produce such abundance without sharing in it. And our encouragement of efforts in Latin America against dictatorship and toward democratic institutions is a mockery as long as we continue to prey on their poverty. I believe there is an increasing area of agreement to bring these forgotten farmworkers into first-class status in American life. I am confident that Congress will measure up to its responsibility and enact needed legislation.

EXPLANATION OF PROPOSED BILLS TO EXTEND THE FAIR LABOR STANDARDS ACT OF 1938, AS AMENDED, TO HIRED FARM LABOR

The form this legislation should take, however, presents certain problems

which I should now like to discuss, together with an explanation of the manner in which the bills I have introduced would meet these problems.

At the present time, there is an exemption from both the minimum wage and overtime provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act for all employees who are employed in agriculture. The term "agriculture" is broadly defined in section 3(f) of the act. Under section 13 (a) (6) of the act the minimum wage and overtime provisions do not apply to "any employee employed in agriculture or in connection with the operation or maintenance of ditches, canals, reservoirs, or waterways, not owned or operated for profit, or operated on a sharecrop basis, and which are used exclusively for supply and storing of water for agricultural purposes."

The child labor provisions of the act do not apply to children employed in agriculture if such children are employed outside of school hours for the school district where such children are living while they are so employed.

The bills I have submitted provide for two alternative methods of dealing with the problems raised by these provisions. Because the problems are complicated and it is not yet clear or certain just how we should deal with them, alternative approaches seem desirable. Both bills are based on the premise that large-scale, corporate-type farming enterprises employing large numbers of employees and increasingly utilizing mechanized equipment are akin to industrial operations and ought to be treated accordingly. Let me explain how they would operate.

Under one of these bills the present exemptions from the minimum wage and maximum hours provisions applicable to employees employed in agriculture under section 13(a) (6) of the Fair Labor Standards Act would be redefined and made applicable to only two different types of farm enterprises. The family farm which is worked by the farmer and members of his immediate family, that is, his spouse, children, or parents, would continue to be exempt. In addition, farm enterprises which used not more than 2,244 man-days of hired farm labor, or an average of between seven and eight employees—during the preceding calendar year—would continue to be exempt.

It would not matter when such man-days were worked; they could all be concentrated in a reasonably short period of time such as may be required in certain situations to harvest particularly perishable crops, thus providing an important element of flexibility in application of the Federal minimum wage in this area. The minimum wage and maximum hour provisions would be applicable to only the large farm enterprises that are operated on an industrial basis with large numbers of employees and that used more than the specific number of man-days of hired farm labor during the preceding calendar year.

For agricultural employees who would be brought under the minimum wage provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act in the manner I have described, the minimum wage would not, however, jump to $1 or to $1.25 if, as I hope, Congress amends the act this session to raise the legal minimum wage to the latter figure. A number of step-ups in the minimum wage would be provided for in the case of such employees. During the first year the minimum would be fixed at 75 cents an hour—which was the legal minimum under the act from 1949 to 1955. At the end of the first year, the minimum would be raised to 85 cents an hour and at the end of the second year $1 an hour. At the end of the third year and thereafter, the rate would become the same as the rate generally applicable to employees covered by the act. These provisions, I feel, would provide ample time for farm enterprises to adjust their operations so as to bring them into line with wage standards that have long been required in American industry.

The other bill would eliminate the present minimum wage and maximum hours exemptions for employees employed in agriculture. Section 13(a) (6) of the Fair Labor Standards Act, which provides this exemption, would be repealed. In its place, a new clause (4) would be added to section 6(a), the minimum wage provisions of the act, and a new subsection (g) would be added to section 13, describing the manner of, and certain limitations on, application of section 7, the maximum hours provisions of the act, to employees employed in agriculture.

Under this bill employees employed in agriculture would be paid not less than the rate or rates established by the Secretary of Labor in accordance with the recommendations of a special industry committee. These rates could be less, but not more than, the minimum wage rate—presently $1 an hour—generally applicable under the Fair Labor Standards Act.

The special industry committee would be equally representative of employers and employees in agriculture and the public. It would investigate economic and competitive conditions in the industry and would be required to recommend to the Secretary of Labor the highest minimum wage rate or rates—not in excess of the statutory minimum wage—that will not substantially curtail employment in the industry.

The special industry committee would be appointed and would function in the same manner, and subject to the same standards as were applicable to the industry committees that operated in the early years of the act and that presently operate in Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, and American Samoa.

Biennial review of minimum wage rates established pursuant to the recommendations of special industry committees is required under the act, so that regular periodic upward adjustment of the rate or rates for employees in agriculture would be assured where necessary and appropriate.

Under both bills the maximum hours provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act to agricultural employees would only apply to employees for whom a minimum wage rate or rates has been established by the Secretary of Labor in the manner I have indicated. With respect to these employees, the Secretary could issue regulations providing reasonable limitations and allowing reasonable variations, tolerances, and exemptions, to and from any or all of the provisions of section 7. They would have to be based, however, on a finding by the Secretary, after a public hearing, and taking into account the same types of factors, particularly the prevention of any substantial curtailment of employment opportunities for hired farm labor, as are applicable to the establishment of minimum wage rates for such employees, that economic conditions warrant such limitations, variations, tolerances, or exemptions.

Neither of these bills amends the child labor exemptions applicable to employees employed in agriculture. If large, industrialized types of farming enterprises, however, are brought under minimum wage and maximum hour standards, the incentive for employing children in agriculture will largely disappear.

Mr. Speaker, I insert at this point in the RECORD the texts of the two measures I have just discussed, as well as "Summary Facts on Hired Farm Labor":

A BILL TO AMEND THE FAIR LABOR STANDARDS ACT OF 1938, AS AMENDED, TO PROVIDE COVERAGE FOR EMPLOYEES OF FARM ENTERPRISES, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Fair Farm Labor Standards Act of 1959."

SEC. 2. Subsection (a) of Section 6 of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof a new clause (4) to read as follows:

"(4) if such employee is employed in agriculture, not less than the applicable rate or rates established by the Secretary of Labor in accordance with recommendations of a special industry committee which he shall appoint in the same manner and pursuant to the same provisions as are applicable to special industry committees established under section 5. Such committee shall have the same powers and duties and shall apply the same standards with respect to the application of the provisions of this Act to employees employed in agriculture, to the extent that such standards are necessary and relevant, as pertain to the special industry committee established under section 5. The minimum wage rate or rates thus established shall not exceed the rate prescribed in paragraph (1) of this subsection."

SEC. 3. (a) Subsection (a) of section 13 of such Act is amended by striking out clause (6) thereof.

(b) Section 13 is amended by adding at the end thereof a new subsection (g) to read as follows:

"(g) The provisions of section 7 shall not apply with respect to employees employed in agriculture for whom the Secretary of Labor is authorized to establish minimum wage rates as provided in section 6(a) (4), except with respect to employees for whom such rates are in effect; and with respect to such employees the Secretary may make rules and regulations providing reasonable limitations and allowing reasonable variations, tolerances, and exemptions, to and from any or all of the provisions of section 7, if he shall find, after a public hearing on the matter, and taking into account the factors set forth in section 6(a) (4), that economic conditions warrant such action."

SEC. 4. This Act shall take effect upon the expiration of one hundred and twenty days from the date of enactment.

A BILL TO AMEND THE FAIR LABOR STANDARDS ACT OF 1938, AS AMENDED, TO PROVIDE COVERAGE FOR HIRED FARM LABOR EMPLOYED BY LARGE FARM ENTERPRISES, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Fair Farm Labor Standards Act of 1959."

SEC. 2. Clause (6) of subsection (a) of section 13 of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"(6) any employee employed in agriculture by a farm enterprise in which the only employees are the farmer-owner of such enterprise and persons standing in the relationship of parent, spouse or child of such owner or by a farm enterprise which used not more than two thousand two hundred and forty-four man-days of hired farm labor during the preceding calendar year: *Provided,* That for purposes of the application of section 6 of this Act to any employee employed in agriculture not exempted under the provisions of this clause (6), such employee shall be paid (1) not less than 75 cents an hour during the first year from the effective date of this Act, (2) not less than 85 cents an hour during the second year from the effective date of this Act, (3) not less than $1 an hour during the third year from the effective date of this Act, and (4) thereafter, not less than the rate prescribed in paragraph (1) of subsection (2) of section 6."

SEC. 3. Section 13 is amended by adding at the end thereof a new subsection (g) to read as follows:

"(g) The provisions of section 7 shall not apply with respect to employees employed in agriculture, except with respect to employees for whom the minimum wage rate prescribed in section 6(a)(1) is in effect; and with respect to such employees the Secretary may make rules and regulations providing reasonable limitations and allowing reasonable variations, tolerances, and exemptions, to and from any or all of the provisions of section 7, if he shall find, after a public hearing on the matter, and taking into account the factors set forth in section 8, that economic conditions warrant such action."

SEC. 4. This Act shall take effect upon the expiration of one hundred and twenty days from the date of enactment.

SUMMARY FACTS ON HIRED FARM LABOR

Farming as an industry: There are some 5 million farms in the Nation. Of these some 70,000 farms cover one-third of the farmland in the United States and two-thirds of the Western States. Investment runs as high as $50,000 per worker—as compared with an $8,000 average in manufacturing. The family farm is gradually losing out. Since 1952, 600,000 farms have been sold.

Productivity in farming: During the 11-year period (1947–58) the per-man hour production for all crops in the United States increased 67 percent. This has been the sector of the economy in which productivity has been rising most rapidly.

Employment and earnings: Between 1950 and 1958 the total hired domestic farm labor force decreased by 374,000, while the number of imported workers increased by 280,000 reaching a total of about 450,000. Nearly 4 million persons worked on farms for wages at some time during 1957—with over 2 million working more than 25 days. Approximately 50 percent of the 2 million farm wage workers are employed on farms of 1,900 acres or larger.

The composite wage rate of all farmworkers for 1958 was $0.76 per hour or $176 a month with housing. Though wage rates have increased 31 percent in the past 10 years, the increases are far below the comparable increases that have occurred in other industries, and have not adequately reflected the rising cost of living. During this same period wages in manufacturing rose 58 percent.

Wages are generally lower on the larger-size farms.

Wages vary from region to region with the Pacific Coast States having the highest composite rate and the States of South Carolina and Mississippi having the lowest rates.

Present Fair Labor Standards Act coverage: No farm workers are now covered by the wages and hours provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act. The FLSA now prohibits children under 16 from working in agriculture during the hours when school is in session in the district where they live while so employed. It applies to migratory as well as local children but does not apply to children who work for their own parents on the home farm. This Federal law applies to every farmer who grows crops or produce which are shipped directly or indirectly in interstate commerce.

Setting of minimum wages in agriculture: Public Law 78 provides that Mexican migratory workers receive the prevailing rate of pay—as determined by the Secretary of Labor. Thus Mexican migratory workers are granted minimum protection, while American workers are denied such protection. Violations are subject to penalty.

Trends in farm output per man-hour versus real hourly wages of hired farmworkers, United States, for selected years, 1945–58 [1]

[1945=100]

Year	Farm output per man-hour (index)	Real farm wages per hour (index)
1945	100	100
1950	130	89
1955	153	95
1957	166	98
1958	179	98

[1] Source: Farm output per man-hour data from table D-65, p. 213, "Economic Report of the President, 1959." Farm wage data from Agricultural Economics Division, USDA. Converted to 1945 base by Clay L. Cochran.

Average hourly wages of hired farmworkers as a percentage of factory wages, 1910–58

Year	Average hourly earnings in dollars		Percent farm wage of factory wage
	Farm	Factory	
1910–14	0.14	0.21	67
1915–19	.22	.34	64
1920–24	.24	.52	47
1925–29	.23	.55	41
1930–34	.14	.50	29
1935–39	.15	.61	25
1940–44	.28	.85	33
1945	.477	1.023	47
1946	.520	1.086	48
1947	.553	1.237	45
1948	.580	1.350	43
1949	.559	1.401	40
1950	.561	1.465	38
1951	.625	1.59	39
1952	.661	1.67	40
1953	.672	1.77	38
1954	.661	1.81	36
1955	.677	1.88	36
1956	.705	1.98	36
1957	.728	2.07	35
1958	.757	2.13	36

Source: Farm and factory earnings, 1910–40, "Migratory Farm Labor in American Agriculture," report of the President's Commission on Migratory Labor, 1951, p. 130. Factory earnings, 1941–58, "Economic Report of the President, 1959," p. 167. Farm earnings, 1941–47, "Farm Labor," serial CCC, House Agricultural Subcommittee hearings, 1958, p. 512; 1948–58, USDA, AMS, monthly report, "Farm Labor," January 1959, p. 14.

Average hourly wage rates of hired farmworkers in the United States in current and constant dollars, 1940–58

Year	Average actual wages per hour (cents)[1]	Average wages per hour in constant dollars
1940	0.16	0.27
1941	.208	.33
1942	.271	.39
1943	.357	.48
1944	.427	.57
1945	.477	.62
1946	.520	.62
1947	.553	.58
1948	.580	.56
1949	.559	.55
1950	.561	.55
1951	.625	.56
1952	.661	.58
1953	.672	.59
1954	.661	.58
1955	.677	.59
1956	.705	.61
1957	.728	.61
1958	.757	.61

[1] Source: "Farm Labor." Hearings before the Subcommittee on Equipment, Supplies, and Manpower of the Committee on Agriculture, House of Representatives, 85th Cong. 2d sess. Serial CCC, p. 512. "Consumer Price Index," BLS conversion to constant dollars. CLC-IUD.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentlemen from Iowa [Mr. CARTER] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, I speak without a script and from a full heart.

First, I should like to tell you that I am tremendously grateful, and it is a wonderful feeling to be back among the land of the living. Just a moment ago I sat here thinking that the last time I sat in this Chamber I sat with the specter of death with me, certain that I had only a short time to live. Since that time the marvelous and tremendous efforts of medical science have treated a cancer that returned. I have been in the hospital since January 30. That treatment has been effective, and my doctors tell me now that I have a normal life expectancy. I am grateful to them and to a gracious God for this chance to live, for this opportunity to serve.

I should like to tell you a little bit about this treatment. The first treatment I took was nitromustard gas in liquid form. They put it into your veins. That was a little rough. But what I do want to mention to you, and what I think the American people should know about the treatment of cancer, is this:

This morning I took, and each morning for the next two weeks I will take, radiation treatments from a 2-million-volt machine. I have no feeling; it does not hurt. There is no reaction at all in my system. They are completing the cure of a cancer that has grown on my spine and caused the terrible pain that I suffered the last time I sat here. I wish the American people who suffer from cancer and who are fearful of the treatment could know this, so that they will not fear this kind of treatment. It is tremendous what medical science has done.

There is much that I would like to do. My life will be dedicated to service. I do not know what your response would be to this experience. Cancer, you know, always happens to the other fellow.

When it does happen there are many things that go through your mind. Your perspective changes and your sense of values is greatly affected. I now have a deeper sense of what is valuable and if anything I am more greatly dedicated to service.

The day I got out of the hospital, Mr. Speaker, I was confronted with a tabloid statement concerning the fact that I had hired my son as administrative assistant, as they call it. Actually, of course, we have no administrative assistants in the House. He was my top secretary.

When I first came here the pain had become so great in my left arm that I was quite certain that I had only a short time to live, because the last time I had this cancer they told me I could expect to live 3 weeks if they did not cure it. So you see I was privately certain that I would not live very long.

While I was undergoing treatment for cancer I wanted someone who was close to me, to be with me, and to help me serve—someone I could depend upon—someone who knew me—who knew how I thought. I hired my son on a basis that was temporary. I gave him a salary of $11,000, which is about the average salary paid to the top secretary. It was a temporary thing. Now the truth of the matter is that as of today his basic salary will be cut in two, because, now that the pain is gone, I can work. I can sleep at night. I can build up my strength and I will be able to be in the office regularly and to serve. The truth of the matter is that it was only a temporary arrangement in the first place. The truth of the matter is that he worked many, many hours a week above and beyond the call of the office, to be with me, to tell me the things that happened and to take the answers and to work with me in giving the kind of service and building up the kind of service that a congressional staff must build if they are to represent their district. And know this—I am proud of the staff that serves the Fourth Congressional District of Iowa. They were superlative. They have kept current with every demand for service from the Fourth District during this period of time when I was being treated. My son's present salary will be less per hour than he earned on a road gang last summer.

There is one other thing, Mr. Speaker, I should like to mention here. I would feel and I do deeply regret it, if this that I have done be a mistake; and I seek forgiveness from the American taxpayers and, particularly, from the people I serve in the Fourth District if it is a mistake; and if what I have done has cast any reflection on any other Congressman who serves here diligently, please forgive me and know that in my heart I am dedicated to your service. I would not hurt any one of you for anything. Know, too, that if it has cast any reflection on the bill that has been under discussion and has been recently submitted out of the House Administration Committee, that if there has been any reflection on that bill to retain an administrative assistant for the Members of Congress that it is not fair because there are many districts in this Nation where the taxpayers will be greatly benefited if their Congressman is allowed an administrative assistant. This must be considered.

Mr. Speaker, there is another matter I would like to mention here. Every reporter who has talked with me concerning this period of nationwide publicity has become a warm personal friend. They have been very kind. They have been very honest. But, during the period of time I have studied this thing before coming to you to talk to you about it, there have been some matters that I have learned about that makes me wonder why their editors have not let the people know about. For example: On the very day that the fact that the young Congressman from Iowa had hired his son appeared in the headlines, one of the truly great public servants of this Nation and one of the best informed men in the country, Hon. WRIGHT PATMAN of Texas, introduced from this floor a statement with conclusive evidence that the Federal Reserve System has bilked the American people out of $10¼ billion and given it to their relatives. And you know—and this is a query I would place to the fourth estate—I searched every newspaper that I could find and I did not find it in the headlines. I did not even find it on page 15. I could not even find it mentioned. Why?

This query I place because I have a feeling that for some reason, that is beyond me and beyond my experience, they have been straining at a gnat when a camel was passing by.

Mr. Speaker, the Members have been very attentive. I express gratitude from a full heart. I want to mention also that the leadership, through this whole ordeal, has been very kind and very gentle. I am especially grateful to you, Mr. Speaker, to the majority leader Mr. MCCORMACK, and to Mr. ALBERT. You have been strong men and great men. It is a great honor to serve here. It has been an honor to serve with you. Thanks a million.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. STAGGERS].

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, I listened to the very able presentation of the gentleman from Iowa who just preceded me, and I agree with him in many things he said. I agree with him especially when he mentioned Speaker RAYBURN, JOHN MCCORMACK, and CARL ALBERT.

I would like to say there is visiting in Washington today a group of young ladies where they will gain first hand impressions of their Government in action. I think more groups from around America should do just that, and we would have a better informed citizenry. Certainly there would be more understanding of our problems.

This group comes from Martinsburg, W. Va. They are a group of young ladies who belong to a woman's club there. I am glad to have them, and I am glad to have any group that cares to visit Washington.

4–H CLUBS PRODUCE RESPONSIBLE CITIZENS

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, it is quite appropriate that the week from March 1 through 7 should be set aside to focus attention on the past achievements and future goals of the 4–H clubs, the national youth organizations dedicated to the ideal of improving family and community living. This year emphasis is being placed on the 4–H alumni recognition program which is designed to honor the thousands of former members whose success and attainments exemplify the high ideals of 4–H in achievement, leadership, and good citizenship. These outstanding citizens, many of whom are now leaders in 4–H clubs, are living proof of the effectiveness of the 4–H club program. There are over 20 million men and women throughout America who are now serving in various occupations and professions where their 4–H training and experience prove extremely helpful and beneficial. Not only are they individually living fuller and more satisfying lives as a result of an appreciation of the fine and worthwhile things in life learned early in their 4–H club work, but the communities in which they reside feel the impact of their training through their active participation in local projects and their desire to serve their fellow man.

One of the principal reasons why our 4-H Clubs in the Second Congressional District of Kentucky and in Kentucky generally are so successful is due to the efficient instruction and able guidance furnished by our county agents, home demonstration agents, vocational agriculture teachers, and 4–H Club leaders. These extremely well qualified men and women give unstintingly of their time and energy, and the effectiveness of their inspired leadership is apparent in the truly outstanding achievements of 4-H Club members in our State. These leaders realize that for the youth to fully develop his character potential he must be given the opportunity to make important and far-reaching decisions in actual life situations on the farm, home, school, and community. They stand ready with advice, suggestions, and encouragement but the young person is impressed with the fact that for him to grow in knowledge, self-reliance, perseverance, and maturity he must solve the problem himself, relying on his own ingenuity and the 4-H slogan, "Learn To Do by Doing."

Experience has shown that leaders in 4-H Club work who meet with the greatest success are those who possess devotion and loyalty to deep moral principles and spiritual ideals and who are willing to assume responsibility in community affairs. We have such leaders in Kentucky, and they deserve our heartfelt gratitude for the important work they are doing in preparing our young people to meet the moral, economic, and

scientific challenges of the world of tomorrow.

The training these young people are now receiving in connection with their 4-H Club projects will be of immeasurable benefit to them in the years to come, and the club motto, "To Make the Best Better," will become a way of life. By practicing the principle of never accepting second best and continually striving for the very best in his own performance, today's youth will grow into a mature citizen anxious to assume his share of responsibility in improving the community of which he is a part.

Another important part of 4-H Club work is the International Farm Youth Exchange. This program was developed by young people and their leaders who were interested in helping create conditions for peace. The international aspect of this plan demonstrates the awareness of our youth with the urgent necessity for understanding the problems and hopes of people of other nations if we are to work effectively for the good of all humanity. These "grassroots ambassadors" are doing a splendid job in gaining friends for America and a broader view of the world for themselves.

I am happy to have this opportunity to commend all present members of the 4-H Clubs in Kentucky for their fine achievements and to thank all former members for the time and interest they continue to give this outstanding youth organization.

CLOSED SCHOOLS: WHAT ROLE FOR THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT?

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, despite the recent triumph of what might be called the middle way in the State of Virginia, Congress and the country is still haunted by the prospect that before school integration solutions can be worked out in other States many public schools will close their doors—some, I fear, for extended periods of time.

Increasing attention is being given to this problem at the Federal level. In his special civil rights message to the Congress on February 5, the President recommended legislation to provide a temporary program of financial and technical aid to State and local agencies to assist them in making the necessary adjustments required by school desegregation decisions. This belated proposal—which draws heavily on the basic idea embodied in the bill I introduced in 1955 in the 84th Congress—declares it to be public policy that the Federal Government "share the burdens of transition through grants in aid to help meet additional costs directly occasioned by desegregation programs." I regard this as a constructive proposal which should win the support of thoughtful men in the Congress.

My colleague, the gentleman from Montana [Mr. METCALF], one of the most creative thinkers in this body, recently went one step further in proposing—H.R. 3742—that Congress enact legislation authorizing the Commissioner of Education to establish and operate free public schools to educate children whose schools are closed in an effort to avoid compliance with the 14th amendment of the Constitution. This far-reaching proposal by the gentleman from Montana rests on his conviction that every child in America has a right to an education—and that Congress should provide this opportunity where State or local officials default in their responsibilities.

On the other hand, the President in his February 5 message advanced a more limited plan designed to provide schooling for some children who are, or will be, deprived of classroom instruction by the closing of public schools. The President's plan would authorize, on a temporary basis, education of children of members of the Armed Forces when State-administered public schools have been closed because of desegregation decisions. This plan, I believe, was drafted to meet the school crisis which existed last month at the naval installation at Norfolk, Va. The President stated that—

> The Federal Government has a particular responsibility for the children of military personnel in federally affected areas, since armed services personnel are located there under military orders rather than of their own free choice.

As one member of the House General Education Subcommittee of the Committee on Education and Labor, I find that these proposals present several new questions which concern the Federal role in our total educational system. In due course these proposals will be carefully evaluated by the appropriate committees, and my only desire at this time is to raise certain questions concerning the policy decisions which lie in back of these proposals.

At the moment my particular concern focuses on the children of military personnel who are stationed in communities where public schools are closed. It seems to me that the President in his message grossly understated his responsibility—and that of the Congress—toward these children. Military personnel, and their families, in the natural course of events, live disjointed, disrupted lives. Consequently, I believe that in these situations the President has an overriding duty he should discharge before asking the Congress to make large outlays of Federal funds to provide free education for these children.

It goes without saying that today neither the President, nor his agents at the Pentagon, would establish a new military base adjacent to any community which did not have, as one of its public services, a free system of public education. Considering the primary responsibility of the President in these matters, is there not then a corresponding duty on his part to ascertain, when school doors are shut in the faces of military children, whether some or all of the functions being performed at that particular military installation can be performed equally well at other bases near cities which offer their citizens free public education. Such preliminary action by the President, it seems to me, is an indispensible predicate to any action by the Congress to set up and finance a Federal school system to provide for the children of men in the armed services.

Happily the Norfolk, Va., situation has now been resolved in favor of the children—and the community. However, it was painfully apparent last month that the central factor which dominated thinking of those community leaders in Norfolk whose leadership kept the schools open, was an awareness that the long-run economic consequences to Norfolk would be extremely severe if its schools remained closed. These Norfolk business and community leaders realized, quite rightly, that had its schools not reopened the logical next step by the executive department of the Federal Government would be a transfer of many of the functions now being conducted at Norfolk by the Department of Defense.

Whether I am right or wrong, it is my belief that once the economic consequences of closed schools are spelled out to a community, moderate opinion will dominate its counsels, and there will be fewer communities that will choose closed schools against the alternative of some form of integration. There is an obvious correlation between the closing of the high schools of Little Rock, Ark., and the fact that not a single business concern has established a major new plant in that city since that event.

From my discussions of this problem with some of the officials of the Executive, I know they are fully cognizant of all of the problems and responsibilities I have mentioned here. This problem should be discussed in its full context, and I hope that these remarks will serve to alert those concerned—both within and without the Congress—to some of the ramifications of closed schools and their impact on Federal military installations.

A PATTERN FOR OTHER COMMUNITIES

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. HALPERN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, in connection with National Brotherhood Week, I would like to call the attention of the House to a unique community-wide celebration planned for this Sunday, March 1, in my congressional district in Queens, Long Island. The event will be the Brotherhood Youth Musical Festival, sponsored by the Queens Veterans Committee for Brotherhood, an organization composed of all major veterans groups in Queens and affiliated with the National Conference of Christians and Jews.

Ever since 1954, when the Queens Veterans Committee for Brotherhood organized the first such festival of its kind in the Nation, these programs have been the highlight of National Brotherhood Week observances in Queens. Their

goal is simple: To promote the ideals of good will, amity, and cooperation among all members of the community regardless of race, creed, color, or national origin. Their success is attested to not only by the huge turnouts every year, but by the National Conference of Christians and Jews which commended the Queens group for its outstanding contribution in promoting harmony and brotherhood.

Mr. Speaker, Brotherhood Week, sponsored annually by the National Conference of Christians and Jews, is a time to remind ourselves of one of the oldest principles of brotherhood taught by both the Old and New Testaments, namely that "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself." It is a time for churches and synagogues, and governments, and people everywhere to ask God's help in building a worldwide community of men based on justice, and peace, and love of thy neighbor.

As part of this objective, the Queens Brotherhood Youth Musical Festival will be held next Sunday, March 1, 1959, from 2 to 5 p.m., at the Jamaica Jewish Center. District Attorney Frank D. O'Connor, who is this year's Brotherhood Week chairman for Long Island and Queens, will delivery the keynote message. The central idea of the program will be simple: Since music is the universal language of all mankind, it should be used to instill in our children love and appreciation for their fellow men.

In connection with this year's celebration, as in past years, I would particularly like to commend my good friend, Morris Gimpelson, chairman of the Queens Veterans Committee for Brotherhood, for his untiring work in promoting the ideals of brotherhood, not only during the week set aside for this observance, but year around. I know of few persons so genuinely dedicated to so fine an objective.

I would also like to salute the hard-working cochairmen of the Queens Veterans Committee for Brotherhood who have contributed so much to this year's festival—namely, Myron Caruso and Frank Scalise, of the American Legion; Mrs. Barbara Duttweiler, of the American Legion Auxiliary; John Huvane, of AMVETS; Frank Marzano, of the Army and Navy Union; Daniel A. Mares, of the Disabled American Veterans; Mrs. Cynthia Israel, of the DAV Auxiliary; Max Rosenfeld, of the Jewish War Veterans; Mrs. Lillian Batkin, of the JWV Auxiliary; Charles Wenz, of the Spanish-American Veterans; Henry Arrighi and Fred Staab, of the Veterans of Foreign Wars; and Mrs. Irene Johnson, of the VFW Auxiliary. I would also like to cite the work of National Conference of Christian and Jews Cochairmen Emil Levin, the Honorable Charles F. Murphy; Dr. John J. Theobold, New York's superintendent of schools; and reigonal director, Mrs. Doris Bardon.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, I am proud indeed that this significant event is taking place in my county and I am proud of these fine people of Queens who are making it possible. This might well be a pattern for other communities throughout the Nation to follow in connection with Brotherhood Week. I am privileged that the occasion this year is being held in my district and that I may use this great forum of the House of Representatives to tell America about it.

RESIGNATION FROM COMMITTEE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following resignation from a committee:

FEBRUARY 25, 1959.

MR. SPEAKER: I hereby submit my resignation from the House Administration Committee.

JOHN H. RAY,
Member of Congress.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resignation is accepted.

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. WALTER, Mr. JOHANSEN, and Mr. MOULDER (at the request of Mr. ALBERT) for 1 week, on account of holding hearings of the Committee on Un-American Activities in California.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. ROOSEVELT, for 15 minutes, today.

Mr. VANIK, for 20 minutes, on tomorrow.

Mr. CARTER, for 10 minutes, today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. FOLEY.

Mr. CURTIS of Massachusetts and include extraneous material.

Mr. BOGGS (at the request of Mr. MCCORMACK) and include extraneous matter.

Mr. ROOSEVELT and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. FULTON (at the request of Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin).

Mr. HULL (at the request of Mr. HALEY) and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina (at the request of Mr. HALEY) and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. SANTANGELO (at the request of Mr. HALEY) and include extraneous matter.

Mr. ROBERTS and to include extraneous matter.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 6 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, February 26, 1959, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

618. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting the annual report of the Secretary of the Treasury on the state of the finances of the Federal Government for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1958 (H. Doc. No. 3); to the Committee on Ways and Means and ordered to be printed with illustrations.

619. A letter from the Assistant Chief of Naval Material (Procurement), Department of the Navy, transmitting the Navy's semiannual report of research and development procurement actions for the period July 1 through December 31, 1958, pursuant to title 10, United States Code, section 2357; to the Committee on Armed Services.

620. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting the 46th quarterly report for the 4th quarter, 1958, pertaining to export control, pursuant to the Export Control Act of 1949; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

621. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the audit of burley and flue-cured tobacco price support and agricultural adjustment programs in North Carolina and Tennessee and review of warehouse tobacco sales in Kentucky, Commodity Stabilization Service, Department of Agriculture, 1956–57; to the Committee on Government Operations.

622. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the study of the feasibility of consolidating the Submarine Supply Office with the Ships Parts Control Center, Department of the Navy; to the Committee on Government Operations.

623. A letter from the secretary and treasurer, Congressional Medal of Honor Society, transmitting the annual report of the Congressional Medal of Honor Society of the United States for the calendar year 1958, pursuant to Public Law 249, 77th Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

624. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to eliminate all responsibility of the Government for fixing dates on which the period of limitation for filing suits against Miller Act payment bonds commences to run"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. FRIEDEL: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 181. Resolution to amend House Resolution 136, 86th Congress, agreed to January 29, 1959; without amendment (Rept. No. 73). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. MILLS: Committee on Ways and Means. H.R. 2906. A bill to extend the period for filing claims for credit or refund of overpayments of income taxes arising as a result of renegotiation of Government contracts; with amendment (Rept. No. 74). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DURHAM: Committee on Armed Services. H.R. 3290. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to eliminate the requirement that each chaplain make an annual report to the Secretary of the Navy; without amendment (Rept. No. 75). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DURHAM: Committee on Armed Services. H.R. 3291. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, with respect to certain medals; without amendment (Rept. No. 76). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DURHAM: Committee on Armed Services. H.R. 3292. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to furnish supplies and services to foreign vessels and aircraft, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 77). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DURHAM: Committee on Armed Services. H.R. 3293. A bill to authorize the construction of modern naval vessels; without amendment (Rept. No. 78). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina: Committee on Armed Services. H.R. 3365. A bill to authorize the crediting of certain service for purpose of retired pay for nonregular service, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 79). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MILLS: Committee on Ways and Means. H.R. 3472. A bill to repeal section 1505 of the Social Security Act so that in determining eligibility of Federal employees for unemployment compensation their accrued annual leave shall be treated in accordance with State laws, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 80). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANDREWS:

H.R. 4985. A bill to repeal the excise tax on amounts paid for communication services or facilities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ANFUSO:

H.R. 4986. A bill to provide for the establishment, under the National Science Foundation, of a National Science Academy; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

By Mr. AVERY:

H.R. 4987. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase the amount of outside income which a widow with minor children may earn without suffering deductions from the benefits to which she is entitled under such title; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BENNETT of Florida:

H.R. 4988. A bill to create the Freedom Commission for the development of the science of counteraction to the world Communist conspiracy and for the training and development of leaders in a total political war; to the Committee on Un-American Activities.

By Mr. BOWLES:

H.R. 4989. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act so as to remove the limitation upon the amount of outside income which an individual may earn while receiving benefits thereunder and to provide full benefits (when based on attainment of retirement age) for both men and women at age 60, and to prohibit discrimination because of age in the hiring and employment of persons by Government contractors; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana:

H.R. 4990. A bill to authorize appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for salaries and expenses, research and development, construction and equipment, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

By Mr. BURDICK:

H.R. 4991. A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. CURTIS of Massachusetts:

H.R. 4992. A bill to provide for nonveteran Federal employees the same appeal rights as are provided by law for veteran Federal employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H.R. 4993. A bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act, as amended; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. DULSKI:

H.R. 4994. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act to increase by an additional one-half of 1 percent the annuity computation formula for determining annuities for certain Federal employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 4995. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to repeal the excise tax on communications; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FOLEY:

H.R. 4996. A bill to establish an effective program to alleviate conditions of substantial and persistent unemployment and underemployment in certain economically depressed areas; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. FULTON:

H.R. 4997. A bill to provide for the establishment, under the National Science Foundation, of a National Science Academy; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

H.R. 4998. A bill to amend section 1552, title 10, United States Code, and section 301 of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 to provide that the Board for the Correction of Military or Naval Records and the Boards of Review, Discharges, and Dismissals shall give consideration to satisfactory evidence relating to good character and exemplary conduct in civilian life after discharge or dismissal in determining whether or not to correct certain discharges and dismissals; to authorize the award of an exemplary rehabilitation certificate; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 4999. A bill to encourage the establishment of voluntary pension plans by self-employed individuals; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H.R. 5000. A bill to amend the Social Security Act and Internal Revenue Code so as to provide insurance against the costs of hospital, nursing home, and surgical service for persons eligible for old-age and survivors insurance benefits, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HARRIS:

H.R. 5001. A bill to amend certain provisions of the Securities Act of 1933, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 5002. A bill to amend certain provisions of the Trust Indenture Act of 1939, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. JUDD:

H.R. 5003. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to protect the public from unsanitary milk and milk products shipped in interstate commerce, without unduly burdening such commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. LENNON:

H.R. 5004. A bill authorizing and directing the Secretary of the Interior to undertake continuing research on the biology, fluctuations, status, and statistics of the migratory marine species of game fish of the United States and contiguous waters; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. McINTIRE:

H.R. 5005. A bill to provide a program of tax adjustment for small business and for persons engaged in small business; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MOORE:

H.R. 5006. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to reduce, for purposes of old-age and survivors insurance benefits, the age requirement from age 65 to 60; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MORRISON:

H.R. 5007. A bill to improve the administration of oversea activities of the Government of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. O'HARA of Illinois:

H.R. 5008. A bill to effectuate and enforce the constitutional right to the equal protection of the law, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PASSMAN:

H.R. 5009. A bill to amend section 2385, title 18, United States Code, to define the term "organize" as used in that section; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5010. A bill to establish rules of interpretation governing questions of the effect of acts of Congress on State laws; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PELLY:

H.R. 5011. A bill to alleviate unemployment in the maritime industry by restricting the transfer of vessels to foreign registry in cases of abnormal unemployment among American seagoing unlicensed personnel, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. QUIE:

H.R. 5012. A bill to establish a Commission on Country Life, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. REES of Kansas:

H.R. 5013. A bill to provide for the discontinuance of the Postal Savings System; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. ROBERTS:

H.R. 5014. A bill to bring employees of the Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation county committees within the purview of the Civil Service Retirement Act and the Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance Act of 1954, to authorize length of service credit for periods of employment by Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation county committees, and to provide that annual leave unused at the end of a leave year shall be credited to the employee's sick leave account; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 5015. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, with respect to crediting certain service as a member of the Women's Army Auxiliary Corps, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. ROOSEVELT:

H.R. 5016. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to permit the use of the new methods and rates of depreciation for used property; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 5017. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to encourage the establishment of voluntary retirement plans by individuals; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 5018. A bill to designate judicial precedents which shall be binding in the administration and enforcement of the internal

revenue laws; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 5019. A bill to amend the Panama Canal Construction Service Annuity Act of May 29, 1944, to extend the benefits thereof to persons otherwise eligible therefor who are naturalized as U.S. citizens after December 7, 1941, and before January 2, 1959; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. ROOSEVELT (by request):

H.R. 5020. A bill to extend the benefits of the act of May 29, 1944, entitled "An act to provide for the recognition of the services of the civilian officials and employees, citizens of the United States, engaged in and about the construction of the Panama Canal," to certain additional civilian officers and employees; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. SISK:

H.R. 5021. A bill to promote mining and development research for beryl, chromite and columbium-tantalum from domestic mines; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Texas:

H.R. 5022. A bill to establish a Commission on Country Life, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ULLMAN:

H.R. 5023. A bill to promote mining and development research for beryl, chromite and columbium-tantalum from domestic mines; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. VAN PELT:

H.R. 5024. A bill to authorize the use of Great Lakes vessels on the oceans; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. WIER:

H.R. 5025. A bill to amend section 503 of title 38, United States Code, to provide that social security benefits shall not be counted as income in determining eligibility for pension; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 5026. A bill to amend sections 522 and 545 of title 38, United States Code, to increase the income limitations applicable to the payment of pension for non-service-connected disability or death to $1,800 and $3,000; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. FULTON:

H.J. Res. 264. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KILGORE:

H.J. Res. 265. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing for the election of President and Vice President; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COAD:

H. Con. Res. 90. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to a program for paying the national debt; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FULTON:

H. Con. Res. 91. Concurrent resolution seeking United States initiative for a joint free world economic mission to India; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DENT:

H. Res. 185. Resolution to authorize the Committee on Education and Labor to conduct an investigation and study of the administration of the Walsh-Healey Act; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Maryland, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to protesting the proposal of a 1½-cent-per-gallon increase in the Federal gasoline tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Minnesota, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to urging the Congress to enact appropriate legislation to repeal the Federal excise taxes upon the transportation of persons; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Montana, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to requesting that Fort Missoula, at Missoula, Mont., be activated and utilized by some regular unit of the United States armed services or maintained and considered for future uses; to the Committee on Armed Services.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CLARK:

H.R. 5027. A bill for the relief of Philip Elias Hays; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H.R. 5028. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Yee (Ng) Fung Lin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ELLIOTT:

H.R. 5029. A bill for the relief of Capt. William Crane Cantrell; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN:

H.R. 5030. A bill for the relief of Franciszek Serafin and Danuta Serafin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FULTON:

H.R. 5031. A bill for the relief of Ida Colaizzi Di Benedetto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5032. A bill for the relief of Assimina Christidou; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5033. A bill for the relief of Betty Keenan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HUDDLESTON:

H.R. 5034. A bill for the relief of Sofia N. Sarris; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'HARA of Illinois:

H.R. 5035. A bill for the relief of David Yung-Liang Liu; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'KONSKI:

H.R. 5036. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claims of Reynaldo Gubbins, of Lima, Peru, and the persons and firms of Argentina, Bolivia, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Mexico, Nicaragua, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Uruguay, and Venezuela which Reynaldo Gubbins represents; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PELLY:

H.R. 5037. A bill for the relief of Sho Kwon Shin (also known as Cheng Ah Mao); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHELLEY:

H.R. 5038. A bill for the relief of Wong Lip Jue; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5039. A bill for the relief of Adela Michiko Flores; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Estonian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 25, 1959

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, commemorating the 41st anniversary of Estonian independence is in fact a study of and a tribute to the spirit of nationalism and freedom. Estonia has demonstrated a spirit strong enough to outlive German landlords and Russian governors; strong enough to withstand, at the end of the First World War, first a Bolshevik invasion, then a German invasion, then another Bolshevik invasion; and strong enough to establish a republic and to maintain it through the trials of over 22 years.

Estonia had been independent from its early beginning until the 13th century. Then it found itself a pawn in the power politics of larger, aggressive neighbors, culminating in Russian rule in 1710. For more than 200 years they lived under oppressive Russian rule. Their chief desire during all that time was to be free, though they were unable to attain their freedom without help from others. But history took pity on these heroic people during World War I. With the Russian revolution of 1917 czarist autocracy was overthrown and that Government's authority over other nationalities was shattered. Estonians felt a taste of freedom, and on February 24, 1918, they proclaimed their independence. In 1920 the U.S.S.R. signed a peace treaty renouncing all rights to Estonian territory. In 1932 a further guaranty was agreed upon, a nonaggression pact. Thus Estonia built its foundations of sovereignty upon the treacherous sands of Soviet paper promises.

But in 1940, the curtain came down on independent Estonia. As one of the first nations to be subjugated by the Soviet Union after the Hitler-Stalin Pact, Estonia was directly incorporated into the Soviet Union. After being occupied by the Nazis during World War II, Estonia was again returned to Soviet rule. Untold hardships and suffering have been inflicted upon this small nation—deportation, execution, imprisonment, and mobilization—total and brutal sovietization of Estonia.

The unhappy Estonians continue to suffer under totalitarian tyranny. But their hope for freedom and their desire for independence is not dead. It is living in the hearts and minds of Estonians still struggling for their liberty. Estonia no longer remains on the map of Europe, but it does remain in the hearts of all freedom-loving people. The United States

still refuses to recognize Estonia as part of the Soviet Union de jure.

Estonians have a spirit—a feeling—of belonging together. This feeling has survived the centuries of division, invasion, and oppression. It was this feeling which, taking the 19th century form of nationalism, founded the Estonian state. The people of Estonia—with their tenacity and their flexibility, their energy, and their courage, their stoicism, and their wit—have suffered the trials of invasion and oppression without being broken or embittered, without losing their capacity for self-government and toleration. We cannot fail to feel in their debt. We encourage the Estonian people in their hope for a complete restoration of freedom; heartily applaud their moral resistance to Communist tyranny, and humbly pay tribute to this long-suffering patriotism.

American Farm Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. R. HULL, JR.
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 25, 1959

Mr. HULL. Mr. Speaker, a lucid and penetrating appraisal of the farm problem in America was made in a recent speech before a convention of Ruritan National by Senator SYMINGTON, of Missouri.

This speech by Senator SYMINGTON, a member of the Senate Agriculture Committee and the astute sponsor of intelligent farm legislation, should be required reading for every American genuinely concerned with recent trends in American agriculture and interested in restoring prosperity to our rural areas.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the address by Senator SYMINGTON:

ADDRESS BY SENATOR STUART SYMINGTON, OF MISSOURI, RURITAN NATIONAL, 30TH ANNIVERSARY CONVENTION, SHERATON-PARK HOTEL, JANUARY 26, 1959

It is a privilege to speak here before the 30th anniversary convention of Ruritan National.

I am especially proud to be here, because the speakers at your past conventions constitute a most distinguished group—one which includes my friend and colleague, the distinguished Senator from Virginia, HARRY BYRD.

There is always a bond between a speaker and the audience when they share common beliefs and philosophies.

I believe this is true tonight.

As Ruritans, you recognize the true and enduring values of rural life; and you have dedicated your organization to promoting and serving those values.

Your basic objective is to bring about a closer union and a better understanding between the farmer and the business and professional man, so as to make the rural community a better place in which to live.

In serving rural communities as you do, you are making a great contribution to your community.

You are also serving a larger cause—that of our Nation.

The influence of agriculture extends far beyond the farm, or even the rural community.

While some 20 million Americans actually live and work on the farms, it is estimated that 42 million are involved in the transporting, processing and retailing of farm products, or in supplying the farmers' needs.

In other words, an estimated three out of every eight Americans are directly involved in the feeding and clothing of the Nation.

Remember those figures, when anybody tries to argue that agriculture is no longer important.

Each year agriculture uses more finished steel than is used in a year's output of passenger cars.

Each year, farmers use more crude petroleum than any other industry in the country.

Each year, American farmers keep 2 to 3 million nonfarm workers employed solely in supplying their needs.

So agriculture is today, as it always has been, one of the pillars of our Nation's economy.

As Ruritans, you are aware of, and concerned with, the close relationship between rural and urban America.

You know well that the small town cannot long survive, much less grow or prosper, in the face of continued depressed economic conditions in agriculture.

A decline in farm income is like an economic cancer. It spreads slowly at first, but soon covers an entire area.

It is only natural that, as farm income and purchasing power decline, the farm family is forced to postpone or curtail purchases of needed or desired goods.

If a farmer cannot afford to buy a new tractor, the sales of local implement dealers drop.

As a result, the implement dealer postpones his planned purchase of a new car.

This means the auto dealer must postpone his remodeling or building a home.

And the chain of reduced purchasing power soon engulfs the entire community.

But it spreads even further—to the factories, the firms, and the people of larger cities.

To see the effect, we need only look at the last few pages of our book of economic history.

Farm prosperity reached record levels in the post-World War II period.

In the early 1950's it began to slump.

Conditions continued to worsen, until in 1957 family farm purchasing power reached its lowest point in 17 years.

As farm income dropped steadily, our small towns and rural communities bore the brunt.

Gradually, however, it spread to the larger cities, to the point where, in 1957, and continuing throughout most of 1958, our entire national economy staggered under the most severe recession since the mid-1930's.

I do not want to imply that our most recent recession was caused solely by a sick farm economy. But most economists agreee that continued drops in farm income and purchasing power helped bog us down as much as anything else.

This is why many farmers, farm leaders, and some of us—not enough—in the Congress, are so concerned when various people make light of agriculture—its people, its importance, and its problems.

Wouldn't we like to get hold of that Madison Avenue fellow who started the story that nearly all farmers are now driving Cadillacs?

Farmworkers put in a 10-hour day. That we know.

I don't know of many farmers who work less than a 6-day week.

Do you?

The work of no one else is more directly concerned with the well-being of each of us.

For what could be more important than our food?

American farmers are the most efficient and productive farmers in the world.

And we are improving, every year.

Last year, average per acre yields on nearly every major commodity set new records.

On 57 acres, we now produce the same amount of food and fiber that we did in 1940 on 100 acres.

We can produce more pounds of meat, with less feed, than ever before.

Milk production, per cow, has increased 39 percent since 1944.

Yes, Americans are the best fed, and best clothed people on the face of the earth.

And this food and clothing is becoming less and less expensive, in terms of the amount of work required to earn the purchase price.

Thirty years ago the average laborer had to work 15 minutes to earn enough to buy a quart of milk.

This year, he will work just half that time for that quart; and his milk will come in a more sanitary package, pasteurized, homogenized, and irradiated with vitamins.

It now requires less than one-third the worktime of 30 years ago to buy a dozen eggs.

And half the time for a pound of meat.

Now in most industries, increases in efficiency or productiveness are rewarded by higher wages or profits.

This has not been true in agriculture. Despite the fact our farmers feed us well, and help to feed needy people in other lands, they have not shared fully in the benefits of their accomplishments.

Per capita income in agriculture is less than half the level of the nonfarm population.

In 1958, farmworkers' wages averaged 76 cents per hour; whereas factory workers' wages averaged more than $2 per hour.

Reports comparing rural and urban standards of living consistently point out that farm families are far short of the conveniences and necessities enjoyed by urban families.

One-fourth of the Nation's farm families have no automobile.

Only half have telephones.

Nearly 2 million farm homes have no running water.

The median income level in agriculture in 1957 was $1,555. This is less than one-third of the median income in wholesaling, manufacturing, transporting, mining—and by far the lowest for any industry group.

Is it not truly a paradox that one of the most efficient and productive segments of our economy is earning so much less than any other?

How, then, can we find ways to help farm families earn a fair return for their effort, without resorting to programs which, in the long run, will hurt farmers, the rural community, and the national economy?

Before entering Government service, I spent nearly 30 years in private business.

Therefore I naturally view this farm problem, or any similar Government problem, from the standpoint of what we used to call "good business practice under sound accounting principles."

With that premise, may we look briefly at a current Government farm problem which invariably is one of management's most important problems, inventory.

All of us know the importance of sound inventory management, and the dangers incident to excess inventory.

We have an inventory problem in Government today which may be the greatest inventory problem ever faced by anybody in peacetime—the inventory currently in the hands of the Department of Agriculture.

As we know, the Department of Agriculture price-support program operates through the making of loans on commodities.

Unless the loan is redeemed, the commodity is taken over by the Commodity Credit Corporation, a legal instrument created to carry out this operation.

In recent years, there has been a tremendous increase in the quantity of farm products moving into the hands of the Commodity Credit Corporation; and it is now clear that this condition has been caused primarily by the Department of Agriculture giving price support without meaningful production controls.

In effect, the Department of Agriculture has been telling farmers in many crops to produce all they can; and at the same time has provided them with a guaranteed price.

There has been no adequate market for this guaranteed production. Therefore it has piled up in Government inventory at a truly appalling rate.

As of November 30, 1958, the most recent Department of Agriculture report, the CCC inventory of Government-owned farm commodities was valued at $5.5 billion. (In January 1953, this inventory was $1 billion.)

But that tells only part of the story.

That 5.5 billion represents the value of the crops actually owned by the CCC.

In addition, there is some $2.7 billion of commodities pledged for loans, most of which will be turned over to the Government within the next few months.

According to the President's 1960 budget message, the CCC actual inventory will be $6.7 billion by next June 30, and $9.1 billion by June of 1960.

If these 1960 estimates are accurate, the Government holdings of surplus farm commodities will have been multiplied 9 times in an 8-year period.

And this does not include any loan pledges, the cost of which may be several billions more.

At the present time, two crops, corn and wheat, make up approximately 75 percent of this total investment; and the prominence of these two crops will continue.

The new corn program of the Department of Agriculture calls for higher price support for most corn farmers; and at the same time does away with all measures of production control.

So we are certain to have even greater corn production; and therefore an even larger Government inventory.

Wheat production is expected to continue at an equally high level.

The figures again.

This Commodity Credit Corporation inventory is nearly $6 billion now; it soon will be $9 billion; and the total obligation—loans and inventory—will be some $10.5 billion.

Therefore the present policy, price support without effective controls just doesn't make sense.

To a farmer, with this gigantic supply hanging over his market, it guarantees heavy trouble.

To all of us, as citizens and taxpayers sharing the cost of this program, including the now heavy storage charges, it constitutes a heavy burden.

To the people who are now entering their 7th year in control of our Department of Agriculture, it is a problem which must now be faced up to.

For that reason all of us, in and out of Congress, hope for sound proposals from the Department of Agriculture this year.

Now what can be done with this $9 billion agriculture inventory?

As I see it, here are the alternatives.

We can continue to store the inventory.

(At present inventory levels, the cost of storage and handling is $420 million per year. As the size of the inventory increases, this cost will, of course increase to, according to the President's state of the Union address, $1 billion per year in storage charges alone.)

At this rate, we will soon run out of places to store our idle surplus crops. Then tens of millions more dollars will have to be spent to build more storage space.

Just not good business.

Secondly, the Secretary of Agriculture can sell these stocks on the market, for what they will bring.

That would be normal business practice, in manufacturing or wholesaling, or retailing.

This latter action would result in sharp cuts in the price of beef and hogs.

Some believe, however, that this day of reckoning is due.

In fact, hog prices are already skidding. In recent months they have dropped from $23 to $17 per hundred pounds; and, according to Department of Agriculture reports, by next fall they may be down to $10–$12, as low as they were in 1955.

Cattle prices, which are now doing fairly well, can only drop heavily if we move our inventory of more than 2.5 billion bushels of Government stocked corn, and possibly wheat, into the market.

Thirdly, we could destroy these surplus stocks.

That would be a heavy levy on every citizen of the United States. All the money invested would be lost.

With hundreds of millions of hungry people around the world, that action might be misunderstood by many.

Fourth, perhaps we could move much of this inventory into the hands of hungry people, all over the world.

To that end, I have introduced a bill which requires that not less than 25 percent of our foreign economic aid be given in surplus farm commodities.

In this way we would be using more of the productive capacity of our American farm families as a weapon in the struggle for world freedom and a just and lasting peace.

Already we are selling some of our surplus stocks for foreign currencies. This is under the Public Law 480 program.

A bill has been introduced in this Congress to allow countries to purchase our food and fiber stocks under long-term contracts, so they can be assured of a supply while they are developing their own resources.

It has also been suggested that the free nations set up a world bank, in which storable food could be deposited, withdrawn, or loaned, in order to meet emergencies of the member nations.

As long as we are going to be in the business, and properly, of strengthening countries to resist communism, why not do it partly with food, of which we have plenty, instead of dollars, with which we are having increasing troubles.

So there they are, the four possible solutions to this growing agriculture inventory problem.

We can destroy this inventory.

We can sell it.

We can use more of it for economic aid.

Or we can keep on storing it.

As Ruritans you are vitally interested in a prosperous rural America.

But you know there can be no true farm prosperity so long as the Department of Agriculture continues to sit on this gigantic surplus of farm commodities.

It is a situation which must be faced; and in the interest of the country as well as the farmer, it should be faced now.

As a member of the Senate Agriculture Committee, I am one of those eager to find the right answer, so the families on the farms, and in the rural communities of America, can share more fully in the unprecedented prosperity of our Nation.

Let us all dedicate ourselves to the right, and therefore the wise, solution to this farm problem.

We would then be striving to do our share toward the attainment of a free and prosperous America.

In that way we would be serving the objective of Ruritan, "to make our community a better place in which to live."

How To Encourage American Investment Abroad

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HALE BOGGS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 25, 1959

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address which I presented before the international section of the New York Board of Trade on February 10, 1959:

HOW TO ENCOURAGE AMERICAN INVESTMENT ABROAD

Mr. Chairman, it is a pleasure for me to join you today to discuss the subject, "How To Encourage American Investment Abroad." This very important problem engages your interest as American businessmen and my interest as a Member of the U.S. Congress. We appreciate the critical importance of this subject and of the need for developing public policy and programs that are adequate.

The London Economist, a week or so ago, put the problem very well. It said that "Provided there is no thermonuclear war, the whole future balance of international manpower is likely to depend on one factor: On whether the poorer nations can be offered the prospect of getting richer within the free world's economic and political system than they would within the Communist one."

When we talk about foreign economic policy as a whole and foreign investment policy in particular, we are talking about policy for national survival. There is no question about it. We are engaged in a life-and-death struggle to save and promote the kind of social, political, and economic system—in short, the kind of world order—that is the heritage of Western democracy. We are trying to do this, challenged by the most artful and persistent foe that we have ever faced. The conflict is all the more trying because we are waging it at this stage without adequate weapons. We have, in fact, an excessive preoccupation with the military side of any prospective conflict. I do not say that military preparedness is not absolutely essential—it is, but by being in the soundest military posture we are assuming hopefully that the Russians will not begin a war with us. Thus, military preparedness only buys time and prevents the conflict from breaking out into a shooting war. The outcome of the long-run competition will not depend on military weapons. The battlefield where the conflict is really joined today and for the future is in the competition for men's minds and allegiances and hence it is where our foreign economic policy, as the economist pointed out, is of such critical importance.

I am afraid that in this department of our strategy for survival we are not well stocked with weapons. In fact, not only have we not devised and put into use the kinds of policies and programs that are essential but we have had a bad habit of stumbling and falling back. One example has come to me very graphically. I am sure that you have all read about the turbine case under the Buy-American Act which led to a Government contract being awarded a domestic manufacturer despite the fact that the

British bidder was $300,000 below the American bid. There are many wrinkles to this case, but what is most striking to me is that the contract was awarded to the domestic firm, despite all the rules and regulations of the Buy-American Act and the Executive order that was proclaimed to implement it, on the grounds of national security. That is, we are asked to believe that letting the contract in England would have jeopardized the national security of the United States. The reason that was given—national security—was just an excuse because it was the only excuse available. What is appalling is the use of such an excuse.

Not only is it ridiculous to think that our national security would be impaired if the two turbines were produced by the British firm in a country that is perhaps our stanchest ally, but what is even more significant is the narrow parochial meaning that this action gives to the concept of national security.

Our national security is not impaired by a liberal trade policy. Quite the contrary. It is through the expansion of trade and investment that we can, in a very real sense, assure our national security. The concept of national security has meaning, of course, only in the context of the threats and dangers that beset us. It is World War I thinking at its worst that defines national security as the maintenance of economic isolationism. In a world where the military threat is one posed by thermonuclear weapons delivered by intercontinental ballistic missiles, if a full-scale war ever gets started, it will be decided in a matter of days. The target of our enemies will be continental United States. We enjoy no military isolation. How can we bemuse ourselves with economic isolation? No, even on purely military grounds, this kind of national security thinking is a phony, at best, and dangerous, at worst. The danger stems from the fact that this attitude shows no comprehension of what the real issues are and what we must do to wage the cold, nonshooting, war that we are already in.

What we must do and I think, if we apply ourselves, can do very well indeed is to give our kind of economic system a chance to work its wonders throughout the world. We must realize that unlike the Soviet Union that can mobilize all its resources through the state by engaging in state trade and aid activities, because we believe in free enterprise, the role of government in our society is necessarily limited. That makes it all the more important that we use governmental policy properly to produce the results we want to achieve. We want to see the growth of international trade in an increasingly free environment. In this way, we can stimulate productivity throughout the world and thus increase standards of living. By avoiding conflicts over trade through restrictionist policies, we would avoid some of the most damaging blows to amity and cooperation among the free world countries.

We seek the expansion of private investment. Private investment through the capital and techniques that it employs is the engine of economic growth. Through its growth we look to the expanded use of economic resources throughout the world and that is the essential base for economic progress.

I want to concentrate today on private investment policy since this seems to me to be a critical area from the point of view of Government policy today. That is not to say that trade policy is not significant or that there is not an intimate relationship between trade and investment policy. I think there is, but we have an established trade policy. Last year the trade agreements legislation was renewed for an unprecedented 4-year period. We are, however, deficient as far as investment policy is concerned. This is a subject that has been under intensive study and discussion for a decade but as yet we have not broken out of the chains of uncertainty and come forward with a meaningful policy.

From what we know about private investment and the incentives and obstacles that promote and deter it, I think we can fairly conclude that it is in the field of tax reform that the most effective incentives to private foreign investment can be found. To be sure, the Government can moderate the nonbusiness risks of doing business abroad through such things as the investment guaranty program and through the consummation of treaties and conventions for the protection of private property and to assure equal rights for American citizens and corporations. But when we talk about private investment, we talk about economic decisions by American corporations that are made on the basis of a calculated profit. Foreign investment, by and large, does not assure the investor that he will earn sufficiently higher returns than he can on domestic investment. Through tax policy, the take-home profit for foreign investment can be enhanced and, in addition, the investor can be encouraged to commit his earnings from foreign operations to new investment.

I know that there is a view held in some quarters that the tax system is not an appropriate instrument to use to achieve public policy objectives. I regard that as an unduly sterile approach to tax policy. It is clear to begin with that our system of taxation does, in fact, impart willy-nilly incentives and disincentives to certain types of economic activity and business pursuits. Any system of taxation is bound to.

Moreover, there have been consciously built into the tax system incentives of one sort or another. The real question is whether any particular change in tax policy that is proposed will be successful in accomplishing a legitimate and desired goal. I think that in the case of private investment, because we want such investment to continue to be private, tax reform is in many respects the only good and effective instrument we have. Now, even aside from the question of providing tax incentives to private foreign investment, it would seem to me that our tax system as it applies to foreign source income could stand reform on equity grounds alone. The operation of the foreign tax credit limitation is an example of this. It is a happy coincidence that in suggesting intelligent tax reform we can accomplish both the objectives of bringing greater equity into the tax picture as well as adapting the tax system so as to provide proper incentives to private foreign investment.

As you know, I introduced a bill on the first day of this Congress, known as H.R. 5, which I believe will help accomplish the objective we have in mind. I want to say at the start that while I believe H.R. 5 to be a good bill, soundly conceived, and one that will bring important benefits, it is by no means perfect in every detail. Some changes have already been brought to my attention that may well deserve incorporation in the bill. Most of these have been of a complicated technical nature and have to be given careful scrutiny. The essential thing to my mind is to strike a balance by including, as I believe I did in H.R. 5, provisions that are realistic and effective. I am sure that not everyone in the business community would feel that H.R. 5 does everything that he feels is necessary, but I would suggest to such people that they realize that we may be in danger of accomplishing nothing if we seek to accomplish everything. That would be as foolish as throwing out the baby with the bath water.

The principal provision of H.R. 5 is that establishing a special class of domestic corporation known as a foreign business corporation to conduct the foreign operations of American firms. The foreign business corporation would enjoy the privilege of deferral of U.S. taxes on its income.

This proposal would, therefore, permit the domestication of foreign base corporations established in tax haven countries and would accord the same tax benefits that are enjoyed by such corporations to the foreign business corporation. The question may well be raised as to what advantage the foreign business corporation form offers American business in view of the fact that they can already avail themselves of the tax advantages of this form through the incorporation of holding companies in foreign tax havens. The answer, I think, is that there are significant advantages and the best test of this is that the American business community has, in the hearings which our subcommittee held, expressed its vigorous interest and support for the proposal.

This support reflects several factors. Foreign incorporation may be a cumbersome and expensive proposition. It may mean committing personnel to a foreign country; it means putting your foreign operations under the sometimes uncertain tax policies of a foreign sovereignty. It also means some uncertainty as to whether the United States tax benefits will continue to be enjoyed. As you know, some of the advantages of a foreign base corporation depend on regulations of the Treasury Department.

These could presumably be revised at some time in the future. Moreover, some commentators have been casting sidewise glances at foreign base corporations and suggesting that these are nothing more than tax evasion propositions. By providing explicitly in U.S. statute for the foreign business corporation and by according status and permanency to the privilege of tax deferral and the other collateral tax advantages, a great deal of the uncertainty that presently exists would be dispelled as would a good deal of the inconvenience and expense of foreign incorporation.

Thus, there are, it seems to me, tangible advantages to the American business engaged in foreign operations to be found in the foreign business corporation proposal. I think that it is as well an important and effective stimulus to expand private foreign investment. Recent Department of Commerce studies have shown that something in excess of 50 percent of the earnings from foreign operations are retained for reinvestment purposes.

Tax deferral recognizes this practice and encourages it by, in effect, giving the foreign investor an interest-free loan equal to the amount of income that would have had to be paid to the U.S. Treasury.

The provision of the bill contained in section 3 relating to transfers and reorganizations should be read in the context of the foreign business corporation provisions. This provision would permit the transfer of property from a U.S. corporation to a foreign corporation without any tax penalties resulting from the transfer. Thus, foreign operations presently organized in the branch form can move into a foreign corporation and enjoy the advantages that that form of enterprise may afford. I would expect that in many instances the foreign branch activities would be shipped into the foreign business corporation. Since these are transfers entirely between domestic corporations, no tax consequences would, of course, arise and, therefore, no special legislation is required.

There is one respect in which section 3 of the bill that I have been referring to might very well be changed. As it presently stands, it does not permit the liquidation, say, of a Panamanian corporation and the tax-free transfer of the assets of such corpo-

ration to the foreign business corporation. To the extent that we wish to have the foreign business corporation form used instead of a foreign holding company, where the investor decides to liquidate his foreign base corporation and reorganize his foreign activities under the foreign business corporation, he should be permitted to do so without incurring tax liabilities.

Section 4 of the bill extends, with very minor modifications, the present Western Hemisphere trade corporation provisions and the consequent tax advantages to foreign source income without regard to the geographic source of such income. The extension of Western Hemisphere trade corporation treatment to the Eastern Hemisphere seems to me to be entirely reasonable. In 1942 when the Western Hemisphere trade corporation provision was first enacted, there may have been special considerations of foreign economic policy favoring special treatment to Western Hemisphere trade and investment.

Today, the Western Hemisphere does not stand in a unique position with respect to the rest of the world. Increasingly, our foreign economic policy objectives have come to comprehend the entire free world. To implement these broader objectives, it is appropriate to generalize what has hitherto been very special treatment.

Tax reduction, of course, has a very direct effect on increasing the profitability of foreign operations, and it is for this reason that it is perhaps the most potent tool in the tax arsenal. It must be recognized, however, that the revenue consequences of across-the-board tax reduction are more serious than of other proposals, and for this reason, this provision of my bill is likely to occasion the most opposition.

What I think is not sufficiently appreciated about section 4 is that any tax reduction is not, in effect, an across-the-board reduction. A 14-point reduction will not yield 14 points of tax abatement on all foreign source income. In those cases where the foreign tax rate is above 38 percent, the amount of the abatement will be commensurately less. What is significant, however, is that, by and large, the lower tax rates are found in the less developed countries.

Hence, the maximum benefits from the 14-point tax reduction will be enjoyed on income earned in such countries. The 14-point proposal, therefore, has in practice a selective effect, and it is a selective effect which coincides with the high priority objectives of public policy in the field of private investment; namely, the stimulation of private investment in the less developed areas of the world.

Skipping section 5 for a moment and turning to section 6, the section relating to tax sparing, this provision takes account of the fact that even in many underdeveloped countries tax rates are high and present a barrier to the expansion of investment. If underdeveloped countries wish to enact incentive tax legislation in order to foster private investment, they should be encouraged to do so. The operation of our foreign tax credit system, however, at present frustrates the achievement of such an objective. To the extent that foreign tax rates are lowered, the U.S. tax liability of the U.S. taxpayer is generally increased. The Treasury and State Departments have been much interested in this problem and have recommended the use of tax treaties containing tax-sparing provisions as the appropriate solution.

H.R. 5 suggests, as an alternative, that there be a legislative mandate to recognize incentive tax sparing by foreign countries as taxes paid for the purpose of the U.S. foreign tax credit. Embodying this policy in legislation seems to me to have many virtues. The principal one, of course, is that it avoids the very important criticism that can be directed at tax sparing through treaties, namely, the circumvention of congressional authority in the field of taxation. In addition, under a general legislative mandate, the Secretary of State would not have to negotiate complicated and time-consuming tax treaties. He could, if he wished merely certify unilaterally which foreign tax sparing legislation would be accorded the treatment provided for. Alternatively, he could use this general authority to negotiate executive agreements in order to obtain reciprocal benefits. Such agreements are simpler to negotiate and do not require the advice and consent of the Senate. Thus, the tax sparing provision of section 6 continues the principle of selectivity inherent in section 4 and gives it broader scope.

Sections 5 and 6 of the bill are provisions that can be supported on equity grounds, pure and simple. Affording the taxpayer the option to choose between the country-by-country limitation and an overall limitation on the amount of tax credit he can take against his U.S. tax liability, would give effect to the principle of equality of treatment on which the foreign tax credit provisions are based. At present, under the existing country-by-country limitation, foreign source income can be subject to a higher rate of taxation than domestic source income of an equal amount. By permitting the option of an overall limitation, this inequity would be removed in those instances where the taxpayer derives foreign source income from other countries where he has unused tax credits. Section 7 similarly rectifies an inequity in present law relating to the question of gain or involuntary conversion of property of foreign subsidiaries. There does not seem to me to be any good reason why a domestic parent corporation that has insured the property of its wholly-owned foreign subsidiary must pay a tax on the insurance proceeds if the property of that subsidiary is involuntarily destroyed or converted. This contingent tax penalty that may arise against the domestic parent deters investment in those countries in which it is either impossible or difficult to secure adequate insurance coverage and where, as a result, the domestic parent must insure the property involved.

H.R. 5 in itself represents, I firmly believe, a balanced and moderate proposal for tax reform in the field of foreign source income that I am confident would go a long way in providing the kinds of incentives that are necessary in order to promote the expansion of private foreign investment. There really is nothing startlingly new or revolutionary about these proposals. In fact, they have been under consideration for some years. I am persuaded of one thing, however: The time has come to do something about the subject. We can no longer afford the vacillation and delay that has characterized discussions of public policy in this critical area. I am encouraged to learn that the public advisory groups established to advise the President in this field will come forward with constructive recommendations in the tax field. We, of course, have to wait for the publication of these reports and findings in order to ascertain what these specific proposals are. But I am encouraged by the initial evidence, at least, that the administration in Washington is bestirring itself, and I hope that a good conclusion will come out of these efforts.

Meanwhile, it is up to the business community, alert businessmen such as yourselves, who are concerned with private enterprise and our foreign economic policy, who are acutely aware of the challenges that confront us, to work unstintingly for the development of sound and constructive policy in this area. In the final analysis, you are the people who will decide what our country will do.

Alabama Delegation Urges Consideration of Coosa-Alabama River Development

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH A. ROBERTS
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 25, 1959

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, the development of the Coosa-Alabama River system has been authorized for some 14 years. An item in the Public Works Appropriation Act, 1956, 84th Congress, called for a comprehensive investigation of the entire river system. An interim report has been submitted to the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors. However, the Board has not scheduled this report for its next meeting in March of this year. Inasmuch as this project has been authorized and a favorable report submitted to the Board and since this project has been inserted as a Senate amendment to the Public Works Appropriation Act for the past 3 years, the Members of Congress affected by this project have submitted a letter to the Chairman of the Board, Gen. Walter K. Wilson, Jr., requesting the Board to schedule this project for the March meeting. Under unanimous consent I ask that this letter be printed in the RECORD:

Maj. Gen. WALTER K. WILSON, Jr.,
Chairman, Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors, Office, Chief of Engineers, T–7, Gravelly Point, Va.

DEAR GENERAL WILSON: We, the undersigned Members of Congress, respectfully urge that the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors consider the report on navigation plans for the Coosa-Alabama River system at their meeting early in March of this year.

It is realized that the agenda for this meeting has been established. However, due to the importance of the development of the Coosa-Alabama River system and in conformance with the remarks of President Eisenhower in his state of the Union message in 1955 indicating that the plan for the development of this waterway is the kind of partnership he would like to see, we urgently request that this report be placed on the agenda for consideration at the March meeting of the Board.

As you undoubtedly know, the development of the Coosa-Alabama was authorized in the 79th Congress in 1945, including construction of a multipurpose dam at Miller's Ferry and two other dams on the Alabama River. Since that time a private concern, the Alabama Power Co., has begun a multimillion-dollar series of dams on the upper stretches of the waterway. The Federal Government has not kept pace, and the work on the Alabama River remains unstarted.

An item in the Public Works Appropriation Act, 1956, Public Law 163, 84th Congress, called for a comprehensive investigation of the entire Alabama-Coosa River. In partial response to this act, an interim report was prepared by the division engineer, South Atlantic Division, and was forwarded to the Chief of Engineers early last fall. This report indicates that the reporting officers have found that the estimated benefits exceed the estimated cost and early construction of the project is warranted.

We realize that, while there is only a short time prior to the Board meeting in March to consider and analyze the data submitted, we

believe that the importance of this project makes it imperative that action be taken which will permit the start of construction at the earliest possible date.

Sincerely yours,

LISTER HILL, U.S. Senator; JOHN SPARKMAN, U.S. Senator; ERWIN MITCHELL, FRANK BOYKIN, GEORGE GRANT, ALBERT RAINS, KENNETH A. ROBERTS, ARMISTEAD SELDEN, GEORGE ANDREWS, ROBERT E. JONES, CARL ELLIOTT, GEORGE HUDDLESTON, Members of Congress.

Boyhood Heroism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN R. FOLEY
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 25, 1959

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, the problems facing the growth of America are natural subjects of concern for all of us as parents, public officials, and citizens. Great publicity is given to individual delinquent acts involving a very small percentage of our young people. Very little or no recognition is given to the many acts of heroism which daily are performed by a much larger percentage of our young citizens. Because of this general omission, I am proud to bring the attention of the Members of the House to a recent act of boyhood heroism by Jimmy Lewis of Eckhart, Md. I feel it will warm your hearts and stir your pride as it did mine. There are many unsung Jimmy Lewises who daily show kindness toward their fellow man and devotion to the welfare of dumb creatures.

In their honor and to the honor of Jimmy Lewis, I have inserted the true story of the saving of the lives of Rex, Bing, and Sam, three beagles:

PLAQUE WILL BE GIVEN TO ECKHART BOY

A plaque will be presented to Jimmy Lewis, 17, of Eckhart, by the Animal Welfare Society for his heroism and kindness in rescuing three beagle dogs which were trapped in an abandoned coal mine last fall.

According to Mrs. W. Earle Cobey, president of the Animal Society, the organization's executive committee took note of Jimmy's action after a news account of the rescue was published. Immediate steps were taken to show him some recognition.

The plaque is to be presented at the meeting of the society January 26 at 7:30 p.m., in the Cumberland Free Public Library. At this meeting, the annual report for 1958 will be given and officers will be elected for 1959.

Mrs. Cobey, commenting upon the award to Jimmy Lewis, recounted the report of the rescue of the three beagle hounds, Rex, Bing, and Sam, as it was first recorded by Herbert L. Knepp, president of the Western Maryland Wildlife Federation. The report shows that:

George W. Lewis, Jimmy's father, was hunting with the dogs when they sighted a huge cat—the kind that goes wild and feeds on game—and chased it into the mouth of the abandoned mine. Fallen timbers and rock had so clogged the mine tunnel that the dogs were able to squeeze through, but were unable to find their way out again.

The elder Lewis had almost given the dogs up for lost when Jimmy remembered an old air shaft that descended to the mine. Checking at this point next day, the dogs were heard whining below, where, it is presumed, they went to get fresh air.

Jimmy prevailed upon his father and two of his friends, William Filsinger and Noah Shroyer, to lower him into the air shaft on a rope—a distance of some 50 feet from the surface—to try to save the dogs. Reluctantly, the men acceded to the wishes of the boy, and he went down into the abandoned pit, where weakened timbers could have sent tons of rock and earth tumbling in upon him. Jimmy put the joyous pups in burlap bags and the men pulled them to the surface.

Jimmy lives at Eckhart with his parents, and is student manager of the Beall High football team. He is advisor to the Eckhart Square Circle Boys Club.

THE ANIMAL WELFARE SOCIETY
OF ALLEGANY COUNTY, INC.,
Cumberland, Md.

Mr. JAMES LEWIS,
Eckhart, Md.

DEAR JIMMY: It is with a great deal of pleasure that we, the Animal Welfare Society of Allegany County, Inc., present to you this special award of 1958 in recognition of your courageous act in saving the lives of three beagle hounds on November 23, 1958.

We feel that you are a very worthy recipient of this award, the first we have ever presented anyone.

Presented January 26, 1959.

VIRGINIA B. COBEY,
WINIFRED A. BIGLER,
HELEN POWELL WISE,
DOROTHY BORDEN,
LOUIS B. YOUNG,
Executive Committee.

JANUARY 26, 1959.

JIMMY LEWIS,
Animal Welfare Society, Cumberland Free Public Library, Cumberland, Md.:

My congratulations for the recognition being so deservedly given you this evening by the Animal Welfare Society. Your heroism and kindness in rescuing Rex, Bing, and Sam is an exemplification of the best qualities of true American boyhood.

My commendations also to the individuals and organizations which have taken due note of your noble action.

With sincere best wishes to you for all future success.

JOHN R. FOLEY,
Member of Congress.

Address by Secretary of Labor James P. Mitchell at Lincoln Day Banquet, Middlesex Republican Club, Boston, Mass., February 12, 1959

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAURENCE CURTIS
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 25, 1959

Mr. CURTIS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, the Middlesex Republican Club of Massachusetts, the oldest Republican organization in the United States, was honored to have Secretary of Labor James P. Mitchell deliver the principal address at its Lincoln Day banquet in Boston on February 12, 1959. He spoke, in part, as follows:

Lincoln Day has always been a challenging one for Republicans, for it brings vividly to mind the first principles of that great President, and commands us to measure our actions against them.

This day is one for frank talk.

And I am going to talk frankly to you this evening.

We must face facts in the same way that Mr. Catton's brilliant oration has told us that Lincoln faced them.

Lincoln knew that victory, to be meaningful, had to be of the people—by a party that showed clearly that it was for the people—all of the people.

In the same way, if we are to win in 1960—and we can win in 1960—it must also be a triumph by the people and in their interest.

There is no greater issue upon which Republicanism stands more solidly with all Americans than that of personal freedom—in the field of personal rights, in the field of labor-management practices, in the field of sympathetic social legislation that recognizes the need for local initiative and responsibility, in the field of fiscal management, in the harmony and balance of big and small governments.

The President who wrote the Emancipation Proclamation and signed the Homestead Act did leave behind him, alive and enduring in this party, a veneration for personal rights, and a determination that they shall be protected.

The dignity of the free human being and the majesty of the free human will exercising its own decisions—whether in the person of a Negro voter in Atlanta, a labor union member in Detroit, a small businessman in Los Angeles, a farmer in Iowa—is the central cause of Republicanism. It always has been, since Lincoln, it still is under President Eisenhower, and it will continue to be under the next Republican President in 1960.

It is because of our philosophy of personal rights that Republicans often find themselves at variance with the political philosophies that cluster together under the expandable label of Democratic.

Obviously, the most direct application of the principles of Abraham Lincoln is in the area of civil rights, the rights proclaimed in the Declaration of Independence and guaranteed by the Constitution.

Some Americans are now being denied these personal rights. Reason and moderation demand that this denial be brought to an end with all deliberate speed.

This is the law of the land, and the requirement of a regard to human dignity.

We seek the support of all Americans who agree with us that none of us is secure in our rights while a single American is denied his rights.

They either exist for all or they do not exist for any, for long. Lincoln reminded us that no nation can endure that is only partly free. This job is not yet finished; it is ours to complete his work.

But, first, we must make certain that our meaning is clear to all the people. This means straightforward and honest campaigns not obscured with issues secondary to that of personal freedom. And it means good candidates.

Good candidates are essential.

Also essential are the precinct workers behind them. The recruit-now-for-'60 program, aimed at enlisting 2 million more precinct workers for the 1960 campaign, is under way.

This party is already on the move to victory.

In this undertaking, too, Lincoln sets the example.

He was defeated in 1858. We were defeated in 1958. He achieved victory in 1860. What can he tell us?

He offered affirmative programs.

Looking over an America gripped in the most terrible dilemma it has ever faced, he affirmed the fact that personal rights precede comfort or expediency.

He stood up, and against the counsel of fear, he asserted the fact that right makes might.

And we, how do we look to America?

Lincoln, in defeat, got his strength to go forward from a belief in personal rights. We can do the same.

How does a respect for personal rights, for human dignity, affect our decisions of today?

First, it requires a courageous determination to maintain the purchasing power of the dollar. Holding the line against inflation means holding the line against governmental extravagance. It means refusing to give way before political pressures. It means creating a stable value in the wages and salaries we earn, so Americans can plan ahead. Insurance policies, pension funds, savings must be protected against those who would drive down the value of the dollar by driving up the rate of Federal expenditure. This takes courage. Pressure groups won't like it. But the growth of our economy must have a firm foundation, a foundation which assures that the American wage earner will be able to plan for a secure future.

Second, it requires that we help the labor movement rid itself of the gangsters and hoodlums who stamp down the personal rights of union members.

Third, it requires that we help all our citizens to equal opportunity for employment and advancement.

Fourth, it requires protecting equally and fairly all persons at work in an industrial economy.

Fifth, it requires helping all our citizens to make use of their right to vote.

Sixth, it requires support for President Eisenhower's policy of encouraging the States and local communities to take full responsibility for protecting those rights of all citizens which are not national concern.

Ours is not a narrow objective—we do not seek to build a fence of favors around the undue influence of some parts of our society. Rights are universal, and our approach to them is also as wide as American opportunity.

It was this approach that extended unemployment insurance to 4 million additional workers, and social security to 10 million more men and women—and began the largest public improvement ever undertaken, the highway program.

It was this approach that granted the largest tax cut in our history in 1954 and created the Department of Health, Education and Welfare.

This approach raised the standard of living in this country to an all-time high, fostered an economy that has brought personal income, wages and profits to new and expansive levels.

This approach has established a new agency for aviation, and a new agency for outer space.

Republicanism has been a positive and virile force in this country but sometimes I think we are trying to keep it a secret.

There are new and grave problems ahead of us in the fields of education, of defense, of international strength, of labor-management relations.

These things are the concern of most Americans, and they are seeking the right answers.

We have a proud record and we have a proud opportunity ahead. In looking toward 1960, and beyond, we must remember that as Republicans, our tradition demands that veneration for the personal rights of all the people—high or low, white or black, urban or rural, rich or poor—that inspired Lincoln and has animated all our party in its finest hours.

That veneration determines our approach to the solution of any national problem, whether in education, politics, business or anywhere else.

We have the positive program.

We have the best way to a new and better America.

Let our opponents, grouped haphazardly together for mutual self-advantage, paint the distorted pictures and use the distorted facts and plaster us with distorted labels—this fact will stand out.

When it comes to personal rights for all Americans, no Republican owes a debt—political, financial, or moral—to any one group, any one faction, any one system or organization. The compromises are all on their side. The implied promise and the part performance is all theirs.

In this respect, we are the majority. We are America. And in 1960 our triumph, like Lincoln's, will be a victory for personal rights, and for the popular confidence of Americans in the party that respects these rights as inalienable.

But keep this in mind—to win, we must deserve to win.

Thank you.

Who'll Be the Next President?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALFRED E. SANTANGELO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 25, 1959

Mr. SANTANGELO. Mr. Speaker, today more than 15 months before the parties select their candidates for President, speculation is rampant as to who the next President will be. In the 18th Congressional District, I have tried to obtain information in order to translate that speculation into an informed prediction.

At the early part of this year, I forwarded to all the registered voters in my congressional area a questionnaire. Included in this questionnaire were the following questions: "Whom do you prefer as President of the United States?" and "Whom do you prefer as Vice President of the United States?"

Many replies were returned to me and about 60 percent of those that answered indicated that it was too soon to determine their choice. The remaining answers indicated various choices for President and Vice President. One can draw many conclusions from the answers and I shall draw several.

In order to better understand the results, a description of my congressional district and the economic position of the residents would be helpful. My district consists of residents who are paying extremely high rents and extremely low rents. The rentals range from $100 per room per month to $5 per room per month. Included among them are the residents of a great number of low income public housing projects. They are workers, businessmen, executives, teachers, and many public employees.

My area is populated probably by the most heterogeneous group in the United States. There are Italians, Puerto Ricans, Negroes, Cubans, Germans, Hungarians, Irish, Czechs, and other nationality groups. This area is known as East Harlem and Yorkville. This area is strictly urban with no private residences or one-family homes.

The names of the Presidential hopefuls were not listed on the questionnaire and the constituency wrote in the names according to their choice. Twenty-one and one-half percent selected Senator JOHN F. KENNEDY for either President or Vice President. Thirteen percent selected Adlai Stevenson. Four and one-half percent selected Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY. Four percent selected Gov. Robert B. Meyner. Two and one-half percent selected Senator STUART SYMINGTON. Two percent selected Mayor Robert F. Wagner. One percent selected Senator LYNDON JOHNSON. Twelve and one-half percent selected Vice President RICHARD M. NIXON, and 9½ percent selected Gov. Nelson Rockefeller.

The choice for Presidency was the closest with JOHN KENNEDY eking out a 1-percent margin over Adlai Stevenson. Mr. NIXON for President had a slight edge of 2 percent over Rockefeller.

This questionnaire was forwarded to the constituency before Governor Rockefeller advocated his high tax program and reduced exemptions. The attitudes of the residents of the State of New York, and particularly in this section, undoubtedly have changed regarding Governor Rockefeller.

It is noteworthy that during the last presidential election, President Dwight Eisenhower defeated Adlai Stevenson in this area by a margin of 18,000. The district is considered a Democratic district, except in a presidential election.

The strength which Senator KENNEDY showed in the polls was surprising. He was clearly either a choice for President or Vice President, and would, in my opinion, prove to be a strong candidate in this congressional district. The strength of Adlai Stevenson was only for President with a small percentage of the people selecting him as their choice for Vice President. Apparently the voters feel that Mr. Stevenson should be presidential and not a vice presidential choice.

The contest between RICHARD NIXON and Nelson Rockefeller was extremely close. During the last New York gubernatorial election, Nelson Rockefeller on an overall basis won in this congressional area, losing in the north end and winning in the south end of the district. The strength that NIXON showed, in my opinion, was surprisingly strong. While more people favored JOHN KENNEDY, sentiment was strong for NIXON.

Other surveys, such as U.S. News & World Report, are based upon preferences of particular leaders with votes in the convention. My survey indicates the choice by the people who cast their votes. In view of the large number of people who abstained from indicating a choice so far in advance, one can readily conclude that the great majority of the voting population is undecided at the present time.

In my opinion, this is the home stretch and those presidential hopefuls who demonstrate aggressive leadership and who are shown by press and television to possess understanding of our domestic and foreign problems, will be the choice of the uncommitted electorate. At this

point, the people of my area who have expressed themselves clearly want JACK KENNEDY for one of the two highest positions in our country.

Remarks by Treasury Secretary Robert B. Anderson, to the Grand Masters of Masonry, Hotel Statler, Washington, D.C., Tuesday, February 24, 1959

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 25, 1959

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include herewith an address made by the distinguished Secretary of the Treasury, Robert B. Anderson, to the Grand Masters of Masonry, in Washington on February 24, 1959.

Mr. Speaker, there is no member of the President's Cabinet who is more highly respected, admired, or in whom the Congress and the public have more confidence than Mr. Robert B. Anderson. Those of us who have worked with Mr. Anderson throughout his years of service as the Secretary of the Navy, Deputy Secretary of Defense, and now Secretary of the Treasury, regard him as a dedicated American. In his present position of world service, freedom-loving people look to him for leadership. He is fulfilling their hopes and aspirations.

The address follows:

ADDRESS BY SECRETARY ROBERT B. ANDERSON

Over 300 years ago, Francis Bacon made this statement: "The true and lawful goal of the sciences is simply this, that human life be enriched by new discoveries and powers."

Bacon was pleading with the scientists of his day to use their skills in improving the ordinary conditions of living. This was a radical suggestion for his time. The new world was just opening up; the compass and the printing press were just beginning to have their incalculable influence in enlarging not only man's physical surroundings but the larger creative environment in which new discoveries can take place.

Yet how cramped a world this seems compared with our own.

We live in a period of great international tension—yet it is a period also of unparalleled inventiveness and achievement. The scientists of today have made it possible for us to believe that sources of energy are available which can in time replace most human toil. For the first time in history, there is a possibility that conditions permitting the full exercise of man's creative abilities can be realized for the many, not just for the few.

A great deal has been said about the need to accomplish greater brotherhood of mankind. Our own order is dedicated to this principle. But translated into real terms, brotherhood begins with improvement in the conditions of living. It begins with getting help to people where they need it.

For help of this sort to be effective it must be adapted to differences in cultural backgrounds as well as in the material conditions of living. We must give frank and honest recognition to dissimilarities in customs, history, philosophy, and religion. We must think in terms of minimizing differences—however sharp they may seem on the surface—and maximizing common interests.

I believe it is a little easier to do this if we remember that our own culture is to a very large extent a borrowed one. The mathematics we use today to send a satellite into space had its beginning long ago in Egypt, in Persia, in Greece. Our art, our music, the body of science we build on, all came initially from others.

We have also been givers. Not only our great proponents of freedom and democracy, but Edison, Morse, Kettering, Einstein, Salk, and many other but less well-known Americans have helped change the conditions of life throughout the world. With all that we have given in the past, however, our greatest opportunity may be now, when the aspirations of millions of people to live better are finding tangible expression in many areas for the first time.

During the past 15 years 700 million people in 20 countries have won political independence. But this is not enough. Brotherhood among men is laudable as an ideal. To be meaningful it must be translated into terms of understandable reality. Though much remains to be done the record of our Government and our people has been a commendable one. I should like to illustrate this first by telling you a story—a true story about a little village in India which I visited last fall, in connection with my participation in the international monetary conferences being held in New Delhi.

This village was the site of a foreign assistance project, sponsored and financed by an American nonprofit institution. There were no impressive structures in the village. There were two Americans giving technical assistance. A team of bullocks was slowly moving around in a circle turning a large arm. Each turn produced 1,600 revolutions in the apparatus which generated electricity—sufficient for one light in each house at night, and for power during the day to run a small woodworking plant employing 50 people.

The same bullock-powered equipment pumped water into pipes which ran along the streets of the village with a tap in front of each house. For thousands of years, the villagers had traveled long distances for water. Now, they could step outside the door and draw water whenever they needed it. Moreover, the excess water went into a reservoir and was sufficient to irrigate 50 acres of land. By means of a simple mechanism thought up by an American agricultural specialist, the village had taken its first steps toward the twentieth century. Here surely is the place where emphasis should be put—at the point where people can be given the means of helping themselves through bettering actual living conditions in their own communities.

The technical assistance programs now in progress are, of course, of many different kinds and are carried on under many different national and international auspices. In every case, the projects are joint operations with the countries concerned. The United States and U.S. technicians, however, have been in the forefront of all of the efforts during the postwar period to help people lift themselves above the level of a bare struggle for existence and into a situation where backbreaking toil does not constitute the whole of living. While there are honest differences of opinion as to scope and detail, I would like to mention a few efforts of our Nation in helping other nations of the world.

Closely allied to the technical assistance programs have been the programs for cultural exchange. These are performing the immensely important service of making possible person-to-person contacts between people of different countries. Through scholarships and exchange of personnel, through on-the-job help when it is most needed, technical assistance and cultural exchange together are probably achieving the most practical results which up to now have been devised for promoting greater well-being among the nations of the free world.

For long-range stability and improvement in standards of living in the less developed countries, however, there must be substantial capital investment extending over a period of years. There must be transportation facilities, powerplants, harbor installations, and industrial equipment of many varieties. Our Government has been a leader throughout the postwar period in the establishment and support of financial institutions providing long-term developmental funds of this type.

The Export-Import Bank, set up by this country in the thirties, has continued since the war to provide financing for the export of American equipment for industrial purposes of many different kinds. In recent years its loans have been largely concentrated in Latin America and Asia.

The International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, formed at the end of the war by the allied countries under our leadership, provides financing for long-run investment programs of various types when private investment is not available on reasonable terms. Recently, the Bank has devoted its funds primarily to assisting economic development in Asia, Latin America, and Africa, contributing enormously to economic development in these areas. The International Bank has had no losses on its loans.

We are hoping that the Congress will promptly authorize the increased subscription to the International Bank proposed in the President's message of February 12. These subscriptions require no cash outlays. The subscriptions to the capital stock of the Banks constitute a contingent liability of all the member governments to meet the obligations of the Bank. In this way the Bank is able to secure adequate loan funds at reasonable rates of interest in the open market.

The President's message of February 12 also proposed to increase our quota in the International Monetary Fund, a companion organization of the International Bank. This institution makes short-term advances to its members in order to facilitate the exchange stability which is an essential condition of healthy international trade.

Unlike the International Bank, the Fund requires outlays on the part of the member countries on a quota basis—one-fourth payable in gold, and the remainder payable in non-interest-bearing securities of the member country. The Fund's activities have grown and have become increasingly effective. To fulfill its obligations properly under conditions of expanding world trade, an increase in the quotas of member countries is imperative. We hope for prompt action on this request also.

The Development Loan Fund, established by the United States, has further assisted economic development by making loans to both governments and private business when a given project cannot obtain financing from the other institutions or from private capital sources. In some cases, the loans granted by this Fund are repayable in the borrower's own currency.

Discussion is now going on within our Government and with foreign countries exploring the desirability of establishing an International Development Association which would be an affiliate of the International Bank. This institution would supplement the functions of the bank by providing loans for development which could not be financed on hard currency repayment terms. It would also permit members with accumulations of

nonconvertible currencies, to use their accumulations for constructive loan purposes.

In addition to the programs already mentioned, we are engaged at the present time in negotiations with the countries of Latin America, looking toward the establishment of an inter-American banking institution which would assist economic development in the countries of this hemisphere.

There have been other important governmental programs which could be mentioned. One which was of immense importance to the free world was the Marshall plan for aid to the devastated countries of Western Europe, shortly after the close of World War II.

Through our timely assistance and through their own efforts, the Western European countries were not only able to get back on their feet, they have since come to enjoy a higher standard of living and a better level of production than ever before. Likewise, countries in Asia—many of them newly established as independent nations—have been assisted in their efforts to improve living conditions, to put their economies on a going basis, and to resist aggression.

Still another program which has paid large dividends in human terms has been our plan for exporting part of our agricultural surplus. Under this program, payment for the goods we send overseas can be made in local currencies, thus permitting countries in need of food and certain other agricultural products to benefit from our abundance, even though they may lack dollar exchange.

The story of America's assistance to other countries has and should continue to emphasize the tremendously important role played by American private capital during the past 15 years and in the years ahead. This capital has aided resources for economic growth in other countries. It has brought to these countries a high degree of technical and managerial skill which they lacked. It has contributed to the development of export industries which provide the means for purchasing needed goods from our own country and from elsewhere.

American business today has investments abroad valued at about $40 billion. Each year there has been a movement of capital from the United States to other countries. For the last 3 years, this annual outflow has been at the rate of about $4 billion a year.

Under present world conditions, private investment faces real difficulties. These stem from frequent political instability, the threat of aggression, and subversion in some foreign countries, and the obstacles to capital investment in areas where economic conditions are unstable and relatively less advanced. For these reasons our Government has tried to assist the expansion of private investment through such devices as tax treaties and guarantees against the incontrovertibility of earnings and the risk of confiscation or possible loss from war.

Private capital is a stern analyst. Even with the encouragement of our Government, private investment is made principally in those countries which are willing to compete for it by the establishment of sound fiscal policies, adequate protection, and the recognition of the right of capital to earn. Both the Government and private organizations are continuing to have a major role in promoting the spread of capital and thus insuring better economic conditions in the underdeveloped areas of the world.

Our Government has also had to provide military assistance. This is in our own interest, as well as in the interest of friendly nations threatened with aggression. Without help, the Soviets would have had a clear road for the pursuit of their program of world domination. I need mention only the Near East and you will understand what I mean.

One of the favorite themes of Communist propaganda is the supposed concern of Communist dictatorships for human beings and their welfare. The Western nations who are leaders of the free world must continue to bring out the true facts with respect to these claims.

To do this we have only to note what has actually happened when a country has fallen under Communist control.

In Soviet Russia, the aristocracy of the Communist Party has been substituted for the aristocracy of the czar. There are some 200 million people in the U.S.S.R. Out of this number there are something like 5 or 6 million Communist Party members. These 5 or 6 million are ruled by a bare handful of dictatorial leaders, and these leaders are subject essentially to the orders of one man.

From China, we are told that the Communist regime has devoted itself to furthering the advancement of man. But what has it done in fact?

Families have been ruthlessly torn apart. Vast numbers of people have been herded into communes, without the slightest effort to obtain their consent.

We hear the Communists speak of the people's rights under their form of government. But there are no free elections, in any meaningful sense of the term. There is no free press. There is no freedom of belief. There is no freedom of choice to work. Human resources are regimented for production as if they were so many tons of steel or coal.

The Communists also like to refer in their propaganda to their respect for the rights of other nations. But we cannot erase from our minds the tragic fate of the Baltic Republics, of Bulgaria, of Hungary, of Poland, of Czechoslovakia, of East Germany. All of these peoples have lost the right to direct their own destinies. When they have tried to reassert that right, they have been cruelly suppressed. We cannot ignore the threats of subversion in other countries.

In contrast, our country has moved steadily forward since the close of World War II to further the brotherhood of man. Our most valued export is still, as it has been throughout our history, the concept of freedom and humanity for which our Nation stands. We can be rightly proud that the first postage stamps issued by the Republic of Indonesia turned out to bear the portraits of Washington, Lincoln, Franklin, and Hamilton, side by side with the founders of the new Republic. But we can also be proud of the countless ways in which our sharing of know-how, capital, and just plain friendliness during recent years has helped strengthen the basis of fellowship and understanding throughout the free world. This is brotherhood in action.

Farewell Appearance of J. J. Singh, "Mr. India," Before the Far East Subcommittee of the House Foreign Affairs Committee To Give His Views on United States-Indian Relations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 25, 1959

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, Mr. J. J. Singh, the president of the India League, is leaving the United States and returning to his native India. Mr. Singh, or "J. J." as he is called, has made many good friends here. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include some of the many personal tributes, news articles, and editorials that have appeared in the newspapers and those that were received on the occasion of the farewell public meeting of the India League of America, held on Wednesday, February 11, 1959, at the Community Church of New York, New York City:

Representative EMANUEL CELLER, of New York, chairman of the Judiciary Committee of the House of Representatives, Washington, D.C., member of the executive committee of the league:

"INDIA LEAGUE OF AMERICA,
"*New York, N.Y.*

"DEAR FRIENDS: I cannot tell you how much I regret not being able to be with you at this farewell meeting of the India League of America. I feel as if I were saying goodbye to old friends by proxy, and that I know is no way of revealing the depth of friendship and regard I have felt for the members of the India League. I wish I could be with you to tell you of the personal satisfaction I have gained from my association and participation in the work of the India League.

"I want to single out from among the many friends in the India League the one with whom I have worked closest and who has given me so much of his time and thought when there was work I could do as a friend of India in the Halls of Congress. J. J. Singh has been a source of strength and inspiration to all of us; a man of dedication to his principles; a sturdy ambassador of good will for India. I remember the work we did together in accomplishing the passage of legislation that removed the obnoxious India Exclusion Act from our statute books and prepared the way for the naturalization of Indians resident in the United States.

"Though he is leaving our midst, I know that our paths will cross again.

"We who are the friends of India will not forget for one moment that a crucial role in world history is now being played by the people of India. India must be given every opportunity to prove to the world that freedom and economic opportunity can exist side by side and that it is not mandatory that freedom of a people must necessarily exclude its economic well being, or that economic progress can only be made at the expense of freedom. This is the test mankind faces in these troubled times and one of the most significant of all testing foregrounds is the subcontinent. It is not a choice, it is a must that we, in the United States, give economic aid to India, help to increase her trade, and help to finance her new industries. That we have so far failed to recognize the importance of India to the development of a free society everywhere is borne out by the fact that of the $20 billion of trade that the United States carries on, only $500 million relates to India. Yet India gives us the mica, the jute, the manganese, the spices that we ourselves must have in the development of our own economic and scientific progress. To India we look for the attributes of charity and compassion, steeped as she is in spiritual strength. We in the United States cannot afford to take our eyes away from the Indian scene. I have witnessed for myself in my visit to India the heartbreaking problems that face her. I have seen, too, the tremendous work that is being done in the villages. The intelligence and sensitivity of her leadership, her men and women of dedication and sacrifice have left a deep impress on me. The world watches the struggles of a free people of India and the progress made under that freedom as against the brutal totalitarianism of Communist China. In a sense then I say—and I repeat—that herein lies the test tube of whence our civilization shall go.

"I shall miss you all, but I must leave you with the assurance that my work and friendship for India shall continue unabated.

"Sincerely and hopefully,

"EMANUEL CELLER."

Justice William O. Douglas of the Supreme Court of the United States, Washington, D.C., member of the national advisory board of the league:

"DEAR MR. SINGH: It was with deep regret that I received the news of the dissolution of the India League in your letter of January 29.

"The work done by the organization, and particularly yourself, has made a significant contribution to the better understanding of India by people in the United States. Through your efforts, many Americans have seen the close kindship between the people of your country and ours as we both struggle toward our common goals of freedom and peace.

"My sorrow at your departure from our shores is tempered by my admiration for your accomplishments. I wish you Godspeed in whatever you put your many talents to in your native land.

"Yours faithfully,

"W. O. DOUGLAS."

Mr. James A. Farley, former Postmaster General of the United States:

"DEAR MR. SINGH: I read with interest and regret the article in the January 18 edition of the New York Times relative to your decision to return to your home in India after 33 years in the United States.

"I can well understand yours and your wife's desire to get back to India again not only for your own, but for your children's sake. You have been a very worthwhile resident of our city and have won the admiration and respect of all who came in contact with you. I want you to know that I have had the opportunity to see and visit with you and like all of your friends, hate to see you leave.

"May I extend to you every good wish for success, health and happiness in your home country.

"Sincerely yours,

"JAMES A. FARLEY."

Senator J. W. FULBRIGHT, chairman, Senate Foreign Relations Committee, the Senate, Washington, D.C.:

"Thank you so much for your letter of the 31st. I regret that you are retiring and returning to India, but you can rest assured that you have made a great contribution to a better understanding of your country in America during these past years.

"Sincerely yours,

"J. W. FULBRIGHT."

Representative JAMES G. FULTON, member of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, Washington, D.C., member of the national advisory board of the league:

"DEAR J. J.: As a personal friend, it is a pleasure to add my comments on your valued contribution to the growing friendship between India and the United States, which I believe will be one of the decisive factors in world affairs in the next generation. I do hope that you will keep me advised as a member of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, when there are matters which you think should be brought to my attention in order to maintain this friendship which has been growing steadily through such a difficult period.

"With personal regards and best wishes,

"Sincerely,

"JIM FULTON."

Dr. Frank P. Graham, U.N. representative in India and Pakistan, member national advisory committee of the league:

"DEAR MR. SINGH: I regret your leaving us and wish you, Mrs. Singh and your family every happiness in your return to your native land. You have been a real nonofficial but effective ambassador to the people of the United States. We will deeply miss you here.

"With high esteem and warm regards to you and Mrs. Singh from Mrs. Graham and me,

"Sincerely yours,

"FRANK GRAHAM."

Dr. John Haynes Holmes, minister emeritus of the Community Church of New York, member of the national advisory board of the league:

"DEAR MR. SINGH: This is melancholy news you send me in your letter of the 29th—melancholy for us who lose, by your return to India, and are deprived of your presence and work here in the hour of India's continuing need in the vast struggle for independence, but happy for you and your wife who return to your beloved country to serve the great cause there, as, for so many years, you served it here in America.

"Your work here on behalf of India's liberty has been truly remarkable. You have functioned in various capacities as scholar, teacher, propagandist, orator, and advocate, of a nation's cause, and all of these upon the highest level of integrity, honor, and resourceful leadership. You have been like the watchman on the towers, always alert, always fearless, militant, and courageous. It's easy to see why we shall miss you, for India is still in critical times, and where shall we look for the guidance and tireless service which constituted always so large a measure of our own strength? But, as I have said, what America loses here is straightway gained by India, and thus made a continuing labor on behalf of your heroic people.

"I am deeply sorry that, because of illness, I shall be unable to participate in, or even be present at, the farewell meeting arranged for February 11 next. I take pleasure, therefore, in accepting your invitation to send you a message of farewell which, in due course, I shall forward to you. It has been my privilege to know you and to admire you, and to share with joy in your work. I should count it my great fortune that, thanks to your courtesy, I may send you this message of farewell, for which you ask.

"With renewed greetings, and all best wishes, I remain,

"Very sincerely yours,

"JOHN HAYNES HOLMES."

Mr. Henry R. Luce, publisher, Time-Life-Fortune, member national advisory board of the league:

"DEAR J. J.: As I prepare to leave for Arizona, for a period of concentrated reading, thinking, and writing, I learn that in my absence there will occur the valedictory meeting of the India League of America. I learn, too, that you are soon to leave us and return to India. The two facts add up to a tautology, for it is impossible to imagine an India League without J. J., and vice versa.

"While I may not have been a regular participant in the work of the league, I am proud of my association with it as a member of the advisory board, and I am specifically proud of certain of the league's achievements. Two examples come to mind. One is the securing of UNRRA relief for the victims of the Bengal famine in 1943. The other is the act of Congress enabling Indians to become American citizens. It will always be a cause for gratification to me that my wife, as a Member of Congress, was a sponsor of that law.

"Of course, when one speaks of the India League's activities in these and other good causes, one speaks mostly of J. J. Singh, who brought the organization to life exactly 20 years ago. You have been good for us Americans. You learned our democratic processes better than most of us and employed them wisely and constructively. You have been a good friend and, particularly since your marriage to the enchanting Malti, an ornament to our society.

"I know that my colleagues in Time, Inc., are toasting you and Mrs. Singh at a party in our offices in mid-February. I deeply regret that I shall be absent. In case I am not back in New York in time to speak directly with you, here are my regretful farewells to the J. J. Singhs, and my hopes that you, as an incorrigible ambassador, will visit us soon again.

"Sincerely yours,

"HENRY R. LUCE."

Senator KARL E. MUNDT, the Senate, Washington, D.C., member of the national advisory board of the league:

"DEAR MR. SINGH: It is with deep regret, because of conflicting dates out in South Dakota in connection with the observance of the 150th birthday of Abraham Lincoln, that I cannot be with you for the farewell public meeting being sponsored by the India League of America in New York City on February 11.

"It is with even greater regret that I learned that the Indian League of America is being dissolved and it is with a genuine sense of personal loss that I learned of your decision to return to your native country of India. You have served both India and America well for a long period of time in your self-assigned responsibility as 'Indian Ambassador without portfolio.'

"Knowing you as I do, I am sure that once you are back in India your service to both countries will continue to be significant and that you will do much to bring about in India better understanding of America and the free way of life which it exemplifies and symbolizes. The future of India is with the free world and I know that you will bring to the attention of the leaders of India the continuing importance of cooperation with the free world in the development of policies and programs designed to prevent the further spread of communism, and the dangers to peace which the expansion of communism necessarily provides.

"With every best wish, I am,

"Cordially yours,

"KARL E. MUNDT,
"U.S. Senator."

Hon. William M. Rountree, Assistant Secretary of State, Washington, D.C.:

"DEAR MR. SINGH: Thank you for your letter of January 31, 1959. I share your regret that the India League of America has decided to end its long service for the cause of Indian-American friendship. I am happy to enclose a message on the work done by the league which you may wish to use at the final meeting.

"Your own efforts will be long remembered and your presence in the United States will be missed. Even though you are ending your work here, I am glad that we will have in your person in India a firm friend of the United States who will continue to work to strengthen the bond of friendship between our two countries.

"Sincerely,

"WILLIAM M. ROUNTREE,
"Assistant Secretary."

"To the India League of America:

"It is with a sense of regret that I send these farewell greetings to the India League of America on the occasion of its last meeting. The league can be proud of its contribution to the close and friendly relations which exist between India and the United States. I am confident that, even though the league itself will no longer exist, its work will be continued by the individuals who were members of the organization. My colleagues and I assure you that we will do our

utmost to strive for an ever larger measure of friendship and understanding between our two countries.

"WILLIAM M. ROUNTREE,
"Assistant Secretary."

[From the New York Times, Feb. 17, 1959]

The city bade a fond farewell yesterday to Sirdar Jagjit Singh, Indian's unofficial ambassador, who has been supporting the cause of his homeland in New York for the last 33 years.

Mr. Singh—"sirdar" is a Sikh honorific roughly equivalent to "captain"—was the guest of honor at a luncheon at the Waldorf-Astoria Hotel sponsored by Mayor Wagner and paid for by the Indian League of America. Mr. Singh is its president. He is leaving for retirement in New Delhi on March 8.

Mr. Singh, or "J. J." as he is known, received a scroll from Mayor Wagner citing him for distinguished and exceptional service to the city.

The citation noted that Mr. Singh "has accomplished so much in furthering mutual friendship and understanding between the people of India, his native land, and the people of the United States, his adopted land for 33 years."

Representative EMANUEL CELLER, Brooklyn Democrat and chairman of the House Foreign Relations Committee, praised his old friend for his efforts at United States-Indian understanding even during dark periods.

Mr. Singh, who said that he considered himself a New Yorker, promised that he would tell his people "about the greatness, kindness and decency of the American people."

[From the New York Herald Tribune, Feb. 17, 1959]

THE UNOFFICIAL AMBASSADOR

Many friends of India will be saddened by the news that, after 22 years of promoting friendship and understanding between our two countries, the India League of America is being disbanded and its president, J. J. Singh, is taking his family back to India.

The league's membership has never been large, but its work, largely carried on through Mr. Singh's personal diplomacy and his tireless lobbying and letterwriting, has, in a quiet way, helped considerably to bring about a greater American understanding of the vastly important but long mysterious giant of the East.

The fact that Mr. Singh's departure has signaled the dissolution of the league is an eloquent measure of his personal contribution to it. The league hopes that another organization (Mr. Singh suggests the Asia Society) will carry on its work. As for unofficial ambassador Singh himself, whose return to India after 33 years here is prompted by family considerations, his enthusiasm remains undimmed, and it perhaps is not too much to hope that he will be as effective an interpreter of the United States to his countrymen as he has been an interpreter of India to Americans.

[From the New York Times, February 18, 1959]

AN UNOFFICIAL ENVOY

In giving a farewell luncheon for J. J. Singh, Mayor Wagner has recognized the distinguished part that this unofficial envoy from India has played in the life of our community. We hope that it is not farewell but merely au revoir, and that J. J.—as he is affectionately known to thousands of Americans—will come back to visit soon and often.

After 33 years in this country Mr. Singh has decided to take his charming family back to his native India and to retire there. No one who knows him can accept the idea of his retiring without the broadest reservation. He will continue to work on behalf of his country and on behalf of better understanding between India and the United States. Perhaps he may even form an America League in India, since he was the life and soul of the India League here for 20 years and as he leaves the India League has disbanded, saying "mission accomplished."

He has been singularly successful in presenting the cause of his people to this country. One reason is that he has understood and liked Americans and made them like him. His ubanity, good humor, common sense, and patriotic devotion have endeared him to everyone who had reason to know him.

J. J. Singh has been an honor to India and a most pleasant vistor here. More like him would do us all good.

SENATE

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 26, 1959

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father, in all the bewilderment of the world's fiery strife, our burdened hearts seek the quiet sanctuary of Thy healing presence.

In these sacred weeks of meditation and introspection over which is the shadow of a waiting cross, grant us the grace to heed the summons to spiritual discipline, to the development of inner strength, and to the nurture of the flowering plants of reverence and of a child-like trust.

Thou only art our strong tower and sure defense amid the flood of mortal ills prevailing. Though the host of a pagan cult encamp against us, in this will we be confident: Thou makest the devices of the wicked of none effect; for the counsel of the Lord standeth forever, the thought of His loving heart to all generations.

O Master Divine, in all the strife of these dark days, keep our hearts with Thee. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, February 23, 1959, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

REPORT ON PARTICIPATION IN INTERNATIONAL ATOMIC ENERGY AGENCY—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 85)

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith, pursuant to the International Atomic Energy Agency Participation Act, the first annual report covering the U.S. participation in the International Atomic Energy Agency for the year 1957, in addition to the U.S. participation in the Agency's Preparatory Commission, which functioned from October 26, 1956, to October 1, 1957.

I do so with great satisfaction because the establishment of the International Atomic Energy Agency resulted from this Government's initiative in 1953 in calling for an international cooperative program to bring the incalculable benefits of the peaceful uses of atomic energy to all mankind and to prevent the diversion of fissionable material from peaceful to destructive purposes.

The work of the Preparatory Commission and the initial activities of the Agency itself were necessarily concerned with administrative problems. These included organization and recruitment of staff; initial financing and the scale of contributions; and establishing appropriate relations with the United Nations and other international organizations concerned with the peaceful uses of atomic energy. In addition, it was necessary to outline a meaningful and realistic program for the Agency to undertake in its early years.

Despite the need to concentrate on initial organizational matters, the Agency made considerable progress, during the few months of 1957 that it was in existence, in developing its substantive program through the creation of a fellowship and scholarship fund and initial consideration of offers of fissionable materials.

Since substantial progress was made toward completing the organizational phase of the Agency's activities in 1957, it was anticipated that increasing attention would be given in 1958 to matters involving the Agency's program.

The first Director General of the Agency is Mr. W. Sterling Cole, formerly a distinguished Member of the Congress, who relinquished his seat in the House of Representatives to assume the responsible position of chief administrative officer of the Agency. The United States remains pledged to make every effort to assist the Agency in achieving its high purpose.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.
THE WHITE HOUSE, *February 25, 1959.*

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, notified the Senate that, pursuant to the provisions of section 6, Public Law 754, 81st Congress, the Speaker had appointed Mr. STAGGERS, of West Virginia, and Mr. MERROW, of New Hampshire, as members of the Federal Records Council, on the part of the House.

The message also notified the Senate that, pursuant to the provisions of section 601, Public Law 250, 77th Congress, the Speaker had appointed Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania as a member of the

Committee To Investigate Nonessential Federal Expenditures, on the part of the House, to fill the existing vacancy thereon.

The message announced that the House had agreed to the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 5) to print additional copies of a committee print entitled "Briefing on the Investment Act."

The message also announced that the House had passed a joint resolution (H.J. Res. 198) to provide for the reappointment of Robert V. Fleming as citizen regent of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the following concurrent resolutions, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. Con. Res. 64. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of House Document No. 234, 84th Congress, entitled "The Prayer Room in the U.S. Capitol"; and

H. Con. Res. 75. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of committee print entitled "Title 38, United States Code, Veterans' Benefits."

HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

The joint resolution (H.J. Res. 198) to provide for the reappointment of Robert V. Fleming as citizen regent of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTIONS REFERRED

The following concurrent resolutions were referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

H. Con. Res. 64. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of House Document No. 234, 84th Congress, entitled "The Prayer Room in the U.S. Capitol":

"Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That there be printed fifty-four thousand two hundred additional copies of House Document Numbered 234, Eigty-fourth Congress, first session, entitled 'The Prayer Room in the United States Capitol', of which forty-four thousand one hundred copies shall be for the use of the House of Representatives and ten thousand one hundred copies for the use of the Senate."

H. Con. Res. 75. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of committee print entitled "Title 38, United States Code, Veterans' Benefits":

"Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That there shall be printed for the use of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs three thousand five hundred additional copies of committee print entitled 'Title 38, United States Code, Veterans' Benefits'."

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, under the rule, there will be the usual morning hour for the introduction of bills and the transaction of other routine business. I ask unanimous consent that statements in connection therewith be limited to 3 minutes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

FILING OF REPORT BY SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON SPACE AND ASTRONAUTICS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Special Committee on Space and Astronautics have until March 15, 1959, to file its report to the Senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the Subcommittee on Production and Stabilization of the Committee on Banking and Currency; and the Subcommittee on Education of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, were authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

On request of Mr. DIRKSEN, and by unanimous consent, the Monopoly and Antitrust Subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes its proceedings today, it stand in adjournment until Monday next at 12 o'clock noon.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

REPORT ON CONTRACTS FOR EXPERIMENTAL OR RESEARCH WORK

A letter from the Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report covering the contracts negotiated by the National Aeronautics and Space Administration and its predecessor, the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, during the period July 1, 1958, to December 31, 1958 (with an accompany report); to the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences.

PLANS FOR WORKS OF IMPROVEMENT IN KANSAS, NEBRASKA, MISSISSIPPI, OHIO, AND OKLAHOMA

A letter from the Acting Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting, pursuant to law, plans for works of improvement on Walnut Creek, Kans. and Nebr.; Gray's Creek, Miss.; upper Wabash, Ohio; and Salt Creek, Okla. (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

AMENDMENT OF SECTION 508(b) OF FEDERAL CROP INSURANCE ACT

A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 508(b) of the Federal Crop Insurance Act, as amended (7 U.S.C. 1508) (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

AWARD OF CERTAIN DEGREES AND CREDITS

A letter from the Acting Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the Commandant of the Judge Advocate General's School to award appropriate degrees and credits (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON NAVAL ROTC FLIGHT TRAINING PROGRAM

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Navy, reporting, pursuant to law, on the progress in the Department of the Navy of the ROTC training program; to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT PROCUREMENT ACTIONS

A letter from the Assistant Chief of Naval Material (Procurement), transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on research and development procurement actions of $50,000 and over, covering the period July 1 through December 31, 1958 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON WORKING CAPITAL FUNDS, DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

A letter from the Acting Secretary of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report setting forth the financial condition of working capital funds of the Department of Defense, as of June 30, 1958, and the results of their operation for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1958 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

NOTICE OF PROPOSED DISPOSITION OF PYRETHRUM EXTRACT

A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a copy of a notice to be published in the Federal Register of a proposed disposition of 66,000 pounds of pyrethrum (20 percent) extract now held in the national stockpile (wtih an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON ESTIMATED OBLIGATIONS OF SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION

A letter from the Administrator, Small Business Administration, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report reflecting estimated obligations by principal activities of that Administration, for the period July 1 through December 31, 1958 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORT ON RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION LIQUIDATION FUND

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Liquidation Fund—Treasury Department Activities, for the period ended December 31, 1958 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORT ON EXPORT CONTROL

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on export control, for the fourth quarter of 1958 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

NOMINATION OF FRANCIS F. HEALY

A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting the nomination of Francis F. Healy for reappointment as a member of the District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

REPORT ON STATE OF THE FINANCES

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, his report on

the state of the finances, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1958 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Finance.

INCREASE OF DUTY-FREE ALLOWANCE FOR ARTICLES ACQUIRED ABROAD

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to increase the duty-free allowance for articles acquired abroad by residents of the United States (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Finance.

EXTENSION OF CERTAIN PRIVILEGES AND IMMUNITIES TO JUDGES OF INTERNATIONAL COURT OF JUSTICE

A letter from the Acting Secretary of State, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to extend certain privileges and immunities to judges of the International Court of Justice (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

AUDIT REPORT ON CUSTODIANSHIP FUNCTIONS, OFFICE OF TREASURER OF THE UNITED STATES

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report on the custodianship functions, Office of the Treasurer of the United States, Treasury Department, fiscal year 1957 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

AUDIT REPORT ON REVOLVING FUND OPERATIONS, CORPS OF ENGINEERS, DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report on revolving fund operations, Corps of Engineers (Civil Functions), Department of the Army, for the period July 1, 1953, through June 30, 1958 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT ON FEASIBILITY OF CONSOLIDATING SUBMARINE SUPPLY OFFICE WITH SHIPS PARTS CONTROL CENTER

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the feasibility of consolidating the Submarine Supply Office with the Ships Parts Control Center, Department of the Navy, dated February 1959 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

AUDIT REPORT ON BURLEY AND FLUE-CURED TOBACCO PROGRAMS

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report on burley and fluecured tobacco price support and agricultural adjustment programs in North Carolina and Tennessee, and review of warehouse tobacco sales in Kentucky, Commodity Stabilization Service, Department of Agriculture, 1956–57 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT OF EXAMINATION OF PRICING OF CERTAIN LANDING GEARS PURCHASED BY DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the examination of the pricing of landing gears purchased from Menasco Manufacturing Co., Burbank, Calif., by the Department of the Air Force prime contractors, dated February 1959 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

LEASING OF BUILDINGS FOR USE OF NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION

A letter from the Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize contracts for the leasing of buildings in the District of Columbia for the use of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (with an accompany paper); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REVISION OF BOUNDARIES OF WRIGHT BROTHERS NATIONAL MEMORIAL, NORTH CAROLINA

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to revise the boundaries of Wright Brothers National Memorial, North Carolina, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORT OF ANTHRACITE MINE-WATER CONTROL PROGRAM

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the anthracite mine-water control program, 1958 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

ASSISTANCE TO KLAMATH INDIANS

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the use of the revolving loan fund for Indians to assist Klamath Indians during the period for terminating Federal supervision (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

DONATION OF CERTAIN FEDERAL PROPERTY IN STATE OF NEW MEXICO

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to donate to the Pueblo of Isleta certain Federal property in the State of New Mexico (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee of Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORT OF FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION

A letter from the Chairman, Federal Trade Commission, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Commission, covering its accomplishments during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1958 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF ALIENS—WITHDRAWAL OF NAMES

Two letters from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, withdrawing the names of certain aliens from reports relating to aliens whose deportation has been suspended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS OF ANNUAL MEETING OF JUDICIAL CONFERENCE OF THE UNITED STATES

A letter from the Chief Justice, Supreme Court of the United States, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the proceedings of the regular annual meeting of the Judicial Conference of the United States, held at Washington, D.C., September 17–19, 1958 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

AUDIT REPORT FOR RESERVE OFFICERS ASSOCIATION

A letter from the executive director, Reserve Officers Association of the United States, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, the audit report of March 31, 1958, for that association (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

AMENDMENT OF FAIR LABOR STANDARDS ACT OF 1938, RELATING TO REVIEW OF MINIMUM WAGE RECOMMENDATIONS

A letter from the Secretary of Labor, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, to provide for review by the Secretary of Labor of the minimum wage recommendations of industry committees (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

REPORT OF U.S. COMMISSIONER OF EDUCATION

A letter from the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the U.S. Commissioner of Education on the administration of Public Laws 874 and 815, 81st Congress, as amended, including a detailed statement of receipts and disbursements, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1958 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

REPORT ON POSITIONS FILLED IN CERTAIN GRADES OF CLASSIFICATION ACT OF 1949

A letter from the Chairman, U.S. Civil Service Commission, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on positions filled under the Classification Act of 1949, in grades GS–16, 17, and 18 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION

A letter from the Chairman, Atomic Energy Commission, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize appropriations for the Atomic Energy Commission in accordance with section 261 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

A letter, dated February 18, 1959, from the Special Assistant to the General Manager (congressional), Atomic Energy Commission, Washington, D.C., relating to letter of February 17, 1959, by the Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission transmitting proposed legislation for authorization of appropriations for fiscal year 1960, and requesting that the aforesaid be replaced with the enclosures in this letter (with an accompanying paper); to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

Two joint resolutions of the Legislature of the State of Montana; to the Committee on Armed Services:

"HOUSE JOINT MEMORIAL 9

"Joint memorial of the Senate and the House of Representatives of the State of Montana to the President of the United States; to the Congress of the United States; to the Secretary of Defense and the Department of Defense; to the Honorable U.S. Senators JAMES E. MURRAY and MIKE MANSFIELD; and to the honorable Representatives in Congress LEE METCALF and LEROY ANDERSON; requesting that the Department of Defense activate and utilize the facilities of Fort Missoula at Missoula, Mont., as a regular Army post, or if such is not presently possible, to keep said post intact, maintained, and under consideration for future use

"Whereas the United States of America formerly established a military reservation in Missoula County, Mont., which was legally denominated Fort Missoula; and

"Whereas Fort Missoula is one of the finest small Army posts in the Nation and the only remaining fort in this State it should not be allowed to stand idle and go to ruin as has occurred at times during the past; and

"Whereas the citizens of Missoula, through John Bonner, E. E. Hershey, and the Missoula Chamber of Commerce, have heretofore donated substantial areas of land to the United States for the reservation at Fort Missoula; and

"Whereas after many land disposals since 1942 the main reservation still consists of approximately 500 acres plus a large firing range and a timber tract both being administered by another department of the Government; and

"Whereas as a branch of Camp Hanford, Wash., little use is being made of the facilities which include permanent type buildings with a capacity of approximately 500 officers and men; and

"Whereas prior to last year when Montana Headquarters (U.S. Army Reserve) was transferred to Fort Lawton, Wash., most of the buildings had been renovated and roads, lawns, and walks replaced or repaired; and

"Whereas considering current budegtary restrictions governing the Department of the Army, this fine old post, the last in Montana, located in one of our country's more favorable climates and scenic valleys and favored by the citizens and Army personnel alike, might well be active: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That the 36th Legislative Assembly of the State of Montana of 1959, the senate and the house of representatives concurring, memorializes the President of the United States, the Department of Defense and the Secretary thereof, that Fort Missoula, at Missoula, Mont., be activated and utilized by some regular unit of the United States armed services as rapidly as possible, and that if this be not presently possible, the said Fort Missoula be kept intact, maintained and seriously considered for future uses; be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this memorial be submitted by Frank Murray, the secretary of state of the State of Montana, to each of the individuals and departments named in the title of this memorial.

"JOHN J. MACDONALD,
"Speaker of the House.
"PAUL CANNON,
"President of the Senate."

"HOUSE JOINT MEMORIAL 10

"Joint memorial of the House of Representatives and the Senate of the State of Montana to the Congress of the United States; to the Honorable JAMES E. MURRAY and the Honorable MIKE MANSFIELD, Senators from the State of Montana; the Honorable LEE METCALF and the Honorable LEROY ANDERSON, Representatives in Congress from the State of Montana; and to the Committee on Military Affairs, Washington, D.C., urging that the Congress of the United States enact legislation granting pensions to World War I veterans as heretofore done for the Spanish-American veterans and veterans of other prior wars of the United States

"We, your memorialists, the 36th Legislative Assembly of the State of Montana, in legislative session assembled, most respectfully represent as follows:

"Whereas the national policy of the United States of America has been to honor the veterans of the wars of the United States by granting assistance to them in their declining years, by pensions, all in consideration of their military services in defense of our country; and

"Whereas the veterans of World War I of the United States have attained an average of approximately 65 years; and

"Whereas there has been no general pension granted to veterans of World War I by the United States; and

"Whereas the United States has been and is aiding many foreign countries in restoring their economy and otherwise; and

"Whereas such aid has not only been and is being extended to our former cobelligerents, but also to nations with which we formerly were at war; and

"Whereas a grateful nation should reward, as heretofore, its defenders who served here and abroad for a mere pittance of pay, and lost the opportunity to profit by the expanded economy due to war, but sacrified their professions and jobs: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Montana (the senate jointly concurring therein), That it is urged that the Congress of the United States of America enact legislation granting pensions to World War I veterans as heretofore for the Spanish-American veterans and the veterans of other prior wars of the United States; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this memorial be sent to the President of the United States, the President of the Senate of the United States, and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, and to each of the members of the Montana delegation in the Congress of the United States.

"JOHN J. MACDONALD,
"Speaker of the House.
"PAUL CANNON,
"President of the Senate."

Two joint resolutions of the Legislature of the State of Montana; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

"HOUSE JOINT MEMORIAL 1

"Joint memorial of the House of Representatives and Senate of the State of Montana to the Congress of the United States; the Honorable JAMES E. MURRAY and the Honorable MIKE MANSFIELD, Senators from the State of Montana; the Honorable LEE METCALF and the Honorable LEROY ANDERSON, Representatives from the State of Montana; and to the Committees on Interstate and Foreign Commerce of the House of Representatives and the Senate of the United States, urging such remedial action, through Congress' authority over the Federal Communications Commission, as will insure continued operation of the free television stations in Montana; regulating companies who transmit signals to feed cable systems from outside the State of Montana; and to insure the continued operation of low power VHF booster stations, to the end that the people of Montana shall not be denied the advantageous services of a Montana system of free television broadcasting

"Whereas almost, if not all, people in communities and farm areas within the State of Montana depend upon Montana free television stations and upon low power VHF booster stations as their only means of receiving television programs; and,

"Whereas the rugged terrain of the Rocky Mountain region makes it impossible for Montana stations to reach many hundreds of small Montana communities and the use of ultra-high frequency translator stations impractical, if indeed not impossible, according to the opinions expressed by competent and qualified broadcast engineers, as well as by certain members of the Federal Communications Commission; and,

"Whereas it is economically impossible for these communities to receive cable service from one of the so-called CATV systems and impossible for the areas to support, construct or operate any other form of duly authorized television service except the free television stations and VHF boosters working in tandem; and,

"Whereas there is ample proof that low power VHF booster stations can be regulated so as to preclude interference with licensed television services or other services; and

"Whereas if the present policies of the Federal Communications Commission are permitted to continue, as pointed out in the report of the U.S. Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce issued December 26, 1958, there soon may not be any free television stations remaining in the States of Montana, Wyoming, and other large western areas to wit:

"The undesirable economic, cultural, political, and other consequences of making Montana and northern Idaho tributary to Spokane, southern Idaho dependent upon Salt Lake City, and Wyoming and western Nebraska mere adjuncts to Denver should be so clear as to require no elaboration—as well as similar possibilities with respect to Nevada, parts of Texas, the Dakotas, and possibly other areas; and

"Whereas, the free television station at Helena has ceased operations as of February 1; the free television station at Missoula has, by sworn testimony, sustained losses exceeding $140,000; and the free television stations at Butte and Great Falls distinctly are menaced; the possibility of a blanked out free television State, due to Federal Communications Commission policies, may be closer than we think; and

"Whereas the Federal Communications Commission did summarily dismiss, without formal hearing, its own rulemaking proceedings relating to repeater or VHF booster stations operating in the VHF television band of frequency assignment; and

"Whereas the Federal Communications Commission did, on December 31, 1958, make formal announcement of its dismissal of petitions for reconsideration; and

"Whereas the question of regulation of the CATV systems has been before the Federal Communications Commission since 1951, (see December 26, 1958, report of the U.S. Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce) and the Federal Communications Commission still refuses to take action; and

"Whereas the Federal Communications Commission did also announce on December 31, 1958, that all VHF booster stations would be getting a period of 90 days in which to apply for conversion to ultra-high frequency (UHF) translators or some other authorized television operation, and upon failure to do so, would be ordered to cease operation: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Montana (the senate concurring herein), That this general assembly hereby memorializes the Congress of the United States for such remedial action within such period as the Congress deems fit, through the exercise of its authority over the Federal Communications Commission, to insure the continued operation of the free television stations in Montana, and the regulation of companies who transmit signals to feed cable systems from outside the State of Montana, and the continued operation of low power VHF booster stations, to the end that the people of the State of Montana shall not be denied their basic right to have access to the informational, educational, inspirational, cultural and entertainment service of a Montana system of free television broadcasting; and be it further

"Resolved, That a copy of this memorial be transmitted to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States; to the Senators and Congressmen representing the State of Montana in the Congress of the United States, and to the chairman and members of the Committees on Interstate and Foreign Commerce of the House of Representatives and the Senate of the United States.

"JOHN J. MACDONALD,
"Speaker of the House.
"PAUL CANNON,
"President of the Senate."

"SENATE JOINT MEMORIAL 1

"Joint memorial by the Senate of the 36th Legislative Assembly of the State of Montana (the house of representatives concurring), to the Congress of the United States; the Honorable JAMES E. MURRAY, U.S. Senator from Montana; the Honorable MIKE MANSFIELD, U.S. Senator from Montana; the Honorable LEE METCALF, Congressman from Montana; the Honorable LEROY ANDERSON, Congressman from Montana; and the Federal Communications Commission to take such remedial action as deemed necessary to preclude the closing of very high frequency booster stations necessary for television reception in areas of the State of Montana

"Whereas there are many communities and farm areas within the State of Montana, whose people depend upon low power very

high frequency stations as their only means of receiving television programs; and

"Whereas the rugged terrain of the Rocky Mountain region and the large number of isolated farm homes, ranch homes, and small communities makes the use of ultra-high frequency translator stations impractical, if indeed not impossible, according to the opinions expressed by competent and qualified broadcast engineers, as well as by certain members of the Federal Communications Commission; and

"Whereas it is economically impossible for these communities and farm areas to support, construct, or operate any other form of duly authorized television service; and

"Whereas the loss of low power very high frequency booster stations would deprive not less that one-fourth of the people of Montana of television service; and

"Whereas there is ample proof that low power very high frequency booster stations can be regulated so as to preclude interference with licensed television services or commercial and military communications and navigation services; and

"Whereas the Federal Communications Commission did summarily dismiss, without formal hearing, its own rulemaking proceedings relating to "repeater" or "booster" stations operating in the very high frequency television band of frequency assignments; and

"Whereas the Federal Communications Commission did on December 31, 1958, make formal announcement of its dismissal of petitions for reconsideration, including those filed by the Honorable J. Hugo Aronson, Governor of Montana; the Honorable James E. Murray, U.S. Senator from Montana; the Honorable Mike Mansfield, U.S. Senator from Montana; the Honorable Lee Metcalf, Congressman from Montana, and the Honorable LeRoy Anderson, Congressman from Montana, all of whom sought to procure reasonable rules which would permit the continued operation of said booster stations under the regulatory power of the Federal Government; and

"Whereas the Federal Communications Commission did also announce on December 31, 1958, that all booster stations would be given a period of 90 days in which to apply for conversion to ultra high frequency translators or some other authorized television operation, and upon failure to do so would be ordered to cease operation: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Senate of the 36th Legislative Assembly of the State of Montana (the house of representatives concurring)*, That the senate of the State of Montana (the house of representatives concurring), hereby memorialize the Federal Communications Commission to rescind its order of December 31, 1958, and the Congress of the United States for such remedial action within such 90-day period as the Congress deems fit through the exercise of its authority over the Federal Communications Commission to insure the continued operation of low power very high frequency booster stations, to the end that the people in the small communities and rural areas of the State of Montana shall not be denied their basic right to equality of access to the informational, educational, inspirational, cultural, and entertainment services of the American system of free television; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of this joint memorial of the 36th Legislative Assembly of the State of Montana, be transmitted by the secretary of state of the State of Montana; to the President of the Senate of the United States; the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States; the Honorable James E. Murray, U.S. Senator from Montana; the Honorable Mike Mansfield, U.S. Senator from Montana; the Honorable Lee Metcalf, Congressman from Montana; the Honorable LeRoy Anderson, Congressman from Montana; and Mr. John C. Doerfer, Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission.

"PAUL CANNON,
"President of the Senate.
"JOHN J. MACDONALD,
"Speaker of the House."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Montana; to the Committee on Public Works:

"HOUSE JOINT MEMORIAL 3

"Joint memorial of the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Montana to the President of the United States, Dwight D. Eisenhower; the Congress of the United States; James E. Murray and Mike Mansfield, Senators from the State of Montana; Lee Metcalf and LeRoy Anderson, Representatives in Congress from the State of Montana; the Committee on Public Works of the U.S. Senate; the Committee on Public Works of the U.S. House of Representatives; the Committee on Appropriations of the U.S. Senate; the Committee on Appropriations of the U.S. House of Representatives; the Secretary of the Army, Wilber M. Brucker; the Chief of the Corps of Engineers, Department of the Army, Maj. Gen. E. C. Itschner; and the Director of the Budget, Maurice H. Stans; urging construction of Libby Dam in two stages, with work beginning on the initial stage as soon as possible in order to protect the national interest in water and water resources rising in the United States; and requesting sufficient appropriations so that detailed planning and design work can begin immediately

"Whereas Libby Dam site is located in Lincoln County in western Montana and Libby Dam will be constructed across the Kootenai River some 15 miles upstream from Libby, Mont.; and

"Whereas preliminary geological and engineering investigation and planning of the Libby Dam project have been carefully completed and the findings compiled; and

"Whereas Libby Dam, the biggest storage project remaining to be built in the Pacific Northwest, will be designed to provide flood control, hydroelectric power, recreation, and navigation benefits to Montana, the Pacific Northwest, and the Nation; and

"Whereas the Libby project's tremendous storage of water—5,985,000 acre-feet—would provide valuable flood control for several hundred miles along the Kootenai and Columbia Rivers and also would substantially aid flood control and navigation on the Columbia River below Pasco, Wash.; and

"Whereas Libby Dam will have an initial installed electric generating capacity of 600,000 kilowatts, an ultimate installation of 800,000 kilowatts of power, which Montana and the Northwest need to bring in new industry; and

"Whereas Libby Dam storage would also firm up power production in the projects downstream on the Columbia River; would provide a regulated streamflow which would add 805,000 kilowatts to the production at Grand Coulee, Chief Joseph, McNary, the Dalles, and Bonneville Dams; and

"Whereas no other proposed single dam on the Columbia River system would provide for generation of as much salable power at site and downstream; and

"Whereas the rapidly increasing population of the Pacific Northwest and the Nation places upon this generation a special responsibility for the maximum utilization of all the great natural resources bestowed upon this country by divine providence; and

"Whereas any lesser development of the Libby Dam site would result in great loss of storage capacity and both at-site and downstream power benefits, which can create thousands of jobs urgently needed to provide for our burgeoning population and the future defense and welfare of our region and the Nation; and

"Whereas the Pacific Northwest is isolated from the major population centers of the Nation by great distances and high freight rates and must rely upon the full development of its own natural resources in providing for its future growth and economic welfare; and

"Whereas hydroelectric power is the only truly inexhaustible energy resource available to a civilization whose entire future growth and economic strength will be increasingly dependent upon the provision of adequate supplies of electric energy; and

"Whereas the industrial development of Montana and the entire Pacific Northwest will be greatly enhanced by the large amounts of low-cost power made available by the full development of the potential of the Libby Dam site; and

"Whereas the people of the State of Montana have seen in the examples of Hungry Horse Dam on the south fork of the Flathead River in their State and many other dams in the Pacific Northwest the immense benefits which accrue as a direct result of the construction of such great projects, not only to the State in which they are constructed but also to the entire region and the Nation; and

"Whereas revenues from the sale of power from Libby Dam represent the most feasible source of funds to aid in the rapid construction and the maintenance of major future irrigation projects in the State of Montana, which developments can provide homes for any farm families which may be displaced by the construction of Libby Dam; and

"Whereas large amounts of storage are required in the Columbia River and Clark Fork River Basins to provide adequate protection against the seasonal floods which periodically cause great loss of life and the destruction of millions of dollars' worth of property, causing great hardship throughout the Pacific Northwest; and

"Whereas many of the large storage projects planned by the Army Engineers for the control of floods in the Columbia River Basin have been and are being lost due to conflicting uses and inadequate development, so that it is seriously doubtful that even the minimum flood control storage requirements of the region can be met; and

"Whereas Libby Dam, with 5,985,000 acre-feet of usable storage in its reservoir is one of the few remaining great storage projects still feasible and not involved in serious controversy in the Columbia River Basin and can provide more usable flood control storage than a combination of all the other feasible potential projects in the Clark Fork River Basin; and

"Whereas Libby Dam, as planned and authorized, must have the approval of the International Joint Commission; and

"Whereas the International Joint Commission has for years been unable to reach agreement on the project and says it will not give approval until the Canadian Government's investigation of alternative uses of the Kootenai waters in Canada has been completed; and

"Whereas one of the Canadian proposals is to divert part of the Kootenai River flow into the Columbia River at Canal Flats, in order to generate additional power at sites in Canada; and

"Whereas such a diversion would materially reduce the amount of water available for storage and generation at the proposed Libby site, and could reduce the amount to the point where Libby dam would be unfeasible; and

"Whereas in order to protect Montana's and the national interest in water and water resources rising in the United States, in order to provide for at least partial flood control and storage: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Montana*, That the Representatives of the State of Montana in the Congress of the United

States be urged and requested to introduce and the Congress of the United States be urged and requested to enact into law an amendment to the existing authorization of the Libby project, necessary to provide for construction in two stages, the first backing water up to the international boundary, the second to be added when agreement is reached with Canada: be it further

"*Resolved*, That the Congress of the United States be urged to provide sufficient appropriations so that detailed planning and design work for two-stage construction can begin immediately and that construction can begin as soon as design work is completed; be it further

"*Resolved*, That the amendment include reservation of a block of power for Montana; be it further

"*Resolved*, That this assembly request the Congress, in making appropriations for the construction of the Libby project, to define the compensations that shall be received from the Government of the United States by the county of Lincoln and by affected cities and school districts in said county for extraordinary expenses resulting from expanded services required in the fields of school and hospital facilities, health and sanitation, and police protection incidental to the construction of said projects; and to provide all necessary funds and take all needed action to insure the construction of all transportation and other facilities needed to provide opportunity equal to that now existing of access to mines, to forests in Federal, State, and private ownership, and to manufacturing and refining plants, to the end that the present steady and continuous employment of Montana people depending upon forests and mines for their livelihood will not be adversely affected; and, be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of this memorial be submitted by the secretary of the State of Montana to each of the individuals and to the chairmen of each of the committees named in the title of this memorial and also to the Presiding Officers of both Houses of the Congress of the United States RICHARD M. NIXON, and SAM E. RAYBURN.

"JOHN J. MACDONALD,
"Speaker of the House.
"PAUL CANNON,
"President of the Senate."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Colorado; to the Committee on Finance:

"SENATE JOINT MEMORIAL 3

"Joint resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact legislation to bring the State of Colorado under the provisions of section 218(d)(6)(C) of the Federal Social Security Act

"Whereas the Federal Social Security Act, old-age and survivors insurance, provides in section 218(d)(6)(C), which is 42 U.S.C.A. 418(d)(6)(C), for several States to maintain established retirement systems in which members under retirement systems established may remain under such existing coverage or may choose to be included in a division of systems which would include both a State retirement system and coverage under the old-age, survivors, and disability insurance program of the Federal Social Security Act, which provision now reads:

" 'For the purposes of this subsection, any retirement system established by the States of California, Connecticut, Florida, Georgia, Massachusetts, Minnesota, New York, North Dakota, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, Tennessee, Vermont, Washington, Wisconsin, or the Territory of Hawaii, or any political subdivision of any such State or Territory, which, on, before, or after the date of enactment of this subparagraph, is divided into two divisions or parts, one of which is composed of positions of members of such system who desire coverage under an agreement under this section and the other of which is composed of positions of members of such system who do not desire such coverage, shall, if the State or Territory so desires and if it is provided that there shall be included in such division or part composed of members desiring such coverage the positions of individuals who become members of such system after such coverage is extended, be deemed to be a separate retirement system with respect to each such division or part.'; and

"Whereas the Colorado Legislative Council has had a special committee, established by Senate Joint Resolution 6, 2d regular session of the 41st General Assembly of the State of Colorado, which will shortly report to this general assembly upon the feasibility of Colorado so amending its retirement plans for employees of the State and its political subdivisions in order to have the choice between existing retirement plans and coverage in a new plan, to include Federal social-security coverage on the basis of the division of the retirement system or coverage into two divisions or parts; and

"Whereas such division of plans in Colorado will be in the best interests of the employees covered, the administrators of the several retirement systems affected, and the State and its political subdivisions, only if the Congress of the United States will provide by amendment to section 218(d)(6)(C) of the Federal Social Security Act, the addition of the State of Colorado to the several States now covered by such section; and

"Whereas benefits available under the Federal act as they relate to the division of systems in Colorado will be available through agreements with the Federal Government under section 218(f)(1)(C) of the Federal Social Security Act, which is 42 U.S.C.A. 418(f)(1)(C), only until December 31, 1959: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Senate of the 42d General Assembly of the State of Colorado (the House of Representatives concurring herein)*, That it respectfully memorializes the Congress of the United States to amend the Federal Social Security Act so as to bring the State of Colorado under the provisions of section 218(d)(6)(C) thereof at the earliest possible time and preferably before March 15, 1959; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That a copy of this memorial be transmitted to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States, and to the Senators and Congressmen representing the State of Colorado in the Congress of the United States, for their appropriate action.

"ROBERT L. KNOUS,
"President of the Senate.
"LUCILE L. SHUSTER,
"Secretary of the Senate.
"CHARLES R. CONKLIN,
"Speaker of the House of Representatives.
"ROBERT S. EBERHARDT,
"Chief Clerk of the House of Representatives."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Colorado; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"SENATE JOINT MEMORIAL 4

"Joint resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States for the establishment of a Great Plains research laboratory in the Great Plains area

"Whereas the area known as the Great Plains in the States of Montana, Wyoming, North Dakota, South Dakota, Kansas, Nebraska, Colorado, Oklahoma, Texas, and New Mexico is vital to the agricultural and livestock production of the Nation; and

"Whereas there are vast acreages of land in these ten States which in periods of extensive drought are subject to severe wind and water erosion; and

"Whereas there is great need for additional intensive research relative to the conservation and maximum use of available moisture and other matters concerning land treatment, use and control of lands which easily erode in periods of drought and wind: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Senate of the 42d General Assembly of the State of Colorado (the House of Representatives concurring therein)*, That this general assembly wishes to express its interest and concern to the Congress of the United States and the Secretary of Agriculture in the establishment of additional facilities to conduct soil moisture research studies for the Great Plains, that such facilities be authorized in the immediate future in a location which will most adequately adapt itself to the required climatic and other physical and geographic conditions required for such an installation; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That a copy of this memorial be sent to the President of the United States, to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States, to the Senators and Congressmen representing the State of Colorado in the Congress of the United States, to the Secretary of Agriculture, and to the director of agricultural research service.

"ROBERT L. KNOUS,
"President of the Senate.
"LUCILE L. SHUSTER,
"Secretary of the Senate.
"CHARLES R. CONKLIN,
"Speaker of the House of Representatives.
"ROBERT S. EBERHARDT,
"Chief Clerk of the House of Representatives."

A resolution of the Senate of the State of Maryland; to the Committee on Finance:

"SENATE RESOLUTION 8

"Resolution opposing any increase in the Federal gasoline tax

"Many thousands of citizens in the State of Maryland have heard, with deep concern, the apparently serious proposal from Federal officials that the Federal gasoline tax be increased by an additional amount of 1½ cents per gallon.

"The Federal Interstate Highway System is being largely financed by a Federal tax on motor fuel. This program is now only 3 years old. It was adopted after extensive hearings and wide study and publicity, with the general public understanding that as proposed and as presented to the people of the country, it would be a self-sufficient program.

"Now, however, after this very short interval, there are definite proposals for an increase in the Federal gasoline tax. We wonder at the necessity for such a rapid change in what we understood were careful and conservative estimates on the cost of this program. The taxpayers of the country had a right to expect that there would not be a proposal for a huge increase in the cost of financing the Interstate Highway program just a few years after that program was initiated. Seemingly, this program, like all other projects, goes upward and upward at the continuing expense of sorely pressed taxpayers.

"We point out also a further encroachment by the Federal Government upon a source of taxation traditionally reserved largely for the States. In recent years, the Federal Government has made proposals that some Federal functions be returned to the several States. The President of the United States, a year or two ago in his address to the conference of State Governors meeting at Williamsburg, Va., made such a proposal. Steps have been taken on the part of the Governor's conference to implement and give substance to the

President's proposals. Now, with Federal officials actively proposing this large increase in the Federal gasoline tax, the entire philosophy aimed at deemphasizing Federal activities and restoring the States to their traditional place, may collapse.

"We earnestly hope that officials and legislators in the Federal Government will reconsider any move to increase the Federal gasoline tax: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate of Maryland, That, on behalf of the people of this State, we protest the proposal for a 1½ cents per gallon increase in the Federal gasoline tax; and be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of the senate be instructed to send copies of this resolution to the Vice President of the United States as Presiding Officer in the Senate of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, each member of the Maryland delegation in the Congress of the United States, and to the Federal Bureau of Public Roads.

"By the senate, February 4, 1959.

"Read and adopted.

"J. WATERS PARRISH,
"Secretary of the Senate.
"GEORGE W. DELLA,
"President of the Senate."

A resolution of the House of Delegates of the State of Maryland; to the Committee on Armed Services:

"HOUSE RESOLUTION 4

"Resolution urging that the U.S. Naval Gun Factory continue operation as engineering center for the Bureau of Ordnance and that the same be modernized and expanded and its name be changed to reflect its current responsibilities

"Whereas the trend in development, engineering, and manufacture of naval ordnance has resulted in a concentrated effort directed to advanced weapons and weapons systems; and

"Whereas the U.S. Naval Gun Factory is an essential and indispensable part of the naval ordnance defense establishment; and

"Whereas there is no other naval ordnance field establishment or private defense contractor capable of displaying the diversification in engineering, scientific, and industrial skills; and

"Whereas there is no other naval ordnance field establishment or private defense contractor capable of displaying the diversification in physical plant and industrial equipment; and

"Whereas there is no comparable naval ordnance field establishment or private defense contractor having the broad technical competence and diversified experience in the conception, engineering development, design, prototype manufacturing evaluation and product engineering of weapons and weapons systems equivalent to the Naval Gun Factory; and

"Whereas the Naval Gun Factory is the only naval ordnance establishment having the comprehensive technical competence and industrial ability in the field of structural fabrications, an area of vital importance in the development and manufacture of advanced weapons and weapons systems; and

"Whereas the Naval Gun Factory has a complete complement of technical skills in the basic fields of the physical sciences and engineering (physics, chemistry, metallurgy, materials, electrical, electronics, mechanical, structure) and superior technical abilities in optics, fire control, hydraulics, engineering management and contract administration supplemented by designers, draftsmen, technicians, engineering aids, technical writers and editors; and

"Whereas the Naval Gun Factory has complete complement of industrial skills in metals processing, fabricating, metals finishing, electroplating, heat treating, molding, casting, forging, electronics, plastics; and

"Whereas the Naval Gun Factory has provided consulting services to nationally recognized corporations in the field of design, materials, and fabrication techniques taking the form of analyses, critiques, and advice in order to support programs in which these contractors are involved, thus facilitating the Navy Department's progress in varied projects; and

"Whereas it is believed that overall operational costs in the Naval Gun Factory are not in excess of those found in comparable industry operating under similar fiscal procedures; and

"Whereas the Naval Gun Factory has displayed outstanding proficiency in contributing to the progress of development of new scientific, engineering, industrial, and related techniques necessary for flexibility in conforming to the everchanging weapons and weapons systems concept; and

"Whereas the citizens of Prince Georges County, and in fact the people of the entire State of Maryland, are vitally affected in the premises aforementioned: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the House of Delegates of Maryland, That a change of name be effected for the Naval Gun Factory that more realistically reflects the establishment's current responsibility such as Naval Ordnance Development Center or Naval Weapons Engineering Center; and be it further

"Resolved, That the Navy Department provide the Naval Gun Factory with a definite mission based on vital engineering functions in lieu of the outmoded weapons and product concepts in order to continue the Naval Gun Factory as an essential link in the chain of national defense; and be it further

"Resolved, That the Naval Gun Factory continue to operate as an engineering center for the Bureau of Ordnance to maintain surveillance and provide adequate contract administration and field engineering service to contractors engaged in the fabrication of defense weapons and weapons systems, in order to prevent the Navy Department from relinquishing control over defense projects; and be it further

"Resolved, That the Navy Department Bureau of Ordnance provide adequate support for the Naval Gun Factory relating to continued modernization of physical plant, installation of necessary equipment, more favorable consideration of N.G.F. proposals for the developmental and prototype manufacture of ordnance weapons and weapons systems, in order to insure Navy Department efficiency, and reduce costs in completion of defense projects; and be it further

"Resolved, That the Navy Department Bureau of Ordnance take cognizance of the potential capabilities and capacities of the Naval Gun Factory as an essential establishment for the defense of the Nation and thereby provide an adequate engineering and manufacturing workload in order to utilize the experience and versatility existing in this naval ordnance field establishment; and be it further

"Resolved, That the chief clerk of the house of delegates be instructed to send copies of this resolution to the President of the United States, Vice President of the United States, Secretary of Defense, Rear Adm. Paul D. Stroup, Chief of Navy Bureau of Ordnance; Vice Adm. Edward W. Clexton, Bureau of Ordnance, O.N.M.; Rear Adm. T. A. Ahroon, Chief of Planning, Bureau of Ordnance; Capt. Charles E. Briner, Superintendent, U.S. Naval Gun Factory; and all of the members of the congressional Armed Services Committee.

"By the House of Delegates, January 20, 1959.

"Read and adopted.

"By order "ELIZABETH M. REESE,
Assistant Chief Clerk.
"PERRY O. WILKINSON,
"Speaker of the House of Delegates.
———— ————,
"Chief Clerk of the House of Delegates."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Minnesota; to the Committee on Finance:

"RESOLUTION 1

"Concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact legislation providing for the repeal of the Federal excise tax upon the transportation of passengers

"Whereas the Federal excise tax upon the transportation of passengers was adopted as a wartime tax to discourage the movement of civilian passengers during World War II; and

"Whereas today, 13 years after the cessation of hostilities, there continues a 10-percent levy on the transportation of passengers (title VI, sec. 609(a) United States Code), which tax while collected by the common carriers of transportation by rail, by highway, by water, and in the air, is imposed upon and collected from the users of such transportation; and

"Whereas millions of dollars in revenues are paid to the State of Minnesota by those common carriers; and

"Whereas the 10-percent tax on transportation of passengers discourages the use of public transportation systems and tends to decrease the revenue of the State and local government by reason of the lesser earnings or volume of business of said public system of transportation; and

"Whereas there exists ample facilities for the public transportation of persons throughout the State of Minnesota and the Nation and the purpose for which said tax was imposed has long since ceased to exist; and

"Whereas the decrease in revenue by reason of the small amount received for said excise tax on the transportation of passengers will largely be made up by the increased income taxes paid by the passengers of common carriers and other excise taxes paid on the facilities and equipment used by said common carriers: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, by the Senate of the State of Minnesota (the House of Representatives concurring therein), That we respectfully urge and request the Congress of the United States to enact appropriate legislation to repeal the Federal excise taxes upon the transportation of persons; be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of state of the State of Minnesota be directed to transmit a copy of this resolution to the President of the United States, the Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States, and to each member of the Minnesota delegation in the U.S. Senate and the U.S. House of Representatives.

"KARL F. ROLVAAG,
"President of the Senate.
"E. J. CHILGREN,
"Speaker of the House of Representatives.

"Passed the senate the 6th day of February 1959.

"H. Y. TORREY,
"Secretary of the Senate.

"Passed the house of representatives the 16th day of February 1959.

"G. H. LEAHY,
"Chief Clerk, House of Representatives.

"Approved February 19, 1959.

"ORVILLE L. FREEMAN.
"Governor of the State of Minnesota.

"Filed February 20, 1959.

"JOSEPH L. DONOVAN,
"Secretary of State."

A resolution of the House of Representatives of the State of Pennsylvania; to the Committee on Public Works:

"Whereas the Tennessee Valley Authority (TVA) is seriously jeopardizing American recovery from the recession by awarding sizable contracts to foreign concerns; and

"Whereas our immediate concern is the loss of a multi-million-dollar turbogenerator contract to the C. A. Parsons Co., of England, while the Westinghouse Electric Corp., East Pittsburgh, Pa., was the lowest domestic bidder; and

"Whereas the importation of this electrical apparatus will result in the loss of more than 1 million man-hours of work for the Westinghouse Electric Corp. employees which is comparable to work for 700 employees for 1 year or 350 employees for 2 years; and

"Whereas there will also result a loss of direct and indirect taxes in the amount of $3,255,500 Federal and $363,300 State; and

"Whereas during 11 months of 1958 the Federal Government awarded $30,530,114 in heavy electrical apparatus contracts and foreign manufacturers were awarded 35 percent or $10,711,070; and

"Whereas we believe that, in addition to the effect this policy has on our economy, it is a reckless and hazardous policy for the security of our Nation, as this equipment will now be dependent on a foreign company, from across the ocean, for maintenance and repair; and

"Whereas the Government of England stands steadfast in its policy that no equipment as referred to herein shall be purchased by English concerns from a foreign country because of national security; and

"Whereas we believe the Government should look beyond the price alone and evaluate the health of our own economy and the soundness of our national defense: Therefore be it

"Resolved, That the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania hereby memorialize the President of the United States and the Congress of the United States to establish a congressional committee to investigate the policies of the Tennessee Valley Authority so that further loss of employment in the United States, at a time when employment is now of grave concern, will be avoided; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States, the Presiding Officers of each House of Congress of the United States, and to each Senator and Representative from the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

"We certify that the foregoing is a true and correct copy of the resolution introduced in the house of representatives by the Honorable John J. Murray, the Honorable George E. Jenkins, the Honorable Maurice H. Goldstein, the Honorable Joseph P. Rigby, the Honorable Thomas J. Foerster, and the Honorable Raymond E. Wilt, and adopted by the house of representatives the 17th day of February 1959.

"HIRAM G. ANDREWS,
"Speaker, House of Representatives.
"J. MINSHY,
"Chief Clerk, House of Representatives."

A resolution of the Senate of the State of Missouri; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"SENATE RESOLUTION 33

"Resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to establish a national recreational area on the Current and Eleven Point Rivers as proposed by the National Park Service and the U.S. Forest Service and to declare the Current and Eleven Point Rivers national streams and to provide for the acquisition of the necessary land without exercising the power of eminent domain

"Whereas there exists, in the valleys of the Current and Eleven Point Rivers in Missouri, five springs of the first magnitude and many hundreds of smaller springs which provide a constant supply of clear, cold, sparkling water for these rivers; and

"Whereas the phenomenon of such large volumes of clear, cold water issuing as springs amid rustic and picturesque surroundings, make places of wonder and rare natural beauty, which offer a lure and inspiration to those who come to view these extraordinary manifestations of nature, and to play, rest, and to refresh themselves in a peaceful and inspiring environment; and

"Whereas these springs make a valuable contribution to fish life in these streams by providing favorable sites for fish hatcheries, and by discharging large quantities of crystal clear water, they become the controlling factor favorable to the propagation and maintenance of game fish and other aquatic life natural to both streams; and

"Whereas the State of Missouri and the U.S. Forest Service own vast acreage adjacent to these streams suitable for recreational development and other improvements for the public use; and

"Whereas the Current and Eleven Point Rivers are nationally famous for their "John Boat" float fishing trips through this Ozark scenic wonderland; and

"Whereas the Arkansas-White-Red Basins Interagency Committee, recognizing the unique natural qualities of the Current and Eleven Point Rivers of Missouri, and their importance to present and future generations, recommended that appropriate State and Federal agencies prepare a plan to preserve and enhance the natural qualities of this region; and

"Whereas a plan was prepared by the National Park Service in cooperation with Missouri State agencies, and was published by the Division of Resources and Development, to preserve and develop the Current and Eleven Point River country, without the exercise of the power of eminent domain; and

"Whereas the U.S. Forest Service has indicated a similar interest in the preservation and development of land adjacent to these streams by recommending the creation of a national forest recreation area in a national recreation plan prepared and adopted in 1936: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That the Missouri Senate in its 70th General Assembly, request of the Congress of the United States, that it establish a national recreation area along the Current and Eleven Point Rivers of Missouri, and that it declare the Current and Eleven Point Rivers as national streams; and be it further

"Resolved, That this assembly request that the Congress enact the necessary legislation providing for the purchase and development of the national recreation area as heretofore described, lest the great scenic and recreational values of the Current and Eleven Point Rivers in Missouri be lost forever to public use by manmade encroachments; and be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of the senate be instructed to send copies of this memorial to the President of the United States Senate, to the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives, and to the Missouri Members of the House and Senate.

"(As appearing in Missouri Senate Journal, 12th day, Feb. 3, 1959.)"

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of North Dakota; to the Committee on Appropriations:

"HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION E

"Concurrent resolution memorializing Congress to provide additional funds for the construction of nursing homes

"Whereas there is an existing backlog of unmet needs in the provision of nursing homes in the State of North Dakota and the Nation; and

"Whereas the shortage will become more acute because of the aging population of this State and Nation; and

"Whereas appropriations by Congress for this purpose have been limited and the rising costs in the construction of nursing homes has even further restricted the program of construction of such homes: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of North Dakota (the Senate concurring therein), That the Congress be urged to increase appropriations for expenditure in accordance with the provisions of Public Law 482, 83d Congress, 2d session, for the purpose of providing an expanded program of nursing home construction; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded by the secretary of state to members of the North Dakota congressional delegation, the President of the U.S. Senate, the Speaker of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Surgeon General of the Department of the U.S. Public Health Service, and the Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

"HJALMAR NYGAARD,
"Speaker of the House.
"GERALD L. STAIR,
"Chief Clerk of the House.
"C. P. DAHL,
"President of the Senate.
"VIC GILBREATH,
"Secretary of the Senate."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Arkansas (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 5

"Whereas the federation of the United States of America is predicated upon the common ideal of government of the people, by the people, and for the people; and

"Whereas certain powers of the people were delegated to the Federal Government by the Constitution of the United States, and by virtue of amendment 10 to the Constitution of the United States those powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people; and

"Whereas plenary control over public education has long been exercised by the various State governments, and

"Whereas recent encroachments upon this State function precipitates preemption by the Federal Government of another power of self-government recognized as inherent in the people: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate of the 62d General Assembly of the State of Arkansas (the House of Representatives concurring therein)—

"SECTION 1. That the General Assembly of the State of Arkansas, pursuant to article 5 of the Constitution of the United States, hereby petitions the Congress of the United States to propose an amendment to the Constitution of the United States which expressly reserves to the citizens of the several States exclusive power and control over their public schools.

"SEC. 2. That the secretary of state of Arkansas, upon adoption of this resolution, shall furnish copies of the same to the President of the Senate and to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the U.S. Congress, to the presiding officers of the senate and house of representatives of each of the other 48 States, and to the members of the Arkansas delegation in the U.S. Congress.

"Approved February 13, 1959."

"STATEMENT OF GOV. ORVAL E. FAUBUS, FEBRUARY 13, 1959, TO BE ATTACHED TO SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 5

"I am hereby approving senate concurrent resolution 5, which would 'petition the Congress to propose an amendment to the U.S. Constitution expressly reserving to the citizens of the several States exclusive power and control over the public schools.'

"I have done this because I believe the intent of the authors and of the legislature in

approving this measure was to reassert the intent already affirmed in the Constitution of certain rights guaranteed to the States, but now being denied by acts of the Federal judiciary and of the Federal Government.

"Amendment 9 to the Constitution now provides that the enumeration of certain rights in the Constitution shall not be construed to deny others retained by the people.

"Furthermore, amendment 10 in the Bill of Rights provides as follows:

" 'The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States, respectively, or to the people.'

"At no place in the Constitution has any power whatsoever been granted to the Federal Government to control or interfere in any way with the right of the States and their people to control and manage their own schools.

"I am of the conviction that our Constitution, as it now reads, firmly and expressly reserves the control and management of the public schools to the States themselves.

"It is, therefore, my conclusion that such an amendment to the Constitution is unnecessary, and that all that is necessary at the present time is the proper observance by the Federal authorities of the Constitution as now written.

"However, because it is clear to me that the reassertion of these rights was the intent of the authors of this resolution, and the intent of the members of the general assembly, I have approved senate concurrent resolution 5.

"ORVAL E. FAUBUS,
"Governor."

A letter, in the nature of a petition, from the Republican Central Committee of St. Louis County, Clayton, Mo., signed by Betty Balcher, secretary, expressing support of the President's budget; to the Committee on Appropriations.

A resolution adopted by the Kern Valley Property Owners and Taxpayers Association, of Isabella, Calif., relating to grants-in-aid programs, and so forth; to the Committee on Government Operations.

A resolution adopted by the Citizens Forum of Columbia Heights, opposing the enactment of legislation granting statehood for Hawaii; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

A resolution adopted by the Township Committee of the Township of Gloucester, N.J., favoring the enactment of legislation to provide funds for the building of a superpassenger ship; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

A resolution adopted by Frank Summerfield Post No. 3363, Veterans of Foreign Wars, United States, Lisbon, N. Dak., favoring the establishment of a Senate Veterans Committee; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Mr. LANGER:

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of North Dakota; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

"HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION F

"Concurrent resolution memorializing the Secretary of Agriculture to reestablish a local testing program for grains that are subject to an application for a Federal loan

"Whereas it has long been the practice of the Agricultural Stabilization Committee to permit local elevator operators to test grain for moisture content and grading purposes prior to the approval of a loan thereon by the Agricultural Stabilization Committee; and

"Whereas such policies have now been changed to require that such testing and grading be carried on at one central station; and

"Whereas such central testing practices result in a delay of from 3 to 6 weeks in the approval of loans with a resultant inconvenience and often hardship to the owners of the grain who are seeking a loan thereon from the Agricultural Stabilization Committee: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of North Dakota (the Senate concurring therein), That the Secretary of Agriculture is hereby urged to discontinue the central testing system now in existence, and that the Agricultural Stabilization Committee accept the results of tests carried on by local elevator operators for the purpose of approving processing and approving applications for grain loans from the Agricultural Stabilization Committee; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded by the Secretary of State to the Secretary of Agriculture and each member of the North Dakota congressional delegation.

"HJALMAR C. NYGAARD,
"Speaker of the House.
"GERALD L. STAIR,
"Chief Clerk of the House.
"C. P. DAHL,
"President of the Senate.
"VIC GILBREATH,
"Secretary of the Senate."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of North Dakota; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION H

"Concurrent resolution endorsing and approving the Bureau of Reclamation project plan report on the Garrison division unit and supporting and urging early enactment of desirable and needed modifying and confirming legislation authorizing the construction thereof

"Whereas the Garrison diversion unit, Garrison division, Missouri River Basin project, located in North Dakota (and a small segment in South Dakota) was in general authorized by the Flood Control Act of 1944, and when developed will:

"1. Enhance the future economic welfare and prosperity of the people of the State, particularly those within the project area;

"2. Provide for the eventual irrigation of over 1 million acres of land periodically subjected to drought which will result in a more diversified and stabilized agriculture in a large region of North Dakota;

"3. Replenish and restore the depleted waters of several lakes, rivers, and streams, and augment the levels and flows therein; and

"4. Make available within affected areas water diverted from the Missouri River for irrigation, domestic, municipal and industrial needs, production of hydroelectric power, recreation, fish and wildlife, and other public beneficial uses; and

"Whereas the construction of the Garrison diversion unit will result in a greatly expanded and more dependable agricultural and business economy in North Dakota, which will result in an accelerated population growth and increased prosperity in the area; and

"Whereas the investigations and studies by the Bureau of Reclamation indicate that the project is economically feasible and the Bureau advises that it is in a position to initiate construction thereof as soon as appropriate modifying legislation now pending in Congress has been enacted and funds made available; and

"Whereas the farmers in the project areas and all North Dakotans have shown a definite interest in and demand for the early construction and development of the Garrison diversion unit: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of North Dakota (the Senate concurring therein), That the 36th Legislative Assembly of the State of North Dakota favors and approves the Garrison diversion unit, and respectfully urges the appropriate committees of Congress to schedule hearings at the earliest date possible on S. 147, H.R. 1891 and H.R. 1963 to make certain provisions in connection with the authorization and construction of said unit, to the end that construction thereof may be undertaken as soon as possible; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies hereof be mailed by the secretary of state to Hon. James E. Murray, chairman, Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs; Hon. Wayne N. Aspinall, chairman, House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs; Senators William Langer and Milton R. Young, Representatives Quentin N. Burdick and Don L. Short; Hon. Fred A. Seaton, Secretary of the Interior; Hon. Fred G. Aandahl, Assistant Secretary of the Interior; and Hon. W. A. Dexheimer, Commissioner, Bureau of Reclamation.

"HJALMAR NYGAARD,
"Speaker of the House.
"GEARLD L. STAIR,
"Chief Clerk of the House.
"C. P. DAHL,
"President of the Senate.
"VIC GILBREATH,
"Secretary of the Senate."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of North Dakota; to the Committee on Public Works:

"HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION G

"Concurrent resolution favoring the early construction of the proposed Pembilier Dam and Reservoir project and urging the Corps of Engineers to expedite the completion of a favorable report thereon

"Whereas the proposed Pembilier Dam and Reservoir project on the Pembina River, near Walhalla, N. Dak., has been under restudy, reexamination, and review by the district engineer, St. Paul district, Corps of Engineers, U.S. Army, for a number of years, with a view of finding a more favorable benefit-to-cost ratio to better justify recommendations for its accomplishments; and

"Whereas the resulting reservoir would insure a municipal and industrial water supply adequate to care for present needs and insure a supply for developments in the immediate future; and

"Whereas there appears to be potential irrigable areas of up to 25,000 acres, or more, susceptible of development in connection with such project, and there are additional benefits, both direct and indirect, which have not been, but should be, considered in the evaluation thereof, all of which would substantially improve and increase the economic feasibility of the project: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of North Dakota (the Senate concurring therein), That the 36th Legislative Assembly of the State of North Dakota favors the early construction of the Pembilier Dam and Reservoir project for flood control, domestic, municipal, industrial, and agricultural water supplies, power, recreation, fish and wildlife, and other uses, and urges the Corps of Engineers to expedite the development and completion of a favorable benefit-cost report thereon to the end that congressional approval thereof may be sought in the next flood control bill; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies hereof be mailed by the secretary of state to the President of the Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the chairmen of the Committees on Public Works, the Chief of Engineers, the St. Paul district engineer, and to Senators WILLIAM LANGER and MILTON R. YOUNG, and Representatives DON L. SHORT and QUENTIN BURDICK.

"HJALMAR NYGAARD,
"Speaker of the House.
"GERALD L. STAIR,
"Chief Clerk of the House.
"C. P. DAHL,
"President of the Senate.
"VIC GILBREATH,
"Secretary of the Senate."

(The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of North Dakota identical with the foregoing, which was referred to the Committee on Public Works.)

By Mr. McGEE (for himself and Mr. O'MAHONEY):

Two joint resolutions of the Legislature of the State of Wyoming; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"SENATE JOINT MEMORIAL 5

"A joint memorial memorializing the Congress of the United States of America with reference to the opposition of the people of the State of Wyoming to the construction of the Snake River Narrows Reservoir in the State of Wyoming

"Whereas construction of the Snake River Narrows Reservoir would cut off Highways 26 and 89 which presently serve both tourists and the residents of Wyoming and on which several millions of dollars have been spent in the last 20 years, and would also cut off Highways 187 and 189 so that no traffic could travel from Yellowstone and Teton National Parks to southwest Wyoming; and

"Whereas two winter feeding grouds for elk and other wild game would be inundated by the construction, with migration routes blocked, spelling doom for one-fourth of the renowned Jackson elk herd; and

"Whereas the historical recreational advantages and desirable fishing in this area would be seriously curtailed; and

"Whereas the purpose of the dam would be the production of kilowatts of power, which power in like or larger amounts could be produced by steam and will probably eventually be produced by atomic power; and

"Whereas there is an alternate and equally feasible site for the proposed dam outside the Snake River Narrows in the State of Wyoming: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate of the 35th Legislature of the State of Wyoming (the House of Representatives of such legislature concurring), That the President and the Congress of the United States of America be and they are hereby memorialized to recognize the opposition of the people of the State of Wyoming to the construction of the Snake River Narrows Reservoir by taking appropriate action in not providing funds for the construction of this dam in the State of Wyoming; be it further

"Resolved, That certified copies hereof be transmitted promptly to U.S. Senator JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY, U.S. Senator GALE W. McGEE, and Representative in Congress KEITH THOMSON.

"NORMAN BARLOW,
"President of the Senate.
"JAY R. HOUSE,
"Speaker of the House.

"Approved February 11, 1959:
"J. J. 'JOE' HICKEY,
"Governor."

ENROLLED JOINT MEMORIAL 5

"Joint memorial memorializing the Congress of the United States of America with reference to providing for an increase in the acreage of sugar beet production allowed to the farmers of the State of Wyoming

"Whereas new irrigable acres of Wyoming farmland are now available for the State's farmers through the completion of Federal reclamation programs and small water projects; and

Whereas these irrigable acres are especially well adapted to the raising of sugar beets, by virtue of soil and weather conditions; and

"Whereas increased production of sugar beets is an integral part of the expanding Wyoming agricultural economy; and

"Whereas each year more residents of the State of Wyoming are desirous of establishing farms to produce sugar beets as a major crop; and

"Whereas the United States does not presently produce enough sugar to satisfy the domestic requirements of the increasing population: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate of the 35th Legislature of the State of Wyoming (the House of Representatives of such legislature concurring), That the President and Congress of the United States of America be and they are hereby memorialized to take such action as may be necessary to provide additional acreage for the production of sugar beets in the State of Wyoming: Be it further

"Resolved, That certified copies hereof be transmitted promptly to U.S. Senator JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY, U.S. Senator GALE W. McGEE, and Representative in Congress KEITH THOMSON.

"NORMAN BARLOW,
"President of the Senate.
"JAY R. HOUSE,
"Speaker of the House.

"Approved February 14, 1959:
"J. J. 'JOE' HICKEY,
"Governor."

By Mr. BENNETT:

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Utah; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 1

"Concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress and the President of the United States to safeguard and preserve established State and individual rights to the use of water within the separate States

"Be it resolved by the Legislature of the State of Utah (the Governor concurring therein)—

"Whereas recent decisions from the Federal courts and recent rulings from the U.S. Department of Justice have deprived States, and persons, of rights which said States and persons previously enjoyed, to regulate and control the use of the water in those respective States; and

"Whereas said decisions and rulings are further a part of a general pattern developing gradually into Federal supremacy and usurpation over water, which, if continued will destroy individual and States rights over water, and substitute in lieu thereof an all powerful centralized government control thereover: Be it therefore

"Resolved by the 33d Legislature of the State of Utah (the Governor concurring therein), That the Congress and President of the United States and the Representatives of Utah in the Congress of the United States be, and they are hereby, urged and requested to take all necessary action to (1) preserve the water rights of the individual and the States and to prevent Federal usurpation of those rights; (2) to see that legislation is initiated and supported to reestablish to the individuals and to the States, the rights taken from them by the Federal courts and the Justice Department; and (3) in every way possible reaffirm, renew, and defend the concepts that water rights are property rights and that these established rights, to the use of water, by a State or an individual, should not be taken away without due process of law and adequate compensation; be it further

"Resolved, That certified copies of the above be promptly transmitted to the President and Vice President of the United States, Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress, chairmen of the U.S. Senate and House Committees of Interior and Insular Affairs, U.S. Senator WALLACE F. BENNETT, U.S. Senator FRANK E. MOSS, U.S. Representative HENRY A. DIXON, and U.S. Representative DAVID S. KING."

KONYA DAY—LETTER AND CONCURRENT RESOLUTION

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, I am delighted to join with my distinguished colleague from California in commending the city of Torrance, Calif., which has set aside February 28 as Konya Day.

Konya, a city in Turkey, was chosen by Torrance as its sister city under President Eisenhower's people-to-people program to establish greater friendship and understanding between this country and other nations. The fine spirit shown by Torrance is just one example of the active role California is playing in fostering international cooperation. The cities of Torrance and Konya are to be congratulated for their united effort to strengthen the ties of people of the free world. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter from the Chamber of Commerce of Torrance and a resolution adopted by the California Legislature commending the city of Torrance.

There being no objection, the letter and concurrent resolution were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
Torrance, Calif., January 27, 1959.

Hon. THOMAS H. KUCHEL,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR SENATOR KUCHEL: The President of the United States and the State Department are vitally interested in "city to city" sponsored by the American Municipal Association in conjunction with the U.S. Information Service.

Torrance has joined hands with the progressive city of Kenya, Turkey, in a united effort to strengthen the ties of people of the free world in the battle against the ungodliness of communism.

We hope that a similar resolution to the one enclosed may be adopted by the Senate of the United States. We are holding Kenya Day on February 28, and will host Madame Ismet Sandli, Turkish delegate to the United Nations.

Thanking you for your consideration, I remain,

Sincerely yours,

DICK FITZGERALD,
Manager.

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION OF THE SENATE AND ASSEMBLY OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA COMMENDING THE CITY OF TORRANCE, CALIF., AND THE CITY OF KONYA, TURKEY, FOR PARTICIPATING AS SISTER CITIES IN PRESIDENT EISENHOWER'S "PEOPLE TO PEOPLE" PROGRAM

Whereas President Eisenhower in 1956 inaugurated the "people to people" program to establish greater friendship and understanding between the peoples of the United States and other nations through the medium of direct personal contact; and

Whereas to implement this program the city of Torrance and other cities in the United States were requested by the American Municipal Association to affiliate with a foreign city of similar characteristics and mutual interests; and

Whereas the Torrance City-to-City Committee selected the city of Konya, Turkey, as Torrance's sister city for participation in said program and the city council of said city endorsed said selection and, on behalf of the people of Torrance, invited the people and government of the city of Konya, to participate with Torrance as its sister city in the President's program; and

Whereas the mayor and Municipal Council of the City of Konya have accepted the invitation of Torrance to become its sister city; and

Whereas the action of the cities of Konya and Torrance is representative of the mutual

trust and understanding that exists between the peoples of our two great nations: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate and Assembly of the State of California, acting concurrently, herewith commend the action of the cities of Konya and Torrance in affiliating as sister cities in President Eisenhower's "people to people" program and congratulates the governments and peoples of both cities on their inspiring example of the fight that individual municipalities can wage against the expansion of international communism and in furtherance of the brotherhood of man among free peoples everywhere.

TAXING OF COOPERATIVES AND THE REA—RESOLUTION

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I have received a resolution adopted by the Pecatonica Farmers Union of South Wayne, Wis., dealing with taxes on cooperatives. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas farm coperatives and REA are two of the few sources of relief to farm people from the cost-price squeeze; and

Whereas the present administration—particularly Mr. Eisenhower—is obviously determined to destroy all the farm cooperatives by unfair taxation of patronage dividends at the source and by forcing the REA into the private money market for the necessary capital to continue operations; and

Whereas the present administration is also determined to eliminate the parity concept of pricing farm commodities and forcing us into the free market without any price protection whatever: Therefore be it

Resolved by the members of Pecatonica Farmers Union meeting at South Wayne, Wis., on February 16, That you use every effort to prevent any new taxes on farm cooperatives and that you support continuation of the parity concept of pricing farm commodities. Also in view of the fact that good financing of REA has always resulted in profits rather than loss, you continue to support the present program of financing REA. We further oppose price supports based on 90 percent of the past 3-year average market prices.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. HAYDEN, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, without additional amendment:

S. Res. 27. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to investigate certain matters within its jurisdiction (Rept. No. 53); and

S. Res. 29. Resolution providing for a study of transportation policies in the United States (Rept. No. 54).

By Mr. HAYDEN, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, with amendments:

S.J. Res. 19. Joint resolution authorizing the Architect of the Capitol to present to the Senators and Representative in the Congress from the State of Alaska the first official flag of the United States bearing 49 stars and which is flown over the west front of the U.S. Capitol (Rept. No. 55).

By Mr. MAGNUSON, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, with an amendment:

S. 12. A bill to expedite the utilization of television transmission facilities in our public schools and colleges, and in adult training programs (Rept. No. 56).

By Mr. ANDERSON, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, without amendment:

S. 82. A bill to amend the act of June 28, 1958, to provide for a National Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 57).

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. SALTONSTALL, from the Committee on Armed Services:

Courtney Johnson, of Indiana, to be Assistant Secretary of the Army, vice Frank H. Higgins.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, as in executive session, from the Committee on Armed Services, I report favorably the nominations of 21 colonels for temporary promotion to the grade of brigadier general in the Air Force. I ask that these nominations be printed on the Executive Calendar.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. YOUNG of Ohio). The nominations will be placed on the Executive Calendar, as requested by the Senator from Nevada.

The nominations placed on the Executive Calendar, are as follows:

Col. Benjamin G. Holzman, and sundry other officers, for temporary appointment in the U.S. Air Force.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, also from the Committee on Armed Services, I report 3,662 nominations for appointment and promotion in the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Air Force, in the grades of lieutenant colonel and below. Since these names have already appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, to save the expense of printing on the Executive Calendar, I ask unanimous consent that they be ordered to lie on the Vice President's desk for the information of any Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The nominations, ordered to lie on the desk, are as follows:

Richard G. Ament, and sundry other officers, for promotion in the Regular Army of the United States;

Louis R. Abraham, and sundry other officers, for permanent oppointment to the grade of first lieutenant in the Marine Corps; and

John W. Wichman, and sundry other persons, for appointment in the Regular Air Force.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. HAYDEN (for himself and Mr. GOLDWATER):

S. 1164. A bill to authorize the appointment of a commissioner for Grand Canyon National Park, Arizona; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SPARKMAN (for himself and Mr. HILL):

S. 1165. A bill to authorize certain commissioned officers to receive retired pay to the extent of $3,000 per annum plus the full salary of any civilian office or position under the U.S. Government or the municipal government of the District of Columbia; and

S. 1166. A bill to establish a program of survival depots in order to provide subsistence for the large numbers of the civilian population of the United States who would be evacuated from the devastated areas in the event of attack on the United States; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BIBLE (by request):

S. 1167. A bill to make the Policemen and Firemen's Retirement and Disability Act Amendments of 1957 applicable to retired former members of the Metropolitan Police force, the Fire Department of the District of Columbia, the U.S. Park Police force, the White House Police force, and the U.S. Secret Service; and to their widows, widowers, and children; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. KEATING:

S. 1168. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act so as to remove the limitation upon the amount of outside income which an individual may earn while receiving benefits thereunder; and

S. 1169. A bill to provide for the credit of subscription charges or insurance premiums with respect to health or medical service plans or programs, or health or medical insurance for the purposes of the Federal income tax, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. KEATING when he introduced the above bill, which appear under separate heading.)

By Mr. BUSH:

S. 1170. A bill making appropriations for certain flood control projects in the State of Connecticut; to the Committee on Appropriations.

(See the remarks of Mr. BUSH when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 1171. A bill for the relief of Katharina Hoeger; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NEUBERGER (for himself, Mr. MORSE, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. MANSFIELD, Mr. KEFAUVER, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. CARROLL, Mr. YARBOROUGH, Mr. PROXMIRE, and Mr. DOUGLAS):

S. 1172. A bill to prohibit discrimination because of age in the hiring and employment of persons by Government contractors; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. NEUBERGER when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MUSKIE (for himself and Mrs. SMITH):

S. 1173. A bill to amend section 24 of the Federal Reserve Act to exempt real estate loans guaranteed by States from its provisions; and

S. 1174. A bill to amend section 24 of the Federal Reserve Act to provide that the existing restrictions on the amount and maturity of real estate loans made by national banks shall not apply to certain loans which are guaranteed or insured by a State or a State authority; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. MANSFIELD (for Mr. HENNINGS):

S. 1175. A bill for the relief of Zoe J. Bithos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ENGLE:

S. 1176. A bill to transfer to the free list of the Tariff Act of 1930 book bindings or covers imported by certain institutions; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. ROBERTSON (by request):

S. 1177. A bill to authorize adjustments in accounts of outstanding old series currency, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

(See the remarks of Mr. ROBERTSON when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. ROBERTSON (for himself and Mr. CAPEHART) (by request):

S. 1178. A bill to amend certain provisions of the Securities Act of 1933, as amended;

S. 1179. A bill to amend certain provisions of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, as amended;

S. 1180. A bill to amend certain provisions of the Trust Indenture Act of 1939, as amended;

S. 1181. A bill to amend certain provisions of the Investment Company Act of 1940, as amended; and

S. 1182. A bill to amend certain provisions of the Investment Advisers Act of 1940, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

(See the remarks of Mr. ROBERTSON when he introduced the above bills, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. DIRKSEN (by request):

S. 1183. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claims of Reynaldo Gubbins; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

S. 1184. A bill to extend the application of the Davis-Bacon Act to Federal contracts for the demolition of existing buildings; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. MAGNUSON (for himself and Mr. NEUBERGER):

S. 1185. A bill to provide for the preservation of historical and archeological data (including relics and specimens) which might otherwise be lost as the result of the construction of a dam; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BYRD of West Virginia (for himself and Mr. RANDOLPH):

S. 1186. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that full benefits thereunder (when based upon the attainment of retirement age) will be payable to both men and women at age 60; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. DIRKSEN (for Mr. BEALL):

S. 1187. A bill for the licensing of public adjusters in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

(See the remarks of Mr. DIRKSEN when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

S. 1188. A bill for the relief of Herman E. Tenzler, Ernest Gallo, and Julio R. Gallo; and

S. 1189. A bill for the relief of William Peck; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAGNUSON (for himself, Mr. ENGLE, Mr. JACKSON, Mr. NEUBERGER, and Mr. MORSE):

S. 1190. A bill to amend the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act, so as to provide that an injured employee shall have the right to select his own physician, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. SALTONSTALL:

S. 1191. A bill to amend and clarify the reemployment provisions of the Universal Military Training and Service Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

(See the remarks of Mr. SALTONSTALL when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. SALTONSTALL (by request):

S. 1192. A bill for the relief of Angela Maria Staia Labellarte; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SALTONSTALL (for himself and Mr. KENNEDY):

S. 1193. A bill for the relief of Eleanor Constan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ANDERSON (by request):

S. 1194. A bill to authorize appropriations for the Atomic Energy Commission in accordance with section 261 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

By Mr. HARTKE:

S. 1195. A bill to amend sections 522 and 545 of title 38, United States Code, to increase the income limitations applicable to the payment of pension for nonservice-connected disability or death to $1,800 and $3,000; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. HARTKE when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. NEUBERGER (for himself and Mr. ENGLE):

S. 1196. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to accord Korean war veterans equal naturalization privileges, and to authorize the Attorney General to admit certain aliens who have served in the Armed Forces of the United States for a period aggregating 5 years as permanent residents; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. NEUBERGER when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. ANDERSON:

S. 1197. A bill to amend the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

By Mr. CARLSON:

S. 1198. A bill to fix the compensation of the General Counsel of the Department of Commerce; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 1199. A bill to prevent discrimination in any public or semipublic place or by any public or semipublic transportation against members of the Armed Forces because of race, color, or creed; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHURCH:

S. 1200. A bill for the relief of Dr. Ernesto Deza, his wife, Mary Brillantes Deza, and their three children, Alfonso Deza, Edmundo Deza, and Zenaida Deza; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BENNETT:

S. 1201. A bill to provide for the establishment of a Soil and Water Conservation Laboratory; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

S. 1202. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to convey to the Metropolitan Water District of Salt Lake City, Utah, all right, title, and interest of the United States in certain lands located in Salt Lake County, Utah; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 1203. A bill for the relief of Joaquin Gil-Carrasco; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. BENNETT when he introduced the first above-mentioned bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. STENNIS:

S. 1204. A bill to provide for the establishment of a regional laboratory to conduct basic research for biological control of the boll weevil and other insect pests; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. FULBRIGHT:

S. 1205. A bill to amend the National Defense Education Act of 1958 in order to provide advanced training for teachers of foreign languages in the areas in which such languages are used; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. FULBRIGHT when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. ALLOTT (for himself, Mr. CARROLL, Mr. WILEY, Mr. MANSFIELD, Mr. CAPEHART, and Mr. LAUSCHE):

S.J. Res. 56. Joint resolution designating the carnation as the national flower of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JAVITS (for himself, Mr. CLARK, Mr. HENNINGS, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. LANGER, Mr. MORSE, Mr. NEUBERGER, and Mr. PROXMIRE):

S.J. Res. 57. Joint resolution to propose an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the jurisdiction of the Supreme Court; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. JAVITS when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. SYMINGTON:

S.J. Res. 58. Joint resolution to authorize the placing of suitable memorials by the American Battle Monuments Commission marking and commemorating the Spanish-American War of 1898; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. AIKEN (for himself, Mr. JAVITS, Mr. KEATING, Mr. MCNAMARA, Mr. PASTORE, and Mr. PROUTY):

S.J. Res. 59. Joint resolution requesting the President to issue a proclamation designating 1959 for the observance of the 350th anniversary of the historic voyages of Hudson and Champlain; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CASE of South Dakota:

S.J. Res. 60. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States granting representation in the House of Representatives and in the electoral college to the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. CASE of South Dakota when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. O'MAHONEY (for himself, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. CURTIS, and Mr. MORTON):

S.J. Res. 61. Joint resolution to amend Public Law 305 of the 85th Congress relating to the establishment of a commission to commemorate the 100th anniversary of the Civil War, to authorize the manufacture and sale of a Civil War Centennial Medal; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. O'MAHONEY when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

AMENDMENT OF SOCIAL SECURITY ACT, RELATING TO REMOVAL OF LIMITATION OF OUTSIDE INCOME

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I also introduce for appropriate reference a bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act so as to remove the limitation upon the amount of outside income which an individual may earn while receiving benefits thereunder.

I have felt for a long time that taking away a man's social security payment if he earns more than $100 a month on his own is wrong. Social security is supposed to be an insurance system, with premiums paid by employers and employees; a man should be free to earn what he can and wants to without having his social insurance payments affected at all. I trust that the House of Representatives and the Senate will take early and favorable action on this important measure.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1168) to amend title II of the Social Security Act as to remove the limitation upon the amount of outside income which an individual may earn while receiving benefits thereunder, introduced by Mr. KEATING, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

CREDIT FOR INCOME TAX PURPOSES OF SUBSCRIPTION CHARGES OR INSURANCE PREMIUMS

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to provide for the credit of subscription charges or insurance premiums with respect to health or medical service plans or programs, or health or medical insurance for the purposes of the Federal income tax.

Mr. President, no domestic problem is of greater importance to the well-being of our Nation than the health of its citizens. Unfortunately, we have not solved the problems of paying for medical care at anything like the rate at which we are solving the problems of improving medical care. I propose that we deal directly with the high cost of health by allowing a graduated credit against taxes due for the cost of any health insurance carried by the taxpayer. Under this tax incentive, health coverage could be extended to virtually the entire population in a relatively short span of time, with the greatest aid going to those who most need it. Moreover, the plan would completely avoid costly and dangerous Government control and direction and would in no way interfere with the traditional private doctor-patient relationship.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1169) to provide for the credit of subscription charges or insurance premiums with respect to health or medical service plans or programs, or health or medical insurance for the purposes of the Federal income tax, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. KEATING, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR CERTAIN FLOOD-CONTROL PROJECTS IN CONNECTICUT

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill making appropriations for certain flood-control projects in the State of Connecticut. I ask unanimous consent that a statement I have prepared with respect to the bill, be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1170) making appropriations for certain flood-control projects in the State of Connecticut, introduced by Mr. BUSH, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

The statement presented by Mr. BUSH is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR BUSH

I have introduced in the Senate today a bill which would appropriate $552,000 for the preparation of detailed plans and specifications for three urgently needed flood-control projects in Connecticut—the Hall Meadow Brook and East Branch dams and reservoirs at Torrington and the Mad River dam and reservoir at Winsted.

Torrington and Winsted were among the communities which suffered most severely in the flood disasters of 1955. They have expended large amounts of local funds for flood protection. The State of Connecticut has authorized a bond issue of $1,750,000 to meet the local costs required under the Army Corps of Engineers' plans for the three dams and reservoirs which were authorized by the 85th Congress.

In Torrington, the Federal Government has already spent substantial amounts of money on two small flood-protection projects undertaken under Public Law 685–84, the Bush-McCormack Act.

However, the progress already made in meeting the flood-protection needs of Torrington and Winsted may be nullified unless prompt action is taken to construct the three flood-control dams and reservoirs which are the key to the protective plans for these communities.

Fortunately, thus far we have been spared a recurrence of the 1955 floods, but no one dares predict how much longer another disaster may be avoided. The construction of the Torrington and Winsted projects must be undertaken as rapidly as possible to provide insurance against a repetition. If delayed, the local and Federal funds already spent are in danger of being wasted. Another flood similar to those of 1955 could wash away all the work already accomplished.

Moreover, justice to the people living in the areas which must be taken for the dams and reservoirs requires an end to the uncertainties which now confront them. The State of Connecticut has provided a source of funds to acquire the homes of these people and other needed real estate at fair market prices and thus enable them to plan their futures. But the properties cannot be acquired until the Corps of Engineers has produced detailed plans and specifications which will disclose the precise areas which must be taken.

I have been advised by Brig. Gen. J. L. Persons, Assistant Chief of Engineers for Civil Works, that this work can be accomplished in the coming fiscal year if Congress appropriates $150,000 for each of the two Torrington dams, and $252,000 for the Winsted project. The total, $552,000, may be found within the limits of the civil works budget submitted to the Congress by minor adjustments in other funds which I shall urge the Committee on Appropriations to make.

Once the detailed plans and specifications have been prepared, it will be possible to move forward rapidly to completion of these three projects which will add substantially to the flood protection for western Connecticut and the Naugatuck Valley.

Torrington, Winsted, and the State of Connecticut have responded to the flood protection needs of the people of those hard-hit communities. It is essential that the 86th Congress take prompt action to fulfill the Federal Government's obligation to do its part.

PREVENTION OF DISCRIMINATION BECAUSE OF AGE OF WORKERS IN DEFENSE INDUSTRIES AND GOVERNMENT CONTRACTS

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, the rigorously competitive climate of the cold war has served to warn the United States against unwise use or wastage of our valuable natural resources. It should similarly serve as a warning against the wastage of our valuable human resources.

It certainly makes no sense—with the fierce scientific, economic, and ideological conflicts of today—for America to let a vast reserve of national strength stand idle. Yet we are in effect wasting many trained minds and many pairs of experienced hands because of cruel employment practices which discriminate against men and women past the age of 40.

In addition to wasting a priceless resource, this discrimination on the basis of age is, to my mind, as reprehensible as discrimination based on racial or religious bigotry. A great deal of suffering and humiliation, as well as loss to our economy, has been caused by this discrimination.

It is for these reasons that I am introducing legislation today which would forbid "any supplier or contractor of our Government from imposing any requirement or limitation of maximum age with respect to the hiring or employment of persons."

The original idea for such legislation was submitted to me by the Fraternal Order of Eagles, which has championed this cause for a long period. The Eagles' jobs-over-40 crusade is one of the outstanding projects of this fine organization, of which I am proud to be a member of long standing.

My bill is identical to the bill I introduced on this subject in the 85th Congress. It is similar to legislation introduced earlier into this Congress by the distinguished senior Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS]. The proposals of the Senator from New York are sweeping and almost universal in their provisions. My bill would apply only to suppliers of the Government—firms which, in many cases, are already subject to special requirements with respect to hiring practices and other matters.

My proposal would still provide for the protection of the health and safety of our older workers. It recognizes regulations prescribed by the Secretary of Labor to protect workers in certain types of employment.

The problem of age discrimination is serious today, and it will become increasingly serious as the older portion of our population increases in proportion to the younger portion. I hope that these proposals, which deal with an extremely critical aspect of our modern American life, will receive careful consideration.

I am introducing this bill for myself and my able colleagues, the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the senior

Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the junior Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], the senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the senior Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the junior Senator from Colorado [Mr. CARROLL], the junior Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH], the junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE], and the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS].

I ask unanimous consent that the text of my bill appear in the RECORD following the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1172) to prohibit discrimination because of age in the hiring and employment of persons by Government contractors, introduced by Mr. NEUBERGER (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the first section of the Act entitled "An Act to provide conditions for the purchase of supplies and the making of contracts by the United States, and for other purposes," approved June 30, 1936, as amended (41 U.S.C. 35-45), is amended (1) by striking out "and" following the semicolon in subsection (d), (2) by striking out the period at the end of subsection (e) and inserting in lieu thereof "; and", and (3) by adding at the end thereof a new subsection as follows:

"(f) That the contractor will not expressly or in practice impose any requirement or limitation of maximum age with respect to the hiring or employment of persons, except such requirements or limitations, in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary of Labor, relating to specific jobs or types of employment as are reasonably designed to protect older workers from tasks which they could not ordinarily because of their age be expected to perform safely or efficiently."

ADJUSTMENTS IN ACCOUNTS OF OUTSTANDING OLD SERIES CURRENCY

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, at the request of the Secretary of the Treasury, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill entitled "To authorize adjustments in accounts of outstanding old series currency, and for other purposes."

The Treasury states that the bill would authorize deposit into the Treasury, as public debt receipts, of the reserves held as security against outstanding old series currency issues. The Treasury states that this would increase the balance in the general fund of the Treasury by about $100.4 million. Under the bill, any old series currency on presentation would be redeemed from the general cash in the Treasury.

The bill would also authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to reduce the amount of old series currency by reason of estimated destruction and total loss and would provide for a historical collection of paper currency issues.

I ask unanimous consent that a Treasury memorandum describing the bill be printed in the RECORD at this point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the memorandum will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1177) to authorize adjustments in accounts of outstanding old series currency, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. ROBERTSON, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

The memorandum presented by Mr. ROBERTSON is as follows:

TREASURY MEMORANDUM—RE DRAFT OF PROPOSED BILL TO AUTHORIZE ADJUSTMENTS IN ACCOUNTS OF OUTSTANDING OLD SERIES CURRENCY, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

The proposed legislation would provide (1) that certain outstanding currency issues be liquidated as such, and constituted a part of the outstanding debt bearing no interest, and (2) that the amount of each denomination of each kind of old large-size currency now outstanding that has been destroyed or irretrievably lost and so will never be presented for redemption, be determined and written off the Treasury statements and accounts.

Old large-size paper currency means any paper currency issued prior to July 1, 1929, and gold certificates issued subsequent to July 1, 1929, and prior to January 30, 1934. The Treasury and Federal Reserve System are carrying gold, silver, and other reserves against this old currency, a large portion of which, in all probability, has been destroyed while in circulation, and consequently, will never be presented for redemption. The adjustments authorized by the bill would free these reserves and permit the Treasury to obtain the benefit of their use for current purposes. The bill provides for the amount of this old currency which is outstanding to be carried as a part of the public debt bearing no interest, and any such old currency presented to the Treasury would be redeemed from the general cash in the Treasury and the amount of public debt outstanding would be correspondingly reduced. The proposal would have the effect of improving the Treasury's cash position by more than $100 million. This would consist of about $32 million in gold, which would increase the balance in the general fund of the Treasury, and more than $68 million additional cash, including about $37 million to be received from the Federal Reserve Banks on account of Federal Reserve notes. These adjustments would not constitute public debt subject to the debt limitation.

This approach to an adjustment of the old large-size currency accounts is along the line of the precedent established by law and regulations for the adjustment of discontinued national bank circulation and Federal Reserve Bank notes.

The bill would also authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to determine the amount of the old currency which, in his judgment, has been destroyed or irretrievably lost and so will not be presented for redemption, and to reduce accordingly the amount, or amounts, thereof outstanding on the records of the Treasury. Except for writeoffs of $8,375,934 in 1880 and $4,842,066.45 in 1920 of the fractional currency issued in the 1870's, the Treasury has never reduced its outstanding currency accounts for currency held in private ownership and destroyed by fires, floods, or in other ways. For example, about $1,100,000 of old Treasury notes of 1890, which have not been issued since 1893, are outstanding, and only about $25,000 of such notes have been presented for redemption in the last 18 years.

The proposed bill also contains a provision to permit the Treasury to withhold from destruction pieces of each currency issue to provide a historical collection of the paper currency of the United States.

There are enclosed a number of statistical statements relating to currency in circulation.

Enactment of this bill would benefit the Treasury without impairing in the least the redeemability of the old currency.

PROPOSED LEGISLATION RELATING TO SECURITIES AND INVESTMENTS

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], by request, I introduce, for appropriate reference, five bills relating to the field of securities and investments.

The first bill contains amendments to the Securities Act of 1933.

The second bill contains amendments to the Securities Exchange Act of 1934.

The third bill contains amendments to the Trust Indenture Act of 1939.

The fourth bill contains amendments to the Investment Company Act of 1940.

The fifth bill contains amendments to the Investment Advisers Act of 1940.

The Securities and Exchange Commission has forwarded along with these bills a statement on each of them which explains the need for each of the amendments in each bill. These statements are complete and extensive. I believe it would be desirable, for the benefit of the many people and firms in the affected industries and for the benefit of the bar associations and others having an interest in the matter, to publish in the RECORD at this point the statements submitted by the Securities and Exchange Commission. I therefore ask unanimous consent that these statements be printed in the RECORD at this point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bills will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the statements will be printed in the RECORD.

The bills, introduced by Mr. ROBERTSON (for himself and Mr. CAPEHART), by request, were received, read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, as follows:

S. 1178. A bill to amend certain provisions of the Securities Act of 1933, as amended.

The statement accompanying Senate bill 1178 is as follows:

AMENDMENTS TO THE SECURITIES ACT OF 1933

GENERAL OBJECTIVE OF STATUTE

The general objective of the Securities Act of 1933 is to protect the public and investors against malpractice in the securities and financial markets. The statute provides for full disclosure of pertinent business and financial facts concerning new securities offerings to the public, and provides civil and criminal remedies for fraudulent and deceptive practices in the sale of securities. The statute contains provisions for enforcement by the Commission through administrative and injunctive actions and for the referral of evidence indicating violations to

the Department of Justice for criminal prosecution.

WHAT THE BILL WILL DO

The amendments embodied in the bill are recommended by the Securities and Exchange Commission. A substantial number of the proposed amendments are designed to make the Commission's enforcement activities more effective by eliminating or minimizing various problems which have come to light in the course of Commission enforcement of the statute over the last several years. They do not alter the general purpose or effect of existing provisions. Some of the proposed amendments are designed simply to recognize changes that have taken place since the original adoption of the statute.

In brief, the proposed amendments would (1) clarify the jurisdictional basis of the civil liability provisions of the statute; (2) provide specific civil and criminal liability with respect to documents filed with the Commission pursuant to Commission rules in connection with exempt offerings; (3) make it clear that a showing of past violations is a sufficient basis for injunctive relief and that aiders and abettors may be responsible in civil and administrative proceedings; and (4) increase from $300,000 to $500,000 the size of offerings which may be exempted from registration under section 3(b) of the statute.

EXPLANATION BY SECTIONS

Section 1 would remove the obsolete reference in paragraph (5) of section 2 of the act to the Federal Trade Commission and substitute instead the Securities and Exchange Commission.

Section 2: Elimination of reference to the Philippine Islands and Alaska in the definition of "Territory."

Present law: Paragraph (6) of section 2 of the act defines the term "Territory" to include Alaska and the Philippine Islands.

Problem: The Philippine Islands are no longer a possession and Alaska is now a State.

Remedy in the bill: The amendment would delete the references.

Section 3: Increasing from $300,000 to $500,000 the size of offerings which may be exempted from registration under section 3(b).

Present law: Section 3(b) of the act provides that the Commission may by rule and regulation, and subject to such terms and conditions as may be prescribed, add any class of securities to the securities exempted by section 3(a) if the Commission finds that enforcement of the registration provisions of the act with respect to such securities "is not necessary in the public interest and for the protection of investors by reason of the small amount involved or the limited character of the public offering," provided no issue shall be exempted the aggregate offering price of which exceeds $300,000.

Problem: When the statute was enacted in 1933, the figure specified in this subsection was $100,000. This amount was increased to the present figure of $300,000 by an amendment in 1945. One of the important purposes of this action was to provide small business with relatively simpler access to needed capital.

The Commission has adopted various regulations governing the sale of securities within the prescribed limits. The most important of these is the general exemption provided by regulation A which is designed largely as a protection against fraud and which requires the use of an offering circular containing prescribed minimum disclosures of pertinent information about the business of the issuer. The requirements of the regulation can be met by filing with a regional office of the Commission a form of notification, copies of the offering circular and certain specified exhibits. The regulation further provides that the Commission may suspend the exemption by order for failure to comply with the regulation. The entire procedure provides a method, less expensive and time consuming than registrations, by which issuers seeking relatively small amounts of money may sell their securities in interstate commerce without complying with the registration requirements of the act.

On July 23, 1956, the Commission revised regulation A in various respects. Under the revision, the exemption is not available for offerings for the account of persons other than the issuer (sometimes called "bail outs") unless the issuer has had a net income from operations in at least 1 of the last 2 fiscal years. Securities issued to promoters, underwriters and others for property and services must be included in determining whether the offering is within the dollar limitation specified in section 3(b), unless appropriate arrangements are made (by escrow or otherwise) to keep these securities off the market for 12 months. Additional provisions make the exemption unavailable where promoters, management officials, large stockholders, or underwriters have a record of past securities violations.

With these changes in its exemptive rules, and a stepped-up enforcement program, the Commission is of the opinion that it has provided increased investor protection in the area of small and medium sized issues of securities without impeding the raising of equity and other capital by smaller business enterprises. In addition, the Commission, on August 16, 1956, established in the Division of Corporation Finance in Washington a new Branch of Small Issues which is responsible for supervising and coordinating the examination by the Commission's staff, both in Washington and in the Commission's Regional Offices, of filings under regulation A.

During the 85th Congress, a bill (H.R. 4744) was introduced which would have made the strict civil liabilities that pertain to persons associated with an offering under full registration applicable to persons associated with an offering under the Commission's exemptive regulations. The Commission opposed this bill on the ground that it would in substance require the equivalent of full registration for small issues and that this would have the indirect effect of repealing the exemption. Another bill (H.R. 173), which would have enlarged the civil liabilities in connection with exempt offerings but which would not have gone to the lengths of H.R. 4744, was supported by the Commission and is included in this proposal as an amendment to section 12(b) of the act, discussed below. Neither of these proposals was enacted. It may be that Congress will give consideration to revising these civil liability provisions, quite apart from any determination that may be made regarding the appropriate maximum size of offerings that may be exempted under section 3(b).

Remedy in the bill: In order to facilitate access to the public capital markets by more small and medium-sized firms, it is proposed that the exemptive limit be raised to $500,000.

In the 85th Congress, the Committee on Banking and Currency, U.S. Senate, reported favorably S. 2299 (Report No. 438) which provided for increasing the exemptive limit of section 3(b) to $500,000.

Section 4 would change the reference in section 9(a) to the United States Code to reflect modifications made in the numbering of its pertinent provisions.

Section 5: Clarification of jurisdictional standards for, and expansion of basis of, civil liabilities.

Present law: Existing action 12(2) provides for civil liability on the part of any person who offers or sells a security by means of a prospectus or oral communication which includes a misleading statement of a material fact or which is misleading because of failure to state a material fact.

Problem: (1) The question arises under the present section whether, in order for liability to attach, the mails or interstate facilities must be used in making the misrepresentation or whether the use of mails or interstate facilities in other aspects of the transaction is sufficient to create liability. There is a split on this question between the courts of appeal of the Second and the Fifth Circuits, on the one hand, and the Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit on the other. In the Second Circuit, in *Schiller* v. *H. Vaughan, Clarke & Co.*, 134 F. 2d 875 (1943), the statute was construed so that delivery of securities through the mails was a sufficient use of the mails to create liability. A similar result was reached in the Fifth Circuit in *Blackwell* v. *Bentsen*, 203 F. 2d 690 (C.A. 5, 1953), cert. dismissed, 347 U.S. 925 (1954). In the Seventh Circuit in *Kemper* v. *Lohnes*, 173 F. 2d 44 (1949), the court held that in order to create liability under this statute, the misrepresentation complained of must have been transmitted through the mails or interstate facilities.

(2) As presently enacted, section 11 of the act provides civil liabilities on the part of the issuer, directors, principal officers, underwriters, and certain other persons in the event of false or misleading statements or omissions in a registration statement, and section 12(2) contains provisions imposing civil liability on sellers which are applicable to the offer and sale of securities generally, whether they are registered or not. Under section 12(2), "any person who * * * offers or sells" a security by false or misleading statements is liable (subject to certain defenses) "to the person purchasing such security from him." Where an issuer, or person in control of an issuer, sells to a dealer for public distribution and the dealer in turn sells to an investor, for example, it has been urged that the investor, in bringing an action under section 12(2), cannot go beyond his immediate seller (the dealer) and recover from the issuer—which may be the person actually responsible for the false or misleading information used in the sale. Moreover, if the dealer or the issuer is an insolvent corporation, for example, so that adequate recovery cannot be obtained from it, the investor cannot necessarily recover directly from the individuals actually responsible for the false or misleading statements. Section 15 provides for the imposition of liability on certain controlling persons, but not on other individuals.

Persons who sign a document filed with the Commission in connection with any offering containing an untrue statement or material omission, any person who makes or causes to be made such untrue statement or material omission, every controlling person and the issuer should be civilly liable to any person (not knowing of such untruth or omission) who receives or is shown a copy of the statement or document in connection with a purchase of such securities, or who relies directly or indirectly on such untrue statement or omission in connection with such purchase. As to the issues, there should be no defense or lack of knowledge of any untruth or omission in a document filed with the Commission. On the other hand, liability for false or misleading statements in an exempted offering should not be imposed on any officer, director, or other individual associated with the offering if he sustains the burden of proof that he acted in good faith and did not know of the untruth or omission on which the action is based. Thus, directors and other individuals should not be liable except for actual misconduct or bad faith, but the issuing corporation should be absolutely liable for any false or misleading statements, even if innocently made.

Remedy in the bill: (1) It is proposed that the jurisdictional language be separately stated so as to make it clear that the section would be applicable if there was any use of the mails or interstate facilities. This would conform the jurisdictional requirements to those contained in section 17(a), which provides the basis for injunctive and criminal actions.

(2) It is proposed that a new section 12(b) be added to the statute to provide clear civil liability on the part of those responsible for untrue statements of material facts or omissions to state material facts in any statement or document filed with the Commission in connection with an offering pursuant to an exemption under section 3(b) or section 3(c). Because of the proposed addition of section 12(b), the existing section 12 is to be designated section 12(a).

Section 6 would amend section 13 the "statute of limitations" for actions for civil recovery, to cover the proposed amendment to section 12 of the act.

Sections 7 and 8: Implementation of provisions relating to the enjoining of violation of, and enforcing compliance with, the act.

Present law: Section 20(b) now provides that the Commission may obtain an injunction when it appears that any person is engaged or about to engage in any acts or practices which constitute or will consitute a violation of the act or any rule or regulation. Section 20(c) now provides for appropriate courts, upon application by the Commission, to issue writs of mandamus commanding any person to comply with the provisions of the act or any order of the Commission made in pursuance thereof.

Problem: (1) Cases frequently arise after the act has been violated. While past violations are considered a sufficient basis for an injunction by the courts since they indicate the possibility of future violation, it would aid the Commission in its enforcement of the act if it were expressly stated that a past violation is a basis for an injunction, even though the violation may have been discontinued, as often occurs when the Commission discovers them. This change would conform the provisions of the act to the provisions of the Investment Company Act of 1940 and the Investment Advisers Act of 1940. Any injunctive relief is subject to the general discretionary powers of a court of equity and therefore not every violation would be a basis for an injunction.

(2) The reference to mandamus contained in section 20(c) should be eliminated in view of the fact that the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure have abolished the writ as a separate and distinct type of action and provide that the same relief may be obtained by an appropriate order.

Remedy in the bill: (1) It is proposed that this section be amended so as to authorize an injunction also on a showing that a defendant has engaged in acts constituting a violation.

(2) It is proposed to repeal section 20(c) dealing with writs of mandamus and provide a comparable remedy in section 20(b).

Section 9 would amend section 22(a) of the act by changing the references in that section to the United States Code to reflect modification made in the renumbering of its pertinent provisions.

Section 10: Expanding the coverage of prohibitions against the filing of false or misleading material with the Commission.

Present law: Section 24 now makes it a criminal offense for any person willfully in a registration statement filed under the act to make any untrue statement of a material fact or to omit to state any material fact required to be stated therein or necessary to make the statements therein not misleading.

Problem: There is at present no section of the act which makes it unlawful willfully to file false or misleading applications, reports or documents, other than a registration statement.

Remedy in the bill: It is proposed that section 24 be amended to apply not only to a registration statement but to any application, report, or other document filed under the act. Thus, for example, under this amendment the criminal responsibility for false or misleading offering circulars and other documents filed pursuant to the Commission's exemptive regulations promulgated under section 3(b) or section 3(c) would be the same as now exists in the case of registration statements.

Section 11: Addition of provisions relating to prohibited activities.

Present law: None.

Problem: There exists no provision of the act expressly prohibiting any person, indirectly or through any other person, from violating the act or any rule or regulation thereunder. Furthermore, the statute should contain an explicit provision that aiders and abettors may be liable in civil and administrative proceedings.

Remedy in the bill: The proposed amendment would prohibit persons from doing indirectly acts which they are prohibited from doing directly and makes it unlawful for any person to aid, abet, or procure a violation by another person, removing any doubt that aiders and abettors may be liable in civil administrative proceedings. The provision does not in any manner constitute a limitation with respect to the applicability in criminal proceedings of section 2, title 18, United States Code.

S. 1179. A bill to amend certain provisions of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, as amended.

The statement accompanying Senate bill 1179 is as follows:

AMENDMENTS TO SECURITIES EXCHANGE ACT OF 1934

GENERAL OBJECTIVE OF STATUTE

The general objective of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 is to protect the public and investors against malpractices in the securities and financial markets. The statute provides for disclosure of information concerning securities listed on exchanges and for the regulation of trading in securities on exchanges and in over-the-counter markets. The statute contains provisions for enforcement by the Commission through administrative and injunctive actions and for the referral of information concerning violations to the Department of Justice for criminal prosecution.

WHAT THE BILL WILL DO

The amendments embodies in the bill are recommended by the Securities and Exchange Commission. A substantial number of the proposed amendments are designed to make the Commission's enforcement activities more effective by providing additional remedies and eliminating or minimizing various problems which have come to light in the course of Commission enforcement over the past several years. Some of the proposed amendments are designed simply to recognize changes that have taken place since the original adoption of the statute.

In brief, the more significant of the proposed amendments would (1) clarify and strengthen the statutory provisions relating to manipulation and to the financial responsibility of brokers and dealers; (2) authorize the Commission by rule to regulate the borrowing, holding, or lending of customers' securities by a broker or dealer; (3) make it clear that attempts to purchase or sell securities are covered by the antifraud provisions of the statute; (4) revise the provisions relating to broker and dealer registration with respect to (a) the basis on which action for denial or revocation may be taken, (b) the sanctions which may be imposed by the Commission, (c) the conditions under which an application for registration may be withdrawn, and (d) the postponement of the effectiveness of an application for registration; (5) prohibit trading in a security in the over-the-counter market for limited periods where the public interest and the protection of investors so requires; (6) clarify the Commission's authority to suspend a security from exchange trading where there has been a failure to comply with the act and where otherwise necessary in the public interest; (7) authorize the Commission to suspend or withdraw the registration of a securities exchange when the exchange has ceased to meet the requirements for original registration; (8) implement the injunctive provisions of the statute and make it clear that a showing of past violations is a sufficient basis for injunctive relief and also that aiders and abettors may be responsible in civil and administrative proceedings; (9) provide that an insolvent broker or dealer may be adjudicated a bankrupt in an injunctive proceeding instituted by the Commission; (10) make it a violation of this act to embezzle moneys or securities entrusted to the care of an exchange member or a registered broker or dealer; and (11) provide for a forfeiture of $100 for each day that any report required under the act is delinquent.

The provisions of each section are explained more fully below.

EXPLANATION BY SECTIONS

Section 1: Modification of definition of term "member" of an exchange.

Present law: Section 3(a)(3) of the act defines the term "member" of an exchange and expressly includes each partner of a member firm but does not include officers and directors of a member corporation.

Problem: Since national securities exchanges now provide for corporate memberships, the Commission believes that officers and directors of a member corporation should be required to meet the same standards and be subject to the same sanctions as partners of a member firm.

Remedy in the bill: To accomplish the foregoing result, it is proposed to amend the definition of the term "member" to include any officer or director of any member firm, organization, or corporation. Since stockholders of corporate members are not included within the definition of "member" it is also proposed to exclude limited partners from the definition.

Section 2: Elimination of references to the Philippine Islands and Alaska in the definition of "State."

Present law: Section 3 (a)(16) of the act defines the term "State" to include any State of the United States and in addition, among others, the Philippine Islands and Alaska.

Problem: The Philippine Islands are no longer a possession and Alaska is now a State.

Remedy in the bill: The amendment would delete these references.

Section 3: Extension of time in which Commission may grant or deny application for registration of an exchange.

Present law: Section 6 of the act provides for the registration of securities exchanges. It requires the applicant exchange to file certain agreements and certain information, and it further provides, as a condition to registration, that it must appear to the Commission that the exchange is so organized as to be able to comply with the act and the Commission's rules thereunder and that the rules of the exchange are just and adequate to insure fair dealing and to protect investors. Subsection (e) provides that the Commission shall enter an order either granting or denying registration within 30 days after the application is filed. Denial of registration must be preceded by "appropriate notice and opportunity for hearing."

Problem: The requirement that an order denying registration of an exchange must be entered within 30 days after the application is filed has created serious administrative difficulties. It has meant that within that 30-day period the Commission must examine the application to determine whether the rules of the exchange meet the statutory standards, conduct an investigation, order a hearing (allowing adequate notice), conduct a hearing, review the record, and enter an order, all in accordance with the Administrative Procedure Act; and it must also prepare an opinion where this is appropriate.

Remedy in the bill: It is proposed to amend subsection (e) of section 6 to change from 30 to 90 days the period within which the Commission's order granting or denying registration must be entered.

Section 4: Clarification and extension of coverage under margin requirements.

Present law: Section 7(c), which deals with the extension of credit on securities, now applies only to members of a national securities exchange and to brokers and dealers who transact a business in securities through the medium of any such member.

Problem: Under section 15 of the act, brokers and dealers in the over-the-counter market must register as a condition to using the mails and facilities of interstate commerce. Most registered over-the-counter brokers and dealers do some business through the medium of exchange members. Technical questions have arisen as to how much business must be transacted in order to constitute transacting a business in securities through the medium of an exchange member.

Remedy in the bill: In order to obviate the question, it is proposed to amend section 7(c) so that these sections will also apply to registered brokers and dealers.

As noted below, this same problem is also presented by the provisions of sections 8, 11(d) and 14(b) of the statute and a comparable amendment is proposed.

Section 5: To meet the problem discussed under section 4 above, it is proposed to make section 8 of the act, dealing with financial responsibility, applicable to registered brokers and dealers.

Section 6: Integration and expansion of coverage under financial responsibility requirements.

Present law: Section 8(b) is intended to require a broker to limit his "aggregate indebtedness" so that it will not exceed 2000 percent of his "net capital" or such lesser figure as may be prescribed by rules of the Commission.

Under section 15(c)(3) of the statute the Commission has general rulemaking power to provide safeguards with respect to the financial responsibility of over-the-counter brokers and dealers. Pursuant to this section the Commission has adopted rule 15c3–1 (17 CFR 240.15c3–1), which has the same purpose as section 8(b) but which specifies in detail what is to be included in the concepts of "aggregate indebtedness" and "net capital."

Problem: Section 8(b) is ambiguous and not effective as it stands. It takes into account aggregate indebtedness arising only in the ordinary course of business as a broker (not dealer), and some question has been raised as to the scope of the Commission's rulemaking power under this section.

Even rule 15c3–1 is not fully adequate because section 15(c)(3) is applicable only when the broker or dealer is effecting, inducing or attempting to induce a transaction in the over-the-counter market. The rule cannot be made applicable when a broker or dealer effects a transaction on a national securities exchange.

Remedy to the bill: It is proposed to transfer to section 8(b) the provision relating to the financial responsibility of brokers and dealers which now appears in section 15(c)(3) of the act, so that regulations under the new section could be applicable no matter where the transaction is effected.

The Commission's rule 15c3–1 now exempts the members of all exchanges whose rules have been found by the Commission to impose requirements more comprehensive than the Commission's requirements, and no change in this regard is contemplated.

Section 7: Tightening of the provisions relating to the handling of customers' securities.

Present law: Section 8(d) makes it unlawful for a member, broker or dealer to lend a customer's security without the written consent of such customer.

Problem: Section 8(d) does not provide for the segregation of customers' fully paid securities or excess collateral. Some stock exchanges have rules which require members to segregate customers' fully paid securities and excess collateral, but they do not apply to brokers or dealers who are not members of such exchanges.

Remedy in the bill: It is proposed to amend section 8(d) so as to make it unlawful for members, brokers, and dealers to borrow, lend, or hold customers' securities in contravention of rules and regulations prescribed by the Commission to provide safeguards with respect to securities carried for the accounts of customers.

Section 8: Tighten antimanipulation provisions relating to "matched orders."

Present law: Section 9(a) deals with the manipulation of the prices of securities which are registered on national securities exchanges. Clauses (B) and (C) of section 9(a)(1) prohibit manipulation by the use of what are commonly known as matched orders.

Problem: Section 9(a)(1) is designed to prohibit manipulation by arrangements, perhaps among confederates or coconspirators, to enter, buy, and sell orders at substantially the same time for the purpose of creating a false appearance of activity and influencing the price. In order to come within the prohibition, however, the section now requires that the orders must be of substantially the same size, entered at substantially the same time, and at substantially the same price. In *Wright* v. *SEC*, 112 F. 2d 89 (C.A. 2, 1940), the Court gave a restrictive interpretation to the phrase "of substantially the same size," which has precluded subsequent reliance on the statutory prohibitions against manipulation by "matched orders." In view of the fact that stock exchange rules and practices normally result in orders being executed in 100-share lots, the overall size of the buy and sell orders placed by a manipulator at a given time does not determine the effectiveness or misleading character of the manipulation by "matched orders."

Remedy in the bill: It is proposed to delete the phrase "of substantially the same size," without changing the other requirements of section 9(a)(1), including the requirement that activity, in order to constitute a violation, must be for the purpose of creating a false or misleading appearance of active trading in the security or a false or misleading appearance with respect to its market.

Section 9: Tighten general antimanipulation provisions and those relating to stabilization.

Present law: Section 9(a)(2) contains the more general antimanipulative provisions of the section. Section 9(a)(6) authorizes the Commission by rule to regulate the related problem of stabilization of securities.

Problem: As they stand, each of these subsections now requires proof of a "series of transactions." The more detailed rules of the Commission with reference to manipulation and stabilization which have been adopted pursuant to the general antifraud and antimanipulative provisions of the act in section 10(b) apply to individual manipulative or stabilizing transactions, without requiring proof of a series of such transactions. Experience has shown that, where the price at which a large distribution of securities is going to be made is keyed to the market price existing at the commencement of the distribution, as is commonly the case, even one manipulative transaction can affect the overall price paid by the public and received by the distributors by many thousands of dollars.

Remedy in the bill: It is proposed to make sections 9(a)(2) and 9(a)(6) applicable where one or more manipulative or stabilizing transactions is effected. The proposal merely involves the codification in the statute of a principle already in effect under the Commission's rules relating to manipulation and stabilization.

Section 10: Clarification of general antifraud provisions.

Present law: Section 10 contains prohibitions against effecting short sales and against engaging in manipulative or deceptive activities in the purchase or sale of securities, in contravention of Commission rules. Subsection (b) now applies to manipulative or deceptive activities "in connection with the purchase or sale of any security."

Problem: The statute should be amended to make it entirely clear (1) that section 10(b) covers the so-called front money racket, that is, obtaining money from an issuer for alleged services in arranging an underwriting or financing for the issuer, without actually intending to or being in a position to arrange the proposed underwriting or financing, and (2) that the section reaches manipulative and deceptive activities in connection with attempts to buy or sell securities as well as in connection with consummated transactions.

Remedy in the bill: It is proposed to make section 10(b) also applicable to manipulative activities an connection with "any attempt to purchase or sell, any security."

Section 11: Extending coverage of prohibitions relating to extension of credits by members, brokers and dealers on new security issues and of requirements for disclosure of capacity.

Present law: Section 11(d) of the act prohibits a person who is a broker and a dealer (1) from extending credit to a customer on any security which is part of a new issue where, within 30 days, he participated in the distribution of such issue as a member of a selling syndicate or group, and (2) from effecting a transaction with a customer unless he discloses the capacity in which he is acting.

Problem: The requirement that the prohibition against credit extension be applicable only to persons engaged in business both as a broker and a dealer was written into section 11 because it appeared that the combination of the broker and dealer functions in the same person made it possible for a dealer who has undertaken to distribute securities to the public to induce his brokerage customers to buy the securities by offering to extend credit on them; see House Report No. 1383, April 27, 1934, to accompany H.R. 9323, 73d Congress, 2d session, page 22. At that time the Congress contemplated the possibility of complete segregation of the broker and dealer functions and directed the Commission, in subsection (e), to make a study of the problem.

In 1936 the Commission submitted its report to the Congress on "The Feasibility and Advisability of the Complete Segregation of the Functions of Dealer and Broker," in which it advised against a requirement of complete segregation of such functions. Separation of functions no longer appears to be pertinent to the problem of extension of credit on new issues of securities.

Remedy in the bill: It is proposed in the amended section to make such section applicable to members, dealers, and brokers whether or not they combine the two functions.

Section 12: To meet the problem discussed under section 4 above, it is proposed to make section 14(b) of the act, dealing with the giving of proxies in respect of customers' securities, applicable to registered brokers and dealers.

Section 13: Tightening provisions relating to denial or revocation of registration of brokers and dealers.

Present law: In general, section 15(b) of the act provides for the registration of brokers and dealers and for the denial, revocation, withdrawal, and cancellation of such registration.

The fourth paragraph of section 15(b) provides that the Commission shall, after appropriate notice and opportunity for hearing, deny or revoke the registration of any broker or dealer if it finds that such denial or revocation is in the public interest and that such broker or dealer, or any person directly or indirectly controlling or controlled by such broker or dealer, is subject to certain specified disqualifications. Procedurally it also provides among other things, that pending final determination whether any registration shall be denied, the Commission may by order postpone the effective date of registration for a period not to exceed 15 days, but if, after appropriate notice and opportunity for hearing, it appears to the Commission to be necessary or appropriate in the public interest or for the protection of investors to postpone the effective date of registration until final determination, the Commission shall so order.

The disqualifications which are the basis for denial or revocation of registration are contained in clauses (A) to (D) inclusive. Clause (B) sets out a disqualification consisting of conviction within 10 years of a felony or misdemeanor involving the purchase or sale of any security or arising out of the conduct of the business of a broker or dealer. Clause (C) makes certain injunctions a basis for denial or revocation. Clause (D) provides a disqualification for willful violations of the Securities Act of 1933 and the Securities Exchange Act of 1934.

Problem: (1) Persons convicted of certain crimes not now covered in clause (B) should also be ineligible for registration when the Commission finds it is in the public interest to deny or revoke registration. Clause (B) should, consequently, be broadened.

Remedy in the bill: (1) It is proposed that clause (B) be amended so that conviction of any felony or misdemeanor which the Commission finds arises out of the conduct of the business of an investment adviser, or involves embezzlement, fraudulent conversion or misappropriation of funds, securities or other property, or involves a violation of the Mail Fraud Statute, shall also be a basis for denial, suspension, or revocation of registration.

Problem: (2) An injunction arising out of the conduct of business of a broker or dealer or an investment adviser, which is not now covered by clause (C), should also constitute a disqualification, so that the Commission can determine whether it is in the public interest for the person involved to be permitted to engage, or continue, in the securities business.

Remedy in the bill: (2) It is recommended that clause (C) be expanded so that it includes an injunction arising out of the conduct of the business of a broker, dealer or investment adviser.

Problem: (3) Clause (D) does not provide a disqualification when the Commission finds that there has been a willful violation of the Investment Advisers Act of 1940. The Commission, here too, should be permitted to determine whether such a violator may consistent with the public interest engage in the securities business.

Remedy in the bill: (3) It is proposed that clause (D) be amended to provide that willful violation of the Investment Advisers Act of 1940, or any rule or regulation adopted thereunder, also constitutes a basis for denial, suspension or revocation of registration.

Problem: (4) Section 15(b) provides only one ultimate sanction in connection with an effective registration, namely, revocation. When, in the Commission's opinion, this sanction is too drastic, the Commission should be authorized to impose the sanction of suspension. Section 15(b) now provides for suspension but only pending final determination in certain situations. Sections 15A(1), (2) and 19(a)(3) authorize the Commission to impose a sanction of suspension (as an alternative to expulsion) upon a member of a registered securities association or national securities exchange under certain conditions. It is believed that if a similar flexibility in the imposition of sanctions is provided for in section 15(b) the purposes and provisions of the section could be more effectively enforced.

Remedy in the bill: (4) It is proposed that section 15(b) be amended to give the Commission authority to impose a sanction of suspension where it believes that the more drastic sanction of revocation of registration is not necessary.

Problem: (5) The present provision with respect to the temporary postponement of effectiveness of a registration when the Commission proposes to institute proceedings to determine whether to deny registration has proved administratively unworkable. Under the statute an application for registration becomes effective 30 days after filing, and the Commission may postpone effectiveness an additional 15 days. Where the Commission has instituted a denial proceedings it may postpone effectiveness until final determination only after hearing. Consequently when the Commission institutes a denial proceeding it now can postpone effectiveness until final determination only if, within 45 days after the filing of the application, it issues a notice and order for hearing, conducts the hearing, reviews the record, and issues its order of postponement. It frequently becomes a practical impossibility to give adequate notice of the hearing, conduct the hearing, review the record, and enter an order within this limited period. Furthermore, if such an effort were undertaken it would ordinarily be necessary to duplicate the conduct of hearings and the taking of evidence on both the postponement question and the ultimate denial question.

Remedy in the bill: (5) It is proposed to amend section 15(b) to authorize the Commission to extend from 15 to 90 days the period during which it can postpone the effective date of registration. In a period of this length, the Commission could ordinarily conduct its proceeding to determine whether registration should be denied.

Problem: (6) Section 15(b) authorizes the Commission to subject withdrawal of registration to terms and conditions deemed necessary in the public interest or for the protection of investors, but does not provide the conditions under which an application for registration may be withdrawn.

Remedy in the bill: (6) It is proposed to amend section 15(b) to codify the existing administrative practice by providing that an application for registration may be withdrawn only with the consent of the Commission if the request to withdraw the application is received by the Commission after it has commenced a proceeding to deny registration. Aside from the wasted administrative energies and expense that might be involved if withdrawal of an application for registration were allowed after a proceeding is begun, it is usually important to complete the proceeding and make a determination as to whether a statutory disqualification exists because it may be impossible at a later date, when a new application is filed, to obtain the witnesses or evidence to establish the disqualification.

Section 14: Prohibition against over-the-counter trading in a "when issued" or "when distributed" basis in contravention of the Commission's rules.

Present law: Section 12(d) gives the Commission authority to deal by rule with the problems of so-called when-issued trading on a national securities exchange (trading in a security prior to its issuance under contracts providing for delivery and settlement "when, as and if" the security is issued).

Problem: This provision does not apply to trading over-the-counter.

Remedy in the bill: It is proposed that the Commission be given express rule-making authority with respect to "when issued" and "when distributed" trading in the over-the-counter markets. This would be done in a new section 15(c)(3).

The present section 15(c)(3), which relates to the financial responsibility of brokers and dealers, would no longer be necessary as a separate provision since it is now proposed to deal with that subject matter in section 8(b), as explained earlier.

Section 15: Extension of the Commission's authority to suspend trading to the over-the-counter markets.

Present law: Section 19(a)(4) authorizes the Commission, under certain stated conditions, summarily to suspend trading, for specified periods, in any security registered on a national securities exchange.

Problem: Section 19(a)(4) applies only to trading on a national exchange and the Commission has no comparable statutory power as to securities traded only in the over-the-counter market.

Remedy in the bill: It is proposed to add a new section 15(c)(4) which will grant the Commission authority summarily to suspend trading in a security in over-the-counter markets similar to the authority to suspend trading on an exchange granted in the proposed amendment to section 19(a)(4). See section 20 below.

Section 16: Addition of express provisions relating to jurisdiction to determine responsibility for violations in administrative proceedings.

Present law: Section 15A(b)(4) now provides, in general, that a person who was the cause of the entry of an order of suspension, expulsion, denial, or revocation, against a broker or dealer, shall be ineligible for membership in a national securities association, and shall be barred from employment by such a member in certain capacities, unless the Commission otherwise directs, in the public interest.

Problem: The statute is silent as to when, how, and by whom this determination of causation is to be made, and the decision in *Wallach* v. *S.E.C.*, 202 F. 2d 462 (C.A. D.C. 1953), has raised some doubt as to the proper course to be followed in determining this issue.

Remedy in the bill: It is proposed to provide expressly in section 15A(b)(4) that the Commission, or the association or exchange entering the order in question, shall have jurisdiction to determine who was a cause of its order, and to provide for appropriate notice and hearing on the question of causation.

Section 17: Provision for review by the Commission of action by a national securities exchange against registered representatives.

Present law: None.

Problem: Sections 15A(g) and (h) provide for review by the Commission of disciplinary action taken by a national securities association against its members and of denial of membership in such association. The Na-

tional Association of Securities Dealers, Inc., the only national securities association, has provided in its rules, adopted pursuant to section 15A of the statute, for the registration with it as "registered representatives" of certain individuals employed by or associated with its members. Where the association takes disciplinary action against both a member and one or more of its registered representatives, its action may now be reviewed by the Commission under subsections (g) and (h) of section 15A. Because there is no provision in the act for review of disciplinary proceedings against registered representatives, there is serious question whether the association can take action against registered representatives without joining a member.

Remedy in the bill: It is proposed to add a new section 15A(o) to afford registered representatives full rights of review in all cases, whether or not related action is taken against a member.

Section 18: Expansion of the Commission's authority to suspend or withdraw the registration of a national exchange.

Present law: Under section 6 of the act the registration of a national securities exchange may be granted only if its rules contain specified provisions, it is so organized as to be able to comply with the act and the Commission's rules thereunder, and the rules of the exchange are just and adequate to insure fair dealing and to protect investors. Section 19(a)(1) of the act authorizes the Commission to suspend or withdraw the registration of a national securities exchange for violation of the act or the Commission's rules thereunder, or for failure of the exchange to enforce compliance therewith by a member or by an issuer of a security registered thereon.

Problem: The Commission is not, but should be, authorized to suspend or withdraw the registration of a national exchange if the exchange has ceased to meet the requirements for original registration, viz., if the exchange is no longer so organized as to be able to comply with the provisions of the Securities Exchange Act and the rules and regulations thereunder, or if the rules of the exchange are not just and adequate to insure fair dealing to protect investors.

Remedy in the bill: It is recommended that section 19(a)(1) be expanded so that the Commission would be authorized, after appropriate notice and opportunity for hearing, to suspend or withdraw the registration of a national securities exchange when the exchange has ceased to meet the requirements for original registration.

Sections 19 and 20: Expansion and clarification of the Commission's authority to suspend trading in any registered security on a national securities exchange.

Present law: Section 19(a)(2), which empowers the Commission, after opportunity for hearing, to deny, suspend or withdraw the registration of a security on a national exchange, does not authorize the Commission to suspend trading in a security which still retains its registered status. Section 19(a)(4) authorizes the Commission, under stated circumstances, summarily to suspend trading on a national exchange in any registered security for a period not exceeding 10 days, or, with the approval of the President, summarily to suspend all trading on any national exchange for a period not exceeding 90 days.

Problems: (1) During the pendency of proceedings under section 19(a)(2) to determine whether to deny, suspend, or withdraw the registration of a security on a national exchange the Commission has exercised its summary power to suspend trading under section 19(a)(4). Since this power to suspend is limited to a period of 10 days, the Commission has followed the practice of issuing a series of consecutive orders under section 19(a)(4); but this practice has required a new determination every 10 days of the necessity of continuing the suspension under the standards of that section. Such periodic review and series of orders should be unnecessary to suspend trading during the course of a proceeding under section 19(a)(2).

(2) Generally, the power under section 19(a)(4) summarily to suspend trading in a particular security has been exercised where sudden changes of circumstances make it appear that the information available to the public about a security is misleading or inadequate to permit investors to make an informed judgment with respect to the purchase or sale of the security, so that there is a possibility for fraud, and it appears that the additional necessary information can be obtained and made available to investors. Sometimes the necessary information cannot be obtained and made available in the 10-day period, and the Commission has had to renew the suspension for one or more additional periods not exceeding 10 days. However section 19(a)(4) does not expressly provide such authority.

Remedy in the bill:

(1) The proposed amendment to section 19(a)(2) would eliminate the necessity of resorting to a series of successive 10-day suspensions under section 19(a)(4) during the pendency of a proceeding under section 19(a)(2) and would empower the Commission temporarily to suspend trading in a security pending determination of a proceeding under section 19(a)(2).

(2) The proposed amendment to section 19(a)(4) would codify the Commission's interpretation that it has the power to renew temporary suspensions for one or more additional periods not exceeding 10 days each.

Section 21 would amend the caption of section 20 of the act.

Section 22: Clarification of provisions relating to prohibited activities.

Present law: Section 20(b) makes it unlawful for any person, directly or indirectly, to do any act or thing which it would be unlawful for such person to do under the provisions of the act or the rules and regulations thereunder through or by means of any other person.

Problem: Section 20(b) is ambiguous, and there may exist some doubt as to the Commission's authority to obtain an injunction, or impose administrative sanctions, against persons aiding or abetting violations of the act.

Remedy in the bill: The proposed amendment would remove the ambiguity and specifically provide that it is unlawful for any person to aid, abet, counsel, command, induce, or procure any violation of the act or rule or regulation thereunder by any other person.

Section 23: Clarification of the Commission's authority to conduct investigations.

Present law: Section 21(a) authorizes the Commission to conduct investigations to determine whether any person "has violated or is about to violate" any provision of the act, or any rule or regulation thereunder.

Problem: Section 21(a) does not specifically provide for an investigation to determine whether any person "is violating" the act or any rule or regulation thereunder, although the section obviously encompasses an inquiry for the purpose.

Remedy in the bill: The proposed amendment would add the phrase "is violating" to section 21(a).

Section 24: Implementation of provisions relating to the enjoining of violations, and enforcing of compliance with the act.

Present law: Section 21(e) authorizes the Commission to institute a judicial action to enjoin violations upon a showing that any person "is engaged or about to engage" in unlawful activities. Section 21(f) provides for the issuance of writs of mandamus commanding any person to comply with the act.

Problem: As pointed out, in connection with section 20 of the Securities Act of 1933, clarification is necessary in connection with past violations as a basis for injunctions.

The reference to mandamus contained in section 21(f) should be eliminated in view of the fact that the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure have abolished the writ as a separate and distinct type of action, and provision for mandatory relief by an appropriate order should be included in the injunctive provisions of the statute; that is, section 21(e).

Remedy in the bill: The proposed amendment would add in section 21(e) the phrase "has engaged" to insure that an injunction may be obtained in an appropriate case, and add a provision giving the Commission authority to seek enforcement of compliance with the act or any rule and regulation or Commission order thereunder.

Section 25: Addition of provisions for appointment of receiver and the application of Federal Bankruptcy Act.

Present law: Where the Commission institutes an injunctive action against an insolvent broker or dealer, the court may appoint a receiver under its inherent powers as a court of equity, but no express provision for the appointment of a receiver is contained in the act.

Problem: As the law now stands such a receivership may be governed by State law, rather than by the standards which the Congress has written into the Federal Bankruptcy Act with reference to bankrupt stock brokers. It is anomalous for State law, rather than Federal law, to be applicable in a proceeding of this type instituted by a Federal agency in a Federal court, particularly in view of the fact that the Congress has dealt specifically and in detail with the problems of bankrupt stock brokers in section 60e of the Bankruptcy Act.

Remedy in the bill: It is proposed to provide in section 21(f) that, if the court has jurisdiction over an insolvent broker or dealer in an injunctive action under section 21(e), it may upon application of the Commission adjudge such broker or dealer a bankrupt if it finds that he is unable to meet his debts as they mature and that such a receivership shall be administered as provided in the Bankruptcy Act.

As pointed out in the discussion under the preceding section, the reference to writs of mandamus now contained in section 21(f) would be deleted, since a comparable remedy would be provided in the amended section 21(e).

Sections 26 and 27 would change the references in section 25(a) and 27 to the United States Code to reflect modifications made in the numbering of its pertinent provisions.

Section 28: Revision of provisions relating to the validity of contracts.

Present law: Section 29 provides that contracts made in violation of the act shall be void in certain respects. It contains exceptions, one being that no contract shall be void because of violation of any rule under section 15(c)(3), which authorizes the Commission to adopt rules to provide safeguards with respect to the financial responsibility of brokers and dealers. It does not provide any such exception for contracts to violation of section 8(b), the other provision of the act dealing generally with financial responsibility.

Problem: It is proposed to consolidate sections 8(b) and 15(c)(3) and to designate the consolidated provisions as section 8(b). Since the consolidated provision may be more closely akin to the present section 15(c)(3) than the present section 8(b), the policy already indicated by the Congress in section 29 should be adhered to and provision made that no contract shall be void

because of violation of any rule under section 8(b).

Remedy in the bill: The proposed amendment would provide that no contract shall be void by reason of section 29(b) because of any violation of any rule or regulation under section 8(b), and would delete the reference to section 15(c)(3).

Section 29: Revision of provisions relating to penalties.

Present law: Subsection (c) of section 32 provides that the criminal penalties prescribed therein shall not apply to violations of the Commission's rules regarding financial responsibility of brokers and dealers under present section 15(c)(3) with certain stated exceptions.

Problem: The proposed amendments relating to sections 8(b) and 15(c)(3) of the act which consolidate in section 8(b) the provisions regarding financial responsibility of brokers and dealers make the reference to section 15(c)(3) inappropriate. In addition, this section should be redesignated in view of section 30 of the bill, which will add a new section 32(c) to the act.

Remedy in the bill: The present section 32(c) would be redesignated as section 32(d). Reference to section 8(b) would be substituted for the present reference to section 15(c)(3).

Section 30: Additional enforcement measures for failure to comply with reporting requirements of the act.

Present law: Section 32(a) provides criminal penalties for willful violations of any provisions of the act or any rules or regulations thereunder. Section 32(b) provides for a forfeiture of $100 for each day for delinquent reports required pursuant to an undertaking provided in section 15(d) of the act. That section requires that a registration statement filed pursuant to the Securities Act of 1933 shall contain an undertaking by the issuer to file the same reports required pursuant to section 13 of issuers with listed securities, if the offering price of the securities covered by the registration statement plus the aggregate value of other securities of the same class amounts to $2 million or more. The $100 a day forfeiture provided in section 32(b) is in lieu of any criminal penalty which might be deemed to arise under section 32(a).

Problem: As already indicated, the $100 a day forfeiture for delinquent reports is applicable only to limited filings required under the act. The imposition of a comparable assessment generally would strengthen the enforcement techniques available to the Commission to assure timely filings as required by the statute or the rules thereunder.

Remedy in the bill: The proposed new section 32(c) would authorize the Commission in its discretion to recover on behalf of the United States $100 per day for the failure to file any information or reports required by the act or rules thereunder for each and every day such failure to file continues beyond the time prescribed for the filing or beyond any time extension granted by the Commission. This payment would not be in lieu of any criminal penalty under section 32(a).

Section 31: Prohibitions against larceny and embezzlement.

Present law: The act now contains prohibitions against fraudulently obtaining customers' funds or securities, but does not contain an express prohibition against embezzling or converting them.

Problem: The distinction between fraudulently obtaining customers' funds or securities and embezzling or converting them is a thin and technical one. It may depend upon the technical question of whether the defendant is assumed to have had a wrongful intent at the time when he induced a customer to entrust securities to him in connection with a securities transaction, or whether the idea of converting the securities first occurred to him after he got possession.

Remedy in the bill: It is proposed to add a new section, designated section 35, which would prohibit any exchange member, broker or dealer, or any other person from wrongfully taking, converting, or embezzling money or securities of, or entrusted to the care of, any member of a national securities exchange, any broker or dealer who transacts business through the medium of such member, or any registered broker-dealer. A somewhat similar provision now appears in the Investment Company Act of 1940.

S. 1180. A bill to amend certain provisions of the Trust Indenture Act of 1939, as amended.

The statement accompanying Senate bill 1180 is as follows:

AMENDMENTS TO THE TRUST INDENTURE ACT OF 1939

GENERAL OBJECTIVES OF STATUTE

In general the Trust Indenture Act of 1939 requires that bonds, notes, debentures, and similar securities publicly offered for sale, except as specifically exempted by the act, be issued under an indenture which meets the requirements of the act and has been duly qualified with the Commission. The act requires the indenture to be qualified, to designate standards of eligibility and qualification of the corporate trustee, to outlaw exculpatory provisions with respect to the liability of the indenture trustee, and to provide provisions by which the securities issued thereunder may be protected and enforced.

WHAT THE BILL WOULD DO

The amendments embodied in the bill are recommended by the Securities and Exchange Commission, which is of the opinion that such changes will materially assist in the enforcement of the statute without altering its basic provisions and purposes. In brief, the proposed amendments would (1) conform the provisions relating to the size of offerings which are exempted from registration to amendments proposed in the Securities Act of 1933, (2) would extend the time within which certain applications for exemption from the act might be filed, and (3) would provide an administrative remedy during the entire period following the filing of the application for qualification and before its effective date. The specific amendments by which such changes would be effected are explained more fully below.

EXPLANATION BY SECTIONS

Section 1—Increase of exemption from $250,000 to $500,000

Present law: Section 304(a)(8) presently exempts any security to be issued otherwise than under an indenture in an aggregate principal amount not to exceed $250,000 within a period of 12 consecutive months.

Problem: Since it is proposed to increase the exemption in section 3(b) of the Securities Act of 1933 from $300,000 to $500,000, the Commission believes that a similar increase should be made in the subject exemption.

Remedy in the bill: To accomplish the foregoing result it is proposed to amend section 304(a)(8) to strike out the $250,000 figure and insert in lieu thereof $500,000.

Section 2—Extension of time within which to file applications for exemption

Present law: Section 304(c) of the Trust Indenture Act of 1939 presently permits the filing of an application for exemption from provisions of the act where the change in an indenture would require the consent of holders of securities outstanding under the indenture or would impose an undue burden on the issuer having due regard to the public interest and the protection of investors. However, this application may be filed only if there are outstanding at the time of filing securities which were outstanding prior to or within 6 months after August 3, 1939.

Problem: In anticipation of the fact that the opportunity to file application for exemption would some day expire, most companies have inserted such provisions of the act in their indenture to become effective when such old indenture securities are no longer outstanding. However, in some cases there was a delay in inserting such provisions, so that there may be a period of time when such a company would be unable to do mortgage financing because of its inability to comply with certain provisions of the act under the standards of this provision.

Remedy in the bill: In order to afford such companies an opportunity to bring their indentures fully into compliance with the act without undue hardship, the Commission proposes to amend such provision so as to extend the time of filing applications for exemption thereunder if securities were outstanding when the application is filed which were outstanding on January 1, 1959.

Section 3—Administrative remedies

Present law: Section 305(b) of the Trust Indenture Act of 1939 presently authorizes the Commission to enter an order in accordance with section 8(b) of the Securities Act of 1933 if it finds after notice and opportunity for hearing that the security is not to be issued under an indenture, that the indenture does not conform to the requirements of sections 310 to 318 of the act, or any person designated as trustee under the indenture is not eligible or qualified under section 310 of the act.

Problem: Section 8(b) of the Securities Act of 1933 requires that the administrative proceeding be instituted not later than 10 days after the filing of the registration statement and the opportunity for hearing must be afforded within 10 days after such notice.

Administrative experience has shown that section 8(b) does not permit sufficient time within which to examine the material filed and to institute the proceeding. Accordingly, the Commission is left without an effective administrative remedy unless the applicant for some reason files an amendment which would constitute a new filing date.

Remedy in the bill: The Commission recommends that section 305(b) be amended to eliminate the reference to section 8(b) of the Securities Act of 1933 and to authorize the institution of such administrative proceedings at any time prior to the effective date of the registration statement, which hearing shall be held within 15 days after such notice.

S. 1181. A bill to amend certain provisions of the Investment Company Act of 1940, as amended.

The statement accompanying Senate bill 1181 is as follows:

AMENDMENTS TO INVESTMENT COMPANY ACT OF 1940

GENERAL OBJECTIVE OF STATUTE

The general objective of the Investment Company Act is to protect the public and investors against malpractices in the control, management, and operation of publicly owned investment companies. The statute seeks in general to secure honest and unbiased management of investors' funds; to give security holders a substantial voice in the company and in the selection of management; to insure sound and feasible capital structures; to assure fairness in all transactions betwen affiliated persons and the company; and to see that shareholders are provided with informative, periodic financial re-

ports. The statute contains provisions for enforcement by the Commission through administrative and injunctive action and for the referral of information concerning violations to the Department of Justice for criminal prosecution.

WHAT THE BILL WILL DO

The amendments embodied in the bill are recommended by the Securities and Exchange Commission as desirable to further the basic intent and objectives of the statute.

These recommendations for changes in the Investment Company Act of 1940 are, for the most part, limited to the clarification of certain provisions, the elimination of inconsistencies, changes to achieve the obvious intent and purpose of a particular provision and conformance of references of other statutes. In several instances, however, substantive amendments are recommended which are considered highly desirable in order to effectuate the purposes and policy of the statute. The Commission has not, nevertheless, made any broad or sweeping recommendations which might involve an extension of the Commission's present supervision over investment companies and their affiliates or which would involve substantially greater limitations upon the management of investment companies.

Briefly, the more significant of the proposed amendments would (1) require the statement of policy of a registered investment company, which cannot be changed without the consent or approval of the holders of a majority of the voting securities, to include its fundamental investment objectives and investment characteristics; (2) strengthen the statutory provisions requiring that at least 40 percent of the members of the board of directors be persons who have no pecuniary interest in the operations and management of the investment company and who are not part of its operating staff; (3) require that if an investment company chooses to keep its securities and investments in the "custody of a bank" such custodianship shall include the cash assets of the investment company; (4) impose limitations upon the proportion of common or preferred stock that may be acquired by face-amount certificate companies issuing fixed obligations (face-amount certificates) to prevent such obligations from becoming unduly speculative; (5) clarify and make more meaningful the definition of an "advisory board" of an investment company and the substantive provisions requiring such a board to have a certain number of independent members; (6) clarify certain exceptions to the definition of an investment company required to register under the act; (7) eliminate the exception from the definition of an investment company for a company subject to regulation under the Interstate Commerce Act when this Commission finds and by order declares that such company is primarily engaged in the business of investing, reinvesting, owning, holding or trading in securities; and (8) clarify the term "depositor" and "share of stock" used in the statute by adding specific definitions of these terms.

Section 1—Modification of the status of an advisory board of an investment company

Present law: "Advisory board" of an investment company is defined in section 2(a)(1) of the Investment Company Act as a board (1) which is distinct from the board of directors or board of trustees; (2) which has advisory functions but no power to determine that any security or other investment shall be purchased or sold; and (3) which is composed solely of persons who do not serve such company in any other capacity.

Problem: The latter qualifying provision has created a problem because it appears to be in the nature of a regulatory provision rather than a descriptive provision.

Section 10(g) provides that the same limitations of section 10 applicable to the composition of the board of directors of a registered investment company shall apply to an advisory board. For example, not more than 60 percent of the members of an advisory board may be affiliated persons of the investment adviser under section 10(a) as made applicable by section 10(g).

Through the use of an investment advisory committee or an advisory group of consultants rather than a board and through the appointment on such committee or group of an officer or employee who does serve such company in any other capacity, it has been contended that the resulting committee or group is not an advisory board within the terms of section 2(a)(1) and, consequently, that the limitations of section 10(g) do not apply. If this were true it would be simple for an investment company to avoid having its advisory committee deemed an advisory board within the meaning of the act. Thus, persons in an advisory position with the investment company and who should be considered affiliated persons of the investment company would not be so considered and would not be subject to such important provisions of the act as those contained in section 10(f) and section 17 relating generally to prohibitions with respect to transactions by an investment company involving an affiliated person. Whether or not an advisory board exists would in this manner rest entirely within the discretion of the investment company.

Although the Commission has handled this problem administratively by insisting that a company may not represent in its prospectus that it has an advisory board, or its equivalent, unless the board actually meets the definition of section 2(a)(1), the statute should be amended to make it more workable and meaningful.

It is also to be noted that because the present definition of advisory board in the statute refers to a board which is composed solely of persons who do not serve such company in any other capacity, the membership of such a board is in effect subject to greater statutory restrictions than the membership of the board of directors.

Remedy in the bill: This change would bring all investment advisory boards, committees, and groups within the definition of "advisory board." Under section 10(g), the same limitations applicable to the board of directors of the investment company would be applicable to the members of such advisory boards. There appears to be no sound reason for an advisory board, which has only advisory functions, to have any greater quantum of independent directors than the board of directors itself which has the actual power to make decisions and take action.

On the other hand there would be a specific exclusion for committees composed solely of directors, officers, or employees of an investment company or of its investment adviser. There is no intention that such management or executive committees be affected by the provisions applicable to advisory boards.

Section 2—Definition of "depositor" of an unincorporated investment company

Present law: The term "depositor" is not defined in the statute.

Problem: The term "depositor" is used in various sections of the act, including sections 2(a)(3), 7(b), 9(a), 10(b), 26 and 27. Although the meaning of "depositor" is ascertainable from the context in which it is used and may also be derived from the legislative history of the act, it would seem advisable to have an express definition of the term. The word was most frequently used, prior to the enactment of the statute, to describe the person or company causing the formation of a fixed trust or semifixed trust during the period when these types of investment trusts were popular. It is used in the statute to describe the person or company promoting, sponsoring, or administering any unincorporated fund or trust constituting an investment company, or who as sponsor or manager of such fund or trust deposits portfolio assets with the trustee or custodian of the fund or trust or who may direct the deposit of additional or substituted securities and the elimination of deposited securities.

Remedy in the bill: The term would be defined as indicated above. Since a trustee or custodian designated in accordance with the provisions of section 26 of the act may, in some cases, be responsible for one or more of such functions, the definition would specifically exclude them.

Section 3—Definition of term "share of stock"

Present law: The term "share of stock" is not defined in the statute.

Problem: Reference is made in several provisions of the act to shares of stock, stockholders, and to stock. Sections 12(d), 18(i), 23(b), and 30(d) contain such terms. While it is apparent that the statutory purpose cannot be avoided by designating a security by some other name, the question has arisen in a sufficient number of cases to suggest the advisability of making it expressly clear that the term "shares of stock" means any security similar in nature to an equity security. The term "security" as now defined includes certificates of beneficial interest, shares in a fund or trust, participation in profit-sharing arrangements, and investment contracts.

The terms "stockholder" and "stock" would in effect be covered by the same proposed definition.

Remedy in the bill: The term would be defined as meaning any security similar in nature to an equity security.

Section 4—Elimination of reference to the Philippine Islands and Alaska in the definition of "State"

Present law: Section 2(a)(37) of the act defines the term "State" to include any State of the United States and in addition, among others, the Philippine Islands and Alaska.

Problem: The Philippine Islands are no longer a possession and Alaska is now a State.

Remedy in the bill: The amendment would delete these references.

Section 5—Modification of exception from the act for company engaged in banking, insurance, small loans, factoring, discount or real estate business

Present law: Section 3(c)(7) of the act provides an exception for—

"(7) Any company primarily engaged, directly or through majority-owned subsidiaries, in one or more of the businesses described in paragraphs (3), (5), and (6), or in one or more of such businesses (from which not less than 25 per centum of such company's gross income during its last fiscal year was derived) together with an additional business or businesses other than investing, reinvesting, owning, holding or trading in securities."

Problem: If taken literally, this section would provide an exception for a company primarily engaged, directly or through majority-owned subsidiaries, in one of the following:

(a) The banking or insurance company business. Section 3(c)(3); or

(b) The small loan business. Section 3(c)(5); or

(c) The commercial discount, factoring or real estate business. Section 3(c)(6).

Yet each of these provisions, that is, section 3(c)(3), (5) and (6), has a test which is

greater than the test of "primarily engaged." Section 3(c)(3), for example, refers to an insurance company, which in section 2(a)(17) is defined as a company, organized as an insurance company, whose "primary and predominant" business activity is writing insurance or reinsuring risks and which is supervised by a state official or agency. Section 3(c)(5) refers to a company "substantially all of whose business" is the small loan business. Section 3(c)(6) has the primary engagement test but excludes face-amount companies and periodic payment plans.

The specific exceptions with their stricter tests are obviously the ones intended rather than the more generalized and indirect exception of section 3(c)(7). This has been the Commission's interpretation following ordinary rules of statutory construction. The section, however, should be revised to make this clear and yet carry out the intention to exempt a company which does business, directly or through majority-owned subsidiaries, in the financial fields of banking, insurance, small loans, factoring and mortgages but which may fall within the definition of investment company under section 3(a)(3) because it deals in "securities" and "securities" constitute its major assets. On the other hand, where a company engages in a number of such activities and also engages in the business of investing, reinvesting, owning, holding or trading in securities to a significant extent, it should not be entitled to the exception of section 3(c)(7). This follows the approach taken in section 3(c)(5), the exception for small loan companies.

Remedy in the bill: Section 3(c)(7) would be amended to limit the exception to a company substantially all of whose business consists of one or more of the businesses described in section 3(c)(3), (5) and (6) and to add a proviso to exclude face-amount companies and periodic payment plans in the case of section 3(c)(6) businesses.

Section 6—Modification of exception from the act for a company, 90 percent or more of whose securities are those of single issuer of certain types

Present law: Section 3(c)(8) contains an exception for a company 90 percent or more of the value of whose investment securities are those of a single issuer included within a class of persons enumerated in section 3(c)(5), (6) or (7).

Problem: (1) One question this provision raises is whether this exception is intended to include a company holding securities of a bank or insurance company included in section 3(c)(3) by virtue of the reference to section 3(c)(7) which in turn contains a reference to section 3(c)(3). It can be argued that if this were intended, then section 3(c)(3) should have been specified because paragraphs (5) and (6) were specifically stated in section 3(c)(8) and yet are also specified in section 3(c)(7).

Remedy in the bill: (1) To remove this doubt, it is proposed to amend the section to include a specific reference to paragraph (3).

Problem: (2) In addition, the Commission is doubtful whether the type of company excepted by section 3(c)(8) is entitled to an exemption from the act any more than a company all of whose security holdings are those of an industrial or commercial corporation, but which could not qualify for an exemption under section 3(b)(1) or 3(b)(2) because not primarily engaged through such holdings in such industrial or commercial business. This seems to be an unwarranted inconsistency. In both types of situations, the essential purpose of the company is that of investing in securities and deriving its earnings from that investment. It is to be distinguished from the holding company situation where the company is, in effect, engaged in a business through its controlled company.

Remedy in the bill: (2) It is proposed that section 3(c)(8) be modified to provide that the exception is only available where the single issuer whose stock is held by the holding company is also a company controlled by the holding company.

Section 7—Modification of exception for company subject to regulation under the Interstate Commerce Act

Present law: Section 3(c)(9) contains an exception from the act for any company subject to regulation under the Interstate Commerce Act.

Problem: The intent of section 3(a)(9) in providing an exception from the act was to avoid subjecting a railroad or a railroad holding company to dual regulation under both the Interstate Commerce Act and the Investment Company Act. As written the section may be used, and has been used, by companies which are essentially investment companies to escape the more pertinent, if more pervasive, regulation under the Investment Company Act by subjecting themselves to the limited regulation under the Interstate Commerce Act designed for different purposes.

In fact, regulation by both the SEC and the Interstate Commerce Commission (ICC) of such a company which is primarily an investment company but which is also the holder of railroad securities would involve little, if any, duplication or conflict, and the burdens thereof, if any, would be minimal. It is anomalous that section 3(c)(9) which was designed to protect stockholders of a railroad holding company against the possible burden of dual regulation can be used by the management of the company at its will, even though it is essentially an investment company, to deprive these stockholders of the protections and safeguards of the Investment Company Act.

The most significant case in point is the Alleghany Corp. matter which is described in the Commission's reports to the Congress for the fiscal years ended 1955 (pp. 101–102), 1956 (pp. 188–189), and 1957 (pp. 165–166). The bulk of the assets of this company has consisted of investment securities, including a large investment in Investors Diversified Services, Inc., an investment company itself which controls or manages, directly and indirectly, $2½ billion of investors' funds. A relatively smaller investment of Alleghany Corp. has been its holdings of New York Central Railroad stock. Because of its control over the railroad, and in connection with a transaction involving the railroad system, Alleghany Corp. was deemed to be a carrier and subjected to certain regulation by the ICC under the Interstate Commerce Act. Thus, Alleghany became entitled to an exception from the Investment Company Act although its business by far was, and has been, that of an investment company.

Remedy in the bill: It is proposed to modify section 3(c)(9) to provide that the exception shall not apply to a company which the Commission finds and by order declares to be primarily engaged in the business of investing, reinvesting, owning, holding, or trading in securities.

Section 8—Clarification of exception for holding company registered under Public Utility Holding Company Act of 1935

Present law: Section 3(c)(10) excepts any company from the definition of investment company if it has a registration in effect as a holding company under the Public Utility Holding Company Act of 1935.

Problem: This exception was necessary in view of the broad and detailed regulation provided under that act. Certain public utility holding companies, although registered under that act, have obtained exemption from regulatory provisions of that act under section 3 thereof. To all intents and purposes such exempt holding companies are not subject to that act and are, therefore, not excepted from the Investment Company Act. The Commission, however, recommends that any possible question of the necessity for their registration under the Investment Company Act be removed.

Remedy in the bill: It is proposed to exclude from the exception for registered public utility holding companies, those which have been exempted under section 3 of the Holding Company Act.

Section 9—Change in a reference to another statute which has been amended

Present law: Section 3(c)(13) refers to section 165 of the Internal Revenue Code, as amended.

Problem: Section 165 has become section 401 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954. This section of the Code covers the subject of the requirements for qualified stock bonus, pension, and profit-sharing trusts.

Remedy in the bill: The indicated substitution is proposed.

Section 10—Modification of definition of "diversified investment company"

Present law: Section 5(b) classifies management investment companies as diversified or nondiversified companies. This is necessary because certain substantive requirements apply to diversified companies. For example, such companies may not change their policy and become nondiversified without a majority vote of stockholders.

In order to qualify as a diversified company, at least 75 percent of the value of the total assets of a company must be represented by (a) cash and cash items, (b) Government securities, (c) securities of other investment companies, and (d) other securities limited in respect of any one issuer to not more than 5 percent of the value of the total assets of the investment company and 10 percent of the voting securities of such issuer.

Problem: A company may have its entire portfolio or a major portion of its portfolio in the securities of other investment companies. The extent of diversification of the portfolio investment company in this case is significant. If the portfolio company is nondiversified, the investing company is essentially nondiversified as well, although it would be technically classified as diversified. This result is one which was not intended.

Remedy in the bill: Section 5(b)(1) would be amended to provide that the securities of other investment companies which can be included within the 75 percent of assets required to be diversified must be securities of diversified investment companies.

Section 11—Elimination of references to the Philippine Islands and Alaska in certain exemptions from the act

Present law: Section 6(a)(1) exempts from the act companies organized and doing business in the Philippine Islands and Alaska so long as they sell none of their stock in any other State.

Problem: The exemption is inappropriate since the Philippine Islands are no longer a possession and Alaska has become a State.

Remedy in the bill: The indicated deletions are proposed.

Section 12—Strengthening the provisions relating to the recitals of investment policy

Present law: Section 8(b)(1) requires every registered investment company to file a registration statement including a recital of the policy of the company regarding various important subjects. These involve such matters as diversification, redeemability of its securities, borrowing money, concentration of investments in any particular industry, and making loans. Under section 13(a) these policies may not be changed unless authorized by a majority vote of the company's stockholders.

Problem: Omitted from the list of subjects as to which policies are to be declared by the investment company is the basic investment objectives and characteristics of the investment company despite the fact that this is one of the most significant factors for the public investor to consider.

Whether an investment company is a balanced fund, a bond fund or a common stock fund is so important that financial publications and financial services analyzing or describing investment companies treat such companies in separate categories. Whether the investment company represents that its investment objective is primarily capital appreciation or income is of the same order of significance. Other primary investment objectives such as investments in controlled companies, investments in special types of securities or in particular geographical areas are also of great concern.

Nevertheless, if a company does not choose to treat these objectives or characteristics as fundamental under section 8(b)(2), it may change its policy as to them without obtaining the consent or approval of its stockholders.

Such subjects are of at least equal importance with the matters required to be stated under section 8(b)(1) and should therefore be required to be set forth as a statement of fundamental policy which cannot be changed without the consent of stockholders holding a majority of the stock. In recommending this legislation, it is not the intention of the Commission to impede management or restrict management beyond requiring the approval of stockholders for significant changes in investment policy.

Remedy in the bill: It is proposed to amend section 8(b)(2) to require a recital of policy in respect of the types of securities in which the company intends to invest; investment objectives as to income or capital appreciation, if it intends to emphasize such objectives; geographical areas of investment, if any; and investment for control or management. Appropriate reservation of freedom to invest in so-called defensive securities may be made under the amendment.

An accompanying amendment is proposed in section 13(a)(3) to prohibit any change or deviation from the statement of policy in this regard without a majority vote of stockholders. See section 16 herein.

Section 13—Strengthening provisions relating to affiliations of directors and requiring certain percentage of independent directors

Present law: Section 10 (a), (b), and (c) have the general purpose of assuring that an investment company will have a certain number of "independent" directors on the board of directors. Section 10(a) is designed to assure that at least 40 percent of the members of the board will be persons who have no pecuniary interest in the management of the investment company and who are not part of its operational staff. Thus, this section provides that not more than 60 percent of the directors shall be officers, employees, or investment advisers of the investment company, or affiliated persons of an investment adviser of the investment company.

Section 10(b) goes further in providing that a majority of the board may not be directors who are regular brokers or principal underwriters of the investment company or who are investment bankers. These provisions also cover affiliated persons of these persons. Section 10(c) provides that a majority of the board may not be officers or directors of any one bank.

Problem: Despite the elaborate limitations of these provisions, because of the limited scope of section 10(a) and the fact that sections 10(a) and 10(b) are not keyed together, it is possible to have a board composed of no "independent" directors. For example, a board of five members could consist of three officers and two regular brokers for the company, or three officers and two principal underwriters for the company, or three officers and two 4.9 percent stockholders of the investment adviser or three officers and two controlling persons of the investment company. Other variations are possible. The legislative history makes it clear that it was intended that there be a few disinterested directors to act as "watchdogs" over the conduct of management.

Stockholders of the investment adviser, including those with less than a 5-percent interest, regular brokers and principal underwriters for the investment company and controlling or controlled persons of the investment company, adviser and underwriter and their affiliates are so closely related to the management that they cannot be deemed to be truly disinterested. They normally have a personal stake in the management and can hardly be considered to be "independent" directors.

In order to effectuate fully the policy of section 10(a), the above-mentioned classes and their affiliated persons should be placed in the same category as officers, employees and the investment adviser of the investment company. In recognition of the view that regular brokers for the company may not be as closely related to the management of the company as the other persons mentioned, the Commission believes that a lesser limitation may be imposed as to them. In addition, a director of a controlling or controlled company should not be deemed a "management" director merely because of his directorship since he may be, in fact, one of the "independent" directors who is also selected as one of the "independent" directors of a parent or subsidiary company.

Remedy in the bill: The proposed amendment places in the 60-percent category, along with officers, employees and the investment adviser, the persons mentioned above except regular brokers and their affiliated persons. It then provides that such persons, together with regular brokers and their affiliated persons, may not exceed 80 percent of the membership of the board. Thus, at least, one person of a board of five or less and at least two persons of a board from six to ten would have to be individuals other than those named above.

Section 14—Clarification of status of underwriter subsidiary of investment company

Present law: Section 12(d) prohibits an investment company from making certain acquisitions of securities of (1) any other investment company, (2) any insurance company, or (3) any broker, dealer, underwriter, or investment adviser. An exception is permitted in the case of persons named in paragraph (3) provided that the company is (A) a corporation all the securities of which are owned by one or more registered investment companies and (B) is primarily engaged in the underwriting or brokerage business. Concomitant with this exception, exceptions have also been incorporated in provisions dealing with transactions of affiliated persons: sections 10(f), 17(a), and 17(d).

Section 10(f) prohibits an investment company from buying a security during the existence of an underwriting syndicate, where certain affiliated persons are acting as principal underwriter of such security. Excepted from the category of principal underwriter is a company of the character described in section 12(d)(3)(A) and (B). Section 17(a) prohibits purchases and sales of securities between affiliated persons and an investment company and certain borrowings. Section 17(d) covers transactions in which affiliated persons and an investment company are joint or joint and several participants. A section 12(d)(3)(A) and (B) company is also specifically excepted from these sections.

Problem: These exclusions, however, appear to extend further than intended. An underwriter subsidiary should, of course, be able to deal with its parent companies either during the course of an underwriting (10(f)) or by purchase and sale of securities (17(a)) or in a joint venture (17(d)). However, the exclusion of the underwriter subsidiary from these sections is expressed in absolute terms and, if literally taken, might be said to exclude from the purview of sections 10(f), 17(a), and 17(d) transactions between the underwriter subsidiary and a registered investment company which is not its parent but affiliated in some other manner. There is no logical reason for the exclusion to go this far. In addition, the absolute terms of the exclusion also raises the question as to whether affiliated persons of the underwriter subsidiary fall within the category of affiliated persons of an affiliated person of a registered investment company and thus subject to the prohibitions of section 17(a) and 17(d). This would be a meaningless exclusion. No rational ground appears for distinguishing such affiliated persons from affiliated persons of other types of subsidiaries of the investment company who are admittedly covered by the language of sections 17(a) and 17(d).

It would appear appropriate that any questions of interpretation such as indicated above be resolved by expressing the policy and intention of the statute in clear terms. The suggested amendments to sections 10(f), 17(a), and 17(d), it is believed will do this and will still afford to underwriter subsidiaries of investment companies the appropriate exemptions they are entitled to have.

Remedy in the bill: Section 10(f) would be amended to limit the exclusion of the underwriter subsidiary only when the registered investment company involved is a parent of the underwriter subsidiary. Section 17(a) would be amended by deleting references therein to the underwriter subsidiary and a new paragraph would be added to section 17(c) to permit specifically the underwriter subsidiary to deal with its parent investment company. See sections 17 and 18 herein. Section 17(d) would be amended in a similar manner. See section 19 herein.

Section 15—Clarification of status of depositor of an unincorporated investment company as its investment adviser or principal underwriter

Present law: Section 10(h) provides in general that the requirements of sections 10(a) and 10(b), which contain certain limitations as to the composition of a board of directors of an investment company, shall apply to the board of directors of the depositor of an unincorporated investment company.

Problem: Under section 10(a) and 10(b)(2) only a limited number of directors of an investment company may also be directors of its investment adviser or principal underwriter. If this limitation applied to the board of directors of a depositor in literal terms obviously a depositor could not also be investment adviser or principal underwriter. This result was not intended and has been administratively so interpreted. An amendment to make this clear appears appropriate.

Remedy in the bill: Under the proposed bill, if the depositor is investment adviser, then the 60 percent limitation would apply to officers and employees and persons affiliated with the depositor otherwise than as a director. If the depositor is not investment adviser, then the limitations would apply fully, placing directors of the investment adviser in the 60 percent category insofar as the board of the depositor is concerned.

If the depositor is principal underwriter, a majority of its board should not be officers or employees or persons affiliated with the depositor otherwise than as a director.

This would comply with the purpose of section 10(b)(2). If the depositor is not principal underwriter than the provisions of section 10(b)(2) should apply fully; thus a majority of the depositor's board could not be officers, employees, or directors of the principal underwriter.

Section 16—Modification of provisions regarding changes in policy

See section 12 above.

Sections 17, 18, and 19—Modification of underwriter subsidiary provision

See section 14 above.

Section 20—Revision of custody provision to provide that "bank custodianship" shall include holding of cash assets

Present law: Under section 17(f), an investment company of the management type must place its securities and investments (1) in the custody of a bank, (2) in the custody of a stock exchange firm subject to rules prescribed by the Commission, or (3) in its own custody subject to rules or orders prescribed by the Commission. If a company chooses to retain the custody of its securities, it must deposit them with a bank for safekeeping, subject to certain rules as to access, earmarking, and inspection.

Problem: If a company chooses to turn over custody of its securities and similar investments to a bank, something more than safekeeping and access upon the mere receipt of company officials must have been intended and this has been the Commission's position. In other words, custody of a bank has signified that not only the company's portfolio securities but the proceeds of those securities are in the bank's hands. Anything less than that would mean that bank custodianship existed only at the desire of the company officials with access to the securities or with power to direct their disposition and was tantamount to a safekeeping agreement.

In fact, however, this kind of bank custodianship does not go far enough. If a company wishes to choose a bank's custodianship as the method for maintaining its portfolio securities, all of its cash assets, including proceeds from the sale of its own securities and income on its holdings should also be held by the bank subject to appropriate directions as to expenditures and dispositions by proper company officials. Most investment companies which use bank custodianship provide for the keeping of all cash receipts by the bank. Some States insist upon this complete bank custodianship as a prerequisite to the sale of securities within the State. It appears to the Commission that if an investment company desires to obtain the advantage of representing that it has bank custodianship, the protection afforded should be complete.

Remedy in the bill: It is proposed to add a sentence to section 17(f) to provide that if an investment company maintains its securities with a bank, all cash assets shall likewise be kept in such custody. A proviso would permit an operating checking account, for convenience, in an amount not to exceed the fidelity bond required under section 17(g) of the act. The section also should be clarified to state that more than one bank may act as custodian.

Section 21—Clarification and extension of investment policy recital requirements relating to companies issuing special series or classes of stock

Present law: Section 18(f)(2) permits an open-end company to have classes or series of stock, each of which has an interest in specific assets allocated to such class or series. There is no specific requirement in section 8(b) for a recital of policy in respect of each class or series of stock and it is not clear whether a change in policy as to any particular class must be approved by the stockholders of that class or by all stockholders of the company.

Problem: In effect this type of corporation comprises a number of individual funds, with each share issued by the company having an interest in only one of such funds. Each fund has its own investment objectives and characteristics and is, in effect, for investment purposes, a separate entity. Moreover, it is anomalous to consider such a company as diversified unless the assets allocated to each series are diversified. Since each of these "funds" has its own investment policies, it would be reasonable to treat each "fund" separately under sections 8(b) and 13. Thus, the policies stated for each series or class of stock would be changed solely by a majority vote of those stockholders affected by the change.

Remedy in the bill: Section 18(f)(2), which permits this particular type of company, would be amended to require a recital of policy in respect of each series or class of stock in accordance with section 8(b)(1) and (2), and any change in policy would have to be authorized solely by the majority vote of holders of such series or class of stock.

Section 22—Tightening provisions relating to cross-ownership and circular-ownership

Present law: Section 20(d) makes it the duty of an investment company to eliminate within 5 years after the effective date of the act, "cross-ownership" or "circular-ownership," existing on the effective date of the act. Thereafter, if cross-ownership or circular-ownership comes into existence "upon the purchase by a registered company of the securities of another company," the investment company has the duty to eliminate such cross-ownership or circular-ownership within 1 year after it knows of its existence.

Problem: It is not adequate to require an investment company to eliminate only those cross-holdings caused by its own purchase of the securities of another company, since a company controlled through stock ownership by an investment company might contend that it can buy securities of the investment company with impunity. This would negate the objectives of this section of the act. While section 48(a), which makes it unlawful for a controlling person to cause to be done any act which would be unlawful for such person to do, might be invoked in this case, it would seem appropriate to amend section 20(b) to prohibit expressly such action by a controlled company.

Remedy in the bill: The bill would amend section 20(d) to require the elimination of cross-ownership or circular-ownership created by a controlled company.

Section 23—Correction of provision relating to sales of stock by closed-end company below net asset value with consent of stockholders

Present law: Section 23(b) prohibits the sale of stock of a closed-end investment company at a price below the current net asset value "except * * * (2) with the consent of a majority of its common stockholders * * *."

Problem: From the content of the statute, it is clear that the language should read "with the consent of the holders of a majority of its common stock."

Remedy in the bill: The correct phrase would be substituted for the present one.

Section 24—Providing limitations on holdings of common and preferred stock by face-amount certificate companies

Present law: A face-amount certificate company may be briefly described as an investment company engaged in the business of selling its own unsecured debentures or debt obligations on the installment basis. The proceeds are invested and used, together with increments, to pay the obligations at maturity.

Section 28(b) requires a face-amount certificate company to have cash or qualified investments equal to its capital stock requirements and certificate reserves. Qualified investments are those of a kind permitted under the District of Columbia Code for insurance companies and such other investments as the Commission may authorize. Since life insurance companies may purchase common and preferred stocks under the District Code, if they meet certain tests, face-amount certificate companies may also purchase such securities. The act places no limitation on the proportion of common or preferred stock that face-amount certificate companies may acquire.

Problem: The face-amount certificate companies studied by the Commission prior to 1940 invested in real estate mortgages and high grade corporate bonds and preferred stock in view of the fixed obligations they undertook to pay at maturity. The failure to place a limitation on the amount of common stock or preferred stock that such companies may acquire would seem to have been an unintentional omission. The entire thrust of the provisions of section 28 is to assure that the company will be able to meet its liabilities. This is not only shown by the legislative history of the act, but is evident from the very elaborate provisions of section 28 itself requiring the maintenance of reserves and requiring their computation on the basis of a rate of accumulation limited to not more than 3½ percent per annum. To make these requirements meaningful, a limitation on the proportion of common and preferred stock which may be maintained as part of the reserve is required. It would be contrary to the purpose of the act to permit face-amount companies to invest in the more speculative types of securities such as common stocks to any appreciable extent.

The Commission has considered the views of one of the face-amount companies registered under the act which would be seriously affected by a stringent restriction on investment in common stock. This company issues face-amount certificates of the installment type in series which provide (1) for a fixed obligation at the end of a 10-year period to pay an amount approximately equal to the amount paid to the company by the holder, and (2) for a participation in the income and possible profits derived from the funds paid in. It is an integral part of the company's purpose and structure that a portion of its funds be invested in stocks to provide for income and possible capital appreciation. The recommended amendment to section 28, discussed below, would provide reasonable limitations upon stock investments by face-amount companies, but would not impair the arrangement adopted by this face-amount company.

Remedy in the bill: Two approaches were taken to the problem. Based upon analogy to the insurance field, an overall limitation of 10 percent of the certificate reserves has been suggested as to common stock and 25 percent as to preferred stock. Some flexibility is thereby accorded to the company in its investment program but most of the speculative element is eliminated by limiting the amount of investment in equity securities. In addition, by analogy to the restrictions in section 18 of the act applicable to closed-end companies, it is believed that additional common stock investments may be warranted where there is asset coverage protection furnished by the capital, or stockholders' equity. An asset coverage equal to 200 percent was selected rather than the 300 percent figure used in section 18(a)(1) because of the additional limitations imposed by the District of Columbia Code applicable under section 28(b). These additional limitations of the code relate to earnings and dividends tests which must be met by the common stock before it may be acquired.

Therefore, it is provided that certificate reserves may also include common stock investments in an amount equal to 100 per-

cent of the stockholders' equity in the company represented by assets consisting of cash or qualified investments. In addition, since the same degree of protection would be afforded, it is also provided that to the extent that the stockholders' equity consists of cash or qualified investments other than common stocks or similar equity securities, the required certificate reserves may include common stock investments equal to 100 percent of such assets. Where certificate reserves and assets are separately allocated for series of certificates, the 10 percent and 25 percent overall percentage limitations would apply to each series which is in effect a separate fund. On the other hand, since the stockholders' equity is a cushion of security for each certificate issued by the company regardless of its series, more flexibility may be permitted in allocating the amount of common stock investments made pursuant to the asset coverage test. To guard against undue speculation in any series of certificates, a limitation of 30 percent applicable to each series is suggested.

Sections 25 and 26 would change the references in sections 43(a) and 44 to the Judicial Code to reflect redesignation of these provisions in the United States Code.

Section 27—Effective date for proposed amendments

Since presently registered investment companies may need some time to comply with the amendments to sections 5, 8(b)(2) and 18(f)(2), it is proposed that these sections would not become effective until six months after the date of enactment of the bill. In addition, it is provided that the terms of section 28(b)(2) would not apply to series of face-amount certificates outstanding prior to the enactment of this section, where the reserve requirements of such series are maintained separately. This would avoid any retroactive effect of the limitations of this section to face-amount certificate companies which have sold series of such certificates on the representation that the holders would participate in the earnings to be realized from a separate fund of investments, including, among other things, common stocks without any limit as to the amount thereof specified in the statute. In all other respects, the amendments would be effective upon enactment of the bill.

S. 1182. A bill to amend certain provisions of the Investment Advisers Act of 1940, as amended.

The statement accompanying Senate bill 1182 is as follows:

AMENDMENTS TO INVESTMENT ADVISERS ACT OF 1940

GENERAL OBJECTIVE OF STATUTE

The general objective of the Investment Advisers Act of 1940 is to protect the public and investors against malpractices on the part of persons engaged for compensation in the business of advising others with respect to securities. The act makes it unlawful for investment advisers registered under the act to engage in practices which constitute fraud or deceit. The act also requires registered investment advisers to disclose the nature of their interest in transactions which they may effect for their clients, prohibits profit-sharing arrangements and, for all practical purposes, prevents the assignment of any investment advisory contract without the consent of the interested client.

WHAT THE BILL WILL DO

The amendments embodied in the bill are recommended by the Securities and Exchange Commission, which is of the opinion that the changes will materially assist it in enforcing the statute.

Administration of the Investment Advisers Act since its adoption in 1940 has indicated to the Commission that it is inadequate in many respects and does not afford the necessary protection to clients of investment advisers and other members of the investing public. The Commission has no authority under the act to inspect the books and records of investment advisers, and cannot even require investment advisers to maintain books and records. It has no adequate means of determining whether investment advisers are engaging in fraudulent or deceptive practices in connection with their business.

The present statute provides for the registration of most investment advisers who use the mails or instrumentalities of interstate commerce in connection with their business. The basis for denial or revocation of registration is very narrow and limited, however, and this makes it possible for undesirable persons to engage in the investment advisory business, essential elements of which are trusts and confidence by the client and scrupulously honest dealing by the adviser.

The provisions of the act prohibiting fraudulent practices apply only to investment advisers who happen to be registered. The investment adviser who evades registration or is exempt from it is not subject to these provisions. The act is inadequate also because it does not give the Commission the power to adopt rules and regulations defining acts and practices which are fraudulent, deceptive or manipulative or prescribing means designed to prevent such acts and practices.

The proposed amendments are designed to make the Commission's enforcement activities more effective by giving the Commission additional authority, and by providing additional remedies and eliminating or minimizing various problems which have come to light in the course of the Commission's enforcement of the act. The more significant of these proposals would, in brief (1) expand the basis for disqualification of an applicant for registration or a registrant because of misconduct; (2) revise the provisions relating to the postponement of effectiveness and the withdrawal of application for registration; (3) authorize the Commission by rule to require the keeping of books and records and the filing of reports; (4) permit periodic examinations of a registrant's books and records; (4) empower the Commission by rule to define and prescribe means reasonably designed to prevent fraudulent practices; and (6) extend criminal liability to include a willful violation of a rule or order of the Commission.

EXAMINATION BY SECTIONS

Section 1—Elimination of reference to the Philippine Islands and Alaska in definition of "State"

Present law: Section 202(a)(18) of the act defines the term "State" to include any State of the United States and in addition, among others, the Philippine Islands and Alaska.

Problem: The Philippine Islands are no longer a possession and Alaska is now a State.

Remedy in the bill: The amendment would delete these references.

Sections 2 and 3—Expansion and integration of provisions relating to statutory disqualifications

Present law: Under section 203(d) registration can be denied, suspended, or revoked because of (1) conviction within 10 years for a felony or misdemeanor involving the purchase or sale of a security, or arising out of activities as an investment adviser, underwriter, banker, or dealer, or as an affiliated person or employee of an investment company, bank, or insurance company; or (2) the existence of an injunction based upon similar conduct or activity; or (3) the willful filing of a false statement in an application for registration or a required report.

Problem: (1) It should be possible for the Commission to keep out of the investment advisory business not only persons who would be barred under the standards now embodied in section 203(d), but also any person who has been convicted of embezzlement, fraudulent conversion of misappropriation of funds or securities; or who has violated the mail fraud statute; or who is subject to an injunction based upon such improper activities. In addition, a willful violation of the Securities Act, the Securities Exchange Act, or the Investment Advisers Act should constitute a basis for denial, suspension, or revocation of the registration of an investment adviser.

One case demonstrates the weakness of the Investment Advisers Act. Information was obtained by the staff indicating that a certain individual was engaged in the securities business relying upon an exemption from registration under the Securities Exchange Act available to persons doing business entirely within one State. Investigation disclosed that this individual actually was engaged in an interstate business, and that the exemption was not available. Upon being advised that registration as a broker-dealer was required, applications for registration were filed not only as a broker-dealer but also as an investment adviser. Investigation revealed several serious violations of the Securities Act and the Securities Exchange Act. A report of financial condition filed as a part of the broker-dealer application falsely set forth his financial condition. Proceedings were instituted to determine whether an order of denial should be entered with respect to the application for a broker-dealer registration, but since there was no statutory bar to registration as an investment adviser, that registration became effective. The applicant, before the date for hearing on the broker-dealer matter, filed a petition in bankruptcy. From documents filed in that proceeding it appeared that customers and other broker-dealers would sustain substantial losses. In connection with a stipulation of facts in the broker-dealer denial proceeding, the staff succeeded in obtaining a withdrawal of the investment adviser registration. It is an anomalous situation that permits the Commission to deny registration to a broker-dealer applicant based upon willful violations of the Securities Act and the Securities Exchange Act but leaves it without authority to deny an application for registration as an investment adviser simultaneously filed by the same person.

(2) Section 203(c) should be revised to require disclosure of information necessary to determine whether there exists a basis for denying registration under section 203(d), as proposed to be amended.

Remedy in the bill: (1) It is proposed to amend section 203(d) to provide that conviction of embezzlement, fraudulent conversion or misappropriation of funds or securities; or violation of the mail fraud statute; or the existence of an injunction based upon such improper activities; or the willful violation of the Securities Act of 1933, the Securities Act of 1934, or the Investment Advisers Act of 1940, will also constitute bases for statutory disqualification.

(2) The proposed amendment would amend section 203(c) to require disclosure of the information necessary to disclose any such disqualification.

Section 4—Provision for postponement of effectiveness of registration when denial proceedings are instituted

Present law: Section 203(e) now provides that the effectiveness of an application for registration is not postponed by the commencement of a proceeding to determine whether an order of denial should be entered, unless the Commission finds that such postponement is in the public interest.

Problem: Under section 211(c) such order postponing effectiveness of registration can be entered only after notice and opportunity for hearing, and this procedure has proved administratively unworkable because such an order generally has to be entered within

30 days after the application is filed or the application will become effective under section 203(c). It would ordinarily be a practical impossibility within that limited period, to give adequate notice of a hearing, conduct the hearing, review the record, and enter an order, all in compliance with the Administrative Procedure Act. Furthermore, if such an effort were undertaken it would usually be necessary to duplicate the conduct of hearings and the taking of evidence on both the postponement question and the denial question.

Remedy in the bill: Under the proposed amendment to section 203(e), the commencement of a proceeding to deny registration would postpone effectiveness of an application for registration for a period of 90 days, or until final determination in the denial proceeding if that occurs sooner; and if the proceeding extends beyond 90 days, the Commission could postpone effectiveness beyond the 90-day period only after a hearing on the question of further postponement.

Section 5—Addition of provision relating to the right to withdraw an application for registration

Present law: Section 203(g) provides that a registered investment adviser may withdraw from registration only upon such terms and conditions as the Commission may impose in the public interest or for the protection of investors. The statute does not contain any provision with respect to the withdrawal of an application for registration.

Problem: Upon receipt of an application for registration, inquiry is made to determine whether there is any bar to such person becoming registered, and whether it is in the public interest to deny the registration. This necessitates investigation concerning many factors, including identity, past history, business experience and affiliations. Frequently it is necessary to obtain evidence on these matters from various parts of the United States, as well as from outside the country. If the applicant has the right to withdraw after a proceeding has been instituted to deny his registration, the Commission may be in a position where it will be unable to prove a disqualification at a later date if a new application is filed. When much time and effort have been devoted to the matter and expense has been incurred, it is appropriate that a hearing be held so that a determination can be made as to whether or not there is a statutory bar and whether it is in the public interest to enter an order of denial. If an applicant is permitted to withdraw under such circumstances, the Commission at a later date may be required to conduct a new investigation to try to find available evidence under circumstances which may make it much more difficult to make the necessary findings.

Remedy in the bill: The proposed amendment specifically provides that an application for registration may be withdrawn only with the consent of the Commission if the request for withdrawal is received by the Commission after it has instituted proceedings to deny registration.

Section 6—Addition of power to compel maintenance of books and records and expansion of power to inspect

Present law: The act now contains no grant of power to inspect the books and records of investment advisers; in fact, there is no requirement that they maintain any books or records. The act authorizes investigations concerning violations of the act only when it appears that its provisions have been or are about to be violated.

Problem: Unless the Commission has sufficient information to bring its investigative powers into play, it has no authority to examine the books and records of investment advisers to determine whether they are engaging in fraudulent, deceptive, or other unlawful practices.

Remedy in the bill: The proposed amendment to section 204 would require investment advisers subject to registration to maintain the books and records prescribed by Commission rules and regulations and would authorize the Commission to conduct routine inspections of investment advisers. The Commission has similar authority with respect to brokers and dealers under section 17(a) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934.

This power of inspection would be limited, however, by section 210(c) of the act which provides that the Commission cannot require an investment adviser engaged in rendering investment supervisory services to disclose the identity, investments, or affairs of any client except in a particular proceeding or investigation. Many investment advisers rendering investment supervisory services have in their records some very personal information about their clients and their clients' families, and there is some question as to whether information concerning the investments or affairs of clients should have to be disclosed except in a formal investigation or proceeding. If a routine inspection of the adviser's books and records should indicate possible fraudulent or other improper practices with respect to the affairs of any client, the Commission could order a formal investigation to obtain information concerning the adviser's handling of clients' accounts.

Section 7—Clarification of prohibitions against performance of certain investment advisory contracts

Present law: Section 205 of the act now prohibits registered investment advisers from entering into, extending, renewing, or performing certain types of investment advisory contracts.

Problem: Section 205 is not specifically applicable to investment advisers subject to registration who have not registered.

Remedy in the bill: The amendment makes section 205 applicable to investment advisers subject to registration, whether or not they have registered.

Section 8—Extension of antifraud provisions

Present law: Section 206 of the act prohibits certain fraudulent and deceptive practices by registered investment advisers.

Problem: This section is now applicable only to registered investment advisers. Fraud is no less vicious because it is perpetrated by an unregistered investment adviser. Just as the antifraud provisions of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 are applicable to brokers and dealers irrespective of registration, so should the antifraud provisions of this act be applicable to all investment advisers.

Remedy in the bill: The proposed amendment would apply the antifraud provisions of section 206 to all investment advisers, whether registered or not.

Section 9—Addition of rulemaking power to implement antifraud provisions

Present law: Present section 206 contains general prohibitions against fraudulent activities.

Problem: Because of the general language of section 206 and the absence of express rulemaking power in that section, there has always been a question as to the scope of the fraudulent and deceptive activities which are prohibited and the extent to which the Commission is limited in this area by common law concepts of fraud and deceit.

Remedy in the bill: It is proposed that a new paragraph (4) be added to section 206 which would empower the Commission, by rules and regulations to define, and prescribe means reasonably designed to prevent, acts, practices and courses of businesses which are fraudulent, deceptive or manipulative. This is comparable to section 15(c)(2) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 which applies to brokers and dealers.

Section 10 would amend the caption of section 208 of the act. In view of the proposed addition of new subsection (d) to this section, the Commission believes that the caption "General prohibitions" would be more descriptive of the content of the section than "Unlawful representations."

Section 11—Addition of provisions relating to prohibited activities

Present law: None.

Problem: There is no provision in the act expressly prohibiting any person, indirectly or through any other person, from violating the act or any rule or regulation thereunder. Furthermore, in the absence of any express statutory provision, there may exist some doubt as to the Commission's authority to obtain an injunction, or to impose administrative sanctions, against persons aiding or abetting violations of the act.

Remedy in the bill: The proposed amendment would make it unlawful for a person to do indirectly what he cannot do directly, and would also make it unlawful for any person to aid, abet or procure a violation by another person. It is also designed to make it clear that persons associated with an investment adviser may be liable in civil and administrative proceedings for violation of the prohibitions which by their terms apply only to investment advisers. This provision does not in any manner constitute a limitation with respect to the applicability in criminal proceedings of section 2, title 18, United States Code, which deals with the criminal liabilities of aiders and abettors.

Section 12—Clarification of provisions relating to the enjoining of violations of the act

Present law: Section 209(e) now provides that the Commission may bring an action to enjoin certain practices when it appears to the Commission that any "person has engaged or is about to engage" in such acts or practices.

Problem: The statute does not specifically provide that the Commission may bring an action for an injunction when it appears that any person is engaged in prohibited acts or practices.

Remedy in the bill: The proposed amendment would modify the quoted clause to read "has engaged, is engaged or is about to engage."

Section 13—Clarification of Commission's power to make public certain matters pertaining to investigations and inspections

Present law: Section 210(b) now provides, subject to certain exceptions, that the Commission shall not make public the fact that any investigation under the act is being conducted, or the results of such investigation, or any facts ascertained.

Problem: As this section now reads, it is not clear that the Commission could disclose to appropriate State officials facts ascertained in an investigation which tends to indicate a violation of State law.

Remedy in the bill: The proposed amendment would make it clear that the information gathered in an inspection or investigation could be disclosed in certain circumstances, but only with the approval of the Commission itself. The amendment would also make it clear that the prohibitions against disclosure apply not only to the Commission, but also to members, officers, and employees as well.

Section 14—Expansion of rulemaking powers

Present law: Section 211 (a) contains a delegation of rulemaking power and authorizes promulgation by the Commission of "such rules and regulations and such orders as are necessary or appropriate to the exercise of the powers conferred upon the Commission elsewhere in this title."

Problem: This rulemaking power is not cast in as broad language as that contained in the other acts administered by the Commission. Section 19(a) of the Securities Act gives the Commission the right to adopt rules and regulations "necessary to carry out the provisions" of the act; Section 23(a) of the Securities Exchange Act gives the Commission the right "to make such rules and regulations as may be necessary for the execution of the functions vested" in it by the act. The power of the Commission under the Investment Advisers Act should be as broad as it is under the other two acts if the Commission is to be able to carry out its powers and functions under this act.

Remedy in the bill: The proposed amendment would specifically permit the Commission also to adopt rules and regulations necessary for the Commission to carry out its functions under the act.

Section 15—Expansion of penalty provisions

Present law: Section 217 now provides penalties for willful violations of the act.

Problem: No provision is made for penalties for violations of rules, regulations or orders promulgated by the Commission.

Remedy in the bill: The amendment would make the penalty provisions also applicable to willful violations of any rule, regulation or order promulgated by the Commission under the authority of the statute.

Section 16—Addition of provision concerning effect on State law

Present law: None.

Problem: No section of the act deals specifically with the effect of the provisions of the act on State laws. The Securities Act of 1933 and the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 now contain provisions making it clear that the jurisdiction of a State securities commissioner or similar officer is not affected by provisions of those acts, so long as there is no conflict with their provisions.

Remedy in the bill: The amendment would add a new section which would provide that the jurisdiction of a State securities commissioner or similar officer would not be affected by provisions of the Investment Advisers Act so long as there was no conflict with its provisions.

LICENSING OF PUBLIC ADJUSTERS IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, the distinguished junior Senator from Maryland [Mr. BEALL], as everyone probably knows, was recently in the hospital. He is now out of the hospital and is convalescing very well. Notwithstanding his convalescence, he still gives great attention to his duties. He has sent me a bill which he desires to have introduced. I introduce the bill on his behalf.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1187) for the licensing of public adjusters in the District of Columbia, introduced by Mr. DIRKSEN (for Mr. BEALL), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

CLARIFICATION OF REEMPLOYMENT PROVISIONS OF UNIVERSAL MILITARY TRAINING AND SERVICE ACT

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend and clarify the reemployment provisions of the Universal Military Training and Service Act, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent that a statement in explanation of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1191) to amend and clarify the reemployment provisions of the Universal Military Training and Service Act, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. SALTONSTALL, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

The explanatory statement presented by Mr. SALTONSTALL is as follows:

STATEMENT IN EXPLANATION OF A BILL TO AMEND AND CLARIFY THE REEMPLOYMENT PROVISIONS OF THE UNIVERSAL MILITARY TRAINING AND SERVICE ACT, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

The purpose of this bill is to amend the existing reemployment provisions of the Armed Forces Reserve Act and the Universal Military Training and Service Act to add certain rights and to clarify certain existing rights. It would consolidate in section 9 of the Universal Military Training and Service Act, the provisions of law providing reemployment rights for ex-servicemen and reservists. Section 9(g)(3) of that act would be replaced by a new paragraph (3) containing the reemployment provisions now contained in section 262(f) of the Armed Forces Reserve Act of 1952 as amended, and section 262(f) would be repealed. The provisions presently contained in section 9(g)(3) would be strengthened and clarified and would be incorporated in a new section 9(g)(4).

Experience in the administration of the laws relating to veterans' reemployment rights has shown that clarifying legislation is needed to resolve inconsistencies and eliminate inequities.

At present, a National Guardsman who performs an initial period of from 3 to 6 months active duty for training has rights inferior to those of a Ready Reservist who performs the same training. This bill will give equal treatment for the same training.

All persons performing such training duty as 2-week encampments and weekly drills and those rejected for service or training now have 30 days to apply for reemployment in their jobs after such training or rejection. It is believed that this 30-day period is unreasonably long in relation to the amount of time away from the job. The bill would remedy this situation by requiring that application be made at the beginning of the next regularly scheduled work period after expiration of the necessary travel time to the place of employment following rejection or release, or within a reasonable time thereafter.

With respect to the period within which an application for reemployment must be filed by any member of a Reserve component or by a rejectee, the bill would permit the application to be filed after a 1-year period of hospitalization incident to training or rejection. This would eliminate the present inconsistent treatment which grants those on active duty in the Armed Forces a 1-year period of grace for hospitalization, some reservists a 6-month period, and other reservists none at all. The bill further provides the same disability protection for those performing training duty as is now provided under section 9(b) of the Universal Military Training and Service Act for persons on active duty or initial active duty for training.

The bill would also clarify the extent of protection accorded persons returning from periods of training duty with regard to their seniority, status, pay, and vacation.

Under existing law reemployment rights do not apply to "temporary" employment. There is a conflict in court decisions with respect to the status of probationary employees under the language "other than a temporary position," as used in section 9(b) of the act. The bill would make clear that probationary employment does not of itself characterize a position as "temporary."

The bill adds a new section 9(g)(5) which makes it clear that members of the National Guard performing specified training duty are covered by the reemployment provisions.

Further amendments to section 9 proposed by the Civil Service Commission have also been incorporated into the bill. These would amend the subsections of the act which confer reemployment rights on Federal employees. They are designed to equalize the rights of Federal employees with those in private employment.

INCREASED INCOME LIMITATIONS APPLICABLE TO PAYMENT OF CERTAIN PENSIONS

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to increase the income limitations applicable to the payment of pension for non-service-connected disability.

This bill does not call for a drastic change in existing legislation, Mr. President. It does not call for an increase in the payments of pension benefits. What it does, is bring up to date an equitable limitation on the amount of income a veteran or his widow may earn and still remain eligible for existing pension benefits.

Similar legislation has been introduced in the House of Representatives by my very able colleague, Representative HOGAN of Indiana. I ask unanimous consent that the bill may be printed in the RECORD at this point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1195) to amend sections 522 and 545 of title 38, United States Code, to increase the income limitations applicable to the payment of pension for non-service-connected disability or death to $1,800 and $3,000, introduced by Mr. HARTKE, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That sections 522(a) and 545(a) of title 38, United States Code, are each amended by striking out "$1,400" and "$2,700" and inserting in lieu thereof "$1,800" and "$3,000", respectively.

EQUAL NATURALIZATION BENEFITS FOR KOREAN VETERANS

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, last year I sponsored legislation to provide equal naturalization privileges for veterans who served honorably in the Armed Forces of the United States during the Korean war. Section 329 of the Immigration and Nationality Act provides that veterans who served honorably in the Armed Forces during the First and Second World Wars are entitled to naturalization, but no provisions were made for Korean war veterans.

This worthy legislation, I am pleased to report, passed the Senate on August 18, but, unfortunately, was not considered by the House of Representatives in the closing days of the session.

It is indeed a pleasure to report that both the American Legion and the Veterans of Foreign Wars have endorsed my proposal to grant equal naturalization privileges to veterans of the Korean war. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD correspondence I have received from Omar B. Ketchum, director, national legislative service, Veterans of Foreign Wars, and Miles D. Kennedy, director, legislative commission, the American Legion.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS
OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, D.C., April 2, 1958.

Senator RICHARD L. NEUBERGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

(Attention: Mr. Walter H. Dodd.)

MY DEAR SENATOR: This is to express the interest and support of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States for your bill, S. 3009, to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to accord Korean war veterans equal naturalization privileges.

S. 3009 was endorsed by the VFW national legislative committee in an official meeting during the month of February 1958. If and when hearings should be set for this bill I would appreciate being advised so that a representative from this office may be present and testify in behalf of our organization.

Sincerely yours,
OMAR B. KETCHUM, *Director.*

THE AMERICAN LEGION,
LEGISLATIVE COMMISSION,
Washington, D.C., May 15, 1958.

Mr. WALTER DODD,
Care of Hon. Richard L. Neuberger,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. DODD: In keeping with our telephone conversation of this afternoon, I enclose two copies of resolution No. 16 adopted at the April 30 to May 2, 1958, meeting of the national executive committee of the American Legion.

It is my opinion that, in keeping with this resolution, our organization can support Senator NEUBERGER's bill S. 3009 which would amend section 329(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act.

Thanking you for calling this matter to our attention, I am

Sincerely,
MILES D. KENNEDY,
Director.

RESOLUTION No. 16

Resolutions by the national executive committee meeting, the American Legion, held April 30–May 2, 1958

Committee: National Americanism Commission.

Subject: Amend section 329 (a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act.

Whereas under section 329(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, any person who, while an alien or a noncitizen national of the United States, has served honorably in an active-duty status in the Armed Forces of the United States during either World War I or World War II, and who, if separated from such service, was separated under honorable conditions, may be naturalized; and

Whereas any person who has served honorably in the Armed Forces of the United States during the Korean war is not accorded the same rights and privileges of naturalization as given to the veterans of World War I and World War II; and

Whereas simple justice requires that Korean war veterans be treated alike for they fought and died in the same manner as the veterans of World War I or World War II, in the service of their country, in its hour of need; and

Whereas the Veterans' Administration treats all veterans alike in passing on their service-incurred disabilities: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the American Legion in national executive committee assembled in Indianapolis, Ind., April 30–May 2, 1958, exert its wholehearted efforts to amend section 329(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act to read as follows (see emphasized portions):

"Any person who, while an alien or a noncitizen national of the United States, has served honorably in an active-duty status in the military, air, or naval forces of the United States during either World War I or during a period beginning September 1, 1939, and ending December 31, 1946, [or during a period beginning June 25, 1950, and ending July 1, 1955,] and who, if separated from such service, was separated under honorable conditions, may be naturalized as provided in this section * * *."

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, this oversight in our naturalization laws was first brought to my attention by the American Legion Cathay Post, No. 384, San Francisco, Calif., when I had the pleasure to address the post in the fall of 1957. The post has been most helpful in furnishing information, and I would like to commend post Commanders Robert K. Fong and Franck W. Wong in particular.

Mr. President, following the introduction of my equal naturalization bill last year, Mr. Omar Ketchum, director, national legislative service, VFW, called my attention to another provision of the Immigration and Naturalization Act which needs modification with respect to equality of treatment for veterans of the Korean war after their naturalization. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to place at this point in the RECORD, Mr. Ketchum's letter to me on this subject, dated April 7, 1958.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS
OF THE UNITED STATES,
Kansas City, Mo., April 7, 1958.

Senator RICHARD L. NEUBERGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR NEUBERGER: This is in further reference to your bill, S. 3009, to extend to veterans of the Korean conflict the same naturalization benefits which are now enjoyed by veterans of World War I and World War II. In connection with this bill you will be interested to know that our VFW Department of Washington adopted a resolution, approved by our national legislative committee, which requests equality of treatment for veterans of the Korean conflict after their naturalization.

Existing law provides that a naturalized United States citizen who returns to his native country for a period of 3 years or who moves to a third country for a period of 5 years loses his United States citizenship. An exception is allowed where the third country is concerned, however, for veterans of the Spanish-American War, World War I, or World War II. Such veterans would still lose their citizenship if they return to their native country and stay for 3 years. If they move to another country, however, they enjoy the same benefits as are enjoyed by native-born citizens of the United States; i.e., they are allowed to stay abroad as long as they wish without jeopardizing their citizenship.

As indicated, the benefits of the law after naturalization with regard to veterans are now available to veterans of the Spanish-American War and the two World Wars. When the present Immigration Code was enacted in 1952, the House version, H.R. 5678 of the 82d Congress, contained the language extending the law to veterans of the Korean conflict as well. The Senate omitted the latter, however, and the reference to the Korean conflict was dropped in the conference committee. The only reason for the omission was that at the time, in 1952, it was considered premature to make provisions for veterans of the Korean conflict, as hardly anyone would have been immediately affected by the law.

At the present time, by contrast, there are a substantial number of veterans of the Korean conflict to whom section 354 would be of importance. In view of the legal principle established by section 354 of the Immigration Act, it would be logical to extend the provisions of that section to this group of veterans as well.

It seems to us that the problem covered by the Washington resolution is so closely related to the problem which resulted in the introduction of your bill, S. 3009, that both matters could be covered by the same law. If you agree with me, may I suggest, therefore, that a second section be added to S. 3009 to read as follows:

"That section 354, paragraph (1) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, is amended by changing the language 'veteran of the Spanish-American War, World War I, or World War II' to 'veteran of the Spanish-American War, World War I, World War II, or the Korean conflict.'"

In closing, I wish to express my deep appreciation for your interest in the problems of American veterans.

Sincerely yours,
OMAR B. KETCHUM,
Director.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, the Department of the Navy has called my attention to a situation that I feel needs to be corrected. At the present time there is no provision in our immigration and naturalization laws to grant permanent resident status and thus eligibility for citizenship, to aliens who have honorably served in the Armed Forces of the United States, including the Coast Guard. At the present time the Navy has the authority to recruit annually up to 2,000 Philippine nationals and the Coast Guard has the authority to recruit 500 Filipinos per year. Many of these Filipinos serve in the stewards mate ratings, but others serve in the many general ratings which make up our modern Navy. The Navy is highly pleased with the fine and loyal service performed by these men.

The Department of the Navy has urged adoption of legislation to provide for the naturalization of aliens who enlist outside the United States and serve honorably in the Armed Forces. Legislation previous to the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952 permitted the granting of permanent resident status and United States citizenship outside of the regular immigration quota to aliens who served honorably in the Armed Forces.

I believe that there is need for such a provision in our laws at this time and

I have worked closely with officials of the Navy Department in drawing up such a proposal which is contained in section 3 of the bill which I am now introducing. My proposal provides that permanent resident status may be granted aliens who have served honorably in the Armed Forces of the United States, including the Coast Guard, for period or periods aggregating 5 years when such alien is a person of good moral character and such action would not be contrary to the national welfare, safety, or security.

Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to accord Korean war veterans equal naturalization privileges and to authorize the Attorney General to admit certain aliens who have served in the Armed Forces of the United States for a period aggregating 5 years as permanent residents, and I ask unanimous consent that this bill be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1196) to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to accord Korean war veterans equal naturalization privileges, and to authorize the Attorney General to admit certain aliens who have served in the Armed Forces of the United States for a period aggregating 5 years as permanent residents, introduced by Mr. NEUBERGER (for himself and Mr. ENGLE), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That subsection (a) of section 329 of the Immigration and Nationality Act is amended by inserting after "December 31, 1946," the following: "or during a period beginning June 25, 1950, and ending July 1, 1955,".

SEC. 2. Paragraph (4) of subsection (b) of section 329 of the Immigration and Nationality Act is amended by inserting after "December 31, 1946," the following: "or during a period beginning June 25, 1950, and ending July 1, 1955,".

SEC. 3. Section 245 of the Immigration and Nationality Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(c) If, upon application of any alien, it shall appear to the satisfaction of the Attorney General that (1) such alien has served honorably at any time in the Armed Forces of the United States (including the Coast Guard) for a period or periods aggregating five years, and who, if separated from such service, was never separated except under honorable conditions, (2) such alien is a person of good moral character, and (3) such action would not be contrary to the national welfare, safety, or security, the Attorney General may, notwithstanding any other provision of this Act or any other law, admit such alien to the United States for permanent residence, or, if such alien is in the United States, record the alien's last entry into the United States as an admission for permanent residence as of the date of such entry."

SEC. 4. (a) Paragraph (1) of subsection (d) of section 101 of the Immigration and Nationality Act is amended by inserting immediately after "December 31, 1946," the following: "or from June 25, 1950, to July 1, 1955,".

(b) Paragraph (2) of subsection (d) of section 101 of the Immigration and Nationality Act is amended (1) by striking out "and (C)" and inserting in lieu thereof "(C)", and (2) by inserting immediately after "December 31, 1946" the following: "; and (D) the term 'Korean conflict' relates to the period from June 25, 1950, to July 1, 1955".

SEC. 5. Paragraph (1) of section 354 of the Immigration and Nationality Act is amended by striking out "or World War II" and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "World War II, or the Korean conflict".

SOIL AND WATER CONSERVATION LABORATORY, UTAH

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to provide for the establishment of a soil and water conservation laboratory. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a statement prepared by me, relating to the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1201) to provide for the establishment of a soil and water conservation laboratory, introduced by Mr. BENNETT, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

The statement presented by Mr. BENNETT is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR BENNETT

I introduce a bill for appropriate reference which would authorize the construction of an irrigation, water control and soil research laboratory at Logan, Utah. This laboratory, which would be located at the mouth of Logan Canyon adjacent to the campus of the Utah State University, would carry out hydraulic engineering and soil studies as directed by the Soil and Water Conservation Research Division of the Department of Agriculture.

For several years, I have been interested in the establishment of these water and soil research facilities, and as a result I have worked cooperatively with other Members of Congress, the Department of Agriculture and officials at Utah State University in the hope of achieving this goal. Last year, I appeared and testified before the Senate Appropriations Committee and urged the appropriation of funds to permit a start on this project. The committee did not appropriate additional money at that time, but the members did recognize the need for such water and soil research facilities. As a result, the Senate Appropriations Committee requested the Department of Agriculture to make a study of facility needs for research on soil and water problems and to make a report to the committee on the scope of research results to be expected from existing facilities, and the feasibility of additional facilities. The report, to be made—not later than March 1, 1959—would also include the Department's recommended priority and procedure to be followed in planning and authorizing additional new research facilities, for all major research programs.

I am sure that the report, which is expected soon from the Agriculture Department, cannot fail to recognize the great need for soil and water research and, therefore, will approve and recommend construction of soil and water laboratory facilities similar to those proposed in this bill. I am today introducing appropriate legislation to call the attention of Congress to the unique advantages afforded at Logan.

WHY ARE THESE WATER RESEARCH FACILITIES NEEDED?

Water is the lifeblood of the West. Without an adequate supply of water, much of the land area in the 13 Western States would be arid desert wasteland, unfit for cultivation or human habitation. The development of a dynamic system of dams, reservoirs and canals to store up water and carry it to the farms and cities where it is put to beneficial use, has turned the desert into verdant meadows, and cowtowns into booming metropolises. The West is growing more rapidly than any area in the United States. Its future growth will be limited or controlled by how wisely and well the available meager supply of water can be put to beneficial use. The Congress, in its wisdom, realized the need for a comprehensive program of water development and has approved and appropriated money for the construction of multiple dams and reservoirs as part of the multi-million-dollar upper Colorado River project. The authorization of the water and soil research laboratory at Logan will be another long step in insuring the development of proper procedures for the delivering of water to the ultimate point of consumption, and to insure the limited supply will be put to its most beneficial use.

At the present time, there are some 1,400,000 acres of land being irrigated in the Upper Colorado River Basin. The potential development is estimated to bring an additional 1,200,000 acres of land under irrigation. Another 500,000 acres of land will receive supplemental water from the Colorado and its tributaries. This all points to the need for a comprehensive water and soil research program, and certainly there is no better place for such scientific studies to be conducted than at the Utah State University at Logan, Utah, a leading land-grant college.

WHAT STUDIES WOULD BE CONDUCTED BY THE LOGAN WATER AND SOIL LABORATORY?

The Utah State University site is ideally located for conducting a comprehensive water and soil research program. The university already owns and operates a power plant and dam across the Logan River, which would provide adequate flow, control and head for the necessary water tests. The site is within 1 mile of the main USU camps, where skilled technicians in all fields of agriculture and engineering are available to participate in the water and soil research program. At present, there is a cooperative State and Federal study being made at the university to find better materials and methods for lining canals so as to prevent water loss. This experiment could be incorporated into the larger overall water laboratory.

I am informed that some of the specific problems in need of accelerated research insofar as agriculture is concerned, include the following:

(1) Water supply, diversion and conveyance. This research will include investigation on water supply and delivery to and on the farm, factors affecting evaporation, and methods of improving development and design of water supply wells.

(2) Water application and drainage. This work would include research on efficient application of water, the problems of uniform distribution, surface soil erosion, drainage and consumptive use.

(3) Nutritional needs of crops and crop adaptation to soil and climate of the Upper Colorado River Basin. This would include research on the availability and need for the various fertilizer elements, including their relationship to moisture level, and, in addition, studies would be made on the problem of chlorosis.

(4) Management practices, including tillage, crop rotations, and reclamation. This research will include an evaluation of the best crop rotations for different areas, a determination of the most effective tillage practices, and development of procedures needed to reclaim soils affected by salinity and alkali.

(5) Physical and chemical properties of soils in relation to efficient crop production and water use. This research would include the determination of the nutrient content and its relative fertilizer need of the principal soil types, a determination of exchangeable ions and treatment needs for reclamation, and the relationship of the important physical properties to irrigation needs, drainage and special tillage and management requirements.

(6) Runoff and sediment yield of watershed lands. This would include the study of problems relating to runoff and would seek means of preventing and controlling erosion on our important watersheds.

The Utah State University has a world-famed corps of soil and water experts who would make invaluable contributions to the entire Nation through this new facility and allied research. I know of no other group of engineers and scientists who are so eminently well qualified to accomplish the vital soil and water research so needed in the arid Mountain States, with their unique problems.

AMENDMENT OF NATIONAL DEFENSE EDUCATION ACT OF 1958

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, the National Defense Education Act of 1958 established the policy that instruction in modern foreign languages is important to the United States. In order to carry out this policy, that act sets up language and area centers within the United States for the teaching of modern foreign languages to which students can go, and it authorizes the establishment of short term or regular session institutes for advanced training of teachers of modern foreign languages. These programs will, I am sure, result in much good to the study and teaching of modern foreign languages in the United States. However, in my judgment, these programs, desirable though they are, do not fill the entire need.

I am, therefore, introducing a bill which will add to the National Defense Education Act a new program, under which a teacher of a modern foreign language could, during the summer months, go to a country in which that language is spoken and could there study the language, the history, and the culture of the country, under appropriate conditions and surroundings. The foreign expenses of the program would be paid from the foreign currencies made available to the United States under such programs as Public Law 480, the Mutual Security Act, and the Economic Cooperation Act. Dollar appropriations would be authorized to pay stipends to prevent the teacher from suffering a financial loss by not obtaining a job in the United States during the summer.

This program would be comparable to the National Science Foundation summer institute programs for science and mathematics teachers, except that the study would take place abroad. It would also resemble the few programs now being undertaken under the Fulbright Act. This summer 20 grants are available for Spanish teachers to go to Colombia; 25 grants are available for French teachers to go to France; and 25 grants are available to German teachers to go to Germany. These three programs, however, do not provide stipends to meet the need of the teacher for earnings during the summer and, consequently, many teachers are unable to take advantage of them. And in any event, 70 grants are entirely inadequate compared to the 15,000 or 20,000 language teachers in the secondary schools.

The need for improvement of teaching modern foreign languages is, I believe, universally recognized, and I can think of no better way to improve it than by studying in countries in which the languages are spoken. Mechanically, a teacher's vocabularly, pronunciation, and use of idiom would be greatly improved. Using a language as a means of communication, with people who speak it as their native tongue, is very different from classroom conversation, and, perhaps, even more important, would be the development of the teacher's understanding of the country, its people, customs, and civilization, and the natural interest and enthusiasm which a visitor to a foreign country obtains. The teacher's students and other teachers in the school system would benefit greatly.

Another benefit would be derived. American teachers going abroad under this program would be excellent representatives to foreign countries of American culture and the American way of life. Exchange of persons programs are an effective way of improving the understanding of one country by the other. And the effectiveness is increased greatly when the people involved are a selected group like our teachers, and even more when they are going abroad for a specific study program in their own professional field.

I am convinced that this program would result in a real improvement in modern foreign language teaching, at a very moderate cost.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1205) to amend the National Defense Education Act of 1958 in order to provide advanced training for teachers of foreign languages in the areas in which such languages are used, introduced by Mr. FULBRIGHT, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Title VI of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 is amended by inserting at the end thereof a new part as follows:

"PART C—FOREIGN STUDY

"Authorization

"SEC. 621. The Commissioner is authorized, during the period beginning July 1, 1959, and ending with the close of June 30, 1962, to make grants to individuals, who are engaged in the teaching, in an elementary or secondary school or an institution of higher education, of any modern foreign language (with respect to which the Commissioner makes the determination under clause (1) of subsection (a) of section 601). Such grants shall be for the purpose of enabling such individuals, during the summer period when their services as teachers are not required, to obtain in an area, region, or country in which the language they are teaching is commonly used, advanced training in such language and training in other fields needed for a full understanding of such area, region, or country.

"Funds made available

"SEC. 622. (a) Notwithstanding section 1415 of the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1953, or any other provision of law, the Commissioner, in carrying out the provisions of this part, may use currencies, or credits for currencies, of any foreign government (1) held or available for expenditure by the United States and not required by law or agreement with such government to be expended or used for any other purpose, or (2) made available under the provisions of subsection (b) of this section.

"(b) In order to make additional funds available for the purposes of this part the Secretary of State is authorized to enter into an executive agreement or agreements with any foreign government for the use of currencies, or credits for currencies, of such government deposited pursuant to agreements entered into under section 142(b) of the Mutual Security Act of 1954 or section 115(b)(6) of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, and not required by agreement with such government to be expended or used for any other purposes.

"Appropriations authorized

"SEC. 623. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this part."

SEC. 2. The table of contents of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 is amended by inserting after

"Sec. 611. Authorization."

the following:

"PART C—FOREIGN STUDY

"Sec. 621. Authorization.
"Sec. 622. Funds made available.
"Sec. 623. Appropriations authorized."

PROTECTION OF JURISDICTION OF SUPREME COURT

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], the Senators from Oregon [Mr. MORSE and Mr. NEUBERGER], and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a joint resolution proposing that the United States Constitution be amended to protect the jurisdiction of the Supreme Court as final authority in all cases involving constitutional issues.

Mr. President, I introduce the joint resolution today because it follows as a proper sequel the action taken on Tuesday by the American Bar Association's House of Delegates.

A serious controversy which is brewing may again endanger the traditional role of the U.S. Supreme Court as ultimate arbiter on the construction of the Constitution. Almost all the proposals included in the Jenner-Butler bill of last

session, which was meant to strike directly at the Supreme Court's jurisdiction in constitutional cases have been reintroduced this year. Individually, many of these bills are meant to deal with specific decisions by the Court; but their cumulative effect is to encourage raiding on the Supreme Court's jurisdiction and basic function, inherent in our form of government, as ultimate protector of the rights of individuals and minorities.

The latest development in this gathering storm took place on Tuesday of this week in Chicago, when the American Bar Association's House of Delegates adopted a series of resolutions directed against Supreme Court decisions dealing with internal security. If they are misunderstood or misconstrued by the American people, there is a very real danger that these resolutions will bolster proposals to limit the Court's jurisdiction to declare laws unconstitutional, a proposition rebutted by these very American Bar Association resolutions, as adopted by its house of delegates.

By massing together the cases to which exception is taken, and by attributing a weakening in our internal security posture to some of the recent decisions by the Supreme Court, the American Bar Association has run the risk of creating the very impression it seeks to refute, for the general public may very easily construe the association's resolutions to mean that the damage was done by wrong or harmful decisions of the Court, rather than by the inadequacy of law and practice which were actually responsible for producing the effect on internal security.

Mr. President, it seems to me that even the bar association's resolutions themselves, whatever there may be to argue about in respect to them, make it clear that, as I understand them, broad, omnibus proposals intended to take away appellate jurisdiction of the Supreme Court in the constitutional law cases are, as I read the resolutions, unwise and are likely to create more problems than they will solve.

Mr. President, previously I have analyzed, and in later speeches I will analyze again, the detailed changes which the Congress has an absolute right to make in respect of decisions of the Supreme Court which indicate where changes have been made. But when the Supreme Court decides on the law, I do not believe it weakens our internal security. If we wish to change the law, it is our job to change it. But we cannot complain that in that way the Court is acting as a legislative arm.

I believe the time has come to certify that the jurisdiction of the Supreme Court is as much ingrained in the Constitution as is the jurisdiction of the Congress or as is the jurisdiction of the President. However, that is not so today. I do not believe the people understand that. This defender of the liberties of the individual—which in the final analysis is what the Supreme Court is—should have its jurisdiction, in terms of its powers, written into the Constitution, just as in the case of the other coordinate branches of the Government.

In our zeal to protect and bolster our internal security, we must never forget that the whole society we seek to safeguard is built upon the proposition that the law as it is decided for one—even one whom all of us may abhor, such as a confirmed Communist—is the law as it is decided for all, including the ordinary citizen who may at any time be accused of a crime, major or minor. It is in this framework that the Supreme Court for more than 156 years has been the guardian of the rights of the individual, performing functions indispensable to each citizen's well being. That is why its jurisdiction with regard to the constitutionality of all laws and actions needs to be spelled out in the Constitution, and not left exposed to the varied political whims or the political climate existing in the Congress at any given time.

Therefore, I believe it is essential that this joint resolution be introduced, so that sincere efforts to clarify congressional intent previously interpreted in decisions by the Supreme Court will not be confused with any all-out drive by the "court raiders" to deprive the Supreme Court of its jurisdiction, or will not be used by them to further their cause. Those of us who opposed the mass attack against the Supreme Court last year, as contained in the Jenner-Butler bill—and that includes the American Bar Association, which opposed it, and previously had recommended a constitutional amendment itself—now have a crystal-clear duty to assure the jurisdiction of the Supreme Court by providing for it in the Constitution. The Court's function of protecting individual freedom must be made secure; it must be put beyond the reach of political pressures or adverse reactions to individual decisions which may prove highly unpopular to any group, be it liberal or conservative.

Although the Supreme Court has, by tradition, historical acceptance, and the continuity of Court decisions, exercised authority to declare unconstitutional any act of Congress or law of a State, and has truly expressed the supreme law of the land in all cases involving constitutional issues, nowhere has that authority been specifically vested in it by the Constitution. There exists the ever present threat that it can be taken away by Congress at any time. It is my intention and that of seven of my colleagues, therefore, to amend section I of article III of the Constitution, which now states that the Court shall have appellate jurisdiction, both as to law and as to fact, with such exceptions, and under such regulations, as the Congress shall make. The amendment would add to that section this new sentence:

> In all cases arising under this Constitution the Supreme Court shall have appellate jurisdiction, both as to law and fact.

It is virtually important that this jurisdiction be confirmed now so as to put an end to—in the words of the American Bar Association report—"omnibus proposals for limiting its (the Supreme Court's) appellate jurisdiction." Such an amendment does not mean that all of us must automatically agree with all the Court's decisions; but those of us who are lawyers do understand and recognize the effectiveness within our constitutional system of a judicial tribunal to give final interpretations of the Constitution. Neither will such a constitutional amendment in any way impede Congress from exercising to the full its legislative duty to set forth its intent in new statutes, when it believes that the Supreme Court mistakenly interpreted its intent in a prior statute. Undoubtedly, there are several appropriate areas which call for congressional action to close up loopholes which I believe are generally attributable to the past failure or inadequacy of Congress to act, rather than to the Court's decisions.

For example, Congress ought to remedy its failure to define in precise terms the authority of the House Committee on Un-American Activities. Similarly, it should determine the question of principal involved in preempting the entire field of sedition against the United States as a field for Federal laws, or whether State laws should also be allowed to have concurrent enforceability—a question raised in the famous Nelson case. Yet another example is offered in the Smith Act decision regarding the language on advocacy of an abstract doctrine, compared with advocacy of action in connection with overthrowing the Government by force. That case involves constitutional questions which would have to be resolved, notwithstanding any law passed by Congress.

This joint resolution is similar to the one I introduced in the 85th Congress in 1958, and has the same sponsors.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 57) to propose an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the jurisdiction of the Supreme Court, introduced by Mr. JAVITS (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PROPOSED AMENDMENT OF CONSTITUTION RELATING TO A VOTE FOR CITIZENS OF WASHINGTON, D.C.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, when you stop to think about the matter, it is a shocking thing that the country which boasts of leadership in promoting self-government and freedom does not provide a voice for the people who live at its own seat of government—Washington, D.C.

Under the Constitution, Congress has the exclusive legislative responsibility for the District of Columbia. Yet no person whose legal residence is Washington, D.C., has a vote in electing any Member of or Delegate to the Congress.

Under laws passed pursuant to the Constitution, the President selects the Commissioners who administer this city's government. Yet no one whose voting residence would be Washington, D.C., has any voice in the election of the President. Only the echo of a voice is provided by the legislation which was enacted within recent years to provide

machinery whereby delegates to national party conventions might be democratically chosen.

For the actual election of a President or presidential electors, citizens of Washington do not vote.

It is time that this situation was changed.

To that end, Mr. President, today I am introducing, for appropriate reference, a constitutional amendment to be submitted to the States.

This amendment would provide for the election of three presidential electors.

Also, consistent with the basis for electoral apportionment, whereby presidential electors reflect representation in the National Congress, this amendment proposes that the people of the District shall be entitled to elect in such manner as the Congress may provide, three Delegates to the House of Representatives with such powers as the Congress, by law, shall determine.

This proposal, Mr. President, I believe, will commend itself to the people of the several States.

In effect, it will provide that here at the seat of government of the United States, the hundreds of thousands of persons with the qualifications required by article II of the Constitution and who do not maintain voting residence in any of the several States, may have representation in the body that makes the laws under which they live and in the selection of the President who heads the executive branch of the Government for them even more directly and completely than for any other part of our country.

Mr. President, in this 150th anniversary year of the birth of Abraham Lincoln, it is "altogether fitting and proper" for us to resolve that those whose taxes we collect and spend, whose sons we take for military service, and whose day-to-day affairs we direct and govern, shall share in "government of the people, by the people, and for the people." This is the city where Lincoln gave his life that the Union might live. Let us honor his memory by action this year.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the proposed constitutional amendment may follow these remarks in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the joint resolution will be printed in the RECORD.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 60) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States granting representation in the House of Representatives and in the electoral college to the District of Columbia, introduced by Mr. CASE of South Dakota, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two-thirds of each House concurring therein), That the following article is hereby proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States:

"ARTICLE —

"SECTION 1. In choosing the President and the Vice President of the United States, the people of the District constituting the seat of the Government of the United States shall be entitled to elect, in such manner as the Congress may provide by law, three electors who shall possess the qualifications required by article II of the Constitution and whose ballots shall be cast and counted as provided by the twelfth article of amendment of the Constitution.

"SEC. 2. The people of the District constituting the seat of the Government of the United States shall be entitled to elect, in such manner as the Congress may provide by law, three delegates to the House of Representatives with such powers as the Congress, by law, shall determine.

"SEC. 3. (a) The Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation.

"(b) All legislation enacted pursuant to this article shall be subject to amendment and repeal.

"SEC. 4. This article shall be inoperative unless it shall have been ratified as an amendment to the Constitution by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within seven years from the date of its submission to the States by the Congress."

CIVIL WAR CENTENNIAL MEDAL

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS], and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a joint resolution to amend Public Law 305 of the 85th Congress relative to the establishment of a commission to commemorate the 100th anniversary of the Civil War, to authorize the manufacture and sale of a Civil War Centennial Medal.

Mr. President, the Civil War Centennial Commission in its meeting on January 6, 1959, unanimously adopted a resolution endorsing legislation granting it authority to enter into agreements with the Department of the Treasury with respect to the manufacture of a medal in commemoration of the centennial of the Civil War.

Money spent for the manufacture of such a medal would come from the appropriation already authorized for the Commission. The proposed joint resolution would give the Commission authority to sell these medals and the Commission hopes that it can sell them at premium above cost. Members of the Commission and others who render noteworthy service to the commemoration will be awarded medals. All the senatorial members of the Commission have joined to cosponsor the introduction of this joint resolution which is an amendment to the act of September 7, 1957, by which the Commission was created.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 61) to amend Public Law 305 of the 85th Congress relative to the establishment of a commission to commemorate the 100th anniversary of the Civil War, to authorize the manufacture and sale of a Civil War Centennial Medal, introduced by Mr. O'MAHONEY (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSION OF TIME FOR JOINT ECONOMIC COMMITTEE TO SUBMIT ITS REPORT

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, according to the Employment Act of 1946 the Joint Economic Committee is supposed to file its report on the Economic Report of the President on the 1st of March. The committee has voted unanimously to request that it be given until March 9 to file its report. I ask unanimous consent that this additional time be granted the committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

TREATY OF AMITY WITH SULTAN OF MUSCAT AND OMAN AND DEPENDENCIES—REMOVAL OF INJUNCTION OF SECRECY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, as in executive session, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate remove the ban of secrecy with regard to the treaty of amity, economic relations and consular rights with the Sultan of Muscat and Oman, Executive A, 86th Congress, 1st session, transmitted to the Senate today by the President of the United States, signed at Salalah on December 20, 1958, and that the treaty, with the accompanying papers, be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and that the message from the President be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The message from the President is as follows:

To the Senate of the United States:

With a view to receiving the advice and consent of the Senate to ratification, I transmit herewith a treaty of amity, economic relations and consular rights between the President of the United States of America and the Sultan of Muscat and Oman and Dependencies, together with a protocol relating thereto, signed at Salalah on December 20, 1958.

I transmit also, for the information of the Senate, the report by the Acting Secretary of State with respect to the treaty.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *February 26, 1959.*

CHANGE OF REFERENCE OF NOMINATION

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, on January 17, 1959, there was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency the nomination of T. Graydon Upton, of Pennsylvania, to be U.S. Executive Director of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development for a term of 2 years.

In view of the fact that proposed legislation dealing with the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development subsequently has been referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking and Currency be discharged from further consideration of the nomination reference and that it be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

This request has the approval of the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Virginia? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

TAXATION OF INCOME OF LIFE INSURANCE COMPANIES—AMENDMENT

Mr. CARLSON (for himself and Mr. HARTKE) submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to the bill (H.R. 4245) relating to the taxation of the income of life insurance companies, which was referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed.

Mr. MORTON subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment submitted earlier today by the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], on behalf of himself and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE], may lie on the desk until the Senate adjourns Monday next, in order that other Senators who may desire to do so may become cosponsors.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ALLEVIATION OF CONDITIONS OF UNEMPLOYMENT IN CERTAIN ECONOMICALLY DEPRESSED AREAS—AMENDMENT

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, on behalf of the junior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS], the senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MCCARTHY], and myself, I submit, for appropriate reference, an amendment to Senate bill 722, the area redevelopment bill.

This amendment would provide assistance to those individuals, companies, and communities suffering serious injury or threatened with serious injury due to increased imports resulting from the national trade policy. In operation, the amendment would provide the President with a useful alternative to the choice presently available to him under the escape clause and peril point provisions of the Trade Agreements Act. If the Tariff Commission recommends an increase in tariffs, but the President finds that it would not be in the national interest to increase the duty, the President is authorized to report this to the Area Redevelopment Administrator. If the Administrator then finds that the reduction of trade barriers "can reasonably be expected to cause continuing unemployment of 6 percent or more," he may make available to the employees, employers, and communities affected all of the assistance provided by the Area Redevelopment Act.

I firmly believe in expanded trade among the free nations of the world. The Trade Agreements Act, which I supported, properly reduces barriers to such trade. However, many of our domestic industries which are legitimately in need of relief from imports learn after they go through the time-consuming, expensive procedures of the Tariff Commission to have their cases fairly adjudicated that the relief must be denied them for national policy reasons. I believe that this confers a responsibility upon the Federal Government to alleviate the distress to industry, the unemployment hardships of the workers, and the harm to the community. The bill does not subsidize American industry or relocate workers. Its only intention is to aid individuals, communities, and industries in their efforts to adjust to changed conditions.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be received, printed, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

NEW USES AND NEW MARKETS FOR FARM PRODUCTS—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILL

Under authority of the order of the Senate of February 19, 1959, the name of Mr. SALTONSTALL was added as an additional cosponsor of the bill (S. 1124) to provide for a scientific study and research program for the purpose of developing increased and additional industrial uses of agricultural products so as to reduce surpluses of such products and to increase the income of farmers, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. CAPEHART (for himself and other Senators) on February 19, 1959.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] be added as a cosponsor of Senate bill 1124, the farm bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

VETERANS READJUSTMENT ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1959—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILL

Under authority of the order of the Senate of February 19, 1959, the names of Senators MCGEE, SPARKMAN, GREEN, MORSE, HILL, RANDOLPH, CHAVEZ, EASTLAND, LANGER, Mrs. SMITH, HUMPHREY, NEUBERGER, GRUENING, CLARK, KEFAUVER, PASTORE, HENNINGS, BYRD of West Virginia, WILLIAMS of New Jersey, KENNEDY, and MAGNUSON, were added as additional cosponsors of the bill (S. 1138) to provide readjustment assistance to veterans who serve in the Armed Forces between January 31, 1955, and July 1, 1963, introduced by Mr. YARBOROUGH (for himself and Senators MCNAMARA, YOUNG of Ohio, MURRAY, and HART) on February 19, 1959.

AMENDMENT OF AGRICULTURAL ADJUSTMENT ACT OF 1938—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Under authority of the order of the Senate of February 19, 1959, the name of Mr. CHAVEZ was added as an additional cosponsor of the bill (S. 1140) to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, introduced by Mr. CARLSON (for himself and other Senators) on February 19, 1959.

ENCOURAGEMENT AND DEVELOPMENT OF PETROLEUM AND COAL RESERVES—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILL

Under authority of the order of the Senate of February 23, 1959, the names of Mr. RANDOLPH, Mr. Moss, and Mr. ANDERSON were added as additional cosponsors of the bill (S. 1157) to encourage the development of petroleum and coal reserves within the United States, introduced by Mr. O'MAHONEY (for himself and other Senators) on February 23, 1959.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD.

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. HARTKE:

Address delivered by Senator SYMINGTON at Jefferson-Jackson Day victory dinner, Indianapolis, Ind., February 14, 1959.

By Mr. FULBRIGHT:

Address delivered by Senator ROBERTSON at the finance industry staff conference, February 20, 1959.

By Mr. ERVIN:

Address delivered by Senator BIBLE before the Young Democratic Clubs of North Carolina on January 17, 1959.

By Mr. BARTLETT:

Address delivered by Senator GRUENING at exercises incident to the 1959 voice of democracy contest, in Washington, D.C., on February 25, 1959.

By Mr. YARBOROUGH:

Tributes to Ernest Joiner, owner and publisher of the Ralls (Texas) Banner, published in the 1958 edition of the South Plains Yearbook "Parade of Progress," and in the Texas Observer of September 19, 1958.

By Mr. WILEY:

Press release issued by him dealing with appointments to U.S. Service Academies.

Letter dealing with Operation Understanding.

NOTICE OF HEARINGS ON CERTAIN NOMINATIONS BY COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, as chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, I desire to announce that the Senate received today the following nominations:

Mrs. Clare Boothe Luce, of Connecticut, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Brazil, vice Ellis O. Briggs.

Henry J. Heinz II, of Pennsylvania, to be the representative of the United States of America to the 14th session of the Economic Commission for Europe of the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations.

Notice is given that the Committee on Foreign Relations, at the expiration of 6 days, in accordance with the committee rule, will give consideration to these nominations.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Ratchford, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

DEDICATION OF STATUE OF DR. FLORENCE RENA SABIN, OF COLORADO

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, at 2 o'clock this afternoon ceremonies will be conducted in the rotunda of the Capitol to honor a Coloradan whose contributions to the field of medicine have made her a beloved figure, not only in my own State, but nationwide.

The bronze statue of Dr. Florence Rena Sabin, who died in 1953, is the first to be placed in Statuary Hall by Colorado. The ceremonies today climax a program, begun nearly 5 years ago, to raise the funds necessary to obtain the statue. All the money has been obtained through public contribution—pennies, as well as dollars—another expression of the esteem in which this remarkable woman is held by the people in my State.

Dr. Sabin won dual fame, first for her outstanding achievements in the field of medical research, and later for her successful battle to improve Colorado health laws and standards.

She was the first woman to be appointed a full professor at Johns Hopkins Medical School. As a student, Dr. Sabin constructed a model of the brain of a newborn child, a hallmark in its field, providing a new area of medical knowledge. In 1925, this native of Central City, Colo., became the first woman elected to life membership in the National Academy of Sciences.

She was the first woman to head a department at the Rockefeller Institute for Medical Research, where she established a Department of Cellular Studies.

As a member of a committee appointed by the National Tuberculosis Association, Dr. Sabin helped integrate various tuberculosis studies, and gave the entire research effort more meaning.

In 1938 this grand woman decided to retire and return home. But 6 years later she moved into what was to become one of her most important roles, membership and leadership on a statewide committee on health.

By 1946 her "quiet hobby" had begun to show signs of the tremendous effect it was to have on our State health program, and the next year the Colorado Legislature passed seven of the eight Sabin health bills.

Dr. Sabin died of a heart attack on October 3, 1953, while watching a world series baseball game. She was 81.

Her death has created a void which today's ceremonies will only partially fill. The statue to be dedicated is a humble tribute from her fellow Coloradans to a remarkable woman and a great humanitarian.

VERMONT TIES OF DR. FLORENCE R. SABIN

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, Vermonters, as well as Coloradans, are proud of the contributions to human welfare of Dr. Florence Rena Sabin, to whose memory an impressive statue will be dedicated this afternoon in the rotunda of the Capitol.

Although Dr. Sabin was born in Colorado, her roots and antecedents were entirely in Vermont. Her father, George Kimball Sabin, was a member of one of the pioneer families in the village of Rockingham, Vt., near Bellows Falls. Various members of the Sabin family were active in local community and State affairs. The Sabin farm was one of the early landmarks of the area.

Dr. Sabin's father moved to Colorado, and became a mining engineer. There he met and married Rena Miner, who had come from Vermont, to teach school in the rugged West. They sent their two daughters, Florence Rena and Mary Sophia, back to Vermont, to have the advantage of their cultural heritage in the Green Mountain State.

Both girls attended the Vermont Academy, at Saxtons River. Florence was graduated from that academy in 1889. Until her death in 1953, at the age of 81, she maintained her interest in the Vermont Academy, and is considered by this school to be its most illustrious graduate. She was made a charter member, cum laude, of the academy's honorary scholastic society; and students and graduates of the academy have contributed generously to the fund which made possible the statue dedicated today.

The Vermont Academy, where Dr. Sabin's intellectual and scientific curiosity was first aroused, is one of the many small but fine educational institutions in Vermont which attract students from many parts of the country. Founded as a coeducational school in 1876, it has since 1931 been an outstanding boarding school for boys.

After graduating from the Vermont Academy, Florence Sabin earned her B.S. at Smith College and her M.D. at Johns Hopkins Medical School, where she later became the first woman to attain the rank of full professor. In 1925 she joined the staff of the Rockefeller Institute for Medical Research, where she established and headed a department of cellular studies, and continued her research on blood and concentrated on the origin of tuberculosis. She also made notable contributions to knowledge of the lymphatic system and the brain.

Dr. Simon Flaxner once referred to Dr. Sabin as "the greatest living woman scientist and one of the foremost scientists of all time." It is not surprising that the National Academy of Sciences made her its first woman member, or that she became the first of her sex to be elected president of the American Association of Anatomists. Dr. Sabin was designated one of the 12 great women of the world and was the recipient of more than a dozen honorary degrees.

After her retirement in 1938 she initiated, fought, and won a hard battle for the improvement of public health laws in her native State, for she was not only interested in basic science, but in the application of science to human welfare.

"A time will come," she declared, "when men and women will live their allotted span quietly, peacefully, without illness, free from pain, until they pass gently, as a tired child closes sleepy eyes, from this world to the next."

Dr. Florence Sabin has helped to bring that time closer to our own. Vermont is proud to join Colorado in paying tribute to the memory of a truly great woman.

THE CARNATION AS THE NATIONAL FLOWER

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, in this hallowed Chamber, we are approaching a somewhat weedy situation. Various proposals for designation of our national flower are springing forth like shoots after a wet spring. They threaten to overrun other, even more vital issues.

I have nothing but the deepest of respect for my midwestern friends who champion the corn tassel. There is no great personal objection on my part to the reproductive significance of this fertile portion of that grand vegetable. Nor do I disdain the grass on which we walk, and which others would have us call our "flower."

My admiration for the good taste of the advocates of the rose is equally great. I grow the flower in my own garden at home. Like so many others, I have been injured by its thorns; but I bear the flower no malice.

However, for our national floral emblem, all these proposals suffer from distinct blights. Two are not true flowers in the accepted sense. The third is the national flower of five other nations, against one of which our forefathers fought—and in that conflict so many died—to gain our country's freedom.

Therefore, I propose as our national flower, a true flower, one which is the most widely grown cut flower in the United States, one which is perpetually flowering and knows no season. I present it in the spirit of Webster, Clay, and Calhoun, the spirit of amicable compromise. I offer for your consideration, Mr. President: The carnation.

Here is a flower acceptable to and appropriate for men as well as for women. Yet it has been accepted by former Congresses and Presidents as the official flower of Mother's Day.

The carnation is a true flower. It is grown and used only for its floral beauty and its symbolism. It has no problems, no thorns, no foliage dropoff, virtually no allergic effects.

While the carnation never has been chosen as the flower of any other nation, it has a history going back to antiquity. It grew wild in the hills of Greece before the birth of Christ. It appears frequently in the paintings of the Middle Ages and of the 18th and 19th centuries. As a flower, it has been

brought to perfection here to the point that many varieties are classed as American carnations.

As a favorite of all nationalities and races, of people such as President McKinley, and as a flower of all areas of our Nation, the carnation is particularly important as a symbol of our past, our present, and our future.

In selecting something so beautiful as a national flower should be, let us cultivate the good which makes America. Let us not mock the flower or mimic other nations. Let us not quarrel over such matters. Let us unite behind the carnation. Let us resolve this floral dispute by forging the second "great compromise."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a joint resolution on the carnation as the national flower may appear at the conclusion of my remarks. The joint resolution is cosponsored by the junior Senator from Colorado [Mr. CARROLL], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE].

There being no objection, the text of the joint resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the carnation is hereby designated and adopted as the national flower of the United States and the President is requested to declare such fact by proclamation.

Mr. KEATING subsequently said: Mr. President, I wish to express my personal gratitude to the distinguished Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT] for sending to me today a carnation to wear.

However, I invite his attention to a fact with respect to which he may not be informed, regarding the proudest, oldest, and loveliest flower—the rose. I invite his attention to the fact that fossils of the genus rosa, establishing the existence of the rose on this continent for more than 33 million years—considerably longer than this body has been in existence—were found in his own native State of Colorado. It is possible that this horticultural fact has escaped the attention of the Senator from Colorado, and that upon realization of that fact he may feel that Colorado should join the State of New York, which has made the rose its State flower. I sincerely hope that that will be the effect of my remarks today.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KEATING. I yield.

Mr. ALLOTT. I am delighted to hear the Senator speak. It is too bad he could not have paid more attention when I was delivering my very graceful—I think—address upon the carnation.

I have already pointed out that five other countries have adopted the beautiful and fragile rose as their national flower. A little over 150 years ago we fought a war to free ourselves from one of those nations.

I agree that the rose is a very beautiful, fragile flower. It looks beautiful in a vase.

However, I invite the attention of my distinguished colleague, who is one of my fine personal friends, to the fact that while the rose looks better upon the gown of a woman, the carnation is a flower which both men and women—and particularly men—may wear, with confidence in its ruggedness, its fertility, its virility, its courage, and all the other attributes that go with it.

Mr. KEATING. I think any flower looks better when worn by a woman than in any other surroundings.

I appreciate the remarks of the Senator from Colorado, but it seems to me that he has added an argument for the adoption of the rose, because, of all things we are seeking to accomplish in this world, one of the foremost is a closer relationship with our friends and allies. Perhaps the adoption of the rose as the national flower would tend to effect closer relationships.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from New York has expired.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from New York be granted an additional minute, in order that he may yield to me.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield to me?

Mr. KEATING. I yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Of course, English history records the War of the Roses, between the House of York and the House of Lancaster. I hope, after this long interlude, that the War of the Roses will not be resumed.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I am distressed to hear what I consider to be the misguided arguments being advanced here today.

The idea of a national flower or a national floral emblem is highly desirable, but I invite attention to the fact that some of us have introduced a bill proposing that the corn tassel be the national flower. With all respect to my friend from Colorado and my friend from New York, one of whom advocates the carnation and the other the rose, the corn tassel has various attributes. Corn has varied and diverse uses. One can speculate indefinitely on the use of corn in many ways. The corn tassel is a very beautiful flower. It represents food, among other things. It represents the strength of our country. It represents the hope of our agricultural regions—and all States are agricultural.

It seems to me that it is not only decorative, but it has great utility, which should appeal. While the rose is beautiful, and is grown in all States, and while the carnation is a wonderful flower, and has great sentimental value, being seen in profusion at funerals, and while I would not discredit the beauty of those flowers, I importune my colleagues to think about the stability and utility of corn, as represented by the corn tassel.

Mr. KEATING. I do not intend to express opposition to corn.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I should like to point out to my colleagues on the other side of the aisle that more roses grow in Oregon than in any other State, and that, unlike the corn tassel, the rose does not need price supports to enable it to flourish. [Laughter.]

Mr. MORTON subsequently said: Mr. President, I regret that I was necessarily absent during the early part of the morning hour because of an engagement I had in downtown Washington. I wish I had been present on the floor at the time my colleague from Colorado introduced his joint resolution designating the carnation as the national flower of the United States.

Mr. President, I wear a carnation. I might add it was given to me, free. I bear the carnation no malice. It is a beautiful flower. From the esthetic standpoint, it serves as a thing of beauty. I have not been able to find that it makes any great contribution to the welfare of our Nation or that it is essential to our economic survival in this troubled world.

I understand, too, that the corn tassel came up for more discussion this morning as a proposed national flower. May I point out that the corn tassel is not a full flower. It is merely the male flower. The ear of the corn is the female flower of the corn plant. I do not think we want to get into any controversy that is going to lose us the women's vote because of our adopting a male flower as the national floral emblem.

I might add, incidentally, that corn is converted into various products. Some of this conversion takes place in my native State of Kentucky. I know from experience we do not want to get into a debate, on what should be the national flower, that is going to stir up the Anti-Saloon League.

I again bring forth the proposal I made some time ago. At the appropriate time I shall introduce the proper resolution. It is that grass be our national flower.

There are those who say grass is not a flower, but I point out that grass does flower and seed. I point out that our first important resource is grass, and that our most important resource is the cow. Let us look at the cow, the foster mother of mankind. Where would the cow be, and, further, where would mankind be, but for grass? We are a meat-eating people. How could we satisfy our national hunger for meat, if it were not for grass, on which feed the animals that supply us with beef and mutton and lamb in such lavish quantities?

It was grass that was mentioned first in the story of creation. It was grass, with its deep, penetrating roots, that gave fertility and protection to the great plains and prairie soils of America. It was grass that sustained the buffalo, whence came our forefathers' food. It is grass that feeds the lowing cattle, the gentle sheep, the patient horse. It is to grass that we turn to heal our fields after they have been eroded and ravished by the plow and the cultivator. Grass is truly the hope of the conservationist and the dream of the naturalist.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I was somewhat surprised to come into the Chamber and learn that the Senator from Kentucky was eulogizing grass as the national floral emblem. I think this

is an attempted travesty on a very important subject. The Senator from Illinois, together with other Senators, has introduced a resolution making the golden corn tassel our national floral emblem.

I think the Senator from Kentucky was attempting, in a very subtle fashion, to ridicule the resolution. Let me say this so far as the golden corn tassel is concerned——

Mr. MORTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield in a minute.

While I do not intend to reflect upon the chief product of Kentucky, which is grass, and very green grass—not blue, but green—I do want to say the golden corn tassel is the natural American floral emblem.

The rose has its backers, and the rose is a beautiful flower; but the rose is already the national flower of Great Britain, Costa Rica, Iran, and I think one other country.

I do not believe we should slavishly adopt the floral emblem of other nations. Furthermore, we should remember that while the rose is beautiful, according to history it was the occasion for the war between the houses of Lancaster and York, between the followers of the White Rose and the followers of the Red Rose. I do not think that we should have such military connotations attached to any American floral emblem.

What I am proposing is the golden corn tassel as a symbol both of the beauty and the bounty of the Nation. Nothing could be more beautiful than a field of corn in full flower. The golden corn tassel is not only beautiful esthetically, but it is a symbol of the richness of our soil and the generosity of our nature.

Furthermore, corn is indigenous to the North American hemisphere. We have found minute ears of corn at least 5,000 years old among the remains of the Indian tribes of the Southwest. I have in my office a photograph of a Mexican piece of sculpture of approximately 1100 A.D., in which the ears of corn are no longer minute but are almost as large as the normal ears of corn today.

It was corn which kept the Pilgrims alive during the first hard winter at Plymouth. It was corn which kept the Jamestown settlers alive during the first difficult winters. Corn went with the pioneers across this Nation and furnished the main source of food for the settlers. Corn is now the chief farm crop of the United States. The center of the corn industry is of course in Iowa and in my own State of Illinois.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am glad to yield.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I will say to the distinguished Senator from Illinois it is corn which is now keeping alive about 300,000 West Virginians, since they do not have employment and their sole sustenance seems to be surplus commodities.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator from West Virginia reminds us of a very tragic fact, that there are hundreds of thousands of families in this country close to starvation, who can only get cornmeal and a few other food products. I wish they could get more corn. We would be glad to let them have wheat, also. When people are in trouble they turn to corn.

Mr. MORTON rose.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I will say to the Senator from Kentucky, a large part of the prosperity of Kentucky has been built upon corn, also—corn put into a liquid form. It is corn which perhaps should not have been imbibed by the people of this country, but nevertheless it is taken in a liquid form.

It ill behooves the Senator from Kentucky to try to upgrade grass and downgrade corn.

Mr. MORTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. MORTON. I want to make clear I was not trying to ridicule the Senator's resolution. I know the Senator is serious and is perfectly sincere in his objective.

As I pointed out earlier, there are some difficulties which I foresee in the legislative path with regard to the adoption of a national flower, as we go through the long legislative process of providing law.

I considered the case of corn, and I pointed out that the corn tassel is the male part of the flower and is not the full flower. The Senator will find Susan B. Anthony rolling over in her grave, should he make the fight for the corn tassel.

With respect to the Senator's remarks regarding the contribution of corn in my own State, the Senator will find the Anti-Saloon League and the WCTU knocking on his door to say, "Down with the corn tassel."

I merely bring out the point that the road before the Senator is a hard and rough road. I wish him well, but I intend to continue the fight for grass.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Illinois has expired.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may continue for an additional minute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Illinois? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I merely say we intend to keep up the struggle to have the golden corn tassel adopted as the American floral emblem. We shall use all proper and legitimate arguments in this endeavor. At a later time I shall develop the arguments at greater length.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, will the Senator yield, before he proceeds?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. In regard to the comments made by our distinguished friend from Kentucky, although I believe I have no relatives who are members of the Anti-Saloon League, the organization might very well have good reason to become concerned about the matter, since it is a fact that the people of this country spend $10 billion a year—$10 billion every 12 months—for the liquid products of corn and some of the other grains.

I sometimes think of a billion in this way: Only a billion minutes have passed since Jesus Christ was born, yet the people of this country every 365 days spend $10 for every minute which has passed since Jesus Christ was born. For what do they spend it? They spend it for something that destroys the minds, bodies, families, and reputations of the American people. It is nothing less than "booze."

I rise to the defense, if one might wish to say it in that manner, of those organizations which are striving to combat an evil which is taking lives of Americans every day, which is sending young men and young women to their deaths, and which is causing individuals to be sent to the electric chair.

I realize the reference was made in a moment of levity, but it is very well that I make a serious occasion of it while we are talking about the matter.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I appreciate the comments of the Senator from West Virginia.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Illinois has again expired.

EQUALIZATION OF RETIREMENT PAY OF MILITARY PERSONNEL

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, on the 19th of January I cosponsored a measure designed to equalize the retirement pay of our military personnel. Oftentimes we forget the great service rendered by these people, and we are prone to turn them out to pasture without proper regard for their future. It is my hope that this measure will be approved and the inequities it undertakes to correct be abolished. Recently, the Army-Navy-Air Force Register published an editorial in this area which I commend to all my colleagues. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in the RECORD, so that they may read it with greater ease.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TEN YEARS TOO LONG

Congress has had 10 years to correct an inequity which deprives certain officers of their proper retirement credit.

For one reason or another, neither the Pentagon nor Congress has put enough steam behind any proposal to make this up to the officers affected.

Here's the problem. When Public Law 810 was enacted there was a provision under title II relating to Reserve officers with less than 10 years of active duty as commissioned officers, which gave them retirement as officers upon completion of a total of 30 years' service.

The law says that after 30 years, counting the active duty time and the time spent in retirement, the enlisted man would be advanced on the retired list to the highest commissioned grade in which he served on active duty in a satisfactory manner for at least 6 months. His retired pay would then be recomputed on the new retired status.

This was fine, but there was one defect. An officer who served in one branch of the Armed Forces and then completed his enlisted service in another branch could not get this benefit.

This could affect men who transferred from the Army into the Air Force, for instance, or from the Navy to the Coast Guard for one reason or another.

There is now no legal authority for the Secretary of the service in which the man had served as an officer to retire an individual of another branch.

H.R. 2492 would correct this inequity. It should get Pentagon and congressional support. And, in view of the long delay in making the adjustment, Congress might be wise to make the payments retroactive to all who have lost benefits thus far.

Only a small number of men are involved, about 500, but the principle of equal treatment is an important one.

CURRENT AGRICULTURAL PROBLEMS AND PROPOSED SOLUTIONS FOR THEM

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, on February 21, 1959, the able and distinguished senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] made a significant speech to the Seventh Farm Press, Radio and TV Institute at North Carolina State College in Raleigh, N.C. Inasmuch as the thoughtful comments of the Senator from Louisiana deserve the consideration of all Members of the Senate and ought to be made available to them, I ask unanimous consent that his speech be printed in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SPEECH BY SENATOR ALLEN J. ELLENDER AT NORTH CAROLINA STATE COLLEGE DURING THE SEVENTH FARM PRESS, RADIO, AND TV INSTITUTE ON FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 21, 1959

Ladies and gentlemen, I appreciate your invitation to join with you in opening the Seventh Farm Press, Radio and TV Institute, and especially to have the opportunity to talk with you about agriculture.

I would like to commend all of those who contributed to the promotion of this meeting. In my opinion, the interchange of ideas and information which I am sure will take place here tonight and tomorrow will be of tremendous benefit, not only to you who participate, but also to the thousands of farmers whom you will reach in the days ahead.

I would also like especially to commend the newspaper, radio and television representatives who have taken the time and trouble to attend this meeting. There is no doubt that you have much persuasive power at your command. You can inform, you can explain, and in so doing you can mold public opinion. But with this power comes responsibility, also the need to be well informed yourself, and I think that your attendance here is a fine display of the interest you have and the obligation you entertain for your profession and the people.

Your attendance is ample evidence of a deep interest in the problems of agriculture and indicative, I hope, of a sympathetic attitude toward farmers. This is why I seized on the opportunity to talk with you tonight.

Let me emphasize that never before in the history of our country have farmers been in greater need of sympathetic understanding than today. As a member of the Senate Agriculture and Forestry Committee for the past 22 years, I can give you assurance of the truth of that statement.

Agriculture is in trouble. Serious trouble. Every farm program now on the books is in danger.

And why?

Simply because there has been a persistent campaign waged over the last 6 years to drive a wedge, first, between city people and farmers, and second, between farmers themselves.

As a result, farm organizations are divided; growers of different crops do not see eye to eye, and there is even division between some growers of the same crop.

The truth is that agricultural legislation of a beneficial nature to farmers is extremely difficult to enact. As a matter of fact, friends of agriculture who are aware of minor weaknesses in existing law hesitate to suggest changes for fear that the roof will fall in, dashing the whole program to the winds.

Now, I am not an alarmist. But I see and hear these things every day. This administration has talked more and done less for agriculture than any other administration in our history. They have talked in platitudes sprinkled liberally with freedoms. Freedom to plant. Freedom to make decisions. Freedom from Government interference, and so forth, but they don't mention freedom to starve. They talk in terms of expanding markets. Not next year you understand, or the year after, but always in terms of "the hereafter."

In my judgment, if there is to be any change in the attitude of those who now feel that agriculture is receiving preferential treatment over other segments of our economy, it will be your task, the molders of public opinion, to lead the way. Only through sympathetic treatment, by presenting the whole picture, will there be a clearing of the misconceptions regarding agriculture. Expenditures by the billions are charged to agriculture when the facts are the exact opposite. The high cost of living is laid at the doorstep of the farmer; when you and I know that is not true.

I have been asked to discuss probable legislation in the 86th Congress. While I have been at this game too long to make a flat prediction, I will try to indicate some areas wherein legislation is possible. I shall also point out some of the weaknesses of the different proposals as I see them. However, I can assure you of one thing, that is, any legislation enacted during this session will be in the nature of a compromise and will not be completely satisfactory to everyone.

Earlier this week Mr. Benson came before the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry with the administration's recommendations on agricultural legislation.

Now I know that the people in this area are particularly interested in tobacco, cotton, and peanuts, and I will discuss the specific proposals as regards these crops in just a minute. But for the present I want to bring before you the overall recommendations as made by the President in his message of January 29.

The President said, and I quote: "I recommend that prices for those commodities subject to mandatory supports"—he means all of the basics which include tobacco, cotton, and peanuts, as well as dairy products—"be related to a percentage of the average market price during the immediately preceding years. The appropriate percentage of the average market price should be discretionary with the Secretary of Agriculture at a level not less than 75 and not more than 90 percent of such average in accordance with the general guidelines set forth in the law. * * * If * * * the Congress still prefers to relate price supports to existing standard"—he means parity—"the Secretary should be given discretion to establish the level in accordance with the guidelines now fixed by law for all commodities except those for which supports presently are mandatory." Here he means zero to 90 percent of parity—still quoting the President—"The effect of either would be to reconcile the farm program with the facts of modern agriculture, to reduce the incentive for unrealistic production, to move in the direction of easing production controls, to permit the growth of commercial markets and to cut the cost of Federal programs." Amen.

Now this is the administration's program, and I ask you just what does it guarantee?

I read the message and re-read it. I studied it, and I questioned Mr. Benson, and this is what I found out.

The only thing guaranteed in this recommendation is lower farm prices.

I must admit it sounds good, but the only trouble is it will not do good.

So let us analyze the message.

Specifically the President says that the effect will be: First, to reconcile the farm program with the facts of modern agriculture.

Now I am not sure what he means, but it could mean that because of increased efficiency the price should be lower. It could also mean that because of increased yields the price should be lower. In either event it means lower prices.

Second, to reduce the incentive for unrealistic production.

Here, there is no question—obviously he means a lower price.

Third, to move in the direction of easing production controls.

This is a very popular point. Most farmers today would like, and in some cases need, increased allotments in order to make ends meet. This is a very real problem.

But I want you to notice that the President does not guarantee increased acreage now, next year, or at any time. He says only that we are going to move in that direction.

It seems to me that any realistic appraisal of the domestic market and the world market would indicate the utter fallacy of this suggestion.

Take cotton for example. At the present time domestic consumption is about 8 to 8½ million bales, while production on the 16 million acres minimum national allotment will be about 14 million bales. Obviously it is necessary to export about 40 percent of total production. Yet this year, the Department of Agriculture is exporting subsidized cotton at competitive world prices and the estimate of total exports is about 3 million bales. This, coupled with domestic requirements is far short of expected production. In addition, cotton farmers can elect a 40-percent increase in acreage for a lower support, both this year and next. Therefore, I cannot understand how the President can expect to increase acreage—at least not in the foreseeable future.

In my judgment the President's stand on this point is a sham, a deception.

Fourth, to permit the growth of commercial markets.

This is a laudable statement, and I think we should permit the growth of markets. Furthermore, I can assure the President that markets will grow—as dollars become available in foreign countries and as population grows, but no faster.

Fifth, to cut the cost of Federal programs.

This is a point on which I agree wholeheartedly. The fact of the matter is that the farm program has never before cost so much as it has under Mr. Benson. I do not care what the measure is, whether it be total cost of all programs, budget expenditures, or losses on sales of commodities, we find that in the 6 years under Mr. Benson costs have more than doubled or tripled, or quadrupled, or more in every instance.

For example, using the Secretary's own figures, the total cost of all agricultural programs primarily for stabilization of farm prices and income amounted to $288.6 million in 1953. In 1958 the total cost amounted to $2.7 billion.

On January 31, 1953, CCC loans and inventories of basic commodities amounted to $2.5 billion. On January 31, 1958, loans and inventories amounted to $6.9 billion. And the

Secretary's estimate of loans and inventories as of July 1, 1960, will be in excess of $10 billion.

Of course, actual losses on the disposition of agricultural commodities is a much smaller amount. In 1958, the actual losses amounted to about $1.4 billion including Public Law 480 sales. But even this was many times the losses sustained in 1953.

Insofar as the overall picture is concerned, this country is using domestically, maximum quantities of agricultural commodities at prevailing prices, which incidentally represent only about 83 percent of parity. The same is true in the field of exports. But here the Government is subsidizing the difference between the domestic and the world market price. Nevertheless, we are moving maximum quantities, but still the surpluses continue to accumulate.

Now, I discuss the President's message with but one purpose in mind. I want you to examine the facts. Look at both sides of the question and then decide for yourself whether or not the objectives outlined are in the best interests of farmers and of our Nation.

When the Secretary of Agriculture appeared before the committee we expected that he would outline in some detail just exactly what provisions he was recommending for the basic commodities. But, much to our chagrin, he also spoke in generalities, more or less reiterating what the President had said.

I think it significant, however, that he specifically recommended that legislation affecting both tobacco and peanuts be enacted. His recommendations with respect to support levels were 75 to 90 percent of the 3-year average or zero to 90 percent of parity. To find out what the 75 to 90 percent of the 3-year average price meant for flue-cured tobacco I obtained the figures from the Department of Agriculture.

This is the result. The 3-year average price for flue-cured tobacco is 55 cents per pound. Ninety percent of this is 50 cents, rounded, while 75 percent is 41 cents per pound. Therefore, if this legislation were to be enacted, the Secretary could set support prices at from 41 cents to 50 cents per pound. Now, if supports were from zero to 90 percent of parity, the Secretary could set the support prices at any level he desired.

While tobacco growers are taking this kind of price cut, there is no assurance of an acreage increase. In fact, tobacco acreage expansion is not even mentioned by the Secretary.

In the case of peanuts, however, acreage expansion is prominently mentioned, as is the type of price support which is the same as that recommended for tobacco.

Only in the case of cotton, rice, and corn did the Secretary seem willing to permit the existing legislation to have a fair trial. He felt that since the law had not as yet been tried it might be desirable to wait and see what the results would be. It will be recalled that the legislation was enacted in the closing days of the last session of Congress.

Although this area is not particularly interested in wheat production, it must be mentioned, because it is the most acute farm problem which will face the Congress this year.

The Secretary made extensive recommendations for this crop, but boiled down they mean only one thing—lower prices.

From the foregoing discussion I am sure that it should be obvious to you that the administration will not desist in its demand for lower support prices. The Secretary is firmly convinced that only through lower and lower prices will the farm problem be solved. His thesis is doubtless anchored to the proposition that lower prices will cause farmers to shift the production of surplus crops to the growing of others that are not in surplus.

I would be less than fair not to admit that I disagree wholeheartedly with the recommendations of the President and the Secretary of Agriculture.

I honestly do not believe that lower prices will result in less production. Of course, the term lower prices is a relative one and is subject to misinterpretation. I take lower prices to be in the vicinity of 60 to 65 percent of parity, and at this level I cannot believe that production will decrease materially. On the other hand, if the price of one commodity is lowered while others are held at high levels, those farmers with alternate possibilities would certainly switch to the more lucrative crop. But in the overall picture, I am firmly convinced of the unsoundness of the administration's proposals.

One other thing. The Secretary points with pride at the recent corn referendum as ample evidence that the producers want less control and lower prices. The fact of the matter is that of the producers voting, 71 percent voted for the elimination of corn acreage allotments with price support at 90 percent of the 3-year average or 65 percent of parity, whichever is higher. The Department estimates this price to be between $1.12 to $1.15 per bushel.

However, the Secretary does not point out that only 12 percent of corn producers were complying with their allotments for supports at $1.36 per bushel. The remainder, some 88 percent of corn producers, were noncompliers and were receiving supports at only $1.06 per bushel.

Therefore, in effect, the majority of producers voted for an increase in support levels of from 6 to 9 cents per bushel with unlimited acreages. This was good sense, but I don't think it a sound basis for saying that farmers want more freedom to make their own decisions and less Government interference.

During the course of the Secretary's testimony, I elicited from him the promise that the Department would actually draft a bill embodying his recommendations. Only then will we be able to analyze and pinpoint the effects of his proposal. The bill is to include all commodities presently receiving support. In other words, the Secretary will submit an omnibus farm bill, the provisions of which he thinks will result in a solution to the farm problem.

In addition to the administration's farm proposals several other bills are attracting considerable attention. Prominent among these is the Talmadge direct payment plan for basic commodities, which includes tobacco, cotton, and peanuts. As you probably know, this plan envisions a domestic allotment equal to domestic consumption. Producers would receive direct payments for the difference between market value and 100 percent of parity on that portion of the crop which is consumed domestically. In addition, allotments as such would be abandoned and farmers could plant whatever they wished with the total crop moving through regular market channels. There would be neither support prices nor purchase or loan programs.

This is not a new proposal. Similar programs have been suggested in the past and have been turned down. What is new about the plan is the popular reception it is receiving in many quarters.

In my opinion, the popularity of this plan can be traced directly to the administration's negative approach to a real solution to the farm problem coupled with its intensive program of alienating the support of many former friends of agriculture. The campaign waged in city areas against price supports for farm commodities, by stressing the high cost of foods to consumers, the emphasis on costs of the program, and the relative well-being of agriculture generally has paid handsome dividends.

Now, I personally am not completely sure that direct payments offer any real lasting solution to the agriculture problem. Such a program would only treat the patient and under this program the patient will have to be treated continuously. Of course, the possibility exists that after a few years the needed changes and readjustments in agriculture will have taken place with the result that payments can either be stopped completely or reduced.

I am sure that other bills embodying the direct payment principle will be introduced or at least presented to the committee for study. One such bill that comes to mind concerns the domestic allotment plan for wheat, which is very similar to the Talmadge bill.

In addition to these proposals I am sure that some type of self-help plan will be either introduced in Congress or put before the committee for study.

This plan would authorize a commodity group to regulate itself and is similar in action to present marketing agreement operations. The principal objective here would be to control production so as to get a fair price in the market place. Last year this type proposal received some support and it is entirely possible that additional support might be engendered after some of the "bugs" are worked out of the plan.

Another type program which appears to be increasing in popularity is the donation type plan. Of course the President has the "Food for Peace" plan which envisions surplus producing countries banding together to provide surplus commodities to countries with low standards of living. There are also plans for domestic distribution of surplus foods including milk.

Public Law 480 might also be included in this category, although title 1 relates to sales for foreign currencies and title 3 concerns the barter provisions.

Many other proposals affecting all phases of agriculture will no doubt also be referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry for hearings and study.

They will all receive fair and impartial consideration. But, most importantly, as I told the Secretary of Agriculture, the bills that he submits embodying his recommendations for a solution to the farm problem will receive most careful and thorough consideration.

While I cannot speak for all members of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, I firmly believe that a real and lasting solution to the farm problem can be found only in a new, bold, and perhaps revolutionary approach.

We are searching for this plan; we study every proposal submitted to the committee, no matter how rabid or conservative it may appear on the surface. So far we have been unsuccessful. But I have not given up hope. I am firmly convinced that continued discussion and search will ultimately result in a workable plan which will provide farmers on the one hand with relatively stable prices and income and consumers on the other with abundant food and fiber at fair and reasonable prices.

I am distressed in not now being able to be more specific in answering the question propounded to me. With your help and that of others who are truly interested in preserving and protecting the most important segment of our economic society, I am hopeful that we can strike a happy solution.

ADVISABILITY OF ELIMINATING THE "GERMANE" AMENDMENTS TO THE TAFT-HARTLEY ACT FROM THE KENNEDY-ERVIN BILL

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, for 2 years I have served upon the Senate

Rackets Committee, which has been headed so ably and courageously by a truly great American, Senator JOHN L. MCCLELLAN. This committee has investigated some 20 unions which act as collective bargaining agents for several million men and women employed in industries affecting interstate commerce.

The testimony taken by the committee has shocked the conscience of the Nation.

This is true because the testimony has made it crystal clear that some or all of the following things have occurred upon frequent occasions in some of the unions investigated:

First. Union moneys in enormous amounts have been converted to their own use, or that of their cronies, by union officers whose duty it was to safeguard them.

Second. Union officers committing such raids upon union treasuries have destroyed union records to conceal their financial misdeeds from union members, income tax authorities, law enforcement officers, and investigating committees.

Third. Union members have been deprived of any real voice in the election of union officers or the management of union affairs by dictatorial activities of union officers, undemocratic regulations, wanton abuse of the trustee process, and even, on occasion, sheer terrorism.

Fourth. Persons convicted and sentenced to prison for armed robbery, burglary, extortion, and other infamous crimes have been placed in positions of authority over honest and law-abiding union members shortly after their release from prison and before they had brought "forth fruits meet for repentance."

Fifth. Union charters have been granted to known racketeers and their associates who have used them as devices to prey upon the public and helpless workers compelled to earn their bread in the sweat of their brows.

Sixth. Union officers and agents of employers have entered into conspiracies resulting in "sweetheart contracts" or other arrangements which constituted betrayal of the union members such officers were supposed to represent.

The great majority of union officers do not countenance or tolerate malpractices of these types in the areas in which they have the power to act. Nevertheless, the testimony taken by the Senate Rackets Committee shows that such malpractices are widespread in some segments of the union movement, and that they will undoubtedly continue unless they are outlawed by Congress. After all, John Stuart Mill was right when he said: "Laws and institutions require to be adapted, not to good men, but to bad."

For these reasons, there is a crying need at this hour for congressional action outlawing the malpractices I have enumerated.

It is obvious that if Congress is to do this, it must enact a statute regulating to a limited extent the internal affairs of unions.

Titles 1 to 5, both inclusive, of S. 505, which is popularly known as the Kennedy-Ervin bill, are well designed to outlaw the malpractices under scrutiny. If it should be enacted into law, the bill would make union officers legally accountable for safeguarding union money, impose criminal penalties upon union officers for willful misuse of union moneys or the willful destruction of union records, bar convicted felons from holding union offices until they have brought "forth fruits meet for repentance," prohibit union officers from arbitrarily using the trustee process and from conniving with management to the detriment of union members, and secure to dues-paying union members both the right and the power to select the officers and control the affairs of their unions.

In laying stress upon the crying need for legislation outlawing the malpractices enumerated by me, and in pointing out that the first five titles of S. 505 are well adapted to accomplish this purpose, I do not overlook these things: First, that industry, labor, and the general public are demanding various changes in the Taft-Hartley Act, which was adopted in 1947 to regulate external relations between industry and labor; and, second, that title 6 of S. 505 contains certain amendments to the Taft-Hartley Act not germane to the primary objective of the bill as set forth in its first five titles. Indeed, I have been convinced by my own study of the subject, and also by testimony presented to the Senate Rackets Committee, that it is highly desirable for Congress to change or clarify some of the provisions of the Taft-Hartley Act, including those relating to organizational picketing and secondary boycotts.

While this is true, Congress should not attempt to outlaw malpractices in the internal affairs of unions and to amend the Taft-Hartley Act in one operation or in a single piece of legislation. On the contrary, Congress should do these jobs one at a time. This is so for these reasons:

First. Malpractices in the internal affairs of unions and problems arising out of the external relations of industry and labor are quite dissimilar in nature, and require quite different legislative treatment. To combine the consideration of such diverse matters is not conducive to sound legislation because it tends to confuse issues and distract legislators.

Second. The passage of needed legislation to outlaw malpractices in the internal affairs of unions ought not to be put in jeopardy by saddling such legislation with unrelated controversies between industry and labor respecting nongermane provisions of the Taft-Hartley Act.

Third. The Taft-Hartley Act is an exceedingly important and intricate law which should not be subjected to indiscriminate amendment on the Senate floor until the proposed changes in it have been adequately studied by the appropriate Senate committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from North Carolina has expired.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be allowed to proceed for 2 minutes additional.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator may proceed.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, for the reasons I have stated I urge that the nongermane amendments to the Taft-Hartley Act embodied in title 6 of S. 505 be stricken out, and that the bill be thus restricted to its primary objective, that is, the outlawing of the malpractices in the internal affairs of unions so clearly revealed by the investigations of the Senate Rackets Committee.

It is safe to make this prediction: If the nongermane amendments to the Taft-Hartley Act are stricken out, S. 505 will pass the Senate by a virtually unanimous vote, with a minimum of debate and delay, leaving the Senate free to consider at a subsequent time, in a manner consistent with orderly legislative procedure, all proposed changes in the Taft-Hartley Act after those changes have been adequately studied by the appropriate Senate committee.

It is likewise safe to make this prediction: If the nongermane amendments to the Taft-Hartley Act are not stricken out, their presence in S.505 will constitute an invitation to every Senator to offer upon the Senate floor, as amendments to the bill, whatever changes in the Taft-Hartley Act he deems desirable. As a consequence, the Senate will be bogged down for days on end in debate upon all the controversial features of the Taft-Hartley Act. This is likely to result either in the defeat of S. 505 or the mangling of the Taft-Hartley Act. Intricate legislation cannot be properly framed amid heated debate upon a legislative floor.

We cannot justify exposing the provisions of the first five titles of S. 505 and the Taft-Hartley Act to these alternative perils. The perils are wholly unnecessary because they can be entirely avoided in the first instance by the simple expedient of striking out title 6. Such action should be taken by the committee, or by the Senate itself in case the committee fails to act.

After this is done, the Senate should reject all subsequent attempts to write into S. 505 any nongermane changes in the Taft-Hartley Act, and send the restricted bill without delay to the House, whose concurrence in the action of the Senate would make it reasonably certain that union treasuries will not be pillaged with impunity by their custodians, that unrepentant convicted felons and racketeers will not be given dominion over honest and law-abiding union members, that dictatorial union officers will not be allowed to rob union members of their basic rights by abuse of the trustee process, that corrupt union officers will not be permitted to connive with management to betray the union members they represent, and that union members will possess the power as well as the right to exercise an effective voice in the selection of the officers and the control of the affairs of their unions.

Surely the investigations of the Senate Rackets Committee make it manifest that this is a consummation devoutly to be wished.

AGRICULTURAL PRICE SUPPORTS

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, last Monday, February 23, I

placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a list of companies and individuals receiving from the Federal Government over $100,000 in price support loans on their 1957 crop. I invited attention to these large payments to emphasize that the price support program under the existing law is definitely not in the best interests of the small farmers but rather that it underwrites the corporate type of farming and absentee ownership.

Today I wish to supplement my earlier statement with additional information which will show that these same corporations and individuals who were receiving substantial Government support on crops produced were at the same time also receiving thousands of dollars for not producing crops on other land which they owned or controlled.

For instance, in the 1957 crop year while the Government was loaning $3,447,902.81 to support the crops being produced by 10 companies, another Government agency was, under a different program, paying these same companies $557,495.35 for not producing crops on another 10,243.6 acres which they controlled.

The Westlake Farms, Inc., Statford, Calif., which company was listed as receiving the third highest price support assistance in 1957—$854,450.67 on cotton—in that same year also placed 1,293.9 acres in the soil bank, for which it received a direct Government check for $125,942.50—$125,000 for not farming and loans of $854,000 to guarantee a profitable operation on the rest of its capacity—and all this was justified on the basis that it was helping a little farmer.

At this point I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a list of 10 operators who were receiving over a half-million dollars in soil bank payments and, at the same time, nearly $3½ million in Government assistance under the price support program.

There being no objection, the information was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Name and address	1957 price support loans		1957 soil bank		
	Commodity	Amount	Commodity	Acreage	Amount
Westlake Farms, Inc., Stratford, Calif	Cotton	$854,450.67	Cotton	1,293.9	$125,942.50
Campbell Farming Corp., Hardin, Mont	Wheat	330,267.51	Wheat	1,942.4	40,227.10
Tillar & Co., Tillar, Ark	Cotton	119,366.00	Cotton and rice.	500.0	34,450.00
George B. Franklin & Son, Holly Ridge, La	do	128,118.87	Cotton	957.7	67,040.33
Dan Seligman, Shaw, Miss	do	173,631.68	Cotton and rice.	804.8	59,992.80
Woolfolk Farms, Tunica, Miss	do	155,787.12	Cotton	500.0	40,500.00
Clark & Roberts, Pecos, Tex	do	237,328.84	do	376.6	57,533.70
Heidrick Bros., Woodland, Calif	Rice	189,882.20	Wheat and rice.	972.5	54,528.08
Bi-county Farms and Horrigan Farms, Prosser, Wash.	Wheat	91,567.57	Wheat	2,611.3	56,519.64
Delta & Pine Land Co., Scott, Miss	Cotton	1,167,502.35	Rice	284.4	20,761.20
Total		3,447,902.81		10,243.6	557,495.35

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, the $557,495.35 in soil bank payments received in 1957 by these 10 companies is over one-third as much as was received by all the farmers in the State of New Jersey—$1,375,441. It is almost as much as was received by all the farmers in Wyoming—$689,857—that year. As a further comparison, 1,227 farmers in Delaware received $917,286 and 869 farmers in Massachusetts received $964,847. All of the farmers in the States of Nevada, New Hampshire, and Vermont actually received less than $80,000 during the same year.

Soil bank payments are direct subsidy Government checks paid to a farmer for acreage he agrees to leave idle or for crops he agrees not to produce.

The time is long overdue when Congress should recognize the unfairness of the present agriculture program not only from the standpoint of the American taxpayers and the American consumers but also from the standpoint of the bonafide American family farms.

Certainly the recommendation of the Secretary of Agriculture that he be given greater discretionary authority to lower these support prices to a more realistic level and to confine Government support to the bonafide family type farm is a step in the right direction.

There can be no justification for continuing to spend the taxpayers' money in support of these large corporate type operations, many of which operate under absentee ownership.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. As the Senator from Delaware knows, under the new farm bill the large payments are to be eliminated. It is my understanding there will be a limitation of $5,000.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I know that is being proposed. I certainly am in favor of limiting these payments, and I have been, for the past several years. In fact, I have offered amendments to that effect at various times, which were defeated.

STANISLAV MENSHIKOV REPORT ON INTERVIEW — INTERPRETATION BY DAVID LAWRENCE

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, Mr. David Lawrence, in the Washington Star of February 24, for a second time has criticized the Russian Ambassador, alleging that he has interfered in the internal political affairs of this country. Since I plan to make some remarks about this article, I ask unanimous consent that both articles be printed at this point in the RECORD. The headline over yesterday's article was "FULBRIGHT Denies Soviet Story."

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE WORLD CAN NO LONGER BE SURE WHO SPEAKS FOR THE U.S. GOVERNMENT IN FOREIGN AFFAIRS

(By David Lawrence)

WASHINGTON.—Mikhail Menshikov, the Soviet Ambassador to the United States, has violated diplomatic rules by a bold intervention in American politics. Heretofore, throughout American history, such an offense has meant sending the meddling Ambassador home.

In this instance, Senator JAMES WILLIAM FULBRIGHT, chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, should be among the first to demand that Menshikov be expelled from this country. For the Soviet envoy violated the confidence of the Arkansas Senator by arranging for the publication by his son, Stanislav Menshikov, in a recent issue of New Times of a report of alleged conversations with Mr. FULBRIGHT dealing with American politics.

In the article, the younger Menshikov says he was told, in effect by Senator FULBRIGHT that if the Democrats win in 1960, the Soviets will have a better chance to get their way in world affairs.

No such intimation probably was given by the Arkansas Senator. The very fact that Ambassador Menshikov arranged for the government-controlled New Times—which is printed by the Soviet Government in eight languages besides Russian and is distributed widely throughout the world—to publish any article purporting to give his conversations with a U.S. Senator, is a sign that he either doesn't know the rules of diplomatic relations or chooses to disregard them. The Menshikov article says:

"To what extent is the victory of the Democratic Party at the elections likely to affect the foreign policy of the Republican Government? Will the Democratic opposition be able and willing to compel the State Department to relinquish its policy?

"I had an interview in Washington with Mr. JAMES FULBRIGHT, Democratic Senator from Arkansas. The Senator, a calm, sober-minded man of 53, with a slow, deliberate manner, thin hair, graying at the temples, light blue eyes, and the old professional trick of peering over his glasses as he listens to you, received me in his office in the new Senate Building."

The article then quotes with approval from speeches Mr. FULBRIGHT made during the summer of 1958, which Menshikov cites as criticizing the American Government for its Far Eastern and Middle Eastern policies and as charging that the State Department was displaying a dangerous apathy in allowing itself to be run by a bureaucracy so fearful of change that it clings desperately to the ancient pillars of policy even as they rot away under the pressure of irresistible developments.

The article went on to predict that Mr. FULBRIGHT would become chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. The Menshikov article then continues:

"My talk with him took place in late November. The Senator had just returned from a trip to Asia and was full of energy and new impressions. He expressed the opinion that war between the Soviet Union and the United States was senseless under all circumstances and that relations between our two countries must be improved at all costs. The whole point was how to do it.

"In the Senator's opinion one splendid way to promote mutual understanding is through personal contacts and cultural ties. He said that the country was heading for a Republican defeat in the 1960 elections and a change in the Government. The State Department would be obliged to some extent to reckon

with the new trends in the country and in Congress. But, he added, the President and the members of his Cabinet cannot be compelled to do anything they did not want to do, and hence, he, FULBRIGHT, did not believe there would be any serious change in U.S. foreign policy in the next 2 years. He did, however, believe that if the Democratic Party were to be sufficiently active in this period it could prepare the ground for such changes by the time the new elections came around."

There is no doubt that the Communists are taking every advantage of the practice which has grown up here in recent years whereby Senators give the impression, perhaps unwittingly, that they speak for the people of the United States on foreign policy. The Constitution makes the President alone the spokesman of the Government in foreign affairs. But, with a divided government in Washington, the world now can't be sure who speaks for America.

FULBRIGHT DENIES SOVIET STORY—ARTICLE ON SENATOR AND U.S. POLITICS BY MENSHIKOV'S SON IS CRITICIZED

Senator J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT, Democrat, chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, has denied the report published in the Soviet Government's weekly New Times which gave the impression that the Arkansas Senator had told a Communist writer softer treatment of Soviet Russia by the United States could be expected if the Democrats should win the 1960 presidential election.

The article in the New Times was written by Stanislav Menshikov, son of the Soviet Ambassador here, while visiting in Washington recently. Inasmuch as the Ambassador's son was writing for a Soviet Government publication and was himself a part of the Soviet Embassy entourage during his 4-month stay in the United States, the publication of this article, impinging on American politics, becomes the responsibility also of the head of the Embassy, Mikhail Menshikov.

This correspondent at first was under the impression that it was the Soviet Ambassador who had the interview with Senator FULBRIGHT and mistakenly wrote it that way but corrected his dispatch an hour later upon learning that the author of the article was the son of the Ambassador.

Unquestionably the Ambassador, however, was familiar with the mission of his son in approaching Senator FULBRIGHT for the interview on politics and must have known the nature or contents of the article finally transmitted to Moscow for publication in the government-controlled New Times.

For an even less tenuous connection with American politics, a British envoy was expelled from Washington by the U.S. Government many years ago.

In this instance, Sir Lionel Sackville-West, British Minister to Washington, sent a letter marked "private" to an American who had asked what would be the best way for a naturalized citizen, formerly of Great Britain to vote in the presidential election of 1888. The Minister wrote that it would be to the best interests of Great Britain if the vote were cast for Grover Cleveland. The letter was made public through friends of the recipient. Though any intent to interfere in American politics was disclaimed by the British Minister, he was promptly handed his passport by order of President Cleveland. But the damage was done, and Mr. Cleveland was defeated in that campaign largely because of the opposition of anti-British groups.

Meddling in American politics by any diplomatic representative of a foreign government has always been considered by the U.S. Government as an improper activity.

In an early instance, Citizen Genet, the diplomatic representative of the French Government, criticized the United States in public for issuing a proclamation of neutrality in the war then going on between France and Great Britain. When he threatened to appeal over the head of President Washington to the American people, his recall was requested by the Secretary of State, Thomas Jefferson.

In 1952, the Soviet Government itself requested the recall of Ambassador George Kennan because of some remarks he made to the press while in Bonn, Germany. These comments were critical of the Soviet Government, which, in a formal note, declared that he had committed "a rude violation of the generally recognized norms of international law." To this, Secretary of State Acheson replied that the Kremlin, itself, had disregarded the rules of international intercourse and that what Mr. Kennan had said was true.

Anyway, the recall, of course, took effect, as it is the custom to comply with the requests of other governments when they declare any member of an embassy or legation to be persona non grata or unacceptable any longer to the resident government.

Mikhail Menshikov, the present Soviet Ambassador, has violated the rules in more ways than one. He refused last November, for instance, while at the Department of State to listen to a tape recording which dealt with the crash of an American unarmed airplane in which 17 Americans were killed. To refuse to accept a part of any communication submitted in diplomatic intercourse and, in effect, to challenge its veracity is to offer an insult to the resident government. For ambassadors are regarded as channels of communication and, if these are inoperative, there is little use in continuing to receive the same ambassador as an accredited representative of his government.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I regret that this interpretation was put upon my comment by Mr. Lawrence, as I do not feel that it is quite an accurate reflection of what I said to him. In order to put this story in the proper perspective, I shall give some background information about how it arose.

Last November, the Ambassador of Russia, Mr. Mikhail Menshikov, introduced me to his son, Stanislav Menshikov, a journalist, who writes for the New Times, and, I presume, for other publications. Mr. Stanislav Menshikov requested an appointment in my office for an interview which was understood to be on the record and to be used by him for publication. His account of the interview, as it appeared in New Times is as follows:

To what extent is the victory of the Democratic Party at the elections likely to affect the foreign policy of the Republican government? Will the Democratic opposition be able and willing to compel the State Department to relinquish its policy?

I had an interview in Washington with Mr. JAMES FULBRIGHT, Democratic Senator from Arkansas. The Senator, a calm, sober-minded man of 53, with a slow, deliberate manner, thin hair, greying at the temples, light blue eyes, and the old professorial trick of peering over his glasses as he listens to you, received me in his office in the new Senate Building.

Mr. FULBRIGHT is one of the leading members of the Foreign Relations Committee, and in common with Senator GREEN, the committee's chairman, was one of those who severely censured the Government in the autumn for its Far East policy. In all probability he will take over the chairmanship of the committee if the 91-year-old Senator GREEN retires.

In the summer of 1958 Mr. FULBRIGHT delivered several speeches in the Senate, charging the State Department with displaying a dangerous apathy in allowing itself to be run by a "bureaucracy so fearful of change that it clings desperately to the ancient pillars of policy even as they rot away under the pressure of irresistible international developments."

The Senator criticized the Dulles-Eisenhower doctrine in the Middle East and demanded a reappraisal of the attitude toward the Baghdad Pact. He said a policy that ignored the existence of 600 million Chinese people was absurd. He pointed out that Soviet policies have evoked "a sympathetic response throughout the world," but that in spite of this the U.S. Government continued to reject every Soviet proposal as propaganda. "We owe it to ourselves," he said, "to consider their ideas carefully and thoroughly."

That was several months before the Democratic victory in the elections. My talk with him took place in late November. The Senator had just returned from a trip to Asia and was full of energy and new impressions. He expressed the opinion that war between the Soviet Union and the United States was senseless under all circumstances and that relations between our two countries must be improved at all costs. The whole point was how to do it.

In the Senator's opinion one splendid way to promote mutual understanding is through personal contacts and cultural ties. He said that the country was heading for a Republican defeat in the 1960 elections and a change in the Government. The State Department would be obliged to some extent to reckon with the new trends in the country and in Congress. But, he added, the President and the members of his Cabinet cannot be compelled to do anything they did not want to do, and hence he, FULBRIGHT, did not believe there would be any serious change in U.S. foreign policy in the next 2 years. He did, however, believe that if the Democratic Party were to be sufficiently active in this period it could prepare the ground for such changes by the time the new elections came around.

I asked the Senator whether he thought there was any possibility of a marked improvement in our relations in the near future, of a return to the good relations of the Roosevelt period.

"I would like to return to that," he replied with a smile. "It is a question of confidence in each other. I do not think that we are really afraid of Communist ideology * * *." America, he added, was not opposed to competition in the field of material production and had nothing to fear from the results of such rivalry.

Mr. President, I think from this statement it is fair to draw the inference that I, as a member of the Democratic Party, foresee that the Democrats will probably elect a President in 1960; and that as a result of such a victory, conditions will be better both here and abroad. Mr. Lawrence interprets this to mean that I think the policy of this Government will be softer toward the Russians. This, I think, is not a proper inference to be drawn from my statement. I think the policies may well be wiser and more realistic, but this does not at all mean that it will amount to appeasement or being "softer" as that word is understood by Mr. Lawrence.

There is one passage in the statement which I think is a misinterpretation of what I said. That passage reads as follows:

He (FULBRIGHT) pointed out that Soviet policies have evoked "a sympathetic response throughout the world," but that in spite

of this the U.S. Government continued to reject every Soviet proposal as propaganda. "We owe it to ourselves," he said, "to consider their ideas carefully and thoroughly."

The point I was seeking to make, from which this thought was extracted by Mr. Menshikov, was that the numerous Soviet proposals which we have responded to negatively without affirmative counterproposals have, I regret to say, elicited sympathetic response in many parts of the world. I did not, nor do I, believe that these proposals were fair or even sincerely designed to reach an agreement in many cases; but nevertheless, considering our lack of imagination and originality in answering them, they have had quite an effect upon world opinion. For example, when the policy advanced by the so-called Rapacki plan was made, our instantaneous reply was "No," without utilizing it as a basis for a counterproposal.

I have made this same criticism of our policies on other occasions. As a matter of fact, I do not think there is anything in the account, as written by Mr. Menshikov, which I have not said on other occasions on the floor of the Senate or in public speeches. It is true, of course, that excerpts from speeches or statements are often subject to misinterpretations. It is, in fact, a very rare occurrence when a reporter conveys in his accounts the precise meaning of the speaker. Sometimes this may be done intentionally, but often it arises from the different point of view of the persons involved.

To sum up, while I think it is possible to say that Mr. Menshikov's account permitted an erroneous inference to be drawn, I do not think there is a serious misrepresentation, and certainly no more serious than normally occurs in matters of this kind. As a matter of fact, the headline, which of course Mr. Lawrence did not write for his column on the 24th, is quite as misleading as is the quote in Mr. Menshikov's account. I did not deny the Soviet story to Mr. Lawrence when he called me on the telephone. All I said was that the inference which he was drawing, that our policy would probably be softer after the Democrats won in 1960, is an unwarranted inference from anything I said. Mr. Lawrence has drawn an inference which I do not draw. That, of course, is a matter of semantics which often plagues understanding between peoples.

In conclusion, aside from the quote which referred to the "sympathetic response throughout the world," I do not feel the interview contains any serious variation from that which was said.

I hope these remarks will clarify the facts as they actually occurred.

WILDLIFE PROPAGATION AIDED BY CONSERVATION PROGRAMS

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I am happy to find that better fishing and better hunting are resulting from conservation programs sponsored by the Government.

One of the problems in which I am very much interested is the matter of promoting fish and wildlife development in the United States, and, especially, in South Dakota. It has been encouraging to me to see how a number of our agricultural programs have been designed to assist in developing feasible fish and wildlife measures and to include such plans in work plans for watershed protection and flood-prevention projects, as well as in the conservation reserve portion of the soil bank program.

The 85th Congress enacted Public Law 85–865, authorizing the Secretary of Agriculture to give technical and financial assistance in installing fish and wildlife measures when such measures are included in small watershed projects developed under authority of Public Law 566, the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act.

The Secretary of Agriculture recently announced that the Government will share up to 50 percent of the installation costs of installing eligible fish and wildlife measures which have certain public benefits.

Under this cost sharing, there is an opportunity for private groups to cooperate with public groups in adding storage or other fish and wildlife facilities for their own use to structures which are built. For instance, a local Izaak Walton League, a wildlife federation group, or a rod and gun club or some other sportsman's organization can cooperate with the farmers who head up the watershed project. I fully expect that sportsmen of South Dakota will take full advantage of this proposal. It will be possible to increase storage capacity in reservoirs to provide additional fishing. It will facilitate streambank stabilization by sloping, grass and tree planting, and other related practices which improve fish and wildlife habitat. Breeding and nesting areas for ducks can be provided, fish ladders installed and a great number of other improvements included in a watershed project to make the general area a haven for fish, animals, and song birds. The local soil conservation office can supply all details to any group, either farmers or sportsmen, who are interested in special projects.

A MILLION ACRES IN SOUTH DAKOTA WATERSHEDS

In South Dakota, we will soon have over a million acres in our watershed projects. The Scott Creek watershed, our first watershed development, was started as a pilot project back in 1954. I was at the dedication ceremony on this project and I went over the entire area with Ross Davies and other soil conservation people from South Dakota. I was impressed, and I am sure that everyone who has ever viewed the project has been impressed, with the many conservation practices and projects which are utilized to control the ravages of flood waters in the Scott Creek area. Tree planting, grass planting, gully control, retention dams, and stock water dams are used to hold water where it falls, instead of letting it rush wildly to the river where floods occur. I am sure that this project will pay for itself many times over.

Since that pilot project was inaugurated, three other watershed projects have been started in South Dakota. These are: Pattee Creek, covering over 25,000 acres in Lincoln, Union, and Minnehaha counties; Richland Creek, with 6,515 acres in Union County; and, Silver Creek, with 20,661 acres.

Five more projects are far enough along so that they can be fairly sure of being started in 1959. They include the Lower Crow Creek, 173,840 acres, in Brown County; Marne Creek, 30,000 acres in Yankton County; North and South Branch Green Creek, 73,620 acres, Union County; Turkey Ridge Creek, 103,000 acres, Hutchinson and Turner Counties; Upper Crow Creek, 240,000 acres, Marshall County. Work on the plans for these watershed projects is from 45 to 90 percent done.

In addition, applications are in from Battle Creek, 182,590 acres, in Custer and Pennington Counties; Brule Creek, 142,000 acres, in Union and Lincoln Counties; and Upper Little Minnesota River, 28,160 acres, in Marshall and Roberts Counties. Planning work on these projects is advancing.

Last week the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry approved another watershed project located in South and North Dakota. This watershed—the Tewaukon watershed—includes 30,587 acres in Marshall County, S. Dak., with the remainder of the acreage in Sargent County, N. Dak.

INCREASED WILDLIFE RESOURCES UNDER SOIL BANK

When Congress passed the Soil Bank Act, providing as it did for conservation reserve acres, it occurred to me that some provisions should be made for including certain practices which would help maintain our fish and wildlife. I offered such an amendment to the bill, and it was adopted.

South Dakota has been one of the top four States of the Nation in taking advantage of the so-called "G" practices—especially the practice of establishing and managing cover specifically beneficial to wildlife. The conservation reserve practices, generally, have proved to be helpful in maintaining cover and breeding areas for wildlife.

WILDLIFE AGENCIES TO HELP

The Department of Agriculture agencies will invite the Fish and Wildlife Service of the Interior and the State game, fish, and parks commission to cooperate fully in assisting local organizations to develop feasible fish and wildlife measures and to include them in work plans for watershed protection and flood prevention projects.

South Dakota's Game, Fish, and Parks Commission budgeted $20,000 to assist in carrying out the "G" practices under the conservation reserve. The commission offered up to 20-percent assistance on projects which provide winter cover for pheasants.

Local organizations, sportsmen, and conservationists will find wildlife agencies of State and Federal Governments ready to give information and aid on any plans for increasing areas which provide for a better habitat for fish and game. The Department of Agriculture agencies will cooperate to get projects started.

CONSERVATION HELPS EVERYONE

While farmers and ranchers are providing for successful wildlife crops in the years ahead, there are many multiple benefits to be derived from conservation practices.

In the few short years since we have undertaken more intensive conservation work in South Dakota, we have seen greatly improved soil and water conditions. This has helped raise the productive capacity of our farmland.

Our good soil is our greatest wealth. It will provide for us and for future Americans. It is good to know that well-rounded conservation programs offer us soil fertility for food, propagation of the beauties of nature, and recreation and sport.

I want to pay tribute to those who work at all levels of government on these important projects. I trust that the areas of interest in these matters will expand under their expert guidance.

THE BEST IS YET TO BE—BROADCAST BY JOYCE ROBERTS

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, apropos the broadcast made by Joyce Roberts, widely noted, printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 2, 1959, I should like to add that Mr. Sam Pryor's article, "The Best Is Yet To Be," was published in 1952. He based his confidence on what he knew would be the constructive achievements of President Dwight D. Eisenhower's administration.

Now, in repeating my hope that Senators will study the text of Mr. Pryor's comments, I would like to suggest that, just as his affirmative approach in 1952 displayed vision, so in 1959 his emphasis upon the positive rather than the negative aspects of America's potential in the march toward new heights in this administration can and should give inspiration to all those who realize that he was right in his approach in 1952.

At the time of the original publication of Mr. Sam Pryor's article, he was able to say that his business took him "into 67 countries of the world." That was in 1952. Today, when this distinguished executive and friend circles the globe as vice president and assistant to the president of Pan American World Airways, he touches 82 countries. This is one reason why he can be happy about his 1952 outlook. Moreover, he can continue to point to the future of the United States in positive terms. His creed has stood the test of history:

Up with labor. Up with management. Up with the farmer. Up with everybody who wants to help build a happier country. Up America. The best is yet to be.

FORTY-FIRST ANNIVERSARY OF LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

Mr. FREAR. Mr. President, on February 16 all Americans of Lithuanian descent commemorated the 41st anniversary of Lithuanian Independence Day.

In the observance of this day we in America cannot help but realize the sobering thought that another year passes, and to the people of Lithuania it is just another day of sadness.

Independence is the most cherished, yet the most difficult political goal for any nation to attain and to hold. Over the years, the Lithuanian people have struggled hard and often to maintain their political freedom and to stand proudly among the nations of the free world.

We in America who so rightly cherish our independence can share this feeling of sorrow of Americans of Lithuanian ancestry that that great nation is still being denied the right to exist as an independent nation under a government of its own choosing.

While it is unfortunate that only Lithuanians residing in the various parts of the free world can celebrate this anniversary, it is understood that the people residing in that nation itself look forward to this day of commemoration for a word of spiritual and moral encouragement from the people of the free world.

May we in America, as we remember and commemorate this occasion, continue to hope and pray that Lithuania will once again take her rightful place among the nations of the free world.

PROGRAM FOR SURVIVAL OF SALMON AND STEELHEAD IN THE COLUMBIA RIVER BASIN

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, the first white men to span the American Continent—members of the Lewis and Clark expedition—were awed by the sight of spawning fish in streams of the Columbia River. Their wonderment over the silvery hordes of salmon and steelhead coursing the Columbia and its tributaries is reflected in the journals of the Lewis and Clark expedition and in their reports to President Thomas Jefferson.

Today only a fraction of the migratory fish of the Columbia exist, as compared to the thousands of silvers and chinooks viewed in the region a century and a half ago. Whether any survive through another century and a half of American history may well be determined by how we approach problems now confronting existence of this great fishery.

The march of progress in the Pacific Northwest has brought the construction of dams to harness waterpower, check floods and irrigate arid acres. Much has been learned since Bonneville Dam was thrust across the Columbia in the 1930's to indicate encouraging success in passage of fish around dams of relatively low heights—in the neighborhood of 100 feet. However, plans are now advanced to construct dams from 400 to 700 feet high across upland tributaries of the Columbia which are essential as spawning grounds for salmon and steelhead. In the present state of knowledge on fish-passage, these dams would prove disastrous to the major portion of migratory fish of the Columbia. There is no proven method of passing adult fish upstream and fingerlings downstream over dams of the lofty size now on the drawing boards. Many strong supporters of full and comprehensive development of water, for all its beneficial uses, have urged that further plans for high dams in the important spawning reaches of the Columbia Basin be delayed until the fish-passage problem may be solved. I think it is significant that many people in our region who want to build more dams support this view. At the same time, those interested in maintaining and expanding the migratory fish runs are not unalterably opposed to dam construction if fishery problems can be solved. Some expert fish biologists, for instance, believe that the storage of water behind high dams may be an instrumental factor in eventually improving the migratory runs of the river by regulating flow and temperature needed for fish growth and control of fish diseases.

But a vacuum exists, Mr. President, in realistically solving the apparent impasse between fish and high dams. No fishery-research program exists on the scale necessary to meet the problems of the Columbia Basin. It may be possible to delay the building of concrete barriers across the spawning beds of the basin, but demands for development cannot be held off indefinitely. Time is running out for the salmon and steelhead runs of the Pacific Northwest, unless a fishery research program is launched immediately. The new 308 review report of the Corps of Engineers on the Columbia implies only 10 years remain in which to find the answers.

The President's budget reduced the funds available for the lower Columbia fish sanctuary program during fiscal year 1960 by $800,000. This may be described as an "$800,000 saving" by the economy minded. But it is foolish and shortsighted to reduce the investment needed for survival of migratory fish in the Columbia. What is more important: the saving of dollars or the savings of a great resource which thrilled and awed the first explorers of our continent? This rescurce could be lost forever.

A detailed program for bolstering the Columbia fishery is available for immediate action. This program, based on the combined studies and judgment of fishery experts of the region, was compiled 2 years ago by the fishery steering committee of the Columbia Basin Interagency Committee, under the chairmanship of Mr. Herbert Lundy, of Portland, editor of the editorial page of the Oregonian. Mr. Lundy's committee has evolved a 5-year program which fish biologists are convinced will open the way for solving many of the problems which now beset the management of a once great resource. His recommendations are supported by the fishery experts of the States in the basin. It is time that the Congress provide the funds to implement this program.

The recommendations of the CBIAC fishery committee were described in detail recently in a speech delivered by Mr. Albert Day, able director of the Oregon Fish Commission and chairman of the fisheries subcommittee. Our State is fortunate in having men in public and private life like Al Day and Herb Lundy, who are willing to devote their time and energies to attacking this vital problem. Without their thoughtful guidance, hopes would indeed be dim for resolving the conflict of fish and dams.

Mr. President, I intend to seek an additional appropriation of $700,000 for launching the long-range fishery research program for the Columbia Basin. So that my colleagues may know fully of the details of this proposal, I ask consent to include with my remarks a copy of the research program submitted by Mr. Day at a meeting of the Columbia Basin Interagency Committee in Boise, Idaho, on February 11, 1959, and his remarks in connection with the report. I also ask consent to include an informative editorial from the Oregonian of February 14, 1959, describing and emphasizing the necessity for such a program.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A RESEARCH PROGRAM FOR FISH AND DAMS IN THE COLUMBIA RIVER BASIN

(Submitted to the Columbia Basin Interagency Committee by its fisheries subcommittee, Boise, Idaho, February 11, 1959: Walter M. Allen, superintendent of fisheries, Montana Department of Fish and Game, Helena, Mont.; John A. Biggs, director, Washington Department of Game, Olympia, Wash.; Ross Leonard, director, Idaho Fish and Game Commission, Boise, Idaho; P. W. Schneider, director, Oregon State Game Commission, Portland, Oreg.; J. T. Barnaby, Chief, Division of Sport Fisheries, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Portland, Oreg.; Samuel J. Hutchinson, regional director, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Seattle, Wash.; Herbert Lundy, Oregonian, Portland, Oreg.; Milo Moore, director, Washington Department of Fisheries, Seattle, Wash.; Albert M. Day, chairman, fisheries subcommittee, Oregon Fish Commission, Portland, Oreg.)

The fisheries subcommittee of the Columbia Basin Interagency Committee, confronted with grave threats to runs of salmon and steelhead valuable to both the commercial and sports fishing industries urges the following program for action by the Congress:

1. An appropriation of $700,000 for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1959.

2. Continuing appropriation of not less than $1 million each year until solutions have been found.

3. The appropriation of these funds to the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers or the Department of Interior for expenditure by Federal and State fishery agencies in the pattern established for the Columbia River fisheries development program.

Priority items in the program attached herewith include research and development in lake and artificial impoundments, protection and guidance of downstream migrants, predation control, improvement of hatchery diets, reestablishment of upper Columbia salmon and resident trout populations, effects of flow and temperature changes on streams below reservoirs, mechanical methods of passing migrant salmon and trout over high dams, improving hydraulic characteristics of upstream and downstream migrant facilities, establishing improved counting procedures, effects of stratification in reservoirs, comparison of fish survival rates in rivers before and after installation of dams, studies of problems of stream rehabilitation and pond rearing of young migrant salmon and steelhead.

These are some of the projects included in the two-volume report of the Columbia Basin Interagency Committee fisheries steering committee drafted after 2 years of study and coordinated effort by biologists and management specialists of the fish and game agencies of the Northwest States and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. No implementation has yet been given that report.

The fishery agencies have only a few years, at best, to seek solutions to the problems raised by dam programs, pollution, changes in land and water uses, and other factors, if the fishery is to be saved for food and recreation.

The greatest concern lies in the persistent decline of the runs of fall chinook, silverside, and chum salmon, despite the conscientious efforts of State agencies to prevent losses by season limitations, closures, and catch limits. Agencies of the States and Federal Government share the anxiety of citizens. A moratorium on dam building in vital sections of the Middle Snake Basin and tributaries has been proposed by the Army Engineers, the Secretary of the Interior, the Oregon Water Resources Board and many other agencies and citizens' groups.

It is imperative that any time so gained be used in an all-out effort to solve the problems of fish passage, propagation, and rehabilitation of natural spawning areas for anadromous and resident fish.

Failure to solve these problems, or delay in attacking them, would constitute a roadblock to comprehensive development of the Columbia Basin. The fisheries program presented to Columbia Basin Interagency Committee is based on the best technical knowledge of those working with the resource and has the support of all important interests, commercial and recreational, in the region.

Approval of this report is recommended.

Research program recommended to the Columbia Basin Interagency Committee by its fisheries subcommittee Feb. 11, 1959

[Typical projects selected from Columbia Basin Interagency Committee fisheries committee report of 1957]

FISH PASSAGE AT DAMS

Description	Objective	Duration	Annual cost	Total cost
Mechanical methods of passing upstream migrant salmon and trout over high dams.	To develop economical, efficient means of passage by investigation of elevators, lifts, and locks.	3 years	$100,000	$300,000
Protection and guidance of downstream migrating salmonoids.	Operational knowledge about guiding downstream migrants will be applied at Brownlee, Pelton, and other dams using the skimmer device in conjunction with lights, electricity, and other methods.	do	85,000	255,000
Improve the hydraulic characteristics of upstream and downstream migrant facilities.	To determine means of energy dissipation and flow controls to provide more efficient means of fish passage and to investigate systems not now employed.	4 years	25,000	100,000
Effects of flow, temperature and chemical changes in the stream below a reservoir on fish and fish food organisms.	Determine basic information for use in establishing optimum spilling or discharge schedules of reservoir water for fish production below a dam.	5 years	50,000	250,000

FISH FARMING, POND REARING, RESERVOIR MANAGEMENT

Lake and artificial impoundment development for salmon and anadromous trout rearing.	Increase the production of existing and new rearing areas by improving the environmental conditions.	5 years	$135,000	$675,000
Effects of temperature stratification on the occurrence of small salmon in reservoirs.	Derive data for use in screening, guiding, and collecting small salmon migrants at dams.	2 years	20,000	40,000
Fish survival rates and species composition in a reservoir area before and after dam installation.	Obtain information for increasing the production of desirable fish in the new reservoir.	5 years	80,000	400,000

PREDATOR CONTROL

Reducing predation and competition in salmon and steelhead habitats in the Columbia River watershed.	Reduce predator and scrapfish by poisoning or by mechanical or electrical methods in order to increase survival of young salmon and trout.	5 years	$75,000	$375,000

INCREASE HATCHERY EFFICIENCY

Application of improved diets to hatchery production (nutrition of salmonoid fishes).	Develop hatchery diets from food ingredients available in the Pacific Northwest but presently not utilized.	5 years	$50,000	$250,000
Control fish diseases	Review present efforts and accelerate studies to control serious disease outbreaks at hatcheries and elsewhere.	do	60,000	300,000

REHABILITATE UPPER COLUMBIA

Study of reestablishment of upper Columbia salmon and trout.	Determine suitable stocks and transplantation techniques for their introduction into presently depleted areas in the upper Columbia River.	5 years	$20,000	$100,000
Total			700,000	3,045,000

REPORT OF FISHERIES COMMITTEE, COLUMBIA BASIN INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE, BOISE, IDAHO, FEBRUARY 11, 1959

(By Albert M. Day, director, Oregon Fish Commission, and chairman, fisheries subcommittee)

Mr. Chairman and members of the Columbia Basin Interagency Committee, I appreciate this opportunity to appear before you today to discuss the critical plight of fishery research and management in the Columbia River Basin and to solicit your advice on how best to remedy the situation.

As you folks are well aware, there are increasing pressures on the fishery agencies to find answers to difficult problems of anadromous and sport fish management while plans steadily proceed for harnessing the great rivers of the Northwest.

We in the fisheries field are not, as some people seem to think, dedicated to opposition to all dams. We know that the future of this great section of the United States must rely on hydroelectric power development if it is to fulfill its destiny in our national economy. We sincerely want to find means of having fish and dams both. We do want to see them placed where they will do the least damage.

The cold hard fact remains, however, that we will never be able to achieve this goal if all we do is sit around and talk about it. Rather we must diligently carry on research and development programs to protect the fishery resources against the hazards of up- and down-stream passage over dams, continued loss of natural spawning beds, and added burdens of management due to changing habitat through the construction of additional projects.

The fisheries subcommittee of the Columbia Basin Interagency Committee is here today to request your support for the following program:

1. An initial Federal appropriation of $700,000 for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1959.

2. Continuing appropriations of not less than $1,000,000 per year until solutions have been found.

3. Appropriations to be made either to the Corps of Engineers as a part of the overall cost of construction of hydroelectric projects or to the Department of the Interior. In either case, they should be available to the various States as well as the Fish and Wildlife Service. I personally feel that appropriation to the Corps of Engineers and subsequent transfer to Interior is preferable.

4. This program might best be an expansion of the Columbia River fisheries development program authorized by the act of May 11, 1938 (52 Stat. 345) and amended August 8, 1946 (60 Stat. 932) 6 U.S.C. 755–757. The pattern has already been established through annual appropriations under this act since 1949 and we have no desire to see it changed.

5. Division of work to be determined by representatives of the Corps of Engineers, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and the fish and game departments of the States of Washington, Oregon, Idaho, and Montana.

No new legislation is needed. Only money. The original action program began 10 years ago. I happen to be personally familiar with it since Milo Moore, then director of the Washington Department of Fisheries; Arnie Suomela, then director of the Oregon Fish Commission; and myself, then Director of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service in Washington, D.C., argued the program through the Bureau of the Budget and the Congress.

It was originally presented as an action program to build hatcheries, clear streams, replant runs and erect fishways over obstructions largely in the lower Columbia. Since this area then presented the most critical problem, no funds were spent in the upper river. Sport fish were not included. Now the revised 308 report recommends upriver construction. It has essentially remained an action program. In the light of present knowledge, research on problems of fish passage at dams was not then emphasized as much as it probably should have been.

In the period a total of almost $25 million of Federal moneys has been appropriated for the restoration, construction and operation of fisheries facilities, largely in the lower reaches of the Columbia. The Corps of Engineers has made some $2½ million available for fisheries research on problems connected with the passage of anadromous fishes at hydroelectric installations. An experimental fish ladder has been operating successfully at the Corps of Engineers-Fish and Wildlife Service research laboratory at Bonneville. Basic research is being conducted at the research station operated by the Fish and Wildlife Service at Willard, Washington, built and maintained with these funds.

Various States have contributed from their revenues in attempting to solve some of the problems. Of particular note have been new advances in isolating and treating diseases of fishes, and in developing new diets at hatcheries in the Columbia River system.

Accomplishments to date have proven to be a valuable adjunct to fisheries management. The hatcheries paid off handsomely last fall when the greatest run of chinooks since 1951 crowded into the Columbia River and its tributaries. All of the hatcheries are now full of salmon eggs and had they not been available, much of this large run would have been lost.

Yet in spite of these large expenditures for hatcheries and stream clearance in the lower river, important fall runs have steadily declined during the same 10 years. From Columbia River commercial landings which averaged 13½ million pounds for many years prior to 1948, the take has gradually declined and last fall was the lowest on record—about 2½ million pounds. The low catch by trollers and gillnetters in 1958 combined with unusual ocean conditions which held the salmon offshore approximately 2 weeks longer than normal accounted for the large upriver escapement.

When looking at the overall picture, fall runs of chinook, silver and chum salmon are in bad shape. In fact, the management agencies of the States of Oregon and Washington within the past 2 weeks have declared a complete November closure on salmon in the Columbia River and tributaries, both sport and commercial, for needed escapement. This is the first time in history that such concerted action has been taken.

Many factors undoubtedly enter into the decline of the fall runs. Pollution during periods of low water, critical summer flows, heavy take of potential spawners by sport and commercial fishermen during the long summer and fall months, mortalities at existing hydroelectric projects, and many other conditions which are as yet unknown, probably contribute to this situation.

On the other hand, the runs of spring chinook and steelhead which fight their way hundreds of miles into the upper reaches of the Columbia and the Snake for their spawning acts, have gradually increased during this past decade. Measured by counts over Bonneville plus the commercial take below, the runs have shown that spring chinook have doubled, summer chinook have more than doubled, summer steelhead remained about the same, and blueback are up 50 percent. The commercial pack in 1958 amounted to 4,600,000 pounds.

Spring chinook are difficult to raise successfully in hatcheries. They are probably the most delicately adjusted creatures that any fishery management agency has to deal with. They need natural gravels and suitable low water temperatures when it comes time to spawn. Then, long residence in hatchery holding ponds and upriver pools before they spawn makes them susceptible to disease.

We have learned much in the past 10 years regarding passage of anadromous fish around dams under 100 feet in height. While there is room for further improvement of fish facilities on these lower structures, the overall picture of passage is not discouraging considering the present number of Columbia River dams.

This brings us to the abrupt realization that if we are to preserve the salmon and steelhead resources we must look to means of finding successful ways of passing fish over dams. And on the engineers' drawing boards, dams are growing higher and higher every year.

The most important streams now available to upriver runs of salmon and steelhead are found in the middle reaches of the Snake. The Salmon, Clearwater, Imnaha, and Grande Ronde are probably the keys to the success or failure of the perpetuation of these valuable races of fish. Members of this committee know perhaps better than I of the plans to block all of these streams with piles of concrete and stone, 400, 500, and 600 feet high. This creates probably the greatest challenge to fishery workers that has ever been given to any body of scientists in the history of conservation.

Important voices are crying for delay in the planning of these great hydroelectric structures until the fish-passage problems can be solved. The Corps of Engineers' "308" report recommends the suspension of activities in this important reach of the river until 1970, in the hope that fish-passage problems will be solved. The Oregon Water Resources Board a few months ago recommended that no more high dams be built in this important area until 1965, when they hoped that fish-passage problems would be solved. The Secretary of the Interior has expressed his opposition to dams here until fish problems are solved. The Izaak Walton League, the Western Association of Fish and Game Commissioners, the Sport Fishing Institute, the National Wildlife Federation, and in fact, almost everyone seems to agree that no new dams should be built in this critical area until fish passage problems are solved. The National Hells Canyon Association wishes to spearhead a drive and solicit the aid of other organizations to seek funds for essential research in this field.

In addition to the lower Columbia problems with anadromous fishes, there are growing needs to look at the upriver problems. Dams for additional storage above Grand Coulee will affect important sport fishes. We have never made a good inventory of what is there and what possibilities the future may hold.

Everyone seems to favor finding means by which these growing fishery problems may be solved. Yet, when it comes to digging down into the old pocketbook to find money to buy the brains and experimental equipment to do the job—all we get is talk. Writing letters, sitting around conference tables, attending meetings such as this, making radio and TV appearances, telling about our woes, will not help get a single fingerling through or over a 600-foot dam unless there is forthcoming cold, hard cash to permit our research workers to get on with the job.

We don't need more conferences to decide what to do. The former fisheries committee of the Columbia Basin Interagency Committee under the capable leadership of Herbert Lundy, editor of the editorial page of the Oregonian, put together two excellent summaries of research and management needs. All the fishery agencies in the Columbia River Basin cooperated in compiling these reports. They are our guide on what to do. But what has happened to them? They have gathered dust since they were originally issued in January 1957.

The present committee has struggled valiantly but unsuccessfully to obtain research funds to go ahead with this program. The Secretary of the Interior advised me a short time ago that our problems were under consideration but reminded us that the Interior Department is already spending some $700,000 on research on Columbia River fishery problems in the current fiscal year. That sum is simply not enough. Funds appropriated to the Fish and Wildlife Service are not adequate to also take advantage of the brains and facilities of the various State agencies that stand eagerly by, awaiting an opportunity to do more in a coordinated approach to the problem.

This committee has taken the Lundy report and selected projects that are of urgent importance and which should be initiated immediately. These items are over and above that now being done by the Fish and Wildlife Service, much of whose research surrounds basic longtime studies such as physiology and morphology. The projects which were selected by this committee deal directly with the principal problem ahead—that is, fish passage at dams, compensation for losses, and increased productivity.

We have worked hard for the past year trying to get this program recognized in Washington. We attempted to secure Saltonstall-Kennedy Act funds, which accrue at the rate of $5 million to $6 million a year from the 30-percent import duty on fishery products and are allocated by the Fish and Wildlife Service for fishery research. So far we have been unsuccessful.

We asked for a modification of Budget Bureau and departmental policy on the use of Columbia River development program money, even if it meant temporary suspension of construction of additional hatcheries. The results of our efforts were that the present budget as submitted to the Congress by President Eisenhower reduced the construction ceiling for this program by $800,000 from $2 million to $1,200,000. It reduced the operation and maintenance ceiling by $100,000.

Our efforts to secure a shift in emphasis was answered by the elimination of all construction funds and no increase for badly needed research.

Thus, at present, we stand with no prospect of relief, yet everyone stands by and talks about a moratorium on dams until the fishery agencies solve the critical fish problem. It simply can't be done under such an unrealistic approach.

We have available a high priority work program for which we seek $700,000 during the next Federal fiscal year. Emphasis is placed on such things as lake and artificial impoundments, protection and guidance of downstream migrants, predation control, improvement of hatchery diets, reestablishment of upper Columbia salmon and trout populations, effects of flow and temperature changes on streams below reservoirs, mechanical methods of passing migrant salmon and trout over high dams, improving hydraulic characteristics of upstream and downstream migrant facilities, establishing new counting procedures, effects of temperature stratification in reservoirs, comparison of fish survival rates in rivers before and after the installation of dams, studies on problems of stream rehabilitation, and others of similar importance.

These estimates constitute the $700,000 requested for the fiscal year 1960. Other research and development projects will be selected to bring the total to $1 million per year for at least the following 5 years. By then, we will have some positive answers to these vexing problems.

Speaking for myself, but I believe that this also echoes the sentiments of my colleagues in the fishery research field, no choice faces us other than opposition to the construction of further high dams in important anadromous fish areas until fish passage and management problems have been solved. We would like to solve them, but we must have money from some source if we are to get on with our part of the job.

[From the Oregonian, Feb. 14, 1959]

CALL FOR FISH RESEARCH

The recommendation by the Fisheries Subcommittee that Congress be asked immediately for funds to launch a new Columbia Basin research and development program has been approved unanimously by the Columbia Basin Interagency Committee, representing State Governors and the Federal departments.

At a meeting in Boise this week, the Columbia Basin Interagency Committee gave its sanction to efforts to obtain a $700,000 appropriation for the coming fiscal year, and continuing appropriations of not less than $1 million each year until solutions have been found to the problems which have roadblocked the construction of many dams.

This is a minimal effort, it falls short of the $5 million long-range program for research alone and the approximately $40-million program for upper basin development given Columbia Basin Interagency Committee by an earlier committee. But it includes several priority projects. In view of the Army Engineers' review of the 308 report which would give the fish agencies about 10 years to find out how to make dams and salmon compatible in the Middle Snake and Salmon Rivers, further delay in expanding fishery research, particularly, would be suicidal.

We do not expect a "moratorium" in the Middle Snake to last that long, if one is declared in response to urgings of the Engineers, Secretary of Interior Fred Seaton and the Oregon Water Resources Board. Nor is there likely to be any cessation of dam building in other areas. The fish problem is critical—particularly the need to save the fall chinook salmon and silversides which once were so abundant. All interested State and Federal agencies, sportsmen and commercial fishermen should combine in support of this proposal to Congress.

CANADIANS OPPOSE WATER DIVERSION

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, as we recall, the State Department, on Tuesday, released an exchange of diplomatic notes between the United States and Canada on H.R. 1, the measure proposing to increase the diversion of water from Lake Michigan at Chicago.

The Canadian Government again expressed—and justifiably, I believe—its opposition to the enactment of this legislation.

Naturally, the decisions of Congress will not, and should not, be dictated by another country. However, the Canadian Government, I believe, has been remarkably restrained and circumspect during consideration of this legislation.

As we recognize, Canada, as well as the United States, has a multi-million-dollar investment in the development of the St. Lawrence Seaway, along with great port and harbor development projects, and shipping interests. The enactment of H.R. 1 would divert dangerously large volumes from Lake Michigan, affecting the water levels of the whole Great Lakes Basin and the St. Lawrence Seaway, thus jeopardizing the interests of both countries.

In view of these facts, the Congress, I believe, ought not ignore the legitimate interests of our good neighbors to the north.

The Canadian interests, of course, are only supplemental to those of the United States. On the evidence of the domestic dangers of the legislation alone, including, among other things, threats to the seaway, port, and harbor development projects, and to trade and commerce on the Great Lakes, the measure should not be enacted.

As we know, hearings on H.R. 1 are expected to be reconvened by the House Public Works Committee on March 3. I would hope that the members of that committee would consider, along with domestic factors involved, the Canadian statement and its implications.

In addition, I would call to the attention of the Senate the restatement of Canada's objections; this serves to emphasize the international significance of this legislation.

In consideration of these factors, I again respectfully urge that the Senate version of this legislation, yet unassigned to committee, be referred to the Foreign Relations Committee, where it rightfully belongs.

I request unanimous consent to have the release by the State Department, accompanied by a statement by myself on it, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statements were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[Department of State release, Feb. 24, 1959]

The State Department today released the text of an exchange of aide memoires between the U.S. Government and the Canadian Government on increased diversion of water from Lake Michigan at Chicago.

The text of the U.S. aide memoire, sent to the Canadian Government on February 9, 1959, is as follows:

"The Canadian Government has, on various occasions in the past, furnished the Department of State with the Canadian views on proposed U.S. legislation aimed at increasing the diversion from Lake Michigan into the Illinois Waterway. The most recent comments of this nature were contained in an aide memoire received on January 6, 1958, from the Canadian Embassy in Washington.

"Once again this year, as in recent years, a considerable volume of legislation, looking to increased diversion from Lake Michigan at Chicago, has been introduced in the 86th Congress. Some of this legislation is similar to former legislation with regard to which Canadian views have previously been expressed. A number of other pending bills, however, such as H.R. 1, a copy of which is enclosed, call for a 1-year additional diversion period to be made as part of a 3-year study of the effect on Lake Michigan and on the Illinois Waterway of such an increased diversion.

"Congressional hearings on this legislation are scheduled to begin in the near future. During the course of these hearings, it is anticipated that the Department of State will be asked to submit a statement as to the present Canadian views. It is hoped, therefore, that the Canadian Government will be able to transmit to the Embassy, at an early date, its views with respect to that proposed legislation which authorizes an additional 1,000 cubic feet of water per second to be diverted from Lake Michigan into the Illinois Waterway for a period of 1 year as part of a 3-year study."

On February 20 the Canadian Government responded to the U.S. memorandum with the following aide memoire:

"On a number of occasions in the past the Canadian Government has expressed its objections to proposals envisaging increased diversions of water from Lake Michigan at Chicago. Once again, and at the invitation of the Government of the United States through the U.S. Embassy's aide memoire of February 9, 1959, the Government of Canada is anxious to make known its views on legislative proposals now before Congress, such as bill H.R. 1, which are intended to authorize an increased diversion of water from the Great Lakes Basin into the Illinois Waterway.

"While recognizing that the use of Lake Michigan water is a matter within the jurisdiction of the United States of America, it is the considered opinion of the Canadian Government that any authorization for an additional diversion would be incompatible with the arrangements for the St. Lawrence Seaway and power development, and with the Niagara Treaty of 1950, and would be prejudicial to navigation and power development which these mutual arrangements were designed to improve and facilitate.

"The point has been made repeatedly by Canada that every withdrawal of water from the basin means less depth available for shipping in harbors and in channels. Additional withdrawals would have adverse effects on the hydroelectric generation potential on both sides of the border at Niagara Falls and in the international section of the St. Lawrence River, as well as in the Province of Quebec, and would inflict hardship on communities and industries on both sides of the border.

"The Government of Canada, therefore, protests against the implementation of proposals contained in H.R. 1."

STATEMENT BY SENATOR WILEY

I am delighted that, in the exchange of diplomatic notes released by the State Department, the Canadians have chosen to speak out boldly—and justifiably, I believe—against H.R. 1.

Throughout consideration of diversion of water from Lake Michigan, the Canadians have acted in a remarkably restrained and circumspect manner; particularly in view of the fact that their national interests were deeply involved. For example, Canada, like the United States, has a multi-million-dollar investment in the St. Lawrence Seaway development program and related power and harbor projects.

As pointed out in the Canadian aide memoire, the diversion of water as proposed in H.R. 1 generally would be incompatible with such programs. Too, it would be prejudicial to navigation and power development on the St. Lawrence Seaway and throughout the Great Lakes Basin. "Every withdrawal of water from the basin means less depth available for shipping in harbors and in channels," the aide memoire rightly emphasized.

The release of the exchange of diplomatic notes on the proposed increased diversion of water of Lake Michigan at Chicago merits the full consideration of the Congress. I would hope that—

(1) The Public Works Committee in the House of Representatives would give full recognition to the importance of the Canadian, as well as the U.S., interests in consideration of H.R. 1;

(2) Recognizing the international aspects of the problems involved in this legislation, the Senate would—as I have respectfully suggested—refer the Senate version of this legislation to the Foreign Relations Committee, where it rightfully belongs;

(3) All Members of the Congress would now awaken to the fact that this is, in many ways, a dangerous piece of legislation. To enumerate a few of the dangers, these include: (a) A threat to the St. Lawrence Seaway project and port development programs being carried on around the Great Lakes in which local communities and the United States and Canadian Governments have millions of dollars invested; (b) lowering the lake levels would threaten shipping and thus have adverse economic effects not only on lake traffic but on inland areas, depending upon such traffic for transportation of their commodities; (c) the dangers in unilateral action by the United States—if H.R. 1 were enacted—with respect to our friendly relations with our good neighbor Canada; (d) the setting of a precedent by which waters with Canadian sources might be diverted to jeopardize transportation and power interests in the United States, particularly in the great Northwest; and other dangers.

The publication of the aide memoire is particularly timely and, I believe, furnishes one more bit of evidence as to why the legislation, H.R. 1, for diversion of larger volumes of water from Lake Michigan at Chicago, should not be enacted.

NEEDED: EXPANSION OF SPECIAL MILK AND SCHOOL LUNCH PROGRAM

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, my colleagues will recall that recently I have urged the continuation and expansion of both the special milk and school lunch programs.

Over the years, these splendid programs for serving milk as well as school lunches have established an outstanding record. The net result has been improved health for our schoolchildren.

Nationally, about 76,478 institutions have served more than 1.9 billion half pints of milk to boys and girls under the special milk program. In addition, over 12 million students have been provided opportunity to be served school lunch in the Nation's schools.

Also, the programs have been a useful outlet for surplus milk, cheese, butter, flour and other farm commodities.

This latter point is of particular importance in view of the fact that as of June 30, 1959, it is predicted that we will have about $9 billion worth of surpluses. In addition, the cost of maintaining the surplus program amounts to almost $1 billion annually. The Nation now faces problems (a) as to how to reduce the flow of farm commodities into surplus stockpiles; and (b) how to best utilize the surpluses that now, and in the future, will continue to be available.

These two programs—the school lunch and the special milk projects—have been among the few bright sports in the surplus picture.

I want to stress that these programs are not exclusively federally supported. To finance the school lunch program, for example, local communities are providing for more matching funds than the Federal Government. In Wisconsin this now amounts to the local school district paying about $5 for every $1 of Federal funds available.

Recently, I received a letter from Mr. Gordon Gunderson, supervisor of the school lunch program in the Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction, first, supporting the merits of the bill, S. 982, which I introduced for expanding the special milk program; and, second, stressing the need for additional funds to carry forward the school lunch program, for which I have urged a minimum appropriation of $155 million.

I request unanimous consent to have the letter of Mr. Gunderson printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE STATE OF WISCONSIN,
DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION.

The Honorable ALEXANDER WILEY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: Thank you very much for your letter of February 9, sending me a sheet from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD publishing your remarks on the floor of the Senate covering the introduction of bill S. 982 to establish the special milk program on a permanent basis and to increase the appropriation to $85 million annually. You are certainly to be commended for the action you have taken. The program in Wisconsin has grown extensively again this school year, and we will be in need of a great deal more money before the year is over than was required to finance the program last year. I am, therefore, happy to see your deep interest and particularly the action you have taken concerning the matter.

The school lunch program will also be in need of further assistance if the price of the lunch is to be maintained at a level where the majority of children are able to pay and if the program is to be expanded to meet the ever-increasing school enrollment. This year in Wisconsin we have been reimbursing school districts 5½ cents per lunch served, meaning that the local school districts and children have been contributing from 25 to 30 cents per lunch locally. Thus it is evident that local school districts are actually matching Federal appropriations for this purpose by $5 to every $1 of Federal funds.

It is also evident that in the coming year this rate of reimbursement cannot be maintained, since a greater number of children will be participating in the program and we will be required to spread the funds thinner or to actually turn down requests for participation by a substantial number of school districts. We are hoping, therefore, that the appropriation by Congress can be increased to meet this need and/or that the transfer of funds from section 32 similar to the action which was taken this year will again be taken by the Congress but that the funds will be sharply increased and that the legislation will be made so abundantly clear that there will be no question on the part of the Secretary of Agriculture to expend such funds for the purchase of food for the school lunch program. We have been informed through our association that there has been a great deal of hesitancy, or rather reluctance, on the part of the U.S. Department of Agriculture officials to actually expend the funds made available to them this year, since there was serious doubt in their minds as to whether or not the funds were being expended in accordance with the legislation and intent of the Congress.

Anything you can do in this matter will be sincerely appreciated. I believe that Federal and/or local expenditure of funds to keep our children physically fit is an expenditure in the interest of national security in addition to its contribution to national health and welfare in general. The program's contribution to the agricultural economy is self-evident, and I am sure needs no further comment by me.

Sincerely yours,

GORDON W. GUNDERSON,
Supervisor, School Lunch Program.

CYRUS EATON: MERCHANT OF PEACE

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Cyrus Eaton: Merchant of Peace," written by John Barden and published in the January 31, 1959, issue of the Nation.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CYRUS EATON: MERCHANT OF PEACE

(By John Barden)

Cyrus S. Eaton, of the United States and Canada, the dominant figure in enterprises worth at least $2 billion, has set his formidable abilities to bringing peace to the world and composure to the United States. The project has the earmarks of an Eaton operation, though larger and more public than any heretofore undertaken. There is a plan which sets out the objectives and the practical action calculated to reach them. The mere utterance of sentiments, however wise and experienced, is a frivolity to which Eaton is not addicted. His approach to peace in the world and composure for the United States is about as frivolous as the organization of Republic Steel Corp., one of his youthful accomplishments.

An Eaton operation is one in which Eaton generally has his way. Major and minimal objectives of both a public and private character are postulated. The opposition seems always to be overwhelming, a situation which brings assiduity to Eaton's work and joy to eventual victory. The choice of weapons is always Eaton's, and he knows the value of surprise. Wonderful coincidences occur, so favoring the Eaton operation at hand that in retrospect it is plain that Eaton coincided them. Powerful allies, well motivated by their interests, suddenly appear from unexpected quarters; opponents are likely to spend time on frolics and detours especially arranged for them.

Eaton assesses the possibilities of defeat as carefully as the potentialities of victory. New situations are estimated from a constant flow of information from reliable sources and skillfully exploited. Last ditches to fight from are constructed in advance; all retreats are tactical; all losses salvageable. The worse his situation, the more formidable he becomes. Even when suffering staggering losses at the outset of the great depression, he kept the Kuhn-Loeb bank's Bethlehem Steel Corp. from merging with Youngstown Sheet & Tube Co.—a 28-year-old precedent the Federal courts are still enforcing today. The results of an Eaton operation are likely to have remarkable permanence.

Though a reader, writer, and thinker, Eaton's characteristic mode of expression is action—and no public talking. He works 7 days a week, and it would take a better man working 7 days a week to beat him, but this has never happened. Eaton has been down (though not out) just once. It took the 1929 depression to do it. That catastrophe only added strength to impressive talent.

In international politics, talking is a weapon, and so for a quiet man Eaton has been doing a great deal of unaccustomed public talking. He has been described as courtly, courteous, austere, dignified, assured, white-haired, tough-minded, intellectual. It's all true, but does not explain his hold upon even hostile audiences. What makes them sit up and listen is the nonconformity of a man plainly answerable only to God. Convincing moral indignation runs through his talk like the denunciations of the prophets. He keeps it convincing by getting down to cases. Eaton's program for the peace of the world and the composure of the United States is specific and barbed.

Although most of Eaton's stated objectives have an oddly left-wing ring in right-wing ears, and a few ring wrong bells in left-wing ears, the right-and-left distinctions, however usefully applied to the French Chamber of Deputies, have no sensible application to Eaton. He believes productive people are the most important people in any society. His audience, as he sees it, is composed of industrialists, labor leaders, farmers and intellectuals. He knows the constituencies they influence constitute a workable majority. When this majority, doing the world's work, sees that the world is unsafe for its interests—human productivity in every form—they will change it. Eaton is sure they can if only they will, and he has set out to make them see their danger.

These notions are basically conservative, though tinctured with the radically democratic assumptions that any man is entitled to ask people to change things and that the people, if persuaded, are entitled to do so. Just how Eaton proposes to do this is becoming clear.

"The United States of America," he told the third Pugwash conference of scientists in Vienna, "has reached greatness, not through its soldiers or statesmen, but through the genius of its scientists, industrialists, agricultural experts, and labor leaders." He closed the brief speech with this statement of the Eaton strategy:

"The 18 influential conference participants from the United States come from the great universities and institutions that have played a major part in the development of atomic energy. I am particularly anxious that they and their colleagues in the powerful institutions with which they are associated will raise their voices boldly and loudly so that superlative achievements of science, industry, agriculture, and labor in America will not be destroyed by the lack of wisdom of statesmen."

The scientists understand Eaton. He is trying to make scientists help make the world safer for scientists.

He said the same thing, differently, to a blue-chip industrialist group, the Economic Club of Detroit, last November. The industrialists understand Eaton, too. His support in his own constituency will be scattered and quiet, but it will be there, and it will be effective.

Eaton will restate his theses to conventions of labor and farm groups when invited, and he will be invited when the time is right. This has not yet occurred because the emergence of powerful allies from unexpected quarters gets careful advance planning in every Eaton operation.

The decisions Eaton has made as chairman of the Chesapeake & Ohio Railway Co., and the simple hospitality of his Acadia Farms near Cleveland, have won important friends like Guy L. Brown and W. P. Kennedy in the powerful railroad brotherhoods. He also has a friend in the United Mine Workers, a fellow named John L. Lewis, to whom he lent effective help in the 1946 coal strike. As for the AFL–CIO, there is not much in Walter Reuther's public statements to which Eaton would object, and what there is may also be unacceptable to George Meany.

By persistently exerting quiet influence favoring open-minded and expeditious bargaining in the steel industry, Eaton has an important friend in David J. McDonald, president of the United Steelworkers. Those interested in how to make friends with labor leaders on the basis of labor's prime interests ("What have you done for us lately?") could do worse than watch the Eaton approach to the AFL–CIO.

A gentleman farmer, Eaton is the son of a prosperous merchant farmer in Nova Scotia. Yet the country squire aspect of Eaton's Scotch Shorthorn cattle breeding at Acadia Farms and Deep Cove Farm near Chester, Nova Scotia, is not irritating to plain farmers. He knows cattle breeding. He has shown PS Troubadour, the Shorthorn calf which took the 1956 international grand championship over all breeds, throughout 11 States and eastern Canada. The trip covered 100,000 miles. More than 75 million people came to see the memorable Troubadour, among them most of the agricultural experts and farm leaders of both countries. Since Troubadour can't talk, they talked with Eaton who, what with one thing and another, chanced to be there when they were. They were likely to learn, among other things, that he had been invited by the Soviet Government to bring Troubadour and representative cattle from his Shorthorn herds to Moscow for an agricultural exhibition. Editor Earl W. McMunn, after meeting Soviet Ambassador Mikhail Menshikov at Acadia Farms, went back to his influential Ohio Farmer and wrote an editorial in support of mutual understanding with Russia. Whatever the gambit, agricultural experts and farm leaders understand Eaton is trying to make the world safer for farmers.

Eaton's conclusions about the world—the place is unsafe and the needed repairs, though not easy, are obvious—come as a shock to the politicians. He has moved in on their territory, and they are frankly at a loss to know how to deal with him. After his attack on the FBI on the Mike Wallace TV show last May, the House Committee on Un-American Activities moved against him. Eaton was only too eager to use the committee as a national sounding board for his views. Though its chief snooper, Richard Arens, stated May 19 on ABC–TV that a subpena had been issued for Eaton, the subpena was never served. The hard-nosed politicians who might have been expected to lead the secret police bureaucracies and the jingoists against Eaton, didn't feel up to it.

The newspapers, with some notable exceptions, are in a quandary about Eaton. He enjoys influential and accurate reporting from the Washington Post, Louisville Courier-Journal, Milwaukee Journal, Cleveland Press, and the Knight newspapers. The rest cannot ignore him. He is news. He stands at the top of a class the press most admires—businessmen and industrialists. His deviations from the American line have to be explained to the public. This cannot be done by calling him a fool, since it is axiomatic that anybody who makes a fortune in industry has brains or luck, and in Eaton's case it wasn't luck. He's done it twice.

Some papers would like to call him a Communist and let it go at that, but too many people traveling in the same circles as the editors and publishers know enough about Eaton to laugh that charge out of the papers. So the standard journalistic approach is to cover the Eaton rhetoric without the substance, then write him off as a well-intentioned tycoon lost in the fog of higher politics through which we see so clearly.

A recent example was the favorable Cleveland Plain Dealer story (December 14, 1958) on an Eaton talk before the Men's City Club. The sharp questions from the audience, duly answered, and a standing ovation for Eaton, were fairly reported. But in reporting the speech, the Plain Dealer quoted Eaton's reference to John Foster Dulles as an "insane fanatic" without quoting the evidence Eaton brought to its support, of which there was a wide assortment. One was a discussion of the recognition of Red China. Eaton fairly stated the Dulles argument that to recognize Red China would dismay our friends, the non-Communist nations of Asia, then proceeded: "Who are these friends? Well, the biggest one is India. India recognized China long ago. * * * Pakistan, Ceylon, Burma, and Indonesia have recognized China. Japan is the only major nation in the Far East which hasn't, and it has been restrained from doing so only by pressure from the United

States. The whole Dulles argument is misrepresentation almost beyond belief."

The assessment of Eaton's capabilities, motives, and prospects in bringing peace to the world and composure to the United States is not easy. According to Eaton, his capabilities are modest, his motives altruistic, his prospects excellent.

Enough has been said, perhaps, of the Eaton capabilities to establish that the only modest thing about them is his disclaimer. He brings to his present objectives 50 years' experience in international commerce, industry, and finance. It is reasonable to suppose that a man who put together $5 million in U.S. public funds and $5 million in Canadian public funds, with about $5 million in private funds, and emerged in full private control of the fabulous Steep Rock Iron Mines, Ltd., understands the basic principles of treatymaking.

Eaton's German industrialist partners in the development of his Canadian iron-ore properties on Ungava Bay—as shrewd and hardheaded a lot as there are in the world—would be surprised to hear Eaton charged with amateurism in international negotiations.

John Foster Dulles, even with a State Department commission, is just another New York bankers' lawyer to Eaton. He has defeated platoons of lawyers like Dulles on their home grounds, the Federal courts, and commissions. He did it to Newton D. Baker's firm in the Bethlehem-Youngstown merger case and to Robert A. Taft's firm in the Cincinnati Union Terminal case, establishing competitive bidding for the issuance of railroad securities.

He has no high opinion, either, of potential adversaries like generals and admirals. "One who reads their memoirs," he says, "cannot help but wonder at their vanity."

It has been laughingly asserted that Eaton thinks Khrushchev can be trusted. What Eaton thinks is that any man, or group of men, can be bound by their own interests. He believes that the Soviet Union, if relieved of our inimical encirclement, could be bound by its interests in building up its own economy to a consistent policy of friendship and trade with the United States. Coming from one who has had exceptional success in binding men by their interests to his own enterprises, this opinion seems worth serious examination.

Eaton is, of course, just one man opposing the policies of large governments. His case depends in the main on his persuasive abilities. Though these are considerable, he is operating in a field of public relations and politics in which he is supposed to be an amateur. This argument overlooks what Eaton did to the political careers of Newton D. Baker, Wendell Willkie, and Robert A. Taft.

Baker came into the 1932 Democratic convention as the candidate who could win the Presidential nomination in the event of a deadlock between Franklin D. Roosevelt and Al Smith. Eaton came to the convention with a solid victory over Baker in the Youngstown case and a natural reluctance to see him made President. He joined forces with James A. Farley and helped persuade William G. McAdoo's California delegation that Roosevelt was their man. The result was that Baker's opportunity never came up.

Wendell Willkie's political life would have been much happier had he not tangled with Eaton. Their relationship went far back into the 1920's. Eaton had known Willkie, somewhat intolerantly, as a cigar-chompin', whisky-drinkin' public-relations man and lawyer-lobbyist for the Ohio Edison Co., which serves the Acadia Farms.

In 1939 the New York financial community, its eye on the control of the Presidency, found or invented a Galahad in Wendell Willkie, president of the Commonwealth Southern Corp., a public utility holding company. Eaton watched this process gloomily, then caught wind of a deal in which Commonwealth Southern was about to buy 125,000 shares of common stock in its wholly owned Michigan subsidiary, Consumers Power Co., at $28.25 a share, the book value. The idea was to fatten up Consumers' equity so it could simultaneously float a $28 million bond issue. Willkie had arranged the underwriting with the usual gentlemanly syndicate of investment banking houses. There was to be no raucous competitive bidding. The underwriters would make $500,000. The deal was classic New York banking practice and was approved by the SEC and the Michigan Public Utilities Commission.

Eaton, who believed in competitive bidding, offered in writing to pay "substantially in excess of $28.25 a share" for the Consumers' stock, politely noting Willkie's oft-repeated complaint that the public wasn't buying utility stocks. If Willkie accepted, the gentleman bankers might walk out on the deal; if the presumptive Republican Galahad rejected the offer—well, his deal was something less than a quest for the Holy Grail.

Willkie rejected the offer, and both sides took to the newspapers. In the end, not only did Willkie have to drop the deal, but the SEC promulgated rule U-50, establishing competitive bidding for all utility issues under SEC jurisdiction.

Willkie turned to easier things like getting to be President. Eaton never let go. He turned pamphleteer and wrote "The Third Term Tradition" for the October 5, 1940, issue of the New York Post in support of Roosevelt's third term. When all three Cleveland papers came out for Willkie, Eaton wrote Secretary of Interior Harold Ickes an open but widely unpublished letter. Cleveland, he said, badly needed another newspaper. Since Eaton could afford the expense personally, this sentiment gave pause to the Forest City Publishing Co., which owned the Plain Dealer and the News, and to the Press, the prosperous keystone of the Scripps-Howard organization. They decided Willkie was not much of a Republican anyway, a feeling which gradually spread among influential Republicans.

Willkie's political career came to an abrupt close in the Wisconsin primaries of 1944, a State in which Eaton had numerous friends engaged in the business (and politics) of utilities, iron ore and shipping. Willkie ran last in a field of six.

The disappointments of Robert A. Taft, a perennial President aspirant, clinched the rule that no serious Eaton adversaries ever become President. Taft, who had told Eaton his application to enter a competitive bid for the $12 million Cincinnati Union Terminal bond issue was "preposterous," twice came so close to the GOP nomination he could taste it. Each time a small windfall of delegates could have put him over, but he found the Eaton influence carefully marshaled against him, and there were no windfalls.

This record surely jeopardizes Eaton's amateur status in the field of politics. It suggests the Eaton objectives of peace and composure are in the realm of the possible, and this raises the next question: What are the Eaton motives?

The motives in typical Eaton operations are apt to be a deft combination of public and private interests. In 1952, Eaton financing enabled the Cincinnati Enquirer employees to outbid the Taft family, which already owned one of the city's other two papers, in a probate court sale of the Enquirer. Eaton's Portsmouth Steel Corp., which put up the $7,600,000 purchase price, made $250,000 as a fee for Eaton's time in less than 4 months. Eaton's time also covered arrangements for common stock financing of the Enquirer and the sale of Enquirer debentures to the public. The proceeds paid off the $7,600,000 purchase price and the $250,000 fee. This account oversimplifies a series of complex transactions, but is a fair statement of the results.

Eaton, when asked, explained that most businessmen act from some combination of public and private considerations and that the money involved in the Enquirer transaction was of no great importance. Though modesty well becomes Eaton, this is not an analytical statement. What he did was stop a possible newspaper monopoly, hand a newspaper to its employees, defeat an old enemy, and make a quarter of a million dollars. Without these elements, the opportunity might not have interested him. Certainly the $250,000 was just one factor.

"What's money?" asks Eaton. "A man can wear only one suit of clothes at a time."

It would be a mistake, in assessing Eaton's present operations, to become so engrossed looking for private motives as to lose sight of his public ones. As the controlling figure in iron ore, coal, steel, lake shipping and railroad companies, Eaton would surely face a period of readjustment for his enterprises were the cold war and the armaments race suddenly to cease, as he advocates. He also knows, though, that he would lose everything permanently in a hot war and that cold war and armaments are heading straight for a hot war. Beyond this, any fair appraisal must grant him the altruism of worrying about the fate of others in such a world.

Eaton has had a hard, firsthand look at the Soviet Union (200 million people), a distant look at Red China (600 million people), and has been heard to say, "If installment buying is ever introduced—and my hunch is that it will come eventually—the increase in demand for consumer products will create a mass market well worth American attention."

Coming from a man with substantial interests in the steel, electrical utilities, rubber, paint, oil refining and chemical industries, this means business—more business, Eaton believes, than American and Canadian industry will ever make in the cold war and armaments. It means business without the risks of death and total destruction now being taken.

With more confidence in his fellow industrialists than most other observers can summon up, Eaton stated the case to Khrushchev: "I told Mr. Khrushchev that anyone who pictured the American businessman as encouraging war preparation in order to sell more iron ore, coal, and steel misunderstood the United States. I expressed the view that we ought to reach friendship and understanding, and that we should trade with each other."

It can be positively asserted that Eaton did not negotiate, begin to negotiate, or even suggest to Khrushchev or any other Russian official any transaction which might benefit the Eaton enterprises in any specific way. He didn't have to.

If his efforts enjoy even limited success in opening up trade between the United States and the Soviet Union, the big foot in the door everybody will suddenly see will be Eaton's. Powerful and well-motivated allies have a way of appearing from unexpected quarters in every Eaton operation. If this was among the things in the back of his mind in his talks with the Russian leaders, it underlines rather than denies Eaton's belief that trade with Russia would benefit the United States as a whole and that the fate of humanity may well rest on which way this decision goes.

The lesser private motives detectable in any study of the Eaton career can be very easily exaggerated. He has in his time been harried by New York banks, politicians, newspapers, law firms, State Department embargoes on trade and travel, and congressional committees. From them he's taken

an unusual amount of punishment—he's been investigated, subjected to surveillance, sold out, libeled, threatened with contempt proceedings, boxed and sandbagged with legal documents and court orders. He has scores to pay off, and he's just the man to do it, provided the retributions can be arranged pursuant to bigger operations aimed at larger considerations. Many an Eaton sortie has sideswiped an eye or a tooth from somebody who once took an eye or a tooth from him, but no Eaton operation has ever been wholly devoted to this Old Testament pastime—with the possible exception of the last days of his association with Henry Kaiser. That one Eaton fought with his back to the wall, a fight ending in courtroom victories for Eaton and the closing of Kaiser's career as manufacturer of Kaiser-Frazer automobiles. The Kaiser lawyers, it is worth noting, were the New York firm of Willkie, Owen, Otis & Bailey, assisted by the usual correspondents, in this case the Baker firm in Cleveland and the Taft firm in Cincinnati. Eaton's instrument in the battle, Otis & Co., is still doing business as a private bank.

A well-read student of the Christian tradition, Eaton loves his individual, corporate, police, and political enemies, though not with a love that surpasseth understanding. He is always willing to devote time to the improvement of their characters through adversity, but only incidentally and only when they get in the way. At the moment Dulles and his State Department are in the way. The David-and-Goliath aspect of this encounter pleases rather than dismays Eaton, but he isn't much interested in Goliath. He's after the Philistines.

There is something of the stiffnecked prophet in the Eaton character. In September 1958, he uttered two prophecies to Khrushchev. "I ventured to suggest that, in due course, the American industrialist, the American labor leader, and the American farmer would demonstrate that they agree with me on friendship, understanding, and trade with the Soviet Union. Meanwhile I suggested patience and forbearance on the Russian part. I also invited Mr. Khrushchev to watch the election returns carefully in November to see if the American voters did not express strong sentiment in favor of fresher and wiser foreign policies." Eaton was surer of the first prophecy, which Mikoyan's visit tends to confirm, than he was of the second, which has been wholly confirmed.

Any estimate of Eaton's prospects for peace in the world and composure in the United States must begin with some definition of what would constitute his failure. World war III would constitute the failure, but who's going to judge it? Short of this, his prospects seem excellent for some measure of success. Muddling through more decades of brinkmanship with the successors of Dulles is not a reasonable alternative. No two great powers about equally balanced in military capability and mutual official hatred can maintain so hostile a balance for long. No great powers ever have.

Eaton is taking his case to the productive people of the world. They will judge him and it.

FOR WORLD PEACE AND THE COMPOSURE OF THE UNITED STATES

(Here are Cyrus S. Eaton's proposals for an American foreign and domestic policy as outlined to John Barden for the Nation.—EDITOR.)

FOREIGN POLICY

1. Dismiss Secretary of State John Foster Dulles: "Mr. Dulles goes gaily on gambling with the destiny of the world without restraint from any quarter. He evidently is impervious to the 1958 election returns, which his inflammatory activities helped render catastrophic for the Republican Party. He blithely courts the ultimate world catastrophe of the bomb without consulting even the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and the House Foreign Affairs Committee."

2. Have President Eisenhower visit the Soviet Union and Premier Khrushchev visit the United States: "Mr. Khrushchev told me he would like to see for himself the great cities, industrial companies, railroads and agriculture of the United States and Canada. With America spending $50 billion annually for defense and the fate of humanity at stake, surely the head of our Government, with his fine personality and his infinite capacity for friendship, can afford to make an attempt to deal directly with his Russian counterpart on the Russians' own ground."

3. Recognize Communist China and admit her to the United Nations: "We have elected to invite the enmity of the 600 million Chinese on the mainland and have substituted for our old friendship with that proud and powerful nation a futile alliance with Chiang Kai-shek, an exiled 'has been' whom we have installed and maintained on a neighboring island at fantastic expense to the American taxpayer."

4. Strike a treaty of peace and friendship with the Soviet Union: "Certainly the risk in such a treaty is fraught with far less hazard to humanity that the cold or a hot war."

5. Halt the nuclear arms race: "Present stockpiles are enough to put to death every human being on earth. Any day, by accident or design, some fool, some fanatic, even some fumbler may touch off the explosion that will cause the holocaust."

6. Quit meddling in the affairs of other nations: "The newspapers of such countries as Denmark, France, Germany, Austria, and England are unanimously critical of our policies. Our high Government officials can no longer visit the republics of South America without inciting riots. In Canada, our near neighbor and best customer, the latest federal election was won by the party that proclaimed its lack of warmth, if not its downright hostility, to the United States."

7. Bring the influence of the world's scientists and scholars to bear on their governments in the interests of peace: Since 1955, Eaton has been host or sponsor of 12 "pugwash" conferences of intellectuals working in a variety of fields at great institutions throughout the world. The last, composed of 80 nuclear scientists from 22 nations—the largest delegations coming from the United States and the Soviet Union—met in Vienna last September. "These conferences cannot be held in the United States," Eaton declares. "The Chinese would not be permitted to enter and the Russians could enter only by subjecting themselves to humiliations no self-respecting scientist or scholar would submit to."

DOMESTIC POLICY

1. Abolish the secretive practices of American police organizations and confine them to legitimate police work: "Blackmail" is Eaton's word for the purpose of the FBI dossiers on every prominent American in or out of Government, not to mention those of city, county, state and other Federal police including congressional committees. "There are no secrets in the industrial or scientific worlds. Investigating and fingerprinting, surveillance and wire tapping, espionage and counterespionage—these keep alive the spirit of suspicion which is one of the evils that plague us. I am just as sure as I am alive that one of these days there will be an enormous reaction against secret police in the United States."

Eaton cited with praise Fred J. Cook's article "The FBI" (Nation, special issue, October 18, 1958), exposing the myth of that organization's infallibility.

2. Forget anti-communism as a security measure: "All this is folly," says Eaton. "We are the only major Nation that doesn't have a single Socialist in its national legislature, the only Nation without a large parliamentary representation of people who believe in Government ownership of everything. I disagree with the police and politicians whose careers are based on the lunatic belief that the American people are so stupid as to embrace communism unknowingly. Our proper posture is not anticommunism, but enlightened capitalism."

3. Establish a warmer understanding between capital and labor: "In every important industry in the United States there should be a meeting at least once a month between top management and labor leaders to discuss their mutual problems in a friendly spirit. Wisdom and restraint are required on both sides. The business leaders responsible for putting right-to-work legislation on the ticket last year hopefully learned some lessons from the defeat not only of this phony measure, but also of the candidates who went down with it."

4. Strengthen our banking system: "In the financial panics of 1907, 1914, 1921, and the depression which began in 1929, the banks fell over one another to see which could sell out their customers fastest in an effort to keep liquid. I am not saying there would have been no 1929 readjustment if our banking system had been stronger, but I firmly believe we could have avoided the depths to which the combination of weak banks and our own emotionalism carried us. We need larger, more powerful banks, established regionally and competitively."

5. Find new leadership toward an enlightened capitalism: "With all due credit to the politician, who must be elected, and to the editor, who cannot get too far ahead of his constituency, I think we must look beyond these old sources of leadership. I nominate the industrialist, the labor leader, and the farmer as representing the indispensable elements of dynamic capitalism. Let the teacher, the preacher, and the scholar add their best thinking, and I know we can look forward to a new era of enlightened capitalism that will excite the admiration of the entire world."

STABILIZATION OF THE DOMESTIC OIL AND COAL INDUSTRIES THROUGH IMPORT QUOTAS

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, in his introductory remarks on S. 1157, the distinguished Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] eloquently presented the reasons, based on the national defense for legislation that looks to the stabilizing of the domestic oil and coal industries through import quotas.

The Senator from Wyoming has shown how oil imports have increased even in the face of the President's restrictive orders. To his figures may I add one more: Imports of residual fuel are now equal to 41 million tons of coal annually. And I call to the attention of the Senate the language in the bill which would limit imports of residual fuel to 10 percent of the total domestic petroleum demand.

In joining the Senator from Wyoming in sponsorship of this bill, may I very briefly point out the importance of the subject to my State of Utah.

As far as development is concerned, oil and coal in Utah are at opposite ends

of the scale: Coal is an old and important industry that is declining—oil is a very new industry that is just entering the phase of large scale production. Utah is underlaid with billions of tons of good bituminous coal, sufficient to satisfy America's industrial needs for a century and more.

However, mechanization plus competition with other fuels have brought unemployment and economic distress to coal-producing areas throughout the country. Unless a way can be found to provide the coal industry a fair share of the Nation's industrial business, we must face the closing of many more mines and of the transportation systems dependent upon them. A mine once closed is difficult—often impossible—to reopen. I do not need to detail what this would mean in a national emergency.

Mr. President, as part of my remarks in the RECORD, I refer to a speech made at the opening session of the Utah State Legislature by Representative Frank C. Memmott, of Carbon County, one of Utah's great coal-producing areas.

Representative Memmott, a young man serving his first term in the legislature, has made a penetrating analysis of the problems facing not only his county, but the coal-mining industry of the Nation as well. I ask unanimous consent that the newspaper account of Mr. Memmott's speech be inserted at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CARBON LEGISLATOR POINTS UP COAL PROBLEMS IN INTRODUCTORY ADDRESS

When the 33d Utah Legislature convened Monday, each representative was given a 3-minute period of time in which to make known the needs of his particular locality. Frank C. Memmott, representative from Carbon County's First District, very emphatically and concisely brought to the attention of the legislature the principal problem confronting Carbon County.

Following is the address delivered by Mr. Memmott:

"Mr. Speaker and fellow legislators, I represent District 1 of Carbon County which is cosmopolitan in population and culture. Better than 50 percent of the population is bilingual. Although we have several problems, I am only going to elaborate and draw to your attention the major one as the others will be irrelevant if this one is not solved.

"Unemployment in the coal industry, due to automation and a diminishing market, is our major problem. Mechanization we are willing to accept because this is progress which enables the coal industry to have the highest industrial wage in America and at the same time be competitive with other fuels where transportation costs do not restrict our competing.

"Last week I checked with our local school board and found that the only item which was less in cost than the preceding year was the purchase of coal. In fact, the price of a ton of coal at the mine tipple is approximately the same as it was 10 years ago.

"Worldwide we are competitive. In fact, the American coal industry can place a ton of coal in Europe cheaper than they can produce it. I have recently returned from an area in West Virginia where approximately 30 percent of the production is being exported to that market. I doubt if the same can be said with regard to cost about any other American commodity.

"During 1957 total wage and salary disbursements for the coal industry in the State of Utah was $19 million, or 21 percent of all mining. Crude petroleum and natural gas was $11 million.

"The $19 million paid the miners of Carbon County is a very important factor in the economy of Utah and is diminishing due to the type of competition the coal industry is allowed to receive from oil and gas. Taxwise the coal industry receives 10 percent depletion, oil and gas 27½ percent.

"We are aware that although coal may be a better type of heat, the convenience factor gives our competition the favored role in home heating. Therefore, our only chance for survival is to receive our share of the industrial business, and this does not mean to call on the coal industry only in times of emergency. If this is allowed to happen, the coal industry will not be in business to meet these demands. A coal mine takes years to develop and cannot be turned on and off as an oil or gas well may be. The mine must be maintained and be a living operation or the mine itself may be lost. The men who produce coal today are technicians of the highest degree trained in operating machines, which involves an initial investment as high as $130 thousand for one machine. These miners are trained in the fields of electricity, hydraulics, and mechanics. To be trained in production and methods is a transition of many years and is only acquired by the practice and experience of the coal mine itself.

"My question is, Can Utah afford to allow this industry, which has contributed to the development of Utah in the past and will be needed in the future, to fall out of our economic structure during this transition period? Since I am limited to 3 minutes, I have only given you an outline of the problem. But during the 33d legislature I expect to acquaint you as legislators and the people of Utah with our problem.

"If it is possible during our busy schedule to visit a coal mine, I will personally arrange a visit to the area, and those who are willing, an underground tour, which will serve to give you a better perspective of this complex situation."

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, I am hopeful that this import quota approach will prove to be the needed stabilizing influence for both the oil and coal industries. As the able and distinguished Senator from Wyoming has pointed out, protection of an adequate domestic supply of energy is absolutely essential to national security, and the subject must receive the most careful study. It is my hope that, as a member of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, I shall be able to make a contribution in this vital field.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I think I should say to the distinguished Senator from Utah, that the administration has not been undiligent on the whole question of oil imports. The voluntary quota system expires on the 28th of this month. The Administrator of the Office of Defense Management has been holding hearings. He will end the hearings, reach a conclusion, and then make his recommendations to the Cabinet Committee. The Cabinet Committee, in turn, will make further recommendations. I apprehend, therefore, that within the next week we will know a good deal more about this matter. I think it is very much in the mill.

Mr. MOSS. I thank the Senator from Illinois.

THE FLIGHT FROM GOVERNMENT BONDS

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I call attention of the Senate to an article entitled "How To Spur Economic Growth—Investors Reported Leery of Inflation as Treasury Finds Bonds Hard To Sell," written by David Lawrence, and published in the Washington Evening Star of recent date. This is a very serious discussion of a highly important subject. It shows that investors are becoming increasingly worried about what the Democratic Party, with its overwhelming control of Congress, might do to the fiscal condition of the United States.

The article points out, further, that unemployment has not been materially reduced, largely because of the failure of heavy industry to make a recovery. This, in turn, is partly due to uncertainty about interest rates on borrowings; to the threatening rise in labor costs; and so forth. Because of its importance, I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Lawrence's article be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOW TO SPUR ECONOMIC GROWTH—INVESTORS REPORTED LEERY OF INFLATION AS TREASURY FINDS BONDS HARD TO SELL

(By David Lawrence)

Lots of Members of Congress are making speeches these days to the wrong audience.

Many of the Democrats, and even some Republicans, are deriding a balanced budget and talking about growth through bigger and bigger spending by Government. But this time the politicians are barking up the wrong tree—they may be convincing those of their constituents who think they are going to be the beneficiaries of the bigger spending, but it is the investors who remain unconvinced and are scared. For the Treasury is up against a crisis in refunding its maturing bonds. Investors are seeking refuge in the stock market, which is recording new high marks.

Ever since the election last November, investors have been growing increasingly worried about what the Democratic Party, with its overwhelming control of Congress, might do to the fiscal condition of the United States. Also, many industrial leaders have held up their expansion plans. Unemployment has not been materially reduced, largely because of the failure of the heavy-goods industries to come back. This is in part due to the uncertainty about interest rates on borrowings and to the threatening rise in labor costs. For, while there is a good deal of pious talk about proposed legislation to check abuses in the labor field, not much of anything is really going to be done by a labor-controlled Congress to remove the monopoly power from the national unions.

The outlook for the heavy-goods industries is clouded when it should be booming. Psychological factors are holding up the fulfillment of many plans for plant expansion that were completed months ago. This is the growth that should be encouraged instead of discouraged.

Congress has failed to come to grips with the crisis. Many of its so-called liberals think the answer lies in bigger and bigger deficits and that it doesn't matter whether the budget is balanced. But the speeches along that line from Capitol Hill are scaring the investors away from bonds and fixed-interest securities.

While some of the speeches in Congress make headlines that can mislead millions of voters—so many of whom are partisanly inclined anyhow—the investors of the country cannot be influenced by anything except sound economics and solid facts. Here, for example, is an extract from the February 14 newsletter of the Whaley-Eaton Service, a nonpolitical weekly published in Washington for many years and read regularly by the very men who handle funds in the financial and business institutions of the country:

"The flight from Government bonds is more ominous than most Washington officials care to admit publicly. Several recent Treasury financing operations have failed badly. As a result, the Treasury is being forced to run faster and faster merely to keep up with its maturities. The fact is that the richest nation in the world is now operating on a hand-to-mouth basis.

"The effect of all this seems utterly lost on advocates of dynamic new spending programs to speed business expansion, eliminate unemployment. The Treasury cannot spend more money than its gets through taxes and Government security issues. Yet professional and naive investors both now distrust the latter. This means recourse to financing through the banks, which increases money supply and is directly inflationary. * * *

"As Federal Reserve Chairman Martin puts it: 'Investors cannot be induced to purchase fixed-income securties if they fear a steady erosion in the purchasing power of the dollar.' Yet this is precisely what they do fear.

"Restoration of faith in the dollar requires facing up to the Treasury's dilemma. But that is something Congress seems unprepared to do."

Another penetrating comment comes from Aubrey Lanston, head of one of the best-known firms in New York that deal in Government securities. In a recent speech before the Kansas City Society of Financial Analysts, Mr. Lanston said:

"I think it can be demonstrated that a close interaction has slowly but persistently developed between what goes on in the Government security market and what goes on in Congress regarding proposed and actual Federal spending and in the budget.

"Altogether, it seems to me clear that the Treasury has quite a job on its hands. It is going to be difficult indeed for it to do much financing outside of the banks. Such a prospect carries with it the usual inflationary connotations. Therefore, if Congress elects to spend money over and above the $77 billion proposed by the President—for whatever purposes—the future inflationary potential will be enlarged.

"I hope that we will find that Congress is fully aware of what is needed. I hope that we will find that there are enough people in this country who care enough about what happens to it to scream the house down from here on, so that Congress will not be tempted to be lax in its No. 1 duty. This is to repair the condition of the Government's finances and to make clear that the credit of the Treasury will be maintained—by promoting a stable currency."

These quotations are typical of what financial men everywhere are saying. They have been frightened by Congress and by the speeches which seem to argue that two and two can make five any time the Government says so.

CHANNEL DEEPENING PROJECTS RELATING TO ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, another example of the fact that the budget proposed by President Eisenhower is not sacrosanct is that he utterly failed to include funds necessary for channel deepening projects necessary to accommodate 27-foot draft vessels following the opening of the great St. Lawrence Seaway.

I support and intend to work actively to have money appropriated to carry out the recommendations of the Corps of Engineers for Great Lakes harbor-deepening projects.

As a Senator representing, in part, all of the citizens of Ohio, I consider it of the utmost importance that Congress follow the recommendations of the Corps of Engineers. This corps, through its board, following a thorough study and survey, recommended including channel-deepening projects for Ashtabula Harbor, Cleveland Harbor, and Lorain Harbor in our State, and, in addition, Marquette Harbor, Presque Isle Harbor, and Buffalo Harbor in neighboring States. The estimated cost of these projects, which are of course essential, is $27 million.

In addition, I find that there is now in process of being transmitted to the Bureau of the Budget a channel-deepening project for (a) Duluth, Minn., and its neighbor city of Superior, Wis., and (b) Ashland Harbor, Wis., at an estimated cost of $4 million.

Furthermore, for the State of Ohio, the Corps of Engineers has approved channel-deepening projects for Sandusky and Toledo Harbors. I actively support both these projects, and will work and vote to have this legislation passed in the Congress.

In the end, our taxpayers will be amply reimbursed for these additional expenditures. The St. Lawrence Seaway, when it is in complete operation, will result in all of northern Ohio becoming a great community workshop. After these channels have been deepened, four of five of all ocean-going freighters may tie up at these ports, which presently accommodate 14-foot draft vessels, which are the only ones heretofore able to go through the Welland Canal.

We want the commerce of the world to come to our ports, and the farm produce and steel and other manufactured products of the Middle West to be shipped more quickly and more economically to European and north African ports.

The lower freight costs and quicker transportation methods will result in better prices for the products of our farms and for manufactured products, machinery, oil, coal, and lumber which will be shipped from our lake ports. International trade is not a one-way street. President Eisenhower was ill-advised when he failed to include these essential expenditures in his budget.

I may add that the favorable recommendation of each of these projects by the Nation's Corps of Engineers was based upon detailed findings in each instance with respect to the anticipated long-term benefits of each project.

In every case, the increased revenue and related economic betterment in Ohio and throughout all of the States having cities on the Great Lakes, and even neighbor States, such as Kentucky, will more than offset the amortized cost of deepening these channels.

Mr. President, not only is it my intention to press my views to the chairman and members of the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and House of Representatives, but I intend to speak on this subject on the floor of the Senate. It is a matter of importance to every workingman and workingwoman in Ohio, whether they live on our farms or in our cities. It is a matter of importance to the Nation.

We must not place a balanced budget over national security, nor over national prosperity and national necessity.

USE OF RUSSIAN IMPORTED EQUIPMENT IN AMERICAN SCHOOLS AND COLLEGES

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, with reference to the remarks I made on Monday of this week concerning the importation of certain school laboratory equipment of high quality from the Soviet Union, which can be sold for one-fourth or one-third the price of American products, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD an article entitled "Russia's Newest Trade Weapon," published in Business Week of January 24, 1959. I think the article will be of great interest.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RUSSIA'S NEWEST TRADE WEAPON—SAMPLES OF SCHOOL LAB EQUIPMENT ARE EXCITING U.S. MAKERS AND CUSTOMERS—QUALITY IS SO GOOD AND PRICES SO LOW

Following a pattern laid down in aluminum and benzene, the Soviet Government's next invasion of the U.S. market will come in the school laboratory equipment market. That seemed clear this week as the first sample lot of 26 items arrived in the United States. The Soviet offer, delivery of the items, f.o.b. New York, at an average price only one-fifth of prevailing prices for comparable United States made items.

In the opinion of educators who viewed the sample Soviet items, there is no question of the quality of merchandise up for sale. "They are," as one expert put it "fantastically good."

"It would be impossible," according to one MIT scientist who carefully inspected the numerous spectrometers, microscopes, navigation instruction equipment, rotators, and the like, "to hope to buy anything of similar quality made domestically for six times the price. They're offering a top-grade spectrometer for $53, f.o.b. New York, including tariff," he points out. "That's about one-third the price of the cheapest spectrometer on the U.S. market today. And the Russian equipment is good enough for a number of industrial uses, too."

GROWING MARKET

The first shipment to be sold in the United States by the Ealing Corp. of Cambridge, Mass., will be valued at $45,000. This will bring in 300 to 500 of each of 12 different pieces of equipment.

The total U.S. market for school lab equipment is currently about $6 million a year. But with the new Federal bill for education, some experts think the total sales potential in the United States could run many times higher in the years just ahead.

AMERICAN WORRIES

Reaction of U.S. school lab equipment makers to the latest Russian move is a mixture of anger and frank incredulity. In an industry dominated by two manufacturers—Central Scientific Co. and W. M. Welch Scientific Co., both of Chicago—most companies

admit they can't hope to fight back against price cuts of this magnitude.

Disturbed as they are over what would seem to be a stunning blow to their business outlook, however, they're banking on the belief that this is just another step in a larger Soviet plan to unbalance first one and then another section of the U.S. business community.

"Maybe," a manufacturer of microscopes suggests hopefully, "they'll shift their interest to somebody else soon."

In the past, this has been the pattern—a large supply of Soviet merchandise would suddenly appear on the market, then as suddenly dry up.

Official Washington is even more unconcerned about the latest Soviet economic maneuver. The average duty on scientific educational materials imported into the United States from Iron Curtain countries is about 42 percent, they point out. This is about as high a tariff bracket as you can find on any legal Russian-made item brought into the States. And it should be enough to protect the U.S. manufacturer, officials say.

MASS PRODUCTION

Why this may not be the case—and why the Russians apparently feel they are now in a position to export quality-grade equipment of this type—is a question that interests industry representatives who have seen the sample items.

One logical answer is supplied by Paul D. Grindle, president of the Ealing Corp. Print order numbers on the instruction books accompanying some of the instruments, he says, indicate that, compared with ours, the Soviet school lab instrument industry is huge.

Science education was one of the announced goals of U.S.S.R. leaders, and one of the first things the postwar Russian economy was tooled up to supply. As a result, the Soviet-produced equipment is the only equipment of its kind being mass-manufactured anywhere in the world today.

MORE TO COME

The economics of mass-manufacturing any standard item are well known. Having amortized engineering and development costs, the Soviet production machine has undoubtedly reached a point at which it costs hardly more than the price of materials to extend production of scientific lab equipment a few hundred thousand items more.

This puts the U.S.S.R. in a position to sell its runoff in world markets on a cutrate basis. On the basis of reports coming out of Russia, the same overrun may occur sometime soon in other things from communications equipment to high-speed cameras. Grindle himself brought back a suitcase full of catalogs of electronic equipment.

MAKING CONTACT

How this particular deal came about is a story of startling simplicity. Ealing's President Grindle happened to notice a picture on the cover of the U.S. Physical Society's Physics Today showing a Russian physics teacher at work in his classroom. On the table top in front of the teacher was an array of lab equipment that would be unusual in a typical U.S. physics classroom.

Grindle asked the U.S. Department of Commerce about the legality of importing sample lots of this equipment and found that it was completely within the law. He inquired about the equipment at the Russian Embassy in Washington and was promptly referred to Amtorg—the Soviet trade corporation in New York. Amtorg suggested a note to the proper authorities in Moscow. This was answered by an encouraging letter and a list of 96 laboratory equipment items that the Soviet Union would be willing to sell, with estimated sales prices.

MISSION TO MOSCOW

Grindle then decided to go to Moscow to look over this bonanza for himself. He found a well-organized sales setup, prepared to handle his requests. Proper Ministry of Trade officials were available for discussions. Raznoexport, the Russian agency charged with handling Soviet consumer products, permitted him to examine any of its sales products.

Almost as startling as this organization and planning is the significance of the quality of the Soviet lab equipment. University professors, looking at the equipment, are flabbergasted at its educational implications. The Soviets seem to have planned it for use in classrooms up to the 11th grade level. In the United States it would be adequate in classrooms up to and including the first year of college.

Moreover, all of the instruments were obviously designed by people who understand and care about science education. "The most awful part about what we saw," says one professor, "is how embarrassingly good it is."

PRELIMINARY REPORT OF THE SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, early this month an article which appeared in Barron's magazine was sharply critical of the activities and procedures of the Small Business Administration. Subsequently, editorials of similar tone appeared in the Wall Street Journal and the Milwaukee Journal. I ask unanimous consent that the article and the editorials be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article and the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From Barron's magazine, Feb. 2, 1959]

EASY MARK—A HARD LOOK AT THE SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION

(By the staff of Barron's)

WASHINGTON.—For more than 5 years, the Small Business Administration, operating through 15 regional and 26 branch offices throughout the country, has been doing a brisk business in lending the taxpayers' money. The number of loans which it has granted now approaches 15,000; the sums outstanding exceed $200 million. By any standard, SBA's loan transactions have become big business.

Despite the size of its financial operations, however, scant attention has been paid to either the philosophy or methods of the Small Business Administration. Yet a number of facts indicate that a hard look is long overdue. For one thing, the agency's own figures on delinquencies and loans in process of liquidation are startlingly high. What's more, a report released last spring by the General Accounting Office suggests strongly that the SBA has been lax in making and protecting its commitments.

The Small Business Administration was created in 1953 after the Government finally had closed the books on the thoroughly discredited Reconstruction Finance Corporation. The new agency was set up to give advice and counsel to small concerns (generally defined as those with assets of less than $1 million); help them to obtain Government contracts; and make loans to those unable to borrow from commercial banks. A revolving fund of $50 million was set up for the latter purpose.

The act which originally established SBA called for it to go out of business in 1955. However, its political appeal proved too strong. As a result, Congress, with administration support, renewed its lease on life, and authorized more money. As of January 1, 1958, a total of $320 million had been approved. Last year, moreover, the 85th Congress, in a burst of generosity, voted the agency another $200 million and gave it permanent status. The 1960 budget provides an equal amount for SBA, making some $700 million in all.

In order to distribute this largesse, the staff of SBA has been processing loans energetically. During the first 6 months of 1958, it went through some 4,700 loan applications, granting more than half. Branch and regional offices, it should be noted, can approve many kinds of loans on their own authority; their power to reject applications, however, is limited. Thus, an applicant who has been refused may ask for reconsideration and have his request forwarded direct to Washington.

Under these circumstances, the total of loans outstanding has soared. From $42 million on June 30, 1956, it had more than quadrupled, to $183.3 million, by mid-1958. The present official estimate of $200 million on the books is probably conservative.

In its haste to meet the credit needs of small businessmen, however, the agency seems to have been something less than prudent, either in making loans or in servicing them. For such shortcomings, SBA officials blame the lack of adequate personnel. Funds for administration, they explain, are appropriated each year on the basis of the previous year's volume of business. Owing to its rapid expansion, the agency is perennially short handed.

Be that as it may, the Comptroller General's audit last year found serious defects in SBA procedures. The GAO reported, for example, that in many cases uncertified and unaudited financial statements were accepted as a sufficient basis for making loans. According to the GAO, some of these statements were of doubtful reliability and accuracy.

Again, in examining loan files at some SBA offices, the Comptroller General's auditors found no evidence that collateral pledged by borrowers had been examined by qualified appraisers. "A review of delinquent loans at one office disclosed instances of rather larger differences between the evaluations of collateral at the date of loan applications and the proceeds realized from foreclosure sales," the GAO report added.

If SBA officials were excessively lenient in making loans, they were even more lax in enforcing the terms of loan contracts. For example, agency regulations provide that debtors must furnish periodic financial and operating statements. However, the GAO found that many, with apparent impunity, were failing to do so. Moreover, where debtors did submit statements, SBA officials often failed to scrutinize them.

The GAO report also notes failure to enforce the rules which call for regular field visits by SBA agents to debtor companies. Says the document: "Our examination of the loan files disclosed numerous cases in which field visits had not been made for as long as 2 years, including some where financial or other conditions were evidently sufficiently unsatisfactory to warrant frequent visits."

The consequences of such slipshod administration could be heavy losses to the Government. By mid-1958, the principal amount of loans in liquidation, or delinquent for more than 60 days, came to $15.3 million, or roughly 8.5 percent of the $183 million of loans then outstanding. Three months later, the sum had climbed to $16.9 million; at latest report, on December 25, it stood at $17.6 million.

How large the losses ultimately will be remains in doubt. Drawing on the experience of the Reconstruction Finance Corp., the SBA estimates that they will run to about 1.8 percent of all loans made. Officers of the agency told the GAO that more than 40

percent of loans in liquidation were considered probable losses in mid-1957. This figure would mean a minimum loss of $3.5 million on the loans which were being liquidated at the 1958 year-end.

Other observers, however, feel that this figure is far too low. Specifically, they point to the steady rise in delinquencies, which shows no sign of coming to an end. To some extent, the shortcomings of SBA can be laid at the door of Congress. The legislation which established SBA, after all, provided that it give credit only to businessmen who cannot obtain normal banking accommodation. Hence its loans necessarily are of poor quality.

Officials of the agency also say that they are under strong pressure from Congress to be lenient with applicants and borrowers alike. Hence they concentrate on processing new applications, rather than on keeping close tabs on existing accounts. Indicative of congressional thinking in this regard was last year's lowering of the SBA interest rate from 6 percent to 5½ percent although the rate at which the agency borrows from the Treasury has climbed from 2¾ percent, when it first was established, to 3¾ percent. Even the earlier spread was inadequate to cover SBA costs. In fiscal 1953, by the way, the agency reported a net loss of $7 million from lending operations. Currently, it is running deeper in the red.

However, neither the congressional pork barrel nor the administrative laxity uncovered by the GAO fully accounts for the fact that so many SBA loans are listed as delinquent. Lending policies established by the agency, ostensibly to help small businessmen, must share the blame. An example is the ease with which borrowers are allowed to postpone repayment.

SBA contracts, as a rule, call for repayment in monthly installments. In a number of cases, however, the agency has deferred all payments until the maturity of the loan, thereby paving the way for its extension. In other instances, outright moratoriums have been granted, thus removing the loans from delinquent status without reducing the risk of default.

In one case, cited by SBA officials as an example of their efforts to help small businessmen improve their operations the agency made a 5-year loan to the owner of a boatyard, who sells and repairs small craft and also runs a parking lot and restaurant. Not long afterward, SBA discovered that the borrower had no idea of his costs and that his various enterprises had been running in the red for 3 years. After helping him install a system of cost-accounting, the agency proceeded to defer all payments on the loan until the maturity date.

Officials of SBA frequently find, after making a loan, that the funds are being used for a purpose other than the one specified in the contract. Characteristically, however, the agency does not sue for breach of contract; instead, unless the loan has to be liquidated, it simply scolds the borrower or, in some cases, amends the contract to authorize the change.

One instance is reported by SBA spokesmen—again to illustrate how its experts are helping the small businessman—in which, in order to justify a loan, a canning company was advised to write up the book value of its plant from $125,000 to $700,000.

SBA, in sum, is the ideal creditor—willing to wipe out most of the distinction between a loan and a gift. However, in the view of some critics, it may be doing more harm than good. For in a competitive economy, loose lending, in the long run, is likely to prove destructive. In many cases, such openhandedness serves only to give false hope—and a temporary lease on life—to entrepreneurs who probably are destined to fail in the end. It constitutes, in short, an unfair subsidy to relatively few at considerable cost to their competitors and to the Nation's taxpayers.

[From the Wall Street Journal, Feb. 6, 1959]

SANCTIFYING SMALLNESS

When the Small Business Administration was set up in 1953 it was itself supposed to be small in size and scope. Also, it was supposed to be temporary.

But now, as an article in "Barron's" this week makes plain, this Federal Agency is both permanent and big, though still making loans only to small businesses. The SBA had 15 regional and 26 branch offices and over the years it has been granted some $700 million. While not yet rivaling the size of its unlamented predecessor, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, it appears headed that way. And to some extent it seems to be emulating the loose financial practices of the RFC.

Delinquencies on SBA loans are high. The General Accounting Office has reported that in many cases loans are made on the basis of uncertified and unaudited financial statements. Enforcement of the SBA's own regulations, such as requiring borrowers to furnish periodic financial and operating statements, is lax, according to the GAO. The Small Business Administration is in the red on its lending operations.

Now this sort of thing is about what you would except in an agency specifically established to make loans to businessmen who can't get them from normal lending institutions. For that alone is a pretty loose way of approaching the problem of financing business.

There is perhaps an even more basic question—one which concerns the whole notion of sanctifying smallness. Smallness itself is not a virtue any more than bigness itself is a vice. Yet it is a persistent fallacy of politicians that small business as such, like small farms as such, must be preserved no matter how marginal, unsound, or inefficient.

Actually bigness and smallness are not reliable criteria of what is economically desirable. A company, to be sure, might get so big that competition suffers; that is, it might if it were not for the antitrust laws which effectively prevent monopolies. Apart from that, the point is not bigness; it is whether competition exists. And the world's most complex economy, which is getting more complex all the time, could not be well served if companies were not able to grow to a size that might have seemed very large 50 years ago.

Despite this trend toward big—but by no means monopolistic—firms, the number of new companies being formed continues to rise. There is no contradiction in this; the explanation is simply that the whole country is growing, and its current needs require all kinds of companies of all shapes and sizes.

But here again the point is not smallness or bigness. Many of the companies that start small naturally go on to become fairly big. Indeed there is no reason why a small steel fabricating concern, for example, should not grow in size and diversity, provided it is intelligently and efficiently run. Nor is there any reason why that same company should not fail if it is poorly run. Everybody has a right to start a business, but nobody has a right to be kept in business by the taxpayers.

It is just such normal and accepted conditions that the politicians distort with their solicitude for small business. By its own terms the SBA unquestionably helps keep going, for a while at least, some ventures that by practical economic standards would otherwise quickly fail. That kind of Federal intervention is no real benefit to such firms themselves. It is no benefit to other businesses of whatever size. It is no benefit to the taxpayers. To the extent it encourages a proliferation of shaky undertakings, it is not sound public policy.

And it is certainly no help to clear thinking to promote this myth, manufactured in Washington, that what is small is automatically sacrosanct.

[From the Milwaukee Journal]

SBA LENDS YOUR MONEY WITHOUT ENOUGH PRUDENCE

The Small Business Administration (SBA) was created in 1953, first year of the Eisenhower administration, as a temporary agency. It was to take over some duties of the discredited Reconstruction Finance Corporation (RFC), and primarily give advice, assistance, and loans to small businesses.

To no one's surprise—least of all the politicians'—SBA has now become permanent. It is no longer small itself. Its clients never were all small in the customary sense, being generally defined as concerns with assets up to $1 million.

SBA's growth has been spectacular. In the 3 years to mid-1956 its loans outstanding reached $42 million. In the next 2 years they more than quadrupled to $183.3 million. And now they are conservatively estimated at $200 million.

Not only in such rapid expansion disturbing, but the General Accounting Office (GAO) has found some slipshod procedures, too. The watchdog agency has reported the acceptance by SBA of many financial statements of doubtful reliability and accuracy as a basis for loans; no evidence that collateral pledged by borrowers in many cases had been examined by qualified appraisers; infrequent visits by SBA agents to debtor companies, even when they were in obvious financial trouble; laxity in enforcement of loan contracts.

As of last June 30, SBA had $15.3 million of loans in liquidation or delinquent more than 60 days—about 8.5 percent of the loans then outstanding. Ultimate losses may not run that high, but the delinquency rate had been rising.

Barron's magazine blames SBA lending policies for some present troubles. They may be paving the way for worse ones in the future. The magazine says that a number of cases SBA deferred loan payments, declared outright moratoriums, or amended the loan contracts.

Congress and the White House seem to show no concern over SBA. They should. If SBA is with us to stay, at least it should be put on a sound basis and be required to follow prudent rules. As Barron's says, loose lending practices can do more harm than good, and openhandedness constitutes "an unfair subsidy to relatively few at considerable cost to their competitors and to the Nation's taxpayers."

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, as chairman of the Small Business Subcommittee, of the Senate Banking and Currency Committee, I was deeply concerned over this criticism—coming as it did, from responsible news sources.

I have since conferred with SBA Administrator Wendell Barnes and members of his staff on the specific charges, and have received a preliminary report covering most of the subjects treated by the press criticism.

The criticism involved three charges.

First. It was charged that SBA delinquencies are high.

The SBA staff inform me that, as of the end of last year, only 35 business loans, having an unpaid principal balance of $465,581, had been charged off. They report that this is about one-tenth of 1 percent of the dollar total of all loans disbursed, and note that the SBA

has approved over 22,000 loans—about 14,000 business, and about 8,000 disaster.

Standing by itself, this would be a better record than that of commercial banks generally, whose charge-off record is nearly two-tenths of 1 percent. However, there were also 310 loans in liquidation at that time, with an unpaid principal balance of about $7.1 million.

I intend to give full attention to the delinquency situation; and I have asked that I be kept informed.

Second. It is charged that the SBA is lax in the enforcement of its own regulations, particularly in the case of not demanding certified and audited financial statements from applicants for loans.

The SBA staff inform me that this was particularly true during the agency's first 4 years of operation, when the SBA was experiencing difficulty in keeping pace with accelerating demand for its service while limited in personnel and funds.

Along this line, the staff also report that uncertified and unaudited financial statements have been accepted as sufficient basis for making loans—but primarily when the loans are recommended by banks who are presumed to have evaluated their soundness.

Third. The charge has been made that the SBA is operating in the red.

The SBA staff report that this is true; that, in fact, the agency experienced a net loss of $6,800,000 in 1958. They point out, however, that many elements contribute to this. One is that their ceiling on disaster loan interest is below the amount the Treasury charges the agency for its funds. Also, this loss covers all costs, salaries, and expenses of the agency.

I welcome the editorials on this subject that have been published, for they serve to call attention to the operations of this extremely important agency. At this time I should like to present the preliminary report of SBA in answer to the charges. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

These articles cite the Comptroller General's audit last year with respect to serious defects in SBA procedures. To set the record straight, that audit covered the first 4 years of SBA's existence and included actions through June 30, 1957. The report, therefore, covers the early formative years of the agency during which it was meeting a continuously growing demand by the public for the services the Congress intended should be made available.

Because of its relative youth and lack of experience in predicting demands to be made upon it, the agency was unable to obtain funds and recruit personnel at the same pace as increases in demand were made upon it. As a matter of fact, it was not until the current fiscal year, in August 1958, that SBA was able to estimate for, and obtain funds in line with, the demands made on it by small businesses. These are facts which the article ignores in referring to slip shod administration.

The comment is made that in many cases, uncertified and unaudited financial statements were accepted as sufficient basis for making loans. Such financial statements are many times accepted by SBA without requiring the applicant to go to the expense of an additional audit, particularly where a bank may be recommending a participation. In such cases, it is believed that the banks, having dealt previously with such applicants, were in a position to observe any weakness or impropriety in such financial statements.

In addition, other reports and appraisals are used as a check on the validity of the statements being presented. It is customary for banks to accept unaudited statements in connection with loans similar to most of those made by SBA. It would obviously be unjust to require the applicants for smaller loans to procure outside audits at costs which could run the total expense of SBA loans far beyond any economic point of no return so far as such loans are concerned. The fact that SBA accepts statements not certified on their faces is not important in view of the fact that the application and all supporting documents are subject to the statutory penalties attendant upon misrepresentations to the Federal Government in connection with requests for its assistance.

Furthermore, approximately 70 percent of SBA's loans are made with bank participations and where banks have accepted borrowers' statements, it would be unseemly for SBA to reject the bank's recommendation for approval solely on the ground that the statements were unaudited or uncertified. Both SBA and the banks require independent audits on larger loans.

Comment is made also that SBA is lax in enforcing the terms of loan contracts, particularly with respect to obtaining financial and operating statements. During the period covered by the audit, there were numerous instances in which, because of lack of personnel, the SBA was not in a position to follow up and obtain copies of financial figures or to make field visits to the extent desired.

In May 1957, the SBA established in each regional office separate loan administration staffs, assigned standards for personnel engaged in loan administration which included a requirement that each man should spend not less than one-quarter of his time in the field in personal visits to borrowers and, in particular, the requirement that personal visits be made to each borrower whose loan became delinquent.

Because of the increasing pressure on limited staffs caused by the progressive rise in loan application activity in each regional office, however, many regions were forced to divert personnel from loan administration in order to take care of pending loan applications. The need for emphasis on this phase of the work was specifically set forth in the budget justification for the fiscal year 1958.

Although Congress in August 1958 authorized staff increases which would permit establishment of adequate loan administration staffs in each region by December 31, 1958, recruiting had still not been completed in some regions because of inability to find and train personnel for this job.

Barron's also made the statement that "at some SBA offices the Comptroller General's auditors found no evidence that collateral pledged by borrowers had been examined by qualified appraisers." Again it should be pointed out that requiring outside appraisers would subject smaller borrowers to uneconomic loan expenses; that SBA asks for appraisals if they are available and verifies them with its own personnel; that SBA asks banks for opinions on collateral offered in connection with participation loans; that on all loans the processing examiner is required to exercise his judgment on the adequacy of the collateral; and that, lastly, SBA has long ago established its own staff of qualified appraisers who are used insofar as staff limitations permit on each loan where appraisers would be helpful in considering the advisability of granting the credit and protecting the Government's interest.

A further statement is made concerning the laxity in failing to require adherence to the repayment provision of SBA loans. All deferments of payments are granted in accordance with sound credit policies. So far as can be determined there has not been any instance of deferment of all payments until the maturity of a loan. There have not been any moratoriums granted borrowers. Installments on some loans have been deferred to a later date, and, in some instances, deferred to maturity of a loan. Deferment of installments is a customary practice of lenders where circumstances warrant such action. Deferments of installments by lenders certainly are not restricted to small business. Lenders grant, and have granted deferments to large corporations. The majority of the agency's loans are made in participation with banks. No deferments on such loans are considered without recommendation of the servicing bank.

Contrary to the implications of the Barron's article, the record of the agency is good, as the following facts will show. On December 31, 1958, only 35 business loans, having an unpaid principal balance of $465,581 had been charged off. This is about one-tenth of 1 percent of dollar total for all loans disbursed.

This compares with a loss ratio of almost two-tenths of 1 percent of losses sustained by banks on loans to small business.[1] It must be stated, however, the loans actually written off represent the unpaid portion of those loans for which all possible efforts to collect, including court action, sale of collateral, and deficiency judgments, had been exhausted.

In addition, 310 loans were in liquidation, with an unpaid principal balance of about $7.1 million. However, there is collateral involved in these loans which has not been liquidated as yet, and if the same experience applies to these loans as the loans actually charged off, the ultimate loss to the Government would be approximately $3.7 million.

This coupled with the losses which actually occurred to date would amount to $4.2 million, or about 1.1 percent of loan disbursed. This compares favorably with the RFC reported loss figure of 1.3 percent of total disbursements.

Both Barron's article and the Wall Street Journal editorial clearly imply that the SBA program is closely akin to subsidization or marginal small businesses which might be left to fail if competition were open. The fact is, that SBA loans are not marginal except in the sense that any term loan is in traditional banking terms, marginal. Many commercial banks because of policy or of restrictions on their loanable funds caused by ratio requirement of regulatory authorities will not make term loans.

Any borrower located in that banks' area is under the definition in these articles therefore marginal. Term loans have been available to large business for many years, but small business, even though adequately secured in comparison with the security provided by larger firms, has been unable to find adequate sources of term funds at comparable rates.

It is no disgrace, therefore, for a small firm to have to be declined by its bank of account before it can qualify for assistance from SBA. In most instances this decline is based on the term of the loan rather than the nature of the risk or the collateral offered.

Finally, SBA has been under considerable congressional criticism because its lending practices are too stiff. The agency has had to walk a tightrope between critics on the

[1] P. 76 and following pages of "Financing Small Business," Apr. 11, 1958.

one hand who would say it was not doing enough for small business, and those on the other hand who would have it do nothing at all. That SBA's record is so closely parallel to that of the commercial banks, who are participating in two-thirds of its loans, is a testimonial to the fact that most of SBA's loans are made, except for the term involved, on the same credit principles which apply in private banking generally.

MOTION PICTURE ACADEMY 1958 NOMINATIONS FOR "OSCARS"

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, as so many of my colleagues who have traveled widely know, to most people abroad the word "California" frequently means Hollywood and the movies.

So pervasive and widespread is this great American medium that the names of many American movie stars and of many American films are almost as well known as that of the great American President whose birth the Nation observed on Sunday.

In carrying out another annual custom of wide significance, the American motion picture industry has just paid deserved compliments to some of its personnel who typify the reason why, among peoples of varied races and cultures, American movies are a potent force for better understanding of our way of life.

The respected Motion Picture Academy has just announced the 1958 nominations for its widely known and coveted "Oscar" awards. Presentation to the final winners will be made on April 6, over a nationwide network which is expected to bring the ceremony to an audience of 90 million people.

Hollywood is, of course, more than a place of glamor and excitement. Hollywood is big business, by any standards. It is the base for one of California's leading industries; it affords employment to many thousands of persons in my State directly, and to scores of more thousands—all over our Nation and around the globe—indirectly. Its impact economically and culturally is worldwide.

Today, more than ever, this universal character of the motion picture is typified in the nominations made for the awards for performance and accomplishment for the past year. Foreign pictures, foreign actors and actresses, and foreign technicians from many countries are on the lists of nominees.

These nominations are also important news, all over the world. Today, in Rome, Paris, Bombay, New Delhi, Tokyo, and hundreds of other cities abroad, the names of these nominees are being talked about by moviegoers.

The American motion picture has become an international messenger. It has brought America to the doorstep of the most remote villager in all the far-flung places of the world. American motion pictures are a vastly admired commodity all over the world, alike in countries which have no picture production of their own and in countries which are major producers.

Thus, in India and Japan, which produce far more pictures, numerically, than do the United States, our techniques, our artistic talents, our writers, and our actors and actresses are regarded as the acme of the profession.

We are pleased that in all countries American motion pictures outdraw by wide margins the films of any other country. Even behind the Iron Curtain, long lines stand patiently in line, waiting to pay admission to see an American film, in preference to watching, either free of charge or for a pittance, a subsidized Russian motion picture.

The American motion picture industry is one of which we in California are proud, and I am pleased to note this occasion of its accomplishment.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, the list of this year's nominations for the Academy Awards to be finally decided on April 6.

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NOMINEES FOR MOTION PICTURE ACADEMY AWARDS FOR 1958

Best picture: "Gigi," "The Defiant Ones," "Auntie Mame," "Cat on a Hot Tin Roof," and "Separate Tables."

Best actress: Susan Hayward, Deborah Kerr, Shirley MacLaine, Rosalind Russell, and Elizabeth Taylor.

Best actor: Tony Curtis, Paul Newman, David Niven, Sidney Poitier, and Spencer Tracy.

Best supporting actress: Peggy Cass, Wendy Hiller, Martha Hyer, Maureen Stapleton, and Cara Williams.

Best supporting actor: Theodore Bikel, Lee J. Cobb, Burl Ives, Arthur Kennedy, and Gig Young.

Best director: Richard Brooks, Stanley Kramer, Vincent Minelli, Robert Wise, and Mark Robson.

KONYA DAY IN TORRANCE, CALIF.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, in our Nation's search for the basis of a just and permanent peace, a significant factor is the need to develop a mutuality of interest with people overseas.

On various occasions, President Dwight Eisenhower has advocated more in the way of interchanges between countries devoted to the principles of freedom and democracy. I think it is apparent that many benefits have flowed from such programs as exchange scholarships, trade missions, and participation in fairs and expositions.

In response to one of the President's appeals, the American Municipal Association urged American municipalities to strike up friendships with foreign cities of similar characteristics and mutual interests. An enthusiastic participant in this effort is the fast-growing city of Torrance, in my State of California. On February 28, in that progressive community, Konya Day is to be celebrated. The event honors the city in Turkey by that name, with which our California city is striving to develop a warm friendship and a reciprocally beneficial association. On this occasion, the Turkish delegate to the United Nations, Madame Ismet Sandli, will be an honored guest, in furtherance of the people-to-people program.

I wish to call to the attention of the Senate this forward-looking step by the people of the city of Torrance, and to commend them for their wholehearted action on behalf of the brotherhood of man among free peoples on opposite sides of the globe.

CONGRESS SHOULD IMPLEMENT INTEGRATION

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD an article entitled "Resolving a Dilemma: Congress Should Implement Integration," written by Ben W. Palmer, of the Minnesota Bar Association, and printed in the American Bar Association Journal for January 1959.

In view of the facts that the Federal courts are already foundering under a backlog of cases and that it is becoming evident that courts are not the effective agencies for handling the complex problems resulting from the Supreme Court's decision on integration, it is vital that the Congress give attention to the development of other institutions and other procedures. Mr. Palmer, a noted Minnesota jurist, has given a great deal of thought to this problem and many other legal problems.

I recommend the article for the thoughtful consideration of the U.S. Senate.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLVING A DILEMMA: CONGRESS SHOULD IMPLEMENT INTEGRATION

(By Ben W. Palmer)

Congress should implement integration principles set forth by the Supreme Court by establishing a system of administrative tribunals to take advantage of the flexibility of administrative law.

When holding that racial discrimination in public education is unconstitutional, the Court restored the cases to the docket for further argument regarding formulation of decrees. On May 31, 1955, in *Brown* v. *Board of Education of Topeka* and other cases, 349 U.S. 294, the Court stated that it had requested further argument on the question of relief because the cases arose under different local conditions and their disposition would involve a variety of local problems. The Court said:

"Full implementation of these constitutional principles may require solution of varied local school problems. School authorities have the primary responsibility for elucidating, assessing, and solving these probems; courts will have to consider whether the action of school authorities constitutes good faith implementation of the governing constitutional principles. Because of their proximity to local conditions and the possible need for further hearings, the courts which originally heard these cases can best perform this judicial appraisal. Accordingly, we believe it appropriate to remand the cases to those courts."

In fashioning and effectuating the decrees, the courts will be guided by equitable principles. Traditionally, equity has been characterized by a practical flexibility in shaping its remedies and by a facility for adjusting and reconciling public and private needs. These cases call for the exercise of these traditional attributes of equity power. At stake is the personal interest of the plaintiffs in admission to public schools as soon as practicable on a nondiscriminatory basis. To effectuate this interest may call for elimination of a variety of obstacles in making the transition to school systems operated in accordance with the constitutional prin-

ciples set forth in our May 17, 1954, decision. Courts of equity may properly take into account the public interest in the elimination of such obstacles in a systematic and effective manner. But it should go without saying that the vitality of these constitutional principles cannot be allowed to yield simply because of disagreement with them.

While giving weight to these public and private considerations, the courts will require that the defendants make a prompt and reasonable start toward full compliance with our May 17, 1954, ruling. Once such a start has been made, the courts may find that additional time is necessary to carry out the ruling in an effective manner. The burden rests upon the defendants to establish that such time is necessary in the public interest and is consistent with good faith compliance at the earliest practicable date. To that end, the courts may consider problems related to administration, arising from the physical condition of the school plant, the school transportation system, personnel, revision of school districts and attendance areas into compact units to achieve a system of determining admission to the public schools on a nonracial basis, and revision of local laws and regulations which may be necessary in solving the foregoing problems. They will also consider the adequacy of any plans the defendants may propose to meet these problems and to effectuate a transition to a racially nondiscriminatory school system. During this period of transition, the courts will retain jurisdiction of these cases.

The cases were then remanded to the District Court "to take such proceedings and enter such orders and decrees consistent with this opinion as are necessary and proper to admit to public schools on a racially nondiscriminatory basis with all deliberate speed the parties to these cases."

I submit for consideration the proposition that problems of integration should be worked out by administrative tribunals established pursuant to act of Congress, subject to judicial review as provided by the act, rather than to cast the burden of integration upon the district courts.

INTEGRATION CASES—A BURDEN ON THE COURTS

The Supreme Court itself as shown by quotations above recognizes the great variety of local situations that must be taken into consideration in achieving integration. The application of the constitutional principles laid down by the Court in specific situations may well involve thousands of cases. The Federal courts cannot sustain the burden of such litigation.

The Supreme Court as of May 19, 1958, had 1,013 cases on its appellate docket and 781 cases on its miscellaneous docket. Since cases generally get into the Court by the selective certiorari process, there is no doubt that they involve questions of great importance not only to litigants but more important that that, to the people of the United States. No doubt the flow of these cases will continue and will increase. To that flow should not be added a large number of integration cases nor should the judges of the Supreme Court be burdened with the study of a vast number of applications for certiorari in such cases.

As shown by the report of the Director of the Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts, Federal District Courts have the highest backlog in history; more than 75,000 cases. Says Warren Olney III, Director of the Office:

"Not only is this the highest backlog in history, but it represents a caseload which will keep the Federal trial courts busy for a year, even if not an additional civil case were filed and not an additional criminal indictment were returned. The inevitable result is that delays in the trial of cases in Federal courts, which in some districts are already as high as 4 years, will be still further increased. During the coming year persons who file cases do not stand a ghost of a chance of having trials within a reasonable time. In many instances this will be simply a denial of justice."

This report shows that Federal judges are working harder in a so far unsuccessful attempt to keep up with the backlog. Since 1941 the average district judge has increased the number of cases of which he disposes in a year from 169 to 231. But during the same period, the average backlog has gone up from 137 to 270 cases per judge.

Not only do the overburdened Federal courts have no time for the determination of thousands of integration cases under the equity powers and pursuant to mandate of the Supreme Court, but they are not equipped to handle such problems.

The Federal judge, with his stenographer and clerk, is not equipped to consider "problems related to administration, arising from the physical condition of the school plant, the school transportation, personnel, revision of school districts and attendance areas into compact units to achieve a system of determining admission to the public schools on a nonracial basis, and revision of local laws and regulations which may be necessary in solving the foregoing problems."

The adversary system is not adaptable to the objective ascertainment of truth and to correct judgments in such cases. Far more than in the case where the court is confined to consideration of expert testimony supplied by the adversaries, the court or body attempting to implement the Supreme Court principles must have its own investigative power and staff. It must be able to direct and control objective research of local conditions and opinions and problems of enforcement. Such staff studies and reports would serve to moderate and stabilize adversary contentions surcharged with emotion. We know from experience that in adversary cases, the tendency of each side is to take an extreme position in the hope that any compromise to resolve the conflict will be more favorable to the party taking an extreme position. This tends to exacerbate rather than allay passions.

The Court itself has recognized that it is impossible suddenly to enforce a uniform rule of law in tens of thousands of school districts in diverse communities in the face of local problems of administration. This is true even in the case of school boards that sincerely desire to integrate.

One reason for the breakdown of national prohibition was, of course, opposition to it in many areas of the country. While acceptable generally in a State which was predominantly agricultural and perhaps previously a dry State, there were metropolitan areas in which enforcement became impossible. Any national law which affects the daily conduct of millions of people throughout the United States cannot hope to succeed if it is a Procrustean bed. There must be some flexibility in the administration of standards laid down by the Constitution as interpreted by the courts or laid down by Congress.

EQUAL PROTECTION—A JOB FOR CONGRESS

Congress should exercise its constitutional power to enforce, by appropriate legislation, the equal protection of the laws of the 14th amendment. We learned from experience that the growing complexity of the economic structure in the United States required, as a practical matter, that administrative bodies be established to apply legislative standards and rules of conduct to particular factual situations from time to time. We learned that through laws of general application we could not effectively regulate such diverse matters as railroad rates, which should be reasonable, or trade and labor practices, which should be fair. We learned that these regulations could not be effectively administered except by administrative bodies. The determination of innumerable problems depends on infinitely varied factual situations. Promptness and efficiency are required on the basis of continuous expert and inexpensive procedures. These procedures are set up so as to secure immediate investigation and the application of statutory rules on the basis of a sound, practical judgment. Administrative procedures are much more adapted than the judicial to secure the quick solution of new and varied problems with practical and ready adjustment to social changes and with flexibility based on experience.

It is on the basis of these needs and principles that we had the vast growth of administrative tribunals and administrative law. Constitutional objections to the delegation of powers were overcome by the courts. It was held that Congress might not only give authorization to determine specific facts, but might establish primary standards, devolving upon others the duty of carrying out the declared legislative policy, that is to fill up the details under the general provisions made by the legislature. The Interstate Commerce Commission was given power to fix reasonable rates. The Secretary of Agriculture was validly authorized to meet local conditions in his regulations. The Federal Trade Commission can determine what are unfair methods of competition and the Federal Communications Commission can take action to insure equality of radio broadcasting service. Agencies were given the power of investigation, separate from the power to take action. Executive officers were authorized to secure the exact effect intended by a congressional act by vesting discretion in them to make regulations interpreting the statute and directing the details of its execution.

Congressional standards were held sufficiently definite as to be constitutionally valid: to determine just and reasonable rates and unreasonable obstructions to navigation, public interest, public convenience and necessity, and protection of investors and undue discrimination in rates. The Interstate Commerce Commission is given the power to prevent undue preferences and to require suitable facilities for transportation of interstate commerce. Thus, an administrative body could determine whether the practice of an employer is unfair in that it interferes with the right of employees to form, join, or assist in labor organizations of their own choosing.

It is true that Congress would have to establish the standards of legal obligation which would properly limit administrative bodies. It would have to set up rules of conduct or policy for application by the administrative body to a particular state of fact and it should require findings to show that such rules of conduct or policy apply to the particular type of fact set forth in the statute setting up the standards.

A SOLUTION—ADMINISTRATIVE AGENCIES

Congress should consider authorizing the President to appoint administrative tribunals for integration for States, counties, municipalities, or school districts. Consideration might also be given to the appointment of one overall national commission to supervise the work of the other administrative bodies within the States. Members of all commissions might be subject to removal by the President or by some officer given that authority. In appointing commissions, care could be taken to procure so far as possible local representatives of high standing and of moderate views and of sound discretion.

Legislation would include a persuasive preamble, a declaration of national policy, and definitions of such terms as "integration" and "deliberate speed." It would set forth the requirements of notice of public hearings

by the integration councils, condition precedent to findings and orders. It would indicate the principal types and range of facts to be considered and included in required basic findings to support integration orders. Such facts, justifying the timing of integration of specific schools to be covered by successive orders, might include the number of pupils of each race or color in the school, the ratio of teachers to each, the adequacy of staff, creation of teachable groups, pupils' residences in relation to the location of the schools, curriculum, physical plant and equipment, particularly as related to integration problems, the cost of needed changes or additions to the plant, sources of funds to meet that cost and of maintenance revenues, and social and economic conditions bearing on the timing and practicability of integration. Factors properly to be considered by a court of equity might also be indicated in general terms.

Commissions or administrative bodies should be given the power to investigate; to educate and inform the public, to determine administrative questions and apply the legislative mandates set out in the congressional act in specific cases. They should be required to accompany or base each opinion or order or rule upon specific or basic findings of fact. The agency should be given the subpena power and the power to require forms of reports from school authorities and to investigate their records and activities. They might also be given the power to gather information by holding referendums and making them the basis of their determinations. They should be given the power to make rules and regulations to carry into effect the congressional will as expressed in the statute, that is the power to fill up the details. They should be given especially the power to prevent possible methods of evasion of the statutory law and deprivation of constitutional rights and the possible concealment of forbidden practices.

The statute should provide that when any of these administrative tribunals acts within its properly delegated discretion, its determinations should be conclusive so far as its findings of fact are concerned as supported by substantial evidence. Advantage, of course, should be taken of the doctrine of administrative finality announced first with reference to the Interstate Commerce Commission. The weight of the evidence should be exclusively for the administrative agency as well as the soundness of its reasons, not subject to review by the courts. So far as constitutionally possible, the function of the courts should be limited to questions of law so as to relieve them from the tremendous burden of reviewing voluminous administrative records and vast bodies of fact and opinion on the subject of integration. This will relieve the courts from the responsibility of becoming sociological experts and making intensive investigations of detailed facts.

We canot afford the bitterness of even a mild form of reconstruction by means of Federal bayonets or an army of U.S. marshals. We cannot afford the criticism of the courts that will inevitably result if they are flooded with thousands of cases which they are not in a position to handle efficiently and promptly. We should not overburden the Federal district judges as many of them were overburdened during the days of prohibition enforcement when they complained that their courts became police courts. We should not place upon the judiciary the responsibility for a solution in detail of complex problems of administration and law enforcement in thousands of cases, and of sociological and economic factfinding for which they are not equipped. This is especially true when there is available an alternative method of a solution to the problem with all deliberate speed under Federal control, but with local aid. We should take advantage of our experience with administrative tribunals and administrative law acquired both on the State and Federal level since the Interstate Commerce Commission was established more than 70 years ago. A congressional approach to the solution of the problem will enable Congress with the aid of the best minds in the country to work out a judicious, sensible, just, peaceful, and practicable solution of the complex problems involved in implementing the decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States.

EXTENSION OF TIME FOR JOINT ECONOMIC COMMITTEE TO FILE REPORT

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, according to the Employment Act of 1946 the Joint Economic Committee is supposed to file its report on the "Economic Report of the President" on the 1st of March. The committee has voted unanimously to request that it be given until March 9 to file its report. I ask unanimous consent that this additional time be granted the committee.

In explanation of the request, Mr. President, I will say that the committee gave authorization to me to say that the request for an extension of time was made by representatives of the minority on the committee, and it is not regarded as a breach of faith for me to so state.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. BUSH. I confirm that what the Senator has said is a correct statement. In fact, I think I asked the Senator to make the request, so that we might have additional time. Of course, the reason why additional time is needed is that we received the draft of the committee report, prepared by the staff, only this week.

Mr. DOUGLAS. It was received Monday morning.

Mr. BUSH. Monday morning. After having examined the draft, the minority concluded it called for some separate views, and we did not feel we could possibly prepare those views satisfactorily within this week, which would have been necessary in order to comply with the law. We are grateful to the Senator for making this request to extend the time.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The majority is very glad to meet the request of the minority.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Illinois? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

TWENTY-FIFTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE WEST VIRGINIA REGISTER

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, February 11 was the 25th anniversary of the West Virginia Register, official publication of the diocese of Wheeling. The occasion merits official notice in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, for the Register has performed a special service not otherwise available to Catholics and other readers who make up its subscription list throughout our State.

Religious publications are of particular importance in an age where so little time is devoted to God by the average person. Although work hours have been reduced over the years, resulting leisure time seldom brings increased attention to divine worship or study. Attendance at Sunday services is not enough to absorb all the knowledge and understanding that man needs to have if he is to fortify himself properly against the temptations of modern civilization.

While some daily newspapers devote regular columns to contributions of religious teachers, the space is necessarily too limited to outline all the moral training needed in every household. The Register thus fills a gap that could otherwise prove costly to children and adults alike.

Msgr. Joseph P. Kiefer, editor of the Steubenville Register, which is edited across the river from the Wheeling diocese, in a tribute to the West Virginia Register points out that throughout its quarter-century, Msgr. Frederick J. Schwertz has served as editor and business manager, in addition to his other duties, in the diocese. I, as a consecrated Baptist, join Monsignor Kiefer, an equally consecrated Catholic and the many other friends of the West Virginia Register, in wishing continued success in the years to come.

VISIT TO THE SENATE BY CAMBODIAN LEGISLATIVE GROUP

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, it is my honor and privilege to present to the Members of the Senate today a delegation of legislators from Cambodia. I present the chief of the delegation, the president of the National Assembly and mayor of Phom Penh, and former Cambodian Ambassador to Thailand, his Excellency Chan Sen Cocsol. [Applause.]

Mr. So Nem, Vice President of the National Assembly, former educator and director of the Agence Khmere Presse, the Cambodian National Press Agency. [Applause.]

Mr. Ong Sim, a National Assembly deputy, prominent businessman, and civil leader. [Applause.]

Mr. Hing Kunthel, National Assembly deputy, vice president of the juridical and constitutional commission, and former teacher of history and geography at the Lycee Sisowath, the largest secondary school in Cambodia. [Applause.]

Mr. Tum Kim Heng, National Assembly deputy, formerly the mayor of Kampong Speu and an official of the Cambodian Government Administration. [Applause.]

Mr. Eng-Tao Sar, National Assembly deputy, a former provincial assembly president. [Applause.]

Mr. Kim San, member of the Council of the Kingdom (upper house), former judge and former chief justice of several provincial courts. [Applause.]

These distinguished legislators of Cambodia are in the United States on what we all feel is an all too short visit to our country. They will visit a number of other places besides Washington. We are happy to have them with us, so that they may become acquainted with the United States. We welcome them with all good fellowship.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, on behalf of the majority leader and the

Members of the Senate on this side of the aisle, I wish to join the distinguished Senator from Iowa in expressing our gratitude to our colleagues from Cambodia in undertaking to visit us in the United States and in undertaking to see what it is that makes America go round, so that they may become better acquainted with our people and institutions. We hope that their trip will be both beneficial and educational. We express the hope that this parliamentary delegation from the friendly country of Cambodia in Southeast Asia will be the forerunner of many other delegations to come.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, it was my privilege the other day to be at the White House with this group of distinguished visitors, and today it was my privilege to have lunch with them, when the distinguished Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] presided. At both of these meetings I was greatly impressed with the sincerity of this fine group of people.

We were informed that all of them speak French and Cambodian, and that some of them speak a little English. English, French, and Cambodian are now taught in the schools. The remarks of the head of the delegation indicated clearly that they were in our country to get acquainted with America.

The President of the United States has entertained them; they met the Justices of the Supreme Court, and other distinguished Americans. Yesterday they received a gavel from the Presiding Officer of the House of Representatives. Today they were entertained in the Senate dining room.

We feel that in this group we have missionaries for the American way of life. They are going back to their country to tell once again the story of America. I am grateful that I have had the opportunity to become acquainted with them.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Moss in the chair). As the Acting Presiding Officer of the Senate, I welcome the gentlemen from Cambodia to this session of the Senate. We hope your visit will be pleasant and instructive, and that the friendship between our countries will grow. We are indeed glad to have you attend our session today, and we hope that your visit in our country will be pleasant and profitable.

WARNINGS FROM STATESMEN OF THE PAST ABOUT THE SURVIVAL OF THE REPUBLIC

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, in this day of propaganda visits by Deputy Premier Mikoyan and fawning over him by some of our bankers and industrialists who would unwittingly aid the mounting Soviet economic offensive, and in these days when too many people seem to be concerned during the day only with chasing the additional dollar and at night only with a new round of entertainment, I think it is important that we recall some of the warnings about the survival of this Republic made by some of our great statesmen of the past. In this regard, I would like to have printed, at this point, in the body of the RECORD the immortal words of one of New Hampshire's most illustrious sons, Daniel Webster, who served so brilliantly and with such distinction in this very body:

Other misfortunes may be borne or their effects overcome. If disastrous war should sweep our commerce from the ocean, another generation may renew it; if it exhausts our treasury, future industry may replenish it; if it desolates and lays waste our fields, still, under a new cultivation they will grow green again and ripen to future harvests.

It were but a trifle even if the walls of yonder Capitol were to crumble, if its lofty pillars should fall, and its gorgeous decorations be all covered by the dust of the valley. All these may be rebuilt.

But who shall reconstruct the fabric of demolished government?

Who shall rear again the well-proportioned columns of constitutional liberty? Who shall frame together the skillful architecture which unites national sovereignty with States rights, individual security and public prosperity?

No, if these columns fall they will not be raised again. Like the Coliseum and the Parthenon, they will be consigned to a mournful and melancholy immortality. Bitterer tears, however, will flow over them than were shed over the monuments of Rome or Grecian art; for they will be the monuments of a more glorious edifice than Greece or Rome ever saw, the edifice of constitutional liberty.

MEDICAL PROBLEMS OF AGING AIRLINE PILOTS

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a letter from General Quesada, Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency.

This letter is responsive to my remarks made on the floor of the Senate on February 16, 1959, in regard to the medical problems of aging airline pilots. I cite this letter because it not only confirms the validity of my remarks but points to the fact of the seriousness of the problem. The letter also indicates that General Quesada and the Federal Aviation Agency is fully alerted to the problem and that studies are under way in regard to it and should give concrete answers, thus making a further contribution to the continuing effort to make the airways as safe as humanly possible.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FEDERAL AVIATION AGENCY,
Washington, D.C., February 24, 1959.

Hon. STYLES BRIDGES,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR BRIDGES: I wish to express my appreciation, and that of my staff, for the attention you directed toward the medical problem of aging in airline pilots by your remarks on the floor of the Senate on February 16, 1959. We are in full agreement with those remarks and with the newspaper article to which they referred. The problem is, indeed, complex and further compounded by the valid but somewhat opposing interests of diverse groups. It is made more difficult by the limited scientific knowledge of the effects of the aging processes on the performance of airline pilots.

Such knowledge as exists, or is currently being developed, on the subject of physiological and psychological aging is under constant review and careful study by the Office of the Civil Air Surgeon. This group is attempting to determine the extent to which available knowledge is applicable to the specification of medical standards for older pilots. The closest attention will continue to be given to this subject by qualified personnel within the Agency.

In addition we plan to initiate studies directly related to the subject of aging in pilots where this is needed to supplement existing knowledge. In the interim before the development of specific and objective medical criteria, however, we are considering the desirability of issuing a maximum age level for those who perform airline pilot duties. Such an issuance will only be made after consultation with all authorities and interested parties such as those to which you referred.

Your continued interest in this problem area will be much appreciated. If you wish I shall be glad to have you advised of significant developments as they occur.

Sincerely yours,

E. R. QUESADA,
Administrator.

SOVIET TACTICS TOWARD THE WEST

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a column by Constantine Brown entitled "Watching the Talk in Moscow," which appeared in Wednesday, February 25, 1959, issue of the Washington Evening Star.

Mr. Brown's statements are a most timely warning in the face of current British-Soviet talks and the increasing indications of the mounting Soviet economic offensive against the free world. It is obvious that the Soviet tactic is to severely test the solidarity of the free world when the juicy plums of trade exchanges are offered. This column is thoughtful reading for all Americans.

There being no objection, the column was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WATCHING THE TALKS IN MOSCOW—POSSIBLE SOVIET TRADE OFFER TO BRITAIN SEEN AS MOVE TO SPLIT WEST

(By Constantine Brown)

The State Department top level is watching with anxiety the developments in Moscow, where the Prime Minister and the Foreign Minister of Great Britain are conducting lengthy negotiations with Comrades Khrushchev and Mikoyan, two of the shrewdest and most ruthless dictators in the world.

The visit of the British team is supposed to be one of exploration only—insofar as Britain's allies and friends are concerned. But the guests of the Kremlin dictators have some irons of their own in the fire. They are interested in any kind of remunerative trade they might be able to find in the Soviet Union and also in any bilateral agreement they could reach which would not affect the immediate allied policies.

Any such achievement, the British Conservative leaders believe, would help them immeasurably at the forthcoming elections. The British ballyhoo artists (public relations experts) are as imaginative as their American colleagues when it comes to making capital of some insignificant human interest detail. They decided to exploit the white hat Sir Harold Macmillan was wearing on his arrival at the Moscow airport. This headgear now has become a near-symbol. The press across the Atlantic

and in America was printing the comment of the hatmakers in the United Kingdom and many other incidentals connected with the white fur cap.

In Washington, politically minded observers hope that the cap of Sir Harold is not a replacement for the now famous umbrella of Neville Chamberlain. As a matter of fact, Sir Neville woke up (somewhat belatedly) from the pleasant dream that one can associate with ruthless self-seeking dictators whose dream is to conquer the world. As far as this objective is concerned, there is no difference between the unlamented Adolph Hitler and Nikita Khrushchev.

Prime Minister Macmillan and free world actual and would-be appeasers might do well to read Sir Neville's speech of March 17, 1939, when he realized that he had been fooled by the blandishments and the professions of good faith and desire for peace of the Nazi dictator. The then British Prime Minister said:

"There is hardly anything I would not sacrifice for peace. But there is one thing I must except, and that is the liberty that we have enjoyed for hundreds of years and which we will never surrender. * * * No greater mistake could be made than to suppose that, because it believes war to be a senseless and cruel thing, this nation has so lost its fiber that it will not take part to the utmost in its power in resisting such a challenge if it ever be made."

This was the end of the appeasement policy of the democratic Western nations, but not the end of the flounderings of their leaders, who despite positive intelligence still believed that they could reach a sensible agreement with the Soviet Union and thus avert war. Their military staffs knew that Hitler would not risk a war without the assurance that he would not have to fight on two fronts. Joseph Stalin, Comrade Khrushchev's predecessor and mentor, gave Hitler that assurance and thus made it possible to unleash World War II—in keeping with the major policies of the Communist doctrines.

Of course the present conditions, insofar as Britain is concerned, are no longer the same. The Empire has fallen to pieces, except for a few rather remunerative remnants. The British Government—be it Conservative or Socialist—must be seriously concerned with making ends meet more desperately than any other country in the world. It is this need, more than the friendly proddings of some policymakers in our State Department, that 10 years ago induced the Attlee government to recognize Communist China.

It is the expectation that, as a result of the present visit by the two most important members of the Conservative British cabinet, Messrs. Khrushchev and Mikoyan may agree to the signing of some juicy trade exchanges. After all, the Soviet dictatorship owes a deep debt of gratitude to the British statesmen. The impact of their cordiality will be strongly felt in all the satellite countries—specially in Hungary. It will offer another convincing argument the Kremlin will be able to use against the fighters for freedom in Eastern Europe. It can say: "Abandon all hope. Britain, which for centuries stood up for liberty, is now accepting the accomplished facts. The other Western countries will come in line, too."

THE FEDERAL BUDGET AND TAXES

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD an editorial appearing in the Washington Daily News of Wednesday, February 11, 1959. I ask this consent as part of my continuing effort to keep before the eyes of the American people the mounting cost of Government and the need to meet it by the restraint of balanced budgets, if we are not to see the American dollar become mere printing press currency. This editorial refers to a tabulation which I had prepared and which appeared earlier in the RECORD. I am pleased that the Washington Daily News and many other papers throughout the country used this material in editorial fashion so that the information could have as wide a circulation as possible in alerting the American public.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHAT YOU PAY FOR

Senator BRIDGES, of New Hampshire, has supplied his fellow Senators with a revealing breakdown of the new Federal budget in terms of taxes.

For instance, $59.50 out of each $100 you pay in income taxes goes for defense. Here is where the rest of the $100 goes:

For interest on the debt, $10.50; for agriculture, $7.80; for veterans, $6.60; for welfare, $5.40; for commerce and housing, $2.90; for international affairs, $2.80; for natural resources, $2.20; for general government, $2.20; plus a dime for leeway, budgeted as contingencies.

Now, let's take just one item, agriculture, and carry it a little closer home. Out of each $100 on your tax bill, $7.80 is spent on assorted services for farmers, 75 percent of it for crop subsidies which keep piling up surpluses.

So pick out your bracket from the next paragraph and you can figure how much of your money is being poured down the drain—in buying up crops to store all over the land, and sometimes to rot or be given away.

If your taxable income is $2,000, $31.20 of your tax payment goes for agriculture. If your taxable income is $4,000, $65.52 is tabbed for this item. If it is $6,000, agriculture takes $106.08. If you pay on $8,000 of your income, $152.88 is used for agriculture.

Senator BRIDGES' chart offers another bloody statistic which shows what has been creeping up on us here in Washington in recent years: Out of each $100 you pay in taxes, only $2.20 goes for general government. That's only 5.4 percent of what's left after the defense bill.

In other words, 94.6 percent of the nondefense cost of the Government goes for interest on the debt, veterans' benefits, subsidies, relief, the postal service, aids to States, small business, hospitals, education, housing, foreign aid, diplomacy, parks, reclamation, and regulation.

Times, and taxes, have sure changed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. YOUNG of Ohio in the chair). Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is concluded.

GERMAN REUNIFICATION AND THE PRESENT BERLIN CRISIS

Mr. DODD obtained the floor.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DODD. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I wish to take this occasion to express my gratitude to the distinguished Senator from Connecticut for giving me an advance copy of the remarks he is about to make. I apologize for the fact that I have been waiting since 1 o'clock to keep an engagement which I should keep.

With the Senator's permission, I should like to suggest the absence of a quorum at this time.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, will the Senator withhold that suggestion for a moment?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Certainly.

Mr. BUSH. Will my colleague yield to me?

Mr. DODD. I yield.

Mr. BUSH. Not knowing that my distinguished colleague from Connecticut intended to make an address this afternoon, I committed myself to another engagement, which will account for my absence from the floor after 5 minutes to 2. I am very sorry that I shall be compelled to be absent. I thank the Senator for an advance copy of his address, which I have not had an opportunity to examine fully, but which impresses me very favorably.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Let me say to the junior Senator from Connecticut that I shall return to the Chamber later. I shall be absent only temporarily. I hope he will understand.

Mr. DODD. I understand.

Mr. MANSFIELD. At this time I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MORTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, a week ago today I submitted a resolution concerning German reunification and the present Berlin crisis. I wish to speak today on that resolution. I join in the debate on this crucial question almost with a sense of regret. I realize my own limitations and the inability of any of us to keep fully abreast of all the shifting developments on the world scene. And surely no new Senator relishes the prospect of pitting his views in opposition to the views of wiser men whom he respects and admires.

Even the most senior Senator cannot study these grave and complex questions without a weariness of mind and of soul that must come to all who seek solutions to seemingly insoluble problems.

What we do and say here is bound to have some influence, for good or ill, in our country and in the world. What we do may be misunderstood. What we say may be misrepresented. What we believe may be in error. All of these misgivings loom large in the mind of one so new to this Chamber as I.

But the Berlin crisis approaches, and the historic responsibility of the Senate to advise and give counsel on questions of foreign policy now devolves upon us. The Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] has rightly urged us to fulfill that duty and bring these problems before the Nation while there is still time for meaningful discussion.

The people of this country are entitled to a sincere public discussion of the problem which, if not properly resolved, may lead them to disaster or to war; and the views of the people must be given expression through debate on the floor of the Senate.

And so I wish today to write into the public record the position of at least one

Senator on this matter of such vast import for the future of mankind.

Let us first review the simple facts of the situation confronting us.

On November 27, 1958, the Soviet Union demanded that the United States, the United Kingdom, and France abandon West Berlin. Each subsequent Soviet statement has made that Soviet ultimatum ever more rigid and unyielding. The free world has been given a deadline, May 27, 1959. Moscow says that on that date, Soviet responsibility for guaranteeing free-world access to West Berlin is at an end. Russian troops are to be withdrawn from East Germany and replaced with East German troops. The Western Powers must then, according to Moscow, make all future arrangements with the East German puppet government.

We are told that if we attempt to maintain our right of access to West Berlin without the approval of the East German puppet regime our forces will be fired upon. If they defend themselves, Russia will call it an act of war and will rush to the defense of the East Germans, thus presumably touching off world war III. This, in brief, is the official Russian policy.

There have been two types of reaction to this Soviet ultimatum. The President and the Secretary of State have responded to it by reaffirming their belief in the soundness and rightness of our policy. They have upheld the basic principles of that bipartisan policy, while suggesting a number of subordinate questions upon which we are willing to negotiate, if the Soviets are really interested in negotiation. The position of our Government, as I understand it, is this:

The Four Powers must make the basic decision on German reunification but representatives of East and West Germany may sit in as advisers. Ultimate free elections are an absolute necessity, but there is room for negotiation over what form these elections will take. I certainly hope that we will call on the United Nations before we use force and before the deadline of May 27. The Western Powers insist upon their right of free access to West Berlin, but they may call for United Nations counsel before using force, and they will use careful forbearance in exercising those rights. Western troops must remain in Berlin, but only so long as the West German Government and people desire them to stay.

This is the policy of our national administration. It is, in my judgment, a policy that is sound, enlightened, and morally right.

Critics of this policy have responded to the Soviet ultimatum in a far different vein. They attack our policy as too rigid and inflexible. They say that "free elections" and "standing fast in Berlin" are slogans, not policies. They argue that a divided Germany threatens the peace of the world and see continued German partition, and German reaction to it, as a certain cause of war. They say that the Soviet ultimatum makes it essential that we reexamine our policy and come forward with compromises and concessions. They insist that because our policy has not produced a settlement in 14 years, it has failed and should therefore be scrapped. They advocate a withdrawal of Western troops because they feel that some accident or chance border incident could set off world war III. They maintain that even token agreements would be a great step forward because they would relax tensions and change the diplomatic atmosphere. They contend that we ought to join in a European security pact that would recognize Red control of Eastern Europe as a permanent fact of history and thus allow the Russians to feel secure. They maintain that the Russians are looking for a face saving way to withdraw troops from Eastern Europe, and that we should make compromises that will help them to do so.

My purpose today is to examine these assumptions.

Is our Berlin policy too rigid and inflexible? I think not. There is no peculiar virtue in the concept of flexibility. To me, flexibility implies compromise and concession. When applied to fundamental principles, right principles, flexibility is not only without virtue; it becomes a vice. What concessions or compromises can we make on the basic principles of our Berlin policy?

Can we abandon the principle of free German elections? To do so would be to abandon the principle that our country has lived by and kept alive for almost two centuries.

Can we withdraw our troops from West Berlin? To do so would leave it at the mercy of Communist encirclement and attack.

Can we submit to a Communist blockade of West Berlin? To do so would mean slow but certain starvation and destruction.

Can we surrender the concept of Four Power responsibility? To do so would be to surrender the reason for our presence in West Berlin and to shirk responsibilities which grew inevitably out of our combined victory over Germany in World War II.

These are the concessions the Soviets demand. I say that we cannot grant any one of them. Let those who complain of our inflexibility address themselves to these basic principles and tell us which one of them is subject to flexible compromise.

If they say that I am setting up a strawman, and that they do not mean to yield on any of these points, then it is they who are sloganizing, not we.

"Free elections" and "stand fast in Berlin" are expressions of principle, not slogans. But cries of "inflexibility" and "rigidity" are indeed slogans unless they spell out the points upon which we should make concessions. If the critics of our present policy advocate compromise on any of the basic points of that policy, they should say so. If they do not, they should give up their slogans and join forces with those of us who stand behind the fundamental principles of our foreign policy.

Mr. Khrushchev stated, only a few days ago, that the Soviet policy is absolutely inflexible; that the Kremlin will make no concessions; that they do not even want a foreign ministers' conference.

The Communists have remained intransigent in their unjust position for 14 years. Must we therefore retreat from our just position? Whenever the Soviets continue to say "No" so long that a crisis becomes imminent, there are always cries from well-intentioned people in our camp that our policy is too rigid, too inflexible, and too unrealistic, and that we should turn to compromise and accommodation. These criticisms should be directed at the Soviet Union. But instead "the righteous are called to repentance instead of the sinners."

When we have resisted these slogans, as we did during the first Berlin crisis, we have made progress. When we have listened to them we have sunk further into the swamp of compromise on basic principle that has in the past led from disaster to disaster. Have we forgotten the lessons of the Hitler era with its compromises, concessions and flexibilities?

There are others who, while remaining silent as to basic concessions, maintain that we ought to make token agreements, that we ought to make our tone of voice more friendly, because small agreements and friendly words would establish a new climate of opinion, an atmosphere of good feeling and mutual trust that would usher in an era of real agreement on basic issues.

On the surface this argument may seem appealing. No one would suggest that we should be brash, or rude, or discourteous in our diplomatic negotiations. These are the hallmarks of Communist diplomacy.

Our diplomatic representatives have not been guilty of these things. On the contrary, American representatives have traditionally conducted themselves with a courtesy and a dignity which is born of dedication to right principles, and confidence that they will ultimately prevail.

But the etiquette of diplomacy solves nothing in this Communist age. At the Geneva Summit Conference in 1955, our leaders indulged themselves to the full in soft words, smiles, and geniality to an extent we should perhaps like to forget now. And while all this was going on, the Communists were shipping guns to Nasser in Egypt to touch off new violence in the Middle East. The belief that soft words, or agreement for the sake of agreement, will make any change in the basic facts of international life is a folly which is incredible in this 42d year of Russian communism.

Such thinking seems to be based on the belief that the great division in the world between freedom and slavery is caused by a great misunderstanding; that we do not really understand the Russian leaders; that they do not understand us; and that if we could only start understanding each other our differences could be resolved.

This insipid sentimentality flies in the face of four decades of history. The Russian leaders understand us only too well. Sometimes they understand us better than we understand ourselves. They understand us and seek ceaselessly to destroy us and everything we stand for. If we could understand them better we

would quickly see that this is their sole objective.

Secretary of State Dulles dealt with this question in testimony before the House Foreign Affairs Committee on January 28 of this year, in words that I would like to quote now:

> It would be easy to devise a form of words which could be agreed to between the United States and the Soviet Union and which would give many unwary people a sense of relief, and a feeling that our Nation need no longer make the efforts and sacrifices that are now called for. The Soviet Government has, for a long time, been trying to get that result. It is, however, my deep conviction that the cold war cannot be ended in any such way and that to take that step would merely make it probable that the cold war would end in victory for international communism.

Mr. President, any artificial accommodation which gives the appearance of agreement without the substance is a dangerous folly that can only disarm us and send us to our doom, comforted, and reassured that all is well.

Another assumption which enjoys wide currency is the argument that a divided Germany threatens us with world war III. This assumption is usually accompanied by reference to Germany's responsibility for two previous world wars.

Such reasoning, I think, overlooks the basic source of tension in the world. World communism and world communism alone, threatens us today with world war. Germany can be no more than a pretext for war, if and when the Kremlin decides that it wants war.

There are some who fear that the proximity of Communist and free-world troops in Germany could give rise to an accident, or an incident, that would touch off war. They contend that the pulling back of atomic weapons and troops from this area is essential.

There is a danger always present when armed forces face each other across a thin line.

We should try, we are trying, and we will continue to try, through disarmament and other negotiations, to reduce and ultimately to remove this hazard.

But this is not the imminent and critical danger. It is the effect, not the cause, of Communist hostility.

We are willing, and indeed anxious, to reach a sound agreement on these questions. The Russians are not. So we come back to the essential point. It is the hostility of the Communists that threatens us with war.

If war comes this year—God forbid—over the Berlin crisis, it will come as a deliberate, calculated stratagem of Red aggression. Berlin is just another phase of their long-term plan to subjugate the free world. The Berlin question is just a pawn in their hands and will certainly not determine, of itself, whether there shall be peace or war.

There is, however, one circumstance which could give rise to a world war that no one wanted. If we, through the appearance of division, through weakness and lack of purpose, encourage the Communists to attempt some new act of aggression, this may well trigger off a war, and a war for which we are tragically unprepared. The hazards of flexibility and vacillation are far greater than those of strict adherence to right principles.

The critics of our present Berlin policy argue that our position has failed for 14 years to bring either German reunification or free elections, and therefore, they say, it is a failure and should be reversed.

But we cannot put a time limit on how long we shall stick with a right policy.

Fourteen years is a short time in the history of freedom. The struggle between freedom and communism is not one of months or even years. It may be a matter of decades or of generations. It may be that generations of Americans will have to stand on the present line in West Berlin in order to prevent the Communists from standing on the Rhine River. Our enemies understand this, and it is about time that we do.

Permanent partition is preferable, I think, to Communist enslavement of West Germany.

Assuming that our German policy is morally right and practically sound, as I believe it to be, we must persevere in it with the same tenacity with which the Communists pursue their evil program for world domination; that long, and then 1 day longer.

Some of those who are demanding a new policy argue that Russian policy is based on a feeling of insecurity and fear of attack. They contend that if we would scrap NATO, pull back our defenses, and enter into mutual security arrangements which recognize and acquiesce in permanent Moscow control of the captive nations of Eastern Europe, then Russia would cease its aggressive acts, and a new day of peace would dawn.

How can this be true? Who threatens Russia with attack? Can we believe that the Communist rulers, who are able to decipher our most carefully guarded scientific and military secrets, could be so completely deceived about this question? Of course not. They know that we will never attack. They know it from our history; from the traditional attitude of our people. They know it from every newspaper in this country, from every issue of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, from every statement that bears upon this subject by any official in the land, from the highest to the lowest.

The historical truth is that Russian policy is based, not on fear of attack, but on a planned deliberate policy of world Communist domination and complete extermination of all that we represent. Failure to grasp this is to miss the central fact of the world we live in.

Finally, there are those who contend that Russia is trying to force a solution of the German problem, because it fears another Hungarian-type revolt in Eastern Germany. This is an interesting thesis. Those who offer this argument contend that Russia fears such an uprising, because it would force Russia to make reprisals that might touch off world war III. Then they move on and conclude that Russia wishes to avoid this prospect and that we should help her avoid it by entering into agreements that would lessen the probability of revolts and, therefore, lessen the probability of general war.

This, at last, I think, brings us face to face with the basic issue of our foreign policy.

In my judgment, to make concessions which strengthen the Kremlin's hold over its enslaved peoples on the false assumption that we thus lessen the probability of general war is only to make certain a general war, one that we cannot win because we will have bartered away every position of strength from which to fight such a war.

One more concession may seriously sap the will of the enslaved peoples to resist. One more disaster may so shatter free-world confidence in our leadership that each ally will seek to save itself through some foredoomed accommodation with world communism.

Will we see a repetition of the 1930's, concerning which Winston Churchill said:

> Each one feeds its neighbor to the crocodile, hoping the crocodile will devour it last.

The problem of Berlin is, of course, the problem of all free peoples everywhere. If we fail in this, what hope is there for all of the enslaved peoples now held in subjugation behind the Iron Curtain. If the Communists, with their capacity for ruthless organization, ever gain control of the vast resources of Germany and add those resources, that technical know-how, that skilled manpower to their own great power, they would at that moment become superior to the free world in economic strength, in industrial might, in scientific capacity, and in military force. That is something to think about.

No; we must stand firm, doing everything we can honorably and peacefully do to stimulate the dissolution of the Russian Empire, confident that constant internal troubles, springing from man's thirst for freedom, will prevent Russia from launching world war III and will eventually force the Kremlin to grant concessions to its peoples that will mark a decisive step away from tyranny and toward freedom.

I say we should stand fast; persevere in the truth; make Russia solve its internal problems through concessions to its captive peoples, and not through free-world concessions to their Kremlin masters.

There are, in my judgment, four ways in which Communist tyranny can be pulled down.

It can be pulled down by an attack from the West, but we rule out that possibility, and rightly so.

It can be pulled down by violent revolution. But the example of Hitler and the example of previous attempts at revolution convince us that under present conditions there is no possibility for any such mass rebellion to be successful.

It can be pulled down, piece by piece, through the steady attrition of hundreds of millions of subjects who, in every way short of open and reckless rebellion, resist the evil philosophy that seeks to reduce them to mere beasts of burden.

And, finally, it can be pulled down by internecine warfare within the Communist high command, by a falling out of the thieves, which is made all the more

probable by reverses in the world and continued resistance at home.

The third and fourth approaches to the dissolution of Soviet tyranny provide the policy which I believe the free world ought to be pursuing.

How do we increase the will to resist of the captive peoples behind the Iron Curtain? How do we increase the likelihood of another split within the Communist high command?

Certainly we cannot accomplish these ends by making it easy for the Russians to get through this difficult period. We can advance these causes only by sticking to our principles in Berlin and by making it crystal clear that we are prepared to face whatever consequences may follow from our action.

For more than a decade we have been living in an era of Communist advance through the device of partition. We have divided Europe, a divided China, a divided Germany, a divided Korea, a divided Indochina.

The Chinese threat to Formosa and the Communist threat to West Berlin may signify that we have passed into a new era, one in which communism, having consolidated the gains made through partition, will now seek, through piecemeal aggression, to end partition and to make what is half free, all slave.

If that be true, we must meet this plot head on in Berlin.

To the end that the United States may approach this crisis united and determined to stand firm on basic principles, I submitted a resolution a week ago today. The resolution lists six basic principles upon which there is preponderant agreement, and from which there can be no retreat.

These principles are their own best explanation, and I should like to read them now:

(1) No plan or treaty calling for German reunification is acceptable which does not provide for a free government, ultimately freely selected by the people of West and East Germany.

(2) Until an acceptable settlement of the German reunification problem is achieved, the continued presence of Western troops in West Berlin, which has proved agreeable to the German people, is under present conditions essential.

(3) The interests of the free world and of the German people are better served by a free West Germany within the Western Community than by a superficially reunited Germany afflicted with a Communist East Germany.

(4) No plan of German reunification or confederation is acceptable which would join a free democratic West Germany with a slave Communist East Germany, except through the free choice of the peoples of West Germany and East Germany.

(5) Whoever may be in nominal control of East Germany, the United States should enforce its right of free access to West Berlin, in concert with its allies, by whatever means necessary.

(6) Recognition can only be accorded to an East German Government which is truly independent and truly representative of the wishes of the people of East Germany.

Mr. President, I believe that this resolution provides an expression of support for the policies of the President and Secretary of State that is needed and deserved, and that will strengthen their hand in these difficult days and in coming months.

My friend and colleague the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] submitted a week ago today another resolution which I commend to all. I was particularly impressed by his suggestion that there be appointed a group of Senators who personally would bring the encouragement of the United States Senate to the people of West Berlin, and who would be in West Berlin on May 27, as an unmistakable symbol of our determination to stand by our pledges.

Mr. President, the hour is late. Our friends in Europe already are discouraged by our appearance of division and vacillation. The dismayed reaction of West Germany's Adenauer and Brandt, of France's Poncet, of Belgium's Spaak, and of other stanch friends in Europe indicate the danger of this appearance of division in the face of the Communist ultimatum.

I ask, Mr. President, with all urgency, that the Senate Foreign Relations Committee promptly consider my resolution or Senator JAVITS's resolution, or that it submit its own resolution, expressing the unity and determination of the American people to stand fast in Berlin. I believe it important that we do this now. I beg my colleagues in the Senate to act favorably and without delay.

Mr. President, I have not always agreed with our Secretary of State, Mr. Dulles. But I have always been thankful that this great man understood the essential nature of the conflict of our time. Mr. Dulles sees this conflict as a great moral struggle between the forces of good and the forces of evil. He has had the courage to describe it as such and to treat it as such in his official acts. This significant fact, more than any other, explains his impact upon world affairs and the sense of loss all of us feel at his tragic illness.

We live in an age so poisoned with the false doctrine of secularism and materialism that even God-fearing men seem strangely embarrassed and ashamed to acknowledge publicly the role of morality in international relations. John Foster Dulles deserves the gratitude of mankind, because he based his policies on moral ground; and because he has, through the example of his dedication and self-sacrifice, become a living symbol of a foreign policy that is morally right.

Abraham Lincoln believed that the Civil War was an inevitable consequence of the perpetuation of, and acquiescence in, the injustice of slavery, by both North and South.

Lincoln believed, and so stated again and again in his state papers, that continued and unredeemed violations of God's moral law led inexorably to catastrophe. If the continued acceptance of slavery for millions resulted in a terrible Civil War, what will be the result of the continued acceptances of slavery for hundreds of millions?

The Berlin question is more than a question of policy, of diplomacy, or of military posture. It poses an inescapable moral question.

With respect to almost every nation that has fallen victim to Communist aggression, there was one point in time, one occasion, when a courageous and vigorous free world policy based on the unselfish application of moral principles could have prevented Communist aggression.

That point in time for the Ukraine was 40 years ago. For Poland it was 13 years ago. For China it was 10 years ago. For Indochina it was 5 years ago. For Germany it is today.

This may be our last chance to redeem our past errors. In a record filled with failures, compromises, and concessions that spelled slavery for millions of people, we have preserved one last outpost of freedom within the Communist slave empire.

That outpost is West Berlin. It must never be surrendered.

It may be that the Soviet tyrants mean what they say this time, and that our devotion to freedom and our determination to protect our own security is now faced with the supreme and ultimate test.

If that is true, this is no time to reexamine our principles. Our principles are right principles and need, not reexamination, but reaffirmation. It is our state of national preparedness which must be reexamined. Mr. President, I think we should embark today upon a 90-day program of the utmost urgency that will prepare the American people, the American economy, and the American defenses for whatever demands that may be made upon them.

If we are in fact facing the ultimate test, let us approach May 27 not as a divided people, seeking ways to avoid our responsibility, asking ourselves if the price of freedom is too high, resentful of our fate.

Let us, rather, approach this date as a united America, proud of our ideals and traditions, conscious of our great mission in the world, and confident that if we but act aright, the hand of God will sustain us to the ultimate victory.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DODD. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I desire to express my commendation of the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD] for this courageous and masterly analysis of the problem confronting the people of our country.

I read the prepared talk, which he has now made, before I came to the Senate Chamber. I vibrated with inspiration in the knowledge that he was intending to deliver it to the Senate and to the people of the United States.

The Senator from Connecticut asked the question, "Have we forgotten the lessons of the Hitler era, with its compromises, concessions, and flexibilities?"

I think that admonition is one which ought to be taken to heart by all American people. Have we forgotten the tragic course that was followed in Europe as Hitler made his advance from the tavern floor to the dictator in charge of the world? I have assembled some material, and, if I may, I should like to get it into the RECORD.

First. Hitler, in building his great strength, began by taking Germany out of the League of Nations on the pretext that the nations at whose hands Germany was created had failed to disarm, while it was compelled to do so.

Second. Despite the terms of the Treaty of Versailles, he reintroduced conscription and proceeded to create 35 divisions of armed forces.

Third. He repudiated the Locarno Pact of 1925, under which defeated Germany had agreed that any disputes with Belgium, Czechoslovakia, France, and Poland would be arbitrated.

Fourth. In violation of the Versailles Treaty, he sent Nazi troops to occupy the demilitarized portions of Germany west of the Rhine.

He at that time half expected that this move would be opposed by French and British military forces. He instructed his commanders that if they were opposed, they should retire rather than oppose the interference to which they were to be subjected. But the interposition did not arise. They allowed Hitler to move in.

Fifth. In 1938, when Hitler was visited by the Austrian Chancellor, the Austrian official was confronted with a brutal series of demands, which finally, abjectly, he accepted. Later, he wanted those demands submitted to a plebiscite of his Austrian people. It was too late; Hitler marched in.

There went Austria.

Sixth. In September 1938, he demanded and obtained the Czechoslovakia Sudetenland. There was an inglorious agreement, signed by Great Britain, France, Germany, and Italy, at Munich. It gave Hitler all that he demanded.

By March 1939 Czechoslovakia became a protectorate, wholly occupied by Nazi troops.

Seventh. In the middle of 1938, Hitler demanded and obtained from Lithuania the city of Memel and its surroundings.

Eighth. Then came Poland. In spite of the nonaggression pact signed in 1934, Hitler denounced that pact, demanded the city of Danzig and a German-controlled highway across the Polish Corridor to East Prussia.

Then, let us not forget Mussolini in Ethiopia, in Albania, and in Greece.

On April 7, 1939, Mussolini invaded Albania. The crown was taken from the King of Albania and given to King Victor Emmanuel.

Previously in 1935, Mussolini attacked Ethiopia. The entire world was shocked by the unscrupulous and unjustified assault on that ancient people, so ill prepared to defend themselves.

Finally, on November 28, 1940, Mussolini attacked the Greeks.

Appeasement, concession, and yielding achieved nothing.

It is for these reasons that I say to the Senator from Connecticut that he has delivered an invaluable message to the people of our country reminding them that they will never appease the Communists. The Communists want to communize the world. They will do it by whatever tactics are necessary.

I am now of the belief that they want some sort of a coalition government in Berlin, but they want that government surrounded by Communists, and when that government is created the next thing will be the complete absorption of it by the Communists. The time has come to quit conceding on basic principles.

We should negotiate. I know the Senator from Connecticut feels implicitly in that proposition.

I should like to ask the Senator from Connecticut at this time to state his views on this matter of negotiation, since the Senator mentions that point.

Mr. DODD. I thank the Senator from Ohio for his compliments and gracious remarks, as well as for his contribution in drawing the analogy between the conditions in the world at the time of the Hitler era and the conditions now.

Of course I believe in negotiating. I think we ought to try all the time to talk to these people and to negotiate a settlement. We should never stop trying, but we should always make the effort in conformity with these basic, right principles. That is the only way negotiation can be successful. If we go to a negotiation with the idea of backing down on these fundamental things, we might as well stay at home.

Negotiation based on proper grounds and on firm premises is one thing. On other grounds it is something else.

There is always an area where one can give and take. For example, I think it has been suggested by the distinguished Senator from Montana that we could make some arrangements or some accommodations about commerce and public facilities—and there are probably other things. I would be in favor of all that. We ought to try to do it. We all owe the Senator from Montana, I think, a debt of gratitude for making the suggestion.

All I wanted to do today, was to suggest that we do have a basic and common area of agreement in this country. There is no real division in this body. There is no real division in the Congress, or between the Congress and the administration, or, indeed, among the administration and the Congress and the American people and our allies. There is no real division. There is only the appearance of division. That is why I made these remarks today. I hope they will be so understood.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DODD. I yield.

Mr. KENNEDY. I should like to congratulate the Senator for a most effective speech. I know that since the Senator took part in the Nuremberg trials he has been a student of Germany and of our policy in Germany.

As I look at page 3 of the Senator's remarks, it seems to me the Senator is not taking a position against all negotiation, or even against being willing to consider substantive questions during negotiations.

Mr. DODD. The Senator is correct.

Mr. KENNEDY. The Senator is merely stating precisely that the position in Berlin cannot be negotiated, and that our position on free elections cannot be negotiated. As I understand the Senator, he is not suggesting it would not be possible under some circumstances to debate the kinds of armaments and the sizes of armaments which might be stationed in West Germany, for example.

I think the Senator has rendered a service in an attempt to distinguish areas in which it is possible to negotiate as opposed to those areas in which it is not possible to negotiate.

Mr. DODD. The Senator is absolutely correct, and that is what I was trying to do. Of course, I would not find fault with negotiations.

I believe that at a press conference the Secretary of State was asked if free elections were the only way Germany could be reunited, and if I recall correctly, he said it was "not the only way." What he meant, I think, although I do not know that he spelled it out, was that within the framework of the principle of free elections the form would not be of decisive importance. I feel that way, also.

Mr. KENNEDY. The position which the Senator takes and the position which Mr. Khrushchev took this week of course run completely athwart each other. I think there is an indication that a climax is going to be reached in our relations with the Soviet Union in the spring. The fact that the Senator from Connecticut, after long study, has attempted to make precise his position, which is the position of at least some other Senators on his side of the aisle, is of value. It does indicate one side or the other is going to have to give way on the basic question of Berlin in the spring.

So long as we take a position which is so diametrically opposed to that of the Soviet Union, and their position is so hard and fast, at least as demonstrated in the public remarks of Mr. Khrushchev, some preparation will have to be made for supporting the position, if it is put to the ultimate test. What seems to me unfortunate is that we take the hard and fast position but do not indicate our determination and our willingness to support that position if our ability to do so is put to a military test. I think that will have to have somewhat of a strengthening. There will be a need for a call for increased military posture, as a part of the hard position on these basic and fundamental questions.

Mr. DODD. I think the Senator is correct. That is why I said we ought to embark on a 90-day crash program. That is how I describe it. I think the danger is quite imminent, and the times are very critical. I think it is a pity that the people of this country have not been made to understand that we stand in just such a dangerous situation and we should reexamine our defenses. We should get ready for what may be a tragedy, which we all hope and pray will not eventuate.

Mr. KENNEDY. I congratulate the Senator on his speech.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DODD. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I should like to commend the Senator for a very thoughtful speech. The Senator covered a great deal of material, and I find

myself in agreement with much of what the Senator has said.

Before I ask the Senator about one or two other aspects of his remarks, I should like to ask a question concerning the last point made.

The Senator is recommending an increase in our defenses. The Senator well knows, of course, that is contrary to the course on which we are proceeding now—against the expressed will of this body or of the Congress as a whole—since there is now taking place a decrease in the number of personnel in our Army. Is that correct?

Mr. DODD. Yes, I know that; and I lament it.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I lament it, also. According to the press, there is also contemplated in the current budget now under consideration, a decrease in the expenditure for missiles, I believe.

Mr. DODD. Yes.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is quite a large amount. The truth of the matter is that the administration not only is not holding its own, but it is going in the opposite direction to that which the Senator is recommending.

Mr. DODD. I think that is so, and it distresses me deeply. I am sure it distresses the Senator from Arkansas as well.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. It does. I, with a delegation, have been to the Pentagon to confer with the Secretary of the Army only recently, in order to urge him, with all the persuasion I posses, at least not to proceed with the announced reduction in the Army, from I believe 900,000 to 870,000.

Mr. DODD. That seems important to me.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. There is one thing the Senator said which disturbed me. The Senator referred to something I wish I could have a more firm conviction about, when he said at one point that we are lamentably or completely unprepared.

Mr. DODD. Tragically unprepared.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Tragically unprepared for any outbreak. I hope that is not so, as of now. I have thought, of course, that it was not. I am not an expert in military affairs. I do not serve on the committee which deals with that subject.

I had assumed that our President, being above all else a miltary man, surely had not permitted such a condition to exist as of now. I had interpreted many criticisms to mean that if we did not do something different, and if we did not change our present policies, such a condition would arise in the future—in 1961 or 1962 or 1963. I hope that statement of the Senator is not correct; I do not know.

Mr. DODD. I meant the statement in a wider sense. I meant that I do not believe this country is prepared in the sense of the people being prepared. From what I hear every day on the street, talking to friends and neighbors, people seem to be going along, somehow pushing this matter aside or not thinking about it at all, not really aware of this grave danger. I do not believe they realize that we are as near as we are to the threshold of a possibly great disaster. That is what I mean.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I am very glad to have that clarification, not only for our benefit, but for the benefit of the Russians. The Senator is not intending to say that he believes that our actual military power at the moment is tragically inadequate.

Mr. DODD. No.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator means that the people of the country are not psychologically prepared for such an emergency, and that they are not acting as though they were confronted with an emergency, or probable emergency. The Senator means that we do not conduct ourselves with the proper discipline and devotion to improvement. Is that correct?

Mr. DODD. That is correct. I do not know enough about the state of our defenses. Like the Senator from Arkansas, I accept the fact that at all times we are in a state of preparation for whatever may come.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I am very glad to have that statement in the RECORD. I do not want the Russians to believe that we are so weak that we could not give a good account of ourselves by May 27.

Mr. DODD. The Senator is correct.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I think that point should be made very clear, in order that we may not add fuel to such a misunderstanding.

Mr. DODD. I quite agree. Such an attitude is the kind of thing which might encourage the Russians to acts of aggression.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is correct.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a moment?

Mr. DODD. I yield.

ASKS EXECUTIVE COOPERATION IN PRESERVING DOMESTIC OIL AND COAL INDUSTRIES

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Perhaps I could say something which bears out the position the Senator from Connecticut has taken.

I am pleased beyond words that he has delivered this masterful speech. I think the country needs it. However, an illustration of the lack of preparedness, in which this country now finds itself, is plainly before us in the indecision in which we are at present involved with respect to the importation from abroad of petroleum and petroleum products, including residual fuel.

In 1955 the Congress passed an amendment to the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Extension Act by which the President was given authority, when he found that the national security of the United States was threatened, to impose certain restrictions upon the importation of any commodity. The immediate result was a declaration by the Office of Defense Mobilization that the national security was threatened by the importation of petroleum.

VOLUNTARY IMPORT RESTRICTIONS FAILED

Accordingly, the President issued a restraining order, which was called a voluntary agreement. That voluntary agreement did not prove successful; and, on the initiative of the Administration, it was altered. Still it did not prove successful. There was no practical limitation upon the importation of petroleum products, so gasoline was coming in; also, residual oil fuel was coming in, displacing coal and creating unemployment in many coal-producing areas of the country, particularly in West Virginia.

OUR SECURITY IS THREATENED

All this was happening by reason of a complete failure to realize that many of the German leaders and the German people were convinced that they lost the war, even before the intervention of the United States, because they did not have within their own borders the sources of fuel and energy supplies. There were no petroleum deposits within the boundaries of Germany. The Germans had to obtain coal from other areas. They made great progress with synthetic fuels, but that was not enough. The V-bombs which the Hitlerites had developed could not penetrate to England and France in sufficient quantity because of the lack of fuel to carry them.

Within a few weeks past the Department of Defense and the Department of State have called upon the division of government headed by Mr. Leo Hoegh to render a judgment again as to whether or not the national defense is threatened by these importations.

I think there is no doubt about the fact that the national defense is threatened, because in the United States today there are producing wells capable of an output of 3 million barrels of oil a day, which are shut in because of importations. If, in the light of the crisis which now exists in Berlin, a challenge comes to the West at the end of May, we shall find ourselves in the same position in which Germany was, because we shall not have readily available domestic sources of energy, although we have the deposits within our borders. Time will be required to develop them. The intercontinental ballistic missile in the hands of the Russians at this moment can be fired so speedily that we shall not have the time to prepare as we had in World War I and World War II. At that time this Nation was protected by the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans, so we had plenty of time to prepare. We have no such time now.

I believe that the message which the Senator from Connecticut has delivered today constitutes a great public service.

LEGISLATION PROPOSED TO SOLVE PROBLEM

Let me add that this week, in both the Senate and the House, bills were introduced to provide for the immediate stimulation of the development of our resources of petroleum and petroleum products. Both of the administration's so-called voluntary programs of restraint upon importations which throttle American development have failed, and the Government is finding itself opposed by two really powerful arguments with respect to such restrictions.

The so-called voluntary agreements, according to the opinions of able lawyers in and out of the Government, are said to be violations of the Sherman Act. Mandatory controls by Executive order, according to written opinions prepared by the legal staffs of some of the great

importing oil companies, are said to be subject to injunction, because it is alleged that there is no power in the President to make mandatory controls workable, and lawsuits are threatened.

TELEGRAM SENT TO SECRETARY STRAUSS

Yesterday, Mr. President—and I think it is vital that this message should be made a part of the RECORD—I sent a telegram to the Honorable Lewis L. Strauss, Secretary of Commerce. Mr. Strauss is head of the President's Committee on Fuel Resources, which is at present working to try to find a substitute for the orders now in existence.

My position is that an effective substitute cannot be prepared unless it is done by legislation. So I have invited the Executive to join with the Congress in finding a solution to this problem of oil imports, in these words:

> While Prime Minister Macmillan was sightseeing in Moscow yesterday the Soviet dictator shocked him and all the Western allies by the restatement of Khrushchev's threat that any violation of the borders of East Germany would be regarded by the Soviet Union "as the beginning of war." The Soviet troops leave Berlin before the end of May. We must be ready for the consequences. If war comes we must have a self-sufficient supply of petroleum and coal in full development. Mandatory controls can be successfully imposed only by Congress. I invite you, as Chairman of the President's Cabinet Committee dealing with this matter, to cooperate with the Members of Congress who sponsor the legislation introduced this week in both the Senate and the House "to encourage the development of petroleum and coal reserves within the United States."

MESSAGE OF SENATOR FROM CONNECTICUT WILL HELP ALERT NATION TO CRISIS

I say to the Senator from Connecticut that in my judgment his message, so eloquently and forcefully delivered, will have a great effect in alerting the people of the United States to the realities of the crisis which confronts us. The President of the United States has said, in words which are not subject to misunderstanding, that the United States will not move out of Berlin and will not sacrifice the rightful position it has taken in defense of West Berlin. We are the defenders of liberty, but liberty with justice. The Communists do not believe in human liberty, because they believe every human being is merely an instrument to be used by the state. The objective which the Communists have in mind, to gain Communist control of the world, means that they are intent upon imposing a dictatorial government all over the world. That we cannot endure. The Senator from Connecticut has made a wonderful contribution to the understanding of the problem.

Mr. DODD. I thank the Senator from Wyoming for his contribution.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DODD. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I shall try not to detain the Senator or the Senate very long. He has already clarified at least one point to my satisfaction. There are one or two other points about which I wish to ask him. First, I should like to say that I agree with the distinguished Senator with regard to standing firm, as he put it, for our rights in Berlin itself, and that we should not agree to move out, or move out without an agreement, and so on. With that I agree. I was going a little further; namely, with respect to the prospect for the future.

I do not know that these points are so important, but there are one or two which I thought might help to clarify the situation. I believe the Senator at one point said there are those who think that if we could understand the Russians and if they could understand us, that might be of some benefit, or might contribute to a solution of the problem, but the Senator from Connecticut thought that that was insipid, sentimental, or something to that effect.

Mr. DODD. I think it is, as applied to our present predicament. Of course, I am speaking in the entire context of my remarks. I am speaking about those who say we can resolve our problems by simply making more efforts to understand the Russians and getting them to understand us. Those people make such statements apparently in the belief that we do not have any deep seated differences with Russia, and that we could settle all the problems of peace and war if only we could get to understand each other.

My point is that the Russians do understand us very well. The only thing which really matters, with respect to the question of peace and war, so far as they are concerned, is that the United States is not a war-making people. Actually we are a peace-loving people.

The American people will not start war or make an attack on the Russians or anyone else in the world. The Russians know it, and there is no need for any more understanding in that respect. That was what I said, and I meant it. I still think I am right.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. If I may, I should like to clarify the full implications of the Senator's statement. I think it might be misunderstood.

Mr. DODD. It might be. It should not be.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. It might be misunderstood in such a way as to hold out no hope at all for the future. The thought which the Senator expressed, coupled with the expression that this is a moral issue, means, I take it, that political implications are secondary, and that this is a moral issue, and that evil is all that is involved. In that case, I think there is no hope whatever for any kind of adjustment or compromise, and therefore we must reconcile ourselves to inevitable war.

Mr. DODD. No.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Let me finish my comment. In addition, I think the Senator said he thought the War between the States was an inevitable war. I have never believed it was inevitable. I think it was the result of the failure of statesmanship. I think some hotheads got hold of the situation. I confess that some of them were in my part of the country. But I do not accept the principle that it was an inevitable war.

Neither can I accept the proposal that war with Russia is inevitable. I admit that we have difficulties. So far as I am concerned, I should like to proceed on the premise that it is possible to find some adjustment in time. I confess that I do not see any great prospect of it immediately. On the other hand, I think that is an assumption on which we should proceed. I find it rather difficult to reconcile such an assumption with the Senator's assumption that this whole struggle is strictly a contest between good and evil.

I think there are some things to be said from the point of view of Russia, although I certainly do not accept their policies. I think they are in error. What we must have in mind and what we must not forget is that Russia was very badly mauled by Germany. I can understand how Russia would have a little different point of view about the reunification of Germany, without safeguards, from what we would have.

The Senator assumes our good intentions. I do too. But I can understand, after the great demonstration of military power that we gave on two occasions, how Russia might think the bases just off the edge of her whole empire might possibly, under some circumstances, be a threat to her. I do not think they are. I think Russia is wrong in saying so.

This leads to the last point I am trying to make.

It might be a mistake to say that there is no hope rising of a better understanding between the peoples of Russia and of this country. I myself believe there is hope. I believe that today the people of Russia, as distinguished from their regime, are not determined to destroy America. The resources of Russia are so great that, given a reasonable chance, the people of Russia will exercise an influence upon the regime, not immediately, not even probably in my lifetime. But this is the basic assumption on which we should proceed.

One point which I think needs clarification is this. I do not like to hear the Senator, if he did intend to do so, announce the principle that he sees no hope through a better understanding. He sees no hope, I assume, in an exchange of persons back and forth; but that this is simply a matter of good and evil, and until Russia changes completely the character of her whole society and her approach, there is no hope of adjustment.

I agree, of course, that ours is a superior society. We believe we are more right than the Russians are. But I am reluctant to base my belief on that basis, because there is an absoluteness about it which admits of no compromise.

I made some criticism of some domestic policies when the Secretary of Agriculture said that the support program was immoral. I say that is not right. He may say it is wrong or unwise. Thus the Senator may say that the Russians are wrong or unwise. But if it is a moral concept, then we are not justified in seeking any kind of accommodation, as I see it.

Mr. DODD. I had not thought anyone would be confused by what I said with respect to understanding. I never said at any time, as I think the RECORD will show, that I thought we should not try to understand the Russian people or try to have them understand us. I am talking about the men who hold the millions

of Russians in their hands, and about those who say that if we could only understand them, or the Russians could only understand us, all our differences would be resolved. The Senator knows there is a distinction.

I favor as many exchanges as we can honorably carry on with the Russians in culture and trade. We are doing those things now. I am in favor of that. I say we should continue to try to talk with them. Right here I should like to answer another point which the Senator from Arkansas has brought out.

I think I understood him to say that, as I posed it, we are the good side, and the Russians are the evil side, and therefore, as the Senator from Arkansas understood me, there is no possibility of a settlement. I do not agree with that. All our lives we fight, most of us, for the things which are right and good. We do not give up, and we do not do violence to those who oppose. We try always to convince those who are among them. There is always hope that the Russians will change. That is the first reason for continuing negotiations. If we are as right as we think we are, then so long as we can hold off war and violence, without appeasement, so long as we can continue to talk to them and try to convince them, if we can, of the rectitude of our way, of course, we should do it.

The situation I posed, particularly with respect to Secretary Dulles, is that he does understand deeply that our cause is the good cause. I do not think I need to labor that oar very heavily in this body. But the Russian cause, the cause of murder, enslavement, aggression, and falsehood is not the good cause. That is what I had in mind when I discussed good and evil. It was in the context which I think the Secretary of State has discussed it. It does not mean that we should not try to convince the Russians. Of course, we should. But the purpose for which I speak principally today is to point out that a lot of mumbo-jumbo and mental mush about rigidity and inflexibility and misunderstanding will never help us, as we face this critical hour.

What we need to say, as American people, and say in unmistakably clear terms, is that we are right. We must tell the Russians why we cannot surrender Berlin. Let us not talk about standing firm, and then in mushy, soft words, say that on some basis, somewhere, somehow we will do something other than stand fast until there are free and fair elections in that area.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I think the Senator from Connecticut has contributed very substantially to a clarification of the RECORD and the thought I had. I agree with what he has said about what is good and bad concerning the things he mentioned. There is no question in my mind that the murders he mentioned and the policies pursued by Mr. Stalin throughout that period were bad. I do not see any possibility of any change in my opinion or that of anyone else in that connection.

But when we talk about the cause of the Russian people and the cause of their nation, we have already noticed some slight change in the character of this regime over the last one. They have at last, up to now, abandoned the extreme form of terror, which is all to the good.

Within that regime there are some modifications.

I am suggesting that for the future—not with regard to Berlin itself now—we should be careful not to make assumptions or to get into a habit of thought which would exclude the possibility not only of changes in the present regime, as such, but also the possibility of changes in the successor to Khrushchev, and in the successor to that one. It would be well for the desires and for the welfare of the Russian people to have a less aggressive regime and policy there. Therefore, it will be well for us to stand fast and to adopt, here at home, wise policies which will justify our belief in our democratic system, and thus will offer some possibility of a basis for action. I want the RECORD to show clearly that I believe we should have that basic policy.

Mr. DODD. I thank the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. President, all of us believe that our best hope with regard to the Russian question is to pursue the course we are advocating today, and not to make concessions or to back down. I think the more difficult it is for the masters of the Russian people to perpetrate more murder and more slavery and more aggression in the world, the more difficult it will be for them to keep under their hands the masses of people who today are behind the Iron Curtain. That is why I said this is one of the ways the leaders of Soviet Russia may be pulled down. I am sure the thinking people in Russia—the intellectuals, the scientists, the artists and the writers, in that great country, and there must be great numbers of them—will demand freedom. So this is one of our best hopes.

But we shall not help them by kowtowing, either on this issue or on any other basic issue, to the dictates and the threats of Khrushchev and those associated with him. If we back down on this issue, we shall retard the movement for freedom inside Russia.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I agree with the Senator from Connecticut with regard to Berlin; I am not questioning that at all.

I shall desist after I make one other observation namely, with regard to whether there is any hope, in the long-time future, with regard to the aggressiveness of Soviet Russia. I believe we should give the Russian people credit, as a nation, for the fact that for a long period of time, except during the last period and during the past war—in fact, for more than 500 years—they have not been quick to challenge in any serious way a major power, in an outright war—for instance, in the same fashion that Germany or Napoleon or others have done. Although the Russian people are now under the influence of a leadership which today is quite provocative, yet there is reason to hope that if that regime can be changed, the people of Russia would be disposed to support a regime which would govern them without challenging us or anyone else. That is my belief.

Mr. DODD. I believe that, too. I believe that was just as true of the German people. I believe that one of the great tragedies of our generation was the fact that the people of Germany were so greatly misled and were whipped into tyranny in their own country and into aggression outside their own land. The German people are good, as the Russian people and as all people are. But the Russian people are prisoners like the Germans were.

As the Senator from Ohio has indicated, a tragic parallel exists between our present plight and that of the 1930's and 1940's.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I thank the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. DODD. I think the people of Germany and Russia are like people everywhere else: They want to raise their families in peace and live out their lives in peace just as we do. I have never entertained any other view.

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Connecticut yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MUSKIE in the chair). Does the Senator from Connecticut yield to the Senator from Wyoming?

Mr. DODD. I yield.

Mr. McGEE. I should like to say a word in behalf of the freshman class of Senators—namely, to express our pride in our colleague, the Senator from Connecticut. I hope the rest of the Senate will join me in this expression. We are proud of the Senator from Connecticut for the contribution he has made here this afternoon, in regard to the very difficult question of Germany.

I could not take my seat without commenting for a moment on the question of Germany. I think the nub of the explanation regarding the difference between the position of the Senator from Arkansas and that of the Senator from Connecticut is to be found in one central fact which perhaps has been omitted from the debate this afternoon in regard to the German question. That is that this is not only a question between the Soviet Union and the people of the United States, or even the peoples of the Western World; it is not alone a question between tyranny and democracy, or one as to the differences between the peoples of the Soviet satellites and our own people. The fact is that we are also being watched by peoples around the world. I think it well that when we are focusing our attention on freedom, we remember that the world is round; that many things that have nothing to do with either Germany or Russia are occurring; and that many things which are happening will not be influenced by the situation in Berlin. For that reason, we should be aware of what is happening to us both in regard to Berlin and our policy regarding it, and in regard to our foreign policy generally.

The Senator from Connecticut has rightly applauded our stand on the basic principle of holding in Berlin. But I believe the trouble with our policy is that it has not gone far enough, and we have

permitted the Communists of Russia to manipulate our policy in Berlin in such a way as to put us in an unfavorable position in the eyes of the rest of the world.

Personally, I resent our having been manipulated into an unfavorable position, when our position fundamentally is right and proper and strong. I think the trouble is that we have failed to take a position which would enable us to maintain the initiative over a tyrannical power which admittedly has a strong position in Berlin. We have failed to put to a test the Russian proposals regarding Berlin. I believe that is what the Senator had in mind. I believe we have failed to exploit what the Senator from Connecticut has described as the right faith in our point of view.

If we really have that faith, and if we really believe in our position, then we should be willing to expose that of the Russians in regard to Berlin, because in doing so we then shall capture the imagination of the peoples of Africa and the imagination of the peoples of Asia. All of them are watching every move we make. It seems to me that it is most important that in recovering the initiative—as we may well be able to do in Berlin—we also recover a little bit of the inspiration of many peoples around the globe. I think that is the whole sore point in connection with the German question.

It is not that there is anything wrong with the administration's position. It is simply that it has not gone far enough, and that we have lost the initiative.

I do not use carelessly the word "initiative." I know that a criminal may have a great deal more initiative to break a law than some policeman may have to enforce it; and I know that the irresponsible masters of the Kremlin have a built-in initiative that is very great, indeed. But I believe we should take one step further the position of the Senator from Connecticut—namely, we should show how we can capitalize on our strength in carrying the ball.

The Senator's suggestion was that we shall have to watch for the decline or the disintegration of the Russian system in one of four possible ways: Either, first, warfare—which we will not undertake; or, second, rebellion—which is not likely to happen; or, third, attrition from within; or, finally, a falling out among the thieves.

But I believe the Senator from Connecticut has failed to mention a fifth possibility, which probably is the way in which we may see these differences resolved. Those differences were dealt with in part by the Senator from Arkansas, when he spoke of change.

Mr. President, if Karl Marx were alive today, he would not recognize as his own "baby" the Soviet Union. The forces of change are taking great toll there, even now. We do not know exactly what changes are occurring; we cannot predict the direction of the changes. But the point is that there is change. If our fundamental foreign-policy position has one premise, it is that if we only remain strong, if we only persevere, some day there will be such a change.

This afternoon my plea is that we continue to probe the wall that separates us; that we always stand ready to capitalize on such a change, the moment that there is a new opening which might play into our hands. I believe we have been failing to do that up until now.

So I would stress that addition to the admirable picture the Senator from Connecticut has painted this afternoon in regard to the German question, because Germany is not all there is to the world. Mr. President, history will show us that there are other forces besides the Germans or the Russians. Who knows what may be the combination of powerful political forces 5, 10, or 20 years from now?

We have to remain adaptable to this continued force of war. History—and I pose as one who taught that subject for a long time—is an excellent guidepost, but a very poor hitching post. I think we might realize that as the history of our time.

Mr. DODD. I thank the Senator. I should like to have cleared up a couple of questions which have arisen in my mind respecting the words of the Senator from Wyoming that we might have moved with more initiative in the last decade.

Mr. McGEE. In the last decade on the German question?

Mr. DODD. Yes.

Mr. McGEE. Let us go back to a shorter period than that period of time, say the last 10 or 20 weeks. I think when the Russians presented their little bombshell of a few months ago, in regard to the deadline in Germany, we might have pressed them, at the discussion level, as to the method by which they were proposing to turn this problem over to the Communists in East Berlin, and methods of reunification that would be more in accord with acceptable standards. Instead, we closed the gate. We refused to discuss the question with them. For that reason I think we contributed to the loss of initiative on our part.

Mr. DODD. I was under the impression that we had indicated we were willing at all times to discuss the question. We have suggested a conference of foreign ministers at which East and West Germans would be present.

I agree with the Senator that we should always look for an opportunity to exercise initiative. I do not assert that has always been done. But I ask my question earnestly, and I search my own recollection, and I try to understand these things. I think it is easy to say that we should seize the initiative and that we should do more than we are doing; but, in fairness, I do not really know what we could have done in that respect, except, as the Senator from Wyoming has pointed out, look all the time for opportunities.

I say again I think we have done as much as we can do. And what have we been met with? Yesterday the Russians stated that they will not participate in a foreign ministers' meeting. They will not talk about anything. They will make no concessions. There is no flexibility there. So I do not know any place where there is really an opportunity, except one, which does occur to me as I speak.

I have always lamented and regretted an omission on our part at the time of the tragic Hungarian revolt, when there was a period of several days intervening between the outbreak of the revolt and the crushing of it by the Soviet armed forces. I thought then that the United States should have taken the lead in proposing that a special United Nations commission be flown into Budapest. I do not know whether it would have made any difference. Who can know? But I am sure it is the kind of thing the Senator from Wyoming is thinking of. In that respect, I would have to say "Yes." I am not saying "No" at all to anything he has said. What I have said is more in the nature of an inquiry rather than a statement. I am grateful to the Senator.

Mr. McGEE. Let me say, in answer to the question of the Senator, reflecting on the fact that we are discussing this question today, the fact that we feel compelled to air the German question, the fact that a good deal of the press of the world is raising the question, the fact that some views of the American position have been called to the frontline, however sincere and compelling our position may have been in our own minds, we have failed to get that position across in the minds of others. We have dealt with the question, rather, as though what we believe to be our own view, or what may be truth, if there is such a thing as absolute truth, is more important. We have failed to state our position with the confidence of our strength and belief to the rest of the world, which has cost us a good deal of our standing around the world.

Mr. DODD. I thank the Senator.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DODD. Yes.

Mr. COOPER. As one Senator on the minority side, I want to commend the junior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD] for the contribution he has made today to the debate on Berlin.

I was much interested in his insistence to the effect that our policy in Berlin be based on a moral position. I think it is. But I believe it can be stated in another way—that is, that our position on Berlin is premised upon the basic idea that we will not permit the problem to be resolved under the threat of force, or by force. That is a basic principle of American policy in international relations.

It has sometimes been said that Mr. Dulles has spoken of problems such as Berlin purely on the basis of what is right and what is wrong. I am glad that the Secretary is moved by moral principles. As I have said, our policy that the Berlin questions and other international disputes ought not to be resolved by force or threat is a moral position. That was the position of Mr. Dulles at the time of the Suez affair in 1956. I do not think the Congress was very clear about its position that time. I do not think the press was very clear about the question. I think we were muddled a bit as to whether it was right to "desert our friends" or right to stand against the use of force, even the use of force by others. But Mr. Dulles understood that

the United States must stand on the principle that the Suez dispute should not be resolved by force.

I understand that this is the position of the Senator from Connecticut, and I concur in what he has said. I rose to comment on the speech of the Senator from Connecticut. But if the Senator will permit me, I wish to digress and to respond to the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. McGEE]. If we consider the American record in Berlin under the last two administrations, I doubt if one can find any place where our position has been clearer, more courageous, and more certain. Just after World War II, Secretary of State Byrnes and Senator Vandenberg stated that the United States would be willing to consider a security arrangement for Europe in which even Russia might join. The Marshall plan embraced the same idea—the United States offering to include in its scope the satellite countries. Both suggestions were rejected by Russia.

The Berlin airlift, under the administration of President Truman, was courageous. At the summit conference, one of the principal decisions insisted upon by the President of the United States and Mr. Dulles was that one of the chief subjects to be considered after the conference would be the unification of Germany. Russia agreed. And Russia, of course, quickly broke its promises.

Since World War II, the administrations of both Mr. Truman and of President Eisenhower have attempted to settle the question of the unification of Germany through the United Nations, but again have been able to obtain no concessions from Russia. So I am at a loss to understand the general statement of the Senator from Wyoming regarding the need for imagination and initiative.

I want to comment briefly on what the Senator from Connecticut has said. I realize all of us have a very deep and serious responsibility in attempting to talk about the Berlin crisis. I am glad the Senator has recognized the firm and strong position of the Secretary of State.

I have never talked to the Secretary of State about the most recent crisis over Berlin. We know, from what the Secretary has said and written, of the strength and firmness of his position: that the Berlin issue shall not be resolved by force and that we will not deliver West Germany to the Soviets, thereby giving up the freedom of the German people.

I suggest, however, that we are confronted by the Soviet Russian ultimatum. The United States has taken a firm position on principle. We are approaching the date when the issue may be resolved. It may not be resolved on that date because, as I understand the situation, there will be meetings between representatives of the Western Powers and Russia.

But we can maintain principle, and still leave an area for negotiation. I cannot state this afternoon all the areas of possible negotiation or what they should be, but we have to keep in mind that two great powers should not so firmly commit themselves upon every issue, outside issues of principle, that no areas of negotiation are left. We could reach a point where either one or the other would be faced with the decision of taking more forceful action. We certainly do not want that to occur.

I am sure the Senator from Connecticut, while he stands firm on principle, has not intended simply to shut off every area of negotiation.

Mr. DODD. On the contrary, I wholly agree with the Senator from Kentucky. I said earlier, and I repeat now, that I believe in talking to the Russians and negotiating with them and trying to solve our problems. I believe we should never cease to try to obtain a settlement with which we can live honorably and safely. I want to make that so clear that there is no doubt about it.

It is a fact that at the Summit Conference, as I recall, Russia agreed to free elections in Germany. Now that agreement seems to have been forgotten by the Communists.

To say these are moral questions does not mean they are not also practical questions. These aspects are not separated. They cannot be separated. These are moral principles and they are also practical principles and they offer the best practical solutions because they are moral solutions. That is the point I wish to make.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DODD. I yield.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. As another Member of the "freshman class," I desire to say today that our distinguished colleague has rendered a tremendous service to the people of our country by bringing to their attention the problems which confront them. I know the Senator has given the matter great thought and preparation.

I had the honor of serving with the distinguished Senator from Connecticut when we were Members of the House of Representatives, where we labored together in the House Committee on Foreign Affairs. My observations of the Senator over the years have impressed me not only with his devotion to duty and his loyalty to his country, but also with his interest in the cause for which we fight and his knowledge of the subject.

Some question has been raised today as to the inevitability of war. I have not misunderstood my colleague to say that war is inevitable. I think the record should show where the inevitability of this matter has its source, if it indeed is inevitable. We need only to look at the words of the Soviets themselves, if we would be cautioned that war may indeed be inevitable.

About 20 or 30 years ago a man by the name of Dimitry Manuilsky in a lecture at the Lenin School of Political Warfare had this to say:

> War to the hilt between communism and capitalism is inevitable. Today, of course, we are not strong enough to attack. Our time will come in 20 or 30 years. To win we shall need the element of surprise. The bourgeoisie will have to be put to sleep. So we shall begin by launching the most spectacular peace movement on record. There will be electrifying overtures and unheard of concessions. The capitalist countries, stupid and decadent, will rejoice to cooperate in their own destruction. They will leap at another chance to be friends. As soon as their guard is down, we shall smash them with our clenched fist.

Let the record show who it was who said that war to the hilt between communism and capitalism is inevitable.

Lenin's words give us concern and I wish to quote him:

> First we will take Eastern Europe, then the masses of Asia. Then we will surround America, the last citadel of capitalism. We shall not have to attack. She will fall into our lap like an overripe fruit.

In our own time we have been threatened by Mr. Khrushchev, and I quote his words:

> Whether you like it or not, history is on our side. We will bury you yet.

So, Mr. President, let us believe that these men once in a while may indeed mean what they say. I feel we must take them at their word when they say that war is inevitable, because, by taking them at their word, we may very well, in keeping with the Boy Scout motto, be prepared for the worst, hoping, of course, that the worst may never come.

There has been some mention of morality, and a question has been raised as to whether moral principles are involved. Of course, moral principles are involved in the Berlin issue. I commend my colleague, the Senator from Connecticut, for taking the position that there are moral principles and religious principles involved. The Father of Our Country said in his Farewell Address something which I think is pertinent to the subject at this point. He said:

> Of all the dispositions and habits which lead to political prosperity, religion and morality are indispensable supports. In vain would that man claim the tribute of patriotism, who should labor to subvert these great pillars of human happiness, these firmest props of the duties of men and citizens. The mere politician, equally with the pious man, ought to respect and to cherish them. A volume could not trace all their connections with private and public felicity. Let it simply be asked, where is the security for property, for reputation, for life, if the sense of religious obligation desert the oaths which are the instruments of investigation in courts of justice? And let us with caution indulge the supposition that morality can be maintained without religion.

It is a matter of record that the men with whom we are dealing have no religion. They say that there is no God above the state. I say to my colleagues that when one deals with an atheist he deals with an individual who will break his word, an individual whose agreement is worthless, an individual who will rape, pillage, burn, and murder. That is the kind of individual with whom we are dealing in the persons of those who guide the destiny of the Kremlin.

Certainly morality is involved. The Psalmist considered this matter carefully in his day, and he might well have been speaking of the situation with which we are confronted in our day when he said:

> Except the Lord build the house, they labor in vain that build it: Except the Lord keep the city, the watchman waketh but in vain.

I think we must be conscious of the religious and moral principles involved

as we face this burning issue. At the same time, we must be aware that we are dealing with men to whom principles mean nothing.

I, for one, wish to stand on the side which my colleague from Connecticut has taken. I say that nothing can be politically right if it is morally wrong.

I further say that it would be morally wrong to yield on the question of Berlin. There can be no surrender here. If we surrender now, there will not be another line at which we might rally to stand firm.

Pericles, one of the noblest of the Athenians, said to his countrymen:

> Fix your eyes upon the greatness of your country, and remember that her greatness was won by men with courage, with knowledge of their duty, and with a sense of honor in action.

Let us Americans today have the courage that our forefathers had at Valley Forge. Let us have the courage that our forebears have displayed throughout all the illustrious pages of American history. With that kind of courage, and with a steadfast belief in the principles for which we stand, there will be no yielding to threats and blackmail on May 27.

I feel that we must continue to engage in talks and efforts to avoid war. We must continue to be willing to negotiate, but we must never be willing to compromise the great moral principles that are involved in the Berlin issue and in the larger issue of German reunification. While I have been critical at times of our present administration's foreign policy, I want to state emphatically that, when it comes to backing the administration on a showdown or a firm stand in dealing with the Russians, I shall do so with all of my strength. When the safety of our Nation is in the balance, there is no Democrat, no Republican; no North, no South. We stand united.

I again congratulate my colleague. I congratulate all other Senators who have taken advantage of this opportunity to make the record clear. We do not know how many more opportunities we shall have to speak out on this question. I, for one, could not resist the urge to let the record show that another freshman Senator feels that if there must be a showdown, it should be in our time, and not in the time of our children.

Mr. DODD. I thank the Senator.

Mr. MORTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DODD. I yield.

Mr. MORTON. I too, wish to commend the Senator from Connecticut for a great speech. As one who was rather intimately associated with Secretary Dulles for about 38 months during the first part of the present administration, let me say that I am grateful for the deserved tribute which the Senator from Connecticut, in his characteristic way, has paid Secretary Dulles. Yesterday was his 71st birthday. I am sure that when he reads certain paragraphs in the address of the Senator from Connecticut his heart will be warmed, indeed.

The other day Mr. Macmillan, in describing his visit to Moscow, made the statement that at the present time the two great dangers of war in connection with the Berlin crisis are, first, that it may come about because of miscalculation; and second, that we may "muddle" ourselves into a war. I think that was the word he used.

The great contribution by the Senator from Connecticut today has been to help prevent miscalculations. I remember accompanying the Secretary of State in his many appearances before the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House, when the distinguished Senator from Connecticut served so well on that committee. I believe he will recall that time and again Mr. Dulles repeated the thesis that the three wars in which we became involved in this century resulted primarily from miscalculation as to American will, American strength, American determination, and the policies of the American Government.

I believe that the clear statement of the Senator from Connecticut today, coming from his side of the aisle, is a great contribution toward preventing another miscalculation as to the will, the intent, and the determination of the American people and the American Government. I commend the Senator for a very great address.

Mr. DODD. I thank the Senator very much.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

POLICIES RESPECTING GERMANY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I, too, wish to speak on the German question. I am sorry that I did not complete the preparation of my speech in time to give copies to my colleagues, to the Official Reporters, or to the press.

I am grateful to the Senator from Connecticut for showing me and others of his colleagues—if not all of them—the courtesy of sending to us copies of the magnificent speech which he has just completed. I commend him most highly, because I think he has made a real contribution to the public understanding of this most important problem. I believe that in emphasizing the difficulties which will face our country and the free world on or before May 27, he has rendered a service which should be appreciated by all.

He minced no words in his speech. I shall mince no words in mine. As a U.S. Senator from the State of Montana, like the U.S. Senator from the State of Connecticut or any other State, I have a duty and a responsibility to call my shots as I see them, to let the cards fall where they may.

So with this apology to my colleagues, the Official Reporters of Debates, and the press for not having a prepared copy of my speech, and with my public commendation and congratulations to the distinguished Senator from Connecticut for making an excellent speech and laying it on the line. I wish to say thanks because he has rendered a public service. I hope other Senators, in addition to the Senator from Connecticut and the Senator from New York, will likewise take the floor and try to let the people of this country and the world know just what the American position is, and to emphasize that, regardless of any differences as to how we shall achieve our objective, there are no differences so far as our desire and our determination to remain in West Berlin are concerned.

Some days ago, I discussed in the Senate the coming crisis in Germany. Other Members have since contributed to the discussion of this critical matter. That is all to the good. I am persuaded that out of this turmoil of thought will come a firm and positive policy, a policy which, even if it does not yield a rapid resolution of the German situation, will at least unite and steel the Nation for the dangerous days which lie ahead.

THE PROSPECTS IN GERMANY

Let there be no mistake about what does lie ahead. This is no diplomatic lark on which the world is about to embark at Berlin. This is no child's play of blind man's buff.

When I addressed the Senate on February 12, Mr. President, I made a deletion from my remarks just a few moments before I delivered them. I did so because I did not wish to be unduly alarmist. Now the same thought has been expressed by the Prime Minister of the United Kingdom. It has been recognized by Members of this body such as the distinguished Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] and increasingly by the press. It is at least beginning to sink home that the world is entering into a situation in Germany in which the lives of tens of millions of people—Americans included—may well balance on the avoidance of a single significant error.

The British Prime Minister warned, the other day, of a suicidal war by "miscalculation." As the distinguished Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON], a former Assistant Secretary of State, has said this afternoon, the British Prime Minister also used the word "muddling."

I can say now with greater assurance what I intended to say but deleted from my remarks on February 12: "I express to the Senate my belief that just ahead lies a period which may well see the Nation and the rest of the world miss a devastating war by a very narrow margin. Indeed, it is a period which may see us in war, limited war or unlimited war, war by accident or war by design, war by childish stubbornness or bravado."

THE RESPONSIBILITY OF SENATORS IN THE IMPENDING CRISIS

If that is the case, Mr. President, what are the Members of this body to do? Are they to guard their silence when conscience compels them to speak? Are they to ignore their responsibilities to their States and our country as they see those responsibilities? Are they to accept as all-pervasive the undoubted wisdom of the President and the executive branch of the Government? Or are they to think for themselves and speak for themselves?

Are they to be more concerned with how words will sound abroad, and so hold their peace? Or must they, even more, seek to dispel any uncertainties of the people of the Nation as to the course which this Government is pursuing, and to seek to do so by examining the issues which underlie that course? Are they to wait until they hear what the Department of State has to say on the matter

and then parrot agreement? Are they to wait to hear what Mr. Khrushchev has to say, so that they may be sure that what they subsequently say will be in disagreement?

I do not know what others may contend in this matter. I can speak only for myself. For myself, Mr. President, I can say only that when conscience compels me to speak, I owe it to the people of my State and our country to speak out. For myself, Mr. President, I hold that the most important matter is not how people abroad may interpret my words. Important as that may be, it is more important that the people of my State and our country understand fully what is at stake in this situation.

More important is the need of the people of the United States to be satisfied that the course to which they are committed by their Government is a sound one. If they are to be asked to give their lives, as well they may be, then the course of this Government must represent the outgrowth of policies which reflect the deepest needs of the people of the United States. They must be policies which are, in fact, the best that can be devised by this Government to safeguard the Nation and freedom, and to do so, if possible, in peace.

Mr. President, to those who say we may upset people abroad by our discussions, I can only reply that we do not fool anyone abroad if we fool ourselves at home. The unity of the slogan may well be no unity at all. It may well be merely the facade of unity; the Communist, the totalitarian concept of unity.

The unity of free man needs to rest on firmer ground. For the grim days which lie ahead in Germany, this Nation needs the unity which can come only from an understanding of where we stand, where it is we are headed, and why. To stand fast in Germany, as indeed we must, we need to think carefully, to think deeply, and we need to do it now. We need to speak out seriously, soberly, and we need to do it now. The time to examine policies is before, not after, their consequences are upon us. I emphasize that point—before, not after—as in Korea a few years ago.

POSITION ON MR. DULLES

Mr. President, I yield to no one in my appreciation of the enormous burdens of the Secretary of State and his Department, charged, as they are, with primary responsibility, under the President, for the Nation's policies. I believe the record of my position in this matter is very clear. I regard Mr. Dulles, as I have since I have known him, as an able and a dedicated civil servant. I have endorsed many of the policies which have been pursued since he took office. I have worked with him closely, very closely, on several of these matters. I have never felt, however, that this constrained upon me a silence when I disagreed; nor, I am sure, did he. I favor the continuance of Mr. Dulles in office now, not out of any sentimentality, but because I believe that if his health permits, Mr. Dulles is capable of making an extremely significant contribution to the security of the Nation and to the search for peace, particularly at this time.

I do not believe in the concept of the indispensable man. However, I do believe that there are times when a man may become virtually indispensable. Because of what Mr. Dulles has done over the past several months, especially during the past several weeks, in going to Western Europe and discussing the Berlin and German matters with our allies, and because of his great capacity, his great knowledge, his great ability, and the leadership which he has displayed, insofar as the Berlin and German situations are concerned, he is in a very large sense indispensable.

I hope that any conferences covering these two questions—because they are interrelated—will be held in Washington, where we can make use of Mr. Dulles' capacities and abilities, to advise and lead the West.

In the last analysis, whether his health will permit him to make that contribution is for the President, the Secretary, and his doctors to decide, as the President so cogently pointed out in his press conference of February 25, 1959.

Let me emphasize, however, that because Mr. Dulles is ill is no reason for declaring a moratorium on a frank and full discussion of the Nation's policies in the light of the critical situation in Germany. If I know Mr. Dulles at all, he would be the first to recognize the need for this discussion to continue. He would be the first to denounce any ghoulish political profiteering on his illness in order to silence this discussion.

There are those who have expressed confusion as to how I can support Mr. Dulles' continuance in office and still criticize some of the policies executed under his name. I can only say that it is not the first time, and I hope it is not the last. We shall have reached a very low point, indeed, in the practice of free and responsible government when a Senator has no choice but to agree 100 percent with a Secretary of State or to hang him in effigy.

I intend to go on as I have in this matter. I shall endorse the foreign policies of this administration when I believe they are sound policies. I shall try to contribute constructively to their reshaping when I believe that they are not—I repeat the word "constructively," because I have always tried to operate constructively. That is a position, Mr. President, which I have maintained since I entered this body, and also during the 10 year prior thereto when I served as a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives. It is the position I propose to maintain so long as I am in the Senate. I shall maintain it regardless of the party which is responsible for the administration of the Nation's affairs.

ATTITUDE ON MR. KHRUSHCHEV

Further, I propose to say what I have to say when I have to say it, irrespective of Mr. Khrushchev's threats or blandishments. It is, to me, a matter of indifference whether Mr. Khrushchev agrees or disagrees with me. I hope this Government, Mr. President, will never, out of a timorous feeling that Mr. Khrushchev may disapprove, fail to stand for what it must stand for. Equally, Mr. President, I hope that this Government will never fail to act as it must act out of an even more timorous feeling that Mr. Khrushchev may approve. What I said on this point on February 12 I believe bears repeating. I said then, and I say again today:

> If we are to be prepared to face this crisis in Germany, it will be best not to become distracted or obsessed by the twists and turns of Soviet behavior. The fundamental question of policy for us is not so much what the Russians are looking for in Germany. We know what they are looking for and they may very well seize it while we amuse or fascinate ourselves by trying to interpret the charades of Russian behavior.

No, Mr. President, it is more important to us, far more important, to know what we ourselves are seeking in Germany. We must bring to this crisis not only courage, but also conviction. We must bring to it a positive and understandable policy which meets our essential national needs and the essential needs of freedom, and, if possible, meets them in peace.

It was that thought, Mr. President, which prompted me to list nine points for exploration in a search for a positive policy on Germany last February 12. Some of these points were then, or at least have since become, a part of the present official policy of the United States. Others are not a part of that policy. They represent what, to me, seem rational approaches to various aspects of the problem of Germany. In great measure, they are not original except in their restatement, as my inserts in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 16, 1959, will show. But for their restatement in the context of the speech, I wish to make it clear that I claim full responsibility.

RECAPITULATION OF THE NINE POINTS

Mr. President, I should now like to review the nine points and to discuss their status in official policy at the present time, as well as certain of the comments which have been made upon them. On February 12 I said:

> I can be wrong, and I stand ready to accept a better illumination of the problem through discussion and debate in the Senate.

I say that again. I may add, however, that little which has since transpired or has since been said prompts me to modify these points in any significant degree.

Point 1: There must be no retreat of the forces of freedom at Berlin. Mr. President, I said that, not once, but at least six times during the course of my remarks on February 12. Weeks before that date, I had publicly endorsed a draft Senate resolution which would have upheld the position of the administration to stand fast. That, I may add, is the only resolution on the German situation which I have endorsed so far.

So far as I know, there has not been any significant difference among Democrats and Republicans, or between the Senate and the excutive branch of the Government, on the need to stand fast at Berlin. Certainly there never has been on my part.

Point 2: The German leaders of the two Berlin communities should be urged to begin serious efforts to unify the public services and municipal government of

that city. I know, Mr. President, that there are those who will say this approach is illusory and unrealistic; that the East Germans cannot be expected to agree even on a common sewage system, let alone on a common municipal government. I would point out in reply, however, that if Berlin does not have a common sewage system, it does have a common subway system. If the German leaders of East and West Berlin can agree on that, as they have, is it beyond the realm of the possible that they may agree on other common public services, particularly if they mean to have peace; or that they may reach a series of agreements which might ultimately lead to a single municipal government for the city? I must ask: What stands in the way of an initiative of this kind? What will be lost by trying to bring about this progress toward municipal unity in Berlin? If we mean to have peace, I believe the effort should be made. It should be made not only to ease the danger of war at this most critical point in Germany; it should be made, too, because if it is successful, out of the microcosm of Berlin could emerge patterns of unification for all of Germany.

Berlin, of course, is an aspect of the whole problem of German unification but it is also the most pressing and compelling aspect. It is at Berlin and along the routes of access to that city that the danger of conflict is greatest. In that sense it requires the most immediate attention, even if solution to its problem of unification may be merely by means of interim solutions, pending the outcome of the whole problem of German unification. So far as I know, Mr. President, at present we are doing nothing, in an official sense, to bring about an attempt at municipal unity in Berlin.

Point 3: The conciliatory services of the United Nations and, particularly, of its Secretary General, should be enlisted, to try to develop an all-Berlin government. If such a government does emerge in the municipality, then a United Nations emergency force should replace both Communist and Allied forces in maintaining free access to the city from all directions, pending a general settlement of the German problem.

So far as I know, Mr. President, no official steps have been taken in this direction. There are hints, Mr. President, that if trouble does develop at Berlin, then the matter will be taken to the United Nations. I would deem it a welcome change, Mr. President, for once to bring the United Nations into an international puzzle before, not after, the pieces have been hopelessly scattered.

Those in the Senate who saw fit to comment on many parts of my last statement generally refrained from comment on this point. I am not prepared to conclude, however, that in Germany at this time there is no possible constructive role for the United Nations and the Secretary General. I believe that there is something to be said for an attempt to bring the United Nations into the situation, now, in the role of fire-prevention, not merely later, in the role of firefighting. For my part I would much prefer to see the whole city of Berlin neutralized on an interim basis, under United Nations auspices, if that can be obtained, rather than to have East German agents of the Soviet Union stamping the permits of Western allied transports to West Berlin. We cannot know whether such an arrangement can be obtained until we try to obtain it. And even if we cannot, what shall we have sacrificed by trying?

Points 4 and 5: Unless a unified, neutralized Berlin under United Nations' auspices is established as an interim measure, then Western forces must remain in Berlin, regardless of whether the Russians leave. It is time to think seriously, however, of replacing as rapidly as possible the thousands of non-German allied military personnel in Berline with West German militia.

Here, again, Mr. President, I find in present policy nothing comparable to this suggestion. Present policy, says, in effect, that the Russians must stay in Berlin—in spirit, if not in body. Apart from the fact that I see no practicable way to make them stay in either body or spirit if they wish to go, I am most reluctant to go along with a policy that seeks to require the Russians to stay anywhere westward, if they propose to take even a few steps backward—eastward.

I am fully aware that their going may complicate our remaining in Berlin. We shall be face to face, then, with East Germans. They will be Communists, to be sure—but, nevertheless, Germans, not Russians. The allied forces may well be compelled, in the last analysis, to face them, if we mean to stay in Berlin at all costs.

It was an awareness of this probability, Mr. President, which prompted me to suggest that it is time to think seriously of replacing the thousands of allied military personnel in West Berlin with West German militia. If there is to be a loss of life among East Germans, in order to preserve what is, in the last analysis, a West German position even more than an allied position in Berlin, then it seems to me best that the allied forces move as quickly as possible to the reserve, even as the Russians intend to do on the other side. This is not a matter of "passing the buck." It is a matter of recognizing that among Germans, as among others, blood may well prove thicker than ideologies.

It will be a tragedy if men must die in this situation in any event. It will hurt the cause of freedom in Germany even more, however, if the Germans who may lose their lives in a limited conflict for access to Berlin lose them by the action of foreign forces.

I know, Mr. President, that there are grave risks in using West German forces in this fashion. Once injected into the situation at Berlin, it is difficult to foresee the contingencies which may subsequently arise. That is why I said it is time to think seriously of using them, not that it is time to use them. The risks must be weighed in the light of all the information and estimates available to the Executive. They must be weighed against the countless risks of trying to preserve, with allied forces, a status quo in a situation which will change, inevitably, once the Russians have left Berlin. There may be sound reasons for not taking this course of substituting West Germans for the allied forces at West Berlin. There are no sound reasons, however, for not exploring fully its implications within our own Government and with allied governments, or for failing to do so promptly.

Point 6: There must be a great deal of talk between Germans who are in authority in the Federal Republic and Germans who purport to be in authority in the Eastern zone.

This is the point, Mr. President, of which much has been made in comments on my remarks of February 12. It seems to me that a monumental issue has been generated here, although, in fact, no substantial issue exists.

The administration—the Western allies—have proposed talks with the Russians, at which each side might have German observers. In other words, East Germans and West Germans are both to be admitted to these talks on Germany, if the Russians accept the Western proposal.

Now, Mr. President, does anyone believe that in talks on the German problem, these Germans—East and West Germans—are going to do nothing but observe? No, Mr. President; they are obviously going to talk, the West Germans through the allied nations, the East Germans through the Soviet Union. If there is a difference between official policy and what I suggested in this respect, it is certainly a minor one. If I may draw an analogy, perhaps I can make the difference clear. I suggested, in effect, that the Germans—East and West—go off into another room and try to come up with concrete proposals on the problem of German unification, which they would then lay before the allied powers and the Soviet Union, for approval and for guarantee.

Many of those who have commented on this proposal have said in effect: "No. That is a dangerous procedure." They have said—those who endorse present official policy on this point—that the West Germans must whisper in the ear of the allies what they think should be done about unification and the East Germans must whisper in the ear of the Soviet Union. Then, the Western allies and the Soviet Union will add their own thoughts and try, out of the conglomeration, to reach an agreement.

Mr. President, either way is agreeable to me. Out of my own limited experience at international conferences, however, I have my own views as to which way is likely to offer greater prospect for success. Those who now conduct foreign policy have theirs. I am more than willing to try their way if they believe it will work. I have a feeling, however, that before we are done with this matter of whispering in ears and the friction of no contact between the Germans, we shall be more than willing to try others.

Point 7: All-German elections may not be essential to peace and to freedom, but there must be some opportunity for the people of East Germany, as there is in West Germany, to express their political preferences and to participate in politi-

cal affairs without terror. Unless there is, the search for peace can lead to the jeopardizing of freedom.

Here again, Mr. President, I do not believe there is a basic difference between the present policies of this Government and the view which I stated. The Secretary of State made clear, long before my speech of February 12, that all-German elections need not be essential as a first step in German unification. I do not know at what stage they would become essential, nor, with all due respect, do I believe anyone else does at this time.

The Secretary has recognized that reality, and I applaud his recognition of it. I say further, however, that unless the hand of political terror begins to lift in East Germany there is a danger to freedom in any form of unification which may be tried. While this point has not been explicitly stated by the Secretary, I am sure that those who are responsible for the conduct of foreign policy are not unaware of it.

Point 8: The Western allies and the Soviet Union must guarantee for a period of time the unified Germany which may emerge from discussions among the Germans. They must see to it that Germany is neither subjected to military pressures from its neighbors nor becomes a source of military pressures to its neighbors.

Again, Mr. President, there is no disagreement on this obvious point. It has long been a part of the policy of this Government to recognize that a peace treaty for Germany, which provides for the reasonable security needs of its neighbors, including the Soviet Union, is an essential of peace. One may differ with the way this objective has been pursued, but there are few differences as to its essentiality.

Point 9: It is essential that our policy, NATO's policies, do not exclude a careful consideration—may I repeat that word, "consideration"—of the Rapacki plan, the Eden plan for a demilitarized zone in middle Europe, or similar proposals in connection with the unification of Germany, predicated—may I repeat that word, "predicated"—or contingent upon the outcome of the conferences on surprise attack, and suspension of nuclear tests now going on in Geneva.

The Western Powers have indicated an interest in negotiating a European security pact. We are now seeking an agreement, at Geneva, on the problem of nuclear testing and the prevention of surprise attack.

Further, I am given to understand that it is the policy of this Government to recognize that agreement is possible to exclude missile bases from all German soil. Similarly, that it is possible to thin out foreign forces in West Germany in return for a thinning out of Soviet forces in East Germany.

If that is the case, Mr. President, there is no basic incompatibility between the essentials that I listed and what official policy is prepared—I repeat that word, "prepared"—to do. The objective is the same. I reserve the right, however, to examine subsequently the way we are going about trying to reach it.

SIMILARITIES BETWEEN OFFICIAL POLICY AND NINE POINTS

The differences between what we are doing, as a matter of official policy, and what I suggested as the essentials of a positive Western policy on Germany, are not numerous. In official policy—without a shadow of a doubt on the part of anyone, either Democrat or Republican—we are committed to stand fast at Berlin. We are committed to the participation of Germans of both zones in the discussion of the problems of German unity. We are committed to explore ways other than all-German elections, at least as a beginning of the solution to the problem of German unity. We are prepared to consider proposals which seek to limit certain types of weapons and the alien military forces in both parts of Germany within the framework of all-European security arrangements. With these essentials, Mr. President, I expressed substantial agreement in my remarks of February 12, although I may differ in particulars with respect to the way they are being presently pursued.

DIFFERENCES WITH OFFICIAL POLICY

The basic points at which I diverge from what is present official policy, I believe, are these:

First. Official policy, in effect, says that the Russians cannot leave Berlin or the routes of access to the city from the West; certainly, that they cannot leave in spirit and, perhaps, not even in body. For my part, I would have no particular desire to see them stay, in body or in spirit, even if they could be persuaded from going, which I doubt.

Second. Official policy does not seek actively to try to bring about a unification of the municipal services and government of the two Berlins at the present time. I believe that effort should be made.

Third. Official policy does not seek to enlist the United Nations in the Berlin crisis at this time. For my part, I believe it is high time that this be done; particularly, that the conciliatory services of the Secretary General be sought.

Fourth. Official policy gives no evidence of considering replacing the thousands of allied forces in Berlin with West Germans. If we are not going to move or cannot move in the direction of trying to bring about the unity and interim neutralization of all Berlin through U.N. conciliation, then, I believe, for the reasons I have already stated, we must give serious consideration to making this replacement.

CONCLUDING COMMENTS

Finally, Mr. President, I must bring to the attention of the Senate the testimony of General Maxwell D. Taylor, the Chief of Staff of the Army before the Senate Disarmament Subcommittee on February 2, testimony which was released only last weekend. The general said, in effect, that there must be total mobilization of this Nation if we are to resist force in Berlin. I must ask: What is being done to bring about this total mobilization, or are we to assume that it will not be necessary?

I hope deeply, Mr. President, that force will not be brought into play at Berlin but there is no certain promise in present circumstances that it will not be. I reiterate my belief that if there is to be a chance to avoid its use, "a Western initiative for peace is essential."

The points which I raised in my remarks on February 12 were designed to indicate a possible direction for that initiative.

Of equal importance with the desire for peace, Mr. President, is the energy and forbearance with which this Government pursues this great need and desire of mankind. Of greatest importance is a national leadership which acts positively for peace.

If the President leads in that fashion, he will find the people of this Nation and the people of the free world will be solidly behind him.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I should like to take this opportunity to express my appreciation, and I know the appreciation of the Senate, for the very fine job the Senator from Montana has done in bringing this question before this body and the country, and in developing it in such a logical and effective way, as he did today and as he did on the previous occasion. I regret very much that illness prevented me from being here on the occasion of the previous speech on this subject by the Senator from Montana. The Senator has already inspired a great deal of very fruitful discussion of this issue, and I think the country and the Senate will benefit immeasurably from the efforts of the Senator from Montana. I wish to join all the other Senators who have complimented the Senator from Montana for his efforts, which have contributed so much to better understanding of this problem.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I thank the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations. I recall to the Senator's memory that we came to the Congress together in 1943, and since that time we have had a fairly close relationship in the foreign policy field. Of course I am indebted to the Senator from Arkansas, the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, for his kind words, for his unfailing understanding, and for his tolerance and strength over the years gone by.

Mr. President, I now wish to turn to another subject.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana has the floor.

NOTICE OF MEETING OF INTERPARLIAMENTARY UNION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I wish to give notice to the Senate that the Interparliamentary Union will meet for organizational purposes at 10 o'clock a.m. tomorrow.

Mr. President, before the Senate adjourns I should like to suggest the absence of a quorum, because I promised the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] I would do so. I will withhold that request for the time being, since other Senators desire to make remarks.

FIFTY-SECOND ANNIVERSARY OF THE SOUTHWEST AMERICAN

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I wish to take this opportunity to pay tribute to one of the leading newspapers in my State. The Southwest American, in Fort Smith, Ark., celebrated its 52d anniversary on February 15.

I think it particularly interesting to note that this paper was originally founded by a former member of this body, Col. William E. Decker, of Ohio.

Mr. President, there are only two surviving members of the original staff. Mr. Sam Gearhart, who is the only surviving member of the original editorial staff, is now vice president and general manager of the Northwest Arkansas Times, another leading paper in my State. Mr. Louis Cohen, who was circulation manager, is a successful Fort Smith businessman and philanthropist.

The paper is edited by Mr. C. F. Byrns, who is a very dear and close friend of mine. Both the city of Fort Smith and the paper have grown considerably in the last 45 years, and a great deal of this progress can be attributed to Mr. Byrns' efforts. It is a pleasure to pay tribute to such a fine paper.

RECOVERY OF GOVERNOR EGAN OF ALASKA

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, news dispatches told of the discharge today from a Seattle hospital of Gov. William A. Egan, of Alaska. He is on the slow but sure road to complete restoration of his health. Governor Egan was stricken shortly after he was elected as the first Governor of the State of Alaska, November 25 last. Since then he has undergone several surgical operations and for several days was critically ill. That he passed the crisis and won through, is due to his indomitable fighting spirit and the wonderful care he received from his physicians and surgeons in Juneau and Seattle, and from the nursing staffs in the hospitals in those cities.

Because many persons in the Capitol and elsewhere in Washington have asked me every day about Governor Egan's condition since he first became ill, I am glad to add here a personal report to that given in the news dispatches. This week I received from Governor Egan in his handwriting one of what must be the very few letters he has himself written since he became ill. Now all he is waiting for is complete recovery so he may assume the duties of his office. It is true that before this may occur another operation will be required, but this, according to what Governor Egan's surgeon told me in Seattle only last week, will be of comparatively minor nature. More recently Mrs. Egan has informed me that her husband is now making much faster progress toward recovery than in the period immediately following the critical nature of his illness. Governor Egan has been a lifelong resident of Alaska, having been born at Valdez. He served in Washington as provisional Senator under the so-called Tennessee-Alaska plan.

For many reasons I am glad to make this encouraging report—because of a long-standing personal friendship, because all Alaskans want him to be Governor of Alaska in fact as well as name as soon as possible, and because so many here have been so constantly solicitous. I am especially grateful to the Chaplain of the Senate, Dr. Harris, for the beautiful and inspiring prayer offered in this very Chamber for Governor Egan when the outlook was bleakest.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McGEE in the chair). The Chair expresses personal gratification for this good news, and is sure that it is received with great rejoicing by all other Members of the Senate.

Mr. BARTLETT. I thank the Chair.

ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION AUTHORIZATION BILL FOR 1960

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I am introducing today, by request, S. 1194, the proposed Atomic Energy Commission authorization bill for capital facilities and the cooperative atomic power program.

This bill is a revision by AEC of the legislative proposal they submitted to the Congress on last Tuesday, February 17, 1959, and which Congressman CHET HOLIFIELD, chairman of the Subcommittee on Legislation of the Joint Committee, stated was procedurally unacceptable. Congressman HOLIFIELD had reference to the fact that the line item project numbers had been omitted, and provisions for ground rules on the atomic power reactor demonstration program, including referral of the basis for proposed cooperative arrangements to the Joint Committee for review, had been eliminated. This would have given AEC wide latitude in changing the purposes of projects authorized and appropriated for by the Congress.

The AEC has revised the bill to restore line item numbers. It also provides some ground rules. However, it does not provide for Joint Committee review of the basis of proposed cooperative arrangements between AEC and power organizations. As discussed later there may be additional questions on procedural problems.

Although the bill does contain procedural changes, the projects and amounts authorized remain the same. Thus section 101 authorizes $115,500,000 for line items for the whole program of facilities for weapons, raw material and production, and research and development. A total amount of $49,500,000 is authorized for civilian experimental and prototype reactors in sections 110, 111, and 112.

In order to permit the Commission to explain its program as proposed, Vice Chairman DURHAM and myself are introducing the revised bills by request. We should like to make clear, however, that we and some of our colleagues have some serious reservations as to the adequacy of the program, projects, and policies recommended.

For example, the AEC request of $115,500,000 for line item projects compares with the amount of $386 million authorized for the current fiscal year 1959; $259 million for 1958; $319 million for 1957; and $269 million for 1956.

The amount of the AEC recommendation is, of course, not all the Commission's fault. AEC requested a total of $186 million and the Bureau of the Budget cut them to $115,500,000, or a reduction of 38 percent.

Last year AEC requested a total of $193 million in its authorization bill. The Joint Committee recommended and the Congress authorized $386 million, an increase of $193 million. This increase included additions for the Hanford convertible reactor, certain atomic reactor design studies, and additional research facilities. The Commission has apparently found use for these added projects, but has been holding up certain others.

This year, in line with our established practice, the Joint Committee through its Subcommittee on Legislation will hold hearings on the 1960 authorization proposal to determine whether additional projects should be added and whether some projects should be deleted. We will be concerned with weapons, production, and research, as well as with military reactors and civilian atomic power projects.

But the civilian atomic program will undoubtedly receive close scrutiny. This program, due to the efforts of the Joint Committee and others, has been increasing, both in terms of capital facilities and funds authorized in the cooperative power reactor demonstration program. However, a year or two ago the imposition of arbitrary budgetary ceilings began to be felt as to authorization of future projects.

For fiscal year 1958 a total of $129,915,000 was authorized in the power reactor demonstration program for eight projects in process of negotiation for total 431,500 kilowatts of electric power. In addition, $48,700,000 was authorized for line item experimental reactors for AEC construction. But for fiscal year 1959 only an additional $25 million was requested for the power demonstration program. $66,550,000 was authorized for line item projects, many of which had been added or urged by the Joint Committee. In addition, $145 million was authorized for the Hanford convertible reactor which could make a contribution to atomic power technology.

More important, during the current fiscal year 1959 since July or August 1958 when funds were authorized and appropriated, AEC has not proceeded with construction of the Kaiser-ACF gas-cooled reactor prototype authorized and appropriated for by the Congress. Moreover, AEC has not proceeded to invite additional proposals for its power reactor demonstration program.

Thus, at the present time AEC appears to be on dead center in its atomic power program. This is reflected also in the over-all program itself since in the last year or so only one new wholly privately financed project—the PG & E Humboldt project—and one proposed

cooperative project—the Philadelphia Electric-General Dynamics project—have been seriously proposed. Each of these is of a modest size, and one is quite advanced.

It is in the above context that the Joint Committee and the Congress must view the legislative proposal submitted by the Atomic Energy Commission for its civilian reactor program. The Commission is proposing $30 million for a small process steam prototype, and a flexible experimental reactor, to be constructed by AEC, and a small prototype plant for a cooperative or public power body, and a 50,000 kilowatt for a private power organization. In addition, AEC proposes $14,500,000 for research and development assistance for the Philadelphia Electric-General Dynamics project, and $5 million for miscellaneous research and development for various projects. In addition AEC proposed to modify the Kaiser-ACF prototype project to make it an experimental reactor with a little power, cutting the funds from $51 million to $30 million. Such a proposed adjustment can hardly justify its being called new project for 1930, especially since the law requires AEC to proceed with the original project in 1959.

Now I am sure AEC believed that the above program was a good one for fiscal 1960, especially in view of the general executive budgetary situation. We want to give them credit for good intentions. But it is the job of the Joint Committee and the Congress to see whether it is adequate to meet the objectives of achieving economic power which AEC and the Joint Committee agree upon. The AEC's own ad hoc committee had the following to say about the program:

> Since the development of nuclear power is in fact proving to be difficult and expensive, the Government has been faced with a hard choice. Either this country continues its leadership at the cost of heavy expenditure or it accepts the probability that there will be no significant nuclear power industry in this country until the technology has been developed elsewhere and can be reintroduced here. This committee knows of little support for the latter alternative.

Does the amount of $49,500,000 constitute the heavy expenditures required? Will the two small and one medium-sized reactors proposed by AEC keep us in front? What about the current year we have lost? Where will the reactors come from after the current crop scheduled for completion in 1960–62 are on the line? They must be authorized and designed in the next year or so with construction following immediately thereon.

It is for the above reasons that the Joint Committee will want to consider additional projects both in terms of making modest advances on existing technology and also to proceed with promising reactor types through the prototype stage.

Accordingly, I would think that the Joint Committee will want to consider authorizing one or two experimental prototype reactors for AEC construction, under contract, at its own installations with the electric power absorbed at the site. We have had favorable testimony in our current hearings on a heavy water moderated and cooled natural uranium reactor prototype. The Congress authorized a design study on this reactor, which will soon be available. This type of reactor has been proposed by AEC for construction twice in the last few years, but has been blocked each time by the Budget Bureau. A reactor of this type was originally recommended by the Joint Committee's distinguished reactor adviser, Dr. W. H. Zinn, in its hearings in 1956.

An organic reactor prototype also appears to merit consideration at this time. AEC has had a small reactor experiment of this type in operation and has the small reactor for the Piqua project designed and ready for construction. Designs and proposals for large-scale organic reactors have been made in Italy, and will undoubtedly be made for the Euratom program by several manufacturers. But before it is likely that many large-scale reactors are bought, utilities both abroad and here will want to see us going forward with an intermediate prototype of a size large enough to prove out large-scale operation. I would think a size of 50,000 to 100,000 kilowatts to be sufficient, although I recognize opinions may differ. AEC has proposed another organic experimental reactor of small size, but last year testified that such an experiment should not preclude going ahead with a prototype.

In addition to the above types there may be other promising types which should be considered. We will want to review the report of the Edison Electric Institute, the JCAE staff study, the AEC ad hoc committee, and AEC's past statements for suggestions. Of interest in this connection, and for other reasons, would be the proposed prototype reactor to utilize nuclear superheat which is being designed in cooperation with the Puerto Rican Water Resources Authority. We also may wish to consider a reactor prototype for installation in a tanker.

With respect to established reactor types, we may wish to authorize one or two additional prototypes the next step up in size from those proposed by AEC. For example, we may wish to consider assistance on a demonstration prototype for private construction in the size range of 75,000 to 150,000 KWE. We may also wish to consider an additional second round proposal for a prototype in the 20,000 to 60,000 kilowatt range for construction in cooperation with municipal organization or cooperative or other public body.

In addition to considering necessary increases in the program, the Joint Committee will also wish to consider the proposed cuts announced by AEC this week. We will wish to make sure that the cutbacks are motivated by technical considerations, rather than the need to obtain funds under stringent budget ceilings.

The proposed methods of administration for the program will also require consideration. AEC has proposed a capital grant of up to 50 percent of the cost of a private nuclear facility. We will wish to examine the ground rules which AEC may have in mind for this type of arrangement. AEC has been quite vague in this respect and this method is fraught with many difficult problems.

I hope these hearings can be conducted on a constructive basis, with the AEC staff showing us the advantages as well as the problems of the types we are considering. We hope they will do the same with what AEC is proposing. We would naturally expect AEC laboratories, and contractors to have full freedom to express their views on the various proposals.

It is only by complete cooperation that we will be able to accelerate the atomic power program. I regret that the working relationship developed near the end of the last session between the Commission and the Joint Committee and their respective staffs did not continue into this session. During the last session we had excellent cooperation on the Euratom legislation and in developing a statement on the atomic power program. The AEC Commissioners even supported our idea of a "convertible" reactor for Hanford which was not in their authorization proposal.

I hope and believe that some improvements can be made in our working relationships, and have been assured by AEC Chairman McCone that the Commission will cooperate to this end. Accordingly the first hearings on the authorization bill which I have introduced today will start tomorrow with understanding, and, I hope good feelings on both sides. I trust that the results will be of great benefit to the whole atomic program.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY NEXT

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, in accordance with the previous order, I now move that the Senate adjourn until 12 o'clock noon on Monday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 43 minutes p.m.), in accordance with the order previously entered, the Senate adjourned until Monday, March 2, 1959, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate February 26, 1959:

United Nations

Henry J. Heinz II, of Pennsylvania, to be the representative of the United States of America to the 14th Session of the Economic Commission for Europe of the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations.

Diplomatic and Foreign Service

Mrs. Clare Boothe Luce, of Connecticut, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Brazil, vice Ellis O. Briggs.

Circuit and District Judges

The following-named persons to the offices indicated:

Bailey Aldrich, of Massachusetts, to be U.S. circuit judge for the first circuit, vice Calvert Magruder, retired.

Latham Castle, of Illinois, to be U.S. circuit judge for the seventh circuit, vice Philip J. Finnegan, deceased.

Anthony Julian, of Massachusetts, to be U.S. district judge for the district of Massachusetts, vice Bailey Aldrich, elevated.

Leonard P. Walsh, of the District of Columbia, to be U.S. district judge for the District of Columbia, vice Bolitha J. Laws, deceased.

THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA REDEVELOPMENT LAND AGENCY

Francis F. Healy, of the District of Columbia, for reappointment as a member of the District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency, for a term of 5 years, effective March 4, 1959.

IN THE ARMY

The following-named officers for promotion in the Regular Army of the United States, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3284 and 3298. All officers are subject to physical examination required by law:

TO BE FIRST LIEUTENANTS

Bean, Loring B., O78225.
Bear, Ben H., 2d, O73543.
Besel, Arlen D., O73491.
Bradby, Harold N., Jr., O73989.
Bramlet, James W., O78573.
Brassert, Charles A., Jr., O81590.
Burgoon, Kenneth L., O83641.
Callahan, James J., O78255.
Conneely, Martin F. X., O84077.
Del Camp, Adrian L., O81619.
Donner, William O., Jr., O73998.
Graham, Robert L., O77413.
Hanmer, Stephen R., Jr., O77427.
Hargett, Paul D., O78338.
Hatcher, Walter L., O81653.
Herlik, Querin E., O84084.
Jacobson, Jon A., Jr., O75215.
Kemp, Freddie L., O78384.
Lee, Ronald D., O73513.
Longshore, Robert L., Jr., O78406.
MacDonald, Frank H., O81692.
McCracken, Julian W., O84713.
McDermott, William L., O76408.
McNaul, James P., O73573.
McPheeters, Leander B., Jr., O74018.
Meserve, Edward N., O84527.
Miller, Carl S., Jr., O75253.
Muth, Arnold J., O74788.
Neighbors, James D., O80225.
Rabdau, James L., O84102.
Scherer, Franklin J., O84718.
Sumner, Brice S., O77718.
Taylor, Wesley L., O84533.
Thomas, David L., O84534.
Thompson, Jackson D., O74032.
Turain, George A., O84110.
Wages, Jerry S., O84537.
White, William T., Jr., O81760.

TO BE FIRST LIEUTENANTS, MEDICAL SERVICE CORPS

Chiei, Dante A., O76822.
Cuzick, William T., O84760.
Dean, John W., O84152.

TO BE FIRST LIEUTENANT, ARMY NURSE CORPS

Rhinehart, Grace A., N2836.

The following-named persons for appointment as chaplains in the Regular Army of the United States, in the grades specified, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3285, 3286, 3287, and 3288:

TO BE MAJOR

Allan, James B., O542817.

TO BE FIRST LIEUTENANTS

Combs, Louis K., Jr., O2289550.
Forsythe, Walter D., O1941877.

The following-named persons for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States, in the grades specified, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3285, 3286, 3287, and 3288:

TO BE MAJORS

Higgins, George W., Jr., O1060127.
Stansberry, Conrad L., O1304136.

TO BE CAPTAINS

Burnett, Neill C., O2210444.
Hobbs, William A., O2205135.
Richardson, Lyman C., O519704.

TO BE FIRST LIEUTENANTS

Benson, Theodore D., O4013868.
Brown, Don E., O4048950.
Crews, Roy A., O4042097.
Hedges, Oliver W., Jr., O4057774.
Ruth, Charles W., O1927828.
Smith, Jean E., O4025418.

TO BE SECOND LIEUTENANTS

Adams, Louis W., O5200590.
Bakeman, Charles D., O4077275.
Breckheimer, Donald G., O4065917.
Christensen, Neal R., O5503193.
Donnelly, Robert W., O4037870.
Greenwood, Walter A., O4047851.
Haase, William S., O5400974.
Haldane, Douglas W., O4038458.
Hampton, Emery W., O4047598.
Irish, Kenneth M., Jr., O5502812.
Irwin, Carl H., Jr., O4050034.
Johnson, Donald K., O4047254.
Jones, Clarence L., Jr., O4075258.
Kammer, Herman C., Jr., O5300542.
Klingbeil, Richard C., O4077229.
LaMar, Jay D., O4035362.
LasCasas, Vincent A., O4016665.
Lembcke, John D., O4033602.
Love, Harold M., O4010899.
Nelson, William J., O1924741.
Rarig, David A., O4013951.
Robinson, Bobby C., O4063207.
Stockhausen, William T., O4031796.
Winslow, John E., O5204488.

The following-named persons for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States, in the grades and corps specified, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3285, 3286, 3287, 3288, 3291, 3292, 3294, and 3311:

TO BE CAPTAINS

Arbiter, David, MC, O5206333.
Baker, Frank L., DC, O4046570.
Blomer, Elizabeth A., ANC, N760882.
Chaffin, Frances V., WAC, L1010422.
Delaney, Marion P., ANC, N762405.
Holt, John E., DC, O2210983.
Kobayashi, Herbert M., DC, O4046554.
Moore, Leota M., ANC, N737746.
Wood, Robert L., JAGC, O956312.

TO BE FIRST LIEUTENANTS

Briot, William R., MSC, O4019673.
Cabell, Ben M., MSC, O995047.
Demaree, Gale E., MSC, O1930183.
Donato, Joseph J., MSC, O1880236.
Easton, Howard V., MSC, O4006814.
Eslick, Joyce E., WAC, L1020660.
Green, Ira J., MC.
Hawkins, William H., MSC, O4006287.
Hughes, Joe C., MSC, O4049012.
Hovind, Virginia D., ANC, N805743.
Jezouit, Helen R., ANC, N902292.
Rupert, Harry W., Jr., JAGC, O2295189.

TO BE SECOND LIEUTENANTS

Bayne, Calvin, MSC, O4059789.
Black, Edward J., Jr., MSC, O5400949.
Bock, William, Jr., MSC, O5301942.
Borek, Thomas W., MSC, O5002183.
Boroski, Marvin R., MSC, O5502119.
Brand, Fred C., MSC, O5505137.
Brooks, Benjamin A., MSC, O5504614.
Cancilla, Anthony G., Jr., MSC, O4067007.
Casasanta, John J., MSC, O4069971.
Cooper, James D., MSC, O2287360.
Danielson, John J., MSC, O4065931.
Emmons, Bobby B., MSC, O5401482.
Franck, Charles D., MSC, O5302368.
Gaffney, John P., MSC, O5701788.
Glynn, Michael G., MSC, O5201059.
Gourley, John H., MSC, O2288995.
Herndon, Joseph E., Jr., MSC, O2288960.
Hickey, George J., Jr., MSC, O4065551.
Hobbs, Robert J., Jr., MSC, O5301761.
Jenkins, William N., MSC, O5505924.
King, Robert M., MSC, O5505197.
Kleber, Robert E., MSC, O5000128.
LaLuzerne, Ronald J., MSC, O4060291.
Leach, William O., MSC, O5506543.
McMahon, George E., MSC, O5205563.

The following-named distinguished military student for appointment in the Medical Service Corps, Regular Army of the United States, in the grade of second lieutenant, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3285, 3286, 3287, and 3288:

Cobbs, John R.

The following-named distinguished military students for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States, in the grade of second lieutenant, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3285, 3286, 3287, and 3288:

Barrow, John P.
Fleming, Lynn M.
Gracey, Lloyd F., Jr.
Krause, David H.
Lamb, Richard D.
MacAlister, James N.
Mezins, Nikolajs
Sharp, John B.
Young, Leon A.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 26, 1959

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Amos 5: 24: *Let judgment run down as waters, and righteousness as a mighty stream.*

O Thou great God of all goodness, may our minds and hearts daily turn instinctively unto Thee to learn what Thou dost will and command.

We pray that the strifes and divisions which exist among the nations of the earth may soon come to an end and that men everywhere may be united in the bonds of a strong and abiding fellowship.

Grant that the blessings of Thy grace and favor may continue to rest upon the citizens of our beloved country as we pursue the ways which make for peace and brotherhood.

Hear us in the name of our Lord and Saviour. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATION NO. 553

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that executive communication No. 553, referred to the Committee on Armed Services on February 12, 1959, be rereferred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

WATERSHED PROTECTION AND FLOOD PREVENTION ACT

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication, which was read and referred to the Committee on Appropriations:

FEBRUARY 25, 1959.

Hon. SAM RAYBURN,
The Speaker, U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the provisions of section 2 of the Watershed Pro-

tection and Flood Prevention Act, as amended, the Committee on Agriculture has today considered the work plans transmitted to you by Executive Communication 606 and referred to this committee and unanimously approved each of such plans. The work plans involved are:

STATE AND WATERSHED

Kansas and Nebraska: Walnut Creek.
Mississippi: Gray's Creek.
Ohio: Upper Wabash.
Oklahoma: Salt Creek.

Sincerely yours,

HAROLD D. COOLEY,
Chairman.

DR. FLORENCE RENA SABIN

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON].

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I wish to take this occasion to invite the Members to attend a special ceremony at 2 p.m. this afternoon in the Capitol rotunda. At that time the State of Colorado will present its first entry in Statuary Hall.

I was one of those who had the great fortune to know the person who will be permanently honored here beginning today, and indeed I was fortunate to have had a hand, while serving in the Colorado General Assembly, in the resolution that chose this famous Coloradan for this signal honor.

Many States have chosen to honor men who have been political or military leaders, but we have chosen to honor a woman. She held no great elective office, and she never ran for office. She was, however, like others honored in this Capitol, a great pioneer. Dr. Florence Rena Sabin was born in the congressional district I represent, in a frontier mining community still called Central City. Her father and mother were pioneers in the historical sense, in the Colorado gold rush. Indeed, this year we commemorate the centennial of our gold discovery with a year-long festival called the "Rush to the Rockies."

Dr. Sabin was a pioneer in her own right and in many ways. Orphaned at an early age, she suffered adversities with no family in a rough mountain environment, but rose to surmount them through a devotion to education and human welfare which has left its mark. Dr. Sabin was a pioneer in many ways. Just contemplate some of her firsts:

First woman elected to honorary life membership in the New York Academy of Sciences.

First woman to earn a medical degree from Johns Hopkins.

First woman to teach at Johns Hopkins Medical School, or any college of medicine.

First woman member of the Rockefeller Institute for Medical Research.

First woman to serve as president of the American Association of Anatomists.

First woman to be elected to the National Academy of Sciences.

First and only Coloradan to win a place in the National Hall of Fame.

Finally, the first Coloradan to be memorialized in the Nation's Capitol.

But Dr. Sabin was more than a pioneer in the limited first sense. Her research on the lymphatics, the blood cells and vessels, bone marrow, and tuberculosis, have won for her the highest recognition of her profession. Indeed, 4 years after she joined the staff of the Rockefeller Institute for Medical Research, the institute's head of medical research, Dr. Simon Flexner, called her the greatest living woman scientist and one of the foremost scientists of all time. If you like, she was a pioneer in her work on the structure of the lymph glands and the lymphatic process.

Her pioneering work lives on, as living researchers build on the knowledge she acquired for the field of medicine. I am proud to say she was the finest kind of soldier, fighting all mankind's war against disease, just as in her life she also fought discrimination against women, and bigotry.

Mr. Speaker, she was a pioneer even in what should have been her retirement. She served Colorado in advanced years when one might have expected her to be resting from her lifelong labors. Her strong conscience aroused by the limitations of the public health facilities that she found in her native State, she toured Colorado many times to arouse public interest. Her crusade revitalized our whole public health program.

Dr. Sabin was also a great teacher, but her talents were not confined to the classroom, the laboratory, nor even to the cause of public health. The U.S. Senate in her late years honored her by appointing her to the advisory council on social security, named by our distinguished late Senator Eugene Millikin. She served with distinction and helped that council prepare reports that contributed appreciably to the reforms since enacted to improve our social security program.

Even then, however, Dr. Sabin was not allowed to retire. Mayor Quigg Newton of Denver, aware of her deep love of humanity, named her to be manager of health and welfare in that rapidly growing metropolis. She cleaned out disease-breeding trash dumps, improved sewage disposal, and got rid of rats. Denver's infant and maternal mortality rates reached a new low, and the city's tuberculosis death rate was halved.

Mr. Speaker, it was my great good fortune to know Dr. Sabin in both of these last two capacities, and to come to appreciate her great humanity, her deep humility, her scholarly wisdom, and her infinite patience.

Likewise, Mr. Speaker, it is my good fortune today to serves as a Member of Congress and be able to participate in our reception of this lasting bronze memorial. It is a recognition that her great life so deservedly merits.

Again, let me repeat my invitation to all my colleagues to share with us of Colorado in this dedication today at 2 p.m.

THE LATE SID SIMPSON

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN].

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, I have the sad duty—one which I little thought would ever befall me—of officially announcing to the House of Representatives the death of our beloved colleague, SID SIMPSON, who passed away on October 26, 1958.

Congressman SIMPSON had represented the 20th Illinois District since the 78th Congress; and it was on October 26, 1958, while he was campaigning for reelection to this Congress that he was stricken with a fatal heart attack only moments after dedicating a new hospital at Pittsfield, Ill. His beloved wife, EDNA SIMPSON—whom we are honored to have with us as a Member of this body—was at his side at the time of his death.

Representative SIMPSON was born in Carrollton, Ill., on September 20, 1893, and received his education at the Carrollton public school. He served his country with the American Expeditionary Forces during World War I, and was one of the founders of the American Legion. He was a businessman, having had his own business for 40 years. Always active in politics, he had just retired as chairman of the Greene County, Ill., Republican Committee—a post he had held for 28 years.

His friendliness and his devotion to his duties were his two outstanding characteristics. He attained recognition and high rank on the important Agriculture Committee and served as chairman of the District of Columbia Committee during the 83d Congress. He, also served as a member of the National Republican Congressional Committee, and as vice chairman of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress.

Our late beloved colleague used his every honest effort to bring about a lasting world peace; communism had no greater foe. He dedicated himself to the proposition that we have the "best form of Government for the people in the history of the world," and he emphasized that we must fight to keep it the best Government.

He believed that honor went to those who achieved success by hard work and he practiced that principle. He also believed that it was the duty of the Government to give the people the kind and the amount of government they need at a price they can afford to pay.

Our late colleague is survived by his charming wife, and two lovely daughters, Mrs. Arthur Stoffel, Jr., of Racine, Wis., and Janet, who is working with her mother to carry on the fine representation Congressman SIMPSON for so many years afforded the people of the 20th Illinois District.

There was no formality about our beloved colleague; he was known as "SID" to all of us.

SID was a lovable soul, and it was my privilege to have had him as a close, personal friend. He possessed the finest of traits—as a husband, as a father, as a friend, as a legislator, and as a businessman. He had an unequaled sense of humor, and how we miss it in these Halls. SID was loyal, always sincere, always fair.

His loss is such a personal one with me that it is difficult for me to say all that is in my heart.

When I think of SID, I can only console myself with the oft-quoted and

beautifully expressed words of James Whitcomb Riley:

I cannot say and will not say
That he is dead. He is just away.
With a cheery smile and a wave of the hand
He has wandered into an unknown land
And left us dreaming how very fair
It needs must be, since he lingers there.

And you—Oh, you, who have the wildest yearn
For the old-time step and the glad return,
Think of him faring on, as dear
In the love of there as the love of here.
Think of him still as the same, I say,
He is not dead—he is just away.

My profound sympathy goes out to Mrs. SIMPSON, to Janet, to Martha. I can only say that time will bring them consolation in their many cherished memories of SID; in the knowledge that his life was full and overflowing with kindness, good deeds, and devotion to his family and country.

Our dear friend SID has not left our midst—"He is just away."

Mr. AMENDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, no one could have a closer friend, nor a better one, than I had in SID SIMPSON. We consulted with each other on many matters, each of us well knowing that we could always rely upon an utterly frank expression of opinion. Whether he agreed with you or not, SID was one of those individuals that said exactly what he thought. I always found in him a man of convictions with the courage of his convictions to express them frankly.

SID was an outstanding Member of this body. He served his district well. This is attested to by the number of years he served with us. As a member of the Committee on Agriculture, he contributed much to the farm area he represented and contributed much to our deliberations on various farm problems.

He had a keen sense of humor. Often his humor in stories and anecdotes were not solely to amuse but to make a point. With an anecdote he could say more pointedly and more emphatically than many of us could say with many words.

With the passing of SID SIMPSON there is indeed a void in this House. I miss him not only as a colleague. I miss him as a personal friend of long standing.

His lovely wife is serving here in his place. I extend to her, and to his two wonderful daughters my sincere sympathy. Theirs is a great loss. We share that loss with them.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MASON].

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, the sudden and untimely death of our colleague SID SIMPSON is evidence of the fact that in life we are in the midst of death. It is difficult on occasions like this to find proper and adequate words to express our feelings. Because I feel the inadequacy of my vocabulary to express the proper feeling, I shall use the beautiful words of an unknown poet who expressed the hope and faith that we all need, and consolation and solace for those who have been left behind.

The poem is entitled "There Is No Death."

There is no death! the stars go down
To rise upon some other shore,
And bright in heaven's jeweled crown
They shine forevermore.

There is no death! the dust we tread
Shall change beneath the summer showers
To golden grain, or mellow fruit,
Or rainbow tinted flowers.

There is no death! although we grieve
When beautiful familiar forms
That we have learned to love
Are torn from our embracing arms.

Although with bowed and breaking heart,
With sable garb and silent tread
We bear their senseless dust to earth,
And SAY that they are dead.

They are not dead! they have but passed
Beyond the mists that blind us here
Into the new and larger life
Of that serener sphere.

Tho' disenthralled and glorified,
They still are here and love us yet:
The dear ones they have left behind
They never can forget.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN].

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, I join with my good friend, the chairman of the Illinois Republican delegation, Mr. ALLEN, in paying tribute to a beloved friend and colleague.

During his many years in Congress SID SIMPSON won the respect and esteem of all of us regardless of political faith. He was a man of great ability and of fine courage and was devoted to the service of his State and country. As a member of the Committee on Agriculture and the District of Columbia, he made notable contributions.

He was a man of solid commonsense and had a practical knowledge of problems that gave him great influence among his associates.

In the passing of SID SIMPSON his legion of friends have suffered a great loss, and to Mrs. SIMPSON and her family we extend our sincere sympathy. To Mrs. SIMPSON, who is so bravely and efficiently carrying on the work of her beloved husband, we particularly voice our deep regrets.

SID SIMPSON served his day and generation with distinction, and he will be ever remembered as a good, true friend and a great American.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT].

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I join the distinguished gentleman from Illinois and his colleagues from that great State in their expression of tribute to the life and service of our late beloved colleague. It was my honor and privilege to serve for many years on the Committee on Agriculture with SID SIMPSON. He was one of the finest members of our committee, as, indeed, he was one of the finest Members of this House. He was a man of great ability. He was kind. He was considerate of others. He had a sense of humor which carried him through the many problems which confronted him as a representative of a great district in a troublesome era.

I join the gentleman in extending to his widow, our distinguished colleague, Mrs. SIMPSON, and their children my own personal regrets, and I extend to them, too, the deepest sympathy of Mrs. Albert in their bereavement. They have lost a wonderful husband and father. We have all lost a dear friend. Our country has lost a great legislator and statesman.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Illinois [Mrs. CHURCH].

Mrs. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, to many of us it is incredible that we are here called upon to pay tribute to our own SID SIMPSON, whose warmth of heart, whose gaiety of spirit, seem so close that we cannot yet realize that he has gone. He represented a great State, and a great district in that State. I think perhaps more than any other man in the House he would often say: "I know what my district thinks of this." He never failed to vote that way.

I like to think of him as I knew him as a friend, as I saw him with his family, as I watched him walk among his own people, humble, capable, full of the confidence that a man who has succeeded by his own effort manages to achieve. I like to think of him as he was here last summer, still laughing with us, still loving to play an occasional trick on LES ARENDS by going down to the floor of the House indicating that he might change his vote, when he had no intention of doing so. I like to think of him as he stood and said, when others left, "There is no death." Today we know that to be true about SID SIMPSON himself. We, of Illinois, will always miss his practical mind, his keen judgment, and his warm friendliness. We know something else—we know that with full vigor, with unstinting industry, with unsurpassed loyalty to our great country, he gave his yesterdays that we who remain may carry on today and tomorrow in the path that he outlined so clearly for us.

To his family I continue to offer my understanding and affectionate sympathy. We, who loved him too, appreciate the depth of their loss.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to my colleague, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SPRINGER].

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I wish I could gather together all of those who have served in this House since 1940. I know they would join me in saying "In losing SID SIMPSON we have lost a friend."

SID SIMPSON was a man of deep conviction and sincere in his devotion to the political philosophy which he advocated. His long record in the Congress is evidence of his ability to sustain that belief.

His was a full life and his achievements for his own people were countless. For almost 30 years he served his community, his State, and his Nation—in one capacity or another.

Thomas Carlyle, in a great essay, said that the truly great man was one who possessed a healthy soul, attuned to the laws of God, as well as a healthy body, attuned to the laws of nature. During

the years I knew SID SIMPSON, I found him possessed of this standard of true greatness.

All of us in the House, regardless of party, looked upon SID SIMPSON with an affection that was not only deep but personal. And in his community he was regarded as a friend by every family who hoped he would drop in for a visit.

This genuine and unaffected interest in other's problems was the characteristic that set him apart from other men.

He was gentle, he had the gentleness of a strong man who had no need to cover up weakness. He was witty and it was a kindly wit which carried not a trace of malice.

As a result, people who knew him were happy with him and sad when he was sad. This resulted in close friendships often denied us who do not have these rare qualities.

Death must come to all of us, at some time. I wonder if many of us could have met death at a better or more appropriate time.

He was dedicating a hospital in his district. For one who had a serious ailment for so long—and keeping it to himself—he must have realized the value of such an institution. I cannot believe that SID SIMPSON could have chosen a better opportunity to depart this life than that which fate directed for him.

He was doing what he liked best—helping others in a great cause—speaking for better health facilities for his people.

I have been his friend—and he mine—for over 10 years. He was a public servant whose counsel and advice I sought and respected. In SID SIMPSON, I lose not only a good friend but a valued colleague of whom I have only the fondest and happiest of recollection and experience.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HOEVEN].

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, SID SIMPSON and I came to Washington together as Members of the 78th Congress. Throughout the years we were closely associated as members of the Committee on Agriculture. Representing agricultural districts, we had many common interests and problems.

SID SIMPSON was one of the most astute politicians I have ever known. If I am not mistaken, he served as Republican county chairman of his home county in Illinois throughout his service in the Congress. SID never had any trouble in being reelected, and his name was so well known in his district that upon his passing his widow was elected to take his place without any difficulty.

SID SIMPSON liked to tell stories, and some of the gems coming from his lips were priceless. He was well liked and respected by his colleagues and a host of friends. He was an able Representative who was very zealous in looking after the interests of his constituents. Conservative in thinking, he was that type of rugged American who thoroughly believed in the Constitution and the rights and prerogatives of the States. One always knew where SID SIMPSON stood on controversial issues, and once having made up his mind, he adhered to his honest convictions.

I regret SID'S sudden passing. The Committee on Agriculture does not seem the same without him. The memory of his service here will linger with us in the days ahead. SID served well his day and generation, and I am confident that this old world is just a little better because SID SIMPSON lived and walked among us.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK].

Mr. MCCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I was very grieved when I read of the death of my late dear friend, SID SIMPSON. God never made anyone better than SID SIMPSON. I do not know what more I can say. He was one of the grandest men I have ever met or that anyone ever will meet in the journey of life. I could talk about him all day, about the fine qualities he possessed and what he symbolized. I will make my remarks short and simply say the good Lord never made anyone better than SID SIMPSON.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BYRNES].

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I am sure the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN] in his opening remarks expressed what is in the hearts of all of us with respect to our late colleague, SID SIMPSON. Certainly he was a conscientious legislator and public servant, and to all of us a wonderful friend. We all, I am sure, will miss him greatly.

To his wife and daughters I wish to express my heartfelt sympathy.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. O'HARA].

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, SID SIMPSON represented as much as any man I ever knew the spirit of Illinois. His were the attributes of simplicity, of humility, of industry, of understanding of persons on all levels, and of straightforwardness that characterized Abe Lincoln. In many ways he seemed to me a modern Lincoln. He had no affectations. He never bowed the knee to pretense. He was as gracious with the humblest as with the mightiest. This, Mr. Speaker, is one of the truest measures of greatness. No person is ever great who has in his character the flaw of pretense, because to pretend is to deny the purpose of man's creation as a human instrumentality of God's purpose.

No man ever lived further from pretense than SID SIMPSON. No man ever lived closer to all his fellow men—and, Mr. Speaker, I would say in this closer to God—than SID SIMPSON. And always he lived with a smile. Always when I shall think of SID SIMPSON I will think of that smile of his, a smile that reflected his love for his fellow man and his faith that all was for the best. When one has that faith of SID SIMPSON'S the problems of the moment are dissolved in the assurance that the storms of the moment will be succeeded by the sunshine.

SID SIMPSON was my beloved friend for many years. Every day the horizons of my world narrow. They were very much narrowed when the word came to me that SID SIMPSON had passed away. To his widow, always so close to him in life, and to the children so deep in his affection goes my profound sympathy. They have the heritage of priceless memories.

SID SIMPSON was a Republican, a Republican Member of this Congress, and a Republican leader in his district and in Illinois. Yet I do not think that party lines counted too much with SID SIMPSON and his constituents. There are differences in political philosophies and in partisan approach to legislation but the clash of philosophies and of partisanship is, as we in the Congress all know, magnified beyond the measure of reality. SID SIMPSON was elected from a district in Illinois that had sent to the Congress one of its great Speakers, the Honorable Henry A. Rainey, a Democrat. He came from a district that had sent to the House the Honorable Scott Lucas, a Democrat who later was elected to and became majority leader in the other body. It was a Democratic district and I doubt if any other person than SID SIMPSON could have carried it for the Republican Party. Election after election he won in a gallop, not necessarily because he was a Republican, but certainly in no little measure because he was just SID SIMPSON. In his passing Illinois has lost a distinguished and beloved son who carried on in his service to the Nation the finest traditions of our State.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALLEN. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, last fall in the closing days of the campaign, I was terribly shaken, when driving home from one of my meetings, to learn via the radio waves of SID SIMPSON'S fatal heart attack that evening. None of us who knew SID so well would have suspected that he would be taken from us so suddenly. Never did I hear him complain of suffering any physical discomfort, and if he did, he was not the kind to burden another with his distress. While small of stature, he was a pillar in his community and a tower of strength to all those who knew him, loved him, and respected him.

I cannot help but recall how evident this was when we attended the funeral in SID'S hometown of Carrollton, Ill. When the hosts of people gathered from far and near to pay their last respects, we found the citizens of Carrollton stunned and sorely grieved for one who lived and played so big a role in their community. Flags at half-mast stretched a cordon around the entire downtown area, and one could feel with heavy heart and deep emotion that here was a man for whom the entire Nation mourned.

Much has already been spoken, and many more kind words will be said about the life and character of SID SIMPSON this afternoon. I would simply concur in all the good things spoken about SID, for to me he was always considerate of others, although standing firm for his own convictions. He was soft spoken but determined; gentle but unwavering. I sought his wise counsel and good judgment many times and always found it to be sound.

Personally I have suffered the loss of a warm friend and fatherly counselor. This House has lost one of its most tried, tested, and valued Members. The country has lost a devoted, dedicated, patriotic public servant. And to EDNA and the girls, I know the loss is unspeakable, and hope some small measure of comfort will be theirs in the knowledge that we here share their profound loss.

Mr. BOYLE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALLEN. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BOYLE].

Mr. BOYLE. Mr. Speaker, I wish to pay tribute to a man whose passing has filled our hearts with sorrow, our late colleague from the 20th Congressional District of Illinois, the Honorable SID SIMPSON.

He was born at Carrollton, in Greene County, Ill., where he was engaged in business for 30 years. In that community he served his political party as Republican chairman of Greene County for a period of 30 years.

During World War I, SID SIMPSON was with the American Expeditionary Force in France and became a charter member of the American Legion.

On January 3, 1943, he first took the oath of office in this Chamber as an elected Representative of the 20th District of Illinois and until the time of his death, October 25, 1958, he was a faithful servant of his people.

Our late colleague performed his duties and pursued his way with little agitation or acclaim. He was a sincere and able representative of his constituency, as indicated by the press comments at the time of death—that he was "an unbeatable candidate."

As senior Republican member of the House District Committee, SID SIMPSON was chairman of that committee during the 83d Congress. He had been a member of that committee since he came to Congress in 1943, and never ceased his activity and interest in legislation relating to his Nation's Capital.

He was third-ranking Republican member of the House Agriculture Committee, where he had served all but the first 4 years of his 16 in Congress.

His many years of public service gave him a great knowledge of the practical side of lawmaking. He made a host of friends both in and out of Congress. He regarded the problems of others as his own. Many a citizen in his district can testify to acts of kindness by him.

During the closing weeks of the 2d session of the 85th Congress, toward the end of August, Mr. SIMPSON joined with other Members of the House of Representatives to pay tribute to a Member from Illinois who was retiring from the House. The pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD record among his remarks these words, "Only time will tell whether a person belongs to the ages." And so today we pause to pay tribute to one whose public service is now marked for recognition in the history of this legislative body.

Like most quite individuals, SID SIMPSON was a careful and consistent student of legislation. He was a great believer in the truth. He went about his work of ruling himself and of legislating for his Nation with that quiet confidence, that modest earnestness, which marks a gentleman who believes in good government.

To the people of Illinois, he was more than just a man whose material existence extended over 15 years in the Congress of the United States. One in public life certainly does not have an easy life—often criticized, misunderstood, and falsely accused. Those of us who knew this man knew him to be modest, cautious, and honest. It took fortitude and strength of character, plus an undaunted honesty, to withhold a statement of opinion upon a controversial subject until after he was satisfied that he had recognized in his thinking all the facts in the case.

In his associations as a public servant, I am reminded of one particular characteristic that stands out clearly in the minds of those who knew him, namely, his faith in his fellow men. He always behaved as a plain, straightforward, and conscientious official, meeting everybody on the same level and keeping an eye single to the public good.

To his courageous wife, and two daughters, who have carried on with exemplary faith, I extend my deepest sympathy. May their bereavement grow less poignant every day so that their loss may be only akin to pain—resembling sorrow as the mist resembles the rain.

Mr. RAYBURN. SID SIMPSON's passing touches us all deeply. He was a good and true man. His gentleness was recognized by all. He was a gentleman of the first order.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, what does one say to adequately express the deep sense of loss at the death of a friend?

Those of us who knew SID SIMPSON through the years as one of our beloved colleagues will remember him as long as memory lasts.

We will remember him for his keen sense of humor, a capacity for seeing the lighter side of life, which time after time helped so much to leaven the workaday cares here on the floor of this Chamber.

I will always remember SID, not only as a colleague but as a companion who asked nothing of his fellow men but their good will.

We will remember him for his fierce loyalty to the party of his choice, the Republican Party, for which he worked with such untiring devotion for so many, many years.

And we will remember SID SIMPSON for his effectiveness as a distinguished member of the Committee on Agriculture, to which he made so many fine contributions during his career in the Congress of the United States.

I have often said that the frequency with which a Member appears in the well of the House is not a true measure of a man's worth to the legislative processes.

Many of our most valued colleagues do their most effective work in the long hours of committee study and deliberation.

SID SIMPSON was one of those.

I received the word of his passing last fall with shock and sadness, and I miss him sorely.

To his bereaved widow, who is now among us, and to his daughters, I offer my heartfelt sympathies.

Mr. LIBONATI. Mr. Speaker, it is with deep feelings of great sorrow that I pause to eulogize the memory and lifework of my dear, intimate friend and colleague, SID SIMPSON. He departed this life on the 26th day of October 1958 scarcely a week before the eve of his election to a ninth term in the Congress.

SID SIMPSON was a true patriot—he served in the AEF in World War I and, as an active member of the American Legion Post at Carrollton, Greene County, Ill., was always in the forefront serving the veterans and their families in their needs and problems. He, as a founder of the American Legion, also attended the Legion conventions and participated in the debates and committee activities.

He was always interested in State legislative matters. He corresponded with members of the Illinois General Assembly on matters affecting business and farm interests, and during my membership—22 years in the Senate and House of Representatives—he frequently visited me in Springfield and made known his interests in these matters.

SID SIMPSON was a person of strong and positive principles and could not be swayed by purely emotional appeals or on arguments based on factless data and without the logical sequence of reason in straight thinking. He was unswerving in his loyalty to Republican principles.

He was a person who valued his friendships and enjoyed being with them. He was devoted to his family and was always happiest in the company of his dear wife, EDNA, who functioned as his business, legislative, and political partner, both in his activities in Washington and campaigning at home. He lived and died a Republican leader in his community. She experienced the ultimate proof of her public acceptance on the drafting of her candidacy and her election to the office within scarcely 1 week. It was just what he would have asked for from the Republican Party as the final blessing to his memory and career.

We loved SID and he, in his quiet, gentle, and knowing way, responded with a warmth of feeling. The Nation and Illinois have lost a valued statesman and patriot. We mourn and pray with his two lovely daughters and his sweet, loving wife, the talented Congresswoman, EDNA SIMPSON, that God grant him his merited reward of peace everlasting, for a life of sacred service to his Nation and fellow man.

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I was grieved and shocked to learn of the sudden passing last fall of my colleague and friend, SID SIMPSON.

He always impressed me with his sincerity, his forthrightness and his utter simplicity.

I personally knew many of his constituents as prior to the last redistricting of Illinois I had the honor to represent part of the district which SID later

served. We worked in close cooperation on matters of mutual interest to the State of Illinois, and our respective districts.

SID'S people believed in his integrity and his courage to face up to an issue. They always spoke to me most highly of his fine service.

He was known as an outstanding authority on farming and dairy products, and was an able member of the House Agriculture Committee. Many of his colleagues leaned heavily upon him for advice in this field. He also had wide business experience which assured a sound approach on legislative matters.

SID was a hard worker, devoted to his duties and to his country. He had an attendance record second to none.

The State of Illinois and the Nation has lost one of its outstanding legislators and foremost citizens. Personally I have lost a warm friend, one for whom I had great regard and affection.

I join with my colleagues in expressing sympathy to his wife and family.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BASS].

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues today in paying tribute to the memory and life of SID SIMPSON. I can say that I knew him well, I liked him very much, and his passing gave me a profound grief. Some of the most pleasant experiences I have had while a Member of Congress have been in association with SID SIMPSON. I served with him on the Committee on Agriculture where I found him to be a hard worker, a sincere man, and a dedicated public servant.

I was a member of the same golf club with SID and I know him as a man who knew how to live. He enjoyed life.

In my last conversation with SID he was telling me that he hoped in the near future to have his service behind him so that he could relax and enjoy life after a busy life as a businessman and a Member of Congress.

I extend to his charming wife and his lovely daughter, my deepest sympathy and condolence in their grief.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DERWINSKI].

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, although I was not privileged to be a Member of this distinguished body when the late Honorable SID SIMPSON served as a Member from Illinois 20th District, I want to join my colleagues here today in paying tribute to this great American.

SID SIMPSON was known to all of us in Illinois for his service to the people of his district and the State. It was a sad day for the country, the State, and the Republican Party when he departed from us. We must admire men of his stature for their honest approach to government and their demonstrated integrity.

I knew of SID SIMPSON through his close friendship with my distinguished predecessor from the Fourth District of Illinois, the late Dr. William McVey, who also died in office last year. Dr. McVey spoke to me often about Congressman SIMPSON'S dedication to duty and the people of his district, and certainly his opinion of men with whom he was in daily contact can only be respected.

The respect that the late SID SIMPSON received from the people of the 20th District of Illinois for the 14 years he was their Representative serves as a public endorsement of his integrity. I know, too, that his integrity, ability, and above all his devotion to his duty as a Congressman, was known and appreciated throughout the State.

He was a great man and I join my colleagues in paying tribute to his memory.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HOFFMAN].

Mr. HOFFMAN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues in paying tribute today to the memory of SID SIMPSON. While it was not my privilege to serve with him as a Member of this House, I knew Congressman SIMPSON personally for many years and of his faithful, able and distinctive representation of the 20th District of Illinois for eight consecutive terms.

Congressman SIMPSON brought to the House a warm and deep understanding of the problems, hopes and wishes, not only of his district but the State of Illinois. His own philosophies and deep-seated devotion to his duties and responsibilities were known to every one. His complete dedication to service was certainly illustrated in his last few moments when he spoke at the dedication of a new addition to the Illini Hospital at Pittsfield.

I first knew SID as a county chairman. For 22 years he served Greene County, Ill., as its Republican county chairman. For 22 years his fellow committeemen recognized him as an outstanding leader. For 10 years the Republican county chairmen of Illinois recognized his ability by electing an officer of the Illinois Republican County Chairman's Association. His outstanding leadership and his ability to analyze political problems were known throughout the State.

I well recall an incident that happened a few years ago. I asked him to come to my county and make a speech. It involved a trip of some 400 miles, but SID appeared. The remarkable part of it was that both of his arms were broken and in casts. To me this typified the man's relentless service to his fellow human beings.

I made this statement during his lifetime, and I would like to make it again today. In my opinion, SID SIMPSON came closer to being an Abraham Lincoln than anyone else I know. His district and the State of Illinois lost an able Representative, and I, a true friend.

Mrs. Hoffman and I extend to his wife, EDNA, and all the other members of his family our deepest sympathies and warm affections.

Mr. ALLEN. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. ABERNETHY].

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join my distinguished colleague the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN] and the other Members of the Illinois delegation in the sentiment that has been expressed regarding the passing of our colleague, SID SIMPSON. I came into the Congress with SID SIMPSON in 1943. I knew him well. I learned to know him early in my service here. I was assigned to the Committee on Agriculture and also to the Committee on the District of Columbia, on which we served together. During my service on those committees I came to know and love SID SIMPSON as well as any Member I have ever known. SID was a true, devoted public servant. He was scrupulous and fair. And, as one of the Members said a moment ago, he knew how to live. Indeed he did. He lived with ease; he lived freely, and he lived a good life, a life that has been worth something to his district, and to his State, and to his country. I was shocked terribly when I learned of SID'S passing. I could hardly believe that it was so. I always enjoyed his company, and I deeply appreciated his friendship. I would like to convey to his good wife, our colleague, and his children the sympathy of my family.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. GATHINGS].

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, as I was traveling about the First District of Arkansas last fall I was deeply grieved to hear a flash over the radio in my car of the passing of my good friend, SID SIMPSON. We were closely associated for many years on the Committee on Agriculture. He served on the Cotton Subcommittee and interested himself in the problems of this important commodity. The expressions that have been made here today bring out clearly the type of man SID SIMPSON was, when it was related that he fulfilled a speaking engagement with two broken arms. As a matter of fact, he had no cotton in his district, but year in and year out he attended the meetings of that subcommittee and gave of himself in the interest of problems of the cotton farmer. He is deeply missed in the Committee on Agriculture. I have lost a true friend—a friend that put service above self.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. AUCHINCLOSS].

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Speaker, I was indeed very much shocked when I learned of the sudden and untimely death of our late colleague, SID SIMPSON, who represented so well the 20th District of Illinois.

SID SIMPSON came to Congress the same time I did and I always valued our association and his friendship. We served together for many years on the Committee for the District of Columbia and his sane, wise approach to the many problems which confronted us were stimulating and constructive. He was an understanding character with an honest and straightforward manner with everyone which won him great respect and many friends. He served his constituency assiduously and well and fulfilled his responsibilities to them with zeal and fidelity.

His widow and children must be comforted in the knowledge that he was a faithful servant and be strengthened by his example of courage and devotion to duty.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. COLLIER].

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, I deem it a solemn privilege to join my colleagues on this sad occasion in paying tribute to our former colleague, SID SIMPSON of my State. In the 2 years of my association with him, I learned to value, as most of you did, his knowledge, his wisdom, and his willingness at all times to be of assistance to all of us, particularly the new Members. It is fitting that in this session of the Congress we have his very able wife as a Member of this body to carry on the fine work that SID did for so many years. I know that we all have missed him and shall continue to do so. His district has lost a very fine Representative, and the country has lost a great American.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FEIGHAN].

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, the passing of my very dear friend, SID SIMPSON, came to me as a harsh shock. It was my privilege to come to Congress the same day SID came. For 4 years I served with him as a member of the District of Columbia Committee, and for 12 years thereafter it was my pleasure to have my office suite adjoining his. During those 16 years I came to know SID SIMPSON extremely well and I had a warm regard for him. We were neighbors in the truest sense and SID rarely left his office in the evening without saying a friendly good night. Mr. SIMPSON passed my office on his homeward way in the evening and many times when both of us had worked late, he would stop at my door for a few brief words, filled with humor, which seemed to lighten the burdens of the day. Often, on occasions during the day when I visited SID in his office, I found his cheerful mood, his friendly spirit, and his keen sense of humor as refreshing as a new day.

SID was perhaps the greatest raconteur who has ever been in Congress. His tremendous popularity was not confined to his district alone. Everyone with whom he came in contact felt the warmth and sincerity of his magnetic personality. The words of a former director of publicity for the Democratic National Committee expressed succinctly the feeling for SID by people who knew him, when he said: "How could anyone ever vote against SID?"

To Mrs. SIMPSON, their two charming daughters, and grandchildren, of whom he was so proud and to whom he was so devoted, I express my sincere sympathy.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, I knew SID SIMPSON long before I sat in this Chamber as a Member. If you lived in the area in which I live, even though almost 75 miles from Carrollton, SID's beloved home community, it would have been difficult not to know him—so general was his reputation as a good neighbor and fine friend.

I was close enough to him personally to know his fine qualities and lived close enough to his home in Greene County to know the great admiration his people held for him. His friends were found by the hundreds beyond his district boundaries, and in particular were they numerous in Madison County in my own district. They spoke with enthusiasm and respect whenever they mentioned their friend, SID SIMPSON.

I seldom made a trip home without finding many of my own personal friends solicitous about SID SIMPSON. He generated a warmth that left the kindest of feelings with everyone who had the pleasure of knowing him.

To Mrs. SIMPSON and her family I extend my deepest sympathy.

Mr. O'BRIEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, as the dean of the Democratic Illinois delegation, and as a warm personal friend of the late Congressman since 1943, I was sad to learn of his death, when on October 25, 1958, the Nation lost an outstanding Member of Congress. We lost a colleague and a friend for whom we had the highest affection and respect. The State of Illinois lost a great friend and leader. The people of the 20th District of Illinois loved him for his fearless courage, for his well-balanced judgment, and the untiring service he rendered in their behalf.

The life of SID SIMPSON, Mr. Speaker, is a wonderful example of real citizenship, of devotion to public duty, and possessing the quality of understanding the problems of those he represented.

SID SIMPSON possessed unqualified devotion to what he believed was his duty; his sudden death occurred at the conclusion of his dedication of a new wing at Illinois Community Hospital in Pittsfield, Ill.

To his brave wife, who is serving so ably in the 86th Congress, and his two daughters, I extend my sincere sympathy. I am certain they can find comfort in the splendid record of Mr. SIMPSON's life. The path of life for our colleague led from the little community in Illinois to the Capitol of the United States. Through service he accomplished this.

Today we pay tribute to SID SIMPSON; there are many things to say and lots of of ways to say them, but in eulogy to him, I say, "He was my friend."

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Speaker, I should like to join my colleagues from Illinois and other Members in paying tribute to the memory of the Honorable SID SIMPSON.

Although we were not members of the same party, I had the privilege of knowing Mr. SIMPSON for a great number of years in our home State of Illinois. He was a tireless worker in his party and the district which he represented for eight consecutive terms. He was highly respected by all who knew him.

I should like to extend my profound sympathy to Mrs. SIMPSON who now has the honor to represent the district and carry out the ideals of her late husband, and to the other members of her family.

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I was shocked and saddened when I received a message of the passing of my good friend and colleague, SID SIMPSON. I want to join with my other colleagues in expressing my feeling of personal loss in his passing.

I considered SID SIMPSON one of my closest, personal friends since we worked together for approximately 16 years on the House District Committee and interchanged as its chairman on two different occasions. We also worked together as members of the House Agriculture Committee and usually held the same opinion on proposed legislation pending before both the District and Agriculture Committees.

I found Mr. SIMPSON to be a source of strength not only in relation to the principles for which he stood, but also the soundness of his thinking at all times. Mr. SIMPSON never became excited over any proposed legislation and usually in his calm manner came up with a sound solution for practically all problems that came before the two committees on which we were privileged to serve together here in the Congress for approximately 18 years.

Mr. SIMPSON always had great respect for his fellow man and gave careful consideration to both sides of any issue that was presented to our committee. He was a great family man and I had the pleasure and privilege of seeing him and Mrs. SIMPSON on several trips during our term of service together here as Members of the U.S. Congress.

As members of the House District Committee we were continuously confronted with numerous controversial problems. We always managed to work out these problems without friction or without causing a division between the majority and the minority members of our committee.

The passing of this great statesman certainly brings a great deal of grief to all of us. I shall remember SID SIMPSON as long as I live as a great statesman and as a gentleman under all circumstances. I do not know of any man who has served in the U.S. Congress during my lifetime who had demanded respect from both sides of the aisle as completely as my good friend, Congressman SIMPSON. He was unanimously liked by both liberals and conservatives on both sides of the aisle.

Mrs. McMillan joins me in expressing our deepest sympathy to Mrs. SIMPSON and her children. I shall personally miss SID SIMPSON as a coworker and as a true friend.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I shall take advantage of this opportunity to join my colleagues in the House in paying tribute to a great American and able legislator, the Honorable SID SIMPSON, of the 20th District of Illinois, whose sudden and untimely death occurred on last October 26.

I first became acquainted with SID SIMPSON soon after I came to the House in June 1944, and we immediately became friends. I considered SID a most diligent and conscientious Member who had the confidence and respect of his colleagues on both sides of the aisle.

I shall always remember SID SIMPSON with fond memories.

The depths of sorrow we cannot tell,
Of the loss of one we loved so well;
And while he sleeps a peaceful sleep,
His memory we shall always keep.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, I was saddened to learn of the sudden death of

SID SIMPSON. SID was a good friend, a gentleman, and an able legislator.

I liked SID SIMPSON from the first time I met him. He was friendly and helpful and always went out of his way to do a good turn if he could. He was considerate and fair in all his dealings, and if he disagreed with you, he told you so. He was direct and aboveboard. Courage and honesty were among his strongest attributes.

SID regarded his congressional duties as a sacred trust, working hard and long to take care of the interests of the people he represented so well. His loss will be felt not only by his constituents, but by the entire country in no longer having the benefit of his keen intellect and mature judgment.

To his fine wife and two daughters I extend my sincere sympathy with the hope that time will heal the profound grief they now feel.

Mr. MACK of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, in SID SIMPSON Illinois had a man worthy of the honor of representing one of the most historic districts in America. SID, as he was affectionately known by all of us, represented part of the Lincoln country along the Illinois and Sangamon Rivers. Part of his district was represented by Abraham Lincoln when he served in Congress over 100 years ago. It included New Salem State Park and adjoined historic Sangamon County. SID SIMPSON lived in the Abraham Lincoln tradition. Like Lincoln, he was a Republican, but also like Lincoln he represented the common people and placed their welfare and the welfare of his country above his party. He ably and effectively represented the interests of his people in the House of Representatives. Through his efforts effective steps were taken to control the floodwaters of the Illinois and Mississippi Rivers. His record will stand as a challenge to those who follow him. Mr. Speaker, the Nation has lost one of its best legislators. The great State of Illinois has lost one of its finest citizens. The people of his district have lost one who thoroughly understood their problems. I have lost a personal friend and a good neighbor. Although of different political parties, SID counseled me when I first came to Congress some 10 years ago. He had been a close friend of my father for some 40 years. Along with my father he was a pioneer in the automotive business in downstate Illinois. His untimely death came only 5 days after my father passed away. I shall miss SID SIMPSON as he will be missed by his many friends back in Illinois and I sympathize with his wonderful family as I fully understand what a great loss this has been to them.

Mr. DAGUE. Mr. Speaker, it is with immeasurable sadness that we return to the contemplation of the untimely passing of our esteemed friend and colleague who left this life at the very peak of his career and at a time when his contributions to his State and the Nation had reached impressive proportions.

It was my great privilege to sit at his side on the Committee on Agriculture and it was a rich experience to have the benefit of his down-to-earth philosophy which was always permeated with a compelling sense of humor. In the day-to-day interchange between the members and in interrogating witnesses he displayed a firm grasp of the economics of our farm problem but never pressed his views to the point where he departed from those gentlemanly characteristics which were the hallmark of his legislative career.

This path we tread is all too short and we are made better when in the course of our journey we are permitted to travel in company with a generous, lighthearted companion such as was the one we mourn. We shall always cherish his memory and we shall remember in our devotions his charming wife and children who have carried on in his absence in a manner that would have delighted his soul. To them goes our heartfelt sympathy and the assurance that their loss has also been very real to those of us who have been honored to call him friend.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the life and accomplishments of our late colleague, SID SIMPSON.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

U.S. PARTICIPATION IN THE INTERNATIONAL ATOMIC AGENCY—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 85)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith, pursuant to the International Atomic Energy Agency Participation Act, the first annual report covering the U.S. participation in the International Atomic Energy Agency for the year 1957, in addition to the U.S. participation in the Agency's Preparatory Commission, which functioned from October 26, 1956, to October 1, 1957.

I do so with great satisfaction because the establishment of the International Atomic Energy Agency resulted from this Government's initiative in 1953 in calling for an international cooperative program to bring the incalculable benefits of the peaceful uses of atomic energy to all mankind and to prevent the diversion of fissionable material from peaceful to destructive purposes.

The work of the Preparatory Commission and the initial activities of the Agency itself were necessarily concerned with administrative problems. These included organization and recruitment of staff; initial financing and the scale of contributions; and establishing appropriate relations with the United Nations and other international organizations concerned with the peaceful uses of atomic energy. In addition, it was necessary to outline a meaningful and realistic program for the Agency to undertake in its early years.

Despite the need to concentrate on initial organizational matters, the Agency made considerable progress, during the few months of 1957 that it was in existence, in developing its substantive program through the creation of a fellowship and scholarship fund and initial consideration of offers of fissionable materials.

Since substantial progress was made toward completing the organizational phase of the Agency's activities in 1957, it was anticipated that increasing attention would be given in 1958 to matters involving the Agency's program.

The first Director General of the Agency is Mr. W. Sterling Cole, formerly a distinguished Member of the Congress, who relinquished his seat in the House of Representatives to assume the responsible position of chief administrative officer of the Agency. The United States remains pledged to make every effort to assist the Agency in achieving its high purpose.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *February 25, 1959.*

REPORT OF THE JOINT ECONOMIC COMMITTEE

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, according to the Employment Act of 1946 the Joint Economic Committee is supposed to file its report on the economic report of the President on the 1st of March. The committee has voted unanimously to request that it be given until March 9 to file its report. I ask unanimous consent that this additional time be granted the committee.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY NEXT

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY AND CALL OF THE PRIVATE CALENDAR ON TUESDAY

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that Calendar Wednesday of next week be dispensed with; and also the call of the Private Calendar on next Tuesday.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce may have until Saturday midnight to file a report on the bill H.R. 1011, the Federal airport bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

PROGRAM FOR THE WEEK OF MARCH 2

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this time to inquire of the majority leader concerning the program for the balance of this week and for next week.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I am glad to reply to the inquiry of my friend from Wisconsin.

There is no program for the remainder of today, except special orders. For next week the program is conditioned upon rules being reported out of the Committee on Rules.

Monday the Consent Calendar will be called, but I can state definitely that there will be no other legislation on that day nor any suspensions.

The Committee on Rules started hearings today on a rule for the Hawaiian statehood bill. If that rule is reported out next week in time for the bill to be brought up, and I hope the Committee on Rules will take that action, I will program the bill for consideration.

The Committee on Banking and Currency has reported out the housing bill. In all fairness, may I say that I cannot expect that a rule would be reported out next week in time for that bill to be brought up. However, if by any chance it should be reported out, I shall program the bill. But knowing the problems confronting the Committee on Rules, I believe it would be rather difficult for that committee, with the Hawaii statehood rule being before it, to come to a decision on the housing bill during the next week in time for that bill to be brought up for consideration.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. At any rate, it would be at the end of the week rather than the early part of the week?

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes. In all fairness to the Rules Committee, I doubt very much that a rule on the housing bill will be reported, but I am programming the housing bill conditionally. So I should like to make a slight reservation on whether or not that bill will come up next week. Once I give my word, of course, I keep it no matter how unfavorable a position I may find myself in.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I might say for the gentleman's information that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILDAY] brought me a bill this morning from the Committee on Armed Services which has to do with the promotion of certain officers in the armed services, a bill the committee would like to get out pretty soon. I just thought the gentleman might want to schedule that bill tentatively, too.

Mr. McCORMACK. There are two bills out of the Committee on Armed Services, may I say to the gentleman from Virginia. One is H.R. 3365, and that relates to service accreditation in relation to retired pay, and the other is H.R. 4413, relating to officer promotions in the Navy. If a rule is reported out on either or both of those bills I shall program them for next week. The gentleman understands there are two bills?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. He brought me only one.

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes; I understand there are two bills.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. What is the status of the airport bill?

Mr. McCORMACK. The committee has until midnight Saturday of this week, so I am informed, to file its report. I am not programing that because I cannot see that the situation will be such that there will be a rule out on that in time to take it up next week, so I am not putting it on the program. But if a rule should come out, I will program the bill the following week.

RESERVE COMPONENTS ARE VITAL TO OUR NATIONAL DEFENSE

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include five resolutions.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, no portion of our national defense structure is more vital than our Reserve, National Guard, and militia forces. In addition to the active duty components which are available to spring into action on a moment's notice, are those forces representing the true citizen soldiers, sailors, and airmen of our Nation who have been trained over the years in their specialties, who remain at a high pitch of combat efficiency through regular training which is integrated with their normal civilian occupation, and who have indicated their willingness to be recalled whenever necessary to defend our Nation. No nation, however prosperous, could afford to maintain on active duty all of the men and women who might be needed in time of full national emergency. But because of the patriotism of those men and women who serve in our Reserve components, we still have this great pool of trained manpower available at a moment's notice.

Because of the tremendous job which our Reserve forces are doing, and because of the special knowledge of defense matters which they have acquired by means of their service, the suggestions and recommendations of these organizations with respect to matters affecting our Defense Establishment in general and the operation and administration of our Reserve components in particular, are especially valuable.

For this reason, Mr. Speaker, it is with great pride that I lay before the Members of Congress at this time five resolutions unanimously adopted on September 13, 1958, by the Army and Air National Guard and Naval Militia Association of the State of New York at its annual conference held in Albany, N.Y. I commend these resolutions to the Members of Congress and to the members of the Armed Services Committees. I hope that Members will give these resolutions most serious consideration in connection with the matters to which they relate. As a member of the Committee on Armed Services, I am particularly happy to report that in accordance with the provisions of one of these resolutions, the House, on February 4, adopted by an overwhelming vote, H.R. 2260, a bill to extend the provisions of the Universal Military Training and Service Act for an additional 4 years.

The resolutions follow:

RESOLUTION CONCERNING SENATE BILL 3240 OF THE 85TH CONGRESS TO AMEND THE RESERVE OFFICERS' PERSONNEL ACT OF 1954

Whereas there are several provisions of the Reserve Officers' Personnel Act of 1954 that are seriously affecting the morale, growth, and potential combat capability of Air National Guard, and that these same adversary restrictive provisions will materially affect the Army National Guard in 1960; and

Whereas it has been indicated that proposed Department of Defense legislation, the Reserve Officers' Personnel Act omnibus bill, will not be submitted to the 86th Congress in sufficient time to provide the immediate relief desired; and

Whereas Senate bill No. 3240 of the 85th Congress would have provided some desirable relief by and of the Reserve Officers' Personnel Act of 1954, by providing for the following:

1. U.S. property and fiscal officers would be retained until the age of 60.

2. Removal of the "pusher" clause.

3. Removal of the phrase, "on vacancy" promotions of Air National Guard and Air Force Reserve units and mobilization designator positions.

4. Retention in units of all officers for 14 years or to the grade of major, whichever is sooner.

5. Retention in units of professional type; that is, Medical Department, Judge Advocate, Chaplains, etc., for 21 years or to the grade of lieutenant colonel, whichever is sooner.

6. Retention of Air National Guard and Air Force Reserve technicians to age 60.

7. Removal of the phrase on appointment of Reserve officers to fill mobilization requirements or active duty positions; and

Whereas Senate bill 3240 of the 85th Congress, which contained the foregoing provisions was not passed by the 85th Congress, but will be introduced in the 86th Congress convening in January of 1959: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That this association recommend and support the introduction and passage of a bill substantially the same as Senate bill 3240 of the 85th Congress in order to secure early approval of this legislation; and be it further

Resolved, That the officers of this association transmit copies of this resolution to the chairmen of the Armed Services Committees of the Congress, the Secretaries of Defense and of the Department of the Army and of the Department of the Air Force, the Members of Congress from New York, the chief of the National Guard Bureau, and the president of the National Guard Association of the United States.

RESOLUTION RELATING TO A STUDY BY AN APPROPRIATE COMMITTEE OF CONGRESS OF THE SUBJECT OF MEDICAL CARE, HOSPITALIZATION, DISABILITY RETIREMENT, AND DEATH BENEFITS FOR MEMBERS OF THE NATIONAL GUARD AND RESERVE COMPONENTS

Whereas under existing Federal law there are many cases of hardship and inequity in regard to the administration and award of medical care, hospitalization, disability retirement, and death benefits for members of the National Guard and Reserve components; and

Whereas a study by an appropriate committee of Congress of this problem and the correction of inequities is necessary and desirable and in the public interest; and

Whereas studies of other matters of comparable import and complexity have previously been undertaken by committees of the Congress of the United States, with the resulting enactment of appropriate remedial legislation: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Army and Air National Guard and Naval Militia Association of the State of New York in general conference assembled at Albany, N.Y., this 13th day of September 1958, That the officers of this association request the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the 86th Congress to refer to a standing committee of the House or to a special committee, as may be deemed appropriate, for study, report and proposal of remedial legislation, the subject of medical care, hospitalization, disability retirement, and death benefits for members of the National Guard and Reserve components and their dependents; and be it further

Resolved, That the officers of this association transmit copies of this resolution to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the Secretaries of Defense and of the Military Departments, the Members of Congress from New York, the chief of the National Guard Bureau, and the president of the National Guard Association of the United States.

RESOLUTION RELATING TO THE STRENGTH AND 6-MONTHS' TRAINING QUOTAS OF THE ARMY NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES AND THE NEW YORK ARMY NATIONAL GUARD

Whereas the Department of Defense Appropriations Act for the fiscal year 1959 (Public Law 85–724) provides that the Army National Guard of the United States shall be maintained at 400,000 strength during the fiscal year 1959, and such act appropriates funds to carry out such purpose; and

Whereas pursuant to such act funds should be allocated by the Military Departments and the Bureau of the Budget to maintain the paid drill strength of the Army National Guard of the United States at 400,000, including not less than 55,000 6-month trainees; and

Whereas under the existing international situation, and the present military commitments of the United States throughout the world, the strength of the Army National Guard of the United States, as an essential part of the land power of the United States, should be stabilized at not less than 400,000; and

Whereas the New York Army National Guard should be maintained and stabilized at not less than 27,000 strength, including not less than 6,000 6-month trainees: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Army and Air National Guard and Naval Militia Association of the State of New York in general conference assembled at Albany, N.Y., this 13th day of September 1958, That—

1. The paid drill strength of the Army National Guard of the United States be maintained at 400,000, including not less than 55,000 6-month trainees during the fiscal year 1959 and that the Departments of Defense and/or Army immediately issue a public announcement to the effect that the appropriations voted by Congress for this purpose will be allocated and used accordingly.

2. The paid drill strength of the Army National Guard of the United States be stabilized in the future at not less than the strength and annual number of trainees set forth above, i.e., 400,000 strength, including not less than 55,000 6-month trainees.

3. Based on a total strength of 400,000 for the Army National Guard of the United States, the New York Army National Guard be maintained at not less than 27,000, including not less than 6,000 6-month trainees.

4. The Federal Departments concerned take such action as may be necessary to insure accomplishment of the above objectives.

5. Copies of this resolution be sent by the officers of this association to the President of the United States, the Secretaries of Defense and Army, the chairmen of the Armed Services Committees of Congress, the Governor of the State of New York, the Members of Congress from New York, the chief of the National Guard Bureau, and the president of the National Guard Association of the United States.

RESOLUTION RELATING TO THE EXTENSION OF FEDERAL LAWS CONCERNING THE PROCUREMENT OF PERSONNEL FOR THE ACTIVE FORCES AND THE RESERVE COMPONENTS, AND RELATING TO THE ELIMINATION OF INEQUITIES IN SUCH LAWS AND IMPLEMENTING REGULATIONS

Whereas the authority to draft persons for 2 years of active Federal service under the Universal Military Training and Service Act will terminate on July 1, 1959; and

Whereas other legal provisions which authorize 6 months' active duty for training for members of the National Guard and Federal Reserves will terminate on August 1, 1959; and

Whereas the requirements of national defense dictate that these laws should be extended; and

Whereas under existing laws and implementing regulations, a Ready Reserve participating obligation is imposed upon those who have already performed 2 years of active service in the Armed Forces of the United States, while many young men do not perform any military duty, and, therefore, the burden of military service is unfairly distributed and is generally inequitable; and

Whereas such laws and regulations should be revised to eliminate these inequities: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Army and Air National Guard and Naval Militia Association of the State of New York in conference assembled at Albany, N.Y., on the 13th day of September 1958, That—

1. The authority to draft persons between 18½ and 26 years of age for 2 years of active duty should be extended for a further period of 4 years, i.e., until July 1, 1963.

2. The obligation of prior service personnel to serve in Ready Reserve units after completing their period of active duty be eliminated, but that they continue to have a Standby Reserve obligation under which they would be subject to call in case of war or national emergency.

3. Authority be extended until July 1, 1963, for persons to enlist voluntarily in the National Guard or Federal Reserves, such persons to be required to perform not less than 3 months or more than 6 months' active duty for training; and that such authority be amended to apply to all persons between the ages of 17 and 26.

a. Persons under age 18½ enlisting in a unit of the National Guard or Federal Reserves under the above authority shall be required to participate as a member of such unit for a period which shall not be less than 3 years following completion of their active duty for training.

b. Persons between the ages of 18½ and 26 years enlisting in a unit of the National Guard or Federal Reserves under the above authority shall be required to participate as a member of such unit for a total of 6 years including their active duty for training.

4. The Universal Military Training and Service Act be amended to provide for the early release of persons inducted for 2 years of active Federal service who have completed a minimum of 6 months of active service, if such persons volunteer to enlist and serve in a unit of the National Guard or Federal Reserve for a total period of 6 years including their period of active service.

5. Copies of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States, the Secretaries of Defense and of the Military Departments, the chairman of the Armed Services Committees of Congress and of the Military Affairs Committees of the legislature, the Members of Congress from New York, the Governor of New York, the Chief of the National Guard Bureau, and the president of the National Guard Association of the United States.

RESOLUTION RELATING TO AMENDING OF UNIVERSAL MILITARY TRAINING AND SERVICE ACT

Whereas thousands of ROTC graduates, after being commissioned in the Army Reserve and after completion of either 2 years of active duty or 6 months' active duty for training, are returned to inactive status, without assignment to Reserve units, as provided for in section VI (D.I.) of the Universal Military Training and Service Act, as amended, due to lack of sufficient vacancies within Reserve units; and

Whereas this results in a great waste of training officer manpower; and

Whereas there should be a flow of these officers coming into the National Guard, and the law should be amended to make this possible: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Army and Air National Guard and Naval Militia Association of the State of New York in general conference assembled at Albany, N.Y., this 13th day of September 1958, That section VI (D.I.) of the Universal Military Training and Service Act, as amended, be further amended to provide that appropriate Reserve units, within the meaning of such section, shall include the Army National Guard of a State, Territory, or District of Columbia, the Governor or other executive authority of which has requested and approved the assignment of such Reserve officers; be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States, the Secretary of Defense and Army, the Governor of the State of New York, the Members of the Congress from New York, the Chief of the National Guard Bureau, and the president of the National Guard Association of the United States.

CRAIG ANDERSON: MINNESOTA CHAMPION

Mr. WIER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. WIER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the very fine 5-minute speech delivered by Craig Anderson, 16-year-old high school junior of Hopkins, Minn., part of my congressional district, as his contribution to the annual broadcast scriptwriting contest of the Voice of Democracy.

When you read this stirring message, I am sure you will agree with me that

Craig earned the honor of being the top winner in our fair State of Minnesota. As such I heartily applaud this young man and predict he will go far. He has the sincere congratulations of the entire Minnesota congressional delegation.

I SPEAK FOR DEMOCRACY

(By Craig Anderson)

Because I am a citizen of a free society, I am able to speak for democracy. I am witnessing the fulfillment of the hopes and aspirations of mankind throughout the ages. The ancient dream, the cause of the patriot where the individual could determine his own destiny; observe Pericles' accomplishments in Athens, tribunes for the Roman plebeians, the Magna Carta, the efforts of John Locke, Voltaire, and Rousseau; the writing of our own Declaration of Independence, and the ratification of our Constitution, show the evolution of this principle of freedom that is now embodied in democratic government.

This self-determination, this stimulus for the citizens of a democracy, has in so many spheres catapulted the power and potential of our Nation. We look to the rewards of sincere effort, not to reprisal for unrealized quotas. Daily we see the typical—a student working for a college education, savings being invested in the future of America, civic-minded citizens soliciting funds for worthy purposes, people endeavoring constantly for improvement of living standards. Through self-determination, the individual's dignity is being enhanced. For me this means: I can determine my education; I can choose where I want to live; I have the right to travel freely; I will be able to influence government through the ballot; I can choose my own reading matter; I can choose my own associates and be reasonably assured of their fidelity; I can select my own field of employment and prepare with confidence for the future.

While I recognize the strength of democracy, I am aware of the human weaknesses of some of its citizens. However, unlike the state of oligarchy, these weaknesses can be altered. Little Rock and Clinton are examples of undemocratic violence today: as Shay's Rebellion, the Pullman strike, and the bonus army were examples in the past, democracy's sensitivity to public opinion and the guarantee of certain inalienable rights by law have provided the machinery to meet these contrasting problems. A letter to the editor, the meeting at the village hall, a radio forum or public debate, all contribute to social criticism which in time may alter our existing society. Democratic processes have provided room so men could have courage to defy existing social structure to right a wrong. Integration is proceeding in scores of southern communities, and child-labor laws, a minimum wage, and collective bargaining have given the worker an improved security.

The perpetuation of our democracy through self-criticism depends upon bold critics; and our democracy has supplied them—the Billy Mitchells, the Robert Oppenheimers, and the Admiral Rickovers, some of the significant dissenters in the problems of national security; the Walter Reeds and the Jonas Salks, pioneers in medicine; the Max Lerners, Carl Sandburgs, the C. W. Milises, and the H. L. Menckens, who examine the problems of their society as they see them. Critics and dissenters who have helped change, not without difficulty, the existing social order. Realizing their importance, the tools (equal justice under law, freedoms of communication and civil liberty) are provided so that the dissenter may transform his society for the better. He may gather with his contemporaries to formulate a course of action; he finds no religious censure from the government; he may use his verbal powers to win needed supporters to his cause. Yes, he is subjected to criticism, but he may fervently refute his adversaries on the open forum. Thus the dissenter—the free man—makes his critical contribution to democracy.

Likewise, I have the opportunity to dissent, to come forth, exercise my own will and pronounce my views.

Conscious of this my sacred heritage, I speak for democracy.

AMERICAN BAR ASSOCIATION CRITICISMS OF SUPREME COURT

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, I think the country was heartened by the press reports which came out of Chicago on Tuesday of the criticism made of the Supreme Court by the American Bar Association.

Of course, there are those, Mr. Speaker, who sincerely feel that the Court should not be criticized or attacked. They take the position that the Court is infallible, that it is sacrosanct, that its decisions should be accepted as though spiritually inspired, and that we should in no way direct criticism at the high tribunal. The very fact that the Founding Fathers left the way open for impeachment of members of the Court nullifies any argument that Americans should accept the actions of the Court without criticism. The members of the legislative and executive branches of our Government are and should be subjected to criticism. Why should not the judicial branch likewise be?

In the judgment of millions of Americans the Court is usurping power delegated only to the legislative branch of our Government. Also in the judgment of multiplied millions it is rendering very unsound decisions. Never before in American history has it been subject to such scathing criticism.

It is most heartening that the American Bar Association has decided to strongly assert itself on the actions of the Court. Certainly it is qualified to do so. And its criticism will not go unnoticed by the high Justices. Though they sit on the highest court in the land the fact remains that they as human beings are sensitive to public opinion and more particularly to that of the American Bar Association. Some of the Justices may get peeved. Some may even withdraw membership from the bar association as the Chief Justice did recently. But this of itself is clear evidence of the fact that the Court is concerned and impressed with the current wave of criticism. It may, as a result, take a second look before it again destroys a long line of stable decisions or again resolves itself into a legislative body.

As a part of my remarks, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include an article by David Lawrence, one of the Nation's well-known writers. The article follows:

BAR GROUP'S DISAPPROVAL OF SUPREME COURT DECISIONS SEEN IMPLYING MISUSE OF POWER

Seldom in American history has there been such a scathing criticism of the decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States as has just come from the American Bar Association.

This has nothing to do with the decisions of the Court on segregation or integration. Nor do the members of the bar—who by overwhelming vote approved at the Chicago convention this week a committee report on the subject of Supreme Court decisions—come from any one section of the country.

The action taken is a formal disapproval of several decisions of the Supreme Court, not only in matters of law but in the misuse of the judicial power itself. The report, comprising about 20,000 words, does not criticize the Supreme Court as an institution nor recommend any limitation of its powers, but does say Congress should at once, in the proper way, endeavor to correct the ill effects of the decisions. The report declares:

"Many cases have been decided in such a manner as to encourage an increase in Communist activity in the United States through invalidation of State sedition statutes, and limitation of State and Federal investigating powers in the field of subversion although these cases might readily have been disposed of without so broadly limiting national and State security efforts.

"The paralysis of our internal security grows largely from construction and interpretation centering around technicalities emanating from our judicial process which the Communists seek to destroy, yet use as a refuge to masquerade their diabolical objectives.

"This trend was treated fully in the Conference of State Chief Justices last year when they called upon the United States Supreme Court to exercise the power of judicial self-restraint. The dissenting opinions of certain Supreme Court Justices have been crystal clear in charting the effect of the failure of the majority to recognize the underground forces that are at work and to appreciate how these decisions affect our internal security."

The bar association's report says it is the duty of members of the bar to defend the institutions of the judiciary from unfair and unjust attacks and that proposals to limit the court's jurisdiction should not be approved. But at the same time the committee report, as adopted by the convention, says that, where remedial legislation can be enacted by Congress to deal with Communists and other subversives, this should be given prompt attention. The report cites a long list of Supreme Court decisions in the internal-security field and points out exactly how they can be overcome by action of Congress.

Also a chapter is devoted to current fallacies about communism. The report says: "It is just as false to measure the strength of communism in the United States by comparing the small number of party members with the large number of non-Communists, as it would be to measure the seaworthiness of a ship by comparing the area of its holes with the area of its hull. A few strategically placed holes can sink the largest ship."

Adding that the "danger and the menace of communism are worse than ever," the report calls on the members of the bar to alert the Nation on the menace of international communism.

As one reads the report, there comes a feeling that its writers tried to be as tactful as possible in their references to the present membership of the Supreme Court but nevertheless reveal again and again their dismay at the abuse of power by the highest court.

LABOR BILLS

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, today I introduced in the House two bills dealing with labor, one a companion measure to the Kennedy-Ervin labor reform bill and the other calling for the repeal of section 14–B of the Taft-Hartley Act.

My State of Kansas was the only State in six at the last election to ratify a right-to-work amendment to the State constitution. The labor unions of Kansas will not immediately be weakened by the amendment. Eventually the result may be a lower wage level.

The Kennedy-Ervin bill is a minimum must for the 86th Congress. A reasonable step in the correction of labor excesses is embodied in this bill.

The Taft-Hartley provision now permits any State to go beyond the Federal law, and a State could take another course than that set forth in the so-called right-to-work provisions. I have always been in favor of uniform legislation for labor and management, and I believe each should be treated alike in every State.

Section 14–B destroys one of the principal beneficial objectives of a Federal labor management relations act—that of uniformity. If the right-to-work principle is sound and just, it should be incorporated into the Federal law. If it is bad and unsound, right-to-work has no place in the scheme of employer-employee relations, either State or Federal

Frankly, a State right-to-work law does not injure organized labor nearly to the extent its advocates hope would be the case. Neither does a provision remedy the evils or curb the excesses of a few powerful labor unions and their greedy corrupt leaders.

Those who delight in sowing discord are the only ones who gain by the drive for right-to-work laws. At a time when real cooperative effort on the part of all our people is sorely needed to offset the ravages of inflation and to defeat the Communist effort for economic supremacy, the right-to-work campaigns aline labor against management and management against labor and the ultimate result is bitter, internecine, class warfare.

Right-to-work victories are empty ones, indeed, especially when serious thought is given to the strife, the hate, and the violent emotions that are generated, and the chasm that is placed between business and the working people of the country.

The greatest threat to the growth of organized labor is the growing number of unemployed in this country which is just as injurious to business, big and little, and to our economic structure.

Let us place our emphasis on solving this problem and concentrate our efforts on legislation which is in the interest of all our people instead of stirring up strife and spreading the flames of hate.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. BOWLES. Mr. Speaker, at the request of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. DAVIS], I ask unanimous consent that his special order for today be postponed until Thursday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

FORTY-FIRST ANNIVERSARY OF ESTONIAN REPUBLIC

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, February 24, 1959, the Estonian Republic commemorated its 41st anniversary. Today, Estonia, along with the other captive nations of central and Eastern Europe, finds itself in the grip of Communist tyranny as a result of developments arising during World War II.

It is certain, however, that both the people of Estonia itself, as well as Estonians throughout the world, remain firm in the belief that one day their land will again be free. It is, therefore, fitting and appropriate to call the attention of the free world to this national independence anniversary and to let all the captive peoples behind the Iron Curtain realize that they are not forgotten or forsaken in their struggle against Communist slavery. It is a pleasure and a privilege to join in this reassurance to the people of Estonia and to remind them of the fact that our Government still refuses to recognize the Communist takeover and the forced incorporation of Estonia into the Soviet Union. We may be able to do little or nothing at the moment for the people of Estonia and the other captive nations but we certainly have a moral obligation to refuse to acquiesce in their brutal absorption by the Kremlin. I am glad to congratulate the people of Estonia on this occasion and to hope that the day of freedom and self-determination for their homeland will come soon.

INCREMENTAL PRICE SUPPORTS FOR WHEAT

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Speaker, surely everyone is aware of the great many varied opinions and criticisms which exist among farm people, taxpayers, and consumers alike relative to the wheat situation today. This situation is one of the major issues in today's complex farm problem.

Through the last 20 years wheat has played an important role in our many and varied attempts to deal with the farm problem in a manner which would reduce surpluses and create a market that would eventually assure to the farmer a full parity income. We have attempted to accomplish this objective by means of wheat allotments and marketing quotas whenever conditions required their application. A minimum wheat acreage allotment of 55 million acres was first established in 1938, and has served as a minimum allotted acreage for the Nation in all the years since that time, with the exception of the years in which demands were greatly increased because of war needs. During this period since 1938, experience has shown us that we have still had real problems with surpluses. They have accumulated to the degree where they have been, and continue to be, real burdens to the Government taxwise, and to the farmers pricewise. This problem reached a peak just before World War II, and has now once again reached a point which demands real concern and attention. Present agricultural surpluses, in addition to preventing the creation of a real market for farm products, are costing the Nation's taxpayers $1 million a day. We have thus far not succeeded.

While this is true, however, the history of our attempts to deal with the farm problem, and more specifically the wheat problem, have shown that we have come quite close to approaching the desired goals. Statistics show that if production had been reduced by a mere 6 percent during the period 1948 through 1958 we would have accumulated no wheat surplus during these years. And also, it is well to note that no longer ago than 1956 and 1957 our wheat surpluses were reduced under the present system of acreage allotment and marketing quotas. This would seem to provide reliable evidence that the matter of achieving the desired goal is not so far beyond reach.

It is my opinion that one of the reasons we have not been more successful in our attempts to arrive at the point where the total disappearance of wheat each year would equal the production is that sufficient opportunity and responsibility have not been delegated to the farmer himself. Under the programs which have been used up to this time, he has had no realistic opportunity to achieve full parity price in return for his efforts at reducing production.

It would seem to me that if we are to entertain hopes for the future whereby we will be able to provide a program with the opportunity of full parity income for the wheat farmer without aggravating the already acute surplus situation, we must first of all provide for him the opportunity to achieve this goal himself. Thus, I am submitting a new principle to the farm program as it applies to wheat farmers—a program which will give the individual farmer the opportunity on an optional basis to achieve full parity prices by voluntarily reducing his production. This should leave with him the proper incentive, as well as the responsibility, to achieve the goal which has been promised him a good many times. Such a program properly administered

carries with it the very desirable result of reducing the surpluses which are presently on hand, thereby greatly cutting down the huge Government expenditures which are presently required to maintain the program.

And, further, it will actually increase the earnings of the individual small farmer, thus enabling him to stay on the farm, and assuring him his just share of the national income, as well as his rightful place in the growth and development of the rural community, its churches, and its schools. He presently is not able to achieve this. Statistics show that the per capita incomes of farm families have constantly been declining during the past several years, while at the same time the per capita incomes of nonfarm people have almost just as constantly been increasing. Surely the producers of food and fiber, so important to the development of our society as well as the strength of our Nation, should have opportunities proportionate to the vital role in which they serve our Nation.

It is my very profound conviction, gained by a lifetime of experience as a farmer, together with 15 years of experience in various fields of the administration of the farm program, that this can be accomplished if the wheat farmer is provided with the opportunity and the assurance that this very desirable economic situation might be accomplished. As we look to the economic future and strength of our Nation, I think it is well that we also recognize that the production of surpluses which become an economic burden, are also wasteful to the future productivity of our Nation and its natural resources. It is my sincere belief that this new approach in dealing with the farm program has the potential of producing the much to be desired results of reducing, and eventually eliminating, these surpluses, together with the promise of placing our farm economy more in step with the Nation's economy as a whole.

The mechanics of the program are very simple and basic, providing incremental price supports and acreage reserve payments. Most of the provisions presently written into law pertaining to wheat allotment and marketing quotas remain in effect. Therefore we will continue to have a wheat allotment established for every farmer in wheat-producing areas, and farmers will still have the opportunity of voting on whether they wish to accept the provisions of a marketing quota. The farmer is then offered the option of reducing his seeded acreage of wheat below the allotment established for his farm. For each 5-percent reduction in seeded acres, he becomes eligible for an increase of 10 percent in the price support available to him through the Commodity Credit Corporation as exemplified by the following table:

If the percentage of his acreage allotment withdrawn from production is not less than—	His level of price support shall be—
5 percent	70 percent of the parity price.
10 percent	80 percent of the parity price.
15 percent	90 percent of the parity price.
20 percent	100 percent of the parity price.

He will thus reach the desired 100 percent of parity if he reduces his allotted acres by 20 percent. This percentage reduction offers the full potential of reducing our surpluses and creating a market for the total wheat production.

It is necessary that one further provision be added. The acreage taken out of wheat production is not to be converted into the production of other crops, which as well might be in surplus. It is required that these acres be kept out of the production of any crop or the grazing of any stock. Acreage reserve payments are provided for these acres at a rate not to exceed $10 an acre per year.

This same principle can very easily be adapted to price-support programs of other small-grain crops as well. It shall be my purpose to project this principle in another bill to other small-grain crops which are presently being supported.

Should Congress see fit to adopt these principles to our present farm program, I believe we will have taken a real forward step toward the solution of the very controversial and burdensome economic condition which has plagued our farm populace during recent years. Its application would as well strengthen our national economy, preserve the national productivity of food and fiber, and prove beneficial to farmers, taxpayers, and consumers alike. For these reasons, it is my hope that Congress in its wisdom may regard this matter with favor.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from New York [Mr. LINDSAY] had a special order for today. I ask unanimous consent that it be transferred to next Thursday, March 5.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking and Currency may have until midnight Friday night to file a report on the bill S. 57.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

AMERICA'S CAPACITY AND THE CHALLENGE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. BOWLES] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. BOWLES. Mr. Speaker, I would like to complete my remarks, if I may, before I yield. After that I will be happy to yield for any questions or comments.

I am concerned, as are many of the Members of this House, with the growing, nationwide disagreement over the public policies best calculated to strengthen our economy to meet the extraordinary challenges of the years ahead.

Unless an earnest effort is made to reconcile these differences now, I am fearful that further divisions will arise among us. Such a development would gravely weaken our national capacity for constructive action, both at home and abroad, at a particularly critical time in our Nation's history.

Today the United States faces a host of problems of a magnitude that is almost unique.

THE INTERNATIONAL CHALLENGE

During the last 15 years, the relatively orderly prewar world has changed almost beyond recognition.

Nearly 1 billion people—one-third of the world's population—have changed their form of government and are now struggling to achieve new national identities. Their tasks have been made infinitely more complex by the worldwide technological revolution which has brought the dream of a new and better life into the most remote villages and has aroused expectations there which at best can be only partially fulfilled.

In China a militant, fiercely anti-American government is effectively organizing the resources of 650 million hard-working people through the iron-fisted techniques of Communist dictatorship.

In the Soviet Union a new industrial and military colossus has arisen whose avowed objective is to bury us. Inspired by the Leninist belief that the road to Paris—meaning the West—lies through Calcutta and Peiping, the Kremlin is actively wooing the people of Asia, Africa, and Latin America with billions of rubles, thousands of technicians, and countless promises, backed by a skilled diplomacy.

In the meantime many respected authorities assert that our nuclear and missile development is lagging at such a rate that we may soon be confronted by even tougher Soviet attitudes in every area of international negotiations, and the consequent danger of war. May I add that if these authorities are wrong and we act on their advice we may lose some money. But if they are right and we refuse to take heed we may lose our country.

THE DOMESTIC CHALLENGE

In domestic affairs as well we find ourselves faced with a variety of problems which touch almost every phase of American life.

Our educational system, which even now is turning out far fewer engineers and scientists than the Soviet Union, will soon be under an enormously increased pressure to keep pace with our exploding population.

Even now there is an immediate need for new building programs, teacher training incentives, higher salaries, and in short an overall improvement of our whole educational system.

Our annual population increase of nearly 3 million, the growing residential flight from the cities to the suburbs, and rapidly changing techniques of transportation are bringing dramatic new pressures on our metropolitan areas. We are only beginning to face up to them.

New agricultural methods in the meantime have lowered our farm income

and brought new economic pressure on our rural areas.

Although we are on the threshold of great and new advances in medical science, we continue to turn out too few doctors and nurses. Everyone knows that our hospital facilities are lagging far behind our needs.

Anyone who attempts to spell out what needs to be done to meet the challenge at home and abroad and suggests the consequences of our failure to do it, lays himself open to the charge of peddling gloom or undermining our national confidence.

But I submit, Mr. Speaker, that it is foolhardy for us to attempt to sidestep the implications of our situation.

Nor do I believe that a clarification of the difficulties which we face necessarily leads to pessimism and frustration. On the contrary, we have only to examine the historic, creative periods of growth in this country to feel a renewed sense of confidence in our own capacity to rise to what is required of us now.

But one point, at least, is clear: If we are to succeed in our efforts to secure peace in the world and prosperity for our own people, we cannot afford to wait for the least likely development of all—for the problems themselves to grow smaller. Instead both we and our economy must grow to meet them.

VOICES OF THE PESSIMISTS

Mr. Speaker, what troubles me more than the problems themselves are the voices which are now being raised to spread the alarm that we cannot do what needs to be done without abandoning our economic system of free enterprise, and submitting to a disastrous inflation.

In a period of domestic and world crisis, these voices tell us that we must be content with a less adequate defense system, with inadequate schools, hospitals, and roads; with a lagging development of natural resources; and with a continuous postponement of the efforts necessary in Asia, Africa, and Latin America if we are to assist underdeveloped nations to stand on their own feet and prevent the Soviet Union from undermining the political and economic stability of Western Europe through the Asia-Africa backdoor.

Let me emphasize that these voices are the voices of sincere and dedicated men. I am confident that many of them are as unhappy as any of us to see our country continue at its present listless pace with high unemployment at a time when the demands upon us are so great, and when the economy of the Soviet Union is booming.

These men have honestly convinced themselves that the American people and their Congress must choose between rapid growth with inflation on the one hand or minimal growth with stable prices and some unemployment on the other.

There are many mistakes that we may make in these coming years. But none, Mr. Speaker, would be more dangerous than to minimize the implications and the danger of inflation.

This is a subject in which I have more than ordinary interest. As Administrator of the Office of Price Administration during World War II and later as Stabilization Director, I had an opportunity to study at first hand both the dangers of inflation and the difficulties of controlling it.

Partly as a result of that experience, Mr. Speaker, I deeply believe that those among us who assume that we must accept a slow rate of expansion with some unemployment as the best means of preventing inflation, are gravely misjudging the problems which we face.

I am convinced that our American system of free enterprise is far more dynamic than they believe it to be. I think that our capacity for growth has scarcely been touched. I believe once we release the pent-up energies of the American people and their economic system, there will no longer be any doubt of our ability to face up effectively to the challenges I have mentioned both at home and abroad.

This is not the first time, Mr. Speaker, that we have been tripped up by folklore. American history is studded with periods where ingrained but outworn economic concepts have lingered on in the midst of changing events.

Because such concepts were familiar, we were reluctant to give them up. Yet over and over again we have seen them finally swept aside either by the harsh requirement of economic reality or by the powerful impact of commonsense.

Students of economics are familiar with the stubborn influence of the first three great English-speaking economists—Adam Smith, Ricardo, and Malthus. These men with all their brilliance mistakenly believed that the so-called working class was doomed to continued poverty, that an expanding population would always exceed the available food supply, and that there was not much that either ordinary or extraordinary men could do about it.

Their dismal postulates have long since been abandoned as guiding theories for our capitalistic economy. But their long acceptance symbolizes our capacity for resisting new ideas until long after these new ideas have been transcribed into actual progress.

THE DEAD HAND OF ECONOMIC FOLKLORE

Let me briefly sketch some of the vivid situations in the last 30 years, which recur to me personally—situations in which our economic thinking was vastly out of tune with reality.

In the spring of 1929, as a young man of 28, I started a new business with a small amount of savings. My confidence was considerable because men long established in the business world had assured me that we had reached a "permanent high plateau of prosperity"—that depressions were once and for all behind us.

Four months later the roof fell in. By the end of the year an estimated $30 to $40 billion in stock market values had been wiped out, and our economy moved rapidly into the most disastrous depression in American history.

We had in fact come to the end of an era. But few men, whether Republican or Democrat, financier or economist, understood this. Andrew W. Mellon, the Secretary of the Treasury, spoke for many respected economists, when he commented:

> I see nothing in the present situation which is either menacing or warrants pessimism.

Events of the next few months soon shattered the stock belief of the 1920's that the ups and downs of the business cycle had somehow ceased to exist. But supreme faith that these up and downs were self-correcting lingered on. By consciously or unconsciously adhering to this faith, many prominent Americans in both political parties helped to prevent effective action.

In 1931 as the depression continued to deepen, President Herbert Hoover said:

> This is not a time when we can afford to embark on any new or enlarged adventures of Government.

In the summer of 1932 the Democratic Party pledged itself to "an immediate and drastic reduction of governmental expenditures, which will accomplish a savings of not less than 25 percent in the cost of the Federal Government and provide for a Federal Reserve budget annually balanced."

On July 30, 1932, Mr. Roosevelt severely criticized the Republican Party for sponsoring deficits instead of reducing expenses. In Mr. Roosevelt's words:

> This was a disastrous policy. Any government, like any family, can for a year or so spend a little more than it earns. But you and I know that a continuation of that habit leads to the poorhouse.

The Democrats took office in March 1933 and promptly moved to fulfill their campaign commitments by reducing Federal payrolls and veterans compensation by $400 million.

If we had persisted in this effort to balance our Federal budget in the depths of the great depression, our economy might have ground to a stop. But to its everlasting credit, the Roosevelt administration soon broke loose from this strangling economic folklore and launched a bold, creative attack on the poverty and misery which threatened to engulf every family in America.

Many distinguished Members of this House, including our Speaker, played a major role in coming to grips with the realities of those difficult times. Our country will always owe them a debt of gratitude.

SUCCESSES AND FAILURES OF THE NEW DEAL

The next few years were years of dynamic and effective action. Out of them grew an increasing understanding of the new role our Federal Government might play in creating conditions of high employment, in removing the injustices within our economic system and in providing greater opportunity and security for all of us.

As the 1930's drew to a close, the New Deal had largely succeeded in its first great objective. It had provided a certain basic economic security for almost everyone, and placed a floor under human misery.

But, Mr. Speaker, let us face the fact that the New Deal failed in its second major objective, which was to restore full employment and prosperity to our

country. In 1940, more than 8 million Americans were still unemployed; 14½ percent of the working force.

Our failure to create a higher level of employment was due to a variety of causes. Not the least of these was the development of a new kind of fiscal folklore, conveniently provided by a certain group of economists and public figures in both parties who had too little faith in the capacity of our American economy for growth. Once more we heard the same depressing assurances that our economy had reached a point of maturity, where future growth would come slowly, if it came at all.

This pessimism was based partly on the belief that economic power had become so concentrated through the growth of monopolies that competition would soon disappear, thus putting a limit on expansion.

Once accepted, this concept of the "mature economy," in which growth at worst was doubtful and at best would come very gradually, began to produce a dangerously logical response.

Prominent labor spokesmen reasoned that if the economy could not expand, any increase in wages must necessarily come from profits. Conversely many manufacturers assumed that any increase in profits must somehow come at the expense of the workers.

To many influential economists, the prospect of increasing wages became a basic threat to the entire system. Since higher wages would have to cut into profits, little would be left over. Money available for expansion would dwindle, and a process of stagnation would take over.

Spokesmen for both groups joined only to cast a jaundiced eye at the depressed agricultural segment of our economy. Any improvement in the lot of the farmers, it was thought, must necessarily come from a sacrifice in the industrial segment, either from the management, from the workers, or from both.

These rigid economic attitudes of the late 1930's were shared to some degree by many leaders in both parties. They were particularly dangerous because they carried within them the seeds of a class consciousness—with labor and management in bitter opposition—that would have gladdened the heart of Karl Marx.

In the meantime Hitler's growing power came under widespread discussion in American political and economic circles. One reassuring and widely accepted view that reflected the lingering influence of old economic concepts was that Hitler would not dare start a major war for the simple reason that he had no gold.

Gold or no gold, Hitler's ambitions finally broke the peace of Europe, and plunged the world into war. As we considered the implications involved, it was not surprising that the atmosphere of negativism and the lack of faith in American enterprise should again put a damper on our initial defense effort.

WARTIME ECONOMIC FOLKLORE

On January 6, 1942, Mr. Roosevelt outlined America's war plans in his State of the Union message. He asked Congress to provide for the production of 45,000 combat planes and 6 million tons of shipping as a contribution to our victory program in the coming fiscal year.

Some of Mr. Roosevelt advisers had told him that these goals were impossibly high, especially in view of the fact that only 1 million tons of shipping had been constructed in 1941. But the President told them to go back and sharpen their pencils.

Many Members still serving in the Congress will remember that the skeptics probably had a safe majority. Most of them kept their peace, however, on the grounds that Mr. Roosevelt's statement represented no more than a clever propaganda gambit designed to frighten the Germans and the Japanese.

But we soon saw that Mr. Roosevelt's estimate of the capacity of the American economy was an understatement. Instead of 45,000 airplanes in 1942, we turned out 48,000. Instead of 6 million tons of shipping, we produced 8 million. Overall industrial production in that 1 year jumped by 22 percent.

And even this was only the beginning. By 1944 the number of airplanes produced soared to 96,000 and the amount of shipping to 20 million tons.

Yet this lack of faith in the capacity of our American enterprise system to produce continued to plague us all through the early war years. In 1942 many authorities agreed that our gross national product could not be expected to reach a level of more than $140 million, an increase of some $50 billion over the late 1930's.

If this had in fact been the ceiling on American industrial and agricultural output, World War II would have been prolonged for several more years, and the American people would have been subjected to very severe economic privation.

Fortunately, those with too little faith in the capacity of our economic system were again proved to be wrong. By 1944 we had reached a gross national product of $211 billion.

If nothing else, World War II proved decisively that the Nation's capacity does not depend on outmoded economic laws. Rather it depends on the Nation's will and organization, on the strength of our determination inspired by bold and vigorous political leadership.

Yet the negative economic folklore of the past died hard. No sooner had we successfully demonstrated our capacity to meet the economic challenge of war, than we began to set up the same old economic straw men to hamper our efforts to create a full production economy in time of peace.

Again Washington was overrun with anxious leaders of industry, labor, agriculture, and government, who outdid each other in offering gloomy prophecies about the future. Our war-created plant capacities, many of them told us, would go largely unused. We must adjust ourselves again to substantial unemployment. Prices must be set high enough to enable good profits to be made with 20 to 40 percent of our capacity idle.

As a member of the War Production Board, I helped plan the reconversion to the peacetime period. I clearly remember the impact of these dire prophecies on our own thinking. It was only with a very great wrench that we threw them off at all.

After much trepidation, however, we based our plans on the premise that we would have continued economic expansion and full employment in the peacetime period that lay ahead. In 1946 I even mustered the confidence to write a book called "Tomorrow Without Fear."

The subject was our economic development after the war. I laid down a goal of a peacetime gross national product of $200 billion by 1948.

For this I was promptly denounced as a visionary. Yet this goal was far exceeded as our gross national product in 1948 moved up to $259 billion.

In 1945, Mr. Speaker, thoughtful men assumed, as many do today, that unemployment was the price we must pay for freedom of enterprise. Yet again the pessimists turned out to be wrong.

Within a short time we were operating at full capacity. A switchover of 12 million veterans to peacetime jobs was accomplished with scarcely a ripple. At no time did unemployment rise above 2½ million during the entire reconversion period.

Mr. Speaker, I have taken some time to dip back into our economic past. I have done so because I believe it is vitally important for us to remember how often our economic judgments have been wrong before, and how fondly many of us, regardless of political affiliations, have clung to myths and folklores irrelevant to events.

As we review the challenges facing us today, I am forced to believe that we are once again getting bogged down in misleading folklore. If we are to measure up to our times, it is essential that we cut through the resulting haze and confusion so that we may embark on another period of surging American growth in economic capacity, moral commitment and vigorous action.

MISCONCEPTIONS ABOUT INFLATION

Mr. Speaker, I believe that the most critical barrier to our progress today is our fixation on inflation as the major development to fear.

Now we know how a fear psychology can help lead us into a recession. Does this psychology work any less potently when the economy starts working upward?

Last summer when our unemployment was hovering around the 5 million mark, administration spokesmen and business leaders announced that the biggest problem facing our country was inflation. Every other newspaper headline and magazine editorial carried the message: We must cut "spending" to curb inflation.

When the election results came in last November, fiscal fears in many prominent quarters increased to a new tempo. Newly elected "radical spenders" would descend on Washington like a hoard of locusts, we were told, and send us all into skyrocketing inflation.

Let us examine what has happened to the stock market since this onslaught of inflationary warnings began to descend upon us. Last year the stock mar-

ket rose by 37 percent, according to the New York Times. This represents an increase in billions upon billions in so-called market values that is clearly not warranted by recovery so far.

The resulting difficulty which this loose, irresponsible inflationary talk has created for the Treasury Department is particularly important. The management of our national debt has been made far more difficult. Because investors have become convinced that inflation is under way, they have become more and more reluctant to invest in long-term bonds with fixed interest rates.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that we have raised a dangerous hobgoblin out of our own fears and uncertainties about inflation.

I believe that our present misconceptions on this and other subjects are comparable to the mistaken attitudes that delayed our recovery from the depression in the early 1930's, to the thinking which later led to our inability to achieve full employment in the years before World War II, and to the efforts which were made to discourage the half-hearted approach which many of us made to the creation of a full-time economy both during and after the war.

Our current misconception about inflation takes on special significance when we put it in the context of our long-range national price history.

Since 1948 we have undergone increases in wholesale price rises averaging 1.3 percent yearly including the Korean war period. During this same decade consumer prices have risen at an average annual rate of 1.8 percent.

This increase is unfortunate. But may I note parenthetically that it is not of panic size. It compares favorably, for instance, with the average annual rates of increase in wholesale and consumer prices for the last 60 years, which is 2½ percent. This same rate of 2½ percent applied to the 16 peaceful years, 1897–1913, as well.

Mr. Speaker, I do not suggest that inflation is not a danger. What I do say, and I say it with the greatest emphasis, is that by repeating the old cliches on inflation, many leaders of American opinion are inadvertently helping to create the very situation of which they are most fearful.

NATIONAL DEBT

But this, Mr. Speaker, is not the only widely shared misconception which is currently victimizing us. Another has grown up about the size and the implications of our national debt.

I venture to guess that a majority of citizens whom we might poll on this subject would assume from all they have heard and read that our national debt has simply been running away from us. But the facts do not support this assumption.

In 1945 the national debt was $279 billion. This amounted to roughly $2,000 for every man, woman and child in the country, adjusted to 1958 prices. Today the national debt is $283 billion. This amounts to a little over $1,600 for each person in the country.

The contrast is even more striking if we consider the percentage of our national debt in relation to our gross national product. In 1945 the national debt was 131 percent of our gross national product. Today it is 62.7 percent.

Mr. Speaker, the most important factor we face is not the total amount of our debt, but the capacity of the American people to carry it. Obviously a debt of $10,000 is far more of a burden to a man earning $5,000 than it is to a man earning $25,000.

We would all like to see our national debt reduced. Indeed I believe it is no less than tragic that we have not seized on previous opportunities to make greater progress in that direction.

For instance, in the spring of 1948 we faced a period of inflation which was largely so-called demand inflation—too much money and too few goods. In that year we had accumulated a Federal budgetary surplus of $8.4 billion.

If there was ever an opportune time for reducing the national debt and at the same time curbing the demand, this was it. Instead, and with our eyes focused, I am afraid, on the fall elections, we cut taxes by $8 billion, and when President Truman vetoed the bill, his veto was promptly overridden.

There is no doubt, Mr. Speaker, that the total American debt—private and public—has increased in these last many years. Since 1945 local and State debt has been increased from $13.7 billion to $50.9 billion. Since 1945 private debt has increased spectacularly from $139.9 billion to $474.5 billion. But as we have seen, the national (Federal) debt as distinguished from the total public debt has increased by less than 2 percent—that is from $279 billion to $283 billion.

INTEREST RATES

Mr. Speaker, another misconception of ours has been actually contributing to whatever inflationary danger exists today. I refer to the high interest rates which have grown out of the administration's tight money policy.

If there ever was a policy which was an ineffective and blunt-edged tool, this is it.

Theoretically by raising interest rates, the Government can curb investment and consumer borrowing, thereby lowering demand and slowing down inflation.

However, Mr. Speaker, we cannot get away from the basic fact that interest rates are also costs that affect almost every phase of our economy. When the interest rates go up, the cost to our Federal Government, to every State and local government, to every school board, to every farmer, to every homeowner, to every individual borrower, goes up also.

We are told that in the coming fiscal year, we must spend $8 billion in interest charges to carry our national debt. In 1946 the carrying charge on our national debt was $4.7 billion.

That is a difference of $3.3 billion—enough to finance substantial programs of urban development, and hospital and school construction.

At the same time the extra cost increases involved in our tight money policy have been adding substantially to the cost of local and State government.

Mr. Speaker, in 1950 in my own State of Connecticut, the town of Milford obtained a school loan with an interest of 1⅝ percent. Over a 20-year period a $1 million loan at this rate of interest would produce a total cost of $1,179,320. This year the town of Newtown obtained a school loan at 3⅓ percent. The total cost over 20 years for a $1 million school at this rate would be $1,391,360—an increase in interest cost of more than $200,000.

The increased cost of interest for our greatly expanded highway programs goes into hundreds of millions of dollars. So it is in much of our defense program.

The consumer also feels directly the impact of costs of this high interest rate. The increase from 4½ to 6 percent on a 15-year, $10,000 home mortgage adds nearly $1,500 to the total cost of the house.

The increase in the carrying charge of a car is nearly $200. This additional cost is also part of the expense every home owner must pay for every refrigerator, washer, or vacuum cleaner bought on time.

In the field of private business the higher cost of interest drastically affects small business while leaving larger business relatively unaffected. The larger corporations today are able to maintain an expansion rate by drawing out of profits.

No one doubts that if interest rates were raised high enough, we could stop growth completely. No one wants to do that. But in the name of stopping inflation, we are moving in that direction. It is difficult for me to conceive of a clumsier tool than the tight money policy to achieve even the goals it is supposed to serve.

But the point is that cutting down the growth of America is not our problem. What we must do is speed up our growth and expand opportunity. That means more purchasing power, so that people can buy what they need—new schools, new hospitals, new homes.

WAGES AND PRICES

Finally we come to what I believe is another misconception in our economic thinking: our failure to recognize the extent to which the rising prices in 1956 and 1957 were caused not by excessive demand, nor by rising wages, but by prices which in several key industries have been set with almost no regard for market pressures of any kind.

The amount of inventory reduction that occurred in 1958 itself is an indication of the extent to which surpluses had been accumulated in previous years. Had consumer demand been strong and persistent, it is unlikely that we would today be operating below our productive capacity in almost every major field.

The automobile industry, for instance, will be lucky to produce three-quarters as many cars in 1959 as it produced in 1955 when our population was 9 million fewer than it is today. Steel was operating in January at only 74 percent of capacity, yet automobile and steel prices have been pushed steadily upward. In the building industry, there is substantial unused capacity and much available skilled labor.

Output in other major sectors of the economy—farm machinery, machine tools, trucks, household furnishings—have all tapered off from 1956 peaks.

Meanwhile, competent studies have shown that the greatest price rises in our recent experience have come in sectors of the economy where concentration of economic power, rather than competition, is the rule. In the more competitive industries such as food, leather, lumber, textiles, and farm products, prices either rose only slightly or actually declined between 1953 and 1957.

The more concentrated industries, those with considerable discretion over prices, have accounted for nearly 85 percent of the increase in the wholesale price level during this period.

Yet the frequency with which we hear such phrases as wage-price inflation typifies the way labor unions and guilt have been linked in the public mind.

I suggest that this is a particularly dangerous and unfair kind of sloganizing.

No doubt there have been cases here and there where labor has acted irresponsibly by pushing exorbitant wage demands. And no one who believes in an expanding economy will seek to excuse such wastefully inefficient practices as featherbedding.

But before we start assigning blame, we must look more closely at the record.

Since 1945 wages have gone up very substantially. But so has labor output per man-hour. Today we are turning out a far greater volume of manufactured goods than we were then.

Since 1945 the rise in labor output per man-hour has remained roughly comparable to wage increases in most industries. Even in those industries where it has lagged somewhat, the gap has been much too small to justify the bitterly unfair attacks that have been launched against the American labor movement as a whole. Much less can it justify the management determined price increases in a basic industry like steel.

INCENTIVES NEEDED

Mr. Speaker, our economy needs incentives to lift it out of our paralyzing, self-induced fears. It needs incentives to encourage growth and to make competition palatable, just as consumers need the encouragement of fair prices and better values.

At the very time when we should be devoting our every effort to finding ways to promote the growth we must have, we are slipping into petty recrimination over who is to blame for an inflation which, after all, does not constitute our major problem.

On top of that, we are being blocked, as on previous occasions in our economic history, by a massive negativism which finds it much easier to stand still than to search for feasible ways of moving ahead.

The need for a fresh affirmative approach becomes all the more urgent when we realize that while we are debating the problem of maintaining a 2 percent annual growth rate, the Soviet Union is expanding its economy at an annual rate of nearly 7 percent. While we are arguing about the inadequacy of our school system, the Soviets are turning out twice as many engineers and scientists. While we are considering cuts in our economic aid to the critical uncommitted nations of the world, the Soviets are substantially expanding their loans and grants to these same countries. While we are hesitating over a stepup in our missile production, Russia is bending 22 percent of her total economy to military defense.

NOT A POLITICAL ISSUE

In closing, Mr. Speaker, let me say that I am anxious that no one will misconstrue what I have said here today. I have no desire to attack any group, any special interest or any political party.

The lack of confidence in the dynamics of our economic system is something that to some extent has cut across party lines. So does an interest in growth.

For instance, many Members may be familiar with the Rockefeller "Report on the American Economy" which was published April 21, 1958. I believe that it should be "must reading" for every Member of this Congress.

This was one of a series of reports on America's position in the world today. These reports encompass our defense policy, our educational problems, our economic relationship with the underdeveloped areas, the use of our natural resources and the issue of economic growth, with which I have been dealing this afternoon.

These Rockefeller reports were planned and reviewed by an overall committee, of which I was a member. Each individual report, with its final recommendations, was put together by a special subcommittee of businessmen and economists. Democrats, I may add, were a very small minority.

Among the members were Gen. Lucius D. Clay, board chairman of the Continental Can Co.; the Reverend Theodore M. Hesburgh, president of Notre Dame; Arthur F. Burns, former chairman of President Eisenhower's Council of Economic Advisers; Mrs. Oveta Culp Hobby, former Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare; David Sarnoff, board chairman of RCA; Frazar B. Wilde, president of the Connecticut General Life Insurance Co.; and James R. Killian, Jr., now Chairman of the President's Science Advisory Committee; Charles H. Percy, who today was appointed to head a committee set up by National Chairman Alcorn, to give the Republican Party itself a fresh perspective.

The chairman of this group was Nelson Rockefeller, present Governor of New York.

The Rockefeller economic report had the following to say on the question of economic growth:

> The first basic conclusion that emerges from our analysis is the very great importance of maintaining a high rate of growth. * * * A growth rate of 5 percent is possible if we realize fully our impressive opportunities for economic expansion. * * * Unless we achieve a 5 percent growth rate, we shall have to hold back otherwise desirable expenditures in the Government field and keep the growth of private expenditures below a level commensurate with our aspirations.
>
> America has a notable record of responding to challenges and making the most of opportunities. With our growing population, our extraordinary record of rising productivity, the inherent dynamism in our free enterprise economy, there is every reason to face the future with full confidence that we shall measure up to the challenges that lie ahead.

I am quoting from this report because I believe we should resist every attempt to turn this question into a political issue. I say this with particular emphasis because I believe there is an unfortunate effort in some circles of our Government and also in our industry to do precisely that.

More and more we see those who sincerely stress the critical need to meet the challenges of this nuclear age deliberately denounced as "spenders."

Those of us who urge a bolder approach to the future, with increased confidence in our economic system, are said to be a danger to the Republic and underminers of the American way of life. Those who speak for the status quo are lauded as sound citizens.

Mr. Speaker, I submit that those who draw political lines on such a basis are doing a grave disservice to America at a time of critical challenge.

I earnestly hope that men of good will on both sides of the aisle in this House and in the other body will unite in a determined effort to get at the central truths that affect our present economic performance.

Let us boldly, honestly, and without partisanship examine where we have gone wrong and pledge ourselves not to repeat these mistakes at a time when we can least afford them.

I have not intended these remarks as an endorsement of any particular legislative proposals. Rather I have tried to sketch a perspective from which we may view various bills that will come before this body in the next few months.

I am convinced that only from such a perspective can we learn how to engage America's great resources more effectively in the struggle for peace and freedom.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOWLES. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I want to commend the gentleman for one of the finest talks on the economic situation which I think we have had in this session of the Congress. His explanations have been clear and concise, and he has backed it up with a great deal of information.

I was particularly pleased at the point that he made on the increase in interest rates on the national debt. A recent article in the Baltimore Sun pointed out that the cost of the national debt this coming fiscal year will be about $8 billion, which is $500 million more than it was last year. It also pointed out a very interesting thing, that in 1953 the interest paid to savings bond holders was $1.68 billion dollars. These are the ordinary people who buy savings bonds, and this year it is down to $1.53 billion; next year it is estimated it will bring $1.4 billion.

In contrast, the Baltimore Sun said that the total take of Government interest by financial institutions, by which they meant insurance companies, banks, trust funds, and so forth has skyrocketed from $3.3 billion in 1953 to $4.6 billion in 1959, and next year it will be $5.2 billion.

The import of this is that the increase in interest rates, certainly, being paid to the ordinary person who buy savings bonds is dwindling. As the gentleman points out the market today is only $86 for a $100 bond. In other words, all the interest the owner gets on it in 10 years will be less than the depreciation in the principal.

The real increase in the interest rate has gone to the big institutions, and I think this is a point which the present administration will have to meet, because one of the first acts that they took when they came into power was to offer certificates of indebtedness at an increased interest rate; and I remember that offering was subscribed to seven times over, which showed that there was not a need for that kind of offer at that time; there was plenty of money in the market place.

This is one point I am glad the gentleman brought out, and he brought out many other points which, of course, I will not comment on. I would like also while I have the privilege of speaking on the gentleman's time to point out the fact that another Member of Congress, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. PASSMAN], has sent each one of us a letter under date of February 25 in which he points out some very interesting facts in regard to who have been the spenders. He points out that under the Truman administration from 1945 to 1953 the national debt was reduced $3,350 million; and that as of June 30, 1959, under the present administration of President Eisenhower, it has increased $19 billion during his 6-year tenure; and he backs this up with a great deal of information from very reputable sources. I know each one of the Members will enjoy reading his letter.

Mr. BOWLES. I thank the gentleman, and I may say that I agree with him that these high interest rates have had particularly savage effects on small-income people.

If a wealthy man buys a Cadillac car he does not have to pay for it on the installment plan. He pays cash and avoids interest. Even if he buys a $100,000 building, he may pay cash, especially if his is a large corporation. It is the small fellow who takes the major impact of high interest rates. The effects are very undemocratic.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOWLES. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. BOWLES] has come to this body with a great background of experience, not only in the executive branch of Government, but also as Ambassador to India, in which position my distinguished friend performed his duties in an outstanding manner. So the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. BOWLES] is well equipped to participate in the serious deliberations of the Congress and to make marked contributions.

In his maiden speech, the speech he has just made, he has demonstrated the profound depths of his understanding, his broad approach; there was nothing partisan at all in the gentleman's remarks. He has made one of the finest addresses and contributions I have ever heard during my 30-odd years as a Member of this body. I congratulate the gentleman, and I particularly congratulate the people of his district for electing him to the National House of Representatives.

Mr. BOWLES. I thank the gentleman, our distinguished majority leader, and my neighbor from Massachusetts.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOWLES. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. COHELAN. I would like to join my senior colleague from California in offering my commendation for the remarks of the gentleman in reference to his statement on our economy. It occurred to me as the gentleman was reciting the condition of our country that there are many people in the United States who fear embarking upon a new program on the ground that in moving in the direction that is suggested by the remarks of the gentleman from Connecticut would in some way erode old values, such as thrift, and that we would in some way or other remove incentive. Would the gentleman care to elaborate on that general subject?

Mr. BOWLES. When there are 5 million people out of work, quite a dent in incentives has already occurred. When we jack up the interest rate to a point where the small businessman finds it very difficult and risky to start any new venture, we tend further to destroy incentives. The administration of our farm programs has tended to destroy hope and incentives on family-sized farms and to benefit instead the often absentee owners and managers of larger farms.

We have been doing many of these things for reasons which I am sure are considered genuine and sincere. But the results have been discouraging. We are destroying incentives rather than increasing them.

What we must strive to do is to develop in this country and abroad full markets for all that we can efficiently produce, then young people with ability will have the courage and confidence to start out for themselves, to go into business, to invest in socially useful production which is going to be beneficial all around.

Mr. COHELAN. I thank the gentleman, and I want to say that I highly endorse the gentleman's remarks.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOWLES. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. REUSS. I, too, would like to commend the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. BOWLES] for an extremely constructive address. I recall some 10 or 12 years ago buying with great profit to myself a paperback edition of the gentleman's book "Tomorrow Without Fear," which I read with a great deal of interest. Today the gentleman has applied to the problems of 1959 and beyond the same courageous outlook.

As a member of the Joint Economic Committee I have had the privilege of listening to various witnesses on this year's "economic report," and I was struck by the fact that almost unanimously the outside experts in economic and public affairs called in by the Joint Economic Committee surveying the situation for 1959 feel that the danger of inflation in 1959 in the way of drastic price rises was not a very great one. They also were practically unanimous in feeling that unfortunately the national objective of our maximum employment and maximum production was not likely to be attained in 1959. I should very much appreciate the gentleman's views on an estimate of the situation as provided by these outside experts.

Mr. BOWLES. It seems to me these views are probably right. We are now expanding our economy at no more than 2½ percent annually. The average since 1953 has been well under 2 percent. As I mentioned earlier, you have to contrast that among other things with the current level in the Soviet Union of 7 percent.

In this connection, the Rockefeller report rejects a 2-percent increase in expansion; it rejects a 3-percent increase in expansion; it rejects a 4-percent increase. It insists that America is capable of producing 5 percent more each year without inflation and with a stable economy. If we can key ourselves to that kind of activity and that kind of confident thinking, we can produce infinitely more than the Soviet Union can ever produce. Challenges which are now hard for us, challenges which now cause us to strain, will then become vastly easier to meet.

Now, I do not want to stress the recession of the last year. We are always bound to miscalculate somewhat. There were plenty of miscalculations last year, and we found ourselves in a recession. I think that mistaken decisions in regard to prices by certain closely controlled industries plus these high interest rates had a good deal to do with it, but that is a question of controversy.

Nevertheless, by allowing ourselves to slump as we did last year, and by taking so long to get out of it, we are literally throwing away $80 billion to $100 billion in production that we could have put to good use. This is production that the free world desperately needs—goods that we are not producing but should be producing, goods that would give us all a greater degree of prosperity and also give us increased national security.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOWLES. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. I would like to thank the distinguished gentleman from Connecticut and say that I think this is an extremely useful service that he has performed. I am particularly impressed by the manner in

which he has done it, obviously very carefully studied, objective. His remarks regarding the recent recession, I think, reflect that temper. It is, indeed, controversial as to the precise effect of the high interest rate on the recession. Another controversial aspect was the failure, I think, on behalf of all of us to insist upon the implementation of the Full Employment Act, which might very well have helped a great deal. I shall preserve tomorrow's RECORD and reread the gentleman's remarks, but I thank him on behalf of all of us who have enjoyed this so much.

Mr. BOWLES. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOWLES. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I, too, would like to join my colleagues in expressing my additional appreciation for the privilege of listening to a very thoughtful and very thought-provoking discussion. I would like to ask the gentleman whether he feels that in the quest of the goal to increase our production levels it might not be possible to have exerted greater leadership in bringing the problems of management and labor into closer focus through the cooperation or the setting up of machinery which would enable management and labor to discuss their problems openly and frankly, bringing in, I hope, the interest of the general public, which often is forgotten, I am afraid, in the negotiations between the two, and thus through that machinery making the public more aware of the very great impact that must come upon our economy by any decision which is made, particularly in any one large industry. For instance, in the upcoming situation in the steel industry, any decision which is made is bound to affect not only the workers in the industry and the stockholders and the management of the steel industry but everybody else who uses the product, and that takes in nearly all of us. I am wondering if the gentleman would think it would be feasible or proper to give leadership or hope that leadership could be prevailed upon to provide that kind of machinery.

Mr. BOWLES. I think the gentleman has raised a provocative point. It is vital that we have machinery in this country which can place the real facts about these fundamental relationships before the people of this country: that is, the relationships of wages, prices, productivity, and profits. Let me refer to the Office of Price Administration again. We took considerable abuse during the war years, some of it even from Members of this body. Nevertheless we performed some useful functions.

One of them was this. We prepared precise statistical analyses industry by industry about what increased outputs were doing to the pressure on prices, about what was happening to wage rates, about the whole relationship of wages, productivity, prices, and profits. It seems to me important that this country should again have some source which consumers, farmers, labor, and management can all trust to give us the real facts on these crucial economic relationships.

This might discourage some labor unions from making inordinate demands. But it would often assist working people to get the wage increases to which they are legitimately entitled by their increased productivity.

Some people talk thoughtlessly about the dangers of higher wages. But where would this country be if it did not have high wages.

If we could find a way to an extra $500 into everybody's pay envelope through general increases of output, this country would very quickly be the richer for it. Or to consider what might happen to our economy right now if $500 were removed from each pay envelope. The present lingering recession would have been infinitely worse.

We do not now clearly see what all the relationships are. As we read about them in the papers, we are often reading positions taken by one group or another which has a particular bias. I certainly would concur in the gentleman's suggestion, and I hope that perhaps in this session of Congress something can be done to improve the machinery of reporting these relationships.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I thank the gentleman, and I would simply add that in all of the discussion on questions of controversial issues which will come before us at a later time I hope we may remember the perspective which the gentleman has so very clearly and very well given us today.

Mr. BOWLES. I thank the gentleman from California.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOWLES. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I should like to join my colleagues in expressing my own personal appreciation of this intelligent analysis of some of our economic problems that we have heard from the gentleman from Connecticut. Also I want to express my gratitude, over a long period of time, for the manner in which he has instructed my own thinking on public questions. I think I have read most of the articles and books the gentleman has authored, since 1940 in any event. I remember one in particular which he called "The New Dimensions of Peace." Here this afternoon he has suggested some of the new dimensions of our economy.

It is my own view that our success in meeting the challenge of peace depends to a great extent on how effectively we meet these economic challenges here at home.

In that connection, I have been particularly concerned with a more intelligent and imaginative use of our agricultural abundance as an instrument of foreign policy, as an instrument of peace. And I have suggested on numerous occasions that we ought to be using more imagination in converting farm surpluses, if I may use that term, into an asset rather than a liability and as a great force for international peace and freedom.

I wonder if the gentleman would care to comment on that.

Mr. BOWLES. I think the gentleman has made a very important point. We have a tremendous accumulated abundance in our farm economy, and we have not yet learned how to use it. That is clear. Public Law 480 provides a framework for more intelligent utilization of this abundance, but we still have a great deal more to learn.

In a broader world sense, our food-abundance situation is reminiscent of 1932 or 1933, when we had 16 million unemployed, many of whom were not getting enough to eat. Food was spoiling in our grocery stores and in the hands of distributors. Yet we were told that hungry people could not eat the spoiling food because so-called iron laws of economics stood in the way.

Gradually we caught a vision of how very wrongheaded we were. We realized that this dilemma was morally wrong, economically wrong, and socially wrong.

So we proceeded to bring the hungry people together with the food that might have spoiled. As a result, the country took hope again. It grew and expanded, workers got jobs, the farmers did better, and people ate properly.

In a way, we are now in a similar situation, with our tremendous capacity to grow food in an ill-fed world. Almost every nation in the world envies us for this capacity. What would the Soviet Union be doing at home, and in Asia, Africa, and Latin America, if they had our capacity? They would be using it ingeniously to bolster the homefront and to undermine our position elsewhere politically and in every other way.

We have made a good start in groping for answers to that question. But obviously we have not found all the answers, by a long shot. We have much further to go.

In a sense I would like to suggest that we are standing today where we stood in 1931. We are more and more aware of the gigantic problems stretched out before us. We realize we do not have clear answers to them. We are in disagreement about what is to be done, and because we are in disagreement, we often find one group set against another group in a most destructive way.

But in 1931, when everything looked so grim and bleak, we were also on the edge of a great surge of vitality, of great creativeness, of great forward strides.

I like to feel that we may be on the edge of a similar period today, and that we will soon again face up to the new techniques and methods and ideas that will be required of us, that we will soon again learn how to bring the infinite capacity of the American people and the American system to bear on the enormous challenges of today's world.

I should like to congratulate the gentleman from South Dakota on the lead he has personally taken on this vital question of turning our great food capacity to effective use.

Mr. McGOVERN. I thank the gentleman. I wonder if I may ask him further if he was not in India at the time some wheat shipments were made from the United States that were very helpful in meeting the problems that existed there.

Mr. BOWLES. The gentleman is quite right. The wheat shipments to India

in 1951 and 1952 helped save India from a famine. That wheat gave India its chance to begin to get up off its back. If we had not sent the wheat when we did, India by now would be facing greater problems than she does today.

Perhaps some of the answers to this question of world food distribution lie in a world food bank or in some similar new mechanisms or new techniques. But clearly as to other questions we shall have to find better and deeper answers than we have today.

I do not profess to have such answers. I only know that answers are urgently required, and that we should join hands across the aisle of this House to try to find them.

Mr. McGOVERN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOWLES. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I was very much interested in the suggestion the gentleman made in regard to the world food bank, and also as to this whole problem of utilizing our food surpluses which are stacking up in our warehouses to the tune of many billions of dollars. As a general principle, would the gentleman think that in extending these food surpluses to these starving nations they should be extended on some type of long-range financial loan basis rather than on a free grant basis?

Mr. BOWLES. I think the gentleman has a good point in connection with our so-called food surpluses. By the way, I wish we could find a better word than "surplus." People who are hungry overseas are mighty confused when we talk about our food "surpluses" as something unwanted that we would like to sweep out of the way.

But I do think it is wise to accept local currencies and to plow those currencies back into efficient use in those countries to help their economies and to help our own programs in those countries. I know it is more acceptable to people in the recipient countries if we can keep agricultural agreements on that basis.

Of course, what happens to these currencies over the years, as we accumulate more and more of them, is another question to which we do not have adequate answers. Here is another new area that deserves a lot of study.

We are moving increasingly into unknown fields. But I think loans for repayment in local currencies are by all odds the best arrangements we have so far in the agricultural field.

I might add this: When you put a certain amount of wheat into an undeveloped country where people are out of work, in a sense you turn that wheat into development capital. If you need to dig more irrigation ditches, and you take a million people who are not employed to dig those irrigation ditches, and you make wheat and cotton cloth available, and give them even a meager wage with which to buy that wheat and cloth, you end up by creating a whole new irrigation system.

You have in fact transformed wheat into capital.

I am confident that in the coming years, we will learn much more about how we can turn the great farm abundance of this country into many of the capital improvements that are so desperately needed by the underdeveloped continents, which may play such a decisive role in tomorrow's world.

COMMODITY CREDIT PROGRAM

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WRIGHT). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. GATHINGS] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, the press has been carrying accounts in the last day or two about individuals and firms who have participated in the Commodity Credit Corporation loan programs. Among these participants were some from my State and district that I am privileged to serve. For example, it is alleged that the firm known as J. G. Adams & Son, of Hughes, Ark., had obtained a CCC loan in the amount of $420,343.70. The news items leave the impression that the Adams firm had obtained a subsidy from the CCC, or from the U.S. Government, of over $400,000. That is a misapprehension that ought to be clarified. I would like to present some facts with respect to these transactions. I have here a telegram which was just received by me from Greenwood, Miss. As a matter of fact, the Adams firm dealt through the Staple Cotton Cooperative Association, of that city since it was a member of that marketing organization. It is directed to me under date of February 26:

> In regard to the recent statements that major benefits under the Government price-support program have gone to the very large corporate operations, I give you below the following information:
>
> On cotton pledged for the loan and withdrawn with dollar amounts involved on the 1957–53 operations of J. G. Adams & Son, Hughes, Ark.:
>
> Total bales pledged to the loan, 3,024; gross amount $420,343.70.
>
> Total bales withdrawn from the loan—of the 3,024 put in—2,706.
>
> The amount comes to the sum of $385,-121.01.
>
> The interest paid by J. G. Adams & Son with respect to that cotton was $2,871.82. The total left in the loan was 318 bales.

So almost 90 percent of the cotton had been withdrawn by Adams & Son and sold. Adams & Son paid the carrying charges as well as the interest on the transactions. So there was no subsidy and could not be unless some of this cotton, after title passed to CCC was subsequently sold by the Government for less than it cost the agency.

The remaining 318 bales of cotton are held subject to the order of Adams and if Adams wants to sell that cotton it could withdraw the balance of 318 bales before the takeover date by the Commodity Credit Corporation.

Mr. PILCHER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GATHINGS. I yield. Mr. Speaker, I want to say that the gentleman from Georgia is one of the best informed men in this House with respect to all phases of the cotton program as well as with regard to any farm problem. He is an outstanding farmer, merchant and businessman who is doing a superb job for his people and the Nation.

Mr. PILCHER. Mr. Speaker, I am glad the gentleman brought this to the attention of the House. I saw that article. It merely sets out the amount of the load. For instance, about 5 years ago I had something over 11,000 bales of cotton in my warehouses in south Georgia that belonged to the farmers. Today I do not have three or four hundred bales. All of that cotton has been pulled out of the warehouse. Not only the interest has been paid to the Government, but all the warehouse charges have been met. They are all bonded warehouse receipts and in order to get a loan from the Commodity Credit Corporation, your warehouse has to be a bonded warehouse. You can take that receipt to any bank if you want to and borrow money on it. In the case of Adams, they would have owed the bank thousands of dollars, but when they sold the cotton they paid it back. There is no subsidy whatever.

Now to be fair about this subsidy, the farmer has 12 months. He puts his cotton in the warehouse and he has 12 months in which to redeem it. He has until June 30 the following year. If the farmer has not taken it out and sold it, then the Government takes it over and sells it. Of course any price below the loan would be a subsidy, but in the case of cotton it is very, very small.

Mr. GATHINGS. It is a storable commodity. The cotton is there ready for shipment.

Mr. PILCHER. That is correct.

Mr. GATHINGS. I appreciate the comments of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PILCHER]. As a matter of fact, the Commodity Credit Corporation program on cotton, as well as on these other storable commodities, is a program that means for the orderly marketing of that commodity. It goes into that loan during the harvest season. The farmer puts it in there during September, October, and November, and he withdraws it from the loan during the lax season, January, February, or March. So it is a great protection to the little farmer as well as to the big farmer, because the big farmer takes advantage of it since he withdraws it from circulation, and therefore it stabilizes the price at a time when the crop is moving at harvesttime.

I want to call attention to another operation. The Miller Lumber Co., at Marianna, Ark., is alleged to have participated in the Commodity Credit Corporation to the extent of $319,000. This farming operation placed some 1,575 bales of cotton in the CCC program for the purpose of orderly marketing of the commodity at a more propitious time. Of this amount, all but one bale was redeemed through payment of interest and carrying charges, and sold out of the loan. There was only one bale left of the Miller Lumber Co. cotton according to the information furnished by this firm.

Now let us look at the situation that exists with regard to the Producers Rice Mill, at Stuttgart, Ark. That happens to be in the district represented by

the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. NORRELL], but I wanted to bring it to the attention of the House. The Producers Rice Mill, Inc., was in the program for $1,460,902.11. That is a farmer-owned cooperative established for the purpose of drying and milling rice of the members of the cooperative. There are about 400 rice farmers who are members of this association. That is not one firm. Four hundred farmers participated since they produced the rice and those farmers find it more economical to deliver their rice to the mill for handling and to store the rice at the mill, rather than take it back for storage on the farm. This rice, delivered by some 400 growers, is placed in the loan for orderly marketing. Mr. H. M. Alderson, general manager of the cooperative, states that all but about 30 percent of this rice has been sold out of the loan, with payment of interest and carrying charges made to the Government.

Mr. Speaker, is it an evil to own a large farm in this country? It would be just as well that we would argue that only an industry which employs 50 or 100 people could get the benefit of the restrictions on imports. If a factory employs a larger number of workers it would not enjoy the benefit that would accrue to the smaller plant. A large farm is an aggregation of small farms when we use the share crop system, which is done in so many parts of the country. Each such small farmer works by contract. Now, the theory that a person who has his money invested in land and applies his talents and hard work should be denied equal opportunities with that of others is not in keeping with the principles, aims, and objects of the American people. All persons should be treated alike and none given any special advantage over the other. To do otherwise would amount to unjust discrimination.

It may be confusing to some as to why growers would place their cotton, rice, or other basic commodities in the loan and then redeem it at a later date. They do this because Congress devised a program to assist in providing orderly marketing of farm commodities and to prevent farmers from being at the mercy of a market glutted at harvesttime by the full year's production. Indeed, the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, carries this statement as to the declaration of policy:

SEC 2. It is hereby declared to be the policy of Congress * * * to assist in the marketing of agricultural commodities for domestic consumption and foreign export; and to regulate interstate and foreign commerce in cotton, wheat, corn, tobacco, and rice to the extent necessary to provide an orderly, adequate, and balanced flow of such commodities in interstate and foreign commerce through storage of reserve supplies, loans, marketing quotas, assisting farmers to obtain, insofar as practicable, parity prices for such commodities and parity of income.

Back in 1956 when this same type of propaganda was used in an effort to discredit our agricultural population, the following chart was placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to illustrate how this loan and redemption program operated in one instance. From this outline the orderly marketing operations of one grower is shown and it indicates that had no such program been available all of this cotton would have been thrown into the market at harvesttime and would have resulted in distress sales by the grower and his neighbors while the price of cotton would have been beaten down. This is the purpose of the program—to insure an orderly flow of cotton and other farm commodities to market to insure the stability of a fair price to the grower and an adequate supply to the consumer.

See from the following statistics how one cottongrower utilized this loan and redemption program and note the results—of a total of $1,292,473.25 worth of cotton placed in the loan, the grower redeemed all but 68 bales, repaying to the Government $1,261,972.04 plus $16,368.39 interest.

	Placed in Government loan		Withdrawn from Government loan		
	Bales	Amount	Bales	Amount	Interest paid
1954—September	1,424	$257,286.19			
October	1,939	339,241.31	173	$29,682.92	$19.21
November	3,910	650,556.01	539	86,311.86	140.62
December	245	39,060.63	90	14,544.04	42.28
1955—January	14	2,233.10	431	70,980 92	331.77
February			3,060	523,099.34	4,712.92
March	22	4,096.01	10	1,505.49	13.44
April			863	149,936.22	2,334.57
May			864	148,820.85	2,689.67
June			864	148,761.94	3,098.69
July			592	108,328.46	2,985.22
Total loan	7,554	1,292,473.25	7,486	1,281,972.04	16,368.39
Withdrawn	7,486	1,281,972.04			
Loan balance	68	10,501.21			

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas.

There was no objection.

HELLS CANYON OF THE SNAKE RIVER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ULLMAN] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, the Middle Snake River is about to be plunged into further controversy by pending private power company application for permission to build another dam, probably at the Mountain Sheep site. I am opposed to this filing because in my opinion it is against the public interest.

The situation is this. The stretch of the Snake River which forms the common boundary between Idaho and Oregon is known as the Hells Canyon of the Snake River. It is the deepest canyon on the North American Continent, deeper even than the Grand Canyon of the Colorado River.

The upper or southern half of this stretch of canyon was proposed by both the Army Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation as the site of the 91-mile long Hells Canyon Dam reservoir.

The lower or northern half of this stretch of canyon has been proposed by the Army Corps of Engineers for development by means of the 64-mile Nez Perce Dam reservoir.

As outlined in its 308 report in 1948, the Corps of Engineers proposed that the Nez Perce Dam be about 615 feet high and have a usable flood control and hydroelectric power storage of 4,800,000 acre-feet. The power installation was proposed for almost 2 million kilowatts and this figure has since been increased to almost 2½ million kilowatts—or more than the capacity of Grand Coulee Dam and more than the capacity of the Kuibyshev Dam in Russia which is today the largest hydroelectric dam in the world.

The two proposed dams, the Nez Perce and, 64 miles upstream, the Hells Canyon Dam, would have been similar to having two Hoover Dams in the same long canyon in stairway fashion.

The downstream project, the Nez Perce Dam, would have a tremendous additional advantage because it would dam two rivers for the price of one dam. In addition to the 64-mile-long reservoir up the Snake River, the Nez Perce Dam would also back water up the famous Salmon River, a distance of 63 miles. The Nez Perce Dam would be located 2½ miles below the confluence of the Salmon River and the Snake River.

The opportunity to dam two rivers with one dam is rare. TVA's Norris Dam stores water on both the Clinch and the Powell Rivers. Shasta Dam in California dams the Sacramento, the McCloud, and the Pit Rivers.

Because of the involvement of the Salmon River, the Nez Perce Dam has a fish problem, as almost a third of the great salmon runs of the Columbia River go up the Salmon River for spawning. This has been made possible by the installation of fish ladders in the downstream dams such as the Bonneville Dam, the Dalles Dam, and the McNary Dam. The highest hydraulic lift of these fish ladders will be about 100 feet in the case of the Ice Harbor Dam which is now under construction.

In our present experience, this is the limit in the height of fish ladders. We started with 60 feet at Bonneville Dam, then 80 feet at McNary Dam and we have full confidence in the 100-foot ladder.

We have no experience with ladders for 600-foot dams. However, much research is in progress and there are many hopeful signs of solution. In fact the Federal Power Commission has approved the so-called skimmer device for use at the Brownlee Dam and the Pelton Dam, both of which are in my congressional district.

In my opinion, a private filing, prior to the hearings scheduled by the Army's Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors on the 308 review report on the Columbia River and tributaries, would be contrary to the public interest. These hearings will take place in Portland, Oreg.; Lewiston, Idaho; Missoula, Mont.; and in Washington, D.C., the second week of March.

The critical issue at these hearings will be on whether the corps should recommend to Congress the building of the Nez Perce Dam as proposed in 1948 or two alternative projects. The alternatives are the construction, at this time, of the high Mountain Sheep Dam on the Snake River and, later, the construction of the lower Canyon Dam on the Salmon River when the fish passage problem is solved.

However, the Nez Perce Dam would cost at least $150 million less, produce more effective flood control and provide more power at a lower cost per kilowatt-hour. In short, the Nez Perce Dam would provide for full, comprehensive development on a truly multiple-purpose basis. The ultimate construction of the Nez Perce Dam should be in the public interest.

The chief argument in favor of the high Mountain Sheep Dam is that it can be built now without waiting for the solution of the fish problem on the Salmon River. My answer to this argument is that we have taken quite a few million years to carve this superb canyon. We have foregone the benefits of its waterpower and upstream storage potential all these years. It will not break us to wait a few more years.

I am confident that the fish-passage problem is on its way to solution. This confidence warrants action by the Congress to place this stretch of river under the status of a reservation until we can have a "yes" or "no" answer on the fish solution.

I am not advocating the immediate authorization and construction of the Nez Perce Dam. I would favor its conditional authorization—conditional on the solution of the fish-passage problem.

Support for this project has been widespread. Earlier this month, Washington was host to over 7,000 people attending the annual membership meeting of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association. This meeting adopted a resolution calling upon Congress to authorize the Nez Perce Dam contingent upon the solution of the fish-passage problem.

Another event earlier this month was the action of the Columbia Basin Interagency Committee at Boise, Idaho, on February 11 in adopting the recommendation of its fisheries subcommittee calling for a speedup in fisheries research. I am proud to say that the chairman of the CBIAC fisheries subcommittee is the Honorable Albert Day, director of fisheries, State of Oregon.

We in Oregon are proud of Al Day because he has shown constructive leadership, patience, and initiative in dealing with the difficult problems which have too often taken the form of a fish versus power controversy. For example, some years ago it was Al Day who had the foresight to say that 100-foot fish ladders in the proposed Ice Harbor Dam would be feasible and thereby facilitated the decision to go ahead with this project.

Another good sign is the recent progress in what is called fish farming. The Japanese have long had great success in raising salmon by means of artificial spawning beds in contrast to our hatchery methods. The Japanese method is much cheaper, produces more fish and reduces the risk of disease. Fish farming is just getting started in Washington, Oregon, and British Columbia. A few more years of experimentation are needed to provide assurance that the fish farming method will supercede the conventional hatchery.

Here again more research is needed. The CBIAC fisheries subcommittee program of fisheries research at a cost of $700,000 for the next year is worthy of our support. The 5-year cost will be a little over $3 million.

A final consideration favoring a reservation of the Nez Perce reach of the Snake River pending solution of the fish problem is the matter of the Asotin Dam. The Corps of Engineers has just recommended the Asotin Dam as the uppermost of the navigation projects on the Snake River to make navigation possible to the lime deposits at Lime Point. The Asotin Dam will provide slack water navigation to the Nez Perce damsite. Such navigation will make unnecessary the construction of a $15 million railroad to the Nez Perce site. A reasonable waiting period will thus permit a reduction in the cost of the Nez Perce Dam.

Mr. Speaker, these considerations warrant attention by the Congress together with appropriate action. It seems to me that we should not idly sit by, thus making it necessary for the general public to spend untold thousands of dollars in order to convince the Federal Power Commission of the need to protect natural resources.

The Snake River belongs to the public, and should be developed in a manner that will insure full utilization.

Unfortunately, the Corps of Engineers in its 308 review report is gradually vacillating its way from an endorsement of the Nez Perce Dam toward approval of the private utility point of view. Apparently this inclination was a last minute decision on the part of the Corps of Engineers because this recently issued five-volume report contains a two-dam recommendation in the front of the report, but someone forgot to change the appendix which clearly shows the superiority of the Nez Perce Dam.

Mr. Speaker, as this situation develops, it is my hope that we in the Congress can adopt a resolution to place this reach of the Snake River in the status of a temporary reservation, and during such a reservation period that we pursue the fisheries research program recommended by the fisheries experts.

STATEMENT IN SUPPORT OF A JOINT BUDGET COMMITTEE

Mr. BURKE of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. RODINO] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill to amend two sections of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 in a way that will provide the Congress with procedures and staff for improved evaluation of the fiscal requirements of Federal executive agencies.

The first of the amendments creates an effective Joint Budget Committee, to replace the long-abandoned Legislative Budget Committee. The earlier committee, established by the Reorganization Act, never was practical. It was anomalous in principle, because its was required to prejudge in a matter of days the results of the detailed studies which Appropriations Committees make throughout most of each session of Congress. It was mistaken in principle also because the committee membership included both the Appropriations Committees and the Tax Committees, yet was required to establish targets for appropriations action alone.

My bill establishes from the membership of the Appropriations Committees alone a small committee on the budget. The organization, staff and duties of the committee insure that it will be active, that it will be concerned with functions that are both feasible and necessary for adequate consideration of the budget, and that the information and counsel which it supplies will contribute effectively to economy and efficiency of government.

The Joint Budget Committee will be an active committee because it is limited in size to 16 members drawn from the Appropriations Committees. Nine of the members will come from the House Committee on Appropriations and seven will come from the Senate committee. The number is sufficiently small that sessions can be arranged without disrupting the Congress. And the slight numerical advantage of the House Members insures that the committee will reach decisions. Similarity of interest and purpose can be expected in a committee composed entirely of members of the Appropriations Committees, with the result that all participate actively in the pursuit of the duties assigned the committee. The duties of the Joint Budget Committee extend throughout the session of Congress. They are not limited to a few days at the beginning of the session. The committee therefore would be effective at all periods during the consideration of legislation. Since the membership are all from the Appropriations Committees,

there would be no loss of position or authority for the members of those committees. The information obtained by the Joint Budget Committee is certain to affect appropriations legislation, because the members of the joint committee which reports the information are members of the Appropriations Committee which writes the legislation. The membership of the Appropriations Committees of the two Houses will have worked together from the beginning of the consideration of the budget, rather than waiting until bills have come to conference and consequently fewer disagreements should arise from the detailed examination of budget estimates in each House.

The Joint Budget Committee is concerned first of all, but not exclusively, to examine information relative to agency budgets, and to provide for Appropriations Committee use information which will be adequate in considering agency budgets. Consistently with this purpose, the staff of the joint committee will be assigned to attend hearings held by subcommittees, to examine agency books for the joint committee, and to counsel the Appropriations Committees.

The joint budget committee is expected to relate appropriations to the whole problem of fiscal requirements and the legislation which creates programs for which money must be appropriated. The joint committee is required to consider information supplied in the President's reports on the economy, and on the state of the Nation. It will consider Treasury and other information about revenues. It also has the duty, consistent with the purpose of fitting appropriations and other legislation into an effective pattern, of reporting to other committees any information it develops relating to deviations from basic legislative authorization, inconsistencies between appropriations and basic legislative authorization, and cutbacks in authorized programs which require appropriations.

The joint committee will consider revenue estimates, but revenues are not made the guide to its deliberations. It is instead to direct its attention, and its reports to the appropriations committees, toward ascertaining how to bring appropriations to the minimum amounts which will provide for the requirements of Government operations and the national security. Consistently with the goal of supporting Government operations and the national security, the joint budget committee will recommend legislation to increase efficiency and economy in Government.

The second section of the proposed bill requires the development of information which will make possible the appraisal of programs from the standpoint of their ultimate budgetary requirements. It requires that the budget document include a special analysis showing the ultimate full costs of all active long-term construction and development programs and projects authorized by the Congress. Grant-in-aid programs are to be included in this analysis. Further, reports on legislation which authorize appropriations are required to include estimates of the probable cost of carrying out the proposed legislation over the first 5-year period of its operation.

The reason for requiring the development and presentation of such information is that the major changes in requirements for appropriation and expenditure of public funds is not increases or reductions in amounts for established activities—increases or reductions required only for economy and efficiency—but major changes derived from the development of new Federal projects and programs. Action on appropriations can be enlightened and reasonable only if the committees and the Congress have knowledge of the future costs for which the Government is being obligated, when programs are authorized and the first appropriations are made.

The bill requires that the joint committee employ a professional staff, but leaves to the wisdom of the committee the determination of the size of that staff.

The bill provides for close cooperation by the Bureau of the Budget with the joint committee and with the Appropriations Committees and consequently it does not imply that the Congress will attempt to make itself independent in budgetary matters from the executive departments. That is to say, the progress of the last 37 years in the development of the executive budget will not be discarded. There is no attempt to return to prebudget conditions in this bill.

WATER RESEARCH

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Utah [Mr. DIXON] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. DIXON. Mr. Speaker, there is now a widespread recognition that insufficient usable water could become a major bottleneck to the further development of this great Nation. Consequently, the Congress asked the Department of Agriculture to prepare a study of future water research needs. The results of this study are to be presented to the Congress by March 1.

Now is a time of keen interest on the part of the Congress in following through with a well conceived plan and program of expanding water research activity. I hope that the Congress will choose to establish several minimum size regional laboratories rather than a single superwater laboratory.

The reasons for this are as follows: First, a single super lab would prove more costly to construct than the expansion of existing facilities at several key locations. Second, the operation of a single super lab would duplicate the work already being done at many existing facilities. Third, by establishing several minimum size marginal laboratories research can be divided among them so as to fit local needs and grassroot sentiment. Fourth, by establishment of several labs most if not all of them could be located at land-grant colleges where they could help train new scientists by becoming integrated into graduate study programs of the colleges.

It is especially urgent that at least one of these new labs be a hydraulic engineering laboratory. Most of the water research which is done has been concerned with the interaction between soil and water. However, the engineering aspects of the physical control of water has long been neglected, yet, it is precisely in these engineering aspects where we make the major expenditures for water development. For example, we do not even have a simple device to measure the water received by each irrigation user. The invention of such a device would be a great stride toward the efficient and economical use of water.

I am today introducing a bill for the establishment of a regional water laboratory at Utah State University because it is unquestionably the best location for a laboratory doing basic research in the engineering aspects of the physical control of water.

The following is a brief summary of tangible evidences why the West and the Nation would be benefited by the selection of Utah State University for this hydraulic laboratory:

First. Utah State already has a dam and reservoir with facilities valued at $500,000 at least. The site is unparallelled at other land-grant universities in the 17 reclamation States because of the firm discharge, storage capacity, and regulation, the stable and ample flow of high quality water from the Logan River, and the lack of pumpage expense. Developing of a comparable storage reservoir for regulating flow would cost in the millions of dollars even at the most favorable sites at other locations.

Second. Utah State University has produced more advanced degrees in the field of water than any other university in the reclamation West over the past 15 years. USU has a qualified staff, library facilities, and has long led in research on water problems of the irrigated West.

Third. The Foreign Agricultural Service of USDA has chosen Utah State University as the training center for officials from foreign countries responsible for irrigation agriculture. More than 200 have participated in approximately the past 5 years.

Fourth. Utah is near the center of the 17 reclamation States and near the center of reclamation activity and has representative agricultural and climatic conditions. Utah State would be conveniently located for assistance with difficult hydraulic engineering problems anticipated with the Colorado storage project, the largest single reclamation program ever authorized by Congress.

Fifth. Water engineering and fluid mechanics are important to national security, and designation of Utah State would conform to the policy of dispersal.

Sixth. Utah State has a very qualified engineering staff, including Dean D. F. Peterson, Jr., of the college of engineering, who has had extensive experience with water research at the world famous Fort Collins Water Laboratory in Colorado.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. GATHINGS, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. ULLMAN, for 15 minutes, today.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia, for 1 hour, on Thursday, March 5.

Mr. LINDSAY, for 10 minutes, on Thursday, March 5.

Mr. WHITTEN, for 30 minutes, March 3.

Mr. STAGGERS, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. VANIK, for 20 minutes, on Monday next.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. JACKSON (at the request of Mr. MICHEL) and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. DAGUE.

Mr. HARRIS (at the request of Mr. McCORMACK) and include extraneous matter.

Mr. BOGGS (at the request of Mr. McCORMACK) and include extraneous matter.

Mrs. KELLY (at the request of Mr. McCORMACK) and include extraneous material.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana and include extraneous matter.

Mr. METCALF (at the request of Mr. BURKE of Kentucky) and to include extraneous matter.

At the request of Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin, the following Members to revise and extend their remarks:

Mr. PELLY and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. SAYLOR (at the request of Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin) and to include extraneous matter.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BURKE of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to. Accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 17 minutes p.m.) the House, pursuant to its previous order, adjourned until Monday, March 2, 1959, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

625. A letter from the Adjutant General, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, transmitting the proceedings of the 59th National Convention of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, held in New York, N.Y., August 17–22, 1958, pursuant to Public Law 249, 77th Congress (H. Doc. No. 84); to the Committee on Armed Services and ordered to be printed with illustrations.

626. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to authorize the commandant of the Judge Advocate General's School to award appropriate degrees and credits"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

627. A letter from the Secretary of Labor, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend and clarify the reemployment provisions of the Universal Military Training and Service Act, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

628. A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, relative to a notice of a proposed disposition of 66,000 pounds of pyrethrum (20 percent) extract now held in the national stockpile, pursuant to the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act; to the Committee on Armed Services.

629. A letter from the Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to further amend the Reorganization Act of 1949, as amended, so that such act will apply to reorganization plans transmitted to the Congress at any time in conformity with the provisions of the act"; to the Committee on Government Operations.

630. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting the third annual report on the accomplishments of the anthracite mine-water control program, pursuant to the act of July 15, 1955 (69 Stat. 352, 30 U.S.C. supp. V, secs. 571–576); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

631. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to donate to the Pueblo of Isleta certain Federal property in the State of New Mexico"; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

632. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to revise the boundaries of the Montezuma Castle National Monument, Ariz., and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

633. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to authorize the use of the revolving loan fund for Indians to assist Klamath Indians during the period for terminating Federal supervision"; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

634. A letter from the Chairman, United States Atomic Energy Commission, transmitting a revised draft of legislation entitled "A bill to authorize appropriations for the Atomic Energy Commission in accordance with section 261 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes"; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

635. A letter from the Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, transmitting a report covering the contracts negotiated by the National Aeronautics and Space Administration and its predecessor, the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, during the period July 1, 1958, to December 31, 1958, pursuant to the authority of 10 U.S.C. 2304(a)(11) and (16); to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

636. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "To increase the duty-free allowance for articles acquired abroad by residents of the United States"; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mrs. PFOST: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 3495. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to administer certain acquired lands as revested Oregon and California railroad grant lands; without amendment (Rept. No. 81). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MILLS: Committee on Ways and Means. H.R. 137. A bill to allow a deduction, for Federal estate tax purposes, in the case of certain transfers to charities which are subjected to foreign death taxes; with amendment (Rept. No. 82). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MILLS: Committee on Ways and Means. H.R. 1219. A bill to amend section 2038 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to revocable transfers); without amendment (Rept. No. 83). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina: Committee on Armed Services. H.R. 3368. A bill to extend the special enlistment programs provided by section 262 of the Armed Forces Reserve Act of 1952, as amended; without amendment (Rept. No. 84). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mrs. PFOST: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 3496. A bill to revise the boundaries of the Kings Mountain National Military Park, S.C., and to authorize the procurement and exchange of lands, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 85). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ARENDS:

H.R. 5040. A bill to amend and clarify the reemployment provisions of the Universal Military Training and Service Act and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BALDWIN:

H.R. 5041. A bill to authorize the improvement of the Walnut Creek Basin, Calif., for flood control as recommended in House Document No. 76, 86th Congress; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BENNETT of Michigan:

H.R. 5042. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to subject television networks to certain controls designed to assure that their operations are in the public interest; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BENTLEY:

H.R. 5043. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with reference to jeopardy assessments, and for other purposes to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BROCK:

H.R. 5044. A bill to amend section 21 of the Second Liberty Bond Act to provide for the retirement of the public debt; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BURLESON:

H.R. 5045. A bill to authorize each Member of the House of Representatives to employ an administrative assistant; to restrict the payment of dual compensation by the Clerk of the House; to provide that the basic compensation of certain positions under the House of Representatives shall be fixed at multiples of $50; and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. CELLER:

H.R. 5046. A bill to control the future expansion of bank holding companies; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 5047. A bill to authorize the National Inventors Council to make awards for inventive contributions relating to the national defense; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COHELAN:

H.R. 5048. A bill to authorize a 5-year program of grants and scholarships for collegiate education in the field of nursing, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DANIELS:

H.R. 5049. A bill to protect the right of the blind to self-expression through organizations of the blind; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 5050. A bill to provide opportunity for Government employees to produce and examine witnesses in connection with actions involving dismissal from the service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 5051. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide monthly insurance benefits in certain cases for brothers, sisters, and other relatives of individuals who die fully insured under such title; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GEORGE:

H.R. 5052. A bill to provide for the reporting and disclosure of certain financial transactions and administrative practices of labor organizations and employers, to prevent abuses in the administration of trusteeships by labor organizations, to provide standards with respect to the election of officers of labor organizations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 5053. A bill to repeal section 14(b) of the National Labor Relations Act which relates to the validity of so-called right-to-work laws; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HERLONG:

H.R. 5054. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 with respect to the marking of imported articles and containers; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 5055. A bill to remove a restriction on the use of certain real property heretofore conveyed to the city of St. Augustine, Fla., by the United States; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H.R. 5056. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide for amortization deductions with respect to housing facilities for farmworkers; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 5057. A bill to amend section 1552, title 10, United States Code, and section 301 of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 to provide that the Board for the Correction of Military or Naval Records and the Boards of Review, Discharges, and Dismissals shall give consideration to satisfactory evidence relating to good character and exemplary conduct in civilian life after discharge or dismissal in determining whether or not to correct certain discharges and dismissals; to authorize the award of an exemplary rehabilitation certificate; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. JENNINGS:

H.R. 5058. A bill to amend section 101(c) of the Agricultural Act of 1949 to stabilize and protect the level of support for tobacco; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado:

H.R. 5059. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to include Colorado among the States which may divide their retirement systems into two parts so as to obtain social security coverage, under State agreement, for only those State and local employees who desire such coverage; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LANGEN:

H.R. 5060. A bill to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949 to provide full parity for wheat by incremental price supports and reduced production and surpluses by voluntary participation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. McGINLEY:

H.R. 5061. A bill to amend section 21 of the Second Liberty Bond Act to provide for the retirement of the public debt; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MADDEN:

H.R. 5062. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide an exemption from the communications tax for wire services used in the education of handicapped individuals; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER:

H.R. 5063. A bill to amend chapter 15 of title 38, United States Code, to provide for payment of a pension of $100 per month to World War I veterans who have attained the age of 60 years; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. MITCHELL:

H.R. 5064. A bill to amend section 6421(c) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to permit the filing of claims for refund of certain gasoline taxes where the period otherwise prescribed for the filing of such claims has expired; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PERKINS:

H.R. 5065. A bill to establish an effective program to alleviate conditions of substantial and persistent unemployment and underemployment in certain economically depressed areas; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. STRATTON:

H.R. 5066. A bill to regulate the foreign commerce of the United States by establishing quantitative restrictions on the importation of handwear; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Louisiana:

H.R. 5067. A bill to repeal section 217 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H.R. 5068. A bill to amend the Shipping Act, 1916, to provide for licensing independent foreign freight forwarders, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. UDALL:

H.R. 5069. A bill to amend section 21 of the Second Liberty Bond Act to provide for the retirement of the public debt; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 5070. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to encourage private investment abroad and thereby promote American industry and reduce Government expenditures for foreign economic assistance; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WATTS:

H.R. 5071. A bill to enable producers to provide a supply of turkeys adequate to meet the needs of consumers, to maintain orderly marketing conditions, and to promote and expand the consumption of turkeys and turkey products; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. WILLIAMS:

H.R. 5072. A bill to amend sections 503(a)(2) and 504 of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 to facilitate financing of new jet and turboprop aircraft; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CUNNINGHAM:

H.R. 5073. A bill to provide for Federal cooperation with the Nebraska Mid-State Reclamation District, Nebraska, in the construction of the Mid-State project; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. DENT:

H.R. 5074. A bill to encourage and stimulate the production and conservation of coal in the United States through research and development by authorizing the Secretary of the Interior, acting through the Bureau of Mines, to contract for coal research, to provide revenues for coal research, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DIXON:

H.R. 5075. A bill to provide for the establishment of a Soil and Water Conservation Laboratory; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 5076. A bill to enable producers to provide a supply of turkeys adequate to meet the needs of consumers, to maintain orderly marketing conditions, and to promote and expand the consumption of turkeys and turkey products; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mrs. DWYER:

H.R. 5077. A bill to protect the right of the blind to self-expression through organizations of the blind; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HOGAN:

H.R. 5078. A bill to provide coverage under the Federal old-age, survivors, and disability insurance system, on an elective basis, for all civilian officers and employees not otherwise covered; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MACHROWICZ:

H.R. 5079. A bill to amend the Mutual Security Act of 1954 to provide for the utilization of certain Polish currency and not to exceed $1 million of appropriated funds, to supplement sums made available from any other sources including private donations, for the construction of an American research hospital in the diseases and disorders of children at the University of Cracow, Poland; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. RAINS:

H.R. 5080. A bill to authorize certain commissioned officers to receive retired pay to the extent of $3,000 per annum plus the full salary of any civilian office or position under the U.S. Government or the municipal government of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. RILEY:

H.R. 5081. A bill to amend article 46 of the Uniform Code of Military Justice to require the execution of certain warrants of attachment or arrest by U.S. marshals; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina:

H.R. 5082. A bill to amend section 708 of title 32, United States Code, relating to the appointment, designation, or detail of U.S. property and fiscal officers; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 5083. A bill to amend titles 10 and 32, United States Code, with respect to Reserve commissioned officers of the Armed Forces; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 5084. A bill relating to withholding for State employee retirement, disability and death benefit system purposes, on the compensation of certain civilian employees of the National Guard; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. RODINO:

H.R. 5085. A bill to amend the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 to provide for more effective evaluation of the fiscal requirements of the executive agencies of the Government of the United States; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. ROGERS of Florida:

H.R. 5086. A bill to amend section 21 of the Second Liberty Bond Act to provide for the retirement of the public debt; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SAYLOR:

H.R. 5087. A bill to regulate the foreign commerce of the United States by amending section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. UTT:

H.R. 5088. A bill to amend section 410 of title 38, United States Code, to provide that all retired members of the uniformed services who served not less than 25 years on active duty, or who were retired for disability in excess of 50 percent, and who die

after 1956 shall be considered to have died service-connected deaths; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. WAMPLER:

H.R. 5089. A bill to provide financial assistance for the support of public schools by appropriating funds to the States to be used for constructing school facilities and for teachers' salaries; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. CELLER:

H.J. Res. 266. Joint resolution requesting the President to issue a proclamation designating 1959 for the observance of the 350th anniversary of the historic voyages of Hudson and Champlain; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOWDY:

H.J. Res. 267. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GARMATZ:

H.J. Res. 268. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOLTZMAN:

H.J. Res. 269. Joint resolution requesting the President to issue a proclamation designating 1959 for the observance of the 350th anniversary of the historic voyages of Hudson and Champlain; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LINDSAY:

H.J. Res. 270. Joint resolution requesting the President to issue a proclamation designating 1959 for the observance of the 350th anniversary of the historic voyages of Hudson and Champlain; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McGINLEY:

H.J. Res. 271. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MITCHELL:

H.J. Res. 272. Joint resolution designating the first Sunday of June of each year as Shut-In's Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TAYLOR:

H.J. Res. 273. Joint resolution requesting the President to issue a proclamation designating 1959 for the observance of the 350th anniversary of the historic voyages of Hudson and Champlain; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DENT:

H. Res. 186. Resolution relating to TVA contracts; to the Committee on Public Works.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Colorado, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to the establishment of a Great Plains research laboratory in the Great Plains area; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, memoria' of the Legislature of the State of Colorado, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to enact legislation to bring the State of Colorado under the provisions of section 218(d)(6)(C) of the Federal Social Security Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Georgia, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to Veterans' Administration hospitals in Georgia; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of North Dakota, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to additional funds for the construction of nursing homes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Washington, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to a toll free bridge across the Columbia River on U.S. Highway 99, between Portland, Oreg., and Vancouver, Wash.; to the Committee on Public Works.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. FARBSTEIN:

H.R. 5090. A bill for the relief of Stefan Bryttan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. IRWIN:

H.R. 5091. A bill to provide for the award of a Silver Star Medal to Evans E. Kerrigan; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MORRISON:

H.R. 5092. A bill for the relief of Josefina V. Guerrero Lau; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'BRIEN of Illinois:

H.R. 5093. A bill for the relief of North Counties Hydro-Electric Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHEPPARD:

H.R. 5094. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Bosilijka Yurkovich Mihelcich; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ZELENKO:

H.R. 5095. A bill for the relief of Wang Chen-Yu; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

89. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the exciation, Washington, D.C., petitioning conecutive director, American Municipal Assosideration of their resolution with reference to authorizing and appropriating additional funds to staff adequately the United States Information Agency posts in support of the people-to-people program; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

90. Also, petition of J. de Jesus and others, Jayuya, P.R., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to approval of Congressman PAUL A. FINO's bill fixing (proposing) a pension of $100 a month for World War I veterans 60 years of age or over; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Nominees for Academy Awards

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD L. JACKSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 26, 1959

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Speaker, as a Californian, it is my pride and pleasure to say a few words about an outstanding industry in my State—the production of motion pictures.

This past Monday evening Hollywood announced the nominations for the most gifted accomplishments in films during the past year. Among these 1958 nominees for the famous Oscars—the annual awards of the Academy of Motion Picture Arts and Sciences—are included the stars and writers, the directors, producers, technicians, and artists of motion-picture making.

On April 6 some 90 million persons will hear and see the election results of these nominations in a program sponsored by the film industry over a nationwide network of NBC television and radio.

To me, these awards are reminders of what Hollywood has meant to us as Californians and also to us as Americans.

Hollywood has always made a major economic contribution to my State. It spends hundreds of millions of dollars on filmmaking. It employs thousands of persons in some 275 crafts and trades. And the people of Hollywood, in their own right, make important contributions to the civic life of the community. They are generous in charity, unstinting in giving time and effort to entertain at benefits not only in California, but around the world.

The best of our films are reaching audiences in the Communist lands. Until recently, most of these audiences have seen no films of any sort from the Western world.

And they are reaching audiences in that part of the world which may be of greatest moment to us in the years ahead. This is the world of less developed but developing free nations of Asia and Africa. The future course of this new free world will surely affect our future.

And what do our films show the Communist world and the non-Communist world about us?

It would be folly to think that they show America as all good—or even as all bad. What they do show, and vividly, are the infinite, varied aspects of a many-faceted nation. They show the face of freedom and individuality and enterprise, the fact of a nation which was built up by peoples of all nations and creeds and colors.

The film, as a human creation, has the capacity to reach men's hearts everywhere, to show the brotherhood of man, to illustrate the human flaws and human triumphs which can link men together in our rapidly condensing world.

It is here, I think, that the film industry makes its distinctive and lasting contribution.

It will be a fine show on April 6. I invite all of you to tune in on the ceremonies of awarding the Oscars.

Now, finally, let me list this year's nominees for the academy awards:

Best picture: "Gigi," "The Defiant Ones," "Auntie Mame," "Cat on a Hot Tin Roof," and "Separate Tables."

Best actress: Susan Hayward, Deborah Kerr, Shirley MacLaine, Rosalind Russell, and Elizabeth Taylor.

Best actor: Tony Curtis, Paul Newman, David Niven, Sidney Poitier, and Spencer Tracy.

Best supporting actress: Peggy Cass, Wendy Hiller, Martha Hyer, Maureen Stapleton, and Cara Williams.

Best supporting actor: Theodore Bikel, Lee J. Cobb, Burl Ives, Arthur Kennedy, and Gig Young.

Best director: Richard Brooks, Stanley Kramer, Vincent Minelli, Robert Wise, and Mark Robson.

Address by Hon. Stuart Symington, of Missouri, at Indiana State Jefferson-Jackson Day Victory Dinner

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VANCE HARTKE
OF INDIANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, February 26, 1959

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, on February 14, 1959, I had the pleasure of introducing the very distinguished junior Senator from Missouri to the Indiana State Jefferson-Jackson victory dinner at Indianapolis. His remarks were inspiring and thought-provoking. Accordingly, I ask unanimous consent to have these remarks of Mr. SYMINGTON printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY HON. STUART SYMINGTON, OF MISSOURI, AT JEFFERSON-JACKSON DAY VICTORY DINNER, INDIANAPOLIS, IND., FEBRUARY 14, 1959

Thank you for the great honor of being with you tonight at your victory dinner.

You Democrats of Indiana certainly have a real victory to celebrate. In just one election, you have taken a Republican stronghold and made it Democratic. If anybody wants to know how the country is going politically, I suggest they take a look at Indiana.

Let me salute your successful candidates.

I salute this young man here who is already making a name for himself in the Senate as a hard worker, a gracious gentleman, and a faithful servant of the people, VANCE HARTKE.

I salute your able and vigorous Hoosier Congressmen: WINFIELD DENTON, RAY MADDEN, JOHN BRADEMAS, ED ROUSH, FRED WAMPLER, EARL HOGAN, RANDALL HARMON, and JOE BARR. There are 8 names on that honor roll—8 Democratic Congressmen out of 11—and last year there were only 2. Keep up the good work, and next time you will have all 11—and a Governor. And then, 2 years after that, you can elect yourselves a second Democratic Senator.

We have been working along this line in Missouri. Now we have only one Republican Congressman left; and we expect next time to make it unanimous. Of course, out in Missouri, we are helped by having in residence the leading Democrat of the whole country, Harry S. Truman. We work all the harder for Democratic victories in Missouri, because we never want to let him down. You in Indiana know that he works at it, too, as his campaign trip here last fall amply demonstrated.

There is no mystery about the Democratic victories that swept the country last November. There is no mystery about the rising tide of Democratic sentiment throughout the Nation. It is no secret that we are going to put a Democrat in the White House in 1960.

The reasons for all these things are out in the open, and apparent to everybody. The people have been oversold on what is really a second-best, do-nothing administration. They were taken in by the fancy packaging, and they bought it. But the product inside was below American standards. So now they are shopping for the genuine article—for a party and an administration that will represent the people, meet their needs, and offer real leadership. And that is exactly what the Democratic Party is going to give them.

If the times were not so dangerous, and the problems we face were not so serious, it would be pleasant to spend a little time discussing the woes of the Republican Party. We Democrats could offer them quite a little advice—in a helpful spirit, of course.

We might, for example, take part in the great debate that seems to be shaking the Republican leaders just now—on the subject: Is the elephant dead or merely sleeping?

Or we might offer our help to Mr. Arthur Larson, the apostle of modern Republicanism, who wrote a sensational book just a few years ago entitled "A Republican Looks at His Party."

We might help him gather material for the sequel, "A Republican Looks for His Party."

Or we might offer some amendments to the Republican theme song—you all have heard it—"There's No Business Like Big Business." Now that the party of big business is shrinking in size its members ought to be more sympathetic to the small businessman's problems. If the Republicans don't stop shrinking, pretty soon they themselves may be able to qualify for a small-business loan.

I have been told that the Republican Party is taking a poll—among people who will still admit they are Republicans—to decide what the public image of the Republican Party should be. Now this phrase "public image" is a bit of Madison Avenuese that needs translation into plain English. It means not what you are, but what people think you are. So the Republicans are trying to find out what will be the best thing for people to think they are. I could give them the answer to that. It's very simple. Democrats.

And don't think that some of the Republicans haven't caught on—in fact, they are trying it out. There's a Republican governor in one of our eastern States who got elected recently by acting like a Democrat. But now, unfortunately, he has put forward a "soak the poor" tax program; and the voters are already beginning to wonder.

In my opinion, it's a mistake for the Republican Party to be looking for a new public image. It's not an image they need so much as a backbone. They need the determination to stand up to the problems we face—unemployment, high prices, poor schools, poor housing, depressed areas, flood control, declining agriculture, Russian arms, and international upheavals—to put forward some new ideas, and to take some action to solve them.

It is rather a sad business, my friends, to count up the losses we have suffered because of the inability of the Republican Party to cope with the problems of the present day. Step by step our national position has deteriorated until we are now in a mess at home and in danger abroad.

In 1952, America was by far the strongest of all nations. We stood at the head of a united free world, a free world which had stopped Communist aggression in its tracks. We had full employment, full parity on the farm, and a Government that worked for the people. Most important, we had the spirit to push ahead, with all our resources, to make America a better place to live.

And what have we today? Nearly 5 million unemployed. National output lagging. Inflation still unchecked. Four million farmers driven off their farms because of this administration's indifference to their problems. Stagnation in some of our key industries, and economic depression in some areas. A diplomatic crisis in almost every part of the globe.

These things would be a big enough price to pay, without more, for a Republican administration. But there is more—a lot more. The most ruthless and most successful dictatorship known to history has now broken through, in the scientific and technological fields, to possess itself of weapons of unbelievable power and deadliness. These new weapons, added to its admitted superiority in submarines and land armies, make the Soviet Union more than ever formidable, in its attempt to communize the world.

I know that this is bad news; and a lot of people would rather not think about it. But the job of a Senator is not always pleasant. And if the country is in danger, it is the duty of every knowledgeable citizen to present the facts to the people. A second-best defense is no good to us. As has been well said, it is worth exactly as much as the second-best poker hand. And the task of creating a first rate defense is a task the Republican administration is failing to perform.

In fact, the Republican administration has not only been failing to perform this task—it has been striving to hide the whole problem from the people. The Republican Party has been feeding us tranquilizing pills compounded of evasion, and at times outright inaccuracies. They try to surround the whole question with a fog of complacency, along with an iron curtain of security.

But when you penetrate these defenses, get to the heart of the matter, and ask them why this task is not being performed, they come up with a curious answer. We cannot have a first rate defense, they say, because we cannot afford it.

And this same answer is given, in the President's budget, to all the important problems of our time. They say we cannot afford to stay in the missile race with Russia. They say we cannot afford to invest in an adequate educational system for our young people. They say we cannot afford to erase unemployment, or step up the fight against disease, or renew our cities, or control our rivers, or put our depressed areas back on their feet.

If this were true, then our Nation would be bankrupt. If a man can't afford a decent house, an education for his children, and can't pay his doctor's bills, we say he is broke. And so it is with a nation. But is the United States of America really broke—as the Republicans would have us believe? Of course not. We can afford these things. America is the richest and the greatest country on earth. We can afford to do whatever we must do, for our security and our welfare.

I think I know why the Republicans give this curious and defeatist answer to the growing needs of the country. They are either unable or unwilling to understand the economic systems of these United States. They fail to understand that government and business must work together for the great goals of national security and domestic prosperity—and that if they do work together, there is no limit to our future progress.

I spent many years in private business, most of them in an effort to convert run-down businesses into going concerns. There is a great deal of difference between rehabilitating a company, and running a country; and I do not pretend to know all that must be done for either. But if there is one concept which would get this country back on the beam again, it is this: Full production.

Today, more than 20 percent of our Nation's industrial capacity is idle. In the steel mills, in the automobile factories, in the textile plants, our production capacity is not being used. Let's look at it this way. We have a machine which could produce 1,000 units. But it is only producing 800. The machine itself is just as expensive, even though it is producing less. And as we all know, if it does produce less, unit cost goes up. This is just not good business.

Let us take the men that are idle, and the production capacity that is idle—and in the interest of our security, as well as our prosperity—put them back to work.

America has more productive ability than any nation on earth. During the war, and afterward, we achieved a miracle of production. And we can do it again. We have the wealth, the manpower, and the skill to accomplish whatever we want. What we lack—and have lacked for the past 6 years—is the leadership.

If this Nation plans successfully to operate at full production, it will remain the world's No. 1 economic system, far, far ahead of the Communists. Khrushchev's goal of catching up with us in industry and agriculture in 7 years will never be realized.

Full production would lick unemployment, and eliminate the pool of chronic joblessness in our small and large cities that is being predicted for the next 2 years. Every able-bodied man and woman anxious to work would be able to work, and at a wage compatible with self-respect. With full production, inflation could be checked, because the new flow of goods would bring supply in line with demand. And finally, the heavy new tax revenue generated by full production, swelled by the very growth of our economy, would pour into the Treasury. That new money could finance both our current necessary expenditures and our needed new ones. We would then have a real chance to balance the budget.

The Democratic Party wants to balance the budget just as badly as do the Republicans. But we want to do it by expanding the economy—and the Republicans want to do it by shrinking the economy. We intend to take the economy out of the Republican straightjacket and put it on a Democratic launching pad.

Our problems abroad are even more complex than those at home. But the application of the principles of the Democratic Party can lead us to their ultimate solution. Let us apply the basic principle of Thomas Jefferson: "The cherishment of the people." From Woodrow Wilson through Franklin Roosevelt to Harry Truman, the foreign policy of the Democratic Party has always been based on sincere concern for the people of every nation in the world.

The greatest task facing the world today is the attainment of a just and lasting peace. The first part of that task is the negotiation of a meaningful disarmament agreement. Ten years of negotiation have taught us that negotiating disarmament with the Communists is not easy. It is frustrating and often heartbreaking. A meaningful disarmament must be mutual. It must be continuous. It must be based on a foolproof system of inspection. And it should include as many countries as possible. Every possible effort should be made to reach this kind of agreement.

If America could take just one-tenth as much as it spends each year for arms, and contribute that money to a world development fund, we could advance world progress 50 years; and at the same time bring underdeveloped countries into the 20th century.

The markets this would open up for American goods could only add to our own prosperity, and the upsurge of economic activity this would produce would liberate the masses of the people in the poorer nations from much poverty—and would aid in turning back the political tides of communism. When the day comes when there can be a reduction in the arms burden, there could well be an easing of the present rate of taxation, and still plenty left over for the great unfinished business of the country—better education, improved health care, security for our older people, and a massive attack on the poverty which still exists in America.

At first glance, it might seem illogical to say that on the one hand we must have more missiles; and on the other, we should continue negotiations for the limitation of arms. But 14 years of cold war makes nothing more certain than this: In order to have any chance of successfully negotiating world disarmament, we must be so strong that the Communists know, if they attack us, they are insuring their own destruction. The reason, therefore, that we should sustain our arms effort is to be able to negotiate for peace from a position of relative strength instead of relative weakness.

If America can bring the world two accomplishments—peace and economic security—then all the effort, all the money, and all the patience will have been more than worthwhile.

This, then, is the Democratic policy: Full production at home. And in the interest of lasting peace, a secure foundation abroad. This challenge is bigger than politics. But at the same time it is part of politics; for as long as the Republicans refuse to face the challenge, as long as they continue to permit America to fall behind, we Democrats must exert even greater effort to win back control of the Government. We of the Democratic Party are ready for this challenge. We have met it and conquered it before. We can and will do it again.

Let us all tonight, as Democrats, and even more important, as Americans, dedicate ourselves to a strong Nation—an America economically, physically, and spiritually strong. In that way, we will be sure to preserve our individual and our national freedom.

Resignation of Hon. Theodore Francis Green as Chairman of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDNA F. KELLY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 26, 1959

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, a few weeks ago when the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations met in regular session, its membership was not aware that the agenda included the resignation of their distinguished chairman, Hon. THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN. They were deeply moved and those of us on the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, who have worked closely with Chairman GREEN and his Senate committee over the years, observing his outstanding leadership, were saddened to learn of it. Senator GREEN's decision to resign as chairman because of failing sight and hearing is typical of this patriotic American who, after determining that he could not continue to give his country service of the very highest order, felt he should step down. It takes real courage, Mr. Speaker, to reach such a decision and I want to add my tribute to the many well deserved commendations he has received from Members of both Houses of Congress and other grateful Americans. It is indeed a great comfort to know that Senator GREEN will remain a member of the Senate committee and that America will continue to have the benefit of his statesmanship and sage counsel.

The Democratic Party and the People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SAM J. ERVIN, JR.
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, February 26, 1959

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, on January 17, 1959, the able and distinguished senior Senator from Nevada [ALAN BIBLE] spoke to the Young Democratic Clubs of North Carolina at Pfeiffer College at Misenheimer, N.C. As is always the case, the Senator from Nevada gave his audience much delight and enlightenment.

I ask unanimous consent that the address of the Senator from Nevada on that occasion be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY SENATOR ALAN BIBLE, OF NEVADA, AT PFEIFFER COLLEGE, MISENHEIMER, N.C., JANUARY 17, 1959

Governor Hodges, Senator ERVIN, Mr. President, distinguished guests, and young Democrats, at the outset I want to thank Congressman ALEXANDER for his very gracious introduction. And I also want to tell you that I am not a total stranger to North Carolina. Four years ago I was in your wonderful State and was inducted as a chief in the Cherokee Tribe. The tribal headdress occupies a prominent spot on the wall in my office and is the center of attraction for the various Indian portraits that surround it. If I can just figure how to collect a few Cherokee votes out in Nevada, along with my normal complement from the Piutes, Washoes. and Shoshones, it might lighten my burdens the next time I run.

The tremendous victory recorded by our party last November was not the result of some magic formula. What happened was really quite simple. We had a message for the people—a message pointing to the fact that the Democratic Party is the party of the people. The big problem lay in getting that message across. And get it across we did. You young people demonstrated the importance of organization in disseminating those truths, and the results were dramatically found in the great sweep across the Nation.

I am proud to report that I am a charter member of the Young Democrats of Nevada. I look back with nostalgia on the many hot and heavy interparty fights we used to have. There were times when I thought that our only political enemies were not the Republicans, but members of some faction within

our own party who were opposing us. I soon learned, however, that we could close the ranks and move forward together when the chips were down in the general election.

A philosopher once said that a sure sign of growing old is to indulge continually in reminiscence. I will try to avoid that pitfall. It still disturbs me a little bit, however, to realize that I am now an honorary member of the Young Democrats of the District of Columbia—an honor to be sure but one that can only be gained by growing old.

Speaking of age, it is interesting to note the results of a postelection survey which showed that last year the Democratic Party elected 8 of the 10 youngest Governors, the 19 youngest U.S. Senators, and 12 youngest Congressmen. The Democrats elected 49 Congressmen of Young Democratic age, while 5 of the Nation's Governors and 4 U.S. Senators are also under 40.

Nelson Lancione, national president of the Young Democrats, commented that these election results clearly demonstrate the recognition which the Democratic Party gives to able young people. He added a significant footnote, however, and I quote: "The record of such revered and beloved senior Democrats as Speaker SAM RAYBURN, 77; Senator CARL HAYDEN, 81; Senator THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN, 91; and Senator JAMES MURRAY, 82; are postive proof that a youthful and progressive approach to politics is not just a function of age."

In our understandable elation over the election, we might tend to bask too long in the warm glow of victory, instead of getting on with the job to be done. The road ahead is not an easy road; nor can we travel it without constant plodding, persistence, and unflagging spirit.

The distinguished majority leader of the U.S. Senate, LYNDON JOHNSON, of Texas, set the tone for our legislative endeavors in a masterful address to the Democratic caucus just prior to the opening of this Congress.

"Our strength is what we are, and what we prove ourselves to be," he said. "What we hold we have earned. What we keep will be no more than what we deserve. That is our special challenge. Freemen can afford much. They can never afford the price of inertia." I agree with Senator JOHNSON and I am sure that my warm friends and colleagues from North Carolina share in that agreement.

As we probe the mysteries of the space age, the unlimited capacities of our young people will come more and more into play—boldness, imagination, vigor, and determination. From the campuses of colleges such as this one where we are gathered tonight will come the answers that the new age is clamoring for—not just in the fields of science and technology, but in all lines of human endeavor.

The advances made by the Soviet Union in the fields of missiles and outer space have made one thing crystal clear: We can no longer enjoy the luxury of a status quo attitude in America. We must reject the fallacy that we have the most and the best, and the future will take care of itself. Softness and complacency are the twin evils of our time. They must be struck down with the same tenacity and force that we would use in destroying any evil that would attack us. Survival is not determined by any timetable. Freemen are free only as long as they realize that freedom is not a birthright, but something that must be fought for continually.

The seeds of party responsibility that are sown in an organization such as yours inevitably flower into an even greater arena of human relationships. I refer to the field of politics as an honorable calling for any young man or woman. The urgency of our times has happily destroyed the old and unfair image of a politician as a glib, selfish type of individual, intent only upon plundering the Public Treasury and hoodwinking the gullible voters. Public enlightenment has served the very useful purpose of exalting, rather than demeaning, public office. More and more knowledgeable people are beginning to look at politics as a dignified profession of useful service.

Interestingly enough, the South has long held the concept that politics was nothing to be ashamed of—and the caliber of men you have sent to Congress over the years gives eloquent testimony to this fact.

During World War I President Woodrow Wilson leaned heavily on North Carolinians for the support of his programs. Senator Simmons of your State was chairman of the important Finance Committee and Senator Overman also held responsible posts that were of great benefit to the administration. Also occupying a high place in the Wilson councils was Josephus Daniels, editor of the Raleigh News and Observer, who served as Secretary of the Navy.

I have done some homework for this talk tonight. I learned, for example, that North Carolina provided more than 86,000 men in the service in the First World War, and more than 2,000 North Carolinians made the supreme sacrifice in that conflict. The record of your State in World War II, when 360,000 of your young men and women served around the world and more than 7,000 of them died, was equally heroic.

To show that I did more than surface digging, in the War Between the States, North Carolina furnished about one-fifth of all the southern soldiers, although it had only about one-ninth of the southern population. Approximately one-fourth of the Confederates killed in action—more than 40,000—were North Carolinians. It was no idle boast when they said that North Carolinians were "first at Bethel, farthest at Gettysburg, and last at Appomattox."

One occasionally reads of southerners being described as too sectional—that southerners in Congress are really ambassadors from their own States to a foreign nation headquartered in Washington. History belies this slander. When the war clouds were gathering in Europe in the late thirties, and in the war years immediately following, it was the voice and strength and unanimity of the South that led the way in responsible legislation for our Nation's security. Such was the courage and leadership of the South at this critical time that even a New York newspaper was moved to comment as follows:

"The recent record of the South in world affairs is inspiring. Lend-lease would have been beaten in Congress without southern votes. When the first year of the first draft expired, 4 months before Pearl Harbor, it was southern Members of Congress who insured its extension. When by one vote Congress decided not to send the soldiers home, it was the South that turned the scale. Representatives of 12 Southern States cast 102 votes in favor of extending the draft and only 6 votes against it."

There have been times in my Senate career when I have been criticized by some as voting like a southerner. Although I am sure it wasn't meant that way, I took this charge as a compliment and readily admitted its validity.

As a matter of fact, there is a natural affinity between the South and the Far West. Sparse in population as compared to the East, our voice in the Senate is nevertheless strong, thanks to our Founding Fathers who decreed that each State shall have two Senators, regardless of population.

The problems of the South and the West have been similar in many respects—the industries of both regions suffer from Federal tariff policies that encourage a steady flow of foreign products to compete with our domestic output. Our mining industry in the West today is staggering under the load of that unfair burden. And your great textile industry has also felt the oppressiveness of such a policy.

Beyond the similarities in the fields just mentioned, there is also the mutuality of interests in a traditional concept of government, which stresses the sovereignty of the State over the complete dominance of the Federal Government. As your own Senator ERVIN once said: "We wear our sovereignty under our own hat." And to that I say: "Amen."

As the sinews of the growing West become stronger, I envisage a shift in voting trends that will catapult that great area into a dominant position in determining the guidelines for American progress.

As this phenomenon develops, I hope that the natural affinity between the South and the West will become even more pronounced—to the point of forging an unbreakable alliance for mutual good. In suggesting this I by no means wish to imply that there should be an arbitrary exclusion of any other section of our country. I only suggest that the day will come when, politically speaking, the tail will no longer be wagging the dog.

Let us affirm that we are, first of all, Americans and our loyalty to the Nation is unswerving, while at the same time, as constitutional Americans, we zealously guard our rights as free citizens of the various States. There can be such a thing as too much government on a Federal level. There can be such a thing as too much so-called benevolence as a synonym for greater control. There can be such a thing as too much dominance from the top and too much submission from the bottom. As a moderate, I want to see a balance—a middle zone—where the States and the Federal government can meet to work for the general good of all the people.

In this connection, I would like to dwell briefly upon another problem that is growing to alarming proportions and can indirectly affect the overall strength of our Nation. I refer to those two distinct economic dangers: big government and big business.

Each passing day gives added evidence of the vast centralization of government in Washington and a corresponding relinquishment of power by the sovereign States. Those of us who believe that the best government is the one that is closest to the people have our work charted for us. Until the time comes when citizens decide to affirm that fundamental, independent concept, I can only predict more government, more redtape and more taxes.

As a member of the Senate's Select Committee on Small Business, I have had the opportunity to see first hand the dire plight in which the small businessman finds himself. Our committee has held grassroots hearings all over the country. Out of the mass of testimony from small businessmen there emerges the unanimous and foreboding prophecy that unless drastic steps are taken we will witness the tragic economic irony of this century—the gradual disappearance of America's small producers during an era of tremendous business activity.

As I said at the beginning of my talk tonight, I have no simple formula to solve all the problems that beset us. I do know this, however. As members of a great political party, we can move forward with a strength of purpose and a dedication to duty that will translate the policies of our party into concrete action. We have the principles. We have the courage. And we have the will. Let's all roll up our sleeves and move forward with our party to meet the exciting challenges that lie ahead.

Thank you very much for your warm and courteous attention.

Address by Hon. A. Willis Robertson, of Virginia, at Finance Industry Staff Conference

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. J. W. FULBRIGHT

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 26, 1959

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, on Friday, February 20, the chairman of the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency, the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], made one of his first statements since he became chairman of the committee, before the Finance Industry Staff Conference held in Washington under the sponsorship of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce.

I ask unanimous consent that this very fine statement by the Senator from Virginia be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS OF HON. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON, OF VIRGINIA, CHAIRMAN, SENATE COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY, AT THE FINANCE INDUSTRY STAFF CONFERENCE, FEBRUARY 20, 1959

It is a pleasure for me to meet, on one of the first such occasions since I became chairman of the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency, with executives of the banking trade associations under the sponsorship of the chamber of commerce. It is also a pleasure to see representatives of publications interested in banking legislation.

Of course, my succession to the chairmanship of the committee did not mark the beginning of my interest in banking legislation. I have had an interest in this subject which long antedates my election to the Senate. After my election to the Senate, I sought and obtained membership on the Committee on Banking and Currency, and it has been one of my ambitions to succeed, one day, to the chairmanship of that important committee.

Ever since I have been a member of the committee, and even while I was a relatively junior member, I have carried a substantial burden of the workload of the committee in the banking field. During my entire membership on the committee, under Democratic chairmanships, I have served as chairman of either the Federal Reserve or Banking Subcommittees.

Although some of the activities of the committee may seem more glamorous politically than banking matters, there are none, in my opinion, which are more important.

The banking field, as you know, involves the money power of the Federal Government. The money power controls the economic lifeblood of the Nation. This has been true throughout our history. It was no accident that the struggles of the American colonists, which culminated in the Constitutional Convention, followed almost a century of disheartening monetary experience. The desire to obtain a sound and freely circulating currency was one of the mainsprings behind the movement toward federalism. The keynoter of the Constitutional Convention, Edmund Randolph, listed what he called the havoc of paper money high in his enumeration of the inadequacies of the Articles of Confederation.

Throughout the history of this country since that time, from the case of *McCulloch* v. *Maryland* through the political and economic struggles over the Bank of the United States; from the populism of William Jennings Bryan to the battles of Woodrow Wilson and Carter Glass to establish the Federal Reserve System, to the bank holiday of Franklin Roosevelt—during all our history—the money power has been the subject of contention and one of the focal points of political decisions until the present day.

The power of the Federal Government in this field, as it developed through all these years, was summed up by Mr. Justice Jackson shortly before his death. In 1955 he wrote:

"Two of the greatest powers possessed by the political branches, which seem to me the disaster potentials in our system, are utterly beyond judicial reach. These are the war power and the money, taxing, and spending power, which is the power of inflation. The improvident use of these powers can destroy the conditions for the existence of liberty, because either can set up great currents of strife within the population which might carry constitutional forms and limitations before them.

"No protection against these catastrophic courses can be expected from the judiciary. The people must guard against these dangers at the polls."

The money power, of course, includes these other powers: The power to tax and the power to spend. As a Member of the House, I served on the Committee on Ways and Means, and, as a Member of the Senate, I have served on the Committee on Appropriations. I have had some experience, then, with the powers of taxing and spending. My present position complements this experience, because it is through the banking system that the money supply is regulated.

I make these opening remarks, emphasizing the importance of the money power, for the purposes of assuring you of my appreciation of the responsibilities of my position and of my humility in the face of them.

Now I should like to discuss with you briefly some of the particular legislative items in which I know you are interested.

As you all have seen in the newspapers recently, the leadership of the Senate apparently has given clearance to the Joint Economic Committee to undertake a full-scale study of our economic system. You will recall that for several years there has been agitation for a National Monetary Commission to undertake a similar study. President Eisenhower proposed in the last Congress that this study be undertaken by a commission of his own appointment. There have been other proposals for joint Senate and House committees, or mixed commissions of private citizens and public officials. The Committee on Economic Development has organized a private study and, as you know, the President has appointed a Cabinet committee to be headed by the Vice President.

It is one of the misfortunes of our present divided Government that we have been unable to reach agreement on a truly nonpartisan and objective study of our economic system, which many of your organizations have advocated for many years. I do not think there is much disagreement on the need for such a study. There is only disagreement about the way in which it should be done and mistrust of the objectives of its various proponents.

Almost 10 years ago, on June 1, 1949, I reported from the Committee on Banking and Currency a bill which would have provided for the establishment of a National Monetary Commission along the same organizational lines as the Hoover Commissions on Government Organization. The Senate passed this bill, but it failed in the House. I often have wondered how the course of our economic system might have been affected had the Commission then proposed succeeded in its objectives.

As to the studies which have been, or are about to be undertaken, I will follow them with great interest. For while these committees and commissions may propose, to a large measure, the committee of which I am chairman, will dispose. To the extent I am able to do so as chairman, be assured that I shall weigh any proposal which affects our jurisdiction most carefully. In this connection, I have directed the staff of the Committee on Banking and Currency to observe the proceedings of these committees and commissions carefully and to give me periodic reports on them.

Some of you may be interested in my attitude toward reviving the Financial Institutions Act which passed the Senate in the last Congress. I still believe firmly that this act is a much needed one. I do not intend to reintroduce it, but I would like to see it introduced on the House side and sent to us for concurrence. It is a good bill and should be enacted into law. In the meantime there may be opportunities to enact some of its substantive provisions as separate bills.

For example, with the cosponsorship of Senators FULBRIGHT and CAPEHART, I have reintroduced our bank merger bill which has passed the Senate on two separate occasions. In view of the renewed interest in the problem of bank mergers, it would seem to me that the approach of this bill ought to enlist the support of all bankers and bank organizations. While it may not be perfectly satisfactory to all, it already enjoys the support of most of you, and it seems to me to be the vehicle by which the public demand for control of bank mergers can be satisfied, and that mergers can be controlled under it in an effective way which takes into account the peculiar nature of banking.

The alternative, it seems to me, is a much different kind of control, one which would treat a bank as an ordinary commercial enterprise and would not take adequately into account the nature of banking as an institution affecting, most vitally, the welfare of the depositors and general public. I urge your support of this bill.

Yesterday I introduced a bill to amend the Federal Reserve Act provisions concerning member bank reserves. The bill was proposed by the Federal Reserve System, as a result of an exhaustive study.

The bill would make three changes in present law. First, it would authorize the Federal Reserve Board to permit member banks to include all or part of their vault cash holdings in their required reserves. Second, it would change the reserve requirement for demand deposits of central Reserve city banks from the present rate of 13 to 26 percent to a range of 10 to 20 percent, the same range as Reserve city banks. Third, it would give the Board more flexible authority to permit individual member banks in central Reserve or Reserve cities to carry reserves at the lower requirement levels specified for Reserve city or country banks.

The statutory provisions for reserves have been the subject of discussion for many years, and the provisions have been changed from time to time in the past. However, no major revision in the reserve requirements has been made since the Banking Act of 1935, and it is necessary to bring these reserve requirement provisions up to date, in the light of present day conditions and needs.

I hope hearings on this bill will result in a reconciliation of the views of all interested parties.

There are, of course, many other matters within the jurisdiction of the Banking and Currency Committee which will be of interest to you as this session of Congress progresses. Time does not permit me even to mention all of them.

These will include, of course, any number of proposals for new Federal credit programs and the expansion of existing ones. With respect to these, my own position will be,

as it has in the past, one of determination to serve the needs of a sound economy.

In this connection, although I am no disciple of his, let me quote a remarkably apt comment of John M. Keynes. He said:

"There is * * * an unbroken chronicle in every country which has a history * * * of a progressive deterioration of the real values of * * * money."

He went on to say that this was no accident, but had behind it as one of its driving forces, what he called "the impecuniosity of government."

So far as I am concerned, I shall resist this force. No group of citizens, public or private, has a greater stake in this struggle than those who make up your organizations.

Nineteen Hundred and Fifty-nine Voice of Democracy Contest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. L. BARTLETT

OF ALASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 26, 1959

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, on February 25, my colleague, Senator ERNEST GRUENING, of Alaska, was the principal speaker at the luncheon at which the semifinalists and the winner in the 1959 Voice of Democracy contest were named. Because his speech was so eloquent and what he had to say was so pertinent in these days when democracy is facing some of its sternest tests, I take pleasure in asking that the text of Senator GRUENING's speech be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

It is a great pleasure and privilege to be present to honor the winners of the 1959 Voice of Democracy contest. All 50 of you are to be congratulated. It's a real achievement to win a contest that gets you to Washington. It is particularly thrilling on this occasion to be able to greet for the first time a representative from the 49th State, Melba Phillco.

Indeed, the entry of the 49th State into our Union was, and is, the Voice of Democracy speaking. It spoke through the elected representatives of the people of the United States when the Congress voted to make Alaska a State. That voice declared that the people of Alaska should no longer remain in their Territorial status; that they should be admitted to the full equality of first-class citizenship. This was the application of the principles of democracy to what had previously been one of America's dependent areas. It was an illustration of what I should like to stress in these brief remarks, namely, that to fulfill the promise of democracy we must buttress our words with deeds. We must, if the voice of democracy is to ring out convincingly, couple democratic preachments with practices. We must, if the voice of democracy is to be believed, constantly bear in mind that actions speak louder than words. In short, that "by their works ye shall know them."

The admission of Alaska to the Union, which was formalized by Presidential proclamation less than two months ago, was a shining evidence of performance matching professions—perhaps the most striking example of our time.

It was—it is—a living demonstration that Uncle Sam does practice what he preaches. It was the application, in fact, of the abstract principle proclaimed in our Declaration of Independence that governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed. Alaskans did not have self-government as long as Alaska remained a Territory. They have it now.

That coupling of promise with fulfillment, of preachment with practice, was never more important than now. When I say now, I mean in our time.

As we all know, democracy has in this, our time, been under savage attack as never before in our history. It has been in the last quarter of a century, and is today, challenged by a basically different philosophy and way of life. That philosophy has taken diverse forms, but only slightly diverse. These forms have variously been presented as fascism, as in Italy under Mussolini; as national socialism, as in Germany under Hitler; and, today, as communism, as in Russia and China. We may correctly describe these as only slightly different forms of totalitarianism. We may accurately assert that the nation which adopts any one of these forms is a police state. It is the purpose and design of the rules of those police states to extend their philosophy and way of life to the rest of the world. It is our hope and purpose, as Americans and members of the free world, that they shall not succeed.

Now the differences between the police state and our free society, between totalitarianism and democracy, are familiar to all of you who are here to give expression to the voice of democracy.

You all know that our democratic faith prescribes certain basic freedoms: Freedom of speech, freedom of the press, freedom of assembly, freedom of worship, freedom from search and seizure. These basic freedoms are enshrined in our Constitution through the first 10 amendments which we know as the Bill of Rights. They were placed there because the fathers of our country had experienced the violation by the government of King George III of those freedoms which the founders deemed natural rights and had earlier declared that fact to be self-evident.

Our forefathers made no provision to safeguard the right to travel freely, to change one's place of residence, to choose one's employment, the right to organize, the right of association. These rights were not safeguarded by the founders because those rights had never been questioned or threatened. Indeed, their violation had not been dreamed of under the colonial rule against which our forefathers rebelled. In fact, the tyranny against which we Americans launched our Revolution was a far milder and far less oppressive tyranny than that which has been imposed in our time on the victims of contemporary totalitarianism. Contrast, for instance, one of the most fundamental grievances of our colonial forefathers—that of "No taxation without representation"—with the ruthless total confiscation of property, the imprisonment without trial, and the so-called "liquidation," which is not other than murder, to which dissenters, or even peaceable nonconformists, are liable under the police state.

I won't dwell at length on this evident contrast between our land of the free and the most loathsome and brutal tyranny the world has known since the Dark Ages. What I want to revert to is the need of our squaring our declarations with our deeds.

What should be and is clear to all of us is that we Americans have not always, by any means, lived up to the principles we profess. It has been so from the beginning; it continues to be so; and, being human beings with human frailties, will always be so to a degree, but let us hope to a steadily diminishing degree. The great men who drafted the Declaration of Independence, whose principles, by and large, have guided us through the most wholesome and inspiring experiment performed by men in all history—those great men saw no contradiction between the Declaration's assertion that all men were created equal and with liberty one of their inalienable rights and, on the other hand, the perpetuation of the institution of slavery. It was not until 87 years later that that inconsistency was removed by the Emancipation Proclamation. In the early days, too, the franchise was often limited to the ownership of property. But time cured that. For over 130 years suffrage was for men only. The 19th amendment, adopted in 1920, decided that women, too, could vote and that they were men in the sense that the word men was used in the Declaration of Independence.

These progressive changes emphasize that democracy is not static; that it is not and never will be a finished product. It is a great legacy handed to us, a trust for us to keep and cherish. But not merely to keep and cherish—also to validate. Democracy, in short, is constantly in evolution and, let us hope, with proper vigilance, devotion, and dedication, becoming ever better. The heartening fact to remember is that while democracy may, and often has, fallen short of its professed ideals, the opportunity for rectification is always there. Whenever there is a failure of democracy, let us take heart that democracy carries within itself the seeds of self-regeneration. It must be our continuing, unremitting effort to make democracy true to its best self. If we bend all our efforts and purposes to that end, then the voice of democracy will sound a clarion call and be heard and listened to wherever men are free or want to be free.

How shall we apply that unremitting effort to make democracy true to its best self?

Let us first understand that the task to which all of us who believe and cherish the democratic system must be dedicated, is to make democracy work. This is a privilege, an opportunity, and, indeed, an obligation, not merely for those in public office, but for every citizen. Democracy should become a work-a-day religion. It must be a militant, not a passive, faith.

Having reached that understanding, what next? How do we proceed?

Well, first, we must all take a keen interest in public affairs and in Government—in government on every level. It is our Government. In a democracy, government is only as good as the people want it to be. If ours is to be—in Lincoln's immortal phrase: "a government of the people, by the people, and for the people"—it can be so only to the extent that the people, by their vigilance, interest, and concern make it so. It is a cause of just reproach that so large a proportion of our citizens do not even take the trouble to vote. Voting, the exercise of our right as citizens, is a precious heritage. Those who neglect this duty betray their heritage.

In addition to voting in elections—city, school district, county, State, and national elections—there is the obligation to inform oneself. I have been painfully impressed throughout the years to find how many citizens—presumably responsible citizens—do not even know the names of their Representatives in Congress. I have encountered this all over the United States. And merely knowing the name of one's Representative in Congress is a far cry from knowing what his attitude is on public issues and how he votes on them.

One of our first duties, therefore, in the assignment of making democracy work, is to inform ourselves. We must banish political illiteracy. If public opinion, which we like to assume is the ultimately ruling force in representative government, is to be effective, it must be an informed and enlightened public opinion.

To put it in another way, we get out of democracy what we put into it. So we had better put in generously. Democracy will be as good as we make it, and only as

good. So our relationship to democracy is a reciprocal process. We must give to it to the extent that we expect to receive from it. We must ever sow if we want to continue to reap.

Therefore, let us think and act on the assumption that for every right which is ours under democracy, we have a duty to perform; for every benefit we enjoy, we owe a corresponding obligation; for every privilege which our freedom confers, we should render a corresponding service.

And thus thinking and thus acting, is the way—perhaps the only way—we can preserve and strengthen our democratic faith and our democratic works.

Thus, and thus only, can we make the voice of democracy ring true and enable it to carry its message to the farthest corners of the earth, penetrating even iron curtains and bearing beyond them its message of good will, peace, and freedom.

Appointments to U.S. Service Academies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, February 26, 1959

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a press release I issued today, dealing with competitive examinations for appointments to U.S. service academies.

There being no objection, the press release was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WILEY ANNOUNCES EXAMINATIONS FOR APPOINTMENTS TO U.S. SERVICE ACADEMIES

Senator ALEXANDER WILEY, Republican, Chippewa Falls, today announced that competitive examinations, scheduled for July 1959, would be given by the Civil Service Commission for appointment to the U.S. service academies.

The available appointments include: 1 appointment to the U.S. Military Academy, 2 appointments to the U.S. Naval Academy, 1 appointment to the U.S. Air Force Academy, and nomination of 10 young men to compete for 7 openings allocated to Wisconsin for the Merchant Marine Academy.

"The examination is open to any high school senior or graduate over the age of 17 but not yet 22, who has never been married and can meet the academic and physical standards," the senior Senator said.

"To be eligible to take the examination, all applicants must file with my office (1) a letter of intention, accompanied by certificate of residence in the State of Wisconsin; and (2) two letters of recommendation from applicant's principal, pastor, physician, or anyone who has personal knowledge of his character.

"This information must be received in my office, room 427, Senate Office Building, Washington 25, D.C., by June 15, 1959, which is the deadline for filing," WILEY pointed out.

"Unfortunately, anyone not filing letters of recommendation and certificate of residence with his application cannot be considered for the examination.

"The examination will be held in July (exact date to be announced later) for appointment in July 1960. The highest ranking candidate will receive principal appointment; second highest, first alternate; third highest, second alternate, etc."

To provide maximum opportunity for obtaining information, Senator WILEY is furnishing all public and private high schools in the State with brochures of each of the Academies.

"Appointment to a U.S. service academy provides qualified young men with a fine opportunity to serve their country as well as to improve their education," WILEY concluded.

From Gettysburg to Padre Island the Nation Needs Parks To Preserve Our Past, Present, and Future History

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH YARBOROUGH
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, February 26, 1959

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, a recent article in a national magazine described how the Gettysburg, Pa., battlefield is gradually being taken over by private interests. A residential subdivision is being built on the field across which Pickett led his famous charge. A motel stands where Union defenses threw back the charge. On the spot where the two armies first clashed there is a free museum and souvenir stand. On another part of the land for which Union and Confederate troops struggled for 7 hours on the 3d day of the battle, rusting autos now are sprawled.

The same article lists nine new national parks which the Nation now needs to acquire, in order to provide our rapidly expanding population with recreation areas and to preserve outstanding and interesting areas in their natural state.

One of the nine areas listed is Padre Island, Tex., a 117-mile-long barrier island in the Gulf of Mexico, stretching roughly from Corpus Christi to Brownsville.

Of the 3,700 miles which make up the Atlantic and gulf coasts, only 240 are in parks for public use. Some 640 more worth saving are still available.

I have introduced Senate bill 4, which provides for establishment of a national park on Padre Island. We must do this now, because a commercial development has already started on part of the island. Other parts are up for sale.

The magazine article tells how completion of the boundaries of the Gettysburg battlefield, in order to protect it for a park, would cost $2 million. To do this to all battlefields now either wholly or in part in park status would cost $10 million; and for the entire national park system, the cost would be $30 million.

Conrad L. Wirth, Director of the National Park Service, is quoted in the article as saying:

Twenty years ago we could have purchased all the land we now need for $5 million. But in those days no money was earmarked for land purchase. Now we receive $1½ million a year from Congress. At this rate, with land prices soaring, it could take another 50 or 60 years and more than $100 million to complete the boundaries.

Padre Island today is facing the same situation. If we do not act now, more of the land will be under private development, and prices will rise.

The benefits of this virgin stretch of windswept sand, with beaches on both sides of the island, and with an historic past stretching back to some of the earliest explorers of the New World, must be protected for the enjoyment of the public now and in the future.

The natural life, both on the island and in the waters around it, is abundant. There are skeletons of oldtime ships, wrecked on the shores, and as covered with legend as they are with moss and barnacles. There are tales of pirate treasure, small settlements, soldiers from a variety of battles, and vacqueros and cowhands.

Another thing to consider about this coastal location is the type of recreation offered: swimming, fishing, hiking, beachcombing and similar beach pastimes, and boating. In 1904, 15,000 boats were being used for recreation in the United States. By 1947, the number had grown to 2,440,000. The total last year was 7,330,000. This year it will probably top 8 million. In the United States 21 million fishermen spend nearly $100 apiece each year. Their numbers are rising all the time.

If Padre Island were made a park, the benefits to the people of the immediate area are obvious. Yet it should also be clear that this would help the Nation, by providing more jobs and more income. Also, Padre Island has the potential to become a summer and winter playground, providing recreation for millions, just as Yellowstone, Yosemite, Big Bend, and other national parks already are doing.

This proposal to establish a national park on Padre Island has the backing already of several civic and conservation groups. Its value to the national economy and welfare is clearly evident.

Mr. President, in further support of my statement, I request unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial, by John W. DeVine, which appeared in the Nueces County News for Friday, January 30, 1959, under the heading: "Padre Island May Become a National Park in Future."

I also request unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, a resolution adopted by the Texas Ornithological Society on February 10, 1959.

There being no objection, the editorial and the resolution were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Nueces County News, Jan. 30, 1959]

PADRE ISLAND MAY BECOME A NATIONAL PARK IN FUTURE

U.S. Senator RALPH YARBOROUGH has introduced a bill—S. 4—which would keep a portion of Padre Island for public use—in simpler works, a national park. In presenting the bill, YARBOROUGH pointed out: "This beautiful half-mile wide natural beach, with its mild climate and bountiful wildlife, is one of Texas' greatest recreation resources."

Then he pointed out that "properly developed, there is no question that as a national park, Padre Island would become the winter

park of America, just as Yellowstone, Yosemite, Glacier National Park, and the Smoky Mountains are summer playgrounds.

"Looked at from the standpoint of historical interest," he continued, "Padre Island is one of the closest links Texas and the United States have with the past, for it was there that one of the earliest explorers set foot on New World soil. The explorer, Alonso Alvarez de Pineda, a Spaniard, in 1519 sailed the gulf coastal waters from Florida to the Mexican port of Tampico, and mapped the coast for future navigators."

YARBOROUGH has asked State legislators of Texas, and other State officials to enact necessary supporting State legislation on this subject, and is urging all Texans to back the creation of Padre Island National Park.

Naturally such a move is going to draw some opposition. Private developers will oppose it; real estate dealers who are interested in selling Padre Island, and owners of land will be opposed to it; but to the average Texan it presents an opportunity to preserve for his own use a long stretch of island where he can go, camp out, fish, hunt, and generally enjoy himself.

Of course, Padre Island is a mammoth island—the coastline on the Gulf, extending from Port Aransas to Brownsville, 131 miles, is the longest island and the longest beach in the United States (probably in all the world, too).

There is plenty of room for establishment of a Government national park without taking away any of the valuable land now under development, and no doubt, it is this land Senator YARBOROUGH has in mind.

This is only one of hundreds of things, Senator YARBOROUGH has initiated since he became a Member of the U.S. Senate a few short years ago. It wouldn't hurt to take time out and drop him a few lines in appreciation.

Every man, from the smallest to the largest, likes to know he is appreciated and his work is appreciated.

If you favor the establishment of a national park on Padre Island to preserve a large portion of it for future generations in its natural state (except for Government improvements that will not ruin it as a vacation resort), drop your State representatives and senators a line and tell them you will appreciate their supporting enabling legislation.

Don't worry, they will hear plenty from those who oppose it. And while you are at it, drop Senator RALPH a line, too. It will encourage him to keep up the good work.

RESOLUTION TO MAKE PADRE ISLAND A NATIONAL PARK

Whereas Padre Island contains a wealth of vegetation and wildlife in substantially the same condition as when this sunny region was first discovered by de Pineda in 1519 and boasts a superb sand beach 30 miles in length along a gulf coast shoreline admirably suited for safe swimming and wading; and

Whereas commercial development has gained two footholds on Padre Island and threatens rapidly to ruin its natural beauty; and

Where Padre Island is unique in scenery, climate, ecology and geology and fulfills in every way the standards for a national park; and

Whereas the establishment of Padre Island as a national park would permanently preserve natural treasures of Padre Island for the benefit of the public; Therefore it is

Resolved, That the undersigned organization hereby urges the adoption of the bill (S. 4) to provide for the establishment of Padre Island as a national park.

Passed this 10th day of February 1959.

A. EARL JOURDE,
President, Texas Ornithological Society.

Legislation Is Needed To Free Our People From the Foreign-Made Shackles of Unemployment

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 26, 1959

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, first I should like to compliment the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY] for his intense and enthusiastic efforts to get through some type of legislation that will free our people from the foreign-made shackles of unemployment. He has done just about everything humanly possible to return to Congress the tariffmaking authority established in it by the Constitution. He deserves a large measure of credit for whatever help the statutory escape clause has been. Unfortunately, diplomatic considerations have superseded economic reality in the final determination of too many escape clause cases, and I think that the legislation proposed by my close friend from West Virginia here today is very sound, practical, and urgently needed. My remarks will be brief. Later I am going to insert some figures on imports that should alarm even the most fervent freetrader, and I want to include a quotation, from a respected naval officer, that belongs in a discussion of this kind.

First, I should like to mention that I am pleased with the reaction of the Westinghouse Co. to Tennessee Valley Authority's plans to purchase foreign generating equipment without so much as a by-your-leave to the American manufacturers and workingmen who have been subsidizing TVA from its inception. Westinghouse has arranged for Governor Lawrence, of Pennsylvania, to come down to meet with our congressional delegation on this important issue Thursday evening. Because of Pennsylvania's wide unemployment, I think it necessary for everyone in the State and Federal Governments to coordinate all efforts in overcoming the economic obstacles that have so many of our families in actual poverty. The detrimental effect of an oversupply of alien commodities entering American markets is an obvious factor in Pennsylvania's economic problems. I hope that more and more of our State's delegation will walk with those of us who have been striving for whatever legislation is required to remedy the present deplorable situation.

We may as well realize one thing, Mr. Speaker. We are not going to stop Government agencies from ordering supplies and equipment from foreign manufacturers if we permit these departments and agencies themselves to make the decisions. For 25 years Government departments have been subjected to such generous doses of international propaganda that free trade has become one of their obsessions. Any time that hearings or inquiries are held on the matter of foreign trade, an assortment of representatives of a miscellany of Government departments always appears with briefcases chockfull of data gathered from hosts of countries throughout the world. These Government officeholders who come out to cheer for further lowering of trade barriers have traveled—at Government expense—hither and yon among the nations of Europe, Asia, and South America, but they apparently are not interested in becoming clued on what is taking place back where the tax dollars are collected.

The average Government worker living in Washington and in Foreign Service is not exposed to the economic ups and downs experienced in the various parts of our own country. Week after week, and month after month, and year after year there are heavy pockets of unemployment throughout central and western Pennsylvania, just as there are in the State of the gentleman who has granted me this time. The U.S. News & World Report for February 20 contains an indication of why Government officials in the Nation's Capital are either uninformed or uninterested about what is going on back at the ranch. "How's Business Around the Country" is the title of a series of tables reporting on conditions in selected communities from coast to coast. Of the 33 eastern cities listed, 19 are marked as victims of substantial unemployment; 13 are classified in the moderate unemployment category; one city—Washington, D.C.—has slight unemployment. As a matter of fact, Washington is the only city of the 78 studied for the United States as a whole in which unemployment is not either moderate or substantial.

While the parties responsible for import-export policy are assured of their paychecks without interruption, the fellow back home who is getting the bill for these services finds his means of livelihood taken away by incredible foreign trade policies. He has only Congress to look to for help. I suggest we give it to him by demanding quick action on this bill to amend section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930 as amended.

I also ask that the House enact the bill which I have introduced to restrict imports of residual oil, the product of foreign refineries which has washed out thousands of jobs in our mine and rail communities. These are the figures which I wish to include in the RECORD:

From January 1 to February 13, 1959, the daily average for residual oil imported into the United States was 807,700 barrels. If this rate continues for the remainder of the year, the 1959 total will come to 294,830,500 barrels—or more than 70 million tons of bituminous coal in energy equivalent. Keeping that figure in mind, please also note this statement by Adm. Arleigh A. Burke as reported in the Washington Star on February 15:

> The possibility of a surprise attack by submarines is very great, and it is causing us a great deal of concern.

Admiral Burke's remark was made at a recent hearing before the Senate Disarmament Subcommittee, at which time it was disclosed that of Russia's 500 submarines, about one-half are long-range craft.

Mr. Speaker, who among us would dare to depend upon foreign oil that must travel over the lonely seaways that even now may be infested with Red submarines carrying the most destructive missiles in the history of naval warfare? The daily imports of residual oil for the first 7 weeks of this year have been equal to 193,830 tons of bituminous coal. In an emergency this tonnage—plus enormously more coal to be used in the actual war effort—would be required. I suggest that, instead of forcing our unemployed coal miners to wander about the country seeking employment opportunities in other industries, we encourage them to remain in their mining communities. They are a vital component of our national defense. They will be ready for whatever demands are made upon them if our foreign trade policies will only give them a chance. The same principle applies to railroad workers. We are not going to have them when we need them if we permit their jobs to be taken away unnecessarily in the meantime.

We may equate the position of the coal miner and the railroad worker to that of the Westinghouse employee who will have no work if foreign generating equipment is allowed to come in and price American products out of the market. We can put the pottery worker, glassmaker, and all other victims of inequitable foreign trade competition in the same category. We owe it to them and to our security to keep them occupied now, for without them we would not have a chance against the common enemy in an emergency.

Why Statesmen and Reporters Turn Gray

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL B. DAGUE
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 26, 1959

Mr. DAGUE. Mr. Speaker, a brief examination surrounding the current visit of British Prime Minister Macmillan to Moscow will furnish the answers to the above caption to these remarks.

In two separate articles appearing in yesterday's Evening Star we see how wide of the mark a columnist sitting in his ivory tower here in Washington can come when his observations are stacked alongside those made by a correspondent closer to the scene.

In his column entitled "Britain Takes the West's Helm," William S. White has this to say:

> Mr. Macmillan's mission to Moscow has quietly turned upside down the diplomacy of the allied world. Today at least, and possibly for a fairly lengthy tomorrow, it is British leadership that holds the initiative on the Western side.

And then in the same issue and on the same subject—Mr. Macmillan's overtures to Communist boss Khrushchev—Crosby S. Noyes, the Star's European correspondent, in a report subtitled "Berlin Outlook Dims," makes this comment:

> In the face of the deliberate insults, the frustration of his hopes and the total intransigence which he has met, it may seem to Mr. Macmillan that his best course at this point would be to cut short his fruitless quest and come home.

All of which simply points up the fact that John Foster Dulles in always taking a firm stand with the Communists and President Eisenhower in refusing to meet with Khrushchev until he shows some evidence of sincerity have been pursuing the proper course all along.

Legislative Oversight, Spectrum, Study, and Investigation—H.R. 4800

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OREN HARRIS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 26, 1959

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, today I had the special honor and privilege of speaking to the Federal Communications Bar Association, composed of distinguished members of the legal profession. I was very glad to have had an invitation to speak to this particular group at this particular time. It gave me an opportunity to discuss with them some most important problems in which I knew they had a great interest, as does the American public.

In that my remarks were directed to the work of our Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and with particular reference to the Special Subcommittee on Legislative Oversight, our plans for this Congress, some exposures of false claims in a recent book, and a discussion of the bill introduced as a result of our committee last year, I thought perhaps the Members might be interested, and therefore include it in the RECORD with these remarks:

ADDRESS OF REPRESENTATIVE OREN HARRIS, CHAIRMAN, INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE COMMITTEE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, BEFORE FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS BAR ASSOCIATION, HOTEL WILLARD, FEBRUARY 26, 1959

Mr. President, members of the Federal Communications Bar Association, honored guests, I welcome this opportunity of appearing before you today. I feel you could hardly have chosen a better time for this discussion because there are several important developments that I would like to talk to you about, and I doubt whether I could find a more interested audience since the things I want to discuss with you are of great importance to you, your clients, and the FCC.

In the first place, there has been a lot of speculation and wide interest in the future program of our committee. I am speaking of our plans for further study and investigation pursuant to the provisions of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946. From the experience we had in the last Congress, I can readily understand this interest.

In our committee report filed January 3 this year, we made recommendations on a variety of questions that needed further study and investigation. I have no other intention than to carry out these recommendations.

In view of the fact that so many of these questions are highly sensitive, I felt it advisable to ask for a budget separate from the other work of our committee in order that the Congress and the public would know just what we had in mind.

You are familiar with the announcement of a few days ago with respect to the reestablishment of the Legislative Oversight Committee.

On Monday of this week, I introduced a resolution requesting $350,000 for the committee to make the special study and investigation. I went before the House Administration Committee and explained our purpose. The committee approved the funds for this work and yesterday reported to the House. It being a privileged matter, the chairman of the committee called it up for consideration. With little discussion and a few pertinent questions, the House approved the request and made the full amount of $350,000 available to the committee.

In the budget that I submitted to the House Administration Committee, $200,000 was for the purpose of continuing the work of the Special Subcommittee on Legislative Oversight. Obviously, we have not had time as yet to get together a staff, since the funds were obtained only yesterday.

I want to make it perfectly clear, however, that the committee will use the greatest precaution in obtaining the kind of a staff that is needed and which will carry out the plans and policies of the committee for a forthright, fearless, fair and objective study and investigation.

We have not had an opportunity to formulate specific plans and a program, but the pattern is fairly well established in our recommendations contained in the report filed January 3.

In the second place, we asked and obtained $150,000 to make a study of what I believe to be one of the most important problems we have today which is of tremendous concern and interest to the American public, that is a study of the proper utilization of the radio spectrum.

Many of the situations which we dealt with in the Oversight Subcommittee are a direct result of the scarcity of desirable spectrum space available for broadcasting purposes.

It is my intention to have our regular Subcommittee on Communications and Power study the present and prospective utilization of the radio spectrum and have it also study the proper governmental machinery and procedures to bring about an efficient utilization of the spectrum.

As you well know, at present there is divided responsibility between the President and the FCC for the allocation of frequencies for governmental and nongovernmental purposes. The demand for spectrum space has grown to such an extent and is expected to grow still further at such speed that it is dubious whether the divided responsibility can bring about an efficient utilization of the spectrum. The spectrum situation may be analogous to the situation which did exist with respect to the use of the airspace by military, commercial, and private planes, and which led during the last Congress to the creation of the unified Federal Aviation Agency.

I consider this study one of the most important ones which our committee can undertake in the field of communications. We shall seek to retain an expert staff to make this study, and the outcome of this study may affect you, your clients, and the American people most importantly.

Thirdly, most of you know that a week ago I introduced a bill, H.R. 4800, to carry

out the legislative recommendations made by the Special Subcommittee on Legislative Oversight in its report to the Congress at the end of the last session. The hearings on which this report was based commenced in January 1958 and continued through November 1958. The hearing record of more than 11,000 pages, exclusive of exhibits, is probably not much shorter than the sum total of news stories that have been written about these hearings, and the individuals involved in these hearings as well as the Members of Congress who conducted them.

One aspect of the hearings, which particularly seems to have intrigued the press, is the proven or alleged misconduct of certain members of the commissions which were under investigation, of parties involved in proceedings before these commissions, and of other persons in public or private life interested in some of these proceedings.

Now, I don't want to deny for a moment that improper or unethical conduct by members of the regulatory commissions and commission employees, by parties and practitioners before these agencies, by persons in the executive branch or in the Congress, constitutes a most serious and difficult problem which ought to be given proper attention and that such conduct ought to be prevented in the future. However, I want to emphasize that even if all the commissioners and all of the persons in public and private life who are concerned with proceedings before these agencies were angels, there still would be other crucial problems in connection with the operation of these agencies which the Congress must come to grips with and on which the American people must be well informed.

Many of you probably have read recent newspaper stories about a book written by a former counsel of the Special Oversight Subcommittee. A few of you even may have read the book. Now, I could spend all of the time which you have allowed me here today in pointing out misstatements of fact and erroneous assumptions and conclusions made by the author. However, I doubt that you would want me to take the time, and I am reasonably sure that it would not be time well spent.

I have thus far refrained from making any comment publicly. However, there are two or three things I would like to say now which I think would be appropriate.

In the first place, even though our committee, in my opinion, accomplished a lot and did a good job in the last Congress, I would be one of the first to admit that some mistakes were made in connection with such a difficult and sensitive task.

In fact, about the first and perhaps the most serious mistake the committee made was that it employed Dr. Schwartz as its chief counsel.

When he was interviewed by the committee and presented with the policy statement previously adopted by the committee, he complimented the statement and thought it constituted a very fine and objective approach. After he became employed, he apparently forgot or else arbitrarily failed to proceed in accordance with the committee policy.

I would never question anyone's right to his ideas on a matter of principle. I do seriously take issue, however, with the methods, tactics, and procedures employed by Dr. Schwartz. I could not agree with them from the first public utterances he made before the Federal Bar Association. This was the major reason for what later developed.

He was determined either to rule or ruin. In my opinion, and as illustrated in his book, he proposes to change completely our fundamental principle of regulatory commissions. (Ch. 2 of the book.)

In other words, the book itself is the most outstanding proof of why the committee should never have employed him. He admits to defiance of the committee and he asserts that it was his purpose and responsibility to make the policies and conduct the investigation according to his own views and procedure.

Having been completely unsuccessful with his tactics, he proceeded to write a book. As for the sharp criticism and personal reflections on me, I care little. I did observe the one compliment, which must have been an oversight, when he referred to me as a "most urbane denizen."

Just let me mention two or three of the false and inaccurate claims:

There is reference to the Albany television case in which Mr. Hagerty was involved.

There was nothing at any time called to the attention of the committee about any problem relating to the Albany TV comparative television case. Neither I nor any other member of the committee received any information from the staff or anyone else until after the expiration of the committee in January, and you have recently seen the publicity.

Dr. Schwartz undertakes to claim credit for the Adams-Goldfine fiasco. There was nothing in the files referring to this matter in any way, with the exception of one memorandum from the Federal Trade Commission which in no way referred to Mr. Adams. Dr. Schwartz gave no information to the committee in public hearings or in executive session, and there was nothing at that time developed on it.

Two staff investigators had obtained the information regarding Commissioner Mack and the channel 10 question. However, this information had not been put together and developed for presentation at the time the committee terminated the services of Dr. Schwartz.

In other words, not only are the claims false, but it again emphasizes his attitude in withholding information from the committee itself.

The book reconfirms my earlier conviction that the author has not as yet grasped the scope of the task assigned to the Legislative Oversight Subcommittee, and that he preferred to follow his own notions of what the subcommittee should investigate instead of carrying out the detailed policies which had been laid down by the subcommittee for the scope and conduct of this investigation. In other words, while he was counsel of the subcommittee and still at the present time, he is almost exclusively concerned with the problem of improper conduct and what to do about it, as if that problem, serious though it is, was the only or even the foremost problem that confronts us in dealing with the independent regulatory agencies and their operation in the public interest.

Under these circumstances, the most important task of the Legislative Oversight Subcommittee, namely a thorough study of the functioning or malfunctioning of the independent regulatory agencies, beyond improper conduct, and of the causes of and the possible remedies for such malfunctioning still lies ahead of us.

That does not mean that the job which the subcommittee has done to date is insignificant. Quite the contrary. I feel that the accomplishments of the subcommittee to date are very substantial, and it is my hope that the bill which I have just introduced and which carries out the legislative recommendations of the Oversight Subcommittee will be enacted into law.

The process by which a bill becomes law is fortunately a slow one. This process offers ample opportunity to all interested parties of making their views known to the Congress. I trust I am correct in believing that you are interested parties, and I appeal to you that you give the provisions of this bill your careful attention both in your own interest and in the interest of your clients and most of all in the interest of the American people.

I appreciate, of course, that the Federal Communications Bar Association cannot take any position with respect to substantive matters. You represent different classes of clients who have divergent interests and it would be too much to expect that you or your clients would agree as to the substantive provisions of the Communications Act. However, H.R. 4800 deals primarily with organizational and procedural problems, and these problems, I feel, are a proper subject for discussion by the Federal Communications Bar Association. It is my hope that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce will have the benefit of detailed and specific recommendations of your association with respect to this legislation. Your constructive criticism and your suggestions for amendments as well as your support for the principles on which this bill is based will be most welcome.

Let us take a brief look at some of the provisions of H.R. 4800. Title I of the bill relates to the FCC exclusively. The other titles of the bill deal with the remaining five of the six big independent regulatory commissions. The provisions for all of the agencies are substantially identical.

Section 101 sets forth the policy. The bill is intended to strengthen the independence and effectiveness of the independent regulatory agencies and to increase the public confidence in their efficient, fair, and independent operation. These objectives are to be reached by taking the following actions: (1) Guarding against improper influence upon and improper conduct of agency members and employees; (2) observing ethical standards by members, employees, parties and practitioners; (3) preventing of off-the-record communications; (4) selecting chairman by agencies themselves; (5) assuming of individual responsibility by commissioners for preparation of agency opinions; and (6) making uniform the President's power to dismiss commissioners for cause.

Section 102 which contains definitions is a most important section because it defines the term "proceeding" and thereby outlines the boundaries of the key provisions of the bill. I want to call to your attention particularly subsection (b) of section 102 which has the effect of making applicable to certain rulemaking proceedings the prohibition against off-the-record communications and the requirement that all communications made concerning such rulemaking proceeding be placed in the public files of such proceeding. The rulemaking proceedings to which this prohibition and this requirement apply, however, are only those in which the Commission actually undertakes an "on-the-record-only proceeding" and where a notice of proposed rulemaking to this effect has been issued.

It seems to us that in those cases of rulemaking, the Commission holds out to the participants and to the public generally that only on-the-record communications will be taken into consideration by the Commission, and therefore there is no room for any other communications. I realize, this may be an innovation and may go beyond the provisions of the Administrative Procedure Act. However, I believe it is desirable to make this change.

Section 103 outlines in general terms criteria of improper influence by parties and others upon the Commission and of improper conduct by Commission members and employees. The Commission is directed to prescribe regulations implementing and supplementing these provisions. While the criminal provisions of the bill do not apply to this section, I want to call to your attention certain provisions of subsection (d) of section 103. In order to bring about compliance with this section, the Commis-

sion is directed to establish procedures for considering and acting on complaints, and the Commission is authorized to issue reprimands and take other disciplinary action, including suspension or disqualification of persons appearing in a representative capacity before the Commission, or take other action which may be warranted in particular instances, including action against the parties to the proceeding. This is a most important power which the Commission would be given, and, in my opinion, this power is necessary if the provisions against improper influence and improper conduct are to be enforced effectively.

Sections 104 and 105 dealing with off-the-record communications and the requirement as to placing certain communications in the public files of proceedings, may perhaps be considered the heart of the bill. We appreciate that exceptions may have to be made with regard to these provisions in order to promote the expeditious and efficient discharge by the Commission of its duties, and in order to secure the cooperation of other agencies of Government. Nobody knows better than the Commission and the attorneys who regularly appear before the Commission how broad these exceptions should be. Under the bill, the Commission would have three months from the date of enactment of this legislation to prescribe the regulations setting forth the exceptions from the prohibition against off-the-record communications. I trust, the Commission can count on your assistance and scrutiny in prescribing proper exceptions, and proper exceptions only.

Please note carefully that the criminal penalties of section 107 apply to sections 104 and 105 as well as section 106(a) which provides for the filing of a notice of appearance by any person who appears for himself or in a representative capacity in any proceeding or matter before the Commission. The hearings before the Oversight Subcommittee developed several situations in which parties had two teams to represent them—an on-the-record team and another one whose existence was not even known to the attorneys who did ther best to represent their clients in accordance with the regular procedures of the Commission. This kind of influence peddling has to stop, and section 106 is designed to help stop it.

Section 111 provides that the Commission shall choose its own Chairman and Vice Chairman. The term of the Chairman is not to exceed 3 years. The Chairman, after serving a full term, may not again serve as Chairman until a full term has elapsed.

The purpose of this provision is undoubtedly clear to all of you, as is the purpose of section 112 which provides for the assumption of individual responsibility by Commissioners for the preparation of agency opinions. Such opinion is to be signed by the member of the Commission who was responsible for its preparation. Specialization in opinion preparation according to types of cases is prohibited.

Several of the big six independent regulatory agencies are already following this practice and the results, according to the testimony before our subcommittee, have been very salutary.

I believe all of you will welcome section 113 which provides that failure of the Commission to act on motions for procedural or interlocutory relief within 60 days shall be treated as a denial of such motion.

Section 114 repeals the honorarium provision now contained in the Federal Communications Act, and section 115 repeals the provision establishing the "Review Staff" and the provision prohibiting certain off-the-record communications. These provisions were added by the McFarland act. The reasons for their repeal are apparent: the provisions of H.R. 4800 are either in conflict with or go beyond the provisions which are to be repealed.

This concludes my very brief review of some of the key provisions of H.R. 4800 which are applicable to the FCC. I appeal again to you to study with care the provisions of this bill, to come forward with your constructive criticism and suggestions because we are most anxious to make this the best possible legislation, and you appreciate that we shall be legislating in a most critical and sensitive area.

It has been a pleasure to be with you today, and I hope that this day will mark the beginning of renewed efforts for fruitful cooperation between your association and our committee. Thank you.

Hon. Hale Boggs, of Louisiana, Suggests U.S. Base Companies To Defer Tax on Foreign Income Used Abroad

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HALE BOGGS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 26, 1959

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the March 1959 issue of the Journal of Taxation:

BOGGS SUGGESTS "U.S. BASE COMPANIES" TO DEFER TAX ON FOREIGN INCOME USED ABROAD

"Why do we force our businessmen to seek out such countries as Liechtenstein, Monaco and Panama to achieve a business result?" asks Congressman HALE BOGGS, Democrat of Louisiana. "I have come to the conclusion that no reason for forcing them to do so exists. It is within our power to provide the means of organizing base companies in the United States itself for the conduct of foreign business operations. We have the example of Canada's 4-K companies and Britain's overseas trade corporations. As a matter of fact, we have the example of practically every other trading country in the world before us to follow."

Because Mr. BOGGS is a member of the Ways and Means Committee and chairman of its Subcommittee on Foreign Trade Policy, this arresting suggestion demands the serious attention of tax practitioners and taxpayers alike.

"Enactment of a law permitting the creation of a unique class of domestic corporations organized for the conduct of business abroad would do much to provide incentives to foreign investment," said Mr. BOGGS in his remarks at the recent meeting of the Foreign Trade Council. "Such companies would be in a position to utilize the earnings derived from their foreign operations for the expansion of their activities in the free countries of the world without the immediate payment of United States tax. These corporations would pay U.S. tax on their foreign source income only when it is severed from the foreign operation by a distribution to the shareholder. Such corporations—I refer to them as U.S. base companies for want of a better term—could and should be permitted to carry on all operations now conducted by foreign base companies. I wish to emphasize that I think that exporting activities be included within permissible activities.

"Provision for U.S. base companies would not in my opinion require any change in the existing law providing for Western Hemisphere trade corporations. Additionally, I see no reason for not permitting any company desiring to do so to continue to operate abroad through a branch.

"It is fair to state that the present fiscal condition of the United States should make deferral attractive to those in the executive department who are responsible for securing the revenues with which to meet the Government's bills. Deferral involves no loss of U.S. revenue since by hypothesis every dollar of foreign earnings would be subject to tax when repatriated to the United States and severed from the base operation by distribution to stockholders.

NEED FOR ACTION IS GREAT

"A most charitable appraisal of the code as it applies to foreign-source income would find it capricious in result, formalistic in impact, and difficult to administer," said Mr. BOGGS. "I know of no one familiar with taxation who does not believe that a thorough legislative overhaul of foreign tax technique and policy is badly needed and long overdue. But it will be an uphill fight to get tax incentives for the encouragement of foreign investment and it behooves us at least to begin by considering recommendations which, though they may not go as far as we believe necessary, have a chance of adoption. I would think it wise for those who have competence in the field of taxation to direct their attention to proposals to defer U.S. tax on foreign source income until it is severed for domestic use.

ADVANTAGES OF THIRD-COUNTRY SUBSIDIARY

"Possibility for the deferral of U.S. taxes on foreign source income now exist under the current code, but the benefits of such deferrals by using foreign subsidiaries or foreign base companies are not available in many instances except at great price. The slow development of the statute and its rather fragmentary administrative and judicial interpretation have effectively denied these benefits to many companies. As an example of a business unfairly treated by the present law, consider company A which at great risk embarked upon the unknown of foreign investment in the 1920's. Legal advisers then had little experience with foreign investment and there were few interpretations of the law. The attitude of the U.S. Treasury Department was certainly far different from its present one. Accepting the best advice available, company A organized its foreign undertaking in the form of a subsidiary incorporated in Brazil. The risk proved worthwhile and the undertaking was successful in Brazil. Company A was also aware that similar markets for its products existed in Argentina, Peru, South Africa, and elsewhere. One would think it a simple matter for company A to transfer a part of its hard-earned, foreign-source earnings to any one of the countries named and establish a similar successful venture for the ultimate benefit of the United States and the countries involved. We know it is not.

"Now look at company B which manufactured a product similar to company A's. For years company B watched the experience of company A and, convinced of the wisdom of foreign investment, decided to move into the foreign field in 1953, but, learning from company A's difficult tax position, it established a base company and, by utilizing this third-country arrangement, is developing the markets in Argentina, Peru and South Africa with profits from other countries untaxed by the United States. This financing ability should be available to company A as well. B's accumulated earnings and profits in any one country may be transferred without the imposition of U.S. tax to another subsidiary where they are needed. Additional benefits accrue to company B such as the averaging of foreign tax rates for the purpose of achieving the maximum benefit of the U.S. foreign tax credit. It may achieve many tax savings on branch

or other agency operations because its base company is not subject to U.S. tax jurisdiction.

"Surely, if we were proceeding de novo, no one would support this inherently unequitable and discriminatory arrangement. Yet we today condone it by inaction and perpetuate the inequity by an overdeveloped concern for the bare possibility of tax avoidance.

"The chief reason why company A is unable to remove this tax handicap is section 367. Section 367 applies only to exchanges which involve gain and provides that, in determining the extent to which gain shall be recognized, a foreign corporation shall not be considered as a corporation for purposes of most of the important sections of subchapter C unless, before any exchange is undertaken, it has been established to the satisfaction of the Secretary or his delegate that the exchange is not in pursuance of a plan having as one of its principal purposes the avoidance of Federal income tax. Section 367 began as section 112(k) of the Revenue Act of 1932 in a campaign against foreign personal holding companies which were then being utilized for the purpose of avoiding the U.S. capital-gains tax. Now, of course, with today's tax rates, it is not difficult for the Treasury Department and the IRS to find that a purpose of a contemplated exchange is the avoidance of Federal income taxes. Deferral is so deemed.

"However, company A has no desire to avoid the payment of U.S. tax. It simply wishes to compete with equality under U.S. law with company B for foreign investment opportunities. This it cannot do because section 367 has cemented, not only company A, but perhaps a majority of the primary companies in the field of foreign investment, into a fixed organization pattern.

"Even if we were to assume that rare thing, the Commissioner's approval of an exchange involving a foreign corporation, company A is by no means out of the woods. Subchapter C of the code was framed with domestic business problems in mind. It does not take into account the vagaries of foreign law and the policy of many foreign countries requiring a high percentage of local ownership in corporations. Thus even assuming that company A can overcome what is almost the irrefutable presumption of section 367, it may nevertheless find itself unable to invest where investment is needed because of a statute which should have as one of its principal objectives neutrality of impact between similarly situated taxpayers."

H.R. 5, introduced by Representative Boggs on January 7, 1959, attempts to solve both of the problems he discussed. Section 2 provides for the creation of a new class of foreign business corporation. Section 3 modifies section 367 of the code to permit tax-free transfer by making that provision inapplicable to an exchange arising out of, or in connection with, a transfer of "foreign business property" (as defined) to a foreign corporation in exchange for its stock.

Summary of Boggs Bill and Initial Industry Reaction

The bill introduced by Representative Boggs to accomplish some of his objectives is seen by some representatives of the foreign trade industry to be facing grave difficulties in its progress through the Legislature. The bill (H.R. 5) contains seven independent sections and it may be that, if the need for compromise develops, one or more sections may be dropped.

Section 1 is introductory.

Section 2 would create a new class of Foreign Business Corporations (FBC). These would be domestic corporations which would be permitted to defer U.S. tax so long as the earnings remained invested abroad, to some extent as third-country, foreign-base corporations now do.

Section 3 would permit the tax-free transfer by U.S. corporations of foreign business assets to controlled foreign corporations.

Section 4 would extend the 14-percentage-point tax reduction allowed to Western Hemisphere trade corporations on all foreign income. Only companies with 90 percent of their income from foreign business could qualify as International Trade Corporations (ITC). The WHTC would be abolished.

Section 5 would create an overall limitation on the foreign tax credit which may be elected in lieu of the per-country limitation.

Section 6 would specifically permit credit for foreign taxes forgiven by the foreign country as part of a tax incentive program.

Section 7 would permit nonrecognition of gain on property of foreign subsidiaries involuntarily converted.

Paul D. Seghers, New York City tax attorney and chairman of the International Section of the New York Board of Trade, expressed one reaction of foreign tax experts to the bill: it's complex and doesn't cover all the points that need correction. Mr. Seghers says that, "The need for encouragement of increased activity abroad through tax incentives is so abundantly clear that it is a disappointment that the one piece of legislation proposed along these lines should fall short of affording sufficient incentive. Nevertheless, it would seem reasonable first to consider whether the urgency for legislation to accomplish the announced purpose of the Boggs bill is so great that it would be better to enact H.R. 5 at the earliest possible moment, rather than to risk prolonged delay by seeking to incorporate changes in it, though they may be very desirable.

"However, H.R. 5, if denuded of its provisions for the extension to worldwide trade of the 14-percentage-point tax reduction and for credit for tax waived by foreign countries, would be inadequate to accomplish satisfactorily its intended effect—'to encourage private investment abroad.'

"Why? Deferment is now available through the use of foreign subsidiaries and, according to the most ardent supporters of deferment, is being quite widely availed of in this manner by their competitors. Why, then, can it be anticipated that another form of deferment, given almost the same tax treatment as a foreign subsidiary, will stimulate U.S. business to put money into foreign operations?

"Hence, all who are concerned with the achievement of the announced objectives of H.R. 5 should unite in insisting that the substance of the 14-point reduction and the tax sparing be retained in it.

"The tax-deferral method adopted is based on a plan proposed by Ira Wonder and E. R. Barlow, both of Harvard. It would be better had the method of deferral proposed by Richard C. Munsche (at the December hearings of the Subcommittee on Foreign Trade Policy) been incorporated in H.R. 5, rather than the Harvard plan. In other words, it would be better, as a method of deferral of the tax, to have the income taxed to the stockholder of the foreign business corporation when distributed, rather than to tax the corporation on its income when distributed by it. Unfortunately, there are many obvious disadvantages in the method of deferral of tax provided in the Boggs bill.

"I note that it is apparently possible to qualify the same U.S. corporation for treatment in the same taxable year as both a foreign business corporation and an international trade corporation. This would afford the benefit of both the tax deferral and the 14-percentage-point tax reduction.

"The proposed allowance, in effect, of either the per country or the overall limitation on the amount of the foreign tax credit is to be commended as a badly needed correction of an injustice. It is to be noted, however, that this still leaves much to be desired to correct the injustices resulting from the Treasury's interpretation and application of the code provisions with respect to credit for foreign taxes levied in lieu of income taxes."

Other reactions run the familiar gamut of varied opinion. At the opposite pole to Mr. Seghers may perhaps be the point to fix the position of Prof. Stanley Surrey of the Harvard Law School. He feels that, at present, there is a drive to secure a distinct U.S. tax preference for U.S. corporations having foreign income; the main goal is a 38 percent U.S. tax rate on those earnings. From the start, as Professor Surrey sees it, basic congressional policy has been that a dollar received from foreign earnings should bear the same ultimate U.S. tax burden as a dollar from domestic earnings. Why then, he asks, should a dollar earned abroad be treated any differently? He feels that this question lies at the root of every tax policy issue relating to foreign income.

Somewhere in between are some practically and politically minded persons who believe that, at this point in our political picture, it will be necessary to settle for deferment alone.

Other minor voices may still be heard. Someone has suggested that, if deferment is to be enacted, foreign incorporated base companies should be required to meet the same standards of reporting to the IRS that will be required of foreign business corporations. Another has inquired why no corrective legislation has been proposed to eliminate the tax advantage which results from the arithmetic operation of the foreign tax credit formula (see 10 J. Tax 33).

Citizens Working Abroad Must Now File Returns

U.S. citizens employed abroad will have to file Federal income tax returns for 1958 and later years, even though their income earned outside the United States may be exempt from tax, as a result of the Technical Amendments Act of 1958. Taxpayers claiming exemptions under section 911(a) on their income from personal sources earned abroad will be required to submit with their tax return a new Form 2555, "Statement to Support Exclusion of Income Earned Abroad."

The 1954 code has always required that a return be filed by a taxpayer who has annual gross income of $600 or more ($1,200 if he is 65 years of age or over).

Formerly, many citizens employed in foreign countries did not have to file returns because their gross income, which did not include income exempt because earned abroad, was less than the minimum gross income for filing a return. Now the taxpayer abroad must include exempt earned income when determining whether he must file an income tax return.

All income received for personal services performed abroad by a citizen who is a bona fide resident of a foreign country for at least one full taxable year is exempt. There is also an exemption of the first $20,000 of income received for personal services performed abroad by a citizen who is physically present in foreign countries for (approximately) 17 out of 18 consecutive months.

If the taxpayer qualifies under either of these two rules, income derived from personal services rendered abroad is exempt. This includes wages, salaries, fees, bonuses, commissions, tips and similar income.

However, income paid by the United States Government is not, under any circumstances, exempt for reasons of bona fide residence or presence in a foreign country. Accordingly, U.S. Government employees abroad are generally not affected by the new filing requirement because their government salary is taxable and they have always been required to file income tax returns.

President Eisenhower and the Public Schools

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEE METCALF

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 26, 1959

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, seven state-of-the-Union messages ago, President Eisenhower stated wisely that our school system demands some prompt, effective help. He said the whole situation calls for careful congressional study and action.

Since that time, his recommendations have ranged from study to first echelon action, then back to second echelon study after first echelon inaction.

In 1954, he put it this way:

In order to appraise the needs, I hope that this year a conference on education will be held in each State, culminating in a national conference. From these conferences on education, every level of government—from the Federal Government to each local school board—should gain the information with which to attack this serious problem.

In 1955, the year the conferences were to be completed, he once again became an action man. He put it this way:

However, such factors as population growth, additional responsibilities of schools, and increased and longer school attendance have produced an unprecedented classroom shortage. This shortage is of immediate concern to all our people. Affirmative action must be taken now.

Without impairing in any way the responsibilities of our States, our localities, communities, or families, the Federal Government should serve as an effective agent in dealing with this problem.

Nineteen hundred and fifty-five was the year, too, that the President sent us a special message.

In 1956, he reported the conclusion of the broadly representative White House Conference on Education, that—

The people of the United States must make a greater effort through their local, State, and Federal Governments to improve the education of our youth. This expression from the people—

He said—

must now be translated into action at all levels of government.

So far as the Federal share of responsibility is concerned, I urge that the Congress move promptly to enact an effective program of Federal assistance to help erase the existing deficit of school classrooms.

He promised, and delivered, to Congress that year his recommended program of Federal assistance for school construction.

He hit his peak in 1957, when he said:

High priority should be given the school construction bill. This will benefit children of all races throughout the country—and children of all races need schools now. A program designed to meet emergency needs for more classrooms should be enacted without delay.

But he also hit bottom in the summer of 1957. In July 25, we all lost when the House, by a vote of 208 to 203, killed the bill authorizing general Federal aid to the States for school construction.

This was the bill President Eisenhower said he wanted—until its life hung on his expression of support on the day the bill was voted on. Then there was silence. A statement from the President prior to the vote, that he would be disappointed if school construction legislation were not passed, would have done a lot more good than his mention of disappointment after the bill was killed. For a shift of three votes would have saved the bill. Ninety-seven Democrats and one hundred and eleven Republicans voted against the bill. One hundred and twenty-six Democrats and seventy-seven Republicans voted for it.

In his 1958 state-of-the-Union message, President Eisenhower lumped education and research together, saying his recommended program "involves new activities by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare designed principally to encourage improved teaching quality and student opportunities in the interests of national security."

But that was the year, too, that he talked of spurring the maximum amount of local effort and called for "redoubled exertions on the part of all Americans if we are to rise to the demands of our times."

This—

He said—

means hard work on the part of State and local governments, private industry, schools and colleges, private organizations and foundations, teachers, parents, and—perhaps most important of all—the student himself, with his bag of books and his homework.

In his 1959 budget message, President Eisenhower proposed another study. He said he would set up a committee of selfless, able, and devoted individuals, outside of Government to make an appraisal of the potentials of our future. The result would be establishment of national goals. The committee also would be concerned "with methods to meet such goals and which levels of Government—local, State, or Federal—might or should be particularly concerned."

As one example, consider our schools, operated under the authority of local communities and States. In their capacity and in their quality they conform to no recognizable standards. In some places facilities are ample, in others meager. Pay of teachers ranges between wide limits, from the adequate to the shameful.

He said:

We need a national goal. Once established, I am certain that public opinion would compel steady progress toward its accomplishment.

So far, we have not heard anything further from the President. His Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare did hold a press conference and released a letter to Speaker RAYBURN. So we are down to a second-echelon study.

Report to the National Rivers and Harbors Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OVERTON BROOKS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 26, 1959

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I present the report which I rendered as president to the National Rivers and Harbors Congress at the annual convention of the Congress held in the city of Washington, D.C., on May 16, 1958.

PRESIDENT'S REPORT TO NATIONAL RIVERS AND HARBORS CONGRESS

(By Congressman OVERTON BROOKS, of Louisiana)

Members of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress and friends in all of the 57-year history of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress, this past year probably has been the most momentous. We have been confronted with more problems affecting the water development program than ever before. We have had to make quick decisions to protect our program. I trust we have acted wisely for we have had to shoot from the hip, so to speak.

The basic event of the last year which affected our flood control, waterway, harbor, irrigation and water supply program, was the launching of Sputnik I by the Russians on October 4, 1957. Speaking as a member of the House Armed Services Committee, I should like to express the opinion that this was one of the major historic developments of our entire era. If I may draw an analogy, I should say that the launching of an earth satellite into outer space was of far more long-term importance to all of us than the invention of the automobile and Marconi's development of radio.

Of course, we were stunned that the Russians beat us to the draw. It was a disturbing development that sharply jerked us up to the realization that the Russians have scientific and technical skills that are far greater than we had previously dreamed possible. May I call your attention to the exhibit of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress in the State Room. We have titled the exhibit "Russian Pork Barrel." It is an imposing display of what is being done in the way of water development on the other side of the Iron Curtain. We are not presenting this display to advertise or to propagandize for the Russians; but to remind ourselves in sober fashion that if the Russians can launch sputniks and missiles and improve their internal economy all at

the same time, we should certainly be able to do the same thing.

National defense goes hand in hand with the orderly development of the water resources of this country. Defense and water resource development cannot be separated arbitrarily by men who do not comprehend how closely interrelated are these twin aspects of our national security and our general well-being. This interrelationship is the theme of our convention.

The National Rivers and Harbors Congress moved into high gear when sputnik was launched. It was immediately obvious to us that we might become so obsessed in pumping funds into the satellite-missile program that we would forget some of the day-to-day problems that remained down here on earth.

Let me recall chronologically the sequence of events that followed Sputnik I and what the National Rivers and Harbors Congress did to meet the threat to the river and harbor program.

1. On October 29, 1957, I addressed the Inland Empire Waterways Association at Longview, Wash. This fine group is directed by Mr. Herbert G. West, who is a member of our board of directors.

In this speech I warned that the launching of sputnik by the Russians would bring about a drastic reappraisal of our budget for waterway development. I also observed that efforts would be made to divert funds which Congress had appropriated for flood control, river and harbor, and irrigation work to the development of satellites and missiles. I observed that we might be threatened with the prospect of getting along with the crumbs that dropped from the table.

2. Through various reports from headquarters of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress, we analyzed the threat to our program. We were first among the organizations in this field to report that there would probably be a 20 percent cut in the budget estimates which would be presented to Congress in January 1958 and that a ban would be placed on the start of new projects in the water development field. There were some who thought we were alarmists in this matter, but events have proved the general accuracy of our fears and predictions.

3. On November 29, 1957, our national headquarters sent out a memorandum to officers, national directors, regional directors, and State vice presidents about the threatened cut in appropriations and in future construction.

This report was circulated to some 150 key Members of Congress who are interested in the overall waterway development program. We had an amazing response from this memorandum—a response that showed that these key Members of Congress were also concerned that the water development program might be scuttled and tossed overboard under the guise of providing funds for the satellite-missile program.

4. In early December, the national headquarters became concerned about the recession. There were several headquarters reports and press releases which carried a survey of news stories appearing in papers all over the country, indicating that we were headed toward hard times. I mention this because we felt that a cutback in construction of public works would further add to the present disturbing business decline.

5. On December 5, 1957, the Bureau of the Budget issued a secret order to the Army Engineers to review the expenditure of the appropriated funds in the light of new budgetary considerations. This meant simply that the Bureau of the Budget was delaying and deferring and obstructing the flow of appropriated funds into projects which were already under construction. We objected strongly to this action and, as a result, the Bureau of the Budget has released all of these funds that had been held virtually in escrow.

6. As the rumor of cutback, delay and ban on new starts persisted through November, I called a special emergency meeting of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress board of national directors, which was held in Washington on January 4, 1958. Seventeen of the twenty-one members of the board gathered at the Mayflower Hotel and produced a remarkable set of recommendations, opposing these antagonistic acts toward the water development program.

I wish that each of you would take the time to read a copy of these recommendations.

7. On January 13, the Bureau of the Budget sent to Congress its figures for flood control, river, harbor, navigation, and irrigation work. Due to the opposition that we had expressed to the Bureau of the Budget, the cuts in construction funds were not as great as the 20 percent that had originally been considered within the Bureau of the Budget. However, the budget did contain a ban on the start of new projects, as we had predicted.

8. On the same day, January 13, I issued a release to the press in which I labeled the budget provisions as the "liquidation of the water development program." In my statement, I predicted strong congressional opposition to the cuts and the deferment of new starts, especially in view of the growing business recession.

9. On March 7, President Eisenhower issued a statement releasing some of the appropriated funds for the waterway program. The ban on new starts remained, however, on the flood control, navigation, and irrigation-reclamation program. I will say that we strongly resist this effort to throttle the program by slow strangulation.

I hope that our resolutions committee will bring out a firm statement in opposition to this effort to sabotage the water development program of the United States. We cannot stand still and see our money being spent on dubious foreign-aid projects while we are being denied the funds to keep abreast and apace of our growing national water needs.

America cannot stand still. The times will not await indefinite delay in this highly important defense and economic matter. The time to meet our needs is now.

10. On March 11, the House passed the 1958 Omnibus Rivers and Harbors and Flood Control bill by an impressive majority of 321 to 81. The Senate had previously passed the measure. This was merely an authorization bill, but it is necessary before the appropriations can be made to start the projects that are required to keep abreast of our national water needs.

11. On April 15, President Eisenhower vetoed this bill. We hope that Congress will either override the veto or assert its prerogative to plan the future water needs of the Nation without undue obstruction. I also expect our resolutions committee to bring in a strong recommendation on that subject—and the stronger, the better.

While all of these hectic developments were taking place, we were stepping up our activity in the matter of publicity and membership. We have prepared a new pamphlet which I hope you take the time to read: "The National Rivers and Harbors Congress—What It Is—What It Does."

You will have a report later on the matter of membership. I wish to commend the efforts of our directors from all over the country. They have all worked hard and are entitled to our appreciation for a job well done. We are growing soundly and steadily, not only in membership, but in effectiveness in our cause.

I think I would be derelict in my duty were I not at this time to make certain recommendations to this organization. I think our country should adopt three basic principles as fundamental parts of our water utilization program. They are:

1. The Nation needs and should have a stabilized program for the purpose of water development, including reclamation and all types of river and harbor development. This program should be set at a definite dollar amount, always taking in consideration the decreased purchasing power of the dollar and the increased population of the Nation, with concurring increased need for flood control, navigation, reclamation, recreation, and industrial and municipal use of water.

2. We should have a definite and dependable program of new starts, and no agency of government should be allowed to strangle our program for internal development by direct or devious means.

3. Present projects under consideration should be speeded up to the time when they are completed and useful to our people, and a reasonable backlog of new projects should be authorized by the U.S. Congress.

The adoption of such a program nationally would serve to relieve those of us who have worked hard and hazarded greatly of the constant annual uncertainty, and would permit us to look forward with more assurance to the future. America, the richest land on earth, has a right to expect reasonable internal development and reasonable programs of projects which create wealth in themselves and make our land more livable for its people.

During the course of the last year, the National Rivers and Harbors Congress has made tremendous progress. I am delighted to be able to report to you, from your officers and directors, the fact that during the course of this year we have moved the offices of this organization from the third-story garret on M Street to the modern LaSalle Office Building across Connecticut Avenue from the Mayflower Hotel. Although our space was ample enough at the time of the move, it already has become crowded and too small, and we are looking forward to the time when we will double the size of these offices. I hope that all of you will seek an opportunity to visit your headquarters there during the course of this convention.

During the course of this year, our membership has increased enormously; and this means expanded influence and expanded activity. Keeping up with the increase in membership has been an increase in the total receipts for the organization. This, in turn, has permitted us to increase our budget without going in the red 1 cent. We have added to our staff, as head of the department of public information, Mr. Lacey Reynolds, formerly a newspaperman. His vitality and his alertness have given strength to our program of publicizing the affairs of your organization.

We now have in mind that the National Rivers and Harbors Congress will soon begin to edit a newsletter at regular intervals and will mail this newsletter to our entire membership. This will give us another way to keep in better touch with those throughout the entire Nation who are interested in water utilization and rivers and harbors development.

In the final analysis, we realize that this organization is the oldest national organization for water development in the United States. It was organized in 1901, and is growing in strength today. In the light of the growing demand upon our water resources, I see no reason why this organization should not continue to keep the lead in this program which means everything to the

progress and development of our land, and, in fact, to the very survival of our people.

As this year ends, I sense a quickening of activity and energy on the part of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress. I tell you that your organization is accepted throughout the U.S. Congress and the Nation with more respect and with growing admiration for its activity and its accomplishment. With your continued help and support, the National Rivers and Harbors Congress will move on to goals yet unsought and as of this date undreamed of.

Republicans To Draft Credo

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS M. PELLY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 26, 1959

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, the history of intra-party differences and conflicts over issues and policies, as between members of the same political party would fill a book and make interesting reading. Actually it is remarkable that under the stress of strong personal loyalties and the resulting cross-convictions of thought that our two great political parties have not splintered into a multiparty system as is the situation today in modern Italy and France. All of which is very much to the good of the great Nation which is so beloved in common by members of both the Republican and Democratic Parties. Moreover, I might add that I doubt if any present Member of Congress will ever live to see a reconstituting or readjustment as between the parties with conservatives joining with conservatives and liberals joining with liberals or some such regrouping.

From time to time, however, in the process of establishing majority views and finding a common basis for agreement, contention manifests itself. Early in this session of Congress Republicans in the Senate in selecting a floor leader revived the modern versus conservative argument of their party. Then in mid-January, in Des Moines, Iowa, at the meeting of the Republican National Committee, partisan roles and policies were under attack and made headlines.

Now at the Senate end of the Capitol, the Democrats are in the limelight with dissident voices asking for more party caucuses to afford wider participation in formulating legislative programs and policies.

But to return to matters pertaining to my own party, which obviously I can discuss with more propriety, Republican Chairman Alcorn has just announced a 44-member committee to draft a long-range statement of Republican Party policy and objectives.

Naturally the question arises, Can any such study group of either party representing all segments of thinking, spell out successfully a set of principles covering a party stand on all vital issues?

Personally, Mr. Speaker, as a Republican I have said that if Republicans stuck to fundamentals and general objectives and principles we can stand firm and find unity. When it comes to regulations on labor, fiscal problems, foreign policy, or domestic programs we should be able to agree on a pattern and framework, but each individual, to have accord, would have to complete the picture for himself or herself as to shades, degree, and details. In other words, there would have to be flexibility and in the spirit of the republican form of government which protects minorities properly there must be mutual respect of viewpoint and compromise between individuals. Each party member cannot demand exactly what fits his or her own convictions down to the last dot. That would be impossible.

Actually, our two great political parties follow the tradition of establishing principles at the grassroots by precinct caucus. After local discussion and free debate, party opinion is implemented and finds substance and form by process of resolution and vote at conventions at various levels until a set of principles and statement of majority views and objectives are consummated in the formal adoption of a party platform. In turn, referring to national principles and objectives, the respective party Members of the House and Members of the Senate establish their respective programs except that the party to which the Chief Executive has allegiance naturally has an influential and active partner in establishing the program deemed in conformity with party policy.

Speaking for myself, I am happy Mr. Alcorn has acted with the President's blessing to have a committee of 44 members of my party draft a statement of principles and long-range objectives. Such a committee should spell out the distinction between the two political parties and point out our Republican philosophy, especially where we insist on need as a requirement to recipients of Federal Government assistance.

To return, however, to my original thought and opening remarks, each political party has its internal differences and sources of conflict. Nothing can effect agreement on all issues. But it is certainly wholesome and constructive for an organization to take a fresh look at what it advocates and at what it seeks to accomplish and how. Self-analysis and self-criticism are healthy signs, and out of what I might call this agony of self-appraisal of the Republican Party I look for Republicans to rally to a rededicated and revitalized party under a strong creed under which our candidates can look for vigorous and united public support.

Of one thing I am sure; no party platform should remain static. For example, the establishment of the European Common Market and free trade areas excluding the United States which became effective in January will require a reexamination of our tariff policy. We stand to lose out to foreign manufacturers and our high-cost American-made products, coupled with worldwide dollar shortages and other barriers, already are cutting U.S. industries out of world competition. I fear American capital may be induced to establish more mass production outlets overseas and then they will ship back into our own domestic markets. Our labor will lose both in foreign markets and here at home.

Therefore we should reemphasize the long-standing Republican principle that foreign products of underpaid foreign labor shall not be admitted to this country on terms which imperil the living standards of the American workman. We will not, I hope, retreat from favoring world trade on the basis of fair and reasonable competition but domestic industry must be protected from serious injury and I feel we Republicans should review our historic position from time to time.

By the same token, on domestic matters such as a farm program, where Republicans have strongly differed within the ranks of party, I am certain unity can be restored if we reexamine and restate our policies. Certainly we believe in building a Nation in which each and every citizen may make the most of his skill, incentive, and enterprise. We believe in individual freedom and oppose a welfare state. We believe in incentives and rewards to workmen and industry for ability, knowledge, hard work, risk, and initiative. This principle should appeal to the laboring people of America.

By the same token Republicans are against big Government spending, big taxes, and Federal control. We would assist those citizens who need help; but in every case the local community and citizens should manage their own affairs and daily lives. We believe that individual opportunity and individual freedom go hand in hand.

The Republican task force to paint the true image of the Republican Party if it succeeds will create an issue which to me needs portrayal to all Republicans. Once we see ourselves and objectives in proper perspective, we can go to the people offering principles which assure the best hope of all citizens—not leaders in Wall Street; not leaders in labor—but all citizens in every walk of life a better and happier existence.

Intra-party issues, selfish interests, and human weakness will always exist as long as politics and politicians compete for popular favor. Yet men and women everywhere regardless of political faith will continue to cherish ideals and hold convictions dear.

It is therefore in our Nation's best interest that both our political parties restudy their policies from time to time and strengthen in every way the honest advancement of principles on which there is united agreement. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I hail with hope and expectation the efforts of the 44 Republicans from all walks of life and from all over the country who will seek a common ground on which members of the Republican Party can find unity and offer leadership and service to the Nation.

SENATE

MONDAY, MARCH 2, 1959

Rev. Philip Gordon Scott, pastor, Westmoreland Congregational Church, Washington, D.C., offered the following prayer:

Almighty and Eternal God, our Heavenly Father, who doth rule in the kingdoms of men, who in the days of old didst give to this land the benediction of Thy grace through heroes and strong men, able for the burdens of their day, bless, we beseech Thee, all who give themselves to the service of their fellow men, in wisdom, patience, courage, and commitment through this Senate of our people. Grant to each of them, according to Thy loving kindness, to live as becomes his duty. In all that contends within our hearts, and in the claims that plead their interest and their urgencies, enable us who stand before Thee to do the work Thou dost give us to do with singleness of heart, serving Thee, learning Thy will, and living in obedience.

Grant unto us, O God, a vision of our land, fair as she may be, that we may ever serve, in all her life, and power, as large a purpose as we can see, that the issues of our choice may be her strength and the peace of all the earth.

As we entrust this day to Thy keeping, our Father, may its tireless strivings be sustained of Thy Spirit, toward the goals Thou dost appoint for Thy people, and may our minds be led forward to Thy truth, through Jesus Christ, our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, February 26, 1959, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILL

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on February 17, 1959, the President had approved and signed the act (S. 961) fixing the representation of the majority and minority membership of the Joint Economic Committee.

REPORT OF OFFICE OF ALIEN PROPERTY—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith, for the information of the Congress, the Annual Report of the Office of Alien Property, Department of Justice, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1958.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *March 2, 1959.*

LIMITATION OF DEBATE DURING MORNING HOUR

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, under the rule, there will be the usual morning hour; and I ask unanimous consent that statements be limited to 3 minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the following committees or subcommittees were authorized to meet today during the session of the Senate:

The Subcommittee on American Republics Affairs of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations.

The Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to consider executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. BYRD of Virginia, from the Committee on Finance:

George N. Sundquist, of Wisconsin, to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 36, with headquarters at Duluth, Minn.

By Mr. MAGNUSON, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

Elwood R. Quesada, of California, to be Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency;

James Tolman Pyle, of Maryland, to be Deputy Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency;

Capt. Chester L. Harding, U.S. Coast Guard, for promotion to the permanent rank of rear admiral in the U.S. Coast Guard;

Charles A. Webb, of Virginia, to be an Interstate Commerce Commissioner; and

Cecil M. Thomas, and sundry other persons, for appointment as warrant officers in the U.S. Coast Guard.

By Mr. SCOTT, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

Robert J. Dodds, Jr., of Pennsylvania, to be General Counsel of the Department of Commerce.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If there be no further reports of committees, the nominations on the calendar will be stated.

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Courtney Johnson, of Indiana, to be Assistant Secretary of the Army.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

U.S. AIR FORCE

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations for temporary appointment in the U.S. Air Force under the provisions of chapter 839, title 10, of the United States Code.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that these nominations be considered en bloc.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nominations will be considered en bloc; and, without objection, they are confirmed.

NOMINATIONS FAVORABLY REPORTED AND PLACED ON THE VICE PRESIDENT'S DESK

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Army, the Navy and Marine Corps, and the Regular Air Force, which had been favorably reported and placed on the Vice President's desk, without being printed in the calendar.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that all these nominations be considered en bloc.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nominations will be considered en bloc; and, without objection, they are confirmed.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of all these nominations.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

CLARIFICATION OF REEMPLOYMENT PROVISIONS OF UNIVERSAL MILITARY TRAINING AND SERVICE ACT

A letter from the Secretary of Labor, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend and clarify the reemployment provisions of the Universal Military Training and Service Act, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Armed Services.

COMPUTATION OF PERCENTAGE DEPLETION IN THE CASE OF OIL AND GAS WELLS

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to define the term "gross income from the property" for the purpose of computing percentage depletion in the case of oil and

gas wells (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Finance.

REPORT ON FINANCIAL CONDITION AND RESULTS OF OPERATIONS OF HIGHWAY TRUST FUND

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the financial condition and fiscal operations of the highway trust fund, for the fiscal year 1958 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Finance.

THIRD PROGRESS REPORT ON HIGHWAY COST ALLOCATION STUDY

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the third progress report of the Highway Cost Allocation Study, dated March 1, 1959 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Finance.

AMENDMENT OF REORGANIZATION ACT OF 1949

A letter from the Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to further amend the Reorganization Act of 1949, as amended, so that such act will apply to reorganization plans transmitted to the Congress at any time in conformity with the provisions of the act (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT ON PERSONAL AND REAL PROPERTY MADE AVAILABLE FOR AND DISPOSED OF TO PUBLIC HEALTH AND EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTIONS

A letter from the Acting Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on personal and real property made available for and disposed of to public health and educational institutions, for the calendar quarter, October 1 through December 31, 1958 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

HEADQUARTERS SITE FOR MOUNT RAINIER NATIONAL PARK, WASH.

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to provide a headquarters site for Mount Rainier National Park in the general vicinity of Ashford, Wash., and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REVISION OF BOUNDARIES OF MONTEZUMA CASTLE NATIONAL MONUMENT, ARIZ.

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to revise the boundaries of the Montezuma Castle National Monument, Ariz., and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORT OF BOYS' CLUBS OF AMERICA

A letter from the chairman of the board, president, and national director, Boys' Clubs of America, New York, N.Y., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the Boys' Clubs of America, for the year 1958 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

AUDIT REPORT ON CONGRESSIONAL MEDAL OF HONOR SOCIETY

A letter from the Secretary and Treasurer, Congressional Medal of Honor Society, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report of that Society, for the period ended December 31, 1958 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

RELOCATION OF NATIONAL TRAINING SCHOOL FOR BOYS

A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for the relocation of the National Training School for Boys, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

AMENDMENT OF SECTION 1915, TITLE 28, UNITED STATES CODE, RELATING TO PROCEEDINGS IN FORMA PAUPERIS

A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 1915 of title 28, United States Code, relating to proceedings in forma pauperis (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SUPPLEMENTAL REPORT ON POSITIONS FILLED IN CERTAIN GRADES OF CLASSIFICATION ACT OF 1949

A letter from the Chairman, U.S. Civil Service Commission, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a supplemental report on positions filled under the Classification Act of 1949, in grades GS–16, 17, and 18, in the Commission on Civil Rights and the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corp. (with accompanying papers) to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

REPORT ON HIGHWAY SAFETY

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the investigation and study made to determine what action can be taken by the Federal Government to promote the public welfare by increasing highway safety in the United States (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Public Works.

REPORT OF THE AMERICAN ACADEMY OF ARTS AND LETTERS

A letter from the assistant to the president, the American Academy of Arts and Letters, New York, N.Y., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that academy, for the year 1958 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION

A letter from the Chairman, Atomic Energy Commission, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize appropriations for the Atomic Energy Commission in accordance with section 261 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

INCREASE OF APPROPRIATIONS TO ATOMIC ENGERY COMMISSION

A letter from the Acting Chairman, U.S. Atomic Energy Commission, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend Public Law 85–590 to increase the authorization for appropriations to the Atomic Energy Commission in accordance with section 261 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Alabama; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 2

"Whereas in recent years the trend of the Federal Government has been to encroach upon activities of government which were reserved to the several States by the Constitution of the United States of America; and

"Whereas this encroachment upon the rights of the several States has caused the States to be powerless to act or regulate in any field where the Federal Congress has enacted legislation; and

"Whereas this has seriously hampered the several States in protecting themselves from internal subversion, in regulating the learned professions and commercial enterprises within their boundaries; and

"Whereas, if the present trend is continued, the several States will be rendered mere political subdivisions of the Federal Government for the purpose of convenient administration of Federal laws; and

"Whereas the doctrine of dual powers, with neither the Federal Government nor the States encroaching upon the constitutional and historically recognized rights of the other, is the genius and identifying feature of the American political system: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Senate of Alabama (the House of Representatives concurring)*, That the Legislature of Alabama does hereby memorialize and make application to the Congress of the United States of America to call a convention, as provided by article V of the Constitution of the United States of America, to consider submitting to the legislatures of the several States for their ratification an amendment to the Constitution in substantially the following form: 'No statute of any of the several States shall be held to be invalid as in conflict with any Federal statute unless such Federal statute expressly provides that such statutes of the several States in conflict therewith are invalid; be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to each member of the Alabama delegation in the Congress of the United States of America to be filed and presented by said delegation to the Congress, and that copies of this resolution be transmitted by the secretary of state of Alabama to the Clerk of the House of Representatives of the United States Congress and to the Secretary of the Senate of the United States Congress.

"ALBERT SOUTWELL,
"President and Presiding Officer of the Senate.
"CHAS. C. ADAMS,
"Speaker of the House of Representatives."

Resolutions of the general court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"RESOLUTIONS MEMORIALIZING THE CONGRESS AND THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES TO ENACT AND ENFORCE LEGISLATION TO IMPLEMENT THE DECISIONS OF THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES OUTLAWING SEGREGATION IN THE PUBLIC SCHOOL SYSTEM

"Whereas the Supreme Court of the United States on the 17th day of May 1954, by unanimous decision, held that 'in the field of public education the doctrine of separate but equal has no place'; and

"Whereas the same Court expressed its desire that its decision should be complied with 'with all deliberate speed'; and

"Whereas the 14th amendment to the Constitution of the United States provides that no State shall deny to any person within its jurisdiction equal protection of the laws; and

"Whereas the interests of orderly government demand that respect and compliance be given to orders issued by courts possessed of jurisdiction of persons and subject matter: Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That the general court of Massachusetts respectfully urges the Congress and President of the United States to enact and enforce legislation to implement the decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States outlawing segregation in the public school system; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the secretary of the Commonwealth transmit forthwith copies of these resolutions to the President of the United States, to the Presiding Officer of each branch of the Congress of the United States, and to each Member thereof from this Commonwealth.

"House of representatives, adopted, February 16, 1959.

"LAWRENCE R. GROVE,
"Clerk.

"Senate, adopted in concurrence, February 18, 1959.

"IRVING N. HAYDEN,
"Clerk.

"A true copy.
"Attest:

"JOSEPH D. WARD,
"Secretary of the Commonwealth."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Idaho; to the Committee on Armed Services:

"SENATE JOINT MEMORIAL 7

"Joint memorial to the Director, Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization, Washington, D.C.

"We, your memorialists, the Senate of the State of Idaho, as assembled in its 35th session, the House of Representatives concurring, respectfully represent that—

"Whereas the State of Idaho has the largest known deposit of cobalt in the United States and is producing 70 percent of the entire production in the United States; and

"Whereas, owing to the reduction in prices paid by the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization, the cobalt operators in Idaho have been compelled to reduce the number of their employees from about 400 to 125; and

"Whereas, the existing contract will expire on or before July 1, 1959, unless it is extended; and

"Whereas under the various Acts of Congress, such as the Stockpiling Act of 1946, the Defense Production Act of 1950 and the Domestic Minerals Program Extension Act of 1953, the Director was authorized to buy more domestic strategic metals; and

"Whereas Idaho has 15 million pounds in reserve ore blocked out with inferred reserves of 15 times that amount, or a total reserve of 225 million pounds; and

"Whereas the mining facilities are ample to handle twice the amount of tonnage; the concentrator is the latest design for the most efficient operation; housing facilities are available for 500 employees, together with modern schools, the very best fire protection, ample electric power, and a sewage disposal system for the entire community; and

"Whereas if forced to close down the mine it will entail a loss of $15 million in expenditures and a layoff of at least 125 additional men; and

"Whereas the U.S. Government should afford its domestic industries equal or superior treatment with foreign countries; and

"Whereas the U.S. Government has made outstanding commitments to take foreign cobalt valued at about $80 million, and as late as March 1957 entered into a contract involving $47 million worth of cobalt from a foreign source; and

"Whereas 2,500,000 pounds of domestic cobalt a year are available and the mining industry should be protected with a price of $2.30 per pound, to compare with the price paid foreign producers: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate of the 35th session of the Legislature of the State of Idaho (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Director of the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization be, and he is hereby, memorialized as follows:

"To exercise the powers heretofore conferred upon him and to enter into contracts with the producers of domestic cobalt at the rate of $2.30 per pound to compare with the rate paid foreign producers; be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of state of the State of Idaho be and he is hereby authorized and directed to forward certified copies of this senate joint memorial to the Director, Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization, the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress, and to the Senators and Representatives representing this State in the Congress of the United States."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Idaho; to the Committee on Government Operations:

"SENATE JOINT MEMORIAL 2

"Joint memorial to the honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States in Congress assembled

"We, your memorialists, the Legislature of the State of Idaho, as assembled in its 35th session, do respectfully represent that—

"Whereas abandoned and unclaimed property in the hands of the Federal Government cannot be removed from Federal records because of the lack of the power of escheat in the Federal Government; and

"Whereas those sums of money and other property abandoned and unclaimed in the hands of the Federal Government belong to the citizens of the various States, and

"Whereas by the 10th amendment to the Constitution of the United States, the power of escheat and custodial possession of property belonging to the citizens of the various States has been especially reserved to said States; and

"Whereas the National Association of Attorneys General has, through its special committee on escheats and unclaimed property, prepared and submitted to Congress, a bill providing that reports should be prepared and made by the Office of the Comptroller General disclosing to the various States the amount of unclaimed money and other property held by the Federal Government and the persons to whom the same belongs or is believed to belong, according to the records of the Federal Government and the provisions of said bill, and permitting the return of the sums of money and other property to the various States entitled thereto: Said bill having been designated as Senate bill 3937 in the 85th Congress, 2d session, but having been introduced too late for action during said session: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate of the State of Idaho, and the House of Representatives therein concurring, That we most respectfully urge upon the Congress of the United States that said bill, formerly known as Senate bill 3937, as submitted to the 85th Congress, 2d session, or a similar one be introduced in Congress and given immediate consideration and approval; be it further

"Resolved, That the Secretary of State of the State of Idaho be, and he hereby is, authorized and directed to forward certified copies of this memorial to the President and Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress, and to the Senators and Representatives representing this State in the Congress of the United States."

Two joint resolutions of the Legislature of the State of Idaho; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"HOUSE JOINT MEMORIAL 6

"Joint memorial to the honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States in Congress assembled

"We, your memorialists, the Legislature of the State of Idaho, respectfully represent that—

"Whereas there is now pending in the Congress of the United States a bill known as H.R. 1929 to establish a National Wilderness Preservation System; and

"Whereas the economy of the State of Idaho is based upon its agriculture, mining, lumber, sheep and cattle industries, and the use of its waters for irrigation and hydroelectric power; and

"Whereas the enactment of this bill will deny to the natural resources industries of the State of Idaho the right to wisely develop the natural resources contained in the great primitive areas of this State, and further deny access to these primitive areas to millions of American citizens, all to the detriment of the said industries and to the people of the State of Idaho; and

"Whereas one of the great potential industries of the State of Idaho is its tourist trade and wildlife attractions: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the House of Representatives, State of Idaho, the Senate concurring, That we most respectfully oppose the enactment of said H.R. 1929, for the reasons that the enactment of said bill prevents the normal development and utilization of the natural resources contained in such a wilderness system, that the agricultural, mining, timber, sheep and cattle industries, and the wildlife and tourist industries will be irreparably damaged, and that the present very satisfactory and normal administration of our natural resources by the present land management agencies will be superseded and replaced by another unnecessary Federal bureau; be it further

"Resolved, That the Secretary of State of the State of Idaho be authorized and he is hereby directed to immediately forward certified copies of this memorial to the Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States of America, the Secretary of the Interior, and to the Senators and the Representatives in Congress from this State."

"HOUSE JOINT MEMORIAL 7

"Joint memorial to the honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States in Congress assembled

"We, your memorialists, the Legislature of the State of Idaho, as assembled in its 35th session, respectfully represent that—

"Whereas House Concurrent Resolution 108, 83d Congress, has been used by the Bureau of Indian Affairs to defend and justify actions which are contrary to the best interests of Indian groups, and

"Whereas Indian Bureau and other Federal officials have repeatedly referred to House Concurrent Resolution 108, 83d Congress as a mandate from Congress; and

"Whereas House Concurrent Resolution 108, 83d Congress, has been strongly and repeatedly objected to by all Indian groups; and

"Whereas House Concurrent Resolution 108, 83d Congress, was passed in Congress without giving the Indians involved an opportunity to be heard on this policy statement: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the House of Representatives, State of Idaho, the Senate concurring, That we most respectfully urge upon the Congress of the United States of America that House Concurrent Resolution 108, 83d Congress, be repealed and that a statement of policy be enacted in regard to our Indian peoples which will provide for the adoption of a constructive approach by the United States toward Indian affairs, so as to offer an opportunity for reasonable progress to the American Indian communities without exacting termination of Federal protection of Indian property or of any other Indian rights as its price; that Indian culture and identity shall not be restricted or destroyed; that technical guidance and financial assistance shall be made available, that the request for assistance shall come from the Indians themselves after each Indian group has studied itself in terms of its own needs; that an impartial effort shall be made to develop the full capabilities of industrial and agricultural production, of improvements in housing, nutrition, clothing, sanitation, and health, that tech-

nical assistance shall be given to long-term, general, vocational, technical, and professional education to enable American Indians to share in and contribute to the total American society, and that older, revered values shall be respected and used as new forms of living are introduced, and that it should be made plain that Federal protection and services shall be ended for any tribe, band, or group only when such unit shall have adopted a plan for its organization and operation under State law, and such plan shall have been approved by the appropriate state and by the Secretary of the Interior prior to its submission to the Congress; be it further

"*Resolved,* That the secretary of state of the State of Idaho be authorized and he is hereby directed to immediately forward certified copies of this memorial to the Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States of America, the Secretary of the Interior, and to the Senators and the Representatives in Congress from this State."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Idaho; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

"HOUSE JOINT MEMORIAL No. 8

"Joint memorial to the honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States in Congress assembled:

"We, your memorialists, the Legislature of the State of Idaho, as assembled in its 35th session, respectfully represent: That

"Whereas under present legislation (Public Law 815) providing for Federal aid for school construction where there are a certain percentage of Indian children in the school district, certain areas which do not quite meet said required percentage are still unable to finance their own school construction because of their exceedingly low valuation assessment due to the high percentages of the most valuable lands in the districts which are Indian owned and tax exempt; and

"Whereas Indian and non-Indian children alike in such areas are being deprived of educational facilities which should be available to all our youth, and

"Whereas if proper school facilities were available for Indian children there would be substantial increases in the number of Indian children attending public schools; and

"Whereas it is unreasonable and discriminatory to deny to non-Indian children adequate school facilities because of the large percentage of nontaxable trust land in their school districts: Now, therefore, be it

"*Reesolved by the house of representatives, State of Idaho, the senate concurring,* That we most respectfully urge upon the Congress of the United States of America that Public Law 815, as amended, be amended as follows: At the end of title IV, section 401, subsection (a), after the word 'law', change the period to a semicolon, and add, 'except that where the reduction of the potential assessed valuation because of the presence of land held in trust by the Federal Government exceeds 50 percent, then Federal assistance to such district for public school facilities construction may be the need as recommended by the Commissioner of Education, and may be equal to the cost, but in no case to exceed the cost, of constructing adequate school facilities;' and be it further

"*Resolved,* That the secretary of state of the State of Idaho be authorized and he is hereby directed to immediately forward certified copies of this memorial to the Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States of America, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, the Secretary of the Interior, the Commissioner of Indian Affairs, and to the Senators and the Representatives in Congress from this State."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Alabama; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION No. 29

"Joint resolution memorializing the Congress and President of the United States to safeguard and preserve established State and individual rights to the use of water within the separate States

"Whereas recent decisions of the Federal courts and recent assertions from the U.S. Department of Justice have deprived States, and persons, of rights which said States and persons previously enjoyed, to regulate and control the use of the water in those respective States; and

"Whereas said decisions and assertions are further a part of a general pattern developing gradually into Federal supremacy and usurpation over water, which will substitute an all-powerful centralized Government control thereover, and will continue to destroy individual and States' rights over water: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Legislature of Alabama, both houses thereof concurring,* That the U.S. Congress and the President of the United States are hereby urged and requested to take all necessary action (1) to preserve the water rights of the individual and the States and to prevent Federal usurpation of those rights; (2) to see that leigslation is initiated and supported to recognize and protect the rights of individuals and the States' rights taken from them by the Federal courts and the Justice Department; and (3) in every way possible to reaffirm, renew, and defend the concepts that water rights are property rights and that these established rights, to the use of water, by a State or an individual, should not be taken away without the process of law and adequate compensation; and be it further

"*Resolved,* That the Legislature of Alabama is cognizant of the great benefits derived from the Tennessee Valley Authority and is in accord and expresses approval of the Tennessee Valley Authority; and be it further

"*Resolved,* That certified copies of this resolution be promptly transmitted by the Clerk of the House, to the President and Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress, the chairmen of the U.S. Senate and House Committees of Interior and Insular Affairs, and the Alabama legislative delegation in the Congress of the United States.

"Adopted by the House of Representatives of Alabama February 17, 1959. Concurred in and adopted by the Senate February 19, 1959. Approved by the Governor February 24, 1959."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Wyoming; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"ENROLLED JOINT MEMORIAL No. 6

"Joint memorial memorializing the Congress of the United States of America with reference to the passing of legislation relating to the amendment of section 2(c) of the Mineral Leasing Act of February 25, 1920, as amended (41 Stat. 448, 30 U.S.C. 184) removing restriction on railroad companies in regard to the leasing of public lands for coal purposes.

"Whereas coal is a major resource in Wyoming and employment in the coal industry has been a major contributor to Wyoming's economy; and

"Whereas several nationally prominent industrial concerns have expressed interest in conducting research toward the establishment of industries utilizing Wyoming coals; and

"Whereas these industries have expressed intent to develop these tremendous coal deposits; and

"Whereas section 2(c) of the Mineral Leasing Act of February 25, 1920, as amended (41 Stat. 448, 30 U.S.C. 184), presently does not permit the development of these coal deposits because of the restrictive provisions put upon the leasing of public lands for coal purposes by railroad companies; and

"Whereas the unique ownership patterns of such coal areas by these railroad companies will restrict the development unless corrective legislation be employed by Congress: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Senate of the 35th Legislature of the State of Wyoming, the House of Representatives of such Legislature concurring,* That the President and the Congress of the United States of America be and they are hereby memorialized to remove the restrictions in said section of the Mineral Leasing Act by repealing or suitable amendment; and be it further

"*Resolved,* That certified copies hereof be promptly transmitted to the President and Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of said Congress, U.S. Senator JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY, U.S. Senator GALE MCGEE, and Representative in Congress E. KEITH THOMSON.

"JAY R. HOUSE,
"Speaker of the House.
"NORMAN BARLOW,
"President of the Senate.

"Approved, February 20, 1959:

"J. J. 'JOE' HICKEY,
"Governor."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Wyoming; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION 2

"Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to abolishing personal income, estate, and gift taxes and prohibiting the United States Government from engaging in business in competition with its citizens

"*Be it resolved by the Legislature of the State of Wyoming (the Senate and House of Representatives concurring herein),* That the members of the 35th Legislature of the State of Wyoming respectfully requests the Congress of the United States to propose to the people an amendment to the Constitution of the United States or to call a convention for such purpose, as provided by law, to add to the Constitution an article providing that:

" 'ARTICLE —

" 'SECTION 1. The Government of the United States shall not engage in any business, professional, commercial, financial, or industrial enterprise, except as specified in the Constitution.

" 'SEC. 2. The Constitution or laws of any State, or the laws of the United States shall not be subject to the terms of any foreign or domestic agreement which would abrogate this amendment.

" 'SEC. 3. The activities of the U.S. Government which violate the intent and purposes of this amendment shall, within a period of 3 years from the date of ratification of this amendment, be liquidated and the properties and facilities affected shall be sold.

" 'SEC. 4. Three years after the ratification of this amendment the 16th article of amendments to the Constitution of the United States shall stand repealed and thereafter Congress shall not levy taxes on personal incomes, estates, and/or gifts;' and be it further

"*Resolved,* That a certified copy of this resolution be forwarded by the secretary of state to the President of the U.S. Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and

to each Member of Congress from the State of Wyoming.

"NORMAN BARLOW,
"President of the Senate.
"JAY R. HOUSE,
"Speaker of the House.

"Approved February 26, 1959:

"J. J. 'JOE' HICKEY,
"Governor."

A resolution adopted by the American Municipal Association of Washington, D.C., favoring the enactment of legislation to authorize additional funds to adequately staff the U.S. Information Agency relating to the people-to-people program; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Resolutions adopted by the Maui County (Hawaii) Committee for Statehood for Hawaii and the California-Nevada-Hawaii District of Kiwanis International, favoring the enactment of legislation to provide statehood for Hawaii; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MOSS:

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Utah; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

"SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 7

"Joint resolution of the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Utah urging the Congress of the United States to take such remedial action as deemed necessary to preclude the closing of low power booster stations necessary for television reception in certain areas of the State of Utah

"Be it resolved by the Legislature of the State of Utah:

"Whereas there are many communities and farm areas within the State of Utah whose people depend upon low power booster stations as their only means of receiving television programs; and

"Whereas the rugged terrain of the Rocky Mountain region makes the use of ultra high frequency translator stations impractical, if indeed not impossible, according to the opinions expressed by competent and qualified broadcast engineers, as well as by certain members of the Federal Communications Commission; and

"Whereas it is economically impossible for these communities and farm areas to support, construct, or operate any other form of duly authorized television service; and

"Whereas there is ample proof that low power booster stations can be regulated so as to preclude interference with licensed television services or other services; and

"Whereas the Federal Communications Commission did summarily dismiss, without formal hearing, its own rulemaking proceedings relating to repeater or booster stations operating in the VHF television band of frequency assignments; and

"Whereas the Federal Communications Commission did on December 31, 1958, make formal announcement of its dismissal of petitions for reconsideration, including those filed by Gov. Stephen L. R. McNichols, of Colorado; the Honorable Edwin C. Johnson, former Governor and U.S. Senator from Colorado; and the Honorable Gordon Allott, U.S. Senator from Colorado, all of whom sought to procure reasonable rules which would permit the continued operation of said booster stations under the regulatory power of the Federal Government; and

"Whereas the Associated Civic Clubs of Southern and Eastern Utah and the County Commissioners Association of Utah have duly, regularly, and unanimously authorized the respective officers of each of such associations to prepare and execute, and such officers pursuant to such authorization have prepared and executed, a resolution urging the Congress of the United States and the Utah State Legislature take all action deemed necessary to preclude the closing of low power booster stations necessary for television reception in certain areas of the State of Utah; and

"Whereas the Federal Communications Commission did also announce on December 31, 1958, that all booster stations would be given a period of 90 days in which to apply for conversion to ultra high frequency translators or some other authorized television operation, and upon failure to do so would be ordered to cease operation: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That the Senate and House of Representatives of the 33d Legislature of the State of Utah do hereby urge the Congress of the United States for such remedial action within such 90-day period as the Congress deems fit through the exercise of its authority over the Federal Communications Commission to insure the continued operation of low power booster stations, to the end that the people in the nonmetropolitan areas of the State of Utah shall not be denied their basic right to equality of access to the informational, educational, inspirational, cultural, and entertainment service of the American system of free television broadcasting; and be it further

"Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be transmitted to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States, and to the Senators and Congressmen representing the State of Utah in the Congress of the United States.

(The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Utah, identical with the foregoing, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.)

By Mr. SALTONSTALL (for himself and Mr. KENNEDY):

Resolutions of the general court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts; to the Committee on Finance:

"RESOLUTIONS MEMORIALIZING THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES AGAINST GRANTING CONCESSIONS ON TEXTILE IMPORTS FROM FOREIGN COUNTRIES

"Resolved, That the general court of Massachusetts respectfully urges the Congress of the United States not to enact any legislation granting concessions on textile imports from foreign countries; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be sent forthwith by the Secretary of the Commonwealth to the president of the United States, to the Presiding Officer of each branch of the Congress, and to each member thereof from the Commonwealth.

"Senate, adopted, February 16, 1959.

"IRVING N. HAYDEN,
"Clerk.

"House of Representatives, adopted in concurrence, February 18, 1959.

"LAWRENCE R. GROVE,
"Clerk.

"A true copy.
"Attest:

"JOSEPH D. WARD,
"Secretary of the Commonwealth."

(The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate resolutions of the general court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, identical with the foregoing, which were referred to the Committee on Finance.)

Resolutions of the general court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"RESOLUTIONS MEMORIALIZING THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES TO ESTABLISH A NATIONAL CEMETERY IN NEW ENGLAND

"Whereas the Secretary of the Army has taken the position that it is the responsibility of the Congress to decide as a matter of public policy whether or not new cemeteries shall be established; and

"Whereas New England, one of the most densely populated areas in the country has no national cemetery; and

"Whereas there are 34 States which have within their boundaries at least one national cemetery with grave space availble; and

"Whereas there has not been any new national cemetery established since the year 1951; and

"Whereas the veteran deserves honor and recognition not only in life but also in a final resting place: Therefore be it

"Resolved, That the general court of Massachusetts respectfully urges the Congress of the United States to take such action as may be necessary to establish a national cemetery in New England; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be transmitted forthwith by the secretary of the Commonwealth to the President of the United States, the presiding officer of each branch of Congress and to each Member thereof from this Commonwealth and the New England States.

"House of representatives, adopted, February 16, 1959.

"LAWRENCE R. GROVE,
"Clerk.

"Senate, adopted in concurrence, February 18, 1959.

"IRVING N. HAYDEN,
"Clerk.

"A true copy.
"Attest:

"JOSEPH D. WARD,
"Secretary of the Commonwealth."

(The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate resolutions of the general court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, identical with the foregoing, which were referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.)

Resolutions of the general court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

"RESOLUTIONS MEMORIALIZING CONGRESS TO ENACT LEGISLATION PROVIDING FOR A MINIMUM WAGE OF $1.25 PER HOUR

"Whereas at the present high cost of living compensation of less than $1.25 per hour is inadequate to support workers and their families; and

"Whereas large numbers of persons engaged in industry are receiving compensation much lower than $1.25 per hour: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That the general court of Massachusetts respectfully urges the Congress of the United States to enact forthwith legislation providing for a minimum wage of $1.25 per hour; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be transmitted by the secretary of the Commonwealth to the President of the United States, to the presiding officer of each branch of the Congress, and to each Member thereof from this Commonwealth.

"Senate, adopted, February 16, 1959.

"IRVING N. HAYDEN,
"Clerk.

"House of Representatives, adopted in concurrence, February 18, 1959.

"LAWRENCE R. GROVE,
"Clerk.

"A true copy.
"Attest:

"JOSEPH D. WARD,
"Secretary of the Commonwealth."

(The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate resolutions of the general court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, identical with the foregoing, which were referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.)

By Mr. LANGER:

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of North Dakota; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

"HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION D-1

"Concurrent resolution memorializing Congress to provide full 100 percent parity for products produced on family-type farms

"Whereas 90 percent of North Dakota's income comes from the soil; and

"Whereas the very existence of the farm home and the family-sized farm is endangered by continuing economic trends; and

"Whereas the best interests and general welfare of the Nation as a whole would suffer incalculable loss if the farm family home were to be replaced by large, commercial, manager-operated farms; and

"Whereas it is for the best interests and general welfare of the whole Nation that those who toil on these family-sized farms to maintain their farm homes and receive for their labors a fair return, comparable with industry, so that these farm homes may not be replaced by large, managerial-type commercially operated farms: Now, therefore, be, it

"*Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of North Dakota (the Senate concurring therein)*, That the Congress of the United States is hereby requested and urged to provide price supports for the products of these family-type farms at 100 percent of parity; be it further

"*Resolved*, That the secretary of state transmit copies of this resolution to U.S. Senator WILLIAM LANGER, U.S. Senator MILTON R. YOUNG, Representative QUENTIN N. BURDICK, and Representative DON L. SHORT.

"HJALMER C. NYGAARD,
"Speaker of the House.
"GERALD L. STARR,
"Chief Clerk of the House.
"C. P. DAHL,
"President of the Senate.
"VIC GILBREATH,
"Secretary of the Senate."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of North Dakota; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

"HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION E

"Concurrent resolution memorializing Congress to provide additional funds for the construction of nursing homes

"Whereas there is an existing backlog of unmet needs in the provision of nursing homes in the State of North Dakota and the Nation; and

"Whereas the shortage will become more acute because of the aging population of this State and Nation; and

"Whereas appropriations by Congress for this purpose have been limited and the rising costs in the construction of nursing homes has even further restricted the program of construction of such homes: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of North Dakota (the Senate concurring therein)*, That the Congress be urged to increase appropriations for expenditure in accordance with the provisions of Public Law 482, 83d Congress, 2d session, for the purpose of providing an expanded program of nursing home construction; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of this resolution be forwarded by the secretary of state to members of the North Dakota congressional delegation, the President of the U.S. Senate, the Speaker of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Surgeon General of the Department of the U.S. Public Health Service, and the Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

"HJALMER C. NYGAARD,
"Speaker of the House.
"GERALD L. STAER,
"Chief Clerk of the House.
"C. P. DAHL,
"President of the Senate.
"VIC GILBREATH,
"Secretary of the Senate."

RESOLUTION OF FARMERS GRAIN DEALERS ASSOCIATION OF NORTH DAKOTA

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a resolution adopted by the Farmers Grain Dealers Association of North Dakota, at Fargo, N. Dak., relating to wheat acreage allotments.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas North Dakota has a record of producing high quality wheat and has steadily taken a large reduction in acreage planted to this crop while other States have been increasing their acreage in the production of lower quality wheat under the 15-acre exemption plan, thereby steadily adding to the wheat surplus: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we ask for an elimination of this 15-acre allowance, at present common usage in territories not usually recognized as wheat producing areas, and that a copy of this resolution be sent to our Senators and Representatives in Washington, D.C.

INTERNATIONAL SALMON TREATY—JOINT MEMORIAL OF OREGON LEGISLATURE

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, on behalf of the Honorable Robert B. Duncan, Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Oregon Legislature, I present house joint memorial 1 of the 50th legislative assembly, respectfully urging the President to complete a treaty with Japan and other foreign countries on maximum salmon fishing in the North Pacific Ocean. Present difficulties over the taking of migratory salmon on the high seas make it essential that such an international treaty be agreed upon speedily if proper management of this fishery resource is to be maintained. I ask unanimous consent that the joint memorial of the Oregon legislature may be printed in the RECORD, and appropriately referred.

The joint memorial was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations; and, under the rule, ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOUSE JOINT MEMORIAL 1

To His Excellency the Honorable PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES:

We, your memorialists, the 50th Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon, in legislative session assembled, most respectfully represent as follows:

Whereas the percentage of the total number of salmon taken from the high seas of the North Pacific Ocean by the fisheries of Japan and other foreign countries has been increasing at an alarming rate in recent years; and

Whereas this trend can operate only to the detriment of the salmon fisheries of the State of Oregon and the United States and the economies of the State of Oregon and the United States as a whole: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Oregon, the senate jointly concurring therein, That we urge the President of the United States to use every effort to complete a treaty with the Japanese Government prescribing the maximum amount of salmon which may be taken annually by the fisheries of the United States and Japan; and be it further

Resolved, That we urge that negotiations for such a treaty be commenced at the earliest possible date, and that all nations of the North Pacific Ocean area be urged to enter into such negotiations and to cooperate in the establishment of a treaty; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this memorial be sent to the President of the United States, all Members of the Oregon congressional delegation and the legislative assemblies of the States of Washington and California.

Adopted by house February 5, 1959.

RUTH E. RENFROE,
Chief Clerk of House.
ROBERT B. DUNCAN,
Speaker of House.

Adopted by senate February 12, 1959.

———— ————,
President of Senate.

Filed in office of secretary of state February 17, 1959.

———— ————,
Secretary of State.

MAINTENANCE OF AN ADEQUATE VOCATIONAL EDUCATION PROGRAM—LETTER, RESOLUTION, AND ARTICLE

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, over the years an outstanding program that has helped our people, individually, and as citizens of this great country—to achieve their personal goals and fulfill their responsibilities—has been the vocational education program.

This program has benefited folks in a wide variety of occupations, including industry, homemaking, agriculture, labor, nursing, and other fields.

As we know, financing for vocational training has been provided by local, State, and Federal cooperation. The States and local communities are now bearing the major portion of the cost burden, matching Federal funds at about a 5-to-1 ratio. For example, for fiscal 1958 the State and local expenditures amounted to over $4,500,000; by contrast, the Federal support is calculated at about $995,000. This is particularly important since, at the Federal level, we have serious fiscal problems.

Fortunately, funds have been provided in the 1960 budget for continuation of this program.

We recognize, however, that currently thought is being given to reducing Federal support of vocational education.

Reconizing the benefits that program has provided for millions of people, it is extremely important, I feel, that we not take any steps that would handicap this program. Rather, we must, as possible, strengthen its ability to serve our people—and, in this way, ultimately our Nation. As we face the future, there now needs to be constructive thinking as to how this program can be further improved.

The question of how this best can be achieved deserves serious consideration.

Recently I received messages from individuals and organizations in Wisconsin stressing the need for a strong, improved vocational education program.

Included among the communications are: First, a letter from G. H. Faber, recording secretary of the United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners of America; and, second, a resolution adopted by the Madison Construction and Trades Council, and sent to me by Pierce L. Roberts, business representative.

In addition, the February 21 edition of the Wisconsin Agriculturist and Farmer carried an article entitled "Our Vo-Ag Education Needs Reappraisal." This

splendid article contains thought-provoking commentary as to how the vocational training program, particularly in agriculture, can be further improved to meet the challenges of the future. This is especially important, in view of the effects of the technological revolution upon farming.

I request unanimous consent to have these messages and the article printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the letter, resolution, and article were referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE UNITED BROTHERHOOD OF CARPENTERS AND JOINERS OF AMERICA,
LOCAL NO. 314,
Madison, Wis.

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: In the interest of all members of Carpenters' Local No. 314 it was voted that we write our Representatives regarding legislation for vocational education.

We believe that the program of vocational education in Wisconsin has had as a primary objective the development of the skills of the working youth and adults of our State. The program of vocational education in Wisconsin has been developed with the assistance of Federal aids allotted to the State under the provisions of the Smith-Hughes and George Barden Acts. With the elimination of Federal aids for vocational education under the Smith-Hughes and George Barden Acts it would require discontinuance of some established training programs for apprentices and employed workers which are essential to the basic economy of our Nation and would hinder the development of needed new programs. Also the elimination of Federal aids for vocational education would weaken the industrial training structure of our country the strength of which is so essential to successful competition with the Communist world.

President Eisenhower in his 1959 budget message to the U.S. Congress has recommended the elimination of Federal aids for vocational education under the Smith-Hughes and George Barden Acts beginning on July 1, 1960, and has stated that legislation will be introduced into the 1959 session of Congress to accomplish this objective.

Carpenters' Local No. 314 does vigorously oppose the recommendations of President Eisenhower for the elimination of Federal aid to vocational education beginning July 1, 1960, and we request your support to defeat any legislation that might be introduced to defeat Federal aid to vocational education and the apprenticeship program.

Very truly yours,

G. F. FABER,
Recording Secretary.

RESOLUTION

Whereas the program of vocational education in Wisconsin has had as a primary objective the development of the skills of the working youth and adults of our State; and

Whereas the program of vocational education in Wiscinson has been developed with the assistance of Federal aids allotted to the State under the provisions of the Smith-Hughes and George-Barden Acts; and

Whereas the elimination of Federal aids for vocational education under the Smith-Hughes and George-Barden Acts would require discontinuance of some established training programs for apprentices and employed workers which are essential to the basic economy of our Nation and would hinder the development of needed new programs; and

Whereas the elimination of Federal aids for vocational education would weaken the industrial training structure of our country, the strength of which is so essential to successful competition with the Communist world; and

Whereas President Eisenhower in his 1959 budget message to the U.S. Congress has recommended the elimination of Federal aids for vocational education under the Smith-Hughes and George-Barden Acts beginning July 1, 1960, and has stated that legislation will be introduced into the 1959 session of Congress to accomplish this objective: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Madison Building Construction Trades Council, AFL–CIO, meeting in the Labor Temple, Madison, Wis., February 23, 1959, take action vigorously opposing the recommendations of President Eisenhower for the elimination of Federal aids for vocational education beginning July 1, 1960; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be presented to the executive board of the Wisconsin State AFL–CIO for their consideration and copies be sent to the executive board of the AFL–CIO, Washington, D.C., and to all Wisconsin congressional Representatives requesting their support to defeat any legislation that might be introduced to deny Federal aids to vocational education.

[From the Wisconsin Agriculturalist and Farmer, Feb. 21, 1959]

OUR VOCATIONAL-AGRICULTURE EDUCATION NEEDS REAPPRAISAL

Vocational agriculture is well into its second 40 years in this country. The program has done much for American farming, and it will do more. But there will need to be changes in vocational agriculture to keep pace with the changes in farming. Below, in excerpts from a speech, are some of the views of Louis M. Sasman, chief of agricultural education in Wisconsin.

Constant evaluation of any program is desirable. There is no question but that there are weaknesses in our school system. For my part, I believe that our educational system is the best in the world and that we need to continually improve it rather than to tear out the foundation stones upon which it rests.

OFFERED SPECIAL TRAINING

About 1,900 educational systems all over the Nation began the introduction of vocational courses that would aid in the preparation of the majority of people for the occupations in which they were most apt to engage and to offer technical training for those who were not going to college.

The advancement of vocational education was certainly not intended to preclude general education. Reading, writing, and arithmetic are still basic in the curriculum.

If people get the schooling that fits them the best individually, the whole Nation will benefit by the activities of trained individuals.

It is just as important to have well-trained farmers as to have well-trained personnel in any other field.

For these reasons, vocational education in agriculture must continue to be stressed in our educational system along with the other subjects that combine to produce an intelligent people.

How can vocational agriculture best move ahead to be sure that during the next 40 years it continues to provide the valuable training to farmers that has been provided since 1917?

Vocational agriculture must, if it is to continue to serve its purpose, be truly vocational.

Agricultural teaching cannot be vocational unless it combines study and practice. There must be class instruction but also individual instruction geared to the individual needs of the student and combining practical experience and theoretical training.

Strong farming programs must continue to be developed. These must be practical farming programs, too, adapted to the student and his circumstances and providing the best possible experience in farming.

All the farming experience that a student gets must be recognized as part of his farming program. Much of it he gets under the direction of his parents. Farming in Wisconsin is, for the most part, a family occupation. A student's responsibilities to his family and to his situation in his family must be fully considered in developing the farming programs.

Some of the greatest problems of the instructor in agriculture are involved in keeping up to date with the rapidly changing science and technology of agriculture.

Programs must also continually be developed to provide professional advancement to the instructors. The instructor in agriculture is a scientist. When he goes out to teach, he has studied more chemistry of various kinds than any other subject. He is continually called upon for a knowledge of soils, feeds, crops, and fertilizers as well as genetics, biology, and physical geography. He must have the opportunity for periods of intensive study.

NEED MORE GENERAL WORK

The instructor in agriculture is a vocational worker in an academic institution. The proportion of agricultural students to the student body of the school is bound to decrease. In Wisconsin, if we are to maintain really vocational programs there must be some actual decrease in the number of students under an instructor. As our rural nonfarm and urban population increases, more general agricultural schooling is needed to provide the necessary understanding of the problems of agriculture.

But a general agriculture program should not be developed at the expense of the vocational. Never have present and prospective farmers needed more training for farming and the necessary amount of training is going to increase rather than decrease.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. HAYDEN, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, without amendment:

H.J. Res. 198. Joint resolution to provide for the reappointment of Robert V. Fleming as citizen regent of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution (Rept. No. 58).

By Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, without amendment:

S. 102. A bill for the relief of Stanislawa Wojczul (Rept. No. 61);

S. 210. A bill for the relief of Pantaleon Ibarra, also known as Elmo Gomes Archibel (Rept. No. 62);

S. 244. A bill for the relief of Alexander Antoniou (Rept. No. 63);

S. 319. A bill for the relief of Theodore Burtzos (Rept. No. 64);

S. 323. A bill for the relief of David Forbes (Rept. No. 65);

S. 324. A bill for the relief of Johann Kalatschan (Rept. No. 66);

S. 333. A bill for the relief of Ethel Auth (Rept. No. 67);

S. 501. A bill for the relief of Balbina Borenstein (Rept. No. 68); and

S. 537. A bill for the relief of Benedict Eremenko (Ben Zuke), Victor Tatarnikov (Victor Kalin), Mikhail Ivankov-Nikolov

(Michael Nikolas), and Victor Solovyev (Rept. No. 69).

By Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment:

S. 46. A bill for the relief of Ben Chassin (Rept. No. 70);

S. 110. A bill for the relief of Yaeko Inouye (Rept. No. 71);

S. 191. A bill for the relief of Marie Silk (Rept. No. 72);

S. 320. A bill for the relief of Sofija Laica (Rept. No. 73); and

S. 322. A bill for the relief of Dr. Stasys Sereika (Rept. No. 74).

By Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, with amendments:

S. 192. A bill for the relief of Clarina Veiga (Rept. No. 75).

By Mr. KEFAUVER, from the Committee on the Judiciary, without amendment:

S. 667. A bill for the relief of Pauline D. Kimbrough (Rept. No. 76).

By Mr. DIRKSEN, from the Committee on the Judiciary, without amendment:

S. 611. A bill for the relief of Harry H. Nakamura (Rept. No. 59).

By Mr. DIRKSEN, from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment:

S. 607. A bill for the relief of the estate of Sinclair G. Stanley (Rept. No. 60).

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. HRUSKA:

S. 1206. A bill for the relief of Ljubica Dajcinovic; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILEY:

S. 1207. A bill for the relief of Rosette Sorge Savorgnan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. WILEY when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MURRAY (for himself and Mr. MANSFIELD):

S. 1208. A bill to amend the wheat marketing quota provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. SPARKMAN (for himself, Mr. JACKSON, and Mr. KEFAUVER):

S. 1209. A bill to clarify paragraph 4 of section 15 of the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942 (56 Stat. 363); to the Committee on Armed Services.

(See the remarks of Mr. SPARKMAN when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

S. 1210. A bill to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 to permit donations of surplus property to volunteer firefighting organizations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

(See the remarks of Mr. HUMPHREY when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr HUMPHREY (for himself, Mr. BYRD of West Virginia, Mr. CARROLL, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. HART, Mr. HILL, Mr. KEFAUVER, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. MANSFIELD, Mr. MCCARTHY, Mr. MCGEE, Mr. MORSE, Mr. MOSS, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. NEUBERGER, Mr. PROXMIRE, Mr. RANDOLPH, Mr. SPARKMAN and Mr. YARBOROUGH):

S. 1211. A bill to strengthen the Nation by providing auxiliary credit resources required to preserve the family-size farm, providing additional credit for farm enlargement and development, refinancing of existing indebtedness, expansion and simplification of farmownership and operations credit programs by amendment of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, and extension and simplification of emergency and disaster farm credit by amendment of the acts of April 6, 1949, as amended August 31, 1954, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(See the remarks of Mr. HUMPHREY when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MURRAY (by request):

S. 1212. A bill to revise the boundaries of Wright Brothers National Memorial, North Carolina, and for other purposes;

S. 1213. A bill to authorize Federal assistance to Guam, American Samoa, and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands in major disasters;

S. 1214. A bill to amend the act of March 11, 1948 (62 Stat. 78), relating to the establishment of the De Soto National Memorial, in the State of Florida;

S. 1215. A bill to add certain public lands in California to the Pala Indian Reservation, the Pauma Indian Reservation, and the Cleveland National Forest, and for other purposes;

S. 1216. A bill to approve an order of the Secretary of the Interior adjusting, deferring, and canceling certain irrigation charges against non-Indian-owned lands under the Wind River Indian irrigation project, Wyoming, and for other purposes;

S. 1217. A bill to add certain public domain lands in Nevada to the Summit Lake Indian Reservation;

S. 1218. A bill to amend the act of December 24, 1942 (56 Stat. 1086, 43 U.S.C., sec. 36b), entitled "An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to acquire lands or interest in lands for the Geological Survey"; and

S. 1219. A bill to extend the leasing provisions of the act of June 14, 1926, as amended by the act of June 4, 1954 (68 Stat. 173; 43 U.S.C., secs. 869–869-3), to certain lands in Oregon, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MUNDT:

S. 1220. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to raise the amount of outside income recipients of insurance benefits thereunder are permitted to earn, to lower the age after which outside earnings are no longer considered for purposes of deductions from benefits; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. MUNDT when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. NEUBERGER (for himself and Mr. MORSE):

S. 1221. A bill to amend the act authorizing the Crooked River Federal reclamation project, Oregon, in order to increase the capacity of certain project features for future irrigation of additional lands; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BIBLE:

S. 1222. A bill for the relief of Floyd R. Lamb, Carlton Lamb, and Monte C. Lamb; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BIBLE (for himself and Mr. CANNON):

S. 1223. A bill for the relief of Alan John Coombs; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

S. 1224. A bill for the relief of Corah Decker and Janet Decker Lincoln; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. YARBOROUGH:

S. 1225. A bill for the relief of Dr. Josephine Shou-Chen Chu; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MURRAY (for himself and Mr. MANSFIELD):

S. 1226. A bill to provide for the construction of the Knowles Dam project on the Flathead River in the State of Montana for the protection and development of the Flathead and Columbia River Basins; to promote the agricultural and industrial development primarily of the State of Montana, but also of downstream areas; to improve navigability and to assist flood control on the Flathead and Columbia Rivers; to provide for the national defense and welfare by advancing the integrated comprehensive development of the water resources of the Pacific Northwest, and for related purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

S. 1227. A bill to amend the Federal Employees' Compensation Act so as to permit injured employees entitled to receive medical services under such act to utilize the services of chiropractors; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. ANDERSON:

S. 1228. A bill to amend Public Law 85-590 to increase the authorization for appropriations to the Atomic Energy Commission in accordance with section 261 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

(See the remarks of Mr. ANDERSON when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BYRD of West Virginia:

S. 1229. A bill for the relief of Delphia E. Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BYRD of West Virginia (for himself and Mr. RANDOLPH):

S. 1230. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to exempt a corporation from the corporate income tax where its operations are carried on in an economically depressed area and provide employment for a specified minimum number of persons in that area; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. TALMADGE:

S. 1231. A bill to prescribe the procedure of courts of the United States in the issuance of injunctions and the punishment of disobedience thereof, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. TALMADGE when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

S. 1232. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to promote the safety of employees and travelers upon railroads by limiting the hours of service of employees thereon," approved March 4, 1907; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MAGNUSON (by request):

S. 1233. A bill to amend section 216 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, to clarify the status of the faculty and administrative status of the U.S. Merchant Marine Academy, to establish suitable personnel policies for such personnel, and for other purposes;

S. 1234. A bill to extend the provisions of title XII of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, relating to war-risk insurance, for an additional 5 years, ending September 7, 1965;

S. 1235. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to enter into contracts for the conduct of research in the field of meteorology and to authorize installation of Government telephones in certain private residences; and

S. 1236. A bill to amend section 432(g) of title 14, United States Code, so as to increase the limitation on basic compensation of civilian keepers of lighthouses and civilians employed on lightships and other vessels of the Coast Guard from $3,750 to $5,100 per annum; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. MAGNUSON when he introduced the above bills, which appear under separate headings.)

By Mr. CLARK (for himself, Mr. PROXMIRE, Mr. BYRD of West Virginia, and Mr. RANDOLPH):

S. 1237. A bill to amend the Employment Act of 1946 to provide for its more effective

administration, and to bring to bear an informed public opinion upon price and wage increases which threaten economic stability; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. SMATHERS:

S. 1238. A bill for the relief of Emily B. Grier, widow of Samuel Grier, Jr.; and

S. 1239. A bill for the relief of Herbert Westermann; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EASTLAND:

S. 1240. A bill directing the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain property in the State of Mississippi to J. P. Carter; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 1241. A bill for the relief of Sirvart Kasabian; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NEUBERGER (by request):

S. 1242. A bill to authorize the use of the revolving loan fund for Indians to assist Klamath Indians during the period for terminating Federal supervision; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. NEUBERGER when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. SALTONSTALL (for himself and Mr. MANSFIELD):

S. 1243. A bill to amend the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended, to establish standards of foreign language proficiency for the Foreign Service of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

(See the remarks of Mr. SALTONSTALL when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MORSE (for himself, Mr. PROXMIRE, and Mr. BARTLETT):

S. 1244. A bill to amend the Employment Act of 1946 to establish policies with respect to productive capital investments of the Government; to the Committee on Government Operations.

(See the remarks of Mr. MORSE when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MORSE (for himself, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. NEUBERGER, Mr. MANSFIELD, and Mr. O'MAHONEY):

S. 1245. A bill to promote mining and development research for beryl, chromite, and columbium-tantalum from domestic mines; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. MORSE when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. PROXMIRE:

S. 1246. A bill for the relief of Ahmed H. Moukaddem; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION

Mr. MURRAY (for himself and Mr. NEUBERGER) submitted a concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 12) to restate Federal responsibility toward Indians and the Federal Government's relation with Indian tribes or groups; which was referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the above concurrent resolution printed in full when submitted by Mr. MURRAY, which appears under a separate heading.)

LIMITATION OF BUDGET EXPENDITURES DURING FISCAL YEAR 1960

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I submit a resolution and ask that it be printed and lie on the desk for 3 days, to enable other Senators who may wish to join me as cosponsors to do so.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the resolution will be received, and will lie on the desk for 3 days, and be printed.

The resolution (S. Res. 86) was received, and referred to the Committee on Appropriations, as follows:

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate that the President and the Congress should cooperate in taking all necessary steps to limit budget expenditures during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1960, to $77 billion, as contemplated in the budget for such year submitted by the President.

ROSETTE SORGE SAVORGNAN

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill for the relief of Rosette Sorge Savorgnan. I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1207) for the relief of Rosette Sorge Savorgnan, introduced by Mr. WILEY, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Rosette Sorge Savorgnan, who lost United States citizenship under the provisions of section 2 of the Citizenship Act of 1907, and sections 104, 401, and 403 of the Nationality Act of 1940, as amended, may be naturalized by taking, prior to one year after the effective date of this Act, before any court referred to in subsection (a) of section 301 of the Nationality Act of 1940, as amended, or before any diplomatic or consular officer of the United States abroad, the appropriate oath prescribed by section 335 of the said Act. From and after naturalization under this Act the said Rosette Sorge Savorgnan shall have the same citizenship status which existed immediately prior to its loss.

CLARIFICATION OF PARAGRAPH 4, SECTION 15, PAY READJUSTMENT ACT OF 1942

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to clarify paragraph 4 of section 15 of the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942. I ask unanimous consent that the bill lie on the table for 1 week, in order that other interested Senators may join as cosponsors.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from Alabama.

The bill (S. 1209) to clarify paragraph 4 of section 15 of the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942 (56 Stat. 368), introduced by Mr. SPARKMAN (for himself, Mr. JACKSON, and Mr. KEFAUVER), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

DONATIONS OF SURPLUS PROPERTY TO VOLUNTEER FIREFIGHTING ORGANIZATIONS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to permit donations of surplus Federal property to volunteer firefighting organizations.

It was my privilege to join with the late Senator Kerr Scott, of North Carolina, in sponsoring this same measure in the last Congress, S. 2745.

This bill would amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949. This act presently provides that personal property which becomes surplus to all Federal requirements may be donated without cost (except for costs of care and handling) for use in any State, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, and the Territories and possessions of the United States for use for purposes of education, public health, or civil defense, or for research for any such purpose when the property is determined by proper authority to be useful and necessary for such purposes.

The bill which I introduce today would amend the present act so as to include volunteer firefighting organizations.

There are thousands of volunteer firefighting organizations throughout the land which are inadequately equipped for their responsibilities in protecting life and property. Tens of thousands of civic-minded individuals give unstintingly of their time, effort, and resources to maintain these units. Modern fire engines may cost from $25,000 to $30,000 or even more. Other types of needed equipment are also costly.

Except for such engines volunteer firefighting organizations' equipment needs are relatively small, consisting of such items as water tanks, pumps, firehose, tank trucks, rope, axes, tarps, picks, shovels, lanterns, hooks, and, when a kitchen is maintained, items such as chinaware, knives, forks, spoons, and cooking utensils and sometimes stoves, and so forth. Witnesses have testified that much of the equipment is in Federal Government warehouses, unused and unwanted, and sometimes it is sold for scrap. Also that sales of this property are usually in larger lots than the volunteer firefighting organizations can afford to acquire, and hence they must purchase at higher retail prices.

Testimony has also revealed that many items of surplus firefighting equipment are not utilized by the Federal agencies nor by the education, health, and civil defense agencies and hence are sold at small return to the Government and then offered for sale to firefighting organizations. It is my opinion that this property bought with public funds, if useful and needed, should be donated to such a high public purpose as protecting life and property by volunteer firefighting organizations.

This proposal, I might add, Mr. President, passed the House of Representatives on August 12, 1958 (H.R. 13673). A similar bill has been offered in the House of Representatives by Mr. FOGARTY (H.R. 3722) again this year.

It is my hope that this measure will be promptly considered and enacted into law.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. RANDOLPH in the chair). The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1210) to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 to permit donations of surplus property to volunteer firefighting organizations, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. HUMPHREY, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Government Operations.

FAMILY FARM YARDSTICK CREDIT ACT OF 1959

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, and Senators BYRD of West Virginia, CARROLL, CHAVEZ, HART, HILL, KEFAUVER, MAGNUSON, MANSFIELD, MCCARTHY, MCGEE, MORSE, MOSS, MURRAY, NEUBERGER, PROXMIRE, RANDOLPH, and SPARKMAN, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a "yardstick" family farm credit bill providing for liberalizing improvements in existing credit programs, as well as for the establishment of new credit services.

Not a day goes by without further evidence that additional credit sources are of vital necessity to the family farmers of this country. Every mail delivery to my office brings accounts from individual farmers telling of their plight. Continued falling farm prices, rising costs of what the farmer must buy to stay in business, and higher interest rates on his increased indebtedness, are more than the farmer can stand without more credit assistance.

Last session, when I introduced a bill similar to this, I pointed out that we are in another of those eras which have come twice in the past 50 years when the Nation must make a major reform in its farm credit policy. This was indisputably true then, and it is indisputably true now. In these past 2 years, the need has intensified. In the interim, too many farmers have been forced to give up their occupation and move into town where they were confronted with rising industrial unemployment. Some tell me that they have changed their type of farming operations so that they might sell their farm machinery for enough cash to carry on for still another year.

Mr. President, these farmers have been in a deepening depression, brought about not because they were inefficient producers, or bad businessmen, but because national farm policies have not been planned or executed with the wholehearted intention of using agricultural resources and production wisely. Corrective legislation is needed in many phases of agriculture. The bill which I am introducing today with my colleagues deals with the farm credit phase, and I recommend that it be given careful consideration and approval.

Let me point out that this bill maintains the yardstick 5-percent interest rate set up in existing law. Attempts have been made to eliminate this protective yardstick in the law, but happily Congress saw fit to block such attempts. There is certainly no inflation in the agricultural segment of the economy which could give even a surface justification for increasing the interest rates on farm credit.

As long as private commercial credit sources are able and willing to meet the farmers' credit needs at 5 percent interest, farmers are not eligible for the lower cost loans proposed in this legislation. It is only when private credit sources lift their interest rates beyond the farmers' ability to pay that Federal programs should offer an emergency backstop. That is the yardstick aim of this proposed legislation.

In brief, here is what this measure would do:

First. Reactivate the former depression-time programs of the Department of Agriculture for assisting farmers and creditors with voluntary farm debt adjustment procedures;

Second. Reinstitute the policy of adjusting repayment schedules on farm loans to a variable basis taking into consideration the net earnings of borrowers from year to year;

Third. Create a comprehensive family farm development or domestic point 4 program in the 500 most poverty stricken rural counties of the Nation. This urgently needed program was developed basically by the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] out of hearings he conducted several years ago to seek a long-range answer to the problems of low-income farmers. His recommendations should have been implemented long ago. The rural development program instituted by the Department of Agriculture is no more than a token effort in this direction. There is no solid base for action in the Department's so-called program. It serves to give an illusion of action, thus diverting attention and efforts away from a worthy program such as proposed here.

Fourth. Lower interest rates and expand loan authorizations for both farm-ownership and farm operating loans under existing programs for those farmers who are unable to borrow through commercial channels at not to exceed 5 percent interest rate.

Fifth. Raise maximum permissible size of water-facility loans to cooperatives, irrigation districts, and municipalities.

Sixth. Amend the Production Disaster Loan Act to extend the special livestock loan program, and add refinancing of existing indebtedness as a permissible purpose for such loans.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a more complete analysis of the bill, section by section.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the analysis of the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1211) to strengthen the Nation by providing auxiliary credit resources required to preserve the family-size farm, providing additional credit for farm enlargement and development, refinancing of existing indebtedness, expansion and simplification of farm-ownership and operations credit programs by amendment of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, and extension and simplification of emergency and disaster farm credit by amendment of the acts of April 6, 1949, as amended, and August 31, 1954, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. HUMPHREY (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

The section-by-section analysis presented by Mr. HUMPHREY is as follows:

ANALYSIS OF PROPOSED FAMILY FARM YARDSTICK CREDIT ACT OF 1959

The proposed bill provides for improving amendments in the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, as amended; the Water Facilities Loan Act; the Emergency and Livestock Loans Act (formerly RACC); the special Emergency Loan Act of August 31, 1954, as amended; directs the Secretary of Agriculture to reactivate the program of assisting farmers and creditors with voluntary farm debt adjustment procedures; and reinstitutes the policy of adjusting repayment schedules of loans to the net earnings of borrowers from year to year.

Section 2 of the proposed bill amends title I of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, as amended, providing for long-term loans to farm tenants and part- and full-time farmowners to buy farms or enlarge their units, as follows:

Reduces the rate of interest charges to the borrower from 5 to 3 percent.

Increases the authorization for annual appropriation for such loans from $50 million to $200 million beginning in fiscal year 1959.

Increases mortgage insurance guarantee fund for insured private long-term farm loans from $25 million to $50 million.

Reduces interest rate paid to insured private lenders from 4 percent to 3 percent—this would involve the Government absorbing the cost of the loan insurance risk and administration of such insured loans—since under the amendment the borrower would be charged 3 percent interest on such insured loans and the entire payment would go to the insured creditor. Under existing law the borrower pays 5 percent interest and the creditor gets 4 percent, the Government taking the 1 percent difference.

Eliminates the existing requirement that only farms smaller than average size in the county can be purchased with proceeds of these loans.

Eliminates the existing requirement that the borrower be charged initial service fees for inspection, appraisal and other service charges, and also eliminates the requirement that the borrower pay the 1 percent annual mortgage insurance charge.

Section 3 of the proposed bill amends title II "Farm Operating Loans" of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, as amended, as follows:

Raises the permissible maximum amount of an initial loan from $10,000 to $35,000 and the permissible size of total indebtedness from $20,000 to $50,000.

Reduces rate of interest charged the farmer-borrower from 5 percent to 3 percent.

Eliminates the 7-year maximum period of indebtedness which existing law allows the Secretary to set aside up to 10 years.

Note: The proposed bill does not change any other provisions of existing farm ownership and farm operating loans titles of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act; of special note is that the proposed bill does not either raise or lower the requirement in existing law that a borrower leave the program whenever he can obtain other commercial credit at not to exceed 5 percent per annum; nor does the proposed bill change the requirement that a potential borrower shall have

exhausted all other possible sources of obtaining needed credit at not to exceed 5 percent interest before being considered eligible to apply for loans under these programs. The proposed bill neither raises the yardstick-5-percent-interest-figure of existing law nor lowers it.

Section 4 of the proposed bill raises from $5 to $15 the permissible maximum per diem payment of county Farmers Home Administration committeemen when engaged in public business in connection with their official duties under the law; and reduces from 5 percent to 3 percent the maximum interest rate the Secretary may charge to farmers under provisions of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act.

Section 5 of the proposed bill raises the maximum permissible size of water facility loans to cooperatives, irrigation districts and municipalities from $250,000 to $1 million, and eliminates requirement that water facility borrowers pay certain mortgage insurance and service charges and fees; and establishes as 3 percent per annum the maximum rate of interest that the Secretary of Agriculture may require the borrower to pay for water facility loans.

Section 6 of the proposed bill amends the Production Disaster Loan Act (Public Law 38) as follows:

Eliminates the July 14, 1961, termination date of the special livestock loan program and eliminates from the language of the act the already repealed provisions prohibiting such loans of smaller than $2,500.

Adds refinancing of existing indebtedness as a permissible purpose for special livestock loans.

Raises the permissible repayment period of special livestock loans from 3 years to 10 years.

Eliminates requirement that large loans be personally reviewed and approved by the Secretary and reduces the maximum chargeable rate of interest from 5 percent per annum to 3 percent.

Authorizes a special loan-in-kind program allowing Secretary to extend all or part of proceeds of special livestock loans from Commodity Credit Corporation stocks of feed grains and also allows repayment in kind. These special food loans must be repaid within 3 years at 3 percent interest.

Section 7 of the proposed bill amends the special Emergency Loan Act approved August 31, 1954, as amended, as follows:

Eliminates the June 30, 1959, termination date.

Eliminates the $65 million aggregate limitation of total loans of this type that may be made during life of the law.

Eliminates the $15,000 maximum amount of any one loan and the maximum of $20,000 indebtedness to any one borrower of such loans provided in existing law.

Keeps existing maximum interest rate of 3 percent on such loans.

Eliminates requirement that a prospective borrower live in an area that has been designated as a disaster area.

Section 8 of the proposed bill adds a new title V to the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, as amended, which new title V provides for the establishment of a family farm development program in not to exceed the 500 most poverty-stricken rural counties of the Nation. The family farm development program established by this new title provides (a) direct and insured loans and technical advisory assistance to farmers and stockmen to encourage and facilitate their development of economically-adequate full and part-time family farms; (b) strengthening of the services of the State employment services in cooperation with the U.S. Department of Labor to facilitate and ease the economic adjustments of farm people who wish to obtain part- and full-time off-farm employment; (c) directs the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to provide special augmented adult vocational training in both farm and nonfarm work in the designated counties; and (d) provides that agencies of the executive branch shall provide technical advisory and service assistance to encourage more rapid industrialization of the low income rural areas in the designated counties.

Section 9 of the proposed bill prohibits the Secretary of Agriculture from requiring the borrowers, or the lenders in insured programs, under any of these farm loan programs to pay fees or make other payments for insuring or servicing of the loans.

Section 10 of the proposed bill makes mandatory the existing discretionary authority of the Secretary of Agriculture to reactivate the voluntary farm debt adjustment program formerly conducted by the Farmers Home Administration and its predecessory agencies.

Section 11 of the proposed bill authorizes and directs the Secretary of Agriculture to establish with respect to all loans authorized by the act variable repayment plans with payments adjusted, without regard to previous ahead-of-schedule repayments, to the net earnings and debt-paying capacity of the borrower from year to year. Existing law permits the Secretary to establish such a variable repayment schedule only if the borrower has previously gotten ahead of schedule on his repayments.

INCREASED AUTHORIZATION FOR APPROPRIATIONS FOR ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend Public Law 85–590, last year's AEC Authorization Act, to increase the authorization for project 59–c–5 from $2,250,000 to $3,550,000.

This is an important atomic weapons project at Los Alamos which was authorized by the Congress last year. The AEC has found that the estimated cost has increased by $1,300,000, which is more than the 25 percent permitted under the act, and therefore has requested authorization of the larger amount.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point, the letter from the Atomic Energy Commission to me dated February 24, 1959, forwarding the proposed legislation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letter will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1228) to amend Public Law 85–590 to increase the authorization for appropriations to the Atomic Energy Commission in accordance with section 261 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. ANDERSON, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

The letter presented by Mr. ANDERSON is as follows:

U.S. ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION,
Washington, D.C., February 24, 1959.

HON. CLINTON P. ANDERSON,
Chairman, Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, Congress of the United States.

DEAR SENATOR ANDERSON: I have submitted today to the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President of the Senate, proposed legislation which would amend the 1959 Authorization Act (Public Law 85–590) to increase the amount authorized for project 59–c–5, phermex installation, Los Alamos, N. Mex., to $3,500,000 from $2,250,000.

The increase of $1,300,000 is attributable to a sharp rise in the cost of components, the need for considerably more monitoring and control equipment than had been originally anticipated and changes in machine design to insure more satisfactory performance. No change is being made in the scope of the project. Since even greater emphasis must be placed upon nonnuclear methods of development during a test moratorium, the need for the phermex installation becomes more compelling than at the time the project was originally requested.

Copies of the proposed legislation and the unclassified analysis of the project are enclosed. Copies of the classified analysis will be furnished separately to your staff.

Sincerely yours,

H. S. VANCE,
Acting Chairman.

AMENDMENT OF SOCIAL SECURITY ACT, RELATING TO OUTSIDE INCOME OF CERTAIN RECIPIENTS OF INSURANCE BENEFITS

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I send to the desk, for appropriate reference, a bill which I am introducing today, to increase, from $1,200 to $2,400, the amount of outside income which recipients of insurance benefits under the Social Security Act may be permitted to earn, in view of the impact of inflation upon the purchasing power of social security pensions.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1220) to amend title II of the Social Security Act to raise the amount of outside income recipients of insurance benefits thereunder are permitted to earn, to lower the age after which outside earnings are no longer considered for purposes of deductions from benefits, introduced by Mr. MUNDT, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

PROCEDURE OF U.S. COURTS IN ISSUANCE OF CERTAIN INJUNCTIONS

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, the true significance of the term "civil rights" has become obscured by the political connotations given it in recent years.

Historically and constitutionally, the civil rights of the American people are those inalienable individual freedoms which are insured in perpetuity by the Bill of Rights of our Constitution.

They are the rights which begin with freedom of religion and extend through all other rights not prohibited to the individual by the Constitution.

They do not include fancied rights synthesized in the imaginations of political opportunists as lures for the votes of this or that pivotal minority.

Neither are they sometime things to be alternately enjoyed and denied according to the dictates of expediency or the whims of whatever majority may be in control of Congress at any given time.

Our Founding Fathers knew from the lessons of history that people lose their civil rights because of governmental action. And it was in recognition of that fact of life that they wrote into the Bill of Rights express prohibitions against

any governmental interference with the enjoyment of them.

While it hardly is likely that the framers of our form of government considered any of the rights which they enumerated in the Constitution to be any more or less important than others, it is most interesting to note that only one was specified more than once.

That is the right of trial by jury which is guaranteed in four separate passages of the Constitution and the Bill of Rights.

Section II of article III provides that "the trial of all crimes, except in cases of impeachment, shall be by jury."

The fifth amendment states that "no person shall be held to answer for a capital, or otherwise infamous offense, unless on a presentment or indictment of a grand jury."

The sixth amendment guarantees that "in all criminal prosecutions, the accused shall enjoy the right to a speedy and public trial, by an impartial jury of the State and district wherein the crime shall have been committed."

And the seventh amendment specifies that "in suits at common law, where the value in controversy shall exceed $20, the right of trial by jury shall be preserved."

No other conclusion can be drawn from the sum of those four passages, Mr. President, but that the men who founded this Nation considered the right of trial by jury to be fundamental to the preservation of individual liberty and the maintenance of constitutional government.

It is more than coincidental, Mr. President, that those who have cried the loudest for legislation to force compliance with their notions of civil rights also are those who have been the most active in seeking to weaken, circumscribe and destroy the right of trial by jury.

The most recent case in point is found in the debates leading up to the unfortunate passage of the misnamed Civil Rights Act of 1957 by the 1st session of the 85th Congress.

Proponents of that legislation wanted a statute which would have permitted the summary punishment without jury trial of individuals accused by the Attorney General of the United States of violating someone's civil rights. They argued in defense of their position that Congress already had set the precedent for such action in enacting 28 regulatory acts beginning with the Interstate Commerce Commission Act of 1887.

Happily, that bill was shorn of its infamous part III by the Senate; but, unhappily, with regard to voting, it placed an unconstitutional qualification upon the right of trial by jury in that it authorized Federal judges to impose jail sentences up to 45 days and fines up to $300 without jury trials.

It cannot be denied, Mr. President, that Congress in conditioning the right of trial by jury and by placing a dollars-and-cents premium upon its exercise violated the constitutional prohibition against the enactment of laws respecting the enjoyment of rights enumerated in the Bill of Rights.

I wish to reiterate, Mr. President, the strong feelings about that so-called compromise which I expressed before the Senate at the time it was adopted. I said:

> If a thing is right, it is right and it must be upheld. If it is wrong, it is wrong and it must be denied.
>
> There is no middle ground when it comes to fundamental truths and basic rights. The question of right and wrong is a question of black and white. There can be no shading of gray in the definition of either.
>
> That is true of the right of Americans to trial by jury.
>
> That right either is fundamental or it is not.
>
> That right either is guaranteed by the Constitution or it is not.
>
> That right either is inalienable with the individual or it is not.
>
> If our Founding Fathers had meant that the right of trial by jury should depend upon the benign generosity of an appointed Federal judge, I believe they would have so specified in the Constitution and the Bill of Rights.
>
> If our Founding Fathers had felt that it was constitutional for appointed Federal judges to incarcerate American citizens for 45 days and fine them $300 on their own arbitrary motions, I believe they would have so provided in the Constitution and the Bill of Rights.

It was on that same occasion, Mr. President, that I sought to emphasize that the mere fact that trial by jury has been denied in 28 instances is no justification for denying it a 29th time. As I stated at that time:

> Jury trial opponents have sought to make much of the fact that there are now 28 laws under which Congress has authorized contempt proceedings without jury trials. Granted that that is true, it must be pointed out that none of them apply to individuals; and, even assuming they did, there is no logic under which justice can be built upon injustice or two wrongs added together to make a right.

One of the most lamentable developments of modern history, Mr. President, has been the ever-broadening tendency to extend the jurisdiction of courts of equity so as to invest them, in effect, with the enforcement of criminal laws.

The result has been to frustrate the administration of justice at the hands of a jury of one's peers and to substitute government by injunction for government by law.

The right of trial by jury both in criminal cases and in suits at common law was aptly described by the distinguished senior Senators from North Carolina and South Carolina [Mr. ERVIN and Mr. JOHNSTON] in their minority views on the Senate version of the 1957 civil rights bill as "the best part of the inheritance of America from England." They emphasized that trial by jury "is the best security of the people against governmental oppression" and pointed out that "tyranny on the bench is as objectionable as tyranny on the throne."

The early history of this Nation affords a graphic example of the tyranny which results from denial of trial by jury in the attempt by King George III to enforce the Stamp Act and other oppressive measures through the courts of admiralty in which trial by jury was not permitted.

As we all know, our forefathers listed deprivation of "the benefits of trial by jury" as one of the "injuries and usurpations" which led them to fight for their independence.

Those who contend that trial by jury should be limited or denied because juries sometimes do not convict either forget or choose to ignore that the basis of American jurisprudence is that the accused is presumed to be innocent until proved guilty. Only in totalitarian countries is it otherwise and to my mind it would be far better for 100 guilty men to go free than for 1 innocent person to be punished.

No free man, Mr. President, should be forced by his government to place his life, freedom, or property in jeopardy except upon the judgment of a jury of 12 of his equals.

It is true, Mr. President, that juries sometimes err. But I submit that it is far more likely that any error made will be made by one judge secure in his life tenure than by 12 impartial citizens cognizant of the fact that their fates, too, might some day rest in the hands of their peers.

I am in complete agreement, Mr. President, with the words of that great liberal, the late Senator George W. Norris, of Nebraska, who declared in this Chamber in advocating the adoption of the Norris-La Guardia Act in 1932:

> I agree that any man charged with contempt in any court of the United States in any case, no matter what it is, ought to have a jury trial. It is no answer to say that there will sometimes be juries which will not convict. That is a charge which can be made against our jury system. Every man who has tried lawsuits before juries, every man who has ever presided in court and heard jury trials knows that juries make mistakes, as all other human beings do, and they sometimes render verdicts which seem almost obnoxious. But it is the best system I know of. I would not have it abolished; and when I see how juries will really do justice when a biased and prejudiced judge is trying to lead them astray I am confirmed in my opinion that after all, our jury system is one which the American people, who believe in liberty and justice, will not dare to surrender. I like to have trial by jury preserved in all kinds of cases where there is a dispute of facts.

It is out of that conviction, Mr. President, that I am today introducing a bill proposing to amend titles 18 and 28 of the United States Code to guarantee that all individuals cited for contempt in Federal courts shall have "a speedy and public trial by an impartial jury of the State and district wherein the contempt shall have been committed."

Furthermore, Mr. President, my bill specifies that no person can be bound by a Federal injunction unless one of three essential conditions is met. They are: First, unless the individual is a party to the proceeding; second, unless the individual is named in the injunction and is served with a true copy of it; or, third, unless the injunction is read and explained by a judge in open court in the presence of the individual named in it.

The measure would apply, Mr. President, in all cases of contempt of court involving individuals except in those instances of contempt committed in the presence of the court.

Mr. President, I have made my bill applicable only to individuals for two reasons: First, because the right of trial by jury is one of those rights vested by

the Constitution in the individual; and second, I have no desire to upset the Nation's body of regulatory law without a full study of all its ramifications.

However, I wish to state before the Senate that I personally favor assuring the right of trial by jury in all cases in which there are facts to be determined with the one exception of cases of direct contempt committed in the presence of the court. And I would be pleased to join with those who profess interest in protecting the civil rights of Americans to make certain that every American, corporate and individual, is accorded that right when before the courts.

The enactment of such a law, Mr. President, would protect all Americans from abuses arising through misuse of the judicial power of contempt and would constitute the most significant civil rights legislation to come out of Congress since the adoption of the Bill of Rights.

Mr. President, I herewith introduce my bill to be read twice and appropriately referred and ask unanimous consent that the text of it be printed at this juncture as a portion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1231) to prescribe the procedure of courts of the United States in the issuance of injunctions and the punishment of disobedience thereof, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. TALMADGE, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) sections 3691 and 3692 of title 18 of the United States Code are amended to read as follows:

"§ 3691. Jury trial of criminal contempts—generally

"Whenever a contempt charged shall consist in willful disobedience of any lawful writ, process, order, rule, decree, or command of any district court of the United States (other than an injunction or restraining order) by doing or omitting any act or thing in violation thereof, and the act or thing done or omitted also constitutes a criminal offense under any Act of Congress, or under the laws of any State in which it was done or omitted, the accused, upon demand therefor, shall be entitled to trial by a jury, which shall conform as near as may be to the practice in other criminal cases.

"This section shall not apply to contempts committed in the presence of the court, or so near thereto as to obstruct the administration of justice, nor to contempts committed in disobedience of any lawful writ, process, order, rule, decree, or command entered in any suit or action brought or prosecuted in the name of, or on behalf of, the United States.

"§ 3692. Jury trial of criminal contempts—injunctions and restraining orders

"In all cases of contempt arising from the disobedience of any injunction or restraining order the accused shall enjoy the right to a speedy and public trial by an impartial jury of the State and district wherein the contempt shall have been committed. This paragraph shall not apply to contempts committed in the presence of the court or so near thereto as to interfere directly with the administration of justice nor to the misbehavior, misconduct, or disobedience of any officer of the court in respect to the writs, orders, or process of the court.

"No individual may be punished for contempt arising from the disobedience of any such injunction or restraining order unless—

"(a) such individual was a party to the proceeding in which such injunction or restraining order was issued, or willfully combined or conspired with any party to such proceeding to violate any prohibition or requirement of such injunction or restraining order;

"(b) such individual before such disobedience received notice of the terms and conditions of such injunction or restraining order through (1) the service upon him of a true and correct copy of such injunction or restraining order, or (2) a full and complete oral explanation of the provisions of such injunction or restraining order and the effect thereof given by the judge in open court in the presence of such individual at the time of the issuance thereof; and

"(c) the prohibitions and requirements of such injunction or restraining order were described therein with sufficient particularity and certainty to provide adequate notice to such individual as to the specific acts prohibited or required thereby.

This paragraph shall not apply to any proceeding for the punishment of any individual for any act or omission committed in his capacity as a director, officer, employee agent, or member of, or attorney for, any corporation, partnership, association, or labor union in disobedience of any injunction or restraining order issued against and duly served upon such corporation, partnership, association, or labor union."

(b) The analysis of chapter 233 of such title is amended to read as follows:

"Sec.
"3691. Jury trial of criminal contempts—generally.
"3692. Jury trial of criminal contempts—injunctions and restraining orders.
"3693. Summary disposition or jury trial; notice—rule."

SEC. 2. (a) Chapter 155 of title 28 of the United States Code is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"§ 2285. Injunctions and restraining orders—requirements

"Every injunction or restraining order issued by any court of the United States must describe each prohibition and requirement imposed thereby with sufficient particularity and certainty to provide adequate notice to each individual subject thereto as to the specific acts prohibited or required thereby. Each such injunction or restraining order must name specifically each individual who is subject to each prohibition and requirement imposed thereby, except that—

"(a) an injunction or restraining order issued against any corporation, partnership, association, or labor union may be made applicable to directors, officers, employees, agents and members thereof, and attorneys therefor, without naming in such injunction or restraining order each such individual; and

"(b) an injunction or restraining order may be issued against a specifically described class or group of individuals if (1) the court determines, upon a satisfactory showing made by the applicant therefor, that each such individual cannot be named specifically and that the applicant would suffer immediate irremediable harm if such injunction or order were not made applicable with respect to such class or group, and (2) such injunction or restraining order provides specifically that it shall not apply with respect to any individual until such individual has received notice of the terms and conditions of such injunction or restraining order through (A) the service upon him of a true and correct copy thereof, or (B) a full and complete oral explanation of the provisions thereof and their effect given by the judge in open court in the presence of such individual at the time of the issuance thereof. This section shall not relieve any court or party from compliance with any additional requirement prescribed by any statute or rule of court for the issuance of any injunction or restraining order."

(b) The analysis of such chapter is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new item:

"2285. Injunctions and restraining orders—requirements."

STATUS OF FACULTY AND ADMINISTRATIVE STAFF AT MERCHANT MARINE ACADEMY

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, by request, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend section 216 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, to clarify the status of the faculty and administrative staff at the U.S. Merchant Marine Academy, to establish suitable personnel policies for such personnel, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent that a statement of the purpose of the bill, together with a sectional analysis, may be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the statement and sectional analysis will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1233) to amend section 216 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, to clarify the status of the faculty and administrative staff of the U.S. Merchant Marine Academy, to establish suitable personnel policies for such personnel, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON (by request), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

The statement of the purpose and sectional analysis of the bill, presented by Mr. MAGNUSON, are as follows:

STATEMENT OF PURPOSE AND NEED FOR PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO SECTION 216, MERCHANT MARINE ACT, 1936, AS AMENDED

GENERAL PURPOSE

In the administration of the maritime training program under section 216 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended (46 U.S.C. 1126) since 1942, it has been the practice of the former Maritime Commission and of the Department of Commerce (to which the Maritime Commission was transferred in 1950) to enroll in the U.S. Maritime Service not only volunteers for training and reserve purposes, known as trainee enrollees, but also other persons assigned to administrative duties, known as administrative enrollees. The term "administrative enrollees" includes the employees serving as the permanent cadre at the U.S. Merchant Marine Academy at Kings Point, N.Y., which comprises the executive staff, administrative force, faculty, custodial, and service groups.

These administrative enrollees have been employed (i.e., "enrolled") under the authority of the above-mentioned section of the Merchant Marine Act. They have been given ranks and ratings, and have been compensated and granted allowances at rates similar to those provided by law for the Coast Guard under authority of section 216 of the Merchant Marine Act, the annual appropriation

acts, and section 509 of the Career Compensation Act of 1949, as amended by the act of May 19, 1952 (66 Stat. 79). The enrollees have been granted leave under a leave system prescribed by regulations pursuant to implied power under the Merchant Marine Act. Insofar as circumstances and applicable laws have permitted, administrative enrollees have been administered on the same basis as members of a military-type organization performing similar duties.

Over the years a number of questions have been considered by the Civil Service Commission, General Accounting Office, and Department of Justice concerning the employment status of these employees. In order to clarify and regularize the employment status of administrative enrollees, it has become apparent that it would be administratively desirable to convert the enrollees, as far as practicable and appropriate, to positions subject to the same civil service, compensation, and leave laws, which are generally applicable to other civilian employees of the United States.

In the interest of simplified and more efficient administration, and of making available and preserving to these employees the same benefits as are granted to other civilian employees of the United States, the Department of Commerce and the Civil Service Commission have reached agreement (1) that an appropriate, flexible system of employment and compensation should be provided by law for the faculty of the U.S. Merchant Marine Academy at Kings Point, similar to that now provided for the faculty at the Naval Academy; (2) that future appointments to nonfaculty positions should be made in accordance with the civil service and classification laws (except as otherwise authorized by law, e.g., to wage board positions); and (3) that present administrative enrollees should be converted to positions subject to the civil service, classification, and leave laws under provisions of law which will authorize adjustments to be made that will avoid undue personal hardship or inequity to the employees and avoid any adverse effect upon the efficiency of the Academy.

As a result of careful study for several years of the problems involved in effecting this transition for persons presently serving as administrative enrollees, the Department, the Civil Service Commission, and the General Accounting Office have reached agreement that legislation is necessary to (1) provide an appropriate compensation system of the type described above for faculty members at the Merchant Marine Academy; (2) avoid serious loss of compensation to nonfaculty administrative enrollees upon conversion to positions subject to the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, or to wage-board positions; (3) avoid serious curtailment of enrollees' existing leave benefits upon conversion to a position under the Annual and Sick Leave Act of 1951, as amended; and (4) provide for creditability of prior service as administrative enrollees for all purposes.

The proposed legislation would accomplish these purposes and enable the Department to administer these positions on the same basis as other comparable civilian positions in the Government service. Upon enactment of this legislation, it is contemplated that faculty members will be employed under excepted appointments authorized by the Civil Service Commission under schedule A of the civil service rules, and that they will be compensated under a system of compensation appropriate to the requirements of an accredited educational institution and similar to that now provided for the faculty of the Naval Academy. It is contemplated that nonfaculty administrative enrollees will be employed under the civil service laws, and that they will be compensated in accordance with the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, or an appropriate prevailing wage schedule, as appropriate. Both groups of employees will receive leave, medical and other benefits under the same laws as apply generally to other civilian employees of the Government.

In view of the fact that the U.S. Merchant Marine Academy, currently the only federally operated maritime training installation, was made a permanent institution by Public Law 415, 84th Congress, the Department recommends favorable consideration of the attached proposed legislation in order that basic personnel policies and problems in administering the maritime training program may be considered and acted upon by the Congress. The need for clarifying the status of administrative enrollees of the U.S. Maritime Service in order that present uncertainties may be eliminated and the Merchant Marine Academy may proceed on a stable basis in personnel matters was recognized in the Report of the 12th Congressional Board of Visitors to the Merchant Marine Academy. The report included the following provision:

"The Board urges those charged with carrying on the discussions directed toward establishing the status of the administrative enrollees of the U.S. Maritime Service to make every effort to bring about an appropriate resolution of this problem, to the end that suitable personnel policies may be established."

Additionally, the report of the Advisory Board to the U.S. Merchant Marine Academy, made to the Maritime Administrator, U.S. Department of Commerce, May 2, 1957, stated, among other things, "the Maritime Administrator has issued appropriate orders defining the status of the existing faculty and setting forth probationary periods for those to be appointed to the faculty in the future. This is all that could have been done and it has been well done. But the position of the faculty at the U.S. Merchant Marine Academy will not be thoroughly satisfactory until appropriate legislation has been enacted."

SECTIONAL ANALYSIS OF THE BILL

Section 216(a): This section is amended to (1) Make clear that henceforth enrollments will be made only for training and reserve purposes in the U.S. Maritime Service, as distinguished from administrative duty purposes such as instruction of trainees, clerical work, maintenance work, and the like; (2) make clear that the Secretary's authority to fix the rates of pay for trainees also includes authority to fix their allowances; (3) provide clear authority for the Secretary to prescribe and regulate the furnishing and wearing of uniforms of persons in the Service; (4) transfer to a new subsection (e) the existing provision for employment of instructors; and (5) make an appropriate, minor correction in a pronoun in the second sentence to refer to discretion transferred to the Secretary from the former Maritime Commission.

Section 216(e): This subsection would provide authority for the employment, and compensation without regard to the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, of all levels of civilian professors, lecturers, and instructors as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of section 216 of the Merchant Marine Act, as amended. Such professors, lecturers, and instructors would be considered civilian officers and employees of the United States for purposes of laws of general application to civilian employees of the United States.

Under existing law the Civil Service Commission is empowered to authorize the Department to employ professors, lecturers, and instructors under excepted appointments, on the same basis (schedule A) as is now provided for the faculty at the Naval Academy. This section will also make possible the establishment of an appropriate compensation system for the faculty of the Merchant Marine Academy, similar to that provided for faculty of the Naval Academy.

Section 216(f): This subsection provides for (1) conversion of existing administrative enrollees, both faculty and nonfaculty, on a date mutually agreed upon by the Secretary of Commerce and the Civil Service Commission, in order to effect an orderly transition; (2) clear-cut legal recognition that after conversion, former administrative enrollees will be subject to laws of general applicability to civilian employees of the United States except as otherwise authorized by law; and (3) certain authority necessary to make possible the conversion of enrollees without undue personal hardship or inequity and without any adverse effect upon the efficiency of the Merchant Marine Academy, with particular reference to compensation, leave, and creditability of prior service for various purposes.

Section 216(f)(1): This subsection defines how the basic compensation of administrative enrollees shall be determined upon conversion and provides for salary-saving and related safeguards in order to avoid reducing the compensation of enrollees as a result of conversion. For example, if an administrative enrollee's total basic pay, quarters and subsistence allowances amount to $5,226.70, and his position is classified at Grade GS–5, he would have his salary set at GS–5, $5,240, which is the next longevity rate over the total amount he is receiving for basic pay, quarters and subsistence. An enrollee receiving a total of $8,850.96 for basic pay, subsistence and quarters allowances whose position is classified at GS–10, for which the maximum longevity rate of the grade is $7,855, will have his salary set at $8,950, which is the top longevity step at GS–11, until he leaves such position, or otherwise is entitled to receive a higher rate by reason of operation of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, or other applicable law, as indicated below.

This subsection applies only to persons serving as administrative enrollees on the date preceding the date of conversion. It does not provide retroactive benefits to any person.

Section 216(f)(2): This paragraph makes provision to specifically ensure what is commonly referred to as salary saving by establishing the fact that the basic compensation as set upon conversion, as provided for in section 216(f)(1), will continue until the employee affected thereby is either separated from his position or receives a higher rate of basic compensation by operation of law or regulation as might occur in the case of promotion, Federal salary adjustments, etc.

Section 216(f)(3): This paragraph takes cognizance of the fact that administrative enrollees have earned, accumulated and used annual leave on a calendar day basis, and most enrollees have a much greater leave accumulation than the accumulation which would be authorized on conversion of such personnel under provisions of the Annual and Sick Leave Act. This paragraph would provide for the conversion of all unused annual leave without actual loss of leave for purposes of future use to the enrollee on the basis of 5 work days' leave for each 7 calendar days of leave.

Administrative enrollees are authorized to take sick leave, up to 4 months in emergencies, as may be necessary, but do not accumulate sick leave. If they had been permitted to accumulate sick leave, most administrative enrollees by reason of their length of service would now have a large accumulation of sick leave. To minimize the effect of losing the sick leave benefits to which administrative enrollees have been entitled, it is proposed that they be credited

on the date of conversion with 13 days' sick leave. Thereafter, sick leave credits would accrue on the same basis as for other employees subject to the Annual and Sick Leave Act.

Section 216(f)(4): This paragraph makes specific provision to recognize active service as an administrative enrollee performed prior to the date fixed for conversion as civilian employment creditable for all purposes in the executive branch of the Federal Government, with the exception that in computing length of service as used under the Classification Act for the determination of one periodic step increase or one longevity step increase, all such prior service shall be counted toward the attainment of same which occurred immediately preceding the date fixed for conversion, as provided in subsection (f). Thus, for such basic purposes as retirement, leave accruals, seniority, length-of-service awards, etc., all previous active service as an administrative enrollee would be creditable as civilian employment in the executive branch of the Federal Government for every purpose, except that in computation of length of service for salary step increases or longevity step increases, only such service as was continuous and uninterrupted immediately prior to the date fixed for conversion would be creditable in the determination of said step increases. Under these circumstances, an employee's salary thus established which is less than the maximum scheduled rate of the grade would be immediately considered against the requirements for one periodic step increase; and, as provided in subsection (f)(1), for purposes of determining eligibility for a periodic step increase, the basic compensation as an administrative enrollee would be considered as the total amount or value of basic pay, subsistence and quarters allowances. Such prior service and basic compensation would also be considered in determining eligibility toward the 10-year aggregate period and 3-year waiting periods for one longevity step increase.

Section 216(f)(5): Administrative enrollees disenrolled from the Maritime Serice are entitled to payment of travel and transportation expenses to their place of enrollment, etc., whether or not such transportation is actually furnished in kind. Administrative enrollees on active duty also receive free medical, dental, surgical and hospital care under the provisions of paragraph (6) of section 322 of the Public Health Service Act of 1944 (58 Stat. 696, U.S.C. 249).

This paragraph is for the purpose of making two practical provisions. First, it provides that administrative enrollees who accept conversion shall forfeit such rights to travel and transportation expenses. Those who elect to resign prior to conversion will be entitled to such benefits in keeping with the terms under which they were "enrolled" as administrative enrollees. Second, it provides that administrative enrollees after the effective date of conversion as authorized by this legislation shall not continue to receive free medical, dental, surgical and hospital care pursuant to paragraph (6) of section 322 of the Public Health Service Act of 1944.

EXTENSION OF PROVISIONS OF TITLE XII OF MERCHANT MARINE ACT, 1936, RELATING TO WAR RISK INSURANCE

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, by request, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to extend the provisions of title XII of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, relating to war risk insurance, for an additional 5 years, ending September 7, 1965.

There is attached to the bill, a statement, outlining the purpose and provisions of this bill, and I ask unanimous consent that the statement be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1234) to extend the provisions of title XII of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, relating to war risk insurance, for an additional 5 years, ending September 7, 1965, introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON (by request), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

The statement presented by Mr. MAGNUSON is as follows:

The bill would extend the life of title XII of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended (46 U.S.C. 1281, et seq.) for an additional 5 years. Section 1214 of the act now provides for expiration of marine war risk insurance authority September 7, 1960.

The Marine War Risk Insurance Act (title XII, 1936 act), which will expire September 7, 1960, is standby legislation which authorizes the Secretary of Commerce with the approval of the President, to provide war risk and certain marine and liability insurance for protection of vessels, cargoes, and crews and personal effects, when commercial insurance cannot be obtained on reasonable terms and conditions. At present, as at the time of enactment of the War Risk Insurance Act, commercial policies covering maritime war risks are issued only subject to automatic termination clauses in the event of outbreak of war between any of the four powers—United States, France, Great Britain, and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. Even though the United States may not be involved immediately, American vessels would be without protection against loss by risks of war. Ships and cargoes could not be moved without adequate insurance coverage.

War risk insurance was provided by the Government in both World Wars I and II, and proved both necessary and effective in protecting the United States and its civilian and military commerce, with premium receipts in excess of losses paid.

Arrangements necessary to have war risk insurance immediately available when its protection is needed for the commerce of the United States are in effect under the Marine War Risk Insurance Act. The United States is now prepared to put into effect in case of need a full wartime insurance program on hulls, cargoes, and personnel.

General Order 75 (revised) of Maritime Administration, published in the Federal Register on February 28, 1957, states that the Maritime Administrator is prepared to provide hull, protection and indemnity, and crew life and personal effects war risk insurance as specified in section 1203 (a), (d), (e), and (f) of title XII, except for vessels under construction as specified in section 1203(a), for the interim period between the time commercial insurance subject to the automatic termination clauses is automatically terminated through the operation of such clauses and the time a full wartime insurance program is placed in effect.

Binders and extensions of binders outstanding as of September 30, 1958, were hull, 917; protection and indemnity, 914; and crew life and personal effects, 825. Amendment 2 to General Order 75, published in the Federal Register on July 2, 1958, extended the expiration date of interim binders to September 7, 1959.

Binder and extension fees (not premiums) have been collected up to and including September 30, 1958, in a net amount of $204,625.48, after payment of agency fees and expenses. General Order 82, published in the Federal Register on November 1, 1958, establishes title XII war risk hull insurance values, pursuant to Public Law 958, 84th Congress, for certain self-propelled oceangoing iron and steel vessels.

Under the authority of section 1203(a) of title XII war risk insurance on American vessels under construction in shipyards in the United States (which insurance is not available in the commercial market), has been furnished. As of September 30, 1958, the Maritime Administration was providing such insurance on 22 vessels under construction. From the inception of this program to September 30, 1958, premiums received have totaled $532,717.73.

At the request of the Secretary of the Navy, second seamen's war risk insurance is being provided without premium, as authorized under sections 1205 and 1206 of title XII, on tankers operated for the account of the Military Sea Transportation Service. This arrangement has been in effect continuously since January 1, 1954. Under section 1205 the Secretary of the Navy has agreed to indemnify the Maritime Administrator against all losses covered by such insurance. As of September 30, 1958, 34 tankers were covered under this program. The USNS *Mission San Francisco* was involved in a collision with a foreign-flag vessel on March 7, 1957. To date 42 personal effects claims totaling $14,537.75 have been paid; and there remain 9 death and 3 personal effects claims, for which an estimate of $46,250 has been retained as a reserve. The USNS *Mission San Miguel* ran aground October 9, 1957, and became a total loss. Claims involving personal effects and repatriation expenses, totaling $18,582.18, have been paid and no further claims are anticipated. Under this program, there remains a net premium saving to the Government estimated at $41,000 as of September 30, 1958.

At the request of the Secretary of the Army and pursuant to sections 1205 and 1206 of title XII, legal liability insurance is being provided, without premium, to a maritime contractor and its subcontractors, with a limit of $10 million for the aggregate of all claims arising from the same event. This insurance has been necessary to cover legal liability resulting from explosion of ammunition transported, and has been in effect continuously since July 1, 1951, when commercial insurance in the required amount could not be obtained. The arrangement provides for indemnification by the Army for all losses paid by the Maritime Administrator. To date no claims have been reported.

Public Law 253, 82d Congress, provides that the Secretary of Commerce may transfer to the fund authorized by section 1208(a) of title XII not in excess of $10 million from the vessel operations revolving fund created by Public Law 45, 82d Congress. It has not been necessary for the Secretary of Commerce to make any transfer of funds under this authority.

To avoid the likelihood of total disorganization of the United States oceangoing commerce and the danger of catastrophic failure of our shipping in support of our defense forces and activities, the War Risk Insurance Act should be extended promptly in advance of its termination.

There is submitted herewith a bill to accomplish the proposed extension.

The Department urges consideration and enactment of the bill at the first session of the 86th Congress, in order that there will be no hiatus in the continuance of the arrangements for immediately furnishing full insurance programs in case of breakout of war or critical emergency, and to continue in effect the insurance required under sections 1205 and 1206 of title XII by the Defense Department and shipyard war risk insurance currently in effect, as above stated, under section 1203(a) of title XII.

CONTRACTS FOR CONDUCT OF RESEARCH IN FIELD OF METEOROLOGY

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, by request I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to enter into contracts for the conduct of research in the field of meteorology and to authorize installation of Government telephones in certain private residences.

There is attached to the bill a statement of purpose of and need for the proposed bill, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

I am advised that the Bureau of the Budget has no objection to the submission of this proposed legislation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1235) to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to enter into contracts for the conduct of research in the field of meteorology and to authorize installation of Government telephones in certain private residences, introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON (by request), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

The statement of purpose and need of the bill, presented by Mr. MAGNUSON, is as follows:

STATEMENT OF PURPOSE OF AND NEED FOR THE PROPOSED LEGISLATION TO AUTHORIZE THE SECRETARY OF COMMERCE TO ENTER INTO CONTRACTS FOR THE CONDUCT OF RESEARCH IN THE FIELD OF METEOROLOGY AND TO AUTHORIZE INSTALLATION OF GOVERNMENT TELEPHONES IN CERTAIN PRIVATE RESIDENCES

Section 1 of this proposed legislation would clarify the authority of the Department to enter into research contracts in the various meteorological fields. At present the only specific authority for entering into such projects is contained in section 803 of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 (72 Stat. 783), which authorizes the Department to enter into research contracts with public and private agencies for the purpose of increasing the safety and efficiency of air navigation.

As a result, the Department, rather than relying upon inherent authority to enter into research contracts, places the contracts on the basis that they relate to civil aviation. It would appear to be preferable to recognize the value of research programs in the entire field of meteorology by removing this artificial limitation on such contracts.

In many cases the most efficient method of accomplishing desired research in a particular area of meteorological science is to have all or part of the project contracted out to private agencies, such as universities, in order that their highly specialized research facilities can be utilized. If the Department were to attempt to perform all such research at its own facilities with its own personnel, substantial temporary increases in both facilities and personnel would be required. Research contracts make available the desired facilities and experienced personnel at far less cost to the Government. Enactment of the proposed legislation would constitute recognition of the value of the use of research contracts in all fields of meteorology.

Moreover, it is believed that the enactment of specific legislation authorizing such contracts would eliminate possible reluctance on the part of contractors to undertake projects not obviously related to aviation meteorology and would stimulate the interest of private organizations in securing such contracts.

Section 2 of this proposed legislation would authorize the expenditure of public money for telephone services installed in private residences for use as the Chief of Bureau may direct in carrying into effect the basic enabling laws authorizing collection and distribution of information on weather conditions throughout the United States, its Territories, and possessions. The telephone installations will be made in cases where frequent need can be shown to exist, or isolated location prevents use of public utility communication facilities to contact meteorological personnel for reports of severe storms, floods, etc., and the dissemination of emergency weather warnings, etc.

At many semi-isolated or isolated locations, Weather Bureau field facilities are not open 24 hours daily, and at these locations field employees have little or no requirements for private telephones in their residences which are often Government-owned. In cases where special weather observations are urgently needed from these stations after normal office hours, or it is urgent that storm warnings or advice be disseminated, there are no telephone facilities now available by which field personnel can be contacted and required reports obtained, or warnings issued. The installation of telephone services in private residences in these instances will insure that emergency meteorological services are available at all locations.

Section 1 of this legislation is merely clarifying in nature and no increase in expenditures would be involved.

Section 2 would involve an estimated expenditure of $8,000 per annum from base appropriation.

INCREASED LIMITATION ON BASIC COMPENSATION OF CERTAIN EMPLOYEES OF COAST GUARD

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, by request, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend section 432(g) of title 14, United States Code, so as to increase the limitation on basic compensation of civilian keepers of lighthouses and civilians employed on lightships and other vessels of the Coast Guard from $3,750 to $5,100 per annum.

There is attached to the bill, a letter of transmittal, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letter will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1236) to amend section 432(g) of title 14, United States Code, so as to increase the limitation on basic compensation of civilian keepers of lighthouses and civilians employed on lightships and other vessels of the Coast Guard from $3,750 to $5,100 per annum, introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON (by request), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

The letter presented by Mr. MAGNUSON is as follows:

JANUARY 13, 1959.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE.

SIR: There is transmitted herewith a draft of a proposed bill to amend section 432(g) of title 14, United States Code, so as to increase the limitation of basic compensation of civilian keepers of lighthouses and civilians employed on lightships and other vessels of the Coast Guard from $3,750 to $5,100 per annum.

The purpose of the bill is to increase the limitation of $3,750 per annum placed upon the basic compensation which Lighthouse Service personnel may receive. Under regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the Treasury, the Coast Guard may fix the hours of duty and compensation of such personnel, except that basic compensation may not exceed $3,750 per annum. It has been the policy of the U.S. Coast Guard, with the approval of the head of the Department in which the service operates, to adjust by administrative action the rates and salary ranges of keepers when legislative adjustments are made in the rates applicable to the grades under the Classification Act of 1949, as amended. Following the amendment of the Classification Act on June 20, 1958, which allowed increases to employees under that act, the Coast Guard, by administrative action, adjusted the compensation of keepers, subject, of course, to the $3,750 limitation.

Even prior to June 20, 1958, the limitation precluded some keepers from being advanced to the maximum of their salary ranges as established. Now, about 75 percent of all keepers are being denied the full benefits they would otherwise enjoy. The limitation is unfair to this small group of deserving employees. The suggested increase would not mean that any keeper would be advanced forthwith from $3,750 per annum to $5,100. The latter figure would be the maximum of the highest salary range of the keeper compensation system. In fact, there is currently no one eligible to advance to that salary.

It would be appreciated if you would lay the proposed bill before the Senate. A similar proposed bill has been transmitted to the House of Representatives.

The Department has been advised by the Bureau of the Budget that there is no objection to the submission of this proposed legislation to the Congress.

Very truly yours,

A. GILMORE FLUES,
Acting Secretary of the Treasury.

SPECIAL LOAN PROGRAM FOR WITHDRAWING KLAMATH INDIANS

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to authorize the use of the revolving loan fund for Indians to assist Klamath Indians during the period for terminating Federal supervision. The legislation is proposed by the Department of the Interior to meet the special needs of Indians who are withdrawing from the Klamath tribe and who are of less than one-fourth Indian blood. This bill will apply to approximately 253 withdrawing tribe members not covered by existing departmental authority. The loan program will permit the Department to make non-interest-bearing loans to all withdrawing members of the Klamath tribe from the revolving credit fund of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, during the period when tribal forest assets are being liquidated.

The proposed legislation is fully justified and is necessary to prevent economic hardship among withdrawees during the coming months. As chairman of the Senate Indian Affairs Subcommittee, I will do my utmost to provide early committee consideration of this bill.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the text of the bill, a copy of a letter from the Department of the Interior to the President of the Senate, dated February 26, 1959, and a copy of a Bureau of Indian Affairs

press release of February 26, 1959, containing information about the loan program proposal.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill, letter, and press release will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1242) to authorize the use of the revolving loan fund for Indians to assist Klamath Indians during the period for terminating Federal supervision, introduced by Mr. NEUBERGER (by request), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to make loans, without interest, from the revolving fund authorized by the Acts of June 18, 1934 (48 Stat. 986, 25 U.S.C. 470), and June 26, 1936 (49 Stat. 1968, 25 U.S.C. 506), as amended and supplemented, to members of the Klamath Tribe of Indians who elected to withdraw from the tribe pursuant to the Act of August 13, 1954 (68 Stat. 718, 25 U.S.C. 564), as amended, regardless of the degree of Indian blood of the borrower, and to collect such loans by setoff against funds payable to the borrower pursuant to said Act of August 13, 1954, as amended. The Secretary is also authorized to refinance from such revolving fund any loan made by a lending agency to a withdrawing Klamath Indian that is secured by encumbrance of his beneficial interest in tribal property with the approval of the Secretary as required by section 4 of said 1954 Act, and to include therein a nonreimbursable grant equal to the interest charges incurred by the borrower prior to such refinancing. In the event adequate funds are not available from the revolving fund to refinance a loan by such lending agency, the Secretary is authorized to pay from the revolving fund, without reimbursement, the interest charged on such loan.

The letter and press release presented by Mr. NEUBERGER are as follows:

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
Washington, D.C., February 26, 1959.

Hon. RICHARD M. NIXON,
President of the Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Enclosed is draft of a proposed bill "to authorize the use of the revolving loan fund for Indians to assist Klamath Indians during the period for terminating Federal supervision."

We recommend that the proposed bill be referred to the appropriate committee for consideration, and we recommend that it be enacted.

The act of August 13, 1954 (68 Stat. 713) as amended, provides for the termination of Federal supervision over the property and affairs of the Klamath Tribe of Indians and the individual members of the tribe. The members who chose to convert their interests in the tribal estate into cash and to withdraw from membership in the tribe were permitted to do so. Those who chose to retain the remaining assets in common ownership, but under Oregon State law, likewise were permitted to do so. The final roll contains the names of 2,133 persons of whom 1,659 elected to withdraw and 474 elected to remain with the tribal entity.

Approximately 77 percent of the tribal assets must be sold on behalf of the withdrawing members. The 1958 amendment to the Termination Act provides for the sale of the forest units during the period April 1, 1959, to April 1, 1961. This delay in the sales procedure means that the withdrawing members will not get the larger portion of their money until sometime in 1960 or 1961. The only source of money available for distribution to the withdrawing members prior to this time will be from the sale of "fringe" units, which will be insufficient for their needs.

Per capita payments in varying amounts have been made to Klamath Indians for many years. The average for the past 3 years has been approximately $1,000 per person per year. Many members have looked to these payments for their livelihood. In order to avoid hardships and an avalanche of welfare assistance requests, and in view of the fact that large sums of money will be available at a later date following the sale of large forest units, assistance to these people in the form of Federal loans, secured by their shares in the tribal asset, is justified.

The Klamath Indians of more than one-quarter degree of Indian blood who have elected to withdraw are eligible for loans from the revolving fund established under the act of June 18, 1934 (48 Stat. 986), as amended and supplemented. As of June 30, 1958, the balance in the fund was $7,314,910. The acts of May 10, 1939 (53 Stat. 698), and May 7, 1943 (62 Stat. 211), however, prohibit loans from the fund to any Indian of less than one-quarter degree Indian blood. A total of 253 (or about 15 percent of the 1,659 withdrawing members) are of less than one-quarter degree Indian blood. The proposed legislation will make them eligible for loans from the fund.

Because the delay in the payments to the withdrawing Klamath Indians is due to no fault of theirs, the proposed legislation also provides that loans made to them from the revolving fund shall be without interest. There is no legal requirement that interest be charged on loans from the revolving fund, but because interest has been and is being charged on other loans, with the exception of a few educational loans made years ago, it is advisable to have such authorization included in the legislation in order to avoid any misunderstanding on the part of members of other tribes who are paying interest on loans. The $8,369,775 outstanding in loans at June 30, 1958, bore interest at the following rates:

1 percent	$3,594,158
2 percent	1,963,956
3 percent	159,796
4 percent	50,857
4½ percent	2,526,005
5 percent	17,760
6 percent	53,002
No interest	4,241
Total	8,369,775

The withdrawing members of less than one-quarter degree of Indian blood, until the proposed legislation is enacted, will be obliged to look to banks and other institutions for financing and in order to obtain funds they will need to encumber their beneficial interests in tribal property as security pursuant to section 4 of the act of August 13, 1954 (68 Stat. 718), as amended. They will be obliged to pay interest on such loans. In order to avoid discrimination between withdrawing members of the Klamath Tribe, the bill authorizes the Secretary to refinance from the revolving fund any loans such members may obtain from banks or other leaders for which their shares in the tribal asset were pledged as security, and to reimburse the borrower for interest charges incurred prior to refinancing.

It is estimated that from 250 to 275 families will require assistance. The amount of the loans needed will vary from small sums to as much as $10,000 per family, depending upon the time needed to distribute the tribal assets. The collection of the full amount of such loans before August 13, 1961, the termination date, is, of course, assured.

The Bureau of the Budget has advised us that there is no objection to the submission of this proposed legislation to the Congress.

Sincerely yours,

ROGER ERNST,
Assistant Secretary of the Interior.

A BILL TO AUTHORIZE THE USE OF THE REVOLVING LOAN FUND FOR INDIANS TO ASSIST KLAMATH INDIANS DURING THE PERIOD FOR TERMINATING FEDERAL SUPERVISION

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to make loans, without interest, from the revolving fund authorized by the Acts of June 18, 1934 (48 Stat. 986, 25 U.S.C. 470), and June 26, 1936 (49 Stat. 1968, 25 U.S.C. 506), as amended and supplemented, to members of the Klamath Tribe of Indians who elected to withdraw from the tribe pursuant to the Act of August 13, 1954 (68 Stat. 718, 25 U.S.C. 564), as amended, regardless of the degree of Indian blood of the borrower, and to collect such loans by setoff against funds payable to the borrower pursuant to said Act of August 13, 1954, as amended. The Secretary is also authorized to refinance from such revolving fund any loan made by a lending agency to a withdrawing Klamath Indian that is secured by encumbrance of his beneficial interest in tribal property with the approval of the Secretary as required by section 4 of said 1954 Act, and to include therein a nonreimbursable grant equal to the interest charges incurred by the borrower prior to such refinancing. In the event adequate funds are not available from the revolving fund to refinance a loan by such lending agency, the Secretary is authorized to pay from the revolving fund, without reimbursement, the interest charged on such loan.

INTERIOR DEPARTMENT PROPOSES BILL AUTHORIZING SPECIAL LOAN PROGRAM FOR WITHDRAWING KLAMATH INDIANS

To meet the special needs of Indians who are withdrawing from the Klamath Tribe of Oregon, the Department of the Interior is proposing legislation that would permit the Bureau of Indian Affairs to make loans to them without interest, Assistant Secretary Roger Ernst announced today.

Such loans are justified, Assistant Secretary Ernst said, because of the fact that sales of tribal forest lands to compensate the 1,659 withdrawing members will be made under existing laws over a 2-year period beginning on April 1, 1959. This delay in sales procedure means that the withdrawing members will not get the larger portion of their money until sometime in 1960 and 1961.

Because this delay is due to no fault of the Indians, the Department proposes to make non-interest-bearing loans to them from the revolving credit fund of the Bureau of Indian Affairs. The loans would be collected by setoffs against the payments due the borrowers from the proceeds of sales of tribal property.

Loans to the withdrawing Klamath members who are of one-fourth or more Indian blood were authorized by an amendment of the Federal regulations approved last December 12. Legislation is needed, however, to permit such loans to the 253 withdrawing members who are of less than one-fourth Indian blood.

The bill proposed by the Department would also permit Indian Bureau refinancing of any loans these members may obtain from private sources prior to enactment and reimbursement of the borrowers for interest charges incurred prior to refinancing.

The Department estimates that from 250 to 275 Klamath families will need the as-

sistance. Loans are expected to range from very small sums to as much as $10,000 per family.

STANDARDS OF FOREIGN LANGUAGE PROFICIENCY FOR THE FOREIGN SERVICE

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, and the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended, to establish standards of foreign language proficiency and to improve recruitment and training for the Foreign Service of the United States. This is a revision of a very similar bill (S. 3552) which I introduced on March 25, 1958, in the 85th Congress. I ask unanimous consent that parts of my statement made at the time I introduced the earlier version of this bill be printed in the RECORD. This statement will explain the background of the bill I am introducing today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the excerpts of the statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1243) to amend the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended, to establish standards of foreign language proficiency for the Foreign Service of the United States, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. SALTONSTALL (for himself and Mr. MANSFIELD), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The excerpts from the statement presented by Mr. SALTONSTALL, are as follows:

EXCERPTS FROM STATEMENT BY HON. LEVERETT SALTONSTALL, OF MASSACHUSETTS, IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. President, I introduce for myself and Mr. MANSFIELD and send to the desk for appropriate reference a bill to amend the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended, to improve recruitment and training for the Foreign Service of the United States.

On May 25, 1956, I introduced Senate Resolution 272 (84th Cong.) calling on the Committee on Foreign Relations to make a full and complete study and investigation of ways and means by which personnel of the Foreign Service of the United States may be more effectively recruited and trained, with particular reference to the desirability of improving and implementing the program of the existing Foreign Service Institute, or, as an alternative, the establishment of a new Foreign Service Academy.

It was subsequently decided that the committee staff should make a study of the subject covered by my resolution. The staff has recently completed its study which has been printed as a committee print entitled "Recruitment and Training for the Foreign Service of the United States." The study, which has been prepared with the full cooperation of appropriate officials of the State Department, is very thorough and searching within its scope.

It contains a draft bill providing legislative proposals designed to implement the recommendations of the staff to improve recruitment and training for the Foreign Service. I have reviewed the staff's study and its recommendations and am very pleased to offer a bill to implement the recommendations of the staff and particularly pleased to have Mr. MANSFIELD, who is a member of the Foreign Relations Committee, join me in the introduction of this bill.

I commend to my colleagues the study on recruitment and training for the Foreign Service. It sets forth in much detail and with much background the need for this bill. The study goes into the recommendations of the Wriston committee report, "Toward a Foreign Service," issued in June 1954, dealing with recruitment and training and the State Department's record of implementing those recommendations. I do not wish to take the time of the Senate to discuss all these details and background.

I would say only now briefly that I am sure we all recognize the tremendous importance to our country that we be well represented abroad. We need a strong Foreign Service staffed with well-qualified and well-trained people just as much as we need strong military services staffed with well-qualified and well-trained people. I think that generally speaking we have such services.

This bill will materially assist in assuring that we continue to have a strong Foreign Service and will also provide for the strengthening of one particular aspect of the Foreign Service which in my judgment needs strengthening. This is the matter of foreign language ability. I think it is very important that our Foreign Service representatives abroad have a good working knowledge of the language of the countries to which they are posted. There are too many instances now where this is not the case. This bill will go a long way toward correcting this deficiency.

In closing I want to compliment our Foreign Relations Committee and its entire staff, and in particular, Dr. Carl Marcy, the chief of the staff, and Mr. George C. Denney, Jr., the staff member who I understand did the largest share of the work on the study, for the excellent job they have done. I would also pay my respects to Deputy Under Secretary of State for Administration Loy W. Henderson and Dr. Harold B. Hoskins, Director of the Foreign Service Institute, and their associates for the fine cooperation which I understand they gave to the Foreign Relations Committee and its staff during the preparation of the study and for what they are doing for the benefit of our country in working for a strong Foreign Service.

AMENDMENT OF EMPLOYMENT ACT OF 1946, RELATING TO PRODUCTIVE CAPITAL INVESTMENTS

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, on several occasions recently, I have spoken in the Senate about the current controversy over the budget recently submitted by the President. A week has not passed since it was submitted that there has not occurred in this body a debate, sometimes a very heated one, over the state of balance in that budget. We have heard argued whether it really is balanced, whether it ought to be balanced, and if it is, who is responsible, and if it is not, who is responsible for that.

In my opinion, much and perhaps all of this debate has been meaningless. I, for one, do not know any more about the budget than I would have known without the debate.

But I do know one thing: the form in which the Nation's budget is now presented to Congress and the Nation is totally inadequate in terms of helping us judge whether or not that budget provides for the needs of the American people.

We are going at our national budgeting like the proverbial blind men who tried to describe an elephant by feeling it. The Republicans in this body have grasped only the tail of the budget; they know only that its last, final figures are in balance, and over and over again they have been telling us: "Ah, it is a balanced budget, therefore it must be a good one."

Well, some of the rest of us have been doing a little more groping around, and we are increasingly concerned about the things that are not to be found in it.

Today I am introducing once again a bill that I think can do much to help us understand the budget. My bill is a capital budget bill; in simple terms, it calls for a separation in the budget between operating expenditures and capital investments. Under the present system, we have no knowledge of the elementary facts on which every private corporation bases its decisions—namely, which outlays are for current operating expenses and which are investments for which full and systematic repayment is planned.

COMING STUDY BY JOINT ECONOMIC COMMITTEE

I say it is time we put the National Government on a businesslike basis.

But before I go further into that subject, I want to mention the fact that the Joint Economic Committee, under the chairmanship of the Senator from Illinois, has been given the green light to proceed with what I believe, and hope, will be a landmark in our understanding of national economic forces. The idea of my bill is, I feel, closely related to this study.

The basic question before the committee will be whether or not reasonable prosperity and high level of employment must inevitably be accompanied by rising prices. Or, how can we have prosperity and full employment without having inflation?

A related question before the committee is that of economic growth, and its part in stabilizing the price level as well as providing sufficient jobs for all Americans who seek work.

This body passed the Employment Act of 1946 13½ years ago. The version actually approved by the Senate was considerably more far reaching than the version that finally became law.

I was an original cosponsor of S. 380 when it was introduced in the Senate. Few laws enacted since then have greater significance for the Nation and its future than that one, and I am proud to be numbered among such authors of it as the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY].

More than any other single piece of legislation, the Employment Act was a product of the great depression. It was the expression of the Nation's fervent hope and prayer that the disaster of economic depression might never again visit our land, and that the Federal Government had a responsibility and an obligation to see that it did not.

Unfortunately, 13 years later we still do not know exactly where we are going in terms of economic growth and whether our rate of growth is sufficient to provide both the necessary number of jobs and a stable price system. There is much economic evidence to indicate that rising prices over the last decade are due to an increasing power of industry to fix its

own prices, regardless of market conditions. Price competition seems to be disappearing; the price level does not fall as consumer incomes fall—we saw that last year when prices resisted the decline in consumer purchasing power.

Economic growth, and by that I mean competitive growth, is the free enterprise system's greatest weapon against administered prices.

I want the members of the Joint Economic Committee, and particularly their great chairman who is a leading authority on this whole subject, to know just how important I think their study is to the future of the Nation.

Today I am offering an amendment to the Employment Act of 1946, and that is why I have prefaced my remarks with this reference. The Employment Act has not been amended in any significant way since it was passed. It remains an expression of policy, rather than a program to assure the country against the twin disasters of depression and runaway inflation.

BILL INTENDED TO HELP ACHIEVE PURPOSES OF EMPLOYMENT ACT

My amendment does not offer any economic plan. But it does offer an economic tool.

It adds to the declaration of policy of the Employment Act by declaring an additional policy of separating capital from operating expenditures in order to assist in achieving the economic goals already stated in the act.

The bill also directs the Council of Economic Advisers to recommend, for inclusion in the Economic Report, a minimum and maximum program of proposed capital investments.

It then provides that in addition to the budget figures he now submits, the President shall add figures differentiating between operating expenses and capital investments.

In general terms, this is known as a capital budget. It is the kind used by corporations, by many of our large cities, by some States, and by many foreign countries to show which expenditures in the budget are really investments and will be repaid to the Treasury.

Proposals for a capital budget have been before the Congress for many years.

PRECEDENT IN TAFT AMENDMENT

A form of it was actually offered by Senator Taft as an amendment to the Employment Act. Much of the controversy in the Senate over that bill involved the same arguments heard on the floor today—will the budget be unbalanced? Do we dare incur more national debt? Who is responsible for adding on to the national debt?

Senators Taft and Radcliffe offered an amendment to the Employment Act that would have brought a considerable degree of order out of the chaotic discussions of the budget and whether it is really unbalanced.

Their amendment provided, and I quote:

> That any program of Federal investment and expenditure for the fiscal year 1948, or any subsequent fiscal year when the Nation is at peace, shall be accompanied by a program of taxation over a period comprising the year in question and a reasonable number of years thereafter, designed and calculated to prevent during that year any net increase in the national debt (other than debt incurred for self-liquidating and other reimbursable expenditures) without interfering with the goal of full employment.

The exclusion of debt incurred for self-liquidating and other reimbursable expenditures from the definition of public debt is the second major budgeting provision of my bill.

It may surprise Senators to know that the Taft-Radcliffe amendment was adopted by a rollcall vote of 82 to 0.

In defining the terms of his amendment, Senator Taft said this about it:

> As a matter of fact, I have been very liberal because I exclude debts incurred for self-liquidating projects, which mean irrigation projects, such as Boulder Dam, any large expenditures which are self-liquidating and will pay themselves off, and other reimbursable expenditures.
>
> I would even except loans. We may question whether they will be paid, of course, but, so far as the system of taxation is concerned, I would not require that taxation be levied to such an extent as to bring in the amount of money needed to make the loans. (Sept. 28, 1945, C.R. vol. 91, p. 9134.)

The definition of self-liquidating investments in my bill is much stricter than the one contemplated by Senator Taft, because it requires full repayment of both interest and principal.

Madison Avenue coined a new word early last fall for the present occupant of the White House, and now he uses it with abandon. This word is the "spenders." He is putting this label on the Democrats at every possible moment. His simple approach bodes no distinction between operating expenditures and capital investments, yet for his corporation buddies this distinction goes to the very heart of corporate finance.

Just how businesslike a proposal my bill is was emphasized in the report of the first Hoover Commission.

HOOVER COMMISSION RECOMMENDED CAPITAL BUDGET

In 1949, the desirability of a capital budget got further recognition in the report of the first Hoover Commission.

In its report on budgeting and accounting, the Hoover Commission recommended the separation of capital outlays in the budget upon its presentation to Congress. I quote the Commission report on "Budgeting and Accounting," as follows:

> There is, at present, constant confusion in Federal budgeting and accounting because current expenditures and capital outlays are intermingled. These two types of expenditures are essentially different in character, and should, therefore, be shown separately under each major function or activity in the budget. This is an important feature of performance budgeting.
>
> The appropriations for capital purposes, provided each year, are usually only a part of the total cost of the numerous projects which the Federal Government is initiating or has under way. Many of these appropriations are made for a year's work on a given project without an adequate understanding of the total previous expenditure and the cost commitment which has been authorized in order to have a complete structure or improvement. This is not good business on the part of the Federal Government.
>
> While capital projects may be carefully analyzed for usefulness, timeliness, and total probable costs at the time of original authorization, the total remaining costs of all capital projects should be set forth in the budget each year, together with costs incurred to date. These costs should be revised in succeeding years to keep them current with later developments.
>
> Recommendation No. 3: We recommend that the budget estimates of all operating departments and agencies of the Government should be divided into two primary categories—current operating expenditures and capital outlays.
>
> The use of this type budgeting has been demonstrated by the budgeting of Government corporations under the Government Corporation Control Act of 1945. Government corporation budgeting practice at the present time amounts to a partial adoption of many of these simplifications based upon functional budgeting, accurate accounting, and separation of capital outlays from current expenditures. It has greatly added to flexibility of management and to simplification of budgeting, accounting, and audit.

Since that time, several bills have been offered in Congress to direct the President to submit the budget in that form. My own bill of 1949 carried such a directive. At that time, I did not regard it as a capital budget, but I think the term is general enough as it is now understood, to apply to a simple separation of operating and capital expenditures.

A budget of this kind would mean that the Federal Government would be practicing what it preaches; it would be keeping the same kind of books that it requires of its taxpayers.

The Internal Revenue Service and all of the Federal regulatory agencies have issued voluminous and exacting accounting instructions and systems requiring all corporations and other business enterprises to conform to the fundamental business practice of distinguishing between operating expenditures and capital investments. If we are to have a businesslike administration of the Government, as well as one that makes possible a reasonable estimate of our economic growth, it seems obvious that a minimum requirement would be the adoption of the same standards of bookkeeping by the Federal Government as the Federal Government requires of private business enterprises, and which they use themselves as a means of judging their expenditures.

I wish to make clear that I do not stand unmovably on all the terms of this particular bill.

In 1949, the capital budget provision in my general budget and tax reform bill provided simply, and I quote from my bill of that year:

> Federal budgetary practice shall be revised to distinguish between operating and capital expenditures, and in transmitting to the Congress the estimates called for in section 201 of the Budget and Accounting Act of 1921, as amended, the President shall, to the extent and in such detail as may be feasible (a) separate operating expenditures from capital, developmental, and recoverable expenditures, and (b) estimate of capital, developmental and recoverable expenditures by agencies and/or purposes of the 6 ensuing fiscal years.

The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] has also introduced capital budget legislation in recent Congresses

that simply directs the President to make this distinction under such definitions and terms as he deems appropriate.

It may well be that that is all that is needed. My bill this year is framed in the Employment Act because by so doing, I hope to relate the usefulness of the capital budget to the issue of the Nation's growth.

I am very anxious that the appropriate committees of Congress take up this matter. It would be useful, I think, for other capital budget bills to be introduced that might be referred to other committees so we could get a wider legislative discussion of the subject.

BILL DOES NOT ELIMINATE PRESENT BUDGET

Let me make a brief reference to some of the objections that have been raised against capital budgeting. I recognize, of course, that economists are not unanimously in favor of it. I shall not present any exhaustive review of opinions pro and con because a committee hearing is the place for that. And I have already referred to the Hoover Commission report on this matter.

One authority on Federal budgeting, Prof. Arthur Smithies, in his book "The Budgetary Process in the United States" makes out a mild case both for and against it. His objections seem to depend mainly upon the taxation and spending policies he assumes would accompany a capital budget.

I mention this because it should be understood that my bill does not substitute a capital budget for the present one. It adds a capital breakdown to the estimates as they are presently submitted. Certainly the qualms of economists about an exclusively capital budget should be allayed by the fact that I am only asking for a submission of these estimates along with the present form of the budget.

As a matter of fact, in 1947, I requested and received from the Budget Bureau a capital expenditure breakdown of the budget we then had before us. The Budget Director, Mr. Webb, provided me with a list of all outlays in the budget the President had submitted that would fall into the classification of capital expenditures; it came to $7,341,062,000 out of a total budget of $37.5 billion.

I suppose the purpose of my bill could be achieved if I were to ask for such a breakdown each year and then put it into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, as I did in 1947. But we should be more systematic than that; and the outlays should be related to the capital investment needs of the country through the machinery of the Council of Economic Advisers and the President's Economic Report.

OTHER OBJECTIVES STEM FROM BUDGETARY ABUSES

During the 1930's, many European governments resorted to dual and even triple budgets in order to handle the extraordinary deficits caused by the depression. Budgetary devices were also used in those days to cover up rearmament which was sometimes going on in violation of treaties.

Unfortunately, that turbulent depression era of dual and extraordinary budgeting tended to scare people away from legitimate reform.

Because of this recent history we should be extremely cautious to insure that when the United States adopts the capital budget that it be done on a conservative basis and in the direction of a more responsible government.

Both Presidents Roosevelt and Truman took some tentative steps toward the capital budget idea, but that period of budgetary evolution was chiefly occupied with the development of the performance or program budget idea which has now largely been adopted.

In my opinion, a capital budget is the next logical step in the process of budget reform.

NO PREFERENCE IMPLIED IN THIS DISTINCTION

My final point is this: The fact that the reimbursable expenditures would be separated in a capital budget in no way implies that revenue-consuming expenditures are less necessary or desirable.

No one of us would vote against a ~~justified~~ defense expenditure on the ground that it is not revenue producing. Such an outlay would be wealth protecting; it is possible to think of many examples of defense expenditures that we would give preference to over a revenue-producing project.

When we consider proposals for other Federal expenditures, as for example, financial aid to the States for education, we get into another area where a nonreimbursable outlay is just as much an investment in the future of America as a reimbursable one. It has been shown that the money the Government spent for the World War II GI bill has been repaid many times in the higher taxes these veterans have paid as a result of the education they received from the GI bill.

When we have some experience with capital budgeting, we may find ways of refining these programs. That is why I have left wide discretion up to the President in making the distinction, guided only by the rules now used by the Internal Revenue Service. Beyond that basic division of expenditures into two categories, capital and operating, however, I have then asked the President to refine the capital outlays to show those having a useful economic life of 10 years or more which are self-liquidating. These would be excluded from the public debt. I would anticipate that Federal grants for construction programs would be classified as capital expenditures rather than operating, but would not fall into the reimbursable category with FHA loans, power projects, and the like.

I put no premium on the desirability of one group of expenditures over another. I expect to work just as hard in the next few weeks to get passed a bill making grants to the States for school construction and teachers' salaries as I will be working for appropriations to start construction of Green Peter Dam.

But when we have a capital budget showing that the funds for Green Peter Dam will be repaid, we may find that $1 billion a year for education is not only an essential improvement but one we can afford better than we thought. We would also be able to see just how much of the grant now being proposed for education would go into capital assets, namely, new classrooms.

My plea, therefore, is not that we plan through this bill for any new national program. It is simply that we adopt a device for classifying expenditures that will give us a better picture of where we are going, and where we should be going. I hope the appropriate congressional committees will give some study to the role a capital budget could play in clarifying the great economic decisions the Nation makes through its budget.

I ask consent that my bill lie on the desk for 1 week so that Senators wishing to cosponsor it may do so before the bill is printed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from Oregon.

The bill (S. 1244) to amend the Employment Act of 1946 to establish policies with respect to productive capital investments of the Government, introduced by Mr. MORSE (for himself, Mr. PROXMIRE, and Mr. BARTLETT), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Government Operations.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have the bill printed in the RECORD, together with a section-by-section analysis of it, which I have prepared.

There being no objection, the bill and section-by-section analysis were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Employment Act Amendments of 1959".

DECLARATION OF POLICY

SEC. 2. Section 2 of the Employment Act of 1946 is amended by inserting "(a)" after the section number and by adding thereto the following subsection:

"(b) To assist in achieving these objectives it is the further policy of the Federal Government (1) to distinguish between its operating expenditures and capital investments, (2) to exclude certain productive capital investments from the public debt, and (3) to retire the public debt."

FUNCTIONS OF COUNCIL OF ECONOMIC ADVISERS

SEC. 3. Section 4(c) of such Act (relating to the duties and functions of the Council of Economic Advisers) is amended by changing the designation of paragraph (5) to (6) and inserting after paragraph (4) a new paragraph (5) to read as follows:

"(5) to evaluate each year the Federal budgetary situation as related to the prospective gross national product and other economic indicators and needs, and to recommend, for inclusion in the Economic Report, a minimum and maximum program of proposed capital investments, including, on a segregated basis, productive capital investments for the next fiscal year, and a six-year projection of such proposed investments;"

CAPITAL BUDGET

SEC. 4. (a) Such Act is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"SEC. 6. (a) In transmitting to Congress the estimates called for in section 201 of the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921, as amended, the President shall also—

"(1) to the extent and in such detail as he shall designate by Executive order (and so

far as practicable consistent with the practices of the Internal Revenue Service) distinguish between operating expenditures and capital investments of the Government, and further set forth the productive capital investments, including mortgage loans, which have a useful economic life of more than ten years and which are revenue producing or self-liquidating in nature;

"(2) advise the Congress as to the progress made in identifying and computing capital investments and more particularly such productive capital investments; and in computing the public debt exclude therefrom an amount equal to such productive capital investments;

"(3) advise the Congress as to a minimum and maximum program of proposed capital investments, including, on a segregated basis, productive capital investments for the next fiscal year, and a six-year projection of such proposed investments; and

"(4) advise the Congress as to the amount of the public debt as computed in accordance with this section and of the effect of the proposed budgetary program upon the retirement of the public debt.

"(b) The amount of obligations issued to finance productive capital investments shall not be considered a part of the public debt for the purpose of limitations on the public debt contained in section 21 of the Second Liberty Bond Act, as amended."

(b) The amendment made by this section shall be effective with respect to each budget transmitted to the Congress pursuant to section 201 of the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921, as amended, after the date of enactment of this Act.

APPLICATION OF GOVERNMENT CORPORATION CONTROL ACT

SEC. 5. The provisions of the Government Corporation Control Act, as amended, with respect to budgets, reporting, auditing, and accounting, shall apply to the functions exercised by any officer or agency of the Government proposing the investment of Federal bond proceeds in productive capital, to the same extent as applicable to wholly owned Government corporations.

The section-by-section analysis presented by Mr. MORSE is as follows:

SECTION-BY-SECTION ANALYSIS
ADDS TO DECLARATION OF POLICY

Section 2 amends the declaration of policy of the Employment Act of 1946 in three ways. In order to assist in achieving the goals already set forth in the Employment Act, my bill further declares it to be the policy of Congress to distinguish between operating expenditures and capital investments in order to clarify and make more logical the conduct of Federal financial operations including the budgetary, accounting and appropriative processes.

This, of course, has implications not only for the operating statement of the Federal Government but also for its balance sheet, therefore the second declaration of policy.

The second policy addition permits the Federal Government to exclude from the computation of the public debt certain productive capital investments as defined in section 4.

The third declaration of policy calls for retirement of the public debt.

These three further declarations supplement and implement the existing policies of the Employment Act of 1946. Whatever the Federal Government does directly to promote maximum employment and the other objectives of the Act would be expressed for the most part in the annual budget message. The budget would then be the Government's fiscal plan of action for the ensuing year.

NEW DUTIES FOR COUNCIL OF ECONOMIC ADVISERS

Section 3 adds a new paragraph to section 4(c) of the Employment Act of 1946 relating to the duties of the Council of Economic Advisers by directing the Council to recommend for inclusion in the Economic Report, a minimum and maximum program of proposed capital investments. This recommendation would be submitted to show productive capital investments for the next fiscal year and a 6-year projection of such proposed investments.

This paragraph should facilitate coordination and consistency between the Economic Report and the annual budget message.

CAPITAL BUDGET

Section 4 adds the new subtitle "Capital Budget" at the end of the Employment Act of 1946, and provides the mechanisms and basic definitions for carrying out the policies set forth in section 2.

Section 4(a) adds to the Employment Act of 1946 a new section 6 calling upon the President in addition to his other duties under the Budget and Accounting Act of 1921 to do four things as set forth in paragraphs (1), (2), (3), and (4).

Paragraph (1) asks the President to submit the annual budget in a form which distinguishes between operating expenditures and capital investments. He is given broad flexibility in defining these terms and as the new procedure evolves he may change the definitions. All these details are to be handled by Executive order of the President.

One guiding suggestion is given to the President in that it is to be "so far as practicable consistent with the practices of the Internal Revenue Service." This should avoid the double standard problem which now prevails as between Federal business and private business in regard to the bookkeeping for capital investments.

Then within the capital investment category the President is asked further to separate out those certain productive capital investments which meet both of two tests, (1) that they represent a useful economic life of over 10 years, and (2) that they are revenue producing or self-liquidating in nature.

The 10-year economic service life is used as a basic test in order to exclude automobiles and other equipment which generally are on a 10-year or less depreciation period.

The second test is that the productive capital investment must be revenue producing or self-liquidating; this is intended to insure the repayment of both principal and interest.

Municipal and State governments have evolved a distinction between general obligation bonds, which are tax supported, and revenue bonds, which are supported only from revenues. This basic difference is here applied to the Federal productive capital investments without going as far as the Hoover Commission recommendation of issuing revenue bonds for each such Federal revenue producing activity.

It is not proposed to change the types of Federal bonds and other borrowings, nor to segregate the income from the projects in separate funds. The differentiation is only made in the budgets, accounts and appropriations records of the Government.

Mortgage loans, such as REA and FHA loans, are included in productive capital investments, because they meet both tests.

The net worth of Federal corporations and similar activities, such as Bonneville Power Administration, should be treated as productive capital investments.

Flood control dams would not meet the test of revenue producing. Irrigation investment would not meet the test of interest repayment. Farm crop mortgages would not meet the test of revenue nor the test of 10 years life. Thus none of these capital investments would qualify as productive capital investment as here defined. The definition is intentionally severe. The productive capital investment is treated in much the same manner as if each such activity were financed strictly by means of revenue bonds.

Paragraph (2) modifies the definition of the public debt so as to exclude an amount equal to the productive capital investments. Utilizing this interrelated definition the President is required to advise Congress annually as to the level of capital investments and, as a part thereof, the productive capital investments, and the residual public debt.

This requires, of course, an identification of the presently existing productive capital investments of the Federal Government such as FHA, REA and other gilt-edge loans, the net worth of Government corporations and such long range revenue-producing assets as hydroelectic facilities, the Alaska Railroad, the St. Lawrence Seaway and many others. These would reduce the public debt to a much more meaningful figure.

Paragraph (3) asks the President to employ these distinctions in presenting his budget and to include therewith a 6-year projection of proposed investments.

Paragraph (4) asks the President to advise the Congress annually as to the amount of the public debt and the effect of the proposed budgetary program upon the retirement of the public debt.

One of the major perspectives of this bill is implicit in the otherwise paradoxical situation which simultaneously justifies an increase and a decrease in the public debt. In boom times when Government revenues are high and there is inflationary pressure it is appropriate to decrease the public debt. Yet at the same time the Government must go ahead with certain productive capital investments.

This bill eliminates this paradox because it distinguishes between what is sometimes called "live weight debt" from "dead weight debt." In certain areas it will be desirable for the Government to increase its "live weight debt" namely for productive capital investments. But these amounts should not be confused with the "dead weight debt" which is the net national debt.

Subsection 6(b) amends section 21 of the Second Liberty Bond Act, by stating that the amount of obligations issued to finance productive capital investments shall not be considered a part of the public debt for the purpose of debt limitations.

Section 4(b) states the effective date of this act.

Section 5 under the subtitle "Application of Government Corporation Control Act" adds the requirements that Federal officers and agencies which propose investment of Federal bond funds in productive capital shall observe the Government Corporation Control Act with respect to budgets, reports, audits, and accounts.

Thus the bill interrelates various existing laws such as the Budgeting and Accounting Act, Employment Act, Public Debt Act, and Government Corporation Control Act by providing a common terminology and financial reference.

This system of terminology and financial reference will not preclude the making of Federal grants and subsidies and the handling of other operating expenditures, but these will all fall generally under the category of operating expenditures. Nor is this to say that the intrinsic benefit-to-cost ratio of a dollar grant for education may not be double that of some certain proposed productive capital investment.

Given a few years of experience with capital budgeting these additional finer distinctions may commend themselves to the President and the Congress. This bill represents a starting point for this rational process. It will be and must be evolutionary in its unfolding.

It is the perspective of this bill to contrast the long run and the short run, to flag the difference between the revenue producing St. Lawrence Seaway and the revenue consuming defense expenditure. This bill puts the pluses and minuses of our budgetary puzzle into two separate columns.

Mr. PROXMIRE subsequently said: Mr. President, I am happy, indeed, to join the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] as a sponsor of his bill to amend the Employment Act of 1946 by providing for the submission by the President of a capital budget, to accompany the regular budget as now submitted.

The provisions of this bill are a moderate and constructive first step in making the Federal budget procedures more understandable and meaningful, both to Congress and to the public. In my opinion, it will accomplish vitally important improvements in our Federal budget procedure.

Under the present budget there is no distinction between a 100 percent sound Government loan, which is sure to be repaid to the Government on the one hand, and spending for a plane, a tank, or a Government salary, which is sure not to be repaid on the other.

This is wrong. It is unwise. It is self-deceptive. It is self-defeating. It prevents the Government from making investments that will help the taxpayer as well as the economic strength of the economy. This is true because the soundest kind of Government loans are treated in the budget as spending. There is enormously strong pressure on Members of the Senate, with real wisdom behind it, to vote to keep the Federal Government from spending more than it is taking in. The consequence of this pressure is not simply to put pressure on Members of the Senate to vote against real spending. The pressure on Members of Congress is to vote against Government loans no matter how sound, how conservative, or how sensible they may be from any standpoint.

This pressure is just as unwise and unfortunate in its consequence on the Government as it would be on a family that steadfastly refused to invest their idle savings in savings bonds because such a loan to Government under Federal bookkeeping procedures would be considered spending.

There is a fundamental difference between spending and investment. Yet, this is not shown clearly in our present budget procedures. Investments such as loans for rural electrification, Small Business Administration loans, or outlays for construction of hydroelectric projects are self-liquidating and wealth creating, in exactly the same way as a businessman's investment in productive machinery, buildings, land, and other productive property are.

Surely these investments by the Federal Government need to be differentiated from spending for current operations. There are times when it might be extremely unwise to curb investments which are wealth creating, even when the need might be particularly acute to cut the cost of operating the Government to the bone. In fact, the same conditions that make severe economy on current operations of the Government urgently necessary may make it of utmost importance to maintain or to expand the Government's rate of investment in wealth-creating projects. This is exactly what occurs frequently in the case of private businesses: When overhead operating costs are excessively high, the wise course for the businessman is to cut those costs to the bone, while increasing his investments in productive property so as to expand his base of income-creating capital in order to provide a more adequate base to support his overhead operating costs.

The support for the budgetary reform provided for in this bill which has been given by the late Senator Robert Taft, and the second Hoover Commission, is a most impressive endorsement of this purpose. This is a step which it is long overdue for our Government to take. It will give to Congress and to the public an effective tool for more conservative and enlightened management of our Nation's finances and economic policies, toward the end that we can achieve greater control over inflationary tendencies resulting from governmental policies, better selection of alternative governmental policies, and more effective contributions by Government policy toward the goal we all seek for our Nation—constantly rising living standards, fulfillment of public needs for schools, health, and other services, fully adequate national defenses, and rigorous economy in the operations of the Government.

PROMOTION OF MINING AND DEVELOPMENT RESEARCH FOR BERYL, CHROMITE, AND COLUMBIUM-TANTALUM

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, during times of defense emergencies chrome is of the highest strategic importance. Despite that fact, our Government is following a policy concerning the production of chromite ore which I believe is of extremely questionable wisdom. If we were to be faced with a serious defense emergency tomorrow, we would have only two sources of chromite ore—that which we import from foreign sources, and that which constitutes our present national defense stockpile.

As a member of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, I feel that we should be prepared at all times to meet the Nation's needs for strategic metals and that we should not be called upon to rely solely on foreign sources and upon stockpiles that would dwindle swiftly under the pressures of defense requirements. Our reliance upon foreign sources of strategic metals is particularly shortsighted because I recall vividly the difficulties we faced during the early days of World War II when our shipping lanes were exposed to constant danger of submarine attack.

Wise planning for defense emergency requires that we keep our domestic mining industry on at least a minimal operating basis to assure an existing and an expandable source of supply on short notice.

Mr. President, let us consider chrome for a moment. The production of strategic chromite ore on the west coast has been at a standstill for almost a year. The stockpiling program was called to an abrupt halt with the closing of the Federal Government's chrome depot at Grants Pass, Ore. A substantial number of the chrome miners in my State belong to the category of small business operators. When they shut down their mining operations they did not automatically shut off the expenses of maintaining their mines in standby condition. In fact, in most instances if these chrome miners did not expend money in keeping their mines in good condition they would be faced ultimately with staggering costs of mine rehabilitation operations.

Mr. President, in order that these mine operators may be placed at least on a minimum operating basis, I am today introducing a bill which is designed to promote mining and development research for chromite and for two other highly strategic minerals, beryl and columbium-tantalum. I ask that this bill be received and referred to the appropriate committee, and I express the hope that the committee may take prompt action on this legislative proposal.

The bill I have introduced provides an incentive for domestic chromite producers. It will not assure the miners the profit to which they are really entitled, but it will give them enough of an incentive to keep the mines in operating condition and to produce at least modest quantities of ore. My bill is framed so as to give every possible assistance to the small producer. For example, the bill contains a limit of 5,000 long dry tons for any one producer annually under the program, and an overall limitation 50,000 long dry tons for all producers.

Mr. President, this legislative proposal is designed primarily to be of assistance to the small producer who constitutes the backbone of our strategic minerals production during periods when the needs of the Nation for these metals are urgent. For the strength and safety of the Nation we should keep these small operators in business. My bill is a step in that direction.

The bill is being introduced on behalf of myself, the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY].

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1245) to promote mining and development research for beryl, chromite, and columbium-tantalum from domestic mines, introduced by Mr.

MORSE (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized and directed to establish and maintain a program of incentive payments to domestic producers of beryl, chromite, and columbium-tantalum in order to promote mining and development research for these minerals, as provided in this Act.

SEC. 2. (a) The production incentive payments authorized by this Act shall be made for the folowing minerals newly mined from deposits located within the United States, its Territories and possessions, in the amounts and subject to the limitations herein specified:

(1) For beryl concentrates (10 per centum BeO basis), $70 per short ton, with premiums and penalties as set forth in the regulations issued pursuant to this Act, for not more than one thousand short tons annually. Incentive payments shall not be made for production in any one year on more than one hundred and fifty short tons originating in any one mining district from properties controlled by any one producer.

(2) For commercial grade metallurgical chromite (46 per centum basis), $16 per long dry ton for the first one thousand long dry tons produced each year by each producer, and $35 per long dry ton for each additional long dry ton produced in such year by such producer, with premiums and penalties as set forth in the regulations issued pursuant to this Act. Incentive payments shall not be made for production in any one year of more than fifty thousand long dry tons by all producers or more than five thousand long dry tons by any one producer.

(3) For commercially acceptable columbium-tantalum concentrates (basis 50 per centum contained combined pentoxides), $2.35 per pound of contained combined pentoxides with ratios of $Ta_2O_5Cb_2O_5$, with premiums and penalties as set forth in the regulations issued pursuant to this Act, for not more than fifty thousand pounds annually. Incentive payments shall not be made for production in any one year on more than ten thousand pounds originating in any one mining district from properties controlled by any one producer.

(b) The incentive payment program for any of these materials shall not be initiated until the termination of existing purchase programs of the Federal Government for that material set forth in the regulations issued under authority of the Strategic and Critical Materials Stockpiling Act (53 Stat. 811), as amended; the Defense Production Act of 1950 (64 Stat. 793), as amended; and the Domestic Tungsten, Asbestos, Fluorspar, and Columbium-Tantalum Production and Purchase Act of 1956 (70 Stat. 579), as the case may be.

(c) No incentive payment shall be made pursuant to the provisions of this Act except upon presentation of evidence satisfactory to the Secretary that the material has been produced and sold in accordance with regulations issued under this Act. For the purpose of this Act, material shall be deemed to be sold, whether or not payment therefor has been received, whenever the producer disposes of, or irrevocably empowers another to dispose of, all of his right, title and interest therein (excepting only a bona fide security interest) to a consumer, mill, processing plant, cooperative marketing agent, or dealer therein.

SEC. 3. The provisions of this Act shall take effect on the first day of the first quarter next following the date of enactment of this Act, and shall terminate on June 30, 1964.

SEC. 4. The Secretary is authorized to establish and promulgate such regulations and require such reports as he deems necessary to carry out the purposes of this Act, but such regulations shall assure equitable distribution of the benefits of the programs provided by this Act throughout the domestic industries affected.

SEC. 5. The Secretary may delegate any of the functions authorized by this Act to the Administrator of General Services.

SEC. 6. (a) For the purposes of this Act—

(1) The term "Secretary" means the Secretary of the Interior.

(2) The term "producer" means any individual, partnership, corporation, or other legal entity engaged in producing ores or concentrates from mines within the United States, its Territories or possessions.

(3) The term "newly mined" means domestic material severed from the land or processed into concentrates subsequent to the date of enactment of this Act, and normal inventories of crude ore then existing. The term does not refer to material recovered from mine dumps, mill tailings, or from smelter slags and residues derived from material mined prior to the date of enactment of this Act.

(4) The term "produced in any one year", and similar terms, include normal inventories of crude ore existing at the beginning of that year.

(5) The term "quarter" means the calendar periods commencing on the first day of the months of January, April, July, and October.

(b) For the purposes of this Act, the Secretary may determine what constitutes a mining district and what constitutes a single operating unit producing ores, and, in the event that more than one producer claims payment for sales from production of a single operating unit, the Secretary may determine the quantity of sales for each such producer to which the above limitations shall apply.

SEC. 7. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated, to remain available until expended, such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act.

SEC. 8. The Secretary shall make semiannual reports with respect to operations under this Act not later than March 1, and September 1, of each year, to the Committees on Interior and Insular Affairs and the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and House of Representatives. Any such report shall contain such recommendations as the Secretary may deem appropriate.

SEC. 9. Any person who willfully violates any provisions of this Act or any regulation issued under this Act shall upon conviction be fined not more than $10,000 or imprisoned for not more than ten years, or both.

FEDERAL RESPONSIBILITY TOWARD INDIANS

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I submit, for appropriate reference, a concurrent resolution sponsored by the distinguished junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER] and myself.

The effect of this concurrent resolution would be to restate the Federal obligation toward Indians. House Concurrent Resolution 108, adopted by the 83d Congress, has been misinterpreted. It has raised fears among Indians that the Federal Government was going to withdraw from responsibility toward some groups of Indians before they were suitably prepared for such action.

I think all of us will agree that eventually Federal responsibility toward Indians will be terminated. However, as this resolution states, "the relationship between the Federal Government and any Indian tribe or group should not be terminated unless such tribe or group has clearly demonstrated that it understands the plan under which such a program terminating Federal supervision and control would go forward, and that the tribe or group affected concurs in and supports the plan proposed."

Furthermore, this concurrent resolution points up the primary importance of Indian attainment of equality in health and education, with appropriate Federal aid, before Federal responsibility is ended.

Mr. President, I believe this concurrent resolution can and will enjoy wide support on both sides of the aisle. The concurrent resolution frankly is based upon a speech made by the Secretary of Interior in Flagstaff, Ariz., on September 18, 1958. The text of the concurrent resolution and a copy of the Secretary's speech will be inserted following these remarks.

I am willing, Mr. President, to accept the words of the administration's spokesman on Indian policy and give them the force of congressional approval.

The cosponsor of this concurrent resolution, the junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER] is a conscientious student of Indian affairs. I am proud to be associated with him in the sponsorship of the concurrent resolution. During the 85th Congress, as chairman of the Indian Affairs Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, a position which he also holds in the 86th Congress, the junior Senator from Oregon conducted long hearings on the subject of Federal Indian policy, taking testimony from representatives of many Indian tribes, as well as their legal advisers and officials of the Department of Interior.

Mr. President, I believe that the adoption of this concurrent resolution can be a milestone of progress in the unhappy history of this Government's relations with the first Americans.

In the belief that other Members of the Senate may wish to join in cosponsorship of this resolution, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution lie on the table for additional cosponsorship until Friday, March 6.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the concurrent resolution, together with the speech of the Secretary of the Interior to which I have made reference, may be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The concurrent resolution will be received and appropriately referred, and, under the rule, the concurrent resolution will be printed in the RECORD; and, without objection, the speech will be printed in the RECORD.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 12) to restate Federal responsibility toward Indians and the Federal Government's relation with Indian tribes or groups, submitted by Mr. MURRAY (for himself and Mr. NEUBERGER), was re-

ferred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, as follows:

Whereas the policy of the 83d Congress expressed in House Concurrent Resolution 108, agreed to August 1, 1953, with respect to according Indians the privileges and responsibilities applicable to others, and to ending their status as wards of the United States, has been misinterpreted as proposing unilateral termination by the Federal Government of trusteeship over Indians prior to the time the tribes concerned may be willing and able to have removed from their tribal and individually allotted lands the protections of the trust restrictions against the encumbrance and loss of their lands now provided by law, without regard to the cultural differences and the economic disadvantages of the Indians concerned whereby they may be unable to compete on terms of equality with the non-Indian culture and economic advantages surrounding them; and further has been misinterpreted as calling for termination, without tribal consent, of tribal jurisdiction over its own members within reservation areas; and

Whereas the Secretary of the Interior on September 18, 1958, in Flagstaff, Ariz., stated that "no Indian tribe or group should end its relationship with the Federal Government unless such tribe or group has clearly demonstrated first, that it understands the plan under which such a program would go forward, and second, that the tribe or group affected concurs in and supports the plan proposed": Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That it is declared to be the sense of Congress (a) that House Concurrent Resolution 108, agreed to August 1, 1953, 83d Congress, shall be interpreted as stating an objective, not an immediate goal; (b) that the relationship between the Federal Government and any Indian tribe or group should not be terminated unless such tribe or group has clearly demonstrated that it understands the plan under which such a program terminating Federal supervision and control would go forward, and that the tribe or group affected concurs in and supports the plan proposed; (c) that no consideration shall be given to forcing upon an Indian tribe or group a so-called termination plan which does not have the understanding and acceptance of a clear majority of the members affected; (d) that no Indian tribe or group shall be cast into the stream of American life until and unless the educational level of that tribe or group is one which is equal to the responsibilities which it is shouldering; (e) that the goal shall be that of eventually attaining a position of parity for Indians with other Americans, socially and economically; (f) that tribes or groups should receive appropriate Federal aid if they are to finally attain the objectives toward which they and the Federal Government are cooperatively striving; and (g) that the attainment by Indians of a position of equality in health and education is a matter of primary importance to these goals, including both projects to assist those adults who have never attended school and to provide adult Indians between the ages of 18 and 35 with salable work skills thus to free them of dependency on reservation resources.

The speech of the Secretary of the Interior, presented by Mr. MURRAY, is as follows:

REMARKS BY SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR FRED A. SEATON, BROADCAST SEPTEMBER 18, 1958, OVER RADIO STATION KCLS, FLAGSTAFF, ARIZ., AND TO BE REBROADCAST SUBSEQUENTLY OVER RADIO STATIONS KTAR, PHOENIX, ARIZ., KIKO, GLOBE, ARIZ., AND KGAK, GALLUP, N. MEX.

For the past 2 days I have had the pleasure of visiting the Navajo country and, frankly, I am very much pleased and encouraged by what I have seen.

On August 1, 1953, House Concurrent Resolution No. 108 was adopted expressing the sense of the Congress of the United States to be that of ending the wardship status of Indian tribes as rapidly as possible. Certain additional provisions applied to Indian tribes located in the States of California, Florida, New York, and Texas, and to some other tribes in other States, with relation to the earliest possible elimination of Federal control over their persons and properties.

This stands as the most recent congressional declaration upon the subject.

Since that time—that is since 1953—the pros and cons of public opinion relative to congressional policy on Indian affairs have been given wide expression in the press and in other media throughout the country. Some people have interpreted these statements to mean that it is the intention of Congress and the Department of the Interior to abandon Indian groups regardless of their ability to fend for themselves.

In my opinion, the stated intentions of the Congress to free Indian tribes from Federal supervision, and to eliminate the need for the special services rendered by the Bureau of Indian Affairs to Indian citizens, is more than adequately counterbalanced in the congressional resolution itself. I now refer you to such qualifying phrases as, and I quote, "at the earliest possible time," and "at the earliest practicable date." The intent is clear, I believe. What the Congress intended was to state an objective, not an immediate goal.

Just today I discussed that matter with Senator BARRY GOLDWATER, of Arizona, who tells me that his memory of the debate is very clear and that what I have said to you was, in his opinion, the intent of the Congress. If the resolution in any way lent itself to varied interpretation, and evidently it did in the minds of some people, the subsequently expressed policies of the Department of the Interior and the Bureau of Indian Affairs, as well as the actions of Congress itself since 1953, should place the national policy statement on Indian affairs in a clear perspective.

To be specific, my own position is this: no Indian tribe or group should end its relationship with the Federal Government unless such tribe or group has clearly demonstrated—first, that it understands the plan under which such a program would go forward, and second, that the tribe or group affected concurs in and supports the plan proposed.

Now, ladies and gentlemen, it is absolutely unthinkable to me as your Secretary of the Interior that consideration would be given to forcing upon an Indian tribe a so-called termination plan which did not have the understanding and acceptance of a clear majority of the members affected. Those tribes which have thus far sought to end their Federal wardship status have, in each instance, demonstrated their acceptance of the plan prior to action by the Congress. I shall continue to insist this be the case and I hope and believe that Congress and its leaders will pursue the same course. To make my position perfectly clear, as long as I am Secretary of the Interior, I shall be dedicated to preserving the principle which I have just enunciated.

I further believe the Commissioner of Indian Affairs tried to make the position of the Congress and the Department of the Interior clear when in the fall of 1953, he stated, and I quote, "We want to give the Indians the same opportunities for advancement—the same freedom and responsibility for the management of their properties—as have other American citizens." Then Mr. Emmons continued, "I know that there are some tribes which are ready and anxious to take over full responsibility for their own affairs at the earliest possible time, and that others will have to move along toward that objective much more slowly and gradually." He then added he recognized that in many areas there is a real need for a continuation of the trusteeship and will be for a span of years. And so it seems to me the intent has never been one of precipitating Indian groups into a position for which they were unprepared.

True enough, Indian groups can continue to exist as cultural islands in the midst of our national populations, isolated from the main group by language and custom, and living at standards far below those of the average American citizen. They can do this. In fact, many of them have done so for many year. But let me put this question to you: "Does the majority of the population of such tribes prefer to live in that manner, or does it do so because there seems to be no other choice? Or, does it do so because there is no general awareness of the alternatives?" I believe the majority of our Indian citizens are as desirous and capable of exercising all of the duties and responsibilities of citizenship as are the rest of us, provided they have equal opportunities with their fellow citizens. And having said that, I want to add this: under no circumstances could I bring myself to recommend the termination of the Federal relationship with any Indian tribe in this country until the members of that tribe have been given the opportunity of a sound and effective education. To me it would be incredible, even criminal, to send any Indian tribe out into the stream of American life until and unless the educational level of that tribe was one which was equal to the responsibilities which it was shouldering.

My recent visit to the Navajo tribal fair at Window Rock, and to the Navajo Reservation, and to other Indian reservations in these 2 years I have been Secretary, confirms my long-held conviction that all our Indian citizens are fully capable of eventually attaining a position of parity with other Americans, socially and economically.

A few short years ago the Navajo were described by many observers as one of the most underprivileged, backward Indian groups in the Nation. Actually, living standards on the reservation stood in such sharp contrast with standards outside the Navajo country that comparison was really difficult to make. True, the people in the main were uneducated, unable for the most part even to speak and understand the English language. Health and sanitation conditions were far below the minimum levels to be found elsewhere in the Nation. I am proud to say that since 1953, when Dwight D. Eisenhower became President of the United States and directed his attention to this problem, a great deal of progress has been made. The Bureau of Indian Affairs of the Department of the Interior has done its best to analyze the basic needs of the Navajo people. The Congress of the United States has made the essential opportunities available and I can assure you that the Navajo Tribe has taken advantage of those opportunities. Illiteracy is declining rapidly on their reservation today, with more than 90 percent of their school-age children enrolled in school. Nearly a third are attending public schools on and near the reservation area.

I wish you all could see the Navajo Reservation today. It is a scene of great activity, largely as a result of the planning of the Navajo themselves and their determination to achieve a position of equality with fellow Americans everywhere. They are investing their own tribal money in long-term programs for the development and conservation of their reservation resources, the creation of industrial job opportunities for their people, and in their training of their young men and women to enable them to play a leading role in resource development. Many of their

plans and aspirations transcend the boundaries of the reservation and promise to contribute to the development of large portions of the surrounding States whether inhabited by Indian or non-Indian population.

They, as well as we, recognize the continued need of the Navajo Tribe for appropriate Federal aid if they are to finally attain the objectives toward which we are cooperatively striving. They are moving ahead rapidly and are assuming additional responsibilities. In the field of health, the transfer of responsibility for the provision of Indian health services to the U.S. Public Health Service has made available for the solution of Indian health problems the vast and highly specialized experience and resources of that Federal agency. In the few years that have elapsed since that transfer was effected, tuberculosis and other diseases high in incidence among Indian groups, but of lower incidence among non-Indians, have declined and, I'm happy to say, have declined significantly.

The attainment by Indians of a position of equality in health and education is, of course, a matter of primary importance, and one to which the Government of the United States has paid particular attention since 1953. Not only has Government assistance been extended to finance the formal education of Indian boys and girls throughout the Nation, but it also has been directed toward the support of programs aimed at the education of Indian adults. This latter effort includes both the project developed to assist those adults who have never attended school and the program designed to provide adult Indians between the ages of 18 to 35 with salable work skills, thus to free them of dependency on reservation resources.

Throughout the Nation, in the past, Indians all too often have been the victims of a set of vicious circumstances that has prevented them from forging a new life for themselves and for their children. The reservation areas are, in many instances, lacking in the resources necessary to support the populations dependent upon them. At the same time, the Indian people in all too many cases lack the training necessary to make their livelihood independently of those inadequate resources.

I believe the recent progress of groups such as the Navajo, the Utes, the Pueblos, the Apaches, and other tribes here in the Southwest, is a valid measure of the capacity and desire of Indian groups to take advantage of opportunities offered for social and economic development. Above all, that progress demonstrates their desire and capacity for the management of their own affairs.

Because we are here in the Southwest, much I have said today has been concerned with the Navajo and other Indian tribes of this area. Nevertheless, what I have said, as to the overall policy of the Department of the Interior, applies to Indian tribes wherever they may live in this land of ours.

What I have tried to make clear is simply this: It is the intention of the Federal Government to fulfill its complete responsibility toward the Indian people throughout the Nation.

No Indian, of whatever tribe, need have any fear about that.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "The Legal Aspects of Indian Affairs From 1887 to 1957," which appeared in the May 1957, issue of the Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science. The article was written by Theodore H. Haas, president of the District of Columbia chapter of the Federal Bar Association who was chief counsel of the Bureau of Indian Affairs from 1944 to 1950, and chief collaborator of Felix S. Cohen in the writing of "Handbook of Federal Indian Law" (1941).

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE LEGAL ASPECTS OF INDIAN AFFAIRS FROM 1887 TO 1957

(By Theodore H. Haas)

(Abstract: As the westward movement of the population proceeded, the demand for the Indians' land increased. Cultural assimiliation became the slogan. "Americanized" Indians would be transformed from hunters and fishermen to farmers and cattlemen, communal ownership would yield to individual ownership, plenty of the tribal lands would be freed for white settlement. The culmination of this policy was the General Allotment Act of 1887. Another step toward integration was the Citizenship Act of 1924. The character and the effects of these policies are detailed by the author.—EDITOR.)

Hunger for Indian land and other resources has been the most important cause of many early conflicts between Indians and whites and Federal and State Governments.[1] Congress enacted the Indian Removal Act of 1830[2] under pressure from the States and with the active support of Andrew Jackson, the first President elected by popular vote and the first from the West. The removal policy was justified on the grounds that segregation would end the conflict between the races and that land would be provided for white settlement in the East. In exchange the Indians would be provided with land in the western territory where they would not be disturbed.

The land hunger was appeased but not satiated. As the settlement and development of the West gathered momentum in the 1880's, the remaining Indian lands were demanded. They consisted in 1887 of some 139 million acres of land west of the Mississippi River, where virtually all Indian tribes under the Government's protection lived on some diminished areas called "reservations."[3]

As with the removal policy, ethical justification was soon found for the enactment of laws which would reduce the Indian land holdings and also achieve the new objective of the rapid assimilation of the Indian. A popular theme, the white man's burden to uplift native people, was given a theoretical base by interpretations of Darwin's view of the evolution of man and Spencer's of the evolution of society. Soon additional arguments would come from the advocacy of the submersion of the varied cultures of immigrants into an American way of life. To attain this conformity, it was, of course, necessary to destroy Indian cultures, which rested not only on different religions and languages, but also on tribal organizations with their indigenous systems of communal ownership of land. All that was necessary to assimilate and make self-supporting quickly the slightly more than a quarter of a million Indians was to transform them from hunters and fishermen into farmers and cattlemen. By dividing the tribal estate among the members, they could gain the benefits of private or individual property.[4] Since the new way of life would not require the use of as much land as the savage economy did, unneeded or surplus land would be available for white purchase and occupancy.

THE DAWES ACT

The policy found its expression in the General Allotment Act of 1887,[5] sometimes called the Dawes Act, which became the keystone of Federal Indian policy until the 1920's.[6] Its momentum was largely lost by 1922 as a result of two unsuccessful attempts to expedite the fragmentation and alienation of Indian lands.[7] The first was a campaign launched in 1917 to force the fee patenting of allotments, a method which was declared illegal by the courts. The second was an attempt of the Secretary of the Interior to secure the enactment of the Bursum Pueblo bill which would transfer the Pueblo land titles to white squatters, and of the Indian omnibus bill of 1923, which would provide for the loss of all Indian property with a special status.

The Dawes Act authorized the individualization of the reservation lands to the tribal members whenever the President believed that the land might be utilized advantageously for agricultural and grazing purposes. The head of a family was to be allotted 80 acres of agricultural land or 160 acres of grazing land; and a single person over 18 or an orphan child under 18 one-half of this amount. The United States retained title to the land until the expiration of a trust period of 25 years, or longer, if the President deemed an extension desirable. Then the allottee was to secure a patent in fee; to be able to dispose of the land as he wished; and to be subject to the laws of the State or Territory where he resided. The proceeds of the sale of surplus or land not needed for allotment were to be covered into the U.S. Treasury for the sole use of the tribe which had owned the land, and, together with interest at 3 percent per annum, were to be subject to appropriation by Congress for the education and civilization of the membership.

Citizenship was granted to any Indian who had voluntarily taken up residence within the territorial limits of the United States apart from his tribe and adopted the habits of civilized life and to an allottee as soon as he received a paper, improperly called a patent, showing that at a future time he would secure a regular patent conveying the fee or full title.[8] Among the various amendments which were subsequently made to the Dawes Act were the following: citizenship was deferred until the expiration of the trust period; provisions were made for the lease, sale, and condemnation of allotments under administrative supervision; for the issuance by the Secretary of the Interior of a certificate of competency to an Indian which would permit him to dispose of trust or restricted property; and for the protection of allotted lands from any charge or encumbrance because of any debt of the allottee. Supple-

---

[1] "From the first discovery of America to the present time, one master passion common to all mankind, that of acquiring land, has driven, in ceaseless succession, the white man on the Indian." Statement by James Barbour, Secretary of War in 1826, to chairman, House Committee on Indian Affairs (19th Cong., 1st sess. (1825)), H. Doc. 102, p. 5.

[2] Act of May 28, 1830, 4 Stat. 411.

[3] Indian lands reached a peak of 150 million acres in 1873. Oliver La Farge, As Long as the Grass Shall Grow (New York: Alliance Book Co., 1940), p. 30.

[4] Thus the Indian like the successful homesteader would attain economic independence and the ideal of a family farm.

[5] Act of Feb. 8, 1887, 24 Stat. 388. For the act's background see Felix S. Cohen, Handbook of Federal Indian Law (Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1945), pp. 206 ff.

[6] Laurence F. Schmeckebier, The Office of Indian Affairs: Its History, Activities, and Organization (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1927), pp. 78–90. Some tribes were excepted from the Dawes Act, but most of them were covered by similar special laws.

[7] Joseph B. Gittler (Ed.), Understanding Minority Groups (New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1956), pp. 42–43.

[8] See *United States* v. *Rickert* (188 U.S. 432 (1903)); *Monson* v. *Simonson* (231 U.S. 341, 345 (1913)).

mentary legislation provided for the apportionment of tribal funds among the members.

TAXATION

The General Allotment Act also had a marked effect on taxation. The original tribal land was exempt from State property taxation, and allotted land became subject to such tax when the patent in the fee was granted. As in all other important questions of Indian law, much litigation has been necessary to interpret treaty and statutory provisions related to taxes. In 1956 a decision of the Supreme Court held that income derived from the sale by the Federal Government of standing timber on allotted lands was exempt from the Federal capital-gains tax.[9] Chief Justice Warren stated that the purpose of the allotment was to protect the Indians' interest and to prepare the Indians to take their place as independent, qualified members of the modern body politic, and to this end it is necessary to preserve the trust land and income derived directly therefrom. The Chief Justice concluded that it would be unreasonable to infer that Congress intended by enacting the income tax law to destroy the tax exemption afforded by the General Allotment Act, since such action would be a sorry breach of faith with the Indians. The importance of this decision is demonstrated by the fact that there are more than 100,000 tracts of individually owned Indian land totaling about 13 million acres held in trust by the Government, most of which were allotted under the 1887 statute.

The widespread belief that Indians pay no taxes is one of the many myths concerning Indians.[10] The area of Indian tax exemption has been confined by legislation and litigation to a narrow range. With a few exceptions Indians are now subject to the same taxes as non-Indians. The most important exception is the exemption from real property taxes of Indian land, which is protected by an express exemption in a Federal treaty or statute, or by the taking of legal title to the land in the United States, as in the case of allotted land.[11]

The members of certain tribes, including the Five Civilized Tribes, which were excluded from the General Allotment Act, were granted title to much of their lands in fee simple, subject to a restriction on alienation without the consent of the Secretary of the Interior. The purpose of keeping the land in a restricted status was the same as the retention in trust of lands divided under the General Allotment Act—the protection of the Indian from the loss or unwise use of his property. The sale or lease of these lands was also restricted. The Indians and the Government officials concerned thought that these purchased tracts had the same status as Indian lands in which title remained in the Federal Government, and that tax exemption always accompanied restricted property, but the Supreme Court held the land and its income taxable because of the absence of an express tax exemption.[12]

One of the two references to Indians in the Constitution has become obsolete. Article 1, section 2, requires the exclusion of "Indians not taxed" from the decennial population count used in apportioning the number of Representatives for a State. Beginning in 1940, the Census Bureau no longer follows its prior hoary custom, at least sixty years old, of computing by guesswork or divination the "Indians not taxed."

Allotment process

Reservations were allotted in Oklahoma, the Lake States, the Plains States, the Pacific Coast States, in fact in varying degrees almost all Indian reservations were allotted, except those in Alaska and most of those in the Southwest. Yet, despite its protective features the General Allotment Act did not fulfill the expectations of sponsors who considered the welfare of Indians. Indian men of many tribes, such as the Sioux, considered farming to be woman's work. The original acreage was usually insufficient for an economic unit, and fractionalization, due to division after the death of the allottee, usually to heirs intestate, added to the difficulty. As Senator Henry M. Teller of Colorado, a former Secretary of the Interior (1882–85), its leading opponent, predicted, most allottees soon lost their lands at bargain prices. By 1933, 91 million acres or two-thirds of the Indian land base of 1887, and generally the most productive, was lost and some 90,000 Indians were landless.[13] In the words of the task force investigating Indians for the first Hoover Commission,[14] "If the 90 million acres lost through the [allotment] process had remained in Indian ownership, the problem of poverty among most tribes could be solved with less difficulty and with more certainty today; and assimilation would take place at a satisfactory level with a minimum of public expense." The report also refers to—

"The mistaken belief that the destruction of tribal organization and culture would bring about or at least hasten the acquisition of white civilization." * * * People move from one base to another, and move slowly. The loss of an existing base, before the new base has been consolidated, means simply frustration and degeneration. The destruction of Indian tribal government, the liquidation of tribal organization and tribal property, and the hostility to all Indian ways and culture that characterized so much of governmental policy now appear to have been a mistake which defeated rather than furthered the Government's ultimate objectives."

Effects of General Allotment Act

The significance of the General Allotment Act extends beyond its impact on Indian land. The law was passed over the strenuous objections of most Indians. Hence, it disregarded the principle of bilateralism or mutual agreement which had been followed in treaty making until 1871, and subsequently in the formulation of statutes. Moreover, prior laws had considered cultural differences among the numerous Indian groups, but the Dawes Act set an important precedent by imposing a uniform legal pattern for Indians generally.[15] Following the new pattern of some provisions of a few prior treaties and statutes, the Government henceforth bypassed to a large extent tribal organizations and Indian leaders and dealt directly with individual Indians. To fill the vacuum caused by the law's weakening of the tribal governments, the authority of Federal administrators over Indians was greatly expanded. This growth is evidenced by the multiplication of laws and regulations relating to Indian affairs. By 1949, Indian statutes exceeded 4,000, and by 1957 climbed toward 6,000 in number. Regulations and manual or letter instructions grew proportionately. Another effect of the law was graphically described by Theodore Roosevelt in his Presidential message to Congress of December 3, 1901. He characterized the law as "a mighty pulverizing engine to break up the tribal mass" whereby "some 60,000 Indians have already become citizens of the United States."[16]

CITIZENSHIP

While prior to the Citizenship Act of 1924,[17] the Dawes Act was the most important method of acquiring citizenship, there are several other general or special statutes and treaties which naturalized Indians. Indian women marrying citizens became citizens by an 1888 law,[18] and a few Indian veterans in World War I were granted citizenship under a 1919 law.[19] Some 125,000 native-born Indians who had not become citizens previously were made citizens in 1924. Although the contrary view was once held, it is now well settled that citizenship does not affect the authority of the Government over the Indians.[20]

As a consequence of attaining national citizenship, the Indians automatically become citizens of the State where they reside. Yet, a 1938 survey by the Department of the Interior disclosed that seven States refused to let Indians vote. By 1947, largely through the efforts of the Federal Government, the attorneys general of several States, and the Indians themselves, all the States with large Indian populations conceded the right of Indians to suffrage on the same basis as non-Indians, except the States of Arizona and New Mexico. In 1948, as a result of judicial decisions, these States withdrew their prohibition on Indian voting.[21] In 1950, the Indians of Maine were denied the franchise, but this problem was corrected by legislation. In the Presidential election of 1956, the Indians of Utah living on reservations were denied the franchise by a ruling of the State attorney general. The problem as of this writing is pending before the Supreme Court of the United States.

REPEAL OF DISCRIMINATORY LAWS

The enactment of the Indian Claims Commission Act of 1946 ended one discrimination against Indian groups, which originated almost a century earlier when the act permitting the Government to be sued on certain claims did not permit suits by Indian tribes.[22] Unfair dealings in lands is the main source of such claims. Generally, judicial decisions have continued to strengthen early recognition of Indian land title by virtue of aboriginal occupancy.[23]

---

[9] *Squire* v. *Capoeman*, 351 U.S. 1 (1956).

[10] The status of being an Indian does not create an immunity from the levy of the Federal income tax. *Choteau* v. *Burnet*, 283 U.S. 691 (1931).

[11] Land subsequently purchased by the tribe which is not taken by the United States in trust is taxable.

[12] *Oklahoma Tax Commission* v. *United States*, 319 U.S. 598 (1943).

[13] "Report of the Commissioner of Indian Affairs," Annual Report of the Secretary of the Interior, 1933 (Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office), p. 68.

[14] "Report of the Committee on Indian Affairs to the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government," Charles J. Rhodes, John R. Nichols, Gilbert Darlington, George A. Graham, Chairman, October 1948 (unpublished manuscript), pp. 15–16.

[15] In the 1880's a few other uniform laws of less importance were passed. While some important Indian groups, such as the Five Civilized Tribes, were excluded from the Dawes Act, most of them were soon subjected to somewhat similar laws.

[16] CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 35, pt. 1, p. 90 (57th Congress, 1st sess., 1901).

[17] Act of June 2, 1924, 43 Stat. 253.

[18] Sec. 2, act of Aug. 9, 1888, 25 Stat. 392.

[19] Act of Nov. 6, 1919, 41 Stat. 350.

[20] *United States* v. *Nice*, 241 U.S. 591, 598 (1916) which overruled *Matter of Heff*, 197 U.S. 488 (1905).

[21] *Harrison* v. *Laveen*, 67 Ariz. 337, 196 P. 2d 456 (1948); *Trujillo* v. *Garley*, D. Ct. New Mexico (1948), unreported. The Department of Justice filed briefs as amicus curiae in these suits. U.S. attorneys are required to render certain legal services to Indians by the act of March 3, 1893, 27 Stat. 612, 631, 25 U.S.C. 175.

[22] For further discussion see "Indian Claims Commission Act" in this issue of "The Annals" by Nancy Oestreich Lurie.

[23] Felix S. Cohen, "Original Indian Title," Minnesota Law Review, vol. 32 (December 1947), p. 28.

It is now well established that individual Indians may sue and be sued, make contracts, and enjoy all the civil liberties guaranteed to their fellow citizens. There is one exception to this general principle; namely, for the protection of this dependent people, Congress can and has imposed limitations on their disposal of trust or restricted property. Administrative or congressional approval is required for the alienation of such property or the expenditure of certain trust funds. Moreover, until fairly recently, many discriminatory Federal laws hampered freedom of speech and sanctioned various measures of military and civil control within the reservation boundaries. Most of these laws were repealed by the act of May 21, 1934.[24] The most important and one of of the oldest such laws was the Indian liquor law, the first prohibition law of our Nation. Many terms popular in the prohibition era, such as "bootlegger" and "whisky runner," originated in the illegal trade with Indians. President Thomas Jefferson, acting in response to a verbal plea by the Indian chief, Little Turtle, recommended this law to Congress in 1802, which forthwith authorized the President to regulate the selling and distribution of spirituous liquors among the Indian tribes.[25] Frequent amendments to this act broadened its scope and made its enforcement easier. The most important of these measures was the act of July 23, 1892, as amended in 1938, which prohibited the sale or gift of intoxicants to Indians and their introduction into Indian country.[26] In 1918, the possession of intoxicants in the Indian country was made a separate offense,[27] but a 1948 law allowed the introduction in Indian country of intoxicants for mechanical, scientific, and medicinal purposes.[28]

The Supreme Court several times upheld the validity of the Indian liquor law as a measure to protect the Indians under the power of Congress to regulate commerce with Indian tribes.[29] In 1953, however, Indians were placed in the same status as non-Indians with respect to intoxicants when off the reservation, except in States which had an Indian liquor law, and the Indians were granted the right of local option with respect to their reservations.[30]

STATE LAWS

Generally, an Indian while off the reservation is subject to State laws to the same extent as non-Indians. The United States, however, has plenary or full, though not absolute, authority over Indian affairs and has passed special laws, such as the Indian liquor law, applicable to Indians while off the reservation. Furthermore, State laws are not enforceable within the territory of an Indian tribe in matters affecting Indians unless and until the Federal Government consents thereto or unless the State law aids in effectuating Federal law and policy.

Since 1887, there has been a steady increase in the areas to which the Congress has granted its consent to the application of State laws to Indians. The first field in which State laws have been applied generally to Indians is inheritance. The General Allotment Act provided that after patents are issued to lands allotted to Indians, the lands shall be inherited by the heirs of a deceased Indian according to the laws of the State or territory where the land is located. State law was applied to such inheritance until 1910 when the Secretary of the Interior was granted full power to determine heirs and partition allotments, to administer the estates of the allottees, and to sell heirship lands. In 1913, the law was amended to permit an Indian to dispose of trust property, real and personal, by will or contract, approved by the Secretary of the Interior. Hence, a will, if approved by the Secretary, need not conform to State law.

By congressional statutes the States of New York, Kansas, and Iowa have acquired jurisdiction over crimes committed by Indians against Indians on Indian reservations. North Dakota acquired the same power over one reservation. In 1953, a law granted similar jurisdiction to California, Nebraska, Oregon (except the Warm Spring Reservation), Minnesota (except the Red Lake Reservation), and Wisconsin (except the Menominee Reservation) and authorized the various other States to assume criminal and civil jurisdiction over crimes and transactions involving Indians on Indian land whenever such States wished.[31]

The Federal jurisdiction over ten major crimes committed by Indians against Indians on Indian reservations, further complicates the administration of criminal law. The punishment of seven major crimes was assumed by the Federal Government 2 years after the Supreme Court held in Ex Parte Crow Dog that in the absence of Federal legislation granting jurisdiction to the Federal courts, they could not try and punish an Indian for the murder of another Indian on on Indian reservation. The tribal governments alone had this authority.[32] Three other crimes were subsequently added to the original seven crimes.[33]

State laws are very important for Indians in the criminal field. In 1898, the Federal Assimilative Crimes Act made offenses by non-Indians against Indians or their property, or vice versa, punishable by the Federal courts in accordance with State laws then in effect. Two of the major crimes, rape and burglary, committed by an Indian against another Indian on an Indian reservation are defined and punished in accordance with State laws. Eight other major crimes are subject to the same laws and penalties as if the offense were committed within the exclusive jurisdiction of the United States.

FEDERAL-STATE COOPERATION

The Federal Government has authorized the enforcement of the following State laws on Indian reservations: (1) sanitary and quarantine laws, under rules prescribed by the Secretary of the Interior; [34] and (2) compulsory school laws, with tribal consent.[35] Federal laws have applied also a wide variety of State laws to particular tribes and areas. For example, Oklahoma has been authorized to tax oil and gas production from Indian lands and mineral production from the Five Civilized Tribal lands.[36]

The most important law which provides for Federal-State cooperation in Indian affairs is the so-called Johnson-O'Malley Act of April 16, 1934.[37] This law authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to enter into contracts with States, Territories and private institutions "* * * for the education, medical attention, agricultural assistance, and social welfare, including relief of distress of Indians in each State or Territory, through the qualified agencies of each State or Territory." With the increase of attendance of Indians at public schools, the Federal grants have increased considerably. State contracts for extension and social welfare services are also becoming more important. The Indian Bureau is in the process of transferring its extension work to the States and the Department of Agriculture. The Department of Health, Education and Welfare, to which were transferred, effective July 1, 1955, the Federal Government's Indian health services including authority previously exercised by the Department of the Interior,[38] has made several contracts with States and universities for medical attention, including health education. A 1952 law, which authorizes the transfer, with tribal consent, of Federal hospital patients to State and local Indian hospitals, illustrates the increasing importance of Federal and State cooperation in the rendering of Indian health services.[39] Contracts with universities for various research projects have been made by the Departments of Health, Education, and Welfare and of Interior.

The most significant research project on Indian affairs was made by a private organization. In 1926, the Department of the Interior invited the Institute for Government Research to make a survey of the social and economic conditions of the Indians. The report of this study, which was published in 1928,[40] helped to inaugurate a new era in Indian administration. On December 4, 1929, President Herbert Hoover took steps to implement the report by stating in his first message to Congress that the Government had an obligation to raise the standard of living of Indians, to provide adequately for their health and education, and to advance their opportunity for profitable employment. There soon followed a substantial increase in appropriations for the Indian Bureau.

INDIAN REORGANIZATION ACT

Toward the beginning of the Franklin Roosevelt administration there was enacted the Indian Reorganization Act,[41] the most comprehensive law relating to Indians since the General Allotment Act. The IRA, as it is sometimes called, laid the foundation for a new Indian policy and has been hailed as a landmark in social science "because it brought to Indian Affairs and to the U.S. Government for the first time, an explicit use of social science principles." [42]

---

[24] 48 Stat. 787. An old law prohibiting the selling of firearms to Indians was repealed by the act of Aug. 15, 1953 (67 Stat. 590). In almost all respects and places discriminatory practices with respect to the granting of social security benefits have ended. One exception is the crippled children's program in Arizona.

[25] Act of Mar. 3, 1802 (sec. 21, 2 Stat. 139). Cohen, *op. cit.* (note 5 *supra*), p. 352.

[26] 27 Stat. 260, as amended by act of June 15, 1938 (52 Stat. 696).

[27] Act of May 25, 1918 (40 Stat. 561, 563).

[28] Act of June 25, 1948 (sec. 1154, 62 Stat. 683, 758).

[29] *United States* v. *Sandoval*, 231 U. S. 28 (1913), and cases cited therein.

[30] Act of Aug. 15, 1953, 67 Stat. 586. By June 30, 1956, 30 tribes had adopted resolutions for the purpose of legalizing intoxicants on the reservation. "Report of the Commissioner of Indian Affairs," annual report of the Secretary of the Interior, 1956 (Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office) p. 215.

[31] Act of Aug. 15, 1953, 67 Stat. 588.

[32] 109 U.S. 556 (1883).

[33] Act of Mar. 3, 1885, 23 Stat. 362, 385; amended by act of Mar. 4, 1909, sec. 328, 35 Stat. 1088, 1151; act of June 28, 1932, 47 Stat. 336, 337.

[34] Act of Feb. 15, 1929, 45 Stat. 1185.

[35] Act of Aug. 9, 1946, 60 Stat. 962.

[36] See Cohen, op. cit. (note 5 supra), pp. 118–119.

[37] 48 Sat. 596.

[38] Act of August 5, 1954, 68 Stat. 674.

[39] Act of April 3, 1952, 66 Stat. 935.

[40] Lewis Meriam Associates, "Problem of Indian Administration" (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1928).

[41] Act of June 18, 1934, 48 Stat. 984, which with minor modifications was extended to Alaska by the act of May 1, 1936, 49 Stat. 1250, and Oklahoma by the act of June 26, 1936, 49 Stat. 1967.

[42] Clyde Kluckhohn and Robert Hackenberg, "Social Science Principles and the Indian Reorganization Act, Indian Affairs and the Indian Reorganization Act: The 20-Year Record," edited by William H. Kelly (Tucson: University of Arizona Press, 1954), p. 35.

The IRA became operative through the majority vote by members of a tribe at a formal election.[43] It ended the allotting of tribal lands and the process of terminating trust periods or periods of restricted alienability, after a fixed period of years. It also placed severe limitations on the operation of allotment in other respects.[44] It recognized the inadequacy of the Indian land base, authorized the appropriation of $2 million a year for the purchase of lands for tribes, and generally limited the disposition of restricted land to Indian tribes and their members. It also empowered tribes incorporated under the act to make consolidations of fractionated lands, with the owner's consent, and provided for the purchase and restoration of land to Indians.

During the ensuing 10 years Indian land was increased from about 52 million acres to more than 56 million acres by governmental and tribal land purchases and by the restoration of land to Indians under the act and by supplementary legislation.

Another important feature of the IRA is that it directed the Secretary of the Interior to promulgate conservation regulations to prevent the erosion, deforestation, and overgrazing of Indian lands.

Since 1948, however, there has been a resumption of the prior downward trend, accelerated by the issuance of patents in fee under the act of May 4, 1948,[45] which authorized the Secretary of the Interior to sell individual Indian lands, and by special enabling acts.

The act of August 9, 1955 (69 Stat. 539) greatly increased the term for which Indian-owned land may be leased.

The IRA sought to reinvigorate and stabilize the powers and organization of Indian tribes. It gave the official governments standing by providing for the approval of constitutions and also of charters, if desired for business purposes. It vested also in tribes which adopted such constitutions the following new powers: approval or veto over the disposition of all tribal assets; the right to spend certain funds; to negotiate with the Federal, State, and local governments; to employ legal counsel, only the choice of counsel and the fixing of fees being subject to the approval of the Secretary of the Interior; and to see appropriation estimates for the tribe's benefit prior to their submission to the Budget Bureau and Congress. Some of these powers were subject to various degrees of supervision by the Secretary of the Interior.

The constitutions add to, but do not detract from, the powers of an Indian tribe. The laws, customs, and decisions of tribal government control large areas of civil and criminal law, including questions of tribal membership, property, taxation, the conservation, development and use of tribal resources, social welfare, domestic relations, health, housing, inheritance, and the form of tribal government. The courts have fairly consistently upheld the Indians' right to home rule. One of the most recent decisions in this field sustained the right of the Oglala Sioux Tribe to pass an ordinance taxing a non-Indian lessee of a grazing allotment and a criminal ordinance covering offenses by Indians against Indians and enforced by the tribal court.[46]

Program

The IRA authorized the establishment of a revolving credit fund which has enabled thousands of Indians to become rehabilitated by providing the means for them to apply modern technology in the use and development of their land and other resources. For the purpose of borrowing and lending money, many tribes adopted Federal corporate business charters under the act which enabled them to make contracts, to sue and be sued, and to relend to individual members.[47] Loans were also made to Indian credit associations and to individual Indians. While most loans have been made for agricultural, livestock, or fishing purposes, a variety of projects have been financed, including stores, salmon canneries, motels, and arts- and crafts-producing and selling organizations. In recent years, the number and amount of loans have decreased due in part to an increased availability of private credit.

The act of March 29, 1956 (70 Stat. 62) authorized the execution of mortgages and deeds of trust on individually owned trust or restricted land in order to stimulate an increase in such credit.

The IRA also authorized annual appropriations not exceeding $250,000 for educational loans and directed the creation of an Indian civil service under which qualified Indians shall have the preference to appointment of vacancies in any position in the Indian Office.

The IRA encouraged cultural diversity, a part of the essence of democracy, in lieu of a pattern of Indian administration emphasizing undeviating conformity, the essence of the philosophy of communism. Each Indian group was able to administer its own assets, by leasing and conserving its land and spending some of its moneys, and to pass laws for local public services. As leases for oil, gas, uranium, and for other purposes have vastly increased the income of some tribes, several tribal councils have established revolving credit funds with their own moneys and set up trust funds to provide college scholarships for their younger members. The total amount of tribal funds used for credit purposes now exceed the amount of Federal funds so used.

Some of these functions have been performed in cooperation with Federal, State, and local governments. The Indian civil and criminal laws have been influenced by Federal and State laws; and their courts have granted bail, parole, probation, and suspended sentences and applied other features of modern laws. The Indians have gained experience in a transitional legal system between their unwritten laws and customs and the white man's more formalized system of justice. They have learned also of legislative and administrative procedures; written constitutions and laws; majority rule; budgets; accounting; public relations; and lobbying in the Congress, Indian Bureau, and Interior Department. They discovered, too, that despite differences in customs, histories, and organizations, many of the problems of one tribe are similar to those of other tribes, and that national, State, and local organizations are as necessary for Indians as for non-Indians. They gained some experience, also, in business organizations and methods by forming and dealing with corporations, cooperatives, and credit operations. They have been provided with stepping-stones toward more economic and governmental responsibilities through their own or other local governments.

The IRA demonstrated anew that local groups' activities help fulfill the individual's need for creativity and a feeling of worth, and that democratic methods offer the soundest way to bring people into the economic and political life of our Nation of many diverse cultures and peoples. Some of the soundest ingredients of the IRA program have become a part of our foreign-aid program for underdeveloped areas. From Iran and Israel to India, Latin America, and the Philippines, former officials of the Indian Bureau are helping the people to achieve scientific and locally controlled programs. Exported technicians are thus working in some countries through IRA methods—not from the top down by bureaucratic coercion or paternalistic charity—but by a partnership with people, thus giving natives a sense of purpose, community cooperation, and human dignity.

A related law should be mentioned in passing—the act of August 27, 1935,[48] which established an Indian Arts and Crafts Board composed of five Commissioners appointed by the Secretary of the Interior. The Board's main function is to promote the economic welfare of Indians through developing arts and crafts.

TERMINATION

It is well established that Congress has the authority to determine when the Federal Government shall terminate its special relationship with an Indian group[49] and when to extinguish Indian title to lands.[50] A demand for expediting the termination process, which has often been linked with a demand for the liquidation of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, was especially strong in some periods of history such as the last decade of the 19th century and the years 1917–18 and 1922–24. Sometimes the beneficiaries of Federal services to Indians have been limited. For example, the Appropriation Act of May 25, 1918, and subsequent laws in general restricted attendance at Federal schools to Indians of one-fourth or more Indian blood.[51]

The most recent expressions of this policy was the passage in 1953 of House Concurrent Resolution 108,[52] which declared that Federal supervision should be ended as speedily as possible for the Indians of five named States and seven specified tribes located elsewhere. Subsequently, termination laws were enacted for two of these tribes, the Menominees of Wisconsin[53] and the Klamaths of Oregon,[54] the mixed-blood members of the Ute Tribe of Utah,[55] and a few other groups.

Contrariwise, Congress provided additional help for some Indian tribes. By the Navaho-Hopi Rehabilitation Act of 1950,[56] the appropriation of $88,570,000 was authorized for a program to improve the educational and economic opportunities of these Indians, including relocation and resettlement, an activity which was subsequently extended to all Indians. While intensified or new functions may be assumed for tribes previously recognized, it is unlikely that new tribes will be recognized for the purposes of

---

[43] One hundred and eighty-one tribes accepted the act, 77 rejected it, and 14 came under it because of failure to vote. Alaskan and Oklahoma groups were covered into the act without a vote.

[44] Cohen, op. cit. (note 5 supra), p. 217.

[45] 62 Stat. 236. The General Services Administration in 1957 estimated that 53,100,000 acres of land was held in trust for Indians by the Federal Government. The Association on American Indian Affairs estimates that some 1,600,000 acres of Indian land have passed from Indian control in the last 4 years.

[46] *Iron Crow* v. *Oglala Sioux Tribe*, of Pine Ridge Reservation, 231 F. 2d 89, 8th Circuit (1956).

[47] The benefits of the revolving credit fund have been extended to groups which did not adopt the IRA.

[48] 49 Stat. 891; 25 U.S.C., 1952 ed., sec. 305 ff.

[49] *Tiger* v. *Western Investment Co.* (221 U.S. 286 (1911)).

[50] *United States* v. *Sante Fe Pacific R. Co.* (314 U.S. 339, 347 (1941)).

[51] 40 Stat. 561, 564.

[52] 83d Cong., 1st sess.

[53] Act of June 17, 1954, 68 Stat. 250; act of July 14, 1956, 70 Stat. 544; act of July 14, 1956, 70 Stat. 549.

[54] Act of Aug. 13, 1954, 68 Stat. 718.

[55] Act of Aug. 27, 1954, 68 Stat. 868.

[56] Act of Apr. 19, 1950, 64 Stat. 44. Several rehabilitation bills for other groups failed to pass.

the Federal Government rendering services to them.[57]

It is now apparent that since Indian groups differ widely in the degrees of their acculturation and educational health and economic conditions, it would be folly for the Government to attempt to fit them into an identical pattern by a general law applicable to all Indian groups.

ENCOURAGEMENT OF DEVELOPMENT OF PETROLEUM AND COAL RESERVES—AMENDMENT

Mr. O'MAHONEY submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 1157) to encourage the development of petroleum and coal reserves within the United States, which was referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

TAXATION OF INCOME OF LIFE INSURANCE COMPANIES—AMENDMENTS

Mr. SMATHERS submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (H.R. 4245) relating to the taxation of the income of life insurance companies, which were referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed.

AMENDMENT OF PUBLIC ASSISTANCE PROVISIONS OF SOCIAL SECURITY ACT—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the distinguished senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] be added as a cosponsor to Senate bill 937, which I introduced on February 4, 1959, on behalf of myself and Senators CHAVEZ, LANGER, MAGNUSON, and PASTORE.

This bill would amend the public assistance provisions of the Social Security Act to eliminate certain inequities and restrictions, and permit a more effective distribution of Federal funds.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PREVENTION OF DISCRIMINATION BECAUSE OF AGE—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, the name of the distinguished junior Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON] was inadvertently omitted from the list of cosponsors of the bill (S. 1172) to prohibit unreasonable discrimination because of age in the hiring and employment of persons by Government contractors which I introduced on February 26. I ask unanimous consent that the name of the Senator from Washington—who joined with us in supporting similar legislation in the last Congress—be added as a cosponsor of S. 1172.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

[57] Compare the limited recognition of the Lumbee Indians of North Carolina by the act of June 7, 1956, 70 Stat. 254, with prior recognition for the Catawba Indians of South Carolina by appropriations for Federal services during a period exceeding the last decade.

ANTHORIZATION FOR VICE PRESIDENT OR PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE TO SIGN BILLS DURING ADJOURNMENT

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, on behalf of the majority leader, I ask uanimous consent that the President of the Senate or the President pro tempore be authorized to sign bills during the recess or adjournment of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. MANSFIELD:

Address delivered by him at Democratic victory dinner, Washington, D.C., February 28, 1959.

Address delivered by Senator ELLENDER before the annual meeting of the New York State Waterways Association in New York City on February 27, 1959.

By Mr. GOLDWATER:

Address delivered by him before Ohio Association of Retail Lumber Dealers, Columbus, Ohio, February 26, 1959.

Editorial entitled "Benson on Farm Surpluses," published in the Washington Evening Star of February 15, 1959.

By Mr. SCOTT:

Address on the subject "The Fight With Inflation," delivered by Senator BENNETT before the Pennsylvania Manufacturers' Association, at Philadelphia, Pa., on February 24, 1959.

By Mr. KEFAUVER:

Address delivered by him before Vanderbilt University Law School, Nashville, Tenn., February 25, 1959.

NOTICE OF HEARINGS ON SENATE BILLS 442 AND 1005, BY ANTITRUST AND MONOPOLY SUBCOMMITTEE OF COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, on Thursday, March 5, at 10 a.m. in room 424 of the Senate Office Building, the Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary will hold hearings on Senate bills 442 and 1005.

These bills would amend the Clayton Act by requiring prior notification of corporate mergers and acquisition. The subcommittee will hear from those witnesses who have requested to be heard on certain aspects of this legislation.

NATIONAL SECURITY—RESOLUTION OF THE VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I am in receipt of a letter from an old friend and fellow Montanan, the national commander of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, John W. Mahan, of Helena, Mont. In his letter, which is addressed to every Senator, Mr. Mahan sets forth his views on the need to maintain the defenses of our country. For example, he states that, according to present plans, our forces are going to be cut, insofar as the Marine Corps and the Army are concerned.

Mr. President, the Marine Corps, according to press reports, has been directed to reduce its strength to 175,000 men by the end of June 1959, even though last year the Congress appropriated funds to maintain the Marine Corps at a strength of 200,000 men. In addition, Mr. President, the Army has been given directions to reduce its strength, by the 30th of June 1959, to 870,000, rather than the 900,000 which was the intent of the Congress when additional funds were appropriated last year.

Mr. President, it is my hope that this matter will be given the most serious reconsideration by the administration, not only in view of the difficulties which have faced us in the past, but also in view of the difficulties which well may face us in the future.

Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of my statement, a table from the February 16 issue of Newsweek, and an article by Hanson W. Baldwin, be printed in the RECORD, together with a copy of the letter from Mr. John W. Mahan, commander in chief of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States.

There being no objection, the tables, article, and letter were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, at the conclusion of the statement:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR MANSFIELD

The Marine Corps, according to press reports, has been directed to reduce its strength to 175,000 by the end of June 1959.

This is a drastic cut below the current actual strength of 190,000 and an even more sizable cut below the 200,000 strength for which Congress appropriated and directed the Marine Corps to maintain for the current year.

This reduction in the Marine Corps has serious implications, to which I will allude later, that go far beyond military matters. But first, there is the matter of our national requirement for a fully manned, adequate, combat-ready, versatile striking force of marines. Recent events underline with irrefutable logic this requirement.

The crises which have followed one upon the other—Suez, Lebanon, and the Formosa Straits—have demonstrated not only the need for our Marine national force in readiness but also the precise and effective manner in which the Marines fulfill that requirement. Lebanon and Formosa are by no means the last of our international difficulties. We are confronted with an international situation that exists now and will continue to exist well into the foreseeable future; a situation characterized by many potential Communist-sparked crises.

So, with the need for marines great or greater than ever before, our Marine Corps is being deliberately, arbitrarily, precipitately reduced. This Pentagon assault on the Marine Corps merits closest congressional and public scrutiny. It is no secret in official governmental circles that there has long been an effort within the Pentagon to reduce the

Marines to merely a ceremonial status. This currently directed cut is just another step in that direction.

"Those who cannot remember the past are condemned to repeat it." With Santayana's warning in mind, let's examine the recent history of Marine Corps strength.

At the conclusion of World War II, during the congressional hearings incident to the passage of the National Security Act of 1947, it was apparent that determined efforts were being made to reduce the Marine Corps to a ceremonial organization. To assure its continued existence as a hard-hitting force in readiness, Congress spelled out, in detail, the roles and missions of the corps.

This action by the legislative branch was taken against concerted and vigorous opposition from certain factions in the Pentagon.

In spite of these elaborate precautions to assure that the Marine Corps would continue to exist to fill an obvious and vital requirement in our Nation's defense structure, the strength of the corps was reduced battalion by battalion until on the eve of the Korean war it had fallen to six infantry battalions. It is worth noting that although Congress had appropriated sufficient funds to support a measurably larger force in 1950–51, the then Secretary of Defense refused to permit the existence of more than six battalions.

The lightning suddenness of the Korean conflict revealed in stark detail the bankruptcy of those policies. The Pentagon had reduced our ready force to the point that invited a national disaster.

Working against overwhelming odds in matters of time and space, the Marine Corps was able to provide a brigade that turned the swelling Communist tide at Pusan and saved the perimeter. Then, at Inchon, a division of marines speedily assembled, literally from opposite sides of the earth, converted the battle for South Korea into a rout of the Communist hordes.

The vital importance of a strong force in readiness had been demonstrated once again with nerve shattering clarity. The lesson was not lost on Congress.

While the Korean war was still in progress, Congress went to great effort to assure that the Nation would not again find itself so nearly without such a force. In 1952 legislation was enacted to prescribe a Marine Corps of not less than three combat divisions and three air wings.

With such a firm and unambiguous requirement established in the law, Congress felt it had assured the existence of a constantly ready combat force of sufficient strength to serve as the first echelon of the Nation's limited war force.

However, in 1955, the Pentagon began a new round of reductions in the Marine Corps over vigorous congressional opposition. In the face of Pentagon plans to reduce the Marine Corps to 193,000, Congress appropriated sufficient funds to maintain the corps at 215,000 for fiscal year 1956. Over $37 million of the funds thus appropriated were impounded by the then Secretary of Defense and the Marine Corps was maintained at 200,000.

Fiscal year 1958 brought a new attack on the strength of the corps. After Congress had appropriated funds to maintain the Marines at 200,000, the Pentagon refused to allocate funds for a strength beyond 190,000.

The budget for fiscal year 1959 revealed a new assault on Marine strength with a reduction from 190,000 to 175,000. Faced with this effort to reduce the corps by 12½ percent below that set by the legislative branch in its appropriations, Congress took new steps to make its position clear.

The House Appropriations Committee found that "a strong Marine Corps is essential to our national defense establishment. The striking power of the operating forces of the Marine Corps consist primarily of three combat divisions and three air wings with supporting forces as provided by law. These forces deployed in this country, aboard ship, and in advance bases in the Pacific and the Far East, form a striking force immediately available and prepared to fight in a general war, a small war, or a limited war. The budget recommended by the President did not make adequate provision for these specifically authorized Marine Corps forces."

In support of this finding the committee recommended, and the House of Representatives approved, appropriations to maintain the Marines at a strength of 200,000.

The Appropriations Committee of the Senate did not rest content with a mere affirmation of the findings of its brethren in the House. It chose to make abundantly clear that this was not a hastily conceived sentimental salute to a particular service. The committee stated, "This decision to appropriate the funds necessary for a 200,000-man Marine Corps was made with full consideration of the fiscal and military implications. The committee desires that it be clearly understood by appropriate agencies in the executive branch of the Government that it is the clear-cut intent of the committee, and of the proposed appropriating legislation, that the Marine Corps be maintained at the strength of 200,000."

The Senate approved these conclusions and the action of the House of Representatives by appropriating the funds necessary to establish a Marine Corps of 200,000.

Although confronted by this clear and unmistakably congressional mandate, the Pentagon has nevertheless directed a reduction of the Marines to 175,000.

When placed in the perspective afforded by recent history, the current actions by the Pentagon fit the old discredited and disastrous pattern of a step by step gutting of the Marines to the status of a ceremonial outfit.

The lessons of history, recent and remote, are ignored. The blind unreasoning refusal to look at the world situation continues. The probability of new situations similar to those we were compelled to face in Korea, Indochina, Suez, and Lebanon is blandly rejected.

Can we attribute the Pentagon attitude solely to a desire for economy? The amount involved will not support this conclusion. Careful study by the Appropriations Committees established this amount at $45,200,000; a small sum, indeed, to maintain the force-in-readiness tailored to provide the versatility and flexibility we need so desperately today.

The complete rejection by the executive branch of the most carefully formulated conclusions of the legislature on matters of military policy, such as Marine Corps strength, is not supported by history or by the current world situation. Nor is it sound governmental procedure.

I have watched with increasing concern and dismay the deterioration of the constitutionally established partnership between the executive and the legislative branches which is so vital to an effective military policy.

At the risk of belaboring the obvious, I feel compelled to state that a partnership cannot endure and prosper when the convictions of one partner are ignored, or arbitrarily rejected, by the other.

The vitality of the doctrine of separation of powers, the cornerstone of our form of government, rests upon the self-restraint of each of the three branches of our Government. In the absence of such self-restraint, characterized by the profound respect for the lawful areas of responsibility of each branch of our Government, a balance of power cannot exist.

As it has demonstrated in the past, Congress is not powerless to enforce its views in matters of military policy. A statutory floor has been placed on the strength of the Army National Guard and the Army Reserve in the Department of Defense Appropriations Act for fiscal 1959.

The Pentagon complains that such action is unduly restrictive upon the executive branch. I suggest to them that by their repeated high-handed rejections of the views of Congress, of which the Marine Corps reduction is a prime example, they compel resort to the rigid prescriptions of statutory law.

Marine Corps strength is the principal illustration. The views of Congress on this matter have been repeatedly expressed and repeatedly flouted or ignored by the Pentagon. A mandatory floor on the strength of the Marine Corps, set forth in the law, appears to be the only means for Congress to insure that its carefully considered judgment will not be thwarted by administrative action.

	Appropriated strength fiscal year 1958	Actual strength Dec. 31, 1957	Appropriated strength, fiscal year 1959	Directed end strength, June 30, 1959
Army	1,000,000	918,111	900,000	870,000
Navy	675,000	629,566	630,000	630,000
Marine Corps	200,000	190,708	200,000	175,000
Air Force	925,000	878,657	850,000	850,000

From Public Law 85–724, 85th Congress (an act making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959 and for other purposes):

From title III, Department of the Army, Military Personnel: "For pay, allowances, individual clothing, interest or deposits, and permanent change of station travel, for members of the Army on active duty (except those undergoing reserve training); expenses incident to movement of troop detachments, including rental of campsites and procurement of utility and other services; expenses of apprehension and delivery of deserters, prisoners, and soldiers absent without leave, including payment of rewards (not to exceed $25 in any case), and costs of confinement of military prisoners in nonmilitary facilities; donations of not to exceed $25 to each prisoner upon each release from confinement in an Army or contract prison (other than a disciplinary barracks) and to each person discharged for fraudulent enlistment; authorized issues of articles to prisoners other than those in disciplinary barracks, subsistence of enlisted personnel, selective service registrants called for induction and applicants for enlistment while held under observation, and prisoners (except those at disciplinary barracks), or reimbursement therefor while such personnel are sick in hospitals; and subsistence of supernumeraries necessitated by emergent military circumstances; $3,175,961,000, and in addition, $375 million, to be derived by transfer from the Army Stock Fund: *Provided*, That section 212 of the act of June 30, 1932 (5 U.S.C. 59a), shall not apply to retired military personnel on duty at the U.S. Soldiers' Home: *Provided further*, That the duties of the librarian at the U.S. Military Academy may be performed by a retired officer detailed on active duty."

RESERVE PERSONNEL

"For pay, allowances, clothing, subsistence, transportation, travel and related expenses, as authorized by law, for personnel of the Army Reserve while on active duty under section 265 of title 10, United States Code, or undergoing Reserve training or while performing drills or equivalent duty, and for members of the Reserve Officers' Training

Corps; subsistence for members of the Army Reserve for drills of 8 or more hours' duration in any one calendar day; $222,759,000: *Provided,* That the Army Reserve personnel paid from this appropriation shall be maintained at an end strength of not less than 300,000 for the fiscal year 1959."

ARMY NATIONAL GUARD

"For pay, allowances, clothing, subsistence, transportation, and travel, as authorized by law, for personnel of the Army National Guard while on duty under section 265 of title 10, United States Code, while undergoing training or while performing drills or equivalent duties; expenses of training, organizing, and administering the Army National Guard, including maintenance, operation, and alterations to structures and facilities; hire of passenger motor vehicles; personal services in the National Guard Bureau and services of personnel of the National Guard employed as civilians without regard to their military rank, and the number of caretakers authorized to be employed under provisions of law (32 U.S.C. 709) may be such as is deemed necessary by the Secretary of the Army; subsistence for officers attending drills of 8 or more hours' duration in any 1 calendar day, travel expenses (other than mileage), as authorized by law for Army personnel on active duty, for Army National Guard division, regimental, and battalian commanders while inspecting units in compliance with National Guard regulations when specifically authorized by the Chief, National Guard Bureau; supplying and equipping the Army National Guard of the several States, Territories, and the District of Columbia, as authorized by law; and expenses of repair, modification, maintenance, and issue of supplies and equipment (including aircraft); $342,093,000: *Provided,* That obligations may be incurred under this appropriation for training of units designated for early deployment under mobilization plans and for installation, maintenance, and operation of facilities for antiaircraft defense without regard to section 107 of title 32, United States Code: *Provided further,* That the Army National Guard shall be maintained at an average strength of not less than 400,000 for the fiscal year 1959."

MILITARY PERSONNEL, MARINE CORPS

"For pay, allowances, subsistence, interest on deposits, gratuities, clothing, permanent change of station travel (including expenses of temporary duty between permanent duty stations), and transportation of dependents, household effects (including storage thereof), and privately owned automobiles, as authorized by law, for Regular and Reserve personnel on active duty (except those an active duty while undergoing Reserve training), $635,692,000, and, in addition, $25 million to be derived by transfer from the Marine Corps stock fund."

From Senate Report No. 1937 (Department of Defense appropriation bill) 85th Congress, 2d session, page 8:

"The Senate committee has approved the action of the House in adding funds to maintain the Marine Corps strength at 200,000 in reducing the appropriation by $1,200,000 in the permanent change-of-station travel account, and in utilizing $25 million of revolving funds in lieu of appropriations.

"The events in the Middle East during the past months have established beyond question, in the considered judgment of the committee, that the security of our Nation demands that the Marine Corps be maintained at a minimum strength of 200,000.

"This decision to appropriate the funds necessary for a 200,000-man Marine Corps was made with full consideration of the fiscal and military implications. The committee desires that it be clearly understood by appropriate agencies in the executive branch of the Government that it is the clear-cut intent of the committee, and of the proposed appropriating legislation, that the Marine Corps be maintained at the strength of 200,000."

From page 5, of the same report:

"Subsequent to the House action, additional budget estimates were submitted in Senate document 103, requesting consideration of an additional $179,561,000 for increased pay costs. This, the Senate committee has approved. In addition, the committee has approved the action of the House in recommending an increase in the strength of the Regular Army from 870,000 to 900,000, and has agreed to the Department's request to restore to a direct appropriation, $100 million, which the House had provided by transfer."

From House Report No. 1830 (Department of Defense appropriation bill) 85th Congress, 2d session, page 49:

"A strong Marine Corps is essential to our national defense establishment. The striking power of the operating forces of the Marine Corps consist primarily of three combat divisions and three air wings with supporting forces as provided by law. These forces deployed in this country, aboard ship, and in advance bases in the Pacific and the Far East, form a striking force immediately available and prepared to fight in a general war, a small war, or a limited war. The budget recommended by the President did not make adequate provision for these specifically authorized Marine Corps forces. It was based on a reduction in the fiscal year 1959 end strength to 175,000 men, 25,000 below the amount determined to be the minimum essential force level of the corps. Accordingly, the committee has provided funds for the maintenance of the Marine Corps which will enable them to reach a strength of 200,000 military personnel at the end of fiscal year 1959. The additional funds required for this personnel increase total $45,200,000 and have been allocated to various appropriations items as follows:

"Military personnel, Marine Corps	$36,650,000
"Marine Corps Troops and facilities	4,875,000
"Medical care, Navy	1,175,000
"Aircraft and facilities, Navy	2,500,000

"The funds recommended by the committee will enable the Marine Corps to maintain itself at the minimum strength required and will enable the corps to fulfill its traditional role in the national defense posture of this country as the Nation's force in readiness."

From page 32 of the same report:

"In the light of all the facts, including the committee's decision to exceed the budget by increasing the strength of the Marine Corps, the Army Reserve, and the Army National Guard and make other improvements in the readiness of our defense such as additional Polaris submarines and acceleration of the Minuteman and Hound-dog missile programs, the committee has decided not to exceed the budget for the 870,000-man Army. However, it is the committee's desire that the Army be provided with the most modern equipment and weapons, and along these lines it was testified that much of the current available equipment does not meet the tactical requirements of the reorganized pentomic forces."

From conference report on Department of Defense appropriation bill (H. Rept. 2503) from page 5:

"Amendment Nos. 5, 6, and 7: Military personnel: Appropriate $3,175,961,000 instead of $2,946,400,000 as proposed by the House and $3,225,961,000 as proposed by the Senate; provide for transfer from the Army Stock Fund of $375 million instead of $425 million as proposed by the House and $325 million as proposed by the Senate; and delete the provision of the Senate that the Regular Army shall be maintained at not less than 900,000 strength during fiscal year 1959. It is the belief of the committee of conference that the national defense requires the maintenance of a Regular Army of not less than 900,000 and it is the intent that the planned strength for fiscal year 1959 be maintained at that level in accordance with the funds provided."

From page 6 of the same report:

"Amendment Nos. 19 and 20, Military personnel, Marine Corps: Appropriate $635,692,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of $604,056,000 as proposed by the House, and delete provision of the Senate that the Marine Corps shall be maintained at not less than 200,000 strength during fiscal year 1959. As with the strength of the Regular Army it is the belief of the committee of conference that the national defense requires that the Marine Corps be maintained at a strength of not less than 200,000 and it is the intent that the planned strength for fiscal year 1959 be maintained at that level in accordance with the funds provided."

[From Newsweek, Feb. 16, 1959]

ADDING UP MILITARY POWER

MISSILE POWER

United States: ICBM's, none; IRBM's, 10.
U.S.S.R.: ICBM's, none; IRBM's, 500–1,000.

AIR POWER

United States: 850,000 men, 1,000 B–47 (medium) bombers, 500 B–52 (long-range) bombers, 35,500 other aircraft.

U.S.S.R.: 700,000 men, 350–850 medium bombers, 100–150 long-range bombers, 24,000 other aircraft.

SEA POWER

United States: 640,000 sailors, 189,000 marines, 15 attack carriers, no battleships, 11 antisub and other carriers, 14 cruisers, 240 destroyers, 112 submarines, 500 auxiliaries, 2,500 patrol vessels.

U.S.S.R.: 850,000 sailors, no carriers, 3 battleships, 27 cruisers, 150 destroyers, 200 attack submarines, 250 coast-defense submarines, 250 auxiliaries, 1,000 patrol vessels.

LAND POWER

United States: 870,000 men, 14 infantry divisions, 2 infantry brigades, 8 infantry battle groups, 6 armored regiments.

U.S.S.R.: 2.5 million men, 100 infantry divisions, 75 mechanized, and tank divisions.

THE NAVY BUDGET: FLEET WILL REMAIN AT CURRENT SIZE BUT AIRCRAFT INVENTORY WILL BE CUT

(By Hanson W. Baldwin)

The Navy's share of the administration's defense budget for the fiscal year 1960 will maintain a fleet of approximately the present size.

Some 864 ships, the same number as are now in service, are scheduled to be in commission in the next fiscal year; 389 will be warships and 475 will be supporting vessels, amphibious craft, and so on. The Navy's active aircraft inventory will drop to 9,117 by June 30, 1960, compared with 10,533 on June 30, 1958. Only some 7,200 of these will be operational. Forty-seven percent will be jet powered.

Fourteen attack aircraft carriers will be maintained instead of the 15 of last June, but new *Forrestal*-type carriers are replacing the old wartime *Essex* class.

SUBMARINE WAR STRESSED

The 1960 budget will maintain 16 carrier air groups—2 of them replacement groups—the same number as this year. More than 600 antisubmarine aircraft will be modified with new radar, and 2 new antisubmarine warfare task forces will be organized.

Patrol and warning squadrons will increase from 39 to 42 and the reorganization

of the Naval Air Reserve, to orient it toward an antisubmarine mission, will continue.

The manning level for the active fleet will average about 81 percent of normal war strength per ship and squadron, about the same as this year.

With new procurement funds the Navy will buy 668 aircraft, which is less than one-half of the annual procurement needed to maintain an active operating naval air arm of 7,200 planes.

AIR ARM SHRINKING

Officials believe that given the present rate of procurement of piloted aircraft, the naval air arm will decrease to 4,000 to 5,000 aircraft by 1963–64.

There is also considerable concern about the growing obsolescence of the fleet. The 1960 shipbuilding program provides for 18 new ships, including a conventional powered aircraft carrier of the *Forrestal* class, 6 guided-missile destroyers and frigates, 3 more nuclear-powered submarines, and 8 other vessels.

Nine Polaris missile-firing submarines had been provided prior to the 1960 budget, but the administration has withheld funds for some of them and has adopted a building program of about three a year and one aircraft carrier every other year.

The 1960 budget contains funds for long leadtime items for three more Polaris submarines, in addition to the nine already provided, but does not authorize or provide funds for the full costs of the three additional submarines.

The building program also includes the conversion and modernization of 13 old ships, including a cruiser, 8 destroyers, and 4 other vessels.

The present naval construction program of about 20 new ships a year is less than half the number needed to replace overage ships if the operating fleet's present size of 864 vessels is to be maintained.

The Marine Corps is already undergoing a reduction from an authorized strength of 200,000 to 175,000 during the current fiscal year; its strength is to remain at the 175,000 level in the fiscal year that begins next July 1.

President Eisenhower's budget message declares that "the Marine Corps will continue to support three divisions and three air wings in their traditional state of high combat readiness."

MARINES DEPLORE CUTS

The Marine Corps flatly disputes this. Gen. Randolph McC. Pate, the Commandant, has testified that the current reduction to 175,000 men will mean the elimination of 6 battalion landing teams out of the corps' current 27, and the elimination of 6 air squadrons.

The Marines will activate additional antiaircraft battalions to operate the Army-developed Hawk missile, designed for use against low-flying aircraft.

During the next 18 months an old aircraft carrier—the *Princeton*—is earmarked for use as a Marine helicopter landing ship. The use of this carrier, which will be operated with no material physical alterations, will give the Marines three ships from which to practice the technique of helicopter assault. Two have already been specially converted.

The administration's 1960 budget provides funds for maintaining a total of 1,030,000 Reserves, both Army and Air National Guard, in a paid status, as compared with 1,082,000 this year.

The President's budget envisages funds during the fiscal year 1960 for 330,000 Army reservists, 360,000 in the Army National Guard, 75,000 in the Air National Guard, 145,000 in the Navy Reserves, 48,000 in the Marine Corps Reserve, and 72,000 in the Air Force Reserve.

The Army National Guard will man an increased number of Nike antiaircraft battalions, and the Naval Reserve will provide at least cadre crews for 48 destroyers or destroyer escorts by the end of 1960.

The Air National Guard, its aircraft already 90 percent jet-powered, will be furnished more modern types in 1960.

The average cost of maintaining a Regular serviceman in uniform increases from $3,885 annually in 1958 to $4,150 in 1959 and to a figure estimated at $4,220 in 1960. This is chiefly due to pay increases and other added costs.

VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS
OF THE UNITED STATES,
Kansas City, Mo., February 27, 1959.

The Honorable MIKE MANSFIELD,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: As commander in chief of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, I recently had an opportunity to meet with leaders from your State during our annual legislative conference in Washington, D.C. Since talking with your constituents, I thought it advisable to write you on a matter that concerns all of us—national security.

The VFW, by resolution and by unanimity of opinion, feels that our country is losing basic military strength through proposed plans to reduce our defense establishment. We believe, and we are on record, that our country should have a balanced defense which is ready to move at a moment's notice whether on the ground, on the seas, or in the air. We further believe that a reduction in our ground forces in the face of the Khrushchev challenge over Berlin is unthinkable. Even though the Berlin situation might be settled peaceably, there are still many trouble spots in the world where American support has already been committed.

It is our understanding that unless plans to reduce forces are halted, the Army will lose one division and the Marine Corps will suffer drastic cuts in its combat strength. Our military strength must be great enough to insure peace.

We are told that Russia has 27 divisions on the borders of Western Europe alone. Instead of a reduction of forces, the VFW knows that the American people are willing to pay more for defense, if necessary, and we should keep our ground forces at least at the level recommended by the Congress which was 900,000 in the Army and 200,000 in the Marine Corps.

We would appreciate hearing from you on this matter and if you agree with us, I sincerely hope that you will lend your influence and support toward maintaining our military and naval forces at the above strength.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN W. MAHAN,
Commander in Chief.

CONTROL OF OIL IMPORTS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, on Saturday, President Eisenhower ordered a temporary, 10-day extension of voluntary controls of oil imports. The extension was made so the President could study new proposals which have been made to him for handling this basic problem.

The situation is serious. An industry that is vital to the security of our Nation is being threatened. It cannot long continue without firm action on the part of our Government.

It is my hope—and I believe the hope of all those who have made a thorough study of the situation—that the President will act firmly to prevent our domestic industry from being swamped by a flood of imports from countries where living standards are so low that our own people cannot compete.

I ask unanimous consent that there be printed at this point in the RECORD the United Press story on the action recommended to the President and the comments from the White House in connection with it.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

President Eisenhower today ordered a temporary, 10-day extension of the voluntary controls over oil imports while he studies new proposals for curbing them.

The White House said the extension until March 10 would give the President time to consider recommendations submitted yesterday by Leo Hoegh, Director of the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization.

The present system of voluntary quotas was to have expired at midnight.

Informed sources said the Government is expected to apply mandatory controls soon. Domestic producers have complained that the voluntary program has failed because some producers have refused to cooperate.

Eisenhower asked Interior Secretary Seaton to take action necessary to continue the voluntary system through March 10.

Press Secretary Hagerty would not comment on whether mandatory controls were recommended.

"I'm not going to say anything about the recommendations," he said. "We'll have an announcement soon."

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the majority leader yield to me?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I think I can fill in just a little at this point, by saying that the administration is aware of the importance of this matter. The former Governor of Iowa, Leo Hoegh, the Administrator of the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization, has concluded his hearings. I believe he has made his recommendations to the Cabinet committee. I apprehend that in this 10-day interim, the Cabinet committee will make an affirmative report; and I hope the report will be of such character and content as will be quite satisfactory.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I appreciate the statement of the Senator from Illinois. He has correctly stated the facts as I understand them to be. I appreciate his support in the matter; and I trust that the President will act promptly and decisively within the 10-day period.

A TRIUMPH OF CHARACTER—JOHN FOSTER DULLES

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, an excellent editorial under the title "A Triumph of Character" was published on last Saturday in the U.S. News & World Report. The editorial constitutes a splendid statement regarding John Foster Dulles and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A TRIUMPH OF CHARACTER

(By David Lawrence)

They ridiculed his phrases, but now they are singing his praises.

Why is there today wide acclaim for John Foster Dulles, Secretary of State, when only yesterday there was such bitter criticism? Americans have been told repeatedly by Democratic Party spokesmen for the last 2 or 3 years that the United States has no friends in Europe, that our allies have been alienated, that the administration really has had no foreign policy, and that Mr. Dulles is to blame.

Still more recently certain Members of Congress made the headlines by crying out that our policy is inflexible, that Mr. Dulles is too rigid, and that we should get off dead center.

The Kremlin, of course, has long been saying through its propaganda—over the radio and to newsmen through Soviet Ambassadors everywhere—that the main obstacle to the ending of the cold war is John Foster Dulles. If only he could be removed as Secretary of State, the Communists have said openly, everything would be rosy.

Plainly the Soviets do not like Mr. Dulles because he will not appease, he will not surrender, and he will not barter away the basic principles of international morality for the sake of expediency.

Events have proved Mr. Dulles was right in his stoical resistance to the insidious propaganda of those who sought peace at any price. That's why there has come, at last, a true appreciation of his services, just as he faces the tragic months ahead in fighting cancer.

There have been some occasions when Mr. Dulles has incurred the displeasure of our allies, especially in his stern stand against a punitive war over Suez. But what has happened since proves he was right.

Time and again Mr. Dulles has been assailed for views which were deliberately distorted in the press of the world. Even today, some critics still say he was wrong in espousing the cause of liberation for the peoples of the captive states of Eastern Europe. His plea for liberation was twisted to mean a threat to use military force.

The critics did not—or would not—perceive that moral force has always been the principal weapon in the arsenal of John Foster Dulles.

The Secretary is, however, no pacifist. His phrase "massive retaliation" has stood the test of time—the concept has proved a powerful deterrent of war. He has always been ready, as he once acknowledged, to go to "the brink of war" to show the sincerity of American purpose and a willingness to make every sacrifice for principle. The critics derided this as "brinkmanship," but they witnessed a successful manifestation of it recently in our decision to protect Quemoy and Matsu if it appeared that any military measures taken there by the Red Chinese were to be the forerunner of an invasion of Formosa itself.

Although Congress, by joint resolution in 1955, had given the President full power to deploy our military forces in defense of Formosa, there emerged in recent months some faint-hearted men in Congress and elsewhere who exhibited "peace at any price" weaknesses. They were inclined to a deal whereby Red China would be taken into the bosom of the free nations of the world and we would let bygones be bygones. But Mr. Dulles never forgot the sacrifices made by American boys in Korea—the many who died or suffered grievous wounds to repel the attack of the Communist Chinese, aided openly, as they were, by the Soviets. He could see no reason to reward an aggressor.

In its latest threat, the Kremlin startled the world by trying to detach Berlin from West Germany. The Moscow Government thought the time had come to test out the strength and determination of the West. This was promptly countered by the conference of Secretary Dulles with the heads of the British, French, and West German Governments. Though suffering excruciating pain physically, Mr. Dulles, undaunted, continued to perform his great mission. He was able to bind together the members of the Western alliance. A demonstration of allied unity has in itself proved to be one of the best ways to prevent the Soviets from assuming that the West is weakening. A miscalculation on that point by Moscow could plunge us into war.

John Foster Dulles has steadfastly adhered to principle. He has tenaciously maintained the ideals of free peoples everywhere. He has refused to be bullied by the Communists abroad or disheartened by the snipings of the partisans at home. He has fought for the best interests of the United States just as bravely as if he were a soldier facing the fire of the enemy. The world has indeed witnessed in his skillful conduct of American policy a heroism which will be engraved on the pages of history.

While the years of life itself are numbered, the years of a man's fame are unnumbered. In the career of John Foster Dulles, we see a triumph of courage, a triumph of unselfish devotion to public service, and, above all, a triumph of character.

AGRICULTURAL HALL OF FAME—THE LATE REPRESENTATIVE CHRISTOPHER, OF MISSOURI

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, Kansas was selected as the site of the home of the proposed Agricultural Hall of Fame.

It is truly fitting that this hall of fame should be located in Kansas, which is the geographical center of the contiguous land area of our Nation.

It is also fitting that the site selected is near Kansas City, which is the center of the great agricultural Midwest. Kansas City is truly the crossroad of our Nation—east and west, north and south. It is the home of the American Royal; it is the annual convention meeting place of thousands of Future Farmers of America. The location of the Agricultural Hall of Fame at Kansas City further closely associates agriculture and its allied interests with this great metropolitan center.

Many organizations and people in Kansas City worked diligently to secure the hall of fame for this area. After numerous proposed locations in both Missouri and Kansas were eliminated, Kansas City, Mo., and Kansas City, Kans., jointly sponsored the new location. Farm leaders, industrial leaders, and civic leaders of both Missouri and Kansas were united in support of this location.

One man I believe can be singled out for his untiring and unselfish interest in securing the location of the Agricultural Hall of Fame in Kansas and Kansas City, Kans., and that is Harry Darby, a former Member of this body.

The Kansas site is a tract of 365 acres of land, about 11 miles west and about 15 miles from the downtown area of Kansas City, Mo. It is near Bonner Springs interchange on Highway No. 70 which is a part of the Kansas Turnpike and on one of the main highways of the Interstate System.

Plans have already been completed for the construction of a $5 million building program at the site selected.

At a meeting of the executive committee on January 30, 1959, some definite plans for the general layout of the structure were agreed upon. These plans fit well into the vision of Mr. Howard Cowden, who has spent much time in the promotion of the Agricultural Hall of Fame, when he stated at an earlier meeting of the board:

> I hope that we can start planning in such a way that this country will some day have an appropriate shrine or memorial honoring those who have given America an agricultural industry that is the envy of the rest of the world.

He urged that the project be approached in the spirit of a motto which reads: "Make no little plans; they have not the power to stir men's souls."

The following units were recommended for inclusion in the Hall of Fame at the executive meeting:

An agricultural museum, a room where individuals who have contributed much to agriculture will be honored—including a shrine for farmers who have served in Congress; a children's unit designed to acquaint them with agriculture; a unit for young people and adults designed to show by exhibits the progress, achievements, and problems in agriculture; an historical library which will feature accomplishments of men honored; an old farm village, including a log cabin, sod hut, adobe house, and appropriate other buildings; an Indian village which will show agricultural practices and crops which we obtained from the Indians.

There will also be an outdoor amphitheater for use in telling in pageant form the history of agriculture, and for use on field days and for other special events; a small auditorium to be used for the presentation of a movie on agriculture; demonstrations on soil and water management, timber and wildlife conservation which are appropriate to the site and area; a room where donors to the Hall of Fame will be honored, and an international shrine.

At the same meeting of the board of governors, special mention was made of the death of Representative George H. Christopher, Congressman from the Fourth District of Missouri, and I ask unanimous consent that the statement be made a part of these remarks.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Agriculture Hall of Fame Association was saddened by the news of the unexpected death of Representative George H. Christopher, Congressman from the Fourth Missouri District, in Washington Saturday, January 24. Last year Representative Christopher introduced the resolution in the House of Representatives favoring the establishment of a hall of fame for agriculture and when it was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, the committee recommended the resolution be specifically directed to this organization. The committee's statement said: "The purpose of this concurrent resolution is to encourage efforts which are being made by private citizens to establish a hall of fame for agriculture. Some of the most distinguished agricultural leaders of the country have been enlisted in the effort to establish an agricultural hall of fame to commemorate and keep alive the

great contributions which agriculture has made to the greatness and prosperity of the United States."

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, House Concurrent Resolution 295, relating to the late Representative Christopher, was approved by the Senate on March 10, 1958.

The concurrent resolution was a duplicate of the Senate Concurrent Resolution which I submitted on March 10, 1958, with 30 additional cosponsors, and I ask unanimous consent that the concurrent resolution and the names of the sponsors be printed as a part of these remarks.

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution and names of sponsors were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 70) favoring the establishment of a hall of fame for agriculture, submitted by Mr. CARLSON (for himself and Senators CASE of South Dakota, SCHOEPPEL, MURRAY, HOBLITZELL, YARBOROUGH, REVERCOMB, CHAVEZ, THYE, NEUBERGER, SCOTT, ALLOTT, CAPEHART, BARRETT, THURMOND, BENNETT, AIKEN, WATKINS, PROXMIRE, HUMPHREY, HRUSKA, PAYNE, MUNDT, SPARKMAN, HILL, IVES, MARTIN of Pennsylvania, JOHNSTON of South Carolina, FLANDERS, SYMINGTON, COOPER, and MAGNUSON) was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, as follows:

"Whereas many of our bravest men and most valiant soldiers were of an agricultural background;

"Whereas the Founding Fathers of this Republic and many of its most eminent leaders were farmers;

"Whereas agriculture has played a dominant role in the rise of our country to greatness;

"Whereas there now exists halls of fame recognizing the glorious past for the baseball player, the cowboy, and others;

"Whereas the ox yoke, the bull-tongue plow, the hand-forged iron kettle, and the sod house represent the evolution of agricultural technology in this country and the difficulties which a determined people faced and successfully overcame in improving their way of life; and

"Whereas our American heritage should be preserved and tribute should be paid to the great men and women who over the years have helped to make American agriculture the most productive in the world: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That it is the sense of the Congress that there be established and maintained, as a memorial to the important role played by agriculture in the development of our Nation, a Hall of Fame for Agriculture, wherein there will be collected and preserved for posterity relics, artifacts, and other evidence and data relating to agriculture and the great contributions it has made and continues to make in the rise to greatness of our country; and the Congress does hereby commend, encourage, and sanction the efforts of any organization which undertakes to establish such a hall of fame."

PAYMENTS MADE UNDER FARM PRICE SUPPORT PROGRAM

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, a few days ago the distinguished Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a table showing large loans made under the farm price-support program to different farmers and farms. One of these was the Hain farm of Sardis, Ala. The table showed that a loan of $156,778 had been made to the Hains.

Following the insertion of that table and the publicity resulting from it, Mr. Val Hain, a member of the Alabama legislature and one of the owners of the Hain farm, gave an explanation which I think throws an entirely different light upon this particular loan. I believe it will be found of interest. Accordingly, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert at this point in my remarks a newspaper item from the Montgomery Advertiser of February 25, 1959.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DALLAS LEGISLATOR EXPLAINS $156,778 FARM LOAN

SARDIS.—One of the owners of a large Alabama farm took issue Tuesday with criticism of his $156,778 Federal farm price support loan of 1957.

Val Hain, a member of the Alabama legislature and one of the owners of the Hain farm near Selma, said four owners and 190 tenant farmers were involved in the loan.

He said the owners never participated in the soil bank cotton program and added:

"We, the owners, don't plant any cotton ourselves. It's allotted to 190 tenant farmers and when you break that figure of $156,778 down it means each individual received only a small amount."

An equal division would give each of the 190 a payment of about $824.

The criticism came from Senator JOHN J. WILLIAMS, Republican, of Delaware, who has sought repeal of current farm price-support laws.

He mentioned the Hain farm as one that received a Federal loan of more than $100,000 in 1957.

WILLIAMS argued that the farm price-support law is "little more than a Government guarantee on the operations of corporate-type farming and actually encourages and underwrites absentee ownership to the detriment of the small farmers."

Hain said his farm was allotted 1,400 acres for cotton and the loan was for 750 bales.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, it is interesting to note from Mr. Hain's statement that not a dollar of this loan went to any owner of the farm, but, instead, that it went to 190 different tenant farmers. The entire farm had an overall cotton allotment of 1,400 acres, not an acre of which was planted by the owners of the farm. These 1,400 acres were distributed among 190 tenant farmers. The loan was likewise distributed among these 190 tenant farmers, and was made on a total production of 750 bales of cotton.

FORTY-FIRST ANNIVERSARY OF REPUBLIC OF ESTONIA

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, belatedly, but most sincerely, I take this opportunity to add my voice to the many who have spoken out on the occasion of the 41st anniversary of the Republic of Estonia which was commemorated on February 24. Our Government has steadfastly refused to recognize the Soviet usurpation of the independent Republic of Estonia. We have not forgotten the Estonian people, who have struggled so against the slavery imposed upon them; we have not forgotten their dream of freedom and independence; and we fervently hope that the day is not too far distant when self-government for their homeland will become a reality.

FINLAND'S KALEWALA DAY

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the people of Finland, like the people of the United States, share a common dream of abundance and happiness. This dream is the source of the traditional Finnish story about Kalewala, the mythical land of joy and plenty.

We in the United States take pride in the contributions to our country by Americans of Finnish descent who have helped to turn myth into reality. I hope we will see early action on reform in our immigration laws to encourage more Finns to come and add their talents to American life. My own State of Minnesota has reaped tremendous benefits in the fields of agriculture and industry from our citizens of Finnish descent.

In observing Kalewala Day, we join all friends of Finland in celebrating this traditional holiday, which reminds us of man's never-ending struggle for peace and prosperity.

AGRICULTURAL PRICE SUPPORT

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, last week the distinguished Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] made a statement on the floor of the Senate in which he criticized the agricultural program and particularly that part of it which allows loans on agricultural products. I know that the distinguished Senator would want to be completely accurate in his remarks; therefore, I wish to invite to his attention, and to the attention of my other colleagues, the true situation relative to five cottongrowers who reside in Arizona and who were listed by the Senator in his statement.

The study shows that the cotton produced by these growers and placed in the cotton loan program was 93.16 percent redeemed prior to July 31, 1958. The remaining 6.94 percent remained in the stock of the Commodity Credit Corporation for sale to the highest bidder. I should like to invite attention to the fact that when a farmer redeems cotton he not only pays the original loan but he also pays storage fees and carrying charges, so actually the Government does not take any loss on redeemed cotton.

Mr. President, I am in no more sympathy with the Agricultural Act we are working under today than is the distinguished Senator from Delaware, but I would be remiss in my obligations to my constituents if I did not invite attention to the fact that those farmers in Arizona mentioned by the Senator have subsequently repaid the loans made, and I might say that this is consistent with their practices in the past. I do not think the Senator from Delaware should criticize individual farmers for taking advantage of an act which was passed by the Congress of the United States.

Rather, he should criticize the Congress if he feels that this action is not proper. I know these farmers personally. I know them to be solid citizens interested in good farming, and I would like the record to stand with no implication that they have acted in any way outside the law. Neither would I want this statement to be deemed critical of my very good friend from Delaware, for whom I have the utmost respect not only personally but for his efforts in calling attention to the ways in which our Government wastes money.

I ask unanimous consent that a table I have compiled be printed at this point in the RECORD, together with a letter written to the editor of the Arizona Republic by Mr. E. S. McSweeny, executive secretary of the Arizona Cotton Growers Association.

There being no objection, the table and letter were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Grower	Bales in loan	Loan principal	Bales out of loan	Interest paid	Bales remaining in loan
Morrison Bros., Higley, Ariz	3,040	$481,465.32	2,712	$5,279.46	328
Charles Urrea & Son, Mesa, Ariz	2,673	304,380.65	2,459	4,142.48	214
W. R. Neely, Chandler, Ariz	2,274	362,214.45	2,038	3,891.09	236
Hooper & Rugg, Casa Grande	2,145	325,279.72	1,946	3,562.37	199
Phillips & Ellsworth, Mesa	1,707	302,924.10	1,489	3,466.75	218

(Figures were provided by E. S. McSweeny of Arizona Cotton Growers Association. He got them from Calcot of California, the outfit which had taken the cotton.)

[From the Arizona Republic]

NEWS STORY UNFAIR TO COTTON FARMERS

EDITOR, THE ARIZONA REPUBLIC:

There appeared February 24 a news release from Washington which we believe is manifestly unfair to the cotton farmers of Arizona and of the United States.

The article quotes Senator WILLIAMS of Delaware as stating that certain farmers, including five Arizonians who are named, received rather large subsidy checks from the Government.

This is a case of taking certain facts to make a point while deliberately ignoring the full story.

Of the cotton produced by the five Arizona growers and placed in the cotton loan program, 93.16 percent was redeemed prior to July 31, 1958 and entered the channels of trade. The remaining 6.94 percent of the cotton concerned remained in the hands of Commodity Credit Corporation for sale to the highest bidder.

Senator WILLIAMS, for his own reasons, deliberately neglects to include in his statement for the record that such cotton is redeemed. When a farmer redeems his cotton, he not only repays the original loan made by Commodity Credit Corporation, but he must also pay storage fees and carrying charges so that the Federal Government does not take any loss whatever on the 93 percent of the loan which was repaid. And the farmer is not just given a U.S. Treasury check to do with as he saw fit.

The price support program was developed for the purpose of permitting a farmer to market his crop in an orderly manner. Rather than being forced to throw the whole crop on the market at harvest time when the market is flooded and the price is depressed, the farmer is allowed to borrow from Commodity Credit Corporation on his cotton, placing the actual cotton in a bonded warehouse for security. The farmer then has a period of time within which to repay the loan and redeem the cotton, paying the charges mentioned.

The farmers mentioned in the story merely took advantage of this opportunity to market their crop in a businesslike manner and to the best advantage. The implication credited to Senator WILLIAMS that they received a handout is incorrect and leads to the wrong conclusion by people reading such articles.

E. S. MCSWEENY,
Executive Secretary,
Cotton Grower's Association.

THE COMMUNIST ECONOMIC CHALLENGE

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, during the past several years, but more especially after my recent trip to the Soviet Union, I have in my public speeches in various parts of the country pointed to the challenge of the Soviet economic offensive to the free world. In the near future I shall attempt to spell out some of the implications of the Communist economic challenge on the floor of the Senate.

In this connection I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excellent article by Gov. Adlai E. Stevenson, "This Time We Might Get Licked," which was published in the New York Times magazine on March 1, 1959. I agree with Governor Stevenson that the very power and magnitude of the Soviet offensive will place us in great peril unless we respond with vigor and determination.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THIS TIME WE MIGHT GET LICKED

(By Adlai E. Stevenson)

In 1926, as a young man, I traveled across the young Soviet Union from the Caucasus to Finland. Now, three decades later, I have traveled from Finland out to Central Asia and Siberia—including areas, closed to foreigners, which the Soviet Government kindly opened to me.

Like all Americans I am curious about Russia, which has contradicted our ideas, organized a vast empire, raised our taxes, and challenged the United States to political, economic, and military competition everywhere—all in 40 years. That is why I went back—to see the Russia of today and its leaders for myself.

The changes I saw in the Soviet Union after 30 years did not surprise me very much—except that the people were more friendly, their ignorance and anxiety about America greater, and the industrialization more spectacular than I had expected.

The journey confirmed my impression that no relaxation in the Communist offensive is imminent and that there are no visible signs of internal weakness or upheaval in the Soviet Union. On the contrary, the material achievements are profoundly impressive; the vast Russian land is beginning to yield up its wealth; and most Soviet citizens are proud and loyal, like most citizens everywhere. Nor could I detect that our negative policy toward the Soviet Union was likely to induce the Soviet collapse which has been periodically foretold from official Washington in recent years, or even contain the expansion of Soviet influence.

But the Communist system has frailties. The imperial czars' successors were chosen by dynastic inheritance, but in the Soviet autocracy no system of orderly transfer of power without conspiracy, violence and exile has been evolved. The present massive stability of the U.S.S.R. obscures the insidious instability of a big, modern, industrial state ruled autocratically. When a system, like the Soviet, lacks a legalized opposition, it is inherently unstable. And I suspect the reason they have not solved the problem of orderly transfer of power is that it is insoluble in the dictatorial framework.

The Russian people have never known real democracy. They passed, by revolution, from czarism to Soviet communism with only moments of chaotic liberalism. But Russia has a long tradition, especially among the intelligentsia, of aspiration for individual freedom, and for the whole scale of humane and compassionate values.

It is a tradition so profound that no surface revolution can erase it. The very violence of the recent official outcry against Boris Pasternak, who has voiced in print the claims of the human spirit, testifies to the fear of its revival. Perhaps—who knows?—the drama of the lonely Pasternak is one of those portents of freedom in Russia of which he writes. And we can find some sober, long-range hope in history's lesson that dictatorship is never eternal.

But I came away from this vibrant country with a much clearer feeling for the people's hunger for peace and dread of another war. I felt that the Russian people are really more fearful of the United States than we are of them, which is not hard to understand in view of our ring of airbases and the incessant propaganda about the hostility of the ruling cliques of the imperialist-capitalist powers.

Assuming we do not invite Soviet military adventure by our weakness, I do not fear a third world war. They know the terrible consequences; the very words "world war" themselves are obsolete as a description of national suicide. But to avoid mutual suicide we are both piling up weapons to shoot at one another. It doesn't make sense, especially to the poor and fearful bystanders—a fact the Soviet peace propaganda skillfully exploits.

Moreover, large-scale war would interrupt the huge economic development program which has been rapidly transforming this backward agrarian system into a highly industrialized, modern state—by methods and at a price, to be sure, which no democratic people would long tolerate. The United States and the capitalists are still the deadly demons of Soviet propaganda. And one is amused by the spectacle of a whole nation damning capitalists and the United States, while at the same time busily trying to catch up with the United States and the hated capitalists.

The new 7-year play for industrial development, if achieved, will bring Russia close to American living standards in another decade. War could only further postpone the day when the long-suffering, hard-working Russian people begin to enjoy the fruits of their toil and relief from the grinding austerity of the past.

On the assumption that well-to-do people are more passive and peaceful than the envious and poor, the liberalizing tendencies in Russia should increase as prosperity increases. So why not trade with them? Why not help them improve living standards? Why not encourage the growth of material abundance and thereby make it harder to

preserve the secrecy, ignorance and tight controls of the Soviet system? Why not help the Soviet leaders subvert their own system of fear with the confidence bred of plenty? And especially why not when our refusal to trade with them has not stopped them from developing the Soviet economy at a spectacular pace?

The Soviet leaders attach topmost priority to the success of their new 7-year development plan. The goals are so ambitious, however, that there must be grave doubt whether they can be reached without reducing military expenditures. The strain will increase in 1960 when the Russian manpower shortage, resulting from the German invasion in the last war, will become most severe.

The foreseeable conflicting demands of heavy industry, consumer goods and military spending suggest that we may be fast approaching the time when the Russians may be more receptive to détente and to serious disarmament proposals—an opportunity we should not overlook. Already the Russians are asking quiet questions about the effect of reduced military spending on the American economy.

But there is risk as well as hope in Russia's economic forward surge. The relaxing, liberalizing effect of prosperity and equality which we can hope for is not as evident as Soviet scientific progress and military might. Probably a fourth of Russia's production goes into war potential, and in the new 7-year plan the military program still seems to get first priority. Then follow the development of China and the Communist bloc; the ambitious economic offensive using trade and aid as the major weapons of Soviet foreign policy; and, finally, the need to raise living standards.

Dominated by the pragmatic communism of Nikita Khrushchev's school of thought, the Soviet Union is seeking to insure its military power and security—and it is doing it. It is seeking to develop its limitless resources—and it is doing it. It is seeking to spread its influence far and wide in a world where choas and misery abound, where new nations are beset with economic difficulties, and where Western democracy is in many places, alas, now on the retreat. And it is doing that, too.

The Russians' primary weapon is economic power. They say so themselves. And we should take them seriously. Congress generously supports our defense effort, but every year we have to fight the battle of trade and aid, as if the Russian economic offensive were something temporary and less dangerous or permanent than the military threat. Nor has the Western alliance faced the realities of the greatest threat of all and concerted its enormous economic power in a coherent counteroffensive.

Evidently the reality of our peril is the most difficult thing for us to accept. Just as I wish Mr. Khrushchev and thousands of Russians of all stations could come here and see what this peaceful, contented, free country is really like, so I wish countless Americans could go where I have gone around the world, see what I have seen, hear what I have heard.

They would see and hear, among other unpleasant things, that the rich nations are getting richer while the poor are getting poorer. This is a disaster for us, the rich, which the Russians are making the most of on a world scale. As a poor nation that has pulled itself up by its own bootstraps, as it were, Russia has a great attraction to other poor nations who are natively suspicious of the West, or have been disaffected by our military bargaining and self-righteous moralizing.

Americans abroad would also discover that the Russians conduct their economic offensive in these decisive population areas with many techniques; they sell Russian products at cut prices to get foreign exchange and capture markets; they barter oil and machinery, for example, for South American coffee and wool: they buy commodities other countries desperately want to sell; they lend money at low interest rates, build industrial plants, and provide technicians who speak the languages and live humbly like the local people.

I think our inquiring travelers would come to the conclusion that Soviet economic-political penetration is formidable and succeeding. The extension of Communist control ultimately means strangulation or conformity for us. And it presents some questions that we Americans and our free friends must grapple with.

Can we, will we, take the bold and costly measures to avert disaster in this contest? Can we, will we, make the greater effort—now while there is still time—to arrest the fatal economic deterioration and provide an alternative to communism as a technique of change and growth in the poor, underdeveloped lands?

But these questions lead to others that we cannot avoid much longer.

In the first place, the political-economic contest with the Communist bloc is not a passing nuisance; it will last a long time; it is serious; and it is probably decisive. We in the West will have to learn to conduct it with the same sense of continuity and urgency that we apply to maintaining our military defenses.

It is a fair question whether we can compete with the Soviet state trading system with our free system of private foreign trade. To match their flexibility—their ability to buy, sell, and invest where, when, and how they please for political advantage—maybe we, too, will have to adopt new methods of state trading, and even combine with other free countries.

And I have saved the hardest questions for the last:

Can our American system prevail in competition with the central planning, control, and direction of the Soviet system?

Can we mobilize, organize, and utilize our human and natural resources as effectively as they can?

Can we do so without imposing controls that imperil the very freedom and values we in the United States are trying to preserve?

Are our institutions adequate to conduct foreign policy in competition with the speed, secrecy, and certainty of the Kremlin?

In a shooting war our system seems to perform more effectively than a dictatorship—or, at least, so the evidence of World Wars I and II suggests. Then everything was subordinated to the demands of victory, and the Government was able to make drastic and uncomfortable decisions, promptly and without fear of serious public protest. But in our present situation, the Government can rarely act promptly and decisively; often it cannot act at all, because domestic political considerations are not subordinated to the needs of an effective foreign policy.

For our Constitution and the unwritten rules of our political system were both designed for a different purpose. They were evolved at a time when we were committed to a policy of nonentanglement with foreign countries. So our Founding Fathers created a system that has proved extremely effective for composing internal differences, but it was not designed for coping with international problems. At the time this did not matter since the oceans provided wonderfully effective protection against all possible enemies.

Now the world is completely different, but our machinery remains the same. Congressmen are bound to be concerned primarily with the demands of their constituents; the national interest is apt to be a secondary consideration. In addition, under our system, any foreign policy measure can be held up or killed by any sizable group in Congress.

Our wheatgrowers can strain our traditional relations with Canada, the textile interests can cause trouble with Japan and England; Zionists can complicate our relations in the Middle East. And a single Congressman in a strategic position can mess up our immigration laws or cripple our overseas propaganda operations.

In particular, it is immensely difficult for the executive agencies to plan and carry out a coherent, farsighted strategy of economic warfare, so long as imports, exports and overseas investments are subject to the whims and self-interest of every domestic pressure group. And, as I have said, it is likely that the economic battlefield will prove the decisive one.

Our traditions place us at a disadvantage in several other ways: for example, our habit of making appropriations on an annual basis only. How can India—or a dozen other countries to which American aid is crucial—make long-range economic plans when they may have to be changed or discarded at the next session of Congress? Or, for that matter, how can we plan a long-range, worldwide economic development program with our allies, or a defense program employing missiles and electronic systems which take decades to develop, on the basis of annual appropriations?

Again, how can we develop a Foreign Service that will attract our ablest talent so long as no pressure group of any consequence has any interest in supporting it? The Russians can order their ablest men into diplomacy or on a disagreeable overseas assignment. But the State Department has to compete against the far higher pay of, say, the advertising and television industries—and no Congressman can hope to win a single vote by fighting to get better pay and representation allowances for the men who are now, literally, the first line of our defense.

What troubles me even more is that the American people are not showing many signs that they are willing to do what is necessary to win the long contest with Russia.

They are frittering away talent, time, and resources on trivialities—ranging from quiz shows to Detroit's chromium creations—while the Russians are concentrating everything on their overriding goal. Again, this is partly due to lack of leadership; they have never been told, by the only men who can command continual national attention, what has to be done, and what sacrifices they must make to achieve it. (And if they are told in a political campaign there is, I think, some evidence at least that they don't like it.)

But I am not sure whether any President can persuade the country—without the stimulus of war—to do these things. Maybe our kind of democracy has a fatal addiction to short views rather than long; to present comforts rather than future safety; to private satisfactions rather than public necessities. Else why do we spend more money on advertising than on education—on tobacco than on books—on entertainment than on urban renewal?

The next 10 years, I would guess, will really prove whether this Nation or any nation so conceived and so dedicated can long endure—and right now the prognosis is not good. We are losing ground nearly everywhere; we are not taking measures necessary to stop the loss; and hardly anybody seems to care.

In our fat, dumb, and happy fashion, we assume that we can't lose—that if we stand firm, persevere, and damn the Communists enough, right will surely prevail in the end. Well, it didn't once before, when Athenian democracy was involved in a similar long, tiresome struggle with Spartan tyranny. On that occasion an infinitely superior civilization went under, because it lacked the self-discipline to survive. One could cite other examples. Is it happening again, right here and right now?

My conclusion is that our Russian competitors are much tougher than most of us have yet realized—and that this time we might get licked, unless we are willing to change our habits, our political behavior and and our complacent outlook on the world.

But the sky, to me, is not dark. I like to think of the great forward thrust of communism not as a threat but as a great chance to demonstrate again that only free institutions can achieve the right ends by the right methods, and thereby satisfy man's innermost urgings.

As Julian Huxley has said: "In lower organisms the only ultimate criterion is survival; but in man some experiences and actions, some objects and ideas are valued for their own sake."

I confess that whenever I hear talk about what we, the great, free Western democracies—we who value actions and ideas for their own sake—can and cannot do or afford to do, I am reminded of the imperial Manchus, who disdained the Western barbarians for inventing steamships. The Manchus were obsolete, and their glory and power have vanished long since.

Are we obsolete, too? Of course not. Our free economy has just survived the third recession since the war and again confounded communism's confident prediction of an inevitable and shattering capitalist depression. Western economic strength has never been greater. And it has expanded and multiplied production and human well-being largely by private investment.

Thus have the free institutions of the West disproved the Socialist doctrine that only government investment and ownership can insure economic growth. One by one the Socialist parties of Europe have abandoned the only basic idea they shared with communism—government ownership of the means of production. And, one by one, the Communist parties of Europe have lost strength.

We have the supreme advantage of living under the economic and political system that most people want, as history teaches us. Once we are fully aware that the system is in danger I have no doubt what we will do.

PROBLEMS OF FARMWORKERS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD my statement submitted to the public hearing held by the National Advisory Committee on Farm Labor in Washington a few days ago. Dr. Frank Porter Graham, former U.S. Senator and University of North Carolina president, is chairman of this committee which held hearings to determine what action might be taken to better the unhappy financial, social, and educational levels of this country's migrant agricultural workers. I was proud to present to this group my views on this subject.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF SENATOR HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, OF MINNESOTA, FOR THE PUBLIC HEARING OF THE NATIONAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON FARM LABOR

Because it is impossible for me to testify in person due to the pressure of Senate activity, I welcome this opportunity to set forth my views on the vital question you are considering in these hearings.

At the outset, let me say that commendation is due this body of prominent citizens for focusing the public conscience on the problem of this mass of workers and their families whose shocking conditions have been a festering sore in our social economy for many decades, and deeply trouble many of us.

The exploitation of these workers year after year by the large-scale corporate and other farm operators has undoubtedly been a considerable factor in accelerating the trend away from family-type farming, because of the competitive advantage it gives the big operators over the family farmer doing his own work with his own family.

Quite frankly, the position of the current administration on this problem perplexes me.

President Eisenhower, in his January 9, 1956, message to Congress, expressed concern about the trend I have mentioned when he said, "More than prices and incomes are involved. In America, agriculture is more than an industry; it is a way of life. Throughout our history, the family farm has given strength and vitality to our entire social order. We must keep it healthy and vigorous."

With that sentiment I heartily agree. Yet I fail to find that sentiment reflected in present public policy.

Only yesterday, Secretary of Agriculture Ezra Benson sent a statement to this distinguished committee completely glossing over the human suffering from low wages and working conditions experienced by multitudes of farm workers in this country, especially the 900,000 migrants, offering as his only conclusion that "if agricultural employment were not available, some of them might be dependent on various types of welfare programs."

Secretary Benson said nothing about the disgracefully low wages which the 2 million farm workers are paid, nor about the shameful working conditions under which many of them are forced to labor. In effect, he admits that their employment in agriculture is a substitute for relief rolls. He apparently dismisses them from further concern on the grounds that in many cases, these people do not have the skills and training to secure nonagricultural employment.

I regret that Secretary Benson had no more constructive suggestions to offer to this group of prominent citizens so deeply troubled by this problem.

Fortunately, it was more encouraging to have Secretary of Labor James Mitchell, one of the speakers at last night's dinner of the National Advisory Committee headed by former Senator Frank P. Graham and including Mrs. Franklin D. Roosevelt and former Senator Herbert Lehman, declare that ideally there should be a minimum wage for farm workers.

Let us hope and pray that this idealism finds fruition soon in a minimum wage law for agricultural workers sponsored by the Department of Labor with full support of the administration.

It is also encouraging that the council of State governments committee on migratory labor is readying proposed legislation that will include a minimum wage for agricultural workers.

I share the view expressed by a group of 10 Congressmen, including 2 from my own State, in a joint statement issued a few days ago that Congress must meet the challenge of the National Advisory Committee's inquiry—that legislation must be considered and supported which will provide a concrete program to raise the living standards of this large segment of our population.

These farm workers, in combination with the three or more million of underemployed family-type small farmers in our Nation, represent a total population, with their families, of somewhere around 20 million. Aside from the humanitarian aspect of concern over their condition in the rural slums in our country, they represent a purchasing-power potential of importance to our national economy.

On the basis of such consideration, as one Senator who was formerly chairman of a Senate Labor and Public Welfare Subcommittee which conducted extensive hearings and made specific recommendations concerning the problems of farm labor, I urge my colleagues in the Senate and House to do something at this session of Congress to effectuate the findings of the National Advisory Committee on Farm Labor deriving from these hearings now in progress—and pledge my personal support to that end.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent that a news story written by Robert E. Hennessee, of the Tufty News bureau, be printed in the RECORD. This article not only reported on the public hearing of the National Advisory Committee on Farm Labor, but also caught the very spirit of the occasion.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WASHINGTON.—The Secretaries of Labor and Agriculture are at loggerheads over the no-good people.

And the do-gooders, who want to help the no-gooders, are happily cheering Labor Secretary Mitchell.

Mitchell has stuck his neck out inside the administration by endorsing a minimum wage standard for Americas 2½ million farm laborers.

Especially, he has incurred the wrath of Ezra Taft Benson, of Agriculture, who, along with most farmers, is against a minimum wage on the farm.

The do-gooders, or romantics, as they are disparagingly called by the realists, are essentially those who make up the National Advisory Council on Farm Labor. The only lobby the migratory worker has.

NACFL, which has been meeting in Washington and received the good news from Mitchell, has some strong supporters on Capitol Hill. And action on minimum wage may be pressed this session.

Mitchell, however, urges them to hold off until next year when he hopes to submit some specific recommendations. But he agrees with the do-gooders that migrant workers will "never be able to successfully resist exploitation" without a minimum wage.

A farm is not like a factory, say the realists of the Benson school, and migrant laborers are beyond the pale, lodged at the bottom of society by their own innate inertia.

But there are no innately incapable, congenitally inferior people, answers Dr. Frank Porter Graham, former University of North Carolina president and U.S. Senator, who is a member of the NACFL council. He urges that we give him "hope in the land of the Pilgrim's hope," this migratory farm laborer.

Who moves north with the sun and south with the birds; moving on, with wife and child, in crowded truck beds at 20 hours to

the clip, from the Florida, Texas, and California citrus groves to harvest sugar beets in Minnesota, beans in Michigan, and potatoes in Maine.

Living in shacks, or at the best barracks; often with one outhouse for 40 or more families; with part of his wages held back to insure the laborer will stick around when the work gets hard, or the sun hot.

They are Southern Negroes, Kentucky hillbillies, laid-off Pennsylvania coal workers, and families, Mexican wetbacks, and imports from the Caribbean.

They are the no-good people.

MILITARY AID WASTE CLAIMED

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I noticed in the Washington Post and Times Herald of this morning, as well as in the New York Times—and I am sure the article appeared throughout the press of the Nation—an article entitled "Military Aid Waste Claimed." According to the article, a House subcommittee lifted the secrecy veil from U.S. overseas arms aid by giving a report as to some of the maladministration of the program.

Mr. President, my comments will be brief and to the point. I have continuously, throughout my years in the Senate, supported our foreign aid program both in its economic and military aspects. I have voted against the proposals to reduce these programs, but, Mr. President, I believe a report such as that which now comes from the House of Representatives, from a subcommittee of the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the other body, compels every one of us to carefully reexamine what has been going on in these programs.

I hope that the President of the United States will give his personal attention to this very, very shocking report which has come to our attention this morning. I have not been able to get a full copy of the report, but I have asked for it from the House Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Just this minute, Mr. President, the interim report has been placed on my desk.

I say, in the spirit of friendship and cooperation in the field of foreign affairs, that it is absolutely imperative that these programs be administered in a constructive and efficient manner. This is a business administration; and the least we can expect is businesslike direction of the greatest program of our Government in terms of economic assistance, namely, the foreign aid program.

I repeat my initial statement, that the President of the United States should give his personal attention to this particular report, and assign whatever personnel may be necessary to track down every claim and every criticism that has been made, so that when the mutual security program is presented to the Senate and the House, we shall have a program that can be justified, not only in terms of dollars, not only in terms of objectives, but also in terms of administration.

I say this as a friend of the program, one who wants to see it effectively administered, and to see its purposes fulfilled. We cannot go on like this. We cannot have the American people being told by a responsible committee of the Congress that there is such an unbelievable waste of foreign aid material.

Some of the findings reported were as follows:

A foreign motor pool got enough tires out of U.S. aid in 1 year to put 44 tires on each truck.

American materials intended for military construction were used to build apartment houses for foreign civilians.

Poor recordkeeping by natives who knew little English produced stock-record cards which read "for so many cases of 'This side up.'"

One U.S.-aided installation had a 185-year supply of a single ammunition item. In another case there was only one 2½ ton truck engine carburetor in stock for an entire army.

This is not a foreign aid program. This is only mismanagement confounded and compounded. It cannot go on.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I ask that the Senator from Minnesota be granted 1 additional minute in order that he may yield to me.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I should like to remind my good friend from Minnesota that I have been preaching this gospel of economy in our foreign aid program for the past 6 years. I hope the Senator from Minnesota will examine the reports on the overseas operations of our Government that I have filed with the Senate Appropriation Committee for the past seven years. I particularly call to the attention of the Senator from Minnesota the report relating to South and Central America, which I filed on February 9 of this year. In this report he will find a number of items which require the close scrutiny of the executive department. Over the past number of years I have been a consistent opponent of waste in our foreign aid programs. For this stand I have received much abuse. I have been labeled as a person who is opposed to all foreign aid. This was not true then and it is not true today.

What I oppose is the vast, unforgivable waste which can be found in many of our foreign aid operations.

Through the past 3 years I have made formal reports—which have been printed—on my findings of waste in foreign aid operations. The record is replete with specific examples of waste that I have seen in the field.

Now, at long last, I am glad to see other voices raised with mine that this unconscionable waste be brought to an end.

Mr. HUMPHREY. As the Senator knows, I have not cheered him very much by my votes. I have voted against amendments which have been offered by the Senator from Louisiana.

I wish to see an adequate foreign aid program. I think we may need an even bigger program than we have; but I cannot, in good conscience, vote for foreign aid measures when examples of maladministration are brought to our attention time after time. We need people to administer a program which is not a political program. We need people who understand the program, and know how to administer a vast oversea economic program. We have had far too many administrators who have not had the time, during their term of office, to carry on efficient and responsible operation.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I am glad to hear the Senator from Minnesota make the remarks he has made today. I have been talking along the same line for the past 10 or 12 years, trying to tell the Senate that the manner in which we administer the foreign aid program throughout the world is doing us more harm than good. I believe that if we dig a little deeper we shall find plenty more in Denmark that is rotten.

RELOCATION OF FAMILIES DISPLACED BY NEW FREEWAYS

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, Mayor Terry Schrunk of Portland, Oreg., has effectively pointed out a serious omission from the Federal Interstate Highway program. This is the problem of relocation of thousands of families who are being displaced by the new freeways. This problem is particularly acute in urban areas, and Mayor Schrunk estimates that in Portland alone, 5,000 households will be displaced during the next 11 years, and 250 families are about to be uprooted by the East Bank Freeway at the present time. Existing State and Federal agencies are unable to deal with this problem.

This problem is particularly acute for tenants who are not property owners and who are forced to move as a result of the highway program. Homeowners receive fair compensation for their property, tenants receive nothing. It is important to note that under the Housing Act of 1949, as amended, provision is made in section 106(2) of title 1 for the payment of up to $100 to families and single individuals and up to $2,500 to businesses for moving expenses and fair compensation for loss of property. Our Federal highway legislation contains no such provision and tenants, homeowners and businesses are completely on their own so far as moving costs are concerned.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks a letter I received from Mayor Schrunk, dated January 26, together with a copy of the mayor's press release on this problem.

There being no objection, the letter and press release were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CITY OF PORTLAND,
OFFICE OF THE MAYOR,
Portland, Oreg., January 26, 1959.

Senator RICHARD L. NEUBERGER,
Portland, Oreg.

DEAR RICHARD: I wish to call your attention to a serious situation which is developing in Oregon and which arises from the

accelerated, federally aided freeway program. The situation is the plight of the thousands of families who will be uprooted by the construction of these freeways. It has been estimated that in Portland alone some 5,000 households will be displaced during the next 11 years.

As you know, the Bureau of Public Roads is the agency through which the States receive 90 percent of the cost of these freeways. I can find no evidence that this agency assumes any responsibility for helping people displaced by freeways to find other places to live. Certainly, the Oregon State Highway Commission assumes none. Its representatives take the position that the Highway Commission is prevented by law from offering any type of relocation service and further that the commission is completely unable to deal with this problem.

It appears that Federal law is in strange contrast to Federal urban renewal law. Title 1 of the Housing Act of 1949, as amended through 1957, provides in section 105(c) that in order to qualify for Federal loans or capital grants, a local urban renewal agency much show evidence that "there are or are being provided, in the urban renewal area or in other areas not generally less desirable in regard to public utilities and public and commercial facilities and at rents or prices within the financial means of the families displaced from the urban renewal area, decent, safe, and sanitary dwellings equal in number to the number of and available to such displaced families and reasonably accessible to their places of employment."

Section 106(2) of title 1 of the same act provides for the payment of up to $100 to families and single individuals and up to $2,500 to business establishments for moving expenses and actual, direct losses of property.

As you will note from the accompanying detailed statement, I feel strongly that both Federal and State highway laws should be amended to make at least some relocation service available to people displaced by highway and freeway construction.

I am asking the Oregon State Legislature to review Oregon's highway laws for the purpose of amending the law in recognition of this displacement problem. However, I also feel very strongly that the Federal highway program should be amended by inserting comparable wording as appears under the urban renewal law in order to assist displaced people and make Federal highway funds available for such a program.

While the physical construction of this magnificent national highway network is important to the economy and defense of this Nation, we must never forget that people are important too.

I am calling this problem to the attention of the U.S. Conference of Mayors and the American Municipal Association and requesting their assistance concerning this problem.

Would you please investigate this problem and discuss it with your colleagues; and then, if you believe this recommendation has merit, introduce and/or assist in sponsoring corrective legislation in this session of Congress.

Please feel free to call on me at any time for any other information that you may desire in this connection.

Yours truly,

TERRY, *Mayor.*

FAST FREEWAYS—FLEEING FAMILIES

We have been hearing a good deal of late about the federally aided freeway program now underway. The potential impact of this program on Oregon residents is staggering. In Portland alone, the city planning commission estimates that 5,000 households will be displaced during the next 11 years. A rough field check indicates that the people in at least 250 households are about to be uprooted by the tiny segment of the East Bank Freeway alinement between the Steel Bridge and North Russell Street. Areawise and in terms of the percentage of households displaced, smaller communities will be even more drastically affected by the freeway construction.

The Federal Government, through its Bureau of Public Roads, pays 90 percent of the cost of these freeways. Oddly enough, that arm of Government completely ignores the fact that its tremendous concrete swaths plow through the lives of people. True enough, homeowners are paid a fair price for their property. But neither the Bureau of Public Roads nor the Oregon State Highway Commission assumes any responsibility for where these people go next or for what happens to other displaced people who are not so fortunate as to own their living quarters.

Contrast this with the requirements of another arm of the Federal Government, the Housing and Home Finance Agency. This is the organization which administers the federally aided urban renewal program; it pays two-thirds of the net cost of any urban renewal project. HHFA will not enter into an urban renewal contract with a local public agency until that agency (1) has determined the number of families and individuals to be displaced and their economic circumstances, and (2) has developed a feasible plan for the relocation of these people in decent, safe, and sanitary quarters that are within their price range. This relocation plan must show either that the existing housing supply is adequate to take care of the needs of the displacees or that additional housing units are being programed.

Once an urban renewal project gets out of the planning stages and into operation, the local public agency must set up a relocation office in the project area and must staff it with personnel to help occupants of the area find other places to live. Before sales or rental vacancies are referrred to families or individuals, they must be inspected by a member of the relocation staff to be certain that they comply with local health, sanitation, and housing codes.

If minority groups, particularly nonwhite people, are represented to a substantial degree in the project area, HHFA requires evidence that consideration has been given to their special housing problems and that adequate quarters will be available to them.

Finally, the Congress of the United States has enacted legislation providing for the payment of moving costs to those displaced by urban renewal activities—up to $100 in the case of residents, and up to $2,500 in the case of businesses and institutions. These costs are paid entirely by Federal funds.

The urban renewal and redevelopment law of the State of Oregon provides that a redevelopment project may not be initiated until there is a plan for the relocation of persons living in the area and until there is a plan for providing, unless already available, decent, safe, and sanitary quarters substantially equal in number to the substandard quarters to be demolished, at rents within the means of those displaced from such substandard quarters as prescribed by Federal and State urban renewal regulations and statutes.

The problem of freeway displacement in its present and potential form has not existed previously. Until recently, those affected have been largely homeowners. Such people, after the highway department pays them for their property, have some means of taking care of themselves. However, in many cases the prices they receive are not sufficient to enable them to buy comparable homes without considerable difficulty. Too, the accelerated freeway program will result in a great increase in the number of displaced owners. Tenants are at an even greater disadvantage. They have no control over their quarters, and, since the highway department rarely has any dealings with them, frequently they have little knowledge as to the timing of right-of-way acquisition.

While the highway department recognizes that a problem does exist in this connection, it emphasizes its lack of legal responsibility for, and its inability to deal with, relocation problems. If this is indeed the case, it would appear that our State and Federal highway legislation should be amended.

Freeway displacement in large volume is not peculiar to Oregon. Eastern and Middle Western States have long since become familiar with it and have dealt with the problems it brings in varying ways. The Illinois division of highways, for example, contracts with the tenants' relocation bureau of the city of Chicago for relocation services to people displaced by its activities. These services are available not only to families and single individuals but also to commercial and industrial establishments. Expenditures include the salaries of the personnel involved, telephone, light, and gas bills for offices on the right-of-way, bills for signs when necessary, transportation costs for personnel while on duty, bills for such incidentals as stationery and office supplies, and a portion of the overhead for the central office of the tenants' relocation bureau.

The Chicago district engineer for the Illinois division of highways has this to say about the relocation program:

"Before setting forth details of cost or contractual arrangements, I would like to state that the assistance rendered to us by the tenants' relocation bureau of the city of Chicago not only met a need but helped tremendously in good public relations in a situation which, at best, is always disagreeable to some."

We in Portland have tried to provide at least a minimal relocation service to freeway displacees through our development commission, which is our urban renewal agency. However, we have been advised by the city attorney that the development commission may not properly expend its own funds for relocation activities in any but urban renewal areas. Thus we are unable to make available any type of relocation service to what will be a very large group of people.

In view of all the foregoing, it is my strong feeling that the Oregon State highway law and the Federal highway law should be amended to provide for certain relocation services to persons uprooted by highway activities. In communities having urban renewal agencies or housing authorities, working arrangements with such agencies might well be the most efficient means of implementing such provisions.

I believe that relocation services should include:

1. Occupancy surveys in right-of-way areas. Such surveys are necessary in order to determine the volume and character of the displacement in each instance. If cities or counties wish to avail themselves of special Federal relocation aids (see item 3), this type of information must accompany the localities' requests for such aids.

2. Information as to available sales and rental housing.

3. Information as to special FHA mortgage insurance available to persons displaced as a result of Government action.

4. Such other aids as can be provided to minimize the difficulties of moving.

TERRY D. SCHRUNK,
Mayor.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, Mayor Schrunk's comments and recommendations on the problem of highway displaced persons have received many favorable comments and widespread attention in my State. I ask unanimous consent to place at this point in my remarks an editorial from the Oregon

Journal of January 29, 1959, entitled "Portland's Own DP Problem," and from the Oregonian of January 30, 1959, entitled "Freeway DP's" together with letters from George D. Dysart, president of the Urban League of Portland, Mary C. Rowland of the Stella Maris House, and Mr. L. B. Macnab, of Portland.

There being no objection, the editorials and letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Oregon Journal, Jan. 29, 1959]

PORTLAND'S OWN DP PROBLEM

Most of us share Mayor Schrunk's concern over the relocation problem posed by the gigantic new interstate highway building program now getting underway.

In Portland alone, he estimates 5,000 households will be displaced in the next decade, 250 of them in the East Bank Freeway area between the Steel Bridge and North Russell. This district is almost of immediate concern.

In terms of persons this involves between 15,000 and 20,000 men, women, and children who will have to find new homes in Portland alone. And additional thousands will be affected in the Portland metropolitan area, where the problem is gravest, and in the State of Oregon.

Some estimates of the total number of Oregon persons affected, that is, facing relocation problems or job changes made necessary by removal of commercial and industrial establishments, may run as high as 50,000.

But taking the Portland relocation problem alone and using the minimum relocation figures, we agree with Mayor Schrunk that some systematic attack on it is imperative.

Unfortunately, the laws dealing with the Federal-State interstate highway program make no provision for relocating displaced persons.

Unlike the laws governing the housing and home finance agency's urban renewal programs, which make proper relocation of displaced persons a condition of approval, laws governing the vast highway program (affecting many more people) leave these citizens to their own devices.

Homeowners and owners of commercial establishments or institutions who are forced to move when urban renewal areas are acquired and cleared for new development get not only technical help with their relocation problems, they also are entitled to monetary aid in making their moves—up to $100 for residents and up to $2,500 for businesses and institutions.

That's why Mayor Schrunk is making an appeal to the State legislature and to the Congress for amendments to State and Federal highway acts to provide necessary occupancy surveys and technical assistance for persons displaced by new highway programs.

Areas such as the East Bank Freeway route in Portland present special problems for renters and members of minority groups who will find it especially difficult to find suitable safe and sanitary housing within their means.

The relocation program of Portland's urban renewal project No. 1 in southwest Portland is moving along satisfactorily. It now appears that with expert UR staff aid and excellent cooperation from apartment house owners, FHA and the Small Business Administration, the 2,300 persons displaced by the project (470 families and 1,000 singles) will find suitable locations elsewhere.

But this merely emphasizes the necessity for doing a comparable relocation job on a much greater scale as new freeways slash through heavily populated areas.

We may even have to face up to the possibility that some additional public housing may be necessary eventually, especially for minority groups and elderly renters of limited means. You can't continue to tear out housing by thousands of units without replacing it, either privately or publicly. Our vacancy rate simply isn't that high.

[From the Oregonian, Jan. 30, 1959]

FREEWAY DP'S

The problems raised by the projected replacement of thousands of Portland households by freeway development, cited by Mayor Terry Schrunk this week, are real and urgent. They cannot be ignored by Federal, State, or local government, if Portland is to accomplish this enormous relocation with justice to those affected.

Fortunately, there is at hand a model for local action. The Portland Development Commission has mapped an orderly procedure for the relocation of persons who live or do business in the south auditorium urban renewal site. First step is appraisal of all property twice, by independent teams of appraisers. The commission thus hopes to obtain reasonable market figures acceptable to owners. It purposes to buy all but a few of the buildings in the project area and will enter into agreements with owners of excepted property for use conforming to the redevelopment plan.

The policy is to arrive at a mutually agreeable price with the owner, based on the independent appraisals. The commission hopes to avoid condemnation proceedings whenever possible. After purchase, the occupants, both busines and residential, will be tenants of the commission until relocated. A minimum of 90 days' notice of evacuation will be given.

Persons living in a building at the time of its acquisition by the commission will be eligible for relocation payments up to $100 to cover moving costs. This aid is particularly important to renters who can count on no return from public purchase. Business concerns, churches, and other nonresidential establishments will be eligible for relocation payments up to $2,500 to cover moving costs and direct loss on equipment, fixtures, machinery, supplies, etc. These relocation funds come entirely from Federal appropriations.

The catch, in applying this systematic plan to freeway relocations, is that the Portland Development Commission is limited by law to the service of authorized urban renewal projects. Highway legislation, both Federal and State, has more or less ignored the problem of urban relocation, on the assumption perhaps that it offers no more difficulty than have right-of-way displacements in the past. This is a myopic view. Individual landowners or householders in rural areas have had their problems of relocation to accommodate highways. But they do not match by any means the upheaval contemplated by the urban freeway program.

Relocation is as much a part of a complete freeway program as it is a part of the urban renewal program. Some large cities of the East have recognized this by the creation of agencies specifically assigned to easing the difficulties of population displacement. Chicago, for example, has a Tenants' Replacement Bureau.

The freeway DP's need counsel and friendly assistance with their problems as much or more than they need money to meet unbudgeted costs. If the Portland Development Commission cannot provide this service, the city should use the commission's experience to date as a guide in setting up a more inclusive relocation agency to seek the active cooperation and assistance of Federal and State highway officials. The latter must be brought to understand that—in an urban situation—the problems of population relocation are as much a part of roadbuilding as is the acquisition of right-of-way.

THE URBAN LEAGUE OF PORTLAND,
Portland, Oreg., February 10, 1959.

Hon. TERRY D. SCHRUNK,
Mayor of Portland,
Portland, Oreg.

DEAR MAYOR SCHRUNK: I want to thank you for having Mr. Ivancie make available to us your letter concerning the need for legislation to provide relocation assistance to persons displaced by the Federal-State highway program. I heartily support your action in requesting such legislation.

You might be interested in two precedents in addition to those that you cited in your letter. By the act of July 14, 1952 (66 Stat. 606, 642), the military departments were given authority to reimburse landowners and tenants for moving expenses when acquiring lands for their public-works projects. This same authority was given to the Department of the Interior by Public Law 85-433, approved May 29, 1958. Under this legislation the Secretary is authorized to reimburse owners and tenants for lands acquired for the construction, operation, or maintenance of developments under his jurisdiction "for expenses and other losses and damages incurred by them in the process and as a direct result of such moving of themselves, their families, and their possessions as is occasioned by said acquisition, * * *." This reimbursement is in addition to any payments that may otherwise be authorized by law. The total of such reimbursement to the owners and tenants of any parcel of land may not exceed 25 percent of the parcel's value as determined by the Secretary. The Interior authority is retroactive to July 14, 1952, the date the authority was given to the military departments.

Very truly yours,

GEORGE D. DYSART,
President.

CAMPBELL & MACNAB,
Portland, Oreg., February 3, 1959.

The Honorable RICHARD NEUBERGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR DICK: Enclosed is a letter I received in this morning's mail from Mary Rowland, of the Stella Maris House, concerning the relocation of the people who will be displaced because of the East Bank Freeway, a federally financed project.

Although the project itself will be of great benefit to the community, certain individuals will be grievously hurt and I appeal to you to do everything you possibly can to secure all possible aid in relieving the difficulties the project creates.

In many instances, I believe the amount offered these good people for their homes is perhaps as much as the home and property is worth, but certainly not enough to relocate them in accommodations as adequate as those they are giving up without causing them to spend considerable money they do not have. Any help you can give to these people will be more than appreciated.

It is good to know your health has improved and hope you will have no further difficulties. Frankly, you had us worried, we just can't afford to lose a guy like you.

Katie joins me in wishing you everything that is good during the coming session and our kindest regards to both you and your good wife.

Sincerely yours,

L. B. MACNAB.

STELLA MARIS HOUSE,
Portland, Oreg., January 28, 1959.

Mr. BARNEY MACNAB,
Campbell & Macnab,
Portland, Oreg.

DEAR BARNEY: The situation concerning housing has come to my attention within the last few months in which I think you would

be interested. The East Bank Freeway is coming through our Albina neighborhood displacing an estimated 250 families. This is part of the federally financed highway project which will continue for the next 11 years displacing an estimated 5,000 households.

Under this project the Federal Government supplies 90 percent of the funds and the State the rest. Due to some oversight, I am sure, the Federal highway laws make no provision for relocation. I am sure this is an oversight as the urban renewal laws bend over backward in helping relocate those who are forced to move.

The people in our Albina area are having two difficulties in relocation, one economic and the second that of their race. Many of the older people have difficulties tearing out their roots to move. These groups seem to need added help and encouragement in relocating which under the present laws is not provided for them.

The city of Portland has under consideration some stopgap measures to assist the people in the Albina area. However, to me, getting at the root cause seems most important in the light of the extended project and 5,000 households to be moved and this root cause is apparently the Federal highway laws. What can we do to get these changed?

Any ideas or suggestions you might have will be greatly appreciated.

Yours truly,

MARY C. ROWLAND.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, as a member of the Public Roads Subcommittee of the Senate Public Works Committee, I feel that this problem deserves the most careful consideration. I am pleased to report that the distinguished Senators from New York State [Mr. JAVITS and Mr. KEATING] have introduced legislation, S. 117, to include in the definition of construction costs the cost of relocation of building tenants. I understand that the New York Senators have previously sponsored such proposals.

The Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1956, as originally passed by the House of Representatives back in 1956 provided that the cost of relocating building tenants is recognized as part of the costs of construction. This provision was not in the legislation as enacted into law.

I realize that including in the Federal interstate highway program the cost of relocation of tenants would add materially to the expense of the highway program. While it is true that the Federal Government is paying up to 90 percent of the cost of the program, purchase of highway rights-of-way is done by the respective State highway commissions and the land belongs to the States. It seems only fair to me that relocation costs for tenants should be included in the highway program. There is ample precedent for this. The cost of relocation of utilities is included in the highway program, and certainly people are more important than telephone poles and powerlines.

JEAN TSCHETTER, SOUTH DAKOTA'S WINNER OF VOICE OF DEMOCRACY ESSAY CONTEST

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, the National Voice of Democracy contest was held in Washington this past week. Participating in the events was the South Dakota winner of the contest sponsored in our State by the South Dakota Broadcasters Association.

After listening to these fine essays written by outstanding high school students from all parts of the Nation, I am convinced we should more often bend an ear to listen to the voice of Young America.

One such voice is that of Miss Jean Tschetter, South Dakota's winner. What she thinks is important, I believe, because it is a reflection upon the heritage that is being given to the younger generation. Perhaps we have abused this rich heritage of America, and in our turning over responsibilities to the young people, we give them stronger and more difficult challenges to meet.

But we need not be dismayed, for the Jean Tschetters and others like her are ready to assume their responsibilities with the same spirit that has guided the destinies of this Nation for nearly two centuries.

Mr. President, I ask permission to have printed in the RECORD at this point a portion of my weekly newsletter "Your Washington and You" which refers to Miss Tschetter's visit, and following this article, I ask permission to have Miss Tschetter's excellent essay included in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpt and essay were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JEAN SPEAKS FOR DEMOCRACY

South Dakota's winner of the Voice of Democracy contest, Miss Jean Tschetter, of Arlington, was in Washington this week along with 49 other State champions. Her essay which earned her the trip to Washington was an excellent expression of Americanism. Jean's brilliant exposition on the meaning of democracy is a credit to South Dakota, and to all young people. Her words demonstrate that our confidence and reliance can continue to rest upon the aspirations of America's youth. Jean Tschetter not only speaks for democracy, but speaks for America.

Read what this fine young American thinks: "I am a young American who values and believes in democracy. Fortune smiled on me when I was born, for it bequeathed to me a most priceless heritage, citizenship in our democracy. * * * What I am or what I shall make of my life is up to me. * * * I believe in democracy because of what it means to me and my fellow Americans. It is a way of life, a good and meaningful way of life."

Jean, a sophomore in Arlington High School, is the daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Amos Tschetter. Mr. Tschetter is superintendent of schools, and well known in the educational circles of South Dakota.

I SPEAK FOR DEMOCRACY

(By Miss Jean Tschetter)

I speak for democracy. Why? Because I am a young American who values and believes in democracy. Fortune smiled on me when I was born, for it bequeathed to me a most priceless heritage—citizenship in our democracy. I might have been born behind the Iron Curtain, or in some other totalitarian state. Thus, the greatest break of my life came at my birth.

I might have been born a descendant of John Adams, or the daughter of an indentured servant. It wouldn't make any difference. What I am or what I shall make of my life is up to me.

In a democracy, we are, as Henley so well says, the masters of our fate and the captains of our souls. I believe in democracy because of what it means to me and my fellow Americans. By democracy, we ordinarily mean a form of government. But it is more, much more.

It is a way of life, a good and meaningful way of life. It grants that voice in our soul an opportunity for expression, individual expression. It gives us opportunity, too, to think and speak and write and do as our better self dictates.

As Americans, we often fail to value our freedoms, and even fail to recognize them. As a youth, I, too, had such inclinations, until 2 years ago it was my privilege to visit our Nation's Capital. I had an awakening and was alerted to the meaning of democracy.

Nowhere else in the world can one sense freedom so strongly as here. My family and I stood in awe at the shrines of democracy there. Our minds and hearts were deeply impressed as we were hoisted to the top of the Washington Memorial and viewed all the symbols that proclaim to the world that ours is a nation that honors, guards, and sponsors freedom for all.

Most impressive was the experience mounting the steps of the magnificent Lincoln Memorial. As you enter the front opening, there before you sits the huge figure of Lincoln as sculptured by Daniel Chester French. It seems as if he says, "I was a common man, common in ancestry, common in appearance, common in every way, but democracy made it possible for me to sit here. I gave my life to bring a more fuller democracy to my country and a segment of my people."

I bow in gratitude to men like him. Then I looked to the right and to the left, and on the walls I noticed inscriptions. On the left, I read these memorable words, "With malice toward none, with charity for all, let us bind up the Nation's wounds."

What nobler words could a human utter?

Have you ever heard words which better typify the true spirit of democracy?

On the right were inscribed the famous words uttered in Gettysburg, "Fourscore and seven years ago, our fathers brought forth on this continent a new nation, conceived in liberty, and dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal."

Did anyone ever speak more clearly and more profoundly for democracy?

Lincoln promoted democracy. Yea, more, he lived it, and gave democracy its greatest boost.

Another grand symbol of democracy in our Nation's Capital is a building, an impressive front, with Ionic Greek pillars, the figures of nine men carved on the top, and above them the significant inscription "Equal justice under law."

That's democracy, my fellow Americans. It behooves us all to cherish it. Therefore, I am happy to speak for democracy.

NEED FOR MORE SUPPORT FOR EDUCATION

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, every citizen of the United States must be educated to the limit of his capacity if this Nation is to survive as a democracy in the nuclear age.

This is not my conclusion alone. It is the belief of Dr. Robert M. Hutchins, former president of the University of Chicago, and one of our Nation's outstanding leaders in the field of education.

In a recent speech, Dr. Hutchins said that educators and the people were united only in wanting education "without pain, either intellectually or financially. History will smile at the spectacle of this great country's getting more

interested in education because of the technical achievements of Russia, and then being able to act as a nation only by assimilating education to the cold war and calling an education bill a defense act."

Unfortunately, in my opinion, Dr. Hutchins is absolutely right in this statement. When the ultimate happiness, progress, and security of free men so clearly depends on their educational attainments, it is indeed incredible that as a people we are so reticent to make vitally needed improvements.

The current administration can be held responsible for its failure to plan and present a bold and dynamic program of school construction and instruction improvement. Instead, it comes to the American people with the attitude that this is "the most we can afford," or that we "can't afford anything at this time." This "can't afford it" view is reflected not only in the administration's proposed budget, but also in the President's Economic Report.

There was a time not too far back in our governmental history when the word "can't" was hardly a part of the national vocabulary. From the very beginning of American history, our colonists did not say "We can't" when they faced the terrible winters and the Indians; Washington and his men did not say "We can't" at Valley Forge; and President Roosevelt and the American people did not say "We can't" in the hard depression days.

Mr. President, if I may be permitted a reference to my home State, I should like to observe that this is the anniversary of the Declaration of Texas Independence, on March 2, 1836. On that day a band of Texans was gathered in a blacksmith shop at Old Washington on the Brazos in Texas.

Mr. President, also on that day 182 men were being besieged in the Alamo by 5,000 soldiers under Santa Ana. Those Texans at Old Washington, on the Brazos, although knowing that it was impossible to go to the aid of the Texans in the Alamo, nevertheless declared for independence. They did not say, "We can't."

Our leaders and the American people in all cases have risen to the challenge because of their deep belief in a dream—in their dedication to the idea of human liberty and freedom.

In all cases they had the courage and vision to set their goals out ahead, and then they reached them at all costs. They never took the position "We can't afford it." It is time the administration understood that we cannot meet the challenge of communism around the world with a "we can't afford it" philosophy.

Whether it is in the field of education or military preparedness, or rivers and harbors development, we need to set our goals and accomplish them. This Nation can afford to pay for anything that is worth the money to the American people and to all free men. The only thing we can't afford is the administration's "we can't afford it" philosophy.

Mr. President, I request unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article which appeared in the New York Times of January 22, 1959, under the heading: "Hutchins Says Survival of the United States Hinges on Maximum Education."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, Jan. 22, 1959]

HUTCHINS SAYS SURVIVAL OF UNITED STATES HINGES ON MAXIMUM EDUCATION—WARNS THAT ONLY MEN ABLE TO MAKE DECISIONS CAN GIVE REALITY TO DEMOCRACY

Every citizen of the United States must be educated to the limit of his capacity if this Nation is to survive as a democracy in the nuclear age, Dr. Robert M. Hutchins said last night.

Dr. Hutchins, who is the president of the Fund for the Republic, warned that throughout the world there was an antidemocratic trend that had little or nothing to do with the Kremlin, but rather with a belief that democracy was an illusion in both old and new states.

To meet this challenge and preserve the democratic faith, he said, men must be sufficiently educated and informed to take part in making decisions in a free society.

"I don't mean trained, amused, exercised, accommodated or adjusted," he said. "I mean that his intellectual power must be developed."

Dr. Hutchins, a former president of the University of Chicago, gave his opinions in a speech prepared for a dinner at the Commodore Hotel at which he received the $1,000 Sidney Hillman Foundation Award. The citation, for meritorious public service, is presented annually in memory of the late president of the Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America.

Dr. Hutchins said that history would have trouble assessing American education in the 20th century.

UNWILLING TO PAY

"It will see a people, who say they are dedicated to education and who are the richest in the world, indifferent to education and unwilling to pay for it," he said. "It will see an educational system that delivers less education per dollar than almost any other saying that all it needs is more money."

Dr. Hutchins said that educators and the people were united only in wanting education without pain, either intellectually or financially.

"History will smile sardonically," he continued, "at the spectacle of this great country's getting interested, slightly and temporarily, in education only because of the technical achievements of Russia, and then being able to act as a nation only by assimilating education to the cold war and calling an education bill a defense bill."

The educator, who recently observed his 60th birthday, said that the way to find money was to remove from education those subjects, those activities, and those people that make no contribution to the development of intellectual power.

The money thus saved and additional funds that may be needed should be applied, he said, first to doubling teachers' salaries, not because all the teachers we have deserve twice as much as they are getting, but because we want to attract the ablest people into the profession. The money should be used to establish a national system of scholarships to enable education on the basis of mental, rather than financial, capacity.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I also request unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of January 23, 1959, under the heading "Slowdown on Education."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SLOWDOWN ON EDUCATION

President Eisenhower wants to spend only half of the $222 million authorized by Congress for fiscal 1960 under the National Defense Education Act. This law was passed under the goad of the sputniks. How can the race with the Russians be won by slowing down?

In view of the President's reduced recommendations for other educational items, it seems that budgetary considerations have at least as much to do with the matter as his expressed desire to hold up aid to scientific education pending further experience with the program. There has been little time to gain experience.

The impression that the size of the budget influenced Mr. Eisenhower is heightened by his refusal to recommend funds for school construction, and by his desire for a cutback in aid to schools overcrowded with the children of Federal workers.

This approach does not make sense in the face of reports such as that of Loren B. Pope, of the New York Times, that "despite a near record of 70,000 classrooms built (in the last year), the deficit apparently is as large this winter as it was last. Figures soon to be published by the Office of Education will show a deficit of about 140,000 classrooms."

Bills providing aid to education on all levels will be introduced in Congress. Some of them already have been influenced by the administration's reluctance. One measure, for example, would be tied to the debt service of school districts instead of providing grants before construction begins. Many districts would encounter legal difficulties in accepting such aid. It would cost more in the long run, but in the short run it would not be reflected in the Federal budget.

Surely this is pennywise and pound-foolish.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of January 25, 1959, under the heading, "No Time for Shoehorn Budget."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NO TIME FOR A SHOEHORN BUDGET

The debate over the Eisenhower budget will not be disposed of by calling the President's message propaganda or a fraud. The Democratic leaders who toss these terms around so freely should keep in mind that they not only have the right to criticize but bear the responsibility for presenting, in effect, a carefully thought out budget of their own.

The Eisenhower budget can be called balanced only by courtesy. The balance depends not only upon holding expenditures down to a $77 billion level which already seems unrealistic, but upon making certain adjustments on the revenue side which already seem unlikely—increasing gasoline taxes 50 percent, raising postal rates yet again, increasing taxes on airplane fuel, and so on. Furthermore, the balance depends upon business recovery from the recession proceeding at such a rate as to increase Treasury revenues $9 billion in a single year. We are told that the administration is counting on a rate of recovery slower than that which followed the 1954 recession. Yet revenues did not rebound by 9 billion in a single year then; how can we count on their doing so now?

It seems highly unlikely, then, that the administration, even if it goes its way on every bill in Congress, could produce a surplus in 1959–60 immediately following a year in which it is producing the biggest deficit (nearly 13 billions) of the postwar period.

But if the administration's own budget bids fair to turn out unbalanced, and if defense, education, foreign aid and other urgent needs require expenditures that will unbalance it still further, the urgent problem for the Democratic leaders is how to make sure that another substantial deficit will not set off another round of inflationary wage and price increases.

One of the strongest criticisms of the Eisenhower budget is that it appears to be based upon calculating a certain rate of business recovery, deducing therefrom a certain level of receipts, and then shoehorning expenditures into the resulting budget total.

This method of budgeting is called "sound" by some, but it ignores the urgent needs of today's world. We simply cannot afford to spend only as much for defense as we think we can afford; we must spend as much as is needed for security, and then devise ways to afford it.

The same principle holds for the great economic, scientific and diplomatic contest on which we are embarked. It holds also for meeting the expanding needs of an exploding and increasingly urbanized society.

To measure the national effort by what the present growth rate of the economy and present tax structure can support is to risk losing a race we dare not lose. The process must be turned the other way around: the growth rate, the budget and the tax structure must be planned to support such a level of national effort as is required by our situation.

It is the Democratic responsibility—specifically, the responsibility of Speaker RAYBURN and Majority Leader LYNDON JOHNSON—to muster the best economic brains for this kind of economic planning. It is the Democratic responsibility to give the country a congressional budget that meets the national needs and at the same time protects the people from a disastrous inflation.

TWO-PRICE PLAN FOR WHEAT MEANS AID FOR OREGON'S POULTRY AND LIVESTOCK INDUSTRIES

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I am very pleased that my warm friend the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON] introduced on February 19, 1959, a comprehensive wheat stabilization program. I feel privileged to be a cosponsor of the distinguished Senator's bill, S. 1140, which is a broader and improved version of his domestic parity measure, S. 774, which I also cosponsored in the last Congress.

This proposal not only will reduce greatly the drain on the Federal Treasury for wheat price supports—which certainly should contribute to a balanced budget or to freeing Federal funds for worthy social purposes such as medical research or Federal aid to schools—while more effectively aiding wheatgrowers, but will also help channel wheat into feed uses in the Pacific Northwest. This result would be of major importance to the poultry and livestock industries in my State.

In the Oregonian of Portland for January 18, 1959, there appeared an excellent article on wheat as a source of animal feed. The story was written by that daily newspaper's capable agriculture editor, Joe Biancc. Because Mr. Bianco's informative report is so timely in view of Senator CARLSON's introduction of S. 1140, I ask unanimous consent that the article, entitled "Survey Concludes Oregon Wheat Supply Holds Key to Livestock and Packing Industries," be printed in the body of the RECORD for the information of the Senate.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SURVEY CONCLUDES OREGON WHEAT SUPPLY HOLDS KEY TO LIVESTOCK, PACKING INDUSTRIES

(By Joe Bianco)

Wheat is feed.

This represents the key to the future growth of the livestock and meat packing industries in Oregon.

The conclusion was reached by a team of Portland college professors and business executives in a comprehensive agricultural economy study released Saturday.

The findings of this group parallel the policies and opinions of some of the State's leading agricultural commodity groups.

The research project was sponsored by Lewis and Clark College and Reed College and financially assisted by a grant-in-aid from the Committee for Economic Development, and the Fund for Adult Education, established by the Ford Foundation.

SHIFT IN INDUSTRY

The business executives' research committee of which the businessmen and college personnel are members conducted the program and published its report in a 39-page booklet.

In 1954 and 1956, the committee published a study of the forest products industries of Oregon. The present study was of the livestock and meat packing industries and in its conclusion explained the growth of the commodity group depended more upon a shift of the industry to Oregon than upon a national growth of the industry.

Favorable to such development will be the improvements in transportation and refrigeration which will tend to shift meatpacking and cattle feeding closer to the basic resources—rangeland and feed, the committee said.

STATE WELL FAVORED

Additional factors favoring such development are:

1. The resources of Oregon are well adapted for large scale grain production, especially wheat production.

2. The Oregon range will not limit growth of these industries, if presently known improved management methods are adopted.

3. The population growth of California, will create an expanding market for Oregon production.

A hindering factor in the growth of the industries is the present price supports which make wheat too expensive to feed in competition with midwest corn, according to the group. This applies particularly to the advancement of the Oregon hog industry which is steadily increasing its production and last year produced the biggest pig crop in 15 years.

DOUBLE PARITY URGED

The committee said it has estimated that with wheat at $1.78 per bushel midwest corn prices would have to be about $1.28 per bushel to permit a competitive hog industry in Oregon based on feeding wheat. Adequate supplies of competitively priced feed grain are also vital to the growth of the Oregon cattle-feed industry.

The group explained in its report that its task was not that of investigating the general problem of price supports. "Therefore," the report continued, "without endorsing or condemning the philosophy of price supports, the committee recommends adoption of the plan for wheat."

The committee also recommended greater exprimentation in the development and use of feed rations for hog raising in Oregon. The objective is to make greater use of available pasture and other forage crops, as well as byproducts, as a means of reducing the percentage of grain input and thus reducing the cost of the whole ration, they explained.

PROMOTION STRESSED

The recommendations of the committee also included range management procedures. Although Oregon ranges are now fully stocked, range capacity need not limit the growth of the State's livestock business, it maintained. Expansion depends upon range management improvements.

Provided the feed grain and range problems can be solved, the group said, the next step would be more aggressive promotion of Oregon meat products. Such promotion should be undertaken by a voluntary association of meat producers and packers.

A major problem in the promotion of a product such as Oregon meat is that of regionally differentiating the product, they added. The committee proposed that the campaign be aimed at the promotion of wheat-fed meat. Wheat will produce beef equal to that fed on corn.

The livestock and meatpacking industries are important contributors to Oregon economy, they said. In 1954, it was estimated that value added in the vertically integrated industrial complex was nearly $37 million. Looking to the future, the committee said that further expansion of the industries is assured, provided certain problems presented in its report can be resolved.

Following is a résumé of five chapters of the report:

Meatpacking is the final stage of a series of vertically integrated economic activities, and the value added by the total of these activities is much greater than that added in packing alone.

If all the inputs to the meatpacking and processing industries were produced within the State, the committee said, the income contribution of the whole vertical industry complex from livestock breeding and feed growing to the final meat preparation would equal the total sales of meat and other packinghouse products—about $77 million.

However, not all the inputs to the meat industry are produced within the State. Oregon imports finished cattle and large numbers of hogs for slaughter, and also her production of cattle and sheep is in excess of Oregon slaughter. Consequently, value added in the entire industry cannot be inferred simply from the gross output of its final stage, the committee explained. The value of livestock production in 1954 was $75 million plus $11,600,000 in meatpacking and processing yields an estimated $86,600,000 value.

POTENTIAL DEMAND

The growth of the livestock and meatpacking industries will depend, in part, upon growth in the demand for meat products in markets accessible to Oregon producers. It will also depend upon the ability of Oregon producers to satisfy larger proportions (in competition with out-of-State producers) of such market demand.

It was estimated the population of the State by 1975 will be 2,344,000.

In addition to home market possibilities nearby out-of-State markets such as California may afford a basis for future expansion, they said. However, a number of factors will constitute whether California will be an important export market. Among these are relative freight rates, feed availability, prices in Oregon, and the possible future expansion in the California livestock and meatpacking industries. Washington also may provide future possibilities for Oregon producers.

FEED SUPPLY

Oregon has an available supply of wheat, oats and barley. Although wheat is Oregon's principal grain, barley is its principal feed grain. Though it is not often classed as a feed grain, there is no technical obstacle to the extensive use of wheat as a feed, the committee pointed out.

The fundamental obstacle to increased use of wheat for feed is price, they said. Wheat is substantially priced out of the feed market owing to the 1958 support levels.

A proposed plan endorsed by the wheat industry in Oregon is the domestic party plan or two-price wheat.

INFLUENCE ON CROPS

The committee reported that advocates of a two-price plan for wheat stress that substantial amounts of wheat would move into feed markets. This might take place by a substitution of wheat for other Oregon-produced feed grains, such as oats and barley, or the substitution of wheat for feed grains currently shipped in from out of State. Approximately 2 to 3 million bushels of corn have been shipped into Oregon each year as feed.

Another possibility would be the considerable expansion of feeding operations in the State. Such a development would greatly assist the State's hog industry, they reported. The feeding of cattle is another potential use for Oregon wheat.

Another factor in the development of the meat industry is proper utilization of the rangelands.

Most authorities are in agreement, the committee said, that, under current management practices, the ranges of Oregon are fully stocked. However, they point out that an increase in range capacity can be achieved through better management practices alone.

By better range management the committee means: Rotation of the stock from area to area within the range, in order to permit recovery of the rangeland; use of particular portions of the range during proper season; and avoidance of overstocking particular range areas at a given time.

The subcommittees that worked on the study were the feed resources and supply subcommittee and demand and marketing subcommittee under chairmen Eugene P. Carpenter, Pacific Telephone & Telegraph Co., and William R. Morrish, assistant to the publisher of the Oregonian, respectively. The faculty advisers were from Lewis and Clark College and Reed College. The research coordinator was Carl M. Stevens, associate professor at Reed College.

Other members of the feed resources and supply subcommittee were James P. Brattain, the Oregon Journal; Lucien G. Alexander, Mason, Bruce & Girard; Robert Vail, General Petroleum Corp.; Lyman Seely, First National Bank of Oregon; John Elorriage, U.S. National Bank; Richard L. Wells, Bank of California and A. D. Venator, Swift & Co.

Other members of the demand and marketing subcommittee were William Rohlffs, Standard Insurance Co.; David P. Landry, Pacific Power & Light Co.; Robert Fitzgerald, Tektronix, Inc.; Kramer Adams, Weyerhaeuser Timber Co.; Jack Brady, Swift & Co.; and Glenn Gillespie, Crown Zellerbach Corp.

The faculty advisers were Raymond L. McIlvenna, associate professor, of Lewis and Clark College; Arthur H. Leigh, professor and George A. Hay, associate professor, both of Reed College.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. YOUNG of Ohio in the chair). Is there further morning business?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

ORDER TO DISPENSE WITH CALL OF THE CALENDAR

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the call of the calendar, under the rule, be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT TO THURSDAY

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate conclude its business today, it stand in adjournment until Thursday next at noon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CIVIL RIGHTS LEGISLATION

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, it is now nearly 5 years since the Supreme Court, by unanimous opinion, issued its historic school integration decisions. Since that time, the executive branch has done little, and the Congress has done nothing, to assist in implementing those decisions, which called for integration of public schools with due deliberate speed.

Instead, in the opinion of many, by agreeing to the striking of part III from the Civil Rights Act of 1957, an action taken under the threat of filibuster, the 85th Congress—specifically, the Senate of the 85th Congress—gave encouragement to those opposing integration at any speed whatever.

It is for these reasons that I feel that the Douglas-Javits-Celler civil rights bill of 1959, of which I am 1 of 17 cosponsors, is as important as any bill to come before this Congress. It is a matter of deep satisfaction to know that this and other bills on the same subject have been scheduled for early hearings in both Houses of the 86th Congress, beginning March 4 before a subcommittee of the House Judiciary Committee headed by Chairman CELLER, and beginning March 18 before the Senate Judiciary Committee's Constitutional Rights Subcommittee, headed by the senior Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS].

These hearings will, I presume, consider three sets of proposals, namely, the comprehensive Douglas-Javits-Celler bill (S. 810), the Johnson bill (S. 499) dealing principally with so-called conciliation procedures, and certain of a group of seven bills constituting the administration's civil rights legislative proposals.

On the eve of these hearings, consideration of these bills has been helped, I believe, by publication of a summary comparison of them, prepared and issued by the executive committee of the Leadership Conference on Civil Rights, consisting of 53 national religious, interracial, civic, welfare, fraternal, labor, and veterans organizations who share a long, deep, and sincere interest in the establishment of civil rights for all Americans. Among these 53 national organizations are the NAACP, the American Jewish Congress, the International Union of Electrical Workers, the United Automobile Workers, the Brotherhood of Sleeping Car Porters, other labor organizations, the Americans for Democratic Action, the American Veterans Committee, the American Civil Liberties Union, the Improved Benevolent Order of Elks, the American Council on Human Rights, the Unitarian Fellowship for Social Justice, and the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom. Roy Wilkins is chairman and Arnold Aronson is secretary of this conference. I ask unanimous consent that this comparative analysis, as published on March 2, be printed at this point in the RECORD; and I urge my colleagues to give it the careful attention and consideration which I believe it merits.

There being no objection, the analysis was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LEADERSHIP CONFERENCE ON CIVIL RIGHTS—SUMMARY COMPARISON OF THE THREE MOST WIDELY DISCUSSED CIVIL RIGHTS BILLS

Attached hereto are a number of sheets comparing in as simple a manner as possible the Douglas-Javits-Celler bill (No. S. 810 in the Senate and H.R. 3147 in the House), the administration bills (S. 955, 956, 957, 958, 959, 960 and 942 in the Senate and H.R. 4557 in the House), and the Johnson bill (S. 499 in the Senate).

The summary comparison would appear to justify the following conclusions:

1. The Douglas-Javits-Celler bill, providing support for the Supreme Court's desegregation decisions and technical and financial assistance to assist the process of school desegregation and including an improved version of the old part III stricken from the 1957 bill, is essential to the accomplishment of school desegregation within a reasonable period and to the maintenance of the equal protection of the laws in other fields; it is certainly the No. 1 civil rights bill. The Javits bill, S. 456 (see also Celler bill, H.R. 3148), which is not included in the summary comparison, also contains an improved version of the old part III of the 1957 bill, but the Javits bill does not contain the remainder of the Douglas-Javits-Celler bill. The old part III contained in both bills authorizes the Attorney General to bring injunction actions against those denying equal protection of the laws to anyone because of their race, color, religion, or national origin, and is the single most essential part of any civil rights legislation.

2. The administration school bills omit part III completely and contain an inadequate version of the remainder of the Douglas-Javits-Celler bill. Other administration bills, and particularly S. 957 authorizing inspection of voting records, make advances in the area of civil rights which deserve the support of civil rights organizations, to the extent that support for the Douglas-Javits-Celler bill is in no way reduced.

3. The Johnson bill, by failing to support the school desegregation decisions and by conciliation provisions that may result in civil rights being bargained away rather than enforced, appears to be a step backward. It seeks to relegate the assertion of rights to equal protection by citizens and defiance of the law by States to the status of a neighborhood quarrel to be resolved only by an ill-defined conciliation procedure. Its other provisions would seem to be better dealt with in the administration and other bills.

DOUGLAS-JAVITS-CELLER BILL	ADMINISTRATION BILLS	JOHNSON BILL
Title I contains findings approving the Supreme Court's desegregation decisions as expressing "the moral ideals of the Nation," recognizing that "the Constitution, as declared by the antisegregation decisions, is the supreme law of the land" and declaring the intention of Congress "that the right to the equal protection of the laws guaranteed by the Constitution against deprivation by reason of race, color, religion or national origin and affirmed by the antisegregation decisions of the Supreme Court, shall be protected by all due and reasonable means."	S. 958 contains limited version of Douglas bill findings, including that "the Constitution as interpreted by the Supreme Court * * * is the supreme law of the land," but not including the Douglas bill findings approving the antisegregation decisions or pledging Congress to support those decisions "by all due and reasonable means."	No provision [Does not support Supreme Court's desegregation decisions; on the contrary notes that constitutional requirements give rise to "disagreements" which disrupt peace and states an intent to "conciliate" these disagreements rather than enforce constitutional rights.]
Title II authorizes the Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare to render technical assistance, through the compilation and distribution of information, making and distributing surveys of progress and of successful case histories, arrangement of conferences, appointment of advisory councils, provision of specialist services, and reimbursement of State and local expenses in cooperating in these activities, to State and local governments in bringing about desegregation of the public school systems (appropriations up to $2½ million a year for 5 years).	S. 958 contains limited version of titles II and III of Douglas bill on reduced scale both as to extent of program and amount of aid to be given—provides assistance for "pupil placement" which has been utilized against desegregation—(estimated expenditure of $4½ million on 2-year program as compared to Douglas title II ($2½ million a year) and title III (40 million a year) for 5 years.)	No provision.
Title III authorizes Secretary to make grants to States and local governmental units for additional school facilities, additional teachers, in-service teacher training, employment of specialists in developing community understanding and other phases of desegregation, short-term training courses and other additional educational measures undertaken to eliminate segregation while at the same time assuring that existing educational standards will not be lowered—also provides grants to local communities eliminating segregation where State threatens to cut off school payments (appropriations up to $40 million a year for 5 years).	See previous paragraph.	No provision.
Title IV authorizes the Secretary, when other methods fail, to assume responsibility for initiating the development of desegregation plans, with fullest possible local consultation and participation.	No provision.	No provision.
Title V authorizes the Attorney General to file compliance actions in connection with desegregation plans approved under title IV, when the Secretary certifies that all efforts to secure compliance by persuasion and technical and financial assistance have failed.	No provision.	No provision.
Titles VI and VII (improved version of pt. III of 1957 bill) authorizes Attorney General to bring injunction actions against those denying equal protection of the laws to anyone, by reason of race, color, religion, or national origin, when there is a signed complaint and when aggrieved person is unable to seek effective legal protection for himself; also authorizes Attorney General to protect local officials trying to comply with desegregation decisions from those who would hinder their actions (Hoxie situation); also authorizes Attorney General to protect those who defend civil rights of others; also permits Attorney General to intervene in equal protection cases brought by others; also provides that any action brought under the bill may be brought without the necessity of exhausting administrative remedies.	No provision.	No provision.
Title VI (see above) authorizes injunctions against conduct covered by S. 955 which can be enforced by contempt proceedings. This is far more effective than the limited usefulness of criminal action.	S. 955 makes it a criminal offense to use force or threats to interfere with court orders in school desegregation cases.	No provision.
No provision. [DOUGLAS is cosponsor of preferred Kennedy-Ervin bill which makes it a crime to possess or transport in interstate commerce explosives for the purpose of destroying any religious, school, or business (but not specifically residential) property and contains a rebuttable presumption that explosives were transported in interstate commerce, thus bringing FBI in on all bombings of religious, school, or business property. Also has fugitive felon provision. Should be	S. 956 makes it a criminal offense to travel in interstate commerce to avoid prosecution or punishment for damage or destruction by fire or explosion of religious or school (but not business or residential) property. May not be adequate to bring the FBI in on all bombings of even religious and school property although the administration believes it is adequate in this respect (Kennedy-Ervin preferable).	Title IV makes interstate transportation of explosives or possession of interstate-transported explosives a crime if transportation or possession is with the knowledge or intent that they be used to damage religious, school or business (but not specifically residential) property. Absence of presumption of interstate transportation changes little the existing involvment of the FBI in this type of case, but fugitive felon provision may help this (Kennedy-Ervin preferable).

DOUGLAS-JAVITS-CELLER BILL	ADMINISTRATION BILLS	JOHNSON BILL
amended to include homes as does the Keating-Javits bill, S. 73.] No provision.	S. 957 requires election officials to preserve Federal election records for 3 years, makes such records subject to examination by the Attorney General and authorizes district courts to compel production for such examination. Department of Justice feels that this provision will assist in voting cases because of inadequacy of subpena power through grand jury process or through institution of civil suits.	Title III grants subpena power to Department of Justice in voting rights cases, but provides it may be used only if the Governor of the State has failed to order the election official to surrender the documents. This loophole would, at the least, permit long delays and, at the most, permit collusion to avoid any subpena. Furthermore, requirement of demand for records before subpena and absence of penalty for destruction adds another possible loophole. (Justice provision greatly preferable.)
Titles II and III of Douglas bill are far preferable to inadequate S. 958. Title III deals with closed schools by offering Federal funds to local communities where State has withdrawn school payments.	S. 958 is bill for technical assistance for school desegregation discussed below. S. 959 authorizes Commissioner of Education to operate schools for children of members of the armed services where local schools are closed; with respect to future schools constructed under the impacted areas program, authorizes repossession where closed. (Should be strengthened to deal with other Federal employees and to authorize repossession of closed schools previously built under impacted areas programs.) Does nothing about desegregating impacted area schools.	No provision. No provision.
No provision.	S. 960 extends Civil Rights Commission for 2 years. Danger is that this will be used to avoid meaningful civil rights legislation with no real civil rights action flowing from the Commission. (Should be strengthened by authorizing Commission to investigate all denials of civil rights because of race, color, religion, or national origin.)	Title II extends Civil Rights Commission until 60 days after January 31, 1961. Although not quite as long an extension as S. 960, has same danger of avoiding meaningful legislation. (Should be strengthened by authorizing Commission to investigate all denials of civil rights because of race, color, religion, or national origin.)
No provision.	S. 942 gives statutory basis to the President's Committee on Government Contracts (should be strengthened with provision, now omitted, that Commission may hold full dress hearings with subpena power and may direct any Government contracting agency to terminate a contract or to refrain from making a new contract where, after reasonable warning, the Commission finds that discrimination has continued). No provision. [Limited version of Douglas bill in this regard.]	No provision.
No provision. [Titles II, III, and IV provide for technical assistance and persuasion in the framework of ultimate enforcement of the school desegregation decisions. Thus, for example, title IV provides that "the Secretary shall make every effort to persuade States, municipalities, school districts, and other local governmental units to make a start toward eliminating segregation in public education and to carry out in full such programs as they may start, and to this end he shall utilize the authority" for technical assistance and grants-in-aid provided in titles II and III. Persuasion where the objective is to bring about compliance with law and where all parties know that the failure of persuasion will result in enforcement action will strengthen constitutional rights; the Johnson conciliation provision without ultimate enforcement can only result in the bargaining away of constitutional rights.] No provision.		Title I establishes a Community Relations Service to conciliate "disagreements or difficulties regarding the laws or Constitution of the United States" and disagreements affecting interstate commerce. Far from supporting the Supreme Court's decisions, the sentence in the bill that "use of force in any manner * * * tends to aggravate the disagreements" seems to imply no enforcement of desegregation decisions. This title seeks to relegate the assertion of rights to equal protection by citizens and defiance of the law by States to the status of neighborhood quarrels to be resolved only by an ill-defined conciliation procedure. Furthermore, the procedure may actually hamper enforcement action in the courts which may hold the Johnson bill's conciliation procedures to be a necessary prerequisite of judicial action.
No provision. No provision [Kennedy-Ervin bill discussed above].	S. 960, extension of Civil Rights Commission discussed above. S. 957, subpena in voting rights cases discussed above. S. 956, bombing bill discussed above.	Title II, extension of Civil Rights Commission discussed above. Title III, subpena in voting rights cases discussed above. Title IV, bombing bill discussed above.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. CHURCH obtained the floor.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator from Idaho yield to me in order that I may suggest the absence of a quorum?

Mr. CHURCH. I am glad to yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE GENEVA CONFERENCE: A PROPOSAL FOR THE 11TH HOUR

PART I. THE PSYCHOSIS OF CRISIS

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, the 2 years I have served in the Senate are but a brief interlude in the life of a nation. Yet these years seem a very long time, perhaps because they have been burdened with unrelenting crises. I came here in the wake of the Suez crisis. It was only being laid to rest, when revolt in Budapest turned our minds to Hungary. We were still tormented by the anguish there, when sudden eruption in Iraq spurred us to dispatch our troops to Lebanon, and once again to switch our attention to another crisis in the Middle East. Then, hard upon this anxiety, we were suddenly confronted with a

grave new crisis in the Orient, as the Chinese Communists commenced to cannon the offshore islands of Quemoy and Matsu, and the issue of war or peace hung in breathless balance over the Formosan Straits.

This afternoon, Mr. President, we are fixed upon the latest crisis to be provoked by the Communists, one that seems now to involve the fate of Berlin. We stare in cold fascination at the swinging pendulum of the clock that ticks off the hours, moving us ever closer to the 27th day of May, the deadline of the Soviet ultimatum.

Will there be war, we ask. Is this not the same question we asked ourselves, again and again, in regard to Suez, Lebanon, and the Straits of Formosa?

Will there be war at Berlin? Only the men in the Kremlin hold the answer. Thus far, they have been content with their war of nerves. The instigation of crises has been their method, as we have been catapulted from one to another, around the periphery of the free world. To be sure, 9 years ago the fighting came in Korea; but it was precipitated by Communist China, not by the Soviet Union. Russia has not yet ventured a shooting war.

And there is good reason to doubt that Russia intends a shooting war over Berlin. It is much more likely, Mr. President, that somehow the Berlin crisis will abate, and a few months from now our concentration will have been shifted to a newly contrived crisis, possibly in Finland or Iran.

The mischief is that we may become, in our frantic ride from brink to brink, transfixed upon the chasms below, and unmindful of the road ahead. So I fear we are about to forsake the conference at Geneva, now approaching its 11th hour. We seem to view Geneva as through the wrong end of a telescope, even as we magnify Berlin. One would think that the cessation of nuclear tests, properly policed, was a matter of distant interest and little consequence to the people of the world.

It is not so.

The conference at Geneva is engaged upon what could easily be the most important work occurring anywhere in the world today or tomorrow.

PART II. GENEVA, THE REASONS FOR HOPE

Last October we went to Geneva in good faith and with stout hope. The prayers of the peaceful have attended our deliberations there, ever since. We went to Geneva to seek an end to all further nuclear tests, through an agreement among the three nuclear powers—the United States, the United Kingdom, and the Soviet Union. The treaty sought had two objectives, tied inseparably together: First, all signatories would agree to suspend further nuclear tests, within the framework of, and, second, a trustworthy international system of inspection and control to safeguard each party against any violation by another.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHURCH. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Montana.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Is it correct to say that at the present time the so-called nuclear club is composed only of these three nations?

Mr. CHURCH. That is correct.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Is it a reasonable assumption to make that if, in some way or fashion, some method is not found to bring about an end to the testing of atomic and nuclear devices, the nuclear club itself is bound to expand and the danger to become that much greater?

Mr. CHURCH. I should say that not only is it an altogether reasonable assumption, but it is an altogether probable assumption, for even now we know France is soon likely to develop a nuclear capacity of her own, and there are other countries very likely to follow in due time.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Has there been talk about the Swedes and the Chinese developing a nuclear capacity?

Mr. CHURCH. There has been. I certainly know of no reason to suspect they do not have the capacity to develop a nuclear technology of their own.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Will the Senator agree that if we do not arrive at an agreement within a relatively short time the club is very likely to expand, the dangers to increase, and the possibilities of agreement to become less and less?

Mr. CHURCH. That is so. That is why the present negotiations at Geneva are so fateful, because this may prove to be the last time when agreement is in fact reachable. If we could reach agreement now, it would provide the basis to extend the agreement to include new nations as they develop nuclear capacity of their own. This may be the last best opportunity. Another comparable opportunity may not come in our time.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I could not agree with the Senator more. The mere fact that the conference is in session, even though the surprise-attack conference in Geneva is in suspension, gives us an opportunity, slim as it is—the Senator has said this is the 11th hour—for possibly some agreement covering regulation of nuclear activity in this particular field to come about.

I think the distinguished Senator from Idaho, who is one of the outstanding members of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, is this afternoon, on the floor of the Senate, performing a distinguished service. I hope the message which he is giving in this speech will be considered not only in downtown Washington, but throughout the world as well.

I hope sincerely it will reach the ears, as I am sure it will, and the eyes, as well, of the delegates in Geneva. I am sure, so far as our delegates are concerned, they are interested in what the distinguished Senator has to say. I express the hope that the Soviet delegates will pay the same attention to what the Senator is saying.

Mr. CHURCH. I thank the Senator from Montana for his helpful questions and the contribution he has made to the discussion this afternoon.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHURCH. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CLARK. I have listened with interest to the colloquy between the Senator from Idaho and the Senator from Montana, who is still present on the floor. I wonder if they would not both agree that the wisest thing we could do would be to make the atomic club the most exclusive club in the world, even though some Members of this distinguished body might be a little jealous as a result.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, we should be interested, not in restricting the membership of the atomic club, for this is outside our power, but the objective sought at Geneva was, and is, a method of control and inspection, internationally managed, into which we could bring not only the existing nuclear powers, but other powers as they develop their capacity in this critical field.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. CHURCH. I am happy to yield.

Mr. CLARK. The Senator from Idaho appreciates I was speaking in a somewhat light vein a moment ago; but I think he will agree that time is of the essence in getting a workable international agreement to eliminate further nuclear testing, and that part of the job will be not only to prohibit, by international agreement, testing among the powers who now have the capability of testing nuclear weapons, but also to discourage and prevent the testing of atomic weapons by those nations which are in the process of acquiring that ability.

Mr. CHURCH. The larger objective is one we have been mindful of at Geneva. I thank the Senator from Pennsylvania in pointing up the timeliness of the present negotiations at Geneva, because I am about to address myself now to the reasons that gave us cause to have hope for success when we went to Geneva 4 months ago.

Mr. CLARK. Will the Senator yield one additional moment? Then I shall not detain him further.

Mr. CHURCH. I am happy to yield.

Mr. CLARK. The Senator from Idaho has been kind enough to give me an advance copy of the splendid talk I know he will shortly make on what seems to be a practical suggestion with respect to how the difficulty regarding inspection, which seems to be the problem on which the conferees are now bogged down, can be avoided. I share with my friend from Montana the hope that this concrete and helpful suggestion will be given serious consideration by our State Department.

I wish to observe also that the Senator from Idaho is making a distinct contribution by virtue of the vigor and imagination with which he is attacking his new duties as a member of the Committee on Foreign Relations, on which committee I am sure the Senator is going to render distinguished service for a long time.

I thank my friend for yielding to me.

Mr. CHURCH. I am very grateful for the kind remarks of my distinguished friend.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield before he proceeds on part II?

Mr. CHURCH. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Montana.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, in late weeks some of us have been advocating that we keep our eyes on Berlin and Germany. The impression may have gone abroad that we were advocating such a course of action exclusively. I am therefore glad to note that in the statesmanlike speech of the distinguished Senator from Idaho he points out, at the top of page 2, that perhaps a few months from now our concentration will have been shifted to a newly contrived crisis, possibly in Finland or Iran—or, I might add, in the Far East or elsewhere. I am happy that this word of warning is being issued at this time in connection with the speech.

Mr. CHURCH. I thank the Senator.

There were reasons, Mr. President, why we could hold stout hope for success at Geneva. In the first place, the formula for a technically sufficient inspection and control system had been given us. At an earlier conference in Geneva last summer, the scientists and technicians of all three countries had agreed upon the structure of the technical system required. Thus a single blueprint had been furnished in advance.

In the second place, there seemed to be at least one fundamental interest held in common. Americans, Englishmen, and Russians all breathe the same air. Radioactive fallout in the earth's atmosphere is poison for us all. If nuclear tests go on unchecked, the dose will gradually become more lethal. We shared a mutual interest in suspending further national tests, while the establishment of international controls afforded us at once a method for confining nuclear explosions for peaceful purposes within safe limits, and a functioning apparatus within which to harness other countries, as they developed nuclear capacities of their own.

Finally, we had reason to hope for success at Geneva, because the suspension of nuclear tests appeared to be compatible, if action were taken now, with the national security interests of each of the negotiating powers. The agreement sought would not restrict the continued manufacture or stockpiling of atomic weapons by either side. Since the technology of nuclear weaponry in the United States and the United Kingdom on the one hand, and in the Soviet Union on the other, had reached a state of relative balance, the agreement sought would not jeopardize the military position vis a vis nuclear weapons of any of the signatories, with respect to one another.

These were the compelling reasons, Mr. President, why it looked as though we had at last found common ground, making agreement possible. So we went to Geneva with our hearts full of hope.

PART III. GENEVA, THE REASONS FOR THREATENED FAILURE

Four months have passed. The Geneva conference is deadlocked. The British Prime Minister, Mr. Macmillan, has gone to the Soviet Union, there to plead with Mr. Khrushchev to end the Russian intransigence which now threatens the conference with impending failure. Our bleak situation, as of now, is well summarized by Mr. Chalmers M. Roberts, in an excellent article that appeared in the Washington Post on Sunday, February 22, 1959. I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GENEVA TALKS HINGE ON MACMILLAN'S BID

(By Chalmers M. Roberts)

The Geneva nuclear test ban negotiations with the Russians are expected to collapse unless British Prime Minister Harold Macmillan can talk Nikita Khrushchev into modifying his demand for a veto.

Philip J. Farley, special assistant to Secretary of State John Foster Dulles for disarmament and atomic energy, flew to Geneva over the weekend to see whether there was any purpose of keeping the talks going. Macmillan reached Moscow yesterday for his talks with Soviet Premier Khrushchev.

It is not clear whether President Eisenhower personally has agreed to break off the talks unless there is a last-minute switch in the Soviet position. But those who should know indicated yesterday the United States is ready to recess the talks. For all practical purposes that would kill the test ban negotiations.

PUT ONUS ON SOVIETS

American officials have publicly put the onus for the Geneva deadlock on the Soviet Union. In turn, Khrushchev has charged that the United States and Britain want such a free-wheeling inspection and control system that it amounts to espionage inside Russia.

The test ban talks began October 31 and have been going on ever since except for a Christmas holiday break.

The United States and Britain have made a number of concessions to the Russians but they have insisted that inspection teams in each nation be composed almost entirely of nationals of other nations. The Russians have offered to have four or five foreign nationals at each station inside the Soviet Union. But they also have demanded what amounts to a veto over the movement of inspection teams which might want to investigate any suspicious activity which could be a clandestine test.

On Friday the chief Soviet delegate at the Geneva meeting, now in its 14th week, charged the West with misrepresenting Russia's position. The West believes the four or five foreigners proposed by the Russians would be without real authority and could not keep adequate check on the 30 or so Soviet technicians expected to man each control post in the Soviet Union.

UNDER RENEWED ATTACK

The American test ban offer recently has been under renewed attack within the Eisenhower administration by both Pentagon and Atomic Energy Commission officials. The offer was made by the President over AEC objections last summer on Dulles' advice.

Dulles and the President took the position that, all political and military factors considered, the United States had to make the offer in part because of the worldwide fear of radioactive fallout. This view has had strong, but not unanimous, support from scientists who believe a test ban actually would be more favorable to the United States because of an American lead in many nuclear weapons developments.

Dulles rebuffed the renewed AEC attacks prior to his illness. It is widely believed in Washington that with the Secretary out of action there is no powerful figure in the administration to advise the President to keep on negotiating at Geneva. Some officials are worried that a collapse of the talks will enable the Russians to claim, and with considerable success around the world, that the United States was responsible for the failure.

GORE'S PROPOSAL

Senator ALBERT GORE, Democrat, of Tennessee, told Mr. Eisenhower last November that U.S. prestige and responsibility were involved and there was no way that the United States can be disassociated from either the success or failure of the conference. GORE suggested that instead of trying to negotiate a control system, the President announce the unconditional and unilateral cessation of all nuclear tests in the earth's atmosphere for a specified period, say 3 years, and ask other powers to do so. This would permit underground, underwater and outerspace testing.

Dulles said at that time that the Gore proposal might be taken up if the Geneva negotiations failed. The Gore proposal was criticized, however, on the grounds that it would lack the political effect of an inspection agreement which would help break down the Iron Curtain.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, when our representatives gathered at Geneva with those of the United Kingdom and the Soviet Union, they had before them the blueprint for what could readily be made a technically sufficient system for the detection of nuclear explosions.

With this formula on the table before them, their task was to fill in the technical framework with a reliable management to operate the system, so that each party could be adequately safeguarded against covert violations of the suspension agreement.

Any trustworthy system for the detection and control of nuclear tests must meet certain elementary standards. It must be operated by an international commission, that is, by an authority apart from the direction of any one participant. The commission must have the power to man and operate the requisite control stations with qualified personnel who are not subservient to the country within which they may be located, but are accountable only to the commission for which they work. And the inspection teams must have the latitude needed to accomplish their purpose, to monitor the atmosphere and report upon any evidence of nuclear activity, and to move promptly, when directed by the commission to do so, to the site of any seismic disturbance, reasonably suspected of being nuclear in origin.

These are the minimum prerequisites of any trustworthy system for the detection and control of nuclear tests. Without accepting these minimums, there is no control system, not even a shadow of one.

It is because the Soviet Union has thus far indicated an inflexible unwillingness to accept these minimums that the Geneva conference is now threatened with imminent collapse. The Russian delegation has adamantly persisted in the following three positions:

First. They demand a veto power over the operations of the proposed international control commission.

Second. They insist that the requisite control posts be self-operated, that is, dominated by nationals of the countries within which the posts are located.

Third. They call for complicated procedures which would easily frustrate prompt action by the commission in dispatching inspection teams to make necessary on-the-spot investigations of subterranean disturbances suspected of being nuclear in nature, or of preventing these essential at-site investigations from occurring at all.

Obviously, Mr. President, these conditions are as unacceptable as the proffered arguments in defense of them are untenable. One of our negotiators at Geneva, Assistant Secretary of State Philip J. Farley, succinctly outlined the reasonableness of the American position at Geneva, when he testified before the Disarmament Subcommittee of the Senate on January 28, as follows:

> The United States believes that any control system which could be frustrated in its day-to-day operations by the veto power in the hands of a single party would be worse than useless.
>
> The Soviet position [to man control posts by nationals of the government on whose territory the control posts are located] would amount to self-inspection and as such cannot be the basis for an agreement in which all parties can have confidence.
>
> Will international inspection groups be organized and ready to move quickly to the site of an event which could be suspected of being an explosion? Or will sending of such a group be subject to weeks of debate and a veto? The Soviet approach would entangle this key provision in miles of redtape.

As to these issues, Mr. President, there can be no compromise. Suspension of all further nuclear tests, in the air, underground, underwater, and in space, must rest upon a workable system of detection and control in which responsible men, mindful of the mortal stakes, can repose confidence.

Unless the Russians recede, the original purpose of the Geneva Conference that of ending all types of further nuclear weapons tests, would not now seem to be attainable.

PART IV. GENEVA, A PROPOSAL FOR THE 11TH HOUR

As it has become apparent that the Russians are likely to hold fast to their three tenets at Geneva, it has seemed to many that the conference may be doomed. Predictions are that it will break up soon, accomplishing nothing. If this should happen, our last best hope for progress in this critical field might well be foreclosed. We may now be in the 11th hour at Geneva, a fateful moment for the human race.

Mr. President, even though I share the pessimism that the conference is unlikely to achieve its original objective, I do not believe it necessarily follows that the conference must, therefore, break up, accomplishing nothing. If we cannot achieve all of our goal, it may still be possible to obtain a part of it.

If Geneva is to fail in its objective of creating a broad international control system that could adequately police the suspension of all further nuclear weapons tests, the responsibility for that failure will be clearly Russian. But if such an eventuality cannot be avoided, I would earnestly hope that my country would make one final effort to salvage something of value, for humanity's sake, from the long labors that have brought us to this conference table.

As a last resort, to attempt the avoidance of a total failure, I strongly urge that the United States make this final proposal: An agreement to suspend further nuclear weapons tests in the earth's atmosphere, within the framework of a trustworthy and sufficient international control system, adequate to reliably detect and report any violation. Such a proposal would exclude for the present any agreement involving suspension or control of nuclear tests occurring underground, underwater, or in outer space, none of which contribute to the pollution of the air, the grave cause of so much world concern.

Mr. President, last week I discussed this proposal with Mr. William B. Macomber, Jr., Assistant Secretary of State for Congressional Relations, and Mr. Ronald Spiers, officer in charge of disarmament affairs, who is involved with the Geneva negotiations. At their suggestion, I submitted the proposal, in letter form, to our Acting Secretary of State, Christian Herter, and they were, at that time, informed of my intention to call the proposal to the attention of the Senate from the floor today. I ask unanimous consent that the letter, dated February 25, 1959, be printed in the RECORD following the conclusion of my address.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, I anticipate that certain objections will at once be raised to my proposal. However, within the context in which I have offered it I believe them to be answerable.

For example, the scientific fact may be that American, English, and Russian technicians, functioning at home, now are able to detect the fact of nuclear explosion anywhere in the atmosphere and determine much concerning it. Nevertheless, we must remember that the commencement of an international control system is the sine qua non of man's progress toward any feasible disarmament. Broadened nuclear testing controls, which we might seek in the future, and eventual inspection for prevention of the surprise attack are but milestones on the road to this goal. It is altogether probable that advancement here will come, if at all, only a step at a time. My proposal would be a first step, and the Geneva Conference may yet constitute the best opportunity left to take it. An international control system which functions, however limited its initial scope might be, is the urgent need.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHURCH. I am delighted to yield to the distinguished Senator from Montana.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I was very much interested in what the Senator from Idaho had to say in the paragraph relating to broadened nuclear testing controls. The Senator said:

> Broadened nuclear testing controls, which we might seek in the future, and eventual inspection for prevention of surprise attack are but milestones on the road to this goal. It is altogether probable that advancement here will come, if at all, only a step at a time.

The Senator from Idaho may recall that in speeches which I delivered on the 12th and 26th of last month on the question of Berlin and Germany I called the attention of the Senate to a number of possibilities. They numbered nine. The ninth possibility is as follows:

> Point 9: It is essential that our policy, NATO's policies, do not exclude a careful consideration—may I repeat that word, "consideration"—of the Rapacki plan, the Eden plan for a demilitarized zone in middle Europe, or similar proposals in connection with the unification of Germany, predicated—may I repeat that word, "predicated"—or contingent upon the outcome of the conferences on surprise attack, and suspension of nuclear tests now going on in Geneva.

What I had in mind, and what I stated on February 12 and February 26, was that if we could achieve reasonable agreements among the powers holding these two conferences in Geneva we might consider, on that basis, the Rapacki plan, the Eden plan, or other plans which seek to bring about a denuclearization of both Germany and Czechoslovakia, as well as Poland, and eventually, and in due course, and under the right conditions, a withdrawal, or at least a thinning out, of troops eastward and westward.

So I am interested in what the distinguished Senator from Idaho has to say, because I believe that very likely he is talking along comparable lines.

The point is that if we are to consider proposals such as the Rapacki plan, the Eden plan, or other plans, there must be a quid pro quo. In my opinion the best quid pro quo we could achieve would be reasonable agreements in the conferences on atomic testing and on surprise attack.

So I hope that this statesmanlike effort by the Senator from Idaho will be heeded, and that from it will come, before it is too late, a reasonable solution to the difficulty in this particular area, which confronts not only the members of the "Nuclear Club," but, in their entirety, the peoples of the world as a whole.

Mr. CHURCH. I thank my good friend from Montana. By now we should be fully disenchanted with an approach to foreign policy which is founded upon some grand design. Progress in this difficult field will not come through the superimposition of one grandiloquent formula upon all the countries of the world. Progress will come fitfully, in little steps. We remember, Mr. President, not so many years ago, when the grand design was the liberation of the peoples of Eastern Europe, and our foreign policy of containment was criticized because it was not sufficiently vigorous or dynamic. That design of liberation was buried with a great many heroic Hungarians in the streets of Budapest.

Then we remember how it became the official doctrine in the State Department to base our foreign policy upon a principle called massive retaliation. That

principle was buried with many French troops at Dien Bien Phu.

Mr. President, there is just one way in which progress will be made in world affairs toward the goals that we would like to realize for the benefit of our children or our grandchildren, and that is by taking little steps. Right now the one place where it may be possible, in this bifurcated world, to take a step on which all can agree and which will serve the common interest of humanity, is at the conference table at Geneva.

Another objection to be anticipated is that this proposal is a futile one, in that the Russian behavior at Geneva makes it apparent that the Soviet Union does not really intend to agree to anything acceptable to the United States and Great Britain. It may be urged that the same considerations, which have prevented agreement within the framework of existing negotiations, would apply equally to my proposal. This may prove to be the case. Indeed, the evidence points very strongly in that direction. But we cannot know that the Russians will reject the proposal, unless and until it is offered and refused.

Throughout the negotiations to date, it is worthwhile to remember that Soviet spokesmen, from Khrushchev down, have repeatedly expressed their fears and suspicions concerning the movement of foreign inspection personnel within Russia. Their characterization of our position, as amounting to a thinly disguised attempt to gain military reconnaissance of their country, is based upon their propaganda specter of teams of technicians scurrying into every corner of their country in the guise of checking seismic disturbances, earthquakes, to see if they are nuclear in origin. This is why they say they want the veto; this is why they say they want the control stations manned with their own people; this is why they say they want our agreement to miles of redtape before inspection teams can move at all.

Under the control system I propose, the necessity for this movement should be largely, if not entirely, eliminated. Fewer control stations would be required, and fewer foreign nationals would need to be stationed in the countries involved.

If the Russians are negotiating in good faith, the lesser control system required to police a suspension of nuclear tests in the atmosphere only, would constitute a refutation of most of the objections they have voiced, since the conference began. It might even serve to allay the unreasoning fears that seem to lurk in the Soviet mind. The Russians were suspicious people long before the Communists achieved ascendancy. The czars maintained their own Iron Curtain.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. CHURCH. I am happy to yield to the distinguished senior Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I have been listening with rapt attention to the speech of the Senator from Idaho. He had started his speech before it was possible for me to come to the floor, and I have been reading the text of his speech from the beginning. I wish to compliment the Senator on his presentation of this very serious question. Because he has just now said "if the Soviet leaders are negotiating in good faith," I should like to ask him if he really sees any evidence that there is the slightest bit of good faith in the approach of the Soviets to any of the questions involving the freedom of people throughout the world?

Mr. CHURCH. I should like to say, in reply to my good friend from Wyoming, that I am very skeptical as to whether the Russians are in fact negotiating in good faith at Geneva. I believe the evidence all points to the contrary. The burden of my talk today is twofold. I make a proposal which I believe is in the interest of the United States and the free world and, indeed, in the interest of humanity everywhere. If the Russians are negotiating in good faith, which I doubt, then this proposal has the merit of undercutting the position they have heretofore taken at Geneva, and thus making it very difficult indeed for them to continue to maintain their objections which now make agreement impossible.

If, on the other hand, the Russians are, as I suspect, not negotiating in good faith, what better way is there to dramatically expose that fact to the world than to submit this proposal to them? It is a proposal which involves a minimal inspection system which could not possibly do any internal mischief inside Russia. If they reject it, it will be exceedingly difficult, even for those artful propagandists, to blame the failure at Geneva upon the United States and our allies.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am grateful to the Senator for his response, because it is important for us to realize that the aim and purpose of the Communist command is to do away with government by the people. They believe in government by dictatorship. They take this attitude, fundamentally, because they have no faith in the relationship between man and God. They do not believe that man is capable of improving himself. They are committed to establishing a world dictatorship which will make all people toe the line the Communists lay down. We must keep that thought definitely in mind in all our approaches to this problem.

Mr. CHURCH. I agree wholeheartedly with what the distinguished senior Senator from Wyoming has said. If I felt for a moment that the present negotiations at Geneva constituted a hazard to the free world or to the relative position of strength held by the free world vis-a-vis Russia and her allies, I would be the first to take the floor and urge us to terminate those discussions forthwith. I believe, as I have explained in my address, that we went to Geneva with an objective that would serve our interest and the interest of our allies, and yet one, owing to the peculiar nature of the problem, which gave us common ground to seek an agreement with the Soviet Union with respect to banning nuclear tests.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Will the Senator from Idaho permit me to add that we went to Geneva with the interests of the people of Russia at heart?

Mr. CHURCH. Indeed, we did.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The dictatorship of the Kremlin is not serving the welfare of the people of Russia—or of Siberia.

Mr. CHURCH. I agree wholeheartedly with that statement.

Mr. President, as I indicated in the course of my colloquy with the distinguished Senator from Wyoming, if the Russians are not negotiating in good faith at Geneva, as I strongly suspect may be the case, then what better way to expose their game than by offering them an international inspection and control system which can safely end the slow pollution of the atmosphere, without possibly doing them any internal mischief? By forcing the Russian hand, refusal to accept such a proposal would reveal their hypocrisy before the world.

But it may be urged, Mr. President, that the Russians might seize upon such a proposal as evidence to bolster the charge that the United States did not really support the ending of all nuclear tests, but always has wanted tests to continue, thus somehow absolving Russia from blame for the failure to reach agreement. I would give little credence to this argument. As I have already stated, it seems to me that the proposal I suggest would weaken, not strengthen, Communist propaganda. In any case, we know that the Russians will contrive to blame the United States for a breakup of the conference. Whatever occurs, their indictment of us will be artfully drawn and made to sound plausible. In some quarters, the Communist story will be believed, regardless of what the truth may be or what we may say about it. But this prospect should not be permitted to govern our decisions. As to these, we are, in the last analysis, accountable only to the trust we hold.

Mr. President, I have made this proposal, not in the spirit of criticism of the course we have heretofore taken in Geneva, but in support of it.

I believe that all nuclear weapons testing should be stopped, subject to a trustworthy control and inspection system, and that we should persist in our striving for this goal at Geneva. It is meant to be a constructive proposal which cannot jeopardize our present negotiations, but might possibly salvage something of value should their failure, as presently cast, become inevitable, and we are faced with the gloomy prospect of leaving the conference table empty-handed.

If there are cogent reasons rendering my proposal inadvisable, then I shall want to know what they are. The people, too, are entitled to know what they are. For we may still possess a momentous opportunity at Geneva, fast slipping from our grasp. It may not come again in our time.

Good conscience commands that we do our utmost there.

This is an anxious hour.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHURCH. I yield to the distinguished Chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I wish to compliment the distinguished Senator from

Idaho. He has evidenced in the hearings before the committee a great interest in and an understanding of the matters he is discussing, but I think the address he is making sums up his views on this subject in a remarkably clear and convincing manner.

I think the Senator's suggestion is an excellent example of constructive statesmanship. I sincerely hope the Department of State and our representatives in Geneva will consider the suggestion seriously and will endeavor to do everything they can to persuade the Russians to agree to it.

I for one, wish to encourage the Senator from Idaho and all other Senators to analyze our problems in such a constructive manner, and to make constructive proposals. I particularly wish to emphasize this because I think there has been some misunderstanding of a remark or a short statement I made over the weekend. I certainly in no way intended to discourage any Senator from speaking upon matters of this kind on the floor of the Senate.

Again I compliment the Senator from Idaho for his most excellent statement.

Mr. CHURCH. I thank the Senator from Arkansas. I appreciate immensely what he has said, because I value his judgment so highly.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. One thing which the Senator is doing that I particularly like is his drawing attention to some fundamental facts which many persons overlook. He mentioned that the Russians had certain characteristics of suspicion toward foreigners and a kind of Iron Curtain long before the Soviets came to power. An understanding of that type of situation puts the matter in better perspective and, I think, gives us more hope for the future than if we attribute all the difficulties simply to the present regime.

Mr. CHURCH. I thank the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHURCH. Before I yield to the distinguished Senator from Tennessee, I wish to say, in reference to whatever remarks he may make, and regardless of how he may feel about the proposal I have offered, that my proposal was largely a result of the original thinking which was done by the junior Senator from Tennessee when he made his proposal a few months ago that the United States should unilaterally terminate atmospheric nuclear tests while retaining the right to continue weapons tests underground and in outer space. That proposal led me to the thinking which, today, I have attempted to outline on the floor of the Senate. I think the Senator from Tennessee knows this. I simply wanted to make it a part of the RECORD this afternoon. His proposal has been very seriously considered and, I understand, continues to be considered at the State Department in the highest councils of the Executive Government.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I had not asked the distinguished Senator from Idaho to yield with the hope of hearing his very generous remarks. I thank him genuinely.

I arose to compliment the Senator for a concise and able summary of the circumstances surrounding the Geneva Conference and an eloquent presentation of his views and concern.

As the Senator from Idaho has pointed out, the proposal which I made earlier and the proposal which he makes now are not dissimilar in character. There are some differences.

I should like, first, to express full agreement with the able junior Senator from Idaho with respect to the importance of taking the first step, as he refers to his proposal on page 7.

Many persons say that all that is needed is mutual confidence between the United States and Russia. I do not deny that confidence is needed. But confidence does not come merely by wishing for it. Confidence does not come because we acknowledge the need for it or because we deplore the lack of it. Confidence between the United States and Russia, between the people of the East and the West, in the context of the present world turmoil, must come step by step upon successive manifestations of fidelity to trust and the honoring of agreements.

In this regard, does not the able junior Senator from Idaho think that a fundamental characteristic of U.S. foreign policy in a conference such as that which is under way at Geneva must be goals which appear reasonable and attainable?

Mr. CHURCH. I do, indeed.

Mr. GORE. The goals set may not have been attainable from the beginning. The able Senator, in a statement on page 4 of his text, refers to certain minimum prerequisites.

Now the able Senator from Idaho lists a control system international in character. Would not he agree that an additional necessary prerequisite, according to the experts who early last year reached agreement in Geneva, would be a worldwide system of control and detection posts?

Mr. CHURCH. Since I cannot presume to know what may be technically required, I would say that the blueprint generally laid down last summer by the experts was one which, upon examination, it was felt would be sufficient to give us the necessary safeguards to enforce a suspension of nuclear testing. I believe it was upon that assumption that we went to Geneva in October.

Mr. GORE. As the able Senator from Idaho knows, at the Geneva conference, it was my privilege and honor to be one of the representatives of the U.S. Senate. As such, I studied in considerable detail the report of the conference of experts and some of the minutes of their proceedings; and I talked at considerable length with some participants in the conference. Upon those bases, I can assure the able Senator from Idaho that the system recommended by the experts was, in fact, a worldwide network of control stations, posts, and teams.

I should like to point out to the Senator from Idaho that neither side at Geneva, during the time I was at the conference, nor, to my knowledge, since my return, suggested the establishment in Red China of controls posts and inspection teams. As the able Senator will recall, the testimony before the Disarmament Committee demonstrates the necessity for the establishment in Red China of such inspection teams for adequate detection of underground tests. I take it that the Senator from Idaho recalls that.

Mr. CHURCH. I do, indeed, recall it; and I also recall participating with the Senator from Tennessee in the questioning.

Let me simply say that, although we may have been fully justified, all things considered, in taking at Geneva the position that the technical system contemplated was a sufficient one to justify the suspension of all nuclear tests, I submit as an added argument in support of the proposal I have made this afternoon that, whatever doubts there might have been with respect to the inspection system which was to be meant as a reliable detection safeguard against all types of nuclear tests, if the agreement actually arrived at were restricted to atmospheric tests only, then the possible gap which would be presented by Red China in such a system no longer would have the importance it might otherwise have had. I believe this is another argument for the general feasibility of the proposal I have made this afternoon.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, again I find myself in agreement with the able junior Senator from Idaho.

I should like to characterize the proposal he makes as one for an attainable goal for the accomplishment of which we can have reasonable expectation.

Earlier I said there were differences between the proposal I had earlier made and the one the able junior Senator from Idaho now makes. If he will be so kind as to permit me to summarize briefly the proposal I made, the differences will readily be apparent.

Mr. CHURCH. I ask the Senator from Tennessee to do so, please.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, after sitting at the table at Geneva, I found myself in such full agreement with some of the conclusions which the able Senator from Idaho now states—particularly his conclusions as to the intransigence of the Soviets and as to the necessity for the United States to improve, strengthen, and establish beyond peradventure of doubt its correct moral and political position in this important matter—that I suggested that the President of the United States save the conference at Geneva from the failure which I fear now impends, by announcing to the world that the United States of America, which constantly is blamed by the Soviets for contaminating the world's atmosphere and radioactive fallout, had stopped all atmospheric tests for a given period—say, 3 years; and then for our country to propose to negotiate at the Geneva Conference a permanent stoppage of such tests by all nuclear powers.

The able junior Senator from Idaho has omitted from his suggestion the unilateral action. I still think it would be a dramatic way for the United States to seize the initiative and to manifest to the world its good faith.

By his suggestion, the able Senator from Idaho has emphasized the importance of establishing an international control system. He has given more emphasis to it than I did in my proposal; and in that respect I believe he is correct. It would be an important first step. If we were to take this important first step, the conference might be saved from failure, and other steps might become feasible.

I think it will be easier, here in the United States, to place on the Russians the blame for failure of the conference, than it will be to fix that blame upon the Russians in the minds of the people of New Delhi, Bangkok, Indonesia and Africa.

Humanity the world over is watching the United States. The United States was the first to use the atom for destruction. So I believe it imperative that the United States be first and foremost in the use of the atom for the benefit of man, and also be first and foremost in curbing the contamination of the world's atmosphere which all mankind must breathe, and thus be first and foremost in seeking effective international control of nuclear weapons.

Mr. CHURCH. I could not agree more.

Mr. GORE. I thank the Senator. I have found his able remarks provocative and stimulating. I congratulate him, and wish to concur in all that he has said, with the addition of the prerequisite to which I have referred, and also to urge him again to consider the advantages to our country for the President of the United States, to dramatize if he so chooses, our position before the world, strengthening our moral and political position thereby, by taking a unilateral action for a given period as a manifestation of our good faith to all who might unfortunately doubt it, and then offer an agreement for permanent stoppage by all nuclear powers.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHURCH. I am pleased to yield to my esteemed friend the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. ANDERSON. I commend the able junior Senator from Idaho for commenting as earnestly and as clearly as he has on the problem he has been discussing. I think we all recognize that the Geneva conference is in grave peril, if not in the utmost period of decay. I can only say I hope the President of the United States and others may follow along with the proposals similar to those the Senator from Idaho has made, and similar to the proposals of the very able Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], that we do not just give up because we encounter disagreement, but that we continue to try to find places and bases upon which we may agree, and try at least to arrive at a proposal which can be acceptable, even if all the things which men might like to include in the proposal may not be included. This is a most difficult situation, and I think people may subsequently blame both sides for intolerance.

Certainly the shift which took place when it was learned our detection devices were not as good as we thought they were might have had some bearing on the outcome of the conference.

Without trying to prejudge what the verdict of history may be, I am glad the Senator from Idaho, as is true of the Senator from Tennessee, continues to hope that out of these negotiations there may be some benefit to mankind resulting from the search for an eventual solution.

I am glad the Senator from Idaho has taken this opportunity to discuss the problem very frankly on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHURCH. Yes.

Mr. GORE. The able Senator from New Mexico, who is Chairman of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, has emphasized that which I was remiss in not emphasizing—the good to come to the world's humanity in reaching agreement upon curtailing further radioactive fallout. I had emphasized earlier the importance of squaring ourselves with world public opinion. The more important objective is that to which the able Senator from New Mexico has just referred.

I shall not undertake here to discuss the hazard of radioactive fallout. I do not know whether it is as serious as some suggest, or less serious. Suffice it to say that world public opinion is concerned about it and that the United States of America is held in major part responsible for the contamination which now exists.

Mr. CHURCH. Would not the Senator agree that the very fact that there is disagreement in this field by the experts themselves is ominous in itself? Regardless of the qualitative appraisal we make, the fact that the experts themselves disagree is enough to alarm the world, and rightly so.

Mr. GORE. I agree. The potential of the hazard is recognized by all. The degree of the hazard is where the disagreement occurs.

Mr. CHURCH. That is correct.

Mr. GORE. So here is a hazard to all mankind for generations to come; and it was the United States that used the first atomic weapon. It is the United States that has exploded most of the nuclear weapons. It is the United States that has released into the world's atmosphere the largest amount of radioactive material.

Therefore, as I said earlier, I think it is imperative that the United States be first and foremost in curbing this hazard.

The Senator from Idaho has, in the opinion of the junior Senator from Tennessee, performed a signal service by bringing this matter to the attention of the Senate.

I was pleased to hear the junior Senator from Arkansas make the statement which he made in correcting the misinterpretation which some persons had placed on his own remarks, because I believe that a Member of the United States Senate owes it to his country to communicate to his country sentiments and views which he regards as vital to its security. That must be one of his foremost considerations.

Mr. CHURCH. If I may interrupt, it is, is it not, the constitutional function of the Senate of the United States to advise and consent in the field of foreign policy—consent to the ratification of treaties, and advise with respect to all aspects of foreign policy? So it is, I should think, incumbent upon the Senate generally and upon each individual Senator individually to do as the Senator from Tennessee has suggested.

Mr. GORE. I agree; and I should like to conclude my overextended trespass upon the time of the able Senator, by referring to his statement that the proposal I had earlier made has received consideration and is still receiving consideration. I can certainly vouch for its having received consideration, for which I am grateful, and I am sure it is still being considered.

In that regard I should like to say that in the conference which I was privileged to have with President Eisenhower on this subject I found him to be generous, patient, understanding, and concerned. I do not think he could have been more concerned about a problem than he appeared to be with regard to this problem. I am grateful for the opportunity to undertake to make a contribution.

Mr. CHURCH. I thank the Senator very much for his valuable contribution to the discussion of this important subject this afternoon.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHURCH. I now yield to the Senator from Alaska.

Mr. GRUENING. The distinguished Senator from Idaho has made a most useful and important contribution toward solution of the impasse in which we as representatives of the free world, and representing ourselves in our negotiations with Russia, find ourselves. The Senator's proposal is so logical and so sound and in its very nature so minimal that it seems difficult to realize there could be any belief that the other party to the negotiation, our opponent in the cold war, will be able to reject it. As the Senator stated, if our opponent continues to be evasive—as the distinguished senior Senator from Wyoming pointed out, there seems to be little reason to expect or hope that the Russians will negotiate in good faith—and if the Russians reject the proposal, it will be a demonstration to the entire free world that we in the United States at least are trying to achieve progress, that we will not desist from our efforts but will continue to try to negotiate, reducing our proposals to the absolute minimum of what seem to be attainable in the hope of achieving some small progress.

I want to further express my great agreement with the comments of the distinguished Senator from Idaho that our gains in this field, with the ultimate objective of world peace, will not be made along the lines of a grand design, which during the last 6 years has proved demonstrably so futile, but will be achieved in a series of small gains here, there, and everywhere, advancing by inches, trying to establish a new forward position on a great variety of fronts.

As the able Senator from Tennessee has pointed out, we in the United States

took the lead, rightly or wrongly, in projecting nuclear warfare upon this world and that we have therefore a special responsibility for trying to end it. If this proposal of the Senator from Idaho is not accepted first by our own State Department and later by our opponents I hope we may have an opportunity to experiment for a time, at least, with the unilateral cessation of nuclear tests and the pollution of the atmosphere, with a clear understanding that if this shining example, which would do us so much credit in the world, is not followed, we will be free to resume tests, a calamity which I hope will not be necessary.

The able and distinguished Senator from Idaho has made a most useful and constructive proposal in a field which overshadows and supersedes all other in importance—the problem of survival.

Mr. CHURCH. I thank my good friend the Senator from Alaska very much for the remarks he has made.

I should like to conclude, Mr. President, by explaining why the approach which I have taken differs from the approach suggested by the distinguished Senator from Tennessee. It seemed to me that, in what may now be the death agonies of the conference at Geneva, there was an urgent opportunity, which was quite possibly slipping away from us, to achieve a breakthrough at the conference table which would establish an essential first step toward international controls, which must in the future constitute the basis of any progress we can possibly make toward the great goals of prevention of surprise attack and general disarmament.

Therefore, I have made this suggestion within the context of the deliberations now going on at Geneva, which are possibly in their closing hours. In doing so, I do not mean that I disagree with the proposition put forward by the distinguished Senator from Tennessee. As the Senator knows, that proposition has my sympathy and my support.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GRUENING in the chair). Does the Senator from Idaho yield?

Mr. CHURCH. I am happy to yield to the distinguished Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. DODD. I congratulate the Senator on his informative and eloquent statement. I find myself in complete agreement with it. I think this discussion helps all of us. I know it helps me.

I recall a similar suggestion of the Senator from Tennessee some time ago. I remember reading it with great interest.

What is particularly appealing to many of us, I think, is the idea that perhaps in these ways we can begin to achieve an understanding with our opponents in the world. What is proposed seems to me to be such a way. I think the Russians will find it very difficult to offer a logical and sensible reason for opposing the suggestion the Senator from Idaho has made.

I wish to compliment the Senator for having made a real contribution to a better understanding of the problems which face us in the world.

Mr. CHURCH. I am very grateful to the Senator for his statement. I will say to the Senator at this time publicly, as I have tried to say to him personally, I read his stirring and powerful statement in defense of the official position that we are taking with respect to Berlin, and found it as moving a statement as any I had heard delivered on the floor of the Senate in my time here.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

EXHIBIT 1

U.S. SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS,
February 25, 1959.

Hon. CHRISTIAN HERTER,
Acting Secretary of State,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: The fateful negotiations now in progress in Geneva are being watched by an anxious world. The United States is once again demonstrating its good faith. We properly seek the suspension of all types of nuclear tests under a trustworthy international system of inspection and control.

I address this letter to you out of grave concern that Russia's continued intransigence may soon stalemate the negotiations at Geneva, causing our best efforts there to come to nought.

It is my understanding that the current difficulty at Geneva centers upon the following aspects of the Russian position:

(1) The Soviet demand for reserving a veto power over the operations of the proposed international control commission.

(2) The Soviet insistence that control posts be self-operated, that is, managed by nationals of the governments within whose territories the posts are located.

(3) The Soviet advocacy of procedures that would easily frustrate prompt action by the commission in dispatching inspection teams to make necessary on-the-spot investigations of subterranean disturbances suspected of being nuclear in nature, or of preventing these essential at-site investigations from occurring at all.

Obviously, unless the Russian attitude toward these matters changes, no reliable inspection and control system, capable of policing the suspension of all types of nuclear tests, is possible. Thus the Geneva negotiations are threatened with impending failure, one that might well foreclose our last hope for progress in this critical field.

If the conference fails in its objective to establish a workable international control system that could end all further nuclear tests, the responsibility for that failure will be clearly Russian. But if such an eventuality cannot be avoided, I would hope that the United States might make one final effort to salvage something, for humanity's sake, from the long labors that have brought us to this conference table.

As a last resort, in order that the conference might not break up accomplishing nothing, I would strongly urge that the United States make this final proposal: An agreement to suspend all further nuclear tests in the earth's atmosphere, enforced through an international control system sufficient to detect any violations. Such a proposal would exclude, for the present, any agreement involving suspension or control of subterranean or extra-atmospheric nuclear explosions, neither of which contribute to the pollution of the air, the principal cause of so much world concern.

I would anticipate that certain questions will be raised as to this proposal. Within the context in which I make it, I believe them to be answerable.

For example, it may be urged that, technically speaking, no international control system is required for the detection of atmospheric nuclear explosions. American, English, and Soviet technicians, all functioning at home, may now be able to detect the fact of nuclear explosion anywhere in the atmosphere, and determine much concerning it. Nevertheless, the commencement of an international control system to accomplish this objective is the sine qua non of man's progress toward any feasible disarmament. Broadened nuclear testing controls, to be sought in the future, and eventual inspection for prevention of surprise attack, are but milestones on the road to this goal. It is altogether probable that advancement here will come, if at all, only a step at a time. My proposal would be the first step, and the Geneva conference may yet constitute the best opportunity left to take it. An international control system which functions, however limited its initial scope might be, is the urgent need.

Another objection to be anticipated is that this proposal is a futile one, in that the Russian behavior at Geneva makes it apparent that the Soviet Union does not really intend to agree to anything acceptable to the United States and Great Britain. It may be urged that the same considerations which have prevented agreement within the framework of existing negotiations, would apply equally to my proposal.

This may prove to be the case, but not necessarily so. Soviet spokesmen, from Khrushchev down, have repeatedly expressed their fears and suspicions concerning the movement of foreign inspection personnel within Russia. Under the control system I propose, the necessity for this movement should be largely, if not entirely, eliminated. Fewer control stations would be required, and fewer foreign nationals would need to be stationed in the countries involved. In any event, it would seem that we ought not anticipate failure as a reason for abandonment of new proposals, even before making them.

Finally, it may be urged that the Russians might seize upon such a proposal as evidence to bolster the charge that the United States did not really support an ending of all nuclear tests, and so, somehow, to absolve Russia from their blame for failure to reach agreement. The answer to this, I think, is that the Russians, in any case, will contrive to blame the United States for a breakup of the conference. Whatever occurs, their indictment of us will be artfully drawn and made to sound plausible. In some quarters, they will be believed, regardless of what the truth may be, or what we may say about it. But this prospect should not be permitted to govern our decisions as to the course we must take.

In making these decisions, Mr. Secretary, I am sure you would be the first to agree that we are accountable, in the last analysis, to the trust we hold. It will be upon our conscience always, if we do less than the utmost in our quest to salvage something of value from the conference table at Geneva.

Sincerely,

FRANK CHURCH,
U.S. Senator.

ANNIVERSARY OF NEBRASKA'S ADMISSION TO THE UNION

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, March 1, 1959, is the 92d anniversary of the admission of the State of Nebraska as one of the United States of America. We Nebraskans call this important day in our State's history Founders Day.

At this point, I should like to stress the fact that the word "founders" has a large "S" in the minds of my fellow Nebraskans. "Founders," to us, is definitely plural. No single individual, no small group of individuals, made possible our statehood. That attainment was made possible by the mutual effort, the com-

mon sacrifice, of every man, woman, and child who had lived in what is now the State of Nebraska up until the time we entered the Union.

We have been called the Cornhusker State. That is true. We are a large corn producer. We have been called the Beef State. That, also, is true. Our cattle contribute to the lives of Americans and to people in the far corners of this earth. We have been called the Tree-Planter State. That is true, too. From a relatively treeless prairie, we have become a State of trees. The very institution of Arbor Day sprang from a Nebraskan's heart and mind.

Yet, I have still another name for Nebraska.

My name for it is, "The Neighbor State."

In 1832 the first artist to interest himself in the Nebraska region, George Catlin, wrote:

> There is no more beautiful prairie country in the world than that which is to be seen here. In looking back from this bluff toward the west, there is one of the most beautiful scenes imaginable. The surface of the country is gracefully undulating, like the swells of the ocean after a heavy storm, and everywhere covered with beautiful green turf. * * * The soil in this region is also rich and capable of making one of the most productive countries in the world.

Catlin, the artist, saw beauty. Other Nebraska pioneers—men and women who wanted to make homes in Nebraska—had different viewpoints. They saw these same beautiful prairies ablaze with destroying fire. They heard the war cries of Poncas, Omahas, Pawnees, Otoes, Sioux, and Cheyennes. They cowered in their sod houses while the white terror of the blizzard roared outside. They felt the heat that withered their first crops. They saw clouds of grasshoppers fall upon them, clouds that shut out the sun.

Yet these pioneers loved the soil on which they built their homes. In spite of suffering, anguish, even the death of their dear ones, they stayed. No quick riches came. There was no gold, no silver. These pioneers had faith in Nebraska soil and in its power to produce.

One of the favorite subjects of frontier art has been the protecting ring of buffalo bulls—and, within that ring, the cows and the calves. Not even the most savage of prairie wolves could break through that formation.

Nebraska pioneers learned by observation. They formed their own protective ring. They relied on instant and complete community cooperation. And such reliance paid off. Without it, they would have perished. With it, they survived.

The more than 100,000 Nebraska pioneers who homesteaded their land since 1862 lived that way.

Times changed. Farm-to-market roads, a Nebraska first, penetrated remote rural regions. The crossroads settlement became a town; the town became a city; the city became a metropolis. Blizzards, prairie fires, hostile Indians, lost their immediate and terrible danger.

Still, the feeling of interdependence—of neighborliness, if you will—remained with the sons and daughters of Nebraska's pioneers. People who could trace their ancestry to the Deep South lived side by side with neighbors whose forefathers came from the bleak and rock-bound coast of New England. Nebraskans of French origin lived next door to Nebraskans of German origin. What is more, they liked it. There are neither Swedes, Danes, Norwegians, Irish, nor Czechoslovaks in Nebraska. There are some 1,414,000 neighborly Nebraska Americans.

That is why, to me, Nebraska will always be the Neighbor State.

We Nebraskans are justly proud of the products of our soil and our toil. But it is one product—definitely in the singular—of which I, as a Nebraskan, am most proud.

Alexander Pope, the English poet who lived and wrote more than two centuries ago, left us a deathless line.

He wrote:

> The proper study of mankind is man.

In that same vein, I say today—on Nebraska's Founders Day, 1959,

> The greatest, the noblest, product of my native State, my home, is—Nebraskans.

VIRGINIA'S STAND AFFIRMED

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a letter written to the New York Times by Mrs. Genevieve Clark Thomson, daughter of the late Champ Clark, one of the greatest Americans to serve as Speaker of the House of Representatives.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

VIRGINIA'S STAND AFFIRMED—HERITAGE OF HER HISTORY LINKED TO VIEWS ON CONSTITUTION

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

Your distinguished Washington correspondent Arthur Krock recently referred to Virginia as "the proudest State in the Union."

Certainly a Virginian with an inferiority complex is a rarity, but Virginia's pride and freedom from a feeling of inferiority are not without foundation. Hers is the oldest civilization in North America.

Our Declaration of Independence was written by a Virginian, Thomas Jefferson. Our victorious Revolutionary armies were captained by a Virginian, George Washington. Our Federal Constitution was fathered by a Virginian, James Madison.

Virginia refused to ratify the Constitution until assured that a Bill of Rights would be added. And the first 10 amendments to the Constitution, now popularly known as the Bill of Rights, were largely the handiwork of Virginians James Madison, George Mason, and Richard Henry Lee.

It is not surprising, therefore, that Virginians should feel that they have as much understanding of and respect for constitutional government as Chief Justice Warren, a second-generation American, or Justice Frankfurter, a naturalized citizen.

And certainly they have as much as Gunnar Myrdal, the Swedish sociologist upon whose views Chief Justice Warren so heavily leaned in composing his fateful opinion of 1954 on desegregation.

Nor would Virginians agree with another of Dr. Myrdal's opinions contained in the same volume to the effect that the United States Constitution is outmoded and should be junked. In fairness, let us assume that the Chief Justice doesn't agree with this opinion, but that he is merely a superficial reader.

It was kind of the Times to commend Virginia for its good manners in a time of deep distress. Most Virginians would, I think, echo the words of Daniel Webster when told of a eulogy passed upon him: "It does me but simple justice."

Now as one citizen of Virginia, if I may do so without discourtesy, I say to the Times: "Look Homeward Angel" to New York, the stench of whose race relations now pervades even the provinces. We have nothing like it in Virginia.

GENEVIEVE CLARK THOMSON.

GAYLORD, VA., *February 5, 1959.*

FEDERAL CIVILIAN PAYROLL

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a statement prepared by me regarding the Federal civilian payroll.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR BYRD OF VIRGINIA

The regular Federal civilian payroll for the first time in history is now running in excess of a billion dollars a month as a constant average.

Payroll for Federal civilian employees in the first 6 months of the current fiscal year (July-December 1958) totaled $6,219,196,000. This would be an annual rate approaching $12.5 billion.

The number of employees changed very little in the first half of this year as compared with the same period last year, running at approximately 2,361,000; but payroll costs, reflecting recent pay raises, were up nearly 11 percent.

The all-time Federal civilian employment peak was reached in the last year of World War II, 1945. In that year employment averaged more than 3.5 million and the payroll totaled a little under $8 billion.

As compared with 1945, civilian employment by Federal agencies is down approximately 33 percent; the payroll is up more than 56 percent; and the per capita average pay has been increased 133 percent.

These figures are taken from records compiled by the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures.

For the coming fiscal year the budget contemplates an increase of more than 72,000 over last year in employment by Federal civilian agencies, exclusive of civilian employment by the military departments, which has been gradually declining.

I recommend reduction in current civilian employment by Federal agencies of a minimum of 150,000. This would be little more than 6 percent. It could be accomplished without impairment of a single essential function.

UNSUNG PUBLIC SERVANTS

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, on February 26, 1959, Dr. F. W. Reichelderfer, Chief of the Weather Bureau, issued a press release and accompanying citation commending 21 of our voluntary weather observers who have assisted the Weather Bureau in observing and reporting weather conditions for more than 50 years. Two of the persons so commended are residents of North Carolina, one of them being Mrs. Charles Edward Taylor, of Southport, and the other Mr. Barry C. Hawkins, of Highlands. These 21 faithful, unsung, and uncompensated public servants merit the thanks of the Nation.

On behalf of the Honorable ALTON A. LENNON, who represents the district in which Mrs. Taylor resides, and on behalf of the Honorable DAVID M. HALL, who represents the district in which Mr. Hawkins resides, and myself, I ask unanimous consent that the release and accompanying commendation be printed at this point in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the documents were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

VOLUNTARY WEATHER OBSERVERS PRAISED

Dr. F. W. Reichelderfer, Chief of the Weather Bureau, Department of Commerce, today reported that the Weather Bureau now has 21 cooperative observers who have taken weather observations daily for more than 50 years. Three of these 21 voluntary—and unsalaried—weather observers have taken daily observations for more than 60 years.

A special citation edition of the Weather Bureau's daily weather map (published on Thursday, February 26) has been issued in honor of these 21 veterans of the nationwide corps of 7,000 cooperative weather observers who take and record weather observations every day of the year—including Sundays and holidays—without any compensation whatsoever. On the back of the regular daily weather map of this date are printed brief service highlights of these remarkable senior citizens.

Dr. Reichelderfer said that without the daily records of these cooperative observers our knowledge of the climate of the United States would be meager.

The Chief of the Weather Bureau added that this weather observing work is an outstanding example of people serving their Government without pay, and he thought their daily but unsung efforts merited the applause of their fellow citizens.

Weather Bureau meteorologists said that these daily weather records made through the years are in constant use in many ways. Such reports are, and will continue to be, important in helping solve weather related problems concerning industry, commerce, and agriculture.

The dean of the Weather Bureau's voluntary weather observer corps is Mr. Barry C. Hawkins, of Highlands, N.C., who has taken daily observations for more than 67 years. His period of personal service is only 5 months shorter than the entire history of the Weather Bureau as a civilian agency. Mr. Hawkins was born in Ohio in 1874, came to North Carolina in 1883, and took his first weather observation there on November 1, 1891. Weather Bureau climatology officials say that throughout Mr. Hawkins' entire period of service his weather records have maintained an exceptionally high standard of accuracy and dependability. For many years Mr. Hawkins walked 10 miles to mail his observation reports to the Weather Bureau.

The cooperative weather observer with the second longest service record is Father Adelhelm Hess, of the Benedictine Abbey at Conception, Mo., whose observations date back to 1894. Father Hess, a former professor of Greek and Latin, received a special letter of commendation from President Eisenhower in October 1954.

The third longest service record of the entire country is Mr. F. O. Alin, of Fullerton, N. Dak., who began his observations on January 1, 1898. During Mr. Alin's 60 years of weather observing, he never missed an observation. He has recorded temperatures from 113° above to 44° below zero. Mr. Alin has been honored by Meritorious Service Medals and by special letters of citation from the Chief of the Weather Bureau and the Secretary of Commerce. The entire town of Fullerton, N. Dak., held a community celebration in March 1957 to honor Mr. Alin's outstanding service record.

The dean of women observers is Mrs. Charles E. Taylor, who has been a cooperative observer in Southport, N.C., since March 1900. She also has the fourth longest service record of all observers. Mrs. Taylor earned the nickname "Hurricane Hazel Heroine" because of her valiant all night efforts to warn her neighbors before Hurricane Hazel struck Southport at dawn on October 15, 1954. In February 1955 she was presented a 50-year award as a weather observer by the Secretary of Commerce, and given a special citation by the Chief of the Weather Bureau.

Shortly after April 9, 1955, Mrs. Taylor was surprised to receive a letter from the White House, in Washington, and which read:

"DEAR MRS. TAYLOR: I have learned from Secretary Weeks of your long and devoted service as a cooperative observer for the Weather Bureau. In providing regular reports during the past 55 years on the weather conditions in your locality, you have made an important contribution to the work of the Bureau and to the welfare of your fellow Americans.

"Along with congratulations on your outstanding record, I send my thanks for your very unselfish service.

"With best wishes,

"Sincerely,

"DWIGHT EISENHOWER."

The help of cooperative weather observers to record the Nation's climate was started early in the last century even before the Weather Bureau was established in 1891. Dozens of individuals who had been taking observations at scattered locations were urged by the new Weather Bureau to continue, and hundreds of additional citizens in all parts of the country and from all walks of life soon volunteered to make local weather observations and keep records of climatological data. More than 7,000 citizens now are taking weather observations without pay. The Weather Bureau furnishes observation instruments such as rain gages and thermometers, and also supplies the record forms on which the observations are logged at least once daily. Observers are drawn from all ranks of life, and by their constant and faithful service have made available to all users an invaluable storehouse of weather data.

Each observer gives an average of about 15 minutes a day to take and record the observations, to answer numerous questions from neighbors in the community about the local weather, and to complete and mail the regular monthly reports. It is estimated that the total time contributed by each observer to the Government over a 50-year period amounts to about 600 eight-hour workdays. The daily services of the thousands of voluntary observers would add up to about 80,000 full 8-hour days of work each year provided our citizens without cost.

In some cases observers from a single family have continued an unbroken series of daily observations for extraordinary long periods of time—the observer work being passed on from one generation to the next. For example, members of the Stern family at Logan, Iowa, have been taking weather readings for 77 years. Miss Amy Stern, present observer, is the granddaughter of the first weather observer at Logan. Carlos Call, present dean of California cooperative observers, has taken daily observations at Fort Ross, Calif., for 52 years and his father (George W. Call) recorded rainfall at the same place from 1874 to 1907. The combined family observation record is now 85 years.

At Rome, Ga., four generations of the Tower family have taken weather observations for nearly 100 years.

Mrs. Jessie T. White, of San Jon, N. Mex., on February 1, 1959 joined the ranks of those who have completed 50 years of daily observations. She graduated from college at the age of 57, and has been a schoolteacher, newspaper editor and rancher. She rides horseback each month to mail her monthly weather reports.

When Walter Eckert, dean of the cooperative observers in the State of Washington, arrived from New York 69 years ago the town of Grapeview in Mason County was called Detroit. Mr. Eckert selected the name "Grapeview" after noting "that all of our mail kept going to Michigan." He was also Grapeview's postmaster for 35 years.

Mr. Irwin Draper, of Red Lodge, Mont., has measured more than 5,600 inches of snowfall in his entire observing career of 56 years. He figures that is enough snow to bury the tallest building in Montana.

Mr. Ralph E. Weber, cooperative observer at Oakland, Md., since September 1903, read the lowest surface temperature ever recorded south of the Mason-Dixon line. It was a bitter cold 40° below zero, and occurred on January 13, 1912.

In addition to the basic job of weather reporting, cooperative observers are occasionally invited to perform a wide variety of special reporting jobs. Some of these jobs in recent years include: (a) reporting dates of the stages of development of various plants to assist in special agricultural studies; (b) telephoning special reports to designated collection centers to assist research work on the development and forecasting of tornadoes; and (c) reporting on the accuracy of weather forecasts.

NAMES, ADDRESSES, AND LENGTH OF OBSERVING RECORD OF THE WEATHER BUREAU'S 21 VOLUNTARY WEATHER OBSERVERS WHO HAVE TAKEN DAILY WEATHER OBSERVATIONS FOR MORE THAN 50 YEARS

F. O. Alin, Fullerton, N. Dak., 60 years.
J. M. Anderson, Manti, Utah, 56 years.
Charles E. Barret, Anchorage, Ky., 58 years.
Carlos A. Call, Fort Ross, Calif, 52 years.
Irwin A. Draper, Red Lodge, Mont, 57 years.
Walter O. Eckert. Grapeview, Wash., 52 years.
Dr. William B. Fulton, Dadeville, Ala., 52 years.
Louis Hardtla, Philo, Ohio, 58 years.
Barry C. Hawkins, Highlands, N.C., 68 years. (Mr. Hawkins is the dean of the entire observer corps.)
Father Adelhelm Hess, Conception, Mo., 65 years.
Plummer F. Jones, New Canton, Va., 54 years.
Michael Kangerga, Henderson, Tex., 51 years.
J. Smith Lanier, West Point, Ga., 53 years.
D. Paul Oswald, Hagerstown, Md., 57 years.
Mrs. Pearl Smith, Brownwood, Tex., 54 years.
Edward H. Stoll, Elwood, Nebr., 54 years.
Hugh A. Storer, Alton, Kans., 51 years.
Mrs. Charles E. Taylor, Southport, N.C., 59 years. (Mrs. Taylor is the dean of women observers.)
Ralph E. Weber, Oakland, Md., 56 years.
Mrs. Jessie T. White, San Jon, N. Mex., 50 years.
Mrs. Gertrude M. Woods, Palmetto, Tenn., 54 years.

OUR VOLUNTARY WEATHER OBSERVERS—7,000 CITIZENS IN ALL PARTS OF THE COUNTRY MAINTAIN GOVERNMENT WEATHER RECORDS WITHOUT PAY

Keeping a record of the climate of the United States is a big job. The act which established the Weather Bureau went into effect July 1, 1891. This law said that the Weather Bureau, among other things, would take "such meteorological observations as may be necessary to establish and record climatic conditions in the United States." This was a large order for a small Bureau. At that time the Weather Bureau had very

few paid observers, and the daily weather map showed only sparse reports from any place west of the Mississippi River.

From 1870 to 1891 the weather service in the United States had been operated as a part of the Signal Corps of the U.S. Army, and this experience had demonstrated that it would require thousands of weather observers to keep an adequate record of the climate of a country as large as the United States. The Weather Bureau therefore followed the plan begun by the Signal Corps, and encouraged citizens in all parts of the country voluntarily to make local weather observations and keep records, and mail them regularly to the Bureau. Today there are over 7,000 citizens taking observations without pay. The Weather Bureau furnishes the rain gages and thermometers and the record forms on which the observations are entered. Observers are drawn from all ranks of life, and by their constant and faithful service have made available an invaluable treasure of data. These data are in constant use to help solve problems of industry, commerce, agriculture, and recreation, as well as to obtain answers to such far-reaching queries as, "Is the climate changing, and if so, how?"

It really is a remarkable service. So many people, in all parts of the country, freely give of their time to make the necessary observations and reports every day in the year, year after year, some of them for 40, 50, and even 60 years. This means that if each observer gives an average of 15 minutes a day to take and record the observations, answer numerous questions about local weather, and make the regular monthly reports, the total time contributed to the Government over a 50-year period amounts to over 570 workdays. On the same basis, the services of all these observers would amount to over 79,800 full 8-hour days of work each year. We know of no other cooperative enterprise that even remotely compares with the climatological service of the Weather Bureau; that is, where the time of those persons cooperating is required every day in the year including Sundays and holidays.

In some cases the observations have been continued for a long period of time in one family, the work being passed on from one generation to the next. For example, members of the Stern family at Logan, Iowa, have been taking weather readings for 77 years. Miss Amy Ann Stern, present observer, is the granddaughter of the first observer at Logan.

In addition to the basic job of weather reporting, cooperative observers are occasionally invited to perform special jobs. Some of these in recent years include: (a) Assisting in a phenological study in Western States by reporting dates of stages of development of various plants, (b) assisting in research on the development of tornadoes by telephoning a special report to a designated collection center under certain weather conditions, and (c) assisting the Bureau in a study of the verification of forecasts.

Cooperative observers are frequently known as the local weathermen, and their readings are used as checks for unofficial thermometers and rain gages. Observers have great pride in their work and take considerable pains to arrange for a substitute observer when they are ill or plan to be away, so as to maintain continuity of data. For example, before a 30-year observer in Kansas was recently hospitalized she arranged for a substitute observer. When the substitute also became ill, the observer arranged for a second substitute to take the observations and for a hospital nurse to phone the rainfall amounts to the proper Weather Bureau office. In another case, an observer in a Western State sold his mine and made plans to move away but when he found that this meant the weather station would be closed, he changed his plans and got a job with the new mine owner.

The survey made in 1958 shows that there are 21 cooperative weather observers who, in February 1959, will have served continuously 50 years or more. Notes regarding these observers follow:

F. O. Alin was cooperative observer at Fullerton, N. Dak., from January 1, 1898 until October 24, 1957 when he gave up the work temporarily after he fell and broke his hip. During his 60 years as weather observer he never missed an observation. He now has a substitute observer, but is looking forward to taking his own observations again. Mr. Alin was born in Sweden on September 18, 1869. He came to this country in 1887 and attended school in Duluth until 1889, when he filed a claim near Fullerton. In April 1957 he was honored for his outstanding accomplishment at the Fullerton Auditorium with a Meritorious Service Medal and letters from the Chief of the Weather Bureau and from the Secretary of Commerce.

J. M. Anderson is serving in his 51st year as cooperative observer at Manti, Utah, and is the oldest observer in point of service in Utah. He has lived his entire life at Manti, where he was born February 28, 1875. He was recently honored for completing 50 years of cooperative weather observing on June 8, 1958. His son Leslie, who lives on the adjoining property, now assists occasionally in the weather program.

Charles E. Barret has been taking weather observations officially at Anchorage, Ky., since September 1903. His father, John J. Barret, was appointed the observer at Anchorage in the fall of 1900, but almost immediately his duties were assumed by his son. In reality, therefore, Mr. Barret's weather service dates from the fall of 1900 to the present time, with the exception of two 9-month periods while he was away at college. Faithful weather service has been rendered by this family for over 58 years.

Carlos A. Call, now dean of California cooperative observers, began his observational program at Fort Ross, Calif., in March 1907. His father, George W. Call, had been recording rainfall there since 1874, which makes the combined family record now in its 84th years. Carlos Call was born in Fort Ross on June 2, 1880, and still lives in the family home. His rainfall records have long been in demand by the Fort Ross community, and the California Wool Growers Association of which he is a member.

Irwin A. Draper was born at Livingston, Mont., on July 8, 1883, and has served as cooperative observer at Red Lodge, Mont., since December 2, 1902. He recently estimated that the snow he has measured during his 56 years of observing, if piled in one heap, would bury the tallest building in Montana. A check of the record indicates he has measured around 5,600 inches of snowfall in his observing career. Mr. Draper is dean of Montana cooperative observers.

While still a youth, Walter O. Eckert's interest was aroused by wind shifts and changes in weather conditions, and this interest remains high. Born in Auburn, N.Y., in 1877, he moved to Washington State in 1890 and settled where he now lives. He became cooperative observer for Grapeview, Wash., in October 1907, and has the distinction of having served longer than any other currently active observer in his State.

Dr. William B. Fulton is the oldest observer in Alabama in years of service. He was born in Mobile, Ala., on October 24, 1869. He is a graduate of Howard College, Birmingham Dental College, and Birmingham Medical College—now the Medical Department of the University of Alabama. He moved to Dadeville, Ala., in 1906, and began as cooperative weather observer in October 1907. He has taught how to test seed for germination at various farmers' meetings.

Louis Hardtla became the official weather observer at Philo, Ohio, in October 1901, having made unofficial weather readings since 1892. In the 1890's employment around Philo was very scarce during the winter months, and there was plenty of time for interesting discussions in the grocery stores and copper shops. Since there were many arguments as to who had the keenest razor, and the most dependable watch or thermometer, Mr. Hardtla decided to apply for appointment as cooperative weather observer so that he might settle all future arguments about the weather. His authority has not since been questioned. His neat handwriting is worthy of special mention.

Barry C. Hawkins, Highlands, N.C., has served more than 65 years at the station at Rock House (his home). He is the dean of the Cooperative Observer Corps, his period of service being almost as long as the history of the Weather Bureau as a civilian agency. Mr. Hawkins was born in Ohio in 1874, came to North Carolina in 1883, and has resided there ever since. His first weather observation was taken on November 1, 1891, and throughout his period of service his records have maintained an exceptionally high standard of excellence.

Father Adelheim Hess' service as a cooperative weather observer dates back to November 1894. Father Hess was born in the mountains of Switzerland in 1874 and came to Conception, Mo., in 1897. Here he was ordained in 1897, and became a professor of Latin and Greek with the sidelines of a country pastor, electrician, and weather observer. Under date of October 30, 1954, Father Hess received the following letter from President Dwight D. Eisenhower:

"I have learned that on November 1 you will complete 60 years of unselfish, devoted service to our country as a cooperative observer for the Weather Bureau—that during this period, without compensation, you have faithfully provided information necessary to record climatic conditions. Such service is truly commendable. I am pleased to express to you my congratulations and gratitude for the service you have rendered our Nation."

Plummer F. Jones, who has been observing since March 1, 1905, is dean of Virginia's cooperative observers. He started at Arvonia, but in 1913 moved the weather station to its present location at New Canton, Va. A graduate and postgraduate of William and Mary College, and a graduate of Union Theological Seminary at Richmond, Mr. Jones is a retired Presbyterian minister.

Michael Kangerga has been keeping the rainfall records at Henderson, Tex., for a period of over 50 years, since the station there was established in July 1908. He has also kept the temperature records for the past 17 years. Mr. Kangerga was born October 4, 1873, in Croatia, then a province of the Austro-Hungarian Empire, and now a part of Yugoslavia. He immigrated to Henderson at the age of 14, and has made his home there ever since. His brother joined him in Henderson, and they formed a business partnership which has lasted to the present time. Their first venture in business was a general mercantile store. Since their business was vitally dependent on the well-being of the farmer, and the farmer in turn was dependent on the weather, Mr. Kangerga requested an appointment and made his start as a rainfall observer.

J. Smith Lanier, who began his service as cooperative observer at West Point, Ga., in the early part of 1906, has made many outstanding contributions of service to his community. He has always lived in or near West Point, having been born just across the Alabama line in Chambers County.

D. Paul Oswald was born March 15, 1886, on the family farm in Chewsville, Md. In May of 1898 his father consented to the establishment of a weather station at his home as a hobby and education for his sons. D. Paul Oswald began sending in weather obseravtions in February 1902. In January

1948 he moved to Hagerstown, Md., where he still makes his daily observations at the weather station called Chewsville-Bridgeport, a combined name of the two stations he has operated. He was recently on the science program closed circuit television for Washington County schools, and has for decades provided weather facts to local newspapers and radio stations.

Mrs. Pearl Smith has been taking weather observations at Brownwood, Tex., since July 1905. She was born in Waco, Tex., on April 9, 1880. Her adult life has been spent as a wife, mother, homemaker, and cooperative weather observer. She has also been active in church and Sunday school work throughout the years.

Edward H. Stoll began taking weather observations in October 1905. His weather station is located on his farm, 10 miles south-southwest of Elwood, Nebr., which has been his home since he came there from Kansas in 1888 at the age of 2 years.

Hugh A. Storer, cooperative observer at Alton, Kans., was born in 1889, and has lived his entire life on the farm homesteaded by his father. He has served as cooperative weather observer since March 1908. He has also served 21 years on the local school board, was secretary-treasurer of the Osborne County Farmers Union for 16 years, served in the Kansas Legislature from 1937 to 1945, and was county commissioner for the third district from 1953 to 1957.

Mrs. Charles Edward Taylor has been a cooperative observer in Southport, N.C., since March 1900, serving as Jessie M. Stevens previous to her marriage to Mr. Taylor in 1909. Mrs. Taylor was born in Chicago on September 22, 1879, moved to Southport in 1888, and is active in church and civic work. On February 23, 1955, in Washington, D.C., she received a 50-year award as a weather observer.

Ralph E. Weber, cooperative observer at Oakland, Md., since September 1903, has the second longest period of service of any present Maryland observer. He was born in March 1887 in Oakland, and has lived all his life on the family farm. Here he makes his daily weather observations, and here he read the lowest surface temperature ever recorded south of the Mason-Dixon line, 40° below zero, on January 13, 1912.

Mrs. Jessie T. White, cooperative weather observer at San Jon, N. Mex., is completing her 50th year of cooperation with the Weather Bureau, having taken over the weather station at Son Jon on February 1, 1909. Born in Corydon, Iowa, in 1880, she moved to San Jon in 1905. She graduated from college at the age of 57, and has been a schoolteacher, newspaper owner, editor, and rancher.

Mrs. Gertrude M. Woods has been cooperative observer at Palmetto, Tenn., since August 1905, at which time she succeeded her father, R. S. Montgomery, who had been weather observer there since 1883. Her name appears in publications as "Mrs. Ross Woods." She has always been interested in her duties as an observer, and read a paper entitled "Duties and Experiences of a Cooperative Observer" before the American Meteorological Society meeting in Nashville in 1927. Reporting on this meeting, the New York Times carried a feature story on Mrs. Woods' work as a cooperative weather observer.

FARM SUBSIDIES

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, on February 23 and 26, I placed in the RECORD two reports, each of which showed our present agriculture program was definitely not benefiting the small family-type farm, but rather benefiting largely the corporate-type farm and underwriting absentee ownership.

I was not alone in those conclusions. I quote from the President's state of the Union message of this year, delivered to the Congress on January 9, 1959:

> Outlays of the Department of Agriculture for the current fiscal year, for the support of farm prices on a very few farm products, will exceed $5 billion. That is a sum equal to approximately two-fifths of the net income of all farm operators in the United States.
>
> By the end of this fiscal year it is estimated that there will be in Government hands surplus farm products worth about $9 billion. And by July 1, 1959, Government expenditures for storage, interest, and handling of its agricultural inventory will reach a rate of $1 billion a year.
>
> This level of expenditure for farm products could be made willingly for a temporary period if it were leading to a sound solution of the problem. But unfortunately this is not true. We need new legislation.

In a message sent to the Congress under date of January 29, 1959, the President emphasized this same point and again called to our attention the fact that under the existing law the major benefits of this program are going to the very large farmers. I quote from the President's message to the Congress on that date:

> The price-support and production-control program has not worked.
>
> 1. Most of the dollars are spent on the production of a relatively few large producers: Nearly a million and a half farms produce wheat. Ninety percent of the expenditures for price support on wheat result from production of about half of these farms—the largest ones.
>
> Nearly a million farms produce cotton. Seventy-five percent of the expenditures for cotton price support result from production of about one-fourth of these farms—the largest ones.

Since my remarks of last week, I have received a telegram from Mr. R. P. Parish, president of the Delta Council of Mississippi, claiming that my remarks were misleading and that actually the Government had made money on these price-support programs that I had criticized. I shall, upon Mr. Parish's request, place his telegram in the RECORD; however, at the same time I shall point out the full story and show the complete fallacy of his argument that this is a profitable program for the American taxpayers.

Last Thursday the chairman of the House Agricultural Committee also quoted the same cases as Mr. Parish and attempted to make the same claim; namely, that I was in error when I said that these programs were costing the taxpayers millions in subsidizing these large farm operations. I respect his opinion favoring these large subsidies to the large farmers, but I cannot let stand unchallenged his argument that the Government is making money on such a ridiculous operation.

I could not help but notice that the chairman of the House Agriculture Committee in attempting to defend these large subsidies was talking both ways at once. In one breath he launched into a tirade against the administration by charging that the Government had lost over $900 million in supporting the cotton program alone under this administration. I quote his statement:

> We have lost in the last 6 years on the cotton program approximately $900 million.

Then in the same speech he made the fantastic claim that on the individual farmers mentioned the Government in supporting their cotton crop was actually making a profit.

That is ridiculous, and I shall take the same cases which he and Mr. Parish mentioned and prove it.

First I shall read the telegram, and in each instance point out the rest of the story as it relates to each case mentioned in the wire. I will show the fallacy of any claim of a profit.

The telegram is as follows:

> GREENVILLE, MISS., *February 26, 1959.*
> Senator JOHN J. WILLIAMS,
> *Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.:*
>
> Reference your statement that large corporate operators have received major benefits from farm program. Your source of information gave only part of story. Delta and Pine Land Company of Scott, Miss., cited as recipient of second largest farm subsidy in 1957, used price supports to promote orderly marketing. This company placed 7,919 bales of cotton in the CCC loan for which they received an advance of $1,167,502.35. Every single bale of this cotton was withdrawn from the loan before end of marketing year and sold on market. Government collected $17,870 interest payment plus carrying charges, thus making a profit. Interest was paid on every dollar for every day it was used.

I repeat one sentence of this claim. The "Government collected $17,370 interest payment plus carrying charges, thus making a profit."

In the past 3 years the farmers of the country have produced a total of 35,737,000 bales of cotton. The national production figures are as follows: For 1956, 13,310,000 bales; for 1957, 11 million bales; for 1958, 11,427,000 bales, or a total of 35,737,000 bales.

During the same 3-year period the Government lost over $800,000,000 in supporting the price of this cotton. That is an average cost to the taxpayer of $22.30 per bale for every bale of cotton produced during the 3-year period.

No one will dispute the fact that the only reason that this corporation or any other individual was able to sell cotton in the open market and obtain prices whereby they could repay the loans was by virtue of the fact that the Federal Government, under Public Law 480 and other laws, was buying a large percentage of the cotton and subsidizing its export. This relieved the pressure upon the market, but at an $800 million loss to the American taxpayers.

This subsidy operated as follows: In 1956 we exported 7,200,000 bales of cotton, at a loss of $400 million to the taxpayers.

In 1957 we exported 5,700,000 bales, at a loss of $281 million to the taxpayers.

In 1958 we exported 3,300,000 bales, at a loss of $126 million to the taxpayers, or a total loss to the American taxpayers in the past 3 years of approximately $807 million in supporting the prices of cotton.

Our total cotton production during the 3 years referred to was 35,737,000 bales.

That means that during the past 3 years the taxpayers have spent an average of $22.30 a bale on every bale of cotton produced, in order to support the cotton market.

I may say in passing that this $800 million item does not include soil bank payments, acreage reserve payments, or any other payments to the farmers.

Now, let us take the case of the Delta & Pine Land Co., of Scott, Miss., wherein it is claimed that the Government is making money. In 1957 that company placed under loan 7,919 bales and borrowed $1,167,502.35. It repaid this loan with interest of $17,370; but the Government, in order to support the market at a level whereby the company could profitably sell this cotton lost on this amount of cotton an average of $22.30 a bale. This loss must be charged to all the cotton produced in the country. It would not be fair to charge it to a particular part of the production; namely, that cotton which is exported. This cotton support program is a program for all the farmers. Therefore, on the 7,919 bales which the Delta & Pine Land Co. produced in 1957, the loss to the American taxpayers was $22.30 a bale, or $176,593.70.

Giving them credit for the interest which was paid would reduce that amount to $159,223.70. It is being rather charitable to give credit for the interest payments, because, after all, the Government borrowed the money which it loaned in this instance, and the Government was also paying interest at the same time.

Even overlooking that fact, we are still left with a figure of $159,223.70 loss on this one company's operation in 1957.

In addition, the Government gave the same company a direct check of $20,761.20 as a subsidy under the soil bank program. This was for acreage which it agreed not to plant. Thus the total cost to the American taxpayers of supporting prices with respect to this one farm, including their subsidy checks received during 1957, amounts to $179,984.90.

The Delta & Pine Land Co. and others who are defending their operations try to show a much different picture. They claim that if the loans are paid we should consider that there is no loss, and I suppose by that line of reasoning if the loans are not repaid, they should be charged as total losses.

I do not think that is fair, but suppose momentarily we accept that argument and apply that argument solely to the Delta & Pine Land Co.

What is the story? In 1955, Delta put under loan 11,773 bales of cotton, for which they borrowed from the Federal Government $1,974,356.12. They repaid the loans on 6,894 bales of cotton or a total of $1,193,081.96, leaving a balance on their loan from the Federal Government of $781,274.16. This they have not repaid. The Government took the cotton for payment and exported it at a loss of nearly $50 per bale. What have they to say about this loss? My computation of $22.30 is much more charitable than charging the whole cost to particular lots. I have here a memorandum which was received from the Department of Agriculture only a few moments ago, calling attention to the fact that the Delta & Pine Land Co., which has been paid so much out of our American agricultural program, is not even an American-owned company. It is a wholly owned English company. It is a U.S. corporation wholly owned by the Fine Cotton Spinners & Doublers, Ltd., Manchester, England. The American taxpayers have been subsidizing this British company on its farming operations here in America to the extent just outlined.

Therefore, I am not very much concerned about their criticism of our agricultural program. I am amazed to find Members of Congress defending the spending of the American taxpayers' money to support the farm operations in the United States of a large British corporation. This was a program which was intended for the benefit of the small American farmer. I would welcome yielding to anyone who would wish to defend such an operation, either on the floor of the Senate or anywhere else.

There are a lot of small American farmers, American taxpayers, and consumers who will be asking for an explanation. Yet this is the law and the administration has been unable to get Congress to correct it.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I am glad to yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Will the Senator state that point again? I did not hear him state the nature of the business carried on by the British company. Is it an agricultural company?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The memorandum I have shows that it is a wholly owned English company. It is owned by the Fine Cotton Spinners, Ltd., Manchester, England. It is a U.S. corporation, incorporated in the United States, but it is owned wholly in Great Britain.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. What is its primary business? Is it primarily an agricultural corporation?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. All I know is that they borrowed money from the Federal Government under the loan program they placed under a guaranteed loan, 7,919 bales of cotton, for which we advanced $1,167,502.35.

The report claims they own general stores, gins, elevators, and many other assets around Scott, Miss.

This is one of the small farms about which so many crocodile tears are being shed.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The only reason I interrupted the Senator to make my inquiry was that earlier in the day, in a private conference with the Senator from Delaware, he showed me a list of corporations receiving payments under the Agricultural Act, and that list showed the Ford Motor Co. of Detroit, Mich., as one of the companies.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. That is correct.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That is a company which is not an agricultural company. It is an automobile manufacturing company. The Senator's list, as I recall, shows that that company received more than $13,000 for not engaging in raising corn and wheat upon a small acreage.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The Ford Motor Co., of Dearborn, Mich., in 1957, was paid a subsidy check under the soil bank program in the amount of $13,649.40 for agreeing not to raise wheat and corn on 309.8 acres.

I ask again what kind of agricultural program do we have if we can justify, in the name of the small American farmer, a payment to the Ford Motor Co. of any amount of money for agreeing not to farm?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I agree with the Senator. I am glad he brought up the matter.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Likewise we find that the Mississippi State Penitentiary received $71,000 for agreeing not to raise cotton on a thousand acres. I did not know that a penitentiary fell into the classification of a small farmer. This story is full of similar illustrations of how the large operators and absentee owners are profiting under the existing law.

It is about time that we recognize this fact, and as the Secretary of Agriculture has told us in committee time and time again, the agricultural laws of the country need a general revision. Certainly by no stretch of the imagination can we let go unchallenged the ridiculous claim that the program is making a profit. It is clearly shown that in the case of the Delta transaction, the Government took over some of the cotton and that the taxpayers lost on the operation. I should like to continue reading from the telegram, which will be placed in the RECORD in its entirety at a later point:

> Dan Seligman, Shaw, Miss., pledged 1,291 bales of cotton for which he received a loan of $173,631.68. Mr. Seligman withdrew 1,205 bales of cotton and sold it on the market, leaving only 86 bales in the loan. He paid the Government $2,111.50 in interest.

Again it is inferred that on that loan the Government made money; however, I say again that in 1957, in order to support the domestic market, the Government exported 3,300,000 bales, at a loss of $126 million.

If we take the average cost of supporting all cotton we find that in the case of Mr. Seligman, a loss of $22.30 for 1,291 bales of cotton gives a total of $28,789.30, then subtract $2,111.50 in interest paid and again I say that is being charitable, because the Government paid interest on the money that it loaned—we get a total net loss, as far as the taxpayers are concerned, of $26,677.80.

That is still not the whole story on Mr. Seligman. He was also paid in 1957 by the U.S. Government $59,992.80 under the soil bank program for cotton which he agreed not to grow on another 804.8 acres. From the standpoint of the American taxpayer, therefore, in 1957 Mr. Seligman's operations cost $86,670.60, which it would not have cost the American taxpayers if that farm had been closed down.

I am not saying that the farm should be closed down, but let us admit the true cost of keeping it going. Let us not kid

ourselves about making money on this kind of operation. If our Government keeps on making money in that way under our agricultural program, we may very well wind up going bankrupt.

I challenge anyone to dispute my claim that in the past 3 years we have spent over $800 million in supporting cotton prices in the United States.

That is a far cry from a profit.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. Would the Senator like to have a colloquy on the whole subject? I feel, as he does, that something should be done about the matter. I wish I were wise enough to know exactly what it ought to be. The matter about which the Senator is speaking relates to the support prices paid by the Government on, I presume, the 12 basic commodities.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Today I am speaking primarily on cotton and rice.

Mr. CAPEHART. The purpose of the support-price program when it started 20 or 21 years ago was to reduce production; is not that correct?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. That was the intent. The program was supposed to reduce production, but it has resulted in the biggest surplus of commodities the Nation has ever known.

Mr. CAPEHART. The act is still in force. Under the act, we said to a farmer: "If you have been growing corn on 100 acres and will reduce your planting of corn to 80 acres, when you get ready to harvest your crop we will lend you the money at a parity price." In those days it was 90 percent. Then we said: "If, one year later, when you get ready to sell your corn, or if you want to sell it in the meantime, and the market price is more than the parity price, you can sell the corn in the open market and pay off your note at your local bank. If the price is less at the end of 12 months or whenever you get ready to sell the corn, you can come to us, we will cancel your note, and you can deliver the corn to us."

That kind of program has been in effect for many years. Big farmers and little farmers have been participating in it. The end result has been that surpluses of various products have been accumulated to the value of about $9 billion.

The principle underlying the act was that reduced production would raise the general level of prices on all farm products. But the act has failed to do that, because farm prices today are very, very low.

The Senator from Delaware is objecting—and I think rightly so—to the fact that the big farmer has received considerable money from the Government. I am not trying to defend the big fellow, because I think he would have much preferred to be left alone. But if the big fellow does not participate in these programs, then certainly there will never be any reduction in production, because it is the big fellow who plants the bulk of the acreage and raises the bulk of the products.

If we eliminate the big farmer from participating, then, or course, there will be more production, and the prices will be lower, if the theory that reduced production will increase prices is correct.

So we come back, do we not, to the main point that the whole farm program, the whole idea of reduced production, was all wrong in principle in the first place?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. We come back to the point that the law as it is presently written does not work in the best interest of the bona fide farmers. I think we had better recognize that fact. I stated in my remarks the other day that the fact that the large farmers are participating is certainly not illegal. The law reads that way. Congress wrote the law with the full intention and the full knowledge that the large farmers could participate. I, myself, think that is wrong, and I offered amendments to correct the situation at the time. The administration has also opposed this policy but, whether it is right or wrong, it is the law. The law needs to be changed. The only way it can be changed is to call the situation to the attention of the people, and let them tell Congress whether they like it or not.

Unquestionably, the major portion of the benefits of the present law are going to the large farmers. That condition will have to be changed. It cannot be justified in the interest of the small farmer.

I want to do something to help the small farmer, but this law is not the answer.

We cannot justify a program which will support a British-owned corporation in its farming operations in America to the amount of nearly $6 million in just 3 years. To pay thousands of dollers to a foreign-owned corporation to grow farm products in America is ridiculous.

How can we justify a program which pays the Ford Motor Co. $13,649.40 not to grow corn and wheat? That is just as ridiculous as a suggestion that we pay the farmers not to manufacture automobiles?

Is it not about time that some of those who are so vocal in defending this British corporation in its large subsidy begin thinking of some of the American farmers in their own districts?

Mr. CAPEHART. In order to enable the big fellow, about whom the Senator is speaking—the corporation—to participate requires the same compliance and accordingly requires him to make a sacrifice by reducing the number of acres which he had planted in cotton.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. He had to comply with the rules. That is not much of a sacrifice when you consider that the taxpayers guaranteed him a profit. Also on other acres they could grow other crops and even get them supported.

Mr. CAPEHART. Will the Senator agree that if he had previously planted a thousand acres of cotton he would have had to reduce the planted acreage to 800 in order to participate in the program? Will the Senator agree that that is so?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I do not know what the percentage of reduction was, but he had to comply with the quotas.

Mr. CAPEHART. I know a man who had a 640-acre farm, all of which he planted in corn. In order to participate in the program, he had to reduce the acreage planted in corn to 421 acres. That left some 220 acres which he could not plant to corn, because in order to participate in the program he had to plant only 421 acres. I do not know whether that was a sacrifice, but it did reduce his production acreage. It was necessary for the farmers to do something of that kind in order to be eligible to borrow money at a given price. Is not that correct?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I do not know how much they cut acreage on cotton. Let me read the figures of what assistance this British-owned firm has received.

In 1954 they placed 7,054 bales of cotton under loan and received $1,292,-472.25.

In 1955 they placed 11,773 bales under loan and received from the Government $1,974,356.12. Of this amount only $1,193,031.96 was repaid.

In 1956 they received a support loan of $1,446,605.67 on 8,967 bales of cotton.

In 1957 they received a loan of $1,167,-502.35 on 7,919 bales.

That is about $6 million which the taxpayers have advanced in the form of loans on cotton produced to guarantee a profitable operation for a corporation which is not even owned by American citizens.

This is one of the so-called little farmers who are reaping the benefits under this program.

Mr. CAPEHART. I was trying to bring out the facts surrounding the situation. As the Senator said a moment ago, nothing illegal was done. I was trying to bring out the fact that Congress passed a law in 1938, in which we said to the cotton farmer—let us talk about cotton, since this case has to do with cotton—the big farmer, the little farmer, the middle-sized farmer, and the corporation farmer—if you will reduce your cotton acreage so much, we will guarantee you X cents a pound for the cotton. In order to get this guarantee, you must reduce your acreage.

The weakness of that plan has since proved, as the Senator's figures indicated in the case of the British company, that while the acreage was reduced, the production was not reduced necessarily. Even though the acreage planted may be reduced, the farmer may have used much more fertilizer and raised more of a crop on a fewer number of acres. Or he may have enjoyed exceptionally good weather which, plus the extra fertilizer, enabled him to raise a greater crop.

So the first mistake which was made in the Farm Act was in referring to acres and not units of production. Had we based the act upon units of production, then the farmer would have been paid for that production, regardless of the number of acres utilized in achieving such production.

That was the first mistake which was made. The Congress dealt in acres, notwithstanding the fact that production on acres varies considerably depending on the weather, the amount of fertilizer used, and the manner in which the ground is tilled and many other variable factors. In the case of corn, for example, the amount of production varies, depending on whether hybrid seed corn is grown.

Having made such a mistake, the Congress now comes to the question, What shall we do about it? Shall we eliminate the big farmer from the program? I think every big farmer would favor being eliminated from the program. But the farmer who plants a number of acres, and who would be called a large farmer does not know whether he should or should not comply. If the law says he should not, I think it will make every big farmer in the United States happy. Then the big farmer will proceed to grow more of his product. He will till every acre, fertilize to the greatest extent, and grow every conceivable bushel of corn or bale of cotton. The result will be an even greater production which will further glut the market, and will result in even lower prices for the little farmer.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Certainly we are not going to say that we are going to support his prices no matter how much he grows.

After all, the mandatory supports are provided by the Government for only the six basic crops. There are many other agricultural commodities for which there are no supports and on which there are no restrictions. The farmers who produce the unsupported crops are making out as well or better, and certainly the taxpayers are better off. The bulk of American agriculture is being produced without the benefit of any of these supports or restrictions.

Certainly we do not need an agricultural program which uses the taxpayers' dollars to support corporate-type farming or absentee-ownership farming. I own a farm, too; but I do not think either the Senator from Indiana, who also has some farmland, or I should be supported in our farm operations. We are not farmers.

The Senator from Indiana and I are absentee farmers. The program was not intended for our benefit or for the benefit of those in similar positions.

In the case of families who live on their own farms and engage in farming operations, I will go along with a program to help them. But in the case of absentee ownership and large corporations such as the ones I have pointed out today as benefiting under the program I will have no part.

This is especially indefensible when we consider that one operation had its ownership outside the United States. Likewise, I will not defend a program under which the Ford Motor Co. of Detroit, Mich., is paid not to grow corn and wheat. That is foolishness.

Mr. CAPEHART. I am in agreement with the able Senator from Delaware; I do not disagree at all as to all that.

I am trying to make a contribution, if I can, about the original purpose of the Act and why it failed. I believe it failed because it dealt in acres, rather than in units of production.

Personally, I would be perfectly willing to vote tomorrow to freeze the $9 billion surplus of agricultural commodities that we have, and to deny the Government the right to sell it, except in starvation cases. In fact, I would be willing to vote to repeal all farm parity price laws. I, myself, would be willing to do that; and I would have the courage to vote to do it, because I believe that in the long run the farmers would be much better off, providing, of course, that we adopt the same sensible, practical, conservative conservation reserve program now in operation.

But my point is that I do not think we should condemn one who has many acres for participating in a program in which he participated because he wanted to help reduce agricultural production in the United States, in order to raise the prices of all agricultural commodities—which was the purpose.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I am not condemning them. I have said that it is legal, but I am pointing out where the money is going, and I am condemning the law on which that authority is based. I propose that the law be changed. That is the reason why I am addressing the Senate today.

Mr. CAPEHART. How does the Senator from Delaware propose that it be changed?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. First, let us adopt the recommendations of the Secretary of Agriculture. They may not be the cure, but his proposals are certainly a step in the right direction.

The Senator from Indiana, I am sure, will agree that the Government is not making money from the support programs in the case of any of these commodities. Certainly when the Government has paid in the last 3-year period more than $800 million to support the price of cotton alone, it is time to take inventory. Whether these payments are made under Public Law 480 or under the Commodity Credit Corporation, so far as the taxpayers are concerned the program makes no difference. It is costing them an average of $22.30 a bale for every bale of cotton that has been produced in the last 3 years. That fact must be recognized, and it cannot be disputed. I am sure that the Senator from Indiana will agree with me that any claim that the Government is making money under this program either on cotton and rice or any other commodity, is not correct.

Mr. CAPEHART. I did not realize that anyone was claiming that the Government was making money on it.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Oh, yes; that is the reason I am speaking here today.

Several parties are claiming that when the cotton was sold in the domestic market and the proceeds were used to pay off the loan with interest there is a profit for the Government. This claim is being made even in the face of the fact that millions of dollars are being lost.

Mr. CAPEHART. In other words, they say they had the cotton put under seal, then borrowed the necessary money from the local bank, and later paid off the note, including the interest. Is that correct?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Yes; and they say the Government is making money on that program when the loans are paid off. They conveniently try to ignore the fact that the Government is buying this cotton to support the market and by so doing has in the past 3 years alone lost over $800 million on its cotton-support program.

Mr. CAPEHART. I presume that the Government might be making money on that specific transaction.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. On that specific transaction they collected a few thousand in interest, and at the same time they are losing millions in the other office on the same crops.

Mr. CAPEHART. But the way it works——

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. They boast that the Government collected a little interest and they ignore the real loss which runs into millions.

Mr. CAPEHART. But it works in this way: If a farmer produces a certain number of bales of cotton, and if he has complied with the acreage controls, then he goes to the local bank and borrows from it the money, in the normal way, and signs a note for the money he borrows. He can either pay off the note at any time he wishes, or, if the market price of the cotton on which he borrowed the money—I refer to the price per unit; for instance, the price of a bale of cotton—is lower than the support price, he can deliver the cotton—deliver it physically—to the Government.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. That is right.

Mr. CAPEHART. Then the Government steps in and pays the local banker the note. But these people claim, as I understand, that they paid off the note before it came due.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. In one instance the Delta & Pine Land Co. paid it off; in another year they did not.

Mr. CAPEHART. Does the Senator from Delaware refer to the interest?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Yes; they call the interest a profit.

It is my contention that the overall cost to the U.S. Government, in supporting the cotton crop under all programs combined must be averaged across the board. The net overall cost is the answer.

Mr. CAPEHART. Yes; I think that would be true, from the standpoint of the Government.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. From the standpoint of the Government and the taxpayers.

By the same token, in the case of a farmer who left his cotton under loan and did not pay off the note, it should not be said that the entire transaction represents a loss any more than it should be said that all of it represents a profit when it is paid off. The existence of either a loss or a profit must be determined on the basis of how much the Government pays out in support of that farm product under all programs. Only in that way can a correct determination be made as to the existence of either

a loss or a profit. On that basis the Government has sustained a loss of over $800 million on cotton and it has sustained a loss on every cotton farmer. That is true because all farmers benefit from the program—both the farmers who sell their products on the domestic market and those who place them under Government loan.

I repeat again—it is perfectly ridiculous for anyone to maintain that the Government made money by supporting the cotton crop of a farmer solely on the premise he paid off his note. If anyone wishes to challenge that statement I would be glad to yield. Under most of these programs a large percentage of the loans might be repaid but the Government itself makes that possible by purchasing the cotton or other crops at artificially high prices in the open market. This boosts market prices and makes it possible for the borrowers then to sell their cotton and pay off their loans. But both transactions considered together represent an overall loss.

Mr. CAPEHART. Does the Senator from Delaware advocate that all farm programs be completely eliminated?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. No; but I do not think the Government should subsidize the production of the large farms, and I think the existing law should be amended lowering the support prices and placing limits on the amount of assistance for any one operator.

Mr. CAPEHART. In other words, is the Senator from Delaware advocating that, in the case of any one farm—whether one owned by the Ford Motor Co., or one owned by a British company or one owned by an individual farmer—we permit the one who operates the farm to borrow not in excess of a certain number of dollars each year?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I would place a limit and restrict all benefits to bona fide family-type farmers.

Mr. CAPEHART. Does not the Senator from Delaware realize that if that were done, it would be better to have no program at all? And if that were the case, the little farmer would be subsidized 100 percent, because if we were to permit the large farmers to produce all that they could—in the case of either corn, wheat, or other crops—there would be even greater production than there is at the present time, and therefore the prices would be lower than they are today. In my opinion, the net result would be to accomplish nothing at all, other than to subsidize the small farmers.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The Senator from Indiana has a right to his opinions; but I do not agree with him.

I do not believe it would be found that under such a program the large farmers would plant large acreage as freely as they are doing now, when they can place in the Government's storage bins all the crops they produce and can place them under loan at a high guaranteed price.

If it be true that the farmers would produce just as much, with low prices, then why did we establish during the war the agricultural program with high supports as an incentive?

Mr. CAPEHART. The Congress should not have done it; it was not necessary.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I believe that during World War II, when the country needed increased agricultural production, high supports were in order as incentive payments, and the record shows that the farmers responded. But today, long after the war is over, we are still making the high incentive payments, regardless of the size of the farms.

Mr. CAPEHART. I should like to disagree there with the able Senator from Delaware.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The Senator from Indiana has a perfect right to do so.

Mr. CAPEHART. My best judgment is that, regardless of whether supports are paid or are not paid, the American farmers, particularly the large farmers who use power equipment and similar facilities and must operate their farms in any event, will till every available acre to the maximum extent and will grow every dollars' worth they can grow, on the theory that the lower the price, the more units they must produce in order to obtain more dollars with which to meet their expenses. For example, if corn is going to sell for $1 a bushel, such a farmer will cultivate the corn and will fertilize it in such a way that he can obtain, let us say, 100 bushels an acre, because thereby he will obtain $100 a year per acre.

If he can get $1.50 for a bushel of corn if he grows 65 bushels per acre, he is getting the same number of dollars. That is where I disagree with Secretary Benson. If I understand Secretary Benson's philosophy—I think I understand it, and if I am wrong, I hope he or somebody else will correct me—it is that the lower the price, the more farmers will be forced out of farming, the marginal farmers will be forced out, the less the bigger farms will raise; therefore, production will be controlled. There will be less production on the market, and the price will go up.

I disagree in this respect with the philosophy of Secretary Benson and would say also that I am not an absentee farmer, as the Senator from Delaware has made reference to some of the farmers as being; I sign the checks and pay the bills and participate actively in the management and control of my farm.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The Senator from Indiana lives in Washington and draws a salary, the same as I do. I call both of us absentee farmers.

Mr. CAPEHART. I understand.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I am merely pointing out that neither the Senator from Indiana nor the Senator from Delaware needs the agricultural program.

Mr. CAPEHART. I agree. I am trying to arrive at the best way to improve the program. I hope we can engage in a colloquy, and get into the RECORD how the whole program operates and how it works.

However, I disagree with the Senator, and I disagree with Secretary Benson that if the farmer who has the acreage is eliminated, production will be reduced. I say production will be increased. If I can give a personal example, I do not have a big farm, but I will say I am going to till every acre every year regardless of price. I am going to use fertilizers and cultivation methods that will produce for me more units.

I am doing the same thing in cattle feeding and hog raising. I am feeding cattle on the basis that I can make $30 a cow or $30 a beef, whereas 20 years ago if a farmer who was feeding cattle did not make $60 to $75 a beef, he thought he could not stay in business. We are going to feed more cattle and try to make $30 on each one, so we can get the same amount of dollars we used to get when we were making $60 to $75 on each beef.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The Senator has just said that, as a farmer, he would cultivate all of his acreage, produce all of the crops he could, and use all the fertilizer possible to increase production, regardless of price. All I can say is that he would not make a success of farming by following such practices. I am sure that if the Senator in his manufacturing business increased his production to the maximum, whether such production could be sold or not, and marketed such production regardless of price, he or anybody else would soon end up in bankruptcy, just as the U.S. Government will by pursuing this policy.

Mr. CAPEHART. Since the Senator is getting personal——

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I am not getting personal.

Mr. CAPEHART. I may point out that I have been in the business of manufacturing radios and television sets.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I am sure the Senator manufactured and sold them according to the market.

Mr. CAPEHART. That is right. Since the Senator is getting personal, let me say this. I think this is one of the problems involved in the Senate. I think it is one of the problems involved in the United States. The Senator from Delaware is a big chicken farmer. He raises chickens by the tens of thousands. He is interested in a high price for his chickens and a low price for feed.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Would it interest the Senator from Indiana to know that I am not producing broilers? Furthermore, I have not accepted any subsidies from the Government under any of the farm programs. Now let us get back to the subject.

Mr. CAPEHART. Neither have I been connected with any manufacturing business for a long while.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Any man, whether he be a farmer or in business operates according to the margin of profit. The less the margin of profit, the less the incentive. I do not think we can get away from that principle.

I know we debated this question 2 or 3 years ago, when certain amendments were proposed. The Senator from Indiana took the other side of the question. He had a perfect right to his argument that this program should not be restricted to the small farmer. My own position is that we should not support these large types of operations. To support that position I am trying to point out that, with the administration of the law as it is written, the major part of the benefits are going to the large operators. One cannot get away

from that point statistically. Whether it is right or wrong is a question for Congress to decide.

I should like to continue reading the telegram and answer their claims. The wire next refers to the Woolfolk Farms, Tunica, Miss. This company in 1957 pledged 1,051 bales of cotton, for which they received a loan of $155,787.12. Nine hundred and eighty-six bales of this cotton were withdrawn and sold, leaving 65 bales in the loan. Interest paid amounted to $2,120.76—again the assumption is that this represented a profit to the Government because interest was paid on the loan.

In order to sell that cotton in the domestic market, the domestic market was supported by the U.S. Government and the American taxpayer. At the national average cost of the cotton support program, it cost a total of $23,437.30 on those 1,051 bales of cotton. In addition, there was paid to this same Woolfolk Farms $40,500 in the same year not to grow cotton on another 500 acres.

I just say there is not enough money in the Federal Treasury to be paying out $40,500 to one farmer not to grow cotton on 500 acres, and then advancing another $155,000 to guarantee profitable operations on the rest of his farm.

Members of Congress can defend that kind of operation all they please. The President has estimated that this year it is going to cost $5 billion to underwrite the cost of our agriculture program unless the law is amended. We ought to recognize the problem we face and correct it. The fault is right here in the Congress.

Mr. CAPEHART. I am not defending it. I am against it. As I said, I would vote to repeal the existing parity price laws and freeze the surpluses tomorrow. I only raise the question to get into the RECORD what I thought was a constructive description of the operation of this program and to point out that we have a terrific problem before us, and to discuss the best way to handle it.

Others may disagree with me; the Senator from Delaware is one of them. He may well be right. I may well be wrong. I know Secretary Benson feels the same way, as do others who possibly are wiser than I am. My conclusions are based on my experience from being raised on a farm, as one who is engaged actively in farming, as one who has participated from time to time in the program. My best judgment is that the lower the price goes, the more acres are going to be tilled and the more production there will be. Of course, we can get to the point where all the farmers can be bankrupt. I am not talking about a price which will automatically bankrupt the farmers. I am talking about what might be considered low prices, such as exist at the moment, because the average farmer is getting about a dollar a bushel for his corn. This price may not necessarily bankrupt the farmer, but it is a low price.

My feeling is that the farmer is going to grow just as much, or maybe more, if the price is low.

I agree with the Senator 100 percent that the so-called support prices, when acreage rather than units are supported, have outlived their usefulness. That program has not worked. It has cost the American taxpayers billions of dollars. We now have surpluses amounting to $9 billion. Therefore, we ought to do something about the problem. I, for one, am perfectly willing to join with the Senator from Delaware or any other Senator in repealing the parity price support law and that we freeze the surpluses.

I would not do that without freezing the surpluses. If we will freeze the surpluses and take them completely off the market, except for possible use in conditions of starvation, I think the American farmers and particularly the little farmers will be much better off than they are under the existing law. I know the taxpayers will be better off.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I do not think there is quite the difference of opinion between the Senator and me as might appear from the debate. We both agree that the present law is not working and that Congress should act promptly to correct these inequities.

Mr. CAPEHART. It is not working. I have said that for a long time.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. It would not be practical to repeal all the laws relating to surpluses and to dump all of these products on the market, but we can begin by taking certain necessary steps.

Mr. CAPEHART. That is correct. We would have to freeze the surpluses.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. We are both in agreement that something should be done to work out a solution. I hope, even though we may not agree as to all of the details that as a result of the debate we can devise a more constructive agricultural law. We cannot afford to keep on paying $4 billion to $5 billion a year in this manner. These heavy expenditures are not of benefit to the small farmers. This program is not helping the family-type farmers. They do not receive the benefit from the huge amounts we spend on these operations.

I read again from the telegram wherein a claim is made with which I am in complete disagreement. I quote:

> The CCC loan program is not a subsidy. It is designed to provide farmers with the opportunity to market crops in an orderly manner and thereby prevent seasonal gluts and sharp breaks in farm prices.

This program is a subsidy.

Mr. CAPEHART. That possibly is the best part of the program.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Yes, but we cannot get away from the fact that the CCC loan program, Public Law 480, and all these programs, must be treated as a combination, and as a combination they are a subsidy program for agriculture.

I can agree fully with the theory that this is only one of many subsidy programs. I was in Delaware some time ago and made the statement that other segments of industry are subsidized to a comparable degree. I think the time has come, particularly in the light of our present budget condition, when we must recognize that these subsidies have gone too far. We must roll these programs back in order to protect the American taxpayer as well as American industry. I am not referring only to this program. There are segments of the mining industry, the aviation industry, the merchant marine, and many others today which enjoy the benefit of checks for subsidies from the taxpayers, and I think this procedure should be reviewed and revised.

Mr. CAPEHART. I believe the Senator agrees with me on at least one item. I have proposed legislation, of course, with the purpose of making certain that the Federal Government will not loan money to anyone at an interest rate lesser than that which the Government pays on its borrowings. I think the Senator will agree that is one thing we ought to do.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. That would be one phase of a subsidy program. But after all, let us be realistic. That is only a minor part of the overall problem with which we have to deal.

Mr. CAPEHART. Of course.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. It is a small part.

Mr. CAPEHART. It is a small part. The farm problem is a much greater problem.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I call for the regular order.

Mr. CAPEHART. What is the regular order?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I have a perfect right to yield to the Senator from Indiana for a question.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I now yield to the acting majority leader.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I should like to ask the Senator from Delaware a question, but I want to predicate it upon a brief statement.

First, I have greatly enjoyed the colloquy we have just heard. I certainly agree we are badly in need of new basic farm legislation. I think one of the best bills which has been introduced—I have not heard it mentioned in the discussion—is a bill introduced by the Senator from Indiana. I am a cosponsor of the bill, as are a good many other Members of the Senate. I refer to the bill which provides for adequate research into the use of farm products. It seems to me we are going to have to do a great deal of that before we succeed in getting rid of our surpluses.

I am in sympathy with what the Senator from Delaware is advocating, which is some control with reference to the payments to the big corporate concerns. However, I have seen efforts made repeatedly in the Senate to control that matter, and we have always had the greatest difficulty in drawing a clear line.

The Senator from Delaware was not present in the Chamber during the morning hour, when I made a very brief statement relating to one of the examples referred to in the table the Senator had printed in the RECORD the other day. I refer to a farm in a little place called Sardis, Ala., which was listed in the table offered by the Senator from

Delaware the other day as having received a loan of $156,778, if I remember the figure correctly.

I noticed in the press report in the Montgomery Advertiser, following the publicity in connection with the matter, a statement that one of the owners of the farm brought out the fact that there are 190 tenant families on the farm and not a single dollar of the money went to any of the owners of the farm, but all of the money went to these 190 individual families.

The entire farm has a cotton allotment of some 1,400 acres, and the 190 tenant families grew 750 bales of cotton which were put into the loan program, but every dollar of the money went to them. I think I am correct in saying that the people who own the farm live on it, and are not what we might call absentee landlords. They simply do not grow cotton. The 190 families are dependent upon the program.

Instead of that case actually being what it appeared to be from the table, and instead of the money going into the hands of a big farm operator, the fact is the money went into the hands of 190 small individual farmers.

I do not know how one is going to make provision for that situation. If the Senator from Delaware has some suggestion as to taking care of a situation such as that, I should like to hear it.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. That sounds like a New Deal trickle-down theory. If there are over 100 families who have cotton acreage——

Mr. SPARKMAN. There are 190 families.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. If there are 190 families who have the cotton acreage upon which the payments are being made, why were the checks not made out directly to those families? Why is this money siphoned through one man? One cannot get away from the fact that based upon the report furnished by the Department of Agriculture—I understand there is no question about it—Dr. J. B. Hain, of Sardis, Ala., put 906 bales under loan and received a check for $156,778.95. Why should we have an agricultural program which has to brokerage down through any individual for 190 families in the hope that a part of the proceeds will trickle down to the real farmers.

Mr. SPARKMAN. My understanding of the matter is that the Department of Agriculture requires the owner of the farm to be tied in with the tenants on the farm, unless there is a clearly defined operation which gives complete control of the matter to the tenant himself. My understanding is that if there is anything like a percentage operation, sharecropping, or anything of that kind, with the owner retaining part control over the matter, the request has to go through the owner. Perhaps the Department of Agriculture can handle that.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. It has to be approved by both, but checks due the tenant can be paid to the tenant.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I certainly would agree that if it can be done safely and without too much trouble administratively, it would be better to have the payments made directly to the 190 tenants on the farm. That would give a clearer picture of the operation.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I do not know how the loan was handled, but as I understand the program, a large percentage of the loans on cotton were repaid, but they were repaid only because of the ability to sell the products in a domestic Government supported market. That domestic market is supported by taxpayers' money. It means not only higher taxes but also higher consumer prices for cotton goods.

The cost may or may not be justified, but at least let us recognize that there is a cost. There is no profit.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further to me?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield to the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I do not know what the figures are as of this date, but I do know that a year or so ago I saw the figures, and, so far as cotton is concerned—and we are speaking of cotton in connection with these particular payments—the program had not cost the Government anything, but the Government had actually made a profit from its cotton operations.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. No——

Mr. SPARKMAN. I do not know what the situation is today, but I know that a year or so ago that was the case.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. No. You are in error.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. To support my statement I quote no other authority than the chairman of the House Committee on Agriculture, Mr. COOLEY, who, even while taking exception to my statement, still called attention to the fact, rather critically, that in the past 5 years the support program on cotton alone had cost $900 million. I quoted a figure of $835 million for the past 3 years.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Was that for cotton?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. For cotton; yes. That is a matter of record.

Mr. SPARKMAN. It may very well be; but up until recent years the Government had actually made a profit on its operations in connection with cotton.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. First let me reply to the Senator from Alabama, and then I shall be glad to yield.

I quote the statement of Representative COOLEY last Thursday, in which he was referring to statements which I had made:

> That under the present administration we have lost in the last 6 years on the cotton program approximately $900 million.

The figures I placed in the record were approximately $835 million, but the chairman of the House Committee on Agriculture might have had an extra year or two in his calculations. I considered only the past 3 years. The major part of the losses occurred in 1954, 1955, 1956, and 1957.

Whether payments should be made without any regard to the size of operations is a point on which there may be a difference of opinion. But there can be no difference of opinion on the fact that we are not making money on this program. We are not making money, and I have little patience for those who try to claim that we are.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Let me say to the Senator from Delaware that I do not wish to be understood as arguing that present programs are adequate.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I understand that.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I do not believe they are. I think we should continue to work and search for some kind of program which will better the present condition of the farmer.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. On that points we are in complete agreement.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I thank the Senator.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I agree that probably in the past few years we have lost a great deal on the price support program. We have been operating under what is called a flexible program.

I should like also to invite the attention of the Senator from Delaware to the fact that until 1953 cotton price supports were at 90 percent. The Government made money on its operations in that field. It made more than $260 million on the cotton program in existence prior to 1953.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I should like to reply first to the reference of the Senator from South Carolina to the argument that the Government had been making money on cotton prior to 1953. I do not have the figures as to the exact operations at hand although I will say that we must not forget that in the early 1940's the Government was in a position with regard to excessive inventories similar to that in which it found itself 4 or 5 years ago. War broke out, and overnight the inventories became very valuable. As they were unloaded and paid for by other agencies for export to our allies and for other purposes naturally there was a profit on any inventory.

What we need is an agricultural program geared to benefit the small family-type farm and not to the theory that we must have war every 5 or 10 years to bail us out of our surpluses. We want a peacetime agriculture program. We are naturally concerned because we have a $9-billion surplus of agricultural products; however, we all know that if we were to have war tomorrow those surpluses would be an asset, but we cannot maintain such a tremendous inventory waiting for a war. I think we should maintain a reasonable surplus. We do not want a war to come in order to make a profit on our agricultural products.

There is no disputing the fact that during the past 3 years our cotton program alone has cost the American taxpayers more than $800 million, or an average of $22.30 on every bale of cotton

produced in America in the past 3 years. In the face of that unchallenged fact and just because loans in connection with one particular program may have been paid back with interest it is absurd to say that we are making money on the operation. That repayment was made possible only by virtue of the fact that another agency put up the money to buy the cotton and then withdrew the cotton from the domestic market and exported it at a loss of over $800 million to the taxpayers.

Furthermore, it is an unchallenged fact that the major percent of the price-support benefits of this cotton program went to the very large farmers.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. I think we have made a constructive contribution to the farm problem this afternoon. It is a serious problem.

In my opinion, unless we find some way to cure the situation, other than taxing the American people several billion dollars a year to support agriculture, we are going into a terrific economic tailspin one of these days. Perhaps it is not more than a couple of years away.

I, for one, am very desirous of avoiding such a situation. I am thinking very seriously at this moment of a program which would involve freezing our surpluses, doing away with our price support program, and appropriating perhaps a billion dollars a year, which is about 25 percent of what we are spending at the moment for so-called conservation controls, which means taking 100 million acres out of production, including entire farms. Then I would propose that we spend a reasonable sum—$100 million or $200 million—which is about one-fifth of what it costs each year to store our surpluses—to find new uses and new markets for farm products.

We are going to cure this situation in one of two ways—either by reducing production to the market level, or by finding new uses and new markets, so that our large production can be absorbed by the market.

As a businessman, I know that there are only two ways to increase business. One is to sell more to one's present customers. This seems to be impossible at the moment. The other is to find new customers.

We must find new uses for farm products. In the meantime we will have to show a great deal of courage in Congress in doing the thing that ought to be done, and I think that is the freezing of surpluses, except to people who are hungry. We must get away from the costly price support program about which the Senator has been talking. It has not only been costly, but it has not accomplished the purpose it was supposed to accomplish. It has been discriminatory, in that the big farmer has received a great deal of money and the little farmer has not received so much. The big farmers did not violate any law. The situation arose because of what is inherent in the law, inasmuch as we try to control acres instead of units of production.

Therefore I wish that the Senator from Delaware and others will give careful consideration to the program of freezing surpluses and carrying perhaps $9 billion in surpluses, and taking them off the market, just as we do in the case of strategic materials, which cannot be sold except by act of Congress.

I believe that if we do that we will be better off. I do not like this particularly, but we must be realistic. We find ourselves faced with facts. What are the facts? The facts are that we have followed a support program for 20 years, under which we have accumulated a $9 billion surplus. Nevertheless we still have comparatively low farm prices. Something is wrong somewhere.

I believe we ought to have the courage to face the situation. We will have to take some drastic steps in respect to the farm problem. Otherwise we shall go into an economic tailspin. I remember that back in the 1920's—1925 and 1926 and so on—manufacturing and the general economy was pretty good. We were going big guns. However the farm prices were low for several years during that time. Finally we had a crash.

History may well repeat itself unless we in Congress have the courage to do what is necessary. The two things that are necessary are these. First, from the long-range point of view, we must find new uses for farm products. From the short-range point of view, we must freeze surpluses and go into some sort of conservation program under which we will take acres completely off the market, and take them out of cultivation for a given period of time.

If we have the courage to do that we can correct the situation the Senator from Delaware is talking about. It is not good. The big farmers do not like it. The little farmers do not like it. The big farmer is caught between the devil and the deep blue sea: "Shall I comply with the acreage restrictions and borrow on my crops and cooperate with the Government and other farmers, or shall I grow all I can and thereby contribute to the surpluses and thus further lower the prices of the little farmers?"

We cannot shoot the big fellow because he happens to own X number of acres. That is in accordance with the American system; there is no law against a corporation being in the farming business. There is no law against Henry Ford owning acres of land. He had the right to produce as much as he could or to put the acres into the acreage reserve and say, "We will not produce anything on those acres."

Therefore we have a very serious problem facing us. We ought to face the issues. The issues are very serious. The Senator from Delaware has been doing a good job in dramatizing the weaknesses and the ineffectiveness of the program. I hope that what we have said here today in our colloquy between the able Senator from Delaware and myself and other Senators will help dramatize the necessity for changing the law. After all, Congress passed the law.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Yes.

Mr. CAPEHART. We are sitting in the Chamber of one of the bodies of Congress that passed the law. Only we in Congress can change the law. The Secretary of Agriculture cannot change the law. The President cannot change it. We and we alone are the only instrumentality in the world that can change the law. We ought to change it, in my opinion. We ought to dramatize all the weaknesses of the law, as the able Senator from Delaware is doing. That is the only way we are going to dramatize the law, by showing the country and the press and other Members of the Senate how serious the problem is, and what drastic steps we will have to take.

I again congratulate the able Senator for dramatizing the situation. I hope he will join with me and others—or I will join with him, it does not make any difference which way it is—in being courageous about this matter and in taking some very drastic steps, because it will take drastic steps, unless I am badly mistaken, to cure this whole problem.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I appreciate the contribution of the Senator from Indiana. Unquestionably he is entirely correct when he says that the solution of the problem lies in Congress. The Secretary of Agriculture, who has repeatedly recommended a change, has no alternative other than to administer the law as we write it. My criticism is not directed against what those people have done. We, in Congress, have made it possible for them to do it. The only way in which we can get the law changed is to show the people of America what this program is costing them. We must explode the theory: "Well, so what? It does not cost anything." Some even dare to claim that we are making a little money.

The fact is that we are not making money, and every Member of Congress knows it.

There is one other example of further interest to Senators, I am sure, which I should like to mention. First, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point the entire telegram from which I have been reading.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GREENVILLE, MISS., *February 26, 1959.*

Senator JOHN J. WILLIAMS,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Reference your statement that large corporate operators have received major benefits from farm program. Your source of information gave only part of story. Delta & Pine Land Co., of Scott, Miss., cited as recipient of second largest farm subsidy in 1957, used price supports to promote orderly marketing. This company placed 7,919 bales of cotton in the CCC loan for which they received an advance of $1,167,502.35. Every single bale of this cotton was withdrawn from the loan before end of marketing year and sold on market. Government collected $17,370 interest payment plus carrying charges, thus making a profit. Interest was paid on every dollar for every day it was used. Dan Seligman, Shaw, Miss., pledged 1,291 bales of cotton for which he received a loan of $173,631.68. Mr. Seligman withdrew 1,205 bales of cotton and sold it on the market, leaving only 86 bales in the loan. He paid Government $2,111.50 in interest. Woolfolk Farms, Tunica, Miss., pledged 1,051 bales of cotton for which they received a loan of $155,787.12. Nine hundred and eighty-six bales of this cotton were withdrawn and sold, leaving 65 bales in the

loan. Interest paid amounted to $2,120.76. M. S. Knowlton Co., Pertshire, Miss., pledged 1,075 bales for which they received a loan of $155,438.80. Mr. Knowlton withdrew 1,008 bales, leaving 67 bales in the loan. He paid interest amounting to $2,197.44. J. G. Adams & Son, Hughes, Ark., pledged 3,024 bales to the loan and received an advance of $420,343.70. He withdrew all but 318 bales and sold it on the market. He paid $2,871.82 interest. The producers rice mill of Stuttgart, Ark., cited by you as receiving largest 1957 subsidy, is a cooperative composed of 400 individual grower members. Price supports averaged less than $4,000 per member. The CCC loan program is not a subsidy. It is designed to provide farmers with the opportunity to market crops in an orderly manner and thereby prevent seasonal gluts and sharp breaks in farm prices. Small farmers actually derive more benefit from the program since they are not in a position to protect themselves from price fluctuations. This information respectfully submitted in interest of full understanding. We hope you will see fit to include it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

R. P. PARISH,
President, Delta Council.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I quote further from this telegram wherein I am criticized for what I said about the Producers' Rice Mill, Inc., Stuttgart, Ark. That corporation in 1957 borrowed $1,460,902.11 on 254,075 hundredweight of rice.

The argument is made that this is a cooperative owned by the membership and therefore should be above criticism. If they wish to join in a cooperative that is their business, but that does not change the fact that the Government lost money. This program on rice is also costing a great deal of money. In 1957 the total production of rice in the country was 42,935,000 hundredweight. On that national production, in order to hold the prices at an artificially high level for the consumers and for the farmers of this country, we spent a total of nearly $47 million. This was broken down as follows, $1.9 million under Public Law 480, in donations to foreign governments, the Commodity Credit Corporation loss in 1958 was $6.2 million. Under title I of Public Law 480, which are sales for foreign currency, we sold $53.3 million worth of rice on which we recovered $14.5 million. That left a loss under title I of Public Law 480 of $38.8 million.

The total loss to the taxpayers was $46.9 million. This averaged $1.09 per hundredweight of rice for each hundredweight of rice that was produced in the United States in 1957. Therefore on the Producers Rice Mill, of Stuttgart, Ark., the Government lost a total of $276,941.75 so far as their operations were concerned in supporting the rice grown by this organization.

We cannot escape the fact that the cost of the program, whether it is rice, cotton, corn, or any other commodity, must be assessed against the total amount of the commodities which have been produced in the calendar year. They must be averaged out. I think that this analysis clearly establishes that not by any stretch of the imagination can any of these programs be called profitable. If there be anyone who does claim differently I would like to hear from them.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a series of editorials supporting the criticism which I have made of the program.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Daily News, Feb. 24, 1959]

IT HELPS WHAT FARMERS?

All that money you taxpayers have been pouring out in billion-dollar gobs to help the "little" farmers mainly is going to the big, corporation, factory-type farms. The little fellow just gets the hind end of it.

Senator JOHN J. WILLIAMS has nailed this fact again in a report to the Senate.

The biggest beneficiary of farm subsidies in 1957 was the Producer's Rice Mill, Inc., of Stuttgart, Ark. The Government gave this outfit $1,460,902 to prop up the price of rice. (You taxpayers pay again in the higher cost of any rice you buy.)

This $1,460,902 one company got, says Senator WILLIAMS, was double the subsidies the Government paid out to all the farmers for all their crops in the whole State of Pennsylvania. (The last farm census showed 128,876 farms in Pennsylvania.)

Just three of these big corporation farms (two in cotton and one in rice) among them got more than $3.4 million in subsidies in 1957. This was more than all the subsidies paid on all crops to all the farmers of Pennsylvania, Maryland, Delaware, and New Jersey. (The last farm census showed 190,359 farms in those four States.)

"The high rigid support program," said Senator WILLIAMS, "is little more than a Government guarantee on the operations of corporate-type farming and actually encourages and underwrites absentee ownership to the detriment of the small farmers."

To see how right the Senator is, take a look at Marshall McNeil's Washington dispatch on page 3 and see how only 54 of these big corporation farmers got nearly $14 million in Government handouts in a single year.

[From the Washington Evening Star, Feb. 24, 1959]

HELPING THOSE FARMERS

The biographical sketch on Senator WILLIAMS, Delaware Republican, in the Congressional Directory notes that he was "born on a farm" and that before entering politics he was in the "grain business." Now beginning his third successive term in the Senate, Mr. WILLIAMS has demonstrated on many occasions a high level of ability to get at the kernel of issues. He has done so again with a few facts and figures on how the whole "Rube Goldberg" structure of high, rigid farm price supports operates on behalf of the poor and the "little" farmers.

Mr. WILLIAMS has submitted to the Senate a Government report on where the really big crop subsidy money went in 1957. The biggest payment, of nearly $1.5 million, went to a "farmer" named the Producer's Rice Mill, Inc., of Arkansas, to encourage the production and high price of rice. The next, of $1.2 million, went to the Delta & Pine Land Co. of Mississippi for growing cotton, and the third, of $854,000, to Westlake Farms of California, for some more cotton.

"The high rigid support program," Mr. WILLIAMS noted, "is little more than a Government guarantee on the operations of corporate type farming and actually encourages and underwrites absentee ownership to the detriment of the small farmers."

Mr. WILLIAMS' information and observations were inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD with "no objections."

[From the Philadelphia Inquirer, Feb. 25, 1959]

BIG FARMS REAP PRICE SUPPORT PLUMS

When Senator JOHN J. WILLIAMS, Delaware Republican and one of the Nation's most articulate and courageous foes of governmental waste and extravagance, speaks out on the inequities of the present farm price support system his words merit close attention.

This goes, in particular, for his speech on the floor on Monday, when he demanded a change in the price support law on the ground, specifically, that it discriminates against the small farmer and in favor of the big grower.

His revelation that three big farm operators in Arkansas, California, and Mississippi received in 1957 support payments totaling $3,400,000 is startling. But it is shocking to learn that these three payments to big growers exceeded the total paid in that year to all the farmers of Pennsylvania, New Jersey, Delaware, and Maryland.

We hear a great deal about the necessity of protecting the family-type farm and helping the small farmer to make ends meet at a time when prices of nearly everything the farmer must buy is increasing in price. But here is a situation in which not the small farmer, but the farmer with thousands of acres, is the chief beneficiary of Government largess.

Furthermore, such huge payments to a few growers can scarcely help but encourage the consolidation of farmlands into bigger and bigger tracts and promote absentee ownership.

It seems to us that Senator WILLIAMS is right in saying that the "support program as the law is now written is definitely not in the best interests of the bona fide American farmer." In addition, of course, is the fact that under this system crop surpluses amounting to more than $9 billion, a tax charge against the whole Nation, have been piled up in storage.

What is needed, at the very least, is a revision of the price support law to bring about fairness to the small farmer—and an end to the million-dollar favors handed out to a few owners of huge farm operations in the South, Midwest, and West.

[From the Delaware State News, Feb. 25, 1959]

CORPORATION FARMING

(By Jack Smith)

Our senior U.S. Senator from Delaware, JOHN J. WILLIAMS, is at it again.

And this time he has taken to task the policy of high rigid price supports for agriculture.

The other day Senator WILLIAMS read into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD some amazing facts—which indicate that the healthy hunk of tax dough we have been paying out, thinking we were helping farmers, has gone to big farm corporations.

There is a definite tendency toward the larger farm. The cost of investment in equipment is making the small farmer, the individual who really built this Nation, obsolete.

But this doesn't mean that all our farm land will be eventually owned or leased by huge corporations—along the lines of General Motors. Here in Delaware there are many fine examples of the medium size farm where the farmer, with adequate equipment, is able to till the soil and make a decent living for himself and his family.

And sure enough, in States like this where acreage is privately owned is where you find the greatest resistance to Government help and subsidy. Like the small businessman, which he is, the farmer would like to make his own way with a minimum of interference.

So it is from the extensive acreage of the Middle West where you get the demands for aid to agriculture. And it is a program that has seen great excesses and, getting beyond control, has cost the American taxpayer many billions in the past few years.

Senator WILLIAMS, in the report he had read into the RECORD this week, advocates that the high rigid price support program be repealed and that the Secretary of Agriculture "be given greater discretionary authority to lower support prices on basic crops."

The Williams report shows that just two operators received over 2½ million support on two basic crops produced in 1957. The first, the Producer's Rice Mill, Inc., Stuttgart, Ark., received Government support on rice produced in 1957 in the amount of $1,460,902.11.

The second, the Delta & Pine Land Co., Scott, Miss., received $1,157,502.35 government support on cotton which they produced in 1957.

"As a comparison," Senator WILLIAMS says, "I call attention to the fact that these two operators received from the Government in support of their 1957 crops over five times as much as the total amount of price support received by all the farmers of the State of Delaware on all the crops they produced in 2 years—1956 and 1957.

"These two companies alone in 1957 received more in price support for their crops than did all of the farmers in the State of Maryland combined.

"The $1,460,000 which one of these companies received in support of their rice crops in 1957 represents an amount double that which was received by all the farmers in the State of Pennsylvania on all their crops for the same year," the Delaware Senator pointed out.

"As a further comparison there were three companies—one in Mississippi, one in Arkansas, and one in California—which received over $3,400,000 in price support operations on the 1957 crops. That is greater than the total amount received on all the crops produced in 1957 by all the farmers in Delaware, Maryland, Pennsylvania, and New Jersey.

"There were 18 large operations in the United States any one of which in 1957 received over four times as much as the total amount received on all the crops by all the farmers in our State of Delaware last year.

"I cite these figures with the comparisons to emphasize that the Government's price support program as the law is now written is definitely not in the best interests of the bona fide American farmer. Instead of being in the best interests of the family type operation, the Federal Government under the present law is with the taxpayers' money encouraging and financing the consolidation of the farms under absentee ownership," Senator WILLIAMS concluded.

[From the Philadelphia Evening Bulletin, Feb. 26, 1959]

THE POOR FARMERS

Going down the list of those poor farmers who were helped by the Government in 1957, Senator WILLIAMS of Delaware finds two who fared sumptuously. One was a firm in Arkansas that received $1,460,902 on rice, and the other a firm in Mississippi that drew $1,157,502 on cotton. The Senator read a long list of firms that were handed checks from the Treasury of over a million dollars.

There is no charge of fraud in these transactions. They are simply the result of the working of our price support and subsidy programs. The larger the firm the higher the payments.

The idea of a subsidized agriculture was born of the necessity to help out farmers who were going into bankruptcy. It has now grown to the point of aiding large corporate establishments. Programs that have so far departed from their original objective call for a sharp revision.

The millions of dollars these firms receive from the Treasury are only one item in the general taxpayer burden. The housewife pays again in higher food prices when she goes to market.

[From the Washington Daily News, Feb. 27, 1959]

TAKE AND TAKE, YOU PUT

Senator JOHN J. WILLIAMS has put another silly face on the farm laws.

Earlier in the week he gave the Senate a list of 54 corporation-size farming outfits each of which—quite legally—had collected $100,000 or more (up to nearly $1.5 million) as price supports on crops grown in 1957.

Now he informs the Senate that 10 of these same corporations also had collected—quite legally—amounts ranging from $20,761 to $125,942 in the same year for taking land out of production.

In sum, 10 corporations got nearly $3.5 million for growing crops and the same 10 got an additional $557,000 for not growing crops.

Most of them got paid for not growing the same crops they got paid for growing. Four got checks from Uncle Sam for not growing different crops.

The corporations take their crops to Government storehouses and take home a check, charged to you taxpayers. The Government rents the storehouses, you taxpayers pay the rent. Corporations take some of their land out of production, you taxpayers pay them for that.

This is supposed to stabilize agriculture and save the family farm. But the big farms get the most subsidy because they raise the most crops. And they get the most from the soil bank because they have the most land to spare for it.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. GRUENING. I should like to ask the Senator one or two questions which have been raised in my mind by the Senator's very able presentation with respect to some of the oddities, what might be called the believe it or nots, in our farm program. I should like to ask, first, how much the farm program has cost the American people, in the Senator's opinion.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The estimate furnished by the President in his message to Congress is that in the current fiscal year it will cost about $5 billion; and I have no reason to dispute the figure.

Mr. GRUENING. Does not the able Senator believe that the elimination or the reduction of that program would be a very helpful step toward balancing the budget?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Certainly. I think the time is long overdue when some recognition should be given to the extravagant cost of this program. As I have said before, I do not think the $5 billion which is being spent is accruing to the benefit of bona fide American farmers. It is going largely to the very large farmers.

Then the Government offered the soil bank proposal to the farmer and said, in effect, "If you will cut back 20 percent or 30 percent, we will pay you so much an acre." The large farming operations can better afford to do that because all they need to do is to run a combine or a tractor into a shed and lay off two or three men. But a small farmer, having one combine, one tractor, and one corn-picker, cannot, with any degree of efficiency, reduce his operations. If he does, his cost of production will increase. So he cannot take advantage of this program.

I grant that the law does not spell out that the program is for the benefit of the large farmers, but it just works out that way unless we enact limitations. The small family farmer cannot afford to participate in these programs because he cannot cut his acreage allotments. The Government is spending each year millions of dollars to support the big farm operations and thereby enables them to buy up the little farms with the taxpayers' money.

I have no objection to any individual or corporation buying and owning as much land as he or it can pay for and operate under our American economic system. I believe in that system. But I do not believe that the money of the taxpayers should be used to foster or to aid in the goal of absorbing neighboring farms. If a farm operator wants to do that, let him do it with his own money.

Mr. GRUENING. Does the Senator believe there is an economic or a moral justification for paying farmers or others for not growing a crop?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. There is a legal obligation, and I am here advocating a change in the law.

Mr. GRUENING. Did I understand the Senator correctly to say that he thought there was something improper or not quite right about a person who was employed elsewhere, such as in Washington, drawing payments as an absentee landlord for not growing a crop on his farm?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I did not say it was improper or illegal. The law as written and as it was passed by Congress provides that absentee owners may collect the benefits just the same as bona fide family farmers. Amendments were offered on the floor of the Senate to correct that situation. Congress in its wisdom, or otherwise, rejected those amendments. No limitations were placed on the payments. That which those men are doing is 100 percent legitimate, and Congress is responsible.

The criticism should be against Congress. Having passed the law, then, if we do not like it, we have been negligent in not correcting it.

The Secretary of Agriculture before our committee has repeatedly called this situation to our attention and has urged the enactment of legislation which would correct it. He testified before the committee again the other day urging that we do something to change the law—at least to eliminate some of these abuses which I am mentioning today. When I say "abuses," I say it advisedly, because while I think the practice is wrong, even though Congress authorized it, I do not say it is immoral or illegal.

Mr. GRUENING. But the Senator would say it is undesirable.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Absolutely. I think the law should be corrected. I do not think the money of the taxpayers should be used to finance or

encourage absentee ownership. There is nothing wrong with absentee ownership. I defend it. I own a farm, and I defend the right to do so. But the Federal Government should not be called upon to help me operate the farm. I am not a farmer and do not claim to be. I do not think absentee owners should be defined as farmers. I do not think anyone who earns his living away from the farm should be defined as a farmer. I do not think a farm program of any description is needed to subsidize such persons.

Mr. GRUENING. Does the Senator mean that a person living away from the farm should forego the receipt of the taxpayers' money to pay him for not growing something?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I do.

Mr. GRUENING. Would the Senator wish to comment upon the newspaper reports about the payments made to President Eisenhower for not growing corn or wheat on his farm at Gettysburg?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Such payments would have been eliminated by amendments which I offered in the Senate but which were rejected by Congress.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE NECESSITY FOR A NATIONAL FUEL AND ENERGY POLICY

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I wish to state for the record a situation which seems to exist with respect to the effort the Government has made, through Congress and the executive branch, to prevent the domestic petroleum and coal industries from being undermined by the imports of crude petroleum and petroleum products.

FORMER EFFORTS TO CURB IMPORTS HAVE FAILED

Early last week I introduced a bill to provide that Congress should seek ways and means to stimulate the domestic production of petroleum and coal. The bill was sponsored by a large number of Senators and was referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. The reason for the introduction of the bill was that, although an effort has been made since 1955 to place restraints upon the importation of petroleum, including residual fuel, the effort has not been a success. Congress, in extending the Reciprocal Trade Agreement Act in 1955, included a provision authorizing the President to establish restraints, provided it appeared to him that the national security was involved. As it happened, a finding to that effect was made. The Special Cabinet Committee on Energy Supplies and Resources Policy, under the chairmanship of the then Director of Defense Mobilization, reported in that year as follows:

> Since World War II importations of crude oil and residual fuel oil into the United States have increased substantially, with the result that today these oils supply a significant part of the U.S. market for fuels.
>
> The committee believes that if the imports of crude and residual oils should exceed significantly the respective proportions that these imports of oils bore to the production of domestic crude oil in 1954, the domestic fuels situation could be so impaired as to endanger the orderly industrial growth which assures the military and civilian supplies and reserves that are necessary to the national defense. There would be an inadequate incentive for exploration and the discovery of new sources of supply.

The purpose of the bill which my cosponsors and I introduced was to do precisely what the report of the Director of Defense Mobilization advised, namely, to provide an adequate incentive for the exploration and the discovery of new sources of supply both of petroleum and of coal. That has not been done.

Two orders have been issued as a result of the provisions contained in the extension of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act. Both of them have resulted in increasing supplies.

Perhaps it is proper to say that these orders restrained the rapid increase which previously was occurring. But there were substantial increases, so that today the position of the domestic petroleum and coal industry is far worse than its position was in 1955, when the action was taken.

ANOTHER FINDING REGARDING NATIONAL SECURITY REQUESTED BY OCDM

Recently, however, because the two previous orders were not adequate to do the job which the Congress and the Executive desired to do—because the President signed the bill Congress proposed—the Department of State and the Department of Defense called upon the Government agency which deals with the national security, the OCDM, to make another finding. Great secrecy has been thrown around the findings of that group. It was announced at the White House, last week—as I recall, it was either on Friday or on Saturday morning—that a report had been received from Governor Hoegh, who is the head of this agency. The newspapermen asked at the White House for the text; but they were not given the text. They asked whether Governor Hoegh had freedom to speak. The reply was that he has the freedom of speech, but that there was very much doubt as to whether he would answer any questions on this subject; I am told that was the response by Mr. Hagerty, the press representative of the President, to the press representatives of the public, when they sought the news and appeared at the White House.

COOPERATION OF CABINET COMMITTEE SOUGHT IN PRESERVING OIL AND COAL INDUSTRIES

On last Thursday, following the introduction of this bill, I submitted, for printing in the RECORD, a telegram which I had sent the previous day to the Chairman of the President's Cabinet Committee on Oil Imports. The chairman happens to be the Acting Secretary of Commerce, Adm. Lewis Strauss. My telegram was dated February 25, and I shall now read it, as it appears on page 3032 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of Thursday, February 26, 1959:

> While Prime Minister Macmillan was sightseeing in Moscow yesterday the Soviet dictator shocked him and all the western allies by the restatement of Khrushchev's threat that any violation of the borders of East Germany would be regarded by the Soviet Union "as the beginning of war." The Soviet troops leave Berlin before the end of May. We must be ready for the consequences. If war comes we must have a self-sufficient supply of petroleum and coal in full development. Mandatory controls can be successfully imposed only by Congress.

Mr. President, I interrupt the reading of the telegram to say that that was an expression of my opinion. The controls which had been in existence were voluntary ones, and voluntary only. They were criticized by many very able lawyers, both in and out of the Government, on the ground that they would undoubtedly result in violations of the Sherman Antitrust Act, because voluntary agreements among alleged competitors cannot very successfully be made without resulting in violation of those laws, even though, when the voluntary agreement is made, the representatives of the President do not gather all the importers together in one room.

I return now to the telegram which I sent to Secretary of Commerce Strauss. After saying, in the telegram:

> Mandatory controls can be successfully imposed only by Congress—

I went on to say:

> I invite you, as Chairman of the President's Cabinet Committee dealing with this matter, to cooperate with the Members of Congress who sponsor the legislation introduced this week in both the Senate and the House "to encourage the development of petroleum and coal reserves within the United States."

CABINET COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN PREFERS TO HANDLE PROBLEM BY EXECUTIVE ORDER

Mr. President, yesterday there came to my office a letter from the Secretary of Commerce. The letter is dated February 27, 1959, and is addressed to me. It reads as follows:

> I appreciated receiving your telegram of February 25, 1959, with reference to the necessity of adequate control of imports of petroleum and its products in the interest of national security. Your message reached my office during my absence from the city on yesterday, hence the delay in this acknowledgement.
>
> As you are undoubtedly aware, the Director of the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization is about to submit to the President his most recent findings with reference to the impact of the present rate of importation of petroleum and petroleum products on the national security, as required by section 8 of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1958.
>
> The Special Committee To Investigate Crude Oil Imports, established by the President, is prepared to act promptly upon whatever findings are forthcoming and expects that such action will be recommended to the President very shortly after the submission of those findings. If mandatory controls appear to be indicated, it is my belief that they can best be instituted by Executive proclamation for the reason that they would be more flexible than legislation if changes as a result of experience with the

program later should appear desirable in the national interest.

With best regards,

Sincerely yours,

LEWIS STRAUSS,
Secretary of Commerce.

EXECUTIVE IS ASSUMING LEGISLATIVE POWER

Mr. President, I regard this letter as wholly in harmony with the developments which have been taking place in recent years, by which the executive branch of the Government tends to assume to itself the lawmaking power which is granted by the Constitution of the United States to the Congress. This letter is a polite and gentlemanly one, and it is very clear. I think the last paragraph deserves rereading—as follows:

The Special Committee To Investigate Crude Oil Imports, established by the President, is prepared to act promptly upon whatever findings are forthcoming and expects that such action will be recommended to the President very shortly after the submission of those findings. If mandatory controls appear to be indicated, it is my belief—

That is the expression of the opinion of Secretary Strauss—

that they can best be instituted by Executive proclamation for the reason that they would be more flexible than legislation if changes as a result of experience with the program later should appear desirable in the national interest.

Mr. President, I think Members of Congress will be interested to know what "flexibility" means in the mind of the Secretary of Commerce. How does it happen that in this hour of international turbulence, which perhaps threatens a third world war, the Secretary of Commerce addresses to a Member of the Senate of the United States a letter in which the Secretary expresses the opinion that executive action is preferable to legislative action because the former is more flexible.

IMPORTS PRODUCED BY AMERICAN CAPITAL SENT ABROAD AFFECT DOMESTIC PRODUCTION

Now, the history of this importation business, with which the domestic industry has been struggling shows a great reduction in the production of coal and petroleum within the continental borders of the United States. Because of that reduction, the producers of these commodities are finding themselves threatened by the increasing importation of these products made abroad by American capital, sent to foreign countries to seek out new petroleum fields, to build new refineries, to make petroleum products, and to export those products into the United States, where the market here will make profits for the importers.

Many years ago the Supreme Court of the United States, in the well known Standard Oil case, ordered the Standard Oil Co. to divide into its several units. It was regarded by the Supreme Court of the United States, in the decision handed down by Chief Justice White, as a combination in restraint of trade, which was forbidden by the Sherman Act, and so those companies had to divide. Within a very short time some of those units which had formerly been combined in the original Standard Oil Company of New Jersey became more wealthy, from the production of petroleum in the United States, than the Standard Oil Co. itself had been before the decision.

These companies, units created as a result of the decision by the Supreme Court, have been combining abroad, have been uniting again abroad, to develop the petroleum which they import into the United States, and which the President's Committee on Energy Resources found are threatening the security of the United States. In spite of that finding, these imports are being brought into the country, inundating our own productive capacity.

I regard this letter which has been read as a challenge to the constitutional right of Congress to legislate. We do not yet know what former Governor Hoegh has reported to the President, but rumor has it that a new order has already been written, that it may be mandatory; but nobody knows what the limitation will be. We do know that the importation, for example, of residual fuel, to the detriment of the coal-producing States of the Union, has been rising under the voluntary program. But nobody knows, and it may be that even the President himself may not know, what the President's committee has recommended.

WE ARE FACED WITH SERIOUS THREAT OF WAR

Oh, the Secretary of Commerce says it is something more flexible than Congress could do. Mr. President, ever since the Deputy Premier of Soviet Russia was in the United States making his tour from State to State, and meeting the people here and meeting the people there, the United States has been concerned, and all of the free world has been concerned, with the Berlin threat. Khrushchev made the threat, and he set a deadline. He said that if the Western allies crossed the boundaries of East Germany to enter Berlin, where the Western allies have the right to be, it would be an act of war. I do not think the dictator of the Kremlin will go that far, but I call attention to the fact that if it be an act of war, and if the Soviet Union undertakes to use the superior manpower which it has available close to Berlin to resist the rightful entry of the Western allies into West Berlin, such entry will mean war.

MODERN WAR IS ECONOMIC WAR

Long before we began to talk about the cold war now going on between Soviet Russia and the United States, everybody knew that modern war is economic war. We know that when we reflect on the huge debt which this Nation carries.

The people of the United States contributed to the war effort by the purchase of savings bonds, by the purchase of long-term Treasury bonds, by complying with rigid regulations that denied them the use of commodities like gasoline. When we were engaged in war, the people were ready to pay all the sums necessary. They were ready to bear all the sacrifices necessary to fight for human freedom.

FAILURE OF OIL PROGRAM HAS ALLOWED INCREASED IMPORTS RATIO

Now we note that, by reason of the failure of the voluntary oil program, the production of these vital national security fuels—petroleum, petroleum products, and coal—in the United States has been seriously obstructed.

I have exact figures, Mr. President, which are perhaps worth reading into the RECORD at this point.

All efforts to limit crude oil imports in the interest of national security have so far depended upon voluntary compliance. Although this program succeeded in halting the rapid upward rise of such imports, nearly a million barrels still enter this country every day. This total is still far in excess of national security limits. Moreover, the increases in imports of other petroleum products, particularly finished and unfinished products other than residual oil, have more than offset this slight decline in crude oil imports.

During the last six months of 1958 these other petroleum products constituted about 17 percent of total petroleum imports. As a result, the ratio of total petroleum imports to domestic crude oil production has continued to rise since the attempted restrictions of 2 years ago. In 1957 imports were 22 percent of domestic production. In 1958 they were slightly in excess of 25 percent. In January 1959, total petroleum imports soared to nearly 2 million barrels daily, almost 30 percent of domestic crude oil production.

IMPORTERS OPPOSE ANY RESTRICTIONS

The showings which have been made in presentations to Governor Hoegh by some of these importers make it clear that they are absolutely opposed to any restriction whatsoever. Some of these companies have filed their briefs to say that the importations must not be limited and that we must continue without voluntary or mandatory controls. That is an argument which is good enough for days of peace, Mr. President, but it is not an argument which is good enough for days of threatened war.

FUEL IS NEEDED TO WAGE WAR

Everybody knows that fuel—coal, petroleum, gasoline, residual fuels, and all the rest of these products—is essential to the manipulation and the use of modern weapons of war, not only tanks and airplanes but also missiles, whether they be intercontinental ballistic missiles or intermediate range missiles. They all need fuel.

We now know, we cannot deny the fact, that Soviet Russia leads the United States in the production of intercontinental ballistic missiles, missiles which can be fired from Soviet territory to reach this territory of ours. But the Secretary of Commerce says he does not want Congress to have any part in determining the policy that the United States should follow. If Congress shall not have any part in it, how can the people of the United States be sure and certain that what is being done in their defense is proper? It is common knowledge in Washington that those who

would like to make huge profits in the American market and who want the imports to come in without any restraint whatsoever are concerned more with the private profits of their companies than they are concerned with the defense of the United States. We cannot prepare for a shooting war or carry on an economic war by allowing our domestic industries to be undermined and destroyed by imports from abroad. If we allow this decline in production to continue, as it has been, we will lose the required know-how.

OIL INDUSTRY FAR WEAKER THAN IN 1955

I should like to continue with a line or two from the statement.

During 1958 domestic petroleum demand was 2.8 percent above that for 1956. Despite this fact, domestic crude oil production dropped from 7,151,000 barrels per day in 1956 to 6,704,000 barrels per day in 1958. That was a decline of 6.3 percent. Exploration and discovery also declined during 1957 and 1958. Exploratory crew activity was 19 percent below the 1956 level, and even further below the 1953 peak. The number of exploratory wildcat wells drilled declined for the second consecutive year to a level 26 percent below that for 1956. Total well completions were 16 percent below 1956, representing more than 9,000 less completions than in the 1956 record year of 58,000. Total footage drilled was also 16 percent below the 1956 level, and the number of active rotary rigs was down more than 26 percent.

Because of our failure to curb excessive imports, the industry is far weaker now than it was when the President's Cabinet Committee made its recommendations in 1955.

FLEXIBLE PROGRAM OF EXECUTIVE HAS HURT THE COUNTRY

"Flexible" is the word the Secretary of Commerce uses, and the Secretary is Chairman of the President's committee. He says "flexible." Well, flexible though Executive action has been, it has been destructive of the vital needs of the United States of America domestically and internationally. Our industry and our Defense Establishment are both suffering. More than that, Mr. President, with the petroleum industry declining and the coal industry also declining, income by way of taxes to the Treasury of the United States is falling.

These two industries and all who are engaged in them are waiting with bated breath for the announcement from the White House as to what the oil import program will be—as to what will be this flexible program which can vary up and down. Unless it is very much more successful than the two orders heretofore issued, it will be flexible to the detriment of domestic industry.

CONGRESS, NOT EXECUTIVE COMMITTEES, WAS GIVEN LEGISLATIVE POWER

Let the RECORD show that when the fathers of the Constitution established this Government they created the Congress in the very first article of that instrument, and declared in that instrument that all legislative power granted therein was to be vested in a Congress of the United States—all legislative power, not a part of it, not even any small part to make it more flexible.

The theory of the founders of this Government was that the people, through their representatives, are the source of legislative power—not a couple of Presidential committees operating behind closed doors.

I have been told by some of the representatives of those who have been protesting against the failures of control that when they have gone to a high official in one of the departments and asked to know what was going on, they were told, "We cannot tell you, because that information must be released by the President."

When they asked, "Shall we make our presentation to the President?" they were told "No, no, no. Do nothing of the kind."

LEGISLATIVE POWER IS EXERCISED BEHIND CLOSED DOORS BY ANONYMOUS APPOINTEES

We are drifting into the delegation of legislative power into the hands of the Executive, to be exercised in the name of the Executive by persons whom no one knows. We know the names of the members of the President's Committee, but who are the experts who gather around and draw the flexible mandatory plan? And who will be favored in the flexible mandatory plan?

The only proper way is the American way. The American way is stated in the Constitution. It is a danger to the United States of America and the aspirations of all mankind for freedom and control over their own Government when a Cabinet officer writes to a Member of the U.S. Senate who, with colleagues, has introduced legislation to impose mandatory control, and says in that letter:

> If mandatory controls appear to be indicated, it is my belief that they can best be instituted by Executive proclamation for the reason that they would be more flexible than legislation if changes as a result of experience with the program later should appear desirable in the national interest.

THE PEOPLE ELECTED CONGRESS TO MAKE THE LAWS

The Congress of the United States will be in session for a long time if the international crisis continues as it now exists. The Congress of the United States is composed of men and women elected by their people in their States and districts. They are trusted by the people in their States and districts to have a knowledge of the needs of the country and the ability, in open hearings, the record of which can be read by all, to define, among other matters, the pattern of restriction of oil imports.

If the United States wishes to have a program to stimulate and develop its fuel resources in this great period of threatened war, which may destroy the very freedom for which we all aspire, the Congress must not permit the Executive to assume legislative power on the basis of the argument that the Executive is more flexible. We can look to Nikita Khrushchev and realize that executive power is more flexible; but it is not more free.

OUR FORM OF GOVERNMENT MUST BE PRESERVED WITH ITS SEPARATION OF POWERS

If the system which our forefathers gave to the world—a government of the people with divided powers—is to be preserved, we must preserve it here, and we must preserve it against the claims of executive representatives who think they are better than the Congress elected by the people of the United States.

They are not better, Mr. President. There may be many more able men, perhaps, but that I doubt. For years I have been associated with Members of the Congress on the floor of the House and in the Senate. I have associated with men in the executive branch of the Government; and I know that in both branches of our Government there are many men of high ability and patriotism.

But we are drifting because we do not hold our minds and hearts steadfast upon the nature of government by the people. That is the sort of government which the Soviet dictators wish to destroy. We cannot successfully prevent its destruction if we imitate some of their policies by disregarding the open forums of the Senate and the House and allowing our policies to be determined behind the closed doors of any agency of the executive branch of Government.

As I say these words, the President has not yet issued the new order. It may be lying on his desk. I do not know. Some of the members of the press think it is, and some of them think it is not. But that is not the way to show the peoples of the world who aspire to free government that we want free government. We cannot show them that we want free government by allowing these policies to be determined behind closer doors by the Executive act of a President who is operating upon the advice, not of the Congress, elected by the people, but of private advisers whom he has selected, and who in many instances have never passed the test of the ballot.

If we stand before the aspiring peoples of the world as the leader of free government, we must make sure that we have a government in which the Congress and the Executive work together, and not a government in which spokesmen for the Executive say to the Senate and the House, "You are not flexible enough for us."

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MEDICAL CARE FOR THE AGED

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, a plan of treatment for persons over 65 years of age with reduced incomes and modest resources constitutes one of the Nation's most urgent health problems. This has become true because of the great number of such persons who are living longer, thanks to

medical advances. There are, in fact, 15 million persons who are over 65 years of age living in the Nation today. In Iowa there are approximately 300,000, the highest percentage—11 percent—of senior citizens per capita in the Nation.

On December 4, 1958, the house of delegates of the AMA passed the following resolution:

That the American Medical Association, the constituent and component medical societies, as well as physicians everywhere, expedite the development of an effective voluntary health insurance or prepayment program for the group over 65 with modest resources or low family income; that physicians agree to accept a level of compensation for medical services rendered to this group, which will permit the development of such insurance and prepayment plan at a reduced premium rate.

The Iowa State Medical Society, on February 22, made Iowa the first State to offer at reduced rates to its senior citizens medical and surgical insurance protection through its Blue Shield plan. Such coverage will be offered for an average charge of $2.50 a month for each subscriber if he is in a low income bracket. Additionally, insured families with incomes up to $5,400 will have the full cost of certain medical-surgical expenses reimbursed. Previously, this full-type protection was offered to families with incomes under $3,600. A $5,400 income in Iowa is almost the median family income. Therefore, it is expected that 50 percent of Iowans are presently eligible for full coverage under this plan. In the last few months commercial insurance companies have also brought onto the market new and exciting noncancelable contracts to cover aged persons.

I congratulate the Iowa physicians for these progressive and positive actions. This is Iowa's second major positive step in solving the vexing problem of improved health services to all citizens of the State. Last summer, in cooperation with the Iowa Hospital Association, the Iowa Nursing Home Association, and the Iowa State Dental Society, the Iowa State Medical Society formed the Joint Council for Care of the Aged.

It is my view that local programs of this kind, wherein all medical groups participate, will prevent the growth of government-dominated medicine. A well-written editorial of the Des Moines Register corroborates and better states my views, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Des Moines Register, Feb. 27, 1959]

MEDICAL CARE FOR AGED

The Iowa State Medical Society deserves congratulations for its new program of low cost medical insurance for persons over 65 who find it a hardship to pay medical bills.

The society is taking the lead in attempting to solve one of the country's most vital health problems. The plan calls for some financial sacrifice on the part of doctors. It's an experiment which, if successful in Iowa, probably would be adopted in many other States.

The plan was approved Sunday at a special meeting of the house of delegates of the medical society. Some details remain to be worked out, but the program is expected to be put into effect by April.

The insurance will be written by Blue Shield, the nonprofit insurance plan of the medical society, and will be available to persons over 65 years of age. If the combined income of a man and his wife is less than $3,000 a year, the couple will be entitled to full-service coverage. An individual can qualify if his income is under $2,000.

The cost to the insured will be about $2.25 to $2.75 per person per month. Income from insurance charges would not be sufficient to pay in full the medical fees which doctors ordinarily charge. So the doctors will accept lower fees to be set by Blue Shield. The fees are expected to cover only overhead costs.

Blue Shield is working with Blue Cross to provide insurance which will cover both hospital and doctor expenses for the elderly at a cost of $6.50 to $7 a person a month. Blue Cross insurance, sponsored by the Iowa Hospital Association, covers hospital costs.

The elderly, who have retired from jobs that paid them a regular income, have less ability to pay medical and hospital expenses than people of working age. But they are more likely to incur heavy medical expenses. It's tragic if they don't get medical care because they can't afford it or if they are forced to become charity patients.

It is estimated that 210,000 of the 300,000 Iowans over 65 years of age will be eligible to take part in the new Blue Shield program. A high percentage of them now have no protection against heavy medical and hospital costs that may come at any time. A 1957 survey made by the National Opinion Research Center of the University of Chicago showed that nationally five out of every eight persons 65 and over had no health insurance protection.

A nation as prosperous as the United States, with highly skilled medical doctors and splendid hospitals, will not just do nothing about the problem of health care for its senior citizens in low income brackets.

Unless programs of the kind the Iowa society plans can be made truly effective, the Government will sooner or later take over the problem in response to general public demand. This is what the American Medical Association fears and why it recommended last December that doctors reduce fees to persons over 65 who have low incomes.

The AMA is bitterly opposed to the Forand bill in Congress. This calls for the Government to provide free hospital, surgical and nursing home insurance for everyone eligible for social security benefits. It would cost $835 million a year. The AMA fears it would lead to free health care for everyone and Government control of medicine.

The Iowa society is taking the best way to fight socialized medicine. It recognizes the gravity of the problem of providing health care to the elderly at costs they can afford and is attempting to do something about this.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, the editorial estimates that the annual cost of the Forand bill will be $835 million. The sponsor of the bill estimates a more realistic cost of $2 billion a year.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CAUSES OF INFLATION

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I think I need not discuss the evils arising from the inflation with which the Nation is now confronted. We are all familiar with the distress that is being caused to persons having fixed incomes, especially to women who must leave their families and work in order to supplement the family income.

The fact that the United States is losing considerable of her foreign market, due to the fact that prices have risen so high that in some areas we have not been competing as successfully as we have in the past, is well known to Members of Congress, to the Executive, and to the public.

I have been heartened by the interest which Members of Congress, both in the Senate and the House, have shown in trying to deal with this problem. It has been encouraging to note so much interest shown and action indicated by the Chief Executive, even though it may come at a late time.

The chief commodity to be considered in determining whether or not there will be inflation is steel. One thing which is quite certain, and on which I think most economists agree at present, is that this is not a demand, cushion inflation. It is not being caused to any great extent by the existence of an amount of money in excess of the commodities which can be purchased. There is an ample supply of commodities of almost every kind.

Even though business has improved, many plants at present are not operating at full capacity. In other words, the business concerns could produce more. We know also that there is continuing large unemployment, about 5 million persons being out of work. So there is unused plant capacity and widespread unemployment.

Mr. President, this is not inflation of the classic pattern. What we have been seeing is a rise in prices. On the one hand, labor says that its wages have not increased to any great extent beyond the increase in productivity.

Business says that most of the price increases have been due to wage increases. But, Mr. President, whoever is to blame, whoever is responsible for bringing about the present situation, is a matter of history.

The important point is that we do something about it now. The important need is that in the Congress and in the executive branch of the Government, including the procurement agencies, and in business and in labor, the facts be obtained, and that then there be unity in an effort to prevent a continuation of the merry-go-round we have been on during the last few years.

We know that in 1957, when the price of steel rose substantially about the first of June, there was a round of inflation. We know that in the case of the prices of almost all other products, the price of steel is an important factor—for instance, in the case of the price of automobiles, farm machinery, tin cans, hairpins—almost all of which use substantial amounts of steel. Thus, when the price of steel rises to any extent, that price rise tends to pyramid as it is passed from

industry to industry. So, when the price of steel rose about $6 a ton about the middle of August of last year, there was another round of inflation.

Mr. President, I think both business and labor should look at the situation in this way: It does not benefit labor a great deal to obtain a little larger wage increase than the increase in productivity if within a few months there is to be a general rise in prices, with the result that the dollar buys less, so that the wage increase which labor has secured is wiped out by an increase in the cost of the things that those who labor have to buy.

On the other side of the picture, it does not help business any to demand very large profits and to have profits set at high levels, and then to have the prices of all other commodities geared to that amount of profits, if in securing those profits, and thus in being able to pay larger dividends, the value of the profits and the dividends is reduced by means of a decline in the value of the dollar.

Furthermore, Mr. President, industry has another big stake in this matter, in that, somehow, it must keep down prices, in order to retain its foreign market and, if possible, to increase its foreign market.

So both industry and organized labor has a great stake in attempting to stabilize prices, in order to stop the leapfrog inflation we have been experiencing.

Of course, as I have previously indicated, the greatest sufferers from such inflation are those who are not in either industry or labor; the greatest sufferers are those on fixed incomes, pensions, and life insurance policies, who do not have the bargaining power of labor union members, and have not saved enough money to tide them over difficult times.

So, Mr. President, it is of tremendous importance to our economy that everyone do what he can to see to it that there is not an increase in the price of steel at the expiration of the steelworkers' contract the end of June of this year.

I have proposed that the steelworkers not request a wage increase larger than the increase in their productivity, with the increase in productivity to be determined, if necessary, by an impartial board. That would be step 1. I have proposed that the steelworkers not request more than that, provided the steel companies do not increase their price for steel. But if, notwithstanding that position, the steel companies nevertheless were to increase their price for steel, then of course the unions would be free to try to secure their share of such an increase.

Mr. President, I know this may not be satisfactory or agreeable to Mr. McDonald—in fact, he said it was not—and I know it may not be agreeable to Roger Blough, the chairman of the board of the United States Steel Corp., or to others in the steel industry. But I hope that before the time runs out they will give the matter further consideration and prayerful consideration, because it seems to me that this is a time when something must be done, and it is a time when something can be done. The uncontroverted record is that in the 1940's there was a more-than-average increase in the price of unregulated products which are not produced by concentrated industries; there was an above-the-average increase in the price of textiles, lumber, and farm products, which are competitive, and the price of which is usually regulated by the demand. But since 1953 the situation has been the other way around; in other words, the large price increases have been in the case of the products of the concentrated industries and the administered industries—for instance, in the case of steel and products which use steel, rubber, copper, aluminum, and other industries in which there is concentration.

The prices of the products of the competitive industries have fallen below the average price. The prices of textiles, farm products, and other products are below the average price. Only the fact that the prices of farm products and textiles have been below the average price has kept the cost-of-living index from rising any more than it has. The one industry in which prices have shot away up above the average price is the steel industry, which is substantially responsible for the large price increases in the products of other administered industries.

Mr. President, this matter is not just the business of Mr. Blough or Mr. McDonald; it is the public's business. Whether there is another round of inflation will depend on what they do. Whether we shall have a sound economy will depend upon the statesmanship they exhibit in the coming few months.

It should also be pointed out that the U.S. Government is, of course, the largest customer of all lines of business. The Government is having trouble balancing the budget. We know that the cost of munitions is rising frightfully, and the cost of everything else the Department of Defense procures—whether oil, steel, tanks, or guns—has been rising. So today we have to spend much more for Department of Defense "hardware" than we have had to spend at any other time during peace. Therefore, if the present situation continues, it will mean higher taxes and a lower standard of living for everyone.

I think I should point out that whereas we have had an increase of approximately $36 billion in the gross national product—according to the 1958 figures—as compared to the situation in 1955, if that increase is measured in terms of 1955 dollars we find that we have had an increase of only $1 billion in the gross national product.

Today the average person receives, in terms of money, a little bit more than he was receiving in 1955—that is to say, if we make the measurement in terms of the 1958 dollar or in terms of the value of the dollar in recent times. But if we make the measurement in terms of the value of the dollar in 1955, then we find that every person in the United States is $7 worse off today than he was in 1955. So it will not help business or labor or anyone else to have the present spiraling inflation continue.

I know that labor and business may not like to have Members of the Senate talk about this problem. We have given this matter a great deal of study and consideration in the Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee, of which I have the privilege of being chairman, but I feel we must speak out, because I think this is the No. 1 issue before the American people today. I think we have a formula at the present time—at least, if the steel industry will hold down prices and if the workers will not ask for any wage increase over productivty increase—that will in the long run be more beneficial to management and to labor than if there were continued what has been happening in the past. I think the influence of public opinion must be brought to bear in this very important matter.

I know this may not happen, and I hope it will not happen, but we have been hearing more lately about wage and price controls that we have in some time. As a matter of fact, some people are advocating such controls as perhaps the only way by which we can control inflation. However, wage and price controls cannot be put into effect only in the steel business or as to workers in a particular industry, because wage and price controls would have to be put into effect for products which go into steelmaking. I think the result of price and wage controls all through our economy would be a frightful thing. There would be regimentation which might have a tendency toward socializing our industries.

During a time of war we can, of course, take extreme measures of that kind; but we certainly do not want to take such a step now. If inflation continues on and on and on, and the demand for such controls becomes greater and greater, we may come to such controls one of these days. I think now is the time to do something about the problem.

I think I should point out that for 26 months before the entry of the United States into World War II we, of course, had the kind of demand pressure which makes for inflation—a scarcity of goods and a great deal of money. There was a tendency to inflation in such a condition. The President of the United States used the force of his office, by means of conferences, by public appeals, by appeals to the patriotism of business and labor. Without any sanction of law, for 26 months, before the OPA was actually put into law by statute, the price line was held without very many price increases at all. There was very little increase in ceiling prices during that time.

Leon Henderson, I believe, was the OPA Administrator, but there was no law establishing the Administration. The President of the United States and others used the force of their offices to try to hold down prices and to bring reason to business and labor. They were successful in doing it. I am encouraged by some of the statements showing the concern of the President over the problem of inflation. I hope President Eisenhower and the members of his administration will use their great influence and great effort in holding down, not merely wages, but prices, in an effort to stabilize economic conditions during these very precarious times.

Mr. President, in the New York Times of Friday, February 27, 1959, there was published a very good article on this subject, discussing the whole problem, written by that very able columnist, Arthur Krock, which I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD following my remarks; and I yield the floor.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STEEL WAGES, PRICES, AND THE COST PLATEAU
(By Arthur Krock)

WASHINGTON, February 26.—A question asked of the President at his news conference yesterday, and his reply, lifted the curtain only briefly on the next great inflationary threat to the domestic economy. This threat will be resolved or will materialize in the outcome of the oncoming wage negotiations in the steel industry.

If, as Senator Kefauver proposed and the President accepted in principle, steel wage adjustments are made on the criterion of equivalent increases in productivity, no new and powerful inflationary pressure should be the consequence of the negotiations. But if wages are again increased in disregard of the productivity factor, on the cozy pay-and-pass-on-to-the-public technique which industry has often employed to avert a strike, the general price scale will make a jet takeoff from the plateau where for some time prices have been resting from their long and steady climb.

The last similar threat, was dispelled when, after a technical strike lasting only 6 hours, the Ford Motor Co., and the United Automobile Workers made a 3-year contract that became a pattern for the industry. The outcome was creditable to the company and Walter Reuther because, though it resulted in some automobile price increases, these were governed by the moderation and sense of responsibility for maintaining a stable economy that prevailed on both sides of the bargaining table.

In a recent speech John S. Bugas, the Ford official in charge of labor relations, reviewed the negotiations, and much of his comment is worth the serious attention of the steel industry and its unions. He explained there had been better communication and a better organized exchange of views among the major auto companies on industrywide issues raised by the UAW. And he said:

"In the no-contract period the union made every effort to see to it that no incident developed into a serious strike * * * the company was equally diligent to avoid incidents which would lend credence to a charge that it sought to provoke a strike. * * *

"If we had ignored the public interest * * * made unlimited concessions and raised wages or other labor costs beyond reasonable levels, we would have contributed to another cost-push inflationary surge, higher prices with consequent buyer resistance, lessening of production and * * * unemployment. On the other hand, if we resisted union demands just because they were union demands, and took an uncalled-for strike * * * it could contribute just as much to an economic slowdown."

Here is a responsible formula for the steel companies and their unions, an important part of which was the close liaison maintained between the three major automakers during the long negotiations in 1958. This—plus the tempering effect on the union of the recession and unemployment—helped greatly to produce a much more moderate settlement and price increase than for many years had resulted from similar negotiations. Moreover, if the steelmakers allow themselves to be pushed out of the same position to avoid a strike they will also put Reuther on the defensive in his own union for making the reasonable settlement he did. And that could end in galloping inflation after violent strikes and a disastrous loss of essential production.

But if the steelmakers are to erect as firm and comprehensive an industry front as the three major auto companies did against the original excessive UAW demands (in 1956 Reuther set his immovable goal at something above an increase of 18½ cents an hour), they need to know in advance what the role of the Federal Government will be in event of a strike. Often in the past the Government, with factfinding boards, high-level conciliation and other activities for the purpose of reopening plants, has put heavy pressures on essential industry to yield to unreasonable and inflationary union demands. If the steelmakers are left to conclude that this would happen again they might well prefer the easier course of acceding to such union demands, and passing the costs on to the public, to being forced to do this very thing by Government pressure.

Also, if the steel unions come to this same conclusion, that a strike—perhaps even the imminence of a strike—will bring this Government pressure on the industry, they will be humanly tempted to get excess profit from it.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I commend the senior Senator from Tennessee, who is leading the fight on inflation. I think he is doing an excellent job, not only in the instant case which he has just discussed with such persuasiveness, the battle to keep prices of steel from rising, but also he has done an outstanding job in focusing national attention on the peculiar nature of the present inflation. The present inflation is an administered price inflation, an inflation which is taking place in a few industries, a few industries in which a very few companies have the power and the discretion to increase prices, and have been doing so.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I thank my distinguished colleague for showing his interest in the subject and for the statement he has just made. I know he has studied this matter carefully, and he has given me and members of the Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee many worthwhile suggestions in connection with the whole problem. We are grateful to him.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I thank the Senator.

TAX EVASION

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, this morning's Washington Post carries a story by Philip Stoddard Brown entitled "Tax Audit Reveals Evasion Is Rife." This article discloses that our Federal Government is losing some $2.6 billion yearly through tax evasion.

The article suggests to my mind that Congress would do well to explore the advantage to our Federal Government and to honest taxpayers of an investment in additional tax auditors. In my State of Wisconsin we have found that income tax auditors repay the Government $20 for every dollar they cost by uncovering tax evasion and requiring delinquents to pay up. Of course, in addition, more vigorous enforcement puts all tax evaders on notice that the Internal Revenue Bureau means business. At a time when our Government urgently needs more revenue to balance the budget, this may be an extremely helpful lead.

Mr. President, as a result of this excellent article, I am writing to the Internal Revenue Department to determine precisely what percentage of income tax returns are audited, the costs of auditing, the recoveries traceable to tax auditing, and the additional revenue that may be derived from doing a far more thorough income tax auditing job than is being done now.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TAX AUDIT REVEALS EVASION IS RIFE

(By Philip Stoddard Brown)

The cost of those great social events of Washington's winter season that get reported in the society pages of this newspaper are, I should guess, tax deductible in most cases—or paid for by governments out of tax revenue. Certainly in these days of steeply progressive income taxes few people can afford to spend $5,000, or even $1,000, of after-tax income for a single party.

But it piques my curiosity how some private hosts and hostesses justify such expenses as ordinary and necessary and directly related to their business or professional duties.

What a difficult task Internal Revenue has to determine the motives and circumstances of entertainment. Should 60 rather than 70 percent of the expenses of a dinner party 4 years ago be allowed as a deduction? Was business or pleasure the main purpose of a trip to New York or Paris?

MAZE OF DEDUCTIONS

The whole domain of tax deductions has become a weird maze. The taxpayer can't even be expected to produce receipts for contributions at church services, for taxi fares and gratuities, or for every meal, telephone call, business magazine, and postage stamp. How, then, can Internal Revenue decide, within wide limits, whether stated deductions were actual expenses? And even where receipts exist, are they valid and do they represent a business, rather than personal, expenditure?

Well, you can't run a tax-collecting outfit by simply accepting the word of each taxpayer. Yet, in many cases you have to do just this. You can't probe behind every figure.

Taxable income might be defined, I suppose, as income that is taxed. Often it is just a plausible figure. Sometimes it is a compromise suggested by the Internal Revenue examiner. The arithmetic must be accurate and the books should be in order, but there's lots of scope for doubt, argument, and estimation in the original entries for expenses, depreciation, and receipts. Was that $5.27 for a business luncheon on April 16, 1956, with Joe Bloke, a lawyer and old friend, really to discuss tax problems or just social?

To be sure, there can be no question about many receipts and expenditures. But where expenses equal, say, 90 percent of receipts, taxable income can be cut in half by neglecting to count 3 percent of income and inflating expenses by slightly over 2 percent. Tax liability is reduced by more than 50 percent.

The amount of understatement of taxable income in the returns of business and professional people may surprise many salaried people whose returns are fairly straightforward.

TWO AND SEVEN-TENTHS BILLION DOLLARS MORE

Recently, the results of a very special audit by Internal Revenue of 36,000 representative returns for 1949 were published. The audit indicated that a similar examination of 6.7 million business and professional returns for that year would have increased net profits by 20 percent and yielded $2.7 billion additional revenue.

Some indicated changes in net profit from that reported are as follows:

	Percent Increase
Manufacturing, total	17.5
Lumber and wood products, except furniture	39.4
Printing and publishing	13.5
Transportation, communication and utilities	25.9
Trade, total	26.4
Department stores, general merchandise and dry goods	36.5
Package liquor stores	37.4
Eating and drinking places	32.0
Automobile dealers	25.6
Lumber, building supplies and coal	11.5
Services, total	11.2
Hotels	36.7
Barber and beauty shops	8.9
Auto repair and garages	21.4
Amusement services	87.1
Professional and social services, total	7.1
Accountants	2.9
Physicians	7.0
Dentists	8.1
Legal services	4.3
Finance, insurance and real estate	10.9
Insurance agents	7.1
Real estate	21.0
Construction, total	18.5
Agriculture and related industries, total	23.1

If the average firm engaged in amusement services understates its taxable income by 46 percent, its perturbing to speculate how much understatement individual firms must get away with. Actually, evasion is greater even than the above figures indicate.

The understatement of profit indicated by this audit is only what fairly experienced examiners might uncover. As Marius Farioletti, who prepared an excellent paper on this remarkable audit, makes clear: Additional errors would have been found if more time had been allowed for examination and if the examiners had been even more experienced. Also, it is likely that there are errors that even the most experienced examiners would not uncover.

CONSULTANTS SWELL GROSS NATIONAL PRODUCT

The income tax has become so complicated—as well as messy—that more and more small proprietors and professional people retain tax accountants. Last week, a friend told me that he pays $1,500 a year to his tax consultant. "My business isn't very big, but there are a lot of tax angles. It's a case of either my attending to my business, or reading all those reports of a tax advisory service that I used to subscribe to, but not both."

Well, the hiring of tax consultants—like the hiring of anybody else—increases gross national product. So the more the better. Gross national product hasn't been rising so fast of late, despite all that research and development going on in Detroit to achieve a shatteringly new look for the 1961 and 1962 model cars.

One returning vacationer is reassuring. He tells me that Florida can be counted on to boost gross national product this year. One of many projects is the building of a mile-long sandy beach along the coral reef of Key West, by trucking sand from somewhere way off. So maybe we can keep ahead of the Russians, after all—provided they don't step up their hiring of accountants even faster and don't haul around even more sand.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BARTLETT in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADJOURNMENT TO THURSDAY NEXT

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, pursuant to the order previously entered, I move that the Senate adjourn until 12 o'clock noon on Thursday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 21 minutes p.m.), in accordance with the order previously entered, the Senate adjourned until Thursday, March 5, 1959, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate March 2, 1959:

FARM CREDIT ADMINISTRATION

The following-named persons to be members of the Federal Farm Credit Board, Farm Credit Administration, for terms expiring March 31, 1965:

Glen R. Harris, of California.
J. Pittman Stone, of Mississippi.

U.S. DISTRICT JUDGE

Harold K. Wood, of Pennsylvania, to be U.S. district judge for the eastern district of Pennsylvania, vice William H. Kirkpatrick, retired.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate March 2, 1959:

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

Courtney Johnson, of Indiana, to be Assistant Secretary of the Army.

IN THE ARMY

The nominations of Richard G. Ament and 393 other officers, which were confirmed today, were received by the Senate on February 12, 1959, and may be found in the Senate proceedings of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for that date under the caption "Nominations," beginning with name of Richard G. Ament, which is shown on page 2260, and ending with the name of Harold D. Zumbro, which appears on page 2262.

IN THE NAVY AND MARINE CORPS

The nominations of Louis R. Abraham and other officers for appointment in the Marine Corps and in the Navy, which were confirmed today, were received by the Senate on February 2, 1959, and may be found in full in the Senate proceedings of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for that date, under the caption "Nominations," beginning with the name of Louis R. Abraham, which occurs on page 1585, and ending with the name of Toshiko Motomatsu, in the Navy, which occurs on page 1592.

IN THE REGULAR AIR FORCE

The nominations of John W. Wichman and 198 other officers for appointment in the Regular Air Force, which were confirmed today, were received by the Senate on February 12, 1959, and may be found in full in the Senate proceedings of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, under the caption "Nominations," beginning with the name of John W. Wichman, which occurs on page 2262, and ending with the name of Larimer J. H. Lenhardt, which is shown on page 2263.

The following additional nominations for temporary appointment, in the Air Force as brigadier generals, were confirmed today.

U.S. AIR FORCE

The following-named officers for temporary appointment in the U.S. Air Force under the provisions of ch. 839, title 10, of the United States Code:

To be brigadier generals

Col. Benjamin G. Holzman, 1102A, Regular Air Force.
Col. Richard L. Bohannon, 19067A, Regular Air Force, Medical.
Col. James G. Moore, 19074A, Regular Air Force, Medical.
Col. Edward J. Hopkins, 1180A, Regular Air Force.
Col. Frank W. Gillespie, 1215A, Regular Air Force.
Col. Frederick R. Terrell, 1221A, Regular Air Force.
Col. Norman L. Peterson, 1291A, Regular Air Force.
Col. Charles E. Jung, 1037A, Regular Air Force.
Col. Richard P. Klocko, 1327A, Regular Air Force.
Col. Neil D. Van Sickle, 1442A, Regular Air Force.
Col. Robert F. Worden, 1510A, Regular Air Force.
Col. Robert G. Ruegg, 1620A, Regular Air Force.
Col. Loren G. McCollom, 1632A, Regular Air Force.
Col. Robert H. Curtin, 1643A, Regular Air Force.
Col. Joseph T. Kingsley, Jr., 1702A, Regular Air Force.
Col. William E. Creer, 1742A, Regular Air Force.
Col. Joseph H. Moore, 1836A, Regular Air Force.
Col. Eugene B. LeBailly, 1920A, Regular Air Force.
Col. Jerry D. Page, 2052A, Regular Air Force.
Col. Stephen D. McElroy, 2053A, Regular Air Force.
Col. Ariel W. Nielsen, 2067A, Regular Air Force.

(NOTE.—The above appointments were made during the last recess of the Senate.)

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, MARCH 2, 1959

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Reverend Wayne E. Scott, pastor, Hillcrest Baptist Church, Hillcrest Heights, Md., offered the following prayer:

Our dear Heavenly Father, we pause just now for divine power and divine guidance. We thank Thee for our great American heritage, but, most of all we thank Thee for our Christian heritage, made possible by Thy gift in Christ.

We are grateful for the privilege of making laws, but God help us to realize that the highest law is God's law. Might each law that is passed here today have as its purpose the purpose to bless people.

We pray for every single person that is here, for the people that they represent. Give to each Congressman and Congresswoman wisdom beyond all human degree. We pray, our dear Heavenly

Father, that each shall have the spirit of Christ as they participate in the discussion on the floor here and in smaller groups.

Help each of us to realize that the highest mandate is not the will of the people but the will of God. We pray for these and other leaders as they face the Berlin crisis and other crises in the future. God, give them the right answer. Help and teach us to realize that the ultimate purpose in life is to make preparation for the life to come.

These things we ask in Christ's name and for His sake. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, February 26, 1959, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Ratchford, one of his secretaries.

CREDIT ON FEDERAL INCOME TAXES FOR CONTRIBUTIONS TO PUBLIC OR PRIVATE EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTIONS

Mr. GRANT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. GRANT. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced legislation providing credit on Federal income taxes for contributions to public or private educational institutions.

This is a new approach not only to the educational problem but indirectly to the integration problem as well and if adopted will injure no one but would be helpful to all in that it will assure the operation of all schools, whether public or private and whether integrated or not.

We all realize that something must be done in this crisis. I am sure that the majority of this Congress does not want Federal control of education; however, there are danger signs along the road that we are traveling. Let us examine the problem and ascertain just what we are interested in. Is it to help the education of the youth of this land, or is it to take over both the minds and social life of the children of this Nation? If it is only to help education, then we should be willing to allow a credit against the tax. It is just that simple.

The proposed legislation would place a limitation upon such credits by providing that such credit for any 1 taxable year shall not exceed 30 percent of the taxpayer's adjusted gross income for such year in the case of an individual or 15 percent of the taxpayer's adjusted gross income for such year in the case of a corporation, or $1,000, whichever is greater.

OFFICE OF ALIEN PROPERTY—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith, for the information of the Congress, the Annual Report of the Office of Alien Property, Department of Justice, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1958.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *March 2, 1959.*

SUBMISSION OF BUDGET ESTIMATES

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced for appropriate reference legislation which would require the submission of budget estimates so as to separate operating expenses from capital investments. I am pleased to report that Senator WAYNE MORSE, Democrat, of Oregon, is introducing an identical bill in the other body.

The legislation I am proposing underlines the current confusion which exists with regard to the annual budget. At the present time, both operating expenses and capital investments are intermingled and no distinction is made between the two. I think it is high time we organize our national budget in a more businesslike way.

Every private corporation operates with full knowledge of which outlays are made for current operating expenses and which are made for investments. Under the present budget system, we have no knowledge of such elementary facts.

It is the purpose of the bill which Senator MORSE has introduced in the other body and I have introduced here to provide such information. Let us see which expenditures will bring a definite repayment into the Federal Treasury and list them separately from those bringing no fixed return.

I want to point out that our legislation will in no way upset the present budgetary form. Rather, it will provide an additional statistical tool designed to aid in the evaluation of proposed expenditures.

Mr. Speaker, I am very hopeful that as the Joint Economic Committee carries on its valuable study of the problem of inflation, it will also focus attention on the value of establishing a capital budget. I think such a study would do much to clear up some popular misunderstandings about the budget, about its state of balance and about its effect on inflation.

OREGON'S MAJESTIC DOUGLAS-FIR

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, the State tree of Oregon is the majestic Douglas-fir. It is a prime factor in my State's economy. The Fourth Congressional District contains more Douglas-firs than any other part of the world. From the Douglas-fir comes such items as lumber, plywood, structural timbers, and other products vital to the Nation's housing industry.

In this Oregon centennial year it is possible for every interested person to have a Douglas-fir of his own.

The Blitz-Weinhard Co., of Portland—Oregon's only and largest brewery—has embarked on a modest international program. The company supplies without cost upon request an "Oregon Do-It-Yourself Kit." Each kit contains a Douglas-fir seedling about 2 years old. The fir is about a foot high.

Today it is my privilege to present to each Member of the House and to the Members of the other body a Douglas-fir. It is no good except for planting at this time. It needs water and tender loving care and will fit nicely in a flowerpot for a time. We Oregonians hope all of you will join us in this modest reforestation plan which has enlarged our "Keep Oregon Green" slogan to "Keep the World Green."

THE FLEMMING FORMULA

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, Secretary Flemming, of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, has brought to Congress a new proposal which he says will help meet the shortage of more than 140,000 classrooms. However, in order to build the 75,000 classrooms that Mr. Flemming says will be built under his formula for Federal aid, State constitutional and statutory debt limits will have to be revised, and basic tax concepts of many States will have to be changed.

Mr. Flemming's talents are being wasted by being confined to education. He should go to work for Clark Griffith. He could announce that the Senators will top the American League and win at least 110 games. This would be done by permitting the Senators to use a modified 37-millimeter gun instead of a pitcher at all home games and to field 11 men instead of the usual 9. Of course, such a procedure would require a change in the rules of baseball and consent from the other American League clubowners in addition to the perfection of a Flemming pitching machine. But those are minor problems. The question still arises, however, whether behind such pitching and fielding the Senators

would get enough runs to win half their games. Even the Flemming formula has not solved that problem yet.

CEREMONIES DEDICATING THE MODERNIZED WASHINGTON POST OFFICE

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I am calling the attention of Members of the House to the invitation of Postmaster General Summerfield to attend ceremonies dedicating the modernized Washington Post Office at 10 tomorrow, Tuesday. The post office building is located near the Union Station. This facility is the finest and most modern post office in the world. We hope you will take a few minutes' time to go down and inspect the building as well as attend the ceremony. Transportation will be provided. Buses will be located between the two office buildings ready for loading at 9:45. Postmaster General Summerfield is desirous that Members attend the ceremony and inspection of the building. The ceremony and inspection will last approximately 30 or 40 minutes. We hope you can be there. I know the Postmaster General will appreciate it.

TAXPAYERS' REVOLT AGAINST EXCESSIVE SPENDING

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I have good news this morning for economy-minded Members of Congress. My news is that a grassroots revolt has started in the State of Washington against excessive and extravagant spending by the State and Federal Governments.

I received 344 letters this morning from citizens of my district urging less extravagant spending by Congress and demanding that no new State or Federal taxes be levied on taxpayers.

Press reports from my State report our Governor has received 10,000 of these taxpayers' revolt letters. Other Congressmen from my State have been flooded with these taxpayer revolt letters.

I hope this grassroots taxpayers' revolt will spread to other States. If it does, the prospects of a balanced budget will be vastly improved.

INTERPARLIAMENTARY JUNKETEERS

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, when it was announced last Wednesday that the Interparliamentary Union would hold a meeting, the minority leader [Mr. HALLECK] asked a few questions concerning the organization. It was my observation that he did not get very lucid answers, and I would like to report further to the minority leader.

The meeting was held, as scheduled, last Friday morning and a goodly crowd was there. At that time I attempted to ascertain whether the American delegation of House and Senate Members, who flew with the greatest of ease to the meeting in Rio de Janeiro last summer, voted for some of the resolutions which were adopted which would send more money abroad and saddle more obligations upon the already well-drained U.S. Treasury. Those present were either unwilling or unable to answer.

But there was no unwillingness on the part of many of those present to offer themselves as sacrifices to some nice fat junkets to foreign lands later this year—at the taxpayers' expense, of course.

Mr. Speaker, the Interparliamentary Union represents junketeering at its congressional best, and I will have more to say on the subject when the appropriation bill comes along—if the appropriation for that cause is not buried so deep that it cannot be found.

INTERPARLIAMENTARY UNION

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, when the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK], the minority leader, inquired about the Interparliamentary Union last week, I referred him to the remarks of the late Honorable Dan Reed of New York whose final report on the activities of the American group of the Interparliamentary Union was inserted in the RECORD on the day before he passed away. If the gentleman from Iowa or the minority leader or any other Member of Congress is interested in the affairs of the Interparliamentary Union, I commend Mr. Reed's remarks to your consideration. When the gentleman from Iowa made an inquiry at the group meeting last week, he was then advised by me that while I was not at the Rio meeting that I would obtain for him a copy of the minutes of the meeting showing exactly how the American delegation voted on all resolutions that were presented at that time, and I shall still be glad to comply with the gentleman's request.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman is well aware that any number of people were present at that meeting who were at the Rio meeting and who could have answered the question.

Mr. COOLEY. The gentleman propounded his inquiry at or near the end of the meeting. I am sure nothing was done in secret. I am sure all information can be obtained.

Mr. GROSS. They had not even elected officers.

REPORT ON H.R. 1011

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce may have until midnight to file a report on the bill H.R. 1011.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

CONSENT CALENDAR

ACQUISITION OF ADDITIONAL LAND ALONG MOUNT VERNON MEMORIAL HIGHWAY

The Clerk called the first bill on the Consent Calendar, H.R. 2228, to provide for the acquisition of additional land along the Mount Vernon Memorial Highway in exchange for certain dredging privileges, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

HANDLING OF STUDENT FUNDS IN INDIAN SCHOOLS OPERATED BY THE BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3643) to regulate the handling of student funds in Indian schools operated by the Bureau of Indian Affairs, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Interior may authorize officials or employees of the Bureau of Indian Affairs to accept and to disburse deposits of funds of students and student activity associations in schools operated by the Bureau of Indian Affairs. Such deposits shall be accounted for under rules and regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the Interior.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TO REVISE, CODIFY, AND ENACT INTO LAW TITLE 39, UNITED STATES CODE, ENTITLED "THE POSTAL SERVICE"

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2339) to revise, codify, and enact into law title 39 of the United States Code entitled "The Postal Service."

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, last week the members of the objectors' committee on both sides of the aisle had inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a statement as to the rules which the members of the objectors' committee would endeavor to follow in this Congress in the consideration of bills placed on the Consent Calender. If I read correctly the report of the bill now before the House it perhaps is unfortunate that the report bears certain language which would appear to cause the legislation to be ineligible for favorable consideration on the Consent Calendar. There appears in the report at page 2, the beginning of the last paragraph, the following statement:

Several of the Departments suggested a number of substantive changes to existing law. Many appear desirable to the Post Office Department. For the most part, however, they are not within the scope of legislation of this nature, but are more properly handled in legislation considered by the legislative committee having jurisdiction of the subject matter.

I would like to ask the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. WILLIS], if the Committee on the Judiciary made any changes in the substantive law in the measure which they now present to us.

Mr. WILLIS. I would say the policy of the committee is to deliberately avoid making changes in substantive law. In the passage which the gentleman read many changes are recommended, but a number of those changes we had to object to on the very basis of avoidance of making substantive changes. I would say to the gentleman that these bills are not brought out overnight. In some cases it takes years to codify a particular title. All Government agencies, in this instance particularly the Post Office Department, and even the Department of State, where foreign mail is involved, all interested department agencies collaborate in the preparation of these bills. The Bureau of the Budget must approve. The committee, in this instance the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, handling the legislation in point, collaborated with our committee, and the final work is an agreement all the way around to be sure that we try to carry out the very point that the gentleman is inquiring about.

Mr. ASPINALL. As I understand then, there are no real important changes made in the substantive law.

Mr. WILLIS. That is correct.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Speaker, in view of its length and, as usual, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be not printed in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlemen from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the committee amendments, as follows:

Page 52, in the chapter analysis strike out "3555. Reduction in salary step or level." and insert "3555. Reduction in salary step.";

Page 102, strike out the catchline and the first sentence of section 3555 reading:

"§ 3555. Reduction in salary step or level

"The Postmaster General may reduce in salary step or salary level an employee whose efficiency falls below a fair standard or whenever it is necessary for purposes of discipline."

and insert:

"§ 3555. Reduction in salary step

"The Postmaster General may reduce in salary step clerks or carriers whose efficiency falls below a fair standard or whenever it is necessary for purposes of discipline."

Page 168, in the first lines of paragraphs (1) and (2) of § 6409, strike out the word "continental."

The purpose of the committee amendments is to insure that the existing law is restated without substantive changes.

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DESIGN OF THE U.S. FLAG

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 75) providing for the design of the flag of the United States.

There being no objection the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That sections 1 and 2 of title 4, United States Code, are amended to read as follows:

"§ 1. Flag; design

"The flag of the United States shall have thirteen horizontal stripes of the same width, alternate red and white, with a union consisting of as many white stars on a field of blue as there are States in the Union.

"§ 2. Same; additional stars; dimensions

"(a) Whenever a new State is admitted to the Union the President shall cause a plan to be made setting forth the positions of the stars in the union of the flag. He shall also cause to be fixed the proportionate dimensions of the constituent parts of the flag.

"(b) The addition of each new star to the union of the flag shall take effect on the 4th day of July next succeeding the admission of a new State.

"(c) All flags of the United States on hand on the 4th day of July next succeeding the admission of a new State may be continued in use until unserviceable, but all flags manufactured for use after that date should conform to the design and specifications adopted pursuant to this section."

SEC. 2. Items 1 and 2 of the chapter analysis of chapter 1 of title 4 are amended to read as follows:

"Flag; design.

"Same; additional stars; dimensions."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DEFINING THE TERM "ORGANIZE" AS USED IN THE SMITH ACT

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2369) to amend section 2385, title 18, United States Code, to define the term "organize" as used in that section.

There being no objection the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 2385 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"As used in this section the term 'organize,' with respect to any society, group, or assembly of persons, includes the recruiting of new members, the forming of new units, and the regrouping or expansion of existing clubs, classes, and other units of such society, group, or assembly of persons."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF ESPIONAGE LAWS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1992) to repeal section 791 of title 18 of the United States Code so as to extend the application of chapter 37 of title 18, relating to espionage and censorship.

There being no objection the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 791 of title 18, United States Code, is repealed.

SEC. 2. The analysis of chapter 37 of such title is amended by deleting the following: "791. Scope of chapter."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ADDITIONAL PEREMPTORY CHALLENGES IN CIVIL CASES

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2978) to amend section 1870 of title 28, United States Code, to authorize the district courts to allow additional peremptory challenges in civil cases to multiple plaintiffs as well as multiple defendants.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to ask a question of a member of the Committee on the Judiciary, this bill having come from that committee. I notice that this legislation, or legislation comparable to it was pocket vetoed by the President a year ago, primarily for the reason that section 2 was added by the other body. In my examination of H.R. 2978 I see no such provision at the present time.

Mr. WILLIS. That is correct. The pocket veto addressed itself to a nongermane section attached to the bill in the other body. That section is not in this bill.

Mr. FORD. This is the bill as it was approved by the House a year or two ago?

Mr. WILLIS. Yes. It is requested by the Department of Justice and approved by the Bureau of the Budget.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section

1870 of title 28, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"§ 1870. Challenges

"In civil cases, each party shall be entitled to three peremptory challenges. Several defendants or several plaintiffs may be considered as a single party for the purposes of making challenges, or the court may allow additional peremptory challenges and permit them to be exercised separately or jointly.

"All challenges for cause or favor, whether to the array or panel or to individual jurors, shall be determined by the court."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COLORING MATURE ORANGES

The Clerk called the bill (S. 79) to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to permit the temporary listing and certification of Citrus Red No. 2 for coloring mature oranges under tolerances found safe by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, so as to permit continuance of established coloring practice in the orange industry pending congressional consideration of general legislation for the listing and certification of food color additives under safe tolerances.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill may be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

LIMITATION ON LIEUTENANT GENERALS IN THE MARINE CORPS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 3323) to establish a peacetime limitation on the number of lieutenant generals in the Marine Corps.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I have several question I should like to ask concerning this bill. First of all, as I understand, this would give the rank of lieutenant general permanently to three officers of the Marine Corps.

Mr. KILDAY. That is correct, but will the gentleman allow me to explain the bill briefly?

Mr. GROSS. Certainly.

Mr. KILDAY. In the first place, in the Officer Personnel Act of August 1947, provision is made for two lieutenant generals in the Marine Corps. That same law, the Officer Personnel Act, contains a provision which suspends the number during periods of national emergency. The national emergency declared incident to Korea is still in effect, and the Marine Corps now has on active duty five lieutenant generals.

After the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 was passed Congress changed the authorized strength of the Marine Corps by which they were limited to two lieutenant generals. The total authorized strength of the Marine Corps was set at 7,000 officers and 100,000 enlisted men. Subsequent to that time the present law fixing the strength of the Marine Corps was passed placing the strength at 400,000. That was after Congress had fixed the number of permanent lieutenant generals at two. The strength of the Marine Corps was increased very materially to consist of not less than three combat divisions and three air wings with a strength not to exceed 400,000, and, importantly, we changed the organization of the Marine Corps to require that they maintain three divisions and three combat wings.

So the bill would make provision for five permanent lieutenant generals. It would not increase the number of lieutenant generals now on duty in the Marine Corps nor, very importantly, would it change the total number of generals in the Marine Corps. These extra three would be charged to the total strength of the Marine Corps.

Mr. GROSS. You would make the three grades of lieutenant general permanent?

Mr. KILDAY. That is correct; it would become permanent. It will increase the permanent lieutenant general strength in the Marine Corps from two to five.

Mr. GROSS. What is the present strength of the Marine Corps? It is about 185,000?

Mr. KILDAY. I think 188,000 or a little less.

Mr. GROSS. In 1942 they had 143,000 approximately?

Mr. KILDAY. Yes.

Mr. GROSS. In 1942 there were 137 colonels and above in the Marine Corps; in 1959 there are 573 colonels and above in the Marine Corps.

Let me ask the gentleman why the number of colonels and generals has increased over three times the total Marine Corps growth?

Mr. KILDAY. First of all, may I say that while I do not have the figures before me as to the strength of the Marine Corps in 1942, for the purpose of this discussion I am willing to accept the figures that the gentleman from Iowa has mentioned.

There are a number of reasons for having more officers in these grades now than even during wartime, primarily because of the action of the Congress of the United States in passing the Officer Personnel Act of 1947. We were attempting at that time to prevent the loss of many highly trained and experienced officers.

We did a number of things to provide for that. The first thing we did was to increase the percentage of star ranks. We increased the percentage of generals and admirals from one-half of 1 percent to three-quarters of 1 percent of the total officer strength. In addition to that, we provided that men who had reached the grades of lieutenant colonel and colonel could remain on active duty for stated periods of 26 and 30 years total service. Those two things are material here.

In addition, there was at that time in the Marine Corps a situation as to colonels that the Commandant of the Marine Corps would not permit anyone to be appointed as a colonel who had less than 18 years of service. There were not enough available for that grade.

Mr. GROSS. By increasing the number of lieutenant generals from two to five does that mean a general increase in numbers of Marine Corps officers?

Mr. KILDAY. No. As I stated before, there is a provision in the Officer Personnel Act as to the total number of generals which the Marine Corps may have. That is not increased by this bill. So there can be no increase in the total number. There can only be the increase in the permanent law of the number of lieutenant generals now on active duty.

Mr. GROSS. Would there be increases in the grades of a number of officers if these lieutenant general grades are made permanent?

Mr. KILDAY. No; that would not be true. That is controlled not only by the percentage distribution of the Officer Personnel Act but by the Arends Act known as the Officer Grade Limitation Act.

Mr. GROSS. Can the gentleman give me any idea of the ages of the officers that are here proposed to be promoted?

Mr. KILDAY. Offhand, I do not know. They are, of course, the most senior generals of the Armed Forces. I would say somewhere in their fifties.

Mr. GROSS. Somewhere in their fifties?

Mr. KILDAY. I think they are all in their fifties or thereabouts.

Mr. GROSS. Are any of these officers who would be given permanent rank drawing flight pay?

Mr. KILDAY. I think there is one.

Mr. GROSS. A newspaper account the other evening said two. I wonder if that figure is correct.

Mr. KILDAY. There may be two, I would not be certain about that, but, of course, this bill does not affect them.

Mr. GROSS. If this legislation is not passed these three lieutenant generals will eventually have to go back to major generals; will they not?

Mr. KILDAY. No. They will finally retire and they will retire in the highest grade satisfactorily held. So they would retire as lieutenant generals.

Mr. GROSS. The Navy has a habit of promoting its officers a grade just before they retire, is that not correct?

Mr. KILDAY. No; I do not think so. The Senate has control of confirmations, of course, and they have been riding pretty close herd on them with reference to that.

Mr. GROSS. Well, I doubt they are riding such close herd as the gentleman thinks.

Mr. KILDAY. I think what the gentleman has in mind is another provision of law that we repealed some time ago where men, because of a combat citation in their record in the past, were retired one grade higher than the grade which they actually held at the time of their retirement. But, in 1949 we repealed that as to any person for any commendation earned after December 31, 1946.

Mr. GROSS. But there is nothing to prevent promotion just before retirement, is there, in the law today? There is nothing to prevent promotion, so that these gentlemen, if given the permanent grade of lieutenant general, could be,

before retirement, promoted to full general and draw that retirement?

Mr. KILDAY. The gentleman is confused. These men, having served a sufficient period of time already as lieutenant generals, no matter in what grade they may be serving at the time they retire, will retire as lieutenant generals, the highest rank satisfactorily held. That is true of every member of the military service, where he serves in a temporary grade higher than his permanent grade, if he serves satisfactorily in that grade, and that is usually defined to be 6 months of service in that grade, and then he retires in his temporary grade with the pay of his temporary grade, so this would not affect that at all.

Mr. GROSS. Does the gentleman think that we should, under the circumstances that exist in this country, logically add three more permanent lieutenant generals to the Marine Corps?

Mr. KILDAY. We are not adding a thing to the Marine Corps, and under the conditions which exist in the country and in the world today, I do not believe we should take any action that would indicate any diminution in the power or striking ability of the Marine Corps. I do not think we can afford to do that.

Mr. GROSS. Why do you want to give them this permanent rank?

Mr. KILDAY. Well, I would say to the gentleman, why should we not? In 1947, with a total strength of 100,000, we limited them to two lieutenant generals. At that time the authorized strength was 100,000 enlisted men and 7,000 officers. We changed it materially here in the Congress. We provided that the Marine Corps shall at all times consist of three combat divisions and three combat wings, so that when you increase the organizational strength and the number of organizations, when you provide for the number of divisions, then you have got to have the higher ranking officers in order to command that organization. That would be true even though your total strength was less. If you have three divisions at half strength, you would still have to have three division commanders, just as you have to have three division commanders when you have three divisions at full combat strength.

Mr. GROSS. May I ask the gentleman this question? If these three officers were to retire, would they retire as major generals or lieutenant generals?

Mr. KILDAY. Lieutenant generals.

Mr. GROSS. As lieutenant generals?

Mr. KILDAY. Yes.

Mr. GROSS. They would be retired without any further action by Congress?

Mr. KILDAY. That is true under present law.

Mr. GROSS. I want to go back to this flight pay business for just a moment, because I think that very serious attention needs to be given by the Congress.

Mr. KILDAY. I do not understand why the gentleman refers to flight pay in connection with this.

Mr. GROSS. Because the whole cost is going to be greater. The gentleman knows if these three are elevated to lieutenant generals, they will retire under any condition, at least as lieutenant generals, and the cost to the taxpayers will be greater.

Mr. KILDAY. I believe the gentleman is thinking of an old law.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice so that I may have more time to study it.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

MAINTENANCE AND TRAVEL EXPENSES OF JUDGES

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2909) relating to the maintenance and travel expenses of judges.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. That is the last eligible bill on the Consent Calendar.

COLORING ORANGES

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill (S. 79) to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to permit the temporary listing and certification of Citrus Red No. 2 for coloring mature oranges under tolerances found safe by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, so as to permit continuance of established coloring practice in the orange industry pending congressional consideration of general legislation for the listing and certification of food color additives under safe tolerances, be recommitted to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, the bill, S. 79, which passed the Senate unanimously, was reported favorably and unanimously by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce on February 23, 1959.

Through inadvertence, the calendar bill print of S. 79, as reported by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce—Union Calendar No. 13—is incorrect. The print set forth the bill as it was introduced in the Senate rather than the bill as it was passed by the Senate. The bill as passed by the Senate contains a number of amendments which were requested by the Food and Drug Administration to make clear beyond any doubt that this legislation is temporary emergency legislation which will become inoperative with the enactment of general legislation concerning food color additives.

My request for recommittal of S. 79 is made for the purpose of having a corrected calendar bill prepared.

THE LATE HON. J. HARRY McGREGOR

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HESS].

Mr. HESS. Mr. Speaker, all Members of the House and especially those of the Ohio delegation, I am sure join with me in the tribute of respect to the memory of our former colleague, J. HARRY MCGREGOR, who has been called from us.

HARRY MCGREGOR was born in Ohio, was educated in its public schools and colleges, and served in the First World War from Ohio. He was a member of the Ohio Legislature from 1935 through 1940. During his service, he was floor leader and Speaker pro tempore.

He came to the House of Representatives on February 27, 1940, to succeed our late colleague, the Honorable William Ashbrook; and served successively from the 77th Congress through the 85th Congress.

HARRY MCGREGOR'S interest was the welfare of the people of the district he served so long. He was interested in the needs of the older people. He was interested in the farmers of Ohio and of the Nation. He was interested in the veterans of our wars; and through his own military service, was a member of all of the veterans' organizations of Ohio.

His was a long, active, and useful life. He gave unstintingly of his time and his enormous capacity for work, to the improvement of the condition of the people of his district and of the State and country.

Unsung work for public welfare and the common good may lack glamor; but what is lacked in glamor was filled for him with the affection, understanding, and good will of the people in whose causes and for whose welfare he labored so unselfishly.

We of the House of Representatives shall miss his calm, wise, and sober counsel, his willingness to give of himself; and his stanch and steadfast loyalty to the causes for which he stood.

Now he rests in his beloved State of Ohio in the midst of friends and family. We, his colleagues, share the void to which everyone feels at the passing of so fine a friend, so dedicated a public servant of us all.

To his children, we extend our deepest sympathy, confident that the memories HARRY MCGREGOR left will be a consolation to his bereaved and a warm and affectionate memory to the people whom he served. I have lost a friend and Ohio a loyal and courageous son.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN].

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join with the chairman of the Ohio delegation [Mr. HESS] in paying tribute to our former colleague, the late lamented J. HARRY MCGREGOR.

It was my high privilege to know HARRY MCGREGOR and his fine family; his wife, his son, and two daughters, throughout almost a lifetime.

I believe our first acquaintance, between Mr. McGREGOR and myself, came about just after World War I had ended. He served the State of Ohio ably and well in the Legislature where his services were such that when the Congressman from the 17th Ohio district then sitting as a Member in this Chamber passed away, Mr. McGREGOR was selected, and elected in a special election, to represent that great Ohio district here. He did so, for practically 20 years, in a way which won him great renown and high respect.

HARRY McGREGOR in private life engaged in highway construction and other contracting work. That experience fitted him especially well to serve as a member of the House Committee on Public Works, where he was one of the real leaders in giving to America not only a splendid interstate highway system, many river and harbor improvements, the St. Lawrence Seaway, and numerous effective flood control projects in various States. The country as a whole is indebted to him for his service in these particular fields. In fact, these great public works, which have been made effective since HARRY McGREGOR came to the Congress, stand as memorials to him today.

His sudden passing last October came as a shock to all of us who knew him, loved him, and served with him here in the House of Representatives. We have all suffered a great loss, but that loss is an especial one for the Ohio delegation, and for the people of our Ohio. To his two daughters, his son, and his grandchildren, we extend our deepest and most sincere sympathy in the great loss that has been theirs.

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HESS. I yield.

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Speaker, I rise with heavy heart to say a few words about my good friend, the late J. HARRY McGREGOR, longtime Member of Congress from Ohio, who left us much too soon.

HARRY and I were close friends and legislative colleagues for almost a quarter of a century. We were both members of the Ohio House of Representatives from early 1935 until HARRY was elected to Congress in early 1940. During that time, he was minority whip and then majority leader. HARRY was an energetic whip and was a persuasive and effective majority leader. He seldom, if ever, failed in his goals as a majority leader.

During his service in the Ohio House of Representatives, he sponsored and was the leader who caused to be enacted into law, school and highway proposals of lasting benefit to Ohio.

His interest in the conservation of our natural resources and his tireless and effective work for flood control is well known to all leaders in this field.

Finally, those who served with him in the Congress well know his fine leadership in all public works, and particularly, in the field of public highways.

An enthusiastic and effective legislator and a great and good friend has left us. Thousands will knowingly and countless millions will unknowingly miss a legislator who has done so much for so many. His fine family has the sympathy of friends everywhere.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to join my colleagues in paying tribute to our dear lamented friend, HARRY McGREGOR. He was a dedicated Congressman. He served his district, State, and Nation well.

I had the pleasure of having many contacts with him at various times. Although he was of a different political persuasion, he was always considerate, courteous, and gracious. He endeared himself to the Members of this House, on both sides of the aisle. We all mourn his loss which will be severely felt in this House.

Mr. HESS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BROOKS].

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I rise at this time to place a wreath on the grave of our departed friend, HARRY McGREGOR. I knew HARRY well. I saw him often in the course of his work, although my committee assignment was different from that of our departed friend. It was always a pleasure to work with him. He was kindly, friendly, always courteous, and he was most competent. I worked especially with him on the highway program to which he devoted many, many long, tireless hours of effort in most unselfish service to the country that he loved so well.

There is a saying asked in the form of a question to the effect "Where, oh where, are the snows of yesteryear?" The snows of yesteryear are gone. They are melted. They are in the streams and forests and farmlands and the richness of the Nation."

So likewise the ability, the sincere achievements, great energies of this great American HARRY McGREGOR who has left us are to be found in the achievements that he supported and the accomplishments which he passed on to the people of America. Now our citizenry is richer and more capable and happier because of his having been a Member of this great body.

Mr. HESS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HENDERSON].

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I desire to join with his friends in paying tribute to HARRY McGREGOR, for many years our colleague here in Congress.

Geographically, HARRY McGREGOR was closer to me and my district than any other Member of Congress, because he lived in the extreme southern part of his district, just adjacent to my own district.

In many other respects HARRY McGREGOR was closer to me than any other Member of Congress. When I first met him I formed an opinion that stayed with me throughout our association together, that here was a man, dedicated to his district and to his Nation, determined in the course that he would take. I liked him and his manner.

HARRY took great pleasure in life. One thing that set him apart was the jollity, the laughter, and the smile of HARRY McGREGOR. We saw it on his face and we knew it was in his heart. You could watch HARRY McGREGOR come into a room with that smile as if by magic, it was imparted to all who watched his face. They became filled with the same sense of lightheartedness that so characterized HARRY McGREGOR.

I watched his work on the floor and the dedication that he displayed. His words in debate carried an insistence that the truth be known. We felt impelled to follow what he demonstrated to be the best course for our Nation.

He was fair, he was able, in his efforts to be of service to his district.

His wife had come from Muskingum County of the 15th District, and Mrs. McGregor and her Congressman husband were known, loved, and held in great esteem in that portion of my district. Whenever I traveled through that area I was constantly being asked: "How is HARRY McGREGOR?" "How is Mrs. McGregor?" And on many occasions his friends there told of the great work that HARRY had performed in behalf of the constituents of his district.

The service that he rendered for those of his district is just one part of HARRY McGREGOR'S life. Here on the floor of Congress, he worked for them. He also worked for all America. Many of the great public works and highways throughout the United States are monuments to the service and foresight of HARRY McGREGOR.

But in his children and his grandchildren we have the living characterization of HARRY McGREGOR'S personality.

They miss him, but they are strengthened and comforted by the realization that he was a great man who served his Nation well. We miss him, too.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HESS. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, it is with a heavy heart that I join today in the eulogies for our late departed colleague, HARRY McGREGOR, with whom I was privileged to serve as a member of the minority on the Public Works Committee, having been a member of that committee since I was elected to Congress some 5 years ago.

HARRY McGREGOR was a great public servant; HARRY McGREGOR was an outstanding American; HARRY McGREGOR was the ranking minority member of the Roads Subcommittee of the Public Works Committee, and through his sponsorship of legislation the great interstate and other Federal-aid highway systems came closer to fruition than at any time previously. It was through his efforts and sponsorship of legislation that the forerunners of the great 1956 Interstate and Defense Highway Act came into being. It was his bill, his sponsorship of legislation in the Republican 83d Congress that resulted in the passage of the forerunner of the great Highway System Act in the 84th and the 85th Congresses. This great Interstate and Defense Highway System is a monument and a tribute to HARRY McGREGOR. He was more interested and qualified in this subject, I venture to say, than any

other Member of the House has been in recent years.

It was indeed a pleasure to serve with him, and it was my great pleasure and privilege to come to know of his ability and dedication on the Public Works Committee. He succeeded as ranking Republican member the Honorable George Dondero who in his turn served with equal ability and distinction.

J. HARRY MCGREGOR was a man of deep conviction, he was a man of sound judgment. He was a man who did not hesitate to get up on the floor and present those principles in which he believed and to fight for them. He was a hard-working and aggressive man, and as a freshman and since I have deemed it a high privilege to serve with him. He gave the greatest leadership and encouragement to me as a member of the Public Works Committee. His understanding of the problems faced by new Members, and his helpfulness to them will linger long not only in my memory but also in the memory of many others in the Congress who came to know him and seek his wise counsel in recent years. It is a high honor for me to join in these eulogies of our departed colleague. He was a great man, an outstanding American J. HARRY MCGREGOR.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HESS. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, I want to join my colleagues who have paid tribute to the memory of J. HARRY MCGREGOR today. I extend my sympathy to the members of the Ohio delegation for the great loss which they have sustained in the passing of our departed colleague, for whom we had such great affection.

I was shocked and saddened last year when I learned of his untimely death, which was an irreparable loss to all of us who knew him.

HARRY MCGREGOR was a Member of the House when I came here and I soon recognized him as one of the outstanding Members of this body. He was an able, capable, and efficient legislator. He worked diligently and conscientiously upon all legislation before his committee, as others have mentioned here today. Whatever he did he did right.

I know that our former colleague, the Honorable William S. Hill, of Colorado, would join in these eulogies to HARRY MCGREGOR if he were here today, as they were very close friends over the years. It was through Mr. Hill that I learned to know HARRY MCGREGOR better and to more fully appreciate his sterling qualities.

HARRY was always congenial and affable. He spread good cheer wherever he happened to be and it was a real pleasure to visit with him.

Mr. Speaker, we can ill afford to lose men like HARRY MCGREGOR in these critical times. His passing was not only a great loss to his district, but to the State of Ohio and to the entire Nation. He was truly a great American, a fine public servant, and a Christian gentleman.

Mr. LEVERING. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HESS. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. LEVERING. Mr. Speaker, it is now my high honor to represent the good people of Ohio's 17th District, the district that was so well represented by the late J. HARRY MCGREGOR for some 18 years. I take this time to join with his other colleagues here in the House in paying tribute to his memory and to extend my sincere sympathy to the members of his family who survive him.

Many of you who have been here for a long time knew J. HARRY MCGREGOR more intimately than I and I know that you, too, can attest to his unfailing courtesy, generosity, and hard work. He faithfully reflected the views of his district, and was considered a stalwart for good government. The high caliber of his representation of the people in our district was reflected by the strong support he invariably received at the polls time and time again.

Although I was his political challenger for the past 10 years, I greatly admired and respected Congressman MCGREGOR personally and for his views on public problems.

Back home he was known personally to thousands of people. J. HARRY MCGREGOR was a people's Congressman. The people felt close to the late J. HARRY MCGREGOR. They felt at all times that they could sit down with him and talk over personal problems, their fears and their hopes for this great country.

I think his practice of going into the district and holding conferences, informal in nature, at the court houses and other places was a most commendable one. This is important if we are to have true representative government in America. It was being close to the people and learning what the people at the grassroots really thought of the issues, great and small, before this country.

The Ohio delegation in Congress, in my opinion, has indeed lost one of its most esteemed members, and the 17th District has lost an able and dedicated spokesman. His family, his two daughters, Mrs. Monroe Horst, Mrs. Warde Butler, and his son, Harry Laird McGregor, have lost a devoted father.

I know that those of you who knew him best in the House of Representatives and in the Senate will join me in this tribute to his memory.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. HESS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks in the RECORD on the life and character of the late J. HARRY MCGREGOR.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHENCK. Mr. Speaker, it is with a heavy heart that I join with my good friend, the chairman of the Ohio Republican delegation, Mr. HESS, in paying tribute to a departed friend and colleague.

J. HARRY MCGREGOR was a warm and friendly man and a devoted public servant. Prior to his election as a Member of Congress, he served with distinction in the Ohio Legislature. Here in Congress he made invaluable contributions to the legislation before the Public Works Committee. With all his work, however, he was never too busy to help others. Time and again I recall his assistance when I was new here, and I treasured his counsel. Those of us who knew him realized his great loss when his beloved wife, Twila, died earlier last year. The McGregors had always been a happy, loving couple. Now he has gone to join her, united again in God's love. To his daughters and son I want to extend my deepest sympathy.

Mr. BAUMHART. Mr. Speaker, during the heat of the past congressional campaign, on October 7, 1958, I was deeply shocked to learn of the sudden passing of one of my best friends and colleagues in the House, J. HARRY MCGREGOR, of the 17th Ohio District. It was impossible to express my sadness to the House since we were in recess, but I and my fellow Members want to speak of him today, and to extend our heartfelt condolence to his daughters, his son, and their families.

HARRY was preceded in death by his beloved wife, Twila, by less than a year, and it was well known to his friends and family the deep burden of grief he carried.

HARRY was my predecessor as "Whip" of the Ohio delegation, and I will always cherish a photograph now hanging on the wall of my office in which he is pictured turning the symbolic whip over to me.

It was my privilege to serve with him in the Ohio State Legislature, where he served the State of Ohio in the house of representatives from 1935, through 1940. During that period of time he also served as minority whip and secretary of the finance committee, as well as majority floor leader and speaker pro tempore. HARRY'S career in Washington in the U.S. House of Representatives was no less distinguished, he being elected at a special election in 1940, and reelected to the 77th on through the 85th Congresses. He proved his dedication to good government through all his outstanding public service. He will be a man long remembered not only for his personal warmth and sweetness of character, but for his complete honesty and integrity. I well remember how many of the staff people with whom he came in daily contact admired and respected him. This combination of personal warmth and dedication to the principles of good government is often difficult to attain, but we all will remember HARRY for these qualities.

He will be sorely missed by all his colleagues.

Mr. BETTS. Mr. Speaker, it is difficult to adequately express one's feelings at the loss of a friend. J. HARRY MCGREGOR was my long-time personal friend. Our friendship began back in the Ohio General Assembly when we were both members of its house of representatives 20 years ago. Our close association over the years gave me ample opportunity to observe the character and ability of HARRY MCGREGOR. He was

a courageous statesman and met every issue openly and without flinching. His qualities as a leader were shown on many occasions but particularly as majority floor leader of the Ohio House of Representatives and the ranking Republican member of his committee in Congress.

HARRY MCGREGOR was respected and admired by his friends and associates both in and out of public life. An example of the esteem in which he was held was the honors which he received as a member of the Masonic Order.

But more significant than any of these accomplishments was the fact that he was in every sense of the word a family man. He and his wife were a devoted couple and with their three fine children made a typical American family. With his many friends and colleagues I share their sadness at his passing.

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, it is a personal privilege to salute the memory of our late colleague, J. HARRY MCGREGOR.

He was more than an able Member of Congress—he was a trailblazer with the courage of his convictions. Future generations will thank HARRY MCGREGOR for his magnificent leadership which gives them the vast Interstate Highway System so essential to our Nation's commerce and defense. None of us who served with him in the 84th Congress will forget his brilliant fight to achieve this victory.

HARRY MCGREGOR will be remembered, too, as an outspoken opponent of sprawling bureaucracy, particularly in those areas where public power threatened the just and legitimate rights of private enterprise. His philosophy of Federal assistance was Lincolnian.

Long before it became popular and expedient, HARRY MCGREGOR fought communism. He waged a vigorous battle against senseless giveaways to the Soviet Union and its satellites. He was one of four Republican Members flown to China in 1952 for conferences with Chinese Nationalist officers and U.S. administrators of aid in Formosa.

HARRY MCGREGOR was Republican floor leader in the Ohio State Legislature when I served there nearly 20 years ago. When I came to Washington in 1955, his counsel was wise and generous and sparkling with the infectious good humor which made him liked by all—even those who disagreed with his public views. He was a warm and loyal friend, a valued adviser, and a tireless servant of the 17th District of Ohio.

Last fall, at the very height of a campaign for reelection, death overtook HARRY MCGREGOR unexpectedly at his home in Coshocton, Ohio. Just as he had lived all his life, HARRY MCGREGOR died a fighter.

Less than 2 years before, on Christmas Day 1956, he lost his beloved wife, Twila. To their three surviving children I extend my heartfelt sympathy.

I know they will remember the farewell of Mr. Valient-for-truth in Bunyan's "Pilgrim's Progress." The words are particularly appropriate for HARRY MCGREGOR:

My sword I give to him that shall succeed me in my pilgrimage, and my courage and skill to him that can get it.

My marks and scars I carry with me, to be a witness for me, that I have fought His battle that now shall be my rewarder.

Mr. HIESTAND. Mr. Speaker, in losing our beloved colleague, Congressman HARRY MCGREGOR, of Ohio, we here in Congress and the people of this Nation have lost a real statesman.

Ever attacking every problem from the viewpoint of "What's best for the people of America," HARRY MCGREGOR was one of the most conscientious and thorough Congressmen it has been my pleasure to know.

Ever maintaining an objective viewpoint, his was a truly selfless service.

Ever mindful of the varied viewpoints of many Members from both sides of the aisle, he won much support for measures he espoused.

HARRY MCGREGOR, to my knowledge, had no enemies. His colleagues mourned with him the loss a year before of his beloved wife and partner for many years. We really shared his grief.

Ever mindful, however, of his duty to his district and his country, he bore up bravely and worked hard and effectively despite his great loss.

We of California and I in particular who knew him well join his Ohio colleagues in paying the highest tribute to J. HARRY MCGREGOR, gentleman, scholar, indefatigable worker, delightful character, but above all, statesman.

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Speaker, when I first met Mr. and Mrs. McGregor, Harry and Twila, I had the feeling that I was in the company of a wonderful couple. There was a team spirit that existed between them that was difficult to explain. When they were separated HARRY'S loss was great. He carried on but there was not the same will to win.

J. HARRY MCGREGOR'S thoughtfulness, understanding, and dedication will never be forgotten by those who were fortunate enough to know him. I miss him.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, when one has served 18 years here in this great legislative body, the bonds welded are strong and they go deep. Between HARRY MCGREGOR and myself there was an even closer tie than most because we shared a special election on February 27, 1940.

A pleasant companion and a good friend—a hard-working Congressman and a loyal citizen—such was HARRY MCGREGOR. One could disagree with him as, I confess, I often did, but disagreement interfered not at all with our friendship. As Ohio whip he served the Republican Party and the Ohio Republican delegation well.

Tireless in his efforts to serve his constituents he gave himself with enthusiasm to work in their behalf, keeping in close touch with their hopes, their fears, their concrete desires, and their needs. The 17th District will miss his heartful service, Ohio will miss his constant watchful work in her interests and the United States a faithful worker in these Halls.

To his fine children and grandchildren I do extend my warmest sympathy and the hope that they know with deep certainty that—

They have not died
They live and breathe with you
They walk now, here at your side
They tell you things are true.

They live, they know, they see
They shout with every breath
All is Eternal Life.
There is no death.

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Speaker, it is most fitting that we who knew him best should gather here today to pay tribute to the worth and works of our friend and colleague, the Honorable HARRY MCGREGOR, of Ohio, who died during last year's fall recess of Congress.

I often think that the roadbuilder is among the greatest benefactors of mankind. The roads they build make it possible for people to get together easier and more frequently to exchange ideas and obtain inspiration from one another. Roads also facilitate the flow of commerce and the exchange of goods, thus promote prosperity and improve living standards.

Our friend HARRY MCGREGOR was a roadbuilder, one of the best and most effective of them, and therefore by his life and works one of the great benefactors of mankind. In private life he was a road contractor and during his 20 years in Congress he was a member of the Public Works Committee and its Subcommittee on Roads.

In the 83d Congress Mr. MCGREGOR was chairman of the Roads Committee and was the author of the Highway Act of that year which paved the way for the greatest advance in roadbuilding this Nation had ever made to that time.

In the 84th and 85th Congresses HARRY MCGREGOR was ranking minority member of the Public Works Committee and along with the Honorable GEORGE FALLON of Maryland, they did more than anyone else to write the present expanded highway program into law. This law, in my opinion, is one of the greatest achievements of Congress in the past 25 years.

HARRY MCGREGOR by his tireless work in Congress for better roads has paved the way for a stronger, more prosperous and happier Nation for generations to come. His work has made all the tomorrows of our Nation better than its yesterdays. Such a life is most worth while.

HARRY MCGREGOR departed life carrying with him the affection of all of us who knew him for he had brought joy into our lives with his friendly and sunny disposition. He left us possessed of our admiration and gratitude because of his large contributions as a legislator to the strength and betterment of our Nation and its citizenry.

AMERICAN BAR ASSOCIATION RECOMMENDATIONS

Mr. SELDEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. SELDEN. Mr. Speaker, last week the house of delegates of the American Bar Association overwhelmingly adopted the report of its special committee on Communist tactics, strategy, and objectives. This report was printed in full in the February 25 issue of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

It is extremely interesting to note that this distinguished body of American lawyers, eminently qualified to examine judicial decisions, agrees with the fears voiced by various Members of this body that certain decisions of the Supreme Court have broadly and unnecessarily limited national and State efforts to protect our people and our Government against Communist activities.

While the bar association's recommendations will require careful study and preparation of legislative proposals in a number of areas, one subject on which this body is in a position to act promptly is that of passport security. The bar association committee's report singles out the Supreme Court's passport decisions of June 1958 as an example of the weakening of our security defenses and strongly recommends remedial legislation. It will be recalled that a divided Court ruled the Secretary of State had no authority in the absence of specific legislation to withhold passports from supporters of the international Communist movement.

Although the administration submitted legislative proposals to the last Congress, those proposals were considered too broad and sweeping by a majority of the committee that examined them. A shorter bill which I introduced at that time was passed by the House in the closing days of the session.

Several weeks ago I introduced a bill, H.R. 55, identical to that which was passed in the last Congress by this body. In the light of the determinations now reached by leading representatives of the American Bar after a detailed, objective study, I would urge that we proceed promptly to consideration and passage of legislation which would authorize the Secretary of State to deny passports to supporters of the international Communist movement and to close this gap in our defenses against those who would undermine this Nation.

JAMES A. GARFIELD NATIONAL MONUMENT

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a bill today directing the Superintendent of the National Capital Parks to remove the James A. Garfield Monument from its present location at First Street and Maryland Avenue SW. to another suitable site on real property of the United States situate in or near the District of Columbia. Under the provisions of my bill the new location for the monument will be selected by the Commission of Fine Arts.

The measure I have introduced would also direct the Superintendent of the National Capital Parks to repave the site now occupied by the James A. Garfield Monument and otherwise redevelop it in cooperation with the Commission of Fine Arts.

My purpose in introducing this bill is to remove what I consider to be one of the greatest hazards to traffic existing today in Washington and at the same time to provide a more fitting site for the location of an outstanding memorial to a great American. As we all know, the monument is located at the foot of Capitol Hill in the center of one of the busiest and most heavy traversed streets in Washington.

In addition to the heavy automotive traffic, First Street SW. contains two lines of track of the D.C. Transit System, Inc. Trolley cars make frequent trips over this line.

First Street runs at the foot of Capitol Hill in a north and south direction. Southbound trolley cars, upon reaching the Garfield Monument, are forced to go around it on the left side in the face of traffic proceeding north. This results in a very hazardous situation for all types of vehicular traffic.

The James A. Garfield Monument was erected by the Society of the Army of the Cumberland with assistance from the Federal Government. It was dedicated on March 12, 1887, to the memory of President Garfield, whose death took place on September 19, 1881, after having been shot by a disappointed officeseeker in July of that year.

President Garfield was a brave soldier in the Union Army during the War Between the States, and his tragic death resulted in the creation of one of our most important Federal agencies, the U.S. Civil Service Commission.

By introducing a bill to remove his national monument to a more suitable location, I in no way intend to reflect upon this great American. President Garfield's place in American history is secure. He gave his life while serving in the highest office his country could offer.

The Garfield National Monument was erected before the day of modern vehicular traffic. When it was dedicated no one could foresee the day when First Street SW. would be the artery for heavy automotive and trolley traffic. Had such a situation been visualized I am sure that those patriotic and devoted Americans who erected the monument would have selected a more suitable site.

I doubt if there is a Member of this House who has not at some time or another had difficulty in getting around the Garfield Monument. Probably there are some in this House who have had near accidents at the monument.

I have utmost confidence in the work being performed by the National Capital Parks and the Commission of Fine Arts. I know that these splendid agencies, if authority is granted to them to do so, will find a suitable place for the location of this monument to a great American. I think it is fitting and proper that this memorial to our second martyred President should be placed in an area more in keeping with its dignity and historic significance.

I hope that my colleagues in the House will support my bill to remove the monument.

HOW THE PEOPLE OF WISCONSIN FEEL ABOUT DICTATORS

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, last Tuesday, February 24, I addressed the House on "How the People of Wisconsin Feel About Dictators"—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, February 24, 1959, pages 2901–2905. My point was that the people of Wisconsin dislike dictatorships, and therefore disagree with the views expressed in an address made early in February by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. WITHROW] to a joint session of the Dominican Congress. I inserted in the RECORD a text of that address as printed in the English-language newspaper, Herald of the Dominican Republic, for February 7, 1959.

On Friday, February 20, 4 days before my February 24 speech, in order to check the accuracy of the text contained in the Herald of the Dominican Republic, my office called the office of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. WITHROW] and asked for a copy of his remarks to the Dominican Congress. We were told that, unfortunately, his office had no further copies.

On Monday, February 23, at 4 o'clock in the afternoon, a member of my staff delivered to the office of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. WITHROW] a copy of the text of the Herald of the Dominican Republic, accompanied by the following letter:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., February 23, 1959.

Hon. GARDNER R. WITHROW,
Member of Congress, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR GARDNER: I am securing a special order to address the House tomorrow, Tuesday, February 24, 1959, on the problem of dictators.

In the course of this address, I shall have to refer to your recent remarks to the Dominican Congress as reported in the Herald of the Dominican Republic, dated Saturday, February 7, 1959. I enclose a copy of the text of your speech as it appeared in this newspaper. I intend to offer this text for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

I am writing this letter so that you may have prior notification of my subject.

Sincerely,

HENRY S. REUSS,
Member of Congress.

Some 23 hours later at around 3 o'clock Tuesday afternoon, February 24, during the course of my remarks on the floor, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. WITHROW] indicated that the report of his address as contained in the Herald of the Dominican Republic was inaccurate, in that he had not in fact used the term "nitwit," as attributed to him in the text of the Herald of the Dominican Republic.

Last Thursday afternoon, February 26, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. WITHROW] came to me and handed me a text of his address to the Dominican Congress which he stated to be completely accurate. It should be noted that Mr. WITHROW's text, unlike the text as printed in the Herald of the Dominican Republic, does not contain the word "nitwit," nor does it contain a reference to the House Committee on Foreign Affairs. I include at this point Mr. WITHROW's text in its entirety:

Mr. President, distinguished guests, friends, I am a little surprised in finding myself here with you today. It was by invitation that I came to visit in the Dominican Republic this week. I was happy to accept the invitation, because I have long wanted to visit this home of Columbus, discoverer of America, and because I have been attracted by the unexcelled record of the Dominican Republic in our war against communism. I came as a friend, but you have now raised me to the level of an official visitor. You have bestowed upon me a privilege that is yours alone to give. I shall long remember this privilege.

The weather, the food, the hospitality of those in official position, and those good citizens whom I met on streets and in their offices and in their homes—all have impressed me greatly. I suppose I should confine myself here to political niceties, and spend my time recounting some of the details of my visit and my observations. I think I shall save this for a report on this trip, which I intend to make to the House of Representatives upon my return to Washington. I think more fact-interested people in the United States ought to have these observations.

And, I suppose I ought to speak in platitudes; but I am not going to do this. Let me talk with you on some events and matters which are of supreme importance to you, and to us in the United States, and to all of us in the Western Hemisphere. These are grave times.

What I am about to say might be called independence. It is. It is the same type of independence which you as a nation have displayed, and for which you must be respected and admired. I have developed the feeling that the Dominican Republic, by its nature, is willing to meet another country or another person more than half way. It is a feeling that you like, and you want to be liked. But, at the same time, it is also clear that you do not really need anyone to get along. I congratulate you on a real independence. Never surrender it.

I stand before you as a friend who defends you when I feel you are right and one who is absolutely certain that if the American States had followed the recommendations of the Dominican Republic first made at Caracas—had we followed them, communism would be a diminishing force in this hemisphere today. Instead, I fear communism grows more and more bold. You can no more compromise with communism than you can with crime. You simply erase it by outlawing it. That was your simple solution.

The world today trembles with rumors of war. We in the United States do not want war, we want only peace, and we will go to almost any lengths to maintain peace. I am no less concerned about war in another sense—revolution, rebellion, civil war. The success of communism lies not in armed conflict of nation against nation. Communism is something which divides a country within itself, and to me this is a far worse crime against Christianity than actual armed warfare when the causes are clear and sometimes just.

There are always small groups who covet war and who encourage rebellion. I think we can identify most of them as Communists. The others would be those who just do not realize what they are doing, and some who seek personal gain. The U.S. foreign aid program has in some instances made international politics profitable, and in still other cases the necessities for U.S. loans is ample evidence that these revolutionaries cannot cope with the complexities of modern government. The administration of a government today is a delicate and difficult thing. The currency and economic crisis of many European countries is satisfactory evidence of the touch needed by a successful administrator. You here in the Dominican Republic have been fortunate in your government. It has brought you peace and prosperity. There are so few countries over the world who could even approach your achievements. I know you give full credit to the amazing abilities of Generalissimo Trujillo, and we do, too. If the generalissimo could be persuaded to turn author, and could be persuaded to write a book on government, the record he has established would make this book required reading in the governments throughout the world. I hope some good friend might prevail upon the generalissimo to write such a best seller.

Economists everywhere who have been unable to do anything write books on how to do it. Here, then, is an administrator who has done it, and who could write the first such authentic book.

We speak eloquently of a free world. Let me tell you very frankly that the United States, and the free nation bloc, is not free to make the decisions today that we might make under different circumstances. The foreign aid program, about which the American taxpayer complains so loudly and for which the President is so insistent and which Congress reluctantly approves—this foreign aid program is mute evidence that we are not free to decide a problem or an issue independently and as we might if the cold war was not with us. Success in the cold war requires us to be expedient, distasteful as it may be to those of us who devoutly believe in principles.

The last war fought upon American soil was the War Between the States in 1861. We called that our Civil War. Our President at that time was the brilliant Abraham Lincoln, who I am proud to say, was a Republican. It was his immortal words "this Nation cannot exist half slave and half free" which rang down through our internal war. Let us apply those immortal words of Lincoln to today. Can this world exist when the peoples of the world are half in slavery of communism and half free?

There are just four reasons for war. The first would be a war for land to live upon. War of this type went out in the early centuries, and except for the Peoples Republic of China, I cannot envision another nation starting a war of this kind and type. Secondly, a war for wealth. I think we can dismiss this one, since this would be a private war of kings. Third is a war for power. Therein lies the real danger of Russia starting war, for political power is the Communist tool and objective. Fourth is a war for security. I cannot by any stretch of the imagination conceive either the United States or the Dominican Republic participating in a war except for their security.

On the other hand, there are overtones in some of the reports of aggression upon the Dominican Republic which are reminded of the Communist programs. Always the Hitlers and the Stalins have precipitated wars on the ill-conceived grounds that it was to protect themselves and their country. We are hearing that propaganda now. Let me very bluntly advise you to beware, and to see it for what it is. Keep your peace by keeping your guard up.

I have constantly fought for a new and firm declaration in the foreign policy of the United States. I have pleaded for, I have insisted upon, a simple policy of cooperating with our friends and excluding our enemies. My task has not always been an easy one.

There were those in the United States who were overjoyed when rebellion took place in Cuba. Then, many of these same persons were horrified when blood ran in the streets in Roman circuses called trials, and when we were called gringoes. In Venezuela we cheered a revolution that we knew absolutely nothing about—only to end up with our Vice President being spit upon, and now some are appalled that the new junta has levied another 10 percent upon our oil interests there. If we sometimes seem confusing I am afraid it is because we quickly bridge 180 years in our minds. We go into these things with the spirit of 1775, and then when the smoke has settled we think in terms of the U.S. Constitution and democracy of 1959. This is real easy for us, but difficult or impossible for anyone else. That is why I am again critical of our new drift in foreign policy and why I shall exert every effort to help to change it. If the world is expected to think as we do, we must realize there are other parts of the world and try to think as they do. Where is the common meeting ground for a world where one-third of the people eat with their fingers and another one-third eat with chopsticks. I hope we can meet and agree upon the single course of action which is immediate and compelling—a unity against communism. Anything else can be left aside, because until communism is defeated, and unless it is defeated, no other political philosophy has a chance to overtake the world.

The greatest fallacy anyone could assume is that strong personality governments are bad and that democracies are good. Each nation and each government has to stand on its own. Any snap decisions and assays, or quick slogan foreign policy is not a safe, long-range policy. If the United States foreign policy ever becomes one which would encourage rebellion and concurred with solidification of revolutionary governments in this hemisphere, I predict we would have succeeded in joining together a new political and economic force in this hemisphere whose course of action would clearly be against the best interests of the United States. I hazard the guess that it might become necessary for us to tear down the very house which we had watched being built as a matter of our own safety.

I hate revolutions anywhere, because internal war is nothing more than the pitting of father against brother, dividing son against son, the dividing of families. Of such was our Civil War. The Latin is foremost in dedication to his family, even unto second cousins. I can think of no greater crime against Christianity than to initiate civil war in which families are blown into hatreds of one another. The Spanish civil war is emerging in history as a monument to horror.

It must seem to you that I have spoken at some length upon war and more particularly upon revolutions. I have, because for more than a quarter of a century you in the Dominican Republic have lived in peace and security. I doubt that any other American state has achieved the prosperity you have right now. It is possible, however, that there are other states which might like to have yours, and might resort to armed invasion to try to get it. You can recall with me that in the Ukraine in Russia in World War II the Russians welcomed the Nazis. Disillusionment was quick and disastrous. I cannot imagine any invaders charging ashore with banners on which might be inscribed your secret ambitions or carrying an ironclad, enforceable manifesto for your welfare. You get not what you want, but what they

are and what they want. Recognize them for the politically dissatisfied, the international brigands they probably will be, whose goal is personal power, personal wealth, not government for the people, and who play the stakes of today for international revolution and diplomatic plunder.

The United States has a possession—Puerto Rico—your neighbor. I suspect this possession has harbored political liabilities to the Western Hemisphere. Living there is one known to you who could not satisfy his political ambitions, but is trying to satisfy his hates. I refer, of course, to German Ormes. The Governor of this possession is Muñoz-Marín, who unlike Alaska and Hawaii does not seem to desire statehood. It was a curious thing to me that it was he who vouched for the purposes of the revolutionary leader of Cuba. It is far more strange that he should be on such familiar terms. If the United States foreign policy is to be firmly and clearly one of nonintervention, then it must apply to our possessions as well as to the continental United States. In the new Congress I asked for and got membership on the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. This committee handles much of the legislation and affairs pertaining to Puerto Rico. It shall be my purpose to pursue some of these curiosities about Puerto Rico.

It has been my privilege and pleasure to meet with your President, the Honorable Hector Trujillo. His simplicity is warming; his programs sound and promising.

It was my very keen and personal pleasure to meet with Generalissimo Trujillo. The Dominican Ambassador to the United States the Honorable Manuel de Moya, had spoken so highly of the generalissimo that I was prepared for a monumental meeting. But, I was not prepared for this meeting and discussion at all. I say this candidly—you have to meet the generalissimo and speak with him before you actually meet up with the personality and the concept of the man who has given the Dominican Republic these great 27 years.

The Ambassador is easily one of the outstanding stars of the diplomatic corps in Washington. However, I remarked to the Ambassador earlier today on the telephone that if the Dominican Republic could persuade the generalissimo to come to Washington I would not be surprised but what there wouldn't be a whole new foreign policy concept given to the Western Hemisphere and the world. Manuel agreed with me that the generalissimo would make the better Ambassador, which is no depreciation of De Moya, but more an appreciation of the insight and organizational concepts needed in Washington in our foreign policies and our diplomatic corps.

I lack the time in residence here, the personal knowledge, and the full understanding of conditions of yesteryear to aggrandize the generalissimo honestly. In a brief 27 years—which is nothing in measuring history and government—the Dominican Republic has gone from rags and storm ruin to the position today where you are envied by all your neighbors. In moving that quickly, I think it only natural that the generalissimo might have stepped upon some toes and might have offended some too sensitive people. Teddy Roosevelt, a great President, stepped upon more touchy toes than any other American. The patient and brilliant Abraham Lincoln was charged with plunging us into civil war and was hated, and finally assassinated. The number of your enemies is sometimes a yardstick of your success.

I should suspect Generalissimo Trujillo's love for his country, his dedicated drive to raise its economy and international standing to its highest level before going to a Christian reward, might have caused some loss of friends—particularly those who sought to interfere with the forward march of progress or who placed greed above service to their country. Our general and President, Dwight Eisenhower, is known to get impatient, also, with those whose views he regards as not in the national interests. I sometimes get impatient, and if you search your conscience, you have too, with members of your family or your employees. A chronic critic is a person who always complains because it isn't being done his way.

There is no one in the Congress of the United States who knows the generalissimo personally, or knows the Dominican Republic peoples, who is a critic. What is there to complain about? There is sanitary water, something you don't find elsewhere in the Latin Americas. There are courts of justice; crime is punished and eliminated where possible. There is law. There is Christianity. There is peace. You have prosperity. There is a public works program, the likes of which I never thought I would see, which improves your economy for all time, and your welfare not for years, not for life, but forever. No, I think the critics are made up of dissatisfied politicans, the ignorant, and those with such infertile minds they succumb to the suave chicaneries of exiles and so-called intellectuals.

I doubt that I would be standing here today if the Dominican Republic had any other but Trujillo at the helm. I came here because I wanted to see this man, this personality, and this country for myself. Would I be taking a liberty if I said this might have been just another Latin republic without the absolute genius and the forceful drive of the generalissimo? Nature gave you a great and fertile island, but your own blood gave you finally a man of devotion to duty and love of country who would convert these natural advantages into your good. I think you know this, too. The remarkable thing to me is that you have no external debts, and a ridiculously low internal debt. I said before if he would write a book on government, it would be a best seller among public administrators.

Your congress could achieve no greater help for the Dominican Republic than to begin now determining just how the progress of the era of Trujillo can be carried into perpetuity. You owe it to the Dominican Republic to seal in this financial prosperity, because you contribute not only to yourselves but to the Western Hemisphere. Now while you have the abilities at hand is the time to do it right and lastingly.

Always bear in mind the real struggle is against a Communist ideology which seeks world power. Do not sell this foe short.

Remember there is no government utopia. Your government and the benefits it can afford to bestow on its people depends on their own efforts and the ability of your governing officials.

I shall be everlastingly appreciative for the help given my country during World War II and for the positive position you have always taken opposing communism.

I am proud that I am an American citizen and know that the people of the Dominican Republic feel that same pride.

I have spoken sometimes frankly, and certainly too long. If I have, I apologize most sincerely to you one and all. Just as France has her Foreign Legion, so too does the Dominican Republic have a foreign legion—a legion of foreign friends, and I am happy to be called a soldier in those ranks.

I hope you will support your government, that you will defend your government from within and without, and I shall help you. You have been gracious; you have been most kind. Until we meet again.

The words in Mr. WITHROW's text will speak for themselves. From his praise of Trujillo and his dictatorship, and from much of the rest of it, I continue to dissent. And so, I am sure, do the great majority of the people of Wisconsin.

SALMON FISHING IN THE PACIFIC OCEAN

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I have the honor to lay before this body House Joint Memorial No. 1 enacted by the 50th Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon meeting in regular session, respectfully urging the President of the United States to complete a treaty with Japan on maximum salmon fishing in the Pacific Ocean and institution of treaty negotiations with other nations of the north Pacific on the same subject. Under unanimous consent I include the text of the memorial at this point in the RECORD.

STATE OF OREGON,
HALL OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Salem, February 25, 1959.

The Honorable EDITH GREEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE GREEN: I have the honor to transmit House Joint Memorial No. 1 respectfully urging the President of the United States to complete a treaty with Japan on maximum salmon fishing in the Pacific Ocean and institution of treaty negotiations with other nations of the north Pacific on the same subject.

Very truly yours,

ROBERT B. DUNCAN,
Speaker, House of Representatives.

HOUSE JOINT MEMORIAL NO. 1

TO HIS EXCELLENCY, THE HONORABLE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES:

We, your memorialists, the 50th Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon, in legislative session assembled, most respectfully represent as follows:

Whereas the percentage of the total number of salmon taken from the high seas of the North Pacific Ocean by the fisheries of Japan and other foreign countries has been increasing at an alarming rate in recent years; and

Whereas this trend can operate only to the detriment of the salmon fisheries of the State of Oregon and the United States and the economies of the State of Oregon and the United States as a whole: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Oregon (the Senate jointly concurring therein), That we urge the President of the United States to use every effort to complete a treaty with the Japanese Government prescribing the maximum amount of salmon which may be taken annually by the fisheries of the United States and Japan; and be it further

Resolved, That we urge that negotiations for such a treaty be commenced at the earliest possible date, and that all nations of the north Pacific Ocean area be urged to enter into such negotiations and to cooperate in the establishment of a treaty; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this memorial be sent to the President of the United States,

all members of the Oregon congressional delegation, and the legislative assemblies of the States of Washington and California.

THE AMERICAN FARMER

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Speaker, one of the biggest problems facing the American farmer during this fiscal year 1959 is how to get a fair press and other publications media which will present the true facts to the American public. All of us received in the mail recently one of the most interesting computations of facts about the American farmer that I have ever read. The articles were prepared under the auspices of the National Grange, and were sent to Members of Congress under the signature of Jack Jackson, director of public relations. I want to give credit to the National Grange for the remarks that follow. Let us ask, in the first place, this question: Who gets Government subsidies?

Over and over again we read in the press of the terrific subsidies to the farmers of America, but we seldom read about the other subsidies that are granted to other segments of the American economy. Did you know, for example, that the following figures indicate the Bureau of the Budget's breakdown of current expenses and special services for a recent year as follows:

	Millions
Post Office Department in favor of business	$670
Navigation aids	137
Air navigation aids	93
Ship operation subsidies	50
Other special aids to business	138
Total to business	1,041
To labor (grants to States for operating employment service and unemployment compensation programs)	200

A report issued by the House Committee on Agriculture on June 25, 1958, states that farm price support losses from 1933 to 1958, a 25-year period, mind you, have cost taxpayers $5,173,746,788. The House Committee on Appropriations, however, reports the following taxpayer subsidies:

	Millions
Mail subsidies (10-year period, 1946–56)	$5,968
Business reconversion payments	43,262
Subsidies to maritime organizations (1938–57)	3,500
Subsidies to airlines (1938–57)	614

The December 12, 1958, issue of the Wall Street Journal reports that subsidies to U.S. ship line operators run $120 million annually, and that, if approved, requests now before the Maritime Board will bring the total to $220 million. The U.S. News & World Report, in an August 8, 1958, issue, reports that the Government is building two new steamships for ship line operators. One, the *America*, is to cost taxpayers $120 million—it will sell for $47 million. The other, the *President Washington*, is to cost Uncle Sam about $80 million and it will sell for $34 million.

Now, there are many other subsidies provided by the Federal Government, but, I shall not mention more of them, except to remind you that most of us who live in homes, and that includes many, many millions of Americans, buy our homes because Uncle Sam has agreed to bail out the lenders in case there is a default in payments. I would like to add this other thought, also; that when we criticize the farm program because of a tremendous payment to one farmer, let us remind ourselves that when we sit down to read a magazine we might well be reading an editorial in a magazine that receives a subsidy through the U.S. Post Office Department, and this subsidy has cut the annual cost of mailing that one publication by as much as $8,604,000.

Now, of course, two wrongs do not make a right and it may be wrong to pay a tremendous subsidy to one farmer, but if that be a wrong I think it only fair to the farmers who, in a few instances, receive a large subsidy, for the American people to know that this subsidy is matched two or three times over by subsidies that go to certain magazines in this country.

Another grave problem that the American farmer has is the unfair press he receives, when over and over again we get the idea that all of the USDA appropriations represent subsidies to farmers. I have read editorials, Mr. Speaker, in some of our outstanding newspapers suggesting that the U.S. Department of Agriculture's proposed expenditures of $6½ or $7 billion this fiscal year represent a subsidy to farmers. I recently heard a popular television commentator very glibly emphasize this erroneous statement.

Now, let us examine in detail the proposed USDA appropriations. For example, the farm commodity export program in 1957 cost $843 million—or about one-sixth of the total USDA appropriation for that year. Is this a subsidy to the farmer, or is it an effort to help win the cold war? Secretary Benson has said of this program, "It is helping keep the free world free. It is an ambassador of good will. Every American can be proud of the constructive use being made of the abundance of American agriculture." I, along with many of my colleagues, have constantly stressed the fact that we would make far greater progress in winning the cold war if we would make better use of our abundant food. Why not consider this program in its proper perspective, and that is, as a defense program. Surely when airplane manufacturers are granted the right to manufacture airplanes on a cost-plus basis—they and the many other large defense contractors who are guaranteed a profit every time they turn out an implement of war, would not deny the farmers of America a small percentage of the defense budget. From 1953 through the first half of fiscal 1959, $1.2 billion worth of surplus foods has been distributed in foreign countries through U.S. voluntary agencies. This money should not be considered as a subsidy to the farmer.

Always, in the total USDA appropriations, we consider the amount that is lent to our REA co-ops for loans. This will amount to about half a billion dollars annually. These loans are repaid with interest and repayments are over $100 million ahead of schedule. Many more millions that are lent and repaid to the Farmers Home Administration are charged as a net cost in the USDA annual appropriation.

The market research program should not be charged totally to the farmers, since as a result of this program handling methods are now saving the grain trade over $1 million annually; techniques which cut industry's cost of storing cotton have been developed and have amounted to a saving of about $2 million per season; and processes reducing food handling have saved $6 million annually in the city of Philadelphia alone.

The Federal meat inspection program, costing about $19 million a year, the brucellosis eradication program, costing around $22 million a year, have as their primary goal public-health protection, and this is an expense that should not be charged to the farmer.

The International Wheat Agreement, costing about $20 million a year, helps provide the farmers a high price for wheat, but it also helps members of the grain trade expand their export business—and profits.

Surely, we would not count the universally popular school-lunch program as a subsidy solely for the farmers. The USDA contributed around $284 million to this program last year. Millions of our schoolchildren shared the benefits of this program. From 1953 through the first half of fiscal 1959, approximately $1.2 billion worth of surplus food has been given to our own people in the United States. Currently, 14 million schoolchildren, 1.4 million needy persons in institutions, and 5.2 million persons in family units are receiving this food. This program should be charged to welfare.

The supervision and operation of 181 million acres of national forests are maintained and managed by the Government for the production of timber, regulation of streamflow, flood control, water power, irrigation, navigation, and municipal water supply—all in the interest of the public. Many of the large business organizations of this country are absolutely dependent upon the national forests for their existence. In addition, 45 million citizens took advantage of the recreational facilities of our national forests last year. Yet the costs of the supervision and operation of our national forests are too often glibly charged as subsidies to the farmer.

Actually, it is my considered judgment that, generally, only about half of the USDA appropriations each year can be legitimately considered as expenses that should be charged to the farmer, and even of that amount, I think, the word "subsidy" should not be properly ascribed to but about 50 percent of the remaining appropriations—or a maximum total of from $2 to $3 billion. Now this is a

lot of money. It may be too much, but it is not as much as the $6 to $7 billion, we are told, are annual subsidies to farmers.

Now, Mr. Speaker, one of the gravest errors perpetrated in the discussion of the farm problem is the error that pictures the price-support program as being responsible for a greater cost to the consumer. Now, of course, any program that costs money is paid for by the taxpayers of America. All of the services of government cost money. But, no less an authority than Secretary Benson himself has stated, in effect, that there is no noticeable correlation between price supports and the cost that the consumer pays in the marketplace. For example, in a peanut candy bar, I suppose the farmer would receive about one-half of 1 cent for the peanuts that would go into a 5-cent candy bar, if you can still find one. If the farmer gave the peanuts away, my guess is that the price of the candy bar would not be decreased to 4½ cents.

Let us take the cotton products and show the farm value and the retail price in a number of these products:

Cotton products	Farm value	Retail price	If farmers donated the cotton, the retail price would be—
Overalls	$0.65	$3.30	$2.65
Pajamas	.35	3.00	2.65
Broadcloth shirt	.28	3.94	3.66
Work shirt	.26	1.61	1.35
Socks	.07	.50	.43
Work trousers	.51	3.58	3.07
Housedress	.33	3.34	3.01
Yard goods (percale) per yard	.09	.51	.42
Bedspread	1.45	6.31	4.86
Sheet	.74	2.35	1.61

Now, Mr. Speaker, these figures assume that the retail prices would remain the same if the farmer obtained his present value of the raw cotton, but experience has proved that this is not the case. When the farmer gets less, the retail prices do not evidence that loss of income to the farmer, but rather, the retail prices go up. My contention is that if the farmer gave his cotton away, that the other factors involved in the cotton economy would cost just that much more money and the consumer would not get the product a cent cheaper and, in fact, would probably pay more. Do you want proof? Well, in 1948, farmers were getting $2.81 per bushel for wheat and consumers were paying 13.8 cents for a 1-pound loaf of bread. By 1955, the farmer's price had dropped to $2.14 per bushel and the consumer's cost had climbed to 17.5 cents per loaf. By 1957, the farmer was getting only $2 per bushel for wheat, and the consumer was paying 18.8 cents per loaf for bread. Thus, between 1948 and 1957 wheat prices dropped 29 percent to the farmer, but bread prices to the consumer increased 38 percent. In 1951, farmers received $20.2 billion for producing food that cost consumers $43 billion. In 1957, farmers received $19.5 billion for producing about 11 percent more food that cost consumers $50.4 billion. Thus, consumers paid $7.4 billion more and farmers received $700 million less for about 11 percent more food. Furthermore, in the food industry during that period, corporate profits increased $0.7 billion, labor costs $3.6 billion, transportation costs $1 billion, and other business expenses $2.8 billion.

In 1952, when producer prices were supported at 90 percent of parity, consumers were paying an average of 22.8 cents per quart for milk. By April 1958 price supports had been dropped to 75 percent of parity and consumer prices had advanced to 25.3 cents per quart. Furthermore, the April 1958 producer price was about the same as it had been a year earlier, but consumer prices had advanced from 24.6 to 25.3 cents per quart.

Between 1947 and 1957, the cost of the family food market basket increased $243, and here is why:

First. The farm value of food involved increased $3.

Second. Labor costs increased $130.

Third. Transportation costs increased $33.

Fourth. Other business expenses advanced $73.

Fifth. Charges to pay Federal income taxes were up $4.

The purpose of my talk is not to criticize other segments of the American economy, Mr. Speaker, but it is to speak for the American farmer as earnestly and as honestly as I can. I say that the price support program has very little relationship with the price that the consumer pays in the marketplace. It is estimated that farmers today receive only about 39 cents from each $1.00 spent for food. I believe if it were not for the price support programs that he would even receive much less than that amount.

Another grave difficulty that the American farmer faces in the lack of proper and accurate presentation of the facts is the idea presented over and over again that the so-called farm subsidy program helps only one segment of the farm economy, and that is the six, so-called, basic crops. Why, I wonder, are we not told about section 32 funds, which are funds derived from 30 percent of the taxes on imports? This money, amounting to many hundreds of millions of dollars, is spent on the so-called perishable agricultural commodities, such as beef, pork, fruit, vegetables, etc. Proper use of these funds has meant much to the farmer who does not plant the basic crops. Why are we not told of all of the vast research programs—the Extension Service programs, the great marketing agreements which give the farmers, for example, engaged in vegetable or fruit production, the right to regulate the sales of a particular agricultural commodity?

What about the great soil conservation programs that help farmers plant their trees, and then in future years will help great business establishments that will be dependent upon these forests?

What about the great watershed programs and reclamation programs some of which are not sponsored by the Department of Agriculture, but represent an area of aid to farmers not engaged in the production of the basic commodities.

One great problem we have in trying to solve the farm problem is the fact that we have what we might call internecine jealousies among farmers themselves. These jealousies and misunderstandings arise not only among sections, but they arise among producers of various agricultural commodities. The American farmers must present a united front as they seek a solution to the many problems that face them.

It should be pointed out that farmers and ranchers are among the biggest customers of American industry. There are 12 million tractors, cars, and trucks on the U.S. farms, and agriculture buys more petroleum than any other industry. Farmers provide a market for 6½ million tons of finished steel annually. Rubber used on the farms of America would put tires on nearly 6 million automobiles annually. Sixteen percent of the gross freight revenue is from agricultural products. Agriculture consumes 50 million tons of chemicals each year. Agriculture uses more electric power than Chicago, Detroit, Houston, Baltimore, and Boston combined.

About 10 million persons actually work on the farms of America. In the total agricultural economy, about 25 million workers are gainfully employed, as follows: 6 million in manufacturing and selling farm production supplies, 10 million actually on the farm, 9 million processing and distributing farm commodities. Thus, approximately 25 million workers or 40 percent approximately of our gainfully employed are involved in the production and distribution of food and fiber from the farms of America. While the actual farm population has steadily declined, this total number engaged in the total agriculture economy has remained fairly stable over a long period of years.

What about the income of the American farmer? The $13 billior net farm income for 1958 was 20 percent above that for 1957. However, this is 24 percent less than for 1947 and is also less than for any year between 1946 and 1954. In 1957, the per capita farm income was $967, while per capita nonfarm income was $2,082—$309 of the farmers' $967 was for work done off the farm. During that year, the hourly income for farm labor and management was 69 cents while workers in manufacturing industries received $2.07 per hour. During 1956, farm families operating the Nation's 2,213,000 commercial farms received an average income of $5,415 while all nonfarm families—including those living on skid row and public relief—received an income of $6,900.

While the farmer's income has been declining, his efficiency has increased. For example: Between 1950 and 1958, output per farmworker increased 26 per cent and during the same period, total per capita farm income dropped from $983 to $967. The number of persons supported by 1 farmworker was 6.9 in 1900, 10.6 in 1940, 15.9 in 1950 and 23.5 in 1958.

Where do we go from here? We are not going anywhere, Mr. Speaker, if first of all the farmers of America do not unite and present a solid front. We

cannot expect our friends who are anxious to help us to be impressed if there are internecine fights between sections of the farming community. In the second place, we must immediately concern ourselves with legislation to help agriculture commodities in greatest difficulty, such as wheat. We must take other commodities and devise legislation to help them. For example, in my Eighth District of Florida, our greatest cash crop which has a price support structure is flue-cure tobacco. One of the great problems facing our little farmer is the fact that his allotment has been decreased to such an extent that he does not have an acreage large enough to make it profitable for him to produce tobacco. I have introduced legislation which will enable him to lease allotments on a year-to-year basis, under the supervision of the county committee, and with appropriate safeguards for overall production. This would enable the little family-size farmer to have enough tobacco acreage allotment to make it profitable for him to farm and, at the same time, would safeguard production restraints.

Another thing that we must do is constantly to work for the family-size farmer. I have always believed, and still do, that the independent family-size farmer is of vital importance to the America that we know and love. I realize that the number of people living on the farm has rapidly diminished from the 84 percent of the total population in the time of Jefferson to, perhaps, not more than 16 percent at the present time; yet, this number is eminently worth saving. Where will the little farmer turn for employment if he is driven off the farm? The answer, of course, is in the crowded sections of the city in many instances, places where jobs are not available, and where present slums are crying for relief. I realize that I have only been on the Committee on Agriculture for 4 years, and certainly am not prepared to give the answers to the agricultural problem, but I do know that we cannot expect the farm economy to go it alone when other segments of the economy are subsidized by the Government. If we should all return to the laissez faire system, well and good. If no one received a subsidy or a Government program, the farmer could stand absolutely by himself. But his lot without the interest of the Government will be that of continuing to pay more and more for what he buys and receiving less and less for what he sells. Another thing, then, that we must constantly keep in mind is that until better programs are proposed for the welfare of the American farmer, we must live with the programs we have and attempt to purify and strengthen them wherever possible. Certainly we should consider more adequate production controls and other remedial techniques during this present session of Congress. However, we should never, in my opinion, barter away the basic right of the American farmer to receive some help from his Government, to assure for him some reasonable income for his toil when the other segments of the economy receive this largess. We should always fight for the proposition that the farmer cannot go it alone, if other segments of the economy are the recipients of special subsidies from the Federal Government.

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, I want to pay tribute to the chairman of the House Committee on Agriculture, the Honorable HAROLD COOLEY and to my colleagues on the committee, many of whom have far more seniority than I, and who for years have worked diligently on the problems of the American farmer. I do not believe the situation is hopeless, but I do believe that it is incumbent upon every American to try to get the true facts about the farm problem, and when he does, I am sure that the people will vote on the side of the American farmer. I for one, am not pledged to any particular program or solution. I shall, however, resist to the utmost of my ability the taking away from the farmer the hard fought gains he has made, which I think are fair to the farmer and the consumer. All of us realize there are deficits in the present program, many of which could have been eliminated if Congress had passed the omnibus agricultural bill reported by our committee last year. The present need is to fan the issue, with resolution and courage, to give an adequate program to the farmers of America, for their benefit and for the benefit of every American, since we all depend for life itself upon the food and fiber from the American farm.

AIRBORNE ALERT A VITAL ELEMENT IN OUR DEFENSIVE POSTURE

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York.

There was no objection.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I was amazed recently, as a new member of the Committee on Armed Services, to learn from the Chairman of our Joint Chiefs of Staff, Gen. Nathan M. Twining, that the United States does not now maintain—and General Twining claimed, with some rare exceptions, had never before maintained—any round-the-clock, airborne alert, that is to say, armed bomber aircraft of the United States in the air constantly ready to react against any enemy surprise attack, and, being airborne, immune to any surprise destructive attack directed against our airbases.

General Twining said that such an alert was too expensive to maintain, except possibly in times of serious crisis. Well, Mr. Speaker, I would certainly think that the Berlin crisis is just such a time. Many persons have already called for a mobilization of our forces to show the Soviets plainly we intend to stand firm at Berlin. Senator JACKSON of Washington called yesterday for the mobilization of four or five Reserve or National Guard divisions. I believe that in a time like this we also require an airborne alert, so that under no possible circumstances can we fall prey to another Pearl Harbor. The stakes are just too great.

In that connection I desire to call to the attention of my colleagues and our leaders in the military the fine column that appeared in the Washington Post this morning, written by Mr. Joseph Alsop. Under unanimous consent I insert it in the RECORD at this point:

ONLY 150

(By Joseph Alsop)

OFFUTT AIR FORCE BASE, OMAHA, NEBR.—If the national intelligence estimates are just no more than normally wrong, this country may soon be nakedly exposed to something infinitely worse than Pearl Harbor.

Only one immediate measure can be taken to reduce the risk. The Strategic Air Command can be ordered to mount an immediate maximum airborne alert.

SAC's brilliant commander, Gen. Thomas S. Power, has already begged the authorities in Washington to put SAC on an airborne alert status. But mounting a continuing airborne alert will cost money. Hence General Power has been turned down, for the usual budgetary reasons.

These are the terrible facts that have been all but burned into this reporter's mind, during his days here, in the headquarters of the great deterrent force that carries the main burden of guarding the United States and the free world. The grim mathematics that prove the facts are indeed that, and not mere figments from a nightmare, can be summarized as follows:

First, SAC is already maintaining a 15-minute ground alert of one-third of its aircraft. But the existing warning system does not see missiles. The new missile-seeing radars will not be in position until 1961, on present projections. Thus SAC now has zero warning against a Soviet surprise attack with ballistic missiles. In these circumstances, the whole SAC force can be surprised on the ground if the Soviet has the missiles to do the job.

Second, the Pentagon leaders have admitted in their recent testimony that the Soviets may well have enough medium range ballistic missiles to destroy all of SAC's overseas bases.

Third, only one question then remains: whether SAC's bases in this hemisphere are equally vulnerable. The number of Soviet ICBM's needed to strike at this hemisphere is proportional, of course, to the target system. Most probably the Soviets would wish their first strike to destroy all of SAC's 30-odd bases on this side of the Atlantic, plus the National Command Post in Washington, plus the main nodes of the communications net of the American Air Defense Command (in order to clear the way for a potential second strike with aircraft). This gives a total of approximately 50 targets, all of them completely "soft." Assuming 33⅓ percent reliability for the Soviet ICBM, a stock of 150 missiles would be enough for the purpose.

On the basis of the national intelligence estimates, the President and the Pentagon leaders alike assert that the Soviets do not have this stock of ICBM's at the present time. On the face of the known facts, the arguments for this estimate appear less strong than the arguments against it. For example, the only sensible explanation for the shutdown of output of the Bison bomber is the conversion of the Soviet's heavy bomber factories to ICBM production. In addition, it is well to remember the persistent optimistic errors in previous national estimates.

In any case, the rightness or wrongness of the estimates does not need to be argued.

The whole American future is now being gambled on a guess that the Soviets do not have a few score weapons, which they have the means to produce and have been working desperately hard to produce. Whether the guess is good or bad, this is a criminal gamble. Only the same psychology that begot Pearl Harbor would permit such a gamble, and especially after this country has received the clearest kind of strategic warning at Berlin.

While we have zero tactical warning, and no missiles of our own in hard pads, there is only one way to reduce the gamble. The maximum feasible percentage of SAC's great force must be kept in the air, with targets assigned, bombs aboard, and ready to go. The word "maximum" needs to be emphasized, since the much easier and cheaper sort of air alert confined to SAC's B–52 squadrons will provide no more than minimum deterrence, which is not real deterrence.

The cost, though considerable, will be under $1 billion a year; but intense efforts will also be needed to increase the flow to SAC of replacement parts, spare crews, jet tankers to improve the B–47 capability, and so forth.

It seems a small price to pay, when you remember General Power's remark that "Pearl Harbor, though a highly successful surprise, was really like stamping on a strong man's little finger." The surprise we are now risking would not just mean the beginning of an ultimately victorious war. It would mean the end of these United States.

BARTER COULD COUNTER SOVIET ECONOMIC OFFENSIVE

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, we all know that the Soviet bloc is mounting an economic offensive against the free world. Part of this campaign is to displace U.S. exports to other free world countries. The Congress has handed our own Department of Agriculture an effective weapon to counterbalance and offset this Communist economic strategy. It is the barter program under Public Law 480.

But, Mr. Speaker, I am sorry to report to the House that this valuable use of our agricultural surpluses, in return for which we are able to accomplish a multiple purpose, by stockpiling vital raw materials, is not being employed as Congress directed it to be. Hostile forces within the administration arbitrarily curtailed the barter program in May of 1957, and they have failed to heed a very clear directive by the 85th Congress that the program should be resumed. As a result, our barter business in the last half of 1958 was only one-sixth of that conducted in the last half of 1956. This program has been put on a starvation diet, in the obvious hope that it will dry up and blow away.

Roadblocks of all kinds have been set up to prevent the restoration of an effective barter program. The biggest obstacle of all is the requirement of evidences of so-called additionality. No shipments can be made to the countries which have big commodity markets—called "A" countries in the Department's regulations—without special permission. Permission to do this is rarely granted, and that is why we do not have a significant barter program.

The purpose of all this administrative redtape is supposedly to protect U.S. cash markets; but the facts indicate that it has the opposite effect. The effect of these restrictions on barter, as the statistics show, has been not only to destroy the barter program but also to diminish the cash markets we had built up while barter was being carried on.

While the administration was prohibiting the barter of U.S. farm commodities to the so-called "A" countries in 1957, the Communists were shipping $89,927,000 worth of these identical commodities to these same countries during that year. Our Government held up the shipment of about a hundred million dollars worth of agricultural surpluses under the barter program, while the Communists filled the orders.

As an example of the continuing seriousness of this situation, during the past 2 months five barter proposals which would involve exports of surplus commodities to Belgium have been vetoed, although Belgium has entered agreements with Communist-bloc countries for the purchase during this year of 372,000 metric tons of these same farm commodities.

Whose cash markets are we protecting? While we continue to prevent the shipment of farm surpluses into "A" markets the Soviets are planning to ship 1½ million metric tons of the same farm products to these countries this year under trade agreements already entered into.

The barter program can help to prevent Soviet encroachment on Western markets. We must realize that the Soviets are in competition with us, and unless we get rid of the silly restrictions which surround some of our export programs, our friends in Western Europe and in other areas will be buying more and more agricultural commodities from the Soviet bloc.

The last thing we all want to do is to aid and abet Soviet economic imperialism. The first thing we all want to do is to find additional outlets for our farm surpluses. Let us hope for an awakening within the administration on this matter. Let us hope that they will institute a significant barter program, as the Congress has directed them to do.

The following tables show 1957 exports from the Soviet bloc to "A" countries, planned Soviet exports to Belgium in 1959, and dollar sales since 1953 compared to barter exports:

Value of selected exports from the Soviet bloc to selected A countries (modified barter program), January–December 1957

[In thousands of U.S. dollars]

	Wheat	Rice	Barley	Corn	Rye, other grains	Tobacco	Cotton		Wheat	Rice	Barley	Corn	Rye, other grains	Tobacco	Cotton
Austria						1,070	2,410	Norway	8,521		40		4,096		
Belg-Lux		139	3,320	129	527	723	952	Portugal						44	
Denmark	835		458		1,635			Sweden				37		42	
France						1,926	5,027	Switzerland		88	2,378	1,140	1,057	168	441
West Germany	2,250		7,490	1,693		2,746	11,031	United Kingdom	1,004		293	248	415		6,650
Italy			2,739	405	1,091	1,587	1,393								
Japan				1,070	265		1,174	Total	12,742	341	23,219	5,318	10,702	8,380	29,225
Netherlands	132	114	6,501	596	1,616	74	147	Combined total				89,927,000			

Source: Department of Commerce, Country-by-Commodity Series, January–December 1957.

Soviet planned exports to Belgium, 1959

Exporter	Commodity	Quantity (metric tons)	Exporter	Commodity	Quantity (metric tons)
Bulgaria	Feed grains	5,500	Rumania	Wheat, flour	85,000
	Tobacco	2,000		Feed grains	120,550
	Rice	2,500	U.S.S.R.	Wheat	[1]
Czechoslovakia	Feed grains	15,000		Feed grains	45,000
Hungary	do	34,483		Tobacco	3,000
	Tobacco	17,582			
Poland	Feed grains	40,000	Total		371,615
	Tobacco	1,000			

[1] Amount unspecified.

U.S. Department of Agriculture—Export of agricultural commodities

[In millions of dollars]

Exports as a result of—	Calendar year 1953	Calendar year 1954	Calendar year 1955	Calendar year 1956	Calendar year 1957	January–March 1958	April–June 1958	July–September 1958
I. Dollar sales:								
A. Other than CCC stocks	2,289.1	2,112.2	1,588.7	1,314.6	2,023.3	372.8	466.3	496.7
B. CCC stocks:								
1. Cash	147.9	344.2	349.1	1,071.7	555.7	221.8	35.6	64.9
2. Credit				4.0	18.2	1.0	.4	2.3
3. Payment in kind					82.9	19.2	16.4	12.1
Total dollar sales	2,437.0	2,456.4	1,937.8	2,390.3	2,680.1	614.8	518.7	576.0
II. Barter sales	14.0	29.9	224.1	349.6	269.0	8.6	19.1	15.8

PUBLIC HOUSING BONDS

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced H.R. 5096, a bill to close a glaring tax loophole in connection with future issues of public housing bonds. It will end Federal tax exemption for future issues of public housing bonds which are secured by pledge of Federal annual contribution contracts entered into after the date the bill becomes law.

My bill will end Federal tax exemption on public housing bonds which are to be secured by pledge of Federal contributions. They represent Federal credit. In an opinion rendered to the President of the United States on May 15, 1953, the U.S. Attorney General stated in part:

> In summary, I am of the view that: * * * A contract to pay annual contributions entered into by the PHA (Public Housing Administration) in conformance with the provisions of the act (U.S. Housing Act of 1937, as amended) is valid and binding upon the United States, and that the faith of the United States has been solemnly pledged to the payment of such contributions in the same terms its faith has been pledged to the payment of its interest-bearing obligations.

Since the Federal Government by law cannot sell its own bonds on a tax-exempt basis it is just plain wrong to permit a public housing agency, in effect, to sell Federal credit on a tax-exempt basis.

Only last Thursday $103 million of public housing bonds were sold to two bond underwriting groups at an average net interest cost of 3.40 percent. All of those bonds are secured by pledge of Federal contributions. Large investors through this financing device are, in effect, buying Federal credit on a tax-exempt basis. Contrast that with the small saver who buys U.S. savings bonds and gets 3¼ percent interest but must pay Federal income tax on the interest he receives. It is a glaring injustice to the small saver to burden him with Federal taxes on his investment and at the same time set up additional tax loopholes for the large investor on his investment. Such discrimination in favor of the big investor over the small saver must end. My bill will do just that.

The Housing Act of 1959, as reported by the House committee, provides for approximately 190,000 additional public housing units. At an average cost of $13,600 per unit that means $2.6 billion total cost. That will be the principal amount of public housing bonds issued to finance that cost. Those bonds will be 100 percent secured by pledge of Federal contributions. Those bonds at an assumed average rate of interest of 3 percent will generate $1.9 billion of interest payments over the 40-year life of those bonds. Those interest payments will be secured by 100 percent pledge of Federal contributions. The large investor will get that amount of interest on a tax-exempt basis. Assuming these wealthy investors are in the 60 percent income tax bracket, they would be getting a tax windfall of over $1 billion. Such a tax-free windfall for the very wealthy cannot be justified.

When the housing bill reaches the floor of the House if any additional public housing authorization is approved, I intend to offer my bill as an amendment to the housing bill and thus plug this tax loophole. We should make the rules of the game that apply to the small saver no more burdensome than the rules that apply to the very wealthy.

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I am greatly distressed about the recent ruling by the Federal Communications Commission that all candidates for public office must be given equal time on regular news broadcasts.

I do not believe anyone in the broadcasting industry or anyone running for office objects to the equal time provision when it concerns interview programs, panels, or advertising. This equal-time provision is a guarantee to all office-seekers that no station may provide an opponent with choice broadcast time in excessive amounts while refusing another candidate the same opportunity to take his message to the voters.

But to say that equal coverage must be given on news broadcasts to all opponents of an incumbent mayor when the mayor opens a fund campaign is carrying the principle too far. Yet that is what the FCC has ruled. The stations which report such activities as opening of charity campaigns are performing a public service. They should not be told to give equal coverage to other candidates unless the candidate whose activities are covered makes a political comment during the course of the coverage.

Carrying out the decision of the FCC will result in a decided reduction in coverage of activities such as charity drives when part of the public service news coverage must of necessity show a person who is incidentally a candidate for election or reelection. The broadcasters in this country do a fine job of public service, and they should be encouraged in their efforts. I do not say that this decision will end such public service news coverage, but it will certainly reduce such coverage or cause it to be stilted in order to leave out a certain person who happens to be a candidate for public office but who also is the principal person involved in the charity campaign opening or in the dedication of a charity program or institution.

Certainly our broadcasters are mature enough to know when a candidate is seeking free publicity. Reporters and editors of our radio and TV stations are not naive. They will watch and catch the candidate who is looking for a chance to turn such coverage into personal gain.

But let us look into the matter further. What about the coverage of a city council or other legislative body which meets during a period when its members are candidates for reelection. Is a station to ignore the meeting of the legislative body? Is it to say that a bill or ordnance passed and no more? Is it to ignore the debate, which is often as important as the vote? I think we would have to answer "No" to these questions. Yet if the FCC ruling is carried out, the radio and TV stations that lead the way—those who do a good job of reporting government news and informing the people—will find it impossible to do a good job.

Such a station might have to report debate thusly: "A bill to increase the State gasoline tax passed the State senate today. The vote was 50 to 11. Somebody said the people do not want the increase. But somebody else said the people are willing to pay for better roads which will result. Another senator said people don't want better roads if it means more taxes."

Now what kind of a newscast would that be?

Or perhaps when a mayor who is a candidate for reelection greets the President of Argentina at the airport—as

happened in the case decided by the FCC—the newscaster in narrating film of the arrival of this foreign head of state—an honored visitor to our country—should say to the viewers: "Please don't pay any attention to the fellow shaking the President's hand and escorting the President to a car. He's a candidate for a political office and we aren't allowed to mention him unless we give 42 other candidates equal time to shake somebody's hand."

These are poor examples. At least I think they are poor examples. I imagine our talented reporters of our radio and TV stations can handle the situations better than this.

But there can be no doubt that strict enforcement of the equal time rule as it pertains to news coverage will cause less effective coverage of both public service activities and government news. And neither of these areas should suffer from reduced reporting coverage.

I am having a bill prepared which will amend the Federal Communications Act so that the FCC is instructed that it should not enforce the equal time rule in every news situation. The FCC would have rules of guidance which would allow a station to report the news as it happens. When one party has a rally, and the other party does nothing, the news reports should reflect this. But when one candidate buys time, the other candidates will continue to have the right to purchase equal time.

It does not take a Solomon to decide whether a station is giving slanted news coverage to one party or one candidate. Any radio or TV news editor has the good judgment to decide what is news and what is not.

The bill I am preparing will relax the equal time provision as it pertains to news coverage only. And it will spell out that the relaxation does not apply to coverage of individual candidates giving political talks, even when such political talks are part of the news coverage.

I invite my colleagues in the House to join me in sponsoring this bill or similar legislation.

BILL REGULATING NATIONAL HOLIDAYS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ASHLEY] may extend his remarks at this point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Speaker, during recent months some dramatic and far-reaching events have commanded our complete attention. The Russians have now launched a manmade planet and there has been a fresh spate of legislation directed at catching up technologically with the Soviets. In addition, thousands of bills have been tossed in the hopper dealing with a host of domestic and international issues which demonstrate conclusively our anxiety over meeting the challenge of our times and staking our claim in outer space. I submit, however, that we cannot permit our overriding concern for maintaining either a military balance of power or a balanced fiscal budget to blind us to the need for achieving progress in other directions.

Today I am introducing a bill to designate the third Monday in February as a legal public holiday called Presidents Day and to provide for the observance of Memorial Day, Independence Day, and Thanksgiving on Friday, thus creating four additional 3-day holiday weekends.

The purpose of this measure is to give Americans at least five 3-day holiday weekends throughout the year, inclusive of Labor Day, and to minimize the number of midweek holiday observances with all their attendant inconvenience and inefficiency.

The advantages of this calendar adjustment both from the standpoint of workers and, indeed, employers, are, I believe, self-evident.

There is no need for me to cite here the infinitely greater pleasure and satisfaction of anticipating and planning a 3-day holiday weekend when by sheer happenstance these holidays occur on Friday or Monday. Quite on the other hand, the interruption of the normal work week for a 1-day holiday not only impairs the smoothness of operations of many industrial, professional, and business concerns, but the abnormal amount of absenteeism that invariably follows is acknowledged to be the bane of bosses and a pain to plant managers.

To those who are shocked by this proposed break with tradition, may I point out that the current fixed date observance of these holidays is not so worthy of veneration as may appear at a glance. Washington was, according to the Julian Calendar used in his day, actually born on February 11. Memorial Day did not become a legal holiday until 1910, and even today veterans are memorialized on four different dates in the United States. As for Thanksgiving, it is within the recollection of all of us that this observance has been shuffled on the calendar and, as a matter of fact, the first Thanksgiving of the Pilgrims was celebrated in October.

Therefore, I earnestly commend the attention of my colleagues to this meritorious resolution to make life more efficient, convenient, and more pleasurable for all Americans and I trust it will receive your thoughtful consideration.

BILL TO ALLOW TAX CREDIT FOR CHILD MAINTENANCE DURING INCAPACITY OF THE MOTHER

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to allow a deduction for certain expenses incurred by a taxpayer for the care of his children while his wife is physically or mentally incapable of caring for such children. The bill would provide that there shall be allowed as a deduction expenses paid during the taxable year by a taxpayer, who is a widower, for the care of one or more children or dependents as defined in subsection (c) and, second, by a taxpayer who is a married man for the care of one or more children as defined in subsection (c); while the wife of the taxpayer is physically or mentally incapable of caring for such children, but only if such care is for the purpose of enabling the taxpayer to be gainfully employed.

The bill further asks that subsection (b) of such section be amended by adding at the end thereof a new paragraph which shall define the term "married man"; a deduction under subsection (a) shall not be allowed unless he files a joint return with his wife for the taxable year; and further that this paragraph shall not apply if for the taxable year the taxpayer is entitled to an exemption for his wife under section 151(b).

The bill which I am proposing further defines child, dependent, and widower. The bill further provides that the determination of whether an individual is married shall be made as of the close of his taxable year, except that if his spouse dies during his taxable year, such determination shall be made as of the time of such death. An individual legally separated from his spouse under a decree of divorce or of separate maintenance shall not be considered as married.

I believe that the bill itself explains the intent behind its passage. The bill is designed to give relief to those men whose wife, by reason of illness, cannot care for their children and who must, in order to support his wife and family, be gainfully employed but in order to be gainfully employed must also make arrangement for child care.

Under the present law a deduction for child care expenses may be allowed only to a taxpayer who is a woman or a widower as defined in the law. A man therefore may be entitled to such a deduction only if his wife has died or he is legally separated from his wife under a decree of separate maintenance or divorce, and he has not remarried at the time the expenses are incurred by him. There is presently no provision in the code under which such a deduction may be allowed to a married man even though his wife is in a mental institution during the period in which child care expenses are incurred.

I believe this constitutes an inequity to the individual citizen and a deterrent to economic growth in our tax laws which should be corrected as soon as possible.

PHILIPPINE WAR DAMAGE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, I have again introduced a bill, H.R. 4287, to provide for the payment of the balance of war damage claims awarded by the Philippine War Damage Commission prior to 1951. A measure to the

same purpose, H.R. 4311, has been introduced by Congressman CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI, of Wisconsin, who made a thorough and forthright statement in its support.

I should not take the time of this body to add one word to the volumes which have been spoken, read, and written on the subject of our lasting friendship and cooperation with the Philippines in peace and war, their present and urgent need of assistance, and the moral justice of discharging the balance of an obligation which we entered into a decade ago, if it were not for the widespread pubication of indiscriminate, misleading and often dishonest reports of the deterioration of our relationship with the Philippine Republic.

I am sure that no one in this House who is aware of even a small part of what I know for certain to be the situation in the Philippines and the long history of our connection will permit himself to be prejudiced against any action favorable to the Filipino people by reason of controversial pronouncements of officious spokesmen and by journalistic outbursts which regard drama more highly than fact.

There is no denying the economic plight of the Philippines resulting doubtlessly, in part at least, from errors in planning and administration. It is an accomplished fact in history that the Philippines with our blessings attained a position of independent statehood in 1946, a mere 12½ years ago. From the first situation stem the urgent petitions for help from the Philippines which upon rejection change to cries of disappointment and often resentment. From the second, the recently acquired independence of the Republic of the Philippines, follow the understandable gestures and official acts which accompany national consciousness even where a close friend and benefactor might be involved.

Moreover, in the matter of claims resulting from monetary measures of the United States in the thirties and from war losses later, there have been persistent demands by the Philippines which perhaps include a staggering number and amount of accounts which have little or no merit but represent either the misguided exaggeration of people who have lost something of indeterminate value or perhaps outright dishonesty which is a calculated risk in all claims procedures.

What we in the exercise of our experienced wisdom and cool judgment must do is discriminate between what is sound and permanent and what is momentary and tenuous. We must recognize that there are elements in suggested aid programs for the Philippines which are not only beyond the capacity of the United States to meet but which are not in a real sense salutary to the Philippines. As to claims we must not reject the entire portfolio because of the inadequacy of some, even the greater part, of its elements.

I strongly urge, Mr. Speaker, that we look through the reported antiforeign agitation against Americans in the Philippines and the political demagogy which singles out the Yankee in Manila as a convenient target, to the 25 million kindly Filipinos who are traditionally proud of their historical relationship with the United States which, to quote from a recent analysis appearing in the Washington Sunday Star, "has given them Anglo-Saxon political forms, the English language and a love for individuality and freedom matched by few nations anywhere." The article goes on to say "Things are askew in the Philippines today but the warm geniality of the Filipinos themselves and their emotional closeness to Americans are beyond cavil."

The Honorable Manuel P. Manahan, a stalwart lieutenant of the late and well-loved President Magsaysay who himself was a candidate for the presidency of the Philippines in the last election has denied that the Philippine people are unfriendly to the United States. He lays the blame for most of the anti-American agitation in the Philippines on a small, powerful, cohesive, and vocal group, stating:

> It is just this group who for reasons of its own has created headlines here and has made the outside world feel that this Nation has turned against its oldest friend. This powerful group, which is headed by anti-Americans of long standing * * * is backed by millions of dollars and has raised a loud cry. * * * The Philippine people in general have nothing against the United States and still consider Americans their friends.

On our side, I respectfully submit that a fair investigation would disclose that articulate American voices which dwell on the widening breach between the Philippines and the United States are not only in the minority but are not remotely representative of the sentiments of 175 million Americans whose feelings for the Philippines based on more than half a century of close ties and nurtured by the simple and heart-warming stories of returning soldiers are filled with affection and a normal desire to be of help in time of need.

Specifically, there has been an unfortunate distortion of the various demands of the Philippines upon our Government for the payment of claims in a vast number and variety of categories. It appears to me to have been a mistake to put the single label on all of the claims or to have heaped them all into a totalizing hopper which would produce to a staggering figure close to a billion dollars. Through error or design this procedure resulted in prejudice which is not fair to many meritorious claims which form parts of the aggregate. Again the announcements of rejection of the total Philippine claims program reportedly emanating from our Government in the first instance seemed to have been colored by bureaucratic disfavor traditional in matters of this kind, and later appeared to have been officially repudiated since there has been no decision either for or against the claims.

In conclusion, may I point out that the war damage awards of the Philippine War Damage Commission forming the subject matter of the legislation now before this House resulted from studied legislative action directly after the end of the war; that, as has been frequently reported, the legislative history behind this action indicates that our Congress had every intention of supplementing the emergency wartime measure with further legislation called for by circumstances which might develop; that even after the most conservative appraisal of properties lost and damaged during the war the amount paid upon the awards made by an agency of our Government, the Philippine War Damage Commission, aggregated only 52½ percent of the face amount of the awards.

The New York Times in an editorial prompted by the current agitation concerning Philippine relations touched on the work of the War Damage Commission in the following language:

> The United States was able to do a good job on the settlement of claims. The administrative cost of making these settlements was remarkably low, the operation was sound from the outset, and it met an immediate need.

It is true that in a strict legal sense there is no enforcible claim against the United States resulting from Philippine war-damage awards. Nevertheless, I do not believe there is a man among us or among our constituents who will resort to legal technicalities to refute a moral obligation of such pronounced clarity as the war-damage awards which we have left unpaid.

In this particular, Mr. Speaker, there is an open Philippine claims adjustment with the United States which must be segregated from any generalities and must be dealt with by us in the light of the history of our legal and moral obligations and the requirements of this moment based upon the condition and economic needs of our friend and ally, the Republic of the Philippines.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER. I yield.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend the gentleman from California for the statement he has just made, and for the bill he has again introduced. Let me add a point or two to underline and support what the gentleman has said. When the Philippines War Damage Act was being studied by the Congress at the end of the war, I was a member of the old Committee on Insular Affairs which handled that legislation under the chairmanship of our former colleague, Judge Bell of Missouri. The act established the War Damage Commission and provided that all claims that the Commission verified as legitimate and reasonable should be paid up to the first $500, and that payment of the balance above $500 should be prorated according to the amount of money available. We had no figures at that time on which to base a firm estimate of what the total of all valid claims would amount to. The figure of $500 million was the first estimate agreed upon, but obviously was in some degree picked out of the air. We could be reasonably sure the total would be at least that. At one time I offered an amendment to authorize $600 million. If the Commission found the justified claims came to less than that, no harm would be done. The money would not be spent. On the

other hand, it would be advantageous to move in quickly and help restore the damage that had been suffered in the Philippines during their valiant defense against Japan. We should remember that most of the damage was inflicted during their liberation—inflicted not by the Japanese forces, but by our American planes and artillery. Yet not a Filipino wavered even when his home or his family or his buffalo was being destroyed by our bombs or our war operations. They were as loyal as any people in history have ever been in their cooperation. I felt then that we should have adequate funds to do the job of restoration as quickly as possible. To get them on their feet rapidly would prove sound economy. A stitch in time would save nine later on.

In the negotiations before the bill finally passed the House and Senate and became law, the amount authorized was $400 million. But, I recall distinctly that in the report and during the debates others besides myself stated that this figure was only a rough estimate and that we recognized our obligation to provide more later if the amount of valid claims required more. So I feel that while it is more than 10 years later, the moral obligation still stands.

At the time the War Damage Commission had disbursed the $400 million we provided, a difference of opinion developed as to the better way to help the Philippine economy and people thereafter. Was it better to pay the balance of those larger approved claims which had been paid up to only about 52 percent of the balance above $500? Or was it better to give aid by making loans or grants for the development of industries in the Philippines? Would the same amount of money do more good if put into building up the whole economy rather, or if given as compensation to individuals or firms or institutions that had suffered damage? This was an honest difference of opinion. I feel that we have a moral commitment to carry through what we said in 1946 we would do and which we have not done fully.

Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield for a moment further, I would like to say a word about this recent talk that the Filipinos are becoming anti-American. Some of that comes from people who see the efforts of the Philippines to develop economic independence as, somehow meaning that they are pulling away from, even turning against, the United States. I cannot agree. The Filipinos would be remiss and would be doing less than they ought to for their own future if they did not make strong and persistent efforts to develop their own economy so that they can stand on their own feet and not be subject to or dependent upon the economy of the United States.

In 1946 we gave them political independence. In the Independence Act we stipulated that they were to move step by step toward full economic independence in 1974. Thereafter they would no longer have tariff preference in their dealings with the United States. Now, how can they develop economic independence by 1974 if they do not now build up their own industries? When they establish their own industries they naturally are run by themselves, not by Americans. Some Americans who have had a privileged status in the past seem to regard that as anti-American. No, it is healthy self-reliance. Of course, there are irritations on both sides; but I have been there a good many times, as the gentleman has, and we have not seen any anti-American feeling among the rank and file of the Filipino people. In fact, there is overall a stronger pro-American feeling than I know of in any other country in the world.

They are short of foreign exchange now, but that is not wholly the result of bad developments. They have started seven or eight hundred new industries in the past few years. That required large investments to get machinery and sometimes supplies from abroad. They had to invest most of the precious foreign exchange they earned and of the loans and grants they were able to get from abroad. So they are short on dollars now, and the peso is weak. But these investments should pay off in the years ahead and give them a sounder and healthier, self-supporting economy. We ought to understand that this shortage of capital in the Philippines which we are hearing about and which this bill will help correct, is in some respects the result of the sound efforts they have been making to become economically independent by 1974. It is a problem to be solved, not something to be condemned.

The Philippines and the United States have a very close relationship, founded first on 50 years of relationship as trustee and ward. Then we had 4 years of the closest comradeship in fighting against a common enemy. We have now had more than a decade of partnership as equals—two sovereign States voluntarily choosing to walk together for common purposes, each helping the other. And, believe me, the Filipinos have been very helpful to us in interpreting us to their fellow Asians. I think it is mischievous for any Americans to misrepresent as anti-American the wholesome desire of the Filipinos to be independent, just as it is mischievous for some Filipinos to charge that the United States is trying to impose or reimpose outside controls on them.

Mr. Speaker, the relationship between these countries has been extraordinarily close. It is loyal friendship and farsighted statesmanship for the United States to do what it properly can at this difficult period in the life of the Philippine Nation to help it through the problems with which its ablest leaders are struggling. We want to go ahead together in the years to come.

Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER. I thank the gentleman.

I now yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK].

UNITED STATES-PHILIPPINE ISLANDS RELATIONS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, what happens in the Philippines is of great concern to the people of America. The people of the Philippines are not only our friends but our allies.

We helped them to achieve their freedom. We led them, so to speak, by the hand to reach their goal of sovereign nationhood.

Recently we read reports in the press that were somewhat disquieting. The newspapers made much of certain unresolved issues between our two countries. They were magnified beyond their just proportions. It is natural for two nations as closely linked by political and economic ties such as the United States and the Philippines to have some disagreements every now and then. In any family there are bound to be some differences, but, with very rare exceptions, they are adjusted.

The United States Ambassador to Manila and the Philippine Ambassador to Washington were recalled by their respective governments for consultations. This was a wise move for a briefing from each envoy was needed to help clear the atmosphere in both countries. It is evident each Ambassador did his share to pour oil on troubled waters. Each one gave his government and people the perspective necessary to view the situation without bias or passion or emotionalism.

We want to assure our friends in the Philippines that the true American sentiment is not only to be fair with them at all times, it is more than that: it is to be of help to them as much as we Americans can. The mills of the gods may grind slowly and in a democracy the wheels of government may not turn as fast as we would want them to. But this does not mean that if an injustice that should be righted has been allowed to go uncorrected that it is a deliberate one. The record of Philippine-American relations shows that whenever an injustice or an inequality has been called to our attention, we have always voluntarily made the correction. The most recent case was the Philippine Trade Act that we first extended and then modified in a manner satisfactory to the wishes of the people of the Philippines.

We are happy to note that Gen. Carlos P. Romulo, our esteemed former colleague in this House, whose unequaled service to his country has earned our admiration, has returned to his post as Philippine Ambassador to Washington. In an interview that he gave to the Manila Times on February 16, 1959, he emphasized that he found no anti-American sentiment in the Philippines, and there is no anti-Philippine sentiment in the United States. In order that in this country our people may know the present temper and attitude of the Filipino people, under unanimous consent I include the interview in my remarks:

CARLOS P. ROMULO SEES NEW PHILIPPINE ISLANDS ATTITUDE—SAYS FORGING OF TIES WITH SEA NATIONS NOT ANTI-AMERICANISM

(By Vicente J. Guzman)

"It is not anti-Americanism that I found in the Philippines."

This is not an off-hand diagnosis by Ambassador Carlos P. Romulo. It is the well-considered view of a man whose perceptions have been sharpened by years of involvement with the problems of the world.

What he found, our Ambassador to Washington said, is a people growing into maturity, seeking new values, in quest of new

goals, reassessing their standards and engaged in searching national introspection.

"Certainly, such a people, blazing a trail for themselves," Ambassador Romulo said, "cannot be accused of being anti this or anti that.

"It is the birth of a new soul, the product of a developing maturity and it is heartwarming and soul-stirring."

The Ambassador had just come home from a luncheon, one of the numerous parties his friends have lined up for him since his return home last January 26. He was in a cool "barong Tagalog" and was every inch the perfect host.

Dick, his third son, the only member of the family around and who acts as his secretary even while poring over his law review books (a Harvard law graduate, Dick is home to take the bar examinations) had gone to classes.

We started with the weather which the Ambassador finds very agreeable. Fifteen years in America have not reconciled him, he said, with the cold Washington climate this time of year.

Since 1935, the general said, Asians had begun to dream of getting together in close ties. This was not possible then because we were divided among ourselves.

India, Malaya, Ceylon, and Burma were under British rule. Indonesia was feeling the effect of ruthless Dutch colonial power, Vietnam, Laos, and Cambodio had not yet freed themselves from the French.

The predominating policy of the colonizers was to divide and rule. The dream of Asians could not be realized in the face of these obstacles.

A quarter of a century has rolled by. Now, the atmosphere has changed, and the feeling of integration is nurtured in the natural development of our maturing nationhood.

"This does not mean," Ambassador Romulo said, "that we are veering away from the United States. This means that we want to update our relations in such a way that we form a close friendship with our neighbors without prejudice to our old ties with America."

He reminded me that the Filipino is a child of the East and the West.

"From 1946," he said, "we devoted ourselves to rehabilitation and reconstruction. We had to pay attention to the material side of our lives. We had to get rid of the scars of war.

"So now we have time," he went on to say, "to devote to the national soul. We are starting to get our bearings spiritually, hungry for reorientation.

"Add to this, the new existing problems that have suddenly cropped up as we enter the atomic age."

Now that our stand on communism has been taken, Ambassador Romulo sees that the Filipinos are realizing the existence of new conditions and new circumstances that they have to meet as a nation.

"We begin to ask questions because of these new conditions," he said.

"For example," he added, "we ask ourselves in our agonizing reappraisal, if and when the intercontinental ballistic missile (ICBM) has become operational and America will no longer need us as a base, what kind of relationship would we evolve with the United States?

"When our usefulness with America expires, when American naval and air bases have become obsolete because of the ICBM, on what basis will Philippine-American relations be laid?"

Our inner tensions are not helped any, in his opinion, when we look around us and see the tremendous postwar industrial advance of Japan.

And there are the teeming millions in the Chinese mainland now under the lash of Red dictators.

"Should we not be thinking of ourselves, caught in competition as we are now in the industrial race between China and Japan?"

And there is India and her new 5-year plan. Romulo feels concerned about the possible effects of this upon the Philippines.

"All these revolutionary changing conditions," the Ambassador said, "impose new appraisals. They open up new horizons. And so we begin to plumb these heretofore unfathomed depths. This is because we as a nation must adapt ourselves to the transmutations imposed by the atomic age.

"Certainly, that is not anti-Americanism. As we delve further and further, we know that nationalism is an essential in internationalism. We can only have an international personality if we have something national to contribute to the world."

With respect to the new concept hereabouts in our foreign relations, Ambassador Romulo is wholly attuned to the idea of the Philippines integrating with the rest of the world and not merely with one nation.

"If the goal of humanity is integration and not fragmentation, should we not," he asked, "begin now preparing for this process even if it may be in the long tomorrow?

"We cannot escape the evolution of mankind. America no doubt is our best friend but it is not because we love our old friends less when we have to prepare for an inevitable future because certainly we love our people more."

Romulo is of the belief that the closer we are to our Asian neighbors, the more the United States will realize the value that we are as allies in the cause of freedom and democracy.

The pariah, Romulo emphasized, is despised everywhere. "We do not want to be a pariah in Asia and no self-respecting nation wants a pariah for an ally," he said.

Speaking of Philippine-American relations, particularly, Ambassador Romulo affirmed there are irritations that have marred the cordial relations between the two countries. These irritations, he said, were the result of the accumulation of unattended claims of the Philippines dating back to 24 years ago.

In this connection, Romulo paid tribute to Filipino patience.

Philippine claims, he said, total $942 million, broken up as follows:

1. $24 million in gold devaluation funds.
2. $130 million in additional war damage payments.
3. $173 million in coconut oil processing tax.
4. $75 million in sugar excise tax.
5. $1 million in claims of Philippine customs duties of imports of the U.S. Army and Navy.
6. $600 million in various military claims, known as the bulk claims.

Of these items, only the first has been attended to. Only last week President Eisenhower sought funds to meet this obligation, which dates back to 1935, in a recommendation to the U.S. Congress.

President Garcia in a summit conference in Baguio last Friday at which the Ambassador was present defined Philippine policy in respect to carrying out these negotiations. That is one of the reasons Ambassador Romulo was summoned to Manila—to help in the formulation of that policy.

I have talked to several officials and others who are keen observers of our foreign policy and I know that Ambassador Romulo, who because of the record of his achievements is considered our premier diplomat, will return to Washington with his hand considerably strengthened by solid support at home.

I also include an editorial that appeared in the Philippines Herald of February 20 about the work that General Romulo did while he was in Manila and an editorial of the Manila Times of February 21 on the same subject:

[From the Philippines Herald, Feb. 20, 1959]

AMBASSADOR ROMULO

Gen. Carlos P. Romulo returned to the United States the other day with the implied full support and confidence of the President, our Congress leaders, and the nation as a whole in his role as Philippine Ambassador to that country. There is no doubt that his brief stay here has been most fruitful, both in the sense of providing him an opportunity to brief the Filipino people and their leaders on vital aspects of the Philippine-American relationship and of getting briefed, in turn, on current trends in this country. But more than this, perhaps, he returns to Washington with his hand strengthened by his nation's confidence in his leadership and ability.

General Romulo is, no doubt, among the best men who can represent us in the United States. The record of his achievements shows this. That he is highly regarded by the American people is also unquestioned, and this, one must admit, is a distinct asset to one charged with the task of representing us in that country. In no better way did he show this competence than when he appeared before the house and senate foreign affairs committees, during which he answered questions put to him forthrightly, revealing a comprehensive grasp of the various aspects of the Philippine-American relationship.

He also made it a point to address various organizations, such as the veterans, the sugar men, the women's groups, the Boy Scouts, student associations, in each case presenting his views lucidly and effectively. That he made good use of every single day that he was here cannot be gainsaid. In his speeches he invariably managed to drive home a fresh perspective or a new point of view.

We are confident he will continue to represent us with the same loyalty and devotion and we wish him success in the difficult task that awaits him in Washington.

[From the Manila Times, Feb. 21, 1959]

THAW IN PROSPECT

Negotiations on outstanding Philippine-American issues enter a new stage as the two ambassadors—Gen. Carlos P. Romulo and Charles Bohlen—return to their respective posts. General Romulo is on his way back to Washington with specific instructions and assurances of full support from both the President and Congress, while Bohlen is returning with possibly a new set of instructions.

General Romulo's brief visit here has enabled both the foreign affairs department and Congress to have an idea of the progress of negotiations at the Washington end and the feeling in the U.S. capital on the various unresolved issues. In turn, it enabled General Romulo to gage the intensity of the local temper and the seriousness with which national officials are trying to press for the early settlement of P.I.-U.S. issues.

The trips of the two ambassadors have provided the necessary opportunity for fresh consultations. A thaw is, we believe, in prospect.

I also wish to include in my remarks the following news item from the Philippines Herald of February 19 which shows that General Romulo returns to his post in Washington not only with the full confidence and support of President Garcia and of the leaders of the Congress

of the Philippines but also of the Filipino people:

ROMULO DEPARTS FOR WASHINGTON

(By Vic Villafranca)

Ambassador Carlos P. Romulo left unexpectedly last night for Washington armed with instructions from President Garcia on ways of pursuing Philippine omnibus money claims against the United States.

Early yesterday, Romulo was assured of congressional confidence and support during a call on legislative leaders.

Senate President Eulogio Rodriguez said that the Ambassador has "our confidence and we are behind him."

Regarding Romulo's work in Washington, Rodriguez said the Envoy was an able and worthy spokesman and has served the Philippines faithfully in the United States.

He also praised the Ambassador's presentation of the state of Philippine-American relations.

The Senate President said:

"Ambassador Romulo has done a remarkable job in the short time that he was in the Philippines by giving not only the members of both houses of our congress but also our people as a whole a clear picture of Philippine Islands-United States relations."

In his appearance before the house and senate foreign affairs committees, Romulo, according to the legislative leaders, acquitted himself not only creditably but in a superb manner.

The Ambassador called on Rodriguez, speaker Daniel Z. Romualdez, speaker pro tempore Constancio E. Castañeda, and other congress leaders yesterday morning.

During his call on the congress leaders, Romulo took time out to sit with the newspapermen in the senate press gallery, some of whom were his colleagues when he was a newsman.

Mr. Speaker, the day General Romulo returned to the United States after his successful visit to his homeland, he was conferred one of America's highest honors. Freedoms Foundation at Valley Forge, on the occasion of the 227th birthday of George Washington, singled out the Filipino Envoy for its highest award, the Freedom Leadership Award, so far given only to three heads of state, Winston Churchill, Konrad Adenauer, and the late Ramon Magsaysay. The selection is by unanimous vote for three successive years by a jury composed of 34 leading Americans who meet at Valley Forge for 2 weeks to deliberate and choose from among various nominees.

The citation engraved on a handsome plaque and presented to General Romulo in a ceremony in Valley Forge last February 22, which was nationally televised, follows:

FREEDOMS FOUNDATION AT VALLEY FORGE HONORS AMBASSADOR CARLOS P. ROMULO

For his spirited, practical leadership of man, for his unfailing devotion to his country, for his wise counsel and exemplary character, Freedoms Foundation at Valley Forge bestows upon Carlos P. Romulo, a soldier of arms and ideas, its highest freedom leadership award.

His wisdom and courage in the quest to sustain and expand man's individual liberties have lifted the spirits of all who seek freedom.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include therein the articles referred to.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, I join the majority leader in welcoming back to Washington and hailing the return of General Romulo, who has done so much to cement relations between our two countries. I can think of no greater bond between two peoples than the blood of their common heroes.

A REAL AMERICAN—THOSE WHO ARE WILLING TO SACRIFICE AND SUFFER FOR AN IDEAL SEEM TO BE FEW IN NUMBER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, one such outstanding individual is Stanley Yankus on a farm near Dowagiac, Cass County, Mich.

Seeking freedom and opportunity, Stanley's parents left their homeland—Lithuania—to become citizens here. Stanley, born in this country, grew to young manhood, married, purchased a farm, has three children.

With the grain grown on his farm and some purchased poultry feed, he raised chickens, established a business where he sold 53,000 dozen eggs a year. His business was successful. He not only was able to provide for his family, but to accumulate a small bank account.

Then those who have comparatively little faith in the ability of the present day American to, shall we say, paddle his own canoe, began to enact and enforce what might be termed social legislation.

Through the expenditure of the tax payers' dollars, a vote-buying program was instituted. As Harry Hopkins said, "We will spend and spend, and tax and tax, and elect and elect." "Spend your dollars to elect me."

One of the provisions of the legislation—and regulations—is that no one, even though he owned his own land, could plant or harvest wheat from more than a fixed number of acres, determined by a governmental agency.

Firmly believing that a man had both the natural and constitutional right to use his own property in his own way when no one was injured. Stanley planted and harvested the wheat from a larger number of acres than that specified by the Government. He used the wheat to feed his chickens. No other purpose. He did not sell, trade or borrow a kernel. The result was that the Government came down on him, convicted him, fined him, has now forced him to sell his farm.

Under the Government regulations, he could not grow wheat, grind it in his own mill, let his wife bake the flour in his own oven, he and his family eat bread made from his own grain. If he did, he violated a Federal law, a Federal regulation.

Learning by experience that our constitutional guarantee of the right to own and use one's property was not true, Stanley has regretfully decided that he will give up his citizenship and, with his family, move to Australia where he hopes his right to freedom will be respected.

An editorial from the News-Palladium of February 24, 1959, published at Benton Harbor, Mich., gives expression to the thought of many—which is that, notwithstanding all of the restrictions imposed upon the citizen and the denial of the freedom which we have all heretofore enjoyed, this is still the country where the individual enjoys greater opportunity, more freedom than in any other country. That editorial reads:

AUSTRALIA BECKONS

Stanley Yankus, rebel Cass County chicken farmer who has been battling the Federal Government for 4 years on the issue of crop controls, announces that his 100-acre farm is for sale, and that when and if he can pay what the Government claims he owes for refusing to comply with acreage quotas of wheat, he and his family will turn their backs on the United States, and emigrate to Australia where he intends to make a fresh start.

Yankus has contended all along that he grew wheat to feed his chickens, rather than for sale on the grain market. The Government, however, has kept after Yankus, impounded his bank account and levied penalties until he is ready to give up, a bitter and disillusioned man.

Yankus intends to get a job in Australia and work for hire until he can acquire land and resume farming "down under." He feels that opportunities for pioneering and freedom are greater there for himself and his children.

The choice Yankus is making is his own, and if it is really his wish to leave America, we hope him fortune and happiness. He is an individualist who, like probably millions of other Americans, chafes under growing bureaucracy and statism. Yet there are few, however great the provocation, who would voluntarily surrender their heritage. For with all its faults, its shortcomings and mistakes, nowhere in the world, not excluding Australia, do people enjoy as much freedom, security and opportunity.

In war and peace, the Western World, at least, looks to America for aid, leadship and inspiration. Our responsibilities, whether we enjoy them or not, are to create a better world, and the effort imposed heavy burdens, among them regulations and burdens we can't shirk.

We doubt that Mr. Yankus, whose antecedents came here from Eastern Europe to escape oppression and to carve out new lives, will find any utopia, or that life in Australia will be without problems and difficulties. He obviously feels, however, that he has reached the end of the line insofar as patience and struggling against interference are concerned. We hope he finds Australia his "promised land," but are not forgetful of the fact that tens of millions throughout the world would make any sacrifice to reach America and achieve U.S. citizenship.

A false rumor circulated in Poland last week, to the effect that the United States had removed restrictions on immigrants to America, caused Poles by the thousands to stampede the U.S. Embassy, seeking entry permits to these shores.

Regardless of whether or not we approve of Mr. Yankus' decision, he may have made an historic contribution to this Nation, by focusing so much attention on menacing growth of dictatorship here and alerting the people to the dangers to their freedom. Mr. Yankus' decision must have been an excruciating one, born of desperation he could no

longer endure. His sacrifice, we hope, will help awaken all America.

But one thing is true—that, for the good of all of us, Stanley is sacrificing his opportunity here and, by so doing, is bringing home to each of us a situation which, if not speedily cured, will destroy us as a free nation.

We recall the statement of Nathan Hale who, about to be hanged by the British, said:

I only regret that I have but one life to lose for my country.

Stanley Yankus is bringing home to every thinking American the necessity of stopping in this country the trend toward tyranny.

He has but one farm to give to those who receive subsidies.

STATEMENT OF STANLEY YANKUS, BEFORE THE ALBERT SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE, FEBRUARY 27, 1959

Mr. Chairman and members of the subcommittee, permit me to express my deep appreciation for the opportunity given me to very briefly call attention to one of the inevitable results which follow the enforcement of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended.

The following is a very brief statement of what I would like to say and I hope that after it is read, I may be permitted to enlarge upon the present situation.

What will happen if the present trend in government continues, in my opinion, based upon my experience, is that the people of the United States of America will no longer be free and independent, nor will this be a free nation.

My name is Stanley Yankus. I have lived on my 100-acre farm since April 1943. I raise wheat and barley and feed it all to my chickens. I have never signed an agreement with the ASC. I have never accepted any subsidies. In the fall of 1953, an ASC agent said I could not raise wheat and feed it to my chickens. I thought this was contrary to everything American. I asked the ASC man how I would be able to make a living if I couldn't use my land? In 1954, my wheat fines equaled my entire net income. That particular year 1,100 chickens died in 10 days from a bad disease. Eggs were cheap and feed was high due to support prices. My wife and I made only $1,000 that year.

In the year 1955 I was fined about $1,034. The March issue of Readers Digest magazine has an article entitled "The Strange Crime of Stanley Yankus." What is my crime? A man does have to commit an offense to get fined or punished. I did not sell any wheat so my offense is not selling wheat. Then my offense had to be using land for producing crops.

Now, Congressmen, I would like to put the shoe on the other foot. You have passed laws permitting the Bureau of Reclamation to put new land into production. In the year 1955 alone, the Bureau of Reclamation added a 136,000 acres of land into production. So who is more guilty of the strange crime of producing crops? The Bureau of Census also states that 6 million bushels of wheat were imported in 1955. I did not add to the surplus of wheat, but you did since you have the power to regulate imports.

During the years 1954 to 1958, inclusive, I was fined $4,562 plus interest and costs. Because many of the farmers in my situation had been through courts and received adverse decisions, I decided to appeal through the press to the American people. The Detroit Times was the first large newspaper in the Nation to champion my cause.

The division of power—legislative, executive, and judicial—has been a fundamental concept of English and American law.

The ASC has nullified this concept because a bureaucrat in the Department of Agriculture can write a regulation through the Federal Register which has the effect of law. The ASC can and does execute and administer these laws, and the ASC acts as judge and jury in determining a farmer's guilt. I am not fighting for the right to grow wheat. I am fighting for the right to own property. If I am forbidden the use of my land, then I do not own it. My rights do not extend much beyond the right to pay taxes. This is tyranny.

The fifth amendment of the Constitution says "no person shall be deprived of life, liberty, or property without due process of law." The right to trial by jury is one of the due processes of law which has been denied to me.

My right to liberty should certainly be my right to earn my own living on my own farm.

Federal law should apply equally to all citizens. Yet in 36 States there are wheat restrictions, and in 12 States there are none. Thus, I am a second-class citizen because I live in a State where restrictions are imposed.

For 5 years my wheat allotment has been about 10 acres per year. Since I began to seek publicity, the ASC gave me an allotment of 28 acres for 1959. This is ample proof that allotments are established arbitrarily.

Not only have I fed all the grain I have raised but I have purchased $12,000 worth of commercial chicken feed each year. This feed contains wheat and so I have been reducing the surplus of wheat.

I have not harmed any other farmers. I have earned my own living. I have paid my taxes. How can you Congressmen justify the laws which have destroyed my means of making a living?

Many people have told me that I would lose everything by opposing these wheat laws. What is everything? Money is of no value to a slave. I think freedom is everything.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. PATMAN, for 30 minutes, on Wednesday and Thursday next, March 4 and 5, and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois, for 1 hour, on March 12 and March 16.

Mr. CRAMER, for 30 minutes, on Tuesday, March 3.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan, for 15 minutes, today.

Mr. POWELL (at the request of Mr. MCCORMACK), for 30 minutes, on Tuesday, March 3; for 30 minutes, on Wednesday, March 4; and for 2 hours, on Friday next.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. PORTER in three instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. SAYLOR and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. REES of Kansas.

Mrs. BOLTON and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. MACK of Washington and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. MCCORMACK and to include extraneous matter.

At the request of Mr. MCCORMACK, the following Members:

Mr. RODINO and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. LIBONATI.

Mr. ALGER.

(At the request of Mr. MCCORMACK and to include extraneous matter, the following:)

Mr. DENT in three instances.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 30 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, March 3, 1959, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

637. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting proposed supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year 1959 in the amount of $427,516,262 for the legislative branch, the judiciary, the District of Columbia, and various departments and agencies of the executive branch of the Government (H. Doc. 90); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

638. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting the report entitled "Third Progress Report of the Highway Cost Allocation Study", pursuant to section 210 of the Highway Revenue Act of 1956, approved June 29, 1956 (70 Stat. 387, 401), as amended by section 1 of the act approved August 28, 1958 (72 Stat. 983) (H. Doc. 91); to the Committee on Ways and Means and ordered to be printed with illustrations.

639. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting the third annual report on the financial condition and fiscal operations of the highway trust fund for the fiscal year 1958, pursuant to section 209(e)(1) of the Highway Revenue Act of 1956 (H. Doc. 92); to the Committee on Ways and Means and ordered to be printed.

640. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to provide for the relocation of the National Training School for Boys, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Government Operations.

641. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting a report covering personal property made available for distribution to public health and educational institutions and civil defense organizations under section 203(j); and all real property disposed of to public health and educational institutions under section 203(k), pursuant to the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended; to the Committee on Government Operations.

642. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a report pertaining to the construction and operation of saline water demonstration plants, pursuant to Public Law 85-883; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

643. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to provide a headquarters site for Mount Rainier

National Park in the general vicinity of Ashford, Wash., and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

644. A letter from the Acting Chairman, U.S. Atomic Energy Commission, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend Public Law 85-590 to increase the authorization for appropriations to the Atomic Energy Commission in accordance with section 261 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes"; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

645. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend section 1915 of title 28, United States Code, relating to proceedings in forma pauperis"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

646. A letter from the national director, Boys' Clubs of America, transmitting the Third Annual Report of the Boys' Clubs of America, covering the period of 1958, pursuant to Public Law 988, 84th Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

647. A letter from the corporation agent, Army and Navy Legion of Valor, of the United States Army, Inc.; transmitting the audit report of the Army and Navy Legion of Valor of the United States of America, Inc., for the period July 24, 1957 through July 17, 1958, pursuant to Public Law 224, 84th Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

648. A letter from the secretary and treasurer, Congressional Medal of Honor Society, transmitting the annual auditor's report for the calendar year 1958, pursuant to Public Law 642, 85th Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

649. A letter from the Chairman, U.S. Civil Service Commission, relative to a report concerning the establishment of positions in grades GS 16, 17, and 18 under the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, including the annual report from the Commission on Civil Rights, and the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

650. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to define the term 'gross income from the property' for the purpose of computing percentage depletion in the case of oil and gas wells"; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

651. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting the report on the investigation and study made to determine what action can be taken by the Federal Government to promote the public welfare by increasing highway safety in the United States, pursuant to section 117 of the Federal-aid Highway Act of 1956, and under the general authority of section 307 of title 23 of the United States Code, entitled "Highways" (H. Doc. 93); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed with illustrations.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, pursuant to the order of the House of February 26, 1959, the following bill was reported on February 27, 1959:

Mr. SPENCE: Committee on Banking and Currency. S. 57. An act to extend and amend laws relating to the provision and improvement of housing and the renewal of urban communities, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 86). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

[Submitted March 2, 1959]

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. ASPINALL: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 1776. A bill to amend the act of June 28, 1958, entitled "An act to provide for a National Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission, and for other purposes"; with amendment (Rept. No. 87). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ROBERTS: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. S. 79. An act to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to permit the temporary listing and certification of Citrus Red No. 2 for coloring mature oranges under tolerances found safe by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, so as to permit continuance of established coloring practice in the orange industry pending congressional consideration of general legislation for the listing and certification of food color additives under safe tolerances; without amendment (Rept. No. 88). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. KILDAY: Committee on Armed Services. H.R. 3320. A bill to amend the act of June 21, 1950, relating to the appointment of boards of medical officers; without amendment (Rept. No. 89). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. KILDAY: Committee on Armed Services. H.R. 3322. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, and certain other laws to authorize the payment of transportation and travel allowances to escorts of dependents of members of the uniformed services under certain conditions, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 90). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina: Committee on Armed Services. H.R. 3366. A bill to authorize the extension of loans of naval vessels to the Governments of Italy and Turkey; with amendment (Rept. No. 91). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. KILDAY: Committee on Armed Services. H.R. 4068. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, by repealing section 7475, which restricts the increasing of forces at naval activities prior to national elections; without amendment (Rept. No. 92). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HARRIS: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H.R. 1011. A bill to amend the Federal Airport Act in order to extend the time for making grants under the provisions of such act, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 93). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. McDONOUGH:

H.R. 5096. A bill to amend section 103 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, relating to interest on certain governmental obligations, and section 10 of the U.S. Housing Act of 1937, relating to annual contributions in assistance of low-rent housing; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ASPINALL:

H.R. 5097. A bill to amend part IV of subtitle C of title 10, United States Code, to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to take possession of the naval oil shale reserves, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 5098. A bill to provide for the application and disposition of net revenues from the power development on the Grand Valley Federal reclamation project, Colorado; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BROYHILL:

H.R. 5099. A bill to improve the administration of oversea activities of the Government of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. CELLER:

H.R. 5100. A bill to provide for the establishment of a U.S. Foreign Service Academy; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CONTE:

H.R. 5101. A bill to provide for the approval of the 1956 payment in lieu of taxes made to the city of Holyoke, Mass., under the U.S. Housing Act of 1937; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. CURTIS of Missouri:

H.R. 5102. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to allow a deduction for certain expenses incurred by a taxpayer for the care of his children while his wife is physically or mentally incapable of caring for such children; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee:

H.R. 5103. A bill to repeal the act requiring the filing of certain information with respect to trade between the United States and its noncontiguous territory; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DURHAM:

H.R. 5104. A bill to amend the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

H.R. 5105. A bill to amend Public Law 85-590 to increase the authorization for appropriations to the Atomic Energy Commission in accordance with section 261 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

By Mr. DURHAM (by request):

H.R. 5106. A bill to authorize appropriations for the Atomic Energy Commission in accordance with section 261 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

By Mr. ELLIOTT:

H.R. 5107. A bill to establish an effective program to alleviate conditions of substantial and persistent unemployment and underemployment in certain economically depressed areas; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 5108. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to exempt a corporation from the corporate income tax where its operations are carried on in an economically depressed area and provide employment for a specified minimum number of persons in that area; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. EVERETT:

H.R. 5109. A bill to repeal the excise tax on amounts paid for communication services or facilities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FALLON:

H.R. 5110. A bill to amend section 4242 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to exempt from the club dues tax certain charges made by nonprofit clubs for the use of facilities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 5111. A bill granting to persons in the classified (competitive) civil service the right to a hearing before removal or suspension, and the right to a judicial review of a removal or suspension; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. FLYNT:

H.R. 5112. A bill to amend section 90, title 38, United States Code, so that burial allowances might be paid in cases where discharges were changed by competent authority after death of the veteran from dishonorable to conditions other than dishonorable; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 5113. A bill to amend Public Law 85-422 so as to place all retired military personnel in one category as to retirement pay; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 5114. A bill to provide for the construction of a new Federal building in Newnan, Ga.; to the Committee on Public Works.

H.R. 5115. A bill to guarantee the right of trial by jury in certain contempt cases in U.S. courts and to restrict citations for contempt to proceedings involving persons having actual notice of terms of writ, order, rule, decree, or command of the court, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5116. A bill to amend sections 4081 and 4082 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to include wholesale distributors within the definition of "producers" of gasoline, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 5117. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide a wage credit of $160 per month for active military or naval service during World War I; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FRAZIER:

H.R. 5118. A bill to repeal the excise tax on amounts paid for communication services or facilities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GIAIMO:

H.R. 5119. A bill to provide that the Secretary of the Interior shall develop and carry out an emergency program for the eradication of starfish in Long Island Sound and adjacent waters; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. GRANT:

H.R. 5120. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide a credit against income tax for contributions to educational institutions and taxes paid for school purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HUDDLESTON:

H.R. 5121. A bill to regulate the foreign commerce of the United States by amending section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. IKARD:

H.R. 5122. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that certain insurance agents shall be treated as outside salesmen for purposes of computing adjusted gross income; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KING of California:

H.R. 5123. A bill to extend the Renegotiation Act of 1951 for 2 years, to provide additional factors to be considered in determining excessive profits, to permit appeals from decisions of the Tax Court in renegotiation cases, to provide for reports to Congress, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LOSER:

H.R. 5124. A bill to amend section 21 of the Second Liberty Bond Act to provide for the retirement of the public debt; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 5125. A bill to repeal the excise tax on amounts paid for communication services or facilities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MATTHEWS:

H.R. 5126. A bill to provide for the construction of a new Federal building in Gainesville, Fla.; to the Committee on Public Works.

H.R. 5127. A bill to provide for the construction of a new Federal post office building in Palatka, Fla.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. O'BRIEN of New York:

H.R. 5128. A bill to amend section 27 of the Revised Organic Act of the Virgin Islands; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 5129. A bill to equalize the pay of retired members of the uniformed services; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. OLIVER:

H.R. 5130. A bill to regulate the foreign commerce of the United States by amending section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PORTER:

H.R. 5131. A bill to provide for the establishment by the Secretary of the Interior of a Pacific Northwest account, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina:

H.R. 5132. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, with respect to active duty agreements for Reserve officers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. SANTANGELO:

H.R. 5133. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to grant an additional income tax exemption for a taxpayer supporting a dependent who is 65 years of age or over; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TOLLEFSON (by request):

H.R. 5134. A bill to authorize a per capita payment to enroll members of the confederated tribes and bands of the Yakima Indian Nation; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ULLMAN:

H.R. 5135. A bill to amend the Employment Act of 1946 to establish policies with respect to productive capital investments of the Government; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. WALTER:

H.R. 5136. A bill to provide for the supervision of deportable aliens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BATES:

H.R. 5137. A bill to amend title 10 of the United States Code with respect to procurement procedures of the armed services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BROYHILL:

H.R. 5138. A bill to extend the grounds of the Custis-Lee Mansion in Arlington National Cemetery; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. COOLEY:

H.R. 5139. A bill to express and effectuate the policy of Congress with respect to the disposal of surplus agricultural commodities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. DAWSON (by request):

H.R. 5140. A bill to further amend the Reorganization Act of 1949, as amended, so that such act will apply to reorganization plans transmitted to the Congress at any time in conformity with the provisions of the act; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. FLOOD:

H.R. 5141. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a taxpayer who resides in an economically depressed area to deduct as a trade or business expense his traveling expenses incurred in seeking and performing employment or self-employment outside such area; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LANGEN:

H.R. 5142. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to protect the public from unsanitary milk and milk products shipped in interstate commerce, without unduly burdening such commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. McGOVERN:

H.R. 5143. A bill to amend section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, as amended; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. METCALF:

H.R. 5144. A bill to provide for the construction of the Knowles Dam project on the Flathead River in the State of Montana for the protection and development of the Flathead and Columbia River Basins; to promote the agricultural and industrial development primarily of the State of Montana, but also of downstream areas; to improve navigability and to assist flood control on the Flathead and Columbia Rivers; to provide for the national defense and welfare by advancing the integrated comprehensive development of the water resources of the Pacific Northwest, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 5145. A bill to provide that certain lands shall be held in trust for Indian tribes on the Fort Belknap Reservation, and to provide that such lands shall become part of such reservation; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MURRAY:

H.R. 5146. A bill to amend title 23 of the United States Code in order to increase the amount authorized for bridges over Federal dams; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. PIRNIE:

H.R. 5147. A bill to provide for the recognition of the Polish Legion of American Veterans by the Secretary of Defense and the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. WHITENER:

H.R. 5148. A bill to provide for the removal of the James A. Garfield Monument from its present location, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. YOUNGER:

H.R. 5149. A bill to limit the size of payments to farmers; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ALFORD:

H.J. Res. 274. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing for reconfirmation by the Senate of certain appointments made by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ASHLEY:

H.J. Res. 275. Joint resolution designating the third Monday in February of each year as a legal public holiday to be known as Presidents' Day, providing for the observance of certain other legal holidays on days other than those now fixed by law, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ELLIOTT:

H.J. Res. 276. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MEYER:

H.J. Res. 277. Joint resolution requesting the President to issue a proclamation designating 1959 for the observance of the 350th anniversary of the historic voyages of Hudson and Champlain; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COLMER:

H.J. Res. 278. Joint resolution authorizing the President to take such steps as he deems necessary to carry out U.S. responsibilities for Berlin; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ANDERSON of Montana:

H. Con. Res. 92. Concurrent resolution that it is the sense of Congress that House Concurrent Resolution 108, dated August 1, 1953 (83d Cong.) shall be interpreted as stating an objective, not an immediate goal, as it pertains to Indian "termination" of relations with the Government; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. METCALF:

H. Con. Res. 93. Concurrent resolution to restate Federal responsibility toward Indians and the Federal Government's relations with Indian tribes and groups; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. WALTER:

H. Res. 187. Resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of House Report No. 41, current session; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. CLARK:

H. Res. 188. Resolution to postpone the consummation of a TVA contract to an English firm; to the Committee on Public Works.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. MARTIN: Resolutions of the General Court of Massachusetts memorializing Congress to enact legislation providing for a minimum wage of $1.25 per hour; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

Also, resolutions of the General Court of Massachusetts memorializing the Congress of the United States to establish a national cemetery in New England; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Also, resolutions of the General Court of Massachusetts memorializing the Congress of the United States against granting concessions on textile imports from foreign countries; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. PFOST: Memorial of the Senate of the State of Idaho with respect to the Director of the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization exercising the powers conferred upon him to enter into contracts with the producers of domestic cobalt at a rate per pound to compare with the rate paid foreign producers; to the Committee on Armed Services.

Also, memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Idaho, relative to repealing House Concurrent Resolution 108, 83d Congress, and that a statement of policy be enacted regarding the Indian people, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States with respect to the Director of the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization exercising the powers conferred upon him to enter into contracts with the producers of domestic cobalt at a rate per pound to compare with the rate paid foreign producers; to the Committee on Armed Services.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to requesting amendment to title IV, section 401, subsection (a) of Public Law 815, as amended, 81st Congress, concerning construction of adequate school facilities; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to prepare legislation that reports be made by the Office of the Comptroller General disclosing to the various States the amount of unclaimed money and other property held by the Federal Government and the persons to whom the same belong, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States, opposing the enactment of H.R. 1929 because of its effect on the natural resources industries of the State; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States, relative to repealing House Concurrent Resolution 108, 83d Congress and that a statement of policy be enacted regarding the Indian people and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Massachusetts, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to investigate and determine the causes of inflation and to enact remedial legislation; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Massachusetts, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to enact and enforce legislation to implement the decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States outlawing segregation in the public school system; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Massachusetts, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to enact legislation providing for a minimum wage of $1.25 per hour; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Massachusetts, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to establish a national cemetery in New England; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Massachusetts memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States against granting concessions on textile imports from foreign countries; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Utah, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to requesting such remedial action as deemed necessary to preclude the closing of low power television booster stations; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Wyoming, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to the passing of legislation relating to the amendment of section 2(c) of the Mineral Leasing Act of February 25, 1920, as amended (41 Stat. 448, 30 U.S.C. 184), removing restriction on railroad companies in regard to the leasing of public lands for coal purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Wyoming, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States concerning the abolishing of personal income, estate, and gift taxes and prohibiting the U.S. Government from engaging in business in competition with its citizens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BOGGS:

H.R. 5150. A bill for the relief of Our Lady of the Lake Church; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURNS of Hawaii:

H.R. 5151. A bill for the relief of Felicidad Caletena; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CURTIS of Massachusetts:

H.R. 5152. A bill to provide for a posthumous cash award in recognition of the contribution made by the late Dr. Saul Hertz in the medical use of radioactive iodine; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CURTIS of Missouri:

H.R. 5153. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon certain claims of Roger W. Evans and Jamerson C. McCormack; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DERWINSKI:

H.R. 5154. A bill for the relief of Miss Anka Grahovac; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FLOOD:

H.R. 5155. A bill for the relief of Ralph H. Traher; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FLYNT:

H.R. 5156. A bill for the relief of the Collier Manufacturing Co., of Barnesville, Ga.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FRAZIER:

H.R. 5157. A bill for the relief of Alexandra Nicholas Karageorgeou; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HIESTAND:

H.R. 5158. A bill for the relief of Shigeko Mizuta; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'BRIEN of New York:

H.R. 5159. A bill for the relief of Epifania Gitto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5160. A bill for the relief of William Joseph Vincent; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RAY:

H.R. 5161. A bill for the relief of Michael Fodale; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROGERS of Colorado:

H.R. 5162. A bill for the relief of Ioannis Doumouliakas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. WEIS:

H.R. 5163. A bill for the relief of the Rochester Iron & Metal Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'BRIEN of Illinois:

H. Res. 189. Resolution providing for sending the bill H.R. 5093 for the relief of North Counties Hydro-Electric Co. and accompanying papers to the Court of Claims; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

TVA Contract

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN H. DENT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 2, 1959

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, last week I introduced a resolution calling upon the TVA, the OMCD, and other departments and agencies of Government to reconsider the contract awarded to Parsons of England, for electrical equipment never before purchased outside the continental United States.

This order would have given much-needed labor to the many unemployed in my district, and other districts in western and eastern Pennsylvania.

In introducing this resolution I had the full support and cosponsorship of the following Members of Congress: Congressman ELMER HOLLAND, Congressman FRANK CLARK, Congressman MORGAN, Congressman MOORHEAD, and Congressman MILLIKEN, of Pennsylvania.

You will note, sir, that this effort is bipartisan. I have since been informed by the following Members of Congress of their full support in this endeavor: Congressman SAYLOR, Congressman VAN ZANDT, Congressman GAVIN, Congressman KEARNS, Congressman RICHARD

SIMPSON, and Congressman STANLEY PROKOP, of Pennsylvania.

I am sure that other Pennsylvania Members would join me if the opportunity presents itself to present a joint plea to bring this work to the workmen and industry of Pennsylvania.

Water Resources Development

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. MIKE MANSFIELD

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 2, 1959

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a very worthwhile speech by the senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER].

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SPEECH DELIVERED BY SENATOR ALLEN J. ELLENDER BEFORE THE ANNUAL MEETING OF THE NEW YORK STATE WATERWAYS ASSOCIATION IN NEW YORK CITY, ON FEBRUARY 27, 1959

Ladies and gentlemen, I am indebted to President Wright for inviting me to speak before your annual meeting of the New York State Waterways Association.

I prize this invitation, since it comes from an organization which, although far removed in miles from my home State of Louisiana, is shoulder to shoulder with us in purpose—the protection and development of one of our most precious resources, water.

My interest in water resources development goes back a long way. I was born at Montegut, La., a small village located about 30 miles from the Gulf of Mexico, and some 16 miles south of my present home at Houma.

Houma, a city of about 25,000 inhabitants, is located about 50 miles southwest of the great port at New Orleans, at the junction of Bayou Terrebonne, a navigable stream which carries a great deal of freight, and the Gulf Intracoastal Waterway, with which all of you are doubtless familiar. The great Mississippi is less than 20 miles away, as the crow flies.

Having been born and reared in this area, I know at first hand the hazards of uncontrolled water, and, conversely, the benefits of wise development of this resource. With such a background the importance of a well-regulated and maintained system of waterways was impressed upon me at an early age. Through the 22 years I have served in the U.S. Senate, that interest has not only been maintained, but it has grown.

In those years I have devoted much time and energy in helping formulate and develop a long-range, well-planned program of our water and land resources. In all humility, but with some pride, I feel that I have achieved some slight degree of success in these long-range plans.

With your indulgence, I would like to expand my remarks to include a birdseye view of the great Mississippi, with the city of New Orleans as the gateway between the Mississippi Valley and the fabulous riches to the south of us.

Some 41 percent of the area of the United States is drained through the Mississippi River. In the last major flood on the Mississippi—that of 1927—an area of 23,000 square miles was inundated. This is about the combined area of the States of Vermont, New Hampshire, and Connecticut.

Cities, towns, and farms were flooded, destroying crops and paralyzing industry. Scores of lives were lost. Property damage ran into hundreds of millions of dollars; rail transportation suffered heavily, with only one rail line operating for a time east and west below Cairo, Ill.; highways and bridges were unstable for weeks; and thousands of people were left homeless and destitute.

The havoc that would result from a repetition of such a flood today, with the increase in population and the growth of industry in this area, is impossible to conceive. Fortunately, a comprehensive plan for the development of the Mississippi River and its tributaries was authorized in 1928, the year following this great flood. Since that time work has progressed steadily, although after 31 years this project is only 72 percent complete. Yet, the benefits from this project already exceed the costs by a benefit-to-cost ratio of 5 to 1.

One of the prime inland waterways of this area, the Gulf Intracoastal Waterway which passes Houma, was authorized on the basis of developing 400,000 tons of commerce a year, but the tonnage on that waterway now exceeds 13 million tons. More important, however, is the fact that the development of this waterway was a major factor in creating the vast industrial complex of the Texas-Louisiana Gulf Coastal area.

Thus my interest in the beneficial development of water resources of the Nation stems from a personal conviction that such developments were an important factor in achieving our present high standards of living, not only in the area of my home State but all across this great Nation of ours.

I believe that unless a well-planned and aggressive program of water resource development is carried forward, our children and grandchildren will not have an opportunity to enjoy the many advantages that today we take for granted.

My convictions in this have been strengthened by my recent travels through Europe and Asia. I believe that unless we protect our greatest resource, water, unless we keep it inland and do not let it flow to the sea unused, some day many parts of our great country may become as barren as the Gobi Desert, or as the lands which I have seen on my travels in old Persia. Our history books tell us that about 500 years before Christ, the entire area of Persia was capable of sustaining the livelihood of 115 million people. Now it adequately can care for less than 14 million.

Consider the great Valley of Mesopotamia between the Tigris and Euphrates Rivers. At one time that area could produce food and fiber for 15 million people. Today that great valley can hardly supply the needs of 2 million people. And why? Because of the neglect of a great natural resource—water. If it had been possible to retain the waters upstream on those great rivers, and not permit them to steal the rich topsoil and float it into the interior of the country and into the sea, the chances are that that great valley would still be very productive.

The fact is, that those rivers carried millions of tons of earth down the streams and clogged the small tributaries and rivers in Mesopotamia. Today that land is not suitable for much cultivation. It is sour. It cannot be farmed. Certainly we cannot afford to let that happen in our great country.

Two years ago I visited various portions of the Soviet Union for well over a month. This was my third trip to this country in as many years. I had the opportunity of visiting cities never before seen by an American Government official; cities in the far reaches of Siberia, an area which had been pictured to me before my visit as wastelands of snow and ice—as a vast prison camp. But that was not what I found. To my great surprise, I saw a virgin land being awakened, a land that promises to make Siberia the granary of Russia. Industry was flourishing to a surprising degree. One of the principal tools the Russians were employing in this development was a well planned utilization of its waterways system, both for navigation and the development of power from falling water. I saw several hydroelectric power stations that were larger than our biggest and one that was almost twice as large as any we have in this country. I saw foundations poured for turbines and generators which will have a rated capacity of 300,000 kw. each—almost three times larger than anything we have. And these projects, gentlemen, were designed, constructed, and had all component parts built within the Soviet Union. In fact, much of the work on the large turbines was being done at Novosibirisk, a place which was a small trading post in 1905, but is now a city of almost 1 million.

As a result of my inspection of installations in Russia, I am convinced that in water transportation and hydroelectric power development the Russians are inching ahead of us.

In any comparison of time, money and effort expended on resource development in Soviet Russia and the United States, there is, of course, absolutely nothing that we can do about the rate of such developments in Russia. They are proceeding with their own resources to meet the needs of their own economy. We must direct our attention to what we can do to satisfy our own needs.

There have been many studies of resource developments by presidential committees. One of the most recent was the Presidential Advisory Committee on Water Resources Policy, dated December 22, 1955. In that report it was stated that the estimated use of water in the United States in 1950 was 185 billion gallons per day and that, based on an estimated population of 200 million by 1975, the requirements would be 350 billion gallons per day.

However, the November 28, 1958, issue of the U.S. News & World Report contained a very penetrating article by Dr. Philip M. Hauser on the so-called explosion of population in the United States, which sheds more light on this problem of expanding population.

Dr. Hauser is head of the Department of Sociology at the University of Chicago, and has been Deputy Director of U.S. Census. He points out that the newest projections of the Census Bureau place the population of the United States in 1975 at between 216 and 244 million.

That is an increase in the predictions of from 8 to 20 percent in the past 3 years.

Putting it another way, taking a mean of the projections, a population of 230 million by 1975 would mean a 30-percent increase in our population in the next 16 years. Think of the tremendous increase in demand on all elements of our resources, including water. In terms of water demand, we will require about 400 billion gallons per day. In other words, during the quarter century period from 1950 to 1975 we will more than double our water requirement.

Thus it should be apparent that plans must be made now to meet these increased needs.

When you consider the time required to develop a major project—3 years or more for planning, then 8 to 10 years for construction—it is evident that it is none too early to start projects needed and justified now.

They will become critically urgent long before they can be completed on an economical program. Crash programs should be avoided if at all possible, since they are always more expensive than necessary, and frequently do not provide for the optimum use of the site.

And yet, in the face of all this data, how is the present administration meeting the known demand for resource development? It has not only failed to recommend funds to start surveys, plans, or new projects that are needed now, but last year built into the budget a planned slowdown which would delay the benefits of the projects underway as well as increase their ultimate cost.

As you all know, last year when the Congress added some new starts for planning and construction, there was a terrific blast from the White House.

On September 2, 1958, the President reluctantly signed the public works appropriation bill. At that time he issued the following statement:

"In the Public Works Appropriation Act, 1959, the Congress has included approximately $39 million in funds to initiate construction on 65 unbudgeted new project starts that will ultimately cost almost $700 million. Adding nearly $700 million to the already heavy future commitments for Federal water resource projects is but another instance of irresponsibility in the expenditure of public funds. I am compelled to approve the act, however, because it appropriates essential funds for continuing work on river and harbor, flood control, and reclamation projects that were started in previous years."

When you consider that the appropriation for construction in the 1959 act was approximately $870 million, was it really an act of irresponsibility in the expenditure of public funds to start new projects which will ultimately cost nearly $700 million? That is adding less than 1 year's future commitment at the present rate of construction.

Unless it is the desire of the administration that the water resource program wither and die on the vine—and that may be the underlying reason—a fair number of new starts should be added each year.

Perhaps those shortsighted planners in the Budget Bureau believe that the Federal Government is spending too large a portion of its budget in developing the water resources of this Nation. Let us examine the facts.

Between 1950 and 1956 our national population increased 11.2 percent. Between 1950 and 1956 the national income increased 42 percent. During the same period the expenditures for rivers and harbors and flood control decreased 14.9 percent.

I believe those figures are very significant.

As all of you know, construction costs have increased on an average of 5 percent a year. If that average is applied to the 1950 expenditure of $627 million, we should be spending about $908 million in 1959 on the civil functions of the Corps of Engineers in order to maintain the same level of operations as in 1950. In contrast, the appropriation was just under $814 million. This comparison disregards the increased need for these public works resulting from our expanding population.

What is the situation in your own backyard—the Middle Atlantic Division of the Corps of Engineers?

The 1960 budget requests $37,448,000 for the continuation of construction on 13 projects. Of these 13 projects, 7 would be completed with the funds requested in 1960. If the budget were to follow its usual course, the 1961 request would be for approximately $24,294,000 for the continuation of six projects, of which three would be completed with the funds requested. By 1962 the budget request would be $21,511,000 for three projects, of which two would be completed with the funds requested. Thereafter you could expect about $13.75 million for the next 2 years to complete the Delaware River Channel.

Had it not been for the new starts added by the Congress, or had the President been granted the item veto he requests, the picture would be even more bleak.

I believe that one of the most vital interests of your association is the improvement and betterment of the 525 miles of the New York State Barge Canal System. This is probably the largest State-owned canal system in the United States. The foresight of the people of the great State of New York in the early 1800's in building this canal has always had my admiration. The part it played in the development of your Empire State and the rest of the United States, particularly the Middle West, cannot be overestimated.

I am aware that efforts are being made to amend the constitution of New York State to permit the legislature to lease or transfer the barge canal to the Federal Government. As I understand the situation, legislation authorizing such transfer passed the legislature in 1958 and similar legislation, now pending, must be adopted this year in order that the proposal may be submitted to the voters in a referendum. Certainly there is a real need for a modern barge canal system, and I am pleased to note that the State legislators are studying the problem of the future of this waterway. It certainly demonstrates a healthy interest by the State of New York in waterway improvements.

The thought expressed in certain quarters as to the reduced future need or role of this system in the overall transportation requirements of the Middle West and Northeastern United States, in view of the early opening of the St. Lawrence Seaway, may be giving some of you apprehension as to the continued interest of the United States in its improvement. While initially there may be some minor traffic for overseas destinations that will be diverted to the new seaway, the system will continue to be a vital artery of commerce to serve the large number of industrial centers which the existence of the barge canal itself helped to create and expand. The seaway will doubtless generate new enterprises and activities which may make your canal system even more vital to the continued growth of the State of New York and the Nation at large.

I can assure you that many Members of the Congress are aware of the continued importance of this system to the welfare of the Nation. This is evidenced by the Federal participation in its modernization as authorized in the River and Harbor Acts of 1935 and again in 1945. It is regretted that the national crisis of the Second World War and the Korean situation made necessary a slowdown of this improvement. I was pleased that last year, through the efforts of the Senate Committee on Appropriations, we were able to give this project a boost by providing an additional unbudgeted $800,000 to the budget estimate of $110,000 in order that a start could be made on replacing a pair of guard gates at Waterford.

In 1935 deepening between locks and the raising of bridges were authorized. Of the 65 bridges to be raised, 42 have been or are being raised and the deepening was completed in 1941 with only some widening at structures remaining to be done. The 1945 act approved deepening through the locks. The sills of 18 locks have been or are in the process of being lowered with 9 locks or structures still remaining to be done.

The Corps of Enginers has been directed to restudy the project with a view of eliminating the restriction in the 1935 act on overall expenditure by the Federal Government and to determine what further improvement might be justified.

Under the present Federal project, the responsibility for preparing specifications and designs rests with the Department of Public Works of the State of New York. Such plans must then be approved by the Corps of Engineers. Contracts are then let by the Department of Public Works of New York and finally, disbursement of Federal funds is authorized by the Corps of Engineers when the work is completed to reimburse the State for expenditures under the contract. Due to the fact that the organization responsible for planning and construction of the project is not the agency that supports the budget request, I fear that the importance of early obligation and expenditure of funds is not fully appreciated.

I recall several occasions when it was impossible to obtain even the budget estimate for this project because funds for the previous year had not been obligated at the time of the hearings.

Your State officials have demonstrated their faith and confidence in the future of their canal system in proceeding with the improvement with State funds pending future appropriation by the Congress.

For years, New York Harbor has had two unique river and harbor activities: the supervision of New York Harbor function and the collection of drift, with which I have become familiar during appropriation hearings. The vast quantity of waste materials generated here surely needs adequate surveillance to insure its proper and legal disposal. The hazard of drift and its damaging effect on boat operation is known to me. I trust our appropriations for these activities have been adequate. If not—show us why.

You have many other interesting and important projects in this area, which are sometimes difficult to follow, since New York Harbor is not included as a whole in one Federal project, but is made up of about 35 projects. Your Kills, or New York and New Jersey Channels project, now nearing completion and again being studied for further improvement; the Newark Bay, Hackensack and Passaic Rivers area, largely completed except for the Hackensack, but needing further study due to your Port of New York Authority's development at Newark and Elizabeth; the Buttermilk Channel that needs completion; the Pierhead Channel in upper bay; and the many smaller channels and harbors. You are truly a series of ports within ports, any one of which in itself warrants the concern, interest and attention of the Federal Government. However, all of these features suffer by reason of the no-new-start policy of the administration.

Unless some of the review studies for modernization of these waterways are permitted to be started, you may have to wait 4 or 5 years before you can start some of the improvements that are needed today.

Another important project in this area is the deepening of the Hudson River, from 27 to 32 feet up to Albany, N.Y. Last year the Senate, following the recommendations of the Appropriations Committee, approved funds to initiate this important modernization of the Hudson River. Unfortunately, this appropriation did not survive the House-Senate conference. I am hopeful that this project can be started in fiscal year 1960.

There are many other projects I could discuss, but those mentioned are vastly important—important not only to the people of New York, but to those of the entire Nation as well.

To plagiarize a phrase often used, I believe that what is good for New York is good for the country, just as I also believe that what is good for Louisiana is also good for the country.

That is why my temper rises and my blood boils when I hear the all too familiar label

of "pork barrel" placed on public works projects. These shortsighted mudslingers have no conception of the good that flows to our entire Nation as a result of such programs.

A channel in New York is deepened, and as a result, increased trade pours into Pennsylvania. A harbor in Louisiana is completed and there is an increased demand for Iowa corn, Pittsburgh steel, and so on.

These are the true end results of public work programs—increased trade and activity which will continue to keep our country great and at the forefront of nations.

That is why I cannot understand the position of the present administration. It is not possible for me to accept the thesis that the American economy cannot afford the expenditure of funds for projects which will eventually produce more wealth for all of us.

Efforts to cut down our public works programs are merely shortsighted attempts to curtail spending that in the long run will just cost the American people more money. If the administration is so eager to cut down Federal spending I invite its attention to the trimming of our foreign aid program.

As you are aware, the Congress has been ask to cut back public works expenditures for next year, while in the next breath, the administration has requested a 26 percent increase in our foreign aid programs.

Perhaps one way to obtain adequate public works programs—and I might add, without the benefit of justification and the close watch of the Corps of Engineers over projects—is to secede from the Union and ask for foreign aid.

If this situation were not so serious it would be farcical. We have an administration that on the one hand is attempting to slowly stifle the progress made in recent years in the development of our waterways, and on th other hand, willingly pours money with both hands into foreign countries.

I repeat, our public works programs are investments in the future of America, and I for one, know of no better place to invest our money, our faith, and our efforts.

I believe the time has come for the Members of Congress—and the entire Nation as well—to stand up and demand that the administration take a new look at its public works policy—or else prepare for the entrance of a new administration that will.

Statement of Secretary of Agriculture on Farm Surpluses

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BARRY GOLDWATER
OF ARIZONA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, March 2, 1959

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, on February 15 there was published as an editorial in the Washington Evening Star Secretary Benson's own condensation of his statement made before the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. President, there are some who dislike the Secretary, some who dislike his actions and doubt his sincerity. I am not one of those. I have the utmost respect for Mr. Benson. I consider him to be one of the finest men ever to occupy a position in public life at such a high level.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the statement, which was published as an editorial, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BENSON ON FARM SURPLUSES

"The question of what to do about our farm surpluses is before Congress once more. This year the question pretty much gets down to what we do about wheat-support prices. The major part of our surplus is now concentrated in wheat. Certainly, if you add cotton and corn to wheat, you have represented 85 percent of the crops in Government hands or under loan, and they presently total above $7.5 billion, and rising. Surpluses will soon cost us about $1 billion annually in storage and interest charges alone.

"We had a great year for wheat in 1958, by far the biggest crop in history. It amounted to 1.2 billion bushels, yet we can consume at home and sell abroad only about 900 million bushels. The rest goes into expensive storage. This does not have a wide benefit for our farmers. As a matter of fact, the bulk of the payments go to less than 10 percent of those who grow wheat.

"Actually, farmers generally are doing fairly well. Farmownership is at the highest level in history, and so are net equities. The condition of life on the farm has improved immensely and there is no longer that old sharp economic, cultural and educational dividing line between life on the farm and life in the city. Transportation, television, electricity have worked wonders. True, there are hardship areas and the cost-price squeeze is especially harmful to farmers, but unrealistic wheat support prices offer no way to alleviate them. There are other means and we are now pursuing them.

"What we need now in the Department of Agriculture is congressional authority to set wheat supports at levels that will lead to sales, not storage bins. In this way, we can retain and build our foreign markets and still produce all that our domestic consumers care to buy. This would save us billions yearly, help to revitalize our agriculture at home and abroad."

The above is Secretary of Agriculture Benson's own condensation of his statement to the Senate Agriculture Committee. We thought it worthy of reproduction in this form. It makes a good editorial.

Dr. Godfrey Lowell Cabot

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES O. PORTER
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 2, 1959

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I would like publicly to congratulate Dr. Godfrey L. Cabot of 242 Beacon Street, Boston, Mass., on the occasion of his 98th birthday on February 26, 1959.

Dr. Cabot is a businessman, a philanthropist, and a citizen who all his life has devoted himself to public service and better government.

Graduating with high honors from Harvard in 1882, Dr. Cabot undertook graduate study in geology and then established the highly successful Godfrey L. Cabot, Inc., in Boston with branches in many parts of the country.

One of his lifetime special interests has been aviation. Dr. Cabot learned to fly at the age of 55, an age when many men are thinking of retiring, by winning his Navy wings at Pensacola in 1918. He then completed a successful experiment of picking up cargo from the water in a moving plane, much to the astonishment of authorities in the Navy Department who were less than enthusiastic, at that time, about aviation. Subsequently, Dr. Cabot has been president of the National Aeronautical Association; one of the original directors of the Aviation Research Foundation, and remains honorary president of the Federation Aeronautique Internationale (FAI) which keeps the official worldwide records for aviation achievements by all countries.

Dr. Cabot in his 90's retains a modern view of the great future possibilities for aviation and in a recent letter to Prof. Langdon P. Marvin, Jr., he made this prophecy:

I predict that the time will come when the freight traffic through the air will greatly exceed passenger traffic through the air, and the receipts for carrying their goods through the air will be greater than for carrying passengers through the air. I predict that the time will come when the passenger and freight traffic through the air will be to a great extent separated, and most of the freight carried by planes that are built specially for that purpose.

It is a source of inspiration to all of us to contemplate the active intelligence of Dr. Cabot, and his many friends join with me in wishing congratulations on his 98th birthday and best wishes for many more birthdays to come.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert a letter from the President to Dr. Cabot and join in the President's congratulations:

THE WHITE HOUSE, *February 24, 1958.*

DR. GODFREY L. CABOT,
Boston, Mass.

DEAR DR. CABOT: I am reminded that February 26 brings around your 97th birthday anniversary. I am sure that as you look back upon America's tremendous progress during your lifetime you have the same feeling of pride as do I, and I hope that you will share in the immense possibilities that seem to be just around the corner for us—and for all peoples.

From my friends I know that you are as keen an observer of the passing scene as ever, and I do hope that I shall have the privilege of sending you my warmest felicitations, as I do now, for many future years.

With best wishes and warm regard,

Sincerely,

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

Second Anniversary of Ghana Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 2, 1959

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following message which I recorded for the Voice of America extending congratulations to the peo-

ple of Ghana on the second anniversary of their independence:

My warmest congratulations to the people of Ghana on this, the second anniversary of your independence.

What a day it was in 1957. Indescribable heat that everyone ignored. Amazingly well-managed crowds—deeply interesting ceremonies culminating in that final midnight moment when the Prime Minister spoke from the little stand in the Polo Field and said: At long last we are free.

All this is in my mind today.

To Dr. Kwame Nkrumah, I extend my good wishes and friendly congratulations.

How proud all of you must be of the advances that have been made in your educational services in all fields of education. Such evidences of your recognition of the fundamental part education plays in all areas of freedom give confidence to all.

Last summer we here in the U.S. Congress of which I am a long-time Member welcomed your Prime Minister with sincere pleasure. He spoke to us of your country's need for American investment. He told us of your efforts to eradicate poverty, disease, and illiteracy, and to achieve the sustained economic development which will permit a reasonable standard of living.

We have been happy that a survey team has gone to you in preparation for a useful mission of technical cooperation. We are ready to serve with you in the program you are developing.

This is but a word, on this, the second anniversary of your freedom, to congratulate you and to wish for you all good things.

Heaven bless you, Mr. Prime Minister, and every man, woman, and child in Ghana.

Washington Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 2, 1959

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following newsletter of February 28, 1959:

WASHINGTON REPORT

(By Congressman BRUCE ALGER)

George Washington's Farewell Address, of September 17, 1796, is read yearly in the House and Senate on his birthday. Though his principles are timeless and enduring, it is ironic to recognize how we moderns seem determined to shut our eyes to the great abiding truths. His admonitions include:

1. The importance of the Federal union of States, and strict observance of the Constitution and its proper amendment process (no amendment by reinterpretation);

2. Government by separated divisions is good, each checking the other (no usurpation of power by one branch or of State powers by the Federal Government);

3. There can be no national morality if the sense of religious obligation and principle fails in us. (How do we measure up here?)

4. Preserve public credit, be selective in tax, avoid debt, do not burden posterity (and now even our Government bonds are considered less desirable as investments because Congress has depreciated the value of our money by profligate spending);

5. No entangling alliances or favored treatment of any nation, but rather commerce and enlightened self-interest (check our foreign aid, trade programs, and alliances against this).

The payroll of a Representative is public information, and should be (although this is not so in practice in the Senate). Who is hired and what is paid, within limits, is left largely to the discretion of the individual Congressman. Some hire kinfolks, and some pay higher than others. The judgment of the Congressman is the deciding factor and is, of course, subject to approval or disapproval by the voters every 2 years. For my part, I believe in running my office like a business, with incentive pay the factor—pay well as it's earned but only for equivalent performance, value received. On this basis, my staff measures up. No secrets either; the pay records will always stand public scrutiny.

The criticism of the Senate leadership leveled by Wisconsin Democrat WILLIAM PROXMIRE points up a problem of concern to all Congressmen in both parties. Under our setup, Congressmen are elected to represent specific areas, not parties. But just as power has gravitated from the States and localities to Washington, power in the Congress has tended to concentrate in the hands of the majority party's leadership. When as at present a party's majority is somewhat lopsided, and there's even a modicum of party discipline, the power of the leadership can be rather considerable. Particularly is this so at present when Democrats in both Houses are led by men from the same area who have long worked in close cahoots. Representative government may not be very representative. A legislative program may depend on a party line and how that line is determined can be vitally important. If it's arrived at by political masterminding at the top rather than from the bottom up, defections are inevitable among Congressmen really trying to be representative of their States or districts, rather than just acquiescent cogs in a party machine over which they have no control.

Debt retirement by the Federal Government received some attention this week, with several Texans proposing that a yearly payment on our debt be included in the budget. Many, including myself, applaud the idea, and I want to help in such a worthy effort. But here's the rub: How can we retire the debt by any amount when the Congress continues to spend more than is taken in? We must cut waste and welfare programs so that there is a balance of cash on hand in the Treasury to pay down the debt. Isn't this so? The irony of this debt retirement proposal is that some of those sponsoring it are among those regularly voting for bigger Federal spending. For example, one gentleman now voicing support for debt reduction voted only 14 percent for economy and 86 percent for big spending last year; another voted 70 percent of the time for big spending last year. Perhaps this inconsistency was the reason for the exhortation of the public to request less of the Federal Government, and this certainly makes sense. However, I hold that a constitutional democracy in a republic demands that our representatives exercise judgment and self-discipline, be leaders, not followers. Therefore, it is up to Congress to vote "No" to big spending proposals and seek to eliminate waste, and to prevent raids on the Treasury by organized pressure groups.

The battle of the budget (and debt retirement) has become a battle of survival for our type of society and human freedom, as I see it. Surely, it is important for each Member to be more concerned with preserving the fiscal health of this great Nation (through the self-discipline of reduced spending) than with his seat in Congress. It's a simple matter of which comes first. Believing this, I intend to press this viewpoint, questioning no one's motives or integrity. If I must, disagree—but without being disagreeable, disliking only the ideas, not the people involved.

Democratic Victory Dinner Address

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MIKE MANSFIELD
OF MONTANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, March 2, 1959

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an address I made at the Democratic victory dinner in Washington, D.C., on February 28.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF SENATOR MIKE MANSFIELD, DEMOCRAT, OF MONTANA, AT DEMOCRATIC VICTORY DINNER, WASHINGTON, D.C., FEBRUARY 28, 1959

The automobile industry is often described as the pace setter of American industry. In other words, it occupies a position in the American economy like the Democratic Party in American politics. There's one difference. Last year the American people didn't go too well for the new cars. Last November they went, with real enthusiasm, for the Democrats.

So, tonight, we are having a victory dinner. You know, there are some people who think you can have too much of a good thing. They say, for example, "There's too many Democrats in the Senate. What's LYNDON going to do with them all?" Well, so far as I know, we don't have any Democratic unemployment in the Senate. The distinguished majority leader has put all the Democratic Members to work, and they are beginning to produce. There's no such thing as an "acceptable" level of unemployment in the Democratic Senate, just as there oughtn't to be in the Nation.

Personally, I don't think you can ever have too many Democrats at work—in the Senate or anywhere else. As a matter of fact, there's a shortage of Democrats. The country could use a lot more of them over in the other branch of the Government. I don't know about the market for automobiles. But, as far as Democrats are concerned, it won't be until 1960 that the supply will begin to catch up with the demand.

In the last few weeks we've been seeing the new automobiles on the streets of this city. They have clean, fresh lines. Some of the cars are conservative looking. Others show liberal style changes. A few even have that futuristic look.

Not to be outdone by the automobile industry, we have our own display of 1959 Democratic models tonight. We've got four lines with us—not Fords, General Motors, Chryslers, and Ramblers. What we do have are Democratic Governors, Senators, Representatives, and Democratic presidential possibilities. We've even done something which Detroit hasn't been able to do for years. We've brought in a successful new producer—Alaska—with three new Democratic designs—all fully equipped with snowshoes.

Some of us have had an opportunity to preview the new 1959 Democratic models in the Senate. We've already looked under the hoods and tried the steering gear and the brakes. Take it from us, the new automobiles have nothing on them. These new Democratic models may not handle as easily—take, for example, the one produced in Wisconsin—but they all do have plenty of power. As a matter of fact, some of us older rattletraps, the model A's are beginning to wonder what the influx of these bright and shining new additions to the Senate is going to do to the used car market.

Nevertheless, we strongly commend them—all of them—to you. We urge you to take them to your hearts as we have done. They add luster drive, safety and countless new extras to the Democratic Party and to the Nation.

That is why I am delighted to participate in this victory dinner. It is true we are celebrating, in a general sense, the triumph of the Democratic Party in the 1958 elections. But in a special sense we are celebrating the victory of these new Senators, new Representatives and new Governors. It is they who add up to the difference between an ordinary election and the great Democratic victory at the polls last November. Through them, the Nation has made clear what it expects of all of us.

I am very glad that the great leader of the Senate, LYNDON JOHNSON of Texas, is here tonight to help us interpret the meaning of this victory. I can tell you that his reputation as a skilled craftsman and mechanic in this trade is fully warranted. He knows his political automobiles. And out of his warm and responsive heart and his clear-thinking head, he knows something much more important. He knows that the function of the Democratic Party is to go; not to seem to go. It is to go, not in starts and stops, not in bursts of power and sputtering stalls, but to go firmly and steadily in the direction which the American people, by giving us this great victory, have commanded us to go.

The late Senator Robert Taft said that the function of the opposition is to oppose. With all due respect to that great Republican leader, I want to say that for Democrats, opposition alone is not enough. We Democrats will oppose when it is necessary to oppose. But we shall oppose responsibly and we shall try to contribute constructively to the security and progress of the Nation whenever and wherever we can.

To do that, we have got to have clearly in mind what we cannot do, as well as what we can do, under our constitutional system. The administration, alone, can lead in this country. True, it is a fact that is going to change in 1960. It is going to change, however, only if we do what the American people have commanded us to do; it is going to change only if we do what we can do, not what each of us thinks he would like to do. What Democrats can do, what they must do, is to point out a constructive path for the Republican administration to follow. We have got to keep it working when it would prefer to relax. For the sake of the American people we must hold the hand of this Republican administration when it is perplexed. We must try to guide it when it loses the way. We owe that to the people who have entrusted us with a large share of the responsibility for running this Government.

In specifics, we have got to try, as we have been trying, to get it started on the road to policies which may lead to a more durable peace. We have got to improve the administration of foreign aid and restore the decent image of the United States in so many parts of the world. We have got to see to it that this Republican administration keeps its nose to the grindstone of the social and economic problems which plague large parts of the Nation. You know those problems—inadequate education and other unequal opportunities for millions, a disgracefully wasteful agricultural policy which sees mountains of decaying surpluses side by side with millions of people without enough to eat, high prices, millions of unemployed, the decay of urban centers, a lagging science, an antiquated and inequitable tax system and a neglect of our older citizens. These and similar matters are the problems which confront us. To boot, we have to try to deal with them within the framework of a sleight-of-hand budget from an administration which last year gave us another such budget along with policies that helped to produce a $12 billion deficit in it.

We Democrats have a duty to try to make this administration work, not for the benefit of one, but for all sections of the Nation and for peace. We have a duty to try to make this administration work, not for the benefit of the few but for the welfare of the many.

That is the meaning of November 1958. That is what the American people have asked the Democratic Party to try to do. I do not know whether we shall succeed. It is a monumental task to try to do anything with a Republican administration. Speaking for those of us who are in the Senate, however, I can assure you that we shall try our best.

The Massive Irresponsibility of the Spenders

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BARRY GOLDWATER
OF ARIZONA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, March 2, 1959

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that remarks I made before the Ohio Association of Retail Lumber Dealers on February 26, entitled "The Massive Irresponsibility of the Spenders," be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE MASSIVE IRRESPONSIBILITY OF THE SPENDERS

(Address by U.S. Senator BARRY GOLDWATER, Republican, of Arizona, before the Ohio Association of Retail Lumber Dealers, Columbus, Ohio, February 26, 1959)

Just a few days ago we Americans observed the birthday of the Father of our Country, George Washington. I am frequently amazed at how the words of really great men ring true generations after their time. Abraham Lincoln, Theodore Roosevelt, Thomas Jefferson—even today their philosophies serve us as a guiding light.

So it is with George Washington. I sometimes think that his Farewell Address should be framed and hung in the office of every Senator and Congressman in Washington, for it offers some very sound advice.

Among his words in that address were these: "As a very important source of strength and security, cherish public credit."

He admonished the Nation to use credit as sparingly as possible and to avoid the accumulation of debt not only by shunning occasions of expense, but by vigorous exertions in time of peace to discharge the debts which unavoidable wars have occasioned, not ungenerously throwing upon posterity the burden which we ourselves ought to bear.

Now, that's a fairly simple formula. The following of it is what takes courage. Political courage.

I am sadly reminded of those words as I observe the spending orgy now under way in Congress. The budget busters are going at it hammer and tongs, determined to spend more and more of your tax dollars on the theory that a little bit of inflation is good for the country.

Some observers have expressed the opinion that Congress has reflected the views of the people by approving increased domestic expenditures. They believe the people generally have taken the attitude that if the United States can afford to spend billions for military and economic aid to foreign countries, then they, as taxpayers, want to get as many benefits as possible under domestic programs.

Whether this was a correct estimate of the opinion held by a majority of the people or not, one is entitled to suspect that it was the basis on which the 2d session of the Democratic-controlled 85th Congress permitted:

1. A deficit of $12.9 billion;

2. The public debt limit to be raised from $275 billion to $288 billion temporarily and to $283 billion permanently; and

3. Nondefense spending for fiscal 1959 to be increased by $5.3 billion against an increase of $2 billion for defense purposes.

The fact is that total national defense spending planned for fiscal 1959 will be $4.3 billion under fiscal 1953's defense budget of $52.6 billion. On the other hand, nondefense expenditures in 1959 are estimated at $9.2 billion above the 1953 level of $21.7 billion.

In the face of the growing public debt, such extravagance has no place in the budget of a prudent government any more than it would fit into the budget of a prudent family.

Let's consider the Federal budget in everyday terms.

A family budget, operated in the same manner as the Federal budget, would mean that the family started out fiscal 1959 with a debt of more than four times its annual income. Following the Federal trend that family would face its financial situation by obligating itself to spend more than $1.08 for every $1 income received during the year. No sound financial institution would accept a note signed by a member of a family in such a condition.

As a matter of fact no family and no business or industry could ever get into such a dire financial situation with private financing. They would be considered broke long before ever reaching such a status.

In the light of such a situation we currently have before us the even sorrier spectacle of certain leaders in Congress practically hand tooling an economic disaster.

If the budget is unbalanced the result will be higher taxes for everyone. And if the revenues to balance the spending are not collected by the Government then the people of this country are in for a period of inflation that could push the cost of living upward and make your dollar worth less and less.

There are several bills coming up for consideration in Congress that involve spending more billions than the budget provides. Those behind this legislation seem to feel that the country doesn't care and the sky's the limit on public spending as long as you hang a "welfare" tag on it.

I can't think of many things that would please the Kremlin gang more than to see the economy of this country weakened from within by irresponsible fiscal policies. Deficit spending and lending, if continued, will lead us straight into the Russian trap envisaged by Lenin, who said: "We shall force the United States to spend itself to destruction."

A nation can hang itself on the gallows of excessive public debt—and we are no exception.

Some people would have us believe that the Federal Treasury is a bottomless grabbag which never needs to be conserved or replenished. Because of this attitude we have seen the national debt soar to dizzying heights. The Federal debt in December 1958, was $283 billion—about $7,000 per family in the United States.

In about 25 years our expanding Federal Government has boosted the average family's tax bill from $120 to $1,600 a year.

We don't often hear these facts.

As I mentioned earlier, this current fiscal year the Federal deficit is estimated at nearly $13 billion—the Government is spending nearly $13 billion more than its receipts. For the coming fiscal year the President has

presented a budget of $77 billion. It is a balanced budget, even though it is the biggest peacetime budget in our history.

Yet some critics have called it a skinflint budget. Actually, as the President himself said, it will "help prevent further increases in the cost of living and the hidden and unfair tax that inflation imposes on personal savings and incomes."

Senator HARRY F. BYRD, an outstanding authority on fiscal policy, has said: "Our free-enterprise democracy is the greatest economic system the world has ever evolved. But there is one controlling requirement, and it must never be overlooked. The system is based on solvent government and sound money. It is in this requirement that we have allowed ourselves to become weak." To those words I say "Amen."

We cannot spend our way into prosperity. Nor can we preserve our prosperity and our free-enterprise system by following a reckless policy of spending beyond our income in peacetime.

The vital necessity of sound fiscal policy is illustrated by the constantly increasing prices of military equipment. Even allowing for the obvious fact that the new weapons and equipment are much more sensitive, powerful, effective, and, therefore, more expensive than the items they are replacing, the truth is that a good deal of inflation is already built into their extremely high costs.

Let me give you a few examples of the rising prices of what is known as military hardware. The B–29 heavy bomber at the end of World War II cost about $600,000. The all-jet B–52 intercontinental bomber of today costs about $8 million.

During World War II, a submarine cost about $4.7 million. The Polaris submarine will cost about $90 million.

Rockets and missiles are expensive, too. It is estimated that the cost of developing ballistic missiles to an operational state will be a good deal more than twice the cost of developing the first atom bomb.

Does this mean that unlimited Federal spending is inevitable? Should we just give up in our attempts to keep the budget within reasonable bounds? If that were so, then we would already have lost the battle to stay free.

But it is not so. Most of our problem thus far has been that the great majority of our people have not been aware of the dangers they face from even bigger Government and irresponsible fiscal planning.

We must wake up. We must alert the various forces in our citizenry to make sure of two things:

First, whatever funds are needed for defense, for space exploration, and for other essential military and civilian purposes must be provided, and provided soundly.

Second, waste, duplication, continuation of governmental services no longer needed must be eliminated and eliminated promptly.

We must live within our income. We must keep our economy sound. It cannot be done by going further into debt. We must maintain fiscal integrity.

This is the road to commonsense, the road to a sound defense—a sound defense against the enemies of freedom, both at home and abroad.

The Federal debt is only a part of the whole U.S. fiscal picture. When we add up our total debt—the net debt owed by Federal, State, and local governments, by business and by individuals—the sum is staggering—$758 billion. It has almost doubled since the end of World War II.

Personal income after taxes is the highest it has ever been. Yet, both mortgage debt and consumer debt have been increasing. In 1958 alone, mortgage debt outstanding went up nearly $15 billion.

At the end of 1958, consumer, or personal, debt totaled nearly $45 billion—seven times what it was 20 years ago. A few years ago only one family out of three had any consumer debt. Now more than half have such obligations.

Worse still, the majority of persons with such personal debt have no liquid assets to fall back on.

We can readily see what a terrible thing inflation is by what it has done to the people of France. In that country the cost of living today is 37 times what it was about 30 years ago.

A pound of butter that cost 10 francs in 1927 is 410 francs today.

Men who put aside savings for substantial annuities find that their pensions are worth only 15 percent of what they were in 1940.

The pensions of French veterans of World War I—pensions once considered adequate—have depreciated to a value of 70 cents a month.

Don't say it can't happen here. The people of France never thought it would happen there.

I do not mean to say that all debt is bad. Of course not. Sound business debt is one of the elements of growth. Sound mortgage credit is a real help to a family that must borrow for a farm or a home.

But is it not apparent that in the areas of both public and personal debt these limitations of soundness are being disregarded by all too many of our citizens?

This matter is of vital concern to all of us, but especially to our younger citizens. They will live under the hysteria of inflation throughout the rest of their lives—if it is not checked now.

They will carry the load of our rising debt, and its growing interest payments—if we go on spending beyond our income.

They and their children will pay the bill that will inevitably be rendered by a continuing fiscal irresponsibility—and it will, I fear, be a bill compounded in hardship and heartache.

Inflation has already robbed our dollar, savings, pensions, annuities, insurance policies, social security, etc., of more than one-half of their purchasing power and real value. It has increased the cost of Government more than 100 percent, thereby raising taxes more than 100 percent. As the dollar buys less and less each year, the cost of national defense rises more and more, thereby seriously crippling this country and the free world in their life-and-death struggle for survival against the disciplined forces of communism.

Since our Government has gone in debt more than all the other governments in the world and since Congress continues to spend more money than it takes in, the money obligations of our Government have been falling in value year by year for a long time.

If this keeps up for a few more years our money will be worthless and the savings of our people for old age, sickness and for their children will be wiped out. It is a certainty—if Congress continues its spending spree. If there is any doubt about this, I suggest reading the history of nations in ancient and modern times. The handwriting is on the wall for all to see but the blind.

This is a period in the early stages of inflation when the owners of equities such as stocks, land, and commodities appear to either hold their own or profit from inflation. This doesn't last long. As history shows, the owners of such equities are finally wiped out.

Under inflation, stocks earn less and less dividends and ultimately their value is based on dividends. Taxes on real property mount ever higher because of inflation until it makes ownership of real property unprofitable. In France and Germany, where inflation was unchecked, the people vainly sought refuge through every type of investment. They all came to the same end—bankruptcy.

Our country is at peace. The economists predict one of the best business years ever. We're all going to make more money, there will be longer fishtails on our automobiles, bigger screens on our television sets, and more chrome-plated gadgets in the kitchen for the little woman.

It sounds just dandy, but I think it would be wise in these times to take a hard look at just where we're headed and see if we are not living in some sort of fool's paradise. Perhaps, as the Chinese say, it is only temporary.

I do know one thing for sure—the massive irresponsibility now being displayed in Congress is definitely not the answer. I think it's about time those elected to high office thought less about winning popularity contests back home and faced up to the responsibility of doing—and voting for—what is best for the country as a whole.

This country faces a challenge greater than any it has ever known. For a nation with so marvelous a heritage to destroy itself by robbing Peter to pay Paul is unthinkable.

We must keep America free and strong—economically, socially, and spiritually—so that our way of life may endure. There is no other way. This is your challenge and mine—a challenge to every American no matter who or what he may be.

Curtailing Foreign Imports

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN H. DENT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 2, 1959

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, as usual, opposition to the present administration on reciprocal trades and the Buy American Act, draws editorial comment, as well as a batch of misinformation, which serves to further confuse the minds of the public as to the realities of the situation. I am submitting for the RECORD today two editorials appearing in local papers which would appear to cover the subject to the uninformed, but to those of us who have made a thorough study of the situation the answer is not so simple. I submit, therefore, Mr. Speaker, my reply to these editors and their editorials:

OPEN LETTER TO THE PITTSBURGH POST-GAZETTE

FEBRUARY 27, 1959.

To the EDITOR.

DEAR SIR: I don't write Letters to the Editor very often. When I do, it's because either the information is in error, or I am badly informed.

On Wednesday, February 25, your editorial appears to put my fight for the awarding of large contracts to foreign governments in a bad light.

Personally, I've been an advocate for liberal trade policies. However, I always felt that the promises of every President, every Secretary of State, and every Secretary of Commerce—since the passage of the original reciprocal trade bills and the foreign aid legislation—were being kept.

Every assurance was and is still being given that no arguments on trade would be made that would prove to be injurious to any American industry.

The facts do not bear out these assurances:

Most of our troubles are of recent vintage, the Buy American Act has been openly and flagrantly abused since the Presidential order of December 1954, decreasing the American

differential allowance from 25 percent to 6 percent.

The escape clause has been invoked 60 times by industry and minor relief has been granted only 19 times and no relief in the other 41 cases.

This record was compiled in spite of the fact that in 31 cases the Tariff Commission ruled unanimously in favor of tariff relief for the injured industries.

Two classic examples are the binocular and watch industries. After many protests against the competition from abroad, they closed shop and are no longer producing in the United States. The prediction is that all the watch industry will fold unless something is done.

These are not isolated cases, they are the rule, and not the exception.

Insofar as your figures for export and import of electrical equipment, the testimony given us is that of all the export business done by American producers all but $200,000 worth was paid for by our own money under mutual aid, ICA, and other Government spending and lending agencies.

Even this market is now threatened by new regulations being put into effect.

I believe a trade agreement has to be mutually beneficial and mutually respected.

In the case of British selling our Government generators and other power-producing equipment, the testimony shows that the British do not permit any foreign country to sell any item of this nature to their entire power industry.

In the case of the Jeannette Elliott plant, the differential was approximately 12 percent and this, according to the President's order, should have given the business to our local company.

However, they invoked a new item into the calculations by giving credit to the Swiss company for the 13 percent ad valorem duty charged on the import.

Needless to say, the Jeannette company, nor their workers, were given credit for the taxes, Federal, State and local, paid.

I don't want to appear to be an isolationist or a high tariff advocate. I do, however, recognize our higher standards of pay, fringe benefits, personal and corporate taxes.

I also recognize that we need friends everywhere. Somehow, I can't believe we make friends by taking over their production facilities with our investments and our markets.

I may be a little short on the economics of the situation, but I can't figure how it will help the American workman and the American businessman by making it more attractive profitwise, and taxwise for an American manufacturer to close his plants here to make investments abroad and to be allowed to take his foreign profits tax free, if he reinvests in other foreign enterprises. The promotion also calls for limiting American investors in foreign enterprise taxes to the limit of the taxes paid through foreign corporation earnings and investments to the taxes assessed by the foreign country.

One example given shows where a steel producer pays a limit of 30 percent on net income compared to 52 percent here. This may be all right if we can afford it, however, I doubt if we can with the debt and budget greater than all the rest of the world combined.

In closing, and to make a point, I refer back to my statement that agreements have to be mutually beneficial and respected.

Let's take the auto industry. We give concessions to foreign cars that permit the following comparative prices in New York City and other places:

New York, United States of America: American Ford $350 more than British Consul, $900 more than German Volkswagen.

London, England: Ford $3,850 more than Consul, $3,800 more than Volkswagen.

Cologne, Germany: Ford $1,900 more than Consul, $3,800 more than Volkswagen.

Copenhagen, Denmark: Ford $2,800 more than Consul, $3,700 more than Volkswagen.

Caracas, Venezuela: Ford, $2,800; Consul, $2,050; Volkswagen, $1,750.

South Africa: Ford, $3,350; Consul, $2,250; Volkswagen, $1,800.

Mexico: Puts a 100 percent tariff on all American cars.

The formula shifts in its application in Brazil, Japan, the Philippines, and other markets, but in every case the heaviest duties apply to American cars.

This is known as market rigging and this is the reason we have lost our foreign market and about 13 percent of our home market.

When we can't keep our production lines at full capacity, it adds to the cost of the item produced and with the loss of foreign markets we are necessarily put into a position where we can't compete successfully with imports.

This doesn't alibi our big cars and luxury items but how do we explain the fact that Nash has all of its "Metropolitan," their cheap, small, unadorned car, made exclusively in England and it's the same car formerly produced here.

I know that both sides of an argument has logic and sincerity on their side. I can't, however, as a public servant, be choosy in the matter of whose job I shall try to save.

To me a worker in the glass plants, rubber works, bicycle shops, coal mines, electrical or any other endeavor is equally distressed if he is unemployed.

I shall never knowingly vote to create conditions that will cause any American worker to lose his job or any American business, including your journalistic enterprise to lose its earnings on its investments and services.

I know this is a long "letter" but believe me, I haven't scratched the surface of the problem.

I hope we can find a solution that will help us keep both our friends, our jobs, and our standard of living.

Sincerely,

JOHN H. DENT,
Member of Congress.

[From the Pittsburgh Post-Gazette, Feb. 25, 1959]

HOW TO PROTECT JOBS

Before Congressmen—and Jeannette's Representative JOHN DENT notably among them—take action to curtail the American importation of such goods as electrical generators, they should be reminded that foreign trade is a two-way street on which this country enjoys a preponderance of the traffic.

The current debate has arisen because Swiss and British firms have underbid American firms on electric generators contracted for by agencies of the Federal Government. Mr. DENT and others have complained that this would deprive American workmen of jobs. While Mr. DENT certainly can't be blamed for protecting what he believes to be the best interests of his constituents, he should take a look at the other side of the street.

Pittsburgh Congressman WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD has pointed out that this country exports far more electrical equipment than it imports. State Department figures for 1957 show that the United States exported $1 billion worth of electric machinery and apparatus while importing the same sort of material valued at only $145 million. In the field of electrical generators alone, American exports totaled $175 million as compared with imports of only $13 million.

When renewal of the reciprocal trade program was up for congressional consideration last year, it was estimated by Government officials that world trade makes jobs for at least 4½ million American workers. Closer to home, exports bring $793.2 million yearly to Pennsylvania, $164.7 million annually to Allegheny County alone. This trade represents full-time jobs for more than 9,400 workers in the Pittsburgh area's five principal industries.

The jobs of these and other workers would be jeopardized, and this Nation's unemployment problem would be aggravated, if Congress supported a program aimed at protecting American workers through higher tariffs or subterfuges in the name of national security. That would invite reprisal by foreign countries which could cost more American jobs than would be protected. If we are to continue to sell our products abroad, we must encourage conditions under which foreign countries can do business with us.

Mr. HARRY PORE, Jr.,
Editor, the Monessen Daily Independent,
Monessen, Pa.

MY DEAR HARRY: Your story and editorial again demonstrate your technique of telling half-truths.

Where did you get the story that Congressman MOORHEAD "hits" DENT on Buy American?

Mr. MOORHEAD has never once argued with me on my position of fighting for the Government orders for Westinghouse and Elliott Co., of Jeannette.

In fact, he was one of the cosponsors of my resolution asking that the orders be given to the American concerns.

The only difference between my thinking and some of the others is that I can't see any difference between my unemployed glass workers, steelworkers, and others because of our trade policy than an electrical worker.

There is no change in the position of my congressional district, since my predecessor, Congressman Kelley, fought and voted against reciprocal trade agreements.

Our district happens to be one of the areas that has been sacrificed to the sacred cow of cotton and other low man-hour production exports.

I am not now, nor have ever been, a Smoot-Hawley high-tariff advocate.

I am now, and have always been, a believer in fair trade and believed what every President and every Secretary of State and every Secretary of Commerce of the United States have said time and time again for the record, "That no reciprocal trade agreement will be made that will cause undue hardship or injury to any American industry."

I believe in that, and I believe also that if we made concessions we should receive same.

I know you would like to be fair, so I'll give you some facts that are compelling, at least to a Representative of the 21st Congressional District of Pennsylvania, with its heavy unemployment. I've just received the latest figures on our trade balance with Japan, and I believe it tells the story that I'm trying to emphasize. We trade payrolls and raw materials for consumer goods and unemployment.

We sell Japan: Cotton, wheat, soya beans, metalworking machinery, heavy oil, crude petroleum, bituminous coal for steel producing, iron and steel scrap, barley, cotton mill waste and pulp, hides and skins, beef tallow, corn, miscellaneous.

We buy from Japan: Processed and canned fish products, iron and steel, pottery, silk fabrics, sewing machines, optical instruments, cotton fabrics, wool and worsted fabrics, pearls, cotton clothing, railway sleepers, glassware, cooking utensils, miscellaneous.

Although there is a slight trade balance in dollars in our favor, the indisputable fact remains that the things we sell are used to make products to sell back to us.

We have 38 million tons of steel capacity idle, yet the U.S. Navy buys 5,700 tons of steel plate from Japan. Last week we ordered $9 million worth of radar equipment from Canada and Westinghouse and

General Electric are on short workweeks with thousands unemployed.

It isn't an easy matter to know the answer but one thing is sure, we can't operate without employment and when the State Department decides which jobs to sacrifice and which jobs are to be protected, let us hope that our district factory workers get as much consideration in the future as oil, wheat and corn planters.

I am not against trades—all I want is reciprocal trades that are reciprocal.

I am attaching a letter with more details of interest which I have sent to the Post Gazette.

Hoping we can work together, at least for our district, I remain,

Sincerely yours,

JOHN H. DENT, *Member of Congress.*

FULL CIRCLE

Representative JOHN H. DENT, of Westmoreland County, is engaged in a strange campaign for a Democratic Congressman of the New Deal persuasion. He is promoting so-called buy American legislation to protect U.S. manufacturers against foreign competition.

It has been a good quarter-century since a Congressman from this area adopted such a position. The last one from Westmoreland County was classified by the Democrats, if memory serves us, as a reactionary.

So apparently we have come full circle on the question of free trade versus protective tariffs. Representative DENT's position is indistinguishable from that of the blackest Republican of the Smoot-Hawley era.

It is hard to avoid the impression that Mr. DENT is more interested in votes than in finding the right answers to problems of foreign competition and world trade. Some industries in his district are feeling the effects of foreign imports; so he proposes the simplest possible remedy—shut out the imports, buy American.

What it pleases him to overlook is that the United States by and large is an exporting country. Take Europe, from where come the products that are bothering Mr. DENT. In 1957 the United States shipped to Europe nearly $6 billion worth of products; we imported from Europe about $3 billion worth.

Does anyone seriously believe that if the United States reverts to a high tariff policy, it will continue to find the world's markets open to it?

Columbus Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 2, 1959

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, for many years there has arisen, from time to time, a movement to make October 12, Columbus Day, a national holiday. It is true that nearly all the States today observe it in one form or another, either as a legal or a public holiday. My purpose, however, in introducing this bill is to make October 12 a truly national holiday, sponsored by the Federal Government. There has, properly speaking, been but one occasion when Congress has purported to declare a national holiday throughout the United States, and that was by the act of March 2, 1889, which used the expression with reference to the following April 30, the "Centennial Anniversary of the Inauguration of the First President of the United States."

I submit that it is time to break the precedent again and the purpose of this bill—H.R. 418—is to declare October 12 a permanent national holiday. No anniversary, surely, could be more basic nor fundamental than that which marks that day in the year 1492 when the eyes of Christopher Columbus first beheld an outpost of the New World. Although he did not know it was a new world, believing it to be merely the western Indies, and died in that belief, it was nonetheless the faith and persistence of this one man, in the face of almost inconceivable obstacles and heartbreaking humiliation and delay, which threw open a new hemisphere for the settlement of mankind and the eventual emergence of a great republic founded on democracy and dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal.

Surely this epochal day merits a yearly observance, both in tribute to the man himself and to an event which forever changed the face of the earth and altered the destiny of the human race.

Oregon, the Beaver State, Host to the World in 1959

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES O. PORTER

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 2, 1959

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article about the Valentine State of Oregon written by one of Oregon's outstanding native sons—Senator RICHARD L. NEUBERGER. The story appeared in the February 1959 issue of Retirement Life.

THE STORY OF A "FRONTIER OF THE FUTURE"—THE BEAVER STATE—HOST TO THE WORLD IN 1959

The first Americans to journey westward to Oregon were on the payroll of the Federal Government. They were a pair of Army captains named Meriwether Lewis and William Clark—the most famous exploring team in all history.

The pay of this redoubtable pair was skimp. Each collected only $1,228 for a pilgrimage which lasted 2½ years. Nor was there any National Association of Retired Civil Employees in 1805 to assure them of a steady Government annuity when the epochal trek was over, although a grateful Congress did vote the exploring leaders 1,600 acres of choice homestead land apiece.

Oregon, which lay at the sunset end of the trail of Lewis and Clark, this year celebrates its first century of statehood. Oregon was admitted to the Union on Valentine's Day of 1859, just about half a century after Lewis and Clark had brought our flag down to tidewater on the Pacific coast.

SUPERLATIVES STUD STATE

Meriwether Lewis had been private secretary to President Thomas Jefferson. He sent to his illustrious superior fabulous reports about the realm called Oregon—its swift rivers, towering mountains, deep harbors, and riches in timber, pelts and fisheries. Oregon still makes this enduring and vivid impression on residents and visitors alike. Superlatives stud the State like raisins in a pudding.

On its eastern boundary, Oregon is bordered by Hells Canyon of the Snake River, deepest chasm on the continent. In some places, it measures over 7,000 feet from rim to river. The western boundary of Oregon is the Pacific Ocean, which caresses beaches of white sand or sends jets of spray against rocky capes and headlands. I once heard a photographer for Life magazine say he had taken pictures of virtually all of the great seacoasts of the world, but the Oregon seacoast was by far the most picturesque and beautiful of any of them.

OREGON CLIMATE MILD

Oregon's northern border is the Columbia River. In its surging reaches lurks nearly one-third of the entire hydroelectric power potential of North America. The Columbia, second in size only to the Mississippi among the rivers of the Nation, drops 2,700 feet from its distant source in the Canadian Rockies to its union with the sea near Astoria, where Lewis and Clark put in the first winter ever spent by Americans along the Pacific seaboard. In addition, the prodigious Chinook and Blueback salmon runs of the Columbia are among the most valuable fisheries on earth—worth almost $20 million annually.

Because of the mild climate which dominates its western slope, Oregon is particularly popular with retired people. Many members of NARCE in Oregon are men and women who came to the State after retirement, liked what they saw—and stayed. My wife and I understand this feeling. We are natives of Oregon, born and bred. The instant Congress adjourns each session, we rush to Oregon, and we never return to the National Capital until just when Congress is ready to resume. We extract every last possible minute in our beloved Oregon.

Besides its awesome topography, which culminates in the 11,225-foot glacial summit of Mount Hood, Oregon has made striking contributions to Government during its 100 years of statehood.

INITIATED GOVERNMENT REFORMS

Oregon was the first State to enact laws setting maximum hours and minimum pay to protect women and children in industry. This set the pace for similar social legislation all over the Nation, Oregon also pioneered in adopting the initiative and referendum. Indeed, these reforms have become commonly known as the "Oregon system." Under them, citizens may circulate petitions on street corners or along country roads collecting signatures to place any proposal on the ballot. Such petitions have been used to enact statutes safeguarding natural resources or providing higher standards of old-age assistance.

Furthermore, Oregon led all other States in bringing about the direct election of U.S. Senators. Until Oregon elected a Senator by popular vote, Members of the Senate were appointed by State legislatures. This often encouraged corruption, deals and the supremacy of special interests. After Oregon had made the breakthrough, the 17th amendment to the Federal Constitution soon followed, making mandatory the election of all Senators at the ballot box. The famed Senator William E. Borah, of Idaho, said Oregon's people were entitled to principal credit for this major reform.

Oregon is noted for its educational attainments. During the mass aptitude tests given our GI's during the Korean hostilities, soldiers from Oregon ranked second in the United States, exceeded only by those from Minnesota. Oregon spends more per pupil on its students than any State where school districts operate the public schools. The University of Oregon Medical School, the

forestry department of Oregon State College and other specialized categories are outstanding in the Nation.

PEAKS COMPARED WITH ALPS

Yet, despite Oregon's leadership in the realm of government, it is the vast outdoor amphitheater of the State which characterizes Oregon most predominantly.

Awesome scenery abounds in Oregon. The Wallowa Mountain Range, with its granite spires and upland meadows, has been compared to the Swiss Alps. Justice William O. Douglas, of the U.S. Supreme Court, actually insists that the Wallowas are the more magnificent. Crater Lake National Park throws a protective stockade around the bluest lake in all the world—a lake formed when a prehistoric volcano blew off its summit in a mighty cataclysm. The lake fills the ancient crater, where icy water has replaced molten lava.

The quiet tree-shaded trails which thread the coast and Cascade Mountain ranges offer an unparalleled opportunity to view the magnificent stands of virgin timber which constitute one of Oregon's major resources. Many of the giant Douglas-fir seen today were standing when Lewis and Clark traveled through this country 150 years ago.

Oregon Caves National Monument, the John Day fossil beds, and the lava formations of the Deschutes and Crooked River gorges provide both entertainment and education for those interested in the history of the earth's crust.

RECREATION AVAILABLE TO ALL

Portland, the metropolis of Oregon, has long, cool spring seasons which are ideal for the growing of majestic roses. This culminates every June in the Portland Rose Festival, where some of earth's loveliest flowers are on display. Portland also has more evergreen trees growing within its city limits than any other community, even including Vienna with its vernal groves which Johann Strauss immortalized in "Tales From the Vienna Woods." Forest Park is a primeval solitude almost within mashie shot of downtown skyscrapers.

Oregon has made a determined effort to insure that all its citizens, and their guests, may enjoy the recreational benefits inherent in the State's scenic grandeur.

Oregon was the first State to levy a gasoline tax to pay for its roads, also the first State to paint a center stripe down the highway to promote safety in fog and night conditions. The efficient highway system reflects this leadership. U.S. 30, the Columbia River Highway, is one of the world's most scenic drives. It has been compared with journeys along the Rhine, the Hudson, and the St. Lawrence, but with the Columbia offering by far the grandest dimensions. U.S. 101 clings to the headlands above the Pacific Ocean like a lariat. This road alternately presents vistas of mountain and sea. Its restaurants and hotels feature meals which highlight a wide variety of seafoods and fresh fish, because the waters off Oregon teem with aquatic life.

HAS MOST STATE PARKS

All the beaches of Oregon belong to the State, thanks to a progressive program instituted by Gov. Oswald West in 1912. No beach can be fenced off. The gleaming sands are a public playground for over 300 miles.

Oregon has more State parks than any other State in the Union. Some combine timbered uplands with ocean bathing. Others are located in the evergreen-shrouded interior mountain ranges, near clear snow-fed lakes or rushing rivers with picturesque names such as Rogue, Siuslaw, and Metolius. For the vacationer, free camping sites are available. For the weekend visitor, roadside picnic facilities are provided. Boating, swimming, fishing, and hiking are accessible to all. These recreation areas are in addition to the myriad of forest camps to be found in Oregon's 12 national forests.

DEER, ELK ATTRACT NIMRODS

Each year over half a million hunters and fishermen find the Beaver State's woodlands, fields, and streams a sportsman's mecca. Deer and elk seasons lure thousands of hunters to the woods in Oregon. Lewis and Clark actually located their historic Fort Clatsop within the present boundaries of Oregon because they glimpsed so many elk, as a source both of food and of replenishing their tattered garments. Oregon ranks second (to California) in the number of mule deer among the States, and second (to Idaho) in its elk population. Mule deer are the biggest of all the deer species.

Pheasant, quail, grouse, and partridge offer fine bird shooting, and for the benefit of waterfowl hunters there exist several public shooting grounds on wildlife management areas.

The State is justly famous for its fine trout and salmon. Deep-sea fishing, a living for many Oregon residents, is an avocation to thousands more who find invigorating sport in landing sea bass, halibut, perch, and other game fish indigenous to Oregon waters.

In all fish and wildlife matters, conservation is the keynote of State policy, thus insuring that future generations will enjoy the same privileges available to sportsmen today.

MUSIC, ART SUPPORTED

Portland maintains one of the finest symphony orchestras in the Nation, and also supports a symphonic choir. The Civic Theater stages numerous contemporary and classic productions with both local and Broadway casts. Regional and internationally known art is displayed in the Portland Art Museum. An extensive free public library system serves the city.

While Oregon's bountiful heritage of natural beauty and outdoor recreational opportunity has drawn thousands of Americans to this Northwest State, there are strong cultural and economic reasons for its popularity with our retired citizens.

ADULT EDUCATION CENTERS

Towns and cities which contain Oregon's 19 colleges and universities provide special advantages associated with the academic community, such as lectures, concerts, and sports events. Extension and adult education courses are accessible in all areas. In smaller communities, organizational events and local festivities provide a ready road to social contacts and congenial companionship.

In a time of generally rising prices, economics becomes more than an academic discipline for those dependent upon fixed incomes. Retirees living on unchanging annuities have no defense against this unfair tax. For this reason I was pleased to join with others in the last Congress to secure a 10-percent increase in the annuities of retired Federal employees. I regard few causes as more merited than that of providing fair upward adjustment of benefits for retired Federal employees and, as chairman of the Senate Subcommittee on Retirement, I intend to continue my efforts in the 86th Congress to insure that retirement funds available to former Government workers bear a reasonable relationship to living costs.

FEDERAL ACTION NEEDED

It is my hope that during the next 2 years Congress will delve deeply into the economic problems facing America's senior citizens. There are serious questions involving not only inflation but job discrimination, compulsory retirement, housing and medical care which demand immediate attention. The need for effective solutions grows more imperative each year as the proportion of our populace over 65 years of age continues to expand. In this connection, I plan to reintroduce in the Senate a proposal for a White House Conference on Aging—an approach suggested by a leader in matters of social welfare and humanitarian concerns, Representative JOHN E. FOGARTY, of Rhode Island.

Major responsibility for the correction of injustices toward older persons belongs to the Federal Government, since only at this level can any substantial degree of uniformity be assured. However, I am proud that Oregon has taken countenance of some of the pressing needs of its senior citizens through effective State action. One example: During the 1957 session of the State legislature a bill was passed and signed by Governor Robert Holmes exempting annuities up to $2,400 from State income taxes.

Oregon has repeatedly resisted adoption of a sales tax, which so discriminates against those forced to subsist on small monthly pension payments. Oregon offers certain inbred economic advantages for retirees who desire to stretch a monthly annuity check.

Housing is readily available in both urban and rural communities. In urban areas apartment selection is broad, and numerous projects devoted entirely to elderly people are under way.

MONEYSAVING POSSIBILITIES

Individual vegetable gardens—a feature of thousands of Oregon suburban and rural homes—permit a moneysaving method of supplementing food supplies. Oregon's climate permits the growing of nearly all fruits and vegetables.

Food processing, a major statewide industry, provides many older persons with an excellent source of supplementary income and a pleasant summer diversion.

Mild weather of western Oregon means low heat bills in winter. The Northwest's vast network of hydroelectric power sources keeps the cost of electricity low.

Perhaps the most persuasive argument attesting to Oregon's desirability as a retirement home is the simple fact that the percentage of people over 65 years in our State is increasing twice as rapidly as the total Oregon population—and an unexpectedly high percentage of the increase is due to migration. Recent statistics indicate that 9.2 percent of Oregon's population is in this age group; the figure is well above the national average.

CENTENNIAL TO ATTRACT 8 MILLION

This year an estimated 8 million persons will visit Oregon's 1959 Centennial Exposition and International Trade Fair. It will be the largest such event held in the West since the San Francisco World's Fair in 1939. Special programs to celebrate Oregon's 100th birthday will be held in cities and towns throughout the State.

Oregon will be on display in 1959. I believe that many who come as interested viewers will eventually remain as enthusiastic residents. Oregon is like that.

Hon. Latham Castle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROLAND V. LIBONATI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 2, 1959

Mr. LIBONATI. Mr. Speaker, President Eisenhower is to be congratulated for nominating the present attorney general of the State of Illinois, Latham

Castle, to become a judge of the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit—Illinois—to succeed the late Judge Philip J. Finnegan.

Latham Castle is of old Illinois pioneer stock. His grandfather, Miles Beach Castle, an early settler in De Kalb County, founded the Sandwich State Bank in 1856. Latham, after service in World War I, was graduated from Northwestern University Law School in 1924. He became city attorney of Sandwich, Ill., in 1926; and in 1928 was elected States attorney of De Kalb County, reelected in 1932 and 1936. His future in the law continued in 1942 until 1952 as county judge. In 1952 he was elected attorney general of the State of Illinois and reelected in 1956.

Latham Castle is a legal scholar as well as a brilliant lawyer. He represents the highest ideals in his profession. He has never forgotten his loyalties to friendship. His career as a public servant has been marked with a real sense of high integrity. He has a fine mind, and life's experience has mellowed his judgment and understanding. His judicial training, together with a high quality of the understanding of law enforcement, both as States attorney and attorney general, have prepared him for the responsibility of this high office.

I congratulate him, his lovely mate, Georgiana, and his son, John, for this merited honor. The court of appeals will welcome such an illustrious son of the law.

Taxpayers' Revolt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RUSSELL V. MACK

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 2, 1959

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Speaker, a long predicted and long overdue taxpayers' revolt against excessive Government spending and high taxes has started in the State of Washington.

Tens of thousands of Washington State citizens are signing petitions and writing letters to State legislators and Members of Congress urging less spending on new programs and demanding that these legislators "hold the line against increasing Government expenditures" and refrain from levying any new and additional State or Federal taxes.

Washington State's two U.S. Senators are quoted in the press as saying that each of them already has received petitions or letters from Washington State bearing more than 1,000 signatures.

The Aberdeen World of Aberdeen, Wash., in my home county—population 55,000—reports leaders of the taxpayers' revolt claim they will obtain petitions or letters to Congressmen and State legislators bearing at least 5,000 signatures.

I received 344 taxpayers' revolt letters from my own county Monday morning and the drive there for a curb on extravagant governmental spending appears to be only at its beginning.

This taxpayers' revolt, newspapers report, is nonpartisan and has the endorsement of leaders in both political parties.

The petitions bear the following heading:

A renewed declaration of independence to the Governor, State of Washington:

We, the undersigned citizens, knowing that the power to tax is the power to destroy, and believing that man is best governed who is least governed, and that government should be held to the same financial responsibility as that to which we are held—namely, to live within its means—do hereby pledge that we shall not require more services of our Government than such as are already being rendered.

We therefore demand that no increased taxes be enacted and that Government, both State and Federal, confine their expenditures to existing sources and limits of revenue.

We further declare that any elected representative of the people who does not subscribe to these views is not worthy of our support at the polls.

Other petitions are addressed to Members of Congress and to State legislators.

Signers of the petitions are following up their petition signing by writing letters to Members of Congress and to State legislators. A typical letter of this kind follows:

I have signed a petition addressed to the Governor, our representatives in the National Congress and our State representatives, in which I have pledged that I will not request any increased governmental services and demanding that no increased taxes of any kind be levied.

You will shortly receive this petition, which it is expected will have the signatures of at least 5,000 citizens of Grays Harbor County, Wash., most of whom will write you a similar letter.

This position is endorsed by leaders and members of both political parties.

I urge that you exert every effort to prevent any additional taxation whatsoever.

Here is a taxpayers' revolt that may become nationwide. If it does become nationwide, it may contribute greatly to Congress and State legislatures obtaining balanced budgets this year.

If the revolting taxpayers accomplish that goal, they will put a brake on the continued rising prices of inflation which are reducing the living standards of millions of American citizens, especially pensioners, retired persons, and others who are on fixed incomes.

The Fight With Inflation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH SCOTT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 2, 1959

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the address made by the senior Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT] before the Pennsylvania Manufacturers Association at Philadelphia, on Tuesday, February 24, 1959.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE FIGHT WITH INFLATION: ADDRESS BY SENATOR WALLACE F. BENNETT, OF UTAH, BEFORE THE PENNSYLVANIA MANUFACTURERS ASSOCIATION, AT PHILADELPHIA, TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 24, 1959

It is always a great inspiration to have the privilege of speaking to an audience of manufacturers, because to me it is like coming home. For 30 years, before I went to the Senate, I was part of the management of a small manufacturing plant in Utah and, like you, I am proud of it. American manufacturers can be proud of their accomplishment, the great heritage of capital they have produced for our country, the millions of jobs they have provided, and the value and variety of the products they supply for our ever-expanding pattern of living. To do this has required the use of all the keys to success—initiative, imagination, great drive and vigor, high integrity and sound judgment.

The very fact that we have done all this makes it hard for me to understand why we are so blind to the forces that, unless we wake up, will destroy both our freedom and our wealth. For 20 years now, a thief has been preying on us and, rather than catching and exposing him, we have helped him rob everybody, including ourselves. Maybe this is true because he is the world's most accomplished confidence man whose hand is much quicker than the eye. He blinds us with promises of something for nothing. He drains our capital away, falsifies our records, dries up our markets, and finally squeezes us dry in our old age. And we applaud him and call for more.

Inflation is a thief that can steal the substance of our wealth without altering its outward appearance. Christ said, "The letter killeth, but the spirit giveth life." Inflation preserves the letter of economic values, but kills the spirit.

So real is inflation's illusion that many hardheaded businessmen—who can spot a phony business deal a mile away—not only think that a little inflation is either natural, inevitable, or desirable, but that it offers a real opportunity for growth and profit to a shrewd and daring operator.

Perhaps all this is possible because without realizing it, most of us have become addicted to a powerful narcotic. We reach eagerly for increasing doses of economic "happy dust" because it brings illusions of greater success and well-being, easier and faster progress, and greater profit.

Or perhaps even though we are wracked with the pain of economic cancer, we mistake fever for the glow of health and puffy swelling for expanding muscle. If this is so, then we are using the narcotic to disguise the pain.

No matter in what terms you describe it, there is a force abroad in our economy that has already taken a fearful toll from every American company, family or individual—an evil that must be exposed, faced, and conquered.

What is its awesome name? Inflation.

LET US WAKE UP TO THE DANGER

Fortunately, many Americans are beginning to wake up to the danger, to recognize inflation for what it is—thief, cancer, and narcotic. President Eisenhower is one of these and in his recent messages to Congress and the people has called for, "Action to meet these challenges by all groups in our society, and by all units of Government."

Specifically, he has challenged consumers, government, labor leaders, and businessmen to meet the particular challenge that inflation presents to them.

Being human, as well as being businessmen, we could generate a great glow of self-righteousness by pointing out to government

and labor both the extent of their particular responsibility for the present inflation and the things they should do to correct their faults. But there has already been too much finger pointing and blaming of one group by another. Tonight, I propose that we businessmen look our own weaknesses squarely in the eye and see what we can do to cure them.

WHY SHOULD WE BE CONCERNED?

There are two basic reasons why we should be concerned with inflation—one humanitarian, and the other based on enlightened self-interest.

If we have any active sense of social responsibility, we will fight inflation for the sake of those who are most vulnerable to its damages and least able to protect themselves. These include all who live on fixed incomes and pensions, the aged, the widowed, and the disabled. Not much better off are the schoolteachers and the civil servants at all levels of government. If any man profits by inflation—even temporarily—it is eventually from these people on pensions and fixed income that his profit comes—a cruel story of Robin Hood in reverse.

But if a few of us are indifferent to the fate of these victims of inflation, none of us should ignore its damage to ourselves—in the context of the well-being of business and industry, both in general, and in our own particular company. In this respect, let me point out four specific ways in which we can be hurt.

1. Inflation discourages the accumulation of capital

By eating away purchasing power year after year, it penalizes thrift and discourages investment. Oh, I know that the smart boys think that investment in common stocks or real estate is a safe hedge, but as more and more people crowd into that escape hatch, they create and accelerate the very force from which they fled until the whole structure of inflated values collapses, as it did in 1929.

2. Inflation destroys capital already accumulated

That this is already going on is demonstrated to every businessman who finds that his allowable accumulation of depreciation reserves will not replace his depreciated assets. As prices rise more rapidly, this erosion shows up in inventory too—while accounts receivable are settled at a discount. The end is bankruptcy, as the Germans found in the twenties.

3. Inflation distorts figures, destroys accurate comparison and forces uneconomic decisions

Speculation replaces sound merchandising, and investments intended to replace money as a device for the dead storage of value are substituted for investments in productive industry to produce more value. Thus we reverse the lesson of the parable, and emulate the man who buried his one talent, rather than the one who put his talents to use and doubled them.

4. Inflation narrows our markets—both at home and abroad

As true purchasing power shrinks, more and more people must use more and more of their remaining purchasing power for basic necessities, and more and more products are in danger of being priced out of the market. This is true for services too, as the great do-it-yourself movement in America demonstrates.

But even more dramatically, inflation dries up our foreign trade. In 1957 we sold $19.5 billion worth of American products abroad. In 1958 it dropped to $16 billion. While our commodity balance of trade is still on the plus side, our balance of payments shifted from plus to minus. In that year we had to pay out $2.3 billion in gold plus $1 billion in dollar balances held by foreigners in U.S. banks to fill the gap. In the past, the effects of our inflation have been balanced by greater inflation abroad, but lately, and by heroic efforts, our chief customers in Europe—finally including even France—have moved to greater stability. The new European Common Market will protect that stability and unless we solve our problem too, our own price policies will be even more responsible than their tariff barriers for shutting us out. And when we can't export goods, we will export capital and know-how behind the European wall, and there will be fewer American industrial jobs. Then our inflated wage scales will be a statistical mockery—victims of inflation. This mockery has already begun.

Inflation effects on the purchasing power of the dollar

These, then, are among the ways in which inflation is hurting both people and business But when we come to measure the actual reduction in the purchasing power of the dollar since 1939, we become truly alarmed.

The most frequent measurement is in terms of a weighted average of consumer prices—the so-called cost of living index. On this scale the 1939 dollar has shrunk in 20 years to 48 cents.

But there have been other serious shrinkages in purchasing power. When we measure it as income, we have to consider also the increased tax bite before we can translate it into a consumer's dollar. A gross income of $3,000 in 1939 would need to have risen to $6,457 today for a man to pay his taxes and buy the same goods he bought in the year 1939. If a man made $10,000 in 1939 he would have to be making nearly $24,000 today to hold his own. In other words, his spendable dollar is worth only 43 cents. And if a man was in the $25,000 bracket in 1939 he would have to be making $70,000 in 1959 dollars to have the same available purchasing power. His spendable dollar then has shrunk to 36 cents.

And this is not all. Some dollars have shrunk faster than others. Looking at price indexes again, while the average 1939 consumer dollar is now worth 48 cents, the dollar you spend on some other products today is worth even less than 48 cents. Take these examples:

The dollar you spend for prime industrial products is worth 45 cents.

Your commercial and factory construction dollar is worth 37 cents.

If you build a new house, your construction dollar is worth 36 cents.

If you buy a house today which was constructed in 1939, you are spending a 33-cent dollar.

If you have your car repaired, you use 30-cent dollars.

These are samples of the damage inflation has done in 20 years. Unfortunately, history—even recent history—shows that once inflation is accepted as inevitable or desirable its rate always accelerates. When we begin to build a factor for inflation into our personal and business decisions, we give it an extra push. Unless we make a stand soon, it can pass the point of no return, beyond which there will be no question as to whether we will have an economic collapse—only when it will come. To argue that we can live with inflation and control its rate is to forget that it is an economic cancer, and that if we can really control it, we can, in fact, eliminate it.

HOW SHALL WE CONTROL IT?

Up to this point I have been pointing out why inflation must be stopped. Now it's time to try to answer the more difficult question—How? As businessmen and managers of industry, what can and must we do to meet President Eisenhower's special challenge to us, and win the fight against inflation in our special and particular area?

I have four concrete suggestions.

First, we must face the problem and prepare to solve it. This requires the same process that we use to solve any other business problem—plus a little extra spiritual strength. We must wipe out from our own thinking the illusions that inflation has created and replace them with the hard facts. Among these illusions are several false ideas.

1. That we have always had inflation

The fact is that until the thirties, the price levels went up and down, but the long term level remained fairly stable. Wholesale prices in 1930 were about the same as in 1790.

2. That inflation is necessary to growth; that without its artificial stimulation men will not work harder or invest more

The same thing can be said about a narcotic, but here we recognize that the effect is temporary and the price for it is too high. Actually, in most periods of great growth like the twenties, prices were slowly falling. Inflation distorts figures to counterfeit growth, as you will easily see when you measure the rate of increase in your business in tons or gallons and then compare this with the rate in dollars.

3. That inflation can be profitable, because it produces something out of nothing

This is the oldest confidence come-on in human experience and always conceals a clever larceny.

4. That even if inflation is inevitable, a shrewd man can outsmart it by clever investment

This is both stupid and cowardly, the action of a soldier who runs from the fight—or a strong man who pushes the helpless out of the lifeboat. In the end, when the inevitable crash comes, even the smart boys get it.

5. That even if it is bad, it's someone else's fault—and that there is nothing we can do about it

This dims and rejects the very spirit of American free enterprise and makes hollow mockeries of all our great technical and productive achievements. If we approach inflation as another business problem, which it is, and develop an understanding of its effects, we can master it. The first job then is to straighten out our own thinking and accept our share of the responsibility.

TEACH THE TRUTH ABOUT INFLATION

The second suggestion in our fight against inflation is to help others—and specifically our own employees—to get the same understanding of the truth. This will not be easy, because while the official union line on inflation is essentially wrong, it is very appealing. Because their basic approach of more pay for less work is obviously inflationary, they support it with the idea that if wages can be raised faster, new markets will be created, and enough new production will come in to control inflation. What they must ignore is that wages are always the predominant element of cost, and that wages that rise faster than productivity are engines of inflation. When price rises inevitably follow such wages increases, they blame it onto exorbitant profits. The true effect can easily be shown by such figures as these from manufacturing. While physical productivity increased only 31 percent between 1947 and 1957, average hourly wages in manufacturing increased 67 percent. Some have referred to this spread between wages and productivity as the "inflationary gap." It is interesting to compare this spread of 36 percentage points with the 32 percent increase in industrial prices over the same period.

Because employees are being fed misinformation regarding the relationship of wages, profits and prices, they too have illusions about inflation. Through patient planned programs of education, these false ideas must be replaced with truth. For obvious reasons the unions will not undertake this, and if work is to be done, we must do it.

In making this suggestion I know it is another case of calling for education in solving specific problems. This need is always with us and always will be. This job will never be finished. But with respect to inflation, it has a special urgency because there is a definite educational process going on through unions intended to produce the wrong results, and this must be offset, and soon.

ADOPT SOUND OPERATING POLICIES

There is a third area in which we can move against inflation, that of our own operating policies. From now on we must think in terms of stable values and force ourselves to face our operating records and our balance sheet after we have wrung out the water of inflation. We should adopt some stable benchmarks for comparison and tie our planning and evaluating to them. From time to time we should make a report to our stockholders and the public in which we spotlight the effects of inflation on our typical dollar figures.

We should always face the problem of inflation in our dealings with our employees and, specifically, fight to keep wage increases well within the total rate of increase in productivity. If we do this, we will leave some share of the benefits of increased productivity for the stockholders whose investment in new equipment really makes most of it possible. But most important of all, we will thus preserve some part of this for the consumer.

In many ways the consumer is the real key to the control of inflation. He is the one who is robbed when prices rise and only when prices fall—ever so slightly—does he, or more properly, she, have a sure share in our progress. When we provide a share of the added benefits of increased productivity to those on the productive side of our two-part economic cycle, it comes in the form of increases, and it means increased wages to the worker and greater profits to the investor. But if the consumer is to have a share, it must be expressed in decreases in price. This has largely been forgotten in the current era of inflation. Forgotten, too, is the once commonly accepted business axiom that mass production produces lower prices. When we in industry begin to plan to give the consumer his share of the progress we make, prices will stabilize or drop, and inflation in consumer prices will disappear. It's just that simple.

REMOVE GOVERNMENT INFLATIONARY PRESSURES

Fourth, and finally, we must work to remove the inflationary pressures that originate in government. These take many forms.

1. Pressures to increase the supply of money to provide easy bank credit at low interest. This is inflationary by definition.

2. Pressures for nonproductive, non-self-liquidating Government programs that either increase taxes or pile up more public debt. As a Senator, I am appalled to find that many Americans, including businessmen, are economic schizophrenics where Government finances are concerned. They keep their concepts of Government expenditures and Government income in two thought-tight compartments. They want more local programs, more loans and grants, but lower taxes. They fight increases in the debt ceiling and are piously for economy but only if it does not affect them. If we are to control or eliminate inflation, we must move into a sustained period of balanced budgets, and this inevitably involves the control of expenditures for procurement and services at the local level—in your town or State and in mine. So long as we insist on more for any reason we will face the threat of inflation.

ELECT NONINFLATIONISTS TO CONGRESS

Since ours is a representative form of government run by men and women chosen through popular elections following campaigns conducted by political parties, we who want to cure inflation and other weaknesses in government must devote enough time and effort in political activity to first select, and then elect, representatives who understand the dangers of inflation—and will resist its temptations. The union leaders, who are essentially inflationists by philosophy, have moved into this field with great success and the representatives they have sponsored and elected are too often inflationists. In my opinion, this has made inflation, direct or disguised, our greatest nationwide economic issue.

Well, this is my story. Inflation is a great and vicious evil, a form of larceny, a cancer, a destructive narcotic. There are many reasons, social and selfish, why we must conquer it. This is true for all of us, and particularly for the managers of business and industrial enterprise. But there is one final and particular reason why this is especially true for you, the members of the Pennsylvania Manufacturers Association. One of the chief functions of your association is to supply casualty insurance. In this field, inflation has been especially destructive. Costs of settling claims have skyrocketed. General figures that demonstrate this are hard to get, but your association officials know that in the field of casualty insurance inflation is a real burden.

INFLATION MUST BE STOPPED

Inflation must be stopped, and we must do it as citizens and businessmen. If we leave this fight entirely to the power of Government, it can only be done by increasing Government interference with our own right to manage our own business, even to the possible imposition in peacetime of price and wage controls. There are men in Congress now who favor that step if inflation continues. Our own experiences with controls occurred so recently that they should still be convincing enough to make us realize that this step should mean the disappearance of freedom and free enterprise—and the end of our way of life.

Shall we continue to drift blindly into economic destruction—or wake up and live? Regardless of what others may do, I think the real challenge is to the leaders of business and industry. Have we the courage and faith with which to meet it? I believe we have, but we must act now to be effective.

Address by Hon. Estes Kefauver, of Tennessee, Before Vanderbilt University Law School

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ESTES KEFAUVER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, March 2, 1959

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the speech I made on the problems of inflation and antitrust before the Vanderbilt University Law School on February 25, 1959.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS OF SENATOR ESTES KEFAUVER BEFORE VANDERBILT UNIVERSITY LAW SCHOOL, NASHVILLE, TENN., FEBRUARY 25, 1959

Vanderbilt University is one of the great educational institutions of the South. It has traditionally sought for and taught truth. This is one of the reasons why Vanderbilt men and women have always been able to contribute so much to the building of America. I am indeed honored to be here today and for this opportunity to address the law school. The theme of my talk today presents the choice that must be made if we are to preserve our free, competitive system.

I firmly believe that the high cost of living is our No. 1 domestic problem. This has been increasingly emphasized in recent weeks as we have heard more and more from all sides expressions of alarm over high prices and inflation. The President, in his Economic Report to the Congress of January 20, 1959, also recognized this problem.

For several years I have served as chairman of the Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate. As chairman, in the spring of 1957, I announced that the subcommittee would conduct an investigation and hold public hearings on administered price industries. As I explained at that time, "The high cost of living is due in no small part to the upward manipulation of prices by big companies in administered price industries." The subcommittee began by hearing from some of the country's leading economists who have specialized in administered prices. From the testimony of these experts, an administered price may be defined as one having two characteristics: (a) it is set by administrative actions and (b) it is maintained for a period of time. With respect to the first characteristic, it is the seller as a matter of individual choice who establishes the price at which he will make sales, whereas in competitive industries, it is the impersonal market which establishes the price. With respect to the second characteristic, there is no generally accepted period of time during which a price must remain unchanged before it can be regarded as an administered price. What is significant here is not so much the frequency of change, but the responsiveness of a price to changes in the market. Prices which are administratively set and maintained are insensitive to changes in the market; that is, they are increased and maintained at the same time that demand is falling off by decreasing output. Dr. Edwin Nourse, a former economic adviser to the President, in his definition of an administered price industry, emphasized that the essential point is that they can maintain a predetermined price by restricting production. These are the administered prices having the potential for economic distress with which the subcommittee is concerned in its inquiry.

Following the testimony of the economic experts, the subcommittee conducted extensive hearings in the steel and automobile industries, two of the most basic in our economy. It was found in these industries that there existed a kind of upside-down competition. This describes the situation where prices continue to go up even when demand decreases. These high prices are put into effect by the largest company in the industry, with their so-called competitors following almost identically. Apparently this is accomplished without any express agreement.

In the steel industry since World War II, the hearings revealed that prices have moved on a number of occasions in the opposite direction to that which was indicated by the changes in demand. The steel price index

continued its virtually unbroken rise even when demand and production declined, as they did in 1949, 1954, and 1957. It also continued its climb when unit labor costs declined, as they did in 1950 and 1955. No matter what the change in cost or in demand, steel prices since 1947 have moved steadily and regularly in only one direction, upward. The subcommittee found that in 1957 steel price increases substantially exceeded cost increases. It was also clear at the time the 1957 price increases were made there was nothing in the information available to the industry to suggest a forthcoming increase in demand that would have supported higher prices. The fact that these price increases were made and maintained despite such underlying adverse economic conditions illustrates how, through price administration by the leader in the steel industry, upside-down competition can result.

In some industries such price behavior possibly would not have caused substantial injury to the public interest, but this is not true of the steel industry which is the very underpinning of our entire economy. Every time the price of steel goes up, it is inevitable that steel consuming industries raise their prices. This has a tendency to cause price increases in many other lines.

When the subcommittee began its hearings in 1957, I think it fair to state that it was the preponderate opinion that the inflation which our country was experiencing was the product of excess demand. It will be remembered that this opinion was so strongly held that the Federal Reserve Board tightened its money policy in an effort to contract demand. In the opinion of many this policy was based on a false analysis and contributed substantially to the recession from which we have not yet fully recovered. Even during this recession period prices continued to rise in most of the administered price industries, such as steel. Dr. Gardiner C. Means, an eminent economist who is the pioneer in the field of administered prices, appearing before the subcommittee on January 24, 1959, said: "Today, after experiencing inflation and depression at the same time, there are few who still think that this inflation has been the product of too much demand. Clearly, the inflation has not been of the old-fashioned, classical kind with all prices going up more or less together. Also, it is now generally understood that the new type of inflation is associated with administered prices and wage rates. For bringing about this understanding, I believe your committee is in large measure responsible. Indeed, we are fortunate that your chairman and your committee had the imagination to see the relation between these two things and the courage to focus attention on them."

In this recent appearance before the subcommittee, Dr. Means also presented wholesale price changes by product groups for the periods 1942–53, 1942–47, 1953–57, and 1953–October 1958.

In the 1942–53 period the wholesale price changes for all commodity groups generally rose in price and by not too different amounts. During some of this period prices were controlled by OPA and OPS.

In the period 1942–47, demand was far in excess of supply and prices in all commodity groups rose. However, prices in the competitive groups far outrose prices in the administered price groups.

In the period 1953–57, there was an entirely different picture. Price increases were practically entirely in the administered price groups. In some market price groups, prices rose very slightly; in others, they actually went down.

The fourth period 1953–October 1958 extending the third period to October 1958, showed generally the same picture as the period from 1953 through 1957, namely, higher prices in administered price groups with little increases or declines in the competitive groups.

Dr. Means made one point clear: administered steel prices had the dominant role in the 1953–58 inflation. Not only did steel prices rise the most in that period, but prices in the steel and steel using groups also rose more than those of any other groups and accounted for two-thirds of the gross increase in prices. It is significant that, as Dr. Means pointed out, the administered price groups accounted for 85 percent of the gross increase in the wholesale price index. Moreover, he stated that if prices in these administered price groups had not gone up, the wholesale price index would have risen less than 1 percent and that so far as the wholesale price index is concerned, there would have been no inflation.

The result of inflation is strikingly shown in the recent Economic Report of the President. The table on page 142 of that report reveals that in current prices, the total gross national product increased from $397.5 billion in 1955 to $436.7 in 1958. However, when expressed in 1958 prices, the total gross national product only increased from $435.4 billion in 1955 to $436.7 in 1958. Thus it is shown that during this period gross national product has increased only $1.3 billion in terms of 1958 prices. Hence when inflation is milked out of the large increase in dollar values, we have only enjoyed a slight increase in gross national product.

The seriousness of the cost of inflation to the American people is further revealed in the Economic Report of the President. In a chart which appears on page 155 of that report, it is shown that the per capita disposable personal income, using current prices, increased from $1,661 in 1955 to $1,784 in 1958. In contrast, however, when 1958 prices are used, per capita disposable personal income actually declined from $1,790 in 1955 to $1,784 in 1958. Thus we reach the remarkable conclusion that every person in the United States was $6 worse off in 1958 than they were in 1955.

Because the automobile industry is so pivotal in the overall economy, the Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee also inquired into the pricing practice of that industry. It is claimed that one out of every seven workers in this country is dependent, directly or indirectly, on the automobile industry for his livelihood. This study reveals that General Motors today commands approximately 50 percent of the automobile market in the United States. During the past 10 years this company's average profit, after taxes, has been an impressive 25 percent of net worth. This compares with a national average of 11 percent for all manufacturing corporations. In 1947 General Motors' profit was only 17 percent, but in 1950 its profits reached 37.5 percent, which was higher than its profits of 36.2 percent in the boom year of 1929. These figures are all the more impressive when the income tax rise is taken into consideration. In 1929 General Motors' profit margin before taxes was 38.5 percent, while in 1950 its before taxes earnings reached 77.4 percent.

Mr. Harlow Curtice, president of General Motors, in his appearance before the subcommittee, stated that he and three other executives determined the prices for all divisions of the corporation and that such prices were fixed so as to return 15 to 20 percent profit after taxes on total investment. It would appear that General Motors sets prices by a formula method, the first ingredient of which is the fixed 15 to 20 percent profit after taxes. To this is added the cost of materials, labor, overhead, taxes, and fixed costs based on a standard volume of 80 percent of production capacity. It is easy to see that if volume exceeds 80 percent of capacity, which it has in many years, profits are bound to rise above the 20 percent goal. The hearings showed that after these prices have been so fixed by General Motors, they become the prices of the industry. A comparison of comparable models of the major producers reveals little or no price differences.

Except for public utilities, our economy is not regulated. Ours has traditionally been a free, competitive enterprise system. But competition is fast disappearing among our basic industries because price competition is disappearing. In almost every industry we now find a big one, two, three, or four where the leader establishes prices and the others immediately follow suit. The problem of high prices and inflation also grows increasingly worse with the decline of price competition.

Almost 70 years ago the first of the antitrust laws, the Sherman Act, was passed by the Congress. This act has been supplemented by a number of others. We refer to these laws as the charter of our economic freedom. We early elected not to force companies to compete. Our antitrust laws seek to remove illegal restraints and monopolistic abuses so that they could compete. Hard core evidence is necessary to prove illegality.

In the past such evidence was forthcoming and many successful cases were brought against giant combinations of economic power. However, evidence of collusion is often lacking today because companies simply do not have to get together to set prices. As I have said, they simply follow the price pattern set by the leader. The Department of Justice and the Federal Trade Commission have told the subcommittee that they are helpless against such pricing practices unless direct evidence of collusion can be produced.

In this unhappy state of affairs the people are caught in a price inflation and the Government, under present laws, appears powerless to do anything about it. The day of decision is here. America must decide, and decide now, whether it wants a free, competitive economic system—not in fancy words, but in reality. It is up to Congress to discover how to exercise its constitutional responsibility of regulating commerce. Today, it appears that more and more of that power is being exercised by a relatively few managers in key industries.

The time has also come for the public interest to be put ahead of the private interests of either management or labor. During this time of high prices, I don't believe labor should demand or receive any wage increases in basic industries which management could justifiably use as the basis for necessary price increases.

Since the end of World War II our economy has been on a wild merry-go-round. As the cost of living increased, labor asked for wage increases as compensation. When wage increases were granted, prices were raised and the cost of living increased again. This, in turn, led to additional wage demands and so on. High prices and inflation obviously affect every group in America. Many U.S. businessmen believe the danger of the United States pricing itself out of foreign markets is an immediate one. In the President's economic message to Congress was the insistence that high prices here at home could lower our capability to compete in world markets. Labor has likewise been harmed. During this same period, we have seen great increases in unemployment. This problem is still with us today.

We now stand at the fork in the road. We must choose either Government regulation of business or the improvement of our antitrust laws. We must restore the climate where competition can be expected. The choice for me is easy. Regulation except in times of extreme emergency is undesirable.

Specifically what legislation might be passed to strengthen the antitrust laws? I would suggest three basic supplements to ex-

isting law. First, the test of section 7 of the Clayton Act, with respect to mergers, should be made to apply to section 2 of the Sherman Act. Under this section of the Clayton Act, the evidence need support only a finding of substantial lessening of competition or tendency toward monopoly in order to make a merger illegal. This change in section 2 of the Sherman Act would afford the Government greater power to destroy monopolies.

Second, I would suggest that unfair methods of competition and unfair acts and practices in commerce which are unlawful under section 5 of the Federal Trade Commission Act should be declared illegal under section 1 of the Sherman Act. This would enable the Department of Justice to attack all trade restraining evils.

Third, I would suggest that there be enacted into law my bill S. 716 authorizing the Attorney General to compel the production of documentary evidence required in civil investigations for the enforcement of the antitrust laws. Not having this power today, the Department is unable to gather evidence on which to base a suit except by use of grand juries in criminal investigations.

Together with the staff of the Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee, I am presently working on bills to amend section 1 and section 2 of the Sherman Act in the manner in which I have just suggested. When these bills are drafted, I shall introduce them in the Senate.

Although I believe the principal problem in our economy is the undue concentration of economic power, I also suggest that the antitrust laws be strengthened in respect to other problems. For example, I have tried for several years to secure the enactment of legislation which would partially change the law as interpreted by the Supreme Court in the Standard Oil of Indiana case in 1951. This bill designated for several Congresses as S. 11 would, contrary to the decision in the Standard Oil case, make illegal under section 2(a) of the Clayton Act price discriminations which may substantially lessen competition or tend to create a monopoly, even where they are made in good faith.

In 1950, when the Kefauver-Celler amendment to the antimerger section of the Clayton Act was enacted, I was hopeful that the amendment would arrest the great merger movement which was then in progress. However, the enforcement efforts of the Federal Trade Commission and the Department of Justice of the antimerger law even as so amended has been most disappointing. Under the amended law only one case, the Bethlehem-Youngstown proposed merger, has been finally adjudicated in the courts, and this case was not appealed. I have again joined with Senator O'MAHONEY in sponsoring S. 442 requiring in specific instances that premerger notification be given to the Federal Trade Commission and the Department of Justice, with the hope that such amendment might add stimulus to the enforcement program of the antimerger law.

Standing at the forks in the road, I have indicated that answer to our basic economic problems of today lies in an improvement in our antitrust laws rather than in Government regulation. I have made some suggestions as to what some of these improvements should be. I believe that given an understanding of the problem and the choice of remedies, the public would support congressional action along the lines I have indicated.

History teaches us that when a nation loses its economic freedom, it also loses its political freedom. Germany, under Hitler, and Italy, under Mussolini, went through this experience. We must not have it happen in the United States. Keeping competitive may not be popular. To insist upon price competition may work temporary hardships on present concentrations of power, but in the long run, it is the only way a democracy can survive. The accomplishment of this purpose is the joint responsibility of business, labor, and Government and one in which lawyers must play a major part.

American Bar Association Supports House-Passed Bill To Free the Federal Payroll of Communists and Fellow Travelers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD H. REES
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 2, 1959

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I share the deep concern expressed by the American Bar Association in its resolution recommending prompt enactment of legislation to close loopholes in the law which permit Communists and fellow travelers in many Federal positions.

After full and complete consideration of individual rights as well as national security requirements, the American Bar Association has strongly endorsed legislation to prevent Federal employment of Communists and subversives—S. 1411—as reported by the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee and passed by an overwhelming vote in the House last year.

Unfortunately, this urgently needed legislation was not acted on by the other body when we could not obtain conference agreement on the House-passed bill.

I agree wholeheartedly with the action of the American Bar Association in thus squarely endorsing the action taken last year by the House of Representatives. The resolution once more confirms the determination made by this House, that a security system for Federal employment, to be really effective, should be spelled out clearly in the law rather than left to the whims and caprices of administrative officials.

As far back as 1946 I secured the adoption of a resolution to investigate reports of malfunctioning of the Federal employees' loyalty program. Investigation disclosed extreme laxity in certain parts of the executive branch concerning infiltration of subversive elements. Based on these findings, a Federal employees' loyalty program was established—but soon proved inadequate because not based on law. The House of Representatives in 1948 approved my bill to establish an effective loyalty program, but there again the other body did not act. Finally, the House passed a bill in the 81st Congress which was approved by the other body and became Public Law 733, providing for summary removal of Federal employees whose actions jeopardize national security.

Public Law 733 was seriously weakened, as a measure to protect national security, by the Supreme Court decision in Cole against Young. The Court decision invalidated a portion of the Executive order on securities issued in 1953 and thereby opened the door for many known security risks to force their way back on the Federal payroll. Also, under this and later decisions, the Government has been required to give over $450,000 in back pay to persons who had been removed from Federal positions as security risks. This came about, not because these persons are not security risks but solely because of the technicality that their positions had not been specifically designated as "sensitive."

The real issue is simply this: Should any individual who is a Communist, fellow traveler, or subversive hold any public office or position in the Government of the United States? The American Bar Association now has joined with the House of Representatives in answering "No." After full deliberation, and with proper consideration of the protection of individual rights in the light of the national interest, they strongly urge enactment of Federal employees' security legislation approved by the House last year.

Mr. Speaker, I believe I can assure the Members that one of the first bills to be brought to the floor by the Post Office and Civil Service Committee in this session will be the bill to close existing loopholes and provide a permanent, fair, and effective security program for Federal employment. These are the major provisions of such legislation:

First. The head of any department or agency may suspend any employee when deemed necessary in the interest of national security.

Second. Within 30 days, after such suspension, the employee shall have an opportunity to reply.

Third. After complete review of investigation the department or agency head may separate the employee if he determines it necessary in the interest of national security.

Fourth. The suspended employee is entitled to a written statement of charges, reasonable opportunity to answer, a hearing, review by the department head, and a written decision.

Fifth. The term "national security" means all Government activities of the United States involving national safety and security, and every Government employee is deemed to be engaged in an activity involving national security.

Sixth. Any reinstated employee shall be paid for time improperly off the payroll in an amount not to exceed the amount he would have earned had he not been separated, less any earnings during the separation.

Seventh. Procedures under the Lloyd-La Follette Act of 1912 or the Veterans Preference Act of 1944, as applicable, must be followed in any suspension or separation, to the extent consistent with national security.

Eighth. Any employee separated under the security provisions is entitled to appeal to the Civil Service Commission for complete review and the Commission's decision is final and must be followed by the department or agency.

This legislation, as was the case with S. 1411 last year, reaffirms the intent of Public Law 733 as enacted by the 81st Congress. It gives every proper measure of protection to the loyal employee, and

at the same time will help keep the Federal payroll clear of Communists and fellow travelers. It will place in effect most of the recommendations of the Wright Commission on Federal employees' security. This Commission, appointed by the President several years ago, submitted a report of nearly 1,000 pages and recommended even stronger Federal employees' security legislation. Mr. Wright, Chairman of the Commission, in testimony before our committee, endorsed this legislation and added:

It is a tragedy, indeed, that we need any loyalty or security programs, and I fervently hope that the day will hasten when we can abolish them. Until that day, however, we dare not forget that the threat is not only real but formidable.

The discerning and forthright resolution of the American Bar Association is in the highest public service tradition of this great professional association. Its report and resolution are of great value in bringing to public attention the crucial importance of early legislation providing the means to deal permanently and effectively with the problem of subversive infiltration in our more than 2 million Federal positions. I commend this report and resolution to the attention of all Members of the 86th Congress.

Statement of Secretary of the Interior Seaton

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 2, 1959

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, recently the members of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs invited Secretary of the Interior Fred A. Seaton to discuss the operation and plans of his Department as they related to the 86th Congress. In his usual precise manner, Secretary Seaton delivered the following statement, the reading of which I commend to our colleagues:

STATEMENT OF SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR FRED A. SEATON, BEFORE THE HOUSE INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS COMMITTEE, FEBRUARY 18, 1959

Mr. Chairman, it is a pleasure to appear again before this committee. My understanding is that you are interested today in discussing the operations and plans of the Department of the Interior as they relate to consideration by, and possible action of, your committee.

Before commencing this discussion, permit me to present to you the members of my staff who are here.

First is Under Secretary Elmer F. Bennett. Many of you, I know, are acquainted with his background. For the information of your new members and the record, however, let me say that Mr. Bennett came to the Department of the Interior from the office of Senator Eugene Millikin, of Colorado. He is an attorney with 17 years' experience in the Federal Government. He has successively served in the Department as legislative counsel, as my personal assistant, as solicitor, and since September 20, 1958, as Under Secretary.

Another gentleman whom most of the members of this committee know is Assistant Secretary Fred G. Aandahl. A former Governor of North Dakota, he also served as a member of this committee when he was Member of the 82d Congress. Secretary Aandahl's responsibility in the Department is in the joint field of water and power. The Bureau of Reclamation, Bonneville Power Administration, Southeastern Power Administration, Southwestern Power Administration, Office of Saline Water, report to him.

Our Assistant Secretary for Fish and Wildlife is Ross L. Leffler. Secretary Leffler came to Interior with a lifetime record of devotion to conservation. He served 29 years with the Pennsylvania Fish and Game Department. While jurisdiction over a great part of the activities of the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife, the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries and the Office of the Commissioner of Fish and Wildlife, all of which report to Secretary Leffler, rests with another committee of the Congress; there is a definite relationship between public lands legislation and action and fish and wildlife conservation.

Roger C. Ernst, our Assistant Secretary for Public Land Management, supervises the Bureau of Land Management, the Bureau of Indian Affairs, the National Park Service, and the Office of Territories. Formerly the Land and Water Commissioner of the State of Arizona, Secretary Ernst also has a full background of experience in the fields of reclamation and conservation.

Another area of our Department, that of Mineral Resources, is supervised by Assistant Secretary Royce A. Hardy. It includes the Geological Survey, Bureau of Mines, Office of Oil and Gas, Office of Geography, Office of Minerals Mobilization and the Office of Minerals Exploration. Secretary Hardy, a graduate of the University of Nevada in mining engineering, is a registered professional mining and metallurgical engineer. Before joining the Department, he was vice president and general manager of Manganese, Inc., of Henderson, Nev.

The next member of our staff needs little introduction here. George W. Abbott, our Solicitor, was counsel for this committee from 1953 to 1957. He is now our chief legal officer. Earlier he served as my assistant.

The Department's administrative management activities are the responsibility of D. Otis Beasley, our Administrative Assistant Secretary. Secretary Beasley, who began his career in Government in 1928, now has the top career position in our Department. He is responsible for Administrative Services, Budget and Finance, Inspection, Management Research, Personnel Management, Property Management, and Security.

The last member of my staff with me today is Ted Stevens, one of my assistants who also serves as legislative counsel. He came to the Department of the Interior from Fairbanks, Alaska, where he had served as U.S. attorney.

Mr. Chairman, as you requested, I am here today to discuss the program of our Department—particularly the budget and legislative aspects of it.

We have completed our hearings before the Interior Appropriations Subcommittee, in which we supported a request for $344,564,400, exclusive of the Reclamation and power agencies. In all, our total budget request for fiscal 1960 is $633,775,400. This amount reflects our recognition of two facts.

First, our programs—in conservation, in science and technology, and in the advancement of human welfare—are of such importance to the Nation as a whole that we must continue to carry them on at a high level of efficiency and intensity.

Second, if we overexpand these programs and thus require excessive cash outlays, we shall necessarily contribute to inflationary pressures, decreasing the value of the dollar, and ultimately hobble the very programs we were trying to aid.

It is of great interest to this committee, I believe, that we are not requesting funds for new reclamation construction starts for fiscal year 1960.

One reason, largely, is that there are 11 new starts in the current fiscal year. During the next few years, these 11 projects, added to the large list we already had underway, will pyramid the fund requirements for the Bureau of Reclamation. The following tabulation lists the totals of fund requirements for construction and rehabilitation from regular funds and from the Upper Colorado River Basin fund, for fiscal years 1959 to 1965 inclusive, with and without the new starts for which funds were appropriated for the fiscal year 1959.

Fund requirements for Bureau of Reclamation construction and rehabilitation, regular funds and Upper Colorado River Basin fund, fiscal years 1959–65

FUNDS REQUIRED

Fiscal year	With 11 new starts provided for in the 1959 Appropriation Act	Without 11 new starts	Increase required by new starts
1959	$214,048,335	$207,828,335	$6,220,000
1960	212,445,000	195,060,000	17,385,000
1961	267,172,000	227,671,000	39,501,000
1962	263,276,000	211,181,000	52,095,000
1963	203,182,000	157,763,000	45,419,000
1964	127,950,000	100,735,000	27,215,000
1965	84,053,000	70,631,000	13,422,000

While the new starts included in the 1959 Appropriation Act raised the fund requirements of the Bureau only about $6 million in 1959, they increased these requirements $17 million for 1960, $39 million for 1961, and $52 million for 1962. More new starts in 1960 would mean more pyramiding in the 2 or 3 years ahead.

The no-new-starts policy for water resources projects is governmentwide; the administration is seeking no funds for starting new projects for flood control, navigation, and related activities of the Bureau of Reclamation or the Corps of Engineers. Nevertheless, the total activities of these two agencies in 1960 are expected to reach an all-time high of $1.1 billion.

If the 11 new starts had not been added last year but rather commenced this year, our schedule through 1965, exclusive of additional new starts, would have looked like this:

Fiscal year:	*With 11 new starts in 1960 appropriation act*
1960	$201,280,000
1961	245,056,000
1962	250,682,000
1963	209,858,000
1964	146,154,000
1965	97,846,000

The peak demand would have occurred in 1962 rather than 1961 and would have been almost $17 million less. When we recall that Congress over the past 12 years has appropriated an average of $188,940,480 for reclamation construction, the point becomes clear. It does seem to me that a further pyramiding of reclamation fund requirements might result in disaster. The surest way to destroy the reclamation program, in my opinion, is to extend the fund requirements beyond hope of realization.

In preliminary legislative studies before the convening of this Congress, the Department reviewed approximately 300 pieces of legislation, a large majority which are within the area of interest to this committee. Some of them have already been sent to you, or similar bills have been introduced by Members of Congress, and referred to your committee.

Foremost of all the items under consideration is, of course, Hawaii statehood. We are grateful to this committee for the privilege extended to me to present my views on the Hawaii bill and for the fact that you have already favorably reported it. To me, few bills to be considered by this Congress will have the national—yes, even the international—attention that will follow action upon the Hawaii statehood bill. And I know, Mr. Chairman, that you will call upon me or any member of my staff, if there is anything more we can do to further its prompt passage.

Next in importance, to me, is our proposal to establish an effective helium conservation program. As you, of course, all know, helium is a unique resource. Its use is essential to our most vital defense and nuclear programs and of growing impoftance to medicine and industry. Our annual consumption of helium has increased fivefold since 1950, yet no major new source of this gas has been discovered in the natural gases being produced from a relatively small area in Texas, Oklahoma, and Kansas. This helium constitutes a minor percentage of these natural gases. Helium, which will not burn, is wasted into the atmosphere through millions of gas stoves and furnaces.

Our conservation program envisions the construction of up to 12 new recovery plants, to be located on certain pipelines, transporting helium-bearing natural gases to commercial markets. This helium would be stored underground until needed.

Since we submitted our legislative proposal to the Congress in the final weeks of the last session, we have reviewed this proposal in its entirety and made some changes in it. As soon as these have been cleared through the executive branch, we shall resubmit our proposal to the Congress.

Mr. Chairman, we have many other items which we consider important. We will again urge favorable consideration of the Fryingpan-Arkansas project in Colorado, the San Luis project in California, the Burns Creek Dam in Idaho, and several other projects for possible initiation of construction after 1960 when our fiscal situation permits. Of course, my recommendations for joint development of the Trinity River Division of the Central Valley project are still before you.

One of the important problems in the mineral resources field is that of coal research. We have previously reported our views to your committee on bills which call for the creation of a Coal Research Commission. We have noted a bill introduced in this Congress which would give contract authority to the Bureau of Mines for research. Our experts have predicted a phenomenal growth in national demand for energy in the next two decades. Increased emphasis on the development and more efficient use of our vast coal reserves should result from research programs conducted by both industry and Government. We hope to have our report on this legislation completed and cleared soon.

Meanwhile the Bureau of Mines is continuing its research program on the production, use, and conservation of coal. Recognizing the need for greater emphasis on shorter range problems, the Bureau has programed research work for the next fiscal year on hydraulic mining and transportation of coal, on degasifying coal beds to eliminate hazards that exist in gassy mines, and on the performance characteristics of commercial coal-cleaning equipment.

Generally, the resurgence in the economy has materially improved employment and the outlook for the major metals and minerals industries. For example, already, copper, aluminum and steel have enjoyed a significant recovery. And there are signs of strength in other mineral markets that were giving us concern in the recent past. For example, the import quotas established by the President, 5 months ago, have had the effect of tending to firm the U.S. price for lead and zinc. Despite the recent drop in lead, U.S. prices still exceed the prices when quotas were imposed. We believe that the general economic recovery will stimulate additional consumption of these commodities.

The work of the Bureau of Mines and the Geologic Survey of our Department is also essential to the continued health and vigor of our minerals industries. Through geologic and mineral resource surveys, investigations and research, both agencies provide the public and industry with basic data, which stimulates exploration for and development of new sources of mineral raw materials.

Through research in geology, geochemistry, and geophysics, the Geological Survey is developing new and more definite knowledge concerning the occurrence and origin of mineral deposits. It is vigorously pursuing the development of new prospecting techniques to provide the key to the discovery of new mineral deposits, particularly those not obvious to surface exploration. Through research in mining methods and metallurgical techniques, the Bureau of Mines is making major contributions to fuller and more efficient utilization of the Nation's mineral resources.

Our Office of Minerals Mobilization is constantly reviewing the mineral mobilization situation of various segments of the American mineral and solid fuels industries, and revising programs to conform with changing defense requirements. In carrying out this function, OMM provides the staff work for the Department under the Strategic and Critical Materials Stockpiling Act, the Defense Production Act, the Trade Agreements Act, and Public Law 480—known as the agricultural barter program.

We are also just initiating the program of the Office of Minerals Exploration designed to stimulate exploration for new domestic mineral reserves. We have already had more than 600 requests for information on this new program.

The Bureau of Land Management is responsible for approximately 475 million acres of the Nation's public lands, including 298 million in the new State of Alaska. Most of the remaining 177 million are in the other 11 westernmost States. The Bureau also has responsibilities in connection with more than 300 million additional acres and for mineral leasing on the submerged lands of the Outer Continental Shelf.

As principal custodian of the public lands, BLM's primary purpose is the wise administration, selective disposal, conservation, and management of the Nation's public lands and resources. These resources include the land itself, minerals (including oil and gas), forests, and range vegetation. Some idea of the scope of the Bureau's responsibilities may be seen in the fact that about 174 million acres are administered under the Taylor Grazing Act and almost 100 million acres are under oil and gas leases. During the fiscal year ending on June 30, 1958, the BLM took in gross receipts for $127,385,000, to increase the total of receipts since the BLM was formed in 1946 from union of the General Land Office and the Grazing Service to nearly $1,077 million.

Among the significant items of legislation we propose to submit to the Congress in this field will be bills to regulate and control the activities and effect of land locators and promoters on the public domain.

We are faced today with a serious situation, resulting from the entrance into the land locating business of a number of promoters, some of whom are not qualified and may be unethical in their practices. They prey upon the desire of people to own land and upon the ignorance of the general public concerning the requirements of the public land laws. Advertising widely, executing contracts which actually promise nothing more than to file an application with the land office, and holding out great expectations of gain, they have induced people by the thousands to file applications—sometimes for substantial fees—under various public land laws.

By and large, these applications have been filed upon lands without respect to the acceptability of the application under the regulations or the availability of the lands under the law. This practice costs the public many thousands of dollars in wasted money and tends to paralyze the land offices by the very numbers of applications and by the conflicts with other applications that result.

We hope to have legislative proposals in this area.

We also believe that the present public land laws do not provide a convenient means by which public lands can be made available for needed developments. We are considering a proposal to permit the sale of public lands chiefly valuable for business and urban purposes. The chief features of this proposal would authorize the sale of such lands to States and local governments at their appraised fair market value and also, where appropriate, sales at public auction to private individuals, associations, and corporations. This proposal, we believe, might facilitate needed commercial, industrial, and suburban developments in the public land areas.

Section 17 of the Mineral Leasing Act establishes a minimum rental for non-competitive oil and gas leases of 25 cents per acre per annum, with a waiver of all rentals for the second and third years. By regulation we have raised the rental for the first year and for the 6th through 10th years to 50 cents. We cannot, however, alter the waiver provision by administrative action. We have found that the low rental and the waiver of 2 years' rental may have encouraged speculation and have in reality been detrimental to oil and gas development. By the payment of a very small sum a party may hold a lease for a number of years with no intention of developing the leasehold but with the hope of selling the lease for a profit. If annual rentals are increased, and there is no longer a waiver of any year's rental, the mere holding of a lease for possible resale will be less attractive, and the speculating leaseholders will, we believe, be replaced by leaseholders interested in the active development of the oil and gas potentialities of the leasehold. The proposed legislation which we have prepared, H.R. 3263, would increase the minimum annual rental per acre to 50 cents and would eliminate the waiver provision. This amendment would have the added advantages of bringing Federal rentals more into line with the prices charged on State and privately owned lands and of recognizing the changes which have occurred in the value of money since this rental provision was first enacted in 1935.

One of the significant legislative proposals affecting the National Park Service is contained in legislation pending before you to authorize the Chesapeake and Ohio Canal National Historical Park and Parkway. Originally it was thought that a parkway road should be constructed along the canal between Washington and Cumberland. Further studies have demonstrated that the canal and adjoining lands should be set aside as a park with emphasis on the preservation of its historic, scenic, and recreational values. We, of course, subscribe to the general objectives of this legislation. Specific details will be discussed in our report, which has not yet been cleared with other interested executive agencies.

We are considering whether we need additional authority to enable the National Park Service to utilize land acquisition funds to pay for options in the acquisition of lands, and to utilize Federal lands adjoining

park areas for park facilities—with the concurrence of affected Federal agencies—without including these lands within boundaries of the park. Moreover, the Park Service should be given authority to avail itself of nongovernmental architectural and engineering services. This is particularly necessary if we are to avoid the necessity of large, temporary increases in our professional and technical staff while Mission 66 is under way. This new authority will make possible a more efficient execution of our Mission 66 program.

In the field of Indian affairs, several controversial subjects will require the consideration of Congress. Unfortunately, there are no easy answers. This is a field in which opinions frequently differ and in which emotional reactions are sometimes strong.

One of the problems that need congressional consideration is the disposition to be made of the submarginal lands that were acquired by the United States during the depression in the middle 1930's and that were transferred by Executive order to the Department of the Interior for administration for the benefit of various Indian tribes. Approximately 326,000 acres are involved. Title has been in the United States now for more than 20 years, and a decision needs to be made regarding the conditions under which the lands may be acquired by the Indians. The problem has been faced on a piecemeal basis in two instances (with the Seminoles in Florida and the Pueblos in New Mexico).

Another problem involving Indian lands that need attention is the heirship problem. After tribal lands were broken up and allotted (i.e., conveyed) in separate parcels to individual Indians, the original owners have died, and the inheritance process has resulted in the creation of almost unbelievable numbers of undivided fractional interests in the lands. In many instances this process has virtually frozen the title in a manner that makes it difficult for the individual owners to use the land themselves or to dispose of it. The problem is to determine the conditions under which the land may be sold by the individual Indian owners when some of them do not agree or cannot be located, and the conditions under which the tribes may, if they wish, acquire the lands that are offered for sale. In the latter case the big problem is how tribal acquisitions should be financed.

The Department's study of these subjects is also proceeding—and we shall work closely with your Indian Affairs Subcommittee in regard to specific recommendations in these areas.

The policy of terminating Federal supervision over the affairs of the various tribes as they become ready for that action has received much attention in the past. The Department expects to submit to this Congress a few termination bills, but as I have previously announced and emphasized, the Department will submit a proposal in this field only if it is fully understood and concurred in by a majority of the Indian group affected. The groups under consideration are small ones and will not present the complex issues that were involved in the Klamath and Menominee legislation.

The major item of legislation we shall submit to your committee in the fish and wildlife field will be our proposal to establish the Arctic Wildlife Range in Alaska. This area of approximately 9 million acres is located in the extreme northwest corner of our new State. Over 5 million acres of the area was formerly withdrawn as part of Public Land Order 82. As a refuge for caribou, grizzly and polar bears, Dall sheep, and wolverine, plus countless flocks of migratory birds of over 100 species, this wildlife range will provide a working laboratory for the study of Arctic life.

Our proposal for this area will seek authorization to permit metalliferous mining under a permit system and to open the area to mineral leasing. We will, however, seek to limit access to the area in order to prohibit appropriation of the surface title under the public land laws. We are currently working with the Department of Defense to eliminate their objections to our original draft bill. We are in substantial agreement now, and as soon as the technical drafting is completed and clearance has been given by the Bureau of the Budget, we shall submit this proposal to Congress.

Of primary interest to this committee is our saline water program. As you know, we recently had an independent board of consultants make a study of the needs of the Office of Saline Water in light of our expanded responsibilities under the demonstration plant authority enacted by Congress last year. This survey resulted in a series of recommendations, mostly administrative in character, which will be put into effect as the program progresses.

Interest in the contemplated demonstration plant activity has been intense. We are approaching the date for the selection of the first process to be demonstrated under this program. Selection of the process will precede and influence selection of the site.

Our budget request for fiscal year 1960 for this portion of our saline water program is $300,000. This amount includes funds for the selection of processes and for the engineering plans for the first conversion plants.

Of course, our basic activity in research and development is continuing.

The development activity is in the areas of three major processes—distillation, membrane, and freezing. In distillation small pilot plant work is under way on rotary vapor-compression stills, long-tube vertical multiple-effect systems, and solar stills of several types. The LTV distillation and the multistage flash distillation cycles continue to look very promising.

Two membrane processes are in commercial use, and a number of small plants are in operation on brackish water treatment. Improvement in equipment and membranes is continuing.

A small pilot plant using freezing as a separation process is now being built. It is based upon successful laboratory research and development recently completed.

Research is being carried out on these major processes, including the reverse osmosis and osmionic processes, and on others, such as solvent extraction. Some of these will be going into small pilot plant development.

In closing, let me repeat, Mr. Chairman, the comments I made to some of the members of this committee recently. It has been a matter of continuing pride to those of us now serving in the Department of the Interior that our relationships over the years with your committee and its members have been most satisfactory and pleasant. We have disagreed—at times—but our disagreement has normally been as to the means we should adopt to accomplish a mutually agreed upon objective. Partisanship has not impeded the important work of the committee (and I like to believe has not impeded the important work of the Department), and the people we all serve have benefited thereby.

I make these comments again to give me the opportunity to assure you, Mr. Chairman, on the record, that it is our intention to do our part in continuing, in every way possible, this outstanding record of cooperation.

We stand ready to assist this committee in any way. And it is my feeling that any disagreements arising during this Congress between any of us will be eventually resolved as they always can be by reasonable and sincere men. If our relationships continue in the future as they have in the past, and I feel confident they will, we will continue to build sound and wise programs for the development, wise use, and conservation of our precious natural resources.

A Definite Challenge

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 2, 1959

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, there is an article in the Wall Street Journal of March 2, 1959, entitled, "Challenge in Science." A summary of the article is in the first paragraph as follows:

> Considering Russia's accelerating pace in research and the Russians' intense motivation to overtake Americans on all fronts, the United States is in danger of losing its overall science leadership within 10 years.

This is, indeed, a sobering statement and so is a statement dated February 26, 1959, of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, the Honorable Arthur S. Flemming. His statement may be summarized as follows:

> I have learned, with considerable disappointment, that many schools across the country, for one reason or another, are failing to take advantage of a virtually cost-free opportunity to strengthen the teaching of science and mathematics.
>
> Government surplus equipment suitable for use in teaching science and mathematics is currently declared surplus at the rate of about $100 million in initial value each year.
>
> Although the equipment is available to colleges and universities and to public, parochial and nonprofit private schools throughout the country, only about 20 percent of the scientific items actually find their way into educational institutions.

Mr. Speaker, the implication of the Secretary's statement seems to be that the schools in the United States are at fault in failing to get valuable scientific equipment virtually free. As chairman of the Special Subcommittee on Donable Property of the House Government Operations Committee and as sponsor of Public Law 61 which made surplus property available to educational activities it is my considered judgment that the failure of the educational institutions to make 100 percent use of the surplus equipment is due to lack of leadership and coordination in the executive branch of the Government. I regret that it is necessary to make this statement but since the passage of Public Law 61 in the spring of 1955 there have been numerous examples of lack of cooperation and coordination between the several executive agencies which are responsible for the execution of the program which was unanimously passed by the Congress.

It is a serious matter, Mr. Speaker, to state on the one hand that the Russians are challenging our leadership in the overall scientific fields and at the same time admitting that useful and necessary scientific items which are surplus to the requirements of the Federal Government are utilized only to the extent of 20 per-

cent for purposes which involve our survival. I urge that Secretary Flemming utilize his authority either directly or through higher echelons and do what is now possible under existing legislation to insure that surplus property when useful and necessary for purposes of education, health and civil defense are so employed and at the earliest possible moment.

Last calendar year surplus property at initial cost of $334,109,167 was transferred to the States for purposes of education, health, and civil defense. However, the 1960 budget statement indicates that there will be a total of $8 billion in surplus property declared in fiscal 1959 and a total of $10 billion in fiscal 1960.

Why there is so much surplus property is a serious matter upon which I have often spoken and, of course, involves the necessary organization of the Department of Defense which generates more than 90 percent of all surplus property.

The full statement of Secretary Flemming follows:

STATEMENT BY ARTHUR S. FLEMMING, SECRETARY OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

I have learned, with considerable disappointment, that many schools across the country, for one reason or another, are failing to take advantage of a virtually cost-free opportunity to strengthen the teaching of science and mathematics.

Government surplus equipment suitable for use in teaching science and mathematics is currently declared surplus at the rate of about $100 million in initial value each year.

Although the equipment is available to colleges and universities and to public, parochial, and nonprofit private schools throughout the country, only about 20 percent of the scientific items actually find their way into educational institutions.

Schools that have picked up scientific surplus property have put it to good use in science and mathematics teaching; but there are many more schools that apparently are unaware of the kinds of equipment that they can obtain simply by paying warehousing and transportation costs.

This equipment ranges all the way from push buttons for second graders to jet airplanes for engineering students. It includes nautical and navigation instruments; radio and radar equipment; electric motors and generators; photographic equipment; spectrometers; laboratory items and supplies, including chemicals; lenses, and electronic items and components.

A large part of this equipment comes from the Department of Defense, where it has been used in research laboratories, in training personnel, or in actual operations throughout the country. Other items come from the Atomic Energy Commission, from the laboratories of the Department of Agriculture, from the Veterans' Administration, and from other Federal agencies. Many of the items are in the original packing cases.

The spotty demand for scientific surplus equipment is in sharp contrast to the speed with which other surplus items, such as building supplies for school maintenance and machine tools and materials for vocational education programs, are picked up.

That scientific equipment could be equally valuable to schools and colleges generally—if they know of its existence—is shown by the fact that it is constantly being bought up by dealers, after it has gone begging for a sufficient length of time, and then is resold to schools.

Once property has been determined surplus—that is, its usefulness to the Government has ceased—the Surplus Property Division of this Department assumes responsibility for getting as much of it as possible where it can do the most good. State surplus property agencies—and every State and the District of Columbia has one—let the Department know how much they think will be requested, and the property is transferred to State warehouses. Representatives of schools may visit these State warehouses and select the items they require. Some States also circulate lists of available materials and accept orders by mail.

Real and personal property which is not disposed of in this way is advertised for sale to the public. About a year ago, for example, 100 instruments which record direction and velocity of the wind were declared surplus property, but educational institutions did not ask for them. They were sold to surplus dealers who in turn sold them to schools. Electrical measuring instruments have been sold by the thousands for as little as a few cents each and later resold to schools.

Where real efforts have been made to inform the schools, the results have been extremely gratifying. The North Carolina State agency, for example, has circularized every school in the State with a list of scientific items available, and established a Saturday warehouse open house for science teachers. The State agency now accepts all the scientific equipment it can get, knowing that the schools will put it to good use. In Nebraska the State agency worked with the University of Nebraska in preparing guide sheets for science teachers, to show how available equipment can be modified or adapted. The Texas agency has on its staff a specialist whose chief concern is to see that available scientific equipment is put to maximum use in Texas schools.

I am convinced that all that is needed is more information about what is available in the surplus property warehouses and greater initiative on the part of the schools themselves.

A school can obtain much useful equipment for its science and mathematics courses simply by:

1. Getting in touch with the State surplus property agency and establishing the school's eligibility.

2. Sending the appropriate personnel to the warehouse to see what is actually available or likely to be coming in.

3. Informing each science or mathematics teacher what is available and at the same time obtaining a list of items that each teacher would like to have for his classes.

4. Providing the State agency with a list of desired items so that the State agency can be on the lookout for them as they become surplus.

In many instances it is simply a matter of backing the school bus or station wagon up to the loading platform of the warehouse, picking up previously selected items and driving off with them.

Valuable scientific equipment constantly comes on this market. Within a few weeks 19 unused dynamometers for checking engine efficiency are likely to be available in the New Orleans area, left over from the Michaud ordnance plant, which formerly built tanks. Each has an acquisition cost of more than $11,000. These dynamometers will—I hope—find their way into engineering schools which need them.

A large number of secondary schools, colleges, and universities have taken advantage of the opportunity to obtain valuable equipment at little or no cost. Just last week $4 million worth of radar units were allocated to universities and colleges. Last fall a $1,300,000 aerial navigation trainer was given to the University of Pennsylvania, which will use its components in building a nuclear reactor. Electronic computors have been given to the University of New Mexico, the Louisiana Polytechnic Institution, the University of Kansas, and George Washington University in Washington, D.C. Students in a Kentucky high school operate a "ham" radio station put together with surplus property—and students in a Virginia technical school operate their own TV station—also assembled from surplus property. The Aeronautical Engineering Department of the University of Maryland has constructed a supersonic wind tunnel from parts of a former Japanese wind tunnel and two large steel tanks formerly used by the Navy in conducting a diving school.

The surplus property utilization program as a whole has made major contributions to our schools, and our public health and civil defense agencies since its establishment in 1946.

During the past 13 years 84,522 acres of land and 6,871 buildings have been conveyed to colleges, universities, and junior colleges. These represent an acquisition and improvement cost of over $296 million.

Over 20,000 buildings have been transferred to elementary and high schools, mostly for use as shops and classrooms. The facilities given to public schools through surplus property are worth more than $500 million.

Early in 1958 vocational and trade schools—and colleges and universities—reported an urgent need for machine tools to expand training facilities and replace obsolete equipment. For this reason, increased emphasis was given this phase of the surplus property program. During 1958, 7,476 machine tools were allocated, with an acquisition cost of nearly $13½ million. This represents an increase over 1957 of 339 percent in the number of machine tools donated, and a 312-percent increase in their acquisition cost. Additional thousands of components, accessories and supplies for these machines, as well as related testing and measuring equipment, were also given to schools. As patterns of defense production continue to change, even more machines are expected to be available in the tools-for-schools program. These machine tools should be in especial demand by area vocational educational programs now being established or expanded under title VIII of the National Defense Education Act.

During the past year, about 80 percent of all surplus personal property was distributed to schools, about 10 percent to hospital and health facilities, and 10 percent for civil defense purposes.

Since the inception of the surplus property utilization program in 1946, personal property with a Government acquisition cost of $1,590,835,673 had been made available to State agencies for donation for health, education, and civil defense purposes. Real property with an acquisition cost of $742,373,674 has been transferred to health and educational institutions.

The Argument for Hawaii

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN H. DENT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 2, 1959

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, for the benefit of those who are not fully prepared with certain facts and figures on the newest proposed State in the Union, I want to present some information that may help our people to have a better understanding of Hawaii, its peoples, its aims, its habits, and more important, its united effort and yearning to become one

of the great States of the United States of America.

After 46 years as an organized Territory of the United States, Alaska in 1958 became the 49th State and left her older sister, Hawaii, the only remaining incorporated Territory.

Hawaii has proved its qualifications for statehood time and time again since becoming a Territory in 1900. The islands' people revere the American flag and the principles it symbolizes. Their mode of life, the type of local government they support, and the service they give to the Nation are a credit to the colors.

They are much like the people of Main Street, U.S.A. For more than half a century they have lived as Americans, worked as Americans, and fought in wars for America. They have always conducted themselves as first-class citizens.

Modern Hawaii, destined to become Uncle Sam's 50th star, is already the Nation's star performer in the Pacific.

Before going into the details, here are some of the salient points that show Hawaii as one of the country's most modern, progressive, and prosperous areas in 1958:

First. A fast-growing population reached 575,000, plus another 41,000 military personnel.

Second. Business in the Territory approached a volume of $2 billion annually, with sugar, pineapple, and tourism leading the industrial moneymakers.

Third. Fifty-nine banks had a total of $481 million assets, clearings of $3.3 billion.

Fourth. With the expansion of tourist facilities and industry, including a forthcoming Standard Oil refinery and a steel mill, construction was a $200 million island industry.

Fifth. Two hundred thousand employed persons in the Islands were paid $850 million annually in wages and salaries.

Sixth. Per capita personal income rose to $1,821 in 1957, ranking Hawaii 25th with the States.

Seventh. Taxes paid the Federal Government reached a record $166 million, putting Hawaii ahead of 10 States as a taxpayer.

Eighth. A total of 136,000 students attended the Islands' 208 public schools in 1958, and 7,000 were enrolled at the University of Hawaii, highest per population in the Nation.

Ninth. The United States was spending more than $300 million to maintain the strength of this Pacific bastion of defense and America's show window on Asia.

Such are some of the highlights of modern Hawaii, an integral part of the United States since 1898, a proud and loyal community of half a million American citizens asking their full measure of equality under the American flag. Hawaii has repeatedly shown her true red-white-and-blue colors. She was never more fit and ready for the crowning honor or statehood. Hawaii is headed for stardom.

By embracing Hawaii as a State, America would advance three bold steps closer to victory in the cold war against communism in the Pacific and Asia.

First. It would demonstrate dramatically that the United States both cherishes and practices the democratic ideal that her citizens stand equal before the law regardless of color and creed. The example of a State of Hawaii would shine in the Pacific for half the world's people to see and to compare with the empty promise of equality held out by communism.

Second. Admission to the Union would bolster Hawaii's role as our defense outpost in the Pacific.

Third. It would make Hawaii a center where the people of the Pacific basin could study and learn our best American traditions.

When the United States granted independence to the Republic of the Philippines, the peoples of Asia understood. Statehood for the strong, loyal body of American citizens of many Pacific races in Hawaii would be an even more striking example for Asia.

It would be a sign to a billion men, women, and children that the Pacific Ocean is no longer a barrier between them and a free way of life. Statehood would confirm their hope that America believes in the full development of local self-government.

In these times, statehood for Hawaii is an ethical rather than a political question.

Old World colonialism has run its course in Asia, leaving its people with a choice—a free way of life, or communism.

Our national policies will be judged in no small measure by the decisions we make in respect to the people of Hawaii.

It is imperative that we continue to demonstrate our belief that all people should have a government of their own choosing.

Hawaii already is a Pacific outpost of the American way of life, a window on our freedoms. The people of Hawaii already have reached a goal still sought by the rest of the world. Nowhere else is there a mosaic of races, national origins, tongues, cultures to compare with this community of Americans.

The Territory is no longer an experiment in democracy. It is proof, tested in war and peace, that people of the East and West can work together for the good of all under the flag of freedom.

Hawaii occupies a key position in the commerce and defense of the Pacific. Her many racial backgrounds give her people a keen and knowing interest in Pacific affairs. A State of Hawaii, fully represented in Washington, would be a voice alert to the problems of national security in the Pacific, with a background of knowledge to furnish ways of meeting the problems.

The people of the islands have long paid tribute to the American way of life by their persistent demand for statehood. They do not seek independence. They do not ask dominion status. They seek American union.

They ask, with overwhelming voice, to share the privileges and responsibilities of full citizenship with their fellow Americans.

Again, more than 50,000 young men of Hawaii served in the Armed Forces during World War II and the Korean conflict. Hundreds more are volunteering or being drafted today on quotas enforced in the same proportion as in the States. Yet Hawaii's citizens had no voice in the passing of the draft law.

Only the change from territorial status to statehood will properly correct this situation by giving Hawaii full equality in the American system of government, including:

First. The right to full voting representation in both the U.S. Senate and the House of Representatives, with the people of Hawaii selecting these representatives.

Second. The right to vote for the President and Vice President of the United States.

Third. The right to choose its own governor, and to carry on functions of government by its own elected officials instead of Federal Adminstrators.

Fourth. The right to the wider latitude of a State in lawmaking by its own legislature.

Fifth. The right to judicial functioning in its courts by local authority rather than by Federal appointees.

Sixth. The right to freedom from overlapping of Federal and local authority.

Seventh. The right to an equal share on a per capita basis in Federal grants for education, health, highways and other public improvements.

Eighth. The right to voice in any proposed amendment of the constitution.

And all of these rights would be irrevocable.

Citizens of all the States enjoy these rights; Hawaii's Americans have earned them too.

Hawaii is an industrious, prosperous, and progressive community—a showcase for democracy.

It is a land of sunshine, scenic beauty, natural grandeur—as Mark Twain said: "The loveliest fleet of islands that lies anchored in any ocean."

It is America's strongest military outpost in the Pacific, a symbol of our Nation's firm intentions.

Hawaii is also a modern American community. It has a streamlined government, a high standard of living, progressive industries, first-rate schools, familiar churches, and up-to-date transportation and communication facilities.

Its citizens live in modern houses, drive new automobiles—some with help of the finance company—belong to Republican and Democratic clubs, and send their children to the University of Hawaii or a favorite mainland college.

Hawaii residents yell themselves hoarse at football games, eat hot dogs, attend church services, watch television. They enjoy Broadway hit plays at Honolulu Community Theater and they take in "thriller" movies at drive-ins; they go to afternoon jazz sessions and attend evening Honolulu Symphony Orchestra concerts; they enjoy exhibits at the Honolulu Academy of Arts and read the funny papers.

They are Americans, through and through.

They are particularly proud that whatever their racial origin, they have learned to live together, work together, play together and study together—that is Americanism too, and the kind that makes the deepest impression on the half of the world's population that faces toward Hawaii. To these peoples, Hawaii is a fascinating laboratory; a place where democracy has been planted and thrives in fertile soil, whose appealing crops are worthy of attention.

This land of economic prosperity and social opportunity deserves a close look from its Pacific neighbors—and from its American neighbors on the mainland.

Hawaii has an area of approximately 6,400 square miles, larger than any of three States—Connecticut, Delaware, or Rhode Island.

The Territorial Department of Health estimates October 30, 1958, put Hawaii's population at 575,711, or a total of 616,711 including military personnel. Hawaii's population was thus larger than the population of any of five States: Vermont, Delaware, Wyoming, Nevada, and Alaska. Hawaii has a larger population than existed in any State at the time of admission with the exception of Oklahoma. As a State, Hawaii will fit the pattern of 14 States, with 1 or 2 Representatives in Congress and the usual 2 Senators.

Eighty-five percent of Hawaii's people are citizens of the United States. More important, between 98 and 99 percent of grade and high school students are citizens.

Hawaii's finances are sound. The Territory has substantial resources in lands and industries and has taken care to build a strong economy with them. For the fiscal year ending June 30, 1958, the Territory paid a record high of $166,306,000 in Federal taxes, more than any of 10 States, including Alaska.

Hawaii has paid more than $2.3 billion in Federal taxes since becoming a Territory.

At the end of June 1957, total assets of the 59 banks in Hawaii were $481 million. Clearings amounted to $3.3 billion.

Hawaii's 1957 mainland dollar earnings were $856 million. Hawaii spent $833 million.

Per capita personal income rose to $1,821 in 1957, putting Hawaii in 25th place nationally or ahead of 24 States—U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, State Tax Collection in 1958, August 1958.

A notable expansion and diversification of industry is taking place. Among the most dramatic of recent developments was the choice of a site on Barber's Point several miles from Honolulu for a $40-million refinery by Standard Oil Co. of California. Construction was begun in October 1958, for this first oil refinery in Hawaii.

The island's first steel mill, for production of reinforcing bars for the construction industry, was to be completed and in operation early in 1959.

Agriculture has branched out into other fields besides sugar and pineapple, such as macadamia nut production.

Hawaii's homegrown textile industry is setting tropical garment fashions for all the Nation.

Agriculture is the foundation of Hawaii's economy. The Territory leads the world in the technique of sugar production and far outstrips the rest of the world combined in the canning of pineapple products.

Nowhere in the world have scientific methods been applied to agriculture on the scale that prevails in the sugar and pineapple production of Hawaii.

The Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee reported in 1951. In 1957, Hawaii's 28 independent sugar plantations produced 1,085,000 tons of raw sugar on their 220,000 acres with a crop value of $148 million.

Hawaii's 9 pineapple canneries processed 30,787,000 cases of fruit and juice grown on 77,000 acres of 13 plantations. Total value of the crop was $117 million.

The young coffee industry in 1957 grew 4,404 tons worth nearly $6 million. Beef and dairy products continued their rapid expansion in order to match the demands of a vital, growing population. Fruits, nuts, vegetables, and flower crops contributed nearly $5 million to Hawaii's economy.

Islanders consumed 7½ million dozen eggs and a goodly quantity of chicken to account for $6.5 million in the poultry industry.

Hawaii's superb climate, scenic beauty, and recreational facilities are a major economic asset to the islands.

Tourism ranks as Hawaii's third basic industry, and is determinedly challenging sugar and pineapple in dollar value.

Every year sees new highs in the number of visitors, which reached a record figure of 168,000 in 1957. In dollar volume this has meant a jump from $6 million in 1946 to $77 million in 1957, or an increase of 1,183 percent. The elements that caused this increase point to further expansion. These include the continuing national population migration to the west coast, and the expansion in volume and speed of air transportation. By early 1959, Hawaii will be served regularly by jet liners taking a scant 4½ hours to fly the 2,000 miles from California.

To accommodate the increase in visitors, multimillion-dollar developments like Henry J. Kaiser's Hawaiian Village Hotel and the rapid rise of luxurious apartment-hotels have become common sights.

Several first-class hotels have been built on the neighbor islands of Hawaii, Maui, and Kauai. One notable area is the Kona coast of the island of Hawaii, which, in a smaller way than Waikiki, has grown phenomenally.

A projection by the Hawaii Visitors Bureau indicates the Territory will be hosting 280,000 tourists annually by 1965.

In 1950, 63 delegates were elected throughout the islands to write a constitution for the proposed State of Hawaii. Foes of statehood said that the ILWU's Communist leadership would control a majority of the delegates. But candidates identified as representing the ILWU leadership were defeated.

As the convention met, the subcommittee of the House Committee on Un-American Activities opened hearings in Honolulu. One convention delegate resigned and another was expelled as a result of testimony, or of refusing to testify, at the hearings.

The State constitution finally drawn contains a provision that "no person who advocates, or who aids or belongs to any party, organization or association which advocates the overthrow by force of violence of the Government of this State or of the United States shall be qualified to hold any public office or employment."

It is the first State constitution to contain such a provision.

Despite bitter ILWU opposition to this conservative constitution, it was ratified by the people by better than 3 to 1 in a plebiscite. The National Municipal League of New York City said Hawaii "had set a new standard in the writing of a modern State constitution by convention."

Among strong anti-Communist measures, Hawaii's Legislature has enacted:

First. Legislation setting up a subversive activities commission to ferret out security risks.

Second. A series of loyalty acts as stringent as in any State.

To summarize, the Nation needs Hawaii because:

Statehood would be an example before the world of American democracy in action. It would bolster Hawaii's defense role in the Pacific. It would make Hawaii a center where Pacific peoples could study American traditions.

Hawaii is a community of Americans who have proved that East and West can live and work together, in peace and war, under the flag of freedom.

Hawaii has passed every test. Congressional committees, Government departments, military leaders and others have marked her "A" for American. Five major Pacific commands in Hawaii show the Islands' military importance. Statehood will serve notice to the world that the United States intends to stay in the Pacific.

The Nation wants Hawaii because:

National surveys since 1941 show public opinion overwhelmingly in favor of admitting Hawaii into the Union.

The American press is nearly unanimous in its support of Hawaiian statehood.

Nearly two score national organizations are on record in favor of it.

The platforms of both political parties call for immediate statehood.

Twenty separate Congressional hearings have exhaustively investigated Hawaii's fitness for statehood.

The U.S. House of Representatives has passed Hawaiian statehood bills three times, in 1947, 1950, and 1953.

Although reported out favorably by the Senate and House Interior Committees in succeeding sessions of Congress, Hawaii's bills never came to a vote in either chamber. The Hawaii and Alaska measures were combined, then

reintroduced separately, and Alaska's bill was finally enacted in the 85th Congress.

Why Hawaii wants statehood:

Hawaii's 575,000 people have fulfilled the obligations of citizenship for more than half a century without enjoying all the privileges.

They pay taxes as residents of the States do and serve on battlefronts equally, but have no voice in either tax or draft legislation. Taxation without representation violates a basic American precept.

Statehood is the expressed will of Hawaii's people. They have elected or reelected 10 ardently pro-statehood Delegates to Washington since 1900. In a plebiscite in 1940, 67 percent of those voting said they favored statehood.

In 1949, the people elected 63 delegates to a convention to draft a proposed State constitution. At the next year's elections they ratified the constitution drawn by better than 3 to 1.

In February 1954, 116,000 persons on all the major islands signed a huge petition for statehood addressed to the U.S. Senate.

The case for Hawaii rests. The people of Hawaii have spoken eloquently and without reservation. They want to belong. Now the American people, through their representatives, must make the all-important decision.

Will Hawaii be admitted as a State in the firmament of the United States of America?

I say "Yes."

Castro's Cuban Justice on Trial Before the Cleveland City Club

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES O. PORTER

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 2, 1959

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address which I delivered last Saturday, February 28, 1959, before a luncheon meeting of the Cleveland City Club in Cleveland, Ohio:

Before I speak about a nation whose new Government is barely 2 months old today, please let me say a word about a State whose 100th birthday was February 14, 1959, Oregon, my State, that is. In the Pacific Northwest we are having a big centennial celebration out there this spring and summer. You are all invited. I personally invited Fidel Castro earlier this week, pointing out to him that he would feel at home because many of the men are sporting outrageous beards and our mountains would please any rebel band. We have many other attractions. Do plan to visit this newer Northwest territory. I guarantee that you will enjoy yourselves.

Here is a proposition I trust you will concede without argument: A Member of Congress becomes an authority in any area, physical or abstract, by any contact—be it ever so slight. I hope to demonstrate this to you today.

According to the title of my remarks today I am an "eyewitness" and as such I am supposed to report to you on Castro's Cuban justice. In a moment I shall lay a foundation for my testimony. First, let us consider the issues on which I shall testify:

1. Does the quality of Castro's justice indicate that Cuba is now a police state or soon will be?

2. Does it show Communist influence and anti-U.S. sentiments, existing and potential?

3. Does it mean that Castro intends to bring revolution to other lands?

4. What can we do, officially and personally, to improve the qualities of Castro's justice and our relationships with Castro's Cuba?

JUSTICE IN THE BROADER SENSE

I make no apology for using justice in the broader sense. I do not confine it to the cases of the accused war criminals. Justice as I use it in these remarks represents the purpose of government. In other words, what does Castro's treatment of accused war criminals tell us about the nature of Castro's government?

Now, as to my qualifications as a witness, a few words so you who have questions for me won't be too hard on me when your turn comes. I don't speak Spanish. I have never had a formal course relating to Latin America. Within the last 2 years I have made two short visits to Puerto Rico, two to Venezuela, one each to Costa Rica, Colombia, Honduras, and Panama. I have visited Cuba three times, the first on my way back from Honduras in December of 1957 for about 3 hours between planes. My wife and I took a taxi into Havana and discovered that we couldn't get within four blocks of the presidential palace because of police barricades. The second time was last month for 2 days and the third time was a week ago for 3 days. Exactly a week ago at this time I was making a speech in Santiago de Cuba at a meeting sponsored by the Santiago Committee for Industrialization and Progress. The Lions Club, the Rotary Club, the Twenty-Thirty Club, and the chamber of commerce were all there. Last Monday I again talked with Fidel Castro, this time for 45 minutes.

Now, if you'll bear with me, just one more flashback:

Shortly after I arrived in Washington, in December of 1956, I learned that a constituent of mine, Gerald Lester Murphy, had disappeared in the Dominican (so-called) Republic. In the course of trying to find out what happened to him I discovered that our official policy was to be kind to dictators. I didn't like this. I said so. Not only did I believe our treating Trujillo as though he were respectable had made him think he could get away with murdering Gerry Murphy, but it was plain to me that our policy conflicted with our Nation's deepest traditions and played into the hands of Communists.

HOW THE BATTLE WAS JOINED

In the course of my expressing my protests about our official policies I naturally included other dictators, Perez Jimenez, of Venezuela; Stroesner, of Paraguay; Somoza, of Nicaragua; and Batista, of Cuba. In my office and in my travels I met many of the antidictator nationals of these countries. I received many letters from them. I learned a great deal from persons who had been in this fight much longer than I, such people as Herbert Matthews, of the New York Times editorial board; Gov. Muñoz Marín, of Puerto Rico; Jose Figueres, former President of Costa Rica; Alberto Lleras Camargo, now President of Colombia; Romulo Betancourt, now President of Venezeula; and many others. I found that my strongest allies were the Inter-American Press Association and newspapermen who knew the area, and also organized labor, particularly the AFL–CIO vice president, Serafino Romualdi.

I am still ignorant in many respects, but not quite so much so, thanks to my friends. My distinguished colleague, Mr. BRAZILLA CARROLL REECE of Tennessee, former chairman of the Republican National Committee, disagrees with me about Castro's justice. On February 9, in an insertion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, he calls me his irrepressible colleague (which in this connection will doubtless continue to be true), and he also calls me one of the principal apologists for Castro. He thinks Castro is encouraging communism. He doesn't want us "to condemn in word or action any government with whom we are in free alliance," but he thinks we "owe it to mankind" to protest the "obvious and proven disregard of the basic elements of justice and fair play" by the Castro government.

THE QUESTION OF A POLICE STATE

This brings us to the first issue on which I shall testify as an eyewitness. Is Cuba now a police state?

It is true that Castro is the strong man in Cuba today. It is true that military tribunals are trying accused war criminals and that some 300 have been executed upon being found guilty. It is true that the procedures do not involve the use of a jury nor of many of the procedural safeguards we deem essential in Anglo-Saxon jurisprudence. It is true there are no freely elected officials in the executive or legislative branches.

It is also true that Fidel Castro, President Manuel Urrutia, Ambassador Dihigo, his Cabinet Ministers, and the barbudos, or "bearded ones" in the 26th of July movement are not the kind of people who countenance "blood baths," much less arrange them. The Cuban people love the barbudos. They greet them and wave to them. What a difference from the way they felt about Batista's soldiers and police.

I think the beards mislead many people in our country. For example, a week ago in Santiago de Cuba, the capital of Oriente Province where the revolution began, I met Manuel Pinero, the commandant of Castro's forces there. He has the most magnificient red beard and locks I've ever seen. Until you talk with him and unless you had known other Castro men, you might think, "What a screwball this guy must be." In fact, though, Commander Pinero is a capable, sensitive and decent man. He studied economics at Columbia University. His wife, Lorna, who has an M.A. in psychology, comes from New London, Conn. At midnight last Saturday he escorted me on a tour of the Moncada, the military barracks in Santiago, where Castro made his famous attack on the 26th of July and where Masferrer, Batista's terrorist-in-chief, had his headquarters and where many boys and men were horribly tortured.

"We don't like this place," Pinero told me. They plan to destroy the buildings where the atrocities were committed and to make a school out of the rest. The weather was excellent that night. Many people were on the streets at 1 a.m. Under Batista, my hosts told me, the streets were deserted after 9 o'clock.

A LESSON IN HUMILITY

On the following day, Sunday, Pinero told me they were going to have a degradation ceremony. His wife thought at first he meant to say "decoration" but he didn't. Some noncom had made a mistake and he was being stripped of his rank in a public ceremony. The Castro men never looted, they never raped, they never tortured or killed prisoners. They don't drink whisky. I have met many of them. Never have I seen one who swaggered or was loud spoken. They are not a rabble in arms. They are

disciplined and restrained, dedicated but not fanatical—because of a humility they all possess. Major is their highest rank. One captain told me they had just been paid for January. His salary after deductions was $208.

I asked Commander Pinero how they were able to indoctrinate the new recruits who joined them in great numbers when they left the mountains last December to march toward Havana. He told me that, in addition to giving them examples of conduct and specific instructions, they shot one new man who stole a can of milk. They are very serious about maintaining the high morality of their revolution, but not to the point of setting up their own terror.

A REBEL IN SUNDAY SCHOOL

As I left Santiago the man across the aisle in the airplane was a Baptist minister from Park Forest, Ill., by the name of Joseph L. Hughes. He and several other Baptist ministers had just spent 2 days in Santiago. "We hadn't been here 10 minutes," he told me. "until we had a different picture than the press had given us." He said they had just left one of Castro's top men teaching a Sunday school class. He shared my admiration for these men and said he and his colleagues would be speaking up on their side when they returned to the United States.

Yes, an army is in control of Cuba, the rebel army. But there are civil liberities, including freedom of the press, and there is a promise of free and honest elections in less than 2 years. The men who are in command are decent men worthy of our support and sympathy in their struggle to establish democracy in Cuba.

After my talk in Santiago last Saturday the Castro men flew me about 50 miles north to the Sagua de Tanamo, a town of about 6,000 inhabitants, which had been cruelly damaged by Batista's air force. Nearly 300 civilians were killed there. This was the first time I had seen a bombed city in this hemisphere. Whether or not it was a war crime is not clear. The evidence is conflicting. The 21-year-old captain who escorted me, owner of a sugarcane farm and student of chemistry who intends to enter politics someday, a softspoken athletic lad by the name of Caleb de Quesada, told me he had been informed that there was no resistance, but barbudos in the village told me they did fight back. Both could be correct. The assault extended over 10 days. The resistance probably developed after repeated attacks. The invariable Castro tactic was to come into a town at night, take all the guns and retire to the hills before dawn. All air attacks were in the daytime. This young captain, by the way was Castro's heavy weapons expert.

WHAT IS A WAR CRIME?

The point here of course is which, if any, of the 40 or more Batista pilots now on trial in Santiago are war criminals. I talked this over with Pinero and with Castro. They agreed that the burden of proof was on the prosecution to show that the accused man knew he was shooting or bombing only to terrorize civilians and not as part of an attack on enemy forces.

This testimony of mine adds up to the finding that Castro and his men are as decent as Batista and his men were indecent.

But, you might ask, because in many instances their procedures were summary and they have executed many men, how do we know that they haven't killed innocent men? I attended no trials. I relied on a free press to tell me about them. The press has been free and wide-ranging since Batista left, yet I have to date seen not even one allegation that an innocent person has been executed or that any one of those condemned had no opportunity to defend himself. This does not mean I endorse the procedures. I do not. From the first I have urged their improvement.

The persons being executed are not shot because they are Batista supporters as one news story stated, but because they were murderers of defenseless men, women, and children. Castro can predict that about 400 will be executed because he knows very well the files on the notorious murderers in the police and in Masferrer's "tiger" army. These files were carefully prepared by thousands of spies. Batista's men helped by not trying to hide many of their atrocities, thinking to intimidate the Cubans. Pinero made available to me pictures taken by Masferrer and his sadistic underlings. They are beyond description. What man can do to man is incredible. The Nazis did no worse.

THE HIGH COST OF WORDS

I knew about these atrocities and I blamed Batista for them while he was in office. Many Cubans and others sent me stories and photographs. Why didn't the Nation know? One reason is that Batista corrupted the press, even some of our own. He bought good words or, at least, silence. The Associated Press, a fine organization with high ideals, fired one of its employees in Havana, Arroyo Maldonado, a Cuban citizen, about a year ago when it found he was receiving money from Batista.

An Associated Press staff writer, Robert Berrellez, one member of the entirely new AP American contingent in Havana, finished his recent series on the Batista atrocities with this paragraph, referring to the 400 (out of 2,000 detained) who Castro said would probably die:

"It could have been more, some quarters say, were it not for the strength of criticism outside Cuba—much of it probably growing out of a lack of information on what had happened here."

The Cuban revolution was not a change of the palace guard. It may not achieve all its noble ends. It may even degenerate into a police state of the left or the right. I don't think it will. The determination in the Cuban heart to establish an honest and democratic government is too intense and too universal.

THE PROS AND CONS

This brings us to the next question, what about procommunism and anti-U.S. feeling in the Castro government? Every enemy of a Latin American dictator is called a Communist and worse. Many Catholics supported Castro and most of his men are of that faith. One cannot be a Catholic and a Communist. Furthermore, Castro and his leaders are middle class people with a social and economic reform program which is not communistic. Of course the Communists are on the scene, with money and know-how, to take advantage if they can of disorganization and to fire up, as best they can, anti-U.S. sentiments.

A Cuban can be anti-United States without being pro-Communist. Historically there has been very little anti-U.S. feeling in Cuba compared to other Latin American countries. I have found no such feelings. I asked Castro last Monday why, in a telecast a few nights previously, he had put out an anti-U.S. version of Cuban-U.S. history. He replied that he had to be honest, but that he was not anti-United States. I believe him. The best proof is the kind of men he has put in high places and the kind of government Cuba now has.

THE NERVOUS NEIGHBOR POLICY

Both Commander Pinero and Premier Castro assured me that they did not intend to sponsor aggression against their nervous neighbor, Rafael Trujillo, the senile dictator of the Dominican Republic. They know that such action would inevitably invoke the organized action of the Organization of American States against them. This brings us to the third issue: Is Castro's government planning to take the lead in igniting the overthrow of other tyrants in Latin America? "Exiles from any land can come here," Castro told me Monday, "and I will not allow the police to bother them." He makes no secret of his dislike for Trujillo.

Trujillo tried to help Batista. He tried to help Dictator Pérez Jiménez, of Venezuela. Now he has, in his capital city, two deposed dictators, Perón and Batista, as living reminders to his long-suffering people that a day of reckoning for such men eventually comes. No wonder Trujillo wishes they would go away.

The shoe is now on the other foot in Latin America. Not long ago the lovers of freedom were running and hiding from torture and death. Now the forces of decency and democracy are strong and becoming stronger. They control Cuba and Venezuela, both potentially wealthy countries. Their leaders speak out against Trujillo. They are only justified in doing so. I think this is in keeping with the most sacred traditions of the United States, a country which was born out of revolution against a tyrant, a country whose citizens know that democracy once attained must be maintained.

THE PROMISE—NOT THE THREAT

Vice President NIXON, with whom I sometimes do not agree, said in Oregon week before last in my presence that "we should concern ourselves more with our faith in freedom, more with the promise of the American Revolution and less with the threat of the Russian revolution." I say amen to that.

My observations in Cuba lead me to conclude that the Cuban leaders do not intend any rash Bolivarlike expeditions against the declining dictators, but that they will join with Venezuela and other countries in condemning all governments based on terror and tribute and that they will carry this policy into the Organization of American States and other international organizations. Such expressions, in my opinion, particularly if joined in by the United States, will be quite sufficient to insure the early downfall of Trujillo by internal forces which heretofore have been frustrated by the respectability misguidedly accorded to this despotic regime. An invasion of attitude in these circumstances can be more readily effective than an invasion of barbudos.

THERE'S A DIFFERENCE

What about Castro's Cuba in its relationships with the United States? I think we will be more friendly than ever, now that our administration has endorsed a policy of differentiating between democracies and dictatorships, now that Cuba is an emerging democracy, and now that we have an outstanding Ambassador in Havana, a career man, Philip Wilson Bonsal, whose opposition to dictators needs no further demonstration. The two political appointees who preceded Bonsal made a sorry mess of our official standing in Cuba by identifying themselves with the dictator and his minions. Our refusal to withdraw our military missions from the Batista government was an error of immense proportions, yet we are now sending Marines to Haiti to repeat that mistake.

A free, uncorrupted press will do much to help reestablish our good relations with Cuba. Cuba's own struggle as it becomes better known here will enlist support and sympathy. I predict brighter days and closer ties between this fair country and our own, ties based on our common devotion to human freedom. Its government is taking hold. Castro appeared more severe and assured when we spoke Monday. Sunday he and the Cabinet spent on a yacht out at sea where they could confer without telephones. I found this out because I was to have had dinner with the brilliant young secretary of

the treasury, Lopez Fresquet. His U.S.-born wife explained where he was and why.

I conclude by listing a few of the features I feel we must include in our Latin American policy:

A GOLDEN RULE OF DIPLOMACY

First, and foremost, we must speak up for freedom and against tyranny. This goes beyond our American Revolution and back to a manger in Bethlehem. Our ambassadors and military men must be instructed not to identify themselves with tyrants but to be particularly friendly in countries striving for the establishment of human freedom.

Second, we should cut off all foreign aid, both military and technical assistance, to Latin American nations whose governments are based on fraud and force. We should increase such aid to democracies.

Third, we should encourage the exchange of information and citizens. When I was in Santiago I found the local businessmen were eager that the American sailors be allowed to come there again on leave, this not having happened for almost 2 years. State Department officials in Cuba favored it. So did Fidel Castro and the U.S. Navy when I asked them. It is now up to the Department of State, and I hope they decide affirmatively without delay.

Fourth, we must work toward commodity controls, particularly with respect to coffee, along the lines of the sugar agreements which have worked so well.

Fifth, we must make more capital loan funds available through the Development Loan Fund and the Inter-American Bank.

Sixth, and this applies to me, there should be more study of the Spanish language in the United States. We should insist that our Foreign Service personnel in Latin America and elsewhere maintain a continuing and intense interest in the language of the country in which they serve.

No doubt there are many other policies we need to adopt or to improve, some perhaps more vital than several I have listed. The most hopeful sign, however, in my opinion as a peripatetic eyewitness of part of this hemisphere, is the greatly increased interest shown by the American people in Latin America in the last year. There is no question where the American people stand with respect to democracy and tyranny, but I know Fidel Castro in his lonely mountain hideout often had cause to wonder why the United States Government didn't reflect more accurately the sentiments of its citizens.

In sum, this eyewitness, on the basis of what he has seen in Cuba and elsewhere, reports to you that Fidel Castro, his barbudos and the people of Cuba are doing their utmost to establish an honest and Democratic government in Cuba. The nightmare of the Batista terror is at last ended. The notorious criminals are being punished. Castro told me Monday that all the trials would probably be finished in a month and that many of those convicted would receive only jail sentences. It was my impression that he too will be glad when this phase of the revolution is finished.

I close with an observation made recently by my friend Jose Figueres, former President of Costa Rica and an outstanding leader of democracy. For many years in this hemisphere, Figueres pointed out, no partisan of Democratic government was safe in Latin America. The dictators, through their thugs, penetrated everywhere, even into the United States. The Cuban war crimes trials, Figueres believes, offer a fitting occasion to show that the hemisphere is a little less safe for the men who do a dictator's dirty work.

Thank you very much.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, MARCH 3, 1959

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Dr. Edward G. Latch, minister, Metropolitan Memorial Methodist Church, Washington, D.C., offered the following prayer:

O God, our Father, Thou everlasting sustainer of our spirits, we thank Thee for the coming of a new day, for every awakening of mind that comes to us, and for the noble ideas that seek lodgment in our minds endeavoring to be heard. Unto Thee would we dedicate the work of this day.

Forgive us, when in our pride and conceit, we think that but for us Thy purposes would fail. Forgive our rebellion against all that is unpleasant in life—against discipline and disappointment and defeat. By Thy spirit living within our hearts help us to learn the lessons whereby we can grow into a greater maturity of mind and of heart.

Lay Thou Thy hand in blessing upon us—the leaders of our people—and grant us wisdom, grant us courage for the living of these days. In Jesus' name we pray. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON INTERNAL REVENUE TAXATION

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication:

MARCH 3, 1959.

The Honorable SAM RAYBURN,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to section 8002 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, the Honorable NOAH M. MASON, of the Committee on Ways and Means, has been designated as a member of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation to fill the vacancy created by the death of the late Honorable Daniel A. Reed.

Sincerely yours,

WILBUR D. MILLS,
Chairman.

OUR FIRST DUTY IS TO RAISE DUTIES ON IMPORTS THAT PUT AMERICANS OUT OF WORK

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, people often ask why the language used in drawing up a bill is so vague and confusing.

Legislators cannot possibly anticipate all the possible ramifications of a given piece of legislation, or the defects in it that will be revealed only through actual experience.

Some programs of the Federal Government start off in a constructive manner, then boomerang back to bite the hand that feeds them.

Then we must tighten up the original law by specific amendments to correct those contradictions that we could not foresee.

Take the Rural Electrification Administration, for example, and the legislation governing its organization, its purpose, and its operation.

Being rural, one would never expect that it would become involved with foreign manufacturers or tariffs. As a consequence, no specific provision was written into the law requiring that corporations or cooperatives securing loans from the REA must place their orders for turbine generators with American manufacturers doing business in this country.

This oversight is now harming American industry and American workers.

Money loaned by the REA is being used by the borrower to buy generators from a Swiss manufacturer, when that business should have gone to General Electric of Lynn, or some other manufacturer in this country.

The Congress must act swiftly to close this loophole before American business and American workers lose their shirts to foreign competitors who will have a field day in our domestic market. For your information on this issue, under unanimous consent I insert in the RECORD the following editorial of February 17, 1959, from the Daily Evening Item, of Lynn, Mass.:

THIS IS RIDICULOUS

With all its other headaches, it is regrettable that American business is now going to be called upon to compete with foreign firms for orders financed by U.S. Government loans and lack of adequate duty protection will deprive American workmen of employment which should rightfully be theirs.

In simple, unvarnished language, that is exactly what has happened to the General Electric Co.'s River Works here in Lynn.

A Swiss manufacturer has been given an order for three 22,000-kilowatt turbine-generators which could have been manufactured by the company's Lynn medium steam turbine, generator, and gear department.

The contract would have given 150 people a full year's work.

The Swiss firm, paying only one-third the wages which GE pays, was able to underbid GE 25 percent even after adding a 15-percent import duty on top of Swiss shipping and production costs.

But the real bit of irony in the whole deal is that funds for the order were provided by the U.S. Rural Electrification Administration, a Federal agency which lends money to groups which promote electrical development.

GE says it is not unusual for its turbines and generators to be higher priced than those of competitors, either American or foreign, but discerning buyers are willing to pay the difference for GE's shorter delivery dates, reliable performance, efficient operation and fast, effective service.

A week ago a similar instance was brought to light when the Tennessee Valley Authority placed a 500,000 kilowatt turbine-generator with a British company, despite a GE bid for the order.

We don't know what the answer is, but it would seem to us that Congress ought to give the tariff and duty regulations which permit such things to happen another long, hard look. It seems ridiculous that the funds of American taxpayers should be used to help knock American workmen out of jobs.

A GREAT LITERARY LIGHT GOES OUT

Mr. IRWIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. IRWIN. Mr. Speaker, in the death of Maxwell Anderson—dramatist and poet—the world has lost one of its most distinguished men of letters.

Mr. Anderson, who passed away on Saturday in the Stamford, Conn., Hospital, was the dean of American playwrights.

And he was but one of many similarly distinguished men of letters who live and work in my home district of Fairfield County, Conn.

This is a section of America renowned for the high caliber of its citizenry, a status that makes Fairfield County one of the most intelligent, most learned, most talented in this great country.

In Maxwell Anderson's death, the world of literature and the world of the theater have lost one of their greatest exponents.

For here was a man whose eyes and pen missed nothing of interest and translated the vital aspects of life as he saw them into a great force for spreading light into the dark corners of human experience.

Maxwell Anderson was in turn a realist, a romanticist, and an individualist.

In tribute, Mr. Speaker, to this remarkable and talented man who has passed into the masterless night of which he once wrote, I would like to introduce into the RECORD the following editorial from the New York Times for Monday, March 2:

DRAMATIST AND POET

The final quiet that came to Maxwell Anderson, dramatist and poet, in a Stamford hospital last Saturday evening, removed a personality that was still active, glowing and impassioned. Nevertheless, Maxwell Anderson's memory and achievements are part of the undying record of the American theater.

Anderson was a shy man, rarely seen in the theatrical circles around Broadway. He was more at home in the quiet country back of Haverstraw, where he spent many working years, or on the Connecticut shore of Long Island Sound, where he passed his productive latter days.

The measure of Maxwell Anderson, as a dramatist and as a man of letters, was equally in the thin volume of poems he published and in the whole field of theatrical expression, from musicals to tragedies. As a poet, he was rightly credited with providing the major impetus to bringing the splendor of verse back to the legitimate stage. To him the drama was no mere entertainment. It was "a religious institution devoted to the exaltation of the spirit of man." He had faith in democracy against "all political patent medicines."

A fearless individualist, he battled against the New York Drama Critics' Circle as the "Jukes family of journalism," and these same critics bestowed upon him two of their highly coveted annual awards for accomplishment in the theater.

Now he goes into that "masterless night" of which he once wrote, and faces his last "defeat, implacable and defiant." His work and his influence will live in the beauty of lines that were written to be read as well as spoken and, as his friends and the theater's friends must hope, in revivals of some of his timeless dramas.

FEDERAL GOVERNMENT SUBSIDY OF ROCK AND ROLL MUSICIANS ATTACKED

Mr. MACDONALD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. MACDONALD. Mr. Speaker, it has come to my attention that under the Postal Policy Act of 1958—Public Law 85–426—the Federal Government has undertaken a program which subsidizes rock and roll, jazz, and hillbilly musicians. I view with regret our present Federal tendency to subsidize large segments of our economy. But I view with absolute horror, the prospect of Federal subsidies for performers such as Elvis Presley, Little Richard, Dicky Doo, Conway Twitty, the Royal Teens, and all the other hundreds of musical illiterates, whose noises presently clutter up our juke boxes and our airways.

When the Congress revised the postal rates last year, it added to the low cost category of fourth-class postal rates, books, manuscripts and such educational recordings as Audio-books, read by such artists as Raymond Massey and Ronald Coleman, bearing such titles as "The Trial of Socrates," "Complete Sonnets of Shakespeare," "The Writings and Speeches of Abraham Lincoln," as well as the works of Bacon, Schopenhauer, Milton, Emerson, Thoreau, Whitman, and others. This addition to that category of educational materials seems to me to be a worthwhile one, for it benefits the education of our children, and as such, is justified.

However, the Post Office Department on August 1, 1958, designated all phonograph records as "educational material" and all records now receive the benefit of being classed as fourth-class mail for postal purposes. Translated into financial terms, the so-called record clubs were thereby enabled to mail recordings for 9 cents for the first 16 ounces and 5 cents for each additional 16 ounces or fraction thereof. Prior to this exemption, phonograph recordings, if under 8 ounces, were required to be sent by third-class mail at a cost of 2 cents for the first 2 ounces or fraction thereof, and 1 cent for each additional ounce or fraction thereof. Thus, the present rate charges are exactly one-half what they were prior to this change in our postal laws.

I certainly object to this situation. By this ruling, the U.S. Government has for all intents and purposes officially stamped rock and roll, hillbilly, be-bop, boogie-woogie, and jazz records as educational material.

A look at some of the titles of the records mailed to our high school and secondary school students tops any objection that I might make as to their educational nature. For example, we have listed such current favorites as "Jailhouse Rock," "You Ain't Nothin but a Hound Dog," "Got a Lot of Livin' To Do," "Dinner With Dracula," "You Bug Me Baby," "Bony Moronie," "Whole Lot of Shakin' Going On," "Picking On the Wrong Chicken," and hundreds of others, ad nauseam.

We all know that our postal service is financed primarily from postal revenue. It is obvious that if the rock and roll musical mills are permitted to continue to mail records at these above special rates, the Post Office Department will be denied hundreds of thousands of dollars in postal revenue which are needed to maintain present operations. I for one feel that this practice is an injustice to the ordinary users of our mails. There is no possible excuse for this situation except to make it even easier for the frenetic rock and rollers to become rich even more quickly than they are presently doing.

In a day when we should be concerned with teaching our children science, mathematics and foreign languages, we should not promote by subsidy the abuses of grammar and the musical illiteracy that we hear blaring from our radios, juke boxes, and TV.

If any changes should be made, it seems to me we should make it more difficult for the phonographs of our teenagers to blare from coast to coast daily and nightly with this trash. Certainly we should not give the purveyors of this musical nonsense, a subsidy in mailing these records to our children.

While I have heard Elvis Presley, Conrad Twitty, and Jerry Lee Lewis, the latter who, you may remember, married his 13-year-old cousin while on a rock and roll musical tour of England, mentioned as having an effect on educational benefits, I have always heard them mentioned as having an adverse effect on educational progress. It seems clear beyond any further discussion that putting such immortal rock and roll classics as "Itchy Twitchy Feeling," "Honey Comb," "Stagger Lee," and "Splish Splash" in the same category as the recordings of Bach, Brahms, and Beethoven, et al., is a horrible perversion of the intent of Congress, who tried to further the purchasing of educational records by placing them in an especially inexpensive mailing category.

I certainly hope that the 86th Congress will see fit to rectify this inequity by taking away this subsidy and the Post Office Department will exercise the good sense to put into effect the intent of Congress, as contained in Public Law 85–426.

POPULATION CHANGES IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, according to an announcement yesterday by the District of Columbia Board

of Commissioners the Negroes in Washington now constitute 53 percent of the total population. It had been announced previously that in the public schools, as of October 31, 74.1 percent were Negro and 25.9 percent white. The percentage of colored in the schools is probably larger now.

This calls for some kind of congratulations to be extended to somebody.

When the investigation of the Washington integrated school system was made in 1956, I pointed out that Washington was turning into a second Harlem. Yesterday's announcement is confirmation of the statement.

The announcement shows that in 1953 when our left-wing sociological Supreme Court turned the Negroes into the restaurants and hotels in Washington the white population was 510,000. Twenty thousand moved out by the next year, 1954, the year the Supreme Court turned Negro children into the white schools. This left 490,000 whites. By the next year, 1955, the mass exodus increased to 33,000, leaving 457,000 whites in the District. In 1956, the migration out had swelled to 42,000, leaving 415,000. Only 6,000 fled in 1957, but by July 1, 1958, another 22,000, a total loss of 123,000 in the 5-year period, leaving the white population 387,000.

What is the situation as concerns the Negro population? In 1953, it was 340,000. It increased by 14,000 to 354,000 in 1954, by 18,000 to 372,000 in 1955, by 21,000 to 393,000 in 1956, by another 18,000 to 411,000 in 1957, and by 27,000 the largest increase of all in 1958, to the figure of 438,000. In the 5-year period the Negro population increased 98,000 while the white population decreased 123,000.

The announcement of this change in population from white to Negro does not seem in all respects to be made with the unbounded enthusiasm which might be expected from those who have done so much to bring it about. In fact, it is possible to detect just a slight effort to play it down in this sentence:

> Thus, it is clear that there has been no substantial migration of nonwhites into the city.

But, whether it is better for Washington to turn into a second Harlem through the exodus of white people or through an influx of Negroes is a matter of opinion, and it may be just an academic question, anyway.

It is of considerable consequence, however, that, of this race which is now in the majority in Washington, more than 1 out of 4 births is illegitimate—actually the figure is 1 out of 3.47—they commit 82 percent of the major crimes; they constitute 87.1 percent of the names on the relief rolls; and of reports of venereal diseases the figures show, of total cases reported, 220 white and 9,126 colored.

With the exodus of white people, the sources of revenue are disappearing, business conditions are worsening, real estate values are diminishing.

I shall not try to say whether the Commissioners should congratulate the Supreme Court, or vice versa, or whether both those groups should congratulate the President and the Justice Department. Someone probably should felicitate the home rule brigade upon the possibility of a Negro city government if they should ever be successful in putting their program into effect.

There is one group to whom I can, and do, extend hearty congratulations, and that is the 123,000 who were successful in getting themselves and families out of the mess that now prevails in the Capital City.

AQUINAS DOMINICAN HIGH SCHOOL, CHICAGO

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for time to inform the House of the pride we in the Second Congressional District of Illinois have in the Aquinas Dominican High School, which is in the great seventh ward of the city of Chicago, a ward of which I have been a resident for many years. Over 28,000 high school students, representing every State in the Union, participated in the 18th annual science talent search for the Westinghouse science scholarships and awards. Of the 427 who in this stiff competition made the honors group, 2 are members of the senior class of Aquinas Dominican High School, Mary Terese Anglim and Dolores Mary Leahy. I know that my colleagues will join with me in extending the congratulations of the Congress to the faculty of this school, and especially to its teachers in science. Of the 427 who won honor awards, 40 were selected for the top group that was brought to Washington by the Westinghouse Co. and the science clubs of America. Mary Terese Anglim is one of the 40, and one of the great evenings of my service in Washington was when I squired her to the science search dinner. That is one affair that a Member of Congress cannot crash on his own steam. I was invited because of what charming, brilliant 17-year-old Mary Terese Anglim had done in her research of topology which she graciously explained to me is an abstruse kind of geometry. On further inquiry I learned that topology is defined as the study of those properties of the geometrical figure unaffected by any deformation not involving tearing or joining. It requires comprehension of theory rather than a series of mathematical processes. Mary Terese modestly gives the credit for her outstanding achievement to her parents, Mr. and Mrs. D. W. Anglim, and to her teachers in Aquinas Dominican High School. Her father is the superintendent of water distribution and maintenance in the central district of Chicago. He is one of my most distinguished constituents.

The Second District is mighty proud of Mary Terese Anglim. On her graduation from high school she hopes to attend St. Louis University to major in mathematics or possibly chemistry. She will do research in the nuclear field.

PUBLIC HOUSING BONDS

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill to end Federal income tax exemption on future issues of public housing bonds secured by pledge of Federal annual contributions contracts entered into after the effective date of the act. This will close a tax loophole and correct a tax inequity.

These public housing agency bonds assisted under the U.S. Housing Act represent local credit in name only. It is true the local public housing agency issues the bonds, but it has no taxing power. The credit which is back of the bonds is the credit of the United States pledged to the payment of principal and interest on the bonds through the annual contributions contract which the Federal Government executes with the local agency. Since the Federal Government by law cannot sell its own bonds on a tax exempt basis there is no reason under the sun why the Federal Government through the financing device used in the public housing program, should permit a local shell agency to, in effect, sell Federal credit on a tax exempt basis.

In yesterday's Wall Street Journal there appears an ad by the Dealer Underwriting Group offering $34.8 million of new public housing bonds issued by 15 different housing authorities. I want to read you the sales pitch on these bonds, this is the way they are sold to the public. Here is what the ad says:

> The bonds of each issue will be secured by a first pledge of annual contributions unconditionally payable pursuant to an annual contributions contract between the Public Housing Administration and the local public agency issuing said bonds in the opinions of bond counsel. Said annual contributions will be payable directly to the fiscal agent of said local public agency in an amount which, together with other funds of the local public agency which are actually available for such purpose, will be sufficient to pay the principal of and interest on the bonds when due.
>
> The U.S. Housing Act of 1937, as amended, solemnly pledges the faith of the United States to the payment of the annual contributions by the Public Housing Administration pursuant to the aforesaid annual contributions contracts.
>
> Quotation from an opinion, dated May 15, 1953, of the Attorney General of the United States, to the President of the United States:
>
> "In summary, I am of the view that: * * * A contract to pay annual contributions entered into by the PHA in conformance with the provisions of the act is valid and binding upon the United States, and that the faith of the United States has been solemnly pledged to the payment of such contributions in the same terms its faith has been pledged to the payment of its interest-bearing obligations."
>
> Interest exempt, in the opinion of counsel to the underwriters, from Federal income taxes by the provisions of the U.S. Housing Act of 1937, as amended.

I call your attention, in particular, to one of the statements in the first para-

graph of the sales pitch, "said annual contributions will be payable directly to the fiscal agent of said local public agency." In other words, the Federal Government does not even pay this money to this local shell agency, instead it makes the payments directly to the bond agent who in turn pays the principal and interest due on the bonds. Now contrast this with the sales pitch on a true municipal bond. Again I refer to an ad which appears in today's Wall Street Journal. This is an ad for the sale of $10.7 million city of San Antonio, Tex., bonds. Here is the sales pitch on this true municipal issue:

These bonds, in the opinion of counsel, will be valid and legally binding general obligations of the city of San Antonio, payable from ad valorem taxes to be levied against all taxable property therein, within the limitations prescribed by law.

That is true local credit. That is local credit supported by the taxing power of the community. That local credit is tax exempt and it should be because it is no way dependent upon a pledge of Federal credit.

What really happens with the financing device used in the public housing program is that the Federal credit sold by the local shell agency on a tax exempt basis is in competition with our municipalities who must come into the market and pledge their own credit and taxing power for the bonds which they sell to private investors. No wonder our municipalities at times experience difficulty in marketing their own credit when they must compete with what in effect is Federal credit sold on a tax exempt basis.

It is long since past the time for exploding the myth that public housing bonds represent local credit. It just is not so and since this in effect is Federal credit it should be treated just the same way as the Federal Government must treat its own bonds; namely, it should not be sold on a tax exempt basis.

THE FLEMMING FORMULA

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, Secretary Flemming, of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, says that his formula will build 75,000 classrooms if the States will cooperate by changing their constitutions, their basic tax policy, and repeal debt limit statutes.

The school districts must consent to go along by getting themselves in debt beyond their admitted capacity to repay.

Secretary Flemming's talents merit wider use than are being given them now.

Secretary Flemming might devote a little of his time to the Washington Redskins. An application of the Flemming formula would result in a prediction that the Redskins now have a formula for winning all the games. When asked about his plan, Flemming could announce that he was going to have the Redskins' ends hovering over the gridiron in helicopters on offense.

The Redskin quarterbacks could pass to either end and the helicopter would fly over the opposition's defensive team and score touchdown after touchdown. Flemming concedes that such procedure will require a change in the basic rules of football and consent will have to be obtained from the other members of the National Football League for this special concession. These are minor obstacles, however, according to Mr. Flemming. He is chiefly concerned whether or not, with Gene Brito gone, the Redskins will ever be able to stop the other team from scoring an equal number of touchdowns.

BILL TO REPEAL FEDERAL EXCISE TAX ON AUTOMOBILE VEHICLES AND PRODUCTS

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, today I received notification that the Michigan State Legislature has again passed a concurrent resolution urging the Congress of the United States to repeal the Federal excise tax on automobile vehicles and products.

My bill, H.R. 2388, which proposes that this tax be repealed, is now before the House Ways and Means Committee. I have written a letter to the committee's chairman urging hearings at the earliest date possible.

In February of last year, when the Michigan State Legislature passed a similar resolution, I pointed out that the measure was in the nature of an S O S from the people of my State who work in the automobile industry. As you well know, unemployment is still a matter of grave concern in Michigan or anywhere else where the automobile industry is the primary source of jobs. And it is a primary source of jobs in a good part of the United States.

I repeat what I said last year—one out of every six businesses and one out of every seven gainfully employed workers in the United States are dependent for a livelihood on the manufacture, distribution, servicing and commercial use of motor vehicles.

The Michigan Legislature has recognized the need for the repeal of this excise tax as an important stimulant to automotive production, and hence cut the unemployment figures in depressed areas all over the country.

It is my considered opinion that the Congress of the United States cannot afford any longer to disregard this plea from the American people to remove an unfair tax measure.

I would also strongly recommend that the whole excise tax structure be given a thorough overhauling at this time. Because of pressures from various directions, some of these taxes have been reduced and some have not. A number, like the automobile tax, are leftovers from wartime measures and hang on to bog down our economy when the emergency which brought them into being no longer exists. The result of all this is discrimination in the Federal excise tax pattern, and it seems to be the only way to clear this thing up is to go over the whole tax structure in light of present conditions.

Because I believe the repeal of the automobile excise tax to be an important step in this direction and of vital urgency for the whole economy, and to every one of my colleagues, I include the Michigan resolution with my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION NO. 11

Concurrent resolution urging the Congress of the United States to repeal the Federal excise tax on motor vehicles

Whereas this Nation is emerging from a business recession;

Whereas business analysts have counted upon strong public acceptance of 1959 automobiles as a major force in our economy, not only because of the thousands of persons employed directly in the manufacture of automobiles and parts therefor, but also because the automobile industry is a large user of steel, glass, rubber products, transportation, and other good and services;

Whereas it is important at this time that all measures possible be taken to stimulate and revitalize the American economy;

Whereas it is believed that the immediate repeal of the excise tax on motor vehicles would supply an important impetus to the sale of motor vehicles and to business activity and employment in automobile factories and related industries throughout Michigan and the rest of the United States; and

Whereas the loss of revenue from the repeal of the excise tax on motor vehicles would be largely, if not wholly, offset through an increase in business activity and the resulting increase in income tax collections: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the senate (the house of representatives concurring), That the Legislature of the State of Michigan, on behalf of the people of Michigan, respectfully urges the Congress of the United States to repeal the excise tax on motor vehicles; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States, the Secretary of Labor, the President of the Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and the members of the Michigan delegation in the Congress.

COMMITTEE ON RULES

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules may have until midnight tonight to file certain reports.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

POLLUTION IN THE MISSISSIPPI RIVER

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL] may extend his remarks at this point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, our country is beset with many problems, one of the most important of which, but least noticed, is pollution of our waters. The once clean waters which flowed in this country, deep and fast, leaping with fish and pure enough to be used for drinking at any point, are now fouled with filth and disease germs, unsafe for drinking and unfit for industrial use. Communities which use these waters find themselves in a curious position, victims of those who use the same water upstream and transgressors on those who use the same water downstream. This water is, of course, used, reused and used again dozens if not hundreds of times in its travel from its source to the sea.

What was once one of our most beautiful, and which is still one of our economically most important rivers, is the stately Mississippi.

I took the trouble to search records of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and the Public Health Service from a conference called to look into this matter as a basis for later enforcement action to abate the pollution.

Some of the language in that report I found to be astonishing. The once lovely Mississippi is even more filthy and foul than I had had any reason to believe.

The quotes below appeared in the report of the conference required under Public Law 660 of the 84th Congress before enforcement can be begun by the Public Health Service. I took the trouble to compare the present day river with the description which Mark Twain made of the same water a little over a hundred years ago. The sadness and shame of this horrible waste is that it need not occur. Vigorous Federal, State, and local action can clean up the Mississippi and restore it to a reasonably pure and sanitary condition, even in modern day industrial America:

THE MISSISSIPPI RIVER

Not only has the Mississippi River been a most important stream in our Nation's life and economy, it also has formed a backdrop for outstanding literary works of American authors. One of these, "Huckleberry Finn" by Mark Twain, is familiar to us all. Who does not recall with pleasure the account of Huckleberry's trip down the Mississippi on a raft accompanied by the runaway slave, Jim Turner, with its flavor of calm, easy-going life on the water?

"We catched fish and talked, and we took a swim now and then to keep off sleepiness. It was kind of solemn, drifting down the big, still river, laying on our backs looking up at the stars. * * * The fifth night we passed St. Louis, and it was like the whole world lit up."

We can only conjecture how Twain would have written this passage today in view of the following description of the river at St. Louis, as did a resident of the area recently:

"Predominant among the floating materials are patches of grease, citrus fruit peels, and scraps of leafy vegetables, typical of garbage, that constitute a broad continuous trail from the mouth of the Mill Creek sewer at least as far downstream as Jefferson Barracks. Condoms abound in the floating material. An oil slick, typical of sewage or oily waste pollution, covers the river from bank to bank in the lower end of this section."

Very few of the people who live along the Mississippi, however, continue to use Huckleberry's rudimentary means of water transportation. Nevertheless, the incredible filth of the Mississippi in the St. Louis area has created concern in many quarters because of the specific ways in which it damages persons who must use the river. Because of this concern, the Public Health Service called a conference to look into this matter as a basis for possible recommendations on action to abate the pollution. There is no more graphic way to describe the situation than in the words of the persons who appeared at the conference and informed the presiding officials as to the effects of pollution on specified water uses.

PURIFYING THE RIVER WATER FOR PUBLIC WATER SUPPLY

"My name is Clayton Wingerter. I am superintendent of the Chester Water Department. * * * Our trouble started a good many years ago.

"Occasionally the dairy was our chief objector. They would come down to check, * * * we would give them a sample out of our filter effluent, which is safe to drink because we carry a high chlorine content; you could see their hair almost stand on end from that phenol. It would actually burn your mouth, the phenol content was so high.

"Another one of the problems we have is the grease. There's times if you look at our filter surface you wouldn't know whether it was a water filter or whether it was something in a well-run sewer plant, because it had curds of what appeared to be kitchen grease floating on the surface. It's covered."

BOATING AND OTHER WATER SPORTS

"Mr. Chairman, members of the conference, my name is Fred B. Lifton. I'm with the Outboard Boating Club of America.

"* * * Several days ago I had the opportunity of getting on the river myself, * * * and I'm not sure I have completely recovered from it yet. I have been around the country, I have seen a great many boating waters, but I can honestly say I have never seen anything approaching the situation that prevails here.

"* * * I had some other people with me who have been * * * in the boating field for many, many years * * * and to a man, these individuals were literally astounded at what they saw. The only comment was one that you have heard many times, and that is, 'It's perhaps a shame that the river wasn't just a wee bit thicker, then you could plow it.'

"When * * * we were disembarking * * * we were approached by several rather hard-bitten individuals who had been in the business of operating marinas and docks for a number of years * * * and these individuals, when they found that we were involved in looking at pollution, came up and in the most imploring way * * * he just pointed to the river and he said, 'It's terrible. It can't go on much longer like this. Please, can't you do something?' "

FISHING

[Mr. T. J. Barnickol, representing the Missouri Conservation Commission]: "The off-taste and odor in fish has become a major fishery problem since 1944. By 1946 similar reports came from Chester, Ill., fishermen and since then these reports of off-flavor and odor have come from fishermen throughout the Missouri section of the Mississippi River below St. Louis—a distance of approximately 316 miles. A Festus, Mo., fisherman reported having to discard a 3,000-pound catch of fish taken near Herculaneum because of the bad odor and flavor. In 1947 commercial fishermen at Valmeyer, Ill., 28 miles below St. Louis reported that often half their catches of fish were discarded because of an off-flavor resulting from pollution. Another fisherman at Kimmswick in 1953 reported that 90 percent of his catch was not marketable as a result of the taste and odor problems. * * *

"One of the Commission's law enforcement officers reported the occurrence of offal from a poultry processing industry whose sewer effluent enters the river in the St. Louis area on the Illinois side. He explained that the river current carries this material for some distance and that in places it becomes so thick at the surface that to drive a motor boat through it is nearly impossible. Feathers and decomposing viscera, presumably from poultry, comprised the major part of this waste."

We can now hazard a guess at how Mark Twain, under today's conditions, would have written the above quoted passage from "Huckleberry Finn":

"We catched fish and talked about how bad they smelled. Jim didn't dare taste one and neither did I, so we threw them back among the rest of the garbage. We wanted to take a swim now and then to keep off sleepiness, but after looking at the water we decided it would be better for Jim to risk recapture and maybe hanging. It was kind of solemn, drifting down the big, still river, laying on our backs looking up at the stars. Every once in awhile, when we thought the river looked a little clearer, we would take the clothespins off our noses for a whiff of ozone. The fifth night we almost passed St. Louis but our raft got stock in a mess of fat and feathers so we managed to pole it to shore where we said goodby to it."

THE BENSON RECORD AS SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I take the floor to call attention to hearings just released today by our Subcommittee on Appropriations for Agriculture. I call these hearings to the attention not only of the Congress, but of the Nation. Anyone who will read them cannot escape the fact that the present Secretary of Agriculture and his policies are not only wrecking American agriculture but the U.S. Treasury as well. From the record, he and his associates apparently will resort to almost any means to have his way.

It is with genuine regret that I make this speech. However, I feel I must, for a balance between agriculture, industry, and labor is absolutely essential to the public welfare. The Secretary's actions are rapidly making that impossible. I have served on the Subcommittee on Agricultural Appropriations since 1945, for 9 years as chairman; I have worked hard, holding hearings for many weeks each year, reviewing in detail all the operations of the Department of Agriculture. I served quite a number of years before the present Secretary of Agriculture took office in 1953.

Mr. Speaker, these hearings before our committee, as well as those for the past 5 years, clearly show that the records of the Department prove the views and the policies of the Secretary to be wholly unsound. The situation gets worse by the day.

I do not complain at the Secretary's personal standing with the public and the press as a man of strong religious beliefs and faith in his church. However, that is no basis on which to determine his stewardship of the Department of Agriculture, its costs to the Treasury, and effect upon farm people.

I am an officer in my church. Most Members of Congress are active in the church of their choice. The point I

make is that the Secretary does not have a corner in that field. However, the Secretary's church affiliation has been played up to the point that most people, including most newspapers and magazines, have not looked at his record as Secretary of Agriculture.

THE RECORD

From the start the Secretary insisted the answer to our problem with basic farm commodities was to reduce price supports and, thereby, force the farmers to reduce production. Many of us tried to tell him that farmers, like others, had investments, large investments, high operating costs—and that they, too, had to meet costs of operations; that the farmer's income, like that of others, was dependent upon volume times price less costs.

We insisted that with costs rising, the Secretary's program of reducing price could only result in causing the farmer to increase volume (production) to offset the Secretary's price reduction. The Secretary would not believe that. He ignored the farmer's personal problems, which after all determine the farmer's personal decisions.

He insisted that to reduce price would cause the farmer to reduce volume, and everything would be fine. His theories, if true, and they are not, would leave the farmer with, first, reduced price, by the Secretary's action; second, reduced volume, if they did as the Secretary thought; and third, increased costs. Now what would that mean? The answer is easy—bankruptcy.

In his efforts to get authority to reduce price supports, the Secretary added billions of dollars in costs to the Government by refusing to offer CCC stocks competitively in world trade during 1953 and 1954. He added further millions of dollars in costs by a refusal to offer cotton competitively in 1955 when he finally offered other commodities. He has followed this course again this year. He spent hundreds of millions of dollars in needless storage and handling charges during that period, and contributed greatly to increasing our competition abroad by holding an umbrella over foreign production—largely U.S. financed. International grain and cotton firms waxed fat. Secretary Benson had his way. He received authority to reduce price supports. Since that time he has reduced supports an average of 20 percent—pages 196–204 of hearings.

Six years of Secretary Benson's policies and practices show that his price reductions have caused the farmer to do what we tried to tell him history showed they would do. The farmer, faced with increasing costs and lower prices, has tried to make up the difference by increasing his volume—production.

As fast as the Secretary has reduced prices, farm production went up—not down. Government expenditures went up—not down. The take of the middleman went up in approximately the same amount; Government holdings increased greatly, and the consumer pays more and more.

Reduced supports for corn, from 90 percent of parity in 1954 to 77 percent in 1958, have led to the Commodity Credit Corporation holdings being doubled from 880.8 million bushels in 1954 to 1,705 million bushels in 1958—page 196 of hearings.

For wheat, reduced supports, from 90 percent in 1954 to 75 percent in 1958, have led to increased CCC holdings from 990.7 million bushels in 1954 to 1,239.1 million bushels in 1958—page 198 of hearings.

Reductions in price supports for oats, from 85 percent in 1954 to 70 percent in 1958, have been followed by increased Commodity Credit Corporation holdings of this commodity from 62.8 million bushels in 1954 to 87.9 million bushels in 1958—page 202 of hearings.

Further, the Department makes much of claimed improvement in the dairy situation under reduced support levels. The Secretary's programs for dairy products have cost $753.7 million since 1954. CCC inventories of nonfat dry milk have increased from 29.9 million pounds in 1952 to 176.6 million pounds in 1958.

SIX YEARS UNDER SECRETARY BENSON

From the Department records, I quote:

1. Personnel:

Dec. 31, 1952	67,406
Nov. 30, 1958	89,464
June 30, 1959 (estimate)	98,487
June 30, 1960 (estimate)	98,945

2. Appropriations:

[In millions]

	Fiscal year 1952	1960 budget estimate
Regular activities	$796.0	$1,277.8
Commodity Credit Corporation:		
Capital Impairment	421.5	1,535.4
Reimbursements	141.0	1,268.1
Total	1,358.5	4,081.3

3. CCC inventories:

	Billions
January 1953	$1.1
January 1958	5.4
June 30, 1959 (estimate)	6.8
June 30, 1960 (estimate)	9.1

4. Public Law 480 (title I): Estimated expenditures through June 30, 1960 — 5.2

5. Soil Bank: Estimated expenditures through June 30, 1960:

Conservation reserve	.7
Acreage reserve	1.7
Total	2.4

In the 6 years of Benson's policies and practices, expenditures paid to warehousemen, railroads, and trucklines, to processors and others, but charged up to the farmer by the Secretary and the President, have increased as follows:

Additional cost and personnel data

[Dollar amounts in thousands]

Item	Fiscal year 1952	Fiscal year 1957	Fiscal year 1958
Interest expense (net)	$16,043	$274,884	$322,876
Carrying charges:			
Storage and handling	73,259	364,391	408,610
Transportation	45,392	186,382	177,728
Processing and other	96	19,082	17,044
Total	118,747	569,855	603,382
Administrative expenses	$15,114	$29,631	$33,875
Man-years of employment	2,742	5,044	4,769
County office expenses	$12,814	$45,082	$50,586
Man-years of employment	3,637	7,498	8,067

As stubborn as a Missouri mule is supposed to be, I believe even a Missouri mule would, at least, have some doubts after that 6-year record, but not Secretary Benson.

The Secretary is an affable, likeable man, in great demand for speeches. Because the press and public go for his pious platitudes, the Secretary refuses to accept his own record. Not satisfied with price reductions authorized at his discretion by law, on January 30, 1959, he reduced farm price supports a further $180 million—to $200 million, by the backdoor method of changing the parity index, as shown on page 86 of the hearings. Although he denied knowing the outcome in advance, the record shows he gave the statisticians go ahead orders only after he had been told that the approximate result would be to reduce the parity index, which, in turn, further reduced price supports.

The Secretary said:

The revisions that have been made in price indexes are simply a matter of good statistical practice, and I didn't know what the outcome was going to be (p. 19 of hearings).

And later on page 21, he testified:

Our technicians are operating free from pressure from the outside as far as I am concerned. I have had pressure on me several times not to announce the index, the parity index, at a certain time because it was just before an election or just after some important decision was to be made.

I have religiously followed the policy that they should not be interfered with in their work in any respect and the record will so show.

Mr. Wells, in charge of this parity index change, testified on page 113 of these hearings, however, and I quote:

Mr. WELLS. After the preliminary calculations last March we did have reason to believe it would probably reduce the parity index. Exactly how much we didn't know.

Mr. WHITTEN. And this year, after the Secretary has been making his pitch for reducing price supports, you went to him and urged him to take final action toward putting the index together, knowing the probable effect, and released it, didn't you?

Mr. WELLS. I recommended that he revise the parity index; yes, sir.

Mr. WHITTEN. And at that time you told him the probable effect?

Mr. WELLS. I told him the approximate effect; yes, sir.

Mr. WHITTEN. Even though it was locked up and the figures weren't known, the Secretary had information from you as the expert in this field upon which he relied. If he let you go ahead and do this work which was locked up so nobody would know it, he knew it would come out in line with his beliefs, did he not?

Mr. WELLS. Approximately, yes.

Prior to that, B. R. Stauber's letter of March 14, 1958, to Wells—pages 211 to 226 of hearings—offered various suggestions as to what could be done in order to reduce the parity index on price supports. That certainly is not in keeping with objective statistical work.

Stauber, Chief of the Agricultural Price Statistic Branch, wrote Wells the various steps whch could be taken in weighting the results to reduce parity. After receiving that information, Wells wrote Assistant Secretary Paarlberg, on

July 9, 1958, asking permission to proceed. Significantly, Wells' letter contains the following, which I quote:

You will note that Mr. Stauber estimates the various changes which might be made which would result in reducing the level of the parity index by somewhere between 3 and 6 percent as of June 1957.

Mr. Stauber suggested that if the smaller farms were dropped from the figures obtained in the survey, this would have the effect of reducing the parity index—page 216 of the hearings—because it would shift emphasis from family living costs to production costs, though small farmers number far more than 50 percent of all farmers.

Then if you will read the records from the files of the Department—page 207 to page 250 of the hearings—you will learn of other steps taken to reduce the index.

This information reveals that the latest revisions were based on surveys conducted in only 300 counties on 6,715 farms for production costs, 3,845 farms for cost of family living, and 2,006 farms for prices received. This represents a few farmers in a little over 10 percent of the counties of the United States. It covers only about one-fourth of 1 percent of the farm families in the United States, with separate groups of farms checked for each element.

Secretary Benson was advised that, if the new compilation were permitted, he could expect a reduction in the parity index. He said, go ahead. Then the so-called objective, and to say "objective" is a farce, statistical compilation was made; price supports were further reduced by approximately $180 million to $200 million, without any change by law or any consultation with congressional leaders. Thus, Secretary Benson invites further efforts by the farmer to offset reduced price by increased volume.

Mr. Speaker, termites never did a better inside job of destruction.

SECRETARY HELD UMBRELLA OVER FOREIGN PRODUCTION; HAD AUTHORITY TO SELL COMPETITIVELY

Now we come to the second major reason for our special hearing. This year the Secretary has admittedly been refusing to offer American cotton for sale in world trade on a competitive basis. On February 3, 1959, the Secretary testified before our committee as follows:

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Secretary, do you agree now that the charter of the Commodity Credit Corporation authorized you throughout your tenure of office to sell CCC commodities in world trade at competitive prices?

Secretary BENSON. Yes; the charter was very clear on that, as I have indicated before. Not only in the case of cotton, but any commodity.

Mr. WHITTEN. You realize that authority existed during these years when you refused to use that authority to be competitive?

Secretary BENSON. Yes. The charter hasn't been changed.

Mr. WHITTEN. Do you agree that, when we finally persuaded you to use it, you sold a million bales of cotton in less than 2 months?

Secretary BENSON. Yes; that is right.

Mr. WHITTEN. Do you agree that the Congress passed this act making it compulsory that you sell cotton competitively to the point of "reestablishing and maintaining" our fair share of the world market, after you went for months and refused to follow up what you showed you could do with the million bales? Do you agree that that happened?

Secretary BENSON. Yes. Of course, the Congress passed the legislation and we are trying to comply with it, Mr. Chairman, and we intend to. (P. 12 of the hearing.)

Then on February 16, 1959, before the House Committee on Agriculture, he testified:

The legal requirement that the Federal Government support a few crops at unrealistic levels is pricing us out of the world market.

Mr. Speaker, that statement is completely untrue. Such statements have been made by the Secretary for years. What can you do with a man who keeps saying such things, when he knows better and admits he knows better?

The record shows that, notwithstanding authority to sell in world markets at competitive prices, which would thereby make American commodities available to the needy peoples of the world at fair prices, Secretary Benson made use of the officers of the $14.5 billion CCC; all employees of his Department—Mr. Farrington, the General Counsel; Mr. Wells, Administrator of the Agricultural Marketing Service; Mr. Morse, President of the Commodity Credit Corporation and Under Secretary; Mr. C. L. Miller, Assistant Secretary; Mr. E. L. Peterson, Assistant Secretary; Mr. M. L. McLain, Assistant Secretary; and other top officials—flatly refusing to use this authority during the years 1953 and 1954, and most of 1955, not only on cotton but on every other commodity for most of that period; holding dairy products off in 1957 and 1958, all the time paying out huge storage charges on what he would not offer to sell competitively; counted such cotton and other commodities to reduce American acreage, to the benefit of our American-financed competition in foreign lands.

I do not know how even the State Department or the President could claim they help needy foreign people of the world by holding our commodities away from them, while making them pay high prices for commodities of American financial interests in Mexico, South and Central America, and elsewhere.

The record of these hearings will show that in 1956, after investigations by our committee disclosed that the Secretary and his policies were holding an umbrella over big U.S. investors in Mexican, and South and Central American cotton production—names and investments appearing on pages 2 and 3 of the hearings—the Secretary finally offered 1 million bales of cotton competitively, which he sold for export in less than 6 weeks, although he had anticipated a year would be required.

Even after this experience, Mr. Benson refused to sell cotton competitively for months, resulting in the Congress passing the Agriculture Act of 1956, the Eastland Act, which contained the following provision—section 203, title II, Agricultural Act of 1956.

In furtherance of the current policy of the Commodity Credit Corporation of offering surplus agricultural commodities for sale for export at competitive world prices, the Commodity Credit Corporation is directed to use its existing powers and authorities immediately upon the enactment of this act to encourage the export of cotton by offering to make cotton available at prices not in excess of the level of prices at which cottons of comparable qualities are being offered in substantial quantity by other exporting countries. * * * Such quantities of cotton shall be sold as will reestablish and maintain the fair historical share of the world market for U.S. cotton, said volume to be determined by the Secretary of Agriculture.

Up until that point, the records will show, the Secretary was consistently giving out erroneous information, which he repeated again on February 16, 1959, before the Agriculture Committee of the House, stating that it was price supports which prevented sales in foreign markets.

At the same time he was continuously pointing out the high cost of storage, largely of his own making. He was not telling the American people that he was raising the rates while exercising his discretion, refusing to use the law which authorized him to sell competitively, and thereby was responsible for this increase in Government holdings, totaling billions of dollars.

As a matter of law, there is no relationship between the level of price supports and sales in world markets, because whatever the level of the price supports the charter of the CCC always has authorized competitive sales. The Secretary admits that fact on page 12, quoted heretofore.

After the passage of this act of 1956, the Secretary and the Department sold approximately 13 million bales of cotton in world trade during the years 1956–57 and 1957–58. Yet these hearings will show that in this current year of 1958–59 the Secretary agrees he has held U.S. cotton 4½ cents higher than comparative qualities in foreign countries, in spite of the provisions of law.

As a result, our sales this year were only about 1.8 million bales; and all the time the Secretary and the President—relying on the information given him by the Secretary—complain about the high cost of storage and the huge Government investment.

On February 3, 1959—page 25 of the hearings—under strong pressure from our committee and others, the Secretary agreed to offer cotton on a competitive basis and to carry out section 203 of the Agriculture Act of 1956, though it was only for August 1 delivery.

The very next day, February 4, 1959, the Department issued its announcement—USDA—34451—binding itself not to sell from CCC stocks even though it became necessary to do so to carry out the provisions of section 203 of the Agriculture Act of 1956.

When that happened, representatives of the Department were called back, and then agreed to carry out that law. As a result, a clarification of such announcement was issued on February 5, 1959, which stated:

If the payment-in-kind program does not prove effective, with reasonable export payments, the Department will be required to reinstate a competitive sales program (from CCC-owned stocks) to the point of reestab-

lishing and maintaining the fair historical share of the world market.

Now we read in the February 21, 1959, edition of the Washington Star a story with regard to the recent visit of President Eisenhower to Mexico, and the communique issued following the meetings of Mr. Eisenhower with President Lopez Mateos, of Mexico. I quote:

The communique said there was agreement that there should be cooperation and consultation between the two governments on the disposal of cotton. This might mean that Mexico will be protected in the future against sale abroad of U.S. cotton surpluses.

Mr. Speaker, reestablishing and maintaining our historical share of world markets is not "disposing of surpluses." I cannot believe even the President would feel he had the right to ignore the law, keep our cotton or any other commodity away from the needy people of the world, all to help Anderson-Clayton and other American firms in their operations in Mexico.

REBATES TO PRIVATE FIRMS

If you wish to see how the Department of Agriculture is really run, read the reports of our committee investigators. You will find the Department witnesses testified that it could not sell by sample the 8 million to 10 million bales of cotton which had been built up during the period the Secretary refused to sell in world markets. Yet the record shows that, as soon as this cotton was sold to private firms, the Department could and did sample; then they classed downward most of this cotton, which was by that time owned by private firms, and paid out approximately $135 million in rebates to the firms—a list of which, together with rebates received, is on pages 167 and 168 of the hearings. This, too, was charged up to cost of the farm program.

Our investigations—pages 372 to 379 of hearings—show that much of this cotton was sold in world trade by these firms at higher than the new class and much at higher than the original class, which to say the least gives our cotton a bad name abroad.

BENSON'S WAY OUT OF THE FARM MESS

Mr. Speaker, I have just read the article appearing in the February 6, 1959, issue of the U.S. News & World Report, entitled "Benson's Way Out of the Farm Mess." My reaction is that if we do not stop Secretary Benson's policies and practices the mess will get much worse. His way out is "more of the same." It is the result of the Secretary's own actions he uses to attack his own farm program, yet no one seems to catch on.

THE CORN STORY

Recently the Secretary has cited the vote of corn farmers against controls as evidence that farmers are coming to his views. Of course they voted against controls—Secretary Benson used his discretion, assured them $1.12 per bushel without controls. This fall he will literally have corn ears sticking out of his ears. However, I feel sure he will act surprised, point out Charlie Brannan was Secretary until 1953, and use the costs in further speeches against all price supports.

INCREASED CONSUMPTION OFFERS LITTLE

His own record proves him wrong in the view that reduced prices will increase total consumption of agricultural commodities. As prices have been reduced during the past 6 years, retail prices which control total consumption have gone up. On the other side, it is agreed generally that the American people, as a group, certainly do not eat too little; rather, according to the medical fraternity, it is too much.

Actually, under our system of selling for what the traffic will bear, if the farmer were to produce, at his own expense, all agricultural commodities and could give them away at the place of production, if the cost of harvesting had to be paid, and processors, transporters, handlers, wholesalers and retailers added what the traffic would bear, it would probably be only a short time before retail prices would be just as high, even though the farmer produced at his own cost and gave away the production. As evidence of that, I point out that with a 20 percent reduction in support prices for many farm commodities, retail prices at the markets have gone up. The American consumer might change what he ate; but it is doubtful if he would substantially increase the quantity consumed.

Even under Public Law 480, where we virtually give agricultural commodities to foreign governments, no effort is made to require sale by those governments at reasonable prices to their own people. Spain sells cotton we have given her to her own people for almost twice the price of cotton in the United States. So it goes. That practice certainly will not increase world consumption.

The Secretary and the President point out the limited number of commodities under fixed price supports. They make no note that many other commodities have price supports of the Secretary's own making. They ignore the fact that reductions in feed prices will bring down prices of livestock and poultry to disastrous levels. Too, they fail to show the millions the administration is paying out in direct purchases of other commodities, the cash subsidies to export perishables, the odious soil bank, the only real basis for which was to put cash from the Treasury in the farmers' hands, to offset their losses under Secretary Benson.

They ignore, too, the fact that price supports on these major commodities have the same lifting effects on other farm commodities that labor contracts by union labor have on wages of nonunion members. The effect is the same.

RESEARCH

The Secretary says the answer is research. We have more than doubled funds for research during the past 7 years. Research is good in its own right. Except for research, since 1940 farm costs would be up $7.5 billion, and the cost of living would be even higher. However, research results do not come fast enough to answer the farm income price problem. Costs go up and prices received go down faster than research can fill the gap.

INDUSTRIAL USE

The Secretary says a further answer is industrial use. Our committee investigated this possibility last year, after the Secretary's committee endorsed such proposal. We are making great advances in promoting the use of fats and there are a number of places where there seem to be some possibilities. However, in most places, the price for agricultural commodities would have to be too low to be of interest. Corn would have to be sold at 26½ cents per bushel to compete as a base for alcohol. Rice and wheat would make fine insulation board—but so will corn stalks, which cost nothing. So it goes. To me this outlet, while it offers some help, could not be expected to make any real dent in the problem.

ACREAGE CONTROLS—INCENTIVE TO INCREASED PRODUCTION

Mr. Benson has agreed repeatedly before our committee that efforts to control production by acreage will not work. I agree with him. Efforts to control production, as shown by the record of the Department, show that to limit the number of acres which any farmer can use for a crop is a great incentive to increase production. In addition to that fact, it also invites the farmer to make huge cash investments in each year's crop, thereby increasing the risk far beyond what is sound business. Many solutions have been offered. If we will only accept the record, the Secretary's solutions make the situation worse. We can then agree on a farm program.

If you are interested in what I suggest we do to improve the situation, read pages 45 to 49 in the hearings.

THE SECRETARY'S SOIL BANK: COME-ON FOR VOTES, 1956, ADDS $2.4 BILLION COST

Nothwithstanding the Secretary's acknowledgment that efforts to control production by acreage will not work—and you will note such acknowledgment in the record of the hearings—in 1956 he recommended to the President—and both he and the President recommended to the Congress—that for the so-called soil bank we pay out $1,200,000,000 to the American farmers in the fall of 1956, to take out acreage, after the President had vetoed the farm bill and the Secretary's policies had the farmers in bad financial shape. Significantly, this was just before the election. Further significant was the recommendation of the Secretary and President that the hundreds of millions of dollars in cash be paid out before the election, on the farmers' promise to take out acreage the following year. I wonder what would have been the reaction of the press and the Nation if a Democrat had proposed any such thing just before an election?

That program has cost the Federal Government nearly $2½ billion. It had little, if any, effect toward reducing production and the acreage reserve, costing $1.7 billions was junked this year on the recommendation of the Secretary and the President.

The conservation reserve section of the soil bank reached relatively few farmers—only 125,000 in 1957–58—and has committed the Federal Government to some $700 million to date; and we are stuck with some contracts from up to 10 to 15 years longer. Here, too, there has

been no real effect on production; and according to committee investigations all sorts of nefarious schemes were used in some instances to bilk the Treasury in connection with the program. Most of the lands rented had little real production history anyway.

From my work on the Appropriations Committee and my study of this whole matter, I am convinced the only excuse for either of these programs was to place in the hands of some farmers cash which they have lost under the policies of Secretary Benson. In the process, however, these moneys are pointed out as cost of the farm program by the same Secretary and at his instance by the President, in speeches which have served to inflame the American people against any farm program.

In an effort to scale the payments down in line with production actually removed, we wrote the following provision in the appropriation act of last year. I quote:

Provided further, That hereafter no conservation reserve contract shall be entered into which provides for (1) payments for conservation practices in excess of the average rate for comparable practices under the agricultural conservation program, or (2) annual rental payments in excess of 20 percent of the value of the land placed under contract, such value to be determined without regard to physical improvements thereon or geographic location thereof. In determining the value of the land for this purpose, the county committee shall take into consideration the estimate of the landowner or operator as to the value of such land as well as his certificate as to the production history and productivity of such land.

Instead of trying to scale payments down in line with production capacity removed by the rentals, the Secretary increased the rate substantially at greatly increased costs to the Treasury.

While wasting these hundreds of millions of dollars, the Secretary would virtually eliminate the agricultural conservation program, which is participated in by approximately 1,250,000 farmers who put up probably twice that much themselves in cash and labor.

The Secretary seems to be determined to pay out any amount to the few but to cut out that which helps the many, and the Nation. He even wishes to cut school lunch, raise the cost of electricity, and appears to be willing to do anything to eliminate the small farmer.

Despite his record, on February 16, 1959, before the House Committee on Agriculture, he used this expression:

To me, the answer to this problem suggests itself in letters of fire a mile high.

And then proceeded to ignore the failure of his policies. That expression sounds very much like that of a zealot.

Mr. Speaker, I repeat, while few seem to notice, it is the costs of the Secretary's own discretionary actions which he uses in his speeches to attack his own administration of agriculture.

If the Secretary had not willfully withheld U.S. commodities from the world trade at competitive prices, we never would have had this big buildup of commodities and foreign production would be much less. If he had not reduced these prices, thereby inviting increased production, our expenditures would have been greatly reduced.

It is surprising to me how he can make speeches such as he does and get away with it as though someone else had been Secretary of Agriculture for 6 years.

THE SECRETARY DRIVES A WEDGE

I started off by saying he had been successful in one thing: With consumer costs going up in spite of reduced farm prices, he has succeeded in driving away and inflaming the urban Members and urban people against any farm program. A balance between agriculture, industry, and labor is essential to a prosperous nation. If one goes down the others will follow.

The Secretary's course is dangerous, because history will show in these countries that are worn out today, the eroded lands came because those in control of the government insisted on food and fiber below the cost of production. It could happen here if the Secretary has his way and he continues to inflame the American people against the farmers to the point of pushing them back to subsistence levels. We will wear out the soil, the base of our prosperous country, and with time we will become like China and India.

This division he generates is far more serious than any problem I can think of, including the inroads he makes on the Treasury or the bad effect he is having on many farmers.

The damage will continue long after both the Secretary and I have passed from the scene.

CONGRESS SHOULD PREVENT REDUCTION IN PARITY INDEX

Therefore, I can and do recommend that the Congress now pass legislation preventing this back-door-change-in-parity means of reducing farm prices from becoming effective. Then we must make a study of each place in existing law where the Secretary has discretion and repeal the authority for him to exercise discretion. If we do not, our Secretary in exercising his discretion will put many more farmers out of business, and make further progress toward bankrupting the Treasury.

FURTHER INVESTIGATION NEEDED

I am today introducing a resolution which would provide for a special investigating committee to be set up by the House of Representatives to investigate the operations of the Department of Agriculture, including the $14.5 billion Commodity Credit Corporation. There is a real basis for such special investigating committee.

As our committee investigations show, this $14.5 billion Commodity Credit Corporation, dominated and operated by officials of the Department, has no real regulations or protection against outside influences nor the premature release of information.

Much has happened to arouse suspicions, to say the least. What makes it worse is that the more paid out in storage, transportation, interest, waste, rebates, or profits to other than farmers, the more it serves the purpose of the Secretary and the President—on the basis of information given him by the Secretary—in attacks against farm programs. This I believe dangerous to the future of our country.

I hope and trust I shall receive favorable action on my resolution.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. When the Secretary first came to the city of Denver, in the heart of my district, after the election in 1953, I heard him say that he wanted to move food out of storage and into stomachs. If I understood the gentleman correctly, he is stating that exactly the reverse has been the Secretary's policy in fact.

Mr. WHITTEN. Certainly in the first 3 years of his being in office. Even under Public Law 480, as far as I have been able to ascertain, there has been no requirement that the governments of foreign countries which really get the commodities are required or called on to sell such commodities at reasonable rates to their own people. For instance, on the cotton we virtually give to Spain under Public Law 480, they charge their own people twice as much as the cotton sells for in this country. So if we let these foreign nations, that is whom we give these commodities to, the foreign nations, that is, sell them for outlandish prices to their own people, you have not increased total world consumption.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Will the gentleman agree that the Secretary, perhaps, should be tested by that old phrase my mother taught me, "What you do speaks so loudly I cannot hear what you say."

Mr. WHITTEN. I would agree with the gentleman as to the saying but I say as of now with Secretary Benson it is working the other way—what the Secretary says sounds so loud that the public will not look at what he is doing.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield.

Mr. HOEVEN. I did not have the benefit of hearing all of the gentleman's speech. I hope he did not make a political speech.

Mr. WHITTEN. May I say to the gentleman that is always a matter of conjecture as to whether a man did or did not. In my judgment, I certainly did not. May I say to the gentleman from Iowa that the faults I find with the Secretary's policies, in my judgment, are the same faults that the gentleman from Iowa has found in numerous speeches on this floor. Finally, I would like to say that the tenor and the objective of my speech has been to urge the Congress and the Nation to judge the Secretary by his actions as Secretary of Agriculture. I think that is essential. In my efforts to get them to do this, I tried to point out the highlights as we know them in our Subcommittee on Appropriations for the Department of Agriculture which tend to show the absolute necessity of beginning to make the Secretary stand on his own record instead of pointing way back over his shoulder as though somebody else were doing these things.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. SISK. I am sorry that I missed all of the gentleman's statement, but I do want to commend him on a very able presentation of the facts that I can agree with. My reason for asking the gentleman to yield was because of some recent, what I consider to be completely unfair, propaganda that has come out of the Department of Agriculture in the way of information purposely intended, in my opinion, to pit the consumer against the producers and against the farmers of this country. And, if the gentleman can spare me as much as 3 or 4 minutes, I would just like to read a few comments here with reference to some of these figures.

Mr. Speaker, the administration and the Department of Agriculture were guilty either of stupidity or deliberate falsehood in misinforming a member of the other body that four central California farm corporations received cotton price supports amounting to $1,857,677.14 in 1957. These funds were not subsidies or support payments. They were loans from the Commodity Credit Corporation, and 96¼ percent of the loan money was repaid—with interest. The Government received high-quality cotton for the remaining 3¾ percent.

Such statements by persons who knew or should have known that they were misrepresentations apparently are intended to divide our citizens and set consumers against farmers. They certainly are not calculated to produce calm consideration of a problem and to assist in working out long-range solutions on a basis which is fair to both farmers and consumers.

Let us take the case of the biggest central California borrower, Westlake Farms, Inc., of Stratford, Calif. True, Westlake Farms received a Commodity Credit Corporation loan of $854,450.67 on 5,611 bales of cotton. But by August 1, 1958, the deadline date for redeeming the loan, Westlake Farms had paid $820,912.08 to redeem 5,386 of the bales it placed in Government loan. In addition, Westlake Farms paid $9,890.02 in interest. If the 225 bales that went into the Government catalog were sold at a net loss of $50 a bale, which the Department of Agriculture claims is the average loss, the loss on this big transaction would have amounted to $11,250—scarcely more than the farmer paid in interest.

Another cottongrower, W. J. Deal, of Mendota, Calif., placed 2,419 in loan for $370,040.84 and redeemed the entire amount, paying $6,510.70 in interest.

As the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. GATHINGS] pointed out so ably a few days ago, the Commodity Credit Corporation cotton program is a program to promote the orderly marketing of this storable commodity. The program prevents the market from being glutted at harvest time, thus helping to stabilize the price for the large grower and the small grower alike.

Now I hold no special brief for the large farming corporations. But I want to point out that no abuses of the existing agricultural stabilization program are involved in the acceptance by large farming corporations of Government loans. It is very unfair to try to place the blame for the costs of the Federal agricultural stabilization program on large cotton growers on the basis of these loan figures.

Let us consider what might happen if large cotton growers were denied such loans and only small growers could borrow from the Government to finance the orderly sale of their cotton crops. As was suggested a moment ago, the present program aids the small grower by protecting the price. If loans were limited to small growers, large producers would sell their crops at the world market price and the Government would be stuck with cotton it would have to sell at a great loss. The program would be much more expensive than it is now, and the economy would suffer for it.

I submit a table showing in detail the loan operations in 1957 of the four central California cotton growers referred to in the other body. It is interesting to note that if all the cotton these four growers let go into the Government catalog were sold at a loss of $50 a bale, the total loss to the Government would fall $677.36 short of matching the $23,727.36 that the growers paid in interest.

The table is as follows:

Commodity Credit Corporation loans to 4 central California cotton growers in 1957–58

Grower	Bales in loan	Amount loaned	Bales redeemed	Amount redeemed	Interest	Bales to catalog	Cost at loss of $50 per bale
Westlake Farms, Inc., Stratford, Calif.	5,611	$854,450.67	5,386	$820,912.08	$9,890.02	225	$11,250
W. J. Deal, Mendota, Calif.	2,419	370,040.84	2,419	370,040.84	6,510.70	0	----------
Frank and Jim Garona, Bakersfield, Calif.	2,387	350,290.43	2,266	332,233.12	3,980.08	121	6,050
Waldo W. Weeth, Coalinga, Calif.	1,898	282,895.20	1,783	265,982.16	3,346.56	115	5,750
Total	12,315	1,857,677.14	11,854	1,789,168.20	23,727.36	461	23,050

Mr. WHITTEN. I thank the gentleman. I would once again hope that he would check the hearings, which support my statements, because I will give page references and quote the record.

If the Secretary had not willfully withheld U.S. commodities from the world trade at competitive prices, as he admits he did, we never would have had this big buildup of commodities. If he had not reduced these prices, thereby inviting increased production, our supply would have been greatly reduced.

It is surprising to me how he can make speeches such as he does and get away with it as though somebody else had been Secretary of Agriculture for 6 years, but nobody seems to charge him with it at all, yet it is his own poor judgment and poor policy that has largely caused the situation.

THE SECRETARY DRIVES A WEDGE

I started off by saying he had been successful in one thing: With consumer costs going up, he has succeeded in driving away and inflaming the urban Members and urban people against any farm program. A balance between agriculture, industry, and labor is essential to a prosperous nation. If one goes down the others will follow. The Secretary's course is dangerous, because history will show in these countries that are worn out today, the eroded lands came because those in control of the government insisted on food and fiber below the cost of production. It could happen here if the Secretary has his way and he continues to inflame the American people against the farmers to the point you push them back to a subsistence level. You will wear out the soil, the base of our prosperous country, and with time we will become like China and India. This division he generates is far more serious than any problem I can think of, including the inroads he makes on the Treasury or the bad effect he is having on many farmers. The damage will continue along after both the Secretary and I have passed from the scene.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include a table.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

THE FARM PROGRAM

Mr. BREEDING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. BREEDING. Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN] for the fine statement he made today. I endorse wholeheartedly his remarks about the mishandling and bungling of our farm program by the Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Benson.

I am a farmer. I have lived on a farm all my life. My roots, Mr. Speaker, are deep in American agriculture. It is particularly painful for one of my background to realize that we have in this country a Secretary of Agriculture who consistently has opposed programs for the best interests of the farmers.

The Secretary is supposed to speak for the farmer, just as the Secretary of Commerce speaks for business, and the Secretary of Labor speaks for labor. Yet we find the Secretary of Agriculture devoting a great part of his time in misrepresenting the position of agriculture and farmers to the public.

It is tragic that the Secretary has seen fit to try to turn the consumer against the farmer. He paints a picture of agriculture as a greedy, special interest group

which gouges the consumer and the taxpayer. This is grossly unfair to the farmer. And, Mr. Speaker, it is a disservice to the whole country. No one should try to turn group against group.

If Mr. Benson worked half as hard in helping farmers as he does in convincing consumers of the evils of the farm program, perhaps we would not be in the fix we are today.

Under Mr. Benson's administration, surpluses have increased, exports declined, and farm prices pushed down. He has had 6 years in office. He blames his present troubles on policies inherited from the previous administration. Perhaps the trouble is more basic. Surely, the previous administration is not responsible for the ineptness which marks so many of the Department's actions.

Also, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Benson has showed a cynical disregard for the intent of Congress whenever possible. The latest example of this is found in the price support levels fixed for feed grains for 1959.

The law specifically relates feed grain price supports to corn through comparative feed values. For example grain sorghums have 95 to 97 percent of the feed value of corn.

But what did the Secretary do? He fixed the price support of corn at $1.12 a bushel, which is equivalent to $2 per hundredweight. Yet for grain sorghums, which have 95 percent of the feed value of corn, he fixed a support price of $1.52 per hundred.

This is a totally unrealistic figure. Farmers in the Southwest cannot produce grain sorghums for this price.

No one should have been surprised at the Secretary's action. He has consistently lowered prices whenever he had the opportunity. Lower prices are a fetish with him.

Mr. Benson believes that cheaper prices will bring about reduced production. This is completely reverse to what actually happens when prices fall. Farmers desperately try to produce more to make up for the drop in income. This is an economic fact of farm life.

Mr. Benson loses sight of the fact that if farmers are to cut production, their income must be protected. Farmers are willing to make sacrifices of production but they need some assurance they can continue to remain in operation. I am sure the Secretary's policy of reducing prices is not the answer.

Again, Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN]. What he said here today needed saying. His remarks should be carefully read by every Member of this House.

SUBCOMMITTEES OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. LIBONATI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that each subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary may have permission to sit during general debate during the rest of the week.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

PROPOSED ATOMIC-POWER FACILITY IN MAINE

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maine?

There was no objection.

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced House Joint Resolution 259, for the construction of an atomic-power facility in Maine, because Maine is a most logical location for such a developmental plant.

Atomic power is presently expensive, but its cost is expected to come down with further progress in reactor development. Obviously, it will become economically competitive first in this country in those areas where the costs of fossil fuels are high. Maine is one of the highest cost fuel areas in the United States.

The early demonstration of economic atomic power is an important objective because of its significance for the domestic economy and also to show our international leadership in developing the peaceful uses of atomic energy. President Eisenhower, the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, and the Atomic Energy Commission all have stated that it is essential for the United States to fortify its world leadership in atomic-power development. The attainment of this objective can be speeded by emphasizing atomic-power development in those areas where the high costs of conventional fuels will enable the achievement of economic atomic power at an earlier date than elsewhere in the United States.

The latest Edison Electric Institute figures show that in 1956 New England's fuel costs averaged 5 mills per kilowatt-hour as compared with 2.9 mills for the United States as a whole. But these same figures show that in Maine and Vermont fuel costs per kilowatt-hour averaged 6 mills, twice the U.S. average.

In that year, the cost per heat unit—million British thermal units—for fuel burned in the steam powerplants of Maine averaged 45.3 cents. This is higher than the corresponding cost in any other State in the Union. It compares with a countrywide average of 25.4 cents and a New England average of 39.3 cents per million British thermal units.

Latest available figures—Electrical World—show that as of November 1, 1957, electric utility generating stations in Maine have a total installed capacity of 653,653 kilowatts, of which 350,633 kilowatts was in hydroelectric stations, 261,150 kilowatts in steam-generating stations, and 41,870 kilowatts in internal combustion stations. This means that my State is today dependent on a combination of hydro and steam generation for its power supply.

To provide the hydroelectric part of the combination for its future power supply Maine has, according to the Federal Power Commission's latest estimate, over 1,100,000 kilowatts of undeveloped power in its rivers. This includes 255,500 kilowatts in the St. John River Basin, 320,425 kilowatts in the Penobscot River Basin, 472,700 kilowatts in the Kennebec River Basin, 38,000 kilowatts in the Androscoggin River Basin,[1] and 69,975 in the Saco River Basin. In an average water-year this undeveloped hydroelectric power could contribute nearly 4½ billion kilowatt-hours of electricity.

In view of the fact that Maine's cost of conventional fuel for the generation of electricity is the highest of any State in the Nation, it would seem obvious that it should be one of the first States in which atomic power could be produced on a commercially self-supporting basis.

Furthermore, the availability of potential hydroelectric power, coupled with streamflow regulation in almost any part of the State would make possible a demonstration of the economy of a combination of atomic power and hydro power, including provision for pumped hydro storage if planning studies indicate that it would be desirable.

Papers delivered at last year's United Nations International Conference on the Peaceful Uses of Atomic Energy, held in Geneva, Switzerland, indicated that atomic power and hydropower will be natural working partners in the efficient power supply systems of the future. They made it clear that the most economical atomic power will be obtained from the use of relatively large generating units operated at a high load factor. This means, of course, that the first atomic powerplants should be planned as base load plants. One of the British papers pointed out that pumped storage hydroelectric plants to carry the peak loads could be associated with such nuclear power stations.

These arrangements also have been suggested in papers presented in this country. About a year ago at an Ebasco Services conference, an expert panel made the following prediction as to use of hydro capacity for carrying peak loads, particularly in connection with nuclear powerplants. The quotation is from "Electrical World" of March 10, 1958:

> The nuclear plant can be fitted nicely into a joint scheme with a pumped storage hydroproject. The first would carry the base load; the latter, the peak. The expected low-fuel cost of nuclear plants should make this even more attractive.

Maine is vitally interested in assuring ample supplies of electricity at the lowest possible cost for its homes and its farms, and to attract further industrial development.

We recognize that, in the long run, fuel-generated power is going to be required to provide a larger and larger part of any area's power supply even though it may seem today well endowed with waterpower. And we feel that, for Maine to participate in the country's future economic growth on a competitive basis, this means development of the technology of atomic power production to the point where it will be not simply competitive but truly low-cost power.

[1] There is about 113,500 kilowatts of undeveloped power in this basin, but only 38,000 of it is in Maine; the balance is in New Hampshire.

This position is fully supported in the address of Elmer L. Lindseth, president of the Cleveland Electric Illuminating Co., and chairman of the EEI Atomic Power Committee, at the Edison Electric Institute's 1958 convention. Speaking on the subject of atomic power, Lindseth described a second major impact of fully competitive nuclear power as the impact on our industry of the ultimate elimination of fuel-cost differentials between areas of this country. He continued:

As the cost of nuclear power is progressively reduced, it will become competitive first in high fuel-cost areas. Eventually, although it may be a number of years later, it will be competitive everywhere.

This single fact is, of course, going to cause a major shift in the economic and industrial geography of the United States.

Today, such industries as basic metals, alloys, and electro-chemicals favor locations where they can most cheaply obtain the large amounts of power they use. But with fully competitive nuclear power, they will be no longer restricted to the low fuel-cost areas of today. Determining factors in their location will be chiefly markets, raw materials, labor force, and available sites.

Obviously, this is going to provide hitherto unknown opportunities to a lot of power companies in their area development programs. Formerly fuel-poor areas will have new advantages for industrial prospects. Conversely, fuel-rich areas that have hitherto had advantages built on lower generating costs are going to have nationwide competition.

Location of developmental atomic power plants in Maine would also be beneficial to the atomic energy program from a dollars-and-cents standpoint. Because of Maine's present high fuel costs, the incremental cost of power from these early developmental atomic plants would be less in Maine, and the burden on the Atomic Energy Commission's budget therefore less, than in almost any other U.S. location.

I would also point out that our fuel costs in Maine are not too far below those of some of the Euratom countries, to which the United States is contributing millions of dollars to assist them to build atomic power plants. If this sort of program is good for Europe, it should be equally good for the high fuel-cost areas of our own country.

I, therefore, ask that the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy give careful consideration to my proposal that a demonstration atomic power facility be constructed by the Atomic Energy Commission in Maine. I would recommend that the project be planned in cooperation with the U.S. Corps of Engineers, so that ultimately it can be operated in coordination with one or more hydroelectric stations at multiple-purpose projects, for flood control and other purposes, in one or more of the Maine rivers, including the possible use of pumped storage to improve the economy and the demonstration value of the combined undertaking.

CONGRESS MUST ACT TO STAMP OUT NATIONAL RACKETEERING BY OUTLAWING TERRORISTIC CONSPIRACIES

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CRAMER] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAMER. I yield.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this time for this purpose. I had wanted to get on the record this statement at the conclusion of the previous remarks of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN] in which he so vigorously attacked Secretary of Agriculture Benson. I should like to give another point of view. I represent an agricultural district, one which is about 12th to 15th in dollar volume in the United States. I can say without any fear of contradiction that at least 90 percent of my farmers fully support Secretary Benson and his policies.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Florida [Mr. CRAMER] is recognized.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced today a bill to outlaw national conspiracies perpetrated by gangsters and hoodlums who use interstate commerce or interstate communications in furtherance of their terroristic activities, crimes, and rackets.

The bill creates a new crime known as a "terroristic offense" which is intended to be a catchall for all types of conspiracies of an interstate nature which presently, because of their interstate character, have been largely beyond the effective reach of local law enforcement.

The definition of a terroristic offense is "any offense proscribed by the laws of or the common law as recognized in any State relating to extortion, blackmail, murder, racketeering, narcotics, maiming, or assault with intent to inflict great bodily harm, and punishable by imprisonment in a penitentiary or by death." The penalties range from fines for lesser offenses to death for terroristic offenses involving murder.

All of America was astounded in November 1957 when 60 hoodlums, who were leaders or dons in the notorious Mafia, were discovered in convention assembled at a gangster's home in Apalachin, N.Y. The presence in one small town of so many fancy Cadillacs aroused the curiosity of a policeman who took down the numbers while the owners fled from their picnic at a barbeque pit to the woods where they hoped to escape detection.

A list of the guests present at the Apalachin party reads like a Who's Who in the gangster world.

One of the visitors identified himself as Louis Santos, of Havana, Cuba. Actually, Santos was Santos Trafficante, Jr., born in Florida in 1914, and son of the man by the same name who was reputed to be the Mafia chief of Tampa, Fla., in my congressional district. The elder Trafficante, for years, was active in the narcotics traffic and in gambling. His son, according to the testimony of John T. Cusack, of the Federal Bureau of Narcotics, was attending the Apalachin meeting as heir to his father's interests.

Here is what Mr. Cusack has to say further in regard to this promising young man:

It is interesting to note in passing that the New York County district attorney's office is now interested in bringing about the appearance of Santos Trafficante, Jr., of Tampa and Havana, for questioning before a grand jury in New York regarding the slaying of Albert Anastasia. According to the authorities, there is reason to believe that Anastasia's death was caused by a dispute regarding gambling concessions in a gambling establishment in Havana, which is operated by Trafficante. Trafficante, it should be noted, operates the nightclub and gambling establishment called the Sans Souci in Havana, and prior to this, Gabriel Mannarino, of 540 Charles Avenue, New Kensington, Pa., had an interest in this same club. Both Santos Trafficante, Jr., and Gabriel Mannarino were at the Apalachin meeting.

The city of Tampa in my district has one of the worst crime records in the United States. There are 19 unsolved sawed-off shotgun gang murders credited to gangsterism. Harry J. Anslinger, Commissioner of the Federal Bureau of Narcotics, tells me that Tampa is one of the principal ports of entry for the dope peddling traffic in the United States.

This $2 billion illicit business which ruins our youth and wrecks so many lives is controlled to the point of monopoly by the Mafia.

I have been deeply disturbed for a number of years upon reading about sawed-off shotgun killings in Tampa, 19 of which, as I mentioned before, remain unsolved. The nature of these killings and the fact that the perpetrators remain unpunished lend credence to the presumption that they are a part of an interstate conspiracy where the killer is shipped in for the job, or in the alternative, the code of the Mafia seals the lips of all parties involved. Some of these killings are identified with the multimillion-dollar bolita racket in Florida. So disturbed was I over a recent killing that I personally requested that the Department of Justice and the FBI investigate the matter and consider supplementing the efforts of the local law-enforcement officials. I was advised that even though the killing was of a gangland nature, there was no Federal crime involved and that, therefore, the Federal law-enforcement authority had no jurisdiction in the matter. The services of the FBI were even requested by the local law-enforcement officials but again the answer was that no Federal crime was involved. With the enactment of this legislation, a Federal crime in that instance would exist, presumably at least, and based upon this, a nationwide dragnet could be put into operation, which is the only method by which this national and international kill-for-money syndicate can be stamped out. I cite Tampa as an example of an area where Federal help is sorely needed.

In 1942 the Federal authorities broke up temporarily some of the Tampa-Kansas City gang of the Mafiosi by sending several Tampa residents to jail. In this case the Federal Government charged that heroin was being brought from Marseilles by way of Cuba and Tampa to Kansas City for distribution in the Midwest. Agents were able to get a microphone into the Kansas City hotel room occupied by one of the Tampa gangsters and a St. Louis hoodlum. The

phonograph record taken over the microphone recorded the Tampan as saying:

You know you don't have to worry about me. Whatever I know I am going to keep to myself. It don't do you no good to talk and have to face two or three ——— of ——— on the outside when you come out. They even asked me about the Mafia—

Said Antinori in a strained voice—

as if I'd say anything about that.

It is a fact that as fast as one of the Mafiosi is imprisoned, two others rise as replacements in the organization. How the conspiracies spread and how vast is its extent is given in an editorial published in the current issue of Life magazine. Recently, Life showed in detail how the national crime syndicate, headed by the Mafia, muscles in on numerous essential services, from garbage collecting to towel supplies—and especially jukeboxes, easy to control because easy to damage. And last week, says Life:

Ralph Kelly, an Elgin, Ill., jukebox operator whose income was cut from $14,000 to $7,000 when gangster Rocco Pranno became his partner, sat cowering before the McClellan committee, too terrified to talk. The sinister-looking Pranno was right beside him. "This is a tragic state," said Senator SAM ERVIN, JR., as Kelly refused to testify, "when a man in the shadow of the Nation's Capitol cringes in fear." Pranno, another witness testified, had threatened to put cement weights on Kelly's legs and drop him in the river.

Terror is nothing new in the world. Neither is crime. What is new, in the land of the free, is terror and crime organized on such a staggering scale that its overlords even hold their own secret conventions (as at Apalachin, N.Y., on November 14, 1957) and pass their own laws (one member, whose sentence was death, waited shuddering in the garage until he learned that it had been commuted to a $10,000 fine for trespassing somebody's jukebox shakedown territory).

That convention was flushed out only by the accident of a State policeman's curiosity of the sudden influx of expensive cars. But the accident revealed frightening facts about America's health, strength, and security. It revealed that a conspiracy, as secret as the Communist underground and certainly as dangerous, was operating without any of the surveillance and penetration which has all but destroyed the latter. The delegates came from all parts of the land, even from Cuba and faraway Italy. But nobody was following them. Nobody knew what they were up to. All the vaunted crime detection agencies—city, State, Federal—were equally in the dark and made to look equally impotent and foolish.

The Apalachin meeting was Mafia but my bill establishing the terroristic crime is aimed at all evil conspiracies—the anti-Semitic bombing of synagogues by out-of-State terrorists—the anti-American wrecking of public schools—the Neapolitan fraternity of the Commorra to which Al Capone belonged—and it covers likewise the racketeering practices of crooked union officials and locals, as revealed by the findings of the McClellan committee. It is also aimed at Murder, Inc.

Just this week end, a new book called "Brotherhood of Evil: The Mafia" was published by Farrar, Straus & Cudahy, of New York. Its author is Frederick Sondern, Jr., one of the roving editors of the Reader's Digest.

Thanks to Commissioner Anslinger, of the Federal Bureau of Narcotics, who wrote the foreword, I was given a prepublication copy of this excellent book. I recommend this book highly to every Member of Congress and to every public-spirited citizen who is worried and fearful about these terrible conspiracies that are flourishing so openly in our country. Here is what the new book has to say about Murder, Inc.:

Murder, Inc.—as the newspapers came to call it—was unquestionably the invention of three dons: Anastasia, Joe Adonis, and Frank Costello. Actually, it was not an invention at all. It was simply the transposition to the United States of an ancient Sicilian system. The three New York capi mafiosi had realized that the whole business of corporal punishment and eventual execution was being administered in a sloppy and dangerous manner. They must have, as one had in Sicily, a pool of trained, experienced, and reliable bravos who would maim or kill on order for a reasonable stipend. This seemed to them not only reasonable but imperative. * * * In less than a decade Murder, Inc., at the behest of its masters, disposed of approximately 130 rivals and recalcitrants with gun, icepick, cleaver, and rope.

When the organization was finally broken up—

Eight murderers went to the electric chair and 47 of their assistants to prison for long terms.

The New York district attorney's office was getting ready to arrest Albert Anastasia when he was shot while getting a haircut in the barbershop of a New York hotel. It is presumed that his assassins were Cubans imported from Havana at the behest of some of those who attended the Apalachin meeting.

I should interject at this point that the Department of Justice has established a special anti-racketeering division headed by Milton Wessel, a very capable young lawyer who happens to have been my classmate at Harvard Law School and who roomed next to me and who is now doing an outstanding job in continuing a thorough investigation into mobster activities, tying together the pieces so that, I am sure, he will show the existence of a gigantic national, and also international, criminal conspiracy that preys upon every American.

Now let us go back and examine the Mafia in order to find out how the evil doing was imported to America where it spread and its members increased like starlings.

The Mafia is not a lodge with a constitution and a definite set of officers nor does it have any particular name. It is sometimes called "L'Unione Siciliano" and sometimes it is called the "Society of Friends" which happens to be the official name of our good Quaker Church.

The Federal Bureau of Narcotics gives this description of the Mafia in America:

The Mafia in its present form is generally considered to have been organized in Sicily during the late 18th century as a resistance to the Bourbon-French conquest of the island, but to have rapidly degenerated into a society of criminals. The Mafia society as it is taken today must be considered synonymous with, or the outgrowth of, the old Black Hand and L'Unione Siciliano.

We consider the Mafia a well-organized secret fraternal order originating from the Palermo area of Sicily. Its members with few exeptions are all of Sicilian origin and are located in every prosperous city in the world, principally cities of Europe and North and South America, where profits in crime are the most lucrative.

The business of the Mafia is what we term the commercial crimes that prey on man's human weaknesses, such as the illicit narcotic traffic, organized prostitution, counterfeiting, bootlegging, organized gambling, loan sharking and extortion.

When the opportunity presents itself, the Mafia moves into legitimate business, selecting ventures where their strong-arm tactics and cash resources will quickly bring large profits.

Our extensive narcotic investigations of various members of the Mafia fraternity during the past 18 years have repeatedly shown a pattern of either infiltration or complete dominance of several legitimate fields including organized labor, the distribution of beer, liquor and soft drinks; the importation and distribution of Italian olive oil, cheese and tomato paste; the control of wholesale fruit and vegetable produce markets, the baking and distribution of Italian bread and pastry; the vending machine business of all types; the operation of night clubs, bars and restaurants. Their night club operations are frequently complemented through their interests in model and theatrical booking agencies and in musical recording companies.

Mafia members use front people, who are completely trusted, as the means to own and operate these various legitimate interests, and doing this they overcome licensing and income tax problems. Legally a "front man" could eliminate the actual owner, but this is seldom, if ever, done as these "front men" are usually a Mafia brother of minor rank and ability, or the members of the family of the actual owner.

In order to further their legitimate enterprises and cloak their illicit operations, Mafia members conduct a well-planned program of ingratiating themselves with people of all walks of life. Their modus operandi calls for interest and activity in community and church affairs, including generous contributions to charities, and to lead an ostensibly quiet family life. They are ever ready to entertain and do favors for the right people.

• • • • •

The following duties are required of Mafia members:

1. Reciprocal aid to all members in any case of need whatsoever.

2. An absolute obedience to the officers of the society.

3. An offense received by one of the members must be considered an offense to the entire society and must be avenged at any cost.

4. Never recur to governmental authorities under any circumstance for justice.

5. Never reveal the names of members or any other secret of the society.

It is difficult to say who is eligible to join the Mafia or who joins it today, whether there is a formal joining, or whether members, through family tradition, are just born into the society. It appears to us, however, that one becomes a member only through family sponsorship. The Mafia fraternal ties are strengthened through intermarriage which brings about an increase of loyalty to the society through the ensuing blood and family ties.

Between 1885 and the present day Mafia members have immigrated to the United States and settled in almost every principal city. During the last 38 years the immigration of the Mafia to the United States has been either clandestine or fraudulent. Many of these criminals fled Sicily to escape

arrest and prosecution for crimes or to seek more lucrative fields for crime in the new world.

The first Mafia members who came to the United States lived as parasites on the great wave of the Sicilian and Italian immigrants who sought the new way of life in America.

The Mafia-Black Hand criminals through violence, the threat of violence, kidnaping, murder and a general reign of terror, extorted vast sums of money from thousands of frightened, hard-working Italian immigrants. What they could not extort, these gangsters gradually gained through their swindles and crooked lotteries. With the coming of prohibition no group was better qualified to assume a dominant role in the golden age of crime in the United States than the Mafia. During the prohibition era Mafia members extended themselves through every part of the country to carry out their traffic in illicit narcotics and liquor.

With the end of prohibition, we find members of this fraternity continuing in their distribution of narcotics and increasing their activities in organized gambling, counterfeiting, and prostitution. During World War II we find them engaged in the black marketing of sugar, motor tires, meat, and in the counterfeiting of ration stamps.

Wherever the Mafia fraternity has gone the members have developed working arrangements with other mobs of the particular country, or with mobs in this country of various national origins. Non-Mafia gangsters often prefer doing business with a Mafia man because of his known reliability.

In almost every city in the Western World Mafia members are usually strong enough not to be pushed around or suppressed by rivals. However, our files indicate they prefer alliances and working agreements rather than open competition and the ensuing gang warfare.

* * * * *

The Mafia throughout the United States, Canada, Mexico, Cuba, Italy, and France is a fraternal organization divided into many different mobs, syndicates, or conspiracies. Members of the fraternity belong to one or more such groups which are often temporary in nature, organized usually to carry out one particular enterprise, such as importation and distribution of narcotics or the operation of a gambling den.

Policy, areas of influence and mutual cooperation in carrying out these various activities is arranged through the Mafia grand council. Rather than being one great unified crime syndicate, the Mafia is a union or association of many syndicates, composed of Mafia members and adhering to the tradition and policymaking directives of the order. As an example, at Apalachin the 58 identified conferees were not, in all likelihood, members of one conspiracy, but individuals who at different times over the years have been engaged with each other in various commercial criminal ventures.

Palermo, Sicily, is the ancient city and stronghold of the Mafia. From Palermo Mafia mobsters still operate throughout Sicily, Italy, Africa, and Europe, specializing at the present time in the smuggling of narcotics and cigarettes, bootlegging, and kidnaping. As recently as 1955 they launched a reign of terror in the Palermo area, in an effort to control the produce market and the lucrative citrus fruit trade of that city.

We are informed that the Mafia society is divided into units of 10 men. Each unit is supervised by a group chief and the group chiefs in turn by an area chief. The area chief would in all probability be a member of the grand council. The meeting at Apalachin, N.Y., should be considered a meeting of the grand council, although all persons in attendance at Apalachin may not be members of the grand council.

The recent Kefauver committee's investigation of crime by members of the U.S. Senate had this comment to make in the course of its hearings:

Senator WILEY. You are of Italian descent, and we want to make it clear, because I think all over America some of our best citizens are Italians. You think only relatively few of the Italian people are mixed up in this Mafia business?

SIRAGUSA. Yes, sir.

Senator WILEY. Have you any basis whatever to give us an estimate of the extent of the Mafia in this country?

SIRAGUSA. I would say that in all principal cities there are segments of the Mafia, and I would say that New York probably has the big bosses.

Senator WILEY. You have given us a pretty clear-cut factual statement showing Luciano's connections in Italy with the trade in this country. Have you any information to tell us whether or not Luciano has the power to enforce his connections here through threatening or coercion or through gunmen or any other methods? If he is the kingpin, we want to know how far his domain extends.

SIRAGUSA. From what I have seen, and I have spoken to some members of his gang here in an undercover capacity (the narcotic agent at the time was passing himself off very successfully as a big buyer of heroin from New York), I would say, if he is not the kingpin, he is one of the royal family. The fact that he receives large sums of money from American gangsters indicates to me that he has definite word in policy matters and that he is still deriving an income from American rackets.

Senator WILEY. You state that he is one of the royal family. Does that mean he has the power that he can enforce through gunmen and coercion and threats his mandate here in this country?

SIRAGUSA. Yes, sir. ("Yes, sir," was the way the agent said it.)

Now, in conclusion, I want to quote from the summary of Mr. Sondern's book, "Brotherhood of Evil":

The brotherhood still thumbs its nose at government. But legislators and public are beginning to understand its mentality and purpose. And something is being done.

The responsibility for the extent and menace of organized crime in the United States, the racketeering of which the Mafia is such an important element, rests on many shoulders. Most legislators, both State and Federal, have been either ignorant of the facts or lethargic. Many of our law enforcement agencies, Federal, State, and local, have not cooperated sufficiently because of traditional jealousies and jurisdictional disputes. Many of our courts, particularly the Federal judiciary, have too often put legalistic hair splitting above basic, realistic justice. The brotherhood has thrived as a result.

It is shocking and outrageous fact, for example, that not 1 of the 20 top mafiosi of the country who have brazenly defied various congressional investigating committees, have been cited for contempt and then voted in contempt of Congress, has been punished as of this writing. Accardo, Fischetti, Costello, Licavoli, and the others who have over and over sneeringly pleaded the fifth amendment have continued to stay safely and smugly behind the shield of a decision of the United States Supreme Court in 1951 which established the doctrine that a witness must give only his name and address; he need answer no further questions whatever—birthplace, business, finances; nothing. Lower courts, bound by this decree, have dismissed one case after the other. The code of omerta could not have been more firmly supported than by this action of our highest Court.

A formidable tide, however, has been gradually but steadily rising against the Mafia. At times during the last 8 years it has seemed to recede, but its momentum has actually been gaining through four principal phases—the Kefauver hearings, the Danial investigation, the consequences of the Apalachin meeting and now the McClellan inquiry. And for the brotherhood it is a dangerous tide indeed.

Only by the enactment of this bill or similar legislation can the answer to the question raised by the Life magazine editorial referred to herein, "Just who is running this country, anyway?" be found, as it should be, say the God-fearing, law-abiding people of America.

Generally, murder is not a Federal offense. While it is a State crime, local authorities may be incapable, because of the lack of personnel, scientific crime detecting equipment, et cetera, to properly investigate the crime and bring the perpetrators to justice. Since the perpetrators cross State lines and use interstate communications to carry out their nefarious deeds, their actions are, in truth and in fact, interstate in nature and therefore should properly come within the jurisdiction of the Federal Government.

In addition, there are many State crimes either recognized by State statute or State common law, in which interstate instrumentalities are used, and because of this latter circumstance, local authorities not having extraterritorial powers, cannot adequately go out to look for and ferret out evidences of the crime. The Federal Government could, however, and should do this.

It is the intent of this bill to bring the crime detection and prevention powers of the Federal Government into play by making available the services of the FBI, the Federal Narcotics Bureau, the Secret Service, and Federal scientific laboratories for the detection of the activities of secret criminal organizations, such as the Mafia, and for the apprehension of its offending members.

I trust that my fellow Members of Congress on both sides of the aisle will take the same deep interest in this horrible situation as I do. I told you how it operates in my own congressional district. You will find out that its network extends into many of your districts. I hope my bill will be taken up and considered in committee and that hearings will be held to assure that the bill, as offered, is an effective way to curb this cancerous growth in our country.

Allow me to point out that our police authorities, under this bill, will not have to seek out just the perpetrators of a crime. They now can seek out the conspiracy and the conspirators themselves, even though far from the actual scene of the crime.

I am dismayed that my bill cannot cover international aspects. We cannot tear out the Mafia implant in America and feel secure until the roots are chopped out in Sicily. Perhaps additional legislation should be written to take up the international aspects through the United Nations and with other governments that find themselves victimized by conspirational terrorism.

The purpose of my bill is to curb the activities of criminal syndicates such as Mafia, Black Hand, Murder, Inc., and so forth, engaged in organized crime in instances where Federal jurisdiction is lacking, with respect to offenses against State law which are perpetrated by means of interstate activities, and I trust immediate action on this legislation will be taken. The general public deserves this needed protection.

A BILL TO PUNISH THE USE OF INTERSTATE COMMERCE IN FURTHERANCE OF CONSPIRACIES TO COMMIT TERRORISTIC CRIMES AND ACTIVITIES, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the analysis of chapter 19 of title 18 of the United States Code is amended by inserting immediately after item 372 the following new item:

"373. Conspiracy to commit terroristic crimes; penalties

SEC. 2. Title 18 of the United States Code is further amended by inserting immediately after § 372 of such title the following new section:

"§ 373. Conspiracy to commit terroristic crimes; penalties

"(a) Whoever travels or causes another to travel in interstate or foreign commerce or uses or causes to be used any interstate communication for the purpose of committing any terroristic offense prohibited by this section shall be fined not more than $10,000 or imprisoned not more than 5 years, or both.

"As used in this section the term 'terroristic offenses' means any offense proscribed by the laws of or the common law as recognized in any State relating to extortion, blackmail, murder, racketeering, narcotics, maiming or assault with intent to inflict great bodily harm, and punishable by imprisonment in a penitentiary or by death.

"(b) If as a result of the violation of subsection (a) of this section any person is murdered, maimed or subjected to great bodily harm, the punishment shall be: (1) death, if any person is murdered and if the verdict of the jury shall so recommend; (2) imprisonment for any term of years or for life if any person is murdered and if the death penalty is not imposed; or (3) imprisonment for not more than ten years if any person is maimed or subjected to great bodily harm."

FEDERAL AID TO EDUCATION

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, on February 24 the gentleman from Montana addressed this body in support of his bill, H.R. 22. Under its terms some $11.5 billions would be expended by the Federal Government over a 5-year period to assist in the construction of schools or to help subsidize teachers' salaries.

During the course of his discussion—and I regret I was not present at the time—the gentleman from Montana criticized as "utterly inadequate" and "feeble and ineffectual" the administration's current proposal—H.R. 4268—in this field. He quotes with approval Senator MURRAY's description of the bill as a "legislative monstrosity." He asserts that it is "neither fiscally sound nor an appreciable help" to needy school districts.

Mr. Speaker, these are strong statements. Perhaps we should excuse the sponsor of a bill for using such language—even though it is unjustified—in his effort to state his own case. Certainly name calling is easy enough, and the gentleman from Montana must have heard uncomplimentary remarks about the value and advisability of his own bill. But the question remains whether inaccurate characterizations of proposed legislation will aid us in our search for moderate and realistic legislation.

Is the administration plan feeble and ineffectual? Let us seek an answer by comparing what H.R. 4268 might accomplish with what has been seriously considered by Congress in this field in previous years.

In July 1956 after prolonged discussion in committee, the so-called Kelley bill—H.R. 7535—was brought to the floor for consideration. Under its terms, some 80,000 classrooms would have been provided for over a 4-year period. This bill was defeated on July 6, 1956.

In 1957, the administration again made recommendations which, if enacted, would have provided 65,000 classrooms over a 4-year period. The bill reported out that year by the committee, H.R. 1, would have provided for 75,000 classrooms over a 5-year period. This bill was defeated on July 25, 1957.

Thus, we can see that the only legislation which has thus far received serious consideration contemplated participation by the Federal Government which would have helped build from 65,000 to 80,000 classrooms.

As the gentleman from Montana must know, if he followed Secretary Flemming's recent testimony before the committee, utilization of the proposed program of Federal advances to help provide annual installments on principal and interest could help support $600 million worth of school construction for five successive years. If a total of $3 billion were so supported, approximately 75,000 classrooms would be built. This, I need not add, compares favorably with all bills seriously considered in previous years.

But how, one may ask, could a Federal program which at its peak requires only $85 million annually build as many classrooms as the proposal of the gentleman from Montana? Perhaps more classrooms might be built under H.R. 22 if too much did not go to the subsidizing of teachers. No one knows first how the $11 billion kitty would be divided. However, one ardent advocate of this multibillion approach indicates that no more than 100,000 might be built in 5 years.

Mr. Edward Hollender, national director of the Americans for Democratic Action, testified vigorously in support of the Metcalf bill. He stressed the overriding importance of subsidizing teachers' salaries. He pointed out that States now apportion their own educational funds so that construction gets roughly one-third and teachers' salaries two-thirds. Mr. Hollender then predicted that a comparable allocation of Federal funds would make it possible to build 95,000 classrooms.

Thus we see, Mr. Speaker, that both bills may have the effect of facilitating the construction of roughly comparable numbers of classrooms. Some advocates of a multibillion dollar program just cannot seem to realize that a greatly reduced Federal expenditure might in fact be equally effective. And they seem to overlook the possibility that hard-pressed taxpayers might prefer the less expensive program.

The gentleman from Montana questions whether H.R. 4268 would help appreciably the needy school districts. It is undeniable that as much help, and as easily available help, would be provided by the administration's present proposal as would have been provided under prior proposals. Any school district which could have qualified under previous proposals could qualify under the terms of the new bill. And so long as such a district continues to be in need, it could continue to receive as much help as would have been made available previously.

Mr. Speaker, the only major differences in the new suggestion involves, first the period of time over which Federal and States funds are paid out, and second, a provision in H.R. 4268 for termination of such assistance if a district ceases to be needy.

The administration program is consistent with the overall fiscal policies established by the President. It is fiscally sound. It directs Federal aid where it is needed most, at the communities which cannot finance additional classroom construction, even with the execution of a reasonable tax effort. Despite contentions to the contrary, every State can participate in the program.

States can participate through, one, the grant of appropriated funds; two, through the loan of appropriated funds or, three, through commitments to advance one-half of annual installments of principal and interest on local bond issues. Previously legislation would have required States to participate through grants or not at all. The administration's present proposal thus affords greater flexibility, and increases its practicability.

SUNFLOWER ORDNANCE PLANT

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and to include a resolution introduced by myself today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, at Sunflower, Kans., there is an ordnance plant that has many buildings. The equipment is up to date and ready to go on solid propellants. For some reason the military is not taking advantage of this plant. There is much unemployment in the area and the people are anxious to go to work. There is no reason why that plant and plants located at Lake City in Kansas City, Mo., and the facility

at Parsons, Kans., should not be utilized and we should like to find out why.

It is my belief that many millions of dollars are being wasted because of the failure to utilize existing facilities and that our military ordnance people are spending literally billions of dollars for private plants.

Just how economy minded is this national administration and which is the party of spendthrifts and wasters? Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The resolution is as follows:

HOUSE RESOLUTION 192

Whereas the Sunflower ordnance plant located near Eudora, Kans., has been shut down for a considerable period of time; and

Whereas such plant, consisting of 2,887 structures and equipment, covering 10,474 acres, is not today being utilized, although such plant is now equipped to produce solid propellants; and

Whereas billions of dollars are being spent for the construction of private facilities which duplicate the facilities located at such plant which are already in being and would cost $474,312,147 to replace; and

Whereas unemployment in eastern Kansas is at a high level, and an ample supply of labor is available to resume operations at such plant; and

Whereas the operation of such plant would save large sums for the United States which are now being spent for facilities which duplicate facilities at such plant: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Committee on Armed Services, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, is authorized and directed to conduct a full and complete investigation and study for the purpose of ascertaining the reasons why the Sunflower ordnance plant, near Eudora, Kans., and other similar facilities in the Midwest area are not now being utilized, with a view to recommending to the House such action as may be appropriate with respect to the operation of such plant.

For the purpose of carrying out this resolution the committee or subcommittee is authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places within the United States, including any Territory, Commonwealth, or possession thereof, whether the House is in session, has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, and to require, by subpena or otherwise, the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memorandums, papers, and documents, as it deems necessary; except that neither the committee nor any subcommittee thereof may sit while the House is meeting unless special leave to sit shall have been obtained from the House. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee or any member of the committee designated by him, and may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member.

The committee shall report to the House as soon as practicable during the present Congress the results of its investigation and study, together with such recommendations as it deems advisable. Any such report which is made when the House is not in session shall be filed with the Clerk of the House.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. WALTER (at the request of Mr. FLOOD) for an indefinite period on account of illness.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. ZABLOCKI, for 45 minutes, tomorrow.

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin, for 1 hour, on Monday, March 9.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. ZABLOCKI.

Mr. MACHROWICZ.

Mr. HECHLER and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. LANKFORD and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York.

At the request of Mr. MCCORMACK, the following Members to extend their remarks in the RECORD:

Mr. MCCORMACK and to include extraneous matter in each.

At the request of Mr. GEORGE, the following Members were granted permission to extend their remarks in the RECORD and include extraneous matter:

Mr. ZELENKO.

Mr. LOSER.

Mr. EVANS.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 11 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, March 4, 1959, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of the rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

652. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the audit of the abaca fiber program, administered by the General Services Administration, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1958 (H. Doc. No. 94); to the Committee on Government Operations and ordered to be printed.

653. A letter from the Administrator, Small Business Administration, transmitting a report covering the progress made in liquidating the assets formerly held by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, covering the quarterly period ended September 30, 1958, pursuant to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Liquidation Act, as amended (67 Stat. 230) and Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1957 (22 F.R. 4633); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

654. A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, relative to transmitting a copy of this year's report on the state of the Nation's Capital; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

655. A letter from the assistant to the president, the American Academy of Arts and Letters, transmitting the official report of the American Academy of Arts and Letters for the year 1958, pursuant to section 4 of their charter; to the Committee on House Administration.

656. A letter from the Administrator, Veterans' Administration, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to extend the authority of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to maintain offices in the Republic of the Philippines"; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. HAYS: Committee on Foreign Affairs. House Concurrent Resolution 34. Concurrent resolution favoring the meeting of the North Atlantic Treaty Parliamentary Conference for 1959 in Washington, D.C.; without amendment (Rept. No. 94). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. MORGAN: Committee on Foreign Affairs. H.R. 2575. A bill to authorize the appropriation of $500,000 to be spent for the purpose of the III Pan American Games to be held in Chicago, Ill.; without amendment (Rept. No. 95). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. O'NEILL: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 190. Resolution for consideration of H.R. 3365, a bill to authorize the crediting of certain service for purpose of retired pay for nonregular service, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 138). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. THORNBERRY: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 191. Resolution for consideration of H.R. 4413, a bill to provide improved opportunity for promotion for certain officers in the naval service, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 139). Referred to the House Calendar.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 1434. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Elba Haverstick Cash; with amendment (Rept. No. 96). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 1457. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Sue Pyle; without amendment (Rept. No. 97). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 1531. A bill for the relief of Cesar Garcia; without amendment (Rept. No. 98). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. DONOHUE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 1546. A bill for the relief of Georg Gahn and Margarete Gahn; without amendment (Rept. No. 99). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 1600. A bill for the relief of Francis M. Haischer; without amendment (Rept. No. 100). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 1601. A bill for the relief of Thomas A. Howe; with amendment (Rept. No. 101). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 1605. A bill for the relief of Harry F. Lindall; without amendment (Rept. No. 102). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 1611. A bill for the relief of Olin Fred Rundlett; without amendment (Rept. No.

103). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 1632. A bill for the relief of Dean E. Foemoe; without amendment (Rept. No. 104). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 1653. A bill for the relief of Evelyn Albi; without amendment (Rept. No. 105). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 1718. A bill for the relief of Oather S. Hall; without amendment (Rept. No. 106). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 1736. A bill for the relief of John C. Mation; with an amendment (Rept. No. 107). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 1766. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Moses Glikowsky; without amendment (Rept. No. 108). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 2044. A bill for the relief of the estate of Richard Anthony Nunes, Jr.; without amendment (Rept. No. 109). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 2050. A bill for the relief of Nissim S. Tawil, Esther Tawil, (nee Goldman), Solomn Tawil, Isaac Tawil, Kathy Tawil, Jacqueline Tawil, and Sarina Goldman; without amendment (Rept. No. 110). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 2065. A bill for the relief of Arthur J. Dettmers, Jr.; without amendment (Rept. No. 111). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 2104. A bill for the relief of Alfonso Giangrande; without amendment (Rept. No. 112). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. ASHMORE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 2279. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Tyra Fenner Tynes; without amendment (Rept. No. 113). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 2280. A bill for the relief of Adele M. Parker; without amendment (Rept. No. 114). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 2586. A bill for the relief of Miss Mame E. Howell; without amendment (Rept. No. 115). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. DONOHUE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 2602. A bill for the relief of William C. Hutto; with amendment (Rept. No. 116). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 2668. A bill for the relief of John R. Cook; with amendment (Rept. No. 117). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 2717. A bill for the relief of Eber Bros. Wine & Liquor Corp.; without amendment (Rept. No. 118). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 2846. A bill for the relief of Dorman William Whittom; without amendment (Rept. No. 119). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. DONOHUE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 2954. A bill for the relief of Joseph E. Miller; without amendment (Rept. No. 120). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 3093. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Dorothy (Hyman) Monk; without amendment (Rept. No. 121). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 3104. A bill for the relief of Col. John T. Malloy; without amendment (Rept. No. 122). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 3111. A bill for the relief of Rachel Nethery; without amendment (Rept. No. 123). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 3240. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Clare M. Ash; without amendment (Rept. No. 124). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. DONOHUE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 3249. A bill for the relief of William S. Scott; without amendment (Rept. No. 125). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 3252. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Martha Nicometi; without amendment (Rept. No. 126). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 3254. A bill for the relief of Thomas Forman Screven, Julia Screven Daniels, and May Bond Screven Rhodes; without amendment (Rept No. 127). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 3406. A bill for the relief of William H. Pearlmutter; without amendment (Rept. No. 128). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 3410. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Leonard O. Erickson; without amendment (Rept. No. 129). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 3522. A bill for the relief of Aaron Green, Jr.; without amendment (Rept. No. 130). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 3797. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Alberta S. Rozanski; without amendment (Rept. No. 131). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 3798. A bill for the relief of Paul Nelson; without amendment (Rept. No. 132). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 3825. A bill for the relief of Dr. Gordon D. Hoople, Dr. David W. Brewer, and the estate of the late Dr. Irl H. Blaisdell; without amendment (Rept. No. 133). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 4142. A bill for the relief of Wintford Jesse Thompson; with amendment (Rept. No. 134). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 4314. A bill for the relief of Samuel Abraham, John A. Carroll, Forrest E. Robinson, Thomas J. Sawyers, Jack Silmon, and David N. Wilson; with amendment (Rept. No. 135). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 4893. A bill for the relief of William R. and Alice M. Reardon; without amendment (Rept. No. 136). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 4964. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Betty L. Fonk; with amendment (Rept. No. 137). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ALGER:

H.R. 5164. A bill to amend section 103 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, relating to interest on certain governmental obligations, and section 10 of the United States Housing Act of 1937, relating to annual contributions in assistance of low-rent housing; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BOGGS:

H.R. 5165. A bill to amend Public Law 455 approved March 29, 1956 (H.R. 6309 authorizing the construction of the Mississippi River-Gulf outlet; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. DIGGS:

H.R. 5166. A bill to prohibit certain acts involving the importation, transportation, possession, or use of explosives; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5167. A bill to prohibit certain acts involving the importation, transportation, possession, or use of explosives; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5168. A bill to amend and revise the laws relating to immigration, naturalization, nationality, and citizenship, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5169. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code so as to prohibit certain acts involving the importation, possession, or use of explosives, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5170. A bill to effectuate and enforce the constitutional right to the equal protection of the laws, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5171. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 so as to increase the minimum hourly wage from $1 to $1.25; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 5172. A bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act in order to permit supervisors to be considered as employees under the provisions of such act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 5173. A bill to establish an effective program to alleviate conditions of substantial and persistent unemployment and underemployment in certain economically depressed areas; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. HERLONG:

H.R. 5174. A bill to amend section 103 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, relating to interest on certain governmental obligations, and section 10 of the United States Housing Act of 1937, relating to annual contributions in assistance of low-rent housing; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HUDDLESTON:

H.R. 5175. A bill to amend the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Maryland:

H.R. 5176. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to permit the retention of chaplains as Reserve officers; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. LESINSKI:

H.R. 5177. A bill to terminate the retailers and manufacturers excise taxes (other than taxes for the highway trust fund and taxes for fish and wildlife purposes) and the excise taxes on facilities and services; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MORRISON:

H.R. 5178. A bill to provide for health and medical services for civilian employees in Government service overseas and their dependents, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 5179. A bill to amend title 14, United States Code, to provide for the patrol of the coastal waterways of the United States; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. ABERNETHY:

H.R. 5180. A bill to enable producers to provide a supply of turkeys adequate to meet the needs of consumers, to maintain orderly marketing conditions, and to promote and expand the consumption of turkeys and turkey products; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ANDREWS:

H.R. 5181. A bill to protect the right of the blind to self-expression through organizations of the blind; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BAKER:

H.R. 5182. A bill to amend the Federal Employees' Compensation Act to provide compensation for the anatomical loss, or loss of use, of a procreative organ as a result of a personal injury sustained by a Federal employee while in the performance of his duty; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 5183. A bill to protect the right of the blind to self-expression through organizations of the blind; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BENTLEY:

H.R. 5184. A bill to amend the antitrust laws by vesting in the Federal Trade Commission jurisdiction to prevent monopolistic acts or practices and other unlawful restraints in commerce by certain persons engaged in commerce in meat and meat products, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CLARK:

H.R. 5185. A bill to extend by 1 year the period for which additional benefits may be paid under the Temporary Unemployment Compensation Act of 1958; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CRAMER:

H.R. 5186. A bill to punish the use of interstate commerce in furtherance of conspiracies to commit terroristic crimes and activities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DIGGS:

H.R. 5187. A bill to prohibit discrimination in employment because of race, religion, color, national origin, or ancestry; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 5188. A bill to authorize the establishment of a Youth Conservation Corps to provide healthful outdoor training and employment for young men, and to advance the conservation, development, and management of national resources of timber, soil, and range, and of recreational areas; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 5189. A bill to declare certain rights of all persons within the jurisdiction of the United States, and for the protection of such persons from lynching, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5190. A bill outlawing the poll tax as a condition for voting in any primary or other election for national officers; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H.R. 5191. A bill to provide for the establishment of a food-stamp plan for the distribution of $1 billion worth of surplus food commodities a year to needy persons and families in the United States; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. DULSKI:

H.R. 5192. A bill to amend section 703(b) of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, relating to longevity step increases; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. FORAND:

H.R. 5193. A bill to amend section 162 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that certain expenditures incurred in connection with measures submitted to the electorate shall be allowed as business deductions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FOLEY:

H.R. 5194. A bill to establish the Chesapeake and Ohio Canal National Historical Park and to provide for the administration and maintenance of a parkway, in the State of Maryland, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 5195. A bill to define the status of retired members of the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mrs. GRANAHAN:

H.R. 5196. A bill to increase the maximum rates of per diem allowance for employees of the Government traveling on official business, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mrs. GREEN of Oregon:

H.R. 5197. A bill to amend the Employment Act of 1946 to establish policies with respect to productive capital investments of the Government; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. GUBSER:

H.R. 5198. A bill to establish a system for the classification and compensation of scientific and professional positions in the Federal Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 5199. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that food and nonalcoholic beverages served at a roof garden, cabaret, or other similar place shall not be subject to the cabaret tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 5200. A bill to provide that an individual's service on vessels of the Army Transport Service during World War II, if insufficient for a civil service retirement annuity, shall in certain cases constitute "employment" for social security purposes upon payment of the applicable employment taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 5201. A bill to amend section 522 of title 38, United States Code, to raise the income limitations applicable with respect to veterans entitled to pension for non-service-connected disability; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. GUBSER (by request):

H.R. 5202. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to provide for the payment to veterans of an amount equal to the cost of repairing or replacing certain prosthetic and other appliances damaged or destroyed as a result of certain accidents; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. HALEY:

H.R. 5203. A bill to amend the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921, to provide for the retirement of the public debt by setting aside the first 5 percent of the budget receipts of the United States for each fiscal year for the sole purpose of retirement of obligations counted as part of the public debt; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. HARRISON:

H.R. 5204. A bill to equalize taxation and provide revenue; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HÉBERT:

H.R. 5205. A bill to amend Public Law 455 approved March 29, 1956 (H.R. 6309), authorizing the construction of the Mississippi River-Gulf outlet; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. HERLONG:

H.R. 5206. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to reduce to 5 percent the manufacturers excise tax on self-contained air-conditioning units; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 5207. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the basis (for determining gain or loss) of property acquired from a decedent; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KING of California:

H.R. 5208. A bill to provide that the tax on admissions shall not apply to admissions to a moving-picture theater; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McDONOUGH:

H.R. 5209. A bill to provide for the establishment of a U.S. Foreign Service Academy; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. McMILLAN:

H.R. 5210. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Alcoholic Beverage Control Act to permit the Board to use its discretion in the case of the requirement relating to the serving of beer at public tables; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. POLK:

H.R. 5211. A bill to amend the Federal Employees Salary Increase Act of 1958 to grant certain increases in compensation to employees of the agricultural stabilization and conservation county committees, to bring employees of agricultural stabilization and conservation county committees within the purview of the Civil Service Retirement Act and the Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance Act of 1954, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. REES of Kansas:

H.R. 5212. A bill to revise the minimum charge on pieces of mail of odd sizes and shapes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. SAUND:

H.R. 5213. A bill to provide for the assessment of costs against the United States in the case entitled *"United States* v. *Fallbrook Public Utility District"*; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCOTT:

H.R. 5214. A bill to repeal the excise tax on amounts paid for communication services or facilities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SMITH of Kansas:

H.R. 5215. A bill to regulate the foreign commerce of the United States by amending section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TELLER:

H.R. 5216. A bill to amend the Social Security Act and the Internal Revenue Code so as to provide insurance against the costs of hospital, nursing home, and surgical service for persons eligible for old-age and survivors insurance benefits, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. VANIK:

H.R. 5217. A bill to insure the equal protection of the laws to all persons regardless of race, color, religion, or national origin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5218. A bill to effectuate and enforce the constitutional right to the equal protection of the laws, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WALLHAUSER:

H.R. 5219. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase the amount of outside earnings permitted from $1,200 to $1,800 yearly without deductions from benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WILLIAMS:

H.R. 5220. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide an exemption from the tax on club dues for nonprofit hunting and fishing clubs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WITHROW:

H.R. 5221. A bill to regulate the foreign commerce of the United States by amending section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as

amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ZABLOCKI:

H.R. 5222. A bill to provide for continuity and support of study, research, and development of programs for peaceful uses in science, commerce, and other activities related to Antarctica, which shall include, but shall not be limited to, gathering, evaluating, correlating, and dispersing of information and knowledge obtained from exploration, research, and other mediums relating to weather, communications, travel, and other areas of information; also to coordinate Antarctic activities among those agencies of the U.S. Government and private institutions interested in or concerned directly with the promotion, advancement, increase, and diffusion of knowledge of the Antarctic; and to direct and administer U.S. Antarctic programs in the national interest; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. DIGGS:

H.J. Res. 279. Joint resolution to establish the Emancipation Proclamation Centennial Celebration Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HARRIS:

H.J. Res. 280. Joint resolution consenting to an interstate compact to conserve oil and gas; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MAILLIARD:

H.J. Res. 281. Joint resolution authorizing and requesting the President to issue a proclamation with respect to the 1959 Pacific Festival, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ROBISON:

H.J. Res. 282. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to disapproval of items in general appropriation bills; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SAUND:

H.J. Res. 283. Joint resolution to authorize participation by the United States in parliamentary conferences with Mexico; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DIXON:

H. Con. Res. 94. Concurrent resolution favoring the operation of very high frequency television booster or repeater stations under certain conditions; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. GEORGE:

H. Res. 192. Resolution to authorize the Committee on Armed Services to conduct an investigation and study to determine why the Sunflower Ordnance Plant near Eudora, Kans., is not being utilized; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. MILLIKEN:

H. Res. 193. Resolution relating to TVA contracts; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. PATMAN:

H. Res. 194. Resolution providing for printing additional copies of House Report No. 2713, 85th Congress; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. SAUND:

H. Res. 195. Resolution authorizing investigation of the effect of imports of fresh fruits and vegetables on Imperial, Coachella, Palo Verde Valleys, and other southern California area growers; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WHITTEN:

H. Res. 196. Resolution to create a select committee to investigate and study the operations of the Department of Agriculture and the Commodity Credit Corporation; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. BOYKIN: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Alabama to the Congress of the United States to call a convention, as provided by article V of the Constitution of the United States of America, to consider submitting to the legislatures of the several States for their ratification an amendment to the Constitution in substantially the following form: "No statute of any of the several States shall be held to be invalid as in conflict with any Federal statute, unless such Federal statute expressly provides that such statutes of the several States in conflict therewith are invalid"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Alabama, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to requesting an amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BOYLE:

H.R. 5223. A bill for the relief of the Moy King Foo family; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5224. A bill for the relief of Constantina Dina Koudounis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRADEMAS:

H.R. 5225. A bill to authorize the advance on the retired list of M. Sgt. Chester E. Games, U.S. Army (retired) to the grade of first lieutenant; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. CRAMER:

H.R. 5226. A bill for the relief of Vincent Ristorcelli; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DANIELS:

H.R. 5227. A bill for the relief of John Wrocenski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 5228. A bill for the relief of Liliana Integlia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HERLONG:

H.R. 5229. A bill for the relief of Patrick W. Gowan, David Dooling, Harlie L. Mize, James H. Blaes, and William L. Perkins; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5230. A bill for the relief of the Simpson Construction Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOLTZMAN:

H.R. 5231. A bill for the relief of Rita Charles; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MULTER:

H.R. 5232. A bill for the relief of Isidor Sturm and his wife, Olga Sturm; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROONEY:

H.R. 5233. A bill for the relief of Zsuzsanna Reisz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

91. By Mr. HORAN: Petition of 612 citizens of Sprague, Wash., urging that no increased taxes be enacted and that the Federal Government confine their expenditures to existing sources and limits of revenue; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

92. By Mr. KNOX: Two petitions of residents of the Upper Peninsula of Michigan in behalf of the sovereign state of Finland and its people; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

93. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the city clerk, of the city of Dunkirk, N.Y., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the late Congressman Daniel A. Reed, distinguished citizen of Dunkirk, N.Y., and Member of Congress; to the Committee on House Administration.

94. Also, petition of Ray Willis, and others, Louisville, Ky., relative to requesting the impeachment and indictment of members of the U.S. Supreme Court; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

95. Also, petition of Mrs. Ruth B. Nelson, San Bernardino, Calif., relative to appropriating remuneration for her claim of redress of grievance; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

"Up Came Hill"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEO W. O'BRIEN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 3, 1959

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Mr. Speaker, too often the stress and strain of current events distort and exaggerate the geographical differences among our people of the North, South, East, and West.

In the broader area of national understanding, however, there are frequent and encouraging signs that ancient prejudices and hatreds are being buried beneath a recognition of the fact that a man's worth should not be measured by the geographical accident of place of birth or by the manner in which he approaches the pronunciation of certain syllables.

Recently, Congress in joint session heard a moving tribute to Abraham Lincoln. Countless people from the North think with affection of the gentle Robert E. Lee.

Any man who contributes to true historical perspective, recognizing ability and merit without respect to the Mason-Dixon line, deserves commendation.

That is why, today, I call attention to a great new book, "Up Came Hill," which brings to life a Confederate general, A. P. Hill, whose deeds too long have been hidden from the true light of history.

This book was written by a distinguished resident of my home city, Judge Martin Schenck. I know something of the monumental labor which went into this lively and readable book.

Most significant to me, however, is the fact that a busy northern gentleman should give so much of himself to provide full measure of historical right to a man who fought in the Confederate Army.

It is one more indication that we are, despite surface signs, a united nation.

Address of Samuel S. Stratton, of New York, at the Democratic National Victory Dinner, Sheraton Park Hotel, Washington, D.C., February 28, 1959

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 3, 1959

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday evening, February 28, 1959, there was held at the Sheraton Park Hotel a tremendous Democratic national victory dinner, which dinner was a great success. Among those who spoke at the dinner was our distinguished colleague, from New York, Mr. STRATTON, who made an outstanding address, which address was received with great enthusiasm.

Congressman STRATTON well said:

And yet the astounding fact is that last fall, in district after district, for all of our individual differences, people who never voted for a Democrat before in their lives, helped to elect Democratic Congressmen, Senators, and Governors. Why? Well, I think it was because people in all walks of life, people in both major political parties, big people as well as little people, even the farmers and small businessmen and workers of traditionally Republican upstate New York, turned to the Democratic candidates, not just because of a party label, but because all these people were desperately hungry, in such dark and critical days, for dynamic, energetic, creative, courageous and fresh political leadership in America. Disheartened, disillusioned, and disappointed with the past, they turned last fall almost as one to the candidates and the party that seemed to them to speak directly to their personal need.

His broad national outlook is also evidenced by the following nonpartisan remarks:

There can be no room today for narrow partisanship or for doctrinaire dogma. Ours must be a fresh, positive program that believes in the future of our land—one that is not tired, not discouraged, not obsessed with false shadows from the past—one which refuses to let America settle weakly for second place in the race for world survival but which is determined instead to see America grow into an even greater and a stronger land, where all may live together in freedom and in peace.

Mr. Speaker, in my extension of remarks I include the able address made by the gentleman from New York, Mr. STRATTON.

Commissioner Donohue, Bishop Hannan, Rabbi Siegel, Speaker Rayburn, distinguished guests, fellow Democrats, and those discriminating and farsighted Republicans you brought with you: You may recall that when Winston Churchill addressed a joint session of Congress in the early days of World War II he remarked, "If my father had been an American and my mother a Britisher, instead of the other way around, I might have made it into these halls on my own."

I know I speak for all my freshman colleagues in the House when I say that the possibility of making it into Congress on ones own is indeed one of the more magnificent features of the heritage of every American citizen. Those of us who were lucky enough to make it here last fall, not on our own exactly but with all kinds of help from all kinds of wonderful people, are already beginning to wonder just how we did it. Some of us may even be wondering how we are going to be able to do it again.

No one freshman Congressman, of course, can presume to speak for all of us. Each of our races was unique. People have asked me how, as the Democratic mayor of a Republican city that hadn't sent a Democrat to Congress in 42 years, I ever got elected. Well, the answer, I tell them, is very simple: I made myself so objectionable, they had to send me to Congress to get me out of town.

"Don't you miss being a big frog in a small puddle?" some have said, "now that you're such a small frog in such a big puddle?" Well, that's an easy one to answer too. Frankly, a mayor's job is all right, but I think it's wonderful just to be in the majority for a change. And such a big majority too.

You know, as mayor of Schenectady, I couldn't even promote myself a place to park in around city hall. So you can imagine the thrill I had the first day I arrived down here to see those signs around the House Office Building, "Reserved for Members of Congress." I drove right up there and parked, even before we had on our special tags. "Hey, you can't park here," the cop told me, "those are for Members of Congress." "Well," I said, "I'm a Member of Congress." "Oh, yeah," the cop said. You know, for a moment, I felt right at home.

And yet the astounding fact is that last fall, in district after district, for all of our individual differences, people who never voted for a Democrat before in their lives, helped to elect Democratic Congressmen, Senators, and Governors. Why? Well, I think it was because people in all walks of life, people in both major political parties, big people as well as little people, even the farmers and small businessmen and workers of traditionally Republican upstate New York, turned to the Democratic candidates, not just because of a party label, but because all these people were desperately hungry, in such dark and critical days, for dynamic, energetic, creative, courageous, and fresh political leadership in America. Disheartened, disillusioned, and disappointed with the past, they turned last fall almost as one to the candidates and the party that seemed to them to speak directly to their personal need.

And so tonight as we gather, quite properly, to celebrate our amazing victories of 1958, let us Democrats not lose sight of the fact that in our triumph we have also inherited a profound and far-reaching and solemn challenge.

For I am deeply convinced that the American people turned to Democratic leadership last fall because they realized that in Speaker SAM RAYBURN and in Senator LYNDON JOHNSON was embodied the kind of sober, responsible forthright, and forward-looking and energetic national leadership that they were seeking.

So it is for us, the rank and file members of the 86th Congress, working together in the days ahead, to bring the promise of that new leadership to real fulfillment in a constructive legislative program designed for all America.

There can be no room today for narrow partisanship or for doctrinaire dogma. Ours must be a fresh, positive program that believes in the future of our land—one that is not tired, not discouraged, not obsessed with false shadows from the past—one which refuses to let America settle weakly for second place in the race for world survival but which is determined instead to see America grow into an even greater and a stronger land, where all may live together in freedom and in peace.

If, as I believe, we Democrats of the 86th Congress do move forward to build just that kind of courageous and dynamic program, then we as a party need have no doubts that we will elect both a Democratic Congress and a Democratic President in 1960.

And when that happens—you and I will have won victory again, not just for ourselves, not just for our glorious party, but—what is even more important—for the future of the American people and for all who love liberty, wherever they may be.

Outstanding Federal Administrator and Federal Employee for the Year 1958

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THADDEUS M. MACHROWICZ
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 3, 1959

Mr. MACHROWICZ. Mr. Speaker, the Federal Business Association of Detroit grants annual awards to the outstanding Federal administrator and the Federal employee of the year.

On February 24, 1959, at the Veterans Memorial Building in Detroit, awards for the year 1958 were made to William T. Hunt, an outstanding Federal administrator and to Herbert S. Hubbs as outstanding Federal employee for the year 1958.

I believe this practice of the Federal Business Association of Detroit to be a very worthy one and conducive to the promotion of higher standards in Federal service. I congratulate the association on its practice and also the recipients on the honor bestowed upon them.

Mr. Hunt, manager, Michigan field office, U.S. Department of Commerce, at Detroit, was born in Arkansas and reared in Indian Territory, now Oklahoma. He enlisted in the Army in June 1917 and served 2 years overseas. Mr. Hunt was American Vice Consul in Barbados, West Indies, from 1920 to 1923. From 1924 to 1945 he had responsible domestic and foreign positions in private industry, including domestic production and sales management, and establishment of distribution and plants throughout Europe.

Joining the Department of Commerce in 1945 as assistant manager of the Detroit office, he was promoted to manager in 1946. His office has been most active in serving all business and the public in development and promotion of domestic and foreign trade.

During the Korean war, the National Production Authority under Commerce controlled the production, distribution, and use of strategic materials and promoted conservation. Mr. Hunt organized and directed this important and complicated operation in Michigan.

Mr. Hunt was sent to Thailand by his Department from 1954 to 1955 on the first

official marketing mission ever sent to a foreign nation in connection with an international trade fair. He is very active in many business and civic organizations, and holds and has held major offices in such groups.

Mr. Hubbs, shop superintendent, post ordnance, Fort Wayne, was born April 16, 1902, at Knoxville, Tenn. He has been a resident of the Detroit area since 1926.

He entered military service in February 1942 and immediately following his discharge in May 1945 he entered civilian Government service as an auto mechanic at Fort Wayne. Mr. Hubb's ability was immediately recognized and within a short time he was promoted to the position of shop superintendent.

Mr. Hubbs established and carried through a safety program which resulted in the Ordnance Division receiving the Fort Wayne merit award for safety performance.

As area fire marshall he earned for the Ordnance Division the award for outstanding performance in fire prevention and protection for both 1957 and 1958. In addition, he has personally received several outstanding performance ratings and several commendations from officers under whose commands he served.

Tax Relief for Retirement Plans for the Self-Employed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KEN HECHLER
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 3, 1959

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, one of the most cherished principles of constitutional government is equality under the law. As Members of Congress we have a special responsibility to see that the legislation which appears on the statute books affords equal treatment to all classes of people in America. Today I would like to raise my voice in support of legislation which is intended to achieve greater equality of tax treatment for those of the self-employed in this country who have the wisdom and the initiative to plan for their retirement years.

I refer, of course, to H.R. 10, introduced by our distinguished colleague from New York, the Honorable EUGENE KEOGH, which was recently reported out of the Ways and Means Committee. This measure was passed overwhelmingly by this body last session but died in the Senate Finance Committee. I wish to congratulate the Ways and Means Committee for their speedy handling of the bill this session. The Congress over the years has studied the Keogh-Simpson-Reed-Jenkins bills with a thoroughness which can be matched by its consideration of very few legislative proposals.

The purpose of H.R. 10 is to reduce the inequity of tax treatment between employees under qualified pension plans and the self-employed. Under pension arrangements which meet the requirements of the Internal Revenue Code, an employee is not taxed on the amount of the retirement contribution paid on his behalf until his retirement benefit is actually paid. This means, in most instances, that this amount will be taxable to the employee at a time when his income is much lower, because he has retired, than it was when the contribution was paid during his working life. Moreover, the employer can deduct the amount of this contribution to the employee's pension as a part of his cost of doing business. The self-employed individual, on the other hand, can get no deductions for the annuity contracts he purchases or the retirement investments he makes and his income is fully taxed at the time of his highest earnings.

H.R. 10 would modify this discriminatory situation by allowing self-employed individuals to take a tax deduction for a limited amount of investment in certain types of retirement annuities, or retirement trusts. The bill would make this deduction available to all self-employed individuals who fall within the meaning of this term as it is defined under the Social Security Act. It would also include doctors and certain ministers who are not self-employed for social-security coverage purposes. The allowable tax deduction would generally be limited to 10 percent of earnings with a deduction ceiling of $2,500 for a year and $50,000 for a lifetime. So that older persons who would have to build up their retirement plans within a shorter period of time would not be disadvantaged, the bill provides that the annual deduction ceiling could be higher for persons over 50 years of age on January 1, 1959.

The deductions would not be applicable to just any annuity contract or retirement trust fund. The annuity policy would have to provide for the starting of payments not later than the time the individual reaches the age of 70, the policy would have to be nonassignable, and if the policy includes a life insurance provision the premium on this portion could not be used for deduction purposes. Similar restrictions are put on the retirement funds authorized under the act. Amounts received by the individual from restricted retirement funds or policies will generally be treated as ordinary taxable income at the time they are received during his retirement years.

To prevent a person from withdrawing the funds invested under one of these restricted plans before the age of 65, a penalty provision is incorporated which, in most cases, would provide that the withdrawals would be taxed at 110 percent of the liability otherwise resulting from including such sums as taxable income.

The legislation presented has been accepted by a substantial segment of the English-speaking world. Great Britain's law on this subject in 1956 was based on the distinguished white paper of the Committee on the Taxation Treatment of Provisions for Retirement headed by Sir James Millard Tucker. Canada followed with legislation in 1957 and the proposal has been under active consideration in Australia and New Zealand. The bill in this country has undergone many revisions and the product we have here today has been modified to answer many of the objections that have previously been raised.

Most of the revisions that have been incorporated into the legislation since it was first considered by the 82d Congress in 1951 have been aimed at reducing the loss of tax revenue by the Federal Government if the bill is enacted. The present administration, although admitting "that the present law does not give self-employed people tax treatment for their retirement savings comparable to that now accorded to employees covered by employer-financed plans," nevertheless has felt compelled to oppose this bill at this time because of the revenue loss. The Treasury Department in its report has estimated that the revenue loss for fiscal 1960 would be $320 million and for the first full year of operation, $365 million.

Testimony before the Ways and Means Committee, however, has questioned the validity of some aspects of the Treasury Department estimate. For instance, some individuals who have studied the provision, believe that the revenue loss would be less than one half the Treasury estimate for the first full year of operation. These people maintain that the experience of Canada and Great Britain has been that the use of the deduction has started on a small scale and has grown slowly.

The fact that there will be revenue loss is axiomatic, of course, with a bill that affords tax relief. I think one is entitled to ask, however, whether this aspect alone can justify the further postponement of this legislation. The equities, in my view, are controlling in this situation and, therefore, I urge the passage of H.R. 10 at the earliest opportunity.

Four Hundred and Fifty-ninth Troop Carrier Wing Wins Safety Award

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD E. LANKFORD
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 3, 1959

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. Speaker, it is with considerable pride and pleasure that I call the attention of my colleagues to the fact that the 459th Troop Carrier Wing, the Washington area's Air Force Reserve flying unit, has won the Continental Air Command's Flying Safety Plaque, emblematic of the best flight safety record in the command. A great many men of this wing are residents of Maryland's Fifth Congressional District, which I have the honor of representing in Congress.

Commander of the wing is Brig. Gen. Ramsay D. Potts, Jr., a prominent Washington lawyer in civilian life and one of the country's most decorated airmen in World War II.

The wing, composed of some 1,500 Air Force reservists who come to Andrews 1 weekend a month to train, have flown

over 26,000 hours and almost 5 million miles, never having an aircraft accident since their inception in July 1954. For the past several years, the unit has boasted their record as not only the best in the command but in the entire Air Force. The award at least substantiates part of the claim. Air Force records are not refined enough to check their performance against other units.

Giving more luster to the wing's accomplishment is the fact that the Federal aeronautics agency has designated the Washington area as one of the three cities with the highest air traffic density in the Nation, thus posing a hazard to flying training.

The award is made each year to the unit that rates the highest in each of the following four areas: (1) Utilization of assigned aircraft and the amount of flying time performed; (2) the mission of the organization and operational tasks accomplished during the period; (3) all other factors influencing the flying hazards faced by the organization, such as accident proneness of type of aircraft flown, air traffic density, weather conditions and terrain; (4) quality of the unit's accident prevention program.

I know I do not speak for myself alone when I say "congratulations" to General Potts and the men of the 459th wing for attaining this most outstanding flight safety record.

Statement in Support of H.R. 3090

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT ZELENKO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 3, 1959

Mr. ZELENKO. Mr. Speaker, at this time I wish to place in the RECORD the following statement I delivered today before Subcommittee No. 5 of the Committee on the Judiciary in support of H.R. 3090 and other civil rights legislation:

Mr. Chairman and my distinguished colleagues, I wish to thank you for affording me this time to speak in support of H.R. 3090. This legislation is similar to many of the bills now being heard by your committee to implement and to expedite progress toward the removing of the stigma of second-class citizenry from millions of first-class Americans.

Enactment of this type of legislation is immediately necessary for we have been most dilatory after nearly 200 years of our proclaimed credo of equality for all in making this principle a fact. In today's changing and turbulent world, we hear the birth cries of new nations achieving their independence. We hear the wails of those peoples whose equality and independence is being stifled and we see the tears of those whose equality has been taken away. These sounds and sights are apparent now not only to us in Washington but also to the Communist overlords in Moscow.

In the present world conflict, more important than the material assistance we offer these people and countries, is our promise to treat with them on the basis of freedom and equality. How can we hope to convince them of our sincerity when it is so apparent to them that millions of our own citizens are in second-class status?

Opponents of this and similar measures argue that this legislation is merely an attempt to destroy their customary and long secured way of life. I respect their opinions but disagree with them that it is in the best interests of our Nation to maintain their status quo.

The history of short-lived nations and civilizations is undisputed in one important respect—that no nation can long exist which is built on the subjugation, in greater or lesser degree, of a large segment of its people.

We, as the leaders of the free world, offer to other nations the principle of equity. By what logic do we refuse it to our own people?

Let us in the spirit, heritage, and requirement of our democracy pass this legislation which is popularly called civil rights but which is freedom rights.

Some Facts About the Budget

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOE L. EVINS
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 3, 1959

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, in my newsletter last week I called the attention of the people of the great Fourth District of Tennessee, which I have the honor to represent, to some facts about the President's budget which have not received as much discussion and consideration as, in my view, they deserve.

Under unanimous consent, I am inserting this newsletter in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. The newsletter follows:

SOME FACTS ABOUT THE BUDGET

The Appropriations Committee of the House is continuing its hearings, studies, and consideration of all aspects of the President's budget proposals.

Everybody wants economy in Government and everyone wants a balanced budget for the Nation. These are the objectives to be desired. However, in the widespread discussions and debates about the limit and extent of the budget, there are certain facts that have not received much discussion.

For example, we hear much talk about "the wild spending in the Congress." What many sometimes do not realize is that much of this so-called wild spending comes about by the recommendations of the President, his Director of the Bureau of the Budget, and the members of the executive departments. In this connection, it should be pointed out that since 1952 the Federal budget has increased from $60 billion to $80 billion. This year the President is proposing an overall budget of $77 billion. Every year since 1952, the President has presented to the Congress larger budgets, calling for increased Federal expenditures. Every year—with the exception of last year when we were threatened with an economic depression—the Congress has reduced the budget by several billions of dollars and in 1957 by some $5 billion.

Members of the Appropriations Committee, during the current hearings, have been somewhat startled—and certainly it has been revealing—to note that every head of each executive agency, without exception, is asking for increased personnel, increased appropriations and a larger budget for their own departments. This includes the Budget Bureau itself, which is asking for an increase of 5 percent in new appropriations; and the White House where the budget has been increased by 33 percent in the past 2 years, and even the Secretary of the Treasury.

After making this closer look at the President's budget, it is apparent that the President is not recommending that spending be reduced in certain areas but rather increased. The proposed economies in the budget are almost entirely in the field of investments in new assets for the Nation, such as public works projects, the development of our own resources and loans that are repayable. In other words, the President's budget calls for cuts in capital assets and investments in the Nation and for increased expenditures in other departments. This means more spending and less investment.

Some news reports have indicated and great claims are made that the proposed budget is a balanced budget. There are several contingencies which are not realized and in all probability will not be realized. Therefore, the budget is not in reality balanced. These contingencies include again raising the postal rates to the people of the Nation—to which the Congress is not likely to give its approval—(2) increasing again gasoline taxes—(3) not considering supplemental appropriations requests, of which there are annually several in number, and (4) the sale of national mortgages and securities held by the Treasury, which would bring in some income to the Government if sold at reduced rates and with profit to private investors. In considering these contingencies and on second examination, the proposed budget is not in fact balanced because these contingencies are not likely to materialize.

The Congress will address itself to the merits of the various proposals and no doubt will approve some of the recommendations, alter and amend others and substitute, in several instances, the collective judgment of the elected Representatives of the people in substitution for departmental recommendations. Keeping in mind previous action of the Congress, it is very likely that the final budget, after all these adjustments, will come closer in reality to being balanced than the budget presented to the Congress and now under consideration.

Address by the Honorable Clifford Davis Before the Fire Department Instructors Conference, in Memphis, Tenn.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. CARLTON LOSER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 3, 1959

Mr. LOSER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I want to include an excellent address by our colleague, the Honorable CLIFFORD DAVIS, before the Fire Department Instructors Conference, in Memphis, Tenn., on Tuesday, February 24, 1959.

CLIFFORD DAVIS is a brilliant speaker and I am sure the people attending the conference appreciated him taking the time out of his busy schedule to speak to them. The address should be read by every person interested in fire prevention and fire fighting. It follows:

Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen, I acknowledge with genuine gratitude the honor which you have accorded me today. This is the second time that I have had the pleasure of speaking on an occasion of this

character. Six years ago we met on the 25th anniversary of the establishment of the Fire Department Instructors Conference, and now I am grateful for the opportunity to discuss with you briefly the past 25 years in Memphis.

On this occasion it is natural for me to give you the unusual history of these many annual meetings in our city of Memphis. Soon after I assumed the office of fire and police commissioner I was able to name the late Irby Klinck, chief. He was one of the most beloved and finished firemen I have known anything about. A man of courage, ability and high character, he became my genuine, devoted friend and a loyal worker in the truest description of the term.

I shall never forget the chief coming to me one morning 25 years ago and stating that we had an opportunity to entertain this conference. In those days we were making every effort to make more efficient a fire department which had already shown fine progress.

Chief Klinck was a natural-born firefighter. For the first time in the history of our department he recognized as chief the value of training, fire prevention, and the development of more scientific methods in combating fire.

Recognizing the possibilities of such a meeting, I went to work enthusiastically as fire commissioner to support him.

In that first Memphis meeting only 106 men registered from 18 States, but it did not take me long to see the extreme value of the organization to the Memphis Fire Department and to the Nation. In those days our dear friend, Richard Vernor, who has since gone to his reward, was the dynamic originator and leader in this whole program. He was truly a dedicated man.

On the concluding day of the conference I took the platform and urged him to bring the conference back to Memphis the next year and was even so bold as to suggest that this should be the permanent meeting place of the meeting. He and his associates considered the invitation and returned. Originally we met in the fire headquarters, a rather antiquated building even in those days.

It was our idea that the department serve a daily complimentary luncheon. My warm friend, Mayor Overton, who is now deceased, fairly hit the ceiling when he signed the voucher covering a payment for onions, potatoes, and coffee, for the fire department. I know that you are still eating at noon and that the department is participating in those luncheons. Who pays for the 2,500 odd plates represented by the fantastic increase in attendance last year, I do not know, but if the city of Memphis is taking care of the entire cost, it is still ahead.

To me it is inspiring to know that John Klinck, now the chief officer of this department, is following in the footsteps of his splendid father in his recognition of the dividends which come from this conference, and is giving his best as co-chairman of this meeting.

I had the pleasure to give John Klinck his first employment. He came to the service upon completing his high school work. His father and I thought it would be temporary. Possessed of all the fine attributes of that father, he brought to this place of responsibility a scholastic education not possessed by his father. In addition he had the vision of youth and an amazing ability for organization.

I am delighted to know that my successors in the office of fire and police commissioner have supported the department and this conference, but I am simply delighted and thrilled with the accomplishments made under the direction of Commissioner Claude Armour.

To my mind, he is one of the best informed, most industrious fire commissioners in all of this country. His knowledge of firefighting organization, his vision for the future are outstanding.

On Sunday when I went through the Claude Armour Training and Communications Center, so appropriately named in recognition of his service to Memphis and the Mid-South, I could not help but think that this building and everything that goes within it shall ever stand as a lasting momument to his effectiveness and worth in this field.

I could not help but be just a little envious when I learned that already a million dollars had been expended in this center, and when completed its value should approximate $2½ million. When I left the city as fire and police commissioner, 19 years ago, our fire department budget for all purposes was only a million dollars.

But in these last 19 years this city has just about doubled in size, populationwise. In industry, manufacturing, finance, and in all other segments of the economy, it has grown even more amazingly. With the additional area more men, fire stations, and equipment have been required. It has taken very careful planning on the part of the commissioner to provide all of this, as he has done so well.

So it is quite natural today that I should tell you that the spirit of this department, its development, its growth, its acceptance of scientific and specialized techniques, must relate itself directly to the very spirit of this Fire Department Instructors Conference.

Memphis is proud of the finest firefighting equipment in the country, and the department is composed of intelligent, well-trained, and high-spirited men from top to bottom. Memphis has gone on to win fire awards too numerous to mention. Your conference has brought to Memphis, the South, and to the Nation, a clinic so valuable that no one will know the number of lives saved, the property conserved, and the scientific gains accomplished.

This conference is unique in that there is no promotion, no politics, and no organizational difficulties. The annual attendance has grown fantastically.

Represented by a group of serious-minded people in exchanging ideas and experiences to be mutually helpful, this organization has grown without promotion on its own through a real job of program development by the Western Actuarial Bureau, and superb planning by the Memphis Fire Department and the cooperation of intelligent, experienced, and wise officers and instructors from fire departments throughout the land.

Unselfish appearances of learned professors and scientific minds from the colleges and universities along with the appearance of governmental officials and representatives of industry and business have made this conference outstanding.

It was in this very city that the first demonstration of a civil defense municipal control center was demonstrated. It was here at this meeting that 50 industries sent their people in 1952, as did over 50 bases of the Armed Forces.

During World War II, the chiefs of 105 explosive ordnance plants were in attendance. While many of you return from year to year, there is still a turnover of 40 percent which denotes the permanency of the organization on the one hand and the opportunity to sow the seed of ambitious progress on the other.

Fire is as old as the world itself. We have but to go back to history to see the damage that it has wrought.

In Rome, about the year 46 B.C., Julius Caesar had nearly completed the construction of the Basilica Julia, a magnificent law courts building, when it was almost destroyed by fire. After the assassination of Caesar 2 years later, Augustus completed the structure as Caesar had intended. Even after all these years, the platform still remains a relic of architectural antiquity and of a serious fire of ancient history.

In the year 64 years after Christ, Rome was nearly destroyed by a fire that burned for several days.

Passing on to 1666 history records the great London fire which consumed the ancient Cathedral of St. Paul, 86 churches, the royal exchange, customs-house, hospitals, libraries, and prisons.

Previous to the year 1795, the town of Boston, then such a flourishing city of science, culture, and enterprise, was visited by a score of fires extensive in their destruction and frightful in desolation. The distressing calamities which had come to Boston from destructive fires induced the people to make the prevention of fire and the relief of sufferers one of their firts objects of charity and philanthropy. The National Fire Protection Association, so ably directed by Percy Bugbee, today has its headquarters in that city of Boston, which appreciated the importance of early fire improvements.

I could go on to mention the New York City fire of 1835 and many others. Perhaps the most spectacular fire in all history, which turned the thoughts of the Nation more vividly and intelligently to improving building ordinances and the beginning of firefighting techniques, was the great Chicago fire which began on Sunday evening, October 8, 1871, in the O'Leary stable.

Would that I had time to review again the dramatics and the serious consequences of this conflagration, but suffice to say that in its fury demon fire knows not wealth, nor creed, nor race, nor station in life. When the last glowing ember had been extinguished, in that Chicago fire, 17,000 homes were in ruins, 90,000 were homeless, 300 lives had been lost. Property, valued even in those days of values, reflected a loss of more than $200 million, and five square miles lay a smouldering waste.

But one may say, "Those fires occurred many years ago. Haven't our improved firefighting equipment, our more drastic fire laws, and better-trained firemen made such holocausts impossible?" The answer is "No."

Every year we have some 40 major fire catastrophies in which large areas of cities, towns, and forest lands are burned and hundreds of lives are lost.

We have but to remember the tragic Cocoanut Grove fire in Boston, in 1942, and the Rhythm Club in Natchez, Miss., a year before. Except for the number of fatalities, it was the same ghastly story as its successor in Boston—a crowd beyond capacity, insufficient exits, flimsy drapes and decorations that burned like gunpowder, frantic guests fighting for their lives and falling unconscious.

Then there was the Winecoff Hotel fire in Atlanta. The terrible Bar Harbor, Maine, destruction, and we remember afresh, vividly and with sadness the unfortunate school fire in Chicago last year.

All of these fires which I have mentioned made headlines because they reeked with tragedy, drama, and sensationalism. Yet these great conflagrations are but a fraction of our fire losses. For every great fire that is broadly publicized, thousands of American homes are burned without mention in current news.

The flame of a gas stove, the burning match, the lighted cigarette, the electric iron, the toaster on the breakfast table all become symbols of disaster.

A fire breaks out in the United States every 20 seconds. A human life is sacrificed every 44 minutes.

It is a well-established and accepted fact that the power of ignition inherent in animal and vegetable substances is often the cause of spontaneous combustion. Cotton, shavings and sawdust, hemp, flax, oily and greasy rags or rubbish, charcoal, turpentine,

paint materials, tarred rope, felt and sulphur are susceptible to low degrees of heat and are often the cause of fire.

There is nothing more frightful than the onrush of a blaze. The hurtling speed, the roaring motors of pumpers, of ladders, and hose trucks, the chorus of bellowing sirens, the grim faces of firemen precariously hanging on the hand rails, the opening furrow in traffic ahead as the right-of-way is given to fire fighters, the first glimpse of the lurid blaze and billowing smoke, the throbbing of the pumping engines, the clatter and thud of rising ladders, the orderly tangle of hose lines, hoarse shouts of command, the impassioned calls, "Water! Water!" the hissing streams from nozzles gleaming in the glare of searchlights, the hideous crackling and grumbling of flames, the heroism of unselfish men, the back-breaking drudgery, the discipline and orderly procedure, the skill and the knowledge gained from experience and at fire school, the complexity of the fire equipment, the drama, the tragedy, the heartbreak, the terror of victims, and the horror on the faces of an assembled crowd found at every fire make for a common understanding of the role that the fireman plays in our everyday life.

As we have seen gains in our march to improved pumping machinery, safety devices, water systems, we must not lose sight of the value of education. We must recognize the importance of the school program with its fire drills. The lessons learned by the young ones will be taken home to parents.

Fire Prevention Week, so effective in so many places, must be strengthened and encouraged. We must never overlook an opportunity to encourage civic and luncheon clubs in the consideration of fire problems.

Newspapers have always been effective and willing to dramatize the spectacular. We must ever be alert to give them short, effective and readable stories on how to prevent the smallest fire.

The night watchman, who for centuries has smoked a pipe and pulled his clock, must be taught the simple rudiments and later advanced by degrees to a better understanding of his tremendous task.

The radio and television may be used to inform and enlighten the people. The chief officer of the fire department today may well use a television film of actual fires for post mortem material, study, and improvement.

We know today that effective apparatus must be used and speed attained in conveying it to the scene of action. It has long been axiomatic that you can never make up on the road for the time you lost in the firehouse.

A smart fire officer encourages the utmost assistance from representatives of light, gas, telephone, and water utilities. Often these men go unnoticed and unrecognized, but it is they who cut electric lines, remove the danger of high power systems, and add to the sum total of safety.

It is the endeavor of all firemen to find every arrangement that will insure the application of water or chemical on a fire in its early stage. The wooden shingle has gone but new problems in construction are with us. Old hazards may have passed away. Gas is no longer used for illumination, but electricity has changed the construction of mercantile establishments and air-conditioning systems close many buildings tightly, leaving no easy places for ventilation. Plastics and chemicals have come a long way, as has television, the use of natural gas and now, atomic energy.

The Claude Armour Training and Communications Center, and all of our educational programs must advance to meet the requirements of specialization.

Uppermost in the minds of all the people at this moment is the conservation of our resources, the conservation of health, education, and opportunity. Water is short in many parts of the country. No longer can fire departments waste this valuable asset. Indeed, so-called wet water and chemicals and scientific use of this powerful weapon must be continually improved.

Communities that have put forth extraordinary effort in teaching fire prevention and the enforcement of fire laws have been rewarded by a substantial decrease in the number of fires, the number of lives saved, and the amount of property destroyed or damaged.

In this short period of a luncheon talk, I have tried to cover a lot of ground. But I am the first to admit that much more should have been said. If a description of the beginning of this conference in Memphis, the long historical background of the fire department profession, the need for applied specialization, training, prevention, and the necessity for public cooperation, along with the plea for continued application to high principle, be of any value, my hope is that my presence with you today may have been of some little worth.

The Byrd Antarctic Commission

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 3, 1959

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill to establish the Richard E. Byrd Antarctic Commission, in order to promote a more effective policy and to better protect our country's interests in the antarctic.

A similar bill has been introduced in the other House by the senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] for himself and for a number of other Senators.

I am delighted to sponsor this legislation in the House of Representatives. Our Government has been actively interested in the south polar region for over a century. As early as 1838, our Government sent its ships on an expedition led by Lt. Charles Wilkes, of the U.S. Navy, to explore Antarctica. Our interest in the exploration of that vital region has continued and grown in importance to this very day. Today, further exploration and potential utilization of Antarctica is of immediate concern to our Nation.

The proposal embodied in the Wiley-Zablocki bill calls for the establishment of a Commission—appropriately named the "Richard E. Byrd Antarctic Commission" in honor of the great explorer whose name symbolizes man's search into the unknown—which would plan, develop, organize, coordinate, and direct antarctic activities among agencies of the U.S. Government and private institutions so as to promote our national and civil objectives.

The specific duties and major purposes of the Commission would be as follows:

First. To collect, coordinate, and better utilize the available data on the south polar region.

Second. To reevaluate this data in the light of current needs, and, so far as possible, make recommendations for clearer, more effective policies.

Third. To conduct field and laboratory studies to further knowledge of science, commerce, and related activities.

Fourth. To conduct research, investigation, and experimentation in antarctic matters relating to the national defense and other interests of the United States.

Fifth. To assist, and, as necessary, direct plans by other U.S. agencies for operations or expeditions into the antarctic, for military, scientific, or other purposes.

Sixth. To establish a depository of information relating to the antarctic.

It is my sincere hope that this legislation will receive prompt and favorable consideration in this House.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I ask to have the text of the Wiley-Zablocki bill printed in the RECORD:

H.R. 5222

A bill to provide for continuity and support of study, research, and development of programs for peaceful uses in science, commerce, and other activities related to Antarctica, which shall include, but shall not be limited to, gathering, evaluating, correlating, and dispersing of information and knowledge obtained from exploration, research, and other mediums relating to weather, communications, travel, and other areas of information; also to coordinate Antarctic activities among those agencies of the United States Government and private institutions interested in or concerned directly with the promotion, advancement, increase, and diffusion of knowledge of the Antarctic; and to direct and administer United States Antarctic programs in the national interest

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Richard E. Byrd Antarctic Commission Act of 1959."

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 2. When used in this Act:

(1) "Commission" means the Richard E. Byrd Antarctic Commission.

(2) "Director" means the Director of the Commission.

(3) "Board" means the Board of Governors.

(4) "Commissioned officer" means a commissioned officer of the Armed Forces of the United States.

THE COMMISSION

SEC. 3. There is established in the executive branch of the Government, the Richard E. Byrd Antarctic Commission. The Commission shall consist of a Director, two Deputy Directors, and a Board of Governors.

FUNCTIONS OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 4. The Commission shall—

(1) maintain a depository of information relating to the Antarctic including: (A) all records of the Commission, (B) originals or copies of records within the executive branch relating to the Antarctic, (C) books, pamphlets, periodicals, and articles dealing with the Antarctic, and (D) such other information as the Commission considers desirable;

(2) conduct such field and laboratory studies and evaluations as it considers advisable to further the knowledge of the Antarctic in science, commerce, and related activities, which shall include, but shall not be limited to gathering, evaluating, and dispersing of information and knowledge obtained from exploration, research and other mediums, relating to weather, communications, travel, and other areas of information;

(3) publish or arrange for the publication of scientific, technical, historical, and general information so as to further the dissemination of information about the Antarctic,

when the dissemination is consistent with the interests of national security and the public interest (publication may be made without regard to section 87 of the Act of January 12, 1895 (ch. 23, 28 Stat. 622), and section 11 of the Act of March 1, 1919 (ch. 86, 40 Stat. 1270; 44 U.S.C. 111));

(4) with the concurrence and approval of the Board, perform, at the request of the head of any executive agency, specific research, investigation, or experimentation in connection with matters relating to the national defense and/or the interests of the United States;

(5) approve the plans for and supervise Antarctic operations or expeditions conducted by, or supported by, other agencies of the United States except for operations or expeditions or parts thereof which are military in character;

(6) assist private Antarctic expeditions or research programs when such assistance is in the best interests of the United States;

(7) accept and utilize the service of voluntary and uncompensated personnel and provide transportation and subsistence as authorized by section 5 of the Act of August 2, 1913 (ch. 744, 60 Stat. 808), as amended (5. U.S.C. 73b–2), for persons serving without compensation; and

(8) acquire by purchase, lease, loan, or gift, and hold or dispose of by sale, lease, or loan, real or personal property necessary for, or resulting from, the exercise of authority under this Act;

(9) receive and use funds donated to the Commission if such funds are donated without restriction other than that they be used to carry out the general purposes of this Act:

(10) report to the President before September 16 of each year, summarizing the activities of the Commission and making such recommendations as it considers appropriate. The report shall include the recommendation of the Board.

THE DIRECTOR OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 5. (a) The Director shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, for a period of six years and shall be paid at the rate prescribed in section 107(a) of the Federal Executive Pay Act, 1956 (70 Stat.). He may be a person appointed from civilian life or a commissioned officer in an active or retired status.

(b) The Director shall—

(1) manage the affairs of the Commission;

(2) issue such regulations as he considers necessary to carry out this Act;

(3) appoint and fix the compensation of such personnel as may be necessary to carry out this Act; and

(4) be a member of the Board of Governors ex officio.

(c) The appointments made and the compensation fixed shall be in accordance with the Classification Act of 1949 and the regulations of the Civil Service Commission. However, the Director may employ such technical and professional personnel, and fix their compensation, as he considers necessary, without regard to the Classification Act of 1949 or the regulations of the Civil Service Commission. The Director may terminate the employment of any officers or employees, except the Deputy Directors, whenever he considers that termination to be in the best interests of the United States, except that no person in the classified service may be removed or suspended without pay unless it is accomplished under the Act of August 24, 1912 (ch. 389, 37 Stat. 555), as amended (5 U.S.C. 652).

DEPUTY DIRECTORS

SEC. 6. (a) The Deputy Directors shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and shall perform such duties as he may prescribe.

(b) The Deputy Directors may be appointed from civilian life or may be commissioned officers in an active or retired status. However, if the Director is appointed from civilian life, only one Deputy Director may be a commissioned officer. If the Director is a commissioned officer, both Deputy Directors shall be appointed from civilian life.

(c) The Deputy Directors shall be paid $ a year.

MILITARY STATUS OF DIRECTOR AND DEPUTY DIRECTORS

SEC. 7. (a) When a commissioned officer is appointed as Director or Deputy Director, he is not subject to military authority and may not exercise command over any members of the Armed Forces of the United States except as the President may prescribe.

(b) The appointment of a commissioned officer as Director or Deputy Director does not affect his status or rank or the pay and allowances incident to his status or rank. He is entitled to receive the pay and allowances payable to an officer of his rank and length of service, for which the appropriate department shall be reimbursed from any funds available to defray the expenses of the Commission. He is also entitled to be paid by the Commission the amount by which the compensation provided for the Director or Deputy Director exceeds his annual military pay and allowances.

BOARD OF GOVERNORS

SEC. 8. (a) The Board—consisting of eleven members—shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. The Board shall consist of the President of the National Academy of Sciences; Director of the National Science Foundation; Secretary of Defense; Secretary of State; Secretary of Interior; Secretary of Commerce, or their designees, plus four selected from civil life who are eminently qualified in their professions so as to provide, in addition to Federal administration, a broad field of knowledge and experience which will properly relate the activities of the Commission to the national welfare.

(b) The members of the Board, in addition to the President of the National Academy of Sciences; Director of the National Science Foundation; Secretary of Defense; Secretary of State; Secretary of Interior; Secretary of Commerce, or their designees, shall be appointed for a period of six years, except that, (1) any member appointed to fill a vacancy occurring before the expiration of the term of his predecessor shall be appointed for the remainder of the term; (2) the term of office of the members first taking office after the date of enactment of this Act shall expire, as designated by the President at the time of appointment, one at the end of two years, one at the end of four years, and two at the end of six years, and (3) a member may be reappointed to the Board for not more than one additional term; and (4) the members of the Board who are Cabinet members shall be members of that Board during the tenure of office as Cabinet members.

(c) Members of the Board shall be paid at the rate of $50 per day—for each day—except members of the President's Cabinet during their services as members of the Board, and shall be allowed travel expenses as authorized by section 5 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (ch. 744, 60 Stat. 808), as amended (5 U.S.C. 73b–2).

(d) The Board shall—

(1) meet annually on the first Monday in November and at such other times as the Chairman determines;

(2) elect a Chairman and Vice Chairman, at the regular annual meeting, to serve for the following year;

(3) review and assess the research and exploration activities relating to the Antarctic; and

(4) make such recommendations to the Commission as they consider appropriate for the advancement and dissemination of knowledge of the Antarctic.

RESEARCH CENTERS

SEC. 9. (a) Under the provisions of this Act there shall be established a minimum of five, and not more than eight, research centers at academic and/or research institutions having special competences or interests in scientific aspects of polar research.

The Commission shall determine that each such center shall meet criteria prescribed by the Commission under the policy guidance provided by the Board of Governors, and the Commission shall be responsible for the overall development and coordination of programs of research which may be approved for development within the research centers in, and related to the Antarctic region. Such programs of research as may be initiated at the research centers with the approval of the Commission shall be supported by Federal or private funds.

(b) Due to the unique requirements of polar research, a designated number of fellowships shall be provided to permit qualified students to conduct studies at the research centers and also in Antarctica. The Commission shall be authorized to grant funds in support of fellowships specifically associated with polar research, recommended by the Director of the Commission and approved by the Board of Governors.

SERVICES AND FUNDS OF OTHER AGENCIES

SEC. 10. (a) The Commission may, with the consent of the agency concerned, accept and utilize on a reimbursable basis the officers, employees, services, facilities, and information of any agency of the United States. However, such services and facilities may be furnished only if it does not interfere with the performance of the primary mission of the agency concerned. An agency having custody of data relating to the matters within the jurisdiction of the Commission shall, upon request of the Director, make that data available to the Commission without reimbursement.

(b) Funds available to any agency of the United States for scientific or technical research, educational, or other public service are available for transfer, with the approval of the head of the agency concerned, to the Commission for such use as is consistent with the purposes for which those funds were provided. Funds so transferred shall be spent by the Commission for the purposes for which the transfer was made or for general administrative expenses until such time as an appropriation is made available to the Commission.

ACTS AMENDED

SEC. 11. Subsection 107(a) of the Federal Executive Pay Act of 1956 is amended by adding the following after clause (22):

"(23) Director of the Antarctic Commission."

SEC. 12. Section 505 of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended (70 Stat. 762; 5 U.S.C. 1105), is amended by adding the following subsection:

"(f) The Director of the Antarctic Commission is authorized, without regard to any other provision of this section, to place a total of seven positions in the Antarctic Commission in grades 16, 17, and 18 of the General Schedule. Such positions shall be in addition to the number of positions authorized to be placed in such grades by subsection (b)."

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, MARCH 4, 1959

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. Walter A. Pegg, D.D., pastor, Metropolitan Baptist Church, Washington, D.C., offered the following prayer:

O Lord our God, we come before Thee, a company of men and women humbly acknowledging Thee as Divine Creator and Lord.

We come in confession of our weaknesses and shortcomings, knowing that the best we can produce, more often than not, falls far short of what Thou dost desire of us.

As those who represent the people of the Nation Thou hast deigned to make great, we come asking for wisdom that is not of ourselves, for clear judgment in a day darkened by confusion and misunderstanding.

We pray for ability to see the way before us if it can only be one step at a time. Our problems are multitudinous, our desires are for the welfare of our fellow men, so help us not to lean upon our own understanding but to avail ourselves of the leading of Thy gracious Spirit, that individually and corporately our service may be beneficial to men and honoring to Thee.

We pray for the President, the members of the Cabinet, especially for him who is ill, for all Members of this assembly and the companion body, the Senate. Grant us a sense of Thy presence both now and through all our days. In the name of Jesus Christ, our Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

THE LATE RALPH ABERNETHY GAMBLE

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. DOOLEY].

Mr. DOOLEY. Mr. Speaker, it is my sad duty to report that former Representative Ralph Abernethy Gamble, a cherished and longtime friend of many of my colleagues and myself, has gone to sleep with his fathers.

He was the son of Robert Jackson Gamble and the nephew of John Rankin Gamble, a Representative from New York.

Ralph was born in Yankton, S. Dak., May 6, 1885. He attended the public schools of Yankton and Washington, D.C., and was later graduated from Tome Prep School, Port Deposit, Md. He entered Princeton University where he excelled as a track star and afterward attended George Washington Law School, Washington, D.C., from which he was graduated in 1911. He was admitted to the bar in 1913, and practiced in New York, in his hometown of Mamaroneck from 1918 to 1933.

He was a member of the New York State Assembly from 1931 to 1937.

Ralph was elected as a Representative to the 75th Congress to fill the vacancy caused by the resignation of Charles D. Millard.

Ralph Gamble was a quiet, introspective, gentle person who had a host of friends. Hampered in health by a pulmonary ailment which made it difficult for him to breathe under some weather conditions, he suffered in silence many years.

He will be missed by those who knew him and particularly by his many friends in the town of Mamaroneck. I grieve with you over his passing and express my sympathy to his beloved wife.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have permission to extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD on the life and character of the late Honorable Ralph Abernethy Gamble.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. KILBURN. Mr. Speaker, Ralph Gamble has been a friend of mine for 20 years. He has visited us at our home up in Malone, N.Y., and we worked closely together for years on the Banking and Currency Committee. He was quiet and unassuming but sound and conscientious in his work in the House. He always voted for what he thought was for the best interest of our country.

He had been in ill health for some time and I know must have suffered greatly. In his passing I have lost a good friend, and Mrs. Kilburn joins me in extending our sympathy to Mrs. Gamble.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, Ralph Gamble came to Congress in 1937, and served on the Banking and Currency Committee until 1957 when he retired. For over 10 years he was the second ranking Republican on that committee and did much to keep our legislation right side up.

He was devoted to his work even to the point of impairing his health.

I am very sorry that he is gone and extend my sincerest sympathy to his family.

PLANNED REDUCTION OF NATIONAL DEBT

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, two of my distinguished colleagues from the State of Texas have introduced bills which would require an annual reduction of 1 percent in the Federal debt. This legislation would require a $2.8 billion debt reduction this year—if it were the law.

The purposes of this legislation are indeed commendable. I heartily endorse the desirable aim of a planned reduction of our national indebtedness.

I submit that an excellent way to achieve this result would be by reducing the ridiculous 27½ percent depletion allowance to a more acceptable 15 percent level. This one improvement in our tax structure would go a long way toward meeting the annual debt reduction aims of the debt-reduction legislation. If we can consolidate these two proposals, I would be pleased indeed to join in hearty support.

PERMISSION TO SIT DURING GENERAL DEBATE IN THE HOUSE

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Science and Astronautics may have permission to sit during general debate in the House today and for the balance of the week.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

PROMOTION FOR CERTAIN OFFICERS IN THE NAVAL SERVICE

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up for immediate consideration House Resolution 191.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 4413) to provide improved opportunity for promotion for certain officers in the naval service, and for other purposes. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed three hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Armed Services, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 191 makes in order the consideration of H.R. 4413, which provides improved opportunity for promotion for certain officers in the naval service, and for other purposes. The resolution provides for an open rule and 3 hours of general debate on the bill.

The purpose of this proposed legislation is to provide equitable opportunity for promotion to officers of the Navy and the Marine Corps who are in or behind the "hump."

The "hump" consists of the large group of officers who were initially commissioned during the 4 years of World War II. This group, disproportionate to all other year groups before and behind it, constitutes about one-fourth of the Regular officer strength of the Navy and the Marine Corps. It has provided the large reservoir of combat-tempered experience which has been the backbone of the Navy and the Marine Corps during the past decade.

Officers in the "hump" are now in the grades of lieutenant commander and commander in the Navy and major and

lieutenant colonel in the Marine Corps. Unless remedial action is taken, about two-thirds of these officers will be retired in the grades in which they are now serving without having had a reasonable opportunity for promotion to a higher grade. Ahead of the officers in the "hump" and blocking their promotion are the officers who were initially commissioned before World War II.

It is obvious that unless corrective action is taken, the attrition rate—that is, the number of people who will fail of selection for promotion—will be fantastically high over the next 10 years.

The Department of the Navy considers that the needed additional vacancies in the higher grades could best be created through the retirement, on a selection basis, of some of the senior officers in those grades a few years earlier than they could be involuntarily retired under present law. The proposed legislation here would, if enacted, provide the necessary statutory authority for the selection of officers for continuation on the active list and for the mandatory early retirement of officers not selected for continuation.

The bill provides that in addition to their retirement pay, the officers who will be retired under the provisions of the bill will be allowed a separation pay or readjustment pay to assist in adjusting to the necessary changes in their personal planning. This separation pay or readjustment pay will amount to 2 months pay for each year of active service that these officers will not be able to complete as a result of the enactment of the proposed legislation. No officer shall receive an amount in excess of $6,000.

In view of the importance of this legislation, and the need for it to be discussed fully on the floor of the House, I urge the adoption of House Resolution 191.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes of my time to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. REECE].

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Speaker, as we move forward to the consideration of the pending rule and the bill it makes in order, I should like to make a few appropriate remarks regarding the subcommittee of the Committee on Armed Services which reported this legislation. It was my privilege to serve on this subcommittee during the previous Congress.

The distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILDAY] is chairman of that subcommittee, and based upon my observation of the gentleman and his work, he is, in my opinion, the most outstanding authority on this type of legislation in the Congress. There are few, if any, in the Department of Defense who surpass the gentleman from Texas in his understanding of these intricate problems.

He has as his able assistant Mr. Blandford, who is counsel for that subcommittee. In all of my experience as a Member of the Congress I have seen no counsel who has a keener understanding of the problems involved in personnel matters of the Department of Defense than has Mr. Blandford, counsel for the Committee on Armed Services.

I just felt like I wanted to make these observations before we move into consideration of this bill. I am in favor of the legislation and I hope its consideration and passage will be expedited.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 15 minutes to our distinguished majority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK].

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, today is the 170th anniversary of the Constitution of the United States.

You and I are Members of the greatest legislative body in all the world, the Congress of the United States, and we sit here in a period of world history that is one of the most trying that any known generation has undergone.

We can look back with pride to the generations of Americans of yesterday who not only founded this great country but preserved and built it to the great Nation it is today.

You and I and other Americans have inherited this great country of ours, with the Constitution of the United States as our fundamental law, and we are charged with the direct duty of not only preserving and strengthening our country but passing it on to the next generation of Americans unimpaired and, in fact, strengthened. With that great heritage, I know that each and every one of us as Americans, without regard to party affiliation, will perform our duty. I might make the terse observation that if there are some persons in the world today in other countries, particularly those behind the Iron Curtain, who think that because the occupant of the White House, the President of the United States, is politically a Republican and that the Congress of the United States is Democratic so far as the majority in control of the Congress is concerned, that that calls for disunity and division, they are badly mistaken. They just do not understand the American mind and they just do not understand the political thinkings and the considerations in the United States under constitutional government, because whenever danger threatens our country, we do not think and act as Democrats or Republicans, but we think and act as Americans. And, on this occasion I make this brief, pointed observation, that if they look for division, they are going to be sadly mistaken, because we are always unified when danger confronts our country. During that great history of 170 years, when our Nation has grown from the weakest that existed at that time, with four or five million souls, to 180 million, to become the greatest nation in the world, one of the great Americans who has played an important part in the development of our country and its progress during the past 46 years is our beloved Speaker, the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN], and tomorrow he establishes a new record in American history. On March 5, 1959, Speaker RAYBURN will have eclipsed former Speaker Cannon's record of 46 years' overall service and become the new holder for total service in the House of Representatives. On March 4, 1959, today, our beloved Speaker will have served 46 years continuously in this, the greatest legislative body in the world, thus equaling the record of overall service compiled by former Speaker Cannon. Former Speaker Joseph G. Cannon, of Illinois, currently held the record for overall service in the House of Representatives, 46 years exactly. He served in the House from 1873 to 1891, from 1893 until 1913, and again from 1915 to 1923. Our beloved Speaker's service has been continuous, and tomorrow sets another mark in American history, for our beloved Speaker will have sat in this body longer than any other in the history of our country. SAM RAYBURN has served for approximately a quarter of the constitutional history of our country. He has seen much water go over the dam during that period. But, while he has served 46 years, he is just as young and just as virile in his thoughts, in his farsightedness, and his actions, as he was 46 years ago. Certainly, there is no one more intense in his love of America as exemplified by his utterances and his actions than our beloved Speaker.

Only a few nights ago, while at a political dinner, he nevertheless made a ringing American speech in which he was joined by the distinguished majority leader of the other branch, and they both served notice upon those who would destroy our civilization that America stands united. While made at a political rally, these were ringing American speeches. And it was the proper place to make those speeches, to send the message to those in the Kremlin who might think that division exists in America or that they would be able to bring about division in America, that they were strong.

SAM RAYBURN is a man with a heart of gold. When he takes that rostrum as Speaker, he does so not as the leader of the Democratic Party, but as the Speaker of the National House of Representatives in Congress. When any point of order is made or parliamentary questions raised he decides it, not as the leader of a party but as the Speaker of the House of Representatives in Congress. Other Speakers in the past have done the same, but SAM RAYBURN has lived up to the great traditions of all Speakers of this great body and he has added luster to their great contributions of yesterday.

In congratulating the Speaker on a new record, may I also congratulate the people of his district, who kept him here; because without their loyalty and their support he would not have been here, just as with each and every one of us who have to have the support of the people in our districts in order to be Members of this body. The people of his district may take great pride in what they have given to America during the last 46 years in the person of that man with a heart of gold, that man who represents the highest ideals that our country stands for, that man who will go down in history as one of the great Americans of all time, our beloved Speaker, SAM RAYBURN from the State of Texas.

May I say that I started to say "from Massachusetts," because SAM RAYBURN is

our beloved Speaker from 49 States of the Union, now that Alaska has become a State, and I hope and confidently expect that he will be the Speaker when the 50th State, Hawaii, comes into the Union.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I am glad to yield to my friend from Indiana, the minority leader of the House.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding. May I say at the outset that I do not blame the gentleman from Massachusetts for trying to claim the Speaker as being from Massachusetts. I think I should like to claim him from Indiana, although probably I would have to say, if he had come from Indiana, he would not have been able to weather all of those 46 years. In any event, we certainly wish the Speaker well on this occasion. He has broken so many records around here that sometimes it becomes a little difficult for all of us to keep up with them. Certainly this is a record of which he may well be proud and of which the people of his State and district may be proud and of which all of the people of this great land of ours may be proud.

I have said before on occasion that in my considered judgment the position of Speaker of the House of Representatives is the second greatest responsibility in the Government of the United States. And certainly SAM RAYBURN has graced that position very, very well; magnificently, in fact.

I agree with the gentleman from Massachusetts that when he takes the Speaker's chair he rules impartially and fairly. But I would not want anyone here, particularly some of the newer Members on our side, to get the impression that on occasion our beloved Speaker cannot be a good Democrat just as well, because he can be, and one of these days they will see him take the floor, down here in the well of the House, and make a great speech.

We all appreciate it, and some might even be persuaded on occasion.

In any event, I should like to add this further word: The gentleman referred to the fact that in times of crisis in world affairs we are not Democrats, we are not Republicans, we are just Americans here presenting a united front in a troubled world.

I might with propriety recall to the gentleman that in 1947 and 1948 I occupied his position, except that I was on this side of the aisle. I was the Republican leader of a Republican Congress, with a Democrat President. Those, too, were troublesome years. Those were years when communism threatened much of Europe. We were called upon by our President to deal with aid to France and Italy, aid to Greece and Turkey, and later on with the Marshall plan. I am sure everyone who was here at that time will agree that on that occasion we were not Democrats, we were not Republicans, we were just Americans who closed ranks in the face of a world threat by a potential foreign enemy.

Today even as then, with a Republican in the White House and Democrats in control of the Congress, great problems confront us, problems of tremendous importance, problems the decisions as to which can affect the lives and the futures not only of the people of our country but the people of the whole world.

So I am reassured, knowing as I do how sincere the gentleman from Massachusetts is and how much and how well he speaks for the people on both sides of the aisle, that in this time of crisis and trial we shall all stand together meeting the problems as they arise.

I recall when the Formosa resolution was adopted, and the Middle East resolution, expressing the united determination of a great American people. I am not indicating by that that any resolution of that sort is to be acted upon at this time. But certainly the words that have been spoken on this occasion by the majority leader are indicative of the fact that in this time of trial the American people and all of us in the Government of the United States will present a united front to the end that the welfare and future and safety and happiness of our Republic shall be assured.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished majority whip, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT].

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I want to join the distinguished majority leader and the distinguished minority leader in claiming the Speaker. Oklahoma has been claiming him as Congressman at Large for many years, and we have always been proud to do so.

Forty-six years ago there began a career of congressional service in this House which was to eclipse the service of all other men who had come here before. Forty-six years ago there began in this House a congressional career which was to become not only the longest in point of time but also the most distinguished in point of service in the history of this legislative body.

Then began the career of a young man who was to serve this country in three wars and through some of the most trying peacetime periods in history Then began the career of a great man who was to become the Speaker of this House and to serve in that capacity longer than anybody before.

I believe sincerely that it is the privilege of us who serve here today to have the honor of serving during our time with the greatest legislator in the history of our country, our beloved Speaker, the Honorable SAM RAYBURN, of Texas.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BOGGS].

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I am honored to be permitted to join in the tributes which have been paid to our distinguished Speaker.

May I take this occasion to point out that the total legislative service of our great Speaker exceeds by 5 years the 46th anniversary that we are celebrating here today.

Speaker RAYBURN began his lawmaking work in the legislature of the great State of Texas on January 8, 1907. That is a little over 52 years ago. I realize that it is very difficult for most of us to comprehend that because 52 years exceeds by several years the age of quite a few Members of this distinguished body.

Some years ago I had the Library of Congress do a bit of research on the comparative service of Speaker RAYBURN and other members of legislative bodies in the world. As all of you know, the American Congress is the oldest, continuous democratic body on the face of the earth. The only competition that Speaker RAYBURN has is in the British Parliament. He has none in either body of the House of Representatives, having exceeded the records of Senator Hale, of Maine, Senator Glass, of Virginia, as well as Mr. Sabath, of Illinois and former Speaker Cannon of the House. Of course, he has served almost concurrently, I believe, with Senator HAYDEN. But, in the other great legislative body of the free world, the British Parliament, he still has one or two records that he might seek to best, and I am certain in light of the aggressive health and leadership of the Speaker that he will best these.

The great William E. Gladstone sat in the British Parliament for 60 years. Lord Balfour sat for 56 years. Winston Churchill is serving his 54th year now. But there is this great and historic distinction. Most of these men were elected to the House of Commons for a limited period of time. Then a grateful nation rewarded them by giving them seats in perpetuity in the House of Lords. So that from the point of view of elective legislative experience and service, SAM RAYBURN, our great Speaker, excels any man in the history of modern democracies.

Insofar as France is concerned, one of the other great democracies in the world, the longest period of service there was for about 42 years. I have forgotten for the moment the name of that distinguished French parliamentarian.

Finally, in closing, I know there is no additional tribute I can pay to a man who is and has been for these many years a great American except to say as one humble Member of this body, I have been so greatly impressed by his life and example and by most of the things that he has said over the years. For instance, I remember a long time ago he made a speech to some of the new Members to whom he gives so much time. He said, "Service is the grandest word in the English language."

Not long ago he told a friend that he could not imagine any career that he could possibly have chosen as a young man which would have given him half the satisfaction that membership in the Congress has given to him. To put it another way, and as he put it, "The chance to help make the people's path a little smoother and their burdens a little lighter is all that any man ought to ask of life."

I think that his devotion to country, his devotion to the House of Representatives, and his devotion to party will be an inspiration to our great country for many, many generations to come.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. EVINS].

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, I should like to congratulate our distinguished majority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] for calling the attention of the House to the distinguished career of our great Speaker. I would like to join with my colleagues in paying a brief but sincere tribute to the gentleman from Texas, Speaker RAYBURN.

I notice, almost in good humor but apparently in error, that our friend, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK], tried to claim the Speaker as from Massachusetts. I want to point out that the distinguished Speaker was born in Tennessee and is a native of Tennessee.

There was a great debate on this floor a number of years ago which I read some time ago with amusing interest. Members of Congress from North Carolina and South Carolina debated on this floor who should claim Andrew Jackson. North Carolina said that General Jackson was born in North Carolina, and South Carolina claimed that President Jackson was born in South Carolina. He was from that border region between the two States, but actually Jackson gained his fame and distinction from Tennessee.

While the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN] has gained great fame as from Texas and is, in fact, an all-American, we all must realize the fact that the gentleman from Texas, SAM RAYBURN, was born in Tennessee.

To illustrate as to how the Speaker is beloved in our State, recently there appeared an article in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD about the gentleman from Texas, Speaker RAYBURN, and somewhere therein it was stated that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN] was born in Texas. One of my friends called this error to my attention, knowing I would want to have the RECORD corrected to show that he really came from Tennessee. My State is proud of the gentleman from Texas, Speaker RAYBURN, and we want the world to know that we proudly claim him.

So I share this occasion with the friends who admire the gentleman from Texas, Speaker RAYBURN, and felicitate him and congratulate our Speaker, as a son of Tennessee.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who may desire to do so may extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Speaker, it is becoming more and more difficult to find appropriate words to use in expressing one's admiration and affection for you. You have so many friends and you have done so much for others that their feelings are as deep as the ocean and as broad as all outdoors. I believe your greatest attribute is your unfailing honesty in your approach to all things and this honesty of yours is so sincere that one looks upon it with reverence. It is not found in the ordinary man but such a characteristic is indigenous to men of great stature and to men who by their examples have shown their love and respect for whatever is good and for whatever is right. Much has been said about your love of country but that, as far as I am concerned, is taken for granted in a man of your character. You have inspired us all by your services and you have taught many who have served in our Government over the years, the constructive approach and the noble attitude.

May your years be many more and may rich blessings always attend your steps.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, this is indeed an auspicious occasion and I am delighted to join with my colleagues in congratulating you on beginning your 47th year of service in the U.S. House of Representatives.

I am certain that all of us view this occasion as a very special tribute to the exceptional abilities, devotion to public service, and outstanding leadership of Speaker RAYBURN. His achievements as legislator, as a leader of his party, and as the Speaker of the House of Representatives are inscribed permanently in the pages of our Nation's history. But furthermore, his personal qualities which made these achievements possible, have made a lasting impression on all of us who have had the privilege of serving with him, and under his leadership, in this legislative body.

It is these attributes which have made Speaker RAYBURN's name known, respected, and loved throughout the breadth and width of our land. His life of public service is an inspiration to every American.

I pray that the good Lord may grant our Speaker many more years of health and activity in our Nation's service.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I have sat at the feet of four Speakers during the time I have been a Member of the House. I have had the opportunity, therefore, of making comparisons and forming judgments. The following is a tribute I paid to the present Speaker in a letter to my people 2 years ago:

Speaker SAM RAYBURN is a Texas Democrat. He has been a Member of Congress for 44 years; has been elected Speaker of the House eight times, holding that high office longer than any other man in American history.

Speaker RAYBURN is a born leader. He is a man that would gravitate to the top position in whatever field he might be placed. He is a great parliamentarian, a great statesman, and a great presiding officer. He is kindly, considerate, tolerant. He possesses the proverbial "patience of Job"—a necessary qualification for the position of Speaker. As Speaker he has more influence over legislation than any other man in either branch of the Congress. In the writer's opinion the office of Speaker ranks next in importance to the office of President.

Speaker RAYBURN seldom takes the floor during debate, but when he does he commands the respect and attention of the Members. He has the unusual ability of saying a great deal in few words—a very valuable asset for anyone to possess. Too many Members are redundant—they use many words to say very little. Speaker RAYBURN is a great American.

Mr. Speaker, I have looked up to you from my seat in this House for 16 years, and I mean looked up in more than a physical sense. I have looked up to you as a great statesman, as a great presiding officer, as a man who is better informed on Government problems than any other man in either branch of Congress, a man who tops me in every way but one—I was born 2 years before you.

State Senator Richard Barr, of Joliet, Ill., was a member of the Illinois State Senate for over 50 years. He claimed the world's record for membership in an elective legislative body. It is my wish that you will exceed his record in the Illinois State Senate, in the length of your service in the United States House of Representatives.

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to join with my colleagues today in congratulating and honoring you, our distinguished Speaker. Mr. RAYBURN's 46 years in this Congress have been the most momentous in the history of the United States. Presidents, statesmen, generals, kings, and queens come and go, but Mr. SAM, like the Rock of Gibraltar, is still here to reassure the American people that all is well with the Republic. Those of us that have served with him for many years have been uplifted by his great qualities of leadership. We are better Congressmen by having served with him.

Mr. RAYBURN, your qualities of leadership, honor, patriotism, duty and integrity not only inspire us but will inspire generations to come.

Mrs. Dorn, my family, my staff, and I wish for you continuing good health, happiness, and many more years of service and inspiration to us all.

Mr. O'BRIEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted that the majority leader has taken the floor to point out the magnificent record of service of our beloved Speaker, SAM RAYBURN, and I want to join wholeheartedly in his remarks.

No man deserves a tribute more than the Speaker. It was my good fortune many years ago to serve on the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce when the Speaker was chairman of that committee. No chairman was ever more capable in the performance of his duties, more learned in the subject matter within the jurisdiction of his committee, and more fair in his attitudes toward members of the committee—Republicans and Democrats alike.

I should state parenthetically that when I ascribe to the Speaker a thorough knowledge of the subject matter within the purview of his committee, I do not thereby mean to imply that this was in exclusion of his understanding of the other great issues which were before the Congress during his long tenure. I have known few people who possess the basic commonsense and acute perception with which the Speaker is gifted. He has the knack of cutting through superfluous and extraneous matters and going right to the heart of an issue. Invariably, too, he comes to the right conclusion.

No finer tribute can be paid to a man than to enjoy the confidence and trust of his neighbors. The long length of service of Mr. RAYBURN bears eloquent

testimony to the high esteem with which he is held by his friends and neighbors in Texas.

The Speaker has called me his friend. In all my years in public service, I have received no finer compliment or higher accolade. I shall always cherish his friendship.

That is why, Mr. Speaker, I wish you long life and good health so that our beloved country may continue to have the benefit of your distinguished service.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, every American is proud of the Speaker of the House of Representatives and his unparalleled record of public service.

In Oklahoma, where Speaker RAYBURN has long been regarded as "Oklahoma's Congressman at large," there has long existed a standing organization known as the Rayburn for President Club.

Thousands of Oklahomans have believed for many years that the best qualified man in the United States for President is SAM RAYBURN, of Texas.

On more than one occasion, I have attended meetings in the Sooner State where all in the room were agreed that Speaker RAYBURN was the best man the Democratic Party could nominate for the Presidency.

On one such occasion, I heard our beloved Speaker tell a large group of Oklahomans that he deeply appreciated such sentiments, but that he firmly and emphatically declined to become a candidate.

Speaker RAYBURN's refusal to become a presidential candidate has been a loss for our party in the White House, but our loss on the executive side of the ledger has undeniably been our greatest gain on the legislative side of the same ledger.

I doubt if any historian of our time will deny that the greatest single influence of this generation upon our Nation's legislative history has been the great Congressman from Bonham, who has served longer than any other American as Speaker of the House.

It has been a great privilege to serve with him in the House.

It is both a privilege and a pleasure to join with my colleagues in expressing congratulations and best wishes as Speaker RAYBURN begins his 47th year of congressional service.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING THE CREDITING OF CERTAIN SERVICE FOR PURPOSE OF RETIRED PAY FOR NONREGULAR SERVICE

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, I call up the resolution (H. Res. 190) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 3365) to authorize the crediting of certain service for purpose of retired pay for nonregular service, and for other purposes. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed two hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Armed Services, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 190 makes in order the consideration of H.R. 3365, which would authorize the crediting of certain service for the purpose of retired pay for nonregular service, and for other purposes. The resolution provides for an open rule and 2 hours of general debate on the bill.

The primary purpose of this legislation is to correct certain inequities which have developed since the enactment of title III of the Army and Air Force Vitalization and Retirement Equalization Act of 1948—62 Stat. 1081—which title authorized retired pay at age 60 for personnel of the Armed Forces who complete 20 years of satisfactory Federal service. The proposal would also authorize certain service to be counted as commissioned service for the purpose of voluntary retirement; and would validate appointments made in the Army of the United States without component under joint resolution of September 22, 1951, which were continued in effect with legal authority until April 1, 1953.

It would permit Reserve personnel to count for this retired pay, service which they performed as an appointed aviation cadet or as a nurse, or service performed as a dietitian, physical therapist, or occupational therapist with the medical department of the Army. Such service may not now be credited for this purpose because of the present limitation that service to be credited must have been performed in the status of a commissioned officer, warrant officer, flight officer, or enlisted person, in the Armed Forces.

It would also allow credit for this retired pay for service in the National Guard after June 14, 1933, if the person served continuously therein from the date of his enlistment in the National Guard, or his Federal recognition as an officer, to the date of his enlistment or appointment, as the case may be, in the National Guard of the United States, the Army National Guard of the United States, or the Air National Guard of the United States. At present credit may be given for service in the federally recognized National Guard only before June 15, 1933.

The Department of Defense recommends enactment of the bill, and the Bureau of the Budget interposes no objection to the bill.

In view of the fact that this legislation seeks to correct inequities in existing law, I urge the adoption of House Resolution 190.

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. REECE].

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, so far as I know there are no requests for time on this side. There is no opposition to the resolution, and I therefore yield back my time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that tomorrow at the close of the legislative business of the day and other special orders heretofore granted I may address the House for 30 minutes.

I hope the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. ALFORD] will be present because my remarks are going to be directed to a review of the report of the Special Committee on Election Expenditures of which I was a member in the 85th Congress, and I intend to address part of my remarks to the Hays-Alford case.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. PERKINS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'NEILL. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Labor Management Reform Legislation be permitted to sit this afternoon during general debate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 7]

Barrett	Hechler	Powell
Becker	Holifield	Rains
Bowles	Kasem	Rivers, Alaska
Corbett	Kee	Rivers, S.C.
Denton	Keith	Robison
Derwinski	McGovern	Scott
Diggs	Magnuson	Shipley
Doyle	Martin	Sikes
Fogarty	Meyer	Siler
Green, Oreg.	Miller, N.Y.	Smith, Miss.
Hall	Mitchell	Taylor
Hargis	O'Konski	Widnall
Hébert	Philbin	Wolf

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 385 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

PROMOTION FOR CERTAIN OFFICERS IN THE NAVAL SERVICE

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 4413) to provide improved opportunity for promotion for certain officers in the naval service, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H.R. 4413, with Mr. EVINS in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 15 minutes.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this bill is to relieve the hump of officers which has developed in both the Navy and the Marine Corps. The report which accompanies the bill is full and complete and it adequately explains the bill. The report, however, is quite technical and involved. It is essential that the report be written in technical language and because of the technical language which the report contains, it shall be my purpose to give a nontechnical explanation of the situation as it exists and to explain what is being proposed to remedy that situation. I believe it would be evident to all that a military organization requires a distribution of officers through the various grades in the numbers and percentages required to exercise the command functions of that military organization. That would mean, of course, that you would begin with a rather large number in the entering grade. You would have a rather large number coming in at the entering rank of ensign or second lieutenant and then, of course, the number entering each of the higher ranks would constantly be reduced. In 1947, the Congress passed what is known as the Officer Personnel Act of 1947. In that law we attempted to do a number of things. It came along at the termination of World War II; when we were contemplating a long period of peace and it became necessary to reorganize all of the military services including their personnel structure. The Officer Personnel Act was for that purpose. We were very much concerned at that time because, from our Regular Naval Forces and our Regular officer strength in the Navy, at the end of approximately 20 years of service, we were losing through attrition something in excess of 50 percent of the Naval Academy graduates because on promotion from lieutenant to lieutenant commander there were not a sufficient number of billets as commander to absorb the less than 50 percent of the lieutenant commanders who were eligible for consideration for promotion. We did a number of things in 1947 in an effort to reduce that attrition. We attempted to open up the flow of promotions so that it would be constant through captain and to some extent to admiral. One thing we did was to increase the percentage ratio of flag officers—admirals in the Navy and generals in the other services, from one-half of 1 percent of total officer strength to three-fourths of 1 percent.

We also provided that a man who attained the rank of colonel in the Marine Corps or captain in the Navy, notwithstanding the fact that he was not selected for promotion to the next higher grade, would remain on duty until he had completed a total of 30 years of service. We also provided that a commander in the Navy or a lieutenant colonel of the Marine Corps, notwithstanding his failure of selection for promotion to the next higher grade, would remain on active duty for a total of 26 years.

The reason for this provision is that we retained for the Government, and for the Marine Corps and the Navy, the services of these men who had been trained at great expense, who possessed the experience which was necessary for our active naval forces. On the other hand, it was true that those officers who found themselves in the category of commander or lieutenant colonel, with less than 26 years of service, felt that they had a period of security until they had completed 26 years, and a colonel and captain in the Navy felt that he was secure until he should reach the end of 30 years of total service.

So that gradually since 1947 it has been referred to as "a guaranteed tour of 26 or 30 years of service." Notwithstanding the fact that it was not for that purpose, I agree that those officers were reasonable in the position which they took and which they now take, that they were no longer vulnerable to elimination from active duty until they had completed these stated periods of service.

The Officer Personnel Act provided a normal flow of promotion. It envisioned certain normal tours, in each grade as the men came along. What we did not foresee was the coming of the Korean conflict. Korea came in 1950. The act of 1947 was well under way. As a matter of fact, some of the provisions of the Officer Personnel Act had not even taken effect when Korea came on us. So that during that period of time normal forced attrition was not completed. During that time, of course, these officers came to a point in their career at which they should have been selected for promotion to the next higher grade. Not having been selected for promotion, they were supposed to be separated from the active duty list by retirement, if above the grade of lieutenant commander, or by severance if below the grade of lieutenant commander. Practically everybody who came up for selection for promotion was promoted. There was no elimination in those grades. Why? During the Korean conflict the Navy was recalling to active duty, involuntarily, without their consent, Reserve officers who were in the inactive reserves. So it did not make sense to be releasing or passing over Regular Naval officers while at the same time calling men to active duty who had no desire to go on active duty but who were subject to compulsory recall to active duty. So that we have in the Navy and in the Marine Corps 3,500 officers who are compressed at the wrong spot in the promotion zones. There are 3,500 officers in the Navy and in the Marine Corps who must be eliminated from the service from active duty. Three thousand five hundred officers in the Navy and Marine Corps are going to be relieved of active duty, whether legislation is passed or not.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. I would prefer to finish my statement now.

Mr. BAILEY. I just wish you would explain how that might happen without an act of Congress.

Mr. KILDAY. That is exactly what I am going to do, and I assure you I will take time enough to answer any questions. But because of the technical nature of this matter, I would like to put my explanation at one place in the RECORD.

I have made the statement that 3,500 officers of the Navy and the Marine Corps are going to be relieved from active duty whether any legislation is passed or not. If no legislation is passed, that 3,500 must come from the relatively low-ranking, young, vigorous officers who are on their way up because they are behind this hump. On the other hand the men who cannot be forced to retire until they have completed 26 years of service if they are lieutenant colonels in the Marine Corps or commanders in the Navy, or 30 years of service if colonels in the Marine Corps or captains in the Navy, are ahead of that hump.

What this bill proposes to do is to give the Navy Department some selection authority as to who is going to go out. Will the 3,500 come from the young vigorous men who are coming up the line? Or will they come from the men in the grades of captain and colonel and, of course, lieutenant colonel and commander?

This bill provides that the Secretary of the Navy shall have the right to convene continuation boards. These continuation boards will be convened and constituted to proceed exactly as selection-for-promotion boards are now convened and as they now function; but instead of deciding who of those within the zone of consideration shall be promoted they will decide who within this group of vulnerable officers shall be continued on active duty. Those they decide should be continued on active duty will be continued until they complete 30 years of service or 26 years of service, depending upon the rank in which they are serving.

Those having faced a continuation board will not be called upon to face another continuation board; it is a one-shot proposition. If he survives one continuation board, then, he will continue on until he has completed the so-called guaranteed tour of 26 years or 30 years of service.

How will an officer be retired? In the first place no one is going to be relieved of active duty who has not completed 20 years of service. Every man who has completed 20 years of service is entitled to retirement for the balance of his life. It is figured at 2½ percent times the

years which he has served; therefore, no one retired will receive less than 50 percent of his base pay. The maximum, of course, will continue to be 75 percent of his base pay if he has completed a total of 30 years, or at the percentage represented by 2½ times his years of service as the total.

There is no question under the law but that the Congress has the power to change the law and that these officers do not hold a contract with the Government, and have never held a contract with the Government under which they were guaranteed this tour. If you will turn to page 10 of the report you will find quotations from the Supreme Court where this specific question was passed upon involving a naval officer. This naval officer at that time was a midshipman. At the present the grade of midshipman is not an officer grade; it applies to a cadet in the Academy, and he is not an officer. But at that time a midshipman was an officer of the Navy, and the Supreme Court has passed upon this question. Here is the language of the Court:

> The primary question in this case is whether a naval officer appointed for a definite time or during good behavior had any vested interest or contract right in his office of which Congress could not deprive him. The question is not novel. There seems to be but little difficulty in deciding that there was no such interest or right. The question was before us in *Butler* v. *Pennsylvania*.

That has been the consistent position. Many times in the past we have changed the rules as to tenure and as to right of retirement.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield. Is there not a matter of good faith on the part of the Congress involved here?

Mr. KILDAY. The very next word I intended to state was good faith on the part of the Congress. I am asking the gentlemen to let me complete my statement, then I will be glad to answer any questions which may be propounded, or, at least, attempt to answer them.

We have the legal right to terminate any tour that these men may have, may claim they have, or contend they have. I am not one of those who takes the position that Congress should always do something simply because it has the right to do it.

Mr. Chairman, this bill has been considered by my subcommittee of the Committee on Armed Services on three separate occasions. The Navy Department brought it to us in the 1st session of the 85th Congress and urged that we take immediate action. We held long hearings about it at that time.

It was brought over to us again in the 2d session of the 85th Congress when we again heard testimony, but took no action. This was something that was distasteful, it was something that my subcommittee did not want to do.

But we have now reached the point where something has to give for the benefit of the country and the stability and vigor of our officer corps of the Navy and Marine Corps. The irresistible force has met the immovable object. Something has to be done. Over a period of more than 2 years I had hoped this problem would go away, but it has not gone away and we must face it.

In the bill that was brought to us originally by the Navy it was recommended that we grant to those to be retired under this provision constructive credit for the purpose of retirement. In other words, they suggested that those retired short of the period that they expected to serve be given credit for active duty of one-half of the period they served. In other words, if a captain who originally was to stay on duty until he had completed 30 years of service had completed 26 years, we would add to the time he actually served, 2 additional years to give him credit for retirement purposes of 2 years he did not actually serve. Of course, that would have been an annual recurring cost, it would have increased our already staggering retired pay costs, and it would continue each year through the life of each of these individuals.

When the proposal came to us from the Department of Defense this year, it was recommended that we give them absolutely nothing for the unserved balance of that tour which they expected to serve. Among the arguments in favor of that position was that since the proposal was originally suggested, the pay bill of 1958, about which I think all of you are hearing from your retired personnel, had granted very materially increased retirement pay to this group and as to all other retired groups after June 1, 1958. It is my own feeling—and this has been sustained by the subcommittee and by the full Committee on Armed Services—that these men should be given something to cushion the shock of early transition from the military service to civilian status. I suggested, and it went to the Navy, that instead of a constructive credit which we are very much opposed to granting because we have never granted constructive credit for purposes of retirement that we provide a lump sum readjustment allowance. We are afraid of a precedent because of what might happen in the future should such a precedent ever be established. The proposal that I made, which was considered by the Navy, was that instead of that we give these men a lump-sum readjustment allowance. That is not novel in the military system, because a Reserve officer released from active duty now gets a certain number of months' pay for each year he has served. The proposal I am about to outline was sent by the Navy to the Department of Defense, and it was rejected. The committee added a provision to the bill that each man now in grade retired under the provisions of this act—and they will all be retired—shall receive 2 months' pay for each year that he does not serve, so that the captain who had served 26 years and would have 4 years yet to go would get 8 months' pay under the provisions of this bill, but not to exceed $6,000. It would not be a recurring cost; it would be paid once, and then it would be over. And he is not being treated badly, because that individual would retire at $7,978 a year, and he would draw as a readjustment allowance $6,000 when he was relieved, or he could spread that out over a period of 3 years if he preferred to do that.

Now, as to what this is going to cost. Attempting to estimate the cost of legislation of this type is most difficult. Whatever conclusion is reached is bound to be very speculative, because there are savings in certain instances and there are costs in other instances. As a saving, for instance; when a captain with less service fills the spot occupied by a captain with more service, he receives less money, so he does not cost you as much as the man with the longer period of service. Then, of course, the actuarial tables come into the question as to how long these people might live and things of that kind. We have given very careful consideration to that, and with the understanding that it is most difficult to arrive at, we give you the figure that for the first year it will cost about $3.5 million and that that will continue at about that cost for a period of 5 years, and that over an extended period of 60 years it will cost approximately $15 million.

Now, as I have stated before, this is not something that we wanted to do. It is something that we have found essential that we do, and we have worked it out the best way that we know how to work it out, with due regard to everyone concerned. Now, all of your captains are not going out; only 35 percent, and as to your twice-passed over commanders, 25 percent will remain on active duty. The difficulty involved here is that if you do not pass this bill, you have over 6,000 younger officers behind this hump many of whom are going to have to go out long before their time, without any opportunity to complete a career. And, with this legislation you will be in a position to be selective in the ones who are going out. They will be the men who have served the longest. It is as fair and equitable as we know how to work it out.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. BAILEY. I would like to have the distinguished gentleman from Texas explain this to the Members of the House. The statement has been made that the Navy is going to go ahead and do this anyhow. I want the gentleman to give a direct answer. The Navy cannot do anything until this legislation is passed toward retiring these people; is that not right?

Mr. KILDAY. Not entirely; no, sir. The situation is this—when you say, "these people," you mean whom?

Mr. BAILEY. Your captains and colonels.

Mr. KILDAY. Captains and colonels and lieutenant colonels and commanders. Now, those men in those grades under existing law cannot be forced to retire until they complete 26 and 30 years of service, respectively. That is true. There must be a law passed in order to retire those two groups. But the gentleman had asked whether the Navy could do anything about it. In the absence of legislation the Navy must do something about it, but not as to those officers. They must go down to the lower grades,

to the younger men, the men who are now on the way up the line and release those men. And there will be nearly 6,000 of them who will fail of selection for promotion to the next higher grade on two occasions, because there is no vacancy in the next higher grade. You cannot promote men into a grade unless there are vacancies in the grade. Unless this hump comes out, nobody can go up.

Mr. BAILEY. We have clarified one point to this extent, then, that the members of the gentleman's Committee on Armed Services are not being misled into thinking that the Navy has authority peremptorily to let those four classifications—captains, colonels, commanders, and lieutenant commanders—to let those go. They would have to act on the entire existing list of officers.

Mr. KILDAY. Without legislation they could not act just on this group; that is true.

Mr. BAILEY. So it is necessary that this legislation be passed. Let me ask another clarifying question or two. The gentleman has told me that he was going to talk about the question of good faith that may be involved here. Am I to understand that this $6,000 contribution that they are making to them when they retire is in repayment for the failure of the Government to keep its good faith in the agreement concerning 26-year retirement and 30-year retirement?

Mr. KILDAY. It is an attempt to do something to alleviate their situation. They have to readjust themselves to civilian life at an earlier time than they may have anticipated had they completed 26 or 30 years of service. It is an attempt to do justice as nearly as we know how to do justice to a group of people unfortunately affected and which we regret has been so unfortunately affected.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FULTON. The question arises as to the timeliness of this legislation, whether it should be brought to the floor at this time in view of the deadline on Berlin which has been given this country, of May 27. Should we not only on the question of the strength of our own forces but on the question of the propaganda value abroad at this time be discussing the cutting off completely from active duty of 3,500 officers?

Mr. KILDAY. May I read to the gentleman the provision on page 12 of the bill, section 5:

SEC. 5. The President may suspend any provision of section 1 or 4 of this act during a war or national emergency hereafter declared. Such a suspension may not continue beyond June 30 of the fiscal year following that in which the war or national emergency ends.

Mr. FULTON. May I comment on that? That requires a specific action to be taken by the President, to declare a national emergency, which then would affect the whole economy of the country. As a matter of fact we are now in a continuing cold war threat and it might be better to let the President have more discretion. I would, therefore, recommend that there be added a provision for a broad presidential discretion both as to time and as to number.

Mr. KILDAY. May I point out to the gentleman that the convening of these boards is not mandatory. On the first page of the bill we say that "the Secretary of the Navy may, whenever the needs of the service require, convene selection boards."

Mr. FULTON. But the provision the gentleman read is certainly restrictive of the powers of the President. It restricts him to a declaration of a national emergency, which he may not want to make.

Mr. KILDAY. In a comparable situation I must point out that the Secretary of the Navy, a member of the President's administration, would not convene the board.

Mr. FULTON. Then why do we need the restrictive clause on the President either as to the matter of a declaration of war or the declaration of a national emergency?

Mr. KILDAY. That is to stop the retirement of these officers who have not been selected for continuation. We are utilizing the existence of the national emergency for that purpose.

Mr. FULTON. May I respectfully suggest with reference to that particular provision that the President be given broad discretion as to the going out of officers, without limiting him to a declaration of war or a time of national emergency. He must affirmatively declare that, and that would affect the economy of the whole country. These officers, I believe, are all in a 4-year period, are they not, so that the great bulk of them that constitute this bulge in our officer corps are in the 1942 to 1945 era?

Mr. KILDAY. That is true. They are compressed, as the report states, in a period of about 4 years.

Mr. FULTON. The 4 calendar years are consecutive, so my question is, Why do you not simply give them a lump sum and treat them all alike, because they are all in about the same age group, rather than extend this particular threat over a long period against good officers who have otherwise served well? Why do you not at one particular time say, "Look, boys, we cannot keep you on active duty, so we will give you a lump-sum payment?"

Mr. KILDAY. I assume there are many alternatives which might be suggested as to what might be done. The committee has worked on this thing for years, and this is the best we have been able to come up with. I might point out in this connection that when you give a readjustment allowance it must have some relationship to the active duty income of the individual. What would be enough to adjust a man of the highest pay bracket on active duty would be a very tremendous sum of money to a man in the lower pay bracket.

My personal experience has been, as far as I am able to determine from friends and associates, that we generally live up to whatever we happen to be earning. The same would be true here, that the man who had been in the higher pay bracket would require a little more for the adjustment than the man in the lower bracket.

Mr. FULTON. That raises the question, should you not have a factor of servicemen's allowances, because a person who would have a large family with many children coming into school and college age would have a need for extra money, while possibly some of the older ones would have a need for less.

Mr. KILDAY. I think the suggestion made by the gentleman from Pennsylvania proves the wisdom of the provision we have adopted here. We cannot possibly now go into a question of dependents' allowances for retired personnel. We have had enough difficulty with dependents' allowances for active-duty personnel in the lower brackets.

Mr. BAILEY. If the gentleman will yield further, would the gentleman have us believe that if we do not give the Navy this authority they would have to move out a few waterlogged admirals over here to make room for some people lower on the list?

Mr. KILDAY. I hope to bring in a bill some time when nothing will be said about the generals and the admirals. I have never seen anybody elected yet by attacking the admirals, but everybody seems to think it is a good way to get elected. If we wiped out every admiral in the Navy, I do not care whether he is a rear admiral of the lower half or a full admiral, if we wiped them all out we would have 297 vacancies. There are only 297 of them on active duty. They have been through every selection from the time they came into the service and they have survived every one of those selections. They were selected for rear admirals, and then for the next higher grade. If we took them all off the list there would be 297 vacancies. If we got rid of every general in the Marine Corps, from 1 star up to and including 4 stars, we would have 62 vacancies. I would like to know how you are going to fit 11,297 commanders into those 297 Navy spots, and 1,900 majors into 62 general vacancies in the Marine Corps?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Will the gentleman please restate the floor that is being used as the base for retirement of these officers? Is this payment a maximum of $6,000?

Mr. KILDAY. It is a maximum of $6,000.

Mr. GROSS. Is that predicated upon service of 20 years?

Mr. KILDAY. No.

Mr. GROSS. On what was it based?

Mr. KILDAY. No one will be retired under this provision who does not have at least 20 years. Of course, today nobody can retire with less than 20 years of service except for disability. Twenty years is the minimum for length of service. This affects the men who have served over 20 years and in one instance they have not completed 26 years, and in the other instance they have not completed 30 years. Of course, you could theoretically say that you have a period of 6 years there for a man when he re-

tired at 26 years during which he might qualify for a part of this and a period of some 6 or 8 years in the other instance. But, as a matter of fact, that is not true because nobody ever gets up to the grades of commander and then colonel and captain until they have served a longer period than that.

Mr. GROSS. For all practical purposes, it puts a floor of 20 years of service and a ceiling of $6,000; is that correct?

Mr. KILDAY. No; it continues the present law that no one can retire for length of service with less than 20 years. That is the present law in all cases, and then this is an attempt to compensate for that portion of the 26 or 30 years of total service which the man does not serve.

Mr. GROSS. I have just another question or two. This is confined to the Navy and Marine Corps?

Mr. KILDAY. That is correct.

Mr. GROSS. It does not go to any of the other services?

Mr. KILDAY. No, sir; this deals specifically with the problems existing in the Navy and in the Marine Corps. The same identical problem does not exist in the Army and the Air Force. They do have many problems and they have other problems, also, but they do not have this identical problem.

Mr. GROSS. And the gentleman is saying that this would cost over a period of years approximately $15 million?

Mr. KILDAY. That is projected over a period of 60 years. You see we are dealing with actuary tables here. There were three different sets of actuarial information. I assume that they figure that somebody in this group who is now, perhaps, forty and some-odd years old, and some of the captains up in the fifties, would probably live another 60 years. I do not know how they project it out, but that is actuarial terminology.

Mr. GROSS. Do I understand that the gentleman's committee is now considering legislation dealing with senior officers and that it is hoped to come out with legislation that would prevent impaction in the future, if it is possible to do so?

Mr. KILDAY. This is designed to remain in effect for 10 years or a little bit over. It will expire in 1970, to remedy the present situation. It is my personal view, and I do not know whether the Navy agrees with it or not, but I do not care whether they do, that the Officer Personnel Act of 1947, if it is complied with by the services in the manner in which it is written, will prevent this from happening—unless another Korea or something of that kind comes up.

Mr. GROSS. I can understand the effect that Korea had on the services. I can understand that. But, my question is—is there anything that the Congress can do to prevent a recurrence aside from a situation of that kind, to bring this back into focus, as we discussed the other day on the floor of the House with reference to the Marine Corps?

Mr. KILDAY. I am sorry that we did not get to finish that discussion. The gentleman cut us off too quickly there.

Mr. GROSS. Some 500 colonels and other senior officers in the Marine Corps seems to me to be too many.

Mr. KILDAY. I would like to discuss that with the gentleman some time. But it is a very long subject as we experienced the other day. But I do want to get into the RECORD that these special pays do not carry over into retirement—flight pay and so on. I did not get a chance to make that statement when the gentleman cut off the debate on the floor the other day.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield.

Mr. BALDWIN. The gentleman mentioned in his earlier remarks that all of us are hearing from those who retired prior to the 1958 act. As the gentleman knows, there have been a considerable number of bills introduced to restore the traditional relationship between retired pay and active duty pay. I wonder if the gentleman has any plan at the present time to hold hearings on those bills?

Mr. KILDAY. May I say to the gentleman from California that the principle and the first rule of the Committee on Armed Services is that a subcommittee shall have jurisdiction of all those bills referred to them by the chairman. The chairman has not referred that bill to me and I do not know what he contemplates doing. I do know that he enforces the rules and I have nothing to do with it at this time.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield.

Mr. VANIK. Is this uniquely a problem of the naval personnel? How is this handled in other branches of the service?

Mr. KILDAY. The identical problem has not arisen in the other services. There are other problems in the other services with reference to the distribution of rank. They will have their proposals here which deal differently with different problems, including a request for authority to pluck out some of those who are in higher ranks and matters of that kind.

I do not want to criticize the Committee on Naval Affairs, but when they integrated, after World War I, they were integrated at the ranks they held. This situation I do not believe could properly arise within the Army and the Air Force. But it is a practical situation that confronts us. It is difficult and it is distasteful, but something has to be done about it. This is the best your subcommittee could do with it, and I think it should be passed now.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas has consumed 43 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GAVIN].

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 13 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, in opening my remarks I want, first, to pay tribute to the members of the Armed Services Committee, particularly to the most able gentleman from Texas, [Mr. KILDAY]. They, along with me, have studied, with such diligence and such attention to detail, the officer hump problem of the Navy and Marine Corps for a period of well over 2 years and extending through three sessions of Congress.

This is a most complex subject and the action taken by the committee and, subsequently, the Congress, in this matter will have the most far-reaching effect on the battle readiness of our Navy and Marine Corps not only today but, of prime importance, on the battle readiness of our Navy of tomorrow which will be made up of those nuclear submarines, jet aircraft and guided missile cruisers that we are authorizing in this session of Congress.

This bill, H.R. 4413, was introduced by the distinguished chairman of the Armed Services Committee for the express purpose of providing improved promotion opportunity for certain officers in the naval service.

The bill, while complex in language, is basically simple in its intended operation. It would permit the Secretary of the Navy to convene boards of officers for the purpose of selecting for retirement a percentage of the senior captains in the Navy and a percentage of the senior colonels in the Marine Corps who have been passed over for the rank of general.

In addition, it would allow Navy and Marine Corps selection boards to select for retirement a percentage of commanders and lieutenant colonels who had failed of promotion at least twice to a higher rank.

The vacancies thus created in the senior grades of captain and commander in the Navy and colonel and lieutenant colonel in the Marine Corps would be sufficient to enable those services to maintain a vitalizing flow of promotions and would insure an equitable opportunity for advancement to those officers who were called to the colors during the recent Great War and who remained in as Regulars to fight on the battlefields of Korea and to patrol the Straits of Formosa or off the shores of Lebanon.

I would like to point out here, that the 85th Congress made a tremendous contribution to the morale of the armed services through the passage of pay legislation early in the final session. But the very concept of the pay bill, which was to provide sufficient incentive for the best officers to remain in the service, would be defeated by closing off the avenue of advancement to those battle-trained Regulars commissioned between 1942 and 1945 who, as the Navy Department testified, make up about one-third of its total Regular strength.

It is now a matter of record before Armed Services Subcommittee No. 1, which held exhaustive hearings on this bill, that promotion to the senior grades in the Navy for the past 15 years has been based largely on seniority with little or no forced attrition at the promotion points. Therefore, the many officers who have achieved senior rank through mere longevity are a formidable block to many dynamic able officers below them who, even with this legislation, will face retardation in promotion as well as a vigorous weeding out process between lieutenant commander and commander, and between commander and captain.

On the basis of keeping faith with the principles of the pay legislation alone, this legislation, then, is essential.

Any legislative relief for the Navy's hump problem must, of course, have as the first consideration the needs of the service. If the needs of the Navy and Marine Corps could be met by continuing these senior officers on to the retirement points they contemplated, we would most certainly have recommended this course of action in the subcommittee.

But we considered carefully every method of approach to the problem and finally came to the inescapable conclusion that a substantial number of naval and marine officers must be involuntarily retired. Thus it is not only a case of who goes and when, but with what degree of selectivity will the removal process be conducted.

The magnitude of the problem is immediately apparent when we consider the fact that there are 8,000 Regular line officers in the Navy who were all commissioned within a period of 4 years—and the captain assignments eventually available for them number only 2,000. As a matter of simple arithmetic it would appear that some 6,000 officers from the group of 8,000 will not be selected for the rank of captain in the Navy and will, thus, be denied a 30-year career.

However, by combining the features of this legislation with some retardation in promotion flow, the Navy will be able to keep on for a full 30-year career many more line officers than would otherwise be possible.

As a matter of real interest to the House I would like, Mr. Chairman, to quote some of the figures that the Navy Department submitted to the committee with regard to retirements without the legislation. The number of line lieutenant commanders forced to retire in that grade within the next 10 years would be 3,000 in round numbers. The number of commanders forced to retire in that grade would be some 2,000.

This totals 5,000 in the line alone, and does not include the number who would also be forced out from the various staff corps.

Now, this bill will not save from early retirement all these young officers, but it will keep on active duty over 1,400 more of the best lieutenant commanders and over 600 more of the best commanders. In addition, it will permit about 50 percent of the remaining commanders to be promoted, eventually, to the rank of captain as opposed to only 25 percent who could be promoted without this legislation.

Very possibly the question may arise in your mind, as it did in mine, as to the immediate impact that this bill will have on the Navy and Marine Corps. What kind of captains and colonels will we be getting? Will we be in danger of losing experienced officers in the senior grades during these critical times?

Prior to voting in favor of this bill in committee, I questioned Vice Admiral Smith, the Chief of Naval Personnel, very closely in this regard. In substance, his answer to me was that first, under section 5 of the bill, the President may suspend any provision of the act during a war or national emergency as conditions may dictate; and second, as to the quality of senior officers that will be coming up, the Navy will get more able, vigorous captains with greater promise for the future.

I would like to enlarge on Admiral Smith's statement and point out that with more able, vigorous captains, the Navy's quality of leadership in the higher echelons will be enhanced to a marked degree, providing increased incentive for high quality young men to embark upon a naval career.

As I have indicated, I am thoroughly satisfied that this bill will have a healthy effect on the Navy and Marine Corps and will improve their military capability in the years to come.

But what of our moral responsibility for the senior captains and colonels who will retire somewhat sooner than they had anticipated? These people have been good officers with commendable records of long and faithful service. Although they might not have achieved the senior grade of captain or commander during a more competitive time, they were, nevertheless, on board when the Navy needed them and they discharged their duties in a sufficiently competent manner to warrant their retention until the hump problem became acute.

Now, can we turn around and let them go without some recognition of their loyalty and, in many cases, of their own laudable war records? I, for one, think not.

In fact, I would like to do more for these officers than the bill now provides.

But, extending continued active duty pay to officers who would be serving in unnecessary Navy or Marine Corps billets at the expense of the military pay—Navy appropriation would be neither ethical nor would it be in the best interests of the taxpayer. I am convinced, however, of the need for some separation gratuity to help these men establish themselves in worthy civilian occupations if they so desire.

In addition to their retired pay, which is in no case less than 50 percent of their base pay each month, the bill provides a separation allowance of fairly generous proportions. It would permit a readjustment payment equal to 2 months' base pay for each year of retirement in advance of the 23-year point for commanders and lieutenant colonels and the 30-year point for captains and colonels, but not to exceed $6,000.

It should be emphasized that this is a lump-sum payment on a one-time basis only—including an option to spread it over a period of 3 years—and does not add to the long-term costs of military retirements. While it is a generous method of caring for the people who are affected, nevertheless it also represents the most equitable settlement ever offered to members of the armed services under similar circumstances.

However, it is an essential feature of this bill, since we cannot, in good conscience, suggest that the laws be changed to foreshorten the careers of some of our officer personnel without, at the same time, appropriately safeguarding not only their accrued retirement benefits but their trust and confidence that the country will provide, in some measure, for their continued welfare.

The committee felt that this readjustment allowance would be sufficient to help these officers over the rough spots of their transition to civilian life, providing a sufficient amount of cash to relieve them and their family of financial worry until such time as they are established in a new position. In addition, let me emphasize once again that the captain retiring with 25 years of service will draw well over $6,000 a year in retired pay alone.

I am keenly aware of and share the concern of the Congress over the rising costs of military pay and military retirements. But insofar as active-duty pay is concerned, it was the position of the Navy Department that no increase in the number of captain and commander billets could be justified. As a consequence, this bill provides the solution to the hump problem without the use of additional numbers of senior officers who would not serve in useful billets but would be promoted for promotion's sake alone.

As to retired pay, it must be remembered that all the officers who are part of the hump problem already have retirement guarantees in law since the 8,000 hump officers in the Navy now hold the rank of lieutenant commander or commander and those in the Marine Corps are at least majors. Thus we are not going to add to retired costs in any appreciable degree in the long run. We are, in fact, going to preclude the early retirement of greater numbers of hump officers by involuntarily retiring more senior officers who are just a few years from the mandatory retirement points.

I would like to emphasize, finally, Mr. Chairman, that the question of costs, individual equity, moral obligation, and guarantees of service, though important considerations, are all secondary to the maintenance of a vital, effective Navy and Marine Corps in continual fighting trim. If we do not pass this bill, the country will lose not only those more senior officers who are due to leave the list shortly in any event, but also vast numbers of younger officers whose training, experience, and leadership we could and should employ for 10 to 15 years longer.

In my mind, Mr. Chairman, the choice is clear. We either temporize with the issue now and live to face the same problem from year to year in greater proportions with the future effectiveness of the Navy and Marine Corps held in the balance, or we vote favorably for this bill and resolve the problem here and now, with the decisiveness expected of us by our people for the good of the Navy, the country, and our posterity.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may require to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON].

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of H.R. 4413 is to equalize the attrition rate among regular officers of the Navy and Marine Corps in such a way that the full brunt of nonselection will

not fall upon regular officers of the Navy and Marine Corps who were commissioned in the period 1941 to 1946.

Now this bill is temporary legislation; it will expire in 1970 and the problem that it seeks to overcome will exist for about 10 years.

The problem has been created because there are not sufficient vacancies in the senior grades of the Navy and Marine Corps to permit a reasonable promotional opportunity for lieutenant commanders and commanders of the Regular Navy and majors and lieutenant colonels of the Regular Marine Corps.

If we do not pass this legislation, more than 6,000 unrestricted line officers of the Navy and Marine Corps now serving in the grades of lieutenant commander and commander in the Navy and major in the Marine Corps will fail of selection because there just are not sufficient vacancies to permit a reasonable number of these people to be promoted.

Now let me explain this in a little more detail.

If the proposed legislation is not enacted, 2,945 unrestricted line lieutenant commanders over the next 10 years will fail of selection because of lack of vacancies.

In the Marine Corps, approximately 1,348 majors will fail of selection to lieutenant colonel over the next 5 years because of lack of vacancies.

If we pass the proposed legislation, only 1,476 lieutenant commanders and 400 majors will fail of selection. Thus, we will make it possible for 1,469 lieutenant commanders now serving on active duty in the Regular Navy to be promoted; and we will make it possible for 948 majors to be promoted who would otherwise fail of selection.

In addition, if we do not pass this legislation, some 2,057 unrestricted line commanders will fail of selection during the next 5 years. With the legislation, only 1,400 unrestricted line commanders will fail of selection.

Thus, we will make it possible in the next 5 years to promote 657 more commanders to the grade of captain who otherwise would have to fail of selection because of lack of vacancies.

To put it in terms of percentages, the attrition rate for promotion from commander to captain will be 75 percent; that is, 75 out of 100 commanders will fail of selection to captain, and eventually 85 percent of the lieutenant commanders in the hump years will fail of selection to commander.

In the Marine Corps 75 percent of the majors in the hump years will fail of selection to lieutenant colonel.

This is over a period of the next 10 years.

These are the people who make up the more than 6,000 officers I mentioned who will fail of selection if we do not pass this legislation.

Now in order to make it possible for more of these officers to be selected, we have to create vacancies.

We do this by retiring regular officers of the Navy and Marine Corps in the grade of commander and captain, and lieutenant colonel and colonel, prior to the years of service that they might otherwise have served if we did not take this action.

Under existing law an officer who is selected to the grade of captain in the Navy, or colonel in the Marine Corps, is not required to retire until he completes 30 years of service and has twice failed of selection.

In other words, even after he has twice failed of selection he can continue to serve on active duty assuming his service is satisfactory until he completes 30 years of service.

Also under existing law a commander or lieutenant colonel is not required to retire until he has twice failed of selection and has completed 26 years of service.

In other words, even though he has twice failed of selection to captain or colonel, he is not required under existing law to retire until he completes 26 years of service.

Now the purpose of the proposed legislation is to bring about increased attrition in the grades of captain and colonel, and commander and lieutenant colonel, in order to bring about a constant and reasonable flow of promotion of officers below these grades.

Today we have stagnation at the top in the grades of captain and colonel, and commander and lieutenant colonel, and no vacancies are being created because so many officers have twice failed of selection and yet still have several years to serve until they complete the 30 or 26 years of service that present law contemplates.

Thus, elimination of these officers at the top must be brought about in order to permit promotion among the officers who are at the bottom of the ladder.

In other words, we have stagnation at the top which is forcing the Navy and Marine Corps to impose a very heavy attrition at the bottom. And the purpose of the legislation is to permit a constant and reasonable flow of promotion in the grade of lieutenant commander and major to the grades above that.

Now, what does the proposed legislation contemplate?

It contemplates that a commander who has twice failed of selection or a lieutenant colonel who has twice failed of selection, provided that he has more than 20 years of service, will be retired prior to completing 26 years of service. It also provides that a twice-passed-over marine colonel will be retired before he completes 30 years of service, and a captain who fails of selection for continuation after serving 5 years in grade, will also be retired before he completes 30 years of service.

Over the next 10 years, it is anticipated that 1,500 captains will have their services terminated short of completing 30 years of service.

It is also anticipated that 1,000 commanders will have their services terminated prior to completing 26 years of service.

During the next 10 years, approximately 400 colonels will have their services terminated prior to the completion of 30 years of service and 600 lieutenant colonels will have their services terminated prior to the completion of 26 years of service.

Now the committee has recommended a readjustment pay for individuals not selected for continuation who are now serving in the grade of colonel or captain, or lieutenant colonel or commander, which will give individuals now serving in these grades a sum of money equal to 2 months' pay for each year by which their retirement precedes the normal retirement point. No officer may receive more than $6,000.

We have also inserted a provision in the bill that will require the Navy and the Marine Corps to show in their records that these officers who will be required to retire before completing 30 or 26 years of service retired voluntarily.

In other words, these officers have performed in a satisfactory manner and no stigma should be attached to their records in any way. The bill specifically requires these officers to be carried on the rolls as having retired voluntarily.

In considering the equities involved in the proposed legislation, it must be remembered that the officers whose careers will be terminated short of the years of service that they might have otherwise anticipated have not been subjected to the attrition contemplated by the Officer Personnel Act.

Many of them were promoted without competition during World War II and thereafter were promoted if found qualified with practically no competition for selection.

In other words, many of these officers have been in selection zones where 100 percent of the qualified officers have been selected.

It also should be remembered that these officers, most of whom were promoted early in their careers to the more senior grades, have been drawing the full pay and allowances of the more senior grades far in advance of the period when they might have anticipated promotion to these senior grades.

If the proposed legislation is not enacted, most of these officers will continue on active duty drawing pay which increases with longevity while the officers junior to them will either face completely unacceptable heavy attrition or an excessively long wait for any promotional opportunity or a combination of both.

The proposed legislation must be considered from the viewpoint of what it does for our national defense. While we must always be conscious of the effect any legislation has on individuals, the overriding factor must be the security of the Nation.

Under the proposed legislation it will be possible to promote about 60 percent of the lieutenant commanders who are now in the hump to the grade of commander. Likewise, about 70 percent of the majors in the hump years will be able to be promoted to the grade of lieutenant colonel.

Under the proposed legislation, it will be possible for approximately 50 percent of the commanders in the hump years to be eventually promoted to the grade of captain, and about 60 percent of the officers in the hump years in the Marine Corps to the grade of colonel.

Without the legislation, 75 percent of the majors and lieutenant commanders in the hump years in the Marine Corps and Navy will fail of selection.

All of these officers are the combat tested, widely experienced officers who we will look to for leadership in the years ahead. To assess this attrition against these officers will seriously affect the capability of the Navy and the Marine Corps now and in the foreseeable future.

For that reason we must keep as many of these officers as we possibly can, and that is the objective of the proposed legislation.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. BENNETT].

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. Mr. Chairman, it is certainly in the interest of national defense to make possible more rapid promotions to the upper officer grades of the Navy, which is the primary purpose of this bill. However, the bill provides for involuntarily retiring many commanders and captains to make way for the promotions of these junior officers. I have felt that the bill is deficient in not giving these competent and loyal naval officers an opportunity to remain in the Navy outside the chain of promotion until completion of 26 years in the case of commanders and of 30 years in the case of captains.

The Officer Personnel Act of 1947 provided:

SEC. 312. (a) Captains * * * of the line * * * whose names, on June 30 of the fiscal year in which they complete 31 years of total commissioned service * * * are not on a promotion list, shall, subject to the provisions of paragraph (1) of subsection 311(c) of this title, if not otherwise retired pursuant to law, be placed on the retired list on that date.

And:

SEC. 312. Commanders * * * whose names, on June 30 of the fiscal year in which they complete 26 years of commissioned service, are not on a promotion list, shall, subject to the provisions of paragraph (1) of subsection 311(c) of this title, if not otherwise retired pursuant to law and if they shall have twice failed of selection for temporary promotion to captain, be placed on the retired list on that date.

Prior to the enactment of this law the situation simply was that officers who had failed of selection to the next higher grade twice or more were required to be either separated or involuntarily retired—see pages 6–19 of NAVPERS 15898—"Officer Fact Book, Facts for Officer Counseling."

The purpose of this 1947 law was shown by the following statements in the committee report—House Reports No. 640:

In reporting the bill unanimously, the committee takes the position that it is bringing before the House an equitable, economical, and forward-looking officer promotion program for the services—a program that will offer careers satisfactory enough to attract capable men, promising enough to hold in service the capable men already in uniform, and economical enough to be acceptable from a budgetary standpoint.

* * * * *

Regular officers of the Army and Navy must be given some assurance, with the least possible delay, as to what the future holds in store for them, or the services will lose a high proportion of their most capable men and the morale of those who remain will be impaired.

Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower, Chief of Staff at that time, approved of the 1947 act "completely and thoroughly"—hearings before Committee on Armed Services, U.S. Senate, July 16, 1947, page 2.

Specifically—

He testified—

we need to tell the young fellow who is coming in what his prospects are, how he stands, what he has to do, what standards he has to reach in order to go ahead.

The moral obligation which the unamended bill now before us would repudiate was thus embodied in the Officer Personnel Act of 1947. There was a commitment in that act that naval officers of captain and commander grade who completed certain service would not be retired until completion of 30 or 26 years respectively. Reference to the hearings on this legislation now before us show that both the representatives of the Navy and members of the subcommittee repeatedly referred to this as a "guarantee by law"—page 3, 1959 hearings—a "guaranteed 30 years of service"—pages 55, 56, 1959 hearings. Elsewhere in the hearings, it is pointed out that by enacting the unamended bill we would be "changing specific rules"—pages 34, 43, and 50, 1959 hearings—or effecting a "change in signals"—page 30, 1958 hearings.

The hearings show that the 1947 act was passed to prevent a loss of officers at a time when they were badly needed, that it was passed to assure these officers that if they completed certain service they would not be involuntarily retired until they completed 26 or 30 years, whichever was applicable, and that the officers affected by the bill before us so understood. This is shown by the hearings in 1958 at page 37.

On February 17, 1959, the testimony of Navy Secretary Thomas Gates shows that the 1947 act was understood as a guarantee and relied upon by these officers.

The amendment I offered in committee to correct the pending legislation left the bill intact as it came from the subcommittee but provided further that before an officer is separated under the act he will be given an opportunity to elect to fulfill his guaranteed service without further promotion, outside the chain of promotion, by reassignment in certain specified activity. This would first be within the Department of Defense and if no utilization is found there other assignments would be possible within other agencies of the Government or in the national interest as specified in the amendment.

Thus, although the amendment would cost some additional dollars these competent officers would be performing valuable service for the Nation, the Navy hump would be eliminated, the moral obligations fulfilled, and the interest of national defense would be served by assuring present and future officers of the integrity of the Federal Government guarantees upon which officers are induced to enter and remain in service.

I do not believe that the Government should repudiate the obligations which I believe are owed to those senior officers. To do so will lessen enthusiasm among others who may be considering entering upon or continuing officer service. Moreover, I dislike the result in the Government's losing the services of these fine officers who are to be separated. These men are in the prime of life. They stood the test of many years of competition with their peers and have survived many selection boards. If they are not to be used in the Navy, their experience and talents can be put to good use elsewhere in the Department of Defense, in the other Government departments and agencies, or in colleges carrying out projects in cooperation with the Federal Government.

The amendment I offered in the full committee reads as follows:

On page 10, immediately after line 16, insert the following:

"SEC. 5. (a) If, before the date prescribed in subsection (i) of the first section of this act for his retirement, an officer applies to the Secretary of the Navy for reassignment under this section, he shall not be retired, but—

"(1) shall be reassigned to perform duty in the Department of Defense;

"(2) shall be reassigned to perform duty with any other department, agency, or establishment in the Government of the United States; or

"(3) if not reassigned to duty under subparagraph (1) or (2), shall be reassigned to perform duties as a member of the faculty or staff of any institution of higher learning cooperating with the Federal Government in scientific, military research, or other Federal activity.

"(b) An officer reassigned pursuant to this section shall be carried as an additional number in grade, shall not be eligible for promotion, and shall be retired on the date applicable to him under section 6376, 6377, or 6379 of title 10, United States Code. For the purpose of applying such sections, such officer shall be treated in the same manner as are officers who have twice failed of selection for promotion and who are not on a promotion list."

I have been unsuccessful in making these views prevail within the Armed Services Committee. There is no solid testimony on the feasibility of my amendment within the committee hearings. There is much merit in allowing the younger officers a reasonable chance for promotion. Under these circumstances I have concluded that it would be best not to offer the amendment in this floor debate but to vote for the bill with the idea that in later stages of the bill's consideration it can be further heard and amended to eliminate its present objectionable features without damaging its good purpose of providing adequate promotional opportunities for younger officers.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN].

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I desire to extend in the RECORD at this point comments by one of the officers affected by this legislation. I have received permission in the House.

The comments are as follows:

COMMENTS BY A NAVY COMMANDER ON H.R. 4413—THE NAVY'S PROPOSED HUMP LEGISLATION

Background: H.R. 4413 is the Navy's proposed temporary legislation to set aside certain provisions in the Officer Personnel Act (OPA) of 1947. Based upon this act, the Navy gave certain assurances to officers of the Navy upon which they could plan their careers. The purpose of this act was to provide incentives for young men coming in the Navy and to induce experienced officers of World War II to join the regular service, and it has been used by the Navy for this purpose. One of the assurances given the career service officer by the Navy under the OPA was a guarantee of the following years' service by ranks, provided, of course, the officer's performance of duty proved satisfactory: Major or lieutenant commander, 20 years; lieutenant colonel or commander, 26 years; colonel or captain, 30 years.

The problem: The hump consists of a large group of officers who were initially commissioned during the 4 years of World War II. This group, disproportionate to all other year groups before and behind it, constitutes about one-fourth of the regular officer strength of the Navy and Marine Corps. It has provided the large reservoir of combat-tempered experience which has been the backbone of the Navy during the past decade.

Officers in the hump are now in the grades of lieutenant-commander and commander in the Navy, and major and lieutenant-colonel in the Marine Corps. Unless remedial action is taken, about two-thirds of these officers will be retired in the grades in which they are now serving without having had a reasonable opportunity for promotion to a higher grade. This is not as serious as it appears because it is not much worse than normal.

Cause of the problem: The official stand is that too many officers were retained after World War II and promotions were stepped up during Korea. Why does not the Air Force and Army have the same problem? Could not the problem in the Navy have been caused in part by poor personnel management? If this is true, the men who caused the problem are either now admirals, or retired, and are not, therefore, affected by the proposed legislation.

H.R. 4413: The bill, as proposed by the Department of Defense, and as amended and approved by the Armed Forces Committee of the Congress at this writing, will authorize the Secretary of the Navy to convene plucking boards for eliminating certain numbers of captains (about 50 percent) who have 5 years service in grade. Certain numbers of commanders (about 50 percent) who twice fail of selection for promotion to captain, will be selected for forced retirement. The Armed Forces subcommittee amended the bill to provide a severance payment of 2 months base pay for each year of service short of the guaranteed 26 or 30 years for commanders and captains respectively, not to exceed $6,000.

Personal effect of H.R. 4413: If this bill is passed it will have the following meaning and effect on nearly all of those officers who are plucked out:

(1) The Congress broke faith (promised by the Navy).

(2) They chose the wrong career.

(3) They will be looking for a new job in their mid-40's. It will prove difficult to get any kind of a reasonable job at their age, especially with the stigma of being a discard. Irrespective of the "voluntary" termination added to the bill by the subcommittee, any man who is kicked out of any organization is severely handicapped in trying to reestablish himself.

(4) The insurance and investment plans for the education of their children would have to be canceled or radically altered and many related financial commitments would have to be terminated at disadvantage.

Recommendations: The following recommendations are respectfully submitted for consideration:

(1) It is recommended that H.R. 4413 be sent back to committee with no further action, thereby leaving the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 in force. The Navy can find more humane ways to solve this problem; or

(2) It is recommended that a severance sum be provided in an amount that will attract voluntary retirement of commanders after 20 years' service and captains after 26 years' service. In this manner the same objective can be accomplished at approximately the same cost and it will be eminently fair for the officers concerned. It is considered that a $10,000 maximum severance payment would attract sufficient early voluntary retirements to solve this problem. This could be financed by a bond maturing in 5 years, similar to the leave bond issued at the end of World War II.

The Navy will, in other words, eliminate a certain number of captains and commanders and promote an equal number into the ranks so vacated. With the selection procedures used by the Navy, it is entirely possible and probable that certain groups of officers will be discriminated against in the prosecution of H.R. 4413 and the bill contains no provision to prevent this.

Based upon the premise that it was good for the Navy to have a mixture of Academy, college and university graduates in the Officer Corps, the Holloway plan was sold to the Congress. This plan provided that all naval officers who did not have a college degree would be sent to college at Government expense for five semesters, then sent to the Navy Line Officers School for 1 year. After this extra education, non-Academy officers were to be considered equal to the Naval Academy officers from an educational and professional standpoint. (I had a college degree when I came in the Navy and was not sent to college under the Holloway plan.)

Captains and commanders who consider themselves the choice ones and all junior officers are in favor of this legislation because it enhances their promotion opportunities, but what will it do to their faith in the laws of the land? As a commander, I could possibly benefit by this law. The worse that could happen is that my career can be cut short by 4 to 5 years from the promise of 26 years. On the other hand my chances of being promoted to captain will increase from approximately 25 percent without the bill to 50 percent with the bill.

Therefore, my basic concern is the shattering of faith that this bill causes and the possible discrimination in its use. If I have no assurances, then even my ultimate retired pay is not sacred. Could I depend on it in my old age? No. Perhaps I would be wise to retire after 20 years' service and try a new career. The younger officers will use the same reasoning. Twenty years' service is not a career because a man's most productive years are between the ages of 40 and 60 years. After H.R. 4413, what will the young men think when the recruiters speak of the "guarantees" provided by the laws of the country? Even at the present time, the Armed Forces cannot attract sufficient young college graduates into the officer corps without compulsory military training. This is mentioned to show that H.R. 4413 can have far more drastic and costly results in the future than in its immediate effect. When any organization practices wholesale and heartless elimination of men near the top of the ladder, who have been successful in their profession, to make room for those down the ladder, even the confidence of those who benefit is severely shaken.

Subcommittee hearings on H.R. 4413: If this bill becomes law and if I am one of the unfortunate ones to be kicked out I could never blame the Armed Services Committee of the House of Representatives because I am convinced that this committee is trying to give the Navy legislation it has asked for. However, in hearings of this type it is suggested that a representative group of officers be called to testify and not a handpicked group.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARENDS].

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, like my chairman, the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, I, too, want to congratulate the subcommittee under the leadership of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILDAY] and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GAVIN] on this side of the aisle, for the splendid work they have done in the hearings and the report they brought to the full committee, which, as I recall, was unanimously adopted by the Committee on Armed Services. This has been an extremely intricate piece of legislation that they have dealt with. I think this is a good bill, something that the House must act favorably on, which will be so beneficial to the Navy in the years ahead.

Mr. Chairman, there has been much discussion concerning the effects of H.R. 4413 on the officers who would be retired as a result of its enactment. Let us turn for a moment to consider the effects on another group of officers if the bill is not passed.

In the Navy there are about 8,000 lieutenant commanders and commanders of the line who presently aspire to be promoted to captain. However, there are only 2,000 line captain vacancies to which this group can be promoted if H.R. 4413 is not enacted. This means that more than 6,000 officers will be retired without ever reaching the grade of captain. The situation in the Marine Corps is just as drab; 3,000 majors and lieutenant colonels must be fitted into 580 colonel's billets.

If the bill is not passed before the next selection board is convened this fall, three out of four of the lieutenant commanders under consideration must be failed of promotion. This is what happened last year: A fantastic 71 percent of the lieutenant commanders had to be failed of selection since relief was not provided by the last Congress. I am sure that most of us have received letters from our constituents as a result of that drastic action, complaining about a lack of a fair opportunity and the loss of morale. The Officer Personnel Act envisioned that only one out of four would be passed over at this stage. In other words, the present lieutenant commanders have been anticipating that three out of four would be promoted rather than only one out of four. If this bill is passed, and only if it is passed, three out of five of the lieutenant commanders can expect promotions and a continuance of their careers. Without it, their situation is hopeless. It is expected that it will get worse even with only 1 out of 4 being promoted; it could drop to 1½ out of 10 and have a devastating effect.

The picture is just as bleak for the full commanders. The Officer Personnel Act envisioned that three out of four

commanders would be promoted to captain. If this bill is not passed, only one out of four can expect promotions. If the bill is passed, their opportunities can be raised to about two out of four, a 50–50 chance.

The Secretary of the Navy, the Honorable Thomas S. Gates, Jr., painted this grim picture very clearly for the subcommittee of the Committee on Armed Services which considered the bill. He pointed out the evils of permitting promotions to stagnate, which would occur if this legislation is not passed and which would also cause the force-out of some of our finest and most needed officers. The officers behind the hump, those serving in the grade of lieutenant or who have been recently promoted above that grade, will also be affected, since they will be held back. In the words of the Secretary:

> We can expect many of these outstanding junior officers to leave the service unless we take action now. These officers are our seed corn for the future. The alternative to complete promotion stagnation would be to force out three-quarters of the officers in the hump group. This would be most unwise. The Navy needs these officers, who combine combat experience in two wars with potential for the future.

Mr. Gates very vividly displayed in atomic-age language the effects on the future Navy if the Congress does not take action to provide the requested relief: "Today we build nuclear ships—supersonic aircraft, missiles with uncanny intelligence—to equip the Navy and Marine Corps for the responsibilities of seapower in the future. The officers we speak of today are the officers who must design, control, and command these forces. We cannot risk second-class leadership. In the national interest, the service requires the best. I am convinced that the legislation we ask for is indispensable to that objective."

After reviewing the facts, which were presented so excellently by Vice Adm. H. Paige Smith, the Chief of Naval Personnel, and Maj. Gen. Donald M. Weller, Assistant Chief of Staff of Personnel of the U.S. Marine Corps, I feel that the Secretary of the Navy expressed himself factually and without any sense of exaggeration. He did not overstate the case or present it extravagantly. The Navy and Marine Corps have a most serious problem which can only be solved by legislation—and now! If more delay is added on the already existing delays, the harm which will be done to the careers of our future leaders will be compounded, possibly even wrecked to the point of not being recoverable.

Considerable soul searching has been done before bringing this legislation on the floor of this House. The Secretary of the Navy, along with the Chief of Naval Operations, and the Commandant of the Marine Corps, gave it his personal attention and concentrated study before recommending the solution to the Congress. The members of the Committee on Armed Services have reviewed it from every corner with the hope of finding a better solution. After months of study, even years, all have concluded that this bill provides the only fair and equitable system.

As has already been pointed out, a continuance of the devastating attrition rates on the junior officers would be unsound and unfair. Now for a moment let us look at the group which would be required to retire in order to provide a reasonable avenue toward a career for the junior officers. To quote from the Secretary of the Navy again:

> There are many officers senior to the hump who have been promoted with no serious attrition. Among them are officers who would not have achieved high rank under comparable competition. The maintenance of quality among our officers and simple equity demand that they should share this burden in some measure. Many of them realize it is in the best interest of a stronger Navy that they do so. Certainly everyone recognizes that they have served their country faithfully and well.

In the personal opinion of the Secretary, and which has been so ably supported here by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILDAY] this bill is in the best interest of both the need of the services and of equity and fairness between individuals. This legislation will preserve the equities between groups of people and preserve good faith and level off the problem in the best interests of the best kind of officer corps that you can envision. Without it, you do not maintain morale and you also lose the objectives which must be sought. All of these complex elements are inextricably interwoven.

And so, stated simply, the problem to be cured is which group of officers must be retired. If H.R. 4413 is enacted, about 35 percent of the senior officers—the individual officer being determined by the Navy's time-honored selection board procedures—will be retired after having had the unanticipated benefits of practically free promotion to the grade of captain and after having enjoyed a reasonable career. If the bill should fail, then about 75 percent of the junior officers will be retired without a fair opportunity of promotion or the completion of a satisfactory career. In other words, H.R. 4313 would provide a selective retirement system and the assurance of having our leaders of tomorrow trained and ready to command the fleets which must guard the seven seas.

With all my heart and strength I urge you to vote "aye" on this bill.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. VAN ZANDT].

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, I, too, want to compliment the members of Subcommittee No. 1 of the House Committee on Armed Services for the bill that they have brought to the floor of the House today. It is a very complicated and technical matter. The House Committee on Armed Services has been looking into it for years, and in my opinion this is an equitable bill and the only approach to a most difficult problem. I intend to support the bill.

Mr. Chairman, during the hearings on H.R. 4413, the Secretary of the Navy and the Chief of Naval Personnel explained, in detail, the dilemma facing the Navy and Marine Corps in relation to their officer personnel structure arising from the post-World War II officer procurement problems. A searching analysis was made by each member of the Armed Services Committee with regard to the human factors involved and the decision to involuntarily retire some captains and colonels short of a 30-year career was made only when it became obvious that, within the next few years, some 3,500 naval and marine officers must be forced out in any event. The statement made to the full committee by my distinguished colleague, Mr. PAUL KILDAY, of Texas, sums up the problem as succinctly as possible and I will not do anything more than enlarge upon one or two of the questions that may have arisen in your minds concerning this legislation.

First, because of the problem of maintaining an effective Reserve force, ready for immediate mobilization in these times when the threat of war is constantly with us, the question arose in my mind of the active duty Reserve officers' chances for promotion and for continuation on active service with the forces at sea.

Naturally, since the noncontinuation features of this legislation apply only to Regular officers and the resulting promotion opportunity figures for commanders and lieutenant commanders submitted by the Navy Department were arrived at from calculations based upon considerations of Regular officers alone; this bill can be considered largely as a vehicle for the orderly promotion and retirement of Regulars. However, without this legislation, the Navy would be forced to release to inactive duty, without further delay, almost all of its senior grade Reserve officers which even then would not solve the problem but would have only an alleviatory effect of very short duration.

One of the questions asked of the Navy Department involved the possible reduction in the magnitude of the problem through the release of Reserve officers. Would such a release program solve the hump problem? In substance, the answer was no—that the release of some 250 Reserve commanders would ease but not remove the rigors of the immediate promotion problem of lieutenant commanders while the removal of the few Reserve captains remaining on active duty would have no effect whatsoever. It was largely the position of the Navy that a preferred course of action would be to permit as many as possible to remain on and take their chances for promotion with the Regulars based upon the competitiveness of their own records. It is obvious that if the promotion opportunity of the Regular is enhanced, the opportunity for the active duty Reserve officer is also somewhat improved.

Next, I would like to dwell in some detail on the cost aspects of the bill. There has been some apprehension that its enactment would lead to a loading of the retired payrolls—a marked increase in long-range retirement costs.

Let me say at the outset that the compelling need for this legislation would, in my opinion, require that we give this measure favorable consideration even though its anticipated cost was of nine digit proportions.

Happily, such is not the case.

The proposed legislation will have fiscal impact on both retired pay appro-

priations and active duty pay appropriations. Committee hearings brought out the following significant information relative to those two areas.

During the next 10 to 15 years our active duty military force will earn progressively more longevity credits for pay purposes. In other words, active duty pay costs per man will increase—with or without legislation. However, enactment of the proposed legislation will serve to decelerate average longevity of the active duty force. Under personnel plans with the needed legislation, a number of the Navy and Marine Corps more senior officers will be retired and replaced by officers with significantly less longevity credits for pay purposes. This means that on a comparative basis, active duty pay disbursements can be expected to decrease—with the legislation.

On the other hand, enactment of the needed legislation will lead to an increase in retired pay costs—now—and most probably in the long haul. Comparative retired pay costs can be viewed from many different vantages. However, from a true cost standpoint, retired pay disbursements to an early retiree—up to the date retired pay would normally have been due—must be considered as additional cost to the taxpayer. However, when the early retiree reaches the point where he normally would have been retired, a reversal takes place. Due to the lower rate of retired pay being disbursed to this individual, pay back against the earlier additional sum commences and continues each year the man lives. Therefore, depending upon how long they live, some of our early retirees represent an additional cost to the taxpayer, others constitute a long-range saving in retired pay dollars.

Readjustment pay for early retirees also constitutes increased cost during the 10-year period 1960–70.

We have carefully considered these financial implications—increased costs involved in retired pay and the readjustment allowance, and decreased comparative costs in active duty pay. In the main, decreases and increases serve to offset each other. As an outside estimate the maximum cost of the legislation will not exceed $15 million spread over the next 60 years.

In conclusion, I hark back to the statement that the compelling need for this legislation far overshadows its traceable financial implications. Of far greater significance are inestimable costs which I am confident will accrue if we do not enact this legislation thus enabling the Navy to pursue an aggressive, forward looking personnel program. Can one really pin a price tag on sound leadership? My answer to that is no. Can one truly assess the damages of mediocrity? My answer to that is no. There is, however, no question in my mind as to which is preferred.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. STRATTON].

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Chairman, as has already been indicated by the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee [Mr. KILDAY], this bill is important because it is designed to accomplish one major purpose, which is to keep the Navy from any stagnation that might accrue from a lack of regular and prompt and somewhat reasonably predictable promotions. We need to keep a Navy that is not only mobile on the seas, but one also mobile from an administrative standpoint, because unless we have a Navy that is mobile in that regard, a Navy in which a man can reasonably expect to move through certain grades with reasonably predictable speed, then the Navy cannot become the kind of an attractive career that it must become if we are to continue to attract and to hold men in positions comparable to those in private and civilian life. This has been a problem to which the House has addressed itself on many occasions in the past, and continues to be a real problem. This legislation, as I understand it, is another piece of legislation designed to make the armed services, and specifically in this case the Navy, an attractive career. The legislation is needed, as the subcommittee was advised, because of a "hump" which has been created, due very largely to the fact that large numbers of officers came in, as has been explained, in a very brief period of time during World War II, and because a very large number of senior officers were retained on active duty during the Korean emergency rather than suffering normal rates of attrition, simply because it would have been a little silly to call back Reserve officers and at the same time retire Regular officers. May I say, Mr. Chairman, in response to one of the questions that was addressed earlier to the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILDAY], that the so-called hump does not refer to the captains and the admirals. It refers, rather, to those officers who are next behind the more senior ranks, the commanders and the lieutenant commanders; and this bill is not designed primarily to solve the hump problem by getting officers out of the hump, but is designed to get officers out of the more senior grades so that the officers in the hump may expect a reasonable promotion ratio in the future.

The officers in the hump are, to a large extent, lieutenant commanders. They are not the officers who are being affected by this legislation.

The problem of a hump is nothing new in the armed services although it probably has never been presented in quite such a substantial form as it is at the present time in the Navy. We had a hump, as I understand it, at the end of World War I. You will remember, for example, that the President of the United States served some 16 years in the grade of major, and General Omar Bradley served a comparable period because, again, the high commission rate for officers during World War I had created a similar problem which in those days had to be solved merely by the stagnation of officers in the middle grades.

In the Navy our officers in the days since World War II have been able to look forward to a reasonably rapid promotion rate. The Navy, in spite of the large number of officers who came in during World War II, has moved these officers up with reasonable rapidity. Perhaps the Navy has not had quite as many captains and admirals under the age of 21 which was reportedly the situation in the Air Force at least during World War II. But in general the Navy, along with the other services, has been able to point to a large number of fairly senior officers who are relatively young in years. This has indeed contributed to the effective and vigorous operation of the Navy.

But now the problem arises: If these officers who have been promoted with such reasonable rapidity are to be retained for the number of years that has been specified in existing legislation, then we are going to have the same kind of stagnation that existed in the Army after World War I, a kind of stagnation which would not only do a disservice to the Navy, but which would also do a disservice to the individual officers affected in all grades, and particularly those in the lower grades.

The only alternative to this legislation would be to pass no legislation. In that case we would either have to require that officers in the lower grades remain in those grades for an indefinite and unreasonable period of time, gradually being attrited out to civilian life at a percentage of up to 75 percent or else we would have to create all kinds of jobs to be filled by officers in senior billets which are not jobs that actually require that kind of high rank or broad experience.

The committee rejected both alternatives as not being in the interests of the service, in the interests of the Government or ultimately in the interests of the officers concerned themselves. Therefore, this legislation is advanced here to suspend for a limited period of time the guarantees of continued service that are prescribed in the Officer Personnel Act.

The only question remaining before our committee was to make sure that the type of suspension and the formula under which it was adopted was fair to the officers who were being affected. In my judgment, this is a fair provision. It provides a degree of retirement pay which will come in some cases to as high as two-thirds of the active duty pay which the officer could expect to receive had he continued on active duty for the full statutory period of his service. And, incidentally, in putting this legislation into effect, the officers who are closest to the statutory retirement point will be the first ones to be affected. Those who have a number of years to run will not be affected, as the Navy has explained it, for several years. So that someone who is facing a particular personal crisis in terms of two or three children in college, for example, will have a reasonable period of time in which to prepare for this eventuality if it should develop.

Mr. Chairman, I have had the opportunity to talk to a number of officers who are in the Navy and who may well be affected by this legislation. I have been surprised to find that in general the attitude of these officers is not unfavorable to this legislation. The big thing they are concerned about is the uncertainty that has existed while this bill has been discussed in the previous Congress and

in this Congress. I think they are prepared to accept the terms of this legislation and to consider it as meeting to a large extent their desires and their needs. What they want is a positive decision from this House and from the Congress so that they can begin to make their plans for the future. If we pass no legislation, we are creating a grave injustice to the other officers who came into the Navy in the latter days of World War II, those who are really in the hump, those who, without this legislation, will not be able to look forward to a reasonable career in the Navy and to a reasonable promotion opportunity. That in turn means, of course, that we will reduce the attractiveness of the military forces as a career service, and will undoubtedly jeopardize the opportunity of the Navy and the other services to attract the kinds of young men and young women that will be needed to carry on the military responsibilities of our Nation.

There may be some disappointment in this legislation for some individuals, but I think the committee has come forward with a proposal which will share that measure of disappointment on an equal basis and which will not make that disappointment so great as to offset the much greater good that will be done by this legislation to the naval service at large and to the country as a whole.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HUDDLESTON].

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Chairman, I was a member of the subcommittee that investigated the Navy and Marine Corps hump problem during the 85th Congress and was present during the exhaustive hearings just concluded by Armed Services Subcommittee No. 1 on the same subject. The bill—H.R. 4413—reported out by the full committee, is a synthesis of the views of the Navy Department, Department of Defense, and the Armed Services Committee. It is the culmination of weeks of hearings extending through at least three sessions of Congress, topped by many, many hours of soul-searching, nonpartisan debate. It is not the kind of bill that one can act upon with enthusiasm since it involves the unpleasant task of hurting some individuals even though the net effect is good and in the best interests of the naval service and the country. But I am convinced that it is a measure that we must support if we are to continue to have an effective Navy and Marine Corps capable of continuing in their present vital role as a major deterrent to this country's potential enemies during these critical times.

The Navy's hump problem had its origin in the unsettled period immediately following World War II when the postwar Regular officer strength was only some 7,000 line officers. The continuing requirements for officer strength—just to man our existing ships and units—was in excess of 24,000 Regular line officers. There was no other pool of trained officers from which to recruit Regulars in such numbers for this postwar fleet outside of those officers originally commissioned during the war and, as a consequence, the Navy hump was born. It started as a procurement problem but, with the passage of time, has now become a job stagnation problem of such proportions as to demand immediate remedial action. Some 8,000 Regular officers in the line of the Navy are concentrated in just a 4-year span. Although they are virtually contemporaries from the standpoint of years of service, age, and experience, there are only 2,000 captain jobs to which these officers can aspire. It would appear then, that roughly 6,000 of these hump officers will not be promoted to captain and, under present law, will be retired short of a 30-year career.

Now, had the 2,000 officers who are presently captains all have been promoted with the same degree of competition as that to be faced in the future by the hump officers, it could be argued that nothing should be done to disturb their tenure. However, this was not the case. Most of the 2,000 captains ahead of the hump were promoted without any significant promotion attrition, and to make the hump bear the entire cost of the problem through attrition on itself would be contrary not only to good sense and sound management practices but would run counter to the best interests of the service. However, the present law would allow the Navy only this course of action. They would have to levy catastrophic attrition on the lieutenant commanders, commanders, majors, and lieutenant colonels in the hump. On the other hand, the bill now before the House would permit the Navy to distribute this necessary attrition across its entire officer spectrum and, thusly, to retain on active duty the best officers in each grade. This is the only way that the best interests of the Navy can be served.

I share the concern of other Members of the Congress as to the number of useful officers who will be forced into early retirement. However, this bill not only reduces the number who will be forced out, but it makes the process selective. For example, by selectively retiring 780 captains before reaching 30 years of service between now and 1964, the Navy will reduce the number of line commanders that it must retire by over 500. The number of line lieutenant commanders retired at 20 years of service will be reduced from 3,400 to about 2,000, thus saving over 1,000 of these younger officers who will still have between 10 and 15 years of useful service remaining. But, equally important, the number of commanders and lieutenant commanders who will have been passed over but who will still be on active duty will have been sharply reduced. Instead of failing three out of four commanders at the promotion point to captain, two out of four will make the grade and continue on as effective leaders in the naval organization.

Without this bill, the Navy will eventually have better than 50 percent of its commanders in a passed-over status. The effect that this would have on the young men that are now in the junior grades would be so adverse in the immediate future as to become a real deterrent to those now contemplating a naval career.

With this bill, I believe that the morale of the Navy and Marine Corps will be considerably improved, since we will provide more vigorous leadership for the men we are recruiting today. In addition, the contact that the ensigns and lieutenants have with the officers in the hump, whose chances will be improved, is far more intimate than the contact they have with the senior captains who may be failed of continuation and involuntarily retired.

You may question whether or not this legislation is establishing a 20-year career pattern. Quite the contrary, it is designed to provide a reasonable opportunity for a certain group of officers to have a 30-year career. This bill will give a higher percentage of a greater number of people the opportunity to serve on active duty for no less than 30 years. For example, for those officers originally commissioned in 1930, 70 out of every 100 have been promoted to captain and, without a change in the law, will continue on to retirement by June of 1960. On the other hand, for those officers commissioned in 1945, only 10 out of every 100 can look forward to a full career if this bill is not enacted into law.

Although this change in the law cannot bring those Regulars commissioned in 1945 up to the opportunity enjoyed by many senior to them, it can raise the number of 30-year captains in each 100 from 10 to 17.

In summation, in terms of total numbers, this legislation would provide an opportunity for approximately 120 more officers out of those commissioned in 1945 to serve out their full time as effective naval officers. Extending this example still further through the other officers in the hump we find that some 1,500 more officers in the line of the Navy will fulfill the expectation of becoming captains and that a greater number will continue on for at least 30 years than would otherwise be the case. These figures do not include the various staff corps which are of such magnitude as to increase the numbers retained in the long run by at least one-third.

Mr. Chairman, every possible alternative solution to this problem was thoroughly investigated by the committee. It might appear that additional numbers in the senior grades would be a more humane method of solving the hump but, as we all know, the Armed Services already have an abundance of senior officers and the Navy testified that the numbers of captains and commanders presently on board are ample to meet their needs. Any increase of numbers in the senior grades would, indeed, provide promotion opportunity but with a concomitant loss of job opportunity to the extent that junior captains and commanders would be forced into duties normally performed by officers of lesser rank. This course of action would have a most debilitating effect on service morale and I do not feel that it can be countenanced to any degree.

In summation, this bill provides for a continued vitalizing flow of promotions in the Navy and Marine Corps, while, at the same time, protecting the equity of the individuals in and above the hump.

Most important, however, it provides for the needs of the Navy and the Marine Corps and will preserve them as effective fighting units now and in the years to come when the safety and survival of this Nation are at stake.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, I understand the gentleman from Pennsylvania does not desire to use more time.

Mr. GAVIN. I have no further requests for time, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) the Secretary of the Navy may, whenever the needs of the service require, convene selection boards, or direct boards convened under chapter 543 of title 10, United States Code, to recommend for continuation on the active list officers of the Regular Navy and the Regular Marine Corps described in subsection (c) and shall convene or direct such boards to recommend for continuation on the active list officers of the Regular Navy and the Regular Marine Corps described in subsections (e)–(g). Except as otherwise provided in this section, the provisions of chapter 543 of title 10, United States Code (other than section 5701 (e)), concerning boards to recommend captains, commanders, colonels, or lieutenant colonels for promotion, apply to each board convened under this subsection.

(b) Each board convened under subsection (a) to consider captains in the Medical Service Corps or the Nurse Corps shall consist of not less than three or more than nine officers on the active list or the retired list of the Regular Navy in the grade of captain or above, two-thirds of whom are officers in the Medical Corps and one-third of whom are officers in the corps concerned. To be eligible for membership on such a board, an officer on the active list in the Medical Service Corps or the Nurse Corps must have been recommended for continuation on the active list by an earlier board convened under this section. When there is an insufficient number of officers of the Medical Service Corps or the Nurse Corps available to serve, the Secretary shall complete the minimum required membership by appointing as members of the board officers of the Regular Navy in the Medical Corps.

(c) Each officer of the Regular Navy or the Regular Marine Corps who has served on active duty for more than five years, who is not on a promotion list, and who will complete at least five years of service in the grade of captain in the Navy or colonel in the Marine Corps by June 30 of the fiscal year in which a board is convened under this section is eligible for consideration for continuation on the active list by that board. An officer who has once been recommended for continuation while serving in the grade of captain or colonel by such a board may not be considered by a subsequent board convened under this section and is not subject to the provisions of subsection (e) or (f). For purposes of this subsection, an officer is considered as serving in the grade of captain in the Navy or colonel in the Marine Corps from the date of rank assigned him upon appointment to that grade under chapter 539 or 545 of title 10, United States Code, until the effective date of his appointment in the next higher grade under chapter 545 of title 10, United States Code.

(d) When the Secretary convenes a board under this section to consider any category of officers described in subsection (c) or (e), he shall establish a continuation zone for that category. The continuation zone for each category shall include such number of officers as the Secretary determines to be necessary to best meet the needs of the service. The senior officer in a continuation zone, for each category of officers, shall be designated by the Secretary. When the Secretary convenes a board to consider for continuation a category of officers for which a continuation board has been previously convened, the senior officer for that category shall be the officer next junior to the most junior officer of that category considered for continuation by the preceding board. The junior officer in each continuation zone shall be designated by the Secretary. In each category, all officers junior to the senior officer and senior to the junior officer in a continuation zone shall be in the continuation zone for that category. Only officers who are in a continuation zone may be considered by a selection board.

(e) Each officer not restricted in the performance of duty serving in the grade of captain on the active list in the line of the Regular Navy, each officer serving in the grade of captain on the active list of the Regular Navy in the Supply Corps, the Chaplain Corps, or the Civil Engineer Corps, and each officer not restricted in the performance of duty serving in the grade of colonel on the active list of the Regular Marine Corps who is not on a promotion list, who has not been previously recommended for continuation in the approved report of a board, and who has at least twice failed of selection to the grade of rear admiral in the Navy or brigadier general in the Marine Corps is eligible for consideration for continuation on the active list by a board convened under this section.

(f) Each officer designated for supply duty serving in the grade of colonel on the active list of the Regular Marine Corps who is not on a promotion list, who has not been previously recommended for continuation in the approved report of a board, and who will complete at least twenty-seven years of total commissioned service, as computed under section 6387 of title 10, United States Code, by June 30 of the fiscal year in which a board is convened under this section is eligible for consideration for continuation on the active list by that board.

(g) Each officer on the active list of the Regular Navy or the Regular Marine Corps serving in the grade of commander or lieutenant colonel (except an officer designated for limited duty, an officer in the Nurse Corps, or a woman officer appointed under section 5590 of title 10, United States Code) who is not on a promotion list, who has not been previously recommended for continuation in the approved report of a board, and who has at least twice failed of selection for promotion to the grade of captain in the Navy or colonel in the Marine Corps is eligible for consideration for continuation on the active list by a board convened under this section.

(h) The Secretary shall furnish the appropriate selection board convened under this section with the names of the officers who shall be considered by the board and, based on the needs of the service, the number of these officers by categories that may be recommended for continuation on the active list. Of the officers considered for continuation by each selection board, the board shall recommend those officers whom the board considers best qualified for continuation on the active list. Each board shall certify in its written report that in the opinion of at least two-thirds of the acting members of the board the officers recommended are selected as best qualified for continued service on the active list. The report of each board shall be submitted to the President and shall become final upon his approval.

(i) Unless sooner selected for promotion to the next higher grade, each officer who is considered for continuation on the active list by a board convened under this section and who is not recommended for continuation in the approved report of the board, shall, not withstanding any other provision of law except subsection (j) or (k), be retired on June 30 of the fiscal year in which the report of the board is approved or in which he completes 20 years of total commissioned service, as computed under section 6387 or 6388 of title 10, United States Code, whichever is later.

(j) An officer in a grade below rear admiral on the active list of the Regular Navy who has the rank of rear admiral while serving in a statutory office and who would be retired under this act may have his date of retirement deferred by the Secretary during the period the officer has the rank of rear admiral and has not attained the age of sixty-two years.

(k) If the report of a board that considers officers for continuation on the active list under this section is approved less than six months before the end of the fiscal year, the retirement of officers who were considered but not recommended for continuation by that board shall be deferred until the first day of the seventh month following the month in which the report of the board is approved.

SEC. 2. (a) An officer who is retired under this Act, unless otherwise entitled to a higher retired grade or higher retired pay, shall be retired in the grade in which he was serving at the time of retirement and is entitled to retired pay at the rate of 2½ percent of the basic pay to which he would be entitled if serving on active duty in the grade in which retired multiplied by the number of years of service that may be credited to him under section 1405 of title 10, United States Code, or, if greater, the number of years of total commissioned service computed under section 6387 or 6388 of title 10, United States Code.

(b) The retired pay of any officer retired under this Act may not be less than 50 percent or more than 75 percent of the basic pay upon which the computation of retired pay is based.

(c) In determining the total number of years of service to be used as a multiplier in computing retired pay, a part of a year that is six months or more is counted as a whole year and a part of a year that is less than six months is disregarded.

SEC. 3. Notwithstanding section 1431 of title 10, United States Code, a change of an election made under that section by an officer who is retired under this Act is effective if made at such a time that it would have been effective had he been retired on the date prescribed by section 6376, 6377, or 6379 of title 10, United States Code, as appropriate, and a revocation of an election made under that section by an officer retired under this Act is effective if made before his retirement.

SEC. 4. (a) Until December 31, 1964, the Secretary of the Navy may establish zones of consideration for male officers of the Marine Corps serving in the grade of major, in addition to or instead of the promotion zones authorized by sections 5765 (b) and (c) of title 10, United States Code. The zone of consideration for that grade shall include such number of officers who are eligible for consideration for promotion as the Secretary determines to best meet the needs of the Marine Corps. The senior officer and the junior officer in a zone of consideration shall be designated by the Secretary. All officers junior to the senior officer and senior to the junior officer in a zone of consideration shall be in the zone of consideration. The zone of consideration for officers designated for supply duty shall consist of those officers who are junior to the senior officer and senior to the junior officer in the corresponding zone of consideration for officers not restricted in the performance of duty. Only officers who are in a zone of consideration or who are senior thereto may be considered

by the selection board. Notwithstanding any other provision of law except the second sentence of subsection (c) of this section, the selection board may recommend as best fitted for promotion, from among the officers who are in or senior to a zone of consideration, the number of officers serving in the grade of major that the board is authorized to recommend for promotion to the grade of lieutenant colonel. An officer who is included within a zone of consideration but is not within or senior to a promotion zone and who is not selected for promotion is not considered as having failed of selection for any purpose.

(b) Whenever a zone of consideration is established for the grade of major pursuant to this section the term "promotion zone" as used in section 5759 (b) of title 10, United States Code, is synonymous with the term "zone of consideration."

(c) Notwithstanding the last sentence of section 5765(b) of title 10, United States Code, the Secretary shall, until December 31, 1964, determine the number of officers of the Marine Corps in a promotion zone for promotion to lieutenant colonel on the basis of a consideration of the number of vacancies estimated for the grade of lieutenant colonel in the next five years, the required number of vacancies in the grade of major, and the age and service characteristics of the officers in the grade of major. The Secretary may, until December 31, 1964, specify the maximum number of officers who may be recommended for promotion to the grade of lieutenant colonel from within and above a promotion zone established under section 5765 of title 10, United States Code. That portion of section 5765(b) of title 10, United States Code, which reads "in order to maintain a flow of promotion consistent with the terms of service set out in section 5768 of this title and" is suspended until December 31, 1964, for the grade of major.

SEC. 5. The President may suspend any provision of section 1 or 4 of this Act during a war or national emergency hereafter declared. Such a suspension may not continue beyond June 30 of the fiscal year following that in which the war or national emergency ends.

SEC. 6. Title 10, United States Code, is amended as follows:

(1) Section 6387(b)(2) is amended by striking out the words "is, or at any time has been," and inserting the words "has been continuously" in place thereof.

(2) Sections 5707(a)(6) and 5708(e) are each amended by inserting the following before the period at the end thereof: "in the next higher grade".

SEC. 7. Section 1 of this act shall have no further force or effect after June 30, 1970.

Mr. KILDAY (interrupting the reading of the bill). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered as read, be printed in the RECORD, and be open to amendment at any point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the committee amendments.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 4, line 9, after the word "considered" insert the words "for continuation".

On page 7, line 18, after the word "Code" insert a period and strike out ", or, if greater, the number of years of" and all of lines 19 and 20.

On page 8, line 2, strike out the comma after the word "pay" and insert immediately thereafter the following: "under subsection (b), and in determining the resultant number of years of early retirement under subsection (d),".

On page 8, after line 5, insert the following new subsections:

"(d) An officer who on the date of enactment of this Act is serving in the grade of captain or commander in the Regular Navy or colonel or lieutenant colonel in the Regular Marine Corps or is on a promotion list for promotion to one of those grades, who is not thereafter recommended for promotion to a higher grade, and who is retired under this Act shall be paid, in addition to his retired pay, lump-sum payments under one of the following methods, at the option of the officer concerned:

"(1) Effective on the date of retirement, an amount equal to the product of two months' basic pay to which he is entitled at the time of retirement and a number which is equal to his number of years of early retirement, but such product may not exceed $6,000; or

"(2) Effective on the date of retirement and the first and second anniversaries thereafter, an amount equal to one-third of the product of two months' basic pay to which he is entitled at the time retirement and a number which is equal to his number of years of early retirement, but such product may not exceed $6,000.

The number of years of early retirement is determined by subtracting the number of years of service credited to an officer under section 6387 or 6388 of title 10, United States Code, as appropriate, at the time of retirement from the number of years of such service the officer would have had if he had been permitted to remain on the active list until completion of the amount of service specified in section 6376, 6377, or 6379 of title 10, United States Code, as appropriate. If the officer dies before receiving all the benefits due and payable under this subsection, the remaining unpaid amount shall be payable in accordance with the provisions of section 2771 of title 10, United States Code.

"(e) An officer who has the qualifications specified in subsection (d) and who has been considered but not recommended for continuation on the active list pursuant to section 1 of this Act shall be considered for the purpose of subsection (d) as being retired under this Act if the officer retires voluntarily prior to the date specified for his retirement under this Act. However, in computing the officer's number of years of early retirement, the number of years of service credited to the officer under section 6387 or 6388 of title 10, United States Code, shall be determined as of the date specified for his retirement under this Act.

"(f) An officer who is retired under this Act shall thereafter be considered as having retired voluntarily pursuant to section 6323 of title 10, United States Code."

On page 10, strike out lines 22, 23, 24, and 25, and on page 11, strike out lines 1, 2, 3, and 4, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"SEC. 6. Section 6387(b)(2) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking out the words "is, or at any time has been," and inserting the words "has been continuously" in place thereof.

"SEC. 7. No officer of the Navy in the Medical Corps, Dental Corps, the Medical Service Corps, or the Nurse Corps is subject to the provisions of this act during the effective period of the Act of June 27, 1957, Public Law 85-62 (71 Stat. 208), as now or hereafter amended."

On page 11, renumber "SEC. 7" to "SEC. 8."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

Mr. BATES. Mr. Chairman, this bill has been under close study by your committee for several years. Definitive action on it has been delayed as various attempts were made to find the most satisfactory solution. It appears, at this time, that no perfect answer can be found but I do believe that this bill does approach the problem as fairly as possible.

We have reached a point where violent action must be taken by the Navy and the Marine Corps if this legislation is not enacted. The rate of attrition in the Navy in selection from commander to captain will be 74 percent; the attrition from lieutenant commander to commander will reach 85 percent; and 75 percent of the majors in the Marine Corps must be released to the retired ranks. This bill will provide a more equitable opportunity for promotion for those officers who are behind the so-called hump.

I believe the bill is the best that can be done to work out a very difficult problem and recommend its passage to the House.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, and ask unanimous consent to speak out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, the temporary Unemployment Compensation Act will expire on April 1. It is very evident that the condition of unemployment in the country today and as it will be as we project our minds to the months ahead calls for an extension of that act. It is just as important that we extend that act as it was for us to pass the bill last year to meet the unemployment situation that existed at that time.

Between 350,000 and 400,000 jobless workers will lose their unemployment compensation benefits on April 1, when the 13 weeks of extended coverage under the Federal temporary unemployment compensation program is ended, unless something is done.

The tentative plan for the Easter recess is to adjourn on Thursday, March 26, at the close of business that day and to come back on Tuesday, April 7. Unless the Congress does something in connection with this bill extending it between now and the contemplated Easter recess, the law will expire and a tremendous economic hardship will be suffered by hundreds of thousands of Americans who are unemployed. Speaker RAYBURN and I conferred today with the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MILLS] and we told him we thought something should be done and that the law should be extended. Economic conditions, particularly in relation to unemployment certainly call for an extension of the law just as much as they called for the passage of the original bill a year ago. The chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means has assured us that he will take the matter up with his committee next week and cooperate. I wanted to make these few remarks so that the men and women who are unemployed throughout the country will be aware of the fact that the leadership in the House of Representatives is aware of the situation and recognizes the necessity for action and that we are

taking action and are hopeful that a bill will pass both branches of the Congress before the Easter recess extending the present law for such a period as the Committee on Ways and Means reports. I repeat the economic situation is such that while there is a rising curve with respect to business, there certainly is also a rising curve with respect to unemployment. It is an unusual phenomenon, but it exists just the same and unless the law is extended, there is going to be tremendous hardship. A just consideration of this problem calls for an extension of the law in view of the unemployment situation which exists today and which, I think, is even higher than when we passed the bill a year ago. Also, in addition to the approximately 5 million persons who are totally unemployed, there are hundreds of thousands of persons who are partially unemployed. The Speaker and I feel that the situation in relation to unemployment throughout the country is just as much a pressing problem and as trying today, and that it will be in the months that lie ahead, as it was when the temporary unemployment compensation bill was acted upon and passed last year by both branches of Congress and enacted into law.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose, and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. EVINS, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 4413) to provide improved opportunity for promotion for certain officers in the naval service, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 191, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have five legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

AUTHORIZING CREDITING OF CERTAIN SERVICE FOR PURPOSE OF RETIRED PAY FOR NON-REGULAR SERVICE

Mr. WINSTEAD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 3365) to authorize the crediting of certain service for purpose of retired pay for non-Regular service, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H.R. 3365, with Mr. LANDRUM in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WINSTEAD] is recognized for 1 hour and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARENDS] will be recognized for 1 hour.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WINSTEAD].

Mr. WINSTEAD. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 15 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 3365. This bill is a Department of Defense legislative proposal, the substance of which had previously been acted upon by this body during the 84th Congress as H.R. 2035. H.R. 2035 passed the House on July 16, 1956, but unfortunately the other body apparently did not have sufficient time to act upon it.

The committee had been advised by the Department of Defense that it had failed to resubmit the item for consideration during the 85th Congress because of administrative delays encountered in redrafting the proposal to conform to the codification of Public Law 810, 80th Congress, in title 10 of the United States Code.

The principal purpose of this proposed legislation is to correct certain inequities which had developed since the enactment of title III of Public Law 810. Title III of Public Law 810 authorized the payment of retirement pay at age 60 for personnel of the Armed Forces who complete 20 years of satisfactory Federal service, this service being a combination of both active and inactive Reserve service. This proposal would also authorize certain active service to be counted as commissioned service for the purpose of voluntary retirement and would also validate appointments made in the Army of the United States without component, which, through an administrative error, were continued in effect without legal authority until April 1, 1953.

In connection with the changes to title III of Public Law 810, the following purposes would be served:

First. It would permit Reserve personnel to count for this retired pay, service which they performed as an appointed aviation cadet or as a nurse, or service performed as a dietitian, physical therapist, or occupational therapist with the Medical Department of the Army. Such service may not now be credited for this purpose because of the present limitation that service to be credited must have been performed in the status of a "commissioned officer, warrant officer, flight officer, or enlisted person," in the Armed Forces. Therefore, because of statutory technicalities this language does not now permit credit for service as a naval aviation cadet under and appointment prior to the Naval Aviation Cadet Act of 1942, for service as a nurse prior to the Army-Navy Nurses Act of 1947, or service as dietitians or physical or occupational therapists in the Medical Department of the Army. In each case, current service which is factually similar is creditable under law.

Under the Navy's original aviation cadet law, the act of April 15, 1935 (49 Stat. 156), candidates were appointed as aviation cadets in the Naval Reserve. Following completion of their training they remained aviation cadets and performed active duty involving flying for a period of 3 years, at the expiration of which time they were appointed commissioned officers in the Naval Reserve. This period of service performed as an aviation cadet may not now be credited for this Reserve retired pay. Since 1942, when the Naval Aviation Cadet Act was enacted, aviation cadets of the Naval Reserve have an enlisted status and thus receive credit for their aviation cadet service. Aviation cadets of the Air Force have always had an enlisted status and thus receive credit for that service.

Until nurses in the Armed Forces were permanently given commissioned officer status by the Army-Navy Nurses Act of 1947 (61 Stat. 41) they had neither officer nor enlisted status. Consequently, Reserve personnel who served in the Army or Navy Nurse Corps before 1947 do not receive credit for that service for this retired pay. Similarly, Reserve personnel who served in a civilian capacity as dietitians, physical therapists, or occupational therapists in the Medical Department of the Army do not receive credit for that service for this Reserve retired pay. These specialists were also given commissioned officer status by the Army-Navy Act of 1947. As service in the Army or Navy Nurse Corps before 1947, and service in a civilian capacity in the Medical Department of the Army as a dietitian or physical therapist after April 6, 1917, and as an occupational therapist before appointment as a commissioned officer in the Army or Air Force, may be counted for all other purposes, no reason is apparent why this service should not be credited for this retired pay.

Second. It would allow credit for this retired pay for service in the National Guard after June 14, 1933, if the person served continuously therein from the date of his enlistment in the National Guard, or his Federal recognition as an officer, to the date of his enlistment or appointment, as the case may be, in the National Guard of the United States, the Army National Guard of the United States, or the Air National Guard of the United States. At present credit may be given for service in the federally recognized National Guard only before June 15, 1933.

The National Guard of the United States was established as a Reserve component of the Army of the United States, by the act of June 15, 1933 (48 Stat. 155). Under that act officers and enlisted members of the federally recognized National Guard did not automatically become members of the National Guard of the United States. Not until April 4, 1934, when War Department General

Order No. 3 was promulgated, were steps taken to blanket in all those persons who were members of the federally recognized National Guard on June 15, 1933. This general order fixed October 31, 1934, as the last day for acceptance of appointments in the National Guard of the United States. Thus, in some cases, over 16 months elapsed between the date the National Guard of the United States was established and the date the individual became a member of it. Under present law service during that period may not be credited to those who were not members of a Reserve component. Approximately 8,750 officers and warrant officers are thus adversely affected.

Officers and warrant officers who were federally recognized in the National Guard after June 14, 1933, and in the Army National Guard, and the Air National Guard after July 26, 1947, the date on which the Air National Guard became a separate component, also encountered administrative delay ranging from a few months to a year or more, in receiving National Guard of the United States or Army or Air National Guard of the United States appointments. It is estimated that 14,400 officers during the years 1934–52 suffered a delay in receiving those appointments. The effect on enlisted members was much less as in most cases enlistment in the National Guard and the National Guard of the United States and in the Army and Air National Guard and the Army and Air National Guard of the United States was concurrent.

Title 10, United States Code, provides for voluntary retirement under certain conditions, for Regular and Reserve commissioned officers of the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps who have completed 20 years or more of active service at least 10 years of which have been commissioned service. As nurses and medical specialists were not permanently given commissioned officer status until 1947, they cannot qualify for retirement under this provision of law unless their service prior to 1947 can be counted as commissioned service. The Army-Navy Nurses Act of 1947 provided that active service in the Army or Navy Nurse Corps would be considered as commissioned service for voluntary retirement for Regular officers of the Navy Nurse Corps. No similar provision, however, was made for Reserve officers of the Navy Nurse Corps, or for Regular and Reserve nurses and medical specialists of the Army or Air Force whereby they could count as commissioned service for this voluntary retirement their active service prior to 1947. This bill would correct this present inequity.

This bill would also validate certain appointments made after December 7, 1941, in the Army of the United States without component under joint resolution of September 22, 1941.

The joint resolution of September 22, 1941, provided the authority for the Army to make temporary appointments of officers in the Army of the United States without appointing such persons as officers in any particular component, such as the Regular Army, the Officers Reserve Corps, or the National Guard of the United States. This act, which provided that appointments should continue during the emergency existing at that time and for 6 months thereafter, was repealed effective July 1, 1948. The Department of the Army considered that by virtue of the provisions of the National Defense Act appointments made under the joint resolution of September 22, 1941, continued in effect until April 1, 1953, and that the repeal of the joint resolution, effective July 1, 1948, merely terminated the authority to make new appointments under that statute. The Comptroller General, however, in a decision dated October 7, 1955, held that these appointments terminated on June 30, 1948, unless continued in effect beyond that date by special legislation, and that service under these appointments for the period July 1, 1948, to April 1, 1953, could not be credited in computing basic pay or in determining eligibility for retirement. This decision resulted in some loss of pay for approximately 5,000 members of the Army still in an active status and for an unknown number now on the retired list receiving retired pay. Among those on the retired list receiving retired pay, there are an unknown number who would be ineligible for retirement and would have to be removed from the retired list unless they can count their service during the period July 1, 1948, to April 1, 1953.

Because of the administrative burden of screening the records to determine how many persons served under these appointments during the period July 1, 1948, to April 1, 1953, and are now retired, and the effect on morale of stopping or reducing retired pay the Comptroller General has agreed to withhold action in this respect, provided the Department of Defense seeks and obtains remedial legislation from the 86th Congress. Section 2 of this proposed legislation would validate those appointments made under joint resolution of September 22, 1941, which were continued in effect to April 1, 1953.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 3365. As has been very accurately outlined by my colleague on the other side of the aisle, this proposal has as its primary objective the elimination of certain inequities in existing law primarily relating to Reserve personnel of the Armed Forces. These inequities are simply the result of technical errors or omissions in existing law, and therefore, enactment of this proposal will not result in an increase in the scope or breadth of the original purpose of enactment of Public Law 810, title III, which was designed to provide an inducement for Reserve personnel to continue participation in Reserve training while in a civilian status.

As you gentlemen well know, under the provisions of Public Law 810, title III, Reserve personnel who have completed the minimum service requirements prescribed by the Congress will, at the age of 60, be entitled to a very modest amount of retired pay.

I would like to elaborate on other considerations already covered by my colleague. In addition to those individuals affected by the change of title III of Public Law 810, I wish to address myself specifically to another category of personnel covered by this bill who are included in the provisions of the bill for the purpose of eliminating the present statutory inequity resulting from a Comptroller's decision affecting appointments made by the Department of the Army under the provisions of the joint resolution of September 22, 1941.

Under the joint resolution of September 22, 1941, 55 Statutes 728, the Army appointed thousands of officers in the Army of the United States without component. Based on Comptroller General's decision B–123992, Army of the United States appointments terminated on June 30, 1948. Prior to October 7, 1955, the Army held that AUS appointments remained in effect until April 1, 1953—end of the emergency plus 6 months. Because of this view, many Army officers retained AUS status through the period April 30, 1948, to April 1, 1953.

Upon receipt of the Comptroller General's decision of October 7, 1955, the Army immediately required all officers then on active duty to subtract any of this Army of the United States service from their total service for pay periods. However, no action was taken to collect back payments made for such service, nor was action taken to recheck the service of officers on the retired list. The Comptroller General agreed to withhold action in this regard pending the outcome of this legislative change.

It has been estimated that the costs involved in searching, finding, recomputing the service, and affecting collection action in the case of the many officers involved in this problem area will probably exceed the cost of paying them for such service.

It is known that some officers now drawing retired pay will be denied such pay if this AUS service is subtracted from their total service. Additionally, many officers on and off active duty will lose pay which they have earned if this legislation is not enacted.

Except for the Army service between July 1, 1948, and April 1, 1953, which this bill would validate, all other types of service that the bill would make creditable in determining eligibility for retirement are already creditable for all other purposes. The persons who would be benefited by enactment of this legislation have actually served in the Armed Forces for the periods for which they would receive credit under the bill. In order to do justice to these individuals, I urge that this bill be enacted.

Mr. WINSTEAD. Mr. Chairman, we have no further requests for time.

The CHAIRMAN. There being no further requests for time, the Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That title 10, United States Code, is amended as follows:

(1) Section 1332(a)(1) is amended—

(a) by inserting the following new clause after clause (C):

"(D) the National Guard after June 14, 1933, if his service therein was continuous during the period beginning on the date of his enlistment in the National Guard, or his Federal recognition as an officer therein, and

ending on the day before the date of his enlistment or appointment, as the case may be, in the National Guard of the United States, the Army National Guard of the United States, or the Air National Guard of the United States;";

(b) by redesignating clauses (D), (E), and (F) as clauses "(E)", "(F)", and "(G)", respectively; and

(c) by striking out the word "and" at the end of clauses (E) and (F) and adding the following new clauses:

"(H) the Army Nurse Corps, the Navy Nurse Corps, the Nurse Corps Reserve of the Army, or the Nurse Corps Reserve of the Navy, as it existed at any time after February 2, 1901;

"(I) the Army under an appointment under the Act of December 22, 1942 (ch. 805, 56 Stat. 1072), or the Act of June 22, 1944 (ch. 272, 58 Stat. 324); and

"(J) an active full-time status, except as a student or apprentice, with the Medical Department of the Army as a civilian employee—

"(i) in the dietetic or physical therapy categories, if the service was performed after April 6, 1917, and before April 1, 1943; or

"(ii) in the occupational therapy category, if the service was performed before appointment in the Army Nurse Corps or the Women's Medical Specialist Corps and before January 1, 1949, or before appointment in the Air Force before January 1, 1949, with a view to designation as an Air Force nurse or medical specialist; and".

(2) Section 1332(a) is amended by adding the following sentence at the end thereof: "For the purpose of clauses (A), (B), and (C), service in the National Guard shall be treated as if it were service in a reserve component, if the person concerned was later appointed in the National Guard of the United States, the Army National Guard of the United States, the Air National Guard of the United States, or as a Reserve of the Army or the Air Force, and served continuously in the National Guard during the period beginning on the date of his Federal recognition and ending on the day before the date of that appointment."

(3) Section 1332(b) is amended by striking out clause (6) and inserting the following clauses in place thereof:

"(6) Service as an inactive Reserve nurse of the Army Nurse Corps established by the Act of February 2, 1901 (ch. 192, 31 Stat. 753), as amended, and service before July 1, 1938, as an inactive Reserve nurse of the Navy Nurse Corps established by the Act of May 13, 1908 (ch. 166, 35 Stat. 146).

"(7) Service in any status other than that as commissioned officer, warrant officer, nurse, flight officer, appointed aviation cadet, or enlisted member, and that described in subsection (a)(1)(J).".

(4) Section 3683(4) is amended to read as follows:

"(4) all active full-time service, except as a student or apprentice, with the Medical Department of the Army as a civilian employee—

"(A) in the dietetic or physical therapy categories, if the service was performed after April 6, 1917, and before April 1, 1953; or

"(B) in the occupational therapy category, if the service was performed before appointment in the Army Nurse Corps or the Women's Medical Specialist Corps and before January 1, 1949."

(5) Section 3926 is amended by adding the following new subsection at the end thereof:

"(d) For the purpose of determining whether a commissioned officer of the Army Nurse Corps or the Army Medical Specialist Corps may be retired under section 3911 of this title, all service computed under section 3683 of this title shall be treated as if it were service as a commissioned officer.".

(6) Section 6324 is amended by striking out the words "an officer" and inserting the words "a regular officer or a reserve officer" in place thereof.

(7) Section 8683(4) is amended to read as follows:

"(4) all active full-time service, except as a student or apprentice, with the Medical Department of the Army as a civilian employee—

"(A) in the dietetic or physical therapy categories, if the service was performed after April 6, 1917, and before April 1, 1943; or

"(B) in the occupational therapy category, if the service was performed before appointment in the Army Nurse Corps or the Women's Medical Specialist Corps and before January 1, 1949, or before appointment in the Air Force before January 1, 1949, with a view to designation as an Air Force nurse or medical specialist."

(8) Section 8926 is amended by adding the following new subsection at the end thereof:

"(d) For the purpose of determining whether an Air Force nurse or medical specialist may be retired under section 8911 of this title, all service computed under section 8683 of this title shall be treated as if it were service as a commissioned officer.".

SEC. 2. All appointments made after December 6, 1941, in the Army of the United States without component under the joint resolution of September 22, 1941 (ch. 414, 55 Stat. 728), that were not earlier terminated by administrative action or specific provision of law may be considered for all purposes to have continued in effect until the close of March 31, 1953.

SEC. 3. This Act does not deprive any person of any service credit to which he was entitled on the day before the effective date of this Act.

SEC. 4. Any person who, on the effective date of this Act, would not have completed 18 years of service for which he is entitled to credit in the computation of his basic pay under the laws in effect prior to the effective date of this Act, and who, as a result of the enactment of this Act, is credited with more than 17 years of such service, shall be allowed twelve months from the effective date of this Act to make the election provided by section 1431(b) of title 10, United States Code, notwithstanding the requirement of the second sentence of that section.

Mr. WINSTEAD (interrupting the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered as read and that it be printed in the RECORD in full at this point and be open for amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the committee amendments.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 1, lines 8 to 11, strike out the words "during the period beginning on the date of his enlistment in the National Guard, or his Federal recognition as an officer therein, and ending on the day before" and substitute in place thereof "from the date of his enlistment in the National Guard, or his Federal recognition as an officer therein, to".

On page 2, lines 16 and 17, strike out ", or the Act of June 22, 1944 (ch. 272, 58 Stat. 324)".

On page 3, lines 15, 16 and 17, strike out "during the period beginning on the date of his Federal recognition and ending on the day before" and substitute the following in place thereof "from the date of his Federal recognition to".

On page 4, line 4, strike out "subsection (a)(1)(J)" and substitute in place thereof "clauses (I) and (J) of subsection (a)(1)".

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. LANDRUM, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 3365) to authorize the crediting of certain service for purpose of retired pay for nonregular service, and for other purposes pursuant to House Resolution 190, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

THE CRUSADE AGAINST INFLATION IS OVERLOOKING THE PERILS OF UNEMPLOYMENT

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, the history of western civilization records many great crusades which have been conducted for theoretical causes. There have been mass hysterias, inquisitions, witch hunts, and so on, against evils that were imagined without the slightest support in fact. There is nothing new in the fact that vigilant campaigners among the opinion-makers of society can cause great masses of people to see ghosts. The general public has often been persuaded to see small evils in greatly magnified form, and as flowing from the wrong causes. Men have been caused to commit great depredations and cruelties to themselves and others in the certain conviction that such things were necessary in this world to avoid fire and brimstone in the world of the future.

In my own time I have never known a campaign conducted on a more theoretical and poorly defined cause than the present campaign against inflation. Nor have I known a campaign conducted with more sincerity, bordering almost on a religious zeal. The campaigners are describing fire and brimstone with an eloquency which would lead one to think

they had actually witnessed these holocausts. Inflation is such an all-consuming evil in the minds of our crusading friends that they are even calling it the "silent weapon of communism."

Here we are in a situation where 6 percent of the Nation's total labor force is unemployed. Just think of it. Six percent of all the eligible workers of this country who ought to be producing cannot find employment. The needs of millions of families for food, for shelter, for the essential services, and for the comforts of life are going unmet. Our economy stagnates while the Russians race on to greater scientific and industrial strength. Yet all these disturbing realities of the day are but nothing compared to the evils of inflation which the crusaders imagine they see looming on the horizon.

Those Members who happened to read the Associated Press article on "U.S. Money Troubles," which appeared in the Washington Evening Star last night, and appeared again in the Washington Post and Times Herald this morning, will have fresh in mind the theology which has been built up around the battle of the budget.

THE CRUSADERS' THEORY OF INFLATION

The writer of that article, Mr. Frank Cormier, had been in to see Secretary Anderson and got the whole explanation right from the high altar. The new trinity is this:

First. The Treasury is having a difficult time persuading people and institutions with savings to invest these savings in Government securities. The reason, we are told, is that investors are afraid of inflation. They are so sure that inflation is coming they are refusing to buy securities that will be paid off in cheap dollars in the years ahead.

Second. When the private commercial banks purchase Government securities they create new money and inflate the money supply.

This is what is called monetizing the debt and it is now admitted to be printing-press money, a fact that has not always been admitted.

Third. Inflating the money supply means that the value of the dollar goes down.

These, then, are the three main propositions in the theory which holds that a Federal deficit in the coming fiscal year would be disastrous.

Now it is most unusual that the Associated Press has made this article available to the newspapers of the country—just as unusual as that two local papers here in Washington covered the same article. Normally the press is not easily tempted to probe into monetary matters. And certainly on those occasions when it ventures into any temple of the money changers, it emerges in hushed silence, eyes turned downward.

So I feel that this is an occasion for congratulating the Associated Press for having made this article available to the newspapers and for congratulating Mr. Cormier for having written it. Although this article presents the doctrine of the new crusaders as certain fact, it also sounds one or two notes of caution which should cause us to examine the doctrine before swallowing it.

The first note is with reference to the recent factual relationship between the supply of money and the supply of goods and services for which this money might be used. Mr. Cormier points out that since 1955 the total supply of goods and services—the GNP—has increased by 7 percent, while the money supply has increased by only 3½ percent. Certainly these facts challenge the proposition that there is a relationship between prices and the supply of money available to purchase goods and services. Otherwise, how do we explain that prices have not gone down since 1955. These facts should also warn the great crusaders to pause and consider the possibility that the recent price increases have not been caused by increases in the money supply at all.

Mr. Cormier appears to have paused. At least he is a little more careful with his terms—and his conclusions, too, I suspect—than some of the other recent expounders on this subject. He speaks of the private banks' creating the money to buy Government securities only as an inflation of the money supply. He does not go so far as to say that inflation of the money supply will surely and automatically bring about inflation in the sense that prices will be increased and the value of the dollar will be decreased. The amount of the money which the commercial banks create he calls the only inflationary potential. These statements are considerably more cautious than those we have been hearing recently from some of the experts.

THE THEORY DOES NOT AGREE WITH THE FACTS

For example, many of us have been attracted by a lengthy address delivered on the floor of the Senate on February 17 by the Senator from Connecticut, Mr. BUSH. Senator BUSH has, of course, had an important background of experience as an investment banker, and I believe that he would be pleased to be called one of the outstanding crusaders for the balanced budget.

This is the way the Senator from Connecticut explained the matter:

He took, just as an illustrative figure, a $10 billion Federal deficit this year and explained what would happen if the commercial banks absorbed this additional $10 billion of Federal debt, pointing out that the banks create the money with which they acquire Government securities, he said: "This is the same as using printing-press money to dilute the value of our money supply. There is actually no difference in the result."

The Senator pointed out that the money supply would be increased by 7 percent if the commercial banks bought an additional $10 billion of Government securities. And on that basis he reasoned that this would surely result in a 7 percent devaluation of the dollar. He said that when we allow the private banks to purchase this $10 billion of securities "we have debased the existing money supply by 7 percent. Thus, the savers, pensioners, social security recipients, and all our people living on fixed incomes, have had the equivalent of a cut in income of 7 percent in 1 year, at one fell swoop. Their money has been debased, cheapened, clipped, by 7 percent."

Now what is wrong with this theory of what would happen as a result of a hypothetical increase of $10 billion in the money supply this year?

Well, the theory does not square with the experience of last year when we had an actual example of the very thing the Senator was talking about.

As I have pointed out previously, the commercial banks did in fact absorb $10 billion of Federal debt last year. Between the end of November 1957 and the end of November 1958, the commercial banks increased their holdings of U.S. Government securities by $10.4 billion. And this meant, as both Senator Bush and Mr. Cormier have said, these banks created the money to buy these securities. They created the money out of thin air, on the credit of the United States.

This should have meant, according to the theory, a 7.8-percent increase in the money supply last year. The total money supply was $134 billion at the end of November 1957, so an added $10.4 billion of bank-created money should have increased the supply by 7.8 percent. And so, too, if all three propositions in the crusaders' triad hang together, this country must have had a 7.8 percent increase in prices last year. The incomes of people living on pensions must have been cheapened by 7.8 percent. But, of course, no such thing happened.

Actually, the money supply was increased by only 3.4 percent from November to November. This was because, despite the $10.4 billion created there were offsetting reductions. There was an important shrinkage in business loans for example.

Here we should remember that the commercial banks create money when they make business loans, just as when they purchase Government securities. And I judge from recent testimony of Chairman Martin that the Federal Reserve would be perfectly happy to see now, and in the months ahead, an increase in the money supply through increased business loans. There is now no worry about inflating the money supply for business loans. Only Federal spending to put people back to work producing useful wealth is being condemned as inflationary.

But comes now the jackpot question. Did prices increase last year by 3.4 percent, the same as the increased money supply?

No, the wholesale price index increased by less than 1 percent, and the consumer price index increased by less than 2 percent.

Is it not interesting then, that the crusade for balancing a budget that leaves 6 percent of our families unemployed and out in the cold is built on visions of fire and brimstone which could be dispelled by a reference to factual experience.

Actually, can we say that any part of the price increases last year were the result of increases in the money supply? Certainly there is a great deal of evidence and common sense to the contrary.

GOOD TIMES AND BAD TIMES TO INCREASE CREDIT

There are times, of course, when it is reasonable to think that an increase in the supply of money would cause an increase in prices. These are times of full employment when production is at full capacity and demand for goods and services is outrunning the supply of goods and services immediately available. At such times as these, when both business and consumers are trying to bid for more goods and services than are available, an increase in the supply of credit with which business and consumers can bid for these goods and services is going to drive the prices up.

But under such conditions as we have today, with 6 percent of the labor force unemployed, with a large percentage of all productive capacity idle, and with great stores of goods piled up in inventories, there is no reason to think that an increase in credit which will bring people back into production should cause an increase in prices.

Considering the price increases which did take place last year, furthermore, it is now apparent that these had none of the earmarks of a monetary inflation. The now famous Gardiner Means paper has driven home the point that the price increases of last year, and the several years before that, were not general price increases. Prices of agricultural goods and prices of many industrial goods went down, while prices in a few big business fields—principally steel and steel fabricating industries—were increased. In other words, we had administered price increases in industries which have the arbitrary power to increase prices.

There is a serious question in my mind, then, about this new crusade against inflation. I cannot help wondering why, if the crusaders are so greatly concerned about the inflation which they think they can foresee and about the perils which they think they can foresee, why it is they are not willing to strike out against the realities of inflation.

THE TREASURY IS CRUSADING AGAINST ITS MARKET

Now there is no doubt that the Treasury is having difficulty selling its securities to investors. But this is not because investors have been loaded to the saturation point. Actually, the total Federal debt outstanding was almost as high 15 years ago. Considering the increase in wealth and the increase in savings, the present Federal debt is considerably less percentagewise than it has been in many periods of the past two decades. There is much to suggest that the Treasury is actually a victim of its own crusading. First, beginning in 1953 and continuing almost ever since, the Treasury has been crusading to get interest rates up. Investors have been conditioned to expect higher and ever higher interest rates; and to an important extent they are now holding back waiting for the still higher rates.

Furthermore, the Treasury has joined in the big crusade which seems to be convincing almost everybody that we are going to have inflation. This is a strange crusade, considering its sources. The life insurance companies are leaders in the crusade, and pretty soon they will convince people that they should not buy life insurance because of certain inflation.

PERILS OF UNEMPLOYMENT ARE NOT IMAGINARY

Perhaps there are real inflationary perils ahead, but I am afraid that the new crusaders are overlooking perils of unemployment that are with us today and do not have to be imagined. I believe that a letter which I received recently from an unemployed family will help to bring back in better proportion these cruel realities of the unemployed. The letter is as follows:

MARION, OHIO, *February 18, 1959.*
To The Honorable WRIGHT PATMAN,
Member of Congress.

ECONOMIC DECLINE AND UNEMPLOYMENT

Let us consider the families of the unemployed before the economic decline and the layoffs. Life was good. By savings, a home was bought—not expensively but nicely furnished. The table was always set, with a good diet for our lovable and growing children. They were always given doctors' or dentistry care when needed. High hopes were had for our children's education. Savings were set aside for them. They had a nice car for the family use. Yes, life was good.

Then came the layoff. Most shops were laying off. It was impossible to get another job. The economic decline was in full swing. Unemployment compensation was a help, but the family income was greatly reduced. The car payments could no longer be made; it had to be sold or be repossessed. Then to make payments on the home, the savings for the education of your children had to be used. How heart-rending to see the hopes and plans you had for your children die. As time goes by, money for family living becomes tighter and tighter. Doctors' and dentistry care must be put off for your children as long as possible. The children's clothes become old and worn. They need new and warmer clothes for the winter months. A good diet on the table is no longer possible. The parents are in tears, sorrow, and despair because they cannot adequately care for their children.

Finally, the home is lost and the family is forced deeper and ever deeper into the pits of despair and poverty.

In this hour in these United States, with God's abundance—produce of farm and factories piled high everywhere—this is an unthinkable and intolerable condition into which many of America's families are forced.

Economic progress and full employment—it is the sacred duty of governments to so govern as to forever guarantee this condition of existence. To do otherwise is to invite destruction and terror within the confines of the Nation's borders.

I plead with you in this hour and year of our Lord that you rectify and correct these conditions that brought on the economic decline and unemployment at once. I believe you men in Congress and the administrative branches of Government are equal to this all-important task. You must not fail, you cannot fail. You must do this to insure orderly procedures of Government and of the economic processes.

To permit economic decline, accompanied by the ravages of unemployment, in this space age, in this age of atomic energy, and of the ICBM missiles is a crime of terrifying and hideous proportions, committed against millions of American families, by those in high places, by those in control of the political, economic, and financial systems of these United States of America. By their acts or perhaps their inaction do economic decline and unemployment take place. And worse yet, it is permitted to exist without a hand being turned to stop it.

The economic structure of this Nation cannot and shall not stand upon the shifting sands of the terrible sufferings of the families of the unemployed. Already dark clouds appear on the horizon, the rumblings of discontent, the thunder of radical and revolutionary ideas, born out of despair and hopelessness. The dangers are ever present among desperate families. The lightning may strike and we in these United States may have an uprising, with the demands for an honorable and good life for the families of the unemployed.

(Signed) UNEMPLOYED.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to turn now to another topic.

I have had the privilege of serving in this House since my first election in 1928. I believe that nowhere has there been finer, better, more patriotic, or greater Americans than the men and women with whom I have had the privilege of serving during these many years. These are honest, sincere, conscientious representatives of the people here in this body—436 Members now—elected every 2 years.

THE HOUSE IS AND MUST BE THE BODY OF POPULAR GOVERNMENT

I believe that the 2-year system should continue. I have opposed the proposed amendment to make the term of Members of the House of Representatives a 4-year term, although a 4-year term would greatly increase the security and convenience of the Members. The great men who wrote our Constitution equalized and balanced the terms of the country's elective Representatives in a way that we should not overturn in any particular. As it is, the House of Representatives is elected every 2 years. It is this body that is closest to the people and most representative of the thoughts and views of the people. In the event of a dangerous trend of any kind, the people can quickly check it by electing an entirely new House of Representatives within 2 years. The House should remain with the people, elected every 2 years, the body of popular government.

All bills for raising revenue must originate in this body. They cannot originate in the other body. The people have a closer, firmer grip upon the purse strings of this Nation because they elect their Representatives every 2 years.

The executive branch is headed by the President of the United States who is elected by vote of the people every 4 years. The Members of the other body are elected for 6 years, one-third of their number every 2 years. The judicial branch of the Government, the judges, are selected for life. So far as the legislative branch of the Government and the executive branch of the Government are concerned, I believe there is a proper balance and the 2-year term should not be upset. It should remain as it is.

The Members in this House I say after long experience are anxious to do a good job for the people they have the honor to represent. They are eager to do their best to help all the people and to help the country. But they are handicapped. As I see it, they are most seriously handicapped because they do not have the

help they need to do their job. I am not talking about clerical assistants and stenographic help. I believe the Members have plenty of help of that kind.

POPULAR GOVERNMENT SHOULD BE EFFICIENT GOVERNMENT

But they are lacking in efficient, professional help. I refer to administrative assistants. If the Members could have administrative assistants, this would help their constituents more than anything else.

In the executive branch of our Government every Secretary, Assistant Secretary, and Under Secretary has at least one administrative assistant, plus assistants to the assistants. We vote appropriations for hundreds and thousands of them.

The judges in our judicial branch of the Government have their law clerks and other assistants. We vote for that. We make it possible, and we are glad to do it, because we want them well equipped to do their jobs. Furthermore, in the judicial branch, whenever there is a question to decide, a big decision to make, the judges have the advantage of professional briefs and arguments on both sides of the question at issue. Every question that can be raised is raised. The judges are not presented with arguments on only one side of a question as we frequently are. They do not have to go out and search for the holes in the arguments; they do not have to do their own research as we frequently have to do.

The Members of the other body—the U.S. Senate—are provided with administrative assistants—one to three each—all provided by our votes here in this body.

But in the House of Representatives we frequently get one side of the question only; and we must dig up all the answers if we are going to have the answers. Sometimes we do not have the answers. Sometimes we are misled, and sometimes we are deceived. These people who are working as lobbyists, which is an honorable work, tend to point out to us only one side of the issue. They are doing everything within their power to point out that one side only; and if that one side is not opposed by somebody else, we just have that one side. We have no one on our staff who is in a position to analyze and evaluate these complex and technical issues and advise us. We are not equipped when we must vote on some of the most important matters affecting the people's interest.

PROFESSIONAL ASSISTANTS WOULD SAVE THE TAXPAYERS THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS FOR EACH DOLLAR OF COST

Every Member of this House should have administrative assistants. Really, I would recommend two; one to do certain things, but one in particular whose work would be devoted entirely to taxes, appropriations, and monetary matters. Certainly Members should have the services of at least one professional assistant for these particular matters. I am not in favor of increasing the amount that a Member of Congress can pay to appoint some political friend. I am not advocating that, and I would not object to standards and requirements being set forth in the law. Certainly we could prescribe high standards that would have to be met in order for an appointment to be made. This has been done in the civil service.

I seriously believe if each Member of the House had the proper help this would save the taxpayers a thousand dollars for every $1 that would be spent for the help. Let me illustrate. Take, for instance, the interest rates on our national debt, which have gone up tremendously in the last few years, absolutely against conscience. I believe that if the Members of the House were able to devote some time to this subject, most of this increased cost to the taxpayers would not have come about.

Take also the fact that a few banks, comparatively speaking—2 or 3 percent of the banks—last year, 1958, received about $7 billion worth of Government securities as a free gift from the Government. All of the commercial banks last year had put in their laps, absolutely without charge, the Government's money-creating powers sufficient to allow them to acquire $10 billion worth of U.S. Government securities. This was absolutely without cost to these banks. And the taxpayers will have to pay between $300 million and $400 million each year in interest charges on this $10 billion gift.

Now, we have seen this sort of thing happen right here in broad daylight. We represent the people. We would like to do something about it, but we are not in a position to do much about it; we are not equipped to do the job. If we were to have a real, fair, objective investigation of the debt management and monetary systems in this country—by people who can do the job, and not by people who are biased in favor of those who are getting the benefits of these subsidies—we could, within a year's time, save $3 billion interest on the national debt.

Interest rates have gone sky high in the last few years. And, if this had been done just for the benefit of savers—the people who save a few pennies or a few dollars every month—why, perhaps we would not object too much. But remember, my friends, this increased interest is not going to the savers.

Most of the money in our country today is money created on the books of the commercial banks. The $67 billion of interest-bearing U.S. Government securities which the commercial banks now hold have all been acquired with money created on the books of these banks. Is there a Member within the sound of my voice who will dispute what I have said about that? Of course there is not. There is not a person in the Government who will dispute it, because it is an inescapable fact. It cannot be disputed. So, here we are, 436 Members of the House, sitting right here on the sidelines seeing this happen in broad daylight and feeling helpless to do anything about it. That is the reason I complain.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. How did the gentleman vote on raising the debt limit?

Mr. PATMAN. Over the years I have had to vote for it, because we voted the appropriations here. The last time I voted against it because it was presented unfairly. But voting to keep down the debt limit does not do the job; that does not substitute for doing our jobs in an efficient and informed way.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

PLANS FOR A COMPREHENSIVE OBSERVANCE OF THE 175TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE CONSTITUTION OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 15 minutes and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a resolution providing for the preparation and completion of plans for a comprehensive observance of the 175th anniversary of the Constitution of the United States.

As the Member of Congress from the Third District of Pennsylvania, it is my happy privilege and great honor to represent the people of this district which includes many hallowed patriotic shrines of the early history of our Nation.

Independence Square and its surrounding area, together with Independence Hall, Congress Hall, and Carpenters Hall, are now under Federal administration as Independence National Historical Park. A great program of restoration and beautification of the area is now well under way through cooperation of the city of Philadelphia, the State and National Governments.

Within this area much of the history of early America was enacted. Here the Philadelphia merchants framed the nonimportation agreement protesting the oppressive Stamp Act. Here both the First and Second Continental Congresses met, George Washington accepted his appointment as general of the Continental Army and later presided over the Constitutional Convention.

Here the world first came to know the brilliance of Thomas Jefferson, the wisdom of Benjamin Franklin, and learned presentments of John Adams, James Madison, and other great men of the time.

Here, too, the Declaration of Independence was written and proclaimed, the Colonies were joined under the Articles of Confederation, and the Convention of Deputies from the Colonies successfully labored to bring forth the document which today is still the foundation rock of our free Republic.

And within the bounds of this area were held the earliest sessions of this Congress until May 14, 1800, in what was then the first Capital of a new Nation, the United States of America.

Mr. Speaker, we are approaching the 175th anniversary of the formation of the Constitution, signed at Philadelphia on May 17, 1787.

This anniversary and related significant dates that followed up to and through the first session of the First Congress convened on March 4, 1789, should be the occasion of a nationwide observance in every community in our land.

As the late Honorable Sol Bloom, Representative from New York and director general of the U.S. Constitution Sesquicentennial Commission, wrote nearly 25 years ago, one of the main purposes of such a program was to promote "a proper understanding of the meaning of the Constitution and its place in the history and daily life of the country—of the origins and principles of our Nation."

In the nearly quarter of a century that has elapsed since the sesquicentennial we have gone through a Second World War, man has emerged into an age of scientific wonders that finds him reaching for the stars, our population has increased by nearly 50 million people, and we have thrived materially.

But at the same time there has risen to power a godless community of dictatorship holding in thrall many other millions of human beings in many other countries—to challenge our bright hopes of a world of peace and justice under the brotherhood of man and the fatherhood of God.

Now more than ever before do we need to renew at the well-springs of faith and patriotism that spirit which moved our Founding Fathers to "secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity—to find sustenance there—and to present their example to the world."

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include the text of my resolution in the RECORD as part of these remarks, and I hope the House will take favorable action on the measure. It is not too early to begin planning for this great event that will begin on May 17, 1962. And I urge that you, Mr. Speaker, appoint a committee or commission to study and recommend a program so that this great historic occasion may be fittingly commemorated.

HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 286

Joint resolution providing for the preparation and completion of plans for a comprehensive observance of the one hundred and seventy-fifth anniversary of the formation of the Constitution of the United States

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That there is hereby established a Commission, to be known as the "United States Constitution One Hundred and Seventy-fifth Anniversary Commission" (hereinafter referred to as the "Commission") for the celebration of the one hundred and seventy-fifth anniversary of the existence of the Constitution, and to be composed of twelve Commissioners, as follows: The President of the United States; the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives, ex officio; three persons to be appointed by the President of the United States; three Senators to be appointed by the President of the Senate; and three Representatives by the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

SEC. 2. The Commissioners shall receive no compensation for their services but shall be paid their actual and necessary traveling, hotel, and other expenses incurred in the discharge of their duties.

SEC. 3. The Commission shall select a Chairman and appoint a Director, who shall appoint, with the approval of the Commission, such assistants and subordinates as he deems necessary.

SEC. 4. That it shall be the duty of the Commissioners, after promulgating to the American people an address relative to the reason of its creation and of its purpose, to prepare a plan or plans, and a program for the adequate celebration of the one hundred and seventy-fifth anniversary, and to give due and proper consideration to any plan or plans which may be submitted to them; and to take such steps as may be necessary in the coordination and correlation of plans prepared by State commissions, or by bodies created under appointment by the Governors of the respective States, and by representative civic bodies.

SEC. 5. That the Commission shall, on or before the adjournment of the present session of the Eighty-sixth Congress, make a report to the Congress, in order that enabling legislation may be enacted.

SEC. 6. That the Commission hereby created shall expire upon the appointment of a permanent Commission to execute the complete arrangements for this celebration.

SEC. 7. That the Commission may receive from any source contributions to aid in carrying out the general purpose of this resolution, but the same shall be expended and accounted for in the same manner as any appropriation which may be made under authority of this Act.

SEC. 8. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of $10,000 to defray expenses.

SOLDIERS' HOMES

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include a letter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, the following copy of a letter was presented to me today by Mr. G. H. Stordock, president, National Association of State Veterans Homes, by Mr. John L. Quigley, of Massachusetts Legislative Committee, who is also commandant of the Chelsea State Soldiers Homes. I believe the House will be much interested in the letter, especially those Members who have soldiers homes in their districts:

THE COMMONWEALTH
OF MASSACHUSETTS,
SOLDIERS' HOME,
Chelsea, March 4, 1959.

You, your committee, and your staff are quite familiar with both the history of State and Territorial Federal allotment statutes and the close relationship existing between Veterans' Administration facilities and State homes. Your familiarity with the background of this problem obviates the necessity for a written presentation of the background; it is, however, pertinent to remind you that the last Federal allotment became effective on September 1, 1954, as a result of a hearing before your committee in February of 1954.

State homes are presently experiencing substantial increases in operating expenses as are all segments of our population. State governments, for the most part, are making every effort to avoid tax increases and so State institutions must make similar efforts to make the same dollars appropriated in past years stretch further to cover the increased cost of providing the same services today. Thus we see that providing services today will be appreciably more expensive than providing identical services a few years ago owing to a general increase in the cost of living.

The general increase in the cost of living, however, is but one of the many valid reasons for increased operational costs of State homes. Among the other reasons are:

First, the gradual transition of State homes in recent years from a simple home or domiciliary to a hospital or rehabilitation center environment. This change has been largely voluntary on the part of States but in many instances has been forced upon us to care for veteran patients recently discharged or transferred from Veterans' Administration facilities for long term care at the State home. The transfers, in most cases, have been made by the Veterans' Administration to make more beds available for short-term cases in Veterans' Administration hospitals; in most cases, too, the transferred veteran has a chronic disability, is unemployed or bedridden, needs nursing, attendant or medical care, and has no place to go. All of these factors go to make a substantial increase in operating expenses since they are drastic changes from home domiciliary centers where minimal care is extended. Even without Veterans' Administration transfers, the homes would have similar problems since they too house veterans in an aging population.

Second, a portion of the increase has been caused by a general improvement in patient care brought about by exchanges of information and professional and educational advancement of home superintendents through annual meetings of our association, hospital association institutes, and participation in Veterans' Administration training program. All such meetings have resulted in presentation of ideas regarding improved patient care, while expensive to institutes, are nonetheless of great value to our veteran patients. The improvement in patient care in our State homes places the standard of care of our veterans on an equal footing with the care of veterans in Veterans' Administration hospitals.

The attached addendum will show a comparison of costs between the quarter ending March 31, 1954 (the time of our last hearing), and the quarters ending June 30, 1958 (the last quarter for which complete costs are available to the undersigned). Since the last increase in Federal allotment, Veterans' Administration auditors have given greater attention to accounting practices of State homes and disallowed a few items which were formerly reported as costs. These disallowances have generally reduced reported costs of State homes and any present report of costs actually is less than similar reports prior to September 1, 1954, since some items formerly allowed are not now included. A review of the addendum will show that only four homes report slight decreases in cost in this period while 26 showed increases. The decreases are partially due, the superintendents advise us, to changes in accounting practices and disallowances of some items by Veterans' Administration auditors. The increases vary from 4.5 percent to 171.8 percent and represent both increased cost of living and expansion of programs. The average of all homes (both increase and decrease) shows a 30.6 percent increase in the 4¼ years under study, or 7.2 percent per year, or 1.8 percent per quarter. The increase of 30.6 percent would appear to justify a dollar increase of $214.20 from Federal funds to meet the proportion of increased operating expenses as, we think, your committee and the Congress intended when the last increase was granted in 1954.

If an increase is approved by your committee, we assume that it could not be effective, as was the last increase, until approximately October 1, 1959. By then an

additional five quarters will have passed since the quarter ending June 30, 1958. Using the average quarterly increase of the March 1954–June 1958 period of 1.8 percent per quarter, we would then add 9 percent to the existing 30.6 percent for a projected total increase of 39.6 percent for the period March 1954–October 1959. This 39.6 percent would represent an actual dollar increase of $277.20.

Thus we see from the above analysis that State homes would appear to be entitled to an increase of from $214.20 to $277.20. We earnestly solicit your support for this increase and hope to enlist your support of H.R. 3752 or any other bill which your committee might care to draw incorporating this increase into new law.

Also attached you will find an addendum showing the actual cost of an increase based on the June 30, 1958, per capita cost for a $100 and a $200 and a $300 annual increase.

We have taken the liberty of reprinting this letter to you, as many of our homes desire to contact their Congressmen regarding this legislation. We felt that this letter would best express our statement of position to you.

With sincere thanks to you for the consideration given to our States' homes, I remain

Very truly yours,

G. H. STORDOCK,
President, National Association of State Veterans' Homes.

JOHN L. QUIGLEY,
Chairman, Legislative Committee.

	March 1954	June 1958	Increase or decrease	Percentage of gain or loss
California	375	546	+171	+45.6
Colorado	402	613	+211	+52.5
Connecticut	508	531	+23	+4.5
Idaho	135	188	+53	+39.3
Illinois	277	391	+114	+41.2
Indiana	337	506	+169	+50.0
Iowa	337	503	+166	+49.3
Kansas	334	297	−37	−11.1
Massachusetts:				
Chelsea	1,007	1,127	+120	+11.9
Holyoke	1,378	1,624	+246	+17.9
Michigan	238	364	+126	+52.9
Minnesota	296	371	+75	+25.3
Missouri	286	307	+21	+7.3
Montana	278	383	+105	+37.7
Nebraska	311	436	+125	+40.2
New Hampshire	513	695	+182	+35.5
New Jersey:				
Menlo Park	506	534	+28	+5.5
Vineland	511	492	−19	−3.7
New York	433	610	+177	+40.9
North Dakota	354	405	+51	+14.1
Ohio	310	268	−42	−13.5
Oklahoma:				
Ardmore	256	300	+44	+17.2
Pennsylvania	230	318	+88	+38.3
Rhode Island	356	580	+224	+62.9
South Dakota	495	429	−66	−13.3
Vermont	352	839	+487	+138.3
Washington:				
Orting	320	460	+140	+43.8
Retsil	342	429	+87	+25.4
Wisconsin	459	530	+71	+15.5
Wyoming	365	992	+627	+171.8
Total	12,301	16,068	3,767	30.6

Actual cost of $100, $200, $500 increase based on June 1958 average present in State homes

	$100 increase	$200 increase	$300 increase
California	$197,060	$394,120	$591,180
Colorado	4,523	9,046	13,569
Connecticut	74,158	148,316	222,474
Idaho			
Illinois	10,361	10,361	10,361
Indiana	26,632	47,932	47,932
Iowa	27,364	51,784	51,784
Kansas			
Massachusetts:			
Chelsea	63,680	127,360	191,040
Holyoke	15,000	30,000	45,000
Michigan	8,732	8,732	8,732
Minnesota	2,500	2,500	2,500

Actual cost of $100, $200, $300 increase based on June 1958 average present in State homes

	$100 increase	$200 increase	$300 increase
Missouri			
Montana	1,118	1,118	1,118
Nebraska	12,871	12,871	12,871
New Hampshire	3,565	7,130	10,695
New Jersey:			
Menlo Park	7,254	14,508	21,762
Vineland	9,755	19,510	24,815
New York	539	1,078	1,617
North Dakota	6,103	6,103	6,103
Ohio			
Oklahoma (Ardmore)			
Pennsylvania			
Rhode Island	21,057	42,114	63,171
South Dakota	11,707	18,959	18,959
Vermont	4,477	8,954	13,431
Washington:			
Orting	16,027	32,054	39,906
Retsil	26,110	46,040	46,040
Wisconsin	27,344	54,688	82,032
Wyoming	702	1,404	2,106
Total	578,639	1,096,682	1,529,198

LATEST PRICE-CUTTING ACTION BY SECRETARY BENSON BAD NEWS FOR THE FARMER AND FOR THE NATION

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, for the past 6 years, Secretary of Agriculture Benson has missed few, if any, opportunities to drive farm prices down, while at the same time expounding the impossible theory that lower farm prices would reduce production and raise farm income.

Needless to say, Mr. Benson's theory has had exactly the opposite effect—farm production has gone up each time he has lowered farm price supports, while farm income has dropped. Farmers have suffered a loss of approximately $18 billion in income under his administration. Farm surpluses held by the Commodity Credit Corporation have virtually quadrupled. Nearly 4 million farm people have been forced to give up farming and join the ranks of city residents seeking employment. The cost of the farm program has been multiplied many times since Mr. Benson took office.

During 1958, because of favorable growing conditions and other factors, net farm income rose to $13 billion, which is an increase of about 20 percent over the previous year. It should be pointed out, however, that it rose in spite of the Secretary's actions, not as a result of them, though he has tried hard to make us believe otherwise.

It should also be noted that last year's net income level was lower than that of any year in the 1946–1954 period, and is far below the reasonable return to which farmers are entitled on their labor, management and investment.

Farming is a costly operation requiring thousands of dollars of investment, as well as hard labor and managerial skill. The typical midwest farming operation represents an investment of about $50,000.

For those who contend that farmers are gaining adequate remuneration for their labors, I would point out that as late as 1957, per capita farm income averaged $967. Nonfarm per capita income averaged $2,082 in the same year. During that year, $309 of the farmer's $967 total income was derived from work off of the farm. The hourly return to farmers for labor and management averaged only a meager 69 cents an hour.

While farm income rose last year, for the first time in 5 years, Secretary Benson apparently has no intention of allowing this situation to repeat itself in 1959.

On February 19 of this year he announced that he was reducing price supports on most feed grains to 60 percent of parity.

I offer for the RECORD at this point a report on the Secretary's latest order by Associated Press writer, Ovid Martin, which appeared in the Sioux Falls Argus-Leader of February 19:

BENSON CUTS PRICE PROPS FOR EIGHT CROPS

(By Ovid A. Martin)

WASHINGTON.—The potential producer value of eight crops has been reduced more than half a billion dollars by a cut in Government price support levels.

The crops are rye, barley, grain sorghums, oats, soybeans, cottonseed, flaxseed and dry beans.

Secretary of Agriculture Benson announced Wednesday that his Department will support prices of these crops at lower levels this year than last.

Should market prices adjust to lower supports—as they are expected to do in view of the existing price-depressing surpluses—grower returns would be decreased correspondingly.

Likewise, the Government's own outlay on supplies which it would take over under price support operations would be reduced also.

In the case of a ninth crop-corn-Benson set a new rate which probably will have little effect on the value of this crop.

Newly announced supports for this year compared with last year, respectively, included: Grain sorghums $1.52 and $1.83 a hundred pounds; oats 50 cents and 61 cents a bushel; and soybeans $1.85 and $2.09.

In the case of corn, Benson set the 1959 rate at a minimum of $1.12 a bushel. This compares with last year's dual rate of $1.36 for corn grown on farms complying with acreage allotments and $1.06 for corn grown on noncomplying farms.

Under a new program in effect this year, there will be no acreage allotments. Farmers will be free to produce all the corn they desire. But there will be a single rate of $1.12.

Inasmuch as more than 80 percent of the affected farms exceeded corn allotments last year, the market price for this grain was largely determined by the $1.06 rate.

This year markets will be determined largely by a rate 6 cents higher.

Consequently, the value of this year's corn crop might well exceed last year's by a small amount assuming, of course, a crop of equal size.

At a minimum, the Secretary's latest action will result in a $15 million loss to the producers of oats, barley, rye, flax, corn, soybeans, and grain sorghums in my State of South Dakota. It could easily be as high as $25 million.

Already, the effects of this arbitrary and completely unjustified action have been felt in the sensitive market places

of the Nation, as the following news story from the same newspaper demonstrates:

SOME GRAINS DOWN SHARPLY

CHICAGO.—The sharpest price break in many months carried some grain futures to new low levels for the season today on the Board of Trade.

Price shifts were broad and rapid as the declines broke open a heavy volume of stop-loss selling in spots and some dealers moved toward reinstatement of positions as the setbacks appeared from time to time to have hit bottoms.

Wheat showed some rallying strength at times, but rye and soybeans, with losses running more than cents a bushel, were under constant heavy pressure.

The liquidation was attributed mainly to new lower price supports for 1959 crops of soybeans and most grains but the Government report on stocks held in price support loan on January 31 also was viewed as bearish by many interests.

At the finish, wheat was unchanged to 1⅛ cents a bushel lower, March $1.93-97⅞. Corn ⅛ higher to ½ lower, March old type contract $1.15¼. Oats ⅝-1½ lower, March 64½. Rye ½-4⅝ lower, March $1.37¼-½. Soybeans 1⅜-3⅜ lower, March $2.19½-¼.

The grain futures market dipped sharply as the news article points out. Furthermore, the break was directly attributed to Mr. Benson's price-cutting actions announced that day. The Secretary's ill-advised decision can only serve to heighten the prolonged agricultural depression, much of which he has created through his policies. It also threatens to lengthen out and perhaps even intensify the recession which this Nation has been experiencing for the past year and a half.

By the latest report, 4.7 million people are still unemployed. Heavy industries are far below full production levels, partly because of decreased farm purchasing power. Is it not, then, the height of irresponsibility to reduce further the incomes of one of industry's best customers—the American farm family?

Let us not forget that farmers provide a market for 6.5 million tons of finished steel annually. They buy more petroleum products than any other segment of the economy. Farmers consume 50 million tons of chemicals annually. They operate 12 million tractors, cars, and trucks on American farms.

Approximately 25 million workers, or about 40 percent of our gainfully employed, are directly dependent upon agriculture for their livelihoods, and millions more indirectly receive much of their incomes from agricultural activities.

It is my conviction that this Nation cannot hope to eliminate the chronic pockets of unemployment and regain its economic health until we deal with the depressed agricultural sector of our economy. The American farmer has provided us with the best food in the world at the lowest prices. He is entitled to an income on a par with his city cousin.

In the past, meaningful farm income improvement legislation has been stopped by Presidential veto. It is my hope, however, that in spite of the veto threat, Congress will make every effort to pass adequate farm legislation.

BARTER AGREEMENT WITH GOVERNMENT OF INDIA

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that I criticized the Department of Agriculture rather sharply on this floor Monday for its failure to carry on an effective barter program, it is a pleasure for me to be able to tell the House today that one particular barter transaction of importance, which has been hanging fire for 18 months, has finally been approved.

At 5:30 yesterday afternoon, officials of the Government of the United States and the Government of India signed an agreement which contemplates the barter of about 17 million bushels of wheat and other food grains for an equivalent value of manganese, ferromanganese, and other minerals produced in India. This is the barter transaction with India that Department of Agriculture officials have been referring to in various statements for the past year. It is indeed a pleasure to learn that the agreement under which it can be consummated has finally been signed.

While I do not want to detract from the accomplishment of Department of Agriculture officials, our natural elation is somewhat tempered by the fact that this proposal was first made in August 1957 and it has taken the Department of Agriculture from that time until yesterday to work out the transaction, and also by the fact that the original proposal was for the barter of several times the quantity of surpluses which are encompassed in the agreement which has just been signed.

Following is the announcement of this transaction which has just been issued by the Department of Agriculture:

BARTER AGREEMENT WITH GOVERNMENT OF INDIA ANNOUNCED

The U.S. Department of Agriculture announced today that basic agreement has been reached between the Governments of India and the United States regarding the exchange of 450,000 metric tons or more of Commodity Credit Corporation-owned foodgrains, principally wheat, for manganese, ferromanganese, and other materials originating in India or processed from materials originating in India.

The processing may take place within India or in friendly countries outside India, including the United States.

After expected completion in the near future of operational details, USDA's Commodity Credit Corporation will issue the terms and conditions under which interested U.S. firms holding firm offers of India material or materials processed from Indian materials may submit offers to CCC.

MISREPRESENTATIONS OF SECRETARY BENSON AND HIS PROGRAM

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Utah [Mr. DIXON] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. DIXON. Mr. Speaker, it is within the nature of our great country and its Congress to be just. Recent statements upon the floor of the House and in the RECORD are in my opinion unjust to our great Secretary of Agriculture and his program.

Yesterday, the Secretary of Agriculture was attacked on the floor of this Chamber in a vicious, scurrilous and entirely uncalled for manner. Even his religion and integrity were challenged. I feel an obligation to apologize here to Secretary Benson in the name of the House of Representatives.

I was glad to see that the Secretary did not dignify the attack on him by a detailed rebuttal. Instead, he pointed out, as well he should, that responsibility for the situation in which we find ourselves today in agriculture lies at the doorstep of those who have the power to change the laws which have led to the shamefully high costs of the farm program and the unmanageable surpluses in a few of the basic crops.

I have asked for a few minutes' time today to correct a few of what I think are fallacies and misrepresentations.

Fallacy No. 1: That the mess we are in is the result of the Secretary's program. As a matter of fact the Democrats have been in control of the last two Congresses and all the Secretary can do is to carry out the mandates of the Congress even though it is not his program. I have been present in the Committee on Agriculture when the Secretary has pled, almost with tears in his eyes, for laws which would correct the very evils of which his opponents complain so forcefully. I do not blame them for complaining and I, like the Secretary, urge them now that they are in such complete control to enact real corrective measures.

Fallacy No. 2: That the rise in Commodity Credit Corporation inventories from 1953 to 1959 is due specifically to lower price supports. Would our critics honestly maintain that the farmers would have chosen to produce less if we had given them as incentives 90 percent or 100 percent price supports? If so, the human nature of the farmer defies analysis if when given such an incentive he decided to produce less. Furthermore, our successful World War II efforts to increase production by raising price supports was all wrong. According to the analysis of Mr. Benson's critics we should have lowered price supports to increase production.

Seriously now the chief reasons for the increasing surpluses are:

First. The miracles of production research and the technological revolution in agriculture production.

Second. The fact that our CCC inventories were low in 1953 only because two wars, involving our responsibility of feeding the world, had drained off our surpluses.

Third. The third great cause is that the Democratic-controlled Congress would not permit sufficient flexibility in price supports to move surpluses into markets rather than into Government storage. Our critics appear to have ignored all three of these most important factors.

Fourth. Our foreign neighbors are now back in production on a big scale—many of them with our help.

Fallacy No. 3: That Secretary Benson's program is the cause of staggering Agriculture Department expenditures. The facts are that 3 out of the last 4 years our Democratic-controlled Congresses have raised agriculture appropriations above what he, the Secretary, wanted to spend. I hope this year to see Democratic majorities vote for less rather than more agriculture spending.

I recall having seen our critics, who cry "economy," vote for a billion dollar a year corn bill, a billion dollar price support freeze bill, which the President had the courage to veto, a billion and a half omnibus farm bill, which we killed on the floor, and a billion and a half food stamp plan, all of which would have forced the Secretary to hire thousands of additional employees and spend additional billions of money.

Fallacy No. 4: That high price supports are the solution to the small low income farmer's problems.

On the contrary, the effect of many of these costly programs has been largely to enrich the big farmers.

In 1956 one-third of our farm products came from less than 3 percent of the farmers and 91 percent of products from 50 percent of the farms. In other words, half of all of the farmers—the small farmers who need the help—produce only 9 percent of the output. Again high price supports discriminate against the small farmer who produces other than the six basic crops. Yet in spite of this handicap it is the basic crops which get most of the help that are in the most serious trouble.

The poultry people have given the law of supply and demand a chance to operate and as a result consumption has increased prodigiously. Our livestock have done likewise and they have represented one of the bright spots in agriculture.

If our critics are so eager to cut costs and help the small farmer why did they refuse to pass bills which several of us introduced which would drastically limit the amount of money that could be paid to any one farmer?

Time and again in the years he has been Secretary, Mr. Benson has called for revisions in the basic legislation which would have permitted agriculture to make an orderly transition from war to peacetime demand. Each time the Congress either refused, or took steps in the opposite direction which caused Presidential vetoes, or grudgingly granted a little—but much too little—of what the President and the Secretary recommended after careful study of the whole situation.

Again and again, Mr. Benson warned of the consequences of this inaction. Today we are seeing the results. Again President Eisenhower and Mr. Benson have appealed to the Congress to revise the law. And what is the response?

Instead of statesmanship, we have the shameful spectacle of veteran Members of this body beating Mr. Benson over the head with the results of a program which certainly is not of the Secretary's making.

We might as well face up to it, Mr. Speaker. The President cannot change the law. He has urged changes again and again. Mr. Benson cannot make the law—it is his duty to administer it. Therefore, it is difficult to draw the conclusion that the failure of the farm law is the failure of the administration.

It is time to say right here and now that the failure of the program is the failure of the legislation—the old, outmoded, unworkable legislation—that this Congress has allowed to continue much, much too long.

The gentleman from Mississippi yesterday attempted to support his personal attack on the Secretary by selecting from a hearing record some carefully culled excerpts regarding the cotton program and the recent revision of the parity index.

I would like to present the facts to you at this point.

A dispassionate review of these facts will indicate that the Secretary was discharging his legal responsibilities as the chief executive officer in charge of the Department of Agriculture with respect to revision of the index of prices received by farmers and the parity index—index of prices paid, interest, taxes, and wage rates.

The law places upon the Secretary the responsibility of determining the indexes and prices used in computing parity prices. It was obviously clearly appropriate for the statisticians to advise the Secretary as to the implications of the data. Pursuant to his responsibility, the Secretary approved the request for funds for fiscal year 1956 for bringing the weighting pattern up to postwar conditions. These are the last major indexes of the Federal Government to be brought up to date after World War II.

Testimony before the Appropriations Committee clearly outlined the need for updating the index and implied the intention of the Department to proceed with the necessary surveys and revisions once the surveys were completed. This it appears the Department has done. Indeed, it is difficult to see how the Department could have withheld the completion of this work, after making the basic surveys and utilizing the funds requested for the purpose.

The situation was in some respects similar at the time of the 1950 revision of the indexes. At the time the 1950 index was revised the Congress had directed that allowance be made for cash wage rates. This addition more than offsets the downward effect which the revision had upon the parity index.

Thus the component for prices paid, interest, and taxes of the revised parity index as published in January 1950 was about 2½ percent lower than the index as computed prior thereto. The addition of the wage factor, however, served to cancel this so that the net effect of the revision, including the addition of wage rates and the revision of the prices received index was to raise parity prices about 4 percent, instead of around 6 percent, which would have resulted without the revision.

The testimony of Mr. O. V. Wells, of the Department, indicates that the farm expenditure survey, although necessarily a sample, was conducted by approved statistical techniques and represents all farms, whether large or small.

The memorandums from Stauber to Wells are clearly technical memorandums exploring the changes which might result from using the new, current data and were not written, as implied, for the purpose of reducing parity prices.

As to the matter of medical services, hospitals, insurance, and the like mentioned by the gentleman from Mississippi, they were not included in the index previously, and their continued omission obviously has changed nothing. These items could not be included because price series are not available.

Finally, the Parity Index continues to relate to all farms, just as it has in the past. It does, however, make use of up-to-date information.

Surely the Congress expects the Secretary to make use of the most accurate and up-to-date statistical information available in his determinations. This it appears the Secretary has done, and I am sure that it is in the interest of agriculture and the whole Nation for our statistical measures to be as accurate as it is possible to make them with available resources.

Mr. Speaker, in his attack on Secretary Benson the gentleman from Mississippi had quite a lot to say about how this administration has handled the cotton export program, his pet commodity. Some of it, unfortunately, was incorrect or misleading. I do not propose to answer my distinguished colleague point by point, but I would like to call attention to some things I think need correction.

The truth is that under the capable leadership of Secretary Benson, the Department of Agriculture since 1956 has sold about 15.5 million bales of cotton under its export program. Exports for the 3 years, including this year 1958–59, will average above 5 million bales. This is considered by the Department, on the basis of testimony and debate at the time the Agricultural Act of 1956 was before the Congress, to represent the U.S. fair share of the world market for cotton. The gentleman from Mississippi, capable representative of his constituents that he is, now would raise this fair share from 5.5 to 6 million bales. I suggest that a study of the record be made.

Later in his remarks the gentleman from Mississippi commented on a communique from the Washington Star concerning the recent visit of President Eisenhower to Mexico and quoted:

> The communique said there was agreement that there should be cooperation and consultation between the two Governments on the disposal of cotton. This might mean that Mexico will be protected in the future against sale abroad of United States cotton surpluses.

My distinguished colleague then went on to say that reestablishing and maintaining our historical share of world markets is not disposing of surpluses, adding that he could not believe that the President would feel he had the right to ignore the law.

The joint statement by the President of Mexico and the President of the United States at Acapulco on February 20, 1959, and made available here by the White House, says in the seventh paragraph—the only reference to cotton—the following:

> Since cotton is Mexico's major export commodity and one of great importance to the United States, the two Presidents agreed that their Governments should cooperate and consult together in their efforts better to protect the interests of both countries in this vital commodity.

The gentleman from Mississippi strayed far afield elsewhere in his speech.

It is ridiculous, for example, to accuse the Secretary of making huge and hasty Soil Bank payments because 1956 was an election year. As a matter of fact, he opposed making the Soil Bank operative in 1956.

The Soil Bank program was placed in effect hastily, it is true, but that was done to meet a specific directive of the Congress.

Early in 1956, Congress passed an agricultural bill in which a Soil Bank authorization was coupled with numerous unwise provisions which the administration had consistently opposed and could not possibly accept. Chief of these objectionable provisions was a return to a wartime rigid 90 percent of parity supports for the basic commodities. Had this provision become law in this period of huge surpluses and rising yields, the cost of the Federal farm program would have skyrocketed beyond all comprehension. The bill would have been self-defeating, because the Soil Bank provisions and the rigid supports would have pulled farmers in directly opposite directions.

Under those circumstances, the President had no choice but to veto the unworkable bill which was handed him by an unfriendly Congress and to request reenactment of the Soil Bank provisions in a form that made sense—and in time for use on 1957 production.

However, when Congress repassed the Soil Bank, the Department of Agriculture was directed to put the program into effect for 1956. That was nearly the first of June. Moving rapidly, the Department of Agriculture went to the field with what was admittedly a special program to meet a time emergency not of the Department's own making.

Launched under such difficult circumstances, the acreage reserve of the soil bank can nevertheless show an outstanding record of accomplishment during the 3 years the program was in operation.

For those 3 years, we can point with pride to perhaps the greatest record of crop adjustment ever accomplished under any farm program in a comparable period. For the five basic crops to which the program was applied, crops were reduced by approximately 50 million acres in the 3 years. Altogether, the acreage reserve prevented the production of many millions of bushels of crops that would have added to the surplus and run up the cost of the price-support program. For corn, the 3-year reduction was nearly one-half billion bushels. For cotton, there was a crop reduction of 3 million bales in 1958 alone. The program was so effective on cotton that the acreage last year was the smallest since 1876.

Why, then, was the program dropped after 3 years? The true reason is that it had accomplished in that 3-year period nearly everything that could be expected through that approach. Cotton acreage was reduced to such a level that Congress directed a program which would offer farmers an opportunity to increase their plantings. Corn farmers, offered a choice, voted for a program which would take controls completely away from corn. Only wheat was left among the major surplus crops, and the Department of Agriculture wisely elected not to offer this special approach to wheat farmers alone.

And, incidentally, payments under the soil bank are made after the acreage adjustment is carried out, not before. No farmer has ever been paid before carrying out his contract—in an election year or any other time.

I suggest in the interest of better information for Members of this House and less questioning of the President's intent to ignore the law that communiques be obtained from official sources.

In connection with the cotton export program the gentleman from Mississippi cited a figure of $135 million as rebates to private firms as the result of the Department's downgrading cotton sold to them. He added that much of this cotton was sold in world trade at higher than the new class and much higher than the original class. This leaves the inference that the firms that handled cotton under the export program received special treatment, or what, in effect, might be described as a bonus. The facts do not bear this out.

Cotton sold under the export programs of recent years came from the 1951 through 1957 crops. Cotton in storage over extended periods tends to change in grade particularly with respect to color. In offering this cotton for export, the Department provided that purchasers might have it reclassified by Government cotton examiners and make final settlement on the basis of that reclassification. I contend that this was only fair and in keeping with trade practices.

My colleague from Mississippi also knows that cotton normally is sold in export on the basis of private types or descriptions rather than on U.S. standards. To assume that cotton sold abroad on description is equal to or better than its classification by the Government leads to the false assumption that exporters made undue profits and that the Government made unjustified refunds for quality claims. This just is not so, as any well-informed cotton man well knows.

Although the acreage reserve was not offered this year, the soil bank remains very much alive and is getting good results. During this coming growing season, there will be some 23 million acres in the soil bank's long-range program called the conservation reserve. That is about 5 percent of all the cropland in the United States. Some of it is not the best land, but much of it is excellent land that would be producing crops on a large scale if it had not been diverted from crops to conservation practices through the soil bank.

A survey of conservation reserve participation shows that this soil bank land did produce in the 2 years before coming into the program large quantities of corn, wheat, cotton, peanuts, rice, oats, soybeans, grain sorghums, and a variety of other crops that would be adding to our surplus problems.

This is in addition to the fact that the entire 23 million acres will by the end of 1959 be in grass, trees, water, and wildlife conservation and other long-range practices that conserve and improve our American soil.

I submit that we cannot solve the farm dilemma by concentrating solely on one commodity—cotton—or by abusing an official of government for carrying out our own directives. Angry tirades will not dispose of surpluses, nor put more money in the pockets of cotton-growers or any other type of farmers. This is an hour and a situation demanding hard thinking and statesmanship.

Mr. WALLHAUSER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIXON. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. WALLHAUSER. I congratulate the gentleman from Utah, the Honorable HENRY ALDOUS DIXON, on his able presentation of the true facts of the farm situation. The charge has been made that our distinguished Secretary of Agriculture has been unwilling to assume responsibility for the program. In my opinion, quite the contrary is true.

It was my privilege last Wednesday night to attend a dinner in Newark, N.J., at which our distinguished Secretary of Agriculture was the principal speaker. There were approximately 1,000 diners present from all over the great State of New Jersey, from all walks of life, many of them farmers.

Much of his speech was devoted to agriculture, its problems and his program. In my opinion, which was subscribed to and attested by the frequent and sustained outbursts of applause of the diners, all present were impressed by his profound knowledge of his subject, his clear presentation, and the fact that he indicated emphatically and without leaving any question in anyone's mind that he is the Secretary of Agriculture and he is the factual head of the Department in every respect.

It is my belief that his record is a very great one and his critics should not say that he is not the head of the Department or is not willing to stand behind his program. On the contrary, our citizens are fortunate to have Ezra Taft Benson as the Secretary of Agriculture.

Mr. DIXON. The Secretary is perfectly willing to stand behind his program. We should not force him to stand behind a program that is not his.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIXON. I yield.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I want to compliment my colleague, the gentleman from Utah, on a very able presentation in support of the

policies of a very able Secretary of Agriculture. I do not know of any person in my lifetime who has been as controversial as has been the present Secretary of Agriculture or a man who has with such fortitude and, indeed, bravery stood up to the criticism of so many people as have criticized the present Secretary of Agriculture. I think it should be pointed out even more fully than the able gentleman from Utah did that the Secretary of Agriculture has as his main goal the welfare of every farmer in the United States of America and that he believes, and I certainly will subscribe to this, that the welfare of those farmers is bound up in getting a higher net return from the acres that they till. The Secretary believes that in order to do this you cannot repeal the law of supply and demand, but you must recognize the existence of it. He also realizes that the farming industry, and it is an industry in many ways, has gone through a technological revolution, that it is an exploding sort of thing which defies the laws which have previously been used to try to understand agricultural economics, and that as long as this situation continues, it will be necessary for brave men and bold men to think bravely and boldly and not try to solve this problem by what has been done in the past. He has recognized the failure of the high, rigid price support formula. He has recognized the fact that something new must be done in order to protect the farmers of the future and to make sure that this Nation has the warp and the woof which is needed and which can be produced only by the farmers of this Nation to insure its future greatness. Again, Mr. Speaker, I congratulate the gentleman for his fine presentation.

I cannot help but join the gentleman in his query directed to the Democrat Members of the Congress. If the administration of the laws passed in Democrat Congresses has had the dire effects you say they have, why have you not, with your majorities in Congress, enacted new laws? Why have you not faced up to the effects of the agricultural revolution and the hardships it has imposed on the modern farmer? The Secretary of Agriculture, your castigate, has tried. He has recommended legislation you have scorned. You have chosen to play politics with the fate of the farmer. His hardships have been perpetuated and deepened by you, not by the Secretary of Agriculture.

Mr. DIXON. I thank the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIXON. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Utah for allowing me to participate and to express my own confidence, and I am sure the confidence of the entire 10th Congressional District of the State of California in the administration of Secretary of Agriculture Ezra Taft Benson. As the gentleman in the well of the House knows, I not only represent one of the fastest growing industrial areas in the United States, but also an area which contains the county which produces the 15th highest amount of agricultural products in the entire Nation. It so happens that these products contain very few if any, price-supported commodities. We have many poultrymen who feed price-supported grains and sell unsupported meat. We have cattlemen who feed price-supported grains and sell unsupported meat. We have countless vegetable farmers and orchardists who pay an inflated price for machinery, brought about by the price-support system, who do not receive price supports.

It happens that I am a third-generation farmer. I have seen farming change in those three generations. I have seen my grandfather, for example, labor long and hard to produce 10 tons to the acre of what we called cow beets. I have seen my father follow him and produce the more refined sugar beet, and work to get 15 to 20 tons per acre if he had a good crop. I have seen times change from my father's day. I have seen the development of new types of fertilizer, sugar beet seed which is blight resistant and rust resistant, new irrigation practices, and new methods of thinning. These developments have increased yields so that today on the same acreage that my grandfather produced 10 tons of beets and my father produced 15 or 20 tons, I produce 30 or 35 tons at a lower unit cost. Even in this day of high prices and higher wages and higher prices for machinery this has been done.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GUBSER. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. Is that sugar you are talking about with regard to beets; are they supported?

Mr. GUBSER. Sugar beets are under the Sugar Act, and payments are made from the revenue from the duty imposed upon Cuban imports.

Mr. GROSS. Pretty well supported?

Mr. GUBSER. That is correct, from the industry itself; not from the U.S. Treasury. There is not a single dollar going into the sugar beet business from the U.S. Treasury. In fact, it pays a profit to the Treasury.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman spoke of tractors. I presume they also use automobiles. Does he charge that excessive price of automobiles and tractors to that industry?

Mr. GUBSER. Of course, Government expenditures have had a great deal to do with inflation. Price supports are a part of Government expenditures.

Let me state that this improved technology that the farmer has experienced in three generations has been responsible for making the present price-support philosophy completely invalid. Today we are basing price supports upon circumstances which existed years and years ago. We have forgotten that it is now possible to produce more of any commodity from a given acre of ground, with less labor and less expended human effort.

I commend Secretary Benson for having the courage to recommend that this outmoded program be brought up to date, and that we use modern theories and modern applications in solving the farm problem.

Yesterday in the colloquy on this floor cotton was mentioned. Secretary of Agriculture Benson was given the blame for the plight of the cotton farmer. I would like to present another theory. I say the cotton farmer of the South has been hurt by the fact that California has gone into the business of producing cotton. Price supports have lured nonfarmers into the cotton-producing business, to produce the surplus which has hurt the southern cotton producer.

The area called the West Side in the San Joaquin Valley, just across the hill from my district, was, until a few years ago, a stretch of thousands upon thousands of arid acres which had never raised anything but jackrabbits. With the lure of a guaranteed profit, men who had never farmed before in their lives, stockbrokers and doctors and lawyers, came to the West Side. They had the money and the capital to sink the wells for each 640 acres, which cost $25,000, and another $25,000 for a pumping plant to lift the water.

They had the money to buy the large crawler tractors which could go over hundreds of acres day and night, and which the little fellow cannot afford. The lure of a guaranteed profit in the cotton industry made cotton farmers out of men who had never done anything with cotton before except perhaps to wear it. These are the kind of men who were brought into competition with the small farmer. It was the price support system which created the corporation farm and drove the small farmer right smack out of business.

I laud Secretary of Agriculture Benson for having the courage and the personal integrity to face this problem squarely. I sincerely hope that we can continue to take a realistic approach to the problem of price supports. I hope that some day the farmers of the country can compete as other businessmen compete, that we can return honest competition to the farm. The Wall Street banker, the doctor, and the lawyer will then be out of the picture, farming will revert to farmers, and we will not have these terrific investments by financial syndicates to operate big corporation farms and drive the small man out of business. I say to you that if you give us a chance to compete under the laws of supply and demand and if you will follow Secretary of Agriculture Benson, we will have prosperous small farms.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIXON. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I want to commend the gentleman for taking the floor and trying to clarify this very important matter of our farm program. I think he very rightly draws the attention of the Congress, and I hope of the people of the country, to the fact that the past two Congresses have been Democratic controlled, and the present Congress is Democratic controlled, and that the farm program we have been trying to make sense out of has not been Secretary Benson's program.

About 3 years ago, I believe in 1955, the minority members of the Joint Economic Committee on which I have the honor to serve, filed supplemental views to the committee report on the Presi-

dent's economic report in regard to the agricultural sector of our economy, pointing out some of the economic factors the gentleman has pointed out. The Secretary of Agriculture has pointed up in his proposed program many of these same points over a period of years. To some degree, as a result of those minority views last year, a subcommittee of the Joint Economic Committee, under the chairmanship of Senator SPARKMAN, conducted extensive hearings and research into the economic aspect of U.S. agriculture. The results of those hearings when we were through, and the scope was nationwide, clearly revealed that Secretary of Agriculture Benson's economic theories on this subject have been right, and the report of the Joint Economic Committee on this subject submitted last year bears that cut. That is the report my Democratic friends do not like to talk about. It does not back up the oratory we listen to here on the floor of the House from people on the majority side who do not like what is going on in agriculture and try to make a political football out of the serious national economic problem.

The usual epithet that we hear here is that Secretary Benson is trying to drive the farmers off the farm. If you analyze that charge you find it probably is as foul a blow as a person could strike, because what in effect a person is saying is when he charges any man with such objectives is that he is lacking in the basic Christian virtues; and, of course, that is not so. We can debate to some advantage the economic effects of the policies which are devised by the Secretary of Agriculture or the Democrat leaders of the Congress or anyone else, but that is not what has been said. The attack has been personal and it has been vicious. I submit that anyone reviewing the hearings of the Joint Economic Subcommittee on Agricultural Policy can come to only one conclusion: That this is a very serious problem that no one man or group of men or party, Republican or Democrat, has created it, and probably that it will take all of us working together and hammering at each other in honest debate to correct it. It is a serious problem and there is only one way we can get to the bottom of it and that is to start bringing out these economic factors into the open and trying to solve them.

I commend the Secretary of Agriculture for trying his best to bring these matters out in the open and, right or wrong on his proposed solutions, his presentation has been hitting at the real nub of the problem. His critics have not earned similar commendation. They have distorted the facts, conceded the issues, and resorted to personal vilification. Then, to top it off, they have offered no solution to the problem and tried to escape the responsibility for their inaction in trying to make the people forget that the Democratic Party has controlled the Congress where action can be taken. We must get at the economics of the situation so we can go forward in this program and solve this very difficult problem for our people.

I thank the gentleman again for taking this time to bring the matter to the attention of the Congress.

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIXON. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. JENNINGS. I have listened to the gentleman uphold the Secretary of Agriculture in his announced program. The gentleman is a member of the Committee on Agriculture of the House and I would like to ask him the question: Has he introduced legislation which would carry out and enact the program that has been advocated by the Secretary of Agriculture?

Mr. DIXON. My answer to that, is definitely "Yes." Representative Hill, of Colorado and I both introduced bills designed to place into operation the exact program which the Secretary of Agriculture recommended. Furthermore, those bills were never considered by our Committee on Agriculture. May I correct the gentleman. I have defended the Secretary and his program. I would like to say again the program that he is being accused of advocating and following is not his program. It is the program of the Democratic majority of the Members of Congress who have been in control of the Congress during the last 4 years.

Mr. JENNINGS. And the administration of that program in effect has caused many of the things that we have just discussed. However, I will say to the gentleman in all fairness, that Representative Hill is not a Member of the Congress any more. The gentleman, I am sure, will recognize there are many new Members of Congress here this year who were not Members of the last Congress.

I would like to ask the gentleman, has he ever introduced any legislation that will carry out and implement the Secretary's or the President's recommendations in this session of the Congress to roll back the price supports and do the other things he is advocating?

Mr. DIXON. The Secretary appeared before our committee and told the committee that it was in control of the Department and that it was in control of the Congress. That if they are dissatisfied with his program they should make one of their own.

Mr. JENNINGS. Which program is the gentleman referring to?

Mr. DIXON. He said that he will go to the end of the road to help the committee build a program. Now it is up to you to build it instead of just complain.

Mr. JENNINGS. We have a program and we would like to have it fairly administered in the interest of all segments of agriculture, in the interest of the economy of America. We are not advocating a particular change in some of the programs that we have; we are advocating a change in the administration of those programs. We are not interested in introducing the legislation which is advocated by the Secretary. To my knowledge, neither the gentleman nor any member of his party has introduced that legislation.

Mr. DIXON. I introduced that legislation last year, and the gentleman knows it.

Mr. JENNINGS. We are talking about a different Congress. As I pointed out, we have many new Members who would, perhaps, like to do the job of legislating to implement the Secretary's program. My question is, Has the gentleman introduced it or has any member of the Committee on Agriculture introduced it, or has any member of the minority in this House introduced it? Certainly, the majority is not going to introduce his program because we do not believe in it.

Mr. DIXON. What good is it to introduce such legislation when we could not even get it before the committee?

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIXON. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. I want to commend the gentleman from Utah for the statement he is making. The plain fact of the matter is that the Department of Agriculture can only administer the laws that are enacted by the Congress of the United States. Another fact that is crystal clear is that for 4 years past the Congress of the United States has been under the control of the Democrat Party. Proposals have been made by the administration for legislative enactments in the field of agriculture. They have been spurned by the Democrat-controlled Congresses to whom they have been presented.

I think it also ought to be emphasized that the primary responsibility for the legislative program is in the Congress of the United States. The House of Representatives is presently controlled by a Democrat majority, 283 to 153. Now, I do not believe that the farmers of this country are going to be fooled by threats of investigation of the Secretary or of the Department or by constant criticism and sniping. If corrective farm legislation is indicated as desirable and necessary, and if no action is had, then I think the Democrats here in the Congress who control the Committee on Agriculture and the Congress of the United States are going to have to answer to the American farmers and to the American people for the situation, and not much longer are they going to be able to confuse the issue as they have sought to do through recent years and months.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Utah has expired.

Mr. DIXON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. TEAGUE] and the gentlewoman from Washington [Mrs. MAY] may extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Utah?

There was no objection.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Speaker, Secretary of Agriculture Benson continues to be the recipient of blasts from pressure groups. He is standing his ground well, however. It should be fully realized that most of the difficulties faced by agriculture and the terrific cost of the present programs are the fault of a Democrat Congress and not of the administration. Secretary Benson must enforce laws which Congress passes, whether he likes them or not. A very high percentage of legislation affecting

agriculture was placed on the books against the Secretary's recommendation. There is much more which Congress has refused to remove, in spite of Mr. Benson's pleas.

The cost of these programs is fantastic. For example, the cost to the Federal Government for agricultural surpluses presently in warehouses is almost $9 billion. This amount would do—or is equivalent to—any one of the following:

(a) Pay for all veterans' benefits programs for almost 2 years.

(b) More than pay a year's interest on the national debt.

(c) Pay for school lunch programs for 30 years.

(d) Pay for all space flight activities for 10 years.

(e) Pay all Regular, Reserve, and retired military personnel for a year.

(f) Run the FBI for longer than any of us will live—80 years.

(g) Equal three times the value of all property in the 13th Congressional District.

(h) Equal the total personal income of everyone in the 13th Congressional District for almost 10 years.

(i) Be almost 10 percent of the value of all Government property.

(j) Equal total California farm income for last 3 years.

Eighty-two percent of these surplus commodities consists of wheat, corn, cotton, rice, peanuts, and tobacco. And yet these particular crops constitute only about 20 percent of the total agricultural production of the United States in dollar value. This comparatively small segment of agriculture is receiving billions of their Government's dollars at the expense of housewives and taxpayers in general.

Furthermore, most of these dollars go to large producers: 90 percent of the funds for wheat go to 50 percent of the farms—the largest ones; 75 percent of the funds for cotton go to 25 percent of the farms—again, the largest ones. For cotton and rice, those with 100 acres or more get an average of $10,000 each per year. The smaller ones get almost nothing. Just 10 farms received almost $4 million from the Federal Government in 1957 for soil bank and price-support payments:

The total cost of handling these surplus crops is over a billion dollars a year. As the President has pointed out, this is more than is being spent on all water resource projects in the whole of the United States this year.

Again, it should be emphasized that the blame for this fiasco should be placed mostly on the Democrat Congress—not on the Secretary of Agriculture. It is my hope that the citizens of the country will wake up and demand that their Congressmen stop voting for extremely costly and unsound agriculture legislation.

Mrs. MAY. Mr. Speaker, throughout recent years the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN] has been an ardent supporter of mandatory, rigid, high-level support at 90 percent of parity, which was dropped on such major commodities as wheat, cotton, and corn at the end of the 1954 crop season. If Mr. WHITTEN's proposals had been continued after 1954 the CCC (a) would have accumulated even larger supplies of these major basic commodities, (b) would have incurred much heavier costs in storage, interest, transportation, and handling these increased quantities, and (c) would have taken heavier losses in all of the surplus disposal operations.

It has been necessary to raise the CCC borrowing authority from $4¾ billion 10 years ago up to $14½ billion at the present time to provide funds to conduct price-support programs directed by Congress. If Mr. WHITTEN's program had been continued in operation it would have been necessary for Congress to have raised the borrowing authority well above the $14½ billion.

THE STRATEGIC AIR COMMAND

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, steps must be taken to get SAC off the ground and one-third perpetually airborne as a minimum essential of defense for national survival.

The American people have the mistaken impression, through no fault of their own, that the Strategic Air Command, operating B–52's and B–47's, representing our Sunday punch presently, has one-third of its planes aloft at all times in a state of operational readiness.

Nothing could be further from the truth.

As a member of the Department of Defense Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations, it is my opinion that the United States is wide open when it comes to a surprise military attack. Our big bombers are like so many sitting ducks to an enemy that has Intercontinental Ballistic Missiles operational.

Our present defenses indicate we have learned precious little from the Pearl Harbor attack that wiped out our Pacific Fleet in 1941, our failure to keep at least a third of SAC always airborne is a virtual invitation to a trigger-happy enemy to spark off world war III with nuclear missiles.

I call on the administration to submit a new emergency supplemental appropriations bill immediately to give SAC the funds necessary to keep the bombers aloft and dispersed, and/or to make a transfer of funds with congressional approval from other accounts without delay so this vital defense step can be activated. I will be glad to assume responsibility for introducing legislation if necessary and to stay with it until enactment, as well as an additional supplemental appropriation and later as an amendment to the 1960 appropriation bill.

It is an ironic and regrettably dangerous development which finds the American people being deceived by propaganda not denied officially that SAC at all times has one-third of its big bombers roaming the skies around the world. Our people have been led to believe that these guardians of the air are on duty 24 hours a day, needing only the word to discharge nuclear weapons. Such is by no means the case: the administration knows it is not so; the Pentagon knows it isn't so, and certain congressional committees know it is not so. But the sooner we make it so the better, and curing the deficiency cannot come too soon.

The situation is one of massive deception and unreasonable neglect in the atomic age. When the Soviets are brandishing their missiles, continuance of this sorry condition is setting the stage for another Munich. This is the sort of thing that encourages Khrushchev to adopt his bullying tactics toward the West. If it continues uncorrected, one of these days, and pretty soon, too, he will call the boys in and give them the bad news. It is getting awfully late and the price of our unpreparedness could be capitulation.

Fortunately there is time enough to repair the damage, but it is running out rapidly. We must act promptly and with decision. What is our wealth going to be worth if we lose our freedom? It is the supreme irony of history, as has been noted, that the richest country in the world seemingly can't afford to buy a defense system that will protect itself. The guardians of the national safety who are more concerned with a fictitious balanced budget than they are with a defense system second to none have much to answer for. If they cannot free themselves from their dangerous thinking, then the people must rally and demand the necessary steps be taken at once. SAC is a great outfit—let us get them into the air, and keep them flying.

The activation of selected Army Reservists is essential also so the country can be prepared for any emergency. We have what it takes to cope with any form of organized tyranny, but in these days of lightning warfare, it is force in being and in readiness that count. Should there be another war, M-day will be D-day. We must be ready to go at the opening gun.

And further, Mr. Speaker, I strongly urge the administration to a mobilization of economic resources and preparedness program to meet the emergency forecast by the looming Berlin crisis.

The grim challenge posed by Khrushchev's intransigence must be met with firmness, we must strengthen the hand of the Bonn Government and strongly reaffirm our solidarity with our NATO allies.

I deplore those who favor appeasement by accommodation and hide behind flexibility as a shield for what would be another and disastrous retreat before the Kremlin's predatory policy, backed by its war machine. We need a full facing up, by our Government, to the realities of the situation.

I call for full speed ahead on the military procurement and planning front, a state of national readiness and support for a program of full employment at the earliest possible date.

We have only to recall that we supplied the Soviets with the materials to stave off Hitler's assaults and help bring about his defeat, to realize we have the resources, know-how, and capacities to deal with any Kremlin threats. But, to these assets must be added the will to do, and the readiness to meet any threat.

I stress the necessity of making the most of our economic powers, it is a prodigal waste of strength to have upward of 5 million available workers jobless at a time when we are confronted with such a grave threat. In my district, Luzerne County, Pa., we have 25,000 men able, ready, and willing to do their part to ready America for any eventuality. It is a sad commentary that these men are denied the opportunity to participate in a preparedness program. The national interest dictates that the administration cooperate with the Congress in the enactment and approval of legislation that will give workers, everywhere in America, the chance to do their bit. To fail to do so is seriously short-changing the national welfare. We need to accelerate our pace of readiness on the one hand, and aim toward the goal of full employment on the other.

I point to the Flood-Douglas bill, presently being considered in congressional hearings, as the kind of constructive action needed to restore the national economy to full strength. The measure calls for funds for loans to communities plagued by chronic unemployment, and for community facilities that will give the jobless ridden communities the tools to qualify for job-producing industry. The measure, in substantially the same form, was passed by the Congress last year but was vetoed by the President.

On the opening day of the present session of Congress I decried the action of the administration in sequestering $1 billion which the 85th Congress had voted to beef up our military forces. The passing weeks have only confirmed the urgent necessity of our getting on with the task of readying the world's best defense forces—anything less is an invitation to disaster. The gathering storm only gives grim emphasis to the urgency of our getting on with the twin tasks of preparedness and the achievement of full employment. I testified before the Senate Banking and Currency Committee on Wednesday of this week on the aid to distressed areas bill. The House Banking and Currency Committee will begin hearings on the measure, known in the House as the Flood-Douglas bill, on March 9. I have been working in close collaboration with Representative WRIGHT PATMAN, of Texas, chairman of the House subcommittee, who will preside over the hearings. The United States is the greatest Nation on the face of the earth, let us keep it so for the sake of peace on earth.

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION HOSPITAL IN LAKE CITY, FLA.

Mr. LEVERING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FASCELL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I have been advised by Veterans' Administration Administrator, Sumner G. Whittier, that he has approved plans calling for the modification and conversion of existing buildings at the Veterans' Administration hospital in Lake City, Fla., to provide hospital facilities which will accommodate approximately 114 additional beds. The Lake City, Fla., facility is presently operating 354 beds and the addition will raise this total to 468.

One June 26, 1958, I introduced a bill calling for the construction by the Veterans' Administration of not less than 2,000 additional beds for care of the disabled veterans in the State of Florida. At that time I cited facts from the records of the Veterans' Administration that attested to the need and the serious hospital-bed shortage in Florida.

Shortly thereafter, Mr. Whittier recommended and offered approval for the construction of an additional 350 beds each for the Veterans' Administration hospitals in Coral Gables and Bay Pines, Fla.

I wish to commend Mr. Whittier, and I feel sure that each of my Florida colleagues join with me, for his latest recognition of the problem and the constructive action that he has taken in providing the additional beds at Lake City.

Florida's growth is continuing at an alarming rate. It is the fastest growing large State in the Nation. It is estimated that Florida's immediate gain in population averaged 5,032 persons each week during the past 3 years.

Florida has grown from a population of 2,771,305 in 1950 to a U.S. Bureau of Census mid-1958 calculation of 4,442,000, or a total 8-year, 60-percent gain of 1,671,000. Only California has added more permanent residents.

Florida's population gain is about the same as the total population of Arkansas, Arizona, or Oregon. In fact Florida is now the 12th largest State in the Union; whereas in 1940 it ranked 27th, and in 1950, 20th. Census Bureau estimators affirm that Florida will take ninth place between the years 1965 and 1970.

The largest growth has taken place in the area now serviced by the Veterans' Administration hospital at Coral Gables, Fla. In my two-county congressional district, alone, the population has grown from 525,041 in 1950 to a 1958 estimated population of 1 million. Dade County alone is showing a 42.2 percent population increase every 5 years. These figures are confirmed by Bureau of Census estimates. The eight other counties in the area serviced by the Coral Gables Veterans' Administration hospital have grown similarly.

The waiting lists for Florida Veterans' Administration hospitals are continually growing larger. Facts show that a 1,000-bed Veterans' Administration hospital is needed now in Dade County to properly care for the veterans of the area. Veterans' Administration officials long ago recognized this need.

As of January 1, 1958, there was a national ratio of 186 veterans to every Veterans' Administration hospital bed. In Florida that ratio was 405 to 1. For neuropsychiatric—NP—patients, the national ratio was 352 NP veterans to each Veterans' Administration NP bed. In Florida, the Veterans' Administration NP ratio was 2,840 to 1. The national ratio of Veterans' Administration TB patients was 1,748 to 1. Florida's ratio was 1 Veterans' Administration hospital bed for 5,287 TB patients.

It is interesting but appalling to note here that of 1,060 Florida veterans who are listed as NP cases, only 14 percent are hospitalized in Florida Veterans' Administration hospitals.

The Veterans' Administration advises me that there were 308,000 veterans in Florida in April of 1950. January 1958 reports show that Florida had 534,000 veterans, an increase of 73 percent.

In comparison, a review of the national veteran population for approximately the same period shows conclusively the alarming rate of veteran influx to Florida. In April of 1950 there were nationally 19,070,000 veterans, and by January of 1957 that figure had reached 22,710,000, an increase of only 19 percent.

So, while Mr. Whittier's foresight will eventually prove to be of great assistance, the Lake City, Bay Pines, and Coral Gables additions still do not fill the need. I trust that the Veterans' Administration will further review their proposed construction program for Florida and that approval will be granted at an early date for the construction of a minimum of 200 additional beds for Veterans' Administration hospital facilities at Coral Gables, 1,000 beds at Gainesville, Fla., and 200 beds at Bay Pines, Fla. From the standpoint of economy, while the Coral Gables and Bay Pines projects are in the present planning stages, it would be wise now to plan for and approve the additional needed beds.

In addition, very serious consideration should be given to the construction in Florida of a diagnostic center specializing in geriatrics. The great portion of our beds are now occupied by older veterans. The problem will be tremendously magnified when the World War II group arrives at this age level. Only immediate research and long range planning can avert an impending national crisis. Planning for such a diagnostic clinic should start immediately.

OHIO NEEDS MORE FLOOD-CONTROL PROJECTS

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Speaker, this has been a hard winter in many parts of the country. It has been one of the hardest the State of Ohio has seen in many a year, with scores of lives lost and flood damage estimated to have caused upward to $200 million damage.

Because the Flood Control Act of 1936 created a Federal responsibility for protecting against flood disaster, I recently undertook to ascertain the extent of the Corps of Engineers' flood-control activities in Ohio.

The results of this inquiry were most revealing.

I was informed that since 1936 Congress has authorized a total of 76 Corps of Engineers projects in the State of Ohio. The estimated Federal cost of these 76 projects was put at $416,851,600. At first glance, this is a pretty imposing figure; it almost suggests that Ohio has received her fair share of Federal flood protection.

But let us take a closer look. Of the 76 authorized projects, 34 have been designated inactive, with the explanation

that they probably will not be undertaken because of economic changes in the area which have taken place since their authorization.

So instead of 76 projects we now have 42. But of these 42, 18 have been deferred for restudy, that is, indefinitely postponed, in order to get an up-to-date analysis of their economic value.

This leaves 24 projects. But on 10 of the 24, construction has not started, either because the Bureau of the Budget has ruled the project outside the scope of Federal activity or because funds otherwise have not been made available.

So this reduces our 76 projects to 14. Of the 14, construction has been completed in 12—over a period of 22 years—and on the final 2 projects construction is under way.

For Ohioans who look to the Federal Government for some measure of protection against another winter as destructive as this one, it should be pointed out that next year's budget contains for Ohio the staggering allocation of $5,823,000 for continued construction on 2 flood-control projects already under way and preconstruction planning on 2 others.

I mentioned at the outset, Mr. Speaker, that the estimated damage from recent floods in Ohio goes as high as $200 million. Certainly it is noteworthy that the Federal cost of the 12 flood control projects which have been constructed in Ohio since 1936 totals $95,150,000, less than half this amount.

I am drawn to the reluctant conclusion, Mr. Speaker, that Ohio has been badly shortchanged. As a representative from the fifth largest taxpaying State in the country, I feel it my duty to develop further facts and figures to ascertain and point out exactly where the billions of dollars have been spent which have been allocated since enactment of the Flood Control Act of 1936. These facts and figures, more than anything I can say, will prove conclusively the extent to which the State of Ohio has been asked to pay but not participate in a program designed to minimize human suffering and property damage for all citizens, including those of Ohio.

At this point, Mr. Speaker, I would like to submit for the RECORD tabulations pertaining to authorized Corps of Engineers flood-control projects for the State of Ohio:

Authorized Corps of Engineers' flood-control projects in the State of Ohio

Project	Estimated Federal cost	Allocated through fiscal year 1959	Balance to complete after fiscal year 1959
Construction completed:			
Berlin Reservoir	$6,288,700	$6,288,700	0
Cincinnati	10,118,000	10,118,000	0
Delaware Reservoir	7,632,000	7,632,000	0
Ironton	2,570,000	2,570,000	0
Massillon	8,140,000	8,140,000	0
Mosquito Creek Reservoir	4,035,400	4,035,400	0
Muskingum River reservoir system	40,150,000	40,150,000	0
Newark	785,900	785,900	0
Portsmouth-New Boston	9,820,000	9,820,000	0
Tom Jenkins Reservoir (Burr Oak)	2,090,000	2,090,000	0
Wellsville (section 1 and 2)	556,600	556,600	0
West Fork Mill Creek Reservoir	2,964,000	2,964,000	0
Construction underway:			
Roseville [1]	750,000	466,000	$284,000
Dillon Reservoir [1]	29,800,000	21,446,000	8,354,000
Construction not started:			
Adena	256,000	20,000	236,000
Dillonvale	359,000	26,000	333,000
Middleport	5,420,000	12,000	5,408,000
Reno Beach-Howard Farms	641,000	6,000	635,000
Caesar Creek Reservoir	7,620,000	10,000	7,610,000
East Fork Reservoir	11,200,000	74,000	11,126,000
Frazeysburg Reservoir	6,410,000	8,000	6,402,000
Black Fork of Mohican River	650,000	40,000	610,000
Shenango River Reservoir, Pa. and Ohio [1]	28,000,000	374,000	27,626,000
West Branch Mahoning River Reservoir [1]	6,940,000	261,000	6,679,000
Deferred for restudy: [2]			
Belpre	3,570,000	0	3,570,000
Buena Vista	593,000	0	593,000
Cheshire	419,000	0	419,000
Coal Grove	888,000	3,000	885,000
Gallipolis	2,670,000	0	2,670,000
Manchester	1,330,000	10,000	1,320,000
Marietta	14,000,000	0	14,000,000
Moscow	1,170,000	0	1,170,000
Pomeroy	16,500,000	0	16,500,000
Proctorville	2,700,000	0	2,700,000
Racine	985,000	0	985,000
Syracuse	1,220,000	0	1,220,000
Big Darby Creek Reservoir	18,600,000	0	18,600,000
Deer Creek Reservoir	13,200,000	0	13,200,000
Deferred for restudy—Con.			
Logan Reservoir	$4,230,000	0	$4,230,000
Millersburg Reservoir	12,000,000	0	12,000,000
Paint Creek Reservoir	13,800,000	0	13,800,000
Rocky Fork Reservoir	4,410,000	$91,000	4,319,000
Inactive: [3]			
Aberdeen	1,430,000	1,000	1,429,000
Athalia	630,000	0	630,000
Bellaire	7,660,000	0	7,660,000
Brilliant	3,240,000	0	3,240,000
Burlington	146,000	0	146,000
Chambersburg	1,600,000	0	1,600,000
Chesapeake	330,000	0	330,000
Chilo	899,000	0	899,000
Cincinnati:			
California section	1,750,000	17,000	1,733,000
Unit 2	16,800,000	0	16,800,000
Unit 4	14,900,000	0	14,900,000
Clarington	2,710,000	0	2,710,000
Cleves	1,240,000	6,000	1,234,000
Empire	3,030,000	0	3,030,000
Hanging Rock	467,000	0	467,000
Higgensport	944,000	0	944,000
Hockingport	568,000	0	568,000
Letart Falls	992,000	0	992,000
Mapleshade	1,330,000	0	1,330,000
Martins Ferry	8,630,000	25,000	8,605,000
Miller	519,000	0	519,000
Mingo Junction	1,920,000	0	1,920,000
New Matamoras	2,090,000	0	2,090,000
New Richmond	3,200,000	7,000	3,193,000
Newport	318,000	0	318,000
Portland	1,040,000	0	1,040,000
Powhatan Point	4,720,000	0	4,720,000
Ripley	1,940,000	8,000	7,932,000
Sardis	285,000	0	285,000
Sciotoville	1,460,000	0	1,460,000
South Point	992,000	0	992,000
Strattonville	2,780,000	0	2,780,000
Zanesville	8,110,000	0	8,110,000
Eagle Creek Reservoir	12,700,000	100,000	12,600,000
Total	416,851,600	118,161,600	298,690,000

[1] Funds for these projects are included in the President's budget for fiscal year 1960 as follows:

Project:	*Fiscal year 1960 budget allocation*
Roseville (to complete construction)	$284,000
Dillon Reservoir (continue construction)	5,160,000
Shenango River Reservoir (continue preconstruction planning)	150,000
West Branch Mahoning River Reservoir (complete preconstruction planning)	229,000

[2] Authorized projects which require reanalysis of their present economic value. Cost data not current.

[3] Projects which probably will not be undertaken because of physical or economic changes in the project area. Cost data not current.

INCREASING COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION FUNDS

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include certain tables.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing two bills that would increase the amount of Commodity Credit Corporation funds which could be used for the special milk program. I have recently learned that the program has grown to the point where many States will have to curtail operations in this field for the remaining months of the school year unless more funds are made available. In addition, the uncertainty over funds will seriously hinder the summer camp milk program, for now is the time when camp managers begin to make their food plans.

The special milk program is one of the most successful programs of the Department of Agriculture. This year, over 2 billion half pints of milk will be consumed under the plan. Added to the 2 billion half pints used in the school lunch program, this represents about 3.5 percent of all the fluid milk consumed by our nonfarm population. Around 80,000 schools and camps are taking part

in the milk program, and about 22 million children are drinking milk at school either under the school lunch program or at recess breaks as part of the special milk plan.

My first bill proposes that the authorization for the special milk program for the fiscal year ending July 1, 1959, be increased from $75 million to $80 million. The second bill provides for future expansion of the program as well as for a temporary increase for fiscal 1959. Under the provisions of this bill, $80 million would be authorized to carry the program through this fiscal year, and the funds would be increased to $85 million for both 1960 and 1961.

Frankly, I can think of no finer investment than this one to insure that our children and our dairy industry continue to receive the full benefits of the special milk program. To my way of thinking, it is far better to use CCC funds to encourage children to drink more milk than to use the money to buy surplus butter, cheese, and dry milk. That is the choice we are facing—more money for the special milk program or more price-support purchases of dairy products.

Although the funds for the special milk program come under the Department of Agriculture budget, I do not feel it is fair to charge the cost of this program to the farmers. Here is one farm program that does more good for the city children than it does for farm kids.

Few responsible citizens will quarrel with the idea that the kids of this country are entitled to an adequte supply of the world's most complete food—milk. That is why the cost of this humanitarian program should not be lumped with the cost of Government purchases of surplus food, as is now being done. This kind of accounting presents an untrue picture of the expense of the price-support program, a picture which is grossly unfair to our farmers.

I have a chart which shows the allocation by States of present funds for the special milk program, the estimated needs for the current fiscal year and the indicated deficit. I would like every Congressman to have chance to check this chart to see the situation in his State. Under leave to extend my remarks, I want to include the chart in the RECORD:

SPECIAL MILK PROGRAM

Apportionment of funds, State estimated needs, and indicated deficit, fiscal year 1959

Administrative unit	Apportionment [1] (1)	State estimated needs [2] (2)	Indicated deficit (3)
State agencies:			
Alabama	$1,075,610	$1,095,680	$20,070
Alaska	17,715	18,675	960
Arizona	326,033	357,223	31,190
Arkansas	641,539	658,127	16,588
California	7,211,353	7,892,289	680,936
Colorado	513,697	591,332	77,635
Connecticut	769,829	843,470	73,641
Delaware	177,535	194,735	17,200

[1] Division of funds among States is based on the pattern of expenditures in fiscal year 1958.
[2] Estimates received in late February 1959, based on actual expenditures through December 1958.

SPECIAL MILK PROGRAM—Continued

Apportionment of funds, State estimated needs, and indicated deficit, fiscal year 1959—Continued

Administrative unit	Apportionment [1] (1)	State estimated needs [2] (2)	Indicated deficit (3)
State agencise—Con.			
Delaware State Hospital	$14,864	$14,864	
District of Columbia	380,504	392,668	$12,164
Florida	1,104,956	1,214,806	109,850
Georgia	1,000,504	1,001,504	1,000
Hawaii	133,161	133,161	
Idaho	167,846	186,102	18,256
Illinois	5,694,117	5,694,117	
Indiana	1,708,650	1,809,618	100,968
Iowa	1,431,776	1,431,776	
Kansas	803,889	830,992	27,103
Kentucky	1,206,233	1,241,457	35,224
Louisiana	470,911	470,911	
Maine	256,697	264,220	7,523
Maryland	1,206,054	1,291,832	85,778
Maryland Department of Budget and Procurement	25,300	25,300	
Massachusetts	2,853,942	2,853,942	
Michigan	3,599,088	3,706,663	107,575
Minnesota	1,726,723	1,726,723	
Mississippi	959,693	1,023,745	64,052
Missouri	2,026,829	2,054,524	27,695
Montana	129,776	129,776	
Nebraska	356,542	356,542	
Nevada	54,363	57,544	3,181
New Hampshire	197,454	200,877	3,423
New Jersey	1,653,465	2,043,551	390,086
New Mexico	333,034	361,943	28,909
New York	8,902,259	9,104,966	202,707
New York Division of Standards and Purchases	139,928	139,928	
North Carolina	1,264,113	1,286,917	22,804
North Dakota	192,250	214,376	22,126
Ohio	3,734,585	3,954,217	219,632
Ohio Department of Public Welfare	127,485	127,485	
Oklahoma	832,292	847,925	15,633
Oregon	467,474	488,766	21,292
Pennsylvania	2,998,416	3,327,468	329,052
Rhode Island	306,804	337,883	31,079
South Carolina	461,089	507,370	46,281
South Carolina Dairy Commission	66,338	66,338	
South Dakota	320,204	320,204	
Tennessee	1,536,638	1,536,638	
Tennessee Department of Agriculture	18,665	18,665	
Texas	2,215,279	2,274,710	59,431
Utah	155,619	155,619	
Utah Department of Public Welfare	7,175	7,175	
Vermont	143,975	143,975	
Virginia	1,294,325	1,307,975	13,650
Washington	1,101,728	1,134,620	32,892
West Virginia	365,913	365,913	
Wisconsin	2,109,633	2,211,730	102,097
Wyoming	146,102	146,678	576
Total State agencies	69,137,971	72,198,230	3,060,259
Area offices:			
Northeast	908,753	1,058,340	149,587
Southeast	391,896	402,082	10,186
Midwest	2,880,270	3,015,916	135,646
Southwest	630,418	630,418	
West	359,592	382,483	22,891
Total area offices	5,170,929	5,489,239	318,310
Grand total	74,308,900	77,687,469	3,378,569

FEDERAL HAZARDOUS SUBSTANCES LABELING ACT

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing legislation designated as the new Federal Hazardous Substances Labeling Act. The purpose of the bill is to provide nationally uniform standards for the adequate labeling of potentially hazardous substances sold in interstate commerce and intended or suitable for household use. The new bill would replace the present out-moded and out-dated Federal Caustic Poison Act.

This new bill covers substances which are toxics, corrosives, irritants, strong sensitizers, flammables, and also substances which generate pressure. The bill provides that the following information must appear on the label of a hazardous substance: First, name and place of business of manufacturer; second, the name of the product; third, a signal word, such as "danger," "warning," or "caution"; fourth, an affirmative statement of the principal hazard or hazards, such as "flammable," "vapor harmful," and so forth; fifth, precautionary measures describing action to be followed or avoided; sixth, first-aid treatment if there is a hazard through contact or exposure; seventh, "poison" for any substance meeting the definition of highly toxic; eighth, instructions for handling and storage of packages which require special care in handling or storage; ninth, the statement "Keep out of the reach of children."

This proposed bill is intended to provide a sound legislative pattern at the Federal level for informative precautionary labeling of hazardous substances intended or suitable for household use. Representatives of major industry groups, including toxicologists, chemists, physicians, company labeling personnel, and lawyers, have participated in a number of conferences on this subject over the past several years. A series of conferences was held last year with regulatory officials, physicians and others interested in this problem. This proposed bill was prepared after careful study to provide a model bill for uniform legislation in this field.

The use of this bill on the Federal level should provide a uniform precautionary labeling program which will adequately advise the consumer of the hazards in the use of the product, as well as make available immediate information for physicians who are called upon to treat cases of accidental injury. It should also provide a pattern which the States may follow in enacting similar legislation.

During the last Congress, three bills on this subject were introduced. These were S. 1900, introduced by Senator BUSH of Connecticut, H.R. 7388, introduced by Representative CURTIS, of Missouri; and H.R. 9063, introduced by Representative WILLIAMS, of Mississippi.

Since introduction of these bills, considerable discussion has occurred among industry groups and with the American Medical Association to draft a new bill which would adequately protect the public, especially young children who comprise the largest number of casualties from the use of hazardous substances.

The present bill incorporates many of the provisions developed by the American Medical Association. It differs from the bills such as H.R. 9063 introduced in

the last Congress in the following principal ways:

First. H.R. 9063 used a definition of "poison" which is now widely used in existing legislation and in industry. It was developed by the Manufacturing Chemists' Association. This poison definition specified animal tests and required that the animals be observed for a period of 48 hours. The new bill has extended the 48-hour observation period to 14 days. This change in the bill should give greater protection to the public and assure proper testing to ascertain which substances should be designated as poisons.

Second. H.R. 9063 provided that one of the signal words, "danger," "warning," or "caution," should be used on the label. The new bill specifies that two categories of hazard are to be recognized in selecting the appropriate signal word. Those products which present the most hazard will bear the signal word "danger," while a lesser hazard will call for the word "warning" or "caution." Danger is used when the substances are extremely flammable, corrosive, or when they meet the requirements of animal test, of the same type as those used for the "poison" designation. All other hazardous substances carry the signal words "warning" or "caution." Animal tests to determine the use of the signal word "danger" is a new requirement as compared to H.R. 9063. It was agreed that these animal tests were necessary to determine with more certainty which substances should carry the signal word "danger."

Third. H.R. 9063 did not cover "strong sensitizer." Strong sensitizers are now included in the new bill as hazardous substances and are defined in section 2 (k). Strong sensitizers are required to be labeled after the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare has found that the frequency of occurrence and severity of the reaction indicates a significant potential for causing hypersensitivity.

Fourth. The term "label" in H.R. 9063 has been redefined in the new bill. There is now a requirement that precautionary information must appear not only on the wrapper but also "on all accompanying literature where there are directions for use, written or otherwise."

Fifth. H.R. 9063 included radioactive substances in the definition of the term "hazardous substance," while the new bill has deleted radioactive substances from coverage. The reason for this action is that it is felt that such substances are more properly under the jurisdiction of the Atomic Energy Commission and, furthermore, there is a lack of technical knowledge necessary to properly regulate such products.

ENGINEERS REPORT ON COOSA-ALABAMA RIVER

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, I have spoken many times of the Coosa-Alabama River system and its importance to the economy of the Nation and our State of Alabama.

Recently, I placed in the RECORD a letter that all members of the Alabama delegation forwarded to Gen. W. K. Wilson, Chairman of the Board of Rivers and Harbors, requesting that the Board consider the latest report on the development of this system at its next meeting on the 13th of March of this year. I also have previously stated that we hope to introduce an amendment to the public works appropriation bill to provide for some $150,000 planning money for the Millers Ferry Dam below Montgomery.

We have received the following letter from General Wilson wherein he has stated that the project has been authorized since 1945 and that the report currently under consideration does not change the authority for the entire project or the ability of the Engineers to proceed with construction of the work below Montgomery for which the plan is essentially firm. He further has stated that consideration of the report presently before the Board is not necessary.

In other words, Mr. Speaker, in analyzing the situation, General Wilson has indicated that the Engineers are satisfied with the need for the development of the river system below Montgomery but have failed over a period of years to incorporate planning money in their request for funds. I believe it imperative to develop our water resources, and to this end, particularly in view of General Wilson's remarks, to request such funds as are necessary, namely, $150,000 be incorporated in the public works appropriation bill to provide for the planning and design of Millers Ferry Dam.

There follows the letter:

HEADQUARTERS,
DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY,
OFFICE OF THE CHIEF OF ENGINEERS,
Washington, D.C., February 26, 1959.

Hon. KENNETH A. ROBERTS,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. ROBERTS: I have received the letter of February 19 signed by you and other members of the Alabama congressional delegation in which you urge that the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors consider the navigation report on the Alabama-Coosa River at its next meeting in March.

You request this action because of the importance of the project and in order that construction may be started at the earliest possible date. Since I believe there is some misunderstanding of the status of the Alabama-Coosa project with respect to authorization and availability for construction I would like to review this matter briefly.

The entire project for development of the Alabama-Coosa was authorized by the River and Harbor Act of March 2, 1945 (Public Law 14, 79th Congress) in accordance with plans being prepared by the Chief of Engineers. This included authorization of 9 foot navigation up the Alabama River to Montgomery and up the Coosa to Rome, Ga. The project was modified by the River and Harbor Act of June 1954 (Public Law 436, 83d Congress) to permit power development on the Coosa River under license from the Federal Power Commission. Under the basic authorization the Congress has appropriated funds for preconstruction planning or design of the three projects, Millers Ferry, Jones Bluff, and Claiborne, required for navigation on the Alabama River up to Montgomery.

In the appropriations act for 1956 (Public Law 163, 84th Congress) funds were appropriated for the present study of the Alabama-Coosa which is now before the River and Harbor Board for review. The purpose of this study is to firm up the plans and justification for the project, but with particular reference to including navigation locks in the dams on the Coosa River which have been or will be built by the Alabama Power Company. This study does not change in any way the existing authority for the entire project, or our ability to proceed with construction of the work below Montgomery for which the plan is essentially firm.

I have reviewed this status because I find that limitations of time will not permit the River and Harbord Board to consider the Alabama-Coosa report at its next meeting which is scheduled for March 13. The Board has just received material from both proponents and opponents of the project and it has been necessary to refer this to our district engineer for review. And I wished to point out that consideration of this report is not necessary to proceeding with the plan below Montgomery, although we recognize the desirability of completing this report in order that the Congress may have further evidence of justification for this project. I am sure, however, you will agree that acceptability of the findings of the report should not be prejudiced by hasty review.

We consider that in a logical development of this river system for navigation the work on the Alabama River up to Montgomery should be undertaken first, and prior to improvements upstream on the Coosa River. Consequently, we had concentrated our planning largely on Millers Ferry and Jones Bluff, the two larger projects below Montgomery. We feel that one of these should be initiated first, as the smaller Claiborne lock and dam and the channel work below could be initiated at a later date, but completed at about the same time as the larger upstream projects. Preconstruction planning for the Millers Ferry and Jones Bluff projects is about 40 percent complete.

I regret that it is not possible to consider the current report on the Alabama-Coosa at the next meeting of the River and Harbor Board, but we plan tentatively to take it up at the first subsequent Board meeting in May 1959. As I have said, however, such action is not necessary for initiation of the project. The Corps of Engineers is aware of the importance of development of the Alabama-Coosa River and I can assure you that we are ready to proceed with the authorized work below Montgomery as soon as funds are appropriated for completion of design and for construction. As you may know, however, there are no funds included in the budget request for fiscal year 1960 for resumption of planning on these projects.

Sincerely yours,

W. K. WILSON, Jr.,
Major General, USA, Deputy Chief of Engineers, for Construction.

TWO SIDES TO TRUJILLO?

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I am including, following these remarks, a speech by the distinguished former Senator from Indiana, Mr. Jenner, in the Dominican Republic September 11, 1958.

He was addressing a joint session of the legislature there, as was done by our

two colleagues, Mr. WITHROW and Mr. JACKSON, earlier this year. Mr. REUSS referred to Mr. WITHROW's remarks last week and on Monday of this week and inserted two versions in the RECORD. Mr. REUSS made it clear that he did not think that the people of Wisconsin agreed with Mr. WITHROW. I would like to add that the people of Oregon, in my opinion, do not agree with Mr. WITHROW and Mr. JACKSON, and they do not agree with former Senator Jenner in his endorsement of Trujillo's government.

It occurred to me, Mr. Speaker, that our colleagues might have missed reading this speech which does present a side of Trujillo's nation which is quite different from the side that keeps appearing to me and, I believe, to most other people. On the other hand, it is plain that this gentleman failed or neglected to read various remarks I inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD during the 85th Congress or, if he did read them, gave them no weight at all.

Two sides to Trujillo? Well, maybe. Anyway former Senator Jenner believes so.

The former Senator no doubt was too busy with other matters to read about the Haitian massacre or about the State Department rejecting the official Dominican explanation as to the death of my constituent, Gerald Lester Murphy, of Eugene, Oreg. Or refusing to make an important witness in the Murphy-Galindez case available for questioning here. Or of a thousand other things, matters involving official murder and thievery over many years.

Former Senator Jenner in his remarks stated:

> My daddy used to say a man can't roll in a hogwallow and come up smelling like a rose.

But this shows what you can do quoting out of context. He really likes the smell of Trujillo. He detects more of the rose than of the hog. He winds up asking God to bless Trujillo. "May you increase and may your example be followed," is his conclusion.

To get the whole flavor, Mr. Speaker, one must read this speech in its entirety, as it was reported in the September 1958 issue of A Look At the Dominican Republic, a monthly magazine of the Embassy of the Dominican Republic, Washington, D.C. I ask under unanimous consent that this speech be appended hereto:

SPEECH DELIVERED BY SENATOR JENNER

Mr. President, members of the Legislature of the Dominican Republic, and friends all by inviting me here you have accorded me an unexpected honor and accorded yourselves an unexpected ordeal, for I don't claim to be an orator like my friend, JIM EASTLAND. I'm just a country boy. I was raised on a farm, so I can appreciate the fine agricultural development I have found in your island paradise. I practiced law in a small country town, so I can appreciate the feeling of at least some of the lawyers among you at finding themselves transplanted to this dignified chamber.

I was transplanted myself, but I didn't take root deep enough to keep me from packing up and moving back home when I decided that was what I wanted to do; however, I spent enough time in the U.S. Senate to learn how bad it is for a country if its leaders do not serve their country's best interests. And, how important it is for a national leader to really lead and not just drift with the tide. I can appreciate how happy and how lucky you have been with the generalissimo.

Where I come from a man is judged mostly by what he does. If he hoes his own row and pays his debts, stands by his friends and stands up to his enemies, we like him and we respect him. I think a country can be judged pretty much the same way. On that basis I like your country and I respect it.

You have proved by your actions that you have learned the most important lesson for any nation in this hemisphere—or any free nation anywhere else—that you have got to stand up to communism or bow down to it. There isn't any inbetween.

Some men and some countries seem to think it is all right to back up a little. But the more you back up, the more you have to back up. When you have backed up long enough to get the habit, the Communists will just push you off the earth, or stamp you into it, and start backing somebody else up until these isn't anybody else for them to push.

Every time a freedom-loving nation, or a freedom-loving man is pushed off the earth, or stamped into the ground anywhere in this world, every other freedom-loving man and freedom-loving nation that is left is worse off than before, because then there is one less freedom-loving man or freedom-loving nation to join the united front against the world Communist conspiracy which we are going to have to put together some day—unless all of us are to be pushed off the earth, or stamped into the ground.

My daddy used to say a man can't roll in a hog wallow and come up smelling like a rose. The Good Book says you can't touch pitch and not be defiled. Any compromise with evil is evil in itself and communism is wholly evil.

Every redeeming feature it seems to have in the eyes of those who do not see clearly is just camouflage. Every fair-sounding Communist promise is just propaganda intended to fool you and me and to be broken whenever it suits Communist purposes to break it.

The Subcommittee on Internal Security studied the record on all the treaties Soviet Russia ever made and there are not a handful of them in the whole history of the country that have not been flagrantly violated by Soviet Russia.

I am not telling you anything you do not know and I thank God for that. This is the only place I have ever been in this whole hemisphere where everybody seemed to have a clear idea of what this fight with communism is all about, and to be willing to take his place in the fight.

I say, God bless you, and God bless your leader, and God bless your country. May you increase and may your example be followed.

FOREIGN POLICY IN SOUTH AMERICA

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, the Time-Life foreign policy does not seem to be working too well in South America at the present time. If the Time foreign policy is a good one, it does seem that with its tremendous foreign circulation we would have an ever-increasing number of foreign friends, but such is not the case. As reports come in from Bolivia the Time policy of foreign economic aid, foreign aid in the form of mutual security, and foreign aid in the form of giving away our markets to foreign imports is simply not working. It cannot work. It creates unrest and dissatisfaction in foreign lands, and unemployment, inflation, and bankruptcy at home.

South American countries have traditionally been stanch friends of the United States until adoption of the Time-Life-Luce foreign policy.

Mr. Speaker, we must return to the Monroe Doctrine policy, which cost the taxpayers nothing and won respect from our South American friends.

THE HANCOCK CLARION HAS OCCUPIED A PUBLIC ROLE OF THE KIND FORESEEN FOR A FREE PRESS

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, on February 19, 1959, the Hancock Clarion, of Hawesville, Ky., completed 66 years of continuous publication.

In 1893 when John W. Maston, Sr., and Clarence Sterret started their venture in journalism they probably did not realize that the new century upon which they were entering would be replete with history-making events. And certainly these first publishers of the Hancock Clarion could not have envisioned the progress that has been made in astronautics and space exploration, or, for that matter, that the airplane would become one of our main means of transportation. During the 20th century we have undergone the industrial age, the atomic age, and now we are entering the age when the secrets of outer space will be discovered. But these two gentlemen of the old school were not only concerned with disseminating news of national and international importance. It was also their purpose to serve the people locally through the coverage of personal events and pursuits, particularly in the field of agriculture. For the communities in Hancock County, Ky., are primarily rural, and, to quote the present editor and publisher of the Hancock Clarion, Mr. Roscoe I. Downs:

> From the soil comes most of our substance, and from the ground we have our living.

Mr. Roscoe I. Downs has conscientiously carried out the principles and practices as laid down and initiated by the Messrs. Maston and Sterrett. He has never failed to realize the great potential that is vested in the people of Hancock County, and his objectives have been to see that the true facts are brought to them through the medium of

his newspaper. The statements in his editorials are never marred by disrespect for the facts. Honorable is one of the strongest words in our language. Surely Mr. Downs has merited the title of "honorable" in public service, and this, in itself, is the acme of moral attainment. Like his predecessors, the founders of the Hancock Clarion, he has never forgotten that it is the people who count. Mr. Downs has realized the necessity of harmonizing differences in schools, in communities, and in our Nation. His precepts could well serve in helping us to live with other nations in a world where peace based on human freedom should prevail.

It is my confirmed opinion that any community is made stronger by virtue of having a good newspaper in its midst. The Hancock Clarion has occupied a public role of the kind foreseen for a free press by such men as Macaulay and Lecky. The influence which this newspaper has wielded in the past 66 years shall not cease, but shall continue to have its impact upon public life, not only in Hancock County but throughout adjoining sections of Kentucky.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. CORBETT (at the request of Mr. FULTON), on account of death in the family.

Mr. SCHERER, for March 17, 18, and 19, 1959, on account of hearings of the Committee on Un-American Activities at Pittsburgh, Pa., on said dates.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. ELLIOTT (at the request of Mr. EDMONDSON), on Monday, March 9, for 20 minutes.

Mr. SAYLOR (at the request of Mr. EDMONDSON), on Monday, March 9, for 20 minutes.

Mr. SLACK (at the request of Mr. EDMONDSON), on Monday, March 9, for 20 minutes.

Mr. MOORE (at the request of Mr. EDMONDSON), on Monday, March 9, for 20 minutes.

Mr. SILER (at the request of Mr. EDMONDSON), on Monday, March 9, for 20 minutes.

Mr. EDMONDSON, on Monday, March 9, for 20 minutes.

Mr. ZABLOCKI, for 45 minutes, tomorrow, and to vacate the special order he had for today.

Mr. DIXON (at the request of Mr. RHODES of Arizona), for 30 minutes, today.

Mr. GROSS, for 30 minutes, on tomorrow, Thursday, March 5, 1959.

Mr. O'NEILL, for 30 minutes, tomorrow.

Mr. FLOOD, for 10 minutes, today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. DEROUNIAN.

Mr. TABER.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN.

Mr. BRADEMAS.

Mr. PELLY.

Mr. ASPINALL and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. METCALF in five instances.

Mr. DORN of South Carolina.

(At the request of Mr. MCCORMACK, and to include extraneous matter, the following:)

Mr. WOLF.

Mr. GUBSER (at the request of Mr. ARENDS).

Mr. HOLT and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. PATMAN, his remarks in Committee of the Whole today and to include extraneous matter.

(At the request of Mr. LEVERING, and to include extraneous matter, the following:)

Mr. FOLEY.

Mr. DOLLINGER in three instances.

Mr. POWELL in four instances.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. LEVERING. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 49 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, March 5, 1959, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

657. A letter from the Under Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a report for the month of January relating to the cooperative program of the United States with Mexico for the control and the eradication of foot-and-mouth disease, pursuant to Public Law 8, 80th Congress; to the Committee on Agriculture.

658. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting two reports of the U.S. Secret Service covering restoration of balances withdrawn from appropriation and fund accounts under the control of the Treasury Department, pursuant to section 1(a)(2) of the act of July 25, 1956 (70 Stat. 648) (31 U.S.C. Supp. V, 701 (a)(2), 84th Cong.); to the Committee on Government Operations.

659. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the review of the loan guarantee program as administered by the Civil Aeronautics Board from its inception September 7, 1957, to June 30, 1958; to the Committee on Government Operations.

660. A communication from the President of the United States, relative to recommending that the Congress establish a Special Commission on Telecommunications; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

661. A letter from the Director, Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization, Executive Office of the President, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to establish a commission to study and report on the U.S. telecommunication resource with special attention to the radio spectrum"; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

662. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a proposed concession contract with DeSoto Hotel & Baths, Inc., for a period of 10 years from January 1, 1959, pursuant to the act of July 14, 1956 (70 Stat. 543); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

663. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a proposed concession contract with Jack Tar of Arkansas, Inc., for a period of 10 years from January 1, 1959, pursuant to the act of July 14, 1956 (70 Stat. 543); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

664. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders suspending deportation as well as a list of the persons involved, pursuant to Public Law 863, 80th Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

665. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders suspending deportation as well as a list of the persons involved, pursuant to the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. HENDERSON: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 4012. A bill to provide for the centennial celebration of the establishment of the land-grant colleges and State universities and the establishment of the Department of Agriculture, and for related purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 148). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BURLESON: Committee on House Administration. H.R. 5045. A bill to authorize each Member of the House of Representatives to employ an administrative assistant; to restrict the payment of dual compensation by the Clerk of the House; to provide that the basic compensation of certain positions under the House of Representatives shall be fixed at multiples of $50; and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 149). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. McMILLAN: Committee on the District of Columbia. H.R. 4282. A bill to supplement and modify the act of May 24, 1828 (6 Stat. 383, ch. CXII), insofar as it relates to the corporate powers of the Sisters of the Visitation, of Georgetown in the District of Columbia; without amendment (Rept. No. 150). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 2741. A bill to amend section 2734 of title 10, United States Code, so as to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to settle claims arising in foreign countries incident to noncombat activities of the Coast Guard; without amendment (Rept. No. 168). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 2975. A bill to validate payments of certain quarters allowances made in good faith, and pursuant to agreements by authorized officials, to employees of the Department of the Navy, but which were subsequently determined to be inconsistent with applicable regulations; without amendment (Rept. No. 169). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. KASEM: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 4615. A bill to relieve certain members

and former members of the naval service of liability to reimburse the United States for the value of transportation requests erroneously furnished to them by the United States and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 170). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 4318. A bill for the relief of D. A. Whitaker and others; with amendment (Rept. No. 140). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. KASTENMEIER: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 4121. A bill for the relief of certain members of the Armed Forces of the United States, or their survivors, who were captured and held as prisoners of war in the Korean hostilities; without amendment (Rept. No. 141). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 3960. A bill for the relief of Patrick W. Gowan, David Dooling, Harlie L. Mize, James H. Plaes, and William L. Perkins; without amendment (Rept. No. 142). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. KASTENMEIER: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 3939. A bill for the relief of Virginia E. Speer; without amendment (Rept. No. 143). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. KASTENMEIER: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 2286. A bill for the relief of Joseph E. Gallant; without amendment (Rept. No. 144). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 2063. A bill for the relief of Otis Parks, W. B. Dunbar, and J. C. Dickey; without amendment (Rept. No. 145). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 1631. A bill for the relief of Joseph B. Kane, Jr.; with amendment (Rept. No. 146). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 1462. A bill for the relief of Logan Duff; without amendment (Rept. No. 147). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. HENDERSON: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 1411. A bill for the relief of T. V. Cashen; with amendment (Rept. No. 151). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. HENDERSON: Committee on the Judicary. H.R. 1471. A bill for the relief of Jim B. Hill; with amendment (Rept. No. 152). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CAHILL: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 1691. A bill for the relief of Oliver O. Newsome; with amendment (Rept. No. 153). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. TOLL: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 1739. A bill for the relief of Lt. Col. John M. Brizzard; without amendment (Rept. No. 154). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. TOLL: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 1744. A bill for the relief of Gordon E. Martin; without amendment (Rept. No. 155). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LINDSAY: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 1749. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Maxine L. Cowan Harrison; without amendment (Rept. No. 156). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. TOLL: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 2099. A bill to provide for a posthumous cash award in recognition of the scientific contributions in the field of electronic ordnance made by the late Paul M. Tedder; with amendment (Rept. No. 157). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 2281. A bill to provide for the payment of relocation expenses to Milo G. and Patricia Wingard; without amendment (Rept. No. 158). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. HENDERSON: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 2289. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Gertrude E. Shetler; without amendment (Rept. No. 159). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. DONOHUE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 2294. A bill for the relief of the Ellis Timber Co.; without amendment (Rept. No. 160). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. DONOHUE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 2295. A bill for the relief of the Sterilon Corp.; without amendment (Rept. No. 161). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CAHILL: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 2603. A bill for the relief of the American Hydrotherm Corp.; with amendment (Rept. No. 162). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. DONOHUE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 2949. A bill for the relief of Lois K. Alexander; without amendment (Rept. No. 163). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. DONOHUE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 2950. A bill for the relief of Lt. Col. James A. Beplat; without amendment (Rept. No. 164). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 3095. A bill for the relief of Hilary W. Jenkins, Jr.; without amendment (Rept. No. 165). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. DONOHUE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 3248. A bill to provide for the payment of just compensation to certain claimants for the taking by the United States of private fishery rights in Pearl Harbor, island of Oahu, T.H.; without amendment (Rept. No. 166). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. KASEM: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 3243. A bill for the relief of Col. Fred E. Dueker; with amendment (Rept. No. 167). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SMITH of California: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 1400. A bill for the relief of Berta Reitberger; with amendment (Rept. No. 171). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 1453. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Mathilde Ringol; with amendment (Rept. No. 172). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 1535. A bill for the relief of Sister Mary Damion (Maria Saveria D'Amelio), Sister Maria Tarcisia (Maria Giovanna Fenuta), and Sister Mary Regina (Maria Lizzi); without amendment (Rept. No. 173). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MOORE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 1727. A bill for the relief of Dimitrios Kondoleon (also known as James Kondolous); without amendment (Rept. No. 174). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 2589. A bill for the relief of Elizabeth Lucie Leon (also known as Lucie Noel); without amendment (Rept. No. 175). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BERRY:

H.R. 5234. A bill to provide for a scientific study and research program for the purpose of developing increased and additional industrial uses of agricultural products and to increase the income of farmers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 5235. A bill to provide for the establishment of a national cemetery on or near the site of the Wounded Knee Battlefield, S. Dak.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BOYLE:

H.R. 5236. A bill to provide financial assistance for the support of public schools by appropriating funds to the States to be used for constructing school facilities and for teachers' salaries; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BROWN of Georgia:

H.R. 5237. A bill to amend section 19 of the Federal Reserve Act with respect to the reserves required to be maintained by member banks of the Federal Reserve System against deposits; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. BROYHILL:

H.R. 5238. A bill to provide for health and medical services for civilian employees in Government service overseas and their dependents, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. CHENOWETH:

H.R. 5239. A bill to amend title I of the Social Security Act to provide that the ownership by an individual of his home shall not be taken into account in determining his need for old-age assistance; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DENT:

H.R. 5240. A bill to make appropriations for the planning and construction of certain rivers and harbors and flood-control projects by the Secretary of the Army acting through the Chief of Engineers; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. DOLLINGER:

H.R. 5241. A bill to amend the Social Security Act and the Internal Revenue Code so as to provide insurance against the costs of hospital, nursing home, and surgical service for persons eligible for old-age and survivors insurance benefits, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FEIGHAN:

H.R. 5242. A bill to authorize the construction of a Federal office building in Cleveland, Ohio, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. FOGARTY:

H.R. 5243. A bill to establish a temporary Presidential commission to study and to report on problems related to blindness and the needs of blind persons, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. FOLEY:

H.R. 5244. A bill to amend the act approved April 11, 1956, to extend the jurisdiction of the Domestic Relations Branch of the Municipal Court for the District of Columbia to cover the adjudication of the interests of husband and wife, of personal and real property in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. GUBSER:

H.R. 5245. A bill to amend the Dependents' Medical Care Act to provide that members of the Armed Forces retired under chapter 67 of title 10, United States Code, after having served on active duty in World War I and World War II shall have the same privileges with respect to medical care as members so retired after having served on active duty for

8 years or more; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HOLLAND:

H.R. 5246. A bill to extend by 6 months the period for which additional benefits may be paid under the Temporary Unemployment Compensation Act of 1958; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin:

H.R. 5247. A bill to increase the authorized maximum expenditure for the fiscal year 1959 under the special milk program; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 5248. A bill to increase the authorized maximum expenditure for the fiscal years 1959, 1960, and 1961 under the special milk program; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. JONES of Alabama:

H.R. 5249. A bill to protect the right of the blind to self-expression through organizations of the blind; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. KARTH:

H.R. 5250. A bill to legalize maritime and building trades hiring halls; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. KING of California:

H.R. 5251. A bill to amend section 162 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that certain expenditures incurred in connection with measures submitted to the electorate shall be allowed as business deductions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McMILLAN:

H.R. 5252. A bill to amend the Federal Trade Commission Act, as amended, so as to equalize rights in the distribution of merchandise identified by a trademark, brand, or trade name; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MAILLIARD:

H.R. 5253. A bill to amend section 249 of title 2 of the Canal Zone Code, as amended; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. MORRISON:

H.R. 5254. A bill to prohibit the charging of a fee to view telecasts in private homes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 5255. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp in commemoration of the 100th anniversary of the founding of Louisiana State University; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. REECE of Tennessee:

H.R. 5256. A bill to repeal the excise tax on amounts paid for communication services or facilities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RODINO:

H.R. 5257. A bill to amend section 1915 of title 28, United States Code, relating to proceedings in forma pauperis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROBERTS:

H.R. 5258. A bill to establish a program of survival depots in order to provide subsistence for the large numbers of civilian population of the United States who would be evacuated from the devastated areas in the event of attack on the United States; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 5259. A bill to provide certain employment preference for Government employees disabled in line of duty; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 5260. A bill to regulate the interstate distribution and sale of packages of hazardous substances intended or suitable for household use; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 5261. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide the same treatment for prepaid dues income received by a nonprofit motor club as is provided for prepaid subscription income; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. UDALL:

H.R. 5262. A bill to revise the boundaries of the Montezuma Castle National Monument, Ariz., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. WAMPLER:

H.R. 5263. A bill to make permanent certain temporary increases in rates of compensation of employees of the postal field service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. WOLF:

H.R. 5264. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to protect the public from unsanitary milk and milk products shipped in interstate commerce, without unduly burdening such commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. YOUNGER:

H.R. 5265. A bill to require that at least 50 percent of the passenger and cargo air transportation requirements of the Government of the United States be obtained from civil air operators, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana:

H.R. 5266. A bill to establish a program to foster and promote the conduct of basic and supporting scientific research through contracts entered into by the United States; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

H.R. 5267. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to exempt from income tax certain amounts received under Government contract for basic or supporting scientific research; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FULTON:

H.R. 5268. A bill to authorize the National Science Foundation to conduct a research and development program to encourage and stimulate the production and conservation of coal in the United States; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

By Mr. GALLAGHER:

H.R. 5269. A bill to extend by 6 months the period for which additional benefits may be paid under the Temporary Unemployment Compensation Act of 1958; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KING of Utah:

H.R. 5270. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to convey to the Metropolitan Water District of Salt Lake City, Utah, all right, title, and interest of the United States in certain lands located in Salt Lake County, Utah; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. KOWALSKI:

H.R. 5271. A bill to provide that the Secretary of the Interior shall develop and carry out an emergency program for the eradication of starfish in Long Island Sound and adjacent waters; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H.R. 5272. A bill to amend section 15 of the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942 with respect to the retired pay of commissioned officers and enlisted men who served on active duty before November 12, 1918; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. LINDSAY:

H.R. 5273. A bill to provide for the establishment of a Federal Advisory Council on the Arts to assist in the growth and development of the fine arts in the United States; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 5274. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide monthly insurance benefits for dependent sisters of certain insured individuals; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. NIX:

H.R. 5275. A bill to establish an effective program to alleviate conditions of substantial and persistent unemployment and underemployment in certain economically depressed areas; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 5276. A bill to effectuate and enforce the constitutional right to the equal protection of the laws, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POWELL:

H.R. 5277. A bill to prevent discrimination in any public or semipublic place or by any public or semipublic transportation against members of the Armed Forces because of race, color, or creed; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRADEMAS:

H.J. Res. 284. Joint resolution providing for the issuance of a special postage stamp in honor of Col. Michael de Kowats; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. WOLF:

H.J. Res. 285. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania:

H.J. Res. 286. Joint resolution providing for the preparation and completion of plans for a comprehensive observance of the 175th anniversary of the formation of the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LESINSKI:

H. Con. Res. 95. Concurrent resolution authorizing reprinting of House Document 451 of the 84th Congress; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. WILLIS:

H. Con. Res. 96. Concurrent resolution authorizing reprinting of House Document 451 of the 84th Congress; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. FRIEDEL:

H. Res. 197. Resolution fixing the basic compensation of the expert transcribers, office of the official committee reporters, and the seven expert transcribers, office of the official reporters of debates, House of Representatives; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. SPENCE:

H. Res. 198. Resolution to provide funds for necessary expenses of the Committee on Banking and Currency; to the Committee on House Administration.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts: Memorials of the Legislature of the State of Massachusetts, memorializing the Congress of the United States to investigate and determine the causes of inflation and to enact remedial legislation; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts: Memorials of the Legislature of the State of Massachusetts, memorializing the Congress and the President of the United States to enact and enforce legislation to implement the decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States outlawing segregation in the public school system; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts: Memorials of the Legislature of the State of Massachusetts, memorializing the Congress of the United States to establish a national cemetery in New England; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. LANE: Memorial of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, memorializing the Congress of the United States to establish a national cemetery in New England; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Alaska, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States with respect to recording its opposition to any further increase in the Federal excise tax on gasoline; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADDONIZIO:

H.R. 5278. A bill for the relief of Giovanni Freda; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5279. A bill for the relief of Bruno Granelli (also known as Luigi Granelli); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ANFUSO:

H.R. 5280. A bill for the relief of Pierino Filosa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOYLE:

H.R. 5281. A bill for the relief of Adelina Rosasco; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5282. A bill for the relief of Pon Choy Kim and Tom Dun Wai; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CURTIS of Massachusetts:

H.R. 5283. A bill for the relief of Comdr. Austin S. Kibbee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CURTIS of Missouri:

H.R. 5284. A bill for the relief of Christine Fahrenbruch, a minor; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOLTZMAN (by request):

H.R. 5285. A bill for the relief of Aida Rosen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado:

H.R. 5286. A bill for the relief of Victoriano Daviz Verastique (Victor Davis); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEITH:

H.R. 5287. A bill for the relief of Edwina L. Lincoln, widow of W. Irving Lincoln; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANE:

H.R. 5288. A bill for the relief of Branka Mardessich and Sonia Silvani; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5289. A bill providing for the extension of patent No. 119,187; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MONTOYA:

H.R. 5290. A bill for the naturalization of Leslie L. Nemes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. OLIVER:

H.R. 5291. A bill for the relief of Angelina Rossini Caucci; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'NEILL:

H.R. 5292. A bill for the relief of Anthony Flambouris; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POWELL:

H.R. 5293. A bill for the relief of Clifford S. and Ethelreda Jorsling; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5294. A bill for the relief of Fitzgerald Devonish; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REECE of Tennessee:

H.R. 5295. A bill for the relief of Rahmi Tugrul; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REUSS:

H.R. 5296. A bill for the relief of Lucille Collins; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 5297. A bill for the relief of Stylianos (Stellios) Anastase J. Theodossiou; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts:

H.R. 5298. A bill for the relief of Stavros Orfan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr SANTANGELO:

H.R. 5299. A bill for the relief of Maria Rubinstein; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TELLER:

H.R. 5300. A bill for the relief of Ho Yuen Mak, also known as George Mak; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TOLLEFSON:

H.R. 5301. A bill for the relief of Harry E. Nelson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Cambodia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ADAM C. POWELL
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 4, 1959

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, I wish today to salute the March 6 independence day of the people of the monarchy of Cambodia, His Majesty Prince Norodom Sihanouk, and His Excellency Nong Kimny, Ambassador to the United States.

Cambodia is a country of 6 million inhabitants, 400,000 of whom are Vietnamese and 350,000 Chinese. The Cambodian economy is essentially agricultural with rice as a principal crop and source of wealth and rubber a close second. Large-scale industry is virtually nonexistent. Most manufacturing consists of agricultural processing in rubber plants, rice mills, oil mills, with limited industries producing lumber, tile, brick, woven goods, rope, baskets, pottery, jewelry, and skins for local needs. Investigations have not revealed substantial mineral resources, but an adequate geological survey has not yet been made of Cambodia. However, some deposits of iron ore, copper, manganese, gold, coal, zircons, and phosphates have been revealed.

Private capital investment has been little utilized in Cambodia in its economic development largely for the fact that emphasis is on projects which are of the basic type frequently carried on by governments. But, says the report of the U.S. Department of Commerce, it also derives from obstacles to private capital investment. Among obstacles to private capital investment are lack of managerial, technical, and mechanical skills and relatively limited domestic capital. Private enterprise has been slow to invest in Cambodia in response to a climate of economic nationalism which inclines the Government toward close supervision of private economic activity. Thus the Government requires prior authorization of new investments by the Minister of Finance who together may decide which proposed activities are useful to the economy of Cambodia. Moreover, the law requires some Cambodian capital participation and the employment of Cambodian personnel, but it also adheres to the principle of a just and equitable indemnity in case of nationalization, and offers the possibility of a 10- and 30-year guarantee against the risk of nationalization.

Cambodia achieved real and complete independence from France on November 9, 1953. The freedom to determine her future which she now enjoys is jealously guarded. The Cambodians, so Prince Noradom Sihanouk has written, will be lackeys of no foreign powers and their policy will be suited to their national needs.

In their foreign relations, the Prince explains, they are favoring neutrality which neutrality, he asserts, has been imposed on them by necessity—a position forced upon Cambodia by its geographical position, lying as it does between the Western bloc and Eastern bloc countries of North Vietnam and the vast Peoples' Republic of China. What choice have the Cambodians but to try to maintain an equal balance between these blocs?

Morever, the Prince inquires, how could their neutrality be taken seriously if Cambodia maintained diplomatic commercial and other relations exclusively with the Western bloc? Prince Sihanouk revealed that although China has given, with no strings attached, $25 million in economic aid, they do not forget that American economic and military aid to Cambodia amounted to $40 million for the 1957 and 1959 budgetary year and that it also was offered unconditionally, as is the aid offered by France, for equipment. But, the Prince explains, he wishes aid would be less rigid, particularly American aid since its purpose is to provide the Cambodians with the framework of a modern state.

Finally, the Prince wishes Americans to clearly understand they are not Communist inclined nor flirting with the Reds; certainly Americans must know that the first concern of the Communists is to get rid of the King and the natural elite of any country they succeed in laying hands on.

I would like to close this salute to Cambodia on this 6th day of March 1959, by giving expression in the Congress of the United States to the words of Prince Noradom Sihanouk which appeared in Foreign Affairs, July 1958, for I am convinced the explanation of their policy and the wisdom which undergirds it should be at our fingertips hereafter

when we discuss our relations with the Afro-Asian bloc countries:

If I have no particular liking for communism, neither have I any cause or means to join a crusade, even a moral one, against the nations that have adopted that ideology and which since 1954 have not given my country sufficient grounds for complaint. It would be absurd to suppose that a tiny country like mine, geographically situated as it is, would risk provoking the Chinese and Soviet colossi now that planes fly so fast and rockets so far.

We are not a breach in the Western bloc merely because we cannot be a rampart. In the event of a world conflict, we might very well become one of the first victims of a harsh occupation. In that case, the free world would have other things to do besides undertaking our liberation, or rather the liberation of what little remained of us.

Are we selfish or wrong-minded in thinking as we do? I maintain that we are merely being realistic. By practicing a genuine neutrality which eliminates any pretext for aggression we have a chance of not bringing down a storm on our heads; and a storm can be dangerous where there is no lightning conductor.

Our precautions may be to no avail and we may one day be invaded notwithstanding them. (I am not afraid of internal subversion which stands no chance here.) If, in spite of our manifest good intentions and our utter propriety in respect to the blocs, one of these should attack us, then I would be the first to advocate reconsidering our policy and invoking aid from the opponents of our aggressors. I profoundly hope that our country will never have to take such a step.

I have quoted here at length the expressions of an Asian country, friendly disposed toward the West but with a mind of its own, with a program for survival that is consistent with its strategic relationship and the aspirations and needs of its people. They are loud and clear enough for all to hear with the force of determination and maturity. It is important that we of the United States listen, comprehend, and react intelligently to the rising expectation unleased in this world and gage our actions accordingly. We must lower our anchors and prepare to ride the tide on an equal surface with justice and humility toward all.

Dr. Flemming's Formula

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEE METCALF
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 4, 1959

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, our new Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, Dr. Flemming, has developed the Flemming formula to solve the classroom shortage.

He has discovered that if the States will repeal their statutory debt limits, amend their constitutions and cooperate by making other fundamental changes in their basic laws that the States and local school districts can raise more money for school construction. This discovery can have results in other educational fields beyond actual school construction.

The application of the Flemming formula to basketball would permit Ohio Wesleyan, the college of which Flemming was formerly president, to announce that it was going to win every game next season and set alltime records—an alltime high in scoring by Ohio Wesleyan and an alltime low in points scored on Ohio Wesleyan.

Under the Flemming formula, two midgets would be added to the Ohio Wesleyan team, one perched on each basket. The midget on the Ohio Wesleyan basket would deflect shots by the opposition. The midget on the opponents' basket would catch a ball fired by an Ohio Wesleyan player and drop it through the net.

Now this would require a change in the rules. Instead of limiting the number of players on a team, the limitation would be their total height. To do so would require a change in the rules of basketball and consent from the other teams, in addition to perfecting a side-saddle perch for the midgets. But those are minor problems for a man who claims he can solve the school construction shortage if only the States will change their constitutional or statutory debt limitations, and their basic tax concepts.

Health Insurance for Our Older Citizens

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ISIDORE DOLLINGER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 4, 1959

Mr. DOLLINGER. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill to amend the Social Security Act and the Internal Revenue Code so as to provide insurance against the costs of hospital, nursing home, and surgical service for persons eligible for old-age and survivors insurance benefits, and for other purposes.

The benefits provided by my bill would be allowed as part of our established social-security system; such benefits would be financed by adding one-quarter of 1 percent to the contribution rates of employers and employees and three-eighths of 1 percent to the contribution rates of the self-employed.

The protection afforded by my bill is vitally needed by those many thousands of our older people who now cannot afford necessary medical, nursing, or hospital care; they cannot obtain or afford private insurance and they cannot meet the expense of illness. Costs of such care continue to rise.

Many outstanding organizations have strongly endorsed health benefits under the old-age, survivors, and disability insurance program, and it is generally conceded that health services for the aged are inadequate throughout the Nation.

It is incredible that, in our Nation of plenty, countless older persons are suffering pain and discomfort, jeopardizing their lives, because they cannot afford medical care; many are denied hospitalization and nursing care which are necessary for their recovery. Mounting evidence proves that present social-security benefits are still grossly inadequate to meet the barest necessities of life—there is nothing left over to pay for the high expenses of illness or medical aid.

I have received hundreds of letters describing pitiful circumstances and great hardships in this regard being suffered by older people in my district; petitions have been sent me bearing the names of thousands of those who need the help provided by my bill.

Numerous studies of the situation have been made. It is obvious that such a health program cannot be provided satisfactorily in any other way; the Federal Government must act. Our older citizens and others covered by the bill are in dire need of the assistance provided. It is unconscionable that their hardships continue.

It is the duty of Congress to take favorable action on legislation providing for an adequate health program for our aged without further delay; our older people rely upon us to give them the assistance and relief now denied them.

Foreign Aid Results

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS M. PELLY
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 4, 1959

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I was pleased to read about a foreign-aid program of which I thoroughly approved. Our U.S. consular representatives in Brazzaville, Congo Republic, have introduced the first baseball there and since January, when we opened our consulate, a league of six teams has been organized.

Apparently, the Americans give their time, but the program costs nothing—the players have no shoes, no gloves or any fancy equipment. Notwithstanding this, these barefoot youngsters and the citizens of this young Republic are developing a tie of friendship with the United States and more power to them.

Compare this with the attitude of Bolivians where our $129 million in aid, more per capita than to any other foreign people during a 6-year period, has resulted in our Embassy and the U.S. Information Service being attacked by mobs and our flag being burned.

An alleged remark of an American official as reported by Time magazine was taken by Bolivia as an insult to the dignity of a friendly nation.

Once under private ownership the tin mines of Bolivia made a profit and paid taxes. However, since these mines were nationalized they lose money and pay no taxes; but our financial assistance to the tune of about $25 million has contributed more than Bolivian income taxpayers toward their budget deficit.

In the interest of restoring good will, perhaps we should cut off sending dollars

and also eliminate other sources of Bolivia's indignity. Instead, we could send some consular representatives who can organize a baseball league. I would suggest Jackie Robinson, Mickey Mantle, Joe DiMaggio, or any one of a dozen others, as foreign service diplomats. They would make friends with the people of other lands. I doubt if the good will sought by our mutual security program reaches much below the high official level of foreign governments.

National Milk Sanitation Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEONARD G. WOLF
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 4, 1959

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill which may be cited as the National Milk Sanitation Act. There has been considerable controversy here in Washington recently concerning the quality of milk, and I hope that my proposal will resolve some of this controversy. I believe it is time that we consider seriously the desirability of a national sanitary milk law.

The main objectives of my bill are to protect the public health and to eliminate the use of unnecessary or unreasonable sanitary regulations which burden interstate commerce. Such regulations, in some cases, eliminate the possibility of a competitive market in milk. This bill would establish uniform standards of quality for milk so that if milk produced in Iowa or anywhere in the country meets these standards it can be sold anywhere in the United States.

The quality yardstick for fluid milk moving in interstate commerce, which would be used under my bill, would be that single standard for high quality milk which has already been set up by the U.S. Public Health Service as the U.S. Milk Ordnance and Code. Designed as a model for the industry, the code is now being followed in 15 States, 2 Territories, and 1,900 cities and counties.

Mr. Speaker, my bill does not require any State or municipality to adopt the code, nor does all milk shipped in interstate have to conform to the code. However, milk which does meet the requirements cannot be excluded from any fluid milk market in the United States, regardless of varying local health regulations. Dairy plant inspections would be certified by the U.S. Public Health Service. Milk from certified plants could not be kept out of any market on health grounds.

This bill provides many safeguards for areas receiving milk shipped from certified plants. Local health authorities would retain the right to inspect the milk upon arrival to make sure it had not deteriorated in transit. From there on, the handling, processing, and sale of the interstate milk would be required to meet the standards applied to milk entering the market from sources inside the State.

Mr. Speaker, I am glad to join with Members on both sides of the aisle in both Houses of Congress who have introduced similar bills which would protect the State and municipal health authorities' right to control the quality of milk shipped within their State, but which would at the same time go a long way toward eliminating the use of sanitation regulations as trade barriers against good, clean milk from other States.

Civil War Centennial Award

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOE HOLT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 4, 1959

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, with the presentation by Gen. Ulysses S. Grant, III, of certificates of commendation to film stars John Wayne and William Holden and motion picture director John Ford for their efforts in producing the new multi-million dollar historical spectacle "The Horse Soldiers," another step was marked today in the Civil War Centennial Commission's official 6-year nationwide program to commemorate the 100th anniversary of the epochal conflict.

The presentation ceremony took place at the Washington headquarters of the Civil War Centennial Commission, of which General Grant is Chairman. It was followed by a reception in honor of Messrs. Wayne, Holden, and Ford, held at the exclusive Army and Navy Club, and attended by members of the Commission, including high-ranking military, naval, and Government officials, and other distinguished guests.

In presenting the commendations, prepared in the form of scrolls, General Grant welcomed the United Artists film as one of the first contributions to the Commission program, "the avowed aims of which are to pay tribute to the memories of our forefathers who took part in the bitter conflict and to provide Americans with a new understanding of the way in which we built from sacrifice and suffering an enduring Nation and a lasting peace."

"The Horse Soldiers," which cost $5½ million to produce and was filmed on location in Louisiana, Mississippi, and in Hollywood, is a recreation of the famous Grierson raid of 1863, a commando-type operation in which several hundred Union cavalry invaded and rode across the State of Mississippi in order to cut the railroad lines of supply and distract the enemy's attention from General Grant's maneuver to take Vicksburg. It was characterized by General Sherman as "the most brilliant expedition of the war." The first General Grant acclaimed it as "one of the most brilliant cavalry exploits of the war."

Today his grandson, the present general, described this horse soldiers' raid as "one of the most strategically important, colorful, and fascinating stories to come out of the Civil War." Of the film he said, speaking for the Commission, "We expect it will prove of great interest and significance to all Americans."

After accepting the commendations for themselves and Mr. Ford, Wayne, and Holden in turn presented to General Grant, for the Centennial Commission collection, an assortment of Civil War memorabilia used in the motion picture, including a McClellan saddle, carbines and carbine holders, and authentic reproductions of gabions (portable wicker cylinders filled with earth to give protection to men digging approach trenches) and guidons (banners mounted on standard poles).

While at Commission headquarters, Messrs. Wayne and Holden arranged with General Grant and the Commission's executive director, Karl S. Betts, for a special showing of "The Horse Soldiers" to the Commission Council as soon as the first technicolor print has been processed. The picture is scheduled for public viewing in motion theaters across the country, beginning on July 4 of this year.

Mr. Kearns' Trip to Far East

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 4, 1959

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, Assistant Secretary of Commerce Henry Kearns has just returned from a significant trip to the Far East. While in Japan and Hong Kong some of Mr. Kearns' statements were taken out of context which, of course, alarmed and shocked our textile employers and employees who are struggling to break even in this great essential industry.

I had a very pleasant and constructive conference with Mr. Kearns on Monday concerning this Far Eastern trip. I am happy to report to the House that at no time during his visit did Mr. Kearns advocate more Japanese textile imports into the United States. On the contrary he explained to the Japanese and Hong Kong manufacturers the detrimental effects of excessive imports on our American industry. He warned the Japanese that more exports to America could result in restrictive action by the U.S. Government. He pointed out that demands would rise in Congress for a lower quota and higher tariffs.

Mr. Kearns was not empowered to negotiate trade agreements but was on a factfinding trip to study the situation in the Far East and inform our friends of the difficult predicament of the American industry. After studying the facts, Mr. Speaker, I must say that Mr. Kearns did a fine job and very ably represented American business interests.

I do believe that in the coming negotiations for a voluntary Japanese quota America will be ably represented by our distinguished Acting Secretary Mr.

Strauss, Mr. Kearns, and other dedicated men in the executive branch of our Government.

I hope and trust that during these negotiations the Japanese quota will not be increased. I sincerely believe satisfactory negotiations will be held with our Japanese allies and another voluntary agreement worked out substantially along the lines of the present one. I am sure our Japanese friends are beginning to realize that the present voluntary quota is working to their advantage with the increasing threat of textiles flooding the world markets from Red China.

Sudan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ADAM C. POWELL
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 4, 1959

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, today I wish to salute the Republic of the Sudan as it moves into its third year of independence.

After 56 years under the flag of Codomini of the Anglo-Egyptian Sudan this state became the sixth sovereign independent state of Africa. On January 1, 1956 the green, yellow, and blue flag of the Republic of the Sudan was flown for the first time.

His Excellency, Sayed Abdulla Bey Khalil, the former Premier, stated on its second anniversary, "When we celebrate Independence Day, we honor the struggle of the present generation of Sudanese who have by their sincerity, patriotism, and patience cast out colonialism from our country. Thus we close that chapter in our history when our country was dominated by foreigners and we entered a new era of freedom and progress."

Sudan, a country situated on an immense plateau of 967,500 square miles in the northeast corner of the African Continent, lies astride the middle reaches of the Nile River. Its 12 million population reflects culturally and racially an admixture hardly duplicated in any other African country. While its citizens of the north may be primarily conditioned by Moslem culture, those of the South are essentially pagan and Christian; though there are on their color chart some who are caucasian in skin texture and physiononic features, the vast majority are brown to black. Though the anxieties which beset the Arab world have their political tremors in the Sudan, that state likewise absorbs and shows grave concern for the independence and welfare of dependent African territories to the south of her.

The Sudan is in the main, a corporate part of the Arab world which accounts for the fact that they hasten to join the Arab League.

The outstanding characteristics of the newly independent Government of the Sudan is its intense desire to remain independent of the influence of other nations. Although they have been eager to attract foreign capital and particularly American industries and are undertaking measures to make such investments appealing, they exercise greater caution in requesting other forms of aid and technical assistance or help from other countries. The Sudan has become a member of the International Bank and the International Monetary Fund as a necessary measure to complete their major development projects.

The Sudanese are very proud of the government which they believe they are laying down a foundation of a sound and durable basis both internally and externally. Moreover, they believe the government's foreign policy has been such as to gain for the country the confidence and admiration of other governments, which constructive progress of the Khalil government has been successfully taken over into the government of General Ibrahim Abhoud. In spite of numerous speculations to the contrary, the enlightened administration of the previous regime and more precisely its relations to the West remains today constructive.

The Sudan is a country with a bright economic future and their leaders are determined to insure that its people are contented and in time overcome ignorance, poverty, and disease.

Cotton production is the basis of their economy and that one crop brings in nearly half the country's annual revenue—the backbone of which production, and thus mainstay of the nation's finances, is the British-initiated Gezira Scheme which is the largest agricultural scheme under one management in the world. The scheme's uniqueness is derived not alone for its economic significance but for its social impact upon every aspect of citizen life. This Western inspired economic and social experiment is a major factor in developing cooperation and social progress, avoiding the disasters of the feudal system, yet it has maintained individual liberty while achieving a unique combination of collective work. Of this scheme Dr. Mohammed Afzal, Director of Research, Pakistan Central Committee, noted it as "one of those outstanding experiments in socio-economic problems of the current century." The scheme is today the property of the people of the Sudan and is a source of annual income, not to captalism or feudal lords, but to the 25,000 tenants who work on it, and in an indirect way it belongs to all the people of the Sudan.

In the economic sphere they have issued their own currency and are able to conclude satisfactory agreements with the former Republic of Egypt now a part of the United Arab Republic and the United Kingdom in this respect.

The Sudan is the world's principal exporter of gum arabic accounting for 80 to 90 percent of the total supply. The United States is the second largest importer of gum arabic, a product used for making sweets and as an adhesive for stamps and envelopes.

The Sudanese people remember affectionately the Western World for its impact on its educational system and its agricultural development plan—the Gezira canalization scheme and we of the West are indebted to the Sudan for their all-out support when we were fighting for our democratic lives for freedom against the Italian invasion of World War II. For the Sudanese volunteers responded from all parts of the country for military duty assisting to their utmost in our war effort. Their industry, though limited, produced an amazing variety of war materials. The leaders of that noble country are to be commended for the nation's movement from virtual British control to complete independence with such marked and exceptional foresight, patience, and peaceful negotiation. We today rejoice at the progress in welding together which is consistently being made in Moslem-Christian relations and the good will which it is exhibiting toward all the people of the world with equal determination that the rule of law shall prevail in its provinces and in international relations.

This third anniversary in the words of our Department of State, "We applaud the tenacious desire of the Sudanese people to guarantee their national sovereignty against usurpation from any quarter."

Tomorrow's Scientists

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 4, 1959

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, the 18th annual science talent search for the Westinghouse science scholarships and awards has ended and I am very proud to say that five young men from the Second Congressional District of New York, which I represent, were chosen for the honors group. Of these, Jeffrey Alan Greenhouse, 16, of 153 Emery Street, Hempstead, was 1 of 40 chosen as winners of the Washington trip.

The other boys from my congressional district in the honors group are: Glenn Own Myers, Jr., 16, of 2017 Dutch Broadway, Elmont; Virgil Dixon Bogert, 17, of 62 Brixton Road, Garden City; Jeremiah Morris, 17, of 5 Grace Court, North, Great Neck; and Michael Adamowicz, 17, of 80 Urban Avenue, Westbury.

These boys were chosen from more than 28,000 candidates on the basis of scientific potential, measured by intricate aptitude tests, by their original science project, and by their all-around record.

I had dinner with Jeff Greenhouse, Monday evening. He's a fine youngster—top student in Uniondale High's graduating class of 285, captain of the math team, editor of the yearbook, and an aspiring chemist. He told me his interest in science is due to the fact that he was taught science from the first grade of school.

For his science search project, Jeff prepared and tested extracts from 32 flowers to determine if the flowers contained acid base indicators. He found

that all of them contained a substance that can be used to show the acidity of solutions.

Last summer, Jeff was 1 of 12 high-school seniors in New York State chosen to attend the 2-week summer science institute at the New Paltz State Teachers College. Following graduation, he plans to study chemistry at Syracuse University. His proud parents are Mr. and Mrs. Bernard D. Greenhouse.

Jeff and all the boys and girls who participated in the science talent search will determine the future progress of our country and its position in the world tomorrow. The science talent search banquet, when 40 of them were the guests of honor, was a memorable occasion for me.

Civil Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ISIDORE DOLLINGER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 4, 1959

Mr. DOLLINGER. Mr. Speaker, the vitally important subject of civil rights is now under consideration by the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives; hearings were begun today.

I am including in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD my statement to the committee, in which I urged that a strong, effective civil rights bill be approved:

Mr. Chairman and members of the Committee on the Judiciary, the need for stronger, effective civil rights legislation is more apparent than ever. Since your committee last considered civil rights legislation, denials of such rights because of color, race, religion, and national origin, have been rampant. The time for moderation and compromise is past; we must end the unconscionable discrimination, harassment, intimidation, and other human indecencies which are being inflicted upon a vast segment of our population.

Civil rights, the denial of such rights, continue to be of great concern to me. I have again reintroduced my many bills dealing with various phases of the subject and I will not take the time to enumerate them, as your committee is fully cognizant of my efforts through the years. I do repeat, however, that we cannot claim to have true democracy in our country, equality of man, equality of opportunity, freedom as guaranteed by our Constitution, until every vestige of discrimination of race, color, or religion, is abolished.

One of my bills which you scheduled for hearing is H.R. 759, to provide further means of securing and protecting the right of persons within the jurisdiction of the several States to the equal protection of the laws and other civil rights guaranteed by the Constitution or laws of the United States. It enlists the powers and influence of the Attorney General in a determined attack upon denials of civil rights. It perfects the procedure by which civil rights may be vindicated. My bill provides a workable solution to many serious problems. The Federal Government must act to assure persons discriminated against or denied their constitutional rights, the assistance and protection they need.

You also scheduled for hearing, my bill H.R. 1902, for the better assurance of the protection of citizens of the United States and other persons within the several States from mob violence and lynching, and for other purposes. We need only recall the Little Rock incidents, the bombings of places of worship, the terrible threats against innocent persons and groups of persons, to recognize that the protection afforded by my bill is necessary, if innocent persons are to be saved from mob hysteria and unfounded hatred which have at their roots the evils of discrimination.

Your committee has before it many bills on civil rights. I am pleased, Mr. Chairman, that you scheduled hearings early in this session of Congress, and I hope your prompt action presages passage of a strong civil rights bill during the present session. I wish to take this opportunity to state that I also favor your bill, Mr. Chairman, which would give Federal technical and financial help to communities that want to integrate their schools.

You have a grave responsibility and a great decision to make in this matter of civil rights. Every right-thinking American looks to you to discharge that responsibility fairly and wisely. I trust that you will vote out a bill of which we can be proud and which will restore, to some extent at least, the prestige which we have lost as a Nation because of our present undemocratic practices.

Maritime Unions Seek Destruction of Our Merchant Marine Fleet

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN TABER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 4, 1959

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, the National Maritime Union, headed by Joseph Curran, and the International Seafarers Union, headed by Paul Hall, are waging a propaganda campaign designed to destroy a vital portion of our merchant marine fleet.

Our citizens now have approximately 1,500 oil tankers, ore carriers, and tramp steamers flying the flags of Panama, Liberia, and Honduras. These are American-owned ships and they receive no subsidy from the United States Government. These ships are called flags of necessity ships; that is, it is necessary to fly under these flags if they are to survive. They simply could not fly under the American flag where seamen would be organized and receive wages three and even four times higher than wages paid to seamen flying under the flags of Western European maritime countries.

The Federal Government already is spending $130 million in annual subsidies to seamen who sail under the American flag. American ship owners do not get a dime out of this. I certainly have no quarrel with this expenditure. It is money well spent and necessary if we want any kind of a healthy and strong merchant marine.

Messrs. Curran and Hall want the flags of necessity ships returned to the American flag. They have a selfish motive in pressing for this radical change in our merchant marine policy. They want more dues-paying members in their unions.

Flags of necessity ships have received the enthusiastic endorsement of the Congress through passage of the Shipping Act of 1916, the Defense Department, and Federal Maritime Administrator Clarence G. Morse. The Congress gave Mr. Morse the authority to transfer these ships to the flags of Panama, Honduras, and Liberia, and only the Congress can take away that authority.

If, perchance, we changed our merchant marine policy and returned these flags of necessity ships to the United States flag, the Federal Government would be saddled with an additional four or five hundred million dollars in annual subsidies to these seamen, because, as I said, these ships cannot possibly compete with low-paid Western European seamen without the subsidy.

We have effective control over these flags of necessity ships. They are doing a great job and they are not asking a dime from the Federal Government. They came to our rescue during the Korean conflict, and they will be available to our Government tomorrow if an emergency should arise.

Of course, if Mr. Curran and Mr. Hall persist in their violent and unfounded attacks on the flags of necessity shipowners, the owners will sell these ships to Great Britain, Norway, or the Dutch. That would be disastrous to our national security. I am not concerned one bit about the profits or losses of these ships, but I am concerned about our national defense and the added burden to the taxpayer if these ships ever should be returned to the American flag.

If flags of necessity ships were sold abroad I do not see how Mr. Curran or Mr. Hall would gain anything. I strongly doubt that these men are thinking in terms of the consequences of their propaganda campaign. They would gain nothing and the United States would lose a lot along the national security and economy front.

The Flemming Formula

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEE METCALF
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 4, 1959

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, Dr. Flemming, former president of Ohio Wesleyan University, and now Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, has a formula for the relief of the classroom shortage which is dependent upon constitutional amendments and repeal of debt limits in most States and fundamental changes in the internal tax structure of many of the States. But Dr. Flemming says with cooperation of the States, he can do the job.

In another Cabinet office, Secretary Benson has some problems. One of them is storage of surplus eggs. If eggs were square they would store much more compactly and there would be less

breakage, and conserve space in the refrigerator, too. At this Easter season, a square egg would be especially utilitarian and would not roll off the table while the children were coloring it and it would stay where you hid it for the Easter egg hunt. One application of Dr. Flemming's formula would take care of this problem. Of course, it would mean some fundamental changes in the internal structure of the hen and depend on her cooperation but under the Flemming formula, those are minor obstacles.

Col. Michael de Kowats, Symbol of Hungarian Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN BRADEMAS
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 4, 1959

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, today I had the privilege of introducing in Congress a resolution authorizing the Postmaster General to design and issue a commemorative postage stamp honoring a man who not only gave noble service to our country in the days of its struggle for independence, but who stands today as a symbol of the yearning for freedom of a brave people now held in bondage behind the Iron Curtain.

Col. Michael de Kowats was a Hungarian cavalry officer who volunteered his services to help the American Colonies win their independence in the Revolutionary War. One authority on Hungarian-American history declares Colonel Kowats to have been the only Hungarian who served in the Continental Army.

It is an instructive commentary on the forces that have molded the American Nation that Michael de Kowats was the Hungarian colonel and righthand man of Count Casimir Pulaski, the champion of Polish and American liberty. General Pulaski recommended, in a report to General Washington dated Trenton, January 9, 1778, the appointment of a master of exercise for the cavalry and urged that Colonel Kowats be named to the post. "I can recommend him," wrote Pulaski, "and assure your excellency will never have reason to repent your confidence in him. If this proposal should be agreeable to your excellency, the sooner I am informed the better, as he will be of infinite service to the cavalry this winter in quarters."

Colonel Michael de Kowats is one of thousands of Hungarians who have given their lives in defense of liberty. On March 15 Hungarians throughout the free world will pay homage to their forefathers who have died fighting tyranny. It was on that day in the middle of the 19th century that Hungary won its freedom from the Hapsburgs and it is on that day that free Hungarians renew their vows to return the blessings of liberty to their compatriots now in the chains of Soviet despotism.

Mr. Speaker, all of us in America will recall, I am sure, the valiant fight not too many months ago of the Hungarian people in the streets of Budapest against the onslaught of Soviet tanks and troops.

Mr. Speaker, on March 15, 1959, the Hungarian-American community of South Bend, Ind., in the district I have the honor to represent, will celebrate Hungarian Independence Day in the William Penn Fraternal Association Hall. The meeting, which will be attended by a predicted 1,500 persons, is being held under the sponsorship of the Hungarian Veterans Club of which Mr. Joseph Farkas is president. The Honorable Edward F. Voorde, mayor of South Bend, will be master of cermonies. Albert Tellson, an American of Hungarian extraction, and a councilman at large of the city of South Bend and himself a fine example of the splendid civic service given by Hungarian-Americans in my district, will also take part in the ceremonies.

I join with these fine Americans in observation of Hungarian Independence Day by offering my resolution in honor of Colonel Michael de Kowats together with the hope that some day the people of Hungary will again be free.

The text of my resolution follows:

JOINT RESOLUTION IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Joint resolution providing for the issuance of a special postage stamp in honor of Col. Michael de Kowats

Whereas the love of freedom and a hatred of tyranny has characterized the Hungarian peoples in their centuries-old fight against oppression and dictatorship; and

Whereas this spirit is exemplified in the conduct and service of Col. Michael de Kowats, who volunteered his services to General Washington's Continental Army and helped organize the cavalry of that Army into an effective fighting force and later died on the battlefield at Charlestown; and

Whereas Colonel Kowats' love of liberty was also present in the hearts of his countrymen who died fighting the forces of oppression in Hungary in 1956; and

Whereas Hungarians the world over celebrate March 15, the date of Hungarian independence from Hapsburg rule in 1849, as Hungarian Freedom Day, dedicated to the restoration of freedom in that land: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Postmaster General is authorized and directed to design and issue a special commemorative postage stamp in honor of Col. Michael de Kowats. Such stamp shall be of such denomination and shall be issued in such quantity and for such period, beginning March 15, 1960, as the Postmaster General shall determine.

Congressman Dollinger's Annual Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ISIDORE DOLLINGER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 4, 1959

Mr. DOLLINGER. Mr. Speaker, at the close of the 1st session of the 86th Congress, I shall prepare and include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD my annual report to my constituents. The report covers legislative work done by the Congress, and my efforts in behalf of the people I represent.

Burma

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ADAM C. POWELL
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 4, 1959

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, on January 4, 1959, Burma celebrated her 11th year of independence. Today I wish to congratulate its leaders, Prime Minister General Ne Win, and His Excellency U Win, Ambassador of Burma, for their leadership and for the good will which exists between the United States and their country.

Although Burma, as an independent country, is only 11 years old the country has made great strides forward in developing its own Government and in advancing democratic administration. In that short period of time the Burmese people have moved far ahead economically as well as in external relations.

While eager to share in the greater material well-being which modern technology affords, the Burmese hasten to explain they will not go overboard for industrialization. Moreover, they have announced their determination to resist the building of uneconomic industrial facilities which would have to be protected by high import duties because they believe in a liberal foreign-trade policy. In fact, they explain they intend to actively explore ways of stabilizing markets and expanding trade with all countries. In all, the Burmese have managed to maintain a balanced economic and social development, while carrying on an extensive program in the training of professional people, technicians, and administrators, including civil servants. The Burmese are a thrifty people determined to protect their newly won economic and political freedom and to preserve their spiritual heritage.

Burma is a natural democracy; a man's birth counts for so little that there are no family names. Women enjoy full equality and marriage and divorce are easier to obtain than in most parts of the United States.

Judge Nadine Lane Gallagher, formerly of municipal court of the District of Columbia, was reported recently as giving credit to the Burmese women along with other women of Asia for being their countries' active forces on social reform.

The Burmese are dedicated to parliamentary democracy and an aversion to totalitarianism which characterizes the approach of the Burmese leaders both to national and international problems. His Excellency U Thant, Ambassador of Burma to the United Nations, stated recently that the Burmese see the world as plagued by age-old tensions, political,

social, and economic and the people of Burma are convinced that the safety and survival of free political institutions depend upon resolving these tensions before they become intolerable. Though Burma herself subscribes to democratic principles and supports democratic institutions, she declines to pass judgment on the international affairs of other countries subscribing instead to policies based on peaceful coexistence.

Mr. Thant's contribution to American thinking is of greatest significance to our present purpose when he seeks to explain the common cause that is the peoples of the Afro-Asian bloc countries follows in the quote taken from an article which appeared last July in the Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science:

Victory will come to the side which understands and takes into account the most important phenomenon of the 20th century—nationalism. The problem is, in essence, the problem of equality of opportunity.

Let me touch briefly on this.

There are millions of people in the world who do not have enough to eat and enough to cover themselves with, and whose children cannot go even to the primary schools.

It seems comic to talk to them about the virtues of democratic ideals and the dignity of man. During the last war there was a great deal of talk of the imperative need for democracy to triumph over fascism. Mr. Churchill had then invited the Burmese people to take part in that war for democracy. Young Burmese nationalists had said then that Burma would not fight for democracy when she herself was enchained in slavery. And for that answer democracy did not hesitate to shut up a number of young Burmese leaders in prison.

Is the situation different today? Take Africa for instance. Over a hundred million people are being ruled today by the free nations of the world. What does the fight against totalitarianism mean to these millions of people? When France, for instance, proudly proclaims to the world that her soldiers are killing 4,000 Algerians every month, is the cause of the democracies enhanced? The white settlers of South Africa, who treat the colored people as worse than lepers, are greater enemies of democracy than the Communists. They are generating tensions much more ruthlessly than the cold war tactics allegedly employed by the Communists.

Let us not delude ourselves with the oversimplification of the world issue. The issue today is not only that of communism versus democracy. The more essential issue is the division of the word into the weak and the strong, the prosperous and the abject poor, the ruler and the ruled, the master race and the subhuman.

Therefore, if the war for democracy has any meaning, it is necessary that we all sit together and create here and now the conditions that will guarantee freedom, justice, well-being, and equality to all.

In all our discussions of the excolonial and colonial world it is well for us to bear in mind the driving determination of the progressive leadership with the support of the overwhelming masses for national solidarity and for advancing and welding of Pan Asian-Pan African as a prerequisite of economic viability and international peace. In the words of Judge Gallagher in all of this, "Our most potent weapon is friendship."

Newly Modernized D.C. Post Office

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES E. CHAMBERLAIN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 4, 1959

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, on March 3 the President and the Postmaster General dedicated the new modernized Washington, D.C., post office. A distinguished audience, including many Members of the Congress, were in attendance.

The introduction of mechanized mail-handling machinery and equipment and the resultant beneficial effects on better mail service are of such significance to the American people that I believe the comments made on that occasion should be inserted in the RECORD.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include President Eisenhower's and Mr. Summerfield's remarks in the RECORD:

COMMENTS BY POSTMASTER GENERAL ARTHUR E. SUMMERFIELD AT DEDICATION OF THE MODERNIZED WASHINGTON, D.C., POST OFFICE, WASHINGTON, D.C., MARCH 3, 1959

Members of the Congress, distinguished guests, my colleagues in the postal service, ladies and gentlemen, today we add a most significant chapter to the long and honored traditions of the U.S. Post Office Department.

This official opening of the world's most mechanized post office—the showplace of the postal world—is a major breakthrough in our efforts to provide better, more efficient mail service for the American people.

The introduction of mechanized mail-handling devices here in the modernized Washington, D.C., post office opens a new era in the postal service, fully as important as the start of railroad service for mail in 1831, or the inauguration of regular air mail service in 1918.

This great advance we are witnessing today is the culmination of 6 years of intensive research and engineering work. It could not have occurred without the wholehearted, enthusiastic support of the President and the vision and cooperation of the Congress. Every American is indebted to our leaders for their support of this effort.

Would the Members of the Congress present here today please arise so we may give you a deserved round of applause?

Thanks are due also to the many industrial, business, and commercial groups whose technicians have worked so cooperatively with the Post Office Department's fine staff of engineers in developing and fitting this equipment so ingeniously and efficiently into floorspace not originally designed for such purposes.

Will these representatives of industry and our own engineers please stand so we may appropriately acknowledge your efforts?

The postal employees of this post office deserve particular praise for their fine efforts in continuing with normal delivery of mails, including holiday mail, during the most trying period while this building was being rehabilitated and this large amount of mechanical equipment installed. Let us give them a round of applause, too.

Will the employee association leaders here today arise so we may pay tribute to you?

Also, I would like to give special recognition to four of my close associates for their dedicated service in carrying this important project through to such a successful conclusion. They are Deputy Postmaster General Edson O. Sessions, who has charge of the entire modernization program for the postal service; Rollin Barnard, Acting Assistant Postmaster General of the Bureau of Facilities; the Director of the Office of Research and Engineering, Wade S. Plummer; and the Regional Director of the Washington Region, Malcolm Clarke.

I should like also to acknowledge the many fine contributions to this effort made by Assistant Postmasters General McKibbin, Siedle, Gillette, Lyons, and Chief Inspector Stephens. Will they please stand so that we may recognize their efforts?

Why have we mechanized this big city "gateway" post office?

Like many others, it has long been out-of-date. It's mail-handling methods were old-fashioned and had not changed much since Ben Franklin's day.

On its workroom floors mail was hand-pushed, hand-sorted, hand-moved in old-fashioned hampers. Working conditions were poor; the work tedious; the results costly to the taxpayers.

In short, the major bottleneck to better, faster mail service is the time now required to sort and distribute mail, to move it through the large "gateway" post offices of the United States.

The seriousness of this problem is highlighted by these facts.

The American people send and receive two-thirds of the world's mail.

This astonishing volume now totals 61 billion pieces of mail plus a billion parcels a year.

As the Nation grows and its economy expands, the number of pieces of mail per person per year, now averaging 350, is expected to double to 700 within the next 25 years.

Necessity, they say, is the mother of invention.

Faced with the facts I have just briefly mentioned, it was apparent your postal managment must speed mail sorting and distribution of mail in its present physical quarters with modern machines and new methods, some of which are commonly used in American industry.

The mechanization in this Washington, D.C., post office will move the mails continuously, make better use of the work floorspace, eliminate drudgery, and use the abilities of postal workers to better advantage. Most importantly, too, this mechanization will decrease the floor space needed to process the increased mail volume of the years ahead.

The modernization work in the Washington, D.C., post office will produce benefits for the entire Nation:

1. It will provide mechanization experience to convert other post offices.

2. It will be a testing ground for the mail processing equipment of tomorrow.

3. It will be close by for postal engineers to conduct tests on further development, and will serve as a national showcase so that visitors from everywhere may see what the Post Office Department is doing about their mail-handling problems. This is the first large office to be completed although many other large offices are now in the planning or construction stage and will be completed soon.

4. It will provide better working conditions for our employees.

An efficient modern postal service is essential to our national welfare.

That is why this Washington, D.C., post office, with its promise of better mail service, is so important. That is why the developments that will take place here, in this working postal laboratory, have great significance for every American.

Ladies and gentlemen, I would now like to introduce some of the distinguished guests on this platform today. They are:

Franklin G. Floete, Administrator, General Services Administration.

Mrs. Barbara Gunderson, Civil Service Commissioner.

Rowland Jones, Jr., president, American Retail Federation, and a member of the Post Office Department Advisory Board.

It is now my privilege to present the Assistant to the President, Gen. Wilton B. Persons, who is here today as the personal representative of the President. General Persons will join me in unveiling this plaque which will be permanently mounted in the lobby of this post office. General Persons.

Ladies and gentlemen, as we hear the band play "Hail to the Chief," it is my privilege to talk to President Eisenhower in the White House.

The President will press the button starting the machinery in this first modern post office in the United States.

Mr. President, we are just concluding our dedication ceremony. The distinguished guests and postal employees gathered here eagerly await a word from you.

REMARKS BY PRESIDENT EISENHOWER

In a moment I shall press the button which will start the machinery rolling in the new mechanized Washington, D.C., post office.

This development, a banner one in the Post Office Department's modernization program, will benefit all Americans as their mail is handled more expeditiously and more economically.

The lessons learned in this working postal laboratory here in Washington will be used in post offices throughout the entire Nation.

It is a pleasure to congratulate Postmaster General Summerfield on this achievement and to now press the button which sets into motion the most newly mechanized postal facility in the world—the Washington, D.C. post office.

Dr. Flemming's Formula

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEE METCALF
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 4, 1959

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, one of the serious problems that labor unions have run into in organizing the dairy industry is that the cows have to be milked twice a day every day. No 5-day week for a dairyman. Many commentators on the changing conditions in farming have pointed to the decline of the family cow. This, too, is mostly caused by the fact that one family cow requires milking every morning and every evening. No weekends permissible when "old bossy" is home bawling to be milked.

Dr. Flemming, Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, has evolved a formula whereby he says 75,000 classrooms can be built without unbalancing the budget if the local subdivisions will only change their tax concepts, if the States will change statutory debt limits and if constitutions in more than half the States be changed. But Dr. Flemming points out these statutory and constitutional changes will be minor obstacles in the working out of his plan if the States and districts will only cooperate.

Dr. Flemming's formula should be used to put cows on a 5-day week. Of course, it will mean a basic change in the constitution of the cow and her cooperation but with the application of the Flemming formula, those minor obstacles can be easily overcome.

Pertinent Information on Puerto Rican Taxation and Cost of Living

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE N. ASPINALL
OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 4, 1959

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, in anticipation of a number of questions which will arise in our forthcoming floor debate on Hawaiian statehood I have asked our colleague, Resident Commissioner FERNÓS-ISERN of Puerto Rico to prepare a memorandum on, first, the economic and fiscal relations between Puerto Rico and the United States; second, tax exemption in Puerto Rico; and third, cost-of-living differential in Puerto Rico allowed civil servants of the Federal Government. Invariably, in Hawaiian statehood debates these matters arise and usually are discussed with much of the factual information not being utilized. In order to provide those persons who wish to discuss these Puerto Rican matters as they relate to Hawaii with reliable information I wish to insert in the RECORD the following memorandum prepared by Resident Commissioner FERNÓS-ISERN:

MARCH 4, 1959.

Dr. JOHN TAYLOR,
Professional Staff Member, House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR DR. TAYLOR: With reference to our recent conversation I am enclosing the memorandum which I have prepared at your request on (1) the economic and fiscal relations between Puerto Rico and the United States; (2) tax exemption in Puerto Rico; and (3) cost-of-living differential in Puerto Rico allowed civil servants of the Federal Government.

If you feel that further details are required, I should be happy to provide them.

Sincerely,

A. FERNÓS-ISERN,
Resident Commissioner.

MARCH 4, 1959.

Memorandum with reference to: (1) Economic and fiscal relations between Puerto Rico and the United States; (2) tax exemption in Puerto Rico; (3) Cost-of-living differential in Puerto Rico.

1. Ever since the United States acquired sovereignty over Puerto Rico under the Treaty of Paris in 1899, the Organic Acts enacted by Congress to organize a civil government in Puerto Rico (1900 and 1917), as well as the Puerto Rico Federal Relations Act (since Puerto Rico became a Commonwealth) have provided that all expenses incurred by the Government of Puerto Rico shall be paid out of the Treasury of Puerto Rico. (See sec. 12, Organic Act of 1900, and sec. 6 of the Second Organic Act of 1917.) No Federal appropriations have ever been made to pay for the expenses of local government, as has been the case in the Territories. This refers, of course, to the government establishment of Puerto Rico and not to the operation of Federal activities and programs undertaken by the United States in Puerto Rico.

The expenses of the U.S. Government in Puerto Rico can be classified into three groups:

(1) The Defense Establishment, including payments to veterans. (Thousands of Puerto Ricans have served during the First World War, the Second World War, and the Korean action and, of course, are entitled to the same compensations as their mainland fellow citizens.)

(2) Civilian Federal agencies, which operate in Puerto Rico in the same way as in any State of the Union. (Federal agencies in Puerto Rico include, of course, the post office system, the Immigration Service, the U.S. district court, buoys, lighthouses, agricultural agencies, etc.)

(3) Grant-in-aid laws, which have been extended to Puerto Rico and which operate with joint Federal-Commonwealth funds, under the supervision of the respective Federal departments.

The same rates of tariff applying in the United States to imports from foreign countries apply to merchandise from foreign countries coming into Puerto Rico. The expenses incurred for collecting the customs duties in Puerto Rico are paid out of collections made, and the remainder is covered into the treasury of Puerto Rico (see sec. 4 of the Organic Act of 1900 and sec. 58 of the Second Organic Act of 1917). There are no customs between United States and Puerto Rico. The U.S. internal revenue laws would have no force and effect in Puerto Rico (see sec. 14 of the Organic Act of 1900 and sec. 9 of the Second Organic Act of 1917).

In other words, Puerto Rico was accorded free trade with the United States, within a common tariff, and was given fiscal autonomy, while it was supposed to support its own government with its own revenues.

This treatment was accorded Puerto Rico on the theory that Puerto Rico was not incorporated into the United States under the terms of the Treaty of Paris with Spain in 1899, nor has it been incorporated by act of Congress at any later date. It was not a Territory in the traditional sense, but "a people" under the sovereignty of the United States. (See sec. 7, Organic Act of 1900.)

The provisions of the Constitution of the United States concerning the uniformity in tax laws do not apply in Puerto Rico as they have always applied to incorporated territories such as the present Territory of Hawaii.

The distinction between incorporated and unincorporated territories was early made by the Supreme Court in the well-known insular cases, *de Lima* v. *Bidwell*, 182 U.S. 1 (1901); *Jones* v. *Bidwell*, 182 U.S. 244 (1901); *Dooley* v. *U. S.*, 183 U.S. 151 (1901); and later confirmed in *Balzac* v. *People of Puerto Rico*, 258 U.S. 298 (1922).

All these congressional and judicial decisions took place long before the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico was organized. The Commonwealth has evolved within this framework of relations. The fact that the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico was created in 1952 did not alter the above situation. As a matter of fact, the sections in the Organic Act of 1917 which dealt with these matters were specifically continued in force and effect, as the Puerto Rico Federal Relations Act (sec. 4 of Public Law 600, 81st Cong., which enabled the people of Puerto Rico to organize the Commonwealth). The Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, therefore, now has the same fiscal situation and economic relationships which Puerto Rico had before it became a Commonwealth.

Although the general rule is that United States internal revenue laws do not apply

in Puerto Rico, it should be noted that the U.S. income tax law applies to the income of residents of Puerto Rico when such income is derived from sources outside of Puerto Rico. This includes Federal salaries paid to residents of Puerto Rico who serve the Federal Government in Puerto Rico. The fundamental fact, then, is not that Puerto Rico is exempt from Federal taxes, but that Puerto Rico is not included in the tax area of the United States and has its own separate tax system as an unincorporated area.

The tax system of Puerto Rico includes income tax laws, excise tax laws, real estate tax laws, inheritance tax laws, etc. The tax laws in Puerto Rico are comparable to those prevailing in the mainland.

2. Puerto Rico has adopted a program of tax exemption for a short period of years, for new industries that may wish to establish themselves in Puerto Rico. This program was implemented in view of the enormous unemployment problem in Puerto Rico and in view of the very limited natural resources. Without this temporary dispensation to new industries, they would have no reason to come to Puerto Rico, and Puerto Rico would neither collect taxes on unexisting industries nor be able to create new opportunities of employment for the unemployed. Since it was not possible to have both taxes and employment from new industries, Puerto Rico had to decide to have one of the two, i.e., employment, and temporarily give up taxes that it would not have received anyway. The program has met with a great deal of success. Employment opportunities in Puerto Rico have increased rapidly. The standard of living has been raised, the purchasing capacity of the average citizen has increased, and as a result (since Puerto Rico does most of its outside shopping in the U.S. mainland) the purchases made by Puerto Rico in the last year exceeded $600 million, actually approaching the $700 million mark. Puerto Rican sales to the United States were about $450 million. Puerto Rico is today the third largest market for U.S. products in the New World.

It should be emphasized that the tax exemption program is applied exclusively to new industries coming into Puerto Rico which duly qualify for the exemption; that each case is decided on its merits. Also that except for these new industries the people of Puerto Rico do pay taxes to the Commonwealth, as aforesaid, in a comparable manner as the citizens of the United States pay taxes to the States and to the Federal Government. It should also be emphasized that the tax exemption given to new industries is a temporary measure, limited to a fixed period of time, and that after that time elapses, the new industries are subject to taxation the same as the old-established industries. It should also be emphasized that tax exemption is not granted to industries that may pull out of the United States and come into Puerto Rico. Only brandnew industries which represent an expansion in the industrial organization of the United States are eligible to tax exemption under the Commonwealth law.

3. Although the average per capita income in Puerto Rico is lower than the lowest average per capita income in any State, it has been found, through surveys carried out at the initiative of the Civil Service Commission, that the cost of living in Puerto Rico is about 17½ percent higher than it is in Washington, D.C. Although there may be differences of opinion as to the reasons for this higher cost of living, it seems logical to assume that among the factors creating this higher cost is the fact that Puerto Rico buys in the mainland no less than 50 percent of the food it consumes and pays very high freight rates for transportation. These high freight rates are paid not only in transportation from the mainland to Puerto Rico but also on what is transported from Puerto Rico to the mainland. All this transportation, according to law, must be made within the terms of the coastwise shipping laws of the United States which apply to Puerto Rico, i.e., in vessels registered in the United States.

Since the same situation prevails in other offshore areas, namely, Alaska and Hawaii, the Congress has adopted the policy of compensating United States officials and employees serving in these offshore areas, for this higher cost of living. It seems to be a sound policy, since what it does in fact is to equalize the income of Federal employees in the offshore areas to the income of Federal employees in the mainland areas.

The fact that the Federal Government follows this policy serves to emphasize the difficult economic problem the people of Puerto Rico must meet in their endeavor to attain a standard of living comparable to that of their fellow citizens in the mainland. They must cope not only with unemployment and the fact that their income is lower than that of the average income in the mainland, but also with the fact that their cost of living is higher than in the mainland.

Puerto Rico is making great strides in improving the lot of its people. It has attained Commonwealth status which the multitudes of its people endorse and support. Commonwealth status means that the people of Puerto Rico have full self-government in a measure comparable to that enjoyed by a State of the Union. But the U.S. Government exercises authority in Puerto Rico also in a measure comparable to the authority it exercises with respect to any State. The people of Puerto Rico, fully participating in the election of their Commonwealth officials, do not participate in Federal election or legislation, except that they have a spokesman in the Resident Commissioner, who may present the views of the people of Puerto Rico before Congress as well as before the executive departments in such matters as affect Puerto Rico and are within the province of the Federal Government.

The people of Puerto Rico do not participate in the election of the President, or the Vice President; they do not elect two Senators; they do not elect a proportionate number of voting Members of the House. If Puerto Rico were a State, it would be entitled to no less than five House Members. Nevertheless, Federal laws apply in Puerto Rico equally as in any State, except tax laws, but including, of course, selective service.

Dr. Flemming's Formula

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEE METCALF
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 4, 1959

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, Dr. Flemming, Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, has come up with a proposal which he says would solve the school classroom shortage. But application of the Flemming formula would require States to alter their constitutions, their statutory debt ceilings and their basic internal tax concepts. Dr. Flemming says these alterations would be a minor obstacle.

The Flemming formula has other applications.

According to Hoyle, the best possible 5-card poker hand is a royal flush. The relative value scales down through a straight flush, four of a kind, a full house, a flush, a straight, three of a kind, two pairs, one pair, to high card.

With individual application of the Flemming formula, a pair of deuces could take the pot over a royal flush. Now this would require a change in the rules—a revision of Hoyle's book—and there undoubtedly would be some constitutional, perhaps even internal, alterations of the players in the resulting disputes. But these would be a minor obstacle to Dr. Flemming.

Of course, it is difficult to see any possible benefit resulting from application of the Flemming formula to poker. It is just as difficult to see any possible benefit resulting from its application to the classroom shortage.

Ghana

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ADAM C. POWELL
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 4, 1959

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, I wish to salute on the second anniversary of the independence of Ghana, March 6, the Prime Minister, His Excellency Kwame Nkrumah, and the country's Ambassador to the United States, His Excellency Daniel Chapman. There is added pride for us in the United States of America in the 2-year accomplishments of Ghana coast and more particularly to,the command post of present-day Ghana. Although Ghana's population is little more than 5 million, inhabiting roughly only 91,843 square miles, its richness and its people have figured most prominently in the direction of the modern world. From the 15th century to the present, Ghana's gold or cocoa or bauxite or people have enriched the coffers of others. Ghana's gold and her human resources, beginning in the 16th century, laid the foundation of, first, the Portuguese, later the Dutch, English, Swedes, Danes, and still later the American economy. The influence of the Guinea coast and its impact upon America is seen every day in virtually one-tenth of the population of this great country. Add today to Ghana's continuing contribution of mineral resources and cocoa, and the impact of her descendants throughout the West, and a new story of Ghana's influence begins to unfold. In the span of 2 years Ghana has hostessed two major conferences where convened representatives from all parts of Africa in an effort to light the torch of liberation throughout Africa. Moreover, the leadership, the solidarity, the consciousness of the combined strength of all Africans for continent welfare and international peace has been asserted with such force that the whole universe world may experience the constructive impact of this small country a disordered world.

During Mr. Nkrumah's recent tour of India, Dr. Sarvapalli Radhakrishnan, the

chancellor of Delhi University, when presenting the scroll of the university said:

I wish to assure you that you have our full support and sympathy in our attempts to build up a new United States of Africa.

To which Dr. Nkrumah responded:

Since Ghana became independent we have grown increasingly conscious that the responsibility for determining our own evolution as a community rests fully on our own shoulders. We are particularly aware of the need to develop our physical, intellectual, and spiritual resources in such a way that the contribution made by our generation and by our country is for the general progress of mankind.

We believe this contribution must be not only distinctly African in character but also international in its approach.

In an address to the Indian Council of World Affairs, Dr. Nkrumah said he had doubt that Africa would involve forms of government rather different from the traditional western pattern but no less democratic in their protection of the individual and his inalienable right.

To the criticism that Ghana has not proceeded in precisely the same way as old Western democracies, the Prime Minister informed the Indians that: "First, Ghana society is by its own form and tradition fundamentally democratic in character." And, he explained, that in time their present form of parliamentary democracy may be expected to conform more closely to their own national and traditional methods of government.

To the criticism by a section of the western press for so-called undemocratic methods Nkrumah retorted:

It would have been more helpful in creating better understanding if these critics had first carefully considered the reality of the situation. As a new and young Government, our first responsibility has been to preserve independence and the security of our state.

Commenting on the African liberalism movement and Ghana's role in it, Nkrumah explained that never before had so many African leaders from all parts of the continent come together to find a solution for their common problems as assembled in Accra when political and trade union leaders met there recently. And, he added, that the process for the total liberation of Africa has begun; the union of Ghana and Guinea, representing the first step along the momentous road toward African union. In this regard, the Prime Minister concluded:

We realize that our union may involve many difficult issues but the basic and decisive fact is that we are determined in spirit and endeavor to unite in order to form the nucleus for a union of African states or republics.

The recent meeting of Nkrumah with Indian leaders has added significance for it symbolizes the realization of Asian and African struggle for a common cause. It denotes a breaking through of African nationalism and a seeking of unity and solidarity with others for international good will. For, as the Prime Minister stated, Ghana shares India's own ideals and aspirations and looks forward to working on solutions for their basic problems. This is continuation of the true meaning of the spirit born in Bandung at the Afro-Asian conference in 1955.

As the whole world totters on the brink of disaster, it is well that the big powers lend a greater ear to the misgivings of the little powers. Maybe there can be found in some cases where we have gone wrong. As for Americans, Dr. William Appleman Williams in his new book, "The Tragedy of American Diplomacy," contends that "the idea that other people ought to copy America contradicts the humanitarian urge to help them and the idea that they have the right to make such key decisions for themselves * * * in some cases the American way does not work for other people." Bearing in mind Dr. Williams' conclusion that other societies come to feel that American policy causes them to lose their economic as well as their political right of self-determination, we must periodically take time to understand the motivations and aspirations of others especially the members of the popularly known Asian-African bloc. Time thus spent can be highly rewarding in terms of good will and human survival. We must listen and hear with sympathy what the smaller countries are trying to tell us for they wish like us to be spared an atomic holocaust.

In conclusion, a message from the African tradition, a proverb, which Prime Minister Nkrumah included in the foreword to Barbara Ward's new book, "Five Ideas That Change the World," is appropriate:

When the bull elephants fight, the grass is trampled down and pleads with the small and uncommitted nations to make their voices heard constructively while there is still time, for in this age of the ultimate weapon the bull elephants would disappear with the grass.

ACHIEVEMENT IN GHANA SINCE THE CELEBRATION OF FIRST ANNIVERSARY OF INDEPENDENCE, 1958

POLITICAL

1. Opening of new diplomatic missions abroad and in Ghana by other countries.
2. Represented at:
(a) Geneva International Conference on the Law of the Sea.
(b) Second Geneva Atoms for Peace Conference.
(c) U.N. Conference on Peaceful Uses of Atomic Energy.
(d) Inauguration of West Indies Federal Legislature.
3. Visits by Prime Minister to:
(a) Independent African States.
(b) Canada and the United States.
(c) India.
(d) Nigeria.
4. His Excellency Ambassador D. A. Chapman elected first Vice Chairman of Governing Council of new U.N. Special Fund.
5. Establishment of:
(a) Regional assemblies.
(b) Houses of chiefs primarily concerned with questions of customary law.
6. Arranged:
(a) Conference of Independent African States.
(b) All-African People's Conference.
7. Union with Guinea to form basis of Union of West African States.
8. Contribution of $3,000 to the programs of the United Nations High Commissioner for refugees.
9. Presentation of a Speaker's chair to the National Assembly by the British House of Commons.

ECONOMIC

1. Venue of First Regional Conference of Food and Agricultural Organization of the United Nations.
2. Trade and goodwill missions to Britain and Western Europe.
3. Trade missions from:
(a) The Netherlands.
(b) Czechoslovakia.
(c) Italy.
(d) West and East Germany.
(e) Poland.
4. Establishment of state lotteries.
5. Issue of own coinage to replace former West African currency.
6. Article of agreement signed with International Finance Corporation.
7. Establishment of:
(a) Tourist bureau.
(b) Committee on Aid to Ghanaian Business.
(c) Insecticide factory.
(d) Commercial vehicles assembly plant.
(e) Nautical college for training of ships' officers and ratings; Ghanaians also being trained as seamen.
(f) Investment promotion board.
(g) Food and Agricultural Organization Regional Office for Africa.
(h) ICA operation mission.
(f) Rockefeller Brothers' Fund to help obtain investment funds and financial assistance for economic development.
(j) Bankers' clearinghouse.
8. Plan to develop Accra Airport to international standards.
9. Formation of iron and steel mill.
10. Modernization of fishing industry.
11. Formal inauguration of Ghana airways, and plans for creation of completely jet-powered airfleet.
12. Training of Ghanaians to become air hostesses.
13. Visit by team of experts from Henry J. Kaiser Co. to make survey and bring up-to-date engineering report on Volta River project. Main factors of scheme: Dam the Volta, produce 600,000 kilowatts capacity and smelt 210,000 tons of aluminum yearly from Ghana bauxite.
14. Revision of company law for speedy development.
15. Signing of investment guarantee agreement to attract private American capital to Ghana.
16. Scheme for establishment of oil mill factory.
17. Represented at:
(a) First session of U.N. Economic Commission for Africa at Addis Ababa.
(b) Forty-first (Maritime) session of International Labor Conference in Geneva.
(c) Conference of International Federation of Agricultural Producers in Brussels.
(d) Montreal Commonwealth Trade and Economic Conference.
(e) New Delhi talks of World Bank and International Monetary Fund.
18. Formation of Ghana National Construction Co. for building factories, carrying out construction works, and training of Ghanaians.
19. Study progress of Tema Harbor, one of the major harbors of Africa.
20. New trade union structure to (a) help develop the country, (b) train the workers to contribute to this development.
21. Preparation of a second development plan which will mark an important step forward in the further development and consolidation of the independence of the country.

SOCIAL

1. Represented at (a) Commonwealth games in Montreal, (b) Conference of Afro-

Asian writers in Tashkent in Soviet Union, (c) World Assembly of Youth in New Delhi.

2. Debut of (a) Ghana Times (daily newspaper), (b) the Ghanaian (monthly magazine).

3. Increased operations of Ghana News Agency which receives and distributes domestic and overseas news to various news organizations in Ghana.

4. Opening of (a) police college for advanced training for police officers, (b) law school, (c) school of journalism.

5. Admission to (a) full membership of UNESCO, (b) membership of International Criminal Police Organization.

6. Arts and crafts exhibitions to develop distinctive Ghanaian culture.

7. Agricultural shows to increase number and variety of crops and the flourish of livestock industry.

8. Training of Ghanaians to become officers in Ghana's Army.

9. Plans (a) to enable Radio-Ghana to cover the whole of Africa, (b) for establishment of medical school, (c) for inauguration of television service, (d) to establish an arts council.

10. More towns connected by new VHF radio-telephone link.

11. Visits by Ghanaians to the United States under various forms of grants.

12. Statue of Prime Minister added to others in Madame Tussaud's exhibition in London.

13. Installation of new automatic street lights.

14. Represented at:

(a) World Health Assembly in Minneapolis.

(b) Sixth International Congress on Tropical Medicine and Malaria in Lisbon.

(c) International Conference on Organization of Community Development in Tripoli.

(d) Sixth Meeting of International Scientific Committee for Trypanosomiasis Research in Brussels.

(e) Eighth International Students' Conference in Peru.

15. Ghana Film Unit Productions shown at Film Festival in Russia.

16. Issue of special stamps commemorating 150th birthday anniversary of Abraham Lincoln.

17. Assistance by WHO and UNICEF in battle against diseases.

18. Opening of new blind vocational training center.

19. Extension to supplies of water, electricity, railways, telephone, medical supplies, and other services to many parts of the country.

20. Construction of bridges, trunk and feeder roads.

21. Venue of International Rally of Girl Scouts.

22. New policy to enable more people to own houses.

23. Provision of primary schooling for all who wanted it.

24. Expansion of middle (similar to junior high) school system.

25. Increase in enrollments in secondary schools.

26. Improvement in existing teacher training colleges.

27. New buildings at university college and college of technology.

28. Award of local and overseas scholarships.

29. Receipt of several offers of scholarships from other countries to commemorate attainment of independence.

30. Recognition of Ghana Red Cross Society by International Committee of Red Cross Societies in Geneva.

31. Furthering of new and better ways of rural life in raising of living standards through community development.

The Farm Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CHARLES S. GUBSER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 4, 1959

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, the national farm price support programs are being closely scrutinized, and rightly so. These programs have failed to fulfill their purpose.

Price support and acreage control had their beginnings more than 20 years ago. Despite some changes, the basic legislation governing these programs is still the Agricultural Act of 1938. No wonder these programs are now outmoded. They have been rendered obsolete by the technological revolution in agriculture.

These outmoded programs have piled surplus on surplus and cost on cost until the Government investment in farm commodities will shortly be $10 billion or more. In the coming fiscal year the cost of storage, transportation, and interest on our Government holdings of surplus farm commodities, accumulated under the old outmoded programs, will exceed $1 billion.

Despite these huge expenditures, agriculture has been harmed not helped by the operations of these programs. Farmers have lost markets for cotton, wheat, corn, tobacco, peanuts, rice, and some dairy products. Dislocations have been caused in the whole agricultural economy. Producers have been subjected to increasing controls and regimentation. As Government has interfered more and more in agriculture, the farmer has had less and less to say about what, where, and how he shall plant.

These defects in the programs have become more and more apparent in recent years. But what has been less apparent—though perhaps most damaging in the long run—has been the extent to which the old outmoded, costly, and harmful farm programs have discriminated against the vast majority of our farmers in favor of producers of a few crops on a comparatively few big farms.

Yes; the old farm programs, whether by design or accident, have been unfair to the great majority of American family farmers. They have channeled most of the vast expenditure of Federal funds in the direction of the big farms, including the corporation farms, the factory farms.

And it is high time that the blame for this sad situation be placed where it belongs.

These programs stem back to the 1930's—and the leadership of the 1930's. They have been changed by various amendments over the past 20 years—but the amendments did not remove the fundamental discrimination against the majority of farmers that is inherent in the programs. On the contrary, efforts to remedy defects in the programs have met the tooth-and-nail opposition of the same political leadership that sponsored these programs more than 30 years ago.

The irony of it is that this same political leadership poses as the friend of agriculture—and in particular as the friend of the small farmer. How their hearts bleed for the low-income farmer—but how they drag their heels and struggle and kick and fight when they are asked to do anything practical to help him.

Let me cite chapter and verse.

In his agricultural message of January 11, 1954, President Eisenhower said:

> No single program can apply uniformly to the whole farm industry. Some farm products are perishable, some are not; some farms consume the products of other farms; some foods and fibers we export, some we import. A comprehensive farm program must be adaptable to these and other differences, and yet not penalize one group of farmers in order to benefit another.

Then, turning specifically to the problems of those families on small farms, the President said:

> The chief beneficiaries of our price support policies have been the 2 million larger, highly mechanized farming units which produce about 85 percent of our agricultural output. The individual production of the remaining farms, numbering about 3,500,000, is so small that the farmer derives little benefit from price supports. During 1954 the Secretary of Agriculture, in cooperation with the National Agricultural Advisory Commission, will give further special attention to the problems peculiar to small farmers.

As a result of that recommendation the rural development program was inaugurated 1 year later. It was the first attempt of this nature in the history of the Nation to make a broad attack on the problems of the small farmer, the farmer who had been largely passed over not only by the technological revolution but by the price support programs. Yes; it was the first real attempt to do something about the forgotten man in American agriculture.

After careful study, clear-cut recommendations for attacking the problems of low income farm families were submitted to the Congress. Although these recommendations for legislation and appropriations were extremely modest, they were adopted only in part. And they were even ridiculed by some who pose as saviors of agriculture.

In his agricultural message of January 9, 1956, the President included a strong plea for adoption of the full rural development program. He concluded this plea with these words:

> Not only the welfare of these families but also of the people as a whole require that this program go forward. Once again, therefore, I urge the Congress to enact the full program recommended in my message of April 26, 1955.

The budget requested at that time for the rural development program for the upcoming fiscal year was less than $4 million. The amount appropriated was less than $2.6 million.

Here is a program of practical aid to underemployed farmers who desire to continue in agriculture. In cooperation with States and localities, the rural development program offers research,

education, supervised credit, and cost-sharing by the Federal Government in improving land, timber, and water resources. Farm and home improvements are a major part of the program.

For those who wish to supplement or replace limited farm incomes with greater income from nonfarm sources, the program helps to establish vocational training in trades and skills. It helps set up additional industries in farming areas where more employment and higher incomes are needed. Under this program farm families are informed of job opportunities in other segments of the economy.

Yet, even to this day the rural development program has not received the support in expression of interest and appropriations from the majority party in the Congress that the program so richly deserves. This is the fundamental reason why the rural development program is now going forward in only about 100 counties out of approximately 3,000 counties in the entire country. If the desire of the majority party is really to improve the lot of small family farmers, why is there not greater support of the rural development program?

And why is there such last ditch opposition to needed changes in the old, outmoded, costly, unfair, and harmful farm programs?

In his agricultural message of January 16, 1958, President Eisenhower pressed these issues again:

There are millions of rural people—

He said—

who, for reasons of small farms, poor soils, limited resources, age, inadequate credit, lack of education, poor health, or insufficient managerial ability, have been unable to make the adjustments called for by modern technology.

Few of the dollars spent on agricultural programs have been of appreciable help to this group.

Price supports have scant meaning to a farmer with little to sell.

Reductions in acreage to support higher prices are contrary to the needs of a farmer whose production is already too small to give him a proper livelihood.

The majority party responded by passing a bill to freeze agriculture in the mold of the old discriminatory programs.

The President vetoed this freeze bill—this bonanza to the few at the expense of the many.

And now this year, on January 29, he pointed out the discriminatory nature of the old programs more clearly than ever before.

There are produced, in the United States, some 250 farm commodities. The law requires that prices of 12 of these be supported. Three of the 12—wheat, corn, and cotton—account for 85 percent of the Government inventory of price-supported commodities, but they produce only 20 percent of the total cash farm income.

Is such a program fair to producers of other commodities? Obviously it is not.

But this is only part of the discrimination. Nearly a million and a half farms produce wheat. Ninety percent of the dollars spent for price support on wheat go to two-fifths of these farms—the largest ones. Actually 140,000 wheat producers account for more of the price-support cost than all the other 1¼ million combined.

Nearly a million farms produce cotton. Seventy-five percent of the dollars spent for cotton price support go to about one-fourth of these farms—the largest ones.

For rice producers it is the same story—one-fourth of the growers have three-fourths of the allotment.

For corn—28 percent of the growers have 65 percent of the allotment.

About 900,000 producers of wheat, corn, cotton, and rice—out of 4½ million farmers—account for most of the price support expenditures.

For wheat producers who have allotments of 100 acres or more, the net budgetary expenditures for price support this fiscal year average about $7,000 per farm.

For cotton producers who have allotments of 100 acres or more, expenditures average $10,000 per farm.

For rice producers who have allotments of 100 acres or more, expenditures also average $10,000 per farm.

Where is the principle of fairness in such a program? How does this help the small producer—the man and his family who really need help?

We are spending in price support programs of various kinds over $5 billion this fiscal year—to subsidize production by comparatively few farm operators—the operators of the larger farms, the more productive farms, the more prosperous farms.

Relatively small numbers of farms—usually those with the highest income—account for the greatest proportion of these Government price support outlays.

In his message of January 29, 1959, President Eisenhower recommended changes in the price support programs—changes that would make the level of supports more realistic—changes that would recognize the existence of the technological revolution—changes that would serve the best interests of agriculture and the whole Nation.

He urged that price supports no longer be related to a standard 25 years old, but to a percentage of the average market price during the previous 3 years.

He recognized that the Congress might still prefer to relate price supports to parity standards. If so, he urged that discretion be provided for establishing the level of support in accordance with guidelines fixed by law. This is what is now done for all commodities except the few for which supports are mandatory.

The recommended program would give growers more freedom to produce and compete for markets.

It would eliminate some of the unfairness of the present programs.

Let us remember that the majority of farm families have received little or no benefit from these programs. Most of agriculture is operated without price supports. There are no supports on cattle, hogs, poultry, eggs, fruits, and vegetables. Producers want no supports on these products.

We need more freedom in agriculture. The commercial farmers of the United States will do a better job of shifting production in answer to economic conditions than the Government can do for them under rigid formulas.

Our problems are difficult, but they are not impossible to solve.

Adoption of the President's recommendations will result in sounder price and acreage programs.

Expansion of the rural development program will help low-income producers make the adjustments necessary to sound permanent progress.

The interest of this administration in the family farmer and our efforts to improve opportunities for a higher standard of living on the small farms of the Nation is indicated by many other actions.

Loan programs have been substantially improved and expanded. This has enabled many more farmers to acquire family sized farms and to make needed improvements in their farms and their homes. Family type farms received loans totaling $170 million in fiscal 1958, compared to $130 million in fiscal 1953. Farm ownership loans totaled more than $50 million in fiscal 1958, compared to less than $30 million in fiscal 1953.

After being out in the cold 19 years, farm families and farm workers were made eligible for the benefits of social-security protection.

More loans for the expansion and improvement of rural electrification and telephones have been made available, and at a faster rate, than ever before.

Conservation has been speeded up and streamlined. More conservation has been applied in the past few years than at any time in history. Limitations are in effect on the total conservation payments that can be earned on a single farm.

These actions indicate who has the interest of the family farmers at heart—and which party is actually the party of the big farm, the corporate farm, the factory farm.

Let us pin the tail where it belongs.

Dr. Flemming's Formula

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEE METCALF

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 4, 1959

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, Secretary Flemming, of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, has brought to Congress a new proposal which he says will help meet the shortage of more than 140,000 classrooms. However, in order to build the 75,000 classrooms Dr. Flemming says will be built under his formula for Federal aid, State constitutional and statutory debt limits will have to be revised and basic tax concepts of many States will have to be changed.

Dr. Flemming should devote his considerable talents to other national programs which are in trouble. The United

States lags behind the Soviet Union in ability to put heavy loads of instruments into space. He could offer a wealth of ideas to solve this problem. He could announce a new ratio of translation between Soviet kilograms and American pounds, which by a simple shift of two decimal points could make the United States payloads heavier than the Soviet performance. Better yet would be to abolish the law of gravity by Executive order, applicable only within the confines of U.S. launching areas. Then we could send our battleships on good will cruises to the moon.

Either of these proposals should be minor problems to an official of the executive branch who cannot see the difficulties in other jurisdictions. A simple edict should suffice, and if the Russians do not see things his way, that is only what should be expected of backward people.

Maryland Voluntary Weather Observers Praised

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN R. FOLEY
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 4, 1959

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, the Weather Bureau of the Department of Commerce recently issued a special edition of the Weather Bureau's daily weather map in honor of 21 veterans of the nationwide corps of about 7,000 cooperative volunteer weather observers who take and record weather observations every day of the year without compensation.

Among the 21 veteran volunteers—those who have taken weather observations daily for more than 50 years—Maryland is the only State in the Union that can claim two of these distinguished citizens as her sons. And, it happens that the Sixth Congressional District of Maryland is the only congressional district in which two of these honored volunteers reside. I refer to Mr. D. Paul Oswald, of Hagerstown, Md., who has been a weather observer for 57 years, and Mr. Ralph E. Weber, of Oakland, Md., who has served for 56 years.

Dr. F. W. Reichelderfer, Chief of the Weather Bureau, in praising the work of these remarkable senior citizens said that without the daily records of these cooperative observers our knowledge of the climate of the United States would be meager. He added that this weather work is an outstanding example of people serving their Government without pay, and he thought their daily but unsung efforts merited the applause of their fellow citizens.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to include in my comments at this point a brief background statement on both Maryland veteran volunteer weather observers which was included in the Weather Bureau citation:

D. Paul Oswald was born March 15, 1886, on the family farm in Chewsville, Md. In May of 1898 his father consented to the establishment of a weather station at his home as a hobby and education for his sons. D. Paul Oswald began sending in weather observations in February 1902. In January 1948 he moved to Hagerstown, Md., where he still makes his daily observations at the weather station called Chewsville-Bridgeport, a combined name of the two stations he has operated. He was recently on the Science Program closed circuit television for Washington County schools, and has for decades provided weather facts to local newspapers and radio stations.

Ralph E. Weber, cooperative observer at Oakland, Md., since September 1903, has the second longest period of service of any present Maryland observer. He was born in March 1887 in Oakland, and has lived all his life on the family farm. Here he makes his daily weather observations, and here he read the lowest surface temperature ever recorded south of the Mason-Dixon line, 40 degrees below zero, on January 13, 1912.

And I want to add my own sincere congratulations and best wishes to these two distinguished gentlemen, on behalf of myself and the entire Nation. Their citation for special merit by the Weather Bureau is a great tribute to their dedicated and unselfish public service. They perform an invaluable and indispensable service to industry, commerce, agriculture, and national defense without fanfare and without sufficient public recognition of their service to the community.

In addition, Mr. Speaker, I should like to include in my comments part of a statement released by the Weather Bureau on February 26, 1959, which illustrates the kind of important function that these volunteer observers fulfill:

The help of cooperative weather observers to record the Nation's climate was started early in the last century, even before the Weather Bureau was established in 1891. Dozens of individuals who had been taking observations at scattered locations were urged by the new Weather Bureau to continue, and hundreds of additional citizens in all parts of the country and from all walks of life soon volunteered to make local weather observations and keep records of climatological data. More than 7,000 citizens now are taking weather observations without pay. The Weather Bureau furnishes observation instruments, such as rain gages and thermometers, and also supplies the record forms on which the observations are logged at least once daily. Observers are drawn from all ranks of life, and by their constant and faithful service have made available to all users an invaluable storehouse of weather data.

Each observer gives an average of about 15 minutes a day to take and record the observations, to answer numerous questions from neighbors in the community about the local weather, and to complete and mail the regular monthly reports. It is estimated that the total time contributed by each observer to the Government over a 50-year period amounts to about 600 8-hour workdays. The daily services of the thousands of voluntary observers would add up to about 80,000 full 8-hour days of work each year provided our citizens without cost.

In addition to the basic job of weather reporting, cooperative observers are occasionally invited to perform a wide variety of special reporting jobs. Some of these jobs in recent years include (a) reporting dates of the stages of development of various plants to assist in special agricultural studies, (b) telephoning special reports to designated collection centers to assist research work on the development and forecasting of tornadoes, and (c) reporting on the accuracy of weather forecasts.

I think we can take renewed inspiration from the high-minded and public-spirited contribution to the Nation that is being made every day by Mr. Oswald and Mr. Weber and by the some 7,000 other Americans who make this important contribution to our knowledge of the weather.

SENATE

THURSDAY, MARCH 5, 1959

Rev. James Roy Smith, minister, Mount Olivet Methodist Church, Arlington, Va., offered the following prayer:

In this historic place, Almighty God, we pause a moment to ask Thy blessing ere we begin our day's work. Make us aware that Thou hast entrusted to this group the power of decision concerning the great issues of our day.

Create within them the awareness that without Thee they are not equal to the task. Make them mindful that the basis upon which they should govern is in accordance with the principles of truth, justice, and honor. Remind them constantly that Thou art the source of truth; Thou art the fount of justice; Thou art the standard of honor; in Thee is to be found their help.

Eternal God, who art the source of all need, the rule of all action, be especially with the Members of the Senate this day. Give them wisdom for their thinking, patience for their problems, understanding for their dealing in human relations, courage for their decisions, and satisfaction for their work. Deliver them from any cowardice that turns its back on new truth, from any complacency that is content with half-truth, and from any pride that thinks it knows all the truth. Make them aware that they best serve their country and their people by keeping themselves close to Thee. Help them to live above the clamor of the crowd, so that they may hear Thy "still, small voice" and follow its message. May this be their guide today and every day. In Thy name we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, March 2, 1959, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, notified the Senate that, pursuant to the provisions of section 8002 of the Internal Revenue Code of

1954, Mr. MILLS, of Arkansas, chairman, Committee on Ways and Means, had appointed Mr. MASON, of Illinois, as a member of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation, on the part of the House, to fill a vacancy thereon.

The message announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 75. An act providing for the design of the flag of the United States;

H.R. 1992. An act to repeal section 791 of title 18 of the United States Code so as to extend the application of chapter 37 of title 18, relating to espionage and censorship;

H.R. 2339. An act to revise, codify, and enact into law, title 39 of the United States Code, entitled "The Postal Service";

H.R. 2639. An act to amend section 2385, title 18, United States Code, to define the term "organize" as used in that section;

H.R. 2978. An act to amend section 1870 of title 28, United States Code, to authorize the district courts to allow additional peremptory challenges in civil cases to multiple plaintiffs as well as multiple defendants;

H.R. 2365. An act to authorize the crediting of certain service for purpose of retired pay for nonregular service, and for other purposes;

H.R. 3648. An act to regulate the handling of student funds in Indian schools operated by the Bureau of Indian Affairs, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 4413. An act to provide improved opportunity for promotion for certain officers in the naval service, and for other purposes.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles and referred as indicated:

H.R. 75. An act providing for the design of the flag of the United States;

H.R. 1992. An act to repeal section 791 of title 18 of the United States Code so as to extend the application of chapter 37 of title 18, relating to espionage and censorship;

H.R. 2339. An act to revise, codify, and enact into law, title 39 of the United States Code, entitled "The Postal Service";

H.R. 2639. An act to amend section 2385, title 18, United States Code, to define the term "organize" as used in that section; and

H.R. 2978. An act to amend section 1870 of title 28, United States Code, to authorize the district courts to allow additional peremptory challenges in civil cases to multiple plaintiffs as well as multiple defendants; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3365. An act to authorize the crediting of certain service for purpose of retired pay for nonregular service, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 4413. An act to provide improved opportunity for promotion for certain officers in the naval service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 3648. An act to regulate the handling of student funds in Indian schools operated by the Bureau of Indian Affairs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

LIMITATION OF DEBATE DURING MORNING HOUR

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, under the rule, there will be the usual morning hour; and I ask unanimous consent that statements made in connection therewith be limited to 3 minutes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the American Republics Affairs Subcommittee of the Committee on Foreign Relations, and the Rural Electrification Administration Subcommittee of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry were authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare was authorized to meet in executive session during the session of the Senate today.

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the Antitrust Subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to consider executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

CONVENTION WITH CUBA FOR CONSERVATION OF SHRIMP—REMOVAL OF INJUNCTION OF SECRECY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the injunction of secrecy be removed from Executive B, 86th Congress, 1st session, a convention between the United States of America and Cuba for the conservation of shrimp, signed at Habana, on August 15, 1958, and that the convention, together with the message from the President, may be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and that the President's message may be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The message from the President is as follows:

To the Senate of the United States:

With a view to receiving the advice and consent of the Senate to ratification, I transmit herewith a convention between the United States of America and Cuba for the conservation of shrimp, signed at Habana on August 15, 1958.

I transmit also, for the information of the Senate, the report by the Acting Secretary of State with respect to the convention.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *March 5, 1959.*

(Enclosures: (1) Report of the Acting Secretary of State; (2) convention for the conservation of shrimp, signed at Habana on August 15, 1958.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. FULBRIGHT, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

James W. Riddleberger, of Virginia, to be Director of the International Cooperation Administration, in the Department of State; and

Lampton Berry, of Mississippi, and sundry other persons, for promotion in the Foreign Service.

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

Rollin D. Barnard, of Colorado, to be an Assistant Postmaster General;

Geraldine T. Forbus, to be postmaster at Kellyton, Ala.;

George T. Hara, to be postmaster at Honolulu, T.H.; and

Virgil S. Davis, to be postmaster at Anaconda, Mont.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there be no further reports of committees, the nominations on the calendar will be stated.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Robert J. Dodds, Jr., of Pennsylvania, to be General Counsel of the Department of Commerce.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

FEDERAL AVIATION AGENCY

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Elwood R. Quesada, of California, to be Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this nomination go over for the time being.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The nomination will be passed over.

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of James Tolman Pyle, of Maryland, to be Deputy Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Charles A. Webb, of Virginia, to be an Interstate Commerce Commissioner for a term of 7 years expiring December 31, 1965.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of George N. Sundquist, of Wisconsin, to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 36, with headquarters at Duluth, Minn., to fill an existing vacancy.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

U.S. COAST GUARD

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the U.S. Coast Guard.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that these nominations be considered en bloc.

The PRESIDENT pro temproe. Without objection, the nominations will be considered en bloc; and, without objection, they are confirmed.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of all these nominations.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina subsequently said: Mr. President, I desire at this time to present two reports on nominations from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

Mr. President, the nominations of Roger W. Jones to be Chairman of the Civil Service Commission and Rollin D. Barnard to be Assistant Postmaster General for Facilities were unanimously approved by the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service on Tuesday, March 3.

Mr. President, the term of the former Chairman of the Civil Service Commission, Harris Ellsworth, expired last Saturday, February 28, and as a result the Commission is currently operating under the supervision of two Commissioners, one of whom is Acting Chairman. There was an unavoidable delay in the confirmation of Mr. Jones, and since the nominee cannot take office until after he has been confirmed by the Senate, I now ask unanimous consent that his nomination be considered at this time.

Mr. President, I have consulted with the majority leader and with the minority leader, and the request has been cleared on both sides.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from South Carolina? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I have no objection to the confirmation of the nomination.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will state the nomination.

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Roger W. Jones to be Chairman of the Civil Service Commission.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination?

The nomination was confirmed.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of the nomination.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, the Senate has just confirmed the nomination of Roger W. Jones to be a member of the Civil Service Commission. I wish to commend President Eisenhower for sending to the Senate the nomination of Mr. Jones to this important position.

Mr. Jones is a career service employee. He began his service with the Federal Government in 1923. He has held many positions in the Federal Government. He is familiar with the operation of the Government. His background and his present position in the Government, together with his many years of service, not only make him familiar with the problems of the Federal Government's employees, but enable him to render outstanding service in seeing to it that the administrative section of the Government is in good hands.

Mr. President, in November 1953, a very splendid article regarding Mr. Jones was published in Fortune magazine. The article was entitled "This Is a Bureaucrat." I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed at this point in the RECORD, in connection with my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THIS IS A BUREAUCRAT

(By Katharine Hamill)

"President Eisenhower today signed 20 bills into law. * * * The legislation was flown from Washington and General Eisenhower penned his signature to them shortly after he arrived at his office at 8 a.m., MST." (Associated Press dispatch from Denver, Aug. 12, 1953.)

The Associated Press correspondent neglected to report that before penning his signature the President read through a letter attached to each bill, a letter summarizing the intention of the bill, its background, and meaning, noting approval or objection from Government agencies concerned with the legislation, and ending with a recommendation from the Budget Bureau for approval or veto. The letters were addressed to "My Dear Mr. President," signed "Respectfully yours, Roger W. Jones, Assistant Director for Legislative Reference."

Roger Warren Jones is a bureaucrat, a paper pusher, a civil servant. Like most of the other 234,000 civilian employees in Washington, he is almost unknown to the public he has served faithfully and well for 20 years. His job in the Budget Bureau as Assistant Director for Legislative Reference is close to the top in civil-service rating, but he is not unrepresentative of many others in the service who devote themselves to running the Government agencies and bureaus regardless of party politics and changes in administration. In his 20 years' service Jones, now 45, has risen from CAF (clerical, administrative, and fiscal) 5 with a salary of $2,000 a year to GS (general schedule) 17 with a salary of $13,400. He heads a staff of 22 legislative analysts, clerks, and stenographers. As one of the major subdivisions of the Budget Bureau, Legislative Reference is part of the Executive Office of the President; Jones and his aids are members of the President's staff. Their functions are to review and analyze all proposed legislation in order to determine its conformity with the President's program and its fiscal impact; to summarize and appraise all bills passed by Congress for the President's information before he takes action; to study all Executive orders and proclamations with an eye to avoiding duplication and confusion. The office is, in short, a clearinghouse for legislation, before and after it is acted upon by Congress. "We try to determine," says Jones, "whether a measure is right or wrong, whether it fits in with the President's overall program, and whether we have the money to pay for it."

In a normal year Jones and his staff process some 5,500 requests and reports from Congress and the agencies, about 1,000 enrolled bills (legislation passed by Congress), and 100 Executive orders and proclamations. The processing is sometimes long-drawn and involved, with dozens of memorandums and letters written in formidable federalese. ("We have to use it to avoid misunderstanding," says Jones. "It's the common language of all Government agencies.") A controversial bill may end up with an inch or more of superimposed paper, may have been the subject of days of conference and discussion as well as research and study. The peakload of work comes at the end of each session of Congress when the legislators push through a big last-minute batch of bills. At the close of the 1st session of the 83d Congress last August, for example, 207 bills (out of the session's total of 515) were passed in the last few days and had to be processed in Jones' office and rushed to President Eisenhower for action within the prescribed 10 days.

On the day before President Eisenhower left for Denver, Jones crossed the street from his office in the old State Department Building to the White House with 72 bills and his 72 covering letters. He stood by with the President's special counsel, Bernard M. Shanley, for an hour and a half to answer questions while the President read and signed. ("He's quick minded. He seems to know what's in the third paragraph before he finishes the second.") In the next week several packets were sent out to Denver by plane, and on the morning before the 10-day deadline Jones ducked across the street with the last 15 bills and turned them over to Shanley, who flew to Denver with them that afternoon.

JONES PROPOSES, IKE DISPOSES

The President, naturally, does not base his decision to approve or disapprove solely on the recommendation of Roger W. Jones, but the summaries and recommendations save his time and facilitate his decision. "It's a great satisfaction, of course, to know our staff work helps him," says Jones. In presenting routine bills to the President, Bernard Shanley groups them according to subject (veterans' benefits, etc.), and introduces them with a verbal report. Such bills are usually quickly signed. More complex or controversial legislation requires more consultation, and may involve policy conferences at the White House. Jones has nothing to do with that. "We do the pro and con, the institutional review. We recommend, but the President and his staff make policy decisions."

When Congress adjourns, the immediate pressure that keeps Jones and his aids working hard and late is off, but there is pending legislation to be reviewed before Congress reconvenes and a constant stream of reports and queries from the agencies coming into the office. (All departments and agencies are required to submit to the Bureau their proposed legislation and reports on bills pending in Congress; congressional committees are not bound by law to consult the Bureau, but many do.) Jones and his staff report on 100 to 150 cases a week all through the year.

Usually about half the legislation enacted is composed of so-called private bills, acts setting aside a section of the Immigration Act to allow the entrance of specific persons, for instance, or acts awarding land patents or veterans' benefits. These are minor bills, but their merits must be closely studied in Jones' office. They must be checked with the Department of State and the Immigration Service or with the Department of the Interior or the Veterans' Administration. Part of Jones' value is that he knows where to check, whom to call, what channels to move through. That is common bureaucratic

knowledge, acquired by long years of service. More important values are Jones' administrative ability and his grasp of the whole legislative program. We're right in the middle of the whole panorama of government. It's a nerve-center operation.

Department and agency men are, necessarily, special pleaders for their own bills, and so are Congressmen. Jones and his staff must review legislation in relation to the general policies of the administration—regardless of the administration's politics or the President's personality. Jones, as he says, is a liberal New England Republican, but that doesn't make him work any more conscientiously now than he did during the Democratic regime. In that respect he resembles the classic conception of a British civil servant. The President is an institution, Jones says; partisan politics don't affect the consideration of most legislation. Politics don't affect Jones' judgment of legislation. Neither have they affected his career in government under Franklin Roosevelt, Harry Truman, and Dwight Eisenhower.

PAPER PUSHER'S DAY

Jones' wide desk in the big, high-ceilinged office in Old State is usually heaped with papers and there are half a dozen blue telephone-call slips stuck on his desk pen when he gets to work at 9. He has been up since 6:30, had a leisurely breakfast, spent three-quarters of an hour reading the Washington Post, and listened to a local broadcast so he can plan his day around any legislative crises. He has driven in from Chevy Chase with his car-pool members (three other Budget Bureau officials) and talked business during the half-hour drive. The first 15 minutes in the office are spent assigning reports on bills to his lieutenants and putting the day's work in motion. There is a staff meeting (the directors and his assistants) at 9:15 every morning.

Staff problems are discussed at the meeting in Mr. Dodge's office at the other end of the long corridor ("saves writing a lot of memos") and Jones gets back to his own room at ten. There are agency reports to read, proposed legislation, requests for information from congressional committees. There is a call from a department's legislative-liaison man, John Adams of Defense, say, or Carl Sapp of Agriculture, or John Carlock of Treasury. One of the department's proposed bills may have come back from Jones's office with a note "not in accord with the President's program" and the liaison man wants to talk it over, to find out just where the difficulty lies so he can try to straighten it out in the department.

At 1 o'clock Jones goes downstairs to the executive cafeteria with two or three other bureau staff members. Over lunch (a salad, maybe, iced tea, and a piece of pie—55 cents) the men talk over problems that have come up during the morning. After lunch, staff members come into Jones's office with the mail, questions are asked about specific reports, decisions made orally to save time. Later, Jones goes across the street to the White House with a briefcase full of papers for Mr. Shanley. Shanley may have questions on pending legislation or on some of the enrolled bills that have to be signed within the next few days. (Except at the rush time when Congress adjourns, Jones tries to send enrolled bills to the President 5 days before he must act upon them.) Another member of the White House staff may ask to see Jones on the wording of an Executive order. Jones may want to check a point of presidential policy with one of the staff.

Back in his own office at 4:30, Jones finds a batch of calls from congressional-committee members and agencies and he is on the telephone most of the rest of the day, except on Thursday, when there is a general top-staff meeting with the director. Official quitting time is 5:30, "but we make no effort to keep it." Jones gets away between 6:00 and 6:30, half the time with a briefcase under his arm.

Jones is happy doing what he is doing, he feels qualified for the job, "although there are days when nothing falls into place and I scream inside," and he can't help knowing he does his job well. Not only Director Dodge and Deputy Director Rowland Hughes think highly of him ("Jones is excellent * * * outstanding"), but so do the department liaison men, White House officials, and his own staff.

There were times when congressional committeemen or department officials resented what they termed the "undue influence" of the Bureau of the Budget on legislation, but that is mostly in the past and most of them now rely on Jones and his staff.

BLAMED BOTH WAYS

Back in 1950, when called before the House Select Committee of Lobbying Activities, Jones testified that "the net effect of the legislative operation of the Budget Bureau has sometimes been construed as an interference with the direct relationship of executive agencies with the Congress, or with the committees of the Congress. On that, I should like to be very categorical.

"Every President of the United States, beginning with President Harding and coming straight down through President Truman, has taken exactly the same position with respect to this Budget Bureau function—that it was not the function of the Budget Bureau in any way to censor the reports of agencies, or to tell them what they might or might not say to committees of Congress. The Bureau's sole role has been to indicate to the agencies the relationship of what they had to say, or the measure they were opposing or advocating, to the President's program. It is perfectly appropriate for the Chief Executive to require that in transmitting a report to the Congress the agency should clearly indicate what the relationship of the measure was to the President's program, or what the relationship of their views with respect to it were."

"The CHAIRMAN. Are you not apt to get blamed both ways, usually by the same group of people, for not having a unified policy on the one hand and having a strict disciplinary policy on the other?

"Mr. JONES. That is correct, but that is pretty much the role of the Budget Bureau straight across the board, and we are, frankly, rather used to it."

Another annoyance that Jones is rather used to is the ridicule, sometimes vilification, of "bureaucrats" by the press and public. He is used to it, but still it makes him angry. That and the jibe "you never had to meet a payroll." He admits that it would be comparatively easy to do a routine job, to push the papers around to the proper departments and let it go at that. But he doesn't want to. In fact, being the kind of man he is, he couldn't.

SOLID NEW ENGLANDER

Roger Jones came to his civil service job by chance, and had been in it 15 years before he realized fully, that it was a career and he was a career man. But it was not by chance that he became a public servant. His inheritance and training had a lot to do with that.

He was born on February 3, 1908, in New Hartford, Conn., a small town 20 miles northwest of Hartford. His father, Henry Roger Jones, Jr., now the elder statesman of New Hartford, was practicing law in those days and running the local weekly, the New Hartford Tribune. The Jones family had been in New England since 1635, and Roger's mother, Eleanor Drake Jones, was old Connecticut, too. The son grew up in a strong New England Congregationalist atmosphere, with 10 generations of Yankee citizens behind him.

After going through local grade school and the Gilbert School in nearby Winsted, Roger was ready for Cornell (where his father had gone before), at 16. He was a good scholar, a battalion commander in the ROTC, and manager of the university musical clubs. After he was graduated with a B.A. in 1928, he spent a year teaching in the Coral Gables (Fla.) Military Academy. The next year he married Dorothy Heyl, Phi Beta Kappa, Cornell, 1929, daughter of a Washington physicist, Paul Renno Heyl. Dorothy was working for a degree in library science at Columbia University and Roger had a job selling books for Doubleday, Doran in New York. He considered going into publishing, but after the crash there wasn't much left to go into, and anyway he found publishing too competitive for his liking.

DEPRESSION YEARS

He decided that what he really liked was teaching American literature, particularly the literature of government and politics. He kept a part-time job with Doubleday while he took an M.A. at Columbia in 1931, and then quit the job to study full time for his doctorate. But life was hard in 1932; he couldn't afford to stay at Columbia, no teaching jobs were open, and his wife was going to have a baby. They went to New Hartford to live with his parents. Roger helped in his father's law office, and got an occasional tutoring job. He was unhappy, even bitter, about a society that wouldn't allow a man to earn a living in his chosen profession. After their first child, Cynthia, was born, the Joneses stayed on in New Hartford long enough to save a small amount of money. With that and a loan, Roger set out for Washington in the fall of 1933 to study in the Library of Congress for his doctor's dissertation. His ambition was to "bridge the gap between belles-lettres and political literature."

It was hard to keep going financially, though, and when his wife's brother-in-law recommended Roger for a temporary job with the Central Statistical Board, he was glad to take it. Jones's job, helping to write a report on the activities of the board, was to last a month, pay him about $200. When the month was up he was offered a 6-month appointment by the board to work on administrative aspects of the general task of coordinating Federal statistics. He needed the money and he thought that practical experience in the Government would be valuable later in academic work. Also, he began to be interested in a government that came down to the level of people's lives through the New Deal programs.

The first appointment was followed by another 6-month stretch. He was classified CAF grade 5, which was automatic for college graduates, at a salary of $2,000 a year, less a 15-percent economy cut. In January 1935 he accepted a regular appointment from the board, expecting to stay for a year or so and accumulate a nest egg so he could continue working for his doctorate. He was an assistant executive officer and in 5 years he rose from CAF–5 to 7 to 9 to 11, taking the civil-service examinations to stay in good standing although he had been classified in the beginning by statutory procedure.

In 1939 the Central Statistical Board was placed in the Bureau of the Budget, which at the same time was moved from Treasury to the Executive Office—where it remains. Jones decided to leave and go back to his studies. Harold D. Smith, then the new Director of the Budget, asked him to stay on to help pull together the Bureau's administrative work. He was made administrative officer, CAF–12, salary $4,600.

WAR YEARS

In addition to his administrative duties for the Bureau, Jones had a hand in setting

up some of the defense organizations before World War II, notably the Office of Facts and Figures under General Donovan. Ever since his ROTC days at Cornell, he had been in the Army Reserve and spent 2 weeks each year in summer training. At Pearl Harbor time he was a Reserve captain of Infantry. He expected regular duty, but Harry Hopkins and Isador Lubin, who were establishing the Munitions Assignments Board, knew Jones' aptitude for staff work and arranged to have him ordered to duty with the Combined Chiefs of Staff, assigned to the board. He stayed there throughout the war, working with American and British officers on munitions pooling and assignment. He worked long, hard hours, rose from captain to major to lieutenant colonel to colonel. The strain caught up with him in 1944 and he was ill for several months, but at the end of the war he was back helping to liquidate the board. For his services he was awarded the Legion of Merit and the Order of the British Empire. Harold Smith asked the Army to release him in 1945 and he went back to Budget to take a hand in liquidating other war agencies. He went back at his pre-war rating, CAF 13, at $6,440 a year. And he still thought he would quit soon to finish his doctorate and go into teaching.

The Joneses had three children, Cynthia, born in 1933, Roger, Jr., born in 1935, and Edward Chapman, born in 1940. They lived in a rented house in Chevy Chase. The family spent the summer in a house they owned in New Hartford, where Jones joined them for his vacation of 26 working days or 5 weeks a year. He still felt more at home in Connecticut than in Washington, and he made a point of keeping in touch with people there, and reading the local weekly so that he wouldn't become "insular or ivory-towerish" in his bureaucratic job. In 1946, after Harold Smith resigned and James E. Webb was made Director of the Budget, Jones was put to work on special assignments (CAF–14) for the bureau's Estimates Division. A year later he was made assistant to the Director for Legislative Liaison (CAF–15), which meant that he was in charge of Bureau contacts with Congress. He spent much of his time on the Hill and became familiar with the workings of House and Senate committees. (Today, Jones seldom sees individual Congressmen. His work is with Congress and he wants to keep it impersonal.)

THE WAY UP

The next step, in 1948, made him Deputy Chief of Legislative Reference. At the same time he began to realize that he was no closer to taking that doctorate than he had been in 1933, that he might as well face the fact that he was not a teacher but a career man in government service. The pay wasn't high, but it was more than he might have made teaching, and there was security in it for himself and his family. He was close to the civil service top and since it was a nonpolitical job he was unlikely to lose it under a new boss or a new administration.

The Joneses sold their New Hartford house and made a substantial down payment on the house they now live in in Chevy Chase. Before long, in 1949, Jones was made chief of the office (his present job). When supergrades were created by law, his job was classified grade 17, which then had a salary of $12,200. The succeeding Directors of the Bureau, Frank Pace and Frederick J. Lawton, kept him on, and when the Republicans came in last January, Joseph M. Dodge, the new Director, made it clear that he wanted everyone except the political appointees at the top to go on working as usual. Mr. Dodge (see "The Banker in the Budget Bureau," Fortune, March 1953) is more involved in the administration's general policymaking than former directors have been and he leaves the second-string jobs in the hands of his assistants. Jones is completely responsible for the work of his aids and for his own decisions; only when serious controversy arises with an agency does he go to the front office. His long administrative training and Army staff work (he learned a lot, he says, from the British on the Munitions Board) serve him well now.

The work of the office is categorized and each aid has charge of a segment. Jefferson Burris, for instance, is in charge of legislation dealing with commerce and finance, James Hyde for international and military affairs, Edward Bowers for enrolled bills (he also drafts most of the covering letters), Harry McKittrick for public works, etc. Mary Sabine, Jones' personal troubleshooter, has worked with him since the thirties; Ann Parshall, his secretary, was secretary to the two former chiefs of the office. Staff members think Jones is a fair and generous boss. "He tells you what he wants," says Mrs. Parshall, "but he lets you do it your own way." Morale is high, contrary to the prevailing climate in certain other Washington offices. Some 40,000 Government people have been fired and another 40,000 vacances have not been filled since the start of the Eisenhower administration; many civil service workers can't be sure of their jobs from one day to another. The Budget Bureau, with comparatively few employees, most of them specialists in the higher grades, has not had severe cutbacks and the offices along the marble-floored corridors are quite calm. Jones' office, is, if anything, understaffed. The men think Jones himself works too hard. "We try to keep work away from him," says Jim Hyde. "We try to make our own decisions, but he keeps everything in his mind and always makes the final decisions."

MEMO TO JONES

Some of the things Jones keeps in his mind are indicated by a typical file attached to one bill signed by the President last August. It concerned legislation to improve factory inspection of food and drugs by removing the necessity of written permission from the factory. The correspondence began on December 29, 1952, under the Truman administration, with a letter from John L. Thurston, acting administrator of the Federal Security Agency, to Frederick Lawton, then Director of the Budget: "There are transmitted to you herewith four copies of a draft bill 'To protect the public health and welfare by restoring authority for factory inspections under the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act,' together with four copies of the proposed letter of transmittal to the Speaker of the House of Representatives. Please advise us as to the relationship of this proposed legislation to the program of the President."

The bill and letter were routed to Roger Jones and turned over by him to Earl Radley, his assistant in charge of legislation for labor, welfare, and education. Mr. Radley, in an office memorandum on January 14, 1953, proposed certain word changes and suggested the idea be developed "that from a budgetary standpoint inspection is the most inexpensive and practical method of regulation." The memo further noted that Mr. Jones already had checked Justice and telephoned a "no objection" clearance to Rufus Miles at FSA. The telephone conversation was confirmed by letter on January 15. The Treasury and the Federal Trade Commission were asked for opinions and returned "no comment" letters.

UNDER NEW ADMINISTRATION

On January 26 Senator H. Alexander Smith wrote Mr. Dodge, asking for a report on the bill, and the letter came to Jones's office. On March 2, Oveta Culp Hobby, the new administrator of FSA (later Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare), wrote Senator SMITH and Congressman WOLVERTON urging passage of the legislation (S. 835 and H.R. 2769), and 2 days later copies of these letters were sent to Jones with a covering note saying "These reports were cleared by telephone with Mr. Bowers of the Bureau by Mr. Ellenbogen of this Agency." On March 16 the Budget Bureau advised Senator SMITH that enactment of the legislation would be in accord with the President's program.

On July 20, Senator SMITH sent a revised bill, H.R. 5740, which had been passed by the House, to Mr. Dodge (Jones) asking for a report at the earliest possible moment. On July 24 there was a yellow memo from Ellenbogen in H.E.W. to Jones sending copies of the proposed report to the Senate committee, and asking for quick review. Miles, said the memo, would call. On July 27 there was a blue memo to Jones from Radley saying clearance was being rushed, with a penciled addition for the record, "Mr. Jones advised Rufus Miles NOB (no objection)." Another blue memo on the same date came from H.E.W.; the bill, it said, was not perfect, but would meet basic needs. On July 30, Lane of H.E.W. submitted Mrs. Hobby's recommendation to Roger Jones, "this report was cleared by telephone with you by Mr. Miles of this Department." On August 3 the bill was passed by the Senate.

FINAL PROCESSING

The next day Mr. Jones wrote Justice and HEW for their reports on the enrolled bill. On August 6, Justice replied that it had no objection, and Mrs. Hobby wrote to Mr. Dodge, "This is in response to Mr. Jones's letter of August 4. The legislation * * * may limit the inspection authority. * * * Whether and to what extent this legislative history may adversely affect enforcement of the law and indicate the desirability of amendatory legislation can only be determined on the basis of accumulated experience under the new law." Mrs. Hobby recommended that the bill be approved.

On August 7, Roger W. Jones wrote his covering letter to the President. The bill, he said, would provide basic inspection authority although it might not provide all the authority considered necessary. "The constitutionality of the proposed legislation was questioned during the course of its consideration by the Congress. We believe that the presumption of constitutionality attaching to measures passed by the Congress should be accorded to H.R. 5740 and that any question in this regard should be left to the judiciary." He pointed out that HEW recommended approval and that Justice interposed no objection. "In view of the urgent need for legislation to enable the Food and Drug Administration to carry on its inspection program, the Bureau of the Budget recommends that the bill be approved." The same day the bill was signed by President Eisenhower.

AT THE END OF THE DAY

Jones comes home from work about 6:30 in the evening, tired, with a clear conscience. After supper with the family, he and his wife may sit for awhile on the terrace by the fish pool out in the backyard or help Edward with his homework. Later Jones takes a look at the Evening Star and settles down to an hour's reading of reports or the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Perhaps he and his wife will go for a walk in the evening or take a drive or drop in on friends for a talk. They don't entertain often, don't like big cocktail parties or official affairs.

Jones doesn't have much time for reading; when he does, it is usually history or poetry, particularly Browning. ("I even play around with verse forms myself sometimes. Very relaxing.") He likes to garden, but doesn't have time to do more than keep up the lawn and shrubbery. When Congress is not in session, he has Saturday afternoons off and can catch up on such chores as getting his hair cut or having the car, a

1951 Chevrolet, greased. On Sundays there are the morning papers to read, church, dinner, a call on Mrs. Jones' mother and father. Occasionally Jones takes Edward to a baseball or football game in the afternoon. More often he takes a walk or works in the yard.

The house at 10 West Leland, a quiet, shady street in Chevy Chase, is unpretentious and comfortable. Edward, 13, is the only child at home now. Cynthia is married and has a daughter of her own. Roger Jr., went to Cornell as a freshman this year. Mr. and Mrs. Jones give time and energy to All Saints Church, the Community Chest, and the Washington Institute of Mental Hygiene, but Mrs. Jones is not content to be just a middle-aged do-gooder. She has put her library-science degree to work and has taken a part-time job with the Montgomery County Library. She likes it, and even a small addition to Jones' salary helps. She has a cleaning woman once a week, but does the rest of the work herself, the cooking and dusting and most of the washing and ironing.

BUDGETEER'S BUDGET

As might be expected, the Joneses keep a careful budget—and stick to it. From the $13,400 salary, $2,147.12 is deducted for income tax and $804 for retirement, leaving take-home pay of $10,448.88 a year. Ceilings have been fixed on regular recurrent items in the monthly budget. They total $706 a month and include college expenses for Roger Jr.; payment on the mortgage (now reduced to $9,000); an allowance of $1 a day for each member of the family for food (plus milk, eggs, and butter at $30 a month); utilities, cleaning, gas and oil for the car; church; newspapers, Edward's allowance; recreation, medical and dental bills. The Joneses allow $60 a month to meet all their clothing and other purchases from Washington stores. A repair-and-maintenance account of $30 a month is kept for the house. Jones allows himself $40 a month for personal expenses, including lunches.

When all these items are accounted for, there is left an annual balance of $1,976.88. This is reserved for paying bills that accrue on an annual basis. This year the balance is allocated as follows:

Life insurance	$536.00
Household and car insurance	166.00
House taxes	375.00
Maryland income tax	160.00
Federal income tax (in addition to the deducted tax)	200.00
Charities	150.00
Water	40.00
Car repair and upkeep	100.00
Reserve for contingencies	249.88
Total	1,976.88

So long as the boys are being educated and the house is being paid for, not much money will be left in the bank at the end of the year. But a good thing about a civil-service job is the security it offers. If Jones works another 10 years, as he intends to do, he can retire from Federal service at the age of 55 with an annual pension computed on the basis of 1½ percent for each year of service, figured on his highest 5 years' overall salary. After 30 years that will mean an annuity of something over $5,000. If he should die, Dorothy and the children would get a pension of half the annuity he had earned at the time of his death, plus his life insurance. The pension is one reason that he has turned down several offers of higher-paid positions in private industry. One reason. The others are that he likes his work and does it well. And above and beyond them all is his sense of duty. He is serving the President of the United States (whether a Democrat or a Republican) and the people of the United States to the best of his ability. And when he leaves the Government in 1963 he intends to go on serving, either as a teacher ("I feel I have an obligation to pass on to others what I have learned here") or in some local office ("I shall have done my duty at the Federal level, but I owe something to Connecticut and New Hartford, too"). If he can't get a teacher's post at Cornell, his first choice, or Wesleyan or the University of Connecticut, he probably will go back home and run for selectman or the legislature.

Roger Jones is pleasantly content with his life and work. He makes enough money to live comfortably and to educate his children and provide for the future. He is devoted to his family, and to his job. "God and the Government," he says, "have been very, very good to me."

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kansas yield to me?

Mr. CARLSON. I am glad to yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. KEATING. I served with Roger Jones during World War II, and came to know a great deal about his capabilities. So I am happy to join in commendation of the President for sending to the Senate the nomination of Mr. Jones, and to speak in the highest terms—as has the Senator from Kansas—of the outstanding record which I am sure Mr. Jones will make in his new position.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, the statement which has just been made by the junior Senator from New York is typical of the statements I have heard from everyone who has had the privilege of working with Mr. Jones during his many years of public service.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

AMERICANS WILL STAND FIRMLY BEHIND THE PRESIDENT IN SUPPORT OF AMERICAN POLICY

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, the President has told us that there is an easing on Russia's stand on Berlin. I believe this arises from the fact that America has demonstrated unity on this issue.

In my judgment, this country will continue to be united. The President will find—and Khrushchev will note—that Americans will stand firmly behind the President in support of American policy.

Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Texas is recognized.

COMMITTEE SERVICE

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, the majority leader has recommended the appointment of the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] to the Joint Economic Committee. This is a result of the increased majority membership, and is pursuant to the ratio provided for under Public Law No. 1. The recommendation is based upon discussions with various persons who are concerned.

The Joint Economic Committee is set up to be representative of the standing committees of the Senate. Senator KENNEDY, as a Democratic member of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, will fill an important gap.

It is also essential, in my opinion, that a Senator from the industrial east should serve on this committee.

This, I believe, will be a very fine appointment. Senator KENNEDY is experienced, able, and prudent. He can bring to the assignment not only his background from the Labor Committee, but also the knowledge he gained as a member of the Small Business Committee—a position which he gave up 2 years ago only because it was necessary to make room for other Senators in need of committee assignments.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the majority leader yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The law is quite specific—namely, that membership on the Joint Economic Committee shall conform, insofar as possible, to the party ratios in the Senate. This nomination is in pursuance not only of the law, but also of the discussion we have had. I think it consummates that action.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I thank the Senator from Illinois.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following communications and letters, which were referred as indicated:

REPORT ON COOPERATION OF THE UNITED STATES WITH MEXICO IN ERADICATION OF FOOT-AND-MOUTH DISEASE

A letter from the Under Secretary of Agriculture, reporting, pursuant to law, that during the month of January 1959 there have been no significant developments to report relating to the cooperative program of the United States with Mexico for the control and eradication of foot-and-mouth disease; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

REPORT ON PROPERTY ACQUISITIONS BY OFFICE OF CIVIL AND DEFENSE MOBILIZATION

A letter from the Director, Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization, Executive Office of the President, reporting, pursuant to law, on property acquisitions by that Office, for the quarter ended December 31, 1958; to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT OF SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION

A letter from the Administrator, Small Business Administration, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Administration, covering operations between July 1, 1958, and December 31, 1958 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORT ON LIQUIDATION OPERATIONS OF RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION

A letter from the Administrator, Small Business Administration, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the progress made in liquidating the assets formerly held by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation which were transferred to the Administrator of Small Business Administration, for the quarterly period ended September 30, 1958 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

EXCLUSION FROM GROSS INCOME AMOUNTS PAID BY THE UNITED STATES TO CERTAIN NONRESIDENT ALIEN EMPLOYEES

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legis-

lation to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to exclude from gross income amounts paid by the United States to certain nonresident alien employees or their beneficiaries (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Finance.

EXTENSION OF AUTHORITY FOR MAINTENANCE OF CERTAIN OFFICES IN THE REPUBLIC OF THE PHILIPPINES

A letter from the Administrator, Veterans' Administration, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to extend the authority of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to maintain offices in the Republic of the Philippines (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Finance.

REPORTS PRIOR TO RESTORATION OF BALANCES, U.S. SECRET SERVICE

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, two reports of the U.S. Secret Service covering restoration of balances withdrawn from appropriation and fund accounts under the control of the Treasury Department, as of February 9, 1959 (with accompanying reports); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT ON REVIEW OF LOAN GUARANTEE PROGRAM, CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on review of the loan guarantee program, Civil Aeronautics Board, dated June 30, 1958 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

AUDIT REPORT ON ABACA FIBER PROGRAM

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report on the Abaca fiber program administered by General Services Administration, fiscal year 1958 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

SPECIAL COMMISSION ON TELECOMMUNICATIONS

The President pro tempore laid before the Senate a communication from the President of the United States, addressed to the President of the Senate, recommending that the Congress establish a Special Commission on Telecommunications, to be composed of five members, appointed by the President; which was referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORT ON SALINE WATER DEMONSTRATION PLANTS

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, reporting, pursuant to law, on the construction and operation of saline water demonstration plants; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

PROPOSED CONCESSION CONTRACTS IN HOT SPRINGS NATIONAL PARK, ARK.

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a proposed concession contract with DeSoto Hotel and Baths, Inc., in Hot Springs National Park, Ark. (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a proposed concession contract with Jack Tar of Arkansas, Inc., in Hot Springs National Park, Ark. (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

AUTHORIZATION FOR COAST GUARD TO SELL CERTAIN SUPPLIES

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend title 14, United States Code, entitled "Coast Guard," to authorize the Coast Guard to sell supplies and furnish services not available from local sources to vessels and other watercraft to meet the necessities of such vessels and watercraft (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

ESTABLISHMENT OF COMMISSION ON TELECOMMUNICATION MANAGEMENT

A letter from the Director, Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization, Executive Office of the President, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to establish a commission to study and report on the U.S. telecommunication resource with special attention to the radio spectrum (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF CERTAIN ALIENS

Three letters from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of orders suspending deportation of certain aliens, together with a statement of the facts and pertinent provisions of law pertaining to each alien, and the reasons for ordering such suspension (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

AUDIT REPORT OF ARMY AND NAVY LEGION OF VALOR OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, INC.

A letter from the Navy Cross corporation agent, Army and Navy Legion of Valor of the United States of America, Inc., Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report of that corporation, for the period July 24, 1957, through July 17, 1958 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

CHANGE OF BASIS FOR FINANCING MILITARY SERVICE CREDITABLE UNDER RAILROAD RETIREMENT ACT AND SOCIAL SECURITY ACT

A letter from the Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Railroad Retirement Act and the Social Security Act to change the basis for financing military service creditable under these acts, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

RESTORATION OF AUTHORITY OF POSTMASTER GENERAL TO ADJUST CERTAIN POSTAGE RATES

A letter from the Postmaster General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to restore the authority of the Postmaster General to adjust the postage rates for airmail weighing in excess of 8 ounces, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Montana; to the Committee on Appropriations:

"HOUSE JOINT MEMORIAL 2

"Joint memorial of the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Montana to the President of the United States, Dwight D. Eisenhower; Senator James E. Murray, of Montana; Senator Mike Mansfield, of Montana; Congressman Lee Metcalf, of Montana; Congressman LeRoy Anderson, of Montana; the Committee on Appropriations of the U.S. Senate; the Committee on Appropriations of the U.S. House of Representatives; the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of the U.S. Senate; the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of the U.S. House of Representatives; the Committee on Public Works of the U.S. House of Representatives; the Secretary of the Interior, Fred A. Seaton; the Commissioner of the Bureau of Reclamation, Wilbur A. Dexheimer; the Secretary of the Army, Wilber M. Brucker; the Director of the Budget, Maurice H. Stans; requesting the introduction and enactment into law of the necessary and proper legislation to authorize and provide funds to start the construction of Yellowtail Dam on the Big Horn River in the State of Montana for 1959

"Whereas since the turn of the century, men of good will and great vision have labored long and wisely to bring Yellowtail Dam into being; and

"Whereas many and high were the hurdles and obstacles that had to be overcome before construction of the Yellowtail Dam could be started; and

"Whereas one by one these many obstacles preventing the construction of Yellowtail Dam were overcome, until one alone remained, and that one was the acquiring of the dam site, upon which the proposed Yellowtail Dam would in time be built, from the Crow Indian Tribe; and

"Whereas that one remaining obstacle, the acquiring of the Yellowtail Dam site, has, due to the wise action of the last Congress, been overcome with the paying of $2½ million to the Crow people for this valuable piece of property; and

"Whereas the American people have a large investment in the proposed Yellowtail Dam; and

"Whereas no returns can be had from the moneys already invested in Yellowtail Dam until said Yellowtail Dam is constructed: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the 36th Legislative Assembly of the State of Montana now in session (the Senate and House of Representatives concurring), That the Congress of the United States be requested and urged to appropriate the sum of $10 million so that the construction of the sorely needed Yellowtail Dam project may begin at once; be it further

"Resolved, That the amendment include reservation of a block of power for Montana; be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this memorial be submitted by the Secretary of the State of Montana to each of the individuals, and to the chairmen of each of the committees mentioned in this memorial, as well as to the presiding officers of both Houses of the U.S. Congress, RICHARD M. NIXON and SAM E. RAYBURN.

"JOHN J. MACDONALD,
"Speaker of the House.
"PAUL CANNON,
"President of the Senate."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Alaska; to the Committee on Banking and Currency:

"SUBSTITUTE FOR HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 1

"Be it resolved by the Legislature of the State of Alaska in the first legislature, first session assembled:

"To the President of the United States; the President of the U.S. Senate, the Speaker of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Secretary of Commerce, the Chairman of the Commerce Committees of the U.S. Senate and House, U.S. Senator Mike Mansfield, U.S. Senator E. L. Bartlett, U.S. Senator Ernest Gruening, U.S. Representative Ralph Rivers.

"The first Legislature of the State of Alaska respectfully represents:

"The prosperity of the United States in general and the State of Alaska in particular depends in large measure upon the successful utilization of their natural resources with which both are so generously endowed.

"The production of gold, until recent years, played a large and important role in the development of America.

"The decline in U.S. gold production is the result of the following factors all dating from 1934:

"(1) Price of gold being artificially fixed at $35 an ounce;

"(2) The tripling of wage and other production costs; and

"(3) Prohibition against U.S. producers of gold selling on the open world market.

"The revival of the Alaska gold industry would not only be of enormous importance to the economy of the State but would also tend to stabilize and strengthen the position of the United States as the leader of the free enterprise system.

"Alaska's legislators urge various reasons for this resolution, among them are:

"(1) Increase in the price of gold by the United States and the free nations would broaden the credit base of world trade.

"(2) Increased employment and prosperity would result and the market for our national exports would be extended without further dependence on foreign trade subsidies in the form of loans and gifts to other nations.

"(3) Loss of United States gold reserves would be halted.

"(4) Strengthening of commodity markets so essential to the stability of restless people in other nations would result.

"(5) It will counter the Russian attempt to gain control of world trade through increased production of their gold.

"The first Legislature of the State of Alaska, therefore, respectfully urges the enactment of congressional legislation that will raise the fixed price of gold to $70 an ounce as proposed by Senators MANSFIELD, BARTLETT, GRUENING, and Congressman RIVERS, in their bills now before the U.S. Congress.

"Passed by the house February 10, 1959.

"WARREN A. TAYLOR,
"Speaker of the House.

"Attest:

"ESTHER REED,
"Chief Clerk of the House.

"Passed by the senate February 16, 1959.

"WILLIAM E. BELTZ,
"President of the Senate.

"Attest:

"KATHERINE T. ALEXANDER,
"Secretary of the Senate."

A resolution of the Legislature of the State of Alaska; to the Committee on Finance:

"HOUSE RESOLUTION 5

"Resolution relating to the Federal excise tax on gasoline

"Be it resolved by the House of Representatives, First Alaska Legislature, in first session assembled:

"Whereas since the State gasoline tax has been historically and rightfully a State tax; and

"Whereas the gasoline tax has traditionally provided the major portion of the funds needed by the States to construct and maintain their highway systems; and

"Whereas in 1932, the Federal Government also imposed an excise tax on gasoline, as a temporary, emergency, revenue-producing measure; and

"Whereas the expressed, and reaffirmed, intent of Congress to vacate this tax field has not been carried out; and

"Whereas instead, the original Federal excise tax on gasoline has been continued and increased by 200 percent; and

"Whereas the mounting Federal tax on this product threatens to preempt this legitimate tax source belonging by priority and equity to the States; and

"Whereas further increase in the Federal gasoline tax rate would lead to serious restriction upon the ability of the States to secure funds for needed highway improvements: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That the House of Representatives of the First Alaska Legislature in first session assembled does respectfully record its opposition to any further increase in the present Federal excise tax on gasoline; and be it further

"Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be transmitted to the office of the President of the United States; to the Members of the U.S. House of Representatives; to the Members of the U.S. Senate; to the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives; to the chairman of the Finance Committee of the U.S. Senate; to the Honorable E. L. BARTLETT and the Honorable ERNEST GRUENING, U.S. Senators from the State of Alaska; and to the Honorable RALPH J. RIVERS, U.S. Representative from the State of Alaska.

"Passed by the house February 17, 1959.

WARREN A. TAYLOR,
"Speaker of the House.

"Attest:

"ESTHER REED,
"Chief Clerk of the House."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Wyoming; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"JOINT MEMORIAL 1

"Joint memorial memorializing the Congress of the United States of America with reference to the opposition of the people of the State of Wyoming to any form of Federal, regional or watershed rules or regulations set up either by legislative act or Executive order, in which the States involved would have no real voice in administration thereof

"Whereas any form of Federal, regional or watershed authority, however disguised, would supersede and nullify existing State laws under which water users have acquired water rights and by which these rights have been protected and administered; and

"Whereas existing water rights established under Wyoming State law would be subject to condemnation proceedings under provisions of acts creating such Federal authority; and

"Whereas the citizens of Wyoming would have no voice in the selection of the directors of the Federal authority, who would have unlimited control over the development of their land and water resources, and

"Whereas under a Federal authority, the only voice permitted the people of the State of Wyoming and their local and State officials would be of an "advisory" nature; and

"Whereas such Federal legislation would place exclusive jurisdiction over water litigation involving the Federal authority in the Federal courts; and

"Whereas such Federal authority would tend to create a Federal power monopoly; and

"Whereas such Federal legislation would to a large extent reduce the States to mere geographical entities, replacing the present powers of local and State governments with a superstate in which the final control is vested in the Federal Government; and

"Whereas such Federal legislation would add nothing to the program of development of land and water resources which is not already available through existing State and Federal agencies, except better coordination which could be accomplished through more democratic means: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the 35th Legislature of the State of Wyoming (the senate of such legislature concurring) That the President and Congress of the United States of America, be and they are hereby memorialized to consider against any proposed legislation or Executive order setting up any form of Federal, regional or watershed authority, however disguised, the strong, unequivocal and unalterable opposition of the people of the State of Wyoming to any such proposition and their determination to resist by every device at their command any such usurpation of the rights, laws, customs, powers, and sovereignty of their local and State governments; be it further

"Resolved, That certified copies hereof be promptly transmitted to the President and Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of said Congress, U.S. Senator JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY, U.S. Senator GALE W. MCGEE, and Representative in Congress E. KEITH THOMSON, to the Secretary of the Interior, the Commissioner of Reclamation and to the Governors and legislatures of the following States: Alaska, Arizona, California, Colorado, Idaho, Iowa, Kansas, Minnesota, Missouri, Montana, Nebraska, Nevada, New Mexico, North Dakota, Oklahoma, Oregon, South Dakota, Texas, Utah, and Washington.

"NORMAN BARLOW,
"President of the Senate.
"JAY R. HOUSE,
"Speaker of the House.

"Approved February 26, 1959:

"J. J. 'JOE' HICKEY,
"Governor."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Idaho; to the Committee on Government Operations:

"HOUSE JOINT MEMORIAL 3

"Joint memorial to the honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States in Congress assembled

"We, your memorialists, the Legislature of the State of Idaho, as assembled in its 35th session, do respectfully represent that:

"Whereas the State of Idaho and the other States of the United States of America are confronted with difficult fiscal problems in connection with their respective general funds because of the loss of revenue potential which has been precipitated by the heavy tax loads enacted by the U.S. Congress on the taxpaying public of the various States; and

"Whereas the tax sources have been thoroughly exploited to the saturation point; and

"Whereas the State governments are unable to match many of the Federal funds available to the States because of insufficient State revenue income for matching funds; and

"Whereas the States have very little or no control in the manner in which these matching funds are appropriated and expended; and

"Whereas a reduction in Federal expenditures would be accomplished, and at the same time make available urgently needed funds to the general fund of the State of Idaho, and the general funds of the various other States of the United States: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the House of Representatives, State of Idaho (the Senate concurring), That we most respectfully urge upon the Congress of the United States of America that 15 percent of all Federal income taxes paid into the Federal Treasury by the public in the State of Idaho and the various other States be retained in the State of Idaho and the various other States to be placed in the general funds of the respective States; be it further

"Resolved, That a reduction of 15 percent be made in Federal grants in aid connected with State legislative appropriations, to the State of Idaho and the various other States; be it further

"Resolved, That the State of Idaho respectfully requests that the Governors of the various States urge their respective States to take similar action; be it further

"Resolved, That the Secretary of State of the State of Idaho be authorized and he is hereby directed to immediately forward certi-

fied copies of this memorial to the Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States of America, to the Senators and Representatives in Congress from this State, and to the Governors of all the 49 States and the Territory of Hawaii."

A joint resolution of the legislature of the State of Oregon; ordered to lie on the table:

"SENATE JOINT MEMORIAL 1

"To the Honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America, in Congress assembled:

"We, your memorialists, the 50th Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon, in legislative session assembled, most respectfully represent as follows:

"Whereas there have been, from the earliest hours of our history as a State, the closest ties and relationship between the people of the Sandwich Islands now the Territory of Hawaii, and the people of Oregon; and

"Whereas these fine Americans have long ago fully demonstrated their capacity to govern themselves as a free commonwealth within the American Union; and

"Whereas we know and respect the people of Hawaii as a result of close association through commercial, cultural, recreational and social exchanges; and

"Whereas the State of Oregon, alone among the States, has enriched our association and strengthened our bonds with the people of Hawaii through the free interchange of territorial students in our State system of higher education; and

"Whereas this February 14 is the 100th anniversary of the admission of Oregon to the Union; and

"Whereas the admission of Oregon's respected friend Hawaii to the sisterhood of States of the Union would further strengthen these bonds and would give added cause for jubilation on the commemoration of our own Statehood: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate of the State of Oregon (the House of Representatives jointly concurring therein), That the Congress of the United States be memorialized to grant immediate statehood, under legislation now pending, to our sister Hawaii, as the 50th State of the United States; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this memorial be sent to the President of the United States, to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, to the delegate in Congress from Hawaii and to all members of the Oregon congressional delegation.

"Adopted by senate February 11, 1959.

"MEDA COLE,
"Chief Clerk of Senate.
"WALTER WEAMON,
"President of Senate.

"Adopted by house February 13, 1959.

"ROBERT S. DUNCAN,
"Speaker of House."

A resolution adopted by the National Association of Attorneys General, at Chicago, Ill., relating to internal security; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

RESOLUTIONS OF GENERAL COURT OF MASSACHUSETTS

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, on behalf of my colleague, the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], and myself, I present two resolutions of the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts memorializing Congress to investigate and determine the causes of inflation, and to enact remedial legislation; and relative to the reenactment and enforcement of legislation to implement decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States. I ask unanimous consent that the resolutions may be appropriately referred.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolutions will be received, appropriately referred, and, under the rule, will be printed in the RECORD.

The resolutions were referred as follows:

To the Committee on Banking and Currency:

"RESOLUTION MEMORIALIZING CONGRESS TO INVESTIGATE AND DETERMINE THE CAUSES OF INFLATION AND TO ENACT REMEDIAL LEGISLATION

"Whereas inflation, as evidenced by price increases which continually raise the cost of living, is partly responsible for the soaring tax rates of our cities and towns as well as for the ever-mounting annual budgets of the States; and

"Whereas inflation is undermining the value of the endowments of colleges, hospitals, libraries and other institutions and rendering inadequate individual provisions for retirement security: Therefore be it

"Resolved, That the General Court of Massachusetts memorializes the Congress of the United States to take immediate steps to investigate and determine the causes of inflation and, on the basis of its findings, to enact such remedial legislation as will tend to stabilize our economy; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be sent forthwith by the Secretary of the Commonwealth to the President of the United States, the presiding officer of each branch of the Congress and to each Member thereof from this Commonwealth.

"House of Representatives, adopted, February 16, 1959.

"LAWRENCE R. GROVE,
"Clerk.

"Senate, adopted in concurrence, February 18, 1959.

"IRVING N. HAYDEN,
"Clerk."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate resolutions of the General Court of Massachusetts identical with the foregoing, which were referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency:

"RESOLUTIONS MEMORIALIZING THE CONGRESS AND THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES TO ENACT AND ENFORCE LEGISLATION TO IMPLEMENT THE DECISIONS OF THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES OUTLAWING SEGREGATION IN THE PUBLIC SCHOOL SYSTEM

"Whereas the Supreme Court of the United States, on the 17th day of May 1954, by unanimous decision, held that 'in the field of public education the doctrine of separate but equal has no place'; and

"Whereas the same Court expressed its desire that its decision should be complied with 'with all deliberate speed'; and

"Whereas the 14th amendment to the Constitution of the United States provides that no State shall deny to any person within its jurisdiction equal protection of the laws; and

"Whereas the interests of orderly government demand that respect and compliance be given to orders issued by courts possessed of jurisdiction of persons and subject matter: Therefore, be it

"Resolved, That the General Court of Massachusetts respectfully urges the Congress and President of the United States to enact and enforce legislation to implement the decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States outlawing segregation in the public school system; and be it further

"Resolved, That the Secretary of the Commonwealth transmit forthwith copies of these resolutions to the President of the United States, to the presiding officer of each branch of the Congress of the United States, and to each member thereof from this Commonwealth.

"House of Representatives, adopted, February 16, 1959.

"LAWRENCE R. GROVE,
"Clerk.

"Senate, adopted in concurrence, February 18, 1959.

"IRVING N. HAYDEN,
"Clerk."

By Mr. KERR:

A resolution of the Senate of the State of Oklahoma; to the Committee on Finance:

"ENROLLED SENATE RESOLUTION 17

"Senate resolution commending Gov. J. Howard Edmondson, Senator Robert A. Trent, Representative Glen Ham, Lloyd Rader and others for working out a program which resulted in an increase for the aged citizens and other welfare clients of Oklahoma

"Whereas the aged citizens and other welfare recipients of Oklahoma will soon receive an increase in their grants; and

"Whereas this increase has resulted from the tireless efforts of certain elected and appointed officials; and

"Whereas the State senate desires to commend these officials: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate of the 27th Legislature of the State of Oklahoma, That Gov. J. Howard Edmondson, Senator Bob A. Trent, chairman of the Senate Social Welfare Committee, Representative Glen Ham, chairman of the House of Representatives Social Welfare Committee, and Lloyd Rader, director of the Department of Public Welfare, be commended for their efforts in working out a program which resulted in a $4 increase per month for the aged citizens and other welfare recipients of Oklahoma; and be it further

"Resolved, That Senator Trent be commended also for his efforts in the several trips he has made to Washington, D.C., in promoting national legislation which resulted in both the recent $4 grant and the very popular hospitalization program for the aged citizens and other welfare recipients; and be it further

"Resolved, That Senator Trent be commended also as author of Senate Resolution 31 of the 1957 session which set up the hospitalization program for the aged citizens of our State and other welfare recipients—the best hospitalization program in the United States; and be it further

"Resolved, That the doctors of medicine and osteopathy, and hospitals of the State who have unselfishly contributed to the medical program be commended; and be it further

"Resolved, That U.S. Senator ROBERT S. KERR and U.S. Senator MIKE MONRONEY and the entire congressional delegation from Oklahoma be commended for their tireless efforts in securing the enacting of legislation in Congress which made possible the increasing of payments under the welfare program of the State of Oklahoma.

"Adopted by the Senate the 26th day of January 1959.

"HAROLD T. GARVIN,
"President of the Senate."

RESOLUTIONS OF ORGANIZATIONS OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a series of resolutions adopted by organizations of the State of New York.

There being no objection, the resolutions were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION 24

A resolution for elimination of unfair foreign competition affecting local industry urged

Whereas an agency for the United States Government has ordered a large steam turbine generator for some $12 million from a foreign country; and

Whereas the city of Schenectady, the Nation's largest builder of large steam turbine generators, has been classified by the Federal Government as a labor surplus area; and

Whereas this classification gives Schenectady a priority for orders from the Federal Government because of Schenectady's high unemployment figure; and

Whereas the large steam turbine department at General Electric in Schenectady is the largest operating department at the company's local plant employing nearly 9,000 persons; and

Whereas an order such as that placed with the foreign country would have kept 600 men working in the department for 1 year at the Schenectady plant; and

Whereas the order was given to a foreign country despite the fact the work could be done in the United States more efficiently and more dependably, particularly on replacement parts, as it affects home defense; and

Whereas the foreign order places American industry and labor in an unfair competitive class due to the lower standard of living in the foreign country: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Schenectady County Board of Supervisors urge the Congress of the United States of America to take a closer look at the purchasing policies of the various Government agencies with the view of eliminating unfair competition, particularly in the manufacture of heavy apparatus constructed by General Electric Co. and ALCO Products, Inc.; and be it further

Resolved, That the Congress take a closer look at Government policies regarding the awarding of contracts to priority areas where unemployment is high but where the work needed by the Government could be done efficiently and competently; and be it further

Resolved, That the Congress consider the tragic circumstances which could arise in the time of war if power for American cities is supplied by foreign generators needing foreign service; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of the foregoing resolution be forwarded to United States Senators JACOB K. JAVITS, and KENNETH B. KEATING, and Congressman SAMUEL S. STRATTON.

RESOLUTION NO. 6571 OF CITY COUNCIL OF SCHENECTADY, N.Y.

Whereas the Tennessee Valley Authority recently awarded a contract for a large steam turbine generator to a foreign manufacturer, outbidding the General Electric Co.; and

Whereas it is reported that four (4) foreign firms are now bidding against General Electric Co. for a large order soon to be placed by the city of Los Angeles; and

Whereas because of the low-cost labor in foreign countries, it is possible for a foreign firm to outbid a domestic concern; and

Whereas General Electric Vice President W. S. Ginn, estimated that the Tennessee Valley Authority and Los Angeles orders involve a total of more than 3 million man hours of work, enough to supply jobs to 750 office and factory employees for 2 full years; and

Whereas the granting of such contracts to foreign firms will increase our unemployment throughout the Nation, and even more important, will endanger our national security in time of war inasmuch as we might have to rely on foreign labor and foreign skills to maintain equipment in our arsenal of democracy; and

Whereas in the city of Schenectady, the awarding of such contracts to foreign firms effects management not only of the General Electric Co. but Alco Products, Inc. as well, together with the IUE Local 301 and the United Steelworkers of America, AFL–Local 128 Steamfitters, Plumbers, and Helpers, as well as all of the Schenectady business enterprises and their employees: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the council of the city of Schenectady, on behalf of its citizenry indignant because of the jeopardy of their economic security and national war-time stability, vigorously protests the awarding of contracts to foreign powers by governmental units in competition with domestic bidders; and be it further

Resolved, That the present contract between the Tennessee Valley Authority and the C. A. Parsons Co., Ltd., of Newcastle, Great Britain be rescinded; and be it further

Resolved, That before any contract be entered into between the U.S. Government or any agency thereof and any person, firm, or corporation of and located in a foreign country, the entire matter shall be referred to the proper congressional committee for review and approval; and be it further

Resolved, That this resolution be spread upon the minutes of the council of the city of Schenectady and copies thereof be sent forthwith by the clerk of the city of Schenectady to Senator JACOB K. JAVITS, Senator KENNETH B. KEATING, Congressman SAMUEL S. STRATTON, Congressman J. ERNEST WHARTON, Congressman LEO W. O'BRIEN, and Congressman DEAN P. TAYLOR and to each and every other Member of the New York State congressional delegation.

This resolution was unanimously adopted by the council of the city of Schenectady on Monday, February 16, 1959.

FREEMAN K. KELLER,
Clerk of the City of Schenectady.

RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY THE LITHUANIAN RALLY ON FEBRUARY 15, 1959

We, Lithuanian Americans of Greater New York, loyal citizens and residents of the United States, gathered on February 15 of this year of Grace 1959 at Webster Hall in New York City to commemorate the 41st anniversary of the restoration of the independent Lithuanian state after a prolonged eclipse of its liberty;

Voicing once again our indignation at and our protest against the brutal suppression by the Government of the Soviet Union of Lithuania's independence and freedom and her subjugation to ruthless Soviet colonial exploitation, perpetrated at a time when Lithuania was living in peace with the U.S.S.R. and was bound to her by a peace treaty and a nonaggression pact;

Stating that the present Soviet challenge to the West, with Berlin as its direct objective, is aimed at the settlement on Soviet terms of the political problems resulting from World War II, namely, at the legalization and consolidation of Soviet criminal conquests in Europe and at creating conditions for further Communist expansion in Europe and elsewhere;

Considering that the present abnormal and dangerous situation in Europe, characterized by the division of Germany, the subjugation of nine formerly sovereign states of central and eastern Europe, including Lithuania, and by the division of the continent, requires an urgent and global settlement in conformity with the wartime and postwar commitments and pledges of the great powers;

Stressing the indivisibility of the problem of central and eastern Europe, of which the restoration of Lithuania's independence is an integral part, and of that of Germany and the European security system—these problems being the major cause of the present international tension;

Resolve, 1. To appeal to the President, the Secretary of State, and the Congress of the United States firmly to pursue and vigorously to promote their repeatedly declared policy of the restoration of the independence and freedom of Lithuania and other captive countries of central and eastern Europe through free and unfettered elections after the withdrawal of Soviet armed forces and agents, and to reaffirm the determination of the government of this great country not to be party to any agreement or treaty which would confirm or prolong the subjugation of Lithuania, now held in bondage by the U.S.S.R.;

2. To rededicate ourselves to the just cause of Lithuania's independence and freedom and to combat Communist aggression and Soviet-Russian imperialism;

3. To assure the Lithuanian people under Soviet occupation of the indissolubility of our ties and of our unswerving determination to spare no efforts and sacrifices for the attainment of the sacred goal of the Lithuanian nation—its independence and freedom;

4. Actively to support the policy of the U.S. Government aiming at the establishment in Europe and elsewhere of a just and durable peace based on the inalienable right of the respective peoples to governments of their own choosing.

DR. EUGENIJUS NOAKAS,
President.
J. DZIKAS, *Secretary.*

RESOLUTION OF NORTHEAST QUEENS COUNCIL FOR SCHOOLS

Whereas there is still a serious shortage of classrooms and of teachers requiring emergency action on the part of the Federal Government; and

Whereas limited financial resources available to many communities are not adequate to support construction programs of sufficient size to eliminate their classroom shortages and not sufficient to provide proper compensation to their teachers; and

Whereas the national interest requires that the Federal Government assist State and local governments in solving these pressing problems: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Federal Government provide Federal financial assistance on a grant basis to help meet the problems of inadequate facilities and inadequate teachers' salaries by enacting such Federal aid to education legislation in 1959.

NAOMI GARSTEIN,
President.

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF RAILROAD AND UTILITIES COMMISSIONERS RESOLUTION URGING REPEAL OF EXCISE TAXES ON COMMUNICATION SERVICES AND TRANSPORTATION OF PERSONS PASSED ON NOVEMBER 19, 1958

Whereas the Federal excise taxes on public utility and transportation services were initially levied or greatly increased during World War II to help defray war costs and to discourage unnecessary use of such services, and

Whereas Congress has acted to remove a substantial portion of this discriminatory tax burden on public utility and transportation services by elimination of excise taxes on the use of electrical energy and the shipment of goods and property, and

Whereas today, 13 years after cessation of hostilities, the excise taxes on communication services and the for-hire transportation of persons are still in effect and are continuing to discourage the public use of these services which are now the only services, regulated or unregulated, against which any Federal excise taxes are levied, and

Whereas a committee of the 85th Congress rejected a proposal for the enactment of legislation which would have continued the Federal excise tax on local telephone service at a lesser rate and which also would have required the imposition of the balance of this unpopular tax by the individual stages as a means of financing a proposed transfer to the States of certain activities completely unrelated to communication services; and

Whereas the Joint Federal-State Action Committee has recommended that Congress authorize distribution for a period of 5 years, 40 percent of the present Federal excise tax on local telephone service to the States in such amounts as to provide revenues equivalent to 140 percent of Federal grants now being made to the respective States to carry on vocational education, and to construct facilities for abatement of water pollution, which are completely unrelated to communications service, and

Whereas the proposal of the Joint Federal-State Action Committee would tend to cause the States to pass laws imposing excise taxes on local telephone service and would tend to make such taxes a permanent part of the tax structure of both the Federal and State Government: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the National Association of Railroad and Utilities Commissioners is of the opinion that the discriminatory excise taxes on communication and transportation services are not in the public interest, that such taxes should not continue to be levied by the Federal Government; and be it further

Resolved, That any similar tax on communications should not be levied by the individual States against the users of this essential service as a means of financing specific programs which bear no relation to the service taxed; and be it further

Resolved, That Congress is hereby petitioned to terminate the discriminatory excise taxes on communication and transportation services at the earliest possible date; and be it further

Resolved, That the special committee on repeal of excise taxes, the committee on legislation, and the legal officers of the association are hereby authorized to appear on behalf of the association before any committee of Congress at any hearing which may be hereafter held upon legislation pertaining to the above matters and to take such further action as may be appropriate to accomplish the objectives of the association in respect to the repeal of the excise taxes on both communication services and transportation of persons.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. JACKSON, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, with amendments:

S. 50. A bill to provide for the admission of the State of Hawaii into the Union; (Rept. No. 80).

By Mr. STENNIS, from the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences, without amendment:

S. 1096. A bill to authorize appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for salaries and expenses, research and development, construction and equipment, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 82).

By Mr. MAGNUSON, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, without amendment:

S.J. Res. 47. Joint resolution providing that certain communication activities at the IX Plenary Assembly of the International Radio Consultative Committee to be held in the United States in 1959 shall not be construed to be prohibited by the Communications Act of 1934 or any other law (Rept. No. 81).

By Mr. KEFAUVER, from the Committee on the Judiciary, with amendments:

S. 726. A bill to amend section 11 of the Clayton Act to provide for the more expeditious enforcement of cease and desist orders issued thereunder, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 83).

REPORT ENTITLED "ACTIVITIES OF THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON ANTITRUST AND MONOPOLY—1958" (S. REPT. NO. 77)

Mr. KEFAUVER, from the Committee on the Judiciary, submitted a report entitled "Activities of the Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly—1958," pursuant to Senate Resolution 231, 85th Congress, 2d session, as extended, which was ordered to be printed.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY ENTITLED "IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION" (S. REPT. NO. 78)

Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, pursuant to Senate Resolution 235, 85th Congress, 2d session, as extended, submitted a report entitled "Immigration and Naturalization," which was ordered to be printed.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY ENTITLED "CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS" (S. REPT. NO. 79)

Mr. HENNINGS, from the Committee on the Judiciary, submitted a report entitled "Constitutional Rights," pursuant to Senate Resolution 234, 85th Congress, 2d session, as extended, which was ordered to be printed.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. BUTLER:

S. 1247. A bill for the relief of Donald O. Olin; and

S. 1248. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Anna Toezser; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUTLER (for himself and Mr. BEALL):

S. 1249. A bill to permit the use of appropriated funds in purchasing land in connection with the Antietam battlefield site; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. BUTLER when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina:

S. 1250. A bill to amend the Act of July 28, 1916, so as to provide procedures for the adjustment of rates or compensation to be paid to carriers for the transportation of mail;

S. 1251. A bill to provide for the transportation of mail by common carriers;

S. 1252. A bill to provide for the training of postmasters under the Government Employees Training Act; and

S. 1253. A bill to preserve the rates of basic salary of postal field service employees in certain cases involving reductions in salary standing, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina (by request):

S. 1254. A bill to clarify and make uniform certain provisions of the law relating to special postage rates for educational, cultural, and library materials, and for other purposes; and

S. 1255. A bill to provide, in the event of an emergency evacuation, certain authority relating to the pay of civilian officers and employees on duty outside the United States or at other places designated by the President; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HARTKE:

S. 1256. A bill for the relief of Lee You Young; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HARTKE (for himself, Mr. CAPEHART, Mr. DOUGLAS, and Mr. DIRKSEN):

S. 1257. A bill granting the consent and approval of Congress to the Wabash Valley Compact, and for related purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ELLENDER (for himself and Mr. LONG):

S. 1258. A bill for the relief of the State of Louisiana; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ALLOTT:

S. 1259. A bill for the relief of Major Elmer L. Greek; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MURRAY:

S. 1260. A bill to grant minerals, including oil and gas, on certain lands in the Crow Indian Reservation, Montana, to certain Indians, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BEALL:

S. 1261. A bill to provide for the enlargement of the Antietam National Cemetery at Sharpsburg, Md.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. FULBRIGHT:

S. 1262. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to establish a research program in order to determine means of improving the conservation of game fish in dam reservoirs; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. FULBRIGHT when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. FULBRIGHT (by request):

S. 1263. A bill to extend certain privileges and immunities to judges of the International Court of Justice; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

(See the remarks of Mr. FULBRIGHT when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

S. 1264. A bill to amend the act providing for a program to eradicate the dogfish shark on the Pacific coast in order to expand such program; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 1265. A bill to amend the Vocational Rehabilitation Act in order to provide assistance to the States for certain workshops, rehabilitation facilities, and rehabilitation evaluation services; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. KERR (for himself, Mr. HRUSKA, Mr. RANDOLPH, and Mr. SCHOEPPEL):

S. 1266. A bill providing for the amendment of title 23, section 131, of the United States Code (sec. 122 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1958), to clarify the said section with relation to municipalities and areas zoned under the laws of the States, and to recognize the laws of the States relating thereto; to the Committee on Public Works.

(See the remarks of Mr. KERR when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. KERR (for himself and Mr. MONRONEY):

S. 1267. A bill to set aside certain lands in Oklahoma for the Cheyenne and Arapaho Indians; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MCNAMARA (for himself, Mr. HART, and Mr. MURRAY):

S. 1268. A bill to provide for notice to States owning surface of lands in which minerals are reserved to Federal Government of proposals to lease such minerals; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BUTLER:

S. 1269. A bill authorizing the construction by the Maritime Administration of 30 merchant vessels of appropriate types; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. BUTLER when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. DIRKSEN (by request):

S. 1270. A bill to authorize the use of Great Lakes vessels on the oceans; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. DIRKSEN when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. ANDERSON:

S. 1271. A bill to donate to the Pueblo of Isleta certain Federal property in the State of New Mexico; and

S. 1272. A bill to provide for the extension of certain oil and gas leases; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HENNINGS:

S. 1273. A bill to amend title 28 of the United States Code, "Judiciary and Judicial Procedure," and incorporate therein provisions relating to the United States Labor Court, and for other purposes;

S. 1274. A bill to amend title 28 of the United States Code, "Judiciary and Judicial Procedure," and incorporate therein provisions relating to the United States Tax Court, and for other purposes;

S. 1275. A bill to amend title 28 of the United States Code, "Judiciary and Judicial Procedure," and incorporate therein provisions relating to the United States Trade Court, and for other purposes; and

S. 1276. A bill for the relief of Irene Cambouris; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HENNINGS (for himself, Mr. LANGER, and Mr. O'MAHONEY):

S. 1277. A bill to extend to uniformed members of the Armed Forces the same protection against bodily attack as is now granted to personnel of the Coast Guard; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SALTONSTALL:

S. 1278. A bill for the relief of Mary E. Preston, surviving widow of James David Preston; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

S. 1279. A bill to provide for the appointment of a district judge for the district of Massachusetts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DODD:

S. 1280. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. DODD when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota:

S. 1281. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to receive from the Devils Lake Sioux Tribe of the Fort Totten Reservation, North Dakota, a deed conveying certain property on such Reservation to the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota (for himself, Mr. LANGER, Mr. MUNDT, and Mr. CASE of South Dakota):

S. 1282. A bill relating to acreage allotments for durum wheat; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. MAGNUSON (for himself and Mr. BUSH):

S. 1283. A bill to regulate the interstate distribution and sale of packages of hazardous substances intended or suitable for household use; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. EASTLAND (for himself and Mr. STENNIS):

S. 1284. A bill for the relief of William E. Stone; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ALLOTT (for himself, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. BIBLE, Mr. COOPER, Mr. DIRKSEN, Mr. GRUENING, Mr. MANSFIELD, Mr. MORTON, and Mr. MOSS):

S. 1285. A bill to provide for the preservation and development of the domestic fluorspar industry; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. ALLOTT when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. JAVITS:

S. 1286. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to make grants to the States to assist in the provision of facilities and services for the day care of children; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. JAVITS when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. JAVITS (for himself and Mr. KEATING):

S. 1287. A bill to provide for the issuance of a postage stamp in commemoration of the 125th anniversary of the granting (at the Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute, Troy, N.Y.), of the first degrees in science and engineering ever granted in any English-speaking country; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

S. 1288. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase from $1,200 to $1,800 the annual amount individuals are permitted to earn without suffering deductions from the insurance benefits payable to them under such title; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. HUMPHREY when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HUMPHREY (for himself, Mr. MCCARTHY, Mr. PROXMIRE, and Mr. WILEY):

S. 1289. A bill to increase and extend the special milk program for children; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(See the remarks of Mr. HUMPHREY when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware:

S. 1290. A bill for the relief of Dexter Phillips and Jeanette H. Phillips; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEATING:

S. 1291. A bill for the relief of Marko Klapan; and

S. 1292. A bill to prohibit eavesdropping under certain circumstances, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. KEATING when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. NEUBERGER:

S. 1293. A bill to provide a temporary 1½-cent increase in the tax on gasoline and the tax on diesel fuel and special motor fuels used in highway vehicles; and

S. 1294. A bill to reduce the rate of percentage depletion for oil and gas wells from 27½ percent to 15 percent; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 1295. A bill to provide for the equitable adjustment of postal rates, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

S. 1296. A bill to reimpose the Excess Profits Tax Act of 1950 effective for taxable years ending after June 30, 1959, and beginning before July 1, 1961; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. NEUBERGER when he introduced the above bills, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. PASTORE:

S. 1297. A bill for the relief of Salim Menashi Eliahoo Reuben; and

S. 1298. A bill for the relief of Concetta Marcella; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EASTLAND:

S. 1299. A bill to protect the effectiveness of State antisubversive laws against unintended Federal preemption;

S. 1300. A bill to define the term "organize" as used in the Smith Act;

S. 1301. A bill to make full disclosure respecting loyalty to the United States a condition of Government employment;

S. 1302. A bill to amend sections 241 and 242 of the Immigration and Nationality Act;

S. 1303. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act with respect to travel in time of war or national emergency and passport procedures;

S. 1304. A bill to broaden the application of the Summary Suspension Act of 1950; and

S. 1305. A bill to amend section 2385 of title 18 of the United States Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. EASTLAND when he introduced the above bills, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MONRONEY:

S. 1306. A bill to readjust the size and weight limitations on fourth-class mail matters; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

(See the remarks of Mr. MONRONEY when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. ELLENDER (by request):

S. 1307. A bill to amend section 508(b) of the Federal Crop Insurance Act, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 1308. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to allow a deduction from gross income for funeral expenses and for all medical expenses incurred in an individual's last illness; and

S. 1309. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that the full amount of any annuity received under the Civil Service Retirement Act shall be excluded from gross income; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. LANGER when he introduced the last above-mentioned bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MUNDT:

S. 1310. A bill to encourage the construction of farm grain storage facilities; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. MUNDT (for himself and Mr. GOLDWATER):

S. 1311. A bill to require the bonding of certain labor union officials; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. CARROLL:

S. 1312. A bill for the relief of Kalliope Giamnias; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GOLDWATER:

S. 1313. A bill for the relief of Rosa Lee Wallace; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORSE (by request):

S. 1314. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. MORSE when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. SALTONSTALL (for himself and Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware):

S.J. Res. 62. Joint resolution authorizing the President of the United States of Amer-

ica to proclaim October 11, 1958, General Pulaski's Memorial Day for the observance and commemoration of the death of Brigadier General Pulaski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. SALTONSTALL when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. SCOTT (for himself, Mr. JAVITS, Mr. KEATING, and Mr. NEUBERGER):

S.J. Res. 63. Joint resolution designating the rose as the national flower of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. SCOTT when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MORTON:

S.J. Res. 64. Joint resolution designating grass as the national flower of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DIRKSEN:

S.J. Res. 65. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, relating to the legal effect of certain treaties and other international agreements; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. DIRKSEN when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. EASTLAND (for himself, Mr. CURTIS, Mr. SYMINGTON, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. RANDOLPH, Mr. ENGLE, Mr. CANNON, Mr. STENNIS, Mr. AIKEN, Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. MORTON, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. TALMADGE, Mr. YARBOROUGH, Mr. NEUBERGER, Mr. HRUSKA, Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota, Mr. JACKSON, Mr. HILL, Mr. MCGEE, Mr. WILEY, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. MOSS, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. MORSE, Mr. CARLSON, Mr. JAVITS, Mr. CASE of New Jersey, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. DIRKSEN, Mr. PASTORE, Mr. KEFAUVER, Mr. CASE of South Dakota, Mr. HART, Mr. MUSKIE, Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey, Mr. MUNDT, Mr. HICKENLOOPER, Mr. MCCARTHY, Mr. CARROLL, and Mr. COOPER):

S.J. Res. 66. Joint resolution to provide for the centennial celebration of the establishment of the land-grant colleges and State universities and the establishment of the Department of Agriculture, and for related purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. EASTLAND when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. CASE of New Jersey:

S.J. Res. 67. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to limit the power of the States and their political subdivisions to tax the salaries and wages of persons who are not domiciliaries or residents thereof; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey (for himself and Mr. CASE of New Jersey):

S.J. Res. 68. Joint resolution providing for the establishment of the New Jersey Tercentenary Celebration Commission to formulate and implement plans to commemorate the 300th anniversary of the State of New Jersey, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION

Mr. DOUGLAS submitted a concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 13) to provide additional funds for a special study by the Joint Economic Committee, which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

(See the above concurrent resolution printed in full when submitted by Mr. DOUGLAS, which appears under a separate heading.)

MAJ. ELMER L. GREEK—REFERENCE OF BILL TO COURT OF CLAIMS

Mr. ALLOTT submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 87), which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

Resolved, That the bill (S. 1259) entitled "A bill for the relief of Maj. Elmer L. Greek," now pending in the Senate, together with all accompanying papers is hereby referred to the Court of Claims; and the court shall proceed with the same in accordance with the provisions of sections 1492 and 2509 of title 28 of the United States Code and report to the Senate, at the earliest practicable date, giving such findings of fact and conclusions thereon as shall be sufficient to inform the Congress of the nature and character of the demand as a claim, legal or equitable, against the United States and the amount, if any, legally or equitably due from the United States to the claimant.

CURTAILMENT OF CERTAIN RAILROAD PASSENGER OPERATIONS

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Mr. President, I submit a resolution to express the sense of the Senate that the Interstate Commerce Commission utilize the full procedure available to it in curtailment of railroad passenger operations. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a news release, prepared by me, relating to the resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MCNAMARA in the chair). The resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the resolution and news release will be printed in the RECORD.

The resolution (S. Res. 88) was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, as follows:

Whereas there are presently pending before the Interstate Commerce Commission 27 applications to curtail or abandon rail passenger service affecting not only many thousands of passengers but also the well-being of hundreds of communities;

Whereas the United States Courts have held that when the Interstate Commerce Commission does not, under the 1958 Transportation Act, exercise its authority to investigate and hold hearings on applications to discontinue service, the Courts have no power to review the Commission's decision not to exercise its authority;

Whereas accordingly, the New York Central Railroad has now been authorized, under the 1958 Transportation Act, to discontinue its Hudson River passenger ferry from Weehawken, N.J., to New York City without opponents having had the opportunity to be heard at public hearings;

Whereas the Congress approved the Transportation Act chiefly to provide improved regulatory procedures and financial assistance to the railroads;

Whereas the Congress did not intend that wholesale curtailment of essential passenger service should be the result of the passage of the Act; and

Whereas legislation to amend the Act will be considered by the 86th Congress: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Senate of the United States, That the Interstate Commerce Commission be urged to investigate and conduct public hearings on all proposed curtailments of railroad passenger operations or services to insure, in the light of current efforts by State and local governments to meet the short-haul traffic deficit, that essential mass transportation services are not irreparably lost through inadequate public consideration; and be it further

Resolved, That the Commission not permit curtailment of essential services without utilizing the full procedures available to it under the law to protect the public interest.

The news release presented by Mr. CASE of New Jersey is as follows:

Senator CLIFFORD P. CASE, Republican, of New Jersey, a member of the Senate Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, will ask the Senate today to go on record against the handling of future train discontinuance cases as the Weehawken Ferry abandonment was handled.

He said yesterday his Senate resolution would call for public hearings on abandonment cases before the Interstate Commerce Commission, thus leaving open to commuters the possibility of judicial review in such cases in the future.

No hearings were held and the courts refused to review the ICC's decision in the Weehawken Ferry discontinuance case brought by the West Shore Division of the New York Central Railroad in proceedings under the Transportation Act of 1958.

His resolution, Senator CASE said he would tell the Senate, would call on the ICC to "not permit curtailment of essential services without utilizing the full procedures available to it under the law to protect the public interest."

Senator CASE said, "the Weehawken Ferry case may be history, but there are 27 applications involving about 100 trains still pending before the Commission. And railroads in the New York-New Jersey area are threatening to abandon additional service affecting many more thousands of passengers and the well-being of hundreds of communities requiring the continued residence of these commuters."

Senator CASE's resolution noted that the current Congress will have an opportunity to amend the Transportation Act of 1958 under which current and threatened discontinuance proceedings will be before the ICC.

Senator CASE is a member of the Senate Surface Transportation Subcommittee to which this resolution will be referred.

EMILY B. GRIER—REFERENCE OF BILL TO COURT OF CLAIMS

Mr. SMATHERS submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 89), which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

Resolved, That the bill (S. 1238) entitled "A bill for the relief of Emily B. Grier, widow of Samuel Grier, Junior", now pending in the Senate, together with all accompanying papers, is hereby referred to the Court of Claims; and the court shall proceed with the same in accordance with the provisions of sections 1492 and 2509 of title 28 of the United States Code and report to the Senate, at the earliest practicable date, giving such findings of fact and conclusions thereon as shall be sufficient to inform the Congress of the nature and character of the demand as a claim, legal or equitable, against the United States and the amount, if any, legally or equitably due from the United States to the claimant.

REVISION AND RENEWAL OF INTERNATIONAL WHEAT AGREEMENT

Mr. KENNEDY, on behalf of himself, and Senators BIBLE, CARROLL, CHURCH,

HART, HARTKE, HUMPHREY, JACKSON, MAGNUSON, MANSFIELD, MCCARTHY, MORSE, MOSS, MURRAY, NEUBERGER, PASTORE, YOUNG of North Dakota, and YOUNG of Ohio, submitted a resolution (S. Res. 90) relating to a revision and renewal of the International Wheat Agreement, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

(See the above resolution printed in full when submitted by Mr. KENNEDY, which appears under a separate heading.)

USE OF APPROPRIATED FUNDS TO PURCHASE LAND IN CONNECTION WITH ANTIETAM BATTLEFIELD SITE—CONSTRUCTION OF 30 MERCHANT VESSELS

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference two bills, and I ask unanimous consent that statements I have prepared in connection with the bills be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bills will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the statements will be printed in the RECORD.

The bills, introduced by Mr. BUTLER, were received, read twice by their titles, and referred as indicated:

To the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

S. 1249. A bill to permit the use of appropriated funds in purchasing land in connection with the Antietam battlefield site.

The statement accompanying Senate bill 1249 is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR BUTLER

In his book "Mr. Lincoln's Army," Bruce Catton described the battlefield of Antietam as follows: "And over above all this perfection of peace and quiet, on the 16th of September, there was a silent running out of time and a gathering together of the fates, as issues that reached to the end of the earth and the farthest borders of national history drew in here for decision * * * there was never another day like Antietam."

Today the battlefield of Antietam consists of less than 200 acres. The acreage is comprised of widely separated plots, a small national cemetery, and a system of narrow roadways. Heretofore, this was adequate inasmuch as the land actually involved in the battle was farmed as it had been 96 years ago, and thus the view was left unimpaired. With the last several years, however, the situation has changed alarmingly. Commercial and residential developments have sprung up along the highways leading into Sharpsburg and have not only marred the site but have threatened to engulf it altogether.

We should welcome this opportunity to set aside forever the field where men struggled to preserve the unity of this Nation, and in so doing, wrote one of the most dramatic chapters of its history. If we are to prevent Antietam battlefield from passing into the heap of forgotten landmarks, we must act now.

If enacted, the proposed legislation which I am introducing today would amend the act of May 14, 1940 (54 Stat. 212) entitled "An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to acquire property for the Antietam battlefield site in the State of Maryland, and for other purposes," by striking out ": *Provided*, That payment for such property or interests shall be made solely from donated funds." This amendment would have the effect of releasing appropriated funds for use in purchasing land in connection with the Antietam battlefield site.

To the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

S. 1269. A bill authorizing the construction by the Maritime Administration of thirty merchant vessels of appropriate types.

The statement accompanying Senate bill 1269 is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR BUTLER

It is impossible to envisage a strong and prosperous America or the continued fulfillment of our obligations to the free world without an adequate, modern American merchant marine. Yet, in review after review by both Government and industry groups over a period of several years, there is but one clear and overriding conclusion. Unless present trends in ship construction are altered, America will soon become a second- or even third-rate maritime power. The present status of the American merchant marine, in terms of quality of ships in being, falls far short of the minimal standards established by the Merchant Marine Act of 1936. The one outstanding fact, undisputed in all of the expert studies and analyses of the merchant marine is this—that the present capability of the maritime industry is less than would be required in a moment of sudden emergency, and to the very extent of the disparity between what we have and what we need, to this extent is our national security jeopardized. Furthermore, to the extent that we fail to maintain an adequate, modern, competitive merchant marine—to that extent we jeopardize America's vital position in world trade.

Our national policy, the role of our merchant marine and its responsibilities, is succinctly stated in the "Declaration of Policy" of the 1936 Merchant Marine Act:

"It is necessary for the national defense and development of its foreign and domestic commerce that the United States shall have a merchant marine (a) sufficient to carry its domestic water borne commerce and a substantial portion of the water borne export and import foreign commerce of the United States and to provide shipping service on all routes essential for maintaining the flow of such domestic and foreign water borne commerce at all times, (b) capable of serving as a naval and military auxiliary in time of war or national emergency, (c) owned and operated under the U.S. flag by citizens of the United States insofar as may be practicable, and (d) composed of the best-equipped, safest, and most suitable types of vessels, constructed in the United States and manned with a trained and efficient civilian personnel. It is hereby declared to be the policy of the United States to foster the development and encourage the maintenance of such a merchant marine."

Thus, our merchant marine is to perform a dual function. Our merchant fleet must conform to a dual set of standards and specifications. On the one hand, the fleet must be sufficient to carry this Nation's commerce on essential shipping routes, and on the other, it must be capable of "serving as a naval and military auxiliary in time of war or national emergency."

The most recent count (November 1, 1958) shows the privately operated active fleet to contain 940 ships, of which approximately 65 percent are freighters, 31 percent tankers, and 4 percent combination type vessels. Out of the total 940, 833 ships are more than 10 years old, and out of this number, 648 were built in the 3 war years, 1943, 1944, and 1945.

Forty percent of the ships in the active fleet work the domestic trade while the remaining 60 percent work the foreign trade. Some one-third of the vessels in the privately owned are subsidized.

Most of the inferior emergency-type vessels built under the stepped-up wartime program have been removed from active service and placed in the reserve fleet. This fleet, the six divisions of which are strategically located in positions on the east, west and Gulf coasts, consists of 1,713 freighters, 226 combination-type vessels, and 54 tankers. Of the 1,713 freighters, 1,415 are low-speed, low-efficiency Liberty ships.

The briefest glance at the figures quoted above should sponsor an appreciation of the critical situation facing the merchant marine. An overwhelming fraction of the active fleet is of uniform age and is approaching obsolescence in a concentrated block, while the reserve fleet is already overcrowded with ships that are not worth the expense of preserving or reactivating, except for defense reasons in an extreme national emergency.

If it were possible to graduate the replacement of the fleet, to replace with a ship of new and modern design each ship that had become economically obsolete, then the fundamental problem of obsolescence would be easy of solution. And if our active fleet were composed of units of varying ages, if, that is, construction over the last twenty years had been undertaken at an even and balanced rate, then such a program of phased development would be feasible and would probably already have been put in operation. Unfortunately, however, the facts do not square with these ideal conditions; the construction of our active fleet was not spaced evenly over the last 20 years but rather was concentrated in the large part during the 5 war years.

Figuring upon an economic lifetime of 20 years, 70 percent of our active fleet will pass into obsolescence between the years 1963–65. To replace this many ships in such a short span of time would be far beyond the present capacity of the shipbuilding industry, and such intensive replacement, even if it could be accomplished, would be inadvisable inasmuch as it would simply perpetuate the block obsolescence problem.

What then, are the present needs of our merchant marine? Although replacement is now figured on a lift-carrying capacity basis rather than on a ship-for-ship basis, and although fewer ships will have to be replaced than actually go out of service, the Maritime Administration estimated in its "Review of Maritime Subsidy Policy of 1954" that to bring both the fleet and the shipbuilding industry up to an acceptable level of strength and activity, a program which called for the construction of 60 ships per year was necessary.

According to a recent summary compiled by the Shipbuilders Council of America, all outstanding contracts call for the construction of 90 ships—17 were to be delivered in 1958, 39 for delivery in 1959, 28 for delivery in 1960, and 6 for delivery in 1961. Of these 90 ships, 18 are being built for foreign flag, leaving a total of 72 being built for American flag lines.

Even if the volume of shipbuilding contracted for increases materially over the next 3 years, the 60-ship-a-year program envisioned by the Maritime Administration will not be achieved.

The mandate of the Government is clear: It must assist more actively in the replacement of the fleet or else face the certainty of progressive deterioration in the quality of the American merchant marine.

At present the Government aids and participates in ship construction through programs of (1) construction differential subsidy, (2) operating differential subsidy, (3) various tax benefits, (4) mortgage aid (this is rarely extended), (5) mortgage insurance aid, (6) trade-in allowances, and (7) U.S. cargo preference provisions.

Items Nos. 1, 5, 6, and 7 above are available to all American operators. Items Nos. 2 and 3, however, are available only to operators who have agreed to (a) the recapture of profits in excess of 10 percent of capital necessarily employed to the extent of subsidy paid to him; (b) the establishment of reserve funds to provide for (1) replacement and acquisition of ships, (2) prompt payment of his obligations to the United States, and (3) continued maintenance and operation of subsidized vessels; (c) the use of articles, materials, and supplies produced in the United States, and the repair of subsidized vessels within the continental limits of the United States. The operators who bind themselves to discharge these obligations and whose applications are approved by the Maritime Administration are known as the subsidized operators. Their status requires them to make certain tax-exempt deposits in capital reserve and special reserve funds, and entitles them to make voluntary tax-deferred deposits in these funds over and above the amounts required.

Fortified as they are with Government assistance, can the private operators themselves initiate a program of phased replacement?

Offsetting the large measure of Government assistance are the vastly increased costs of construction and operation, which have far outdistanced the corresponding increases in corporate earnings. The result is, of course, that a larger and larger share of these earnings must be deposited in depreciation funds if the capital necessary for new construction is to be accumulated. The following figures were quoted in the 1954 House Merchant Marine Review of maritime subsidy:

"The allowance for depreciation in subsidized cargo ships for the 13 operators receiving subsidy amounted to $15,455,889 in 1952, or 14.3 percent of profit, before depreciation and taxes, but after gross subsidy accrual. This compares with an estimated allowance for depreciation on the ships required in the replacement of these vessels of $55,950,250, or 51.9 percent of 1952 profit. Including passenger-carrying ships in this statement would further increase the percentage of replacement depreciation to profits. It is clear that operators of subsidized ships will have to produce substantially higher earnings in order to maintain this 1952 rate of profit and cover the depreciation charges of new vessel replacement."

The low level of depreciation allowances results from the fact that most of the ships now active were purchased under the provisions of the Ship Sales Act of 1946. Under this act war tonnage of questionable value was offered at prices commensurate with this value; the purchasers then fixed the depreciation allowances accordingly, i.e., at the annual rate of 5 percent of the purchase price. The consequence of all this has been that the accumulated depreciation funds now on hand are woefully inadequate when measured against the expense of constructing modern tonnage.

It is obvious that the private operators cannot replace tonnage ahead of schedule when they are so hard put to finance even scheduled replacement. Partially matured depreciation funds are obviously unable to provide the capital which fully matured funds are unable to provide.

If the 60 ships-a-year program prescribed as essential by the Maritime Administration in 1954 is to be established, the Government must come immediately to the project's aid. Were the Government to authorize the construction of vessels at this time, the result would be doubly advantageous. In the first place, to the extent that these vessels incorporated the speed and efficiency features which are the product of modern design, they would upgrade the quality of the merchant marine. In the second place, as these vessels are absorbed into the industry and take the place of other vessels now working on certain essential routes, they would force into the reserve fleet ships which are now actively in service. By so doing, they would cause the quality of the reserve fleet to be upgraded.

There is approximately a 30-vessel difference between the 60 ships a year called for by the Maritime Administration and the number constructed in 1958 and under contract for delivery in 1959. This difference must be compensated for Government-authorized construction of vessels of such type as will remedy the present deficiencies of the merchant marine.

If the deterioration of our merchant marine is permitted to continue, this Nation will eventually be able to mount neither a commercial effort in time of peace nor a defense effort in time of war; our fleet will be driven in mockery from the seas by more modern and efficient foreign vessels, and our national strength and prestige will suffer incalculable damage.

Accordingly, I am introducing a bill providing for the construction of 30 modern merchant vessels by the Maritime Administration. I believe that it is essential that Congress give this problem immediate attention.

RESEARCH PROGRAM TO DETERMINE MEANS OF IMPROVING CONSERVATION OF CERTAIN GAME FISH

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to establish a research program in order to determine means of improving the conservation of game fish in dam reservoirs.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill, together with a statement I have prepared explaining its purpose, be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill and explanatory statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1262) to direct the Secretary of the Interior to establish a research program in order to determine means of improving the conservation of game fish in dam reservoirs, introduced by Mr. FULBRIGHT, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Interior shall establish a program of research and experimentation in order to determine means of improving the conservation of game fish in dam reservoirs.

SEC. 2. For the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this Act, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized (1) to acquire by purchase, condemnation, or otherwise such suitable lands, to construct such buildings, to acquire such equipment and apparatus, and to employ such officers and employees as he deems necessary; (2) to cooperate or contract with State and other institutions and agencies upon such terms and conditions as he determines to be appropriate; and (3) to make public the results of such research and experiments conducted pursuant to the first section of this Act.

SEC. 3. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act.

The explanatory statement presented by Mr. FULBRIGHT is as follows:

STATEMENT OF SENATOR FULBRIGHT

I am introducing a bill today to authorize the Fish and Wildlife Service of the Interior Department to carry out a research program designed to improve fishery conservation practices in Government reservoirs.

Sports fishing is becoming more popular each year in this country. One only has to look at a trout stream or a good bass lake on the first day of the season to realize the tremendous interest in this sport. It is one sport in which the young and old can participate on equal terms. The old term "gone fishing" is literally true today as millions more each year find an elusive peace of mind by sitting on the bank of some quiet stream or in a boat bobbing in a secluded cove. Somehow the pressures and conflicts of our day to day existence seem to dissolve when the line hits the water. It is a much more pleasant and, probably healthier, interlude than a session on the psychiatrist's couch. It is impossible to single out any one factor responsible for the increased enthusiasm for this sport. Greater leisure time, better transportation, better physical facilities in fishing areas, population growth; all these and many other factors have had their effect. I believe, however, that the water resource programs of the Federal Government have contributed more to the expansion of sport fishing than any other single factor.

It is difficult to realize that the water impounded by Corps of Engineer and Bureau of Reclamation dams now cover over 3 million acres of once dry land. Other State, municipal, and private reservoirs bring the total of artificial impoundments to about 13 million acres. Most of the Federal projects have been completed since World War II and although they have been constructed primarily for flood control and power generation, they have also provided outdoor recreation-minded Americans with excellent fishing and boating opportunities.

In 1957 over 95 million visitor-days were recorded at Federal lakes and about 14 million persons went fishing. The attendance at the six Federal lakes in Arkansas was nearly 5½ million in that year. For Corps of Engineer reservoirs nationwide there was an almost 20 percent increase over attendance in 1956. There is every indication that attendance at these Federal projects increased substantially in 1958, but these figures have not yet been compiled. Although the majority of the visitors at large reservoirs do not fish, their exposure to the lures of fishing has resulted in many new converts. It is reasonable to expect that with the development of fishing facilities and improved access, angling activity will probably double in the foreseeable future.

Although additional fishing areas are created each year by completion of new reservoirs, we do not attain a corresponding net increase in total fishing yield. Initial fishing in new reservoirs is usually phenomenal, but, at the same time, fishing yields in older reservoirs decline. As the reservoirs age the catches tend to taper off to a stable, and many times undesirable, level.

The vexing problems involved in trying to maintain or improve fishing in reservoirs, especially the large Federal projects, has been too great a problem for State fish and game agencies. The State agencies must spread their limited budgets so thin that it is impossible for them to approach the problem in an adequate manner. Without proper research, game-fish population in reservoirs will continue to decline as time passes. Unless careful study is given to the development of fishery conservation practices in reservoirs, the growing demand for good fishing will not be met.

The bill I am introducing authorizes a research program designed to solve the problem of declining reservoir yields. It is a simple bill but it will have nationwide applicability. It would give the Secretary of the Interior authority to conduct a nationwide study of reservoirs; Federal, State, local, or private, to determine methods for maintaining and increasing fishery assets. There is much that is unknown about the causes of declines in fishing yields as reservoirs age. The objectives of this bill are to find these causes and develop conservation practices to offset or eliminate them. I have left the language sufficiently broad to allow the Secretary to develop the research program in any way he deems proper in order to achieve the desired objective. The problems encountered will undoubtedly be different in various sections of the country, and even from reservoir to reservoir in the same area. It is not contemplated that the program will involve actual research in each reservoir in the country or even a fraction of them. Although the actual work may be conducted at only several representative lakes, the results will be applicable to all.

This will, of necessity, be a long-range project. I anticipate that it will take 10 or 15 years to carry out the research needed. A conservation program cannot be developed to solve the reservoir aging problem without actually studying aging over a period of years. Of course, much helpful information will be discovered as the project proceeds. I have been advised that a limited project along the lines I propose could be carried out for about $250,000 a year. This sum is minute in comparison to the benefits which will accrue to the sports fishing enthusiasts throughout the country. I urge all Senators to give support to the bill in order to get the project underway as soon as possible.

EXTENSION OF CERTAIN PRIVILEGES AND IMMUNITIES TO JUDGES OF INTERNATIONAL COURT OF JUSTICE

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, by request, I introduce for appropriate reference, a bill to extend certain privileges and immunities to judges of the International Court of Justice. This bill was submitted to the Vice President by letter on February 17, 1959.

The proposed legislation has been requested by the Acting Secretary of State, and I am introducing it in order that there may be a specific bill to which Members of the Senate and the public may direct their attention and comments.

I reserve my right to support or oppose this bill, as well as any suggested amendments to it, when the matter is considered by the Committee on Foreign Relations.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill may be printed at this point in the RECORD, together with the letter from the Acting Secretary of State to the Vice President in regard to it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill and letter will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1263) to extend certain privileges and immunities to judges of the International Court of Justice, introduced by Mr. FULBRIGHT (by request), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the judges of the International Court of Justice, other than nationals of the United States, shall be entitled in the territory of the United States to the same privileges and immunities as are accorded to diplomatic envoys accredited to the United States.

The letter presented by Mr. FULBRIGHT is as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, February 17, 1959.

The Honorable RICHARD M. NIXON,
President of the Senate.

DEAR MR. VICE PRESIDENT: The International Court of Justice, to whose statute the United States is a party by virtue of its membership in the United Nations, sits at The Hague. Its 15 judges, representing the main forms of civilization and the principal legal systems of the world, frequently choose to reside in countries other than their own in order to enable them expeditiously to travel to The Hague when needed.

The General Assembly of the United Nations, on December 11, 1946, adopted Resolution 90(I), which provided in part as follows:

"The General Assembly * * *

"2. Recommends that if a judge, for the purpose of holding himself permanently at the disposal of the Court, resides in some country other than his own, he should be accorded diplomatic privileges and immunities during the period of his residence there."

The U.S. delegation voted in favor of this resolution.

Implementation of this resolution has been undertaken by some United Nations members. France and Italy, for example, grant diplomatic privileges and immunities to judges not nationals of the state of residence.

Although the United States has not yet taken steps fully to implement this resolution, a substantial measure of privileges and immunities is presently granted in the United States to judges of the International Court of Justice. Under article 19 of the Statute of the Court, judges engaged on the business of the Court enjoy diplomatic privileges and immunities. In addition, under section 7(b) of the International Organizations Immunities Act [Public Law 291, 79th Cong., 1st sess. (1945)] judges are immune from suit and legal process relating to acts performed by them in their official capacity and falling within their functions. However, these provisions might not protect a judge while in residence in the United States, even if he had taken up residence here in order to be readily accessible to The Hague.

Accordingly, there is submitted for your consideration and favorable action a draft bill to give judges of the International Court of Justice, other than nationals of the United States, the privileges and immunities which the United States now grants to envoys accredited to it. The granting of such privileges and immunities would be in conformity with the recommendation of the General Assembly. It would also symbolize the importance attached by the United States to the impartial and independent functioning of international judicial tribunals.

The Department has been informed by the Bureau of the Budget that there is no objection to the submission of this proposed legislation.

Sincerely yours,

CHRISTIAN A. HERTER,
Acting Secretary.

CLARIFICATION OF TITLE 23, SECTION 131, UNITED STATES CODE

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, and Senators HRUSKA, RANDOLPH, and SCHOEPPEL, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend title 23 of section 131 of the United States Code, being the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1958. I ask unanimous consent that the bill lie on the desk until the close of business on Monday next, to enable other Senators who wish to be cosponsors, to add their names.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from Oklahoma.

The bill (S. 1266) providing for the amendment of title 23, section 131 of the United States Code (sec. 122 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1958), to clarify the said section with relation to municipalities and areas zoned under the laws of the States, and to recognize the laws of the States relating thereto, introduced by Mr. KERR (for himself, Mr. HRUSKA, Mr. RANDOLPH, and Mr. SCHOEPPEL), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Works.

NOTICE BY STATES TO FEDERAL GOVERNMENT RELATING TO LEASING OF CERTAIN MINERAL LANDS

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], and my colleague, the junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to provide for notice to States owning surface of lands in which minerals are reserved to Federal Government of proposals to lease such minerals.

This bill would require the Secretary of the Interior, upon receipt of applications for the lease of Federal mineral rights in State-owned land, to promptly notify the affected State.

The State then would have 30 days in which to present its views on whether the lease should be granted.

The need for such legislation was pointed up recently by a situation which occurred in the Swan Creek Wildlife Refuge in southwestern Michigan.

The surface of this land is owned by the State of Michigan, while the Federal Bureau of Land Management retains the oil and mineral rights.

Oil rights were leased some time ago to a private concern, but the first notice the State had of it was when the private concern sought a drilling permit.

The State of Michigan had no opportunity to express its views on whether the lease should ever have been granted in such an area.

Notice to the States of lease applications is particularly necessary when the land is in public use as a park or for conservation purposes, as is Swan Creek.

Commercial operations could rapidly destroy its attractiveness as a haven for migratory birds.

I am sure there was no deliberate intent on the part of the Bureau of Land Management to prevent the State from expressing its views before the lease actually was granted.

However, it is very important, for the sake of sound Federal-State relations,

for the Bureau of Land Management to work closely with the States in these matters.

State land is owned by the citizens, just as is Federal land. Therefore, the States should have something to say about how its property is to be used.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1268) to provide for notice to States owning surface of lands in which minerals are reserved to Federal Government of proposals to lease such minerals, introduced by Mr. MCNAMARA (for himself, Mr. HART, and Mr. MURRAY), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

USE OF GREAT LAKES VESSELS ON THE OCEAN

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, by request, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to authorize the use of Great Lakes vessels on the ocean. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a memorandum relating to the proposed legislation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the memorandum will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1270) to authorize the use of Great Lakes vessels on the oceans, introduced by Mr. DIRKSEN (by request), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

The memorandum presented by Mr. DIRKSEN is as follows:

MEMORANDUM

Subject: Legislation to remove restrictions on certain Great Lakes vessels

The purpose of the attached bill is to remove a restriction limiting to the Great Lakes and its connecting waterways the operation of certain vessels sold under the Ship Sales Act of 1946, as amended. If this bill is enacted, such vessels would be permitted to be used on the oceans during the winter months when the lakes season is over.

When legislation authorized the sale of vessels for Great Lakes use, it provided that these ships should be operated for exclusive use on the Great Lakes. At the time of that legislation, this was academic as there was no method by which the vessels could be taken in or out of the lakes. Actually, to get these vessels originally into the Great Lakes, it was necessary to remove all of their superstructure and float them on pontoons up the Mississippi River. But now that the St. Lawrence Seaway will soon open, these ships will be able to reach the high seas without any difficulty and other vessels will be able to go into the Great Lakes to compete with them.

Of the ships to which this bill might apply, five are converted to bulk carriers and the sixth to a passenger and automobile carrier. As the five bulk carriers probably cannot qualify for operation on the oceans in view of their type of conversion, this bill would as a practical matter affect only the vessel *Aquarama*. The *Aquarama* has facilities for carrying up to 2,500 passengers and 180 automobiles. The vessel has no sleeping accommodations for passengers so that she is limited to use on short voyages. She is presently employed carrying passengers and cars between Cleveland and Detroit. The season on this run is limited to the summer months and the vessel in the past year operated only 84 days. As a result of the limited season, the ship, which cost the owners $4,500,000, has lost money every year. During the season, approximately 250 people are employed in the operation of this vessel. During the off season, however, almost all of these must now be discharged.

Enactment of this proposed bill will enable the ship to be put into a useful winter trade in a warm climate on a day-ship basis. The increased utilization of the vessel should permit it to achieve profitable operations. It will also permit the employment of the ship's personnel on a year round rather than a short seasonal basis. Because of the fact that the ship must be limited to a short run it should offer no competition to any established American liner company.

This bill involves no subsidy or any other expense to the Government. It may, however, result in revenue to the Government in the event that the removal of the restriction permits profitable rather than loss operation, as such profits would, of course, be subject to tax.

AMENDMENT OF SUBSECTION B OF SECTION 349 OF THE IMMIGRATION AND NATIONALITY ACT

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I introduce and ask for appropriate reference of a bill to amend subsection B of section 349 of the Immigration and Nationality Act. I should like to briefly explain this amendment.

There are a large number of Americans, born in this country of immigrant parents, who as children were taken back to the country of their parents during the difficult years of the great depression. This is particularly true of Portuguese Americans, who brought this problem to my attention. Connecticut is fortunate to number among its citizens a large number of Portuguese Americans and I have a deep interest in their problems.

The American-born children who grew up abroad were in due course drafted into the armies of foreign countries. Many of them, after completing military service and attaining maturity, wished to return to America, the country of their birth. However, they found their reentry into the United States barred.

Under our immigration laws, service in the army of a foreign nation and the taking of the required oath of allegiance to that nation are causes for forfeiture of American citizenship.

A long list of court cases ensued, and the decisions affirmed again and again that an American citizen can forfeit his citizenship only through willful, voluntary acts.

Being drafted into a foreign army is so obviously an involuntary act that the Passport Division of the State Department has for a long time granted reentry into the United States to those who can offer reasonable proof that their foreign military service was forced upon them by foreign laws.

However, section 349B of the Immigration and Nationality Act, which became law in 1952 takes this determination out of the hands of the Passport Division in cases where the person in question has resided for 10 years or more in a foreign country. Under the terms of that section, the foreign military service of such a person is automatically and arbitrarily presumed to be voluntary, if he had resided abroad for 10 years prior to his military service. This section does violence to common sense and basic justice.

An act is either voluntary or it is involuntary. It is the element of intent, not the element of time that should govern.

The bill which I offer today would change the "conclusive presumption" to a "rebuttable presumption." This gives an opportunity to the individual in question to establish whether or not the act that threatens his citizenship was a voluntary act or an involuntary act. If they are proved to be involuntary, his citizenship would not be affected. Each of us can trace his freedom, his security, and his way of life to a simple blessing that has come to him through his American citizenship.

Everyone who is born in this country must from time to time thank a kind Providence for the good fortune that, through no virtue or effort of his own, has elevated his lot above that of all other peoples of the world. We did not earn the heritage which came to us at birth. It was a gift, the most valuable temporal gift we have. We should therefore, seek to protect the rights of our fellow citizens with a zeal born of our gratitude for this gift.

We should surround it with special safeguards because we appreciate the tragedy of its loss. We should protect it against administrative decrees or legislative oversight.

No one born in this country should have his citizenship taken away because of acts beyond his control, or because of minor acts or omissions done in complete ignorance of their consequences.

The bill which I offer today would give every such citizen protection against the arbitrary nullification of his citizenship by giving to him the opportunity to prove that he has not forfeited that citizenship through any willful act. Every person born in this country is entitled to such an opportunity. We owe this much to ourselves. We owe it to each other. And above all, we owe it to our concept of the worth of our common citizenship.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1280) to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act, introduced by Mr. DODD, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRESERVATION AND DEVELOPMENT OF DOMESTIC FLUORSPAR INDUSTRY

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, the fluorspar industry is presently closed down with the exception of three captive operations—mining operations owned by metals or chemical manufacturing firms. This is a result of an international surplus of fluorspar resulting principally from the actions of the United States Government to stimulate production at home and abroad. Domestic producers have enjoyed the benefits of the stockpiling program, while

the foreign producers have had the advantage of loans and grants to assist in financing the development of fluorspar mines and minerals. The foreign producers have participated in the stockpiling program and also have shipped substantial amounts of imported fluorspar under barter contracts. The Public Law 733 program has been completed and today the domestic production of fluorspar has practically ceased.

Fluorspar is perhaps one of our most strategic minerals. At the same time our civilian economy is requiring greater and greater quantities of this mineral. Fluorspar is indispensable to the production of steel, aluminum, hydrofluoric acid, atomic energy, and fluorine gas. Fluorine, the commercial derivative of fluorspar, is the most perfect oxidizing agent we have for our rockets and missiles. It is essential to the operation of either solid or liquid fueled equipment. Consumption, particularly of acid grade fluorspar, is increasing at an astounding rate, greater than that of any other mineral.

Mr. President, on behalf of myself and Senators MURRAY, BARTLETT, BENNETT, BIBLE, COOPER, DIRKSEN, GRUENING, MANSFIELD, MORTON, and MOSS, I introduce for appropriate reference, a bill to provide for the preservation and development of the fluorspar industry and ask that it lie on the table through March 11.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from Colorado.

The bill (S. 1285) to provide for the preservation and development of the domestic fluorspar industry, introduced by Mr. ALLOTT (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, this proposed legislation is offered in an attempt to maintain some domestic production of fluorspar and simultaneously to prevent unnecessary injury to foreign producers. It would divide the present domestic consumption approximately on a 50–50 basis between importers and domestic producers. Foreign producers would be given, under this bill, approximately three-fourths of the rapidly increasing consumption, so that within 2 or 3 years the foreign producers will have somewhere between 60 and 75 percent of the domestic market. Foreign producers through their quotos and barter contracts would import at about the same record high level maintained over the last 3 years and slightly more than they imported last year. The barter material would go to supplemental stockpile.

The consumer's interest is protected by a ceiling price.

Under the proposed legislation domestic producers would be permitted to furnish 200,000 tons of the consumption requirements of fluorspar containing more than 97 percent calcium fluoride—acid grade—with imports providing the balance of requirements. Each year foreign producers would have their share of the market increased by receiving 75 percent of the increase in consumption until imports had reached the level of the average imports for the years 1956, 1957, 1958. Thereafter they would receive 60 percent of such increase.

Domestic producers would be permitted to furnish 125,000 tons of the consumption requirements of fluorspar containing not more than 97 percent calcium fluoride—metallurgical grade—with foreign producers providing the balance of requirements. Each year foreign producers would have their share of the market increased by receiving 75 percent of the increase in consumption until imports had reached the level of the average imports for the years 1956, 1957, 1958. Thereafter they would receive 60 percent of such increase.

On the basis of 1957 consumption, domestic producers would have furnished 200,000 tons of acid grade fluorspar and 125,000 tons of metallurgical grade fluorspar; foreign producers would have provided 140,000 tons of acid grade fluorspar and 200,000 tons of metallurgical grade fluorspar.

Additionally, in order to prevent any injury abroad, the Director of Commodity Credit Corporation is directed, to the extent possible, to enter into barter contracts for fluorspar in an amount which when added to commercial imports will bring the total of imports up to the average level for the years 1956, 1957, 1958.

The Secretary of the Interior allocates foreign quotas on the basis of the average imports for the years 1956, 1957, and 1958. However, to permit new countries to participate, 20 percent of the total foreign quota is held for 60 days. If no country makes application, this 20 percent is prorated among the original countries.

The Secretary of the Interior is authorized to increase either domestic or foreign quotas as the need may be, in order to assure an adequate supply of fluorspar to consumers.

In order to assure the consumers of fluorspar of reasonable prices, this legislation places price ceilings on both domestic and foreign fluorspar. General Services Administration prices on metallurgical grade fluorspar and Public Law 733 prices on acid grade fluorspar are used, except for a $2 per ton increase in acid grade fluorspar, to allow for drying and transportation to barge or car. For stockpiling purposes, acid grade fluorspar could not be in dry form and was purchased f.o.b. mill with deduction for moisture content. These prices are to be adjusted annually, being tied to the Department of Labor Nonferrous Metals Index and subject to its fluctuations.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Colorado yield?

Mr. ALLOTT. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Alaska.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, my colleague, the distinguished junior Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], and I are gratified to be cosponsors of the bill introduced by the distinguished Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT] which calls for applying the principles of the National Sugar Act to fluorspar, one of this Nation's sick strategic minerals industries.

While many Senators may not realize it, Alaska has rich resources of fluorspar. In fact, I am informed that the tailings of a tin operation in Alaska constitute one of the best fluorspar mines on the basis of the richness of the ore contained in the tailings.

We in Alaska, because of our geographic location, are also intensely aware of the importance of an "at home" supply of fluorspar which the missile experts have told us is the base, the vital ingredient in the ultimate rocket and missile fuel.

I hope that the Interior Committee will see fit to quickly hold hearings on this bill and report it out for floor action.

Mr. ALLOTT. I thank the distinguished Senator from Alaska for his statement.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ALLOTT. I am happy to yield to the distinguished Senator from Montana.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I am happy to join with the distinguished Senator from Colorado and others in the sponsorship of a bill designed to keep open the fluorspar mines of this Nation.

The approach to the problem provided in this bill is patterned after the Sugar Act which has proven highly successful in the past. I see no reason why this same approach would not operate successfully in the case of fluorspar and other strategic minerals.

Last year Dr. Wernher von Braun, the great missile and rocket expert, advised the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee that fluorine, which comes from fluorspar, is a vital ingredient in the ultimate fuel which we must and shall develop for the propulsion of our advanced missiles, rockets, and satellites.

Since January 1 of this year, every fluorspar mine in the United States, with the exception of one and possibly two captive mines, have been closed down—forced to close down by excessive foreign imports.

In view of the statement by Dr. von Braun, we cannot afford as a Nation to permit this situation to continue much longer.

I believe that this so-called Sugar Act approach is a workable one. It will provide stability in production, stability in price for the protection of the ultimate consumer, protection of the national security, and provide employment for hundreds of American miners now idle.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that three recent newspaper articles taken from the Salt Lake Tribune, American Metal Market, and the Journal of Commerce, reporting on the first public announcement made by the distinguished junior Senator from Utah, Senator Moss, that the Sugar Act approach to our minerals problem was

being contemplated, be printed in the RECORD:

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Salt Lake Tribune, Feb. 7, 1959]

MOSS BIDS FOR PROGRAM TO ASSURE U.S. METALS

DENVER, February 7.—A Federal mining program patterned after the Sugar Act "to assure at all times domestic production of the major minerals and metals" was proposed by Senator FRANK E. MOSS (Democrat, Utah) when he addressed the National Western Mining Conference.

The new Utah Senator said Chairman JAMES E. MURRAY, of the Senate Interior Committee, agrees with him that there should be a staff study to determine the advisability of such legislation.

Senator Moss, who also belongs to the Interior Committee which handles the mining legislation, held that such a study is in the interest of national security, in the interest of employment in the metal and mineral mines of this Nation and in the interest of the mining industry in general.

The Utahan also used the occasion to criticize the Eisenhower administration's current economy program and determination "to keep the Federal Government out of the red by keeping Federal revenues up."

"I fervently agree with the commendable objective, but I must point out that a sick mining industry paying little or no income tax to the Federal Government is not in a very good position to help keep Federal revenues up," he said.

[From the American Metal Market, Feb. 10, 1959]

SENATOR MOSS PROPOSES MINERAL LAWS LIKE THOSE FOR SUGAR

WASHINGTON, February 9—Legislation patterned after the Sugar Act was proposed by Senator Moss (Democrat, of Utah), Saturday at Denver as a solution to the problem of assuring at all times domestic production of major minerals and metals.

Speaking before the National Western Mining Conference, Senator Moss said that he and Senator MURRAY, chairman of the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, have agreed that a staff study should be held to determine if such legislation is advisable.

The freshman Senator from Utah said that he and Senator MURRAY are concerned that metals lost ground in 1958.

Senator Moss said he was disturbed by a recent speech of the Under Secretary of Interior with a "thread running through his remarks to the effect that if the budget is to be kept balanced, there is little or no aid to be given to the sick mineral industry."

Although the objective of balancing the budget is commendable, Senator Moss said, a sick mining industry paying little or no income tax to the Federal Government is not in a very good position to help keep Federal revenues up.

The Sugar Act has often been discussed as a possible solution to the problem of keeping the domestic mining industry in a stabilized condition, but this is the first time it has reached the stage of a proposed staff study by the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee.

[From the Journal of Commerce, Feb. 9, 1959]

PATTERNED ON SUGAR ACT: PLAN VISUALIZES INSURED MARKET FOR U.S. MINERALS

(By Robert F. Morison)

WASHINGTON.—Plans are taking shape among westerners in Congress to make the most ambitious move yet to insure to U.S. producers of a wide range of minerals and metals a major share of the domestic market through an arrangement similar to the 10-year-old Sugar Act.

These plans are expected to be completed within 2 weeks and, at this stage, are expected to include such materials as fluorspar, iron ore, aluminum and oil and oil products, including residual oil.

Whatever final mechanism is decided upon to administer the overall program—and informed sources say a three-man top-level board will probably be proposed—the plan will provide:

Determination of domestic producers' share of the U.S. market.

The difference between consumption and domestic supplies to be divided among foreign producers.

PROVIDES GUARANTEES

An annual review so import quotas can keep pace with U.S. growth, except that at all times domestic producers' share will be guaranteed.

Supporters of this approach—who have failed in the past to obtain import quotas, higher tariffs, subsidies or other aids for domestic extractive industries—believe it will give producers here and abroad, as well as consumers, stable prices and dependable supplies.

First public disclosure of this new approach came Saturday in Denver, at the annual meeting of the National Western Mining Conference.

Senator FRANK E. MOSS, Democrat, Nevada, disclosed that he and Senator JAMES E. MURRAY, Democrat, Montana, chairman of the Senate Interior Committee, "are in agreement that there should be, in the interest of national security, in the interest of employment in the metal and mineral mines of this Nation, and in the interest of the mining industry in general, a staff study to determine if it is advisable that Congress enact legislation patterned after the Sugar Act to assure at all times domestic production of the major minerals and metals."

STUDY WELL ALONG

The staff study, it is learned, is well along and prime movers supporting the program hope to have it completed shortly.

The administration's professed liberal trade policy, plus the Democratic leadership in Congress which also generally favors freer trade, have been the chief obstacles to protection for these industries.

Further, control of the key Senate Finance Committee and House Ways and Means Committee, through which quota and tariff legislation must go, has virtually assured defeat for these proposals in past years.

However, this sugar act approach may be able to bypass these two committees.

The Sugar Act itself, which is up for extension this year, is handled by the Agriculture Committees in the House and Senate. The hope is that the Interior Committees may be able to handle the new plan.

CITES NEW ATTITUDE

Supporters are also counting for help indirectly on the administration's weakening on import quotas—as in the case of lead, zinc, and oil—and its switch in attitude on international commodity problems.

State Department officials, it is learned, have been filled in on what details have been firmed up on the minerals' program, but there is no indication what the official reaction will be.

The administration is not expected to be happy with this approach, but may find it difficult to oppose in light of the restrictive actions on lead, zinc, and oil and its willingness the past year to discuss—without making any commitments—international commodity problems on cocoa, coffee, lead, zinc, and copper.

Approaching the mining industries' problems this year in this fashion, sources say, may encounter additional advantages.

GRANTS TO STATES TO ASSIST IN PROVISION OF FACILITIES AND SERVICES FOR DAY CARE OF CHILDREN

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill entitled "The Day Care Assistance Act of 1959," to authorize a program of Federal aid for the day care of children outside the home not to exceed $25 million annually with half that amount to be allotted to States on a matching dollar-for-dollar basis and the remainder to be administered to impacted areas in which specific Federal activities like defense work or military bases have created a special need for such facilities.

State plans for day care centers and services are to meet standards set by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and on approval Federal funds would become available under the bill to assist in providing care for the children of working mothers and also for those children who require special attention because they or their parents are mentally or physically handicapped.

Hundreds of thousands of children throughout the United States will continue to be the chief losers so long as we fail to recognize that providing suitable day care for the children of working mothers is a national problem which urgently requires Federal aid to activate State and local efforts in this field and to back up the outstanding voluntary programs now in effect. Until a Federal program such as the one contemplated in my bill is enacted, we are not looking after the needs of these children in households where economic necessity forces the mother to work outside the home. In cases where adequate adult supervision is not available, children are exposed to influences which lead to juvenile delinquency and the serious rise in youth crime. Also, we are not meeting the needs of an expanding national economy which cannot fully utilize the highly trained skills and services possessed by thousands of American mothers with small children who may wish to join the work force.

Six and a half million to seven million children in the United States under the age of 12 have mothers who work outside the home. Initially, the great majority of them not now served would be the direct beneficiaries of professionally staffed, well equipped day care centers established by States and municipalities under a national program. It would also lend support to the activities pioneered by voluntary groups such as the Day Care Council of New York currently carrying so much of the burden in supplying essential facilities.

To categorically blame the waywardness of the children on the delinquency of the parents in homes where children do not receive sufficient care during the

day, especially after school, is grossly unfair in many instances. One-fifth of our young working mothers have little choice but to hold down full-time jobs because they are either widowed, divorced, or separated and there is no male breadwinner in the household. In addition, in families where the husband's yearly salary is under $1,500, at least one wife and mother out of every four is working to help supplement her family's meager income so that her children may receive the bare necessities. The percentage of cases where the mother leaves her children unattended so that she can earn money to purchase luxuries is very low.

Federal assistance for children's day care is not a new concept. The Lanham Act passed in the early 1940's set up such a program but it was allowed to lapse after the close of World War II. However, there are approximately 2 million more women in our labor force today than there were during the record war production year of 1944 when civilian manpower and womanpower was fully mobilized. Today, one out of every three workers is a woman and the proportion of young working mothers is bound to increase as we step up our entire level of industrial and business activity to meet the cold war challenges, both economic and military, posed by the Soviet Union.

The national interest will demand to an increasing degree that child day care centers and services become an integral community function especially in highly industrialized areas where working mothers are contributing to our total defense effort. Federal impetus supplied through the operations of a sensibly scaled program, allotting half to its annual authorization of $12.5 million to the States on a matching fund basis and the rest to federally impacted areas, offers the best means for attaining that objective.

Under the terms of the legislation, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare is charged with the responsibility of administering the program through its Children's Bureau. The bill further provides that any of the $12.5 million in matching funds granted to States for day care and not spent for that purpose, shall be repaid; also should any State find that it does not require all of these funds allocated to it, the Secretary of the Department may reassign such surplus amounts to other States. A system of appeal and judicial review of ruling by the Secretary is also provided.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1286) to authorize the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to make grants to the States to assist in the provision of facilities and services for the day care of children, introduced by Mr. JAVITS, was received, read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

AMENDMENT OF SOCIAL SECURITY ACT, RELATING TO INCREASED OUTSIDE INCOME

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I introduce a bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act so as to increase from $1,200 to $1,800 a year the amount of earned income a person may receive without having his social security benefits reduced.

The law now provides that persons who are 72 years of age or older may earn any amount without having their social security benefits reduced. For persons under 72, however, the maximum annual income per year which they may earn without losing any benefits is $1,200. For each $80 or fraction of $80 over $1,200 in yearly earned income, 1 month's benefits can be lost.

For example, a person who earns $110 each month, loses 2 months' benefits each year; a person earning $175 each month, loses all his benefits.

I believe, Mr. President, that this present limitation on earnings is far too low. Few people would argue that social security benefits are so high that outside income is not only desired by beneficiaries, but in many cases is an absolute necessity to maintain a decent standard of living. To raise the earnings limitation by $600 a year seems to me a most modest proposal.

I think it should be noted, also, Mr. President, that my bill would lower the barrier facing beneficiaries who do not wish to retire completely and would like to continue doing at least part-time work. Many of our older citizens have valuable skills acquired through long years of training and experience. Our Nation needs these skills, and we should be offering greater incentive to such people who do desire to work. My bill would be a step in this direction.

There is another point which also should be noted: Under present law, the $1,200 annual income limitation pertains only to earned income, and not to pensions, dividends, interest, and insurance. For example, while a beneficiary with an annual income from investments of $5,000 is entitled to full social security benefits, a beneficiary with an annual income of $5,000 in the form of wages or net income from self-employment normally loses his benefits entirely.

There is, to my mind, a serious question, as to the justification for such a distinction. While my bill does not do away with the present differentiation between earned income and investment income, it does at least modify it.

For these reasons, Mr. President, I believe that my amendment would be a great improvement in the present law. I hope it will be favorably considered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1288) to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase from $1,200 to $1,800 the annual amount individuals are permitted to earn without suffering deductions from the insurance benefits payable to them under such title, introduced by Mr. HUMPHREY, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

EXTENSION OF SPECIAL MILK PROGRAM FOR CHILDREN

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, my colleague from Minnesota [Mr. MCCARTHY], and the Senators from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY and Mr. PROXMIRE], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill that will make additional funds available for use in the special milk program for the balance of this fiscal year, and will provide for a needed expansion in 1960 and 1961.

It will be remembered that this special program to increase the consumption of milk by schoolchildren was first authorized in the Agricultural Act of 1954. In late June of 1958, Congress authorized a 3-year extension of the special milk program, with an annual authorization of $75 million.

Previously, when I sponsored the extension of this program, I asked for an increasing authorization to provide for expanded school enrollment and participation. We now learn from the Department of Agriculture that the authorization provided last year is already proving insufficient.

The Department of Agriculture has revealed that State estimates of needs, compared to apportionment of the $75 million, will result in a deficit in 38 States—amounting to an indicated total deficit of $3,378,569 if the program were to be carried on at the current level until the end of this fiscal year.

Unless we increase the authorization soon, States will have to tell their schools to cut down the milk supply to children who need it.

Therefore, the bill I am introducing today asks for the addition of $5 million to the current authorization, to wipe out the deficit for this fiscal year, and to increase the authorization for 1960 and 1961 by $10 million and $15 million, respectively, in order to provide for further expansion of school enrollment in the Nation.

Our school enrollment keeps going up as our population increases. We simply must realize that these health programs for our young people must be expanded, in order to keep pace with that growth.

I ask unanimous consent that a table, provided by the U.S. Department of Agriculture, showing the apportionment of funds, estimated State needs, and indicated deficit for fiscal 1959, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SPECIAL MILK PROGRAM

Apportionment of funds, State estimated needs, and indicated deficit, fiscal year 1959

Administrative unit	Apportionment [1] (1)	State estimated needs [2] (2)	Indicated deficit (3)
State agencies:			
Alabama	$1,075,610	$1,095,680	$20,070
Alaska	17,715	18,675	960
Arizona	326,033	357,223	31,190
Arkansas	641,539	658,127	16,588
California	7,211,353	7,892,289	680,936

[1] Division of funds among States is based on the pattern of expenditures in fiscal year 1958.

[2] Estimates received in late February 1959, based on actual expenditures through December 1958.

SPECIAL MILK PROGRAM

Apportionment of funds, State estimated needs, and indicated deficit, fiscal year 1959—Continued

Administrative unit	Apportionment [1] (1)	State estimated needs [2] (2)	Indicated deficit (3)
State agencies—Con.			
Colorado	513,697	591,332	77,635
Connecticut	769,829	843,470	73,641
Delaware	177,535	194,735	17,200
Delaware State Hospital	14,864	14,864	
District of Columbia	380,504	392,668	12,164
Florida	1,104,956	1,214,806	109,850
Georgia	1,000,504	1,001,504	1,000
Hawaii	433,161	133,161	
Idaho	167,846	186,102	18,256
Illinois	5,694,117	5,694,117	
Indiana	1,708,650	1,809,618	100,968
Iowa	1,431,776	1,431,776	
Kansas	803,889	830,992	27,103
Kentucky	1,206,233	2,241,457	35,224
Louisiana	470,911	470,911	
Maine	256,697	264,220	7,523
Maryland	1,206,054	1,291,832	85,778
Maryland Department of Budget and Procurement	25,300	25,300	
Massachusetts	2,853,942	2,853,942	
Michigan	3,599,088	3,706,663	107,575
Minnesota	1,726,723	1,726,723	
Mississippi	959,693	1,023,745	64,052
Missouri	2,026,829	2,054,524	27,695
Montana	129,776	129,776	
Nebraska	356,542	356,542	
Nevada	54,363	57,544	3,181
New Hampshire	197,454	200,877	3,423
New Jersey	$1,653,465	$2,043,551	$390,086
New Mexico	333,034	361,943	28,909
New York	8,902,259	9,104,966	202,707
New York Division of Standards and Purchases	139,928	139,928	
North Carolina	1,264,113	1,286,917	22,804
North Dakota	192,250	214,376	22,126
Ohio	3,734,585	3,954,217	219,632
Ohio Department of Public Welfare	127,485	127,485	
Oklahoma	832,292	847,925	15,633
Oregon	467,474	488,766	21,292
Pennsylvania	2,998,416	3,327,468	329,052
Rhode Island	306,804	337,883	31,079
South Carolina	461,089	507,370	46,281
South Carolina Dairy Commission	66,338	66,338	
South Dakota	320,204	320,204	
Tennessee	1,536,638	1,536,638	
Tennessee Department of Agriculture	18,665	18,665	
Texas	2,215,279	2,274,710	59,431
Utah	155,619	155,619	
Utah Department of Public Welfare	7,175	7,175	
Vermont	143,975	143,975	
Virginia	1,294,325	1,307,975	13,650
Washington	1,101,728	1,134,620	32,892
West Virginia	365,913	365,913	
Wisconsin	2,109,633	2,211,730	102,097
Wyoming	146,102	146,678	576
Total State agencies	69,137,971	72,198,230	3,060,259
Area offices:			
Northeast	908,753	1,058,340	149,587
Southeast	391,896	402,082	10,186
Midwest	2,880,270	3,015,916	135,646
Southwest	630,418	630,418	
West	359,592	382,483	22,891
Total area officers	5,170,929	5,489,239	318,310
Grand total	74,308,900	77,687,469	3,378,569

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I want to point out that California will be $680,936 short of meeting its estimated milk fund needs this fiscal year. New Jersey has an estimated deficit of $390,086; Ohio needs $219,632; Rhode Island needs $329,052; New York needs $202,707.

Fortunately, we in Minnesota appear to have an adequate apportionment to fulfill our own needs; but we are just as much concerned that young people everywhere shall have the opportunity to participate in this milk program.

This special program was initiated in September of 1954; and in the first year almost 450 million half pints of milk were consumed by the schoolchildren. In the fiscal year 1956, as the program became more firmly established, more than 1,394 million half pints of milk were consumed. It is interesting to note that, in 1959, about 29 percent more schools and other outlets participated in the program than in 1956, and 50 percent more milk was consumed.

I ask unanimous consent that a table, prepared by the U.S. Department of Agriculture, be printed, at this point in the RECORD, so that all may readily see how this program has expanded to reach more and more children.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SPECIAL MILK PROGRAM

Participation, milk consumption, and expenditures, fiscal years 1955–59

Fiscal year	Number of outlets participating	Milk consumption (½ pints)	Expenditures	Increase in expenditures over previous year
		Million	*Million*	*Percent*
1955	41,094	449.8	$17.1	
1956	62,266	1,394.2	45.9	168.4
1957 [1]	71,239	1,752.7	60.5	31.8
1958	76,478	1,918.2	66.3	9.6
1959 [2]	[3] 80,000	2,100.0	[4] 74.3	12.1

[1] In addition to schools, program was extended by Congress to summer camps and other child-care institutions.
[2] Estimated.
[3] Does not include summer camps. Summer camps in summer of 1957, 2,220; summer of 1958, 3,026.
[4] Maximum funds available. State estimated needs for funds amount to $77.7 million.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I feel that this proposal for the expansion of this valuable program merits immediate action. As a Member of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, I shall urge that it be given priority. I trust that my colleagues will join with me in considering this one of the important moves we can make for the welfare and health of the nation's young people.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1289) to increase and extend the special milk program for children, introduced by Mr. HUMPHREY (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

PROHIBITION OF EAVESDROPPING IN CERTAIN CASES

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to prohibit eavesdropping under certain circumstances, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

Mr. President, the bill is designed to protect the right of privacy against unauthorized invasion and, at the same time, to facilitate the fullest use of scientific methods of crime detection by law-enforcement agencies. The bill represents the first effort in Federal legislation to deal comprehensively with the new methods of electronic monitoring of conversations and other communications.

Under the terms of the bill, unauthorized eavesdropping would be a Federal criminal offense if it occurred in any area under Federal jurisdiction, or was for the purpose of aiding or abetting the perpetration of any Federal offense, or involved the use of facilities of interstate commerce.

However, the bill contains detailed provisions under which law enforcement agencies can obtain court orders for eavesdropping under procedures paralleling those applicable to warrants for searches and seizures.

One important provision of the bill would overturn the Supreme Court decision in the Benanti case and make it clear that evidence obtained by authorized State wiretapping would be admissible in Federal and State courts.

We cannot avoid coming to grips with this subject any longer.

While the present laws erect substantial and unreasonable impediments to effective police action against organized crime, they are almost entirely ineffective in dealing with blackmailers and other unscrupulous interlopers. This incredible situation demands legislative attention. I am hopeful that this bill will serve as a framework for consideration of needed revision of the law in this field.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1292) to prohibit eavesdropping under certain circumstances, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. KEATING, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That part I of title 18 of the United States Code is amended by adding thereto a new chapter:

"CHAPTER 28—EAVESDROPPING

"Sec.
"570. Definitions.
"571. Eavesdropping prohibited.
"572. Possession of eavesdropping instruments.
"573. Ex parte order for eavesdropping.
"574. Admissibility of evidence.
"575. Exceptions.
"576. Duty to report violations.

"§ 570. Definitions

"As used in this chapter—

"(1) 'Eavesdropping' refers to a situation in which a person—

"(a) not a sender or receiver of a telephone or telegraph communication willfully and by means of instrument overhears or records a telephone or telegraph communication, or aids, authorizes, employs, procures or permits another to do so, without the consent of either a sender or receiver thereof; or

"(b) not present during a conversation or discussion willfully and by means of instrument overhears or records such conversation or discussion, or aids, authorizes, employs, procures or permits another to do so, without the consent of the party to such conversation or discussion; or

"(c) who, not a member of a jury, records or listens to by means of instrument the deliberations of a jury or who aids, authorizes, employs, procures or permits another to do so.

"(2) 'Person' means any individual, partnership, corporation, or association including the subscriber to any telephone or telegraph service involved but excluding any law enforcement officer while acting lawfully and in his official capacity in the investigation, detection, or prosecution of crime.

"(3) 'Instrument' means any device, contrivance, machine, or apparatus or part thereof designed or used for acoustical detection including but not limited to wiretapping equipment, microphones, detectaphones, dictaphones, radio transmitters, and recorders.

"§ 571. Eavesdropping prohibited

"A person who engages in eavesdropping—

"(1) in the District of Columbia or any Territory or possession of the United States; or

"(2) for the purpose of aiding or abetting or perpetrating any Federal offense; or

"(3) where the conversation, discussion, or communication overheard or recorded is by wire or radio; or

"(4) for the purpose of obtaining information concerning any activity under Federal regulation; or

"(5) where the information overheard or recorded is to be transmitted in interstate commerce or outside the United States; or

"(6) where the instrument employed to overhear or record the conversation, discussion, or communication utilizes or involves facilities in interstate or foreign commerce, shall be fined not more than $5,000 or imprisoned not more than one year and a day, or both.

"§ 572. Possession of eavesdropping instruments

"A person who has in his possession any eavesdropping instrument under circumstances evincing an intent to use or employ or allow the same to be used or employed for unlawful eavesdropping under section 571 of this chapter, or knowing the same to be so used, shall be fined not more than $1,000 or imprisoned for not more than six months, or both.

"§ 573. Ex parte order for eavesdropping

"(1) An ex parte order for eavesdropping may be issued by any judge of any United States Court of Appeals or a United States District Court or any judge of the Municipal Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia or the Municipal Court for the District of Columbia or any Commissioner of the United States, upon oath or affirmation of an authorized agent of any Federal law enforcement agency that there is reasonable ground to believe that evidence of Federal crime may be thus obtained and particularly describing the person or persons whose communications, conversations, or discussions are to be overheard or recorded and the purpose thereof, and, in the case of a telegraphic or telephonic communication identifying the particular telephone number or telegraph line involved. In connection with the issuance of such an order the judge may examine on oath the applicant and any other witness he may produce and shall satisfy himself of the existence of reasonable grounds for the granting of such application. Any such order shall be effective for the time specified therein but not for a period of more than two months unless extended or renewed by the judge who signed and issued the original order upon satisfying himself that such extension or renewal is in the public interest. Any such order together with the papers upon which the application was based, shall be delivered to and retained by the applicant as authority for the eavesdropping authorized therein. A true copy of such order shall be retained in his possession by the judge issuing the same, and, in the event of the denial of an application for such an order, a true copy of the papers upon which the application was based shall in like manner be retained by the judge denying the same.

"(2) Orders for eavesdropping must be obtained before the eavesdropping commences, except as hereinafter in this section provided. A law enforcement officer may eavesdrop without a court order obtained, pursuant to this section only when he has reasonable grounds to believe (a) that evidence of crime may be thus obtained, and (b) that in order to obtain such evidence time does not permit an application to be made for such a court order before such eavesdropping must commence. In any such case an application for a court order pursuant to this section must be made within twenty-four hours after such eavesdropping commenced. In computing said twenty-four-hour period legal holidays shall not be considered. The application for such a court order must contain, in addition to the requirements set forth in this section, the time when such eavesdropping commenced. If such application is granted, the order shall be made effective from the time the eavesdropping commenced. If the application is denied, the eavesdropping must cease immediately.

"(3) Except in any trial, hearing or other proceeding, a person who willfully discloses to any person, other than a carrier whose facilities are involved, or other authorized agent of any law enforcement agency, any information concerning the application for, the granting or denial of orders for eavesdropping, or the identity of the person or persons whose communications, conversations, or discussions are the subject of an ex parte order granted pursuant to this section shall be fined not more than $1,000 or imprisoned not more than six months, or both.

"§ 574. Admissibility of evidence

"Evidence obtained by any act in violation of this chapter, and evidence obtained through or resulting from information obtained by any such act, shall be inadmissible for any purpose in any civil action, proceeding or hearing: *Provided, however,* That any such evidence shall be admissible in any disciplinary trial or hearing or any administrative action, proceeding or hearing conducted by or on behalf of any governmental agency.

"§ 575. Exceptions

"(1) Nothing contained in this chapter shall prohibit eavesdropping by any law enforcement officer or agency of any State or any political subdivision thereof, or the introduction in any court of evidence obtained by such eavesdropping, where the eavesdropping is authorized by the laws of such State and is carried out in conformity with such laws.

"(2) There may be introduced in any court of the United States evidence relating to the existence, contents, substance, purport, effect, or meaning of any communication by wire or radio which has been intercepted by any law enforcement officer or agency of any State or political subdivision thereof, where the interception of such communication was authorized by the laws of such State and was carried out in conformity with such laws.

"(3) Information obtained prior to the effective date of this chapter by any authorized agent of any Federal law enforcement agency through or as a result of the interception of any communication by wire or radio upon the express written approval of the Attorney General of the United States in the course of any investigation of any Federal offense shall, notwithstanding the provisions of section 605 of the Communications Act of 1934 (48 Stat. 1103), be deemed admissible in evidence in any criminal proceedings.

"§ 576. Duty to report violations

"It shall be the duty of every carrier subject to the Communications Act of 1934 (48 Stat. 1103) to report to the law-enforcement agency having jurisdiction, any information coming to his attention with regard to violations of this chapter. Any willful violation of this section shall be punishable by a fine of up to $500."

SEC. 2. The proviso contained in section 605 of the Communications Act of 1934 (48 Stat. 1103) is amended to read as follows: "*Provided,* That this section shall not apply to the interception, receiving, divulging, publishing, or utilizing the contents of (a) any radio communication broadcast or transmitted by amateurs or others for the use of the general public or relating to ships in distress, or (b) any eavesdropping by any person in accordance with chapter 28 of title 18 of the United States Code."

SEC. 3. The Communications Act of 1934 (48 Stat. 1064), as amended, is amended by adding the following new section:

"§ 223. Authorized interceptions

"All carriers subject to the provisions of this chapter are hereby authorized to permit eavesdropping by any person in accordance with chapter 28 of title 18 of the United States Code."

SEC. 4. If any provision of this chapter or the application of such provision to any circumstance shall be held invalid, the validity of the remainder of this chapter and the applicability of such provision to other circumstances shall not be affected thereby.

READJUSTMENT OF SIZE AND WEIGHT LIMITATIONS ON FOURTH-CLASS MAIL MATTER

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to adjust the size and weight limitations on fourth-class—parcel post—mail matter. I feel strongly that this is important legislation urgently needed by the Post Office Department and by tens of thousands of small businesses—manufacturers, wholesalers, retailers, and service establishments—which must use parcel post regularly.

The legislation I propose would immediately reestablish a large measure of uniformity in the limits of size and weight of parcels mailed between all post offices in the United States. My proposal, if enacted by the Congress, would eventually bring a return to complete uniformity of permissible size and weight of parcel-post packages at the level which served the Post Office Department and the people of the United States so well through the 20 years preceding 1952.

In the closing weeks of the 85th Congress, I introduced a bill having the same objective of parcel-post size and weight uniformity as I now propose. The provisions incorporated in that bill, S. 3899, had been previously approved by the Post Office and Civil Service Committee as part of a general postal rates bill, now Public Law 85-426. The parcel-post size and weight provisions, however, were deleted by the Senate from the general postal rates increase bill to permit separate consideration. To that end I introduced S. 3899. Unfortunately, strictures of time before adjournment of the 85th Congress prevented Senate consideration of my proposal.

This present proposal, while directed to the same end of achieving parcel-post

size and weight uniformity, differs from S. 3899 in the maximum limitations proposed.

In talking with mail users and postal officials in their home States, Senators have undoubtedly found, as I have in the State of Oklahoma, overwhelming demand for adjustment and standardization of size and weight limits on parcel post mail.

Remedy, so long overdue and so urgently needed by the Post Office Department and mailers, is contained in my present proposal. I hope other Members will join me in curing this sorry situation early this session.

Parcel post provides a convenient, reliable, and economical means for small package shipment all over the country. It is a major factor in the promotion of our Nation's commerce and trade. Parcel post brings buyers and sellers of the United States into close contact with each other no matter how far they may be separated by distance.

For small business, particularly, parcel post is an almost indispensable business tool.

Prior to 1952, for 20 years there had been one uniform regulation governing the size and weight of packages permitted to be shipped by parcel post to and from every post office throughout the United States. The Post Office Department and the users of parcel post conveniently geared their operations to that single uniform parcel post regulation.

Beginning with 1952, however, through the enactment of Public Law 199 of the 82d Congress, that single, uniform regulation was replaced by three differing parcel post regulations.

Operating confusion and heavy added expense has been experienced by both the Post Office Department and parcel post users as a result of Public Law 199. The Post Office Department suffered a net revenue loss in excess of $70 million in the first year of operation of Public Law 199, according to testimony of Department representatives, to Congress.

The Department further informed Congress "that Public Law 199 (65 Stat. 610) imposing nonuniform weight and size limitations on parcel post has created operational difficulties, losses of postal revenues, and widespread public misunderstanding and dissatisfaction."

The users of parcel post through the intervening years have paid heavily in increased expense for labor and materials and in higher postal rates as a result of Public Law 199.

I was a member of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee when Public Law 199 was enacted by the 82d Congress. May I repeat in part my statement to the Senate in the 85th Congress in presenting S. 3899. My statement last year on the background of Public Law 199 applies equally to my present proposal except that the need for relief from the penalties of Public Law 199 has since become even more acute:

I am not very proud of the patchwork pattern of ratemaking that we provided in the bill, but it was the best that we could do at the time. There were various reasons why we had to provide for three distinct rates. The committee had no way of knowing how much difficulty they would cause.

Under Public Law 199 parcels shipped between first-class post offices in the first two zones (approximately 150 miles from point of mailing) were limited to 40 pounds and 72 inches combined length and girth. Parcels shipped between first-class post offices, zone 3 through zone 8, were limited to 20 pounds and 72 combined inches. We retained the old maximum limits of 70 pounds and 100 combined inches for parcels shipped between post offices other than those of the first class. In addition, we exempted agricultural products, books, and certain other items, so you might say that we really have four rates.

This was not good ratemaking and we realized it. However, we did not want to eliminate this service to areas where it was otherwise unobtainable.

The committee felt that this legislation should be reviewed about every 2 years. It has now been 6 years since it has been reviewed. Certainly, time has demonstrated that we need to correct some of the inequities and undue penalties resulting from the practical operation of Public Law 199.

As you know, one of the reasons for passage of Public Law 199 was to assist the Railway Express Agency in overcoming its deficit and loss of business. I think it is rather interesting to note that while we passed the bill we apparently did no great service to the Railway Express Agency. Their complaint in 1951 was that their employment had declined by 32,000 from 1946 to 1950 because of competition of parcel post. Of course, part of the decline was caused by reductions in volume of business after the war. Actually, Railway Express had an all-time employment high of 81,000 in 1946 as a consequence of wartime business. Prewar (1940) employment had been 44,000, which was about the same as in 1951.

In 1952, when Public Law 199 became effective, Railway Express employment increased to 46,000. Since that time it has continued to decline and by 1957 it had dropped to 37,000. The fact that employment has dropped about 7,000 since the bill was passed does not support the Railway Express Agency's testimony before the committee in 1951, which I am sure was quite sincere, that their business troubles were largely the result of the competition of parcel post.

Railway Express less-than-carload shipments dropped to 78 million in 1951 from a wartime high of 231 million, and it is interesting to note that 6 years later shipments were still only 80 million.

Parcel post also lost a large amount of business in that same period, dropping from 7,485 million pounds in 1951 to 5,238 million pounds in 1957.

Obviously, Public Law 199 brought neither Railway Express nor parcel post any gain in business from the other's loss. Both lost business in a period when American business generally was experiencing large and prosperous growth.

During this 6-year period, the Interstate Commerce Commission has approved, and I think quite properly so, increases in Railway Express rates in five successive steps, from a 93-cent minimum to a $2.20 minimum, with proportionate increases in other rates.

It would seem to me that the arguments which were cogent at the time, and given in all good faith, simply do not stand up in the light of experience.

I think the parcel post size and weight legislation embodied in Public Law 199 has placed an unduly costly operating burden on the Post Office Department. These regulations are very confusing to the postal workers, and judging from the letters I get from my constituents, extremely confusing to the public.

I believe my proposal is a reasonable solution to what I consider an unreasonable situation. I hope the bill I am introducing will be reported by the committee and given consideration by the Senate early this session of Congress.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill and summary explanation will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1306) to readjust the size and weight limitations on fourth-class mail matters, introduced by Mr. MONRONEY, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Act entitled "An Act to readjust the size and weight limitations on fourth-class (parcel post) mail," approved October 24, 1951 (65 Stat. 610; 39 U.S.C. 240a), as amended, is further amended by striking out so much thereof as precedes the first semicolon and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"That on fourth-class matter the limit of size shall be one hundred inches in girth and length combined and the limit of weight shall be over sixteen ounces and not exceeding fifty pounds until midnight on June 30, 1960, after which the upper limit of weight shall not exceed seventy pounds."

The summary explanation presented by Mr. MONRONEY is as follows:

SUMMARY EXPLANATION OF BILL

Present law provides upper limits of weight for parcel post packages of 40 pounds in the first and second zones, and 20 pounds in the third through eighth zones. The proposed bill would establish a uniform upper limit of 50 pounds, regardless of zone, until June 30, 1960.

Present law makes exceptions for packages mailed to or from Army or Fleet post offices; second, third, and fourth class post offices; or rural and star routes; and for packages containing agricultural commodities and books. In these cases, the upper limit of weight is now 70 pounds. These exceptions would be continued under the proposed bill until June 30, 1960.

After June 30, 1960, the upper limit of weight of all parcel post packages would become uniform at 70 pounds.

Present law provides an upper limit in girth of 72 inches, except for packages mailed to or from Army or fleet post offices; second, third, and fourth class post offices; or rural and star routes; and for packages containing agricultural commodities and books. In the latter cases, the upper limit of girth is now 100 inches. The proposed bill would establish a uniform limit of girth of 100 inches, effective immediately.

EXCLUSION FROM GROSS INCOME OF FULL AMOUNT OF ANY ANNUITY RECEIVED UNDER CIVIL SERVICE RETIREMENT ACT

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I am introducing a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that the full amount of any annuity received under the Civil Service Retirement Act shall be excluded from gross income.

Mr. President, I fully realize that it is difficult to suggest to Congress additional exemptions under the Federal income tax laws, under present budgetary conditions. However, Mr. President, under the Langer-Chavez-Stevenson bills which was passed by the Congress, I had placed an exemption in it for the

civil service annuities from the payment of income tax.

However, when the Civil Service Retirement Act was passed, not so many people earned enough to pay income tax, since the salaries were less than they are today and the personal exemptions were higher. For the foregoing reason, the exemption of the civil service annuities was knocked out of the Langer-Chavez-Stevenson bill before it was enacted into law.

Mr. President, when the Railroad Retirement Act was passed, the payment of income tax was an important subject and Congress did grant exemptions therein as they did in the social security law.

Mr. President, the purpose of this bill would be to place the civil service annuities on the same level as the railroad retirement and social security payments in relation to exemptions under the Federal income tax law. I ask that this bill be referred to the appropriate committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1309) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that the full amount of any annuity received under the Civil Service Retirement Act shall be excluded from gross income, introduced by Mr. LANGER, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

AMENDMENT OF RAILROAD RETIREMENT ACT OF 1937

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, at the request of Thomas Stack, I am introducing a bill for the amendment of the Railroad Retirement Act. Mr. Stack is president of an organization known as the National Railroad Pension Forum, Inc.

I want to make clear my purpose in introducing this bill. I have very great misgivings about the soundness of this legislation which represents the program of the National Railroad Pension Forum, Inc. Nevertheless, I want the record to show that all points of view will have been considered in our deliberations concerning amendments to the Railroad Retirement Act.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1314) to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, introduced by Mr. MORSE (by request), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

GENERAL PULASKI MEMORIAL DAY

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I send to the desk a joint resolution which I have had the honor to submit for a number of years, authorizing the President of the United States to proclaim October 11, 1959, General Pulaski Memorial Day, for the commemoration of the death of Brigadier General Pulaski.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 62) authorizing the President of the United States of America to proclaim October 11, 1958, General Pulaski's Memorial Day for the observance and commemoration of the death of Brigadier General Pulaski, introduced by Mr. SALTONSTALL (for himself and Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

DESIGNATION OF THE ROSE AS THE NATIONAL FLORAL EMBLEM

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a joint resolution to designate the rose as the national flower of the United States.

The rose is the universal symbol of peace, loyalty, love, devotion, and courage. It would be a fitting companion to the eagle as an American national symbol.

The rose goes far back into American history. Fossilized rose blooms have been found in Oregon and California. Their age is estimated at 35 million years. When the *Mayflower* landed at Plymouth it was recorded: "The shore was fragrant like the smell of a rose garden and the happy children gathered strawberries and single wild roses."

A national poll conducted a few years ago indicated that Americans prefer the rose by some 18 to 1 over any other flower.

The symbolism and popularity of the rose gives it the highest qualifications for the national flower of the United States.

Mr. President, I may add that the distinguished Senators from New York [Mr. JAVITS and Mr. KEATING] join me in sponsoring this joint resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 63) designating the rose as the national flower of the United States, introduced by Mr. SCOTT, for himself, Mr. JAVITS, and Mr. KEATING, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SCOTT. I yield.

Mr. ALLOTT. It seems to me that the Senator has come up with too little too late.

Mr. SCOTT. I have had the benefit of the observations of a number of Senators with regard to their preferences. I submit that the rose is never too little, since it is one of our most abundant flowers. It is never too late, because no matter what time of the year or season the rose may be in bloom in any part of the country, it gives joy, pleasure, hope, and inspiration to all those who observe it and enjoy its lovely fragrance.

Mr. ALLOTT. I hope the Senator realizes that the carnation is a much more distinguished flower. It is extensively worn by both men and women, and is peculiarly adapted for designation as the national flower.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, what I have said has not been in derogation of the carnation. However, recently I have heard the statement made on the floor that the carnation was the most popular flower to be found at funerals. Therefore it does symbolize memory and appreciation of those gone before. I believe the rose, on the other hand, is a beloved symbol of the future, as well as of the present and the past.

PROPOSED AMENDMENT OF CONSTITUTION, RELATING TO TREATYMAKING POWER

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, for a number of Congresses prior to the 86th Congress, the Senate has considered what is known as the Bricker joint resolution. Long hearings were had on the joint resolution in the Committee on the Judiciary. The matter was also thrashed out on the floor of the Senate. It lost by one vote, as I recall.

Because of the interest in it all over the country, I think the joint resolution ought to be reintroduced. So, under my own name, I introduce the last version of the Bricker joint resolution, and ask for its appropriate reference.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 65) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, relating to the legal effect of certain treaties and other international agreements, introduced by Mr. DIRKSEN, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

CENTENNIAL CELEBRATION OF ESTABLISHMENT OF LAND-GRANT COLLEGES AND STATE UNIVERSITIES AND ESTABLISHMENT OF DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a proposed joint resolution on behalf of myself, Mr. CHURCH, Mr. SYMINGTON, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. RANDOLPH, Mr. ENGLE, Mr. CANNON, Mr. STENNIS, Mr. AIKEN, Mr. SPARKMAN, Mr. MORTON, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. TALMADGE, Mr. YARBOROUGH, Mr. NEUBERGER, Mr. HRUSKA, Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. JACKSON, Mr. HILL, Mr. MCGEE, Mr. WILEY, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. MOSS, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. MORSE, Mr. CARLSON, Mr. JAVITS, Mr. CASE of New Jersey, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. DIRKSEN, Mr. PASTORE, Mr. KEFAUVER, Mr. CASE of South Dakota, Mr. HART, Mr. MUSKIE, Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey, Mr. MUNDT, Mr. HICKENLOOPER, Mr. MCCARTHY, Mr. CARROLL, and Mr. COOPER, to provide for the centennial celebration of the establishment of the land-grant colleges and State universities and the establishment of the Department of Agriculture, and for other purposes.

I ask that a letter of transmittal from the Secretary of Agriculture to the President of the Senate recommending this proposed joint resolution be printed in the RECORD at this point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without ob-

jection, the letter will be printed in the RECORD.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 66) to provide for the centennial celebration of the establishment of the land-grant colleges and State universities and the establishment of the Department of Agriculture, and for other related purposes, introduced by Mr. EASTLAND (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The letter presented by Mr. EASTLAND is as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, D.C., January 29, 1959.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE,
U.S. Senate.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: The Department recommends the passage of the attached joint resolution that provides for centennial celebrations in 1962 of the U.S. Department of Agriculture, and of the land-grant colleges and State universities. Both founding acts were passed in 1862 and now stand as landmarks in legislative history. They have attained progressive significance with the growth and development of the USDA land-grant college system of Federal-State cooperation. From this teamwork has come the leadership that produced an unparalleled agricultural revolution. From the Morrill Act has come a national system of higher education uniquely designed to expand educational opportunity and the search for and dissemination of basic and applied knowledge in the arts and sciences.

The proposed joint resolution establishes a Commission to commemorate these important events, with the President, Vice President, the Speaker of the House, the Secretary of Agriculture, and the president of the American Association of Land-Grant Colleges and State Universities as honorary members, and members to include Senators, Representatives, representation from the executive agencies involved, and individual representatives of interested organizations.

The Commission would coordinate and approve suitable plans for the centennial celebration in which observances may be developed jointly and separately by the Department and the land-grant colleges and State universities. For instance, the Department has working relationships with the State departments of agriculture that do not concern the colleges, and the land-grant colleges and State universities have relationships with the Departments of Defense, and of Health, Education and Welfare, that do not concern agriculture. The Commission would make a special effort to encourage participation by farm organizations, industry and business associated with agriculture, as well as by appropriate bodies of the State, and the legislatures of such States, in local, regional, and national celebrations.

The Commission, in carrying out the purposes of the resolution would be authorized to employ such employees as may be necessary, accept donations of money and property, cooperate with public or private organizations with assistance through grants or otherwise, in relation to activities approved by the Commission. An executive committee is provided to carry out the functions of the Commission under its general direction.

The resolution authorizes and directs the Secretary of Agriculture to prepare plans for the appropriate commemorative celebration of the founding of the U.S. Department of Agriculture and to join in celebrating the centenary of the land-grant colleges and State universities. The Secretary of Defense is authorized to prepare plans for celebrating the ROTC relationships with the land-grant colleges and State universities. The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, through its Office of Education, is authorized to prepare plans for celebrating the long association with the land-grant colleges and State universities in resident instruction. In so doing, these Federal agencies are to use funds and authorities otherwise available to them.

It is believed that approximately $200,000 would be needed to carry out the provisions of this proposed legislation.

The Bureau of the Budget advises that there is no objection to the submission of this proposed legislation to the Congress for its consideration.

Sincerely yours,

E. T. BENSON.

PROPOSED NEW JERSEY TERCENTENARY CELEBRATION COMMISSION

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, on behalf of my colleague, the senior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE] and myself, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a joint resolution providing for the establishment of the New Jersey Tercentenary Celebration Commission to formulate and implement plans to commemorate the 300th anniversary of the State of New Jersey, and for other purposes.

Mr. President, New Jersey has 300 years of significant and very meaningful history to celebrate. State legislators have already taken steps to make certain that the celebration will be worthy of the Garden State. Cooperation, at a national level, as proposed in this resolution is essential, too.

Ample precedent exists for such action at the national level. In 1935, a similar commission was established for the 300th anniversary of the founding of Connecticut; for the 300th anniversary of the Massachusetts Bay Colony in 1930; for the Tennessee Centennial in 1896; and for the 100th anniversary of Texas in 1935.

The first deed of lease signed in 1664 by James, Duke of York, to John Lord Berkeley was for those lands "bounded on the east part by the main sea, and part by Hudson's river, and hath upon the west Delaware bay or river, and extendeth southward to the main ocean as far as Cape May at the mouth of Delaware bay; and to the northward as far as the northernmost branch of the said bay or river of Delaware, which is forty-one degrees and forty minutes of latitude, and crosseth over thence in a strait line to Hudson's river in forty-one degrees of latitude; which said tract of land is hereafter to be called by the name or names of New Caesarea or New Jersey."

The Commission would have 15 members. Four Senators would be appointed by the Senate President. Four Representatives would be chosen by the House Speaker, and seven would be appointed by the President. The President would designate one member as Chairman. Commission members would receive no salary. The Commission would expire upon the completion of its duties, no later than March 1, 1965.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the proposed joint resolution, along with the joint resolution already passed by the New Jersey State Legislature, be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the joint resolution, together with the joint resolution of the New Jersey Legislature, will be printed in the RECORD.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 68) providing for the establishment of the New Jersey Tercentenary Celebration Commission to formulate and implement plans to commemorate the 300th anniversary of the State of New Jersey, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey (for himself and Mr. CASE of New Jersey), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 68

Joint resolution providing for the establishment of the New Jersey Tercentenary Celebration Commission to formulate and implement plans to commemorate the three hundredth anniversary of the State of New Jersey, and for other purposes

Whereas the year 1964 will mark the tercentenary of the patent conveying all the lands between the Connecticut River and the east side of the Delaware River from Charles II to James, Duke of York; and

Whereas the year 1964 will also mark the three hundredth anniversary of the execution of deeds of lease and release by the said James, Duke of York, to John Lord Berkeley, Baron of Stratton, and Sir George Carteret, of Saltrum, of those lands "* * * bounded on the east part by the main sea and part by Hudson's river, and hath upon the west Delaware bay or river, and extendeth southward to the main ocean as far as Cape May at the mouth of Delaware Bay, and to the northward as far as the northernmost branch of the said bay or river of Delaware, which is forty-one degrees and forthy minutes of latitude, and crosseth over thence in a strait line to Hudson's river in forty-one degrees of latitude; which said tract of land is hereafter to be called by the names or names of New Caesarea or New Jersey * * *" and of the right of government herein; and

Whereas the year 1964 will also be the tercentenary of the signing and publication by John Lord Berkeley and Sir George Carteret of "The Concessions and Agreement of the Lords Proprietors of the Province of New Caesarea or New Jersey to and with all and every the Adventurers and all such as shall settle or plant here", a declaration of the organic law of the colony and, truly, "the Magna Carta of New Jersey"; and

Whereas these foregoing events mark the beginning of the separate history of New Jersey as a colony; and

Whereas it is fitting and desirable that we commemorate the beginnings of the State of New Jersey, together with its subsequent history and its present and future role in the family of the United States, for the benefit of all the people of our Nation; and

Whereas such a commemoration, with careful planning, can be of enduring, rather than transitory, worth to our people: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) there is hereby established a commission to be known as the New Jersey Tercentenary Celebration Commission (hereafter referred to in this joint resolution as the "Commission") which shall be composed of fifteen members as follows:

(1) Four members who shall be Members of the Senate, to be appointed by the President of the Senate;

(2) Four members who shall be Members of the House of Representatives, to be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives;

(3) Seven members to be appointed by the President.

(b) The President shall, at the time of appointment, designate one of the members appointed by him to serve as Chairman. The members of the Commission shall receive no salary.

SEC. 2. (a) The functions of the Commission shall be to develop and to execute suitable plans for the celebration of a series of anniversaries occurring between 1959 and 1964, both years inclusive, commemorating the three hundredth anniversary of the State of New Jersey.

(b) In carrying out its functions the Commission is authorized to cooperate with and to assist the New Jersey Tercentenary Commission and any other agency created or designated by the Legislature of the State of New Jersey for the purpose of planning and promoting the New Jersey Tercentenary Celebration. If the participation of other nations in the celebration is deemed advisable, the Commission may communicate to that end with the governments of such nations through the Department of State.

SEC. 3. The Commission may employ, without regard to the civil-service laws or the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, such employees as may be necessary in carrying out its functions. Service of an individual as a member of the Commission or employment of an individual by the Commission, on a part-time or full-time basis, with or without compensation, shall not be considered as service or employment bringing such individual within the provisions of sections 281, 283, 284, 434, or 1914 of title 18 of the United States Code, or section 190 of the Revised Statutes of the United States (5 U.S.C. 99).

SEC. 4. (a) The Commission is authorized to accept donations of money, property, or personal services; to cooperate with patriotic and historical societies and with institutions of learning; and to call upon other Federal departments or agencies for their advice and assistance in carrying out the purposes of this joint resolution. The Commission, to such extent as it finds to be necessary, may, without regard to the laws and procedures applicable to Federal agencies, procure supplies, services, and property and make contracts, and may exercise those powers that are necessary to enable it to carry out efficiently and in the public interest the purposes of this joint resolution.

(b) Expenditures of the Commission shall be paid by the executive officer of the Commission, who shall keep complete records of such expenditures and who shall account also for all funds received by the Commission. A report of the activities of the Commission, including an accounting of funds received and expended, shall be furnished by the Commission to the Congress within two months following the celebration as prescribed by this joint resolution.

(c) Any property acquired by the Commission remaining upon termination of the celebration may be used by the Secretary of the Interior for purposes of the national park system or may be disposed of as surplus property. The net revenues, after payment of Commission expenses, derived from Commission activities, shall be deposited in the Treasury of the United States.

SEC. 5. The Commission shall expire upon the completion of its duties, but in no event later than March 1, 1965.

SEC. 6. There are authorized to be appropriated such sums, not to exceed $75,000, as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this joint resolution.

The joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of New Jersey, presented by Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey, is as follows:

ASSEMBLY, No. 548, STATE OF NEW JERSEY

Providing for the establishment of the New Jersey Tercentenary Celebration Commission to formulate and implement plans to commemorate the 300th anniversary of the State of New Jersey, and for other purposes

Whereas the year 1964 will mark the tercentenary of the patent conveying all the lands between the Connecticut River and the east side of the Delaware River from Charles II to James, Duke of York; and

Whereas the year 1964 will also mark the 300th anniversary of the execution of deeds of lease and release by the said James, Duke of York, to John Lord Berkeley, Baron of Stratton, and Sir George Carteret, of Saltrum, of those lands "* * * bounded on the east part by the main sea, and part by Hudson's River, and hath upon the west Delaware bay or river, and extendeth southward to the main ocean as far as Cape May at the mouth of Delaware Bay; and to the northward as far as the northernmost branch of the said bay or river of Delaware, which is 41° and 40′ of latitude, and crosseth over thence in a strait line to Hudson's River in 41° of latitude; which said tract of land is hereafter to be called by the name or names of New Caesarea or New Jersey * * *" and of the right of government therein; and

Whereas the year 1964 will also be the tercentenary of the signing and publication by John Lord Berkeley and Sir George Carteret of "The Concessions and Agreement of the Lords Proprietors of the Province of New Caesarea or New Jersey to and with all and every the Adventurers and all such as shall settle or plant here", a declaration of the organic law of the colony and, truly, "the Magna Charta of New Jersey"; and

Whereas these foregoing events mark the beginning of the separate history of New Jersey as a colony; and

Whereas it is fitting and desirable that we commemorate the beginnings of the State of New Jersey, together with its subsequent history and its present and future role in the family of the United States, for the benefit of all the people of our Nation; and

Whereas, such a commemoration, with careful planning, can be of enduring, rather than transitory, worth to our people: Now, therefore,

Be it enacted by the Senate and General Assembly of the State of New Jersey, That 1. There is hereby created the New Jersey Tercentenary Commission to consist of 11 members, 2 to be appointed from the membership of the Senate by the President thereof, 2 to be appointed from the membership of the General Assembly by the Speaker thereof, and 7 citizens of the State to be appointed by the Governor, who shall serve without compensation and who shall constitute a commission for the purpose of formulating and implementing plans to observe appropriately the tercentenary of the beginning of New Jersey. The Senate and General Assembly members of the commission shall serve only while members of the Senate or General Assembly, respectively; the citizen members shall serve for the duration of the commission until December 31, 1964. Vacancies in membership of the commission shall be filled in the same manner as the original appointments were made.

2. The commission shall meet at the call of the Governor and organize by the selection of a chairman from among its members and a secretary who need not be a member of the commission.

3. It shall be the duty of the Commission to formulate and implement a 5-year program for the proper observance of the beginnings of New Jersey and its subsequent role in the lives of the people of this State and Nation. This program shall be planned for its lasting effect, for its contributions to the preservation and interpretation of New Jersey's heritage, and to stimulate and coordinate the activities of Federal, State, municipal, and private agencies and organizations. This program shall include such activities as the Commission deems desirable and practicable and may include the publication of a tercentenary history of New Jersey and other materials, the arrangement of public ceremonies observing a series of anniversaries occurring between 1959 and 1964, the microfilming or duplicating of source materials located outside of New Jersey, the resumption of the publication of "New Jersey Archives," the arrangement for the rehabilitation of the State's historic sites, buildings and markers, and the establishment and maintenance of a publicity service to further the objectives of the Commission.

4. The Commission shall be entitled to employ an executive director and such other assistants as it may require and to incur necessary traveling and other necessary expenses in order to perform its duties, and as may be within the limits of funds appropriated or otherwise made available to it for said purposes.

5. The Commission may receive gifts of money or property for carrying out the purposes of this act.

6. The Commission may meet at such place or places as it shall designate and shall report on the progress of its program and any recommendations it may have to the Governor and the legislature as soon as practicable after its organization and, thereafter, whenever it shall deem it advisable but at least once every year.

7. For the fiscal year 1958–1959, there is hereby appropriated for the purposes of the Commission the sum of $25,000. Any part of such appropriation not expended during the fiscal year 1958–1959, unless otherwise provided, shall be reappropriated for its use during succeeding fiscal years.

8. This act shall take effect immediately.

ADDITIONAL FUNDS FOR SPECIAL STUDY BY JOINT ECONOMIC COMMITTEE

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I submit a concurrent resolution to provide for a study by the Joint Economic Committee of the problems of providing maximum employment and an adequate rate of economic growth, as well as maintaining price stability and preventing inflation. This resolution was given final consideration at a meeting of the full Committee on March 3, and was approved unanimously. The study would be conducted under the general responsibilities assigned to the Joint Economic Committee by the Employment Act of 1946.

I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 13) was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 13

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Joint Economic Committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, as authorized by the Employment Act of 1946, as amended, is authorized and directed to conduct a full and complete study and investigation into the

problems of providing maximum employment and an adequate rate of economic growth, as well as maintaining price stability and preventing inflation, including among others, the following subjects:

(1) Historical and comparative rates of unemployment, production, and prices;

(2) Inflation and deflation caused by increases and decreases in the effective supply of money and credit and the effects of these and of interest rates on growth, employment, and economic stability;

(3) The effect of monopolistic and quasi-monopolistic practices upon prices, profits, production, and employment;

(4) The effect of increases in wages, salaries, and the prices of personal services, together with union and professional practices, upon prices, profits, production, and employment;

(5) The effect of governmental expenditures, taxation, and budgetary surpluses and deficits, and of monetary and debt management policies upon price levels, production, and employment;

(6) International influences affecting prices, production, trade, and employment; and

(7) Constructive suggestions for reconciling and simultaneously obtaining the three objectives of maximum employment, an adequate rate of growth, and substantial stability of the price level.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution, the joint committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized through January 31, 1960, (1) to appoint and fix the compensation of such experts, consultants, or organizations thereof, and clerical and stenographic assistants as it deems necessary and advisable; and (2) to hold such hearings, to sit and act at such times and places, to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses, and the production of such books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, and to make such expenditures, as it deems advisable. Subpenas shall be issued under the signature of the chairman or vice chairman of the joint committee, and shall be served by any person designated by them.

SEC. 3. The joint committee shall from time to time report its findings and recommendations to the Senate and the House of Representatives and shall make its final report at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1960.

SEC. 4. The expenses of the joint committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $200,000, through January 31, 1960, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the joint committee.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I should like to ask the ranking minority member of the Joint Economic Committee to speak about this matter, if he cares to do so.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I thank the acting majority leader [Mr. MONRONEY], and my friend, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS].

I did not hear all that the Senator from Illinois said, but I assume that he has just submitted a resolution, on behalf of the Joint Economic Policy Committee.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is correct; and I said it had been approved by the minority members as well as by the majority members of the Joint Economic Committee.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, not only do I confirm that statement, but I also hope the Senate will approve the resolution. It calls for the authorization of the appropriation of a substantial sum of money—a matter which we discussed very fully in the committee. We concluded that although the committee might very well do with less money than is called for, we would unite in attempting to hold down the expenses of the committee, but that it is in the interest of the overall project that the budget called for in the resolution be approved, and that our request for its approval is a proper one for the committee to make.

So the action was unanimous.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I thank the Senator from Connecticut.

REVISION AND RENEWAL OF INTERNATIONAL WHEAT AGREEMENT

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I have been concerned over the progress of the negotiations for renewal of the International Wheat Agreement. That agreement, unless renewed, will by its terms expire on July 31, 1959. Representatives of the participating countries have been meeting in Geneva since January 26 in an effort to negotiate new understandings. Unfortunately, there is as yet no sign of general agreement.

I believe our negotiators must be made aware of the urgency of their mission, of its importance as an instrument of foreign policy, of its use as an aid to the solution of domestic farm problems, and of new and expanded uses which it can serve. That is why I am submitting, for appropriate reference, on behalf of myself, and Senators BIBLE, CARROLL, CHURCH, HART, HARTKE, HUMPHREY, JACKSON, MAGNUSON, MANSFIELD, MCCARTHY, MORSE, MOSS, MURRAY, NEUBERGER, PASTORE, YOUNG of North Dakota, and YOUNG of Ohio, a resolution expressing the sense of the Senate that:

First. The International Wheat Agreement be renewed;

Second. In any renewal there should be maximum prices to wheat importing countries and minimum prices to wheat exporting countries;

Third. The International Wheat Council be continued as part of the agreement; and

Fourth. The International Wheat Council be empowered to encourage and coordinate the distribution of additional supplies of wheat on concessional terms to countries unable to purchase sufficient supplies in the commercial market to meet the nutritional needs of their people.

In the past, this agreement has been of important assistance in the orderly international distribution of wheat. It has an even greater potential in the future. Today, when the wheat surplus is termed by many writers as our number one farm problem, there must be provision for international consideration of the distribution problem.

Some two-thirds of the human race are underfed. I believe that so long as there is a single undernourished family the wheat surplus problem is, at least in part, a wheat distribution problem. Assuming the entire United States food surplus were distributed to the hungry people of the world, it would mean the equivalent of only two teacupfuls of rice every 17 days. If we attempt unilaterally to fashion our wheat exporting policies, we run obvious risks of either alienating our wheat producing friends by selling for too low a price or of directing insufficient supplies to needy nations by selling for too high a price. Our Public Law 480 program, under which immense quantities of our surplus have moved into food deficit countries, is a magnificent demonstration of the productivity, the generosity, and the resourcefulness of the American people. However, unilateral action is a delicate and difficult feat. Even the recipient countries hesitate to become heavily indebted to a foreign power, despite the good faith of the exporting country.

Never has the world had to cope with the quantities of surplus wheat held in storage today. The roster of surplus countries and needy countries is a list of our friends, our allies, and those we must support if we are to win the battle against international communism. I understand that the Soviet Government is planning a systematic increase in grain production and, according to a report just released by the Netherlands Government, it is probable that the Soviet Union will soon start dumping wheat as an instrument of political pressure. Such practices can be disastrous to the free world as producers of tungsten, tin, and other minerals have recently learned. These forays have a single purpose—to disrupt free-world trade. That is why it is especially important that we continue to meet together in an International Wheat Council to find the solution to our surplus problems and, at the same time, to serve the cause of world peace.

I should like to call particular attention to the provision of the proposed resolution empowering the Council to coordinate and distribute supplies of wheat on concessional terms to needy nations. Here, in one place, will be gathered the responsible officers of the wheat exporting and wheat importing countries. Here there is presented the opportunity to decide how wheat can best be used to raise the standard of living of suffering nations. Under appropriate procedures, the Council can use surplus wheat to promote world peace.

All major free-world wheat nations are represented. Forty-eight nations ratified the present agreement. Although the United Kingdom was not one of these, it has expressed a strong desire to join the agreement if the jurisdiction of the agreement can be broadened in a manner similar to that suggested in this resolution.

Mr. President, I hope the same type of International Council can be formed and utilized, ultimately, to deal with other international food problems. In the very near future, too, I expect to join in cosponsoring, with many of my colleagues, changes in Public Law 480 to make it a "Food for Peace" Act. The new Public Law 480, under this proposed bill, would emphasize the foreign policy objectives of farm surplus disposal.

At any rate, it is essential that the International Wheat Agreement be renewed, and I hope the Senate will take prompt action upon the resolution.

The resolution (S. Res. 90), was received and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, as follows:

SENATE RESOLUTION 90

Resolved, That the President is hereby urged, by such means as he deems appropriate, to effect a revision and renewal of the International Wheat Agreement, ratified by 48 importing and exporting countries, including the United States, and which agreement will expire on July 31, 1959.

SEC. 2. It is further the sense of the Senate that, with widest possible participation on the part of wheat importing and exporting countries, any revision and renewal of the International Wheat Agreement should (1) continue to assure supplies of wheat to importing countries at not more than agreed maximum prices, and markets for wheat exporting countries at no less than agreed minimum prices; and (2) continue the existence of the International Wheat Council heretofore established.

SEC. 3. It is further the sense of the Senate that the International Wheat Council be empowered under the new International Wheat Agreement to encourage and coordinate the distribution of additional supplies of wheat on concessional terms to countries unable to purchase sufficient supplies of wheat in the commercial market to meet nutritional needs of their people.

AMENDMENT OF CIVIL RIGHTS ACT OF 1957—AMENDMENT

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment to S. 960, the bill to extend for 2 years the life of the President's Commission on Civil Rights, and ask that it be appropriately referred.

Mr. President, my amendment would authorize and direct the Commission on Civil Rights to study and investigate discrimination in employment and in labor organizations by reason of color, race, religion, and national origin.

Whether practiced by employers or by labor unions, discrimination on grounds of race, creed, color, or national origin which bars a person from an occupation for which he is qualified is offensive to those who believe in steady forward progress in the field of civil rights. Equally offensive are practices which result in segregated employment rights.

The need for an impartial investigation of this problem as it involves labor organizations has been emphasized by an official complaint made by the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People to the AFL–CIO.

Mr. Roy Wilkins, executive secretary of the NAACP, wrote to President George Meany, of the AFL–CIO, on December 19, 1958, charging that a pattern of racial discrimination and segregation exists in many affiliated unions.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Wilkins' letter to Mr. Meany, and a memorandum from Herbert Hill, NAACP labor secretary, to Boris Shiskin, director, AFL–CIO civil-rights department may be printed in the RECORD following these remarks.

Mr. President, I hope the Committee on the Judiciary will give serious consideration to my amendment when it conducts hearings on bills which I have cosponsored to implement President Eisenhower's recommendations on civil rights.

I believe the proposed study and investigation by the Commission on Civil Rights will help to create a climate of public opinion which will make possible more rapid progress toward elimination of the discrimination of which the NAACP complains, and also of similar discrimination by employers.

There being no objection, the letter and memorandum were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION FOR THE ADVANCEMENT OF COLORED PEOPLE,
New York, N.Y., December 19, 1958.

Mr. GEORGE MEANY,
President, AFL–CIO,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR GEORGE MEANY: Please find enclosed copy of memorandum from Herbert Hill, NAACP labor secretary, to Boris Shishkin, director, AFL–CIO civil rights department. This memorandum contains complaints from members of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People charging racial discrimination and segregation by unions affiliated with the American Federation of Labor-Congress of Industrial Organizations.

For the past 3 years the association has cooperated diligently with the civil rights department and with affiliated international unions in attempting to resolve problems of discrimination and segregation. In addition, representatives of the NAACP national office were active in efforts to defeat "right to work" legislation in Ohio, California, and elsewhere. I received a kind letter from James L. McDevitt, national director of the AFL–CIO committee on political education, thanking the association for the efforts of our labor secretary in helping to defeat "right to work" proposals in Ohio.

We recall that the merger convention of the AFL–CIO incorporated the following provision into its constitution: "To encourage all workers without regard to race, creed, color, or national origin to share in the full benefits of union organization."

However, 3 years after the merger agreement there is clear evidence that many unions continue discriminatory racial practices. Some affiliated international unions which have eliminated constitutional provisions limiting membership to white persons today exclude Negroes by tacit consent. Other AFL–CIO affiliates limit Negro membership to segregated or "auxiliary" locals. Some international unions have moved sincerely to eliminate inequalities but progress has been slow.

Increasingly, we are receiving complaints against trade unions from our members and from Negro workers throughout the country charging racial discrimination and segregation. Careful investigation by our staff has in most instances sustained these individual charges and, in addition, has revealed a pattern of racial discrimination and segregation in many affiliated unions.

Among the valid complaints received by us are those against the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, United Association of Journeymen and Apprentices of the Plumbing and Pipe Fitting Industry, Communication Workers of America, International Hod Carriers, Building and Common Laborers Union of America, United Paper Makers and Paperworkers Union, International Brotherhood of Pulp, Sulphite, and Paper Mill Workers, International Union of Operating Engineers, Brotherhood of Railway Carmen of America, International Brotherhood of Boilermakers, Brotherhood of Maintenance of Way Employees, etc. I am sure you are aware that the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers and the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen continue to exclude nonwhite persons from union membership by constitutional provisions.

A typical example is the complaint received from Barry J. Henderson, who for many years has been a leader in the NAACP in East St. Louis, Ill. Solely because of his race, Mr. Henderson and other Negroes in the St. Louis-East St. Louis area are forced to belong to segregated local lodges maintained by the Brotherhood of Railway and Steamship Clerks, AFL–CIO. As Mr. Henderson states in the affidavit submitted to the AFL–CIO civil rights department, "the system of segregated local and segregated seniority rosters denies Negro workers equal seniority rights and does serious harm to their economic status."

I am sure you realize that the NAACP is obligated to its own membership to press vigorously for the elimination of discriminatory practices within trade union organizations. In previous memoranda and in discussions with responsible AFL–CIO officials we have expressed our conviction that the problem is of such magnitude that it cannot be resolved by the present procedure of taking up random individual complaints. We believe discrimination can be eliminated only through a systematic program on the part of the leadership of the AFL–CIO to enforce its basic policy of nondiscrimination throughout the organized labor movement.

This problem will be cited in our staff reports to the annual meeting of the NAACP January 5, 1959, and may be treated in a resolution by our board of directors meeting later that same day.

We would be pleased to have any comment of yours which could be cited with our January 5 report on the situation as we see it.

We are not unaware of some of the difficulties faced by the AFL–CIO in implementing the just policy it has set for itself. Some of these difficulties stem from long-established, but unjust traditions and practices within certain international unions themselves. Some are rooted in the present climate of opinion in the South and in other sections of the country. Some undoubtedly are connected with politics within unions and with the general program and priorities of the organized labor movement.

We remain convinced, however, that the only way to attack is to attack, and, as in the school desegregation problem (which presents similar obstacles) to make a beginning. As I have indicated, we have certain inescapable responsibilities to our members. We must present their cases and press them toward a solution. Naturally, we stand ready, as always, to cooperate fully in an active and continuing program looking toward elimination of those practices which both our organizations deplore and denounce.

With kind personal regards, and with greetings of the holiday season, I am,

Very sincerely yours,

ROY WILKINS,
Executive Secretary.

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION FOR THE ADVANCEMENT OF COLORED PEOPLE,
New York, N.Y., December 4, 1958.

Memorandum to: Boris Shishkin, Director, Civil Rights Department, AFL–CIO
From: Herbert Hill, labor secretary, NAACP

Please find attached affidavits and other data from members of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People charging racial discrimination and segregation by unions affiliated to the American Federation of Labor-Congress of Industrial Organizations.

AFFIDAVIT OF BARRY J. HENDERSON VERSUS BROTHERHOOD OF RAILWAY AND STEAMSHIP CLERKS INTERNATIONAL UNION

Mr. Henderson is a member of Local Lodge 6115 of the Brotherhood of Railway and Steamship Clerks in East St. Louis, Ill. Local Lodge 6115 is a segregated local of Negro workers employed by the Wabash Railroad in the St. Louis area. White persons

are in Local Lodge 5221 which denies membership to Negroes. In the St. Louis area there are 14 all-colored locals and 14 all-white locals.

In addition to the rigid pattern of segregation in local lodges there is maintained a pattern of segregated joint councils, as the East St. Louis and St. Louis joint council is composed of the segregated Negro locals and the St. Louis district council is composed of the all-white locals. As Mr. Henderson indicates in his affidavit "the system of segregated locals and segregated seniority rosters denies Negro union members equal promotional rights and does serious harm to their economic status."

"Investigation by the NAACP indicates that the Brotherhood of Railway and Steamship Clerks maintains segregated local lodges in the North as well as in the South. The existence of segregated local lodges and separate racial seniority rosters seriously limits Negro job mobility and violates the seniority rights of Negro union members.

"Repeated efforts by Negro members of this international union to secure the elimination of discrimination and segregation have been to no avail and, therefore, they have now requested the assistance of the NAACP."

SEGREGATION AND DISCRIMINATORY RACIAL PRACTICES, BROTHERHOOD OF RAILWAY AND STEAMSHIP CLERKS, TULSA, OKLA.

Officials of local lodge 6257, which is a segregated Negro lodge, affiliated to the Brotherhood of Railway and Steamship Clerks in Tulsa, Okla., have requested the assistance of the NAACP national office in attempting to eliminate discriminatory practices suffered by Negro workers employed by the St. Louis-San Francisco Railroad in Tulsa. The Brotherhood of Railway and Steamship Clerks maintains lodge 777 for white employees of the railroad and lodge 6257 for Negro employees.

On March 3, 1956 the president of the Negro local in a letter to the general chairman of the union's Frisco system board requested the elimination of segregated locals and stated, "At a meeting held February 15, members of this organization decided that it would be to our best interests to merge with lodge 777 and surrender our charter. Since the schools of our city and State have integrated without incidents, we are sure the same would happen between our lodges." The brotherhood has refused the request of the Negro lodge to merge with lodge 777 and continues to maintain racially segregated lodges for white and colored workers employed by the same railroad.

Negro workers belonging to lodge 6257 have frequently charged violation of their seniority and promotional rights by the white local. The collusion of the all-white local, lodge 777, with the railroad has caused great harm to many Negro railway workers, some with 12, 17, and 37 years of seniority and is typical of the discriminatory practices engaged in by the Brotherhood of Steamship and Railway Clerks throughout the United States.

An analysis of the union's operation in Tulsa and elsewhere indicates quite clearly that because Negro workers are admitted into membership only in segregated local unions they are denied equal representation and bargaining rights and are in fact denied the full benefits of trade union membership. Because representatives of the Brotherhood of Railway and Steamship Clerks have repeatedly refused to eliminate the discriminatory practices suffered by Negro workers attorneys for the NAACP in Tulsa are prepared to initiate legal action if the practices of discrimination and segregation are not eliminated by March 1, 1959.

It is necessary to note that the Brotherhood of Railway and Steamship Clerks, together with other international unions, engages in discriminatory racist practices in violation of the stated civil rights policy of the AFL–CIO and unfortunately alters these practices only when forced to by State statutes or courts of law. An example of this was the year-long refusal of lodge 364 in Minnesota to accept one Negro worker into membership. This complaint was filed with the Minnesota State fair employment practices commission which directed that the Negro complainant be accepted into membership by the Brotherhood of Railway and Steamship Clerks with seniority beginning on the date of acceptance. The respondent union accepted the Negro into membership more than a year after the initial complaint was filed and only after the State of Minnesota, through its fair employment practices commission, indicated its intent to use the full penal power of the law. It is ironic to note that the president of this union, Mr. George Harrison, is a member of the civil rights committee of the AFL–CIO.

AFFIDAVIT OF WILLIAM GAMBLE AGAINST INTERNATIONAL HOD CARRIERS, BUILDING AND COMMON LABORERS UNION OF AMERICA

Since 1953 Mr. Gamble has attempted to secure membership in local 100 of the International Hod Carriers, Building and Common Laborers Union in East St. Louis, Ill. Officials of local 100 have continuously denied him such membership and in addition refused to honor the traveling permit issued to him by local 110 in St. Louis, Mo.

As Mr. Gamble states in his affidavit, "This is in violation of the established practices of the international union and has prevented me from securing employment. Membership in other locals and traveling permits held by white persons are recognized."

Negro workers are currently denied employment in the major construction projects in the St. Louis and East St. Louis area because of the discriminatory practices of unions affiliated to the Building Trades Council of the AFL–CIO. If within 90 days Mr. Gamble and other qualified Negroes are not admitted into membership by this union, attorneys for the Illinois State Conference of NAACP branches will initiate legal action.

AFFIDAVIT OF JETHRO SMITH VERSUS INTERNATIONAL BROTHERHOOD OF ELECTRICAL WORKERS

Mr. Jethro Smith is a qualified electrician and has worked as such for over 13 years. Because the union has consistently refused to admit him into membership he has been permitted to work only on minor jobs within Negro residential areas and has been prevented from securing employment in major construction installations including Federal Government projects in the St. Louis area. Membership in Local 309 of the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers is limited to white persons only.

If within 90 days Mr. Smith and other qualified Negro electricians are not admitted into membership, attorneys for the Illinois State Conference of NAACP branches are prepared to initiate legal action.

AFFIDAVIT OF HENRY DENSMORE VERSUS OPERATIVE PLASTERERS AND CEMENT MASONS INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF THE UNITED STATES AND CANADA

Local 90 of this union like several others in the St. Louis and East St. Louis area maintains a rigid policy of excluding Negroes from membership thereby preventing qualified colored mechanics from securing employment on major construction projects.

Mr. Densmore states in his affidavit that, "Mr. L. H. Ellis, the business agent on the premises, refused to give me an application form and after some discussion I was told to appear at a meeting on August 8 at the Broadview Hotel to apply for membership. Upon my arrival at the designated time and place, I found there was no meeting, nor had any such meeting been arranged for."

If within 90 days Mr. Densmore and other qualified Negro mechanics are not admitted into membership attorneys for the Illinois State Conference of NAACP branches are prepared to intiate legal action.

AFFIDAVIT OF FRANK T. LYERSON VERSUS UNITED ASSOCIATION OF JOURNEYMEN AND APPRENTICES OF THE PLUMBING AND PIPEFITTING INDUSTRY OF THE UNITED STATES

Local 630 of this union like the majority of those affiliated to the Plumber's Union limits membership to white persons exclusively thereby preventing qualified Negro workers from securing employment in their chosen trade. Local 630 has repeatedly refused membership to Mr. Lyerson and all other Negroes in the East St. Louis area.

If within 90 days Mr. Lyerson and other qualified Negro mechanics are not admitted into membership attorneys for the Illinois State Conference of NAACP branches are prepared to initiate legal action.

The complaints cited above are typical of the continued discriminatory practices engaged in by building trades unions throughout the country. Union membership is a condition of employment in the construction industry, therefore, the refusal to admit into membership because of color completely denies qualified Negroes the right to work in their chosen trade. It is essential that the National AFL–CIO vigorously proceed to eliminate the well-known pattern of discrimination and segregation in the many unions affiliated to the AFL–CIO Building Trades Council.

UNITED PAPER MAKERS AND PAPERWORKERS UNION AND INTERNATIONAL BROTHERHOOD OF PULP, SULPHITE, AND PAPER MILL WORKERS

Members of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People who are members of both the United Paper Makers and Paperworkers Union and the International Brotherhood of Pulp, Sulphite, and Paper Mill Workers have requested the assistance of the association's national office in eliminating the rigid pattern of segregation and discrimination maintained by these two international unions. At the present time a great many local unions affiliated to the United Paper Makers and Paperworkers and the International Brotherhood of Pulp, Sulphite, and Paper Mill Workers are segregated and deny equal seniority and job rights to Negro workers.

Typical of such practices where these two unions hold joint collective bargaining agreements and maintain a rigid pattern of racially segregated local unions with separate seniority lines limiting Negro employment to laborer classifications and denying Negroes seniority and other rights is at the Union Bag-Camp Paper Corp. in Savannah, Ga. All of the Negro workers are limited to membership in two segregated locals, Local 601 and Local 615, affiliated to the International Brotherhood of Pulp, Sulphite, and Paper Mill Workers. All white workers hold membership in Local 388 and Local 435 of the same union and Local 408 of the United Paper Makers and Paperworkers Union.

These unions maintain segregated locals with discriminatory seniority lines, negotiated into the collective bargaining agreement in many other manufacturing plants. Among these are the plants of the International Paper Co. in Mobile, Ala.; Georgetown, S.C.; Natchez and Moss Point, Miss.; and Bastrop, La.; at the Hudson Pulp and Paper Mill in Palatka, Fla.; and at the Crown Zellerbach Corp. plant in Bogalusa, La.

OIL REFINING AND CHEMICAL INDUSTRY

At the present time there is pending with the President's Committee on Government Contracts many complaints against trade unions. Among these are actions filed by the NAACP against the Galveston (Tex.) Metal Trades Council, AFL–CIO, and Local 347 of the International Union of Operating

Engineers charging collusion with the Carbide and Chemical Co. (division of Union Carbon and Carbide Corp.), in maintaining separate lines of progression for Negro and white workers which limits Negro employment to some few menial jobs, wage differentials based upon race, and other forms of job discrimination. Similar complaints are pending against the Lake Charles (La.) Metal Trades Council, AFL–CIO and the Cities Service Refining Corp. in maintaining also a rigid pattern of separate seniority lines which limits Negro employment to laborer classifications and which denies seniority and other rights. The same condition exists at the Lion Oil Co. plant in El Dorado, Ark., where the collective bargaining agreement is held by Local 381 of the International Union of Operating Engineers, AFL–CIO.

COMMUNICATIONS WORKERS OF AMERICA-WESTERN ELECTRIC CO., GREENSBORO, N.C.

In some industrial unions which generally maintain desirable civil-rights policies there is often found to be significant examples of discrimination and segregation at the workplace. The NAACP national office filed complaints with the President's Committee on Government Contracts charging collusion between the Western Electric Co., Greensboro, N.C., and Local 3062 of the Communications Workers of America, AFL–CIO.

In the complaint filed with this Federal agency the association described a rigid pattern of job discrimination based on separate lines of progression, the limiting of all Negroes, however well qualified, to menial job classifications, and the denial of equal seniority rights. A similar situation currently exists at the Atlantic Steel Co. in Atlanta, Ga., where the collective-bargaining agreement is held by the United Steelworkers of America, AFL–CIO. In this plant, because of the operation of separate seniority lines, hundreds of Negro workers suffer dishonest and false job classifications, and are denied the right to develop job skills which would permit employment in more desirable production jobs.

In addition to the Brotherhood of Firemen and Enginemen and the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen which exclude Negroes by constitutional provision many international unions affiliated to the AFL–CIO continue to exclude Negroes by tacit consent and other AFL–CIO unions limit Negro membership in most instances to segregated or auxiliary locals. Among these are:

International Association of Railroad Telegraphers.

International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers.

United Association of Journeymen and Apprentices of the Plumbing and Pipe Fitting Industry of the United States and Canada.

Brotherhood of Maintenance of Way Employees.

Brotherhood of Painters, Decorators, and Paperhangers of America.

Brotherhood of Railway Carmen of America.

Brotherhood of Railway and Steamship Clerks, Freight Handlers, Express and Station Employees.

International Brotherhood of Boilermakers, Iron Ship Builders, Blacksmiths, Forgers, and Helpers.

International Union of Pulp, Sulphite and Paper Mill Workers.

Sheet Metal Workers' International Association.

United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners of America.

United Brotherhood of Paper Makers and Paperworkers.

In many industries in basic sectors of the American economy the racial practices of the trade union certified as the collective bargaining agent will be the decisive factor in determining the status of Negro workers. All too often there is a significant disparity between the declared public policy of the National AFL–CIO and the day-to-day reality as experienced by Negro wage earners in the North as well as in the South.

Today many affiliated unions are blatantly violating the declared civil-rights policies of the AFL–CIO and increasingly Negro workers are experiencing a significant alienation from the organized labor movement. As I have urged in previous memoranda it is totally inadequate for the Civil Rights Department to proceed from individual random complaints which often take years to resolve if ever. What is clearly necessary is a direct frontal attack against segregation and discrimination within trade unions conducted on a systematic basis by the AFL–CIO. Obviously a policy has meaning only to the degree that it is enforced, otherwise one must conclude that it is simply a matter of empty ritual.

The National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, in fulfilling its obligations to its own membership and to all Negro workers, will continue to bring these matters to the attention of the responsible leaders of the AFL–CIO, to call upon public opinion when it is deemed necessary and finally to initiate litigation against trade union organizations responsible for discriminatory practices which deny Negro workers equal job rights and do serious harm to the well-being of the entire Negro community.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be received, printed, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

TAXATION OF INCOME OF LIFE INSURANCE COMPANIES—AMENDMENTS

Mr. BUTLER submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (H.R. 4245) relating to the taxation of the income of life insurance companies, which were referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed.

HAWAIIAN STATEHOOD—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS] be added as a cosponsor of Senate bill 50, the bill dealing with statehood for Hawaii.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT OF REORGANIZATION PLAN NO. 2 OF 1953—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I have been informed that the name of my respected colleague from Minnesota [Mr. MCCARTHY] did not appear as a cosponsor on the bill to amend Reorganization Plan No. 2 of 1953 so as to return full authority to the Administrator of the Rural Electrification Administration (S. 144). This omission is my fault. I am very sorry.

I ask unanimous consent that the name of the junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MCCARTHY] be added as a cosponsor of this measure.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PROPOSED LEGISLATION RELATING TO INTERSTATE COMMERCE—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILLS

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH], be added as sponsors to two railroad-safety measures which I introduced on February 6, namely, S. 995, to amend the Interstate Commerce Act so as to provide for the protection of railroad employees by regulating the use of track motor cars, and for other purposes; and S. 996, to promote the safety of employees and travelers upon common carriers to maintain tracks, bridges, roadbed, and permanent structures for the support of way, trackage, and traffic in safe and suitable condition, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PROMOTION OF MINING AND DEVELOPMENT RESEARCH FOR BERYL, CHROMITE, AND COLUMBIUM - TANTALUM — ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my name be added to the list of cosponsors of S. 1245, introduced by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] on Monday of this week. This is the bill to allow the continuance of our beryl, chromite, and columbium-tantalum industries, which was title II of the bill, S. 2375 of the 85th Congress, proposed by Secretary Seaton and introduced by Senator Watkins on June 24, 1957.

I am glad that my good friend, the Senator from Oregon, has brought this measure before us again. If he had not done so, I was planning to, but the important thing is that this bill receive the consideration it deserves by this 86th Congress.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. SYMINGTON:

Address delivered by Senator MUSKIE at the annual Jackson Day dinner in Springfield, Mo., on February 21, 1959.

By Mr. KUCHEL:

Address delivered by him entitled "The REA and Trinity Power," before the 17th annual meeting of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, February 9, 1959.

Address delivered by him entitled "Think Anew—Act Anew," before the San Francisco County Republican Central Committee, San Francisco, Calif., February 10, 1959.

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

Excerpts from address entitled "All-Out U.S. Effort To Combat Soviet Penetration of Asia, Africa, and the Mideast," delivered

by him before the World Affairs Council, at Troy, N.Y., on December 12, 1958.

By Mr. CASE of New Jersey:

Address delivered by Secretary of Agriculture Ezra Taft Benson at New Jersey Republican State Committee fund-raising dinner, at Newark, N.J., on February 25, 1959.

NOTICE OF PUBLIC HEARINGS BY SENATE CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS SUBCOMMITTEE ON CIVIL RIGHTS BILLS

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, as chairman of the Standing Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights of the Committee on the Judiciary, I wish to announce that the subcommittee has agreed to begin public hearings on Federal civil rights proposals on Wednesday morning, March 18, 1959.

The hearing is set for 10 a.m., in room 318—the caucus room—of the Old Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

The following are the bills referred to the subcommittee to date: S. 435, S. 456, S. 499, S. 810, S. 957, S. 960, and S. 1084.

The following is the general order for appearances of witnesses: U.S. Senators, sponsoring, supporting, or opposing legislation; the Attorney General of the United States and other executive department spokesmen; representatives of organizations supporting legislation; State officials—Governors and attorneys-general; representatives of organizations opposing legislation; individuals.

Anyone wishing to testify or file a statement for the record should communicate immediately with the office of the Senate Constitutional Rights Subcommittee so that the schedule of witnesses can be prepared; the telephone number is Republic 7-7500—or Government Code 181, extension 2363. It would be helpful if requests were also submitted in writing; the mailing address is: Senate Constitutional Rights Subcommittee, U.S. Senate, Washington 25, D.C.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF THOMAS C. MANN TO BE REPRESENTATIVE ON COMMISSION ON INTERNATIONAL COMMODITY TRADE OF ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL OF UNITED NATIONS

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, as chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, I desire to announce that the Senate today received the nomination of Mr. Thomas C. Mann, of Texas, Assistant Secretary of State for Economic Affairs, to be representative of the United States of America on the Commission on International Commodity Trade of the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations.

Notice is given that the Committee on Foreign Relations, at the expiration of 6 days, in accordance with the committee rule, will give consideration to this nomination.

NOTICE OF HEARINGS TO BE HELD BY THE COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, there are pending before the Committee on Banking and Currency the following bills:

First. S. 1062—introduced by myself, Mr. FULBRIGHT, and Mr. CAPEHART—to amend the Federal Deposit Insurance Act to provide safeguards against mergers and consolidations of banks which might lessen competition unduly or tend unduly to create a monopoly in the field of banking;

Second. S. 860—introduced by Mr. PROXMIRE to amend section 19 of the Federal Reserve Act with respect to the use of vault cash holdings as required reserves against deposits; and

Third. S. 1120—introduced by myself, Mr. FULBRIGHT, and Mr. CAPEHART—to amend section 19 of the Federal Reserve Act with respect to the reserves required to be maintained by member banks of the Federal Reserve System against deposits.

It is my intention, subject to the concurrence of the committee, that these bills will be the subject of hearings before the committee beginning on or about March 18, 1959.

All persons who wish to appear and testify at hearings on these bills are requested to notify Mr. J. H. Yingling, chief of staff, Committee on Banking and Currency, room 303, Senate Office Building, telephone Capitol 4-3121, extension 3921, as soon as possible, and in any event, before the close of business on Monday, March 16, 1959.

LACK OF A FARM BILL—STATEMENT BY SENATOR LANGER

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a statement by me in connection with the lack of a farm bill.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR LANGER

During the recent campaign in North Dakota the opposition to the Republican Party was profuse in paid advertisements showing the price the farmer received for his product in 1952 as compared to that he was receiving in 1958 and also what he was paying for farm machinery in 1952 and what he had to pay in 1958. These advertisements were printed in every county newspaper and undoubtedy had a profound effect on the election results.

Since November 4, I have been patiently waiting for the introduction of the farm bill. I say patiently because hundreds of farmers have written to me asking when this new farm legislation was going to come before Congress and whether it was going to be passed before seeding time. The Democrats have approximately a two-thirds majority in the House and in the Senate. They have been condemning the various farm proposals offered by the administration and yet November, December, January, and February have gone by and we are into March and still no sign of a farm bill.

Mr. President, I simply don't believe in hyprocrisy. If these farmers were being robbed and cheated and put out of business, as was so strongly stated by the Democratic opposition last fall. Why haven't they done something to remedy the situation; why haven't they at least reported a bill out of the committee which they control 2 to 1? Certainly the farmers of the Midwest are entitled to better treatment than they have been getting. Because I know they should get a better deal, I wish to add my voice to those of the farming population who are asking for a square deal from the Congress. I, also, wish to assure the Democratic leadership that if they will report out a decent farm bill, I will not only vote for it, but, if the President vetoes it, I will vote to override the veto.

RETIREMENT OF HARRIS ELLSWORTH AS CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION CHAIRMAN

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I want to take a few moments today to comment on the retirement of the Chairman of the Civil Service Commission, Harris Ellsworth, who has discharged his duties in this position in an extremely fine and meritorious manner. I am confident that the hundreds of thousands of civil service employees in the Nation are better off for his years of service.

During the time Mr. Ellsworth has been Commissioner, competence and general efficiency within the Civil Service Commission have been of the first order. Under his guidance, the relationships between the Government employees and the various organizations which represent them have improved. Also there has been more coordination between the various agencies of the Government.

I have very fond memories of my association with Mr. Ellsworth, for we became Members of the Congress in 1943. I know him as a kind and gentle man of great intellect. During the time he served in the House, he was devoted to the cause of his constituents and the State of Oregon. He took these fine traits with him to the Civil Service Commission, and they were very evident during his career as an administrator.

We shall miss Harris Ellsworth in Washington, but we know he will enjoy returning to his home State of Oregon. I take this opportunity to wish him and Mrs. Ellsworth and their family good luck and Godspeed.

Mr. President, I now desire to turn to another subject.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana has the floor.

FEDERAL RESPONSIBILITY TOWARD INDIANS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, on Monday of this week my distinguished colleagues, the senior Senator from Montana and chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs [Mr. MURRAY] and the junior Senator from Oregon and chairman of the Subcommittee on Indian Affairs [Mr. NEUBERGER], submitted Senate Concurrent Resolution 12, which calls for a restatement of Federal responsibility toward Indians and their tribal organizations.

These two Senators are to be highly commended for their initiative in attempting to revitalize and improve our present Federal Indian policy. In recent years the relationship between the Indians living on reservations in this country and the Federal Government has deteriorated at an alarming rate. I would not be honest if I did not openly admit that I have been quite critical about certain Bureau of Indian Affairs policies as they affect the Indians in my State. This disagreement has arisen largely from the misinterpretation of Senate Concurrent Resolution 108, as adopted during the 83d Congress.

I think all will agree that the Federal Government has a very definite responsibility to the Nations first citizens, the Indians. We have a responsibility to help them improve their economic and social status, so that they can compete with others in our society. We also have a responsibility to see that the Indian children are provided with adequate education and health facilities. Education and good health are vital if the Indian is to meet his other responsibilities.

There is general agreement that eventually the Federal Government will relinquish all responsibility to the Indians, other than the responsibility our Government has to every citizen. The major disagreement is over the matter of timing. Federal responsibility over an Indian tribe should never be terminated until the Indians themselves agree to it, and until they have fully demonstrated their ability to assume their new role.

In my estimation, the Bureau of Indian Affairs is trying to move too fast; and many of its policies on welfare, land sales, and relocation tend to thrust responsibilities on many Indians before they are ready, and to dissolve traditional Indian relationships. The answer to many of our problems pertaining to the Indians is through education, so as to show the younger people a better way of life. Much progress has been made in this area, but we must also have coincidental advancements in the area of welfare and administration of Federal policy. I think we must recognize that we are going to have to take care of some of the elder Indian citizens for the remainder of their years, and I think we are responsible for discharging that responsibility well.

There are in Montana seven Indian reservations, with as many varied backgrounds and problems. We have a very unhappy situation at the present time; and it is my hope that a reversal of Senate Concurrent Resolution 108 and the speedy adoption of Senate Concurrent Resolution 12 will redirect and reinterpret our Federal Indian policy.

We are not recommending anything new or drastic in the area of Federal-Indian relationships. What we are actually doing is placing the views of the Secretary of the Interior on Indian policy in the form of legislation, and what I sincerely hope will be new administrative policy. Senate Concurrent Resolution 12 is still open for cosponsorship; and I hope that a number of my colleagues in the Senate will indicate their interest in sponsoring this measure.

INFLATION

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there may be printed in the body of the RECORD following these remarks a copy of an advertisement printed a few days ago over the name of the International Latex Corp., the title of the advertisement being "Inflation's Time Bomb." I ask that following the advertisement an editorial from the Wall Street Journal, entitled "The Modern Fallacy," be printed.

Both these matters have to do with the general subject of inflation, which I think is not as well understood as it should be. I shall have more to say about the subject from time to time and week by week.

There being no objection, the advertisement and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INFLATION'S TIME BOMB

There is a new factor—and a very disturbing one—which now affects the will of the Nation to resist inflation. Until very recently there was no respected member of the academic world in this country, or any responsible political leader, who openly argued for inflation as a way of life.

But this has now changed. The arguments for the advantages of creeping inflation and a gently rising price level are vigorously presented almost weekly by Prof. Sumner Slichter of Harvard University, who has standing in the academic world. The Slichter thesis on the benefits of rising prices is repeated and amplified by many lesser lights in the academic world, and by some political leaders.

It is therefore a cause of satisfaction when other academic figures who have great influence in financial, industrial and political circles enter the lists to offset the inflationists. Dr. Marcus Nadler of New York University needs no introduction to the business community nor does Dean G. Rowland Collins.

They are the authors of a brief but most interesting study entitled "The Problem of Inflation," which has been issued as the first bulletin of the C. J. Devine Institute of Finance, recently established at the NYU Graduate School of Business Administration. No more fitting monograph could have been issued by the newly established Devine Institute of Finance. Here is a sound analysis of the current situation, with specific reference to Dr. Slichter's theories.

It should be noted that Dr. Slichter did not talk about the benefits of inflation, and the advantage of rising prices when he first began to condone the current inflation many years ago. His reasoning at that time ran something like this: Since powerful labor unions will get wage increases greater than is warranted by increased productivity, there will be a tendency for prices to rise. The increase in prices must, in time, cause decreased sales and unemployment unless the money supply is expanded by the Government and monetary authorities. This new money ought to be provided, said Dr. Slichter, in order to insure continuing prosperity. The only other alternative—curbing the monopoly power of unions—is not advisable, Dr. Slichter said. So being unwilling to curb union power, he was willing to condone inflation.

But then the good doctor made a long, theoretical leap. In recent articles, he not only condones inflation but he praises it. Dr. Slichter says (1) inflation does not cause widespread distress, and only "well heeled" people protest about it. The opposite is true. What about pensioners, ministers, civil servants, etc., who are cruelly affected?

(2) Inflation is necessary for substantial growth and prosperity. What about many great periods of prosperity when prices were declining, such as 1875 to 1892 and 1923 to 1929?

(3) Creeping inflation can continue forever without becoming "galloping." How does he know this? Creeping inflation has always accelerated into national disaster throughout history.

Dr. Nadler meets the Slichter statements head on. He says that "creeping inflation" is dangerous. At the present moment it reveals itself in the stock market, in real estate markets, and in the demoralized condition of the bond market. Consumer and industrial prices are resting for a short while.

But the fear of inflation can turn a "creep" into a "gallop." People are not dumb—they will become convinced of the inevitable loss in purchasing power of their savings. Then they would save less and spend more. A boom would result in consumer goods and in capital goods, and a big demand for expanded bank credit and long-term capital.

But inflation would dry up the flow of funds into savings institutions and bonds. At the same time the Federal Reserve Board would have to clamp down on bank credit, in order to dampen down the rising prices. Home building and capital goods expansion would suffer and the inflationary boom would inevitably come to a halt.

A recession and large-scale unemployment would result. Then, says Dr. Nadler, there would be the real danger of a tremendous new inflation to cure unemployment and revive the boom once again.

Specifically how do we meet the problem now? Here Dr. Nadler stresses a point repeatedly mentioned in this column. "Inflation," he says, "can be sustained only if the money supply is large enough to support the expanded volume of business at rising prices. If, through central bank restriction of credit, the growth of the money supply is stopped and the velocity of deposits cannot be further appreciably increased, the boom comes to an end."

Plainly the way to stop a future depression is to prevent the inflationary boom that precedes it. This requires the Federal Government to balance the budget and the monetary authorities to prevent a credit spree. It is encouraging to have stout allies like Dr. Nadler and Dr. Collins of New York University waging this battle.

(Presented as a public service by International Latex Corp., Playtex Park, Dover, Del.)

[From the Wall Street Journal, Mar. 4, 1959]

THE MODERN FALLACY

For an insight into the modern political philosophy now dominant in Congress, consider some comments made by one of its more articulate spokesmen, Senator JOSEPH CLARK, of Pennsylvania.

As quoted in the current issue of the Atlantic magazine, Mr. CLARK expresses annoyance that the word Government is sometimes equated with other nouns having an evil connotation—such as waste, extravagance, socialism, bureaucracy. Such an identification, in the Senator's opinion, is a pernicious tendency. More specifically, he objects to the fallacy that private spending is inherently good and public spending is inherently bad—and therefore public spending should always be minimized and private spending increased.

Now, put in this somewhat negative way, the viewpoint seems innocuous enough. Obviously, the concept of government as such is not evil, and obviously, public spending as such is not necessarily bad. We know of no thinking person who contends they are.

But the real point is the clearly implied one: That Americans should learn to regard growing government and growing government spending as positive and good things; as another of the moderns in Congress has expressed it, the danger may be not that we

have too much government but too little. Hence the effort to suggest that public spending is at least as good as, and quite possibly much better than, private spending; that anyway they are just two sides of the same coin.

Well, let's see. Some rather marked—and inherent—differences between public and private spending occur at once. Private spending comes from the money individuals are able to accumulate through their own work. Public spending cannot come from anything generated by the Government itself; it comes from what the Government is able to extract from those same individuals either in actual taxes or in the more sinister tax of inflation.

The more the Government spends, the more it must take through either of these routes, and the proportionately less the individuals have to spend or save, as they see fit. Thus public spending is not merely another form of spending; it is a positive depressant on private disposition of income, as any taxpayer and/or inflation victim can readily attest.

Beyond these elementary differences are others. The vast bulk of public spending is nonproductive; that is true not only of defense but of many other things the Government does. The Government is by and large a consumer of huge hunks of the economy, while private individuals are producer-consumers. The latter combination is what makes the economy grow. Moreover, the bigger the Government becomes the more it competes with the private economy, and in this pressure against the available limit of supplies is a special inflationary force.

And because Government operates without the built-in restraints of the private economy, it is a peculiarly powerful incubator for precisely the evils Senator CLARK thinks should not be associated with Government—waste, extravagance, bureaucracy. The bigger the Government the worse the evils.

Finally, what is the political result of encouraging Government growth and growing Government spending on the theory that, after all, they are not really bad? The end result must be the triumph of the State over the individual, whether that condition be called socialism or something else.

There is an appalling air of naivete about the expressed views of some of the "modern" political philosophers. It is impossible that they are unacquainted with the history of man's struggle against the all-encompassing State, which is also the very heart of today's conflict with Communist tyranny. Can it be, then, that they are incapable of relating past and present human experience to their own country?

For men deliberately to propagate this fallacious philosophy would be regrettable. But it is perhaps even sadder if they truly cannot see that what they call "modern" and "liberal" are rooted in concepts most ancient and most illiberal.

SCARCITY OF WATER

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the increasing scarcity of water in some parts of the world, and in some parts of the United States, is properly causing concern. This is a matter of world interest, as well as of national importance.

The Secretary of the Interior, Mr. Fred Seaton, has just announced progress toward an important breakthrough in desalting seawater. He has announced a process to be used in a new plant pursuant to legislation passed during the last session of Congress. I was glad to join with the distinguished Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] and the distinguished Senator from California [Mr. ENGLE] in sponsoring and pushing this legislation.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD at this point a news article from the Washington Post and Times Herald of March 3 and an editorial from the New York Times with reference to this important scientific progress.

There being no objection, the article and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald, Mar. 3, 1959]

CHEAPER CONVERSION OF SEA WATER ACHIEVED

A multiple-effect distillation process will be used in the Government's first saline water conversion demonstration plant.

Plans call for the plant to convert sea water to fresh at the rate of 1 million gallons a day. The estimated cost of less than $1 a thousand gallons is about half the cost in the most efficient plants now operating, Secretary of the Interior Fred Seaton said yesterday in announcing selection of the process.

The site of the plant has not been chosen. It will be one of three Congress has authorized for construction on the east, west, and gulf coasts.

Congress also has authorized construction of two plants to treat brackish waters, to be located in arid areas of the Southwest and in the Northern Plains.

The process selected for the first plant is known as long-tube vertical multiple-effect distillation. A pilot plant using the process has been operated almost continuously at Harbor Island, near Wilmington, N.C., since November 1957.

"This process gives promise of achieving a remarkable breakthrough in saline water conversion," Seaton said.

[From the New York Times]

UNSALTING THE SEA

As the world's population grows, mankind is more and more in the position of the Ancient Mariner, who complained that there was water, water everywhere, nor any drop to drink. Most of the world's water is salt. For many years scientists have been trying to take the salt out of water at a cost low enough for water users to pay. The United States has had a saline water conversion program, or its equivalent, since 1952.

Now comes an announcement by Secretary Seaton of the Department of the Interior of a remarkable breakthrough in making salt water fresh. Mr. Seaton believes that a new process known as long-tube vertical multiple-effect distillation can get the cost down to less than $1 per 1,000 gallons. This compares with about 30 cents per 1,000 gallons now charged for water used in American homes. It may also be compared with the cost of $3 per 1,000 gallons, which was the best that could be done 3 or 4 years ago. A further cheapening would be necessary if sea water, or other saline water, were to be used for irrigation, but we seem to be on the way. Atomic power might someday enter into the picture, though not tomorrow or the day after.

Along certain coasts in the world an economic method of purifying sea water would be the equivalent of countless new homes and families. Los Angeles, for example, and the whole of southern California will have a definite limit to their population if they continue to depend on natural fresh water. In many other parts of the world, such as the northern coast of Chile, great sections of Australia, Palestine, and other regions of the Middle East, and much of the northern coast of Africa, an abundant supply of sea water would mean a dense population where few are able today to make a living. The sea is the mother of all living things. Perhaps the day is near when she will nourish her children as she has never done before in all human history.

TAXATION ON LIFE INSURANCE COMPANIES

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I have received a very challenging letter from Harold F. Bowes, of the Phoenix Mutual Life Insurance Co., of Hartford, Conn. Mr. Bowes is now located in Milwaukee.

Among other things, the letter reads:

I am writing you today regarding bill H.R. 4245 which has to do with the proposed increase in taxation on life insurance companies. I am amazed to learn that this bill would increase income taxes on life insurance companies approximately 70 percent.

Mr. President, I do not know anything about the bill. I hope to investigate it. But I wish to say that there are in this country many people who are savers, who have put their savings into insurance policies. We have already taken away from them about 50 percent of the value of their insurance policies as a result of inflation. Now the question is whether or not those who have saved are to be penalized further. I feel the matter requires real study.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the letter to which I have referred, and that it be thereafter returned to my office.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PHOENIX MUTUAL LIFE INSURANCE CO.,
Hartford, Conn., March 3, 1959.

Hon. ALEXANDER WILEY,
Senator of the State of Wisconsin,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: I visited with you several times in Washington a number of years ago, and on one or two occasions in Milwaukee. I've enjoyed and appreciated being on your mailing list and note with interest the good job you have always done for us in Washington.

I am writing you today regarding bill H.R. 4245 which has to do with the proposed increase in taxation on life insurance companies. I am amazed to learn that this bill would increase income taxes on life insurance companies approximately 70 percent.

I suggest that this places too heavy a burden on the thrift of our citizens and that every effort should be made to keep tax on policyholders funds within more reasonable limits.

Today in this period of increased living costs and high income taxes, it is extremely difficult for the average person to have an estate other than through life insurance. If our welfare had to take care of all people who lost their wage earner and who had no insurance, the rest of the people would be taxed and you can agree that they would have no funds left over to save themselves. Through the purchase of life insurance, a man can provide for his family.

Through inflation we have decreased the purchasing power of the dollar by 50 percent and are now contemplating taxing heavily his life insurance in that he will necessarily have to pay increased premiums.

You have always been a great believer in the institution of life insurance, and we have on record what you have said about the institution on several occasions. We are hopeful that you will take a strong

position in regard to this increase in taxation which penalizes thrift and tends to discourage a man doing the job himself.

I shall appreciate anything that you can do to protect the best interest of thousands of our citizens of this State who rely upon you to protect their best interests.

Sincerely and faithfully yours,

HAROLD F. BOWES,
Manager.

DEFENSE FACILITIES PROTECTION ACT OF 1959

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, on January 29 I introduced Senate bill 776 which would authorize the Federal Government to guard strategic defense facilities against individuals believed to be disposed to commit acts of sabotage, espionage, or other subversion.

To illustrate the sensitive problem to which this legislation is pointed, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD, at this point, an eye-opening speech which was delivered several months ago by Lt. Gen. Arthur G. Trudeau, Chief of Research and Development of the Department of the Army.

In making this request, I should like to emphasize General Trudeau's theme that "there is documentary evidence of the excellence of Communist industrial espionage," and to urge that S. 776 be scheduled for hearing and consideration at the earliest possible moment.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS BY LT. GEN. ARTHUR G. TRUDEAU, U.S. ARMY, CHIEF OF RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT, DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY, BEFORE THE FOURTH GENERAL CONVENTION OF THE AMERICAN SOCIETY FOR INDUSTRIAL SECURITY, SHOREHAM HOTEL, WASHINGTON, D.C., SEPTEMBER 16, 1958

I quote from the Constitution of the United States of America—article III, section 3. This section of our Constitution defines treason, as follows:

"Treason against the United States shall consist only in levying war against them, or in adhering to their enemies, giving them aid and comfort."

It is unthinkable that any good American in his right mind would deliberately commit treason. Yet some otherwise good Americans actually do give aid and comfort to the enemy—through their deficiencies in industrial security. These deficiencies do not occur by accident. They are caused by either inexcusable ignorance or willful carelessness. Even more distressing, some Americans give aid and comfort to the enemy knowingly, deliberately, and with malice in their hearts.

In withholding aid and comfort from the enemy, I stand shoulder-to-shoulder with you, the members of the American Society for Industrial Security. Together, we strive for ever greater industrial security, and thereby greater security for our beloved Nation.

After more than three decades of Army service, I think I know the danger that faces us from communism. And I hope I know the importance of security in our military hardware in every phase from inception of a weapon or an item of equipment; through research and development; production and procurement; storage, maintenance and distribution; to ultimate use on the battlefield.

As you know, I have served as Assistant Chief of Staff, Intelligence, or G–2, with principal responsibility for Army intelligence and counterintelligence.

In my present assignment as Chief of Research and Development, I work in the beginning and very critical phase of the Army hardware cycle. As a combat commander in Korea, I saw the terminal or combat phase of the Army hardware cycle—in which we counted on our weapons and equipment to destroy a fanatical enemy. I had similar experience in combat operations in World War II, in the Southwest and Western Pacific. Research and development and combat are certainly the Alpha and Omega, the beginning and the beginning of the end of our mission to preserve the security of our weapons and equipment.

I know that all of us are well agreed that maintaining security is no childish game of cops-and-robbers. Nor is it only an intellectual exercise of matching wits with the enemy.

Security is actually one of the most important elements of our struggle for survival as a free nation in a free world, and we are woefully weak as a nation in preserving it.

Our freedom is challenged today by an enemy who is powerful, fanatic, shrewd, ruthless and unscrupulous. The Communists regard the struggle between themselves and us as a matter of life or death—as it truly is.

As Lenin said: "We are living not merely in a state but in a system of states, and the existence of the Soviet Republic side by side with imperialist states for a long time is unthinkable. One or the other must triumph in the end."

Listen to Lenin again:

"A funeral dirge will be sung over the Soviet Republic or over world capitalism."

Joseph Stalin frequently repeated these warnings.

Listen to Dmitri Z. Manuilsky, Soviet economist and representative at the United Nations. Manuilsky says:

"War to the hilt between communism and capitalism is inevitable. The bourgeoisie will have to be put to sleep. * * * As soon as their guard is down, we will smash them with our clenched fist."

Now listen to how Nikita Khrushchev states the Communist determination. Krushchev says it in five syllables:

"We will bury you."

From these warnings, I think it is plain that we must regard the struggle between the Communists and the free world in exactly the same way as the Communists consider it—as literally a matter of life or death, a matter of national survival.

As I have pointed out, security is actually one of the most important elements in this struggle for survival. And at no time is security more important than in the research and development phase, for R. & D. is the fountainhead of all our weapons and equipment. An item compromised in the research and development phase is compromised straight through the production, distribution and use phases; and the enemy has plenty of time to prepare his defenses against it.

We just can't accept any risk that our industrial base is thus jeopardized.

The importance of our industrial base as one of the cornerstones of our national security has been recognized since the days of our Founding Fathers. Alexander Hamilton put it this way, in the Federalist Papers:

"Not only the wealth but the independence and security of a country appears to be materially connected with the prosperity of manufactures * * *. Every nation, with a view to those great objects, ought to endeavor to possess within itself all the essentials of national supply. These comprise the means of subsistence, habitation, clothing, and defense. The possession of these is necessary to the perfection of the body politic; to the safety as well as to the welfare of the society."

Still quoting from Alexander Hamilton, he continued:

"The extreme embarrassments of the United States during the late war, from an incapacity of supplying themselves, are still matters of keen recollection; a future war might be expected again to exemplify the mischiefs and dangers of a situation to which that incapacity is still, in too great a degree, applicable * * *. To effect this change, as fast as shall be prudent merits all the attention and all the zeal of our public councils; 'tis the next great work to be accomplished."

What he has to say is just as fresh, just as applicable, today as it was when he first uttered it. As he points out, a future war might be expected again to exemplify the mischiefs and dangers of our present situation.

But the Communists consider themselves perpetually at war—last year, this year, next year, always. They even define peace as a condition that can exist only on their terms of a classless world.

Their intelligence and counterintelligence, accordingly, is practically on a wartime basis. And their espionage, particularly their industiral espionage, is rated as superior by our own intelligence professionals.

There is documentary evidence of the excellence of Communist industrial espionage. It was most effective against Germany during the 1920's and 1930's. It was effective in this country during World War II—and would have been far more effective but for the yoeman work done by the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the military services, and the scientific and industrial organizations themselves.

As a specific example of the effectiveness of foreign espionage—including that inspired by the Communists—we have only to recall how much came to light as the result of the defection of Igor Gouzenko, the Soviet Embassy clerk who had the cold courage to go to the Canadian Government with his story of the true proportions of Communist espionage. Herbert Philbrick, who was a Communist for the FBI in this country, similarly testifies to the effectiveness of Communist espionage.

For another example, during the Spanish Civil War, about 2,000 Americans and Canadians volunteered to fight for the Loyallist. Each of these volunteers was required to surrender his passport to the Communists. We have to assume that these passports have been used time after time by Soviet agents to assume validated and accepted identities as American citizens. In one well-known case, a Soviet agent assumed the identity of a Canadian citizen, then was naturalized as an American citizen, and in this disguise penetrated a sensitive installation. It is safe to assume that we are still being hurt by these agents.

For still another example, consider the case of the Farben Industries in Germany in the 1930's. Communist agents were extremely active within it, and remarkably successful. It was a long time before investigation revealed the extent of their penetration of the Farben Industries.

In this connection, I wonder seriously just how many of us can say that our organizations have never mislaid a classified document? The word "mislaid" is, of course, a euphemism. Actually, whenever a classified document is mislaid, or unaccounted for, it is completely out of security control. It takes only a minute or two for an agent to photograph a document and return it with no indication that it has been compromised.

In most cases of mislaid classified documents, the only safe assumption is that security has been violated. Smart agents do not steal documents if they can photograph

them. Reporting the loss will not repair the damage that has been done. It will help greatly, however, to prevent a recurrence.

As we all know, espionage is not nearly so much a business of a sinister-looking agent slitting a throat to make off with a briefcase full of top secret war plans, as it is the patient putting together of numerous bits of information to complete the grand design. The typical industrial espionage agent today is much more apt to be an industrial expert than a cloak-and-dagger expert.

As a specific example of the importance of safeguarding classified information in smaller matters as well as large, let me cite an experience I had on one of my recent visits to a contractor working on a very sensitive project. I will not identify the company further. I noted example after example of what seemed to me very loose security handling, particularly in ignoring established control procedures. Some of these deficiencies, even though not too serious in themselves, could have quickly added up to an extremely critical threat.

On my return to Washington, I called the matter to the attention of the Assistant Chief of Staff, Intelligence. Fortunately, the problem had already come to his attention and he was taking corrective measures.

What bothered me is that probably some damage had already been done at this particular plant. Our only sure knowledge of how badly we are being hurt in such cases comes from defectors from the Communist cause or when they develop equal or superior items of equipment from the knowledge gained.

What bothered me even more is that if this particular plant is a fair sample, similar laxities and deficiencies probably exist at other plants. Thus, in spite of our best security efforts, and no matter how well we may think we are doing, we still have very serious security problems.

Not all our security problems come from the formal Communist intelligence apparatus. Soviet-inspired espionage in the United States falls into two general categories—legal networks and illegal networks. A legal apparatus is one in which the control agent has entered the United States legally. He may have diplomatic status as a military or commercial attaché, or he may be a member of a trade commission or a visiting cultural group.

An illegal apparatus is one in which the control agent has entered the United States illegally under such cover as a false name, forged passport, or false birth certificate.

In either case, his mission is to establish an espionage ring in a given target area or to take over control of one already established.

In the case of the legal net, the control agent is able to work from the cover of a diplomatic establishment. If his insidious activities are discovered, he has the protection of the Soviet Union. The worst that can happen is that the individual may be subjected to a persona non grata action, and recalled home.

A recent example of this is the case of the Soviet commercial attaché whose espionage activities were exposed by the FBI.

In the case of the illegal apparatus, the control agent does not have the protection of his government. In fact, his government will deny any relationship with him. When exposed, he is subject to prosecution under the espionage laws of the United States. A recent example of this is the Soviet master spy Colonel Abel, who is serving a prison term for his longtime espionage activities.

Since these agents must have sources and information, they must establish rewarding contacts within their particular target area. It is here we find the traitors who for many reasons sell their services, and perhaps their souls, to the cause of Communist espionage.

Such individuals may be members of the Communist Party. If they are, it is considered their duty to accept any espionage mission assigned to them by their Soviet masters. Other individuals may have compromising matters in their background which they would not dare to have made public. Such "skeletons in the closet" of persons in the target area are assiduously sought by the Communist recruiters. The threat of exposure is used to blackmail the victim into furnishing information to the Communist control agent.

If a prospective informant is known for his ultraliberal views, the Communist approach is tailored to fit his views. Here we find the "Science knows no boundaries" or the "We work only for peace" approaches.

Unfortunately, there are Americans gullible enough to be taken in by these approaches.

Another standard approach to the intended informant is the social approach. Here some mutual interest, perhaps stamp collecting, photography, or sports, is pretended and exploited.

In every approach and recruitment, the entrapment proceeds slowly. At first, the requests for information appear to be innocuous. Usually information is requested which is available from open sources.

Then, under some legitimate-appearing pretext, payment is offered, perhaps small sums at first. When the payments are accepted, the trap is sprung.

If the informant is reluctant to furnish classified information, he is threatened with exposure to the authorities. This method is used even with American Communists, since it is suspected that they may still have in their veins a drop or two of patriotic blood.

The important aspects to remember are: First, that the intended source or informant must be in the target area and must be in a position to gain access to the desired information; and second, that the agents will ruthlessly exploit every conceivable approach to the victim.

Bribes, blackmail, sex, alcohol, narcotics, and every other tool of Satan are their stock in trade. Like spiders, they gradually weave a web around their victim, using his own weaknesses to help them, until he is completely at their mercy—and they have no mercy.

The end result is always the same—Communist espionage has gained still another channel of information.

I wish I could speak out even more strongly on this subject, using some recent cases we know of, because it's a subject on which I feel most strongly; but I am unable to do so in a public address at this time.

However, I say without fear of contradiction, that the advanced state of Soviet technology today is due more to Soviet success in espionage and subversion than it is to their scientific apparatus, good as it is.

I should like now to make two requests of you members of the American Society for Industrial Security.

My first request is to the industrial security officers. I ask that you always inform us immediately if classified papers are mislaid or lost. I ask also that you inform us immediately if you sense a pattern of an office or an individual consistently asking to see classified documents which are outside the normal area of interest of the office or individual—in other words, when there is no real need to know. A pattern of espionage may be developing which, together, we can recognize and correct—as in the example of the Farben Industries I mentioned earlier.

My second request is to the executives of our contracting firms. I ask that you give your complete support to your industrial security personnel. By this I mean not only policy guidance and executive direction, but also all the resources necessary to accomplish their mission, such as manpower and funds.

I suggest that these efforts will be well spent—not only from the standpoint of our national security, but also from the standpoint of giving better protection to your own trade secrets and proprietary information.

Now, let me restate and summarize my remarks today. I have made five main points:

1. The Communist threat to our Nation is real and proximate. We are in a life or death struggle. To win, to survive, we must develop a greater sense of urgency.

2. Our industrial base is essential to our national security. It is therefore a principal target of Communist espionage and sabotage.

3. The Communist espionage apparatus is formidable. We must assume that their capacity for sabotage is equally formidable.

4. Industrial security is the key to defending our industrial base against Communist espionage and sabotage.

5. Industrial security is the primary responsibility—and proud privilege as well—of both management and the individual who has the classified information in his hands.

If he can't be trusted, safes are useless and security manuals are ridiculous—for our industrial security is compromised and our national survival is jeopardized.

It's our task, yours and mine, to help that individual person keep his trust and keep classified information secure.

I can think of no greater contribution we can make to keeping our Nation the land of the free because it's the home of the brave—and the trustworthy.

Thank you very much.

RECENT DECISIONS OF THE SUPREME COURT

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, last Monday morning in the Baltimore Sun there was published a very informative editorial in connection with some of the recent decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NOW THE AMERICAN BAR ASSOCIATION

(By C. P. Ives)

Of course no comment on the current Supreme Court could exceed in relevance and gravity the historic remonstrance put out last summer by the conference of State chief justices. This was protest from within the household, by men unhappy with the High Court's recent behavior just because they share that Court's ultimate responsibility for the rule of law.

Nevertheless, the resolutions now published by the house of delegates of the American Bar Association also have their weight. Here again we have particular competence to speak, and automatic assurance that what is said has been measured prayerfully against professional obligation.

There is a certain fortunate accident even in the timing of the American Bar Association statement. Prior organization scheduling forced the State chief justices to speak at a moment when the desegregation controversy happened to be at one of its peaks. This allowed a dissenter to suggest, what was untrue, that the unstated animus of the chief justices' protest was white supremacist objections to *Brown* v. *Board of Education*. The American Bar Association scheduling released its statement during a desegregation lull.

This stresses the most notable thing about the current criticism—that it would exist had *Brown* v. *Board* never been announced.

Many reflective Americans feel, after all, that the desegregation cases are beyond the normal orbit of juridical discourse and will be absorbed in pragmatic terms as the national history unrolls over a period of years. The State chief justices and now their lawyer brethren have things to say wholly aside from and independent of this other matter.

Nor should it be supposed that the lawyerly discussion of the current Supreme Court is limited to the practicing branches of the legal profession. Some of the most telling protest has come from the great law schools.

Thus Professor Alexander M. Bickel, of Yale, has spoken of the Court's default in rational justification of key decisions. No criticism could be more searching, none more damaging, and this from the very nature of the Court. For it is beyond political accountability, and depends wholly for its acceptation among the people on persuasions addressed to the mind. And yet, says Professor Bickel (in 1957).

"The Court's products has shown an increasing incidence of the sweeping dogmatic statement, of the formulation of results accompanied by little or no effort to support them in reason, in sum, or opinions that do not opine and of per curiam orders that quite frankly fail to build the bridge between the authorities they cite and the results they decree."

Equally grave is the comment last October of Harvard's law dean, Erwin N. Griswold, a passionate defender of some of the current Court's decisions: "In the field of interstate commerce, Congress has refused to pass a workmen's compensation act, but has instead left in force the Employer's Liability Act, which bases liability on negligence and fault. Yet over a series of years, the Court has, by one extreme decision after another, largely transformed this statute into a workmen's compensation act, with unlimited liability.

"Closely related to this has been the substantial elimination of any effective judicial restraint in civil jury trials, so that State courts are repeatedly required to allow juries to find verdicts on an amount of evidence which can hardly be called scintilla."

These direct and palpable erosions of property rights are not, however, the things most worrisome to many of the Court's critics. More troubling far are decisions involving the deadliest foe property—and liberty—have ever had, namely world communism.

The quality of the Court's judgment in this area has been pretty well dramatized by Prof. Bernard Schwartz, of the New York University Law School, citing the recent Du Pont and Yates cases. In the Du Pont case the Court pushed antitrust theory to an extreme in outlawing corporate stock acquisitions of some 40 years before. In the Yates case it declined to touch Communist organization activities of only 12 years before, urging a 3-year statute of limitations.

"What are we to think," wonders Professor Schwartz, "of a tribunal which rushes in to make a decision against Du Pont, but withdraws into its shell of narrow, literal construction when a decision against the Yates defendants is at issue? At the very least, there is a disturbing inconsistency in the High Tribunal's approach to the two cases."

It was of the Yates and other subversion cases that the dean of all our commentators, Professor Corwin, of Princeton, was speaking when he referred sadly to "a recent tenderizing of the judicial mind toward the American Communist Party."

The ground may differ, but the State chief justices, the American Bar Association, the Corwins, Griswolds, Bickels, Schwartzes, make a rising consensus of dismay. Yet the Court is wholly dependent on such men for defense against critics less informed, much more numerous and infinitely more virulent.

CALIFORNIA WATER PROJECTS

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, the phenomenal growth of the State of California has been accompanied by the construction of a variety of public works, some of them literally monumental in size and effect, to conserve, regulate, and control our often difficult-to-manage water resources.

On several occasions I have remarked that the job of building America is by no means finished. On the contrary, our steady increase in population and rising standard of living present successive problems to meet the needs of our people. Foremost among these in California is the urgent demand for continuing programs to assure sufficient supplies of water for agricultural, industrial, domestic, and municipal purposes, to equalize the maldistribution of our State's extensive water resources, and to safeguard our people and their homes, businesses, communications lines, transportation systems, industries, and other installations against the ravages of uncontrolled floods.

California notably has a complex water problem. Its solution calls for energetic efforts of Federal, State, county, and local governments, together with numerous semigovernmental agencies created by forward-looking citizens. Ambitious programs have been devised and initiated to satisfy the sometimes conflicting requirements of California with regard to water.

Because the urgency of solving this problem is increasing rather than diminishing, I have obtained from several Federal agencies comprehensive data in the form of inventories of projects authorized but still unstarted which would help greatly in meeting my State's demands for better control and utilization of its available water. I believe these tabulations will be of widepsread interest and will provide a better understanding of what California is attempting to accomplish. Therefore I request unanimous consent to have them printed in the RECORD as part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the tables were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CORPS OF ENGINEERS

Uncompleted active authorized projects in the State of California

A. PROJECTS ON WHICH CONSTRUCTION HAS NOT BEEN STARTED

Project	Total estimated Federal cost	Estimated cost preconstruction planning	Appropriations through fiscal year 1959	Balance to complete after fiscal year 1959
Navigation:				
Los Angeles and Long Beach Harbors	[1] $519,000	$43,000	[2] $13,000	$506,000
Newport Bay and Harbor	1,241,000	41,000	[2] 1,000	1,240,000
Noyo River and Harbor:				
Breakwater in harbor	2,250,000	70,000	14,000	2,236,000
Extension of channel	419,000	16,000	[2] 10,000	409,000
Redwood City Harbor:				
30-foot depth, San Bruno shoal entrance and Redwood Creek channels	1,380,000	12,000	[2] 2,000	1,378,000
Channel extension and 2d turning basin	560,000	17,000	[2] 10,000	550,000
Sacramento River, shallow draft channel	[3] 421,000	22,000	[2] 7,000	414,000
San Diego Harbor, area M	477,000	12,000	[2] 2,000	475,000
San Francisco Harbor and Bay, drift removal plant	1,400,000	29,000	[2] 3,000	1,397,000
Santa Cruz Harbor	1,740,000	110,000	110,000	1,630,000
Beach erosion control:				
Carpinteria to Point Mugu	90,000	[4] 5,000	[4] 5,000	85,000
Humbolt Bay, Buhne Point	50,000	[4] 2,000	[4] 2,000	48,000
Point Mugu to San Pedro Breakwater	5,313,000	[4] 30,000	[4] 30,000	5,283,000
Santa Cruz County:				
Cliff Drive Seawall, vicinity 49th Ave	14,000	----------	----------	14,000
Beach erosion control—Continued				
Santa Cruz County—Continued				
Twin Lakes Beach	$460,000	[4] $7,000	[4] $7,000	$453,000
West Cliff Drive Seawall	196,000	[4] 3,000	[4] 3,000	193,000
San Diego County:				
Imperial Beach	115,000	[4] 6,000	[4] 6,000	109,000
Ocean Beach	12,000	[4] 4,000	[4] 4,000	8,000
Ocean Side	181,000	[4] 1,000	[4] 1,000	180,000
Seal Beach, Anaheim Bay Harbor	108,000	[4] 13,000	[4] 13,000	95,000
Surfside, Anaheim Bay Harbor	192,000	[4] 13,000	[4] 13,000	179,000
Flood control, local protection:				
Sacramento River, Chico Landing to Red Bluff	1,760,000	100,000	[3] 8,000	1,752,000
Mill Creek levees	1,740,000	107,000	107,000	1,633,000
San Jacinto River and Bautista Creek levees	5,770,000	215,000	215,000	5,555,000
Stewart Canyon debris basin	1,670,000	150,000	88,000	1,582,000
Flood control, reservoirs:				
Hodges Reservoir [5]	2,410,000	110,000	[3] 99,000	2,311,000
Hogan Reservoir	19,300,000	740,000	740,000	18,560,000
New Melones Reservoir	80,600,000	1,600,000	193,000	80,407,000
Oroville Reservoir [5]	[6] 50,000,000	200,000	[3] 75,000	49,925,000
Tuolumne River Reservoirs: Exclusive of Cherry Valley (New Don Pedro Reservoir) [5]	3,170,000	110,000	45,000	3,125,000

[1] Exclusive of work performed by local interests for which reimbursement was provided in Public Works Appropriation Act for fiscal year 1958.
[2] Amount shown is cost incurred for preauthorization studies only.
[3] Exclusive of completed work.
[4] There are no Federal preconstruction planning costs after project authorization. Amount shown reflects costs incurred for preauthorization studies only.
[5] To be constructed by local interests with payment by the Federal Government for flood control storage.
[6] Preliminary estimate.

B. PROJECTS ON WHICH CONSTRUCTION IS UNDER WAY

Project	Total estimated Federal cost	Appropriations through fiscal year 1959	Balance to complete after fiscal year 1959
Navigation:			
Halfmoon Bay Harbor	$5,210,000	$1,083,000	$4,127,000
Playa del Rey Inlet and Basin	3,231,000	1,762,000	1,469,000
Port Hueneme Harbor	[1] 6,115,000	879,000	5,236,000
Sacramento River deep water ship channel	45,600,000	14,031,000	31,569,000
San Francisco Harbor:			
Removal of shoals and 45-foot main ship channel	814,000	814,000	0
50-foot main ship channel and Black Point Shoal channel	684,000	684,000	0
San Joaquin River, Stockton deep water ship channel	10,990,000	1,861,000	9,129,000
Flood control, local protection:			
Devil, East Twin, Warm, and Lytle Creeks	10,700,000	3,582,000	7,118,000
Eel River	944,000	436,000	508,000
Los Angeles County drainage area	338,000,000	193,945,000	144,055,000
Lower San Joaquin River and tributaries	12,300,000	3,127,000	9,173,000
Middle Creek	1,550,000	900,000	650,000
Flood control, local protection—Con.			
Sacramento River, major and minor tributaries	$23,000,000	$3,705,000	$19,295,000
Sacramento River flood control project	78,200,000	61,612,000	16,588,000
San Antonio and Chino Creeks	12,900,000	8,040,000	4,860,000
San Lorenzo Creek	6,240,000	2,144,000	4,096,000
San Lorenzo River	4,333,000	4,059,000	274,000
Santa Clara River	2,930,000	567,000	2,363,000
Santa Maria Valley levees	11,400,000	694,000	10,706,000
Truckee River and tributaries, California and Nevada	1,200,000	329,000	871,000
Flood control, reservoirs:			
Black Butte Reservoir	18,300,000	1,187,000	17,113,000
Carbon Canyon Dam and channel	6,000,000	2,544,000	3,456,000
Pine Flat Reservoir (including Kings River channel improvements)	41,200,000	39,068,000	2,132,000
Russian River Reservoir	13,802,000	11,290,000	2,512,000
Success Reservoir	14,200,000	7,148,000	7,052,000
Terminus Reservoir	23,600,000	6,125,000	17,475,000

[1] Corps of Engineers cost only. In addition, Navy share of cost is $1,425,000.

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION

Projects under construction in State of California—"Construction and rehabilitation" appropriation

Name	County	Estimated total obligations			Federal obligations, June 30, 1959	Remaining after June 30, 1959
		Federal	Non-Federal	Total		
Wholly within State:						
All-American Canal System (D. & M.C.)	Riverside and Imperial	$70,963,416		$70,963,416	$64,418,427	$6,544,989
Cachuma (D. & M.C.)	Santa Barbara	43,513,782		43,513,782	43,513,782	
Central Valley	Various	803,460,578	$94,239	803,554,817	558,994,414	244,466,164
Santa Maria (D. & M.C.)	Santa Barbara and San Luis Obispo	11,512,314		11,512,314	11,512,314	
Solano	Solano	37,156,517	57,898	37,214,415	36,849,517	307,000
Ventura	Ventura	28,934,768		28,934,768	28,542,768	392,000
Orland (R. & B.)	Colusa, Glenn, Tehama	1,038,095		1,038,095	538,095	500,000
Partly within State: Klamath	Klamath, Oreg., and Siskiyou and Modoc, Calif.	18,140,738		18,140,738	15,261,487	2,879,251
Palo Verde diversion (D. & M.C.)	Yuma, Ariz., and Riverside, Calif.	4,731,560		4,731,560	4,731,560	
Washoe, Prosser Creek	Various	50,547,000		50,547,000	800,000	49,747,000

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION

Loan program, State of California

Name	County	Estimated Federal obligations	Federal obligations June 30, 1959	Federal obligations remaining after June 30, 1959
Wholly within State:				
Distribution systems:				
Solano Irrigation District [1]	Solano	$12,302,000	$12,280,000	$22,000
Saucelito Irrigation District	Tulare	4,650,000	4,650,000	
Chowchilla Irrigation District	Madera	2,650,000	2,650,000	
Porterville Irrigation District	Tulare	2,877,000	2,877,000	
Terra Bella Irrigation District [1]	do	1,900,000	1,900,000	
Small projects:				
Goleta County Water District	Santa Barbara	2,080,000	2,080,000	
Santa Ynez Water Conservation District	do	3,800,000	3,800,000	

[1] Funds have been allotted for these loans. Table assumes remaining loans will be approved and supplemental appropriations made available prior to June 30, 1959.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Status of watershed programs in California

	Date started	Estimated total Federal cost (1954 prices)	Total Federal obligations June 30, 1958	Remaining Federal after June 30, 1958
FLOOD PREVENTION (FLOOD CONTROL ACTS OF 1936 AND 1944 AS AMENDED AND SUPPLEMENTED)				
Projects:				
Los Angeles	Before 1946	$19,350,496	$9,329,574	$10,020,922
Santa Ynez	1946	3,791,276	1,953,363	1,837,913

	County	Date started	Estimated total cost			Federal obligations June 30, 1958	Remaining after June 30, 1958
			Federal	Non-Federal	Total		
Watershed protection, pilot: Department of Agriculture Appropriation Act of 1954 and Public Law 46, 74th Cong.							
Projects:							
Calleguas Creek	Ventura and Los Angeles.	1954	$3,713,099	$4,359,193	$8,072,292	$1,466,446	$2,246,653
Walnut Creek	Contra Costa	1954	4,470,454	3,573,417	8,043,871	1,693,519	2,776,935
Watershed protection, Public Law 566: Public Law 566 as amended by Public Law 1018, Public Law 85-624, Public Law 85-865.							
Projects:							
Adobe Creek	Lake	July 31, 1958	748,266	200,720	948,986		748,266
Arroyo Grande	San Luis Obispo	July 26, 1956	289,244	142,317	431,561	177,602	[1] 111,642
Buena Vista Creek	San Diego	July 31, 1958	978,800	719,600	1,698,400		978,800
Central Sonoma	Sonoma	do	9,858,900	1,967,500	11,826,400		9,858,900

[1] Project under study for revision.

WATERSHED PROTECTION (PUBLIC LAW 566)

APPLICATIONS AND PLANNING

Applications received January 1, 1959: 32.

APPLICATIONS APPROVED FOR PLANNING

Watershed and county

Smith Creek [2]: Riverside.
Upper Chino Basin: San Bernardino, Riverside.
Small Canyon [1]: San Bernardino.
Marsh-Kellogg Creek: Alameda, Contra Costa.
Sonoma Creek. Sonoma.
Green Canyon-Santa Maria: Santa Barbara.
Bryant Canyon: Monterey.
Napa River: Napa.
Ulatis Creek: Solano.
Diaz drainage area: Santa Barbara.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, these tables show that tremendous sums are being and will be invested in a host of well-planned projects. They also reveal that substantial appropriations will be required in the future to carry the programs to a successful conclusion. I do not for a moment expect, Mr. President, that these large sums will be appropriated suddenly nor do I intend to ask that the Federal Government assume burdens which my State might properly be expected to carry.

In submitting these figures, I wish to point out that California is doing its share in financing these undertakings. Many of the outlays are in whole or in part reimbursable and a number of the projects will be financed through loans to be repaid to the Federal Treasury. Our people are helping meet the expense through purchase of water and of hydroelectric power, as well as through substantial contributions to construction costs and by taking on the obligation of operation and maintenance.

GENERAL PULASKI'S BIRTHDAY

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, Wednesday, March 4, marked the 211th birthday anniversary of the birth of Gen. Casimir Pulaski, the gallant Pole who contributed his fortune and life to the cause of the American Revolution.

General Pulaski fought for freedom in both the New and Old World. In Europe, he was a leader in the struggle for the liberty of his native Poland against the tyranny of the Russian Empire. Forced to flee Poland in 1773 because of his activities in freedom's cause, he came to France, where he met Benjamin Franklin and Silas Deane, who were recruiting volunteers for the war against the English. Casimir Pulaski offered his services "for your freedom and ours" and in 1777 joined the American forces, engaging in his first battle at Brandywine in September of that year, where he distinguished himself by his courage. He earned a brigadier general's commission and commanded the entire cavalry of the American forces.

Wounded in 1779 at the Battle of Savannah, Pulaski died on the American warship *Wasp* on October 11. The monuments since raised to his memory have been many. But perhaps his greatest monument is the freedom we enjoy today and the knowledge among the people of Poland that through General Pulaski and the almost 5 million of fine Americans of Polish extraction who have lived in America since the Jamestown settlement there is a strong bond of the love of liberty which binds our people. We have a right to hope that this inspiration will one day again light the way to making today's Poland a free society.

[1] Planning terminated.
[2] Planning suspended.

THE NEW SENATE OFFICE BUILDING

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, yesterday was the 170th anniversary of the meeting of the First Congress of the United States under the Republic. It met in New York. Only eight Senators appeared. There was no quorum, and they had to wait until the 6th of April before there was a quorum to transact business.

I have devoted some thought to the growth of business for the Congress from that day to this. I did so in connection with the new Senate Office Building, and have prepared a statement relative to this subject.

I have seen critical and uncritical arguments, statements, and speeches about the ornateness and lavishness of the building, and the amount of space to be made available for Senators.

I ask unanimous consent that this statement, in its entirety, be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Much has been said about the new Senate Office Building, its cost, its embellishments, its marble fittings and other items. Some of the stories which have appeared seem to convey the impression that this structure is an unnecessary extravagance on the part of the Senate.

Probably the same argument will be made when the new House Office Building is completed for the convenience of Congressmen in the discharge of their public duties.

In pondering the matter, all this has underscored the fact that yesterday—March 4, 1959—marked the 170th anniversary of the opening of the First Congress under the Constitution. This First Congress met in New York. Only 8 Senators appeared. There was not a quorum and hence they were compelled to wait until April 6, 1789 when a quorum appeared.

That First Congress had to produce rules and regulations and establish procedures under the direction of John Adams, the Vice President, and under John Langdon, of New Hampshire, who was first president pro tempore of this body.

It was a distinguished body and among other Members it numbered distinguished people, such as Oliver Ellsworth, of Connecticut; Charles Carroll, of Maryland; Robert Morris, of Pennsylvania; Richard Henry Lee; and James Monroe, of Virginia, and others.

It was interesting to go back and examine some of the data developed by Dr. George B. Galloway, who served as Chief of Staff to the Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress in 1945 and 1946. I was a member of that committee and took particular account of the excellent work done by Dr. Galloway, who also served with the Legislative Reference Service in the Library of Congress.

Subsequently Dr. Galloway authored and published a book under the title "Congress at the Crossroads," and in that volume he alludes to the business of the First Congress.

Among other things it "established the State, War, and Treasury Departments; fixed import and tonnage duties and regulated their collection; appropriated revenue and provided for public debt; admitted Kentucky and Vermont to the Union and settled certain State accounts; established courts of justice and fixed the compensation of public officers; provided for the census of 1790 and regulated trade with the Indians; and otherwise dealt with the comparatively simple problems of the Federal Government in that remote age."

Dr. Galloway observes that the First Congress approved 96 public laws, of which 18 dealt with foreign affairs (including tariff duties), 16 with relations between the Central Government and the States, and 10 with the defense of the infant Nation. He comments also that 18 were concerned with administrative matters (including salaries), 15 with questions of public finance and 9 with the Judiciary. Only 3 were pension acts and only 2 were for the relief of private claimants.

The population of the country when the First Congress met was about 4 million.

I believe it would be interesting at this point to present a tabular summary by way of comparison between the 1st Congress and the 85th Congress. One need but examine this table to note the tremendous increase in public business, and yet it must be observed that the statistics in themselves furnish no complete clue to the growth of legislative business.

It does not account for the individuals and groups who come to Washington in the interest of legislation.

It does not take account of the tremendous correspondence which takes place between Senators and Congressmen and their constituents nor the vast amount of literature having a bearing on nearly every public and legislative matter which is submitted for consideration.

Nor does it take account of the unending investigations which are conducted by the Congress today and of the host of problems which spring from the growth in population and the growth in complexity of our economic and social life. The comparison does, however, indicate this growth and indicates, also, how the staffs of legislators have grown to cope with this business and, therefore, the necessity for additions of space from time to time the better to discharge the public business.

Let me then present to the Senate the items in this table to show a comparison in part of the workload:

Points of comparison

	1st Cong.	85th Cong.
Number of bills and resolutions introduced	268	20,706
House of Representatives	142	15,660
Senate	126	5,046
Number of laws enacted	118	1,720
Public acts and resolutions	108	936
Private acts and resolutions	10	784
Number of Members	91	534
House of Representatives (including Delegates)	65	438
Senate	26	96
Number of days in session [1]	519	547
House of Representatives	-------	276
Senate	-------	271

[1] During the 85th Cong., the House was in session for approximately 1,147 hours and 31 minutes, and the Senate for approximately 1,875 hours and 29 minutes.

Points of comparison—Continued

	1st Cong.	85th Cong.
Number of committees (standing, select, and special)	3	103
House of Representatives	2	34
Senate	1	32
Joint committees	-------	12
Joint commissions and boards	-------	25
Committee reports issued	155	5,224
House of Representatives	85	2,719
Senate	70	2,505
Executive department communications received	72	2,268
Nominations confirmed by the Senate	221	103,311
Petitions filed	650	737

RECAPITULATION OF THE 85TH CONGRESS

The total laws of the 85th Congress numbered 1,720, which were divided as follows: House bills, 937; House joint resolutions, 114; Senate bills, 649; Senate joint resolutions, 20, making a total of 936 public laws and 784 private laws.

The House passed 1,253 House bills and 120 House joint resolutions; and 669 Senate bills and 22 Senate joint resolutions together with 51 House concurrent resolutions.

The Senate passed 988 House bills, 115 House joint resolutions, 1,062 Senate bills, 37 Senate joint resolutions.

Fifty-one measures were vetoed, and only one veto was overridden.

There were introduced 13,876 House bills, 704 House joint resolutions, 381 House concurrent resolutions and 699 House resolutions.

In the Senate there were introduced 4,329 bills, 203 joint resolutions, 123 concurrent resolutions and 391 Senate resolutions.

House committees made 2,719 reports and Senate committees made 2,505 reports.

There were 415 rollcalls in the House as follows: 222 quorum calls and 193 yeas and nays. In the Senate there were 566 rollcalls divided as follows: 253 quorum calls and 313 yeas and nays.

The Congress received 2,268 executive department communications, and 737 petitions were filed.

The President submitted 104,193 nominations for confirmation by the Senate, of which 103,311 were confirmed. Fifty-four nominations were withdrawn, and 828 remained unconfirmed.

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD from January 3 through August 30, 1957:

	Pages
House proceedings	5,869
Senate proceedings	9,423
Total	15,292
Appendix	7,325

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD from January 7 through August 24, 1958:

	Pages
House proceedings	6,721
Senate proceedings	11,389
Total	18,110
Appendix	8,375

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I should like to furnish a few figures for the information of Senators. In the First Congress there were considered in the Senate 126 bills and resolutions. In the 85th Congress 5,046 were considered.

The number of laws enacted in the 1st Congress, under the heading of public acts and resolutions, was 108; in the 85th Congress, 936. The number of private acts and resolutions enacted in the First Congress was 10, in the 85th Congress 784.

With regard to committee reports, in the 1st Congress, in the Senate, there were 70 committee reports; in the 85th Congress there were 2,505.

Let me refer to one further item. The number of nominations confirmed by the Senate in the 1st Congress was 221; in the 85th Congress the number was 103,311.

This study indicates the growth of business in every field, and the necessity for adequate space to enable the Senate properly to discharge its public responsibilities.

COTTON EXPORT PROGRAM

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, in the past week or so rumors have been circulating throughout the cotton trade that efforts are being made by the State Department and the White House to bring about a change in the cotton export program which was announced by the Department of Agriculture early last month. The announced increase in the export subsidy from 6½ cents to 8 cents for the new cotton year was well received by the cotton industry. The increased subsidy would have been of substantial help in aiding the United States to regain our traditional share of the world cotton market. I am very disturbed about the possibility of reducing the announced subsidy rate, and I hope that the White House and the Department of State will not interfere with the Secretary of Agriculture's decision.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD an article entitled "Benson's Handling of Cotton Program Is Complete Failure," written by Mr. Leland DuVall, and published in the Arkansas Gazette on March 1. This article presents a thorough summary of the effects of Secretary Benson's cotton policies. It is apparent from reading this article that the world cotton market for our country will deteriorate unless the announced export program is carried out. We simply cannot compete in the world market at the present subsidy rate, and our cotton surpluses will undoubtedly increase substantially in the coming cotton marketing year unless the scheduled subsidy increase is allowed to stand.

I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD my telegram to Mr. Don Paarlberg, Economic Adviser to the President, protesting any changes in the announced cotton export program.

There being no objection, the article and telegram were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Arkansas Gazette, Mar. 1, 1959]

BENSON'S HANDLING OF COTTON PROGRAM IS COMPLETE FAILURE

(By Leland DuVall)

The U.S. Department of Agriculture has painted itself into a corner in the matter of maintaining an export market for its cotton. Despite the national policy that calls for American cotton to be offered to the world market under competitive prices, the situation has deteriorated badly in recent months.

There are three basic reasons:

1. Foreign buyers (and the domestic trade, for that matter) are aware of the fact that the selling price of American cotton will drop sharply at the beginning of the new market year August 1. They would be stupid businessmen if they carried an inventory into that period.

2. The crop will be considerably larger this year, if the weather is favorable, and this could dump excessive amounts of cotton on the market and reduce the price still further.

3. Foreign producers and merchants who handle foreign cotton are also aware of this condition so that they are underbidding American cotton on the world market. The theory here is that they can make more money selling just under the present American market price than they will be able to make when the American price drops at the end of this market year.

Each of these facts must be considered in more detail.

The August 1 decline in the cotton market is predestined by the terms of the new Government production control and marketing system. The new law makes it mandatory for the Government to offer to buy all cotton grown within the acreage allotment at about 34.1 cents a pound, basis middling one inch. This cotton will be offered for sale in the open market at around 31.2 cents a pound.

Middling one-inch cotton is now propped at about 35 cents and the average free-market price at 14 Southern markets has been hanging just above 34 cents. All buyers and others who deal in the fiber know that cotton now selling just above 34 cents will be available August 1 at around 31 cents—and maybe less. Naturally they will carry as small an inventory as possible into the new crop year.

This situation has had a direct influence on the amount of the 1958 crop that has moved into the loan and also into export sales. Last week the International Cotton Advisory Committee revised downward its estimates of American cotton exports in the 1958–59 marketing year. The committee said the export total might not reach 3 million bales in the 12 months that will end July 31. Earlier the group had said that exports might be as high as 3,500,000 bales.

Last season, U.S. cotton exports were 5,700,000 bales and in the 1956–57 season sales to foreign countries reached 7,900,000 sales.

The obvious reason for part of the decline is that cotton merchants know the price will come down at the beginning of the new market year.

The larger cotton crop that is expected this year is also a factor in keeping the pipelines as empty as possible.

Last year domestic cotton production was about 11,600,000 bales from about 12,400,000 planted acres. The national allotment was above 17 million acres but the acreage reserve of the soil bank and other factors reduced the planting.

This year there will be no acreage reserve of the soil bank and the national allotment will be about 16,300,000 acres. In addition to this, each cotton farmer will have the privilege of adding 40 percent to his allotment under plan B of the new cotton law. Theoretically, the cotton crop could be up to 23 million acres if all farmers exercised their option but, of course, this will not happen. The best guess now seems to be that actual planted acreages will be slightly above the base allotment but there are estimates that the planting could reach 18 million acres.

If yields should be up around the 1958 level the 1959 crop could run 15 million to 16 million bales. This means that the Government will have a heavy supply of cotton for sale in the new crop year, a fact that

the domestic and foreign cotton trade understands quite well.

Foreign producers and merchants who handle exports are obviously making their plans on the basis of this situation. The result is that a large amount of the foreign market needs is being supplied by cotton from other sources. Recently, for example, a well-liked grade of U.S. cotton was quoted at 35 cents in a Western Europe market. Mexican cotton of a roughly comparable grade was being sold at 28.7 and Nicaraguan cotton was offered at 26.5.

The U.S. Government is required by law to keep American cotton priced competitively in the world market. The present policy of the USDA attempts to accomplish this with an export subsidy of 6.5 cents a pound. As this works out, a U.S. shipper who sells in the world market can claim a subsidy of this amount in the form of cotton from the CCC stocks. As can be seen from the figures above, this is not quite enough to move American cotton. Consequently, the level of exports has dropped.

However, Secretary of Agriculture Ezra Taft Benson has revealed that the export subsidy will be boosted at the beginning of the new cotton year to 8 cents a pound. This, coupled with the known price reduction that is coming as a result of the lower supports, has tipped off the world cotton traders that they can expect to be able to buy American cotton next year much cheaper than the present going price.

By using the present export subsidy of 6.5 cents, shippers can offer cotton at American docks for around 28 cents. The larger subsidy and the lower price supports will make this same cotton available next year at around 23 to 24 cents.

Secretary Benson has insisted that he is dedicated to the job of getting the Government out of the commodity business but the Government's own figures show that he has failed. At the end of fiscal 1952 the price support inventories of the United States amounted to about $1 billion. At the end of this fiscal year it will be around $6 billion and the Commodity Credit Corporation has predicted that at the end of fiscal 1960 the inventory will be just under $10 billion.

The most obvious conclusion that can be drawn from this is that the Benson program has been a complete failure. The handling of the cotton situation is a fair example of why it has failed.

WASHINGTON, D.C., *February 27, 1959.*

Hon. DON PAARLBERG,
Economic Adviser to the President,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.:

I am deeply concerned by reports that the White House and State Department are bringing pressure upon the Department of Agriculture to modify the cotton export program. It seems clear to me that under Public Law 480 it is the responsibility and duty of the Secretary of Agriculture to determine the prevailing world price of cotton and to establish the U.S. export price at that level. I believe that Secretary Benson acted in good faith in establishing the export price, and I think that he should be supported in his decision.

Export sales under Public Law 480 have been helpful not only to American agriculture, but I also believe that the program has been beneficial in maintaining friendly relations with other nations. The export program must be continued even if it does not happen to meet with the approval of the large cotton companies operating in Mexico which for years have been sheltered under the umbrella of our domestic price support program.

This matter is of vital importance to the economy of my State as well as other cotton-producing areas. Arkansas Farm Bureau Federation and other agricultural leaders strongly support this position.

J. W. FULBRIGHT,
U.S. Senator.

CABINET RESPONSIBILITIES

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, last summer in delivering the commencement address before my daughter's college graduating class, I sought to explain some of the reasons why this country has in recent years failed in its role as leader of the West. With respect to one point which I sought to make, I quote from my speech on that occasion:

In this, the most critical period of our history, when the full reserve of American political ability should be at the disposal of the national community, hardly 10 percent of the chief posts of Government are now filled by men with any previous experience in political affairs. The rest are amateurs, pitted in a worldwide contest against adversaries who are carefully trained political professionals.

As has happened all too often in our history, our Secretaries of Defense, of Treasury, of Commerce, of Agriculture, of Labor, of Interior—all except the Secretary of State—had negligible, if any, experience in governmental affairs prior to assuming their Cabinet responsibilities. And the same pattern holds true throughout the realm of Under Secretaries, Assistant Secretaries, and the heads of independent boards and agencies. Except for the pomp and circumstance involved, few show any liking or talent for Government itself. Rather, most come to Washington bewailing the sacrifices of their personal fortunes for the public good, and declaring their intention to return to private business at the earliest possible hour. And in truth, too many of them do return to their businesses just as they begin to understand their jobs in Washington.

Since last summer, it seems obvious that we are if anything in an even more critical period. Our country urgently needs the services of men of ability, intelligence, and experience. We need in the highest seats of the Government men who not only understand the forces at work in this complex world, but who also have been trained in and have mastered the highly complex art of government.

I must, therefore, express my regret that one of the key persons in the present administration, Secretary of Defense McElroy, has indicated that he will return to private business in several months—certainly before the expiration of the President's term.

The far-reaching effect of the administration's policy of bringing in businessmen for a rotating tour of duty in Washington was the subject of a column by the eminent columnist Mr. Walter Lippmann on March 3, 1959. I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Lippmann's column be printed at this point in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE MCELROY AFFAIR

(By Walter Lippmann)

The news that Secretary McElroy may be resigning in a few months raises a serious question about the prevailing standards of public service.

It appears that when the President approached Mr. McElroy about appointing him to what is surely one of the most difficult and most responsible offices in the Government, they came to an understanding that Mr. McElroy might serve for a very limited period only. The reason for this seems to have been that Mr. McElroy could take only so much leave of absence from his business without sacrificing certain financial benefits for which he is eligible.

When we remember that what is at stake is the Office of Secretary of Defense, it is necessary to ask whether Mr. McElroy should have laid down or that the President should have agreed to the conditions under which his appointment was made.

For this limited period of service was just about long enough to enable Mr. McElroy to begin to learn to be Secretary of Defense. He is a bright and intelligent man, but when he took office he had no background of experience in the Military Establishment and no important experience in public life.

The Defense Department is an enormously complex organization, and the great issues on which the Secretary must pass are highly technical ones in the field of strategy, tactics, engineering, production, and research. Moreover, the Secretary of Defense is the key man in the relations between the armed services and the Congress.

Eighteen months are perhaps enough for a reasonably good introduction to the work of the Office. But, as Mr. McElroy's recent testimony before the congressional committee showed, while he has learned many lessons, yet he is far from having mastered the job.

Now, with the problem of American armed power at the center of the world situation, Mr. McElroy is looking forward to leaving in order to go back home and make more money. A successor must be found who can then look forward to about 18 months in office before he goes home. Mr. McElroy expects to leave the job just as he is about ready to do it. His successor, if he comes from the outside, may be able to learn about the job just as the time comes for him to leave the job; if his successor is promoted from within the Department of Defense, he is more likely than not to be a caretaker and not much more.

All this adds up to the fact that with so much at stake a very serious Office has not been treated seriously enough. This is against the national interest which requires a highly competent Secretary of Defense, and it is a bad example of how the public service should be valued by our people.

Broadly speaking, there are two kinds of opinion as to how the highest offices of the Government should be recruited. There are those who believe that for the most part—although there are exceptions to all such rules—the big offices can be filled most successfully by men who have made a success in private business. The theory here is that there is no great difference between public and private life, and that experience in business is not really different from experience in Government. With the conspicuous exception of Secretary Dulles, who has combined a lifetime of public service with a highly successful law practice, President Eisenhower has shown a predilection for successful corporate executives.

The other school of opinion holds that the public service is in itself a vocation and a professional career and that it cannot be treated, like Sunday painting or Sunday golf, as an interlude for amateurs. Those who think this way regard it as a fundamental fallacy to suppose that success in corporate business is preparation for success in the public business. They believe that on the whole it is better to fill the higher offices with men whose main work in life has been in politics and the public service.

Those of us who take this view believe that public service is a profession and an art which must be acquired by long experience

in public life. For the art of governing men is a great art itself—perhaps the greatest as it surely is the most momentous, of all the arts, and a lifetime is not too long a time in which to learn it.

TELEVISION FOR RURAL AREAS

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that in the remarks I am about to make I may exceed the 3-minute limitation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senator may proceed.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I should like to take a few minutes to discuss a problem which appears to be a matter of considerable concern to both the House and the Senate at this time. I have noted comment in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD calling upon the Congress to overrule a decision of the Federal Communications Commission issued on December 30, 1958. This Commission decision would require certain unlicensed and, therefore, illegal television transmitters, called boosters, operating in several Western States on VHF—very high frequency—television channels 2 through 13 to be converted to so-called translator stations which operate on UHF—ultrahigh frequency—channels, 70 through 83.

The booster stations or reflectors, as they are sometimes called, according to information furnished me, receive the weak signals of distant television stations on a mountain or high elevation near a community which cannot receive the television station directly, amplifies the signal or signals and rebroadcasts them on the same channel or on some other channel in the VHF band. The Commission has never assigned channels for these boosters and has never licensed them, although there are some 1,500 of them estimated to be in operation today.

A translator station, according to the Commission's rules and regulations, is a low-power television broadcast station which the Commission has established for the specific purpose of receiving signals from distant stations and rebroadcasting them on one of the top 14 UHF television channels to small towns where television reception might not otherwise exist.

The Commission's order did not, as some would have us believe, require that the illegal stations be converted to translator operation within 90 days. It simply required that applications be filed with the Commission for authority to convert within 90 days. Now, this period has been extended to 6 months.

I can appreciate the genuine concern of Members of the Congress about the difficult problem of providing television reception to small towns remote from television stations. However, before accusing the Commission of being callous and of having no regard for the needs of persons residing in rural areas for television, or stating that the Commission's action in requiring the booster stations to convert to translator operation was precipitate, ill-considered, and was taken without proper study of the best methods for providing rural area television, I think we should ascertain the facts.

Proponents of the booster stations have stated that there is no other economic and technically feasible method of providing television service to these rural communities, and that if the Commission's decision is allowed to stand many of our rural citizens will be absolutely deprived of television. There are now 25 bills or joint resolutions before the House and at least two before the Senate which, if adopted, would express the sense of Congress to be that the Federal Communications Commission should authorize the operation of VHF television boosters.

It seemed incredible to me that the Commission would arbitrarily deny television service to persons residing in fringe areas. I could see no reason why the Commission would not want to make every possible effort to make television service available in rural areas by the most economic and practicable means available. Neither have I been able to comprehend what ulterior motive the Commission might have in refusing to license VHF television boosters and reflectors, if it would be in the public interest to do so.

Since the Congress is being asked to set aside a decision of the Commission and to substitute its judgment for that of the Commission on a highly technical engineering matter, I felt that it was incumbent upon me to obtain all of the facts I could with respect to the Commission's action.

I, for one, do not want to be placed in the position of pressing the Commission to set aside a decision, or of forcing it to adopt policies, which in its expert judgment, it believes are not in the public interest. On the other hand, if the Commission is not doing its job properly, I want to know this too.

This Congress cannot expect the Commission to make the independent decisions for which it was created, and to command the respect of the public and of the Congress if the Congress itself is guilty of undue interference in matters requiring the expert judgment of an expert agency.

Far from being precipitate and ill considered, I find the Commission's order to have been based upon several years' study and upon two formal records of investigation in which all interested parties had full opportunity to participate.

I find that the Commission's order is based upon its expert opinion, and that of its staff, that the illegal boosters and reflectors constitute a potential and practical source of interference to communications services assigned for the protection of life and property, and that such boosters are a potential and practical cause of destructive interference to television reception on home television receivers.

In addition, the record shows that the Commission has developed and promoted the UHF translator service as a substitute for the boosters, and the Commission's studies have convinced it that the translators provide an excellent means for obtaining rural area television service.

My investigation shows that the Commission has not only grappled with this problem for at least four years, but that it has issued three separate rulings, one based on law and two based on engineering considerations, seeking to force the boosters to cease operating. In view of this history of the matter, I wanted to know why the Commission feels the way it does.

Here are some of the facts which I have developed from the Commission's files.

The television boosters got their start in 1954 in the Western States as a sort of do-it-yourself method of securing television in areas where the distant stations could not be received. While "do-it-yourself" is in the best American tradition, neither construction permits nor licenses were obtained from the Federal Communications Commission for the stations. Some months after the Commission was first advised of the development of the stations, in March of 1955, it took formal action against an unlicensed station by the issuance of a cease and desist order directed against an organization known as C. J. Community Service, Inc., at Bridgeport, Wash. This action directed that organization to show cause why an order should not be issued commanding it to cease and desist from operating the booster station in violation of the licensing and other provisions of the Communications Act. Similar orders were directed at this time to the operators of unlicensed stations at Nespelem and Quincy, Washington.

At the hearing in the show cause orders, jurisdiction of the Commission over these stations was challenged by the operators on the theory that the stations operated wholly within the borders of one State and were, therefore, not subject to the Commission's jurisdiction. In October of 1955, the Commission Hearing Examiner, who heard the case, ruled that even though the stations might be operating in violation of law, the Commission could permit them to operate on the assumption they created no harmful interference.

The Commission overruled its hearing examiner by a decision adopted in February of 1956, and found that the booster stations were operating in violation of three separate provisions of the act. Subsequently, the Commission's decision was appealed to the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit. Finally on May 3, 1957, more than a year after the Commission's decision, the court of appeals ruled that the Commission had jurisdiction, but soundly criticized the Commission for what the court thought was the failure of the Commission to take any steps to provide television facilities for rural areas.

In the meantime, however, during the pendency of the proceeding before the court, the Commission had undertaken an investigation of the rural area television problem and at the conclusion thereof in May of 1956, had established the UHF translator service as the Commission's answer to a low-cost method of providing television service to the rural areas.

Two months after its jurisdiction over the boosters was upheld, by the court of appeals on July 2, 1956, the Commission issued a memorandum opinion as an outgrowth of its investigation of the use of the UHF boosters by UHF television stations, and at the same time ruled on the proposals made in that case by the supporters of the illegal boosters. In its report and order in this case, known as docket No. 11331, the Commission stated its continuing concern about the important problem of extending the benefits of the television art to the many small isolated communities beyond the normal range of television stations. In rejecting the proposals for licensing the VHF boosters, the Commission first pointed to its previously established translator service and said:

> We firmly believe that translators offer excellent means for bringing service to communities and areas without service. Our experience in the administration of the translator rules since their adoption last June confirms our view. Some 75 translator stations have already been granted with many translators already in operation and providing excellent service. Over 50 applications for additional translators are pending and the flow of new applications continues at a rapid rate. We see no reasons why translators cannot be employed by any community beyond the range of existing television stations as a means of providing service.

With respect to the proposals for licensing VHF boosters, the Commission said in part that the bulk of the comments suggesting such a service were not supported by engineering data. The Commission also was highly critical of the VHF booster engineering, saying that no attention was given in the design of the apparatus to important matters such as limiting the band width to insure that only the desired channel is transmitted, or to other engineering techniques to minimize the dangers that the transmissions of the boosters would interfere with other vital communications services outside the television channel.

The Commission explained that the same relaxed engineering standards could not be applied to VHF boosters as are applied to the UHF translators. The reason for this is that the translators operate in the upper 14 UHF channels where the spectrum is not congested, where there is little danger of interference between television channels, and where communications services devoted to the protection of life and property do not operate. Thus, it was possible, said the Commission, in the case of translators to reduce the technical and supervisory requirements for the equipment to the barest minimum.

On the other hand, the Commission noted that the VHF boosters operated in the highly congested VHF portion of the spectrum. The VHF television channels allocated for broadcast services are not in a continuous band, and certain frequencies between channels 4 and 5, and between channels 6 and 7, are allocated for important radio safety services intended for the protection of life and property. The Commission said that if it imposed the restrictions and safeguards necessary for the VHF booster service, it would make their operation economically impractical.

Even after this forthright and detailed explanation of why the VHF boosters could not be operated, the Commission, upon the request of interested parties that adequate opportunity had not been accorded VHF booster proponents to show that boosters are preferable and practical, set aside its previous decision and instituted a new investigation of boosters which it called docket No. 12116. In this investigation, the Commission set up a series of proposed minimum rules to provide the basis for comments by interested parties, looking toward possible establishment of a booster service.

Very extensive comments were filed by the proponents of the boosters, as well as the opponents. Again, on December 30, 1958, the Commission issued its final report and order terminating its latest investigation, and rejecting the VHF booster concept.

According to the Commission, a majority of comments filed in this proceeding were in the nature of mere expressions of opinion favoring the licensing of VHF boosters, but contained no technical data indicating the boosters could be satisfactorily operated and meet public requirements for service on the basis proposed by the Commission.

To the contrary, although the Commission had stated that its proposed rules were the barest minimum of which the Commission could conceive for such a service, many of the comments said the rules were far too stringent and the Commission found that none of the existing boosters could even meet its bare minimum requirements.

The Commission noted that in its new proceeding there was no information which tended to show that the translator stations in the UHF television band are not suited to various types of terrain or that such devices will not perform as well, if not better, than the low-power devices proposed in the VHF band. The Commission repeated that it was convinced that the service being provided by the translator stations is superior in quality of signal and extent of coverage to that provided by the majority of the existing unlicensed boosters.

In the meantime, the Commission had adopted rules which permitted an increase in the maximum power of the translator stations to approximately 10 times that of the original translators.

With respect to cost, the Commission found that on the whole, the UHF translator installations in many cases would be less expensive, and in few, or no cases, could they be expected to be more expensive to the public than VHF installations. Directing its attention in its report, again to the VHF boosters, the Commission said with respect to those currently in operation that such apparatus tends to lose its stability when amplification is high and that extreme care must be exercised in the design and installation of boosters to prevent improper operation and interference to other stations and services. Even when properly operated, according to the Commission, they are believed to be inherently a source of interference to the direct signals of the stations they are retransmitting. According to the Commission, the VHF boosters could be made to work only with extensive engineering and complex apparatus, and that because of the costs involved, the Commission could not consider them an acceptable solution to the problem of inadequate television in small, remote areas. Little point would be served in going into all of the details of the Commission's criticism of the VHF booster proposal. However, I am asking that the Commission's full report and order be printed in the RECORD so that all Members of Congress having a genuine interest in this problem can have the opportunity to study the Commission's report.

It is inconceivable to me that anyone can urge that the Commission has not carefully and thoroughly considered this problem. Those criticizing the Commission's decision do not seek to meet the issues raised by the Commission with respect to the boosters. This is a highly technical and complex field and nobody has suggested any reason to me why the Commission would not have licensed the VHF boosters years ago if it were technically feasible to do so. Perhaps the easiest solution to the entire problem for the Commission if it had not thought the public interest would be most adversely affected would have been to license the boosters immediately.

I, for one, do not believe that the Commission is deliberately trying to prohibit people in the rural areas from having television service and I am willing to rely upon the expert judgment of the Commission that the translator service is an excellent low-cost method of providing television service, and that the VHF booster service is inherently dangerous to the present television allocation plan, to television reception in congested areas and to other communications services which had been allotted channels in the VHF spectrum and which are intended to be used in the protection of life and property.

I was absolutely astounded a few days ago to learn that in spite of 4 years of grappling with this problem during which the Commission has permitted the number of illegal boosters to grow from a mere handful to more than 1,500, it has again given evidence that it may continue this incredible situation for an additional period of time.

The record shows that there have been a large number of applications filed for translator stations and that many such stations are in operation. One of the original stations against which the Commission issued a cease and desist order, Quincy, Wash., has filed an application to convert their illegal booster to a translator. I am certain that all of the citizens of the United States receiving their television from these unlicensed stations, if they could be made to understand that a superior type of service is available, and that the boosters are dangerous and not in the public interest, would readily comply with the requirements that their stations be converted to licensed operations.

I was surprised to read a public notice dated January 27, 1959, in which the Commission says it will extend from 90 days to 6 months the time within which it will require the VHF booster operators to convert to UHF operation and that, in the meantime, it will study further the legal and engineering considerations involved. This looks as if the Commission may be bowing to pressures from the Congress and considers itself forced to abandon its own convictions as to what is in the public interest. I strongly urge that all Members of Congress carefully study the record of the Commission's handling of this matter, and that it note the Commission's continuing insistence that the VHF booster will not serve the public interest and that it is inherently dangerous so that each Member of Congress can then inquire in his own mind why it is the Commission cannot be left alone to do what it thinks is best on a matter of extreme technical complexity.

Let us leave the Commission alone and let it administer the Communications Act without undue interference, and let us back it up when it makes a decision on the merits of a problem instead of forcing it to do what it believes is unsound and not in the public interest. It must be remembered that it is the Commission's job to provide a television service for the entire Nation on a sound engineering basis. It is charged by law with protecting the airway on a nationwide basis and serving the public interest of the entire country.

RETIREMENT OF GEN. EDWIN W. RAWLINGS

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, on February 28, 1959, Gen. E. W. Rawlings, who has been commander of the Air Materiel Command for 7½ years, retired.

General Rawlings brought to the Air Materiel Command, the buying and logistics arm of the U.S. Air Force, an unusual understanding of management techniques and a comprehension such as characterizes the most progressive private businesses in the country. As a result, the growth and development of the U.S. Air Force logistic system has been impressive.

General Rawlings is an able administrator, and has great skill in encouraging people to work for the good of the enterprise.

It is appropriate at this time to mention a few of the major contributions of this fine officer—contributions not only to the Air Force, but to the Department of Defense and to America.

In 1951, a Special Weapons Office was set up in Headquarters Air Materiel Command to centralize the command's participation in the atomic energy program.

In 1952, Air Materiel Command started to decentralize as a solution to the management problems of bigness. Workloads were broken down into more manageable segments and top management was left with more freedom to do its overall job of managing. In addition, actions were taken to reduce pipeline time lags and to standardize logistics for oversea operations. As an example, aerial resupply alone cut pipeline time for filling requisitions and reduced inventory levels by millions of dollars.

In 1953 a new technique, that of monetary inventory accounting, was tested in the Air Materiel Command, with the result that the system was adopted throughout the whole Air Force.

In 1954 Air Materiel Command installed electronic data processing equipment which translated the voluminous detail of logistics into more manageable terms and made possible logistics operations of unprecedented speed and flexibility.

In 1955 a worldwide transceiver network was installed to speed up the distribution of supplies needed by units of the Air Force wherever they might be.

In 1956 the Air Materiel Command Ballistic Missiles Office was set up—a milestone in logistics thinking and a prototype of a new era of space-age support.

In 1957 the logistics program was further streamlined so that much of our oversea military operations could be supported directly from this country—thereby reducing substantially the size and expense of our oversea logistic establishments.

In 1958 the Air Materiel Command Aeronautical Systems Center and the Air Materiel Command Ballistic Missiles Center were established to decentralize weapon system management and central buying functions.

This, then, is but a brief chronology of a few of the major contributions which General Rawlings has made to defense efficiency in recent years.

As one who has worked with General Rawlings, I am proud to say, from personal knowledge, that his is a record of brilliance and of devotion to duty that should be imitated but would be difficult to equal.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me on this subject?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I am very glad to yield to the distinguished senior Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. BRIDGES. I wish to join with the distinguished Senator from Missouri in his statement on General Rawlings, and to add my word of tribute to a great public servant and a great American leader.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I thank the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire for his kind remarks with respect to a great American patriot.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement I have prepared on this subject.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR BRIDGES

This month our Nation is losing the valued services of an outstanding military figure. I refer to Gen. Edwin W. Rawlings, who is retiring after 30 years of distinguished service in the Army and Air Force. I have known Ed Rawlings for many years and I know that his departure will be felt keenly not only by the Air Force but by the Department of Defense as well. However, General Rawlings is a young man in both age and outlook, and I know that he will continue to make a substantial contribution to his country, notwithstanding that he will no longer be in active service. I know the Air Force and the Military Establishment will continue to build on the firm logistic foundation and around the logistic framework which General Rawlings molded and shaped with such consummate skill during his long, successful years as commander of the Air Materiel Command.

When General Rawlings first went to the Air Materiel Command, he was not unfamiliar with Air Force logistics or with staff operations. Immediately before going to Air Materiel Command he had distinguished himself in his capacity as Air Force Comptroller, in Headquarters, U.S. Air Force. In this position, he brought a vitalized financial management consciousness to the Air Force. He had been groomed for this Washington post through a number of challenging and carefully selected positions as well as through the opportunity he had had to attend the Graduate School of Business Administration at the Harvard School of Business. The lessons which General Rawlings' staff assignments and graduate studies in business administration provided were well learned. The patterns of thinking which he had developed in these assignments found full fruition in his work as head of the Air Materiel Command.

I would like to discuss very briefly a few of the management techniques and improvements which General Rawlings brought to the Air Force logistics system. But before I do that, I would like to point out that this officer never left a stone unturned in the search for new ideas and for truth, in his desire to improve systems, in his endeavor to encourage his commanders and subordinates, to bring out the best in the individuals associated with him in the Air Force logistics operation—and there were some 200,000 logisticians and administrators, military and civilian, in this worldwide organization. He studied the techniques which had been developed by American business leaders. He was an avid listener. He contrived to set up learning situations from which he and his commanders and their staffs could profit. He sought out the ideas of military and political leaders, union leaders, businessmen, professors, scientists, and he elicited information and ideas from these sources which could be used by the Air Materiel Command. At the same time he insured that the USAF paid its way through the free flow or interchange of ideas. Many techniques presently employed in American industry have been developed as a result of this interplay of ideas on management and management improvement.

Among the administrative techniques which General Rawlings fostered in the Air Materiel Command were decentralization, direct support, and the utilization of the latest developments in electronic data processing equipment, and in communications and transportation. He developed management methods which have improved the effectiveness of the entire logistics system. Among these were the programs for the development of executives and managers through schooling, a system of managing by exception—whereby managers devoted their attention only to problem areas rather than areas already functioning as desired.

Perhaps one of General Rawlings' greatest assets was his own ability and willingness to accept new ideas, to evaluate them soundly and to place these ideas in operation when they had passed a sufficient service test. Exemplifying his philosophy concerning new ideas, General Rawlings recently voiced the following views on the challenge that has mushroomed out of the space and nuclear age: "There are three rules which we may consider reliable constants for our guidance.

First, we must learn, seek out, and be receptive to new ideas—and be creatively imaginative in grasping the relationship of new knowledge to the fundamental resources of management. Second, we must clearly keep in view the paramount importance of the human element in management. Third, and possibly the hardest guideline to follow, we must cultivate a willingness to change. We must be willing to yield the old to the new, to change our methods, and to change the very patterns of our personal thought which may have cost us blood, sweat and tears in their genesis. It is always easier to look forward than to move forward. But theory without practice can yield only a mirage of progress."

Another indispensable asset to General Rawlings has been his unwavering integrity. During his tenure as commander of Air Materiel Command, he was directly responsible for the expenditure or obligation of public funds in excess of $85 billion. He performed this task of high responsibility to the best advantage of the Air Force and to the Nation. His own integrity has been an inspiration to the many military and civilian officials who have assisted him in his great and complex task.

Today, on the eve of General Rawlings' retirement, I wish to commend him to the Nation and to express appreciation to him as well as to his associates who have aided General Rawlings in the effective performance of the tasks which the Department of Defense and the Air Force placed upon him. Gen. E. W. Rawlings has won an undisputed place in the hall of fame of the U.S. Air Force.

THE BUDGET

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, at this time we hear a good deal of pious talk about cutting the budget and balancing the budget. I submit that no budget has ever been cut or balanced by talk alone. Action is necessary, and in that regard I should like to cite a couple of examples from my own thrifty, dollar-conscious State of New Hampshire.

At this point, I ask unanimous consent to have appear in the body of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Reduced Budget," which appeared in the February 20, 1959, issue of the Union-Leader, Manchester, N.H. The examples of the city of Keene and the State of New Hampshire should be followed by all those budget cutters, who would practice what they preach.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REDUCED BUDGET

Every little bit helps. Consider the fact, for instance, that the Keene city council has reduced the budget and that a tax cut is now in order. Not by any great amount, that is true. Indeed, the reduction is so small that some people—but not Keene taxpayers—may scoff at it.

The essential truth is, however, that the budget has been cut and that therefore some alleviation in the tax burden has been made possible. That is news indeed in these days of everincreasing spending by Government.

The Keene budget might have upped, and would have been had there been a lot of additional spending. But the council held the line, just as Governor Powell is doing on the State level.

Where there's a will, there's a way to economy.

THE SHOOTING DOWN OF AN UNARMED AIR FORCE TRANSPORT PLANE OVER SOVIET ARMENIA

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have appear in the body of the RECORD a United Press International story entitled "United States Sends Another Uncollectible Bill," which appeared in the February 20, 1959, issue of the Union-Leader, of Manchester, N.H.

The story refers to our attempt to collect for the unconscionable shooting down by the Soviet Union of our unarmed planes. While payment for these planes could in no way atone for the loss of human lives involved, at least payment for the property damage would be some indication of the Soviet Union's intention to recognize moral and legal obligations. No better example of Soviet Russia's hardened ruthlessness can be found than in these continuing atrocities and the refusal to make even property damage amends, slight token as they might be.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES SENDS ANOTHER UNCOLLECTIBLE BILL

WASHINGTON.—The United States will send Russia a bill for about $3 million for the Air Force transport plane downed in Soviet Armenia last September 2, officials said yesterday.

Its chances of collecting are virtually nil. Since World War II, U.S. claims of nearly $8 million have been lodged against Moscow for five U.S. planes shot down by Soviet fighters. Russia has paid only $724,947, or half of one claim.

The United States took two of the claims to the World Court but Russia refused to recognize the Court's jurisdiction.

CUTTING THE BUDGET

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have appear in the body of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Cutting the Budget" which appeared in the Union-Leader, of Manchester, N.H., on February 20, 1959.

I submit this because it is another excellent graphic presentation of the staggering cost of Federal Government to the local taxpayer. Seventy-seven billion dollars is a figure which can be mouthed all too glibly but when broken down in figures of local cost the impact is tremendous. An example of this is the fact that the people of my State of New Hampshire are taxed at the present time for Federal Government over five times what they are taxed for their State government. I feel that these figures will be informative, not only to the people of New Hampshire, but they can be readily translated into corresponding figures for the other States of the Union.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Union-Leader, Manchester, N.H., Feb. 20, 1959]

CUTTING THE BUDGET

Senators KARL MUNDT, STYLES BRIDGES, and SPESSARD HOLLAND, all members of the Senate Appropriations Committee, have made interesting comment on the Eisenhower budget.

HOLLAND and MUNDT have voiced their opinion that domestic spending programs should be cut if it develops that the $41 billion outlay for defense proposed by the President is not sufficient. And Senator BRIDGES, ranking Republican member on the committee, says he believes there are ways to cut the budget beyond what the President did.

The point is this: If there are ways to cut the budget for fiscal 1960, it would seem that cuts in nondefense spending should be made even if additional funds are not needed for defense. We heartily join with the Council of State Chambers of Commerce in declaring that the President's budget, far from constituting a penny-pinching approach to Government spending, actually could stand some cutting—particularly in nondefense items.

This newspaper has heard few complaints from the American people about having to pay taxes to provide for national defense. The American people realize that the Communist threat to the Nation must be met. But, by the same token protests over Government paternalism and extravagance, the mislabeling of other expenditures under the heading "Defense," the waste and extravagance in foreign aid, and the spending of millions of dollars to bolster the economies of Communist nations, are daily becoming more vocal.

The astronomical figures in the President's $77 billion budget are beyond the grasp of the average person, but when you break down these expenditures on the State level—as the chamber of commerce did recently in its publication, Taxpayer's Dollar—the results are alarming. Take the States of Massachusetts and New Hampshire, for instance.

New Hampshire's estimated share of the fiscal 1960 budget is $246,500,000. Of this amount, $146,600,000 will go for major national security; $25,900,000 for the interest on the national debt; $19,200,000 for agriculture; $16,300,000 for veterans' affairs; $13,200,000 for labor and welfare; $7,200,000 for commerce and housing; $6,800,000 for foreign affairs; $5,600,000 for general government; and $5,500,000 for natural resources.

Massachusetts' share of the total national budget is $2,719,200,000. Of this amount, $1,616,900,000 goes for major national security; $285,800,000 for interest on the national debt; $211,600,000 for agriculture; $179,600,0000 for veterans' affairs; $145,800,000 for labor and welfare; $79,200,000 for commerce and housing; $75,100,000 for foreign affairs; $61,300,000 for general government; and $6,400,000 for natural resources.

When presented with this graphic picture of the growth of Federal bureaucracy, especially when we compare these figures with the amounts spent by State governments, it is easy to see why so many of the States are starved for revenue to run their own affairs.

THE SOFT APPROACH TOWARD COMMUNISM

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, recently former British Prime Minister Clement Attlee spoke in the great-issues course at Dartmouth College in my State of New Hampshire. He again repeated his soft-approach policies toward communism by advocating the United States recognition of Red China.

In the lead editorial of the Union-Leader, of Manchester, N.H., of February 19, 1959, there is a most telling and thoughtful evaluation of the consequences of a policy of Red China recognition. I ask unanimous consent to have this editorial appear in the body of the RECORD, because it is such a complete answer to Clement Attlee's proposal.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Union-Leader, Manchester, N.H., Feb. 19, 1959]

ATTLEE'S VISIT TO DARTMOUTH

Dartmouth College students who recently heard former British Prime Minister Clement Attlee advocate U.S. recognition of Red China should soberly evaluate the inevitable results of such a policy. Indeed, Attlee's lecture in Dartmouth's great issues course carried the appropriate title, "World Government or World Chaos?" Attlee seems to favor both.

Dartmouth students should consider, first of all, that Attlee always has favored the soft approach toward communism, an approach that has been shunned by Congress. It is worth remembering, also, that the Kelly resolution opposing recognition and U.N. membership for the Peiping regime was passed 391 to 0 in the House and 86 to 0 in the Senate, and that presidential candidates of both parties have run on platforms containing almost identical planks against such recognition and U.N. membership. A recent nationwide poll of 8,752 Protestant clergymen showed 87 percent opposing diplomatic recognition of Peiping.

It goes without saying that admission of Red China to the U.N. would be a violation of chapter II, article 4, of the U.N. Charter, which states that members must be peace loving. On February 1, 1951, by a vote of 44 to 7, the General Assembly approved a resolution declaring that "the Central Peoples' Government of the People's Republic of China, by giving direct aid and assistance to those who were already committing aggression in Korea, and by engaging in hostilities against United Nations forces there, has itself engaged in aggression in Korea." The designation as an aggressor still stands, as does Red China's role in aiding aggression in Vietnam and its repeated attacks on Matsu and Quemoy and its threat to take same, by force if necessary, just as they ruthlessly obtained—and retain—control over the 600 million people of mainland China. Mao Tse-tung's 1937 promise of free elections in China has never been kept.

Admission of Red China to the U.N. would threaten the existence of free China and threaten British control of Hong Kong, a prospect which might interest Mr. Attlee. Millions of Chinese now in Hong Kong, Formosa, and southeast Asia would be betrayed, a prospect which obviously does not interest Mr. Attlee.

All of the 18 essential human rights named in the U.N. Declaration of Human Rights have been arrogantly violated by the Peiping butchers.

U.S. recognition of Red China would be a mortal blow to the survival of non-Communist governments in the Far East, disheartening the latter and opening up new fields of subversion to the former. Attlee's argument that we must recognize Red China because it exists is as phony as a three-dollar bill. There is not now and never has been a principle of international law which approves recognition on such a shallow basis. Red China has violated all established principles of international law and civilized conduct. While millions of Chinese are dying of starvation, rice is exported for political purposes. While the population increases by 13 million a year, 12 million of these are added each year to the roving bands of hungry, landless serfs. Human degradation on such a scale has never before occurred in history.

We do not pretend that Red China does not exist, as Attlee asserts. When expedient we have negotiated with it for particular purposes, at Panmunjom, at the Geneva Conference on Indochina, in bilateral negotiations at Geneva, and even now at Warsaw.

Dartmouth students should consider well these words of Walter S. Robertson, Assistant Secretary of State for Far Eastern affairs: "Let no one say we are denying representation of 600 million Chinese. The defiant Marxist imposters in Peiping come no closer to representing the true interests, aspirations and will of the Chinese people than William Z. Foster comes to representing the will and aspirations of the American people."

We trust that directors of the Dartmouth great issues course, in the great liberal tradition, will now invite another prominent public official to present rebuttal to Mr. Attlee's position on Red China.

WASTE AND EXTRAVAGANCE IN GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD at this point an editorial appearing in a recent issue of the Hampton (N.H.) Union.

This editorial, in referring to New Hampshire's Gov. Wesley Powell, mentions his "uncompromising attitude toward waste and extravagance in governmental affairs." Already he has put his "uncompromising attitude" into action by slashing $10 million from departmental requests in New Hampshire's biennial budget.

Last fall, when Republican political fortunes were at the lowest ebb in years, this young man, at the age of 42, became Governor of the State of New Hampshire. He did so by espousing good solid Republican principles of a balanced budget and a pay-as-you-go policy in regard to State finances.

It is on the young leaders of our party, such as Governor Powell of New Hampshire, that will fall a great deal of the work of revitalizing grassroots republicanism. I am confident that, with men of his caliber, following the clear principles on which the Republican Party was founded and grew great, we can look forward to 1960 not only with hope, but with anticipation of Republican political success.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Hampton (N.H.) Union]

POWELL'S BUDGET

No one with the least knowledge and understanding of Gov. Wesley Powell and his uncompromising attitude toward waste and extravagance in governmental affairs, whether on the local, State or national level, should have been surprised when he slashed $10 million from State department spending in presenting his proposed $44.5 million budget for the coming fiscal year.

The Powell budget does not cut nor diminish any of the present State services. What it does, in effect, is to serve notice on the various State agencies that rather than simply ask for more money to operate their departments, they should look for economies and more efficient methods of operations, which will allow them to furnish the desired services within the means of State's pocketbook.

Powell's "hold-the-line" budget won the acclaim of both Republicans and Democrats in the house and senate who are, for the most part, conservative Yankees at heart and members of a political party by choice.

Even his detractors now grudgingly admit that Powell has handled budgetary matters with efficiency and courtesy to all department heads but with determination to keep within the spending limits which the people can afford.

This also should come as no surprise at all in view of Powell's valuable experience in Washington as top aid to Senator BRIDGES, top ranking Republican on the Senate Appropriation Committee. This is big league training in governmental budgetary matters, the likes of which few men have the opportunity to experience.

Governor Powell also displayed his long-held beliefs in conservatism, which, like the raccoon coat, is coming back in style after years of being considered a badge of disgrace for reactionaries.

True conservatism is an entirely different breed of cats, however, and simply means spending within an ability to pay, whether it be for local, State or Federal services or in one's own family or personal affairs.

This is Powell's philosophy of good government for New Hampshire and is one which most of us heartily support.

INTERNAL SECURITY

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, the February 27, 1959, edition of the Chicago Tribune contains an editional which merits thoughtful consideration. The editorial is particularly timely in view of the recommendations of the American Bar Association, resulting from their mid-winter meeting in Chicago on February 24, 1959.

This editorial recalls to memory some of the more notorious examples of the need for continuing vigilance in the internal security field. I commend its reading to my colleagues, and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the body of the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Chicago Tribune, Feb. 27, 1959]

THE RED NEW DEALERS ARE STILL WITH US

Frank Coe, former $20,000-a-year secretary of the International Monetary Fund and before that monetary research Director of the Treasury Department, accused in 1948 of being a Communist and an accessory to Soviet espionage, has bobbed up again. His resignation from his post with the fund was obtained in 1952 after he had taken refuge in the fifth amendment when questioned about Communist attachments by the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee.

Coe reappears as a contributor to a Chinese Communist magazine, China Reconstructs, published in Peiping. He is described as "now visiting" Red China, although the State Department doesn't know how he got there.

Coe's article extols industrial progress achieved in Communist China's "leap forward," which was marked by severe regimentation of the populace. He says this was made possible by "ideological rectification," for which translate guns and terrors.

This tawdry American was first exposed in 1948 as a Communist operative by Elizabeth Bentley, who repented after serving Communist espionage as a courier. Those were the days when charges were first flying around about services to communism performed by Alger Hiss, a former high official in the State Department who went on to a fat job with the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace.

Hiss was busy issuing denials, and Coe followed suit, denying under oath that he had ever been a Communist. Before his next appearance before a congressional committee in 1952, Hiss had been hooked for

perjury; so Coe, moved to caution, pleaded the amendment against self-incrimination. Back again in 1956 before the Senate subcommittee, he denied that he had ever been a Communist spy, but again pleaded the fifth rather than respond when asked if he was, or had ever been, a Communist.

Coe was only one of dozens of men who rose high in the New Deal only to be unmasked later as Soviet agents. There was a mess of these people in the Treasury Department, where they thrived under the benevolent protection of Harry Dexter White, assistant secretary, who later moved on to the post of U.S. Executive Director of the International Monetary Fund. The fact that White was already under fire as a Communist did not prevent President Truman from permitting his appointment to go forward. In the Fund, he was again in association with Coe, as he had been in the Treasury.

White died mysteriously a few days after he had made the expected denial before the House Committee on Un-American Activities that he was or had been a Communist. Later papers in his own hand for transmission to the Soviet spy ring were produced by Whittaker Chambers, who blew the lid off the Hiss case.

All of these Communist stooges were originally brought to public notice either thru the House committee or the Senate subcommittee. There have been persistent efforts of late to kill or cripple these investigating bodies. Although no Communist scandals have been brought home to the present Republican Administration, it would be naive, in view of the tremendous number of New Dealers who carried over into the new administration, to believe that there are no longer Communists in Government service.

For this reason, and becauce of their invaluable services to the country, the committees merit the support given them this week by the house of delegates of the American Bar Association. The association's governing body aptly says that "the continuation of the work of these committees is essential to the enactment of sound and adequate legislation to safeguard the national and State security." As the continuing investigations of these committees show, there will always be work for them to do.

THE BERLIN CRISIS

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 5 minutes on the Berlin situation, instead of the 3 minutes allowed under the unanimous consent agreement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. (Mr. MCNAMARA in the chair). Without objection, the Senator may proceed.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, current developments in the Berlin crisis dictate that the Senate should proceed with immediate consideration of S. Res. 85, submitted by me, and S. Res. 82, submitted by the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], and cosponsored by me, which both deal with the Berlin crisis. I emphasize the fact that we are not slaves to our specific resolutions. However, a resolution on this subject, backing up our policy, ought to be adopted.

Congress no less than the Executive should have to make up its mind about a crisis of this character, which is likely to call for action—at least within its constitutional responsibility for appropriations—but not without preparation and deliberation well in advance of that event. Senator DODD's resolution and mine serve notice that the Congress and the Executive are a unit in their determination that, as the President said yesterday, "We will not retreat from the exercise of the rights that are ours with respect to Berlin, and we will carry the responsibilities that are laid upon us by these international agreements until eventually there is a new solution for the German problem."

At the same time the President added:

But, our readiness to negotiate with respect to German peace and everything else has not only been emphasized time and again, [and] if there were indeed no room for negotiation there, then there certainly would be no reason for any kind of a meeting.

On the other hand, Premier Khrushchev, speaking at almost the same time in Leipzig, Germany, was underlining the Soviet intention to proceed unilaterally to conclude a peace treaty with its own puppet Communist state, East Germany, just as it was proposing to proceed unilaterally with respect to the Western Powers getting access to Berlin. Premier Khrushchev said, "If the Bonn republic does not want to sign, there will be a treaty for the German democratic republic alone." Premier Khrushchev then very emotionally added: "What we want is peace, peace, peace."

We want peace, too, Mr. President. However, we do not want the peace of surrender, the peace of slavery, and the peace of the tomb. It has been properly stated that the United States could walk away from its responsibility in Berlin, and that would be, I assume, Premier Khrushchev's definition of "peace." But it would also mean the beginning of the end for a Germany which is a part of free Europe, and the opening of the opportunity for a Germany which can be gradually subverted and taken over into the Communist empire. Let no one underestimate what this could mean. For the addition of the German industrial complex to the growing Communist industrial complex would at once transform the Communist bloc into an industrial power equal to, and, in view of interior communications, perhaps greater than, that of the Western World. From then on the fate of the free world might be sealed.

It seems to me that the Congress should play its proper role in shaping the foreign policy that faces us now as the Congress did by resolution in the Formosa crisis in 1955 and the Mideast crisis—Eisenhower doctrine—of March 9, 1957, and in respect of the dispatch of U.S. troops to Lebanon in August 1958. The reasons are these:

First. We do face a real crisis on Berlin and every bit of information which can be given to the people to enable them to support advisedly appropriate measures which may have great risk in them is of inestimable aid to the cause of the free world.

Second. Hearings directed to specific resolutions meet the objection that the authority of the United States should not be confused by "uncoordinated and perhaps conflicting advice" as the chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee has defined it. Hearings would undoubtedly be preceded by executive sessions; thereby national security is fully protected. This is the only present substitute we have for the kind of debate which is available openly and publicly under a parliamentary form of government such as that prevailing among our European allies in which cabinet level officials may be heard. The British and French Parliaments have these debates all the time.

Third. There is little doubt that the nature of the Berlin crisis and the danger it represents will compel Senator after Senator to address himself to this subject, as well as other prominent citizens, public and private, to do the same. How much better to channel all of the thinking in an orderly way into hearings on specifics where it can do the most good.

Fourth. The traditional way in which we pound out foreign policy in this country is not by passive agreement to keep mum (practically, of course, this is an impossibility)—but by the very process of debate which the hearing I suggest would produce in an orderly way.

Finally, I call attention to the fact that one aspect of my own resolution calls for a special committee of seven Senators—which could be changed to a congressional delegation—to go to Berlin to express to the *Senat* of West Berlin the spirit of understanding and support on the part of the U.S. Senate of the trials of the people of West Berlin in the present crisis. This is very important and very desirable. If we in the United States think this is a great crisis, just imagine how the people of Berlin feel, who have the heat right on them.

Mr. President, peace will not be bought by surrender, nor will peace be bought by yielding to the fundamental issue of this matter. But peace, in my mind, will be attained if we shall take advantage of our responsibilities, and if the American people are given an opportunity to say that they expect to back these responsibilities as traditionally they have backed their sacred obligations always, with all the resources of the country, all of its prestige, as well as all its power.

We, too, want peace, peace, peace. But we do not want a peace which can only lead into slavery or to a world war III. I think we have now reached the bridge which we must guard in that respect.

OREGON STATE SENATE JOINT MEMORIAL NO. 1 FAVORS STATEHOOD FOR HAWAII

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I was pleased to be able to participate this week in the favorable and unanimous reporting by the Senate Interior Committee of the bill, S. 50, providing statehood for our friends and fellow Americans in Hawaii.

Today I present to the Senate, on behalf of the distinguished president of the Oregon State Senate, the Honorable Walter J. Pearson, Senate Joint Memorial No. 1 of the 1959 session of the Oregon State Legislative Assembly.

This memorial urges us of the Congress to admit Hawaii as the 50th State of the Union, a step our Interior Com-

mittee already has taken under the leadership of the distinguished senior Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] and the able junior Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], who is chairman of the Territories Subcommittee.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that State Senator Pearson's letter and Oregon State Senate Joint Memorial No. 1 be printed in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter and memorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE OF OREGON,
OREGON STATE SENATE,
Salem, Oreg., March 3, 1959.

Hon. RICHARD NEUBERGER,
U.S. Senator,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR DICK: Enclosed is Senate Joint Memorial No. 1 relative to statehood for Hawaii signed by the president of the senate and the speaker of the house on February 25. We are hopeful that Hawaii will this year become the 50th State of the Union. I know that you, personally, have been active in this endeavor for a long time.

Best regards,

WALTER J. PEARSON,
President of the Senate.

ENROLLED SENATE JOINT MEMORIAL NO. 1

To the Honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America, in Congress assembled:

We, your memorialists, the 50th Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon, in legislative session assembled, most respectfully represent as follows:

Whereas there have been, from the earliest hours of our history as a State, the closest ties and relationship between the people of the Sandwich Islands, now the Territory of Hawaii, and the people of Oregon; and

Whereas these fine Americans have long ago fully demonstrated their capacity to govern themselves as a free Commonwealth within the American Union; and

Whereas we know and respect the people of Hawaii as a result of close association through commercial, cultural, recreational, and social exchanges; and

Whereas the State of Oregon, alone among the States, has enriched our association and strengthened our bonds with the people of Hawaii through the free interchange of Territorial students in our State system of higher education; and

Whereas this February 14 is the 100th anniversary of the admission of Oregon to the Union; and

Whereas the admission of Oregon's respected friend Hawaii to the sisterhood of States of the Union would further strengthen these bonds and would give added cause for jubilation on the commemoration of our own statehood: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate of the State of Oregon, the House of Representatives jointly concurring therein: That the Congress of the United States be memorialized to grant immediate statehood, under legislation now pending, to our sister Hawaii, as the 50th State of the United States; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this memorial be sent to the President of the United States, to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, to the delegate in Congress from Hawaii, and to all Members of the Oregon congressional delegation.

SMALL BUSINESS INVESTMENT ACT GETTING INTO HIGH GEAR

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, as a member of the Senate Select Committee on Small Business, I have been particularly interested in progress of the agency's new Investment Division which was created by the Congress late last year. This may well become one of the most popular and effective projects of the Small Business Administration.

Getting this act into operation is a difficult and involved matter and Administrator Wendell B. Barnes of SBA is to be complimented for the forceful and effective way he has tackled the problem. He has selected as his Deputy Administrator in charge of the Investment Division a man of wide experience and proven ability in Duncan H. Read, president of the Middleburg, Va., National Bank and formerly a partner and longtime associate of the well-known investment firm of Dillon, Read & Co.

Administrator Barnes and Deputy Administrator Read have carefully mapped the objectives, regulations, and operational procedure to be followed by the Division which should be of vast help to small businesses everywhere. They have acquainted commercial bankers, investment firms, and individual investors with the plan and how it will work. This has resulted in widespread interest and formation of a number of small business investment companies which will work closely with SBA in financing small businesses on an equity-type and long-term loan basis. They have held briefing sessions in several major cities, at which many hundreds of interested financial people were present.

These efforts have brought a number of applications for licenses to operate small business investment companies. Mr. Barnes informs me that conditional "go-aheads" have been given to 17 applicants for licenses, this being tantamount to approval of the companies' applications when they comply with the agreed-upon conditions.

One of the Investment Division briefing sessions was held in Kansas City a short time ago. It was largely attended and the interest it aroused was beyond expectations. More than 700 attended. A large publication, Bank News, which covers the States of Missouri, Kansas, Texas, Nebraska, Colorado, Wyoming, and New Mexico, carried a most comprehensive article about the Investment Division in its issue of February 15.

I feel sure that Members of this body will find the Bank News article of much interest, just as it will be to banking and investment people throughout the Middlewest. I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the body of the RECORD:

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SMALL BUSINESS INVESTMENT PROGRAM STARTS TO ROLL

(By Lloyd C. Riggs)

With the first licenses for small business investment companies expected to be issued this month, the program for long-term equity financing for small business is starting to roll.

The Small Business Investment Act of 1958, signed into law by President Eisenhower last August 21, makes this program possible by appropriating an additional $250 million to the existing revolving fund of the Small Business Administration. This money may be used for the purchase of subordinated debentures of small business investment companies, and for loans to them.

Thus, indirectly, Government funds are made available to help fill what generally has been recognized as a gap in the national economy, financing for companies needing money for a longer period than banks should lend, and who are too small to offer their securities through regular investment banking channels.

In December, the SBA released the final regulations under the act, and great impetus was given to the program through a series of three meetings across the Nation in January, at which all phases of the program were explained to bankers and others interested by Washington officials of the SBA, including Administrator Wendell B. Barnes and Securities and Exchange Commission representatives.

All three of these gatherings—in Kansas City, Los Angeles, and Philadelphia—attracted overflow crowds, comprised mostly of bankers, which exceeded expectations of host officials.

The Kansas City meeting, sponsored by the Kansas City Chamber of Commerce and held at the Hotel President on January 19, was attended by about 800 persons, and C. I. Moyer, regional director of the Kansas City SBA office, reports that interest in the program has gained considerable momentum since that time.

Any number of bankers have shown interest in the possibility of participating in the establishment of a small business investment company, Mr. Moyer advises, and about 50 requests for proposal forms had been received by his office early this month.

There are at least three reasons why various types of investors have shown an interest in small business investment companies. These are:

1. For profit. Many investors in high tax brackets are impressed by the tax advantages offered.

2. Public relations. Many banks, investment firms, insurance companies and other financial institutions feel an obligation to make every effort to help provide long term capital financing and equity capital to small business concerns.

3. Community development. Bankers and businessmen have evidenced an interest in organizing small business investment companies for the basic purpose of helping their communities from an economic standpoint. Mr. Moyer states that most bankers with whom he has visited have shown the greater interest because of this third point.

ABA'S POSITION

Carl M. Flora, chairman of the ABA Small Business Credit Commission and vice president of the First Wisconsin National of Milwaukee, gave an excellent talk on this subject at the ABA's National Credit Conference in Chicago January 23, and he reviewed some of the background of the admittedly controversial Small Business Investment Act.

He stated that "the number of new small business units formed since the war and the large volume of credit extended to small business demonstrated that the banks were doing their job in this field."

"However," he added, "since 1949 committees of the Senate and the House have considered many bills to provide credit and equity and financing to small business concerns. Banking has been faced with the political problem of trying to convince these committees that adequate credit was available to small business through banks and other private lenders.

"Fortunately, the report made last spring by the Federal Reserve System to the Senate and the House committees shows that adequate credit is available to small business from banks and private sources. However,

the report indicates that there is a gap in the field of equity or capital financing.

"When it appeared last year that Congress would pass legislation to furnish equity capital and long term capital financing to small business, a special ABA committee was appointed to study this legislation. The report of this committee was approved by the Administrative Committee and the Executive Council and became the official position of the ABA.

"In making its recommendations, the special committee had in mind three primary factors:

"1. That there is real need at this time to stimulate the availability of capital funds to small business.

"2. That the taxpayers' money should be used for such purposes to the least extent possible.

"3. That the banking system should participate in the program to the greatest extent possible consistent with sound banking principles."

Further explaining ABA position, Mr. Flora added:

"If legislation was to be passed to try and make equity capital more readily available to small business, we recommended to Congress that it should embody the following general principles:

"Federal legislation should temporarily stimulate the flow of investment funds through existing development credit corporations and encourage the creation of additional development credit corporations where needed.

"Any long range, constructive solution to the need of small business for equity and long term capital financing should basically depend on the availability of and access to the resources of private financial institutions and investors, and any governmentally sponsored program should be intended as a temporary stimulant and supplement to private financing facilities.

"The primary source of any equity funds needed to inaugurate any such program should be local private financing resources.

"The responsibility for the management and administration of any instrumentality created to carry out any such program at the State or local level should lie with local private citizens."

Mr. Flora asserted that, "The act, as passed by Congress, conforms with the principles advocated by the ABA and contains many of the provisions we recommended."

The Wisconsin banker concedes that the act is an experiment, but that it is "a sincere and intelligent attempt to solve the problems of making equity capital more readily available to small business concerns." He acknowledged that whether this new method will close the gap that exists in equity financing to small business will be determined only from experience.

HOW TO PROCEED

How does one go about establishing a small business investment company? How does it operate?

Following are brief answers to pertinent questions. Bankers or others desiring more detailed information should contact the appropriate regional SBA office, as indicated in the box on page 20.

Small business investment companies organized to operate under this act should be chartered by the State in which the company is to operate, unless the State does not issue charters of this kind. In that event, the charter application should be submitted to the SBA.

Organizers fill out and file with SBA a proposal or preliminary application on Form 414, copies of which may be obtained from any SBA regional or field office. The proposal is filed with the appropriate regional office, and after a preliminary check, is sent on to the SBA's Small Business Investment Division in Washington. Form 414 is a detailed document, which may be filed either before or after the company has been incorporated. After consideration of the proposal, the proponents will be notified by SBA whether the proposal may justify issuance of a license. If so, SBA will notify the parties who filed the proposal to proceed with all action necessary to qualify their company for execution of a formal license application on Form 415 for final consideration by SBA as a licensee.

If chartered by the SBA, incorporators must number at least 10 persons or existing corporations—such as a bank. Otherwise, State laws apply.

Paid-in capital and surplus must be at least $300,000. The SBA is authorized to purchase the debentures of any such company in an amount equal to not more than $150,000. Such debentures are deemed a part of the capital and surplus.

Shares of stock in such companies are eligible for purchase by national banks, and by State bank members of the Federal Reserve System and by FDIC member banks to the extent permitted under applicable State law. However, no bank may invest more than 1 percent of its capital and surplus in such stock.

Each small business investment company has authority to borrow money and to issue its debenture bonds, promissory notes, or other obligations under such general conditions and subject to such limitations and regulations as the SBA may prescribe.

In addition to the debentures which it may purchase, the SBA is authorized to lend funds to such investment companies, but the total amount of such borrowings from the SBA at any one time may not exceed 50 percent of the paid-in capital and surplus of an investment company.

The small business investment companies may provide a source of needed equity capital for small business concerns by purchasing debenture bonds of such concern which shall—

1. Bear interest at such rate, and contain such other terms, as the company may fix with SBA approval;

2. Be callable on any interest payment date, upon 3 months' notice, at par plus accrued interest; and

3. Be convertible at the option of the company, or a holder in due course, up to and including the effective date of any call by the issuer, into stock of the small business concern at the sound book value of such stock determined at the time of the issuance of the debentures.

Or, small business investment companies may make loans to small business concerns, for maturities of up to 20 years, renewable for additional periods not to exceed 10 years.

It is understood that the interest rate in each case stands on its own merit, except that the rate must not be more than the legal maximum authorized by State law.

Not more than 20 percent of the combined capital and surplus of a small business investment company may be loaned to and/or invested in the securities of any one small business concern, without the approval of the SBA.

Wherever practicable the operations of a small business investment company, including the generation of business, may be undertaken in cooperation with banks or other financial institutions, and any servicing or initial investigation required for loans or acquisitions of securities by the company under the provisions of the act may be handled through such banks or other financial institutions on a fee basis. Any small business investment company may receive fees for services rendered to banks or other financial institutions.

TAX ADVANTAGES

Small business investment companies offer these tax advantages:

Taxpayers investing in their stock will be allowed an ordinary-loss deduction rather than a capital-loss deduction on losses arising from worthlessness or sale of such stock. Small business investment companies will also be allowed an ordinary-loss deduction, rather than a capital-loss deduction, on losses sustained on convertible debentures, including stock received pursuant to the conversion privilege. The loss deduction will include losses due to worthlessness as well as those arising from sale or exchange of the security.

Such companies will also be allowed a deduction of 100 percent of dividends received from a taxable domestic corporation rather than the 85-percent deduction allowed corporate taxpayers generally.

ALUMINUM PRODUCTION AS A SOVIET ECONOMIC WEAPON

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, a look at the effects of economic penetration of free world markets for aluminum and aluminum products by Soviet Russia and its satellite producers is suggested in a recent editorial in the Oregon Journal of Portland. I call this editorial review to the attention of the Senate because this product—upon which my own region is heavily dependent for payrolls and industrialization—has become somewhat of a bellwether for activation of the Soviets' cold war, which is based on economic weapons.

The economy of Soviet Russia is a form of government capitalism by which portions of the nation's productive capacity can be diverted to achieve political goals in the field of foreign affairs. Our own economic system does not provide equivalent flexibility for implementing foreign policy objectives by manipulation of production and marketing of essential products. For this reason that we must be more dependent on and responsive to the needs and programs of our allies if we are to counteract the effects of calculated Soviet efforts to undermine portions of our productive capacity. In meeting the issue of Soviet economic penetration, a relationship of interdependence exists among nations of the free world.

The editorial in the Oregon Journal emphasizes that there must be more cooperation both by the aluminum industry and governments of the free world in solution of present marketing problems if the threat of Soviet economic warfare is to be met. So that my colleagues may know of the views expressed in this editorial analysis, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD the Oregon Journal editorial of March 1, 1959.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Oregon Journal, Mar. 1, 1959]

ULTIMATE ANSWER TO ALUMINUM DILEMMA

The U.S. aluminum industry would be happier if foreign imports now cutting seriously into its own domestic market could be curtailed, but, to its credit, it does not see this as the long-range answer to its problems.

Because per capita consumption of aluminum products in the United States is 21 pounds per year compared to an average of 6.2 pounds in Western Europe and Canada and 0.7 for the rest of the world, the U.S. market has become extremely attractive to

aluminum producers and fabricators in other parts of the world.

A background memorandum prepared by the U.S. aluminum industry for Government agencies and officials states that the United States now is importing more aluminum than it exports. The invasion from abroad of the U.S. market, plus the curtailment of foreign markets for U.S. producers, has idled 30 percent of existing aluminum production facilities and halted work on additional nearly completed facilities. This obviously has serious implications for the Pacific Northwest, where aluminum production has become so important a part of our economy.

The memorandum doesn't say so, but obviously the biggest foreign seller in our domestic market is our good friend Canada, and any attempt to restrict her sales would lead to an even worse disruption of our relationship than any of those which have caused ruffled feelings in the past. However, increasing supplies are coming in from Western Europe, and the memorandum alleges that dump-priced Soviet aluminum is being used in Belgian, German, British, and Austrian mills to fabricate sheet, rod, and foil which find their way into the U.S. markets.

The rapidly growing Soviet aluminum industry is seen as a one element of Russia's economic warfare threat, and Soviet boss Khrushchev's statement, "We value trade least for economic reasons and most for political purposes," is recalled. Also his "declaration of war" in the peaceful field of trade.

The mobilization of free-world economic forces to meet this threat is not a bright prospect for the immediate future. The competition among friendly nations of the West is still too keen, but the aluminum industry says, "Unified free-world action is essential to combat Soviet economic warfare."

This view was taken by Senators WARREN MAGNUSON, and HENRY JACKSON, Democrat, of Washington, in a Vancouver meeting last fall on the aluminum problem, and JACKSON was to present the challenge at a NATO meeting in Paris.

"The ultimate answer to both aluminum world trade problems and to the threat of Soviet exports," says U.S. aluminum producers, "is the energetic development of world aluminum markets * * * in spreading the benefits of aluminum to more people in all parts of the world, including Russia. Everybody benefits from this approach, instead of robbing Peter to provide Paul with an aluminum market."

The prospect is that new U.S. aluminum products in the offing will increase substantially the U.S. per capita consumption, but not until these new uses are shared by peoples abroad will there be adequate markets for present and growing productive capacity. This will be a job both for the industry and Government and will require in the long run a higher degree of cooperation among the producers and governments of our free-world friends than we now have.

IMPORTANCE OF BASIC RESEARCH

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, it is my firm conviction that our quest for knowledge is our most important effort as a people. In this regard, our program of basic research must take a high priority. Awareness of this is becoming more general, but such awareness is not bringing appropriate action.

The total research of industry is increasing, but it is largely practical research or developmental work. Perhaps pursuit of knowledge for its own sake must of necessity be left to the public sector of the economy—universities, foundations, and State and Federal agencies.

An Air Force official, whose responsibility is in the research field, recently said it is unrealistic to expect to determine in advance the direct relationship between basic research and specific military needs. However, instead of stopping there, he went on to conclude that the country must, nonetheless, support research in those areas which are related to "future military technological capabilities."

Like so many others, he has missed the point. The importance of basic research lies not only with the military capabilities of this country; nor does it lie with just industrial use. Real basic research can lead down many paths.

A recent editorial in the Denver Post goes a long way toward delineating the real need. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in full at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Denver Post, Feb. 16, 1959]

WE NEGLECT BASIC RESEARCH AT OUR PERIL

Featured in Sunday's editorial section was an account of basic research about the planet Jupiter.

Very fascinating, some may say, but why bother? Jupiter is so cold nothing can live on it. Man probably can never visit it. Why not just let it wander its frigid way unnoticed?

Generalized, the question being asked here is: Why should we try to know anything that has no direct usefulness? Isn't it just like mountain climbing—something done without practical purpose, just because it's there?

This is the key question that must be answered by those who say basic research is essential to civilization.

It is true, of course, that not everything important to us need be useful. Music and art, for example, are not useful except to lift the human spirit and probe the true meaning of life.

In the same sense, basic research gives meaning to life, too. The reach of the fully alive mind always exceeds its grasp—it is always stretching beyond the limits of its own understanding.

But this is not enough for the hard-headed businessman, who insists on something of value for his dollar. Here is the answer he seeks as to: What good is basic research?

Very little first-rate basic research has not led to substantial, and often epoch-making, practical developments.

Franklin, with his kite and his key in the thunderstorm, was only satisfying his yearning to know. Yet his discovery was basic to the practical development of electricity, which has changed the world more in 100 years than it had changed in the previous millenium.

Einstein, when he developed the famous formula, $E=mc^2$, was only searching for unity in the basic forces of nature, with no practical end in mind. Yet this formula was the key to atomic power and the atomic bomb, the Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde of physical force that are leading humanity who knows where.

Sometimes it takes only a few years or decades, sometimes hundreds of years, but basic discoveries, often just happened upon by men with the rare talent of noticing the totally unexpected, eventually pay off.

That is why Dr. Hans Selye, the famous medical scientist, wrote in the Saturday Evening Post recently:

"The future welfare of humanity depends largely upon the recognition of first-rate research in its earliest stages, when it lacks practical applicability."

In short, if the hard-headed businessman wants results from the basic research, he cannot insist on knowing what they will be in advance or when they will flower into practicality.

Those are the terms. Without agreeing to them, there is no such thing as basic research, nor ultimately any such thing as progress.

Dr. Selye predicts that our era will undoubtedly go down in history as the age of basic research. Man has gained unprecedented power through investigation of natural laws. This power can lead us to the brightest chapter in human history—or the final chapter.

The answer to which of these fates awaits us depends in part on our response as a society to the best of human values.

The pursuit of applied science may preserve, for a time, our military and economic superiority over the Russians.

But the neglect of basic research—knowledge for its own value—carries the seeds of destruction, in practical as well as spiritual terms.

RESTORATION OF FULL LOAN-MAKING AUTHORITY TO REA ADMINISTRATOR

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I wish to inform the Senate that last Wednesday the Reorganization Subcommittee of the Senate Government Operations Committee favorably reported Senate bill 144 to the full committee. Senate bill 144 is one which I introduced, on behalf of myself, the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], and other cosponsors, to restore the full loanmaking authority of the Administrator of the Rural Electrification Administration.

I want to take note of the action of the subcommittee, because of the widespread interest in the bill, which is cosponsored by 23 Senators.

I also want to take this opportunity to thank the distinguished majority leader for his kind remarks about this bill at the recent annual meeting of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, held here in Washington. Senator JOHNSON of Texas has always been a great friend of the American farmer and the rural electrification program; and this warm friendship has been recognized, treasured, and respected by the people in the rural areas who have benefited from REA.

I am informed, Mr. President, that the 7,500 people who attended the NRECA meeting jumped to their feet and shook the rafters with applause after Senator JOHNSON had delivered a ringing and challenging address. In addition, I am told that during the course of his remarks, the audience interrupted him time and again with enthusiastic applause.

I had hoped, Mr. President, to place Senator JOHNSON's remarks in the RECORD; but, upon inquiry, I found that he had spoken extemporaneously, and no complete transcript was available. I do have available a few paragraphs, however, in which the majority leader discusses the administration's efforts to jack up the REA interest rate and send the rural electric systems to Wall Street for their loan funds. He also gave a splendid endorsement to the bill which the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] and I, joined by 22 of our colleagues, have introduced.

This bill, Mr. President, restores to the REA Administrator the loanmaking authority which was stripped from him by Secretary of Agriculture Ezra Taft Benson. I have discussed this bill and its background several times on the floor of the Senate, both in this Congress and the prior one; and I am sure Senators are familiar with it. It is a moderate measure, designed only to insure that the REA Administrator, and only the REA Administrator, shall have final authority over individual REA loans. It does not take the REA out of the Department of Agriculture and set it up as an independent agency, nor does it interfere with the general policy control of the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. President, I should like to quote some of the remarks the distinguished majority leader made on these subjects to the rural electric people. He said:

> We are not going to raise the interest rates. We are not going to require you to go to Wall Street for your money. And we are going to pass HUBERT HUMPHREY'S bill that gives the REA Administrator the power Congress intended him to have, and that he ought to have.
>
> The privately owned, business-managed rural electric cooperative is here to stay, and stay as we set it up. Your organization is the best people's organization in Washington, D.C.

The majority leader closed his remarks, Mr. President, with this statement:

> This is going to be our program. This is the kind of program that I predict most of the Congress will favor.

Mr. President, I appreciate this fine endorsement of Senate bill 144 just as much as the rural electric people did. I introduced the measure, in the first place, partly because of their deep concern about the arbitrary action of the Secretary of Agriculture. I understand the bill has been unanimously endorsed by the last two annual meetings of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, and by the last two series of regional meetings held in every part of the country. In addition, I have received countless letters endorsing the bill from individuals and State associations. It is clear beyond any doubt that this is the moderate, corrective action the rural electric people seek.

As Senators know, the distinguished junior Senator from Nebraska has introduced a bill which would take the REA out of the Department of Agriculture altogether, and would set it up as an independent agency. This bill is cosponsored by the distinguished senior Senator from Georgia.

At this time I do not wish to discuss that specific bill. However, I, too, had been invited to address the NRECA annual meeting; and in my prepared speech I discussed my reasons for thinking an independent status for REA would not be in the overall best interests of the rural electrification program. Unfortunately I was delayed, due to heavy snows in my home State, and was unable to get to Washington in time to deliver the address—a fact which distressed me, because I had looked forward eagerly to the occasion.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point the portion of my speech which dealt with this question.

There being no objection, the excerpt from the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXCERPT FROM SENATOR HUMPHREY'S ADDRESS PREPARED FOR THE ANNUAL MEETING OF THE NATIONAL RURAL ELECTRIC COOPERATIVE ASSOCIATION, FEBRUARY 10, 1959

The proposal has been made and bills have also been introduced this year to set REA up as an independent agency altogether. I thoroughly considered this approach before deciding on the bill as now drafted and as, I am glad to say, you have supported in State, regional, and national resolutions throughout the last year and a half.

Here are some of the factors I took into account:

First, I admit I had a strong desire to get REA completely out from under Secretary Benson's domination. However, we had to temper this understandable desire with a realization of the fact that Benson will not be in this agriculture post forever. Over the years, REA has definitely benefited from being a part of the Department of Agriculture. It has benefited by having a spokesman at the Cabinet level. It has benefited by the association with the Department of Agriculture in obtaining funds and in sound administration of those funds.

Second, you as farmers or rural residents are benefiting from REA's close association over the years with the Department of Agriculture. The program objectives have been oriented toward people instead of toward kilowatts alone, as might well be the case if REA were operated as a power agency. This, I am sure you will agree, is highly important.

Third, as part of the Department of Agriculture, REA has had the benefit of working with committees of the Congress most friendly to rural electrification and rural telephony. This raises no question as to the attitude of other committees toward REA. My point is simply that you know where you stand with your present committees. This is a benefit to REA I would not want to be responsible for jeopardizing.

Fourth, sound administration certainly suggests that this Government must be simplified rather than be made more complex. Is it in the national interest to establish a new independent agency when it is possible to accomplish our objective without doing so? Personally, I don't believe it is. My bill retains REA as a part of the Department of Agriculture. The Secretary of Agriculture continues to be the man in charge of broad policy and to serve as the Cabinet-level link between REA and the President. But my bill establishes in no uncertain terms that no one shall interfere with the Administrator's duty and responsibility in handling your loan applications. As I said, we want no politics of any kind injected into those considerations.

Isn't that the kind of administration of REA that you want?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a resolution, unanimously adopted by the NRECA delegates, which endorses Senate bill 144. Senators will note that the resolution specifically mentions that the bill does not take the REA out of the Department of Agriculture. I understand that no resolution which called for independent status was proposed or discussed.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION NO. C-5 ADOPTED BY THE DELEGATES TO THE ANNUAL MEETING OF THE NATIONAL RURAL ELECTRIC COOPERATIVE ASSOCIATION, FEBRUARY 12, 1959

Subject: Reorganization of REA.

Whereas the original Rural Electrification Act of 1936 provided for strictly nonpartisan administration of REA and provided for the appointment of an Administrator by the President, with confirmation by the Senate for a 10-year term to insure nonpartisan, nonpolitical administration; and

Whereas Secretary of Agriculture Ezra Taft Benson pledged himself to a congressional committee to make no changes in REA without first consulting the proper congressional committees and other interested groups; and

Whereas in June 1957 the Secretary did reorganize REA by requiring that all loans of $500,000 or more, and all loans of whatever amount to new borrowers, be reviewed by the Secretary's office; and

Whereas the Humphrey-Price bill would restore to the REA Administrator all of the functions and authority vested in him by the original act of 1936, without divorcing REA from the Department of Agriculture: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we urge the Congress to pass the Humphrey-Price bill as early as possible in the 86th Congress.

J. J. SINGH AND THE INDIA LEAGUE OF AMERICA

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, every now and then, in this world whose governments all too often seem unable or unwilling to get along together, an individual shines through as a beacon of good will, showing the way to human brotherhood to all who are willing to see. Such a human being is Mr. J. J. Singh, the remarkable president of the India League of America. It has been a genuine pleasure—as well as enlightening and inspiring—to know this great spirit during much of his stay in this country. As he prepares to return to his native India, I want to tell my colleagues a little about the contributions of Mr. Singh and of the India league. I want to acknowledge here the debt that all Americans owe this friend of our people and of all peoples.

The India League of America, which has devoted 22 years to the improvement of Indian-United States relations, now brings its operations to a close. The primary aims of this uniquely valuable organization were to inform the American public about India, and to secure support for the cause of Indian independence. It is good to realize that these aims have been realized to the point that the sponsors of the league believe another organization can take over and can continue the fostering of good will between the two countries.

The life of the India league cannot be separated from that of Mr. Singh, one of its founders, its long-time president, and its undauntable moving force. The 1926 Philadelphia Sesquicentennial Exposition brought him to this country, to arrange the Indian part of the exhibit. After finishing that, he decided to start an import business in New York City. Success in the American free enterprise system meant to him only the opportu-

nity to work more effectively for better understanding between his homeland and his adopted country. The tributes from many Americans in public and private life, as Mr. Singh at the age of 61 prepares now to return to India with his family, are some indication of the results of his efforts.

Until 1947, Mr. Singh and the India League concentrated on informing the American people about the principles that underlay the movement for Indian independence. Their intelligent efforts helped to acquaint the American people with the methods of passive resistance and with the names of Gandhi and Nehru, and spurred support in the United States for Indian independence. This sympathetic support, created, in turn, in India a deep reservoir of good will for America, and should today serve as a model to us as we shape our policies and attitudes toward the efforts of other people to achieve independence and international respect for their rights as human beings.

The India League did not limit its activities to politics. In 1943, the 50 million inhabitants of the Indian State of Bengal were faced with a sweeping famine. Largely through Mr. Singh's efforts, Bengal was placed within UNRRA's jurisdiction, to receive emergency food shipments; and literally millions of Indians were saved from the grim certainty of death by starvation.

Indeed, wherever energies have been spent to help strengthen friendship and cooperation between the United States and India, there could be found the good offices and selfless efforts of Mr. Singh and of the India League, who have worked constantly to modernize immigration laws, solve foreign aid problems, solve political misunderstandings, and, above all, to help in the priceless areas of human relationships across seas and within communities.

Since India's independence, the letters-to-the-editor columns of many American newspapers have often contained Mr. Singh's wise and sympathetic explanations of India's position in international affairs. These letters have discussed everything from Goa and Kashmir to Algeria and American economic aid. How fortunate for us that on his return to India, Mr. Singh's letterwriting will be directed to Indian newspapers, in his continued efforts to deepen the ties of Indian-American understanding.

We know we shall be the poorer for his leaving us, so we cannot help but regret his departure. But we know, too, how much we have to be grateful for, in having had his companionship and wise insight in our midst for one-third of a century; and we understand his yearning for his own beautiful homeland. We salute him and his India League on the conclusion of so many years of such a great service; and we wish him Godspeed on his journey and in his renewed work for peace and love, in times which are so sorely in need of both.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an article entitled "United States Loses Envoy to Call of India," which appeared in the New York Times on January 18, 1959, and an editorial entitled "An Unofficial Envoy," which was published in the New York Times of February 18, 1959, be inserted at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article and the editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, Jan. 18, 1959]

UNITED STATES LOSES "ENVOY" TO CALL OF INDIA—J. J. SINGH, A "NONOFFICIAL" AMBASSADOR, WILL RETURN HOME AFTER 33 YEARS

(By Joseph Morgenstern)

A man from India who got to be "ambassador extraordinary" without the benefit of an ambassadorship or an embassy is going home to New Delhi after 33 years in the United States.

J. J. Singh, president of the India League of America, has decided to leave his handsome house on East 61st Street and raise his children in New Delhi.

Until now, he has divided his time between an import business and anyone or anything offering him the opportunity to explain India and the United States to each other.

The 61-year-old Sikh from northern India, who wore a turban and a beard in his early days here, began acting like an ambassador to the United States when India had no official envoys of her own. He continued doing so, to the advantage of both countries, after India won her freedom.

NONOFFICIAL ADVANTAGE

"A nonofficial has an advantage over an official in this kind of work," he said. "People often open up more and speak frankly."

In addition to being a nonofficial, Mr. Singh was a nondrinker until 1942, is still a nonsmoker, and "not the sort of person who stays inactive." Lobbying in Washington, writing articles and scores of letters to newspapers, sitting in on United Nations meetings, appearing on radio and television forums, and presiding over informal dinner forums in the quiet elegance of his own home: These have helped to keep him from inactivity's clutches.

When Mr. Singh leaves New York in March with his wife and two sons, the India League will be dissolved. He became its president in 1941.

"I do hope that some other organization will continue the league's work of friendly interpretation between the United States and India," he said.

EXPOSITION FAILS

When he is asked about himself, Mr. Singh usually replies by discussing India. He said he has been gratified by the steady growth of knowledge about India in the United States.

"Originally, when people found out that I came from India, they were disappointed that I couldn't do the rope trick or produce a snake," he said.

That was in 1926 and shortly thereafter, when Mr. Singh arrived as one of the organizers of the Indian section of the Philadelphia Sesquicentennial Exposition.

"The exposition was a flop and I lost my shirt," he recalled, "so I decided to stay and recover that shirt."

Moving to New York, Mr. Singh opened the wholesale office of an importing firm specializing in Indian textiles. Subsequent business success enabled him to revive the India league with money and new ideas.

NEHRU HIS IDOL

At the center of his political convictions is a belief that India and the United States have a common bond in freedom.

During the period of British rule in India, which Mr. Singh calls "the era when we were not free," he sought to rally supporters for the cause of Indian independence.

"You were once under British rule," he used to tell Americans, "and the British are ruling us." The response, he said, was usually quick and affirmative.

Convinced that India will not take orders from world communism, Mr. Singh says that modern India would long ago have torn itself into pieces but for Nehru. Prime Minister Jawaharlal Nehru is one of Mr. Singh's idols.

DENTS IN VITAL ISSUES

"A private citizen dealing with governments can only make dents on vital issues," Mr. Singh said. One of the many substantial dents he made in Washington legislative circles led to congressional approval of United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration aid for victims of the general famine of 1943.

Another of his campaigns to influence the influencers led to an amendment of U.S. immigration laws permitting a hundred Indians a year to enter this country and become permanent residents and citizens.

In 1951 Mr. Singh married the former Malti Saksena, the daughter of the High Commissioner for India in Canada and Consul General for India in New York. Although Mr. Singh and his wife both speak Hindustani and English, their two sons will have to learn an Indian language in India.

A STUDY OF INDIA

Before he came to the United States by way of Britain, Mr. Singh was active in Indian politics. As a young man he "did what many young men did—leading mobs, getting beaten up, getting shot at—the privileges of those who fought for India's freedom." At 24 he was the youngest member of the All-India Congress Committee.

Whether he will reenter the political life of his country is a decision for the future. "My first job will be to study India," Mr. Singh said.

"With small disappointments," he said, "my faith in the United States has not been shaken."

In a few months, when Mr. Singh's new home is completed in New Delhi, the United States will, in its turn, have an unofficial ambassador to India in an unofficial embassy.

[From the New York Times, Feb. 18, 1959]

AN UNOFFICIAL ENVOY

In giving a farewell luncheon for J. J. Singh, Mayor Wagner has recognized the distinguished part that this unofficial envoy from India has played in the life of our community. We hope that it is not farewell but merely au revoir, and that J. J.—as he is affectionately known to thousands of Americans—will come back to visit soon and often.

After 33 years in this country, Mr. Singh has decided to take his charming family back to his native India and to retire there. No one who knows him can accept the idea of his retiring without the broadest reservation. He will continue to work on behalf of his country and on behalf of better understanding between India and the United States. Perhaps he may even form an American league in India since he was the life and soul of the India league here for 20 years, and as he leaves the India league has disbanded, saying "Mission accomplished."

He has been singularly successful in presenting the cause of his people to this country. One reason is that he has understood and liked Americans and made them like him. His urbanity, good humor, commonsense, and patriotic devotion have endeared him to everyone who had reason to know him.

J. J. Singh has been an honor to India and a most pleasant visitor here. More like him would do us all good.

CAREER SERVICE AWARDS TO OUTSTANDING CIVIL SERVICE EMPLOYEES

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, last Monday evening the National Civil Service League presented career service awards to 10 of our outstanding career civil service employees.

The National Civil Service League was organized in 1881, and is a nonpartisan citizens' group which is working to improve public service through better personnel at all levels of Government—Federal, State and local.

The president of the National Civil Service League, Nicholas Kelley, was chairman of the dinner meeting; and the address was delivered by the Honorable Frank Pace, Jr., president of the General Dynamics Corp. and former Director of the Bureau of the Budget, and former Secretary of the Army.

Mr. Pace stressed the importance of our Federal Civil Service employees in relation to the economic and political problems of our present day world.

A message of greeting was received from the President of the United States, and it reads as follows:

Please extend my greetings to all attending the National Civil Service League's fifth annual career service awards presentation and my heartiest congratulations to the 10 outstanding Federal employees being honored.

The magnitude of Government activities and the vast responsibilities that it bears make it imperative that this Nation have and maintain a public service of high competence and complete integrity. The 10 individuals chosen for these awards exemplify the exceptional competence and the devotion to the principles of public service so necessary to the attainment of this goal.

The National Civil Service League is to be commended for its efforts to strengthen the public service and for its program of bringing national recognition to significant careers in the Federal Service.

(Signed) DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

Career service awards were presented honoring the following, who were selected from their departments for outstanding service and special recognition:

Lyle T. Alexander, Department of Agriculture; John B. Barnwell, Veterans Administration; James C. Evans, Department of Defense; William F. Finan, Bureau of the Budget; Lyle S. Garlock, Department of the Air Force; Paul W. McDaniel, Atomic Energy Commission; Robert J. Myers, Department of Health, Education and Welfare; Richard W. Weiss, Department of the Army; Joseph E. Winslow, Executive Office of the President; Conrad L. Wirth, Department of the Interior.

EDITORIALS IN SUPPORT OF THE BILL TO STRIKE THE LOYALTY OATH REQUIREMENT FROM THE NATIONAL DEFENSE EDUCATION ACT OF 1958

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a number of editorials commenting on the bill, which the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] and I have introduced, to strike the loyalty oath requirement from the National Defense Education Act of 1958. These editorials make it abundantly clear that this loyalty provision furthers neither the objectives of the Education Act itself nor our Nation's security against Communist dangers. I am very much pleased that the Education Subcommittee of the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee will soon hold hearings on this bill. I hope we shall act soon on the bill and that we shall remove this unnecessary obstacle to American educational progress.

Mr. President, I also ask permission to have printed in the body of the RECORD a letter which on November 1, 1958, was sent to the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee by the American Association of University Professors.

There being no objection, the editorials and letter were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Madison (Wis.) Capital Times, Feb. 10, 1959]

SENATOR KENNEDY STRIKES NEEDED BLOW AT SCHOLASTIC OATH

Senator JOHN KENNEDY, Democrat, of Massachusetts, has, with Senator JOSEPH S. CLARK, Democrat, of Pennsylvania, introduced a bill to repeal a provision of the National Defense Education Act which requires any recipient of its benefits to sign an oath of loyalty and an affidavit declaring that he did not believe in, belong to, or support any subversive organization.

We are glad to see Senator KENNEDY come forward with his proposal to repeal a law that is obnoxious to academic principles as well as to general political principles. It is not easy for Senator KENNEDY to take this position since he comes from a State that was a hotbed of McCarthyism. He deserves credit for taking the stand he has.

The provision he wants repealed was another manifestation of McCarthyism. It reflected again the hysterical suspicions that were aroused toward education during the McCarthy era.

This kind of an oath in order to qualify for scholarship aid is not required of other groups that receive aid. It is flatly discriminatory against scholars and in that sense helps to defeat the very purpose of the Education Act.

Even if there were some practical way to enforce it, it would still be offensive. It penalizes the very people we want and expect to have the searching, inquiring minds that are most apt to be asking the challenging questions that need to be asked if freedom is to provide the long-range benefits intended.

This loyalty oath has caused nothing but trouble for education administrators and with scholars who naturally resent it. As Senator KENNEDY has pointed out, the oath can only have the effect of keeping scholars out of the scientific fields into which the act was designed to encourage entrance.

[From the San Francisco Sunday Chronicle, Feb. 22, 1959]

PROTESTS ON STUDENT OATH GROW

The faculty of the University of California, as represented by the Berkeley chapter of the American Association of University Professors, is again joined in battle with the nine-lived, multiform special loyalty oath.

This time the professors are asking the administration to withdraw from the student loan program of the National Education Act of 1958. It requires applicants to sign a non-Communist affidavit as well as an oath of allegiance.

In this fight they have abundant and active allies. Six institutions—Antioch, Bryn Mawr, Haverford, Princeton, Reed, and Swarthmore—have already declined to accept funds under the act. Presidents of five others—Bates, Bowdoin, Colby, Emory, and the University of Wisconsin—have spoken out against the act. So has Arthur Flemming, secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, and he has been publicly commended for it by presidents Pusey of Harvard and Griswold of Yale.

None object to the requirement for an oath of allegiance. All resent the special requirement of a non-Communist affidavit, holding it a threat to academic freedom, a slur upon all college students, a useless obeisance to the diehard vestiges of McCarthyism. President Gould of Carleton College observes wryly: "We give $6 billion to the farmers but don't expect any loyalty oath."

The educators are not alone in their opposition to this special requirement—written into the act by Senator MUNDT, of South Dakota. Three bills for its repeal have been introduced in the House. Senators KENNEDY of Massachusetts and CLARK of Pennsylvania have cosponsored a repeal bill in the Senate.

For all the reasons cited above, and doubtless for others, this special non-Communist requirement is offensive and mischievous. The UC administration should join the academic revolt against it and throw its weight into the swelling pressure for its early repeal.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post and Times Herald, Feb. 1, 1959]

MEANINGLESS OATH

Congress surely ought to repeal the loyalty oath requirement of the National Defense Education Act. As Senator KENNEDY noted when he introduced his bill to terminate this unnecessary provision, card-carrying members of the Communist Party have no hesitancy about perjuring themselves in such an affidavit. The requirement, which has hastily written into the legislation by Senator MUNDT on the Senate floor last summer, is an insult to the students and teachers applying for loans and other benefits available under the act.

Loyalty oaths have a way of hanging on like leeches, but this one may be an exception. Health, Education, and Welfare Secretary Flemming has acknowledged that the provision would do little or no good because genuinely subversive individuals have no scruples about signing such an affidavit and taking such an oath. The American Association of University Professors, the Association of American Colleges, and the presidents of such universities as Harvard, Yale, Princeton and Wisconsin have all protested the requirement. The list of opponents of the oath is as impressive as the logic of their argument.

[From the Boston (Mass.) Morning Globe, Jan. 31, 1959]

EXCESS BAGGAGE

Senator KENNEDY is on strong ground in asking Congress to eliminate a provision of the National Defense Education Act which requires students who get Federal grants to take a loyalty oath.

Arthur S. Flemming, Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, has openly criticized this requirement, especially a section which compels such students to sign a statement that they do not belong to any subversive organization. Nine universities and colleges have expressed opposition to this provision; Haverford and Bryn Mawr refuse to take part in the loan program while this requirement remains in the law.

In a letter to Mr. Flemming which has the support of President Pusey of Harvard, President Griswold of Yale well expressed the case against loyalty oaths. Experience, he said, has taught education to regard

such tests as at best odious symbols, at worst potential threats. They are ineffective as Communists never hesitate to take them. Belief cannot be compelled by law. Such requirements are distasteful to young people—most of them about 18—embarking on an enterprise in scholarship.

As Senator KENNEDY says, the oath may keep from the program inquiring young minds. Congress should remove from the act this excess baggage.

[From the Pittsburgh, (Pa.) Post-Gazette, Feb. 3, 1959]

NO AID TO EDUCATION

As the new National Defense Education Act goes into full operation, Senator JOHN F. KENNEDY, of Massachusetts is moving to divest it of a feature that could limit its effectiveness. With the cosponsorship of Senator JOSEPH S. CLARK, of Pennsylvania, Senator KENNEDY is introducing a bill to repeal a requirement of a loyalty oath by recipients of Federal aid under the act.

The loyalty oath provision was tagged onto the bill from the floor at the last moment before passage, with scant debate and little publicity. Since its existence has become more widely known, it has been criticized by Arthur S. Flemming, Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, and by the presidents of Harvard, Yale, and Princeton Universities, and Bryn Mawr, Haverford, Swarthmore, Bates, Bowdoin, and Colby Colleges. The American Association or University Professors has called for elimination of the oath, and Bryn Mawr and Haverford have refused to participate in the education aid program unless the requirement is dropped.

Senator KENNEDY put the reasons for repeal succinctly. He said it would not keep out actual members of the Communist Party because they would "have no hesitancy about perjuring themselves." At the same time, he added, it might defeat the very purposes of the act by excluding "the most inquiring minds," by repelling nonconformists and dissenters and those who find test oaths distasteful or who are against them for reasons of conscience.

Now that it has had time to reconsider what it adopted so hastily, Congress should abolish the unnecessary and offending oath.

[From the Pittsfield (Mass.) Berkshire Eagle, Feb. 3, 1959]

EDITORIALS

It is good to find Senator KENNEDY adding his voice to the scattered but articulate chorus criticizing the loyalty oath provision of the 1958 National Defense Education Act. His statement that the provision is "an unnecessary, futile gesture toward the memory of an earlier age" that might defeat the very purpose of the education bill by discouraging "the most inquiring minds" is a well-phrased indictment of this latest restriction upon academic freedoms.

Senator KENNEDY thus joins a goodly company, including the presidents of Harvard, Yale, Princeton, Bryn Mawr, Swarthmore, Haverford, Bates, Bowdoin, and Colby. Along with the Association of American Colleges and the 40,000-member American Association of University Professors, these educational leaders have taken the most serious exception to the oath provision, which requires any applicant for financial aid under the act to sign a non-Communist affidavit and swear his allegiance to the United States.

As Dr. Hugh Borton, president of Haverford, declared 2 weeks ago, filing the disclaimer is "tantamount to signing away one's right to freedom of thought as well as endorsing a Government action which makes the individual's opportunity for education contingent upon his personal beliefs." Dr. Borton's Pennsylvania Quaker institution will refuse to take part in the program until the oath provision is removed, but will make loans to students at comparable rates.

The academic atmosphere induced by such a provision was the particular target of the presidents of the three Maine institutions—Bates, Bowdoin, and Colby—who asserted that it would replace "a fearless and honest search for truth" with "a feeling of hesitancy and fear and a consequent restriction on the free inquiry and association that are the heart of academic freedom."

Moreover, they noted, to require such an oath solely of young people who are studying at institutions of higher learning is invidious, since it implies that they are members of a suspect group.

And, of course, all who have considered the practical side of the matter, apart from its vote-winning aspects, agree that the disclaimer does not do what it pretends to do: It does not separate the subversives from the loyal citizens. For as Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare Arthur S. Flemming admitted in a discussion of the Republican-sponsored bill December 15, real subversives "have no scruples about signing such an affidavit and taking such an oath."

At the moment there are at least three bills in Congress, introduced by Republicans as well as Democrats, aimed at excising the loyalty-oath provision from the Defense Education Act. It is to be hoped that our representatives in Washington will lend their weight to the move before this futile gesture toward the memory of an earlier age causes any of the trouble that has been so eloquently foreseen.

NOVEMBER 1, 1958.

Sent to Members of the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee and the House Education and Labor Committee

The American Association of University Professors has in mind petitioning the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare of the 86th Congress to reconsider the requirement of section 1001(f), title X, of the National Defense Education Act of 1958, which reads:

"No * * * funds * * * shall be used to make payments or loans to any individual unless such individual (1) has executed and filed with the Commissioner an affidavit that he does not believe in, and is not a member of and does not support any organization that believes in or teaches the overthrow of the United States Government by force or violence or by any illegal or unconstitutional methods."

This disclaimer requirement, which will apply to large numbers of young people seeking loans, fellowships and grants to carry on their education, and to many teachers and to consulting experts, seems thoroughly harmful. It singles out persons in education as objects of suspicion; it imposes a test oath repugnant to our traditions; and it exposes those signing the affidavit to the possibility of perjury prosecutions resting on vague allegations or improper and intimidating inquiries about their conduct and their beliefs.

The affidavit requirement appears certainly to affect at least these persons:

1. Undergraduate students receiving loans (including minors).
2. Graduate students receiving fellowships.
3. Secondary school guidance and counseling personnel who attend training institutes.
4. Staff of language research centers.
5. Foreign scholars teaching at language research centers.
6. Individuals receiving stipends for advanced training in foreign languages.
7. Staff of language institutes.
8. Individuals attending language institutes who receive stipends.
9. Members of the Advisory Committee on New Educational Media.
10. Special personnel under title VII (TV, radio, cinema).
11. Members of the Science Information Council.

The American Association of University Professors believes that the requirement which it opposes is subject to the following specific objections:

1. Vagueness: A person required to execute a disclaimer statement is given no guidance as to the organizations which are of the designated variety, and no definition of the "support" to such organizations which he must disclaim. We submit that it is a denial of due process of law to compel an individual to gage his conduct by such vague criteria, when criminal liability may turn on his action.

2. Unconstitutionality of the substance of the disclaimer: There is ground for grave question concerning the validity of requiring a disclaimer of the sort specified in the act, as a condition of enjoying governmental benefits. The justification which a majority of the U.S. Supreme Court held to be present with relation to the requirement of the Labor-Management Relations Act involved in *American Communications Association* v. *Douds* (339 U.S. 382), is of doubtful applicability here. Moreover, the provision here in question is not in terms limited in "knowing" support of the specified type of organization; without such a limitation, the provision probably falls under condemnation of the view of the U.S. Supreme Court in *Wieman* v. *Updegraff* (344 U.S. 183).

It is difficult to leave unquestioned legislation which borders so closely on unconstitutionality in a first amendment area, and which may well overstep the line.

3. The invidiousness of the requirement: A disclaimer requirement or "test oath" by its nature cannot fail to be invidious. If an individual refuses to sign, he raises a suspicion that he is unworthy of public trust or benefit. If he signs, he endorses the pertinency of the general suspicion about him and his kind which is embodied in the requirement. Social safeguards should be directed to specific dangers; they should not, as in this instance, take the form of inescapable and unwarranted derogatory implications directed toward a whole class of persons and all its members.

This association, with a membership of 40,000 college and university teachers, is particularly concerned about the application of the disclaimer to education. In the past, the Federal Government has made available numerous benefits to individuals and organizations whose activities have been of national importance, and who have had a clearly established special need; rarely has there been a requirement of an affidavit or statement disclaiming subversive belief or association. Now, in 1958, we are shocked and alarmed to find that students and teachers, when they are to receive funds, are placed in a special category and must enter a humiliating disclaimer. The act seems to say to members of the educational community: "You are an important part of American life and you have an admitted real need, but let there be no mistake about the fact that you are a particularly suspect part of the population and will have to pass a special test that other citizens need not take." This is a prejudgment of the teachers and students of America which we cannot believe the Congress intended to make.

We respectfully request that you give consideration to the objections stated in this letter. It is our hope that you will conclude that the position of the American Association of University Professors is correct and that you will be able to share it with us.

Sincerely yours,

BENTLEY GLASS,
President.

WILLIAM P. FIDLER,
General Secretary.

UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, at the end of this month the law providing temporary unemployment compensation benefits will expire. The law was designed for a very limited purpose and had a very modest effect. Only one out of every four people receiving compensation are affected at all by it.

It was enacted at a time when our unemployment crisis was so critical, our business decline so severe, and our economy so in need, that a stopgap measure had to be enacted to cover the most glaring inadequacies in our system of unemployment compensation. Under it, 17 States have enacted laws extending benefits for a 50-percent longer period of time.

It was hoped—but I confess that in the minds of many of us there was not much more than a hope—that by the time the temporary law expired, unemployment would be reduced substantially, and that the experience gained under this law would enable us to proceed with permanent, long overdue legislation.

We have had that experience. Every study has conclusively proved the value of unemployment compensation both to the individual recipients and to the economy. Only this week, the University of Michigan released a study showing it helped cushion the recession, meet individual hardships, and prevent some of the economic loss that normally accompanies large-scale unemployment.

Unfortunately, however, the temporary law is scheduled to expire before the anticipated drop in unemployment occurs. According to the latest available figures, we still have almost 5 million unemployed. Even with the temporary extension of benefits, exhaustions are averaging approximately 200,000 per month. When the temporary law expires, between 300,000 and 400,000 additional jobless workers will suddenly be deprived of any unemployment-compensation benefits at all.

This has led to a suggestion in the other body that the temporary unemployment-compensation law be extended. Of course, every consideration should be given to a full program which will take care of those presently unemployed as well as those who will lose their jobs in the future. But any temporary extension of the present law must be considered only as a transition to a permanent bill. We must not postpone any longer consideration of the establishment of permanent standards such as those contained in the bill introduced by the junior Senator from Minnesota, the senior Senator from New Jersey, myself, and 31 other Senators. I do not believe the answer to the present crisis is a crash program. I do not believe the answer to a defective Federal statute is a series of temporary extensions of temporary laws. This is but evidence of the inadequacies of the basic statute. I will never oppose any temporary assistance to the unemployed, little as it is, but it must not be regarded as a solution to the problem.

Mr. President, I hope the announcement of the movement to extend the temporary law does not forestall or delay consideration of S. 791, the bill to provide for adequate permanent standards of unemployment compensation. In the near future I intend to discuss fully the hardships caused by the tragic delay in enacting the permanent unemployment-compensation bill.

Mr. President, I am associated in these remarks by the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], the junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MCCARTHY], and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE]; and I am confident the senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], who is a cosponsor, also joins me.

There is no point in merely reenacting the law providing temporary benefits unless we do something about providing Federal minimum standards for unemployment compensation. The President has recommended these standards since 1954. No State has adopted them in toto. I think it is time, with almost 5 million unemployed, that the Government adopt Federal minimum standards in order to assist those States which honestly desire to reach such standards to assist their unemployed, without providing a competitive advantage to States which do not wish to have such standards in attracting industries to those States.

Mr. HART subsequently said: Mr. President, I wish to congratulate the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] who is continuing the drive for which he has long been noted to require minimum unemployment compensation standards in the States, with respect to the contest for industry and the approaches made in soliciting that industry by offering cheap unemployment compensation programs.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in my remarks some comments extracted from a speech I made last Saturday on this subject, and, since I think it is also appropriate, I ask unanimous consent to have an article which was published in the Ann Arbor, Mich., News of March 2, 1959, printed in the RECORD. The article reflects the judgment of three very distinguished economists on the necessity for Federal unemployment compensation standards.

I, of course, associate myself with the remarks made by the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY].

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KENNEDY in the chair). Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Michigan?

There being no objection, the excerpts and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The unemployment situation in my State of Michigan, and in far too many other States must somehow be dramatized.

The President says this isn't the time to do anything different because we are on a curve of rising prosperity.

Let me say that one subject that I am qualified to speak on in Washington, or anywhere else in the Nation, is the very serious human situation that prevails back home today.

Just a few simple facts might set this thing in its proper perspective:

We have over three-quarters of a million people in Michigan today who are eligible to receive the very limited surplus food packages Mr. Benson is willing to let go out of his food stocks.

The city of Detroit ran out of welfare funds 6 months through the current fiscal year and has had to turn to the State for help.

In mid-January we had over 405,000 persons unemployed in the State.

Over 243,000 of these unemployed workers exhausted their unemployment benefit payments during 1958, and over 100,000 have exhausted their extra payments under the temporary unemployment compensation program.

So difficult is the situation at the automobile plants that a worker has to have 8 years seniority to be employed at Ford, and at the Dodge main plant it was up to 12 years seniority.

But Michigan isn't the only State with serious problems. New Jersey, Pennsylvania, West Virginia, to name just a few, find a level of unemployment this winter which cries out against the administration's fancy predictions.

The recession, which we are told is now passing, has hit millions of Americans. They have been in the path of a great storm, and the wreckage that is left behind is not more nor any less a disaster for them than had they been in the path of a flood or hurricane.

These men and women were not responsible for the disaster that has swept over them. Far too many of them—some 900,000 will have exhausted their temporary unemployment compensation benefits by April 1 of this year.

Over 1.8 million of the persons unemployed in this country are not eligible for temporary programs or have exhausted all employment insurance rights.

This Congress, I feel, should put a new roof on the unemployment compensation program. This can be no dishpan program to meet the aftermath of the disaster, and prepare for future crises.

There has been a steady deterioration of the unemployment compensation program since 1939. We must have a bill, such as has been introduced in both houses, to build meaningful Federal standards into the programs. We must stop the unhealthy situation where one State competes with another for industry because of variations in their unemployment compensation laws.

We must also do something very soon to be sure that those who have not been covered or who have exhausted all their benefits are not left as castaways on the economic road to recovery but receive the same humane treatment any victim of disaster receives.

Just because this economic disaster didn't hit with the suddenness of a flood or hurricane doesn't mean that the wreckage of families left in its path is any less severe.

[From the Ann Arbor (Mich.) News, Mar. 2, 1959]

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN MEN SAY MORE UNEMPLOYMENT FUNDS SHOULD HAVE BEEN PAID OUT IN 1958 RECESSION

More unemployment compensation money should have been paid out to jobless workers during the 1958 recession and coverage of compensation plans should be broadened in the future, three university professors have recommended.

Profs. Fedele Fauri, William Haber and Wilbur Cohen declared Saturday that urgent improvements in Federal and State legislation "are vitally needed while the lessons of the recession are still fresh in our memory." A recession study showed the Nation failed to make full use of jobless insurance plans to relieve family hardships and shore up the economy, they said.

They urged extension of the temporary Federal-aid jobless program, which expires at the end of March, until States improve their compensation laws. State action the

professors recommend includes expanded coverage to take in more workers, increased duration of benefits and larger benefit payments.

PROGRAM EXTENDED

Under the temporary Federal program enacted last year, duration of unemployment compensation benefits was extended to a maximum of 39 weeks. Most States normally pay benefits for 26 weeks of unemployment.

The Federal Government lent the States interest-free money to finance the program. Loans are to be repaid by 1964 unless some future Congress cancels them.

The Michigan professors, who are specialists in the fields of economy and social work, said the temporary program should be extended "until permanent Federal standards and supporting State legislation are enacted to improve the benefit duration and financing arrangements of State laws."

Professor Fauri is dean of the University of Michigan School of Social Work and chairman of the Labor Department's Federal advisory council on employment security. Haber is an economics professor, a member of the advisory council and an authority on jobless insurance. Cohen is professor of public welfare administration and an adviser to the commission on social security.

BILL INTRODUCED

A bill to extend the temporary Federal program 6 months from the scheduled April 1 expiration has been introduced in the House.

The Michigan professors based their findings on continuing studies by the University's Survey Research Center on the nationwide impact of the recession during 1957–58.

The professors said more money should have been paid out to the jobless.

"The tragic part of the situation," they said, "was that there was $7 billion in unemployment insurance reserve funds which were not touched during the recession. If State and Federal unemployment laws had been more adequate and had permitted $1½ to $2 billion of these reserves to be used to pay benefits to the unemployed many personal hardships could have been avoided. There would still have been about $5 billion of reserves left if unemployment insurance benefits had been more adequate."

NOT SATISFACTORY

The professors declared, "the experience of the recession indicates that the existing built-in stabilizers in our income maintenance programs were not—and still are not—satisfactory to meet another similar recurrence."

"A free enterprise economy," they said, "must make more effective provision than we now have for meeting the employment hazards which occur from the free play of economic forces in the market place."

Their recommenadtions included:

Broadening unemployment insurance coverage to take in 1,800,000 employes in small firms, who are not covered in 33 States, and some groups of hired farm laborers.

Increasing maximum duration of benefits to at least 30 weeks in a benefit year in all States.

Establishing an equalization fund "to reduce the excessive costs of unemployment insurance in States suffering from a high incidence of unemployment caused by national economic conditions."

Providing benefits equal to half their normal full-time gross weekly earnings to "the great majority of eligible claimants." They said States and employees should be given six years to reach this objective.

Including dependents, benefits as an integral part of each State unemployment insurance program.

Making Federal and State funds available for direct relief to "assure all needy persons a floor of protection against want in all localities."

The professors said, the Survey Research Center's studies show "both unemployment insurance and public assistance programs made an important contribution to meeting some of the hardships and economic losses caused by unemployment during the recession."

B'NAI B'RITH WOMEN CELEBRATE 50TH ANNIVERSARY

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, one of our leading Jewish women's organizations, B'nai B'rith Women, will celebrate its 50th anniversary on March 9. I wish to commend to the attention of the Senate these gallant women who will observe this milestone in keeping with their long tradition of service. They have renounced fanfare and elaborate festivities; instead they are commemorating their anniversary with acts of special service to the Nation and the community.

On March 9, B'nai B'rith Women, throughout the United States and Canada, will gather to make mass blood donations at Red Cross or other community blood banks. Since the organization has some 137,000 members, it is easy to realize that its contribution will substantially boost our critical blood reserve. Undoubtedly, it will also serve as an example to other organizations, and a graphic reminder to us all that March is Red Cross Month.

The dedication of these ladies to giving service is again illustrated by their sponsorship of a national youth conference in Washington, D.C., April 12 to 14. Representatives of 150 national women's organizations have been invited to participate in the conference, which has adopted the theme: "Building our Youth for the Future—Building the Future with our Youth."

B'nai B'rith Women at its half-century mark has 856 chapters in the United States, Canada, and 15 other countries. In recent years, it has raised more than $1 million annually for its philanthropic projects and programs. Though it is a Jewish organization, its benevolent undertakings have always been carried out without regard to race, religion, or creed.

Time after time, the organization has been cited for special achievement in the educational, humanitarian, patriotic, and philanthropic causes to which it devotes itself. It has received awards from the U.S. Treasury Department, Veterans' Administration, Crusade for Freedom, National Foundation for Infantile Paralysis, and many others.

Knowing what B'nai B'rith Women has accomplished in the past 50 years, I feel certain that it will go on to even greater achievements in the next half century.

RESIGNATION OF HON. EARL E. T. SMITH AS AMBASSADOR TO CUBA

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD an editorial which appeared in the New York Journal-American commending the service in Cuba of our recent Ambassador, the Hon. Earl E. T. Smith. The editorial reflects the recent commendation given to Mr. Smith by Secretary of State Dulles. I join in the sentiments expressed therein.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A JOB WELL DONE

The 20 months in which Earl E. T. Smith served as our Ambassador to Cuba required a precarious kind of high-wire diplomacy. We think he kept his balance remarkably well.

Soon after he took office Ambassador Smith visited Santiago where he saw Batista's police roughing up men and women gathered in a demonstration against the dictator. Mr. Smith was outspoken in voicing his abhorrence of police brutality, and Secretary Dulles said he wished we had more Ambassadors of that stamp.

This was not the conduct of a man personally in sympathy with the Batista regime, nor was Ambassador Smith's conduct toward Batista himself. He was correct and formal, which he had to be as the envoy of the United States to an established government. Had he been otherwise he would have been neglecting his assignment.

Finally, Mr. Smith's voluntary resignation "because there is bound to be an unfavorable reaction against an Ambassador to an overthrown government" displays a sensitivity of feeling that goes beyond diplomatic correctness. We think he did a good job in a difficult situation.

FORTY-SECOND ANNIVERSARY OF THE GRANTING OF CITIZENSHIP TO THE PEOPLE OF PUERTO RICO

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, it is with great pleasure that I join with the many other friends of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico in extending greetings on the 42d anniversary of the granting of American citizenship to the people of the island, which fell on March 2. As we look back over the years since March 2, 1917, we can feel a justifiable pride in the way in which the people of Puerto Rico have accepted the responsibilities and obligations of citizenship, and have contributed to the welfare and strength of the United States.

The people of Puerto Rico regard their citizenship as something precious and dear, and they have amply demonstrated their patriotism by their ready response to the call to arms in two World Wars and the Korean conflict. In these conflicts Puerto Ricans fought side by side with their brothers from the mainland, and together with them, many paid the supreme sacrifice.

In Puerto Rico today, in spite of great obstacles and the comparatively small size of the island, great progress is being made. During my recent visit to the island, I was amazed at the progress which has been made in this area which only a few years ago was appropriately labeled "underdeveloped." New industries are being created with breathtaking speed. The agricultural segment of the economy is being diversified. The standard of living is rising rapidly.

On all sides, one can sense a feeling of dynamic action in the air. Much of the credit for these near miracles of progress is due to the intelligent, wise, and enlightened leadership with which the island has been blessed over the years. But the greatest credit is due,

I think, to the people of Puerto Rico, who have been responsive to their leadership and who have, above all, shown a fundamental good sense, a grim determination to better their lot, and a willingness to put in a great deal of good, hard work.

The close ties of Puerto Rico with the continent and the kinship of the island's citizens with their fellow Americans have also helped greatly in this surge of progress. Through the success of Operation Bootstrap, now 12 years old, the people have demonstrated that no challenge—economic, social, or political—is too great for a democratic government backed by loyal and enterprising people like our Puerto Rican neighbors.

Unquestionably, Operation Bootstrap is being closely watched by the leaders of the underprivileged people of Asia and Africa—many of them included among the so-called uncommitted nations. They are learning that economic progress and political freedom are inseparable, and that each can act as a catalyst for the other.

Puerto Rico's progress has shown the world an example of the highly democratic development of an underdeveloped area in free association and cooperation with the United States. It is an important lesson for all the world to ponder—and for the United States to publicize—in this day of grim cold war economic competition.

In this connection, it is important to note that the deep religious fervor of the Puerto Rican people, which no visitor to the island can overlook, has contributed materially to the progress of the Commonwealth. These strong religious ties also serve as a sure-fire bulwark against the inroads of the atheistic Communist conspiracy in Puerto Rico.

The people of my State of New York have special bonds of friendship with the Puerto Ricans because of the great numbers from the island who have come to live in our State. Like many newcomers to our shores, they have often found it difficult to adjust to our fast-moving civilization and unfamiliar ways, but they are determined to achieve all that is rightfully theirs as good citizens.

Progress has been slow but sure. In New York State, legislative enactments and recognition and appreciation of the capabilities and qualities of Puerto Ricans have helped much to improve their status. In spite of the lack of privileges, in spite of prejudices and discrimination, Puerto Ricans in this country today are coming into their own.

But there are many hurdles still to be overcome. We must work to remove those inequities and injustices which still prevent our Puerto Rican citizens from enjoying full equality with other Americans. I am fully aware that this involves many profound problems which will take time to overcome. It will certainly require patience, good will, and cooperation from all of us.

The important thing is that we continue to move forward in the battle to achieve equality for all citizens. As this battle has progressed, as they have conquered language difficulties, and as they have gradually overcome deep-seated prejudices, Puerto Ricans have begun to make great contributions in our country in a wide variety of fields. We can surely look for even greater results in the years ahead, based on the strong traditions and rich heritage which these people bring to our land. These friendly, progressive people, both on the mainland and on the island, combine well the traditions of old Spain and the modern influences of the New World.

It is significant that March 1 to 8 has been proclaimed by Gov. Nelson A. Rockefeller, of New York, as Puerto Rican Week. In his message of proclamation, the Governor said, in part, the following:

> The people of Puerto Rico, those who have remained at home as well as those who have come here, have worn their citizenship with dignity and patriotism. In three major wars they have borne their share of the task of defending American freedoms.
>
> In times of peace they have also proved their right to the same privileges as those enjoyed by people of any of the 49 States of the Union, including that of equality of opportunity for all, without reservation and without exception.

In varied commemorations this week in New York State, tribute will be paid to Puerto Rico and its people on the occasion of this significant anniversary.

It is my hope that this anniversary will merely mark the beginning of many more years of progress for Puerto Rico. I am sure all Members of this body join with me in wishing the people of Puerto Rico continued prosperity, success, and happiness, in the true spirit of democracy and friendship which binds our peoples together.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KEATING. I yield to my colleague from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. I should like to join my colleague in congratulations to the people of Puerto Rico. I am very much pleased that my colleague has taken the initiative in making the remarks on the Senate floor which he has just submitted. The Commonwealth of Puerto Rico is one of the most interesting and enlightening experiments in the world. It shows how the United States deals with people who would otherwise be independent. The United States leaves those people free, and gives them every kind of benefit, as well as the privileges of citizenship. Our treatment of Puerto Rico represents to the other American countries and to those of the Caribbean the real attitude of this Nation toward the people of that vast area of the world.

I am glad my colleague from New York has presented his views. I am delighted to join with him in the sentiments he has expressed.

Mr. KEATING. I appreciate the remarks of the Senator.

RADIOACTIVE WASTE—A PERIL OF THE ATOMIC AGE

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD an article entitled "Radioactive Waste: A Peril of the Atomic Age," written by David Shea Teeple, and published in Human Events.

Mr. Teeple expresses thoughts and fears I have been concerned about for some time, and of which I wish to bring to the attention of the Senate and those who read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RADIOACTIVE WASTE: A PERIL OF THE ATOMIC AGE

(By David Shea Teeple) [1]

Radioactive wastes—under an AEC program deceptively called waste disposal—are today being accumulated at a rate which may very well threaten the future of mankind.

Radioactive wastes are the residues produced from the operation of atomic reactors and chemical processing plants. They may be classified as either low-level or high-level wastes (depending on the amount of radiation). At the present time we are dumping the low-level wastes into the ocean, allowing them to evaporate in pits or filter themselves through soil formations. It has been estimated that up to this point the United States alone has released over 2 million curies into the ocean, and by 1980 will have dumped over 1 billion curies. A curie is defined as the quantity of radiation roughly equivalent to one gram of radium. (Just for comparison, some authorities have estimated that 2 million curies exceeds the radiation of all the radium in the world prior to 1925.)

No responsible scientist suggests that we and the rest of the world can continue to dump this low-level residue into the world's water supply indefinitely without deleterious effect upon sea life. These effects will eventually be transmitted to humanity.

High-level wastes are produced as a result of the fission products which build up within the fuel elements of atomic reactors. Periodically these fuel elements have to be replaced. In certain types of reactors they are in solid form, in others, liquid.

Regardless of the type, these fuel elements have to be chemically processed to recover the uranium–235 which did not burn (fission) as well as to extract the plutonium for which the Government pays a subsidy up to $35 per gram. As a result of the chemical processing a liquid residue remains which is toxic, corrosive and highly radioactive.

The extent of the problem is difficult to visualize. At Hanford in the State of Washington, for example, we now have a minimum of 52 million gallons of this material. The stopgap measures now in use consist of storing the material in stainless steel tanks buried in the ground. Since the material creates heat (around 25 B.t.u.'s per hour) it must be cooled, which of course adds to the problem. At Hanford alone we have $114 million worth of steel tanks and a conservative estimate is that it costs us over $2 million annually to maintain and watch the equipment.

It must be emphasized that this is not a "dead storage" but an operation which requires meticulous instrumentation and constant observation. Obviously, stainless steel tanks, like any other manmade product, have a limit to their existence. Some of them are now 15 years old. Sooner or later we may expect trouble.

Additionally, Hanford is not the only storage site. Similar conditions prevail at the atomic plants at Idaho Falls, Savannah River, Oak Ridge, Paducah, Fernald, and others.

[1] David Shea Teeple, a specialist in atomic matters and consultant to industry and government, first called attention to the dangers of America's civilian atomic program in "Nuclear Nonsense," an article appearing in Human Events for Feb. 11, 1956.

The total amount of waste material on hand can only be estimated, but certainly it exceeds 150 million gallons. Storage tanks at present have cost over $200 million with an annual upkeep of at least $10 million. AEC figures indicate that, if we proceed at the present rate, by the year 2000 (just 40 years away) we will have between 40 million and 50 million gallons annually to deal with. (These figures do not include the Soviet Union, Great Britain, France, Canada, or others now engaged in reactor operation.)

If this material should escape its container vessel and reach the environment in which we live, contamination would be serious. This can occur by the rupture of a tank either as a result of corrosion, a disturbance of the elements (earthquake), or induced sabotage. It also could easily occur while the material was being transported from the reactor site to the chemical processing plant or from the processing plant to the storage site.

In the first instance—from the reactor to the chemical plant—most of the material would be in solid form and would be far less of a hazard. From the plant to the storage site it would be in liquid form and would constitute a cargo with more potential danger than any ever transported by man. The same hazard would apply in the instance of those reactors (known as homogeneous) which produce liquid wastes.

At this point one might well ask if the Government is not aware of these conditions and is not controlling shipments in such a way as to protect the public interest. Unfortunately, the answer is "no." In the first place, the AEC has assumed the responsibility for all radioactive wastes produced in Government and civilian powerplants. At the present time, no Government agency outside itself regulates shipments made by the AEC. And no State has a comprehensive statute to cover the situation. As one prominent scientist stated in a recent seminar: "The AEC can get away with a lot of things that private corporations could not."

Dedicated geologists, geophysicists, and health physics experts are hard at work attempting to find satisfactory solutions for the problem of waste storage. They are investigating the possibility of fixing these materials in inert matter such as ceramics, plastics, glass, and special cements. They are experimenting with various separation processes to remove the most hazardous elements and they are seeking adequate reliable safe storage sites for these dangerous liquids. They are fully aware of the nature of the problem and are utilizing every resource at their disposal in an attempt to find answers.

At the present time no satisfactory answer is in sight. If it is to be found it will only be by the efforts of this unglamorous band of men who are cognizant that in the final analysis the work which they are doing may be the most important in the whole atomic energy project. They are the unsung heroes in this struggle between man and the atom.

Research to date on waste storage, while not providing an overall solution, has given us certain indisputable facts. They are: (1) Chemical processing plants should be located adjacent to storage sites, (2) reactors, insofar as possible, should be close to storage sites, (3) because of geological factors certain areas of the country are not suitable for waste storage and no atomic plants should be located therein, (4) the production of waste materials should be minimized as much as possible until such a time as solutions are found for storage, (5) research and experimentation on waste separation and storage should be pursued on a scale far exceeding the present operation, (6) the primary criteria for the location of atomic plants should be the question of the feasibility of waste storage at the site.

Those who are determined to get the Government into the production of power for civilian uses and thereby use the atom as a force for socialism proceed merrily ahead without any regard for the points cited above. Their present plans are for the United States to launch a program of civilian power reactors all over the country, at a cost of about a billion dollars in the next 5 to 7 years.

In no instance has the question of waste storage been among the criteria used for location. No scientists, for example, would have had the audacity to locate the Shippingport reactor in the Pittsburgh area; waste material cannot be stored there, but must be shipped, thus increasing the hazard. For the same reason no person in his right mind would have built the gigantic Savannah River plant at Aiken, S.C.; but political persuasion prevailed.

Knowing what we now know about this problem of radioactive waste, we would never locate the great plants of Oak Ridge and Hanford on the great watersheds they now occupy.

Who can justify the location of the Lagoona Beach reactor adjacent to Detroit? Professor Gomburg, of Michigan, has warned us that if this ever melts down it could kill 145,000 people. Who wishes to defend the reactor at Hallam, Nebr.? (Nebraska has the largest underground waters in America.)

We must realize that there are certain great corporations who make money out of the construction of these economic monstrosities and who have powerful political lobbies which push some of these deals through. Also, certain States—including New Mexico, which is represented by Senator CLINTON ANDERSON, chairman of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy—reap a harvest of hundreds of millions of dollars a year from our atomic activities.

The time has come to call a halt. The advice and counsel of our men of science must be heeded. The public interest must be protected. The hucksters must be stopped, be it by injunction or by State regulation of those matters which concern the health of our people. The AEC, producer and shipper of the wastes, should not be allowed to monitor its own activities. This is a public health function.

We have an ample supply of electric power in the United States. As a matter of fact, if there should be any shortage, it could be traced to the Atomic Energy Commission, which, is now using over 15 percent of the total installed electrical capacity of the United States annually.

Even the most ardent advocates of the socialistic atomic power program do not deny that our fossil fuels will last us for a century. The power bill which the American consumer pays is the last thing which worries the collectivists. Atomic power is 10 times as expensive and hazardous and its backers are using it to promote socialism.

No other factor more clearly exposes the fraudulent claims for atomic power costs than the question of waste storage. If the costs of such storage were borne by the operators of atomic power plants instead of by the Government (as they should be in any honest project), the rate per kilowatt for atomic power would zoom out of sight. Furthermore, these costs are permanent and ever-increasing. We are still paying to store the wastes from materials used 15 years ago.

It is time, therefore, that the people of this country took a hand in the matter and demanded that this technology be developed in such a way that it may be of service to man, and not an instrument for his destruction.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is concluded.

ADDITIONAL FEDERAL REVENUES TO PROTECT FREE WORLD AND AVOID GOVERNMENTAL DEFICITS

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, today I make my contribution to the national discussion over the budget and fiscal matters.

I have every faith that the American people will respond to this appeal with their customary courage, responsibility, and maturity.

I am introducing four bills to increase the revenues of the Federal Government.

These bills are as follows:

First, a bill to increase temporarily the Federal highway fuel taxes by 1½ cents a gallon on gasoline, diesel fuel, and special fuels. It would raise approximately $724 million in additional revenues in fiscal year 1960.

Second, a bill to lower the special depletion allowance for oil and gas companies from 27½ percent to 15 percent. It would raise approximately $325 million in additional revenues annually.

Third, a bill to allow the Post Office Department to set postal rates based on due consideration of cost of both public and nonpublic services. Under the postal policy established by Congress in 1958, this measure would enable the Department to raise approximately $350 million in additional revenues in fiscal year 1960.

Fourth, a bill to reinstate the excess profits tax of 1950. While this bill is not so susceptible to an accurate ascertainment of revenues, it produced $1.6 billion in 1953, the last year of operation.

NO EASY PATH TO FOLLOW

Mr. President, this is not an easy program. It holds out no illusions that the way ahead is strewn with rose petals. It asks sacrifices of the high, the low, and the in-between. It recognizes the grim fact that we are engaged in a cold war with a mighty colossus, the Soviet Union, and that the survival of the free world may depend upon our capacity for sacrifice and unselfish service.

Actually, two of the bills I have introduced are necessary to balance even the shaky budget sent to us by President Eisenhower. These are the measures to increase highway fuel taxes and to provide for some form of raising postage rates. I have added two others which will ask big business and big corporations to share the additional load that has been proposed by the White House.

Mr. President, action on these revenue measures which I submit today cannot constitutionally be initiated by the Senate. I present them in the hope that they will stimulate congressional and public interest and discussion of the revenue policies of the Federal Government. The House, of course, has a constitutional duty to originate all revenue legislation.

I have been a Member of the Senate only 4 years, since early in 1955. During that time I have observed that it is far easier to vote for appropriations and spending than to support proposals for bringing money into the Treasury. Perhaps that is one reason why the Federal debt is so huge today that the second largest item in the budget—outranked only by national defense expenditures—is that providing for debt service charges.

Surely nobody can say to the people of this country that tax reduction lies ahead, at a time when the leaders of our Armed Forces have asked for between $10 billion and $20 billion more than is included for the military in the President's $77 billion budget. What if these people are correct? What if our defense is inadequate even with the huge sums included in the budget? Can we rest our heads on our pillows contentedly as the Berlin crisis approaches ever nearer?

UNITED STATES MUST PREPARE FOR FUTURE

I am offering these bills today because I believe the time has come when we must confront the long-range implications of the need to pay for the governmental services made essential by the urgency of the 20th century. Like the British a decade and a half ago, we must be prepared for blood, sweat, toil and tears. And if we are thus prepared, the future may not be so jolting or disturbing when it actually arrives.

I have in mind the successful candidate for Governor of my State in the recent 1958 elections. He glibly promised the voters lower taxes and a smaller budget. These promises proved impossible from the time he took the oath of office, and disillusionment has steadily set in. Both he and our State would have been benefited if he had candidly told the voters that increasing numbers of school children and college students made lower taxes and smaller budgets in Oregon out of the question.

I have great respect for the intelligence of the average citizen. I think he would rather be told the truth than a palpable falsehood. For example, I doubt if there are very many motorists who think the Federal Government can go on putting up 90 percent of the cost of the impressive new four-lane Interstate express highways without raising Federal taxes on motor fuels to cover increased costs of this program. Yet today 29 State Governors have announced their opposition to any increase in the Federal gasoline tax. Only last year 47 State Governors informed the Senate Public Works Committee that it would be tragic to extend the Interstate construction program beyond completion date authorized in 1956 and urged completion in accordance with the original schedule.

Some may claim that it is not the path of true liberalism to suggest that revenues be collected in order to pay for governmental benefits. I challenge such a contention.

FDR SOUGHT TAX INCREASES

During the ordeal of World War II, President Franklin D. Roosevelt suggested repeatedly to Congress that taxes be increased so the burden would not be so completely shoved off on future generations. He proposed a $25,000 ceiling on incomes of those at home while men were perishing at the front for $2 a day. Congress rejected his proposal. Congress passed over President Roosevelt's veto a tax bill which he regarded as utterly inadequate to pay for the great burden of history's most terrible war.

In 1947 and 1948 we all recall the unwise and premature tax reductions enacted by the 80th Congress, during a period of great national prosperity and a huge national debt. President Harry S. Truman, then in the White House, vetoed these tax reductions. Congress passed them, nevertheless, over the President's veto. But in November of 1948 the American people sustained President Truman rather than the 80th Congress.

The American people are mature, they are wise, they are very knowing. They realize that defending ourselves against the Russians, building four-lane superhighways and conserving our natural resources are things which cost money. They will not be fooled for long by any politician who claims it is possible to do these things and not to collect, eventually, the funds to finance such undertakings.

One of the real challenges today is to tell the American people the truth about the sacrifices ahead—if we are to defend the free world and to live up to our obligations with respect to schools, resources, health, and other essentials.

If the people are told the truth, they will respond affirmatively. In our State last year, I explained that new Post Office buildings and decent wages for postal employees necessitated higher postage rates when the Post Office Department was running a $700 million annual deficit. Despite the political attacks made upon me, I found that the electorate realized the facts of the case very discerningly.

TAXES PRICES OF PROGRESS

Not a day passes but what my mail from Oregon is heavy with demands for Federal funds for schools, dams, harbor improvements, National Forest roads, and trails, Post Office buildings, historic shrines, four-lane highways and fish and wildlife conservation. Most requests are for legitimate and needed expenditures. But the price must be paid. We must face up to the need for collecting revenues to pay for good works. That is the reason for the bills I am offering today.

Mr. President, one of our great political leaders, Thomas Jefferson, said long ago that each generation had to make its own fight for liberty. It is folly to presume that our fight will be any less costly and sacrificial than those which have occurred before.

Today we confront, in the Soviet Union, a vast and mighty nation—disciplined, bulging with natural resources, dedicated to the world advancement of a monolithic Communist state. Russia has 2½ times the area of our own land. I should like to emphasize that this is 2½ times the area of all 49 States, including the vast new State of Alaska, which is represented in part by the distinguished senior Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT], who is presiding over the Senate at this time.

Russia embraces 200 million people. Russian schools and colleges claim a larger share of Russia's national income than do our schools and colleges. We lead Russia by far in the number of automobiles, but Russia produces more missiles, more medical doctors, more huge power dams each year. At our present pace, we will have the finest tailfins on cars but will Russia be first to the moon?

Can we be the bulwark of the free world—militarily, economically, and culturally—and yet not tax ourselves to finance this great responsibility? I doubt it, Mr. President. Is there a thinking American anywhere, regardless of political party, who believes our rivalry with the Soviet Union can be carried on successfully without tapping his pocketbook? Who can hide his head under the covers that much?

Mr. President, I should like to discuss briefly the four tax measures which I commend to the Senate today.

HIGHWAY PROGRAM FACES HALT

Mr. President, unless Congress takes action during the current session, the highway program initiated in 1956 stands in danger of coming to a standstill. During the last Congress, we passed special stopgap legislation to cover increased costs and to insure that the program continue as nearly on schedule as possible. But the administration has indicated that there will be a deficit in the highway trust fund of $241 million by the end of fiscal year 1960 and a staggering $2.2 billion shortage by the end of fiscal 1962 if corrective measures are not taken immediately.

In considering this program, Congress might employ one of several alternative approaches. It might first increase general fund revenues to meet the bill for roads; second, extend the period over which the program will be completed; third, incur additional public debt; or fourth, increase highway fuel taxes temporarily. I favor the latter course.

If the increased costs of the highway program were paid for out of general revenue, the bulk of the burden would undoubtedly be borne by lower income taxpayers. Of moneys in the general fund, over one-half comes from individual income tax receipts. More than 60 percent of these taxes are collected from persons or family units with a taxable income of $4,000 a year or less. Furthermore, in an era when administered prices are commonplace in many markets, it is to be expected that the impact and the incidence of other Federal taxes, such as the corporate income tax and excise taxes, will not be identical. Sellers will be able to shift the tax until the ultimate burden falls on the consumer. Incidentally, President Eisenhower has called for this increase in the motor fuels tax.

I ask unanimous consent that my bill to increase highway fuel taxes by 1½ cents for a 4-year period be included in the RECORD at this point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1293) to provide a temporary 1½-cent increase in the tax on gasoline and the tax on diesel fuel and special motor fuels used in highway vehicles, introduced by Mr. NEUBERGER, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Finance, and

ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 4081(a)(1) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to tax on gasoline) is amended by striking out "a tax of three cents a gallon." and inserting in lieu thereof the following "a tax of—

"(1) 3 cents a gallon, in the case of gasoline so sold before July 1, 1959, or on or after July 1, 1964, or

"(2) 4½ cents a gallon, in the case of gasoline so sold on or after July 1, 1959, and before July 1, 1964."

SEC. 2. (a) Section 4041 (a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to tax on diesel fuel) is amended—

(1) by inserting after the first sentence thereof the following new sentence:

"In the case of any such liquid so sold or used on or after July 1, 1959, and before July 1, 1964, the tax shall be 4½ cents a gallon, in lieu of 3 cents a gallon.";

(2) by inserting after "3 cents a gallon" in the third sentence of such section (as amended by paragraph (1))", or 4½ cents a gallon, whichever is applicable"; and

(3) by inserting after "one cent a gallon" in the fourth sentence "or 2½ cents a gallon, whichever is applicable.".

(b) Section 4041(b) of such Code (relating to tax on special motor fuels) is amended—

(1) by inserting after the first sentence thereof the following new sentence:

"In the case of a liquid taxable under this subsection so sold or used on or after July 1, 1959, and before July 1, 1964, the tax shall be 4½ cents a gallon, in lieu of 3 cents a gallon.";

(2) by inserting after "3 cents a gallon" in the third sentence of such section (as amended by paragraph (1)) ", or 4½ cents a gallon, whichever is applicable"; and

(3) by inserting after "1 cent a gallon" in the fourth sentence "or 2½ cents a gallon, whichever is applicable,".

(c) Section 4041(c)(2) of such Code (relating to rate reduction in 1972) is amended by striking out "second and third sentences" and inserting in lieu thereof "third and fourth sentences".

SEC. 3. (a) Section 4226(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to floor stocks taxes) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(5) 1959 tax on gasoline.—On gasoline subject to tax under section 4081 which, on July 1, 1959, is held by a dealer for sale, there is hereby imposed a floor stocks tax at the rate of 1½ cents a gallon. The tax imposed by this paragraph shall not apply to gasoline in retail stocks held at the place where intended to be sold at retail, nor to gasoline held for sale by a producer or importer of gasoline."

(b) Section 4226(d) of such Code (relating to due date of floor stocks taxes) is amended to read as follows:

"(d) Due Date of Taxes.—The taxes imposed by subsection (a) (other than by paragraph (5) of such subsection) shall be paid at such time after September 30, 1956, as may be prescribed by the Secretary or his delegate. The tax imposed by paragraph (5) of subsection (a) shall be paid at such time after September 30, 1959, as may be prescribed by the Secretary or his delegate."

SEC. 4. Section 6412 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to floor stocks refunds) is amended by redesignating subsection (e) as (f), and by inserting after subsection (d) the following new subsection:

"(e) 1964 Floor Stocks Refunds on Gasoline.—Where before July 1, 1964, gasoline subject to the tax imposed by section 4081 has been sold by the producer or importer and on such date is held by a dealer and is intended for sale, there shall be credited or refunded (without interest) to the producer or importer an amount equal to the difference between the tax paid by such producer or importer on his sale of the gasoline and the amount of tax made applicable to such gasoline on and after July 1, 1964, if claim for such credit or refund is filed with the Secretary or his delegate on or before November 10, 1964, based upon a request submitted to the producer or importer before October 1, 1964, by the dealer who held the gasoline in respect of which the credit or refund is claimed, and, on or before November 10, 1964, reimbursement has been made to such dealer by such producer or importer for the tax reduction on such gasoline or written consent has been obtained from such dealer to allowance of such credit or refund. No credit or refund shall be allowable under this paragraph with respect to gasoline in retail stocks held at the place or intended to be sold at retail, nor with respect to gasoline held for sale by a producer or importer of gasoline."

SEC. 5. Section 6416(b)(2) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to special cases in which tax payments considered overpayments) is amended—

(1) by inserting after "3 cents" in subparagraphs (H), (I), and (J) "or 4½ cents"; and

(2) by inserting after "1 cent" in subparagraphs (H), (I), and (J) "or 2½ cents, whichever is applicable,".

SEC. 6. Section 6421 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to gasoline used for certain nonhighway purposes or by local transit systems) is amended—

(1) by inserting after "1 cent" in subsections (a) and (b)(1) "or 2½ cents, whichever is applicable"; and

(2) by redesignating subsection (i) as (j), and by inserting after subsection (h) the following new subsection:

"(i) Gasoline purchased after June 30, 1959, and before July 1, 1964.—In the case of gasoline purchased after June 30, 1959, and before July 1, 1964, the applicable amount under subsections (a) and (b)(1) shall be 2½ cents for each gallon of gasoline."

SEC. 7. Section 209 (f) of the Highway Revenue Act of 1956 (relating to expenditures from trust fund) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(5) 1964 Floor Stocks Refunds.—The Secretary of the Treasury shall pay from time to time from the Trust Fund into the general funds of the Treasury amounts equivalent to 100 percent of the refunds made under section 6412(e) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 in respect of gasoline subject to tax under section 4081 of such Code."

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, the Senate Public Works Committee has issued a report indicating that the 65 million cars in operation as of 1957 will soar to 100 million vehicles by 1975. Can we ignore the pressing need for better highways? Can we rationally refuse to support an assessment which will cost the average motorist less than 19 cents a week to supply these necessary roads?

Mr. President, I introduce at this time a proposal for reduction of the percentage depletion allowance on oil and gas wells from 27½ percent to 15 percent, and ask that the bill be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1294) to reduce the rate of percentage depletion for oil and gas wells from 27½ percent to 15 percent, introduced by Mr. NEUBERGER, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) section 613(b)(1) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to percentage depletion rate for oil and gas wells) is amended by striking out "27½ percent" and inserting in lieu thereof "15 percent".

(b) The amendment made by subsection (a) shall apply with respect to taxable years beginning after the date of the enactment of this Act.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I claim no originality of legislative thought in introducing this bill. Although during my career in the Senate I have consistently supported efforts to reduce this allowance and thus narrow a gaping tax loophole, I have been a follower rather than a leader. The senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the senior Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS], the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the junior Senator from Colorado [Mr. CARROLL], the junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE], and other able Senators played major roles in our attempt to rectify this inequity in the last Congress. My proposal is similar to corrective legislation again introduced this year by the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS].

DEPLETION ALLOWANCE INEQUITABLE

The inequities of the depletion allowance are well known. It permits a tax bonanza for the oil and gas industry. The rate has not been adjusted since 1926. Yet the maximum corporation income-tax rate is now nearly four times greater, thus tremendously increasing the value of the allowance. The deduction may continue year after year; it disregards original investment costs. It is in addition to other major tax advantages accorded the oil and gas industry.

The measure which I offer with respect to percent depletion allowance is comparatively mild. I am hopeful that increased public attention focused on this glaring tax loophole will result in affirmative action by the Senate on my proposal.

Mr. President, my proposal for charging the Post Office Department with responsibility for initiating postal rate changes is not novel. In past years a number of suggestions have been put forward for placing such authority in the hand of the Postmaster General, subject to certain limitations, or assigning this task to an independent commission. In 1931 the Senate approved an amendment which would have transferred the ratemaking function to the Interstate Commerce Commission. At the present time, the ICC possesses the power to determine rates on fourth class mail.

Under the provisions of the bill which I introduce today, the Postmaster General would be empowered to determine a fair and reasonable domestic postal rate structure, taking into account both the general and specific benefits which

accrue from operation of the postal system. Proposed changes would be published and public hearings held. Cost accounting methods would replace political logrolling.

The Postmaster General's suggestions for rate alterations would then be submitted to Congress for consideration. If Congress did not within 90 days pass a concurrent resolution stating that it did not favor the adjustment or modification recommended by the Postmaster General, the proposal would be submitted to the President of the United States and become effective if not disapproved by him within 10 days.

REVENUE ESTIMATED AT $350 MILLION

The Eisenhower administration has indicated that it will present to Congress later in this session a rate-increase proposal adequate to provide at least $350 million. It is estimated that the postal deficit in fiscal year 1960 will be $522 million.

My experience this past year in the bitter political battle over postage rates has convinced me that such an issue should not be determined by partisan or personal politics.

Congress has no direct control over the rates at which the Bonneville Power Administration sells its kilowatts or over the cost of timber stumpage in the national forests or on O. & C. lands.

What if Senators were to be pressured, day after day, over the cost of a Bonneville kilowatt to a private utility or an aluminum plant? What if we were lobbied every week over the appraised value of a stand of white pine in the Fremont National Forest or over the value put on Douglas-fir in the Willamette National Forest? Yet, that is what happens when postal rates are at issue. That is why the rates charged by the Post Office Department have lagged so far behind costs, often to the detriment and sacrifice of the families of the men and women employed by the Post Office Department.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this bill, together with a section-by-section analysis, may be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill, together with the analysis, may be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1295) to provide for the equitable adjustment of postal rates, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. NEUBERGER, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

GENERAL STATEMENT

SEC. 101. The Congress recognizes that—

(1) adjustments from time to time of the domestic postal-rate structure are necessary and desirable in order that, to the extent consistent with the general public interest, postal revenues may be approximately equal to postal expenses; and

(2) it is necessary and desirable that provision be made whereby the domestic postal-rate structure may be revised promptly, as the need therefor arises, thus minimizing the impact of postal deficits on the Treasury of the United States.

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 102. For the purposes of this Act "domestic postal-rate structure" includes—

(1) postal rates applicable to the several classes of mail;

(2) zones, size and weight limits, and other conditions of mailability applicable to the several classes of mail.

DECLARATION OF POLICY

SEC. 103. It is hereby declared to be the policy of the Congress that (1) the American people are entitled to a postal system with the highest possible standards of tradition and service consistent with good business administration; (2) the inherent advantages of the postal service in the promotion of social, commercial, and intellectual intercourse among the people of the United States be maintained; (3) the domestic postal-rate structure be revised promptly from time to time so as to reflect reasonable charges and other conditions of mailability applicable to the several classes of mail; and (4) the revenues of the postal service shall be sufficient to insure that the postal deficit shall not exceed an amount greater than that determined to reflect the general benefits to the public accruing from operation of the postal system.

SEC. 104. (a) The Postmaster General is authorized, empowered, and directed to determine from time to time a fair and reasonable domestic postal-rate structure.

(b) In the exercise of his authority to determine a fair and reasonable domestic postal-rate structure, the Postmaster General shall give due consideration to—

(1) the preservation of the inherent advantages of the postal service in the promotion of social, cultural, intellectual, and commercial intercourse among the people of the United States;

(2) the development and maintenance of a postal service adapted to the present needs, and adaptable to the future needs, of the people of the United States;

(3) the promotion of adequate, economic, and efficient postal service at reasonable and equitable postal rates;

(4) the effect of postal services and the impact of postal rates on users of the mails;

(5) the requirements of the postal establishment with respect to the manner and form of preparation and presentation of mailings by the users of the various classes of mail;

(6) the value of mail;

(7) the value of service rendered in terms of priority, secrecy, security, speed of transmission, and other factors; and

(8) the value of time of delivery of mail.

SEC. 105. When the Postmaster General finds on experience that changes, adjustments, or modifications are necessary in the domestic postal-rate structure to meet any of the standards or requirements prescribed in this Act, he shall—

(1) promptly publish in the Federal Register a notice setting forth his findings and the proposed changes, adjustments or modifications in the domestic postal-rate structure based thereon; and

(2) under regulations prescribed by him, afford opportunity to all interested persons to present views, data and arguments, either orally or in writing, with respect to the proposed changes on a date which shall be not less than 30 days after publication of the proposed changes in the Federal Register.

SEC. 106. (a) After consideration of all relevant matter presented, the Postmaster General shall submit to the Congress a report which shall contain (1) a statement of his findings with respect to the necessity or advisability of making changes, adjustments, or modifications in the postal-rate structure, and (2) his proposals, prepared with due regard for the legislative forms and procedures of the Congress, for such changes, adjustments or modifications.

(b) If, in the case of any proposal for a change, adjustment, or modification in the postal-rate structure submitted by the Postmaster General to the Congress as provided in subsection (a) of this section, the Congress does not, prior to 90 days after the filing thereof, pass a concurrent resolution stating that it does not favor such change, adjustment, or modification, the proposal shall forthwith be submitted to the President and shall become effective on the first day of the first month beginning more than 90 days after the filing of the report if not disapproved by him within ten days (Sundays excepted) after it shall have been presented to him.

SEC. 107. (a) The provisions of this section are enacted by the Congress—

(1) as an exercise of the rulemaking power of the Senate and the House of Representatives, respectively, and as such they shall be considered as part of the rules of each House, respectively, and such rules shall supersede other rules only to the extent that they are inconsistent therewith; and

(2) with full recognition of the constitutional right of either House to change such rules (so far as relating to the procedure in such House) at any time, in the same manner and to the same extent as in the case of any other rule of such House.

(b) As used in this section, the term "resolution" means only a concurrent resolution of the two Houses of Congress which states in substance that the Congress does, or does not, favor such proposal of the Postmaster General for a change, adjustment, or modification in the postal-rate structure.

(c) A resolution shall be referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service of the Senate or the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service of the House of Representatives, as the case may be, and may be reported at any time prior to 60 days after the filing of the report.

(d)(1) When a resolution has been reported, it shall at any time thereafter be in order (even though a previous motion to the same effect has been disagreed to) to move to proceed to the consideration of such resolution. Such motion shall be highly privileged and shall not be debatable. No amendment to such motion shall be in order and it shall not be in order to move to reconsider the vote by which such motion is agreed to or disagreed to;

(2) Debate on the resolution shall be limited to not to exceed four hours, which shall be equally divided between those favoring and those opposing the resolution. A motion further to limit debate shall not be debatable. No amendment to, or motion to recommit, the resolution shall be in order, and it shall not be in order to move to reconsider the vote by which the resolution is agreed to or disagreed to;

(3) All motions to postpone consideration of a resolution, and all motions to proceed to the consideration of other business, shall be decided without debate; and

(4) All appeals from the decisions of the Chair relating to the application of the rules of the Senate or the House of Representatives, as the case may be, to the procedure relating to a resolution shall be decided without debate.

(e) If, prior to the passage by one House of a resolution of that House with respect to a proposal of the Postmaster General, such House receives from the other House a resolution with respect to the same proposal, then—

(1) if no resolution of the first House with respect to such proposal has been referred to committee, no other resolution with respect to the same proposal may be reported; and

(2) if a resolution of the first House with respect to such proposal has been referred to committee—

(A) the procedure with respect to that or other resolutions of such House with respect to such proposal which have been referred to committee shall be the same as if no resolution from the other House with respect to such proposal had been received; but

(B) on any vote on final passage of a resolution of the first House with respect to such proposal the resolution from the other House with respect to such proposal shall be automatically substituted for the resolution of the first House.

The analysis presented by Mr. NEUBERGER is as follows:

EXPLANATION OF BILL "TO PROVIDE FOR ADJUSTMENT OF POSTAL RATES, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES"

Section 101 of the bill contains a general statement of the Congress which recognizes the need for the provision of postage rates which will, to the extent consistent with the general public interest, produce postal revenues approximately equal to postal expenses and the necessity for the establishment of a simplified means of adjusting postal rates as the need arises.

Section 102 defines "domestic postal-rate structure" as including all postage rates applicable to all classes of mail and the zones, size and weight limits and other conditions of mailability. Under this section and the remaining sections of the bill, the Postmaster General would not seek approval of the Interstate Commerce Commission for changes in the rate structure for parcel post. Rather, he would determine the rates he thinks proper, as he does now, and submit those rates to the Congress. If the Congress does not reject the proposals (see sec. 106(b)), his proposals will become final, if not disapproved by the President.

Section 103. This section contains the congressional policy with respect to postal rates. It provides in short that the American people are entitled to a postal system of the highest possible standards of tradition and service consistent with good business administration; that the inherent advantages of the postal service in the promotion of social, commercial, and intellectual intercourse must be maintained; that the postal rate structure must be revised promptly so as to reflect reasonable charges for the several classes of mail; that the revenues of the Department shall be such as to insure that the postal deficit will not exceed an amount greater than that determined to reflect the general benefits to the public accruing from operation of the postal system.

Section 104. This section authorizes and directs the Postmaster General from time to time to determine a reasonable postal rate structure. It provides standards under which he will make his determinations. For example, it commands him to consider, among other things, the need for the preservation of the advantages of the postal service in the promotion of the social, cultural, intellectual and commercial intercourse among our people; the promotion of an adequate, economic, and efficient postal service at reasonable and equitable rates; the impact of postal rates on users of the mail; the requirements imposed by the postal service with respect to the manner and form of presentation of mailings by users of the mails; the value of mail and the value of service rendered in terms of priority, secrecy, security, and time of delivery.

Section 105. This section will require the Postmaster General upon his determination that there is need for readjustment of the rate structure to publish his findings and his proposed changes in the Federal Register. It further requires that he afford opportunity to all interested persons to present either orally or in writing their views and arguments with respect to the proposals.

Section 106. This section will require the Postmaster General to consider all relevant matter presented to him and then to file with the Congress a statement of his findings with respect to the necessity or advisability of making rate adjustments and his specific proposals for such adjustments. This section further establishes a procedure similar to that established for reorganization plans. Under the procedure, the rates proposed by the Postmaster General will become final unless (1) prior to 90 days after the filing, the Congress passes a concurrent resolution stating it does not favor the changes, or (2) in the event the Congress does not pass this resolution, the President withholds his approval.

Section 107 establishes the reorganization plan procedure to be observed by the Congress under the bill.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, in this age of the nuclear threat, we know that war cannot benefit anyone, whether he be on the winning side or the losing. But if there is no one who benefits from war, there are still those who profit from armed peace.

Mr. President, in this age of the nuclear threat, we know that war cannot benefit anyone, whether he be on the winning side or the losing. But if there is no one who benefits from war, there are still those who profit from armed peace.

The last year of World War II spending was fiscal year 1946. In fiscal 1947 our national expenditures on military security, which include atomic energy and military foreign aid, were $14.6 billion, about 6 percent of the gross national product. In fiscal 1948 they were $12.3 billion, in 1949 they were $15 billion, and in 1950 they were $14 billion. In other words, in the 4 years of the Truman administration prior to the Communist attack in Korea, our defense expenditures averaged about $14 billion annually. This was approximately 5 percent of our national product, which during these same years expanded by $50 billion.

DEFENSE COSTS REMAIN HIGH

In fiscal 1952, at the height of the Korean war, we spent on defense $42 billion. Since that time annual defense expenditures have not fallen below $40 billion. There is no reason to believe that we may be able significantly to reduce these expenses in the foreseeable future if we are to fulfill our responsibilities as a world leader.

The administration's budget for fiscal year 1960 calls for the expenditure of $45.8 billion for major national security. This sum represents nearly 60 percent of all budget expenditures and almost 10 percent of the predicted gross national product for the calendar year 1959. While it would be foolish to deny that there are important secondary benefits involved, it is, nevertheless, true that the principal beneficiaries are those who own or operate firms engaged in producing defense items.

A story in the Washington Post and Times Herald of Tuesday, March 3, 1959, reported that the net income of Aerojet-General Corp., a subsidiary of General Tire & Rubber Co. and the largest solid-propellant rocket-fuel producer in the United States, rose to $6,028,000 for the fiscal year ended November 30, 1958, compared with $3,818,000 in the previous year—an increase in earnings of over 56 percent. According to the Sunday New York Times of March 1, 1959, stock in General Tire reached a 1958–59 high, some 207 percent above its low, while stock in Thiokol Chemical, next in size in this field, realized a gain of some 230 percent. The Times reported that Thiokol's sales in 1957 were $30,947,457 and estimated 1958 sales at more than $80 million—over 2½ times greater.

Yet in the same issue of the Post to which I referred, there appeared an article citing a tabulation by the First National City Bank of New York of earnings reports issued by 2,219 corporations which showed aggregate net income in 1958 down 12 percent from 1957. But this effect of the recession was little felt in many defense-related firms. Weapons soared while other corporations often suffered.

ARMAMENT BOOM BENEFITS SELECTIVE

Massive profit from defense business is, of course, not restricted to missile fuel manufacturers. Aircraft, automotive, petroleum, and other industries have gained from the armament boom.

Mr. President, I want it clearly understood that I do not challenge the need for large defense expenditures. I have supported appropriations believed to be necessary for our security in the past, and I shall continue to do so. As I indicated previously, it is possible that we are not allocating enough of our resources for the protection of the United States and fulfillment of our obligations to the free world. But I think that it is time that we recognized the financial impact of these expenditures on corporate profits. When we contemplate the incredible complexity of modern defense technology, we realize that large defense budgets are here to stay. Yet, I do not believe that we should automatically condone the type of limited prosperity which they imply.

Taxation of unreasonable, windfall profits resulting from certain defense and economic necessities facing our Government is a complex and difficult realm of policy. We have accumulated years of experience over the past decade and a half with techniques, programs, and devices in the field. I do not pose as an expert in this area. Accordingly, I am not today presenting original legislative proposals for excess profits taxation. The bill which I am introducing is one whose text and provisions previously have won the approval of the Senate.

My bill to reimpose the excess-profits tax does not attempt to redraft all of the technical and complex provisions of that law, as we last knew it. Perhaps some of these provisions would need to be redrafted in the light of changed conditions. This could easily be done by the Treasury Department and by the congressional committees which deal with taxation, if the basic decision should be made to reimpose an excess-profits tax.

PURPOSE PUBLIC DISCUSSION

For the sake of directing attention and study to the question of this basic decision, however, my bill simply proposes to reimpose the excess-profits tax of the 1950 act for the taxable years ending after June 30, 1959, and beginning before July 1, 1961. Such amendments as are incorporated in my very brief bill itself are merely intended to bring that earlier excess-profits tax act up to date by changing from provisions of the Internal Revenue Code of 1939 to the provisions of the new Internal Revenue Code of 1954, and by moving up the governing dates accordingly.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of this bill be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1296) to reimpose the Excess Profits Tax Act of 1950 effective for taxable years ending after June 30, 1959, and beginning before July 1, 1961, introduced by Mr. NEUBERGER, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, notwithstanding any contrary provision of the Internal Revenue Code of 1939 or the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, subchapter D of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1939 shall apply to taxable years ending after June 30, 1959, and beginning before July 1, 1961.

SEC. 2. Effective with respect to taxable years ending after June 30, 1959, and beginning before July 1, 1961, subpart A of part III of subchapter N of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to foreign tax credit) and chapter 6 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to consolidated returns) are amended so as to include the provisions of the amendments to the Internal Revenue Code of 1939 made by section 302 of the Excess Profits Tax Act of 1950 and by section 301 of such Act insofar as it relates to subchapter D of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1939.

SEC. 3. In applying the provisions of subchapter D of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1939 to taxable years ending after June 30, 1959, and beginning before July 1, 1961—

(1) Any reference in such subchapter to any provision or term of the Internal Revenue Code of 1939 (other than to a provision within such subchapter) shall refer to the corresponding provision or term of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954;

(2) The dates 1946, 1947, 1948, 1949, 1950, 1951, 1952, and 1953 wherever used in such subchapter shall refer to 1954, 1955, 1956, 1957, 1958, 1959, 1960, and 1961, respectively; and

(3) The provisions of subtitle F of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to procedure and administration), other than subparagraphs (A) and (B) of section 7851(a)(6), shall apply with respect to the tax imposed by such subchapter.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I do not suggest that the proposals which I have advanced this afternoon are by any means the only revenue sources suitable for congressional exploration. The junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE] pointed out on Monday that a special audit by the Internal Revenue Service has indicated that the Federal Government is losing $2.6 billion annually due to tax evasion in connection with the income tax. The Senator announced at that time that he was writing to the IRS to determine precisely what percentage of income tax returns are audited, the cost of auditing, recoveries traceable to tax auditing, and the additional revenue that may be derived from performing a more detailed audit. I look forward to his report, and hope that it will result in affirmative action by the Congress.

Likewise, I believe that we should examine carefully the tax on capital gains, various excises, and tax treatment of different groups and individuals on the basis of special distinctions.

Mr. President, I do not wish to have it thought that because of my advocacy of the four tax proposals which I have just discussed that I have become a victim of the balanced-budget fetish.

I do not believe that there is anything sacrosanct about any item now in the President's budget. Nor do I believe that a program outside the President's arbitrary framework is untouchable. The administration has created a mythical balanced budget which was achieved on paper a year and half before it was possible to actually balance the books—and with heavy reliance on revenue measures not yet law, for example, the motor-fuels tax increase.

Mr. President, I wish to emphasize the point that even the present budget, which has been sent to Congress by the White House, for $77 billion, cannot be regarded as balanced unless Congress increases motor fuel taxes and increases postal rates. Two of the bills which I have introduced today are intended to accomplish that purpose. Therefore, I believe it is wise that Members of the Senate recognize the basic, unassailable fact that we are not talking about a balanced budget of even $77 billion unless two of the revenue measures which I have introduced here are enacted into law.

The fundamental purpose of the budget is to weigh "opportunity costs," the price of giving up one thing so as to do something deemed of greater importance, the division of resources between the public and the private sectors of the economy, between competing programs within the budgetary framework.

The fact that a particular program has accumulated a hoary tradition of congressional support is no argument in itself for its continued Federal backing. The budgetary procedure is one of review and allocation. It should not be stultified by habit or pressure.

Nor do I wish to leave the impression that concern with the questions of inflation or deficit spending has caused me to lose sight of the problems of full employment and maximum growth which face us today.

EMPLOYMENT, GROWTH GOALS VITAL

In this session, as in the past, I urge enactment of a broader housing program, liberalization of unemployment compensation, passage of a depressed areas bill to relieve those living in sections of chronic unemployment, increase and extension of the minimum wage law. I again support measures to provide Federal assistance to the States in classroom construction, extend Federal help offered airports, authorize construction of water control projects. All of these measures will have a beneficial effect on growth and employment and will tend to increase tax revenues and aid in solving problems of stagnation which have appeared in the "post-recession" economy.

But while I recognize these facts, I am disturbed by the continued reluctance to seek new revenue sources. Increasing concern is being shown as to placement of the public debt. There exists the possibility that debt monetization may increase through the commercial banking system more rapidly than economic growth, thus supplying a potential source of inflation.

Interest and service charges involved in bond financing add to the cost of the program to be implemented. These costs benefit directly only the lenders. Interest payments in fiscal year 1960 are estimated at $8,096 million. In fiscal year 1955 the figure was $6,438 million. In 5 years interest costs increased over 20 percent. Today interest payments represent 10.5 percent of total budget expenditures—more than we will spend on all the Federal functions of commerce and housing, natural resources, and labor and welfare.

Mr. President, that proportion of GNP represented by nondefense expenditures by the Federal Government has declined every year since fiscal year 1954 with the exception of 1958 when special stimulatory measures were taken to aid the economy in recovering from the recession. I believe that if we are to effectively provide the goods and services which our country needs, we must consider increasing that share of resources allocated to the public sector through taxation. As Oliver Wendell Holmes once said: "Taxes are what we pay for civilized society."

I share with Governor Nelson Rockefeller of New York the view that we should not shove off onto the backs of future generations our own burdens today. They will have plenty of problems of their own. Are we self-sacrificing enough to meet the test of the 20th century? This question is implicit in the revenue-raising measures I have introduced in the Senate this afternoon.

In his thoughtful syndicated column for March 5, Mr. Walter Lippmann has called for higher taxes in order to meet our ever-rising duties in our own land and in the world. This column appeared here in the Washington Post and Times-Herald and in the Oregonian of Portland, Oreg. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that it be printed in the RECORD with my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE STULTIFYING DOGMA

(By Walter Lippmann)

The President's budget is now a football in a political scrimmage. Both parties are pretending that they are struggling to bal-

ance the budget. In fact neither the administration nor the Congress shows any sign of being willing to vote the taxes which are absolutely essential if the budget is to be balanced.

As of now, both parties regard as untouchable the income tax rates which were fixed in 1954, the date of the Eisenhower reduction of taxes. The President's budget plan, if we accept some rather fancy calculations, can be brought into balance—but only if Congress will raise postal rates and increase the gasoline taxes. As Congress is certain to reject the new taxes, the official theory of the Democrats seems to be that they can balance the budget by cutting down on what the President has asked for in foreign aid.

Both parties have now worked themselves into a jam which, considering the state of the world, is not an inspiring thing to look at. The Republicans have gotten themselves into a position where they must save on spending for native American needs—such as education and public facilities, almost certainly also the national defense. But the Republicans, as the great savers, are implored by the President to spend abroad on foreign aid the sums they would like to spend here at home.

The Democrats on the other hand have worked themselves into the embarrassing position where they, the party of Wilson, Roosevelt, Truman, and Stevenson, are threatening to save on foreign aid in order to spend more at home.

Surely, there is something inherently absurd in a situation where the Republicans are the globalists and the Democrats are the isolationists. Could such a topsy-turvy situation have developed if politicians in both parties had not forgotten the realities of our national needs while they play politics with the budget and with taxes?

What has happened to all these earnest and patriotic men? They have become entangled in a dogma which few of the Members of Congress and none of the leaders in Washington have the courage to challenge. What is the dogma? Is it that the budget should be balanced? No. The budget should if possible be balanced, and if that is impossible, there should nevertheless be a serious attempt made to balance it.

The dogma which confuses the whole situation and the position of both parties is that the budget must be balanced without raising the income tax rates. The crux of the matter is the acceptance by both sets of political leaders of the dogma that the income tax rates of 1954 are sacrosanct.

Once that dogma is accepted, the budget cannot be balanced except by two equally unacceptable methods. One is to balance it by taxes on consumption. This is something that Congress will not now do. The other method is to balance the budget at the expense of our national defense and of our foreign policy, and of our internal public needs and development. This is something that the country cannot afford to do.

Here, having accepted the dogma about the 1954 income tax rates, we have locked ourselves in a room from which there is no decent exit.

What is in prospect now, unless there is a revival of national leadership at both ends of Pennsylvania Avenue, is, first, a budget which does not balance because Congress and the President between them will not produce the taxes necessary to balance it; second, a budget which does not support our national interests at home and abroad, and will, therefore, have to be supplemented in the near future by extraordinary appropriations.

While this is going on we shall have to pay the price of having neglected our national needs because we were too soft and too timid to tax ourselves enough.

STANDARDS OF FOREIGN LANGUAGE PROFICIENCY FOR THE FOREIGN SERVICE

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, last Monday I introduced for myself and the distinguished Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] a bill (S. 1243) dealing with foreign language proficiency standards and training for the Foreign Service of the United States. The bill also contains provisions designed to facilitate recruitment for the Foreign Service.

The United States has come of age in the past two decades. We have once and for all joined the world. America's detached and distant situation, as Washington called it in his Farewell Address, is gone like yesterday's snows. And gone with it is any possibility of following Washington's advice to steer clear of the foreign world.

Largely because of the recentness of our advent to the position we now occupy in the world, our country is in a comparatively immature stage in preparing its people for life as citizens of a leading international power. By and large American educational processes and family life are still inner directed relative to the rest of the world. There are, however, many developments in education which are turning our people more and more to an "outer directed" orientation vis-a-vis other nations and their people.

Let me mention a few:

In January 1948, Congress passed the U.S. Information and Educational Exchange—Smith-Mundt—Act, Public Law 80–402, which gave the Government permanent authority to engage in worldwide educational and cultural exchanges with the people of other countries. The semiannual reports of the Secretary of State and of the U.S. Advisory Commission on Educational Exchange contain a review of the manifold programs and activities under the act.

Last year marked the 10th year of educational exchanges under the world renowned Fulbright Act, Public Law 79–584.

The program of university contracts abroad for technical assistance, administered by the International Cooperation Administration, has been in operation under the Mutual Security Act since 1951.

Title VI of the National Defense Education Act of 1958, Public Law 85–864, established a program to further the teaching of modern foreign languages not generally taught in this country and to provide for studies necessary for a full understanding of the areas in which such languages are commonly used.

Several institutions in my State of Massachusetts are leaders in various fields of international studies. Among these are my own alma mater, Harvard University, which has a host of programs and activities at the undergraduate and graduate levels; the University of Massachusetts, which is participating in faculty-exchange programs in Japan and Venezuela under ICA and USIA, respectively; Tufts College and its Fletcher School of Diplomacy; Boston University, which has one of the Nation's leading African area studies programs; Massachusetts Institute of Technology and its Center for International Studies, which has done excellent work under contract to the Foreign Relations Committee; Clark University, a leader in the study of geography; Newton College of the Sacred Heart, Mount Holyoke; Radcliffe, Smith, and Wellesley Colleges with well-established international student-exchange programs; Brandeis University with its Wien international scholarship program, and its Mediterranean, Near Eastern, and Judaic studies; Amherst College with its Merrill Center for Economics at which international summer seminars on major economic problems are held.

Recently I have been corresponding with Father Vincent R. Dolbec, A.A., dean of the faculty of Assumption College, about its newly proposed summer institutes in Russian and French languages and culture. The school has a proud reputation for its foreign-studies effort.

Only a few days ago I conferred with Dr. Glenn A. Olds, president of Springfield College, and heard something of the promising new projects which he is planning there.

Plainly, more and more is being done in America in the development of programs of international education, research, and study, whose long-run effect will be felt throughout the fabric of our society in giving all our citizens an orientation consistent with the role in the world which our Nation must play. Similar influences stem from the continually expanding oversea operations of American business enterprises and the steadily increasing activities of our many nongovernmental, informal educational organizations.

However, we would be deluding ourselves if we failed to recognize that there is room for much more to be done. We are indeed fortunate that the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, the distinguished Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], recognizes this. The bill (S. 1205) which he filed on February 26, to amend the National Defense Education Act of 1958 to provide advanced training in foreign countries during summer vacation for teachers of foreign languages, is an imaginative and constructive proposal which deserves prompt and favorable consideration by the Congress.

The educational activities which are going on and which are being planned in America are but a small proportion of all that will have to be done before the vast majority of our citizens will be globally oriented; before our young people will come to regard an oversea career with the same interest and alacrity as they now view domestic careers. I commend to all Senators for study the hearing of the Foreign Relations Committee held February 18 at which Dean Harlan Cleveland, dean of the Maxwell Graduate School of Citizenship and Public Affairs, Syracuse University, and two of his associates discussed in most stimulating fashion the subject of the oversea Americans.

During the course of the hearing, Dean Cleveland made the following observations in talking about the urgency of

changing the attitudes of our citizens to make them more compatible with the role of our Nation in the world:

I am also painfully aware as an educator that there is a certain cycle in growing people, as there is in other forms of agriculture, and that if we have an outstanding personnel, oversea personnel service, including the Foreign Service and other forms of oversea civilian service in a generation, we will have to operate with the greatest urgency today in growing the kinds of people that will have to make up that service.

* * * * *

So the first thing is to put it on a long-range basis, and the second thing is to establish enough training and education programs around the country to begin to produce a real pool of qualified people.

I think there is much wisdom in these observations by Dean Cleveland. Perhaps their principal significance is their implication for the Foreign Service of the United States and our other governmental oversea operations, for they must recruit their personnel from the ranks of young men and women with the outlooks and qualifications which today's American education and family life impart to them. Until time and hard work have wrought the transformation in outlook and qualification of our citizens so as to create a real pool of first-rate oversea emissaries, it seems inevitable that there will have to be considerable orientation and language training of Americans who are to serve in our Government's oversea operations.

The principal center for such training within the Government is the Foreign Service Institute, which is doing a fine job in its crucial work.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in my remarks two interesting, recent magazine articles about the Foreign Service Institute.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Reader's Digest, February 1959]

OUR OVERSEAS TASK FORCE IN MUFTI

(By John Stuart Martin)

In a Japanese port, a brisk, Michigan-bred woman strides into a police station near the waterfront. She exchanges greetings with her good friend, the desk sergeant, and listens to what is troubling him this evening: Some American seamen have wrecked a tavern and have been locked up. Riding herd on such cases has long been one of this lady's specialties as a U.S. consul charged with matters maritime.

In New Delhi, India, a U.S. attaché who can read and speak Hindi pores over stacks of Blitz, a virulently anti-American journal. His task: To find out the editor's grievances and then try to clear up his misconceptions.

Somewhere in Southeast Asia, a U.S. consular official broadcasts a radio warning: "Attention, all American citizens. Attention. Call the U.S. consulate at once." With Red guerrillas approaching his area, he is preparing an emergency evacuation of American residents.

In the Foreign Service of the United States are about 4,500 such people, counting those on duty in State Department offices at home. Serving about 12 years abroad to 3 stateside, they staff 278 Foreign Service posts in 87 foreign lands.

Their duties are of two basic kinds: Diplomatic—maintaining friendly relations with foreign governments; and consular—protecting American lives, rights, trade, and property throughout the world. Ranging in rank from Ambassador down through minister to first, second, and third secretary, and from consul general to consul and vice consul, they are the unarmed custodians of our national honor and interest wherever our flag flies on a guest basis.

The instruments they use are mainly psychological and economic, ranging from money grants to cultural exchanges, from information and propaganda to farm aid. The job involves everything from making arrangements for Danny Kaye or Marian Anderson on a good-will tour to explaining Little Rock, juvenile delinquency, or Hollywood absurdities.

Recently I went to Washington to learn what kinds of people are now entering our Foreign Service, and how the corps is being trained for its crucial work. I was aware of the criticism that has been directed at our overseas representatives: That they are drawn from the most privileged groups, that their training prepares them to deal more with social amenities than with the realities of the cold war.

I found that in the last few years the entire concept of foreign service has been revitalized, thanks to the potent stimulus of the Wriston report of 1954, the personnel-policy study headed by Henry M. Wriston, then president of Brown University. Except at the very top, where the President still enjoys latitude in choosing Secretaries of State and Ambassadors as his personal representatives, entry into the Foreign Service is no longer possible through influence or affluence. From the bottom up the corps is entirely career, wide open, and highly competitive.

More than 4,000 candidates annually take the tough entrance exams at 65 educational centers throughout the country. Only about 150 are selected. No college degree is required, but usually some 65 percent of the winners have not only B.A.'s but M.A.'s, and 5 percent have Ph. D.'s. Average age is 26. Men outnumber women 15 to 1, but able women are prized.

Those selected through the written exams are screened orally for an exacting combination of traits: leadership, mental and moral fiber, special flair for languages, skill in political analysis. The men and women finally chosen are a remarkable cross section of the country's young talent, and could almost certainly climb fast in other professions. In the Foreign Service their pay begins at about $100 per week, and they know that 12 or 15 years must pass before that figure is doubled. The knowledge of their eliteness, plus the realization that they are performing a vital service, must be a large share of their reward.

To the Foreign Service Institute, founded in 1946, is entrusted the job of turning these new recruits into accomplished diplomats. Operating today with a budget commensurate with its importance in our national life, the Institute has become a highly professional college, where making friends and influencing people on a world scale is approached as a fine art.

Now housed in new quarters a couple of miles up the Potomac from the Pentagon, the Foreign Service Institute is headed by Harold Boies Hoskins, 63, a sharp-witted former textile executive with years of foreign-trade experience. To its old basic-training course for new Foreign Service officers there has been added a refresher course for promising midcareer people. Atop that, there is now a course for seniors who are eligible and needed to fill the highest Foreign Service posts.

The basic course for Foreign Service recruits lasts 12 weeks. It teaches the Service's history and its place among other Government agencies. Packed in tightly are lectures and seminars on large subjects like "Answering Criticisms of the United States Abroad," "Philosophy of World Labor Groups," Middle East problems, Communist strategy, international law. For the most part, however, the instruction deals with rules and tools: how Foreign Service posts operate, how to promote American trade, how to handle routine consular duties such as visas, admission of aliens, intelligence work. There are also field trips to such government agencies as an immigration center, an Atomic Energy Commission laboratory and the Agricultural Research Center at Beltsville, Md.

Perhaps one or two expert linguists in a class of 25 will go abroad immediately; the rest will stay in Washington for a year or 18 months, working at desk jobs in the State Department and continuing their language studies. For it has finally dawned on Washington that Americans are woefully clumsy with the most potent peace tool of all: the ability to speak other peoples' languages. There is now a crash program in language learning throughout the Foreign Service. Besides its Washington classes, the Institute runs language-study centers in Mexico City, Paris, Frankfurt, Beirut, Tokyo and Taichung (on Taiwan). Using texts and tapes from home and tutors hired locally, it gives extension courses to some 2,700 U.S. employees at 158 overseas posts.

On the Institute faculty there are nearly 200 instructors, half of whom are foreign-born tutors in 22 languages. The school's corridors buzz at coffee breaks with conversations in Burmese, Cambodian, Persian, and other exotic tongues. The course is probably the world's most intensive. The method used is "overlearning"—constant reiteration to achieve speech that is instinctively correct. Hour after hour, in groups of six or less, the trainees sit in cubicles with phonetic lesson sheets before them and learn, by repeating phrases after the tutor, to coordinate tongue, ear and brain in foreign patterns. They also practice "kinesics," the motions and gestures of head, hands and body proper to the language they are learning.

In off hours the trainees have at their disposal an audio-tape practice room, nicknamed "Babel," containing three dozen booths, each with a two-track tape recorder. Turning on his machine, the student hears a tutor speak. He echoes the words into his mike, then plays back both voices. Spotting his own mistakes, he can erase his track, then try over and over again. In the tape library are rolls containing courses in 43 languages.

Wives are considered so important that, before posting abroad, they are invited to the Institute for coaching in foreign amenities—dress, deportment, handling of servants. In charge of this program is Mrs. M. Williams Blake, a Foreign Service widow with experience in nine countries.

For the Institute's mid-career course, promising officers of 10 or 12 years' service are picked, in groups of about 20, to become higher-powered administrators, analysts, negotiators. Each group is first sequestered for a fortnight on an old Army post at Front Royal, Va., where they study typical problems a mission might face. Example: What aspects of U.S. life should an American contribution to an international trade fair stress?

Back in Washington, the group plunges into sociology. Professor Marion J. Levy of Princeton, for one, expounds to them such subjects as the contrasting effects of Westernization on the old cultures and politics of China and Japan, and what lessons the contrast teaches about the modernization of underdeveloped countries today.

Then, to learn the inside facts about our national policies and our present strength, the midcareerists are briefed by top Government brass.

Gordon Gray, special assistant to the President for national security affairs, ex-

plains the workings of our highest, most secret policy body—the National Security Council. The Chiefs of the State Department's Bureau of Intelligence and Research and of the Central Intelligence Agency set forth their techniques for studying our country's friends and foes. George Allen, boss of the United States Information Agency, lectures on good propaganda and bad. ("I don't like that phrase, 'selling ourselves.' One hard fact is worth a gallon of hogwash.")

A Congressman reports congressional temperatures on foreign policy, and what determines them. Leading publicists interpret present-day U.S. culture and attitudes, which often startle Foreign Service officers after years abroad. The midcareerists may also hear authoritatively from industry, labor, the pulpit and universities.

The Institute's senior course, new last September, enrolls only a dozen Foreign Service officers of the three top ranks (average age, 43), plus maybe a half dozen seniors from other services, including the military. Among them are officers already serving or ready to serve as Ambassador, minister, consul general. Much of their 10-month course is devoted to advanced studies of foreign policy, and to preparing analytical reports on trips to U.S. labor and trade congresses, scientific conclaves, meetings of bar and medical associations, which bring them up to date on the climate of American society.

"If we are to insure our future," Senator LEVERETT SALTONSTALL, of Massachusetts, said recently, "our Foreign Service officers would appear to be our most promising overseas task force."

[From the Saturday Evening Post, Jan. 3, 1959]

SCHOOL FOR MODERN DIPLOMATS

(By Henry F. and Katharine Pringle)

Not very long ago, the typical young man who chose the United States Foreign Service as a career was a socialite, a graduate from an eastern seaboard college, had a private income and took pleasure in wearing striped pants. He limited his official and social contacts mainly to other diplomats. He spoke cultivated English and perhaps halting French or German. The mere notion of learning Arabic, Chinese, or Malayan would have filled him with well-bred distaste. Foreigners should, of course, speak English.

Happily, much of this has changed. Important in the evolution of our new, more practical style in diplomats is a unique school, the Foreign Service Institute, operated by the State Department in Arlington, Va., where successful candidates for the Foreign Service come for training. The backgrounds of the students are varied. They come from every State in the Union, plus Hawaii. They are graduates of many different colleges, some quite small and obscure. Many are ex-servicemen; some have had experience as businessmen, newspaper reporters, teachers, lawyers, and engineers. Ten percent of them are girls—a fact which would have caused yesterday's diplomat to choke on the olive in his martini. Before going abroad, all of them will, through an intensive new method, learn to speak at least one foreign language.

The primary purpose of the Foreign Service Institute is to prepare the people who represent the United States in foreign lands to do the best possible job. This requires a broad curriculum which is offered to an average enrollment of about 3,000 a year, including 1,000 full-time and 2,000 part-time students. The full-time students include recently appointed Foreign Service officers who are undergoing 3 months of basic training, followed by another 4 months of special language training if they need it. Usually there is a handful of senior officers, even an occasional Ambassador, taking specialized training. In addition, the FSI is open to personnel of a number of Government agencies concerned with foreign affairs, such as the U.S. Information Agency and the International Cooperation Administration. Also among the students, all voluntarily, are the wives of junior Foreign Service officers who want to learn something about the culture and customs of the strange posts for which they are soon to depart—places such as Addis Ababa, Saigon, Kabul, or Taihoku. All students, except the wives, of course, draw full pay while they are going to school.

The novice diplomats are instructed in everything from consular procedures to the most effective ways of answering foreigners' criticism of the United States. To the wives are unfolded the mysteries of diplomatic protocol. Informal meetings, limited to the ladies, are arranged with experienced wives who have served from Oslo to Cape Town. No questions are barred. At one such session was a bright-eyed girl with a blond pony tail. Not yet a wife, but a very earnest fiance, she was to be married to a junior officer just before he set out on his first assignment.

"Looking ahead," she said, practically, if prematurely, "will I be expected to go to official functions when I'm pregnant?"

When the older wives stopped laughing, they told her that the answer depended somewhat on the post. She would certainly be welcome in most places, particularly in Latin America, where motherhood is warmly approved. On the other hand, the tribal taboos of a few African chiefs forbid receiving women in an expectant condition.

Common-sense hints to the wives are given under the direction of Regina Olszewski Blake, widow of a Foreign Service officer, who, during the 16 years of her marriage, accompanied her husband to Warsaw, Basel, Tampico, Teheran, Rome and Dakar. A warmhearted, friendly and reassuring woman, she warns the youthful wives that their jobs abroad sometimes will be more difficult than those of their husbands, who will spend most of their working hours in the relatively American atmosphere of their offices. The wife is on her own in an alien land. She must manage the house, take care of the children, direct servants who often pretend to know more English than they really do, buy unfamiliar foods in crowded native markets and handle mechanical breakdowns. Pointing up the need for resourcefulness, she tells the story of the wife at a remote post who chewed vast quantities of gum in order to make plugs for leaks in the plumbing.

Because the thirty to forty wives in any one class may be going to thirty or forty different posts out of the total of 278 the United States maintains around the world the general lectures cannot take up specific problems peculiar to one area. But Mrs. Blake keeps in her office a Post Guidance file which all wives are urged to consult. Here is detailed information, supplied by experienced Foreign Service wives on such things as food problems and social customs in all parts of the world. And the new officers' wives are given personal briefings on practical problems in their future posts. If possible, Mrs. Blake arranges for a student who is going to, say, Afghanistan, to talk with a wife who has been there. In such a case the young wife may learn that she and her husband cannot expect to have Western-style contacts with Afghan couples because the women there are kept in strict purdah—seclusion. Questions about housekeeping get answered in these interviews. How long will a sheet last when washed on the rocks in Djakarta? About as long as when subjected to a Washington laundry, it appears. Is the water safe to drink in Teheran? Not unless it is from the Embassy's private water supply, as the city water system consists of open jubes, or ditches, which also are used for washing clothes, bathing, and rinsing dishes.

The wives' course is not limited to protocol and household hints. Along with secretaries, clerks, and men from other Government agencies assigned abroad, they may take a 2-week orientation course in the fundamentals of American oversea missions. Mrs. Florence Finne, a slim, composed, and pretty Foreign Service officer, presides over these sessions, bringing in speakers from State and other departments to discuss their specialties. They explain the organization of Embassies and consulates. They outline Communist stategy and tactics. They take students through a quick survey of the American scene in politics, labor, art, agriculture, music, and architecture to make sure that representatives of the United States abroad will be able to talk intelligently about their homeland.

The Foreign Service Institute is tackling the serious challenge of language by spending 60 percent of its $5 million budget for the teaching of foreign tongues. The system is called intensive or sometimes the Army method. During World War II it was found useful for teaching Japanese and Pacific-area languages, which had been considered extremely difficult to learn. The FSI language classes are tough.

At first, they purposely avoid teaching rules of grammar, and rely on long hours of drill until the new vocabulary and idiom are so well learned that the pupil thinks in the language.

Under the new system an astonishing number of Foreign Service officers are mastering not only Spanish, French, and German but also such tongues as Russian, Polish, Czech, Serbo-Croatian, Finnish, Greek, Turkish, Arabic, Hindustani, Mandarin Chinese, Japanese, Burmese, and Korean. A few students simply cannot adjust their vocal cords or curl their tongues in the right way. Once in a while a student, unable to stand the intensive drill, collapses into hysterics and quits. But such failures are rare.

This new emphasis on learning at least one foreign language well reflects a change in U.S. conception of diplomacy since World War II. The old idea was that our representative abroad was a delegate from our Government to the foreign government. The modern conception is that he is also our representative to the people of the host nation. It is no longer good enough for the Foreign Service officer to associate mainly with a few members of the foreign ministry. He has a basic obligation to know the people—something best achieved by talking with them in their own language.

In November 1956, Secretary of State Dulles approved a new language policy for the Foreign Service under which all officers would be expected to acquire a useful knowledge of at least one foreign language within 5 years or within the same period after appointment, and preferably fluency in a second language as well. Junior officers would not be promoted until they had met the requirement. Exceptions would sometimes be made for senior officers or others whose post did not provide opportunities for language learning. It would hardly have been feasible to force the minority of political Ambassadors to become fluent before taking up their duties. But our Ambassador to Brazil, Ellis O. Briggs, a career officer who already knew Spanish, volunteered to take 3 months of intensive training in Portuguese at the FSI. So did Mrs. Briggs.

This past year the FSI had classes going full time in 27 different tongues. In charge of this rather staggering program is Howard E. Sollenberger, dean of the School of Languages. He has been bilingual from childhood, having been raised in North China by missionary parents. Before joining the FSI, Sollenberger taught Chinese to workers of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration and prepared them for service in the Far East.

Sollenberger has a staff of about 100 tutors or native speakers, some of them part time, and 20 full-time linguistic scientists—many of whom oversee classes in more than one language. The linguistic scientists worry the students as little as possible with textbook rules. People communicate by talking far more than by writing; besides, the way a language is written is often no key to the way it is spoken.

The new policy already is beginning to pay dividends. Take the case of a youthful consul, Robert E. Barbour, assigned to Vietnam. Before going to his post he was sent to Georgetown University, in Washington, for his preliminary work in Vietnamese, and then went through several months' grind at the FSI. When he reported to Ambassador Elbridge Durbrow in Vietnam, he was instructed to spend his first 3 months in further concentration on the language. By the time the new American consulate opened at Hué, a seaport north of Saigon, the young man had made the acquaintance of all the provincial chiefs and other officials in his area. He invited 180 of them to the opening ceremonies, where he translated the Ambassador's remarks and those of the Vietnamese representative. Durbrow reported to the State Department that the Vietnamese were deeply gratified by the new consul's fluency in their own language.

Reading and writing are not ignored in the FSI's language classes. The importance of being able to read the language of the host country was demonstrated not long ago in Indonesia. Until an officer who could read the native papers in the original language was sent to Djakarta, the State Department had not been fully aware of their anti-American tone. The Embassy's Indonesian employees had been clipping and translating only the news and editorial items which, they thought, would please their American bosses.

All this reflects the postwar American anxiety to make friends and influence people abroad. The same spirit pervades the whole FSI curriculum. An anthropologist, D. Scott Gilbert, is on hand to impress on students the importance of understanding and respecting the cultures and customs of other peoples. Gilbert shares with other Institute lecturers a tendency to toss off high-flown anthropological terms, to caution against "ethnocentricism" and "culture shock." But the talks boil down to a very sensible warning not to go abroad with the set conviction that the American way of life is superior in all ways to all others.

Another name for the FSI might be School for Dos and Don'ts in the Foreign Service. These classifications are hammered into the young men and women from 9 a.m. to 5:30 p.m., with case histories to underline the point. There was, for instance, the brash junior officer who had been assigned to visa work in Manila. An attractive young Filipino girl came to the consulate to have her passport validated. The vice consul looked at her pretty face and legs and made a wisecrack.

"I suppose you're going to the United States to snag yourself a rich husband?"

The girl's father happened to be a prominent official of the islands. She reported the vice consul's impertinence to papa, and within a couple of weeks the offending young man was on his way home, his Foreign Service career at an end.

Advice on how to make use of the customs of the country is given by experts such as William Barnes, former chief of the State Department's foreign-reporting staff. One morning last year Barnes concluded a solemn discussion of the problems of obtaining and analyzing economic data abroad with a story of his own experience in Finland. One of the best ways to collect economic information there, he had discovered, was to attend a sauna, or steam-bath party, with a group of Finnish bankers and industrialists. A sauna involves being parboiled, naked, at high temperature in a steam room, after which the participants plunge into the frigid waters of an adjoining lake. Thus stimulated, and still naked, the guests relax on a porch with their host and sip drinks. At this stage, said Barnes, they are likely to talk very frankly about their problems.

"Under the circumstances," he observed, "it is hard for them to play their cards close to their chests."

How and how not to use an interpreter is the subject of a hilarious FSI skit which acknowledges a debt to "The Teahouse of the August Moon." Performed regularly for each new group of junior officers, the purpose of the playlet is to dramatize the mistakes that an inexperienced Foreign Service officer might make.

The scene is a seaport town on Okinawa. In a performance last fall, Richard Noss, of the language staff, played the role of a newly arrived American vice counsul calling on the mayor. Two of the Institute's tutors, Kiyanao Okami and Teruki Komatsu, represented the mayor and the vice consul's interpreter. The three scholars showed surprising histrionic talent. The vice consul was brusque and in a hurry. He told the interpreter to tell the mayor he had only fifteen minutes.

"Express to the mayor some noble sentiments and all that," he said. "Keep it brief. Tell him three United States Senators are arriving next week and I'm in charge of the reception."

An interminable conversation in Japanese, the language used in Okinawa, ensued between Messrs. Okami and Komatsu, with much bowing and scraping, followed by this dialogue in English:

"VICE CONSUL. What was that all about?

"INTERPRETER. He talk and talk a long time.

"VICE CONSUL. I could see that. What did he say? Keep it short.

"INTERPRETER. Mayor expressed appreciation of kind sentiments. Said he wished to discuss important matter—American airbase expansion which robbing the farmers of their land.

"VICE CONSUL. Oh, tell him all I want is to have him go to the airport to meet the Senators, to take some important people with him. Nanki-Poo! Funny costumes! All that kind of stuff."

Okami and Komatsu engaged in another long exchange in Japanese. The interpreter then explained that the mayor was inviting the American official to his house for tea, to which the vice consul replied that he hated tea, "but I'll take a rain check."

"Rain check?" asked the puzzled interpreter. This involved the vice consul in a long explanation of the rules applying to American baseball tickets.

After the playlet ended, amid laughter, Noss summed up its lessons. The misunderstandings were not merely funny, he warned. They might have been disastrous. The consular officer should have addressed his remarks directly to the mayor, and not to the interpreter. He should have assumed that the Okinawan official understood some English, as he probably did. The vice consul should not have used American colloquialisms. And obviously he should not have ignored the expected formalities, nor rudely brushed aside the subjects which the mayor wished to raise.

The Foreign Service Institute is without doubt a livelier and more effective teaching agency today than it was a few years ago. The school was established in March 1947. With the greatest expansion of the Service after World War II, it was essential to train large numbers of new officers to get along with foreign peoples and to report their activities accurately. But within the next few years the morale of the State Department and of the Foreign Service slumped, due largely to the claim of the late Joseph R. McCarthy that Communists had infiltrated. The Institute became something of a stepchild, badly housed on C Street at a short distance from the State Department.

In March 1954, the Secretary of State appointed a distinguished committee, of which Henry M. Wriston, then president of Brown University, was chairman, to appraise the Department's personnel policies. Its report was highly critical. The Foreign Service officer corps, it found, numbered only 1,285, the lowest strength in 5 years. Only 355 officers had been appointed to the beginning-officer classification in the past 8 years. One remedy proposed by the committee was that Foreign Service officers should be recruited from all parts of the country, bringing the Service closer to a democratic ideal.

Today there is no shortage of candidates. Last year nearly 340 new junior officers were selected from among 6,500 hopefuls who took the examinations. Many are attracted by the lure of strange places, by an aura of glamour which still clings to the Foreign Service. They can be sure of fairly complete security and of salaries ranging from $4,730 at the bottom to a top of $20,000, plus some expense allowances.

In its criticisms of the Foreign Service, the Wriston report described the Foreign Service Institute as having fallen into the "intellectual doldrums." It had not measured up to the standards envisioned by Congress, which had hoped for an institution comparable to the Naval and Army War Colleges.

In March 1955 Harold B. Hoskins was made Director of the FSI, and the Institute began a rapid emergence from obscurity. Hoskins, in his early sixties, is not an educator, but a businessman of wide experience. Born in Beirut, the son of missionaries, Hoskins' hobby for years has been the role of the United States in foreign affairs. He has often served the State Department as a consultant on Middle Eastern economic problems and gone on missions to Arab nations. His ability as a salesman, acquired during his industrial career, has been of great value in explaining the FSI's budget to congressional committees.

Congress has been fairly generous. Among other things, the FSI no longer need apologize for its quarters, which are efficient, if not luxurious. Since the spring of 1957 the classrooms, offices, and auditorium have been housed in what used to be the lower-floor garage of Arlington Towers, one of the plush apartment developments on the outskirts of Washington. The space has been divided into two floors, and has a functional all-glass front that extends for about a block along one wing of the building. This setting gives more of a government than a campus atmosphere to the school.

The prestige of the Foreign Service Institute, which was quite low for a time in the eyes of State Department brass, gained ground in the last 3 years. Last September even Secretary Dulles took an hour out of his whirlwind schedule to inaugurate the first senior-officer course, the State Department's equivalent of the Defense War College.

Hoskins and his assistants are constantly pondering what should be added, subtracted or modified to keep the FSI in tune with needs of the Foreign Service. They are now concerned that the courses for midcareer officers may not be stimulating enough independent thinking. They are worried about the area specialization courses, although the very fact that the Foreign Service now has some 400 specialists trained in Near and Far Eastern and Iron Curtain country languages and problems is encouraging. Should there be more economics taught at the FSI? More on international-labor movements?

Most impartial observers of the FSI would probably agree that its intensive language training and its advice for living and working with other peoples are its major contribu-

tions to diplomacy in today's troubled world. The down-to-earth tutoring goes much deeper than protocol or the right clothes for Rangoon. The young officers, their wives and clerical personnel are all urged to keep up their hobbies abroad or develop some, for many doors to friendships will thereby be opened. They are told about the consul who was assigned to Lourenço Marques, the capital of Portuguese Mozambique. He was an avid amateur ornithologist and was delighted to find that few places in the world had so great a variety of strange birds as this outpost. He made contacts with the local ornithologists and won their gratitude by giving his leisure time to helping out at the natural-history museum. Then there was the diplomat's wife who was a ham radio operator. When an earthquake tumbled buildings in Quito, Ecuador, and disrupted communications, she was able to send out messages and assist rescue expeditions. She was decorated by the Ecuadoran Government for her services.

The young people who will leave shortly for their first foreign posts are warned against yearning for London, Paris or one of the other great capitals. The work at a smaller Embassy may be much more rewarding and important. They are also cautioned against being disappointed if they are assigned to consular work, as 60 percent of them are sure to be. The consul's job may not seem dashing, but it deals closely with people.

"We've got an American dying here. What shall we do?" is one of the more troublesome inquiries a consul may have from a hotel or boardinghouse. In a case some years ago a lazy but imaginative consul in Indochina solved his problem by persuading an American at death's door to take out French citizenship, "to avoid being a damned nuisance to me when you pop off." That sort of thing is frowned on these days. The consul is supposed to see that a fellow citizen felled by illness has proper medical attention and, if the worst happens, to locate the deceased's relatives, perhaps arrange a funeral, or to settle his estate. One consul found himself handling the sale of a large herd of cattle.

Live Americans abroad, however, are even more of a problem than dead ones—at least to a consul. They may demand anything on earth, including funds to go home. The Foreign Service is trained to help as much as it can, but there are limits. That is why one of the most respected rules taught its students by the FSI is: "Never lend your own money."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, the Foreign Service Institute offers what is perhaps the best intensive training in more foreign languages than is available in any other educational institution in the United States.

The purpose of the bill (S. 1243) which I have introduced with the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] is in part to establish standards of foreign language proficiency for our Foreign Service and to assure utmost use of the Institute's facilities in achieving and maintaining such standards.

While it is important to recognize that foreign language proficiency will not in and of itself assure high-caliber performance of overseas service, it is hard to conceive of such service being effectively rendered by Americans who are blind, mute and deaf to the language of people of the countries where they serve.

Secretary of State Dulles wrote as follows in the 19th semiannual report to Congress on the international education exchange program:

True communication among people of different cultures is greatly enhanced by the ability to speak and to read each others' language.

Surely no one can disagree with this statement.

In this connection, I am reminded of a statement by the great German poet, Johann Wolfgang von Goethe, who wrote:

A man who is ignorant of foreign languages is ignorant of his own.

Goethe's statement, probably made with only semantics in mind, has special subtlety and wisdom as applied to the task of communication in our oversea representation. The same is true of a statement by Samuel Johnson, which all of us who travel from Washington by train have seen many times over the entrance to Union Station.

He that would bring home the wealth of the Indies must carry the wealth of the Indies with him. So it is in traveling: a man must carry knowledge with him if he would bring home knowledge.

The application of these statements to our people who go abroad is dramatically illustrated in the much-publicized book "The Ugly American." This book has done much to focus public attention on the deficiencies in the international orientation of our people and the handicaps which these deficiencies impose on our oversea operations.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD some excerpts which I have made from the last chapter of "The Ugly American."

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[Excerpts from ch. 22, "A Factual Epilogue," of "The Ugly American," by William J. Lederer and Eugene Burdick]

It would seem a simple fact of life that Ambassadors to at least the major nations should speak those languages. Yet in France, Italy, Germany, Belgium, the Netherlands, Norway, and Turkey, our Ambassadors cannot speak the native tongue (although our Ambassador to Paris can speak German and our Ambassador to Berlin can speak French). In the whole of the Arabic world—nine nations—only two Ambassadors have language qualifications. In Japan, Korea, Burma, Thailand, Vietnam, Indonesia, and elsewhere, our Ambassadors must speak and be spoken to through interpreters. In the entire Communist world, only our Ambassador to Moscow can speak the native language.

If Ambassadors were mere figureheads surrounded by experienced, linguistically trained career diplomats, their inability to speak or read on the job would be little more than an insulting inconvenience to the local officials. * * * Unfortunately, Ambassadors are more than figureheads; they are in charge, and, like Sears, their misunderstandings can have grave consequences. Moreover, the career men on their staffs are generally not linguistically trained for their jobs. * * *

In his masterful analysis of the Foreign Service, John Osborne states that the most important element in a good Foreign Service officer is the faculty of communication. Yet, as James Reston reported in the New York Times of March 18, 1958, "50 percent of the entire Foreign Service officer corps do not have a speaking knowledge of any foreign language. Seventy percent of the new men coming into the Foreign Service are in the same state." These figures represent those who can speak no language other than their own—not even French, Spanish, German, or Italian. The number of Americans in the Foreign Service who can speak any of the more difficult languages is miniscule.

In addition to our Foreign Service staffs, we have more than a million servicemen overseas. Only a handful can speak the language of the country in which they are stationed, and when difficult military and scientific data are involved this handful shrinks to almost zero. So be it, but that our trained representatives in Asia are little better qualified in languages is unacceptable. On the other hand, an estimated 9 out of 10 Russians speak, read, and write the language before they arrive on station. It is a prior requirement. The entire functioning staff of Russian Embassies in Asia is Russian, and all the Russians—the officials, stenographic help, telephone operators, chauffeurs, servants—speak and write the language of the host country.

In the American Embassies the servants, the messengers, and the interpreters are locally hired. The telephone operator in almost every American mission and agency in Asia is an Asian. It is, of course, a maxim of espionage that one of the most useful agents is the planted employee. * * *

Because we must rely on interpreters who are almost always non-Americans, our on-the-spot information is both secondhand and subject to minor censorship and editing without our knowledge. The recent turmoil in Indonesia emphasized this handicap. We had to rely on native translators to interpret the press, the radio, and personal conversation. Following Asian etiquette, by which one avoids telling one's employer of matters which would distress him, the interpreters gave our diplomats rose-tinted reports of local sentiment and events. Only after a dangerous delay did it seep through to our soundproofed representatives that Indonesia was in the grip of political upheaval. In Indochina our military and diplomatic missions could speak only to the French, whose view of the rebellion against them was one-sided, to say the least. One of the authors seeking to hear the Vietnamese side of the question without using either a French or Vietnamese interpreter succeeded only through an American priest, who, like the Father Finian of our book, was fluent in the native tongue. Like the Russians, but unlike ourselves, the church realizes that its work in Asia cannot be done without close communication with Asians.

Blockage of information itself is not the only penalty we pay. Think, for a moment, what it costs us whenever an official American representative demands that the native speak English or be not heard. The Russians make no such mistake. The sign on the Russian Embassy in Ceylon, for example, identifies it in Sinhalese, Tamil, English, and Russian. The American Embassy is identified only in English.

John Foster Dulles stated what was in our minds when we wrote the stories of Colonel Hillandale, the Ragtime Kid, and John Colvin, on the one hand, and of Sears and Swift and Joe Bing, on the other. He said, "Interpreters are no substitute. It is not possible to understand what is in the minds of other people without understanding their language, and without understanding their language it is impossible to be sure that they understand what is on our minds."

* * * * *

Americans like Swift, who cannot speak the language, can have no more than an academic understanding of a country's customs, beliefs, religion, and humor. Restricted to communication with only that special, small, and usually well-to-do segment of the native population fluent in English, they receive a limited and often misleading picture

of the nation about them. A recent American ambassador to Ceylon—an able, extremely popular diplomat—had an experience which pointed up this dilemma. He had become intimate with the leaders of the political party in power, a group relict of colonial days composed largely of the rich and English-educated upper class. The ambassador apparently got all his information from them, because he gave no warning to our State Department before the nationalistic political upheaval occurred which suddenly left his friends with but 8 of 101 seats in the government.

On the other side of the ledger, we have told the story of the ugly engineer and Colonel Hillandale who, speaking the language, were able to go off into the countryside and show the idea of America to the people. These characters are based on actual Americans known to the authors. There are others like them; but by and large they are not beloved of the American officials in the various Asian capitals, and are a wild exception to the rule.

While a few Hillandales and the many Russians roam the barrios and the boondocks, most Americans are restricted, both by official tethers and by language barriers, to communion with each other. * * *

* * * * *

Vice President NIXON, in his National Press Club speech on his tour of Latin America, said, "I could have concentrated on a whole round of cocktail parties and white-tie dinners. If we continue to concentrate on that area we can figure we will lose the battle." What our diplomats need to do, he said, is to get out and mingle with students, labor leaders, and opinion makers, who comprise the "wave of the future."

* * * * *

In the stories of Major Wolchek and Major Monet, "The Iron of War" and "The Lesson of War," we have tried in fiction to describe a condition of avoidable ignorance. For years both we and our allies have put in much expensive effort trying to ferret out in advance the Communist plan for both tactical maneuvers and great conquests. Yet, during the struggle in Indochina the authors could find no American (or French) military or civilan official who had read, or even studied a precis of, the overall Communist operation plan contained in "The Selected Works of Mao Tse-Tung," published by Lawrence Wishart, Ltd., London, and International Publishers in the United States. A four-volume edition was published in 1954 but the basic material was available in print as early as 1934. (A useful shorter study is "The Organizational Weapon: A Study of Bolshevik Strategy and Tactics," by Philip Selznick, McGraw-Hill, 1952.)

In his remarkable work Mao, one of the brilliant tacticians of our time, analyzes almost every campaign and battle in which his Red Armies fought. He dissects every defeat (very few) and most victories, and he explains what they taught him. In doing so he lays down a pattern of strategy and tactics which the Communists of southeast Asia have followed undeviatingly.

The battles which led to Dien Bien Phu were classic examples of the Mao pattern. And yet our military missions advised, and the French went down to defeat, without having studied Mao's writings.

Why our representatives abroad have not learned the languages they need or studied basic sources of information such as Mao's writings is a question which involves the entire American Nation. Whatever the reasons, our overseas services attract far too few of our brightest and best qualified college graduates. * * *

* * * * *

We do not need the horde of 1,500 Americans—mostly amateurs—who are now working for the United States overseas. What we need is a small force of well-trained, well-chosen, hard-working, and dedicated professionals. They must be willing to risk their comforts and, in some lands, their health. They must go equipped to apply a positive policy promulgated by a clear-thinking Government. They must speak the language of the land of their assignment, and they must be more expert in its problems than are the natives.

* * * * *

Actually, the state in which we find ourselves is far from hopeless. We have the material and, above all, the human resources to change our methods and to win. It is not the fault of the Government or its leaders or any political party that we have acted as we have. It is the temper of the whole Nation. If knowledge of the problem becomes widespread, and if the enthusiasm of the people can be aroused, then we can succeed. As Cordell Hull once said, "The Government of the United States is never far ahead of the American public; nor is it very far behind."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, the bill which I have filed with the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] would insert in the Foreign Service Act of 1946 a statement of policy to govern the appointment of chiefs of mission and Foreign Service officers which could profitably be adopted by all Americans who go overseas. In a very real sense, any of us who goes abroad is representing the United States, regardless of our purpose. Whether such representation of our country will serve her well or ill will largely depend on the extent to which we apply to ourselves the policy which the bill would prescribe for the appointment of chiefs of mission and Foreign Service officers.

Mr. President, the policy declaration contained in section 1 of my bill reads as follows:

> It is the policy of the Congress that chiefs of mission and Foreign Service officers appointed to serve the United States in foreign countries shall have, to the maximum practicable extent, among their qualifications a useful knowledge of the principal language or dialect of the country in which they are to serve, and knowledge and understanding of the history, the culture, the economic, and political institutions, and the interests of such country and its people.

The responsible officials of the Department of State have unquestionably, in my judgment, been working hard at the task of improving the foreign language proficiency of our Foreign Service officers. Because of the limited funds for salaries and administrative and training expenses which the Congress appropriates to the State Department, the rate of progress possible in this vital aspect of training leaves much to be desired. Section 2 of my bill would add to the Foreign Service Act a new section to establish the framework within which a more vigorous program of foreign language training could be established, assuming that the Congress appropriates the funds necessary for its full implementation.

Sections 3 and 4 of the bill would make significant additions to the authority of the Secretary of State in order further to facilitate tapping to the full the excellent training activities of the Foreign Service Institute and to create incentives for all Foreign Service personnel to take advantage of such activities.

Mr. President, we must leave no stone unturned in our efforts to assure that our Foreign Service personnel have the utmost in qualifications that institutionalized training can give—especially in the field of foreign languages. In addition to their ramified duties as representatives of the United States, the people of our Foreign Service are our first line of defense and the strongest offensive force which our peace-loving society can muster.

Mr. President, in closing, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a number of articles relating to the subjects I have discussed.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New Bedford (Mass.) Standard-Times, Jan. 21, 1959]

SILENT SPOKESMEN ABROAD

John B. Fisher, former administrative assistant and chief political aid to Senator SALTONSTALL, Republican, Massachusetts, recently returned from his fourth trip to the Middle East with some forthright criticism of the U.S. Foreign Service.

A New Bedford audience heard Mr. Fisher direct particular attention to the language training of State Department representatives abroad, which he described as so elementary as to be no training at all—in our embassies abroad fewer than five or six Americans in an Embassy can speak the language of the country in which they serve.

In Belgrade, only 3 of 44 Americans can speak the Yugoslav national tongue.

In Athens, only 6 of 79 Americans in the Foreign Service can speak modern Greek dialects fluently.

In New Delhi, the United States has no personnel who can speak the several Indian dialects required for effective communication there. By contrast, the Russians have specific training courses in Moscow devoted exclusively to training diplomats for Indian service.

As Mr. Fisher concluded on the basis of this unenviable record, "In other words, our spokesmen abroad can't speak—hence, are no spokesmen at all."

This is a dangerous, if not tragic, situation in a world in which nations must know in precise detail what is going on virtually every minute. To be uninformed could mean failure to survive in the present East-West power struggle of the cold war.

If, as Mr. Fisher declared, "the State Department almost automatically rejects every proposal to improve our Foreign Service," Congress should embark upon a study of the situation, aimed at overriding and overhauling the State Department system. The program for training Foreign Service officers should be broadened and intensified.

With regard to language abilities of Americans in general, there is another approach that might be made, Dr. James Bryant Conant, president emeritus of Harvard, has been studying America's high schools for the last 2 years. Dr. Conant commented, "Almost without exception, I found a deplorable state of affairs in regard to foreign languages. Too many students with limited ability were studying a foreign language for 2 years; too few able students were studying one language long enough."

Americans must devote earnest attention to this problem, all the way from the high school class to the level of the Secretary of State. To misunderstand or to be misunderstood in the delicately balanced family of nations is riskier than ever these days.

[From the Reading (Mass.) Chronicle, Feb. 5, 1959]

OUR REPRESENTATIVES ABROAD

Our foreign policy has many angles. It is criticized by many who know very little about the actual situation in many of the countries involved. Then again, it is sometimes constructively criticized by someone with some real knowledge of foreign countries.

"A little simple honesty in our relations abroad—a little old-fashioned patriotism at home"—these words of wisdom were recently spoken by John B. Fisher, a partner in Joyce & Fisher Associates of Washington and Boston before a joint service clubs luncheon in Washington. Fisher is a former administrative assistant and chief political aid to Senator SALTONSTALL and has recently returned from his fourth trip to the Middle East in the past 12 months. He was emphatic in his criticism of the Department of State and of our Foreign Service in that part of the world.

"East is East and West is West, but the twain have met—long since," said Fisher, "a fact of which our diplomatic representatives abroad seem wholly unconscious. Our policies and practices in Greece, Turkey and Iran, for example, threaten disaster for us and for them. We seem to do even the right things in the wrong way.

"I found our Department of State disliked and distrusted throughout this area. I found our Foreign Service personnel considered fearfully ill-equipped to deal with the people and problems among which they work. And this, I know from other travelers abroad, is not an unusual situation.

"Our Foreign Service is, on the whole, inadequate to America's vital needs abroad—inadequate in its recruitment program, in the training of its personnel and in its protocol-ridden, ingrown operations in countless cities around the world.

"The Department of State almost automatically rejects every proposal to improve our Foreign Service. The dangerous implications of this are beyond description:

"The recommendation that a Foreign Service Academy be established comparable to West Point and Annapolis is dismissed for the most absurd of reasons.

"The language training of our Foreign Service personnel is so elementary as to be no training at all—in our embassies in a dozen major capitals abroad fewer than five or six Americans on embassy duty can speak the language of the country in which they serve.

"For example: In Belgrade, the capital of Yugoslavia, only 3 of 44 Americans on duty in that Embassy there can speak Serb-Croat, the Yugoslav national tongue; in Athens, not more than half a dozen of our 79 Americans in Foreign Service can speak modern Greek dialects fluently; in New Delhi, the capital of India, we have no personnel who can speak the several Indian dialects required for effective communication there, whereas the Russians are known to have specific training courses in Moscow for Indian service alone.

"In other words, our spokesmen abroad can't speak—hence are no spokesmen at all. This is worse than a crime; it is a political blunder of the first magnitude—and we, as American citizens, are to blame for not insisting on the very best representation abroad, in our own interest, in our own defense.

"Most important of all, perhaps, is our Government's failure to make use of our able, well-informed businessmen in these nations.

[From the Louisville (Ky.) Courier-Journal, Mar. 30, 1958]

AN AMBASSADOR NEEDS THE POWER OF SPEECH

Senator SALTONSTALL, of Massachusetts, believes it is important for American officials in Foreign Service to speak the language of the country in which they are serving. He has introduced a bill to advance his idea. He would require that certain posts in certain countries be filled by Foreign Service officers who can speak the native tongue.

This might seem elementary in diplomacy, as it would in business. But Senator SALTONSTALL had apparently read a recent story by James Reston of the New York Times. It revealed that 50 percent of our Foreign Service officers have no speaking knowledge of any foreign language. These are men and women, remember, who sought a lifetime career in diplomacy. Mr. Reston further disclosed that our Ambassador in Moscow, Llewellyn Thompson, is the only one we have in a Communist country who speaks the native language; that only two American Ambassadors in the nine Arab States speak Arabic; and that even in the West, we have Ambassadors in eight NATO countries who suffer from a similar handicap.

Such language failure puts us at a severe disadvantage, by comparison with the Russians and all other leading nations. We are the only ones who do not demand language proficiency for Foreign Service. We are the ones, too, who are most likely to be thought arrogant and superior when we ignore the languages of other nations.

The Saltonstall bill may start something of a revolution in our Foreign Service. The reform is painfully overdue. Daniel Defoe determined long ago that he would venture the injury of giving a woman more tongues than one. Our Foreign Service could hardly venture less, in sending men and women out to represent us in the capitals of a troubled and sensitive world.

[From the Foreign Service Journal, June 1957]

OUR TONGUETIED FOREIGN SERVICE

(By Leon and Leila Poullada)

An editorial in the October 1956 issue of the Journal, from which the title of this article is shamelessly borrowed, pointed up the need to develop adequate language skills in the Foreign Service. While the Department has been making noteworthy progress in the matter of language and area training at the Foreign Service Institute more vigorous efforts are required if we are really to untie the tongues of our Foreign Service employees.

Language training programs can, like Gaul, be divided into three parts:

1 Programs designed to arouse the interest of Foreign Service employees and their dependents in languages: The Foreign Service Institute has done commendable work on programs of this type and they are gradually gaining momentum and popularity. No matter how well-conceived this type of program may be, however, its limitations should be recognized. Its principal values lie in the psychological effect on the foreign population of having Americans sufficiently interested in their country to try to learn their language, and the satisfaction the student feels in being able to communicate with servants, shop in the bazaar, and so forth. By its very nature, however, this type of general program cannot produce a corps of fluent language experts.

2. Programs designed to meet the need for Foreign Service officers to acquire and retain fluent command of at least one world language (French, Spanish, German, Russian, Arabic, Chinese): It has been axiomatic in the diplomatic services of all countries (including until recently our own) that anyone who aspired to enter the career ranks would come equipped with command of at least one world language. It is disturbing to learn from a recent survey that 50 percent of the officers in our Foreign Service are not adequately equipped (even by their own self-appraisal) in any world language. It also revealed that language deficiencies are largely concentrated in three groups of officers; (a) A few senior officers who have allowed their language skills to lapse; (b) officers, recently integrated under the Wriston program, whose previous employment did not require foreign language proficiency; and (c) new entrants to the bottom ranks of the service who, under relaxed standards of admission, have been admitted on the understanding that they will make up their language deficiency within a stated period.

It is interesting to contrast briefly the deficiencies in language studies in the United States with the extensive programs reportedly being carried on in the Soviet Union. In all south Asian countries where the writers have served, the number of Soviet diplomats fluent in the local language has been impressive. A recent article in the New York Times revealed the full scope of the Soviet language effort. According to this article not only are foreign languages a compulsory part of the curriculum in the elementary and secondary schools of the U.S.S.R. but a drag-net system of scholarships brings the ablest language students into institutes of higher learning such as the National Institute of Foreign Languages, where they are subjected to a strenuous 5-year course in which one or more foreign languages constitute the core of the curriculum. It is from schools of this kind that the Soviet diplomatic service draws many of its officers and the results already observable abroad are indeed impressive.

However, the only forthright solution is for the Foreign Service to provide a combination of adequate study facilities coupled with a system of sanctions and incentives. Taking into account the heavy work-load and social duties (also work) of most officers, the penalties for failure to acquire minimum language skills will have to be considerable to arouse the necessary individual effort. On the basis of experience both in learning and teaching languages, the writers have reluctantly concluded that Draconian measures will be needed to bring all officers in the Service up to the required mark. In the writers' opinion nothing less than a time limit for passing required examinations (given on a servicewide basis) coupled with loss of promotion eligibility for failure to pass, will achieve the desired results. Some measures in this direction have already been taken by the Department in recent instructions to the field such as that requiring efficiency reports to include specific statements about the officers' efforts to improve his language ability. These measures will no doubt stimulate the more conscientious, but for the Service as a whole stiffer requirements will be needed.

So much for the stick approach. Any effective program of personnel management must also include the "carrot." In the long run, the latter will, of course, produce more lasting results. Incentives should therefore be devised for rewarding employees who achieve fluency in certain languages. The Foreign Service Institute should prepare a list which would include all the world languages plus other languages of importance to the Foreign Service in which an actual or potential shortage of fluent speakers exists. In the writers' opinion, Arabic and perhaps Chinese and Russian, should be considered world languages for this purpose—in addition to French, Spanish and German. No special incentive would be offered to Foreign Service officers for fluency in only one of these world languages, since this should be considered a basic requirement for employment. But fluency in any additional language on the list should receive special recognition.

What form should these incentives take? Two possibilities are suggested here. No doubt others can be devised. A number of

European countries offer monetary "language bonuses" to their diplomatic officers. The systems vary from country to country but the British method is fairly typical. Anyone who feels qualified, applies for an examination in the language of his choice. The test is both oral and written. Different tests are given for varying levels of proficiency, additional cash bonuses being awarded for each examination successfully passed. The bonus is an increment to yearly salary usually averaging about 100 pounds. This is a permanent increment and is not lost with promotion to a higher salary bracket.

The department might do well to investigate, if it has not already done so, the various incentive programs of other countries and devise a suitable one for our Foreign Service. Perhaps a better incentive than money would be to offer "language preference" points towards promotion. This might work as follows: A separate language dossier could be prepared on each officer, listing the languages on which he has successfully passed examinations and for which he is entitled to receive a certain number of promotion points. After selection boards have rated all eligible candidates on a competitive basis without reference to language ability, the language dossiers would be handed to the boards and additional points would be awarded to those officers entitled to language credit. Thus, of two officers originally rated at the same level, the one with superior language qualifications would earn preference for promotion. This would indeed be a powerful incentive and stimulus to serious language study. It would also spur officers to gain ever higher language proficiency since this would progressively enhance promotion opportunities throughout their entire career. A similar system could be worked out for the staff corps. Administrative details would admittedly present some difficulties but if the need for developing language skills is as great as everyone seems to agree it is, the obstacle could be overcome.

3. The Foreign Service also faces a critical shortage of language and area experts, particularly in the so-called exotic areas which have in recent times become increasingly important to the foreign relations of the United States. To improve the quantity and quality of language and area training will require a greater effort than has thus far been made.

To be really effective a language and area specialist should acquire a deep understanding of the history, art, religion, social structure, and economy of the region. He must also have a good command of the language. Unless he can converse with government officials, businessmen, merchants and leaders of religious and minority groups, and can at least read the local press in the vernacular, his specialized training will not pay full dividends. Measured by these standards, language and area specialization programs, in south Asia, at least, have in the past been indequate though we understand that greater emphasis is now being given to reading especially during the latter stages of specialist training.

The problems involved in establishing an effective corps of language and area specialists are many and complex. To surmount them will, in the writers' opinion, require improved training programs. The following minimum considerations are suggested: (a) recognition of the special difficulties involved in the study of the so-called exotic languages; (b) improvement of initial and follow-through training programs; (c) improvement of teaching methods; (d) provision of special incentives.

It is a fact that most of the exotic languages in which the Foreign Service is deficient are languages which are not easily learned by Westerners in general or Americans in particular. The structure, syntax, and the cultural concepts embedded in these languages are quite unfamiliar to the American student. Often the student is faced with a bewildering multiplicity of local language variants and dialects. South Asia alone, according to some linguists, offers 17 major language groups and several hundred variants. To be really effective in this area a south Asia language officer should know well at least three basic languages: Hindustani (which is really two languages, Urdu and Hindi, with a common spoken vocabulary of perhaps 40 percent, but different roots and scripts), Bengali, and at least one south Indian language, probably Tamil (a Dravidian language of different ancestry from Hindustani and Bengali which are Indo-European). In addition to these three major languages, he would also find at least a basic knowledge of Persian essential in Afghanistan and important in Pakistan as well as in Muslim areas of India.

In addition to multiple languages, the area specialist is often confronted with different levels of speech within the same language. These exist in nearly all languages but rarely in so exaggerated a form as in the exotic ones. Within one language, different vocabularies and forms are often matters of rigid social prescription and wide variances are found in classical as against contemporary literature with still different forms used for official occasions, everyday polite speech and colloquial conversation. It is difficult to find equivalent examples in any Western language unless we hark back to Roman times and compare the classical Latin of Horace with the contemporary Vulgate and the still more common idiom of the plebeian masses. The language and area specialist must somehow command the major languages of his region and sort out the various speech levels for the proper social occasions and groups.

Recognition of these special problems points the way to the improvements which should be made in language and area training. Perhaps the first and most important step is to gain acceptance for the concept that once an officer is selected for language and area specialization he becomes part of a marked group whose needs and problems necessarily differ from those of other officers. Routine administrative and personnel practices cannot meet these peculiar requirements. Special consideration will have to be given to this group with the Foreign Service Institute playing a more prominent and controlling role in such matters as assignments, tours of duty, advanced training details, etc.

Until recently, initial training for most language and area specialists consisted of a year's study at a university. Both area and language studies had to be compressed into this relatively short time. After the study tour, the specialist was largely on his own. He often had to scramble by his own efforts for an assignment where his training could be put to use. In some cases lack of vacancies and shortage of personnel resulted in assignments to posts where his newly acquired language was not generally spoken. In many cases what had been learned became rusty from disuse and ground was lost instead of gained.

Then again there appeared to be no attempt at career planning for the language and area specialist as such. There was, and still seems to be, no planned program of assignments aimed at safeguarding and developing the Government's initial investment in the specialized training. Assignments to future posts depended, and still do, on the vagaries of existing vacancies, position classifications, coincidence of home-leave and transfer schedules of officer replacements and all the usual paraphernalia of personnel redtape. Recently there have been signs of improvement. The initial training period has been lengthened and is usually preceded by intensive language training at the Foreign Service Institute. Language schools, such as the one for Arabic in Beirut, have been set up in a country where the language is spoken to give the student practical experience along with academic training. A number of other improvements have been instituted or are on the way. But much more is needed.

In the writers' opinion, an adequate training program for a language and area specialist (particularly for south Asia) would consist of a period of initial training and a period of followthrough training. The initial training would include:

1. Three months' full-time intensive language training at the Foreign Service Institute.

2. One full year of academic language and area studies at a university.

3. Eighteen months of travel, residence, and study in the area, nine months of which could be at a university with a specific research assignment to fulfill.

4. Assignment to a post in the area where the language is widely spoken.

This initial training period should be followed by a 10-year planned program of assignments which would constitute the followthrough training. This career-planning phase should be started as soon as the officer is selected for training. Before he finishes his university assignment both the Department and he should know in a rather definite way what his assignments for the next 10 years will be. The objective of this plan would be to insure that this period of followup training will develop the language and area skill acquired during the initial training period. The career planning office recently established in the Department could make an excellent start by giving priority to planning the careers of language and area specialists in whom the Government already has a very substantial investment which should not be dissipated by haphazard assignments. To insure that future slots exist at the right time and place for language and area officers, would it not be possible to establish one or more unclassified positions at appropriate posts and in the Department? This would permit assignments in accordance with career-planning needs rather than as dictated by the fortuitous existence of vacancies in the right grades at the right times. At present it is only rarely and by bare chance that the right officer and the right vacancy coincide. Only by creating extra positions not subject to rigid personnel classification can this difficulty be overcome. The actual duties of an officer occupying one of these positions would depend on his rank and special abilities. To establish such positions will require understanding and cooperation from the personnel and budget offices in the Department and perhaps special congressional action, but this or some similar plan is an indipensable step.

Another problem which requires more study than can be given to it in this article is the question of language teaching methods. This is a murky and somewhat controversial field in which one risks drawing down the wrath of the linguistic scientists who have strongly influenced language teaching since the last war. Not being linguistic scientists, the writers are not qualified to enter into the merits of this controversy from a scientific viewpoint. Our comments are simply based on actual field experience in learning and teaching languages and we are interested in the practical question: What actually produces the best results from the standpoint of the student? These observations have led us to conclude that the new teaching techniques have much to commend them and are especially effective for students who want a quick, useful, but not necessarily accurate, command of a language. They are therefore better suited for general language programs than for training language and area specialists whose needs are of a different order.

The new systems of language teaching have discarded traditional methods in favor of

shortcut or direct teaching courses in which the primary emphasis is on the spoken language. These lessons are often written in transliterative systems which employs so many diacritical marks to represent the strange sounds of the exotic language that in many cases it is just as easy to learn the foreign script as to learn the romanized transliteration.

Language schools for missionaries in south Asia with many years of experience in language teaching have long ago concluded that for students who careers are to be in the area, it is just as easy and ultimately far more fruitful, to teach the local scripts from the beginning. Their language tests are therefore written in the native alphabets. Progress at first may be slower but in the long run the ability to read fluently gives the student a deeper and broader knowledge of the language. This principle is perhaps even more applicable to the language and area specialist whose language needs are of the same long-range nature but even more demanding than those of the missionary.

A similar argument can be made for the study of grammar. It is sometimes overlooked that grammar itself is a short-cut to language. It can be learned empirically or inductively from numerous examples, but for many adult students it is much quicker to learn the rule which is the essence of the many instances and then apply it to individual cases, rather than the other way around. A great deal depends, too, on the propensities of each student. It is the writers' feeling that these differences in susceptibility to various teaching methods have not been sufficiently recognized. Just as educational psychologists now recognize that some students are eye-minded and some ear-minded, experience in teaching languages shows that some students learn more readily by methods which side-step grammar and rely heavily on direct spoken exercises whereas others can advance further and more quickly by learning the basic rules of the language and applying them to individual speech situations.

As the reader may have guessed, this is a plea that the teaching methods now in general use for the training of language and area specialists, be carefully reviewed. Not all traditional ways of learning a language are necessarily bad, any more than all the new methods are necessarily good. Perhaps the solution lies in a reasonable synthesis of the two systems which, after testing in the crucible of experience rather than in speech laboratories, would incorporate the best aspects of both.

Lastly, the problem of providing adequate incentives to language and area specialists must be tackled. Judging from appeals which have been periodically circulated to the field, the Department encounters considerable difficulty in attracting sufficient numbers of candidates for language and area training. This has been especially true for those regions of the world, such as the Middle East and south Asia, where needs for specialists are growing. The reasons for the reluctance of Foreign Service officers to volunteer for this training are clear. To the candidate for language and area training, many disadvantages and few advantages are visible. If he applies for this training he must take 1 or 2 years out of his regular career while his colleagues in substantive assignments presumably enhance their chances for promotion. After his training he and his family have to look forward to a lifetime of service in a series of hardship posts with only occasional relief by assignment to Washington, which to many in the Service, is just another hardship post. In spite of references in the precepts to selection boards there has been little in the performances of past boards to indicate that the language and area specialist serving in Madras, Jidda, or Vientiane is viewed with any particular preference for promotion over his nonspecialist colleagues in Madrid, Buenos Aires, or Sydney. Furthermore, he may discover that prolonged service in one area will adversely affect his finances. He will find that his household appliances, clothing, and car wear out much faster than they would in nonhardship areas and that cost-of-living allowances will seldom cover these added expenses. Not only must he reequip himself and his family more frequently but he will find this process is more expensive than for his nonspecialist colleague.

An illustration will make this clear: Officer X, an area specialist, and officer Y, a nonspecialist, serving at Lahore are transferred. Following normal Foreign Service practice they order from the United States a car and other items needed to equip themselves at their next post. As an area specialist, X is transferred within his area to Bombay. As a nonarea specialist, Y is available for worldwide assignment and is transferred, let us say, to Rome. X at once finds that he must buy many items for Bombay which Y does not need to purchase for Rome. But even worse, in accordance with Foreign Service regulations, X must pay the difference between what it would have cost to ship his purchases Lahore-Bombay and the actual shipping cost New York-Bombay.

All these considerations add up to rather powerful deterrents, even for those whose natural interests attract them to these uncomfortable areas of the world. The language and area specialist thus finds himself a member of a select group but one that is singled out for penalty more often than for privilege. This, of course, has its psychological advantages in creating a certain élan and esprit de corps among the specialist group. The Marine Corps and the Foreign Legion have found it advantageous to elevate this masochism (latent to some extent in all men) to heights of heroism. But although this may have some appeal to the language and area candidate, the task of building a solid and effective corps of specialists will require powerful and positive incentives.

These incentives should be both psychological and material. The former category could include some of the reforms suggested in this article such as effective initial training and a planned followthrough series of assignments. The language and area officer should be given the feeling, supported by tangible evidence, that he belongs to a specially selected group over which the Department, and particularly the F.S.I., maintain a vigilant eye.

In the category of material incentives, the logical first step should be to remove or minimize some of the obvious inequities which now accompany the mere fact of being a language and area specialist. In addition to correcting obviously discriminatory procedures, positive incentive, either in the form of pay increments or through some system of promotion preference similar to that suggested for general language programs in the first part of this article, should be instituted. In this case too, separate dossiers could be prepared on language and area specialists which would be handed to selection boards only after all eligible officers have been rated, so that as between two officers of equal ability, the language and area specialist would receive promotion preference. Incidentally, a specialist officer who was extraordinarily gifted in language might thus earn a double promotion credit, one for his language and area specialization and one along with other officers who had successfully passed examinations in language listed for promotion credit. The languages of his area of specialty would, of course, not earn him credit in the general language incentive program.

To sum up, the problem which faces the Foreign Service in its attempt to untie the tongues of its employees is a complex and difficult one. Different types of programs will be needed for the different groups that have to be reached: one for employees interested only in acquiring a useful knowledge of the local language; another for all officers who need to have a command of at least one world language; and again another for the particular needs of language and area specialists. The key to the solution of these problems lies in the formulation and institution of adequate training programs and of incentive systems tailored to the results which the Department hopes to achieve.

[From the Foreign Service Journal, February 1959]

FOREGN LANGUAGE: CHINK IN AMERICA'S ARMOR?

(By Jacob Ornstein)

"The United States is probably weaker in foreign language abilities than any major country in the world," declared Marion Folsom, former Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, before a Senate committee in January 1958. He added, "If we are to gain and hold the confidence and good will of peoples around the world, we must be able to talk to them not in our language but in theirs." In recent months a growing number of statements of this kind by public leaders has caused thinking Americans to become more than a little concerned about the shocking state of our foreign language preparation.

In the pre-sputnik days warnings about the poor state of our linguistic preparedness were greeted by yawns, or at best, mild interest. The Soviet satellites circling about the earth brought us face to face with some very disquieting facts. One of the most upsetting of these has been the news that of the 1,400 or so Soviet technical journals received by our libraries, less than 50 have until now been regularly translated.

Does it matter? In 1951 an article on contact relay networks appeared in the Journal of the U.S.S.R. Academy of Sciences. So few of our scientists read Russian that it was not noticed until 1955. In the opinion of Dr. William Locke of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, this oversight cost us at least $200,000 in duplicated research, not to mention the time-lag.

A survey by the author published last year by the State Department's External Research Staff revealed that of our 1,800 or so colleges less than 180 were teaching Russian—to about 5,000 students. By contrast, in the U.S.S.R. an estimated 10 million Russians of all ages are busy mastering English.

World War II left the United States in a position of leadership for which we were ill-prepared linguistically. Decades of neglect had brought language training to its lowest level in our history. When Hitler invaded Poland in 1939 about 20 colleges were teaching Russian, while an insignificant number offered the languages of Poland, Czechoslovakia, Yugoslavia, and other strategic areas. The Armed Forces and the Government scrambled to set up emergency teaching programs where weary-eyed GI's raced against time to get a smattering of Japanese, Norwegian, Bulgarian, and some 40 other tongues urgently needed to conduct the war on our farflung battlefronts.

The postwar period brought an aggravation of the language problem. The tasks of occupation and of dealing with new states created an unprecedented demand for linguistic know-how. Since the end of the war at least 15 sovereign states have been born, many employing languages not offered by any American school. India alone has at least 100 dialects and 14 official tongues. Of these, Hindi, spoken by about 150 million persons, is taught by a mere half dozen American universities.

Those whose stock answer to this problem is "Let 'em learn English" are simply blind

to the international facts of life. The dangers of linguistic ignorance are dramatically shown by a story which has become well-known in Foreign Service circles. When the American Embassy was set up in a certain new Far Eastern state, we had not a single officer with competence in the language and had to hire local interpreters. Wishing to please their employers, they translated everything to sound very flattering to the United States.

When we were able to train and send out our own linguists, we were horrified to find that anti-American sentiment was raging fiercely in that country.

Secretary of State Dulles, in requesting additional funds for language training at the 85th Congress last year, pointed out that less than half of our Foreign Service officers had a practical speaking and reading knowledge of French, German, or Spanish, while barely 25 percent of the incoming trainees had a working knowledge of these tongues. For this reason, he observed, the State Department had been obliged to relax severely its language requirement in recruiting new officers. Perhaps the most telling commentary on these figures has been provided by Secretary Dulles himself when he asserted that "the effectiveness of our efforts to create a stable pattern of international relations hinges to an important degree on the establishment of understanding between peoples. Language can both aid and obstruct this vital understanding."

While American high school students have been enrolled in driver education, basket-weaving, and telephone techniques, the Soviets have left no stone unturned to provide their citizens with the ordnance of foreign language. Writing in the New York Times, Mr. Theodore Shabad a few months ago described the ambitious network of schools being established throughout the Soviet Union where at the tender age of 8 bright youngsters are launched on all-out programs of language mastery. In Moscow there are three schools where youngsters are getting their three R's exclusively in French, German, or English. In Leningrad two elementary boarding schools put the children through their paces in Chinese and Hindi. Special schools have been established in the Soviet Republic of Uzbekistan to introduce youngsters to Chinese, Hindi, Arabic, and other languages.

In vivid contrast to the intense Soviet language drive, the linguistic picture in the United States is a depressing one. According to Modern Language Association figures, of the 24 major languages of the world, each spoken by more than 20 million persons, only Spanish and French are studied by an appreciable number of Americans. It is hardly any wonder, therefore, that of our representatives abroad perhaps 1 out of 40 can speak effectively any language but English.

That this problem reared its ugly head as early as the Colonial Period is revealed by John Adams in a letter addressed to the Treasury Board. In it he commented:

"I found myself in France ill-versed in the language, the laws, customs, and manners of the country, and had the mortification to find my colleagues little better informed than myself, vain as this may seem."

Referring to Benjamin Franklin, he noted that the latter "spoke the language imperfectly and was able to write bad French."

However, the language needs of those early diplomats appear trifling compared with those of today. At a conference in linguistic needs in government, held by the U.S. Office of Education in March, 1957, it was learned that a total of 106 foreign tongues are required for our Government agencies and armed services. As our schools have simply not been producing enough qualified linguists, the services and many Government agencies have been obliged to create special schools. At the Army Language School, for example, intensive training, lasting from 6 to 15 months, is provided in 29 languages, ranging from French to Vietnamese.

Despite the acute need for Americans who can speak languages, few students enrolled in college language courses go far enough in their study to be able to carry on a simple conversation or read a newspaper editorial; worse yet, too few colleges provide courses which give insight into the background of areas other than Western Europe. The Conference on Asian Affairs recently reported that fully 40 percent of our colleges have no courses on the Far East where over half the world's population resides.

Condemning the short-sightedness of many of our universities, Dr. Grayson Kirk, president of Columbia University, last year stated, "We must make an effort to know more of the life and thought of the great Asian leaders who have had such profound influence on the lives of hundreds of millions of men and women. It will be a long time," he added, "before Asoka and Akbar and the Gupta Kings are commonplace terms along with Julius Caesar, Henry IV of France, and the Tudor Kings of England."

The Modern Language Association of America, in a 4-year study supported by the Rockefeller Foundation, has revealed facts and figures on language in our schools which give little reason for complacency. Surveying 971 American colleges and universities, the Association found that more than half of these schools offer no language other than French, Spanish, or German. It concluded that three-quarters of the world's population speaks languages not taught in American universities.

While the Soviets are busy courting the uncommitted neutrals through a never-ending series of cultural, scientific missions, dance groups and sports teams—all well supplied with linguists—we have the doubtful distinction of sending more tonguetied persons abroad than any other modern country. Unhappily, this is not limited to the average citizen who invests in a summer cruise, but applies to our intellectual and school leaders as well. Commenting on this, the distinguished teacher and writer, Henri Peyre, of Yale University, has written: "Americans have taken refuge in the easy but paralyzing prejudice—totally groundless, in fact—that they are not gifted for languages. * * * They have been afflicted by shyness when confronted by the need to master another tongue and have cultivated inhibitions which a little courage would soon dispel. American scientists, scholars, and diplomats have thus done incalculable damage to the prestige of their country abroad, through their placid assumption that everyone should understand English."

Is there any way out of the language muddle? Indeed, the situation has become so critical that Government leaders have decided to take action. Public Law 85–864, passed by the 85th Congress, authorizes $887 million for a 4-year program of development in science, mathematics, and languages.

The plan proposes some daring innovations. It calls for a system of language institutes to be established at colleges for the purpose of providing language teachers and supervisors with training intended to improve the quality and effectiveness of instruction. In addition, the proposal provides for the development of foreign-language training and service centers at selected institutions to furnish instruction in rare but strategic tongues rarely or never taught in the United States.

This is certainly a step in the right direction. However, despite the merit of such a plan, it is still an emergency measure which does not attack the problem at the very core. The solution to our linguistic dilemma can come only through a thorough overhauling of our language teaching system.

First of all, it is necessary to streamline our teaching methods. Most of the Nation's 25,000 language instructors are capable and devoted individuals. Unfortunately, there are still a considerable number who teach a language by the well-known expedient of keeping one page ahead of the class. Elsewhere, well qualified teachers find themselves hamstrung by a rigid program of study stressing grammatical analysis and translation of literary classics. This has resulted in drab, uninteresting instruction which has caused many generations of Americans to abhor language study, recalled by them as a tortured exercise in the memorization of irregular verbs and adjectives.

Part and parcel of the improvement of teaching methods is the need for increased use of audiovisual aids and laboratories. Although no panacea for language problems, the use of magnetic tape recorders and other equipment in soundproof laboratories has proved to be a boon to the teaching of foreign languages, especially for the speaking and understanding phases.

A sweeping change must be made with regard to the age at which young Americans are introduced to foreign languages. In no other civilized country is the mistake made of presenting a second language to the individual so late in his school career. The findings of physiological, psychological, and linguistic researchers indicate clearly that by the age of 5 a child has mastered his own tongue and is ready to learn one or several foreign tongues.

Fortunately, America is witnessing the development of a vigorous trend—the movement to introduce foreign languages in the elementary schools, known as FLES by educators. Sparked by Earl J. McGrath while he was U.S. Commissioner of Education in 1952, the movement has had a meteoric career. In 5 years, the number of grade-school youngsters has risen from insignificant numbers to some 300,000 junior linguists enrolled in French, Spanish, German, Italian, and other languages. Even so, at the present time, less than one youngster out of a hundred can get started in a foreign lauguage at a time when he can learn it perfectly and effortlessly.

In the modern program of language instruction which America so badly needs today, the youngster would begin the study of a foreign language by the third grade and continue it through high school and into college, until he has a good speaking, writing, and reading knowledge. Let it be remembered that a Soviet youngster who wishes to attend college must present at least 6 years of a modern language and that he must usually continue it there for several years more.

In addition to increasing the number of years that a foreign lauguage is studied, it is essential that we expand greatly the range of languages taught in our schools. Most high schools and colleges are still offering the same languages which they taught 30 years ago. There is an urgent need to introduce important world languages like Russian, Polish, Czech, Chinese, Japanese, Indonesian, Arabic, Swahili, and others.

Moreover, the language profession needs to be made much more attractive. Dr. H. B. Wells, president of Indiana University, has called attention to the declining number of students going into the linguistic field. "Last year," he noted in 1957, "of the entire graduating class a mere 1.6 percent was specializing in languages, a mere drop in the bucket compared to our needs." It is, however, little wonder that present-day youth is giving this field a cold shoulder, when incentives are so poor. The training of a language teacher or translator requires from 7 to 10 years. Consequently, many youngsters prefer to go into fields where the training is less rigorous and rewards are greater.

In the final analysis, there can be no lasting solution to the language problem until the general public is made aware of the linquistic problem and demands from its

schools the type of language training suited for a jet-propelled world where borders are constantly shrinking.

A start has been made in acquainting Americans at the grassroots with language problems. The U.S. Commission for UNESCO, in cooperation with the Modern Language Association, has, during the past few years held several hundred "citizen consultation" meetings intended to acquaint laymen and leaders in typical American communities with the facts and figures on our language snarl. Electrified into action, many individuals and civic groups have acted through their school boards and administrators to improve language facilities at the local level.

Americans are beginning to wake up to our dangerous language lag—a weak chink in the Nation's armor. As a leader in the free world, the United States cannot afford to continue to be tonguetied in the world arena. Language—the verbal stuff of international communication—deserves a new deal in the American classroom.

[From the New York Times, Mar. 19, 1958]

FOREIGN SERVICE WOES: A COMMENT ON INABILITY OF U.S. ENVOYS TO TALK LANGUAGE OF NATIONS THEY'RE IN

(By James Reston)

WASHINGTON, March 18.—Sometimes a small incident tells more about the problems of U.S. foreign policy than a month's debate in the Senate. President Eisenhower's luncheon yesterday with the Advisory Committee of the Foreign Service Institute is a case in point. The purpose of the meeting was to discuss the sad state of language training in the Foreign Service, which is primarily responsible for the administration of U.S. foreign policy at home and overseas.

Actually, what it turned out to be was a briefing session, primarily by men outside the Government, for the President on just how poorly trained in languages his staff is.

The facts are as follows:

Fifty percent of the entire Foreign Service officer corps do not have a speaking knowledge of any foreign language.

Seventy percent of the new men coming into the Foreign Service are in the same state.

Llewellyn E. Thompson, U.S. Ambassador in Moscow, is the only U.S. Ambassador in a Communist country who speaks the language of the country to which he is assigned.

In the nine Arabic-speaking countries, the only U.S. Ambassadors who speak Arabic are Raymond Hare in Egypt and Parker T. Hart in Jordan.

In the non-English-speaking countries of the North Atlantic Treaty nations, the U.S. Ambassadors do not have a workable knowledge of the language in Belgium, France, Germany, Iceland, the Netherlands, Portugal, Turkey, and Greece.

Vinton Chapin, the Ambassador in Luxembourg, is fluent in French; Val Peterson, in Copenhagen, claims a fair knowledge of Danish; Frances E. Willis, in Oslo, says she can speak fair Norwegian, and James D. Zellerbach, in Rome, says merely that he is studying Italian.

The same state of affairs, or worse, exists in the U.S. embassies of Asia, and naturally enough, the President was not only interested but enthusiastic about doing something about it.

Those at the White House luncheon were Gen. Alfred M. Gruenther, of the Red Cross; Robert Calkins, of the Brookings Institution; Hamilton Fish Armstrong, editor of Foreign Affairs; Dr. Clyde K. Kluckhohn of the Peabody Museum; Charles E. Saltzman, former Assistant Secretary of State; and Henry M. Wriston, former president of Brown University.

Also, for the administration, Under Secretary of State Christian A. Herter; Deputy Under Secretary of State Loy Henderson; Gen. Robert Cutler, an assistant to the President; Harold B. Hoskins, Director of the Foreign Service Institute; and the newly appointed Director of the Bureau of the Budget, Maurice H. Stans.

It is the function of the Foreign Service Institute to provide language training for Foreign Service officers, but its funds have repeatedly been cut, with little or no effort by the President to do anything about it.

Though he is responsible for the appointment of ambassadors, and though the Foreign Service officers who head our embassies overseas are his personal representatives, the President's attitude was reported to be: "Why didn't somebody tell me about this?"

He was sincerely disturbed, and even angry, about the difficulty in getting adequate funds to provide the necessary language training. He observed that a former secretary of his was recently given a 4-year training course at a university on Air Force funds, and he wondered why it was not possible to get even a few months' training for the men who were involved in one of the most lively periods of diplomatic activity in recent years.

REPRESENTATIVE ROONEY INVOLVED

His visitors told him in plain and simple terms. The reason, as almost everybody familiar with the State Department's problems knows, is Representative JOHN J. ROONEY, Democrat, of the 14th District of New York (Kings County).

Mr. ROONEY is chairman of the House Appropriations subcommittee that presides over the State Department budget. He has been slashing that budget for years, is less than enthusiastic about giving ambassadors the necessary language training or representation allowances, and is generally regarded, despite his obscurity, as one of the most powerful men in America, in a negative way, so far as U.S. foreign policy is concerned.

The President was interested in Mr. ROONEY and offered to do something about talking to him. He could not have been more sympathetic to the problems placed before him and his visitors came away convinced that they had had a most useful luncheon.

But at least some of them wondered why the language and training problem had not been discussed and dealt with at the highest level of the Government more than 5 years ago, or at least in 1956, when the embassies were filled with presidential appointees who could not speak the language of the countries to which they were assigned.

[From the Christian Science Monitor, July 5, 1959]

WHERE AMERICA IS LAST

Recently when some Americans were visiting a school in Moscow a Russian girl of high school age arose and addressed the visitors in English.

It was rather broken English, but it was intelligible. And one of the American visitors, Jenkins Lloyd Jones of the Tulsa Tribune, confessed to sadness that there was not a public school in the United States where a single pupil could welcome Russian visitors in the Russian language.

While English is taught in most of the leading schools of Russia the Russian language is taught in few public schools in the United States.

A few weeks ago a convoy of three Russian airplanes landed at the capital city of one of the countries of the southwestern Pacific. Every one of the 125 visiting Russians was able to speak the native language. They had been trained in that language before they undertook their mission. But in the American Embassy in that island capital there was only one employee who could speak the native language, and he was a native of the island, an interpreter employed by the United States.

It is unusual for an American Ambassador to be able to speak the language of the country to which he is assigned. This ignorance of foreign languages has its handicaps. To begin with it is a positive embarrassment, because an ability to speak many languages is considered the hallmark of an educated person in most of the world's capitals.

Hence no matter how skilled the American representative may be in the language of his own country he is written down as ignorant when he shows his inability to speak another tongue.

It has been argued for years that no one should be sent abroad to represent the United States officially unless he is able to speak the language of the country to which he is assigned. But nothing important has ever resulted from the argument. Primarily the United States is simply unable to find competent diplomats who are acquainted with foreign languages. So we continue to send into the capitals and cultural centers of the world men who are unable to understand one word of the language they hear in councils or on the streets.

Nothing corrective is likely to be done about this for a long time. You can imagine what would happen to the American lawmaker who launched a movement to require the teaching of the Russian language in all American schools. Yet Russian speech is gradually becoming the court language of half the world. (Daily Oklahoman.)

IMPORTANCE OF THE RAILROAD INDUSTRY

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, sometimes we are prone to forget and to neglect a word of tribute or praise to an industry—and to the men who are engaged in it—which plays so important a role in the lives of every one of us and which is so essentially a fundamental part of our progress and development as a Nation. We are fortunate in the great and diversified types of our American industry. Our past development has been possible because of the progress these industries have made through their growth and expansion. We owe them much for that.

Our future progress may well depend upon the preservation and continued healthy existence of these vital industries. Too many of our citizens have their private funds invested in them for that investment to be neglected. Too many workers depend upon their continued employment in all our industries for us to allow any one to be the object of discriminatory practices or policies.

In my opinion, one of the most vital of our industries today is our railroads. To neglect this segment of our economic system would indeed have dire and far-reaching consequences. Thousands of workers depend upon our great railway system for their employment—trackworkers, repairmen, engineers, brakemen, conductors, station agents, office workers, and executives. So we must not overlook any of them when such a vital industry requires our thoughtful consideration for its future well-being.

I have prepared a brief statement relative to this great industry, and I desire to have my statement incorporated in the RECORD. Later, I shall expand my remarks, for this vital and ingenious

American enterprise deserves our most careful consideration.

TRIBUTE TO A VITAL INDUSTRY

For the past few years, I have become increasingly concerned about the physical and financial condition of our great American railroad industry. I followed with much interest the hearings which were held last winter under the able leadership of our colleague, the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS]. I was much encouraged, of course, when the Congress, in August, enacted the Transportation Act of 1958, and removed the onerous 3 percent excise tax on freight shipments.

These two pieces of legislation were, of course, very helpful, and, in my opinion, constituted a good beginning. We must, however, continue to look for a complete solution to the still present problems of discriminatory regulation, subsidization, and excessive taxation—all of which still plague this great industry. The ultimate solution of these problems can be accomplished only when the Congress acts to take into account the railroads' essentiality and importance to the economy of this country.

More than $35 billion of private capital has been invested in an immense railroad plant of shops, signals, communications, and rolling stock. More than 2 million freight and passenger cars weave in and out across the 220,000-mile network of rails, and carry almost half of the Nation's intercity freight traffic and nearly one-third of its commercial passenger load.

The accomplishments of the railroads are staggering. In just a 60-minute period, more than 1,000 freight and passenger trains start on scheduled runs all over the Nation, and the same number pull into terminals. More than 3½ million tons of goods will move some 20 miles during the same hour. On the passenger side, trains will perform transportation equivalent to carrying 3 million people 1 mile. Yet, even in the light of these facts, some persons think that the railroads are dying.

Let me say a word about the human side of railroading. At the end of 1956, more than 1 million persons were regularly employed in our railroad industry. Today, because of the problems which are still hanging around the necks of the railroads, and because of the recession, railroad employment has dropped to about 825,000 people, who receive about $5 billion a year in wages. Another half-million people work for companies which are directly dependent upon the $3 billion the railroad industry spends in an average year for materials, supplies, new plants, and equipment. Still more people—a million, in fact—have invested their savings in railroad stocks and bonds.

What about the financial support the railroads give to local and State governments and to the Federal Government? More than $1 billion is paid by the industry in a normal year in the form of taxes which help the States build and maintain our schools and other important projects. All of this makes America a better place in which to live. Some of the railroads' tax money even finds its way into the construction of highways, waterways, airways, and airports. This is a remarkable benefit to competing carriers.

So this is a vital industry which reaches into Hometown, U.S.A. Hundreds of thousands of men and women providing essential services, bread and butter payrolls for railroaders and suppliers, a flow of investment returns, and a veritable torrent of tax payments—all of which contribute to bringing progress and prosperity to our country.

I am certain that you will agree with me, Mr. President, that America needs and will continue to need its railroads. I cannot possibly see how this need can diminish in the future. If we are to believe the Census Bureau forecasts of a 60 million increase in our population by 1975, accompanied by a possible doubling of our output of goods and services, we shall need an even greater railroad system than we have today. More people mean more production—which will certainly increase the demand for volume transportation.

And in this area the railroads can concentrate a fantastic amount of transportation in a limited space, and can turn out a maximum of transportation with a minimum of manpower, fuel, and materials.

The ability to expand capacity rapidly is another feature which is characteristic of the railroads. During World War II, for example, using their same basic plant, the railroads doubled their freight traffic load over previous years, and carried more than four times as many passengers.

So here we have a very efficient type of transportation—one which can expand tremendously, one whose capacity is huge, one that feeds the economy of the country with a $5 billion annual payroll, and, finally, a form of transportation that, in spite of all I have told, Senators, earns far less on its net investment than does any other large industry in America—not even 3 percent.

One might well ask at this point: Why, with all their virtues and capabilities, are the railroads in such serious trouble today? The answer is fairly simple—grossly discriminatory governmental policies and practices.

Let me point out the disastrous consequences these governmental practices and policies have brought the railroad industry. Carloadings dropped from 35½ million in 1957 to about 30 million in 1958—or a decrease of 15 percent. Net income declined in 1958 by 20 percent under the previous year. Gross capital expenditures on property and equipment dropped from $1,383 million in 1957 to $740 million last year—a whopping 46½ percent. This reduction in purchasing not only impairs the physical condition of the railroads, but it seriously affects the supply industry, along with its hundreds of thousands of employees. Because of the serious decline in railroad employment, increased benefits to the unemployed have placed a serious burden upon the unemployment compensation fund. This is not a pretty picture, is it?

The financial illness of the railroads did not spring up overnight. It is in the form of creeping paralysis which has been coming on for years. If we do not begin immediately to try to cure it, the defense of America will be in serious jeopardy.

In any new national emergency, our country would again find itself short of trucks, gasoline, rubber tires, and necessary automotive parts. Our biggest and fastest airplanes, particularly the jets, would be diverted to military spots throughout the world. The railroads, as in World War II, would then be called upon to carry both our military personnel and the vast numbers of civilians diverted from the highways and airways. The Department of the Army recently told the Interstate Commerce Commission that the ability of the railroads to provide passenger service has declined to the point where further reductions would endanger our national defense.

Department of Defense officials have told the railroads that their freight car fleet is inadequate to meet the demands of full mobilization. Perhaps it is; I do not know. I do know, however, that there were only about 28,000 new freight cars on order as of last December 1. But how can we expect the railroads to repair its old cars and buy new ones as long as the industry, hamstrung by adverse public policies, is prevented from earning any more than 3 percent?

This country of ours must have a healthy and prepared railroad industry that will have the capacity to exceed even the great job it did in World War II, when our railroads hauled 90 percent of all domestic military freight and 97 percent of all organized troop movements.

What is the answer—nationalization? Nationalization in any vital industry accomplishes little. The possibilities of permanent harm is always present when Government attempts to do what private industry can do better. Furthermore, nationalization of any industry is contrary to our American concepts of free enterprise. No, I do not believe that nationalization is the answer, and I think Senators will agree with me after I tell them what happened 40 years ago. Most Senators will remember that the Government took over the railroads in 1918 and operated them for 26 months during the First World War. A comparison between the performance of the railroads under public and private operation is astounding and frightening. With one-fourth fewer employees, one-third fewer locomotives, one-fourth fewer freight cars, and one-third less passenger cars than we had in 1918, the railroads moved almost twice as much freight and more than twice as many passengers in World War II when they were privately operated. Deficits resulting from Federal operations cost the taxpayers nearly $2 million a day during World War I, while the railroads during World War II paid taxes to our Government averaging $3½ million a day. And that is not the whole story.

Serious as is the effect of Government ownership upon the railroads, its effect upon Government itself is equally serious. The most immediate effect if the railroads were nationalized today would

be the addition of nearly a million employees to Government payrolls. A second effect upon our Government would be an increase of its public debt as a result of having to pay billions of dollars to the present owners of the railroads. All of us know what a time we are having with the country's debt ceiling today. We can imagine the impact of the loss of tax money on our States and thousands of our communities across the United States if the railroads were Government-owned and tax free. Such a thought is indeed frightening.

But what about the effect of Government ownership upon the related economic systems? At present, railroad service is supplied by hundreds of private companies, each one independent with its own operations and its own services, yet working with others to create a unified national transportation service. In addition, of course, thousands of trucking firms and hundreds of water carriers, airlines, pipelines, and such are furnishing transportation. All of these companies are in competition not only between and among the several forms of transportation but also with each other. If we ever come to Government-operated railroads, we would thus produce competition between private and public enterprise—at least until the other forms of transportation came under the aegis of Government. After this nationalization, then what? Steel, coal—but why go on? We cannot let this come to pass. Nationalization would result ultimately in socialism in full bloom. Socialism, as we know it, is only one step removed from communism.

If Senators agree with me, and I am sure they do, that nationalization is out of the question, what can be done to restore the railroads to a healthy competitive position so that they can earn enough to attract additional capital to maintain their plants adequately and to expand to meet the needs which might well come tomorrow from a national emergency and which certainly will come from peacetime growth?

Frankly, I do not have the answer today. I ask, however, if and when transportation legislation comes before the Congress, that all of us consider such legislation in the light of the railroads' far-reaching essentiality and great importance to the economy of our country. Our railroads are indispensable. America cannot afford to let this vital industry wither on the vine.

If I were asked to what industry America owes more than to any other for its expansion and development, I would in all candor be bound to say that our debt is to the railroad industry. Consequently, we owe to it, the past, and to our future, that we preserve this great industry—so vital and so needed for further peace and prosperity—and so indispensable for us in case of a national emergency.

IMPORTANCE OF THE AMERICAN MERCHANT MARINE TO THE NATIONAL ECONOMY

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, the importance of the American merchant marine to the national economy, as well as to national security, fortunately is recognized by many civic and industry groups throughout the country. One of the business associations most steadfast and vocal in this regard is the Mississippi Valley Association, which includes in its membership the major business, industrial, public and agricultural interests of the mid-continental and gulf coast areas. At its recent 40th annual convention, the 1,300 delegates present unanimously pledged their active support to the country's privately owned merchant fleet, in an all-out endorsement that deserves the thoughtful attention of every Member of Congress. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MERCHANT MARINE

We pledge our active support to the promotion and maintenance of a strong, well balanced, privately owned and operated U.S. merchant marine to provide the shipping services essential to our industry, agriculture and commerce in time of peace, capable of implementing our international policies and ready to serve our national security in time of war.

We strongly urge that U.S. industry voluntarily patronize American-flag ships in order to assist in developing and strengthening the American merchant fleet.

We commend the chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff for his forthright declaration of the continuing need for an American merchant marine for the defense of our Nation; and the maritime industry for its efforts to demonstrate that in addition to its defense role, the industry makes a substantial contribution to the economic welfare of our country.

We affirm our support of the 50–50 law requiring that at least 50 percent of the cargoes generated by the U.S. Government should be transported in U.S.-flag ships to the extent they are available at reasonable rates.

We reaffirm our support of the basic principles and procedures of the 1936 Merchant Marine Act and its program of Federal support, based upon the principles of parity and of essential trade routes operated by American companies which are domiciled, owned and controlled in the domestic areas which they serve.

We condemn certain practices of foreign nations, which discriminate directly or indirectly against American-flag shipping and we urge increased effort by the Department of State to seek their elimination.

We commend the efforts being made by industry and the administration, with congressional support, to begin the largest peacetime vessel replacement program in our history and we urge adequate appropriations by the Federal Government so as to insure that, when combined with private investment, there will be sufficient funds to maintain an orderly and economic replacement schedule.

We recommend an expanded Government research program on ship design, ship propulsion and port facilities so that the latest and best information will be available to various segments of the American merchant marine.

We recommend that, in the event of mobilization, the merchant marine be placed under the jurisdiction of the Maritime Administration so that the experience and knowledge of the management of privately owned steamship companies may be effectively utilized.

We support the U.S. Government policy of encouraging effective steamship conference for the purpose of insuring rate stability, and fair and equal treatment of shippers and receivers in international commerce.

We also endorse the principle that such steamship conferences, to be effective and to meet the competition of nonconference steamship lines unwilling to accept the responsibilities of conference membership, must be permitted to continue entering into reasonable contractual arrangements with shippers and receivers tying together the parties to the contract.

AUTHORITY FOR PRESIDENT OR PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE OF THE SENATE TO SIGN BILLS DURING RECESS OR ADJOURNMENT OF THE SENATE

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President of the Senate or the President pro tempore be authorized to sign bills during the recess or adjournment of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

INVESTIGATION BY COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 49, Senate Resolution 27.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 27) authorizing the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to investigate certain matters within its jurisdiction.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution (S. Res. 27) authorizing the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to investigate certain matters within its jurisdiction, which was reported from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce with an amendment, and subsequently reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration without additional amendment.

The amendment of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce was, on page 3, line 4, after the word "exceed", to insert "$225,000", so as to make the resolution read:

Resolved, That the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdictions specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to—

(1) interstate commerce generally;
(2) foreign commerce generally;
(3) maritime matters;
(4) interoceanic canals;
(5) transportation policy;

(6) domestic surface transportation, including pipelines;
(7) communications;
(8) Federal power matters;
(9) civil aeronautics; and
(10) fisheries and wildlife.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, from February 1, 1959, to January 31, 1960, inclusive, is authorized (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ, upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided*, That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $1,200 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1960.

SEC. 4. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed $225,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, what is the pending question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to the resolution.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, this is a resolution authorizing the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to investigate certain matters within its jurisdiction, and providing funds for the operation of the committee.

The resolution was reported from the committee unanimously, with a quorum present. Some members were not present, but I have had no indication from those members of any opposition to the amount of money for which we have asked.

The ranking Republican member of the committee, the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL], and I appeared before the Committee on Rules and Administration and submitted a long and detailed statement concerning the work of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and the anticipated work for the coming session. Without burdening the Senate by reading the entire report, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks a letter addressed to the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS], chairman of the Committee on Rules and Administration, and signed by myself on behalf of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, setting forth not only the jurisdiction of the committee, but all of the anticipated work.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE
AND FOREIGN COMMERCE,
January 28, 1959.

Hon. THOMAS C. HENNINGS, Jr.,
Chairman, Committee on Rules and Administration, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CHAIRMAN HENNINGS: Senate Resolution 27 is now before your committee for consideration and action. This resolution would authorize the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to expend not more than $225,000 between February 1, 1959, and January 31, 1960, upon studies and investigations of any and all matters within its jurisdiction. This is the same amount that was granted under Senate Resolution 224, 85th Congress, 2d session, which authority expires on January 31, 1959, with unexpended funds in the amount of approximately $40,680.

During the 2d session of the 85th Congress, the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce approved 56 of the 109 bills submitted to it, and the Senate passed 51 of them, 2 of which were vetoed. Forty-three of these measures were signed into law by the President.

During 1958, the committee held 126 days of open hearings and 27 executive meetings. Fifteen major and 574 routine nominations were reported and confirmed.

The Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, in accordance with section 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act, has the responsibility of exercising continuous watchfulness of the execution by the administrative agencies concerned of any laws, the subject matter of which is within the jurisdiction of such committee. This committee has legislative jurisdiction over a greater number of quasi-judicial agencies than has any other committee; in fact, six of these arms of Congress come under the jurisdiction of the committee. They are: The Interstate Commerce Commission; the Federal Communications Commission; the Federal Trade Commission; the Civil Aeronautics Board; the Federal Power Commission; and the Federal Maritime Board.

In addition to these quasi-judicial boards and commissions, our responsibility to legislatively oversee certain of the agencies in the executive branch of the Government is a major one. Practically all of the activities of the Department of Commerce, for example, are within the jurisdiction of this committee. To a lesser degree, this committee finds within its jurisdiction matters which are the concern of the State, Treasury, Defense, Agriculture, and Interior Departments, and the General Services Administration.

With respect to the foregoing, some examples of such jurisdiction would be international air agreements, the Coast Guard, Military Air Transport Service, Military Sea Transport Service, transportation of farm commodities, fisheries, and transportation of Government freight. The committee also shares with the Committee on Armed Services jurisdiction over the Panama Canal.

I am listing below a brief summary of anticipated activities of the committee:

SURFACE TRANSPORTATION

Surface transportation, like other forms of transportation, will be faced with many problems in Alaska. We also expect requests for legislation that would allow the ownership of one form of transportation by a competing form, i.e., railroad ownership of trucklines. In addition, hearings may be necessary to legislatively oversee the effectiveness of the Transportation Act of 1958, the first major overhaul of railroad and truck legislation in many years. We are informed the Interstate Commerce Commission will submit at least 11 legislative proposals for introduction.

COMMUNICATIONS

During the last Congress, extensive hearings were held on the many problems presented to us by the communications industry. This committee appointed a special ad hoc committee of outstanding experts to look into the allocation of TV channels. Its report has been received, is now being studied by the FCC, and we expect their comments shortly. The UHF-VHF problem will unquestionably need further hearings.

The "FCC Network Study" (1,485 pages) recommending considerable change in TV regulation is completed, and specific recommendations from it will come to the committee this session. Subscription, or pay TV will be before us again, and bills have already been introduced on this controversial subject.

Television network practices are under continuing study. A staff report has been issued on this subject and forwarded to the FCC and the Department of Justice. When the comments from these agencies are received, the committee can proceed with whatever legislation is proposed.

In the summer of this year, an international conference on international frequency allocations will be held. No change has been made in these allocations since 1947. This committee will be heavily involved in this proceeding.

We anticipate hearings on legislation concerning communications common carriers in the domestic and international fields. Over 16 years ago, Congress issued a mandate requiring Western Union to divest itself of its international operations. For a variety of reasons, this company has not been able to accomplish this divesture. Legislation may be necessary which will entail exhaustive hearings.

On January 27, 1959, we opened hearings on S. 12, the educational TV bill. Unless some action is taken in this field by the Federal Government, we are endangering the channels reserved for this purpose.

Just recently the FCC declared TV boosters illegal, an action that some claim will take away the benefits of TV reception from many of our small communities, and people living in fringe-reception areas. Yesterday, the Commission extended the time for compliance from 90 days to 6 months, and announced they would again study the legal and technical aspects of boosters. Almost at the same time the original order was issued, this committee issued a staff report on "The Problem of Television Service for Smaller Communities." Specific recommendations for action by the FCC were made. It is our intention to hold hearings on this problem as soon as possible. Certainly we should be sure that television is made available to all who want it.

AVIATION

Last year the President vetoed the airport-aid bill. This legislation has been reintroduced (S. 1) and hearings started January 22, 1959. The competition of military transportation with commercial airlines must be investigated, and the vexing problem of the awarding of international air routes to foreign carriers, a sort of continuous giveaway, must again be looked at. Our international air policies may need an overhaul.

MERCHANT MARINE

Preservation and updating of the Nation's privately owned commercial ocean fleet, subsidized and unsubsidized, will be a major matter for consideration and action. The President's budget for 1960 recommended review and (if needed) modernization of the national maritime policies set down in the 1936 act, with reference to such basic questions as subsidies, useful life of vessels and

transfers to foreign registry. Any Department of Commerce proposals in any of these fields will require lengthy public hearings and committee decisions of vital importance to the future of American shipping.

Meanwhile, with bulk cargoes now totaling nearly 75 percent of the country's total foreign trade, something must be done, promptly, to provide incentives for replacement and strengthening of our remaining fleet of bulk vessels, which are presently inadequate for immediate, let alone future or emergency needs.

As a corollary proposition, the desirability of Government's participation, through mortgage insurance, in needed modernization of port facilities to keep step with technical improvements in ship construction and cargo handling, requires committee attention.

Provision for increased safety on the Great Lakes, through requirements for the use of experienced pilots on all vessels navigating U.S. waters thereon, must have immediate attention, in advance of the opening of the St. Lawrence Seaway this summer to vessels of 27-foot draft.

Further utilization of atomic propulsion units for commercial vessels is of the highest importance, as is the need for an atomic icebreaker to advance this country's knowledge of, and security in, the Arctic regions.

The 85th Congress enacted a stopgap bill preserving for 2 years conference dual rates in the foreign, oceanborne commerce of the United States. It is imperative that this field of regulation, untouched for 40 years, be reexamined and revised where necessary in the 86th Congress.

A bill providing for licensing and the terms of payment of foreign freight forwarders was received from the House too late for complete study in the 85th Congress. This field of cargo expediting has been the source of heated controversy for many years and requires committee study.

All industries in any way associated with the merchant marine have expressed their unanimous support for a consolidation of the shipping and maritime statutes. Consistent with the President's budget for 1960, such a program would include a reevaluation of the policies and objectives expressed in the various laws presently governing American ocean shipping.

During the adjournment following the 85th Congress, the committee began an initial investigation of the costs of shipping through the various west coast ports, to be followed by a study of east and gulf port costs, if necessary. Completion of the study in the 86th Congress will considerably enhance legislation directed at improving port facilities and encouraging increased use of commercial docks by military shipping.

BOARDS AND COMMISSIONS

We anticipate legislation to make the terms of office of the members of these agencies uniform as to expiration, so that all under our jurisdiction remain in office until their successor has been nominated and qualified, allow all such agencies to elect their chairman as some do now, and to spell out a workable code of ethics.

ALASKA

The advent of the 49th State into the Union will create problems in all of the fields for which this committee holds responsibility. As an example, transportation will now be regulated in the State of Alaska, but the sole railroad operating there is owned by the United States, and is not regulated. Joint rail-water rates, and jurisdiction over them, will necessitate considerable study.

FOREIGN COMMERCE

It is the intent of the committee to continue to evaluate the work of the Department of Commerce and other agencies in the field of foreign commerce. It appears that over 80 percent of the firms which utilize the services of the Department of Commerce are small businessmen who cannot afford export departments to aid them in the conduct of trade abroad. The committee is of the opinion much more can be done to promote the sale of American products overseas.

We would like to stimulate a hard, all-out competition for world markets, and thereby increase our exports, so necessary to the economic welfare of our country. We should understand that we are in an all-out fight in this field, a fact first pointed out by Khrushchev on October 19, 1957, when he said, "We declare war upon you in the peaceful field of trade. We declare war. We will win over the United States. The threat to the United States is not the ICBM, but in the field of peaceful production. We are relentless in this, and it will prove the superiority of our system." Just yesterday Mr. Khrushchev was quoted in the daily papers to the same effect under the headline "Khrushchev Outlines Economic Offensive." The article points out that a campaign for the economic conquest of the West has been launched.

In addition, we expect the Federal Power Commission to submit proposed legislation dealing with both the Federal Power Act, and the Natural Gas Act.

The workload of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee is extremely heavy and covers a range of important subjects, vital to the well-being of our Nation. Our plans, as outlined above, plus the additional legislation that will be referred to the committee from the Senate will determine our workload. In view of our wide jurisdiction and the essential volumes of work it involves, we believe our request is a modest one.

Sincerely yours,

WARREN G. MAGNUSON,
Chairman.

Budget of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to investigate certain matters under its jurisdiction pursuant to S. Res. 27, for the period of Feb. 1, 1959, through Jan. 31, 1960

Position	Number	Base salary (per annum)	Gross salary (per annum)	Monthly salary (gross)	Total for period of budget (gross)
STAFF					
Professional staff members in following general fields:					
Aviation, fisheries and wildlife, merchant marine and Coast Guard, MATS-MSTS study, auto-marketing practices, general transportation, television inquiry, and communications.	5	$8,000	$14,979.45	$1,248.28	$74,897.25
	1	6,000	11,709.76	975.81	11,709.76
	1	5,520	10,925.02	910.41	10,925.02
	1	4,680	9,466.33	788.86	9,466.33
	1	4,620	9,358.42	779.86	9,358.42
	1	4,200	8,568.87	714.07	8,568.87
	1	4,080	8,342.80	695.23	8,342.80
Clerical staff:					
Clerical assistants and stenographers	1	4,200	8,568.87	714.07	8,568.87
	2	2,940	6,195.07	516.25	12,390.14
	1	2,580	5,516.84	459.73	5,516.84
	1	2,460	5,290.76	440.89	5,290.76
Clerk-messenger	1	2,100	4,612.55	384.37	4,612.55
	1	1,920	4,273.42	356.11	4,273.42
Total	18				173,921.03
ADMINISTRATIVE					
Contribution to civil service retiremend fund (6½ percent of total salaries)					11,399.68
Travel (inclusive of field investigations)					15,000.00
Hearings (inclusive of reporters' fees)					10,000.00
Stationery, office supplies					1,000.00
Communications (telephone, telegraph, postage)					3,000.00
Newspapers, magazines, documents					200.00
Contingent fund					10,479.29
Total administrative expense					51,078.97
Total S. Res. 27					225,000.00

Mr. MAGNUSON. Also, I should like to submit for the RECORD a brief summary of the Government activities under the jurisdiction of the committee, in connection with the 1960 budget requests, which total some $2,581,499.

There being no objection, the summary was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Government activities under the jurisdiction of the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce—1960 budget requests

ACTIVITY AND AMOUNT	
1. Department of Commerce, including—	
(a) General administration	$2,940,000
(b) Civil Aeronautics Board	70,118,000
(c) Coast and Geodetic Survey	14,100,000
(d) Business and Defense Services Administration	6,030,000
(e) Area assistance activities	55,000,000

Government activities under the jurisdiction of the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce—1960 budget requests—Continued

ACTIVITY AND AMOUNT	
1. Department of Commerce, including—Continued	
(f) Bureau of Foreign Commerce	$6,632,000
(g) Office of Business Economics	1,405,000
(h) Maritime activities	278,816,000
(i) National Bureau of Standards	19,215,000
(j) Weather Bureau	51,855,000
Total	506,111,000
2. Federal Aviation Agency	602,400,000
3. U.S. Coast Guard	260,300,000
4. Interior Department—Fish and Wildlife Service	68,055,000
5. Panama Canal	22,030,000
6. Federal Communications Commission	11,000,000
7. Federal Trade Commission	6,975,000
8. Federal Power Commission	7,478,000

Government activities under the jurisdiction of the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce—1960 budget requests—Continued

ACTIVITY AND AMOUNT	
9. Interstate Commerce Commission	$20,150,000
Grand total	1,504,499,000
10. MATS (1956)	596,000,000
11. MSTS (1956)	481,000,000
Total	2,581,499,000

(NOTE.—The committee is also directly concerned with activities of the Department of Defense (MSTS, MATS), Department of State (foreign trade promotion), National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, and other operations.)

Mr. MAGNUSON. Certain other activities are set forth in the report, including activities in connection with the automobile-marketing field, and the entire problem of surface transportation, maritime fisheries, communications, trucks, railroads, buslines, the Coast Guard, boards, and Commissions, including, as the present occupant of the chair well knows a proposed inquiry into certain aspects of our foreign trade, which is under the direct jurisdiction of our committee.

We think we have asked for a modest sum. The record of the committee will show that whenever we have not found it necessary to proceed with certain inquiries and studies we have turned a part of the money back. Every year we have turned back a portion of the amount for which we have asked.

I believe the present request is modest. In the maritime field alone we must investigate the entire problem of dual rates, which the Supreme Court declared to be technically illegal last year.

A study is long overdue relating to the consolidation and codification of maritime laws, which has never been done.

The committee has under its jurisdiction the opening of the St. Lawrence Seaway and the entire problem of communication and navigation on the seaway, as between Canada and the United States, including the activities of pilots.

We have a port facility and rate study under way, which would include some problems in the new State of Alaska.

In the field of communications it seems that the problems are never ended.

Many Senators have been vitally concerned with the problem of booster stations, particularly in the West, where television cannot operate to the benefit of smaller communities.

There is a long-standing problem, which will require a great deal of the time of the committee, in connection with the question of mergers of international common carriers, involving a new cable across the Atlantic. That will require legislation.

We have the continuing problems in connection with the regulation of broadcasting networks. The airport-aid bill has passed the Senate, but that subject is under our jurisdiction.

We had the problem of MATS versus commercial airlines, and the entire question of international air policies, which have a great effect upon our commercial system.

Under Senate Resolution 29, next on the calendar, the committee would be directed by the Senate to make a complete study and inquiry into the entire field of surface transportation.

Considering the jurisdiction of the committee over all the agencies I have mentioned, in connection with a budget of $2,581,499,000, I believe that we have asked for a very modest sum.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. Is the Senator advocating the theory that since his committee has jurisdiction over agencies which spend $2½ billion, then that justifies the $225,000 he is asking?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes.

Mr. ELLENDER. Then the Senator's committee expects to look into the expenditure of $2½ billion by these agencies?

Mr. MAGNUSON. We do it all the time.

Mr. ELLENDER. Last year the Senate granted $225,000 for that purpose to the committee. Yet, the committee spent only $182,886. To what extent did the committee go into the expenditure of the moneys appropriated by the Congress for the various agencies?

Mr. MAGNUSON. We make constant inquiries into the Federal Trade Commission, the Federal Communications Commission, and the Interstate Commerce Commission. We all remember the excellent work the Senator from Oklahoma did with respect to the marketing of automobiles. We used some of the money to look into the policy of automobile marketing. Finally we brought out proposed legislation to compel the manufacturers of automobiles to put detailed price lists on automobiles.

We continually look into all the Commissions. Hardly a month goes by that we do not have to consider the reappointment of an official or the nomination of an official of one of these Commissions. We must have our staff look into all these questions. We must look into how the Commissions are spending their money, and many times we must direct them in their respective fields.

For example, the Senator from Louisiana has joined me, unofficially, in starting an inquiry into the Federal Trade Commission. The Senator has been interested in that subject. It deals with the price of drugs. I do not know at the present time how much money we have saved the people of the United States by that inquiry alone.

Every time a Commissioner is appointed or reappointed, we must look into his qualifications. A staff must investigate all of these matters. Our committee considers 78 percent of all the nominations that are sent to the Senate for confirmation.

Mr. ELLENDER. What does the committee's regular staff do? How many staff members does the committee have now?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I will file the exact number in the RECORD.

Mr. ELLENDER. Under the Reorganization Act the committee is authorized to employ four professional staff members and six clerical assistants.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes.

Mr. ELLENDER. Is it not a part of their duty to investigate matters connected with nominations, and to do similar work?

Mr. MAGNUSON. It is a part of their duty to do the best they can. For example, we are now considering the nomination of the new Secretary of Commerce. Our committee is looking into that matter. It would take a little FBI organization to run down information of the kind that must be looked into. We do not have the people to do it. Our people are doing the very best they can. All of them are kept busy. There are countless items of that kind which must be looked into. I will put into the RECORD the exact number of people employed by the committee.

Mr. ELLENDER. The resolution asks for $225,000.

Mr. MAGNUSON. That is what we had last year.

Mr. ELLENDER. Last year the committee expended $182,886.32.

Mr. MAGNUSON. That is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. Why does the Senator ask for more than the committee spent last year?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Because I cannot anticipate fully exactly what we will have to spend this year. Last year we went into the textile matter. A study was made by a group headed by the Senator from South Carolina and the Senator from Rhode Island. Then along came the fall, and everyone became very busy, and the Senator from Rhode Island had to go into a campaign for reelection. Therefore we did not spend as much money as we thought we would spend during last year. We are now continuing that textile inquiry. We held hearings on the textile labeling bill, and that took almost $9,000 in expenditures merely for the reporting of the hearings.

Mr. ELLENDER. I am sure money for that purpose is provided by the committee.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes; but we do not have enough money.

Mr. ELLENDER. The subcommittee can always come to the Senate for more money.

Mr. MAGNUSON. That is what we are doing today.

Mr. ELLENDER. Why can the regular staff not handle such problems?

Mr. MAGNUSON. The regular staff, under the Reorganization Act, of which the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] was one of the authors, could not possibly handle all that work in our committee, and every member of the committee knows that to be a fact.

Mr. ELLENDER. Our good friend from Oklahoma knows all about the Reorganization Act. He is one of the authors of it. It merely seems to me that the costs which have been added to the operation of Congress in recent years are unconscionable.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. As of this date—and I am informed that we have not seen the end of these requests for addi-

tional funds to conduct special investigations by various subcommittees—if the Senate approves these two resolutions before us today we will increase the total authorizations for this purpose during this session of Congress by $4,082,000. A few weeks ago I complained about the huge amount of money which has been allocated to the Committee on the Judiciary for special investigations to be conducted by its many subcommittees. That committee, as well as the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and any other major committee, has a regular stipend allotted to it of one hundred twenty-and-some-odd-thousand dollars. With the funds it can employ four professional staff members and six clerical assistants. In addition, each of these committees receives $10,000 to pay for printing and carrying on of hearings. I could well understand, if the Senator's committee needs more money with which to hold hearings, that it would be appropriate to grant additional money, because practically all of the committees do get additional money for that purpose. However, in this instance, I wish to point out to my good friend from Oklahoma that during this Congress—and we are not through by any means—the two resolutions before us would raise the total amount authorized for special hearings to $4,082,000, in contrast to the total last year of $3,708,500, for these identical investigations.

Mr. MONRONEY. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. MONRONEY. We have come to the floor of the Senate to show that we did not spend all the money that was allocated to us last year. We were frugal and economical. We doubled up wherever we could on the joint use of the staffs on many hearings. Although we did all that, the Senator from Louisiana now says, "Because you did save some $40,000 for the Government, we do not dare trust you with the money you ask for now, which is $225,000."

I ask the Senator not to charge us with $4 or $5 million of expenditures. I remind the Senator that our committee is the basic business committee of the Senate.

Every major part of our transportation industry and our communications—whether it be telephone or telegraph or radio or television—and our railroads and airlines and trucklines—almost every facet of this great Nation's flow of commerce comes before our committee. We could, of course, bring to the Senate bills on which no hearings had been held—bills unheard of or unsung, so to speak—and ask the Senate to pass such bills. On the contrary, we have always tried to bring to the floor bills on which full hearings have been held. I call attention particularly to the fact that, as the RECORD will show, about 90 percent of the bills we have brought to the floor were passed almost without opposition. A great deal of good has come to the consumer as the result of our efforts. As has been mentioned, for example, a great deal of good flowed to the consumer as the result of the automobile pricing law. We have brought to the Senate bills to help rehabilitate the railroads. The $225,000 is a very small percentage in proportion to the two dozen or so types of industries which the committee has in charge so far as legislation is concerned. We hear all about their problems and try to bring about some sensible solutions.

Mr. ELLENDER. Does the Senator mean to say that the investigations are brought about by complaints on the part of some people; or just how does the committee handle these matters?

Mr. MONRONEY. I can say that all with which I have been connected—and I am sure this is also true of those with which the chairman of the committee has been connected—have been investigations which have been urged for a period of time. We take preliminary steps, and, if the facts warrant it, a full-dress investigation is made. That was the case in the automobile industry, where we uncovered abuses in the small business field. Those abuses were eliminated completely by the committee's action. Last year that cost about $10,000. I venture to say that the results have been worth hundreds of millions of dollars to little business.

I would say that the results of the savings from the automobile pricing act have saved upwards of a billion dollars in the case of automobile purchasers.

These things do not come about accidentally. They come about as a result of hard staff work. They come about as a result of great concentration and effort.

When we wrote into the Reorganization Act the provision that each committee may employ four staff experts, we realized that there would be some variations with respect to the workload of the various committees. I serve on committees which do not need even two experts. I am sure the Senator has found that to be true from his experience.

It should be remembered also that our workload has been increased, and the Senate took note of it last month when it increased the membership of our committee. That alone is evidence of the increase in the workload of our committee.

The Senate would indeed be penny wise and dollar foolish if it expected our committee to do less than good staff work. The only way we can get good staff work done is by employing competent attorneys who know the law and who understand the problems and who are able to advise the members of the committee. They must help us draft legislation to bring about a correction of the abuses we find to exist. The Senator knows, I am sure, that we cannot get lawyers in Washington to work for the Government for $5,000 a year.

Mr. ELLENDER. If every committee were to pursue that course, we would have to apropriate three times as much as we have appropriated in the past. I am just wondering about the necessity of it all.

Mr. MONRONEY. I am saying that it is necessary to have someone who studies all the hearings to know what the requirement is.

Mr. ELLENDER. In addition, there is another resolution pending before the Senate which seeks to have $290,000 appropriated for the use of this committee, or a total of $515,000 for various investigations.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. MAGNUSON. This is for the general work of the committee. The other resolution pertains to another matter. I shall be glad to discuss it with the Senator from Louisiana when it is called up.

Mr. ELLENDER. I point out that in addition to the regular amount which is authorized to operate the committee, it is proposed to authorize additional funds for these two subcommittees.

Mr. MAGNUSON. If the Senator will defer that matter until we come to it, I shall explain it then; and if he wants to vote against it, he may do so. The investigation to be conducted under the next resolution was directed by the Senate, not by the committee itself, and I think the Senator from Louisiana voted for the investigation.

Mr. ELLENDER. The committee of which the distinguished Senator from Washington is the chairman is a close competitor, in the use of money, with the Committee on the Judiciary. I think the Senator once served on the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes.

Mr. ELLENDER. Believe it or not, as I have pointed out, the Committee on the Judiciary, of which my good friend, the distinguished Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], is the chairman, leads all other committees in the amount of extra money spent for special investigations. The Committee on the Judiciary, aside from the $156,000 it receives to pay its regular staff, has been authorized to spend almost $1,400,000.

The Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, of which the Senator from Washington is the chairman, will be a close second to the Committee on the Judiciary, if the entire amount requested here today is allowed. The $225,000 which is requested in the pending resolution and the $290,000 requested in the resolution to follow make a total of $515,000, aside from the $126,000, as I recall the amount, which is provided for each standing committee.

I think some of these investigations should be curtailed. But since we are now providing fine new offices for special committees, I suppose we may expect them to grow in number, rather than to diminish. The new Senate Office Building provides from five to six rooms for each Senator, and extra rooms for the special committees. The special investigating committees and subcommittees will find their quarters so nice, I presume, that they will try to perpetuate themselves, as has been done for the past 20 years.

I have often pointed out to the Senate that in 1940 the total amount which was spent for investigations did not exceed $140,000. The amount which was spent by each standing committee was about half the amount it gets now. But

in the field of special investigations, this year we have already provided for more than $4 million, in contrast with the $3,708,000 provided for these identical investigations last year. And we are not finished yet. Mark what I am saying, many more resolutions will come before the Senate to augment the current sum of $4,082,000 to authorize investigations during the first session of this Congress.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I intended to ask some questions of the distinguished Senator from Washington, who is chairman of the committee, rather than to seek the floor myself. But I must be off to a session of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, so I hope he will forgive me if I take a minute or two to ask him some very burning questions.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Very well.

Mr. JAVITS. They do not relate to the resolution now being considered; they relate to the next resolution. That is why I intended to seek the floor in my own right. The questions concern commuters. There is a real, serious crisis in the whole commuter business around New York, the State which I have the honor, in part, to represent. New York has most of the commuters of the Nation. There are 370,000 daily commuters to New York City alone. All of them are working people, most of them the heads of families. They are in very grave danger right now of losing a very large part of the service on which they depend. I note with satisfaction that the committee of which the distinguished Senator from Washington is the chairman intends to have this problem considered by the special committee which is proposed.

I refer to the letter to the chairman of the Committee on Rules and Administration, which discusses a study of the problems of commuter service as an integral part of the policy consideration of the kind and amount of railroad passenger service necessary to serve the public and provide for the national defense.

Our problem is that the horse may have died long before any further action can be taken. The problem stems from the debate on the Transportation Act, which was enacted only last year. In that act, the Senator from Washington will recall, Congress allowed, for the first time, discontinuances of commuter services standing by themselves; that is, each commuter service standing on its own feet instead of in the context of the whole railroad system.

The Senator will remember that I fought against that, because I thought I saw what was coming. I was unhappily overruled at that time. But now there has already been discontinued in the State of New York a piece of railroad called the Putnam Division of the New York Central Railroad. Also, there has just been a decision by the Supreme Court affirming the discontinuance by the Delaware, Lackawanna & Western Railroad of a ferry carrying passengers between New Jersey and New York.

The distinguished senior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE], who is not in the Chamber at the moment, has been fighting the battle very manfully as a member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and is trying very hard to get something done to remedy this condition.

Drastic remedies will have to be used to maintain the commuter service, outside of bankrupting the railroads themselves. Money must be found to continue the commuter service. That service is highly essential to the business of my home city. It is essential to the transportation of important people. It is essential to the growth and development of the suburbs, which are very desirable from the point of view of the country, and essential to the national defense.

I have risen to ask a question on the assumption that an urgent crisis confronts the commuters of the Nation. I am delighted to see in the Chamber the distinguished Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], who has led the subcommittee with respect to this matter. My question is: Can we expect that the committee which undertakes the special investigation will address itself on a crash basis to the matter of commuter service? Whatever one may think about the advisability of the Transportation Act, or its inadvisability, the fact is that the commuter service is in a serious crisis. It is getting hurt, and badly hurt. We cannot wait. Therefore, the body which gave birth to the power in the Interstate Commerce Commission to allow discontinuances should also give birth to some remedies of the crisis which has been brought about by those in authority in the ICC.

Will the Senator from Washington be so kind as to give me some information?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I appreciate the deep interest which the Senator from New York has in this matter, as well as in many others which come from the congested areas. Chicago has the same problem. So has New Jersey.

Last year, when Congress passed the broad Transportation Act, which required weeks and months of hearings, which were presided over by the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], we went into the commuter problem to the extent that we said to the railroads that they could do something about the situation themselves, rather than to have the State commissions hold up the discontinuance of some services. But we never suggested that those services should be abandoned when a State commission had unanimously said to the Interstate Commerce Commission that such service was vital and necessary. The Interstate Commerce Commission has not so acted.

But in order to provide for the so-called crash program for the railroads last year, Congress passed a broad transportation act, the Transportation Act of 1958.

In the bill, S. 3778, the Senate directed that other things be done, since this was an emergency program. It permitted guaranteed loans to be made to railroads, and provided many other necessary amendments to the Interstate Commerce Act. It was provided also in the report on the bill that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce should proceed, as was stated in the speech made today by the Senator from South Carolina, to look at the whole surface transportation problem, especially as it pertained to the railroads. The Senate unanimously directed the committee to make such an investigation in Senate Resolution 303. Obviously, the committee could not do that without extra help. At its last meeting in August, before Congress adjourned, the committee decided to wait until this year and then to go into the matter in some detail. Hence a resolution was submitted which is substantively the same as Senate Resolution 303 adopted by the Senate last year, asking the Committee on Rules and Administration to authorize the funds.

The Senator from New York will note that the authorization provides seven fields in which we would generally examine transportation problems. The Senator from New York will see that number 5 relates to policy considerations "for the kind and the amount of railroad passenger service necessary to serve the public and to provide for the national defense"—which is very important. We found, for instance, that no one had yet figured out—and I direct the attention of the Senator from Illinois to this matter—how railroad cars would be transported from Texas to Pennsylvania, in the event that the Chicago railroad yards were bombed. Likewise, we found that consideration was needed in the case of similar problems relating to the national defense.

The Senator from Florida and the Senator from Kansas, who is not present at this time, spent weeks on the study and inquiry to bring us up to date, in order to determine whether we could help our entire transportation system, including the railroads, to be strong. If the pending resolution is agreed to, that will definitely be a part of our intention. I think the Senator from Florida can answer more fully on that point.

Mr. JAVITS. I am attempting to make clear to my colleagues that an emergency has developed. In my opinion, that has occurred because of the new authority given by the Transportation Act which Congress passed last year. Therefore, in view of the fact that that problem has developed, as some of us anticipated, following the enactment of the proposed legislation which was reported by the same committee, I believe we are entitled to have the same committee take promptly the action I have called for. I believe we are entitled to crash attention to the proposed legislation which has been submitted.

I have introduced proposed legislation, and so has the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE], asking the agency to go slow in these instances.

It seems to me that we are entitled to have action taken promptly in order to do something at the commuter level for the railroads; and I believe we are entitled to have a review made of the authority which recently has been given to the Interstate Commerce Commission, under the new Transportation Act.

The fact is that communities and people are being hurt right now; and they cannot wait for long study and long de-

liberation. They are entitled to emergency consideration of pending legislation or newly proposed legislation which is needed in order to deal with their situation. It is that for which I am pleading to the chairman of the committee.

So, Mr. President, I hope to obtain a reply from my colleague, the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] or from my colleague, the Senator from Florida, as to what we can expect by way of prompt consideration of proposed legislation to deal with this particular subject.

Proposed legislation of this sort is now before the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. Of course, I cannot make that committee reply. Perhaps the committee will wish to think over the matter and determine what it can do.

But let me assure the committee that in the case of Federal taxation, loans, and perhaps even direct financial aid, it can do something to help in this situation; and I strongly urge the committee to do it promptly. I feel that this is a proper place and a proper time—now that the subject is raised, in connection with a proposed investigation—to request such action.

The people in my community and the people in all other commuter areas have a right to ask for action by the Congress; and they lay their troubles at the door of this Transportation Act. Let us make no mistake about that.

I join them in that position; and I hope very much that prompt action will be taken by the committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DODD in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now is on agreeing to the resolution as amended.

The resolution (S. Res. 27), as amended, was agreed to.

STUDY OF TRANSPORTATION POLICIES IN THE UNITED STATES

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 50, Senate Resolution 29, which provides for a study of transportation policies in the United States.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Oklahoma.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution (S. Res. 29) providing for a study of transportation policies in the United States, which had been reported from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce with an amendment, and subsequently reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration without additional amendment.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, Calendar No. 50, Senate Resolution 29, deals with a separate matter before the Committee on Interstate and Foregn Commerce. That committee appeared before the Committee on Rules and Administration; and in a letter of January 28, 1959, to the Committee on Rules and Administration, the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce set forth the justification for the study, as directed to the committee by the Congress last year.

We also have submitted to the Committee on Rules and Administration a well-thought-out budget for the type of staff which would be necessary for this very comprehensive and very complex job. I ask unanimous consent that the letter and budget be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter and tabulation were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE
AND FOREIGN COMMERCE,
January 28, 1959.

Hon. THOMAS C. HENNINGS, Jr.,
Chairman, Committee on Rules and Administration, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The purpose of this letter is to transmit a proposed budget to your committee for use in connection with Senate Resolution 29, a resolution providing for a study of transportation policies in the United States.

Late in the last Congress, Senate Resolution 303, a similar resolution, was approved by your committee and, in turn, was approved by the Senate. Due to circumstances beyond our control, only background work has been done under the resolution. Consequently $95,919.20 of the initial $100,000 appropriated under Senate Resolution 303 remains unspent.

It is the opinion of the committee that these important transportation studies should be continued. Sweeping hearings held by the Surface Transportation Subcommittee last year indicate that such action is imperative.

The resolution would authorize the study of any and all matters pertaining to—

1. The need for regulation of transportation under present-day conditions and, if there is need for regulation, the type and character of that regulation;

2. The area of Federal policy dealing with Government assistance provided the various forms of transportation and the desirability of a system of user charges to be assessed against those using such facilities;

3. The subject of the ownership of one form of transportation by another;

4. Federal policy on the subject of consolidations and mergers in the transportation industry;

5. Policy considerations for the kind and amount of railroad passenger service necessary to serve the public and provide for the national defense;

6. The problems arising from action by the Interstate Commerce Commission in permitting the charge of more for a short than a long transportation haul over the same line in the same direction; and

7. Additional matters of Federal regulation (and exemption therefrom) and Federal promotional policy in regard to the various forms of transportation.

High on the agenda of the committee among the foregoing would be a study of Federal policy on the subject of consolidations and mergers in the transportation industry; a study of the problems of commuter service as an integral part of the policy considerations for the kind and amount of railroad passenger service necessary to serve the public and provide for the national defense; and a study of policy considerations relating to the ownership of one form of transportation by another.

The $290,000 requested to carry on the work under Senate Resolution 29 is proposed to be spent as shown in the budget attached.

Sincerely yours,
WARREN G. MAGNUSON,
Chairman.

Budget of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to make a study of the transportation policy in the United States pursuant to S. Res. 29, for the period Feb. 1, 1959, through Jan. 31, 1960

Position	Number	Base salary (per annum)	Gross salary (per annum)	Monthly salary (gross)	Total for period of budget (gross)
Professional staff:					
Staff director	1	$8,000	$14,979.45	$1,248.28	$14,979.45
Transportation experts	5	8,000	14,979.45	1,248.28	74,897.25
Transportation lawyers	3	8,000	14,979.45	1,248.28	44,938.35
Transportation economists	4	8,000	14,979.45	1,248.28	59,917.80
Clerical and stenographic:					
Clerks	5	2,040	4,490.50	374.98	22,452.50
Stenographers	8	2,040	4,490.50	374.98	35,924.00
Total					253,109.35
ADMINISTRATIVE					
Contribution to civil service retirement fund (6½ percent of total salaries)					16,452.11
Travel (inclusive of field investigations)					6,000.00
Hearings (inclusive of reporters' fees)					4,000.00
Communications (telephone, telegraph, postage, etc.)					1,500.00
Stationery and office supplies					250.00
Newspapers, magazines, and documents					150.00
Contingent fund					8,538.54
Total administrative expense					36,890.65
Total, S. Res. 29					290,000.00

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, many persons have been deeply interested in this matter, and have felt that we should even do much more than we intend to do by means of this study. The Senator from Florida, the Senator from Kansas, and I cut almost in half the amount that many persons thought should be a minimum figure. The study will entail a most difficult job. I am convinced it is needed. The Senate was convinced last year that it was needed. The House was convinced it was needed in the last Transportation Act. Although there was enacted what I thought was very well thought out legislation in the field of railroad transportation, railroad financing, and other matters, I think we all appreciated the legislation was of a temporary nature. Railroads were in dire financial trouble. Things look a little better now, but the

whole problem of our national transportation system is involved, as related to the question of mergers, commuter service, ownership of one form of transportation by another and other relevant matters. These problems should be looked into.

I think we have asked for a modest sum. I know of no group that worked harder, spent more time, more hours and weeks, with a very small staff, to bring out a transportation bill, which was hailed by the whole business community, than the group which considered the bill proposed by the Senator from Florida last year. But we did not complete the job. The problem is a continuing one. All of us know the problem of transportation involves national defense and other facets of our economy.

Surely, the Senator from Florida and the Senator from Washington do not particularly like this job. It is not going to be easy. It is going to require much hard work. It is going to mean the same kind of hard work which is done by the Subcommittee on Public Works. We had many witnesses last year. I am willing to wager there will be more this year. The committee is not looking for this job. It decided the job must be done. The job is not glamorous. It will not create newspaper headlines. It will not involve personalities. It will mean hard work and digging for the facts. I think our transportation system is worth that amount of effort.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield the floor.

Mr. ELLENDER. I appreciate the remarks my friend the Senator from Washington has made about the Appropriations Committee's Subcommittee on Public Works. However, I must point out that most of the work of that subcommittee is done by individual Senators, and not by an enlarged staff.

I notice that last year the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce was provided a total of $225,000 and that it expended a total of $182,886. Among the items to be studied was transportation policy. I notice the present resolution provides for a study of transportation policies in the United States.

Why is it necessary to create a separate subcommittee for the study of that subject? If it is necessary, will a portion of the force of the committee for which the Senate provided $225,000 be reduced and transferred to the new subcommittee which will have at its disposal $290,000?

Mr. MAGNUSON. No. The money provided for the committee was for day-to-day problems.

Mr. ELLENDER. Such as what?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Such as amendments to the Interstate Commerce Act, freight rates, the question of whether or not the Interstate Commerce Commission should do this or that, examining into confirmations of nominations—all the day-to-day problems. We have a staff man, and he is now present in the Chamber, who does that work almost singlehanded. The Senator from Florida and the Senator from Kansas will assure the Senator from Louisiana that witness after witness stated this study would merely touch the subject. Many witnesses stated such a study is necessary. The study contemplated would be a broad one. I have in my hand the seven different fields which it would cover. The study could not be done by the present subcommittee.

Mr. ELLENDER. Does any one of the seven points listed for this new subcommittee cover any of the work which was done by the subcommittee to which the Senate provided $225,000?

Mr. MAGNUSON. The studies will not overlap. The committee hopes to use the experts the committee has for the day-to-day work on transportation problems to supervise the personnel to be used in the special study.

Mr. ELLENDER. So the committee plans on using the personnel of the subcommittee which received $225,000 to work on the subcommittee which will receive $290,000?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes.

Mr. ELLENDER. Why would the committee do that?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Because the committee has experts who will help the employees in that field.

Mr. ELLENDER. Last year this new subcommittee was allowed $100,000, and it spent only $5,000. Why was the study delayed? Why did not the committee consider it last year?

Mr. MAGNUSON. For the simple reason that the transportation bill, which provided for the inquiry, was not passed until July 30. It was not signed by the President until near the middle of August. Shortly thereafter Congress adjourned. It being a year when many Members were in their home States and quite busy, the committee decided to postpone the study until the beginning of this session.

Mr. ELLENDER. Why was it necessary to wait for the enactment of the bill last year?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Because this resolution was a part of the transportation bill.

Mr. ELLENDER. What about the $100,000 the subcommittee received last year?

Mr. MAGNUSON. The committee did not use it because the committee did not get into a study last year. The committee had no time to go into the question between November and December. The committee had no time to pick a staff. We were unable even to get the committee together. Congress had adjourned. Otherwise the committee would have gone into the matter pretty deeply, and would probably be asking for more money by now. The committee could have justified the request, too.

Mr. ELLENDER. Am I correct in stating that both subcommittees will continue work in the transportation field in some way or other?

Mr. MAGNUSON. The committee has day-to-day problems to consider.

Mr. ELLENDER. I recognize the words the Senator is saying, but for the life of me I cannot understand how there will not be duplication of work. Why is it necessary to provide over a half million dollars——

Mr. MAGNUSON. Because the committee has a transportation expert doing the normal day-to-day work.

Mr. ELLENDER. Why is it necessary to provide that amount of money to study a problem which the committee has supposedly been studying for the past 3 or 4 years? The providing of the amount of $225,000 has been a yearly expenditure for how long now—4 or 5 years?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes.

Mr. ELLENDER. And the subjects to be studied, among other things, were transportation policies, for which the committee is now requesting $290,000.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Among the subjects the committee has to study are:

Interstate and foreign commerce generally.

Regulation of interstate railroads, buses, trucks, and pipelines.

Communication by telephone, telegraph, radio, and television.

Civil aeronautics.

Merchant marine generally.

Registering and licensing of vessels and small boats.

Navigation and the laws relating thereto.

Rules and international arrangements to prevent collisions at sea.

Merchant marine officers and seamen.

Measures relating to the regulation of common carriers by water and to the inspection of merchant marine vessels, lights and signals, lifesaving equipment, and fire protection on such vessels.

Coast and Geodetic Survey.

The Coast Guard, including lifesaving service, lighthouses, lightships, and ocean derelicts.

The United States Coast Guard and Merchant Marine Academies.

Weather Bureau.

Panama Canal and Interoceanic Canals generally.

Inland Waterways.

Fisheries and Wildlife.

Bureau of Standards.

I could give the Senator a list which would comprise five more pages.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator has obtained that list from the Reorganization Act. All committees have such duties. But is it necessary to investigate every facet of a particular field just because the committee has jurisdiction of it?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Seventeen Members of the committee so decided.

Mr. ELLENDER. I know that. I presume that the force which will be required to make that study will include 20 or 30 employees, will it not?

Mr. MAGNUSON. That was a budget worked out by the Subcommittee on Surface Transportation.

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I approved it, because I thought it was given the best of consideration.

Mr. ELLENDER. With the increase in the personnel and subject matter of all the committees and subcommittees, I can now well understand the necessity for our expanding building program. We will need a lot of space to take care of all these additional workers on the

Hill. The great trouble is that our Government is building so rapidly and is becoming so heavy that some day it will fall on us.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Vote! Vote! Vote!

Mr. MAGNUSON. I want to point out to the Senate there is a time limitation on the bill, so the study will not be a permanent and continuing thing. That is provided in the bill itself.

Mr. ELLENDER. That provision can be easily amended, which is what usually takes place.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, without getting involved in the colloquy between the able Senator from Louisiana and the able chairman of the committee, I venture to say that everyone recognizes the importance of transportation to our Nation. The transportation industry pays 20 percent of all taxes. Two out of every ten jobs in the United States are related to our transportation industry in one form or another. Transportation is vital to our prosperity, vital to our growth, and vital to our national defense. I am certain everyone appreciates the importance of an efficient and healthy transportation system.

This whole study is designed only to see to it that we continue to have a healthy transportation industry.

Mr. President, the able senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE] called me earlier today and said he wanted to offer an amendment to the resolution to the effect that such study and investigation shall not cover any matters relating to or contemplating either the payment of new subsidies or payment of any increase in the existing subsidies paid by the Federal Government to any of the various modes of transportation.

I asked the able Senator from Ohio not to offer the amendment, and the Senator said he would not if I would, in my remarks on the floor, state for the RECORD that so far as I knew none of the money would be used for the purpose of increasing any subsidies which are now paid to some forms of transportation, and, so far as I knew, the money would not be used for the creation of a subsidy program for any forms of transportation. I believe that is true, insofar as I can speak, and I know of nobody on the committee who thinks that the study is going to lead to the creation of a subsidy program.

I wish to make that statement for the RECORD, in order to live up to my part of the bargain. The Senator from Ohio did not offer his proposed amendment, and so I make that statement for the RECORD.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SMATHERS. I yield to the Senator from Washington.

Mr. MAGNUSON. As a matter of fact, we hope to look into the justification for some of the present subsidies.

Mr. SMATHERS. Exactly. As a matter of fact, we like to think that the study will result in a lesser payment of subsidy for some of the methods of transportation now receiving subsidies.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment of the committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. It is proposed, on page 3, line 21, after the word "exceed," to insert "$290,000."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution as amended.

The resolution (S. Res. 29), as amended, was agreed to, as follows:

Whereas a sound national transportation system is essential to the continued economic development and defense of the United States; and

Whereas fair and equitable Federal policies are necessary to assure such a sound national transportation system; and

Whereas hearings held by the Surface Transportation Subcommittee of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce have disclosed there is urgent need for a comprehensive study of such transportation policy and related problems by the Congress, to the end that sound policies may be evolved: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdiction specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to—

1. the need for regulation of transportation under present-day conditions and, if there is need for regulation, the type and character of that regulation;

2. the area of Federal policy dealing with Government assistance provided the various forms of transportation and the desirability of a system of user charges to be assessed against those using such facilities;

3. the subject of the ownership of one form of transportation by another;

4. Federal policy on the subject of consolidations and mergers in the transportation industry;

5. policy considerations for the kind and amount of railroad passenger service necessary to serve the public and provide for the national defense;

6. the problems arising from action by the Interstate Commerce Commission in permitting the charge of more for a short than a long transportation haul over the same line in the same direction; and

7. additional matters of Federal regulation (and exemption therefrom) and Federal promotional policy in regard to the various forms of transportation.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, from February 1, 1959, to January 31, 1960, inclusive, is authorized (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ on a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided*, That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $1,200 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1960.

SEC. 4. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed $290,000 shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

The preamble was agreed to.

CORRECTION OF CERTAIN DECISIONS OF THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a number of bills to carry out the recommendations of the American Bar Association to correct certain decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bills will be received and appropriately referred.

The bills introduced by Mr. EASTLAND were received, read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, as follows:

S. 1299. A bill to protect the effectiveness of State antisubversive laws against unintended Federal preemption;

S. 1300. A bill to define the term "organize" as used in the Smith Act;

S. 1301. A bill to make full disclosure respecting loyalty to the United States a condition of Government employment;

S. 1302. A bill to amend sections 241 and 242 of the Immigration and Nationality Act;

S. 1303. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act with respect to travel in time of war or national emergency and passport procedures;

S. 1304. A bill to broaden the application of the Summary Suspension Act of 1950; and

S. 1305. A bill to amend section 2385 of title 18 of the United States Code.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a brief explanation of each of these bills be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the résumé was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RÉSUMÉ OF BILLS TO IMPLEMENT RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE AMERICAN BAR ASSOCIATION TO ELIMINATE OBSTACLES TO THE PRESERVATION OF INTERNAL SECURITY

1. To define the term "organize" as used in the Smith Act.

Bar association recommendation: "Amend the Smith Act to define the word 'organize' to include the recruitment of new party members, the formation of new party units, and the regrouping, expansion or other activities of an organizational nature performed by members of existing clubs, cells, classes, and other units so as to insure the applicability of this section of the act to Communist actionists, agents, organizers, colonists or members currently performing organizational work."

This proposed bill would accomplish the precise purpose of the bar association recommendation. The Supreme Court decision in the Yates case rendered the organizing section of the Smith Act unenforcible against current Communist activity. Enactment of this bill would restore the effectiveness and applicability of this section of the law.

2. To protect the effectiveness of State antisubversive laws against unintended Federal preemption.

Bar association recommendation: "That wherever there are reasonable grounds to believe that as a result of court decisions weaknesses in internal security has been disclosed,

remedial legislation be enacted by the Congress of the United States, including a specific pronouncement of congressional intention that State statutes proscribing sedition against the United States shall have concurrent enforcibility."

The bill as drafted is confined to the specific recommendations of the bar association.

3. To make full disclosure respecting loyalty to the Unitd States a condition of Government employment.

Bar association recommendation: "Establish the right of each branch of Government to require as a condition of employment that each employee thereof shall not refuse to answer a query before a duly constituted committee of the Congress or before duly authorized officers of either the executive or judicial branches of the Government with respect to Communist, Communist-front, or other subversive activities or any other matter bearing upon his loyalty to the United States, as the Government has a right to know his record."

This proposed bill comports exactly with the recommendation of the bar association. It would cover refusals based upon a claim of fifth-amendment privilege, or upon any other claim of constitutional privilege, or for any other reason. Under this bill, if enacted, it would be the refusal by an employee to answer a question bearing upon his loyalty to the United States which would constitute a breach of a condition of his employment, not the reason, if any, claimed by the employee as justification for his refusal

4. To amend sections 241 and 242 of the Immigration and Nationality Act.

Bar association recommendation: "Invest in the executive branch of the Government the right to protect our internal security against the activities of aliens who were or became Communists at any time subsequent to their entry into the United States by providing for their deportation without any deprivation of due process; and the right to make and enforce reasonable restrictions on aliens awaiting deportation to prohibit them from engaging in any activities identical or similar to those upon which the aliens' deportation order was based, with further right fully to interrogate aliens awaiting deportation concerning their subversive associates or activities."

This bill will fully carry out the recommendation of the bar association. Since existing law already provides for deportation, the bill concerns itself with the right to make and enforce reasonable regulations on aliens awaiting deportation, consonant with due process.

The first section of the bill would overcome the effect of the Supreme Court decision in *Bonetti* v. *Rogers*, and would restore the applicability of the deportation provisions of the Immigration and Nationality Act to any alien who has been a member of the Communist Party at any time after any entry into the United States.

5. To amend the Immigration and Nationality Act with respect to travel in time of war or national emergency and passport procedures.

Bar association recommendation: "Restore to the executive branch of Government the right to deny passports to persons knowingly engaged in subversive activities, or activities designed or intended to further international communism by the establishment of criteria and standards to be applied in the issuance or denial of passports. These criteria and standards should be clear and unequivocal, and in addition contain a specific authorization to the Secretary of State empowering him or the Acting Secretary to withhold a passport in the national interest based upon confidential information and upon which he shall certify that it is contrary to the interests of this Nation that a passport be issued to the applicant; and further, to prevent foreign espionage agents from departing this country for the purpose of carrying out their espionage pursuits or to escape disclosure or prosecution; and that such legislation establish adequate appeal procedures which would insure due process of law so as to provide recourse to the individuals concerned in the event of any arbitrary and capricious exercise of discretion not properly founded."

This bill embraces all the recommendations of the bar association with respect to passport legislation.

6. To broaden the application of the Summary Suspension Act of 1950.

Bar association recommendation: "Restore to the executive branch of our Government the right to determine and to dismiss, if required, those who are security risks in both sensitive and nonsensitive positions in the Government service."

This bill accomplishes the objective of the bar association recommendation in the manner suggested by the Supreme Court itself in the case of *Cole* v. *Young*, that is, by making the summary suspension authority applicable to all departments and agencies of the Government.

7. To amend section 2385 of title 18 of the United States Code.

Bar association recommendation: "Amend the Smith Act to make it a crime intentionally to advocate the violent overthrow of the Government of the United States or to teach the necessity, desirability, or duty of seeking to bring about such overthrow; in order that (1) this Nation might take protective steps to prevent acts which, if not prevented, could result in bloodshed and treachery; and (2) this Nation need not be forced to delay the invoking of the judicial process until such time as the resulting damage has already been wrought."

This bill would implement the recommendation of the bar association report. At the same time, the bill does not attempt to proscribe the "mere abstract teaching" of Marxist doctrine; rather, the bill is directed against the teaching or advocacy of an alleged duty or necessity or desirability or propriety of overthrowing the Government by force or violence.

The second section of this bill focuses on the intent back of teaching or advocacy. No question is involved here of the results of such an attempt; it is the attempt itself, by the performance of an overt act intended to cause the violent overthrow of the Government, which is made a crime.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, the text of the report of the American Bar Association Special Committee on Communist Tactics, Strategy and Objectives, criticizing numerous decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States and pointing out the adverse impact those decisions have had upon the internal security of this country, was placed in the RECORD a few days ago by a Member of the other body. Ordinarily, under such circumstances, I would not ask that this material be printed in the RECORD again. However, I propose to speak about this report at some length, and to quote from it, and to introduce legislation based upon the recommendations contained in the report. Therefore, and in order that my colleagues and others reading the record of my remarks may have the text of the report itself to refer to, I ask unanimous consent that the full text of this report, including the 1-page statement of transmittal from the board of governors of the American Bar Association, may be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the statement and report were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF THE BOARD OF GOVERNORS TO THE HOUSE OF DELEGATES TRANSMITTING THE REPORT OF THE SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON COMMUNIST TACTICS, STRATEGY, AND OBJECTIVES

The board of governors herewith transmits to the house of delegates the report of the special committee without any deletion or alterations excepting a minor correction in recommendation No. 1.

The board recommends approval by the house of the several recommendations in the report and their transmittal to the Congress of the United States in order to correct legislative defects in the field of internal security revealed by particular decisions cited in the report.

In making its recommendations for approval, the board does not in any way intend to indicate censure of the Supreme Court nor an attack upon the independence of the judiciary. Indeed, the obligation of the bar to defend the Supreme Court as an institution is emphasized in the first resolution proposed by the committee's report.

The recommendation for approval, in the case of this report as in the case of all other reports of association sections and committees, does not constitute endorsement of statements in the report itself, such statements being those of the individual members of the committee.

AMERICAN BAR ASSOCIATION REPORT OF THE SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON COMMUNIST TACTICS, STRATEGY, AND OBJECTIVES

FOREWORD

International communism continues its worldwide conquest with the same vigor which has enabled it to bring 900 million people under its control while covering one-quarter of the earth's surface. In these United States its threat increases as far too many of us fail to comprehend its sinister purpose. The objective of worldwide communism has never changed—only do its tactics change in order to more effectively infiltrate life in America, to lower resistance to its propaganda and to cripple our defenses against this tyrannical and deadly way of life.

There is not one home in our land which is not affected by communism in some manner. Above all, our national economic security has been underminded by the necessity of building our defenses against the threat of Soviet aggression and through the Red impact on world trade. The U.S. gold reserves are becoming alarmingly low. Our country is the lone nation in the civilized world which admits foreign capital from undisclosed owners.

Our internal security has been weakened by a lackadaisical attitude on the part of the public and technicalities raised in judicial decisions which too frequently in the public mind have had the effect of putting on trial the machinery of the judicial process and free the subversive to go forth and further undermine our Nation. Lenin once stated as a prerequisite for a revolutionary situation which the Communists could exploit, the fact that "The ruling classes can no longer govern." Must we admit that we have reached that point?

The Soviet advances in seeking superiority in the control of space have doubtless been aided by the theft of secrets from American scientists in the same manner in which the Soviets gained the know-how to develop nuclear weapons. Should the United States come under attack, it will then be too late to allocate responsibility. Corrective action must be taken now. Time is running out on us.

It is now an established fact that every institution, every force and every person ac-

tively engaged in the forefront of the defense of our country against the rising menace of communism becomes the target of attack and vilification by Communists, crypto-Communists, fellow travelers, their stooges and innocent but beguiled persons.

The agencies of Government charged with protecting our internal security have demonstrated by past performance their ability to protect our Nation. We take pride that a lawyer, Director J. Edgar Hoover, of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, and his staff, composed largely of lawyers and others with legal training, have been in the forefront most often under very difficult circumstances. In war and peace the FBI has demonstrated the ability to carry out its responsibilities to the American people in a truly American manner avoiding the excesses of both the NKVD and the Gestapo. It therefore merits the wholehearted support and continued confidence of the bar and of the American public.

The fight to keep America free and secure must be strengthened by providing those agencies of our Government which are responsible for our internal security with the means to maintain the security of our shores; the fight for a free America cries out for a furthering of the educational program to combat the evil ideas of communism with truth, and the American bar's responsibility has never been so great as at the present time to assume leadership in the preservation of the freedoms so gallantly won by our forefathers.

RECOMMENDATIONS

I

Whereas the Supreme Court of the United States and an independent judiciary created by the Constitution have been and are the ultimate guardians of the Bill of Rights and the protectors of our freedom, and as such it is the duty of the members of the bar to defend the institutions of the judiciary from unfair and unjust attacks; and

Whereas this association recognizes that sharp differences have been expressed as to the soundness of some of the recent decisions of the U.S. Supreme Court affecting the National and State security, with particular reference to the activities of domestic and foreign Communists within our country; and

Whereas such differences have given rise not only to severe criticisms of the decisions, but unfortunately to condemnation of the Court itself, and to omnibus proposals for limiting its appellate jurisdiction; and

Whereas, while members of this association view some of the decisions to be unsound and incorrect, they deem such broad omnibus proposals at this time unwise and likely to create more problems than they will solve: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That the American Bar Association disapprove proposals to limit any jurisdiction vested in the U.S. Supreme Court; and be it further

Resolved, That wherever there are reasonable grounds to believe that as a result of court decisions weaknesses in internal security have been disclosed, remedial legislation be enacted by the Congress of the United States, including a specific pronouncement of congressional intention that State statutes proscribing sedition against the United States shall have concurrent enforcibility.

II

Whereas recent declarations by the U.S. Supreme Court (notably in *Watkins* v. *U.S.*, 354 U.S. 178) have been construed as holding that the House of Representatives has not spelled out with sufficient clarity or detail the authority granted to the Committee on Un-American Activities and queries whether the said committee has been carrying out properly its congressional mandate, which interpretation has resulted in the reversal of trial court convictions for contempt of Congress; and

Whereas it has been deemed by many Members of the Congress, the bar and the public that such declarations and interpretations thereof tend to impede the work of the Congress through its committees and thereby create a problem, the solution to which must be found; and

Whereas it is the view of this association that the quickest and best solution is for the House of Representatives to rewrite its resolution of authority to its congressional committee investigating internal security and Communist activities in terms so thoroughly, carefully and precisely worded as to leave no area for reasonable misunderstanding or evasion: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That this association recommend to the Congress that the House of Representatives rewrite and adopt its basic resolution of authority for the Committee on Un-American Activities under the same name or such name as such legislative body shall designate setting forth that the purpose in creating said committee is to study the operation of existing laws and the requirements of further legislation, in addition to defining clearly and adequately the powers of such committees.

III

Whereas your committee deems it advisable that the precise terms of the basic authority of the congressional committee which subpenas the witness to appear and testify should be made available to each witness subpenaed, for his enlightenment in advance of the hearing: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That this association recommends to the Congress that whenever any of its committees subpenas a witness to appear and testify or to give evidence, such committee should furnish the witness at the time he is subpenaed with a copy in writing of the precise terms of the basic authority of the committee.

IV

Whereas recent decisions of the U.S. Supreme Court, in cases involving National and State security and with particular reference to Communist activities, have been severely criticized and deemed unsound by many responsible authorities; and

Whereas problems of safeguarding National and State security have been exposed or created thereby which this association feels would be best solved by the careful study of each decision, and the prompt enactment of sound amendments to existing laws within the constitutional powers of the Congress: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That this association recommend to the Congress the prompt and careful consideration and study of recent decisions of the United States Supreme Court and the preparation and passage of separate amendments to the laws involved so as to remove any doubt as to the intent of the Congress, and to remedy any defect in the existing law revealed by the decisions; and be it further

Resolved, That legislation be promptly enacted to eliminate obstacles to the preservation of our internal security in the following areas:

(a) Amend the Smith Act to define the word "organize" to include the recruitment of new party members, the formation of new party units, and the regrouping, expansion or other activities of an organizational nature performed by members of existing clubs, cells, classes, and other units so as to insure the applicability of this section of the act to Communist actionists, agents, organizers, colonists, or members currently performing organizational work.

(b) Amend the Smith Act to make it a crime to intentionally to advocate the violent overthrow of the Government of the United States or to teach the necessity, desirability, or duty of seeking to bring about such overthrow; in order that (1) this Nation might take protective steps to prevent acts which, if not prevented, could result in bloodshed and treachery; and (2) this Nation need not be forced to delay the invoking of the judicial process until such time as the resulting damage has already been wrought. (See *Yates* v. *U.S.*).

(c) Establish the right of each branch of Government to require as a condition of employment that each employee thereof shall not refuse to answer a query before a duly constituted committee of the Congress or before duly authorized officers of either the executive or judicial branches of the Government with respect to Communist, Communist front or other subversive activities or any other matter bearing upon his loyalty to the United States, as the Government has a right to know his record.

(d) Invest in the executive branch of the Government the right to protect our internal security against the activities of aliens who were or became Communists at any time subsequent to their entry into the United States by providing for their deportation without any deprivation of due process; and the right to make and enforce reasonable restrictions on aliens awaiting deportation to prohibit them from engaging in any activities identical or similar to those upon which the aliens' deportation order was based, with the further right fully to interrogate aliens awaiting deportation concerning their subversive associates or activities.

(e) Strengthen the effectiveness of the Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1948 by a requirement that political propaganda by agents of foreign principals be labeled for what it is where such agents are situated outside the limits of the United States, but nevertheless directly or indirectly disseminate such propaganda within the United States.

V

Whereas the respective records of the Subcommittee on Internal Security of the Senate Judiciary Committee and of the House Un-American Activities Committee both charged with the duty of investigating internal security and Communist activities are records of accomplishment and great service to the Nation; and

Whereas the continuation of the work of these committees is essential to the enactment of sound and adequate legislation to safeguard the National and State security: Now, therefore be it

Resolved, That the American Bar Association recommends that the House of Representatives continue to maintain a committee to investigate matters relating to national security with particular emphasis on Communist activities invested with adequate jurisdiction to accomplish its purpose, and that the Senate continue to maintain and support its Subcommittee on Internal Security; and be it further

Resolved, That such committees maintain close liaison with the intelligence and security agencies, as well as with the Attorney General of the United States, to the end that they may be kept advised as to legislative needs of the executive branch of the Government required to carry out its responsibilities for internal security.

REPORT

Inasmuch as the house of delegates of the association referred back to the committee on Communist tactics, strategy, and objectives, to study the recommendation that the association endorse H.R. 12949 and the recommendation that the association endorse S. 1411 in cooperation with the special committee on individual rights as affected by national security, this committee submits its recommendations with the body of the report. Such a procedure is followed because the two committees to which the recommendations were referred for further study have not had a sufficient opportunity to

jointly discuss their findings. The recommendations are submitted herewith:

Be it resolved, That this committee recommends that legislation be promptly enacted to eliminate obstacles to the preservation of our internal security in the following areas:

1. Restore to the executive branch of our Government the right to determine and to dismiss, if required, those who are security risks in both sensitive and nonsensitive positions in the Government service.

2. Restore to the executive branch of Government the right to deny passports to persons knowingly engaged in subversive activities, or activities designed or intended to further international communism by the establishment of criteria and standards to be applied in the issuance or denial of passports. These criteria and standards should be clear and unequivocal, and in addition contain a specific authorization to the Secretary of State empowering him or the Acting Secretary to withhold a passport in the national interest based upon confidential information and upon which he shall certify that it is contrary to the interests of this Nation that a passport be issued to the applicant; and further, to prevent foreign espionage agents from departing this country for the purpose of carrying out their espionage pursuits or to escape disclosure or prosecution; and that such legislation establish adequate appeal procedures which would insure due process of law so as to provide recourse to the individuals concerned in the event of any arbitrary and capricious exercise of discretion not properly founded.

It is with a profcund sense of high privilege and grave responsibility that your committee submits the following report to the house of delegates and, through it, to the bar and to the public.

UNLESS

International communism will enslave the peoples of every nation of the free world—including the United States—unless they:

Awaken from their apathy and their indifference to the dangers that exist and threaten.

Learn and appreciate the freedom and the human rights they enjoy—and are determined and prepared to fight to preserve them for themselves and for their children.

Learn and appreciate the meaning of enslavement of the individual as it exists under communism.

Learn and appreciate the difference between the idealistic pretensions of communism and its inhuman reality.

Learn that the Communist ultimate goal of dominating and controlling every nation and every human being, never changes—though its tactics vary from day to day.

Understand that wishes and prayers alone will not suffice to overcome communism or to avoid its menace.

Know that only by unity, determination, strength—moral, scientific, and military—and a willingness to state their position in advance, and to be ready to fight for it, can they best safeguard the free world and its institutions.

Remember that Communists respect only those with equal or greater strength.

Know that the plea for peaceful coexistence is a fraudulent tactic of international communism seeking to blind the American people to the Soviet record of broken promises and aggression and intended to paralyze and disarm the free world in advance of the coming Soviet onslaught.

Never forget that international communism—particularly the Soviet—has the worst record for broken treaties in all history.

Remember that communism has never sold itself on its merits nor has it ever been adopted by a free vote of a free people.

Realize that free industry and free labor unions in any country are free only so long as communism does not dominate there—and that both industry and labor carry grave responsibilities in the defense of their nations against communism.

Realize and warn that partisan politics by those occupying or seeking public office may be a great aid to international communism and a serious handicap to one's own country.

Remember that subversion—aided by treason and treachery of domestic citizens—has been the most successful tool and tactic of international communism in gaining control of now-enslaved nations or in weakening or dulling the resistance by those nations which remain free.

Never forget that international communism still maintains as one of its fundamental tenets—where and when necessary—the overthrow by force and violence of any free nation when such overthrow can be successfully accomplished.

Know that one of the Communists' chief tactics is to keep the free world on the defensive by prodding and creating problem spots in every area of the globe.

Know that without sacrifice free nations cannot be protected or prepare themselves for defense from communism's constant assaults or against outright war.

Realize that the process of weakening the free nations is constantly carried out in many ways through subtle and persistent propaganda, and that the weapon of counterpropaganda by truth has not as yet been adequately or affirmatively used against the Communists.

Never forget that while from time to time we may have to confer and negotiate with Communist Russia or other Communist enslaved nations, their agreements have no sacred or serious meaning to them, will be breached when it is expedient for them to do so, and that such negotiations should be carried on by duly constituted officials of government and not by self-appointed apologists.

Remember that international Communists continue to talk peace but relentlessly wage war in its many forms at the same time.

Never confuse Communists with the freedom-loving peoples of the Nations they dominate and control, or fail to appreciate that these peoples crave freedom and a better way of life, peace and understanding with other nations

But, if the peoples of the free world are alert to what communism is and how it operates and what it costs in determination, dedication, toil and sacrifice to protect our freedoms and our way of life, then the free world will survive and communism will ultimately dissipate or destroy itself and its devoted followers.

Most persons who are informed on communism think our country now faces its greatest danger. The thesis of J. Edgar Hoover's new book, "Masters of Deceit", is:

"Communism is the major menace of our time. Today it threatens the very existence of our western civilization." [1]

In his speech to the 1957 National Convention of the American Legion, Mr. Hoover warned:

"To dismiss lightly the existence of the subversive threat in the United States is to deliberately commit national suicide. In some quarters we are surely doing just that."

And on December 22, 1958, Mr. Hoover added:

"* * * Sensing a more favorable atmosphere, the Communist Party, U.S.A., and its dupes and sympathizers gained further courage and became more vocal in their attacks upon law enforcement and other professions which are dedicated to preserving our freedoms."

[1] P. vi.

The lawyer-author of the Gaither report to the President on national security recently told our association:

"Our security is in unprecedented peril. * * * The ultimate objective of international communism is world domination, and the Soviet Union will pursue this objective ruthlessly and relentlessly, employing every possible political, economic, subversive, and military stratagem and tactic." [2]

COURT DECISIONS RELATED TO COMMUNISM

Mr. Justice Jackson in *American Communications Association* v. *Douds* [3] concluded that the Communist Party, U.S.A., is not a political party but "Is a conspiratorial and revolutionary junta organized to reach ends and to use methods which are incompatible with our constitutional system." Likewise, former Chief Justice Stone reached a similar conclusion several years earlier in *Schneiderman* v. *United States.* [4] So, too, did former Chief Justice Hughes when, as Secretary of State, he refused to recognize the Communist government of Russia, and former Chief Justice Vinson in *Dennis* v. *United States* [5] which decision upheld the convictions under the Smith Act of the American Communist leaders.

Similar pronouncements are contained in the preambles to many State sedition laws as well as in the preamble to the Communist Control Act of 1954, where Congress stated specifically that "The Congress finds and declares that the Communist Party of the United States, although purportedly a political party, is in fact an instrumentality of a conspiracy to overthrow the Government of the United States * * *." Likewise, the Subversive Activities Control Board has, after protracted hearings, found the Communist Party to be a Communist-action organization required to register under the Internal Security Act of 1950.

In spite of this, much dicta has appeared in recent decisions of the Supreme Court to the effect that the Communist Party is a political organization of a lawful nature similar to the Republican, Democratic, or Socialist Parties, hinting that disclosure of membership therein or association therewith is entitled to the protection of the first amendment. While this view has not been actually held in any known case, language contained in many of the decisions has invited confusion.

Many cases have been decided in such a manner as to encourage an increase in Communist activity in the United States through invalidation of State sedition statutes, and limitation of State and Federal investigating powers in the field of subversion although these cases might readily have been disposed of without so broadly limiting national and State security efforts. The paralysis of our internal security grows largely from construction and interpretation centering around technicalities emanating from our judicial process which the Communists seek to destroy, yet, use as a refuge to masquerade their diabolical objectives. This trend was treated fully in the Conference of State Chief Justices last year when they called upon the U.S. Supreme Court to exercise the power of judicial self-restraint. The dissenting opinions of certain Supreme Court Justices have been crystal clear in charting the effect of the failure of the majority to recognize the underground forces that are at work and to appreciate how these decisions affect our internal security.

It has frequently been said that "Justice delayed is justice denied." The delays in arriving at final determinations in criminal

[2] American Bar Association Journal, May 1958, pp. 425–426.
[3] 339 U.S. 382, 424.
[4] 320 U.S. 118, 170.
[5] 341 U.S. 494.

proceedings have invited criticism of the American judicial process. In no area has this been more tragically illustrated than in cases dealing with Communists. The proceeding against the Communist Party before the Subversive Activities Control Board is a case in point which makes a mockery of justice. Eight years have now elapsed since the enactment of the Internal Security Act of 1950. The status of the Communist Party continues to remain unadjudicated. The constitutionality of the act remains to be determined by the Supreme Court of the United States. The Communists have used every tactic to delay the determination of this case and subsequent enforcement of this act.

Your committee wishes to make clear that this delay is not the fault of the Subversive Activities Control Board itself which is composed of men and women of great talent who have diligently and courageously maintained a rare judicial attitude and composure despite the Communist vilification which has been heaped upon the Board and the members personally. They have endured frustrations imposed upon them by judicial delays and failures to meet the issues in a decisive manner so that justice might inure to the American people as well as to the accused.

The Subversive Activities Control Board, under the mandate of the Internal Security Act of 1950, issued its order on April 20, 1953.[6] That order, issued after exhaustive hearings and documented in a scholarly manner on a legal basis, found that the Communist Party, U.S.A., was a Communist-action organization and directed that it must comply with the act. This order remains to be enforced. We reassert the views stated in the brief which the American Bar Association filed in the U.S. Supreme Court in support of the Internal Security Act of 1950. If any part of the said act violates the Constitution, the courts should so hold. Congress should then enact new legislation or amend the present act to conform to any constitutional requirements as determined by the courts. If the act is constitutional, the Communist Party should not continue to enjoy immunity from its security provisions during many years of protracted litigation.

The importance of the Communist Party proceeding before the Subversive Activities Control Board justifies a brief résumé of this matter:

1. The Supreme Court did not determine the constitutionality of the act but rather remanded the case to the Board for exploration of charges supported by affidavit made by the party in the Court of Appeals concerning the credibility of three Government witnesses, namely, Crouch, Johnson, and Matusow. The charges made by the Communist Party in the court of appeals were not controverted by counteraffidavit of the Department of Justice for the reason that there was other overwhelming evidence to sustain the Board's order. The Supreme Court stated that since the assertions were not challenged by the Department it must remand the case to the Board for exploration.

2. When the case was returned to the Board the Department of Justice did not undertake to challenge the veracity of the charges made against these three witnesses. Accordingly under the Supreme Court's opinion the Board had no alternative but to expunge their testimony in its entirety from the record, and on the basis of the remainder of the evidence—testimony and documentary—the Board entered a new order.

3. The case again was argued before the court of appeals. After oral argument there and prior to decision by the court of appeals, the Supreme Court handed down its opinion in the Jencks case (noted later in this report). The party thereupon filed motions invoking the Jencks doctrine. The court of appeals then remanded the case to the Board for production of documents in relation to witness Mary Markward. The Communist Party then filed a petition for rehearing and a motion to adduce additional evidence in relation to Witness Budenz. In the course of preparing a reply to the petition for rehearing and the motion the Department discovered the existence of a recording of the initial interviews with Budenz after he left the party, the substance of which had been previously reported. This discovery was made known to the appellate court and it thereupon remanded the Budenz question also for production of documents.

4. All documents ordered by the Court to be produced have been furnished by the Department to the Subversive Activities Control Board in relation to the two witnesses. It developed, however, that Budenz was unavailable for further cross-examination due to a grave heart condition. The party now has a motion pending to reopen the case for cross-examination of all FBI agents who interviewed Budenz, claiming among other items that there are inconsistencies between the documents produced and the testimony of Budenz before the Board.

5. On February 9, 1959, The S.A.C.B. in an order for the third time after months of additional study, required the CPUSA to register in accordance with the Internal Security Act of 1950. In its most recent order, the Board rejected the Communist Party claim that false testimony had been given by a witness in another proceeding. Another round of appeals no doubt will be sought by the Communist Party to further delay a final adjudication of this case.

The following are the principal cases that have been criticized by the public, public officials and the bar in varying degrees as illustrative of how our security has been weakened:

1. *Pennsylvania* v. *Steve Nelson* (350 U.S. 497 (April 2, 1956)): The Court held 6 to 3 that the Federal Smith Act which prohibits the knowing advocacy of the overthrow of the U.S. Government by force and violence, suspends the enforcibility of the Pennsylvania Sedition Act in certain respects—which act proscribes the same conduct—on the grounds that Congress has preempted the field of sedition against the United States to the exclusion of parallel State legislation that the dominant interest of the Federal Government precludes State intervention, and that the administration of the State act would conflict with the operation of the Federal plan. Three justices dissented in every respect and pointed out that the Court should not void State legislation without a clear mandate from Congress.[7]

2. *Communist Party U.S.A.* v. *Subversive Activities Control Board* (351 U.S. 115 (April 30, 1956)): The Board found the Communist Party to be a Communist-action organization subject to the registration provisions of the Subversive Activities Control Act of 1950. The Communist Party appealed to the U.S. Court of Appeals and filed a motion for leave to introduce additional evidence before the Board alleging that three Government witnesses had committed perjury in other similar cases which motion was denied. The Government did not challenge the allegations in the motion, but simply contended that the Board's order was amply supported by evidence other than the testimony of the witnesses in question. The Supreme Court held 6 to 3 that the Court of Appeals had erred in denying the motion and remanded to the Board to permit the evidence to be introduced. Three justices dissented on the grounds that denial of the motion was within the lower court's discretion and that there had been no abuse of discretion. The dissent criticized the refusal of the majority to deal with the constitutional issues presented.

3. *Watkins* v. *U.S.*, 354 U.S. 178 (June 17, 1957): A union officer appearing as a witness before a subcommittee of the House Committee on Un-American Activities refused to answer questions as to past Communist Party membership of certain persons, objecting on grounds of lack of pertinency to the subject under inquiry by the subcommittee. The Supreme Court held 6 to 1 (two Justices not participating) that under the applicable statute a congressional investigating committee must upon objection of a witness on the grounds of pertinency, state for the record the subject under inquiry at that time and the manner in which the propounded questions are pertinent thereto. The Court stated that the phrase "Un-American Activities" was vague and that the evidence failed to show that the question under investigative inquiry was ever made specifically known to the witness. The dissent declared that the pertinency of the questions asked to the matter under investigation had been sufficiently shown. (This decision has led to a continuing discussion and challenge by witnesses as to the pertinency of questions. No court could function smoothly under such an impediment.)

4. *Cole* v. *Young*, 351 U.S. 536 (June 11, 1956): An employee in the U.S. Health, Education, and Welfare Department, who was charged with "sympathetic association" with individuals reliably reported to be Communists and making contribution to an allegedly subversive organization, was summarily dismissed by the agency head under the authority of the Summary Suspension Act of 1950 which authorizes heads of specified agencies to summarily dismiss employees "in the interests of the national security of the United States." The act provides that the determination of the agency head is conclusive and final. The Supreme Court in a 6 to 1 decision overturned the dismissal on the ground that the Summary Suspension Act has reference only to those activities directly concerned with the Nation's safety, and that the employee in question did not occupy a sensitive position. Three Justices dissented holding that the clear purpose of Congress was being frustrated in that the statute had been intended to authorize summary dismissal of employees whose retention would be inimical to the national interests regardless of the sensitivity of their positions.

5. *Leedom* v. *International Union of Mine, Mill, and Smelter Workers*, 352 U.S. 145 (December 10, 1956): The National Labor Relations Board after an administrative investigation and hearing found that an officer of the plaintiff union had filed a false non-Communist affidavit. The Board, in accordance with the National Labor Relations Act which denies the benefit of the act to unions whose officers have not filed such affidavits and makes union officers who have filed false affidavits subject to criminal penalties, issued a decompliance order barring the union from the benefits of the act until it complied. The U.S. Supreme Court held that this order was beyond the Board's authority and that the only remedy which the act permits in the case of false affidavits is the criminal penalty.

[6] Subversive Activities Control Board Report, S. Doc. No. 41, 83d Cong. 1st sess., April 23, 1953.

[7] The frequency of dissents in the Supreme Court decisions on matters relating to Communists reflects how the Court is divided and supports the thesis of this committee that corrective action is called for by enactment of legislation.

6. *Amalgamated Meatcutters and Butcher Workmen of North America* v. *National Labor Relations Board*, 352 U.S. 153 (December 10, 1956): An officer of plaintiff union had been convicted of filing a false non-Communist affidavit. The Board issued an order directing the employer to correct an unfair labor practice. The court of appeals refused to enforce this order on the ground that the union was not in compliance with the act and thus not entitled to its benefits. The Supreme Court reversed, reiterating the view stated in the Leedom case that the sole penalty for false filing of a non-Communist affidavit is the criminal penalty.

7. *Gold* v. *U.S.*, 350 U.S. 985 (January 28, 1957): Defendant president of a labor union was convicted of having filed a false non-Communist affidavit with the NLRB. On defendant's appeal to the U.S. Court of Appeals the conviction was affirmed. It appeared that an FBI agent investigating another similar case telephoned or visited three members of the jury during defendant's trial and inquired whether they had received any propaganda literature. The issue reaching the Supreme Court was whether the impact of these contacts on the jurors was so prejudicial as to require reversal. The Court so held in a per curiam opinion. Four Justices dissented on the ground that no effect upon the jurors adverse to the defendant could reasonably be anticipated by virtue of the accidental intrusion on their privacy.

8. *U.S.* v. *Witkovich*, 353 U.S. 194 (Apr. 29, 1957): The Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952 requires that an alien against whom a deportation order has been outstanding for more than 6 months shall be required "to give information under oath as to his nationality, circumstances, habits, associations and activities, and such other information, whether or not related to the foregoing, as the Attorney General may deem fit and proper." Appellee being an alien against whom a deportation order had been outstanding for 6 months refused to answer questions put to him by the appropriate immigration authorities regarding his present Communist relationships. He was indicted under the criminal provisions of the act. The Supreme Court held, 6 to 2, that the statute authorized only questions reasonably calculated to keep the Attorney General advised regarding the continued availability for departure of aliens whose deportation is overdue and ruled for dismissal of the indictment. Two Justices dissented expressing the view that under the statute an alien could properly be questioned as to activities indicated by past conduct and that the statute raised no constitutional question.

9. *Schware* v. *Board of Examiners of New Mexico*, 353 U.S. 232 (May 6, 1957): Schware's application to take the New Mexico bar examination was denied on the ground that petitioner had not shown good moral character in view of his past membership in the Communist Party, his use of aliases and his record of arrests. Schware, unlike other individuals, did not invoke the fifth amendment and was frank and candid with regard to his past Communist activities. While the petitioner made out a good case on his conversion from Communist ideology, nevertheless the decision casts grave doubt on the propriety of the Supreme Court to substitute its standard of fitness for the bar of New Mexico in place of the standard established by the bar and the courts of New Mexico. The Supreme Court reversed the State Supreme Court of New Mexico holding that Schware's exclusion violated due process, stating that the record did not support the State court's conclusion that petitioner had not shown good moral character.

10. *Konigsberg* v. *State Bar of California*, 353 U.S. 252 (May 6, 1957): Petitioner refused to answer questions as to present and past membership in the Communist Party put to him by the California State Bar Examiners. He was thereupon refused admission to the bar on the grounds that he had failed to prove that he was of good moral character and did not advocate the overthrow of the Federal or State Governments by unconstitutional means. Five Justices of the Supreme Court overruled the California Supreme Court holding that petitioner's right of due process had been violated since the evidence did not rationally support the finding that he had failed to prove that he was of good moral character and that he did not advocate the overthrow of the Federal or State Government by force and violence. Two Justices dissented on the ground that refusal to answer questions relevant to fitness without constitutional justification justified the committee's refusal to certify petitioner for admission to the bar. One Justice dissented on procedural grounds. (This decision is the greatest inroad on the traditional right of each State to establish its standard of fitness for its own bar and was severely criticized by former President David F. Maxwell in his annual address to this association.)

11. *Jencks* v. *U.S.*, 353 U.S. 657 (June 3, 1957): An officer of a labor union was indicted for filing a false non-Communist affidavit with the NLRB. At his trial he filed a motion requesting an inspection of reports made to the FBI by Government witnesses as to event and activities to which they had testified at the trial. His motion was denied and he was convicted. The U.S. Supreme Court overturned this conviction, five Justices concurring; stating that the defendant was entitled to examine these reports. The former practice of submitting Government documents to the trial judge for his determination of relevancy and materiality was disapproved and the Court held that if the Government wished to exercise its privilege to withhold the reports in the public interest then the criminal action must be dismissed. Three Justices dissented in part, holding that the documents should be produced for the examination of the trial court in camera to determine their relevancy as well as the applicability of the Government's claim of privilege in the public interest. One Justice dissented en toto.

12. *Service* v. *Dulles* (354 U.S. 363 (June 17, 1957)): Plaintiff, a Foreign Service officer, was on numerous occasions investigated as to loyalty and standing as a security risk. These investigations involved extensive hearings. In the most recent one the State Department gave him clearance and this action was approved by the Deputy Under Secretary. However, on a post audit the Loyalty Review Board of the Civil Service Commission made unfavorable findings and recommended his discharge. The Secretary of State accepted these findings without making an independent review of the evidence. The U.S. Supreme Court reversed the action of the Secretary of State and of two Federal courts holding that Dulles' action was in violation of the loyalty and security regulations under which the Secretary of State was bound to make an independent determination after a review of the evidence.

13. *Yates* v. *U.S.* (354 U.S. 298 (June 17, 1957)): Defendants were charged with conspiring to advocate and teach the forcible overthrow of the Government of the United States and to organize as the Communist Party of the United States, a society of persons who so advocate and teach, all in violation of the Federal Smith Act. The Supreme Court reversed convictions in two lower Federal courts and held that teaching and advocating the abstract doctrine of the forcible overthrow of the U.S. Government was not punishable under the Smith Act as long as it was "divorced from any effort to instigate action to that end." The Court further held that the term "organize" as used in the Smith Act referred only to acts entering into the creation of a new organization and stated that since the Communist Party was organized in 1945 and the indictment not returned until 1951, that the prosecution on this charge was barred by the 3-year statute of limitations. This decision is characterized by numerous partial dissents and partial concurrences on the part of the various Justices. Two Justices in dissent stated that overt acts in furtherance of the conspiracy could be proved from the record.

14. *Raley, Stern & Brown* v. *Ohio* (354 U.S. 929)): The Supreme Court vacated the judgment of the Ohio Supreme Court and remanded for consideration in the light of *Sweezy* v. *N.H.*, a case concerning the conviction of three men who had refused to answer questions about Communist activities put to them by the Ohio Un-American Activities Commission. One Justice dissented for the reasons stated in his dissenting opinions in Sweezy and Watkins and another Justice dissented indicating his desire to note probable jurisdiction and set the case for argument. On remand the Ohio Supreme Court reiterated its earlier conviction and the case is once more pending appeal.

15. *Sweezy* v. *New Hampshire* (354 U.S. 234 (June 17, 1957)): In the course of an investigation of subversive activities in New Hampshire a witness refused to answer questions concerning a lecture given by him at the State University and questions concerning the Progressive Party and its adherents asked by the New Hampshire attorney general acting as a one-man legislative committee. The Supreme Court reversed the contempt conviction by the State court, four Justices basing their decision on the ground that the State Legislature had not made clear in the authorizing legislation that it desired the information sought by the attorney general and deemed the lack of authorization to be a lack of authority on the part of the attorney general. Two Justices dissented from this reasoning saying that the distribution of powers on the State level is not a matter of Federal concern, but concurred in the result on the ground that the State had failed to show that the protection of State interests justified the invasion of the witness' constitutionally protected academic and political freedoms. Two Justices dissented from the result in its entirety.

16. *Slochower* v. *Board of Education of the City of New York* (350 U.S. 551 (April 9, 1956)): Under the terms of a New York City charter provision which had been long in effect a City College professor was discharged without notice or hearing for claiming his privilege against self-incrimination when asked about Communist Party membership by a congressional committee investigating matters of national security. It seemed that the professor had answered similar questions put by a State investigating body and that this information was in the hands of city authorities at the time of his discharge. The Supreme Court reversed the decisions of three New York courts and held that this automatic discharge was unconstitutional because of alleged lack of due process. Four Justices dissented.

17. *United Mine Workers* v. *Arkansas Oak Flooring Co.*, 351 U.S. 62 (April 23, 1956): Louisiana State courts had enjoined picketing by a union which had failed to file the non-Communist affidavits and other data required by the National Labor Relations Act. The Supreme Court held that the State courts had no power to enjoin the picketing on the ground that while the union could not resort to the NLRB because of its failure to comply with the filing requirements, it could nevertheless take other lawful action, e.g., peaceful picketing. One justice dissented on the ground that the said act contained no implied limitation on the State power exercised under these facts.

18. *Sacher* v. *U.S.*, 78 S. Ct. 842 (May 19, 1958): Sacher refused to answer three questions put to him by a subcommittee of the Internal Security Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary. His contempt conviction was upheld by the Court of Appeals. The Supreme Court remanded the case for reconsideration in the light of *Watkins* v. *U.S.* The case was reargued before the Court of Appeals and the conviction reaffirmed. The Supreme Court again reversed the order of conviction and found that questions relating to proposed legislation barring Communists from practice at the Federal bar constituted an excursion outside the committee's authorized scope of inquiry. The grant of certiorari and reversal order were made at the same time and in the same per curiam decision. Two justices dissented on the grounds that the questions were pertinent to the authorized inquiry and that the Court had refused to hear argument from Government attorneys.

19. *Kent & Briehl* v. *Dulles*, 78 S. Ct. 1113 (June 16, 1958): The Secretary of State turned down passport applications of Kent and Briehl on the grounds that they were Communists and that they had had constant and prolonged adherence to the Communist Party line. The Supreme Court reversed two lower Federal courts and held that since statutes provided that it is unlawful for a citizen to enter or leave the United States without a valid passport, the Secretary of State did not have authority to promulgate regulations denying passports to Communists or to persons whom evidence showed were going abroad to further Communist causes, or regulations demanding non-Communist affidavits from citizens applying for passports. Three justices dissented in all regards stating that the Secretary of State's passport power permitted the regulation in question.

20. *Dayton* v. *Dulles*, 78 S. Ct. 1127 (June 16, 1958): Dayton, a native born citizen, is a physicist who has been connected with various Federal projects. He applied for a passport to enable him to travel to India in order to accept a position as a research physicist there. This application was turned down by the Secretary of State for three reasons: (1) his alleged association with various Communists, (2) associations with persons suspected of being part of the Rosenberg espionage ring, (3) his alleged presence in an apartment in New York which was allegedly used for microfilming material obtained for the use of a foreign government. Basing its reasoning on *Kent* v. *Dulles*, the Supreme Court overruled two lower Federal courts and held that the passport could not be denied to a U.S. citizen on the ground that it was believed he was going abroad to engage in activities which would advance the Communist movement. Four justices dissented on the same grounds as the dissent in *Kent* v. *Dulles*.

21. *Yates* v. *U.S.*, 78 S. Ct. 128 (November 25, 1957): Yates and 13 others were indicted and convicted of conspiring to violate the Smith Act. In the course of the trial Yates refused to answer 11 questions relating to whether other persons were members of the Communist Party. The trial court held her in contempt for each refusal and imposed 11 concurrent sentences of 1 year each. Supreme Court reversed two lower Federal courts holding that this action constituted an improper multiplication of contempts because the witness when first inquiry was made stated that she would not identify any Communist Party members. The Supreme Court reversed all but the first conviction which was vacated and remanded for resentencing "in the cool reflection of subsequent events". Three justices dissented to the remand of the first conviction holding that all the convictions should be thrown out.

22. *Bonetti* v. *Rogers*, 78 S. Ct. 976 (June 2, 1958): Bonetti was an alien admitted to the United States for permanent residence in 1923 who joined the Communist Party in 1932 and left it in 1936. In 1937 he went to Spain to fight the Spanish Civil War. In 1938 he returned and was admitted for permanent residence as a quota immigrant and thereafter continued to reside in the United States, except for a 1-day visit to Mexico in 1939. The Internal Security Act of 1950 provides for deportation of any alien who was at the time of entry into the United States, or has been at any time thereafter a member of the Communist Party. The Supreme Court reversed two lower Federal courts and held that plaintiff's time of entry for purposes of the act was 1938 not 1923, and not having been a party member then or subsequently, was not deportable. Three justices dissented stating that this construction deletes the phrase "at any time" out of the act and reads the word "last" into the statute and thereby "cripples the effectiveness of the act."

23. *Flazer* v. *U.S.*, 79 S. Ct. 191 (December 15, 1958): Flaxer was convicted of contempt of Congress and failing to produce pursuant to a subpena duces tecum issued by the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee records of his union showing names and addresses of members employed by the Federal, State, or local government. The Supreme Court remanded the case for reconsideration in the light of *Watkins*. Upon reaffirmation of Flaxer's conviction the Supreme Court reversed on the ground that the indictment named October 5, 1951, as the date of contempt when actually the subcommittee had given him 10 days from that date in which to comply. The Court states "Yet for all we know, a witness who was adamant and defiant on October 5 might be meek and submissive on October 15."

24. *Uphaus* v. *Wyman*, 355 U.S. 16 (1957) (pending): Appellant Uphaus appealed from affirmance by the New Hampshire Supreme Court of his conviction of contempt of court for refusing on grounds of the first amendment to produce a response to subpena duces tecum, a guest list and certain correspondence with speakers at World Fellowship, Inc., a summer camp in Albany, N.H., of which appellant was executive director. The documents were subpenaed by a State legislative committee in the course of a State investigation of subversive activities. The U.S. Supreme Court without hearing argument on October 14, 1957, vacated the judgment of the New Hampshire Supreme Court and remanded the case for further consideration in light of *Sweezy* v. *N.H.*, whereupon the New Hampshire Supreme Court reaffirmed its former decision and appellant again appealed. This case was argued before the U.S. Supreme Court on November 15, 1958, and a further decision is now pending.

The Sheiner case (Florida): In accordance with the resolution of the house of delegates and authorization of the board of governors, our committee—on the request of the State attorney for cooperation—applied for and obtained permission to appear as amicus curiae in the appeal pending in the Supreme Court of Florida from the order of dismissal of the disciplinary proceedings against Leo Sheiner. Leo Sheiner had twice previously been ordered disbarred by the Circuit Court of Florida.

Our committee prepared and submitted a brief to the Supreme Court of Florida in which its views were set forth with relation to the duty of the bar and of the courts concerning the responsibilities in maintaining the high standards of fitness required of lawyers. The committee further defined its concept of an acceptable standard for attorneys. Any member of the bar who, in appropriate proceedings persists in refusal to answer pertinent questions concerning his activities in the Communist Party or Communist-dominated fronts on the ground that his answers to such questions concerning his activities might tend to incriminate him is unfit. It is inconceivable to us that an attorney and officer of the court may continue in good standing while he pleads self-incrimination in refusing to answer questions relating to subversive activities.

The brief pointed out that labor-union officials, teachers, Government employees, and employees of private industry, have been safeguarded in invoking the fifth amendment to inquiries which might tend to incriminate them. However, in so doing, they demonstrate lack of candor required of attorneys and forfeit their positions of trust and responsibility. The Sheiner case is most important to the bar. Other States having such problems await the final decision.

The appeal was argued before the Supreme Court of Florida on February 8, 1958. Julius Applebaum, a member of our committee, argued as amicus curiae for this association. On July 24, 1958, the court ordered further argument on September 5, 1958, and requested supplemental briefs as to the application of three decisions, *Max Lerner* v. *Hugh J. Casey et al.; Herman A. Beilan* v. *Board of Public Education, School District of Philadelphia;* and *Milton Knapp* v. *Mitchell D. Schweitzer et al.*, rendered by the United States Supreme Court on June 30, 1958. Our committee prepared a supplemental brief on behalf of the association and participated in the supplemental argument. As of this writing, the Supreme Court of Florida has not yet rendered its decision. The committee is willing to appear in similar cases upon direction of the house of delegates or board of governors.

In sharp contrast to the due process afforded Sheiner is the Associated Press dispatch of September 16, 1958. By decree of the Communist regime in Hungary, 3,500 lawyers were disbarred. They were deemed to lack approved political qualifications.

COMMUNIST TACTICS

The Communists have set forth their master plan of world conquest even more forthrightly than did Hitler in "Mein Kampf." The Communist Manifesto is specific: "The Communists disdain to conceal their views and aims. They openly declare that their ends can be attained only by the forcible overthrow of all existing social conditions."[8] Communists have never deviated from the theory enunciated by Marx and the strategy devised by Lenin.

The Communist master plan for world conquest has been outlined by both Lenin and Stalin as entailing the violent smashing and overthrow of all non-Soviet governments, including those of Great Britain and the United States. Prior to this overthrow and to prepare for it in each instance, the Communist Party is to make transmission belts of all possible nonparty agencies for the diffusion of the Communist line, weakening the country to be overthrown. Already this has become an historical fact to which once free peoples, now enslaved, can testify. Need we have more evidence of Soviet intent?

During the last 25 years, the United States has participated in hundreds of meetings with the Communists, including those held at Teheran, Yalta, Potsdam, Panmunjom and Geneva. All this talk has led to many major agreements and Soviet Russia has broken almost all of them. The Communists have followed Lenin's dictum about

[8] "Manifesto of the Communist Party" by Karl Marx and Friedlich Engels (International Publishers, New York, 1932), p. 44.

treaties and agreements: "Promises are like pie crusts—made to be broken." [9]

The United States has met on countless occasions with the Chinese Reds to negotiate the release of American prisoners. The record is a dismal one. In June 1954 a total of 76 Americans were held in Red China. On August 1, 1955, 35 were released. An additional 28 were released at the end of 1955. Since then nine more have been released. On January 9, 1958, the Reds in China were holding four Americans and in October 1958 had arrested a fifth American, a Roman Catholic priest. The Communists have followed Stalin's principle of diplomatic intercourse:

"Words must have no relation to action—otherwise what kind of diplomacy is it? Words are one thing, actions another. Good words are a mask for concealment of bad deeds. Sincere diplomacy is no more possible than dry water or iron wood." [10]

HINDSIGHT OR SOUND APPRAISAL

On June 17, 1958, when the Soviet news agency, Tass, announced the executions of former Hungarian Premier Imre Nagy, Gen. Pal Maleter, and two other leaders of the anti-Communist rebellion of 1956, Western leaders expressed shock and dismay. General Maleter, the hero of the rebellion, had been seized by the Soviets when he met with them under a flag of truce to negotiate the withdrawal of the Red army from Budapest. Nagy and his associates were executed, although they had received in advance a written guarantee of safe conduct when they left their asylum in the Yugoslav Embassy.

In March 1945, 16 top leaders of the Polish Government were invited to Moscow to participate in the conduct of negotiations. They were promised on the word of honor of the Soviet Government that they would be afforded safe conduct. All 16 were arrested and then vanished. Nothing further was heard of any of them until 10 years later, when the wife of Gen. Leopold Okulicki was notified of his death 9 years before in a Soviet prison.[11] Since the Katyn Forest massacre, which came to light in 1943, where thousands of Polish officers who were prisoners of the Soviets were shot and buried in a trench, it has been obvious that coexistence with communism is a contradiction in terms.

Marx and Engels stated this objective in the Communist Manifesto:

"The theory of the Communists may be summed up in the single sentence: Abolition of private property." [12]

Lenin gave this command to Communists:

"It is necessary to agree to any and every sacrifice, and even, if need be—to resort to all sorts of stratagems, maneuvers, and illegal methods, to evasion and subterfuge." [13]

On another occasion, Lenin added:

"As long as capitalism remains we cannot live in peace. In the end one or the other will triumph—a funeral requiem will be sung over the Soviet Republic or over world capitalism." [14]

On September 17, 1955, Nikita Khrushchev warned us: "If anyone thinks that our smiles mean the abandonment of the teachings of Marx, Engels, and Lenin, he is deceiving himself cruelly. Those who expect this to happen might just as well wait for a shrimp to learn how to whistle." [15]

Khrushchev made this statement to Western diplomats at a Moscow reception on November 18, 1956:

"If you don't like us, don't accept our invitations and don't invite us to come to see you. Whether you like it or not, history is on our side. We will bury you." [16]

Khrushchev appeared on our American television screens on June 2, 1957, and confidently told us: "Your grandchildren will live under socialism."

William Z. Foster dedicated his book, "The Twilight of World Capitalism," to his great-grandson, "who will live in a Communist United States."

The key to Communist tactics is the dialectic; expressed through what is known as historical materialism. By constant examination of the directive documents which flow from Moscow to the Communist parties of the world, and adapted in turn by them to the conditions of each country, we see the dialectic at work through the Communist line.

Under the theory of the dialectic, as it allegedly works in society and history, the triumph of the world Soviet dictatorship or socialism, leading to world communism, is inevitable. No action of any human agency can halt this fatalistic process. But it is not a progress that is made on a straight line or even on a curve; it is a zigzag movement due to the struggle of contending forces and their relative strengths from time to time, a course which, however, leads ever onward toward world dictatorship. This results at times in Communist advances, at times in retreats. Each development must be taken advantage of by Red tactics and strategy to forward the course of world dictatorship to the maximum under the prevailing conditions.

Stalin has stated clearly the object of the strategy of retreat or apparent retreat when he says: "The object of this strategy is to gain time, to demoralize the enemy, and to accumulate forces in order later to assume the offensive." [17] This follows Lenin's tactics which have been described in his work "One Step Forward, Two Steps Backward".[18]

The result of the strategy and tactics thus devised, to take into account the relationship of forces at any particular time, is the appearance of forward and backward movements, which are all designed by their zigzag course to lead to furthering Soviet advances. Because of the general lack of knowledge in the United States of these tactics and strategy, as laid down by Lenin and Stalin and summed up in the latter's "Foundations of Leninism," the Soviet advance made during the past 25 years has been little less than amazing.

History now records the facts of Communist dialectics at work. Under Stalin the change from hostility to apparent friendship and back to hostility were changes by periods. There was the Hitler-Stalin pact period (time of hostility), the World War II period (time of apparent friendship), and the postwar period (time of hostility again). Under Khrushchev Stalin was damned, Lenin exalted, and then at a 1957 diplomatic reception Khrushchev switched and said, "God grant that every Communist should fight for the interest of the working class as Stalin did." The Communist strategy under Lenin, Stalin, and Khrushchev is to use both hot and cold methods at once. Thus in the past few months we have witnessed the shelling of Quemoy and threats to Berlin coupled with cultural exchanges and the trip of Soviet Deputy Premier A. I. Mikoyan. We saw his smiles and snarls. The Communists aim to keep us complacent until the choice is annihilation or surrender, at which time they confidently expect us to submit to a negotiated surrender.

Also during the past year, the Communists went forward with the rocks and garbage thrown at Vice President NIXON in South America; backward with the smiles of Menshikov; forward with the executions of Nagy and Maleter; backward by allowing Tito to make a few anti-Soviet statements; forward with the defeats of anti-Communists in Syria and Indonesia—all with the same unity of purpose that makes everything contribute to their plan of world conquest.

Current Communist tactics include the following:

1. Nullification of the Smith Act and other anti-Communist legislation. FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover testified January 16, 1958, at a House hearing made public in May, that 49 of the 108 Communist leaders convicted by Federal juries under the Smith Act have been set free by Supreme Court decisions.[19] As of January 25, 1959, only 33 convictions of Communists remain as such while of the 108 convicted 75 have been released. Judge Richard H. Chambers, of the U.S. court of appeals, in a decision releasing 11 of these convicted Communists, said that Supreme Court decisions have left the Smith Act, as to any further prosecution under its provisions, a virtual shambles.

J. Edgar Hoover has testified that a top Communist functionary described the Supreme Court decision in the Smith Act case of June 17, 1957, as the greatest victory the Communist Party in America has ever received.[20] The Daily Worker summed up the Yates, Watkins, and other cases of that same day in these words: "The curtain is closing on one of our worst periods." [21] The Sunday Worker of May 11, 1958, contains strong opposition to any legislation to overcome the Supreme Court's rulings on internal security.

Other anti-Communist laws which have been targets of the Communist Party and which are now nullified or weakened by the judicial decisions are the Subversive Activities Control Act of 1950, the anti-sedition laws of 43 States, and Hawaii, key security provisions of the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952, and the Summary Suspension Act of 1950.

2. Muzzling the FBI and congressional investigations. For years the Communist Party has poured out its most hysterical language against that which the Reds call "the Gestapolike FBI," and congressional "inquisitions and witch hunts." This tactic has been so successful that it is now said that the Communists don't have to tell congressional committees anything. The effectiveness of the Communist propaganda machine is attested to by the frequency of attacks from sources of presumed respectability. It is significant to note the similarity of these so-called respectable verbal and written brickbats with Communist poisoned darts. As the world Communist onslaught continues, an intensification of attacks on the FBI, congressional committees, and, indeed, all other effective anti-Communist forces can be expected. In fact an excellent criteria of the effectiveness of any group which labors to preserve the American way of life is the intensity of Communist and radical attacks directed at them.

---

[9] Collected Works of Lenin, vol. 9, Russian, 4th ed. pp. 290, 291; Proletarian No. 20, 1905; address of Secretary of State Dulles before Atomic Power Institute, Durham, N.H., May 2, 1958.

[10] Stalin—Elections in Petersburg (Jan. 12, 1913, Sochineniya (Gospolitizdat, Moscow, 1946), vol. II, p. 277.)

[11] Mikolajczyk, Stanislaw, "The Rape of Poland," New York, McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1948, pp. 111–112

[12] Ibid., footnote 8, sec. II.

[13] V. I. Lenin Selected Works (International Publishers, New York, 1943, pp. 95, 96.)

[14] Lenin, "Speech to Moscow Part Nuclei Secretaries" (Nov. 26, 1920); Selected Works (International Publishers, New York, 1943, Vol. III, p. 297.)

[15] St. Louis Post-Dispatch, Sept. 16, 1955.

[16] U.S. News & World Report, Dec. 27, 1957, p. 32

[17] "Foundations of Leninism", Little Lenin Library ed., p. 98

[18] HUAC, Marxist Classics, op. cit., p. 187.

[19] U.S. House Appropriations Subcommittee Hearings on the Department of Justice, Jan. 16, 1958, p. 173.

[20] Ibid., p. 174.

[21] Editorial, June 19, 1957.

Judge Robert Morris, chief counsel for the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee for 6 years, said: "The power of the Congress to learn the underlying facts of the [Communist] conspiracy has been hamstrung" since the decision in the Watkins case.

There appears to us to be little question that the dicta in such cases as Watkins and Sweezy have compounded the difficulties of investigating committees in the security field. Witnesses, dominated by the Communist Party, have used the dicta to impede the function of Congress in its legislative responsibility. On this basis Communists have adopted the tactic of invoking the first amendment rather than the fifth amendment in refusing to answer obviously pertinent and important questions.

In the first session of Congress subsequent to the Watkins decision, hearings by the House Un-American Activities Committee was practically brought to a halt and the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee suffered a similar plight. On July 5, 1958, the press reported that congressional investigations into the Communist conspiracy have reached an all-time low for the last two decades. However, committee files are bulging with data on the conspiracy which are crying for exploration to form the basis for corrective legislation.

The experience of France, and more particularly, Germany, show the danger of restricting legislative investigations.[22] Bismarck so feared the power of parliamentary investigation that he dissolved the Prussian Parliament when it attempted to assert its right of investigation. Historians agree that the lack of legislative investigation was the greatest single cause for the authorization of Imperial Germany.

When the Weimar Republic was created, article 34 of the constitution granted the Reichstag the power to appoint investigating committees. When the Reichstag attempted to exercise its constitutional right, the German Constitutional Court, in two key cases, narrowed the scope of parliamentary inquiry so considerably that the investigating powers of the Reichstag were inadequate to its tasks. As a result, the Reichstag never exposed the Nazi, purges by Hitler, concentration camps, and secret police. The success of the Nazi conspiracy taught the German Supreme Court a lesson. On August 17, 1956, it handed down a scholarly 375-page opinion which outlawed all activities of the Communist conspiracy in West Germany.

Notwithstanding some mistakes—fewer than generally charged—the service to our country by the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee and the House Un-American Activities Committee has been incalculable and worthy of far greater praise than has been accorded to them. The Communist and radical propaganda against these committees has never subsided. Our committee, therefore, recommends the adoption of Resolution V.

This committee has been astonished to read the proposal to the Congress that one of its committees charged with investigating National and State security and Communist activities be discontinued. We regard any attempt to terminate or to curtail the work of the committee of each House charged with this vital duty as a distinct disservice to the Nation.

3. Ultimate elimination of Federal and State security programs. This tactic has been successful with regard to nonsensitive position in government and evidence is abundant that the Communist conspiracy considers nonsensitive position vitally important. Government employment is not a right but a privilege.

4. Communism is worldwide in its scope of operations which require travel on the part of its propaganda and espionage agents. For this reason Communists and their dupes aided by innocents have long been carrying on a vigorous campaign to break down, or weaken, passport control in the United States. Meanwhile, they maintain strict controls in the Soviet Union, Red China, and other satellite countries.

5. The peace offensive. On April 1, 1951, the House Un-American Activities Committee issued a report called "The Communist Peace Offensive; a Campaign To Disarm and Defeat the United States." This document showed in detail how intellectuals, professors, writers, and others who influence public opinion, were attracted to various Communist peace fronts. This report said: "The most dangerous hoax ever devised by the international Communist conspiracy is the current worldwide peace offensive."

Today, under the slogans "peace" and "peaceful coexistence," we are witnessing an intensification of this Communist peace offensive. The Czechs and Hungarians found that coexistence with communism is enslavement. Peaceful coexistence means Communist conquest without war. In his February 1956 report to the 20th Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union Khrushchev asserted in Aesopian language that peaceful coexistence would lead to the victory of world communism.[23]

Dr. Fred C. Schwarz, in his testimony before the House Un-American Activities Committee, has accurately described what the Communists mean by peace: "Every act that contributed to the Communist conquest is a peaceful act. If they take a gun, they take a peaceful gun, containing a peaceful bullet, and kill you peacefully and put you in a peaceful grave. When the Chinese Communists murder millions, it is an act of peace. When the Russian tanks rolled into Budapest to butcher and destroy, it was glorious peace." This is what J. Edgar Hoover calls "semantic sabotage."

In describing the recent case involving the Communist spy Rudolph Ivanovich Abel, J. Edgar Hoover testified:

"I mention this case particularly, Mr. Chairman, because there are some people who think that the matter of Soviet espionage is a thing of the past and no longer exists in view of the theme of peaceful coexistence the Soviets continue to expound. Many of the incidents in the Abel case occurred in 1957." [24]

We must realize that Communist governments resort to blackmail, counterfeiting, forgery, kidnaping, lying, mass murder, slavery, subversion, theft, and treaty breaking as part of their official state policy. It is a matter of historical record that the Kremlin blackmailed the Allies into concessions during World War II by threatening to sign a separate peace with Hitler; that Communist governments have counterfeited American money and forged American passports; kidnaped American citizens and held them for ransom; kidnaped 28,000 Greek children in the most cruel mass abduction in modern history; murdered thousands of Polish officers at Katyn Forest[25], 6,112 American soldiers whom they captured in Korea,[26] and thousands of boys and girls in Hungary; forced millions of Polish, Latvian, Lithuanian, Esthonian, Czech, Hungarian, and Ukrainian citizens to work as slave laborers in Siberia; stole 600 tons of gold bars worth $600 million from the Government in Spain in 1936; [27] destroyed by subversion the postwar Republics of Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, and Poland; and violated 50 of their last 52 treaties.

6. Summit conference: Pressures exercised to influence the President of the United States to arrange for a summit conference with Khrushchev are unfortunate. Such pressures have been applied by friendly nations and by some inexperienced but well-meaning citizens. Communists have the most deplorable record in all history for violation of sacred treaties. It is the policy of Communists to promise anything and to perform nothing unless it serves their immediate needs. Communists should first demonstrate by concrete actions their good faith in their stated desire for peace. Without such evidence of good faith any conference becomes merely a Communist vehicle for their propaganda purposes. It is hopeless and futile to rely upon voluntary compliance with treaties by Communists. The Communists, through Khrushchev can free East Germany, Hungary, Poland, Czechoslovakia, and other enslaved nations and thus demonstrate in 24 hours their good faith and a true desire for peaceful coexistence.

Experts on communism testified before the U.S. House Un-American Activities Committee on April 30, 1958, that the Kremlin looks upon a summit conference solely as another weapon in its program for global conquest. Time will tell us the influence which the Soviet Deputy Premier A. I. Mikoyan, in his "open sesame" tour of the United States last January has exerted to entrap the United States into another summit conference.

7. Cultural exchanges: Nikita Khrushchev's famous report of 1956 lists cultural and business exchanges as one of those developments which will bring about the growing weakness of the United States and advance world socialism. On June 2, 1957, Khrushchev appeared on American television screens and called for a wider exchange of cultural delegations.

On December 22, 1957, the Communist Daily Worker desecrated the greatest religious holiday in Christendom by declaring that perhaps the best Christmas present Santa Claus will bestow on America will be the widespread cultural exchange of certain Americans with Soviet agents coming to this country.

On January 27, 1958, the United States signed a 2-year agreement with the Soviet Union for the exchange of persons in the cultural, scientific, technical, and educational fields. The primary activity of every one of Moscow's cultural delegates while in this country is to promote the Communist world revolution. E. H. Cookridge, former British secret service agent and an authority on Soviet espionage, had this to say: "Every Soviet football team, every athlete competing at an international sport event, Soviet scientists attending a congress abroad, the Moscow Ballet performing in a Western capital or a group of Soviet artists at a film festival are invariably accompanied by special agents of the Soviet secret police." Judge Robert Morris, who has spent the last 17 years intensively studying and exposing the Communist conspiracy, said: "In past years of the exchange, secret police have passed as farmers, ice skaters, clergymen, and scientists, for the purpose of conducting espionage operations in this country." Professor Seymour Mellman of Columbia University at a disarmament conference held in Washington, D.C., on January 23, 1959, stated (as reported in the Washington Daily News of that date) that, "Owing to the possibility of moving

[22] Ehrmann, Henry W., The Duty of Disclosures in Parliamentary Investigations: A Comparative Study, 11 University of Chicago Law Review, 117–153, February 1944.

[23] HUAC Marxist Classis, op. cit., pp. xxiv–xxv.

[24] Hearings on the Department of Justice, op. cit., p. 178.

[25] U.S. House Katyn Forest Committee Final Report, Dec. 22, 1952.

[26] U.S. Senate Committee on Government Operations, Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations, Korean War Atrocities, Jan. 11, 1954.

[27] "Scope of Soviet Activity," pt. 51, pp. 3434, 3435.

nuclear warheads in small containers, it is not excluded that the principal cities of the world may already be mined with atomic warheads and their appropriate firing devices." Under these circumstances, what guarantee do we have that Soviet visitors may not engage in such destructive practices? AFL–CIO President George Meany said, on cultural exchanges: "No believer in the basic principles of free trade unionism could today conceivably desecrate these principles by undertaking to visit a country whose tyrannical leadership has for the 40 years of its existence been the avowed and uncompromising enemy of all human rights."

Cultural exchange with Soviet Russia should not be a one-way street. There can be no doubt that understanding could come from an honest two-way cultural exchange program where there is a full disclosure of the identities of visitors to any country. So when a Mikoyan visits the United States, those who fete him should know who he is and that for which he stands.

The responsible Newsweek magazine has this to say about Mikoyan in its issue of January 12, 1959:

"Mikoyan is one of the butchers of Budapest. It was he who helped engineer the great doublecross that crushed the Hungarian revolt in October 1956. To lull the leaders of the revolt Mikoyan endorsed Imre Nagy as the new premier; at the same time, he made plans for the Communist puppet Janos Kador to take over. His promise to withdraw the Russian forces from Hungary lured Nagy's Defense Minister to a meeting where Soviet troops could arrest him."

Henry A. Wallace, in a frank article published in 1952, related that he did not realize during his tour of Soviet Russia how the Communists were making feverish efforts to hoodwink him. Wallace said that it was only much later that he learned how a Communist slave labor camp had been transformed into a show city, with prisoners herded out of sight and watchtowers torn down, merely to deceive the American Vice President. Elinor Lipper verifies this in her book, Eleven Years in Soviet Prison Camps. As a prisoner in a slave camp visited by Wallace, she gives an inside account of how American tourists in Russia are deceived.

8. Recognition of Red China. Much of the propaganda in this country which supports recognition of Red China is Communist-inspired or encouraged. Diplomatic recognition is helpful to Communist subversion. The Communist espionage apparatus uses the diplomatic immunity of its embassies and consulates to establish spy centers. It requires the unbroken seal of the diplomatic pouch to transmit orders to its spies and to receive in turn their reports and microfilmed documents.

The Red diplomatic apparatus functions are described in detail in the report of the Canadian Royal Commission [28] which investigated code clerk Igor Gouzenko's revelations. They may be found, too, in the Report of the Australian Royal Commission [29] which investigated Embassy Secretary Vladimir Petrov's confession. They are told as well in the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee investigation of United States Communists working for the U.N.[30] conducted by Senator Herbert O'Conor, immediate past chairman of this committee:

That Red China will model her tactics after the tactics of Soviet Russia is made clear by the statement of Premier Chou En-lai in the Communist magazine International Affairs:

"The great Communist Party of China, organized by progressive elements of the Chinese people, was founded and developed under the influence of the October Revolution, and was modeled on the Communist Party of the Soviet Union." [31]

The most important loss that would be sustained by our recognition of Red China would be (1) the prestige that the Communist regime would attain therefrom and (2) the demoralization of and hurt to the free nations, particularly in Asia. Moreover, can we give recognition to a government that is presently destroying the very fabric of human relations—the family—and enslaving its people in the manner that even the Communist rulers in Russia have not dared attempt? Responsible governments of free nations still have some responsibility to mankind and civilization. History has shown the recognition of the Soviet Union to have been a grievous error. We should not repeat that error with Red China.

9. Halt nuclear tests: The Communist tactic to obtain an agreement with the West halting nuclear tests is similar to Soviet exploitation of the agreement made at Panmunjom, namely, not to rearm the North and South Koreans with jet planes and other modern weapons. The Soviets promptly violated this agreement. Then they violated its inspection clause by refusing to permit the neutral inspection team to inspect North Korean airfields.

The suspension of nuclear tests without complete inspection would result in the United States termination of testing. However, within the vast, isolated Soviet land mass there would be a circumvention of this ban on testing.

10. East-West trade: Khrushchev's report of February 14, 1956, before the 20th Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, calls for East-West trade; [32] and this has been a part of the Communist line for many years. Foreign trade to a Communist country is a political weapon to be turned on and off in accordance with its military strategy as a means of waging cold war. It is a means of obtaining from the outside world the strategic materials with which it can arm itself for world conquest. Trading with the Communist bloc would be a psychological as well as a military defeat for the United States. The goods we might sell to the Communist bloc will be used against us just as the superb Rolls Royce engines sold to Russia were used to power the Mig–15's against us in Korea.

In May 1958, Khrushchev sent an 8-page letter to President Eisenhower in which he brazenly suggested that the United States grant Soviet Russia long-term dollar credits in order to finance trade with the United States. We would not gain by trading our machinery for Soviet I O U's or even Russia's raw materials. The Senate report on the "Accessibility of Strategic and Critical Materials" issued July 9, 1954, shows that the Western Hemisphere contains all the 77 critical and strategic materials needed for military security. The bait of foreign trade is held out with the objective of developing pro-Soviet sympathy within the United States and thus undermining our national unity.[33]

1. Propaganda: Communists are spending billions annually on propaganda around the world and it is reaching every city and hamlet in our Nation. This propaganda comes not only from the Soviet Union but also from Red China, from Iron Curtain countries, and from Western Europe. Much additional Red propaganda is published in the United States by Communist publishers.

12. Humiliation: The Communists use the tactic of humiliation. This tactic had already been used by the Communists on American prisoners in Korea. Communists have been active in supporting insulting demonstrations all over South America. On July 18, 1958, a mob of 100,000 Communists gathered in front of the American Embassy in Moscow and threw ink bottles and stones which shattered many of the windows on the first five floors. There has been a wave of demonstrations against the American information agencies in various parts of the world, accompanied by burnings of the American libraries. A number of Americans are being held captive behind the Iron Curtain.

13. The Communist tactics of vilification: One of the most constantly used tactics and tools of the Communists, and those deliberately aiding them, or misled by them, is the effort to defame, destroy, or becloud the reputation of anyone, whatever his position or standing, who exposes or fights communism. No regard for truth is ever permitted to halt such campaign. Lies and half truths are effective with the unthinking or the indifferent.

Example after example can be cited. Every member of congressional investigating committees has been the victim of this tactic. The FBI and its dedicated Director have been a prime target—and will continue to be so long as they are effective in combating communism. Every judge who did not respond to their arguments became a subject for this tactic.

The irony of fate has frequently decreed that this tactic be used by ruling Communists—temporarily in power—against their "comrade rulers" of yesterday when the simple struggle for power makes their "comradeships" a threat within the ruling clique. The guillotine of office or rank—followed by the routine, groveling, demoralizing "confession" is frequently not enough. The campaign of vilification and defamation must still be pursued. The degradation of Communists knows no bottom.

We plead with the bar—its leaders and members and the American people to understand this prime tactic of Communists and not to be misled by it. When the bar thinks an American agency or public official deserves criticism let them do it in the American way by going first to the public official or responsible administrator and call the facts to his attention. Perhaps there is another side to the issue. Those who charge violation of due process can strengthen their position by first practicing the principles of due process. When the enforcement machinery of our State, county, municipal or Federal Government comes under unjust attack it is the duty of members of the bar as community leaders to come to their defense.

With each succeeding act of Soviet bad faith, many Western spokesmen express surprise. When anti-Communists reply "You should have expected this," the politically naive make a common rejoinder: "That is mere hindsight; no one could have predicted that the Communists could be that bad." It is appropriate to point out that informed anti-Communists have always known and publicly stated that it is impossible to negotiate with international communism.

It was not hindsight, it was sound appraisal when Secretary of State Bainbridge Colby said on August 10, 1920:

"The existing regime in Russia is based upon the negation of every principle of honor and good faith. * * * The responsible leaders of the regime have frequently and openly boasted that they are willing to sign agreements and undertakings with foreign powers while not having the slightest intention of observing such undertakings or carrying out such agreements. * * * Upon numerous occasions the responsible spokesmen of this power, and its official agencies, have declared that it is their understanding that the very existence of Bolshevism in Russia, the maintenance of their own rule,

---

[28] June 27, 1946.
[29] Aug. 22, 1955.
[30] Jan. 2, 1953.
[31] Nov. 1957, p. 20.
[32] HUAC Marxist Classics, op. cit., pp. xxiii–xxiv.
[33] The U.S.S.R. still owes vast sums to the United States that are overdue and unpaid.

depends, and must continue to depend, upon the occurrence of revolutions in all other great civilized nations, including the United States, which will overthrow and destroy their governments and set up Bolshevist rule in their stead. They have made it quite plain that they intend to use every means, including, of course, diplomatic agencies, to promote such revolutionary movements in other countries. * * * We cannot recognize, hold official relations with, or give friendly reception to the agents of a government which is determined and bound to conspire against our institutions; whose diplomats will be the agitators of dangerous revolt; whose spokesmen say that they sign agreements with no intention of keeping them." [34]

It was not hindsight, but sound appraisal when Secretary of State Charles Evans Hughes stated on March 21, 1923:

"We are just as anxious in this Department and in every branch of the administration as you can possibly be, to promote peace in the world, to get rid of hatred, to have a spirit of mutual understanding, but the world we desire is a world not threatened with the destructive propaganda of the Soviet authorities, and one in which there will be good faith and the recognition of obligations and a sound basis of international intercourse." [35]

It was not hindsight, it was sound appraisal when Robert F. Kelley, Chief of the Division of Eastern European Affairs in the Department of State, wrote in a memorandum dated July 27, 1933:

"The fundamental obstacle in the way of the establishment with Russia of the relations usual between nations in diplomatic intercourse is the world revolutionary aims and practices of the rulers of that country. It is obvious that, so long as the Communist regime continues to carry on in other countries activities designed to bring about ultimately the overthrow of the government and institutions of these countries, the establishment of genuine friendly relations between Russia and those countries is out of the question." [36]

It was not hindsight, it was sound appraisal when United States Ambassador to Moscow Laurence Steinhardt reported, on June 17, 1941:

"My observation of the psychology of the individuals who are conducting Soviet foreign policy has long since convinced me that they do not and cannot be induced to reopen to the customary amenities, that it is not possible to create 'international good will' with them, that they will always sacrifice the future in favor of an immediate gain, and that they are not affected by ethical or moral considerations nor guided by the relationships which are customary between individuals of culture and breeding. Their psychology recognizes only firmness, power and force, and reflects primitive instincts and reactions entirely devoid of the restraints of civilization. I am of the opinion that they must be dealt with on this basis and on this basis alone." [37]

CURRENT FALLACIES ABOUT COMMUNISM

So much misinformation is current about communism that it is appropriate to expose some of the major fallacies.

1. "Communism in the United States is dwindling in power because the party is dwindling in numbers."

This popular belief shows a complete misunderstanding of Leninism. Lenin's great contribution to communism was his principle of the dedicated few. He coined the expression "the fewer, the better." He originated the party of professional revolutionaries subject to military discipline. He rejected the idea of a popular party, and enunciated the principle that no one should be given party membership unless he was under discipline. This is how Lenin was able to establish communism in Russia with only a handful of supporters and later to take over Russia with only 40,000 followers.

It is just as false to measure the strength of communism in the United States by comparing the small number of party members with the large number of non-Communists, as it would be to measure the seaworthiness of a ship by comparing the area of its holes with the area of its hull. A few strategically placed holes can sink the largest ship.

A substantial strength of communism in the United States is the number of non-Communist organizations and individuals who will collaborate with the Communists. For every Communist Party member, there may be 10 non-Communists who will do the work of the Communists.

The Communists have had hundreds of fronts. In addition, they have fronts in front of the fronts. Making use of their fellow travelers and dupes, plus their united-front tactic, the Communists boast they can have 50,000 letters on any issue sent to Capitol Hill or the White House inside of 72 hours.

The strength of the Communist Party was succinctly dealt with by J. Edgar Hoover in his book "Masters of Deceit" where on page 5 he states:

"The party's membership in this country reached a low in 1930 when it had 7,500 members, and a peak of 80,000 in 1944: its membership at 5-year intervals since 1930 has been as follows: 1935—30,000; 1940—55,000 (a drop of 15,000 from 1939); 1945—64,600 (a drop of 15,400 from 1944); 1950—43,200; 1955—22,600; and by the summer of 1957 membership had further declined.

"Fluctuations in the American party parallel those in foreign countries. The record clearly establishes that Communist parties have the power of swift and solid growth when the opportunity arises. The following figures reflect how party membership can dwindle and then spurt:

"In Italy, party membership went from 6,000 in 1943 to 2,500,000 in 1951; in France, from 20,000 in 1929 to 400,000 in 1956; in Syria, from 250 in 1931 to 10,000 in 1956; in Brazil, from 25,000 in late 1947 to 100,000 in 1956; and in Indonesia, from 30,000 in 1953 to 500,000 in 1956.

"When the Communist Party was at its peak in the United States it was stronger in numbers than the Soviet Party was at the time it seized power in Russia.

"The size of the party in the various Soviet satellites at the time each came under Soviet control discloses how a well-organized band of revolutionaries can impose its rule over the majority population."

	Date of Communist takeover	CP membership on that date	Population on that date
Bulgaria	September 1945	20,000	7,020,000
Rumania	March 1945	800,000	16,409,000
Poland	January 1949	1,000,000	25,225,000
Czechoslovakia	May 1948	1,329,000	12,338,000
Hungary	August 1947	750,000	9,383,000
Albania	December 1945	12,000	1,120,000
Yugoslavia	Mid-1945	141,000	14,500,000

2. "The Communist Party is just another political party."

It has been established by the hearings of the Subversive Activities Control Board in 1951 and 1952, by 20 years of investigation by congressional committees, and by the prior decisions of the Supreme Court in *Dennis* v. *United States* [38] and in *American Communications Association* v. *Douds*,[39] that the Communist Party, U.S.A., is not just a minor political party like the Prohibition Party. In the Dennis case, Chief Justice Vinson rightly described the Communist Party as "a highly organized conspiracy, with rigidly disciplined members subject to call when the leaders, these petitioners, felt that the time had come for action."

Like an iceberg, eight-ninths of the Communist Party has always been underground. The crypto-Communists who carry no cards, and whose names appear on no party records, are the most dangerous Communists. Top Communist agents such as Klaus Fuchs, Guy Burgess, and Donald MacLean never marched in a May Day parade, never carried a hammer-and-sickle banner, never raised a clenched fist at a Red rally. They were effective agents because they were always underground conspirators, and never aboveground. Communism will never win or gain followers on the basis of merit of its ideology or of truth. Ironically there are also those who have been infected with the Communist propaganda of inevitability. Secretary of State John Foster Dulles dealt with this matter in a speech before the National Council of Churches in Cleveland, Ohio, last November when he said:

"There are some who seem to feel that because international communism is a powerful and stubborn force, we should give way before it.

"Nothing could be more dangerous than to operate on the theory that if hostile and evil forces do not readily change, it is always we who must change to accommodate them.

"But let us make our opposition not just a barren negative, but a positive alternative." [40]

3. "Poverty breeds communism."

This is the false "stomach" theory of communism. Communism is not a disease caused by an empty stomach; it is a disease of the mind and soul. Communism does not always originate with the poor, the uneducated, the exploited, or the working class. These groups are the victims of exploitation by the Communists. On the other hand, the world's roster of Communists contains the names of many who were well educated and came from families of immense wealth. The list of important Communist agents who were once known as student intellectuals is an endless one. All that is needed is to call the roll of important Communist leaders and secret agents and among them will be found once well-fed ingrates who were traitors to their society, in their quest for personal power.

4. "The only alternative to peaceful coexistence is world war III with nuclear destruction of our cities."

The Communists do not want to destroy us or our cities if they can take our cities intact as they captured Prague and the giant Skoda munitions works. They plan to capture America with native Communists, just as they took Czechoslovakia with Czechs, China with Chinese, Indochina with Indochinese, South Korea with Koreans, and almost took Spain with Spaniards. Why should they want to destroy our productive might if they can win it by subversion and convert it to furthering the Communist world?

Sir Winston Churchill, whose ability to look ahead has been established as a historical fact said, more than 20 years ago:

"Communism is not only a creed. It is a plan of campaign. A Communist is not only the holder of certain opinions; he is the pledged adept of a well-thought-out means of enforcing them. The anatomy of discontent and revolution has been studied in

[34] U.S. Senate Internal Security Subcommittee, Second Report, Mar. 22, 1954, p. 41.
[35] U.S. News & World Report, Dec. 17, 1954, p. 128.
[36] Ibid., p. 130.
[37] Ibid., July 4, 1958, p. 72.
[38] 341 U.S. 494.
[39] 339 U.S. 382.
[40] New York Times, Nov. 19, 1958, p. 6.

every phase and aspect, and a veritable drill book prepared in a scientific spirit for subverting all existing institutions. The method of enforcement is as much a part of the Communist faith as the doctrine itself.

"At first the time-honored principles of liberalism and democracy are invoked to shelter the infant organism. Free speech, the right of public meeting, every form of lawful political agitation and constitutional right are paraded and asserted. Alliance is sought with every popular movement toward the left.

"The creation of a mild Liberal or Socialist regime in some period of convulsion is the first milestone. But no sooner has this been created than it is to be overthrown. Woes and scarcity resulting from confusion must be exploited. Collisions, if possible attended with bloodshed, are to be arranged between the agents of the new government and the working people. Martyrs are to be manufactured. * * *

"Pacific propaganda may be made the mask of hatreds never before manifested among men.

"No faith need be, indeed may be, kept with non-Communists.

"Every act of good will, of tolerance, of conciliation, of mercy, of magnanimity on the part of governments or statesmen is to be utilized for their ruin.

"Then when the time is ripe and the moment opportune, every form of lethal violence from mob revolt to private assassination must be used without stint or compunction. The citadel will be stormed under the banners of liberty and democracy; and once the apparatus of power is in the hands of the brotherhood, all opposition, all contrary opinions, must be extinguished by death.

"Democracy is but a tool to be used and afterward broken; liberty but a sentimental folly unworthy of the logician.

"The absolute rule of a self-chosen oligarchy, according to the dogmas it has learned by rote, is to be imposed upon mankind without mitigations progressively forever.

"All this, set out in prosy textbooks—written also in blood in the history of several powerful nations—is the Communists' faith and purpose." [41]

The need for all Americans is to know the Communist objectives and what they stand for. In 1937 Pope Pius XI asked a searching question about communism:

"How is it possible that such a system, long since rejected scientifically and now proved erroneous by experience, how is it, we ask, that such a system could spread so rapidly in all parts of the world?"

He answered his own question in these words: "The explanation lies in the fact that too few have been able to grasp the nature of communism."

Twenty-one years later, an additional 750 million human beings have been swept behind the Iron Curtain. But it is unfortunately still true that all too few people understand what communism is. Two years ago our committee reported:

"The greatest asset the Communists have at the present time is not the hydrogen bomb, certainly not Soviet satellites, but world ignorance of their tactics, strategy, and objectives."

When our enemy was Nazi Germany, our Government and military leaders studied every detail of the enemy and his strategy. George S. Patton was one of the truly great generals of the European campaign. Early in World War II, when the Germans were advancing, General Patton was asked one day if he wasn't discouraged. His answer was precise:

"I have studied the German for 40 years. I have read the memoirs of his great men. I have studied every detail of all his military campaigns. I have attended some of his staff courses. I know exactly how he will react under any given set of circumstances. He does not know what I will do. For this reason, when the time comes, I shall beat the hell out of him."

And this he did. The tragedy is found in the fact that there are too few George Pattons.

We can no more save our Republic from communism merely by saying we are against communism, than parents can save their children from polio by fervently being against polio. To conquer any disease requires intelligent study to isolate the germ and discover the vaccine. As the number-one killer in the world today, communism is a disease which merits our urgent study.

REPORT ON COMMUNIST LEGAL SUBVERSION

On Monday, February 16, 1959, the House Un-American Activities Committee made public its report on Communist legal subversion—the role of the Communist lawyer.

We shall not attempt in this already long report to summarize this congressional report. The report should be read not only by every member of this association, but particularly by the officers of the various State and local bar associations of which some of the attorneys mentioned in the report are members. The report does not name every attorney who is a Communist or a member of the Communist Party, but sufficient of them are named to constitute a challenge to the bar. The American Bar Association, while ready to assist, nevertheless, has deemed it more properly to be within the jurisdiction of the State and local associations to take action of investigation, and, where warranted, disciplinary proceedings concerning and against members on their rolls. Our committee feels that no new resolution need be passed by the house of delegates as it has already recommended proper action by the State and local associations against attorneys unworthy of membership in the provision by reason of their activities and their disloyalty to our form of government and to their oaths of office.

On this serious problem, the duty of cleansing our ranks of unworthy or questionable members is that of the bar, and the entire bar will suffer until the stigma on its rolls is removed. With sincere regret our committee must publicly state that the State and local bar associations have not fulfilled their duty to the public. the courts, or the bar.

CONCLUSION

Upon the bar of each nation primarily falls the duty to protect and defend its constitutional form of government and courageously to lead and soundly to advise the peoples and their governments. By their very training and experience, none more than lawyers should be aware of the dangers and the menace of international communism—and, therefore, none is more responsible for the protection of the free world.

Remember, there is no bar worthy of the name in Communist enslaved countries.

Only by alertness and dedication can the organized bar and each of its members perform their duty.

The danger and the menace of communism are worse than ever. Precious time is running out.

Wishes and prayers are not enough.

Respectfully submitted,

Peter Campbell Brown, chairman; Julius Applebaum, James S. Cremins, Egbert L. Haywood, Ray Murphy, Louis B. Nichols, Kendrick Smith, Henry J. TePaske, Jackson A. Wright, Louis C. Wyman.

APPENDIX—RECOMMENDED READING

Books play a vitally important part in the history of government and economics. One need only mention "Das Kapital," the "Wealth of Nations," "Uncle Tom's Cabin," and the "Federalist Papers" to be reminded that books have started wars, changed the economy of great nations, and established new governments.

A number of books published in the past by some of the world's top experts on communism testify to the overriding importance of the Communist issue, and to the unhappy reality that the United States is losing the battle against international communism. A study of the following books and reports could halt the rising tide of world communism.

1. Congressional committee hearings and reports: For 20 years the House Un-American Activities Committee has been patiently investigating the Communist conspiracy. The reports of its hearings, and those of its Senate counterpart, the Internal Security Subcommittee, are an encyclopedia of information on this continuing conspiracy. The abuse which has been heaped upon these committees by the Communists and their fronts is itself an attestation of the value of these reports.

2. "Masters of Deceit": The story of communism in America and how to fight it by FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover (Henry Holt & Co., New York, 1958, $5). Mr. Hoover's preeminence as an authority on communism is unchallenged. This book provides us with a valuable primer on communism in the United States; its history, strategy, membership, and future. He describes the day-to-day operations of the Communist Party, what goes on underground, and how discipline is enforced. He shatters many anti-anti-Communist arguments and shows why this is no time for complacency regarding internal subversion.

3. "What We Must Know About Communism," by Dr. Harry and Bonaro Overstreet (W. W. Norton & Co., Inc., 1958, $3.95). These well-known educators and foremost authorities in adult education examine communism and report from an educator's viewpoint in a clear factual manner. Many authorities on communism regard this book as one of the great contributions to anti-Communist literature.

4. "No Wonder We Are Losing," by Judge Robert Morris (the Bookmailer, New York, 1958, $2.50). Judge Morris has put into this book his personal record of 17 years' investigation of communism on behalf of the New York State Legislature, Naval Intelligence, and as Chief Counsel for the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee. Particularly important chapters concern the famous hearings on the Institute of Pacific Relations, communism's reach into education, and methods and rules of congressional committees.

5. "I Was a Slave in Russia," by John H. Noble (Devin-Adair Co., New York, 1958, $3.75). The author, an American citizen, was captured by the Russians just after V–E Day in 1945 and held prisoner for 9 years. In this book, he tells of his shocking experiences as a slave laborer in Siberia; of other Americans who are still there; and of the millions of political prisoners and how they are treated. This book is especially useful for those who believe in summit conferences and cultural exchanges with the Communists.

6. "Communist Psychological Warfare: Consultation with Edward Hunter," by the U.S. House Un-American Activities Committee (U.S. Government Printing Office, March 13, 1958). In 25 pages of testimony under questioning by Staff Director Richard Arens, Edward Hunter gives a brilliant analysis of current Communist strategy and how it follows here the pattern so successful in Asia. A distinguished journalist, author, and expert on communism in the Far East, Mr. Hunter first translated the term "brain-

[41] Great Contemporaries, by Winston Churchill (G. P. Putnam & Sons, New York, 1937), p. 168.

washing" from the Chinese. In this report he warns that Communist psychological warfare is now winning such extensive victories in the United States that the Red bloc will not need to employ direct military force against us in order to win the total war which they are waging.

7. "International Communism: Consultation with Dr. Fred C. Schwarz," by the United States Un-American Activities Committee (U.S. Government Printing Office, May 29, 1957). Dr. Schwarz is an Australian physician who is one of the world's top authorities on communism, particularly on the Communist mind. In this testimony, Dr. Schwarz gives his expert diagnosis, prognosis, and recommended treatment for the disease of communism. He shows how the first step in the Communist conquest of every country is the ideological conquest of the student mind.

8. "A Guide to Anti-Communist Action," by Dr. Anthony T. Bouscaren (Henry Regnery Co., Chicago, 1958, $4). Dr. Bouscaren is the author of a number of authoritative works in the field of international Communist operations. He is a professor of political science at Marquette University, Milwaukee, Wis., and is currently teaching at the National War College, in Washington, D.C. This book provides specific answers to the question of how individual Americans can combat communism with knowledge and facts.

9. "The Naked Communist," by W. Cleon Skousen (the Ensign Publishing Co., Salt Lake City, Utah, 1958). The author was formerly with the FBI and on the faculty of Brigham Young University and now chief of police, Salt Lake City, Utah; has been a student of communism for the better part of his adult life. His book is a painstaking account of the rise of communism, its philosophy, methods, and tactics. The book is well indexed and documented and belongs on the bookshelves of anyone who has a desire to learn of communism and its worldwide objectives.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, in a foreword to its report, the bar association committee on Communist tactics, strategy, and objectives has said a number of things that needed to be said, and has said them in language which can hardly be improved upon. I quote from this foreword:

The objective of worldwide communism has never changed—only do its tactics change in order to more effectively infiltrate life in America, to lower resistance to its propaganda and to cripple our defenses against this tyrannical and deadly way of life.

There is not one home in our land which is not affected by communism in some manner. * * *

Our internal security has been weakened by a lackadaisical attitude on the part of the public and technicalities raised in judicial decisions which too frequently in the public mind have had the effect of putting on trial the machinery of the judicial process and free the subversive to go forth and further undermine our Nation. * * *

* * * Should the United States come under attack, it will then be too late to allocate responsibility. Corrective action must be taken now. Time is running out on us.

It is now an established fact that every institution, every force and every person actively engaged in the forefront of the defense of our country against the rising menace of communism becomes the target of attack and vilification by Communists, crypto-Communists, fellow-travelers, their stooges and innocent but beguiled persons.

* * * * *

The fight to keep America free and secure must be strengthened by providing those agencies of our Government which are responsible for our internal security with the means to maintain the security of our shores; the fight for a free America cries out for a furthering of the educational program to combat the evil ideas of communism with truth, and the American bar's responsibility has never been so great as at the present time to assume leadership in the preservation of the freedoms so gallantly won by our forefathers.

I am glad that the American Bar Association report has in unequivocal terms called the attention of the American people to the inexcusable failure of the Supreme Court to discharge its constitutional responsibility in passing upon the Subversive Activities Control Act. I think part of what the American Bar Association committee had to say on this point is worth quoting here:

It has frequently been said that "justice delayed is justice denied." The delays in arriving at final determinations in criminal proceedings have invited criticism of the American judicial process. In no area has this been more tragically illustrated than in cases dealing with Communists. The proceeding against the Communist Party before the Subversive Activities Control Board is a case in point which makes a mockery of justice. Eight years have now elapsed since the enactment of the Internal Security Act of 1950. The status of the Communist Party continues to remain unadjudicated. The constitutionality of the act remains to be determined by the Supreme Court of the United States. The Communists have used every tactic to delay the determination of this case and subsequent enforcement of this act.

Your committee wishes to make clear that this delay is not the fault of the Subversive Activities Control Board itself.

The Subversive Activities Control Board, under the mandate of the Internal Security Act of 1950, issued its order on April 6, 1953. That order, issued after exhaustive hearings and documented in a scholarly manner on a legal basis, found that the Communist Party, United States of America, was a Communist action organization and directed that it must comply with the act. This order remains to be enforced. We reassert the views stated in the brief which the American Bar Association filed in the U.S. Supreme Court in support of the Internal Security Act of 1950. If any part of the said act violates the Constitution, the courts should so hold. Congress should then enact new legislation or amend the present act to conform to any constitutional requirements as determined by the courts. If the act is constitutional, the Communist Party should not continue to enjoy immunity from its security provisions during many years of protracted litigation.

Mr. President, when the board of governors of the American Bar Association transmitted to the house of delegates the report of the American Bar Association special committee on Communist tactics, strategy, and objectives, and when the house of delegates overwhelmingly adopted the recommendations in that report, a landmark was reached in the fight to stop progressive weakening of the internal security laws, which are the major bulwark of this country against the world Communist conspiracy.

The influence of the American Bar Association is very substantial; and until the action taken in Chicago there was a good deal of misunderstanding about the American Bar Association position on antisubversive legislation, especially legislation to correct, insofar as possible, the results of a number of decisions of the U.S. Supreme Court which have weakened internal security laws.

I venture the opinion that the misconception that the American Bar Association as a body was opposed to such legislation accounted for more than the one vote by which the Jenner-Butler bill was defeated in the Senate last year.

In transmitting the report of the special committee on Communist tactics, strategy, and objectives to the house of delegates, the American Bar Association board of governors used careful language, specifically disavowing any censure of the Supreme Court or any intent to attack the independence of the judiciary, and reiterating the obligation of the bar to defend the Supreme Court as an institution. The board also used careful language in characterizing the recommendations of the special committee as being designed "to correct legislative defects in the field of internal security revealed by particular decisions cited in the report."

Technically, this language was justified, since a law passed by Congress is only what the Supreme Court says it is, unless and until Congress speaks again to correct any misinterpretations or misconceptions which the Court may have embodied in its opinions. The fact is, of course, that the defects which need correcting were not inherent in the legislation passed by the Congress, but were grafted into it by the Supreme Court through interpretation and, in some cases, outright judicial legislation.

The most important thing about the action of the American Bar Association house of delegates is the clear indication it gives that the heart of the Nation's lawyers is sound, and that the great majority of these men who are the officers of our courts recognize the inroads upon internal security legislation which have been made by a long series of Supreme Court decisions in recent years, and want something done about it.

The American Bar Association report adopted by the house of delegates contains the clear statement that "recent decisions of the U.S. Supreme Court, in cases involving National and State security, and with particular reference to Communist activities, have been severely criticized and deemed unsound by many responsible authorities."

I do not know whether I am one of the "responsible authorities" to which the American Bar Association report refers, but I have been voicing such criticism for several years. At first it seemed almost as though I were a voice crying in the wilderness, but many other voices have since been raised to cry the same theme.

An earlier report of this same committee of the American Bar Association—unfortunately not presented to the house of delegates—documented this criticism from the record.

The chief justices of the States, by an overwhelming majority, voiced similar criticism in a report which was at once a masterly and scholarly marshaling of the facts, and a scathing indictment of the recent line of majority decisions of the U.S. Supreme Court in the field of

communism, subversion, and internal security.

The 1957–58 National Convention of the American Legion adopted resolutions similar to those of the American Bar Association. National Commander Preston J. Moore sent a congratulatory telegram to Ross Malone, president of the American Bar Association, following the adoption of the report, wherein he said:

The committee on Communist tactics, strategy, and objectives of the American Bar Association performed a monumental work in its documented study. The committee has earned the gratitude of the American people.

The facts can no longer be hidden. They can no longer be glossed over. They can no longer be successfully misinterpreted. They must be faced. Congress must live up to its responsibility, under the check-and-balance system provided by our Constitution, to take effective action to curb the disastrous trend which has been implemented by this series of Supreme Court decisions.

The report of the American Bar Association committee contains a section which is captioned with the single word "unless." This is so important, and so extremely well phrased, that I wish to read from it at some length:

International communism will enslave the peoples of every nation of the free world—including the United States—unless they:

Awaken from their apathy and their indifference to the dangers that exist and threaten.

Learn and appreciate the freedom and the human rights they enjoy—and are determined and prepared to fight to preserve them for themselves and for their children.

Learn and appreciate the meaning of enslavement of the individual as it exists under communism.

Learn and appreciate the difference between the idealistic pretensions of communism and its inhuman reality.

Learn that the Communist ultimate goal of dominating and controlling every nation and every human being, never changes—though its tactics vary from day to day.

Understand that wishes and prayers alone will not suffice to overcome communism or to avoid its menace.

Know that only by unity, determination, strength—moral, scientific and military—and a willingness to state their position in advance, and to be ready to fight for it, can they best safeguard the free world and its institutions.

Remember that Communists respect only those with equal or greater strength.

Know that the plea for peaceful coexistence is a fraudulent tactic of international communism seeking to blind the American people to the Soviet record of broken promises and aggression and intended to paralyze and disarm the free world in advance of the coming Soviet onslaught.

Never forget that international communism—particularly the Soviet—has the worst record for broken treaties in all history.

Remember that communism has never sold itself on its merits nor has it ever been adopted by a free vote of a free people.

Realize that free industry and free labor unions in any country are free only so long as communism does not dominate there—and that both industry and labor carry grave responsibilities in the defense of their nations against communism.

Realize and warn that partisan politics by those occupying or seeking public office may be a great aid to international communism and a serious handicap to one's own country.

Remember that subversion—aided by treason and treachery of domestic citizens—has been the most successful tool and tactic of international communism in gaining control of now-enslaved nations or in weakening or dulling the resistance by those nations which remain free.

Never forget that international communism still maintains as one of its fundamental tenets—where and when necessary—the overthrow by force and violence of any free nation when such overthrow can be successfully accomplished.

Know that one of the Communists' chief tactics is to keep the free world on the defensive by prodding and creating problem spots in every area of the globe.

Know that without sacrifice free nations cannot be protected or prepare themselves for defense from communism's constant assaults or against outright war.

Realize that the process of weakening the free nations is constantly carried out in many ways through subtle and persistent propaganda, and that the weapon of counter-propaganda by truth has not as yet been adequately or affirmatively used against the Communists.

Never forget that while from time to time we may have to confer and negotiate with Communist Russia or other Communist-enslaved nations, their agreements have no sacred or serious meaning to them, will be breached when it is expedient for them to do so, and that such negotiations should be carried on by duly constituted officials of Government and not by self-appointed apologists.

Remember that international Communists continue to talk peace but relentlessly wage war in its many forms at the same time.

Never confuse Communists with the freedom-loving peoples of the nations they dominate and control, or fail to appreciate that these peoples crave freedom and a better way of life, peace, and understanding with other nations.

But if the peoples of the free world are alert to what communism is and how it operates and what it costs in determination, dedication, toil, and sacrifice to protect our freedoms and our way of life, then the free world will survive and communism will ultimately dissipate or destroy itself and its devoted followers.

It is important to note, Mr. President, that in its very first recommendation, this American Bar Association report, now adopted as the policy of the American Bar Association, recognizes that "there are reasonable grounds to believe that as a result of court decisions weaknesses in internal security have been disclosed."

An earlier version of the report, which was given to the press before the house of delegates acted, contained the phrase "grounds to believe that as a result of court decisions internal security is weakened." The language finally used is perhaps more diplomatic, and more careful of the sensibilities of the Court; but the original language, as first printed in the newspapers, was a more precise statement of the fact. Internal security has been weakened as a result of court decisions, and every lawyer who has studied the cases knows it. Remedial legislation by the Congress is urgently required, and I propose to do everything I can to see that such legislation is considered and enacted at the present session. In this effort I am confident I shall have the support of a great many of my colleagues.

The American Bar Association report has specifically recommended that because "problems of safeguarding national and State security have been exposed or created" by this line of Supreme Court decisions, the Congress should give "prompt and careful consideration and study" to these decisions and should prepare and enact amendments to the laws involved "so as to remove any doubt as to the intent of the Congress, and to remedy any defect in the existing laws revealed by the decisions." This is precisely what the Congress must do. The study of these decisions and their impact upon our internal security has been long under way, and the bills which I am presenting to the Senate today are designed to provide some of the remedies which so clearly are needed.

The report of the American Bar Association special committee begins with the statement that it is the duty of the members of the bar "to defend the institutions of the judiciary from unfair and unjust attacks."

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield to the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. LANGER. As I understand, the bills which were recommended by the American Bar Association were unanimously reported by the Committee on the Judiciary, were they not?

Mr. EASTLAND. The bills which were recommended by the American Bar Association have been introduced today.

Mr. LANGER. The Senator is introducing them today?

Mr. EASTLAND. Yes. Last year the Committee on the Judiciary reported a number of bills in the same field.

Mr. LANGER. They were reported unanimously, were they not?

Mr. EASTLAND. From the Committee on the Judiciary?

Mr. LANGER. Yes.

Mr. EASTLAND. Frankly, I do not remember whether they were unanimously reported.

Mr. LANGER. My recollection is that they were unanimously reported.

Mr. EASTLAND. They were reported by an overwhelming favorable vote, I know.

The board of governors of the American Bar Association, and its house of delegates, naturally concurred in the statement of the special committee I have just quoted. Notwithstanding this statement, the transmission of the report was approved by the board of governors, and the recommendations of the report were adopted by the house of delegates of the American Bar Association. It is necessarily implicit that these bodies recognized that the criticisms of court decisions contained in the report, and its recommendations for legislative action to correct some of the results of these decisions, are neither unfair nor unjust.

The American Bar Association committee has put its finger squarely on one of the greatest problems raised by the line of recent Supreme Court decisions when it stated that—

Much dicta has appeared in recent decisions of the Supreme Court to the effect that the Communist Party is a political organi-

zation of a lawful nature similar to the Republican, Democratic, or Socialist Parties, hinting that disclosure of membership therein or association therewith is entitled to the protection of the first amendment. While this view has not been actually held in any known case, language contained in many of the decisions has invited confusion.

Mr. President, this is a careful understatement. When the lawyers of this American Bar Association committee state that this false view has not been "actually held in any known case," they are speaking from the lawyers' viewpoint that a "holding" in a judicial decision can only include statements necessary to a determination of the case. There is no doubt, and the bar association committee, I am sure, had none, about the fact that this unrealistic view has been expressed in Supreme Court decisions. It has been expressed repeatedly and it has been expressed clearly, in spite of previous direct holdings by earlier court majorities to the contrary.

When everyone with even an elementary knowledge of communism knows that the Communist Party, U.S.A., is a part of the worldwide Communist conspiracy, an integral and functioning part of that conspiracy, it is hard to understand how a Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States can write that membership in the Communist Party, U.S.A., is merely "a matter of belief and association." But it has been done. I agree with the apparent conclusion of the bar association committee that these statements have been mere dictum. But the adverse effect of these decisions has been widespread.

As the American Bar Association put it:

> Many cases have been decided in such a manner as to encourage an increase in Communist activity in the United States through invalidation of State sedition statutes, and limitation of State and Federal investigating powers in the field of subversion, although these cases might readily have been disposed of without so broadly limiting national and State security efforts.

I do not think, Mr. President, that the fact these statements were dictum and not doctrine in any way lessens the offense. In a sense, it aggravates it. As the American Bar Association committee so well points out:

> The paralysis of our internal security grows largely from construction and interpretation centering around technicalities emanating from our judicial process which the Communists seek to destroy, yet use as a refuge to masquerade their diabolical objectives.

Some segments of the press have devoted a good deal of space to the statement in the first recommendation of the American Bar Association special committee that "while members of this association view some of the decisions"—of the Supreme Court—"to be unsound and incorrect," they deem "broad omnibus proposals" as "unwise and likely to create more problems than they will solve." This recommendation has not, I think, been presented to the public in its true light by these newspaper stories. The American Bar Association committee did not condemn omnibus proposals as such; it referred specifically to omnibus for limiting its—the Supreme Court's—appellate jurisdiction.

I wish to say that I personally favor limitation of the Court's jurisdiction.

The committee report then proceeded to say, in the next paragraph, that members of the American Bar Association "deem such broad omnibus proposals at this time unwise and likely to create more problems than they will solve." It is clear that this American Bar Association report has not intended to lay any stricture against comprehensive legislation for meeting the problem created by this line of Supreme Court decisions which has weakened our internal security. The bar report has only inveighed against broad omnibus proposals which would "limit any jurisdiction vested in the United States Supreme Court by the Constitution."

It may be that there is an overtone here of disapproval of inclusion of provisions limiting the appellate jurisdiction of the Supreme Court in a bill dealing at the same time with other and less controversial aspects of the problem. But I am confident that the American Bar Association is quite willing to leave to the Congress, as a matter of legislative policy, the determination of whether, in amending several different statutes in order to correct the adverse effect of Supreme Court decisions, without limiting the Court's jurisdiction, the matter should be dealt with in many bills, or in few bills, or in a single bill.

The bar association committee has put its recommendations for various statutory revisions in a single report; the American Bar Association House of Delegates has approved these recommendations; and if the Congress chooses to deal with these recommendations in one bill or in several, that is for the Congress to decide.

It should be made clear that the bills which I am presenting to the Senate today do not embrace by any means all of the legislative proposals which appear desirable as a result of a study of the line of Supreme Court decisions affecting our internal security. These bills cover only the specific recommendations made by the American Bar Association committee for particular legislation. It is immaterial to me whether these bills are considered separately or as part of a broader overall study. What I am primarily concerned with is that they shall be considered promptly and that they shall be brought, within a reasonable time, before this body for its action.

It is significant, Mr. President, that the first recommendation of the American Bar Association committee disapproves proposals "to limit any jurisdiction vested in the United States Supreme Court" or, as it was stated in the first version reported in the press, "any jurisdiction vested in the United States Supreme Court by the Constitution." It is not the exercise by the Supreme Court of its jurisdiction vested in it by the Constitution which gives the gravest concern; it is the exercise or attempted exercise by the Court of legislative powers and other powers not only not granted to the Court by the Constitution, but in some cases specifically denied to the Court by the Constitution.

The report adopted by the American Bar Association contains a precise recommendation for "a specific pronouncement of congressional intention that State statutes proscribing sedition against the United States shall have concurrent enforceability." This stems, of course, from the fact that the Supreme Court decision in the Nelson case at one stroke wiped out all antisubversive statutes at the State level. By this opinion, the States were rendered powerless to act against subversion, whether directed against State governments themselves or against the National Government, in the preservation of which every State has a valid and substantial interest. In order to arrive at its decision in the Nelson case, the Supreme Court found it necessary to attribute to the Congress an intent to preempt this entire field of legislation, in the face of a very strong legislative history to the contrary, including an explicit statutory statement that the enforcement of State laws in this field should not be interfered with.

The American Bar Association report has summarized Supreme Court decisions in 24 cases "as illustrative of how our security has been weakened." The committee's summaries of these cases are restrained, objective, and conservative. I will not repeat these summaries, which are already in the RECORD. But I do want to look at these 24 cases for a moment from the angle of the various rights which have been invaded by these Supreme Court decisions. I shall refer to them in the order in which they are listed in the American Bar Association committee's report.

In the Nelson case, the Supreme Court took away the right of the people to combat subversion through the machinery of their State governments.

In the Communist Party U.S.A. case, the Supreme Court frustrated the right of the people to deal with subversion through laws enacted by their duly elected Representatives to Congress. By ducking its constitutional responsibility to pass on the constitutionality of the Internal Security Act when that question was squarely presented, and instead making it possible to keep the act in litigation until more than 8 years after its passage, the Supreme Court has not only deprived the people and the country of the benefits which would have resulted from effective enforcement of this law, but has also effectively deprived Congress of the opportunity to deal with this situation.

If the Supreme Court had declared the law unconstitutional in 1953, Congress long since would have enacted new legislation to deal with this situation.

My own opinion is that if the Supreme Court could have found a basis for declaring this law unconstitutional when the question was presented to the Court, that would have been its decision. Lacking a basis for invalidating the law, the Court preferred to prolong litigation rather than to adopt the forthright course of holding the law constitutional.

This question will come before the Court again, I hope, at its session this

fall. I do not see how the Court can this time avoid or escape its responsibility of passing upon the constitutionality of this statute. The people are demanding action. Nor do I see how the Court can possibly hold the act unconstitutional, though the Communists and others seeking to invalidate it have had 8 years to work on the problem.

But even if a decision shall be rendered next fall or the following spring upholding the law, that decision will be very, very late. Better late than never, of course, even in this instance; yet the delay, this unnecessary delay of more than 5 years, will have gravely hampered the efforts of the Nation to combat the Communist conspiracy within its borders, and thereby gravely weakened the internal security of the Nation.

If the Internal Security Act could be enforced effectively, either the Communist Party would have to register with the Subversive Activities Control Board or individual Communists would have to register; Communists would be barred from Federal office and employment; Communists would be barred from employment in defense facilities and defense areas; the Communist propaganda which is flooding the country would be required to be labeled as to its source; and other sanctions would be applied against the Communist Party and individual Communists. All of these sanctions, which Congress deemed necessary for the protection of the internal security of this Nation, have been held in abeyance because this act has been kept in litigation all these years.

In the Watkins case, the Supreme Court abrogated the right to judge a man by the company he keeps. The Supreme Court has in effect created a new "first amendment right," which it has designated the "right of freedom of association," and has held in effect that a man's associations with Communists are his own personal business, and that he cannot even be asked about such associations without invading his right of privacy. If the same principles should be applied to associations with known criminals, law enforcement in this country would be as much of a shambles as the Smith Act is today.

In the Watkins case, the Supreme Court has also invaded the right of congressional committees to decide what questions are pertinent to their investigations.

From the beginning of our Republic, the rule was that a legislative body, in the conduct of an investigation, was the sole judge of the pertinency of the question it asked. The courts repeatedly said it was their duty to a coordinate branch of the Government to presume that Congress or one of its committees had a legislative purpose in any investigation it conducted, and might decide for itself what information it needed, and that any question reasonably designed to produce such information was pertinent. But in Watkins against U.S., the Supreme Court laid down the new rule that Congress or a congressional committee not only had to justify its legislative purpose and explain the pertinency of each question, but had to do it to the satisfaction of the witness.

In the Watkins case, the Supreme Court has also invaded the right of each House of the Congress to determine for itself whether its committees are satisfactorily performing the duties assigned to them. The Court arbitrarily stepped in between the Houses of Congress and their respective committees, and arrogated to itself the right to decide whether a committee has properly carried out the wishes of its parent body. A more flagrant invasion of the legislative process by the judiciary could hardly be imagined. Under this decision, the Senate itself may be perfectly satisfied with what the Internal Security Subcommittee is doing, but if the Supreme Court does not like it, the Court will say the committee is exceeding its authority or is improperly discharging its duties, and on that basis will try to put the committee out of business. The Court did this with the House Un-American Activities Committee in the Watkins case.

In Cole against Young, the Supreme Court limited the right of a head of a Federal agency to get rid of subversives in that agency. In doing this, the Court in effect rewrote an act of Congress specifically granting this right, writing into that law, by Court interpretation, a limitation making it applicable only to so-called sensitive positions.

Mr. President, two principles are involved here, and the Court is wrong on both of them.

Considered from the standpoint of the opportunity to do harm, it is hard to say that any position does not offer a Communist such opportunity. It is well known that Communist espionage agents frequently operate in low echelon positions, using them as cover for their real purposes. Who can say that even a janitor emptying wastebaskets, or a cleaning woman dusting desks, or a file clerk, or a typist, could not have opportunities for espionage or sabotage or both?

The other point involved—and it is at least as important as the point of opportunity to do harm—is the point whether a Communist, dedicated to the overthrow of this Government by force and violence, should receive any remuneration or sustenance or benefit from that Government. My own position is that he should not, and I think most Americans will agree with me. But the Supreme Court of the United States does not agree.

In the case of Leedom against International Union of Mine, Mill & Smelter Workers, the Supreme Court took away from the National Labor Relations Board the right to require that a union divest itself of Communist leadership in order to have benefits under the National Labor Relations Act. This was a right which I am firmly convinced Congress intended to grant, and did grant, by law; but the Supreme Court has abrogated this right.

In the Amalgamated Meatcutters case, the Supreme Court went further in its denial of the right of the National Labor Relations Board to take action against unions under Communist leadership; and in the Gold case, the Supreme Court freed a labor official who had been convicted of filing a false non-Communist affidavit, on the specious ground that when an FBI agent investigating another similar case telephoned or visited three members of the jury to inquire whether they had received any propaganda literature, this was an improper interference with the privacy of the jury and so prejudicial to the defendant's case as to require reversal.

In the Witkovich case, the Supreme Court abrogated the right of immigration authorities, specifically granted by Congress, to keep aliens awaiting deportation from engaging in Communist activities, and to question such aliens about such activities. The Court held that the Government of the United States cannot prevent aliens who are awaiting deportation from engaging in Communist activities, even where such activities formed the basis for the original deportation order. The Supreme Court has even held that the Immigration and Naturalization Service cannot question such aliens about their Communist activities. The Court took this position in spite of the fact that there is a law on the books, passed by Congress, explicitly giving the Immigration and Naturalization Service the right to keep such deportable aliens under reasonable supervision, and to require them to answer reasonable questions. The Court said that even under this statute, all that the Immigration and Naturalization Service can ask about is the availability of the alien for deportation, not what he is doing while he is still here.

In the Schware and Konigsberg cases, the Court invaded a field which it had previously said was outside its jurisdiction, and took away from the supreme courts of the individual States and the boards of bar examiners of those States the right to pass upon admissions to the State bar. As the American Bar Association committee's report has pointed out in the Schware case the Court substituted its standard of fitness for the bar of New Mexico in place of the standard established by the bar and the courts of New Mexico; and in the Konigsberg case, the Supreme Court of the United States actually held that membership in the Communist Party over a period of years, and refusal to answer questions as to present and past membership in the Communist Party, put to the applicant by the California State Bar Examiners, did not rationally support the finding of the California Supreme Court that the applicant had failed to prove that he was of good moral character and that he did not advocate the overthrow of the Federal or State Government by force and violence.

In the Jencks case, the Supreme Court invaded the right of the Government to protect its confidential records, even the records of its security agencies, from prying by Communists and their lawyers. Congress acted promptly to overcome some of the worst effects of this decision; but even before Congress could act, numerous convicted criminals, both Communists and others, were given their freedom under this new doctrine, and a number of prosecutions were discontinued because of inability to comply with the new requirements set by the

Court without seriously damaging security.

In Service against Dulles, the Supreme Court invalidated the right of the Secretary of State to fire subversives, holding on purely technical grounds that a man who had had clandestine meetings with a Soviet espionage agent and who furnished classified State Department documents to persons outside the Department must be reinstated as a State Department employee.

As a result of this decision and the decision in the Cole case, the New York Times reported on July 11, 1958, that more than 300 Government employees who had been fired for being security risks would have to be reinstated with backpay. The Internal Security Subcommittee is trying right now to find out exactly how many such employees have been reinstated, and where they are now and what they are doing; and we are having some trouble getting the information.

In the Yates and Schneiderman case, the Supreme Court destroyed the right of the Government to stop the work of Communist organizers. By construing the word "organize" as used in the Smith Act so narrowly as to include only the original organization or complete reorganization of the Communist Party, the Court in this decision made this section of the Smith Act inapplicable to any present Communist activity, and therefore useless. Unless and until new legislation is passed by the Congress, Communist organizers are free to go on with their work unhampered by any restrictive Government action.

This same decision also abrogated the right of the Government to prevent Communists from teaching that communism is right, and from advocating the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force and violence. The Court held that the Smith Act provision against advocating the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force and violence, and teaching that it is right, proper, or a duty to work for the overthrow of the Government, could not be enforced without showing that it had produced the result of some overt move toward such overthrow. The effect of this decision was to make the Smith Act, in the words of Judge Richard Chambers of the U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals in California "a virtual shambles" as to any further prosecutions under it.

In the Sweezy case, the Supreme Court took away from a State legislature the right to determine the distribution of powers on the State level, and also took away the right of a State legislative investigating committee to ask a witness about Communist or pro-Communist activity.

In the Raley case, the Supreme Court extended its attack on the right of States to investigate communism, by reversing the conviction of three witnesses who had refused to answer questions about Communist activities put to them by the Ohio Un-American Activities Commission. The Court based its decision in this case on its own judge-made law as enunciated in the Sweezy case.

In the Slochower case, the Court invalidated the right of a State or a community or a board of education to fire Communist teachers, holding that a teacher in the New York public schools could not be fired for taking the fifth amendment when asked about Communist activities, even though an existing State law declared that failure to answer such questions when posed by a duly constituted authority should be grounds for dismissal.

In the case of United Mine Workers against Arkansas Oak Flooring Co., the Supreme Court took away the right of a State to prevent picketing by a Communist union. The union in this case had failed to file non-Communist affidavits and other data required by the National Labor Relations Act, and the State courts of Louisiana had enjoined it from picketing; but the U.S. Supreme Court held that despite its failure to comply with the filing requirements, the union could go ahead and picket anyway, and the Louisiana State court injunction was invalid.

The importance of the question here, Mr. President, goes far beyond the matter of whether the United Mine Workers was Communist dominated or only in technical noncompliance with the law. This is so because the doctrine of this case is just as applicable to the most strongly Communist-dominated union in the country as it is to the United Mine Workers or any other union. Under the doctrine in this case, a Communist union can take steps to enforce its will upon an employer, even though Congress in the National Labor Relations Act enacted into law provisions designed to force Communist leadership out of labor unions and to deny to Communist-led unions the rights which are preserved to non-Communist unions.

In the Sacher case, the Supreme Court, in effect, denied the right of a congressional committee to inquire about more than one subject in the course of a single hearing, even though both subjects inquired about were clearly within the jurisdiction of the committee.

In its handling of this case, the Supreme Court also denied the right of Government attorneys to be heard in oral argument before having a decision against them.

In the Kent and Briehl case, the Court denied the right of the Secretary of State to deny passports to Communists or to persons whom evidence showed were going abroad to further Communist causes. In this case the Court also denied the right of the Secretary of State to ask citizens applying for passports to make a statement respecting their Communist affiliations, if any. The Court denied these rights, in spite of the fact that up until the time of the Court's decision, the issuance of passports had always been considered an adjunct of the foreign relations of the United States, the conduct of which is by the Constitution committed to the President, and, in the case of passports, is delegated by him to the Secretary of State.

In the Kent and Briehl case, the Court took occasion once more to refer to communism as a matter of belief and association, ignoring its own prior finding, and prior legislative and executive findings, that the Communist Party U.S.A. is a part of the world Communist conspiracy. The Court said that Kent and Briehl "are being denied their freedom of movement solely because of their refusal to be subjected to inquiry into their beliefs and associations."

In the Dayton case, the Court in terms denied the right of the Secretary of State to withhold a passport on the basis of a finding that to grant it would be contrary to the national security of the country. The Supreme Court declared—listen to this, Mr. President—that to deny a passport because its issuance would be contrary to the national security of the country is to deny for "an impermissible reason." That is the Court's own language.

Although the Secretary of State found that Dayton associated with members of the Rosenberg spy ring, and had actually been present several times in the room where secret Government documents were microfilmed for transfer to the Soviet Union, and that Dayton was going abroad to work with a Communist who recently had renounced his American citizenship, and although on this basis the Secretary of State formally found, and stated, that to grant a passport to Dayton would be contrary to the national interests of the United States, the Supreme Court said this was "an impermissible reason" for refusing to grant the passport.

In the second Yates case, the Supreme Court denied the right of a Federal judge to sentence a Communist witness for repeated contempts committed before him in open court. The defendant had been held in contempt for refusing to answer 11 questions relating to whether other persons were members of the Communist Party; but the Supreme Court said that while she might be held in contempt for refusing to answer the first question, she could not be forced to answer any of the others. The Court then went on to vacate the sentence even with respect to the first contempt, and sent the case back for resentencing "in the cool reflection of subsequent events."

In the Bonetti case, the Supreme Court revoked the right of the Government to deport an alien who became a Communist after coming to this country. The Court accomplished this by judicial legislation amending the Immigration and Nationality Act in a manner which three dissenting Justices declared "cripples the effectiveness of the act." What the Court said, in effect, was that if an alien becomes a Communist after entering the United States, that subjects him to deportation; but if he can get out of the country and can come back in again before being deported, the past offense is wiped out, and he may stay here.

In the Flaxer case, the Court denied the right of Congress to secure the records of a Communist-dominated union composed of employees of Federal, State, and local governments. Flaxer flagrantly defied the committee, in refusing to produce the documents which had been subpenaed. He was asked whether it would make any difference if he were given 10 days in which to produce them; and he said that it would not, that he

would not produce them in any event. But after he had been convicted for contempt, on the basis of this refusal, the Supreme Court said that what had really happened was that the committee had granted him an additional 10 days in which to produce the documents; and that although the Court knew that the documents had not in fact been produced, and that Flaxer had made no move to produce them, and had given no indication that he would produce them if the committee had asked him again, he might have produced them, and so his contempt conviction should be reversed.

In the Uphaus case, the Supreme Court completed the destruction of every right of the people of a State to combat subversion within the boundaries of that State, by holding that a State legislative committee could not even investigate subversive activities in the State.

I have not discussed by any means all of the instances in which the Supreme Court has denied or abrogated or curtailed established rights. I have been confining myself to the 24 cases listed by the American Bar Association special committee. Numerous other cases, both inside and outside the field of subversion and security, could be mentioned.

For instance, in the Girard College case, the Supreme Court abrogated the right of a testator to say in his will how his money shall be used. In the Brown case, the Supreme Court took from State and local authorities the right to control their own schools. States rights have been invaded by numerous other Supreme Court decisions, in various areas, including the fields of labor law and taxation.

Perhaps the greatest right which the Supreme Court has abrogated is the right of the people to know what their Constitution means.

The Constitution of the United States is the basic charter of our liberties. Unless its meaning can be known by all, is the same for all, is the same this year as last year, and is the same next year as this year, its worth is destroyed. If there is no certainty in the basic law of the land, then there is no certainty in the law. The Constitution itself provides that it can be amended only in a certain way, and with ratification by three-fourths of the States. Jefferson warned against the danger of amendment by usurpation. But the Supreme Court of the United States has repeatedly amended the Constitution to mean something different from what it meant originally, something different from what the Court itself had previously declared the Constitution to mean. This has been true in many instances. To name some of them: In the case of Brown against The Board of Education, the Court completely changed the meaning of the 14th amendment, as it had stood and been sustained by Court interpretations for many decades. In the Watkins and Sweezy cases, the Court created a new constitutional right of freedom of association. In a long series of decisions dealing with fifth amendment Communists, the Court changed the provisions of the fifth amendment so as, in effect, to strike out the words "in any criminal case," and to grant to witnesses before congressional committees the privilege of refusing to answer questions. In the many and various cases which encroach upon States' rights, the Supreme Court has narrowed, and narrowed again, the provision of the 10th amendment that the powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States, respectively, or to the people.

The constitutional provision that "all legislative powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States, which shall consist of a Senate and House of Representatives"—although this is article I, section 1 of the Constitution—has been evaded time after time by the Supreme Court, which has proceeded to make law by judicial legislation.

Under the Constitution, the Supreme Court has the function of interpreting and enforcing the laws of the United States; but this is not the same thing as for the Court to make law. If law in the United States is to be what the Supreme Court thinks it ought to be and says it is, at any given time, rather than what the Constitution provides and intended, and what the laws passed by Congress provide and intend, then there is no certainty in the law; there can be no final justice; and the so-called basic charter of our liberties is not a charter at all, but is simply a chessboard on which the Court may maneuver, to bring about the results it desires.

The common denominator of this line of Supreme Court decisions is usurpation—the same usurpation against which George Washington warned. The Court is taking to itself powers, and is exercising those powers, without any justification in statute or Constitution, without any reliance on recognized principles of law, without any basis whatever except its own naked thirst for power. The Court appears determined in all fields to make the law what it, the Court, thinks the law should be.

Mr. President, there cannot be freedom under law unless there is law—law which can be ascertained in advance by the average citizen, and can be relied upon by him. When the Supreme Court is making the law in each individual instance to suit its own judgment as to what the law of the case should be, we have a situation in which justice under law is impossible.

We have that situation today, Mr. President; and thereby the most basic rights of the citizens of this Republic have been violated.

We cannot in conscience permit this situation to continue. Some of my colleagues may differ with me, or with each other, respecting the exact form our action should take. But all of us will agree, I think, that we must take action designed to preserve the balance of powers in our Government, under the Constitution, and to restore certainty to the law, so that the rule of law and freedom under law shall once more be incidents of the American way of life.

As the State chief justices said in their report on the Supreme Court's derelictions:

> We are not alone in our view that the Court, in many cases arising under the 14th amendment, has assumed what seems to us primarily legislative powers. * * * We do not believe that either the framers of the original Constitution or the possibly somewhat less gifted draftsmen of the 14th amendment contemplated that the Supreme Court would, or should, have the almost unlimited policymaking powers which it now exercises.
>
> It is strange, indeed, to reflect that under a Constitution which provides for a system of checks and balances and of distribution of power between National and State Governments, one branch of one Government—the Supreme Court—should attain the immense, and in many respects dominant, power which it now wields.

It is not only strange, Mr. President, it is frightening. I say to my colleagues that the great newspaper, the Nashville Banner, was 100 percent correct when it declared editorially on August 22, 1958:

> Unless the Congress resists the continued encroachment upon its legislative functions by the Supreme Court, the United States may soon find itself dominated by a tyrannical Federal judiciary which has taken unto itself, beyond the limits of the Constitution, the role of policymaker for 170 million people.
>
> When that happens, God save these United States.

EXHIBIT A

RÉSUMÉ OF BILLS TO IMPLEMENT RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE AMERICAN BAR ASSOCIATION TO ELIMINATE OBSTACLES TO THE PRESERVATION OF INTERNAL SECURITY

1. To define the term "organize" as used in the Smith Act.

Bar association recommendation: "Amend the Smith Act to define the word 'organize' to include the recruitment of new party members, the formation of new party units, and the regrouping, expansion, or other activities of an organizational nature performed by members of existing clubs, cells, classes, and other units so as to insure the applicability of this section of the act to Communist actionists, agents, organizers, colonists, or members currently performing organizational work."

This proposed bill would accomplish the precise purpose of the bar association recommendation. The Supreme Court decision in the Yates case rendered the organizing section of the Smith act unenforceable against current Communist activity. Enactment of this bill would restore the effectiveness and applicability of this section of the law.

2. To protect the effectiveness of State antisubversive laws against unintended Federal preemption.

Bar association recommendation: "That wherever there are reasonable grounds to believe that as a result of court decisions weaknesses in internal security have been disclosed, remedial legislation be enacted by the Congress of the United States, including a specific pronouncement of congressional intention that State statutes proscribing sedition against the United States shall have concurrent enforceability."

The bill as drafted is confined to the specific recommendations of the bar association.

3. To make full disclosure respecting loyalty to the United States a condition of Government employment.

Bar association recommendation: "Establish the right of each branch of Government to require as a condition of employment that each employee thereof shall not refuse to answer a query before a duly constituted

committee of the Congress or before duly authorized officers of either the executive or judicial branches of the Government with respect to Communist, Communist-front, or other subversive activities or any other matter bearing upon his loyalty to the United States, as the Government has a right to know his record."

This proposed bill comports exactly with the recommendation of the bar association. It would cover refusals based upon a claim of fifth-amendment privilege, or upon any other claim of constitutional privilege, or for any other reason. Under this bill, if enacted, it would be the refusal by an employee to answer a question bearing upon his loyalty to the United States which would constitute a breach of a condition of his employment, not the reason, if any, claimed by the employee as justification for his refusal.

4. To amend sections 241 and 242 of the Immigration and Nationality Act.

Bar association recommendation: "Invest in the executive branch of the Government the right to protect our internal security against the activities of aliens who were or became Communists at any time subsequent to their entry into the United States by providing for their deportation without any deprivation of due process; and the right to make and enforce reasonable restrictions on aliens awaiting deportation to prohibit them from engaging in any activities identical or similar to those upon which the aliens' deportation order was based, with further right fully to interrogate aliens awaiting deportation concerning their subversive associates or activities."

This bill will fully carry out the recommendation of the bar association. Since existing law already provides for deportation, the bill concerns itself with the right to make and enforce reasonable regulations on aliens awaiting deportation, consonant with due process.

The first section of the bill would overcome the effect of the Supreme Court decision in *Bonetti* v. *Rogers,* and would restore the applicability of the deportation provisions of the Immigration and Nationality Act to any alien who has been a member of the Communist Party at any time after any entry into the United States.

5. To amend the Immigration and Nationality Act with respect to travel in time of war or national emergency and passport procedures.

Bar association recommendation: "Restore to the executive branch of Government the right to deny passports to persons knowingly engaged in subversive activities, or activities designed or intended to further international communism by the establishment of criteria and standards to be applied in the issuance or denial of passports. These criteria and standards should be clear and unequivocal, and in addition contain a specific authorization to the Secretary of State empowering him or the Acting Secretary to withhold a passport in the national interest based upon confidential information and upon which he shall certify that it is contrary to the interests of this Nation that a passport be issued to the applicant; and further, to prevent foreign espionage agents from departing this country for the purpose of carrying out their espionage pursuits or to escape disclosure or prosecution; and that such legislation establish adequate appeal procedures which would insure due process of law so as to provide recourse to the individuals concerned in the event of any arbitrary and capricious exercise of discretion not properly founded."

This bill embraces all the recommendations of the bar association with respect to passport legislation.

6. To broaden the application of the Summary Suspension Act of 1950.

Bar association recommendation: "Restore to the executive branch of our Government the right to determine and to dismiss, if required, those who are security risks in both sensitive and nonsensitive positions in the Government service."

This bill accomplishes the objective of the bar association recommendation in the manner suggested by the Supreme Court itself in the case of *Cole* v. *Young,* that is, by making the summary suspension authority applicable to all departments and agencies of the Government.

7. To amend section 2385 of title 18 of the United States Code.

Bar association recommendation: "Amend the Smith Act to make it a crime intentionally to advocate the violent overthrow of the Government of the United States or to teach the necessity, desirability, or duty of seeking to bring about such overthrow; in order that (1) this Nation might take protective steps to prevent acts which, if not prevented, could result in bloodshed and treachery; and (2) this Nation need not be forced to delay the invoking of the judicial process until such time as the resulting damage has already been wrought."

This bill would implement the recommendation of the bar association report. At the same time, the bill does not attempt to proscribe the mere abstract teaching of Marxist doctrine; rather, the bill is directed against the teaching or advocacy of an alleged duty or necessity or desirability or propriety of overthrowing the Government by force or violence.

The second section of this bill focuses on the intent back of teaching or advocacy. No question is involved here of the results of such an attempt; it is the attempt itself, by the performance of an overt act intended to cause the violent overthrow of the Government, which is made a crime.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, the frightening thing is, I believe, that today some intemperate persons in this country pour their spleen upon our venerated highest tribunal. Some in this Chamber just a year ago asked the Members of the Senate to join with them in voting for legislative proposals designed to undermine, to weaken, and to traduce the Court's jurisdiction. Those legislative proposals went down to their well-deserved defeat on rollcall votes here in the Senate. I think that is a rather telling and decisive answer to the comments made by the distinguished Senator from Mississippi. In saying that, I desire vigorously to object to the opinions which the distinguished Senator from Mississippi has just expressed. In my judgment, the great majority of the people of the Nation, and the great majority of the Members of the Senate hold vigorously to contrary opinions. The Supreme Court will live in history as a bulwark of our constitutional system.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield to me, I desire to state that I find myself in accord with the views expressed by my good friend, the senior Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL].

I recognize the distinguished service which the chairman of the Judiciary Committee [Mr. EASTLAND] has rendered, and the keen interest in this whole subject which confronts the country. But, reluctantly, I find myself unable to agree with the Senator from Mississippi. That is perhaps all the more natural because the Philadelphia Bar Association, which represents the city where American liberty found its birth, has taken a position adverse to the one taken by the American Bar Association.

Although I know it is somewhat out of order under the rules, I wonder whether my friend will permit me to request unanimous consent that an article stating the position of the Philadelphia Bar Association, and published in the Philadelphia Bulletin, and a letter by the dean of the University of Pennsylvania Law School, the Honorable Jefferson B. Fordham, which was published in the New York Times, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article and letter were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Philadelphia Bulletin, Mar. 3, 1959]

PHILADELPHIA BAR DISOWNS CRITICISM OF HIGH COURT BY U.S. BODY

The Philadelphia Bar Association this afternoon repudiated recent implied criticism of the U.S. Supreme Court by the American Bar Association.

More than 450 local lawyers, attending the local bar's quarterly meeting in the Bellevue-Stratford, engaged in a free-for-all discussion of criticisms of Supreme Court decisions on individual liberties and civil rights.

After a stormy session, the lawyers voted 288–183 to adopt a resolution presented by the bar's Civil Rights Committee. The resolution, offered by committee chairman Morris L. Forer, said:

"This association affirms its faith in the Supreme Court in its traditional role as interpreter of the Constitution and as a protector of our cherished freedom and of the rights of the individual against invasion of his constitutional rights and liberties."

The American Bar Association's House of Delegates last week questioned whether some of the high court's rulings weakened the internal security of the country.

Under fire from the ABA were rulings on accused Communists.

Today, before the local lawyers could resolve their differences, there were four voice votes, one standing vote and a paper-ballot vote (the final 288–183 decision).

Forer told the lawyers that his committee deplores implications in the recent criticisms that the Nation's security has been weakened by the decisions.

He said they were not founded on fact and he added, "Such criticisms should be repudiated."

[From the New York Times, Mar. 5, 1959]

LAWYERS GROUP CRITICIZED—BAR ASSOCIATION SAID TO ALINE ITSELF WITH LAY CRITICS OF COURT

(The writer of the following letter is dean of the Law School of the University of Pennsylvania.)

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

By action of its house of delegates taken on February 24 the American Bar Association failed the American public in interpreting for the citizens the work of the Supreme Court in our constitutional and legal system. What the bar association did, in short, was to aline itself with lay critics of the Court. I am grieved that this is so.

On that date the house of delegates adopted recommendations put forth by the association's Special Committee on Communist Tactics, Strategy and Objectives. These recommendations began by declaring that it was the duty of members of the bar to defend the institutions of the judiciary

from unfair and unjust attacks and expressed disapproval of proposals to limit Supreme Court jurisdiction.

They went on, however, to laud the Internal Security Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary and the House Un-American Activities Committee for their "records and accomplishments and great service to the nation" and to recommend a number of changes in Federal legislation.

In calling for changes in Federal legislation the house of delegates was left a very strong impression that the reason it is considered to be needful is the bad job the Supreme Court is thought to have done in interpreting the Constitution and Federal statutes, the latter in particular. To suggest statutory change is one thing, to imply that it is needed due to bad work by the highest court is another.

EFFECT ON SECURITY

I simply do not believe that any weakening effect on internal security has been shown or that the association's attack on the court can be effectively sustained on a lawyer-like basis. The decisions that the Court has made in cases involving security problems have been supported by legal reasoning and methods of interpretation which are familiar to members of the legal profession and generally respected.

It is, for example, a well-understood and well-accepted doctrine in constitutional interpretation that a constitutional question is to be avoided in the interpretation of a statute if this can be done without violence to the measure examined in its totality. Yet when the Court followed this doctrine in the Yates case and thereby made it unnecessary to pass upon a serious question as to the constitutionality of the Smith Act, the critics of the Court seemed to be able to see nothing but the fact that the result in the case was not to their liking. The American Bar Association would so change the Smith Act as to present squarely the substantive constitutional question which, under the present language, the Court was able to avoid in the Yates case.

The action of the house of delegates discloses strong preoccupation with matters of internal security rather than with the protection of civil liberty. I do not suggest that lawyers have no proper concern with internal security. But I must say that I find a serious imbalance reflected in the action of the house of delegates. In my system of values the pre-eminent concern of lawyers, as individuals and as a group, is with human liberty. Security does not mean much to me except as a means to preserve the conditions under which there will exist maximum freedom for individual human expression and fulfillment.

APPLAUSE FOR COURT

The bar association action has a Maginot line psychology. For my part, I am glad to record the opinion that instead of being charged by the organized bar with reaching decisions inimical to our internal security, the Supreme Court should be warmly applauded by the profession for its fidelity to the substantive and procedural safeguards of the Bill of Rights and for its interpretation of statutes in keeping with the spirit of the Bill of Rights.

When it comes to recommendations for substantive legislation I think the American Bar Association should assert leadership in the realm of civil rights and civil liberties. For years the committee on Communist tactics, strategy, and objectives has been very active and strongly supported, while the committee on the Bill of Rights has languished.

Considered as recommendations for legislative change the bar association proposals are vulnerable. I invite particular attention to the proposal that Congress specifically provide that State statutes forbidding sedition against the United States be enforcible concurrently with the Smith Act.

The Smith Act was interpreted in the Nelson case to supersede a Pennsylvania State sedition law so far as sedition against the United States was concerned. The State supreme court had held that, as to sedition against the United States, the Smith Act superseded the State law. The Supreme Court of the United States agreed with this.

Is not national security a national responsibility? How would it aid to leave each State free to have its own law and enforcement machinery on this subject? I can see in such a system ample grist for the mill of politically ambitious local prosecutors, with the attendant hazards to fair play and civil liberty, but I do not delude myself with the notion that the cause of national security would be served.

JEFFERSON B. FORDHAM.

PHILADELPHIA, *February 26, 1959.*

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, I desire to say there is no doubt in the mind of any reasonable man that the internal security law, which was intended to save this country from acts of subversion, has been weakened by the Supreme Court of the United States. The Senate Committee on the Judiciary is going to work on that problem. It will make recommendations this year. I am not afraid of public sentiment in this country. God bless the American people. They are sound and want to protect their heritage and liberties against an international conspiracy which would enslave them.

GOING TO BUY A CAR? YOU MAY RUN INTO AN AUTOMOBILE LOAN SHARK

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, for the past 5 years I have been urging the U.S. Senate to appropriate $1 million for the operation of the Senate Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee so that it may fully protect the people from all types of monopolistic processes.

Mr. President, you cannot shoot down a giant tank with popguns. Nor can you properly investigate big business practices that hoodwink the consumer with peanut appropriations. In a previous statement to the Senate, I outlined the subcommittee's difficulties in fully investigating oil, steel, automobile manufacturers, private power industry, farm machinery, meatpackers, large grocery chains, because industry spends more to prepare for a 1-day hearing than the subcommittee spends for a full year of investigation.

Now, we are investigating automobile financing. This investigation boils down to the big three auto manufacturers versus the multimillion dollar financing companies and their insurance company subsidiaries.

At first glance, it would appear that all the sympathy must be with the so-called independent auto financing companies who may be injured by General Motors Acceptance Corp.—GMAC—or by General Motors or the proposed finance companies of Ford Motor Co. and Chrysler Motor Co.

Before we get to the meat of this discussion, I should review for the RECORD that I have been conducting investigations and hearings into the small loan rackets in many States that not only charge exorbitant, usurious, and outrageous interest rates, but demand credit, life and health and accident insurance, with unbelievable high rates, as a tie-in to get to the receiving of a small loan. We have brought these facts to the public.

For example, at the hearings in Montgomery, Ala., the record showed that a credit life policy cost the borrower $40 per year per $100 borrowed, whereas that insurance policy could be purchased through group insurance at a rate of 49 cents for $100 borrowed per year. The record which shortly will be submitted as an Antitrust Subcommittee report reveals the high rate of profit of those small loan companies that demand tie-in insurance through companies they own directly or indirectly.

How does this relate to auto financing? On Monday, March 2, 1959, the Washington Daily News, under the byline of Jack Steele, Scripps-Howard staff writer, carried a story headlined, "High Insurance Profits Bared—Tax Free for Credit Life." The article follows:

A group of insurance companies which deal chiefly in so-called "credit life insurance" have been rolling up huge tax-free profits in recent years, a survey by Scripps-Howard newspapers revealed today.

That's the type of insurance that pays the loan on your auto, or other small loan, if you die while payments still are due.

The huge profits of these credit life insurance companies—ranging from 100 to 2,800 percent a year on paid-in capital have virtually escaped Federal income taxes because of a loophole in the Internal Revenue Code.

This loophole would be closed by a bill revising the tax laws for life insurance companies. The bill was passed by the House 10 days ago.

The Senate Finance Committee will open hearings on it tomorrow in an effort to get it enacted before the life insurance industry's 1958 tax returns fall due on March 15.

Spokesmen for the credit life companies contend the House bill, which would subject them to the full 52-percent tax rate paid by other corporations, would drive them out of business.

They also insist that old line life insurance companies—which write the bulk of credit insurance and also reap substantial profits from it—would gain a competitive advantage by paying lower taxes under the bill.

Representatives of the old line companies, on the other hand, say the bill would boost the taxes paid by the life insurance industry 70 percent, largely because of the big profits made by the credit life companies.

The credit life insurance business has mushroomed since World War II with the boom in installment buying. In 1946 only $729 million of such insurance was in force. By 1957 it had jumped to nearly $20 billion.

Most companies which specialize in credit life insurance have been set up in the last decade as captives of big finance and credit companies. Typically, the finance company owns all or most of the insurance company's stock and the officers and directors interlock.

Here is a rundown on the profits made and income taxes paid in 1957—the last year on which figures are available—by three big captive credit life companies:

The Patriot Life Insurance Co. was formed in New York in 1953 as a wholly owned subsidiary of the City Financial Corp., one of the Nation's largest auto finance firms.

In 1957 Patriot had total premium income—most of it from credit life policies—

of $21.8 million. The company paid out death benefits of $4.9 million and added $2.2 million to its reserves.

Its net operating gain (or profit) was $13.9 million—a profit of 926 percent on its paid-in capital of $1.5 million.

Yet it paid estimated Federal income taxes of only $52,000 on net investment income of $381,768.

The Alinco Life Insurance Co., South Bend, Ind., was formed in 1954. It is owned and controlled by Associates Investment Co., which through other affiliates also does a big auto finance business.

Alinco in 1957 had premium income of $11.1 million. It paid out $4.5 million in death benefits.

Its net gain from operations was $5.6 million—a profit of 2,800 percent on its $200,000 capital.

Yet its Federal income tax was only an estimated $20,000 on its net investment income of $258,437.

The General Fidelity Life Insurance Co., of Richmond, Va., is wholly owned by the State Loan & Finance Corp., a small-loan company which has headquarters in Washington, D.C., but operates mostly in Maryland and Virginia.

In 1957 General Fidelity, which was formed in 1953, had $3.8 million of premium income. It had operating gains of $2.2 million—a 725 percent profit on its paid-in capital of $305,000.

General Fidelity's estimated Federal income tax was only $3,100 on investment income of $41,833.

The issue of income taxes on insurance companies is now pending before the Senate Finance Committee, and we should have the printed hearings and an extensive report in the near future. Therefore, I shall not delve into that subject here except to note its relation to the issue of high profits and generally low taxes of credit insurance. However, when the Finance Committee reports to the Senate, I shall have more to say on the issue of income taxes on insurance companies.

It is indisputable that the subsidiary tie-in credit life insurance, an insurance that pays the loan on one's auto and small loan if one dies, is an extraordinary profitable business. In many instances it is more profitable than the parent loan company's operation.

Let us look at the record. From the statement filed with the Securities Exchange Commission in 1957, the State Loan & Finance Corp., mentioned in the Washington News article above, showed net income of $1,505,800 from operations other than the life insurance company it owns and net income of $2,009,206 from its wholly owned subsidiary company. Most witnesses representing auto finance companies who appeared before the Senate Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee testified that they owned a subsidiary insurance company to insure their loans. They further testified that their insurance company insures about 50 percent of the loans that they processed. At the direction of the acting chairman, Senator PHILIP HART, the auto finance companies are to submit to the subcommittee profit and loss statements for the record.

Mr. President, let us examine the testimony taken at the recent antimonopoly subcommittee hearings on auto financing.

First. Most independent financing companies testified that their business has been growing in the past 10 years in the face of steeper competition from banks which deal in auto loans and the loss of business from dealers of General Motors production. I should point out further these witnesses stated that if Ford Motor Co. and Chrysler Motor Co. should go into the auto financing business, it would be ruinous to the independent auto financing companies.

Second. Mr. Theodore Yntema, vice president of Ford Motor Co., read into the record that an average independent auto financing company has been earning about 20 percent return on its investment after taxes, which he stated means about 40 percent return before taxes. He quoted the percentage of profit of each company that appeared before the subcommittee from published reports submitted by these individual auto finance companies.

Third. Mr. Yntema also testified:

In general but not universally, banks offer the most favorable financing rates to dealers and car buyers. * * * Finance companies promote the sale of automobile, physical, damage insurance and various forms of credit life and disability insurance frequently provided by affiliated insurance companies, the variety and complexity of finance insurance arrangements and the charges for them are such as almost to defy comprehension. * * *

We estimate GMAC provides new car financing and insurance services to GM dealers at a cost to the dealer averaging about $65 per car less than the cost of financing and insurance service typically offered by other finance companies. In some areas typical finance-company charges may exceed GMAC charges by as much as $100 to $150. * * *

Competition among finance companies has failed in two respects to provide the kind of service our dealers and customers should have:

1. The rates charged have generally been considerably above those charged by GMAC—about $65 and in some areas as much as $100 to $150 higher.

2. The package of financing and insurance services has typically included high-cost, high-profit extras that have added unnecessarily to the cost of the automobile to the consumers.

Hearings before congressional committees have revealed that during the time when new automobiles were scarce, dealers would be reluctant to sell cars for cash because of the loss of commissions and/or profits from the finance charges and insurance rates required for the purchase of the car.

Mr. Yntema continues:

From time to time we have let it be known that we wished finance companies would make available to our dealers financing and insurance services and rates competitive with those provided by GMAC. The largest independent finance company told us bluntly, it would not meet GMAC rates. * * * Our decision to enter the business of finance and insuring the sales of automobiles to dealers and to consumers was a last resort. We could not find any other practicable means by which all our dealers and consumers could have available to them a streamlined financing and insurance service and a low level of rates such as provided by GMAC. We came to this decision reluctantly.

In order to be fair, I must state that the independent finance companies testified that they are competitive with GMAC with rates charged. On cross-examination they analyzed what they meant as competitive.

Mr. President, I have been contacted by independent finance companies and several banks which deal in auto financing in North Dakota, stating that the big three manufacturers would pose a threat to their auto-financing business if they were allowed to finance automobiles. Naturally, I would want to help the smaller companies against the giant three automobile manufacturers, but if the testimony of Mr. Yntema is accurate and the auto finance companies refuse to be competitive with GMAC and further include high-cost, high-profit extras that have unnecessarily added to the costs of autos to the consumer, then I would be compelled to take the same position that I have taken against the small loan companies—"sharks"—that force tie-in sales of insurance at high rates to the detriment of the small borrowers who desperately need the $25, $50, $100, or $300 that they must borrow to pay their most necessary and pressing bills.

In concluding my remarks, Mr. President, it appears from Mr. Yntema's testimony that an ordinary purchase of an automobile, for example, a North Dakota farmer, would have to pay from $65 to $150 more for finance charges and insurance coverage if financed through an independent finance company as against the rates charged through GMAC.

There appears to be a diametrically opposed view in the testimony between Mr. Yntema and the testimony from the officers of several of the independent auto financing companies in this respect. Since the automobile purchaser is the one who may suffer by paying a higher price for his car through the finance and insurance charges, I believe it would be appropriate if the Federal Trade Commission would make a full investigation into this matter and report what the true facts are as to financing and insurance rates charged by the various auto financing companies in comparison with GMAC.

Mr. President, as everyone knows, inflation is the No. 1 domestic problem facing us today. It is imperative that Congress exercise every possible precaution to assure the people that they would be able to purchase goods and products of all types at the lowest possible price. Savings of finance and insurance charges from purchases of approximately 6 million automobiles a year can have a material impact on cutting down the inflationary spiral.

DECISION OF FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION RELATING TO "BOOSTERS"

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, during the past several weeks the Federal Communications Commission has been under considerable public pressure to authorize a so-called television booster service for fringe television reception areas.

Under attack here is the Commission's 6 to 1 decision of December 30, 1958, requiring unlicensed, and therefore illegal television transmitters called boosters, operating on VHF or very high frequency television channels 2 to 13 to be converted prior to March 30, 1959, to so-called translator stations, a legal service operating on UHF—ultrahigh frequency—channels 70 to 83. The deadline has been extended to June 30, 1959.

It has been suggested that this action by the Commission was "precipitate and ill-considered," that it was taken without sufficient exploration of how best to provide rural area television. As a result, there now are 25 bills or joint resolutions before the House, and at least 2 before the Senate, which, if adopted, would call for reversal of this recent Commission decision.

Far from being "precipitate and ill-considered," I find the Commission's December 30 order to have been based upon several years' study and upon two formal records of investigation, in which all interested parties had full opportunity to participate. It is as a result of these thorough investigations that the Commission found these illegal reflectors to be an immediate source of interference to communications, services designed for protection of life and property, and a cause of destructive interference in television reception on home television receivers.

The record also shows that the Commission has developed the UHF translator service as a substitute for the boosters. The studies of the Commission's expert staff conclude that these translators provide "an excellent means" for obtaining rural area television service. This seems to be borne out by the successful operation of more than 150 translators, with an additional 50 translators under construction at the very time the Commission issued its recent decision.

The Commission and its staff have grappled with this problem for at least 4 years, during which it has issued three separate rulings—one based on law, and two based on engineering considerations, seeking to force the boosters to cease operation. At the same time the Commission, cognizant of its obligation to provide television reception service to fringe area communities and to rural residents, developed the above-mentioned UHF translator service.

I hope that the Commission will be permitted to administer the Communications Act in the public interest in this case, and all others, free of interference, and without cognizance of political considerations.

TRAFFIC SAFETY

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, the traffic problem in the District of Columbia is one of great concern to all of us.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter to the editor from the GAPA, a civic organization, that was printed in the Washington Evening Star recently dealing with the subject of traffic safety. Also an editorial from the first publication of the Traffic Safety Reporter, issued late in February 1959, the official publication of the Department of Motor Vehicle, with one of its articles dealing with selected action items from their master plan for traffic safety.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Evening Star]

JANUARY 28, 1959.

To the EDITOR:

I noticed recently in your newspaper, an article that the Metropolitan Area Traffic Council plans to step up efforts to meet Washington area traffic problems. In the article, it mentioned that among groups to be organized will be a new public support subcommittee.

The Greek American Progressive Association (GAPA) in conjunction with the Council of Orthodox and Greek Societies participated in a Metropolitan Area Traffic Council conference in order to see how civic, fraternal, religious and service organizations could best help improve the area traffic problem.

Fully realizing that correcting traffic problems can best be handled through experts in that particular field and through greater efforts in law enforcement, the GAPA feels that a more forceful activity in public relations and public information could do very much in correcting many of the traffic problems in the Washington area. In this respect, not only do the newspapers, radio, television stations play a very important role, but also the civic, fraternal, religious, and service organizations can do very much in educating their respective members in the advantages of exercising courtesy, consideration, and common sense in everyday driving.

As was pointed out by the representative of the Council of Orthodox and Greek Societies at the Metropolitan Area Traffic Council conference, many drivers, who do not necessarily violate traffic laws, do drive in such a manner as to add to the traffic problems of many large cities. This includes taking up two lanes rather than one, weaving from one lane to the other indiscriminately; driving much slower than speed limit and thereby creating a congestion, driving in the so-called speed lane rather than keeping to the right as much as possible, entering an already clogged intersection and thereby tying up traffic when lights change prohibiting movement of traffic in either direction, lingering in no-parking or no-standing zones, and such other practices which are more conducive to traffic jams than actual violation to traffic laws as people understand them to be.

It is hoped that the Metropolitan Area Traffic Council will vigorously pursue its new subcommittee so that it may encourage every civic, fraternal, and religious organization in the city of Washington to actively participate in such a program.

The benefits of such a program will be reflected in less traffic deaths, personal injuries and property damage. Also, it will revitalize the downtown Washington section that has been strangled by "traffic congestionitis."

Very truly yours,

JOHN BROUMAS,
President, GAPA.

[From Traffic Safety Reporter, Feb. 21, 1959]

The official traffic safety program of the District of Columbia calls for the publication of a periodical to disseminate the program for the information and support of our citizens. As a result, the District of Columbia Traffic Safety Reporter now makes its bow.

Traffic safety, it is commonly said, is everybody's business. So this newsletter is aimed at "everybody". It will be published monthly in the interests of traffic accident prevention for the use of all who want to take a hand in promoting greater safety on our streets and highways.

We will attempt to keep you informed about the District's traffic accident situation and what your Government is doing to improve it. We hope that our words and pictures will encourage a greater sense of individual responsibility for safe driving and walking at all times.

At the same time, we want you to let us know about any traffic safety activities in which you have engaged or plan to undertake. We will be glad to lend you a hand in any such undertaking.

What we are trying to do, in short, is to combat the concept of public apathy to the shocking traffic toll—the idea that the man-in-the-street has no concern for his fellow man. To quote the National Safety Council's publication Traffic Safety:

"The public has a heart, let us find a way to engage that heart in the war on traffic accidents."

[From Traffic Safety Reporter, Feb. 21, 1959]

SELECTED ACTION ITEMS FROM THE PROGRAM

ENFORCEMENT

Obtain following additional equipment:

(a) Modern radios for motorcycles and other tariffic vehicles.

(b) Camera equipment for accident investigation vehicles.

(c) An additional investigation vehicle.

(d) Breath-testing equipment.

Obtain 21 additional police for the Traffic Division, within existing Department ceiling of 2,500 men.

Obtain two additional prosecutors thoroughly trained in law enforcement and particularly familiar with the handling of traffic cases.

Review all traffic laws and regulations in light of present conditions to meet the needs of safety and uniformity.

TRAFFIC COURT

Designate in advance two judges to be assigned to the traffic branch for the ensuing year. The judges will divide the duties as agreed upon between them, so that each will serve the equivalent of a 6-month tour of duty.

Insure attendance of judges assigned to traffic branch at traffic conference prior to said assignment, and recognize serious nature of traffic laws and regulations.

DRIVER LICENSING

Revise the written portion of our permit examination to indicate a more thorough knowledge of the rules of the road on the part of the applicant.

Explore ways and means of increasing attendance at the personal conference held under the point system driver improvement program.

TRAFFIC ENGINEERING

Increase traffic engineering staff by at least five engineers and technicians, and by five draftsmen.

Resume the program of installing "supplemental" traffic signals so that within 5 years there will be two signal indications facing each lane of traffic approaching a signal-controlled intersection.

Study existing working hours and physical locations of Government employees from data available in the Bureau of the Budget to determine if further changes in staggered working hours are feasible.

SCHOOL TRAFFIC SAFETY EDUCATION

Conduct periodic school-by-school surveys of the traffic problem as to safety.

Explore the feasibility of creating a full-time supervisor of traffic safety education.

Explore the feasibility of offering the Police Department's traffic school course in the senior high schools.

PUBLIC TRAFFIC SAFETY EDUCATION

Initiate the publication and distribution of an official traffic safety periodical to disseminate the District's official traffic safety program for the information and support of business, professional, civic, service, women, labor and other community leaders and organizations.

Administer an official traffic safety speaker's bureau composed of District officials, public support group members, safety chairmen of District organizations and other interested citizens.

VEHICLE IMPROVEMENT

Assist the Police Department in its continuing campaign to rid the streets of unsafe vehicles, regardless of place of registration.

UNIFORM VEHICLE CODE

Seek the assistance of a nonofficial agency in conducting a comparative study to determine wherein District regulations vary from those recommended in the Uniform Vehicle Code.

DRIVER AND VEHICLE RECORDS

Explore the feasibility of further mechanization of recordkeeping, relating it to the requirement for office space.

ACCIDENT RECORDS

Explore the feasibility of employing additional electromechanical equipment to expedite compilation and distribution of accident data.

PUBLIC SUPPORT

Expand the charter of the present Commissioners' Traffic Advisory Board to include leadership in public support.

Broaden the base of the public relations support for the traffic safety program.

A PROGRAM FOR THE 86TH CONGRESS

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, earlier today the distinguished junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER] made an extremely trenchant speech on the subject of the need for a review by Congress of tax revenues and tax sources in the light of our continuing United States domestic and foreign obligations.

I regret that I was not able to be on the floor when he delivered his address. I should like to commend him for it now, and to indicate my concurrence with the philosophy which he has outlined, and to proceed to make an effort on my own behalf to lay down a suggested program for the 86th Congress.

Mr. President, it is rather a coincidence that in the Washington Post and Times Herald today the commentator, Mr. Walter Lippmann, in an article entitled "The Stultifying Dogma," arrived at practically the same conclusions which the junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER] and I have reached on the same matter. Since the distinguished junior Senator from Oregon has placed that column in the RECORD, I shall not ask to have it printed again.

Mr. President, it is now 6 weeks since the program of the President was presented to the Congress and the American people in the form of messages from the White House on the State of the Union, the Budget, and the Economic Report.

The President's program has been criticized, and it has been stoutly defended. It is time for those of us who disagree with the President's concept of America, for today and tomorrow, to say why we think the President's program is deficient, and to provide a bill of particulars setting forth a positive program of our own.

No one Senator can be presumptuous enough to lay down the program for the 86th Congress. But, in our tradition of free debate, I want to suggest to my colleagues the broad outlines of a program to lead us out of the difficulties in which the President's proposals have placed us.

WHY THE PRESIDENT'S PROGRAM IS DEFICIENT

A few days ago, at the ceremony commemorating the anniversary of the birth of Lincoln, Carl Sandburg quoted these words of the Great Emancipator:

> The dogmas of the quiet past are inadequate for the stormy present. We must think anew, we must act anew, we must disenthrall ourselves.

The three messages which present the program of the President are replete with "the dogmas of the quiet past." That program is not good enough for "the stormy present." It is a complacent program, self-satisfied with the status quo in both foreign and domestic policy.

If we follow the program of the President—and follow it long enough—the result will surely be a steady decline toward a second-class America, incapable leading the defense of freedom in the world and indifferent to social, political, and economic injustices at home. We will be risking the loss of our precious liberties by default.

The safety of Americans and the growth and progress of our country depend upon the Congress substituting for the program of the President a program of its own which will protect our national security and our position of world leadership and meet the great national needs which confront us at every turn.

The fatal deficiencies in the President's program arise from the way in which it was put together. The administration has not drawn a picture of the kind of America we want to have 10 years or 5 years, or even 1 year hence, then computed what national action has to be taken to get us there, including a financial program.

Instead, it has done the reverse. It begins with a financial program formulated within arbitrary and predetermined limits, controlled largely by the level of present revenues. Our national goals then become whatever the present revenues can pay for if the budget is balanced. Our national needs are thus ignored.

In short, the President's budget is not a means to an end; it is the end.

Mr. President, there is nothing sacrosanct about a budget put together in this fashion. The responsible course for the Congress is to discard it and start all over again. We should make our own assessment of national needs and formulate our own national program to meet them. And in doing so, we should weigh our needs against our resources without blind pre-conceptions as to what we can and cannot afford.

When the Executive falls short in the performance of its duty, it falls upon the Legislature to fill the breach.

A BILL OF PARTICULARS

If we look at our national needs open-mindedly, what do we find? I do not presume, of course, to prejudge what any committee will recommend when it examines our requirements in particular areas of national need. But it may be useful to outline in broad strokes our present position insofar as a policy of unjustifiable Executive secrecy has permitted the elected representatives of the people to become aware of it.

FIRST: NATIONAL SECURITY

The President boasts of America's military, naval, air and missile strength. But he boasts of that strength in a vacuum. Nowhere in his program is there even an attempt to compare our strength with that of our Communist opponents. Yet, surely that is the only relevant test of our national security. Can it be seriously doubted that, in the last 6 years, our comparative power has been declining while that of our adversaries has been steadily growing?

There can be no doubt that we are losing the race for atomic missile equality: the Secretary of Defense himself has testified that he will not even try to match the Russians. With their present missile thrust, the Russians could strike devastating, if not fatal, blows to our country. Our retaliatory power is still great but the gap is widening every day. All the evidence suggests that our Strategic Air Force, crowded on inadequate bases, is not keeping pace with obsolescence. Our intermediate range missiles based abroad are vulnerable to surprise attack.

All the evidence suggests that if war were to come—as it might in May over Berlin—Russian submarines would not only control the sealanes but could, at their leisure, lob nuclear bombs on the great cities of our coasts.

And as for limited war, we just do not have in being adequate mobile forces capable of dealing with localized attacks on our allies, particularly if crises should occur simultaneously in far-removed locations.

To those who question such gloomy conclusions I refer for authority to the published summary of the Gaither report and the Rockefeller report of a year ago, to the report of the Johnson subcommittee on preparedness whose critical findings were published last February, and to the testimony of our leading scientists and militarymen this winter, much of it readily available although some of it still unjustifiably classified from most Senators and the general public.

It is true that we have heard soothing statements from some of the civilian and military leaders of the Defense Department. But the Congress cannot accept

without the fullest examination the assurances given by men who have limitations imposed on their freedom of expression, their voices gagged by an administrative ukase expressly forbidding disagreement with the military program in order to keep the ugly truth from the American people.

Money alone will not remedy the critical deficiencies in our defense posture. It will take much more than that. It will require the elimination of that smug and complacent self-satisfaction which is the hallmark of the Eisenhower administration. It will take a lot of hard work by a lot of dedicated men—men who will stay on the job and not quit and go home to make more money after a get-acquainted sojourn in Washington. It will take a reawakening of the spirit which made America a proud and compassionate Nation.

But it will take money, too—a lot more money than the President and his friends want to spend.

It will require a vast national effort which will terminate when, but only when, we are able to negotiate a meaningful and enforceable disarmament agreement with the Russians and the Chinese.

As the report of the Rockefeller Committee, chaired by the man who is now the distinguished Republican Governor of New York put it last year:

> Programs of great importance to U.S. security now suffer from insufficient funds. * * * Recent military expenditures are therefore insufficient to maintain even our current force levels. And events have made clear the inadequacy of these levels. * * *
>
> The price of survival, then, is not low. * * * But we can afford to survive.

No individual Senator can say with confidence how much should be added to the defense budget to overcome our alarming weaknesses. The report of the Gaither Committee, which is still secret, according to published reports, suggested stepups of $6 billion a year. The Rockefeller report suggested successive additions of $3 billion during each of the next several years. The distinguished chairman of the Defense Subcommittee of the House Appropriations Committee (Mr. MAHON) has suggested that next year's defense budget should be raised by $2 billion.

In any case, we can perhaps agree that the answer clearly does not lie in the kind of action reported in the Washington Post and Times Herald on February 22 by Mr. John G. Norris, whose lead paragraph I quote:

> A Defense Department report just made public reveals that the Pentagon plans to invest * * * in missile-weapon systems next year * * * about $400 million less than this year.

SECOND: FOREIGN RELATIONS

The conduct of foreign affairs is of such momentous importance to this Nation, and to every person in it, that it should be the subject of political discussion and debate as much as any other aspect of our public life. Under our Constitution, the President does not have the exclusive responsibility and authority for our foreign policy. While day-to-day conduct of foreign affairs is necessarily in the hands of the Executive, our Founding Fathers wisely placed on the Congress a heavy responsibility and authority in this field, and throughout our history the Congress has played its proper part in exercising that responsibility and authority—most recently in the Formosa and Middle East resolutions. Perhaps the time has come when we should do so with respect to Berlin. We should be ready to support the President when imminent danger threatens, but we would be derelict in our duties if we failed to participate in the formulation of foreign policy and in following closely the moves of the Executive in carrying it out.

In the cold war the battle for the allegiance of the uncommitted nations of the world, particularly in Asia and Africa, is critical. The Soviet Union and Red China have demonstrated that underdeveloped lands can make great material advances by following the path of communism. If free Asia and free Africa are to remain outside the Iron Curtain, their peoples must be convinced through experience that comparable progress can be attained in freedom.

So far, these struggling countries have not achieved that rate of progress. It has been estimated that in the last 7 years India's industrial output has increased by 33 percent, compared to an increase in Communist China of 144 percent. The increase in China's grain production has been even more spectacular, and Peiping is now exporting grain to other Asian countries.

The challenge to American policy is today of a magnitude comparable to that presented by the threatened collapse of Europe in 1947. The underdeveloped nations will not attain economic growth in freedom without the intelligent help of the wealthier nations of the free world. We must help them as we helped Europe.

We need not do it alone. Other States in the Western World have well-established and sizable foreign aid programs. We should pursue with vigor the suggestion made by the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] and others to combine our efforts, experience and resources with the British, French, West Germans, Japanese, and others.

Meanwhile, we must press forward with our own mutual security and economic assistance programs.

It may well be that the sums recommended by the President to increase the capitalization of the World Bank and its subsidiaries, to create a bank for Latin American investment, and to increase the capital structure of the Development Loan Fund are inadequate. In the case of the Fund, it is hard to believe that the request for $700 million for fiscal 1960 is sufficient, in view of the present rate of applications and the recommendations by Under Secretary of State Dillon and others made before the folklore of budget balancing became paramount over even programs bearing upon national survival. I suggest that the minimum rate of appropriation should be at least $1 billion per year and therefore support the proposal made by the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] and the senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] to increase the Development Loan Fund appropriation for 1960 by $300 million.

There should be no decrease, in my view, in the sums requested for the Foreign Service, the ICA, the USIA, and the CIA. Indeed, with respect to the first three, it is important that representation allowances should be increased. It is also of the greatest importance that we provide our ambassadors in the more expensive posts with the allowances necessary to permit the appointment of men of moderate means, including Foreign Service career officers.

Finally, we must remember that the success of our foreign relations efforts will hinge on the spirit in which they are carried out. With this, the Congress has much to do. Walter Lippmann recently stated the ideal eloquently:

> The whole operation of foreign aid would wear a different face if it were founded on the principle * * * that we make a contribution because it is the simple duty of the rich to help the poor. It would be a noble act, which would pay big dividends in self-respect at home and good will abroad, if the Government would declare the principle that to fight against poverty is a duty, not an instrument of our military strategy.

THIRD: DOMESTIC PROGRAMS

Let us look at those critical domestic programs which require appropriations and loan authorizations higher than those recommended by the President.

EDUCATION

Hearings before committees of both Houses held over a period of years have documented the clear need for more than doubling our national expenditure for education—roughly from $20 to $40 billion over the next few years. The best use that can be made of the increased expenditures is to increase salaries across the board.

Our teaching profession is in drastic need of rehabilitation, and even the administration admits the existence of a serious shortage of classrooms. Too large a percentage of bright young people are not going to college because of financial stringency. The aid given in that connection under the National Education Act of last year is pitifully small, that our local school districts and States, hard pressed as they are to balance their budgets and forced to rely in the main on property and sales taxes, are in no position to provide all of the needed $20 billion is clear to all who have seriously studied the problem.

The time for Federal action is now. We should have acted years ago.

If our object is, as it should be, to provide substantial aid without Federal control, then we should enact a measure along the lines of the Murray-Metcalf bill presently under consideration in the Labor and Public Welfare Committee of the Senate. This bill would make grants to the States without Federal control, beginning at about $1.1 billion in the first year, for the purpose of increasing teachers' salaries and constructing schools. Surely, the expenditure of $25 per pupil for these purposes, as provided in the bill, is a modest beginning to a program that should continue and be accelerated over the next several years.

In addition, the National Defense Education Act should be amended to supply a limited number of scholarships as well as loans.

HOUSING AND URBAN RENEWAL

The housing bill already passed by the Senate will enable the Nation to move forward in an area vital to economic growth. Its provisions for further FHA guarantees, veterans' loans, college housing, urban renewal, and public housing are modest enough when we consider the clearly demonstrated national need to raise home building from last year's level of 1,200,000 units to 2 million units a year.

There can be no turning back in meeting the objectives of the Housing Act of 1949—a decent home for every American family. Nor is there need to turn back. The budgetary implications of this legislation for the immediate future are minimal. The cost of the program for fiscal 1960 in excess of the recommendations of the President is estimated at $135 million. The cost in 1961 is hardly more.

AIRPORTS

Similarly, it would be both economic folly and bad business judgment to permit our airports and airlanes to become obsolete at the very beginning of the jet age. It is abundantly clear that neither the States nor the localities nor the commercial airlines can afford the cost of proper airport development; and the country just cannot afford to get along without such development. Indeed, the provisions of the Senate bill are, in all likelihood, too modest. Again, the excess over the President's budget is slight in amount, totaling $35 million for 1960.

WATER RESOURCES

Again we are told, this year, that the country cannot afford to begin any new projects to develop and conserve our water resources and bring disastrous floods under control, and that we must stretch out existing projects. The false economy of this course is shown again and again, year after year. Only a few weeks ago, damage of over $75 million occurred in my State alone as the result of preventable floods.

This is no time to retrench. With technological unemployment increasing daily as automation progresses, this is the time to take up the slack in employment by the construction of wealth-producing or wealth-conserving capital projects. Since most water resource projects would be some months in getting under way, the effect on next year's budget would not be great. Perhaps $100 million would suffice.

ATOMIC ENERGY

In the development of atomic energy for peaceful purposes, Government activity should be stepped up to the level necessary to insure that this country does not fall behind its competitors in both the Communist and free worlds. It is futile to expect the leaders of industry to invest vast sums of their stockholders' money in atomic development projects which hold no early prospect of profit. Nor can we, on the other hand, afford to drift until we awake one day to find that we have been left behind in the development of this amazing new asset to civilization. I am much impressed with the proposals made recently by the able and farsighted chairman of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, Mr. ANDERSON. It is my understanding that, if adopted, they would have no appreciable effect on expenditures in the fiscal year 1960.

AREA REDEVELOPMENT

A meaningful area redevelopment bill should be promptly passed, providing for a program of loans to new industries which create employment in depressed rural and industrial areas, together with loans and grants to local communities to enable them to provide the necessary public facilities. The sum proposed in the Douglas-Cooper-Clark-Beall bill is $389 million, but only $100 million of this, at the outside, would be spent in fiscal 1960. These expenditures will pay for themselves by utilizing resources of wasted manpower—which now represent a drain on the economy—to expand the economy instead.

HEALTH AND WELFARE

Unless the economy snaps out of the recession faster than it is now doing, there will be almost as much need for temporary unemployment compensation benefits this year as last. There were still 4.7 million unemployed at the last count—only 700,000 less than at the unemployment peak last June. By the end of the month, the temporary benefits will have cost $412 million, according to the budget estimate. We should allow perhaps half that much for extension of this program into next year.

Reductions proposed in aid to hospitals under the Hill-Burton Act and for stream pollution control should not be accepted. Here again, the need has not declined; I am sure that in every other State, as in mine, there are large backlogs of projects that should be undertaken. Altogether, for these programs and for expansion of research and teaching, another $100 million would appear to be amply justified in terms of the Nation's needs to improve our standards of health and control diseases.

Finally, there is every reason to extend the GI bill of rights to post-Korean veterans, as to veterans of earlier periods. Estimated cost is about $100 million for 1960.

ECONOMIES

I have no doubt that the Congress will be able to find some economies in the budget. Again, I do not want to prejudge where savings might be found, because the members of the Appropriations Committee are far more experienced and skilled than I in ferreting out waste in the budget. I am inclined to believe, however, that some of the bills proposed for agriculture by Democratic Senators from farm States, whose devotion to the welfare of the family farmer is thoroughly tested and proven, would result in considerable economies below the more than $3 billion in this year's price support operations. I am also sure that through further unification of the armed services, better management of procurement and other means, the Defense Department could save considerable sums.

However, I want to be conservative in this presentation and I therefore will not attempt to place any dollar figure on these economies to offset them against the additional expenditures I have outlined. As they develop during the session, we can take account of them, but there are undoubtedly further expenditure needs also, beyond those I have mentioned earlier. So let us regard these potential economies instead as providing us with a reserve for contingencies over and beyond the $100 million set out as a reserve in the President's budget.

If we were fortunate enough to end the fiscal year 1960 with a substantial surplus—and I, for one, would be prepared to take the action necessary to achieve that result—what better use could we put the surplus to than to reduce the national debt, and thus strike another blow in support of the soundness of the dollar?

RECAPITULATION

What I have tried to suggest is not a series of specific expenditure figures but an approach. The specific figures will depend upon the work of the committees of this and the other body. But it may be useful to add the estimates made earlier as to the increases in the President's budget that a budget related to national needs would require. The total comes to a little over $4 billion in the fiscal year 1960, as follows:

	Billion
National security (using the smallest of the estimates discussed earlier)	$2.0
Development Loan Fund	.3
Education	1.1
Housing and urban renewal	.135
Airports	.035
Water resources	.1
Atomic energy	-----
Area redevelopment	.1
Public health and welfare	.4
Total	4.170

While this would increase Federal expenditures from $77 billion to $81.17 billion in fiscal 1960, suggestions for increasing revenue which I will make shortly would more than cover the increases and permit the budget to be balanced at slightly more than $81 billion.

Mr. President, this would be a realistic budget. It would be a budget geared to our national requirements in our struggle of survival with the Communist world. It would be a budget for national growth and progress. It would be a budget that would lead to higher revenues in the years immediately ahead. It would be a budget for a higher level of domestic economic well-being.

ECONOMIC WELL-BEING

Not long ago, the learned senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] reminded us of the three economic goals we seek to attain: substantially full employment, an adequate rate of economic growth, and a stable price level. Not all of us are against inflation. But the hue and cry on this subject has been so deafening that we have lost sight of the other two economic goals. Achieving stable prices is not enough in itself. We must have maximum employment and steady economic growth, too.

1. SUBSTANTIALLY FULL EMPLOYMENT

The President says in his budget message:

We are now entering a period of national prosperity and high employment.

What are the facts? Unemployment is close to its highest point since the great depression, with 4,700,000 men and women seeking work, and perhaps another 2 million on part-time employment at wages inadequate to maintain decent standards of living. Seven million American families are existing on incomes of $2,000 a year or less. In my own State of Pennsylvania, 11 percent of the labor force is without work, and in one county, Fayette, the figure is 23 percent. Five hundred and eight thousand Pennsylvanians are walking the streets right now seeking employment which they cannot find; 926,800 Pennsylvanians are receiving surplus food. It may look like high employment from the first tee of the Augusta National Golf Club, but the cupboard is bare in Detroit and Wilkes-Barre and Lawrence, Mass.

The Employment Act of 1946 states that maximum employment and maximum production shall be objectives of national policy. Yet one can search the program of the President in vain for any serious discussion of ways and means of attaining these ends.

2. ECONOMIC GROWTH

Let us look next at economic growth.

For the first half of the 20th century, our gross national product per capita in terms of constant dollars increased at the rate of about 3 percent a year. In the same terms, from 1953 through 1958, during the first 6 years of the Eisenhower administration, the rate of real economic growth was about one-fortieth of 1 percent a year. Our economy under this administration is growing about as fast as a glacier moves or a snail walks.

I recently asked the staff of the Federal Reserve Board to compute for me the gross national product per capita, in constant dollars, for the years 1946 through 1958. I ask unanimous consent that a table containing the information furnished me be included in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Gross national product per capita, in 1958 dollars, 1946 through 1958

1946	$2,208
1947	2,163
1948	2,208
1949	2,172
1950	2,318
1951	2,459
1952	2,505
1953	2,575
1954	2,482
1955	2,634
1956	2,653
1957	2,635
1958	2,509

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Alaska.

Mr. GRUENING. Has it occurred to the able Senator from Pennsylvania that in the part of the United States where most of our glaciers are located, which is Alaska, the majority of them are now receding?

Therefore, when the Senator speaks of the slow movement of a glacier, we must bear in mind that in the majority of cases glaciers do not advance, but recede. I believe that is the explanation of what is going on under the present administration in terms of national movement.

Mr. CLARK. The Senator from Alaska has made an excellent point. I accept his amendment with pleasure. I am quite convinced that he is correct, and that it will not be long before the national growth is stopped entirely and a recession begins, unless we change the disastrous policies which the present administration is following.

Mr. GRUENING. That is inevitable, and will be so until we change the policies or change the administration.

Mr. CLARK. I thank my friend for his pertinent comment.

What this table shows, Mr. President, is that from 1952 to 1958, during the Eisenhower years, production per capita rose from $2,505 to $2,509. This is less than $1 a year, or one-fortieth of 1 percent.

There will perhaps be objection that we should not use 1958, a recession year, as a basis for comparison. But even if we use the relative boom year of 1957, the increase is only 5 percent in 5 years—from $2,505 to $2,635—or 1 percent a year.

By comparison, the growth rate on a per capita basis in the 6 years from 1946 through 1952 was $297, or 2.2 percent a year.

There we have the picture: In the first half of this century, 3 percent; in the first 6 postwar years, well over 2 percent; the first 5 Eisenhower years, 1 percent; the first 6 Eisenhower years, nothing at all.

The glacier had stopped moving.

Returning to the aggregate gross national product, in constant dollars but ignoring population growth, we find our growth rate of less than 2 percent compares to a rate in the Soviet Union estimated to be about 3 percent per annum. The growth rate of Communist China is said to be even higher.

The Rockefeller Brothers Fund has suggested that the United States can achieve an average of 5 percent expansion, year after year; the Committee for Economic Development has said 4 percent. Compared to targets like this—which are well within the range of possibility—and in the light of the Communist threat, the record of recent years should really frighten us all.

It is often overlooked—and in this budget it is quite forgotten—that in many respects the private economy of the United States floats upon a substructure of public expenditure. Obviously, without public highways the automobile industry could not have developed; without public airports and airways the aviation industry could not have grown; without public river-development projects, ports would languish and industries which depend upon navigation or cheap hydroelectric power could not have prospered. Our native private economic growth, which had been the most spectacular in the world, has rested on a foundation of public education. Governmental research has contributed immensely and directly to private production—perhaps most notably in the field of agriculture. And public health activities of all kinds have contributed to the productivity of our people.

More recently, the relation of public programs to the expansion of the housing industry and the economic development of our cities and their suburbs has been recognized. In our hearings on urban renewal, for example, it was brought out that each $1 million of Federal investment has made possible $10 million of private investment. Each $10 million added to the gross national product returns about $2 million to the Federal Treasury in taxes. So the Federal expenditures are returned twice over by the private economic expansion which they stimulate. FHA, VA, and FNMA programs have added hundreds of thousands of units each year to the number of homes built, and the profits from the building of these homes have swelled substantially Federal income tax receipts.

Yet, despite the demonstrable relationship between the Federal budget and economic growth, the administration seems this year to have signaled out for repressive action those very areas most directly related to economic expansion.

The President's program is almost wholly negative in its proposals for education, for housing, for urban renewal, for river development, for airports, for hospital construction. In many of these areas, the President proposes a rate of activity less than the current rate—in other words, he calls for cutbacks at a time when we should and could be moving rapidly forward.

In the words of the distinguished Senator from Alaska, the Presiding Officer at this time [Mr. GRUENING], the President is prepared to have the glacier recede through the medium of his 1960 budget.

Are these cutbacks justified by the threat of a runaway inflation, as the President contends? Let us deal briefly with both the shadow and the substance of this controversial subject.

3. A STABLE PRICE LEVEL

A certain segment of public opinion has been convinced by the President and that section of the press which can be best described as the journals of plutocratic opinion that any cash deficit in next year's budget would mean runaway inflation. Personally, I find this somewhat unconvincing. To a large degree, I suspect, the constant talk of inflation is merely an alibi concocted by those who are trying by any means at their disposal to kill off governmental programs.

If deficits inevitably meant inflation, the proof should be confronting us right now. For this year—right now, as we talk here on the floor of the Senate—the Federal Government is running the heaviest cash deficit since World War II—officially estimated at $13 billion this year. Yet, our general price level is stable and has been for almost a year. Indeed, an analysis of the past few years shows that our inflationary periods have

usually been years of budget surplus and our stable periods years of budget deficits. If we were to adopt the fallacious doctrines which the President and his advisers are trying to foist on us, that Federal budgets are the determinants of the price level, then we should logically be seeking a deficit for fiscal 1960 as the means of controlling inflation.

But let us not go that far. Let us simply agree that the doctrine of budgetary causation is not sustained by the evidence and look elsewhere for the causes of inflation.

If we examine the components of the price indexes, as Mr. Gardiner Means has done for us, we find that the inflationary movement for the last decade has been centered in a few concentrated industries where prices are not subject to the normal workings of the law of supply and demand, and that higher prices have been the rule in these industries in good times and in bad, unaffected either by budget surpluses or budget deficits. The way to curb inflation, then, is to take a long, hard look at which prices are going up, and why. And here the President's program is sadly deficient.

Nowhere are concrete measures to curb inflation suggested.

This matter was brought to the floor of the Senate by the distinguished senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], when he pointed out the critical effect which an increase in steel prices would have, and the importance of our applying governmental pressures to prevent additional increases in the price of steel.

It is not enough to be given little lectures on the dangers of inflation, supplemented with admonitions to organize labor to stop trying to improve the lot of the worker and to management to stop looking out for stockholders. Some stronger medicine is obviously required.

In the hope of encouraging some more serious steps than "jawbone control," I have joined with several of my colleagues—and Representative REUSS has introduced a similar bill in the House—in introducing a measure which would first, amend the Employment Act of 1946 to make clear that a stable price level is an objective of the act of equal importance with maximum employment and maximum production; and second, require publicity for price increases in the administered price industries and authorize the Council of Economic Advisors to investigate their causes.

These steps would be a good start. If they do not work, we will have to face up to enacting some form of limited and perhaps indirect controls, while utilizing the antitrust laws more forcefully to break up monopoly.

What, then, should we do about balancing the budget for fiscal 1960?

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK. I am happy to yield to my friend from Wisconsin.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Is it not true that what the study of Gardiner Means showed was that we have a different kind of pressure on prices now—that is, between 1953 and the present time—than we had during the period of the Second World War and afterward?

Mr. CLARK. The Senator is correct. I wish someone would tell that to the Council of Economic Advisers, so that they could tell it to the President.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The point that Gardiner Means makes, as I understand it—and it seems to me that this is the principal point—is that during the earlier period, during the Second World War and afterward, there was a genuine, traditional monetary inflation situation; that is, a shortage of goods and a shortage of labor.

Mr. CLARK. Too much money chasing too few goods, in the words of the cliche.

Mr. PROXMIRE. It seems to me this point should be driven home right here. We have not had that kind of economy. There has been an excess of labor and an excess of plant capacity.

Mr. CLARK. There has been deficient production.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Deficient production and a kind of classic economic situation which should drive prices down. It is perfectly obvious that under these circumstances a relatively modest increase in the deficit or in Government spending would not have any real effect on prices.

Mr. CLARK. I think the Senator from Wisconsin is correct. Nevertheless, for other reasons I think the budget should be balanced.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I think so, too.

Mr. CLARK. I am happy to have the Senator's views on the subject.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I agree 100 percent with the Senator from Pennsylvania. I agree wholeheartedly that the budget should be balanced. But I think it is extremely important that speeches like that of the Senator from Pennsylvania be made in the Senate, because the American people are being told, over and over again, by the strongest voice in American political life, that of the President of the United States, that there is only one cause of inflation: an unbalanced budget.

I think this is most unfortunate. I will not say it is a deception, because I am sure it is not deliberate on the part of the President, but is a most unfortunate understanding. It can have grievous consequences because, as the Senator from Pennsylvania is pointing out so well, it means that Congress is likely to have great pressure placed on it, pressure which will attempt to persuade Senators and Representatives not to do the job which they should do to promote the kind of economic growth which is essential if this Nation is to survive.

Mr. CLARK. I thank the Senator from Wisconsin for his pertinent comments. I find myself in complete agreement with him. I have stated earlier in my remarks that I think we have become the victims of economic folklore, of the obsolete economics of a day which has gone.

There is always a certain amount of lag between what politicians are prepared to do and what the brains of the country know ought to be done. I think it is the function of the Executive to minimize that lag. When he does not do it, Congress ought to move in and do it for him.

I think the Senator from Wisconsin has made as great a contribution to this subject as any other Member of this body. I thank him for his comments.

WE SHOULD BALANCE THE BUDGET AT AROUND $81 BILLION

Mr. President, I say we should balance the budget for 1960 at around $81 billion.

Even if it were agreed that the measures just discussed are the essential means of controlling inflation, and a balanced budget is not a necessary consideration at this time, there are other strong reasons that lead me to conclude that the budget should be balanced in fiscal 1960, although at a higher level than that recommended by the President.

The ill-advised and repeated public statements of the President that failure to balance the 1960 budget will result in runaway inflation, economic disaster, and national catastrophe have themselves had their insidious and unfortunate effect not only at home but abroad. If the cost of living, due to other factors, were by mere coincidence to begin to rise again, many well-meaning but ill-informed people might conclude that the Congress was fiscally irresponsible and that the soundness of the dollar was imperiled because the elected representatives of the American people did not have the political guts to balance the budget at a time of relative prosperity for most people.

I think the senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. MCNAMARA], whom I see sitting in the Chamber, and I, from Pennsylvania, know full well that that prosperity seems to have managed to skip most of our respective States, except certain areas near Grosse Pointe, in his State, and out in the general vicinity of Sewickley, near Pittsburgh, in mine.

The psychological effect of such a widespread feeling would be, in itself, an evil we should strive to prevent.

Moreover, there is no real need for continuous deficit financing. All that is needed is the political guts required to get rid of the inequities which constitute a concealed raid on the U.S. Treasury by certain favored taxpayers who have contrived tax loopholes by which they benefit.

LET'S CLOSE THE TAX LOOPHOLES

An objective analysis of these loopholes produces convincing evidence that the more than $4 billion referred to earlier can be found without the imposition of new taxes or any general increases in rates.

Leadership in identifying and closing these loopholes is what we need from the other end of Pennsylvania Avenue, instead of a passive acquiescence in the present inequitable distribution of the tax burden, instead of the demagogic suggestion that a tax cut may be in prospect for the presidential election year of 1960.

I suggest a program for raising the additional revenue needed to balance the budget at around $81 billion:

First. Increase the staff of the Internal Revenue Service charged with enforcing

tax laws and direct them to concentrate on the larger returns.

In its early years, the Eisenhower administration reduced the personnel of the enforcement section of the Internal Revenue Service by 3,000 employees and the results have been costly to the Treasury. During the first six years of this administration, an average of 25 million more income tax returns were filed annually than during the last six years of the Truman administration. This larger number of returns averaged $27 billion more per year than in the previous period. Nevertheless, the average annual amount of tax deficiencies assessed has been $320 million less during the 6 Eisenhower years than during the 6 Truman years.

Better administration alone might well raise more money than closing any single loophole. In fact, a special audit of 36,000 representative business and professional returns, recently published by the Internal Revenue Service, indicates that if auditing could have been extended to 6,700,000 such returns for the same year, the taxable income of the taxpayers involved would have been increased by 20 percent and yielded $2.7 billion additional public revenue. This is a matter which might well be investigated by the Senate Finance Committee. If even half this amount could be obtained, the increased revenues would be $1.3 billion.

Second. Require withholding and reporting of income taxes on dividend and interest payments at source, as in the case of wage payments—$600 to $800 million.

Third. Tighten the rules regarding deduction of business expenses. Expenditures by businessmen for which they receive a large element of personal return should not be recognized as deductions from taxable income. Such abuses appear to be prevalent in claimed deductions for expenses of wives on so-called business trips, transportation to conventions held abroad, company cars, yachts, airplanes, lodges, lavish entertainment at night clubs and theaters, and many related items. The cost of gifts exchanged between businessmen should not be deductible. Consideration should be given to limiting deductions for advertising expenses not related to the sale of products—$1 billion.

Fourth. Limit the transferability of operating loss carryovers in purchases of corporations with heavy losses. Tax windfalls should not be given to those persons who make a profession out of "milking" losing businesses—$100 million.

Fifth. Limit the amount and type of foreign tax credits permitted. At present, many large domestic corporations with sizable income from foreign sources escape all or part of U.S. income taxes by this device—$200 million.

Sixth. Repeal the special tax credit and exclusion for dividend income established in the 1954 Tax Code. As a result of this advantage given to unearned income, a wage earner netting $5,000 must pay $60 more in taxes than a person living on unearned income of the same amount—$400 million.

Seventh. Reduce the depletion allowance on oil and gas income from 27½ to 15 percent and limit the total of such allowances to the adjusted basis of the property—$400 to $600 million.

Eighth. Revise the rules regarding gains and losses to eliminate capital gains treatment of net gains from sale or exchange of depreciable property used in trade or in business and peripheral items—$800 million.

Ninth. Treat the termination of an interest in a life estate as a taxable transfer—$500 million.

Tenth. Combine estate and gift taxes in an integrated transfer tax structure—$500 million.

Eleventh. Reduce the tax advantage given to upper-income married couples and heads of households by the income-splitting provisions of the Internal Revenue Code—$1,000 million.

The suggested changes in the tax laws and in their administration would increase the public revenues by an estimated $7 billion per year, or almost twice the amount necessary to cover the increased expenditures suggested earlier. They would impose no unfair burdens; on the contrary, they would equalize tax burdens which are now inequitably distributed. While mildly progressive, rather than regressive in nature, they would not deter initiative which would otherwise be devoted to expanding the economy. In a word, they would redress injustices while at the same time yielding needed Federal revenue.

A LESSON FROM THE FALL OF ATHENS

I claim to have no final answers to the critical problems which confront us in the 86th Congress. I can only say that the foregoing proposals are the earnest effort of one Senator to come to grips with the central issue which confronts all of us under the dome of the Capitol this year.

In the end we will resolve that issue on the basis of the spirit in which we approach it.

Some years ago, a great American, indeed, George Catlett Marshall, said that it was difficult to understand the stresses and strains of the present unless one had read the history of the Peloponnesian wars. Surely the analogy is too pertinent for comfort. America is Athens, and Russia, Sparta. Across the water to our west lies China, the Persia of today, preparing to move in for the kill. Despite Pericles, Sparta finally triumphed, and freedom died in ancient Greece. Let us not make the mistake of underestimating our danger as the Athenians did after Pericles died. Surely, Carl Sandburg was right when he told us on Lincoln's birthday, less than a month ago:

> Whenever there is freedom there have been those who have fought, toiled, and sacrificed for it.

Mr. President, there are few, if any, Members of this body who would quarrel with these words of our great American poet.

The present question which confronts us is: Who shall make the financial sacrifices necessary to defend freedom?

I am against having further sacrifices made by the unemployed, the ill-housed, the ill fed, the elderly, and the infirm.

I am against having further sacrifices made by American boys and girls who receive an inadequate education.

I am against placing the safety of the whole body of Americans in jeopardy through failures to spend enough money on national security.

It may well be that in the end the sacrifices for freedom will have to be made by each and every one of us alike.

These are perilous and dangerous times, and I know there is no sacrifice the American people would not make to preserve themselves in freedom.

But for the immediate future I suggest that the sacrifices should be made by those—individuals, and corporations alike—who, far from making sacrifices, are unjustly avoiding payment of their fair share of that national tax burden which may well be in the immediate future the price of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

Let us approach the task of meeting our national needs with the knowledge that there is no easy way out; that we cannot retreat, like the lotus-eaters, into a never-never land; that we cannot put our heads into the sand and hope the dangers will go away. No; we must toil and sacrifice. In that way we can be worthy of the great American tradition which we have inherited and which we must hand over, unblemished, to the generations who will follow us.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. McNAMARA. I wish to compliment the Senator from Pennsylvania upon the excellent speech he has made in the Senate today. The presentation which has been made by the Senator from Pennsylvania, including the many citations he has made as to the immediate and pressing needs of the country, and his spelling out of the programs which particularly need attention in these trying times, is one with which I heartily agree.

Let me ask him whether he mentioned, in the earlier part of his remarks—I regret that I did not hear all of them—the programs enacted by the 85th Congress which already are proving helpful, insofar as our economy is concerned, in these trying times. I have in mind programs such as the one for stepped-up highway construction, which today is providing increased employment, and this year will provide employment to approximately 700,000 persons. That is something the Congress had to do. But in that connection, Congress had to fight the administration to some degree.

Mr. CLARK. The Senator from Michigan is correct.

The emergency housing bill is another example. It put $1 billion into the economy, and put people back to work, and resulted in the construction of tens of thousands of houses which otherwise would not have been built.

Mr. McNAMARA. That is correct. And the 85th Congress also, in passing the educational bill for national defense,

likewise made a great contribution in this area.

Mr. CLARK. That is correct. My colleague and I will agree that the Congress would have done better if it had adopted the Senator's amendment which dealt with school construction.

Mr. McNAMARA. We certainly do agree as to that, and we certainly hope the 86th Congress will see the light and will go along with us on that amendment.

Mr. CLARK. Yes; I share the hope for a broad education bill this year.

Mr. McNAMARA. Let me also refer to the payments under the social security system, which are very much needed because of the increase in prices and the increase in the cost of living. Certainly that legislation should not be overlooked.

Mr. CLARK. Certainly it should not be.

Mr. McNAMARA. And also the unemployment insurance which has kept so many persons off the welfare rolls—a subject with which all of us are very much concerned.

Mr. CLARK. Yes; even though that extension was made on an inequitable basis, as the Senator from Michigan well knows. Let us hope we can do better in the near future. In that connection, let me point out that the Senator from Michigan has done me the honor of inviting me to join him in sponsoring a bill which will do just that.

Mr. McNAMARA. These are things which I believe should be mentioned in connection with the remarks of the Senator from Pennsylvania in regard to the Employment Act of 1946, in order to show that the Congress has not been entirely derelict in the performance of its duty, but has met opposition from many quarters on this program which is so necessary in these days which are so difficult both at home and in the rest of the world.

Mr. CLARK. I thank my friend for his addition to my speech. I believe what he has said makes an important contribution to the debate on this matter.

Mr. McNAMARA. The Senator from Pennsylvania is very kind.

He referred to citizens of Grosse Pointe, Sewickley, and similar areas.

Mr. CLARK. In self-defense, I should have added "the Main Line of Philadelphia."

Mr. McNAMARA. But even those citizens are more and more recognizing the fact that they cannot be prosperous if the rest of the country is not also prosperous. Gone are the days when, under our economy, one section of our society could prosper at the expense of the rest of our society. I think those who live in the areas to which the Senator from Pennsylvania has referred are apparently waking up to the realization that they cannot long prosper if hardship and want exist in the other areas of our economy. As our economy goes, so goes all of our economy, not just parts of it; and I believe that these people now are belatedly waking up to realize that fact.

Mr. CLARK. I think the Senator from Michigan is correct.

I think I should say with respect to my constituents, and perhaps also with respect to his, that certainly they, too, are good Americans; and if these additional tax burdens are imposed on them—as the Senator from Michigan and I think should be done—they will meet those burdens in good spirit, as good Americans, and all of us will proceed together along a road which will lead to a better and more prosperous America for all our people.

Mr. McNAMARA. Again, I wish to congratulate the Senator from Pennsylvania on the fine presentation he has made; and I desire to assure him that in his attempts to implement the things he has stated here, I shall be glad to be his partner.

Mr. CLARK. I thank the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Pennsylvania yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GRUENING in the chair). Does the Senator from Pennsylvania yield to the Senator from Wisconsin?

Mr. CLARK. I yield.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I, too, wish to compliment the Senator from Pennsylvania on the excellent, eloquent, and extremely necessary speech he has made. I believe that it is about time that a Democratic Senator rose on the floor and offered an alternative to the Eisenhower budget. The fact is, I believe, that the President and the Republican Party are scoring some points. I do not think it is enough for Democrats to condemn the budget, without offering an alternative; I do not think it is completely responsible to condemn, without offering an alternative.

So I believe it is a great thing that the Senator from Pennsylvania has had the courage and the sense of responsibility to offer an alternative.

For example, when we attempt to defend the housing bill, which now is under fire, but when we make no reference to the source of the funds which will be required to pay for it—although the people are conscious of the desirability of having a balanced budget, as both the Senator from Pennsylvania and I agree we should have—I believe we are put in a position which is weakened and a position which should not be weakened as it has been.

I should like to add these additional words: I was very happy to have a chance to examine the provisions proposed by the Senator from Pennsylvania for raising additional tax revenues. I have worked on this matter; and I believe that the proposals of the Senator from Pennsylvania are sound and, as a matter of fact, are conservative. He says his proposals would raise an additional $7 billion of tax revenue.

I notice that the very first proposal he makes is to have more careful and thorough and comprehensive auditing of income-tax returns.

Mr. CLARK. This matter was called to my attention by the distinguished junior Senator from Wisconsin himself, who offered it on the floor a few days ago.

That was the first time I had heard of it.

I think the Senator from Wisconsin is correct—namely, that the estimate is conservative. I have tried to make the estimates conservative throughout. I believe we should do so, because undoubtedly there will be those who will say that our figures are those of wild-eyed spenders. Therefore, we should be sure we know what we are talking about when we say that certain amounts of additional revenue can be raised by these means.

However, I believe I am substantially conservative when I state that approximately $1 billion of additional tax revenue can be raised by this means.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Of course, the Government has to pay the salaries and expenses of those it employs to do tax auditing. But let me point out that on the basis of the experience we have had in Wisconsin, for every dollar that is paid to those who do such tax auditing, $20 is returned to the Government, by way of the collection of additional income taxes. In the case of the Federal Government, I believe the proportion would be much greater; I believe that in the case of the Federal Government the actual additional revenue collected would be nearer $50, and perhaps a great deal more, for every dollar spent for such auditing.

Mr. CLARK. I believe the Senator from Wisconsin is correct—namely, that if the tax officials do what they should—in other words, see how much additional revenue they can obtain by means of such auditing, rather than attempt to make a record in regard to the number of returns they audit, without regard to the amount of additional tax revenue they obtain, which I understand is the policy the tax officials have been following——

Mr. PROXMIRE. Of course, it is never popular to provide for increased taxes.

Mr. CLARK. Perhaps it is fortunate that the Senator from Wisconsin has 6 years before he must again present himself before the electorate. In my case, I have 3½ years.

Mr. PROXMIRE. However, as I look over the proposals which the Senator from Pennsylvania has made, I observe that they would not increase the tax rates.

Mr. CLARK. That is correct.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Generally speaking, they would not increase the burdens on conscientious taxpayers who now pay their taxes in full, and who are on a salaried basis.

Mr. CLARK. That is correct, although my proposal to do away with the dividend credit would raise the taxes on those who obtain a major part of their income from dividends.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Yes. But my point is that people who earn their living from salaries and wages would not have their taxes increased by these proposals of the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Pennsylvania for his contribution.

Mr. CLARK. I thank the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. President, I have here a note which indicates that in the case of the cost of obtaining the Federal government's tax revenues, for every 32 cents of additional expenditure, $100 of additional revenue will be raised. These are quite striking figures.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Pennsylvania yield to me?

Mr. CLARK. I am very happy to yield to the Senator from Oregon, whose most courageous speech on this subject, earlier today, I had occasion to comment on before he returned to the Chamber.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I do not like to engage in a trading of compliments on the Senate floor, but inasmuch as the speech of the able Senator from Pennsylvania was available to my office late yesterday afternoon, I took it home with me and read it through in full last evening.

Mr. CLARK. That is the greatest compliment one Senator can pay to another, and may I say it is a very unusual one, and I am most grateful to the distinguished Senator.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I have heard it said that the only greater tribute one Senator can pay to another than to listen to a Senator's speech is to read it.

Mr. CLARK. The Senator is correct.

Mr. NEUBERGER. So I wished to give the ultimate accolade to the Senator from Pennsylvania, whom I admire very much.

The senior Senator from Pennsylvania has just delivered this outstanding address on the floor of the Senate, and I should like to ask him several questions.

Is it not a fact that even the very shaky budget presented by the administration—the $77 billion budget—is not a balanced budget unless the Congress adopts higher postage rates and increases taxes on motor fuels?

Mr. CLARK. The Senator is correct. In addition to which I suspect the estimated revenue is at least $1 billion too high. Of course, we shall not know until later, but certainly it is a rosy estimate of the revenues to be received. The Senator from Oregon is quite correct with respect to his statement about special taxes.

Mr. NEUBERGER. The administration is making an issue of a balanced budget. As the Senator from Wisconsin stated earlier, it is a pretty good issue. It has widespread appeal in the country. There is genuine validity to it. However, very few of the American people realize that it is not now a balanced budget unless very extensive and comprehensive tax increases are voted by this Congress.

Mr. CLARK. The Senator is entirely right.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Unless I am mistaken, Congress will have to enact legislation which will increase the motor-fuel tax by about $724 million a year, and will have to increase postage rates by about $350 million.

Mr. CLARK. In other words, about an additional billion dollars.

Mr. NEUBERGER. That is correct. So I think it is well that this point be emphasized on the Senate floor by the able Senator from Pennsylvania and myself, so that the news can perhaps get out to the country that the present balanced budget is only mythically or hypothetically balanced.

Mr. CLARK. The Senator is correct.

Mr. NEUBERGER. And that unless the Congress accepts the recommendations of the President on motor fuels, an issue before the roads and highways subcommittee, which is so ably headed by the senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. MCNAMARA], and unless Congress enacts higher postage rates, which are before the Senate Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, where the Senator from Pennsylvania and I serve, we have no balanced budget at all today. I think its is very important to stress this point, so that the people will recognize that we are talking about a budget which is balanced as of now only in legend and in theory, and not in fact.

Mr. CLARK. The Senator is correct.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I do think it is an occasion of much value to the country when a Senator makes a speech such as the Senator from Pennsylvania is making, for one cardinal reason: I doubt if any nation such as ours can face a colossus such as the Soviet Union unless our people are willing to make sacrifices. The Russian people are disciplined. The Russian people are led by tough-minded men who do not have to respond to public opinion. Russia has no real elections. The Russian people have enormous natural resources. They have a great deal of dedication to their country. They have a great deal of patriotism. Unless we are willing to sacrifice, I think that perhaps the gloomy prophecy contained at the end of the address by the Senator from Pennsylvania could unfortunately prove to be true. I doubt if at any period in American history our Nation has risen to great heights, unless the people have been willing to make sacrifices.

Mr. CLARK. The Senator had occasion to refer to the words of Winston Churchill in Great Britain's dark days at the beginning of World War II, when Churchill stated he had nothing to offer except blood, sweat, toil and tears. I have a strong feeling it is that kind of talk that should be coming from the President at this time, instead of what we hear coming out of the press conference, that everything is well and will come out all right.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I agree. The place this warning must originate, if all the people are to heed it, is the White House, because only the President has the ears of all the people. It was President Woodrow Wilson, I believe, who said that the Presidency is preeminently a position of moral leadership. In a crisis such as we face today, this moral leadership must come from the President of the United States.

In fairness to the President, I want to say he has laid down a challenge to the Congress, because he has asked Congress to raise motor-fuel taxes and to raise postage rates. There are other proposals, such as the closing of tax loopholes, which the Senator from Pennsylvania has enumerated. I offered several other suggestions, including reduction of oil and gas percentage depletion allowances, which was also mentioned in the Senator's address, and restoration of the excess profit taxes on armaments and weapons production, which I think is long overdue.

Mr. CLARK. I think the Senator has rendered a service to the country in making this proposal. We could well look back to the tax structure as it existed before the 1954 tax reduction. If it was found we needed more revenues, they might be obtained in that manner, and the loopholes could be closed. I do not think that we shall need to do it, but if we needed them, we ought to tax to get those revenues.

Mr. NEUBERGER. That is correct. When we think of the fact that the armed services have asked for $10 to $20 billion more than is contained in the President's budget, we face a frightening prospect. I wonder if the size of the defense budget was a political or military decision. Suppose the military services are right and we need an additional $10 billion to $20 billion, and we do not have it, and the Berlin crisis, which we were warned about by the senior Senator from New York, should—God forbid—boil over into world war III.

Mr. CLARK. I think the Senator is quite correct in that statement. I think we can have the normal discounting of military requests that they always need more money. The Senator and I know, having been in the military forces, that the military is bound to exaggerate its needs. But I cannot believe they have exaggerated to the tune of $20 billion in any one year, particularly in view of the Gaither and Rockefeller reports.

Mr. NEUBERGER. If our Joint Chiefs of Staff are right about these additional sums being needed, and they are not included in the budget, that could have grave consequences for the United States and the future of the free world. Is that not right?

Mr. CLARK. The Senator is correct. The only reason why I indicate a somewhat pessimistic tone is that when $1 is authorized for the military, we do not receive the benefit of it for 1, 2, or 3 years. For example, Congress cannot appropriate money now to take care of the Berlin crisis in the immediate future.

Mr. NEUBERGER. It takes years to tool up military equipment and weapons in the military field.

I want to conclude by saying it seems to me the leaders of this Nation have to face up to the issue. When I say leaders, I do not mean only in the Senate, but throughout the country. As a member of the Public Works Committee, I have been disturbed by the fact that 29 Governors have petitioned Congress not to increase the motor-fuel taxes. The Governor of my own State is on the list, even though he is a Republican and our President is a Republican. The President favors the increase. Yet these Governors are telling us, by all means, to keep the interstate highway program on schedule. They are telling us not to let the program go by the boards. Yet they want the Federal Government to pay 90 percent of the program and put up 90

percent of the funds and not increase the motor-fuel taxes. How is the Federal Government going to pay out that money? Are we going to do it with wampum? Are we going to do it with beads? Are we going to set up printing presses in the basement of the Senate Office Building? Where do they expect us to get the funds in order to construct these vast four-lane highways on schedule and at the same time not increase the motor-fuels tax?

Mr. CLARK. I am in general accord with my good friend, the Senator from Oregon. I thought the tax bills which the Senator from Oregon introduced today demonstrated a great deal of political courage.

I can understand why the Governors do not want a Federal gasoline tax superimposed over the State gasoline taxes, which the States in turn are going to have to increase in order to take care of the State highway needs. It occurs to me that possibly one way out of the dilemma would be to have a Federal excise tax.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. NEUBERGER. If the Senator from Pennsylvania will permit, I will ask the distinguished Senator from Michigan if there is not, at the present time, a Federal excise tax on the automobiles which are manufactured in his State?

Mr. McNAMARA. There is a Federal excise tax, but unfortunately the funds collected do not go into the roadbuilding program and do not go toward helping the program.

Mr. NEUBERGER. The taxes are paid into the general fund?

Mr. McNAMARA. The taxes are paid into the general fund. There is a great deal of confusion on this item, because some 50 percent of the revenues from the excise taxes on the trucks, trailers, and buses go into the highway fund. However, this is a very small part of the excise taxes paid by the motor industry. It is only a very small part of the total which goes into the highway fund. This is what is generaly misunderstood.

Senators have been talking about the proposed increase of 1½ cents in the Federal gasoline and fuels tax. We have held preliminary hearings in the Subcommittee on Public Roads of the Committee on Public Works. I find that not only are the Governors opposed to the increase in the tax, but there is an indication that the majority of the members of the Subcommittee on Public Roads are opposed to the increase, also. It seems to me we have little chance, because of the opposition of some 32 Governors, to increase the tax.

The Governors say that the proposed increase in the tax on fuels should be an item for consideration at the State level rather than for further preemption by the Federal Government since this is almost the last item left to the States on which to levy taxes in order to raise the State share of the road program. The State share of the cost of the program is not 10 percent over all, for in general on the secondary roads and the so-called ABC roads the State share of the cost is 50 percent. There is a tremendous problem for the States in this regard. We are going to hear more and more about this problem.

It seems to me we are going to have a very hard time in getting approval of the 1½-cent-a-gallon increase in the tax. I think we have to start looking around for other programs, such as those the Senator from Pennsylvania has suggested, in order to get the job done. It seems to me, judging from the preliminary inquiries which we have made, that there is very little chance of getting approval of an increase of 1½ cents in the tax.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I will say to the able Senator from Michigan, who has given us a very careful analysis of the problem, that I sympathize with the Governors in their desire to have the gasoline tax left under the jurisdiction of the States. But so long as those same Governors say that the Federal Government should pay for 90 percent of the most expensive part of the road program in those States I think they are on the shakiest of ground.

Mr. McNAMARA. In fairness to the Governors, it should be said that we said we would pay the 90 percent from the Federal Government's funds. We were not particularly requested by the States to do that. However, we recognized the problems of the States in regard to the road building, and we came to the conclusion that we would never get the program accomplished unless the Federal Government collected the revenue, which was largely on a "pay as you go" basis.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Have the States not asked us to keep the program on schedule?

Mr. McNAMARA. The States have asked us to keep the program on schedule. The asking to keep the program on schedule is a realistic approach, because when we undertook the program in 1956 we indicated what the schedule would be. The States are asking us to live up to our commitment, which is a very normal request.

Some of the States have had to borrow money at very high interest rates to meet the State share of the program. It is on this basis that the States are asking us to keep the program on schedule.

There is a further concern regarding the saving of lives, which has already been demonstrated to be true, by the interstate highway program. This is the basis for the request. I think the request to keep the program on schedule is a reasonable and logical one.

Mr. NEUBERGER. That is definitely true, but at the same time the States cannot deny us the source from which to put up 90 percent of this vast sum of money.

Mr. McNAMARA. The Senator is correct. The States have not said that there are not other ways to raise the money. I think if we asked the Governors about that, they would have 32 different plans for raising the money.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I want to tell the Senator from Michigan why I am opposed to expand the road building program from the general tax revenues of the United States. I think that would be too much of a bonanza for the big truckers who operate on these highways. If we paid for the program from the general income taxes and used the general revenues to expand the highway program, it would mean that the big truckers who operate over the roads with these huge behemoths would escape paying their share of the additional cost of the road program. That would be unfair.

I received a table from the Post Office Department during the discussion of the postage rates last year, and the table showed that with regard to the general income taxes a little over 60 percent, if my memory is correct, is paid by families with incomes of $4,000 a year or less.

Mr. CLARK. The figure referred to a net taxable income.

Mr. NEUBERGER. The Senator is correct. Therefore, a large part of the tax money comes from families with comparatively low incomes. I do not want to take tax funds from those families to build these roads, because I think it would be fairer that the funds should be paid by the road users.

To that extent I think the 1½-cent increase on the motor fuels tax is fair to the average motorists, to the truck operators, to the bus operators, and to the general taxpayers. The reason I cite this is I think we in the Congress are going to have to show enough courage to face up to the problem. We are going to have to tax the little fellow for his motor fuel and we are going to have to tax the big fellow who manufactures armaments and weapons and who is having a field day today with regard to profits. I think we will have to do the taxing on an across-the-board basis, through many segments of society, to live up to our responsibility in this world of crisis.

Mr. McNAMARA and Mr. JAVITS addressed the Chair.

Mr. CLARK. I thank my friend from Oregon for his valuable contribution, and I yield now to my friend the distinguished Senator from Michigan.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, the interstate program is largely a pay-as-you-go program and it is largely paid for by the motorists, including the big truckers. There is some justification for putting the general funds of the Treasury into the program, because many people in addition to the users of the highways, whether they use passenger cars or trucks, benefit from the roadbuilding program. To the degree the general public benefits from the program, perhaps we should give consideration to the fact that the general public should make a contribution to the cost.

I do not think we have gone too far in that direction. I do not think we should lose sight of the fact that the big truckers and the drivers of the passenger cars generally will pay, over the life of this program, the total cost of the program.

We are now in a little bit of a financial box, because we have a wide spread—we can call it a recession or call it whatever we want, but there is a nationwide recession which has caused the highway fund to be temporarily short. I am sure

that over the life of the program it will be a self-sustaining fund. I think any money which is taken out of the general funds of the Treasury, in excess of the proportion which the general public should pay for, will ultimately be returned.

I think in fairness to the whole program this statement should be made.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I agree with the Senator from Michigan that the whole public benefits from the road program, but if funds are taken out of the Treasury to reimburse the highway trust fund, exactly the same amount of money must come from somewhere else to supply the Treasury. Additional funds must go to the Treasury to make up that amount. That is obvious and logical.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK. I am happy to yield to my friend, the Senator from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, when I heard what the Senator was speaking about today I came to the Chamber. I hope the lesson which the Senator is teaching will not be lost in all the dust about—and I say this with all due respect—the highway trust fund, which is very important, for the Senator is speaking in terms of a very basic thing. The highway trust fund is not as important as the basic thing to which the Senator is addressing himself. With all due respect, the particular tax loopholes the Senator points out are not as important, either.

My only reason for asking the Senator to yield is to try to emphasize, fundamentally, what the Senator is talking about, which is very serious for our country. Fundamentally the Senator is telling us we are in grave trouble.

Mr. CLARK. The Senator is correct.

Mr. JAVITS. We must do monumental things about it. Men may argue about whether we must have this or that tax, or whether we can raise the money from the big operators, or whether it is wise to do it exclusively in that way, and so forth. But certainly one should not lose sight of what may become a partisan discussion, regardless of party, between Members on different sides of the economic fence. The basic fact is that we are in grave trouble, and we shall not be able to get out of the trouble unless we are willing to pay the bill. The bill is big, and it will last for a long time.

Mr. CLARK. The Senator is correct.

Mr. JAVITS. I like the Senator's analogy with respect to Athens and Sparta. This question has been worrying me very deeply. More and more we see indications of the seriousness of the situation. Even those who might be irritated by whatever tax program we might develop, must realize that the choice is a very grim one, and that the choice may be between slavery or extinction, and the kind of society which we know and which we love so much.

Individual Senators are not subject to as much pressure, in political terms, as Members of the other body. They do not run quite so frequently. It seems to me that if a man serves his country here for 6 years superbly well, he should not be worried about whether he is to be reelected or not. Six years is ample time in which to spell out a basic contribution to our country and our time.

I hope very much that more and more Senators will encourage a realization on the part of the people of the country of the peril in which we stand, and the fact that the bill is not going to be paid by "him and her" but by "you and me." I think this is the body in which that can be done.

Mr. CLARK. The Senator is correct. I thank him for his pertinent comments.

Mr. JAVITS. I do not have to agree with all the details, and I do not wish to become lost in details. Let as many of us as possible—and I hope before long it will be a majority—focus the attention of the country upon the fact that we are in a very grim situation, and that we shall have to pay out a great deal, over a long time, in order to be around here to see another day.

I thank my colleague.

Mr. CLARK. I thank the Senator again for his very pertinent comments.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK. I am very happy to yield to my good friend from Alaska.

Mr. GRUENING. The Senator from Pennsylvania has made a most important, most constructive speech. He has called his speech a program for this Congress; and it is—properly—not limited to a mere discussion of the budget, although that is essentially what it is.

Inherent in the discussion is the basic idea that the paramount issue depends on the fallacious and timid concept of the budget which has been advanced by the administration, and that it goes to the heart of all that ails this country and that is needed to move it forward.

Mr. CLARK. The Senator is correct.

Mr. GRUENING. The administration appears to think that the prime issue is the alleged balancing of the budget. As my good friend the Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER] pointed out, that is a legend, a myth. The terms which he applied are very polite terms. Somewhat harsher terms could be used, in view of the fact that the administration is going before the country and charging those who will not accept the proposal for raising taxes and allegedly balancing the budget with being spenders. We are nothing of the sort. The Senator has pointed out that we have a far higher duty than that which is pointed out by the President in his budget message.

There is one field upon which I hesitate to enter, in view of the fact that I have come to the Senate so recently. I note that in the Senator's discussion of foreign relations he says, quite properly, that under the Constitution the President does not have exclusive responsibility and authority in connection with foreign policy. He pointed out that the Founding Fathers wisely placed upon the Congress a heavy responsibility. The Senator referred to some recent resolutions.

Does the able Senator from Pennsylvania not agree that, in addition to the function of the Congress in connection with foreign relations, having to do with resolutions and treaties, there should be the function of watching the tremendous expenditure for foreign aid which is asked for every year, currently to the extent of some $4 billion, and totaling to date some $70 billions in an effort to eliminate waste?

Mr. CLARK. I agree with the Senator.

Mr. GRUENING. I venture to raise the question with a great deal of humility as one so recently a Senator. Why is it that when Congress is faced with a request for a small appropriation of a few thousand dollars within the 49 States, it must go through the entire routine of the Bureau of the Budget and the Appropriations Committees, and be passed by both Houses of Congress, whereas unseen men in bureaus can dispose of $100 million or more without any check or balance in foreign countries? Would it not restore some of the authority of Congress if appropriations for expenditures abroad were subjected to the same routine and procedure as appropriations for domestic expenditures? If the State Department were required to come to Congress and justify requests for such proposals as an expenditure of $250 million for a dam in such-and-such country, whereas the administration is not willing to spend any amount of money for a high dam in the West, where such dams have proved to be so beneficial, and if the State Department had to demonstrate to the Congress that the expenditure was necessary, might it not be possible to have a far more realistic and effective and less wasteful foreign aid program?

Mr. CLARK. The Senator has touched upon a very important point, and one with which I dealt only briefly, namely, the insidious policy of secrecy, which involves keeping from not only the American people, but Members of Congress, the details of our foreign policy and of the expenditure of the taxpayers' money. I believe it is high time that a great deal of the so-called classified information should be spread upon the record. I realize that there may be reasons why the State Department does not wish Turkey to know how much we are spending in Afghanistan. But in my judgment, Turkey knows a great deal more about what we are spending in Afghanistan than does the Senator from Alaska or the Senator from Pennsylvania; yet we are the ones who are asked to appropriate the money.

I could continue in considerable detail with respect to information which has come to me under the ban of secrecy, information which I am not permitted to reveal to my constituents or my colleagues, and which, if it were revealed, would make a great many members of the administration look very silly indeed.

When we are given such information, we are told that we must not disclose it. Our lips are sealed. I believe perhaps the distinguished junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] has suffered more restively under such inhibition than have any of the rest of us. I have had occasion to discuss the subject with him from time to time.

Let me cut this colloquy short by saying to my friend from Alaska that I think he is on the right track.

Mr. GRUENING. I hope this subject will be very seriously considered by the Congress. I see no reason why $4 billion should be handled in the form of a blank check by unseen men in Government Bureaus. I think it is distinctly the function of the Congress to exercise greater control and greater scrutiny over the manner in which these mammoth expenditures are arranged and ladled out.

Mr. CLARK. I thank my friend for his contribution.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, the colloquy which has just taken place raises in my mind several questions which I should like to discuss at greater length at some future time. At this time I rise for another purpose.

I am very much interested to see my colleagues on the other side of the aisle take a little interest in the balancing of the budget and the financial condition of the country. I find it very heartening indeed; and I, for one, will join them in this interest.

I am not one of those who believe that the credit of the United States is a bottomless well; and the sooner we realize that it is not a bottomless well, the better off we shall be. We might have what appears to be even a fairly healthy financial situation in this country. I do not believe that such a situation exists now; and in the event of emergency we would find ourselves in a very stringent situation.

If I may be pardoned a personal reference, when I was a boy I had a big brown geography book. In that geography book, in the discussion relative to China, it was stated that one of the chief handicaps and drawbacks to the advancement of China was ancestor worship. I merely wish to say that in this day and age those of us here today will never have to worry about this country suffering from ancestor worship, when our children and grandchildren see what we have handed them.

Mr. HUMPHREY subsequently said: Mr. President, I join with other Senators today in commending the distinguished senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] on a remarkable address entitled "A Program for the 86th Congress." I truly believe the Senator from Pennsylvania has demonstrated a quality of legislative leadership that is of the highest standard and of the finest quality.

The Senator has stated that he does not set forth the program for the 86th Congress; but, as he said, in the tradition of free debate he outlines or sets forth the broad outlines of a program to lead us out of the difficulties in which the President's proposals have placed us. That is a quotation from his address.

The program is both in the field of domestic policy and foreign policy. Also, it relates to the very practical problem of how to pay for the cost of these programs.

The senior Senator from Pennsylvania has concentrated his attention in the field of taxation upon the so-called tax loopholes. These loopholes represent the inequities in the tax structure. It goes without saying that a tax structure is no better than the justice and the fairness of its provisions. I regret to say that in recent years—in fact, over the years—our tax laws have been riddled by special adjustments here and there, and special provisions which lend themselves to special privileges for selected groups and individuals. In other words, the tax structure has been filled with tax loopholes which permit the escape of needed revenue, and also make the tax structure unfair and inequitable in many of its applications.

The Senator from Pennsylvania is to be commended for his courageous and thoughtful treatment of the tax laws. I would only say to him that some years ago I outlined, here in the Senate, during one of the debates on the tax bills, a program of very much the same type—one of closing loopholes. From time to time I have heard that the Treasury Department is giving thought to this important subject. Not only do I hope that it will give thought to it; I also hope that it will lend itself to a program of action and accomplishment. Surely these loopholes should be closed. At the least, the areas in the tax laws which are open to the most serious criticism for their inequities should be remedied.

Mr. President, I feel that the proposals of the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] are in the main very constructive. In fact, I can find no fault with any of his legislative proposals. They seem to me to present a program that is worthy of the 86th Congress and of any Congress in the foreseeable future.

STATEHOOD FOR HAWAII

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, the indications that our colleagues in the other body will shortly take up the Hawaii statehood bill has given me the greatest pleasure I have known in some time. Now that the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs has again reported this bill, I am hopeful that we can immediately get to consideration of the measure so that it will not again become mired in the confusion generally associated with the closing days of a session. We have already waited far too long to recognize the appropriateness of Hawaiian statehood.

On July 8 of last year I requested the majority of this body to permit a vote on statehood for Hawaii. Only the week before we had granted statehood to Alaska. But we were never given that opportunity to provide equal treatment for the Territory of Hawaii.

By every criterion except geographical size, which is hardly an important factor, Hawaii is equally, if not more deserving of statehood than was Alaska. Hawaii became an organized Territory 13 years before Alaska. Hawaii's population of over 600,000 is more than three times that of Alaska. By every economic standard, the case for Hawaii is as sound as was that for Alaska.

No Territory has ever served as long an apprenticeship awaiting statehood as has Hawaii. Hawaii became an integral part of the United States in 1898, through a Treaty of Annexation. The Hawaiian Organic Act, providing for civil government, was enacted in 1900. The debate on that measure in the House led to defeat of an amendment the purpose of which was to declare the intent of Congress that Hawaii was not necessarily going to achieve statehood ultimately. Ever since that moment, 59 years ago, the people of Hawaii have been entitled to expect statehood. They have waited long enough.

Mr. President, the House has now approved statehood for Hawaii four times; during the 80th Congress, the 81st Congress, the 83d Congress. The only time the Senate has approved statehood for Hawaii was in the 83d Congress. However, on that occasion this body voted to tack Alaska statehood on to the Hawaii bill. That turned out to be a crippling amendment when the minority leader, and present Speaker of the House, objected to the unanimous consent request to send the joint Alaska-Hawaii bill to conference.

But now we are given another chance, a chance, if you will, to redeem ourselves by granting the people of Hawaii the right for their own cause to be heard on its own merits, without the issue being cluttered up with other arguments for another cause. Let us seize that opportunity with all haste.

Mr. President, I think all of us must remember the great, spontaneous wave of enthusiasm with which our action last year in granting statehood to Alaska was greeted by the American people. I cannot recall any other action of Congress which has brought such widespread approval.

One of the most thrilling moments I have ever witnessed in the U.S. Senate occurred on the night when the Senate voted approval of statehood for Alaska. The great Governor of Alaska, along with his associates, left the gallery of the Senate and walked down to the Prayer Room of the Capitol, to return thanks for the act of the Senate which had, in effect, made Alaska a State of the Union.

The action of Congress in granting statehood to Alaska meant to me, that the American people had been alert all along, to the justice of the Alaska statehood cause. There can be no doubt that this same great majority of the people feel similarly about Hawaii.

If there were no other arguments—and there are, of course, many—in support of statehood for Hawaii, the people's approval of what we did for Alaska ought to awake us to our responsibility to Hawaii. To put it conversely, this widespread and virtually unanimous approval of Alaska statehood should serve to signal us that the American people will not look kindly upon any further delay in the granting of statehood to Hawaii.

From the standpoint of our world prestige, of maintaining our position of leadership of the free world, it has now become more important than ever that we give to Hawaii this thoroughly deserved status. If we were to fail to do so, having granted that status to Alaska, we would become subject to charges of

discrimination by those who are constantly on the lookout for anti-American propaganda material. And not only by them but some of those who are disposed toward us in a more friendly manner would have their doubts about the sincerity of our doctrines.

Mr. President, by giving statehood to Hawaii we will at one and the same time refute two of the favorite charges of the Communists; one, that the islands are a colony, and the other that the United States is a nation of racists dedicated to the theory of white supremacy.

On this subject, Mr. President, I want to refer to some remarks which were made last September in San Francisco by our distinguished and very able Governor of Hawaii, William F. Quinn. Governor Quinn was speaking at a luncheon of west coast State Governors and the ambassadors of some 30 Pacific area nations which climaxed a week-long Pacific festival sponsored by the city of San Francisco.

What could be a more dramatic and effective act to counter (Soviet Communist) charges than to make Hawaii a State?—

Governor Quinn said.

How better could we woo the sympathies of aur Asian neighbors? And what a fine, splendid, and completely American act it would be.

Governor Quinn then quoted a remark which recently had been made by Dag Hammarskjold, United Nations Secretary General, who said that lack of understanding between the Western World and the nonwhite world is the greatest threat to the future peace of the world.

The greatest thing we can do toward creating better understanding is to make Hawaii a State—

Governor Quinn told his audience.

The people of Hawaii overwhelmingly want statehood. We were bitterly disappointed that we could not get congressional action in the last session.

We were overjoyed when our big sister Territory, Alaska, was voted in. I will say that we felt somewhat like the man who has plied a slot machine with coins and while he turns away to get more change someone else drops one coin in and hits the jackpot. He deserves the jackpot all right, but the first fellow was certainly working long and hard to get it.

There is only one more candidate for Governor Quinn's statehood jackpot. Hawaii is the last remaining incorporated Territory which, as such, is inherently entitled to statehood.

Mr. President, Hawaii needs and deserves statehood. And we need Hawaii as a State.

It is my fervent hope that we can demonstrate in this body that, regardless of political considerations, we are united in the support of the principles which made our country what it is today—the most basic of which is the right of a mature, organized segment of our population to equal representation in these Halls. Hawaii can provide us with a point of view sharpened by proximity to our Asian neighbors. Hawaiians know and understand, and many are even descendants of, that portion of our world which is fathomless to many of us. The sooner Hawaiians can be with us, as duly elected, voting representatives of a great State, the better off we all will be.

Mr. President, I request unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD the definitive remarks of Secretary of Interior Fred Seaton on Hawaiian statehood before our committee on February 25.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT ON HAWAIIAN STATEHOOD BY SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR FRED A. SEATON, BEFORE THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON TERRITORIES AND INSULAR POSSESSIONS OF THE SENATE INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS COMMITTEE, FEBRUARY 25, 1959

Mr. Chairman, members of the committee, permit me to begin my testimony by expressing my thanks to this committee for permitting me to appear before you. Your chairman has asked that these hearings be limited to the presentation of new information pertaining to the admission of Hawaii into the Union as a State and I am so limiting myself this morning.

As you know, my statement in support of immediate statehood for Hawaii was presented to the 85th Congress on April 2, 1957, when former Under Secretary Hatfield Chilson appeared before you in my behalf while I was a hospital patient.

There can be no possible question concerning the position of the administration on Hawaii statehood. Since this Congress convened, the President has on several occasions urged the Congress to admit Hawaii into the Union as a State. You are dealing this year not with an enabling act but with an admission act. We of the executive branch wholeheartedly concur in this approach and recommend that the bill before you be dealt with as expeditiously as possible.

Mr. Chairman, my 1957 statement discussed briefly some of the history of Hawaii—particularly as it applied to the various efforts of Hawaiians to become more closely identified with the United States. It is, I believe, particularly important that these aspects of the Hawaiian cause be kept closely in mind when deliberating upon the current petition of Hawaii for full and equal membership in our Union of States.

The record is clear. For over 100 years peoples of Hawaii have been dedicated to the goal of complete union with our mainland. The accomplishment of their goal became inevitable with the annexation of Hawaii in 1898 as an integral part of the United States. To me, there can be no question properly raised as to whether Hawaii should become a State. The question is simply when shall Hawaii become a State?

As a personal observation, I believe that the language we all use in referring to the admission of Hawaii into the Union is not technically correct. Hawaii is as much a part of this Union today as any State. As an incorporated Territory, and the only one we have left, Hawaiians are subject to all of the obligations imposed upon any citizen in any State by the Federal Government. The problem arises because they are denied some of the most precious prerogatives of free men, among them equal representation and the right to vote in national elections.

The record is also clear on another aspect of the subject before you. Since the incorporation of Hawaii into the Union, Hawaiians have developed their islands at a rapid pace. Any part of the Hawaiian economy, culture, philosophy, or political institutions that is examined today will be found to be a duplicate of or modeled after the way of life in vogue in the continental United States. Hawaii is the picture window of the Pacific through which the peoples of the East look into our American front room.

This will be particularly important in our future dealings with the peoples of Asia, because a large percentage of the population of Hawaii is of Oriental or Polynesian racial extraction. The participation of the people of Hawaii in the full measure of the benefits of American citizenship will bring a fresh, new, informed outlook to our councils. More significantly, the peoples of those eastern lands washed by the waters of the Pacific will look through that front window of ours and take renewed notice that we do, indeed, practice what we preach. There can be no finer way to demonstrate the dynamic nature of our Union and the everlasting validity of the principles upon which our Republic was founded than by the admission of Hawaii as a State in this session of Congress.

While I have mentioned the racial background of some Hawaiians, let me hasten to point out that it would be both unfair and inaccurate to conclude that the objectives of Hawaiian people are in any way foreign to those of any other American group. No conclusion could be further from the truth. The overwhelming majority of Hawaiians are native-born Americans—they know no other loyalty and acclaim their American citizenship as proudly as you and I.

Their economy is self-sustaining—Hawaii is adequately prepared, financially, for the burdens of statehood. More than a million tons of sugar, worth nearly $150 million are produced annually, from over 200,000 acres of cane. Capital investment in this industry amounts to nearly $200 million, of which about $50 million is in irrigation facilities alone. In sugar production techniques and per-acre production, Hawaii leads the world, and its hourly rated employees receive the world's highest year-round agricultural wages.

Hawaii also produces 85 percent of the total U.S. supply of canned pineapple products; which is to say 65 percent of the world's production. Pineapple production utilizes about 75,000 acres of intensely cultivated land, and provides employment for over 22,000 people annually. The annual value of the output, estimated at about $115 million, gives pineapples second rank to sugar.

Although other specialty crops for export may be considered as minor in comparison to those already named, they add annually about $10 million to Hawaii's gross income.

Aside from agriculture and the processing of farm products, a second major source of income for the people of Hawaii is the tourist trade. In 1922, the total number of visitors was less than 10,000. As late as 1941, the peak prewar year, it was only 32,000. In my statement presented to you in 1957, we pointed out that 133,000 tourists visited Hawaii in 1956. We now can tell you that in 1957 it had reached a total of 169,000, more than five times the number of 16 years before. That 169,000, incidentally, represents the number of persons staying 2 days or more. They spent nearly $80 million in Hawaii in that year, and thus put tourism next to sugar and pineapples as a source of income from private industry.

Most of Hawaii's economic possibilities are already well-developed, and the Territory is already a tax-paying partner, carrying a full share of the burden of supporting the Federal Government. Federal internal revenue collections in Hawaii last year amounted to $166,306,000, a figure higher than in 10 of the present States: New Hampshire, Vermont, North Dakota, South Dakota, Montana, Idaho, Wyoming, New Mexico, Nevada, and Alaska.

The geographical area of Hawaii is comparatively small (6,423 square miles), although not so small as three of our present States—Rhode Island, Delaware, and Connecticut. The Territory is thickly settled, comparatively, with a population estimated in June 1958, at about 635,000—larger than

that of six of the present States: New Hampshire, with 584,000; Delaware, 454,000; Vermont, 372,000; Wyoming, 320,000; Nevada, 267,000; and Alaska, approximately 214,000.

In fact, Hawaii today has a greater population than that enjoyed at the time of admittance by any of the States—other than the original 13—with the single exception of Oklahoma.

It is with some difficulty that I proceed with the balance of my statement. When testimony is limited to new material, it is extremely difficult to approach the subject of what can, today, be stated as an argument against statehood for Hawaii. So far as I am aware, there are no new arguments against Hawaii. There are none which were not thoroughly discussed in this committee in 1957, and thoroughly considered by the full Senate when the Hawaii bill was passed in 1954. With the exception of one subject, I would venture to state that every argument that is currently raised against Hawaii was in fact raised during the debates which lead to the incorporation of Hawaii into our Union as an organized Territory in 1900. Many of these same arguments were made in opposition to the admission of Louisiana in 1812, which, as the members of this committee well recall, was the first State to be admitted from territory outside of that embraced by the Original Thirteen States.

One argument against Hawaiian statehood, that of Communist infiltration, seems to demand explanation here today. Historically, even this is not a completely new subject in debate and consideration of statehood, because the question of loyalty to the United States has, indeed, been raised in regard to other States prior to their admission. Debate in the Congress as to the extent of French influence in Louisiana and that of the Spanish-speaking people of New Mexico are significant examples. The Communist question, of course, presents a new ramification of the subject of loyalty not presented in the past, and that is whether any substantial segment of Hawaii actually is committed to a doctrine which advocates the violent overthrow of the very Government in which the overwhelming majority of Hawaiians seek to permanently become a full partner.

For myself, I believe that this committee and all advocates of Hawaiian statehood will squarely face the Communist issue.

The people of Hawaii have time and time again rejected completely the Communist philosophy and have thwarted every attempt of the Communists to influence their government.

The proposed constitution of the State of Hawaii contains a far-reaching prohibition against any Communist holding public office or public employment of any kind.

A perennial target of alleged Communists in Hawaii has been the law enacted by the 1949 territorial legislature following a prolonged dock strike, which empowered the Territorial government to seize Hawaiian docks in the event of a strike. Notwithstanding four general territorialwide elections for the legislature, those laws are still on the books in Hawaii today. In each election the laws were an issue, and in each legislative session attempts have been made to repeal them. This is a prime example of the dogged determination of Hawaiians to stand firm on what they consider to be a matter of principle.

This committee needs no exposition of the rebuttals to the argument based on noncontiguity, upon the loyalty of Hawaiians, or upon the subject of whether approximately 635,000 people deserve equal representation. Normally, this last argument is directed at whether 635,000 people deserve to have two Senators when New York's almost 16 million, California's 13 million, and Pennsylvania's 11 million people have but two Senators. A succinct answer to the last argument can be presented by any student aware of the wise compromises agreed to in the Constitutional Convention by our Founding Fathers.

It helps, I believe, to keep the Hawaiian statehood movement in the proper perspective. In my opinion, statehood for Hawaii will bring as much good to the other 49 States as it will to Hawaii itself. The admission of any fully qualified partner does strengthen the whole Union. As every one of the 36 States, which have been admitted since the Original Thirteen, entered, the Union has become more vibrant and has enjoyed at the very least a great moral uplifting.

We teach our children in our homes, churches and schools to think in terms of fair dealing, and in terms of devotion to the principles of our Declaration of Independence and our Constitution. Hawaiians are teaching their children the same thing, but what will all this come to mean to these Hawaiian children if they witness again and again the denial of their petition for equal rights and privileges?

Gentlemen, in my opinion the major question before you is a question of when to take action. It is a moral question and one which raises serious implications throughout the world. It is my firm hope that the Hawaiian cause, which really involves a plea for simple justice, will be answered forthwith with the only remedy available—that which is granted by the Constitution to the Congress exclusively: the power to admit new States into the Union.

We have no other Territory which is incorporated and ready for statehood, and Congress itself must first grant to any other Territory the basic status of incorporation into the Union before any new apprenticeship can begin.

As you continue your deliberations, please feel free to call upon me or the personnel of the Department of the Interior for any information or assistance you may desire. We stand ready to assist in any way to bring about the immediate admission of Hawaii as a State.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I also ask to have printed in the RECORD a joint memorial of the Legislature of Colorado relating to the proposed admission of Hawaii as a State.

There being no objection, the memorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATE JOINT MEMORIAL 2

Joint memorial memorializing the Congress of the United States to grant statehood to the Territory of Hawaii

Whereas the people of the Territory of Hawaii have shown through the processes of democracy that they wish to join the Union, sharing both the responsibilities and the privileges of being one of the United States of America; and

Whereas Hawaii has served the United States as an extended frontier for the development of peaceful pursuits, as well as wartime bulwarks; and

Whereas it is in the best interest of our national defense to bring the people and resources of this outlying territory under the American flag in full partnership; and

Whereas the people of Hawaii, many of whom migrated there from 1 of the 49 States, have demonstrated their fundamental belief in peace, democracy and good citizenship under God: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate of the 42d General Assembly of the State of Colorado (the House of Representatives concurring herein), That we, the members of the General Assembly of the State of Colorado, which was the 38th State to be admitted to the Union after serving her country, ably as a territory for many years, do hereby memorialize the Congress of the United States to enact legislation necessary to admit Hawaii into the Union as a sister State; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this memorial be transmitted to the President of the United States, to each Member in the Congress from Colorado, and to the Governor of the Territory of Hawaii.

ROBERT L. KNOUS,
President of the senate.
LUCILE L. SHUSTER,
Secretary of the senate,
CHARLES R. CONKLIN,
Speaker of the house of representatives.
ROBERT S. EBERHARDT,
Chief clerk of the house of representatives.

DISTRIBUTION OF ELECTRIC POWER IN THE MISSOURI BASIN

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I desire to address myself for a few moments to a matter in which I have long been interested and which is of vital concern to the future economic development of Nebraska. I refer to the distribution of the electric power generated by the great dams constructed by the Corps of Engineers on the Missouri River. The problem is referred to locally as the distribution of Missouri Basin power.

My interest in the development of the Missouri River Basin goes back a long way. I authored the resolution in the House of Representatives that brought forth the Pick plan of the Army Engineers for the Missouri River Basin. I served on the flood control committee that wrote the authorizing legislation. The bill went to the Senate, and by that time the plan of the Bureau of Reclamation known as the Sloan plan was presented to Congress. The Senate added the Sloan plan to the Pick plan. The bill went to conference and I served as a conferee on the part of the House. In the conference, the Senate version, combining the two plans, was approved. The power preference clause was approved in the conference. Later, the conference report was approved by both the Senate and the House, and the Missouri River Basin plan, sometimes known as the Pick-Sloan plan, came into being as part of the Flood Control Act of 1944.

The Missouri Drainage Basin includes parts of the States of Montana, Wyoming, Colorado, North Dakota, South Dakota, Minnesota, Iowa, Kansas, Missouri, and Nebraska. Nebraska is the only one of these States which lies wholly within the basin. All of the other States lie partially, and some of them almost wholly, outside the basin.

From these facts it would seem that Nebraska, as the heart of the basin, was entitled to the utmost consideration in the distribution of any benefits which arise from these great projects.

Nebraska is unique in another particular. It is the only all-public power State in the Union. Many years ago all of the private utilities in Nebraska were sold to public agencies of the State of Nebraska, which are denominated as public power districts and political subdivisions of the State, and which for many years have produced, transmitted, and distributed all of the electric power in Nebraska.

It is obvious, therefore, that Nebraska and all of its electric loads are preference customers within the conception of the distribution of federally generated power to preference customers. One would assume, therefore, that Nebraska was entitled to an equal pro rata share of all of the power generated in the basin, along with and in equal proportions to the preference customers within the other States in the basin.

I am, therefore, Mr. President, much disturbed by a revised tabulation of the Department of the Interior's proposal for the distribution of this power, which was issued by the Department on February 20, 1959, because that tabulation shows that, whereas, most of the other preference customers within the basin are receiving somewhere from 60 percent to 83 percent of their total power requirements from these Federal facilities, Nebraska, the only State wholly within the basin, the only completely public power State in the Union, is only receiving 22 percent of its requirements.

This tabulation shows that the total estimated load of the preference customers within the basin is 2,122,695 kilowatts, and that of that amount Nebraska's estimated load is 920,715 kilowatts, or nearly 50 percent of the total electrical requirements of the basin States. I am completely at a loss, therefore, to understand why Nebraska's share of this allocation is only 22 percent of its requirements.

I understand that in the first instance in the allocation of this power the Interior Department gave weight to the theory that it would deduct from the equal pro rata share of each of these preference customers whatever generating capacity the customer had which was usable. This, obviously, would work a very serious injury to Nebraska, and I think is unfair.

For many years, Nebraska has provided its own generating equipment. It has issued, through its various public agencies, nearly $210 million of revenue bonds to provide great generating stations, hundreds of miles of high-voltage transmission lines, and still other hundreds of miles of secondary distribution, to serve more than 300 cities and towns within the State.

There is some misunderstanding in certain quarters as to the nature of Nebraska's public power system. It is not Federal power. The cost of acquiring these power systems has been borne by Nebraskans. The money secured for this purpose was almost totally private money. Revenue bonds, totaling $210 million, were issued by Nebraskans to obtain this private money. Bonds were issued to the Federal Government for PWA loans totaling $43 million and those bonds are now held by the GSA, but they constitute but a small portion of the total. These figures that I have cited do not include the municipal power systems and distribution systems owned by hundreds of our cities and towns. I have also excluded REA from this tabulation because that is a nationwide program that serves all of the States alike.

Should Nebraska be penalized because its people have assumed their own burdens, carried their own loads and made these tremendous investments? And is it fair that other areas which have not invested any of their own money, which have not made any attempt to carry their own responsibilities, are now to be favored by a greater allocation of power than a State which has endeavored to care for its own needs? It seems to me such a plan is obviously unfair; that, if anything, the State or community which has provided its own capacity and invested its own money should be actually favored as against those who have done nothing.

I understand that plan has now been abandoned by the Interior Department, but that the present allocation is based upon a percentage of requests for power that was made to the Bureau of Reclamation. Mr. President, this plan is equally unfair.

Because Nebraska has been an all-public power State, there have been constant misgivings by some of its neighboring States that, due to its highly preferential position, Nebraska would receive more than its fair share of this power. For that reason, our Governors through the last several years and the managers of our public power agencies have repeatedly assured their sister States that Nebraska would never ask for more than it actually needed and would make no attempt to take advantage of its highly preferential position. The result is that, although Nebraska had an estimated electric load of 920,715 kilowatts, the State only asked for an allocation of 267,019 kilowatts. This was based upon the utilization of much of the equipment which the State has bought and paid for and was done in an attempt to be more than fair with the other States in the basin.

On the contrary, we now find that many other preferred customers within the basin have made application for their total power supply and in some cases have actually applied for more power than their own estimates show will be usable in 1963. It is obvious, therefore, that when the Department undertakes to apportion power on the requests for allocations which it has, that it is still doing a very grave injustice to Nebraska. According to the theory now adopted, if Nebraska had asked for three times as much as it did ask for, it would receive an allocation somewhere in proportion to that received by other States. We are paying, therefore, a very high penalty for our integrity and fairness in not asking for our total requirements.

Again, let me point out that Nebraska, through the Rural Electrification Administration and through financing of its own, has constructed, or is in the process of constructing, two major transmission lines to its nearest source of power at Fort Randall; whereas, other States have invested no money whatever in transmission lines. On the contrary, the Department has built hundreds of miles of basic transmission system for the distribution of power to neighboring States, so that here again, Nebraska is being penalized for having the prudence and foresight to make its own investments with its own money to meet its own needs.

It is said that Nebraska is receiving more power than I have herein indicated because it is getting approximately 100,000 kilowatts of so-called summer firm power. This is power which would otherwise go to waste during the flood seasons of the summer, and even that power is to be withdrawable from Nebraska in 1966 for the purpose of providing pumping energy to pump water onto irrigated areas in the States to the north of Nebraska.

For all these reasons, therefore, Mr. President, I deem the present allocations to be completely unfair and inequitable to the only State in the basin which has stood on its own feet, financed its own needs, and, therefore, contributed millions of dollars to a firm supply of energy in its area in the basin. I can see no reason why municipal plants in Minnesota, which already have firm contracts for power supplies from other sources, should now receive 83 percent of their total requirements from the Federal Government, with no expense for transmission lines or anything else, when Nebraska, which has provided itself with adequate generation and transmission facilities, should be given only this relatively insignificant portion of its needs.

I shall insist that the Bureau of Reclamation, charged with the responsibility of making these allocations, consider the equities I have pointed out herein, and give to Nebraska its fair pro rata share, based on its total needs, of the power generated by Federal dams in the Missouri Basin.

INCREASED RADIOACTIVITY IN FOODSTUFFS

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, last Monday I outlined to the Senate a proposal which I made in letter form on February 25 to the Acting Secretary of State, concerning the negotiations being conducted at Geneva.

In order to keep the RECORD complete, I wish to lay before the Senate the reply which I yesterday received from the Acting Secretary to my letter of February 25.

In this letter to me, Secretary Herter said that the Department of State now has my suggestion under study.

This is a critical matter. Today the Atomic Energy Commission's quarterly strontium report details the results of a new study of radioactivity in foodstuffs, showing that levels have reached new highs in a variety of edibles collected from different parts of the world. Today there was a disclosure that the strontium 90 level in Minnesota wheat has risen as high as the maximum permissible concentration, and North Dakota milk has a strontium 90 contamination level as high as 40 percent of the recommended maximum.

This contamination comes from radioactive fallout originating from atmospheric nuclear explosions.

These things, Mr. President, emphasize the critical importance of this matter. I am glad that my proposal is being studied at the State Department, for, as I have said, the cessation of nuclear test-

ing under a trustworthy inspection and control system is the urgent hope of a distraught world. It is imperative that we have such a system functioning under international authority, not only to prevent further pollution of the atmosphere by the present nuclear powers, but by other nations whose developing technologies already have brought them to the edge of testing which will multiply this poisoning manyfold.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD the text of Secretary Herter's letter of March 4 and also an article entitled "Fallout Sets New Highs in Foodstuffs," published in the Washington Post and Times Herald, of today, March 5, 1959.

There being no objection, the letter and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, March 4, 1959.

The Honorable FRANK CHURCH,
U.S. Senate.

DEAR SENATOR CHURCH: Thank you for your thoughtful letter of February 25, 1959, about the Geneva nuclear test negotiations. The support you express for the U.S. position in Geneva is gratifying. We continue to feel, as you do, that we must press the Soviet Union on the control issues you outlined so that we may if at all possible achieve a suspension of all types of nuclear tests under a trustworthy system of international control and inspection.

The Department of State has been giving active consideration to what might be done should it prove, despite all of our efforts, that the Soviet Union will not accept the controls necessary to monitor a complete suspension of nuclear tests. The suggestion you have made, among others, is under study; you will appreciate that many technical factors must be assessed before a final decision can be reached.

In view of your interest in this problem I have asked Mr. Philip J. Farley and members of the Department's disarmament staff to keep you advised of the progress of our consideration of the matter you have raised.

With warmest regards.

Most sincerely,

CHRISTIAN A. HERTER,
Acting Secretary.

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald, Mar. 5, 1959]

FALLOUT SETS NEW HIGHS IN FOODSTUFFS—WEST GERMAN DATA REPORTS BIG RISE FOR STRONTIUM 90

A new study of radioactivity in foodstuffs shows that levels have reached new highs in a variety of edibles collected from different parts of the world. In some cases, the levels of strontium 90 have exceeded the maximum permissible concentration recommended by the U.S. and International Committees on Radiation Protection.

The study, made by the West German Institute for Milk Research, was published in the quarterly strontium report of the U.S. Atomic Energy Commission. This report also showed that strontium 90 has been accumulating in the soil at an increasingly rapid rate.

It came on the heels of the recent disclosure that the strontium 90 in Minnesota wheat has risen as high as the maximum permissible concentration and has gone 50 percent higher in one sample. There also have been reports that the milk in North Dakota has reached levels as high as 40 percent of the recommended maximum.

The maximum permissible concentration of strontium 90 in foodstuffs has been set at 80 micromicrocuries per kilogram. A kilogram is equal to 2.2 pounds. A micromicrocurie of radioactive material is the amount which undergoes 2.2 disintegrations per minute.

ECONOMIC STAGNATION

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I was attending a meeting of the Subcommittee on Latin American Affairs of the Committee on Foreign Relations this afternoon when the present Presiding Officer of the Senate, the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], delivered his brilliant speech entitled "A Program for the 86th Congress." I should have liked to have been here to participate in the discussion which took place on the floor following the speech. I wish to associate myself with the underlying thesis of the speech, and to make a comment or two about it.

Next week I intend to make a speech in the Senate on the failure of the leadership of the Eisenhower administration in respect to the economic welfare of our country. In the course of that speech, I shall present data which will support my allegation that the United States is confronted with economic stagnation; that since 1953 the United States has the dubious distinction of being a nation in which the real economic output per person has remained practically at a standstill; that the United States has the distinction of being the only modern nation in which per capita real income has not kept up with population since 1953. I mention these items because I think they show the need for the kind of foresight and statesmanship which the Senator from Pennsylvania demonstrated in his very able speech this afternoon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CLARK in the chair). The Chair thanks the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. But I desire to make a comment concerning that part of the Senator's speech on page 5 which deals with foreign relations. I say this in the presence of the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], who is chairman of the Subcommittee on Disarmament of the Committee on Foreign Relations.

In his speech, the Senator from Pennsylvania emphasized a point which time and time again in recent years I have tried to drive home to the Senate and to the country. The Senator from Pennsylvania said:

> The conduct of foreign affairs is of such momentous importance to this Nation, and to every person in it, that it should be the subject of political discussion and debate as much as any other aspect of our public life.

Time and again, I have spoken out against the hush-hush policy in regard to the problem of foreign policy which has prevailed too long in the Senate. It has almost become a subject of political taboo on both sides of the aisle. It happens to be the one subject which, in the long run, will determine the destiny and the very survival of the Nation.

The Senator from Pennsylvania continues:

> Under our Constitution, the President does not have the exclusive responsibility and authority for our foreign policy.

How important it is that we get that point of view across to the American people. There will be a meeting of editors in Washington within a few days. I hope someone will get that idea across to the editors, because for years in this country the editors have demonstrated that they are laboring under the misapprehension that the Executive operates a kind of police state control in the field of foreign policy; that there is some kind of dictatorship in the field of foreign policy; that under the Constitution of the United States the authority to formulate foreign policy is given exclusively to the President of the United States. Time and time again, I have tried to point out that that is not so.

What has happened, to be brutally frank about it, is that Congress has not fulfilled its responsibilities, under the Constitution, in the field of foreign policy.

The Senator from Pennsylvania went on to say:

> While day to day conduct of foreign affairs is necessarily in the hands of the Executive, our Founding Fathers wisely placed on the Congress a heavy responsibility and authority in this field, and throughout our history the Congress has played its proper part in exercising that responsibility and authority most recently in the Formosa and Middle East resolutions.

Of course I disagree with the emphasis of the Senator from Pennsylvania. In my judgment, we should not have delegated congressional authority as we did in the Formosa and the Middle East resolutions. But at least the Senator from Pennsylvania is correct—that in the debate on those two resolutions, we recognized the responsibility of the Congress. I happen to be of the opinion that we came to the wrong action; but at least the Congress acted under its constitutional responsibility.

The Senator from Pennsylvania also said:

> We should be ready to support the President when imminent danger threatens, but we would be derelict in our duties if we failed to participate in the formulation of foreign policy and in following closely the moves of the Executive in carrying it out.

In my opinion, we cannot emphasize that too much.

I wish to say to the Senate and to the country that it is of the utmost importance that in this period of crisis, the Congress stop the trend in America of letting the President and the Secretary of State act in secrecy in regard to American foreign policy. It does not matter whether the President concerned is this President or any other President; if ever there was a time when we should have full public disclosure of the problems involved in American foreign policy, it is now; and I do not intend to be silenced by any of the editorial and newspaper publicity or propaganda from any source to the effect that one must not speak about foreign policy matters but must leave them to the President and the Secretary of State. I speak respectfully when I say that I can think of nothing more dangerous to the future of our democratic procedure.

As the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] knows, the other day I attended a meeting of his Subcommittee on Disarmament; at that meeting a presentation was made in regard to some of our disarmament problems. Some of the top officials of the Military Establishment participated in that presentation.

The meeting disturbed me very much; and I believe it is within the bounds of propriety to say that after listening to those military officials, I expressed my concern about the survival of my country in the decades ahead if the attitude and the philosophy which I heard expressed by the American military leaders present at that meeting were to prevail.

Certainly those at the Pentagon Building should be compelled to attend a quick refresher course on the economic history of the world; attendance at that course should be compulsory in the case of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the other top military officials of this Government, because at that meeting of the Disarmament Subcommittee, headed by the Senator from Minnesota, at which those military witnesses testified, I failed to see any evidence to give me any confidence that they understood the serious plight in which all mankind finds itself.

Of course, it is very easy to wave the flag and it is very easy for one to wrap the flag about himself and to talk about what our country will do in terms of military action. Certainly I will vote for what is necessary for the defense of my country, so as to make perfectly clear to Khrushchev and the entire Russian Communist gang that they have everything to lose and nothing to gain by an aggressive course of action.

But there is no hope for peace in the world, in terms of the long pull, if we follow the philosophy of the American military, as I heard it expressed at the meeting of the subcommittee headed by the Senator from Minnesota, because I think those officials are blind to the lessons of history. As they spoke, they showed no evidence that they appreciate the fact that we cannot continue in this mad nuclear armaments race and have America survive.

As the Senator from Minnesota will recall, I asked them what they had to say to the committee about the danger to the health of both the people of our country and mankind generally from the fallout presently coming from nuclear tests.

One of them replied, "the scientists are in disagreement about the effect."

My reply was, "Does that mean that I am to conclude that because the scientists are in disagreement as to the danger of the fallout, there is no danger?"

As the Senator from Minnesota knows, I said I thought his subcommittee has a great responsibility—and he agreed—in the course of its disarmament studies, to analyze the latest data available in regard to the threat of the nuclear fallout to the health not only of the American people but of people everywhere in the world.

Mr. President, when one goes to Asia and Africa, one of the arguments he meets is in regard to the course of action the United States of America is following, along with Russia, in threatening the health of millions of people in the areas where the nuclear tests are taking place. That is why I said that, in my judgment, when we consider this matter from the standpoint of moral principles, we as a nation do not today meet the tests of morality.

The American people do not like to hear that said; but someone must say it. Neither does Russia meet the tests of morality. It is the old story that two wrongs do not make a right. We cannot justify the following of an immoral course of action just because someone else is following one.

Mr. President, I say that today my country is acting immorally in regard to the matter of nuclear tests, because I think there is enough evidence to demonstrate clearly that the tests we are now making are endangering the health of people in some parts of our own country; and, furthermore, the Japanese people will tell us—as they told me when I was in Japan—that they deeply resent what they consider to be the increasing danger to the health of the Japanese people as a result of the Pacific nuclear tests conducted by the United States and as a result of the Siberian tests conducted by Russia.

Mr. President, let no one mistake my meaning: I am putting blame on both Russia and the United States, in this field of nuclear tests; and I am charging both of them with violating standards of international morality in connection with nuclear tests.

In that connection, we had only to listen to the speech made the other day by the Senator from Idaho, who referred to the matter again today, in the course of a speech he made in support of an attempt to work out some stopgap program which will bring these tests to an end.

Mr. President, today I am pleading for a recognition on the part of the officials of my Government—before it is too late—that we are going to be judged adversely in the pages of history for the course of action we are following in our time as we continue these nuclear tests.

And we are going to be condemned, in the pages of history, for continuing the tests when the evidence was clear that a continuation of them endangered the health of many, many people.

But, Mr. President, I move beyond that, because it seems to me, if both the Soviet Union and the United States continue their present nuclear weapons policies, the inevitable result will be, sooner or later, someone will pull the trigger.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. Let me finish this thought. As Nehru said in the debate, in which I participated, in New Delhi, India, in December 1957, one of these nuclear weapons may go off, either by accident or in disobedience of orders; but, once one goes off, there will be no time to determine why it went off. The holocaust will be on. And it is about the awful consequences of that holocaust that I want to speak for a moment, after I yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator for his courtesy. My only purpose in rising is to note, since the Senator from Oregon has referred to the Subcommittee on Disarmament and the meetings we recently held, that, first of all, as much of the testimony as we could possibly get cleared has been released to the public—the testimony of military officers, as well as of scientists.

I am sure the Senator knows I had a rather difficult time getting some of this material released. It was only after direct insistence again and again that some of the material was cleared. I should like to point out that some of the original censorship of material was so ludicrous that, when we insisted that the material be released, since it in no way affected any matter of confidence or security, reexamination revealed that the original censorship made no sense whatsoever.

Furthermore, the Senate should be informed that the staff of the Subcommittee on Disarmament—a very limited staff, as the Senator knows, in terms of numbers, but competent in its ability—is attempting to make as much of a survey as possible of radioactive fallout.

This responsibility has been in the past more or less shouldered by the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, which has technicians attached to it who have a very good understanding of the technical matters involved.

Also, I think it ought to be noted that in the past 3 or 4 weeks very, very disturbing evidence has come from scientists as to an increase in the amount of strontium 90 that is to be found in the soil in my own State of Minnesota. Out of a number of samples of wheat in that area, one of the samples revealed a dosage or degree of strontium 90 that was far above the normal or far above the safe levels.

There is information yet to come. Some of our most respected doctors and scientists in the area, a group headed by Dr. Maurice Visscher, had made a report to our Government, which report has been made available to the U.S. Atomic Energy Commission and to the U.S. Public Health Service, that is anything but comforting, and, in fact, I would say is rather disturbing.

What disturbs this Senator far more than anything else is the fact that the Atomic Energy Commission has been unwilling to recognize the potential dangers involved in this matter. Some of the scientists or some of those who are responsible in the area of atomic energy have not given proper credence to some of the assertions which have been made by those who are deeply concerned by the degree of radioactive fallout.

I make one other prediction. There will be more of radioactive fallout, because there is a great deal of difference in atomic explosions or thermonuclear explosions in the area of the equator, which explosions result in radioactive fallout coming over a long period of time, in very small amounts, as compared with explosions in what we call the northern areas, or in the sub-Arctic areas, in which radioactive fallout results very rapidly, in very large amounts.

What we are getting right now, this month, is a considerable amount of radioactive debris of the tests of last

spring and last fall. There is yet more to come.

The Senator from Oregon is correct in his statement as to the dangers involved in this matter. I am not a scientist, and I do not say the dangers are beyond human endurance or that the dangers will adversely affect personal health; but I know there is deep concern on the part of some. As such, it appears to me that a government which is based on Judaic-Christian principles ought to express a concern that goes far beyond what we have heard or seen.

I thank the Senator from Oregon for what he has said. I assure him that no effort will be spared by the chairman of the Subcommittee on Disarmament to see that this matter is looked into meticulously and objectively—and I repeat "objectively."

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I am making this statement today, among other reasons, for the reason that I see the Senator from Minnesota present on the floor, and I wanted to give him the backing to which I think he is entitled, because his has been one of the few voices in the last 2 or 3 years raised in a courageous cry of warning to the American people about the matter of nuclear testing.

I have stood with him before. The work he is doing impressed me greatly the other day, when I attended his committee meeting. I supported him there, and I am making these statements today in support of the moral principle the Senator from Minnesota has been defending for some time.

Before going to the next point in the observations which I desire to make, let me repeat, from a little different angle, what I consider to be the right of the populations of other nations, not involved in the manufacture of nuclear weapons, to say to Russia and the United States and our allies, "We are going to judge you, so far as your intentions of peace are concerned, to the extent that you proceed to conform to moral principles in the field of international relations." We are not conforming to obvious principles of morality when we continue a course of atomic weapon manufacturing and testing, any one of which weapons, as Nehru pointed out in the historic debate to which I referred, once discharged, will start a holocaust which will produce the inevitable result I now want to mention.

It was interesting the other day to listen to the military officials of our Government say before the Humphrey committee, "But the scientists are in disagreement as to what the present danger of fallout is." To which I said, as I have stated, "Does that mean, General, that because the scientists are in disagreement, there is no danger?"

It was at that point I said to the Senator from Minnesota, referring to what he has said the committee is going to do. "I think you owe it to the Senate to see to it that an exhaustive study is made by the Disarmament Subcommittee in regard to the dangers of this fallout."

Mr. President, I know of no disagreement among the scientists, as to the possibility of danger and this is the important point to keep in mind. I would have the American people keep it in mind, as we hear more and more open advocacy in this country of a preventive war philosophy. I never thought I would live so long as to read, openly stated in the American press and periodicals, suggestions which almost reach the point of proposals and recommendations that we notify the world we may involve ourselves in a preventive war and that perhaps we should serve notice that we may make a strike before an act of aggression in fact is committed against us.

We cannot reconcile that with our historic record. We cannot reconcile it, if we want to talk with Asians and Africans, with our professions that we seek peace. I think the talk in this country about a preventive war, or proposals about a strike or giving warning that we may make a strike, is going to cost us dearly in world prestige if we do not stop.

The President in his last press conference the other day scotched the idea, and I commend him for it, but we have to go beyond that, because it is recognized that if a nuclear war starts and Russia and the United States let loose on this world the nuclear weapons ready for discharge, it not only will do irreparable damage to life, human, and animal, in all those parts of the world where the radiation will reach life, and it not only will do irreparable damage in the immediate present, but it will continue to damage life for several thousand years.

It will not end life, of course. There will be life remaining. However, in those areas of the world—and they will be large parts of the world—the radiation, I understand, will continue to damage life for several thousand years.

Senators can see why I am talking about a matter of morality. Senators can see why I am suggesting that we had better take a look at the future, for centuries to come. We must stop a course of warlike action, and so must Russia, since that course of action threatens such damage to the sanctity of life.

It is easy to say that, but a fair question is, Then what should we do about implementation? Of course, if there is no hope for reason, then all is lost, anyway. But I am not ready, Mr. President, to take the position that reason cannot prevail, even with Communists. That is why I think we should keep ourselves strong and make it clear to Khrushchev that we do not intend to be intimidated by him in respect to Berlin or in respect to any other place in which he wants to try to threaten us.

U.S. SHOULD REMAIN WILLING TO TALK AT ANY LEVEL

We should make clear, however, that we are willing to sit down and let reason operate, on any level—on the top level, on the intermediate level, or on the lower echelon.

We should make perfectly clear to Russia that we are willing to submit any of these issues to the judicial processes of the United Nations for determination. For example, Mr. President, as a Nation we have yet to propose requesting the first advisory opinion of the World Court on an international issue.

That is unbelievable but true. Instead, we have been following the Dulles course of massive retaliation, of threatening the world with atomic bombers encircling large segments of the world carrying nuclear warheads. Do we think that has made any friends for us in Asia or Africa?

Mr. President, no one prays any harder for the recovery of the Secretary of State than I, because I wish personal misfortune to no man, but let the RECORD be perfectly clear I am as much opposed to his foreign policies over all now as I ever was, because in my judgment the mistaken foreign policies of John Foster Dulles have put us in the precarious position in which we find ourselves in the world today, so far as Asia and Africa are concerned.

The Senator from Pennsylvania in his speech this afternoon calling for congressional consideration of American foreign policies was absolutely correct. We must make perfectly clear that we have no executive dictatorship in this country in any phase of government, including foreign policy.

Mr. President, I think there must be a great change in American foreign policy from that which has prevailed under John Foster Dulles. I think we must make very clear that we are not going to yield to the intimidation of Russia in Berlin, but that we are ready to submit to the judicial processes of the United Nations the international law issues which are raised by Russian policy on Berlin.

WE SHOULD ALSO TAKE OUR TREATY RIGHTS TO COURT

We say—and rightly so—that our rights in Berlin rest upon international treaties. So they do. Certainly we are not afraid to have them reviewed by an international judicial tribunal, are we? We are not worried, I hope, about the application of the rule of law to any issue involving the United States. I think Russia is, because on issue after issue she would lose if the rule of law were applied.

What we must do in the field of foreign policy is to try to get the facts before the world through media and tribunals recognized as impartial, so as to demonstrate to the people of the world that it is not true that we seek a preventive war.

That is why I think we should change our policy in regard to nuclear testing. That is why I think we should change our course of action in regard to threatened use of nuclear warfare. That is why I think we should start submitting these issues, by way of offer on our part, to judicial processes for determination.

I am not afraid of a summit meeting. What a great case, and what a great forum would be afforded if the President of the United States were to go to a summit meeting and "lay it on the line" to Khrushchev—"This is our proposal for a German settlement. What is yours? As for our rights under existing agreements, we are ready to submit them to the rule of law through judicial processes."

We cannot long continue, nor can Russia, the mad buildup of a nuclear armament race, without placing mankind in the jeopardy of having all life, animal and human, for several thousand years greatly damaged in those areas of the globe where radiation from nuclear war would reach.

I say these things tonight, with the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] in the Chamber, and with the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] in the chair, not for the sake of agreement, but because if we are to follow the course of action which the Senator from Pennsylvania has suggested in his speech, we must be willing, as a Congress, to come to grips with the facts. We must come to grips with the fact that, although we do not like it, in many parts of the world we are already condemned as an immoral nation. So is Russia. However, it does not make me any happier to take a look at my cellmate.

Mr. President, I turn now to another subject briefly.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon has the floor.

THE SITUATION IN BOLIVIA

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Latin American Affairs of the Committee on Foreign Relations, I wish to make a very brief comment on the very serious situation which exists in Bolivia.

Our committee has been informed that the demonstrations in Bolivia were the immediate result of a story which appeared in the Latin American edition of Time magazine, in which the magazine made the following statement:

> The only solution to the Bolivian problem is to abolish Bolivia and let the neighbors divide the country and solve the problem.

It is alleged that some member of the American Embassy in La Paz made this unfortunate remark in the form of a wisecrack or facetious statement. The American Embassy denies that the remark was made. As yet I have read no denial from Time magazine.

Whether it was made or not, the important thing is that the situation in Bolivia was so delicate that the belief that it was made set off the demonstration. That is the important thing for us to keep in mind.

The demonstrations apparently were participated in by extremists. I am inclined to believe, on the basis of such information received so far, that it is probably true that both the extreme leftists and the extreme rightists were involved. It is interesting to note that in a moment of hysteria the extreme totalitarians, representing extreme points of view, namely, Communists and Fascists, seem to come together.

But be that as it may, I am also satisfied that these demonstrations do not represent the basic good feeling of the overwhelming majority of the Bolivian people toward the American people. I think they recognize that the Americans are their friends. Officials of the Bolivian Government have made it very clear to us that they are friendly toward us. It was unfortunate that Time magazine published this statement, but Time magazine will have to answer for its own journalistic irresponsibility.

ECONOMIC PROGRESS IN BOLIVIA

Something needs to be said this afternoon about the progress which is being made in Bolivia. Bolivia is not subject to all the adverse evaluations of its economic progress that we have been hearing about.

I hold in my hand a report dated February 13, 1959, in Business International, which is a business information publication service maintained by a very distinguished businessman in this country, a man who has the confidence of the American business community. I refer to Mr. Eldridge Haynes.

I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks the material beginning on page 2 of the February 13, 1959, issue of Business International, under the heading "Bolivian Stabilization Progress May Open Up Lush New Markets."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BOLIVIAN STABILIZATION PROGRESS MAY OPEN UP LUSH NEW MARKET

The progress made thus far by Bolivia's rigorous stabilization program gives promise that the "beggar on a throne of gold" is on the verge of enjoying his inheritance. For U.S. manufacturers this could mean greater consumer goods sales as food imports decline, freeing foreign exchange, and purchasing power increases; new sales opportunities in the machinery and equipment field, as a start on the long-planned Bolivian development program becomes feasible; the prospect of a second Venezuela, as oil hopes brighten; and eventually, interesting investment possibilities in an economically and politically stable country offering tangible investment concessions and inducements.

In the period from December 1956, when the stabilization program began (Business International, Jan. 4, 1957, p. 8), to the present:

The boliviano, which rose immediately to 7,500 per dollar, has slumped back slowly to its starting point (12,000 per dollar) but not gone over it.

Similarly, the cost-of-living index, which fell 18 percent, has climbed back to but not exceeded the December 1956 level.

Bolivia has paid off $25 million of its foreign obligations ($15 million during 1957; $10 million during 1958).

Agricultural production has ballooned more than 80 percent (over the past 4 years). During 1954, Bolivia imported wheat to the amount of $14 million, last year only $1 million. Increased production in rice, sugar, vegetables, citrus and other food commodities have reduced even further Bolivia's foreign exchange spending.

The country has opened its doors to foreign private investment, with millions of dollars pouring into the nation's oilfields.

The communications system has been improved to such an extent that for the first time in the country's history its roads were kept open the year round in 1958.

A democratic government has withstood the temptation to use totalitarian methods in overcoming opposition to the austerity program.

The record would have been even better had the country's foreign exchange earnings during the period not dropped to their lowest point in recent history. Export earnings from 1952 through 1956 averaged $110 million yearly but for 1957 dropped to $90 million and during 1958 fell to $65 million, owing to tightened tin quotas and lower tin prices. Even U.S. aid, vital to the country's stability, fell off from an average $25 million yearly to $19 million in 1958.

But the biggest problem has been labor. During 1958 Bolivia suffered from no less than 500 strikes, and 9 more have taken place since the first of the year. In all of them, private industry or the Bolivian Government was obliged to grant wage increases and other benefits detrimental to the stabilization program. Principal agitator behind most of the strikes: labor boss Juan Lechin.

The solution to these deterrents appears to be in sight, however. The government was vastly encouraged by the outcome of a recent 10-day Lechin-inspired bank strike, which threatened to undermine the entire austerity effort. The strike was finally brought to end when other union members (mostly miners, who were hardest hit by the stabilization program) marched through the streets of La Paz carrying placards with the legend "Beware Lechin" (an ex-miner himself). The government feels that at last it can look forward to a period of relative labor calm, since Lechin's influence has vastly waned as a result of this upset.

Higher tin prices, more liberal quotas from the International Tin Council, a revival of U.S. aid (to $23 million this year), and the possibility of the United States purchasing tin for its own stockpile should all help Bolivia's cause.

PLAN TO ATTRACT INVESTMENT

As one immediate result of the progress already made, International Monetary Fund officials say that Bolivia may soon be in a position to carry out its long-planned Bs2CO billion (more than $16.5 million) investment development program. Funds would be used to purchase machinery and other materials for the Bolivian state oil agency, the state mining corporation, communications and irrigation projects, and other development plans such as power and agriculture.

At the same time, the U.S. Development Loan Fund has agreed to a $2.5 million loan to Gasser y Cia., Industrias La Belgica SA, for expanding its sugar mill near Santa Cruz. Aside from saving Bolivia $1.1 million annually in sugar imports, this project will increase employment and stimulate agricultural production in the area.

As a result of the country's liberal petroleum code, 11 U.S. firms hold large concessions in the heart of the Bolivian oil lands. Active exploration activities are being carried out, while the Gulf Oil Co. expects to begin drilling its third, fourth, and fifth wells this summer. It says indications of a strike are good. The Bolivian American Oil Co. feels that Bolivia could become a second Venezuela, offering another lush import market.

Taking heart at the excellent results of the petroleum code, the Bolivian Minister of Economy, Jorge Tamayo, is preparing a new general investments code soon to be presented to the Bolivian Congress. Under the new code, private investment capital would enjoy new benefits and guarantees, including tax exemptions of up to 10 years; 50 percent income tax reduction on reinvested profits; exemption from import duties and fees on all machinery, equipment, tools, and other materials; exemption from all export taxes and of up to 5 years from any new direct taxes instituted subsequent to the investment.

Mr. MORSE. The report states that the Government of Bolivia is doing a very much better job than some of the adverse reports would seem to indicate.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks, with the editing I have done in order to con-

form to the rules of the Senate, a very fine editorial entitled "The Bolivian Explosion," published in the New York Times of today.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE BOLIVIAN EXPLOSION

There are many reasons for feeling disturbed over the anti-American riots in La Paz, Bolivia, but two sources of anxiety are obviously overruling. There is, first, the new evidence that hostility to the United States is always close to the surface in many Latin American countries. The other problem lies in Bolivia itself—whether this disturbance will not worsen the already precarious political and economic state of the nation.

As always, one must in fairness try to understand why the people of the country involved felt and reacted the way they did. It so happens that geopolitical theoreticians in Latin America have for years speculated in their irresponsible and impractical way on the supposed desirability of Bolivia, which is desperately poor and landlocked, being divided up among her neighbors. When, therefore, Time magazine in its Latin American edition quoted an American official at the Embassy in La Paz as favoring such a solution, even in jest, a raw, sensitive nerve was touched.

Add to this fact the economic distress, the opportunity offered to the political opposition, the agitation of labor union extremists, some of them Trotskyite, and the always latent anti-Yankee feelings and the result seems natural. The government of President Hernan Siles Zuazo was slow to realize the danger, but when the President reacted he did so firmly and intelligently.

What happened was deplorable, but it should not be allowed to destroy or even lessen the good and useful relationship between our two countries. Bolivians should recognize the great efforts that the United States has made in recent years to help them. * * * Fortunately, Bolivia's Foreign Minister, Victor Andrade, was for years Ambassador in Washington. He and President Siles know the extent of American good will and how much it means to Bolivia.

Mr. MORSE. Also, with some editing in order to conform to the rules of the Senate, I ask to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks an editorial entitled "The Bolivian Tempest," published in the March 4, 1959, edition of the Washington Post.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE BOLIVIAN TEMPEST

Words as well as deeds can be an incitement to violence, as the mob disorder in Bolivia demonstrates in a distressingly vivid way. What immediately precipitated the riots in La Paz was some injudicious language in Time magazine, and some even more injudicious words from Capitol Hill could worsen matters further. Political passions are quickly stirred in the impoverished and mountainous republic, and there can be no minimizing of the grave peril in which some 1,800 U.S. citizens in Bolivia have been placed. The State Department has protested the attacks on the Embassy, and has taken steps to move U.S. citizens to the suburbs where armed protection can be more effectively provided.

The circumstances fully justify this action. * * * What earthly purpose is served by threatening to send troops and cut off U.S. aid unless the disorder is immediately halted. Words like these are especially inflammatory in a country where it is not fully understood. * * *

Doubtless Time was ill advised to quote an anonymous U.S. Embassy source as saying with misplaced jocularity that the solution to Bolivia's problems is to "abolish" the country. But it should also be noted that the riots are providing an outlet for anti-government passions in a country governed by a badly divided party with a volatile tradition.

Mr. MORSE. These newspapers are performing a great service in making the American people appreciate the fact that when some unfortunate incident such as that which occurred in Bolivia takes place, we must try to understand.

We must study what happened before we condemn. We must ask ourselves the questions, "Why should an incident that seems so minor to us cause such an uproar? What can we do, what should we do, what is it reasonable to expect us to do, in order to alleviate the situation which gives rise to such an anti-American demonstration?"

Of course we must get across to the Bolivian people the facts about our record. I wish to put some of those facts into the RECORD this evening.

From 1952 through June 30, 1958, our grant aid to Bolivia has been $91,300,000. In 1959 there will be a technical aid program of an additional $5.5 million. A surprising amount of this aid has gone for foodstuffs. Following the briefing of my subcommittee the other day by the Assistant Secretary of State in Charge on Latin American Affairs, I commented upon the large amount of foodstuffs which had been shipped to Bolivia. In commenting upon it, I used an American colloquialism, well understood in this country. Although I have no reason to believe that it was misunderstood in Bolivia, I got to thinking about it today, and decided that in talking about Bolivia on the floor of the Senate, I would make perfectly clear what I had in mind in using a perfectly good American colloquialism in talking about these millions of dollars in foodstuffs that we have sent to Bolivia. In making my comments I expressed satisfaction that the Bolivian people appreciate our action, that we have a great reservoir of friendship there because of it, and I did not think the Bolivian people were people who would bite the hand that feeds them.

A Latin American may not understand that colloquialism, or might give it an interpretation not intended. Therefore I wish to say this evening, in discussing these figures on foodstuffs, that what I meant was that I believe the Bolivian people appreciate that we came to them in a period of great economic emergency which has existed in their country from 1950 to today, and that out of the great characteristic of generosity of the American people, expressed through our Government, we have provided them with a good many millions of dollars worth of foodstuffs.

That act on our part, that act of friendship, speaks louder than any words of friendship we can utter. What I meant by my colloquialism was that I am satisfied that the Bolivian people understand that demonstration of a good neighbor policy on the part of the American people to the Bolivian people.

I ask unanimous consent that there be inserted in the RECORD at this point a table showing our mutual aid program which we have conducted in Bolivia since 1952, along with the footnotes in explanation of the table, to be found at page 1711 of our committee report on the Mutual Security Act of 1958.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Bolivia

Population: 3.3 million.
Per capita GNP: $73.
Program started: Fiscal year 1952 (mutua security program).

[Obligations in millions]

	Fiscal year 1956	Fiscal year 1957	Fiscal year 1958 (estimated)	Cumulative through June 30, 1958
Economic aid by category:				
Total	$25.4	$23.3	$20.1	$91.3
Defense support	-------	20.0	-------	20.0
Development assistance	22.9	-------	-------	31.4
Technical cooperation	2.5	3.3	3.1	17.0
Special assistance	-------	-------	17.0	17.0
Other	-------	-------	-------	5.9
Economic aid by type:				
Project aid	$4.4	$3.3	$4.2	$20.3
Nonproject aid	21.0	20.0	15.9	71.0
(Surplus commodities)	(17.1)	(7.7)	(------)	(------)

U.S. interests: In 1952, a social revolution, led by an armed populace, overthrew a regime which had a vested interest in large mineral holdings. Large-scale social and economic changes were effected including mine expropriation and agrarian reform. Inflation became critical and the new government requested assistance in monetary stabilization from the United States. Within the framework of a monetary stabilization program, U.S. objectives are to provide and support measures designed to increase production, diversify and stabilize the economy, maintain political stability, and provide productive employment opportunities for the 70 percent Indian population which lies outside the commercial framework of the country. In spite of the progress achieved so far by the Government's economic stabilization program the Bolivian economy remains somewhat precarious.

Military program: None.

Economic program: Special assistance aid provides project and nonproject aid primarily designed for short-term objectives. Technical cooperation primarily provides project assistance designed for long-term objectives.

Project aid: Directed at expanding and improving agriculture, education, public health, highway maintenance, credit facilities, atmosphere for foreign investment, and resettlement for surplus labor. Local currency from counterpart and section 402 is used for budgetary support and in general support of project aid.

Nonproject aid: Consists of sugar, aviation gas, agricultural and earth-moving equipment, and section 402 wheat and flour.

Loans: No loans made to Bolivia under the mutual security program.

Public Law 480: A title I sales agreement for $6.8 million was signed during fiscal year 1957 but has not yet been consummated. Bolivia also had received $17.9 million in emergency food supplies by the end of fiscal year 1957, under title II.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD that part of a table found at page S–19 of the foreign grants and credits by the U.S. Government for the total postwar period, the fiscal year 1957, and the fiscal year 1958, which deals with the country of Bolivia. It shows that since July 1, 1945, the U.S. Government has made available to Bolivia in grants and credits a total of $139 million, and that means in grants and loans from the Export-Import Bank, for example, and other lending sources.

There being no objection, the excerpt from the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD.

Summary of foreign grants and credits

[In millions of dollars]

	Total postwar period	Fiscal year 1957	Total	Fiscal year 1958			
				July–September 1957	October–December 1957	January–March 1958	April–June 1958
Bolivia:							
Net grants and credits	139	23	31	4	13	7	8
Net grants	105	23	32	4	13	7	9
Gross grants	105	23	32	4	13	7	9
Less Reverse grants and returns	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)		(1)	
Net credits	34	—*	—*	—*	—*	—*	—*
New credits	43	1	(1)			(1)	
Less principal collections	9	1	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)

[1] Less than $500,000.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, from the floor of the Senate today I wish to say to the Bolivian Ambassador in Washington and to the people of Bolivia that these are the facts which show our friendship for the people of Bolivia.

These facts are our rebuttal to the unfortunate news item printed in Time magazine that seemed to reflect a contemptuous attitude on the part of the United States which, in fact, is not the true attitude of either the Government of the United States or the people of the United States.

To Bolivia I would say that there is no doubt about the fact that the Government of the United States and the people of the United States seek only to strengthen our bonds of friendship. We know that whatever the domestic situation may be which exists at the present time in Bolivia, it will be resolved and that at a very early time the friendly ties which existed prior to these unfortunate demonstrations in Bolivia will be reestablished.

AN ANSWER TO THE WHEAT PROBLEM

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, on February 19 I was pleased to join with the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON] in cosponsoring the bill, S. 1140, to stabilize the Nation's wheat program.

The new wheat proposal is discussed briefly, but in excellent fashion in an article written by Mr. Clancy Jean, of Pendleton, Oreg., executive vice president of the Oregon Wheat Growers League, published in the February 5, 1959, issue of the Oregon Farmer.

I ask unanimous consent that the full text of this article be included in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GROWERS SEEK AN ANSWER TO THE WHEAT PROBLEM—SUGGESTED BY THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF WHEATGROWERS: A MODIFICATION OF THE TWO-PRICE PLAN AND BUSHEL ALLOTMENTS

(By Clancy Jean, executive vice president, Oregon Wheat League)

Only a person completely sheltered from newspapers, magazines, radio and television doesn't know that "wheat is the No. 1 farm problem in the United States today."

It might be of some interest to take a look at what the wheat growers have to say about the problem, since it is they who, in the final analysis, will have to make the necessary adjustments if a path is to be blazed out of the present maze.

When the National Association of Wheat Growers met for its ninth annual convention in Denver just before Christmas, growers took a long, hard look at their own situation and at the national picture.

Essentially, they gave cognizance to two basic factors: (1) There's lots of wheat. Further, in any evaluation of the present program, which resulted in the 1958 wheat crop of 1,450,000,000 bushels, it is evident that present production control laws are inadequate. It would apear that, with respect to this point, they would be in agreement with Secretary Benson. So, the growers say a new approach is needed to stabilize production.

(2) From the grower's standpoint, the most pressing problem is that of maintaining sufficient income to purchase the products of industry and labor, which he needs for his operation as well as to retain a satisfactory standard of living in face of reduced acreage and rising costs of production. Thus, a new approach is definitely needed to stabilize income.

In developing their plan the Nation's wheat growers kept four basic concepts in mind:

Wheat growers' net income must be maintained if they are to reduce production below the current level;

The build-up of CCC stocks must be stopped and gradually reduced to a normal level;

Further reduction in acreage of wheat must not be shifted to other crops;

Increased yields per acre must not be reflected in increased Government holdings of wheat.

What is needed, the growers say, is to stop the buildup of Commodity Credit's stocks, and even reduce them, while also reducing production through a program that takes increased yields into consideration and prevents diverted wheat acres from creating problems with other crops—do these things and maintain growers' incomes.

To accomplish this the Nation's wheat producers are proposing a production and income stabilization plan.

First off, they say, do away with acreage allotments and checking of compliance along with current marketing quotas—and substitute for these marketing allotments expressed in bushels.

They want marketing allotments based on the wheat base acreage for the average of the 1952–53 planted acreage. Each farm would receive a bushel allotment. This would be arrived at by multiplying the base acreage by the normal yield per acre, factored to the county allotment. Normal yields, they say, should be based on the period that provides the most equitable relationship between counties and States.

For example, it would have worked out this way for 1958:

(1) Estimated amount used for food in the United States, 485 million bushels.

(2) Estimated amount of U.S. exports, 430 million bushels.

(3) Total estimated demand, 915 million bushels.

(4) Less amount of wheat to be moved out of CCC stocks each year, 75 million bushels.

National marketing allotment, 840 million bushels.

The plan also calls for price supports of $1.60 per bushel for the national marketing allotment. This allotment, as shown above, would be spelled out for each farm in bushels and there would be a price support on this amount of $1.60 per bushel.

In addition, certificates would be issued on each grower's share of the 485 million bushels used for food in the United States. These certificates would be redeemable in an amount to return to the grower full parity on that portion of his production. Using 1958 as an example, food uses of wheat were equal to about 60 percent of the national marketing allotment suggested by the plan.

But, in order to be eligible to receive these certificates, the grower would have to put at least 20 percent—but not more than 30 percent—of his wheat base in the conservation reserve. Moreover, wheatgrowers insist that neither the $5,000 limitation nor the depletion of the soil bank base requirements should apply under this plan. They recognize, moreover, that a suitable cover must be maintained on the acreage placed in the conservation reserve.

Nor is this all the plan includes. The growers further believe that redemption of the certificates should be provided through the sale of the certificates to processors. This provision is taken from the domestic parity plan, long advocated by wheatgrowers. This would relieve the taxpayer of a major part of the costs of the stabilization plan, it is pointed out.

Wheat growers have long held that they are entitled to full parity for at least that portion of their crop that is used for food consumption in the United States.

The proposal, officers of the National Association of Wheat Growers maintain, would save the Federal Government an estimated $500 million per year, based on current costs. A condensed list of the possible savings shows the program would save the Federal Government $100 million from reduced export subsidies; $75 million for the annual storage costs of the proposed defense stockpile and remaining CCC stocks; $10 million for administrative costs due to elimination of acreage allotments and market quotas; $310 million, brought about by not only arresting the annual increase in CCC stocks, but also by moving 75 million bushels from CCC stocks each year.

Additionally, the growers' plan calls for no restrictions on the use of wheat on farms where produced or when sold to other farmers or to bonded feed processors.

As outlined, the plan would provide a wheatgrower with income from four sources: (1) He would receive $1.60 (approximately 65 percent of parity) for his share of the national allotment, which is computed to be 840 million bushels for 1958; (2) about 60 percent of his bushel quota would be eligible to receive certificates, which when redeemed would provide him full parity on this part of his production; (3) he would receive soilbank payments from placing 20 to 30 percent of his wheat base acreage in the conservation reserve, which is a requisite of the plan in order to obtain certificates; and (4) should his production exceed his bushel allotment, this wheat could be marketed only to bonded feed processors, other farmers, or fed on his own farm—at no support level at all.

To implement the program, the growers believe that at least 500 million bushels of the present CCC stocks should be set aside in a defense stockpile. The wheatgrowers point out that stockpiles of food are equal in importance to munitions and strategic materials and this stockpile, like others, should be maintained as part of our national defense program. This is generally recognized as the minimum level of carryover advisable under current world tensions. The growers also note that costs of storage could be greatly reduced if bids for this defense stockpile were asked on a 5-year contract with a schedule of premiums and discounts that would permit turning of stocks by warehousemen.

The National Association of Wheat Growers insist the proposal will work only if adopted in its entirety. The association proposes that the plan be offered to farmers in a national referendum. Eligibility to vote would be based on those eligible to vote in the last wheat marketing quota referendum, and a simple majority of those voting should be sufficient to make it effective.

THE DISPLACED FAMILY PROBLEM

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the Washington Post on March 2, 1959, in an editorial entitled "Displaced Family Problem" has, once again, performed a public service to the Washington community by directing attention to the need for adequate public housing in the Capital.

Two years ago, in company with my distinguished friend and colleague from Pennsylvania, Senator CLARK, I had occasion to visit and compare living conditions in the slums against those prevailing in public housng. He will remember, as I do, the shocking conditions, the human degradation, the squalor, and the filth which we found in the slum area. The contrast with public housing was complete. In the latter, the families were decently housed, the children were clean and although in the case of one family, the mother had a serious physical disability, there was a feeling and an atmosphere which bespoke assurance that the children's values as they matured would be those we like to think of as typically American. By exposure to health and decency, those children, in my judgment, will be better prepared when the time comes for them to fill the role of parents.

The important point which I wish to stress today, Mr. President, is that unless wise and careful planning is done now, and unless provision is made for decent housing for families displaced by urban renewal and by our highway programs, we run the grave risk of perpetuating and extending our slums.

The proposals for solutions to the problem suggested by the editorial, those for example which seek the rehabilitation of existing family housing, and the writing down of the cost of reclaimed and cleared slum properties, are worthy of careful consideration. I would also suggest that the Federal Government itself can do much to meet the problem by turning over to the public housing authorities at nominal cost, properties which are surplus to the needs of the executive branch.

In view of the direct and hidden costs of slum housing to the Capital, the use for decent low-income housing of such areas as the National Training School for Boys site, the Bolling Field Airbase site, and others, would seem proper and justified. I sincerely hope that this suggestion and those made in the report of the Commissioners' Committee on Public Housing Sites be given thoughtful consideration followed by swift action on the part of those charged with responsibility in these areas.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial to which I have alluded be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DISPLACED FAMILY PROBLEM

The community needs to ponder carefully the report of the Commissioners' Committee on Public Housing Sites. It says, in effect, that new thinking about public housing is essential if the city is to continue its fight against slums and blight. Indeed, new means of housing displaced families will have to be found if the city is to cope with its traffic congestion by building the Inner Loop and to go forward with construction urgently needed by governmental agencies. The basic fact is that there is almost no vacant land left in the District. Thus projects of any substanstial size involve displacement of people, and housing for at least some of them must be found.

More than 4,000 public housing units will be needed in the District in the next few years, the Committee found, to permit vital urban renewal propects to go forward. It is hoped that the National Capital Housing Authority may be able to meet some of this need by building in slum areas taken over by the Redevelopment Land Agency. But this will necessitate a write-down in the cost of reclaimed and cleared slum properties, for the addition of full acquisition and clearing costs to building costs would push the total outlay per unit above the maximum fixed by the Public Housing Administration for projects eligible for rental subsidies. Some relief may thus be forthcoming, but it certainly will not go far enough.

The Committee suggests that the NCHA also be authorized to acquire existing houses in specified areas with the object of rehabilitating them for public housing use. The acquisition of some large older dwellings would greatly ease the problem of housing large families. It is virtually impossible to build new units for these families within the PHA's cost limitations. Purchase of individual houses or relatively small groups of houses would also tend to overcome the mounting objections to large institutionalized projects for low-income families.

Some communities have tried to meet the problem of excessive site costs by building multistory apartments, but these are particularly unsuitable to the large families with small children that the District needs especially to house. The two feasible alternatives appear to be write-downs for cleared land and greater flexibility in the acquisition of low-cost housing already in use. There is no really valid distinction between building new public housing projects for low-income families and purchasing on the open market of existing structures for this purpose, except that the latter course is easier on the public purse. Certainly the Capital City cannot permit its progress in clearing slums and rebuilding blighted areas to be cut off for want of feasible means of relocating displaced families.

PRICE SUPPORT PAYMENTS

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, recently the distinguished senior Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] had occasion to address the Senate upon the subject of price support payments. In the course of his address he cited an Oregonian, Mrs. Amanda Duvall, of Heppner, Oreg., as receiving a payment of $104,944. The speech was carried upon the press wires.

Mr. Al Lamb, manager of the Morrow County Grain Growers, Inc., has brought to my attention certain facts which suggest that the whole story was not made clear in the presentation to the Senate. I feel sure that the facts were not available to the Senator from Delaware, for if they had been, I am confident that he would have made reference to them.

In order that the complete picture may be presented, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Lamb's letter, dated February 27, which shows that Mrs. Duvall redeemed 26,195 bushels of her wheat at a cost to her of $47,736.96 in principal, interest, and loan charges, be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MORROW COUNTY GRAIN GROWERS, INC.,
Lexington, Oreg., February 27, 1959.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senator, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I feel the recent Associated Press report quoting Senator JOHN J. WILLIAMS in reference to the 1957 price-support payments to Mrs. Amanda Duvall, of Heppner, does an injustice by way of not giving the full story.

Actually Mrs. Duvall took CCC loans amounting to $104,944 on her 1957 crop of wheat and barley. What isn't reported is that Mrs. Duvall redeemed 26,195 bushels of her wheat which was under loan prior to the Government takeover date at a cost to her of $47,736.96. This sum was paid CCC as payment of principal and interest plus loan charges by Mrs. Duvall who then marketed the 26,195 bushels through this cooperative.

The above-mentioned payment of almost $50,000 reduces the tota cash benefits by this figure. In addition the CCC took full title to the balance of her 1957 crop of wheat, amounting to 10,912 bushels, stored in our elevators, plus her full harvested crop of barley. The wheat she redeemed and sold was in her own farm storage and carried a later loan date hence lower interest charges.

The market value of the commodities taken over by the Government amounted to

very nearly the loan price plus interest and charges. Reducing the total cash received by the amount paid back by Mrs. Duvall plus the value of the grain surrendered certainly pares the net benefits received to a very low figure.

While admitedly there are defects in the present farm law, it hardly seems fair to this writer that Mrs. Duvall, a widow whose only daughter was killed not long ago, should be held up as a horrible example by a Member of the U.S. Senate. Mrs. Duvall is a successful farmer whose farming operations are an example to her neighbors, and she is one that has always complied with the letter and spirit of the law. It seems to the writer that those who wish to make political hay out of the results of the present administration of the Farm Price-Supports Act, might do well to turn their guns against those largely responsible for results rather than on hard-working farmers who are also taxpayers.

Sincerely,

AL LAMB, *Manager.*

INTERNATIONAL MEDICAL RESEARCH

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, one of the most gratifying developments in these early months of the 86th Congress has been the commencement of early hearings on a bill which I am convinced will become one of the great landmarks of this or any other Congress.

I refer to the important Senate Joint Resolution 41, authored by the dean of the Senate's health legislation, the esteemed senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] to create a National Institute for International Medical Research.

I have been pleased to note the unanimity with which the bill has been greeted not only by the medical profession and other professions in the healing arts, but by the American people generally.

It is my pleasure and privilege to be one of the cosponsors of this bill, along with well over half the Members of the Senate, including the majority leader, the distinguished Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON], who shares the deepest of interest in advancing human health everywhere.

BUREAU OF THE BUDGET POSITION OVERLY RESTRICTIVE

It is my understanding that next week, the administration's leading experts in the health field will testify on the bill. It is my further understanding that they will endorse the principle of the bill. I am delighted that S.J. Res. 41 will have their general support.

The only question which remains—and it is a very big question—is the level of specific financial authorization for the bill.

Here the controlling factor which persists in the administration's mind is apparently the restrictive position of the Bureau of the Budget.

I should like to point out, however, that $50 million as proposed by the Senator from Alabama amounts to one-fourteenth of 1 percent of the overall budget expenditures which will be incurred this year.

Fifty million dollars amounts to less than 33 cents per person in the United States per year.

It is my hope that whether the administration specifically approves the Hill bill's authorization level or not the bill in its final form will, indeed, contain the $50 million figure.

We are all aware of the fact that the appropriation process is entirely separate from the present authorization process. We know that the Senate and House Committees on Appropriations can independently judge later on as to the exact amount which should actually be allocated in any given fiscal year.

MY EUROPEAN TRIP CONFIRMED RESEARCH NEED

So far as I am concerned, I do not have any doubt that there is needed right now for a great many deserving international research projects, a very considerable sum of money—in the millions of dollars.

I do not base this estimate on conjecture; I base it upon the findings of my tour of Western European countries in November and December of 1958.

In instance after instance, I heard from French, British, Norwegian, Swedish, Finnish, and other scientists of specific under-nourished projects where speedy American assistance might prove virtually indispensable toward unlocking the answers to major diseases.

So, LISTER HILL's great bill is needed now—today. I earnestly hope that money under it will actually start moving through the pipeline not next year, but in this calendar year, itself.

SUBCOMMITTEE PRINT CONFIRMS LEGAL GAPS IN AUTHORITY

There are two other points: It is essential, as the Senator from Alabama contends, that there be adequate statutory authority for the support of international medical research.

Tomorrow, there will be released the second committee print, prepared by the Subcommittee on Reorganization and International Organizations, of which I am privileged to be chairman, in the Committee on Government Operations. This print is entitled "Statutory Authority for Medical and Other Health-Related Research in the U.S. Government—the Basis for International Cooperation."

The print documents the fact that although there is broad general authority now for the conduct of overseas medical research, there are certain omissions so far as specific authority is concerned.

On page X of the introduction, I point out that a specific mandate would indeed appear to be in order. A mandate for what purpose? A legal mandate for greatly expanded medical research.

I point out further that Congress has indicated, time and time again, its virtually unanimous support for the superb work which is being done by the medical research arms of the United States Government, notably the great National Institutes of Health under Dr. James Shannon. Now, at last, under the Hill bill, the NIH will be given the full and specific statutory authority which it needs and should have.

MY LETTER TO PRESIDENT EISENHOWER

The second point which I should like to make is that the President of the United States has likewise often signified his deep interest in this subject.

When, in December 1958, I returned from my visit with Premier Khrushchev, one of my very first acts was to visit the White House, at the invitation of President Eisenhower, in order to report to him in full as to my visit.

I discussed with him my comments in the field of health, as in other fields, with Premier Khrushchev. I am glad to say that President Eisenhower responded with warmth and interest, particularly on the subject of expanded health cooperation.

It is my earnest hope that the President will now follow through, not only by giving the Hill bill the administration's full support, but by a host of other actions.

I do not have any doubt in my mind that the officials of the executive branch who are responsible for health are fervent supporters of expanded world health cooperation. Here, I include the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, Dr. Arthur S. Flemming; the Surgeon General of the U.S. Public Health Service, Dr. LeRoy Burney; the Director of the Office of Vocational Rehabilitation, Miss Mary Switzer; ICA's Director of Health, Dr. Eugene Campbell; and many others down the line.

A great deal more remains to be done in the world health field.

ERADICATION ACTION, NOT JUST RESEARCH NEEDED

In the weeks and months ahead, I shall be submitting specific comments as to what should be done as our International Health Study proceeds. But I can say now that future action should include a bold program for the conquest of infectious diseases throughout the world, especially in the developing areas.

Here I do not refer simply to research against these diseases—for, in many instances we already know the answers to the diseases. I refer instead to the need under World Health Organization auspices to apply presently available remedies to conquer widely rampant scourges.

What are the actual methods of conquest? They range from mass immunization or vaccination to clinical treatment of the diseases; control or eradication of disease-carrying insects; and, in particular, control of human waste disposal through public health service sanitation programs in areas like Asia, Africa, the Middle East and Latin America.

Returning now to the research front, on the very day I visited the President, I confirmed some of my comments in a memorandum to the White House, which was thereafter promptly acknowledged. I have never publicly referred to this memorandum. But I believe it is so pertinent now to the consideration of the Hill bill that I ask unanimous consent to have it printed at this point in the RECORD, together with my letter to the President.

There being no objection, the letter and memorandum were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DECEMBER 9, 1958.

Hon. DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER,
The President,
The White House, Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Confirming our conversation this morning, I am enclosing in outline form, material bearing upon in-

ternational health and medical research efforts.

I want you to know how greatly I appreciated the opportunity to report to you.

With all good wishes, I am,

Sincerely,

HUBERT H. HUMPHREY.

MEMORANDUM

DECEMBER 9, 1958.

To: The President of the United States.
From: Hubert H. Humphrey.
Re data on world and medical research.

BASIC FINDING

One of the international phases of the President's message to the Congress on the state of the Union in January of 1958, has stimulated particular interest among many world leaders. This was the proposal under the theme of "Works for Peace," for expanded health cooperation to help banish disease. At that time, the President specifically invited the Soviet Union to join with the United States in combating heart disease and cancer, among other scourges.

Commencing November 17, I began a series of meetings with political, diplomatic and medical leaders in European countries for the purpose of exploring ways and means of assisting in carrying out this concept.

In every single country which I visited, including the Soviet Union, I found that this suggestion in the President's message had met with a unanimity, warmth and fervor of the very type that the United States would most desire.

BACKGROUND OF STUDY

I have been reviewing this subject in my capacity as chairman of a Subcommittee on Reorganization and International Organizations of the Senate Committee on Government Operations. Under Senate Resolution 347 of the 85th Congress, $30,000 was approved unanimously by the Senate for a study of international health research, assistance and rehabilitation activities.

This study resolution came as a part of a series of actions by the Senate in the 85th Congress among which were the following:

(1) The incorporation, at my suggestion, in the Mutual Security Act of 1958, Public Law 85–477, of two health amendments—

(a) Declaring "it to be the policy of the United States to continue and strengthen mutual efforts among the nations for research against diseases such as heart disease and cancer."

(b) Approving an amendment to the Agricultural Trade Development Act, Public Law 480, 83d Congress empowering the use of counterpart currencies for supporting scientific, including medical, research.

(2) A Senate resolution, Senate Resolution 361, inviting the President to consider the possibility of inviting the World Health Organization to approve an international health and medical research year.

Other actions, outside the Congress, have likewise advanced this general goal:

(a) The action of the United States, as announced by Dr. Milton Eisenhower at the WHO meeting in Minneapolis, making available $300,000 for the purpose of planning for an enlarged role of research by the World Health Organization.

(b) The action last Friday by the United Nations General Assembly in unanimously deciding to invite the World Health Organization to carry out its plans for an international health year. This proposal now is scheduled to come up before the WHO executive board in January and before the next meeting of the world health assembly in May.

SUBCOMMITTEE TRIP

My study tour of Western Europe included the following research centers, among others:

Geneva, the World Health Organization, including consultation with its Director General, Dr. N. G. Candau and the Chiefs of WHO specialized sections.

Paris, the Radium Institute and Hospital, the Pasteur Institute, the Maternity Hospital, and the Hospital for Sick Children.

Stockholm, the Carolinska Institute's Centers of Bacteriology and Immunology, Children's Hospital, and Institute of Cell Research.

Helsinki, the Brain-Damage Institute, the Institute for Occupational Diseases, Tumor Center, the Children's Hospital, and others.

My discussions were not limited to leading medical researchers, including Nobel Award winners, but rather extended to executive officials such as the President of Finland, diplomats, such as the Acting Foreign Minister of Norway, Departmental heads, such as the Minister of Health of France, and many others.

APPROVAL BY PREMIER KHRUSHCHEV

The most significant of my conversations during the trip was my 8-hour discussion with Soviet Premier N. S. Khrushchev. More than one-fourth of the period of our meeting was devoted to health and medical research.

I submitted to him, point by point, a series of specific suggestions. His response was uniformly favorable and, indeed, enthusiastic. The specific proposals included—

(1) The further prompt implementation and broadening of the medical exchange provisions of the Lacy-Zarubin Exchange Agreement. (This agreement, albeit limited, has in my judgment, been working out very well indeed to date.)

(2) An expanded program to speed two-way flow of medical data, including fuller and prompter exchange of medical articles, monographs, books and abstracts.

(3) Increased personal contact between Soviet and American scientists, through both correspondence and visits, as well as by greater participation in international symposia and in panels of experts of the World Health Organization.

(4) Speedy progress toward the proposed international public health and medical research year.

(5) Soviet-United States collaboration in one particular new field of universal interest, perinatal research. This would consist of a campaign of intensified research into maternal-child health, commencing prior to the birth of babies and extending through the crucial weeks following entry of the new life into the world.

I spelled out certain additional detail in my conversations with Dr. V. M. Zdhanov, Soviet Deputy Minister of Health, including a recommendation for a joint Soviet-United States rehabilitation program. This would be particularly geared to serve the needs of disabled veterans, but would include handicapped civilians as well.

ADVANTAGES TO THE UNITED STATES

Some of the advantages of further Soviet-United States cooperation in health are, in my judgment as follows:

(1) From a humanitarian interest, cooperation fulfills the creed expressed in all the religions of mankind to "heal the sick." Cooperation likewise carries out the concept of medicine, itself, in its dedication to making available knowledge, irrespective of ideology or boundary.

(2) From a diplomatic standpoint, it may help to thaw at least one phase of the cold war.

It will help to lower the wall of suspicion between the Soviet Union and the United States, because here is a field in which even the barriers of distrust tend to lessen before the common desire to serve human beings.

(3) From a practical standpoint, it will bring more and more Russian citizens into contact with Americans and other foreign nationals.

AMERICAN IMPLEMENTATION

Several specific opportunities, as I see them, await the United States:

(1) Favorable consideration by the executive and legislative branches next year of legislation which will be offered by Senator LISTER HILL of Alabama and which I will be pleased to cosponsor. Its purpose would be creation of a new National Institute for International Medical Research. Such an institute would become the channel for American oversea research aid.

(2) Consideration of the research recommendations which will come from the WHO meeting in May. While it would be premature at the moment to say what WHO's recommendations will be, it seems clear that what will be needed most of all is a United States contribution to a special WHO research account. This would be an open-end multilateral fund to be used for carrying out research, principally into heart disease and cancer.

It is to be hoped that the Soviet Union and many other nations would contribute to such a special account. Already as a precedent the United States has made substantial contributions to the WHO special malaria account.

(3) Much broader and prompter use of Public Law 480 and other counterpart funds, for example, for the purpose of furthering medical education and medical research abroad.

None of the sums of money contemplated in any of the references above are substantial in relation to the overall budget commitments of the United States. If, however, they are authorized, they would help not only directly but indirectly in generating enlarged health budgets in countries throughout the world. Thus, we would be serving as a catalyst toward research breakthroughs not simply in our own land but in other lands; and all mankind would ultimately benefit.

SALUTE TO MINNESOTA MEDICINE AND ITS CONTRIBUTIONS TO WORLD HEALTH

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, Minnesota, the North Star State, has made outstanding contributions in countless fields. But in one particular field, I am sure, Minnesota, by universal agreement, stands among the very first rank in the 49 States. I refer to the contributions which the State of Minnesota has made and is making in advancing and protecting human health.

Minnesota medical discoveries have literally circled the earth. And so have Minnesota-born and Minnesota-trained doctors. Over a period of many years, it has been my privilege—first, as a private citizen, later as mayor of Minneapolis, and now as U.S. Senator—to see at first hand the pioneering by Minnesota health leaders.

I have had the pleasure of visiting in person, time and time again, not only the University of Minnesota and the great Mayo Foundation, but I have met with a great many physicians across the length and breadth of my State; with general practitioners, with specialists, with public health officers; with leaders in medical schools, hospitals, sanitariums, nursing homes, and other health facilities. I can say that my contact with these dedicated members of the healing arts has been one of the most rewarding experiences of my life.

STUDY BY REORGANIZATION SUBCOMMITTEE

These facts were confirmed anew to me in the course of my work as chairman of the Senate's International Health Study. Twice the Senate has authorized this vital work—the first time in August 1958, when Senate Resolution 347, 85th Congress, was approved, and then, again, in January, when a 1-year extension was authorized under Senate Resolution 42 of the 86th Congress.

To attain the goals of this International Health Study, my colleagues and I on this Senate Government Operations subcommittee have set what might be called a dragnet for ideas. We have sent letters of invitation for comments to every medical leader, at home and abroad, whom we might possibly contact with limited time and staff.

The outpouring of response has been tremendously gratifying. But I can say, in all truth, that the State of Minnesota yields to none in the quality and quantity of the constructive replies which it has sent.

I have prepared a brief report on the subjects and names of a few of the distinguished leaders who have sent in their comments. To make any such selection is difficult, in that so broad and detailed have been many of the responses that it would be virtually impossible to do anything more than touch upon a few highlights.

MEDICAL LEADERSHIP FROM THE NORTH STAR STATE: COMMENTS TO INTERNATIONAL HEALTH STUDY SUBCOMMITTEE

It would take many pages to include references to all of the Minnesota medical groups, voluntary health agencies, doctors of medicine, biologists, chemists, and civic-minded laymen who have kindly written to our subcommittee.

Not only have they documented what they are now doing in international medical research and international medical assistance programs but, most important, they have sent valuable suggestions for improving the health program of U.S. Government agencies.

Here, without attempting to be all-inclusive, are a few highlights:

COMMENTS FROM UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

First. In his response, Dean Robert B. Howard, of the University of Minnesota Medical School, pointed out with promptness and thoroughness, many helpful facts. He cited, for example, that there are more than 60 young men and women from all over the world taking graduate training in the various clinical and basic science departments of our medical school. He documented Minnesota's pioneering achievements of the past including great research contributions, ranging from Dr. Wesley Spink's work on brucellosis and Dr. J. T. Syverton's work in the department of bacteriology and immunology—which has been of such importance in the development of an oral vaccine against polio—to the studies of Dr. Cecil W. Watson on metabolism of bile and blood pigments.

Second. Dr. Stewart C. Thompson, associate director of the School of Public Health, pointed out that in the last 4 years students in that school have come from no less than 36 countries.

On the research phase, he pointed to the esteemed work of Dr. Ancel Keys on the problem of atherosclerosis, including Dr. Key's recent work in Yugoslavia, where he headed a team of 20 from 6 countries.

Dr. Thompson has pointed out, too, the very considerable number of faculty members of the school who have become consultants to a great many foreign countries.

Third. Dr. Keys, incidentally, in a letter to me, pointed to the important recommendations which have been filed by the Research Committee of the International Society of Cardiology, of which Dr. Paul Dudley White and Dr. Keys are cochairmen. This research program contemplates what I, too, regard as a "must"—a vast epidemiological program involving examination, follow-up, and reexamination 5 years later of men age 40 to 59 in 15 to 20 areas, in order to get a graphic picture and understanding of the incidence of heart disease.

PREVENTING MOUTH CANCER

Fourth. Dr. Robert J. Gorlin, chairman of the division of oral pathology, school of dentistry, who has done very fine work in the field of mouth cancer, has pointed up the great international possibilities for further constructive work along this line. In many areas of the world—India, China, and even within our own Western Hemisphere—Cuba, for example—oral cancer, for unexplained reasons, amounts to 40 percent or more of all body cancer.

I point out that Minnesota has taken the lead in the drive to detect oral cancer, first with a pilot detection project at Willmar, followed by a second project at Winona.

Fifth. Dr. John A. Anderson, head of the department of pediatrics, wrote on a subject of special interest to me: expanding world collaboration in prenatal research. This was one of the points of five point health program which I took upon with Premier Khrushchev in Moscow and on which the Soviet Premier indicated warm accord.

Sixth. Director Katherine J. Densford, of the school of nursing, pointed out the great international challenges in the nursing field. Miss Densford is recognized as one of the foremost authorities in this important area of health services.

MINNESOTA REHABILITATION LEADERS

Seventh. Dr. William Kubicek, leader in innumerable health capacities and famed particularly in the department of physical medicine and rehabilitation, has been of tremendous aid to us in pointing up the great opportunities and needs in his specialty for additional work throughout the world.

Let me mention, too, that Dr. Frederick J. Kottke, director of the University of Minnesota Rehabilitation Center, has cited the diverse challenges in physical medicine and rehabilitation. I may say that one of the most inspiring pieces of literature which one might read is the second biennial report for 1956–58 on the work of the center. Here are described not only the impressive research programs, but also the educational activities and the medical and rehabilitation services for patients.

I could not turn from the rehabilitation subject without citing, as well, the universally admired name of Dr. Frank Kruzen, senior consultant at the Mayo Clinic.

Not long ago, Dr. Kruzen wrote to me:

> Wise development of international programs for the improvement of the health of the peoples of the world will, in my opinion, tend to break down prejudices. Furthermore, I think that such programs will teach the people of other countries the true character of the American people.

Let me mention, too, excellent suggestions from Dr. Paul M. Ellwood, Jr., director of in-patient service at the Elizabeth Kenny Institute in Minneapolis.

Eighth. Dr. Harry R. Meyering, director of special education at Mankota State College has given the subcommittee the benefit of his experiences as the first assistant director of Tarsus American College in Turkey as well as the information he was able to gather during his survey of private educational institutions in Syria, Lebanon, Turkey, and Greece.

MAYO FOUNDATION COOPERATION

Ninth. Dr. Edward C. Clark, of the Mayo Clinic, has given us counsel on medical research opportunities and has suggested a number of ways in which international medical cooperation might be strengthened.

Tenth. Dr. Charles W. Mayo is personally giving us his full cooperation and has encouraged the staff to be of all possible assistance.

Eleventh. At the request of Dr. Mayo, Dr. Charles F. Code sent us an excellent outline of the wonderful research work that world-recognized Mayo staff members are doing all over the world.

Of course, each of these distinguished leaders has given all due credit to colleagues for indispensable collaborative work.

These, then, are but a few of the honored individuals who have interrupted their busy days in order to share observations with our international health study.

Right now, my colleagues on the subcommittee and I, together with our subcommittee staff, are exploring a great many "leads" which have been suggested to us by Minnesotans and others on ways and means of advancing world medical science.

NEED FOR MORE HILL-BURTON FUNDS

It is my hope that the medical facilities of my own and other States will be still further enabled to meet their growing responsibilities.

Very recently, I heard from Dr. Robert N. Barr, secretary and executive officer of our State department of health, with regard to the increasing needs under the Minnesota State plan for hospitals, public health centers and related medical facilities. He pointed out that in Minnesota, despite our splendid programs, there are 43 community hospitals outside of Minneapolis and St. Paul which need complete replacement, or major remodeling, and additions in order to meet present hospital standards. Adequate Hill-Burton funds are, there-

fore, not a luxury for the United States; they are an absolute necessity in order to fulfill the desires and needs of our growing American population.

AMERICA'S HEALTH NEEDS

America needs more doctors. It needs more nurses. It needs more modern health facilities and health specialists. It needs more researchers. It needs higher pay and higher esteem for its researchers.

The world has needs as well. Without in any way detracting from or limiting our responsibilities to the American people, we must seek to fulfill our international health responsibilities, especially among the developing areas of the globe.

Doing so will pay back dividends of satisfaction and peace of mind, in addition to dividends of new medical discoveries.

Cancer, heart disease, mental disorders, neurological ailments, allergies, dental troubles, arthritis, diabetes, eye, speech and hearing problems, congenital malformations—these are the burden of many Minnesotans and of the people of all 49 States of the Union.

These are universal burdens as well, weighing heavily on men and women everywhere.

As medical research anywhere unlocks the mysteries of disease, men are helped everywhere.

Tomorrow, as today and yesterday, medical light from the North Star State will continue to illuminate the major unsolved medical problems of our times.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate adjourn until Monday next, at 12 o'clock noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 7 o'clock and 1 minute p.m.) the Senate adjourned until Monday, March 9, 1959, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate March 5, 1959.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Thomas C. Mann, of Texas, Assistant Secretary of State for Economic Affairs, to be the representative of the United States of America on the Commission on International Commodity Trade of the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations.

ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION

Paul F. Foster, of Maryland, to be representative of the United States of America to the International Atomic Energy Agency, vice Robert M. McKinney.

FEDERAL RESERVE SYSTEM

George Harold King, Jr., of Mississippi, to be a member of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System for the unexpired term of 14 years from February 1, 1946, vice James Kimble Vardaman, Jr., resigned.

U.S. ATTORNEY

S. Hazard Gillespie, Jr., of New York, to be U.S. attorney for the southern district of New York for the term of 4 years, vice Paul W. Williams, resigned.

POSTMASTERS

The following-named persons to be postmasters:

ALABAMA

George N. Chastang, Citronelle, Ala., in place of S. B. Thomas, retired.

John F. Segrest, Jr., Tuskegee, Ala., in place of J. H. Meadors, retired.

ALASKA

Ola M. Cosgrove, Delta Junction, Alaska. Office established July 13, 1957.

Martha R. Prater, Glenallen, Alaska, in place of A. G. Simmons, resigned.

Corinne M. Thompson, Hoonah, Alaska, in place of Frank Shotter, retired.

Harold B. Lie, Kotzebue, Alaska, in place of A. G. Francis, resigned.

ARKANSAS

Travis G. Carroll, Waldo, Ark., in place of F. E. Fincher, deceased.

CALIFORNIA

Allan Muilenburg, Artesia, Calif., in place of H. S. Summers, retired.

Irene K. Chilcote, Clearlake Oaks, Calif., in place of F. H. Meyer, removed.

Edna M. Bequeaith, Kenwood, Calif., in place of H. G. Hoe, removed.

Earl J. Copenhaver, Norco, Calif., in place of A. E. Pries, retired.

Hazel R. Jacobson, Tecopa, Calif., in place of G. K. Monike, retired.

Henry A. Davis, Walnut, Calif., in place of M. A. Broadbere, resigned.

Walter E. Lang, Jr., Wilton, Calif., in place of G. B. Stout, deceased.

COLORADO

Hubert E. May, Alamosa, Colo., in place of R. D. Saunders, retired.

Evelyn L. Henion, Winter Park, Colo., in place of G. H. Allison, resigned.

FLORIDA

Robert L. Burgust, Apopka, Fla., in place of F. L. Burgust, retired.

William H. Hicks, Brooker, Fla., in place of T. B. Pinholster, retired.

Robert K. Tillman, Bushnell, Fla., in place of W. T. Eddins, retired.

Blanche E. Williams, Cassadaga, Fla., in place of R. A. Williams, retired.

Lula M. Barnes, Coleman, Fla., in place of Clara Wicker, retired.

Charles W. Curtis, Daytona Beach, Fla., in place of C. H. Talton, retired.

Ora E. Terry, Fort White, Fla., in place of T. M. Crouch, deceased.

Charles L. English, Greenville, Fla., in place of E. A. Laird, retired.

Gaynelle H. Mutter, Intercession City, Fla., in place of Ethel Cox, removed.

Sara Bryan Rogers, Live Oak, Fla., in place of F. M. Greene, Jr., deceased.

Audrey S. Duff, Mims, Fla., in place of C. K. Duff, retired.

Edmund G. Krigline, Opa-locka, Fla., in place of W. S. Griffiths, resigned.

Ray H. Schmidt, Panama City, Fla., in place of Bernard O'Brien, resigned.

John R. Douglass, Port Tampa City, Fla., in place of Mildred Hanks, deceased.

Joseph William Penrod, Stuart, Fla., in place of R. W. Hartman, retired.

GEORGIA

George E. Towns, Alamo, Ga., in place of V. W. Hartley, Sr., transferred.

Susie D. Bryant, Calvary, Ga., in place of C. C. Allen, retired.

Jean H. DeLoach, Claxton, Ga., in place of T. V. Nevil, retired.

Joseph H. Summerour, Duluth, Ga., in place of J. H. Summerour, deceased.

William R. Cook, Fairburn, Ga., in place of S. B. Green, retired.

Evangeline D. Burgamy, Irwinton, Ga., in place of R. L. Lindsey, retired.

Oneita H. Barrett, McRae, Ga., in place of M. C. Barineau, retired.

Edgar P. Faulkner, Tucker, Ga., in place of C. A. Randolph, retired.

IDAHO

Paul L. Byrd, Palisades, Idaho, in place of Vera Miskin, resigned.

ILLINOIS

Clarence P. Siebert, Aledo, Ill., in place of C. D. Lawson, retired.

Maurice J. Wiersema, Fulton, Ill., in place of J. P. Hook, retired.

Thomas W. Harney, Itasca, Ill., in place of I. E. Hanson, removed.

Leonard A. Graham, Shobonier, Ill., in place of O. W. Morell, transferred.

INDIANA

Philip E. Buecher, Jasper, Ind., in place of Albert Rumbach, deceased.

Jack V. Porter, Roachdale, Ind., in place of W. E. Etcheson, retired.

Glenn H. Newby, Russiaville, Ind., in place of I. D. Watson, deceased.

IOWA

John R. Cuvelier, Aplington, Iowa, in place of Celia Boom, retired.

Dale A. Early, Bristow, Iowa, in place of L. M. Frisby, deceased.

Nels M. Nelson, Crystal Lake, Iowa, in place of P. S. Juhl, retired.

Cleon D. Sires, New Albin, Iowa, in place of S. E. Hartley, retired.

Calvin O. Levorson, Riceville, Iowa, in place of F. M. White, retired.

KANSAS

George E. Cox, Buffalo, Kans., in place of J. K. States, retired.

Lee M. Fraker, Winchester, Kans., in place of J. G. Hunsucker, deceased.

KENTUCKY

James C. Davis, Gray, Ky., in place of R. D. Higgins, transferred.

James H. Easterling, Grayson, Ky., in place of W. L. Horton, removed.

Jean C. Hall, Viper, Ky., in place of M. H. Brashear, retired.

LOUISIANA

Viola H. Smith, Bonita, La., in place of E. E. Sisson, transferred.

Ruel Gene Roberson, Dubach, La., in place of C. H. Avery, transferred.

MASSACHUSETTS

Paul H. Smith, Monument Beach, Mass., in place of H. A. Dainty, resigned.

MICHIGAN

Philip R. Norman, Bark River, Mich., in place of H. W. Boyle, retired.

E. George Moser, Richville, Mich., in place of E. R. Moser, deceased.

MINNESOTA

Lester W. Graner, Kellogg, Minn., in place of C. G. T. Lydon, retired.

Herbert F. Zelmer, Kilkenny, Minn., in place of Alice Gillespie, retired.

Seth G. Withers, Red Wing, Minn., in place of A. F. Hernlem, retired.

Robert L. Penne, Saint James, Minn., in place of C. J. Strom, resigned.

MISSISSIPPI

Eugene H. Webb., Beaumont, Miss., in place of L. B. Dietz, retired.

William R. Moore, Duck Hill, Miss., in place of J. E. Patridge, retired.

James W. Bingham, Guntown, Miss., in place of S. M. Davis, retired.

MISSOURI

Warren C. Moser, Auxvasse, Mo., in place of S. S. Harrison, retired.

Truman R. Nickerson, Bethany, Mo., in place of W. W. Wilson, transferred.

Orpha Mae Bolin, Bois D'Arc, Mo., in place of Lottie Mason, retired.

Kenneth V. Hollocher, Eolia, Mo., in place of W. T. Jensen, retired.

Oren Dee Moor, Lincoln, Mo., in place of W. L. White, Jr., transferred.

George E. Wolfe, Linn, Mo., in place of J. F. Suellentrop, retired.
Oliver M. Judd, Mapaville, Mo., in place of W. J. Onder, resigned.
John R. Allison, Marceline, Mo., in place of Anna Watson, retired.
Jesse F. Kilpatrick, Rolla, Mo., in place of C. E. Jones, retired.
Clifton E. Schuenemeyer, Union, Mo., in place of C. F. Halligan, deceased.

MONTANA

Lee M. Enochson, Medicine Lake, Mont., in place of N. P. Miller, retired.

NEBRASKA

Ruben G. Werner, Battle Creek, Nebr., in place of A. H. Stuckwisch, resigned.
Ben D. Fussell, Geneva, Nebr., in place of C. E. Rock, deceased.
Carl J. Mann, Hoskins, Nebr., in place of G. E. Fletcher, deceased.
Roy H. Clements, Riverton, Nebr., in place of M. I. Onstot, retired.
Milo T. Jelinek, Wilber, Nebr., in place of Fred Shimerda, retired.

NEW HAMPSHIRE

Halton R. Hayes, Milton Mills, N.H., in place of F. E. Carswell, deceased.
William J. Driscoll, Plymouth, N.H., in place of G. L. Rand, retired.

NEW JERSEY

Walter F. Haddock, Midland Park, N.J., in place of Frank Martin, retired.
Byron B. Holmes, Ocean Grove, N.J., in place of W. E. Austin, retired.
Regina J. Todd, Port Monmouth, N.J., in place of R. G. Young, removed.

NEW YORK

Alfred A. Zottola, Bedford Hills, N.Y., in place of J. P. Bruen, retired.
Helen M. Hlavac, Bohemia, N.Y., in place of G. E. Hlavac, deceased.
David A. Wait, Burnt Hills, N.Y., in place of Valentine Bubb, retired.
James D. Sproull, Cayuga, N.Y., in place of E. T. McDonald, retired.
Walter M. Paul, Clark Mills, N.Y., in place of H. M. Nolan, retired.
Harry C. Young, East Amherst, N.Y., in place of Louis Witnauer, retired.
Charles P. Buonora, Far Rockaway, N.Y., in place of Abraham Finkle, deceased.
Ellen M. Newman, Greenhurst, N.Y., in place of J. A. Johnson, retired.
Penelope M. Bolton, Hague, N.Y., in place of C. F. Fitzgerald, resigned.
Elizabeth M. Jones, Hurley, N.Y., in place of G. C. Kent, retired.
Edward O. Wood, Ilion, N.Y., in place of T. R. Morris, retired.
Edward H. Essig, Jamaica, N.Y., in place of G. W. Rosenquest, retired.
Earl F. Wheeler, Lindley, N.Y., in place of J. K. Holmes, resigned.
Martin J. O'Carroll, Monticello, N.Y., in place of R. S. Washington, retired.
Chester H. Whitcher, Mount Morris, N.Y., in place of A. M. Cipriano, removed.
Jane M. Snide, Newcomb, N.Y., in place of M. E. Owen, retired.
Sherwin A. Radka, Oakfield, N.Y., in place of W. E. Farnsworth, retired.
Glen H. Alberding, Oriskany Falls, N.Y., in place of Gertrude Russell, retired.
Horace F. Davies, Plattsburgh, N.Y., in place of Arthur Sharron, deceased.
Betty P. Kanar, Porter Corners, N.Y., in place of E. M. Menshausen, retired.
Allen B. Cranston, Portland, N.Y., in place of B. F. Skinner, retired.
John S. Hobbs, Red Hook, N.Y., in place of Roland A'Brial, resigned.
Gladys Behr, Rocky Point, N.Y., in place of M. T. Mushler, retired.
Charles N. Manuel, Sea Cliff, N.Y., in place of R. T. Stevenson, resigned.
Kirk E. McKee, Smyrna, N.Y., in place of B. A. Sweet, retired.
Robert B. Scott, Jr., Warwick, N.Y., in place of W. R. Carr, retired.
John P. Potter, Wells, N.Y., in place of T. E. Brown, retired.
Oswald D. Kirkby, Westport, N.Y., in place of Lorrin Eggleston, retired.
Ethelyn M. Cox, Williamstown, N.Y., in place of Harry Burns, deceased.

NORTH CAROLINA

Howard G. Crissman, Aberdeen, N.C., in place of E. E. Maurer, removed.
Walter W. Monroe, Eagle Springs, N.C., in place of M. C. Lewis, retired.
Willard W. Reavis, Hamptonville, N.C., in place of B. F. Gough, retired.
Wayne Jefferson Edwards, Marble, N.C., in place of B. H. Mintz, retired.
Erlean S. Stevens, Mayodan, N.C., in place of J. V. Highfill, retired.
Lucile R. Eagle, Misenheimer, N.C., in place of C. A. Dry, resigned.
William R. Stanley, New Bern, N.C., in place of R. R. Eagle, retired.
Virginia E. Sears, Seaboard, N.C., in place of J. B. Stephenson, resigned.
Edward V. Gore, Jr., Shallotte, N.C., in place of I. B. Parker, retired.
Maxwell G. Rush, Southern Pines, N.C., in place of A. G. Pierce, resigned.
Joseph Howard Revis, Whittier, N.C., in place of M. P. Williams, retired.

NORTH DAKOTA

Simon H. Gimbel, Hazelton, N. Dak., in place of E. M. Shea, transferred.
John Boyko, Stanton, N. Dak., in place of B. P. Pulles, resigned.

OHIO

Harriett R.Vasbinder, Brinkhaven, Ohio, in place of M. A. Power, retired.
Donald R. Kempton, Laurelville, Ohio, in place of F. M. Lappen, retired.
Wayne E. Laibe, Lima, Ohio, in place of E. R. Leach, retired.
Frederick B. Gatch, Milford, Ohio, in place of F. W. White, retired.
Melvin R. Fuller, Oakharbor, Ohio, in place of O. E. Herring, retired.
Harold H. Haggard, Urbana, Ohio, in place of P. H. Gifford, deceased.

OKLAHOMA

Eugene J. Krivanek, Mustang, Okla., in place of R. H. Stevens, transferred.
John F. McDaniels, Owasso, Okla., in place of G. B. Combs, removed.
Hiram H. Wright, Paden, Okla., in place of Kinley Case, deceased.
Boyd A. Troop, Tuttle, Okla., in place of T. D. Jones, transferred.

OREGON

Leroy F. Fernlund, Bonanza, Oreg., in place of D. D. Horn, resigned.
Dean S. Reimers, Delake, Oreg., in place of S. E. Wadsworth, retired.
Reese D. Jenkins, Ontario, Oreg., in place of C. F. Trow, retired.
James F. Egan, Tangent, Oreg., in place of J. E. Jenks, Jr., retired.
Veeda A. Goodell, Valsetz, Oreg., in place of D. H. Weaver, resigned.
Edwin H. Condit, Westport, Oreg., in place of R. C. Neitzel, deceased.

PENNSLYVANIA

Norman H. Fulton, Glenolden, Pa., in place of A. T. Connor, retired.
Marie J. Schoppy, Locust Gap, Pa., in place of J. J. McDonnell, removed.
Henry L. Haines, Maytown, Pa., in place of M. E. Culp, retired.
Harold S. Derr, Jr., Montoursville, Pa., in place of Jewett Shirm, retired.
W. Ned Beckley, New Paris, Pa., in place of H. C. Mickle, retired.
Gaynelle A. Stewart, Penn Run, Pa., in place of A. F. Stewart, deceased.
Gerald Rufus Gearhart, Shadygrove, Pa., in place of W. R. Kline, resigned.

PUERTO RICO

Gabriel A. Cabrera, Camuy, P.R., in place of L. M. Lopez, retired.
Anardi Agosto Baquero, Canovanas, P.R., in place of Carmen Villalobos, retired.
Enrique Pardo, Ensenada, P.R., in place of Julia Chacon de Vidal, retired.
Regina L. de Lluch, Lajas, P.R., in place of Monserrate Figueroa, retired.

SOUTH CAROLINA

Henry G. Rutland, Sr., Fairfax, S.C., in place of J. B. O'Neal, retired.
Charles R. Orr, Great Falls, S.C., in place of M. C. Stroud, Jr., transferred.
William P. Scarborough, Lamar, S.C., in place of M. C. Spears, retired.
Fred G. Best, McClellanville, S.C., in place of J. D. Mackintosh, retired.
Charles C. Morgan, Jr., McCormick, S.C., in place of J. E. Bell, retired.
Thomas T. Adkins, Marietta, S.C., in place of J. N. Cleveland, retired.
William H. Masche, Jr., Mount Pleasant, S.C., in place of J. E. Sanders, retired.
William A. Linder, Smoaks, S.C., in place of A. L. Smoak, deceased.

SOUTH DAKOTA

Melvin R. Bollinger, Bowdle, S. Dak., in place of Emma Erbe, deceased.
Dale A. Wiltfang, Mansfield, S. Dak., in place of E. A. Berndt, retired.

TENNESSEE

Carlin T. Brooks, Bolivar, Tenn., in place of J. J. Parran, retired.
Elisha T. Morris, Jr., Carthage, Tenn., in place of Jere Gardenhire, retired.

TEXAS

Bonnie J. Summers, Channelview, Tex., in place of L. L. Bradley, Sr., deceased.
Thurmon O. Storey, Deport, Tex., in place of C. H. Nobles, retired.
Eugene Mallory, Mineola, Tex., in place of D. S. Lankford, retired.
Johnnie L. Richardson, Sanger, Tex., in place of J. A. Nicholson, retired.
Edgar Harris, Timpson, Tex., in place of J. J. Compton, retired.

VERMONT

Ernest A. Pike, Craftsbury, Vt., in place of F. L. Kemp, retired.
Deane K. Page, Groton, Vt., in place of R. F. Brown, removed.

VIRGINIA

Franklin T. Payne, Aldie, Va., in place of S. T. Ish, retired.
Elizabeth K. Harman, Bishop, Va., in place of M. G. Arnold, resigned.
Beulah J. Skeens, Dante, Va., in place of R. S. Griffith, Jr., resigned.
Noble Conley Bishop, Duffield, Va., in place of E. P. Tompkins, retired.
James K. Sullivan, Grottoes, Va., in place of P. R. Cosby, retired.
Charles H. Arrington, Hays, Va., in place of I. M. Baker, retired.
Joel F. Coleman, Jr., Prospect, Va., in place of J. V. Lewis, retired.
Albert F. Bennett, Saltville, Va., in place of T. B. Slate, transferred.
Carl A. Parsons, Jr., Sugar Grove, Va., in place of E. M. Calhoun, deceased.
Richard W. Rock, Troutville, Va., in place of E. L. Boone, deceased.

WISCONSIN

Milton L. Dickinsen, Augusta, Wis., in place of T. F. Boehrer, retired.
Irving P. Aamodt, Emerald, Wis., in place of P. W. Fleming, resigned.
Gilbert D. Stannard, Greenbush, Wis., in place of H. R. Stannard, transferred.
William W. Lambert, Onalaska, Wis., in place of L. L. Shove, retired.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate March 5, 1959:

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Robert J. Dodds, Jr., of Pennsylvania, to be General Counsel of the Department of Commerce.

FEDERAL AVIATION AGENCY

James Tolman Pyle, of Maryland, to be Deputy Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency.

INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION

Charles A. Webb, of Virginia, to be an Interstate Commerce Commissioner for a term of 7 years expiring December 31, 1965.

CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION

Roger W. Jones, of Connecticut, to be a Civil Service Commissioner for a term of 6 years from March 1, 1959.

COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS

George N. Sundquist, of Wisconsin, to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 36, with headquarters at Duluth, Minn., to fill an existing vacancy.

U.S. COAST GUARD

Capt. Chester L. Harding, U.S. Coast Guard, for promotion to the permanent rank of rear admiral in the U.S. Coast Guard.

The following-named persons for appointment to the grades indicated in the U.S. Coast Guard:

To be chief warrant officers, W–4

Cecil M. Thomas	Peter S. Fredriksen, Jr.
John Needham	George W. Tanghe
Arva S. Alexander	Roy L. Daisey
Robert J. Mohr	Cecil L. James
Frank P. Coffin	Charles E. Mueller
Wesley R. Hansberry	Thomas E. Harwell
Gerard A. Hearn	Joseph M. McGahee
Peter Majkut	Arthur N. Colona
Raymond E. Holley	John E. Rowe
William M. Parker	
Oscar D. Diel	

To be chief warrant officers, W–3

Arloy F. Jensen	Victor M. Adams
"A" "Z" Shows	Charles I. Carpenter
Charles H. Sanders	Jack S. Breschini
Richard G. Degnan	Ferdinand J. Selissen
Louis W. Stanley	Ernest T. Bittman
Jack D. Rodgers	Julian R. Sherman
Marshall K. Phillips	Leo V. Walsh, Jr.
Artell B. Crowley, Jr.	Adrian Fulcher
Gordon R. Campbell	Shelbert P. Creech
Martin F. Groff	George J. McKinlock
Ronald McClellan	Glenn N. Nelson
Lloyd T. Twiford	David A. Smith
Millard W. Johnson	Walter S. Yeargain
Daniel W. Cluff	Elmer L. Alban
Robert C. Ashdon	George D. Miller, Jr.
George W. Hupper	Frederick D. Mann
Harry J. Backman	James W. Berry
Henry O. Aeschliman	William F. Brock
Morris J. Marshall	Dolly Fulcher
William E. Hughes	Merle S. Wilson
Joseph L. Richardson	Finis L. McClanahan
Norman R. Hundwin	Robert F. Konrad
John T. Mears, Jr.	Cornelius A. Johnson
George D. Doll	Palmer F. Guarente
Earl W. Skinner	Clinton O. Gregory
Lester G. Quarles	Francis C. McCracken
Stanley Thoroughman	Howard A. Carande

To be chief warrant officers, W–2

Frederick J. Alles	William F. Kortlang
Edward J. Fraser	William E. Woodman
Thomas A. Gauld	Robert E. Bonville
Melvin C. Mize	Robert L. Williams, Jr.
Paul P. Sherrill	Neil H. Endsley
Timothy J. Crowley	Charles O. Franklin
John H. DeBoe	

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, MARCH 5, 1959

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rabbi Isadore Gruen, Haym Salomon Synagogue and Center, Brooklyn, N.Y., offered the following prayer:

Our Father, Sovereign of the universe, as we gather here this day to perform the sacred tasks of government, we humbly invoke Thy blessing. Grant Thy guidance and inspiration unto those who are charged with the great responsibility of directing the affairs of our Nation. May Thy Holy Spirit dwell richly within them, as they work for freedom, justice, and peace. Continue to imbue them with wisdom, courage, and strength, so that their deliberations, when translated into action, reflect well upon our country and help achieve the noble principles upon which this Nation is founded.

Almighty God, bless all the inhabitants of our land. Unite them for goodness and peace, so that by virtue of their working together in brotherhood, the United States of America will remain a great citadel of freedom from which light and hope shall be sent forth to those living in darkness and despair.

Gracious God, may the Biblical ideals of liberty, justice, and equality, enshrined in the American Constitution, become the heritage of all the peoples of the earth.

May this be Thy will. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

COMMITTEE ON RULES

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules may have until midnight tonight to file certain privileged resolutions.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

JOINT MEETING TO RECEIVE THE PRESIDENT OF THE REPUBLIC OF EL SALVADOR

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it may be in order at any time on Wednesday, March 11, 1959, for the Speaker to declare a recess for the purpose of receiving in joint meeting the President of the Republic of El Salvador.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL MONDAY NEXT

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the call of the Calendar on Wednesday next be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

VACATING SPECIAL ORDER

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the special order granted me for today be vacated.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

UNWARRANTED ATTACK

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I noticed an attack upon me in today's Washington Post.

Mr. Speaker, it is almost as great a compliment to be attacked by the notoriously radical Washington Post as it is to be attacked by the Daily Worker.

THE NEED FOR A FOREIGN SERVICE ACADEMY

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, I recently have introduced a bill (H.R. 417) to provide for the establishment of a United States Foreign Service Academy similar to the academies operated by the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force. I believe that this bill incorporates a built-in solution to a twofold current problem. The establishment of a Foreign Service Academy would both provide the Foreign Service with an especially excellent source of qualified candidates and also insure the effective training and education of the prospective officers in the languages and cultures of the areas of assignment as well as in the necessary functional skills.

My bill provides for the establishment of a Foreign Service Academy in or near the District of Columbia under the supervision of the Department of State. The Secretary of State would prescribe a course of instruction and training for diplomatic cadets equivalent to the curriculum prescribed by accredited colleges and universities as a prerequisite to the granting of the degree of bachelor of arts. Special emphasis would, of course, be placed on the study of the history, culture, customs, folklore, and language or languages of the nations in

which diplomatic cadets may elect to serve. H.R. 417 would also provide for field studies in such nations.

Competitive entrance examinations would determine the selection and admission of cadets to the Academy, and those in attendance would be entitled to quarters and subsistence. There also would be appointed each year a Board of Visitors consisting of five members from the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations and five members from the House Committee on Foreign Affairs. And, perhaps most important of all, preference would be given to the Foreign Service Academy graduates in the appointment of permanent officers to the Foreign Service Corps.

Mr. Speaker, I have introduced this bill because, in my opinion, the increasingly crucial role and growing training needs of this career professional Foreign Service Officer Corps require immediate attention and legislative action. There are about 3,400 of these officers, both men and women, currently serving the interests of their country in some 200 posts in approximately 80 foreign countries. America's expanding interests and responsibilities in world affairs since World War II have necessitated increasing demands on the Foreign Service Officer Corps, and the response in most cases has been commendable. The dedication of our diplomatic corps, even under the most difficult circumstances, has been essentially unquestioned.

There are, nevertheless, a large number of Foreign Service personnel who are being called upon to assume responsibilities for which they are not fully prepared. Through the press and perhaps most recently through the discussions prompted by the growing popularity of "The Ugly American," the American public is becoming more aware of the deficiency of qualified overseas personnel in many critical areas.

We need more specialists, for example, in the cultures and languages of Asia, Africa, and the Middle East as well as of Europe and Latin America. We need, in short, a better trained and more highly skilled diplomatic corps to translate the foreign policy of our Nation into action in the many day-to-day diplomatic relations with the peoples and officials of other governments. Indeed, the very preservation of the free world hinges on the effective activity of such a corps.

I am convinced that the establishment of a Foreign Service Academy would mark an important step forward in the development and improvement of the caliber and effectiveness of our diplomatic corps. Such an academy would help to provide the service with the number of qualified area specialists which our increasing overseas commitments require. Because of its specially designed curriculum, the Academy would be able to provide the prospective officers with the combined advantages of, first, the highest level of formal academic instruction in the study of international relations and other closely allied fields; second, an extensive and intensive foreign language training program; third, the knowledge and understanding which can be acquired best through the field work program; and fourth, the benefit of the instruction of and discussions with experienced Foreign Service officers.

Also the provision of quarters and subsistence might well encourage many of our capable young men and women, who might otherwise be unable to afford such specialized education, to obtain a high level of education beyond the high school and to use this background in representing their country abroad. Finally, the establishment of a Foreign Service Academy would contribute to a greater recognition of the diplomat as an individual performing services of vital importance to his fellow citizens and as one well qualified in all respects to represent the interests of his Nation abroad.

It has been said that "at the root of the work of the Foreign Service is diplomacy, which is the art and practice of conducting negotiations between nations." In addition to his role as negotiator, of course, the Foreign Service officer also serves as an on-the-spot observer and reporter for our Government. He is also called upon, in many instances, to perform various consular functions for American businessmen and other American residents of the area. Favorable interpretation and representation of the democratic way of life and the building of good will with the people of the other nation are also among an officer's most vital and demanding responsibilities.

It is clear that such tasks require not only many people with many skills operating at various levels of generalization and specialization but also that often they may depend on a single person who combines the abilities of both the generalist and the specialist. The demands of an increasingly complex international scene, in other words, call for persons who not only know a little bit about many things but who also know a good deal about a particular geographic area, language, or people. This broad knowledge also should encompass an understanding of the political, military, scientific, and economic interests of the host nation as well as of its cultural affairs and certain other policies. Such knowledge and understanding are necessary for the kind of on-the-spot reports which often are designed to assist the Secretary of State in the preparation of recommendations to the President.

One current deficiency in the Foreign Service which has received considerable attention recently is that of foreign language ability. According to one study, that is, of ambassadorial appointments, both noncareer and career Foreign Service, deficiency in foreign languages is "the major flaw in the U.S. Embassies and Legations overseas." A survey made in 1957, moreover, showed that less than half of the then approximately 4,000 Regular and Reserve Officers and Staff Corps had a "useful knowledge" of French, German, or Spanish. The number of those trained in eastern European, Asiatic, or African languages did not even meet at that time the "minimum basic requirements of the Department." It has also been estimated that about 70 percent of the new officers admitted to the corps do not have a practical knowledge of any modern foreign language.

A more recent survey—completed in October 1958—of the language skills of Foreign Service officers also indicates that about 40 percent of all Foreign Service officers do not have what the Department considers "the necessary foreign language proficiency in both speaking and reading one or more foreign languages to meet representation and professional work requirements." More than 15 percent of all Foreign Service officers were estimated in this survey as not having even the basic knowledge of one or more foreign languages sufficient for routine social and office requirements.

In recognition of the need for more and better language training, the Department of State has progressively been improving and expanding its training facilities. This is typical, I might add, of the Foreign Service's continuous history of progress and development in step with America's expanding role in international affairs. Language needs are being given considerable attention and a long-range program of expanded training is currently in operation. All Foreign Service officers are also required to have a language check-up approximately every 2 years as part of the Department's mandatory language testing program. This periodic inventory of language proficiency is considered an additional incentive for language training.

The fact still remains, however, that many attempts at Foreign Service training improvement are still in the experimental stages or, even where in actual operation, include only a relatively small number of officers. The Foreign Service Institute simply does not provide an in-service training program comparable to those offered by the armed services.

The fine area study programs in American colleges and universities, of course, offer a wide variety of high level academic training. Such programs, however, are not always adequate in number, in geographic accessibility, and in curricular content to provide the level and extent of formal instruction and field work desirable and even necessary to fill our Foreign Service needs.

Lack of knowledge about the peoples and cultures of other countries is another unfortunate area of deficiency among Americans abroad. It was reported, for example, that in 1957 Prime Minister Jawaharlal Nehru, of India, made a few eye-opening observations before a group of several hundred U.S. point 4 technicians which may well be applicable to many such situations.

After thanking the U.S. representatives for the help they had given to India, he reportedly told the American Ambassador, who was also present, that the United States did not have to send so many technicians, but that it might send fewer but better ones. The Prime Minister mentioned condescension in dealing with nationals and an apparent lack of respect for the older way of doing things as possible areas of improvement.

Not long ago Dean Harlan Cleveland, of Syracuse University, who has been conducting a study for the Carnegie Foundation on the training of Ameri-

cans for working abroad, said he hoped that before long a 1- or 2-year immersion in a foreign culture abroad, perhaps during the college years, would be a requirement for all persons planning to work overseas. Such an experience, it is believed, would increase greatly the number of Americans building good will with foreign nationals. Effective American activity abroad clearly depends upon this so-called cultural entity, or, as one Brazilian is reported to have expressed it:

To teach American baseball to Brazilians you first have to learn how Brazilians play soccer.

This skill for cultural entity was rated by Dean Cleveland even above language skills. There are already too many Americans abroad who are considered "fluently arrogant," he observed.

In December 1958 the State Department announced the reestablishment of its overseas science officer program. Seven distinguished scientists were appointed to serve in this capacity. It is significant to note that these men were selected not only for their experience and reputation as educators, research scientists, and administrators but also for their knowledge of the status of science and their acquaintance with scientists in the country of assignment. And last, but not least, each also had a facility in the language of the country of assignment.

Mr. Speaker, I am certain that the Members of this House are well aware of the importance of a qualified and effective diplomatic corps to serve and represent this Nation abroad. A Communist strategy of frightening proportions is threatening the free peoples of the world. A well-fought battle on the diplomatic field could easily be the decisive factor in determining whether the strategic forces of democracy or communism will ultimately succeed.

For this reason, I call on the Members of the House to support the program outlined in H.R. 417. There are, surprisingly enough, no specific formal education or job experience requirements for Foreign Service officers. Successful candidates, of course, usually have at least the equivalent of the bachelor's degree, and many also hold advanced degrees.

The fact remains, however, that we are sending too many of our representatives abroad without the specialized preparation necessary for the unique demands that will be made on them.

Broad general knowledge is no longer enough to "wage the peace," nor do short training and indoctrination periods at the Foreign Service Institute always provide an adequate background for the men and women who play such a strategic role in the work of the Service. A program combining a uniformly high level of academic instruction with the distinct advantages of on-the-job training is urgently needed.

My bill provides for such a program through the establishment of a Foreign Service Academy. I call the immediate attention of the Congress to this matter and urge the early consideration of H.R. 417.

WIDOWS' BENEFITS, SOCIAL SECURITY ACT

Mr. SANTANGELO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. SANTANGELO. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced today a bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to reduce the eligibility age for widows' benefits from 62 to 50. I stress the word "widow."

This bill would carry out the original purpose of the social security law and eliminate a hardship which has developed in its application. The cost would not be great, and the benefits would be many.

In the years since the passage of the Social Security Act, Congress has consistently and determinedly made efforts to improve and expand the social security program. In this process, however, we have learned that these efforts must continue to be made if we are to maintain the program on an equitable basis. Our social security problems are far from being solved.

We made a start in alleviating the problems of the widow in 1956, when Congress abandoned the arbitrary age 65 requirement for widows by lowering it to 62. It is already apparent, however, that this action was not sufficient.

One of the most pressing problems which faces us today, and one which I believe this Congress must solve, is the unjust and difficult position of the widow under present provisions of the law. While a wife enjoys the income which a retired husband receives at age 65, she loses it upon his death if she has not reached the age of 62. Under my bill, if she has reached the age of 50 years, she will still receive social security benefits notwithstanding the death of her husband.

The arguments in favor of my amendment are sound ones, and ones which I believe far outweigh in importance any consideration of the limited amount which this liberalization would cost. Primarily, however, I believe we must view the amendment in the light of the terrible hardship which a widow in this country often faces.

More than a dozen widows in my district between the ages of 50 and 62 have asked my assistance because they found themselves suddenly cut off from social security benefits upon the death of their husband. It is simple enough to close our minds to the entire question, and urge our older women to leave their homes to find employment. This is, indeed, the solution that some widows have necessarily found for themselves. But, for too many of them, this is frequently impossible.

Studies have clearly shown that once a woman passes her 35th or 40th birthday, her job opportunities are severely diminished. At an older age, it may well be impossible for her to find employment, especially when there are so many younger people unemployed and willing and qualified to work. This inability to find employment is especially true for the woman who has spent most of her life in the vital and creative task of caring for her home and family. It is also true for women who have had professional or technical training and experience.

Unable to depend on employment wages for sustenance, these widows generally lack an adequate income from any other outside sources. Difficult though their situation may be, they must wait until they reach age 62 before they are eligible for any payments through the social security program. For many, this may mean long years of virtual impoverishment and hardship.

Considerable injustice in the present age requirement also exists in that a woman who has qualified for social security benefits as a widowed mother with small children may suddenly have all benefits stopped when the youngest child reaches 18. No longer able to qualify for a mother's benefit, she still may not have reached that vital 62d birthday when she would begin to draw benefits as an aged widow. She is, thus, denied benefits at a time when she most needs them and frequently when her children are attending school. As a consequence, children are compelled to withdraw from their educational process to work to support a mother who is too young to receive benefits and too old to obtain employment.

I sincerely believe that the hardship and injustice which exist under our present legislation must be corrected. The amendment which I propose today, I believe, goes far in furthering this end, and I urge favorable consideration of this legislation.

MEMBER BANK RESERVE REQUIREMENTS

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I introduced yesterday a bill (H.R. 5237) to eliminate a long-standing inequity in the law relating to reserve requirements for banks that are members of the Federal Reserve System. Under the Federal Reserve Act, member banks are required to maintain reserves amounting to certain percentages of their net demand deposits; currently, the requirements are 18 percent for central reserve city banks, 16½ percent for reserve city banks, and 11 percent for all other banks—commonly referred to as "country banks." Today, each member bank must maintain its required reserve balance on deposit with its Federal Reserve Bank; it cannot count cash in its vaults toward meeting its reserve requirement. This is inequitable because operating conditions force some banks, particularly country banks, to keep larger amounts of cash on hand than other banks do. All banks should be permitted to count their vault cash toward meeting

their reserve requirements because, as the Federal Reserve Board has stated:

> Vault cash holdings and reserve balances at the Reserve Banks are interchangeable and both serve the same purpose in influencing the volume of bank credit.

Accordingly, my bill would allow the Federal Reserve Board to permit member banks to count all or part of their currency and coin as reserves. It is necessary to give the Board some flexibility in putting this change into effect, because if it were immediately put into effect in full for all banks it would inflate the money supply too drastically.

The Federal Reserve Act does not specify the exact reserve requirements for member banks, but rather authorizes the Federal Reserve Board to establish reserve requirements from time to time with maximum and minimum limits prescribed in the act. Today the act fixes a floor of 13 percent and a ceiling of 26 percent for central reserve city banks; my bill would change these limits to 10 percent and 20 percent, the same as apply for reserve city banks. Finally, the bill would give the Board wider discretion in allowing banks in central reserve cities or reserve cities to maintain the lower reserves in effect for reserve city banks or country banks, where the character of the bank's business warrants such an adjustment.

I am convinced that the bill's provisions as to vault cash are sound and necessary to give fair treatment to all banks. While I realize that there may be differences of opinion as to whether the other provisions of the bill go too far or not far enough in permitting the Federal Reserve Board to eliminate distinctions in reserve requirements as between banks, I feel that this compromise proposal worked out by the Board deserves serious consideration by the Banking and Currency Committee. I have been assured by the chairman of the committee, the Honorable BRENT SPENCE, that he will refer the bill to the subcommittee of which I am chairman, so that early hearings may be scheduled. Persons interested in testifying on the bill should write to me, in care of the House Banking and Currency Committee, room 1301 House Office Building, by March 20, so that I may arrange a schedule of witnesses on the bill.

NATIONAL PEANUT WEEK

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, for many years I have been appealing to you in behalf of anthracite coal, with some degree of success but not, of course, sufficient to take care of what I wanted you to do.

Today I am sure I will have better luck, because I can appeal to the great agriculturists on both sides of the aisle.

I speak in behalf of peanuts. I want you to know this is National Peanut Week. We are going to have a big shindig all over the town today, from all over the country, on peanuts. My home town of Wilkes-Barre, Pa., is the headquarters of Mr. Peanut, the great Planters Peanut Co., although we have to go down to Virginia and some other places to grow the peanuts. However, I am sure you will be excited to know that this is National Peanut Week. It therefore seems appropriate that we pause for a moment to pay tribute to this nutritious food product that has become so important in the diet of people over the entire world.

The peanut was introduced in New York about 1870, and soon became known the country over at the circus, baseball parks, stadiums, carnivals, and amusement parks the length and breadth of this land. But as we enjoy crunching the peanuts and savoring their flavor, we tend to forget how important the lowly peanut is, not only for thousands of farmers in the South, but as an ingredient in many industrial products, and as an important source of energy for our citizens. We fail to realize the progress that has transformed the peanut from a rare delicacy to a widely consumed nutritious food.

The peanut ranks high in food energy with abundant vitamins and all the basic elements of good food. It is nourishing and fully digestible. One pound of peanut butter contains more calories, protein, minerals, and vitamins than a pound of beefsteak. A pound of peanuts contains 2,700 calories, which is the daily requirement for a man, and 118 grams of protein, which is 1½ times the daily requirement of an adult. Peanuts are a good source of phosphorus and also contain a considerable amount of both calcium and iron. Based on a recommended daily allowance for adults, a pound of peanuts contains 1⅗ times the daily need for calcium, and four-fifths of the daily need for iron. Peanuts and the products that are made from the oil, and the meal which remains after the oil has been taken out, and the way these foods can be combined with other foods should be of universal interest.

Nowadays the housewife relies more and more on numerous peanut products to add a party touch to innumerable household occasions. She uses peanut oil in the preparation of fried foods and in baking the most delicate pastries.

Thanks to companies such as the Planters Nut & Chocolate Co., Wilkes-Barre, Luzerne County, Pa., a wide variety of peanut products are always available to us in nearly every store at reasonable prices. Let us hope that the peanut industry in this country and the world over will remain strong and that we will always be assured of an adequate supply of this most important food product.

HAWAIIAN STATEHOOD

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include a memorial from the Oregon Legislature.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I have the honor to lay before the House an enrolled memorial of the Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon, praying for the early enactment of the bill for Hawaiian statehood. I ask that the text of this memorial, and the letter of transmittal, signed by the Honorable Walter J. Pearson, president of the Oregon Senate, be printed at the end of my remarks. Mr. Speaker, I am proud of the fact that one of the numerous bills for Hawaiian statehood which has been before the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, is H.R. 1917, which I introduced early in the session. We in Oregon, as this memorial indicates, have long enjoyed a close relationship with the people of Hawaii, and we are convinced of the mutual benefit which has arisen from that relationship. In a sense, Oregon's ties with Hawaii are particularly close, since our great State system of higher education has had the privilege of enrolling many young men and women from the Territory.

In this hundredth year of Oregon statehood, the people of Oregon and their Legislative Assembly are united in the hope that this 86th Congress will emulate the example of its immediate predecessor and bring to an end the long period of tutelage in which the American citizens of this Pacific Territory have been held, long after demonstrating their ability to use the tools of self-government, their willingness to assume the burdens of statehood, and their complete understanding of and devotion to, the American way of life.

STATE OF OREGON,
OREGON STATE SENATE,
Salem, March 3, 1959.

Hon. EDITH GREEN,
Member of Congress,
Old House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MRS. GREEN: Enclosed is Senate Joint Memorial 1 relative to statehood for Hawaii signed by the president of the senate and the speaker of the house on February 25. We are hopeful that Hawaii will this year become the 50th State of the Union. I know that you, personally, have been active in this endeavor for a long time.

WALTER J. PEARSON,
President of the Senate.

SENATE JOINT MEMORIAL 1

To the Honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America, in Congress assembled:

We, your memorialists, the 50th Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon, in legislative session assembled, most respectfully represent as follows:

Whereas there have been, from the earliest hours of our history as a State, the closest ties and relationship between the people of the Sandwich Islands, now the Territory of Hawaii, and the people of Oregon; and

Whereas these fine Americans have long ago fully demonstrated their capacity to govern themselves as a free commonwealth within the American Union; and

Whereas we know and respect the people of Hawaii as a result of close association through commercial, cultural, recreational, and social exchanges; and

Whereas the State of Oregon, alone among the States, has enriched our association and strengthened our bonds with the people of Hawaii through the free interchange of territorial students in our State system of higher education; and

Whereas this February 14 is the 100th anniversary of the admission of Oregon to the Union; and

Whereas the admission of Oregon's respected friend Hawaii to the sisterhood of States of the Union would further strengthen these bonds and would give added cause for jubilation on the commemoration of our own statehood: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate of the State of Oregon (the House of Representatives jointly concurring therein), That the Congress of the United States be memorialized to grant immediate statehood, under legislation now pending, to our sister Hawaii, as the 50th State of the United States; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this memorial be sent to the President of the United States, to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, to the Delegate in Congress from Hawaii, and to all members of the Oregon congressional delegation.

MONTANA LEGISLATURE URGES ACTION ON YELLOWTAIL DAM

Mr. ANDERSON of Montana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include a memorial from the State Legislature of Montana.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANDERSON of Montana. Mr. Speaker, the 36th Legislative Assembly of the State of Montana today sent to Congress its Joint Memorial 2, requesting the introduction and enactment into law of legislation calling for the resumption of work on the Yellowtail Dam project on the Big Horn River in Montana and the provision of funds necessary for the resumption of this vitally needed multipurpose project.

The memorial follows:

HOUSE JOINT MEMORIAL 2

Joint memorial of the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Montana to the President of the United States, Dwight D. Eisenhower; Senator James E. Murray, of Montana; Senator Mike Mansfield, of Montana; Congressman Lee Metcalf, of Montana; Congressman Leroy Anderson, of Montana; the Committee on Appropriations of the U.S. Senate; the Committee on Appropriations of the U.S. House of Representatives; the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of the U.S. Senate; the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of the U.S. House of Representatives; the Committee on Public Works of the U. S. House of Representatives; the Secretary of the Interior, Fredrick B. Seaton; the Commissioner of the Bureau of Reclamation, Wilbur A. Dexheimer; the Secretary of the Army, Wilber M. Brucker; the Director of the Budget, Maurice H. Stans; requesting the introduction and enactment into law of the necessary and proper legislation to authorize and provide funds to start the construction on Yellowtail Dam on the Big Horn River in the State of Montana for 1959

Whereas since the turn of the century, men of good will and great vision have labored long and wisely to bring Yellowtail Dam into being; and

Whereas many and high were the hurdles and obstacles that had to be overcome before construction of the Yellowtail Dam could be started; and

Whereas one by one, these many obstacles preventing the construction of Yellowtail Dam were overcome, until one alone remained, and that one was the acquiring of the damsite, upon which the proposed Yellowtail Dam would in time be built, from the Crow Indian Tribe; and

Whereas that one remaining obstacle, the acquiring of the Yellowtail damsite, has, due to the wise action of the last Congress, been overcome with the paying of $2½ million to the Crow people for this valuable piece of property; and

Whereas the American people have a large investment in the proposed Yellowtail Dam; and

Whereas no returns can be had from the moneys already invested in Yellowtail Dam until said Yellowtail Dam is constructed: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the 36th Legislative Assembly of the State of Montana now in session (the Senate and House of Representatives concurring), That the Congress of the United States be requested and urged to appropriate the sum of $10 million, so that the construction of the sorely needed Yellowtail Dam project may begin at once; be it further

Resolved, That the amendment include reservation of a block of power for Montana; be it further

Resolved, That copies of this memorial be submitted by the Secretary of the State of Montana to each of the individuals, and to the chairman of each of the committees mentioned in this memorial, as well as to the Presiding Officers of both Houses of the U.S. Congress, RICHARD M. NIXON and SAM E. RAYBURN.

JOHN J. MACDONALD,
Speaker of the House.
PAUL CANNON,
President of the Senate.

AMBASSADOR ABBA EBAN'S RESIGNATION

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, the Embassy of Israel has announced that Ambassador Abba Eban has resigned and will return to Israel the end of May.

Those of us who know of his fine service in the United States as well as his work in the United Nations, will all join in wishing him well in any future career.

Speculation has it that the Ambassador is going home to enter politics, and if so there is every reason why he should achieve success.

As his country's representative in Washington, D.C., he has demonstrated remarkable talents and a brilliant mind and knowledge of world affairs.

Ambassador Eban's place will not be easily filled, but to compensate for our loss we can be confident that wherever he is entrusted with an opportunity to serve, the United States and freedom-loving people everywhere can expect from him continued and greater accomplishments in a common cause and friendship.

A NATIONAL LOTTERY

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, while we in this Congress continue to ignore the tremendous revenue-producing features of my national lottery bill, many States and cities, hard pressed for additional funds, have been wrestling with proposals to take full advantage of the natural betting urge of the American people.

The city of New York, which finds itself in financial straits, has asked the State legislature for legalization of off-track betting. Trial balloons have been sent up in Louisiana, Pennsylvania, California, Arizona, and other States and municipalities all across the country in an effort to tap the benefits of gambling.

The other day the New York State Legislature at the recommendation of the Governor approved a bill calling for an additional 10 racing days to the State's flat track racing season. This recent legislative action was not only to further satisfy the gambling instincts of man but, more importantly, it was designed to increase the State's revenue from parimutuel betting to the tune of $4½ million annually.

All of these legislative movements represent a complete recognition of the fact that the urge to gamble is deeply ingrained in humans and that its regulation by law will provide the Government with tremendous funds which could and would help to relieve the unconscionable burden borne by the taxpayers.

Why not capitalize on this natural gambling spirit of the American people?

My national lottery bill is a voluntary and painless revenue-raising measure which would bring into the coffers of our Treasury $10 billion a year. It is about time that we wiped out hypocrisy and seriously considered the merits of this legislation. I doubt very much whether the American taxpayers would rather continue to pay higher and higher taxes than resort to the tremendous revenues that can be realized from a national lottery in the United States.

GEN. JOHN J. PERSHING

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a joint resolution to establish a commission for the celebration of the 100th anniversary of the birth of Gen. John J. Pershing. Surely, Mr. Speaker, we in this country, and in other countries too, ought to pay tribute to the great general who led us to victory in World War I. I believe the people of the United States will thoroughly endorse this measure.

Mr. Speaker, I am introducing also today a bill to incorporate the Army and Navy Union of the United States.

THE READING OF GEORGE WASHINGTON'S FAREWELL ADDRESS

Mr. MUMMA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. MUMMA. Mr. Speaker, George Washington's Farewell Address to the Congress has always stood out in my mind as a stirring one and one of the greatest messages he has given us in his writings.

Symbolical of his stature and the greatness of this speech, here each year in the House of Representatives and in the Senate also, we devote a session of Congress to a reading of that address. This year was no exception when once again we paid homage to the Father of our Country and selected his Farewell Address to be read again into the RECORD of the proceedings of the House and Senate.

I just wanted to say that I would like to commend it as a wonderful reading experience so to that end I am having George Washington's Farewell Address printed up at my own expense and plan to give it circulation among my constituents. These brief introductory remarks will serve as a short preface to that great literary work.

ELECTION TO COMMITTEE

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I send to the desk a resolution (H. Res. 199) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That CHARLES E. CHAMBERLAIN, of Michigan, be, and he is hereby, elected a member of the standing Committee of the House of Representatives on House Administration.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the special order to address the House for 2 hours tomorrow, which was granted to the gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL] may be transferred to today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

ROBERT AUFDERHEIDE, SUPERVISOR OF THE WILLAMETTE NATIONAL FOREST

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. PORTER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, the Fourth District of Oregon contains more national forests than any other district in the Nation. One national forest alone, the Willamette, which contains 1,615,000 acres, contributes over 10 percent of the total revenues received from all the national forests in the United States. The other national forests in my district, the Siuslaw, the Siskiyou, the Rogue River, and the Umpqua, are also tremendously productive.

But productivity in terms of timber is not the sole criterion by which we can judge the great contribution these forests make to our national well-being. These forests are watershed forests and recreation forests. They are not grazing forests. There are great expanses of solid Douglas fir, hemlock, cedar and pine, mile after mile of it. The towering trees, 200 feet and even taller, stretch for miles like an unbroken sea.

But these forests do not exist by the grace of God alone. They exist because of the foresightedness of men like Gifford Pinchot, who saw that if we were going to have forests in perpetuity, man was going to have to manage his natural resources for the benefit of posterity. The United States Forest Service has had this job and discharged it well since 1905. The people in the Forest Service have the responsibility for doing the job and in carrying out this responsibility they have had the cooperation of the citizens of the Nation. But I think it is true that those who have the job are really the responsible ones, for by their day-to-day action, by their devotion to duty the job is done. While the general public has an interest, it does not have the responsibility.

LEADERSHIP FROM THE FOREST SUPERVISOR

In my district we have been exceedingly fortunate in the leadership that we have had from our forest supervisors. One of these men stands out above the others. His name is Robert Aufderheide. He started with the Forest Service in 1933 on what is now the Gifford Pinchot National Forest in the State of Washington. Aufderheide's first job was planting trees. He then came down to Oregon working first in eastern Oregon on the Ochoco National Forest, then in western Oregon in the Rogue River National Forest. He then returned to the State of Washington—to the great rain forest, the Olympic. After that he worked in research, and in 1950 he returned to my district as supervisor of the Umpqua National Forest at Roseburg. There his record was outstanding, and although a relatively young man, his ability brought him to Eugene in 1954 as supervisor of the Willamette National Forest, the greatest of all the national forests in the entire system.

One of the real problems facing us in Government—and we see it more every day in top positions—is the tendency of people to come in for a few years and when they have just about learned their jobs to go back where they came from to earn more money.

VALUE OF EXPERIENCE AND UNDERSTANDING

The art of government requires not only dedicated and aggressive leadership but constant effort. I think that the work Bob Aufderheide has done as supervisor of the Willamette National Forest is an outstanding example of the benefit that the people get from experienced leadership. He has brought to the job a great deal more than experience. He has an understanding of forest problems, of silviculture and tree growth, and of the economics of the logging industry. He has successfully practiced multiple-use management in such a way that all these benefits have flowed in great measure.

And he has had problems in meeting the challenge before him. Funds have not always been available to do the job that he knew should be done. Last year the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee made a review of the national forest timber sales program. It was a genuine pleasure to me to see that while some of the other forests had not overcome problems which they faced due to fund shortages, the Willamette National Forest under Bob Aufderheide's superior leadership had done an outstanding job and in fact was an example for the rest of the region.

Under his leadership a tree nursery has been activated at Fall Creek, not far from Eugene, and a second tree nursery is being established at Westfir. In 1958 alone the Willamette National Forest planted 2.6 million trees. In addition, fire protection and fire prevention have received more than adequate consideration. The log and slash which develops from timber sales are carefully disposed of so that the cutover lands can be returned to early productivity.

PRACTICAL APPLICATION OF RESEARCH

On the Willamette National Forest we also have the H. J. Andrews experimental forest. Bob Aufderheide, understanding the value of forest research and its practical application, has done an outstanding job of applying the results of research so that this forest is doing an above average job of land management.

In my district, which contains the headwaters of the Willamette River, there are a number of dam projects under the Corps of Engineers—Detroit, Hills Creek, Cougar, and Lookout Point. These dams are within the Willamette National Forest. These have a far-reaching impact on recreation use, on timber cutting, on transportation routes and power transmission.

Huge quantities of timber had to be cleared from reservoir basins while these dams were under construction. There were great accumulations of log slash which had to be disposed of carefully. Ranger stations and other facilities had to be moved. Bob Aufderheide dealt with these difficult problems with great skill and foresighted planning so that the Willamette National Forest increased its contributions to community development while solving each of these problems in stride.

All of the people in our part of the country are aware of the tremendous recreation use that is made of our national forests. In 1958 alone 400,000 recreationists visited the campgrounds and

other areas in the Willamette National Forest. Almost 2 million people enjoyed the scenic routes along the Oregon Skyline Trail. Bob Aufderheide, by careful management of the meager Operation Outdoor funds available, has stretched the recreational facilities of the Willamette National Forest to try to accommodate this growing use.

HE KNOWS HIS FOREST

I think the outstanding contribution that Bob Aufderheide has made in his long and successful career has been the understanding that he has developed among all who use and enjoy our national forests of the role these forests play in our Nation's development. Every community within or dependent upon the Willamette National Forest knows Bob Aufderheide. He has visited with every small logger, millowner, Izaak Walton League chapter, wilderness group, chamber of commerce, and the many others who have an interest in how our forests are used. He has been tremendously successful in acquainting them with what conservation really is.

Equally important is the enthusiasm he has instilled in the people who work with him in the Forest Service. His record would not be possible without their cooperation. Their cooperation would not have been obtained without his leadership.

Too often we take for granted the great ability of many of our Federal employees. We take for granted their dedication to duty. I am sure that Bob Aufderheide has never felt that he was sacrificing any material gain in his job. He is too big a man to think of money first and the welfare of his Nation and his community second. There are many more like him in the Forest Service and in other Federal agencies, but I know of none whose capabilities are greater or whose contributions have been more constant.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this time in order to inquire of the majority leader, if he can at this time, to advise us as to the program for next week.

Mr. McCORMACK. Monday is District Day. I am informed that the Committee on the District of Columbia will have one bill up, H.R. 4282, a bill relating to the amendment of the charter of the Sisters of the Visitation in Washington, which charter was originally obtained by them in the year 1828. The charter is quite a historical one and is signed by John Quincy Adams and it was my great privilege to introduce this bill relating to the amendment of that chapter. If a rule is reported out on Hawaiian statehood, then we will take up that bill on Monday for general debate. That will be general debate only if it is capable of being considered on Monday. In any event, if a rule is not reported out so that we can bring it up on Monday, and a rule is reported out so that it can be brought up next week, I shall bring it up as quickly as possible after the rule is reported out.

If a rule is reported out on the Federal airport bill, H.R. 1011, that will follow the Hawaiian statehood bill. In any event, if a rule is reported out so that it can be considered next week, it will be considered in the House.

If rules are reported out on H.R. 1, that is the Lake Michigan water diversion bill, we will bring that up next week; also H.R. 2575, a bill relating to the pan-American games in Chicago.

The usual reservation, that any further program will be announced later.

Mr. HALLECK. I thank the gentleman.

COMMITTEE ON RULES

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the consent request heretofore granted that the Committee on Rules may have until midnight tonight to file reports be rescinded, and I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules may have until midnight tomorrow night to file privileged rules.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

NATIONAL DEFENSE EDUCATION ACT

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. LINDSAY] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced an amendment to the National Defense Education Act designed to eliminate section 1001(f)(1) of title X of the act. This provision reads as follows:

No * * * funds * * * shall be used to make payments or loans to any individual unless such individual (1) has executed and filed with the Commissioner an affidavit that he does not believe in, and is not a member of and does not support any organization that believes in or teaches the overthrow of the U.S. Government by force or violence or by any illegal or unconstitutional methods.

I believe that this amendment has been introduced by and has the support of several other Members of the Congress from both sides of the aisle.

It will be noted that I do not propose any change to section 1001(f)(2) of title X, which calls for an affirmative oath of allegiance to the United States.

The American Association of University Professors has pointed out, I believe correctly, that the disclaimer requirement contained in section 1001(f)(1) is subject to the objections of vagueness, possible unconstitutionality, and invidiousness. The association sums up its case as follows:

This disclaimer requirement, which will apply to large numbers of young people seeking loans, fellowships, and grants to carry on their education, and to many teachers and to consulting experts, seems thoroughly harmful. It singles out persons in education as objects of suspicion; it imposes a test oath repugnant to our traditions; and it exposes those signing the affidavit to the possibility of perjury prosecutions resting on vague allegations or improper and intimidating inquiries about their conduct and their beliefs.

The association makes out a good case. An equally strong case against the disclaimer requirement has been made by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, Dr. Arthur S. Flemming. Dr. Flemming has pointed out that the requirement is, first, unnecessary; second, ineffectual, and third, expensive to administer. Here is what he says in this regard:

All persons involved in the administration of this act would have been able to deny funds to persons who themselves seek, or who belong to organizations that believe in or teach, the overthrow of the Government by force or violence, even though this provision had never been inserted. It is clear that such persons are not entitled to and should not receive funds from the U.S. Government.

Requiring persons who receive funds under this act to sign an affidavit and an oath of allegiance will not uncover any persons who themselves seek or who belong to organizations that believe in or teach the overthrow of the Government by force or violence. Such persons have no scruples about signing such an affidavit and taking such an oath.

The inclusion of this requirement in the National Defense Education Act will make it necessary for educators and students to go through a procedure that results in unnecessary expenditures on the part of the Government without making a contribution to national security.

There is no question but that this requirement has caused great concern among educators. Most educators, I believe, accept the oath of allegiance in this legislation. We require an oath of allegiance in many areas of governmental endeavor. But the disclaimer provision, in the form of a negative affidavit, they regard as a potential threat to their profession. Recently Dr. A. Whitney Griswold, president of Yale University, wrote a letter to Dr. Flemming, Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, commending Dr. Flemming for his statement to which I have just referred. In his letter President Griswold refers to the instinctive dislike that educators have for a requirement of this sort. He points out that symbolically such a measure is offensive and that it is not efficacious as a public safeguard, tending to alienate the good will of the loyal citizen without gaining corresponding advantage in protecting the Government against the actions or intentions of the disloyal. He points out further that the requirement also has the weakness of giving the public a false sense of security which, if it became too literal and too strong might lead to our undoing.

Loyalty—

States Dr. Griswold—

can only be won by the powerful attraction of unarmed truth implicit in the educational process. It cannot be induced or assured by oaths exacted in advance as conditions to participation in this process.

Finally, Dr. Griswold warns us that a negative affidavit of this sort is especially

distasteful when it is required of young people just entering the most important phase of their educational experience, as it seems to represent lack of confidence in those young people and in their future as well as in the educational process itself. Dr. Griswold's letter merits wide attention and with his permission and the permission of Dr. Flemming, I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, that it be included in the body of the RECORD at this point.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

(The letter referred to follows:)

YALE UNIVERSITY,
New Haven, Conn., December 19, 1958.

Hon. ARTHUR S. FLEMMING,
Secretary, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: May I commend your statement as reported by the Associated Press on December 15 concerning the affidavit and oath required by the National Defense Education Act of 1958?

It seems to me that there are four main reasons why those of us who participate in the educational process, whether as students or teachers, dislike such measures; and that if these reasons could be more generally understood it might help matters. The first reason is that we recall many instances in the long history of the educational process in which it has been distorted and disrupted by forces operating under the shelter of test oaths. This knowledge has imbued us with an instinctive dislike of such oaths that is not unnatural in the circumstances and should be understandable to persons familiar with history. Moreover, our instinctive dislike is fortified by reasoned objections such as that of the Supreme Court in *Ex Parte Garland* in 1867 when the Court declared "All enactments of this kind partake of the nature of bills of pains and penalties, and are subject to the constitutional inhibitions against the passage of bills of attainder, under which general designation they are included." In our eyes such measures are at best odious symbols, at worst a potential threat to our profession.

In the second place, as you yourself have pointed out, it is hard to understand why anyone should believe such oaths to be efficacious as public safeguards. Far from deterring real transgressors, they offer them a convenient cloak for their intentions and transgressions. In this respect they are worse than futile. They tend to alienate the good will of the loyal citizen without gaining a corresponding advantage in protecting the public against the actions or intentions of the disloyal. They give the public a false sense of security which, if it became too literal and too strong, might lead to our undoing.

Thirdly, it is our conviction that belief cannot be coerced or compelled. On this principle the Russian novelist, Boris Pasternak, whose treatment by his own government with respect to the Nobel Prize has been the object of indignant protest in the United States, has recently spoken eloquently in his novel "Dr. Zhivago":

"I think that if the beast who sleeps in man could be held down by threats—any kind of threat, whether of jail or of retribution after death—then the highest emblem of humanity would be the lion tamer in the circus with his whip, not the prophet who sacrificed himself. But don't you see, this is just the point—what has for centuries raised man above the beast is not the cudgel but an inward music; the irresistible power of unarmed truth, the powerful attraction of its example."

Thus we feel—and we think the overwhelming majority of those who have ever had any experience in teaching students of any age will agree with us—that belief in the rightness of our cause which assumes the positive form of loyalty to the United States, its Constitution and its laws, "can only be won by the powerful attraction of unarmed truth implicit in the educational process. It cannot be induced or assured by oaths exacted in advance as conditions to participation in this process."

Finally, oaths and affidavits of this sort are especially distasteful when they are required of young people who are just entering upon the most important phase of their educational experience. They seem to represent a lack of confidence in those young people and in their future, as well as in the educational process itself. Since they were first embodied in early colonial laws and later made explicit in the teachings and writings of Adams and Jefferson, the right of all Americans to be educated up to the limit of their native ability according to the principle of equal opportunity, and the necessity of providing for such education, have been fundamental articles of our national democratic faith. To attach such conditions to this faith as now appear, particularly in the negative affidavit under section 1001(f)(1), seems like a loss of faith in the faith itself. It seems to say to these young people upon whose education our very survival as a Nation depends that we do not trust them and are not even sure that their education will contribute to our security.

In the normal course of events it would be natural to expect that, as the National Defense Education Act becomes operative, it will undergo revision and improvement through the process of amendment. I hope very much that in this process the requirement of the affidavit and oath may receive further consideration, and I again commend you for calling this matter to the attention of the public.

Believe me,
Respectfully yours,
A. WHITNEY GRISWOLD.

I should point out that Dr. Griswold's objection appears to go to the oath of allegiance as well as the disclaimer provision. I don't think that our consideration of these two provisions should be lumped together and my bill therefore singles out only the disclaimer requirement. I point out also that the Association of University Professors has interposed no objection to the affirmative oath.

I hope that this proposed amendment to the Education Act will receive the widespread support of the Members of this body.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LINDSAY. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. GRIFFIN. I want to say that while I think the gentleman has made an important contribution on the subject which he is discussing, perhaps it should be made clear for the RECORD that the defense education bill as it was reported from the House Committee on Education and Labor in the last session did not include the oath provision; it was added by the Senate and was agreed upon in conference.

I do not agree with everything the gentleman has said. For example, I cannot understand the logic of pointing to the cost of administration and then proposing an amendment which eliminates only the disclaimer oath and retains the affirmative oath requirement. If cost is a concern that approach would not seem to be a solution.

Mr. LINDSAY. I appreciate the gentleman's remarks and am glad that he pointed out that the disclaimer provision was not part of the original bill as reported out of the House Committee on Education and Labor and considered by the whole House of Representatives.

I should add on the point of expense that the administration of this bill is in the hands of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, Dr. Flemming, and it is Dr. Flemming who voices the opinion that in his considered and professional judgment the administration of the disclaimer provision, quite apart from the administration of the oath of allegiance, is both expensive and unnecessary.

I am happy to adopt his conclusion in that regard, as I believe he is highly qualified to speak on this subject.

RESOLUTION TO INVESTIGATE THE NATION'S MONEY AND CREDIT SYSTEMS, HOUSE RESOLUTION 50

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I desire to call attention of the Members of the House to a resolution now pending which would authorize a committee of the House to make a complete and thorough investigation of the Nation's monetary and debt-management systems.

This is House Resolution 50 which was introduced by me.

It has now been 50 years since there was an investigation of the Nation's money and debt systems. And a great many changes have come about in these 50 years. Many changes have come about in the credit system. Many changes have come about in Government, even in the ideas about the responsibility of Government. And many changes and improvements have been developed in the ideas and techniques for proper money and debt management. More than that, there have been recent changes in the policies and operations of the Federal agencies involved which have a critical bearing on our whole economic system. Such an investigation is long overdue.

I proposed such an investigation as this in 1955. The House considered my resolution that year and voted it down. Our Republican colleagues made a party issue of the matter and defeated the resolution with the help, I might add, of a few Democrats.

Then, again, early in the 85th Congress I proposed such an investigation. The House considered my resolution in 1957 with the same result. The Republican Party again made a partisan issue of the investigation and succeeded in defeating it again.

Certainly it is no secret why all previous efforts in this body have failed to produce an inquiry into the handling of the Nation's debt and monetary affairs

under this administration. These efforts have failed simply because this administration has mobilized all of its forces to prevent an investigation.

I might add that since the last resolution was defeated there has been a great change in the House. If there had been a switch of 25 votes on the last resolution we would have won. Since that time 48 Members on the other side who voted against the resolution have been defeated. That means if those who defeated the ones who had voted against the investigation are now in favor of it, then we will win by approximately 25 votes.

In the weeks and months preceding the votes on my two previous resolutions, powerful financial groups were busy pulling strings and passing down orders to defeat these resolutions. National associations, such as the American Bankers Association, sprang into action and mobilized their membership to manufacture "grassroots" opposition. Republican leaders in the House went to work and—not once, but twice—organized their Members with a party solidarity seldom reached in the history of the House. And they did not stop at merely lining up passive opposition in their own ranks. They held party caucuses to do what the Wall Street Journal called "generate steam" against these resolutions.

When we voted in 1955, only 1 out of the 203 Republican Members of the House broke away from the organized opposition and voted to investigate. And when we put the question to a vote again in 1957, only 2 out of the 200 Republican Members voted to investigate.

In reminding the Members of the history of the two previous resolutions, my purpose is not to embarrass our colleagues on the other side of the aisle. By bringing up the facts which now show how misled they were or how wrong they were in listening to the word passed down from the Nation's money manipulators, I only wish to make the point that the House has not considered this proposal on its merits.

When we voted on this proposal in 1955, business was prosperous. Business was still prosperous, on the whole, when we voted again in early 1957. At least big business was booming; and our economy had been making a modest year-to-year growth. Almost all of the people who needed and wanted to work had jobs.

These rather favorable conditions were associated with a widespread belief that our Government had a new-found magic in its money and interest policies. There had been many official utterances and much propaganda which would have us believe that this magic could confidently be relied upon, not only to prevent inflationary booms and preserve the value of the dollar, but to lift the economy out of a recession, should so unlikely an event ever occur again. The brief recession of late 1953 and early 1954 was not, we were then told, a result of a first and overhasty attempt to raise interest rates throughout the business system. On the contrary, we were told the rapid recovery from that recession was positive proof that our Government's monetary magic holds all the curative powers needed to deal with unforeseen economic ills. To many of us, no doubt, continuing prosperity seemed assured.

Under these conditions, it is perhaps understandable why our Republican colleagues could profess a blind and unquestioning faith in the mysteries of our Government's bag of monetary tricks. It is perhaps understandable how, acting on blind faith, they would mobilize to prevent an investigation which seemed to be a probing into the administration's most sacred innerworkings. After all, the official wisemen had solemnly assured the country that the high-interest, tight-money policies then in vogue were for a good purpose. They assured us the purpose was to check an inflation which the money managers thought was about to happen, and which did happen after their high-interest cures had been swallowed.

TIME TO STOP GUESSING

What is needed for an understanding of our money and credit systems is an investigation and study of both the public and the private agencies of banking and finance. Such an investigation must develop a complete understanding of the functions and policies of the Federal Reserve System, since this agency more than any other determines how much money and credit are available for business, farmers, and consumers—through the privately owned agencies of banking and finance.

Such an investigation must develop a full understanding of the functions and policies of the Treasury Department, since the operations of this agency also have an important bearing on both interest rates and the amount of credit which is available in the private agencies of banking and finance. As the Nation's biggest user of credit, the Treasury greatly influences these things by the kinds, amounts, and prices at which it issues Federal securities; and as the Nation's biggest bank depositor, it greatly affects these things by the amounts of funds which it deposits with the private banks, and by the conditions under which it leaves these funds on deposit. Such an investigation must develop an understanding of the functions and policies of the private commercial banks, because these banks also operate on a delegated power of the Government to create money, and to destroy money and thus lessen the money supply.

Such an investigation must also make a critical review of the functions and policies of the Federal agencies which regulate, supervise, and examine the commercial banks, such as the Comptroller of the Currency and the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation.

Finally, such an investigation must develop an understanding of the part played in the Nation's money and credit systems by those kinds of financial companies—such as the insurance companies, the investment trusts and others—which have come into being or come to be important sources of credit since the last monetary investigation was made almost 50 years ago.

As to the Federal Reserve System, there is certainly one thing that should be cleared up in the public's mind. Some Federal Reserve publications state that the Federal Reserve banks are owned by the commercial banks through the ownership of stock in which the commercial banks have invested in the 12 Federal Reserve banks. Yet that is absolutely untrue. The truth is that the commercial banks have invested—it is an involuntary investment—only about $350 million in what is called "stock." And the word "stock" in this instance is a misnomer. It is not stock. The private banks have no proprietary interest whatever in the Federal Reserve System. Upon the investment in that stock the banks receive 6 percent interest, or they have been since 1913; and that is all they get out of it. That is all they are supposed to get out of it.

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the gentleman for the fight which he has carried on over these many years on this very subject. To me it is the very essence of our problem today in meeting up to the needs of this economy of ours.

I should like to ask the gentleman this question. Is it not true that there is considerable testimony in the various records of the Government, committees and whatnot, that substantiates the very point which the gentleman has made, that there is no proprietary interest in this so-called stock?

Mr. PATMAN. That is very true. It took me 20 years of interrogating different members of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System and others in authority to get that admission. But in the last 3 or 4 years we have gotten that admission repeatedly, because that conclusion is inescapable. The banks do not own the Federal Reserve System. The Federal Reserve System is owned by the United States Government.

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield further.

Mr. OLIVER. Am I correct in my understanding that the American Bankers Association itself have so admitted on various occasions?

Mr. PATMAN. Yes, they have admitted it.

I want to say to the gentleman that the Federal Reserve System comes nearer to being a cooperative than any other form of organization. The commercial banks that own this so-called stock, cannot vote that stock according to the amount of the stock they hold. It has no such relationship to voting. This is just like a cooperative. Each bank has one vote, whether it is a big bank or a little bank.

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield further.

Mr. OLIVER. I want to say to the gentleman that I thank him for this

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

opportunity to listen to this discussion, and I want him to know that I join him in his fight and shall lend him such support as I am capable of lending.

Mr. PATMAN. I thank the gentleman. His support is most welcome.

May I state that in a very short time, the next day or two, I expect to be presumptuous enough to send a letter around to the Members of the House asking them if they would like to be notified of a meeting in the Caucus Room, at which time we expect to organize a bloc for the purpose of sponsoring this resolution and similar resolutions having to do with correcting this high-interest hard-money policy. I should like to get as many Members as I can, and ask each one of them to be cosponsors and have just as much credit as I would have for anything that may be accomplished. In other words, we would all go into this together, working shoulder to shoulder, and receive equal credit for any achievements that might come our way.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I appreciate the opportunity of hearing what the gentleman has to say. May I ask him if I am correct in my understanding that the President feels that the Federal Reserve System is independent of the Chief Executive?

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, the President has stated that it is independent—which is a great disappointment to me and I think many other people, because section 3, article II, of the Constitution states—in outlining the duties and responsibilities of the President—"that he shall take care that the laws be faithfully executed." That is the Constitution. The Federal Reserve Act is a law just like any other law. It was passed by the Congress and signed by the President of the United States. When the President says he has no responsibility, that this agency of the Government is separate and independent, I think he is wrong. I am afraid he has accepted the wrong advice.

I concede that in 1951 the Federal Reserve attempted to secede from the Government, and I use that phrase "secede" advisedly. It attempted to secede from the Government and go out on its own, to be a fourth branch, if you please. The Federal Reserve people had been looking for an opportunity to do that for a long time. The opportunity came in 1951 when the popularity curve of the then President of the United States was at a low level, and they took advantage of that opportunity to declare themselves independent.

They are using the Government's money which they obtain from the Bureau of Engraving and Printing free of charge. They have the use of this money to trade for U.S. Government securities that are interest-bearing. They keep the interest-bearing securities in their vaults, and the taxpayers must pay interest on those securities, the amount aggregating around $600 million a year. That gives the Federal Reserve ample funds to spend for any purpose in the world, and they are spending it for almost every purpose. Then 90 percent of what is left over goes back to the Treasury of the United States. All of it should go back to the Treasury, because the money belongs to the Government, but they keep about 10 percent of it each year and put it in a "surplus reserve."

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. If I understand the situation correctly, last year the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. REUSS] suggested that the monetary and fiscal policies of this Government be brought into line with the other policies under the Employment Act of 1946 in order that we could promote and maintain maximum employment, production, and purchasing power. We were given to understand from reading that record in the hearings of the Committee on Government Operations that the President refused to submit any recommendations with respect to monetary and credit policies to this body, because that was not in the executive branch. It seems to me the gentleman's suggestion that there be a congressional resolution would certainly be in order so long as this administration is in power. If the administration is not going to review the policies of the Federal Reserve System, then it has to be the responsibility of somebody, and perhaps the Congress should assume some responsibility. Is that the gentleman's understanding?

Mr. PATMAN. Yes; that is exactly right. The last economic report of the President does not even mention money and credit policies, outlook, problems, and so on. Yet this report is supposed to present a complete economic picture of the Nation, to carry out the Employment Act of 1946. I do not know what solution the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. REUSS] proposes. I have not studied it.

But this much I would say. I believe in the present banking system. I would make no fundamental change in it. I do not object to the Federal Reserve System.

I do not object to the fractional reserve system nor to the private banks using the Government's power to create money, which they are exercising and enjoying today, to the extent that they use this money-creating power to provide business and consumer credit—particularly to people in the area where the bank is located. But I do not think the private banks should use the Government's money-creating power which is delegated to them to buy securities of foreign governments or to buy securities of the U.S. Government. And for that matter, I don't think the country banks should use their power to buy securities of New York City, Chicago, San Francisco, and so on. In other words, the local banks should serve the local areas that they are supposed to serve. The Federal Reserve System is a great system. There is nothing wrong with it that could not be cured by putting public officials in all the positions of power and trust. At present, many of the top policymakers are not public officials—they are representatives of the private banks. They should all be public officials so that they will carry out the will of the Congress that created the System. The System operates on a delegation of Congress' power to create money and regulate the value thereof.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for just one more statement?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that the Congress in 1946 made it clear that it was their intent that all of the programs of the United States be used to promote and maintain maximum employment, production, and purchasing power and that the hard-money policy that had been followed by the Federal Reserve Board in recent years is definitely and fundamentally at variance with securing full employment. The fact that we still have nearly 5 million at present unemployed after more than a year of public discussion at this point, and the fact that we have interest rates still going up, it would seem to me to be ample evidence that something is fundamentally if not absolutely rotten in Denmark, and at least something is fundamentally weak in our monetary and credit policy and it is high time that this Congress called into examination the monetary and credit policies in an effort to try to get the Federal Reserve which is the duly authorized banking system to act responsibly in keeping with the announced policy of both the Republicans and the Democrats in the Employment Act of 1946, and I thank the gentleman for the statement that he is making because I think he is pointing in that direction.

Mr. PATMAN. The gentleman is entirely right. The Employment Act of 1946 imposes a duty on every agency of our Government to do certain things, and to coordinate, to achieve maximum employment, production, and purchasing power. The Federal Reserve officials have admitted, in answer to questions, that they recognize it as their duty to carry out the Employment Act of 1946. But they have a rather unusual way of attempting to carry out this duty.

We had Mr. Martin, Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board, before the Joint Economic Committee early last month. Senator DOUGLAS pointed out to him that prices had been stable for almost a year, but that we have 6 percent of the labor force unemployed. Mr. Martin seemed to feel he should not do anything about this. He said he believed that some employment would be provided by what he called further adjustments in the market. Senator DOUGLAS asked him what he would do if after 6 months these people are still not back at work, and Mr. Martin answered that he could not say. Actually, the Federal Reserve is now tightening the purse strings and it is choking off the business recovery, in my view. We are in one of those periods, in my judgment, when we have sufficient consumer and business demand to have full employment, but the Federal Reserve's tight-money policies are holding the country back from full employment.

Early last year, however, in the depths of the recession, the Federal Reserve announced that it was trying to do something about the recession by easing credit. What the Federal Reserve did was to put into the laps of the private banks $3½ billion of new reserves, free of charge, on which these banks could create money at the rate of seven to one to acquire earnings assets. This was supposed to be for the purpose of helping the banks help business and help consumers. But what the banks did was create $10 billion with which to buy U.S. Government securities. They invested in U.S. Government securities, but they did not use the money to expand business loans. They actually called in and canceled $1½ billion of business loans. This $10 billion free gift of Government securities to the private banks, which the Federal Reserve could have bought itself, will cost the taxpayers between $300 million and $400 million in interest charges each and every year.

Do you not think we ought to do something about this? Do you not think we ought to do something about the high interest policy? It is running wild. The Treasury is saying that we are facing inflation. Insurance companies and the Federal Reserve say we are facing inflation. That is scaring the investors away. They are saying, "If we are going to have inflation, why invest in long-term bonds? We will only invest in stocks and perhaps a little in short-term bonds." They say, "Why take life insurance that will be paid off in cheaper dollars?"

This is a terrible campaign that they are putting on. It is against the public interest.

After 50 years we certainly should take a look at what is going on. I imagine you will find some things that will cause you to wish you had gone into these matters many years before now.

STUDIES BY PRIVATE GROUPS ARE NO SUBSTITUTE FOR CONGRESS' DUTY

Clearly, it is a responsibility of Congress to learn the facts and gain for itself an understanding of our money and credit system. We cannot sit back and wait for private groups to tell us what they think we ought to know.

These things are of great importance, and it is clear that both the administration and important private groups think so.

Only recently the Committee for Economic Development set up a large committee of private individuals to make an investigation. But unfortunately—and I say this with all respect to the individuals involved—this group is topheavy with people who have an ax to grind and who have fixed ideas about the answers which their investigation should reveal. Furthermore, this group of private businessmen is handicapped. They do not have subpena powers and they can command only the testimony and the facts which the bankers want to give. Finally the group will probably have no report and no information for the public for 3 years.

IS THE RECESSION BY ACCIDENT OR DESIGN?

The investigation which I propose that a committee of the House make will have both short-term and long-term results. Obviously, much of the information and understanding we need, and should have developed long ago, cannot now be developed for many months and perhaps even several years. On the other hand, we should be able to obtain promptly the answers to some of the key questions facing us today. We should be able to learn rather quickly whether or not Congress is wasting time and giving the people false hope in considering any measures to help pull the country out of this recession. If this recession is a deliberate objective and plan of the money-managers, then we should be able to learn that rather quickly, in which case we can quit wasting time on the kind of antirecession measures we have been considering. Furthermore, if this recession is planned, as many people think, then we should be able to learn when the money-managers plan to bring us out of the recession, if ever.

Developing this information will not only help the people in making their plans for the future; it will also tend to give everybody a chance at the financial gains which can be made by having this information. On the other hand, if the money-managers are not capable of manipulating the country out of the recession, we should know that. If these monetary manipulations are not capable of doing the things we have been led to believe they can do, then we should know that the bankers and the money-lenders have been enriched for no good purpose and the people are paying, according to my estimate, $10 billion in interest charges they would not be paying if interest rates had been left at their 1952 levels. This $10 billion a year means $60 per capita or $300 annually for a family of 5. We should know these things so that we will free ourselves from a misplaced faith and put our minds to finding methods of government that will work, and work in the public interest.

Surely no Member of ths body can hold a blind faith in the money managers today. Heaven knows it is time, and past time, that we open our eyes and ears and learn for ourselves how our Nation's money and credit affairs are being managed. We should know who is managing these affairs and for what purpose. And we should try to learn to what extent guidance of this Nation's economic destiny does depend upon manipulations of the supply and price of money, and what the virtues and evils of these methods are.

The Nation is still in a serious recession. At least 6 percent of the labor force is unemployed. Furthermore, according to the Joint Economic Committee's study of the President's Economic Report, it appears that the administration is expecting unemployment to continue at about 6 to 7 percent through the end of this year. Thousands of efficient small businesses are going bankrupt monthly. The Nation's production has fallen, and its productive strength deteriorated, when our very hopes of winning the cold war rest on increasing production and economic growth.

WE SHOULD FIND OUT IF THE RECESSION WAS PLANNED

I do not hold any categorical belief that the recession was caused, deliberately or otherwise, by our Government's money and debt policies. We cannot ignore the fact, however, that some eminent authorities have said that these policies helped to bring on the recession. More than that, the policies did not stop the inflation, which was the sole excuse given for these policies; they added to the inflation. The head of the economics department of Harvard University appraised these policies in conservative terms, for a committee of the Senate, testifying as follows:

> Despite a vigorous policy, the Federal Reserve failed to stop inflation and yet helped to bring on a recession. * * * To stabilize prices with a large cost inflation could only be done by inducing unemployment through a restricted monetary policy. This the Federal Reserve has accomplished.

We cannot ignore the fact that there has been wide discussion of a deliberate, planned recession, even before the first signs of the recession appeared. As early as July of 1957 the New York Journal of Commerce reported, in a feature editorial, as follows:

> The evidence now points strongly to the conclusion that both the administration and the Federal Reserve authorities believe that "a moderate recession now" would be a small price to pay for the avoidance of another boom-and-bust later on.

This financial journal is generally read only by a small number of people and people who are in full sympathy with the administration's inner thoughts. In the same editorial it went on to discuss the public relations problem which bringing on this recession posed for the administration. It said:

> Such a policy leads compellingly to the all-important psychological—or public relations—problems of whether the administration should take the public into its confidence by trying to explain its goals and methods—or whether it is better just to follow the course it deems necessary without attempting to make it palatable to the public by official explanations.

ANTIRECESSION MEASURES MAY BE WASTED EFFORT

Is it the plan to keep the country in a recession of about 6-percent unemployment? Certainly, some very powerful financial and business leaders have said this country cannot have a stable dollar without unemployment; and they have made it clear that, as between the two, unemployment is a small evil in their view; if an evil at all.

Congress is spending a great deal of time and energy on measures which we hope will bring back full employment and economic growth. Many of us are struggling with proposals for putting the unemployed back to work. Some of us are even considering what we can do to stop the mounting toll of small business failures and the growing monopolization of business. And some of us are considering what we can do, if anything, to

help the farmers and the farm people who are being shoved off the land.

If our idea of trying to bring back full employment is contrary to the wishes of the money managers who run the Republican Party, then we may be wasting our time and giving the people false hopes. Whatever measures we finally pass may be futile. They may do nothing more than cause the money managers to take further steps to offset the effects we intend. Certainly, then we have reason for questioning whether this administration intends to restore full employment any time in the foreseeable future. It has proposed no measure which would accomplish this purpose, and it has plainly lacked enthusiasm for such measures that have been started in Congress.

In any case, why do we study, consider, and try to understand all of these various piecemeal economic measures, and yet avoid any study and understanding of the role which our money and debt system plays in the economic system? This is like trying to guess what kind of fruit the tree will bear, and whether it will bear well or poorly, when we have not yet bothered to learn what kind of tree it is, or what kind of fertilizer and care it needs.

THE BANKS AND WALL STREET STILL PROSPER

Certainly, no part of the financial community has suffered from the money or public debt manipulations. In the years when interest rates were being raised, profits of the banks and the moneylenders went up, up, and up. And since the recession started, profits of the banks and the moneylenders have still gone up. Every important step which our Government's moneymanagers have taken in the name of easing credit has been a step which has permitted the banks to create more money to buy more Government bonds and collect more interest.

According to my estimates, the American people paid out $10 billion more in interest charges last lear than they would have had to pay if interest rates had been left at the 1952 levels. This $10 billion which counts interest charges on installment debt, mortgages and everything else is the same amount as the gap in consumer purchasing power estimated by a number of economists, and it is the amount of increased spending and increased debt which these economists say the Government will have to assume to bring back full employment.

This $10 billion of increased interest payments means that the farmers and home buyers are paying more on their mortgages, that consumers are paying more to finance purchases of automobiles, furniture and appliances, that small businesses are paying more to carry inventories, that the State and local governments are paying more to finance schools and other community facilities, and that the people in every community of the country are paying more taxes. Yet this is only a drop in the bucket. It does not count how much more consumers are paying in higher prices, even when they buy for cash. The high-interest charges are added on to the cost of raw materials, added on again in the cost of manufacture, added on again in the cost of wholesalers and retailers, because business at all of these levels is done in large part on borrowed money. And finally it is the consumers who pay.

A DUTY OF CONGRESS LONG NEGLECTED

What is being neglected here is a duty of Congress, and this is a long-neglected duty of Congress. The Constitution reserves to Congress the power to create money and to regulate the value thereof. And the Constitution reserves to Congress the power to issue debt in the name of the United States. But Congress has delegated these powers and duties to the U.S. Treasury, to the Federal Reserve, and to the private banks, and it has not bothered to check on how these duties are being carried out.

As to issuing money and regulating its value, we have simply turned the job over to the Federal Reserve, the U.S. Treasury, and the private banks; then we have closed our eyes to what is being done.

As to issuing debt against the United States, we maintain only a ceiling on the total amount that may be outstanding—which ceiling we raise from time to time when requested. But we pay no attention to the methods by which the debt is issued, to whom it is issued, and how much unnecessary interest and other premiums are paid.

The last time there was a full investigation and study of our monetary system, the Federal Reserve System was set up. Nearly half a century has passed since that investigation was made. In this half-century new types of financial institutions have come into being. Other types which then handled only unimportant amounts of savings and investments now handle gigantic sums. Many of these, such as the insurance companies, the investment trusts, and the savings banks appear to have close working relationships in and among themselves, and with the commercial banks and the investment bankers. Just what are their interconnections? Are the vast sums of savings of millions of families being handled in the public interest? How do these new financial giants fit under our laws that are supposed to safeguard the public interest in financial institutions?

PRIVATE BANKERS GIVEN POWERS OVER MONEY AND INTEREST

In the emergency of depression, Congress amended the Federal Reserve Act in 1933 and again in 1935 without waiting to study what the effects would be. That study has still not been made, although these amendments made basic changes in the Federal Reserve. Before these changes were made, the Federal Reserve had been a system of regional banks, with each region having its own powers. But those changes of 1933 and 1935 created a central bank. They took away the powers of the regional banks; and centered those powers in the New York bank.

Woodrow Wilson was supposed to have settled, once and for all, the question whether the private bankers would have representation on the boards and committees of the Federal Reserve System. He settled, he thought, the question whether the private bankers would have representation on any public board which determines what the money supply shall be, determines what the interest rates shall be, or determines any other matters of bank regulation. The bankers went to him and proposed such representation when the Federal Reserve legislation was being drafted and he flatly turned them down. President Wilson said then that the private banks had no more right to be on the public boards to regulate money, interest rates, or other banking matters than the railroad owners had a right to be on the Interstate Commerce Commission, to help fix freight rates.

WORLD'S MOST POWERFUL MONEY GROUP TRADES IN SECRET

But the 1935 act—we now know—gave the bankers the representation which Woodrow Wilson had said no civilized country would permit. This act created the present-day Open Market Committee and gave that committee the Federal Reserve's powers to buy and to sell Government securities. This committee is today by all odds the most powerful financial body in the world. It has all the resources of the Federal Government—all of the gold in Fort Knox—at its disposal and discretion. In this committee of 12 men, 5 are selected by representatives of the private banks. Now this is something to think about: the buying and selling of Government securities is the most powerful weapon the Federal Reserve has for determining what the Nation's supply of money and credit shall be, and what interest rates the people will pay. And the committee of 12 that decides these things has on it 5 members who are chosen by representatives of the private banks.

The creation of the Open Market Committee has brought about some strange divisions of responsibility within the Federal Reserve System. The System now has two boards or committees with powers and duties for issuing money and regulating its value. The Federal Reserve Board has this power, which it can exercise by changing the percentage of deposits which the member banks are required to keep in reserve. And the Open Market Committee has an even greater power, which it can exercise by buying or selling Government securities or changing the price at which it offers to buy or sell these securities.

Certainly, then, this is a matter which should be looked into.

Here we have two bodies—neither of which is responsible to the other, and neither of which is responsible to anybody, except Congress—with separate powers to go in opposite directions.

For example, when credit needs loosening the Open Market Committee can buy Government securities. This helps, first, the Government and the taxpayers because the interest on those securities comes back into the Treasury. And this method of easing credit also helps the private banks, because it makes more

bank reserves available on which the banks can make loans at higher rates of interest than the Government securities pay. But the Federal Reserve Board can also loosen credit, when it wishes to do so, by lowering the percentage of deposits which the private banks are required, by the Board's regulation, to keep in reserve. This method of easing credit primarily helps the private banks, because it allows the banks to create more money for loans and keep the Government securities too. In this way, instead of the interest on the Government securities coming back to the Government, it goes to fatten bank profits.

Are these conflicting powers being used in the public's interest? Does one board or committee force the other to act, by itself refusing to act? Or is action deadlocked while the public interest suffers?

Today the Open Market Committee holds the greatest portfolio of securities in the world. It has bought with public money, and is holding, almost $25 billion of securities of the U.S. Government. It trades in these securities with private dealers to the tune of about $10 billion a year. Yet all of this trading is carried on in secret deals with a small group of about 15 private dealers and speculators. The prices at which these deals are made are secret; the amounts of securities traded with individual dealers are secret; and even the names of the dealers are secret. In addition, this Committee trades in U.S. Government securities with foreign central banks to the tune of about $5 billion a year; and all the details of this trading are also secret. Certainly this, too, is something that Congress ought to look into.

WHO MAKES THE NATION'S MONEY AND CREDIT POLICIES?

Actually, we do not know what real division of power and responsibility over monetary matters exists among the Federal Reserve System, the Treasury Department and the White House. At various times since this administration has been in power, the President has made public statements referring to the then current monetary policies as the administration's policies. But at alternate times the President has referred to these monetary policies as matters decided solely by the Federal Reserve System and at these times he has said that the administration could not and would never try to influence the Federal Reserve on the monetary policies it makes.

Who, then, actually determines these policies? We do not really know; but we ought to know.

Clearly, however, the manner in which the Treasury manages the public debt has a great influence on interest rates and on the amount of credit which is available to business, consumers, and farmers. And this we do know: Since the present administration has been in power, it has repeatedly issued new Federal securities at interest rates that were above the going market rates. Such rates were proved to be too high, over and over again, because the securities were quickly being resold in the market at prices much higher than the Treasury got for them. In fact, this administration had not been in office 2 months when it embarked on a program of issuing new Federal securities at artificially high interest rates. In February of 1953, it issued about $8 billion of Treasury certificates paying 2¼ percent interest, and exchanged these for securities paying 1⅞ percent. Shortly after that, it issued $1 billion in bonds at 3¼ percent, when the longest term negotiable bond then outstanding paid 2½ percent. And what is more, it issued these new high-interest bonds at a time when the Treasury did not need the money.

Now the President has warned that he may ask Congress to raise the legal ceiling on the interest rate at which the Treasury can issue long-term bonds. This ceiling of 4¼ percent has been in effect since the end of the First World War. So it looks as though the money-managers do not think interest rates have hit the ceiling yet, but that they will go through the ceiling and take off into outer space.

WHO MANAGES THE TREASURY "GIVEAWAYS"?

What then are the facts of the Treasury's influence? Do the arbitrarily fixed prices at which it issues securities force interest rates up or down throughout the banking system? Do these repeated Treasury "giveaways" force up interest rates with or without the consent of the Federal Reserve? Why should the Treasury arbitrarily fix interest rates on its securities in any case? Why should it consult with an advisory committee of big bankers and money lenders who are going to buy the securities about at what level the interest rate should be fixed? Why does the Treasury not sell its securities on the basis of open, competitive bids, just as the States and most of the private corporations sell their securities? This, too, is a matter which we should certainly look into.

I have indicated only a few of the questions which should be looked into. There are many others that are equally vital to the proper functioning of our economic system.

Let me call your attention to one of two other matters.

We have heard a great deal about giving the Federal Reserve standby authority to control consumer credit. Is that a good proposal?

What about controls over business credit? The need for such controls has been much more clearly demonstrated than the need for control over consumer credit. Let me illustrate.

OBJECT OF TIGHT MONEY

Chairman Martin and other Federal Reserve officials have repeatedly stated that the object of the tight-money squeeze of 1955–57 was, not consumer buying, but the boom in business investment—specifically investment in new plants and equipment. Yet to try to dampen the investment boom the Federal Reserve had to squeeze credit for everybody, including the State and local governments that were trying to build schools and other essentials.

It had no authority to restrain the borrowers that were engaged in the runaway expansion, namely, the big industrial corporations. It had no authority to restrain the lenders who were supplying most of the credit, namely, the insurance companies, the investment trusts, and other nonbank lenders. The Federal Reserve has authority only to squeeze or loosen credit in the commercial banks.

Certainly no one can argue now that the Federal Reserve has any good way of squeezing credit in nonbank sources to dampen a big-business investment boom. It can raise interest rates throughout the credit system, yes, and that it did in 1955–57. And the big corporations wanting to expand stayed away from the insurance companies and the bond markets for a while, because they did not want to pay the high rates. But they went to the commercial banks and got the money on a temporary basis—and took up the credit that would normally have been available to small firms.

Then, last year when we had this recession "shakeout", and the Federal Reserve brought the long-term rates down for a while, the big corporations then went to the insurance companies and to the bond market and arranged their long-term financing and paid off the bank loans. And now that this is all arranged, the Federal Reserve has tightened credit and raised long-term rates higher than ever.

In the meantime, however, small business was shaken out of the credit picture and pretty much out of existence. The industrial giants now have a bigger share of the market and a stronger control over markets than ever before.

Between October of 1955 and October of 1957 bank loans to corporations having more than $100 million of assets increased by 66 percent, while bank loans to firms with less than $50,000 of assets dropped 3 percent, which is only added evidence that the Fed was more successful in squeezing small firms out of the credit necessary for carrying on their previous levels of operation than it was in checking big-business expansion.

I will insert in the RECORD here three tables which the Federal Reserve System itself made on this subject. These cover a survey that I requested in December of 1956, although the survey was not actually made until the end of March 1958, after the big credit squeeze of 1955–57 was over and the damage had been done.

I might add that while the squeeze was on, some of us tried to point out that the big corporations were getting the credit and the small firms were being squeezed out. But at that time we were being assured by the monetary authorities that we were all wrong. We were told that the banks were rationing the credit to take care of small firms. And we were told that the reason why the big corporations seemed to be getting a disproportionate share of the credit was that it was the big-business industries that were expanding. But the Fed's

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

own figures now show that this was not just a matter of which industries were expanding.

There are separate figures for the individual industries. And these show that within each industry the big firms got the credit, and the bigger the firms, the bigger the slice of the credit they got. The tables are as follows:

TABLE 1.—*Business loans of member banks, 1955 and 1957, by size of borrower*

Size of borrower (total assets, in thousands)	Amount of loans					Number of loans					Average size of loan		
	Millions of dollars		Percentage change, 1955–57	Percentage distribution		Thousands		Percentage change, 1955–57	Percentage distribution		Thousands of dollars		Percentage change, 1955–57
	1955	1957		1955	1957	1955	1957		1955	1957	1955	1957	
All sizes	30,805	40,618	31.9	100.0	100.0	1,185.2	1,280.6	8.0	100.0	100.0	26.0	31.7	22.0
Less than $50	1,501	1,456	−3.0	4.9	3.6	503.1	504.7	.3	42.5	39.4	3.0	2.9	−3.3
$50 to $250	4,505	5,256	16.7	14.6	12.9	414.9	494.3	19.1	35.0	38.6	10.9	10.6	−2.1
$250 to $1,000	5,051	6,302	24.8	16.4	15.5	125.8	157.6	25.3	10.6	12.3	40.2	40.0	−.4
$1,000 to $5,000	5,586	6,775	21.3	18.1	16.7	37.9	48.2	27.2	3.2	3.8	147.3	140.5	−4.6
$5,000 to $25,000	4,742	5,912	24.7	15.4	14.6	11.0	13.3	21.1	.9	1.0	432.8	445.7	3.0
$25,000 to $100,000	3,240	4,893	51.1	10.5	12.0	4.4	5.4	22.7	.4	.4	732.6	901.6	23.1
$100,000 or more	5,297	8,815	66.4	17.2	21.7	6.0	6.5	7.3	.5	.5	878.8	1,363.5	55.1
Not ascertained	883	1,207	36.7	2.9	3.0	82.0	50.7	−38.2	6.9	4.0	10.8	23.8	121.3

NOTE.—Details may not add to totals because of rounding.

TABLE 2.—*Change in amount of business loans of member banks, 1955–57, by business and size of borrower*

[Increase, or decrease (−). In percent unless otherwise noted]

Business of borrower	Amount outstanding Oct. 16, 1957 (in millions of dollars)	Size of borrower (total assets, in thousands of dollars)							
		All borrowers [1]	Less than $50	$50 to $250	$250 to $1,000	$1,000 to $5,000	$5,000 to $25,000	$25,000 to $100,000	$100,000 or more
All businesses	40,618	31.9	−3.0	16.7	24.8	21.3	24.7	51.1	66.4
Manufacturing and mining:									
Food, liquor, and tobacco	2,392	28.0	−33.5	7.1	23.7	5.4	−4.6	8.5	104.5
Textiles, apparel, and leather	1,685	−3.0	−38.7	−20.7	−7.8	−4.0	−9.5	3.6	47.7
Metals and metal products	5,526	70.5	−18.2	20.1	20.2	46.7	35.1	106.1	151.2
Petroleum, coal, chemicals, and rubber	3,750	44.1	−16.2	2.2	40.3	18.3	7.2	20.4	138.1
All other	2,793	47.2	−7.2	8.4	20.1	46.1	76.1	82.7	119.2
Trade:									
Retail trade	4,588	33.2	3.4	28.3	51.4	48.7	32.3	36.6	33.7
Wholesale trade	2,982	24.7	−10.6	21.8	23.7	17.9	31.0	105.2	134.7
Commodity dealers	816	10.7	−18.8	13.4	44.2	−22.1	−2.4	61.2	20.2
Other:									
Sales finance companies	3,096	9.3	−32.5	−24.0	20.2	−6.6	7.5	36.3	5.9
Transportation, communication, and other public utilities	4,168	47.0	31.2	13.0	10.5	44.6	56.1	84.0	40.0
Construction	1,981	17.1	−7.7	9.4	9.3	23.6	−.5	101.2	310.0
Real estate	2,976	22.5	−24.9	9.9	23.3	17.1	27.6	109.3	19.9
Service firms	2,263	28.3	4.6	29.5	36.2	42.1	79.8	29.7	9.3
All other nonfinancial	1,606	20.4	6.0	18.0	26.9	−1.3	25.1	30.4	96.1

[1] Based on data that include a small amount of loans for borrowers whose size was not ascertained.

NOTE.—Details may not add to totals because of rounding.

TABLE 3.—*Business loans of member banks, 1955–57, by business and relative size of borrower* [1]

Business of borrower	Loans outstanding Oct. 5, 1955				Increase, or decrease (−), 1955–57						
	Millions of dollars	Percentage of industry total, by size of borrower [2]			Millions of dollars	Percentage of industry total, by size of borrower [2]			Percentage change, by size of borrower		
		Small	Medium	Large		Small	Medium	Large	Small	Medium	Large
All businesses	30,805	20.5	44.9	31.7	9,813	6.9	39.5	50.4	10.6	28.0	50.7
Manufacturing and mining:											
Food, liquor, and tobacco	1,869	21.4	55.4	22.4	523	10.0	6.2	83.7	13.0	3.1	104.5
Textiles, apparel, and leather	1,736	33.0	47.2	18.2	−53	[3]−154.4	[3]−95.3	[3]157.1	−14.3	−6.2	26.3
Metals and metal products	3,941	38.7	36.1	24.0	2,285	16.6	32.0	51.4	30.2	62.5	151.2	
Petroleum, coal, chemicals, and rubber	[illegible]3	28.7	44.7	21.7	1,147	13.0	14.5	68.0	20.0	14.3	138.1
All other	1,896	18.6	61.8	18.4	895	2.1	58.9	38.0	5.4	45.0	97.5
Trade:											
Retail trade	3,445	13.8	51.0	33.1	1,144	1.4	56.9	38.9	3.4	37.1	39.0
Wholesale trade	2,392	23.9	56.5	17.8	590	16.0	48.4	37.2	16.5	21.1	51.5
Commodity dealers	736	8.9	36.5	52.3	79	7.4	12.7	78.7	8.9	3.7	16.2
Other:											
Sales finance companies	2,832	25.1	32.1	42.5	263	−2.7	74.9	27.1	−1.0	21.8	5.9
Transportation, communication, and public utilities	2,835	1.7	49.0	46.6	1,334	1.1	53.6	39.7	31.2	51.5	40.0
Construction	1,692	7.8	51.1	38.0	289	−3.5	27.9	62.8	−7.7	9.3	28.2
Real estate	2,430	24.4	22.7	44.7	546	4.1	23.5	52.6	3.7	23.3	26.4
Service firms	1,763	17.4	50.1	27.0	499	2.8	56.7	41.4	4.6	32.0	43.3
All other nonfinancial business	1,333	7.1	37.5	48.8	272	2.1	41.7	46.5	6.0	22.7	19.4

[1] For classification of borrower by relative size, see appendix A.
[2] Figures do not add to 100 percent because some loans were made to borrowers whose size was not ascertained.
[3] Net change for industry was a decrease; sign indicates direction of change for size group.

Source of tables: "Financing Small Business," Report to the Committees on Banking and Currency and Select Committees on Small Business, U.S. Congress, by the Federal Reserve System, 85th Cong., 2d sess., 1958.

GOVERNMENT MONEY AGENCIES ARE NOT AUDITED

Now consider this: The Federal Reserve Banks have never been audited by an independent agency of the Government. All of their audits are internal audits, made by their own personnel. They have had a private auditing firm come in on a few occasions to observe a few of these audits being made. But there is still no audit by the General Accounting Office.

Here, then, is a government-owned agency which handles more money than any other Government agency, and it has never been audited.

Consider this also: The New York Federal Reserve Bank is the fiscal agent for the Treasury. It handles billions of dollars of the Treasury money each year. That has never been audited by the Government.

Then consider this: The Office of the Comptroller of the Currency, in the Treasury Department, has handled more than $157 billion of Government currency—$1 bills, $10 bills, and so on. This Office has the job of destroying all the wornout and damaged currency issued by the Federal Reserve—what are called Federal Reserve notes. Yet this Office has never had an official audit.

A FAIR INVESTIGATION BY DEMOCRATIC METHODS

What is wrong with having a committee of the House investigate, study, and report to the House on the answers to these questions? What objection can there be to making the facts known? Are there skeletons to hide?

The committee which I propose will be composed of both Democrats and Republicans. If this committee uncovers any facts which are embarrassing to the administration, or to any powerful financial group, the Republican Members will have every opportunity to express their views and to present whatever justification for these facts they care to present. If any member of the committee does not like what the majority reports, he will have the usual opportunity of making a minority report. He will have an equal opportunity of convincing the public that his facts are right and the others are wrong.

To refuse to investigate is to deny ourselves and deny the public the facts. That is undemocratic, and it leads to misinformed public opinion. Refusing to investigate and learn for ourselves could lead to bad laws, and it could lead to plunders unheard of.

The investigation I propose is, I think, a fair procedure. It is a democratic procedure. It will lead to an informed public opinion, and it will give Congress the facts and the understanding it needs to carry out its legislative duties.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

WORLD PEACE, DISARMAMENT, AND THE ENEMY WE FACE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ZABLOCKI] is recognized for 45 minutes.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, the Communist pressure on Berlin and on other vital spots in the free world require that we take a fresh look at the situation around us—at the prospects of disarmament and world peace, and at the nature of the Communist enemy which faces us.

To this end, I would like to make a few observations in the hope that they will contribute to the serious debate on this very important subject, and stimulate greater understanding of what we are really up against.

PART I—PREREQUISITES OF WORLD PEACE

There are, of course, many prerequisites for the achievement of lasting world peace. The foremost among them, in my opinion, are justice and effective disarmament arrangements.

The first prerequisite is self-explanatory. Lasting peace can only be built on the foundation of justice. There is no other way, because injustice, particularly on a national scale, contains within itself the seeds of rebellion. And, as we all know, any revolt on a large scale will result in international repercussions which can promptly embroil the world in a new conflict.

The second prerequisite, effective disarmament arrangements, cannot be achieved unless the following two factors prevail:

First. All nations, and particularly their governments, must have a sense of moral responsibility. Such a sense of moral responsibility will cause them to honor and uphold international agreements and treaties. If there is no disposition on the part of a nation to honor agreements with other countries, an international treaty becomes just a piece of paper—completely worthless.

Second. All nations must be included in, and bound by, an agreement on disarmament. This applies particularly to all nations which—because of large population, natural resources, or possession of atomic weapons—have a power potential. What I mean by the term "power potential" is the capacity of any nation to disrupt international order by inflicting, through military means, serious damage upon some other nation.

So here, in brief, in my opinion are the prerequisites of world peace: a sense of justice, and a sense of moral responsibility on the part of nations and their governments, and the inclusion of all potentially strong nations in a workable disarmament agreement.

PART II—THE OUTLOOK FOR WORLD PEACE

Do these prerequisites of world peace presently exist in the community of nations? I use the term "world peace" in the sense in which we all know it, implying not only the absence of out-and-out wars, but also an end to the cold war.

Personally I do not find the prospects of achieving such peace to be encouraging at the present time. I say this because the Communist system violates the prerequisites of world peace.

During the 42 years of its existence, the Communist system has not changed. The Communist goal remains the same: they want to remake their own people, and the world, in the image of their atheistic, materialistic blueprint. Our country's strength and our way of life is the chief obstacle which the Communists have to overcome to realize their plans.

Justice and moral responsibility, as we know them, are completely alien to the Communist system. The Communists have in the past and are always ready to lie, to murder, to enter into agreements—and to break them—in order to achieve their purpose.

These are the facts which must be realized clearly and fully by all of us.

If the past 42 years of experience with communism have not taught us this simple lesson, then I am very much afraid that we are in mortal danger of being hoodwinked, outwitted, outflanked, and ultimately destroyed by the masters of the Kremlin.

I repeat: Until the Communists in power crumble or undergo a complete moral reorientation, it is foolish to appeal to their sense of justice, simply because they do not have one; and we would be equally naive to stake our future on any agreements or treaties with the Communists. The Communists may temporarily honor an agreement, even when it works to their disadvantage. They are ready to accept such tactical losses. In the long run, however, they will break the agreement the minute they feel that, by doing so, they can advance their plans for world domination.

These are not empty phrases. They are fully supported by the record of countless treaties broken by the Communists during the last 42 years, and by their ruthless persecution, enslavement, and wanton murder of millions of peoples in Soviet Russia and in Communist-dominated territories. If history can teach us anything, this is one fact which it should have taught us to date.

This is the primary reason why I do not believe that we can achieve world peace, and easing of tensions between the East and the West, at the present time; to repeat, simply because the Communist system, as it stands today, has no room for justice, moral responsibility, or similar considerations.

This obstacle to the attainment of world peace will be overcome when the Communist leadership disintegrates, is overthrown, or undergoes complete moral and political reorientation. The latter change will be quickly apparent to the free world. We will see evidence of it as soon as the Communists make peace with their own people. But as long as they remain at war with their own people, and with the free world, their fundamental concepts and goals have not changed, no matter what they say.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

Let us now consider the second prerequisite of an effective disarmament agreement. I have already pointed out that, to be effective, such an agreement, in addition to providing for inspection and enforcement, must apply to, and bind, all nations which have a power potential.

We do not have to look far to find the reason for this requirement. We have seen in recent years how the Soviet Union, in its strategy aimed at conquering the world, has used other nations, and other peoples, for its own ends. Communist-inspired use of force and instigated aggression in Korea, on the borders of Tibet and Burma, in the Formosa Straits, and in Hungary are cases in point.

Even if we could achieve an effective disarmament agreement with the Soviet Union, including provisions for inspection and enforcement, and even if we had adequate reason to believe that Soviet Russia would uphold their end of the agreement, we would still lack any appreciable degree of security if the Communists could circumvent the agreement by advancing and sponsoring aggression through Red China, North Korea, or any other Communist-dominated nation which was not a party to the agreement.

I do not believe, therefore, that we will be able to achieve any effective disarmament agreement until all countries with any appreciable power potential will be included in such an agreement, and will have the moral responsibility and desire to be bound by its terms.

PART III—THE COMMUNIST STRATEGY

If my analysis of the nature of the Communist system is correct, and I sincerely believe that it is, then it follows that we must squarely face the facts and make some serious decisions.

First of all, we cannot expect that the easing of tensions between the East and the West, wishfully envisioned by some people, will occur easily or in the near future.

Second, we must accept the fact that Communist pressures will continue as long as their goals remain unchanged. Conflict is the chief instrument of their drive to remake their people, and the world, in accordance with their Communist blueprint. We must, therefore, be prepared for a long siege of continuing Communist pressures.

Third, we have every reason to believe that the Communists realize that an open attack upon our Nation, or upon one of our allies, will lead to immediate retaliation which could result in mutual destruction. For this reason, I do not believe that they will chance an all-out war. As a matter of fact, I am strongly of the opinion that, no matter how hard they will push us, they will take precautions to stop short of any large-scale open outbreak. But they will continue their war of nerves, hoping that we will not call their bluff, and that we will yield and retreat under pressure, surrendering new areas to their domination.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ZABLOCKI. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. JUDD. I want to commend the gentleman from Wisconsin for the very excellent statement that he is making. He is one of the ablest and hardest working members of the Committee on Foreign Affairs. He has done a lot of work and thinking in preparing his comprehensive discussion and review of our foreign policy in the present world situation. He speaks from years of experience and firsthand knowledge. On the point that the gentleman is just making, I should like to ask, Does the gentleman feel that the greater danger to our country at this moment is that the Communists may go ahead, come what may, and start a war over Berlin? Or that they may successfully prevail upon Americans who misunderstand the situation to put pressure on our Government to weaken its position in the face of their intransigence?

Mr. ZABLOCKI. There is no doubt in my mind that the greater danger is that they will prevail upon some of the wishful thinkers in our country to prevail upon our Government to weaken our position. It would be a mistake on the part of our Government to weaken under Communist pressure. As the gentleman will recall, last year, when the Communists threatened Quemoy and Matsu, some people in our country said "What do we need those two islands for," or "For what purpose should we be firm in saying that the Communists shall not forcibly take those islands?" I think it was a blessing that we stood firm. The Communists did not take those islands. They were testing us. I think that their pressure on West Berlin, like their pressure on Quemoy and Matsu, is another test.

Mr. JUDD. I certainly agree. The gentleman knows that the Prime Minister of, perhaps our closest associate and ally, the United Kingdom, has just come back from the Soviet Union to report that Khrushchev really means business. Some people seem to conclude that, therefore, we must rush over to make some more concessions. Does not the gentleman believe that, on the contrary, the surest way to war, or to surrender would be to indicate that we are less firm than they? The fact is that we are in a much stronger position in Germany and in Europe than they are. They are under greater pressure to solve the Berlin problem than we are. It hurts them worse than it hurts us. Why should we pursue them and reduce our chances of success? If they want to liquidate the West Berlin situation, as they do because it is a tremendous thorn in their flesh, let them offer some concessions. If we stand firm and show that we too mean business, there will not be any war.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. I agree with the gentleman, and that is the very reason I am taking this time to address the House today. Khrushchev means business in this sense: the Communists have been and continue to be dedicated to conquering the world for their purpose. That is the business in which they are engaged. They have been in this business right along, and they are undoubtedly sincere about it. We should, and must, be just as sincere in our determination to prevent them from conquering the world.

Mr. JUDD. Does not the gentleman agree that their objective in the Far East last fall was not just a little island, it was an attempt to force the United States to retreat under pressure and thereby demonstrate to all the free peoples of Asia, pretty nearly a billion of them, that we are a weak and undependable ally? And likewise that their objective now is not just West Berlin, they are trying to convince the people behind the Iron Curtain and the peoples on their borders that those peoples cannot count on the free world, that it is the Communists who have tough nerves, and that the free world governments will timidly say, "We have just got to yield something here, and make a few more concessions there," demonstrating weakness and retreat which can bring only a disintegration of the whole collective security system and our own security?

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Exactly. Our action in yielding under Communist pressure would have a particularly serious effect on the smaller nations of the free world. They could easily conclude that their fate does not matter to us—that, under Communist pressure, we will someday cast them to the wolves. This would be a terrible mistake.

Mr. JUDD. I agree completely with the gentleman. I hope that the press will quote at length from his remarks and that our people will read them and realize first, that there are inescapable and grave risks in living on the same planet with a conspiracy that is dedicated to our destruction; but that the risks of standing firm in support of our principles, in support of our honorable commitments, in support of our allies, and in support of the efforts of peoples everywhere to retain their freedom or to regain it, are less than the risks of softness and weakness, and that the former course provides infinitely greater hope of preventing war.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. I thank the gentleman for the fine contribution he has made.

To continue, Mr. Speaker:

Fourth, the Communists, while playing their deadly game of poker in international politics versus the governments of the free nations, are continuing their undercover drive to absorb southern Asia and the Middle East, to disorganize Africa, to undermine Africa, and to disrupt the cohesion of Western Europe. In this manner, they are trying to isolate the United States before staging the final showdown.

It is an established fact that the Communists have thousands of agents all over the world, working for their goals. These agents are today particularly active and strong in the vital free areas of southern Asia, the Middle East, and Africa. Many of them have been drawn from native populations, trained in Moscow, and returned to their homelands to carry the Communist message directly to the people. They are united by Communist ideals, dedicated to them, and actively supported by funds, propaganda material, technical and economic aid from Moscow.

The work of these agents is to win the people of those nations to communism, to turn them against the United States, and to subvert or infiltrate their governments. They are trained not only in Communist ideology, sabotage, and political agitation, but also in the native dialects and languages, customs and traditions of the areas to which they have been assigned. With an eye to the future, Soviet Russia continues to train thousands of such agents each year. Through these agents, who work directly through the people and not only through the official and very often artificial and even corrupt channels of governments, the Communists plan to accomplish the greater part of their goal of peacefully absorbing southern Asia, the Middle East, and other vital areas of the world.

PART IV—THE COURSE WE MUST FOLLOW

In view of these facts, there is but one course we should follow. In order to avoid the horrors of a general hydrogen war or the terror of worldwide Communist dictatorship, we must beat the Communists at their own game. We have to stand fast under their pressures, and we have to make it impossible for them to outflank and envelop our country.

We have been, of course, working for these goals. Our mutual security effort, our student and leader exchange programs, our sharing of agricultural commodities with our friends abroad, and our other programs in this field are dedicated to the containment of Communist aggression and expansion, and to combating the undercover Communist activities in the underdeveloped countries of the world.

It seems to me, however, that, in the process of designing and improving those programs, we may have underestimated the full implication and effectiveness of the Communist effort to encircle and isolate our country. It is for this reason—because I earnestly believe that insufficient awareness of the Communist threat and inadequate steps to beat it will exact a heavy price from us within the next 10 or 15 years—that I offer the following suggestion for debate and consideration by the Members of this House:

First, we should endeavor to strengthen all positive non-Communist energies behind the Iron Curtain—not by exciting them through irresponsible short-range propaganda to ephemeral rebellions, but by developing them in depth by long-range action which will—by a gradual, steady process—reorientate all levels of the administration, economy, social, and cultural life within the Communist-dominated empire.

To this end, we must continually strive to keep alive the love of freedom which is firmly implanted in the hearts of many Communist-dominated peoples; make them constantly aware of the fact that we are concerned about their tragic plight; and convey to them, in meaningful terms, the true spiritual, religious, and cultural basis of our way of life, in addition to showing them how our system, which respects the dignity of the individual human being, is capable of providing them with material advancement.

I am afraid that, thus far, we have laid altogether too much stress on the material and technological components of our way of life, creating the impression in the minds of some people in other lands that we are dedicated to the pursuit of materialistic ends. This, to my mind, has been one of the grave shortcomings of our efforts in this field—a shortcoming unfortunately too much in evidence among our Government and private personnel abroad.

Second, we should try to immunize the most exposed areas of southern Asia, the Middle East, and Africa against Communist expansion, and thereby slow down the Communist envelopment movement.

This objective should be accomplished through long-range, efficient action, one, on an ideological level, spreading ideas and vision surpassing the Communist ideology; and two, by persons and teams which will organically carry this vision directly to the peoples of those countries. We must remember that ideas without a movement remain disincarnated. As I already pointed out, the greatest strength of the Communist offensive is that they have men and women throughout the world who are imbued with Communist ideals and zealots who are able to carry their message directly to the peoples of the underdeveloped countries. The free world has thus far failed to come up with a comparably comprehensive movement.

We need more people who will be able to communicate directly and carry our message, our vision, our philosophy our way of life to the peoples behind the Iron Curtain, and in Southern Asia, the Middle East, Africa and other parts of the world where the Communists are actively campaigning for their system. We have in our midst a reservoir of people who themselves, or whose parents, came from those areas. Many of them know the language of the nations I have mentioned. In addition, they fully appreciate our American way of life and our ideals. I do not think that we have sufficiently availed ourselves of their talents. They can be invaluable in combating communism. In addition, we should encourage our youth, our technical specialists, and our Government personnel to study foreign languages and the traditions of foreign lands, so that they will be able to better communicate with the people of those countries whenever they have the opportunity to personally participate in our anti-Communist offensive.

We must strive for a more direct contact with the peoples of those countries and this brings me to my third point, which goes hand in hand with what I have just said.

Third, we should put new life into our point 4 program and allied undertakings, intended to help eliminate starvation, oppressive poverty and diseases which create the most fertile soil for Communist agitation.

This social, economic, and technical aid can be much more effective and helpful for the human freedom in the world if the men and women channeling it are not only technical specialists but also imbued by an ideal and vision. Otherwise, they can prove to be just the forerunners of the Communist dynamism which will rush in to fill up the moral, spiritual, idealogical vacuum.

A technique is a necessary means, but not a full answer to the human problems. The Communist technicians usually are not just professional technicians. If our and other free world technicians should be only technicians, they will not achieve our goals. A bulldozer, a plane, a chemist, an engineer, a medical doctor can be used to build a Communist world as well as the free world. What matters is the spiritual inspiration.

We have been fortunate indeed to have our church and voluntary organizations imbued with spiritual ideals working against communism in all parts of the world. I could not adequately praise their efforts and achievements. We have supported their efforts through private contributions and through governmental measures. I believe, however, that we have not done enough. More emphasis, attention, and assistance should be given to these efforts.

Fourth, we should thoroughly review the effectiveness of our overseas information-disseminating mediums and efforts.

I have some doubts whether our radio broadcasting activities, directed to the peoples behind the Iron Curtain and to other areas where communism is on the march, are fully effective. To mention but one point, they reach a limited number of people. Further, the choice of some of the material prepared for broadcasting which I have seen did not impress me. Nevertheless, properly used, this instrument can be a potent, if limited, force in our hands.

To cite but one example: reports received by the Far East Subcommittee of the Foreign Affairs Committee indicate that the Communist attack on Chinese family life through the imposition of the commune system in Red China has profoundly affected those Chinese who live in free countries in southeast Asia, the Far East, and the Pacific.

The free Chinese residing in that region have been deeply shocked by the commune movement in Red China. In the judgment of informed observers, this sense of shock has strengthened their opposition to the recognition of the Chinese Communist government. Many of them have now begun to realize that communism is fundamentally opposed to, and threatens, their way of life which has long centered on the unity and integrity of the family unit.

The subcommittee also received reports that the Chinese living in various free countries have stopped sending remittances to their families on the Communist mainland, because such funds are not permitted by the Communist regime to reach their relatives.

The Communist suppression, by military force, of the uprising in Hungary, in Poland, and in other nations, has not been fully exploited.

These are some of the issues and developments which should be explored fully and thoroughly. We must bring

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

before the peoples of the world the true nature of the Communist system. We must expose the Communists for what they really are, by showing—step by step—what they are doing behind the Iron and the Bamboo Curtains. We must carry these facts not only to the peoples who live in cities and towns, but also to every last village and hamlet.

In this regard, it seems to me that we should put greater stress on unmasking the true nature of communism—and, what is equally important, on carrying the facts about our way of life, our spiritual concepts, and our ideals—through the means of simple, graphic publications distributed freely in Communist-infested areas.

There are regions in the free world today where Communist literature and propaganda enjoy virtual monopoly—simply because, heavily subsidized by the Kremlin, such Communist reading material is made available to the peoples of those nations either at very low cost or completely free of charge, This can hardly be expected to work to our advantage.

Finally, we must at all times remember that adequate military strength must underlie and support all of our efforts against the Communist menace. We must advance our goals from a position of strength. We cannot afford to reduce, or to economize, on our military defenses. Our military power remains the key factor in our efforts against Communist expansion and Communist pressures. If anything, we must continue to consolidate and improve our position of strength.

These, then, are some of the thoughts that I would like to leave with you. Many of them have been already expressed by others. Nevertheless, I believe that these issues are so important, and the crisis facing our Nation and the free world so very grave, that they need to be repeated, discussed, and understood by everyone.

We must successfully answer and defeat the challenge of communism, or we shall be destroyed—and with us, the freedoms and the entire precious heritage which our forefathers have fashioned for us through the long centuries of our Judo-Christian civilization.

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ZABLOCKI. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. ADAIR. I would like to commend the gentleman for the very excellent speech he has made. We certainly cannot be too often reminded of the universal threat of communism, and particularly Russian communism. As the gentleman has pointed out, this is not a threat upon a single front, but the Communists use every possible avenue to accomplish their end. I hope that our people will read and study this speech and will take it to heart in our continuing effort to preserve the way of life which we cherish.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ZABLOCKI. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. JUDD. May I add a little footnote to what the gentleman from Wisconsin has said so well and so convincingly. Some people may feel it is not wise to emphasize what the gentleman has pointed out, the picture may seem to them too desperately dark. But is it not true that we have had testimony before our committee in recent weeks that there is increasing awareness of the nature and seriousness of the Communist threat among the people along the borders of the Communist bloc? A few years ago, particularly in some Asian countries, many were enamored by the material progress that was allegedly being made in China, even though at the price of all freedoms. But now, largely because of the strong, patient, and firm stand of our Government in resistance to further Communist expansion, several years of time have been bought in which the full truth of what happened to people in Red China has come home to the non-Communist peoples, and more of them today realize that the great threat, in fact the only threat, to themselves comes from the Godless, ruthless, Communist system that has been imposed upon the Chinese people. Therefore we can be encouraged to continue policy of strength that events have proved sound. Some people say our policy is sterile because we are not running off in all directions to sign worthless agreements. Actually our policy has been very, very productive. Patient, constant firmness and strength in support of freedom has enabled the truth about communism to become more and more apparent to peoples who were not previously awake to it. In my opinion many in those countries are more wide awake now to the nature of this threat than a lot of people in our own country are.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. I thank the gentleman and I fully agree that more nations are beginning to realize the full implications of Communist goals and Communist strategy. Some of them are not as yet ready to join with us in an open fight against communism, but they do see the danger of communism. As the gentleman said, our past efforts are bearing fruit, and our position is not a sterile one. We are prepared to negotiate with the Communists in an effort to resolve world problems, but we cannot hope to reach an effective agreement until the Communists will demonstrate their sincerity, their willingness to reach a just settlement, and their determination to abide by any such agreement. Thus far, we have no evidence that they have any such intentions.

Mr. JUDD. So that the position of the United States is one of holding the door always open for any genuine cooperation and concessions, but firmly closed to any blackmail or further one-sided surrenders.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. That is correct.

If my statement appears a bit dreary and dark, I can assure my colleagues that if the Kremlin would pull aside the Iron Curtain, and make peace with their own people, we could very possibly find a bright solution to the world's problems.

That, however, can never be the case when one has to bargain with a government that has no intention of either entering into an agreement, or keeping an agreement.

The Communists announced not long ago that they were willing to make some concessions, but what were their concessions? Their concessions amounted to a restatement of their original demands. So if our position is moral and right, and it certainly is, then we need not compromise. It would be fatal to compromise on any moral principles.

Mr. JUDD. Is it not also true that their behavior during Macmillan's visit made clear that their purpose was not to get a settlement? Their purpose was to try to demonstrate, to people who are still uncertain, or wavering, that the Communists are masters of the situation, that they can insult the head of the great British Commonwealth with impunity, and thereby try to weaken the resolve of those peoples?

Mr. ZABLOCKI. That is so true.

Mr. JUDD. And, to some extent, some people in this country, as well as in other countries, are perhaps giving the impression to others that, because we are peaceful and decent and long-suffering, we therefore are being or can be intimidated. It should be made very plain to the leaders in the Kremlin that they will be making a fatal mistake if they come to any such conclusion.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ZABLOCKI. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BOW. I compliment the gentleman for the address that he has made here today and his reference to the things that we are today doing to strengthen our position in the free world in our stand to fight against Soviet communism and communism throughout the world. I wonder if the gentleman would agree with me that among these things that we should be doing perhaps there is some self-analysis that we should make of things that we should not be doing.

Would the gentleman agree with me that we do not paint a particularly good picture at times of ourselves which can be taken to other countries and be used against us? I have in mind particularly, if the gentleman will yield further, some of the motion pictures sent abroad. The gentleman has referred to USIA. I make reference to efforts we are making in motion pictures abroad with USIA, and the fact that the motion-picture industry in this country will send motion pictures abroad that do great violence to this country and do violence to our system of government and do not show the real free world or the real America. They destroy the effect of the effort of USIA.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. I agree with the gentleman. Some of the things which the gentleman from Ohio mentioned certainly do not show our country in good light.

When the study mission of which I was the chairman was in the Far East in 1955, we visited countries in which such situations existed. It is unfortunate that our Government apparently cannot pre-

vail upon some profit-motivated companies not to export such films and other material which create erroneous impressions about our country. I think that we should register our objections more strenuously.

Mr. BOW. It seems to me we should raise this question throughout the country so people will know of the great harm being done. We should object to these things that are discrediting Americans here and abroad. Books written in fiction that give a false picture of our service in foreign lands have done us great harm. Certainly such pictures do not help our situation in the free world. The same applies to those who write magazine articles that create situations that are destructive of all we have been trying to do in certain countries. This applies likewise to some of the broadcasts other than the Voice of America that go out in world broadcasts which attack the freedoms upon which this Nation is founded. Each individual American should think carefully before he acts in a manner that may place his country in an unfavorable light in the eyes of the world. Then there are those of us who serve here in the Congress who do not take seriously our obligations to the people, and that makes the Congress at times look bad throughout the world. It seems to me some of these things that should not be done should be considered along with the gentleman's suggestion of things that should be done.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. I thank the gentleman from Ohio for a very valuable contribution and assure him that a subcommittee of the Committee on Foreign Affairs is studying that very problem. We do hope that we can find a solution, because some of these things, as the gentleman pointed out, truly work to the detriment of our country.

NATIONAL TURKEY MARKETING ACT

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina.

There was no objection.

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced today a bill which I hope will become the National Turkey Marketing Act of 1959. This bill is similar to that introduced by our esteemed colleague, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. WATTS], and follows, in part, the bill introduced by him last year and which I testified in favor of. The bill was not reported out by the Agriculture Committee last year. I intend to write today to my neighbor of North Carolina, Chairman HAROLD COOLEY, of the House Agriculture Committee, and ask for early hearings.

In December of 1958 I had the privilege of addressing, and conferring with, the officers and members of the South Carolina Turkey Federation. Almost unanimously, this fine group of food producers expressed themselves in favor of this legislation. Upon such expression I feel honor bound to push this legislation.

This legislation favors Government regulation and control of marketing conditions, and seeks to promote and expand the consumption of turkeys and turkey products. I am wary of Government interference, and except for the overwhelming desire from the producers themselves, would hesitate to promote governmental control. I feel, however, that the best interests of the industry justify this measure.

In order to include some escape clause, wherein the industry can throw off the controls if they become as obnoxious as most governmental controls grow to be, I have provided that the industry, by demand of 25 percent by volume of the commodity affected, may call for a referendum, on any or all of the provisions of this act, even to its complete abolition if it becomes detrimental to the industry. This is the only way some measure of control by the industry, instead of the bureaucracy, can be accomplished. This gives the industry a final veto power.

We are proud of our turkey industry, and grateful for its contribution to the economy of this Nation, to the food capacity, the high standard of living of our people. I know my people favor legislation to help them. I hope this legislation will pass.

LET THE RECORD SPEAK THE TRUTH ABOUT THE FARM PROGRAM

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 10 minutes and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

THE FARM PROGRAM

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, this Country is being flooded with erroneous and misleading information in a deliberate campaign to bring the whole farm program into disrepute.

While this campaign is widespread, well directed and has many facets, I will limit my discussion today to matter recently placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and the news reports thereon which carried to the Nation the impression that some large farmers are receiving payments or subsidies from the Government amounting to $1,000,000 or more each, while our small farmers are being neglected.

It is unfortunate and almost tragic that the RECORD of this Congress should carry such statements which, whether intentional or not, are calculated to mislead the public, to bring the farm program into disrepute, and to hold the farmers of the Nation up to ridicule.

The material placed in the RECORD referred to benefits or supports to farm operations, indicating that these agricultural enterprises, individual or corporate, had received direct subsidies amounting to many thousands of dollars each. Particular attention was given to so-called benefits to cotton producers.

Mr. Speaker, no farmer in the United States has received a "payment" for growing cotton. They have been aided by the Commodity Credit Corporation loan program which is available to every cotton farmer—large or small.

The CCC loans to a few large farm operations, to facilitate orderly marketing, have been misrepresented to discredit the whole price support program which has been of such great benefit to many hundreds of thousands of our smaller farmers.

It is unfortunate that those who are spreading the incorrect and misleading information do not understand, or do not care to know about, either the philosophy or the operations of the loan program which is conducted through the Commodity Credit Corporation. They pretend not to know that each cotton loan is secured by a first mortgage on cotton and that cotton has been good collateral since the very beginning of our Government.

It is unfortunate that they do not tell the American people that the transactions referred to were in fact legal interest-bearing loan transactions and neither gifts nor subsidies. The Government actually collected on all the loans on cotton which was withdrawn from the Commodity Credit Corporation and sold on open markets in an orderly fashion.

It is also unfortunate that they do not tell the American people that on January 1, 1953, when the Eisenhower administration came into office, the cotton price support loan program administered by the Commodity Credit Corporation, actually showed for its 20-year operation a net profit to the Government of $268,629,000. Neither do they point out that under the present administration we have lost in the last 6 years on the cotton program approximately $850 million.

Moreover, the people should be advised that the price support program through the Commodity Credit Corporation on all the six basic crops—corn, wheat, cotton, tobacco, rice, and peanuts—after the program had been in operation for 20 years, showed a net profit of $13 million, but under the present administration the program for these same crops now shows a loss in excess of $2,500 million.

When Mr. Benson took office losses on all crop support programs through the Commodity Credit Corporation for 20 years, on perishables and nonperishables, amounted to only $1,064 million. The same program now shows a loss of approximately $6 billion.

When the Republican administration took over the program the Government had invested in commodities and commodity loans only $2,452 million and now we have invested right at $8,500 million notwithstanding the gigantic losses which have been sustained.

And how have our farmers fared? Net farm income in the last 6 years, while Mr. Benson has been administering the farm program, has been $17 billion less than in the 6 years prior to his taking office.

Mr. Speaker, as heretofore mentioned, the RECORD has carried the names of several farmers and farming businesses, as

recipients of large benefits or subsidies from the Government.

I have been supplied reliable information that Delta Pine Land Co., of Scott, Miss., which was cited as recipient of the second largest farm subsidy in 1957, used price support loans to promote orderly marketing, that this company placed 7,919 bales of cotton with the Commodity Credit Corporation for which it received a loan of $1,167,502.35, that every bale of this cotton was withdrawn from the loan before the end of the marketing year and sold on the market, that the Government collected the total loan of $1,167,502.35 plus $17,370 in interest plus carrying charges, thus making a profit.

Further, I am informed that Dan Seligman, of Shaw, Miss., pledged 1,291 bales of cotton to the CCC for which he received a loan of $173,631.68, that Mr. Seligman withdrew 1,205 bales of cotton and sold it on the market, leaving only 86 bales in the loan, and that he paid the Government $2,111 in interest; Woolfolk Farms, Tunica, Miss., pledged 1,051 bales of cotton for which they received a loan of $155,787.12, that 986 bales of this cotton were withdrawn and sold leaving 65 bales in the loan, with interest paid amounting to $2,120.76; M. S. Knowlton Co., Perthshire, Miss., pledged 1,075 bales for which it received a loan of $155,438.80, that Mr. Knowlton withdrew 1,008 bales leaving 67 bales in the loan, and that he paid interest amounting to $2,197.44; J. G. Adams and Son, Hughes, Ark., pledged 3,024 bales to the loan and received an advance of $420,343.70, that he withdrew all but 318 bales and sold it in the market, and he paid the CCC interest amounting to $2,871.82.

My inquiry has produced the information that the Producers Rice Mill of Stuttgart, Ark., cited as receiving the largest 1957 subsidy, actually is a cooperative composed of 400 individual grower members. The cooperative received loans and not payments or handouts.

I cite these few cases as typical of the misleading information inserted in the RECORD recently with respect to the CCC commodity loan program.

The Commodity Credit Corporation has been operated in recent years in such a manner that it has lost substantial amounts of money on the commodities it has taken over when many farmers did not pay off their loans and instead surrendered to the CCC the commodities they had put up as collateral. But the amount of a loan to an individual producer in no way is a measure of any cash benefit that producer has received through the operation of the commodity loan program.

Mr. Speaker, these are the facts. I have presented them to correct the RECORD so that the RECORD will speak the truth.

LATIN AMERICA AND THE STATE DEPARTMENT

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, now we can understand why the administration is so soft on the dictatorships of Trujillo, Duvalier, and Batista. Five political appointees have gone on trips totally free for the past few days. Among those who went are a White House secretary, a Government lawyer, a member of the Department of Justice, a top official of the Republican National Committee, and a Presidential appointee to an important national commission.

The State Department and the administration are again in the business of supporting bloody dictators. Months ago in my office I questioned very sharply the Assistant Secretary of State, Mr. Rubottom, concerning the sending of Marines to bolster up the Haitian Army. I was shocked when they told me that "all of the Haitian people had asked for the Marines." This is an out and out untruth. At that time I asked the members of the State Department whether they had consulted with the three most important Haitians living today, namely Senator Dejoie, Clement Jumelle, and Daniel Fignole? These three men between them represent 80 percent of the Haitian people. The State Department said that they had not. These men, or their representatives, were available right here in Washington, D.C. The State Department stated further that they would back up Duvalier because he had given more stability to Haiti than any other of his numerous predecessors.

Does the State Department think that the American people have forgotten that an American was beaten to death by the Army of Duvalier after he had guaranteed the U.S. Embassy safe custody? Does the stability of Haiti depend upon destroying every single newspaper in Haiti, the imprisonment of its owners and editors, and the breaking up of the printing presses?

Does the stability of Haiti depend upon members of the Army who roam the streets under the orders of Duvalier at night clothed in masks beating and shooting citizens and looting and destroying property?

In my conversations with the people in Cuba, including Senator Dejoie, I can reveal that there are hundreds of men in training now ready to invade Haiti. These men are under the leadership of the Dejoie-Jumelle-Fignole coalition. There are over a hundred thousand Haitians in Cuba—50 miles from Haiti.

The treasury of Haiti was empty when Duvalier took over and it now has $8 million deficits—is that good financial stability? Yet, from the pockets of American people will come the money to shore up another dictator and pay for his program of murder, terrorism, and the destruction of property.

The International League for the rights of man in with such distinguished executive officers as Pearl Buck, Norman Aneglo, and Eduardo Santos has already written the Acting Secretary of State protesting that they are astonished at the United States deciding to support the present dictatorship in Haiti. The International League for the rights of man has presented to the Department of State a factual record of the political assassinations, imprisonments, exiles, raids, suppression of newspapers and police violence. Protests have been lodged in the United Nations against Haiti and its violations of civil and political liberties.

American support of the present dictatorship will not only fail but even more surely it will antagonize throughout Latin America and elsewhere the democratic forces on which the American Government should depend for defense of the non-Communist world.

I call on the Foreign Affairs Committee to investigate this entire situation; to pay strict attention to the number of administration officials and appointees who have been taking free rides with all expenses paid recently as guests of Duvalier, Trujillo, and Batista. And while they are investigating they should investigate the private individuals who received $150,000 that Duvalier gave for public relations in the United States. Were the recipients of this money or were they not close White House advisers and outstanding leaders in the present administration?

Our State Department's stupidity with Cuba and Castro may yet be matched by or surpassed in our dealings in Haiti and the Dominican Republic. If so, God help us. Latin America is about to be lost. By the force of communism? No. By the force of American aid to Fascists. If so, what a tragic sellout it would be of the American people by the State Department and the administration.

SCANDAL IN THE AIR FORCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LANE). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include an article from True magazine.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, never have I read a more shocking indictment of a military training program than that reported in an article in the current issue of True magazine entitled "Scandal in the Air Force."

It is impossible for me to believe conditions could exist at one of our military installations such as those described in the article. It relates how recruits at Lackland Air Force Base, San Antonio, Tex., are being toughened physically by roller skating to the strains of waltz music.

According to the article:

> It is official Air Force training policy—endorsed by the Secretary of the Air Force himself.

The article goes on to report:

> And, surely for the first time in military history, the recruits are paying for their own physical training.

And where does the money go? Most of it, at least, goes straight into the pockets of the rink operator, a fatcat civilian concessionaire who is already several times a millionaire.

Mr. Speaker, I have written to the Secretary of the Air Force to demand an explanation. In particular, I want to know if it is, in fact, official Air Force policy that recruits are required to roller skate as part of their training, and at their own expense.

Here is a situation, if true, that demands the attention of this body, and I call to the attention of all Members, and members of the Armed Services Committee in particular, the complete article from True magazine, which follows:

SCANDAL IN THE AIR FORCE—WHEN U.S. AIRMEN BEGAN PAYING FOR THEIR OWN TRAINING TO FATTEN A CIVILIAN PROFITEER, ONE MAN HAD THE GUTS TO RISK HIS CAREER TO EXPOSE THE CORRUPTION—YET IT CONTINUES TODAY

(By David Nevin)

SAN ANTONIO, TEX.—This may come as a happy surprise to the Russians, but the U.S. Air Force, constantly striving to maintain combat readiness for what would be the most horrible war in history, is training its new recruits on roller skates. At Lackland Air Force Base in San Antonio, Tex., the Nation's only training center for basic airmen, the men who may someday punch SAC bombers over the polar cap are getting toughened up by drifting gracefully around a skating rink to the strains of waltz music.

It has to be a waltz; anything faster is considered dangerous. And this, mind you, is supposed to be physical conditioning—the toughening of future combat airmen. Some 120,000 young men a year—every single recruit who enters the Air Force—start military life at Lackland. And this is their introduction to the service; not the tough atmosphere of a Navy or Marine boot camp but the soft symphony of a Strauss waltz.

This is no gag. It is official Air Force training policy—endorsed by the Secretary of the Air Force himself.

And, surely for the first time in military history, the recruits are paying for their own physical training. This is not, of course, strictly voluntary. Their arms are twisted more than somewhat by orders of Lackland's determined high brass.

And where does the money go? Most of it, at least, goes straight into the pockets of the rink operator, a fatcat civilian concessionaire who is already several times a millionaire.

In fact, that's the whole point of training on roller skates, according to the sworn testimony of Lackland's chiefs—not good training but the desire to further enrich a millionaire.

Naturally this doesn't lead to high morale any more than it does to adequate training, as witness the Lackland recruit whose letter to his mother was quoted recently in Reader's Digest magazine.

"We were supposed to have survival training today," wrote this potential fighting man, "but it was postponed on account of rain."

This ran in a gag column, but it was something less than funny to Americans who know the Air Force stands between them and global atomic war. Nor was it funny to the officers and men at Lackland who are supposed to make fighting men of recruits in 4 short weeks. But they're keeping quiet about it, for they've had a vivid demonstration of what happens to anyone who tries to fight the system.

Col. James Smyrl tried it. At 39 he was a tall, tough officer, his chest splashed with combat decorations. As commander of the recruit training group, he was responsible for tomorrow's Air Force. Roller skates and a rich concessionaire infuriated him and he had the courage to buck the man who was responsible. Unfortunately, that was Maj. Gen. Herbert L. Grills, the commander of Lackland and a man little interested in reason or logic.

Colonel Smyrl has left Lackland now. Only by the bitterest battling did he survive the most savage attempt to ruin a field grade officer in recent military history.

General Grills has left Lackland, too, anything but the victor in the sorry war he started. The battle smoke has cleared a little, but all it reveals is an electric sign reading "Waltz" that still burns steadily over a floor full of fighting men on roller skates. It's a battle the Air Force would like to file and forget, but that sign keeps shining. And the cause for which Colonel Smyrl sacrificed himself is far from won.

The crisis began in General Grills' office on the afternoon of March 15, 1957. Grills was 56 then, a barrel-bodied man who, when he remembered, spoke in a cultivated rumble and twirled his horn-rimmed glasses with what he considered a philosophic air. But he wasn't philosophic that day. He was angry to the bone, for headquarters had lined him up to take the rap. Instinct told him he needed a fall guy. "Get Colonel Smyrl over here," he snapped to his deputy commander. "I'm going to teach him the facts of life."

To be fair to Grills, he had not created his problem. The rink had already been built by the time he took command of Lackland in 1956. But, unfortunately for the builder, tomorrow's airmen had shown little interest in roller skating and the pressure on Grills to change this situation was mounting. You might think General Grills would have questioned the propriety of urging recruits to use the rink, but he apparently did not. He merely saw this as a nasty little problem that must be solved. How could he induce his men to pay their money for roller skating and thus pull the civilian concessionaire's chestnuts out of the fire?

The rink itself is the heart of the trouble. Roller skating, particularly without girls, is hardly a national sport. It was a mistake to authorize the rink in the beginning, but the Air Force brass doesn't like to admit mistakes, so they had to make the rink pay off.

No one will deny that soldiers need recreation. But, aside from the fact that there were already plenty of recreation facilities at Lackland, no one bothered to find out if today's young men were roller-skating addicts. Air Force brass all the way up to Pentagon level decided that they'd love a rink, but there was a problem. The Air Force had no spare cash for building rinks, yet the law forbids private ownership on a military base.

They needed a gimmick, and somebody found one: The builder would turn ownership of the rink over to the Air Force in return for a 10-year contract to operate the business.

Oddities that suggest this was more than a simple business deal cropped up immediately. Contrary to the law, for instance, no written specifications were issued to insure uniformity of bidding. Therefore, there was no competitive bidding.

A contractor who offered to put a tent over a hardwood floor for $40,000 was laughed out the back door while a red carpet was rolled out the front for one Morris Jaffe. Jaffe is an exceedingly wealthy man with a record of strange business deals that produce great sums of money—and his Lackland enterprise was no exception. He offered to build a magnificent rollerdrome of brick and stucco, complete with a snack bar and a gleaming neon sign. It would cost more than a quarter-million dollars and it would be given to the Air Force.

As the Air Force later was to admit, complaining "lax procedures permitted preferential treatment" for Jaffe, that contract smelled. But there wasn't much investigation, for the simple reason that every record of the contract negotiations suddenly disappeared. The opinion around Lackland is they were destroyed quickly when the heat went on. Strangely, the investigation stopped there, despite certain obvious implications which always arise when questionable public records mysteriously vanish.

Grills took over Lackland in time to see the beautiful rollerdrome finished, its ground landscaped in sharp contrast to the barren base, its lavish snack bar crowded with pinball machines which—though it doesn't bother the Air Force—are illegal in the Texas country surrounding Lackland. It stood on a foundation capable, so the operator boasted, of supporting a 10-story building. Just why has never been explained.

But, spectacular as it was, nobody wanted to roller skate. So the rink stood gleaming and empty, skates in their racks and cash registers silent. The operator, his dreams of sudden wealth dissolving, screamed in anguish. General Grills reacted by issuing orders which he thought would remedy the situation. The failure of those orders sent him barreling into war—the war that flamed into the open that Friday afternoon.

Colonel Smyrl walked into Grills' office with a salute that snapped. He is a tall man, wide shouldered and dark haired, and he has a look of power contained by rigid self-discipline. A prudent man would know immediately Smyrl would be a bad man in a fight, but Grills was hardly prudent.

As commander of the basic training group, Smyrl had the considerable responsibility of introducing as many as 24,000 youngsters at a time to their new military life. He was a firm, tough, but apparently well-liked commander.

Grills glared furiously at Smyrl, picked up the report from headquarters and began to read. "The rollerdrome • • • apparently (is) not receiving the support of the basic trainees. There has been a considerable investment in these facilities. To insure successful operation, wholehearted support will be required."

He stared at Smyrl and added in an ice water voice. "You are not supporting my policy on open post. Do you intend to or must I start looking for a new group commander?"

Naturally, Smyrl was stunned. The threat to relieve a field grade officer is one of the most serious possible in the military. It implies extreme malfeasance. Smyrl certainly had opposed the open post plan verbally, but only for what it clearly was—a scheme to fatten a millionaire's bankroll at the expense of basic training.

The open post had been Grills' first plan to boost the rink's attendance, thereby getting his concessionaire friends off his back. When the rink was planned, the recruits were spending 11 weeks at Lackland. The first 4 weeks consisted of intensive and highly restricted indoctrination. The last 7 were more relaxed, giving the recruits more free time—which it was expected they'd spend at the rollerdrome.

Before it could open, the system was changed. Most recruits were sent to other bases after the intensive 4 weeks. So when the rink opened, even had recruits been inclined to skate, they'd have had mighty little time. But Grills saw time as the only obstacle.

"I have a deep knowledge of human nature," he once said. "I know young men. If they were free to skate, they certainly would skate." In Grills' youth, they might have—but times have changed.

Still clinging to his faulty theory, Grills ordered a quarter of the basic trainees given the freedom of the post on each of four nights

per week. This open post policy gave them the time but did nothing for their inclination. After marching all day, the recruit didn't want to march another 2 miles to the rink and pay 50 cents for the privilege of marching some more on roller skates.

Smyrl opposed the plan as a dangerous slackening in a training period purposely and intelligently designed to harden soft youths for the tough jobs they would face. When he protested, his commanding general ordered: "Smyrl, I want you to support that rink and I want you to encourage your trainees to use it."

"Sir," Smyrl said in a tight voice, "I understood the open post policy was to give trainees more free time. Would you mind clarifying just what this policy is supposed to accomplish?"

"It's up to you to see that the rink gets all the support it needs," Grills said flatly.

"How far am I supposed to go with this support?"

The deputy commander said, "I've made a complete study of the rink's needs, and it takes $300 a day income to get the job done." (Later the deputy admitted under oath his complete study consisted solely of asking the concessionaire how much money he wanted to make.)

"There you are," Grills said. "Go do it."

It didn't take much thought to get the picture. Smyrl said later, "It was apparent that General Grills wanted me to use my position to put pressure on the basic airman to use the roller rink."

It just happens such pressure is illegal. But when he protested, Grills said: "The average basic airman has more money in his pocket than he's ever had before. He is going to spend it somewhere and we might as well get it here."

It is perhaps the first time in history that a major general has been concerned with "getting" his troops' pocket money. Having left Smyrl speechless with that one, Grills ended the discussion with: "Now you know how much the rink needs to make and it's up to you to get the job done. You get out of here now and decide what you're going to do. Come back Monday, and give me your answer."

Smyrl is from Manchester, N.H. He is a polished and handsome man, and yet there is something of the New England Puritan about him. He drinks only socially, rarely swears, sometimes even walks out on a dirty story. He is one of those rarities, a born military man, and he carries a soldier's sense of duty and ethics firmly grafted to his somewhat stern native character.

He has an excellent military record. During some of the toughest raids in bombardment history, he rose from lieutenant to lieutenant colonel in 18 months and volunteered for a second tour over Germany. While he was proving himself in combat, he also developed a flair for administration and after the war he drew diplomatic assignments and bigger commands. At Lackland he reorganized the recruit group until, according to Grills' predecessor, it ran smoothly for the first time in base history.

Certainly the rapid rise of this proud, highly principled man had not been without clashes, often enough with superiors. But no trouble in the past had so thoroughly outraged him nor caused him such soul searching. He went to the wing chaplain, who agreed that Smyrl's reaction to Grills' order was morally right. Then Smyrl sat down to think through that weekend of decision. If he blew the whistle, he knew, he could blast his career to pieces. But, to him, the choice was clear and unavoidable.

On Monday he was in Grills' office. "Sir, I've tried hard, but I haven't yet found any way to accomplish your directive to support the rink to the extent of $300 a day." Face tightening, he added, "It seems to me you're placing me in the impossible position of using the basic trainees to insure the concessionaire's investment."

"There's no moral issue here," Grills snapped. "Or if there is, it's my decision and the moral issue is up to me." (Later he was to say under oath: "He voiced some obscure moral issue which I was unable to understand.")

Anger pales some men, but not Smyrl. His face flamed a deep scarlet now as he stared at Grills. "Sir," he said in a deadly quiet voice, "can you advise me how I can guarantee skaters without simply ordering these recruits to skate?"

"That's why you're drawing a colonel's pay—to figure out things like that," Grills snapped angrily, thus passing the buck neatly back to Smyrl.

Smyrl took a deep breath. "Then I must inform you, sir, that I know of no way to insure patronage to the rink without coercing my men—and that I will not do."

There was a long silence. Then Grills said, "You are to remain in command of the basic training group and to run it in accordance with your convictions until such time as I can obtain a replacement for you."

With those words the die was cast, the battle joined.

Three days later Colonel Smyrl was officially relieved of duty. But of course that didn't make the open post policy a success, so Grills announced a new policy.

Recruits could take up to 10 of their required 28 hours of physical training on roller skates. And they would pay, at 50 cents an hour, for their own training. They were given alternatives, of course. They didn't have to skate—they could do an hour of pushups under a blazing Texas sun or police the grounds on hands and knees. Few of them thought twice.

This was—and is today—official Air Force policy, endorsed by the Pentagon itself. While it does not do much for the physical well-being of the recruits, it did accomplish its primary objective. It filled the rink with skaters at 50 cents a head, much to the joy of Morris Jaffe.

Maybe the rink's new success mellowed Grills. Or perhaps he had begun to realize that he was on shaky ground. At any rate, he did not write an unsatisfactory effectiveness report on Smyrl. The report merely noted Smyrl had been relieved "for failure to support and encourage resistance to the open post policy."

But the dismissal of a field-grade officer does not go unnoticed. Lt. Gen. Charles Myers, head of Air Force Training Command, promptly called Smyrl to his headquarters. It wasn't a pleasant talk, for Smyrl had committed himself to fight, and he fought hard.

"Sir," he said bluntly, "at Lackland there is a climate—an atmosphere—of exploitation of basic trainees."

He directly accused Phillip A. Johnson, civilian manager of the base exchange system. Supervisor Johnson ran liaison between the concessionaires and the Lackland brass. Civilian-operated concessions included an archery range, a riding stable, too many barber shops, laundries, shoe shops and a photo concession which victimized recruits with specific Air Force help. When those select concessionaires who made it their business to stay on Johnson's good side complained that their profits were less than they wanted, Johnson bee-lined for Grills' office, pressure went on the recruits, and business boomed.

Life was pleasant for Johnson, for concessionaires went all out to please him. The photo studio operator built him a magnificent home at a saving estimated as high as $12,000. Others enabled him to own a boat, a barbecue pit, a car air conditioner and other luxuries at or well below cost.

Johnson and Grills were famous pals. Under oath Grills once said, "We went hunting and fishing together. I practically lived with him on several occasions on weekend fishing trips." The latest of these trips came just before Smyrl was dismissed.

When Smyrl raised an objection about gifts showered on himself and other senior officers, the deputy commander snapped, "If you don't want to drink it, bring it up here." A major general reasoned: "Oh, you're paying too much attention to that. General Twining (then Air Force Chief of Staff, now Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff) is entertained (by contractors) and everyone expects that."

Grills has observed sourly, "Some people have such a confused, warped sense of ethical principles they believe people can't be friendly without being in collusion."

When Smyrl insisted good training was more important than Jaffe's bankroll, Jaffe paid him a personal visit two weeks before the showdown. "Jim," he said heavily, "I've got $275,000 invested in that skating rink. I'm in it to make money and the way I operate, I'm not particularly interested in any five or six percent return on my investment. If I was, I'd have put my money in General Motors." Then the velvet glove came off to show the mailed fist. "We've got this thing pretty well set up. Everybody seems to be going along with us but you. Now I've watched you operate and you're a bright young fellow. I like you. But I'm going to tell you, you'd better get with the system or you'll get hurt."

The incredible situation of a civilian threatening an Air Force group commander rocked Smyrl. His face flamed red and his hands gripped his chair until they were white. But he maintained perfect control and this is an important point. Jaffe is not an observant man. Later he was to say naively, "I thought it was a very pleasant conversation."

General Myers listened to Smyrl's story in chilly silence. But the colonel had gone too far to be ignored. Myers ordered his inspector general, a Colonel John E. Fox, to Lackland to investigate.

Fox sniffed around a little and reported that Smyrl's charges were unfounded. Unfortunately for Smyrl, he was wrong. Later, Fox himself even admitted under oath: "I guess we didn't look very hard. There was a lot we missed. I guess it wasn't a very good investigation."

But Myers couldn't know that. He assumed Smyrl's charges were the inventions of an immature man trying to get himself off the hook by blackening others. In disgust he changed Smyrl's effectiveness report to unsatisfactory and ordered him to show cause why he should remain in the Air Force.

When Smyrl learned in effect he would have to stand trial for his commission, he demanded a court of inquiry. Instead the Pentagon gave him a board of inquiry. The difference was significant. A court would have permitted him to subpena witnesses and records to prove his points. A board, lacking subpena powers, gave him almost no authority to do anything.

It was like handing him a pistol with which to defend his life—but carefully withholding the bullets.

Then the Air Force announced the hearing would be closed to the press and public. It was pretty clear what that meant, and so Smyrl settled down to fight another skirmish. Through the summer of 1957, his civilian attorney fired thousands of angry words into the Pentagon and the newspapers. He won—but later he paid dearly for that fighting. When other charges against Smyrl began to collapse, those press releases were added to the list of crimes for which he should be booted from the Air Force.

At the same time, Grills and his staff officers attacked Smyrl in television and newspaper releases. Grills was heard to say in public: "Smyrl is a man of no intellectual honesty. He has no moral sense. * * * I

wasn't mad at first. I thought he was just a misguided lad. But now I'm boiling."

As the hearing grew nearer, a phalanx of Air Force public relations men dedicated themselves to selling newsmen on Grills. One of the sillier—a Pentagon import—told this reporter solemnly: "General Grills is a great—truly a great man. Once he took me into his kitchen for a drink. That tough old general had tears in his eyes when he told me, 'It hurts me all over when I think what that boy Smyrl has done.' Really, Grills is one of the Air Force's great gentlemen."

A few days before, that "great gentleman" personally had fired Mrs. Jacqueline Smyrl from the base hospital where she was one of the very few officers' wives who had volunteered for humanitarian work.

The skating rink, meanwhile, ran wide open—but hardly with voluntary attendance. A medical WAF recalled skating formations assembled at dawn. All day flights marched to the rink. Few recruits complained. After all, it was a hell of a lot more fun than pushups.

Still, nobody was skating on his own time. Recruit barracks were from a half- to a 2-mile hike from the rink. On free nights the men showed a singular preference for the soft drink machines in their own barracks patios. And if they wanted more entertainment, the Air Force supplied it.

In their immediate area were 4 air conditioned movie theaters, 4 ice cream stands, gyms, 6 swimming pools, bowling alleys, a golf course, a hobby shop, 20 tennis courts and 2 service clubs with television, records, libraries, games, and snack bars. There were also regularly scheduled concerts, shows, and boxing matches. Obviously, there had been little need for the roller rink. Morris Jaffe's hired man who ran the rink thought they were uninterested because they'd never skated. "A lot of these boys have never been on skates," he observed brightly. Then, as if to prove his point, he tried the rink himself, fell and broke three ribs.

But Grills' orders insuring that the rink make money were enforced. The civilian concessionaire told the group first sergeant which flights to send for training, and oh, how the money rolled in.

The hearing at which Colonel Smyrl's future would be determined opened September 24, 1957, in a psychology research center at Lackland. It was an ironically fitting setting. The psychologists watched the clashing and often ill-concealed motives in the courtroom with professional glee.

The board consisted of two brigadiers and a major general, all in training command. General Myers, who appointed them, was also their boss and custodian of their futures. It was a little like letting the district attorney hire and fire the judges who hear his cases.

Jim Smyrl walked in, his chest covered with ribbons, his face impassive. As the days passed and hundreds of thousands of words rolled on—most of them insulting—his jaw jutted out just as it had so many times in his career. His eyes stayed calm and almost remote, but his face flushed deeply. And a sensitive man, watching the contained passion in that graven face, would have known that here was a man who would fight until he was dead.

They started with his record, from recruit to full colonel at 35, and it was clear Smyrl was a fighter from the start. He had ambition and conceit and he worked like fury. Like most fast climbing men he had troubles along the way. But his faults were the faults of a rather humorless man of force and drive who does the job as he thinks it should be done, not to please others.

He tangled with his command at Moody AFB. But a major general testified he believed that was a mere personality clash.

He crossed a general while on duty in El Salvador and on this the board pounced happily. After a hearing, the matter had been stricken from his record, but now the board insisted he discuss it. To their dismay, they learned the trouble started when he exposed two favored officers. One ran munitions to El Salvador. The other was dickering for a fat job supervising the El Salvador Air Force.

The charges at Lackland were failure to carry out an order, failure to demonstrate leadership, and temperamental unsuitability. The latter is an ambiguous general charge particularly handy for railroading someone out of the service, since it involves opinions rather than provable facts. By implication, it is particularly damaging, for it is in this category the Air Force lumps homosexuals, security risks and thieves.

The testimony showing Smyrl's alleged temperamental unsuitability was pitiful. A colonel said he considered Smyrl unsuitable because Smyrl had contradicted him a little too bluntly in a meeting. An Air Force doctor who, with two colleagues, had treated Smyrl for stomach cramps, swore they were induced by hysteria. He was flatly contradicted by the other two doctors who since had left the service and so were not obliged to please generals.

But the board ignored the even temperament displayed by Smyrl's calm when Jaffe threatened him.

When General Grills took the stand, startled reporters wondered just who was charged with temperamental unsuitability. He strode in like a pompous bulldog, sat down, glared around the room, and said, "I've been in the service more than 30 years and in that time I've acquired an excellent knowledge of human nature. I know young men like to roller skate. They would have skated if they'd been given the opportunity.

He blandly ignored the fact these same young men still refused to skate more than was necessary to dodge real physical training. Under questioning he admitted without hesitation his sole concern with the new training program was the rink's prosperity. Then the prosecutor pulled the plug on Grills' emotions by asking if there was anything he cared to add.

"I certainly do," Grills rumbled and set off on a tirade that left both reporters and the board open-mouthed, and reminded observers of Captain Queeg's celebrated crack-up scene in the Caine Mutiny. Air Force public relations men, charged with making him look good, turned pale. His voice lost its cultivated rumble and edged toward hysteria. Veins throbbed in his face as he shouted, "Colonel Smyrl is a childish man, a man of much egocentricity. He apparently has no understanding of the responsibilities or of the professional ethics of the military service. Smyrl was grossly disloyal to me personally and to the Air Force. He played all sides of the street. He tried to subvert my officers against me."

He ranted on to an incredible climax. "Smyrl shows extreme vacillation of purpose. I believe it results from a peculiar influence exerted on him by his wife. She is a foreign-born woman——"

Jacqueline Smyrl is an exceedingly handsome and cultured Frenchwoman who stood by her husband with steadfast devotion. Her uncle and guardian is a former commander of the French Foreign Legion and she grew up in the leading military and political circles of Europe. Such an intemperate attack by a general officer of the United States constituted a deep insult to this Nation's allies—and diplomatic circles buzzed with it for months.

Smyrl's attorneys broke into the general's diatribe with the objection that Mrs. Smyrl had not been mentioned previously. But before the board could rule, Grills shouted, "I object to that objection. I'm trying to show Smyrl's immaturity, and his wife figures heavily in it."

Shocked, Smyrl's attorney fired, "We object to the attempt of the witness to act as an advocate."

"Objection sustained."

Grills glared at the board, which he barely ranked. "Well, now, I object to that. I believe a discussion of his wife is germane. She's caused enough trouble around my base——"

desperately, "the board is in recess for 10 minutes." He turned his back on the enraged general as newsmen dashed for telephones.

The hearing resumed, never again to reach such dramatic heights. Now a procession of Smyrl's officers and enlisted men paraded through the room, all testifying that he was fair and reasonable and that on his explicit orders they had obeyed the open post policy.

Grills' admitted reason for firing Smyrl was failure to obey that policy. He admitted he based his belief on concessionaire complaints. Now it was clear if he'd ever bothered to check his facts, he wouldn't have fired Smyrl. And it was equally clear had Myers known Smyrl's complaints were true, he wouldn't have ordered the hearing. It was a tragic comedy of errors.

Smyrl's counsel fought to introduce the concession irregularities. "We have evidence of a $10,000 payoff," they said bluntly. But the board, insisting the issue was simple disobedience, refused to hear it. Yet the most serious charge against Smyrl was based on just that. In effect, his best defense was thrown out while the dirtiest charge stuck.

Then a sergeant from the ground safety office heaved a bombshell. During the first 8 months of Rollerdrome operation, he said, it had 14 disabling accidents. They cost the Air Force 248 lost work days and, thereby, more than $7,410. This was greater for the same period than injuries in all other physical training, including football and gymnastics.

At Lackland, any activity that produces two disabling accidents is considered dangerous. The waxing of office floors was discontinued after two men slipped and fell. But no one seemed worried by the rink's toll.

Next came a dreary parade of senior officers, most of them Smyrl's former friends. They sat hunched, not looking at Smyrl, as they nervously muttered that they believed him guilty. A reporter whispered wonderingly, "Why, they're frightened."

One of them was the wing chaplain who'd given Smyrl moral advice. He was a sick man, soon to retire. Now, avoiding Smyrl's unbelieving stare, he not only repudiated his former support but offered this clincher: "I believe it is the duty of young Americans to support those facilities which are set up for their pleasure and benefit."

Thus the guarantee of Morris Jaffe's bankroll had become a matter of moral obligation for young soldiers.

The shameful farce finally ended and on October 3, 1957, the board found Smyrl was not guilty of disobeying an order. But it said he was guilty of temperamental unsuitability and failure to demonstrate leadership. "The board recommends that Col. James A. Smyrl be removed from the active list of the regular Air Force."

Smyrl, at attention before the board, stepped forward, saluted with great precision and wheeled from the table. His face was pale and drawn. He looked as if he'd been punched in the stomach. The wife of one of his attorneys went to him in tears. He smiled then and comforted her. In a few minutes he left, head high and walking like a soldier.

Air Force regulations say such a hearing shall be "fair and impartial." But this was a damned peculiar example.

Grills said with satisfaction. "I consider the Smyrl case a closed issue."

It was not the first time in his life that Gen. Herbert Grills had been dead wrong.

Smyrl appealed the verdict to a five-general board of review in Washington which met January 7, 1958. In the meantime, he lived on at Lackland in loneliness. Friends dropped him. A man who fed on action, he spent a year without duties. He was one of the few full colonels at Lackland to be jet qualified. Now he sat at home and listened to the jets come over fast and sweet, leaving far behind their scream of passage. Sometimes they popped their afterburners and the violence of it shook his house with a muted thump. He would walk out then and study the sky and finally go back to his books and say nothing. Smyrl and his wife were lonely outcasts in the only world they cared for.

The hearing in Washington followed the same lines and produced the same result: Dump Smyrl.

It was a savage blow for the man who dared challenge the generals. But Smyrl had come in fighting and he meant to go out the same way. He had just one more hope.

Through New Hampshire Senator STYLES BRIDGES, Air Force Secretary James Douglas had agreed to give Smyrl an interview before acting on the board's recommendation. The scheduled 15 minutes lasted more than an hour while Douglas, himself an attorney, heard Smyrl's story.

Then he offered a compromise. Smyrl could stay in service with a rank reduction of one grade. Smyrl gazed at the Secretary a long time. Then, as his attorneys' smiles changed to looks of horror, he said quietly, "Sir, I believe I performed the duties of a colonel adequately. I see no reason why I should accept a reduction in rank."

Douglas studied him a moment in thoughtful, perhaps admiring, silence. Then came his decision. Smyrl not only would stay in the Air Force as a full colonel but would be transferred to the elite Strategic Air Command.

The San Antonio Light bannered it simply: "Colonel Smyrl Wins."

To the dismay of the Lackland group, itself already in serious trouble, it became even a greater victory than it had seemed. Given his choice of assignments, Smyrl asked for Morocco where he'd met his wife. A month after he arrived at Nouasseur AFB, French Morocco, he was named deputy commander of the base—the biggest job he's ever held.

There were other victories. Back at Lackland, Johnson was fired and Grills used his pal's hearing as a podium from which to loose a furious blast at Gen. Thomas White, Air Force Chief of Staff. Immediately he found himself out of Lackland and in a NATO post in Italy usually reserved for a mere brigadier. And to top it, a brigadier was sent to Lackland to take Grills' job.

So Smyrl won—and yet, in a larger sense, he lost. For everything he was fighting remains unchanged today.

At Lackland, Air Force recruits still travel toward an unknown and frightening future on roller skates. They still pay for their own training. This is still official Air Force policy.

The men coming out of Lackland today are not the rugged fighters Americans expect for their combat airmen.

Discipline and morale are shot. A husky recruit recently broke his element leader's nose and got off with a $50 fine. He mauled his training instructor and merely was transferred to another flight.

This is commonplace at Lackland and it grows from a sick attitude that comes down from the top—an attitude typified by a skating rink that's considered more important than effective training methods.

In the midst of the great rink battle, the archery concessionaire asked that troops also be marched to his range for physical training credit. In a way, he made sense. If we're training our first line of defense on roller skates, they may someday have to fight with bows and arrows.

SPECIAL ORDER

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LANE). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. O'NEILL] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, a point of order. The gentleman from Massachusetts has indicated to me that he desires to speak on the subject of an election contest. That being a matter upon which the entire membership of the House should be informed, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman withhold that for a moment?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I withhold the point of order.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to say to the gentleman if this is going to be the practice there will be no more special orders by the gentleman or any of his friends.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I renew the point of order.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman insists on his point of order I shall feel obliged to move to adjourn the House. Does the gentleman insist on his point of order?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I do not think this speech should be made without the membership of the House being present and I insist on the point of order.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. ALBERT) there were ayes 6, noes 47.

So the motion was rejected.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 8]

Anderson, Mont.	George	Philbin
Ashley	Gray	Pilcher
Barden	Green, Pa.	Preston
Barrett	Griffiths	Prokop
Belcher	Hall	Roush
Blitch	Hébert	Rutherford
Bolling	Hechler	Shipley
Bowles	Herlong	Sikes
Brademas	Holland	Spence
Breeding	Hosmer	Springer
Brock	Jackson	Taber
Bush	Johnson, Colo.	Taylor
Carter	Jones, Ala.	Teller
Celler	Kee	Thompson, Tex.
Chenoweth	McDowell	Udall
Clark	McGovern	Vanik
Cooley	McSween	Van Pelt
Corbett	Mack, Wash.	Walter
Denton	Madden	Wampler
Edmondson	Magnuson	Widnall
Evins	Martin	Withrow
Farbstein	Meader	Wolf
Fenton	Miller, George P.	Zelenko
Frelinghuysen	Moss	

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 348 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

PERMISSION TO SIT DURING SESSION OF THE HOUSE

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Armed Services may be permitted to sit during the session of the House this afternoon.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

HAYS-ALFORD CONTESTED ELECTION CASE

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. O'NEILL] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Reserving the right to object, do I understand the gentleman does not plan to yield to anyone to permit a full discussion of what he is now about to say?

Mr. O'NEILL. It is my intention to complete my remarks. At that time I will yield to anyone who wishes to discuss the matter.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, during the 85th Congress I was appointed by the Speaker to serve on the Special Committee To Investigate Campaign Expenditures created by House Resolution 656, a special committee to investigate the election of Members of the House of Representatives. We met here after the election during the month of December.

Among the duties imposed upon by the committee by House Resolution 656 were those of "investigating and reporting to the House by January 3, 1959, any violations of Federal or State laws which would affect the qualifications of a Member of the House of Representatives within the meaning of article I, section 5, of the Constitution."

The committee was also charged with the "investigation of such matters relating to the election of Members of the House of Representatives in 1958 and the amounts spent by candidates thereon as the committee deems to be in the public interest and which in its opinion will aid the House of Representatives in deciding any contest that may constitute and involve the right to a seat in the House of Representatives."

Under the rules of the committee:

The committee is authorized to act upon its own motion and upon such information as in its judgment may be reasonable or reliable. Upon complaint being made to the committee under oath by any person, candidate, or political committee setting forth allegations as to facts which under this resolution it would be the duty of said committee to investigate.

Several people came forward. I believe there were seven elections regarding which evidence was presented to the

committee. It is my intent this afternoon to speak only with regard to the Alford-Hays campaign or election which took place in Arkansas.

After we had completed a number of investigations of the Arkansas election your committee went into executive session and voted. I voted with the majority. It was the recommendation of this committee that when the 86th Congress convened that Dr. DALE ALFORD be asked to stand aside and be not seated until a thorough investigation of this matter, including all questions of fact and of law, be undertaken and completed by the Congress.

This committee also recommended that the House fix such a time within which the investigation be completed and reported to the House as the magnitude of this investigation required.

The reason why I voted that way was because I recall a year ago or in the past 85th session there was a contested election between Mr. Oliver and Mr. Hale, and the committee decided the matter on the closing day of the 85th session. It so happens Mr. HALE was the man who was seated. When the investigation and election were over and the returns considered, he was still a Member. But had Mr. Oliver been declared the winner, he would have been denied the right to a seat in this House while the House was actually in session.

So I believed that for an election of this type, with the evidence such as was presented to the committee, instead of referring it to the Committee on House Administration, which is the custom, a special committee should be set up and they should go forward immediately.

On the opening day of the session this year Mr. DINGELL asked that Mr. ALFORD step aside. I was on my feet. It was my intention to ask that Mr. ALFORD step aside. The Members of the House took the oath of office, and immediately following that Mr. MCCORMACK rose and presented a resolution. I was on my feet at the same time. I had intended to present a resolution, but the majority leader was recognized. Had I been recognized I would have presented a resolution asking that Mr. ALFORD not be seated in this Congress until such time as the investigation had been completed.

It was my intention when Mr. MCCORMACK offered his motion to offer a supplementary motion to amend his motion. But he moved the previous question and I was shut out. The previous question was ordered.

Mr. Speaker, as far as minority views are concerned with regard to the Members who were on our special committee, this is what they have to say:

5. We entertain the highest respect and regard for Mr. Hays based upon our long and close association with him in the House of Representatives. However, Dr. ALFORD was granted a duly executed Certificate of Election by the proper officials of the State of Arkansas and it is our firm belief that the Congress of the United States has a responsibility to acknowledge and to give this certification the recognition to which it has been historically entitled in the absence of proof of fraud.

It is the further view of the minority that further investigation is justified in this matter and to this extent we agree with the majority.

In the opening days of the Congress when there was quite an ado about the Alford case and there was publicity in the papers about it, I sat down with some of the Members from the South who had known of my plans. They tried to prevail upon me not to go forward. However, the parliamentary procedure prevented me. Those Members were far more friendly to Brooks Hays than I was. They had known Brooks Hays for all of the 18 years that he served in the Congress, and there was never one word of criticism of Mr. Hays. He never was a social friend of mine.

Mr. Speaker, this is not an issue of segregation. This is an issue as to whether a man who has served in this Congress for 18 years can by, in my opinion, a corrupt election be defeated, or knocked out by a stolen election. I would not care whether that man came from the South, the North, the East, or the West or whether he was black, white, Hindu, or what his religion was. If I served on that committee, as I did, and in my heart, in my mind and conscience I thought there was a fraudulent election, then I would stand on this floor, if I stood alone. That is what I honestly believe about this election.

I do not want to get up here and tend to indulge in any demagogery. I do not want to get into the issue of segregation at all. That is not the question.

There has been a report filed by our committee. I do not know how many Members of the Congress have read it. But let me read a little bit to you now.

I made mention earlier in my remarks that any person under oath could bring a complaint before our committee. You do not necessarily have to be a candidate of a political party. But, in this particular case we had a gentleman by the name of John F. Wells, of Arkansas, who made the complaint, and it was on his complaint that we acted. Now, he presented evidence to the committee.

On December 15, 1958, the committee heard the complainant, John F. Wells, and the successful candidate, Dr. DALE ALFORD, in public hearings. At that time, Mr. Wells submitted a second sworn statement supplementing his complaint of December 3, 1958. With his supplemental statement he also submitted the affidavit of A. Christos, manager of operations of the Service Bureau Corp., an affiliate of International Business Machines, dated December 14, 1958, describing the methods used in checking the names of those who voted in Pulaski County, Ark., against the official 1958 list of electors for that county.

Mr. Christos' document was subscribed to before a notary public.

So, let us see what happened down there in the Little Rock election.

In North Little Rock, ward 3, precinct B, Mrs. Van Mills, 2022 West 16th Street, was a judge. She states that the polling place was overrun by persons handing out Alford stickers and that despite her protest that this was illegal the activities continued, and that two deputy sheriffs who delivered an additional box for the ballots declared that the distribution of the stickers within the polling place should not be stopped.

Then we have evidence that showed that when the ballots arrived and they opened the box that the ballots were in, there were stickers in the ballot box.

We have evidence that showed that the stickers were lying on the table when you came to get the ballot and that you would also take the sticker.

There was evidence presented that showed that a group of Negroes were brought in and voted en bloc.

There was evidence that showed that when certain people came up to vote, members of the council would go over and peer over their shoulders and watch them while they were voting.

Now, that evidence came to the various members of the committee in letters, including myself. But, in regard to the testimony of the Service Bureau Corp., let us get down to this.

The Service Bureau Corp., an affiliate of International Business Machines, was engaged to compare the voters' list with the Pulaski County official list of qualified voters, that is, all persons registered as qualified electors not later than October 1, 1958.

In Jacksonville, SBC reports after a series of checks that 129—over 10 percent—of those listed as voters there did not appear from the records to be qualified electors in that town.

In other words, 129 people voted in that town on that day who were not registered voters and who were not qualified electors to vote in the town on that day.

It would be necessary, of course, to have access to the ballots to determine how many of those were among the—at least—66 votes reported in Jacksonville, ward 2, in excess of the number of persons who, if the register can be relied upon, actually received ballots in that precinct. Here 434 votes were counted in the Congress race—325 for ALFORD and 109 for Hays—whereas in the Governor's race, with names of both candidates printed on the ballot, the total vote was only 164.

In the contest for Governor, Democratic against Republican, with both names on the ballot, 164 votes were cast, but in a sticker contest, where only the name "Hays" appeared on the ballot, 434 votes were cast. In Jacksonville ward 2, there were 195 prima facie questionable ballots.

In North Little Rock ward 4, precinct B, where 368 names were on the list of persons voting but where 427 votes for Congress candidates were counted, 243 for ALFORD and 184 for Hays—SBC reports that 50 persons who appeared not qualified to vote were among those listed as having voted.

Adding the 59 excess of votes over voters in that precinct to the 50 apparently not qualified voters, the prima facie void vote in that precinct is 109.

Now we come to the Big Rock Township, precinct E.

In Big Rock Township, precinct E, where 569 voters were listed but where 626 votes were counted for Congress candidates—452 for ALFORD and 174 for Hays—SBC reports that 67 persons who appeared not qualified

were on the list of voters for that township. Adding the 57 votes in excess of the total number of voters in that precinct to the 67 apparently not qualified voters, the prima facie void vote in that precinct is 124.

It is not all on the side of ALFORD. Reading from the report, we come to the town of Little Rock ward 3, precinct C.

Thus in Little Rock ward 3, precinct C, where 522 votes were counted for Congress candidates—437 for Hays and 85 for ALFORD—and where only 520 names of voters were listed, an explanation should be forthcoming. This can only be had by taking the legal steps by which your committee might have the ballot boxes opened and the ballots checked.

In other words, of 12 communities that were reported to us, in all of these precincts it showed that there were more votes cast for the Congress than were actually listed. Brooks Hays was the winner by a considerable number of votes in one precinct.

I said this to various witnesses before the committee. I said, "I have been familiar with campaigns. I have been familiar with recounts through the years. If they say there are 500 registered voters in the precinct, how is it possible for 600 or 700 people to vote? Where do the ballots come from? I know in my particular area they only send 5 percent over of ballots to the election commission, and they must be accounted for."

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for an explanation on the question he asked?

Mr. O'NEILL. Yes, I yield.

Mr. HARRIS. The gentleman has just made the remark concerning certain precincts in which apparently there were more votes cast at that time than there were on the poll tax list for that precinct; is that the question?

Mr. O'NEILL. Yes, that is the question in part.

Mr. HARRIS. In our State, the State law is that we have a 30-day qualification in the precinct, 6 months in the county, and 1 year in the State. It happens that we have had a housing development in that area. That is not in my district and I have not been into this issue or in this controversy, but I do know something about the procedures under the law. There was this housing development in Jacksonville, one of the places the gentleman mentioned. That housing development had progressed to the point where it had been completed and many of those houses became available. People moved from within the county into that precinct, and that is responsible for the number of votes in that particular precinct.

Did the committee look into that and find out the reason for it?

Mr. O'NEILL. We were going into that as of the date of October 30.

Mr. HARRIS. That is the explanation. The gentleman asked how they could do it? I am telling the gentleman that under the law of our State, if a man has lived within that precinct for 30 days, or if he has lived in the county for 6 months, he becomes eligible.

Mr. O'NEILL. Basically the law in the gentleman's State is not any different from any other law. A man must be listed; regardless whether he moves or does not move, he must be listed.

Mr. HARRIS. They are listed. If the gentleman would look further he would find they were listed in another precinct, and within that county. He would find that they were eligible voters within the laws of our State.

Mr. O'NEILL. I know I have looked into them very thoroughly, and I cannot agree with that interpretation. We have the report of the SBC.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'NEILL. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. YATES. Is that not exactly what the gentleman wants? He wants the committee to look into it further.

Mr. O'NEILL. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. HARRIS. I do not want any wrong impression to be gotten by anybody. I am not opposed to any investigation and I do not know of anyone in my State who is opposed to the investigation.

Mr. O'NEILL. I thank the gentleman for making that statement. That is my only purpose for being on the floor this afternoon. In my opinion, after having served on the committee, it appears to me that a former Member of this House is entitled to an investigation by the House. As a matter of fact, I could even go further than that. I would say that perhaps between certain people there was an implied agreement that there would be an investigation of this matter shortly after the House was in session.

Mr. HARRIS. I was not in that agreement.

Mr. O'NEILL. I did not say the gentleman was. Now we are into March. I have asked the Committee on House Administration to go forward immediately. Dr. DALE ALFORD when he appeared before the committee did not seem reluctant to have a committee hearing. All he wanted to do was, "Well," he said, "if there is going to be a committee investigation, I want my rights protected." His rights will be protected, and so should the rights of Brooks Hays be protected. I am asking the Committee on House Administration to go forward immediately and to have this investigation and clear the matter up once and for all.

Mr. HARRIS. The reason I asked the gentleman to yield was not to indicate that I personally or, so far as I know, anyone within my State would be opposed to an investigation, but the gentleman is giving facts here to the House in this RECORD on a matter which to me is so academic, because, if you were familiar with the laws of the State, it could be so easily explained; but reading the context of the gentleman's report, it is so far from what the facts are. That is the reason I rose at this time.

Mr. O'NEILL. Does it appear to the gentleman that an affiliate of the International Business Machines Corp. who went into a district to make a survey, and who would bring back these facts and these figures, a paid organization, would bring back a false report and submit it? This was the evidence presented to our committee.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

TURBINE CONTRACTS

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. STRATTON] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the fact that so many Members of the House are assembled to hear my remarks. This is a matter, I think, that will be of interest to every Member of the House, because it concerns the award of certain turbine contracts outside the United States, with the consequent loss of employment within the United States.

Mr. Speaker, I have risen on this floor before and other Members have risen to discuss the subject of the awarding by the Tennessee Valley Authority of a contract for the construction of a half-million-kilowatt generator to a British firm rather than to one of two American firms that have had wide experience in this field and both of which are located in areas of major unemployment and of labor surplus. This 500,000-kilowatt generator is, incidentally, one of the greatest machines of its kind that has ever been constructed. There are very few, if any, machines of this size which have previously been constructed. The Tennessee Valley Authority, as a part of its overall power complex, is now acquiring this huge machine and is going to go to Britain to buy it unless the Office of Civilian and Defense Mobilization intervenes on Monday to prevent the purchase.

Mr. MILLER of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STRATTON. I would like to yield briefly to the gentleman, but my time is limited. If the gentleman will join with me in getting an extension of time, I would be more than happy to yield to him, but because of the rather complex nature of the material, I prefer not to yield until after I have completed my remarks.

Mr. WIER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a little help?

Mr. STRATTON. I am always happy to have help.

Mr. WIER. I join with the gentleman with reference to this matter because I have a firm that is in the same boat, that has been losing these REA and large generator bids to foreign competitors, and I join with the gentleman in checking into this whole matter of these bids being let on these big projects.

Mr. STRATTON. I thank my colleague from Minnesota.

Mr. MILLER of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a little more help?

Mr. STRATTON. I am happy to yield to the gentleman for some help.

Mr. MILLER of New York. I am in accord fully with every statement that the gentleman makes, and I have always opposed strenuously these public power authorities, and I presume before this session will end that there will be a bill presented here to permit the TVA to handle its operations by the flotation of bonds. I hope the gentleman will keep that in mind when the bill comes up and help to get the House to pass it.

Mr. STRATTON. I thank the gentleman from New York. Let me assure him that the actions of the TVA in this instance are not making too many friends in the 32d Congressional District of New York.

Mr. Speaker, the whole matter of this contract has been appealed before the Office of Civilian and Defense Mobilization by the General Electric Co. on the grounds of national security. Just yesterday I received a lengthy communication from the TVA in which they discussed this matter and at least to their satisfaction disposed of it. In my judgment, the answer of the TVA has not satisfied me on this point of national security. I think they have failed to make out their case that the national security would not be jeopardized by this award; and I would like to discuss briefly just three of the reasons why I think they have failed to make this case. First of all, Mr. Speaker, it seems to me clear that the whole electrical power complex of the United States is very important and an essential component of our national defense. We have been discussing in the Committee on Armed Services, for example, the so-called hardened installations for intercontinental ballistic missiles and the point always comes up that at some point you have to cut into the power complex and at that point the hardening becomes a little soft. Certainly the overall framework of our power is one of the most critical points in our whole defense structure. It just does not make sense for Government agencies to undertake to equip their power-producing centers with material which is made in foreign countries. This is not a matter of trying to stir up ill feeling between these countries. It is not a matter of trying to interfere with our reciprocal trade. It is simply recognizing that when it comes to important elements of national defense, it does not make any more sense to acquire power generators abroad than to acquire battleships or military aircraft. The British themselves have had a policy of not acquiring this large electrical generating equipment outside their own borders. Canadians who have been buying it from abroad are now also considering limiting purchases to Canada itself. Obviously, if we are going to build up our defense with equipment which is purchased abroad, and which would have to be serviced abroad and repaired abroad, in the event of a national emergency we would have needlessly jeopardized a substantial part of our national defense structure.

The second point concerns certain engineering aspects of this question. I am not an engineer, but as the Representative of a district which has a large number of distinguished engineers living in it, I have perhaps acquired a little of this information by osmosis from my constituents. At least the main point, as the engineers explain it to me, is that this TVA generator is designed to generate 500,000 kilowatts of electricity. That is larger, by some 300,000 kilowatts, than the largest generator that has ever been manufactured and put into operation by the British firm of Parsons, which was the successful bidder. Even the great General Electric Company of Schenectady has previously built and put into operation only a generator capable of generating 400,000 kilowatts, and our engineers tell us when you move up, the wisest step is to move up in stages of 100,000 kilowatts, rather than to jump up 300,000; as Parsons is doing here. To do otherwise is to run the risk of major engineering failures or engineering delays. Those of you who have been in England know that the electric lighting system there seems to flicker a little. That is because theirs is a 50-cycle system rather than 60-cycle system we have in the United States. That means that an American generator has to revolve at 3,600 revolutions per minute, in comparison with a British generator revolving at 3,000 revolutions per minute. This means an increased engineering burden which the British firm will encounter in trying to meet TVA requirements. How can we be sure they will measure up to the job?

Two Parsons generators failed in Canada in 1954, Mr. Speaker, and it took a year and a half to repair them in comparison with a requirement of only 76 days in one case and 129 days in another required to repair generators manufactured in the United States.

If we ever get into another emergency—and I hope we never will—this kind of delay could indeed be fatal. In fact, the requirements of the TVA, if all of the generating equipment now on order performs at top performance, will exceed by only 3 percent the peak load which the TVA expects for 1962. If there is any failure in this equipment, if there is any failure to measure up to the very large requirement that has been estimated by this British firm, if the TVA has underestimated its needs, then we may well find ourselves short when an attack comes, of vital and necessary electric power.

I feel that the matter ought to be fully examined by the Office of Civil Defense Mobilization. We have an important problem here that involves our national defense, and I feel that these national defense factors must be considered by the one agency which is charged with that responsibility—the Office of Civilian Defense Mobilization and not left for final determination by TVA.

The TVA has also said, Mr. Speaker, that the bids placed by the American firms of General Electric and Westinghouse were excessive in cost, and amounted to a sum almost $6,000,000 greater than the British bid. The TVA thus suggests indirectly that they have placed their contract abroad in the hope of forcing American producers to lower their price. Considering that the American bids were both very close, a question arises in my mind as to just how the British firm could manage to quote a figure so much lower than the prevailing American figure. Even the differential in wage costs, as the TVA analysis points out, amounts to only about $1.5 million. Could it be that the British firm of Parsons & Co. is being subsidized by the British Government in an effort to enable them to break into this important manufacturing field in the United States? I have no desire to see American agencies pay excessive prices for equipment, but we already have, Mr. Speaker, a procedure which permits the renegotiation of important defense contracts. I would think that the proper solution in this case, if TVA feels that the price is excessive, would be to require a renegotiation of the contract with a domestic firm rather than placing the contract abroad in an effort to penalize American manufacturers.

I am particularly dissatisfied with TVA's understanding of the unemployment problem in this country. Unemployment is no joke, and I think its significance deserves to be considered far more seriously by all agencies of the executive branch of our Government. The TVA has suggested that funds spent in Britain will go just as far toward relieving unemployment in this country as funds spent domestically. This, Mr. Speaker, is complete nonsense. The unemployment problem which we face today is a localized problem centered in certain specific localities, and bearing most heavily on heavy industrial manufacturing areas like Schenectady, N.Y. Money which may be spent in this country by British purchasers would do almost nothing to relieve this problem since at best it would be spent without regard to location. The only expenditure that will help these heavy industries would be increased purchases of this heavy industrial equipment, and this is precisely what we are hoping that American Government agencies would be able to do these days rather than going abroad. It has been estimated that the award of this contract to the General Electric Co., for example, would provide employment for 600 persons for a full year in Schenectady.

What is particularly serious about the TVA decision is the danger that it will set a new trend in purchases in the turbine field. The city of Los Angeles is already considering the purchase of a 200,000-kilowatt turbogenerator from a Swiss firm, and they may indeed already

have acted to award that contract to the Swiss firm instead of to General Electric. If this trend carries on there can be real disaster for those areas of this country where heavy electrical equipment is now being manufactured. It is quite true that the power needs of this country will grow, but if a trend develops at the same time to purchase the generating equipment for this increased power from abroad, then this growth will contribute to unemployment here rather than the reverse. In fact, if foreign firms, as Mr. William S. Ginn, vice president of the General Electric Co. in Schenectady, has suggested, can underbid American firms in this field any time they want to, then there is a real danger that American capital will also consider moving overseas in order to compete in this field, and the result in America will be ghost towns at regular industrial localities from one coast to another.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that the American Government has a serious responsibility in this matter. I believe that the Government ought to take the lead in recognizing the importance of this heavy electrical industry and the importance of stimulating its productive activity, rather than letting the situation drift.

As I have mentioned, the Office of Civilian and Defense Mobilization has been urged to recommend to the President that this contract with Parsons & Co. be canceled on the grounds of national security. Monday, March 9, is the last day on which the contract can be canceled without penalty to the Government. I hope, Mr. Speaker, that the Director of OCDM will take these arguments seriously to heart and will exercise the power conferred upon him to rescue this situation before it is too late. I hope that on Monday next the action of OCDM will be an action in support of American industry and a decision to maintain our American power facilities on a genuinely American basis. I hope that there will not be any shrinking of this responsibility in OCDM, so that we will not have to consider Monday next a blue or even a black Monday for American industry and American employees. Just a few weeks ago OCDM recognized the importance of national security in the case of a 50,000-kilowatt turbine for the Greer's Ferry project in Arkansas. Surely, they can recognize the importance of national security in a unit which is so comparatively small, how can they fail to recognize the even greater aspect of national security interest implicit in the construction of a piece of machinery 10 times as large? Surely, Mr. Speaker, the laws of the game must apply to all players, not just to a privileged few. I hope that the decision of OCDM, taken on Monday next, will be one that will renew confidence in the people of our land and will reestablish their faith that those who decide on these matters in Washington are genuinely concerned about their welfare and are sensible to their economic needs.

Mr. Speaker, in order to give the Members of this House some indication of the sentiment in my district, I ask unanimous consent to include at this point the text of a resolution adopted by post 41 of the AMVETS organization located at Fort Hunter, N.Y., a resolution adopted by the city council of the city of Schenectady, and also an editorial which appeared in the Watertown Daily Times of February 11, 1959. Although Watertown is not in the immediate area of Schenectady and is outside my district, I know the people of our district are gratified to realize the extent to which the people of other sections of our State understand the serious concern which we have in this award. I hope that every Member will have an opportunity to read these resolutions and to make his views felt to the OCDM before Monday next.

RESOLUTION OF AMVETS QUEEN ANN POST, NO. 41, OF FORT HUNTER, N.Y.

At a regular meeting of this post on February 11, 1959, at 8 p.m., in Fort Hunter, N.Y., the following resolution was unanimously adopted:

"*Resolved*, That inasmuch as all members of this post and residents of this area are vitally concerned with the labor surplus which already exists in this area and inasmuch as many of the members of this post and residents of this area depend upon income derived from employment in this area and particularly the General Electric Co. at Schenectady, N.Y., we feel compelled to go on record in this manner as being unalterably opposed to the letting of a large Federal Government contract for a turbine to a foreign firm when such can be built just as well, and perhaps better, in this country and particularly in Schenectady, N.Y.; that this is a gross miscarriage of governmental consideration toward its own people which will tend further to depress the economic condition of this area; that the living standards of our own people must be first taken into consideration and compared with foreign labor; that by making governmental purchases in this country a large portion of the purchase price will be returned to the Government in corporate and individual taxes; that our Representatives in the Congress and Senate be urged to take all steps necessary to reverse this decision and to prevent future instances of the same nature."

RESOLUTION NO. 6571 OF THE COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF SCHENECTADY, N.Y.

"Whereas the Tennessee Valley Authority recently awarded a contract for a large steam turbine generator to a foreign manufacturer, outbidding the General Electric Co.; and

"Whereas it is reported that four foreign firms are now bidding against General Electric Co. for a large order soon to be placed by the city of Los Angeles; and

"Whereas because of the low-cost labor in foreign countries it is possible for a foreign firm to outbid a domestic concern; and

"Whereas General Electric Vice President W. S. Ginn estimated that the Tennessee Valley Authority and Los Angeles orders involve a total of more than 3 million manhours of work, enough to supply jobs to 750 office and factory employees for 2 full years; and

"Whereas the granting of such contracts to foreign firms will increase our unemployment throughout the Nation, and, even more important, will endanger our national security in time of war inasmuch as we might have to rely on foreign labor and foreign skills to maintain equipment in our arsenal of democracy; and

"Whereas in the city of Schenectady the awarding of such contracts to foreign firms affects management not only of the General Electric Co. but Alco Products, Inc., as well, together with the IUE Local 301 and the United Steelworkers of America, AFL, Local 128 Steamfitters, Plumbers, and Helpers, as well as all of the Schenectady business enterprises and their employees: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That the Council of the City of Schenectady, on behalf of its citizenry indignant because of the jeopardy of their economic security and national wartime stability, vigorously protests the awarding of contracts to foreign powers by governmental units in competition with domestic bidders; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the present contract between the Tennessee Valley Authority and the C. A. Parsons Co., Ltd., of Newcastle, Great Britain, be rescinded; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That before any contract be entered into between the U.S. Government or any agency thereof and any person, firm, or corporation of and located in a foreign country the entire matter shall be referred to the proper congressional committee for review and approval; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That this resolution be spread upon the minutes of the Council of the City of Schenectady and copies thereof be sent forthwith by the clerk of the city of Schenectady to Senator JACOB K. JAVITS, Senator KENNETH B. KEATING, Congressman SAMUEL S. STRATTON, Congressman J. ERNEST WHARTON, Congressman LEO W. O'BRIEN, and Congressman DEAN P. TAYLOR, and to each and every other member of the New York State congressional delegation."

This resolution was unanimously adopted by the Council of the City of Schenectady on Monday, February 16, 1959.

FREEMAN K. KELLER,
Clerk of the City of Schenectady.

[From the Watertown (N.Y.) Daily Times, Feb. 11, 1959]

TVA AWARD TO ENGLAND

The Tennessee Valley Authority has awarded a contract to an English firm for a huge steam turbine-generator, refusing to consider the higher bids by domestic firms. Naturally this decision to bypass the American firms to give the contract for the 500,000 kilowatt unit for TVA's Colbert plant is protested, most vehemently by General Electric which submitted the low domestic bid.

It is only right to make such an award to the lowest bidder when domestic companies are concerned. But this case is different. A foreign corporation was one of the competitors and entered the bidding with a loaded deck. There was little danger of being outbidded for it had the immediate advantage of lower construction costs due to the abnormally low wage scale prevailing in England.

The General Electric has every right to make a vehement protest for this company and for that matter any company in the country is at a disadvantage in competing against foreign manufacturers. Naturally the bid of the British firm was lower, $5,500,000 to be exact, and that is quite a sizable difference.

But there are other facts to consider. All of the money expended on the turbine-generator unit will be spent in England. American labor and allied manufacturers will not share in any of the work. There is also the matter of necessary repairs, which would be handicapped when they are to be done by the foreign builder. Much valuable time would be lost.

In these days of high unemployment every effort should be made, especially by such agencies as the TVA, to aid in every way to create jobs. That cannot be done if firms from outside of this Nation are given contracts. A protest over this TVA action is in order.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

FEDERAL AID TO EDUCATION

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. STAGGERS] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, for many years the question of Federal aid to education has been discussed by the Members of Congress, by educators, and by interested lay citizens. There has been much difference of opinion among those engaging in these discussions as to the role of the local, State, and Federal Governments in providing for the education of our youth. Despite the differences of opinion there were these basic agreements: First, that the youth of each State and each local community should be provided an opportunity to attend a school of acceptable quality; second, that the opportunity to attend a good school is still being denied many thousands of children in many of the States of our country.

Until a year ago last October it appeared that this might be treated as an academic question subject to continued debate. With the launching of the Russian sputnik it became apparent to the discerning people of this country that our relative position among the nations of this earth was not what we had been led to believe with regard to education and technological skill. From the position of the acknowledged leader in education and technology one day, we found ourselves, but a few hours later, forced to concede that the growth of education and science in Russia since the war has been accelerated to the extent that our safety, our continued existence as a free people is gravely threatened.

While we were debating whether or not we would choose to use our full resources to give our people the quality of education which we agree they need, Russia, recognizing that the position of any nation in today's world will be determined by the quality of the education of its people, gave first priority to the improvement of its schools. Physical facilities and equipment were improved. A program of studies designed to meet their purpose with standards of pupil achievement was established. The position of the teacher was elevated to that held by other important professions. Their recent achievements in space exploration and in other scientific endeavors are strong evidence that progress comes through education. Can we longer persist in debating how we shall provide good schools for all of our people? Russia has chosen to battle, at the present, in the classroom. Have we any alternative other than to accept that challenge? Must we not acknowledge that the education in this country is an essential part of our national defense and as such becomes a joint responsibility of the local, State, and National Governments?

Let us take a look at some of the conditions to be found among the school systems of our States. To what extent is there an ability to provide the money needed for good schools? Estimated average salaries paid the instructional staff range from a high of $5,925 in one State to a low of $2,650 in another. The estimated average per pupil expenditure ranges from a high of $482 to a low of $158 with the national average being $340. In education as in business, experience teaches us that there is a positive relationship between the price we pay and the quality of the product we receive. This range of teachers salaries and per pupil expenditure indicates that many of our schools are substandard. A good teacher in a poor State needs the same professional training as does the teacher in a wealthy State. If the teaching profession is to secure and keep the number of able young people needed in our schools, teaching must be made as financially attractive as are other professions requiring an equal amount of college preparation.

We are told that the average age of the teachers in the public schools is 48 years and that more than a hundred thousand qualified teachers are now needed. From 4 to 7 years are required to prepare a high-school graduate to teach. The school population will continue to increase drastically as long as the growth in the birth rate continues. Provisions should be made at once to insure our having an adequate supply of qualified teachers. This can be done only through increased local, State, and Federal support for schools.

The aid to education as provided under the Murray-Metcalf bill cannot longer be delayed without further jeopardizing our national defense.

As a second step toward an ultimate solution of the problem of providing a good school for each boy and girl, I would recommend the establishment of a relatively small commission to set forth in as clear and simple manner as possible a statement of standards which could enable the interested lay citizen along with the education profession to more readily evaluate each individual school as to the quality of its staff, program, plant, equipment, and maintenance.

As a third step, I would provide for the employment of a qualified staff to determine the relative ability of each State to support a school program of an acceptable standard.

There is a fourth step—probably the most important. Enlighten the people to our plight. I would recommend an all-out crash program to inform and alert every community, every county, and every State to the second-class status of the great majority of our teachers and schools. Bombard the people with the unvarnished truth in understandable terms. As an eye opener: During the year 1956 this Nation spent for liquors over $9 billion; for tobacco almost $8 billion; and for cosmetics, beauty, and barber shops, close to $4 billion which makes a sum of almost $21 billion.

Now, compare $21 billion with $11 billion spent for education for the same year. Half again more for liquor, tobacco, and beauty than for education of our youth. It just does not make sense.

When the people are awakened to the truth, they will urge and support appropriations for better schools and better paid teachers. A basic salary of $10,000 is not too much for well qualified teachers who have spent thousands of dollars and years of study and research to prepare themselves for the educational field. A good teacher should earn as much as a lawyer, a doctor, or a politician.

Again, I remind you our only hope and salvation is an enlightened people. With the will and means to grow and improve, our educational system in this country will cease to be second rate. We want to be as good as any. We should be the best.

I urge all elected officials from the county level up to the President of the United States to recognize our situation and prove to the mothers and fathers that their trust is well placed, and with their help and with the help of the good Lord, new life will be put into our crippled educational system.

AMICABLE RELATIONS WITH CANADA ENDANGERED BY H.R. 1

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include an article by the attorney general of the State of Wisconsin.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I am calling attention to the statement made by the Honorable John W. Reynolds, attorney general of the State of Wisconsin, before the Subcommittee on Rivers and Harbors of the Public Works Committee on February 17, 1959.

Mr. Reynolds was elected to the office of attorney general on November 4, 1958, and is the third Democrat to serve Wisconsin in that position during my lifetime. It was my privilege to know John W. Reynolds, Sr., the father of the present attorney general, who served as attorney general from 1927 to 1933 as a Progressive Republican. From 1935 to 1938, John W. Reynolds, Sr., served in the office of the Wisconsin Progressive Party, Madison, Wis., and it was my privilege to know him personally and to work with him at the time I was chief clerk of the Wisconsin Assembly. He made an outstanding record in the 6 years he served as attorney general of Wisconsin. As a matter of fact, it was John W. Reynolds, Sr., while he was attorney general of Wisconsin, who secured the original decree from the U.S.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

Supreme Court in 1930 which established the present limit on the amount of water that Chicago may take from Lake Michigan. I am glad his son now has the opportunity to carry on his father's work.

Since the Public Works Committee has reported out H.R. 1, amended, I would like to call my colleagues' attention to the fact that Canada has renewed its firm opposition to the Chicago water diversion, and that the Honorable Sydney Smith, Secretary of State for External Affairs of Canada, has transmitted a note of opposition to the U.S. Ambassador at Ottawa.

At this point in the RECORD I am glad to submit the statement of the Honorable John W. Reynolds, Jr., attorney general for the State of Wisconsin:

STATEMENT OF JOHN W. REYNOLDS, ATTORNEY GENERAL OF WISCONSIN, BEFORE THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON RIVERS AND HARBORS, COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, FEBRUARY 17, 1959

Gentlemen, my name is John W. Reynolds, and I am the attorney general of the State of Wisconsin. I would like to thank you for the opportunity you have given me to appear before you.

Speaking on behalf of the State of Wisconsin, the city of Milwaukee, and the Milwaukee Port Authority, I urge this committee to take no action on H.R. 1 at this time for the following reasons:

1. The matter of the diversion of Lake Michigan water is presently the subject of litigation. In December 1958, Wisconsin, joining with the other Great Lakes States, which were parties to the original action in the case of *Wisconsin et al.* v. *Illinois and the Chicago Sanitary District*, filed its application with the Supreme Court of the United States to reopen the decree of April 21, 1930. By that decree the United States Supreme Court retained jurisdiction over present application to the United States the subject matter of H.R. 1. Wisconsin's Supreme Court is for the purpose of requesting the Court to appoint a special master to take evidence to determine whether Chicago should be compelled to follow the practice of all other Great Lakes cities and return its unused domestic pumpage, after it had passed through its waterworks and purification system, to the Great Lakes Basin.

The State of Illinois and the Sanitary District filed their brief in opposition to our application in January of this year.

In connection with this litigation, I would like to point out that the Solicitor General of the United States, Mr. J. Lee Rankin, is taking an active interest in this case. He has notified the United States Supreme Court that in order to protect the sovereign interests of the United States he will file a brief in March of this year.

In addition, the Solicitor General has called a conference on March 2, 1959, of all the Great Lakes States concerned, including Illinois. I cannot predict what results may be reached at that conference, but I respectfully and specifically request that the records of this committee be kept open to receive a report of that conference.

2. The second reason that we request this committee to take no action on H.R. 1 at this time is that on February 25 and 26 of this year there is going to be held in Detroit a meeting of Senators, Governors, attorneys general, and mayors of Wisconsin, Ohio, New York, Michigan, Pennsylvania and Minnesota, and mayors of several Canadian cities, to plan unified opposition to bills and suits on the diversion of water from the Great Lakes. I also request that the records of this committee be kept open to receive a report of that conference.

On behalf of the State of Wisconsin I am here to reiterate our strenuous objection to the never-ending effort of the Chicago Sanitary District to take the waters of Lake Michigan. No other city on the Great Lakes in the United States or Canada has ever sought or asserted the right to deplete the waters of the Great Lakes Basin.

Wisconsin has been fighting for 30 years to preserve and protect the water of Lake Michigan. As a matter of fact, it was my father as attorney general of Wisconsin who got the original decree from the Supreme Court of the United States in 1930, which established the present limit on the amount of water that Chicago may take from Lake Michigan.

Since our time as well as the subject matter at this hearing is strictly limited, I would like permission to incorporate in the RECORD at this point two statements of the attorney general of Wisconsin. The first was made to this subcommitte in March 1957 and recorded in the report of this committee on the hearings of H.R. 2, March 26 and 27, 1957, pages 66–68. The second is reported in the hearings before a subcommittee of the Committee on Public Works of the U.S. Senate on H.R. 2 and S. 1123, held July 28–29 and August 7, 1958, pages 273–275.

These two statements outline the position of Wisconsin. First, that it is a scientific fact that the diversion of an additional 1,000 cubic feet per second of Lake Michigan water will have no effect upon pollution in the Chicago drainage canal or the Illinois River Waterway; and second, that an attempt by the U.S. Congress unilaterally to divert this water from an international system of lakes and rivers is violative of international law and would create a dangerous precedent in our dealings and negotiations with Canada over the mutually beneficial use of international waters.

The present bill proposed on behalf of the Chicago Sanitary District, H.R. 1, is considerably watered down from previous bills which have been before the House of Representatives and before your committee. It makes the comparatively modest proposal to increase the diversion of water by the city of Chicago by 1,000 cubic feet per second for 1 year. The alleged purpose of the bill is to permit the U.S. Public Health Service to determine the effect of such increased diversion upon Chicago's woefully mismanaged sewage disposal problem and the problem of pollution in the Chicago Drainage Canal and the Illinois River Waterway.

Our primary objection to this bill is twofold. First, such a bill would establish a highly undesirable precedent. Our second objection is that according to the best scientific and professional advice that we can obtain, we know in advance it is not going to do the city of Chicago or the Chicago Sanitary District one iota of good. The available evidence which we have already accumulated indicates that the mismanagement by the city of Chicago of its sewage disposal facilities has now resulted in a pollution problem so great that nothing less than the diversion of 10,000 cubic feet of water per second would do any good.

Surely, gentlemen, if you propose to recommend this bill for passage, you should insist that the proponents of this bill present the testimony of at least one competent and qualified sanitary engineer that there is at least a possibility that the proposed diversion will have a beneficial effect upon the pollution caused by the city of Chicago in its drainage canal and the Illinois River Waterway. According to the best advice I can obtain, the proponents cannot obtain such testimony.

This bill would interfere with a difficult and perilous international question. To increase Chicago's take of Lake Michigan water could seriously jeopardize the negotiations which I understand our State Department is now conducting with Canada concerning our mutual rights and obligations in the use of all international waters including, particularly, the Columbia River.

In this connection I would respectfully call your attention to two publications. The first is entitled, "Document on the Use and Control of Waters of Interstate and International Streams," which is a compilation of compacts, treaties, and adjudications affecting the use of interstate and international waters, published by the U.S. Department of the Interior in 1956. The second is the proceedings of the 10th conference of the Inter-American Bar Association held in 1957 at Buenos Aires, Argentina, entitled, "Principles of Law Governing the Uses of International Rivers and Lakes," published in Washington, D.C., in April 1958.

It is my considered opinion that these two publications establish beyond all reasonable doubt the principle that no state or nation can act unilaterally on a matter affecting an international water in a manner which will adversely affect some other state or some other nation.

The distinguished authority on international law, Lauterpacht, who is now a judge of the International Court of Justice, has stated that "the duty of the state not to interfere with the flow of a river to the detriment of other riparian states" is "one of those general principles of law recognized by civilized states which the Permanent Court is bound to apply to virtue of article 38 of its statute" (1 Oppenheim, International Law, 346–347 (8th ed. Lauterpacht, 1955)).

The so-called Harmon doctrine, under which former U.S. Attorney General Harmon asserted in 1895 that the United States could deal with the waters of the Rio Grande without regard to the rights of the United Mexican States, has never been followed. In fact, by the Rio Grande Convention negotiated in 1906 by the President of the United States of America and the President of the United States of Mexico, the United States agreed to insure delivery to Mexico of 60,000-acre feet of water annually. And in our relations with Canada we have entered into four separate treaties: The Boundary Waters Treaty of 1909; the Lake of the Woods Convention of 1925; the Rainy Lake Convention of 1938; and the Niagara River Water Diversion Treaty of 1950.

If we are to protect and preserve our amicable relations with Canada, I most respectfully suggest to you that no diversions of water whatsoever from the Great Lakes Basin should be authorized or permitted in the absence of a specific convention or agreement ratified by our own U.S. Government and the Government of Canada.

In conclusion, it is Wisconsin's position that to permit an additional diversion of 1,000 cubic feet per second so that the U.S. Public Health Service can make a so-called study of the effect of a diversion is totally unjustified for the following reasons:

1. Such a study would be fruitless and a waste of the time of an important Federal agency as well as the taxpayers' money.

2. Such unilateral additional diversion would violate international law and seriously affect our relations with Canada.

3. Such additional diversion would create a disastrous precedent, and if followed by other Great Lakes cities would have the effect of seriously diminishing the value of the St. Lawrence Seaway project.

4. Such additional diversion would interfere with the jurisdiction of the U.S. Supreme Court.

I would like to remind the committee of our sincere belief that the riparian rights of the Great Lakes States of the United States are subject to the jurisdiction only of the U.S. Supreme Court under the decree of April 21, 1930, and of any modification that the Court may make thereof upon proper application. As I have stated, there is litigation presently pending affecting those rights, and I most respectfully urge upon the Congress that it should do nothing which would prejudice the outcome of that litigation.

Gentlemen, I would like to again thank you for your consideration.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. STRATTON, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. BECKER (at the request of Mr. HALLECK), for 60 minutes, on Monday, March 16.

Mr. STAGGERS, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri, for 60 minutes, on Monday next.

Mr. WILLIAMS (at the request of Mr. ALBERT), for 45 minutes, on Monday next, March 9, 1959.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. PELLY in two instances.

Mr. ALGER.

Mr. FULTON.

Mrs. SULLIVAN and to include an article by Mrs. Roosevelt.

Mr. LINDSAY and to include extraneous matter.

Mrs. DWYER and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. CRAMER (at the request of Mr. HALLECK).

Mr. BOLAND.

At the request of Mr. MCCORMACK, the following Members to extend their remarks in the RECORD:

Mr. BARING and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. ANDERSEN of Minnesota.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois in three instances, in one to include a remarkable article by the senior Senator from Illinois, Senator PAUL DOUGLAS.

(At the request of Mr. COLLIER, and to include extraneous matter, the following:)

Mr. SCHWENGEL.

Mr. DIGGS.

(At the request of Mr. ALBERT, and to include extraneous matter, the following:)

Mr. COFFIN.

Mr. ANFUSO in two instances.

Mr. FOGARTY and to include an article entitled "A Report to the Nation Presented by American Heart Association and National Heart Institute on 'Decade of Progress Against Cardiovascular Disease,'" which is estimated by the Public Printer to cost $621.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 47 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, March 9, 1959, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

666. A letter from the Director, Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization, Executive Office of the President, transmitting the 32d report on property acquisitions for the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization for the quarter ending December 31, 1958, pursuant to the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950; to the Committee on Armed Services.

667. A letter from the Administrator, Small Business Administration, transmitting the 11th Semiannual Report of the Small Business Administration covering operations between July 1 and December 31, 1958, pursuant to Public Law 85-536; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

668. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend title 14, United States Code, entitled 'Coast Guard,' to authorize the Coast Guard to sell supplies and furnish services not available from local sources to vessels and other watercraft to meet the necessities of such vessels and watercraft"; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

669. A letter from the Postmaster General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to restore the authority of the Postmaster General to adjust the postage rates for airmail weighing in excess of 8 ounces, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

670. A letter from the Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act and the Social Security Act to change the basis for financing military service creditable under these acts, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

671. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to exclude from gross income amounts paid by the United States to certain nonresident alien employees or their beneficiaries"; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

672. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders suspending deportation as well as a list of the persons involved, pursuant to the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. ROGERS of Texas: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 1306. A bill to amend section 2(b) of the Columbia Basin Project Act, as amended; with amendment (Rept. No. 176). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 4405. A bill to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Interior to conduct studies and render a report on the feasibility of developing the water resources of the Salt Fork of the Red River in the State of Texas; with amendment (Rept. No. 177). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DELANEY: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 93. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Agriculture to make certain studies and investigations; with amendment (Rept. No. 182). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. DELANEY: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 182. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Ways and Means to conduct studies and investigations relating to matters within its jurisdiction; with amendment (Rept. No. 183). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. TRIMBLE: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 200. Resolution providing for the consideration of S. 79, an act to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to permit the temporary listing and certification of Citrus Red No. 2 for coloring mature oranges under tolerances found safe by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, so as to permit continuance of established coloring practice in the orange industry pending congressional consideration of general legislation for the listing and certification of food color additives under safe tolerances; without amendment (Rept. No. 184). Referred to the House Calendar.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 3816. A bill for the relief of Mukhtar Mohammed; without amendment (Rept. No. 178). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SMITH of California: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 3817. A bill for the relief of Jose Santiago Savedra Calza; without amendment (Rept. No. 179). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MOORE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 4445. A bill for the relief of Stirley Louis Berutich; with amendment (Rept. No. 180). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 4549. A bill for the relief of Jacob Naggar; without amendment (Rept. No. 181). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANDERSEN of Minnesota:

H.R. 5302. A bill to extend rural mail delivery service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. ANDERSON of Montana:

H.R. 5303. A bill to make permanent the provisions of the Sugar Act of 1948; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ANFUSO:

H.R. 5304. A bill to establish in the Bureau of Customs the U.S. Customs Enforcement Division in order to improve the enforcement of the antismuggling laws; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BECKWORTH:

H.R. 5305. A bill to amend chapter 35 of title 38, United States Code, to provide educational assistance to the children of veterans who are permanently and totally disabled from wartime service-connected disability; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. COFFIN:

H.R. 5306. A bill to provide for unemployment reinsurance grants to the States, to revise, extend, and improve the unemployment insurance program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. DWYER:

H.R. 5307. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a deduction for income-tax purposes of expenses incurred by an individual for transportation to and from work; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 5308. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to eliminate the provisions which reduce the old-age or wife's insurance benefits of a woman becoming entitled to such benefits before she attains age 65; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GARY:

H.R. 5309. A bill to amend part I of the Federal Power Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. GRIFFIN:

H.R. 5310. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that the rental value of a parsonage shall not be included in determining the amount of a retired minister's outside earnings for purposes of the work clause; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 5311. A bill to authorize the use of Great Lakes vessels on the oceans; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H.R. 5312. A bill to amend the Federal Coal Mine Safety Act so as to provide further for the prevention of accidents in coal mines; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HEMPHILL:

H.R. 5313. A bill to enable producers to provide a supply of turkeys adequate to meet the needs of consumers, to maintain orderly marketing conditions, and to promote and expand the consumption of turkeys and turkey products; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HORAN:

H.R. 5314. A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. LINDSAY:

H.R. 5315. A bill to amend the National Defense Education Act of 1958 to eliminate the requirement of an affidavit provided by subsection 1001(f)(1) thereof; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. MACHROWICZ:

H.R. 5316. A bill to extend by 1 year the period for which additional benefits may be paid under the Temporary Unemployment Compensation Act of 1958; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MATTHEWS:

H.R. 5317. A bill to amend section 21 of the Second Liberty Bond Act to provide for the retirement of the public debt; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MORGAN:

H.R. 5318. A bill to establish an effective program to alleviate conditions of substantial and persistent unemployment and underemployment in certain economically depressed areas; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. PATMAN:

H.R. 5319. A bill to provide readjustment assistance to veterans who serve in the Armed Forces between January 31, 1955, and July 1, 1963; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. PELLY:

H.R. 5320. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to make it clear that the tax on transportation of persons does not apply to ferry service provided by State-operated ferryboats; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 5321. A bill to extend medical, surgical, and dental treatment in hospitals and stations of the Public Health Service without charge to certain seamen on U.S.-flag fishing vessels in international waters; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. POFF:

H.R. 5322. A bill to amend title 28, entitled "Judiciary and Judicial Procedure," of the United States Code to provide for the defense of suits against Federal employees arising out of their operation of motor vehicles in the scope of their employment, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RODINO:

H.R. 5323. A bill to insure the equal protection of the laws to all persons regardless of race, color, religion, or national origin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts:

H.R. 5324. A bill to incorporate the Army and Navy Union of the United States of America; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SANTANGELO:

H.R. 5325. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to reduce from 62 to 50 the age at which widows' benefits become payable thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 5326. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to permit an accelerated amortization deduction for facilities devoted to the conduct of aeronautical and space activities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SMITH of California:

H.R. 5327. A bill to amend section 1371 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to permit stock of a small business corporation which is owned by a husband and wife to be treated as owned by a single shareholder for purposes of determining the number of shareholders of such corporation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. STAGGERS:

H.R. 5328. A bill to amend the Federal Employees Salary Increase Act of 1958 to grant certain increases in compensation to employees of the agricultural stabilization and conservation county committees, to bring employees of agricultural stabilization and conservation county committees within the purview of the Civil Service Retirement Act and the Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance Act of 1954, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. TAYLOR:

H.R. 5329. A bill to provide for the issuance of a postage stamp in commemoration of the 125th anniversary of the granting (at the Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute, Troy, N.Y.) of the first degrees in science and engineering ever granted in any English-speaking country; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. TOLL:

H.R. 5330. A bill to establish an effective program to alleviate conditions of substantial and persistent unemployment and underemployment in certain economically depressed areas; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. ASPINALL:

H.R. 5331. A bill to provide for the preservation and development of the domestic fluorspar industry; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BARING:

H.R. 5332. A bill to provide for the preservation and development of the domestic fluorspar industry; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BOSCH:

H.R. 5333. A bill to amend section 1372 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the period for the making of an election as a small business corporation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BOYLE:

H.R. 5334. A bill to extend credit to private nonprofit hospitals for the purpose of construction and expansion of facilities; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CHENOWETH:

H.R. 5335. A bill to provide for the preservation and development of the domestic fluorspar industry; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. FORD:

H.R. 5336. A bill to amend title 28 of the United States Code to increase the limit for administrative adjustment of claims against the United States under the tort claims procedure to $2,500; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. GRANAHAN:

H.R. 5337. A bill to amend section 401 of the Postal Field Service Compensation Act of 1955, as amended, with respect to the salaries of certain Postal Transportation Service substitutes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. GRIFFIN:

H.R. 5338. A bill to amend and clarify the reemployment provisions of the Universal Military Training and Service Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H.R. 5339. A bill to raise the minimum wage under the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, to $1.25 an hour, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 5340. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act to increase to 2½ percent the multiplication factor for determining annuities for certain Federal employees engaged in hazardous duties; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HEALEY:

H.R. 5341. A bill providing for the Surgeon General of the United States to establish a hospital in the State of New York especially equipped for the treatment of persons addicted to the use of habit-forming drugs; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. LANE:

H.R. 5342. A bill to create a presumption that certain impairment of health caused by hypertension or heart disease of a Federal or District of Columbia employee is incurred in line of duty for purposes of certain retirement and disability compensation laws or systems; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. LANKFORD:

H.R. 5343. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to repeal the manufacturers excise tax on lacrosse sticks; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 5344. A bill to establish the Chesapeake & Ohio Canal National Historical Park and to provide for the administration and maintenance of a parkway, in the State of Maryland, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mrs. MAY:

H.R. 5345. A bill to strengthen and improve State and local programs to combat and control juvenile delinquency; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. MORRISON:

H.R. 5346. A bill to amend the Federal Employees Salary Increase Act of 1958 to extend to employees of agricultural stabilization and conservation county committees the salary increase benefits provided by such act; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. STUBBLEFIELD:

H.R. 5347. A bill to provide for the preservation and development of the domestic fluorspar industry; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey:

H.R. 5348. A bill to incorporate the U.S. Civil Defense Council; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. UTT:

H.R. 5349. A bill to provide for the conveyance to Orange County, Calif., of all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to certain real property situated in Orange County, Calif.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BECKWORTH:

H.J. Res. 287. Joint resolution designating the rose as the national flower of the United States; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mrs. DWYER:

H.J. Res. 288. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution prohibiting a State from taxing certain income of a nonresident; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HESS:

H.J. Res. 289. Joint resolution designating the 7-day period beginning October 25, 1959, as Cleaner Air Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MERROW:

H.J. Res. 290. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to disapproval of items in general appropriation bills; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts:

H.J. Res. 291. Joint resolution to establish a commission for the celebration of the 100th anniversary of the birth of Gen. John J. Pershing; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. Con. Res. 97. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of House Report 1328, 85th Congress, 2d session; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. McGOVERN:

H. Con. Res. 98. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to a program for paying the national debt; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. FORAND: Memorial of the Rhode Island General Assembly, memorializing the President of the United States, the Senators and Representatives from Rhode Island in the Congress of the United States, and the Secretary of the Interior, to make every effort to have built on Federal unused land in the city of Newport, R.I., a saline water conversion plant; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Rhode Island General Assembly commending Hon. JOHN O. PASTORE, Senator from Rhode Island, for his stand and recommendations with respect to the creation of a permanent Textile Interagency Committee in the Department of Commerce to deal with the problems and foster the interests of the ailing textile industry and memorializing Congress to enact legislation to activate these recommendations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States, urging that 15 percent of all Federal income taxes paid into the Federal Treasury by the public in the State of Idaho and the various other States be retained in the State of Idaho and the various other States to be placed in the general funds of the respective States, etc.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Montana, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States, requesting appropriation of $10 million so that the construction of the Yellowtail Dam project may begin at once; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Oregon, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States, requesting that immediate statehood be granted to Hawaii; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Wyoming, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States with reference to the opposition of the people of Wyoming to any form of Federal, regional, or watershed rules or regulations set up either by legislative act or Executive order, in which the States involved would have no real voice in administration thereof; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Alaska, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States, urging enactment of legislation that will raise the fixed price of gold to $70 an ounce; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BOLLING:

H.R. 5350. A bill for the relief of Mary W. Greene; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOYLE:

H.R. 5351. A bill for the relief of Harry H. Nakamura; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUCKLEY:

H.R. 5352. A bill for the relief of Maria Rubinstein; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURNS of Hawaii:

H.R. 5353. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Aki Mato; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5354. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Tom Pon Shee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5355. A bill for the relief of Concepcion Lamer and Norma Soriano Tactacan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5356. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Tome Takamoto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DAVIS of Georgia:

H.R. 5357. A bill for the relief of Loretta F. Ossorio; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DONOHUE:

H.R. 5358. A bill for the relief of Einar J. W. Lundell; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HÉBERT:

H.R. 5359. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Rita Pasentine Peterman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HEMPHILL:

H.R. 5360. A bill for the relief of William Thomas Burch; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HERLONG:

H.R. 5361. A bill for the relief of Mr. Louis Fischer, Feger Seafoods, and Mr. and Mrs. Thomas R. Stuart; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5362. A bill for the relief of M. E. Boales; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. KELLY:

H.R. 5363. A bill for the relief of Gaetano DiChiara; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANKFORD:

H.R. 5364. A bill for the relief of Sp2c. Martin Adams, Jr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MONAGAN:

H.R. 5365. A bill for the relief of Hlias Anthony Lousedes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'HARA of Illinois:

H.R. 5366. A bill for the relief of Marica Logonder; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROONEY:

H.R. 5367. A bill for the relief of Evangelos Pittas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SAUND:

H.R. 5368. A bill to authorize an extension of time for submitting final proof on the desertland entry of Mrs. Marian R. Smith; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. WILSON:

H.R. 5369. A bill for the relief of Calia Longini Palma; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5370. A bill for the relief of Guillermo Chial; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. UTT:

H.R. 5371. A bill for the relief of Kate Lorenz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5372. A bill for the relief of Jesus Martinez-Silvas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

96. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the chairman, the National Association of Attorneys General, Chicago, Ill., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to being in support of legislation to reinstate the concurrent enforcibility of State sedition laws, etc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

97. Also, petition of the chairman, Maui County Committee for Statehood, Wailuku, Maui, T.H., petitioning consideration of their resolution relative to endorsing statehood for Hawaii; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REGULATION OF LOBBYING ACT

In compliance with Public Law 601, 79th Congress, title III, Regulation of Lobbying Act, section 308 (b), which provides as follows:

(b) All information required to be filed under the provisions of this section with the Clerk of the House of Representatives and the Secretary of the Senate shall be compiled by said Clerk and Secretary, acting jointly, as soon as practicable after the close of the calendar quarter with respect to which such information is filed and shall be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The Clerk of the House of Representatives and the Secretary of the Senate jointly submit their report of the compilation required by said law and have included all registrations and quarterly reports received.

QUARTERLY REPORT

The following reports for the third calendar quarter of 1958 were received after October 20, 1958, too late to be included in the published reports for that quarter:

A. Active-Retired Lighthouse Service Employees Association, Post Office Box 2169, South Portland, Maine.
D. (6) $181. E. (9) $285.33.

A. Claris Adams, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Life Convention, 230 Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

A. American Dental Association, 222 East Superior Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $10,580.39. E. (9) $10,580.39.

A. American Legion, 700 North Pennsylvania Street, Indianapolis, Ind.
D. (6) $1,576.35. E. (9) $20,597.22.

A. American Library Association, 50 East Huron Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $67.60. E. (9) $4,415.99.

A. American Life Convention, 230 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $468.63. E. (9) $515.88.

A. American Merchant Marine Institute, Inc., 11 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $5,840.20.

A. American Nurses' Association, Inc., 2 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $53,460.98. E. (9) $4,298.63.

A. American Retail Federation, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $81,489.76. E. (9) $5,215.10.

A. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $10,290.06. E. (9) $22,136.03.

A. Samuel W. Anderson, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. United States Lines Co., 1 Broadway, New York City, N.Y.

A. Arkansas Railroad Committee, 1115 Boyle Building, Little Rock, Ark.
D. (6) $3,000. E. (9) $1,033.77.

A. Arnold, Fortas & Porter, 1229 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Commissioner of Baseball, 30 Rockefeller Plaza, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $1,056.24.

A. Arnold, Fortas & Porter, 1229 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Yuba Consolidated Industries, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) $1,250. E. (9) $27.77.

A. Ash, Bauersfeld & Burton, 1921 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Edwin W. Pauley, 717 North Highland Avenue, Los Angeles, Calif.
E. (9) $62.27.

A. Association of American Medical Colleges, 2530 Ridge Avenue, Evanston, Ill.
E. (9) $2,500.02.

A. Balfour, Guthrie & Co., Ltd., 72 Wall Street, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $2,135.16.

A. Joseph H. Ball, 90 Broad Street, New York, N.Y.
B. American Steamship Committee on Conference Studies. Room 233, Barr Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Barash & Hoffman, 710 Sheraton Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Michel T. Halbouty, 511 Westheimer Road, Houston, Tex.; Skyline Oil Co., Atlas Building, Salt Lake City, Utah; Global Enterprises Corp., 800 Petroleum Club Building, Denver, Colo.; and Don R. Link, 841 Petroleum Club Building, Denver, Colo.

A. Barash & Hoffman, 710 Sheraton Building, Washington, D.C.
B. John H. Trigg, Hinkle Building, Roswell, N. Mex.

A. Adm. Frederick J. Bell, 2000 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Automobile Dealers Association, 2000 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,903.83.

A. Mrs. Rachel S. Bell, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Legislative Committee of the Committee for a National Trade Policy, Inc., 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Carl H. Berglund, 1219 Washington Building, Tacoma, Wash.
E. (9) $11.83.

A. Bergson & Borkland, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Freeport Sulphur Co., 161 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $0.75.

A. Marcia Musicant Bernstein, 1564 Mount Eagle Place, Alexandria, Va.
B. United States-Japan Trade Council, 1000 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $150.

A. Andrew J. Biemiller, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,510. E. (9) $842.30.

A. Robert J. Bird, 816 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Massachusetts Protective Association, Worcester, Mass.

A. Robert J. Bird, 816 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Paul Revere Life Insurance Co., Worcester, Mass.

A. Joel D. Blackmon, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Confederated Unions of America, Reymond Building, Baton Rouge, La.
D. (6) $450. E. (9) $17.37.

A. Joel D. Blackmon, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Federation of Independent Oil Unions, Post Office Box 1449, Ponca City, Okla.
D. (6) $450. E. (9) $33.23.

A. Mrs. Paul Blanshard, 408 A Street NE., Washington, D.C.
B. Unitarian Fellowship for Social Justice.
D. (6) $60. E. (9) $40.

A. W. G. Blewett, 301 Olive Street, St. Louis, Mo.
B. Peabody Coal Co., 301 Olive Street, St. Louis, Mo.

A. John J. Boland, 40 Wall Street, New York, N.Y.
B. Merrill Lynch, Pierce, Fenner & Smith, 70 Pine Street, New York, N.Y.

A. A. Dewey Bond, 727 National Press Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $300. E. (9) $248.51.

A. Hyman Bookbinder, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,029. E. (9) $435.64.

A. Boston & Maine Railroad, 150 Causeway Street, Boston, Mass.

A. Boykin & De Francis, Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Mrs. Claire Hugo Stinnes, Grossenbaumerstrasse 253, Mulheim-Ruhr, Germany.
E. (9) $140.

A. Boykin & De Francis, Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Studiengesellschaft fur Privatrechtliche Auslandsinteressen, e.v., Contrescarpe 46, Germany.
E. (9) $277.

A. Homer L. Brinkley, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $6,049.92. E. (9) $80.50.

A. C. Blake Brown, 839 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Motor Bus Operators, 839 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Brown & Lund, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American & Foreign Power Co., Inc., 100 Church Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $500. E. (9) $66.05.

A. Lyman L. Bryan, 270 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.
B. American Institute of Certified Public Accountants, 270 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $125. E. (9) $60.

A. George B. Burnham, 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D.C.
B. Burnham Chemical Co., 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $224. E. (9) $224.

A. Robert M. Burr, 101 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.
B. Mica Industry Tariff Committee, Spruce Pine, N.C.
D. (6) $800. E. (9) $668.70.

A. Robert M. Burr, 101 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.
B. National Electrical Manufacturers Association, 155 East 44th Street, New York, N.Y.

A. John L. Carey, 270 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.
B. American Institute of Certified Public Accountants, 270 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $250.

A. Albert E. Carter, 1026 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Pacific Gas & Electric Co., 245 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) $3,000. E. (9) $2,663.80.

A. William L. Carter, 1105 Barr Building, Washington, D.C.
B. International Association of Ice Cream Manufacturers.

A. Citizens Committee on Natural Resources, 2140 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,045. E. (9) $3,894.29.

A. Colorado Railroad Legislative Committee, 615 C. A. Johnson Building, Denver, Colo.
E. (9) $1,974.22.

A. Victor F. Condello, 466 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.
B. Associated Railroads of New York, 466 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $397.

A. Arthur D. Condon, 1000 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Amana Refrigeration, Inc., Amana, Iowa.

A. Arthur D. Condon, 1000 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. General Counsel for Independent Advisory Committee to the Trucking Industry, Inc.

A. Arthur D. Condon, 1000 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Galveston Cotton Co., H. Kempner, and Texas Cotton Industries, Galveston, Tex.

A. Arthur D. Condon, 1000 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Salt Producers Association, 726 La Salle-Wacker Building, Chicago, Ill.

A. Congenial Retirement Association, Hampton Bays, N.Y.

A. Eugene P. Conser, 36 South Wabash Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
B. National Association of Real Estate Boards, 36 South Wabash Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $750.

A. Bernard J. Conway, 222 East Superior Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. American Dental Association, 222 East Superior Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $3,250.

A. Council of State Chambers of Commerce, 1025 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,042.44. E. (9) $1,042.44.

A. Donald M. Counihan, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Corn Millers' Federation, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Donald M. Counihan, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Classroom Periodical Publishers Association, 38 West Fifth Street, Dayton, Ohio.

A. Paul L. Courtney, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $300.

A. Gilbert Cox, Elliston, Va.
B. National Association of Soil Conservation Districts, League City, Tex.

A. Oscar Cox, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Balfour, Guthrie & Co., Ltd., 72 Wall Street, New York, N.Y., and Congopalm, 12 Avenue de Aviateurs, Leopoldville, Belgian Congo.
D. (6) $1,362.53. E. (9) $11.28.

A. Robert W. Coyne, 1501 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
B. Council of Motion Picture Organizations, Inc., 1501 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $623.29. E. (9) $415.41.

A. Credit Union National Association, Inc., 1617 Sherman Avenue, Madison, Wis.
D. (6) $131,826.11. E. (9) $1,122.03.

A. John T. Curran, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,029. E. (9) $689.99.

A. S. P. Deas, 520 National Bank of Commerce Building, New Orleans, La.
B. Southern Pine Industry Committee, 520 National Bank of Commerce Building, New Orleans, La.

A. Robert J. Demichelis, 640 Central Avenue, Deerfield, Ill.
B. National Committee for Insurance Taxation, Hay-Adams House, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,575. E. (9) $185.60.

A. John M. Dickerman, 1625 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Home Builders of the United States, 1625 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,031.25. E. (9) $62.84.

A. Cecil B. Dickson, 1600 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Motion Picture Association of America, Inc., 1600 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. William C. Doherty, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Letter Carriers, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,125.

A. John W. Edelman, 1025 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Textile Workers Union of America, 99 University Place, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $2,211.50. E. (9) $461.57.

A. Harold E. Edwards, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. United Steelworkers of America, 1500 Commonwealth Building, Pittsburgh, Pa.
D. (6) $3,304.85. E. (9) $100.

A. Otis H. Ellis, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Oil Jobbers Council, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $8,000.

A. John W. Emeigh, 1040 Warner Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Rural Letter Carriers' Association, 1040 Warner Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $542.87. E. (9) $10.

A. Far East Group, Inc., 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $55. E. (9) $719.

A. Mrs. Albert E. Farwell, Box 188, route 2, Vienna, Va.
B. National Congress of Parents and Teachers, 700 North Rush Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. First United Corp., 80 Wall Street, New York, N.Y.
B. Sea Coach Transatlantic Lines, Inc., care of Hotel Dixie, 250 West 43d Street, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $1,710.

A. W. Robert Fokes, 400 Midyette-Moor Building, Tallahassee, Fla.
B. Florida Railroad Association, Midyette-Moor Building, Tallahassee, Fla.

A. W. Robert Fokes, 400 Midyette-Moor Building, Tallahassee, Fla.
B. The Florida Savings and Loan League, post-office Box 2246, Orlando, Fla.

A. E. F. Forbes, 604 Mission Street, San Francisco, Calif.
B. Western States Meat Packers Association, Inc., 604 Mission Street, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) $7,500.

A. Forest Farmers Association, post-office Box 7284, Station C, Atlanta, Ga.

A. James F. Fort, 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $400. E. (9) $68.09.

A. Nolen J. Fuqua, Duncan, Okla.
B. National Association of Soil Conservation Districts, League City, Tex.

A. General Federation of Women's Clubs, 1734 N Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Clair P. Guess, Jr., League City, Tex.
B. National Association of Soil Conservation Districts, League City, Tex.

A. Mrs. Violet M. Gunther, 1341 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Americans for Democratic Action, 1341 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,769.95. E. (9) $260.51.

A. C.L. Hancock, 420 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.
B. Copper and Brass Research Association.
D. (6) $5,322.47 E. (9) $976.83.

A. L. James Harmanson, Jr., 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,024.96. E. (A) $271.75.

A. Winder R. Harris, 441 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Shipbuilders' Council of America, 21 West Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Douglas L. Hatch, 2027 O Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Tungsten Mining Corp., Henderson, N.C.
D. (6) $2,500.

A. Kit H. Haynes, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,625. E. (9) $105.19.

A. Charles H. Heltzel, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Pacific Power & Light Co., Public Service Building, Portland, Oreg.
D. (6) $930. E. (9) $211.50.

A. Noel Hennendinger, 1000 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
B. United States-Japan Trade Council, 1000 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $50.

A. Jake D. Hill, 1005 Security Federal Building, Columbia, S.C.
B. South Carolina Railroad Association, 1004 Security Federal Building, Columbia, S.C.
E. (9) $893.42.

A. Frank N. Hoffmann, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. United Steelworkers of America, 1500 Commonwealth Building, Pittsburgh, Pa.
D. (6) $4,000. E. (9) $800.

A. Edward D. Hollander, 1341 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Americans for Democratic Action, 1341 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $71.40.

A. Mrs. Jency Price Houser, 1420 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,193.01. E. (9) $1,193.01.

A. Vernon F. Hovey, 101 Nott Terrace, Schenectady, N.Y.
B. National Dairy Products Corp., 260 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $3,000. E. (9) $127.30.

A. William J. Hull, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Ashland Oil & Refining Co., 1409 Winchester Avenue, Ashland, Ky.

A. William J. Hull, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Ohio Valley Improvement Association, Inc.
E. (9) $75.

A. John M. Hurley, 302 Hoge Building, Seattle, Wash.
D. (6) $1,049.85.

A. Independent Advisory Committee to the Trucking Industry, Inc., 1000 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. International Association of Machinists, Machinists Building, Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $1,820.

A. Joe Jenness, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $56.

A. Jewelry Industry Tax Committee, Inc., 820 Highland Avenue, Newark, N.J.
D. (6) $625. E. (9) $416.15.

A. William T. Jobe, 810 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Ice Industries, 810 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Knowland Jones, Jr., 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Retail Federation, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,700. E. (9) $100.34.

A. Max M. Kampelman, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Lipschultz, Altman, Geraghty & Mullally, 530 Minnesota Building, St. Paul, Minn.

A. Jerome J. Keating, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Letter Carriers, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,873.

A. Franklin E. Kepser, Berwick Bank Building, Berwick, Pa.
B. Associated Railroads of Pennsylvania, Room 1022, Transportation Center, Philadelphia, Pa.

A. A. W. Koehler, 839 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Motor Bus Operators, 839 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Kominers & Fort, 529 Tower Building, Washington, D.C.
B. A. H. Bull Steamship Co., 115 Broad Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Kominers & Fort, 529 Tower Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Marine Transport Lines, Inc., 11 Broadway, New York, N.Y.

A. Herman C. Kruse, 245 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.
B. Pacific Gas and Electric Co., 245 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) $3,905. E. (9) $5,719.20.

A. Samuel J. Lanahan, 616 Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Family Finance Corp., 201 West 14th Street, Wilmington, Del.
D. (6) $500. E. (9) $7.62.

A. Charles R. Larson, 1040 Warner Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Rural Letter Carriers' Association, 1040 Warner Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $542.87. E. (9) $10.

A. Dillard B. Lasseter.
B. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,000. E. (9) $150.

A. John Lawler, 270 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.
B. American Institute of Certified Public Accountants, 270 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $250. E. (9) $110.

A. Legislative Committee of the Committee for a National Trade Policy, Inc., 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,801. E. (9) $3,574.52.

A. J. M. B. Lewis, Jr., Box 1517, Bluefield, W. Va.
E. (9) $516.85.

A. J. M. B. Lewis, Jr., Box 1517, Bluefield, W. Va.
B. Iron Ore Lessors Association, Inc., W-1481 First National Bank Building, St. Paul, Minn.
E. (9) $99.64.

A. Joe T. Lovett, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Retail Federation, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Harold O. Lovre, 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $3,000. E. (9) $159.08.

A. John E. Lyle, 707 Wilson Tower, Corpus Christi, Tex.
B. Shell Oil Co., 50 West 50th Street, New York, N.Y.

A. LeRoy E. Lyon, Jr., 530 West Sixth Street, Los Angeles, Calif.
B. California Railroad Association, 215 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) $3,125. E. (9) $1,549.04.

A. William C. McCamant, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Retail Federation, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $550. E. (9) $20.

A. Charles E. McCarthy, 1501 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
B. Council of Motion Picture Organizations, Inc., 1501 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $390. E. (9) $157.03.

A. Robert E. McClelland, Duncan, Okla.
B. National Association of Soil Conservation Districts, League City, Tex.

A. William A. McClintock, Jr., 7447 Skokie Boulevard, Skokie, Ill.
B. National Committee for Insurance Taxation, the Hay-Adams House, Washington, D.C.

A. Joseph J. McDonald, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. United Steelworkers of America, 1500 Commonwealth Building, Pittsburgh, Pa.
D. (6) $3,304.85. E. (9) $100.

A. Edward F. McGinnis, 375 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.
B. Joseph E. Seagram & Sons, Inc.

A. Joseph B. McGrath, 1625 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Home Builders of the United States, 1625 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,875. E. (9) $201.87.

A. MacLeish, Spray, Price & Underwood, 134 South La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. National Committee for Insurance Taxation, 221 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
E. (9) $281.02.

A. James D. Mann, 714 Sheraton Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Truck Council of America, Inc., 714 Sheraton Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Marks & Trowbridge, Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Basic Industries Power Committee, 400 Erie County Savings Bank Building, Buffalo, N.Y.

A. Walter J. Mason, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,029. E. (9) $821.05.

A. Arnold Mayer, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Amalgamated Meat Cutters and Butcher Workmen of N.A., AFL-CIO, 2800 North Sheridan Road, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,170. E. (9) $1,680.01.

A. Kenneth A. Meiklejohn, 1908 Q Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Retail, Wholesale, and Department Store Union, AFL-CIO, 132 West 43d Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $675.

A. Ross A. Messer, Post Office Box 1611, Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Post Office & General Services Maintenance Employees, Post Office Box 1611, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,200. E. (9) $71.81.

A. James G. Michaux, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Retail Federation, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,000. E. (9) $100.

A. Miller & Chevalier, 1001 Connecticut Avenue N.W., Washington, D.C.
B. Harry B. Betty Estate, First Federal Building, Davenport, Iowa.
D. (6) $300.

A. Claude Minard, 215 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.
B. California Railroad Association, 215 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) $350. E. (9) $307.83.

A. Marion S. Monk, Jr., Batchelor, La.
B. National Association of Soil Conservation District, League City, Tex.

A. Moot, Sprague, Marcy & Gulick, 400 Erie County Savings Bank Building, Buffalo, N.Y.
B. Basic Industries Power Committee, 400 Erie County Savings Bank Building, Buffalo, N.Y.

A. Silas A. Morehouse, Post Office Box 4085, Jefferson Manor, Alexandria, Va.
B. F. W. Clarke, 112 North St. Asaph Street, Alexandria, Va.

A. Andrew P. Murphy, 1625 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Home Builders of the United States, 1625 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,625. E. (9) $88.03.

A. John H. Myers, 1224 Cleveland Street, Wilmette, Ill.
B. National Committee for Insurance Taxation, the Hay-Adams House, Washington, D.C.

A. J. Walter Myers, Jr., Post Office Box 7284, Station C, Atlanta, Ga.
B. Forest Farmers Association Coop., Post Office Box 7284, Station C, Atlanta, Ga.

A. National Associated Businessmen, Inc., 910 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,127.82. E. (9) $1,335.55.

A. National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, 20 West 40th Street, New York, N.Y.

A. National Association of Home Builders of the United States, 1625 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $8,110.98. E. (9) $13,355.76.

A. National Association of Letter Carriers, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $343,511.86. E. (9) $13,530.19.

A. National Association of Motor Bus Operators, 839 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $1,161.18.

A. National Association of Post Office & General Services Maintenance Employees, Post Office Box 1611, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $10,003.29. E. (9) $1,714.48.

A. National Association of Real Estate Boards, 36 South Wabash Avenue, Chicago, Ill., and 1300 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $14,753.89.

A. National Association of Refrigerated Warehouses, Inc., 1210 Tower Building, Washington, D.C.

A. National Association of Wheat Growers, Wasco, Oreg.
D. (6) $950.30. E. (9) $950.30.

A. National Automobile Dealers Association, 2000 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $30,555.51.

A. National Committee for Insurance Taxation, The Hay-Adams House, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $290. E. (9) $2,797.81.

A. National Congress of Petroleum Retailers, Inc., 325 Farwell Building, Detroit, Mich.
D. (6) $1,799.12. E. (9) $1,606.26.

A. National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $995. E. (9) $2,043.97.

A. National Council, Junior Order United American Mechanics, 3027 North Broad Street, Philadelphia, Pa.
E. (9) $150.

A. National Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs, Inc., 2012 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $332,632.64. E. (9) $2,244.75.

A. National Federation of Independent Businesses, Inc., 740 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $9,012.99. E. (9) $9,012.99.

A. National Rehabilitation Association, Inc., 1025 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $392.54. E. (9) $680.

A. National Rural Letter Carriers' Association, 1040 Warner Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $12,401.50. E. (9) $10,235.72.

A. National Tax Equality Association, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,374.84. E. (9) $1,823.97.

A. National Turkey Federation, Post Office Box 69, Mount Morris, Ill.
D. (6) $330. E. (9) $330.

A. National Woman's Christian Temperance Union, 1730 Chicago Avenue, Evanston, Ill.
D. (6) $1,099.80. E. (9) $1,708.12.

A. George R. Nelson, Machinists Building, Washington, D.C.
B. International Association of Machinists, Machinists Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,500. E. (9) $320.

A. John W. Nerlinger, Jr., 325 Farwell Building, Detroit, Mich.
B. National Congress of Petroleum Retailers, Inc., 325 Farwell Building, Detroit, Mich.
D. (6) $225.

A. Robert H. North, 1105 Barr Building, Washington, D.C.
B. International Association of Ice Cream Manufacturers, 1105 Barr Building, Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $125.90.

A. John A. O'Donnell, 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,749.99. E. (9) $188.70.

A. Robert J. O'Donnell, Majestic Theatre Building, Dallas, Tex.
B. Council of Motion Picture Organizations, Inc., 1501 Broadway, New York, N.Y.

A. Charles A. Parker, Room 714, 1346 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Aviation Trades Association, 1346 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,699.50.

A. Joseph O. Parker, 531 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Turkey Federation, Box 69, Mount Morris, Ill.
E. (9) $83.56.

A. Patent Office Society, Box 685, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $225. E. (9) $225.

A. Mrs. Esther Peterson, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Industrial Union Department, AFL–CIO, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,557.66. E. (9) $754.17.

A. Hugh Peterson.
B. Georgia Power Co., 75 Marietta Street, Atlanta, Ga.
D. (6) $3,750.

A. Iris Peterson, 4201 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Air Line Stewards and Stewardesses Association International, 55th and Cicero Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

A. Philco Corp., Tioga and C Streets, Philadelphia, Pa.

A. James F. Pinkney, 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,000. E. (9) $61.46.

A. Plains Cotton Growers, Inc., 220–221 Lubbock National Building, Lubbock, Tex.
D. (6) $6,981.25. E. (9) $1,525.

A. Gordon M. Quarnstrom, 7447 Skokie Boulevard, Skokie, Ill.
B. National Committee for Insurance Taxation, the Hay-Adams House, Washington, D.C.

A. Mrs. Richard G. Radue, 3406 Quebec Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Congress of Parents and Teachers, 700 North Rush Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. Otie M. Reed, 1107 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Creameries Association, 817 New York Building, St. Paul, Minn.
D. (6) $1,875. E. (9) $3,794.27.

A. George L. Reid, Jr., 1010 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington D.C.
B. National Association of Wheat Growers, Wasco, Oreg.
D. (6) $900. E. (9) $50.30.

A. George L. Reid, Jr., 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,999.98. E. (9) $72.85.

A. John Arthur Reynolds, 653 Cortland, Fresno, Calif.
B. Western Cotton Growers Association of California, 2201 F Street, Bakersfield, Calif.
D. (6) $1,800. E. (9) $8,001.25.

A. Hubert M. Rhodes, 740 11th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Credit Union National Association, Inc., 1617 Sherman Avenue, Madison, Wis.
D. (6) $575. E. (9) $2.

A. Bill Richards, Orleans, Nebr.
B. National Association of Soil Conservation Districts, League City, Tex.

A. Harry H. Rieck, Preston, Md.
B. National Association of Soil Conservation Districts, League City, Tex.

A. John J. Riggle, 744 Jackson Place, Washington, D.C.
B. National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,021.96.

A. George D. Riley, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,029. E. (9) $1,115.37.

A. H. J. Ripp, 811 North 22d Street, Milwaukee, Wis.
B. Botherhood of Railway and Steamship Clerks-Freight Handlers Express and Station Employees, 1015 Vine Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.
D. (6) $990. E. (9) $624.74.

A. William Neale Roach, 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,000. E. (9) $326.30.

A. Royall, Koegel, Harris & Caskey, 500 Wire Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Rayon Staple Fiber Producers Association, Room 7319, Empire State Building, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $21,723.21. E. (9) $1,732.06.

A. Francis J. Ryley, 519 Title and Trust Building, Phoenix, Ariz.
B. General Petroleum Corp., Los Angeles; Richfield Oil Corp., Los Angeles; Shell Oil Co., San Francisco; Standard Oil Co. of California, San Francisco; Tidewater Oil Co., San Francisco; Union Oil Co., Los Angeles.

A. Selvage & Lee, Inc., 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Carpet Institute, Empire State Building, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $3,000. E. (9) $211.68.

A. Selvage & Lee, Inc., 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Chicago Mercantile Exchange, 110 North Franklin Street, Chicago, Ill.
E. (9) $8.49.

A. Selvage & Lee, Inc., 1625 I Street, Washington, D.C.
B. Ivanhoe Trading Co., Inc., 274 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $5,000. E. (9) $469.82.

A. Selvage & Lee, Inc., 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. New York Coffee & Sugar Exchange, 70 Pine Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $1,200. E. (9) $12.41.

A. W. Lee Shield, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Life Convention, 230 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $146.48. E. (9) $7.35.

A. Paul Sifton, 1126 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. United Automobile, Aircraft, Agricultural Implement Workers of America (UAW).
D. (6) $3,211.66. E. (9) $793.66.

A. M. C. Small, Post Office Box 69, Mount Morris, Ill.
B. National Turkey Federation, Post Office Box 69, Mount Morris, Ill.
D. (6) $120. E. (9) $175.

A. Smaller Magazines Postal Committee, Post Office Box 975, New Canaan, Conn.
D. (6) $1,954. E. (9) $1,520.37.

A. Charles M. Smith, 740 11th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Credit Union National Association, Inc., 1617 Sherman Avenue, Madison, Wis.
D. (6) $487.38. E. (9) $6.25.

A. Dr. Spencer M. Smith, Jr., 1709 North Glebe Road, Arlington, Va.
B. Citizens Committee on Natural Resources, 2140 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,061.35. E. (9) $553.09.

A. William D. Snow, 970 Spitzer Building, Toledo, Ohio.
B. National Congress of Petroleum Retailers, Inc., 325 Farwell Building, Detroit, Mich.
D. (6) $375.

A. William D. Snow, 970 Spitzer Building, Toledo, Ohio.
B. National Congress of Petroleum Retailers, Inc., 325 Farwell Building, Detroit, Mich.
D. (6) $375. E. (9) $81.54.

A. Southern Pine Industry Committee, 520 National Bank of Commerce Building, New Orleans, La.
D. (6) $368.25. E. (9) $186.01.

A. Thomas G. Stack, 1104 West 104th Place, Chicago, Ill.
B. National Railroad Pension Forum, Inc., 1104 West 104th Place, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,800. E. (9) $4,618.51.

A. Nelson A. Stitt, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. United States-Japan Trade Council, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Mrs. Ada B. Stough, 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D.C.
B. American Parents Committee, Inc., 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D.C.

A. Strasser, Spiegelberg, Fried & Frank, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Adhesive Manufacturing Association of America, 441 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Strasser, Spiegelberg, Fried & Frank, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Blackfeet Tribe, Browning, Mont.

A. Strasser, Spiegelberg, Fried & Frank, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Ben Blumenthal, 608 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Strasser, Spiegelberg, Fried & Frank, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The Hualapai Tribe of the Hualapai Reservation, Peach Springs, Ariz.

A. Strasser, Spiegelberg, Fried & Frank, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Laguna Pueblo of New Mexico, Laguna, N. Mex.

A. Strasser, Spiegelberg, Fried & Frank, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Boating Association, 1521 Hennepin Avenue, Minneapolis, Minn.

A. Strasser, Spiegelberg, Fried & Frank, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The Nez Perce Tribe, Lapwai, Idaho.

A. Strasser, Spiegelberg, Fried & Frank, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The Oglala Sioux Tribe of the Pine Ridge Reservation, Pine Ridge, S. Dak.

A. Strasser, Spiegelberg, Fried & Frank, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The San Carlos Apache Tribe, San Carlos, Ariz.

A. Arthur Sturgis, Jr., 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Retail Federation, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $16.04. E. (9) $13.80.

A. J. Monroe Sullivan, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Pacific American Steamship Association, 16 California Street, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) $562.50. E. (9) $896.92.

A. Surrey, Karasik, Gould & Efron, 1116 Woodward Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Shell Oil Co., 30 West 50th Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $16,687.50.

A. Noble J. Swearingen, 1790 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
B. National Tuberculosis Association, 1790 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $875.

A. Dwight D. Taylor, Jr., 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Airlines, Inc., 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Christy Thomas and Barry Sullivan, 536 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. The National Association of River and Harbor Contractors, 15 Park Row, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $250. E. (9) $295.90.

A. J. Woodrow Thomas, 1000 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Trans World Airlines, Inc., 10 Richards Road, Kansas City, Mo.
D. (6) $1,500.

A. Julia C. Thompson, 711 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Nurses' Association, Inc., 2 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $1,911.49.

A. Townsend Plan, Inc., and Townsend National Weekly, Inc., 808 North Capitol Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Trustees for Conservation, 251 Kearney Street, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) $12,335.91. E. (9) $12,156.32.

A. United Cerebral Palsy Associations, 321 West 44th Street, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $1,418.29.

A. United States-Japan Trade Council, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $596.60. E. (9) $323.

A. Universal Research and Consultants, Inc., 221 Dupont Circle Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Republic of Cuba.
E. (9) $12,655.84.

A. A. Devitt Vanech, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American President Lines, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $6,000.

A. Richard E. Vernor, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Life Convention, 230 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $322.15.

A. Herbert F. Walton, 7447 Skokie Boulevard, Skokie, Ill.
B. National Committee for Insurance Taxation, the Hay-Adams House, Washington, D.C.

A. Charles A. Washer, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Retail Federation, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $19.80.

A. Jeremiah C. Waterman, 165 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
B. Southern Pacific Co., 165 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $952. E. (9) $204.55.

A. Weaver & Glassie, 1225 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Eastern Meat Packers Association, Inc., Statler Hotel, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $500. E. (9) $13.80.

A. Weaver & Glassie, 1226 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Electrical Contractors Association and the Council of Mechanical Specialty Contracting Industries, Inc., Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $12,000. E. (9) $848.87.

A. Weaver & Glassie, 1225 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The National Independent Meat Packers Association, 740 11th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,500. E. (9) $71.88.

A. Weaver & Glassie, 1225 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Philco Corp., Tioga and C Streets, Philadelphia, Pa.

A. John C. White, 838 Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $750. E. (9) $3.63.

A. Western States Meat Packers Association, Inc., 604 Mission Street, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) $19,907.67. E. (9) $254.59.

A. John J. Wicker, Jr., 501 Mutual Building, Richmond, Va.
B. Mutual Insurance Committee on Federal Taxation, 20 North Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $2,140.85. E. (9) $2,140.85.

A. Myron Wiener, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The Far East Group, Inc, Room 501, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Wilkinson, Cragun & Barker, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Arapahoe Tribe of Indians, Wind River Reservation, Fort Washakie, Wyo.
E. (9) $33.06.

A. Wilkinson, Cragun & Barker, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The Confederated Salish and Kootenai Tribes of the Flathead Reservation, Mont.
E. (9) $19.11.

A. Wilkinson, Cragun & Barker, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Klamath Indian Tribe, Klamath Agency, Oreg.
E. (9) $81.01.

A. Wilkinson, Cragun & Barker, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Menominee Tribe of Indians, Keshena, Wis.
E. (9) $32.35.

A. Wilkinson, Cragun & Barker, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Quinaielt Indian Tribe, Taholah, Wash.

A. Wilkinson, Cragun & Barker, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Spokane Indian Tribe, Wellpinit, Wash.

A. James L. Wilmeth, 3027 North Broad Street, Philadelphia, Pa.
B. The National Council of the Junior Order of United American Mechanics of the United States of North America.

A. E. Raymond Wilson, 104 C Street NE., Washington, D.C.
B. Friends Committee on National Legislation, 104 C Street NE., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,453.84. E. (9) $15.27.

A. Burton C. Wood, 1625 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Home Builders of the United States, 1625 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,187.50. E. (9) $53.22.

A. Albert Y. Woodward, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The Flying Tiger Line, Inc., Lockheed Air Terminal, Burbank, Calif.
E. (9) $1,149.92.

A. Albert Young Woodward, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Signal Oil & Gas Co., 811 West Seventh Street, Los Angeles, Calif.

A. Paul D. Yager, 916 Investment Building, Washington, D.C.
B. The Income Fund of Boston, Inc., 294 Washington Street, Boston, Mass.
E. (9) $55.87.

QUARTERLY REPORTS

The following quarterly reports were submitted for the fourth calendar quarter 1958:

(NOTE.—The form used for reports is reproduced below. In the interest of economy in the RECORD, questions are not repeated, only the essential answers are printed, and are indicated by their respective letter and number.)

FILE TWO COPIES WITH THE SECRETARY OF THE SENATE AND FILE THREE COPIES WITH THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES:

This page (page 1) is designed to supply identifying data; and page 2 (on the back of this page) deals with financial data.

PLACE AN "X" BELOW THE APPROPRIATE LETTER OR FIGURE IN THE BOX AT THE RIGHT OF THE "REPORT" HEADING BELOW:

"PRELIMINARY" REPORT ("Registration"): To "register," place an "X" below the letter "P" and fill out page 1 only.

"QUARTERLY" REPORT: To indicate which one of the four calendar quarters is covered by this Report, place an "X" below the appropriate figure. Fill out both page 1 and page 2 and as many additional pages as may be required. The first additional page should be numbered as page "3," and the rest of such pages should be "4," "5," "6," etc. Preparation and filing in accordance with instructions will accomplish compliance with all quarterly reporting requirements of the Act.

Year: 19_____

REPORT

PURSUANT TO FEDERAL REGULATION OF LOBBYING ACT

P	QUARTER			
	1st	2d	3d	4th
(Mark one square only)				

NOTE ON ITEM "A".—(a) IN GENERAL. This "Report" form may be used by either an organization or an individual, as follows:
(i) "Employee".—To file as an "employee", state (in Item "B") the name, address, and nature of business of the "employer". (If the "employee" is a firm [such as a law firm or public relations firm], partners and salaried staff members of such firm may join in filing a Report as an "employee".)
(ii) "Employer".—To file as an "employer", write "None" in answer to Item "B".
(b) SEPARATE REPORTS. An agent or employee should not attempt to combine his Report with the employer's Report:
(i) Employers subject to the Act must file separate Reports and are not relieved of this requirement merely because Reports are filed by their agents or employees.
(ii) Employees subject to the Act must file separate Reports and are not relieved of this requirement merely because Reports are filed by their employers.

A. ORGANIZATION OR INDIVIDUAL FILING:
1. State name, address, and nature of business.

2. If this Report is for an Employer, list names or agents or employees who will file Reports for this Quarter.

NOTE ON ITEM "B".—*Reports by Agents or Employees.* An employee is to file, each quarter, as many Reports as he has employers, except that: (*a*) If a particular undertaking is jointly financed by a group of employers, the group is to be considered as one employer, but all members of the group are to be named, and the contribution of each member is to be specified; (*b*) if the work is done in the interest of one person but payment therefor is made by another, a single Report—naming both persons as "employers"—is to be filed each quarter.

B. EMPLOYER.—State name, address, and nature of business. If there is no employer, write "None."

NOTE ON ITEM "C".—(*a*) The expression "in connection with legislative interests," as used in this Report, means "in connection with attempting, directly or indirectly, to influence the passage or defeat of legislation." "The term 'legislation' means bills, resolutions, amendments, nominations, and other matters pending or proposed in either House of Congress, and includes any other matter which may be the subject of action by either House"—§ 302(e).
(*b*) Before undertaking any activities in connection with legislative interests, organizations and individuals subject to the Lobbying Act are required to file a "Preliminary" Report (Registration).
(*c*) After beginning such activities, they must file a "Quarterly" Report at the end of each calendar quarter in which they have either received or expended anything of value in connection with legislative interests.

C. LEGISLATIVE INTERESTS, AND PUBLICATIONS in connection therewith:

1. State approximately how long legislative interests are to continue. If receipts and expenditures in connection with legislative interests have terminated, ☐ place an "X" in the box at the left, so that this Office will no longer expect to receive Reports.

2. State the general legislative interests of the person filing and set forth the *specific* legislative interests by reciting: (*a*) Short titles of statutes and bills; (*b*) House and Senate numbers of bills, where known; (*c*) citations of statutes, where known; (*d*) whether for or against such statutes and bills.

3. In the case of those publications which the person filing has caused to be issued or distributed in connection with legislative interests, set forth: (*a*) Description, (*b*) quantity distributed, (*c*) date of distribution, (*d*) name of printer or publisher (if publications were paid for by person filing) or name of donor (if publications were received as a gift).

(Answer items 1, 2, and 3 in the space below. Attach additional pages if more space is needed)

4. If this is a "Preliminary" Report (Registration) rather than a "Quarterly" Report, state below what the nature and amount of anticipated expenses will be; and if for an agent or employee, state also what the daily, monthly, or annual rate of compensation is to be. If this is a "Quarterly" Report, disregard this item "C4" and fill out item "D" and "E" on the back of this page. Do not attempt to combine a "Preliminary" Report (Registration) with a "Quarterly" Report.

AFFIDAVIT

[Omitted in printing]

PAGE 1

NOTE ON ITEM "D."—(a) *In General.* The term "contribution" includes *anything of value.* When an organization or individual uses printed or duplicated matter in a campaign attempting to influence legislation, money received by such organization or individual—for such printed or duplicated matter—is a "contribution." "The term 'contribution' includes a gift, subscription, loan, advance, or deposit of money, or anything of value, and includes a contract, promise, or agreement, whether or not legally enforceable, to make a contribution"—Section 302(a) of the Lobbying Act.

(b) IF THIS REPORT IS FOR AN EMPLOYER.—(i) *In General.* Item "D" is designed for the reporting of all receipts from which expenditures are made, or will be made, in accordance with legislative interests.

(ii) *Receipts of Business Firms and Individuals.*—A business firm (or individual) which is subject to the Lobbying Act by reason of expenditures which it makes in attempting to influence legislation—but which has no funds to expend except those which are available in the ordinary course of operating a business not connected in any way with the influencing of legislation—will have no receipts to report, even though it does have expenditures to report.

(iii) *Receipts of Multipurpose Organizations.*—Some organizations do not receive any funds which are to be expended solely for the purpose of attempting to influence legislation. Such organizations make such expenditures out of a general fund raised by dues, assessments, or other contributions. The percentage of the general fund which is used for such expenditures indicates the percentage of dues, assessments, or other contributions which may be considered to have been paid for that purpose. Therefore, in reporting receipts, such organizations may specify what that percentage is, and report their dues, assessments, and other contributions on that basis. However, each contributor of $500 or more is to be listed, regardless of whether the contribution was made solely for legislative purposes.

(c) IF THIS REPORT IS FOR AN AGENT OR EMPLOYEE.—(i) *In General.* In the case of many employees, all receipts will come under Items "D 5" (received for services) and "D 12" (expense money and reimbursements). In the absence of a clear statement to the contrary, it will be presumed that your employer is to reimburse you for all expenditures which you make in connection with legislative interests.

(ii) *Employer as Contributor of $500 or More.*—When your contribution from your employer (in the form of salary, fee, etc.) amounts to $500 or more, it is not necessary to report such contribution under "D 13" and "D 14," since the amount has already been reported under "D 5," and the name of the "employer" has been given under Item "B" on page 1 of this report.

D. RECEIPTS (INCLUDING CONTRIBUTIONS AND LOANS):

Fill in every blank. If the answer to any numbered item is "None," write "None" in the space following the number.

Receipts (other than loans)

1. $_____Dues and assessments
2. $_____Gifts of money or anything of value
3. $_____Printed or duplicated matter received as a gift
4. $_____Receipts from sale of printed or duplicated matter

5. $_____Received for services (e.g., salary, fee, etc.)
6. $_____TOTAL for this Quarter (Add items "1" through "5")

7. $_____Received during previous Quarters of calendar year
8. $_____TOTAL from Jan. 1 through this Quarter (Add "6" and "7")

Loans Received

"The term 'contribution' includes a . . . *loan* . . ."—Sec. 302(a).

9. $_____TOTAL now owed to others on account of loans
10. $_____Borrowed from others during this Quarter
11. $_____Repaid to others during this Quarter

12. $_____"Expense money" and Reimbursements received this Quarter

Contributors of $500 or more (from Jan. 1 through this Quarter)

13. Have there been such contributors? Please answer "yes" or "no": _____

14. In the case of each contributor whose contributions (including loans) during the "period" from January 1 through the last days of this Quarter total $500 or more:

Attach hereto plain sheets of paper, approximately the size of this page, tabulate data under the headings "Amount" and "Name and Address of Contributor"; and indicate whether the last day of the period is March 31, June 30, September 30, or December 31. Prepare such tabulation in accordance with the following example:

Amount	*Name and Address of Contributor* ("*Period*" from Jan. 1 through _____, 19____)
$1,500.00	John Doe, 1621 Blank Bldg., New York, N.Y.
$1,785.00	The Roe Corporation, 2511 Doe Bldg., Chicago, Ill.
$3,285.00	TOTAL

NOTE ON ITEM "E".—(a) *In General.* "The term 'expenditure' includes a payment, distribution, loan, advance, deposit, or gift of money or anything of value, and includes a contract, promise, or agreement, whether or not legally enforceable, to make an expenditure"—Section 302(b) of the Lobbying Act.

(b) IF THIS REPORT IS FOR AN AGENT OR EMPLOYEE. In the case of many employees, all expenditures will come under telephone and telegraph (Item "E 6") and travel, food, lodging, and entertainment (Item "E 7").

E. EXPENDITURES (INCLUDING LOANS) in connection with legislative interests:

Fill in every blank. If the answer to any numbered item is "None," write "None" in the spaces following the number.

Expenditures (other than loans)

1. $_____Public relations and advertising services
2. $_____Wages, salaries, fees, commissions (other than item "1")
3. $_____Gifts or contributions made during Quarter
4. $_____Printed or duplicated matter, including distribution cost
5. $_____Office overhead (rent, supplies, utilities, etc.)
6. $_____Telephone and telegraph
7. $_____Travel, food, lodging, and entertainment
8. $_____All other expenditures

9. $_____TOTAL for this Quarter (Add "1" through "8")
10. $_____Expended during previous Quarters of calendar year

11. $_____TOTAL from January 1 through this Quarter (Add "9" and "10")

Loans Made to Others

"The term 'expenditures' includes a . . . *loan* . . ."—Sec. 302(b).

12. $_____TOTAL now owed to person filing.
13. $_____Lent to others during this Quarter
14. $_____Repayment received during this Quarter

15. Recipients of Expenditures of $10 or More

In the case of expenditures made during this Quarter by, or on behalf of the person filing: Attach plain sheets of paper approximately the size of this page and tabulate data as to expenditures under the following heading: "Amount," "Date or Dates," "Name and Address of Recipient," "Purpose." Prepare such tabulation in accordance with the following example:

Amount	*Date or Dates—Name and Address of Recipient—Purpose*
$1,750.00	7–11: Roe Printing Co., 3214 Blank Ave., St. Louis, Mo.—Printing and mailing circulars on the "Marshbanks Bill."
$2,400.00	7–15, 8–15, 9–15: Britten & Blatten, 3127 Gremlin Bldg., Washington, D.C.—Public relations service at $800.00 per month.
$4,150.00	TOTAL

A. Claris Adams, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Life Convention, 230 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

A. J. Carson Adkerson, 976 National Press Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Arthur F. Aebersold, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Retirement Federation of Civil Service Employees of the U.S. Government, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,706.68. E. (9) $43.50.

A. AFL–CIO Maritime Committee, 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $7,842.60. E. (9) $8,852.45.

A. Aircraft Industries Association of America, Inc., 610 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $7,132.54. E. (9) $7,132.54.

A. Alex Akerman, Jr., 1366 National Press Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Anti-Price Fixing Association, 1366 National Press Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Louis J. Allen, 1121 Nashville Trust Building, Nashville, Tenn.
B. Class I Railroads in Tennessee.

A. Nicholas E. Allen and Merrill Armour, 1001 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Music Operators of America, Inc., 128 East 14th Street, Oakland, Calif.
D. (6) $850. E. (9) $66.21.

A. W. L. Allen, 8605 Cameron Street, Silver Spring, Md.
B. The Commercial Telegraphers' Union, 8605 Cameron Street, Silver Spring, Md.

A. William B. Allen, 917 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. United Rubber, Cork, Linoleum and Plastic Workers of America, High at Mill Street, Akron, Ohio.
D. (6) $2,130.

A. American Bottlers of Carbonated Beverages, 1128 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. American Cancer Society, 521 West 57th Street, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $7,500.22.

A. American Cotton Manufacturers Institute, Inc., 1501 Johnston Building, Charlotte, N.C.
D. (6) $6,888.21. E. (9) $6,888.21.

A. American Farm Bureau Federation, Merchandise Mart Plaza, Chicago, Ill., and 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $21,621. E. (9) $21,621.

A. American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations, AFL–CIO Building, Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $34,981.80.

A. American Hotel Association, 221 West 57th Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $156,649.11.

A. American Hull Insurance Syndicate, 99 John Street, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $16,452.78.

A. American Humane Association, 896 Pennsylvania Street, Denver, Colo.
E. (9) $1,464.82.

A. American Institute of Marine Underwriters, 99 John Street, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $400.

A. American Life Convention, 230 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $358.16. E. (9) $380.76.

A. American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $10,000. E. (9) $11,086.37.

A. American National Cattlemen's Association, 801 East 17th Avenue, Denver, Colo.
D. (6) $11,326.68. E. (9) $3,414.11.

A. American Optometric Association, Inc. (Development Fund-Legislative), care of Dr. H. Ward Ewalt, Jr., 8001 Jenkins Arcade, Pittsburgh, Pa.
E. (9) $1,717.49.

A. American Osteopathic Association, 212 East Ohio Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $575.57. E. (9) $575.57.

A. American Paper and Pulp Association, 122 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. American Parents Committee, Inc., 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D.C., and 52 Vanderbilt Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $2,868.22. E. (9) $1,397.40.

A. American Petroleum Institute, 50 West 50th Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $32. E. (9) $8,895.

A. American Pulpwood Association, 220 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. American Retail Federation, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $64,045.26. E. (9) $1,453.66.

A. American Short Line Railroad Association, 2000 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,381.85. E. (9) $2,381.85.

A. American Steamship Committee on Conference Studies, Room 233, Barr Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $50,235. E. (9) $14,654.73.

A. American Tariff League, Inc., 19 West 44th Street, New York, N.Y.

A. American Textile Machinery Association, 60 Batterymarch Street, Boston, Mass.
D. (6) $2.20.

A. American Tramp Shipowners Association, Inc., 11 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $1,750. E. (9) $6,093.35.

A. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $10,290.06. E. (9) $14,922.37.

A. AMVETS (American Veterans of World War II), 1710 Rhode Island Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $1,562.50.

A. American Veterinary Medical Association, 600 South Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
E. (9) $497.09.

A. American Warehousemen's Association, 222 West Adams Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. American Zionist Committee for Public Affairs, 1737 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,915.76. E. (9) $3,291.26.

A. America's Wage Earners' Protective Conference, 815 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,725. E. (9) $2,078.20.

A. Jerry L. Anderson, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 200 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Samuel W. Anderson, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Cerro de Pasco Corp., 300 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Walter M. Anderson, Jr., Montgomery, Ala.
B. Alabama Railroad Association, 1002 First National Bank Building, Montgomery, Ala.

A. Area Employment Expansion Committee, 1144 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $5,000. E. (9) $138.16.

A. Arkansas Railroad Committee, 1115 Boyle Building, Little Rock, Ark.
B. Class 1 railroads operating in the State of Arkansas.

A. W. C. Arnold, 200 Colman Building, Seattle, Wash.
B. Alaska Salmon Industry, Inc., 200 Colman Building, Seattle, Wash.

A. George E. Arnstein, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Division of Legislation and Federal Relations of the National Education Association of the United States, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $274.20. E. (9) $18.70.

A. Arthritis and Rheumatism Foundation, 10 Columbus Circle, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $1,215.04.

A. Associated General Contractors of America, Inc., 20th and E Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Association of American Medical Colleges, 2530 Ridge Avenue, Evanston, Ill.
E. (9) $2,500.02.

A. Association of American Physicians and Surgeons, Inc., 185 North Wabash Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,500. E. (9) $1,500.

A. Association of American Railroads, 929 Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $13,613.45. E. (9) $13,613.45.

A. Association of American Ship Owners, 76 Beaver Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Association of Casualty and Surety Companies, 60 John Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $1,957.88. E. (9) $1,957.88.

A. Association of Western Railways, 224 Union Station Building, Chicago, Ill.

A. Edward Atkins, 51 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
B. National Association of Shoe Chain Stores, Inc., 51 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $250. E. (9) $250.

A. Charles E. Babcock, Route 2, Box 406, Vienna, Va.
B. National Council, Junior Order United Americans, 3027 North Broad Street, Philadelphia, Pa.
D. (6) $150. E. (9) $1.

A. Harry S. Baer, Jr., 1115 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Aeronautical Training Society, 1115 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,500.

A. Frederic A. Baker, 296 Lexington Road, Berkeley, Calif.
B. Federated Indians of California.

A. George P. Baker, 6 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
B. Transportation Association of America.

A. John A. Baker.
B. The Farmers' Educational and Co-Operative Union of America (National Farmers Union), 1404 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,274.88. E. (9) $96.42.

A. Joseph H. Ball, 90 Broad Street, New York, N.Y.
B. American Steamship Committee on Conference Studies, room 233, Barr Building, Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $326.81.

A. J. H. Ballew, 1103 Stahlman Building, Nashville, Tenn.
B. Southern States Industrial Council, Nashville, Tenn.
D. (6) $2,800.

A. Hartman Barber, 401 Third Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Brotherhood of Railway and Steamship Clerks, Freight Handlers, Express and Station Employees, 1015 Vine Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.
D. (6) $2,301.96. E. (9) $976.44.

A. Robert C. Barnard, 224 Southern Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Cleary, Gottlieb, Friendly & Ball, 224 Southern Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Robert C. Barnard, 224 Southern Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Cleary, Gottlieb, Friendly & Ball, 224 Southern Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Arthur R. Barnett, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Electric Companies, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $232.42. E. (9) $17.

A. William G. Barr, 711 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Parking Association, Inc., 711 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Roy Battles, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The National Grange, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,450.

A. E. F. Behrens, 1319 18th Street N.W., Washington, D.C.
B. National Lumber Manufacturers Association, 1319 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Bert Bell, 1 Bala Avenue, Bala-Cynwyd, Pa.
B. National Football League, 1 Bala Avenue, Bala-Cynwyd, Pa.
E. (9) $1.75.

A. Mrs. Rachel S. Bell, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Legislative Committee of the Committee for a National Trade Policy, Inc., 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Ernest H. Benson, 401 Third Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Brotherhood of Maintenance of Way Employees, 12050 Woodward Avenue, Detroit, Mich.
D. (6) $4,500.

A. Marcia Musicant Bernstein, 1000 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
B. United States-Japan Trade Council, 1000 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $150.

A. Bessemer Securities Corporation, 800 Second Avenue, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $50,000.

A. Andrew J. Biemiller, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Federation of Labor & Congress of Industrial Organization, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,510. E. (9) $839.69.

A. Hudson Biery, 4517 Carew Tower, Cincinnati, Ohio.
B. Ohio Valley Improvement Association, Inc., 4517 Carew Tower, Cincinnati, Ohio.

A. Bigham, Englar, Jones & Houston, 99 John Street, New York, N.Y., and 839 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Institute of Marine Underwriters, The Association of Marine Underwriters of the United States, American Cargo War Risk Reinsurance Exchange, American Hull Insurance Syndicate.
D. (6) $400. E. (9) $15,995.60.

A. Robert J. Bird, 816 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Massachusetts Protective Association, Worcester, Mass.

A. Robert J. Bird, 816 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Paul Revere Life Insurance Co., Worcester, Mass.

A. John H. Bivins, 50 West 50th Street, New York, N.Y.
B. American Petroleum Institute, 50 West 50th Street, New York, N.Y.

A. James C. Black, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Republic Steel Corp., Republic Building, Cleveland, Ohio.
D. (6) $600. E. (9) $500.

A. Joel D. Blackmon, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Confederated Unions of America, Reymond Building, Baton Rouge, La.
D. (6) $450. E. (9) $178.28.

A. Joel D. Blackmon, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Federation of Independent Oil Unions, Post Office Box 1449, Ponca City, Okla.
D. (6) $450.

A. Wm. Rhea Blake, 1918 North Parkway, Memphis, Tenn.
B. National Cotton Council of America, Post Office Box 9905, Memphis, Tenn.

A. W. G. Blewett, 301 Olive Street, St. Louis, Mo.
B. Peabody Coal Co., 301 Olive Street, St. Louis, Mo.

A. Eugene F. Bogan, 1108 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Investment Companies, 61 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $375.

A. A. Dewey Bond, 727 National Press Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Meat Institute, 59 East Van Buren Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $300. E. (9) $198.30.

A. Hyman Bookbinder, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,029. E. (9) $658.18.

A. Joseph L. Borda, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Lyle H. Boren, Seminole, Okla.
B. The Association of Western Railways, 224 Union Station Building, Chicago, Ill.

A. Robert T. Borth, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. General Electric Co., 570 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $375. E. (9) $203.

A. G. Stewart Boswell, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Cotton Council of America, Post Office Box 9905, Memphis, Tenn.

A. Joseph E. Brady, 2347 Vine Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.
B. International Union of United Brewery, Flour, Cereal, Soft Drink and Distillery Workers of America, 2347 Vine Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.

A. Harold P. Braman, 907 Ring Building, 18th and M Streets NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National League of Insured Savings Associations, 907 Ring Building, 18th and M Streets NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $525.

A. Harry R. Brashear, 610 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Aircraft Industries Association of America, Inc., 610 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Frank P. Brennan, Avoca, Iowa.
B. Iowa Power & Light Co., Des Moines, Iowa.

A. W. Kenneth Brew, 122 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
B. American Paper & Pulp Association, 122 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Homer L. Brinkley, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Council of Farmer Cooperatives.

A. W. S. Bromley, 220 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
B. American Pulpwood Association, 220 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Milton E. Brooding, 215 Fremont Street, San Francisco, Calif.
B. California Packing Corp., 215 Fremont Street, San Francisco, Calif.

A. Derek Brooks, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Retail Furniture Association, 666 Lake Shore Drive, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $600. E. (9) $445.96.

A. Brotherhood of Railway and Steamship Clerks, Freight Handlers, Express and Station Employees, 1015 Vine Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.
D. (6) $3,599.96. E. (9) $3,599.96.

A. Bryant C. Brown, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Mutual Insurance Alliance, 20 North Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.

A. J. D. Brown, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Public Power Association, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $50.

A. Brown & Lund, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Electric Companies, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $356.25. E. (9) $410.13.

A. George S. Buck, Jr., Post Office Box 9905, Memphis, Tenn.
B. National Cotton Council of America, Post Office Box 9905, Memphis, Tenn.

A. Henry H. Buckman, 54 Buckman Building, Jacksonville, Fla.
B. Florida Inland Navigation District, Citizens Bank Building, Bunnell, Fla.
D. (6) $1,350. E. (9) $49.37.

A. Henry H. Buckman, 54 Buckman Building, Jacksonville, Fla.
B. The Florida Ship Canal Navigation District, 720 Florida Title Building, Jacksonville, Fla.
D. (6) $1,350. E. (9) $87.70.

A. George J. Burger, 740 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Burger Tire Consultant Service, 250 West 57th Street, New York, N.Y., and National Federation of Independent Business, 740 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,219.06.

A. Burley & Dark Leaf Tobacco Export Association, Post Office Box 860, Lexington, Ky.
D. (6) $11,000.

A. Robert M. Burr, 101 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.
B. Mica Industry Tariff Committee, care of S. A. Montague, Spruce Pine Mica Co., Spruce Pine, N.C.
D. (6) $1,200.

A. Robert M. Burr, 101 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.
B. National Electrical Manufacturers Association, 155 East 44th Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Orrin A. Burrows, 1200 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, 1200 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,374.99.

A. Hollis W. Burt, Room 1212, Munsey Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Supervisors of State Banks, Munsey Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $41.25.

A. Sherman E. Burt, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Coal Sales Association, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Charles C. Butler, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 2300 Merchandise Mart, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $275. E. (9) $4.37.

A. C. G. Caffrey, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Cotton Manufacturers Institute, Inc., 1501 Johnston Building, Charlotte, N.C.
D. (6) $760.20. E. (9) $27.

A. Gordon L. Calvert, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Investment Bankers Association of America, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $300. E. (9) $387.35.

A. Campaign for the 48 States, Cotton Exchange Building, Memphis, Tenn.

A. Carl C. Campbell, 502 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Cotton Council of America, P.O. Box 9905, Memphis, Tenn.

A. James A. Campbell, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Federation of Government Employees, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $4,403.81. E. (9) $440.38.

A. John T. Carlton, 2517 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Reserve Officers Association of the United States, 2517 Connecticut Avenue NW.

A. Braxton B. Carr, 1025 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
B. The American Waterways Operators, Inc., 1025 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,000. E. (9) $276.20.

A. Robert S. Carr, 1220 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Hiram Walker & Sons, Inc., Penobscot Building, Detroit, Mich.

A. Henderson H. Carson, 600 First National Bank Building, Canton, Ohio, and 744 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.
B. East Ohio Gas Co., 1405 East Sixth Street, Cleveland, Ohio.
D. (6) $1,000. E. (9) $580.

A. Albert E. Carter, 1026 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Pacific Gas & Electric Co., 245 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) $3,000. E. (9) $1,668.64.

A. Francis R. Cawley, 1101 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Magazine Publishers Association, Inc., 232 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $320. E. (9) $355.70.

A. Chamber of Commerce of the United State, 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Justice M. Chambers, 2521 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. M. Golodetz & Co., 120 Wall Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $5,000.

A. Christian Amendment Movement, 804 Penn Avenue, Pittsburgh, Pa.
D. (6) $2,609.68. E. (9) $6,207.47.

A. Earl W. Clark, 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D.C.
B. Labor-Management Maritime Committee, 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $900. E. (9) $97.88.

A. Omer W. Clark, 1701 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Disabled American Veterans, 5555 Ridge Avenue, Cincinnati, Ohio.
E. (9) $2,919.71.

A. Robert M. Clark, 525 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.
B. The Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Railway Co., 80 East Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Ill.

A. Clear Channel Broadcasting Service, 532 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Cleary, Gottlieb, Friendly & Ball, 224 Southern Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Papermarkers' Felt Association, 1215 Unity Street, Philadelphia, Pa.

A. Cleary, Gottlieb, Friendly & Ball, 224 Southern Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Sporting Arms & Ammunition Manufacturers' Institute, 250 East 43d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Clarence E. Cleveland, Montpelier, Vt.
B. Vermont State Railroads Association, Montpelier, Vt.

A. A. C. Cocke, 821 Graiver Street, New Orleans, La.
B. American Steamship Committee on Conference Studies, 233 Barr Building, Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $693.22.

A. Coles & Goertner, 1000 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
B. American Tramp Shipowners Association, Inc., 11 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $234.63.

A. Committee for Broadening Commercial Bank Participation in Public Financing, 50 South LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. Committee for Collective Security, 90 John Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $75. E. (9) $117.61.

A. Committee for Oil Pipe Lines, 418 Munsey Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Committee for Return of Confiscated German and Japanese Property, 926 National Press Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $200. E. (9) $100.

A. Committee for Study of Revenue Bond Financing, 149 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $10,343.92.

A. Victor F. Condello, 466 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.
B. New York State Association of Railroads, 466 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Arthur D. Condon, 1000 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Amana Refrigeration, Inc., Amana, Iowa.

A. Arthur D. Condon, 1000 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. General Counsel for Independent Advisory Committee to the Trucking Industry, Inc.

A. Arthur D. Condon, 1000 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Salt Producers Association, 726 La-Salle Wacker Building, Chicago, Ill.

A. John C. Cone, 815 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Pan American World Airways System, 815 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Conference on State Defense, 111 8th Avenue, New York City, N.Y.

A. Julian D. Conover, Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Mining Congress, Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,500.

A. Orval R. Cook, 610 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Aircraft Industries Association of America, Inc., 610 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Raymond A. Cook, 2200 Gulf Building, Houston, Tex.
B. Hughes Tool Co., Houston, Tex.

A. J. Milton Cooper, 1100 Bowen Building, Washington, D.C.
B. New York Stock Exchange, 11 Wall Street, New York, N.Y.

A. J. Milton Cooper, 1100 Bowen Building, Washington, D.C.
B. R. J. Reynolds Tobacco Co., Winston-Salem, N.C.

A. Cooper & Silverstein, 1100 Bowen Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Association of Advanced Life Underwriters, 708 Bowen Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Cooper & Silverstein, 1100 Bowen Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Coal Association, Southern Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Wilmer A. Cooper, 104 C Street NE., Washington, D.C.
B. Friends Committee on National Legislation, 104 C Street NE., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $161.54.

A. Cooperative League of the United States of America Association, Inc., 343 South Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $10,500. E. (9) $1,100.

A. Cordage Legislative Committee, 350 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $2,166.44.

A. Ben C. Corlett, 730 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Bankers Association, 12 East 36th Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $1,250. E. (9) $143.85.

A. Edward J. Coughlin, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Federation of Technical Engineers, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $195. E. (9) $20.

A. Council of Mechanical Specialty Contracting Industries, Inc., 610 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $4,295.24.

A. Donald M. Couniban, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Corn Millers' Federation, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Donald M. Couniban, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Classroom Periodical Publishers Association, 38 West Fifth Street, Dayton, Ohio.

A. Covington & Burling, 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Chicago & North Western Railway System, 400 West Madison Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $4,441.78.

A. Covington & Burling, 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Committee on Joint Resolution 1955 Legislature, Post Office Box 3170, Honolulu, T.H.

A. Covington & Burling, 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Mutual Savings Banks' Committee on Taxation, 60 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Covington & Burling, 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Machine Tool Builders' Association, 2071 East 102d Street, Cleveland, Ohio.

A. Covington & Burling, 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Ohio Deposit Guarantee Fund, 1303 Fifth Third Bank Building, Cincinnati, Ohio.

A. Gilbert Cox, Elliston, Va.
B. National Association of Soil Conservation Districts, League City, Tex.

A. A. M. Crawford, 704 Title and Trust Building, Phoenix, Ariz.
B. Southern Pacific Co., 65 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif., and the Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Railway, 121 East Sixth Street, Los Angeles, Calif.

A. Edward B. Crosland, 195 Broadway, New York, N.Y., and 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Telephone & Telegraph Co., 195 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $4,999.99.

A. H. C. Crotty, 12050 Woodward Avenue, Detroit, Mich.

A. Paul Cunningham, 575 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.
B. American Society of Composers, Authors and Publishers, 575 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. John T. Curran, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,029. E. (9) $881.73.

A. Ralph E. Curtiss, 917 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Licensed Beverage Association, 420 Seventh Street, Racine, Wis.
D. (6) $750.

A. Charles L. Cusumano, 42 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
B. Vincenzo Buttaro, 64 Nelson Street, Brooklyn, N.Y., and Miss Domenica Buttaro, Via Euccarine 76, Mola di Bari, Province of Bari, Italy.
E. (9) $60.

A. John R. Dalton, 1508 Merchants Bank Building, Indianapolis, Ind.
B. Associated Railways of Indiana, 1508 Merchants Bank Building, Indianapolis, Ind.

A. D. C. Daniel, 1627 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Independent Dairies Association, 1627 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. John C. Datt, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 2300 Merchandise Mart, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,150. E. (9) $22.37.

A. Joan E. David, Wyatt Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Counsel Associates.

A. Bertram G. Davis.
B. The American Legion, 700 North Pennsylvania Street, Indianapolis, Ind.
D. (6) $1,905.

A. Charles W. Davis, 1 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. Sears, Roebuck & Co., 925 South Homan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

A. Charles W. Davis, 1 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. The Singer Manufacturing Co., 149 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $262.30.

A. Donald S. Dawson, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Hilton Hotels Corp., 720 South Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

A. Donald S. Dawson, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Schenley Industries, Inc., Empire State Building, New York, N.Y.

A. Michael B. Deane, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Watch Association, Inc., 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $4,250.22.

A. Tony T. Dechant.
B. The Farmers' Educational & Co-Operative Union of America (National Farmers' Union), 1404 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D.C., and 1575 Sherman Street, Denver, Colo.

A. Richard A. Dell, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Mary S. Deuel, 3026 Cambridge Place NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Washington Home Rule Committee, Inc., 924 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $840.

A. R. T. DeVany, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Manufacturers of the U.S.A.

A. Cecil B. Dickson, 1600 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Motion Picture Association of America, Inc., 1600 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Timothy V. A. Dillon, 1001 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Sacramento Yolo Port District, 705 California Fruit Building, Sacramento, Calif.
D. (6) $2,728.30. E. (9) $103.30.

A. Timothy V. A. Dillon, 1001 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Westlands Water District, Post Office Box 4006, Fresno, Calif.
D. (6) $833.89. E. (9) $133.89.

A. Disabled American Veterans, 5555 Ridge Avenue, Cincinnati, Ohio.
E. (9) $4,508.32.

A. Disabled Officers Association, 1604 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $3,750.

A. District Lodge No. 44, International Association of Machinists, 1029 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $20,961.78. E. (9) $25,065.88.

A. Division of Legislation and Federal Relations of the National Education Association of the United States, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $13,592.72.

A. Robert C. Dolan, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Electric Companies, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $25.75 E. (9) $3.56.

A. Paul R. M. Donelan, 1523 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $306.68. E. (9) $16.13.

A. James L. Donnelly, 200 South Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
B. Illinois Manufacturers' Association, 200 South Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

A. Robert F. Donoghue, 239 Wyatt Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Pacific American Tankship Association, 25 California Street, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) $1,624.99.

A. Thomas J. Donovan, 155 East 44th Street, New York, N.Y.

A. J. Dewey Dorsett, 60 John Street, New York, N.Y.
B. Association of Casualty and Surety Companies, 60 John Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $118.75.

A. C. L. Dorson, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Retirement Federation of Civil Service Employees of the U.S. Government, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,768.69. E. (9) $80.

A. W. A. Dozier, Jr., 17 Molton Building, Montgomery, Ala.
B. The Medical Association of the State of Alabama, 17 Molton Building, Montgomery, Ala.
D. (6) $2,500. E. (9) $225.

A. Ben DuBois.
B. Independent Bankers Association, Sauk Centre, Minn.

A. Stephen M. DuBrul, 11-134 General Motors Building, Detroit, Mich.
B. General Motors Corporation, 3044 West Grand Boulevard, Detroit, Mich.

A. Read P. Dunn, Jr., 1200 18th Street N.W., Washington, D.C.
B. National Cotton Council of America, Postoffice Box 9905, Memphis, Tenn.

A. Stephen F. Dunn, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Manufacturers.

A. William E. Dunn, 20th and E Streets NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The Associated General Contractors of America, Inc., 20th and E Streets NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Henry I. Dworshak, 1102 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Mining Congress, Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,000.

A. Eastern Meat Packers Association, Inc., 740 11th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2.62. E. (9) $94.63.

A. Herman Edelsberg, 1640 Rhode Island Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Antidefamation League of B'nai B'rith, 515 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $140. E.(9) $15.

A. Harold E. Edwards, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. United Steelworkers of America, 1500 Commonwealth Building, Pittsburgh, Pa.
D. (6) $3,304.85. E. (9) $50.

A. Otis H. Ellis, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Oil Jobbers Council, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,000.

A. Perry R. Ellsworth, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Milk Industry Foundation, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $500. E. (9) $4.50.

A. John H. Else, 302 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Retail Lumber Dealers Association, 302 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,550. E. (9) $159.20.

A. Ely, McCarty and Duncan, 1200 Tower Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Public Power Association, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Ely, McCarty and Duncan, 1200 Tower Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Department of Water and Power of the City of Los Angeles, 207 South Broadway, Los Angeles, Calif.
D. (6) $1,500.

A. Ely, McCarty and Duncan, 1200 Tower Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Department of Water Resources, State of California, Sacramento, Calif.
D. (6) $1,625.

A. Ely, McCarty and Duncan, 1200 Tower Building, Washington, D.C.
B. East Bay Municipal Utility District, 2130 Adeline Street, Oakland, Calif.
D. (6) $800.

A. Ely, McCarty and Duncan, 1200 Tower Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Imperial Irrigation District, El Centro, Calif.
D. (6) $2,100.

A. Ely, McCarty and Duncan, 1200 Tower Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Six Agency Committee and Colorado River Board of California, 909 South Broadway, Los Angeles, Calif.
D. (6) $4,772.50. E. (9) $16.12.

A. Myles W. English, 966 National Press Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Highway Users Conference, Inc., 966 National Press Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Lawrence E. Ernst, 301 East Capitol Street, Washington, D.C.
B. National Star Route Mail Carriers Association, 301 East Capitol Street, Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $62.

A. Family Tax Association, 2110 Girard Trust Building, Philadelphia 2, Pa.
D. (6) $6,200. E. (9) $1,022.13.

A. Farmers' Educational and Co-Operative Union of America (National Farmers Union), 1575 Sherman Street, Denver, Colo., and 1404 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $36,796.40. E. (9) $20,333.79.

A. Joseph G. Feeney, 201 World Center Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Association of American Railroads, Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,000. E. (9) $150.

A. Harold E. Fellows, 1771 N Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Broadcasters, 1771 N Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. John A. Ferguson, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Independent Natural Gas Association of America, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Josiah Ferris, 510 Union Trust Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Sugar Cane League, New Orleans, La., United States Sugar Corp., Clewiston, Fla., Fellsmere Sugar Producers Association, Fellsmere, Fla., and Okeelanta Sugar Refinery, Inc., South Bay, Fla.
D. (6) $6,099.96.

A. James Finucane, 926 National Press Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Committee for Return of Confiscated German and Japanese Property, 926 National Press Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $100.

A. John B. Fisher, Suite 1112 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Coal Shipping, Inc., 17 State Street, New York, N.Y.

A. John B. Fisher, Suite 1112 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Bangor & Aroostook Railroad, 84 Harlow Street, Bangor, Maine.

A. John B. Fisher, Suite 1112 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.
B. C. H. Sprague & Son Co., 10 Post Office Square, Boston, Mass.

A. John B. Fisher, Suite 1112 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Suffolk Farms Packing Co., 152 Pearl Street, Chelsea, Mass.

A. Berchmans T. Fitzpatrick, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Wood, King & Dawson, 48 Wall Street, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $175.

A. Norman A. Flaningam, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Consolidated Natural Gas Co., 30 Rockefeller Plaza, New York, N.Y.

A. Roger Fleming, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 2300 Merchandise Mart, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,250. E. (9) $12.45.

A. Donald G. Fletcher, 820 Midland Bank Building, Minneapolis, Minn.
B. Rust Prevention Association, 820 Midland Bank Building, Minneapolis, Minn.
D. (6) $3,000. E. (9) $379.52.

A. Florida Citrus Mutual, Lakeland, Fla.
E. (9) $1,843.98.

A. Florida Inland Navigation District, Citizens Bank Building, Bunnell, Fla.
E. (9) $1,399.37.

A. Florida Railroad Association, 404 Midyette-Moor Building, Tallahassee, Fla.
D. (6) $14,133. E. (9) $6,230.47.

A. Florida Ship Canal Navigation District, 720 Florida Title Building, Jacksonville, Fla.
E. (9) $1,437.70.

A. W. Robert Fokes, 400 Midyette-Moor Building, Tallahassee, Fla.
B. Florida Railroad Association, Midyette-Moor Building, Tallahassee, Fla.

A. W. Robert Fokes, 400 Midyette-Moor Building, Tallahassee, Fla.
B. Savings and Loan League, Post Office Box 2246, Orlando, Fla.

A. Foreign Policy Clearing House, 300 Independence Avenue SE., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,775. E. (9) $2,384.17.

A. Forest Farmers Association, Post Office Box 7284, Station C, Atlanta, Ga.

A. James W. Foristel, 1523 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $737.50. E. (9) $12.71.

A. James F. Fort, 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $400. E. (9) $97.43.

A. Ronald J. Foulis, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C., and 195 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
B. American Telephone & Telegraph Co., 195 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $2,250.

A. Fowler, Leva, Hawes & Symington, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Waterways Council Opposed to Regulation Extension, 21 West Street, New York, N.Y.

A. George H. Frates, 1163 National Press Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Retail Druggists.
D. (6) $3,900. E. (9) $1,124.

A. Elmer M. Freudenberger, 1701 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Disabled American Veterans, 5555 Ridge Avenue, Cincinnati, Ohio.
E. (9) $1,588.61.

A. Philip P. Friedlander, Jr., 1012 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Tire Dealers and Retreaders Association, Inc., 1012 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Friends Committee on National Legislation, 104 C Street NE., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $18,385.12. E. (9) $5,422.43.

A. Wallace H. Fulton, 1707 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Securities Dealers, Inc.

A. Henry T. Gage, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Wine Institute, 717 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.

A. Lawrence H. Gall, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Independent Natural Gas Association of America, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. M. J. Galvin, 207 Union Depot Building, St. Paul, Minn.
B. Minnesota railroads.
D. (6) $500.

A. Earl H. Gammons, 1735 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Marion R. Garstang, 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Milk Producers Federation, 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $10. E. (9) $1.70.

A. Gas Appliance Manufacturers Association, Inc., 60 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Gus F. Geissler.
B. The Farmers' Educational and Co-Operative Union of America (National Farmers Union), 1404 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D.C., and 1575 Sherman Street, Denver, Colo.

A. J. M. George, 165 Center Street, Winona, Minn.
B. The Inter-State Manufacturers Association, 163–165 Center Street, Winona, Minn.
D. (6) $1,500.

A. J. M. George, 165 Center Street, Winona, Minn.
B. National Association of Direct Selling Cos., 163–165 Center Street, Winona, Minn.
D. (6) $3,000.

A. Ernest Giddings, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Division of Legislation and Federal Relations of the National Education Association of the United States, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,059.80. E. (9) $73.25.

A. Joseph S. Gill, 16 East Broad Street, Columbus, Ohio.
B. The Ohio Railroad Association, 16 East Broad Street, Columbus, Ohio.

A. Leif Gilstad, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Transportation Association of America.

A. Henry W. Goodall, 209 South La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. Mississippi Valley Association, 1976 Railway Exchange Building, St. Louis, Mo.
D. (6) $2,250.

A. John A. Gosnell, 801 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Small Business Men's Association, 801 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,500.

A. Lawrence L. Gourley, 1757 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Osteopathic Association, 212 East Ohio Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $375.

A. Government Employees' Council, AFL–CIO, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $6,584.47. E. (9) $6,022.25.

A. Government Relations Committee of the Office Equipment Manufacturers Institute (OEMI), 777 14th Street N.W., Washington, D.C.

A. James L. Grahl, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Public Power Association, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Grain & Feed Dealers National Association, 400 Folger Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $15.42. E. (9) $6.90.

A. Grand Lodge of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen & Enginemen, 318–418 Keith Building, Cleveland, Ohio.
D. (6) $16,927.30. E. (9) $15,260.85.

A. Mrs. Edward R. Gray, 3501 Williamsburg Lane NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Congress of Parents and Teachers, 700 North Rush Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. Mrs. Virginia M. Gray, 3501 Williamsburg Lane NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Citizens Committee for UNICEF, 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $210. E. (9) $10.53.

A. Richard D. Green, 515 Investment Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Editorial Association, 608 South Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. Jerry N. Griffin, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Coal Association, Southern Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,875.

A. Weston B. Grimes, 1001 Bowen Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Cargill, Inc., 200 Grain Exchange, Minneapolis, Minn.
D. (6) $6,000.

A. Group Health Federation of America, 343 South Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $300. E. (9) $217.

A. Clair P. Guess, Jr., League City, Tex.
B. National Association of Soil Conservation Districts, League City, Tex.

A. Mrs. Violet M. Gunther, 1341 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
B. Americans for Democratic Action, 1341 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,906.10. E. (9) $508.95.

A. Frank E. Hass, 280 Union Station Building, Chicago, Ill.
B. The Association of Western Railways, 224 Union Station Building, Chicago, Ill.

A. Hoyt S. Haddock, 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D.C.
B. AFL–CIO Maritime Committee, 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,560. E. (9) $482.53.

A. Hoyt S. Haddock, 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D.C.
B. Labor-Management Maritime Committee, 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $900. E. (9) $190.73.

A. Hal H. Hale, 423 Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Association of American Railroads, Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Harold T. Halfpenny, 111 West Washington Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. Hugh F. Hall, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 2300 Merchandise Mart, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $725. E. (9) $4.37.

A. Radford Hall, 801 East 17th Avenue, Denver, Colo.
B. American National Cattlemen's Association, 801 East 17th Avenue, Denver, Colo.
D. (6) $3,000. E. (9) $414.11.

A. E. C. Hallbeck, 711 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Federation of Post Office Clerks, 711 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $4,374.96.

A. Harold F. Hammond, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Transportation Association of America.

A. Eugene J. Hardy, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Manufacturers of the U.S.A.

A. L. James Harmanson, Jr.
B. National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Conrad P. Harness, 1117 Barr Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Home Manufacturers Association, 1117 Barr Building, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,250.

A. Robert E. Harper, 1913 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Business Publications, Inc., 1913 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Herbert E. Harris II, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 2300 Merchandise Mart, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $683.33. E. (9) $22.37.

A. Winder R. Harris, 441 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Shipbuilders Council of America, 21 West Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Merwin K. Hart, 7501 Empire State Building, New York, N.Y.
B. National Economic Council, Inc., 7501 Empire State Building, New York, N.Y.

A. Stephen H. Hart, 520 Equitable Building, Denver, Colo.
B. National Livestock Tax Committee, 801 East 17th Avenue, Denver, Colo.
D. (6) $2,069.60.

A. John A. Hartman, Jr., 67 Broad Street, New York, N.Y.
B. Cable & Radio Corp., 67 Broad Street, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $390.29.

A. Paul M. Hawkins, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Health Insurance Association of America, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $4.78.

A. Kit H. Haynes.
B. National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Joseph H. Hays, 280 Union Station Building, Chicago, Ill.
B. The Association of Western Railways, 224 Union Station Building, Chicago, Ill.

A. John C. Hazen, 801 Sheraton Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Retail Merchants Association, 100 West 31st Street, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $6.35.

A. Health Insurance Association of America, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $24.65.

A. Patrick B. Healy, 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Milk Producers Federation, 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $150.

A. George J. Hecht, 52 Vanderbilt Avenue, New York, N.Y. and 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D.C.
B. American Parents Committee, Inc., 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D.C.

A. Kenneth G. Heisler, 907 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National League of Insured Savings Associations, 907 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $325.

A. Charles H. Heltzel, 606 Commerce Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Pacific Power & Light Co., Public Service Building, Portland, Oreg.

A. Noel Hemmendinger, 1000 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
B. United States-Japan Trade Council, 1000 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.

A. Willon A. Henderson, 612 South Flower Street, Los Angeles, Calif.
B. General Petroleum Corporation, 612 South Flower Street, Los Angeles, Calif.

A. Edmund P. Hennelly, 150 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
B. Socony Mobil Oil Co., Inc., 150 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $1,232.43. E. (9) $107.43.

A. Maurice G. Herndon, 1002 Washington Loan and Trust Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Insurance Agents, 96 Fulton Street, New York, N.Y., and 1002 Washington Loan & Trust Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $141.50. E. (9) $141.50.

A. Clinton M. Hester, 432 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Boston Wool Trade Association, 263 Summer Street, Boston, Mass.
D. (6) $600. E. (9) $33.30.

A. Clinton M. Hester, 432 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Hot House Vegetable Growers, Post Office Box 659, Terre Haute, Ind.

A. Clinton M. Hester, 432 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Football League, 1 Bala Avenue, Bala Cynwyd, Pa.
E. (9) $52.80.

A. Clinton M. Hester, 432 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Wool Trade Association, 263 Summer Street, Boston, Mass.

A. Clinton M. Hester, 432 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Philadelphia Wool and Textile Association, Post Office Box 472, Station E, Philadelphia, Pa.

A. Clinton M. Hester, 432 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.
B. United States Brewers Foundation, 535 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $5,000. E. (9) $80.55.

A. W. J. Hickey, 2000 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Short Line Railroad Association, 2000 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $218.75.

A. Ray C. Hinman, 150 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
B. Socony Mobil Oil Co., Inc., 150 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $1,250.

A. Frank N. Hoffmann, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. United Steelworkers of America, 1500 Commonwealth Building, Pittsburgh, Pa.
D. (6) $4,000. E. (9) $500.

A. John R. Holden, 1710 Rhode Island Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. AMVETS, 1710 Rhode Island Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,000. E. (9) $75.

A. George C. Holdrege, 1416 Dodge Street, Omaha, Nebr.
B. Union Pacific Railroad Co., 1416 Dodge Street, Omaha, Nebr.
D. (6) $4,750.

A. Edward D. Hollander, 1341 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Americans for Democratic Action, 1341 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $184. 88.

A. Fuller Holloway, 1000 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.
B. The Toilet Goods Association, Inc., 9 Rockefeller Plaza, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $256.81.

A. Richard C. Holmquist, 570 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.
B. General Electric Co., 570 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Home Manufacturers Association, 1117 Barr Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,250. E. (9) $2,200.

A. J. M. Hood, 2000 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Short Line Railroad Association, 2000 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $318.75.

A. Samuel H. Horne, Munsey Building, Washington, D.C.
B. The Singer Manufacturing Co., 149 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $262.30.

A. Lawrence W. Horning, 1010 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.
B. New York Central Railroad Co., 466 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Donald E. Horton, 222 West Adams Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. American Warehousemen's Association, 222 West Adams Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. J. Cline House, 711 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Federation of Post Office Clerks, 711 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $4,500.

A. Harold A. Houser, 1616 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Retired Officers Association, 1616 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,950.

A. Vernon F. Hovey, 101 Nott Terrace, Schenectady, N.Y.
B. National Dairy Products Corp., 260 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $3,000. E. (9) $452.98.

A. Erma D. Hubbard, 509 Ridgely Avenue, Annapolis, Md.
B. Military Survivors, Inc., 509 Ridgely Avenue, Annapolis, Md.

A. William T. Huff, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Independent Natural Gas Association of America, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. William J. Hull, 326 Cafritz Building, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Ashland Oil & Refining Co., 1409 Winchester Avenue, Ashland, Ky.

A. William J. Hull, 326 Cafritz Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Ohio Valley Improvement Association, Inc.

A. Robert L. Humphrey, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Manufacturers.

A. C. E. Huntley, 2000 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Short Line Railroad Association, 2000 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $298.75.

A. Illinois Railroad Association, 33 South Clark Street, Chicago, Ill.
E. (9) $916.18.

A. Bernard J. Imming, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. United Fresh Fruit and Vegetable Association, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Independent Advisory Committee to the Trucking Industry, Inc., 1000 Vermont Avenue, Washington, D.C.

A. Independent Natural Gas Association of America, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $8,979.63.

A. Industrial Union Department, AFL–CIO, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $12,980.27. E. (9) $12,980.27.

A. Institute of Scrap Iron and Steel, Inc., 1729 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $300. E. (9) $1.25.

A. International Association of Machinists, Machinists Building, Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $1,768.

A. International Union of Electrical, Radio, and Machine Workers, 1126 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $1,112.

A. Inter-State Manufacturers Association, 163–165 Center Street, Winona, Minn.
D. (6) $3,000.

A. Iron Ore Lessors Association, Inc., W–1481 First National Bank Building, St. Paul, Minn.
E. (9) $1,022.17.

A. Chester W. Jackson, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The National Grange, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,000.

A. Robert C. Jackson, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Cotton Manufacturers Institute, Inc., 1501 Johnston Building, Charlotte, N.C.
D. (6) $2,000. E. (9) $178.

A. Japanese American Citizens League, 1634 Post Street, San Francisco, Calif.

A. Daniel Jaspan, Post Office Box 2013, Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Postal Supervisors, Post Office Box 2013, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,817.51. E. (9) $48.

A. Ray L. Jenkins, 700 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Societe Internationale, Pour Participations Industrialies Et Commerciales, S.A., Peter Meriansir 19, Basle, Switzerland.

A. Robert G. Jeter, Dresden, Tenn.
B. H. C. Spinks Clay Co., Paris, Tenn., et al.
D. (6) $517.90.

A. Peter Dierks Joers, 810 Whittington Avenue, Hot Springs, Ark.
B. Dierks Forests, Inc., 810 Whittington Avenue, Hot Springs, Ark.

A. Gilbert R. Johnson, 1208 Terminal Tower, Cleveland, Ohio.
B. Lake Carriers' Association, 305 Rockefeller Building, Cleveland, Ohio.

A. Reuben L. Johnson.
B. Farmers' Educational and Co-Operative Union of America, 1404 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,727.36. E. (9) $19.20.

A. W. D. Johnson, 401 Third Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Order of Railway Conductors and Brakemen, ORC&B Building, Cedar Rapids, Iowa.

A. George Bliss Jones, 1002 First National Bank Building, Montgomery, Ala.
B. Alabama Railroad Association, 1002 First National Bank Building, Montgomery, Ala.

A. L. Dan Jones, 1110 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Independent Petroleum Association of America, 1110 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $16.25.

A. Rowland Jones, Jr., 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Retail Federation, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,000. E. (9) $50.

A. Edwin W. Kaler, 547 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Waterman Steamship Corp., 61 Saint Joseph Street, Mobile, Ala.
D. (6) $8,750.

A. John E. Kane, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Petroleum Institute, 50 West 50th Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $3,780. E. (9) $527.65.

A. George J. Kelly, 730 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Bankers Association, 12 East 36th Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $375. E. (9) $46.

A. Miss Elizabeth A. Kendall, 2310 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $30.

A. I. L. Kenen, 1737 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Zionist Committee for Public Affairs, 1737 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. William J. Kennard, M.D., 1523 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $483.40. E. (9) $139.03.

A. Harold L. Kennedy, 420 Cafritz Building, Washington, D.C.
B. The Ohio Oil Co., Findlay, Ohio.
D. (6) $500. E. (9) $225.

A. Miles D. Kennedy, 1608 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The American Legion, 700 North Pennsylvania Street, Indianapolis, Ind.
D. (6) $3,500. E. (9) $434.29.

A. Ronald M. Ketcham, Post Office Box 351, Los Angeles, Calif.
B. Southern California Edison Co., Post Office Box 351, Los Angeles, Calif.

A. Omar B. Ketchum, 1000 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States.
D. (6) $3,750. E. (9) $280.

A. Jeff Kibre, 1341 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union, 150 Golden Gate Avenue, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) $1,482.62. E. (9) $1,390.96.

A. John A. Killick, 740 11th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Eastern Meat Packers Association, Inc., 740 11th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $12.50.

A. John A. Killick, 740 11th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Independent Meat Packers Association, 740 11th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $221.25.

A. H. Cecil Kilpatrick, 912 American Security Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Minot, DeBlois & Maddison, 294 Washington Street, Boston, Mass.
D. (6) $8,902.92. E. (9) $10.25.

A. Kenneth L. Kimble, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Life Insurance Association of America, 488 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $112.12. E. (9) $1.09.

A. Ludlow King, 2071 East 102d Street, Cleveland, Ohio.
B. National Machine Tool Builders' Association, 2071 East 102d Street, Cleveland, Ohio.

A. T. Bert King, 812 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.
B. United States Savings and Loan League, 221 North LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,250.

A. Mr. and Mrs. Harry L. Kingman.
D. (6) $525. E. (9) $525.

A. Clifton Kirkpatrick, 1918 North Parkway, Memphis, Tenn.
B. National Cotton Council of America, Post Office Box 9905, Memphis, Tenn.
D. (6) $225. E. (9) $10.66.

A. Burt L. Knowles, 20th and E Streets NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The Associated General Contractors of America, Inc., 20th and E Streets NW, Washington, D.C.

A. Robert M. Koch, 1015 12th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Agricultural Limestone Institute, Inc., 1015 12th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $25.

A. Robert M. Koch, 1015 12th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Crushed Limestone Institute, Inc., 1015 12th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $10.

A. Germaine Krettek, 200 C Street SE., Washington, D.C.
B. American Library Association, 50 East Huron Street, Chicago, Ill.
E. (9) $2,364.70.

A. Herman C. Kruse, 245 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.
B. Pacific Gas & Electric Co., 245 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.

A. Frank W. Kuehl, 1523 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $575. E. (9) $71.06.

A. Mrs. Catherine G. Kuhne, 2012 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs, Inc., 2012 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Labor-Management Maritime Committee, 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $5,649.98. E. (9) $5,320.31.

A. Lake Carriers' Association, Cleveland, Ohio.

A. A. M. Lampley, 401 Third Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen, 318 Keith Building, Cleveland, Ohio.
D. (6) $2,750.

A. Russell A. Langdon, 20th Street, at New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Fleet Reserve Association, 20th Street, at New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Fritz G. Lanham, 2737 Devonshire Place NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Fair Trade Council, 1434 West 11th Avenue, Gary, Ind.
D. (6) $250.12.

A. Fritz G. Lanham, 2737 Devonshire Place NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Patent Council, Inc., 1434 West 11th Avenue, Gary, Ind.
D. (6) $1,000.12.

A. Fritz G. Lanham, 2737 Devonshire Place, NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Trinity Improvement Association, Inc., 718 Insurance Building, Ft. Worth, Tex.
D. (6) $1,275.

A. Dillard B. Lasseter, 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,000. E. (9) $150.

A. Alan Latman, 210 East 38th Street, New York, N.Y.
B. National Committee for Effective Design Legislation, 122 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $1,249.98. E. (9) $187.03.

A. John V. Lawrence, 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $105. E. (9) $3.70.

A. Warren Lawrence, 225 Bush Street, San Francisco, Calif.
B. Standard Oil Co. of California, 225 Bush Street, San Francisco, Calif.
E. (9) $100.

A. H. Harold Leavey, 2020 L Street, Sacramento, Calif.
B. California-Western States Life Insurance Co., 2020 L Street, Sacramento, Calif.
E. (9) $30.86.

A. Ivy Lee and T. J. Ross, 405 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $4,472.22. E. (9) $4,472.22.

A. Legislative Committee of the Committee for a National Trade Policy, Inc., 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,243.

A. G. E. Leighty, 401 Third Street, NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Life Insurance Association of America, 488 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y. and 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $8,899.65. E. (9) $8,899.65.

A. Lester W. Lindow, 1735 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Association of Maximum Service Telecasters, Inc., 1735 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Robert G. Litschert, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Electric Companies, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $250. E. (9) $29.02.

A. Walter J. Little, 944 Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Association of American Railroads, Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $188.33. E. (9) $85.10.

A. John M. Littlepage, 15th and K Streets NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The American Tobacco Company, Inc., 150 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Arthur Y. Lloyd, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Burley & Dark Leaf Tobacco Export Association, Post Office Box 860, Lexington, Ky.

A. Gordon C. Locke, 418 Munsey Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Committee for Oil Pipe Lines.

A. George E. Long, 10 East 40th Street, New York, N.Y.
B. Eugene R. Pickrell, 10 East 40th Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Leonard Lopez, 1029 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. District Lodge No. 44, International Association of Machinists, 1029 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,492.34. E. (9) $15.

A. Joe T. Lovett, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Retail Federation, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Otto Lowe, Cape Charles, Va.
B. National Canners Association, 1133 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $750.

A. Lowenstein, Pitcher, Spence, Hotchkiss, Amann and Parr, 25 Broad Street, New York, N.Y.
B. Aircraft Industries Association of America, Inc., 610 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Scott W. Lucas, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Finance Conference, 176 West Adams Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,250.

A. Scott W. Lucas, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Emmco Insurance Co., South Bend, Ind.
D. (6) $500.

A. Scott W. Lucas, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Mobile Homes Manufacturers Association, 20 North Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,000.

A. Scott W. Lucas, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Roadside Business Association, 646 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $500.

A. Scott W. Lucas, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Joseph E. Seagram & Sons, Inc., 375 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $1,250.

A. Scott W. Lucas, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Adolph von Zedlitz, 60 Sutton Place, South, New York, N.Y.

A. Scott W. Lucas, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Western Medical Corp., 415–423 West Pershing Road, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,000.

A. Scott W. Lucas, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. World Commerce Corp., 445 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $1,250.

A. H. B. Luckett, 311 California Street, San Francisco, Calif.
B. American Steamship Committee on Conference Studies, Barr Building, Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $365.75.

A. John M. Lumley, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Division of Legislation and Federal Relations of the National Education Association of the United States, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $340. E. (9) $72.85.

A. Milton F. Lunch, 2029 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Society of Professional Engineers, 2029 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $750.

A. John C. Lynn, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 2300 Merchandise Mart, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $2,025. E. (10) $127.42.

A. A. E. Lyon, 401 Third Street N.W., Washington, D.C.
B. Railway Labor Executives Association.
D. (6) $900.

A. William C. McCamant, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Retail Federation, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. John A. McCart, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Federation of Government Employees, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,268. E. (9) $15.60.

A. J. L. McCaskill, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Division of Legislation and Federal Relations of the National Education Association of the United States, 1201 16th Street N.W., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $870. E. (9) $47.84.

A. Robert S. McClelland, Denver, Colo.
B. National Association of Soil Conservation Districts, League City, Tex.

A. McClure & McClure, 626 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. The Coca-Cola Export Corporation, 515 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. McClure & McClure, 626 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Twenty Grand Towing Corp., Offshore Oil Center, Morgan City, La., and Tidewater Marine Service, Inc., 211 The Warwick, New Orleans, La.

A. Angus McDonald.
B. The Farmers' Educational and Cooperative Union of America (National Farmers Union), 1404 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,007.68. E. (9) $139.15.

A. Joseph J. McDonald, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. United Steelworkers of America, 1500 Commonwealth Building, Pittsburgh, Pa.
D. (6) $3,304.85. E. (9) $50.

A. Joseph T. McDonnell, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Electric Companies, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. E. D. McElvain, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Phillips Petroleum Co., Bartlesville, Okla.
D. (6) $500. E. (9) $320.

A. A. J. McFarland.
B. The Christian Amendment Movement, 804 Penn Avenue, Pittsburgh, Pa.
D. (6) $999.99. E. (9) $350.

A. Edward F. McGinnis, 375 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.
B. Joseph E. Seagram & Sons, Inc.

A. Thomas Edward McGrath, 4012 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Taxpayers, U.S.A., 4012 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $225. E. (9) $225.

A. William F. McKenna, 535 Lincoln Building, 60 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
B. National Association of Mutual Savings Banks, 60 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $112.78. E. (9) $69.03.

A. William H. McLin, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Division of Legislation and Federal Relations of the National Education Association of the United States, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,885.20. E. (9) $68.50.

A. W. H. McMains, 1132 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Distilled Spirits Institute, 1132 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Clarence M. McMillan, 1424 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Candy Wholesalers Association, Inc., 1424 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Ralph J. McNair, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Life Insurance Association of America, 488 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $243.75. E. (9) $6.05.

A. William P. MacCracken, Jr., 1000 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
B. American Association of University Women, 1634 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $75.

A. William P. MacCracken, Jr., 1000 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
B. American Optometric Association, Inc., Development Fund, 8001 Jenkins Arcade, Pittsburgh, Pa.
E. (9) $0.75

A. William P. MacCracken, Jr., 1000 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
B. Frankel Brothers, 521 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) 0.75.

A. John G. Macfarlan, 1503 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Railway Express Agency, Inc., 1503 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,478. E. (9) $1,133.64.

A. Maclay, Morgan & Williams, 76 Beaver Street, New York, N.Y.
B. Association of American Ship Owners, 76 Beaver Street, New York, N.Y.

A. MacLeish, Spray, Price & Underwood, 134 South La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. United States Gypsum Co., 300 West Adams Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $2,325.

A. Don Mahon, Box 959, Ben Franklin Station, Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $184.82.

A. William J. Mahon, 1 Gracie Terrace, New York, N.Y.
B. Associated Railroads of New York State.

A. John H. Mahoney, 80 Broad Street, New York, N.Y.
B. Seaboard & Western Airlines, Inc., 80 Broad Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Walter E. Maloney, 40 Wall Street, New York, N.Y.
B. American Steamship Committee on Conference Studies, Room 233, Barr Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $800. E. (9) $250.23.

A. Carter Manasco, 4201 Chesterbrook Road, McLean, Va.
B. National Business Publications, Inc., 1913 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $600.

A. Carter Manasco, 4201 Chesterbrook Road, McLean, Va.
B. National Coal Association, Southern Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,000. E. (9) $181.06.

A. Manufacturing Chemists' Association, Inc., 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,375. E. (9) $2,375.

A. Olya Margolin, 1637 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Council of Jewish Women, Inc., 1 West 47th Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $1,682.40. E. (9) $81.23.

A. Rodney W. Markley, Jr., Wyatt Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Ford Motor Co., Dearborn, Mich.

A. Edwin E. Marsh, Salt Lake City, Utah.
B. National Wool Growers Association, Salt Lake City, Utah.
D. (6) $2,500.

A. Winston W. Marsh, 1012 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Tire Dealers and Retreaders Association, Inc., 1012 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Fred T. Marshall, 1112 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The B. F. Goodrich Co., 500 South Main Street, Akron, Ohio.

A. J. Paull Marshall, 944 Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Association of American Railroads, Transportation Building, Washington, D. C.

A. Mike M. Masaoka, Suite 1217, Hurley-Wright Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Japanese American Citizens League, 1634 Post Street, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) $200.

A. Walter J. Mason, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,029. E. (9) $669.66.

A. David Mathews, Jr., 345 Fourth Avenue, Pittsburgh, Pa.
B. Pittsburgh Coal Exchange, 345 Fourth Avenue, Pittsburgh, Pa.

A. P. H. Mathews, 944 Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Association of American Railroads, Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $430.36. E. (9) $115.08.

A. Joe G. Matthews, 944 Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Association of American Railroads, Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.

A. C. V. and R. V. Maudlin, 1111 E Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Waste Material Dealers, Inc., 271 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Cyrus H. Maxwell, M.D., 1523 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $750.50. E. (9) $55.69.

A. Arnold Mayer, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Amalgamated Meat Cutters and Butcher Workmen of N.A., AFL–CIO, 2800 North Sheridan Road, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,105. E. (9) $2,028.70.

A. John S. Mears.
B. The American Legion, 700 North Pennsylvania Street, Indianapolis, Ind.
D. (6) $635. E. (9) $1.20.

A. The Medical Society of the District of Columbia, 1718 N Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Kenneth A. Meiklejohn, 1906 Q Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Retail, Wholesale, and Department Store Union, AFL–CIO, 132 West 43d Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $675.

A. J. T. Metcalf, 1002 L & N Building, Louisville, Ky.
E. (9) $225.34

A James G. Michaux, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Retail Federation, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. G. R. Milburn, Grass Range, Mont.
B. American National Cattlemen's Association, 801 East 17th Avenue, Denver, Colo.

A. Clarence R. Miles, 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Chamber of Commerce of U.S.A.

A. John R. Miles, 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Chamber of Commerce of the U.S.A.

A. Military Survivors, Inc., 509 Ridgely Avenue, Annapolis, Md.
D. (6) $992. E. (9) $806.93.

A. Milk Industry Foundation, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Miller & Chevalier, 1001 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
B. Ampex Audio, Inc., Sunnyvale, Calif.
D. (6) $7,500. E. (9) $28.07.

A. Miller & Chevalier, 1001 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
B. Harry B. Betty Estate, First Federal Building, Davenport, Iowa.
D. (6) $450.

A. Miller & Chevalier, 1001 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
B. Estate of S. Howard Easton, 1204 Industrial Bank Building, Providence, R.I.
D. (6) $763.65.

A. Miller & Chevalier, 1001 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
B. Estate of William R. Semans, 806 Mercantile Trust Building, Baltimore, Md.
D. (6) $375.

A. Dale Miller, Mayflower Hotel, Washington, D.C.
B. Dallas (Tex.) Chamber of Commerce.
D. (6) $2,200.

A. Dale Miller, Mayflower Hotel, Washington, D.C.

B. Intracoastal Canal Association of Louisiana and Texas, 2211 South Coast Building, Houston, Tex.
D. (6) $2,250.

A. Dale Miller, Mayflower Hotel, Washington, D.C.
B. Texas Gulf Sulphur Co., Newgulf, Tex., and New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $2,250.

A. Edwin Reid Miller, 1004 Farnam Street, Omaha, Nebr.
B. Nebraska Railroads Legislative Committee, 1004 Farnam Street, Omaha, Nebr.
D. (6) $2,512.

A. Lloyd S. Miller, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C., and 195 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
B. American Telephone & Telegraph Co., 195 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $4,500.

A. Seymour S. Mintz, William T. Plumb, Jr., Robert K. Eifler, and Richard A. Mullens, 810 Colorado Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Hughes Tool Co., Houston, Tex.

A. Seymour S. Mintz, 810 Colorado Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Tennessee Products & Chemical Corp., Nashville, Tenn.

A. Clarence Mitchell, 100 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, 20 West 40th Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $1,875. E. (9) $250.

A. M. D. Mobley, 1010 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Vocational Association, 1010 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Harry L. Moffett, 1102 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Mining Congress, Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,500.

A. Albert H. Monacelli, 161 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $50,000.

A. Marion S. Monk, Jr., Batchelor, La.
B. National Association of Soil Conservation Districts, League City, Tex.

A. Donald Montgomery, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Hotel Association, 221 West 57th Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $400. E. (9) $50.65.

A. Walter H. Moorman, 4650 East-West Highway, Bethesda, Md.
B. Maryland Railroad Association, 300 St. Paul Place, Baltimore, Md.
D. (6) $2,500. E. (9) $229.79.

A. Jo V. Morgan, Jr., 815 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Whiteford, Hart, Carmody & Wilson, 815 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,249.98. E. (9) $214.84.

A. Morison, Murphy, Clapp & Abrams, 1144 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Reciprocal Insurance Association, Kansas City, Mo.
D. (6) $2,500.

A. Morison, Murphy, Clapp & Abrams, 1144 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Area Employment Expansion Committee, 1144 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $2.10.

A. Morison, Murphy, Clapp & Abrams, 1144 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Ford Motor Co., the American Road, Dearborn, Mich.

A. Morison, Murphy, Clapp & Abrams, 1144 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Morison, Murphy, Clapp & Abrams, 1144 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.
B. The Sperry & Hutchinson Co., 114 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $650.

A. Giles Morrow, 1111 E Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $5,000.06. E. (9) $139,56.

A. H. S. Mosebrook, 220 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
B. American Pulpwood Association, 220 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Harold G. Mosier, 610 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Aircraft Industries Association of America, Inc., 610 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $4,056. E. (9) $286.75.

A. William J. Mougey, Washington, D.C.
B. General Motors Corp., 3044 West Grand Boulevard, Detroit, Mich.

A. Bernard R. Mullady, 1200 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers.
D. (6) $2,600.

A. Vincent S. Mullaney, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. General Electric Co., 570 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $875. E. (9) $683.

A. T. H. Mullen, 711 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Paper and Pulp Association, 122 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. T. H. Mullen, 711 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Pulpwood Association, 220 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Walter J. Munro, Hotel Washington, Washington, D.C.
B. Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen.

A. Dr. Emmett J. Murphy, 5737 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Chiropractic Insurance Co., National Building, Webster City, Iowa.
D. (6) $300. E. (9) $300.

A. Mutual Savings Banks Committee on Taxation, 60 East 42d Street New York, N.Y.

A. J. Walter Myers, Jr., Post Office Box 7284, Station C, Atlanta, Ga.
B. Forest Farmers Association Cooperative, Post Office Box 7284, Station C, Atlanta, Ga.

A. Paul A. Nagle, 1300 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Postal Transport Association, 1300 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,000.

A. National Agricultural Limestone Institute, Inc., 1015 12th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,099.50. E. (9) $1,099.50.

A. National Anti-Price Fixing Association, 1366 National Press Building, Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $23.25.

A. National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, 20 West 40th Street, New York, N.Y.

A. National Association of Direct Selling Companies, 163–165 Center Street, Winona, Minn.
D. (6) $13,875. E. (9) $29.22.

A. National Association of Electric Companies, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $276.88. E. (9) $6,089.32.

A. National Association of Frozen Food Packers, 1415 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. National Association of Insurance Agents, Inc., 96 Fulton Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $3,499.15. E. (9) $6,968.06.

A. National Association of Margarine Manufacturers, Munsey Building, Washington, D.C.

A. National Association of Mutual Savings Banks, 60 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $112.78. E. (9) $179.81.

A. National Association of Postal Supervisors, Post Office Box 2013, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $8,746. E. (9) $5,079.37.

A. National Association of Social Workers, Inc., 95 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y., and 1346 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,235. E. (9) $2,235.

A. National Association of Travel Organizations, 1424 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $8,787.56. E. (9) $682.50.

A. National Association of Wheat Growers, Wasco, Oreg.
D. (6) $959.35. E. (9) $959.35.

A. National Audio-Visual Association, Inc., Box 337, Fairfax, Va.
D. (6) $24.96. E. (9) $160.87.

A. National Board of Fur Farm Organizations, Inc., 152 West Wisconsin Avenue, Milwaukee, Wis.

A. National Business Publications, Inc., 1913 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. National Coal Association, 802 Southern Building, Washington, D.C.

A. National Committee for Effective Design Legislation, 122 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $1,373.48. E. (9) $2,469.02.

A. National Committee for Municipal Bonds, Inc., 161 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $737.05.

A. National Committee on Parcel Post Size and Weight Limitations, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. National Cotton Compress & Cotton Warehouse Association, 1085 Shrine Building, Post Office Box 23, Memphis, Tenn.
E. (9) $31.

A. National Conference for Repeal of Taxes on Transportation, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. National Cotton Council of America, P.O. Box 9905, Memphis, Tenn.
D. (6) $684.40. E. (9) $684.40.

A. National Council on Business Mail, Inc.
D. (6) $50.86. E. (9) $613.75.

A. National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D.C.

A. National Counsel Associates, Wyatt Building, Washington, D.C.

A. National Crushed Limestone Inst., Inc., 1015 12th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $253.90. E. (9) $253.90.

A. National Economic Council, Inc., 7501 Empire State Building, New York, N.Y.

A. National Electrical Contractors Association, Inc., 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. National Electrical Manufacturers Association, 155 East 44th Street, New York, N.Y.

A. National Federation of Federal Employees, 1729 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $99,513.64. E. (9) $8,957.11.

A. National Federation of Independent Business, Inc., 740 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $8,089.51. E. (9) $8,089.51.

A. National Federation of Post Office Clerks, 711 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $128,287.65. E. (9) $14,262.23.

A. National Grange, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $10,200.

A. National Housing Conference, Inc., 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $23,308.68. E. (9) $21,110.98.

A. National Independent Dairies Association, 1627 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. National Independent Meat Packers Association, 740 11th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $648.22. E. (9) $1,715.72.

A. National League of Insured Savings Associations, 907 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $923.33. E. (9) $882.59.

A. National Livestock Tax Committee, 801 East 17th Avenue, Denver, Colo.
D. (6) $2,069.60.

A. National Lumber Manufacturers Association, 1319 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $67.11. (E) (9) $75.43.

A. National Milk Producers Federation, 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,036.64. E. (9) $1,036.64.

A. National Multiple Sclerosis Society, 257 Fourth Avenue, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $810.03.

A. National Parking Association, Inc., 711 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. National Postal Transport Association, 1300 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $10,100.40. E. (9) $10,100.40.

A. National Reclamation Association, 897 National Press Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $14,922.25. E. (9) $11,847.85.

A. National Retail Furniture Association, 666 Lake Shore Drive, Chicago, Ill.

A. National Retail Merchants Association, 100 West 31st Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $4,125. E. (9) $4,367.90.

A. National Rivers and Harbors Congress, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $560. E. (9) $6,904.15.

A. National Small Businessmen's Association, 801 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $5,000. E. (9) $1,805.28.

A. National Society of Professional Engineers, 2029 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $50,977.20. E. (9) $3,513.01.

A. National Tax Relief Coalition, 2309 Pine Croft Road, Greensboro, N.C.
B. L. S. Franklin, 2309 Pine Croft Road, Greensboro, N.C.
D. (6) $485. E. (9) $825.

A. National Tire Dealers & Retreaders Association, 1012 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $16.57. E. (9) $16.57.

A. National Wool Growers Association, 414 Crandall Building, Salt Lake City, Utah.
D. (6) $43,066.

A. Nation-Wide Committee of Industry, Agriculture and Labor on Import-Export Policy, 815 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $15,150. E. (9) $15,383.09.

A. Robert R. Neal, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Health Insurance Association of America, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. William S. Neal, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Manufacturers.

A. A. Z. Nelson, 1319 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Lumber Manufacturers Association, 1319 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. George R. Nelson, Machinists Building, Washington, D.C.
B. International Association of Machinists, Machinists Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,500. E. (9) $268.

A. Paul Nelson, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Herschel D. Newsom, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The National Grange, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,750.

A. New York and New Jersey Dry Dock Association, 161 William Street, New York City, N.Y.
D. (6) $4,425.52. E. (9) $3,985.28.

A. New York Stock Exchange, 11 Wall Street, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $3,000.

A. Henry G. Nolda, 1729 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Federation of Federal Employees, 1729 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,307.72. E. (9) $89.71.

A. O. L. Norman, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Electric Companies, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Robert H. North, 1105 Barr Building, Washington, D.C.
B. International Association of Ice Cream Manufacturers, 1105 Barr Building, Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $847.53.

A. Harry E. Northam, 185 North Wabash Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
B. Association of American Physicians and Surgeons, Inc., 185 North Wabash Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

A. Northern Hemlock and Hardwood Manufacturers Association, 207 Northern Building, Green Bay, Wis.
D. (6) $100.

A. E. M. Norton, 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Milk Producers Federation, 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $100.

A. Brice O'Brien, 1102 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Mining Congress, Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $750.

A. George J. O'Brien, 225 Bush Street, San Francisco, Calif.
B. Standard Oil Co. of California, 225 Bush Street, San Francisco, Calif.

A. R. E. O'Connor, 122 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
B. American Paper and Pulp Association, 122 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Herbert R. O'Conor, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Merchant Marine Institute, Inc., 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C., and 11 Broadway, New York, N.Y.

A. John A. O'Donnell, 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,749.99.

A. Eugene O'Dunne, Jr., Southern Building, Washington, D.C.
B. The Associated Business Publications, 305 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Eugene O'Dunne, Jr., Southern Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Wool Manufacturers, 386 Fourth Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Ohio Railroad Association, 16 East Broad Street, Columbus, Ohio.

A. Alvin E. Oliver, 400 Folger Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Grain and Feed Dealers National Association, 400 Folger Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $15.42. E. (9) $2.

A. Fred N. Oliver, 110 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y., and Investment Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Mutual Savings Banks, 60 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y., and Mutual Savings Banks Committee on Taxation, 60 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Richard M. Oliver, 610 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Aircraft Industries Association of America, Inc., 610 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Robert Oliver, 1026 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Morison, Murphy, Clapp & Abrams, 1144 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Clarence H. Olson, 1608 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The American Legion, 700 North Pennsylvania Street, Indianapolis, Ind.
D. (6) $2,490. E. (9) $25.66.

A. Samuel Omasta, 1015 12th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Agricultural Limestone Institute, Inc., 1015 12th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $7.50.

A. Order of Railway Conductors and Brakemen, O.R.C. & B. Building, Cedar Rapids, Iowa.
E. (9) $4,182.13.

A. Clayton L. Orn, 539 South Main Street, Findlay, Ohio.
B. The Ohio Oil Co., Findlay, Ohio.

A. Morris E. Osburn, Central Trust Building, Jefferson City, Mo.
B. Missouri Railroad Committee.

A. Kermit Overby, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $32.

A. Vaux Owen, 1729 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Federation of Federal Employees, 1729 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,884.62. E. (9) $7.90.

A. Pacific American Tankship Association, 25 California Street, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) $200. E. (9) $1,624.99.

A. Edwin F. Padberg, 1223 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.
B. The Pennsylvania Railroad Co., 6 Penn Center Plaza, Philadelphia, Pa.

A. Everett L. Palmer, 901 Hamilton Street, Allentown, Pa.
B. Pennsylvania Power and Light Co., 901 Hamilton Street, Allentown, Pa.

A. Lew M. Paramore, Post Office Box 356, Kansas City, Kans.
B. Mississippi Valley Association, 1978 Railway Exchange Building, St. Louis, Mo.
D. (6) $3,375.

A. A. Lee Parsons, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Cotton Manufacturers Institute, 1501 Johnston Building, Charlotte, N.C.
D. (6) $350. E. (9) $40.15.

A. Perry S. Patterson, 800 World Center Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Automatic Phonograph Manufacturers Association, 1603 Orrington Avenue, Evanston, Ill.

A. James G. Patton.
B. The Farmers' Educational and Co-Operative Union of America, 1575 Sherman Street, Denver, Colo. and 1404 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Robert T. Patton, 1008 West Sixth Street, Los Angeles, Calif.
B. Shell Oil Co., 1008 West Sixth Street, Los Angeles, Calif.
D. (6) $262.60. E. (9) $93.14.

A. Edmund W. Pavenstedt, 14 Wall Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Albert A. Payne, 1300 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Real Estate Boards, 1300 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,000. E. (9) $60.05.

A. Philip C. Pendleton, Second Street Pike, Bryn Athyn, Pa.
B. Family Tax Association, 2110 Girard Trust Building, Philadelphia, Pa.
D. (6) $900. E. (9) $282.81.

A. Peoples Water Service Company, 1607 Mercantile Trust Building, Baltimore, Md.

A. Francis E. Perkins, 21 School Street, Concord, N.H.
B. Boston and Maine Railroad, North Station, Boston, Mass.

A. Hugh Peterson.
B. Georgia Power Company, 75 Marietta Street, Atlanta, Ga.
D. (6) $3,750.

A. Iris V. Peterson, 4201 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Air Line Stewards and Stewardesses Association, 55th and Cicero Avenue, Washington, D.C.

A. J. Hardin Peterson, Post Office Box 111, Lakeland, Fla.
B. Florida Citrus Mutual (Legislative Fund), Lakeland, Fla.
D. (6) $1,800. E. (9) $224.79.

A. J. Hardin Peterson, Box 111, Lakeland, Fla.
B. West Coast Inland Navigation District, Court House, Bradenton, Fla.
D. (6) $1,800. E. (9) $21.

A. Kenneth Peterson, 1126 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. International Union of Electrical, Radio and Machine Workers, 1126 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,031.

A. J. E. Phillips, 225 Bush Street, San Francisco, Calif.
B. Standard Oil Co. of California, 225 Bush Street, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) $100.

A. Eugene R. Pickrell, 10 East 40th Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Albert Pike, Jr., 488 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.
B. Life Insurance Association of America, 488 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $67.50.

A. James F. Pinkney, 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,000. E. (9) $24.19.

A. T. E. Pinkston, 101 East High Street, Lexington, Ky.

A. Plains Cotton Growers, Inc., 220–222 Lubbock National Building, Lubbock, Tex.
D. (6) $74,339.08. E. (9) $1,025.

A. Kenneth M. Plaisted, 152 West Wisconsin Avenue, Milwaukee, Wis.
B. National Board of Fur Farm Organizations, Inc., 152 West Wisconsin Avenue, Milwaukee, Wis.

A. J. Francis Pohlhaus, 100 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, 20 West 40th Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $887.69.

A. James K. Polk, 40 Wall Street, New York, N.Y.
B. Consolidated Edison Company of New York, Inc., 4 Irving Place, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $90.

A. James K. Polk, 40 Wall Street, New York, N.Y.
B. The Western Pacific Railroad Co., 526 Mission Street, San Francisco, Calif.

A. Frederick T. Poole, 418 Munsey Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Committee for Oil Pipe Lines, 418 Munsey Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Frank M. Porter, 50 West 50th Street, New York, N.Y.
B. American Petroleum Institute, 50 West 50th Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Nelson J. Post, 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Milk Producers Federation, 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $10. E. (9) $2.40.

A. Powell, Dorsey, Blum & White, 1741 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Committee for the Study of Revenue Bond Financing, 149 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $2,870. E. (9) $55.71.

A. Powell, Dorsey, Blum & White, 1741 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Securities Dealers, Inc.

A. William H. Press, 1616 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Washington Board of Trade, 1616 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $4,800.

A. Allen I. Pretzman, 150 East Broad Street, Columbus, Ohio.
B. Scioto-Sandusky Conservancy District, 150 East Broad Street, Columbus, Ohio.
D. (6) $120. E. (9) $65.13.

A. Harry E. Procter, 319 Investment Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Oliver & Donnally, 319 Investment Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Public Information Committee of the Cotton Industries, 304 Empire Bank Building, Dallas, Tex.

A. Ganson Purcell, 910 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Insular Lumber Co., 1406 Locust Street, Philadelphia, Pa.

A. Purcell & Nelson, 910 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Detroit Bakery Employers' Council, 2901 Grand River Avenue, Detroit, Mich.
D. (6) $5,000.

A. Purcell & Nelson, 910 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Government Development Bank of Puerto Rico.
E. (9) $150.46.

A. Alexander Purdon, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Committee of American Steamship Lines, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $937.50. E. (9) $447.17.

A. C. J. Putt, 920 Jackson Street, Topeka, Kans.
B. The Atchison, Topeka and Santa Fe Railway Co., 920 Jackson Street, Topeka, Kans.

A. William A. Quinlan, 1317 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $111.91.

A. Luke C. Quinn, Jr., 1001 Connecticut Avenue, NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Cancer Society, Arthritis and Rheumatism Foundation, United Cerebral Palsy Association, and National Multiple

Sclerosis Society, New York, N.Y.; National Committee for Research in Neurological Disorders, Minneapolis, Minn.; Association of American Medical Colleges, Evanston, Ill.
D. (6) $13,750.13. E. (9) $6,444.06.

A. Alex Radin, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Public Power Association, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Railway Labor Executives' Association, 401 Third Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Alan T. Rains, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. United Fresh Fruit and Vegetable Association, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Thomas M. Raysor, 1366 National Press Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Sydney C. Reagan, 3840 Greenbrier Drive, Dallas, Tex.
B. Southwestern Peanut Shellers Association, Box 48, Durant, Okla.
D. (6) $150.

A. Joseph H. Ream, 1735 De Sales Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Columbia Broadcasting System, Inc., 485 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Stanley Rector, Hotel Washington, Washington, D.C.
B. Unemployment Benefit Advisors, Inc.
D. (6) $1,000.

A. Otie M. Reed, 1107 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Creameries Association, 817 New York Building, St. Paul, Minn.
D. (6) $1,875. E. (9) $2,446.09.

A. J. B. Reeves, 9th and Jackson Streets, Topeka, Kans.
B. The Atchison, Topeka and Santa Fe Railway Co., 9th and Jackson Streets, Topeka, Kans.

A. George L. Reid, Jr., 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,999.98. E. (9) $19.70.

A. George L. Reid, Jr., 1010 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Wheat Growers, Wasco, Oreg.
D. (6) $900. E. (9) $59.35.

A. Herbert S. Reid, 466 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.
B. New York State Association of Railroads, 466 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. James Francis Reilly, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Potomac Electric Power Co., 929 E Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,000. E. (9) $200.

A. Reserve Officers Association of the United States, 2517 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Retired Officers Association, 1616 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $47,315.02.

A. Retirement Federation of Civil Service Employees of the U.S. Government, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,359.20. E. (9) $9,914.

A. Theron J. Rice, 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Chamber of Commerce of U.S.A.

A. Edward McGee Rider, Munsey Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Margarine Manufacturers, Munsey Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Harry H. Rieck, Preston, Md.
B. National Association of Soil Conservation Districts, League City, Tex.

A. Siert F. Riepma, Munsey Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Margarine Manufacturers, Munsey Building, Washington, D.C.

A. John J. Riggle, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Council of Farmer Cooperatives.

A. C. E. Rightor, 3300 Rolling Road, Chevy Chase, Md.
D. (6) $1,703.33. E. (9) $1,200.82.

A. George D. Riley, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations, 815 16th Street N.W., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,029. E. (9) $844.67.

A. J. J. Riley, 1128 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Bottlers of Carbonated Beverages.

A. John J. Riley, 20th and E Streets NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The Associated General Contractors of America, Inc., 20th and E Streets NW., Washington, D.C.

A. E. W. Rising, 328 Pennsylvania Avenue SE., Washington, D.C.
B. Western Sugar Beet Growers Association, Post Office Box 742, Great Falls, Mont.
D. (6) $300. E. (9) $474.94.

A. William Neale Roach, 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,000. E. (9) $113.04.

A. Paul H. Robbins, 2029 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Society of Professional Engineers, 2029 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $250.

A. Frank L. Roberts, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Chrysler Corp., 341 Massachusetts Avenue, Detroit, Mich.
D. (6) $250. E. (9) $100.

A. Charles A. Robinson, Jr., 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $13.38.

A. Edward O. Rodgers, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Air Transport Association of America, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $375. E. (9) $18.35.

A. Donald L. Rogers, 730 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Association of Registered Bank Holding Companies, 730 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $625. E. (9) $3.80.

A. Frank W. Rogers, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Western Oil and Gas Association, 609 South Grand Avenue, Los Angeles, Calif.
D. (6) $4,213.50.

A. George B. Roscoe, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Electrical Contractors Association, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Maurice Rosenblatt, Wyatt Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Counsel Associates.

A. Robert M. Ruddick, 738 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.
B. United Air Lines, 5959 South Cicero Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

A. Albert R. Russell, 1918 North Parkway, Memphis, Tenn.
B. National Cotton Council of America, Post Office Box 9905, Memphis, Tenn.
D. (6) $420. E. (9) $117.57.

A. Horace Russell, 221 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. United States Savings and Loan League, 221 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $481.25.

A. M. O. Ryan, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Hotel Association, 221 West 57th Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $500. E. (9) $308.75.

A. William H. Ryan, 1029 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. District Lodge No. 44, International Association of Machinists, 1029 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,988.43. E. (9) $60.

A. Robert A. Saltzstein, 508 Wyatt Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Associated Business Publications, 205 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $3,000. E. (9) $117.73.

A. Robert A. Saltzstein, 508 Wyatt Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Smaller Magazines Postal Committee, Post Office Box 975, New Canaan, Conn.

A. Kimball Sanborn, 4000 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Boston & Maine Railroad, Boston, Mass.

A. L. R. Sanford, 21 West Street, New York, N.Y.
B. Shipbuilders Council of America, 21 West Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Harrison Sasscer, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Division of Legislation and Federal Relations of the National Education Association of the United States, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $230.80.

A. Satterlee, Warfield & Stephens, 460 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.
B. American Nurses' Association, 2 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $300. E. (9) $50.60.

A. O. H. Saunders, 1616 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Retired Officers Association, 1616 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,350.

A. J. A. Schwab, 1223 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Pennsylvania Railroad Co., The Penn Center Plaza, Philadelphia, Pa.

A. Schoene and Kramer, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Railway Labor Executives' Association, 401 Third Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Seaboard & Western Airlines, Inc., 80 Broad Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Durward Seals, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. United Fresh Fruit & Vegetable Association, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Hollis M. Seavey, 532 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Clear Channel Broadcasting Service (CCBS), 532 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Harry See, 401 Third Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen.

A. Fred G. Seig, 944 Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Association of American Railroads, Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Leo Seybold, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Air Transport Association of America, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $450. E. (9) $26.05.

A. Alvin Shapiro, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Merchant Marine Institute, Inc., 1701 K Street NW, Washington, D.C., and 11 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $200. E. (9) $41.40.

A. John H. Sharon, 224 Southern Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Cleary, Gottlieb, Friendly & Ball, 224 Southern Building, Washington, D.C.

A. John H. Sharon, 224 Southern Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Cleary, Gottlieb, Friendly & Ball, 224 Southern Building, Washington, D.C.

A. A. Manning Shaw, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Brown & Lund, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $283.25.

A. Leander I. Shelley, 608 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.
B. American Association of Port Authorities, Inc., Washington, D.C., and Airport Operators Council, Inc., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,249.98. E. (9) $17.93.

A. Bruce E. Shepherd, 488 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.
B. Life Insurance Association of America, 488 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $150.

A. Laurence P. Sherfy, 1102 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Mining Congress, Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $750.

A. W. Lee Shield, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Life Convention, 230 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $216.20. E. (9) $6.80.

A. Richard C. Shipman.
B. The Farmers' Educational and Cooperative Union of America (National Farmers Union), 1404 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,073.96. E. (9) $45.05.

A. Robert L. Shortle, 801 International Building, New Orleans, La.
B. Mississippi Valley Association, 1978 Railway Exchange Building, St. Louis, Mo.
D. (6) $3,000.

A. Charles B. Shuman, Merchandise Mart Plaza, Chicago, Ill.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, Merchandise Mart Plaza, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $625.

A. Paul Sifton, 1126 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. United Automobile, Aircraft, Agricultural, Implement Workers of America.
D. (6) $2,821. E. (9) $957.76.

A. Leonard L. Silverstein, 1100 Bowen Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Women's and Children's Apparel Salesmen, Inc.

A. Six Agency Committee, 909 South Broadway, Los Angeles, Calif.
D. (6) $10,000. E. (9) $3,016.13.

A. Stephen Slipher, 812 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.
B. United States Savings & Loan League, 221 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,687.50.

A. Smaller Magazines Postal Committee, Post Office Box 975, New Canaan, Conn.

A. Elizabeth A. Smart, 144 Constitution Avenue NE., Washington, D.C.
B. National Woman's Christian Temperance Union, 1730 Chicago Avenue, Evanston, Ill.
D. (6) $606.12. E. (9) $146.20.

A. T. W. Smiley, 135 East Eleventh Place, Chicago, Ill.
B. Illinois Railroad Association, 33 South Clark Street, Chicago, Ill.
E. (9) $91.18.

A. Harold Arden Smith, 605 West Olympic Boulevard, Los Angeles, Calif.
B. Standard Oil Company of California, 225 Bush Street, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) $300. E. (9) $137.

A. James R. Smith, 719 Omaha National Bank Building, Omaha, Nebr.
B. Mississippi Valley Association, 1978 Railway Exchange Building, St. Louis, Mo.
D. (6) $3,750.

A. Lloyd W. Smith, 416 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Chicago, Burlington & Quincy Railroad Co., 547 West Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Ill., and Great Northern Railway Co., 175 East Fourth Street, St. Paul, Minn.
D. (6) $4,257.

A. Wallace M. Smith, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Mutual Insurance Alliance, 20 North Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.

A. Lyle O. Snader, 944 Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Association of American Railroads, Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Edward F. Snyder, 104 C Street NE., Washington, D.C.
B. Friends Committee on National Legislation, 104 C Street NE., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,168.27.

A. J. D. Snyder, La Salle Hotel, Chicago, Ill.
B. Illinois Railroad Association, 33 South Clark Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $825.

A. Society for Animal Protective Legislation, 745 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $27,120.52. E. (9) $349.68.

A. Marvin J. Sonosky, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Southern States Industrial Council, 1103 Stahlman Building, Nashville, Tenn.
D. (6) $23,811.50. E. (9) $24,720.95.

A. William W. Spear, 214 National Bank Building, Fremont, Nebr.
B. Standard Oil Co., 910 South Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $900. E. (9) $486.40.

A. Lyndon Spencer, 305 Rockefeller Building, Cleveland, Ohio.
B. Lake Carriers' Association, 305 Rockefeller Building, Cleveland, Ohio.

A. Thomas G. Stack, 1104 West 104th Place, Chicago, Ill.
B. National Railroad Pension Forum, Inc., 1104 West 104th Place, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,800. E. (9) $4,657.24.

A. Howard M. Starling, 837 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Association of Casualty & Surety Cos., 60 John Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $150.

A. Mrs. C. A. L. Stephens, P. O. Box 6234 Northwest Station, Washington, D.C.

A. Russell M. Stephens, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Federation of Technical Engineers, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $240. E. (9) $20.

A. B. H. Steuerwald, 401 Third Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Brotherhood of Railroad Signalmen of America, 503 Wellington Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $100.

A. Stevenson, Paul, Rifkind, Wharton & Garrison, 1614 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Ampex Corporation, Redwood City, Calif.

A. Stevenson, Paul, Rifkind, Wharton & Garrison, 1614 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. N. R. Caine and Co., 40 Exchange Place, New York, N.Y.

A. Stevenson, Paul, Rifkind, Wharton & Garrison, 1614 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Howard F. Knipp, 3401 South Hanover Street, Baltimore, Md.

A. Stevenson, Paul, Rifkind, Wharton & Garrison, 1614 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Committee for Insurance Taxation, The Hay-Adams House, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,395.25. E. (9) $9.63.

A. Charles T. Stewart, 1300 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Real Estate Boards, 36 South Wabash Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,500.

A. Erskine Stewart, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Council on Business Mail, Inc., 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $13.75.

A. Nelson A. Stitt, 1000 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
B. United States-Japan Trade Council, 1000 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.

A. Edwin L. Stoll, 1300 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Real Estate Boards, 36 South Wabash Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,125.

A. Joseph M. Stone, 821 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Local One, AFSCME, AFL–CIO, 333 National Press Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $100.

A. W. S. Story, 1729 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Institute of Scrap Iron & Steel, Inc., 1729 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $300. E. (9) $1.25.

A. Sterling F. Stoudenmire, Jr., 61 Saint Joseph Street, Mobile, Ala.
B. Waterman Steamship Corp., 61 Saint Joseph Street, Mobile, Ala.
D. (6) $1,250. E. (9) $234.69.

A. Francis W. Stover, 610 Wire Building, 1000 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States.
D. (6) $1,750.02. E. (9) $69.62.

A. O. R. Strackbein, 815 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. America's Wage Earners' Protective Conference, 815 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,846.16.

A. O. R. Strackbein, 815 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. International Allied Printing Trades Association, Box 728, Indianapolis, Ind.
D. (6) $625.

A. O. R. Strackbein, 815 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Nation-Wide Committee of Industry, Agriculture, and Labor on Import-Export Policy, 815 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $6,250.

A. Norman Strunk, 221 North LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. United States Savings and Loan League, 221 North LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $950.

A. William L. Sturdevant, Jr., Wyatt Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Counsel Associates.

A. Arthur Sturgis, Jr., 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Retail Federation, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. J. E. Sturrock, 607 Littlefield Building, Austin, Tex.
B. Texas Water Conservation Association, 607 Littlefield Building, Austin, Tex.
D. (6) $1,800. E. (9) $1,121.55.

A. J. Monroe Sullivan, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Pacific American Steamship Association, 16 California Street, San Francisco, Calif.
E. (9) $300.90.

A. Frank L. Sundstrom, 350 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.
B. Schenley Industries, Inc., 350 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Surrey, Karasik, Gould & Efron, 1116 Woodward Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Fluorspar Importers & Producers Institute, 41 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $3,171.23.

A. Noble J. Swearingen, 1790 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
B. National Tuberculosis Association, 1790 Broadway, New York, N.Y.

A. Charles P. Taft, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Legislative Committee of the Committee for a National Trade Policy, Inc., 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Glenn J. Talbott.
B. The Farmers' Educational and Co-Operative Union of America (National Farmers Union), 1404 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D.C., and 1575 Sherman Street, Denver, Colo.

A. Edward D. Taylor, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Office Equipment Manufacturers Institute (OEMI), 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Temporary Committee on Taxation of Mutual Life Insurance Companies, Mutual of New York, 1740 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $71,280.50. E. (9) $32,607.94.

A. Texas Water Conservation Association, 607 Littlefield Building, Austin, Tex.
D. (6) $5,449.50. E. (9) $8,220.91.

A. Christy Thomas and Barry Sullivan, 536 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. The National Association of River and Harbor Contractors, 15 Park Row, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $750. E. (9) $58.62.

A. J. Woodrow Thomas, 1000 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Trans World Airlines, Inc., 10 Richards Road, Kansas City, Mo.

A. Oliver A. Thomas, 125 North Center Street, Reno, Nev.
B. Nevada Railroad Association, 125 North Center Street, Reno, Nev.

A. William B. Thompson, Jr., 944 Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Association of American Railroads, Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Eugene M. Thoré, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Life Insurance Association of America, 488 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $3,255. E. (9) $89.52.

A. G. D. Tilghman, 1604 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Disabled Officers Association, 1604 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,750.

A. William H. Tinney, 1223 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.
B. The Pennsylvania Railroad Co., 6 Penn Center Plaza, Philadelphia, Pa.

A. M. S. Tisdale, 4200 Cathedral Avenue, Washington, D.C.
B. Armed Services Committee, Chamber of Commerce, Vallejo, Calif.
D. (6) $295. E. (9) $792.43.

A. Tobacco Associates, Inc., 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $537.

A. H. Willis Tobler, 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Milk Producers Federation, 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $300. E. (9) $36.34.

A. John H. Todd, 1085 Shrine Building, Memphis, Tenn.
B. National Cotton Compress & Cotton Warehouse Association, 1085 Shrine Building, Memphis, Tenn.

A. F. Gerald Toye, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. General Electric Co., 570 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $1,000. E. (9) $22.40.

A. Transportation Association of America, 6 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

A. Richard S. Tribbe, 1508 Merchants Bank Building, Indianapolis, Ind.
B. Associated Railways of Indiana, 1508 Merchants Bank Building, Indianapolis, Ind.

A. Matt Triggs, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 2300 Merchandise Mart, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,537.50. E. (9) $41.09.

A. Glenwood S. Troop, Jr., 812 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.
B. United States Savings and Loan League, 221 North LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $875.

A. Paul T. Truitt, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Plant Food Institute, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $6.76.

A. J. T. Trullinger, National Bank of Commerce Building, Olympia, Wash.
B. General Petroleum Corp., 612 South Flower Street, Los Angeles, Calif., Richfield Oil Co., 555 South Flower Street, Los Angeles, Calif., Shell Oil Co., Shell Building, San Francisco, Calif., Standard Oil Co., of California, 225 Bush Street, San Francisco, Calif., Tidewater Oil Co., 4201 Wilshire Boulevard, Los Angeles, Calif., and Union Oil Co., of California, Union Oil Centre, Los Angeles, Calif.

A. Stanley R. Tupper, 154 State Street, Augusta, Maine.
B. Boston and Maine Railroad, North Station, Boston, Mass.

A. Harold J. Turner, Henry Building, Portland, Oreg.
B. Spokane, Portland & Seattle Railway Co., Southern Pacific Co., and Union Pacific Railroad Co., Henry Building, Portland, Oreg.

A. William S. Tyson, 821 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Local No. 30, Canal Zone Pilots, I.O.M.M. & P., P.O. Box 601, Panama, C.Z.

A. Lewis H. Ulman, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C., and 195 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
B. American Telephone and Telegraph Co., 195 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $2,250.

A. Union Producing Co., 1525 Fairfield Avenue, Shreveport, La., United Gas Pipe Line Co., 1525 Fairfield Avenue, Shreveport, La., and W. E. Wilson, 1525 Fairfield Avenue, Shreveport, La.

A. United States Gypsum Co., 300 West Adams Street, Chicago, Ill.
E. (9) $2,325.

A. United States-Japan Trade Council, 1000 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $178.

A. United States Savings and Loan League, 221 North LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.
E. (9) $10,098.95.

A. The United States Trotting Association, 1349 East Broad Street, Columbus, Ohio.
D. (6) $144,577.51.

A. Richard E. Vernor, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Life Convention, 230 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $141.96.

A. L. T. Vice, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Standard Oil Co. of California, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. R. K. Vinson, 1346 Connecticut Avenue, NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Machinery Dealers National Association, 1346 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. H. Jerry Voorhis.
B. The Cooperative League of the United States of America Association, Inc., 343 South Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $300.

A. Carl M. Walker, 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Milk Producers Federation, 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $50. E. (9) $26.20.

A. Paul H. Walker, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Life Insurance Association of America, 488 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $199.50. E. (9) $3.14.

A. Stephen M. Walter, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Electric Co's., 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Thomas G. Walters, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,000.

A. Charles A. Washer, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Petail Federation, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Washington Board of Trade, 1616 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Washington Home Rule Committee, Inc., 924 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,176. E. (9) $2,463.03.

A. Vincent T. Wasilewski, 1771 N Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Broadcasters, 1771 N Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Jeremiah C. Waterman, 165 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
B. Southern Pacific Co., 165 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $50.

A. Waterways Council Opposed to Regulation Extension, 21 West Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $2,165. E. (9) $14.35.

A. J. R. Watson, Room 1, I.C.R.R. Passenger Station, Jackson, Miss.
B. Mississippi Railroad Association, Room 1, I.C.R.R. Passenger Station, Jackson, Miss.

A. Watters & Donovan, 161 William Street, New York City.
B. New York & New Jersey Dry Dock Association, 161 William Street, New York City.
D. (6) $3,750.

A. Henry B. Weaver, Jr., et al., 1225 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Eastern Meat Packers' Association, Inc., Statler Hotel, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $500. E. (9) $235.58.

A. Henry B. Weaver, Jr., et al., 1225 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Electrical Contractors' Association and the Council of Mechanical Specialty Contracting Industries, Inc., Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $733.35.

A. Henry B. Weaver, Jr., et al., 1225 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Electrical Manufacturers' Association, 155 East 44th Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $3,500. E. (9) $148.70.

A. Henry B. Weaver, Jr., et al., 1225 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The National Independent Meat Packers' Association, 740 11th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $5,000. E. (9) $339.89.

A. William H. Webb, La Salle Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Rivers and Harbors Congress, 1028 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,880.40. E. (9) $534.87.

A. Donald D. Webster, Room 233, Barr Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Steamship Committee on Conference Studies, Room 233, Barr Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $4,375. E. (9) $321.67.

A. William E. Welsh, 897 National Press Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Reclamation Association, 897 National Press Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,750. E. (9) $38.67.

A. West Coast Inland Navigation District, Court House, Bradenton, Fla.
E. (9) $621.

A. George Y. Wheeler II, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Radio Corp. of America, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Wherry Housing Association, 1737 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $6,981. E. (9) $7,103.54.

A. Don White, Box 337, Fairfax, Va.
B. National Audio-Visual Association, Inc., Box 337, Fairfax, Va.
D. (6) $3,250. E. (9) $1,813.45.

A. Richard P. White, 635 Southern Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Association of Nurserymen, 635 Southern Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,750. E. (9) $99.46.

A. Whiteford, Hart, Carmody & Wilson, 815 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,249.98. E. (9) $214.84.

A. H. Leigh Whitelaw, 734 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Gas Appliance Manufacturers Association, Inc., 60 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Louis E. Whyte, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Independent Natural Gas Association of America, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Warren E. Whyte, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,218. E. (9) $131.19.

A. Wilkinson, Cragun & Barker, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Arapahoe Tribe of Indians, Wind River Reservation, Fort Washakie, Wyo.
E. (9) $6.30.

A. Wilkinson, Cragun & Barker, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The Confederated Salish and Kootenai Tribes of the Flathead Reservation, Mont.

A. Wilkinson, Cragun & Barker, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Klamath Indian Tribe, Klamath Agency, Oreg.
E. (9) $3.50.

A. Wilkinson, Cragun & Barker, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Menominee Tribe of Indians, Keshena, Wis.
E. (9) $12.37.

A. Wilkinson, Cragun & Barker, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Quinaielt Indian Tribe, Taholah, Wash.

A. Wilkinson, Cragun & Barker, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Spokane Indian Tribe, Wellpinit, Wash.

A. Franz O. Willenbucher, 1616 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Retired Officers Association, 1616 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,250.

A. Edward Brown Williams, 411 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. United Fresh Fruit & Vegetable Association, the Wyatt Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,430.

A. John C. Williamson, 1300 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Real Estate Boards, 1300 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,200. E. (9) $260.19.

A. E. Raymond Wilson, 104 C Street NE., Washington, D.C.
B. Friends Committee on National Legislation, 104 C Street NE., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,292.31.

A. John J. Wilson, 815 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Whiteford, Hart, Carmody & Wilson, 815 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,249.98. E. (9) $214.84.

A. W. E. Wilson, 1525 Fairfield Avenue, Shreveport, La.
B. Union Producing Co., 1525 Fairfield Avenue, Shreveport, La.

A. W. F. Wimberly, 873 Spring Street NW., Atlanta, Ga.
B. The Pure Oil Co., 35 East Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.

A. Everett T. Winter, 1978 Railway Exchange Building, St. Louis, Mo.
B. Mississippi Valley Association, 1978 Railway Exchange Building, St. Louis, Mo.
D. (6) $4,125. E. (9) $125.58.

A. Theodore Wiprud, 1718 M Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Medical Society of the District of Columbia, 1718 M Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Walter F. Woodul, 1828 Bank of the Southwest Building, Houston, Tex.
B. Angelina & Neches River RR. Co., Keltys, Tex., et al.
D. (6) $5,348.26. E. (9) $345.29.

A. Walter F. Woodul, 615 Capitol National Bank Building, Austin, Tex.
B. Humble Oil & Refining Co., Houston, Tex.
D. (6) $15,609.52. E. (9) $204.02.

A. Wood, King & Dawson, 48 Wall Street, New York, N.Y.
B. Committee for Broadening Commercial Bank Participation in Public Financing, 50 South La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. Frank K. Wooley, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 2300 Merchandise Mart, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,662.50. E. (9) $17.72.

A. Edward W. Wootton, 1100 National Press Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Wine Institute, 717 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.

A. Donald A. Young, 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Chamber of Commerce of the U.S.A.

A. J. Banks Young, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Cotton Council of America, Post Office Box 9905, Memphis, Tenn.
D. (6) $210. E. (9) $19.84.

A. Edmund A. Zabel, 1000 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States.
D. (6) $1,699.98. E. (9) $126.85.

REGISTRATIONS

The following registrations were submitted for the period from October 1, 1958, to January 20, 1959, inclusive.

(NOTE.—The form used for registration is reproduced below. In the interest of economy in the RECORD, questions are not repeated, only the essential answers are printed, and are indicated by their respective letter and number.)

FILE TWO COPIES WITH THE SECRETARY OF THE SENATE AND FILE THREE COPIES WITH THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES:

This page (page 1) is designed to supply identifying data; and page 2 (on the back of this page) deals with financial data.

PLACE AN "X" BELOW THE APPROPRIATE LETTER OR FIGURE IN THE BOX AT THE RIGHT OF THE "REPORT" HEADING BELOW:

"PRELIMINARY" REPORT ("Registration"): To "register," place an "X" below the letter "P" and fill out page 1 only.

"QUARTERLY" REPORT: To indicate which one of the four calendar quarters is covered by this Report, place an "X" below the appropriate figure. Fill out both page 1 and page 2 and as many additional pages as may be required. The first additional page should be numbered as page "3," and the rest of such pages should be "4," "5," "6," etc. Preparation and filing in accordance with instructions will accomplish compliance with all quarterly reporting requirements of the Act.

Year: 19_____

REPORT

PURSUANT TO FEDERAL REGULATION OF LOBBYING ACT

	QUARTER			
P	1st	2d	3d	4th
(Mark one square only)				

NOTE ON ITEM "A".—(a) IN GENERAL. This "Report" form may be used by either an organization or an individual, as follows:
(i) "Employee".—To file as an "employee", state (in Item "B") the name, address, and nature of business of the "employer". (If the "employee" is a firm [such as a law firm or public relations firm], partners and salaried staff members of such firm may join in filing a Report as an "employee".)
(ii) "Employer".—To file as an "employer", write "None" in answer to Item "B".
(b) SEPARATE REPORTS. An agent or employee should not attempt to combine his Report with the employer's Report:
(i) Employers subject to the Act must file separate Reports and are not relieved of this requirement merely because Reports are filed by their agents or employees.
(ii) Employes subject to the Act must file separate Reports and are not relieved of this requirement merely because Reports are filed by their employers.

A. ORGANIZATION OR INDIVIDUAL FILING:
1. State name, address, and nature of business.

2. If this Report is for an Employer, list names or agents or employees who will file Reports for this Quarter.

NOTE ON ITEM "B".—*Reports by Agents or Employees.* An employee is to file, each quarter, as many Reports as he has employers, except that: (a) If a particular undertaking is jointly financed by a group of employers, the group is to be considered as one employer, but all members of the group are to be named, and the contribution of each member is to be specified; (b) if the work is done in the interest of one person but payment therefor is made by another, a single Report—naming both persons as "employers"—is to be filed each quarter.

B. EMPLOYER.—State name, address, and nature of business. If there is no employer, write "None."

NOTE ON ITEM "C".—(a) The expression "in connection with legislative interests," as used in this Report, means "in connection with attempting, directly or indirectly, to influence the passage or defeat of legislation." "The term 'legislation' means bills, resolutions, amendments, nominations, and other matters pending or proposed in either House of Congress, and includes any other matter which may be the subject of action by either House"—§ 302(e).
(b) Before undertaking any activities in connection with legislative interests, organizations and individuals subject to the Lobbying Act are required to file a "Preliminary" Report (Registration).
(c) After beginning such activities, they must file a "Quarterly" Report at the end of each calendar quarter in which they have either received or expended anything of value in connection with legislative interests.

C. LEGISLATIVE INTERESTS, AND PUBLICATIONS in connection therewith:

1. State approximately how long legislative interests are to continue. If receipts and expenditures in connection with legislative interests have terminated, ☐ place an "X" in the box at the left, so that this Office will no longer expect to receive Reports.

2. State the general legislative interests of the person filing and set forth the *specific* legislative interests by reciting: (a) Short titles of statutes and bills; (b) House and Senate numbers of bills, where known; (c) citations of statutes, where known; (d) whether for or against such statutes and bills.

3. In the case of those publications which the person filing has caused to be issued or distributed in connection with legislative interests, set forth: (a) Description, (b) quantity distributed; (c) date of distribution, (d) name of printer or publisher (if publications were paid for by person filing) or name of donor if publications were received as a gift).

(Answer items 1, 2, and 3 in the space below. Attach additional pages if more space is needed)

4. If this is a "Preliminary" Report (Registration) rather than a "Quarterly" Report, state below what the nature and amount of anticipated expenses will be; and if for an agent or employee, state also what the daily, monthly, or annual rate of compensation is to be. If this is a "Quarterly" Report, disregard this item "C4" and fill out item "D" and "E" on the back of this page. Do not attempt to combine a "Preliminary" Report (Registration) with a "Quarterly" Report.

AFFIDAVIT

[Omitted in printing]

PAGE 1

A. American Federation of Musicians, 425 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Americana Associates, 134 East 32d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Buist M. Anderson, c/o Connecticut General Life Insurance Co., Hartford, Conn.
B. Connecticut General Life Insurance Co., Hartford, Conn.

A. Joseph H. Ball, 90 Broad Street, New York, N.Y.
B. American Steamship Committee on Conference Studies, 233 Barr Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Laurie C. Battle, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Manufacturers, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Robert J. Bird, 816 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Occidental Life Insurance Co. of California, 1151 South Broadway, Los Angeles, Calif.

A. Charles B. Bowling, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The National Grange, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D.C.

A. F. William Burnside, South Orange Federal Building, South Orange, N.J.
B. Dobbins, Woodward & Co.

A. David Burpee, Fordhook Farms, Doylestown, Pa.

A. Enoch D. Chase, 1102 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Mining Congress, Ring Building, Washington, D.C.

A. D. C. Cone, 401 Third Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Railway Labor Executives' Association, 401 Third Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Donald S. Dawson, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Consumers Life Council, Washington Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Dawson, Griffin, Pickens & Riddell, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Consumers Life Council, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Cecil B. Dickson, 1523 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. Dobbins, Woodward & Co., South Orange Federal Building, South Orange, N.J.

A. James J. Donohue, 1107 Warner Theater Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Asociacion Nacional de Ganaderos, Inc., Ciudad Trujillo, Dominican Republic.

A. Otis L. Frost, Jr., 1151 South Broadway, Los Angeles, Calif.
B. Occidental Life Insurance Co. of California, 1151 South Broadway, Los Angeles, Calif.

A. Garrett Fuller, 1210 Wyatt Building, Washington, D.C.
B. West Coast Steamship Co., Board of Trade Building, Portland, Oreg.

A. Gardner, Morrison & Rogers, 1126 Woodward Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Bigham, Englar, Jones & Houston, 99 John Street, New York City, and Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Jerry N. Griffin, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.

B. National Consumers Life Council, Washington Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Rodger S. Gunn, 4618 Highland Drive, Salt Lake City, Utah.
B. Liberty Under Law, Inc., Post Office Box 2013, Salt Lake City, Utah.

A. Harlan V. Hadley, 830 Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Taxation Committee, Automobile Manufacturers Association, 830 Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Raymond V. Hall, 245 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.
B. Pacific Gas & Electric Co., 245 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.

A. C. L. Hancock, 420 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.
B. Copper & Brass Research Association.

A. John A. Hartman, Jr., 67 Broad Street, New York, N.Y.
B. American Cable & Radio Corp., 67 Broad Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Glynn C. Hawthorne, 401 Third Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen, 318 Keith Building, Cleveland, Ohio.

A. Thomas J. Keyes, Jr., 404 AFL–CIO Building, Washington, D.C.
B. International Association of Fire Fighters, 404 AFL–CIO Building, Washington, D.C.

A. James F. King, 1825 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Manufacturing Chemists' Association, Inc., 1825 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Charles R. Larson, 1040 Warner Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Rural Letter Carriers' Association, 1040 Warner Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Hal Leyshon, 122 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
B. American Federation of Musicians, 425 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Liberty Under Law, Inc., Post Office Box 2013, Salt Lake City, Utah.

A. Jonathan Lindley, 740 11th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Credit Union National Association, Inc., 1617 Sherman Avenue, Madison, Wis.

A. Robert E. McCormick, 801 Sheraton Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Retail Merchants Association, 100 West 31st Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Albert E. Maddocks, 1883 South Seventh East, Salt Lake City, Utah.
B. Liberty Under Law, Inc., Post Office Box 2013, Salt Lake City, Utah.

A. Walter E. Maloney, 40 Wall Street, New York, N.Y.
B. American Steamship Committee on Conference Studies, 233 Barr Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Miller & Chevalier, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Aircraft Industries Association, Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Slator M. Miller, 723 Investment Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Hawaiian Sugar Planters' Association, Honolulu, T.H.

A. National Federation of Country Clubs, Inc., 503 Perpetual Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Joseph L. Nellis, 908 Colorado Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Consumer Organizations, Inc., 9424 Dayton Way, Beverly Hills, Calif.

A. Edgar L. Newhouse III, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Smelting & Refining Co., 120 Broadway, New York, N.Y.

A. John A. O'Donnell, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Philippine Sugar Association, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Hurley F. Offenbacher, 404 AFL–CIO Building, Washington, D.C.
B. International Association of Fire Fighters, 404 AFL–CIO Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Richard M. Oliver, 610 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Aircraft Industries Association, 610 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Edwin B. Patterson, 1523 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. K. M. Regan, Post Office Box 172, Midland, Tex.
B. Angelina & Neches River Railroad Co., et al., Keltys, Tex.

A. James W. Riddell, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Consumers Life Council, Washington Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Hugo J. Ripp, 811 North 22d Street, Milwaukee, Wis.
B. Brotherhood of Railway Clerks, 1015 Vine Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.

A. Donald L. Rogers, 730 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Association of Registered Bank Holding Companies, 730 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Henry F. Rood, Fort Wayne, Ind.
B. Lincoln National Life Insurance Co., Fort Wayne, Ind.

A. Wayne H. Smithey, 1200 Wyatt Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Ford Motor Co., Dearborn, Mich.

A. Thomas C. Thompson, Jr., 816 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Occidental Life Insurance Co. of California, 1151 South Broadway, Los Angeles, Calif.

A. Henry B. Weaver, Jr., 1225 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Electrical Manufacturers Association, 155 East 44th Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Joseph T. West, 401 Third Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen, 318 Keith Building, Cleveland, Ohio.

A. Russell J. Woodman, 401 Third Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The Order of Railroad Telegraphers, 3860 Lindell Boulevard, St. Louis, Mo.

A. John H. Young, 1411 Major Street, Salt Lake City, Utah.
B. Liberty Under Law, Inc., Post Office Box 2013, Salt Lake City, Utah.

A. Edmund A. Zabel, 610 Wire Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Jackson Day Dinner Address Delivered by Hon. Edmund S. Muskie, of Maine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STUART SYMINGTON
OF MISSOURI
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, March 5, 1959

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, on Saturday, February 21, the distinguished junior Senator from Maine [Mr. MUSKIE] spoke at Springfield, Mo., on the occasion of our annual Jackson Day dinner.

We in Missouri were privileged to play host to Senator MUSKIE. We know him as a gracious gentleman and a true servant of the people.

His speech on that occasion was inspirational to all of us who had the opportunity to hear him.

I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SPEECH BY HON. EDMUND S. MUSKIE, OF MAINE, AT SPRINGFIELD, MO., FEBRUARY 21, 1959

I can think of a number of reasons why it is good to be in Missouri.

First of all, there was the cordial invitation extended to me by your distinguished Senators, STU SYMINGTON and TOM HENNINGS, and your able Congressman, CHARLIE BROWN. To my previous awareness of their impressive records of public service, I have been privileged to add the warmth and friendliness of personal association. The fact that outstanding Americans of this stature should welcome such a contribution as I can make to this great gathering is a compliment I could not ignore. Secondly, I have long had a healthy curiosity about the State which entered the Union at the same time as my own State of Maine. The compromise, which made possible that historic coincidence, reflected sharp differences in public opinion with respect to the great political issues which were involved; but, more important, it was symbolic of the fact that, in America, such differences can be resolved, given mutual respect, patience, understanding, and good will.

Thirdly, I have enjoyed my associations in the Governors' conference with your personable and capable Governor, Jim Blair, who has a common sense knack of striking to the core of a problem which is familiar to one accustomed to dealing with practical, down-to-earth Maine Yankees.

Finally, this is the home of Harry Truman—the man who made great decisions with the sure touch and unhesitating courage of a man of clear vision—with an instinctive understanding of the importance of firm and positive leadership in his high office. Our times would be different and far more fearful but for this fact.

It is appropriate that Democrats should gather from time to time as you have here, tonight. It is understandable that we should indulge in a little partisan rejoicing over the victories which swept the country from coast to coast—from Maine in September to Alaska in late November. It is proper that we take stock of yesterday's results and tomorrow's prospects—which have never looked brighter. It is an opportunity to gain inspiration and enthusiasm from each other's presence. More important, it provides an opportunity to reevaluate our party's meaning for ourselves, our neighbors, and our children.

There has never been a time in our country's history when such a reevaluation was so vital to our survival and our well-being as it is today. We love freedom. We believe in the dignity and the worth of the individual. We hold that a society which recognizes and implements these principles is best calculated to achieve happiness for each of us and for our neighbors. Today, all of this is in deadly danger, and cannot survive unless we are alert to the danger and willing to mobilize all our resources to meet the threat—intelligently, effectively, and immediately.

Over the long years of its great history, the Democratic Party has demonstrated a sensitivity to the objectives of a free society, an alertness to the challenges and opportunities of each new day, and a willingness to move forward in the face of great obstacles and difficulties, which has been unmatched among political parties. This is not to say that every Democrat who ever lived has been, and is, more effective than any Republican who ever lived. We know this is not so. It is not to say the Democratic Party has always measured up fully to the responsibilities of any given day. We know this is not so. It is to say that, on the record, the Democratic Party has been a party of great achievements and that it will continue to be if we, who are entrusted with the stewardship of its affairs, will fortify ourselves with the best of its traditions.

What is required today?

Let me give you some thoughts expressed by Thomas Jefferson in 1816 in a discussion of the relationship between men and their governments:

"I am certainly not an advocate for frequent and untried changes in laws and constitutions. I think moderate imperfections had better be borne with. But I know also that laws and institutions must go hand-in-hand with the progress of the human mind. As new discoveries are made, new truths disclosed, and manners and opinions change with the change of circumstances, institutions must advance also, and keep pace with the times."

Expressed and implicit in these words are some impressive beliefs:

1. That change, new and more difficult problems, unforseen circumstances, are inevitable in human affairs.

2. That the human mind and the human spirit are capable of recognizing and adjusting to them.

3. That society and governments must be so constructed as to give free play to this great potential for adaptability and change.

4. That our country has the resources—material, human and ideological—to meet any challenge, however great.

5. That our people, within the framework of a free society, have a capacity for growth which can carry them to even greater heights of achievement: but only if they are constantly stimulated by broad and wide-ranging thinking, and by imaginative and purposeful leadership.

I say these beliefs are impressive. This is so because, although they are as old as our country, they are a fresh and ever-flowing fountain of inspiration and reassurance at a time when confusion tends to blur our vision, when doubt tends to paralyze action, when timidity and fear of the unknown feature tends to blunt our instinctive urge to grapple with the problems of the day in their full dimensions.

At the age of 81, with his youth and vigor far behind him, Jefferson said, in a letter to a friend:

"Men by their constitution, are naturally divided into two parties. Those who fear and distrust the people—those who identify themselves with the people, have confidence in them, cherish and consider them as the most honest and safe depository of the public interest."

I don't know what kind of a program Jefferson would present to us if he were President today. I don't know what, specifically, he would have proposed to do about the budget, education, the Soviet menace, our military posture, labor-management relations, or any of the host of problems which beset us. There are those who indulge themselves in the game of speculating upon such things for the purpose of suggesting Jefferson's approval or disapproval of some point of view. Jefferson himself was not so presumptuous. Many times, he warned against those who ascribe to the men of the preceding age a wisdom more than human, and suppose what they did to be beyond amendment.

I do know that Jefferson's attention was always focused on the ultimate objective of a free society—the advancement and well-being of the people. I know that his versatile and searching mind was not restricted by the straitjacket of outmoded and outworn ideas and methods, however worthwhile they may have been yesterday. I am confident that he would have chosen means and methods suited to the dimensions of the tasks with which we are confronted. He would have believed today, as he believed in his own day, that there is a greater risk in standing still than in moving forward, that a problem is not solved by half measures, that a problem does not disappear because it is ignored: That, above all, the American people are willing, able, and eager to know the truth, to understand the truth, and to assume the burdens and sacrifices which the truth indicates they must assume. I believe this about Jefferson because he understood the nature and the responsibility of leadership in a free society—leadership as demonstrated by the Jacksons, the Lincolns, the Roosevelts, the Wilsons, the Trumans.

What is the truth?

The truth today is that our position in the world, by any standard of measurement we chose to use, is incomparably weaker than at any other time since the dark days of World War II. The truth today is that there is less than full realization of this fact, and that there should be and must be if we are to make the hard decisions which are indicated. The truth today is that we are not being called upon to make the supreme effort that those in a position to know the facts should realize must be made. The truth today is that there is a lack of faith among too many that we have the resources, the stamina, and the guts to do all that must be done.

To these people of little faith, those who indulge in creative thinking are radicals.

To these people of little faith, those who honestly expose our weaknesses as a challenge to greater effort are purveyors of gloom and doom.

To these people of little faith, those who believe that a given problem cannot be solved without a greater effort are spenders.

To these people of little faith, our growth has stabilized at a level which holds little promise of greater things to come. In speaking of people, I am not thinking of individuals or of particular parties. I am, rather, personalizing an apathy, a complacency, and

a stagnation in thinking which is seeping out into the country and which can destroy us before a foreign enemy can get the chance.

To point out this weakness is not to say that the alternatives are prodigal spending, wasteful effort, or a frenzy of activity to do everything which comes to mind. There are things which government must do. There are other things which government should not do. There is a great broad area of desirable activity as to which we must be discriminating and intelligent in assigning proper priorities. There is room in this area for differences of opinion—differences which can and ought to exist as between the executive and legislative branches of government—differences which can and ought to exist as between Members of the legislative branch. It is only by exposing these differences, by subjecting them to the crossfire of debate that we can work out sound and enduring answers.

The current concept that the Congress has no prerogative and no duty to think independently, to reach independent conclusions, and to act independently in its sphere of activity is destructive of the very vitality of our democratic process. It must not be allowed to prevail.

It is in the area of things that must be done, that we must give our concentrated and immediate attention.

This has to do with our national survival—not just as an independent, geographically identifiable state—but as a vital, meaningful force which, by its leadership and by its example, can lift the world upward to ever higher levels of social and economic progress for men and women everywhere. Unless we are the latter, we will not always be the former. This suggests, I hope, that we are concerned with more than Maginot line security. We are concerned with more than a retaliatory capability which can destroy our potential enemy. We are concerned with more—and I should say something far different—than political domination of other areas of the world. We are concerned with demonstrating here, at home, and to the peoples overseas that our way of life does give us strength, that it does enable us to prevail over those who would destroy us, and that it is the last best hope of little people everywhere who yearn for opportunity, dignity, and freedom.

I say that we are concerned with this—and I mean concern with an emotion that we have never had to feel before. Our policies and programs since our beginnings have been based on the assumption that we had resources to burn, that no other nation could match them, that our way of life and our institutions had an irresistible attraction for peoples not privileged to enjoy them—the assumption of manifest superiority.

This is assumption that is no longer valid. What we are, what we have, and what we offer, are being weighed on the balance against the supposed attractions of an alien system. We are being judged by peoples who are not advocates of either democracy or communism, but who are concerned as to their own status in life and its improvement. To these peoples, we are no longer manifestly superior.

To capture their minds and hearts—and there are more than a billion of them—it is necessary that we utilize to the maximum every resource at our disposal—material, human, and ideological. We must live our national life with a fire, and enthusiasm, and a confidence in ourselves that we have always found it possible to summon in times of national crisis.

What does maximum utilization require?

It requires, first of all, that we become a progressively stronger economic force in the world, gaining strength not only for ourselves, but for peoples everywhere who seek to develop an economic climate favorable to the recognition of the dignity and worth of the individual.

It requires, secondly, the establishment of a military posture which is dynamic, not static; which utilizes to the full the tools of scientific research; and which unhesitatingly and firmly seizes every advantage and makes maximum use of every new development which promises to strengthen our sinews. Such a posture is the shield behind which we can mobilize the economic and ideological strength which will give us the ultimate victory.

Thirdly, that we develop every resource here at home. Measured by the tasks to be performed, there is plenty of work for all our people and they must all be kept busy to the limit of their skills and their capacities. We do not have enough scientists. We do not have enough teachers. We do not have enough doctors, nurses, psychiatrists, technicians of all kinds. Everywhere we turn, we find shortages of skills. Who says there isn't enough work to keep all Americans employed? There is work begging to be done. How do we fit the square pegs in the round holes?

One great bridge between the man and the job is the educational process. This isn't to say that with the proper school we can train anyone to do anything. It isn't to say that the answer to current unemployment is to send everyone to school. It is to say that we have great unfilled needs in the field of human skills, that we are doing too little about it, and that we cannot retain the image of America as the strength and hope of the world unless we utilize every potential talent which we have wherever it may be found. It is time to deal with a national problem by providing a national answer to it.

These are the kind of great challenges to which the Democratic Party traditionally rises. These are the great crises of the kind which the Democratic Party has always been eager and willing to meet. These are the needs for great leadership of the kind which the Democratic Party has so often been able to provide.

We won't do it today, or tomorrow, by sitting on our hands. We will not do it today, or tomorrow, by smugly glorying in past victories. We will not do it today, or tomorrow, without thinking without taking the people into our confidence—without asserting the creative and productive capacity which lies in the hearts and minds of a free people.

Someone once said, "The road that stretches before the feet of a man is a challenge to his heart long before it tests the strength of his legs." What he was saying is that the heart is often capable of greater decisions than the mind. The heart of America is its secret weapon.

New Legislation To Bring Relief to the Fishing Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS M. PELLY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 5, 1959

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, for reasons which are pretty generally known, fishermen and the fishing industry have been suffering from cheap foreign imports. Tariff relief under regular procedure which should have been available to the New England industry, for example, was denied because of factors of foreign policy relating to national security. That is not an easy obstacle to overcome.

One of the great problems of fishermen is an item of expense arising from the cost of insurance which runs into hundreds of dollars for each boat. As I understand it, the high claims and experience of losses cause the insurance underwriters to continually increase their rates.

There have been various suggestions as to ways in which the Federal Government might help. One of these has been to underwrite a portion of these insurance premiums, but knowing and sharing the prejudice against special subsidies, I have come up with a proposal which might indirectly contribute toward a solution by means of greatly reducing insurance costs.

The idea has been incorporated in a bill which I introduced today. This measure would extend medical, surgical, and dental treatment in hospitals and stations of the Public Health Service without charge to seamen on American-owned U.S. flag vessels in excess of 20 feet in length regularly engaged in fishing in international waters.

This medical care and hospitalization is available, of course, to our sailors and seamen in larger oceangoing boats. My bill would simply extend this service and by the saving to insurance companies through lesser number of claims result in a reduction in premium rates.

Here is a means of assisting the entire fishing industry. As I see it, all fishermen, Atlantic, Gulf, and Pacific coast, would benefit by my bill. Accordingly, I offer it for consideration with the hope it might invite united support from the fishing industry and thus encourage the Congress to give it utmost consideration.

Think Anew, Act Anew

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS H. KUCHEL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 5, 1959

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a speech I made before the San Francisco County Republican Central Committee last February 10 be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THINK ANEW, ACT ANEW

(Address by U.S. Senator THOMAS H. KUCHEL before the San Francisco County Republican Central Committee, Elks Club, San Francisco, Calif., February 10, 1959)

I suggest that a very special and fundamental responsibility devolves upon each of us who continues his basic Republican allegiance at Lincoln's natal celebration in 1959. For the strength of the traditionally American two-party system becomes pretty much of a question of what we Republicans now do and now say. That the system of two strong parties, not three or four or eight or ten—and God help us, not one—represents one of the greatest assurances for the maintenance of our free American political system no reasonable citizen can deny. The splinter parties of some Western nations

which require patchwork coalition ministries do not fit the American pattern. And the one-party system—the "one party or else" doctrine of Russia and of communism generally—is as painfully clear an example as I know of why the American people will never, never embrace the Red ideologies of Moscow. Our conception of freedom includes freedom of choice at the ballot box. It is unquestionably true that the two-party system, American style, has effectively prevented the destruction of individual liberty which the one-party Communist system has enforced.

Thus, for us who constitute the presently remaining membership of the minority party in California and in much of the United States what we do, what we say, as partisans, will have a telling—perhaps I can fairly say a crucial—impact upon the future of our wonderfully unique kind of personal and political freedom which the Colonies of 1776 fought for and won and sought to preserve in constitutional guarantees, and for which Mr. Lincoln, one of the greatest leaders in the cause of freedom in all recorded history, gave almost all his adult years, and gave his life as well.

What then, my fellow Republicans, can we now do, or begin to do, to attract to our banner men and women who are registered in the Democratic Party or who are registered in neither party, or who—though registered Republicans—habitually stay at home or habitually vote against Republicans?

Can we not first agree that the Republican Party deserves to win only when it represents the better, or the best, means of assuring the maintenance of our free constitutional system? This must be true, and we recognize that, on many occasions, maybe almost all, that question is entirely a matter of opinion of the people. And on many, many occasions, let the record show, the people of our State and country have voted Republican. I predict they will again.

Is it not also true that the best means of assuring—or of honestly trying to assure—the maintenance of this free Republic, is to chart our course, our partisan and our political course, as Americans as well as Republicans, on one basis and one alone—the old textbook maxim, "the greatest good for the greatest number"?

Mr. Churchill said to the American Congress in the early days of the war that in his father's time in Great Britain, it was deemed that government was meant "for the few and for the very few." He and his political party overcame that special interest creed when they came into power in England in the early days of World War II. The exhilarating path for Republicans to travel in 1959 is the way of government for the many and for the very many.

Mr. Chairman, friends, Lincoln and his fellow Republicans were abused and denounced in their day, a century ago, as dreamers and political radicals. Is there not some basis here, now, in this new era of human life, for us to rededicate our party to the Lincoln role, the role of neither dreamers nor radicals, but the role of one group of fellow citizens whose love of man's freedom strengthens them and gives them courage to keep it and, beyond that, to share it with all humankind?

It is the people—the best interests of all the people—which our Republican Party must strive to serve. That is the Lincoln tradition. And that is the way, my fellow Republicans, by which I believe the rehabilitation of our honorable political party must surely come.

This great century-old, free Republican Party of ours came into existence by the courage of those Americans who were determined to wipe out human bondage and to push on our frontier to the Pacific Ocean limits of this North American Continent. And it is in precisely that same spirit of man's freedom of opportunity and of life, and of a never-ending pioneering for new hopes and aspirations for all humankind which must rekindle our partisan spirit as we look forward to the presidential and congressional election of 1960.

The Republican Party must, and ought to, attract to its cause men and women from every walk of life and from every creed and color and race. Thus Lincoln's philosophy will live on in our party. We are, and we should be, dedicated to human freedom. We are an American party, and thus eternally dedicated to America and America's welfare. We ought to gain our strength as our country gains her strength: from having among our members citizens of diverse religious and racial ancestry, and from every walk and segment of our national life.

We are not, and we do not intend to be, a party of extremists. We seek man's progress by avoiding the two opposing poles on the political spectrum. We believe that man is entitled to a reasonable compensation for his toil, and we respect the virtues of thrift and savings. Thus, we want to consider the problems of both the wage earner and the person living on a fixed income. Republicans believe in free enterprise, but we do not intend to permit any group to take advantage of the people as a whole. We believe there is a national interest in the health and the economic well-being of all our people without condemning them to the regimentation of a welfare state. We believe there is a national interest in the proper education of our youth, regardless of color, and we applaud the Federal Government's record of reclamation assistance to western America under a policy initiated by the Republican Roosevelt over 50 years ago. We accept the responsibility of leadership in the cause of a just peace in the world, and we extend our hand of friendship to free peoples all around the globe.

To be given the people's faith, the Republican Party cannot be antilabor, organized or unorganized, nor can it be prolabor either. Labor reform legislation, on a national level, is long overdue and Republicans need here to keep the public interest uppermost in mind. We have had, alas, Republicans who have almost genuflected before some labor leaders. Those Republicans are just as offensive to the public weal as those other Republicans who automatically say "No" to anything which organized labor through their leaders espouses. In this connection, I suggest that we cannot shift with the winds. We cannot in one election campaign exalt the right of labor to bargain collectively, and to enjoy job security, and then, in the next election, advocate legislation to destroy job security or to undermine collective bargaining.

With equal finality, we, the Republican Party, decline to act as the political advocate of any business organization or individual, or, for that matter, of any special interest group, as against the great unorganized body of people as a whole. To the contrary, we—Republicans—ought, I think, now to rededicate our party to the splendid theme: "Let us raise a standard to which the wise and honest may repair."

Republicans, there is a tremendous record of constructive accomplishment by our party during these last 6 years. The earnest thanks of peace-loving Americans go to Dwight Eisenhower for helping to deter aggression and for fending off the terrible hazards of a red hot global conflict. America is waging peace. At home, in the early days of this administration, we banished wage controls and price controls when many of our Democratic colleagues demanded that they be continued as a part of what they called the needs of a planned economy in peacetime. The phony misnamed "excess profits" tax, with its unfair and uneven impact on business, was scrapped, as it ought to have been, over the anguished objections from the other side of the aisle. Excise taxes, on a Federal level, generally have been cut under this administration. Small business has been given tax relief. I think Republicans brought back a decent measure of fiscal sanity.

In the Lincoln field of human dignity, we passed the first civil rights law since the Civil War, and we did it over frenetic Democratic objections.

My fellow Republicans, all problems confronting our Nation are minor when measured against the threat to our national life and the lives of our people posed by international communism, and the policies which Soviet Russia has consistently practiced for at least the last 25 years, and her growing potential to wage nuclear war. All of us now know that from the date of our official recognition of Russia down through the years of the Second World War, the Russian Government, although professedly an ally in the war, was unremittingly advancing its secret policies aimed at the destruction of all free institutions. Soviet policy has utilized the techniques of indoctrination and propaganda. Infiltration has been advanced by two groups: First, the professional espionage agents who successfully sought secret information of a military character, particularly with reference to the atomic bomb; and second, the followers organized into cells and carefully nurtured in the deadly teachings which already have caused infinite damage to Western civilization.

Ever since the Second World War, the Western Powers have sought to achieve a lasting peace rooted in international law and justice. The beginning of these efforts was the Atlantic Charter, and continued through innumerable war and post-war conferences of varying effectiveness but the most productive of which was in this beautiful city when the Charter of the United Nations came into being.

Long before the war was well underway, Soviet wrecking crews were busily engaged in their deadly work. In the end they broke up the wartime alliance, violated war and postwar agreements, virtually paralyzed the United Nations with its "Nyet" and thus far have prevented any successful agreement for effective control of atomic warfare. The so-called peace treaties signed by Russia with the former Balkan States were only a means to achieve complete political subjugation of them. Now, some 17 have gone down the drain.

Now the Soviets have offered a new challenge to the West. They have handed us an ultimatum with a time limit, telling us to get out of Berlin or risk an all-out atomic war.

This is no idle threat, and we cannot be lulled into any false appraisal of Soviet motives or intentions, despite Mr. Mikoyan's charming suggestion that we must forget the past and look to the future. The Kremlin has been able to exploit, periodically, the earnest desire of the West to discover reasonable motives in Soviet policies by launching policies of peaceful coexistence. "We will bury you," you will remember Nikita S. Khrushchev has said, speaking about us, while his Chinese counterpart, Mao Tse-tung has declared:

"Political power grows out of the barrel of a gun. * * * Yes, we are advocates of the omnipotence of the revolutionary war, which * * * is good and is Marxist."

We have come to believe that dictators do mean what they say, a belief founded upon the painful experience of finally discovering that Hitler's "Mein Kampf" was a complete and factual statement of future Nazis' plans and actions.

Perhaps a fitting contemporary illustration of this thesis is furnished us by putting in juxtaposition the following news

item which appeared in a recent wire service news story from the town of Presque Isle, Maine:

"The management of the Presque Isle Star-Herald has reason to believe there must be news of international interest in its columns. The Aroostook County weekly said the Washington Embassies of the Soviet Union and the Polish Peoples Republic recently have ordered 1-year subscriptions. Presque Isle is the site of the Air Force Base which soon will be one of the Nation's first operational Snark guided missile sites."

This is only one form of the Soviet threat. At the 21st Communist Party Congress in Moscow a few days ago, Soviet Premier Khrushchev predicted that the balance of world economic power will soon shift to the Communist bloc. And by 1970, Khrushchev argues that the Soviet Union will outstrip the United States in productive capacity.

Soviet successes in achieving the goals set in their new 7-year plan between now and 1965, will, according to the Soviet Premier, "attract millions of new adherents to socialism and bring about changes not only in our country, but in the whole world."

While we may doubt the validity of these assumptions, we cannot afford to be sanguine about this newest form of Soviet competition. For Khrushchev reiterated his confidence that it will be by success in this economic competition that communism will triumph on the world scene.

The administration views these threats in their true dimensions. The President has declared our intention to maintain our defense forces in sufficient size to meet both the possibility of limited war and to retain their fundamental role of deterring all-out aggression. Unlike the Soviet's, our objectives are not conquest and control of other peoples. The President declared in his state of the Union message:

"We seek victory not over any nation or people but over the ancient enemies of us all: victory over ignorance, poverty, disease, and human degradation wherever they may be found.

"We march in the noblest of causes—human freedom.

"If we make ourselves worthy of America's ideals, if we do not forget that our Nation was founded on the premise that all men are creatures of God's making, the world will come to know that it is free men who carry forward the true promise of human progress and dignity."

Now there has been considerable discussion abroad in the land which questions the adequacy of our Armed Forces and weapons systems to meet the continuous military pressures of the Soviets. Let me remind you how difficult it is to answer charges about our defense posture. The President must weigh, in the most delicate manner, the advantage to other nations of any military or defense information made available to the American public. His recommendations for defense spending are always based on what the military joint chiefs of staff themselves recommend and, of course, on what the civilian service Secretaries and the Secretary of Defense recommend to him.

Listen to what the Secretary of Defense said to me, in writing, a few days ago:

"As Secretary of Defense naturally I have complete access to the best intelligence information available to this Nation. I also have the help of the top military brains in the country interpreting this information and developing a program to meet the threat to our national security.

"I can say to you that our present and planned programs adequately meet the requirement of protecting this Nation's security."

"This country must be in a position of sufficient retaliatory strength to deter a potential enemy from launching general war. We must be prepared to handle limited war situations effectively, so that our obvious readiness will deter such wars or keep them small and handle them quickly. We have need of maintaining the defenses of the continental United States. We must keep open the sea lanes which are essential to maintaining our commitments with allies throughout the world. All these needs have been carefully considered.

"It is my belief that the program provided in the new budget meets these needs adequately. This is not only my belief, it is also the view of the President.

"Moreover, it is shared by the Joint Chiefs of Staff, who have said to me in writing that they consider that the fiscal year 1960 proposed expenditure figure is adequate to provide for the essential programs necessary for the defense of the Nation for the period under consideration. The Chiefs state that they find no serious gaps in the key elements of the budget in its present form. While expressing these views as to the adequacy of the overall programs, each Chief does of course express some reservations regarding some of the program items of his own service."

A concomitant of our military policy which is designed to insure national survival, has been our mutual security program. Initiated shortly after the Second World War, it has continued to be of fundamental importance to the western alliance. As the President put it, "The need for economic growth among the underdeveloped countries continues to be of paramount importance to the enlightened self-interest of the economically developed nations, especially our own."

Since 1954, the Communists have seized upon the social and economic aspirations of the free world's less fortunate peoples, as fertile ground in which to extend Communist influence. Of the world's population, now estimated at 2,800 million people, 35 percent, or 950 million, are under the control of the Sino-Soviet bloc; 25 percent, or 700 million people, are located in newly independent countries like the Sudan, Libya, Ghana, and so on, with the remaining 40 percent located in the free world. The Sino-Soviet bloc, during the last year, applied more of its resources to expanding trade and credit ties with less developed countries than in any similar period since the start of its economic campaign.

Such aid is highly concentrated on selected targets, with 5 of the 17 countries which receive Soviet aid being recipients of 90 percent of the total. These five are Afghanistan, the United Arab Republic (Egypt and Syria), India, Indonesia, and Yugoslavia.

You can appreciate the relative facility with which Soviet policy can be adjusted quickly to seize the initiative in a moment's notice, whenever an opportunity is presented. The Kremlin needs consult nobody but itself in deciding what to do. Consider the much greater difficulty involved in a governmental system like our own, where agreement must be worked out between the executive and legislative branches of our Government, and thereafter, where foreign policy is involved, discussed with our free allies abroad.

Much of our concern must be with international affairs and the security of the Nation; yet all our efforts in this direction are pointed to one end, the right of each of us to develop along our own lines to the full extent of our ability.

But what of other problems confronting us? What is the Republican answer to domestic questions? Here I think Lincoln expressed what our philosophy ought to be when he said:

"The legitimate object of government is to do for a community of people whatever they need to have done, but cannot do at all or cannot so well do for themselves—in their separate and individual capacities.

"In all that the people can individually do as well for themselves, government ought not to interfere."

It is in keeping with this philosophy that the administration proposes to abandon altogether the model T machinery for helping farmers gain a fair price for their products and gear farm price supports to the open market.

The New York Times described current farm legislation as a chronic festering sore on the economy since it was adopted as an emergency measure at the outbreak of World War II. This legislation has cost the Treasury a billion dollars a year just to maintain storage facilities for farm surplus and nearly $5½ billion a year to carry out the price support program. I submit to you that this is not a legitimate object of government. "The need to reduce the incentives for excess production has been explicit in the three special messages I have previously sent to Congress," the President contended, and it remains to be seen whether the Congress, under Democratic control, will go along—and go along for the benefit of all the people.

"The material foundation of our national safety is a strong and expanding economy," the President declared in his state of the Union message, and central to that material foundation is the employment of every American at a job of his choice, in a place of his choice, and at a wage commensurate with his responsibility. We Republicans must support, as a national policy, legislation designed to encourage high employment and to protect the jobs of all Americans.

By the same token, we as Republicans believe the public interest requires labor reform legislation. Such legislation on a national scale is very long overdue. In the last Congress, I voted for such things as democracy in unions, including provisions for the secret ballot and specified terms for all offices, complete disclosure of union receipts and expenditures, with subpena power in the Secretary of Labor, and fines and jail sentences for failure to comply. I regret no legislation was enacted. I hope it will be this year.

Also central to a material foundation is an educational system which will insure adequate schooling to all our people. This does not mean that Government should supersede the States in their control of this historic function. It does mean that Government must continue its support of research especially in the physical sciences, but in the social sciences and the humanities as well. It does mean that our Nation must recognize a real relationship between education and survival. You may ask how much Government support? To that question no definitive answer can be given. No blanket program of massive aid-to-education is likely to achieve the promises of its advocates, although the fact is that the Federal Government has supplied aid to education since at least the time of Lincoln when the Land Grant College Act came into being.

As a party, we have an obligation to see to it that the teaching profession at all levels be made a more attractive work. We must attract greater participation in our party of young people and the members of the academic community. Plans to implement this idea are currently being developed and have the warmest support of the President.

There are many urgent problems confronting us as a Nation and as a party. For example, the crisis over civil rights precipitated by the public officials of some States to refuse to obey the law. We may remind our Democratic friends that the solution to the school problem offered by some members of their party has been to close the schools altogether. The Republican Party has been in the vanguard of equality before the law since its very inception. The civil rights law of the last Congress is the result of Republican

leadership, and we have a right to be proud of that accomplishment.

Our party has a rich heritage, the central theme of which has been the greatest freedom for the individual consistent with the basic needs of society. We hold to that noble idea even more strongly today. Let us then, as Lincoln said, "Think anew, and act anew" to strengthen our party and to merit and to receive the people's faith. Republicans in the next century must continue to hold high the banner of human freedom, as our party's first President so nobly envisioned.

Enforcement of Our Antismuggling Laws

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 5, 1959

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, during the past dozen years or so since the end of World War II there has been a considerable increase in the illicit traffic in narcotics throughout the world, and we know that there is much smuggling of narcotic drugs into our country. We also know that the growth of juvenile delinquency in recent years is attributable in large measure to narcotic addiction among teenagers, who are driven to commit serious crimes in order to obtain funds to purchase these drugs.

In a report to the United Nations Economic and Social Council regarding its session in Geneva in May 1957, the Commission on Narcotic Drugs discusses the resolution it adopted concerning the illicit traffic in narcotics. The resolution states:

ILLICIT TRAFFIC

The Commission on Narcotic Drugs, noting that the volume of illicit traffic in narcotic drugs throughout the world is considerable and that there are indications of an increase in this traffic, considering the seriousness of the problem of this traffic in its different stages (production, transit, consumption), recalling that the Economic and Social Council has, on several occasions, requested Governments to give particular attention to the control of illicit traffic—

1. Urges governments to apply strictly the provisions of Economic and Social Council resolutions 159 II A (VII), 246 E (IX), 436 C (XIV) and 548 J (XVIII).

2. Again urges Governments to take appropriate measures to combat the illicit traffic, in particular by:

(a) Increasing their efforts to detect and suppress the illicit production and illicit manufacture of drugs, and strengthening the measures for apprehending traffickers.

(b) Imposing on persons convicted of narcotic offences very severe penalties in every country.

(c) Reviewing preventive measures for the purpose of satisfying themselves that the competent administrative bodies have the power everywhere to combat the illicit traffic.

(d) Arranging for the direct exchange of information with the authorities which in other countries are responsible for the control of the illicit traffic.

(e) Discharging fully the obligations placed on the states parties to the international narcotics treaties, in particular so far as the communication of information relating to the illicit traffic is concerned.

Mr. Speaker, you will note that the resolution speaks of the increased volume in the traffic of narcotics and the seriousness of the problem. It then urges appropriate measures to combat this illicit traffic and recommends five steps. I should like to call your attention to step (a) which advocates strengthening the measures for apprehending those who traffic in narcotics, and step (c) which calls for a review of preventive measures to ascertain that the competent administrative agencies have the power to combat this traffic.

Regarding the first of these steps referred to above, it is interesting to note that instead of strengthening the ranks of customs enforcement officers whose task it is to apprehend traffickers in narcotics, their ranks have actually been reduced to a point where we now have fewer officers in the Customs Enforcement Division since its establishment in 1909.

Furthermore, in order to make up budget deficits, it has recently become customary to close customs offices on Federal holidays and to give the enforcement officers time off. Smugglers are quick to take advantage of this situation which provides them with a safe period in which to carry on their operations. It should be realized that law enforcement should be carried on at all times. Crime does not take a holiday.

Not to be confused with customs agents or customs inspectors, the customs enforcement officers are the only armed personnel regularly assigned to our ports of entry and international airfields on a 24-hour basis in order to detect and apprehend anyone engaged in smuggling activities. Thus the customs service has sole responsibility to prevent smuggling and its enforcement officers constitute our first line of defense against smuggling. It is imperative, however, that this remain a 24-hour-per-day service if is to be effective.

As for the other step listed above, that is, a review of the preventive measures to give the agencies the power to combat the traffic in narcotics, it is quite obvious that at the present time the competent administrative bodies do not have such power everywhere to stop this traffic. In the same connection, it is interesting to reproduce the opinion expressed a little over a decade ago by the then Commissioner of Customs in a letter to our distinguished majority leader, the Honorable JOHN W. MCCORMACK, when a reduction in the Customs appropriation was considered. Mr. MCCORMACK inserted that letter into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 11, 1947, and from it I quote the following paragraph:

Careful examination of the possibilities for meeting this situation (i.e. curtailment of activity) satisfied me that the only activity that can be discontinued without a substantial revision of statutory law is that directed toward the prevention of smuggling. While this is a clear statutory duty of the customs service, there is no statutory prescription as to how it shall be conducted and the effectiveness of our smuggling control has always depended upon the action of the Congress in furnishing funds.

This clearly shows that the extremely important work performed by the Customs Enforcement Division is not established by law. This was the time when the Customs Border Patrols were discontinued entirely and the Port Patrols were decimated to the point of ineffectiveness. The doorways of entry into our country remained wide open and practically unguarded. Narcotic control had ceased then, and soon thereafter we read in the newspapers of school children buying narcotics from peddlers and dopesters on our city streets.

It is absolutely necessary to expose the narcotics trade and the evil men who smuggle this poison into our country and force it into the inexperienced hands of thrill-seeking youths. Narcotics are smuggled in by ship and plane, as well as across our borders, and then distributed to the dope traffic. If we can succeed in plugging up this evil trade and the corrosion of human lives, we will have solved much of this problem. Several years ago, Harry M. Durning, the collector of customs for the port of New York, stated that only one out of every five ships entering New York can be searched for smuggled narcotics because of the lack of sufficient personnel in the customs service. This situation has not improved since then, if anything it is worse today.

Congress must take effective action to suppress this vile trade by giving the Customs Service the means and the personnel for the proper enforcement of our antismuggling laws. In order to achieve this, I am introducing a bill to establish a Customs Enforcement Division in the Bureau of Customs in order to improve the enforcement of the antismuggling laws. The purpose of the bill is to make statutory the position of the Customs Enforcement Officer and the Enforcement Division under which he operates. This branch of Customs was originally created by Executive order of President Taft, but since 1947 its effectiveness in enforcing antismuggling laws has been seriously impaired due to budget deficiencies.

In addition to narcotic drugs, the bill also advocates the enforcement of laws relating to the prevention of clandestine introduction of biological, chemical or radiological weapons into the United States. This is a very important phase of our national security for which adequate means should be taken now to safeguard our Nation against future dangers. It should be done through specially trained enforcement officers, with special equipment and established at strategic locations.

The bill stresses that the Customs Enforcement Division is to be a major law enforcement body with adequate and most efficient means and facilities available, including radio-equipped motor vehicles, small watercraft and other equipment, for use in enforcement work in our harbors, airports and along the U.S. coasts. Enforcement officers shall be assigned to carry out their activities on a 24-hour basis, and they shall be empowered to make searches of all vessels, as well as make seizures and arrests in accordance with U.S. laws.

It should be noted also that in enforcing the antismuggling laws the customs enforcement officer renders other

important public services. He helps safeguard the public health from diseases brought in by parrots, monkeys, and other animals used as pets. He helps protect our agriculture from destructive insects which accompany certain imported plants. He similarly helps protect the livestock industry from foreign animal diseases, such as rinderpest, foot-and-mouth disease, and so forth. Furthermore, he helps to apprehend stowaways who might be subversives, to intercept obscene and seditious literature, and the enforcement of export-control and navigation laws.

Passage of this bill would once again tighten the cordon of men in our ports of entry and deal a formidable blow to the nefarious peddlers of narcotics. It would make the enforcement of the antismuggling laws a mandatory function of the Bureau of Customs. Our failure to pass this bill will result in continued violation of our laws, increase in crimes, and growing costs to the Nation and to the individual taxpayer. Hospital facilities would have to be increased to handle drug addicts, State and municipal police forces would have to be increased to cope with crimes and criminals, and the budgets of welfare agencies would have to be increased to aid victims and their families.

Mr. Speaker, there is no doubt in my mind that parents, teachers, welfare workers, church leaders, civic organizations, and especially our young people, whose health, morale, careers, and their whole future life are at stake, will heartily support this legislation. For the sake of our Nation's future, Congress must safeguard our youth.

All-Out U.S. Effort To Combat Soviet Penetration of Asia, Africa, and the Mideast

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, March 5, 1959

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, it was my privilege to be the guest speaker at the World Affairs Council meeting in Troy, N.Y., on Friday, December 12, 1958. The subject of my address was "America Needs a Constructive Program in Asia, Africa, and the Mideast."

I ask unanimous consent that excerpts from that address be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpts from the address were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXCERPTS FROM ADDRESS BY HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, OF MINNESOTA, BEFORE THE WORLD AFFAIRS COUNCIL, TROY, N.Y., DECEMBER 12, 1958

I want to talk to you tonight about the challenges to the United States on the world scene.

I will base my remarks to a considerable extent on my findings during my recent 3½ weeks' trip in Europe, particularly my week in the Soviet Union.

Europe's challenges are many—the crisis over Berlin, the question of atomic arms for West Germany, the problem of German reunification, the controversy over proposed disengagement in central Europe, the disputes over free trade and the European Common Market, the Geneva talks on nuclear test suspension and surprise attack, and many other problems as well.

Most of these issues have been rather well publicized. But tonight I should like to turn to an even more crucial area, a less understood area, Asia, Africa, and the Middle East.

For one of the principal findings on my recent trip is confirmation of this fact—the Soviet Union is laying plans and executing plans on these developing areas to a degree that we of the United States have not begun to match.

Soviet agitation in these devoloping areas, Soviet propagandizing in them, has unfortunately long since begun to pay off in terms of rising Soviet influence and prestige there.

We need only look at the disturbing headlines in the United Arab Republic, in Iraq, in Yemen and elsewhere to see proof of that fact.

But most Americans regrettably do not yet perceive the overall dimensions of the Soviet threat in the underdeveloped part of the world.

In other words, in the years up ahead, unless we take immediate effective action, we are going to find that the grim problems which we now face, for example, in the Middle East, are multiplied manyfold in South Asia, Africa, and yes, in South America.

I, for one, believe that there is still time for us to maintain and strengthen freedom among the one-third of the world which is uncommitted.

As you know, it is my privilege to serve as chairman of the Middle East Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations. In that capacity, I have noted the many facets of the Soviet offensive in this part of the globe: the economic facet, such as Soviet purchases of Egyptian cotton; the military facet, such as Soviet barter of arms for that cotton; the cultural facet, such as artistic performers from Eastern Europe pouring in to the Middle East; the psychological facet, such as the playing on deep seated resentments, frustrations, and fears within the Middle East against Western Powers.

In all this, the Soviet Union is playing for enormous stakes. In the Middle East, it is playing for ultimate control of the billions of dollars of petroleum reserves lying beneath the hot desert sands. Indeed, everywhere, it is playing for access to raw material reserves upon which the Western World vitally depends, both for its factories and mills and for its earnings. Everywhere the target is people—discontented, disenfranchised, unhappy people—millions of them in the neutralist part of the globe.

The philosophy of the Kremlin is that the entire developing area of the world is in a state of revolution against present or past imperial ties with the West. The Kremlin believes, as Premier Khrushchev told interviewers, that the West has no right to seek to impose a status quo in the face of this anticolonial revolution. Premier Khrushchev has indicated without saying so that the Soviet Union has the right to advance this anticolonial revolution as it sees fit. But when he says "anticolonial" he means, of course, only Western colonialism; he does not include colonialism of Moscow or Peking.

By contrast, Premier Khrushchev denies the right of revolution in central Europe. Here he insists that the status quo—meaning Soviet imperial occupation—continue. And he further insists that the West cease and desist from any effort to impair that status quo.

This, then, is the inconsistency of the Soviet position. It is not a logical position, it is self-contradictory, but as usual, that does not bother the Soviets. For one pattern which they always observe and reject is what they regard as their own raw self-interest.

And they feel that their self-interest requires the exploitation of the conditions of Asia, Africa, and the Middle East—the exploitation of south Asia, for example, where income per capita still averages only $50 per year, the exploitation of hunger, hopelessness, fear and misery, illiteracy, and disease.

While I was in Moscow, I could see certain passes of the Soviet Asian pattern developing.

Let me refer to three such evidences:

1. In the streets of Moscow, in the theaters, the auditoriums, the schools, I could see a tremenodus proportion of visitors from Asia. Many of these visitors were from the Central Asian Soviet Republics which are part of the U.S.S.R. itself.

But many were visitors from Asian countries. For example, I spoke with students from Hanoi—the Viet Minh capital. I encountered youngsters from mainland China and other Asian countries.

Always the emphasis of the Soviet is on youngsters—youngsters who are the leaders of tomorrow, youngsters on exchange programs, youngsters who will work in Russia, not just for a year, but for many years, and whom they hope will ultimately return as the leaders in the Communist world of tomorrow.

2. In addition to the Asians whom we encountered, Mrs. Humphrey and I recall very vividly a Soviet motion picture which we saw entitled "Panorama." It is basically the American cinerama-type motion picture with three cameras projecting on a wide angular screen. Its subject was a travelog of the vastness of the Soviet Union.

But the most powerful part of the film was the sequence taken at a mammoth international student festival which was held in Moscow, attended by some 100,000 youngsters of whom around one-third came from abroad.

We cannot forget the sequence showing the students in particular from Asia and Africa, parading in the huge Moscow stadium, seating 110,000. The sequences were staged as a great propaganda spectacle, one which we know is designed for the eyes of Asia, as well as Europe.

3. And let me cite a third point now. The key theme of Soviet propaganda to the developing part of the world is:

"In 1917, we were relatively a primitive country. Now we are the second strongest industrial power on earth. What we have done you can do and just as fast. Follow our example."

This theme one could see throughout Soviet propaganda in Moscow. It has a powerful appeal to Asia-Africa. For these countries are experiencing what Prof. Arnold Toynbee has called a revolution of expectations.

These countries are impatient. They want to jump overnight from the age of kerosene oil lamps to the age of mammoth hydroelectric dams. They want steel mills and all the other symbols of Western industry, and they may be attracted to the Soviet mirage that only a collectivist society can fulfill their overnight expectations.

FOUR POINT PROGRAM

What then must be our answer to Soviet action and propaganda in the developing areas? Let me suggest the following program:

1. We must greatly increase our program of exchanges and leader grants with Asia, Africa and the Middle East. At present, for example, we have a total of 45,000 foreign students studying in the United States. This may seem like a large figure, but actually when you see the breakdown, country by country, you note how relatively thin is our

coverage of some of the distant countries which are the principal Soviet targets.

We have a great many Latin American exchanges, for naturally we are interested in inter-American relations. I hope that we will increase the number of students from this hemisphere studying here and the number of Americans studying below the Rio Grande. But I also hope that we will greatly increase the number of youngsters from elsewhere in the world, in addition to sending many of our young people to heretofore larger unfamiliar countries in the East.

2. In the second place, we must greatly increase our overall familiarity with Asia, Africa and the Middle East. We Americans have tended to be Europe-oriented for many reasons. Most of us stem from European origins. Europe traditionally has been the seat of power in the world, the seat of culture, of economic strength.

But a new day is dawning. No longer can we afford to be ignorant of or indifferent to the economics, the culture, the religions and aspirations of the Asian-African-Middle East area.

Our universities must develop centers of familiarity with the heretofore exotic cultures of the East. Our newspapers and magazines, television and motion pictures must seek to give still greater emphasis to these regions—not simply to the headline crises but rather to the long-range developing trends.

3. The backbone of our policy must be to strengthen the capacity of the newly emerged nations to fulfill their aspiration for a better life for their own people. Loans at more favorable terms than presently available through the Development Loan Fund, through the Export-Import Bank, the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, must be provided if, for example, the second Indian 5-year plan and similar efforts are not to flounder.

And as I have repeatedly stressed, we must use the bounty of America's soil, our farm crops, through Public Law 480 sales to antidote the hunger and the shortage of capital in these regions.

4. A fourth essential point in our program is that we come face to face with reality on the big problem of Asia which occupies so much of the thinking of Asian peoples—namely, America's future relations with mainland China.

As we are all aware, the question of recognition, as such, of Red China is one of tremendous complexity. It has moral, legal, political, economic, military, social, and other overtones, none of which can be ignored. The aggression committed by the Communist Chinese in Korea as confirmed by the indictment of the United Nations, still stands for all to see and remember.

What I am urging, however, is not any premature off-the-cuff approach to the complex problem of Red China. Instead, I am urging a factual reappraisal of U.S. Chinese relationships, so that we can carefully chart our future policy, based upon the best interests of our Nation and of mankind.

The minimum fact of the matter is that we cannot any longer permit a news blackout on Red China. We cannot afford to be as relatively ignorant as we are of precisely what is going on in that vast land mass of 600 million people.

We must have more facts about the mainland.

While I was in Geneva visiting at the World Health Organization, I saw one particular phase of the serious consequences of our lack of information about the mainland.

You will recall that the Asian flu virus which struck the United States and the rest of the world was first reported via health listening and reporting posts in places like Hong Kong, Malaya, Japan, and other countries on the periphery of the mainland. Fortunately, we had this advance warning that the virus was on its way. And so we were able to prepare vaccine for our citizens. Even with that vaccine, our economy suffered a serious loss in working days because of Asian flu illness.

The important fact to remember, however, is that the first news about Asian flu virus originated inside the Chinese mainland, but it did not reach the outside world in time. The result is that 2 crucial months elapsed before the world learned that a new strain of type A virus with epidemic possibilities was on its way. Only subsequently when a letter arrived from the mainland to a WHO official was this fact confirmed: The virus could have been attacked 2 months ahead of time—if only there had been better communications with the mainland.

So the feeling among many health officials is that the world cannot afford to continue to be ignorant about even the most elementary health facts inside the Chinese land mass.

Even, however, if this health factor did not exist (and it does), the question is: How long can even the most elemental contacts between the West and mainland China be barred?

These are problems which cannot be ignored. The Peking government is, of course, seeking to exploit our interest in facts such as those I have mentioned above. We know that it has failed to date to fulfill its obligations as a member of the society of man. It has much to account for to the conscience of the world. These facts, too, must not be forgotten.

But above all, we must ask ourselves the question: How best can freedom be maintained and strengthened with all of Asia, Africa, and the Middle East? Closing our eyes or "sweeping issues under the rug" can hardly serve to satisfy the needs of our Nation.

Unemployment Compensation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK M. COFFIN
OF MAINE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 5, 1959

Mr. COFFIN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to place in the RECORD, on behalf of my distinguished colleague from the State of Maine, Mr. OLIVER, and myself, a statement regarding the unemployment situation in Maine, and its implications regarding proposals for legislation to improve the unemployment compensation program.

The continuing unemployment crisis, with its attendant human suffering, waste of productive capacity, and demoralization of workers and their families, demands early action by the Congress. There is a danger of becoming callous to the needs of the millions of unemployed as the recession stretches out beyond the shock of the initial job losses. Within a month the temporary Federal program extending benefits to workers who have exhausted their eligibility under the unemployment compensation program will cease, even for those workers in the 17 States which have taken advantage of this gesture toward the plight of those without work through no fault of their own. As unemployment continues, unless necessary legislation to establish adequate benefit levels and payment duration is adopted, the recession will tend to be self-perpetuating as purchasing power is reduced even further.

In our own State there are some 40,700 persons unemployed—10.9 percent of the total working force. In some communities the percentage is two to three times higher. Of those without jobs, 19,400 are now receiving unemployment compensation payments. In less than a year, 32.7 percent of those eligible for unemployment compensation payments—9,900 of the jobless—have exhausted their benefits. This means an additional burden on towns for relief payments at a time when there are increased demands for education expenditures. On April 1, the beginning of the new benefit year, some of these workers will receive payments again, but at a reduced rate.

The Maine State Legislature has closed the door to any improvement in the unemployment compensation program at this time. By refusing to extend the benefit period, even on a temporary basis, and by refusing, for the second time within 1 year, to take advantage of the Federal emergency program, they have dramatized the need for Federal action to establish adequate standards in the unemployment compensation program to deal with extended recessions.

There are many ways of looking at the impact of unemployment. We are conscious of the 4.7 million persons without jobs across the country; the empty factories, sitting idle in a land of plenty; bills in the home of an unemployed worker, where even inadequate unemployment payments have stopped, where children are hungry and where hope is dim; and lost purchasing power which reduces demand for products and causes other unemployment. However we view the problem, a crying need confronts us. Congress must take action and adopt legislation for Federal standards for unemployment compensation and extended duration for the payment of these benefits. Such action will give our economy needed stimulus and it will restore hope where there is fear. The legislation which we are supporting will not increase the Federal budget and it will not contribute to inflation. It is a minimum step designed to combat the recession and provide a basis for confidence for those who are without work.

Debt Reduction and Government Spending

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 5, 1959

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, as one who has long been concerned over our apparent unwillingness in Congress to play fair with generations of Americans

yet unborn, February 25 was a red-letter day for me. I do not know when I have been more heartened or encouraged than I was on hearing two Texas colleagues come out squarely, not only for a balanced budget, but for a sensible start toward paying off our debt—toward lifting the staggering mortgage we have all too heedlessly placed upon our children's futures.

Though the plan specifically advanced the other day involves no new idea, as its sponsors freely concede, I truly believe the Wright-Ikard resolution points the way to solvency. Of course, pointing—just pointing—is really pretty pointless, unless one is willing to travel in the direction pointed. In government, as in each of our households, there is little difficulty in formulating a balanced budget. The trick lies in living up to one—in showing enough fortitude to say "no" to our own wants and desires until such time as a family or a government is living on its income.

We are fortunate that, unlike many of the problems confronting Congress, this one is entirely uncomplicated; even a schoolboy knows that he cannot regularly spend more than he regularly takes in without facing bankruptcy. He knows, too, that incessant borrowing to meet regular current expenses will only beget the need for heavier borrowing to meet interest costs, and will ultimately destroy his credit, and with it, himself.

I am perfectly confident that the Wright-Ikard resolution will be roundly endorsed by those of us who have tried consistently, over the years, to tighten our governmental belt to the point of solvency. What encourages me mightily is the fact that, judging by the speeches made here the other day, the resolution will apparently command the support of a good many others, as well, some of whom have, to say the least, not acquired any reputation as nickel-nursers during their political careers. That strong support for fiscal responsibility should develop, and that it should spring from some of the quarters where it appears to be developing, is indeed most heartening.

But while this resolution, as I said, points the way, let us not kid the public about what it can actually accomplish. Any proposed budget whether submitted by a Republican or a Democratic administration, can be only a list of projected expenditures measured against an estimate of anticipated income. No administration can stipulate the amount of money to be expended nor can it determine in any way the amount of the Government's income. Only Congress can appropriate money, and even Congress can only estimate the anticipated revenues from taxes imposed by the Congress. Just as in our households, all the "budgeteering" any administration may do, and all our directions to a Treasury Secretary to include a sum for debt retirement in his anticipated expenses, will not mean a thing in the world unless we here in Congress show the fortitude and determination to live within our governmental income. We can neither wish nor legislate away the obligations we have already contracted, nor can we simply direct a Treasury Secretary to do something about it if we ourselves fail to show a self-discipline to match our heralded good intentions.

As a gentleman from Wisconsin so aptly put it the other day, "all new recruits to the economy block" are certainly to be welcomed with open arms by an encouraged minority and a grateful Nation; and surely no one would be so mean as to suspect that any Member's votes might not jibe with his avowals. However, I cannot help but recall a Democratic leader's recent admonition about setting a coyote to guard the herd of sheep. Well, our Federal expenditures are based on votes, not speeches; and after a series of sheep killings, most of us would tend to judge a dog's trustworthiness, not by the wag in his tail, but by the wool in his teeth.

Principles Which Should Guide the Republican Party

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLIFFORD P. CASE
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 5, 1959

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an outstanding speech by Secretary of Agriculture Ezra Taft Benson at a recent meeting in New Jersey. His frank statements about the principles which should guide the Republican Party deserve the most thoughtful consideration.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE EZRA TAFT BENSON, AT NEW JERSEY REPUBLICAN STATE COMMITTEE FUND RAISING DINNER, ESSEX HOUSE, NEWARK, N.J., FEBRUARY 25, 1959

It is an honor and also a pleasure for me to be here with you tonight in the home State of your outstanding Senator, CLIFFORD CASE. He typifies the high quality Republican congressional delegation that New Jersey has sent to Washington. They're doing a good job for New Jersey and the Nation.

I'm happy that this district has continued its Republican representation in Congress with GEORGE WALLHAUSER hard at work in his first term. We all wish his predecessor, Bob Kean, were in the Senate. However, we're pleased that New Jersey is maintaining its healthy ratio of nearly 2 to 1 Republicans in Congress. I'm sure your goal is to improve even further this majority—meanwhile yours is an excellent example for Republicans throughout the Nation.

It is my privilege to bring to this meeting the greetings of our great President, Dwight D. Eisenhower. His leadership is a challenge to us all.

I want to pay tribute to Senator CASE and the able representation he is giving your State in the Senate.

Senator CASE has shown a keen understanding of agriculture. It would be easier to get constructive, sound farm legislation if we had a few more like him in Congress.

We need him there for many more years. He's setting a good example for all of us by having already started working for 1960. Senator CASE, we all pledge you our wholehearted support.

With such men as New Jersey Republicans have sent to Washington, I do not fear for the future of our party. I see no reason for any of us to fear the future as long as we face facts, stick to our principles and begin working now for victory in 1960 and beyond.

As Chairman Meade Alcorn said in Des Moines:

"We have a great party. Throughout its history of more than a century, the Republican Party has consistently risen to great challenges. Its greatest hours have often followed time of adversity and even defeat."

This is the first large Republican audience I've addressed formally since the election last November when we took a plain, out-and-out beating. We were licked pretty thoroughly from coast to coast with a few notable exceptions, some of which, I'm glad to say, were here in New Jersey.

But there are no alibis. From President Eisenhower on down, there have been no alibis. And I want to tell you tonight that I'm proud to be a Republican and I believe you are too. In the hour of our defeat is our greatest challenge.

It takes a defeat now and then to make us take a hard look at ourselves—and where we've been and where we're going.

It takes adversity sometimes to bring into focus the principles for which we stand—to recognize anew those ideals which have made republicanism a symbol of America since the days of the first great Republican President whose 150th year of birth we are currently observing.

Abraham Lincoln tasted defeat often in his rugged life. Don't forget that Lincoln's defeat of 1858 was transformed into the victory of 1860. His victories were few, though memorable. In virtually the very hour of his greatest victory tragic death overtook him. Yet even as he rose to become a greater and greater man from each of his life's defeats, he has risen in death to a degree of immortality accorded few men. He has achieved a permanent victory. He truly belongs to the ages. And as Republicans we are humbly proud it was Lincoln—100 years ago—who led our party to the White House.

Lincoln's party is made of much of the same stuff. Even before the final devastating vote total was tabulated last November, Republicans from coast to coast were saying: The 1960 campaign begins today.

Not for a moment have I seen any signs of defeatism. Ideas were immediately advanced toward strengthening the party for 1960. The Congress assembled with new and vigorous Republican leaders on both sides of the Capitol.

There were signs of fight and vitality at the party's conclave in Des Moines in late January. There is a strong feeling of strength within the administration under the leadership of President Eisenhower and Vice President NIXON. I sense much of that same vigor here tonight.

This is an opportunity then for self-examination, for restating our principles, in this hour of uncommon challenge.

The Republican Party must be first of all a party of principle. It must stand as a rallying point for sincere, patriotic, and enthusiastic people who want good government in this blessed land.

As a great midwestern newspaper put it recently in an editorial entitled "First Principles," if the party "must compromise its character to win, the victory is better lost." I call your attention to this because character is the one thing we can build in this life and take with us into the next. The integrity of the Republican Party is dependent upon the character of its members and supporters. When you give freely of your money to a political party—as you have here to-

night—you have a right to expect, and the party has a duty to reflect, character-building qualities. This means to formulate and adhere to sound basic principles.

The Republican Party must be more interested in preserving and strengthening the competitive system—more interested in real Americanism—than in winning the next election.

Here are some of the basic principles which I believe we as a party should adhere to religiously:

First. We should follow those courses of public action which seek to build character and integrity. We must hold tenaciously to those basic concepts which have built this great Nation. What is right. What is best for the Nation. These objectives should guide us. This is so basic a matter that I need not dwell further upon it, except to say that such a concern has motivated my every act during more than 6 years as Secretary of Agriculture. If a thing is right it should be done. And if a thing is right, in the long run, it will also be the best politics. If the time should ever come in this country when this is not true, it will be a sad day for America.

Second. We should pursue public policies which seek to keep men free. Free agency is an eternal God-given principle. The struggle for freedom is a never ending one. We have an obligation to unborn generations to leave this country in a state more conducive to freedom of individual action than we found it.

With respect to agriculture, one of the principal goals of this administration has been, is now, and will continue to be to unshackle the farmer from burdensome Government controls and to restore to him the ability to take his full part in the dynamic economy that has made this Nation the envy of the world. Our goal is a prosperous, expanding and free agriculture.

As the 1952 Republican platform stated so well, "the tending of the soil is a sacred responsibility. * * * Any program that will benefit farmers must serve the national welfare. And a prosperous agriculture with free and independent farmers is fundamental to the national interest."

The issue is clear indeed. Are the people in this country to manage their own economic affairs? Or, are they to be managed from Washington? Which better serves our individual interests and the Nation's welfare? Shall Government continue to subsidize the various segments of the economy, including agriculture, in such a manner that it also takes complete control? Or shall Government implement private decisions and actions in the role of a servant or partner?

Third. We must stand firmly and unequivocally for the free enterprise system. We enjoy many economic benefits today because great Republicans devoutly defended public policies which had as their aim the enhancement of a capitalistic economic system, with its emphasis upon private ownership and private management.

Our abundant blessings have come to us through an economic system which rests largely on three pillars:

1. Free enterprise, the right to venture, to choose.

2. Private property, the right to own.

3. A market economy, the right to exchange.

This means permitting—not preventing—the market forces of supply and demand to allocate resources into the most productive channels and to determine the rewards for hard work and honest endeavor.

Fourth. We must keep Government from trespassing on private initiative. Lincoln's precept, as emphasized by President Eisenhower, that the Government should do for citizens only that which they cannot do for themselves is the Republican philosophy of government. Republicans will continue to wage a hold-the-line battle on this threat.

This administration has made progress in getting the Government out of your business. The Government is in too many businesess now. It is not right for the Government to be in business in competition with its own taxpaying citizens.

Fifth. We must ever be mindful of our traditional Federal-State relationship. This administration has been determined to reverse the trend to bigger and bigger Federal Government. We will continue our fight to strengthen the States. The Federal Government did not create the States of this Republic. The States created the Federal Government.

State and local governments must accept the responsibility for problems that are essentially local and State problems. Inevitably, in centralized Federal programs the money is not as wisely spent as if the States participated financially. We believe that a larger proportion of our tax dollars should be spent at local and State levels.

Sixth. The Republican Party stands for the expansion of markets and the strengthening of our private marketing machinery—not Government handouts. Only in this way can we insure that honest economic effort will be amply rewarded.

As our most recent platform emphasizes, a sound program for agriculture, or for any other segment of the economy, must create the widest possible markets and highest attainable income for our people.

I refer to our platforms because we do not emphasize often enough just what we stand for as Republicans. Although expressions of differences of opinion during the drafting of a platform are healthy and desirable, once the party has decided upon a course of action, we should close ranks and stand firm. I mention this because, as you know, the administration's farm program, based upon the party platform, has experienced some damaging opposition from within the party. This is destructive, not helpful.

The 1956 platform makes it clear that the Republican farm program does not envision making farmers dependent upon direct governmental payments for their incomes. Rather it underscores the principle that our objective is the building and expansion of markets at home and abroad and the development of new uses for farm products. The platform recognizes, as this administration has asserted since the day it took office over 6 years ago, that a Government warehouse is not a market. Farmers want to produce for markets and not for Government bounty.

Capitalism—through our God-given freedom of choice—not government decree, creates markets. Capitalism not government decree can best reward productive effort. This the Republican Party should never forget else it fall by the wayside in its struggle for public support. What is true of agriculture is also true of other segments of our economy.

Our economic order is not perfect, because it is operated by imperfect human beings. But it has given us more of the good things of life than any other system. Let us admit the weaknesses that exist. Let us work aggressively to correct them. But let us never make the catastrophic blunder of putting the chains of big government on our basic economic freedom.

Seventh. The Republican Party stands for fiscal integrity.

Closely allied with the trend toward bigger and bigger government is the tendency toward loose fiscal policy. This is of the utmost concern to every citizen. A nation can hang itself on the gallows of excessive public debt, and we are no exception. The Republican Party believes in fiscal integrity, in living within our income especially in peacetime prosperity such as we enjoy today.

For the coming fiscal year, the President has presented a budget of $77 billion. It is a balanced budget, even though it is the biggest budget in our peacetime history. Yet some of our expert thrift opponents have called it a skinflint budget.

Actually, as the President stated, it will "help prevent further increases in the cost of living and the hidden and unfair tax that inflation imposes on personal savings and incomes."

It has been truthfully said that our free enterprise democracy is the greatest economic system the world has ever evolved. But there is one controlling requirement, and it must never be overlooked. The system is based on solven government and sound money. It is in this requirement that we have allowed ourselves to become weak.

We cannot spend ourselves into higher prosperity but we can spend ourselves into real trouble. Nor can we preserve our prosperity and our free enterprise system by following a reckless policy of spending beyond our income in peacetime. I hope and pray that the present Democratic leaders of Congress will act in a way to avoid the label of a spendthrift Congress which is already being attached to it by many of our right thinking citizens who have watched with deep concern its actions in recent weeks.

The great majority of our people need to become aware of the dangers they face from ever bigger government and loose fiscal policy.

We must wake up. We must alert the various forces in our citizenry to make sure of two things: First, whatever funds are really needed for defense, for space exploration, and for other essential military and civilian purposes must be provided, and provided soundly.

Second, we must continue our fight to eliminate waste, duplication, continuance of unsound governmental subsidies and services no longer needed. We must live within our income. We must keep our economy sound. It cannot be done by going further into debt. We must maintain fiscal integrity.

We know that our dollar tobogganed in value to 52 cents from 1939 to 1952. Today it is worth about 48 cents. This has hit our farmers hard. From 1939 to 1952 farm costs more than doubled. Since 1958 farmers' costs have increased only 4 percent.

We know what inflation has done to the people of France where the cost of living today is 37 times what it was about 30 years ago.

I am told that a pound of butter that cost 10 francs in 1927 is 410 francs today.

Don't say it can't happen here. The people of France never thought it would happen there.

All of us as Americans have a patriotic responsibility not to contribute to the inflation danger by needlessly building still higher the mountain of total debt.

Here are some of the things we can do to meet President Eisenhower's objective of establishing a firm economic foundation for the months and years ahead:

First. We must live within our means, and that means to me a balanced Federal budget.

Second. We must strive for price stability as a national goal as proposed by the President in his economic report to the Congress.

Third. We must maintain a sound credit policy and guard against the danger of low-cost credit which can feed inflationary appetites.

Fourth. We in the Federal Government must set an example of stability for the whole economy. Certainly here President Eisenhower is exercising vigorous leadership. For example, he recently established a Cabinet Committee on Price Stability for Economic Growth, of which I am privileged to be a member. We are already at work.

Fifth. We must see to it that fair competition operates in our economy. This we are

doing through judicious application of the antitrust laws, for example.

Part of our overall responsibility is to do all in our power to make sure that our Government programs are sound and realistic. I am particularly interested that this be true of our farm programs.

What is the agricultural situation today? Presumably, in this audience, there are not many directly involved with farming as an occupation. But agricultural policy is of national import and is a concern of us all.

Most of you know we are plagued by large surpluses, but only in a very few crops. Remember, when you hear and read about our surpluses and their shocking cost, that most of agriculture is healthy today and that our farmers—the best in the world—are doing a wonderful job. Only 12 out of 250 farm products produced commercially are Government supported.

But bear in mind, also, that we should be thankful for the blessing of abundance. We should be grateful that our problems are those of oversupply rather than scarcity. Not many peoples in the world can say this.

If we look at our agriculture over the broad scope, it is today a fairly bright picture.

Production is at the highest levels in history, so is gross and per capita farm income.

Farmownership is at its highest level, and so is the farmer's net equities.

Transportation, telephones, television, electricity, and other aids to abundant living are more widely available than ever before.

The standard of living on our farms is the highest we have ever known.

There are still serious unsolved problems, including the cost-price squeeze, though we are making progress.

Farming is a hazardous occupation.

Farmers are not as highly organized as other groups in our economy. They have only limited control over the supply of their products. In other words, they lack adequate bargaining power. However, they are moving in the right direction through their farmer-owned and farmer-controlled organizations.

Most of agriculture is free of controls. And this free part, representing more than four-fifths of our agriculture, is doing fairly well. The problem narrows down to a few crops—only 5 of them controlled—for which outmoded programs have been too long continued in the mistaken belief they would serve farmers.

The legal requirement that the Federal Government support a few crops at unrealistic levels is pricing us out of world markets and may be doing irreparable harm to vital exports. For example, as is generally recognized, cotton has lost markets at home and abroad—to foreign producers and to manufacturers of synthetics. Tobacco is pricing itself out of markets at home and abroad also.

But at this moment the classic example of our mistake is in wheat. After the legislation enacted at the last session of Congress, wheat today comprises a very major part of the problem. If you combine wheat, corn and cotton you have represented 85 percent of the Government inventory of price supported commodities. But these three crops produce only 20 percent of the total cash farm income.

We are growing much more wheat than we can consume and sell abroad. Most of the costs under the wheat program result from the production of a comparatively few large growers; in fact, to less than 10 percent of those who grow wheat.

The obvious answer to this problem is to eliminate as rapidly as practicable ineffective controls and use price supports at levels that will preserve and build markets.

Price support programs of a realistic nature can be a valuable tool in helping to facilitate orderly marketing. This administration has so considered them and so used them, except where the law required their mandatory use at unrealistic levels.

On July 1, 1959, it is estimated that the Commodity Credit Corporation investment in commodities for which price support is mandatory will total $7.6 billion. All but $100 million—$7.5 billion—will consist of these crops for which price support is mandatory: Corn, cotton, wheat, rice, peanuts, and tobacco.

Yes, price supports are valuable, but they should not be used to destroy markets and fill warehouses.

But there are areas in which Government can provide permanent assistance to help the American farmers achieve adequate income. Important areas, for example, are through public research, education and market expansion.

During the past 6 years the budget for agricultural research has more than doubled. Any long-range farm policy which is going to serve agriculture and the Nation must give a prominent place to research, education and market expansion.

American agriculture—our farmers, ranchers, and their families—has been victimized during the past 10 years through the failure to make such needed changes in old, outmoded legislation. Many of our farm families will continue to reap the sad economic consequences of obsolete rigid programs unless recommended changes governing our price support laws are made without delay.

The President has pointed the way to necessary changes again this year. I have amplified them in appearances before both Senate and House Agriculture Committees. It is my hope that the Congress recognizes the urgency of the situation and will make the adjustment that only Congress can make.

Only in this way can we achieve the objective which we seek—a more prosperous, expanding, and free agriculture for all America.

As Republicans we must stand up and be counted for what we believe to be right. It is not too early to start, especially for you here in New Jersey. I understand you have a vital State election coming up in November.

The way to victory is through hard work. First, get the best possible candidates for the legislature, for if anything was proved last November it was that a sound and an appealing candidate is one of the basic ingredients of victory. Second, work hard for their election by dint of plugging away on a door-to-door basis.

We Republicans have a good story to tell. But we must sell that story, and go forth as missionaries of republicanism. Thus, I was most pleased to note the plans for getting our story across to the American people that were developed at the recent meeting of the national committee.

We must continually be thankful for the blessings of good government, but, at the same time, be eternally mindful that this God-given blessing is ours only because there are those who fought and always will fight to preserve it.

Yet these very blessings could prove to be our undoing unless our perspective is right and our idealism more concerned with eternal standards and value than with material gain and worldly honors.

History tells the story again and again. As nations become wealthy and standards of living rise the tendency is to concentrate on preserving material security, not on keeping ever fresh and alive the basic concepts that made the Nation great. Security is too often sought as an end in itself. That is our mortal danger in this perilous age. Our Nation, established on great spiritual and moral principles, cannot afford to lose its sense of uprightness. We as a people must keep our sights raised above the dollar sign. We must look beyond material things.

In all this we must hold a proper regard for the importance of our political faith. I believe it no exaggeration to say that world peace and our national security depend directly on the maintenance of the free-enterprise system, which is the foundation stone of the Republican Party.

The maintenance of peace, of course, is the No. 1 goal of any God-fearing people. Thank God, this Nation under the unwavering leadership of President Eisenhower has maintained the peace.

The President would be the first to give high credit for our role as keeper of the peace to a courageous, brillant leader who has been stricken seriously ill. I refer, of course, to our great Secretary of State, John Foster Dulles.

Lincoln tasted defeat in 1858 but he led the Republican Party to victory in 1860. One hundred years later—in 1958—our party suffered defeat; so let us resolve to let Lincoln's example spur us on to victory in 1960.

With God's help, we will build a prosperous, expanding and free agriculture in a prosperous, expanding and free America—an America which is economically, socially and spiritually sound.

Thomas G. Masaryk: Defender of Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND

OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 5, 1959

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, Saturday March 7, is the anniversary of the birth of Thomas G. Masaryk.

It is especially appropriate for us in the United States to honor Thomas Masaryk. Here was a man who, as the founder and first President of the Czechoslovak Republic, stood for the principles embodied in the Preamble to the Czechoslovak Constitution, which bears a close resemblance to our own. The preamble unequivocably states the desire to consolidate the people in a Republic which shall establish a reign of justice, contribute to the welfare of all citizens, and secure the blessings of liberty to coming generations.

In it was stated also, that it was the desire of the newly formd Republic to take its place in the family of nations as a member at once "cultured, peace-loving, democratic, and progressive."

The ideals of this new nation were those of Thomas Masaryk, who led it, and who genuinely stood for all of these things. Among his personal characteristics was a passionate love of truth. He advocated the scrupulous preservation of the rights of individuals and the fair and just treatment of minorities. A man of the people himself, he championed the people's cause. He succeeded in building a progressive democracy.

When he died, in 1937, one of his biographers wrote:

He had founded a state in which freedom was the watchword and he had educated a nation to be conscious of both the rights and duties of democratic citizenship. * * * But he never forgot the need of "a faith, a

living faith in something higher than ourselves, something great, sublime, eternal."

That this nation to which he gave so rich a heritage should have since fallen behind the Iron Curtain with all of its curtailment of individual freedom, its insistence that man should serve the state alone, and its denial of a faith in anything higher than that state—that this should have happened to Czechoslovakia, conceived in the democratic ideal of its great leader, is the greater tragedy. But that that ideal lives on in the heart of Czechoslovakia today we have no doubt. No more have we doubt of that than we have of the permanence and effectiveness of the contribution of Thomas Masaryk himself, defender of freedom.

Metropolitan Area Residents Affected by Federal and State Tax Laws

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FLORENCE P. DWYER
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 5, 1959

Mrs. DWYER. Mr. Speaker, I have reintroduced, for consideration by the 86th Congress, two bills I first introduced during the preceding Congress. Both represent efforts to deal fairly and equitably with residents of metropolitan areas, especially those areas that are located close to State boundary lines, insofar as such residents are affected by Federal and State tax laws.

The first bill, H.R. 5307, would allow as a deduction from Federal income taxes, the reasonable and necessary expenses incurred by individuals for transportation to and from work. The maximum deduction in any one taxable year would be $300, and the deductible expenses would include transportation costs either by private automobile or public transportation.

I share the conviction with many of our colleagues that this is a long overdue reform in our tax structure. Especially for those who live in the suburbs of our large metropolitan regions, the costs of transportation to and from work—the costs of commutation—are considerable. In my own Sixth Congressional District—where the number of commuters represent a fair average for the metropolitan New York-New Jersey-Connecticut area—I know of a great many instances where people must pay from $300 to $1,000 in commutation costs each year.

These travel expenses, I believe, are a necessary and legitimate cost of holding one's job, just as necessary and just as legitimate as those expenses presently authorized to be deducted on income tax returns. It is not always possible or even desirable for families to establish their homes in areas immediately adjacent to their jobs. Jobs change and employment opportunities shift, and seldom is it possible for the employee to control these circumstances. To insist that the taxpayer move his home every time he changes his job is obviously impossible and unjust, especially in crowded metropolitan areas. But we unfairly pressure such a person in this direction when we discriminate against him by refusing to permit normal, standard tax treatment for his necessary costs of traveling to and from work.

This legislation would in no way favor one group of taxpayers as against another. It would simply recognize a situation that has grown increasingly significant in recent years—the great migration to the suburbs of America. It would help restore a measure of fair and equitable treatment for these millions of our people. And it would remove the unjust price tag from one of our country's most precious freedoms—the freedom to live where one wants to live.

My second bill, Mr. Speaker, House Joint Resolution 288, proposes to amend the Constitution by prohibiting any State from taxing the wages or salaries or other compensation for personal services received by a person who is not a resident of that State.

This measure, too, has been introduced by several of our colleagues, and I am hopeful that with greater awareness of the elementary justice involved in this proposed amendment there will come the support necessary to win the approval of the Congress.

While the problem this amendment would solve affects residents of New Jersey and Connecticut especially, it also affects residents of several other States who have been recently subjected to the tax laws of the States in which their jobs are located.

Here, again, we are confronted with the same fundamental questions: Shall American citizens be free to establish their homes wherever they choose? Or shall we permit citizens who exercise this right to be penalized because of it?

Not only is there a cherished principle involved here—and who does not, in theory at least, subscribe to the dictum, there shall be no taxation without representation—but there is also much at stake from a practical viewpoint. Income taxes levied by some States have grown steadily heavier, and, of course, it has been this growing burden that has prompted some to seek added revenues from outside their boundaries. But States like New York have gone even further and discriminated against nonresidents in such a way that the nonresident's tax is more than the resident's tax, when both are in similar circumstances. Of course, the nonresident receives few if any of the benefits and services provided residents, for which the tax was levied in the first place.

But then there is little reason to expect logic where there is no justice.

Mr. Speaker, 60 percent or more of the American people have chosen for a variety of reasons to live in metropolitan areas. They are fully aware of the special problems, as well as advantages, which life under such crowded conditions means. And they are willing and able to solve these problems if they are allowed the means to do so. They ask no special privileges, no subsidies, no unwarranted exemptions from civic responsibilities.

They ask only justice, fair play, and equal treatment with fellow citizens living under different conditions. It is time, I believe, for Congress to recognize that America is no longer a rural nation. It is time for us to give the city and suburban dwellers of America a fair break.

Work Being Done by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare in Implementing the National Defense Education Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN V. LINDSAY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 5, 1959

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, I wish once more to illustrate the impressive work being done by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare in implementing the National Defense Education Act. It gives me great pleasure to advise this House that a counseling and guidance training institute will be conducted at Hunter College July 1 through August 7, 1959. Hunter College is located in the heart of Manhattan and in the heart of New York's 17th Congressional District. Hunter is one of the many institutions in the 17th District that makes the 17th one of the truly great communities of the Nation.

The selection of Hunter as the site for one of the Nation's training institutes under the National Defense Education Act results from preliminary arrangements concluded between the U.S. Commissioner of Education, Lawrence G. Derthick, and Dr. Harry N. Rivlin, dean of teacher education, College of the City of New York, representing the four municipal colleges—City, Hunter, Brooklyn, and Queens.

A central feature of the institute at Hunter will be a reexamination of guidance policies in the light of today's needs as the core of a training program for counselors.

What are some of these needs? The Congress has declared that the Nation is losing too much of our most valuable and precious resources—the talents of our children in our schools. We know, for example, that many able students do not continue their education beyond the high school. At any time, but especially in these critical times, we cannot afford such waste. The survival of our democratic way of life demands nothing less.

Consequently, the Congress, through the National Defense Education Act of 1958, authorized a program of federally financed counseling and guidance training institutes. They represent one of several features of the act designed, in the words of the act itself, "to insure trained manpower of sufficient quality and quantity to meet the national defense needs of the United States." Title V of the act is entitled "Guidance, Counseling, and Testing; Identification

and Encouragement of Able Students." The cited title suggests the problem which the program of counseling and guidance institutes—such as the one at Hunter—will attack. It will do so by expanding educational programs for the professional preparation of counselors. The need is great for professional personnel to identify, counsel, and motivate the more able students to continue their schooling. This does not mean that current educational programs for counselors are not good. It is simply that a national condition exists, which the Congress has recognized by calling on our colleges and universities to meet it. The institute at Hunter is a response to this challenge.

We can take pride that we are in a good position to help meet the challenge. Physical facilities at Hunter, and nearby, will lend themselves admirably to the purposes of the institute. In fact, since 1950, there has been an on-going program of graduate training in guidance and school counseling at our municipal colleges. The standards of this program are high and well recognized. As a result, skilled training resources will be available to meet a critical need. This insures the leadership of a faculty for an imaginative program contributing to the maximum development and utilization of the rich talents possessed by the young people of the metropolitan New York area.

This institute is but one of some 40 that will be conducted this summer throughout the Nation under the authority of title V–B of the National Defense Education Act. But it represents the imaginative way in which the Office of Education is implementing this important legislation. It is an example of the sound principle of building on strength by utilizing the outstanding skills and resources of institutions well qualified to tackle this problem. New York City and other urban areas—indeed school systems throughout the Nation—stand to benefit enormously from this militant attack upon the problem of America's loss of able manpower.

I call upon the Congress once again to act promptly on the President's request for additional funds to carry out this and other vital programs authorized by the National Defense Education Act. I know that friends of education everywhere join me in urging this action.

Independent State of Ghana

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES C. DIGGS, JR.
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 5, 1959

Mr. DIGGS. Mr. Speaker, 2 years ago, on March 6, 1957, as an official representative of the United States Congress, I had the great privilege of witnessing the emergence of the Gold Coast of Africa into the independent State of Ghana. Today that occasion is being commemorated in the world as a triumph not only for the African people of this State, but for all men and women who believe in human freedom, individual dignity, and justice. In the 2 years since its independence, the State of Ghana has made significant economic, political, and social advances, despite the difficulties of its new statehood. It has evidenced a strong capacity for leadership in which the institutions of free and democratic government everywhere in the world have a vital stake. How great is this stake is made clear by the words of Prime Minister Nkrumah, of Ghana, who said recently:

> The hopes and ambitions of the African peoples have been planted and brought to maturity by the impact from western civilization. The West has set the patterns of our hopes and by entering Africa in strength has forced the pattern upon us. Now comes our response.

The American people feel these ties and are personally gratified, therefore, by the progress which the State of Ghana has made under the banners of democracy and freedom. Mr. Speaker, on this occasion, as a Member of the House of Representatives of the United States, and of the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House, I would like to extend congratulations to the State on Ghana on its second anniversary and on its progress and success. I am certain all of us share intimately the hopes of this people for a future that finds them an increasingly strong and free nation working among the family of nations for dignity, peace, and friendship among all mankind.

Broadcast Music, Inc., Has Rendered a Real Service to the People of America by Commissioning Four New Busts of Lincoln, Two of Which Were Unveiled February 9 in Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRED SCHWENGEL
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 5, 1959

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, February 9, I had the honor to participate with the distinguished Senator from Kentucky, Mr. JOHN SHERMAN COOPER, in unveiling two magnificent new heads of Abraham Lincoln executed by the internationally known sculptor, Avard Fairbanks.

This event took place at the headquarters of the Lincoln Sesquicentennial Commission in the Archives Building and was one of the numerous affairs scheduled in connection with the celebration of the 150th anniversary of Abraham Lincoln's birth.

Dr. Fairbanks, the sculptor, is consultant in fine arts to the University of Utah and resident sculptor on that campus. He will be remembered as the sculptor of the bronze statue in Greece of Lycurgus, the Spartan lawgiver; the doughboy of Idaho; the pony express for the Utah centennial; the celebrated statue of Lincoln for New Salem, Ill.; and a statue of Albert Woolson, last survivor of the Grand Army of the Republic for the cemetery at Gettysburg. He also created the 91st division memorial at Fort Lewis, Wash.; and the Marcus Whitman statue in the Capitol.

The heads unveiled by Senator COOPER and me at the ceremony depicted "The Young Lincoln" and "Lincoln, The President." They were commissioned as two of a series of four busts by Broadcast Music, Inc., of New York City, whose president, Mr. Carl Haverlin, is a distinguished Lincoln collector and an honorary member of the Lincoln Sesquicentennial Commission.

The completed heads—these were plaster models that we unveiled—will be 21 inches high, 10 inches wide and 9 inches deep. They now can be seen at the Broadcast Music, Inc., exhibit of Lincolniana at the Statler Hotel in Washington.

The other two heads, when completed, will depict Mr. Lincoln at other stages of his life.

These are inspiring works which reflect fully the statement made by the sculptor that, "The truth of spirit is more important than external form." The external form is there, however, for the model used by Dr. Fairbanks was the Volk life mask of Lincoln, cast in 1860.

Mr. Haverlin, speaking for his company, said that the four heads will be executed finally in marble by Dr. Fairbanks and will be donated to the Lincoln Sesquicentennial Commission and thereafter made available for perpetual display at an appropriate place in Washington where our millions of visitors, both American and from foreign shores, may take from them the same inspiration that those of us who participated in this ceremony experienced last Monday.

Among those present on that occasion from the Congress of the United States in addition to Senator Cooper were Senator Frank E. Moss of Utah, the Honorable Arthur V. Watkins, former Senator from that State and Senator Ralph Yarborough of Texas.

I believe that Broadcast Music, Inc., has rendered a tremendous service to the people of this Nation through this generous gift.

State-Owned Ferries Should Be Exempt From Excise Tax

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS M. PELLY
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 5, 1959

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I have long held the opinion that a State-owned nonprofit ferry system is a link between State highways similar to a bridge or a tunnel, and as such no ferry tolls, more than tolls of a State-owned bridge or highway, should not be subject to Federal transportation excise taxes.

The Washington State Toll Bridge Authority, which constructs and operates

both toll bridges and ferries, held this same view in contrast to the claim of the Commissioner of Internal Revenue. In this resulting dispute to allow for an orderly judicial determination, an agreement was arrived at whereby the State in 1957 increased its ferry system fares in the amount of the Federal tax and the amount of revenue accruing as a result was to be deposited in escrow. This fund contained originally 3 percent of property freight charges and 10 percent of fares of passengers. Subsequently, when Congress repealed the 3 percent tax on freight, I had hoped for a refund or some relief to the ferry users on account of the termination of the one transportation tax but the agreement provided for the taxes under the modified law to be held until final settlement.

So until final judgment the escrow of funds is continuing, but if the United States repeals or otherwise modifies existing laws so as to specifically exempt States from the 10 percent tax on passengers, the deposits, of course, would cease.

The funds on deposit collected from users of the Washington State ferry systems on property is $114,862.05; the amount which is regularly being added on account of possible tax liability from passenger transportation at the end of January 1959 was $239,060.97.

In the 85th Congress, 1st session, I introduced H.R. 2028 to amend the Internal Revenue Codes to make it clear that this tax on transportation of persons and property did not apply to ferry service provided by State-operated ferryboats. That was before the repeal of the tax on property. But other legislation took precedence and the Ways and Means Committee was unable to consider my bill.

Now I have introduced a new bill to exempt these State-operated ferryboats from the tax imposed by section 4261 on persons transported on a nonprofit basis by a State as defined in section 7701(a)(10) or by an agency or instrumentality thereof. The tax under my bill would cease on and after January 1, 1959.

I hope now the committee will take up this bill promptly. Meanwhile, let me make it clear that the passage of my bill would not admit any previous liability of the State. Rather its passage would clarify the State exemption which I believe already exists, and, of course, the excess fares which are being collected and placed in escrow would no longer be required.

The text of the bill is as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 4263 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to exemptions from tax on transportation of persons) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(g) STATE-OPERATED FERRYBOATS.—The tax imposed by section 4261 shall not apply to amounts paid for ferry service provided by a ferryboat operated on a nonprofit basis by a State (as defined in section 7701(a)(10)) or by an agency or instrumentality thereof."

SEC. 2. The amendment made by the first section of this Act shall apply only with respect to amounts paid on or after January 1, 1959, for transportation on or after that date.

In Further Support of My Bill To Curb the National Conspiracy of Gangsters Through the Enactment of H.R. 5186

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM C. CRAMER
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 5, 1959

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I am including in the RECORD a copy of a wire received from the Honorable Nick Nuccio, mayor of Tampa, in support of my bill to give the Justice Department and the FBI jurisdiction to punish the use of interstate commerce in the furtherance of conspiracies to commit terroristic crimes and activities of gangsters and hoodlums. His wire clarifies, and properly so, the present situation in Tampa.

I also include my reply to the mayor which clearly indicates that my remarks, consistent with the position of the mayor, as made on the floor of the House on March 3 was in reference to the previous record of unsolved murders which, in my opinion, in order to have been perpetrated, must have been conspired on an interstate basis.

I also include a copy of my letter to the Attorney General, written on March 4, in transmitting a copy of my bill for his consideration, which further amplifies on my remarks.

I firmly believe that legislation of the nature I have introduced is essential if the people of this Nation are to be protected—whether it be in Tampa or in another community—from the nefarious activities of national criminal and racketeering conspiracies. As will be noted from my letter to the Attorney General, even the sheriff of Hillsborough County, on August 12, 1953, requested such help and my bill will provide Federal assistance when the crimes committed are of an interstate nature. My bill would make avaliable to local law enforcement the very type help requested.

The above-mentioned follows:

TAMPA, FLA., *March 5, 1959.*

Hon. WILLIAM C. CRAMER,
New House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

I wish to congratulate you on introducing a bill in Congress yesterday to curb terroristic conspiracies. As we have discussed before in regard to your thinking on this matter this is a law which is vitally needed and I am sure that all good citizens in our county join me in urging you to push for speedy enactment of this bill during this session of Congress. However, I would like to call your attention to the fact that Tampa is not the criminal city it was several years ago. It has always been my belief that organized crime cannot exist without the blessing of law-enforcement officers. Since my election as mayor of the city of Tampa 2 years ago, I have waged a vigorous compaign against all types of criminal activity and will continue to do so. Because of this Tampa today is living down its past reputation as a center of organized crime. The only recent killing was found to have no gangland connection after thorough investigation by city, county, and State law-enforcement agencies. Again congratulations on the job you are doing in Washington for the people of the First District of Florida.

NICK NUCCIO,
Mayor.

MARCH 5, 1959.

Hon. NICK NUCCIO,
Mayor of the City of Tampa,
Tampa, Fla.:

I wish to express my appreciation for your wire supporting my bill to curb national gangster conspiracies. I am fully aware of your announced purpose to wage a vigorous campaign against all types of criminal activity.

I congratulate you in this effort.

I trust that neither you nor my respected constituents of Tampa misinterpret any of my remarks or actions as being critical of Tampa's present local law-enforcement efforts.

I have referred to the 19 unsolved murders in Tampa's past history, without reference to the most recent killing that I understood the grand jury had found was outside the scope of the type of killing my bill is directed toward, that is, of interstate character inspired by a national gangster conspiracy: but it is my considered opinion, buttressed by information provided by the FBI, the Bureau of Narcotics, and the Justice Department, that other killings in Tampa's past history have the earmarkings of being part of an interstate conspiracy. My bill aims at that type of conspiracy because of its interstate nature, which is beyond the reach of local law-enforcement officials, the area where Justice Department and FBI assistance is needed to assist in stamping out such outside influences on communities such as Tampa.

I am forwarding by airmail a copy of my letter to the Attorney General dated March 4 in which I transmitted my bill for consideration of justice which I think clearly states my position. I am making your wire and this reply together with my letter to the Attorney General a part of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as furthar amplification of my remarks of the third in order to avoid any misconstruction.

WILLIAM C. CRAMER,
Member of Congress.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., March 4, 1959.

In re H.R. 5186, a bill to establish the crime of conspiracies to commit terroristic crimes and activities when interstate commerce is used with the objective of stamping out national racketeering.

The Honorable WILLIAM P. ROGERS,
Attorney General of the United States,
U.S. Department of Justice,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR ATTORNEY GENERAL ROGERS: You will find enclosed herewith a copy of the bill above referred to which I introduced on March 3 and about which I made a speech on the floor of the House, a copy of which I have previously forwarded to you. I am herewith forwarding to you a copy of the bill for your consideration, anticipating that the bill will be officially forwarded to you by the Judiciary Committee for a report by your Department. Of course, I am hopeful that this bill will result in favorable consideration of some legislation that will accomplish the same objective.

To amplify on this matter, I am sure your files will indicate that some 4 years ago, subsequent to the occurrence of one of the murders which I referred to in my remarks as one of the "19 unsolved sawed-off shotgun gang murders," I directed a request to the Justice Department that the FBI and the Department act favorably upon the request of the local law enforcement officials and assist those officials in attempting to solve this murder by placing the Mafia on

the subversive list which would make it subject to Justice Department surveillance.

I stated at that time that it was my opinion that because this was a murder similar to those that had occurred in the past and which were also unsolved, apparently it was being done on the basis of the killer being shipped in and out rapidly in interstate commerce and that there was a connection between such killings and national gangsterism and possibly the Mafia or Murder, Inc. It was on this basis that I thought the FBI could accept this responsibility but I was advised that the Department of Justice had determined that it had no jurisdiction in the matter because no Federal crime was involved and that the Mafia did not come within the definition of subversive and thus could not be placed on your list pursuant to Executive Order 10450.

The purpose of my bill is obviously to plug up the loophole and in the future to make the FBI and the Justice Department available in similar instances with the presumption that interstate commerce is involved when this type of killing or other crime takes place.

I want it clearly understood that my remarks in the RECORD refer to the national activities of Murder, Inc., the Mafia, and other gangster conspiracies which prey upon cities such as Tampa, and I cited Tampa as an example that I think is one of the clearest indications that this nefarious outside influence is affecting the local community and that, because such influence is of an interstate nature, the local law enforcement officials have not been capable of coping with this problem. Such officials obviously are not equipped to cope with this problem when it is of an interstate nature as is clearly indicated by the request of Sheriff Ed Blackburn, Jr., of Hillsborough County, for the assistance of the FBI and the Department of Justice to place the Mafia on the subversive list pursuant to Executive Order 10450, his request having been made in the fall of 1953 and my request having been made to back him up. My predecessor, the Honorable Courtney Campbell, properly initiated the sheriff's request by forwarding it to your Department.

Since that time when we were advised that no Federal crime was involved and that the Mafia was construed not to come within the definition of subversive, you know, in that I have been in consultation with the Department on a number of occasions concerning it, that I have been in the process of considering legislation to make such interstate gangster activities a Federal crime and the enclosed bill is the consummation of those efforts.

I want to make certain that you understand that my citation of Tampa is for the purpose of indicating a concrete example of where, in my opinion, the outside influence of gangster conspiracies in the past has had a very telling effect beyond the power of the local law enforcement officials to cope with and my reference to the city's having one of the worst crime records of course refers specifically to the 19 unsolved murders in the past. It is obviously not in any way intended as a reflection upon the efforts of the local law enforcement officials to clean up the city. To the contrary, it is my opinion that in recent years much has been done within their jurisdiction to clean up Tampa but that this national conspiracy still poses as a threat to the future safety of the citizens of this community and communities throughout the country.

It is my hope that legislation of this nature will be enacted, first, in that it will be a deterrent to future national activities of gangsters having local effects similar to those that have happened in Tampa in the past, and, second, should crimes be committed of this nature in the future in Tampa or anywhere else, the Department of Justice will have jurisdiction to investigate the matter.

I believe this matter is of sufficient concern for you to give personal attention to it and that is the reason for my forwarding to you a copy of my remarks and a copy of my bill and for calling this to your attention again, it being a follow-up of my previous correspondence and discussions with the Department on this matter.

Thanking you for your attention to and consideration of this matter, and with kindest regards, I am,

Sincerely,

WILLIAM C. CRAMER,
Member of Congress.

Full Text of Senator Douglas' Article: "A Catholic Can Become President"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. BARRATT O'HARA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 5, 1959

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, by unanimous consent, I am extending my remarks to include the following article by the senior Senator from Illinois, the Honorable PAUL H. DOUGLAS, in the current issue of Coronet:

A CATHOLIC CAN BECOME PRESIDENT

(By Senator PAUL H. DOUGLAS)

I think a Catholic can be elected President of the United States.

Given the right man, a Catholic should be elected President.

It saddens me that it should still be necessary in America today to document these beliefs. Yet the issue is clouded by so much confusion that both non-Catholic and Catholics can profit by its frank discussion. For the closer we move toward the 1960 political conventions, the greater the danger that, in the heat of debate, matters of principle may become further distorted by the cobwebs of myths and religious suspicion.

The chief argument advanced for the contention that a Catholic either cannot or should not become President are:

1. Gov. Alfred E. Smith, of New York, the only Catholic presidential candidate in U.S. history, lost disastrously in 1928 because of his religion—and the memory of his defeat remains too fresh.

2. The religious views of a Catholic President would necessarily conflict with his constitutional duties.

3. The electorate still is not sufficiently tolerant to elect a Catholic.

4. Even if the electorate might prove willing to elect a Catholic, the professional politicians would be too cautious to nominate him.

Let us examine each of these arguments.

There can be no question about the overwhelming extent of Al Smith's defeat. He lost to Herbert Hoover by more than 6 million votes. He failed to carry four States of the solid South. He even lost in his beloved native State of New York and wound up with just 87 electoral votes.

It is also true that the Democratic candidate's Catholicism was a long and bitterly discussed issue. Methodist Episcopal Bishop James Cannon, Jr., argued that "no subject of the Pope" should be President. The Republican national committeewoman from Virginia declared: "We must save the United States from being Romanized and rum-ridden, and the call is to the women to do so." A well-circulated cartoon depicted a kneeling Al Smith inviting his running mate, Senator Joseph Robinson, to kiss the Pope's bare toes. At the upper end of the intellectual scale, a noted attorney, Charles C. Marshall, addressed a 5,000-word open letter to Smith in The Atlantic Monthly, questioning the Governor's qualifications on the basis of the past pronouncements of various Catholic spokesmen. In reply, Smith issued a moving 4,000-word manifesto.

Nevertheless, historians now believe that the religious issue was only one of several that caused Al Smith's downfall. Quite probably it was not even the most important one. For Al Smith's America differed greatly from the America of the space age in one almost forgotten respect. Bishop Cannon also attacked Smith as the master henchman of evil forces representing the foreign-populated city called New York. William Allen White of Kansas' Emporia Gazette railed against him as the agent of saloon, prostitution, and gambling interests.

It is a little difficult not to smile at the notion today, but the fact is that in Al Smith's day much of rural America was in a state of undeclared war against its urban counterpart. To many voters in the rural South and Midwest the stereotype of the cigar-chewing machine politician from the East spelled government by city slickers, corruption, and foreigners. Happily, education, automobiles, television, and other unifying factors have pretty much wiped away these prejudices. Moreover, about 63 percent of the population now lives in urban areas.

Most difficult for Al Smith, perhaps, was the prohibition issue. Again, it may be hard for voters now in their 20's and 30's to picture how many people sincerely—and vehemently—opposed the legalized sale of liquor. Smith was an ardent wet and said so. After the votes were in, Prof. William F. Ogburn of the University of Chicago made a study of 173 counties and concluded that the prohibition sentiment was 3 times more decisive than the religious issue.

I am convinced, in view of this, that Al Smith's fate should not be too significant for any Catholic candidate of the future.

Since I am a Protestant, I feel I can discuss objectively the claim that the teachings of the Catholic Church would lead a Catholic President into inevitable conflict with our laws. Frankly, this so-called danger does not worry me.

It is, of course, possible to find some basis for conflict between church and state in the writings of the Catholic hierarchy of the past. This is particularly true of Pope Pius IX, who asserted in 1864: "To say in the case of conflicting laws enacted by the two powers, the civil law prevails, is error." The statements of Pius IX were, however, made primarily in reference to European conditions, and were issued a long time ago. I am convinced, however, that in our modern United States such areas of potential dispute would seem to exist chiefly in the realm of theory alone. Certainly Al Smith thought so when he answered Charles Marshall in the Atlantic Monthly:

"I believe in absolute separation of church and state * * * I believe in the support of the public school as one of the cornerstones of American liberty * * * I recognize no power in * * * my church to interfere with * * * the Constitution of the United States."

In other words, Catholicism is a matter of faith and morals for most members of the Catholic Church. Catholic officeholders have had no difficulty reconciling their faith with their politics in this country. As the militantly Protestant journal, Christian Century, pointed out during the 1928 campaign:

"Catholic political action in modern times has shown itself more modern than Catholic. France was overwhelmingly Catholic; it

threw off the yoke. Italy was overwhelmingly Catholic; it destroyed the temporal power of the papacy. Catholics do not act as a unit at the wave of the Pope's baton. In actual practice, American Catholics love their country as much as Protestants do."

To which I would add: just what could a Catholic President of the United States do—against the will of the non-Catholic majority—to aid the Pope? The Constitution provides ample checks against the usurpation of powers by the executive branch, so that we need not—and indeed we must not—deny to 36 million Americans the right to have a qualified member of their faith elected to the White House.

Not only do I think that a member of a minority religion would do nothing to offend the beliefs of the majority, I believe there is strong evidence that Catholic officeholders would bend over backwards to avoid charges of religious prejudices against themselves or their coreligionists.

There is, for example, no record that Catholic members of our highest tribunal, the Supreme Court, ever found themselves in conflict with the laws they were chosen to interpret. This is true of two Catholic chief justices, Roger Brooke Taney and Edward Douglass White, who presided over the Court about 40 years. More recently, another Catholic justice, the late Frank Murphy, voted in favor of the right of a Jehovah's Witnesses minister to set up a public address system in a municipal park and make anti-Catholic broadcasts on Sundays. Currently, Supreme Court Justice William J. Brennan, Jr., a Catholic, has also shown himself to be a stout defender of individual rights and civil liberties.

Looking over the ranks of my Catholic Democratic colleagues in the Senate, I must confess that the average quality of their performance seems to surpass the average performance of my fellow-Protestants.

There is Senator JOHN F. KENNEDY of Massachusetts, who is considered the frontrunner for the Democratic presidential nomination in 1960; Senator MIKE MANSFIELD of Montana, the Democratic assistant majority leader; such veterans as Senators JAMES MURRAY of Montana and JOSEPH O'MAHONEY of Wyoming; newer Members like Senator JOHN O. PASTORE of Rhode Island, FRANK LAUSCHE of Ohio and PAT MCNAMARA of Michigan; and newly elected Senators PHILIP A. HART of Michigan, EDMUND S. MUSKIE of Maine and STEPHEN M. YOUNG of Ohio. In addition, there are two other freshmen Senators who have served with distinction in the House of Representatives: EUGENE MCCARTHY of Minnesota, and THOMAS J. DODD of Connecticut. In the House, for the first time, there are nearly 100 Catholic Members.

I find these men remarkably free of prejudice and, as a group, less self-righteous than a large proportion of my fellow-Protestants. It may be that most Catholic legislators are above-average at their jobs because they had above-average obstacles to overcome in achieving election. Whatever the reason for their collective stature, I would like to see more such men in Congress.

If a Catholic is nominated for the presidency in 1960, or at any other time in the foreseeable future, I must admit that his religion would—regrettably—be held against him by some voters.

The Gallup poll has been asking a cross section of voters: "If your party nominated a generally well-qualified man for the presidency this year, and he happened to be a Catholic, would you vote for him?"

In 1955, 23 percent replied "No." In 1956, 22 percent. Last October, 25 percent.

To me, however, the more significant points established by these polls are:

1. Anti-Catholic voters are clearly in a minority.

2. Since a Catholic candidate almost certainly would be a Democrat, the majority of anti-Catholic votes in the public opinion polls were cast by Republicans who would not vote for him anyway.

3. The above figures compare with a "No" vote of 31 percent in the same poll taken in 1940.

4. The October 1958 Gallup poll also shows that anti-Catholic prejudice is significantly lower among younger voters and voters with a college education.

Clearly then, the trend is toward less religious prejudice in our voting habits. And it should be. Historically anti-Catholic feeling in this country has been an anti-immigrant prejudice against the stereotyped Irish cop, saloonkeeper or favor-peddling ward heeler. Catholics, Protestants, and Jews live in more or less separate social compartments. Nowadays, economic and social barriers are dropping rapidly. There is much more interfaith communication than ever before. We know and understand each other better than we ever did. The war and military service in a common cause melted away many hatreds. Few Americans still blindly believe that a man wears invisible horns because he worships the same God in a different church.

Recent election results bear this out. The electorate of Maine is only 26 percent Catholic and not noted for upsetting political apple carts. It was a State with a firmly fixed tradition that no man of immigrant stock and no Catholic could be elected to high office. Yet in 1954, Maine elected MUSKIE—a Catholic and the son of a Polish immigrant tailor—as the first Democratic Governor in 20 years. In 1956, it reelected him by the greatest majority ever given a Governor of either party. In 1958, it made him the first Democrat ever popularly elected U.S. Senator from Maine.

Analyses of the 1952 and 1956 election results also show that quite a few Catholic candidates for Congress ran substantially ahead of Adlai E. Stevenson. Among these were Representatives LEO W. O'BRIEN and JAMES J. DELANEY of New York (who ran 16 and 15 percent ahead of the national ticket, respectively); PETER W. RODINO of New Jersey (21 percent); Senator KENNEDY (12 percent); Senator PASTORE (12 percent); Senator LAUSCHE (26 percent); Representative CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI of Wisconsin (33 percent); Representative (now Senator) EUGENE MCCARTHY (12 percent); and Senator MANSFIELD (21 percent).

Many of these front runners undoubtedly come from areas with relatively heavy Catholic populations. But I believe that most of their constituents voted for these men simply because they thought they would do a good job.

By the same token, I will concede that many southern delegates who jumped on the KENNEDY-for-Vice-President band wagon at the 1956 Democratic convention did so largely because of their distaste for the alternative choice, my friend ESTES KEFAUVER of Tennessee. But it was an historic change to see delegates from the South (where, according to Gallup, only 51 percent of the voters would accept any Catholic Presidential candidate) rally to the KENNEDY banner—even for the second place on the national ticket. It showed that the South was willing to live with a Catholic Vice President.

There is no question in my mind that the increased acceptance of Catholics in public office is also attributable to the efficiency and fairmindedness of most Catholic officeholders at the municipal level. Robert F. Wagner, Jr., in New York, Richard J. Daly in Chicago, John B. Hynes in Boston, deLesseps S. Morrison in New Orleans and David Lawrence in Pittsburgh have two characteristics in common. All are Catholics. All have been excellent mayors.

Because of his fine record, the voters last year elected Mayor Lawrence the first Catholic Governor of Pennsylvania. Three Catholics already were Governors of other States and making good records: Stephen L. R. McNichols of Colorado, Albert D. Rosellini of Washington, and Foster Furcolo of Massachusetts. Nor was Lawrence the only newly-elected Catholic Governor. Chosen in the last election were Christopher Del Sesto of Rhode Island, J. J. Hickey in Wyoming, Michael V. DiSalle in Ohio; and, most notably, Edmund G. (Pat) Brown in California. Brown defeated Senator William F. Knowland by 1,029,000 votes.

I think, therefore, that an impressive case can be made for the argument that the vast majority of today's voters look their candidates over for merit, not for religious beliefs. Now what about the politicians who nominate Presidents?

Here we are on more speculative ground. Politicians are worriers. Worriers are cautious. I am afraid there is evidence that a Catholic presidential candidate might aid, rather than hurt, the cause of the Democratic Party. At least this is the conclusion of a careful statistical study sponsored in 1956 by John Bailey, the Democratic State chairman of Connecticut. Its most intriguing findings were that Catholics tend to vote more diligently than do Protestants, and that their voting strength tends to be concentrated in 18 large cities of 12 key States. The study concludes:

"The Catholic voters in these cities can usually determine the size of the Democratic margin in these cities. The size of the Democratic margin in those cities usually determines whether these States go Democratic. Whether these States go Democratic usually determines whether the Democrats win the election."

This is a rather coldly clinical approach to the issue of religion in politics. But the men on the floor of our nominating conventions are clinicians who should be impressed by such statistics. They should also be impressed by the consistently spectacular showing made in the Gallup polls by Senator KENNEDY, whose Catholicism is not precisely a secret.

The second point I would raise with our over-cautious politicians is the same that I want to raise with all Americans: Hasn't the time come for us to quit thinking of our public officials in terms of their religious faith?

I think it has.

This is the 20th century, not the 18th or 19th century. We should not let the fears of the past dominate our thinking today. And surely it is essential that we cast aside all remnants of prejudice in a time when the whole world is watching to see whether we live democracy, or merely talk it. Personally, I believe that when the right candidate comes along—regardless of his religion—the American people will do the right thing. They usually do.

The REA and Trinity Power

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS H. KUCHEL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 5, 1959

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of a speech which I made before the 17th annual meeting of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association on February 9, 1959, in Washington, D.C., be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE REA AND TRINITY POWER

(Address by U.S. Senator THOMAS H. KUCHEL, of California, before the general session, 17th NRECA annual meeting, Washington, D.C., February 9, 1959)

President George, Mr. Ellis, members of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, and friends, I am delighted with this opportunity to exchange views with the organization which has brought millions of Americans one of the means of better living: electricity.

Much as the pioneers did who put the plow to our broad and fertile land in order that there might be a plenitude of food for the people and an ample supply of fibers for their needs, the rural electric cooperatives have blazed a trail through the wilderness of technological maladjustment so that the American farmer and his family might receive the benefits of this convenient form of energy at prices tolerant to their income. Thanks to the cooperatives, 19 out of 20 farmhouses today can command the assistance of electricity at the flick of a switch. Clean incandescent and fluorescent lighting has literally eclipsed the kerosene lamp. The electric motor has accepted the strains of human toil in the house and the shop and barn. Even the human hunger for entertainment is filled in part by devices utilizing the magic of electrokinetics. Indeed, the farmer who is a member of his electric cooperative may have today all the conveniences of city living—plus the joys of living in the country.

The banding together by neighbors for the purpose of obtaining electrical service is clearly in consonance with the philosophy of government expressed 100 years ago by Abraham Lincoln. This greatest of Americans said, "The legitimate object of government is to do for a community of people whatever they need to have done, but cannot do at all, or cannot so well do for themselves in their separate and individual capacities."

Your meeting is being held in a historic setting. Washington has been the seat of American Government for 169 years. In the old Supreme Court room of the Capitol, a mile or two from this armory, one of the most useful applications of electricity was accomplished when Samuel F. B. Morse demonstrated the first telegraph, sending his message, "What God hath wrought," over the wires instantaneously from Washington to Baltimore.

Northward, a couple of hours from here by automobile, lies Philadelphia, where Benjamin Franklin interested himself, among many other subjects, in the phenomenon of electricity. Franklin was a practicing scientist of government. He perceived, as Lincoln did later, that the people have to do jointly many things which they cannot accomplish as individuals; for it was Ben Franklin who established the Post Office Department in order that the public might have a far better mail service than they could supply for themselves. He carried out a legitimate object of government.

About 23 years ago, the Congress of the United States concluded that if rural America were to receive electric service, this would have to become a "legitimate object of Government" through Federal assistance to local cooperatives. The undertaking has been successful. A tremendous amount of new business has been developed, which benefits the total American economy; for when thousands upon thousands of farm families buy electrical appliances, industry hums in Schenectady and Chicago and all around the land. The cooperatives have had a magnificent record of financial soundness. They have served a legitimate object of government.

But now it is proposed to emasculate the foundation of the rural electric cooperatives. Other speakers during this meeting will discuss the attempts to exact higher fees for the money which cooperatives must borrow. They will remind the public that the rate of interest paid on REA loans in most of these past 23 years has exceeded the interest rates paid by the Government in the money market. They will note that under the "area covenants" which a cooperative undertakes when it accepts Federal assistance, that cooperative must give service to any farmer in the territory even if the individual account may not be profitable. This, of course, the private utilities cannot be compelled to do; and until the idea of rural electric cooperatives was born, many such farmers had to endure a standard of living which reflected the lack of electrical service.

These financial policies, as I say, are not within the scope of my remarks; but they interest me very much. In this connection, I hope you will permit me also to remind you that I am a coauthor in the U.S. Senate with Senators AIKEN, HUMPHREY, SPARKMAN, KENNEDY, MILTON YOUNG, COOPER, MANSFIELD, HILL, HENNINGS, CURTIS, MURRAY, LANGER, and CLARK on the resolution to clarify the lending authority of the Rural Electrification Administration.

The aspersions upon REA interest and loan policies constitute a threat to the magnificently successful rural electrification program. I want to discuss another, equally serious threat—the attack upon the governmental policy of giving preference to publicly owned and operated agencies when it disposes of federally generated power. By definition those agencies include military installations, irrigation districts, municipalities, and rural electric cooperatives.

The present battleground in the war upon the preference policy is my own State of California. Hydroelectric power is a feature of Federal multipurpose reclamation projects. Great dams are built to impound quantities of water for irrigation. As these waters fall over the dam, or, rather, go through a penstock, they turn electric generators. You are far more familiar with the process than I.

Revenues from the power sales have contributed substantially to project construction costs. The reclamation projects of the United States are not built for profit. Their purpose is to serve the needs of the people. They incidentally—and importantly—assist in controlling floods and in controlling salinity. They provide new recreational opportunities. And, utilizing the inevitable hydro head, they produce power.

Whenever we study these governmental projects, it must be borne in mind that the size of the dams is governed not by the output of the powerplant, but by the needs of irrigation. Irrigation is the primary purpose. These are reclamation projects. They are power projects only incidentally. The ability of the Government to receive income from the power has, of course, helped to guarantee a dependable and economical supply of water for crops.

Moreover, if the dams had been built simply for power, they would be small. Their capacity for irrigation needs would be irrelevant. There is an excellent example of this in my State. There, on the great Feather River, the private utility has built a series of dams. Each produces a hundred thousand kilowatts or so of electrical energy. But they do not hold back much water for summer irrigation. Their flood control values are negligible. In the disastrous flood of 1954–55 in the Sacramento Valley, it was not the Sacramento River which caused the loss of 70 lives and wreaked tremendous property loss, but the Feather and other streams, upon which there are no reclamation dams at the present time. On the Sacramento, the mighty Shasta Dam, a reclamation project of the United States, holds back more than 4 million acre-feet of water; if it had only to serve the needs of power production, it could be of a capacity of a relatively few thousand acre-feet.

Reclamation was found—under the administration of a great Republican President, Theodore Roosevelt—to be a legitimate object of the U. S. Government. No individual could possibly cope with a reclamation undertaking costing hundreds of millions of dollars; but it was both possible and practicable for the community of people, the Government, to do so. And thus, in the best sense, it was in the Lincoln tradition.

The disposal of the water from these projects, and of the power, was dealt with on behalf of the community. A limitation was placed upon the number of acres an individual might own if he accepted the irrigation benefits; and, in order that its benefits might be shared by a maximum number of people without profit to any at the expense of the Government, the electric power was put at the disposal of Federal installations and public agencies.

This preference, with respect to power, constituted the forms of assistance which the Federal Government could make available for rural electric cooperatives. If the preference policy were to be eroded away, the Federal agencies would have to come to Congress for more money to cover the mounting costs of their power bills. The cities which have established municipal power distribution, and the electric cooperatives, would lose one of their principal means of helping to build America. With half of your systems directly dependent upon Federal projects for wholesale power, you have cause to be deeply concerned.

It is with respect to a great new Federal project in my State that such erosion is being attempted. If the private power industry succeeded in preventing the Government from making the electricity from the Trinity available to "preference" customers, I think it only logical to expect that a like attempt would be made with respect to all Federal reclamation projects, in being or in prospectus. The efforts of the community of people to accelerate the economy of rural America through electric cooperatives would suffer a disastrous reversal.

Congress authorized the Trinity division of the Central Valley project in July 1955. My former colleague, William F. Knowland, and I coauthored the bill in the Senate. I was proud to have the opportunity of successfully presenting the necessary legislation in committee, and in the Senate as a whole. As finally approved, the Trinity bill was the version passed earlier by the House of Representatives.

By reason of the lateness of the season, Representative CLAIR ENGLE requested the Senate to take up his House-approved bill. It was similar to the Senate version, except that it provided also for a continuance of studies and a report to Congress by the Secretary of the Interior on proposals for power development through the purchase of falling water at Trinity by a non-Federal agency, the result of proposals made by the Pacific Gas & Electric Co.

The Trinity project is unique. It will take a million acre-feet of water annually from the Trinity River on the west side of the coast range of mountains in northwestern California, and dump it into the upper reaches of the Sacramento River on the other side. The transfer will be accomplished through several tunnels through the mountains. As the waters descend, they will develop electricity at three powerplants in a total of 330,000 kilowatts of firm power.

When the water has reached its destination, it will supplement the Central Valley project, and stabilize the Sacramento River. It will provide some flood protection on the Trinity and Klamath Rivers. It will have recreational values. And this multipurpose project will generate power.

When they headed the administration of my State's government Earl Warren and Goodwin Knight both urged the Trinity project. Edmund Brown supported it as attorney general and since becoming Governor has stated his continuing approval for Federal construction of the power feature of the project. So in the Congress we have been carrying out the wishes of the State—which is as it should be.

In accordance with the reclamation laws, the power feature of the Trinity was included in the 1955 legislation. But as we worked for passage of the legislation, it became necessary in the House of Representatives to accept the amendment which I have described. This was the provision for a report by the Secretary of the Interior on the purchase of falling water at Trinity by a non-Federal agency. In plain English that would be the so-called "partnership" between the Government and the Pacific Gas & Electric Co.

I want to emphasize that Congress in authorizing Trinity was at great pains not to waive the national policy regarding public power and the preference principle. In fact, in reporting the Trinity bill, the Senate committee flatly declared it was its intention to preserve inviolate the preference clause sections of the reclamation laws. The committee went on to indicate that the study by the Interior Secretary was not to be interpreted as approving any departure from the traditional policy which goes back to Theodore Roosevelt's administration. That was certainly my intention in handling the bill. It was, I believe, the intention of the Senate in passing it.

The studies called for in the act were made by the Bureau of Reclamation. They were reported to Congress 2 years ago by the Secretary of the Interior, who recommended the so-called "partnership." The Commissioner of Reclamation said, in his report attached to the Secretary's recommendation, that:

"The all-Federal development assumes extending to the Trinity Division policies and reclamation law which provide for sale (1) of power to preference agencies, (2) at lowest rates to all customers consistent with the financial needs of the project.

Obviously, under the "partnership," public preference would be emasculated. The Commissioner himself stated that under the "partnership" the power available from the Central Valley project, into which the Trinity Division has been incorporated, would be curtailed. He calculated that 650,000 kilowatts would be available to nonprofit agencies under Federal development, contrasted with 400,000 kilowatts under private development. A later study by Samuel B. Morris, the distinguished Los Angeles engineer, found that the difference would be not 250,000 kilowatts, but 330,000 of firm power.

Using 250,000 kilowatts, the Secretary calculated that the excess cost to public agencies for their power needs would be $118 million, of which $71 million would be paid for by Federal installations, and $47 million by local preference customers. The report was sent to Congress on February 12, 1957. In June of the same year, after it had been discovered that the earlier figures were based on an obsolete rate schedule of the private utility, the Secretary revised his total figure upward to $150 million as increased costs to public agencies, including the proposed new San Luis Reservoir.

Mr. Morris calculated that with San Luis, the excess cost to preference customers would be $192 million—using the Secretary's figure of 250,000 kilowatts as the power output of the Trinity project. But Mr. Morris, as I have said, reckons the output at 330,000 kilowatts of firm power. He finds that the difference in cost to preference customers, if they bought the larger amounts from the private utility, would be $257 million over the 50-year payout period of the Trinity project.

While it is extremely difficult to make precise calculations on a problem so complicated as this one, everyone concerned clearly understands that the excess cost to preference agencies under the "partnership" proposal would run into millions of dollars. We know that the Federal installations which use Central Valley project power would find it necessary to budget for higher costs. Congress would have to provide the money for them. We would be selling the falling waters at Trinity at one level, and we would have to buy back the power at a higher level to pump water into the San Luis Reservoir, and for other Federal purposes.

Against the excess costs to Federal installations, municipalities, rural electric cooperatives, and irrigation districts would be the offset of the amount the private utility would pay for the falling waters at Trinity. But even if the offset were 100 percent—which it is not—this would be nothing more than robbing Peter to pay Paul.

Beyond the fact that the "partnership" proposal violates my understanding of economics, I subscribe to the principle that the people of a community have the right to determine for themselves the kind of electric power service they want. This they do for water service, and transportation, and a number of other public objectives. Is it not abundantly true, my friends, that in this Republic of ours, it is the people whose right it is to decide what they want for themselves?

One does not need to be doctrinaire on power policies in order to recognize the right of people to determine the kind of electric service they desire for their community or district, under preferences given to them by Federal law on Federal reclamation projects. It is illogical to urge that the Federal Government build a $225 million project only to compel its own agencies and local nonprofit agencies to pay private rates for the electric energy produced by the waters stored therein. Indeed, it would be illegal under the existing Trinity authorizing law.

Congress will not consider repealing the preference clause. That was my judgment 2 years ago, which I expressed during a speech in the U.S. Senate. It is my judgment now.

The recommendation of the Secretary of the Interior for private power development at Trinity is fraught with many perils. The theory of California water law is one of beneficial consumptive use. Our semiarid State cannot afford to waste water. In a Federal reclamation project, the Bureau of Reclamation must determine what is the most efficient use of the water in the storage reservoir for both domestic and agricultural use. That is the basis upon which it must discharge its responsibility of administering reclamation projects. Beneficial consumptive use must have complete priority over using the water for the generation of electricity. Under the Secretary's proposed contract, the single responsibility of the company would be to produce hydroelectric power in a manner most efficiently to supply the needs of its own customers. In the proper functioning of the Central Valley project, I visualize a deadly serious problem of the needs of water by the Central Valley were to conflict with the needs of electricity by the customers of the private utility under the "partnership" proposal.

There is room in our Nation for both public power and private power to meet the growing needs of our expanding economy. Where facilities have been created through an investment of public moneys, as in the Central Valley project and its Trinity division, I believe the power produced by them should be distributed to public agencies, as has been done so successfully for many years. The Central Valley project was built to satisfy an urgent need among our people for reclamation assistance. Its benefits should be distributed on as wide a range as possible.

My decision as to Federal construction of the Trinity division power feature has not been lightly taken. It was recommended by both the Warren and the Knight administrations. It is endorsed by the Brown administration. It is the way Congress passed the bill and the way President Eisenhower signed it. Never in my life have I been subject to such contemptible pressures to change my position. But never in my life have I found a decision more inescapable, more logical, more right, than this one, and I give you my assurance that Trinity will be completed as a multipurpose Federal project, and that this latest assault on the preference clause of Federal reclamation law will go down to its well-earned defeat.

In this 86th Congress I will fight with all my resources for an appropriation to build the powerplant at Trinity. I called on the Secretary of the Interior 2 years ago to include an item in his budget for planning the generating equipment. I repeated that urgent suggestion last fall, but the budget does not include the necessary funds. Indeed, the Under Secretary of the Interior has made speeches in California asserting the intention of his Department to continue a "rear guard action" for approval of the "partnership" scheme. I shall not attempt to characterize the speeches; but some in my State have likened this approach to blackmail. If the generators are not ordered soon, they cannot be ready when the Trinity Dam is finished. The benefits of power production will be lost until the generators start turning.

Ladies and gentlemen, the rural electric cooperatives, in California and all across the land, have brought modern living to the American farmer. They are part of American life, and Federal law makes them so. And, in precisely this same category, Federal law and policy, for over a half century, provide for multipurpose reclamation projects whose byproduct of electricity shall be sold, first, to nonprofit agencies—Federal, State, or local. Federal reclamation has helped materially to build the West. It has been assaulted and condemned by selfish people who want no yardstick, and who resent what they sneeringly call socialism.

If when a community of people elect to produce or distribute electric power, that constitutes socialism, then the great city of Los Angeles practices socialism—because, like your REA's, it produces and sells electricity to its people. If that is true, then my own home city of Anaheim must plead guilty, too.

A generation or so ago, these selfish people objected to the Federal Government building any great dams. They lost. The dams, like Hoover Dam, which serves almost all of southern California water and power, were built by the Federal Government to satisfy the people's needs. Now those same selfish people urge what they euphemistically call "partnership." And I say to you, in dead earnest: They will lose again. With your help, we'll see that they do.

Mrs. Roosevelt Discusses Need for a Food Stamp Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 5, 1959

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, all of the Members of the House who served here last year will remember the debate

and vote on my bill to establish a food stamp plan for the distribution of up to $1 billion worth of surplus food a year to needy Americans. That bill, numbered H.R. 13067, was before us on August 18, 1958, and the debate was printed partly in the RECORD of August 18 and the remainder in the RECORD of the following day. I urge new Members to look up the debate and vote in the RECORD for those days; I am sure they will find it informative and interesting.

The vote on H.R. 13067 was 196 yeas, 187 nays, 1 present, and 45 not voting. Although a majority of the Members approved the bill, it was called up under circumstances requiring a two-thirds vote, and so it did not pass.

It is worth noting, I believe, that many of the opponents of the bill last year are no longer Members of the House.

WILL SEEK EARLY CONSIDERATION

Mr. Speaker, I am planning to ask the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture to plan for early hearings on the same bill which a majority of the House voted for last year. This year, the bill is numbered H.R. 1359. It is identical with the bill we had before us last August. It is practically the same as the bill which I first introduced on this subject 5 years ago, and which has been the subject of widespread interest throughout the country ever since.

The point is that we have food in such abundance it is considered a national problem, whereas it could be a great blessing if it were properly used to help feed not only hungry people abroad but millions of our own Americans not now receiving an adequate diet.

HELPING TO BETTER THE LIVES OF PEOPLE AT HOME

Earlier this week, in her column in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, Mrs. Franklin D. Roosevelt discussed the need for a food stamp plan in a manner which, I believe, makes convincing reading. I might say that when her article refers to the cost of storing our surplus food as being $1 million a year, it is either a typographical error or the result of misinformation, for this figure understates the actual cost rather widely. Actually, the cost of storing our farm surpluses is now 1,000 times $1 million a year—it is now $1 billion a year. It used to run $1 million a day, but the President has informed us that in the coming fiscal year it will be about three times that amount, or $1 billion a year.

Otherwise, I commend Mrs. Roosevelt's article and I hope all Members will read it. It speaks of the need to use our surpluses to help better the lives of our own people. Following her article, I submit for the RECORD the full text of H.R. 1359, so that the details of the bill will be available to all those interested in this matter.

First, Mrs. Roosevelt's column from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of March 2, follows:

DISTRIBUTING SURPLUS FOOD

(By Eleanor Roosevelt)

REXBURG, IDAHO, March 2.—I have several letters in my mail about the question of our national food surpluses. People read about the great surpluses piling up in storage in this country and about the efforts made to send this food to foreign markets.

The reaction seems to be twofold. There is a willingness to share with other people in the world, but also a realization that sometimes, due to private situations which have brought about financial difficulties, there are many people here at home suffering from undernourishment. I quote from a letter of a Michigan correspondent. He writes:

"What is this so-called surplus? I think it is food, butter, beans, rice, flour, fruit, etc., that people in the lower brackets of income cannot afford to purchase.

"Millions of people, the aged, unemployed, those unable to work because of disability, etc., are unable to buy this much-needed surplus.

"Why not release this so-called surplus to more of the American people? They would soon reduce this vast hoard of food that our Government has purchased at a cost of billions of our tax dollars and is now paying $1,000,000 a year for its storage.

"Retired and handicapped people 65 or over living on social security checks could be presented with a card that would entitle the bearer to purchase some of this food for about the retail price.

"This would quickly reduce the surplus and help the Government to obtain a part of the cost of its expenditure."

I feel quite sure this could be done now: something like the stamp plan used during the depression might be inaugurated. But this does not mean that we should not make a careful study of what we can do for the world as a whole both by selling and by giving where it is necessary.

It is always said that anything of this kind should not be entered into lightly because it might upset the economies of areas elsewhere in the world. This is true, of course, and we should cooperate with Food and Agricultural Organization of the United Nations and get some of our best financial brains to study the problem of distribution.

It may well be that we will need to enlist our farmers, who are both intelligent and literate, in a real campaign to change the surpluses that we now grow. We have a great range of climate. We can produce more meat, if needed, by feeding cattle some of our surplus grain. We can process certain things and send them to distant areas of the world.

All of this will require study, ingenuity and determination to be really useful to our fellow men who are hungry in other parts of the world. But it does not in any way prevent us from looking at our own home situation. Wherever surpluses can be used for helping to better the lives of people at home, it certainly should be done.

Mr. Speaker, the text of H.R. 1359 now follows:

[86th Cong., 1st sess., in the House of Representatives, January 7, 1959. Mrs. SULLIVAN introduced the following bill; which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture]

H.R. 1359

A bill to provide for the establishment of a food stamp plan for the distribution of $1,000,000,000 worth of surplus food commodities a year to needy persons and families in the United States

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That in order to promote the general welfare, raise the levels of health and of nourishment for persons whose incomes prevent them from enjoying adequate diets, and dispose in a beneficial manner of food commodities acquired by the Commodity Credit Corporation or the Department of Agriculture in carrying out price support operations or diverted from the normal channels of trade and commerce under section 32 of the Act of August 24, 1935, as amended, the Secretary of Agriculture (hereinafter referred to as the "Secretary") is hereby authorized and directed to promulgate and put into operation as quickly as possible, but not later than January 1, 1960, a program to distribute to needy persons in the United States through a food stamp system such surplus food commodities.

SEC. 2. In carrying out such program, the Secretary shall—

(1) distribute surplus food made available by the Secretary for distribution under this program only when requested to do so by a State or political subdivision thereof;

(2) issue, or cause to be issued, pursuant to section 3, food stamps redeemable by eligible needy persons for such types and quantities of surplus food as the Secretary shall determine;

(3) distribute surplus food in commercially packaged form, preferably through normal channels of trade;

(4) establish standards under which, pursuant to section 3, the welfare authorities of any State or political subdivision thereof may participate in the food stamp plan for the distribution of surplus foods to the needy;

(5) consult the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, and the Secretary of Labor, in establishing standards for eligibility for surplus foods and in the conduct of the program generally to assure achievement of the goals outlined in the first section of this Act; and

(6) make such other rules and regulations as he may deem necessary to carry out the purpose of this Act.

SEC. 3. The Secretary shall issue, to each welfare department or equivalent agency of a State or political subdivision requesting the distribution of surplus food under section 2(1), food stamps for each kind of surplus food to be distributed, in amounts based on the total amount of surplus food to be distributed and on the total number of needy persons in the various States and political subdivisions eligible to receive such food. The food stamps shall be issued by each such welfare department or equivalent agency to needy persons receiving welfare assistance, or in need of welfare assistance but ineligible because of State or local law, and shall be redeemable by such needy persons at local distribution points to be determined by the Secretary under section 2(3).

SEC. 4. Surplus food distributed under this Act shall be in addition to, and not in place of, any welfare assistance (financial or otherwise) granted needy persons by a State or any political subdivision thereof.

SEC. 5. In any one calendar year the Secretary is authorized to distribute surplus food under this Act to a value of up to $1,000,000,000, based on the cost to the Federal Government of acquiring, storing, and handling such food.

SEC. 6. For the purposes of this Act, a needy person is anyone receiving welfare assistance (financial or otherwise) from the welfare department or equivalent agency of any State of political subdivision thereof, or who is, in the opinion of such agency or agencies, in need of welfare assistance but is ineligible to receive it because of State or local law.

SEC. 7. The Secretary of Agriculture, in consultation with the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare and the Secretary of Labor, shall make a study of, and shall report to Congress within six months after the date of enactment of this Act, on the feasibility of, the costs of, and the problems involved in, extending the scope of the food stamp plan established by this Act to include persons receiving unemployment compensation, receiving old-age and survivors

insurance (social security) pensions, and other low-income groups not eligible to receive food stamps under this Act by reason of section 6 of this Act.

SEC. 8. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this Act.

Legal Control of Outer Space

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 5, 1959

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement by Senator KENNETH B. KEATING:

STATEMENT OF SENATOR KENNETH B. KEATING (REPUBLICAN, OF NEW YORK), FORMERLY RANKING MINORITY MEMBER ON THE HOUSE JUDICIARY COMMITTEE, BEFORE THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE AND ASTRONAUTICS ON MARCH 5, 1959

The United States has made great scientific strides in the year and a half since Sputnik I began its historical orbit around the Earth. Within a few months we had our first satellite, Explorer I, circling the globe with an apogee of some 1,600 miles. This has been followed by about half a dozen other successful orbiters and two space probers which penetrated into space to distances of 71,300 and 63,580 miles, respectively. And just 2 days ago our first Sun rocket was successfully launched.

I am confident that within the next decade we shall place a man on Earth's own satellite—the Moon. Nothing should be spared to assure our eventual leadership in this new field of astronautics. A second-best position behind Russia in this space race could spell disaster for the whole free world.

Americans are fully aware of the scientific challenge with which we are confronted, and I have no doubt of this Nation's willingness to make whatever sacrifice is necessary to meet that challenge. But it would be a fatal mistake to approach the space era solely in terms of satellites and solar probes. While we must not slacken our great technological effort, it is of importance also that we develop an appropriate basis for meeting other vitally significant aspects of the space era.

I believe that there has not been enough emphasis on the necessity for adapting some of our earthbound concepts to the requirements of this new age. For that reason I am very gratified at this committee's initiative in centering attention in these hearings on one of the most pressing of all the new nonscientific problems raised by the space age—the need for new rules of law for the settlement of space controversies.

It may be, as many people claim, that it will be the scientists who will chart the future course of the world. Their spectacular achievements certainly have merited them unparalleled eminence. But the scientists cannot be counted upon or expected to keep our moral progress abreast of our scientific advances. This responsibility ultimately lies with the people, and they will properly expect their lawmakers to take the lead in proposing the new concepts and principles which are necessary. These hearings can serve a historic purpose if they result in even the most tentative first steps in the direction of devising a new legal code for the space age.

There are some who underestimate the serious consequences of any lag between legal and scientific developments. They recall with nostalgia the centuries required for the flowering of the common law, and fondly anticipate similar development of the new space law. I grant that law is shaped and nourished by experience—but I also insist that it is fundamentally based on necessity. The necessity for new laws and concepts in this case is overwhelming. There will be no time for legal craftsmanship and judicial speculation after rival claims are made to the moon or to space itself. Civilization has now reached a point at which a gap between our moral and technological tools could be fatal. The rule of law in the age of space is not a matter of philosophy, but a matter of survival.

The legal problem is not a new one. Down through the ages man has striven to attune his legal codes to progress in other fields. Constant change to insure maximum justice has been the hallmark of progressive and successful legal thought. History reveals that the physical sciences did not reach fruition until the proper moral climate had been achieved in civilized sectors of the world. This was brought about by the rise of mature religions and the promulgation and acceptance of legal standards by which man's conduct could be guided.

We have made some progress in dealing with this new dimension of our national existence, but much remains to be done. One of the important steps in the right direction was the enactment of legislation for a new National Astronautics and Space Agency. This legislation authorizes the agency to develop a comprehensive program of research and development in aeronautics and space science "and related matters."

I emphasize the phrase "and related matters"—which was added to the original bill by this committee. In my judgment these words were added among other reasons, to make it clear that the agency should consider the legal as well as scientific aspects of our space program. I hope that this committee will confirm my interpretation and reexpress the intention of Congress that the exploration and regulation of our interplanetary exploits must develop hand-in-hand.

I have also been very gratified by the proposals made by the United States to the United Nations for international cooperation in the exploration of outer space. This was concrete evidence of this Nation's determination to foster world peace and security. It revealed in a most dramatic and impressive manner our intention to do all we can to use the new discoveries from space exploration for the benefit of all mankind.

I have long advocated such a course by the United States. More than a year ago, I urged the following three-point program for international action: First, an immediate declaration that outer space was not subject to appropriation by any nation; second, an international agreement barring the use of outer space for any military purpose; and third, the creation or utilization of an international agency for the joint exploration of outer space.

Such a program is urgently needed to promote a universal dedication to the development of outer space for peaceful, scientific and humanitarian objectives.

We should all be gratified at the initiative taken by the United States to block the use of outer space for military purposes and to shower its benefits on all mankind. Our proposals in this field should have a profoundly favorable effect on world opinion. They are a most fitting response to the challenge of outer space by a nation dedicated to man's constant spiritual and material advancement.

These are the broad outlines of the Government's response to the nonscientific problems of outer space. I advocate two additional steps to complete our reorganization for the space age. First of all, I propose that there be established a Federal Department of Science and Research or its equivalent. Such a department could coordinate the efforts of agencies such as the NASA, the Atomic Energy Commission, the National Science Foundation, and the Bureau of Standards. It would consolidate under one roof all fields of scientific endeavor in which our Government has an interest. This would facilitate the coordination of all these activities and guarantee cabinet-level consideration of the Government's overall undertakings in this field.

My second proposal is that there be established a Joint Congressional Committee on Outer Space modeled after the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. At present each House has its own separate committee on outer space. In addition, other committees in both Houses, such as the Armed Services and Foreign Affairs Committees, are continuing to exercise their jurisdiction over some of the problems in this area. This has meant that a great deal of valuable time of our top scientists and military experts is being spent on Capitol Hill instead of in the laboratories and on the proving grounds. While the testimony of these experts is, of course, essential to the work of Congress, the creation of a single joint committee would avoid duplication and greatly expedite matters.

These are problems primarily of Government organization. There are many, many more legal problems of direct practical concern. One of these is the question of who owns space—or even more fundamentally the problem of what is space. In "Coke on Littleton" we find the maxim: "To whomsoever the soil belongs, he owns also to the sky and to the depths. The owner of a piece of land owns everything above and below it to an indefinite extent." This maxim barely survived the age of aeronautics. It holds little promise for the age of astronautics.

In 1902, shortly after the Wright brothers' first flight, a convention was proposed under which the air would be free to commerce and travel just as is the sea. This proposal was rejected. During the First World War, each nation began to assert exclusive control of the airspace over its territory. After the war, the law of absolute sovereignty over airspace was formalized in the Paris Convention of 1919. This provided that "every power has complete and exclusive sovereignty over the airspace above its territory." This principle has since been consistently adhered to in domestic legislation as well as in international treaties.

Significantly, the term "airspace" has never been defined in any of these treaties. Scientists have now established that there is no fixed separation between airspace and outer space. It is apparent that law and science will have to join forces in arriving at an acceptable definition of these terms.

Suppose one were to attempt to apply the principles of established international law by extending the boundaries of each nation into outer space. Because of the curved face of the earth, the extension would produce an inverted cone which would grow bigger and bigger in relation to the country as it reached farther into space. At some point these cones would overlap and more than one state would be occupying the same airspace. Moreover, the continuous movement of the earth on its axis means that the relationship of particular areas on the surface of the earth to space beyond the atmosphere would be constantly changing.

These solar facts illustrate the impossibility of applying existing concepts of international law to the control of outer space. In my opinion, space beyond the atmosphere must remain the common property of all the nations, or, what is the same thing, the property of no nation.

Another legal problem is determining the rights of nations to terrestrial bodies. Here again it is doubtful that the present earthbound rules of discovery and occupation are suitable. I believe that only an early and firm assertion of international jurisdiction over such areas will avoid the kind of territorial conflicts in outer space which have plagued the earth for its entire history.

Looking ahead, it is apparent that we will also need new laws for the protection of persons, industries, and territories, from misguided missiles and plunging Pioneers. Rules will have to be devised with respect to liability for injury or damage from activities in outer space. What would you say as to the launching Nation's liability for damages if a satellite were to come crashing down on this room at this very moment?

I believe that an immediate start should be made in drafting a code for outer space which would cover such contingencies and numerous others. It could provide for such things as the filing of flight plans to prevent interstellar collisions and confusion; it could regulate spacecraft broadcast so as to avoid interference with present frequency allocations; it could set forth return-to-earth covenants, navigational guides, and the like. If we act in this field now, we can avoid the pitfalls which confront attempts to deal after the fact with comparable problems arising out of travel on the high seas and in the air and in the exploration of Antarctica.

Many legal scholars are pondering these problems. The American Bar Association has already organized a standing committee on space law. The International Astronautical Federation has become active in the field. Articles on the subject have been appearing in the legal periodicals. A report of the International Law Association deals extensively with these problems.

I have been very pleased to learn that these questions are being given serious consideration even by Soviet legal experts. A recent issue of a Russian legal periodical carried an article urging that no government be permitted to incorporate any portion of interplanetary space under its jurisdiction. The article suggests that a government's sovereignty over the space above its territory should be limited to a height sufficient to safeguard each nation from encroachments on its territory or from threats to its independence. In a more practical vein, the author urges that all satellites and other bodies sent into space be required to have identifying marks so that responsibility can be assigned for any damage caused by their falling back to earth. The article also recognizes the need for international agreement on assignment of radio frequencies for signaling apparatus sent into space. This is particularly interesting, since a complaint has been filed with the Federal Communications Commission protesting the Russian sputnik's use of radio frequencies in violation of international agreements for radio frequency allocation.

The official Russian line expressed by its representatives at the U.N. does not justify too much optimism about the adoption of needed international agreements for the legal control of space. Still we must not give up hope. A genuine international effort to define the rights of all nations in space is one of the world's compelling needs. Anarchy in space could be more dangerous than anarchy on earth. The United States should move ahead in this field with or without Soviet cooperation. If we succeed in promulgating a code which is reasonable and fair, world opinion might force its enactment as the law of the universe. Success in this effort, in the long run, may constitute our Nation's greatest contribution to the cause of peace and progress in this new era.

Fight To Save Reno From Freeway Destruction

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER S. BARING
OF NEVADA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 5, 1959

Mr. BARING. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I should like to direct attention to a prepared statement of mine before the Special Investigating Subcommittee of the House Committee on Government Operations investigating the Federal Interstate Highway selection through Reno-Sparks-Verdi, Nev.:

BARING FIGHTS TO SAVE RENO FROM FREEWAY DESTRUCTION

Mr. Chairman, colleagues and citizens of Reno, we meet here today in defense of the city of Reno. We here constitute a vanguard to stave off a concrete onslaught upon the Biggest Little City in the World.

We are gathered to prevent a project that would wipe out every vestige of industry that Reno has today, and it would forevermore block a further advancement of industry in this city.

I intend to prove that the Third Street route is in violation of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1956, which in part reads that "Any State highway department which submits plans for a Federal-aid highway project involving the bypassing of, or going through, any city, town, or village, either incorporated or unincorporated, shall certify to the Commissioner of Public Roads that it has had public hearings, or has afforded the opportunity for such hearings, and has considered the economic effects of such a location."

I do not believe that any consideration has been given whatsoever to the economic effects of the Third Street location.

The situation we face today had its beginning back in 1955. The issue then played a very important part in the city elections of that year. Mr. Len Harris, who was a candidate for the important post of mayor of the city of Reno, declared that he would never tolerate a dual-lane highway through Reno.

Those aspiring to be city councilmen, with the exception of Mr. Mastriani, who was later appointed, stood firmly on their denunciation of a transcontinental highway bisecting this city.

I propose to introduce in evidence during this hearing newspaper advertisements to support these statements. After the elections were over things were different. When the time came to decide upon the routing of the freeway through or around Reno, the State highway department employed a firm of engineers to survey the several possible routes. The project cost the taxpayers $86,000, and their report rocked the people of our city like a supersonic blast.

Court Street had been recommended as the path of the interstate defense freeway.

You all remember what happened following that report. Many of you here in this room were up in arms. Some of you, who now belong to the Realistic Freeway Association, realized that your properties were endangered and you fought bitterly to prevent such a catastrophe. The result was a compromise. Raymond Smith, who decided to migrate to our city, recommended Third Street as such a measure. I cannot believe that he had any notion of what this would entail from an engineering standpoint. One bridge alone, in the form of a Y must diagonally cross the Truckee River at the city police department building at a cost of some $2½ to $3 million.

Eighty-six thousand dollars flew out the window, because the firm engaged by the State highway department did not even survey Third Street as a possibility.

During the events which led to the selection of Third Street, letters of protest began to flood my office. People of Reno pleaded with me to stop William Howard Smith, field engineer of the Bureau of Public Roads, from throwing his weight around, as they expressed it. They accused Smith and Houston Mills, our State engineer, of acting like a couple of dictators.

It is not uncommon for people to petition their Representative in Congress when things are not going well, and it was only in the line of duty that I responded to the voice of three-quarters of the population of Reno in their cry for help. I, too, am a taxpayer and a citizen of this city. As such, I opposed any routing of the freeway through town, and will fight to the end to prevent such a calamity, because once the freeway is built it is too late. The damage is done. Reno is fenced in and cannot expand. Its industry is knocked out. Homes are destroyed. Businesses are destroyed. Men are thrown out of jobs and many heartbroken citizens of Reno, who have worked hard all their lives to build the city will never again invest their money and their efforts to rebuild what they have lost.

Yes, I will fight, and fight hard, not only as your Congressman, but as a member of your community and my community to preserve our city against the onslaught of a concrete monstrosity.

However, beyond representing the will of some 17,000 of the people of Reno, there was another responsibility that I had to face. The Congress of the United States is charged with the responsibility of policing the expenditure of Federal funds. As you all know, the interstate freeway project is to a very large extent to be financed by our Federal Government. In the State of Nevada, some 95 percent of the cost of this freeway will be assumed by the Bureau of Public Roads in Washington. This money is appropriated by Congress, and I am a Member of that body. If I have been accused of interfering in a local matter the accusation is unfounded, and without the support of fact.

Realizing its importance to the defense of this country, the Congress of the United States appropriated a vast sum of money, which has now been raised to $27 billion, to build an interstate freeway system across the United States.

According to reports of the national chamber of commerce, the program has already bogged down because of local selfish interests. Some cities have attempted to exploit moneys appropriated to defend our country by diverting such funds to city improvements. Some city fathers have put their hands in the grab bag for local construction, because their city treasuries were exhausted. This happened right here in Reno. Certain city officials boasted that the only way to build railroad overpasses was with Federal funds. This greed has already taken a tremendous toll, both in loss of time and in increased costs.

To the north of Reno there is a natural bowl. The entire distance from Verdi to Vista can today be traveled by jeep. The inside rim of this bowl is referred to as the north rim route. It is approximately 17 or 18 blocks north of the post office in downtown Reno. It forms a natural line for the construction of a transcontinental defense highway.

Not only this, but the people of Reno want the freeway to skirt the city. I know this, because since I took up the fight some 3,500 people have written me commending me for the stand I have taken. These letters came from all over Washoe County, as well as other counties throughout the State—not just the people along the Third Street line.

As a child I fished the Truckee River from Lake Tahoe to Vista, and I do know every bend along the way, as many of you do. Also, as a college student, I took a course in geology, and I have prospected the greater part of Peavine Mountain. Two of my four years in college were in the department of engineering, and I certainly understand the topography of Reno. If the freeway, starting from the State line, followed a northeasterly course to skirt Verdi to the north, the entire route could be constructed without superstructures, and with the use of a couple of steam shovels and bulldozers the entire 19 miles could be made ready for concrete in short order, and the construction could be completed by snowfall of this year to service the winter Olympics.

There is no sane reason for following scheme J. That scheme crosses a deep ravine, and would require the construction of a trestle 125 feet high—as high as the Mapes Hotel—at a probable cost of $3 million.

There is no justification at all for the construction of an elevated freeway through Reno, at a cost of approximately $40 million, or $8 million per mile.

The Third Street line includes 13 turns, several bridges, and it has been said by an expert that, as designed, it would give a hotrodder a loop the loop, shoot the shoot, cheap thrill, driving 40 miles per hour.

To offset the destruction of the city, the destruction of industry, the destruction of homes, the destruction of established businesses, and I could go on, the Bureau of Public Roads has, in approving Third Street, relied entirely on what they term a cost-benefit factor. The benefit assigned to this factor is derived from a traffic study made back in 1955, and is nebulous at best. The cost is conservatively four times greater than the north rim routing.

It is amazing that such a nebulous benefit factor conceived 5 years ago can have the force to offset the expenditure of $30 million of taxpayers' money.

But how was the decision reached to follow scheme J and the Third Street line through Reno?

As you all know, the selection of scheme J was accomplished long before the so-called public hearings were held in Reno. Many Third Street advocates attended the Verdi hearings.

The board of county commissioners had rejected scheme J. It was not feasible. It would follow the sheltered side of the mountain, where snow drifts up to 20 feet. The cost would be prohibitive.

However, on August 5, 1957, Ferin, Bureau engineer from San Francisco, wired William Howard Smith, Bureau of Public Roads engineer stationed at Carson City, that no Federal funds would be made available except for scheme J.

This information was immediately communicated to Commissioner Peterson, and a special meeting of the board of county commissioners was held, at which meeting Peterson explained to the other board members that he had been notified that the Bureau of Public Roads would only support scheme J.

They then passed a resolution reversing their previous decision, and subsequently scheme J was submitted through the State highway department to the Bureau of Public Roads in Washington, requesting Federal approval. Third Street advocates were successful. They had gotten a foot in the door and had practically railroaded a downtown routing of the freeway through Reno.

Then followed the so-called public hearings at Reno. To say that inadequate notice was posted in the local papers is the understatement of the year. As was the case at Verdi, no mention whatever was made of any specific route. The papers did carry a notice that consideration of several proposed routes would be the subject of a public hearing 4 or 5 days later.

The meeting was a farce. Third Street supporters immediately stole the show. They were given every opportunity to speak their piece, and the mayor was booed off the stage for belying his campaign promises. As the day faded, the people became tired and restless, many having already left. Members of the United Freeway Association were finally recognized late that evening, but were given admonition to make their stories brief. Actually, in the presence of Bureau of Public Roads officials, the Chair explained that no routing outside of the city of Reno was under consideration, as the Bureau would not provide Federal funds, except for a selection through the city.

Furthermore, the transcript of the hearings included the startling information, evidenced by a statement made by Mr. Holcomb, assistant engineer, who was in charge of the hearings, that he did not know where the north rim route was.

The Third Street selection was dressed up like a Christmas tree in all its tinsel and spangles. The people were told that it included railroad overpasses, and, as a matter of fact, this was the biggest selling point. For years, north and south bound traffic has been held up by passing trains, sometimes by long and slow moving freight trains. At last Reno would be rid of this bottleneck. This was the big selling point, yet after the Bureau of Public Roads in Washington denied the Third Street routing as submitted and explained to Mr. Houston Mills, our former State engineer, that the Federal Government could not build railroad overpasses, Mills took the trimming off the tree and returned the Third Street proposal to Washington without the railroad overpasses, and deliberately omitted a new public hearing. This was a flagrant violation of the Federal law which requires that a public hearing be held and a study be made of the economic impact for each new proposal submitted. I have already quoted the law.

Even though the overpasses were used to bait the public, he claimed that the omission of these overpasses did not materially alter the original Third Street plan and that it was not necessary, therefore, to hold new hearings. This was typical of his insolent attitude and indifference toward the people of Reno.

He did, however, turn to the city council, the board of county commissioners and the State highway board for their approval, so he must have recognized that a new proposal existed.

The same Mr. Mills, who has consistently refused to survey the north rim route at the request of the people of Reno, stated publicly that he did not believe the Bureau of Public Roads was right in refusing to build railroad overpasses, but, in any event, he would find funds from other sources, such as primary and secondary funds, to build them with.

I maintain that the State highway department did not follow Federal law in resubmitting Third Street without a new public hearing, and that there have been irregularities throughout all of the events leading to the approval of the Third Street line.

I want to call it to the attention of this committee that the people of Reno are fighting mad. Many of these people are fighting for their very homes. They are fighting to protect their city against the small handful of men who have always dictated what shall be and what shall not be done.

Yes, for the first time in their lives, the people have stood up against the city fathers. This issue is bigger and hotter than any issue that has ever faced the people of Reno.

It was made an election issue. Two county commissioners, a Governor, a State controller, an attorney general, and one city councilman who sought a position in the State legislature, were defeated at the polls—this because they supported the Third Street routing, while at the same time my vote increased in Washoe County by some 8,500 votes, each of them a vote for the north rim route.

Had the freeway question been submitted to the people as a referendum, the Third Street issue would have then been resolved in triumph for the United Freeway Association, and the citizens of Reno.

Immediately after the election, with a new highway board, consisting of Governor Sawyer, Attorney General Foley, and Controller Keith Lee, I asked the Bureau of Public Roads to stop all further work and to freeze Federal funds until the new highway board could either affirm or disaffirm the decision of the old board.

Congressman BLATNIK, chairman of the Government Operations Subcommittee on Legal and Monetary Affairs, formally requested Mr. Turner of the Bureau of Public Roads to issue a stop order. When he refused, Congressman DAWSON, chairman of the full Committee on Government Operations, made a similar request. I will not say here, but I have a strong suspicion that it was not until a person even more influential than either of these two gentlemen interceded that Mr. Turner finally agreed to withhold Federal funds until this issue could be decided.

I had already asked for a congressional investigation of the whole mess, based on an excessive and unwarranted expenditure of Federal funds, as well as irregularities in the selection of the Third Street route. Nevertheless, Mr. Houston Mills, our former State engineer, stated publicly that he didn't care whether BARING had asked for a congressional investigation or not, he was going to build the Third Street Freeway, and went right ahead.

As a matter of fact, word has come to me from several different sources that the firm employed by the highway department is still surveying, driving stakes, and otherwise spending Federal funds, so in addition to other charges I have made, I must now charge that department with contempt of Congress.

Before closing I should like to leave with you a few thoughts. Picture, if you will, the Third Street Freeway come to fruition. There are two ammunition depots in the proximity of Reno. Ammunition trucks heavily laden with supplies and ammunition would rumble through the heart of town. Large tankers, transport trucks, and other vehicles practically bumper to bumper would roar their presence.

Elevated sound becomes more intense as it blankets the city. Many of the larger vehicles parallel the noise of our transport planes, and we all know the disturbance of a single plane flying over town. This noise

would render motels, rooming houses, and homes absolutely valueless, because people cannot sleep in the vicinity of an elevated freeway.

Yet the owners of this property have no redress at all under our statutes. Only property actually taken must be paid for.

Picture again what might happen should a gasoline truck explode—one did on the Los Angeles Freeway only several months ago—we would have a burning inferno in downtown Reno.

More than ever before, we recognize the need of a defense highway. The Congress recognized this need when it appropriated $27 billion for its construction. Ammunition must be transported. In the event of an emergency possibly the entire population of towns must be evacuated. Foodstuffs must be brought in. We need a transcontinental freeway, but we certainly don't need all of this in the middle of our city, and parallel to a transcontinental railroad. One bomb could knock out both.

I have received several letters, with documented statements of the American Medical Association, stating that noxious gases emitted from this tremendous trucking industry would be conducive to the occurrence of cancer. There is a far better opportunity for these gases to dissipate out of the city in the open spaces.

In summary, only $13 billion were originally appropriated to support the Federal highway program. This sum has already been advanced to $27 billion.

It is in instances like those we face today, asinine plans that involve expensive trestles, river crossings, unnecessary elevated sections and the acquisition of expensive real estate to clear rights of way, that costs pyramid.

The freeway has not yet been built through Reno, but there is one thing that is certain—when it is built it will be built with your money.

Are we as taxpayers going to be coerced into spending millions of dollars unnecessarily to serve the selfish interests of a few individuals?

I have been in this fight for a long time, and I can assure you I have been thoroughly castigated by the Reno press. For 10 months there wasn't a newspaper that didn't carry a headline, "BARING Blasted." I became the most blasted man in the county. Even the Bureau of Public Roads engineers called me a rabble rouser, and quite a few able and responsible citizens of Reno have also enjoyed the same treatment from the press.

I have also been accused by my opponents of using the freeway issue for political gain. If fulfillment of my oath of office is politics, then politics is the science of government, rather than the means of gaining political favor.

Ladies and gentlemen, and my colleagues, if this committee permits the Bureau of Public Roads to construct a freeway through Reno at the cost of $8 million a mile, and if this committee permits the Bureau of Public Roads to continue to whitewash every action on their part, be it in wisdom or in ignorance, then there will be a thousand Renos across the entire country, exploiting Federal funds to fulfill local selfish interests. Then the Congress will have to appropriate many more billions of dollars, because the Federal road system will reach astronomical proportions, and the $27 billion now appropriated will not begin to scratch the surface. It is up to this committee and the citizens of Reno to prevent this. It is up to us to lend fulfillment to the purposes for which the Federal road program was conceived, and it is up to this committee to insure the construction of a defense highway around Reno, rather than permit the destruction of the homes of those very people who must pay for it.

Bill Introduced To Improve and Extend Rural Mail Delivery

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. H. CARL ANDERSEN
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 5, 1959

Mr. ANDERSEN of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill designed to correct an inequity in our rural mail delivery service that has existed for many, many years.

The present Postmaster General has effected more improvements in rural mail service during his term in office than any other Postmaster General in my recollection. In my district alone, literally hundreds and hundreds of farm families have in the last few years seen desirable changes made in their mail delivery. These changes have included more expeditious handling of the mail in transit, greater efficiency in physical facilities of the post offices receiving and delivering mail, rural route extensions, and driveway delivery.

Having received my own mail on a rural route the better part of my life, I know how much good mail service means to farm people, and we are deeply grateful to Postmaster General Arthur E. Summerfield for the tremendous improvements he and his staff have made. We are also obtaining approval of house delivery in more and more of our towns and villages and that is a service long overdue in rural areas.

It will be recalled that one of the first improvements instituted by the present Postmaster General in behalf of farm people was the change in number of patrons required for rural route extensions from the previous rule of four to a mile to a more realistic three to a mile. Then, just last year, he announced that extensions would be approved on the basis of two families to a mile including retrace.

Regrettably, there are still many farm families who have to walk or drive long distances for their mail simply because they do not in their immediate area meet the test of two families to a mile of rural route. In some instances they fail to qualify by only a small fraction of a mile and it is inequitably unfair for them to have to go six-tenths of a mile or more for mail while a neighbor just one-tenth of a mile off the old route has his mail delivered to his driveway under the newly authorized extensions.

My bill proposes to correct most of these inequities and, at the same time, adhere to the Postmaster General's policy of providing rural mail delivery on routes averaging two families to a mile for the entire distance traveled. To illustrate the inequity I seek to correct, under present regulations a new route may be established or an extension approved if the new route or the extension will serve an average of two patrons per mile. However, where a route already exists extensions may be approved in only those instances in which the extension, by itself, will serve an average of two patrons per mile. This policy prevails regardless of the number of patrons per mile of the old, established route and regardless of the further fact that if a new route was being established it might gain approval with the proposed extension included on the basis of two patrons per mile of total length.

If approved, this bill would treat all families living in rural areas alike and I am advised that it would lead to extension of routes to serve virtually every farm family in a district like mine. All of us believe in the American principle that everyone be afforded equal treatment under the law and I propose such equality in this measure.

It seems elemental to me that a rural mail delivery policy of two families to a mile should be applied to old, established routes as well as to new ones. If it is the policy to approve an extension of a route on the basis of serving two patrons per mile of new route, then it should likewise be the policy to approve extensions where the total route, as extended, would serve an average of two per mile for its entire length. In simple terms, my bill extends to all farm people an equal opportunity for rural mail delivery on the basis of the present policy of the Post Office Department in approving proposed rural route extensions and the approval of new routes.

I hope the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service agrees on the merits of this proposal as it would be a wonderful thing for farm people to know that the Congress recognizes their entitlement to equal treatment in the delivery of their mail. American farmers have certainly not received equality of consideration in an economic sense and it seems to me the least we can do is to treat them fairly in the delivery of their mail.

The provisions of the bill are as follows:

A bill to extend rural mail delivery service

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That rural mail delivery shall be extended so as to serve, as nearly as practicable, the entire rural population of the United States. For the purposes of this section, it shall be considered practicable to establish a new rural mail delivery route or extend an existing route if the new route or the existing route as extended will serve an average of two families for each mile of its total length, including retraces.

Who Really Desires a U.S.-Latin American Rift?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 5, 1959

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, on May 26, 1958, I introduced a resolution in the House of Representatives, House Concurrent Resolution 335, to establish a Pan American Parliamentary Associa-

tion to be made up of parliamentary representatives of all the 21 nations of the Western Hemisphere. In my statement on the floor of the House at the time the resolution was introduced, I defined the purposes of the association as follows:

The purpose of this organization should be to create better understanding among the peoples of the hemisphere, expansion of educational and scientific exchange programs, closer cultural relations, improvement in trade relations, encouragement of large-scale tourism between North and South America, help to provide relief in times of disaster, seek means to dispose of surplus commodities in the various countries to help their economies, etc.

In that statement, I also pointed to the Communist efforts to obtain a foothold in Latin America and to discredit the United States. I stressed the urgent need for the United States to help Latin America achieve a higher standard of living, and I concluded thus:

We have taken the Latin Americans for granted, while pouring our aid to other parts of the world. A positive people-to-people approach in our dealings with our neighbors has been lacking. We must restore such relationship.

Subsequently, I made a trip to several Latin American countries in connection with my resolution and was received by heads of governments, as well as legislative leaders, with whom I discussed my proposals. The press of the countries I visited reported on my trip and the comments made by various leaders who hailed the purposes of the resolution as a great step in the right direction. For example, the chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee of Argentina's Chamber of Deputies, Juan Lopez, was extremely enthusiastic about my plan, while the President of the Brazilian Chamber of Deputies, Ranieri Mazzilli, made a public statement in which he said about the proposed Pan American Parliamentary Association:

It could mean a new stage in the relations among our countries, a new era of good friendship.

From time to time thereafter, because of my interest in Latin American affairs, newspaper representatives visited me or called me on the telephone for an expression of my views whenever Latin American problems arose. I saw such a reporter on March 2, 1959, after it had been reported in various newspapers and magazines that trouble was brewing between Haiti, the Dominican Republic, and the new Government of Cuba, and that threats of invasion had been made against one or another of these countries.

On this particular occasion I was asked by the reporter, who represented the United Press International—certainly a most reputable news agency—whether I favored armed intervention on the part of the United States in the event of such invasion. I stated most emphatically that peace in the Western Hemisphere "should not be left up to the United States alone." Then I added as follows:

The whole idea of the Monroe Doctrine has been superseded by the Organization of American States. However, the United States has a large stake in maintaining peace and security at its backdoor and this certainly concerns such countries as Haiti, Cuba, and the Dominican Republic.

For this reason, I think if there is a serious threat that any one of these nations will start an armed invasion, then the United States should take the lead in calling upon the other 20 members of the OAS to establish a police action to prevent such an invasion.

The above is taken verbatim from the UPI story as it appeared on the UPI news ticker of March 2, 1959, and which was published in various newspapers here and abroad. On March 3, Radiodifusora at Caracas, Venezuela, broadcast a vitriolic attack on me which was intended as a reply. Following is the full text as reported by the Foreign Broadcast Information Service, in its daily report No. 42:

REPRESENTATIVE ANFUSO HELD WIDENING UNITED STATES-LATIN AMERICAN RIFT

Caracas, Radiodifusora Venezuela, in Spanish to the Americas, March 3, 1959, 0400 GMT—W.

The U.S. Democratic Representative VICTOR ANFUSO said today that the United States should ask the Organization of the American States to intervene to prevent the liberation of the Dominican Republic, Haiti, and Nicaragua. Such is the sense of a statement of another disciple of Foster Dulles. The Representative says that the OAS must prevent any invasion in the Caribbean by police action.

The impudence of this enemy of Latin America reached such extremes of cynicism that he added: "The United States should (play a bigger role?) in the maintenance of peace and security." And further on he said: "If a threat of an armed invasion presents itself"—naturally, he is referring to the Caribbean problem—"then the United States must take the initiative to call on the other 20 members of the Organization of American States to take police action to prevent such an invasion."

Such are the demagogic statements of Mr. VICTOR ANFUSO. Mr. VICTOR ANFUSO, Representative, Democrat, to the U.S. Congress, trying to (bring back?) a new intervention of the sadly famous marines, going back 40 years in history and (one word indistinct) to discredit even more, if it were possible, the foreign policy of the State Department. No wonder that the rift between the United States and our peoples is growing daily.

Mr. Speaker, when this attack and distortion of my words and aims was called to my attention, I was shocked and infuriated. The report of the Venezuelan radio appeared to be a deliberate attempt to create dissension and to discredit me as a friend of Latin America. No fairminded person could have so mutilated my statement, which a careful comparison between my words and the Venezuelan radio will readily prove.

I say, in all sincerity, that I profoundly regret this. If friends of Venezuela and of Latin America generally, people who are earnest in their efforts to create better understanding and mutual cooperation throughout the hemisphere are going to be thus berated, then I fear not only for the future of Venezuela but for the future of all of Latin America and of the whole world to survive in freedom and democracy. We are waging a great struggle against an evil power which seeks our enslavement and the eradication of every vestige of human freedom and human dignity. This is no time for bickering. We must stand united throughout the whole Western Hemisphere, if we seriously want to prevent this hemisphere from falling under the yoke of communism.

To deliberately distort my words to show that I am preaching armed intervention, when in reality I suggested that the United States call upon the other 20 members of the OAS to prevent such an invasion; to call me an enemy of Latin America, when actually I am advocating hemispheric unity and cooperation to achieve a higher standard of living for the people of Latin America and I am urging greater economic aid to the Latin American countries, to twist my words in this manner and to make them appear demagogic could have been done only by someone who is not serving the interests of Venezuela or of Latin America, but those of communism.

Only a person who is steeped in Communist methods of falsification and forgery, in Communist propaganda tactics and the perversion of ideas, could do something as vicious as that. That person is not interested in creating better United States-Latin American relations—his interest lies in creating a greater and a wider rift on which Communist elements could capitalize for their benefit.

I expect to communicate with the President of Venezuela in the very near future and to request an explanation of this vitriolic attack on me, who is behind it, and why I was singled out for this attack.

A Report to the Nation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY
OF RHODE ISLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 5, 1959

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, as many Members of this House are aware, on Thursday, February 19, here in Washington, D.C., the National Heart Institute and the American Heart Association joined in presenting a report to the Nation on 10 years of progress against heart disease. This report was made by six of the most eminent physicians and medical scientists in the United States. I might add that it was at the suggestion of my colleague in the Senate, the Honorable LISTER HILL, of Alabama, and myself, that the Heart Association and the Heart Institute combined forces, as it were, to give the results of this 10-year war on diseases of the heart and blood vessels. Because this report was of such great significance and because it has proved to be a truly historic event, under unanimous consent, I include the entire report in the RECORD.

The report follows:

A REPORT TO THE NATION PRESENTED BY AMERICAN HEART ASSOCIATION AND NATIONAL HEART INSTITUTE ON "A DECADE OF PROGRESS AGAINST CARDIOVASCULAR DISEASE"

(Participants: The Honorable Lister Hill, U.S. Senator, Alabama; the Honorable John E. Fogarty, U.S. Representative, Rhode Island; Leroy E. Burney, M.D., Surgeon General, U.S. Public Health Service; Francis L. Chamberlain, M.D., president, American Heart Association; and James Watt, M.D., director, National Heart Institute. Panelists: Howard B. Sprague, M.D., meeting chairman and panel moderator; Paul Dudley White, M.D.; Irvine H. Page, M.D.; Robert W. Wilkins, M.D.; Michael E. DeBakey, M.D.; and Robert W. Berliner, M.D.)

Dr. SPRAGUE. Senator HILL, Representative FOGARTY, distinguished guests, this is a unique meeting. So far as I know, it is the first report to the Nation to be given to the people on the advances made possible through their magnificent support of medical and scientific research.

This is a unique meeting also because it could not be held anywhere else in the world. In no other country do we find so highly developed the institution known as the independent voluntary health agency, through which physicians, scientists and laymen combine their efforts to advance the national interest in so vital a field as health.

In no other country does the phenomenon exist of such a voluntary association working side by side and in closest harmony with an official governmental agency dedicated to the same objective. Simply stated, this objective is the reduction of death and disability from heart and blood vessel disease.

Too, this meeting is unusual in that it comes at the invitation and suggestion of two eminent statesmen who have personally played leading roles in the creation and growth of the National Institutes of Health, of which the National Heart Institute is a part.

I do not know, Senator HILL and Representative FOGARTY, whether you and the other Congressmen here today are aware of it, but all of you have helped to make American physicians and scientists the envy of our colleagues throughout the world.

I do not say this on my own authority but on that of the distinguished British medical publication, the Lancet. In an editorial last September, the Lancet declared:

"Those who visit American medical schools are impressed by the amount of money at their disposal for medical research. * * * In the United States, all avenues into medical research are wide open. * * * Congress is putting into research 20 times the budget of our Medical Research Council. Last year the grant from Federal funds alone was $186 million. By full deployment of talent and by the effort of great numbers, an immensely rich soil is being developed from which new research ideas can be harvested. By contrast, medical research in this country (Britain) is undergoing relative attrition despite an expanding economy."

Through this report to the Nation, we seek to make two points clear. One is that the past 10 years have been a period of extraordinary advance, producing new knowledge through which thousands of lives have already been saved, prolonged or enriched, and giving this Nation a position of world leadership in the field of cardiovascular medicine.

The other is that these advances have brought us to the threshold of even greater developments, of decisive breakthroughs that will make possible the large-scale prevention of these diseases that now cut down so many people in the best years of their lives.

The bounty of our efforts extends not only to the people of this Nation but to those of other nations as well. The new knowledge we have brought to fruition—thanks to the accelerated and intensified research programs—should prove to be an export commodity of great usefulness in winning friends and influencing people in behalf of freedom and democracy.

Research results cannot be produced by fiat or timetable. By the same token, it is usually impossible to assign research gains to any one specific year. As someone has said, "Great discoveries are not made, they grow." Like the jigsaw puzzle to which it is sometimes compared, research usually develops new knowledge through the putting together of many small pieces by many people working in many places. Once the puzzle has been filled, it must then undergo the never-ending test of application and experience. Therefore, it is all the more remarkable that we can ascribe so many specific accomplishments in the cardiovascular field to the past decade. And it should be noted, in passing, that this 10-year period coincides with the lifespan of both the American Heart Association and the National Heart Institute.

We have many advances to report. Yet, had there been no specific gains applicable to patients, the very fact that we have mounted a tremendous research effort would in itself deserve recognition as a major achievement. As we all know, the first need of any research effort is to mobilize human resources.

Today, there exists in the United States a corps of research workers in the cardiovascular field of unprecedented number and scientific capacity. Its creation has been very largely stimulated and nourished by the joint endeavor of the two agencies reporting here today: the American Heart Association and the National Heart Institute.

Here, in a sense, is the greatest accomplishment of all, for in the hands and minds of these research workers are the keys to the future—a future already bright with promise of decisive victory over the cardiovascular diseases.

It is appropriate that we open our forum today with remarks from one of its spiritual architects—a statesman whose profound concern for the health and welfare of the American people has found expression, over the years, in his stanch support of progressive health legislation. We are proud and honored to have with us today the Honorable LISTER HILL, U.S. Senator from Alabama. Senator HILL.

Senator HILL. Dr. Sprague, distinguished guests, and my friends, Congressman FOGARTY and I requested the American Heart Association and the National Heart Institute to have this meeting this morning that we might have reports on the progress that has been made in the attacks against cardiovascular diseases, diseases of the heart and of the blood vessels.

Due to the leadership of the American Heart Association, the National Heart Institute, we have here this morning distinguished, outstanding doctors and scientists in the field of the heart and the cardiovascular diseases—I don't think it would be possible to bring together a more distinguished panel than we have here this morning—who will make their report on the progress that has been made during the past 10 years.

It is just ten years ago that the American Heart Association was reorganized to become a great national voluntary association of doctors and laymen. It is just 10 years ago that the Congress of the United States brought into being the National Heart Institute; and so on this tenth anniversary of the Heart Association, of the National Heart Institute, we will have these reports. I'm sure they will be not only tremendously gratifying but tremendously challenging. It is most important that the people back home, the people throughout the country, realize the part they have played in the work that has brought about this progress—that they have made many necessary and vital contributions in their support of the American Heart Association, in their support of congressional appropriations for the National Heart Institute.

The last 10 years has witnessed great progress in the battle against these diseases. With the support of the people, under the leadership of brilliant and distinguished men such as we have here today who give of themselves and of their services in this never-ending battle, the next 10 years should be the most momentous in all the history of medicine.

As we hear these reports today, I hope you'll not only be stimulated and challenged but we may go forth with resolution in our hearts that we'll give our most active support, our best support, to the men in the Heart Association, to the National Heart Institute, in the cause of better health and a longer life for all our people. [Applause.]

Dr. SPRAGUE. Thank you, Senator HILL.

Old presidents of the American Heart Association seem to have a remarkable talent for health and longevity. Not only do they refuse to die; they also refuse to fade away—as witness the presence of so many of us here on this platform today. This would seem to foreshadow many more years of activity for our next speaker, who is to present a brief accounting of the vital part played by the American Heart Association in the decade of progress being reported today.

It is my privilege to present Dr. Francis L. Chamberlain, of San Francisco, president of the American Heart Association. Dr. Chamberlain. [Applause.]

Dr. CHAMBERLAIN. Dr. Sprague, Senator Hill, Representative Fogarty, distinguished guests:

My colleagues who have been presidents of the American Heart Association will soon report to you in their capacities as world authorities on various aspects of cardiovascular medicine and research. To me is reserved the privilege of speaking as president of the American Heart Association.

In this capacity one ceases to act as an individual physician, scientist, or teacher. He becomes instead the spokesman for a vast partnership of American laymen and physicians who, realizing that 54 percent of Americans are suffering from some form of circulatory or heart disease, have voluntarily banded together to reduce death and disability from cardiovascular disease. It is this citizens' army that reinforces and sustains our research scientists, and that invests with greater meaning the efforts of the practicing physicians through whom the benefits of research flow to the people.

The initiative in creating this magnificent partnership came from a small group of physicians who, in 1948, transformed the American Heart Association from a professional society into a voluntary health agency, and thus set in motion a force of singular effectiveness.

One of the first endeavors of this newly formed agency was to spur the establishment of the National Heart Institute and to participate actively in the evolution of the policies and program.

Drawing its vigor from the grassroots of America, with dedicated leadership supplied by outstanding physicians and laymen, the American Heart Association immediately became the catalyst which gave strength, purpose, and direction to the struggle against cardiovascular disease.

As this new force gained momentum, programs were developed not only for the acquisition of new knowledge through research but also for its application through community service programs reaching into every State of the Union. Widespread professional educational activity has been paralleled by an intensive program of lay education through which a remarkable transformation

is being wrought in the popular attitude toward cardiovascular diseases. A new climate of hope and confidence is being created—in itself one of the most important achievements of the past decade.

Let me conclude by saying it is especially appropriate that today's meeting is being held during the month of the Heart Fund campaign, which is the time of year when 50 million Americans are expected to show their support of the American Heart Association through their voluntary contributions of time, effort, and funds. Since 1948, this support has increased more than eightfold. It is a convincing reaffirmation of public confidence in the Heart Association program and an eloquent expression of the people's determination to conquer cardiovascular disease. [Applause.]

Dr. SPRAGUE. Thank you, Dr. Chamberlain.

The close working relationship between the American Heart Association and the National Heart Institute is effectively illustrated by the activities of our next speaker. Having spent the major part of his professional life in the conduct and administration of medical research and public health, he has served as Director of the National Heart Institute since 1952. He is a member of the editorial board of Circulation, the American Heart Association's official journal, and he has served on numerous Heart Association committees during the past several years. It is my privilege to present Dr. James Watt. Dr. Watt. [Applause.]

Dr. WATT. Dr. Sprague, Senator Hill, Congressman Fogarty, guests, friends: We shall, in the next half hour or so, hear what Dr. Sprague has so aptly called a unique report. It is, indeed, so far as I know, the first time that such a message has been conveyed to the American people in this way. I am delighted that Senator HILL and Mr. FOGARTY asked the Heart Institute to join with the Heart Association in putting together this story of 10 years of progress against heart disease. As we shall soon hear, it is a dramatic story—a story of service and solid achievement.

I think, too, that all of us here owe a debt of gratitude to the two distinguished legislators sharing the platform this morning. It is, of course, to the Congress that the Heart Institute owes its existence; for in 1948 it was the 80th Congress that created this research arm of the Public Health Service, with the pasasge of the National Heart Act.

Since that time we have come a long way. We now have a substantial research establishment at Bethesda where a unique combination of resources enables us to pursue both basic and clinical studies under one roof. Research workers in these laboratories have made many outstanding advances. When these achievements are added to those of our grantees throughout the country, a picture of progress emerges that has few parallels in the history of medical research. Though an uncharted wilderness still remains to be explored, we have blazed a long trail toward heart disease prevention and cure. In our 10-year journey, dramatic milestones in heart surgery and drug therapy have followed close upon one another. New diagnostic methods are facilitating tremendously the work of our cardiovascular surgeons. With the combined efforts of the American Heart Association and the National Heart Institute lending an ever-brightening prospect to the hopes of heart patients, who can say whether the next 10 years may not reveal a means of prevention or cure for arteriosclerosis or high blood pressure?

With so much of our national substance going into the awesome but indispensable weapons of defense, it is easy to lose sight of the need for stocking medicine's arsenal. I am reminded of a remark my predecessor, Dr. C. J. Van Slyke, the first director of the Heart Institute, made some years ago. Commenting on the need for increased support of medical research, he said, "* * * there is no phase of Government spending in which there is a greater return to all of our citizens. It is an investment in which the balance sheet of the future will show returns in human lives as well as dollars."

We are now privileged, I think, to witness this prophetic statement nearing fulfillment. [Applause.]

Dr. SPRAGUE. Thank you, Dr. Watt.

We come now to our report to the Nation on "A Decade of Progress Against Cardiovascular Disease." Each of our six panelists has been assigned a specific area for discussion and has been requested to restrict his presentation to 5 minutes. One of our panelists will discuss prevention, one diagnosis; three will discuss advances in treatment, with one each being assigned to the specific areas of arteriosclerosis, hypertension, and cardiovascular surgery. Our final panelist will discuss basic research in its many applications.

The 5-minute restriction imposes a severe handicap. We know you can summarize the story of creation in less than 10 words: "In the beginning, God created heaven and earth."

I mention this because it would be difficult for any of our doctors to report on progress in their respective areas within the time allotted. Indeed, it might even be said that the telescoping of so much progress in 5 minutes is in itself a major achievement.

Before we begin our progress reports, I want to direct your special attention to the cards which have been distributed with your programs. If you will write your inquiries on each of the cards, they will be collected later and the doctors will attempt to answer them in this question-and-answer period.

I wish to draw to your attention that this question-and-answer period has been moved to the very end of the program.

My assignment today involves three special roads: those of chairman, moderator, and panelist. Having undertaken assignments one and two, I now turn to the third: a discussion of what has happened in the past 10 years in the field of diagnosis.

Fortunately for all of us, diseases of the heart can usually be discovered by a physician using his ears, eyes, and sense of touch, with the help of simple instruments, such as the stethoscope; but the impressive advances in treatment of heart ailments in the past 10 years, particularly in surgery, have made the simple description of the kind of heart disease not adequate in those cases in which special treatment is now available.

The detailed diagnosis of the damage to a heart valve by rheumatic fever, the exact nature of complex congenital defects in the heart, the remediable kinds of high blood pressure, and the extent of coronary artery blocking remain the major challenges for diagnostic study.

The past decade has supplied tools for such study. The vast and growing fields of radioactivity and electronics are rapidly adding instruments of amazing utility in the area of heart diagnosis, and the contributions of the American Heart Association, and of the National Heart Institute, have made these tools and techniques more widely and quickly available than in any other way.

While X-ray science is 63 years old and was early used to delineate the heart, it has developed recently the ability to photograph in rapid sequence a series of views of the heart as an opaque liquid passes through it, showing its course and the time elapsing for the substance to flow into the arteries of the lungs and the rest of the body. A very new device, the image intensifier, which gives a brilliant view of the heart on the fluorescent screen, with considerably less exposure of the patient to the X-rays, permits not only motion pictures to be made, but the transmission of the living image to a television screen in another room, where a large group of physicians can study it.

The cardiac catheter, first threaded into a vein and thence into his own heart by an intrepid German, Forssmann, in 1924, has turned to tremendous advantage in heart studies by Cournand and others in this country. Now it is possible to pass it directly through the chest into the left side of the heart and to measure the pressures behind and ahead of the two valves most commonly affected by rheumatic fever. The catheter is actually exploring the coronary arteries and, cooperating always with the X-ray, it is discovering the regions of blocking of those arteries by outlining them with a readily absorbed gas, carbon dioxide. By the catheter method, also, electrocardiograms and records of heart sounds can be led from inside the heart itself to instruments at a distance from the patient.

The electrocardiograph has developed from an instrument which, in a sense, looks at the heart electrically with one eye into a new electronic device, the vectorcardiograph, which traces on a fluorescent screen the actual course of the electrical energy of the heart. This can be photographed in stills or movies and transformed into a stereoscopic view with three dimensions.

Radioactive tracer material is widely used in cardiovascular research but in clinical diagnosis chiefly in discovering disturbance of thyroid function, which can upset the heart's action.

The striking expansion of chemical knowledge leads the physician daily to the chemical laboratory for information about the subtle diagnostic changes in the blood, urine, and tissues of his patients. The discovery of alterations in salts, fats, enzymes, and the multitude of chemical components of our bodies guides the treatment of all forms of heart disease. Sensitive chemical or biological detectors can show us the presence of a special tumor of the adrenal gland which, if removed, will cure a type of high blood pressure; or the amount of sodium coming from one kidney may reveal a disturbance which, if relieved, may cure another type.

The ultracentrifuge with a force 300,000 times that of gravity; the electron microscope with a magnifying power almost a hundred times as great as that of the ordinary microscope, are discovering diagnostic elements in human tissues.

The "electric eye" oximeter measures the oxygen in the blood, the gas phase chromatograph tells us the elements of complex fats in food and body substances.

Chemical analyses which have always been extremely time-consuming are now performed by electrical instruments of superhuman ability, and electronic computers give us data at unbelievable speed.

Cardiovascular diagnosis of the present day looks forward to a future when these new methods can signal dangers which, hopefully, new methods of treatment can combat in the wholesale prevention of heart disease. Based on the advances made during the past 10 years, and the assumption that cardiovascular research will be highly accelerated and intensified, I would prophesy that we can look forward to markedly reduced heart disease in young and middle-aged people.

It was not many years after the turn of the century that our next speaker informed his friends he planned to specialize in cardiovascular medicine. Since so very little was then known about the heart and its disorders, they greeted this annoucement with astonishment and disbelief. Yet time has

amply demonstrated the rightness of his decision. He has achieved a high measure of eminence among the world's cardiologists, many of whom affectionately regard him as a sort of living legend. A founder and former president of the American Heart Association, a former member of the National Advisory Heart Council of the National Institutes of Health, now president of the International Society of Cardiology Foundation, and emeritus professor of medicine of Harvard University, he is, of course, Dr. Paul Dudley White, who will summarize the past decade's progress in the area of prevention. Dr. White. [Applause.]

Dr. WHITE. Dr. Sprague, ladies and gentlemen, when I was a child, a medical student, a young doctor in the hospital, they said it couldn't be done. What couldn't be done? A lot of things that threatened the lives of all of us. I shall name a few. First there was still a high infant mortality. My earliest days as an intern were spent in a pediatric ward where babies died like flies, mostly of dysentery before the days of the routine pasteurization of milk. This was the will of God. The next year I had under my wing adult wards which were overcrowded every fall with patients severely and often fatally ill with typhoid fever and at other times of the year with pneumonia, empyema, meningitis, rheumatic fever, and malignant endocarditis. There was no room for cardiovascular patients even if we had been interested in them. Tuberculosis was still a great menace and syphilis and diphtheria quite common. Deformities of the heart and great arteries were strictly untouchable. And sudden deaths were acts of God. Often the good died young, no matter what their social or economic status. Only a small minority of Americans survived 70 and you were growing old at 50. There was only one threat to life in those days, that is, before 1920, that was infinitesimal compared to its huge size today and that was the toll from the automobile on the Nation's highways. Incidently I have personally come to believe that even more as a hazard to life and limb from acute injury, the automobile has become a symbol of the soft life unnecessarily engendered among our fellow citizens by our slavery to automotive devices and to the rusting effect of our enriched diets; even our everyday breads are no longer what they used to be. I shall not, however, belabor these points further except to appeal for the maximal amount of intensive and extensive research to answer for once and for all the questions on every tongue and in every news sheet and TV program today.

And what remains? Still enough rheumatic heart disease, acute and chronic, to keep us busy in its treatment and control for another generation, following the excellent program set up by the American Heart Association during the last 10 years. But the toughest problems are still unsolved. The three which demand the highest priority in cardiovascular research are in the order of their prevalence: (1) A serious degree of atherosclerosis of the arteries supplying blood to heart muscle, brain, viscera, including the kidneys, and the legs; (2) high blood pressure of the so-called essential (especially the malignant) type with serious effect on the heart and arteries; and (3) congenital defects of the heart and blood vessels of almost infinite variety. There is no reason to doubt, based on our experience of the past, that we can protect our young and middle-aged males by diet, exercise, medicines, and other measures from the ever-increasing threat of coronary heart disease, provided we support to the full medical and other scientific investigators working hard on this disease entity. I am sure it can be done, but we must maintain a well-organized and vigorous offensive to guarantee victory in our time. Although high blood pressure is a less dramatic problem, it too needs much patient study to render it not only controllable as it is already in some cases, but, much more importantly, preventable. A harder nut to crack because of its complexity and infinite diversity is that of congenital heart and blood-vessel disease secondary to injury during fetal life or to defects in the germ plasm or to both. But even here too, if we go at it in the proper way, we should be able to accomplish much within a generation.

It has been a source of the greatest satisfaction to me to have had the privilege and opportunity to have served both the American Heart Association in its early development and in recent days in its annual heart drives, and simultaneously, to have served as a member of the first National Advisory Heart Council under the U.S. Public Health Service after the passage of the National Heart Act which in June 1948 established the National Heart Institute. I would like to express to my colleagues and friends (both of the staff and among the consultants), who have given me such a wonderful 10 years, my deepest appreciation and affectionate regards. Also a word of gratitude to you gentlemen of the Congress serving on the committees of the House and Senate; I thank you from the bottom of my heart. I am sure that what has been started in the last decade in this country can now develop throughout the world as I have already seen some of its beginnings in other countries like Finland, Canada, and Australia. Thank you. [Applause.]

Dr. SPRAGUE. Thank you, Dr. White.

We now leave the area of prevention and turn to the field of treatment, where cardiovascular medicine has scored some of its most dramatic advances over the past 10 years.

Our exploration will get under way with a summation devoted to treatment within the broad framework of atherosclerosis. For this presentation, we are indeed fortunate to have with us one of the Nation's foremost medical scientists, Dr. Irvine H. Page of Cleveland.

Dr. Page, a past president of the American Heart Association, and formerly a member of the National Advisory Heart Council of the National Institutes of Health, has been director of research of the Cleveland Clinic Foundation since 1945. Dr. Page. [Applause.]

Dr. PAGE. Dr. Sprague, ladies and gentlemen, I doubt that 5 minutes is too long to talk about a disease described 5,000 years ago that kills about 500,000 Americans a year.

The problem of the prevention and treatment of arteriosclerosis, whether in the brain or the coronary vessels of the heart, differs from the prevention and treatment of infectious diseases where a single microorganism can be the cause of the trouble. It was during the past decade that medical science crystallized a profoundly important conclusion; namely, that arteriosclerosis is not just a degenerative disease and an inevitable concomitant of the aging process. On the contrary, we now know that arteriosclerosis affects all age groups and may well be reversible. Furthermore, it has many facets, the importance of each varying greatly in different people. Thus it has:

One, a strong hereditary factor. Formerly, this meant that nothing could be done about it but to make more careful selection of your parents, but the more modern "blue gene" age now has it within its power to change the hereditary mechanism. All that remains is to decide what it wants.

Now, the second factor is a hypertensive one. Elevation in blood pressure, even a small one, increases the amount of arteriosclerosis. Fortunately, treatment for hypertension has advanced rapidly in the past 10 years; hence, this factor is, in large measure, controllable.

Third, an exercise factor. Exercise seems to have several mechanisms by which it reduces the tendency to develop arteriosclerosis. We are a generation who seems about to give up the use of legs. As far as I can see, women are the only ones smart enough to find a use for them. [Laughter.]

Fourth is the stress factor. This seems to me to be overstressed. It may be that extreme stress might be more concerned with the development of a clot in the vessels of the heart or brain, rather than of arteriosclerosis itself. Children and Russians being what they are, it is hard to see how stress can, in turn, be much reduced. [Laughter.]

Smoking and alcohol are considered stress factors by some. This all depends on who is doing the smoking and/or drinking. I'd like to point out that 76 percent of the body is composed of water and some of my friends might like to keep it so. [Laughter.]

Now, fifth, there is a sex factor. This factor does not seem to have been invented primarily with the intent of preventing women from developing arteriosclerosis, but in practice it seems to be working out this way. Femaleness seems to be much more than sex, as many of the richer males are finding out. [Laughter.]

Femaleness seems to assure that women will inherit this earth, at least. [Laughter.]

Sixth, a diet factor. Obesity has long been believed a factor hastening development of atherosclerosis and overeating of certain kinds of fat in the diet as well. What constitutes the proper amount and kind of fat has been the subject of much talk and less investigation. There is growing evidence that saturated or animal fats in too great quantities are detrimental and that unsaturated or liquid fats are less so. The Bantu of South Africa has been the center of this controversy, although it is doubtful if he realizes it. [Laughter.]

It is possible that the low fat content of his diet protects him against coronary arteriosclerosis; unfortunately, there is much to suggest that being an American is more fun than being a Bantu. [Laughter.]

Diet is a facet of arteriosclerosis most likely to be investigated on large numbers of people to determine whether changes will reduce the incidence of heart attacks and strokes. This is now a practical possibility, in my opinion.

Thus I can summarize by making several relatively commonsense suggestions for the prevention and treatment of arteriosclerosis.

1. Reduce weight if obese. Eat less in the hope you will live longer to eat more.

2. If heredity is poor and blood cholesterol level is high, see your doctor and try to reduce the level by changes in dietary habits.

3. Reduce blood pressure if it is elevated.

4. Reduce the proportion of solid animal fats to the liquid vegetable fats and reduce the quantity of both. A balanced diet is important and extremes of all sorts should be avoided.

5. Increase the amount of regular exercise.

6. Avoid excesses of all kinds, but don't miss anything. [Laughter.]

7. Accept life's challenges. Come to terms with the inevitable and live as though you would live forever, and in spirit you will.

Thank you. [Laughter and applause.]

Dr. SPRAGUE. Thank you, Dr. Page. I can assure the audience from my long knowledge of Dr. Page's habits that he lives by his own precepts. [Laughter.]

For a summary of advances in treatment, with special reference to hypertension, I now turn to a colleague who has a distinguished record as a clinician, teacher and medical scientist. A former president of the American Heart Association and a pioneer in the use and development of drugs to control hypertension, he is Dr. Robert W. Wilkins, professor of medicine at the Boston University School of Medicine. Dr. Wilkins. [Applause.]

Dr. WILKINS. Dr. Sprague, friends, since 1950, a number of new drugs have come into use for the treatment of high blood pressure and, considered together, they represent one of the great advances of medical science during the period of our report. These drugs have changed not only our treatment of hypertension, but also our concepts of the nature of this disease. Except in a few rarer forms, the cause of high blood pressure is unknown. None of the new drugs used in treatment, therefore, was designed to get at the cause. Rather, they were designed primarily to relieve the result; namely, the elevation of blood pressure, whatever its cause might be. However, the action of these drugs in lowering blood pressure has provided new information on the nature of hypertension and has brought us closer to a true concept of the cause or causes of this condition.

There are five main categories of drugs now in use for high blood pressure. These are (1) rauwolfia, or Indian snake root, and its derivatives; for example, reserpine; (2) hydralazine or apresoline; (3) veratrum viride and its derivatives; (4) the nerve-blocking agents, such as hexamethonium; (5) (and probably most important) chlorothiazide and similar diuretics that stimulate the kidney to excrete salt.

Each of these agents acts to lower blood pressure, but each acts in a different way. Rauwolfa has a tranquilizing action on the brain and lessens nervous tension. Hydralazine dilates the blood vessels directly, especially those in the kidneys. Veratrum also dilates blood vessels but reflexly through the autonomic nervous system. The nerve-blocking drugs, on the other hand, prevent reflex constriction of blood vessels by blocking excessive nervous reactions. Chlorothiazide and the other diuretic drugs seem to change the body's content or its distribution of sodium chloride and other salts, lessening the blood vessels' constrictive reactivity and the resultant elevation of blood pressure.

Thus, the doctor today has in his bag new chemical tools for lowering blood pressure, and he has a variety of them. One of the most interesting findings has been that these chemical tools are more effective when used together than when given singly, even in increasingly large doses. This is an old trick in treatment, familiar to everyone in the use of different drugs together for pain; for example, aspirin, phenacetin, caffeine, and codeine for severe headaches. The trick is that when the drugs, each in a small dose, are used together against a single undesirable effect, they "gang up," as it were, on that effect, whereas their own bad side effects are so dispersed that they produce no unpleasant symptoms. Thus, the doctor has learned that when rauwolfia, the mildest agent, is not effective alone in a hypersensitive patient, he must add apresoline or chlorothiazide, or both. He may then achieve a very satisfactory result which he could not obtain with any one of the drugs used alone.

The results of treatment of high blood pressure with drugs are most dramatic when the disease itself is so severe or malignant that without such treatment it would be quickly fatal. In less severe cases of hypertension, drug treatment may be as dramatic in lowering the blood pressure; but since many of these patients have not as yet been incapacitated by the disease, their symptomatic improvement is not as striking as in the malignant cases. Nevertheless, all observers are in agreement that treatment of all such cases is most worth while. The area of disagreement is now restricted to the question of whether the very mildest or earliest of cases should be treated with drugs in a preventive way, before strains develop in the heart and blood vessels and especially in the kidneys.

It would appear that in patients with a strong family history of serious high blood pressure this may also be worth while, since it is now clear that high blood pressure is definitely a familial disease that tends to progress with age. Finally, the newer diuretic drugs, by shedding light on the handling of salt by the body, have tended to reemphasize the important role of the kidney in hypertension, and of salt excretion, which normally is under the control of the adrenal glands. Thus, one can say that drug treatment is not only helping people who already have high blood pressure, but is also teaching us more about the nature of the disease, and how to prevent it, or at least how to prevent its more serious effects.

Thank you. [Applause.]

Dr. SPRAGUE. Thank you, Dr. Wilkins.

Our summation of advances in treatment—this time with special consideration of heart and blood vessel surgery—continues with a report by an outstandingly eminent authority in this area. Winner of the 1954 Matas award for work in vascular surgery, cochairman of the committee on medicine and surgery of the National Research Council, member of the National Advisory Heart Council of the National Institutes of Health, and chairman of the Department of Surgery at Baylor University's College of Medicine, he is Dr. Michael E. DeBakey of Houston. Dr. DeBakey. [Applause.]

Dr. DEBAKEY. Dr. Sprague, ladies, and gentlemen, few areas in medicine have exhibited the phenomenal progress that has taken place in the field of cardiovascular surgery during the past decade. Indeed, the advancement made during this period far surpass all previous efforts in this field of surgery. Among the most striking features of these advancements, and undoubtedly important factors underlying their attainment, have been the increasing intensity of research endeavors and the bold ingenuity and aggressive approach characterizing the surgical attack on these grave diseases. As a consequence, many conditions which only a few years ago were considered hopeless are now amenable to effective therapy. No less important has been the fact that these surgical investigations have contributed significantly to greater knowledge and better understanding of the underlying fundamental factors involved in the pathologic, physiologic, and biochemical disturbances of cardiovascular diseases.

This is well illustrated by the progress which has been made in recent years in the surgical treatment of acquired diseases of the aorta—the main artery of the heart—and major peripheral arteries, particularly aneurysms and occlusive lesions. An aneurysm is a ballooning out and thinning of the wall of an artery.

Aneurysms of the aorta, for example, have challenged physicians for centuries; and although various methods of treatment were devised and attempted, none were effective. Within the past decade, however, curative therapy has been accomplished by the development of the surgical principle of extirpation of the lesion with restoration of normal function. The successful application of this method of treatment and development of these principles is dependent upon a number of factors, among the most important of which are the principles of blood vessel suture and arterial graft replacement.

The development and refinement of these principles were brought to full clinical fruition in the research laboratory. More recently, and as a result of these investigations, the problem of replacement of diseased arteries has been effectively solved through the development of substitute arteries made of such plastic materials as nylon, Dacron, and teflon; and these are now as readily available in the operating room as suture material.

Surgery to replace diseased arteries has become a complete reality. Deadly lesions which were formerly considered hopeless are now amenable to curative treatment.

Equally striking has been the progress made in the treatment of arteriosclerotic occlusive disease, the gravity of which has long been recognized. In arteriosclerotic occlusive disease, the thickening of the wall of the artery gradually narrows and ultimately blocks the opening in the artery.

Owing to its predilection to involving and blocking of such vital arteries as the aorta and those which supply blood to the brain and heart, it is by far the most common cause of death and disability among vascular lesions. As a consequence of intensive research and clinical investigations during the past decade, an important concept of the disease has been evolved which has led to the application of highly effective methods of surgical treatment. This concept is based upon the demonstration that in many forms of this disease the atherosclerotic occlusive lesion is well localized and segmental in nature with relatively normal arteries proximal and distal to the diseased segment of the vessel. From this fundamental knowledge, methods of surgical treatment were developed to restore normal circulation by removal of the occlusive lesion or by its replacement with a substitute artery. Within the past few years, sufficient experience has accumulated with these methods of treatment to establish their efficacy; and it can be stated that a high proportion of patients who formerly would have died or been seriously disabled from gangrene of the lower extremities, strokes, and high blood pressure due to arteriosclerosis, may now be completely relieved.

Equally significant are the brilliant advances made in surgery of the heart. Although pioneering efforts in cardiac surgery were made at the turn of the century, most of the important developments have occurred during the past decade. During this short period, intracardiac surgery was introduced. Although at first the scope of operative procedures on the valves and septum was limited by the fact that maintenance of cardiac function was vital during intracardiac manipulations, the efforts and contributions of the era of closed heart surgery were truly impressive.

Recently a major obstacle in heart surgery was overcome with the introduction of methods for open heart surgery. This problem was solved by the development of mechanical devices to substitute temporarily for the function of the heart and lungs, such as the pump oxygenator—or mechanical heart lung, as it is generally known—which is now in widespread use. Whereas less than 10 years ago only a selected few cases of congenital cardiac disease were amenable to surgical correction, today the majority of cardiac anomalies are completely correctible.

As outlined in this brief account, the tremendous strides that have been made during the past decade clearly reflect the vigor and intense activity characterizing the current status of cardiovascular surgery and portend other advances of even greater importance. With continuing generous support of these research endeavors, only the limits of imagination should restrict their progress.

One thing is certain: The future of cardiovascular surgery is brighter than ever. [Applause.]

Dr. SPRAGUE. Thank you, Dr. DeBakey.

Up to now, our discussions have largely concerned the clinical aspects of cardiovascular research. Our final panelist opens a new and vital area of exploration. He is to discuss the role of basic research in making possible the achievements already described and those we fervently hope will be forthcoming. One of the world's foremost authorities on renal function and electrolyte metabolism, he came to the National Heart Institute in 1950 and has been its associate director in charge of research since 1954. It is my privilege to present Dr.

Robert W. Berliner. Dr. Berliner. [Applause.]

Dr. BERLINER. The tremendous stimulation of research which has occurred through the efforts of the American Heart Association and the National Heart Institute has already been cited to you by our chairman as a major achievement of the past 10 years. Much of this research is basic research. Thus the greatest portion of the research supported by the American Heart Association's national program falls into the category of basic research or has basic implications. Similarly, the philosophy that guides the research appropriations of the National Heart Institute also recognizes the vital importance of fundamental studies.

It is characteristic of basic research that its advances have the immediate purpose only of increasing our fundamental knowledge of ourselves and the world in which we live. In what way some specific bit of information will eventually serve its useful purpose is very difficult to predict. The basic research worker, however, does not concern himself with the application of his contributions, since experience has shown that it is upon such fundamental knowledge that the advances in applied science are built. Rather than attempt to guess which of the many major and lesser basic scientific discoveries of the last 10 years will eventually find important application in the control of cardiovascular disease, I would like to start with the other end and fill in the background of one of the more important practical achievements of recent years. In doing so, I hope to illustrate the practical results of scientific research done originally only out of scientific curiosity.

Dr. Wilkins has already mentioned the important advance made in the development of chlorothiazide. This drug has not only markedly improved the management of hypertension but, because of its capacity to cause loss of salt in the urine, has greatly facilitated the treatment of heart failure. It has reduced the need for rigid and onerous low-salt diets and practically abolished the need for repeated hypodermic injections in the management of cardiac patients. I would like to recount the development of chlorothiazide.

The story begins nearly 40 years ago. At that time, biochemistry was in its infancy as a science. One of the substances which quite naturally came under study was carbon dioxide, the main waste product of the burning of foods in the body. We eliminate it when we exhale. It was found that the blood can carry carbon dioxide, a gas, to the lungs because the carbon dioxide can react with water to produce carbonic acid. In the lung blood vessels, this is converted back to gas and excreted as we breathe out. However, when the rate of this conversion was studied, it was found to be quite slow. The question arose as to how the conversion could possibly occur fast enough so that the blood could give up its carbon dioxide during the very few seconds it spends in the lung blood vessels. It was concluded that there must be a substance in the blood which speeds up the reaction. Studies to find the substance resulted in an enzyme known as carbonic anhydrase. Subsequent studies showed that the enzyme was present in a number of tissues, although the nature of its function in these tissues was not clear.

Perhaps 20 years later we pick up the next thread of the story of chlorothiazide—and in an entirely separate context. It begins with the discovery in the late thirties that sulfanilamide was effective in the treatment of bacterial infections. As an unfortunate side effect, it was noted that patients treated with sulfanilamide developed a disturbance known as acidosis; but sulfanilamide was soon supplanted by other closely related drugs which did not have this side effect.

Nevertheless, some basic research workers remained interested in this property of the now obsolete sulfanilamide. It was finally shown that sulfanilamide was an inhibitor of carbonic anhydrase, the enzyme discovered some years earlier. The production of acidosis was attributable to this blocking action of the sulfanilamide on the substance that speeded up the elimination of carbon dioxide.

In the next few years, studies of the mechanisms of urine formation showed that carbonic anhydrase also had an important function in the kidney. When it was inhibited, not only was acidosis produced, but sodium was lost in the urine.

Now, since producing sodium, or salt, loss in the urine is one effective way of treating heart failure, it was suggested that sulfanilamide might be useful for this purpose. It was tried and found to have some favorable effect, but again its toxic effects were too numerous. Nevertheless, this led to the synthesis and trial of a large number of other carbonic anhydrase inhibitors; and finally one called diamox was found, which, although only moderately effective, found a considerable place in the treatment of heart failure.

Now, the search began for a more effective carbonic anhydrase inhibitor. One was found that proved to be far more effective than any other. This was chlorothiazide.

My story could end here but it doesn't, for a new twist has been added with the discovery that although chlorothiazide was synthesized, tested, and started on clinical trial because of its capacity to inhibit the enzyme carbonic anhydrase, it actually turns out to owe its effectiveness to a new and as yet unexplained activity.

Now investigators are following this trail back into pharmacology, physiology, and biochemistry. By the time they explain how chlorothiazide really works, which enzyme it inhibits and what that enzyme does in the body, who knows where and in what form it will turn up again in clinical medicine?

Chlorothiazide's story is, of course, but one example of the practical results that eventually grow out of basic research, chosen because it relates to one of the major advances of the period reported on here today—the control of hypertension. But of equal importance is the fact that the past decade has witnessed a great accumulation of basic new knowledge about the most fundamental processes involved in life itself—knowledge we need to break down the barriers of ignorance that nature has placed in our path.

As someone has said, "Basic research is a way of making nature talk." Before too long, I am confident, her voice will be loud enough in the land to show us the road to victory over the most pressing problems of cardiovascular disease.

To quote the recent report of a committee of consultants by Dr. Bayne-Jones to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, "Pressures of the practical results cannot be allowed to supersede the kind of fundamental studies which, in the long run, result in revolutions rather than mere improvement in health standards." [Applause.]

Dr. SPRAGUE. Thank you, Dr. Berliner.

May I ask you now that any of you who have filled in cards, pass them to the right and left, not the center aisle, where they can be collected.

A report to the Nation, which necessarily focuses on past achievements would be incomplete without inclusion of a statement regarding the future needs and aspirations of cardiovascular medicine. For this summary, we are privileged to have with us today Dr. LeRoy E. Burney, Surgeon General of the Public Health Service, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Dr. Burney. [Applause.]

Dr. BURNEY. Dr. Sprague, Senator Hill, Congressman Fogarty, and distinguished Members of Congress and guests, I think one has an advantage in appearing at this part of the program because all of the worthwhile things have already been said and one doesn't expect too much. [Laughter.]

I'm sure all of you have been impressed with the complexity of the problem of the cardiovascular diseases; and if one only takes a look at the various gentlemen here on this platform and whom they represent, I think one would even be more impressed with all of the forces we have used in our country to combat this No. 1 cause of death.

You have heard representatives of the American Heart Association, representing the thousands of volunteer workers throughout the United States, who give not only of their dollars but of themselves, unselfishly, enthusiastically, to this program of education, of research and of service.

You have heard one of your fellow Congressmen here, Senator HILL, and you will hear from another one who represents the very interested and understanding and, I should say, very generous support that the Public Health Service through the National Heart Institute has received for funds for research training, for research projects, and for the construction of research facilities in which this research should be done; and I think I can say without contradiction that nowhere in the world have we had a legislative body that has been so interested and so generous in the support of research as we have in these United States; and through the very fine leadership of our leaders in Congress and through Senator HILL and Congressman FOGARTY who are here before you today, I think we can be very proud of this contribution.

Then we see all the doctors here on this platform representing medical schools, universities, and laboratories that are doing clinical and basic research and we see Dr. Watt, the administrator of the National Heart Institute—all of whom are important contributors to this very great problem—if this does nothing more than to impress upon you that there is a complex problem; that it is not the isolated issue of any one group, whether it is official or voluntary or research or public.

I think of the vast cooperative enterprise so characteristically American which has brought us so far within a period of 10 years and which undoubtedly will carry us to new heights a decade from now. We in the Public Health Service are proud of the part we have played in this aspiring story of achievement. The report we have heard this morning is one of great hope for the future. The advances we have heard about represent not just dollars, not just research, but they represent human lives that have been saved; and we cannot overestimate the progress so meaningful to humanity.

In looking ahead, however, we must soberly evaluate the vastness of cardiovascular diseases as a national health problem, even an international or world health problem. We are, in fact, just beginning to realize the magnitude and complexity of this problem. I submit that even this realization is a measure of our progress. It is a measure of progress because it points to an intensification of two trends, now already discernible, which will chart our direction against heart disease in the next 10 years. The first is a strengthening of basic research, whose great promise has been so ably presented this morning; and, of course, necessary for that is the continued emphasis on training of research manpower and the facilities in which research people can perform their research work. The second is the speedy application of research findings to the lives of human beings. It isn't enough just to have the knowledge,

unless that knowledge is speedily applied to the people who need it.

Now, as you can well understand, this calls for a comprehensive attack. It calls for a total involvement of all groups, all agencies, all the individuals who can contribute to our forward progress; and, as Disraeli once said, "The health of the people is really the foundation upon which all of their happiness and on which all of their power as a state depends."

Thank you. [Applause.]

Dr. SPRAGUE. Thank you, Dr. Burney.

When I opened this meeting, I referred to Senator HILL as one of its spiritual architects. Before turning to the question-and-answer period, it is fitting that we bring our formal part of the program to a close with remarks by the Representative in Congress who joined Senator HILL in requesting this meeting. He is well known to all of us for his stanch support of medical research and related programs. I refer, of course, to the distinguished Representative from Rhode Island, the Honorable JOHN E. FOGARTY. [Applause.]

Representative FOGARTY: Mr. Chairman, my distinguished colleague of the Senate, Senator HILL, distinguished guests, and ladies and gentlemen, the American Heart Association epitomizes the present urge of the American people to achieve better health through voluntary collaborative effort. It is one reason why medical research, in contrast with most other fields of research endeavor, finds as much support from private as it does from public sources. There is lasting strength in such diversity, and I am confident that a balanced pattern of support will be maintained in the years ahead.

The Public Health Service's National Heart Institute, Federal partner of the Heart Association, mounts its programs through tax funds—your tax dollars and mine. As a legislator with some responsibility for the activity of the Federal Government in medical research, I think I have some evidence that the people of our country unequivocally support the use of tax funds for medical research.

In a sense then, since Federal funds are and must be used in a way that is responsible to public forces, its funds too are volunteered by the people for the purpose of bringing heart disease under control.

As I have listened to these reports of progress that have been made against heart disease, I feel its impact primarily in human terms. Broad statistics are, of course, important in appraising all or a segment of the national health and medical research scene. We must never forget that 54 percent of all deaths in the United States are caused by some form of cardiovascular disease, that this means about 900,000 deaths from heart disease last year and that the total number of deaths from the more than 20 disorders of the heart and blood vessels about which so little is known can be expected to increase, I am told; but one must never forget that behind all these statistics are people, human beings—their families and their friends and their community of which they are a living part.

When premature and tragic death strikes, deaths which would be unnecessary if man knew as much as he should about his life processes, it is a hundred percent failure for medical science as far as the individual and his loved ones are concerned.

The decade of progress that has been summarized today has permitted the percentage, in the case of many people that you and I know, to be, on the other hand, a 100-percent success. For example, I know a child who suffered an acute attack of rheumatic fever which led to heart disease. Once she would undoubtedly have been stricken again and again with increasing damage to the heart and early death; but today, because of research and because of the discovery of antibiotics, with antibiotic prophylaxis and sound medical care she can avoid increments of damage to her heart and predictably can live a normal, healthy, and happy life.

I know a man in his early forties, a man with average income and a family of three young children, who was afflicted with severe hypertension. Again, with a combination of sound medical care and therapy, with blood pressure lowering agents that have been recently developed, he is living a normal productive life as a father and a breadwinner; and, as now defined, not only can he keep the hypertension under control but it will become less difficult to control as time goes on.

I know a child, a boy of 3, born with a congenital heart defect—a large hole in the wall of one of the chambers of the heart. Just a few years ago, that defect could not have been repaired and the child would have been doomed to a few years of half living and premature death before his teens. Today the defect has been located and measured. New surgical techniques have been developed, making it possible for the opening to be closed. The child and his parents are now awaiting the time when the doctors think it best for the operation to be performed; but, as Dr. White has said a while ago, there is of course no absolute guarantee of success, but I am told the chances are well worth taking and the parents will be eternally grateful to medical science because today they have hope instead of the hopelessness of a few years ago.

These are just three among many people I know and you know who measure the past decade of progress against heart disease in the most meaningful terms of all, but the long tortuous road to better understanding and to better ability to control the diseases of man stretches out ahead. We cannot know its lengths or its turns or the lanes that lead off into a network of pathways that may or may not lead back into the main route again; but we can do two things, I think. First, we can express and demonstrate our confidence in the scientists and doctors and research institutions—professional societies and the American Heart Association and other health agencies—that lead in the support of and search for new knowledge and the means for its application to better health; and, second, I think that we can assure the people that we will not impede progress against disease by failing to provide adequately through our contributions and our appropriations for the support of health and medical research activities today and for the increased resources required, if the health challenges of tomorrow are to be met.

I join with you wholeheartedly and pledge that I shall continue to do everything in my power to see that these needs are met.

In recent days I have had the opportunity to study the appropriation requests for medical research that we are studying this week. The appropriation hearings have just started in the House of Representatives before the committee, of which I am chairman; but I am very sorry to report to you this morning that apparently the Bureau of the Budget feels it must go backward instead of moving ahead, if one can judge by the appropriation requests for medical research that have been placed before our committee for the coming fiscal year.

As a Member of Congress, I share a responsibility to create and maintain an efficient and responsible Federal Government. As a Member of Congress, I also have a responsibility to see that basic human needs are going to be met. I deeply believe that in the interests of efficient and responsible Government, its health programs must advance—not stand still or fall back—notwithstanding any action of the Bureau of the Budget to the contrary. [Applause.]

From the record of Congress in the past, from the sentiment I sense in Congress today, and from my personal knowledge of the convictions of many of its Members—and may I say at this point that in the 13 years I have had the privilege of serving on this particular committee, we have had occasion to disagree on many items in our appropriation bill; but when it comes to appropriating funds for medical research, I can say, without fear of contradiction, that politics was swept aside, there is no middle aisle, that men and women on both sides have cooperated fully and selflessly. I think that is a wonderful record for the Congress of the United States; and I would like to include many who are here in our audience today—leaders of our Federal Government, leaders in our House and in the U.S. Senate.

I am happy to see my counterpart on this committee, Mr. LAIRD, from Wisconsin, and the chairman of the full committee, Mr. CANNON, from Missouri, both of whom have shown keen interest in research in the medical program; and I think I can assure medical people that because of their support of medicine in the past that their Congress will continue to act for their better health as long as we have the manpower and the facilities and the will to solve these problems.

To me the words "better health" mean more than the words "balanced budget"; and in this matter, I don't believe we could have a stronger ally than one of the most stimulating, energetic, able leaders in the field of medical research and one of our truly great Senators—my colleague on the other side of the Capitol, the Honorable LISTER HILL, from that great State of Alabama. [Applause.]

Dr. SPRAGUE. Thank you, Representative FOGARTY.

We now end the formal part of this report to the Nation and go on to the question-and-answer period.

I have a few questions here; and from looking at the early ones, I can see that the gentlemen who are going to answer them can either spend an hour with each question or they can say, "I don't know." [Laughter.]

I think we had better take a compromise position.

Dr. White:

"You are a noted advocate of snowshoveling. When you hand a man over 50 a shovel, how do you know what the condition of his arteries may be?"

Dr. WHITE. I don't hand a snowshovel over to such a person unless I know he is used to vigorous exercise and is in good condition; and I think one of the great faults of today is that at about the age of 25, especially with our men, we begin to lead soft lives, and for the next 20 years they accumulate trouble and at 45 it may prevent one shoveling adequately. I think we've got to have a campaign to keep active, especially our men; and then I think they can shovel snow right through till they are a hundred years old. [Applause.]

Dr. SPRAGUE. Thank you.

Dr. Wilkins:

"How close are we getting to discovery of the underlying causes of essential hypertension?"

Dr. WILKINS. I'll also have to say, "I don't know." As I tried to indicate in my report, I think we're getting closer and closer to it.

Dr. Page on my left is very fond of saying that the causes of hypertension are mosaic, they are not simple, and they are probably not single; and, incidentally, this is the phase of health and disease work that we're in now.

I think it's perhaps a little naive to expect that we're going to find—from here on, at least—many diseases for which there is a single cause; but the mechanisms and the causes combine to give different people—perhaps different mechanisms in different people—hypertension.

We're coming closer and closer to understanding, and I think perhaps the next 10 years will see that pretty well delineated—perhaps not completely.

Dr. SPRAGUE. Thank you.

Dr. DeBakey, we have one for you:

"From time to time we hear conjectures about the transplanting of human hearts. What are the chances of this happening in the foreseeable future?"

Dr. DEBAKEY. Well, this is dependent upon further basic knowledge about the transplantation of tissues from one person to another.

So far as the technical aspect of transplanting a human heart is concerned, this I think has been solved and can be done now, but there is a basic factor involved in the transplantation of tissues, and that is what we call the rejection phenomenon.

Now, there is much work being done in this field and, of course, this opens up a whole new vista of surgery if we solve this problem of the transplantation of tissue. Now, whether it will come in 5 years or 10 years is something I can't say yet.

Dr. SPRAGUE. Dr. Page—listen very carefully [laughter]: "Would you advocate a 'crash' program against heart and blood-vessel diseases—something comparable to what we did in producing the A-bomb and are now trying to do with ICBM's?"

Dr. PAGE. No. [Laughter.]

Dr. SPRAGUE. May I ask why you said "No"?

Dr. PAGE. Yes; because I think you can buy research up to a certain point and after that point you begin to just multiply a spinning of the wheels. I think what you don't get is creativity—that is, new ideas.

In other words, I would advocate a maximal efficiency in the spending of money but realizing full well that this goes only up to a certain point and then you don't go any faster than that because you don't have the creativity which is necessary to do this.

I think that there are many ways that we can improve the efficiency of research today.

Please don't misunderstand me on that score; nevertheless, I think there is an upper limit.

Dr. SPRAGUE. Dr. Berliner:

"How can we get more well-qualified medical scientists interested in doing basic research?"

Dr. BERLINER. Well, I would think that the most important factor in getting more qualified people into basic research and more people qualified to do basic research is to try to increase the understanding of what basic research really is and what its eventual products are so that the scientist gets a little more of the credit and a little more of the understanding from people for his achievements.

Dr. SPRAGUE. I think that this audience might be interested to realize at this time that the term "basic research" is often a matter of semantics. A discussion of this appears this week in Science wherein it is pointed out that universities, when they are asked, "How much do you think is given by the Federal Government to basic research?" come out with a figure which is twice as much as the amount which those who distribute the money think is given for basic research.

In other words, the motivation which occurs in the recipients, themselves—determines the basic nature of the use of this money; so we shouldn't be too confused by a statistical approach in relation to this term "basic research."

Now, I can't avoid answering a question addressed to me:

"Why do some people die suddenly of heart attacks after the doctor has given them a clean bill of health?" [Laughter.]

I have a standard reply to this. I say, "If I knew the answer to this, I would be working for the life insurance companies only." [Laughter.]

Actually, there are some types of heart disease that can be readily diagnosed; but in the case of coronary artery disease, which is the type which causes sudden death in most instances, diagnosis may be very difficult—particularly if the patient has no symptoms and there are no changes in the electrocardiogram.

An answer to this might be one suggested by my friend, Dr. William Castle, some years ago; and that is that each one of us should engage every day in what he calls "sublethal exercise"—that is, we should exercise to the point where we don't drop dead. [Laughter.]

And that would help to build up, as Dr. White pointed out, sound coronary blood vessels.

Now, Dr. DeBakey, I have a question for you which says:

"I saw a story recently which said, in effect, that an impending stroke might be detected by X-ray and that if this were so, perhaps the surgeon could actually go in, make certain repairs, and thus prevent a stroke. Is this possible?"

Dr. DEBAKEY. Yes; definitely. Now, some strokes are due to an atherosclerotic process partially blocking and then finally blocking part of the arteries which supply blood to the brain. Now, usually these can be diagnosed precisely by opaque substances injected into the arteries and they can now be operated on successfully to restore the normal opening in the artery and thus prevent the artery from becoming blocked.

Dr. SPRAGUE. Thank you.

Dr. White:

"During the past 10 years, what, in your opinion, has been the most beneficial discovery in the field of heart disease?"

Dr. WHITE. Well, research teaching and practice is the fundamental reason for the great advances that have been made; and then 10 years ago came this united effort—private and public enterprise hand in hand—the recognition of the need of that and of going along with these heart drives. We can't submerge them into community heart drives; the time is not ripe for that yet.

I think the realization that all research must be supported—I think that's possibly the most important advance. We know of many detailed advances which would be equally beneficial.

Dr. SPRAGUE. Also Dr. White:

"Are we keeping pace with the Soviet Union in heart disease research?"

Dr. WHITE. Well, I think so. I think we are ahead of them, actually. They are just planning to start a Russian heart association. It wasn't in operation last September, I know, but they said they were going to establish one and join the International Society of Cardiology.

Well, I think that's about the way we were a good many years ago.

Dr. SPRAGUE. Dr. Watt, there is a question that says:

"We haven't heard very much this morning about the so-called epidemiological approach to heart disease. Do you think that this approach has received sufficient emphasis in the past decade?"

Dr. WATT. I think it's one of the really neglected areas and yet one that has seen quite a lot of development in plans and in activity within the last—oh—2 to 3 years. I would add that this is going to be shortly accelerated with a National Conference on Epidemiology, planned by the Heart Association, and the Heart Institute to be held within the next 2 months. Work on planning that meeting is already actively under way.

Dr. SPRAGUE. This question is for Dr. Wilkins:

"You told us how high blood pressure is being controlled. Can it ever be cured?"

Dr. WILKINS. I think it's conceivable that we may be able to cure hypertension if we really find enough causes in individual cases that we can remove. Actually, we cure hypertension now—as I may have wished to indicate in my report—and they are the rarer forms. There are very severe cases of hypertension due, let's say, to a removable cause, a single removable cause, such as one bad kidney or a tumor of the adrenal gland. These can be removed, and the hypertension is cured.

I'm glad you asked that question because many times patients or the lay people misunderstand the word "treatment." They think of that as being synonymous with "cure" but it isn't. The treatment you must continue in order for it to be effective, at least at some level.

"Cure" means you give the treatment, the patient is cured, and you can stop the treatment and he stays well. We are not at that stage yet, but I believe that it may be possible that we will achieve it in time.

Dr. SPRAGUE. Dr. Page:

"We hear much about fats being a possible factor in developing heart disease. Does the present body of knowledge indicate that we should now recommend any significant changes in the dietary habits of Americans?"

Dr. PAGE. That's a loaded question. [Laughter.]

Dr. SPRAGUE. The intention is so. [Laughter.]

Dr. PAGE. Well, I think that you have to divide the problem really into two sections: one, the question of treating sick people—and if you say then that they should change—rather, people with heart disease or arteriosclerotic heart disease—if you want to lower the fat content of their diet I think it would be desirable, particularly if their blood cholesterols are elevated. There is another group of people who have a high hereditary factor in the thing with high blood cholesterols, and I think those people might well be prone.

Now, when you talk about the problem of changing the fat content of the diet of the entire American public, I think you're talking about something else again because you're dealing with problems of youngsters, problems of old age; and I think the whole problem simply deserves more careful consideration rather than any wholesale recommendation at the present time. I think it has to be individualized.

Dr. SPRAGUE. There is a question addressed to me:

"What, in your opinion, will be the next important advance in the diagnosis of heart disease?"

As I indicated earlier, I think the diagnosis of latent or incipient coronary disease is most difficult, and perhaps we may be able to find a coronary-prone individual for whom we should do more, perhaps, than for the general population.

Dr. Page has told you about the hereditary factors in coronary heart disease and it does seem that—at least in early life—under the age of 40, certainly, it is common in males and it is extremely uncommon in females. There is one coronary differentiation, and it does seem, perhaps, as if coronary disease is more common in muscular individuals who put on weight after the age of 25, but it's very difficult to be sure of a true coronary type.

Dr. Watt:

"In testing new cardiovascular drugs, what are the immediate needs—where are the critical gap areas?"

Dr. WATT. The immediate needs and the critical gap areas can be summed up in a few short words—the current shortage of trained clinical investigators to test and evaluate these new cardiovascular drugs. Just the other day I heard that something like 6,000 compounds were developed during the past year alone. To test these compounds adequately and to make them available readily, means that we literally have to have more trained people to be effective in carrying out studies to determine the safety and effectiveness of these drugs.

Dr. SPRAGUE. We have about 3 minutes. We started 5 minutes late and I'm going to end this at the proper time.

I'm going to ask Dr. White a question and Dr. Page a question.

Dr. White:

"You mentioned nothing about anticlotting drugs in preventing recurrences of heart attacks and strokes. Don't these drugs deserve listing as a major achievement?"

Dr. WHITE. Some of us used to be skeptical, and I think rightly so, until we had more proof; and now there seems to be more proof that anticoagulants, properly administered and carefully controlled, can help a good deal in persons who already have had evidence of thrombosis or embolism in the past or perhaps in those who in the past have had insidious symptoms of angina pectoris; so there is a place and this has been an important advance, without doubt.

Dr. SPRAGUE. I will address this final question to Dr. Page. There are several that come in this same category and they have to do with this rather popular notion at the present time that the emotional stress of our lives has something to do with the development of atherosclerosis of the coronary arteries.

Well, how do you feel about this, Dr. Page?

Dr. PAGE. Well, I feel I have answered the question many times before. I think that this problem is one that suffers from lack of objective definitions.

What do we mean by "stress"? It's always been with us. For instance, children have been defined by the agony of their illness and by the exhaustion of their well-being. [Laughter.]

And yet we have to have them, I am told. [Laughter.]

Now, I think that, again, stress has been in every generation. Every generation thinks they have more stress than the others. I am sure that building pyramids must have been a great stress for the people. It must be of some satisfaction now to know that the pyramids are holding down the Pharaohs. [Laughter.]

Now, I think that, lastly, this problem is a peculiarly human one in the sense that man is the only individual who really meets a challenge. Challenge is the one way we strive for success in the world. If there is a purpose in the world—and I believe there is one—then that is defined in terms of challenge; and if people can't meet challenge, they are something less than human in my book. Therefore, I would say that let's meet the challenges of the world as best we can because that is our purpose; and then let's not worry about the consequences of it.

We'll live the best we can; we'll take things as inevitably as we can; but let's still remain human beings.

Thank you.

Dr. SPRAGUE. I would like to end by saying that I agree with what Dr. Page says. If we let our citizens become so soft and fearful that the normal challenges of living may be harmful, then there is great danger that a less timorous and less pampered nation may well take us over; and I think that if stress were the important thing in the production of coronary disease, all these members here on the panel would go home and have a coronary thrombosis; and I don't think they are going to.

Thank you very much. [Applause.]

SENATE

MONDAY, MARCH 9, 1959

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father God, above all the babel of strident voices assailing our ears in these hectic days of angry contentions, we would turn to Thy changeless concern for Thy earthly children and rest in the comforting promise, "I will keep that man in perfect peace whose mind is stayed on Me."

"Father in Thy name we pray—
Let us know Thy will today.
With Thee we are unafraid.
For on Thee our minds are stayed;
Though a thousand foes surround
Safe in Thee we shall be found."

In all the problems of governance which center in this Chamber of the people's will, we would ever be conscious that this dear land of our hopes and prayers is rooted in a compelling faith in spiritual verities without which life itself is devoid of valid meaning.

In the sacred pilgrimage of these weeks of the passion, with the steadfast countenance of "Man's best Man" ever before us, grant us the grace to turn from all that hides Thy face.

We ask it in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, March 5, 1959, was dispensed with.

STATE OF THE NATION'S PREPAREDNESS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that three articles published in today's New York Times be inserted in the RECORD.

The first article is entitled "Four Military Chiefs List Objections to Budget Limits."

The next article is a text of the military chiefs' memorandums giving their views on the budget. This was published on page 14 of today's New York Times.

The third article is entitled "McElroy Reports on Berlin Plans."

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FOUR MILITARY CHIEFS LIST OBJECTIONS TO BUDGET LIMITS—VIEWS DETAILED IN NOTES TO SENATE INQUIRY—CUTS IN ARMY PERTURB TAYLOR

(By Jack Raymond)

WASHINGTON, March 8.—The chiefs of the Army, Navy, Air Force and Marines have presented to Congress in detail the reservations they have about President Eisenhower's $40,945 million defense spending budget. They endorsed the proposed budget 2 months ago.

Gen. Maxwell D. Taylor, the Army's Chief of Staff, was most vehement in his comments. He said that in his opinion and in the opinion of his principal Army commanders, "their personnel resources" were "inadequate to meet in full the requirements of their assigned missions."

He called attention to the Army's recruiting of foreign nationals not only in Korea, but also in Europe, as well for combat and support units—"thus incurring a heavy dependence upon foreign personnel which might have serious consequences in an emergency."

SUBMITTED IN WRITING

The service Chiefs expressed their reservations about the budget in memorandums to the Senate Preparedness Subcommittee. Their comments will be included in the printed record, expected to be issued in a few days, of the subcommittee's recent hearings.

The Chiefs' memorandums, taken collectively, represented a strong reinforcement of congressional differences with President Eisenhower over the adequacy of the country's defenses.

In the special meetings with congressional leaders on Friday President Eisenhower asserted that the United States had sufficient atomic and conventional forces to carry out political commitments to defend Berlin.

There were indications that congressional critics of the President's stand would now cite the views of General Taylor and the other Chiefs, although these views were not based on the Berlin situation.

Gen. Thomas D. White, Chief of Staff of the Air Force, expressed concern in his memorandum about marginal military construction, slow replacement of the Strategic Air Command's B–47 bombers, and the rejection of plans to proceed with building a nuclear-powered airplane.

Adm. Arleigh A. Burke, Chief of Naval Operations, cited five reservations. These dealt with maintenance and modernization of ships and aircraft, procurement of new weapons, acceleration of antisubmarine warfare defenses, progress of the Polaris missile-firing submarine plan, and increased research and development.

Gen. Randolph McC. Pate, Commandant of the Marine Corps, singled out personnel reductions as paramount, but he mentioned also ships, aircraft and construction of facilities.

The subcommittee to which the Chiefs' communications were submitted has scheduled new closed hearings on defense to start on Wednesday. The hearings will concern the Berlin crisis.

In announcing the new hearings, Senator LYNDON B. JOHNSON, of Texas, the subcommittee chairman, called attention to the reservations the service Chiefs had voiced when they endorsed the budget.

Mr. JOHNSON, the Democrats' Senate leader, referred to a statement made by Neil H. McElroy, Secretary of Defense, when he testified before the committee that the Chiefs supported the budget. In part, Mr. McElroy said that the Chiefs "find no serious gaps in the key elements of the budget in its present form, but all have reservations with respect to the funding of some segments of their respective service programs."

The memorandum that endorsed the budget was dated January 19 and was signed by the service Chiefs and Gen. Nathan F. Twining, chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

In the subsequent hearings the Chiefs were asked to comment upon their reservations. They did so, but Senator JOHNSON also requested that they put their opinions in writing. The memorandums were sent to the committee after the hearings had been adjourned early in February.

Before being sent to the committee, the Chiefs' statements were cleared with the office of the Secretary of Defense. It is understood that in the forthcoming hearings the Chiefs may be asked whether any changes had been made in the statements.

GETTING DOWN TO CASES

In announcing that he would call Secretary McElroy and the members of the Joint Chiefs for a discussion of service needs in the light of the Berlin crisis, Senator JOHNSON said:

"We are going to try to get down to cases."

In their memorandums to the subcommittee, all four Chiefs expressed fears about the possible lack of an adequate surface-to-air missile defenses.

While discussing the antimissile program, General Taylor said that adequate appropriations had been requested for research for the Nike-Zeus. But no funds, he said, were allocated to initial production of tactical equipment for the weapon now under development that would be capable of defending retaliatory forces and vital centers against intercontinental and submarine-launched ballistic missiles.

"My reservation in this area arises from the unopposed ICBM threat and my conviction that the importance of obtaining this unique antimissile weapon at the earliest possible date outweighs the possible financial risks in initiating selective production now," said General Taylor.

In commenting on personnel reduction, General Taylor called attention to his own recommendation last year that the Army be maintained at 925,000, while the new budget called for a reduction to 870,000.

TEXT OF MILITARY CHIEFS' MEMORANDUMS GIVING VIEWS ON BUDGET

WASHINGTON, March 8.—Following are the texts of the memorandums by the service Chiefs prepared for the Senate Preparedness Subcommittee:

GEN. MAXWELL D. TAYLOR

"On January 19, 1959, the Joint Chiefs of Staff submitted a memorandum to the Secretary of Defense, subject JCS position on the fiscal year 1960 budget. The following statement is to clarify my position as requested by the chairman of the Senate Preparedness Investigating Subcommittee, with regard to my reservations with respect to certain Army programs, mentioned in the January 19 memorandum.

"The reservations which I had in mind pertain specifically to four major Army programs. These are (1) Army modernization, (2) the anti-missile-missile (Nike-Zeus) program, (3) the personnel strength of the Active Army and Reserve forces, and (4) the Army surface-to-air missile program.

"Modernization

"The Army's modernization program is designed to achieve both modernization of the existing inventory and a gradual increase in quantity of inventory to meet the estimated combat and training requirements of the early months of mobilization and of war. The first step each year is to seek funds to replace the average annual inventory loss due to consumption, wear-out and obsolescence. Experience indicates the need to replace annually for these causes about 10 percent of the current equipment inventory. As the value of the Army inventory is approaching $14 billion, the annual sum required for replacement is about $1,400 million.

"A second requirement is to increase gradually the Army's inventory level from $14 billion to a level of $20 billion, the quantity of equipment which is needed in our supply system to meet the early requirements of mobilization and combat. This level constitutes the Army material objective which we wish to attain in a 5-year period. Thus, in addition to the $1.4 billion for replacement, the Army seeks another $1.2 billion as an annual increment of a 5-year plan to increase the inventory to meet the material objective mentioned above, and about $200 million for industrial mobilization and transportation. Therefore, a procurement appropriation of approximately $2.8 billion per year (exclusive of Nike-Zeus) over a 5-year period is needed to support this phased program to provide the Army with ample modern equipment. Against this requirement of $2.8 billion, the fiscal year 1960 budget will make available $1.19 billion for procurement and $176 million for industrial mobilization and transportation. The $1.19 billion amount is about $200 million less than the amount required to offset the annual drawdown in inventory due to consumption, wear-out, and obsolescence and makes no provision for building up our present inventory from $14 billion to $20 billion.

"My reservation with regard to this program arises from concern over the inability under the fiscal year 1960 budget to make the desired progress in modernizing the present equipment of the Army and in acquiring the necessary additional quantity of material.

"The antimissile missile (Nike-Zeus)

"Nike-Zeus is provided sufficient funds in the fiscal year 1960 budget to continue research and development at an optimum rate. It is the only system currently under development which will be capable of defending our retaliatory forces and our vital centers against intercontinental and submarine launched ballistic missiles. No funds are provided to initiate production of tactical equipment and missiles.

"My reservation in this area arises from the unopposed ICBM threat and my conviction that the importance of obtaining this unique antimissile weapon at the earliest possible date outweighs the possible financial risks inherent in initiating selective production now.

"Personnel strength

"During the development of both the fiscal year 1959 and fiscal year 1960 budgets, I recommended that the active Army be maintained at a strength of 925,000, 15 divisions and the Reserve components at a paid drill strength of 700,000. The fiscal year 1960 budget will provide an Active Army strength of 870,000, 14 divisions and a paid drill strength of 630,000 for the Reserve components.

"My reservation with regard to the personnel situation in the Active Army is based upon the results of reports and of my personal visits to the principal Army commanders abroad and in the United States, all of whom consider their personnel resources as inadequate to meet the full requirements of their assigned missions. In order to compensate for the shortage of American personnel, Army commanders in Europe and Korea have been obliged to incorporate large numbers of foreign nationals into combat and support units, thus incurring a heavy dependence upon foreign personnel which might have serious consequences in an emergency.

"With regard to the reduction in the paid drill strength of the Reserve components, my concern is over the adverse effect on the reorganization of the National Guard structure currently under negotiation with State governors and the adverse impact of the reduction on the readiness of many National Guard and USAR units to meet the desired mobilization time schedule.

"Surface-to-air missiles

"Army objectives in numbers of surface-to-air missile units for the continental air defense and for air defense in overseas theaters are determined by the Joint Chiefs of Staff after consideration of the recommendations of the commander in chief, Continental Air Defense Command, and the commanders of unified commands. The funds for Army surface-to-air missiles in the fiscal year 1960 budget fall substantially short of those needed to reach the goals recommended by the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

"My reservation in this field is over the failure to make sufficient provision for these air defense weapons which will be needed for the indefinite future to cope with the high and low altitude threat of the manned bomber and the air-to-surface missile."

GEN. THOMAS D. WHITE

"This statement is in reply to the direct request of the chairman, Senate Preparedness Committee. It confirms oral examples given to the committee at the time of questioning and completes my recital of reservations concerning the Air Force fiscal year 1960 budget.

"The present Air Force fiscal year 1960 budget does not permit the replacement of B–47's as rapidly as requested. While certain scientific advisers do not feel that we are ready to start building a nuclear powered aircraft, I consider that our aircraft nuclear powered program (ANP) is sufficiently advanced so that we should proceed with construction of the prototype development airframe and should accelerate the propulsion phase of the program. The density of coverage that will result from the Bomarc procurement proposed in this budget is substantially less than the Air Force initially submitted.

"The Air Force military construction program is marginal in terms of support type of facilities and does not provide for the cumulative and growing deficit in many equally important areas. In fiscal 1960 the Air Force operations and maintenance funding is minimal and will require deferral of certain programs which it would be desirable, and in some cases more economical to accomplish with fiscal year 1960 funds."

ADMIRAL ARLEIGH A. BURKE

"1. As Chief of Naval Operations my concern is to keep Navy capabilities up to the level where the Navy can do what it will be required to do, now and in the future. We must strike a balance, within the resources made available to the Navy, between immediate readiness and future capability.

"2. In response to questions by this committee, I stated I had certain reservations with regard to this budget, which reservations related to Navy capabilities to respond to unforeseen demands of national policy and to provide the quality of Navy which will be required in the future.

"The budget areas in which I have reservations are these:

"(a) Maintenance and modernization of ships and aircraft.

"(b) Procurement of new ships, new aircraft, guided missiles, and their associated electronic equipment.

"(c) Acceleration of ASW (antisubmarine warfare) progress.

"(d) Rate of procurement of FBM (fleet ballistic missile) weapon systems.

"(e) Increased research and development effort."

GEN. RANDOLPH M'C. PATE

"My reservations respecting the funding in the 1960 budget as related to Marine Corps requirements, which I am now presenting in response to committee invitation, involve four categories: Personnel, ships, aircraft, and maintenance of facilities. Of these, I regard the first, personnel, as paramount.

"With respect to personnel, it has been and is my firm conviction that to carry out its assigned missions, the Marine Corps requires personnel to adequately man three divisions and three aircraft wings. My initial budget calculations were based on 200,000 marines. The 1960 budget as submitted to the Congress provides for 175,000 marines.

"Thus my first reservation results from the level of manpower under which the Marine Corps will operate in fiscal year 1960.

"With respect to the Navy construction program for amphibious assault ships

(LPH's) there has been progressive slippage starting from its inception. The 1960 new construction provides for but one LPH, which added to the two on which construction has been started will result by fiscal year 1963 in only three modern helicopter assault troop carriers.

"Thus, my second reservation is that new ship construction provided by this budget will fall short in effecting the transition to modern amphibious techniques.

"In the aviation area, I must relate Marine Corps requirements to the overall framework of naval aviation. Aircraft procurement in this budget, as stated by Admiral Burke to the committee on January 29, 1959, does not meet the requirement of aircraft arising merely from predicted attrition. We are thus faced with the inevitable prospect of declining inventory of aircraft with all that means in terms of exploitation of seapower.

"Thus my third reservation involves the decline in naval air strength which will surely result.

"With respect to maintenance and construction of facilities, the Marine Corps at the start of the budget cycle stated its requirements at approximately $45 million. The budget under consideration will provide $9 million of that amount.

"Thus my fourth reservation concerns the continued deterioration of facilities and the slippage of new construction which has characterized our supporting establishment during the entire postwar era.

"The foregoing statement of reservations, it should be remembered, are made from my vantage point as chief of service. While to me they involve matters of personal conviction, it is patent that other considerations additional to those available to me as a military man, must be and have been applied to the problem areas in which I entertain the foregoing reservations."

McELROY REPORTS ON BERLIN PLANS—SAYS WEST IS DEVISING WAYS TO MEET BLOCKADE—SOVIET CHIEF IN PEACE APPEAL

WASHINGTON, March 8.—Secretary of Defense Neil H. McElroy said today that the United States and its allies were working out a variety of combinations of air and ground access to Berlin to be used in the event of a Communist blockade.

The Secretary said these combinations were a part of very real and definite military planning by the United States, Britain, France, and West Germany. This is designed to meet the threat posed by Premier Nikita S. Khrushchev's announced determination to turn over control of Allied access routes to West Berlin to the East German Communist Government if the West refuses to sign a German peace treaty and withdraw from the city.

Mr. McElroy said the things that are being done are the right things to be doing at this stage.

He added that he thought the chances of settling the Berlin crisis by negotiation were a much more real possibility at this stage than was the possibility of war.

[Speaking at an East Berlin reception, Mr. Khrushchev pledged to work to end the cold war if the Western Powers would agree to withdraw from Berlin, the Associated Press reported. The Soviet leader will confer with Erich Ollenhauer, West German Socialist chief.]

Secretary McElroy's assertion, delivered on "Meet the Press," National Broadcasting Co. television program, came amid a rising chorus of demands by Democratic lawmakers that the Eisenhower administration move faster to match the quickening tempo of events in Germany.

Senator LYNDON B. JOHNSON of Texas, Democratic leader of the Senate, urged in a broadcast to his constituents that the administration get on with the job of preparing the Nation militarily, morally, and economically to meet the crisis.

Senator J. W. FULBRIGHT, Democrat of Arkansas, chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, voiced opposition to the administration's planned cuts in Armed Forces strength. He also said the United States should move promptly to seize the diplomatic initiative from the Soviet Union.

Secretary McElroy defended the planned reductions in the Army and the Marine Corps on the basis that the United States was relying on the ground forces of our allies as well as upon the nuclear striking power of the Strategic Air Command. He refused to say whether Allied troops or U.S. troops might be called upon to break a Berlin blockade imposed by East Germany.

The Secretary repeated that it would be very difficult to keep any hostilities over Berlin restricted to a so-called limited war.

His confidence in the possibility of a negotiated settlement was supported by the Speaker of the House, SAM RAYBURN. The Texas Democrat said he hoped and believed that there was a better than 50–50 chance that there can be a compromise on both sides.

Senators JOHNSON and FULBRIGHT and Mr. RAYBURN, with other Members of the congressional leadership and of the Senate and House Foreign and Armed Services Committees, attended discussions on Berlin held by the President Friday. Subsequent reports indicated deep Democratic concern over the President's insistence on placing a balanced budget ahead of more defense. In formal statements at the White House the congressional leaders had announced their united support for the administration's plans and procedures.

Senator JOHNSON told his constituents that the countdown had begun at Berlin and that the United States "must move now to insure for ourselves the greatest possible strength for the day when the showdown comes."

"We can no longer sit by and see our strength—military, moral or economic—decimated by delay, defeat or retreat," he said. "Words are useless. Criticism is wasteful. Delay is unthinkable. Let us together get on with the job which lies ahead."

Senator FULBRIGHT agreed with the President's contention that there was no need for general mobilization. But he said planned cuts in the Armed Forces and announcements of a cut of $400 million or $300 million were very bad psychology.

"It tempts the Russians to be more aggressive than they otherwise would be," he said.

Secretary McElroy, defending administration concentration upon building up nuclear striking forces at the expense of conventional forces, said he was confident the United States would have adequate radar defenses against a Soviet missile attack by the time the Russians were able to launch a sizable attack. He said the Soviet Union did not have the capability for such an attack now.

BOMBERS COULD BE ALERTED

He said he doubted that even an attack by 200 Soviet missiles would be adequate to knock out this country, although some experts have estimated that the 50 largest military bases could be wiped out by such an attack.

He said that although Strategic Air Command bombers were not now in a condition of air alert, with planes actually flying, we will go to it any time we feel we need it.

Mr. McElroy said he thought Atlantic alliance forces in Europe were adequate to contest what he said might be an almost accidental incursion into European territory by Communist forces.

The Secretary said the Berlin situation was the sort of crisis that might persuade him to change his announced plans to resign in the autumn. If the President felt his continuance in office was necessary to the national security, he said, "then I would stay."

In a separate interview, Secretary of the Army Wilber M. Brucker echoed the President's assertion that mobilization was not needed at present. He said, too, that military plans had been completed to meet any conceivable situation arising from the Berlin situation.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, the Preparedness Investigating Subcommittee of the Senate Armed Services Committee will continue its hearings on the state of the Nation's preparedness program, with special emphasis on the Berlin situation, starting next Wednesday.

During our hearings in February it was brought out that each member of the Joint Chiefs had signed a letter supporting this year's military budget, with certain reservations. The committee asked that it be furnished copies of these reservations. The committee has now been furnished the detailed lists, and they will be contained in the printed record of the original hearings, which will be released within the next day or so. I commend them to the attention of all Members of the Senate.

At the time of their original testimony, Generals Taylor, White, and Pate and Admiral Burke indicated that while they considered this year's budget "adequate," they had certain reservations. The term "adequate" is still subject to further definition.

The Berlin situation places a new light on the subject.

General Taylor, since appearing before the committee, has said that in his opinion the Army's personnel resources are inadequate to meet the full requirements of its assigned missions. Mr. McElroy is quoted as saying, "The things that are being done are the right things to be done at this stage."

It will be the purpose of the pending hearings to get down to cases, and to try to get the truth with the bark off.

The "countdown" has begun with the Berlin situation, and we must insure that we have adequate strength. And—more than that—the American people must be informed as to what the military, moral, and economic requirements are.

Mr. President, the hour is late. There can be no question that all Americans will stand together and firmly support the principles to which we are committed. But now is the time for us to realistically appraise the situation. We cannot afford to indulge in wishful thinking, but rather must appraise the facts as they exist and steadfastly face the issue squarely.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD at this point a statement I made to a press conference following the White House conference on March 6.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATE MAJORITY LEADER LYNDON B. JOHNSON, MARCH 6, 1959

This morning I attended a meeting at the White House on the Berlin situation—one of the most serious developments this country has faced in several years. There is no easy solution to a very hard and thorny problem.

Of one thing we can be certain. The country will stand united. It must stand united behind our President because the situation calls for strength, resolute firmness, and unity.

There can be no question but that Americans will exhibit those qualities.

The point that presses upon us most strongly is not whether we will stand firm in May—or whatever date or wherever a showdown comes—but what we will do now to gather our strength, as much as necessary as soon as necessary.

Some of us are deeply disturbed by the fact that at this point we are still whittling away the strength of our Army, our Navy, our Marine Corps, and our Air Force.

The Joint Chiefs of Staff appeared before our Preparedness Committee. We asked them to give us all the facts with the bark off. Each one stated that the budget as a whole was adequate, but expressed reservations as to its effect upon his own service. At the time, it seemed to me that this was very much in the class of saying: "This is all right with me, but don't blame me if things go wrong."

The Berlin crisis puts a different focus on the situation. It sharpens the necessity for maintaining our strength. We must determine whether the military policies of our country are being written by military officers through the judgment of our Joint Chiefs or a budget officer.

The Preparedness Committee will resume open and closed hearings early next week. We will call the Joint Chiefs of Staff and we will invite the Budget Director and get right down to cases.

Our Nation is facing a period of trial. We must be certain that we approach the ordeal not only with courage but with all the strength that is at our command. And finally, when we have explored all possible courses and made our decisions, we present to the world a unified front.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. I am very much interested in what the distinguished Senator from Texas just said about the size of our Army. The Senator is aware of the fact, no doubt, that last year the Appropriations Committees of both Houses provided sufficient funds for an Army of 900,000 men. If I may refresh the memories of Senators, last year the House Appropriations Committee approved the administration measure which provided funds for an Army of 870,000 men. Congressman SIKES, of Florida, amended the measure on the floor of the House so that funds sufficient for the maintenance of a 900,000-man Army were available.

The Senate Appropriations Committee approved the measure and on the floor of the Senate an amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND] to set a mandatory level of 900,000 men for the Army was unanimously approved. In that form the entire bill was passed by the Senate.

When the measure went to conference, House conferees objected to the mandatory Army limit being included in an appropriations bill. The Senate conferees receded and instead, the mandatory limit was included in the conference report.

In my judgment the intent of Congress is very clear on this point—that there should be a minimum of 900,000 men in our Army. Apparently, however, the Defense Department is determined to flaunt the will of the Congress and intends to cut the Army down to 870,000 men by the end of this fiscal year, the Congress notwithstanding.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. General Taylor, the Chief of Staff of the United States Army, states in his letter to the committee that:

> During the development of both the fiscal year 1959 and fiscal year 1960 budgets, I recommended that the Active Army be maintained at a strength of 925,000, fifteen divisions and the Reserve components at a paid drill strength of 700,000. The fiscal year 1960 budget will provide an Active Army strength of 870,000.

Which is 55,000 less than recommended.

> Fourteen divisions and a paid drill strength of 630,000 for the Reserve components.

Mr. ELLENDER. It was on the basis of such testimony as the Senator is now quoting that the Congress provided sufficient funds for a 900,000-man Army. That is why I say now that steps should be taken to make the Defense Department follow the dictates of the Congress.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I am sure the committee is concerned with two things, as Americans, and not as representatives of any party. First, do we have adequate plans to deal with the security of this country at all times? Second, if we have adequate plans, do we have the necessary strength to implement and carry out those plans? The committee is attempting, in as objective, energetic, and diligent a manner as it can, to obtain answers to those questions.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I do not want to occupy the floor too long, but I do not want to refuse to yield. I ask unanimous consent that I may yield to the Senator, since the Senator would be entitled to 3 minutes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Texas? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, the Constitution provides in article I, section 8, that Congress shall have the power to raise and support armies. This power is in addition to the power the Congress has to appropriate money.

I saw the Secretary of Defense on television yesterday. The Secretary considered the appropriations of the Congress, as mere invitations to raise armies over and beyond the armies which the administration thinks advisable. I should like to submit to the Senator that Congress has not discharged its responsibility to raise and support the armies necessary for the defense of this country by merely inviting the Secretary of Defense and the President to expend funds for that purpose. If we believe our defenses are inadequate Congress should go further than merely to appropriate money as an invitation to the Executive to provide strength.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I wholeheartedly concur in the wise admonition of the Senator from Louisiana. One can lead a horse to water, but cannot make him drink. We appropriated, I am informed, in the defense budget for last year, more than a billion dollars which has been impounded. I deeply regret that the time has come when an appropriation bill of the Congress can be nullified and the unanimous action of both Houses of Congress can be nullified by the action of a budget clerk. I hope the defenses of this Nation will be built upon the advice and recommendations of the best military men we have, instead of some civilian Budget Director.

The committee is now attempting to ascertain, in an objective and prudent manner, what are the facts. I am not willing to reach conclusions which might be calculated to frighten the people, but I know that money we appropriated last year has not been expended, and the action has been negated and has been nullified. The money has been impounded. The strength we thought we should have, and for which in performing our duty under the Constitution we provided, is not in existence because individuals nullified the action by impounding the funds.

This has been true with respect to other administrations. I regret to say that not many years ago a Democratic President took the same action. I opposed the action then. I think that if the President is not going to use the funds he ought to veto the bill and send a message back to the Congress.

I do not think the time has come when a Budget Director should have more power, first, than the military men, and, second, than the Congress itself; but we are living in such a day, I will say, because I am informed that word was received by the Chiefs of Staff from sources on high to review this memorandum, and each one of them said, "While I have reservations concerning my own agency, I will agree to the general overall amount." What they meant, to me, was that they were saying, "Well, I am going to approve it, but don't blame me if something happens." That is what we are trying to develop in the hearings, and we will find out what the situation is.

Mr. LONG. Congress has a duty, in this connection, beyond the mere power to appropriate money. It has the power and duty to require that the Armies and defenses be sufficient for our needs.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I wholeheartedly agree with the Senator.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield to the Senator from Illinois, who would be entitled to 3 minutes of his own time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DODD in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am very glad the Senator from Texas has made the point which he has made with respect to the appropriations which Congress made last year. As I understand, we appropriated $1 billion additional for missiles, and ap-

proximately $150 million to keep the Army strength at 900,000, to prevent the Marine Corps from being reduced to 175,000 men, and to make it possible to increase its strength to 200,000.

It was specifically stated in the report which the Senate Appropriations Committee made that it was the intent of Congress that the land forces should be raised to 900,000 and 200,000, respectively.

As the Senator from Texas has said, this mandate was not carried out; and as a result the Army is being reduced from 15 divisions to 14 divisions, and the Marine Corps units are being made seriously understrength, at a time when the Berlin crisis has been boiling up.

I very much hope that the Senator from Texas, for whose great ability I have profound respect, and other Members of the Senate will make this point crystal clear, because at a time when there is real danger of limited war, our capacity to defend ourselves in a limited war is being reduced by the administration, against the specifically declared will and purpose of Congress.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I appreciate what the Senator has said. At every opportunity I have had, I have asked the highest authorities two questions: "First, do we have adequate plans to deal with any eventuality? Second, in your opinion have we the strength necessary to carry out those plans?"

I have received assurance that, in the opinion of those high in authority, the answer to both questions is in the affirmative.

I hope that each Member of the Senate, as a part of his homework tomorrow, will read the rather clear and concise statement of each member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, so that Senators may know what the best military minds of the Nation think should be done. It may be that those in the Bureau of the Budget know more about the subject than do the Joint Chiefs of Staff—Admiral Burke, General White, and General Pate. But if they do, we have been wasting money on West Point for a long time.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I concur in the restraint exercised by the majority leader in dealing with the question of military preparations, and the question as to whether or not we have what would be required under any circumstances. However, I wish to reemphasize what I said informally last week, that I hope there will be careful and necessary restraint. The reason I make that statement is that a certain speech was made on this floor last week. I read two paragraphs from the copy which came to me——

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I am glad to yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I hope the Senator does not imply that I was guilty of any lack of restraint or prudence.

Mr. DIRKSEN. No; I have just indicated that I concurred fully in the Senator's restraint

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I thank the Senator.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I should like to read two paragraphs:

> All the evidence suggests that if war were to come—as it might in May over Berlin—Russian submarines would not only control the sea lanes but could, at their leisure, lob nuclear bombs on the great cities of our coast.

Mr. President, it seems to me that it goes pretty far for a nonmilitary man to make that kind of statement. While I very much dislike to reveal the name of the person who made that speech, I must say that it was made by the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK]. He made it on the floor of the Senate last week. He said, further:

> And as for limited war, we just do not have in being adequate mobile forces capable of dealing with localized attacks on our allies, particularly if crises should occur simultaneously in far-removed locations.

Mr. President, that is a very unfelicitous statement to make from the floor of the Senate, in my judgment.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I shall be glad to yield when I have completed my statement. I believe that every Senator is entitled to be heard on the floor of the Senate. Nevertheless, I should like to refer to what has been said by Admiral Burke. He is an eminent military authority. He was in command of a destroyer squadron in World War II in the Pacific area. He also served in the Atlantic area, and later he served in Korea. He is a great military man. He now serves as our Chief of Naval Operations.

On February 25 of this year he made a speech at the Treasury Conference of Industrial Leaders in Washington. At that time he said:

> If an attack is launched against the United States, our forces will provide a wide mix of weapons strategically positioned and designed to react from different sectors. In the period 1959 to 1962 these will include ICBM's and manned bombers from the United States; manned bombers from overseas bases; deployed tactical missiles of our Army, Navy, and Air Force; missiles from our submarines at sea; and a contribution to be made by our atomic-capable Tactical Air Force units and attack carrier striking forces deployed in strategic areas.

I could ask to have the remainder of the speech printed in the RECORD. However, I allude to it only for one reason.

Yesterday I had a moment to read a little of the life of Edwin M. Stanton, Secretary of War under Abraham Lincoln. At that time there was in existence a congressional committee on the conduct of the war. It was one of the greatest nuisances of that day that could possibly be imagined.

We are entitled to ventilate our views. Nevertheless I hope that in doing so we will be careful not to undertake to initiate from the floor of the Senate somewhat pontifical statements about strategy and tactics; as to what we have and what we do not have.

I commend the majority leader for his restraint in this matter. He said we should let the facts speak for themselves. I agree. I believe also that we should be careful not to express an attitude with regard to military matters which would indicate that we are speaking as military experts. After all, it is on the military leaders that we must rely.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. LONG. The Senator has referred to Admiral Burke.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I regard him as one of our military experts.

Mr. LONG. The Senator has referred to Admiral Burke, the Chief of Naval Operations. Admiral Burke has testified on the same subject and along the same line taken by the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] in his remarks on the floor of the Senate the other day. Admiral Burke himself admitted that the Navy did not have the strength to prevent a submarine from launching atomic missiles from either below the surface or from a submarine firing missiles on the surface.

Such missiles could be launched from submarines lying off our coasts. I heard the Admiral testify to that effect before the Subcommittee on Disarmament. I believe Admiral Burke is a great military authority, as the Senator from Illinois has said.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, at this point I ask unanimous consent to have the complete text of Admiral Burke's remarks at the Treasury Conference of Industrial Leaders printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the remarks was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADMIRAL BURKE ASSAYS U.S. MILITARY POSTURE

"It is not probable that any nation possesses the ability to destroy us, or to attack us, without receiving unacceptable damage in return, today or in the foreseeable future," Adm. Arleigh A. Burke, Chief of Naval Operations, told the Treasury Conference of Industrial Leaders in Washington, D.C., February 25.

After outlining the number of Soviet and U.S. military forces, Admiral Burke pointed out:

"We should measure the adequacy of the number of those forces solely by whether they are sufficient to satisfy the needs of the nation concerned."

He then gave the following comparison of Soviet and U.S. forces.

COMPARISON OF MILITARY FORCES

1. Ground forces: "With respect to ground forces, the Soviet Union clearly outnumbers the United States, but there is a wide difference in requirements. The Soviet Union needs large ground forces to maintain internal security within the Soviet bloc and to man their long frontiers. We have no such requirements. Therefore, our tactical forces in the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and the Air Force, together with the substantial forces contributed by our free world allies, are available to deal with limited war situations and to carry out essential tasks in a general war."

2. Seapower: "Our seapower is clearly superior to that of the Soviet Union, even though they have made substantial improvements since World War II and have large numbers of submarines in operation. We have different aims and policies. We need to be able to maintain freedom of the seas and to project our seapower overseas. In the event of war this requires ships and aircraft to control overseas areas—in

the air, on the land, and under the sea. We need some submarines for this purpose, but not as many as the Soviets need to try to dispute our ability to control the sea.

"You are probably aware that the Soviet Union has no aircraft carriers while the United States is in a position to deploy both in the Mediterranean and the Far Pacific powerful task forces built around aircraft carriers. These carrier task forces in general war together with Polaris submarines constitute a retaliatory capability unique to the United States."

3. Airpower: "Our airpower is clearly superior to that of the Soviet Union.

"The manned bomber will for some time constitute the primary means of delivery of strategic weapons in volume and with the degree of accuracy required.

"Our primary nuclear capability rests today in our manned bombers and the same is true of the Soviet Union. The United States outnumbers the U.S.S.R. in intercontinental jet bombers and in medium bombers. Our bombers are manned by the most highly trained and experienced crews in the world. They are ready now.

"Our air defense system is capable of doing the job that it is required to do. No air defense system can guarantee 100 percent protection."

4. Missiles: "As to missiles, we do not know with positive assurance exactly what the Soviet Union is producing. We can estimate their capability to design, build, test, produce, and deploy missiles, and we employ these estimates in our planning. This does not mean that they will definitely produce the number which we have estimated they could produce in our estimates of their initial operational capabilities. Nevertheless, we must assume in advance that over any given period they are going to use available capacity and resources. * * *

"While it is true that our intelligence estimates indicate that the Soviet Union could produce more ICBM's than we are planning to produce in the years 1959 to 1962, a comparison of any single weapon inventory is not a measure of the relative striking force of two nations."

TOTAL U.S. MILITARY POSTURE

Taking such factors into account, Admiral Burke then gave the following picture of total U.S. posture:

"If an attack is launched against the United States, our forces will provide a wide mix of weapons strategically positioned and designed to react from different sectors. In the period 1959 to 1962 these will include ICBM's and manned bombers from the United States; manned bombers from overseas bases; deployed tactical missiles of our Army, Navy, and Air Force; missiles from our submarines at sea; and the contribution to be made by our atomic-capable tactical Air Force units and attack carrier striking forces deployed in strategic areas. * * *

"On the basis of all the information available, and in view of the mix and strategic locations of our retaliatory weapons systems, it is not probable that any nation possesses the ability to destroy us, or to attack us, without receiving unacceptable damage in return, today or in the foreseeable future. This is true in spite of the fact that the Soviet Union could test, produce, and deploy more ICBM's in the period 1959–62 than we plan now to produce in the same time period.

WEAPONS ONLY A PART OF NATIONAL DEFENSE

Admiral Burke emphasized in his conclusion that "weapons are only one part of our national defense effort."

He said, "We cannot afford to win an arms race and to lose the battle for men's minds. It is in this area that the Communists will make their major offensive. To defeat them we must be morally and spiritually strong—politically wise—financially and economically stable—sure of our cause. * * *

"The sound economic strength of this country," he asserted, "is the base on which our armed might is built."

Mr. LONG subsequently said: Mr. President, during the morning hour today, the minority leader, the distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], referred to the views of Admiral Burke. It seemed to me that he was perhaps overlooking the dangers of missiles fired from submarines, or at least was not giving full weight to that factor. That was the basis upon which I interrupted him this morning. I am not sure that our views are different at all.

However, to make the record more complete, I should like to place in the RECORD a portion of the hearings before the Subcommittee on Disarmament of the Committee on Foreign Relations, in which Admiral Burke indicated that we have no way to be sure that such missiles cannot be launched against our bases, and that the Navy is not in a position to assure us that Russian attacks with such missiles would not be successful.

I ask unanimous consent that the portion of the testimony to which I refer be printed at the point where the colloquy occurred during the morning hour.

There being no objection, the testimony was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SUNRISE ATTACK BY SUBMARINES

Senator LONG. I want to ask a question in that connection, Admiral Burke.

There was a very good Air Force base commander who told me that while he was in the Far East he felt he was in position to pick up radar warning in the event of air attack, but he never was confident that his counterpart in the Navy was in any position to protect him against sub-launched missiles. In other words, he felt he was a sitting duck for that weapon.

What is your reaction to that type of situation? You have a naval base in Puerto Rico, and you have some Far Eastern bases right on the sea.

Admiral BURKE. Yes, sir. There will be no way that you can absoltuely guarantee that an attack will not get through. If they would concentrate on such type of an attack some of it would get through.

Senator LONG. The point is that you just do not have any way of being sure that that type of an attack cannot be made.

Admiral BURKE. No, sir. There are thousands and thousands of square miles of ocean, and looking over the ocean you can only cover a very small area at any one particular time. There is no equipment that can guarantee that there is not a submarine at a particular spot in the ocean, except in a very small area, and even then you cannot guarantee that you have got it.

Senator LONG. That is a lot of area, and the Soviets can have a missile with an accurate range from, say, 300 miles away, too; is that not possible?

Admiral BURKE. Yes, sir. That is for the same reason the Russians are in a tough spot on that. There is no way that they can search all the oceans either. There is no way of doing it, and it is more true for submarines, but it is equally true for surface ships. There is a tremendous area that has to be searched all the time.

Senator HUMPHREY. The thing that worries me about this, Admiral, is that we are much more of a maritime nation than the Soviet Union. We are much more vulnerable to attack because of the miles of coastline that we have as compared to the Soviet Union.

The Soviet Union has no coastline except the Pacific; that is Siberia and Vladivostok.

They use that area for missile testing sites, for maneuvers, and war games activity, all the way up to the Pacific side.

Of course there is development of the seacoast as such. But submarines would have a rather difficult time making much of a missile attack on the Soviet Union. [Deleted.]

Admiral BURKE. It would depend upon the number of submarines we wanted to place and where we wanted to place them. [Deleted.] The Arctic Ocean is a very good place because there are holes in the Arctic ice, and you can put a submarine into the holes and it launches through them or it can come up next to the coastline and it is very difficult to detect.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Illinois has expired.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I am sure that all of us are tremendously concerned about the situation in Berlin. It is so serious that many of us believe we should not speak unless there is good reason and purpose for doing so. I should like to say, however, that the speeches of the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], and the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, have been valuable and helpful to the executive branch of our Government.

I speak as a Member of the Senate who is not a member of the Committee on Foreign Relations or of the Committee on Armed Services. I believe there is a very narrow line between the type of speeches which could be helpful to the executive branch of the Government and to the people of the United States, and speeches which can be construed as being political.

I dislike saying this. However, I read during the week of the promises of unity and cooperation—and such promises are made by Members of the Senate and the leadership when they visit the White House to speak to the President. Then on Monday morning, I read stories of television and radio programs, and quotations from those programs, which seem to me to go over the political line. They are far from the kind of speeches which are helpful either to the Senate or to the country, and, as I have said, seem more political. I know the line between the two is narrow, and, of course, the truth must be given, whether it is political or nonpolitical. I realize that is a responsibility and right of Members.

I should like to make one suggestion. I made it several weeks ago to the distinguished majority leader, whom I regard as a great patriot. There is constant talk about the inadequacy of our defenses. The only way in which we can finally reach satisfactory conclusions about the state of our defenses is through the committees of Congress, who are charged with the duty of completing their investigations and, after executive discussion of the subject, of reporting their conclusions to the Senate. That

is the proper way to get the best judgment of our colleagues.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. COOPER. In a moment I shall be happy to yield. There are several committees working on defense problems. The situation in Berlin being what it is—a dangerous situation and one of concern to all of us and to the Nation—I would hope that our leadership on both sides of the aisle, and particularly the majority, will regard the investigations by these committees as the first work to be done for the benefit of Congress and the country. Then the committees should come to the Senate with their conclusions as quickly as possible. Those conclusions should be based upon all the facts, and should represent the mature judgment of the members of the particular committees charged with responsibility.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The Senator from Kentucky mentioned my name. Will he yield to me?

Mr. COOPER. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I merely wish to say that last year we took 7,000 pages of testimony on this subject, and we did exactly what the Senator believes should be done. We made 17 recommendations. I hold in my hand those recommendations. Many of them have never been carried out. I say to the Senator from Kentucky those recommendations were unanimous recommendations. They were the unanimous recommendations not only of the Preparedness Subcommittee, but of every member of the Committee on Armed Services who desired to join us in the hearings. We gave every member who joined us an equal opportunity with us to participate and to cast his vote.

We pointed up the necessity of urgency in many fields, specifically the missile field. We have had rather extended hearings this year. We have not filed a report this year because we wished to hear from the CIA, and we also wished to get detailed recommendations from the Joint Chiefs of Staff, which have just been presented to us. I have no doubt that we will make further recommendations in this field. However, I should like to have carried out some of those recommendations which we have already made.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD at this point the 17 recommendations to which I have referred. They deal with the relative strength as between ourselves and the Soviet Union. The recommendations were included in the subcommittee's report of January 23, 1958.

There being no objection, the recommendations were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The committee has received many urgent recommendations. The principal areas covered, though not necessarily in the following order of priority, upon which decisive action must be taken are:

1. Modernize and strengthen the Strategic Air Force.
2. Step up the dispersal of SAC bases.
3. Put more effort into developing antimissile missiles.
4. Improve our early warning system for manned aircraft and accelerate the development of an early warning detection system for ballistics missiles.
5. Modernize and strengthen ground and naval forces.
6. Provide an adequate airlift for ground troops.
7. Pour more effort into our antisubmarine program.
8. Step up production schedules of Atlas, Thor, Jupiter, and accelerate the development of Titan.
9. Reduce lead time in the development of weapon systems by cutting down on decision time and by simplifying procurement procedures.
10. Provide for a freer exchange of scientific and technical information between the nations of the free world.
11. Start work at once on the development of a rocket motor with a million pounds thrust.
12. Give serious attention to the question of shelters and stockpiles for civil defense.
13. Reorganize the structure of the Defense Establishment.
14. Provide increased incentives for the retention of trained personnel in the military services.
15. Accelerate and expand research and development programs, provide funding on a long-term basis, and improve control and administration within the Department of Defense or through the establishment of an independent agency.
16. Put more effort in the development of manned missiles.
17. Accelerate the development of the Polaris missile system.

Mr. COOPER. I am well aware, of course, of the recommendations. What I am urging is in the interest of the Senate and the Congress and the country. It is that we make the issue of defense the first issue before Congress, and that we have the judgment of the members of the committees charged with responsibility. This is better than statements of Members on the floor of the Senate who read from newspapers and from parts of defense testimony—statements which in many cases are taken out of context.

It the situation in Berlin is as serious as we say—and it is—then our first duty, our first order of business, is to determine exactly the condition of our defenses.

I make a second suggestion. It is true that we who are not members of the Committees on Foreign Relations and Armed Services do not have access to the evidence which their members have. After the committees have done their work—the situation being as serious as it is—perhaps the leaders on both sides could devise a way in which full information obtained in the various committee meetings could be given to the other Members of the Senate before we debate and vote upon the issue. Because we, too, have our great responsibility at this time, one as great as members of the committees.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. COOPER. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Every member of the Committee on Armed Services is ex officio a member of the investigating subcommittee, and a good many members of the Committee on Armed Services have attended most of the meetings of the subcommittee. Every Member of the U.S. Senate is welcome at those meetings at any time, and many Senators have attended the hearings. I again extend a welcome to each Member of the Senate to attend whenever we take further testimony.

Mr. COOPER. I understand that. I suggest that the Senate, and Congress as a whole, indicate to the people of the country its own self-discipline, and perform its own task first, before engaging in off-the-cuff remarks and statements out of context—statements about our defenses which give a wrong impression to the people of the country.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. COOPER. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I should like to have the attention of the majority leader for a moment. I am confident that he made one statement which perhaps was broader than he intended it to be. He said that some of the 17 recommendations had never been carried out. I hope he will agree with me that a report on them has not been made to Congress since the first of the year.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I will not agree at all with the Senator on that point. The committee has had the Secretary of Defense come before it at frequent intervals and has asked him to state the progress which has been made. He has said that progress is being made on this point or that; but I say there are substantial items in those recommendations which have not been completed.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. But we have not had an answer from the Secretary on all 17 points.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Oh, I beg the Senator's pardon. We have called the Secretary to attend many meetings. We have held hearings in the hearing room of the Committee on Banking and Currency. The Secretary took up the recommendations point by point and told us what he had done about them.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Since the first of this year?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Oh, no.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. That is my point. I am hoping that we will have the Secretary make such a report.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. One of the first witnesses called was the Secretary of Defense. He gave us his opinion relative to the overall military strength of the Nation. I think I am fair in saying that the Secretary of Defense feels that the amount of money provided in the President's budget is sufficiently adequate to take care of any eventuality which he contemplates. I think it is fair to say that the President of the United States feels the same way.

I certainly have no desire to frighten the people, or to try to scare the people into thinking that we are not prepared, because the President and the Secretary of Defense have stated that the amount they mention is what they think they need. But I do think it is only fair, reasonable, right, and a part of our duty, that the committee hear from the Joint Chiefs of Staff. We have heard from

them, and have placed their information in the RECORD.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I want to hear from the Secretary of Defense on those 17 points when the committee meets this year, because I am confident that substantial progress has been made.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I am sure, as the Senator has indicated, that if he wants to hear from the Secretary of Defense on any point, the Secretary of Defense will accommodate him. I know of no one who is closer to the Secretary of Defense than is the senior Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I do not desire to prolong the discussion. I simply wish to say that it would be highly regrettable if any Member of Congress in this very critical period of our history were to seize on the discussion of the military strength of the Nation for purely political purposes. I doubt very much that that would be done. I hope, however, that the gravity of the situation will not deter any Member of Congress from fully and freely expressing his views on the military situation or on our military strength, because Congress has a constitutional responsibility in that area, and we are not to be absolved by any desire to avoid the appearance of partisanship.

The Senator from Kentucky said he hoped we would make statements only after careful hearings and after the committees had had an opportunity to consider the subject matter of the discussion. I point out that last year not only did the Committee on Armed Services and its subcommittees hold lengthy hearings in this field, but also the Committee on Appropriations had extensive hearings relating to the national defense. So far as I recall now, no question was raised on the floor of the Senate, when the Senate in the discharge of its constitutional responsibility recommended that the strength of the Army be maintained at 900,000 men and the Marine Corps, for example, be maintained at a strength of 200,000 men. A number of other factors are involved, but the number of personnel is something which everybody understands. Therefore, I shall confine my remarks to that subject.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. COOPER. I should like to correct one statement. If the Senator from Georgia understood me to say that I thought no comments or speeches should be made on the floor of the Senate on the subject of defense until the committees had reported, I must say that I did not mean that, and I do not think the RECORD will show that I said it. I simply said that, considering the danger we face in Berlin, I should like to see the Senate and its leaders meet its responsibility, prosecute its investigations through committee hearings, and receive their full recommendations regarding our defenses. Then we can do our duty. I think that would be more valuable than Monday speeches following television programs over the weekend. I recognize the ability, restraint, and patriotism of the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, Mr. RUSSELL.

Mr. RUSSELL. I thank the Senator from Kentucky for his kind statement. I trust I have not misrepresented him. I had understood that he had rather expressed the opinion that it would be well to put the brakes on this type of discussion. If the discussion is for political reasons, I agree. But if it is for the purpose of alerting the people of the Nation to an understanding that we must have adequate means to preserve the country, I disagree. I think every Member of Congress has a responsibility for expressing his views. Congress is an equal and coordinate branch of the Government. We provide the means, and we have the constitutional responsibility for maintaining the national defense.

In accord with that responsibility, we last year fixed the strength of the Army and the Marine Corps. I use those services, because they offer the simplest illustration; everybody can understand what was done.

We find now that the strength we fixed is not being utilized. Even today, I notice in the memorandum from General Taylor, as well as the memorandum from General Pate, of the Marine Corps, which deal with their reservations as to the adequacy of the present budget, references to that area of the personnel.

General Taylor, perhaps in consideration of the fact that the worsening situation in Berlin might first develop into a clash between so-called conventional forces of East Germany and the United States, recommends an increase of strength in the Army.

Certainly I do not think anyone would advise the launching of an atomic war against East German forces. If we did, we would be on unfavorable ground at the beginning. I would be more apprehensive of some such limited clash than I would be of all-out atomic war.

In the memorandum, which I believe appeared today in the New York Times, General Taylor says, that he had recommended a strength of 925,000 men, or an increase of 25,000 over the number last year—possibly in view of the very alarming developments in Berlin—and that he had advocated full maintenance of the drill strength of the Reserves, which is higher than the budget, as finally submitted to us, provides. General Pate said his official budget calculations were based on 200,000 marines. The 1960 budget, as submitted to the Congress, provides for 175,000 marines.

Last year we went through all of these matters, and no one raised any question about them here on the floor of the Senate when the appropriations were made; and that is the way we fixed the strength of the Armed Forces. But we we have had great difficulty in seeing to it that the will of the Congress in that area was carried out.

I do not say this in any critical sense, Mr. President, and certainly my statement is not prompted by any political considerations. I say this because when the question is one of faith in judgment, I have as much faith in General Taylor's judgment—he is the one who will be directly responsible on the ground, in Berlin—and in General Pate's judgment as I do in that of any other military man.

For that reason, so far as I can now see—although I have not closed my mind, and I am going to listen to all the testimony before the Appropriations Committee—I shall endeavor to see to it that the constitutional responsibilities of the Congress of the United States to the people of this country for its defense and protection are fully met when we consider the appropriation bills and the President's budget for this year. Unless new evidence is presented, I do not believe we shall meet it by reducing our ground forces in this very critical period.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield for a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Georgia yield to the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. First, I wish to commend the Senator from Georgia for his very partiotic statement, which is thoroughly in keeping with his attitude on all these matters.

The Senator from Georgia has touched on a question of crucial significance, namely, that as dangers multiply, we are reducing our capacity to fight limited war.

Would not it be very easy for the administration to reverse itself by merely stopping the reductions in strength? The numbers have not yet gone down, as I understand them, to 870,000 for the Army and 175,000 for the Marine Corps. By stopping their reduction, and by accepting volunteers in the Marine Corps and either volunteers or drafted men in the Army, within the space of 2 months their strength could be increased to 900,000 and 200,000, respectively, and thus an additional Army division could be saved and we would have the 3 Marine divisions at full strength. That could be done easily by administrative order.

May not discussions of this type on the floor of the Senate and on the floor of the House of Representatives be extremely constructive in pointing out our deep concern over what is happening, and may not they serve as a prod to the administration to act?

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I do not know that I could go quite that far with the Senator from Illinois, because Congress has made its position perfectly clear. But, despite that, these reductions have been proposed.

But certainly we pointed out to the American people that this coordinate branch of the Government, which has the responsibility of providing the sinews of war, thought it was necessary to provide for 900,000 men in the Army and 200,000 in the Marine Corps. In order to dispel any lingering thought that any would-be aggressor might have as to our lack of firmness or as to our lack of intention to meet our obligations all over the world, I earnestly hope that the administration will see fit to withdraw this stop order, will let the provision made by Congress take effect, and will provide for the 900,000 men in the Army and the 200,000 men in the Marine Corps.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, is the Senate now proceeding in the morning hour? Or is a bill being debated?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. YOUNG of Ohio in the chair). The Senate is still in the morning hour.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, a moment ago I asked the Senator from Georgia to yield, because I wished to confer with the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER].

I believe that what the Senator has been pointing out, and what we should be very clear about, is not that the Appropriations Committee should not act or that the Congress should not discharge its responsibility; but, as all of us know, the Senator's point is that the chief of a service never has enough men or enough equipment, nor did any general who ever fought a battle, nor did I when I was a staff officer in a particular branch of the armed services during World War II.

What the Senator has said—and I thoroughly agree with him—is that we are entitled to have the staff work done by the congressional committees involved. The work of the staff is to develop findings of fact on which we may comment and speculate, and which we may disclose to the country.

However, Mr. President, at this time the matter of high priority is that we not wait for the normal action, because we cannot. No one appreciates more than I do the patriotism and leadership of the distinguished senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], the chairman of the Armed Services Committee; and normally this matter would fall within the purview of his committee. But we are appealing for some findings of fact—similar to the ones a court would make—upon all these conflicting claims. We need findings of fact which, when we speak on the conflicting views in regard to Berlin—as I have and as other Members of Congress have—will give us some assurance regarding the ground on which we stand. Without such findings of fact, not only do we have to speculate upon the policy involved—which is hard enough to do—but we also have to speculate on the defense posture of the country.

I do not say that all of us will agree when such findings of fact are presented to us; but at least they will be screened and authoritative, and will not be on a hit-and-run basis.

Therefore, simply to crystallize my thoughts on the matter, I state that I believe we should give this matter the highest priority. Regardless of whether in the case of the hearings of the Preparedness Subcommittee, which our distinguished friend, the majority leader, is heading, or whether we are to proceed in some other way, let us place the highest priority right now—not later—on findings of fact as to our posture of military preparedness to face various crises, particularly the present Berlin crisis. That is as specific as one can make the matter.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I wish to express my appreciation for the very complimentary references made by the senior Senator from New York.

However, I was referring to the fact that the committees had already, last year, for the current fiscal year arrived at these figures, but the figures have not been observed in all instances.

No one knows better than I do that all these questions of military strength are, in the last analysis, opinions on the part of someone, somewhere. There are those who think we should have a relatively small Military Establishment. Others would, as the old saying goes, fortify the moon; and that saying may come to have a present-day meaning and significance if the space efforts are completely successful.

But I was really pointing out that, so far, we have had these findings, and they are in effect. But they have not been completely coordinated as between the coordinate branches of the Government.

Mr. JAVITS. Let me say to the Senator from Georgia that, the way of the world being what it is, the reports and recommendations made last year are no longer sound currency, in terms of the country, in the face of the crisis which confronts us today. They may be sound as they can be on the facts and the merits of the question. I am not arguing that at all. But in terms of our needs and the crisis, they are not greater than what our country can meet. Therefore, I join the Senator from Kentucky in suggesting that this be done now, even if it means taking the same recommendations and making them over, but at least so we can understand the defense posture of the country today in the face of this crisis. I, for one, having spoken to this crisis, have the feeling that if we had such an appraisal, I would know more of what I was talking about.

I yield now to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I know the intentions of the Senator from New York are good; but if the findings of last year were accurate, the need for additional ground forces is even greater now. In view of the Russian threats to turn over West Berlin and access to West Berlin to the East Germans, the dangers are even greater now. So if we needed those 50,000 troops last year, we need them even more now.

I would remind my friend that anyone who reads the New York Times with any care, or anyone who reads the British or continental newspapers, knows there has been a serious reduction in the ground forces of our allies, that 2 years ago Great Britain began to decrease the strength of its army, and to put its strength in limited warfare, and withdrew battalion after battalion; that the French, for a considerable period of time, sent more and more forces to Algeria and weakened her troops on the western front; that Denmark is reducing its troops from 16,000 to 13,000; that Belgium is decreasing the period of compulsory service from 15 to 12 months. So amongst the whole Western alliance we find a tendency to reduce our land forces at a time when the danger is increasing.

While I deeply respect the Senator from New York and the Senator from Connecticut, it seems to me, without the slightest bit of hysteria, it is the duty of every Member of the Senate who knows these common facts to speak up and protect the country, and indeed, the administration, from this policy of decreasing our forces when the need has increased.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from New York has expired.

Mr. KEFAUVER subsequently said: Mr. President, I wish to associate myself with the remarks of the distinguished majority leader, the Senator from Georgia, and the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] on the constitutional duty of Congress in connection with the defense of our country at this and every other time.

Of course, we do not want to make politics of our defense effort, particularly at a crucial time such as this, before the Berlin crisis is reached in May. However, I do believe that we must point out what the committees have recommended, and that we have a duty to state the facts. The facts are that in the face of congressional recommendations that we strengthen ground forces, we are actually demobilizing them to some extent. Plants are being closed down, as well as installations, in many parts of our country.

Perhaps the recommendations with respect to demobilizing and cutting down our ground forces will change; but certainly this is no time for feeling that everything is all right and that we can reduce our ground forces. I remember that in the House of Representatives not too long ago we almost demobilized right before World War II. I remember that the vote on extending the draft was 210 to 211. I was happy indeed to hear the Speaker announce that the motion to send the bill back to committee had lost. I have criticized my own party for demobilizing after World War II. That brought on Korea. I certainly do not want the same thing to happen at this time. We cannot afford to have it happen again.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I was much interested in the debate in regard to our defenses, which occurred today on the floor of the Senate. Such debate is, in my opinion, healthy and constructive. We should have more of it.

Increasing concern about our defense capabilities is now being expressed by many people, through many information media.

Everybody appears to favor standing firm in Berlin.

What is becoming hard to understand is "how?" and "with what?"

The President says we will not give an inch, a position in which he has full support of the American people.

The Secretary of Defense states the administration is going ahead with its plans to cut the manpower strength of the Army and Marine Corps; and at

times he asserts he supports those reductions.

But when asked why the manpower cuts were delayed last summer, in view of the Quemoy and Lebanon crises, and why they were now going ahead, despite the Berlin crisis, the Secretary of Defense replied:

Any rationalization I could give you isn't one I could regard with any respect myself.

This is an honest statement from an honorable man, and gives but additional proof that despite the growing world crisis, budget considerations continue to dominate defense planning.

Several weeks ago, the Secretary of Defense admitted the Russians were being allowed to attain a three-to-one lead over the United States in intercontinental ballistic missiles.

A few days ago, however, when House Majority Leader JOHN MCCORMACK observed to Secretary McElroy, "You have also stated that within a year or two you expect the Soviet Union to be considerably ahead of us in intercontinental ballistic missiles," the Secretary of Defense replied, "I do not expect they will."

There is more of this confusion.

On January 29, the head of the Strategic Air Command—SAC—General Power, testified before the Senate committee, "We do not have any air alert." General Power added that we should "get one going just as soon as we can. We have the capability, have proven the feasibility of an airborne alert."

In his press conference last week, however, President Eisenhower stated that an air alert would be really worse than useless.

Last week the press reported that Secretary McElroy told his press conference:

We do have about one-third of our medium and heavy bombers on ground alert. That is what is regarded as the military requirement at this time.

But, according to the press, other officials in the Pentagon promptly denied this assertion by the Secretary. These officials stated that the goal of one-third SAC readiness will not be achieved for about 1 year.

Apparently in an effort to justify our current lack of readiness, the Secretary stated that a surprise nuclear attack would be virtually impossible in the foreseeable future.

The press promptly noted that this appeared to undercut President Eisenhower's frequently voiced concern about a surprise attack.

There is more of this confusion—much more of it.

In a speech several weeks ago, at Charleston, S.C., Admiral Burke added to the confusion by announcing:

Whether the U.S.S.R. has several-times as many missiles as the United States is academic.

But on January 29, the head of the Air Force Ballistic Missile Division, Gen. Bernard Schriever, stated:

In view of the very dangerous situation with respect to a ballistic missile threat, I think we should build greater ballistic missile forces [ICBM].

In further reference to the Charleston talk, Admiral Burke stated:

The probability of a nuclear attack is remote.

But on the television program "Meet the Press," only yesterday, the Secretary of Defense stated that in all probability any possible war over Berlin would be a nuclear war.

It would appear, therefore, that we, our allies, and the Sino-Soviet imperialists know today that—

Despite world conditions and our announced intentions not to give an inch, we plan to continue with the reduction of our conventional forces.

Despite the sworn testimony of the head of SAC, we plan to continue without an air alert.

There is a difference of opinion about the current status of our ground alert.

There is a difference of opinion between the President and his Secretary of Defense as to the danger of a surprise attack.

There is a difference of opinion between the Chief of Naval Operations and the Air Force Ballistic Missile Division head about the dangers arising from our current plan to let the Russians get a long lead in intercontinental missiles.

There is a difference of opinion between the Secretary of Defense and the Chief of Naval Operations as to whether, if an unacceptable block is thrown on us in Berlin, the result will be a conventional war or a nuclear war.

On some occasions the Secretary of Defense has approved further reductions in our Army and Marine Corps. But at other times he has questioned such action.

The Army Chief of Staff has made clear that he does not believe the present size and modernity of our Army is adequate to meet its oversea commitments.

In an article, by Mr. James Reston, published yesterday in the New York Times, the President's meeting of Friday with leading Members of Congress was reported in considerable detail. Included in that report were details about the strength of our forces now in Europe, with their families, as against the strength of the Communist forces.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD an excerpt from the article; the excerpt has to do with information about those forces.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

In the meeting that followed, the President asked Allen Dulles to give an intelligence report on Berlin. Mr. Dulles had a large map of the area on which were written the Soviet and East German Communist force levels in the area: 315,000 Soviet troops in East Germany and 15,000 Soviet policemen; 75,000 East German troops and 45,000 East German policemen.

The map did not show the Western forces in Berlin and Western Europe, but there are 4,000 United States troops in Berlin and an additional 7,000 from Britain and France.

In addition, there are five U.S. divisions in the rest of Western Europe: three pentomic divisions and two armored divisions, which are equipped with M-48 Patton tanks, atomic cannon and Honest John and Redstone missiles.

Officials here talk about a maximum of 21 North Atlantic Treaty divisions in Western Europe, compared with 175 Soviet divisions in Eastern Europe, but even the 21 in the West are either dispersed, as are the French in North Africa, or undermanned. This compares with the 96 divisions the Allies agreed to provide to the North Atlantic Treaty area (excluding Greek and Turkish forces) in February 1952, 7 years ago.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, the world now knows that President Eisenhower intends to go ahead with these heavy reductions in our military forces; that "he was not going to halt the present program in any way, and he was definitely not convinced that it was necessary to increase the military program."

Mr. President, in order to bring out the degree of the President's insistence on further reduction in our military strength at the same time that he asserts we will not "give an inch," I ask unanimous consent that another excerpt from the New York Times article of March 9, by Mr. Reston, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

After Mr. Dulles had given the report on Berlin, the questioning started with Mr. VINSON, a 75-year-old Georgian who has been in the House since 1914, addressing the President.

Was it not inconsistent, he asked, to go forward with the administration's cuts in the manpower of the Armed Forces in the light of the disturbing report just given to the group by Mr. Dulles?

The President said it was not. He expressed confidence that, while the Berlin crisis was serious, the United States had enough atomic and conventional forces to deal with it.

Senator FULBRIGHT asked whether, even if the President was satisfied that he had enough forces, it was good psychology to cut the United States ground forces just at the point when Washington was telling Moscow that we would not "give one inch" on our rights in that city and were prepared to fight, if necessary, to preserve our rights?

OPPOSED EMERGENCY ACTION

The President said he appreciated the psychological problem but was nevertheless determined to go right on with his plans to cut the ground forces as outlined early this year.

Moreover, he added, he did not think it was wise to give an impression of emergency action. He did not think it was wise to stir up the country too much. He was not going to evacuate any Americans from any posts overseas; he was not going to halt the present program in any way and he was definitely not convinced that it was necessary to increase the missile program.

Time and again General Eisenhower was reported to have come back to the thesis that the Russians were working on a strategy of "spending the United States into bankruptcy."

Whenever it was suggested that the Nation should step up its missile program or, particularly, that it increase its conventional Armed Forces to be able to deal with any military outbreak around Berlin without using atomic weapons, he returned to the thesis about not getting caught in the

Communist strategy of trying to spend us broke.

Thus there developed in the conversation at the White House a central question: What was the first priority? Was it to keep the forces in balance to be able to deal with Soviet conventional military threats without using atomic weapons? Or was it to keep expenditures for both missiles and conventional forces down so we could balance the budget?

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, these actions, admittedly in the interest of a balanced budget, are obviously becoming a matter of increasing apprehension, to all free people.

The reaction on our allies is well described in a paragraph of an article by Dr. Henry A. Kissinger, published in yesterday's magazine section of the New York Times. Dr. Kissinger is associate director of the Center for International Affairs at Harvard University, the author of the now famous book, "Nuclear Weapons and Foreign Policy," and executive director of the Rockefeller report on our relative military position. In his article, Dr. Kissinger states:

Because many Europeans doubt our steadiness and reliability, the repeated declarations that the United States will stand firm on Berlin have proved relatively ineffective, all the more so as our deeds are so inconsistent with our words.

It is difficult to convey determination while reducing our armed forces and focusing the national attention on a balanced budget.

That is the way these actions impress our allies.

Should we not consider also how they impress the Communists, as the latter continue their push against the walls of freedom.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Missiles and Diplomacy," from the current issue of Life magazine. I hope my colleagues will read the outstanding article by James Shepley to which the editorial refers. The article is published in the same issue of Life magazine.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MISSILES AND DIPLOMACY

Turning from the immediate crisis to a longer term problem: Is the President's defense budget too small? There is a strong argument, made on page 117, that it should be reopened and enlarged to offset the "missile gap" of 1961–65, during which critical years the Russians will otherwise enjoy a 3-to-1 edge in installed ICBM capacity. By doubling our Atlas orders for those years at a cost of some $600 million a year, we could reduce the chances that Russia might get the drop on us.

The arguments are not all on one side. Since our present nuclear delivery systems are enough to destroy everything in Russia, why pay more? Filling the gap would be to indulge in what is gruesomely known as overkill. The argument proceeds to technical questions of launching times, warning margins, and accuracy probabilities, which we shall not pursue here.

But two observations we will make. First, budgetary considerations should not be allowed to decide the issue. Second, there are political reasons for filling the gap that the President and Secretary McElroy may have underestimated.

As to the budget, we wholeheartedly support the President's determination to balance it—and as close to his $77 billion estimate as possible. But the defense component of that budget ($40.9 billion) was set before the case for more Atlas squadrons had been thoroughly made inside the Pentagon. It should therefore be reopened on its own merits. If 200 more Atlases are a good insurance buy, the annual $600 million premium can certainly be found. If it cannot be found elsewhere in the present military budget, then it can be found in the $36 billion scheduled for civilian spending. The farm program alone is budgeted at $6 billion. Farmers, like most Americans, would presumably accept a 10-percent cut for the sake of survival.

The budget ceiling must remain at a Caesar's-wife distance from any suspicion that it is controlling in a major defense policy decision. We can afford what we need—and without unbalancing the critical 1960 budget.

Our second observation is that the physical security of the continental United States is not the only thing at stake here. Regardless of any security risk, there is also a grave political risk in accepting a second-class role in the missile race.

"Atomic missile blackmail" is a new and dangerous variable in the equations of the cold war. The United States, we trust and predict, will not succumb to it so long as we have any retaliatory power at all. But unlike the peace we are trying to keep, the courage of an alliance is not indivisible.

For all its NATO installations, Europe as a whole could no more defend itself against an all-out Soviet assault than could the city of Berlin. Its security and self-confidence depend on the commitment to NATO of U.S. policy and U.S. arms—in short, on SAC. Every politician in Europe knows this whether he admits it or not. Thus the U.S. defense budget is an international issue. A marked Soviet superiority in missiles might or might not endanger the continental United States, but it certainly could mean a marked deterioration in the political morale of NATO's weaker links. Already there is an alarming reluctance (except in Britain) to accept ICBM's lest they make Europe too conspicuous as a Soviet target.

No doubt the Russians are as reluctant as we are to fire an ICBM in anger. But they are ready enough to brandish them for political effect. When Marshal Malinovsky recently boasted, "Your arms are to short"—meaning our ICBM's—he was speaking not as a military tactician but as a Communist propagandist. If we are going to play in the missile league, neither a hedgehog nor a poormouth stance is appropriate. The size, range, and numbers of our weapons are part of the strength of our diplomacy, essential to keeping followers of a strong American dipomatic lead. If our allies should suspect us of their own worst failing in NATO, namely, military cheese-paring for the sake of domestic politics, their confidence in the alliance would sink to the level of their confidence in themselves.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, it woud now appear to some that the President is giving a higher priority to balancing the budget than he is to meeting the growing threat of the Communist conspiracy.

In this connection, it is interesting to note a statement in a thought-provoking speech made last February 14 by the senior Senator from Vermont. He said:

Abraham Lincoln had to choose between conflicting values, and he chose the greater ones.

He could have balanced the budget, and lost the Union.

He could have held down the national debt, and perpetuated slavery.

And no doubt had he chosen the latter course, he would have been applauded by many solid citizens of that day.

People are beginning to realize, as was stated editorially yesterday in the Washington Star, that the accuracy of many predictions, made after sputnik, that the balance-of-power in the military sense had shifted to the Communist bloc has become evident; because, as the Star states, "the Soviet Union is acting with a cool confidence and single-mindedness that did not prevail on earlier occasions."

If President Eisenhower is attempting to justify further the reduction of our conventional forces on the ground of the need for economy, then why does he not take those steps toward the further service unification which he himself advocated some 15 years ago—and in that way modernize the structure and functioning of our Defense Department on the basis of progress, instead of continuing to let it operate on the basis of tradition?

Mr. President, some of us have more confidence in the basic strength of our private enterprise system than apparently do those who fear that an adequate defense program will spell bankruptcy.

Some of us believe that a more effective use of our productive capacity would go further toward balancing the budget than will the current policy of retrenchment backed by this administration.

What faces us now, however, is what we plan to do in the few weeks remaining before May 27, or June 27, or July 27, as pointed out so ably on this floor on February 26 by the junior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD].

As the people of the world hear and read all these contradictory statements, are not they justified in asking what has happened to the wise policy of the late great Theodore Roosevelt, who said, "Speak softly but carry a big stick."

At this point I ask unanimous consent that there be inserted in the RECORD two articles from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of February 6 and March 7, by Gen. Thomas Phillips, one entitled "McElroy Has Admitted that United States will have 200 ICBM's in 1962 Against 600 for Russia," and the other "Conflict Over Berlin Could Not Be Limited, McElroy Says"; and also an article by Jack Raymond from the March 7 New York Times on the subject of air alert.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, Feb. 6, 1959]

MCELROY HAS ADMITTED THAT UNITED STATES WILL HAVE 200 ICBM'S IN 1962 AGAINST 600 FOR RUSSIA—BUT PLANNERS NOTING OUR FAILURE TO THINK AS FAST AS TECHNOLOGICAL REVOLUTION DEMANDS FEAR SOVIET WILL HOLD UNBEATABLE MARGIN BY 1964

(By Brig. Gen. Thomas R. Phillips, U.S.A. (retired)

WASHINGTON, February 6.—Secretary of Defense Neil H. McElroy privately, and in executive testimony before the Senate Armed

Services Committee, has admitted that the United States will have 200 intercontinental ballistic missiles in 1962, while Russia will have 600. He believes that our diversified arsenal of other weapons, including our strategic bombing force, will make up for this particular missile lag.

His estimates for the United States include 90 Atlas ICBM's and 110 Titans, 9 and 11 squadrons respectively. Atlas development is proceeding satisfactorily. The 90 Atlases can be expected to be ready, although the first fully operational squadron will not be ready, according to industry sources, by the first part of 1960 as McElroy has asserted. The first fully operational squadron will be ready, if all goes according to plan, in the fall of 1960.

The Titan ICBM, being developed by Martin Aircraft, was originally on a schedule about 1 year behind Atlas. This has slipped to 18 months behind. All attempted live tests have failed to date.

INDICATION OF ERROR

If the slippage is not made up, the first Titan operational squadron will not be in readiness until early in 1962. This indicates, obviously, that the McElroy schedule of having 11 Titan squadrons operational in 1962 will not be met.

In contrast the McElroy estimate of 600 Soviet ICBM's at that time is on the low side. Such estimates, where the other person's plans and intentions are not known, are usually made with considerable latitude, with a bottom floor and a top ceiling. This estimate appears to be a bottom, rather than a median or top estimate.

A great many officers in the Air Force, as well as planners from other services, are not at all satisfied that the diversified U.S. arsenal of other weapons can make good the missile lag. It is their opinion that the significance of the military revolution made by ballistic missiles has not penetrated the thinking of the average officer.

Maj. Gen. Bernard A. Schriever, commanding the ballistic missile division of the Air Force, is one such. Before the Senate Preparedness and Space Subcommittees, he was the lone official to question the adequacy of the U.S. missile program.

CITES GREAT DANGER

"In view of the very great danger," he told the subcommittee, "we should be building larger ICBM forces."

One scientist, speaking of the lag in understanding the importance of long-range ballistic missiles, said that we are sociologically backward in the midst of an exploding technological revolution. The minds of the users of the new weapons, in other words, have not kept pace with the possibilities of the weapons.

In contrast, Soviet military men seem to have retired into their ivory tower in the early phases of missile development and to have thought through the implications and possibilities of the missile revolution in war.

If the assumption is accepted that the United States should proceed to manufacture more ICBM's on an urgent basis and as early as possible, it will be necessary to increase the orders for Atlas.

When the Titan project was initiated 1 year after the Atlas was given the green light, it was thought that Titan was a more sophisticated approach and would have considerable advantages in range and payload. As Atlas has been improved during development, most of its disadvantages in comparison to Titan have disappeared.

PERFORMANCE RATING

Atlas will have performance within 2 percent or 3 percent of Titan. Both missiles use some Rocketdyne engines clustered two together in the first stage. The Atlas has a sustainer engine of 60,000 pounds of thrust clustered with the other two engines. The Titan has a second stage rocket with 60,000 pounds of thrust.

The Titan was planned to use inertial guidance, whereas Atlas has a combination of inertial and external radio guidance. The external, or redundant, guidance of the Atlas makes it difficult to put it in underground protected launching pads.

Atlas, however, after the first four squadrons have been built, will be changed to all inertial guidance and can then be placed underground as easily as any other missile.

It is, therefore, feasible to increase the production of Atlas. In view of the minor advantages still to be expected from Titan, the question has been raised whether it would not now be better to go all out for Atlas and to stop further development of Titan.

If heavier loads are desirable, and Soviet missiles do carry warheads of three times the explosive force of U.S. intercontinental ballistic missiles, a second stage can be placed on Atlas. This is already under way in plans to use the Atlas as a first-stage booster with a second-stage rocket for space probes by the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

APPARENT ADVANCE FADES

Three and one-half years ago, when the decision to build Titan in addition to Atlas was made, its design seemed to be much more sophisticated, a definite step forward. With the greater knowledge and experience of today, it no longer appears to be a material advance.

Real advances can be made only when a family of rocket boosters of various thrusts has been developed. Except for second-stage engines and the million-pound-thrust engine being developed by NASA, no family of boosters is under way.

Instead, the United States is pinning all its hopes on the solid-propellent Minuteman missile. This is the magic bird-in-the-bush that is keeping us from doing all possible with Atlas, which is the bird-in-the-hand. Planners who look at our hesitation on missiles, our failure to think as fast as the technological revolution demands, state their misgivings that by 1964 the U.S.S.R. will have a military advantage of such proportions that we never can overcome it.

[From the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, Mar. 7, 1959]

CONFLICT OVER BERLIN COULD NOT BE LIMITED, MCELROY SAYS—RUSSIA WOULD ALMOST INEVITABLY BE INVOLVED, HE ASSERTS—U.S. PLANS IN EUROPE BASED ON MAJOR WAR

(By Brig. Gen. Thomas R. Phillips, U.S.A. (retired)

WASHINGTON, March 6.—Secretary of Defense Neil H. McElroy warned yesterday that if the Berlin crisis leads to conflict, the Soviet Union will almost inevitably be involved.

"I do not see how such a conflict in Europe would be kept to limited war," he said at his press conference. Our plans for war in Europe, he said, have always been based on the requirements for a major war.

If we mobilize, McElroy declared, it will be for more than fighting a limited war in East Germany over Berlin.

McElroy refused to discuss any Pentagon plans, declaring that it obviously would be improper to do so. He said that various contingencies are being considered now on the staff level.

Asked about air alert for the Strategic Air Command, the Secretary of Defense declared that the Joint Chiefs of Staff have considered it, but do not regard it as necessary at this time.

About one-third of SAC's bombers are on 15-minute ground alert now, he added, and an air alert can be ordered at any time it appears to be necessary.

SECURITY COUNCIL SESSION

A few hours before his press conference McElroy had attended a special meeting of the National Security Council, which had dealt with the Berlin crisis, and the unusual step had been taken to announce the subject of the meeting. Coming after his meeting with the President and other members of the NSC, McElroy's statements were given substantial weight as an indication of U.S. policy and outlook.

McElroy said that at this stage the Berlin crisis is no more serious than were the Quemoy and Lebanon crises last year.

"All of them have been potentially inflammatory," he said, "and so is this one." That is the exact reason for the executive branch of the Government to move with great deliberation, but with firmness.

McElroy said in reference to a possible Berlin blockade that it was not a situation where it appeared a solution could be worked out with ground forces. He declared, however, that no plans had been made for an airlift at this time. The solution, in case of a blockade, he said, might be a combination of air and ground or either singly.

NUCLEAR WEAPONS

Asked about the use of tactical nuclear weapons, the Secretary said that nuclear weapons of all kinds will be used as required for military purposes.

But, he added, "There is reluctance to use them unless large action is indicated, but we shall continue to feel free to use them—always only by authorization of the President—but I hope we won't reach the action where that kind of weapon is required."

Asked whether the United States had given West Germany nuclear-capable weapons, that is, the delivery systems for nuclear weapons, McElroy said we had not. He admitted, however, that West Germany had bought the Matador, a winged missile that can carry a nuclear warhead 600 miles, and Nike air defense missiles.

The latter, while built primarily for use as air defense weapons, can be armed with nuclear warheads and used against ground targets.

The Russians have objected to the Nike-Hercules air defense missile just as strongly as they have to supplying Germany with surface-to-surface ballistic missiles.

DISCOUNTS SURPRISE ATTACK

The Secretary discounted the capability of the Russians to launch a surprise attack on the United States. To coordinate such an attack, he said, would require a large amount of radio communications, which can be monitored, and considerable movements of troops and aircraft.

He believes, with missile launching sites dispersed as greatly as they must be, together with all the other requirements of preparation for war, that a surprise attack is unlikely. The Russians appear genuinely interested, he said, in reaching an agreement that will eliminate the possibility of a surprise attack.

If the Russians were making obvious military preparations, McElroy said, the situation would "pose a very serious problem for the President." The choice whether to strike the first blow, if to all appearances a potential enemy was making preparations for a surprise attack, would be "very, very rough," he said.

NOT RECALLABLE

McElroy said one bad thing about missiles was that they are not recallable once they have been launched. In contrast, bombers can be alerted and started on their way and still be brought back up to the last minute.

McElroy failed to clarify his remark made Monday on Capitol Hill that while this country's policy is that it will not strike the first blow in a war, this might not always be true.

Plans to reduce the Army and Marine Corps strength to 870,000 and 175,000 respectively have not been changed, McElroy stated. These levels to be reached June 30, will require a further reduction in the Army of 20,000 men and a lesser number in the Marine Corps.

He admitted that this will require the elimination of one division from the Strategic Army Corps. Although the Secretary did not say so, the division to be eliminated is ineffective as a part of the STRAC force, because it is exclusively engaged in training and rotating troops to overseas units.

Queried about his personal plans for the future, McElroy said that he planned to remain as Secretary of Defense for most of the current year and until the 1961 budget had been established in its major outlines. If there were an emergency, however, and the President asked him to continue as Secretary of Defense, he would do so, McElroy said.

[From the New York Times, Mar. 7, 1959]

AIR ALERT GOAL STILL YEAR AWAY—PLAN FOR 600 U.S. BOMBERS TO BE READY IN 15 MINUTES LINKED TO BASE BUILDING

(By Jack Raymond)

WASHINGTON, March 6.—A defense system that will permit at least 600 bombers, one-third of the Strategic Air Command's striking force, to be ready for takeoff in 15 minutes is expected to be in operation in about a year.

Authoritative sources said today that the alert plan was adopted as a goal more than a year ago, in response to Soviet missile achievements.

In the meantime, demands have grown for a system under which a certain number of nuclear-armed bombers would always be aloft as a precaution against surprise attack.

The administration has rejected the airborne-alert proposal as it has rejected demands that the United States match the Soviet Union in the production of intercontinental ballistic missiles.

INQUIRY PLANNED

However, Representative GEORGE H. MAHON, chairman of the House Defense Appropriation Subcommittee, said today that his committee would explore the controversy fully.

"We need to know much more about it than anybody seems to know," the Texas Democrat said.

Mr. MAHON said that he has been pushing the Air Force for information in connection with the airborne-alert proposal. Representative DANIEL J. FLOOD, Democrat, of Pennsylvania, an advocate of the proposal, estimated that it would cost about $1 billion a year to carry out.

Officials conceded that some confusion had developed in the administration's portrayal of the actual status of the Strategic Air Command's readiness.

M'ELROY'S STATEMENT

A statement by Neil H. McElroy, Secretary of Defense, was cited. The Secretary told his news conference yesterday that about one-third of the SAC force was on ground alert now.

"We do not have an air alert because the Joint Chiefs of Staff do not find a military need for an air alert," Mr. McElroy said. "We do have about one-third of our medium and heavy bombers on 15-minute ground alert. That is what is regarded as the military requirement at this time."

Officials said that the Secretary had been mistaken in his belief that the one-third goal has been achieved. The goal of one-third ground readiness—that is, with crews and planes ready for takeoff within 15 minutes—depends on a base dispersal building program that will not be completed for another year, authorities said.

The present 15-minute alert capability of SAC is a secret, but it is understood to include 400 aircraft. One-third of the SAC is 600 planes.

The 15-minute warning time has been adopted as a standard on the premise that that would be all the warning the United States could expect should the Soviet Union decide to launch a surprise attack with intercontinental ballistic missiles.

It is estimated that a 6,000-mile ICBM, armed with a nuclear warhead, could reach its target in about 30 minutes.

There was also reaction to Mr. McElroy's statement that a surprise nuclear attack, with all the preparations that it would entail, was virtually impossible in the foreseeable future.

First, it was said that Mr. McElroy's statement, which he said had been supported by the Joint Chiefs of Staff, appeared to undercut President Eisenhower's frequently voiced concern about surprise attack.

It was recalled that the Soviet Union, only with reluctance and with a certain amount of ridicule, agreed to negotiations to prevent surprise attack.

Second, the Secretary's statement was regarded as an effort to refute criticism of the administration's policy on the production of intercontinental ballistic missiles.

According to this policy, the United States will not attempt to match the Soviet Union ICBM for ICBM, although it is expected that Moscow may produce as many as 500 or more by 1962.

Pentagon sources confirmed today that an Air Force study has been presented to the Secretary of Defense calling for the production of some 400 ICBM's by mid-1963 instead of about 200, as presently planned.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed two editorials from the Washington Post, entitled "On and Off," March 6, and "The Missing Rudder," March 7.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 6, 1959]

ON AND OFF

If it were not so deadly serious it would be funny. On Wednesday President Eisenhower appeared to take a more optimistic if somewhat malfocused view of the differences with the Soviet Union, despite Mr. Khrushchev's recent rudeness and rigidity. Yesterday morning, as if in response to criticism that the administration does not appear to be taking the situation seriously enough, Mr. Eisenhower held a special meeting of the National Security Council on Berlin and the German problem—just after Mr. Krushchev had turned on the warm spigot in Leipzig and said that the deadline on Berlin might be postponed. Then yesterday afternoon, amid the reports that the administration was considering some sort of gesture of preparedness, Defense Secretary McElroy asserted that there are no plans for partial mobilization or for deferring military manpower cuts, although other steps are being considered.

It is all very confusing. Of course, the situation itself is confusing, no doubt as the result of a deliberate tactic by Mr. Khrushchev. It is not easy to draw the fine line between prudence and panic, between restraint and recklessness. One can readily have sympathy with the President and Secretary McElroy in their wish not to seem either frightened or provocative. But the possibilities in Berlin are frightening, even if, as everyone must hope, they do not come to pass. There is a danger that in failing to give some further indication of serious preparation now the United States will seem not confident but complacent.

Mr. McElroy hinted strongly, to be sure, that something is being done to strengthen forces other than ground forces, presumably meaning air forces. He also implied that any war over Berlin could not be kept limited, and that hence any trouble over Berlin might invite an all-out response.

Certainly it is difficult to imagine any direct clash with the Russians remaining limited for very long. The United States must consider the grave possibility of large nuclear war. But is there not also a danger in seeming to adopt a policy that would convert any conflict with the Russians into all-out war even though the circumstances might argue for extraordinarily efforts to limit it? There would always be the question whether, in the case of a skirmish over a stopped convoy or the like, we would in fact push the button for nuclear war that also might result in destruction being rained on the United States. The curious Mr. Krushchev, an inveterate gambler, might be tempted to find out—to the woeful detriment of all of us.

What should be done to beef up the limited war forces in Europe at this particular time is debatable. Nevertheless, Mr. McElroy's announcement that Army and Marine Corps manpower reductions will proceed as scheduled is psychologically harmful, whether or not these will have any influence on the forces that could be brought to bear in NATO. We suspended the cuts at the time of Quemoy, but won't do it over Berlin. This seems to say that we just won't pay the price for a limited war force, thereby virtually insuring that any war would be all-out.

The same point is applicable respecting the rather futile argument over who would strike the first blow. Mr McElroy asserted that we would not commit suicide; that we would have means of detecting a coming Soviet blow and taking action. But of course after Soviet missiles had been sent on their way, American retaliation would not be very consoling even if it would affect the conclusion. A deterrent is successful only if it deters any sort of attack or plan for attack in the first place. It is here that the attitude of the Administration, that we cannot afford an across-the-board defense, is so distressing and damaging.

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 7, 1959]

THE MISSING RUDDER

It is time, we think, for the Democratic majority in Congress to assert the leadership that has been lacking from the administration in the looming crisis with the Soviet Union. This country and its Allies may very shortly face an extremely touchy and demanding military problem over Berlin. It will take far more than vague reassurances of bipartisanship, such as emerged from congressional leaders after their meeting with the President yesterday, to convince the Allies and the Russians that American intentions are backed with carefully conceived plans. Generalizations about standing firm and rallying around the flag really do not mean very much.

Perhaps the administration is doing much more than it acknowledges publicly. If American policy were to zig every time Mr. Khrushchev zagged, the country soon would become seasick. It is easy to be too impatient and too critical. Nevertheless, the administration's public position has seemed to alternate between optimism about negotiations and the ill-considered assertion of Secretary McElroy that any war over Berlin would be of the all-out variety. With Mr. Dulles ailing, the administration gives the impression that it is operating without any consistent and thought-out guidance in this crucial area of foreign affairs. And appearances can be terribly important.

What can be done? One would think that the first thing the administration would do

would be to halt the scheduled reductions in Army and Marine Corps manpower. Such moves as the prospective cut in the Strategic Army Corps from four to three divisions have a devastating psychological effect at this time. They seem to say that this country deliberately prefers all-out nuclear war to limited war, in the unhappy event that a clash should come, and is constituting its forces accordingly.

Beyond this, Adlai Stevenson has suggested in a speech in Boston that a resolute stand against interference in Berlin be coupled with exploration of a possible settlement in Europe "less unstable and explosive than the present situation," and that Democratic leaders in Congress attempt to focus public opinion. Former Secretary of State Dean Acheson in an article written several weeks ago advocated the strengthening of conventional NATO forces in Europe. Senator JACKSON has called for the mobilization of four or five additional Army divisions to undergird diplomacy.

Some or all of these things may be necessary. Of course, Congress cannot itself frame foreign policy or conduct negotiations, for the responsibility still rests with the administration. What it can do is urge detailed military planning for defense of land access to Berlin and any clash with the Russians, and encourage Western counterproposals on the larger differences with the Soviet Union.

But the underlying need is not so much partial mobilization, however important that may become in the present situation. It is, rather, the achievement and continuation of military parity with the Soviet Union. This is a long-range rather than a short-range problem. Ever since the first sputnik Soviet leaders have thrown their weight around. The administration has compounded its miscalculation on the significance of the earth satellite with a willingness to accept numerical inferiority in missiles and an unwillingness to prepare adequately to cope with limited war.

It is this, more than anything else, that is undercutting American diplomacy; and it is here that leadership is most necessary. Far beyond the particular crisis over Berlin, if we are to avert war and reach any sort of eventual settlement with the Russians, this will have to stem from military equality. The most important thing that Democratic leaders such as Senators JOHNSON and FULBRIGHT could do to strengthen confidence in the country's position, in this newspaper's judgment, would be to serve notice of their intention to increase the military budget so as to overcome the missile gap and provide for more adequate limited war preparedness.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I also ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point an editorial by Bob Hotz from Aviation Week, February 23, entitled "Will We Close the Missile Gap?" and a Roscoe Drummond article from the March 6 issue of the New York Herald Tribune, and an article only this morning by Miss Marguerite Higgins in the same paper entitled "After Ike, the Deluge?"

There being no objection, the editorial and articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From Aviation Week, Feb. 23, 1959]

WILL WE CLOSE THE MISSILE GAP?

The recent congressional hearings on the current United States defense posture and the program planned for its future development in an era of revolutionary technical change in weapons development have thrown a glaring spotlight on three facts vital to the future survival of this Nation. They are:

1. The Soviet Union will have a numerical superiority of 3 to 1 in intercontinental ballistic missles for at least the next 3 years. This is the most conservative estimate of our national intelligence agency and has been reduced from earlier estimates without much explanation of why such reductions were rather hastily made. Other sources with access to the same intelligence data dispensed in secret briefings, such as Senator STUART SYMINGTON, unequivocally state the admitted Soviet superiority is actually 4 to 1. Based on our own sources, we are inclined to regard even Senator SYMINGTON's estimate as being unduly conservative.

2. The United States has no present plans for attempting to close this ICBM gap befor 1962 at the earliest. This was made abundantly clear by Defense Secretary McElroy in his testimony on Capitol Hill. Mr. McElroy also made it clear that plans for closing the gap by 1963 were based largely on the hoped for operational use of new missiles that are still in the early research and development stage and which, in fact, may not meet what many observers consider to be unrealistic operational timetables.

3. During this period between now and 1963, the United States strategic deterrent will depend upon a mixed bag of weapons consisting primarily of Strategic Air Command's manned B–47 and B–52 bombers. New weapons scheduled to phase into some operational capability to assignment SAC's bombers beginning in 1960 include the USAF Atlas ICBM and the Navy's submarine-launched Polaris IREM, with the USAF Titan and Minuteman ICBM's scheduled to appear later. This position again was made clear in Mr. McElroy's testimony before Congress, although some of his earlier optimistic statements on operational capability dates of new weapons were admitted to be erroneous and were corrected to later dates for the official record.

SPEARHEAD CHANGES

Now, it is a hard technical fact that must be faced that the sharp spearhead of our strategic deterrent based on the doctrine of instantaneous, massive retaliation has passed from the 600-mile-per-hour manned bomber to the 18,000-mile per-hour ICBM. And, although other elements will still play a supporting role, it is the quantity, operational development and reliability of this megatontipped ICBM spearhead that is the most significant factor in the immediate future balance of military power.

With the present planned and publicly announced Defense Department policy, we are deliberately allowing the Soviet Union to take a significant and commanding superiority in the most significant weapon for the next 3 to 5 years. Our announced ICBM program for the next 3 years will see 9 squadrons of Atlas and 11 squadrons of Titan ICBM's emplaced and operational by 1963—a total of only 200 missiles. From the officially confirmed intelligence estimates, this justifies the conclusion that the Soviets will have an operational ICBM capability expanding from the present to at least 600 ICBM's by the end of 1962. It did not take Nikita Khrushchev's public announcements that the Soviets are in series production on their ICBM to relay this fact to U.S. sources. And the great ICBM production complex in the Dniepropetrovsk area hardly lends itself to concealment even in a police state such as the U.S.S.R.

ATLAS CAPACITY

In the face of these officially admitted and well-documented facts, it is difficult to comphehend why the only ICBM production line now operating in this country is operating at hardly more than 40 percent of its current tooling and plant capacity. We have listened to all of the arguments against increasing Atlas production to its current capability to make the only attempt now feasible to cut the Soviet missile superiority to a less dangerous margin in the next 3 to 5 years. None of them really hold water in the face of facts.

The Atlas is the only ICBM that has demonstrated reasonable systems reliability and mission performance over intercontinental ranges. Its initial operational version, the Atlas D, has a range of more than 7,500 nautical miles, capable of reaching any target in the Soviet Union from any spot in the United States. It has a development growth stretch in its propulsion system to accommodate even larger warheads for the future. It is already programed for inertial guidance and its internally pressurized structure can be deployed in concrete silos or any other type of hardened base utilizing maximum dispersal potential.

The total cost of an immediate maximum acceleration of the Atlas production program, plus the accelerated base construction and crew training operations required, is less than the $3.5 billion we taxpayers have already spent to store surplus corn in the past few years. Its immediate effect on the fiscal 1960 budget would probably not exceed $500 million.

It is high time that Congress, the Defense Department and the White House faced up to the grim facts they have publicly spread on the record. They must immediately tackle a concrete plan to narrow the ICBM gap with the Soviet Union in the quickest and only feasible method left within the critical time period we face. The alternative is to allow the Soviets to build an ICBM force capable of smashing both our own small ICBM capability and the grounded bombers of SAC in one swift 30-minute blow.

ROBERT HOTZ.

[From the New York Herald Tribune, Mar. 6, 1959]

PRESIDENT URGED TO TAKE SECOND LOOK AT ICBM POLICY

(By Roscoe Drummond)

WASHINGTON.—There are sober, somber, weighty, and mounting reasons why the Eisenhower administration should, and I believe will, want to take a second hard look at its decision to allow the Soviets—who are getting more truculent, not less—to maintain a 3-to-1 lead in intercontinental missiles during the next 3 years.

There is plenty of evidence that the American people are far from persuaded by the line of reasoning advanced by President Eisenhower and Secretary McElroy and are not satisfied with the decision.

If this decision was sound 6 months ago, it is being overtaken by events. Two of the events are these:

1. The ever larger use by the Soviets of their lead in missiles as a powerful instrument of diplomatic blackmail.

2. The necessity of being prepared for the worst over Berlin, and the increasing awareness that the best guarantee against the worst is to show that we are not going to permit the Soviets to upset the balance of military power.

I am not suggesting that I am enough of a military expert to assert that they Government is wrong in conceding a 3-to-1, 3-to-4-year missile lead to Moscow. But I believe it to be profoundly true that we cannot rest easy until the President faithfully reexamines this decision and offers more conclusive arguments to the public that it is a safe risk.

I am not suggesting that the mix of deterrent power which the United States now possesses is today, at this moment, unequal to the danger. I am suggesting that by deliberately allowing the Kremlin to enjoy its missile superiority, we are risking the future, the visible future, in a way which is un-

necessary, may be imprudent and could be a catastrophe.

I am not suggesting that it would be just ducky to unbalance the budget, that it doesn't matter how much we spend for military hardware. It does matter. It matters a lot. I am suggesting that if the President, after a new look at the Soviet missile menace, concludes that faster American production is needed, he could find the needed funds within the $40 billion Pentagon budget. I am suggesting that if the Democratic leaders in Congress really believe their own statements—that more missiles sooner are imperative—they could find the needed economies within the nonmilitary items of the budget.

There is no doubt that Mr. Eisenhower is right when he insists that our deterrent power today is massive and adequate. The deterrent of mutual terror prevails. But will it prevail next year and the next and the next if we concede the missile race to the Communists from here to 1964? We have already given the Soviets an 18-month lead. And what we do, or fail to do, today will determine how we stand tomorrow.

The overhanging danger of war—either because the Communists are prepared to risk war over Berlin or for any other reason—is not the only danger which comes from letting them hold the lead in the most persuasive and destructive weapon in the world, the ICBM.

The prime danger is that thereby we are inviting exactly the same kind of diplomatic blackmail which Hitler practiced on Britain and France in the thirties, and practiced successfully.

The prime danger is that our willingness to permit the Soviets to keep such a lead, and to keep it without our even challenging them, would induce much of the world to believe that we have neither the will nor the means to resist.

The missile technicians say that an average of less than $700 million a year for 4 years, put into stepping up the production of Atlas, would produce an insurance stockpile of ICBMs which would make all the difference between conceding dominance to the Soviets in the biggest deterrent of all and the awful gamble of not doing so.

The latest Gallop poll reveals the gravest public anxiety over the Russian lead in missiles and in rocketry.

I am convinced that the country would draw a sigh of profound relief if President Eisenhower announced that he was reexamining the administration's missile policy.

[From the New York Herald Tribune, Mar. 9, 1959]

AFTER IKE, THE DELUGE?

(By Marguerite Higgins)

WASHINGTON.—Today, in this cold-war Capital, the only thing that matches in intensity the high-spirited, bipartisan support for firmness in Berlin is the intensity of bipartisan misgivings over President Eisenhower's refusal to disturb the planned everyday pattern to show that this firmness is something more than bluff.

Although the Republican leadership has—so far—been loyally acquiescent in the administration line, it is certainly not just the Democrats who are wondering whether this is the right moment to press forward with cuts in Army, Navy, Marine, and Air Force manpower and whether this may not be an unfortunate moment to accentuate the acknowledged Soviet lead in short-range, medium-range, and long-range missiles by planning an even greater gap in the enemy's favor.

Nor are these misgivings confined just to the legislative branch. They are widespread in the Department of State. And, as you might expect, at the Pentagon the word "misgiving" is far too mild, at least for those who are not yet in a position so high as to be ideological captives of budget first. (For instance, to the distaste of congressional committees, such a person as General Twining, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, has suddenly developed into an expert economist, an authority on what this Nation can and cannot afford.)

And at a foreign embassy the other day a disillusioned diplomat was heard to say: "Your President may have been a great hero of World War II, but so was France's Marshal Petain the hero of World War I at Verdun and yet lived to preside over his country's defeat." Now this is undoubtedly an exaggerated and exceptional attitude, but it is important as a sign of the times.

Now all of this does not relate solely to the erosion of the myth of President Eisenhower's military infallibility, although this, too, is an important political and historical reality.

What has caused the ebbing of this myth? Primarily, the march of events. President Eisenhower has said he knows more about the current military situation than anybody else, and few would question this insofar as access to the facts are concerned. But what is questionable is Mr. Eisenhower's application of the facts in making decisions on such things as numbers of bombers, missiles, and divisions in face of enemy strength. Bluntly, at issue is not the quantity of facts at his command but the quality of his judgments.

For, as the record shows, it was Mr. Eisenhower who, despite the facts at his command, was at the helm when this country deliberately gave up the quantitative and qualitative lead in the most advanced scientific weapon—the missiles—and, according to Defense Secretary McElroy, is deliberately planning to risk perpetuating that situation. And the record also shows that in President Eisenhower's administration the United States lost its position as the world's strongest power.

But was this decline of American power inevitable anyway?

Now, this is, of course, the main point and leads to another cause of misgivings.

For even if Mr. Eisenhower's military judgments have proved less than infallible, they would win a far less critical audience if they were based primarily on military reasons. But they are not.

What, of course, troubles Washington increasingly is the fact that Mr. Eisenhower is basing crucial military decisions on judgments in the field of economics in which he has very limited experience and in which he depends heavily on a conservative and minority school of businessmen. These are led by George M. Humphrey, former Secretary of the Treasury and the man of the curl your hair depression, whose views, to say the least, are so controversial as to be contested not only by leading economists throughout the country but by many important people.

It is notable that President Eisenhower in his unpublicized meeting Friday with congressional foreign and military affairs leaders quoted Mr. Humphrey repeatedly; in the process, incidentally, he harped on one of the most mistaken promises in current history: that the Russian aim (attributed to Lenin) is to cause this country to spend itself to death. The Soviet thesis is, of course, precisely the opposite: that U.S. Government spending props up the capitalist economy which would otherwise collapse.

By now there are many in Washington who have heard President Eisenhower assert without qualification that "national security and sound economy are synonymous". But what the President does not apparently see is that the definition of sound economy remains variable, whereas the definition of national security remains a constant. In essence, national security means having enough strength not to get licked. And even if the Eisenhower luck holds through the Berlin crisis, the truth is that the balance of strength is slipping so fast into the enemy's hand that responsible American's today for the first time talk out loud about the possibility of defeat. "After Ike, the deluge," is not an idle phrase.

For what happens after 1960 when the weapons gap and the manpower gap he permitted in Russia's favor have grown ever wider?

Mr. SYMINGTON. In addition, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD two articles from the Washington Evening Star, one by William Hines on February 17, and one by L. Edgar Prina on March 6.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Evening Star, Feb. 17, 1958]

POLICIES OF WASHINGTON BLAMED FOR MISSILE LAG

(By William Hines)

A swing through the industrial and military complex we have labeled missileland provides convincing evidence that the scientists, production men and military officers in the field are doing a superlative job. But at the end of such a trip, there is still a nagging question:

Why are we where we are missilery—in second place to the Russians?

The first, obvious answer is that we got started later. We waited for the feasibility of a hydrogen bomb to be proved and the Russians didn't, and consequently we are several years behind.

This explains the whole thing away nicely, although it begs the question of the wisdom of our course. But it does not explain the fact that while research, development, production, and operating efficiency are high in missileland, morale is sagging and perplexity is king.

Nor does it explain the widespread feeling out there that Washington is a sort of big brother—always watching, but not wanting to be bothered with a lot of troublesome questions.

OFF AGAIN, ON AGAIN

It leaves unanswered, too, question about off-again, on-again production schedules; inaccurate public statements by officials that cannot be refuted by officials in the field because of security wraps; contradictory statements of objectives; tangled lines of authority; information policies that swing overnight from arrant press agentry to air-tight security.

Too often, the observer feels, distraught missilemen look to Washington for guidance and find the paths of responsible officials criss-crossing like contrails in the sky.

Examples:

The Army is told to acquire some more land for its White Sands range in the New Mexico desert so the antimissile missile, Nike-Zeus, can be tested there. But now there is doubt whether the Zeus will ever be built.

The Douglas and Chrysler people are ordered to open their Thor and Jupiter assembly lines to press tours at virtually the same moment as Thors and Jupiters are becoming passe.

Project officers on the solid-fueled Minuteman ICBM forge doggedly ahead, but cannot be sure that Minuteman will ever get built—much less off the ground.

Congress, the usual thorn in the side of Government activities in the field, is less of a vexation than in most cases. There are probably two reasons for this.

First, the missile business is spread rather evenly around the country and a lot of money is being spent. Inclinations to rock the boat are absent.

Second, with the exception of a handful of legislators, Congress doesn't comprehend the complexities of the missile age.

Occasional summonses to Washington to appear before this committee or that committee are regarded by military and industrial leaders in missileland as minor annoyances, rather than an outright harassment.

INFORMATION POLICIES HIT

There are strong complaints, however, about information policies. Often the fire centers on Assistant Defense Secretary Murray Snyder, head of Pentagon public relations.

"Murray seems to regard public information as a proprietary commodity," one west coast industrialist commented. "He says this or that can't be given out because of security, so we point out that the information has already been published. 'All right,' he says, 'it's policy' not to put it out. And how do we answer that?"

It is clear to the visitor to missileland that Mr. Snyder's role there is an important one. Constantly the visitor runs into evidences of a restraining hand on information that seems to go beyond the requirements of security. There is scarcely a plant but has things that can be shown, described in detail, even sketched—but not photographed because the timing isn't right. Hardly an industry publicist but has a drawer full of photographs he can show, but cannot release.

The restrictions are less oppressive than they might be, however, because newsmen have little trouble, given adequate contacts, in getting the information they need from services beyond Pentagon control.

STUNTS CRITICIZED

The other side of the information coin is the use of strategic weapons for publicity stunts. The sober second thought of 2 months since the orbiting of the talking Atlas has left scant doubt that the shot was a stunt, however good, with only secondary scientific advantages. Numerous industrial, scientific, and military men expressed the opinion to this writer that shots which could not stand up on their scientific value alone should not be undertaken.

"At a time when the American public should be aware of its defense and space potential, it is being confused," one scientist prominent in industry said. "Whether the confusion is deliberate or accidental, I am in no position to know."

NUMEROUS AGENCIES

The men in the field attribute a good part of the confusion surrounding the missile program to the complicated governmental setup which finds a sextet of agencies—the civilian National Aeronautics and Space Agency and the Pentagon's Defense Research and Engineering office, its Advanced Research Projects Agency and the Army, Navy, and Air Force—all figuring in the space and missiles programs.

The ire and perplexity of industrialists and military men was more than mirrored recently in that of Senate Majority Leader JOHNSON who heads the Senate Space Committee. So criscrossed were chains of command in the Pentagon that Senator JOHNSON was unable to find out who, among Pentagon space officials W. M. Holaday, Roy W. Johnson, and Herbert F. York, was boss, Dr. York assumed the position—but only retroactively, a day after the go-round before the space group.

COOPERATION IN THE FIELD

In evaluating America's missile progress, one looks at the obvious things. Cooperation among the services in the field is excellent, and sharply in contrast with the jungle warfare of the Pentagon. The performance of industry oozes efficiency, and whatever slippages in production schedules occur can usually be traced back to a moment of indecision or a change of plans in Washington.

The conclusion one reaches is that our place in the race must be blamed in part at least on this fact: There are seven leading contenders for space and missile supremacy in the world. One is in Moscow. The other six are in Washington.

[From the Washington Star, Mar. 6, 1959]

MCELROY SEES BIG WAR IF BERLIN FIGHT FLARES

(By L. Edgar Prina)

Defense Sceretary McElroy has warned that any fighting over Berlin would in all probability lead to general war with the Soviet Union.

At the same time, he said that he and the Joint Chiefs of Staff believe that an all-out surprise attack on the United States by the Russians would be almost impossible now or in the foreseeable future.

Discussing the critical Berlin question at length, the Secretary told a news conference late yesterday that he did not expect war although the situation was potentially very inflammable. He noted that diplomatic negotiations were going forward.

But if there was armed conflict it would be very difficult to keep it a limited war, he said, adding:

"The reason I say this is I don't see how you could avoid involving Russian forces and we don't see ourselves fighting Russia in a limited way."

LOTS OF PLANNING

Mr. McElroy said "we are not doing a very great deal now" in a military way in reaction to the Berlin threat beyond lots of planning. He said that while specific movements of forces are being considered in these plans it would not be in the national interest to discuss them.

Under questioning, Mr. McElroy said the administration was going ahead with its plans to cut the manpower strength of the Army and Marine Corps. The Army is slated to drop from 980,000 to 870,000 and the Marines from 185,000 to 175,000 by June 30.

Asked why the manpower cuts were delayed last summer in view of the Quemoy and Lebanon crises but are not being held up because of Berlin, the Secretary smiled wryly and replied:

"Any rationalization I could give you isn't one I could regard with any great respect myself."

He then went on to say that he does not see a ground forces solution to the Berlin problem and that if any mobilization were ordered it would not be to send more troops to Europe. This seemed to imply that America's reliance would be placed in its strategic striking forces like the Air Force's long-range bombers.

NEEDS OF AGGRESSOR

On the matter of possible surprise attack, Mr. McElroy explained that any time a nation organized as massive a strike as it would need to destroy hundreds of thousands of targets simultaneously here and in the free world, it would be virtually impossible to avoid being observed and reported.

He mentioned the vast interchange of communications that would be necessary for an aggressor to have and also just plain motions in preparing for a surprise attack.

Mr. McElroy said the most dangerous possible situation which would face the United States would be if we relaxed our guard after an enemy seemed to be demonstrating nothing but peaceful intentions for a long period of time.

He said he sees no Pearl Harbor danger now because the Nation's military forces are on substantial alert. It could only happen, he added, if we go to sleep.

On other matters, the Secretary made these statements:

1. He did not suggest to a House committee that we change our policy of not striking the first blow in any war, but only meant to say that all Government policies should be subject to review.

2. He is tentatively planning to retire from his post at the end of the year unless the President decides that world conditions are such that he should stay on. His reasons, he said, were partly financial and partly concerned other personal matters he would not discuss.

3. The United States will use nuclear weapons of all kinds when we regard them as required for our military purposes. But we will always have a hesitancy to use them, he added.

4. If there is a new Berlin blockade, the free world is not thinking of an airlift as the exclusive response. In fact, he said the use of ground convoys could be used exclusively or there could be a mix of air and ground methods.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, every American is becoming anxious about our relationship with our friends and allies throughout the world.

The previously referred to article by Dr. Kissinger in the New York Times magazine, as of yesterday, Sunday, March 8, is entitled, "As Urgent as the Moscow Threat—The immediate task arising out of the Berlin crisis is to strengthen the unity of NATO, for European doubts of American dependability have weakened the alliance".

This is indeed an able and informative article, based on experience. Therefore, Mr. President, I ask that excerpts from it be included at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The current Berlin crisis raises a fundamental threat to the future of the Western alliance.

* * * * *

The Western alliance is in serious danger, partly because of confusion about our purposes.

* * * * *

For the first time, there exists grave doubt about our willingness to run risks on behalf of our allies, and even about our ability to understand what might constitute a threat.

* * * * *

It is beside the point whether this attitude is justified; it is the psychological environment in which our actions will be interpreted and with which we must reckon.

* * * * *

A French editor, to whom I remarked on what seemed to me the excessive suspiciousness of high officials, replied: "They think you are about to commit treason in a war that has already started."

* * * * *

As long as European security was thought to depend entirely on United States willingness to engage in all-out war, the European powers could rely on our nuclear capability without participating in it.

* * * * *

With the Soviet's development of long-range missiles, the steady shrinking of the United States capability for limited war and the widely advertised "missile gap," confi-

dence in American power and in our willingness to run risks has been gravely shaken.

* * * * *

A United States policy that our European allies interpret as irresolute will inevitably result in a redoubled effort to develop a local deterrent; in other words, in a vain and therefore demoralizing attempt to make the United States strategically dispensable. And the political corollary will be an increasing tendency to loosen Atlantic ties.

* * * * *

Moscow seeks to split the Western alliance by citing to us the "rigidity" of our European allies while warning them of our "unreliability."

* * * * *

The question that German and French editors, officials and political leaders asked most frequently was: What does the United States really want? There was concern that the United States attitude toward Europe had become confused and uncertain.

* * * * *

The reiteration of slogans such as "elasticity" and "new approaches" seemed less a constructive policy than a panicky reaction to a Soviet menace. The impression was that we have neither a new policy nor the courage to stand by our previous convictions.

* * * * *

It is easy to share the dismay of many critics about our unimaginative foreign policy of the past 6 years. There is no doubt that we have defined our position more by what we oppose than what we stand for, that every Soviet initiative has drawn Western energies into essentially sterile, defensive countermoves. Neither German unity nor European security nor the problems of the emergent nations have evoked a dynamic, consistent American response. We seem to be prisoners of circumstances rather than their creators.

* * * * *

But in making these criticisms we stand in danger of overestimating the degree of flexibility open to us in Europe. Our European allies would very likely interpret any basic shift in our policy now as a sign of American vacillation under stress. The common feature of such proposals as, the substitution of German troops for those of the West in Berlin, disengagement, or the Rapacki plan for a neutral zone in Middle Europe is that each of them became a subject of intense controversy only after the Soviet threat to Berlin.

* * * * *

Each of these schemes is based in some measure on the dubious premise that the danger to European security is Western rearmament even though the opposite proposition is more nearly true: Soviet pressure has become possible precisely because the Western defense effort has been all too inadequate. And each disengagement proposal would involve a withdrawal of American forces at a time of intense Soviet menace. Under current conditions, an American guarantee could not be substituted for the presence of American troops. If serious doubts already exist about our willingness to honor our commitments at a time when U.S. forces are in the direct line of Soviet advance—a withdrawal in the face of what Europeans consider a Soviet ultimatum would inevitably be interpreted as a United States attempt to escape its responsibilities.

* * * * *

Because many Europeans doubt our steadiness and reallibility, the repeated declarations that the United States will stand firm on Berlin have proved relatively ineffective, all the more so as our deeds are so inconsistent with our words. It is difficult to convey determination while reducing our Armed Forces and focusing the national attention on a balanced budget.

* * * * *

If we behave imaginatively, as in the days of the Marshall plan and the Greek-Turkish aid program, we can lay the basis for a new era of ever deeper Western cooperation—and not only in Europe. The Far East, the Middle East, Africa, and Latin America all require new approaches. But the area under attack is hardly the place to prove our flexibility.

* * * * *

The most crucial task before the West is therefore to get its own house in order. The challenge is not simply to devise a hurried proposal to meet a Soviet demand. We must not delude ourselves that a negotiating position can remedy the lassitude of nearly a decade or that clever bargaining can substitute for the effort and dedication that have been lacking heretofore.

* * * * *

Free access to Berlin will be the touchstone of all other measures. If the sequence of events initiated by the Soviet threat ends with what is interpreted by our allies as an American defeat or withdrawal, NATO will prove no stronger than the French system of alliance in the interwar period.

* * * * *

To say that we will be firm on Berlin is not a policy. Our task is to give this term concrete content. We should make specific proposals defining guarantees of free access, to be given either by the Soviet Union or by a four-power agreement. The guarantee should be registered with the United Nations. With such a guarantee, it would make little difference whether Russians or East Germans man the checkpoints. But in the absence of such an assurance we cannot escape the problem by designating East Germans as Soviet agents.

* * * * *

At the same time, it is essential to make clear the seriousness of the situation to our people, to our allies, and to the Soviet Union. During the Soviet warning period on Berlin, the West has been bemused with determining Soviet intentions, first by marking time until the Mikoyan visit, then waiting for the 21st Party Congress, than for the result of Prime Minister Macmillan's sojourn in Russia.

* * * * *

We are sliding toward a crisis for which the American people have not been prepared. Our allies are becoming nervous about the lack of a tone of urgency in the United States and the Soviet Union may be misled into the brief that the issue of Berlin can be pressed with impunity.

* * * * *

A congressional resolution affirming our determination to maintain our rights in Berlin and an increased alert of our Armed Forces would seem minimum requirements.

* * * * *

Negotiating tactics: We should always be ready to negotiate not only for substantive but also for psychological reasons: To convey our peaceful purposes to the rest of the world. Negotiations, even if they fail, can at least project to other nations the issues for which we are prepared to contend. At the same time, it is important that, rather than expend energies on debates over abstractions like "rigidity" or "flexibility," we concentrate our efforts on developing a concrete program.

* * * * *

Rigidity is surely not helpful. But neither is flexibility an end in itself. Indeed, it may sometimes make agreement more rather than less difficult. If we base our negotiations on the principle that the West has an obligation to break any deadlock with new proposals, we shall encourage Soviet obstinacy, for we will nurture the belief that if Soviet negotiations hold out long enough they will elicit ever more favorable Western offers.

* * * * *

We have no obligation to make only proposals that the Soviet Union says it will accept, for this would turn diplomacy into a device for surrender. We do have a responsibility to make proposals that express our values and take into account legitimate Soviet security concerns. In short, the West requires a sense of direction more than negotiating skill. Only the purposeful can be flexible.

* * * * *

Western cohesion: The Western Powers should not confine themselves to issues raised by the Soviet Union; they should act boldly to strengthen unity among themselves.

* * * * *

A basic cause of Allied disunity is the weakness of NATO and the ambiguity of its strategy. Against the background of this weakness, declarations of firmness ring hollow and the sense of insecurity of our allies must inevitably increase.

* * * * *

Moreover, NATO has never resolved the question whether it is a device to unleash all-out war or a means to prevent Soviet occupation of Europe should deterrence fail. By adopting an uneasy compromise, NATO is in danger of paralyzing itself. The doubts of our allies as to our willingness to risk all-out war for the defense of Europe, while five U.S. divisions are stationed there, underline the inherent lack of plausibility of the doctrine of massive retaliation.

Two sets of measures are required: (1) an immediate strengthening of the U.S. overall deterrent with respect to its size, its mobility, and its dispersal; such a program is the prerequisite for all other measures; (2) a common effort to devise a defense of Europe which does not have the aspect of suicide. While we require the capability for massive retaliation to prevent a Soviet surprise attack on the United States, we should not rely on it as the sole deterrent to an attack on Europe or the chief means of defense against Soviet aggression should deterrence fail.

* * * * *

A defensive alliance which cannot protect the territory of its members without destroying them is inherently brittle. There is no reason why the United States and Western Europe, whose combined resources, human and material, still far exceed those of the U.S.S.R., cannot create an adequate force for a local defense of Europe. The obstacle is not capability, but lack of will.

* * * * *

Nothing is possible without a more dynamic conception by the United States of its role in the world. For too long we have treated our problems as technical ones; we have sought courses of action which involved the least effort and sacrifice.

* * * * *

As a result our military program is inadequate; continued at its present scale it will doom our diplomacy to futility by creating constant opportunities for Soviet pressure while reducing the means to resist them. Our economic program, both domestic and foreign, is too tentative and too conscious of the obstacles in the path. Our diplomacy lacks dynamism.

* * * * *

We are living through a period which, in retrospect, will undoubtedly appear to be one of the great revolutions in history. We cannot withdraw from it; we can only contribute to shaping it constructively. The great challenge of our time is that the self-sufficient nation-state is breaking down. No nation—not even the largest—can survive in isolation or realize its potentialities, material or spiritual, on its own.

* * * * *

In the past, the Soviet threat has often produced Atlantic unity. It may again.

But ultimately the unity of the West depends on what we affirm rather than on what we reject. It must flow from our convictions and hopes, not our fears.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, in the interest of our national security, should we not put an end to all this confusion, perhaps described many years ago by Lewis Carroll in the following stanza from his famous book:

All in the golden afternoon
Full leisurely we glide;
For both our oars, with little skill,
By little arms are plied,
While little hands make vain pretence
Our wanderings to guide.

Mr. President, the decision we have before use is clear. Have we a better chance to reach a just and lasting peace if we negotiate from a position of relative weakness, or from one of relative strength?

Mr. President, I want to thank my colleague from Wisconsin for his gracious courtesy in yielding to me after the morning hour had been concluded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator from Wisconsin yield now to the Senator from Alaska?

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, it is my understanding that the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] would like to have the floor for a few minutes, so he can reply to the junior Senator from Missouri. So I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Massachusetts may have the floor for a few minutes, without my losing my basic right to the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I desire to make two or three very brief comments at this time. First I wish to call attention to the address of the President of the United States on the state of the Union delivered before a joint session of the Congress.

In these days of unceasing technological advance, we must plan our defense expenditures systematically and with care, fully recognizing that obsolescence compels the never-ending replacement of older weapons with new ones.

The defense budget for the coming year has been planned on the basis of these principles and considerations. Over these many months I have personally participated in its development.

The aim is a sensible posture of defense. The secondary aim is increased efficiency and avoidance of waste. Both are achieved by this budgetary plan.

Working by these guidelines, I believe with all my heart that America can be as sure of the strength and efficiency of her Armed Forces as she is of their loyalty.

Those were the President's words on the state of the Union.

The Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, General Twining, on January 29, 1959, before the Senate Preparedness Subcommittee, in response to a question from the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], stated as follows:

The Senator from South Dakota asked:

Do you feel that you can measure our ability to deliver nuclear missiles intercontinentally today by a single weapon, or by considering the entire military team?

General Twining replied:

We have an entire gamut of weapons. We use a mix of weapons to carry out our nuclear retaliation.

General Twining said further:

I would much rather have the defense posture and the capabilities of the United States than that which the Soviet is facing today.

Mr. President, I have had prepared by the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress a list of committee hearings on the subject of national defense which have been held since the start of the 86th Congress. It is an impressive list.

The responsible committees of the Congress have heard a great deal about our defense policies and programs. As yet these committees have not digested all that they have heard, and they have not reported to the Congress and the American people.. Until they do we shall not know the conclusions they have reached as to that part of the military structure which they have studied.

I should like to read very briefly a list of the committee hearings which have been had on the subject of national defense, as prepared by the Library of Congress at my request:

COMMITTEE HEARINGS ON THE SUBJECT OF NATIONAL DEFENSE, 86TH CONGRESS

HOUSE COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

February 3, 4, 5, 6, 1959: Hearings regarding military posture.

February 25, 1959: Met with representatives of the Central Intelligence Agency in executive session.

March 2, 3, 4, 5, 1959: Hearings on authorization for construction at military installations.

HOUSE COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS

January 28, 29, 1959: Met in executive session and received a briefing on the current world situation.

February 11, 1959: Subcommittee for Review of the Mutual Security Programs met in executive session and received testimony from Deputy Assistant of Defense for Military Assistance Programs Charles H. Shuff.

HOUSE COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS

February 4, 5, 6; March 2, 3, 5, 1959: Subcommittee on Military Operations. Hearings relative to management of the military missile program.

HOUSE COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE AND SPACE EXPLORATION

February 2, 3, 4, 5, 9, 10, 16, 17, 18, 1959: Hearings to brief new members and others with regard to current developments in the field of science and astronautics.

March 3, 1959: Hearings with respect to the production of the Nike-Zeus antimissile system.

March 4, 1959: Hearings with respect to international telecommunications and communications satellites.

SENATE COMMITTEE ON AERONAUTICAL AND SPACE SCIENCES

February 17, 1959: Held organizational meeting and appointed a subcommittee to study authorization legislation for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

February 19, 20, 1959: Hearings on pending space legislation.

February 27, March 2, 1959: Hearings on missile and antimissile program of the United States.

SENATE COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

January 16, 1959: Subcommittee on Central Intelligence, executive, to hear CIA Director Allen Dulles.

January 20, 1959: Committee met in executive session to receive a briefing on national defense from Secretary of Defense Neil H. McElroy and Chairman of Joint Chiefs of Staff Nathan F. Twining.

January 22–23, 1959: Committee met in executive session to receive a briefing from Secretary of the Army Wilber M. Brucker and Army Chief of Staff Gen. Maxwell D. Taylor.

January 26, 1959: Met in executive session, received a briefing from Secretary of the Navy Thomas S. Gates, Jr., and Chief of Naval Operations Adm. Arleigh A. Burke.

January 27, 1959: Met in executive session to receive a briefing from Secretary of the Air Force James H. Douglas and Air Force Chief of Staff Gen. Thomas D. White.

January 28, 1959: Air Force briefing. Heard Secretary of the Air Force James H. Douglas and Air Force Chief of Staff Gen. Thomas D. White.

January 29, 30, February 4, 1959: Preparedness Investigating Subcommittee. Hearings on the general subject of U.S. preparedness.

SENATE COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

January 16, 1959: To receive testimony on the defense position of the United States from the Secretary of Defense Neil H. McElroy and Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff Gen. Nathan F. Twining.

Mr. President, I understand the Senator from Missouri is heading a new committee to investigate space waste, which does not appear on this list.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON ATOMIC ENERGY

January 8, 1959: Subcommittee on Research and Development held an executive meeting to receive a briefing on the status of the Soviet nuclear-powered aircraft program, received testimony from representatives of the CIA and Air Force Intelligence.

January 13, 1959: Executive, to consider possible effects of a moratorium on further nuclear weapons testing.

January 14, 1959: Committee held executive hearings to discuss possible effects of a moratorium on further nuclear weapons development, with testimony from Dr. Carl Romney and Dr. Jack Oliver, both of the ad hoc panel of seismologists, the President's Scientific Advisory Committee; and Philip Farley, Special Assistant to the Secretary of State for Disarmament and Atomic Energy.

January 19, 1959: Committee held further executive hearings to receive testimony with regard to results of recent nuclear weapons tests (Hardtack operation, phases 1 and 2) and possible effects of a moratorium on further nuclear weapons development, with testimony from Adm. E. N. Parker, Chief, and Col. Jack Ledford, both of the Armed Forces Special Weapons Project; and Gen. Herbert B. Loper, Assistant to Secretary of Defense for Atomic Energy.

January 19, 1959: Subcommittee on Military. Applications held an executive session to receive a briefing on the Polaris missile project from Rear Adm. W. F. Raborn, Director, Special Projects, Navy.

January 27, 1959: Met in executive session to receive testimony on the aircraft nuclear propulsion program from Secretary of the Navy Thomas S. Gates, Jr., and Rear Adm. J. T. Hayward, assistant Chief of Naval Operations.

February 5, 1959: Executive meeting to discuss a proposed agreement with the United Kingdom relative to exchange of military information and to discuss the present status of and future prospects for the aircraft nuclear propulsion program.

March 2, 1959: Met in executive session for a briefing on Project Rover (nuclear rocket), Project Pluto (nuclear ramjet), and Project Snap (nuclear auxiliary power for space vehicles).

In addition, Mr. President, this morning the majority leader announced further hearings of the Preparedness Subcommittee.

I mention these matters, and have read the list off in detail, to indicate what the Congress is doing, and the committees investigating these subjects. When we have heard the conclusions of these committees, in my opinion, we shall have a better basis for thoughtful and careful consideration of our defense posture.

I thank the Senator from Wisconsin very much for yielding to me.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the statement I made earlier in the day on the state of the Nation's preparedness, together with the ensuing debate, be printed in the RECORD immediately after my unanimous consent request that the reading of the Journal of last Thursday be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

LIMITATION OF DEBATE DURING MORNING HOUR

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, under the rule, there will be the usual morning hour; and I ask unanimous consent that statements made in connection therewith be limited to 3 minutes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

ELIMINATION OF LIMITATION ON CERTAIN WHEAT

A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, to eliminate the 30-acre limitation on the amount of wheat exempt from wheat marketing quotas where all the wheat produced on the farm is used on the farm for feed, food, and seed (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

EXTENSION OF AUTOMATIC PRESERVATION OF ACREAGE HISTORY PROVISION OF AGRICULTURAL ADJUSTMENT ACT OF 1938

A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 377 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, to provide for the extension of the automatic preservation of acreage history provision, with certain modifications (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

REPORT ON SPECIAL PAY TO CERTAIN OFFICERS OF ARMED FORCES

A letter from the Secretary of Defense, reporting, pursuant to law, that the permissive authority vested in the Secretary of Defense to pay special pay, in addition to any other pay prescribed by law, to certain officers, was not exercised during the calendar year 1958; to the Committee on Armed Services.

AMENDMENT OF SECTION 13 OF DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA REDEVELOPMENT ACT OF 1945

A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 13 of the District of Columbia Redevelopment Act of 1945, as amended (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

RESERVATION OF CERTAIN LAND FOR USE OF THE DALLES DAM PROJECT, OREGON

A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to set aside and reserve Memaloose Island, Columbia River, Oreg., for the use of the Dalles Dam project and transfer certain property to the Yakima Tribe of Indians in exchange therefor (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPEAL OF CERTAIN STATUTES FIXING OR PROHIBITING THE COLLECTION OF FEES FOR SERVICES UNDER NAVIGATION AND VESSEL INSPECTION LAWS

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to repeal and amend certain statutes fixing or prohibiting the collection of fees for certain services under the navigation and vessel inspection laws (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REPORT OF ACTIVITIES AND TRANSACTIONS UNDER MERCHANT SHIP SALES ACT OF 1946

A letter from the Under Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the activities and transactions under the Merchant Ship Sales Act of 1946, from October 1, 1958, through December 31, 1958 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

INTERSTATE TRANSPORTATION OF FISH

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to clarify a provision in the Black Bass Act relating to the interstate transportation of fish, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

ADMISSION OF CERTAIN ALIENS

A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of orders granting the applications of certain aliens found admissible into the United States (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF ALIENS—WITHDRAWAL OF NAME

A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, withdrawing the name of Pasquale Auricchio from a report relating to aliens whose deportation has been suspended, transmitted to the Senate on January 15, 1958 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADMISSION OF DISPLACED PERSONS—WITHDRAWAL OF NAME

A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, withdrawing the name of Wah Sing Hou from a report transmitted to the Senate on January 15, 1959, pursuant to section 6 of the Refugee Relief Act of 1953, with a view to the adjustment of his immigration status; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADJUSTMENT OF IMMIGRATION STATUS OF CERTAIN ALIENS

A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of orders entered in the case of certain aliens, relating to adjustment of their immigration status (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT ON ACTIVITIES OF DIVISION OF COAL MINE INSPECTION, BUREAU OF MINES

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the activities of the Division of Coal Mine Inspection, Bureau of Mines, for the calendar year January 1, 1958, through December 31, 1958 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

PROPOSED WORK HOURS ACT OF 1959

A letter from the Secretary of Labor, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to establish standards for hours of work and overtime pay of laborers and mechanics employed on work done under contract for, or with the financial aid of, the United States, for any Territory, or for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

PROPOSED FEDERAL EQUAL PAY ACT

A letter from the Secretary of Labor, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to prohibit discrimination on account of sex in the payment of wages by employers having employees engaged in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce, and to provide procedures for assisting employees in collecting wages lost by reason of any such discrimination (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

AMENDMENT OF FEDERAL EMPLOYEES PAY ACT OF 1945

A letter from the Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1945, as amended, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A resolution of the House of Representatives of the State of New Mexico; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

"HOUSE MEMORIAL 10

"Memorial memorializing against discrimination in price supports in similar farm commodities by the Secretary of Agriculture of the United States

"Whereas grain sorghums and corn are similar, and have substantially the same feed value; and

"Whereas some areas of the United States are suited to agricultural production of grain sorghums, and other areas of the United States are suited to the agricultural production of corn, and discrimination in the price supports between the two is a discrimination between different areas of the United States; and

"Whereas there is a prejudicial discrimination in the price supports for grain sorghums in that the supports are even below the cost of production; and

"Whereas the area of the United States defined as the high plains, which includes the State of New Mexico, has been unreasonably and unjustly discriminated against by the unrealistic support price of grain sorghum; and

"Whereas the area of the United States defined as the Midwest has been preferred by the relatively high price support for agricultural production of corn; and

"Whereas the State of New Mexico has been especially damaged by this unfair and unjust administrative determination of price supports; and

"Whereas the State of New Mexico should be preferred rather than prejudiced if any discrimination should exist in view of the fact that the agricultural producers of this State are otherwise greatly handicapped by lack of water, proximity to markets, and lack of cheap agricultural labor available generally throughout the Midwest; and

"Whereas the Congress of the United States never intended that price supports be provided on such an unequitable, unjust and discriminatory basis: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of New Mexico, That the New Mexico delegation to the Congress of the United States is memorialized to implore the Secretary of Agriculture to correct administratively the discrimination against the high plains area of the United States with respect to the nominal price support applied to agricultural production of grain sorghums in relation to preference given the midwestern area in the relatively high price supports applied to agricultural production of corn; be it further

"Resolved, That in the event that the Sectary of Agriculture declines to correct such inequalities administratively, the New Mexico delegation to the Congress of the United States is memorialized to introduce appropriate legislation to insure against such prejudicial and preferential price supports and to exert maximum effort for its passage; be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this memorial be transmitted to the President of the United States, the President of the U.S. Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, the Secretary of Agriculture, and the Members of the New Mexico delegation to the Congress of the United States.

"MACK EASLEY,
"Speaker, House of Representatives.
"ALBERT ROMERO,
"Chief Clerk, House of Representatives."

A resolution of the Senate of the State of Oklahoma; ordered to lie on the table:

"ENROLLED SENATE RESOLUTION 27

"Resolution commemorating the life and achievements of Charles Curtis, member of the Kaw Nation and Vice President of the United States; and expressing the gratitude of the Senate of the State of Oklahoma to those persons whose efforts resulted in the presentation of a statue of Vice President Curtis to the National Hall of Fame for Famous American Indians at Anadarko

"Whereas this sovereign State of Oklahoma has long been known among all her sister Commonwealths as the foremost repository of those memorials and monuments which preserve for future generations of Americans some knowledge of the culture of the American Indian and of the indelible imprint made on our national character by the original inhabitants of this great land; and

"Whereas the proudest heritage and most cherished birthright of every Oklahoman is the proud legacy of courage and honor bestowed upon our State by our Indian citizens; and

"Whereas the very name of our great Commonwealth springs from the meaningful and melodious tongue of one of the greatest of the American Indian Nations; and

"Whereas Anadarko, Okla., was therefore chosen as the site of the National Hall of Fame for Famous American Indians, established for the perpetuation of the memory of the contributions of this great people, and for the preservation of the symbols and memorials of their noble way of life; and

"Whereas Charles Curtis, outstanding attorney, civic leader and statesman, five times U.S. Senator, and Vice President of the United States from 1929 to 1933, was a member of the Kaw Nation, and had a tribal allotment in the lands of that people in Oklahoma; and

"Whereas because of his contributions to the cultural, spiritual, and social development of the American way of life, it has long been desired that this illustrious son of the Kaw Nation be included among that select and immortal group of American Indians honored in the National Hall of Fame for Famous American Indians at Anadarko; and

"Whereas a life-size bronze bust of Charles Curtis will be unveiled at Washington, D.C., on March 4, 1959, by his daughter, Mrs. Webster Knight II, of Providence, R.I., and will therefore be transported to Anadarko, where it will be dedicated and permanently installed in the Hall of Fame for Famous American Indians on August 17, 1959, in the presence of thousands of persons of American Indian descent from all over the United States; and

"Whereas this wholly appropriate tribute to the greatness of Charles Curtis and this magnificent addition in our own Oklahoma institution has been made possible only by the unceasing efforts and devotion of a dedicated band of Oklahomans, both private citizens and members of our congressional delegation, and a group of citizens of other States whose gracious efforts on behalf of this project should earn them the gratitude of our entire State; and

"Whereas it is appropriate that this body tender its tribute to the memory of Charles Curtis and express its deep appreciation to those who have given so unstintingly of their time to consummate this tribute to Mr. Curtis and the transfer of his bust to our Indian Hall of Fame: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate of the 27th Legislature of the State of Oklahoma, That this body, now duly assembled, does hereby pay official tribute to the accomplishments of the late Charles Curtis, illustrious son of the Kaw Nation, and does hereby officially express its deep gratitude on behalf of the people of Oklahoma, to the following persons who have obtained this signal honor for the National Hall of Fame for Famous American Indians: Hon. Patrick J. Hurley, general chairman; Hon. Edgar S. Vaught, Oklahoma City, Okla.; Joe W. McBride, Oklahoma City, Okla.; Hon. Roy Johnson, Ardmore, Okla.; Gov. Floyd Maytubby, Oklahoma City, Okla.; Paul Stonum, Anadarko, Okla.; Helen Peterson, executive director of National Congress of American Indians, Washington, D.C.; Dena Woods, Washington, D.C.; Allan Cromley, National Press Building, Daily Oklahoman, Washington, D.C.; Mrs. Peter J. Ward, 8144 Audrain Drive, St. Louis, Mo.; Mrs. Logan Billingsley, Katonah, N.Y; Robert Goombi, tribal chieftain and president, American Indian Exposition, members of the Charles S. Curtis memorial committee; Hon. Richard Nixon, Vice President of the United States; Hon. Henry A. Wallace, former Vice President of the United States, honorary members; Mrs. Webster Knight II, Providence, R.I.; Madeleine Park, Katonah, N.Y., the sculptress; Hon. Ed Edmondson, Carl Albert, Tom Steed, John Jarman, Page Belcher, and Toby Morris, U.S. Representatives from Oklahoma, Senator Robert S. Kerr, and Senator Mike Monroney, our U.S. Senators; be it further

"Resolved, That properly prepared copies of this resolution be mailed to the persons above-named, to the University of Oklahoma Library, and to the National Hall of Fame for Famous American Indians, at Anadarko, Okla.

"Adopted by the senate the 25th day of February 1959.

"HAROLD T. GARVIN,
"President Pro Tempore of the Senate.
"LEO WINTERS,
"Secretary of the Senate."

Joint resolutions of the Legislature of the State of Montana; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"HOUSE JOINT MEMORIAL 12

"Joint memorial of the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Montana to the Congress of the United States; Senator JAMES E. MURRAY OF Montana; Senator MIKE MANSFIELD of Montana; Congressman LEE METCALF of Montana; Congressman LEROY ANDERSON of Montana; the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of the U.S. Senate; the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of the U.S. House of Representatives; and the Secretary of Interior, Fred A. Seaton; requesting the establishment of a Federal Indian policy which recognizes the duty of the Federal Government to the American Indian

"Whereas the State of Montana contains the fourth largest Indian population of the several States of the United States; and

"Whereas the U.S. Government, in exchange for vast grants of territory ceded by certain Indian tribes, did guarantee retained ownership of certain areas of land within the boundaries of the State of Montana as well as special services and privileges to these Indian tribes; and

"Whereas said guarantees and other agreements between the United States and said Indian tribes, is evidenced by treaty, custom, and statute of the Federal Government—thus establishing a special legal relationship between the Federal Government and said Indian tribes; and

"Whereas the 83d Congress did adopt House Concurrent Resolution 108, stating a policy whereby Indians were to be "subject to the same laws and entitled to the same privileges and responsibilities as are applicable to other citizens of the United States" and terminating "their status as wards of the United States"; and

"Whereas the policy adopted in House Concurrent Resolution 108 was a direct circumvention of the treaty-established Federal responsibility to Indians; and

"Whereas experience has shown that the Indians within Montana were and are not economically, emotionally, or socially prepared for application of such policy; and

"Whereas the actual invocation of said policy has: (1) Worked to the extreme detriment and severe hardship of Indian individuals and tribes within the State of Montana, (2) caused the Indians of Montana to become separated from their lands at an alarming rate, (3) created inordinate social and welfare problems within the State of Montana and the cities, towns, and counties thereof; and

"Whereas the State of Montana and the cities, towns, and counties thereof should not be laden with the cost or the administrative burden of assuming a responsibility which is historically Federal: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That the 36th Legislative Assembly of the State of Montana of 1959, now in session, the senate and the house of representatives concurring, do respectfully request and urge the Congress of the United States, the Members of the House of Representatives and Senate, the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, and the Secretary of the Interior, Fred A. Seaton, that action be taken to reaffirm the Federal responsibility to the American Indian and that such reaffirmation be stated as congressional policy and carried out by acts which will aid the Indians of the State of Montana in the development of their personal and tribal resources; be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this memorial be submitted by the secretary of state of Montana to the Congress of the United States; Senator James E. Murray, Senator Mike Mansfield; Congressman Lee Metcalf; Congressman LeRoy Anderson; the chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular

Affairs of the U.S. Senate; the chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of the U.S. House of Representatives; and to the Honorable Fred A. Seaton, Secretary of Interior.

"JOHN J. MACDONALD,
"Speaker of the House.
"PAUL CANNON,
"President of the Senate."

"SENATE JOINT MEMORIAL 2

"Joint memorial of the Senate and the House of Representatives of the State of Montana to the Congress of the United States; Hon. JAMES E. MURRAY and Hon. MIKE MANSFIELD, U.S. Senators of Montana; Hon. LEE METCALF and Hon. LEROY ANDERSON, Members of the House of Representatives of Montana; the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of the U.S. Senate; the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of the United States House of Representatives; the Secretary of the Interior; and the United States Commissioner of Reclamation, urging that the Congress reject the program of the United States Bureau of Reclamation, as set forth in its report on the Three Forks Division, Missouri River Basin project, insofar as it relates to the diversion of water from the Madison River and that the Congress assures the preservation of recreational and fishery resources values of the Madison River Valley

"Whereas the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation since 1942 has been investigating various plans to divert water from the Madison River in Montana, and

"Whereas the Bureau now has set forth a recommended plan of development which includes construction of the Cameron diversion dam on the Madison River and a 32-mile canal; the Madison diversion dam on the same river and a 58-mile canal; and the Lyon powerplant on the Madison River and a 6.3-mile canal, all of which are intended to divert water from the Madison River for irrigation or power purposes, and

"Whereas said proposed diversions of water would aggregate 885 cubic feet per second for power purposes and 675 cubic feet per second for irrigation purposes, all of which would dangerously reduce the amount of water for fishery resources in the Madison River; and

"Whereas this plan would result in heavy drawdown of Hebgen Lake during the summertime irrigation season, causing serious fluctuations in the lake level, creating unsightly mud flats and reducing the value of homes and recreational facilities which are located on the shores of Hebgen Lake; and

"Whereas Hebgen Lake and the Madison River are universally recognized as being among the finest rainbow trout fishing waters in the entire world, attracting each year large numbers of sportsmen from all sections of North America; and

"Whereas residents of the town of Ennis and its surrounding recreational area have made large investments based on the tourist trade, and the economy of this area is largely dependent upon a continuation of excellent fishing and recreational activities, and

"Whereas fluctuations in the levels of Hebgen Lake and the Madison River would result in serious adverse effects, if not complete destruction, of the fishery resources of the area; and

"Whereas the diversion of 675 cubic feet per second of water from the Madison River would reduce the flow of the river by one-third to one-half during the irrigation season and would nearly deplete the river during periods of severe water shortage, thereby causing serious adverse effect on recreation and fishing and on landowners with long-standing water rights on the river, and

"Whereas the power installation proposed at Lyon site is unnecessary and wasteful and would duplicate the power supply which has adequately served the area for 58 years; and

"Whereas encroachment by the Government in the power-supply industry in the Madison River Valley would threaten the existing facilities of the present supplier and would jeopardize the tax revenue now received by Madison County of these facilities, such tax revenues exceeding $81,000 per year; and

"Whereas the present operation of Hebgen Reservoir is controlled by regulation of the Federal Power Commission for the purpose of preserving the area for recreation and fishing; and

"Whereas the Bureau of Reclamation would not be subject to control and regulation by that Commission; and

"Whereas the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service has objected to parts of the Bureau of Reclamation program and the Montana Fish and Game Commission has expressed strong opposition to the adoption of the Bureau's plan because of the serious adverse effect on fishery resources of the Madison River Valley: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That the Senate and the House of Representatives of the State of Montana memorialize the Congress of the United States to reject the Bureau of Reclamation proposal to divert water from the Madison River and to declare it to be the intent of Congress that any program which would jeopardize the fishery resources and recreational values of the Madison River Valley and which would result only in impractical, unwise, costly, and wasteful irrigation and power projects shall cease; and be it further

"Resolved, That the appropriate committees of the Congress convey to the Department of the Interior and the Bureau of Reclamation notice of this congressional intent; and be it further

"Resolved, That we call upon the Department of the Interior and the Bureau of Reclamation to abandon all plans for diverting Madison River water in such ways as would adversely affect the recreational values, sports fishery resources, and water rights in the area; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this memorial be submitted to the secretary of state of Montana, to each of the individuals named, and to the chairman of each of the committees and agencies named in the title of this memorial, and to the Presiding Officers of the Senate and the House of Representatives of the U.S. Congress.

"PAUL CANNON,
"President of the Senate.
"JOHN J. MACDONALD,
"Speaker of the House."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Idaho; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"SENATE JOINT MEMORIAL 10

"Joint memorial to the honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States in Congress assembled

"We, your memorialists, the Legislature of the State of Idaho, respectfully represent that—

"Whereas the Atomic Energy Commission has, for the past number of years, seen fit to withdraw certain lands in the Atomic Energy Commission area of the Idaho Falls site, commonly known as the Twin Buttes area of the Lost River Grazing District; and

"Whereas livestock ranks second to lumbering as the most important industry in Idaho; and

"Whereas these withdrawals have worked extreme hardships on approximately 100 livestock grazers by reducing the grazing area by some 540,000 acres; and

"Whereas these lands were leased at considerable cost to the permittees, and with the withdrawal have now made their livestock-raising activities precarious; and

"Whereas grazing lands to replace these withdrawals are not available to the livestock grazers of this area; and

"Whereas the livestock grazers have received no compensation for the loss of their grazing privileges, nor for the damage sustained: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate of the State of Idaho, House of Representatives concurring, That we most respectfully urge upon the Congress of the United States of America that the necessary action be immediately taken to compensate these livestock operators for the loss in grazing privileges, and for the damage that they have sustained by the above-mentioned action; be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of state of the State of Idaho be, and he hereby is, authorized and directed to forward certified copies of this memorial to the President and Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress, and to the Senators and Representatives representing this State in the Congress of the United States."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Idaho; ordered to lie on the table:

"SENATE JOINT MEMORIAL 8

"Joint memorial to the honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States in Congress assembled

"We, your memorialists, the members of the Senate and House of Representatives of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, assembled in the 35th session thereof, do respectfully represent that—

"Whereas over 99 percent of the pupils in the public schools of Hawaii are citizens of the United States; and

"Whereas the half million people of the islands include among their members large numbers of three great racial groups who speak five of the greatest languages heard around the world; and

"Whereas members of nearly 50 language and racial groups and subgroups have long been associated together in amity and mutual esteem in the public schools of the Territory; and

"Whereas as long ago as 1851, the islanders secretly petitioned these United States to be taken under our protection; and

"Whereas the islands of Hawaii were annexed by joint resolution of Congress in 1898 and established as a Territory by law in 1900; and

"Whereas the people of the Territory have amply demonstrated their capacity for self-government and self-reliance; and

"Whereas the people of the United States must demonstrate to the world that our published ideals of liberty, fraternity, and equality are in truth a living creed to which we adhere: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the 35th session of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, now in session, the Senate and House of Representatives concurring, That the Congress and President of the United States be respectfully petitioned to admit Hawaii to statehood without delay: And be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of state of the State of Idaho be, and he hereby is, authorized and directed to forward certified copies of this memorial to the President and Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress and to the Senators and Representatives representing this State in the Congress of the United States."

Resolutions of the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

"RESOLUTIONS MEMORIALIZING THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES TO ESTABLISH A FEDERAL DOMICILIARY HOSPITAL IN NEW ENGLAND

"Whereas the Federal Government has provided eighteen domiciliary hospitals throughout the Nation for the care of its veterans; and

"Whereas the New England area, comprising a group of six States having a veteran

population of 1,350,000, has no domiciliary hospital therein; and

"Whereas the nearest domiciliary hospital to the New England area is located in Bath, N.Y., thereby entailing additional hardship and expense on the families of New England veterans now hospitalized when they visit their loved ones: Therefore be it

"Resolved, That the General Court of Massachusetts respectfully urge the Congress of the United States to take such action as may be necessary to establish a Federal domiciliary hospital in New England; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be transmitted forthwith by the secretary of the Commonwealth to the President of the United States, to the Presiding Officer of each branch of the Congress and to the Members of the Congress from this Commonwealth and the other New England States.

"House of representatives, adopted February 17, 1959.

"LAWRENCE R. GROVE,
"Clerk.

"Senate, adopted in concurrence February 19, 1959.

"IRVING N. HAYDEN,
"Clerk.

"A true copy.
"Attest.

"JOSEPH D. WARD,
"Secretary of the Commonwealth."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

"ASSEMBLY JOINT RESOLUTION 10

"Relative to memorializing Congress concerning the establishment in California of a soil and water conservation laboratory

"Whereas a proposal is under consideration to provide for the establishment by the Secretary of Agriculture of four soil and water conservation laboratories, one to be located in the western irrigated area of the United States; and

"Whereas there is a great interest throughout California's extensive agricultural community in research into problems relating to soil and water management and conservation; and

"Whereas an excellent location for such a conservation laboratory exists at the Davis Campus of the University of California: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Assembly and Senate of the State of California, jointly, That the Legislature of the State of California respectfully memorializes the Congress and the Secretary of Agriculture to provide such laboratories; and be it further

"Resolved, That the Legislature of the State of California wishes to express its intent to the Congress and to the Secretary of Agriculture that it shall provide necessary land at or near the Davis Campus of the University of California upon which a conservation laboratory may be established and maintained; and be it further

"Resolved, That the chief clerk of the assembly is hereby directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President of the United States, to the President of the Senate in the Congress of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives in the Congress of the United States, to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States, and to the Secretary of Agriculture."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on Armed Services:

"ASSEMBLY JOINT RESOLUTION NO. 13

"Relative to equalizing retirement benefits for retired members of the Armed Forces who retired prior to June 1, 1958

"Whereas there is now pending before the Congress of the United States legislation concerning the improvement of benefits for retired members of the United States Armed Forces who retired prior to June 1, 1958; and

"Whereas there appears to be no basis for the gross discrimination against retired personnel who retired before June 1, 1958, as they are, by reason of past meritorious services, equally entitled to the increased benefits granted personnel who retire, or have retired, after such date; and

"Whereas this false distinction violates the basic precepts of fair play, and the circumstances of retirement should not penalize these honorable members of our society, who must meet the present ever-increasing cost of living the same as personnel that retired after June 1, 1958: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Assembly and the Senate of the State of California, jointly, That the Legislature of the State of California respectfully memorializes the Congress of the United States to enact legislation that will increase the retirement benefits of the retired personnel who retired prior to June 1, 1958, so that they will be treated equally with personnel who retire, or have retired, after such date; and be it further

"Resolved, That the chief clerk of the assembly is hereby directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii; ordered to lie on the table:

"SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 11

"Whereas the people of Hawaii have lived for 59 years in the American tradition and throughout this entire period have demonstrated their understanding of national ideals and their capacity to conduct effectively their social, economic, and political affairs and have contributed worthily to the life of this Nation; and

"Whereas the people of Hawaii have repeatedly expressed their desire to enjoy the privileges of fullfledged citizenship by seeking to assume and discharge the responsibilities of statehood and have, in furtherance of this objective, prepared and adopted a constitution for their proposed new State, the spirit of which is embodied in the following preamble: 'We, the people of the State of Hawaii, grateful for Divine Guidance, and mindful of our Hawaiian heritage, reaffirm our belief in a government of the people, by the people and for the people, and with an understanding heart toward all the people of the earth, do hereby ordain and establish this constitution for the State of Hawaii': Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii, the House of Representatives concurring, That the deep appreciation of the people of Hawaii be expressed to those Members of the Congress who are responsible for the rapid progress now being made toward the granting of statehood to Hawaii, and to the President for his wholehearted support, and that they be and hereby are respectfully petitioned to continue in their efforts so that Hawaii's bright star may be added to those of the 49 sovereign States in this, the 184th year of the independence of the United States of America; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this concurrent resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States, to the Vice President of the United States and to the majority leader of the Senate of the United States, to the Speaker and majority leader of the House of Representatives of the United States and to the Delegate to Congress of the United States from Hawaii."

"THE SENATE OF THE TERRITORY
OF HAWAII,
"Honolulu, T.H., February 27, 1959.

"We hereby certify that the foregoing concurrent resolution was adopted by the Senate of the 30th Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii on February 20, 1959.

"HUBERT K. H. LEE,
"President of the Senate.
"JAMES H. KAMO,
"Clerk of the Senate.

"THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
OF THE TERRITORY OF HAWAII,
"Honolulu, T.H., February 27, 1959.

"We hereby certify that the foregoing concurrent resolution was adopted by the House of Representatives of the 30th Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii on February 25, 1959.

"'———— ————,
"Speaker, House of Representatives.
"HERMAN T. F. LUM,
"Clerk, House of Representatives."

A resolution adopted by the Louisiana School Boards Association, at Monroe, La., relating to segregation in the schools of Louisiana; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The petition of Ophelia Beard, of Chicago, Ill., praying for a redress of grievances; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION OF MINNESOTA LEGISLATURE

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a concurrent resolution adopted by the 1959 Minnesota State Legislature entitled, "A concurrent resolution memoralizing the Congress of the United States to enact legislation providing for the repeal of the Federal excise tax upon the transportation of passengers," be printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution was referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION 1

A concurrent resolution memoralizing the Congress of the United States to enact legislation providing for the repeal of the Federal excise tax upon the transportation of passengers

Whereas the Federal excise tax upon the transportation of passengers was adopted as a wartime tax to discourage the movement of civilian passengers during World War II; and

Whereas today, 13 years after the cessation of hostilities, there continues a 10 percent levy on the transportation of passengers (title VI, sec. 609(a) U.S. Code), which tax while collected by the common carriers of transportation by rail, by highway, by water, and in the air, is imposed upon and collected from the users of such transportation; and

Whereas millions of dollars in revenues are paid to the State of Minnesota by those common carriers; and

Whereas the 10 percent tax on transportation of passengers discourages the use of public transportation systems and tends to decrease the revenue of the State and local government by reason of the lesser earnings or volume of business of said public system of transportation; and

Whereas there exists ample facilities for the public transportation of persons throughout the State of Minnesota and the Nation and the purpose for which said tax was imposed has long since ceased to exist; and

Whereas the decrease in revenue by reason of the small amount received for said excise tax on the transportation of passengers will largely be made up by the increased income taxes paid by the passengers of common carriers and other excise taxes paid on the facilities and equipment used by said common carriers: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate of the State of Minnesota, the House of Representatives concurring therein, That we respectfully urge and request the Congress of the United States to enact appropriate legislation to repeal the Federal excise taxes upon the transportation of persons.

Be it further resolved, That the secretary of state of the State of Minnesota be directed to transmit a copy of this resolution to the President of the United States, the Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States, and to each Member of the Minnesota delegation in the United States Senate and the United States House of Representatives.

KARL F. RALVAAG,
President of the Senate.
E. J. CHILGREN,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

Approved February 19, 1959.

ORVILLE L. FREEMAN,
Governor of the State of Minnesota.

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION OF LEGISLATURE OF SOUTH DAKOTA

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the concurrent resolution passed by the Legislature of the State of South Dakota memorializing the Congress of the United States to refuse to enact any increase in the Federal gasoline tax.

The South Dakota Legislature points out that since the enactment in 1919 of the first State gasoline tax, this levy has been historically and rightfully a tax field particularly for the States. And insofar as South Dakota is concerned, such a tax since 1921 has been the principal source of revenue for State highway construction, maintenance, and supervision.

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution was referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 3

A concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to refuse to enact any increase in the Federal gasoline tax

Be it resolved by the House of Representatives of the South Dakota Legislature, the Senate concurring therein:

Whereas since the enactment in 1919 of the first State gasoline tax, this levy has been historically and rightfully a tax field particularly for the States, and

Whereas, South Dakota has imposed such a tax since 1921, which levy has been the principal source of revenue for State highway construction, maintenance and supervision since such date, and

Whereas in 1932 the Federal Government first imposed an excise tax on gasoline which was supposed to be a temporary emergency tax relief measure, but which has since been increased two hundred percent and has now been set over as the principal source of revenue for the Federal Highway Trust Fund, and

Whereas the State and Federal gasoline tax combined averages about nine cents per gallon for the Nation as a whole and amounts to a levy equivalent to substantially 41 percent of the average retail price of gasoline, and

Whereas the President of the United States has recently suggested to the Congress of the United States that the Federal gasoline tax be increased 1½ cents per gallon, making it a tax of 4½ cents per gallon, and

Whereas such further increase could have the effect of discouraging the use of motor vehicles and would thus have serious consequences for the economy as a whole as well as highway transportation, and could jeopardize the tourist travel which is so advantageous to the State of South Dakota, and also might jeopardize the national highway program by retarding the normal growth of highway tax revenues, and

Whereas the Federal automotive excise taxes now imposed raised $1½ billion in the last fiscal year above the Federal excise taxes dedicated to the Federal Highway Trust Fund and is far in excess of any suggested future deficit which might occur in such Highway Trust Fund: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the South Dakota Legislature, the Senate concurring therein, That we respectfully request and memorialize the Congress of the United States to oppose any increase in the Federal gasoline tax; and be it

Resolved further, That the Members of Congress from the State of South Dakota are hereby urged and requested to oppose any such legislation to increase the Federal gasoline tax; and be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of state transmit copies of this resolution to the Senate and the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States, and to Hon. KARL MUNDT and Hon. FRANCIS CASE, Members of the United States Senate from South Dakota, and to Hon. E. Y. BERRY and Hon. GEORGE MCGOVERN, Members of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States from the State of South Dakota.

JOHN F. LINDLEY,
Lieutenant Governor,
President of the Senate.
W. K. HOLLAND,
Secretary of the Senate.
ARCHIE GUBBRUD,
Speaker, House of Representatives.
W. J. MATSON,
Chief Clerk, House of Representatives.

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION OF SOUTH CAROLINA LEGISLATURE

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and my colleague, the senior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON] I present for appropriate reference a concurrent resolution of the General Assembly of South Carolina, memorializing Congress to remove the wartime excise taxes upon local and long distance telephone service.

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution was referred to the Committee on Finance, and, under the rule, ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A CONCURRENT RESOLUTION MEMORIALIZING CONGRESS TO REMOVE THE WARTIME EXCISE TAXES UPON LOCAL AND LONG DISTANCE TELEPHONE SERVICE

Whereas in 1941, as an emergency wartime measure, Congress imposed a 10 percent excise tax upon all local and long distance telephone service for the purpose of supporting the war effort and to discourage the use of telephone service during this emergency; and

Whereas telephone service has become an essential part of our economic and social life and under no circumstances can it be considered a luxury item, taxed as such; and

Whereas this tax stands out alone in that other household and business necessities, including electricity, water and gas, are not taxed; and

Whereas placing this high excise tax upon such a necessity of life results in the taxation of those citizens who can least afford to pay in the same manner as those of unlimited financial means; and

Whereas the wartime emergency for which this tax was imposed and the restriction of the use of telephone service has long since passed: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the house of representatives, the senate concurring, That the Congress of the United States be memorialized to remove the unfair and unequitable excise tax heretofore imposed upon telephone service and that the tax be removed during the present session of Congress; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded by the clerk of the house to the President of the United States, the Vice President, the Speaker of the House of Representatives and to the two Senators and each Member of Congress from this State.

I hereby certify that the foregoing is a true and correct copy of a resolution adopted by the South Carolina House of Representatives and concurred in by the Senate.

INEZ WATSON,
Clerk of the House.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of South Carolina, identical with the foregoing, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION OF KANSAS LEGISLATURE

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, water is one of our Nation's greatest resources and one we all too often take for granted. Those of us who live in the great Midwest fully realize that the growth and development of our area is going to be determined by the amount of water we can conserve and use for beneficial purposes.

The Kansas Legislature, which is now in session, is fully aware of this problem and the house of representatives and the senate are to be commended for approving House Concurrent Resolution No. 20, which stresses the urgency of this problem.

It is so important that I ask unanimous consent that this resolution be printed in the RECORD and referred to the appropriate committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. YOUNG of Ohio in the chair). The resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the resolution will be printed in the RECORD.

The concurrent resolution was referred to the Committee on Public Works; and, under the rule, was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 20

Concurrent resolution petitioning the Congress of the United States to take appropriate action to assure the continuance of surveys and planning and cooperation in the construction of projects in the State of Kansas that are vital and necessary to the control of floods and the conservation of soil and water by sufficient appropriations being granted for this purpose to the Bureau of Reclamation, the U.S. Department of Agriculture and the Corps of Engineers and other Federal agencies and departments

Whereas water and soil are the most valuable natural resources of Kansas; and

Whereas the citizens, industries, farms, and cities of Kansas have always been subject to flood and drought but more recently they have experienced severe hardships and

great financial losses from floods and droughts during the years 1951, 1952, 1953, 1954, 1955, 1956, 1957, and 1958; and

Whereas many cities, industries, and farms have recently suffered from a critical shortage of water and at the same time are exposed to the further hazards of flood and drought; and

Whereas the nature of rivers is such that storms occurring in headwater regions of a stream in one State frequently inflict damage to areas in other States, and the benefits of stream stabilization resulting in adequate and dependable water supplies in one State become beneficial to areas in other States; and

Whereas it has become evident that we must use every means available and feasible to conserve and control all of the sources of water supply for agricultural, municipal, industrial, and recreational use; and

Whereas land treatment and watershed development have been increasingly emphasized as vital to all programs for the conservation of water and soil by the executive and legislative branches of State government, the State water resources board, State department of agriculture and other agencies, and the program is lagging because of the insufficiency of Federal funds for planning purposes; and

Whereas the Federal Government through acts of Congress has delegated to three agencies, namely, the Bureau of Reclamation, the Soil Conservation Service of the U.S. Department of Agriculture, and the Corps of Engineers the principal responsibilities for the conservation of water and soil, and more specifically, such matters as water supply, irrigation, pollution control, soil conservation, and flood control: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Kansas, the Senate concurring therein, That we respectfully urge, request, and petition the Congress of the United States to take such action necessary to assure (1) continuance of surveys, planning, and cooperation in the construction of projects in the State of Kansas that are vital and necessary to the prevention of floods and to the conservation of water and soil, and (2) that Federal funds for this purpose be appropriated in sufficient amounts to the Soil Conservation Service of the U.S. Department of Agriculture, the Bureau of Reclamation, and the Corps of Engineers, and also other Federal agencies and departments; and be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of state be instructed to transmit enrolled copies of this resolution to the President of the United States, the Vice President of the United States, each Member of Congress of the United States, and the Director of the Bureau of the Budget of the United States.

I hereby certify that the above concurrent resolution originated in the house, and was adopted by that body February 16, 1959.

JESS TAYLOR,
Speaker of the House.
A. E. ANDERSON,
Chief Clerk of the House.

Adopted by the senate February 27, 1959.

JOSEPH W. HENKLE, Sr.,
President of the Senate.
RALPH E. ZARKER,
Secretary of the Senate.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD a resolution, House Concurrent Resolution No. 20, passed upon by the Legislature of the State of Kansas, pertaining to the subject of control of floods and soil conservation in the State of Kansas.

The concurrent resolution was referred to the Committee on Public Works.

(See the above concurrent resolution printed in full when presented by Mr. CARLSON today.)

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Kansas, identical with the foregoing, which was referred to the Committee on Public Works.

HAWAIIAN STATEHOOD

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, the Kansas Junior Chamber of Commerce, an organization of 4,000 members, representing 65 communities in the State of Kansas, adopted a resolution at its meeting on the 24th day of February 1959, urging that the Territory of Hawaii be admitted to the Union as the 50th state.

I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be printed in the RECORD, and referred to the appropriate committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the resolution will be printed in the RECORD.

The resolution was ordered to lie on the table, as follows:

KANSAS JUNIOR CHAMBER OF COMMERCE RESOLUTION

Whereas the Territory of Hawaii has long been an integral part of the United States of America, with its people having served and contributed to our Nation in time of peace and war; and

Whereas the said Territory of Hawaii has progressed economically, politically and socially to the point where it is ready and willing to assume the position of a sovereign State and now seeks admittance to our great Union as the 50th State: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Kansas Junior Chamber of Commerce, an organization of 4,000 members representing 65 communities in the State of Kansas, That the Territory of Hawaii should be admitted to the Union as the 50th State by the Congress of the United States by immediate passage of the Hawaiian statehood bill; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to all Kansas Congressmen and Senators urging their support for Hawaiian statehood.

Dated this 24th day of February 1959.

KANSAS JUNIOR CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
By: EMERSON SHIELDS, *President.*

Attest:

WAYNE FOX,
Secretary.

RESOLUTIONS OF GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF RHODE ISLAND

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, on behalf of my colleague, the junior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE] and myself, I present a resolution of the General Assembly of Rhode Island memorializing the President of the United States, the Senators and Representatives from Rhode Island in the Congress of the United States and the Secretary of the Interior, to make every effort to have built on Federal unused land in the city of Newport, R.I., a saline water conversion plant.

I ask unanimous consent that the resolution may be appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and, under the rule, ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 255

A resolution memorializing the President of the United States, the Senators and Representatives from Rhode Island in the Congress of the United States and the Secretary of the Interior, to make every effort to have built on Federal unused land in the city of Newport, R.I., a saline water conversion plant

Whereas the Department of the Interior of our Federal Government is about to have built, five saline water conversion plants somewhere in the United States; and

Whereas it has been stated that unused Federal land would be used for this purpose; and

Whereas we, in the city of Newport, R.I., have many present inactive Federal Government installations; and

Whereas we, in the city of Newport, R.I., had a recent water shortage that caused the hiring of a rainmaker; and

Whereas the fact that the city of Newport is on an island and depends on watershed water that requires much treatment with chlorine, etc.; and

Whereas the taste of this water (due to the treatment it must have) leaves much to be desired and many people buy distilled bottled water for drinking and cooking purposes: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the General Assembly of the State of Rhode Island and Providence Plantations does now respectfully request the President of the United States, the Senators and Representatives from Rhode Island in the Congress of the United States and the Secretary of the Interior to make every effort to have built on one of the inactive Federal Government installations in the city of Newport, R.I., and not necessary to the public defense, a saline water conversion plant; and be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of state be and he is hereby authorized and directed to transmit duly certified copies of this resolution to the President of the United States, to the Senators and Representatives from Rhode Island in the Congress of the United States and to the Secretary of the Interior.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, at its January 1959 session, the Rhode Island General Assembly passed house resolution 1250, which became effective February 28, 1959.

I have the honor to call this resolution to the attention of my Senate colleagues, the title being: "Resolution commending Hon. JOHN O. PASTORE, Senator from Rhode Island, for his stand and recommendations with respect to the creation of a permanent textile interagency committee in the Department of Commerce to deal with the problems and foster the interests of the ailing textile industry and memorializing Congress to enact legislation to activate these recommendations."

In the conduct of the investigation of the textile industry and its related problems undertaken by the special subcommittee of the Senate Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee during the 2d session of the 85th Congress, my distinguished colleague the junior Senator from Rhode Island, as chairman of that subcommittee, performed a remarkable service to the Congress and to the textile industry itself.

It is, indeed, fitting that the Rhode Island General Assembly has recognized this important service of my Senate colleague by passage of house resolution 1250. I hereby ask unanimous consent

for the printing of the complete text of this resolution in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to lie on the table, and, under the rule, ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

House Resolution 1250

A resolution commending Hon. JOHN O. PASTORE, Senator from Rhode Island, for his stand and recommendations with respect to the creation of a permanent textile interagency committee in the Department of Commerce to deal with the problems and foster the interests of the ailing textile industry and memorializing Congress to enact legislation to activate these recommendations

Whereas Hon. JOHN O. PASTORE, Senator from Rhode Island, of the Pastore textiles subcommittee, and his associates have recommended the creation of a permanent textile interagency committee in the Department of Commerce to deal with the problems and foster the interests of the ailing industry; and

Whereas the suggested committee would fall short of last year's recommendations to the subcommittee that a new Federal textiles agency be established, but it is designed to allow for a continuing close look at the industry by the executive departments whose policies can affect it for better or worse; and

Whereas at the same time the subcommittee, a special group named last year and headed by Senator JOHN O. PASTORE, urged that the Senate Commerce Committee should create a permanent textiles subcommittee, a sort of congressional watchdog over the proposed executive watchdog; and

Whereas the recommendations were the first points of a program which won approval of the parent Commerce Committee, while other points included:

Collection, analysis, and publication by the Commerce Department of statistics of the industry, under the supervision of the textile interagency committee;

Establishment of quotas on textile imports, under the supervision of the textile interagency committee;

A careful administrative review of the foreign aid program with a view to encouraging other countries to concentrate on development of industries other than textiles;

More realistic interpretation of the current peril-point provision of the Trade Agreements Act and faster action on escape-clause cases brought before the Tariff Commission;

Earmarking of some proportion of customs duties on imported textiles to foot the cost of Federal aid for research in the textile industry: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the General Assembly of the State of Rhode Island now commends Senator JOHN O. PASTORE, of Rhode Island, chairman of the textiles subcommittee, for the excellence of his recommendations and those of the subcommittee, requesting Congress to pass needed legislation to activate the program; and be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of state be and he is hereby authorized to transmit to the Senators and Representatives from Rhode Island in the Congress of the United States duly certified copies of this resolution.

GEORGE H. LEHLEITNER—CONCURRENT RESOLUTION OF ALASKA LEGISLATURE

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, the Alaska State Legislature has passed a resolution expressing appreciation to a distinguished citizen of New Orleans, La., for his participation in the movement to achieve statehood for Alaska.

His service in behalf of this cause of Alaskan statehood has been so unique, so unselfish, and so outstanding that, before presenting the resolution for the RECORD, I desire to make a brief comment about him.

George H. Lehleitner is a successful, self-made businessman in New Orleans. During World War II, he enlisted in the Navy and was stationed in Honolulu. There, he became greatly interested in the cause of Hawaiian statehood, and worked to promote that cause. Inevitably, the interest he developed in Hawaiian statehood led him to an equal concern for Alaskan statehood.

Finding that despite a steadily growing and overwhelming public sentiment in favor of both Alaskan and Hawaiian statehood, as evidenced not merely by the public opinion polls but by the polls taken in numerous congressional districts by Members of Congress, enactment of statehood legislation was lagging. George Lehleitner, to counter this lag, extracted precedents out of America's past history and proposed a bold course of action.

That proposal was that the people of Alaska should adopt the procedure first originated in 1796 by the pioneer people of the region west of the Appalachians, which was to become the State of Tennessee. In 1796, the Tennesseans, impatient because the first three Congresses had not enacted statehood for Tennessee, elected two United States Senators and sent them to the National Capital—which was then Philadelphia—to work for statehood. The plan succeeded, and in a few months, Tennessee was admitted to the Union. The first Representative in the House of that great State was none other than Andrew Jackson, subsequently the seventh President of the United States. A similar procedure was adopted in 1835 by Michigan; in 1846 by Iowa; by California in 1850; by Minnesota in 1858; by Oregon in 1859; and by Kansas in 1861.

It was George Lehleitner who called this important historical precedent to the attention of the people of Alaska. Detailed information was secured from the Library of Congress, through the helpful and friendly intercession of the distinguished junior Senator from the State of Louisiana [Mr. LONG] and presented to the people of Alaska. The Alaska Territorial Legislature, in 1955, had already provided for a constitutional convention in advance of action by the Congress, appropriating $300,000 for it, scorning the advice of the timid that if Alaska waited until Congress enacted a statehood bill, the cost of the constitutional convention would be defrayed by Federal funds. The people of Alaska, after 88 years of territorialism, were determined to wait no longer. They had been far more patient than the people of Tennessee, and far more patient than the people of California who leaped boldly over any interval of territorial status. Fifty-five delegates—the same historic number as those who met in Philadelphia in 1787 to draft the Constitution of the United States—met at the University of Alaska in November of 1955, and there drafted a constitution which political scientists have compared favorably with any existing State constitution. The constitutional convention also provided for presentation to the people of Alaska an ordnance which would enable them to decide whether they wished or did not wish to adopt the Tennessee plan and to elect two Senators and a Representative and to send them to Washington to work for statehood. At an election on April 24, 1956, the people of Alaska both ratified the constitution and voted to adopt the plan which was henceforth named the Alaska-Tennessee plan. The only essential difference between Alaska's history and the history of the seven States which earlier adopted the Tennessee plan is that their Senators were seated without another election. Alaska's were not.

The author, the pioneer, and the promoter of this bold and successful adaptation of earlier American history was George Lehleitner. He journeyed to Fairbanks at his own expense to appear before the Alaska Constitutional Convention to urge its adoption. In the intervening months, he spent liberally of his own funds in travel and in other ways to advance the cause of statehood for both Alaska and Hawaii. His sacrifices were wholly unselfish and motivated solely by his adherence to basic American principles, above all, to that most fundamental of American principles—the principle of government by consent of the governed.

It is not often, Mr. President, that we find a man in private life devoting his time, his energy, and his funds to the advancement of a principle and a cause in which he believes and from which he stands to gain no personal benefit whatsoever.

Therefore, it gives me great pleasure to ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, at this point—at the conclusion of my remarks—House Concurrent Resolution No. 7 of the First State Legislature of Alaska, introduced by Representative Helen Fischer, of Anchorage, the National Democratic Committeewoman for Alaska, and Representatives James Hurley, of Palmer, and John S. Hellenthal, of Anchorage, which expresses the gratitude of the people of Alaska to that outstanding American, George H. Lehleitner.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, as follows:

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 7

Concurrent resolution relating to an expression of gratitude to George H. Lehleitner

Whereas the struggle to attain full statehood for Alaska has spanned a half century of time and many persons have contributed greatly to the success of the statehood movement, to all of whom Alaskans owe a debt of gratitude; and

Whereas there is one person, a private citizen, whose completely unselfish, vigorous, and dedicated attention to the cause of Alaska statehood was most unusual in that he had never been in Alaska, but believed sincerely that statehood was the inherent right of Alaska, and to that end devoted many years of his life at great personal sacrifice: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the First State Legislature, the Senate concurring, That George H. Lehleitner, of New Orleans, La., be recognized as the father of the Alaska-Tennessee plan, and that the Legislature of the State of Alaska on behalf

of the people of Alaska hereby conveys its appreciation to the said George H. Lehleitner for his invaluable assistance in their successful bid for statehood; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be transmitted to the said George H. Lehleitner.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, I am glad that my colleague, the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING] has brought to the attention of the Senate the resolution of the Alaska State Legislature in praise of George Lehleitner. In my opinion no man has ever been more deserving of the esteem and gratitude of an entire people than this gentleman from Louisiana. His efforts in behalf of Alaskan statehood were those of a dedicated man in a dedicated cause. He sought nothing—absolutely nothing—for himself. He sought only the attainment of the goal now reached—Alaska statehood.

George Lehleitner gave ever so freely of his money, time, and the contributions of his first class mind in his determination that Alaska should be a State. I have never known a man more selfless and more unselfish. Perhaps this legislative resolution is the first official expression which has gone to George Lehleitner indicating how Alaskans feel about him. But even if no other recognition were ever to be extended to him—an unlikely contingency, I assure Senators—I want these words of mine to stand as a declaration that those of us who were closely associated with him as we sought Alaskan statehood together will retain always for George Lehleitner a deep feeling of thanks for his really tremendous contributions and a feeling of pleasure that this cause enabled us to come to know, respect, and entertain affection for a very wonderful human being.

Mr. LONG subsequently said:

Mr. President, it has been extremely gratifying to me to hear the words of praise for George Lehleitner from the two Senators from Alaska. George Lehleitner is truly a noble American, and one of the most selfless persons whom I have ever had the privilege to know. Without George Lehleitner I am inclined to believe that the case of statehood for both Alaska and Hawaii would have died a natural death for lack of interest from outside the Territories, and as a result of the discouragement incident to continued frustrations by reason of the repeated failure of efforts to pass earlier statehood bills.

George Lehleitner refused to be discouraged, and persisted at a time when when the cause looked most dismal.

It was to a large degree because of his efforts as a true believer in statehood that Alaskan statehood became a reality; and I believe that it will be in large measure due to his determined efforts that statehood for Hawaii will become a reality at this session of Congress.

AMENDMENT OF SOCIAL SECURITY ACT, RELATING TO RESTRICTION OF ANNUAL EARNINGS—RESOLUTION

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, and my colleague, the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], I present a resolution adopted by the Board of Aldermen of the City of Somerville, Mass., relating to the restriction on annual earnings under the Social Security Act. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution may be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION MEMORIALIZING THE U.S. CONGRESS RELATIVE TO AMENDING SOCIAL SECURITY LAWS ANENT ANNUAL EARNINGS RESTRICTION

Whereas the present law restricts the earnings of people between the ages of 65 to 72 to $1,200 in a calendar year; and

Whereas the higher cost of food and commodities and the general rise in the cost of living affects all: Be it therefore

Resolved, That the Board of Aldermen of the City of Somerville, Commonwealth of Massachusetts, does hereby go on record as favoring an amendment to the social security laws, and does petition for same, whereby people between the ages of 65 and 72 shall be allowed earnings of $2,000 in a calendar year, in order to alleviate the hardships caused by the increased cost of living; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to the U.S. Senate and the House of Representatives, and to Senator JOHN F. KENNEDY, Senator LEVERETT SALTONSTALL, Congressman TORBERT H. MACDONALD, and Congressman THOMAS P. O'NEILL, JR.

CLOSING OF SOUTH BOSTON NAVAL ANNEX—RESOLUTION

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, and my colleague, the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], I present a resolution adopted by the Board of Aldermen of the City of Somerville, Mass., relating to closing of the South Boston Naval Annex. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution may be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Armed Services, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION MEMORIALIZING THE U.S. CONGRESS AND THE SECRETARY OF NATIONAL DEFENSE OF SOMERVILLE BOARD OF ALDERMEN'S OPPOSITION TO PROPOSED CLOSING OF THE SOUTH BOSTON NAVAL ANNEX

Whereas the Secretary of National Defense has given indication of the closing of the Boston Naval Shipyard's South Boston Annex facility, the South Boston Naval Annex, with the overhauling and repair work to be transferred from said South Boston Drydock to southern ports; and

Whereas the South Boston Naval Annex employees some 1,500 to 2,000 civilian artisans, many of them Somerville residents, who will become unemployed if said South Boston Naval Annex is closed, thereby causing hardship to these workers and their families; and

Whereas the South Boston Naval Annex has proved its value to our country in both peace and war and is recognized as geographically and strategically essential to our national defense in the event of hostilities: Be it therefore

Resolved, That the Board of Aldermen of the City of Somerville, Commonwealth of Massachusetts, does hereby go on record as opposing any proposed closing of the South Boston Naval Annex as being contrary to the interests of our national defense as well as the economic welfare of the greater Boston community; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to both branches of the U.S. Congress, members of the Massachusetts congressional delegation and Secretary of Defense Neil McElroy.

RESOLUTION OF BOARD OF CITY COMMISSIONERS, FARGO, N. DAK.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I present, for appropriate reference, a resolution adopted by the Board of Commissioners of the City of Fargo, N. Dak., relating to the establishment of the Office of Water Pollution Control. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution may be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Public Works, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it resolved by the Board of City Commissioners of the City of Fargo:

Whereas there is now before the 86th Congressional Assembly of the United States of America, a bill providing for the amendment of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to increase grants for construction of sewage treatment works; to establish the Office of Water Pollution Control, and for other purposes, being House of Representatives congressional bill No. 3610; and

Whereas the passage of said bill will be of great benefit to all municipalities of the United States of America: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Board of City Commissioners of the City of Fargo, N. Dak., hereby strongly endorses said bill, and urges its passage; be it further

Resolved, That a certified copy of this resolution be forwarded to the Honorable JOHN A. BLATNIK, chairman of the Rivers and Harbor Subcommittee of the House of Representatives; the Honorable CHARLES A. BUCKLEY, chairman of the Committee on Public Works of the House of Representatives; and to the North Dakota legislative delegation in Washington, D.C.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, without amendment:

S. 243. A bill for the relief of Donald D. Ellis, an individual trading as the Ellis Timber Co. (Rept. No. 84);

S. 328. A bill for the relief of Ellen B. Mueller (Rept. No. 85);

S. 330. A bill for the relief of Erminio Neglia (Rept. No. 86);

S. 331. A bill for the relief of Jakob Liblang, Jr. (Rept. No. 87);

S. 332. A bill for the relief of Martin Albert (Rept. No. 88);

S. 624. A bill for the relief of Girolamo Naselli (Rept. No. 89);

S. 633. A bill for the relief of Yasuko Kitano (Rept. No. 90); and

S. 869. A bill for the relief of Konstantinos A. Kostalas (Rept. No. 91).

By Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment:

S. 459. A bill for the relief of Penelope Carnavas Kafos (Rept. No. 92); and

S. 460. A bill for the relief of Gorjana Grdjic (Rept. No. 93).

By Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, with amendments:

S. 327. A bill for the relief of Cwy Pinkusiewicz (Rept. No. 94); and

S. 425. A bill for the relief of Klarchen Huebner (Rept. No. 95).

By Mr. RUSSELL, from the Committee on Armed Services, with amendments:

H.R. 2260. An act to extend until July 1, 1963, the induction provisions of the Universal Military Training and Service Act; the provisions of the Act of August 3, 1950, suspending personnel strengths of the Armed Forces; and the Dependents Assistance Act of 1950 (Rept. No. 96).

REPORT ENTITLED "PATENTS, TRADEMARKS, AND COPYRIGHTS"—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE (S. REPT. NO. 97)

Mr. O'MAHONEY, from the Committee on the Judiciary, submitted a report entitled "Patents, Trademarks, and Copyrights," pursuant to Senate Resolution 236, 85th Congress, 2d session, as extended, which was ordered to be printed.

REPORT ENTITLED "1959 JOINT ECONOMIC REPORT" (S. REPT. NO. 98)

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, on behalf of the Joint Economic Committee I submit for filing the report, with illustrations, of the Joint Economic Committee on the January 1959 Economic Report of the President, with minority and other views. The report is being filed at this time in accordance with the extension which was granted by unanimous consent in the Senate and the House of Representatives on Thursday, February 26.

I ask unanimous consent that the report with the minority and other views be printed as a Senate report, with illustrations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be received and printed, as requested by the Senator from Illinois.

REPORTS ON DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, from the Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments, to which were re-referred for examination and recommendation two lists of records transmitted to the Senate by the Archivist of the United States that appeared to have no permanent value or historical interest, submitted reports thereon, pursuant to law.

STUDY OF FEDERAL JUDICIAL SYSTEM—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, from the Committee on the Judiciary, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 91), which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdictions specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to make a complete study and examination of the Federal judicial system with a view to determining the legislative or other measures, if any, which may be necessary or desirable in order to increase the efficiency of the Federal courts in justly and expeditiously adjudicating or determining the cases, controversies, and other matters which may be brought before them.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, from February 1, 1959, to January 31, 1960, inclusive, is authorized to (1) make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ, upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided,* That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $1,200 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with such recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1960.

SEC. 4. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed $60,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

SUMMARY OF MONTHLY PERSONNEL REPORTS ON CIVILIAN EMPLOYMENT BY JOINT COMMITTEE ON REDUCTION OF NONESSENTIAL FEDERAL EXPENDITURES

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, as chairman of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures, I submit a summary of monthly personnel reports on civilian employment in the executive branch of the Federal Government for the period November 1958 to January 1959 inclusive.

In accordance with the practice of several years standing, I request that the summary be printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the summary was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Personnel summary, November 1958 through January 1959, and pay summary, October 1958 through December 1958

Total and major categories	Civilian personnel in executive branch			Payroll (in thousands) in executive branch		
	In January numbered—	In November numbered—	Increase (+) or decrease (−)	In December was—	In October was—	Increase (+) or decrease (−)
Total [1]	2,337,823	2,354,767	−16,944	$1,118,638	$1,068,439	+$50,199
Agencies exclusive of Department of Defense	1,253,821	1,262,289	−8,468	624,625	560,214	+64,411
Department of Defense	1,084,002	1,092,478	−8,476	[3] 494,013	508,225	−14,212
Inside continental United States [2]	2,154,638	2,157,345	−2,707			
Outside continental United States [2]	183,185	197,422	−14,237			
Industrial employment	569,395	573,673	−4,278			
Foreign nationals	197,073	203,409	−6,336	[3] 25,974	24,712	+1,262

[1] Exclusive of foreign nationals shown in the last line of this summary.
[2] Beginning in January 1959 employment in the State of Alaska is reported inside continental United States. Formerly employment in Alaska was reported outside continental United States. January employment in Alaska totaled 13,200.
[3] Subject to revision.

TABLE I.—*Consolidated table of Federal personnel inside and outside continental United States employed by the executive agencies during January 1959, and comparison with November 1958, and pay for December 1958, and comparison with October 1958*

Department or agency	Personnel				Pay (in thousands)			
	January	November	Increase	Decrease	December	October	Increase	Decrease
Executive departments (except Department of Defense):								
Agriculture	83,573	89,464		5,891	$37,720	$39,603		$1,883
Commerce [1 2]	30,147	88,188		29,041	15,143	31,568		16,425
Health, Education, and Welfare	57,494	56,821	673		27,301	26,345	$956	
Interior	49,210	50,144		934	24,894	26,382		1,488
Justice	30,174	30,477		303	17,842	18,014		172
Labor	5,805	5,894		89	3,150	3,297		147
Post Office	542,551	545,304		2,753	[3] 287,428	223,567	63,861	
State [4]	35,263	[3] 35,174	89		16,063	16,253		190
Treasury	76,123	76,079	44		39,421	39,474		53

See footnotes at end of table.

TABLE I.—*Consolidated table of Federal personnel inside and outside continental United States employed by the executive agencies during January 1959, and comparison with November 1958, and pay for December 1958, and comparison with October 1958*—Continued

Department or agency	Personnel				Pay (in thousands)			
	January	November	Increase	Decrease	December	October	Increase	Decrease
Executive Office of the President:								
White House Office	402	401	1		$260	$256	$4	
Bureau of the Budget	423	425		2	343	347		$4
Council of Economic Advisers	34	33	1		30	26	4	
Executive Mansion and Grounds	72	71	1		28	30		2
National Security Council [5]	62	61	1		43	44		1
Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization	1,650	1,622	28		1,083	1,096		13
President's Advisory Committee on Government Organization	6	6			5	4	1	
President's Committee on Fund Raising Within the Federal Service	4	4			4	4		
Independent agencies:								
Airways Modernization Board [2]						206		206
Alaska International Rail and Highway Commission	2	1	1		2		2	
American Battle Monuments Commission	511	543		32	90	94		4
Atomic Energy Commission	6,760	6,863		103	4,440	4,493		53
Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System	607	605	2		361	352	9	
Boston National Historic Sites Commission	3	3			1	1		
Career Executive Board [7]	3		3					
Civil Aeronautics Board [2]	682	714		32	461	478		17
Civil Service Commission	3,887	3,903		16	2,120	2,149		29
Civil War Centennial Commission	6	5	1		4	4		
Commission of Fine Arts	4	4			3	3		
Commission on Civil Rights	60	56	4		39	30	9	
Development Loan Fund	62	53	9		41	35	6	
Export-Import Bank of Washington	225	222	3		135	152		17
Farm Credit Administration	854	851	3		511	512		1
Federal Aviation Agency [2]	30,210	322	29,888		17,376		17,376	
Federal Coal Mine Safety Board of Review	7	7			4	4		
Federal Communications Commission	1,231	1,226	5		775	764	11	
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation	1,229	1,230		1	737	718	19	
Federal Home Loan Bank Board	938	937	1		547	540	7	
Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service	338	339		1	270	270		
Federal Power Commission	790	770	20		493	491	2	
Federal Trade Commission	724	720	4		490	486	4	
Foreign Claims Settlement Commission	76	81		5	56	57		1
General Accounting Office	5,221	5,277		56	2,921	2,920	1	
General Services Administration [8]	28,059	28,084		25	11,978	12,091		113
Government Contract Committee	26	26			15	14	1	
Government Printing Office	6,473	6,492		19	3,318	3,196	122	
Housing and Home Finance Agency	10,956	10,855	101		6,197	6,072	125	
Hudson-Champlain Celebration Commission	3	2	1		1		1	
Indian Claims Commission	17	17			10	14		4
Interstate Commerce Commission	2,236	2,238		2	1,368	1,359	9	
Lincoln Sesquicentennial Commission	8	8			5	5		
National Aeronautics and Space Administration	8,450	8,299	151		5,243	4,921	322	
National Capital Housing Authority	295	290	5		134	131	3	
National Capital Planning Commission	30	31		1	22	22		
National Gallery of Art	318	327		9	131	124	7	
National Labor Relations Board	1,395	1,383	12		934	896	38	
National Mediation Board	118	121		3	80	102		22
National Science Foundation	416	450		34	218	245		27
Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission [9]	10	2	8		1		1	
Panama Canal	14,112	14,229		117	4,014	2,927	1,087	
Railroad Retirement Board	2,375	2,412		37	1,135	1,135		
Renegotiation Board	315	316		1	242	238	4	
St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation	153	174		21	97	95	2	
Securities and Exchange Commission	913	906	7		575	572	3	
Selective Service System	6,394	6,365	29		1,838	1,846		8
Small Business Administration	1,742	1,654	88		1,067	958	109	
Smithsonian Institution	993	968	25		460	445	15	
Soldiers' Home	1,002	1,005		3	299	266	33	
South Carolina, Georgia, Alabama, and Florida Water Study Commission [10]	6		6					
Subversive Activities Control Board	32	32			25	25		
Tariff Commission	222	224		2	152	151	1	
Tax Court of the United States	153	153			104	107		3
Tennessee Valley Authority	14,931	15,480		549	8,131	8,642		511
Texas Water Study Commission [11]	8		8					
Theodore Roosevelt Centennial Commission	2	2			2	3		1
U.S. Information Agency	10,750	10,736	14		3,870	3,800	70	
Veterans' Administration	172,430	172,372	58		70,234	68,638	1,596	
Virgin Islands Corporation	1,055	736	319		90	105		15
Total, excluding Department of Defense	1,253,821	1,262,289	31,614	40,082	624,625	560.214	85,821	21,410
Net change, excluding Department of Defense			8,468				64,411	
Department of Defense:								
Office of the Secretary of Defense	1,687	1,680	7		1,208	1,189	19	
Department of the Army	407,214	413,353		6,139	[13] 173,352	189,112		15,760
Department of the Navy	359,012	360,383		1,371	175,010	174,431	579	
Department of the Air Force	316,089	317,062		973	144,443	143,493	950	
Total, Department of Defense	1,084,002	1,092,478	7	8,483	494,013	508,225	1,548	15,760
Net decrease, Department of Defense			8,476				14,212	
Grand total, including Department of Defense	2,337,823	2,354.767	31,621	48,565	1,118,638	1,068,439	87,369	37,170
Net change, including Department of Defense			16,944				50,199	

[1] January figure includes 204 seamen on the rolls of the Maritime Administration and their pay.

[2] The Federal Aviation Agency was created pursuant to Public Lc . The Airways Modernization Board was abolished thereby and its functions and duties were transferred to the new Federal Aviation Agency effective Nov. 1, 1958. In accordance with Bureau of the Budget directive dated Dec. 30, 1958, the Civil Aeronautics Administration, Department of Commerce, and certain functions of the Civil Aeronautics Board were transferred to the Federal Aviation Agency, effective Dec. 31, 1958.

[3] Includes pay of temporary Christmas employees.

[4] January figure includes 12,819 employees of the International Cooperation Administration as compared with 12,730 in November, and their pay. These ICA figures include employees who are paid from foreign currencies deposited by foreign governments in a trust fund for this purpose. The January figure includes 2,036 of these trust fund employees and the November figure includes 2,057.

[5] Revised on basis of later information.

[6] Excludes personnel and pay of the Central Intelligence Agency.

[7] New agency created pursuant to Executive Order 10758, dated Mar. 4, 1958.

[8] Includes 3 employees of the Federal Facilities Corporation.

[9] New agency created pursuant to Public Law 85-470.

[10] New agency created pursuant to Public Law 85-850.

[11] New agency created pursuant to Public Law 85-843.

[13] Subject to revision.

TABLE II.—*Federal personnel inside continental United States employed by the executive agencies during January 1959, and comparison with November 1958*

Department or agency	January	November	Increase	Decrease
Executive departments (except Department of Defense):				
Agriculture	82,357	88,080		5,723
Commerce [1] [2]	29,546	54,718		25,172
Health, Education, and Welfare	56,971	55,020	1,951	
Interior	48,581	47,027	1,554	
Justice	29,820	29,942		122
Labor	5,708	5,782		74
Post Office	540,570	542,699		2,129
State [3]	8,724	[4] 8,639	85	
Treasury	75,246	75,081	165	
Executive Office of the President:				
White House Office	402	401	1	
Bureau of the Budget	423	425		2
Council of Economic Advisers	34	33	1	
Executive Mansion and Grounds	72	71	1	
National Security Council [5]	62	61	1	
Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization	1,650	1,622	28	
President's Advisory Committee on Government Organization	6	6		
President's Committee on Fund Raising Within the Federal Service	4	4		
Independent agencies:				
Alaska International Rail and Highway Commission	2	1	1	
American Battle Monuments Commission	14	14		
Atomic Energy Commission	6,727	6,831		104
Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System	607	605	2	
Boston National Historic Sites Commission	3	3		
Career Executive Board [6]	3		3	
Civil Aeronautics Board [7]	682	709		27
Civil Service Commission	3,878	3,886		8
Civil War Centennial Commission	6	5	1	
Commission of Fine Arts	4	4		
Commission on Civil Rights	60	56	4	
Development Loan Fund	62	53	9	
Export-Import Bank of Washington	225	222	3	
Farm Credit Administration	844	841	3	
Federal Aviation Agency [8]	28,752	322	28,430	
Federal Coal Mine Safety Board of Review	7	7		
Federal Communications Commission	1,216	1,199	17	
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation	1,227	1,228		1
Federal Home Loan Bank Board	938	937	1	
Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service	338	339		1
Federal Power Commission	790	770	20	
Federal Trade Commission	724	720	4	
Foreign Claims Settlement Commission	76	81		5
General Accounting Office	5,142	5,195		53
General Services Administration [9]	28,010	28,028		18
Government Contract Committee	26	26		
Government Printing Office	6,473	6,492		19
Housing and Home Finance Agency	10,780	10,663	117	
Hudson-Champlain Celebration Commission	3	2	1	
Indian Claims Commission	17	17		
Interstate Commerce Commission	2,236	2,238		2
Lincoln Sesquicentennial Commission	8	8		
National Aeronautics and Space Administration	8,446	8,295	151	
National Capital Housing Authority	295	290	5	
National Capital Planning Commission	30	31		1
National Gallery of Art	318	327		9
National Labor Relations Board	1,373	1,361	12	
National Mediation Board	118	121		3
National Science Foundation	416	450		34
Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission [10]	10	2	8	
Panama Canal	406	413		7
Railroad Retirement Board	2,375	2,412		37
Renegotiation Board	315	316		1
St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation	153	174		21
Securities and Exchange Commission	913	906	7	
Selective Service System	6,215	6,182	33	
Small Business Administration	1,719	1,628	91	
Smithsonian Institution	977	957	20	
Soldiers' Home	1,002	1,005		3
South Carolina, Georgia, Alabama, and Florida Water Study Commission [9]	6		6	
Subversive Activities Control Board	32	32		
Tariff Commission	222	224		2
Tax Court of the United States	153	153		
Tennessee Valley Authority	14,931	15,480		549
Texas Water Study Commission [10]	8		8	
Theodore Roosevelt Centennial Commission	2	2		
U.S. Information Agency	2,669	2,656	13	
Veterans' Administration	171,258	171,173	85	
Total, excluding Department of Defense	1,194,418	1,195,703	32,842	34,127
Net decrease, excluding Department of Defense			1,285	
Department of Defense:				
Office of the Secretary of Defense	1,644	1,640	4	
Department of the Army	350,396	353,211		2,815
Department of the Navy	326,506	327,534		1,028
Department of the Air Force	281,674	279,257	2,417	
Total, Department of Defense	960,220	961,642	2,421	3,843
Net decrease, Department of Defense			1,422	
Grand total, including Department of Defense	2,154,638	2,157,345	35,263	37,970
Net decrease, including Department of Defense			2,707	

[1] January figure includes 204 seamen on the rolls of the Maritime Administration.
[2] The Federal Aviation Agency was created pursuant to Public Law 85-726. The Airways Modernization Board was abolished thereby and its functions and duties were transferred to the new Federal Aviation Agency effective Nov. 1, 1958. In accordance with Bureau of the Budget directive dated Dec. 30, 1958, the Civil Aeronautics Administration, Department of Commerce, and certain functions of the Civil Aeronautics Board were transferred to the Federal Aviation Agency, effective Dec. 31, 1958.
[3] January figure includes 1,841 employees of the International Cooperation Administration as compared with 1,806 in November.
[4] Revised on basis of later information.
[5] Exclusive of personnel of the Central Intelligence Agency.
[6] New agency created pursuant to Executive Order 10758, dated Mar. 4, 1958.
[7] January figure includes 3 employees of the Federal Facilities Corporation.
[8] New agency created pursuant to Public Law 85-470.
[9] New agency created pursuant to Public Law 85-850.
[10] New agency created pursuant to Public Law 85-843.

NOTE.—January figure includes 13,200 employees in the State of Alaska. Formerly employment in Alaska was reported outside continental United States in table 3 of this report.

TABLE III.—*Federal personnel outside continental United States employed by the executive agencies during January 1959, and comparison with November 1958*

Department or agency	January	November	Increase	Decrease
Executive departments (except Department of Defense):				
Agriculture	1,216	1,384		168
Commerce [1]	601	4,470		3,869
Health, Education, and Welfare	523	1,801		1,278
Interior	629	3,117		2,488
Justice	354	535		181
Labor	97	112		15
Post Office	1,981	2,605		624
State [2]	26,539	[3] 26,535	4	
Treasury	877	998		121
Independent agencies:				
American Battle Monuments Commission	497	529		32
Atomic Energy Commission	33	32	1	
Civil Aeronautics Board		5		5
Civil Service Commission	9	17		8
Farm Credit Administration	10	10		
Federal Aviation Agency [1]	1,458		1,458	
Federal Communications Commission	15	27		12
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation	2	2		
General Accounting Office	79	82		3

[1] The Federal Aviation Agency was created pursuant to Public Law 85-826. In accordance with Bureau of the Budget directive dated Dec. 30, 1958, the Civil Aeronautics Administration, Department of Commerce, and certain functions of the Civil Aeronautics Board were transferred to the Federal Aviation Agency, effective Dec. 31, 1958.
[2] January figure includes 10,978 employees of the International Cooperation Administration as compared with 10,924 in November. These ICA figures include employees who are paid from foreign currencies deposited by foreign governments in a trusts fund for this purpose. The January figure includes 2,036 of these trust fund employees and the November figure includes 2,057.
[3] Revised on basis of later information.

TABLE III.—*Federal personnel outside continental United States employed by the executive agencies during January 1959, and comparison with November 1958*—Continued

Department or agency	January	November	Increase	Decrease
Independent agencies—continued				
General Services Administration	49	56		7
Housing and Home Finance Agency	176	192		16
National Aeronautics and Space Administration	4	4		
National Labor Relations Board	22	22		
Panama Canal	13,706	13,816		110
Selective Service System	179	183		4
Small Business Administration	23	26		3
Smithsonian Institution	16	11	5	
U.S. Information Agency	8,081	8,080	1	
Veterans' Administration	1,172	1,199		27
Virgin Islands Corporation	1,055	736	319	
Total, excluding Department of Defense	59,403	66,586	1,788	8,971
Net decrease, excluding Department of Defense			7,183	
Department of Defense:				
Office of the Secretary of Defense	43	40	3	
Department of the Army	56,818	60,142		3,324
Department of the Navy	32,506	32,849		343
Department of the Air Force	34,415	37,805		3,390
Total, Department of Defense	123,782	130,836	3	7,057
Net decrease, Department of Defense			7,054	
Grand total, including Department of Defense	183,185	197,422	1,791	16,028
Net decrease, including Department of Defense			14,237	

NOTE.—January figure excludes 13,200 employees in the State of Alaska. Employment in Alaska is now reported inside continental United States in table 2 of this report.

TABLE IV.—*Industrial employees of the Federal Government inside and outside continental United States employed by the executive agencies during January 1959, and comparison with November 1958*

Department or agency	January	November	Increase	Decrease
Executive departments (except Department of Defense):				
Agriculture	3,047	3,204		157
Commerce [1]	2,000	2,743		743
Interior	6,846	6,776	70	
Treasury	5,467	5,438	29	
Independent agencies:				
Atomic Energy Commission	156	158		2
Federal Aviation Agency [1]	808		808	
Federal Communications Commission	13	13		
General Services Administration	1,238	1,244		6
Government Printing Office	6,473	6,492		19
National Aeronautics and Space Administration	8,450	8,299	151	
Panama Canal	6,964	7,046		82
Tennessee Valley Authority	12,118	12,674		556
Virgin Islands Corporation	1,055	736	319	
Total, excluding Department of Defense	54,635	54,823	1,377	1,565
Net decrease, excluding Department of Defense			188	
Department of Defense:				
Department of the Army:				
Inside continental United States	[3] 135,250	[3] 137,474		2,224
Outside continental United States	[3] 9,500	[3] 9,583		83
Department of the Navy:				
Inside continental United States	202,837	204,010		1,173
Outside continental United States	5,187	5,217		30
Department of the Air Force:				
Inside continental United States	158,267	158,455		188
Outside continental United States	3,719	4,111		392
Total Department of Defense	514,760	518,850		4,090
Net decrease, Department of Defense.			4,090	
Grand total, including Department of Defense.	569,395	573,673	1,377	5,655
Net decrease, including Department of Defense.			4,278	

[1] In accordance with Bureau of the Budget directive dated Dec. 30, 1958, employees of the Civil Aeronautics Administration, Department of Commerce, were transferred to the Federal Aviation Agency, effective Dec. 31, 1958.

[3] Subject to revision.
[4] Revised on basis of later information

TABLE V.—*Foreign nationals working under U.S. agencies overseas, excluded from tables I through IV of this report, whose services are provided by contractual agreement between the United States and foreign governments, or because of the nature of their work or the source of funds from which they are paid, as of January 1959, and comparison with November 1958*

Country	Total		Army		Navy		Air Force	
	January	November	January	November	January	November	January	November
Belgium	11	11					11	11
England	4,171	4,692					4,171	4,692
France	22,197	22,894	16,824	17,164			5,373	5,730
Germany	84,549	85,435	72,444	73,175	57	59	12,048	12,201
Japan	73,378	77,468	28,833	32,861	16,096	15,926	28,449	28,681
Korea	7,640	7,538	7,640	7,538				
Malta	82	78			82	78		
Morocco	4,389	4,636	23	48	831	876	3,535	3,712
Netherlands	41	42					41	42
Norway	25	25					25	25
Spain	2	2					2	2
Trinidad	588	588			588	588		
Total	197,073	203,409	125,764	130,786	17,654	17,527	53,655	55,096

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. WILEY (by request):

S. 1315. A bill for the incorporation of the Blue Star Mothers of America, Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 1316. A bill amending title II of the Social Security Act so as to provide that the minimum lump-sum death payment shall be $255; and

S. 1317. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to allow a deduction for certain expenses paid by a taxpayer in obtaining a college education or in providing a college education for his spouse or dependents; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 1318. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, render judgment upon the claim of Col. Walter E. Cole for retirement from the Army of the United States due to a service-connected disability; and

S. 1319. A bill for the relief of Henry Gappert; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HICKENLOOPER:

S. 1320. A bill for the relief of Taufic Deoud Gebran (also known as Taufic G.

Dawd) and his wife, Hanne Elias Wehby Deoud; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. AIKEN (for himself and Mr. PROUTY):

S. 1321. A bill to authorize the Attorney General to consent, on behalf of the Library of Congress Trust Fund Board, to a modification of the terms of a trust instrument executed by James B. Wilbur; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RANDOLPH (for himself and Mr. BYRD of West Virginia):

S. 1322. A bill to provide emergency food assistance to persons in areas of severe economic distress caused by unemployment; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. McNAMARA (for himself, Mr. CLARK, Mr. HART, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. MANSFIELD, Mr. MORSE, Mr. NEUBERGER, Mr. GREEN, Mr. GRUENING, Mr. BYRD of West Virginia, Mr. RANDOLPH, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. McCARTHY, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. KENNEDY, and Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey):

S. 1323. A bill to authorize temporary unemployment benefits for individuals who exhaust their benefit rights under existing unemployment compensation laws, and for individuals who were employed in noncovered employment; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. McNAMARA when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BEALL:

S. 1324. A bill to provide for the licensing and bonding of collection agencies in the District of Columbia;

S. 1325. A bill to provide for the regulation of closing-out and fire sales in the District of Columbia; and

S. 1326. A bill to prescribe penalties for willful concealment of goods or merchandise on the premises of stores in the District of Columbia; and to exempt certain persons having probable cause to believe such offenses have been committed, from civil liability in connection with apprehension of persons suspect thereof; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

S. 1327. A bill for the relief of Ida L. Rollins; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

S. 1328. A bill for the relief of Parker E. Dragoo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina (by request):

S. 1329. A bill to restore the authority of the Postmaster General to adjust the postage rates for airmail weighing in excess of 8 ounces, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HOLLAND (for himself and Mr. SMATHERS):

S. 1330. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act for the relief of the city of Fort Myers, Fla., and Lee County, Fla.," approved July 22, 1958; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CASE of New Jersey (for himself, Mr. BUSH, Mr. CLARK, Mr. DODD, Mr. JAVITS, Mr. KEATING, and Mr. NEUBERGER):

S. 1331. A bill to amend the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, so as to strengthen and improve the national transportation system, insure the protection of the public interest, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. CASE of New Jersey when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. CASE of New Jersey (for himself and Mr. NEUBERGER):

S. 1332. A bill to promote public confidence in the integrity of Congress and the executive branch; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Mr. KEATING:

S. 1333. A bill to provide for the temporary free entry of religious sceneramas and other articles imported for exhibition by religious societies or institutions; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

S. 1334. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to impose a graduated tax on the taxable income of corporations; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 1335. A bill to amend section 4B of the Clayton Act;

S. 1336. A bill to amend the Clayton Act to declare private antitrust suits to be impressed with a substantial public interest; and

S. 1337. A bill to provide for the publication before entry of decrees, judgments, and orders entered by consent upon the merits of civil antitrust proceedings; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HUMPHREY (for himself, Mr. CLARK, Mr. LONG, and Mr. MORSE):

S. 1338. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to supplement existing laws against unlawful restraints and monopolies, and for other purposes," approved October 15, 1914, and to amend the act entitled "An act to protect trade and commerce against unlawful restraints and monopolies," approved July 2, 1890, for the purpose of prohibiting loss leader sales; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HUMPHREY (for himself, Mr. LONG, and Mr. MORSE):

S. 1339. A bill to amend the Clayton Act to prohibit sales in commerce at unreasonably low prices where the effect may be to injure competition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

S. 1340. A bill to provide for disaster loans to small business concerns which suffer economic injury due to Federally-aided highway construction programs; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

(See the remarks of Mr. HUMPHREY when he introduced the above bills, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. JAVITS:

S. 1341. A bill to strengthen and improve State and local programs to combat and control juvenile delinquency; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. JAVITS when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. JAVITS (for himself and Mr. CLARK):

S. 1342. A bill to create a Federal Limited Profit Mortgage Corporation to assist in the provision of housing for moderate-income families and for elderly persons; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

(See the remarks of Mr. JAVITS when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. YARBOROUGH (for himself, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. CARLSON, Mr. KERR, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. MANSFIELD, and Mr. MURRAY):

S. 1343. A bill to amend section 105(b) of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, relating to price support for oats, rye, barley, and grain sorghums; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(See the remarks of Mr. YARBOROUGH when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. COOPER (for himself, Mr. CASE of New Jersey, Mr. JAVITS, and Mr. PROUTY):

S. 1344. A bill to establish standards for hours of work and overtime pay of mechanics employed on work done under contract for, or with the financial aid of, the United States, for any Territory, or for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; and

S. 1345. A bill to prohibit discrimination on account of sex in the payment of wages by employers having employees engaged in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce, and to provide procedures for assisting employees in collecting wages lost by reason of such discrimination; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. COOPER when he introduced the above bills, which appear under separate headings.)

By Mr. COOPER (for himself and Mr. MORTON):

S. 1346. A bill providing for the establishment, equipment, and maintenance of a nuclear energy-coal experiment station in the coal regions of eastern Kentucky; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. DIRKSEN:

S. 1347. A bill for the relief of George T. Moore, Carl D. Berry, and Dr. Harold J. Heck; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANGER (for himself and Mr. DODD):

S.J. Res. 69. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to the equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCOTT:

S.J. Res. 70. Joint resolution to provide for the designation of August 27, 1959, as "Oil Industry Centennial Day"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BEALL:

S.J. Res. 71. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution to provide that the people of the District of Columbia shall be entitled to vote in presidential elections; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEFAUVER:

S.J. Res. 72. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing for the election of President and Vice President; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. KEFAUVER when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HART:

S.J. Res. 73. Joint resolution extending an invitation to the International Olympic Committee to hold the 1964 Olympic games at Detroit, Mich.; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

(See the remarks of Mr. HART when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. JOHNSON of Texas (for himself and Mr. DIRKSEN):

S.J. Res. 74. Joint resolution consenting to an extension and renewal of the Interstate Compact To Conserve Oil and Gas; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

CEREMONIES IN ROTUNDA IN CONNECTION WITH STATUE OF THE LATE JOSEPH WARD, OF SOUTH DAKOTA

Mr. CASE of South Dakota (for himself and Mr. MUNDT) submitted the following concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 14), which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the South Dakota State Historical Society of South Dakota is hereby authorized to place temporarily in the rotunda of the Capitol a statue of the late Joseph Ward, of South Dakota, and to hold ceremonies in the rotunda on said occasion; and the Architect of the Capitol is hereby authorized to make the necessary arrangements therefor.

RESOLUTION

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, from the Committee on the Judiciary, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 91) authorizing a study of the Federal

judicial system, which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

(See the above resolution printed in full, where it appears under the heading "Reports of Committees.")

TEMPORARY UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION ACT OF 1959

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, and Senators CLARK, HART, MURRAY, MANSFIELD, MORSE, NEUBERGER, GREEN, GRUENING, BYRD of West Virginia, RANDOLPH, HUMPHREY, MCCARTHY, DOUGLAS, KENNEDY, and WILLIAMS of New Jersey, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to authorize temporary unemployment benefits for individuals who exhaust their benefit rights under existing unemployment compensation laws, and for individuals who were employed in noncovered employment.

The latest unemployment statistics indicate that we are fast approaching last year's record postwar level. January ended with 4.7 million Americans out of work.

Approximately 2.9 million of these workers are drawing some form of unemployment insurance benefits. This means that almost 2 million others have either exhausted their benefits or are not eligible for such benefits.

As of today, I have seen no evidence offered to prove that this situation is capable of self-correction. On the contrary, most facts point to an even further deterioration.

We spent a substantial period last year debating this problem. Many of us at that time believed that only a bold Federal action program could provide an effective solution.

We asked the Congress to enact a Federal unemployment insurance standards law—establishing uniform minimums for both benefits and duration. And we asked that such a program be accompanied by Federal grants of temporary uniform benefits to those who had exhausted their benefits or who were not covered by unemployment insurance.

This was not done. Instead, legislation was enacted which enabled States to borrow from the Federal Government if they wished to provide their covered unemployed with 50 percent more benefits.

Unfortunately—only 17 States did participate in this program—and 5 others established programs of extension through their own funds. The amount of relief provided was small in comparison to the needs—and we now find ourselves confronted by a level of unemployment far beyond that which we can tolerate.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the latest unemployment figures as released by the Department of Labor. This table lists only the number and percentage of the unemployed in covered employment.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Insured unemployment for week ended Feb. 14, 1959, continental United States

State	Insured unemployment							
	State and UCFE				UCX [2]	UCV [3]	Temporary programs [4]	Total (excluding railroad)
	Number	Rate (percent) [1]	Change from—					
			Last week	Year ago				
Total	2,465,444	5.9	+58,862	−664,799	68,341	28,575	347,716	2,910,076
Alabama [5]	32,607	5.6	−760	−13,703	1,551	561	8,229	42,948
Arizona [6]	9,716	4.5	+194	−2,896	327	192	436	10,671
Arkansas [5]	24,005	9.1	−151	−4,301	881	344	3,559	28,789
California [5]	230,846	6.1	+34,511	−84,997	3,934	2,250	37,063	274,093
Colorado [7]	13,778	4.0	+1,966	−3,260	404	255	777	15,214
Connecticut [7]	44,733	5.8	−75	−13,230	756	216	5,241	50,946
Delaware [5]	8,427	6.5	+577	+2,289	156	63	1,112	9,758
District of Columbia [5]	8,359	1.9	−345	−1,764	232	187	1,552	10,330
Florida [6]	29,054	3.4	+211	+1,876	554	438	2,304	32,350
Georgia	33,442	4.3	−236	−11,270	1,065	458	220	35,185
Idaho [6]	9,746	8.5	−1,086	−2,060	387	216	148	10,497
Illinois [7]	132,628	4.8	+1,391	−31,016	2,188	974	22,750	158,540
Indiana [5]	54,854	4.9	+6,933	−32,717	1,725	809	10,587	67,975
Iowa	15,528	3.5	+458	−7,380	428	180	56	16,192
Kansas	16,880	4.5	+223	−3,480	482	196	70	17,628
Kentucky [6]	36,830	7.7	−1,592	−19,808	1,461	800	2,211	41,302
Louisiana	36,668	6.1	+767	+10,077	962	414	121	38,165
Maine	18,264	9.2	−761	−3,416	585	313	156	19,318
Maryland [5]	46,239	6.2	0	+1,593	958	389	9,112	56,698
Massachusetts [5]	89,846	5.8	−1,348	−20,080	1,678	680	13,480	105,684
Michigan [5]	127,873	6.7	−4,378	−95,130	4,374	1,860	29,808	163,915
Minnesota [5]	47,081	6.8	+262	−8,004	2,460	607	6,962	57,110
Mississippi	20,721	7.8	+185	−5,712	569	291	297	21,878
Missouri	49,537	5.0	+3,493	−16,345	1,649	693	425	52,304
Montana	14,802	12.3	+542	−3,030	395	171	22	15,390
Nebraska [6]	11,054	4.9	+1,103	−1,505	307	63	36	11,460
Nevada [5]	5,959	8.2	+505	−1,462	42	31	605	6,637
New Hampshire	7,771	5.1	−91	−2,667	201	88	73	8,133
New Jersey [5]	112,716	7.2	−515	−30,096	1,866	737	24,074	139,393
New Mexico [6]	6,053	3.6	+669	−1,310	233	142	246	6,674
New York [5]	337,604	6.5	+11,504	−23,835	5,591	1,870	55,109	400,174
North Carolina	45,960	5.3	−967	−19,106	1,662	572	479	48,673
North Dakota [6]	7,777	10.7	−161	+45	644	188	159	8,668
Ohio [7]	112,458	4.3	+1,591	−89,726	4,680	1,810	25,859	144,807
Oklahoma	22,435	5.5	−367	−3,104	654	323	147	23,559
Oregon [6]	32,887	8.9	+2,238	−12,537	820	596	648	34,951
Pennsylvania [5]	279,702	8.7	−4,951	−29,902	8,822	3,165	58,288	349,977
Rhode Island [5]	18,064	7.2	+270	−8,253	367	128	3,433	21,992
South Carolina [6]	16,588	4.0	−433	−5,910	672	295	472	18,027
South Dakota	4,065	5.3	+147	−419	324	143	22	4,554
Tennessee	45,974	7.0	+25	−22,383	2,366	738	1,494	50,572
Texas [6]	65,356	3.5	+511	−104	2,276	1,163	1,958	70,753
Utah	9,523	4.9	−303	−2,554	258	103	49	9,933
Vermont	4,776	6.5	+86	−2,112	209	95	55	5,135
Virginia	27,921	3.7	+527	−5,017	936	494	384	29,735
Washington [6]	58,120	8.9	+5,177	−13,297	1,208	753	1,644	61,815
West Virginia [5]	35,838	9.3	+24	−7,546	2,262	831	8,833	47,764
Wisconsin [7]	39,039	4.5	+93	−14,062	1,655	616	6,929	48,239
Wyoming	5,340	8.1	+1,199	+817	135	74	22	5,571

[1] Based on average covered employment during the 12 months ending Mar. 1958.
[2] Ex-Servicemen's Unemployment Compensation Act of 1958 effective Oct. 27, 1958. To avoid duplication excludes claims filed jointly with other programs.
[3] Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952. To avoid duplication excludes claims filed jointly with other programs.
[4] Extended benefits to exhaustees under the State UI, UCFE, and UCV programs. As of Feb. 21, 1959, a total of 36 States had temporary programs in effect under Federal and/or State plans; all States, however, can take interstate claims for extended benefits as agent State.
[5] Federal plan for State UI, UCFE, and UCV exhaustees.
[6] Federal plan for UCFE and UCV exhaustees only.
[7] State plan for State UI and UCFE exhaustees, and Federal plan for UCV exhaustees.

Source: Office of Program Review and Analysis, Bureau of Employment Security, U. S. Department of Labor, Feb. 27, 1959.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, figures are not available, on a State-to-State basis, listing total unemployment. But the Department of Commerce's unofficial estimate of 4.7 million total unemployment is probably a conservative one.

There is only one real solution for this problem. That is the enactment of a Federal unemployment insurance standards bill. We are going to make every possible effort to insure that the bill—S. 791—introduced by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], and others, will be passsed this year.

However, we still must find some way to solve the problems that are immediately before us. The standards bill must be supplemented by Federal grants to those who have or soon will have exhausted their present unemployment eligibility or who have never enjoyed such eligibility.

The bill which we have introduced today will accomplish those ends.

It will provide a uniform 16 weeks of benefits—at the dollar amount provided by State unemployment insurance laws—to those who have exhausted their normal eligibility. It will also provide 16 weeks of benefits to those who have not been covered—at a dollar level equal to 1¼ percent of their annual earnings, up to the State maximum set by unemployment insurance laws.

Those not now covered by unemployment insurance will have to meet two criteria to be eligible under this bill. They must have earned a total of $1,000 in either of the 2 calendar years prior to their application for benefits—and have worked a total of four quarters during those 2 years.

These requirements will insure that those who have not compiled a substantial record of employment in the recent past will not burden the administering agencies in the States. I want to point out that such records are available through the social security files—and can be obtained promptly.

If we are going to provide grants from the Federal Treasury for those in covered employment, we cannot, in justice, fail to provide assistance for those who have worked in uncovered employment.

The problems faced by these workers and their families are the same that are faced by those who have exhausted their unemployment insurance eligibility. Their families still require food, housing and medical care—and the fact that they have worked for a small employer or some other employer not required to participate in an unemployment insurance program—should not be a barrier to their receiving help.

In conclusion, Mr. President, let me emphasize that this is not a dole. Each and every person who is helped by this bill will have to be ready and willing to work.

Let us not make the same mistake we made last year. It should be apparent to us now that glowing predictions about recovery do not produce recovery. It takes a reasoned plan of attack on recession to overcome it. This bill is a necessary part of such a reasoned plan.

I ask unanimous consent that this bill lie on the table for 1 day to allow other Senators to join in cosponsorship.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from Michigan.

The bill (S. 1323) to authorize temporary unemployment benefits for individuals who exhaust their benefit rights under existing unemployment compensation laws, and for individuals who were employed in noncovered employment, introduced by Mr. MCNAMARA (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

REVIEW BY INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION OF RAILROAD PASSENGER TRAIN AND FERRY DISCONTINUANCES

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, Senators BUSH, CLARK, DODD, JAVITS, KEATING, and NEUBERGER, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to provide for thorough consideration and review by the Interstate Commerce Commission of railroad passenger train and ferry discontinuances. I ask unanimous consent that the bill lie on table until end of week during which time any Senator may join as a cosponsor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will lie on the desk as requested by the Senator from New Jersey.

The bill (S. 1331) to amend the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, so as to strengthen and improve the national transportation system, insure the protection of the public interest, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. CASE of New Jersey (for himself and other Senators) was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. The wave of discontinuance notices which has flooded the Commission since the passage of last year's Transportation Act has created a critical situation. The 1958 law will allow such discontinuances to go into effect, unless the ICC, within 5 months of the time it is notified that a train or ferry will be discontinued, orders the railroad to continue the train or ferry for another year. We have grave doubts whether the Commission can adequately consider the diverse and complex issues involved in each of these cases within the time allotted.

Unless Congress acts, therefore, to amend the act, this extremely important matter affecting many thousands of railroad passengers may be determined on the basis of a hasty and incomplete consideration of all the facts.

The problem can best be approached by recalling the circumstances under which the Transportation Act of 1958 was adopted.

As stated in the reports of the Surface Transportation Subcommittee and the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, section 5 of the Transportation Act of 1958 which became section 13a of the Interstate Commerce Act was enacted in order to vest the Interstate Commerce Commission with authority to authorize in proper cases the discontinuance, curtailment, or consolidation of unprofitable railroad services and facilities burdening interstate commerce. Evidence elicited by the subcommittee tended to demonstrate that State regulatory bodies had been unduly repressive in requiring the continuation of uneconomic and unnecessary passenger services by the railroads. There was also testimony to the effect that these same regulatory bodies frequently delayed decisions for an unreasonable time. In order to correct this situation, the subcommittee and the full committee proposed to give to the Interstate Commerce Commission jurisdiction in the field of discontinuance or change of rail services similar to the jurisdiction which the Commission now has over intrastate rates under section 13 of the Interstate Commerce Act. It was thought that to do this would protect and further the broad public interest in a sound transportation system and would prevent undue importance being attached to matters of a purely local nature.

The bill which was enacted into law for these purposes has not accomplished them. Rather it has resulted in a delegation of congressional authority directly to the railroads of this country, with no effective machinery for review by any regulatory agency.

The act has been construed by the railroads as on open invitation to abandon interstate passenger service without regard to public need. Twenty-seven notices to discontinue approximately 100 trains are pending before the Commission. And railroads are threatening to discontinue additional service affecting many more thousands of passengers.

As the law is now written and interpreted by the Federal courts and the Commission, the railroads are given what amounts to full authority to remove any passenger train they desire, unless stopped by action of the ICC in the limited time provided by the act.

The experience of recent months clearly indicates the need for providing more effective review by the Commission of passenger train and ferry discontinuance. We believe our bill will accomplish what Congress sought to achieve last year and at the same time prevent the wholesale elimination of passenger service. It will do this by giving to the Interstate Commerce Commission jurisdiction over passenger train abandonments similar to the jurisdiction it now has over the abandonment of railroad lines by virtue of paragraph 18 of section 1.

Under that old section and under our new bill, before it may abandon a line or discontinue a train or ferry, a railroad is required to come to the Commission and obtain a certificate permitting it to do so. There is no 4-month time limit within which the Commission must reach a decision. And the Commission may order the line, train, or ferry continued for whatever period it deems necessary.

This can be done by the insertion of a new paragraph 19 in section 1 of the act. No railroad has ever complained about the provisions of paragraph 18, nor have they complained of the treatment received at the hands of the Commission in cases arising under that paragraph. Furthermore, section 1 is the logical section of the act in which to place passenger train abandonment provisions—abandonments of lines of railroads and discontinuance of passenger trains are identical in terms of their effect on the public, be it the riding or shipping public, the railroads and their employees. And the ICC has many years of precedents involving line abandonments on which to rely in determining passenger train abandonments. In short, we have, in paragraph 18, a logical precedent on which to pattern legislation dealing with discontinuances.

Our bill would require the railroads to apply to the ICC, if the particular States involved have not legislated regarding train discontinuances, and it gives the railroads an option to choose between the ICC and a State commission where the States have regulatory laws regarding such discontinuances. Upon the filing of an application, the Commission shall hold a hearing prior to acting upon the discontinuance application. All interested parties would be permitted to be heard at the hearing. The ordinary procedures now followed by the Commission in line abandonment cases then would be pursued with the result that each train abandonment would be fully considered by the Commission regarding its effect on the public and the railroad. The time restrictions now placed on the Commission would be eliminated, but in a normal case this would mean that the final discontinuance of the service, if such were warranted, would be postponed for only 2 or 3 months. In addition, the Commission would be empowered to impose conditions which it found the public interest required. Under the present statute the Commission has held that it has no such power.

In summary, the bill which we propose would permit the railroads to discontinue all trains which should be discontinued but will prevent the railroads from discontinuing those trains for which there is a public need. In other words, this bill will accomplish the purposes for which section 13(a) was intended but which it has not and will not achieve.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I wish to identify myself with the bill introduced by the distinguished Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE] and to comment on the action of the Interstate Commerce Commission in permitting the discontinuance of commuter service.

There are 500,000 railroad commuters in the United States, of whom 208,000 commute to New York City alone. I point out that only 100,000 commuters commute by automobile. So railroad commuter services are vital. The railroads lost $165 million on such service in 1958.

Last year I opposed that provision of the Transportation Act of 1958, which allows what I call hasty discontinuances. I hope we shall take constructive action concerning the commuter problem, which is so grave and is one of the major problems of our country as it affects metropolitan areas.

I am very glad to join with the distinguished senior Senator from New Jersey in the introduction of the bill. I believe we shall have other similar measures to suggest to Congress.

Mr. BUSH subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my remarks may be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of the remarks of the distinguished Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE] when he introduced the bill applying to the commuter railroads this morning.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Connecticut? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I am happy to join the Senator from New Jersey in sponsoring this bill. However, I wish to make it clear that in my judgment the bill will in no way really solve the problem of the commuter. It will reopen that question, which was dealt with to some extent in the 1958 act affording relief to the railroads. We hope that the introduction of this bill will focus attention upon the problem of the commuter railroads. The 1958 act did give some relief, but it was not noticeable. Certainly it was not a sufficient amount of relief or consideration for the commuters or the railroads.

What they need is one of several things, or perhaps each of several things, including reasonable rates to be charged for the service, reduced costs, or a subsidy from the States served by the commuter roads. Perhaps they need a combination of all three things.

Those railroads must not be put in a straitjacket by legislation. They must be permitted to earn a living.

In joining the Senator from New Jersey and other Senators in sponsorship of this particular bill, my purpose is to reopen the question of the commuter railroads before the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee of the Senate and before the Interstate Commerce Commission itself.

DISCLOSURE OF FINANCIAL INTEREST OF FEDERAL GOVERNMENT OFFICIALS

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill designed to promote confidence in the integrity of our governmental processes. The distinguished junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER], who has long taken a particular interest in the maintenance of high standards of public service, joins me in sponsoring the measure.

Talk of influence, charge, and counter-charge of special interest, are a commonplace in American political life. It would be naive to deny that there is occasional corruption, that there are instances of improper influence. In my own experience, however, most public officials are sincerely, and to the best of their ability, trying to carry out the responsibilities of their office. Apparently, however, human nature being what it is, it is always easier to believe the worst. Certainly, it is a fact, a tragic fact, I believe, that far too many Americans tend to look upon politicians as practitioners of a not quite respectable profession. As repeated polls show, the average American does not want his children to enter politics and, while he may be saddened, he is not surprised by stories of "fixing" and political favoritism.

This situation is, I believe, cause for serious concern. Carried far enough, this attitude can only result in a general disenchantment and cynicism that saps the validity of the democratic process. Recent French history is a case in point. For if there is any aspect of the troubled history of France since the war upon which all commentators seem agreed, it has been the contempt of the French people generally for their elected representatives.

I do not suggest we are approaching that unhappy state. But I do not think we can afford to view with complacency a situation where, for example, any and all travel by a congressional committee, however conscientious its members and worthy its purpose, tends to be automatically dismissed as a junket; where, for example, many people take it for granted that any vote can be explained in terms of the pressures, generally sinister, brought to bear on the individual legislator.

However unwarranted and unjustified—and they are in most cases—these are not uncommon attitudes.

The bill we introduce today is designed to dispel the mystery and secrecy that inevitably tends to breed such attitudes. First, it would require full disclosure of the financial interests of all top officials in the Federal Government, Senators, and Congressman, as well as the top people in the executive branch and in the independent agencies.

Second, the bill would require that all communications in regard to a pending case, whether by letter or by word of mouth, to a regulatory or semi-judicial agency be made part of the public record in the case.

Two other provisions would require, first, itemized expense accounts for all travel by members or staff of congressional committees, the accounts to be published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and, second, the establishment of a Commission on Legislative Standards to study and make recommendations concerning problems of conflicts of interest confronting Members of Congress as well as their relations with executive and other agencies. This would include such matters as that of disqualification from voting on particular items, and the often difficult determination of the line between adequate representation of constituent interest and attempted influence.

The basic notion behind the bill is not new. It is simply that disclosure of the facts offers the most effective way of dealing with this kind of problem. Rather than attempting to police what is inherently unpoliceable, my proposal would put the facts on the record where the people can make their own decisions.

The mere fact that Members of Congress and Federal employees would be required to report gifts and outside income would, I believe, serve as a brake on both those who would influence and those who would be influenced. When an individual realizes that a gift, for example, will be a matter of public record, he is likely to give additional consideration to the propriety of the gift.

The bill is similar to one I introduced in the last session. Following its introduction I received many letters. The number of people who took the time to write was gratifying indeed. But many of the letters contained a disturbing note. Their general import was that while the writers heartily approved this kind of approach they could not believe that it could or would be adopted. The implication is, of course, that Members of Congress cannot afford to expose their financial interests or activities to public view.

To my mind this kind of reaction only confirms the need for some such measure as we propose.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1332) to promote public confidence in the integrity of Congress and the executive branch, introduced by Mr. CASE of New Jersey (for himself and Mr. NEUBERGER) was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

FREE IMPORTATIONS OF CERTAIN RELIGIOUS ARTICLES

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to provide for the temporary free entry of religious sceneramas and other articles imported for exhibition by religious societies or institutions. This is the identical bill that was passed by the House of Representatives during the last session of Congress. It was sent to the Senate, but was not reported out of committee in the few days—9—left before Congress adjourned.

The need for this bill came to my attention when I learned that the Sisters of Notre Dame in Rochester, N.Y., were charged duty on religious objects borrowed from their Motherhouse in Canada. The articles, consisting of several posters and small statutes, were used in a Mission Scenerama at the Rochester War Memorial to illustrate firsthand the meaning of "Catholic Action Around the World."

Under present customs regulations, these articles are not specifically exempted from duty payments. Therefore, the Sisters were forced to pay the rate charged on all imported goods consisting chiefly of wood. This is, of course, unjust. It seems obvious to me that material used strictly for and by religious groups, without profit to anyone, should be free from duty when brought into the United States. This bill will eliminate this serious shortcoming in the present tariff laws.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1333) to provide for the temporary free entry of religious sceneramas and other articles imported for exhibition by religious societies or institutions, introduced by Mr. KEATING, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

PROPOSED LEGISLATION RELATING TO SMALL BUSINESS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, one of the many outstanding accomplishments of the 85th Congress was the legislation enacted on behalf of small business. I refer to the Small Business Investment Act, the Small Business Administration being made a permanent agency, and the small business tax relief measures. I need not, at this time, recite all the reasons why this legislation was so badly needed. It is sufficient for the moment to point out that small business failures climbed last year to the highest total in 25 years. Surely this is reason enough for the Congress to correct some of the imbalance in our economic system.

What may be easily overlooked in this entire matter is the importance of the very fact that legislation on behalf of small business was actually passed. The action of the 85th Congress in passing such legislation indicates a growing awareness of the fact that economic, social, and political forces have combined in recent years with increased momentum to create competitive handicaps to small business which are artificial to the extent that they are traceable to size alone. The removal of these artificial barriers is necessary not only for the continued growth and development of the small business community, but also to preserve a truly free enterprise economic system.

We have, indeed, made a good start in removing these artificial barriers. It is my earnest expectation and, I am certain, the most fervent hope and desire of every person who is concerned with the welfare of the Nation's 4 million small enterprises that this Congress continue the constructive program it began last year.

I am happy to report that already a number of bills designed to aid small, independent businessmen have been introduced. I am proud to have joined in five of these as cosponsor with the distinguished Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN].

I refer specifically to S. 59, a bill to provide a program of tax adjustments for small business by allowing a deduction for additional investment in depreciable assets, inventory, and accounts receivable; S. 725, a bill to amend the Clayton Act to permit the institution of actions for damages for violations of the Robinson-Patman Act; S. 1009, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, so as to encourage the establishment of voluntary retirement plans by individuals; S. 1010, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, so as to permit the use of the new methods and rates of depreciation for used property; and S. 1011, a bill to designate judicial precedents which shall be binding in the administration and enforcement of the internal revenue laws.

Today, I introduce seven bills which also are aimed toward making it more possible for business success to depend upon an individual's judgment and ability, by his relative efficiency, and not by his size, or power of prestige in his field of enterprise. These measures are:

First, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, so as to impose a graduated tax on the taxable income of corporations.

This bill would substitute graduated rates for the present normal and surtax rates applicable to corporate income. It is drawn in such a fashion as to bring the maximum benefit to those who need it most, the smallest corporations.

The present law imposes a normal tax rate of 30 percent on the first $25,000 of corporate net income and a surtax of 22 percent for a total statutory rate of 52 percent on all net income over that amount. The bill which I have introduced today would substitute the following rates:

If the taxable income is:	The tax is:
Not over $10,000	20 percent of the taxable income.
Over $10,000 but not over $25,000	$2,000, plus 25 percent of excess over $10,000.
Over $25,000 but not over $50,000	$5,750, plus 35 percent of excess over $25,000.
Over $50,000 but not over $100,000	$14,500, plus 45 percent of excess over $50,000.
Over $100,000	$37,000, plus 52 percent of excess over $100,000.

I am sure my colleagues will be interested in a comparison of this bill and the present law, and I am therefore requesting that there be printed in the RECORD at this point, a table showing the tax yields at various taxable income levels ranging from $10,000 to $10 million, together with data showing the amount and percent of change in corporate income tax payments that would result from this bill.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TABLE 1

Taxable income	Present rate (percent)	Proposed rate (percent)	Present tax liability	Proposed tax liability	Change	
					Amount	Percent
$10,000	30.0	20.0	$3,000	$2,000	−$1,000	33⅓
$15,000	30.0	21.66	4,500	3,250	−1,250	27.77
$20,000	30.0	22.5	6,000	4,500	−1,500	25.0
$25,000	30.0	23.0	7,500	5,750	−1,750	23.33
$50,000	41.0	29.0	20,500	14,500	−6,000	29.26
$100,000	46.5	37.0	46,500	37,000	−9,500	20.43

TABLE 1—Continued

Taxable income	Present rate (percent)	Proposed rate (percent)	Present tax liability	Proposed tax liability	Change	
					Amount	Percent
$250,000	49.8	46.0	124,500	115,000	−9,500	7.63
$500,000	50.9	49.0	254,000	245,000	−9,500	3.73
$1,000,000	51.4	50.5	514,500	505,000	−9,500	1.84
$5,000,000	51.9	51.7	2,594,500	2,585,000	−9,500	.36
$10,000,000	51.95	51.84	5,194,500,000	5,184,500	−9,500	.18

Mr. HUMPHREY. I said at the outset of my remarks, Mr. President, that this bill is designed to bring the maximum benefit to those who need it most, the smallest corporations. I believe the table which I have just introduced will establish this point. Corporations with taxable net incomes up to $10,000 would make the greatest rate of savings in the taxes they pay under the present law, viz, 33⅓ percent. I should like to point out additionally that these same corporations constitute upward of 60 percent of the total number of corporations.

At this time, therefore, I request that a second table which includes data supplied by the Internal Revenue Service with respect to Statistics of Corporate Incomes for 1956, the latest year available, be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TABLE 2

Taxable income	Number of returns	Percent of total
Under $10,000	340,285	−60.79
$10,000 under $15,000	48,643	8.69
$15,000 under $20,000	33,027	5.9
$20,000 under $25,000	31,916	5.7
$25,000 under $50,000	51,058	9.12
$50,000 under $100,000	23,735	4.24
$100,000 under $250,000	16,510	2.94
$250,000 under $500,000	6,486	1.15
$500,000 under $1,000,000	3,515	.62
$1,000,000 under $5,000,000	3,409	.60
$5,000,000 under $10,000,000	548	.09
$10,000,000 and over	578	.10

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, these tables I have presented conclusively demonstrate that the smaller corporations get the greatest benefit from this graduated income tax bill. Current financing practice and the broad welfare of our economic system make this imminently necessary.

Current financing practice has forced the small concern to rely on its retained earnings as the principal source for its working capital, thus restricting its growth potential. This is the story told me by businessman after businessman. It is substantiated by sound economic research.

A few years ago, Profs. John Lintner and J. Keith Butters, of Harvard University, found that in the period 1925–29 retained earnings financed about 75 percent of the net physical expansion—including inventories—of U.S. nonfinancial corporations; for the period 1947–50 the proportion increased to 80 percent; and in the 3 years 1953–55 it rose further to 87 percent.

High corporate taxes restrict in particular the growth of small companies, which are at a disadvantage as compared to the larger corporations in obtaining outside capital on satisfactory terms. The small corporations must rely heavily on retained earnings for growth and development.

Clouding the entire small business problem is the strong merger movement that has invaded our economy in recent years. It has even become advantageous for large corporations to absorb their smaller competitors who have suffered losses in order to take advantage of the tax savings through loss carryovers.

One final observation: The American wage earner has a special stake in this bill, inasmuch as the job security and an improving standard of living for thousands and thousands of wage earners depend on the prosperity, growth, and expansion of small business. Over 98 percent of all manufacturing firms in this country employ less than 500 employees. This is a common definition of small business applied by the Small Business Administration. Bureau of the Census figures reveal that 54.8 percent of all persons employed in manufacturing are employed in such small concerns.

Mr. President, in my opinion, and this is based on many years of close study of the problems of American small business, this bill for a graduated corporate income tax gives promise of bringing meaningful relief to an important segment of the American small business community and, at the same time, of serving to strengthen the economic and social fiber of our entire free enterprise system.

It should be noted, Mr. President, that the Democratic Party in its platform as adopted at the 1956 Chicago convention advocated a graduated corporate income tax.

My second and third bills today are closely related. The second bill prohibits the waiver of private enforcement rights under the antitrust laws; the third bill declares private antitrust suits to be impressed with a substantial public interest. Both of these bills have developed as a result of the public hearings held jointly last year by the Subcommittee on Retailing, Distribution, and Fair Trade Practices and the Subcommittee on Monopoly of the Small Business Committee. They are identical to S. 4234 and S. 4233 which I introduced in the last session.

Mr. President, our committees discovered that it is common practice in certain industries for major suppliers to require their lessee and contract dealers to waive their legal rights to sue for damages resulting from their suppliers' antitrust violations. Despite the universal recognition of the rule that statutory rights may not be waived where to do so would be against public policy, it was discovered during the hearings that there may be some question as to the applicability of this rule to the waiver of private enforcement rights under the antitrust laws. My second bill is introduced in order to remove all doubt as to congressional intent in this matter.

The third bill introduced here is focused on a slightly broader scope. It is directed toward the whole role of private antitrust enforcement in protecting small business.

Briefly, let me state that the right of private parties to sue for treble damage redress of business injuries resulting from trade restraints and other monopolistic practices first found statutory expression in section 7 of the Sherman Act. By allowing injured parties to recover costs of suit, plus three times the amount of the damage done, Congress hoped to give businessmen a strong incentive to become copartners, in effect, with the Government in antitrust enforcement. The procedures established reflected a logical uniting of self-interest with public policy.

After a quarter century of experience, however, it became clear that private enforcement of the Sherman Act was falling far short of expectations held for it. Therefore, in 1914, the Congress passed the Clayton Act and the Federal Trade Commission Act. Congress reaffirmed the right of private suit and, to make it an effective instrument, proclaimed that a final judgment or decree rendered in a criminal antitrust prosecution against a defendant shall be prima facie evidence against that defendant in a private suit. But, and this is important, the Congress declared this was not to apply to consent judgments or decrees.

Little did the framers of this section—section 5—of the Clayton Act realize that in certain periods to come the Department of Justice would be settling the heavy majority of its antitrust cases by means of consent judgments, thus vitiating the purposes of section 5 of the act. Justice Department records for 1957, for instance, reveal that the Antitrust Division terminated by consent judgment 83 percent of all antitrust cases instituted. By contrast, between 1935 and 1955, only 70 percent of the Government's civil cases ended by negotiated settlements. The necessary result is that private litigants are being increasingly deprived of section 5's benefits and antitrust violators are getting away with minor punishment.

My third bill, therefore, is aimed at restoring private antitrust enforcement to its intended role as a copartner with the Federal Government by declaring once and for all that private antitrust suits are impressed with a substantial public interest.

My fourth bill would require publication of the terms of antitrust judgments and orders in the Federal Register, 30 days before such judgment or order is to become final. The purpose is to give the general public an opportunity to lodge objections to the proposed judgment or order with the Justice Department or the Federal Trade Commission. This bill will also enable the general public to put a brake on the light punishments so often meted out to antitrust violators.

Fifth is a bill prohibiting loss leader sales. This bill would amend both the Sherman Act and the Clayton Act by making it unlawful for a retailer to sell any commodity at less than his delivered cost. As defined in the bill, the term "delivered cost" means invoice cost, less discounts, and includes all transportation costs and applicable taxes. Enforcement of the bill's provisions would lie with private parties and would be undertaken by any person damaged by a loss leader practice which affects interstate commerce.

I should like to point out that this is identical to S. 3851 which I introduced last year and is the same bill which was introduced in 1952 when Congress was considering the legislation which was to become the McGuire Act.

Sixth is a bill to amend section 2 of the Robinson-Patman Act to prohibit sales in commerce at unreasonably low prices where the effect may be to injure competition. This is identical to S. 3852 which I introduced last year. It is intended to be a civil counterpart to the somewhat similar provision now found in the criminal prohibitions of section 3 of the Robinson-Patman Act. The need for such protection against predatory pricing practices has long been recognized.

Seventh, a bill to provide for disaster loans to small business concerns which suffer economic injury due to condemnation proceedings under federally aided highway construction programs. This bill is similar to one which I introduced last year, S. 3434.

The State highway commissioner of the State of Minnesota, Mr. L. P. Zimmerman, has expressed to me his concern that many small businesses which are forced to move as the result of highway programs have no loan program which would assist them in making the change-over to a new place of business.

Last year there was a very interesting article in the Washington Star, which estimated that perhaps as many as 50,000 American businesses may be forced out of their current sites in the next few years because of the tremendous amount of redevelopment and highway construction scheduled.

My proposal addresses itself solely to condemnation proceedings of small businesses as a result of federally aided highway construction programs. Clearly this is a Federal undertaking and a Federal responsibility.

The Small Business Act now provides a program of disaster loans at very low interest to business firms which suffer economic hardship as a result of floods, droughts, and other natural catastrophies. These loans are to be made either by the Small Business Administration directly, or in cooperation with private lending institutions, at 3 percent interest payable within 20 years. It seems to me, Mr. President, that the disastrous effect on many small businessmen who are forced to move is no less complete than a disaster suffered as a result of natural causes. It is in my opinion only equitable there be set up a program to provide such small businessmen with disaster loans to enable them to make the transition over to a new place of business.

It will be argued that in condemnation proceedings there is a constitutional guarantee of just compensation. I am informed, however, that very often business property in particular is undervalued. The courts seldom permit appraisers to take into consideration such items as loss of goodwill, costs of moving the business to a new location, or loss of profits occasioned by the move. It is for this reason that I think my proposal should be enacted.

The support for this proposal which I have received from numerous small businessmen has been most heartening. I wish to quote from one typical letter:

> In regard to your recently introduced bill enabling a person put out of business by coming tide of new highways, I am faced with having to move for the third time since 1936 on this account, and I think your bill will do more for a smooth transforming of business and help for a person faced with this problem than anything else that could be devised.

In view of the scope of the Federal Interstate Highway program which is now under way, this is a problem which is going to be of increasing importance. I believe that now is the time to enact legislation to ease the difficulties of countless businessmen in making the move to new locations.

Mr. President, I introduce these small business bills in the firm belief that the independent businessman is a prime cause and not merely a product of America's economic greatness and strength. It is the energy, ingenuity, competitive challenge of our Nation's 4 million small businessmen which stimulates the timely arrival of a variety of new and better products. Moreover, it is our small entrepreneurs, who, by their number and diversity and independence of action, constitute the most effective safeguard against the creation of corporate giantism and monopoly. So long as small businessmen remain numerous, healthy, and prosperous, our economy will continue free and competitive and, thus, a fount of opportunity for all.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bills will be received and appropriately referred.

The bills, introduced by Mr. HUMPHREY, were received, read twice by their titles, and referred, as indicated:

To the Committee on Finance:

S. 1334. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to impose a graduated tax on the taxable income of corporations.

To the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. 1335. A bill to amend section 4B of the Clayton Act;

S. 1336. A bill to amend the Clayton Act to declare private antitrust suits to be impressed with a substantial public interest;

S. 1337. A bill to provide for the publication before entry of decrees, judgments, and orders entered by consent upon the merits of civil antitrust proceeding;

By Mr. HUMPHREY (for himself, Mr. CLARK, Mr. LONG, and Mr. MORSE):

S. 1338. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to supplement existing laws against unlawful restraints and monopolies, and for other purposes," approved October 15, 1914, and to amend the act entitled "An act to protect trade and commerce against unlawful restraints and monopolies," approved July 2, 1890, for the purpose of prohibiting loss leader sales; and

By Mr. HUMPHREY (for himself, Mr. LONG, and Mr. MORSE):

S. 1339. A bill to amend the Clayton Act to prohibit sales in commerce at unreasonably low prices where the effect may be to injure competition.

To the Committee on Banking and Currency:

S. 1340. A bill to provide for disaster loans to small business concerns which suffer economic injury due to federally aided highway construction programs.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bills be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objections, the bills were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 1334

A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to impose a graduated tax on the taxable income of corporations

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That subsections (a), (b), and (c) of section 11 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to tax on corporations) are amended to read as follows:

"(a) CORPORATIONS IN GENERAL.—A tax is hereby imposed for each taxable year on the taxable income of every corporation. The tax shall be computed under subsection (b) in the case of a taxable year beginning before January 1, 1959, and under subsection (c) in the case of a taxable year beginning after December 31, 1958.

"(b) TAXABLE YEARS BEGINNING BEFORE JANUARY 1, 1959.—In the case of a taxable year beginning before January 1, 1959, the tax shall consist of—

"(1) a normal tax equal to 30 percent of the taxable income, and

"(2) a surtax equal to 22 percent of the amount by which the taxable income (computed without regard to the deduction, if any, provided in section 242 for partially tax-exempt interest) exceed $25,000.

"(c) TAXABLE YEARS BEGINNING AFTER DECEMBER 31, 1958.—In the case of a taxable year beginning after December 31, 1958, the tax shall be determined in accordance with the following table:

"If the taxable income is:	The tax is:
Not over $10,000	20 percent of the taxable income.
Over $10,000 but not over $25,000.	$2,000, plus 25 percent of excess over $10,000.
Over $25,000 but not over $50,000.	$5,750, plus 35 percent of excess over $25,000.
Over $50,000 but not over $100,000.	$14,500, plus 45 percent of excess over $50,000.
Over $100,000	$37,000, plus 52 percent of excess over $100,000."

SEC. 2. (a) Section 12(7) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (cross references relating to tax on corporations) is amended by striking out "section 11(c)" and inserting in lieu thereof "section 11(b)(2)".

(b) Section 244(2)(B) of such Code (relating to dividends received on certain preferred stock) is amended to read as follows:

"(B) the denominator of which is that percentage which equals—

"(i) the sum of the normal tax rate and the surtax rate prescribed by section 11, in the case of a taxable year beginning before January 1, 1959, or

"(ii) the tax rate prescribed by section 11 (determined as though the amount of such tax were expressed entirely in terms of

a percentage of taxable income), in the case of a taxable year beginning after December 31, 1958."

(c) Section 247(a)(2)(B) of such Code (relating to dividends paid on certain preferred stock of public utilities) is amended to read as follows:

"(B) the denominator of which is that percentage which equals—

"(i) the sum of the normal tax rate and the surtax rate prescribed by section 11, in the case of a taxable year beginning before January 1, 1959, or

"(ii) the tax rate prescribed by section 11 (determined as though the amount of such tax were expressed entirely in terms of a percentage of taxable income), in the case of a taxable year beginning after December 31, 1958."

(d) Section 511(a)(1) of such Code (relating to imposition of tax on unrelated business income of charitable, and so forth, organizations) is amended by striking out "a normal tax and a surtax" and inserting in lieu thereof "a tax".

(e) (1) Sections 802(a) and 802(c)(2)(A) of such Code (relating to imposition of tax on life insurance companies) are amended by striking out "a normal tax (computed under section 11(b)) and a surtax (computed under section 11(c))" and inserting in lieu thereof "a tax (computed under section 11)".

(2) Section 811(a) of such Code (relating to imposition of tax on life insurance companies) is amended to read as follows:

"(a) TAX IMPOSED.—A tax (computed under section 11) is hereby imposed, on the life insurance company taxable income of every life insurance company, for each taxable year beginning after December 31, 1958."

(f) Section 852(b)(1) of such Code (relating to taxation of regulated investment companies and their shareholders) is amended (1) by striking out "Normal Tax and Surtax" in the heading and inserting in lieu thereof "Tax", (2) by striking out "a normal tax and surtax" ind inserting in lieu thereof "a tax", and (3) by striking out "the normal tax under section 11" and inserting in lieu thereof "the tax under section 11 (but only the normal tax under such section in the case of a taxable year beginning before January 1, 1959)".

(g) Section 922(2)(B) of such Code (relating to special deduction for Western Hemisphere trade corporations) is amended to read as follows:

"(B) the denominator of which is that percentage which equals—

"(i) the sum of the normal tax rate and the surtax rate prescribed by section 11, in the case of a taxable year beginning before January 1, 1959, or

"(ii) the tax rate prescribed by section 11 (determined as though the amount of such tax were expressed entirely in terms of a percentage of taxable income), in the case of a taxable year beginning after December 31, 1958."

(h) Section 1361(h)(1) of such Code (relating to imposition of taxes on unincorporated business enterprises electing to be treated as domestic corporations) is amended by striking out "the normal tax and surtax" and inserting in lieu thereof "the tax".

(i) Section 1503(a) of such Code (relating to computation and payment of tax on consolidated returns) is amended (1) by striking out "tax imposed under section 11(c)" and inserting in lieu thereof "surtax imposed under section 11", and (2) by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: "For purposes of the first sentence of this subsection, the term 'surtax imposed by section 11' means (1) the tax imposed by section 11(b)(2), in the case of a taxable year beginning before January 1, 1959, and (2) that portion of the tax imposed by section 11(c) which is attributable to consolidated taxable income exceeding $25,000, in the case of a taxable year beginning after December 31, 1958."

(j) Section 1551 of such Code (relating to disallowance of surtax exemption and accumulated earnings credit) is amended by striking out "provided in section 11(c)" and inserting in lieu thereof "provided (in the case of a taxable year beginning before January 1, 1959) in section 11(b)(2)."

SEC. 3. The amendments made by this Act shall apply only with respect to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1958.

S. 1335

A bill to amend section 4B of the Clayton Act

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 4B of the Act entitled "An Act to supplement existing laws against unlawful restraints and monopolies, and for other purposes", approved October 15, 1914 (38 Stat. 730, as amended; 15 U.S.C. 15b), is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 4B. Notwithstanding any provision contained in any contract, agreement, or conveyance, any action arising under section 4 or section 4A may be commenced at any time within four years after the accrual of the cause of action upon which such action is based. Any such action shall be forever barred unless commenced within four years after the cause of action accrued. No cause of action barred under existing law on the effective date of this section as originally enacted shall be revived by the enactment of this section."

S. 1336

A bill to amend the Clayton Act to declare private antitrust suits to be impressed with a substantial public interest

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) section 4 of the Act entitled "An Act to supplement existing laws against unlawful restraints and monopolies, and for other purposes", approved October 15, 1914 (38 Stat. 731; 15 U.S.C. 15), is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: "Each such suit shall be deemed to be impressed with a substantial public interest."

(b) Section 16 of such Act (15 U.S.C. 26) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: "Each such suit shall be deemed to be impressed with a substantial public interest."

S. 1337

A bill to provide for the publication before entry of decrees, judgments, and orders entered by consent upon the merits of civil antitrust proceedings

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 4 of the Act entitled "An Act to protect trade and commerce against unlawful restraints and monopolies", approved July 2, 1890 (26 Stat. 209; 15 U.S.C. 4), is amended by—

(1) inserting, immediately after the section number "SEC. 4.", the subsection designation "(a)"; and

(2) adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(b) In any action instituted under this section, no proposed decree, judgment, or order for the final determination of such action upon its merits as to any defendant may be entered by consent of such defendant, without adjudication by the court as to the merits of the action with respect to such defendant, unless the full text of such proposed decree, judgment, or order has been published by the Attorney General in the Federal Register not less than thirty days before the date of entry of such decree, judgment, or order."

SEC. 2. (a) Section 15 of the Act entitled "An Act to supplement existing laws against unlawful restraints and monopolies, and for other purposes", approved October 15, 1914 (38 Stat. 736; 15 U.S.C. 25), is amended by—

(1) inserting, immediately after the section number "SEC. 15." the subsection designation "(a)"; and

(2) adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(b) In any action instituted under this section, no proposed decree, judgment, or order for the final determination of such action upon its merits as to any defendant may be entered by consent of such defendant, without an adjudication by the court as to the merits of the action with respect to such defendant, unless the full text of such proposed decree, judgment, or order has been published by the Attorney General in the Federal Register not less than thirty days before the date of entry of such decree, judgment, or order."

(b) Section 11 of such Act (15 U.S.C. 21) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"In any proceeding before a board or commission against any person for the enforcement of any provision of this Act or the Federal Trade Commission Act, no proposed order for the determination of such proceeding upon its merits as to such person may be entered by consent of such person, without an adjudication by the board or commission upon the merits of the proceeding with respect to such person, unless the full text of such proposed order has been published by the board or commission in the Federal Register not less than thirty days before the date of entry of such order."

S. 1338

A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to supplement existing laws against unlawful restraints and monopolies, and for other purposes," approved October 15, 1914, and to amend the act entitled "An act to protect trade and commerce against unlawful restraints and monopolies, and for other purposes, approved July 2, 1890, for the purpose of prohibiting loss leader sales

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Act entitled "An Act to supplement existing laws against unlawful restraints and monopolies, and for other purposes", approved October 15, 1914, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"SEC. 27. (a) For the purposes of this section—

"(1) The term 'delivered cost' shall mean invoice cost to a seller less the value of discounts received by a seller in money or the equivalent, plus the cost of transportation incident to delivery to the seller, and plus applicable excise and sales taxes to the seller.

"(2) The term 'seller' shall mean a vendee, as used in this Act, who purchases for resale.

"(3) The term 'loss leader practice' shall mean selling a commodity, or advertising or offering a commodity for sale at retail at a price below the delivered cost of the commodity to the seller except that it does not include any of the following sales, or any advertisement or offer in connection therewith:

"(A) Any sale of a commodity for the bona fide purpose of discontinuing dealing in such commodity or of discontinuing the seller's business, when plain notice of that fact is given to the public.

"(B) Any sale of a commodity which is substantially damaged or deteriorated in quality if plain notice of the fact is given to the public.

"(C) Any sale by an officer acting under on order of court.

"(D) Any sale to any association organized and operated exclusively for religious, charitable, scientific, literary, or educational purposes, or for the prevention of cruelty to children or animals, no part of the net earnings of which inures to the benefit of any private shareholder or individual.

"(E) Any sale of a perishable commodity if further retention of the commodity by the seller could reasonably be expected to result in a loss to the seller.

"(F) Any sale which reasonable business practices require the seller to make in order to liquidate an inventory of a commodity to avoid insolvency or bankruptcy.

"(G) Any seasonal clearance sale made in accordance with customary business practices in order to dispose of excess inventory.

"(b) Any loss leader practice which affects commerce is hereby declared to be unlawful and actionable at the suit of any person damaged thereby.

"(c) (1) Any person injured in his business or property by any loss leader practice hereby declared to be unlawful may sue therefor in any district court of the United States, as provided in section 4 of this Act, or in any State court of competent jurisdiction, and recover threefold the damages by him sustained, and the costs of suit, including a reasonable attorney's fee. Any person threatened with injury by any loss leader practice shall be entitled to injunctive relief against such threatened injury in any court of the United States, as provided in section 16 of this Act, or to sue for and have such relief in any State court of competent jurisdiction when and under the same conditions and principles as injunctive relief against threatened conduct that will cause loss or damage is granted by courts of equity in that State, under the rules governing such proceedings, and upon the execution of proper bond against damages for an injunction improvidently granted and a showing that the danger of irreparable loss or damage is immediate, a preliminary injunction may issue.

"(2) Section 15 of this Act (providing for suits by United States district attorneys to restrain violations of this Act) shall not apply with respect to any loss leader practice."

"(d) (1) Nothing contained herein or in any of the Antitrust Acts shall render illegal any contract or agreement prohibiting a seller from reselling at a price below his delivered cost, any commodity which bears, or the label or container of which bears, the trade-mark, brand, or name of the producer or distributor of such commodity and which is in free and open competition with commodities of the same general class produced or distributed by others, when contracts or agreements prescribing minimum prices are lawful under any statute, law, or public policy now or hereafter in effect in any State, Territory, or the District of Columbia, in which such resale is to be made, or to which the commodity is to be transported for such resale, or for delivery to a vendee pursuant to a sale.

"(2) Nothing contained herein or in any of the Antitrust Acts shall render illegal the exercise or enforcement of any right or right of action created by any statute, law, or public policy now or hereafter in effect in any State, Territory, or the District of Columbia, which provides in substance that willfully and knowingly advertising, offering for sale, or selling any commodity at less than the minimum prices prescribed in any such contract or agreement whether the person so advertising, offering for sale, or selling is or is not a party to such contract or agreement, is unfair competition and is actionable at the suit of any person damaged thereby: *Provided, however,* That the rights or right of action created by or under such contracts and agreements shall not apply where the minimum price prescribed in such contract is higher than the delivered cost to the seller: *And provided further,* That the rights or right of action created by or under such contracts and agreements shall not apply to any of the following sales, or advertisement or offer in connection therewith:

"(A) Any sale of a commodity for the bona fide purpose of discontinuing dealing in such commodity or of discontinuing the seller's business, when plain notice of that fact is given to the public.

"(B) Any sale of a commodity which is substantially damaged or deteriorated in quality if plain notice of the fact is given to the public.

"(C) Any sale by an officer acting under an order of court.

"(D) Any sale to any association organized and operated exclusively for religious, charitable, scientific, literary, or educational purposes, or for the prevention of cruelty to children or animals, no part of the net earnings of which inures to the benefit of any private shareholder or individual.

"(E) Any sale of a perishable commodity if further retention of the commodity by the seller could reasonably be expected to result in a loss to the seller.

"(F) Any sale which reasonable business practices require the seller to make in order to liquidate an inventory of a commodity to avoid insolvency or bankruptcy.

"(G) Any seasonal clearance sale made in accordance with customary business practices in order to dispose of excess inventory."

SEC. 2. That section 1 of the Act entitled "An Act to protect trade and commerce against unlawful restraints and monopolies," approved July 2, 1890, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"SECTION 1. Every contract, combination in the form of trust or otherwise, or conspiracy, in restraint of trade or commerce among the several States, or with foreign nations, is hereby declared to be illegal. Every person who shall make any such contract or engage in any such combination or conspiracy, shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor, and, on conviction thereof, shall be punished by fine not exceeding $5,000, or by imprisonment not exceeding one year, or by both punishments, in the discretion of the court."

S. 1339

A bill to amend the Clayton Act to prohibit sales in commerce at unreasonably low prices where the effect may be to injure competition

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 2 of the Act entitled "An Act to supplement existing laws against unlawful restraints and monopolies, and for other purposes", approved October 15, 1914 (38 Stat. 730, as amended; 15 U.S.C. 13), is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(g) It shall be unlawful for any person engaged in commerce, in the course of such commerce, to sell or contract to sell goods at unreasonably low prices if the effect of any such sale at any such price may be to destroy competition or to eliminate a competitor."

S. 1340

A bill to provide for disaster loans to small business concerns which suffer economic injury to federally aided highway construction programs

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 8(b)(1) of the Small Business Act is amended by inserting before the word "floods" the words "condemnation proceedings under federally aided highway construction programs, or because of".

IMPROVEMENT OF PROGRAM TO COMBAT JUVENILE DELINQUENCY

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to strengthen and improve State and local programs to combat and control juvenile delinquency and youth crime, with a portion of the costs to be shared with the States.

The emergency, 5-year program set up by the measure entitled "The Juvenile Delinquency Control Act" has three primary objectives:

First. To assist States in the establishment and operation of major juvenile delinquency control programs, $2 million in Federal funds will be made available the first year and $5 million annually for the remaining 4 years to States whose plans have been approved by the Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, with no allocations to exceed two-thirds of the amount spent by States on such projects;

Second. To encourage the research, development, and demonstration of new techniques in dealing with behavioral problems of children and youth crime, Federal grants totaling $500,000 for the first year but not to exceed $2 million annually for the remainder of the program may be made to share project costs with States, municipalities, and public and other nonprofit institutions of higher learning or research; and

Third. To promote the training of personnel to staff programs for the control and treatment of juvenile delinquency, Federal moneys identical with the sums listed under (2) will be used to pay part of the cost incurred by the States and public and nonprofit institutions.

The legislation would also create within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare a Federal Advisory Council on Juvenile Delinquency, and at the State level State advisory councils would be set up; in each instance their membership would include public officials directly dealing with youth problems in addition to professional experts and community leaders who are experienced in the fields of welfare, education, health, vocational rehabilitation, and police and court procedures as they concern juvenile delinquency.

An all-out, coordinated national attack against juvenile delinquency is about the only way we are going to stem the alarming increase in youth crime now approaching emergency proportions in some rural as well as urban areas. In a preliminary report just released by the FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover reveals what he terms an appalling 8-percent rise in U.S. crime in 1958 with even steeper rises noted in smaller and medium-sized cities than in larger metropolitan areas. The most ominous figure in the report, however, is the statistic showing nearly a 7-percent increase in arrests of youths under 18 in 1958, which marks the sixth consecutive year that figure has gone up.

There seems little hope that any significant improvements will be noted

when a more detailed breakdown is released. In 1957, persons under 18 accounted for more than one-fourth of all arrests for robbery, over half the arrests for larceny and burglary, and nearly 70 percent of those for auto thefts. Since 1952, the juvenile population in the United States has increased about 22 percent, but juvenile arrests have shot up 55 percent; at this rate, a million youngsters may be arrested by the year 1961, if not sooner.

Some cities have already issued a crime report for 1958. The other day the New York State Commissioner of Corrections revealed that juvenile arrests in New York City last year increased 18.3 percent as compared with 1957.

In the face of these grim statistics, Congress should not postpone a major Federal juvenile delinquency program. At present a minor job of the Children's Bureau in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare is to supply technical assistance to States in the amount of about $200,000 annually as salaries for professionals who advise on State and local delinquency and youth plans and activities. Certainly, the 5-year effort provided for in this "Juvenile Delinquency Control Act" which limits Federal expenditures to a maximum of $39 million in all is the minimal program which should be undertaken at this time and will have no material impact on the budget in any one year.

This program I am proposing is in substance the one called for by the President's budget for the fiscal year of 1958, and supported by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and the Department of Justice. In general, its provisions would realize the Federal legislative goals in the field of juvenile delinquency supported by the American Municipal Association in its 1959 National Municipal Policy Statement.

Juvenile delinquency has been diagnosed as a critical social disease which makes itself most keenly felt when it flares up into sensational headlines reporting a grave youth crime, sometimes even murder. However, despite public consciousness of the chronic nature of this disease and the activities of voluntary and public agencies to stamp out the sources of infection and to rehabilitate youthful offenders where it is already too late to prevent their delinquency, they need more financial help if we are to stop losing ground, as we now are, in the fight to combat and control it.

Probing studies including one by the New York State Temporary Commission on Youth and Delinquency reveal that the well-known factors contributing to the upsurge in youthful offenders like lack of organized recreation, substandard housing and low economic status are often secondary to primary causes like broken homes, personality maladjustments, too little help for borderline delinquents and inadequate rehabilitation of youngsters following their apprehension.

The broad-scale offensive envisioned for the legislation I introduced today will enable each State to launch a coordinated attack on all phases of juvenile delinquency, with special concentration on experimentation, demonstration projects in problem areas and training personnel including psychiatrists, psychologists, and social caseworkers in the new methods of prevention, control, and aftercare. All this can be accomplished in partnership with the Federal Government which will provide $3 million the first year and $9 million for each of the last 4 years to help combat youth crime at the grassroots level.

The Federal Advisory Council on Juvenile Delinquency established by the act would be of invaluable aid in furnishing overall supervision of the nationally launched program. It could compile and make available data on new developments and inform local authorities on job needs and opportunities for youth.

Temporary patchwork improvement of existing methods and agencies are no substitute for Federal legislation to support and intensify State and local efforts through public and voluntary organizations to combat juvenile delinquency. We must affirm that it is an integral part of our national policy to prevent the sapping of our manpower resources attributable to juvenile delinquency and youth crimes for we are dealing here with our most precious resource, our youth, to whom we will entrust the future of our country and, in a very real sense, the future of the free world.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1341) to strengthen and improve State and local programs to combat and control juvenile delinquency, introduced by Mr. JAVITS, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

FEDERAL LIMITED PROFIT MORTGAGE CORPORATION

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, and the distinguished senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], I introduce a bill to establish a Federal Limited Profit Mortgage Corporation which could issue tax-exempt bonds up to a maximum of $2 billion after the first year of operation for the purpose of directly aiding in the construction of 150,000 housing units for lower and middle income families.

This bill, the Federal Limited Profit Mortgage Corporation Act, would establish a new housing program on the Federal level, which is intended, without substantial cost to the Federal Treasury, to fill part of the most shocking gap in the entire national housing picture—the needs of those families whose income is too high for low-rent subsidized public housing but is substantially below the levels which unassisted private enterprise is able to meet.

Basically, the concept for this national middle income housing program was pioneered in New York State where the States limited profit housing program, twice approved by referendum, will build about 25,000 units in the next 5 years with monthly rents or carrying charges of between $20 and $25 per room per month. This has been achieved by making available to private enterprise assistance in terms of lower interest rates and amortization payments, limitation of builders' and investors' profits, and other assistance. It was established and has been carried forward on a nonpolitical, bi-partisan basis and has received commendation from all parts of the Nation.

The one principal distinction between the proposed Federal program and that in the State is that the latter utilizes direct State loans, while the proposed program will be financed through the issuance of bonds with guarantees similar to FHA, without requiring direct loans from the Treasury. The Corporation which this act establishes, would be authorized to issue tax-exempt bonds, $500 million at its inception and up to $1,500 million after 1 year at the President's discretion. Its funds are lent to private rental builders and cooperatives who meet the act's requirements at the rate at which the Corporation secured the funds plus one-half percent, in the form of 50- year, 90-percent mortgages, with the remaining 10 percent supplied as an investment or downpayment.

In order to be eligible for loans under the program, builders would have to meet the all-important requirement that profits be limited to 6 percent, and that the Corporation approve rents and carrying charges to keep them within the limits which the program is intended to meet.

This new program should prove a significant stimulus for increased State and local government activity at little or no cost to them, for it would also give preference to housing which is granted some local tax assistance, aid in the assembling of land, and the use of urban renewal sites.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a section by section analysis of the bill be printed at this point in the RECORD, and that the bill be appropriately referred.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the analysis will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1342) to create a Federal Limited Profit Mortgage Corporation to assist in the provision of housing for moderate income families and for elderly persons, introduced by Mr. JAVITS (for himself and Mr. CLARK) was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

The analysis presented by Mr. JAVITS is as follows:

SECTION-BY-SECTION ANALYSIS OF "FEDERAL LIMITED PROFIT MORTGAGE CORPORATION" ACT

Section 1. Statement of congressional findings: This section reiterates the national housing policy of the Housing Act of 1949, that governmental assistance shall be utilized where feasible to enable private enterprise to serve more of the total housing need, and determines that there is a need for a supplementary system of financing to permit private enterprise to meet the needs of families of moderate income and elderly persons. It also makes a determination that State and local governments can give assistance in certain areas without substantial

cost to themselves, and encourages such further help to carry out the purposes of this act.

Section 2. Statement of purposes: The purposes are set out in self-explanatory manner—to make financial assistance available to eligible borrowers for the provision of housing for those groups which neither private nor public programs now in existence have been able to serve.

Section 3. A Federal Limited Profit Mortgage Corporation is created, with all the corporate powers of the usual Government-owned corporation.

Section 4. The corporation is run by a board of five directors, the chairman of which is the Housing and Home Finance Administrator, and the members of which are officers or employees of the agency. It also elects a president, who is the actual operating head of the corporation. In addition, an advisory committee of seven members is created, which represents the building industry, local governments, and others whose experience can help the board and president in the implementation of the program.

Section 5. The Corporation is authorized to issue capital stock in the amount of $100 million, or such smaller amounts as are required. This represents the only contribution to the Corporation out of the Treasury, and represents an investment receiving preferred dividends; it is the working capital of the Corporation to get it into business. This section also provides that, on liquidation, the Treasury shall receive any profits which the Corporation has made.

Section 6. The Corporation is authorized to make mortgage loans to private rental or cooperative mortgagors, who meet the following requirements: that the proposed project will meet a need for housing of families of moderate income or elderly persons, that it will be economically sound and of economical design, that the borrower has agreed to bar excessive fees and salaries, to establish rents at a level which can meet the intended needs and reflect the savings which the provisions of the act create, and, in the case of borrowers other than nonprofit corporations, that it agrees to limit dividends to 6 percent. The mortgage loan is not to exceed 90 percent of the project's development cost and not to be for more than 50 years (with an emergency extension provision to 60 years), and cost certification is required. The loan is made at the rate at which the Corporation secured its funds, plus one-half of 1 percent, which is for administrative costs plus the creation of reserves. [It has been shown in New York that this amount is sufficient for these purposes.

Section 7. The Corporation is authorized to issue bonds in the amount of $500 million, and, after its first year, additional amounts up to $1,500 million with the approval of the President. Such obligations are obligations of the Corporation and not of the United States; however, in case the Corporation (not any individual borrower) defaults, which is very unlikely, then it will exchange its bonds for debentures guaranteed by the Treasury, similarly to the FHA approach, but carrying a more realistic rate—that of the defaulted bonds.

Section 8. This section establishes a reserve fund, to be built up from half of the premium charged the borrowers.

Section 9. This section provides that priority shall be given to applications with respect to which the State or locality has also given some additional assistance as specified in the statement of purposes.

Section 10. Definitions.

Section 11. Technical amendments of other acts.

Section 12. This section makes the debentures and bonds of the Corporation exempt from taxation, in the same manner as bonds and obligations of public authorities under the low rent program. The interest saving to be secured through this exemption is one of the major factors contributing toward the purposes of this program. The exemption goes only to the Government Corporation, not to the borrower.

Section 13. The Davis-Bacon Act is applied to construction under this program.

Section 14. Penalties are imposed on false applications, false advertising, forgery, etc.

AMENDMENT OF AGRICULTURAL ACT OF 1949, RELATING TO PRICE SUPPORTS FOR OATS, RYE, BARLEY, AND GRAIN SORGHUMS

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I introduce for reference to the appropriate committee a bill to amend section 105(b) of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, relating to price supports for oats, rye, barley, and grain sorghums.

Mr. President, on this bill I am joined by Senators CHAVEZ, CARLSON, KERR, HUMPHREY, MANSFIELD, and MURRAY.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill lie on the desk for 2 days in order that other Senators who so desire may join in cosponsorship of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will lie on the desk for 2 days, as requested by the Senator from Texas.

The bill (S. 1343) to amend section 105(b) of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, relating to price support for oats, rye, barley, and grain sorghums, introduced by Mr. YARBOROUGH (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, the purpose of this amendment is to secure equitable treatment of feed grain farmers under our present farm price support program. Under the Agriculture Act of 1949, as administered by Secretary of Agriculture Ezra Taft Benson, there has been unfair discrimination against the feed grain producers. The amendment which I propose does not provide for any serious or far-reaching change of the existing law. It simply directs Secretary Benson to administer the program as the Congress contemplated it would be administered under the original act. Certainly, it was not the intention of the Senate or the House that our price support program would be used to the detriment of one group of farmers.

There has been unfair discrimination against the feed grain producer.

The Secretary of Agriculture raised unallotted corn 16 cents a hundred and lowered unallotted grain sorghum 31 cents a hundred on the national average. This will glut the corn market and will ruin the feed grain producers this year and the corn producers next year. The grain sorghum producers have met in emergency sessions during the past 10 days in Texas, Oklahoma, New Mexico, and Kansas, and have strongly urged the congressional delegations of all these States to tie grain sorghum to the corn support in direct relation to its feed value to corn. These producers have asked the congressional delegations for urgent and immediate aid to secure relief. Many of these producers advise us that the program outlined by Secretary Benson would call for a reduction in prices that would be below the cost of production. If the Secretary persists in his current course, it will force many tenant farmers to abandon their farms. The current program of the Secretary of Agriculture would reduce prices to a level equivalent to the lowest level since 1942. In view of other increased operating costs on farms, this would cause great loss in the farm communities. I am advised that the producers in the Panhandle section of Texas alone would suffer a loss of $38 million.

In connection with some of these crops, it would appear that it might have saved the Government money to have kept the support level somewhere near the 1958 level. For example, in the case of soybeans, it would appear that the acreage would be cut now for the new support level has been announced in favor of planting more corn, to be supported at $1.12 per bushel. This will just pair up with corn, and at the same time will cut back soybeans which we know how to dispose of domestically and overseas.

We have a good market for soybean meal. The price is actually higher this year than last year, in spite of the fact that we have been producing the beans at a record level.

A sizable delegation of congressional representatives met with Secretary Benson last Friday to explore alternative solutions under the present statutes. The Secretary advised the delegation that he would not proceed further under the present law to correct this inequity. Consequently, this amendment is offered to remedy this inequitable plight of the feed grain producers in the various States who are in urgent and immediate need of remedial legislation.

The bulk of our grain sorghum production comes from sections of the country of less rainfall than the average, where producers have little or no choice as to what they plant.

Because of the production restrictions imposed by nature and the production restrictions imposed by law, the sponsors of this bill, and I hope a great majority of the Members of the Senate will see that it is unfair to further penalize the feed grain farmers.

This bill is needed to save farmers of the feed grain area from economic disaster.

WORK HOURS ACT OF 1959

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE], the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] and the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY] I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to establish standards for hours of work and overtime pay of mechanics employed on work done under contract for, or with the financial aid of, the United States, for any

Territory, or for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1344) to establish standards for hours of work and overtime pay of mechanics employed on work done under contract for, or with the financial aid of, the United States, for any Territory, or for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. COOPER for himself and other Senators was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an explanation of the bill.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT AND EXPLANATION OF PROPOSED WORK HOURS ACT OF 1959

The purpose of this bill is to clarify the heretofore piece-meal legislation detailing the circumstances under which daily overtime may be worked on Federal contracts that require the employment of laborers and mechanics and to modernize that legislation. I am referring to the 8-hour laws.

The bill has three major objectives. They are:

First, to replace the uncoordinated and confusing series of laws presently existing with a single statute. This statute would make clear such things as the fact that there exists a right of action by laborers and mechanics protected by the 8-hour laws for the overtime pay required by those laws. The existence of such a right of action is not clear under the present construction of the 8-hour laws by the courts. It will also provide the Comptroller General of the United States with express authority to disburse contract funds withheld for violations of the 8-hour laws to the laborers and mechanics found underpaid. The Comptroller General has declined to make such disbursements in the absence of this authority.

Second, to provide for weekly as well as daily overtime payments for work performed on projects subject to the bill. The straight-time workweek would be one of 40 hours. Payment at not less than time and one-half would be required for hours worked in excess of 40. This is similar to the overtime provisions of the wage and hour law, the application of which depends on whether or not the work of the employees involved is connected with interstate commerce. Under the present 8-hour laws, it is possible for a contractor to work his employees 56 hours a week without paying 1 cent of overtime in those situations where the wage and hour law is not applicable.

Third, to require the payment of overtime not only on direct Government contracts, as now provided by the 8-hour laws, but also to those Federally financed and assisted contracts which require the payment of minimum wages determined by the Secretary of Labor. This proposal is designed to carry out the recommendations of the President for the strengthening of the 8-hour laws, as noted in his 1958 Economic Report and in his 1958 budget message. The Congress has already taken a step in this direction by requiring the payment of daily and weekly overtime compensation to construction under the Federal Civil Defense Act as amended by Public Law 85-606 during the last Congress.

EQUAL PAY WITHOUT DISCRIMINATION ON ACCOUNT OF SEX IN INTERSTATE EMPLOYMENT

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, for myself and my colleagues Mr. CASE of New Jersey, Mr. JAVITS, and Mr. PROUTY, I introduce a bill to prohibit discrimination on account of sex in interstate employment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1345) to prohibit discrimination on account of sex in the payment of wages by employers having employees engaged in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce, and to provide procedures for assisting employees in collecting wages lost by reason of such discrimination, introduced by Mr. COOPER (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement in explanation of the bill which I have just introduced.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT IN EXPLANATION OF A BILL TO PROVIDE EQUAL PAY WITHOUT DISCRIMINATION ON ACCOUNT OF SEX IN INTERSTATE EMPLOYMENT

This proposal is designed to provide a means within the scope of the Federal regulatory power to eliminate discrimination in wage rates based on sex where men and women are performing comparable work for the same employer. It is a part of the legislative program of the Department of Labor.

The proposal would apply to employers whose employees are engaged in commerce or in the production of goods for interstate commerce. The administration of the act would be vested in the Secretary of Labor and procedures of enforcement and wage collection authorized similar to those now utilized by the Department of Labor in the administration of the Fair Labor Standards Act.

The payment of lower wage rates to workers of one sex for the same or comparable work as that performed by the other sex has an undesirable effect on the economic life of the entire Nation. Such practices tend to affect adversely the general purchasing power and the standards of living of workers. Unfair competitive advantages are enjoyed by employers who pay discriminatory wage rates based on sex. In addition to the tangible economic ills caused by discriminatory wage practices, such practices violate fundamental principles of justice and impair the prestige of the United States in international affairs.

A nondiscriminatory wage level makes possible the maximum utilization of worker skills. This, together with collateral benefits, such as morale improvement, may stimulate production and lessen the effects of unfair competition.

It is of great importance that Congress eradicate discriminatory pay practices in interstate commerce.

EQUAL PAY PROPOSAL—SECTION-BY-SECTION ANALYSIS

Section 1, title of act: Establishes short title of "Federal Equal Pay Act."

Section 2, finding and declaration of policy: Enumerates undesirable conditions in interstate commerce resulting from payment of wage differentials based on sex and intention of Congress to correct such conditions.

Section 3, prohibition of wage rate differential based on sex: Prohibits employers having employees engaged in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce from discriminating, on the basis of sex, in payment of wages in any place of employment in which their employees are so engaged. The language descriptive of proposed coverage and the supporting definitions in section 10 are phrased to make available precedents established under the Fair Labor Standards Act in determining coverage under the proposed legislation.

Section 4, administration: Authorizes the Secretary of Labor to issue rules and regulations, make investigations regarding compliance with the act, issue subpenas, and restrain violations. These provisions are largely adapted from similar provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act.

Section 5, wage restitution and liquidated damages: Provides that employers who violate the act shall be liable for wages of which an employee is deprived and for not more than an additional equal amount as liquidated damages. The liability in employee suits for unpaid wages and liquidated damages is like that now provided by the Fair Labor Standards Act, as modified by section 11 of the Portal-to-Portal Act.

Section 6, enforcement: Authorizes employee suits to recover amount of employer liability under section 5. Authorizes Secretary to supervise payment of wages withheld in violation of the act and to bring suits for such wages in behalf of employees upon their request. The recovery of unpaid wages, but not liquidated damages, is authorized in suits by the Secretary of Labor or by administrative action in supervising employer payments. Establishes a 2-year period of limitation for commencing recovery action after cause accrues.

Section 7, posting: Requires employer to post copy of act or official poster explaining its provisions in each place of employment where act applies.

Section 8, unlawful discharge or discrimination and penalties: Makes it unlawful to discharge or discriminate against any employee assisting in the enforcement of the act. Upon a second conviction for such discharge or discrimination, imposes a criminal penalty. Provides that the United States district courts will have jurisdiction of criminal proceedings for violation of this section.

Section 9, injunction proceedings: Provides that the U.S. district courts will have jurisdiction to restrain violations of the act or regulations issued under it.

Section 10, definitions: Defines terms used in the act principally as defined in the Fair Labor Standards Act.

Section 11, appropriation: Authorizes necessary appropriations to carry out act.

Section 12, effective date: Provides that act will take effect 120 days after passage.

ELECTION OF PRESIDENT AND VICE PRESIDENT—PROPOSED CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing for the election of President and Vice President.

It is identical with the so-called Lodge-Gossett amendment which was agreed to by the Senate in 1950 by vote of 64 to 27. Unfortunately, the proposed amendment failed to pass in the House of Representatives.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 72) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing for the election of President and Vice President, introduced by Mr. Kefauver, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. KEFAUVER. The purpose of the proposed amendment would be to abolish the unit-rule system of counting electoral votes in favor of a method whereby the President and Vice President are elected by taking the popular vote cast for a given candidate and establishing the proportion which that vote bears to the total vote cast and the number of electoral votes available to a given State.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a very brief analysis of the proposed legislation which is contained in Senate Report No. 594 of the 82d Congress.

There being no objection, the analysis was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ANALYSIS OF THE PROPOSED CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT

1. It abolishes entirely the office of presidential elector. The electoral vote per State (equal to the total number of Senators and Representatives, as under the existing system) is retained—but purely as an automatic counting device.

2. It eliminates the possibility of an election being determined by the House of Representatives solely and permits the determination of an election for President or Vice President by both the Senate and House of Representatives only in the event the electoral vote of any single candidate does not total 40 percent of the whole number of electoral votes.

3. It does away with the so-called unit-rule system of counting electoral votes. Under the existing system, the candidate receiving a plurality of the popular vote in any given State is credited with all the electoral votes of that State, regardless of how infinitesimal the plurality. Under the proposed system, the electoral votes in each State are automatically divided among the candidates in direct proportion to the popular vote.

Example: A State has 12 electoral votes. Of the 2,400,000 popular votes cast in that State, R, the Republican, received 1,600,000. D, the Democrat, received 600,000. T, the third party candidate, received 200,000. Under the present system, all of the State's 12 electoral votes would go to R. Under the proposed system, the electoral vote would be divided in proportion to the popular vote as follows: 8 electoral votes for R; 3 electoral votes for D; and 1 electoral vote for T.

The electoral votes which each candidate receives therefor represent his proportional strength in the State. These votes are then taken and added to the electoral votes received in all the other States. The candidate having the greatest number of electoral votes wins the presidency unless no candidate receives 40 percent of the whole number of electoral votes, in which event 1 of the 2 persons having the 2 highest numbers of electoral votes for President will be elected by the Senate and the House of Representatives assembled in joint session.

In order to be elected, however it is necessary that 1 of these 2 persons receive a majority of the votes of the combined authorized membership of the Senate and the House of Representatives.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, nearly 10 years have passed since this proposal failed of adoption in the House of Representatives. It is my hope that the legislation can be approved again by the Senate promptly and sent to the House for its reconsideration. The reform contained in this amendment is long overdue, and it is my hope that the present House of Representatives will look upon it with considerably more favor than the House during the 81st Congress.

INVITATION TO HOLD 1964 OLYMPIC GAMES AT DETROIT, MICH.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a joint resolution, the purpose of which is to have the Government of the United States invite the International Olympic Committee to hold the 1964 Olympic games in Detroit.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 73) extending an invitation to the International Olympic Committee to hold the 1964 games at Detroit, Mich., introduced by Mr. HART, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

ACQUISITION OF ADDITIONAL FOOD COMMODITIES FOR DISTRIBUTION TO NEEDY PERSONS—AMENDMENT

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia (for himself and Mr. RANDOLPH) submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to the bill (S. 653) to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to acquire additional food commodities for distribution to needy persons, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and ordered to be printed.

CHANGES OF REFERENCE

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Armed Services be discharged from further consideration of S. 723 and S. 911, and that these bills be referred to the Committee on Finance.

S. 723 would amend title 38 of the United States Code, which is the codification of veterans benefits, and relates to the amounts that would be payable under the Servicemen's Indemnity Act, which was considered in the Finance Committee. For these reasons I ask this change of reference.

S. 911 relates to the circumstances under which a former member of the armed services may be paid a pension by the Veterans' Administration, and this fact appears to place the bill within the jurisdiction of the Finance Committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Armed Services be discharged from further consideration of Senate bill 1165. This bill relates to the so-called dual compensation provision in the Economy Act of 1932. The Committee on Armed Services has never exercised jurisdiction over the dual compensation and dual employment statutes, since the impact of any changes in them is on civilian employment. For this reason I ask that S. 1165 be re-referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXTENSION OF GI BENEFITS FOR EDUCATIONAL PURPOSES—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT] may be added as an additional cosponsor of the bill (S. 270) to extend the educational benefits of the Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952 until such time as existing laws authorizing compulsory military service cease to be effective, introduced by me on January 14, 1959.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CLARIFICATION OF PARAGRAPH 4, SECTION 15, PAY READJUSTMENT ACT OF 1942—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILL

Under authority of the order of the Senate of March 2, 1959, the names of Senators MANSFIELD and BEALL were added as additional cosponsors of the bill (S. 1209) to clarify paragraph 4 of section 15 of the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942 (56 Stat. 368), introduced by Mr. SPARKMAN. (for himself, Mr. JACKSON, and Mr. KEFAUVER), on March 2, 1959.

AMENDMENT OF EMPLOYMENT ACT OF 1946, RELATING TO PRODUCTIVE CAPITAL INVESTMENTS—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILL

Under authority of the order of the Senate of March 2, 1959, the names of Senators NEUBERGER, MAGNUSON, GRUENING, and HART were added as additional cosponsors of the bill (S. 1244) to amend the Employment Act of 1946 to establish policies with respect to productive capital investments of the Government, introduced by Mr. MORSE (for himself, Mr. PROXMIRE, and Mr. BARTLETT), on March 2, 1959.

FEDERAL RESPONSIBILITY TOWARD INDIANS—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF CONCURRENT RESOLUTION

Under authority of the order of the Senate of March 2, 1959, the names of Senators MANSFIELD, CHAVEZ, MCCARTHY, GRUENING, CHURCH, DOUGLAS, and GOLDWATER were added as additional cosponsors of the concurrent resolution (S.

Con. Res. 12) to restate Federal responsibility toward Indians and the Federal Government's relation with Indian tribes or groups, submitted by Mr. MURRAY (for himself and Mr. NEUBERGER) on March 2, 1959.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. JOHNSON of Texas:

Address, "The Place of Government in Agriculture," delivered by Hon. HAROLD D. COOLEY, chairman of the House Committee on Agriculture, before the National Farm Institute, at Des Moines, Iowa, on February 21, 1959.

By Mr. DODD:

Address entitled "Needed Leadership for Our Economy," delivered by Senator SYMINGTON at the Democratic victory dinner, at Clarksburg, W. Va., on March 7, 1959.

By Mr. ENGLE:

Statement by him before Subcommittee on Territories and Insular Affairs regarding Hawaiian statehood, February 25, 1959.

By Mr. MUNDT:

Weekly newsletter by him and column entitled "Here's How To Give the People What They Want Without Increasing Taxes," written by Elmer Roessner and published by the McClure Newspaper Syndicate, February 17, 1959.

NECESSITY FOR NEW TAXES

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, we receive numerous letters in which we are asked, "What are you fellows doing there in Washington?"

Let me point out that at this session more than 7,000 bills have been introduced—6,000 in the House of Representatives and 1,300 in the Senate. Only a small handful of them are major measures of broad national interest.

A rough count indicates that almost one-fourth of the total would confer special benefits upon such important numbers of voters as the 2.3 million Federal civilian employees, the 2.5 million in the military services, the 12-plus million beneficiaries of social security, or the 22.7 million veterans. In no case, Mr. President, are any offsetting new taxes proposed.

Another large segment proposes direct tax relief for individuals or corporations by permitting them new or larger deductions for certain expenses, by increasing exemptions, by lowering rates, or by cutting excises.

A third, very large group embraces spending bills of all types and sizes. These range from the pet measures of individual Members of Congress for local projects to authorizations or appropriations for vast undertakings, the cost of which would ultimately run into the high billions of dollars.

However, Mr. President, higher taxes are the only honest answer to the fiscal dangers posed by new spending programs. Mr. President, in my humble opinion we must see to it that such programs are met in that way.

Labor's demands on the economy put consumers at a growing disadvantage. Wage demands that force price levels up are self-defeating. Pressures for more deficit-financed welfare programs further undermine the value of the dollar. The long-term effect is to diminish not only the value of the currency, but also the value of the workingman's labor.

Mr. President, I bring these matters to the attention of the Senate because we are going off in all directions except the right one—namely, to see to it that, if we are going to spend, we raise the necessary funds by appropriate taxes.

NECESSITY OF MAINTAINING READY COMBAT UNITS OF THE ARMY AND THE MARINE CORPS

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, from the President and from congressional leaders we have had splendid expressions regarding the Berlin crisis, assuring our complete unity. I heartily applaud and fully concur in those sentiments.

But is this unity to include the continued dismantling of our ready combat units of the Army and the Marine Corps? I think not. In view of the Berlin situation, certainly it should not.

Current reductions in these fighting units must be reversed. Not a single day should be lost. Furthermore, not one day should be lost in rebuilding those units to their 1958 strength or above.

Quite briefly, let me refer to congressional action for the current fiscal year 1959 as to our ready combat troop strength.

In acting on the defense appropriation bills for the current fiscal year, the Congress provided the funds required to keep the Army at a strength of 900,000, and the Marine Corps at a strength of 200,000, although the executive branch contemplated reducing the strength of the Army to 870,000 and the strength of the Marine Corps to 175,000.

The amount of money involved is slightly more than $99 million for the Army, and slightly more than $45 million for the Marine Corps.

The intent of the Congress was made crystal clear in the conference report on the defense appropriation bill, which states:

> It is the belief of the committee of conference that the national defense requires the maintenance of a Regular Army of not less than 900,000, and it is the intent that planned strength for fiscal year 1959 be maintained at that level in accordance with the funds provided.

Similarly, the conference report contains the following statement with reference to the strength of the Marine Corps:

> As with the strength of the Regular Army, it is the belief of the committee of conference that the national defense requires that the Marine Corps be maintained at a strength of not less than 200,000, and it is the intent that the planned strength for fiscal year 1959 be maintained at that level in accordance with the funds provided.

Nevertheless, the Department of Defense is proceeding to reduce the strength of the Army and the Marine Corps below the levels intended by Congress.

Earlier this year, when Department of Defense officials appeared before the Committee on Armed Services, the committee pressed an inquiry into how the Army and the Marine Corps would absorb these reductions. Frankly, I had expected the absorption to be made in noncombat troops areas. But the testimony is that this cannot be done.

The reduction in the Army is being absorbed by eliminating one of the divisions of STRAC, an acronym composed of the initial letters of the motto of the Army's Strategic Striking Force: "Strong, tough, ready around-the-clock." The impact of this, Mr. President, is appalling. This is a mobile, combat-ready force consisting of both ground forces and paratroops designed to meet the initial—I repeat, the initial—requirements of limited war, or to provide the initial reinforcements in the event of general war. When asked about the possibility of absorbing this reduction in noncombat troops, the Army officials indicated that for several years the Army strength has been diminishing, and that all units have been combed to try to accomplish the reductions without affecting the combat capability. They testified it was impossible to absorb the 30,000 reduction in manpower without losing a STRAC division.

For the Marine Corps, the reduction means that in each of its three divisions the Marine Corps must disband two battalion landing teams. This means a total loss of 6 of 27 such landing teams in existence before the reduction.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 1 additional minute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President this dismantling policy must be reversed. To fail to reverse it now will be tragic error.

Within the last 8 months we have had the Lebanon crisis. We are now facing the crisis in Berlin. The situation there grows more serious by the hour. Solemn treaties obligate us to more than 40 different nations around the globe, should those nations be placed in jeopardy. Trouble still brews in Formosa and Korea. Many other similar obligations bind us to respond in some degree in other potential trouble spots.

Furthermore, this is a step which would require no great outlay of additional appropriations. Ninety-nine million dollars for the Army and $45 million for the Marine Corps for the current fiscal year have already been appropriated. I am convinced that a reevaluation of various phases of our military program, including travel expenses, point defenses, and related matters, would allow the saving of virtually the same amount in the 1960 budget.

Can we afford to actually liquidate existing combat units already trained and already on a standby alert for instant action, the very units we are most likely to need within the next few years?

Mr. President, I plead for adequate strength where strength is needed. Let

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

us have unity. But in this instance we must have unity of action.

I urge responsible officials to reconsider. We cannot delay any longer. Combat strength already lost must be retrieved.

Now, and for several years to come, offensive ground strength is one of our greatest deterrents.

This loss of manpower, especially in view of the relatively small sum involved, is indefensible. It may prove fatal.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to consider executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. YOUNG of Ohio, in the chair) laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, from the Committee on Armed Services, I report favorably the nominations of two admirals and four vice admirals in the Navy; two generals, one lieutenant general, six major generals, and nine brigadier generals in the Army, and two generals in the Air Force. I ask that these nominations be printed on the Executive Calendar.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The nominations will be placed on the Executive Calendar.

The nominations are as follows:

Lt. Gen. Samuel E. Anderson, 92A (major general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force, to be assigned to positions of importance and responsibility designated by the President, in the rank of general;

Gen. Edwin W. Rawlings, 95A (major general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force, to be placed on the retired list in the grade of general;

Brig. Gen. Isaac Sewell Morriss, and sundry other officers, for temporary appointment in the Army of the United States;

Gen. Henry Irving Hodes, Army of the United States (major general, U.S. Army), to be placed on the retired list in the grade of general;

Lt. Gen. Clyde Davis Eddleman, Army of the United States (major general, U.S. Army), to be assigned to a position of importance and responsibility designated by the President, in the rank of general;

Maj. Gen. Paul DeWitt Adams, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army), to be assigned to a position of importance and responsibility designated by the President, in the rank of lieutenant general;

Vice Adm. Robert L. Dennison, U.S. Navy, for appointment to the grade of admiral while serving for commands and other duties determined by the President;

Vice Adm. George C. Towner, Vice Adm. Hyman G. Rickover, and Rear Adm. William R. Smedberg III, U.S. Navy, for appointment as vice admirals for commands and other duties determined by the President;

Adm. James L. Holloway, Jr., U.S. Navy, for appointment to the grade of admiral on the retired list; and

Adm. Byron H. Hanlon, U.S. Navy, for appointment to the grade of vice admiral, on the retired list.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further reports of committees, the nominations on the calendar will be stated.

FEDERAL AVIATION AGENCY—NOMINATION PASSED OVER

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Elwood R. Quesada, of California, to be Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency, which nomination had previously been passed over.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, by request, I ask that the nomination go over. I am informed that we shall be ready to act on the nomination some time in the middle of the week. But the Senator who is interested in this matter is not present at the moment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection being heard, the nomination will go over.

INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION ADMINISTRATION

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of James W. Riddleberger, of Virginia, to be Director of the International Cooperation Administration, in the Department of State.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Rollin D. Barnard, of Colorado, to be an Assistant Postmaster General.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask that that nomination go over. I have received from a Member of the Senate an objection to it. I understand that the Senator desires to confer with the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The nomination will go over.

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Diplomatic and Foreign Service.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask that these nominations be considered en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations will be considered en bloc; and, without objection, they are confirmed.

POSTMASTERS

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations for postmasters.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask that these nominations be considered en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection the nominations will be considered en bloc; and, without objection, they are confirmed.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask that the President be notified immediately of the nominations today confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM—EASTER RECESS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I should like to make a brief announcement for the information of the Senate. Last week the policy committee met and carefully considered the bills I shall enumerate which have been reported or are about to be reported to the Senate. It is the hope of the leadership that all these bills can be considered before the Senate recesses for Easter. That will depend on committee action.

The policy committee, however, has authorized the leadership to motion up, with the approval of a majority of the Senate, the following bills, and I should like to have all Senators on notice that these bills may be motioned up:

Calendar No. 73, S. 1096, authorizing an appropriation to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

I am informed that bill will be brought up by motion later today, after Senators have concluded their statements, and will be handled on the floor by the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS]. That is an authorization bill, involving some $48 million. Calendar No. 75, S. 50, the Hawaiian statehood bill.

We anticipate that we may get to that bill in the latter part of this week, perhaps Thursday. I am informed by several Senators there will be some discussion of the bill. I would not anticipate a vote before the early part of next week. If action on the bill could be completed this week, well and good, but I do not anticipate it will be. Monday is a bad day for a vote. Next Tuesday is St. Patrick's Day. Several Senators will be away. It may be that the earliest day we can complete it will be Wednesday.

We expect to have the draft bill precede the Hawaiian statehood bill. That bill is being marked up, I am informed. The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] is present.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, the bill is in the process of being prepared for reporting. The chairman stated he understood it would be on the calendar and ready to debate on Wednesday.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The hearings are available. The reports will be printed today. The committee has already reported the bill. Senators who may desire to read the report will have ample opportunity to do so. If it is

agreeable with the minority leader, we shall attempt to work out an arrangement to take up the draft bill on Wednesday, and follow it with the Hawaiian statehood bill.

The next is Calendar No. 76, S. 726, amending section 2 of the Clayton Act.

I will give the Senator from Illinois a list of these bills.

Calendar No. 52, S. 12, the educational television bill.

I have already mentioned the bill on extension of the draft.

Senate bill 722, the area redevelopment bill. I am informed the committee anticipates it will report that bill this week, but it will take a few days for the minority members to file their views, so I do not anticipate it will be called up until after the Hawaiian bill, which will be later next week.

S. 465 or S. 562, the juvenile court bill.

S. 643, relating to the collection of taxes in the District of Columbia.

S. 644, providing for the taking of a school census in the District.

S. 645, amending the Removal of Dangerous Buildings Act in the District of Columbia.

S. 745, amending the Condemnation of Unsanitary Buildings Act.

S. 4245, the life insurance tax bill.

That is a very important bill. It involves millions of dollars in revenue. I am informed the House has completed hearings, and will have the bill ready by the 16th or 17th. Shortly thereafter it will be reported. Senators interested in it will want to keep up with the hearings as they become available, at least in part. If possible, we would like to act on that bill before Easter. If it is not ready by that time, it will have to go over.

S. 1094, the International Monetary Fund and World Bank bill.

That bill is being heard by the Committee on Foreign Relations. We do not know when it will be reported, but it has a very high priority.

S. 747, relating to surplus property in Illinois.

I have to get some details on that bill from the Senator from Illinois, but I trust it is not too controversial.

S. 422, requiring prenotification of mergers.

That is an important bill, from the Committee on the Judiciary. It had been reported by the subcommittee, and the full committee sent it back for other action, but the committee expects to report the bill before Easter.

S. 505 is the labor reform bill, the Kennedy-Ervin bill.

I am informed it is hoped amendments can be considered in the committee this week, and that a report will be made by the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare at the earliest date possible.

I am not sure I have mentioned Senate Joint Resolution 41, the International Medical Research Institute bill.

I am informed the only thing holding that bill up is the testimony of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. It is anticipated he will testify in the middle of the week. We hope to get as early action on that bill as possible.

S. 226, the railroad retirement bill, has been reported by a subcommittee and will shortly be acted upon, by the full committee, I am informed.

I hear the House anticipates it will recess on the Thursday before Good Friday, be in recess the following week, and resume its duties on the following Monday. That will give Members of Congress about 10 days to visit among their constituents or attend to any other business they care to transact.

The minority leader and I have not been able to agree on those dates as yet, because we want to see how much of this proposed legislation we can get through. But we are both hopeful we can adopt a resolution that will concur in the House action. If it is at all possible, we are going to do so. We are working to that end.

Mr. President, I have a brief statement on another subject——

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Yes.

Mr. LANGER. I have received a great many letters about when the farm bill is to be brought up for consideration. Does the majority leader have any information at all on the farm bill?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I have asked the members of the committee to give thorough and prompt consideration to the farm bill, but I do not think it is in a stage now so we can predict accurately when it will be reached for consideration.

I will say that once a farm bill is reported, it will take the highest priority, and we will try to get it up for consideration as early as possible. As a result of the inquiry of the Senator, I will make appropriate inquiries of the committee members.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Am I to assume there will be a session of the Senate every day this week?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I am not sure about tomorrow. The draft bill is ready, but we would like to have Members of the Senate go over the report. I do not think it is too controversial. I may ask the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] if there was a divided vote in committee.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. No, Mr. President; it was a unanimous report. The report and the hearings will be ready by Wednesday, I am informed.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I am not sure about tomorrow. We will know about that a little later today.

Mr. President, I am informed that the majority leader of the House has said the House Easter recess will be from the Thursday before Good Friday until a week after the following Tuesday, instead of coming back on a Monday.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. If I have any time remaining, I yield to the Senator from Alaska.

Mr. BARTLETT. I merely wanted to ask the distinguished majority leader if he will indicate at this early date whether the Senate will be in session on March 17. Many of us who are Irishmen have engagements out of town on that day.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I will confer with the Senator about that matter. We had no plans not to be in session, but I am always interested in accommodating the Irish.

WHO GETS GOVERNMENT SUBSIDIES?

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota is recognized.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, in recent months there has been far more than the usual amount of criticism of farm programs and their costs. In almost every magazine or newspaper one will find news items condemning farm subsidies and farm programs.

The costs of farm programs have increased sharply, and unnecessarily so. Farm legislation which would do more to help farmers receive fair prices than the present program does, and at much less cost, could and should be written.

However, the costs are far less than most news stories would indicate. Unfortunately, a true picture of the budget is not presented in most of these stories. This is understandable, since the Secretary of Agriculture does little himself to present an accurate picture to the public.

Because of this adverse publicity, most people believe that farmers are being highly subsidized. This has tended to create suspicion, distrust, and discord between farm and nonfarm people.

If this condition is permitted to continue, there will be a wide and bitter rift between farmers and their always good friends in the urban centers of the Nation.

The National Grange—the oldest farm organization—has rightly taken cognizance of the ever-widening fight between farm and nonfarm folks. The Grange has prepared some excellent information, from official Government records, to prove that farmers are among the least-subsidized people in our Nation.

This information deserves wide publicity. I hope all Senators will read it. It is for this reason that I ask, Mr. President, that the data prepared by the National Grange be printed in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the data were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHO GETS GOVERNMENT SUBSIDIES?

Ask the average man on the street what he thinks of Government subsidies and chances are 10-to-1 that he will tell you he is against them. Ask him who gets most Government subsidies and his answer will be farmers. Ask him if he or his business receive a subsidy and the answer is likely to be an emphatic "no."

But despite such commonly expressed opinions, the American public has been supporting an elaborate system of Government subsidies since the First Congress met in 1789. It is difficult to name a business which is not receiving some type of Government

subsidy. This average man on the street who says he is opposed to all subsidies, comes into contact with them everyday.

When he awakens in the morning, he turns on a light and immediately starts sharing the results of a subsidy provided through a fast tax writeoff plan which saves power companies billions of dollars—and which reduces his light bill accordingly.

When he goes to a breakfast of bacon and eggs, he shares the benefits of the Government's $19 million Federal meat inspection program—a program conducted by the U.S. Department of Agriculture for the sole purpose of assuring the public a safe and wholesome supply of meat.

If he has children in school, their education is subsidized by taxes paid by the childless neighbor across the street. And, if his are among the 35 million children who eat a hot lunch provided through the highly popular Government school lunch program, he receives direct benefits from another $100 million Government subsidy. If his children are in one of the 62,000 schools participating in the special school milk program, they come in for a share of still another $75 million subsidy.

When Mr. Average Man on the Street drives the family car into the filling station and tells the attendant to "fill her up," he again shares in a major Government subsidy—one brought about through a special depletion allowance tax regulation which cuts the petroleum industry's annual operation expense by about $1 billion a year.

If he makes a trip by plane, he rides at a fare made possible by a direct subsidy to airlines—and by tax supported airports and air traffic control facilities.

If he lives in a house purchased with a GI loan, he pays a lower rate of interest because Uncle Sam has agreed to bail the banker out, in case there is a default in payments.

When he sits down to read a magazine, he starts sharing a subsidy provided through the U.S. Post Office Department, a subsidy which has cut the annual cost of mailing a single publication by as much as $8,604,000.

Ready for bed, the average man on the street goes to a closet and places his trousers on a steel hanger that came from a plant built on a cost-plus basis during World War II and sold to a steel company for a song a few years later.

So, throughout the day, the man who says he is opposed to all forms of subsidy, has been sharing special services provided at the taxpayer's expense.

The following figures show the Bureau of the Budget's breakdown of current expense of aids and special services for a recent year:

	Million
CCC losses on farm price support	$184
International wheat agreement	77
Grants-in-aid (extension service, experiment stations, etc.)	60
Other USDA operations	94
Total for agriculture	463
Post Office Department in favor of business	670
Navigation aids	137
Air navigation aids	93
Ship operation subsidies	50
Other special aids to business	138
Total to business	1,041
To labor (grants to States for operating employment service and unemployment compensation programs)	200

These conditions do not justify a continuation of ineffective farm price support programs now in operation, they do show clearly that farmers have not been, and are not now, the exclusive beneficiaries of special subsidies and services supplied at the expense of U.S. taxpayers.

TOTAL USDA APPROPRIATIONS NOT A SUBSIDY TO FARMERS

Editorials labeling total USDA's expenditures as a 6½ or 7 billion dollar subsidy to farmers have become commonplace.

Many critics, in an effort to discredit farm programs they do not like are using inaccurate and misleading figures which tend to turn the public against any type of Government service to agriculture, and even against farmers themselves.

Eliminating excessive Government farm program cost, and even farm programs themselves, where they are not effective, should be the goal of every American, but we cannot—and we must not—permit the public to think of the cost of all USDA activities as a subsidy to farmers.

We must remind the public that USDA activities serving the total public include:

A. The farm commodity export program, which in 1957, cost $843 million, or about one-sixth of the total USDA appropriation for that year.

Secretary Benson has said of this program: "It is helping keep the free world free. It is an ambassador of good will. Every American can be proud of the constructive use being made of the abundance of American agriculture."

B. About half a billion dollars annually for REA loans. These are repaid with interest and repayments are over $100 million ahead of schedule.

C. A market research program: The $28 million appropriated for this program last year is financing over 600 projects, the results of which are already benefiting industry and the public as well as farmers. Studies already completed have provided:

(a) New handling methods now saving the grain trade over $1 million annually.

(b) Techniques which cut industry's cost of storing cotton by $2 million per season.

(c) Processes reducing food handling cost by $6 million annually in the city of Philadelphia alone.

D. Federal meat inspection, which cost about $19 million annually: The sole purpose of Federal meat inspection is to assure the public of a clean, wholesome supply of meat. It is, in effect, a program for policing the packing industry.

E. The brucellosis eradication program: This one cost around $22 million annually and its primary goal is public health protection.

F. The International Wheat Agreement, which has been costing about $20 million annually. This program helps provide farmers a higher price for wheat—but it also helps members of the grain trade expand their export business—and profits.

G. The universally popular school-lunch program: In terms of cash and commodities, USDA contributed around $284 million to this program last year. Several million schoolchildren shared the benefits of this program. (Among these are those whose fathers are writing editorials referring to the program as a part of the $6½ or $7 billion subsidy to farmers.)

H. The supervision and operation of 181 million acres of national forests: These are maintained and managed (by the Government) for the production of timber, regulation of streamflow, flood control, water power, irrigation, navigation, and municipal water supply—all in the interest of the public. Furthermore, over 45 million citizens took advantage of the recreational facilities of national forests last year.

USDA appropriations editorially referred to as "a subsidy to farmers," or, "the cost of the price support program," are also used to pay for the operation of rural development program, Extension Service, retirement program for some 83,000 USDA employees, Commodity Exchange Authority, and many other USDA activities, which serve the general public as well as farmers.

SUBSIDIES TO FARMERS AND OTHERS

A report issued by the House Committee on Agriculture on June 25, 1958, states that farm price support losses from 1933 to 1956, have cost taxpayers $5,173,746,788.

The House Committee on Appropriations, however, reports the following taxpayer subsidies:

Mail subsidies (10-year period, 1946–56)	$5,968,000,000
Business reconversion payments	43,262,000,000
Subsidies to maritime organizations (1938 through 1957)	3,500,000,000
Subsidies to airlines (1938 through 1957)	614,000,000

SHIP LINE SUBSIDIES

The December 12, 1958, issue of Wall Street Journal reports that subsidies to U.S. ship line operators run $120 million annually, and that, if approved, requests now before the Maritime Board will bring the total to $220 million.

The U.S. News & World Report for August 8, 1958, reports that the Government is building two new steamships for ship line operators.

One, *The America*, is to cost taxpayers $120 million; it will sell for $47 million.

The other, *The President Washington*, is to cost Uncle Sam about $80 million and it will sell for $35 million.

This is not so say that all subsidies are wrong or that they are right; it is clear proof that subsidies are not an exclusive benefit of farmers.

Effect of farmer's price upon retail costs

Cotton products	Farm value	Retail price	If farmers donated the cotton, the retail price would be—
Overalls	$0.65	$3.30	$2.65
Pajamas	.35	3.00	2.65
Broadcloth shirt	.28	3.94	3.66
Work shirt	.26	1.61	1.35
Socks	.07	.50	.43
Work trousers	.51	3.58	3.07
Housedress	.33	3.34	3.01
Yard goods (percale) per yard	.09	.51	.42
Bedspread	1.45	6.31	4.86
Sheet	.74	2.35	1.61

INFLUENCE OF FARM PRODUCTS ON INCREASED COST OF LIVING

[Price index (1947–49 equals 100)]

Nineteen hundred and fifty-seven: (a) Clothing, 105; (b) Food, 115; (c) All consumer items, 120; (d) Rent, 135; (e) Medical care, 138; (f) Hospital charges, 195; (g) All medical care, 140; (h) Physicians' services, 138; (i) Dental care, 130.

NOTE.—Food and clothing—products of the farm—up less than any other item.

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN WHEAT AND BREAD PRICES

In 1948, farmers were getting $2.81 per bushel for wheat and consumers were paying 13.8 cents for a 1-pound loaf of bread.

By 1955, the farmer's price had dropped to $2.14 per bushel and the consumer's cost had climbed to 17.5 cents per loaf.

But by 1957, the farmer was getting only $2.00 per bushel for wheat, and the consumer was paying 18.8 cents per loaf for bread.

Thus, between 1948 and 1957 wheat prices dropped 29 percent and bread prices increased 36 percent.

FOOD A BARGAIN IN TERMS OF WAGES

One hour's pay would buy (a) 6.4 one pound loaves of bread in 1929, and 11 loaves in 1957; (b) 1.2 pounds of steak in 1929, and 2.2 pounds in 1957; (c) 7.8 pints of milk in 1929, and 16 6 pints in 1957; (d) 1 pound of butter in 1929, and 2.8 pounds in 1957; (e) 1.3 pounds of bacon in 1929, and 2.8 pounds in 1957; (f) 1.1 dozen eggs in 1929, and 3.8 dozen in 1957; (g) 17.7 pounds of potatoes in 1929, and 36.3 pounds in 1957; (h) 1.3 dozen oranges in 1929, and 3.6 dozen in 1957.

Weekly wages—beef prices (1950–58):

Between February 1950, and February 1958, the average New York retail price of a pound of beef increased from 70 cents to 74 cents.

During the same period, average weekly earnings of factory workers increased from $59.33 to $80.85.

Thus, beef prices increased 5.7 percent while weekly earnings increased 35 percent, and the amount of working time required to buy a pound of beef dropped from 30 to 19 minutes.

TRENDS IN FARM PRICE AND CONSUMER COST OF FOODS

In 1951, farmers received $20.2 billion for producing food that cost consumers $43 billion.

In 1957, farmers received $19.5 billion for producing about 11 percent more food that cost consumers $50.4 billion.

Thus, consumers paid $7.4 billion more and farmers received $700 million fewer for about 11 percent more food.

Furthermore, in the food industry during that period, corporate profits increased $700 million, labor costs $3.6 billion, transportation costs $1 billion and other business expenses $2.8 billion.

WHY FOOD PRICES RISE?

Between 1947 and 1957, the cost of the family food market basket increased $243.

Here is why:

(a) The farm value of food involved increased $3.

(b) Labor costs increased $130.

(c) Transportation costs increased $33.

(d) Other business expenses advanced $73.

(e) Charges to pay Federal income taxes were up $4.

MILK PRICES

In 1952, when producer prices were supported at 90 percent of parity, consumers were paying an average of 22.8 cents per quart for milk.

By April 1958, producer price supports had been dropped to 75 percent of parity and consumer prices had advanced to 25.3 cents per quart.

Furthermore, the April 1958 producer price was about the same as it had been a year earlier, but consumer prices had advanced from 24.6 to 25.3 cents per quart. (Even so, the return from 6½ minutes of work would buy a quart of milk, whereas 10 years earlier, it took 10 minutes.)

FARM FACTS

Here is one to think about:

A 10-percent increase in farm prices could (a) increase consumer food cost 4 percent; (b) increase net farm income 50 percent.

Here is how it figures:

Farmers receive 39 cents from each $1 spent for food. Therefore, if we increase the farmer's price by 10 percent, consumers will pay 3.9 cents more or about $1.04 for food that now cost $1 (4 percent increase).

The farmer has about 80 cents expense on each $1 of sales. In other words, if his total sales run $10,000, his expense is about $8,000 and profit $2,000.

Increase his price 10 percent and his profit increases $1,000, or 50 percent.

Thus, if no one else were to act, a 10-percent increase in farm price would increase the farmer's net income by 50 percent and food cost 4 percent.

THE FARMER'S INVESTMENT

The typical midwestern farm represents an investment of about $50,000 per worker.

That compares with about $15,000 per worker in industry.

Farmers have $3 invested in production for every $1 that is invested in the marketing of their products.

FARM EFFICIENCY

The number of persons supported by 1 farm worker was 6.9 in 1900, 10.6 in 1940, 15.9 in 1950, and 23.5 in 1958.

FARMERS ARE CUSTOMERS

Farmers and ranchers are among the biggest customers of American industry.

For example:

There are 12 million tractors, cars, and trucks on the U.S. farms. Agriculture buys more petroleum than any other industry.

Farmers provide a market for 6½ million tons of finished steel annually.

Rubber used on the farms of America would put tires on nearly 6 million automobiles annually.

Sixteen percent of the gross freight revenue is from agricultural products.

Agriculture consumes 50 million tons of chemicals each year.

Agriculture uses more electric power than Chicago, Detroit, Houston, Baltimore, and Boston combined.

CHANGE IN WHOLESALE PRICE INDEX

From June 1955 to July 1957: Farm products, up 1.1; processed foods, up 3.2; other than farm products and processed foods, up 8.7; all commodities, up 7.2.

TRENDS IN NET FARM INCOME

The $13 billion net farm income from 1958 was 20 percent above that for 1957.

However, this is 24 percent less than that for 1947; and it is also less than that for any year between 1946 and 1954.

AGRIBUSINESS

About 10 million persons actually work on the farms of America.

In the total agriculture economy, about 25 million workers are gainfully employed as follows:

(a) Six million in manufacturing and selling farm production supplies.

(b) Ten million actually on the farm.

(c) Nine million are processing and distributing farm commodities.

Thus, approximately 25 million workers, or 40 percent (approximately) of our gainfully employed, are involved in the production and distribution of food and fiber from the farms of America.

While the actual farm population has steadily declined, this total number engaged in the total agriculture economy has remained fairly stable over a long period of years.

COMPARISON OF FARM AND NONFARM INCOME

In 1957, per capita farm income was $967, while per capita nonfarm income was $2,082. ($309 of the farmers' $967 was for work done off the farm).

During that year, the hourly income for farm labor and management was 69 cents while workers in manufacturing industries received $2.07 per hour.

The above figures are for all farmers, what about the bigger and more efficient?

During 1956, farm families operating the Nation's 2,213,000 commercial farms received an average income of $5,415 while all nonfarm families, including those living on skid row and public relief, received an income of $6,900.

FARM EFFICIENCY AND FARM INCOME

Efficiency is essential to continued success in any business, but increased efficiency has not provided farmers an equitable income.

For example, between 1950 and 1958, output per farm worker increased 26 percent. During the same period, total per capita farm income dropped from $983 to $967—and per capita income for work done on the farm dropped even more—from $751 to $658.

The trouble is, of course, that increased efficiency on the farm has little influence on many off-the-farm forces which determine the economic pattern in which farmers operate.

DEATH OF FORMER SENATOR JOSEPH F. GUFFEY, OF PENNSYLVANIA

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, it was with deep regret that I learned the sad news of the death on last Friday night, of our former colleague and my good friend, Joe Guffey, of Pennsylvania.

The glory of man, says Solomon, is strength, and Joe Guffey was strong. He was strong physically, as evidenced by his long life of 88 years; strong in his steadfast loyalty to his friends; strong in his devotion to the principles of truth and justice and humanity, strong in the courage with which he fought against tremendous odds for these principles, and strong in his faith in the people and in our country.

When Joe was only 24 years old he was Secretary of the Board of Civil Service Examiners at the Pittsburgh Post Office and was the recipient of a letter from Theodore Roosevelt, the then Chairman of the U.S. Civil Service Commission, thanking him for zealous and efficient service and stating that the Commission congratulated itself upon having him as Secretary of the Board.

All of his adult life Joe Guffey was intensely interested in politics and the affairs of Government. He served two terms in the Senate from 1935 to 1947 and was the only Pennsylvania Democrat in more than 100 years to be so honored by his party and the voters of the State. In the Senate he was a fighting New Dealer who never once failed, who never lowered his arm in battle but who always pressed on and fought on for the New Deal programs that saved the Nation and led the American people out of the distress and suffering of the great depression. Two of his many accomplishments were the passage of the Guffey Coal Act and the Guffey Merchant Marine Act. He stood side by side with Franklin Roosevelt in marshaling America's strength and building the mighty forces that brought our victory in World War II.

Joe Guffey did so much for so many, but the three things that he was proudest of was the number of young men that he had helped to secure a college education, his unwavering support of Woodrow Wilson, particularly the financial support which he gave that made possible Wilson's famous trip across the country to the west coast fighting for the League of Nations, and the fact that Franklin Roosevelt received more votes from Pennsylvania than from any other State for the nomination for President in the 1932 Democratic Convention.

For nearly four decades Joe Guffey's uncle, the late Col. James M. Guffey, was Pennsylvania's leading Democrat,

DIGITIZED BY ARMSTRONG LIBRARIES

but Joe Guffey broke with him to become one of the original supporters of Woodrow Wilson for President. Wilson had no stancher friend or more active supporter through the years than Joe Guffey. Not many days before his death Woodrow Wilson wrote Joe Guffey, "I often think of you and hope that you realize how much I value your generous friendship. It cheers me to learn that I may soon have the pleasure of a talk with you."

Joe Guffey and Franklin Roosevelt were coworkers for Woodrow Wilson and Joe was one of the original supporters of Franklin Roosevelt for President. In speaking of Roosevelt, Joe said, "Over a lifetime in politics our paths had steadily converged; in convention after convention and campaign after campaign we had made the same fight for the same things, until finally our efforts united in the battle for the New Deal." As Franklin Roosevelt was the gallant leader, Joe Guffey was the gallant comrade in arms.

Joe Guffey was a Democrat who served the party indefatigably and who fervently echoed the words of that dashing cavalryman of political conflict, the late beloved Pat Harrison of Mississippi—"I love my party better than anything in the world except my country."

Today we say hail and farewell to the friend, the warrior, the patriot, the statesman, the champion of the people's welfare, the great American, Joe Guffey.

To his devoted sister, Emma Guffey Miller, a great woman and an outstanding leader, and to all his family we express our deep sympathy.

THE CALIFORNIA POPPY

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, champions of various forms of floral and horticultural beauty have spoken lately in this Chamber, each advocating selection of his favorite bloom as the national flower of the United States.

The mounting enthusiasm displayed by exponents of the rose, the carnation, the marigold, the corn tassel, and the bluegrass, prompts speculation that the Congress may become the setting for a botanical sweepstakes.

In that event, Mr. President, I believe sympathetic and favorable consideration should be given the utterly incomparable Golden Poppy of California. I wish to enter the bloom which has so fascinated human beings for more than two centuries that its host of designations includes "Copa de Oro" (Cup of Gold). "Land of Fire" is one of the terms used to describe a scene where it blossoms in colorful profusion.

The California poppy is the harbinger of the beauty of our State. It welcomes travelers of the 20th century just as in early days it served as a veritable beacon for seafarers who gazed in awe at rolling foothills glowing with a golden sheen.

Athough most breath-taking when seen in an eye-catching blanket as a spring flower, the ubiquitous and brilliant California poppy is so adaptable and hardy that it will be welcoming my colleagues from across the aisle in midsummer when—like the gold seekers of a century ago—they trek to the Pacific coast in search of a candidate for the Presidency of this great Nation.

I wish to alert my Democratic brethren who will attend the Democratic National Convention in 1960, to observe the grandeur of the poppy they will see blooming even in the desert as they approach Los Angeles by automobile or railroad train.

I trust that while reveling in other beauties of our State—the seashore, the mountains, the forests, and the unique animate and inanimate attractions of spectacular Hollywood—delegates and visitors to the Democratic convention will not be unmoved by the California State flower. I am certain they will understand why its incomparable coloring and satinlike sheen long have delighted lovers of nature.

It would not be inappropriate, Mr. President, to note also that California's golden appeal to Americas of the opposite political faith is reflected in our State motto as well as typified by our State flower. The inspiring Greek exclamation "Eureka"—meaning "I have found it"—historically echoes the triumphant cry of the gold hunter. According to legend, native Indians believed that the yellow metal the white man held so precious was a collection of fallen petals of the golden poppy. Considering their present bewilderment, it is not inconceivable that the delegates to the 1960 Democratic National Convention will shout with relief "Eureka" when they finally agree upon a nominee. Who knows but that one from this Chamber may be chosen?

The various exponents of other entries in our botanical sweepstakes have noted utilitarian features of their favorites as a factor to be given weight in selecting a national flower. The California poppy is no floral do-nothing such as those of which it sometimes is said "neither do they spin." On the contrary, California's Indians found its feathery foliage when boiled made nourishing food and early Spaniards extracted a hair dressing from oils derived from the plant.

The inspirational character of the golden poppy should not be overlooked. Perhaps it will be equally as uplifting to my brethren across the aisle in 1960 as it was to an Indian man and his young squaw in a lasting California legend. This touching story relates how a great drought came upon the land, followed by pestilence, famine, and intense cold. Only these two survived the rigors of arduous times. In response to their prayers, the Great Spirit sent the "Fire Flower" to drive away the cold and to fill the land with warmth and plenty.

I submit a blossom and plant of such romance and versatility, to say nothing more of its hardiness and significance, deserves the most careful consideration in the choosing of a national flower.

THE PROBLEM OF TEACHER SALARIES

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, since 30 other Senators and I joined in the introduction of Senate bill 2, which would provide Federal support to the States for school construction and teachers salaries, I have received many letters from all over the country pointing out the need for enactment of the bill.

I should like to quote from a letter I have received from one of the more than 200,000 public school teachers who receive less than $3,500 annually:

> In your press release you said, "The average salary of classroom teachers for 1958–59 is estimated at $4,775." Do you know what my annual teaching salary was? It was $3,492 for the year of 1957–58, and it will be the same for this school year. What are my teaching qualifications? I have an A.B. degree (and at one time I had 11 hours' work on my masters degree; that has now expired, because I could not finish the required work for my masters degree within the required time, due to my financial condition), a lifetime teaching certificate, and I am now teaching my 25th year. * * *
>
> You may say there are scholarships or fellowships available, but have you ever tried to get one? I have, but I have never gotten one. Practically all of the scholarships are for teachers of science or mathematics. Not all of the teachers can be teachers of these two courses; therefore, what about the other teachers, and how about solving the problem of keeping one's family while he is attending the college during the summer? Surely every teacher would like to continue his studies, but the married teachers have a family to support. You cannot stretch a dollar further than a dollar. What is going to happen when the older teachers have to retire, and the new teachers apply for positions in States that pay a higher wage scale? Then too, since they are new and young, they do not have the ties that a married teacher or an older teacher has. They can accept a position in a State that ranks near the top in salary scale. Then, too, are there as many preparing for the teaching profession as the schools need? Lack of an adequate salary does not interest the young boys and girls to prepare for a teaching position when they can earn a better wage in industry. You can help the public school teachers.
>
> This letter was not sponsored by an organization, but contains my personal thoughts. I hope that you will read my letter, and that you will give it thought. I thank you.

Mr. President, in my view, enactment of legislation to assist the States in building desperately needed schools and in providing a sufficient number of teachers and a decent salary for them is deserving of the highest priority.

SEVENTY-FIVE YEARS OF UNINTERRUPTED FAST MAIL SERVICE BY BURLINGTON RAILROAD BETWEEN CHICAGO AND COUNCIL BLUFFS-OMAHA

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, March 10, 1959, marks an occasion of historic interest involving the U.S. Post Office Department and one of the Nation's great railroads.

In the formative years of our country the transportation of the U.S. mail was of great importance and responsibility, just as it is today. By the year 1884 the volume of mail from the East destined to California and many points in the West had grown to considerable proportions. There was then railroad service to handle this mail from the East to Chicago, and also from Omaha, Nebr., westward to California. Getting this mail from Chicago to Omaha posed a problem

to postal officials that was solved when the Honorable Walter Q. Gresham, Postmaster General, and two assistants went to Chicago and completed arrangements with the Chicago, Burlington & Quincy Railroad to inaugurate a train service between Chicago and Council Bluffs-Omaha to move this eastern mail on fast, dependable schedules. The first train left Chicago the night of March 10, 1884, making possible a continuous movement of mail from the East to the Far West.

The Burlington Railroad has handled the fast mail between Chicago and Council Bluffs-Omaha ever since; and March 10, 1959 marks 75 years of uninterrupted service by the railroad to the Post Office Department. Recognition is due the Burlington on this occasion. Recognition should also be given to the vital part the railroads have had down through the years in the growth and development of our Nation.

RESOLUTIONS OF THE 14TH NATIONAL CONFERENCE ON HIGHER EDUCATION

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, on Tuesday, March 3, 1959, I had the privilege of addressing the National Conference on Higher Education in Chicago, a conference representing the top leadership of American colleges and universities in a 4-day meeting.

At the conclusion of the meeting, the conference adopted 10 conference resolutions, each of which commends itself to the attention of a broad audience.

I invite particular attention to Resolution No. 2 which commends the Congress for its action in passing the National Defense Education Act and urgently recommends that the Congress appropriate the funds authorized by the act.

This resolution also recommends that the forgiveness provisions of title 2 of the act be extended to those recipients of loans who later teach in any institution of higher learning as defined in section 103 of this act. This resolution goes on to oppose the requirement of an affidavit disclaiming belief or membership in subversive organizations on the part of individuals receiving payments or loans. In each of these recommendations, I strongly concur.

Resolution No. 5 calls attention to the continued need to provide financial assistance for talented students, and supports a program of additional scholarships, fellowships, grants-in-aid and loan assistance to those with ability but with limited financial means. I invite attention to the fact that I have introduced legislation which would provide 46,000 scholarships for talented students, with the size of the stipend dependent on need.

I also commend Resolution No. 8 which urges that leaders in higher education do all in their power at the local, State, and National levels to provide equality of educational opportunity without discrimination because of race, creed, or sex. Such a vigorous statement of belief and intention by this distinguished conference cannot help but have far-reaching consequences in our educational institutions.

I am very pleased indeed to note that Resolution No. 9 of the 10 resolutions specifically commends the idea of an international education development fund which I proposed for the first time at the conference on March 3. The association urges that educators and other interested citizens give serious consideration and support to the objectives of this proposal.

I intend shortly to present to the Senate a specific legislative proposal for such a foundation, and at the moment I am conferring with interested groups in higher education in the drafting of this important legislation.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD the entire preamble and text of the resolutions adopted by the participants in the 14th National Conference on Higher Education at Chicago, March 3, 1959.

There being no objection, the preamble and resolutions were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTIONS ADOPTED BY PARTICIPANTS IN THE 14TH NATIONAL CONFERENCE ON HIGHER EDUCATION

PREAMBLE

Higher education in 1959 finds itself in a race against time. This is a race to maintain national defense, foster international understanding and cooperation, and find the perspectives necessary to meet the many needs of curriculum, facilities, staffs, and students which colleges and universities will face in the future.

Our national survival depends on the full development of all intellectual resources. Well-educated persons are needed in all fields of endeavor. Only an informed, competent citizenry can possibly deal with the complex problems of the space age. Higher education has the awesome responsibility to educate specialists and citizens, soldiers and civilians, lighting their paths toward learning and wisdom. Higher education is a necessity to offset the forces of fusion and fission which threaten to destroy our world. The ultimate defense of our society rests on the educated minds and informed understanding of a free people.

Higher education has a responsibility not only to help maintain national defense but also to help foster international sanity. Never before has need for improved communications, for mutual understanding, for cultural interchange among peoples been so great. It is higher education's sober responsibility to help lead Americans out of the provincialism of the present into an awareness of the needs, concerns, interests, and perspectives of the world community of which we are a part.

America's institutions of higher learning have achieved much in the past. We call upon them to strive for greater achievements in the future. We urge them to extend educational opportunities, and to continue to seek excellence in all aspects of their programs. We urge them to continue their valuable experimentation with courses of study and methods of teaching.

Responding to the threefold challenge is no easy task. To win the race against time means unparalleled accomplishment. To lose it means disaster. This America cannot afford. This effort will call for increased expenditure of time, thought, and energy on the part of educators and of increased financial support on the part of the public.

As members of the 14th National Conference on Higher Education we call upon educators to lead in imparting that vision and understanding which are essential to the perpetuation of our free society.

CONFERENCE RESOLUTIONS

1. Higher education and national defense: The 14th National Conference on Higher Education recognizes that colleges and universities must and will continue to respond to the necessity of maintaining and increasing the intellectual strength and broad competence required for national survival. The Federal Government, in executing its responsibilities for defense, must recognize that enduring strength is built from many talents, and that we must be prepared to engage in a conflict of ideas as well as a competition for technical supremacy.

2. The National Defense Education Act:

(a) The 14th National Conference on Higher Education commends the Congress of the United States for its action in passing the National Defense Education Act and urgently recommends that the Congress appropriate the funds authorized by the act, and adequate funds for its administration by the Office of Education. We also commend the Office of Education for its efforts under adverse circumstances to implement this act.

(b) We recommend that the forgiveness provisions of title II of the National Defense Education Act be extended to those recipients of loans who later teach in any institution of higher learning as defined in section 103 of this act.

(c) The 14th National Conference on Higher Education opposes the requirement of an affidavit disclaiming belief or membership in subversive organizations on the part of individuals receiving payments or loans, because we believe in equality of treatment with respect to Federal assistance and object to the singling out of students receiving this aid as a special group to demand expressions of loyalty from them. We, therefore, recommend amendment of section 1001(f) of the National Defense Education Act so as to remove this requirement.

3. The college housing loan program: We commend the Senate of the United States for acting promptly to increase the funds available for Federal college housing loans and for extending the program to include loans for construction of academic facilities. The 14th National Conference on Higher Education urges the Congress to adopt this legislation so that higher institutions may have the benefit of low-cost loans for construction. The conference further urges that the professional services of the U.S. Office of Education be more directly involved than at present in the administration of the college construction loan program.

4. ROTC facilities: The 14th National Conference on Higher Education urges the Congress to establish a program of Federal participation in meeting construction and maintenance costs of physical plant facilities used for ROTC programs.

5. Financial assistance to talented youth: The 14th National Conference on Higher Education calls attention to the continued need to provide financial assistance for talented students. It firmly believes that the Federal and State Governments as well as private agencies can and must provide additional scholarships, fellowships, grants-in-aid and loan assistance so that those with ability but with limited financial means may secure a higher education. Such assistance should be available to those entering any field of study. Furthermore, the size of the stipend should be related to the individual's financial need.

6. Recruitment of college teachers: The 14th National Conference on Higher Education recognizes the critical need for qualified college teachers now and in the years ahead. We encourage colleges and universities granting higher degrees to develop well-defined programs preparing students for college teaching. We encourage the coun-

seling of promising students into these programs. We bespeak the cooperation of Federal and State Governments, as well as foundations and other agencies, to provide financial and other supports for prospective college teachers.

7. Experimentation in higher education: The 14th National Conference on Higher Education commends colleges and universities for their experimentation in curricula, teaching, student selection, and use of facilities. We urge that in order to meet the demands they face, colleges and universities experiment constantly with better ways of achieving their objectives, evaluate, act on and publicize their results. We also urge that foundations and other donors continue and expand their generous aid to educational experimentation.

8. Equality of opportunity in educational institutions: In keeping with our democratic ideal of equality of opportunity, and mindful of the requirements of national security and survival, the 14th National Conference on Higher Education urges that leaders in higher education do all in their power, at the local, State, and National levels, to provide equality of educational opportunity without discrimination because of race, creed, or sex.

We commend those individuals and agencies whose leadership and example have contributed toward the achievement of equal educational opportunity by eliminating racial segregation in educational institutions. Since we believe that the public schools are a bulwark of a democratic nation, we deplore the closing of public schools as an alternative to complying with the decisions of the courts. We urge individuals, as well as public and private agencies, to continue their efforts toward the elimination of racial segregation from educational institutions and organizations.

9. International educational development fund: The 14th National Conference on Higher Education commends the idea of an international educational development fund, as presented by Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY on March 3, 1959, to this conference, and urges that educators and other interested citizens give serious consideration and support to the objectives of his proposal.

10. Appreciation: The 14th National Conference on Higher Education expresses appreciation to President Russell Cooper and the executive committee, to Dr. Leland Medsker and his planning committee, to Dr. G. Kerry Smith and to the hard-working staff of the association for providing leadership in American higher education, to the principal speakers and conference leaders for a better understanding of basic issues; to the Varsity Glee Club of Purdue University, to the Congress Hotel and the city of Chicago for cordial hospitality.

We express appreciation to the various mediums of communication for their objective and thorough coverage of the meetings, and to all who helped make this conference an outstanding success.

Resolutions Committee: Charles C. Cole, Jr., chairman; Robert G. Bone; T. W. Cole; Glenn Kendall; William McGlothlin; Jerome J. Marchetti, S. J.; Peter Masiko, Jr.; Harrison Sasscer, consultant.

RUMANIAN FREEDOM AND THE BERLIN CRISIS

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, as we approach new negotiations with Soviet Russia, it is well to remember an anniversary that passed almost unnoticed on March 6.

On the 6th of March 1945, 3 weeks after the Yalta Declaration, a Soviet Communist puppet government was installed in Bucharest by the famous Vyshinski diktat. The Red Army had already disarmed the police force, occupied the government buildings and was patrolling the streets with tanks. Behind Vishinsky's arrogance and violence were the guns of Marshal Malinovski. While Rumania was being occupied by the Red Army, 19 Rumanian divisions were fighting alongside the Allies in Hungary and Czechoslovakia.

This puppet government was recognized in January 1946 by the United States and, despite the bloody and fraudulent elections conducted by the Communists in November 1946, the United States signed a peace treaty with them on February 10, 1947. This treaty has been constantly and systematically violated by the stooge government in Bucharest. The human rights and political liberties of the Rumanian people have been absolutely destroyed. The military provisions of the treaty have been cynically infringed and the country transformed by the Soviet agents into a Russian base directed against the West. Notwithstanding, the Bucharest government was admitted to the United Nations, December 1955, by means of the famous package deal.

Since the Hungarian uprising the Russians have tightened their control on Rumania. A new wave of terror and persecution is reported from the country. Arrests, deportations and the whole gamut of police state abuses are mounting. Economic exploitation has greatly impoverished a country which was previously considered as the granary of Europe and which possessed the most important deposits of oil on the Continent outside Russia.

The Rumanian question is a part, although not in the immediate forefront, of the complex issue raised by the Berlin crisis. By the force of circumstances Berlin has become the beacon of freedom in a sea of expanding Soviet slavery. The real background of the Berlin issue is not merely the German problem. It is the whole area of Central and Eastern Europe. The Russians are working to confuse the real positions in any future negotiation on Europe by the imposition of the Soviet puppet governments of Poland and Czechoslovakia at the conference table. Thus they reckon to take out of the hands of the United States the trump card of a counterattack on the issue of the Soviet domination of Central and East Europe.

While I am on this subject, I was pleased to hear and I am grateful for the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER], in which he specifically exempted me, the able senior Senator from New York, and other Senators from the category concerning which he spoke, and having to do with certain speeches on the floor of the Senate about the Berlin situation and the world situation.

When I spoke on this floor a week and more ago I had a very specific and limited purpose in mind. I spoke because I truly believed that there was apathy and confusion abroad in this land with respect to this critical Berlin situation. I wished to give an alarm; and I hope I did. I was not trying to point out any deficiency in our military defenses, because I am not specially informed on that subject. I am not a military man. But I realize that there are those among us who are informed. I believe they should speak up. We should have the benefit of their informed judgment. Now I think there has been a change in the last 2 weeks. I believe that Members of the Senate who have spoken—and there have been many—have done a real service to the country, and that we have achieved a degree of national unity, cleared up some confusion, encouraged our friends, and forewarned our enemies.

There was a good meeting at the White House on Friday; and there have been many expressions of unity on both sides of the aisle. Every foreign policy statement from spokesmen of their party in recent days has reflected a clear resolve to stand firm in Berlin. Now we are partially over that hill, it seems to me. But I would not have my colleagues, or those beyond these walls, understand me as saying that everything is now all right. There are many grave problems which still plague us. There does remain a serious need for doing all that can be done in the next 3 months to prepare our economy and military defense for whatever may lie ahead.

The administration and Congress must be ready with standby programs of economic controls, in case they are needed.

I do not know why the administration does not want standby controls. Certain disciplines are absolutely necessary at a time of grave national crisis. I hope my colleagues will think about this problem and speak up, and do what they can to urge that controls be placed on a standby basis through the action of Congress.

So we have more to do than to unite and stand firm on Berlin. There is other work to do. Adequate stockpiles of essential materials must be ready. Our civilian defense program needs immediate attention. Scheduled reductions in military strength must be postponed. Whatever can be done in so short a period to strengthen our Strategic Air Command must be done. Plans for the activating of Reserve units must be in complete readiness. Our military policy is based upon the assumption that we could destroy the Soviet Union if they attacked us and that Kremlin knowledge of this will prevent any such attack.

The success of this policy depends upon Soviet awareness of free world unity and military strength and it is important that in coming weeks we take every step necessary to make it crystal clear to the Kremlin that we have this unity and this strength. Fearful and awful as the prospect is, the American people have made up their minds that they are faced with a decision which involves a choice between freedom or slavery. We have chosen freedom.

Let the Communist slave masters take note. May they recall our past record when confronted by a similar situation.

ELEVATION OF METROPOLITAN JAMES A. COUCOUZES AS GREEK ORTHODOX ARCHBISHOP OF NORTH AND SOUTH AMERICA

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President——

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Tennessee. The Chair will endeavor to be fair in recognizing Senators, and will alternate recognitions from both sides of the aisle.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, in order to be entirely fair, the recognitions should be on the basis of 2 to 1. There are approximately 60 Members on this side, and 30 on the other side of the aisle. Let us not carry fairness too far.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will take that into consideration.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, church and lay leaders from all corners of the Nation are celebrating the election of Archbishop James A. Coucouzes as spiritual leader for the more than 6 million Greek Orthodox in North and South America.

Archbishop Coucouzes is the first American citizen ever to be entrusted with the task of guiding communicants in this hemisphere.

The new archbishop obtained his citizenship during his 12 years of service as dean of the Boston Cathedral of the Annunciation. He will assume his new duties in New York and thus carry on the fine spiritual work of the late Archbishop Michael.

Archbishop Coucouzes is a dedicated and devoted church leader. He is well qualified and has the experience, wisdom, and maturity to fill this great post for his church.

The Deacon James Coucouzes was ordained to the priesthood at Holy Trinity Church, Lowell, Mass., less than 20 years ago. A particularly astute student, he earned his master's degree in sacred theology from Harvard Divinity School in 1945 during his deanship at the cathedral. He also attended Boston University School of Theology.

During his Boston service, he was a member of the mixed council of the Church-Laity Congress of the church. He was active in promoting the GOYA movement and a spiritual adviser to Philoptohos and fraternal groups.

For a year prior to his elevation to a bishopric, the then Father Coucouzes served as vicar general of diocese III, including New England and eastern Canada. In December 1954 the then cathedral dean was named dean of the theology school.

Just 4 years ago he was elevated to a bishopric. Recently he has been stationed as personal representative of the Ecumenical Patriarch to the World Council of Churches in Geneva, Switzerland.

The new archbishop is one of the outstanding spiritual leaders of our generation and his unanimous election by the Holy Synod should serve as an inspiration to all of us.

THE PURCHASE OF A GENERATOR FOR THE TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY'S COLBERT STEAM PLANT

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, a considerable blanket of fog has been generated around the recent purchase of a huge generator for the Tennessee Valley Authority's Colbert steamplant near Tuscumbia, Ala.

I wish to attempt to cut through this fog and draw a clear picture of what I feel to be the indisputable, hard facts about this contract—as painful as they may be to some.

The TVA has been under fire directed by two large firms in the United States because the contract for this 500,000-kilowatt turbogenerator was awarded to a British firm.

Nobody regrets more than I that any American firm or its employees should lose work such as this, but the truth frequently hurts.

I believe I know why these two American firms—Westinghouse and General Electric—were unable to compete for this contract.

GE and Westinghouse are two of only three American firms which manufacture large turbogenerators. Since 1951, the prices charged by these three firms for such equipment have increased by more than 50 percent. In the same period, the wholesale price of all commodities has increased only about 5 percent.

Westinghouse and GE make other products, too, including refrigerators, air conditioners, and other appliances. Prices on these products have, in many instances, decreased over the same period.

There are many firms making these appliances. GE and Westinghouse have been forced to compete on a price basis in these fields. It would be interesting to know whether GE and Westinghouse, because of their bigness, would actually be able to meet this appliance price competition if they did not have monopoly profits from other ventures, such as turbogenerators.

In the turbogenerator field, little or no price competition exists in this country. Thus the price goes right through the roof and keeps on going. It is the same story that we have been hearing in the big steel and automobile industry hearings before the Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee. It is the story of administered prices. Where big business gains an exclusive grip on the market, the price goes up, up, up.

In the case of the TVA contract for the turbogenerator, we can see one end result of the evil—American firms lose out on the business of our own American TVA.

I have been getting mail from stockholders and employees of these two big outfits. Protect our investment, say the stockholders. Save our jobs, say the employees. Buy American, cry GE and Westinghouse.

Should the TVA pay a premium of $6 million to answer these letters and pleas? Should the subscribers to TVA electric power, individual and industry alike, pay the price in increased rates to answer these cries for help?

Or should General Electric and Westinghouse take a real, hard look at their pricing structure and profits and ask themselves this question: "Why can't we make turbogenerators that compete in price with a British firm when we can make air conditioners that meet the prices of our competitors here at home?"

I think GE and Westinghouse, and the exclusive monopoly they share, need to take this hard look before they talk of TVA hurting GE and Westinghouse stockholders and employees.

TVA had reason to invite bids from abroad. It has been disturbed for some time by the skyrocketing price of turbogenerators. GE and Westinghouse have sold millions of dollars worth of such equipment to TVA. I think if they want to continue to sell they will have to find a way to compete.

When the bids were opened on the Colbert plant turbogenerators, and before they were evaluated for comparison on such points as guaranteed efficiency of machine, differences in escalation of prices, and willingness of the manufacturer to pay damages for late delivery, GE and Westinghouse were only $70,000 apart on their bids and almost $6 million higher than the British firm, C. A. Parsons & Co., Ltd.

In the evaluation, the Parsons price was firm while the GE and Westinghouse bids were subject to escalation clauses. After adjustment, the bids compared as follows: Parsons, $13,140,700; Westinghouse, $19,453,725; GE, $19,673,780.

Westinghouse and GE were then more than $6 million higher than Parsons. Moreover, only Parsons was agreeable to payment of damages for late delivery. GE and Westinghouse took specific exception to this provision.

And what is more, Parsons was still $6 million lower than GE and Westinghouse after including in the Parsons bid about $4 million in Buy American and import duty requirements to protect domestic bidders.

The import duty figure of $1.5 million alone was enough to protect the U.S. manufacturers against differences in labor costs.

Parsons enjoy a good record of delivery on schedule and backs it up with a penalty clause. It maintains service facilities and personnel in Canada, as favorably located as those of the domestic firms' facilities.

Parsons' reputation and record of high standards of quality and efficiency were investigated fully by TVA before the firm was invited to bid. And TVA is required by law to accept the lowest bid.

Now, if Parsons can make, deliver and back up a turbogenerator, including import duty and Buy American provisions, for $6 million less than GE and Westinghouse can, who shall TVA buy from?

The answer seems simple and sad.

And the question that follows automatically has an even more painful clarity. It is: "Why can GE and Westinghouse not come anywhere close to competing?"

Only GE and Westinghouse can provide the answer—to TVA, to the American consumer, to their own stockholders and employees.

GE and Westinghouse might try something like this: "As long as our prices are administered in this atmosphere of monopoly, we just will not get the business. When we face up to the fact that realistic price competition is still a factor to be reckoned with, even in the turbogenerator field, we will find a way to compete—and that means we will still make a reasonable profit, we will still give our stockholders a fair return on their investment, and we will still pay our employees a fair wage."

I hope these remarks have helped cut through the fog that has been thrown around the Colbert steamplant turbogenerator matter. And I hope, also, that I have been able to throw some light on the key role administered prices have played in this.

It is an unusually clear demonstration of how monopoly eliminates price competition and pushes prices ruthlessly upward. Only in this instance, a British firm put the spotlight on this unhealthy condition in our economy and underscored the primary part it plays in our continuing inflationary spiral.

In support of my remarks I introduce for the RECORD the full statement of TVA concerning the award of the Colbert steamplant turbogenerator contract. It is an unanswerable defense of the contract award, as painful as this truth may be.

I ask unanimous consent that the statement may be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY TVA ON PURCHASE OF TURBOGENERATOR FROM C. A. PARSONS & CO., LTD., ENGLAND

On February 6, 1959, TVA purchased a 500,000 kilowatt turbogenerator, to be installed at the Colbert steamplant near Tuscumbia, Ala., from C. A. Parsons & Co., Ltd., of England. The delivered price will be $12,095,800.

The purchase, made under competitive bidding procedures required by the TVA Act, was based on the following considerations:

1. The evaluated Parsons bid was more than $6 million lower than the evaluated bids of the only other bidders—Westinghouse Electric Corp. and General Electric Co.—both American firms.

2. Full compliance with the provisions of the Buy American Act and established national policy on foreign purchases.

3. A determination that Parsons is qualified, technically competent, and adequately equipped to build and deliver the turbogenerator on schedule.

4. Assurance that Parsons is able to provide promptly, any repair service and replacement parts which may be necessary during the life of the machine.

Prior to the final action by the TVA Board in purchasing the turbogenerator from C. A. Parsons, all the factors involved, including such considerations as national security, were subjected to a detailed and intensive study.

Some subsequent public comment indicates a lack of understanding or of facts on the matter. This statement has been prepared to provide those facts.

WHY DID TVA SEEK FOREIGN BIDS?

For some time TVA has been disturbed by the rising prices of turbogenerators. There are only three American firms which manufacture large turbogenerators. Since 1951 the prices charged by these manufacturers for such equipment have increased by more than 50 percent, while the average wholesale price of all commodities has increased only about 5 percent.

It was this history of price increases by the only United States suppliers which led TVA to invite bids from qualified foreign manufacturers as well as domestic ones.

WHO WAS INVITED TO BID?

TVA invited bids from the three United States manufacturers and the two leading British manufacturers of large steampower generating equipment. Bids were received from three companies: the Westinghouse Corp., the General Electric Co., and C. A. Parsons & Co., Ltd.

In its invitation to bidders TVA set forth certain factors that would be taken into account in comparing bids. These included differences in guaranteed efficiency of the machine, differences in escalation of prices, and willingness of the manufacturer to pay specified damages if the machine were not delivered on time.

COMPARISON OF THE BIDS

Before reflecting the evaluation factors just referred to, the base bids received were as follows:

Parsons (including duty)	$12,095,800
General Electric	17,563,000
Westinghouse	17,633,000

The Parsons price was firm, while the bids from General Electric and Westinghouse were subject to escalation clauses. After adjustments for efficiency and escalation, the evaluated bids compared as follows:

Parsons	$13,140,700
Westinghouse	19,453,725
General Electric	19,673,780

The evaluated General Electric and Westinghouse bids were thus nearly 50 percent higher than the Parsons bid.

Moreover, of the three bidders only Parsons indicated a willingness to accept a contract containing the provision specified in the invitation for payment of damages in the event of delay in delivery. General Electric and Westinghouse both took specific exception to the provision. This exception constituted a material deviation from the terms of the invitation which rendered their bids unresponsive and unacceptable even if one of them had been a low bidder.

This provision for liquidated damages is a very important one. A number of the large generating units which TVA has bought in recent years have been delivered late, and TVA has had to incure substantial additional costs as a result. Inclusion of a liquidated damages provision in the final contract gives TVA added assurance that Parsons will give its full attention to making delivery within the time necessary to meet TVA's requirements as specified in the invitation.

NATIONAL POLICY ON THE ACCEPTANCE OF FOREIGN BIDS BY FEDERAL AGENCIES

National policy governing purchases of foreign equipment has been established by the Congress in the Buy American Act and by the President, in Executive Order 10582 of December 17, 1954, prescribing the manner in which all Federal agencies shall apply the Buy American Act. The act provides generally for purchases of domestic articles, materials, and supplies, unless their cost is determined to be unreasonable as compared to foreign goods. The Executive order provides that ordinarily the offered prices of materials of domestic origin shall be deemed to be unreasonable and purchase shall be made from competing foreign source if the domestic price exceeds the amount of a foreign bid by more than 6 percent. If the low domestic bidder is in an area of substantial unemployment, a 12-percent differential is used in accordance with a recommendation of the Council on Foreign Economic Policy.

TVA'S INVITATION FAVORED DOMESTIC MANUFACTURERS

TVA stated in its invitation for bids on the 500,000 kilowatt turbogenerator that it would accept the lowest bid from a U.S. manufacturer if it did not exceed the lowest foreign bid by more than 20 percent. (Such an increase in the price advantage for domestic manufacturers is permitted under the Executive order if the Government agency involved determines that it has sufficient reason to increase the differential. If, under these conditions, purchase is made from a domestic manufacturer the agency is required to submit a special report on the matter to the President.)

This price advantage given to U.S. manufacturers was in addition to the import duty which would have to be paid by the foreign manufacturer.

The import duty which will be paid by Parsons amounts to about $1.5 million. The additional 20 percent advantage provided for domestic manufacturers, based on Parsons' evaluated bid, was over $2.6 million. Therefore, the total price advantage enjoyed by domestic bidders as a result of these two items alone amounted to over $4 million. Further, foreign bidders had other added costs for such items as transoccan shipping and marine insurance.

DO LOW FOREIGN WAGES ACCOUNT FOR THE DIFFERENCE IN BIDS?

One explanation which has been offered for the inability of American manufacturers to meet the foreign price competition in this field, is the difference in wages paid in this country and abroad.

Wages paid to workers in the electrical industry in England are lower than those paid by domestic manufacturers. Westinghouse says that British labor receives only 37 percent of the hourly rate paid to the electrical workers here. General Electric has suggested that the ratio is 40 percent.

Westinghouse has told TVA that 1,080,000 man-hours of work in its shops would have been involved in building the turbogenerator. General Electric is quoted as saying that 600 man-years of work, which is closely comparable to the Westinghouse man-hour estimate, would have been required. The Bureau of Labor Statistics reports the average hourly wage rate in the electrical manufacturing industry for October 1958 was $2.28.

The foregoing figures suggest that differences in labor costs would be in the neighborhood of $1.5 million, and this does not allow for any greater manufacturing efficiency in the larger U.S. plants of General Electric and Westinghouse. This computed difference is less than half the price advantage provided for domestic manufacturers. In fact, it appears that the import duty is adequate to protect U.S. turbogenerator manufacturers against differences in labor costs.

THE COMPETENCE OF C. A. PARSONS & CO., LTD.

C. A. Parsons was a pioneer in steam turbines. Outside of the United States the Parsons Co. is the largest manufacturer of such equipment in the free world. Half of the turbogenerators it builds are exported. For example, it has built most of the steam power generating equipment that is operating in Canada. It has an English order for a 550,000-kilowatt unit. In fact, Parsons & Co. and General Electric are the only two companies in the world

known to be building units as large as 500,000 kilowatts, General Electric now being engaged in building one such unit, which TVA ordered from it in the fall of 1957.

Before any supplier, whether domestic or foreign, is invited to submit bids on large power equipment, TVA first satisfies itself as to the company's ability to meet high standards of quality and efficiency. Further, TVA must be satisfied with the ability of the supplier to provide repairs and replacement parts with reasonable speed. In the case of the Parsons Co., as with other approved bidders, TVA appraised these qualifications by an inspection of the company's facilities and detailed discussions with its responsible officials and engineers. TVA has determined to its full satisfaction that this British firm has the plant, equipment, skills, and manpower necessary to build and service an efficient and reliable machine. Further, Parsons maintains service facilities and personnel in Canada, which are as favorably located as the corresponding facilities of the U.S. firms.

NATIONAL SECURITY

All the foregoing has a bearing on the effect on national security of this purchase from a British firm. The Parsons Co. has a good record of delivery on schedule, and its guarantee is backed up by a penalty clause in the contract. There are similar assurances that the machine will be highly efficient.

Fears that competition by foreign firms will result in all or most large turbogenerators being manufactured abroad, thereby eliminating American productive capacity as a supply source in defense emergencies, are unfounded.

It appears that the total capacity in the entire free world for producing such equipment is so limited that all of it, both in Europe and the United States, will normally be required to supply the large turbogenerators necessary to meet the rapidly increasing demands of this Nation and others for electric energy.

In the event of total war, the problem of repair or replacement of generating units would be about the same whether they had been manufactured domestically or abroad. Any realistic contemplation of such a war must assume that American turbogenerator manufacturing plants could be destroyed or damaged in the same attack which might damage or destroy the unit installed in the Colbert steamplant. Early repair or replacement would seem unlikely no matter where the unit had been built.

In event of a less extensive attack or acts of sabotage, it should be recognized that generating units manufactured by all the major American suppliers are incorporated in the TVA system. Widespread damage to the system could result in heavy demands on all these suppliers, both by TVA and by utilities in other sections of the country. Addition of the Parsons unit to the TVA system increases the number of suppliers who can be called on in the event of such an emergency and thereby reduces the risk of delay in getting maximum capacity back into service.

Economical operation of the TVA power system, to which the saving of more than $6 million contributes, is important in the national defense budget, since half of the power from the TVA system goes to Federal defense installations. Introduction of real price competition into the turbogenerator manufacturing field makes a contribution to combating inflation. At the same time, purchase of the unit from Parsons strengthens the economic position of our ally, Great Britain.

For national security, strong allies, a healthy world trade, essential industries strengthened by stimulation of competition, are likely to be at least as important as the location of specific powerplant repair facilities. These basic purposes are served by the award of the contract under discussion to Parsons of England.

IMPACT ON EMPLOYMENT AND NATIONAL ECONOMY

TVA would regret any real net loss of employment for American workers from its purchase of an English turbogenerator. However, it seems more likely that there will be a net benefit to American labor. TVA will make payment in dollars for its purchase from Parsons. It can reasonably be assumed that these dollars will be used to finance British purchases of other goods either in the United States or in third countries which will in turn use the dollars to make purchases in the United States. Those dollars can be expected to create and pay for as many man-hours of work in the United States as would have resulted from domestic manufacture of the turbogenerator.

In addition, the saving of over $6 million affects TVA's ability to provide low-cost power to farms, homes, and industrial concerns within its power service area. The availability of ample power at the lowest cost stimulates industrial employment, and enables the home consumers of this power to continue to provide the best market in the Nation for electrical appliances. The money TVA invests in generating equipment is exceeded by the purchases by consumers of TVA power of electrical appliances and equipment—more than $2 billion worth since the end of World War II—of which General Electric and Westinghouse are leading suppliers.

THE TURBOGENERATOR WILL BE PAID FOR BY THE USERS OF TVA POWER

Contrary to the impression that prevails in some quarters, the money to be spent for the turbogenerator will not come from taxes. The cost will be met from power revenues paid by the users of TVA power.

THE COMMUTER TRANSPORTATION SITUATION IN URBAN AREAS

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I have joined in sponsoring the measure introduced by the distinguished Senator from New Jersey, because I feel strongly that we must focus attention on a problem which is becoming increasingly acute; namely, the transportation situation which faces the mass of commuters in our urban areas. It cannot be stated categorically that the provisions of this legislation are effective or complete solutions to the commuter problem. I do say that the Federal Government, the States, and localities, and the railroads must cooperate in this area lest many of our citizens be deprived of the transportation so vital to their livelihood.

In passing the Transportation Act of 1958, the Congress demonstrated its concern over the financial plight of the Nation's railroads. And let me add that I have not wavered in my desire to restore this industry, so important to our national security and economic well-being, to a position of health and vitality. That is the reason for my sponsorship with Senator JAVITS and Senator SALTONSTALL, of legislation to permit railroad corporations to take full advantage of tax relief measures enacted or granted by the States and their political subdivisions. At the same time, we cannot in all good conscience, overlook the needs of the commuting public.

I am fully aware that the great measure of passenger traffic losses sustained by the railroads is due to urban or interurban commuting service, particularly in the Northeast, and that many of the factors involved are subject to the control of State and local government. Yet, I do not believe it was the intent of the Congress, in approving the Transportation Act of 1958, to permit undue discontinuance of commuter service before needed solutions are found and put into operation. In this connection, I commend the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee for the study it is undertaking, which includes consideration of "the kind and the amount of railroad passenger service necessary to serve the public and to provide for the national defense." I therefore urge the committee, in recognition of this problem, also to take emergency action in order to alleviate the serious problem with respect to the discontinuance of commuter service.

Mr. President, I have received a telegram from the chairman of the New York State Public Service Commission outlining the views of the State of New York on this problem.

I ask unanimous consent to have the text of the telegram printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Honorable KENNETH B. KEATING,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Congressional reevaluation of section 13a of the Interstate Commerce Act, as added by the Transportation Act of 1958, is more than called for. The New York Public Service Commission's recent reports to the Governor, the legislature, and the people of this State (January 26, 1959) pertaining to the Railroad industry, set forth the case for "revision of a misguided national transportation policy which would appear to be bent deliberately toward the destruction not the preservation of the country's railroad industry in general and the passenger service portion thereof in particular" (p. 40). In this respect, the commission had particular reference to the passenger discontinuance authorizations conferred upon the railroads by the Transportation Act of 1958 (p. 16, 31–33) as follows:

"At the moment, it would appear that by action of the last Congress, the railroads (under no restraint to initiate discontinuance action) and the Interstate Commerce Commission (severely over-subscribed in any effort to defer it) together hold in their hands exclusively, the key to the preservation of all rail passenger service in this State and country.

"That, we submit, is an awesome power to be exercised and an awesome responsibility to be discharged, both with marked caution. If such does not prove to be the experience, any State and local governmental assistance which might conceivably be extended to the industry pales into insignificance and per force becomes the essence of futility." (33).

As you know, at Governor Rockefeller's instigation, we in New York are moving with dispatch to carry out the recommendations of the report and other suggestions for State and local governmental assistance to preserve vitally necessary rail passenger service here. Any action which you, Senator JAVITS, and other New York congressional representatives may initiate to prevent the disappearance of those services before the full impact of the State's efforts can be realized,

will be a great contribution to the public welfare. Under section 13a, as interpreted and applied by the Interstate Commerce Commission and the courts, the sudden termination of much of our essential rail service—including commuter service—may be accomplished at the whim of the industry and without opportunity for presentation or adjudication of the public interest in the matter.

That, I submit, is not a healthy situation of affairs under any circumstances.

JAMES A. LUNDY,
Chairman, New York Public Service Commission.

ANNIVERSARY OF THE ENSLAVEMENT OF RUMANIA

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, 14 years have passed since the installation of a Communist dictatorship in Rumania. It was on March 6, 1945, that the Russians, in violation of the Yalta agreements—and, indeed, almost before the ink was dry on the documents—established their domination over Rumania.

As in the case of other nations behind the Iron Curtain, the Russian occupation has brought with it a ruthless exploitation of the land and stern repression of all who would oppose the dictates of the men in the Kremlin. Yet, the spirit of freedom continues to burn bright in the hearts and minds of the people of noble Rumania. They continue, through acts of sabotage and other means of silent resistance, to oppose their Communist overlords.

We in the free world must, by all the means at our command, assure these brave people behind the Iron Curtain that they are not forgotten. We must hope and pray for their liberation.

A part of this great effort demands that we remain strong militarily, and that we stand firm in the face of Russian attempts to divide the free world in its opposition to the international Communist conspiracy. The people of Rumania know that the only language the Soviets understand is firmness and strength. The sooner the American people recognize this, and the more solidly we apply it to situations such as the Russian-manufactured crisis over Berlin, the greater will be the hope for turning the Communist tide and speeding the day of universal peace.

On this occasion of the anniversary of Rumanian enslavement, then, let us rededicate ourselves to the freeing of these brave people. Let us unite in our resolve to work ever harder for the day when Rumania will once more take her rightful place among the family of free nations.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, March 6, 1959, marked the 14th anniversary since Rumania was subjugated by the Soviets. The continuing determination of the Rumanian people to again resume their rightful position as a free and independent nation can best be told through a letter I have received from the League of Free Rumanians. I ask unanimous consent that this letter be printed in the body of the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE LEAGUE OF FREE RUMANIANS,
New York, N.Y., March 5, 1959.

The Honorable STYLES BRIDGES,
U.S. Senator from New Hampshire.

DEAR SENATOR: This 6th of March will mark the dark anniversary of 14 years since Rumania has been militarily occupied and politically enslaved by the Soviets.

Knowing your clear-sighted and courageous militant stand against Communist imperialistic expansion and infiltration, we respectfully appeal to you to call attention to the ordeal of the Rumanian people at the hands of the expoliting ruthless tyranny of Moscow.

We know you feel it is the interest of the American people not to forget that the Rumanians, an old Latin and Christian nation, being a part of the European-American community of civilization and an advance post in the defense of this community, although under the Soviet yoke, are preserving their inner allegiance to its values and ideals. All intelligence we receive coming from Rumania, assures us of the determination of the people to continue their resistance and be prepared to stand up, at a critical moment, on the Western side.

These national explosive forces in Rumania, as well as in the rest of Eastern Europe, are a permanently suspended threat for the Russian bridgehead of aggressive expansion the Kremlin is trying to maintain and consolidate in the center of Europe. The last Russian political moves concerning Berlin stress the anxiety of the Soviets to add a new, decisive prop to the consolidation of this bridgehead. The brutal repression of the Hungarian revolt was not enough, they need to destroy that last bastion of freedom within their European springboard, a free Berlin. Either a neutralized Berlin, or one protected by United Nations token units of neutral Communists, such as Yugoslavs, Czechs, Poles, etc., or uncommitted such as Indians and Egyptians, will mean the liquidation of that symbol of freedom which is Berlin, a perpetual sore spot under their very noses.

Not only the Germans, but the Rumanians and the other peoples are watching Berlin, for they know that as long as the Russians cannot eliminate it by obtaining recognition of the East German Communists, or through neutralization, the freezing of the Soviet domination status quo in Europe will not be completely achieved and the resistance of the enslaved will not be dealt a mortal blow.

The resistance of the Rumanian people, although not getting publicity in the Western coexistence press, is widespread, diverse, and persistent. The economic sabotage directed against the plans of the socialist camp has taken such proportions that a new wave of repressive terror is under way. Life imprisonment and the death penalty are imposed at will for the slightest misdemeanors, in order to stem sabotage.

This state of things behind the Iron Curtain raises the question: Is it not in the interest of the United States in an approaching ministers' conference and eventual summit meeting, in discussing Berlin, to avail themselves of the weakest spot in the Russian armor, namely, the Soviet enforced domination in the whole of central and Eastern Europe?

It is extremely puzzling that even now when the Russians are demanding that the United States get out of Berlin, nobody on this side is demanding that the Soviets get out of Bucharest, Budapest, or Warsaw. It is true that Eastern Europe has been ceded to Russia and their Soviet stooge governments recognized in the hope of peace in our time, but as has become amply evident it has served no purpose and the aggressive aims of Russia are stronger than ever. Why, therefore, should one not make use of this powerful weapon of the rights and liberties of formerly free nations? We humbly believe, on the basis of direct knowledge of Russian political reactions and maneuvering, that it is a profound error of judgment to consider that making such a retort would impair one's negotiating position with the Russians; on the contrary, the Kremlin understands and takes seriously only negotiations from strength, using all available means which exploit the weakness of the opponent.

On this sad day, the Rumanians are looking toward the United States and any word of encouragement coming from you will deeply be appreciated by Rumanians in their enslaved country as by those in the free world.

Please accept our sincere gratitude for your ever kind sympathy and understanding.

I remain,

Yours respectfully,
MIHAIL FARCASANU,
President.

THE AMERICAN FARM SCHOOL IN GREECE

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, for 55 years, the American Farm School in Greece has been educating the sons of farming families of Macedonia and Greece to become better farmers, better Christians and better citizens.

The American Farm School is now headed by Bruce M. Lansdale, the third director in the school's 55 year history. Mr. Lansdale is a graduate of Monroe High School in Rochester, N.Y., and the University of Rochester, with a master's degree from Cornell University. He is currently visiting in the United States.

The American Farm School was founded in 1903 by the Reverend John Henry House and opened its doors to its first class of 12 students in 1904. It was incorporated in this same year under the laws of the State of New York as the Thessalonica Agricultural and Industrial Institute—it has become known affectionately and familiarly both in Greece and in this country under the shorter title—and is still operating under the charter granted in that year.

The school is authorized to operate under the laws of the Kingdom of Greece and, as an educational institution located in that country, derives in a small measure financial support from the Greek treasury. At irregular intervals through the years our Government has also, through grants from one or another of the Government agencies connected with the mutual security program, provided financial assistance. Currently the school enjoys a scholarship grant under the provisions of Public Law 480, and an application is pending for assistance, to be employed for capital improvements, from funds available under the International Cooperation Administration Mutual Securities Act, section 400(c).

Since founding, however, the school has depended in very large measure down through the years for financial support from the contributions of private citizens, chiefly generous and thoughtful Americans.

From an original enrollment of 12 students, who studied in a single building located on a campus comprising 50 acres, the school today has increased its enrollment to 200 boys, its buildings to 50 and its holdings of land to 340 acres. It is especially noteworthy—and, I believe, unique—that, through the efforts of the students—who learn by doing—the faculty and the staff, the sale of farm and animal products thus produced provide more than 60 cents of every dollar of the cost of operating the school.

In addition to the regular 4-year course for farm boys, the school has given for the past 5 years a series of short courses—at the urging of and cooperation with the Ministry of Agriculture of the Greek Government—for farmers and their wives, their elder sons and daughters, ranging in duration from 2 weeks to 2 months. The subjects taught range from tractor driving for girls—a defense measure—to beekeeping for elders as a supplement to cash income in a country 65 percent agricultural.

Mr. President, this school finds support for its expanding program of service through committees of friends and contributors in a number of cities throughout the Eastern United States. It is a tremendously worthwhile enterprise which has accomplished great good, both for the residents of Macedonia and Greece and for the cause of friendly international relations. I know that all my colleagues will join me in saying Godspeed to Mr. Lansdale and his associates.

I now desire to turn to another subject.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York has the floor.

ANNIVERSARY OF THE BIRTH OF THE GREATEST CZECH OF THEM ALL: THOMAS G. MASARYK

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, March 7 marked the anniversary of the birth of a great man, Thomas G. Masaryk, the father and founder of the Czechoslovakian Republic. This day is celebrated by all who love freedom, including those today trapped behind the Iron Curtain. Before Czechoslovakia was overrun by the Communist hordes, it was celebrated there as a national holiday. Today its observance is limited to covert commemorations by those brave people who continue to hold high the torch of freedom in spite of the oppressive tactics of their occupiers.

Here in America, March 7 serves as a fitting occasion for rededication to the cause of freedom for which Masaryk worked throughout his life.

Thomas G. Masaryk was a noted scholar and writer, whose contributions on the subject of democracy will live forever. But he was also a man of action. He led the way to the liberation of his people, and for 17 fruitful years he served as President of the newly formed Republic. His tenure in office was characterized by wisdom, tolerance, patience, and significant progress for his beloved land.

His death in 1937 saved Masaryk from witnessing the terrible tragedies which followed for Czechoslovakia—including the Munich fiasco, the awful years of Nazi occupation, and the even worse hell of domination by the Communists. Today in Czechoslovakia, the name Masaryk is revered by those dedicated to freeing that land. It is feared by the Communist overlords, who seek by all means at their command to stamp out the spirit of freedom and liberty which his name signifies.

Because Czechoslovakia today writhes in the chains of Communist domination, it is important for us in the free world to do all we can to offer hope and encouragement to her people. We must assure those behind the Iron Curtain that they are not forgotten.

By our observance of the anniversary of the birth of the great Masaryk, we are contributing to this effort. The life of this far-seeing patriot is truly an inspiration to all men everywhere who yearn for freedom or who work to spread liberty to all sectors of the globe.

Surely a people who produced a giant such as Masaryk will once again free itself from oppression and rejoin the world of free men. We pray that day will come soon. Then, the Czech people, themselves, will be able to join us on future occasions in celebrating once more the birthday of their greatest leader, Thomas G. Masaryk.

CONSERVATION IS MORE THAN A WORD; IT IS ALSO THE MAN

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, "conservation" became a household word because of Gifford Pinchot, Teddy Roosevelt, and the national forests. Since 1905 the U.S. Forest Service has been protecting and building our forests for our people to use and enjoy.

Our national forests are more than an everlasting source of wood, grass, water, and recreation—they are a part of our Nation's moral fiber. As we care for our forests and their resources so well we display our national interest in a vigorous, forward-looking, growing America. Our treatment of our natural resources today fixes unchangeably our resource base for tomorrow.

Because man possesses the ability to so change the forest, this wonder of nature is also the work of man. The men who manage our forests are our link with nature. Upon their excellence, their ability, their experience, their training, and their dedication to duty rests the future of the forest.

In Oregon, we have been fortunate to have many outstanding foresters in charge of our forests. Dr. Richard McArdle—the present Chief of the Forest Service—worked there early in his career. Lyle F. Watts, his able predecessor, is an Oregonian. Ed Cliff, who is now in charge of national forest administration, spent much of his career in Oregon.

The U.S. Forest Service has been noted for its outstanding success in developing a genuine career service free of the vicissitudes of political appointments. In this atmosphere many outstanding conservation leaders have developed.

I can think of no finer example today than a young man who has risen from a tree planter in 1933 on the old Columbia National Forest to Forest Supervisor of the Willamette National Forest. It is reasonable to expect perhaps that Bob Aufderheide, who got his start in what is now the Gifford Pinchot National Forest, should exhibit the same conscientious devotion to duty as did Pinchot himself.

Bob Aufderheide has done a truly outstanding job. The Willamette National Forest is in the heart of Oregon's forest industry. Over 400 million board feet of timber are cut from its timber stands each year—and it alone accounts for over 10 percent of the entire Forest Service income. Over 400,000 people use its recreational facilities. It has been the scene of extensive dam construction work by the Corps of Engineers. It is a center for applied forest management research. It has a 400,000-acre wilderness area on the crest of the Cascade Mountains.

It takes real leadership to administer more than 1,500,000 acres of growing forest and Bob Aufderheide has displayed not only leadership but outstanding judgment and human understanding. He has, by example, stimulated his associates on this great forest to respond with the best of their abilities. This in my opinion is the test of leadership because the job he has is too big for one man to do alone. He has been extremely capable in securing cooperation from those who use the forest.

To me, Bob Aufderheide's career exemplifies the response to public duty that too often we take for granted. I do not want to let it go unnoticed because we depend upon Bob and others like him to not only do their job but do it well.

It often is the custom when a man high in government retires to eulogize his great accomplishments. I think it far better that we also should remember those who work outside the national spotlight, and to call attention to their great work while they are still engaged in it.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the 1958 annual report of the Willamette National Forest and my letter of February 4, 1959, to Forest Supervisor Bob Aufderheide be printed in the RECORD following these remarks.

There being no objection, the report and letter were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WILLAMETTE NATIONAL FOREST 1958

1958 HIGHLIGHTS

Last year, for the first time, we were able to obtain the foresters we could finance. Consequently, we were able to obtain most of our objectives. Our most noteworthy accomplishment was selling the new allowable cuts established by the reinventory completed the year before. Our 1958 sale program called for the sale of 610 million board feet; our accomplishment was 668 million board feet. The sale of this timber will permit the purchasers to take advantage of any improved market condition that may occur in 1959.

Another real accomplishment was the initiation of a $200,000 construction program. We are building new dwellings, offices, warehouses, and work camps, and are thus getting set to provide the extra services indicated by the greater cuts of timber and other public demands.

We had a rough fire season and obtained excellent help from the logging industry. This fine cooperation kept our losses down to reasonable levels.

Recreational use continues to expand rapidly, and all our facilities were filled on most weekends. Heretofore full capacity would occur only on special holiday weekends such as the Fourth of July. Our allotment for recreation was less than in 1957. Available funds were used to replace worn-out facilities in existing camps, and we were unable to do much in the way of new campgrounds. We completed a road into Big Lake, and this beautiful lake will now be accessible to the motoring recreationist.

Coordinating all the activities on the forest and adjusting conflicts that threaten other important uses and values continues to be an evergrowing job. We assure you that we shall continue to keep the Willamette forest a good place for recreation.

We appreciate your continued interest and help and will welcome any suggestions you have.

Sincerely,

ROBERT AUFDERHEIDE,
Forest Supervisor.

GENERAL ADMINISTRATION

Good progress has been made in easing our housing problems, and as a result we have been able to recruit a few more foresters to help get the job done. The following facilities were constructed at ranger stations or work centers during the past year: three 12-man bunkhouses, one 20-man bunkhouse, two warehouses, three 20-man messhalls, seven 3-bedroom dwellings, two water systems.

Also, a residence and lot were purchased at Mill City which will serve as an office and headquarters site for the new ranger district to be split off the Detroit district. The completion of the purchase of six residences which formerly were owned by the Army Engineers at Mill City was accomplished, and these buildings were rehabilitated and will serve the new district. Similar accomplishments are hoped for during the present year to further relieve the operational problems that have hampered our progress.

In an operation of this size, personnel and crews are not static. Transfers, military furloughs and resignations, as well as seasonal fluctuations, necessitate changes. Our technical force seems to average about 60 foresters assigned to the various activities as needs dictate, but with timber management receiving by far the greatest number. Maximum employment on the forest totaled 455 for a short period in the late summer. This did not include firefighters.

This force of foresters utilizes our finances and limits the standard of management we can observe in the handling of the resource. Additional management funds would provide for more intense management and the harvesting of salvageable volume by thinning.

TIMBER MANAGEMENT

New goals were set and won in the sales business during 1958, and the attainment of the harvesting of the allowable annual cut does not seem far off. The following figures tell the story for the past year.

	Over $2,000 value	Under $2,000 value	Total
Number of sales made	138	526	664
Volume sold (thousand feet board measure)	638,727.0	29,950.0	668,677.0
Value all sales	$12,697,805.35		
Volume cut (thousand feet board measure)	477,218.05		
Total value of cut	$10,397,448		

These figures apply to the entire sale program, which includes all types of forest products measured or converted into board-foot figures.

Presale work was carried on to provide for the early selling of the allowable annual cut volume for each working circle during the present year.

The reinventory of the timber resource in the South Santiam drainage was completed in the early fall. Now the office computation of the new allowable annual cut must be done before the project is complete. However, an interim adjusted volume of 85 MM is being used for planning and sales purposes until a computed figure is obtained.

A new transplant nursery was established on the Lowell District, and 85 M Douglas-fir 2–1 transplants were produced for use in reforesting some of our more severe sites. Plans are for the expansion of this program and the production of approximately a half million transplants this year.

The reforestation of our cutover lands continues to be top priority. During the year, 5,000 acres were stocked with 2,600,000 seedlings and transplants.

Two new scale stations were built—one on the McKenzie River near Blue River and on Fall Creek near Lowell. These stations can handle 4 trucks at a time and as many as 175 loads of logs have been handled through these stations in an 8-hour day.

SOIL AND WATERSHED MANAGEMENT

The Cougar Reservoir on the South Fork McKenzie drainage has now been logged and cleared and the slash disposed of by burning. This phase of the dam project was completed during 1958. Similarly, most of the Hills Creek Reservoir work on the Middle Fork Willamette drainage was accomplished. This achievement on these projects during the past fire season is noteworthy and eliminates a serious fire potential which was a major problem.

Replacement roads are now being constructed above the flood line on each project. These should be completed in 1959.

Continued attention is given to the problem of soil disturbance in our development work. Studies have been made of all of the forest roads which will lead to the stabilizing of back slopes, embankments, etc.

Through timber sale procedure we are eliminating logjams and drift from stream channels. The opening of the channels eliminates much of the danger associated with flood conditions.

This year we received our first allocation of funds for rehabilitation and channel improvement on Salt Creek near Oakridge. Several large drifts were cleaned up and obstructions were bunched and burned. This work should do much toward eliminating the periodic damaging floods experienced in this drainage in past years.

The water and soils program will continue to expand under the multiple-use concept of management. Continuing studies are being carried on at the Andrews Experimental Forest to determine the impact of logging methods, size of units, road construction, and other forces which affect water runoff and the quantity and quality of water produced.

RECREATION AND OTHER LAND USE

The mild winter of 1957–58 caused little damage to our trails and allowed for the early maintenance of many of the high-country recreation routes. Approximately 1,200 miles of our 1,800 miles of trails were maintained. An additional 2 miles of construction was accomplished on the Obsidian Trail—this completes the new trail from Frog Camp to the Skyline Trail.

Reconstruction was done on the Marian Lake trail and on the Oregon Skyline Trail from Jefferson Park to Pamelia Lake and from the Maxwell Shelter to the North Santiam Highway. Additional work is planned on other sections this year.

Campground work has been about equally divided between rehabilitation of old camps and expansion with new projects. The Fall Creek area camps received a complete overhaul with some expansion of facilities. Several new shelters were constructed at the Clark Creek organization site. These were badly needed and will be used by youth groups camping in the area.

The campground roads and parking areas at Clear Lake, Scott Lake, and Olallie were much improved during the summer.

On the Detroit District, new campgrounds were established at Hoover Falls and on Piety Island. This latter one is unique in that it is accessible only by boat. However, the popularity of this reservoir for fishing and boating insures a heavy season-long use.

In several campgrounds in the McKenzie Bridge area, a light cutting of some very old and defective trees was accomplished. The cutting of these defective trees eliminates the possibility of their blowing over in severe windstorms with resulting damage to the improvements or harm to the campers. Careful thought has been given to their removal. In the establishing of new camps, younger stands are often considered more desirable.

Land-use plans were completed for the McKenzie and Blue River Districts. Study continues on other areas where multiple use can be practiced through wise use of water, utilization of timber, and the full realization of the recreation and esthetic values.

Rights-of-way problems continue as more roads are needed to reach the untapped resources needing management and land and timber values increase. The cooperation we receive from the private landowners is good and minimizes many of the problems. However, legal requirements are often-times frustrating and occasionally upset time schedules which have been established.

WILDLIFE AND RANGE MANAGEMENT

The grazing of domestic stock on this forest is a minor use. However, the utilization of the forage resource by game animals is recognized and considered in the application of the multiple-use concept. As the cutting of the old-growth stands progress, the cutover areas will be utilized by big game animals until the young stands shade out the browse and forage plants. Thus, the regulated management of the timber resource will insure a constant habitat for the deer and elk, and we have multiple use. Also, the hunting provided because of the game population figures in our recreation use.

FIRE CONTROL AND SLASH DISPOSAL

The 1958 fire season was the worst since 1951. One hundred thirty-eight fires burned 1,284 acres, which was much greater than the 5-year average of 84 fires and 151 acres. Improvement over 1957 was noted in the man-caused fire statistic. Thirty-eight fires burned 88 acres this year, while in 1957 43 fires burned 300 acres.

The excellent cooperation of loggers and industrial workers, coupled with good prevention tactics, enabled us to get by without a serious logging operation fire. The number of man-caused fires is still too high, but the decrease over the past year may still be significant, considering the critical fire weather and the increase in recreation and other man use of the forest experienced in 1958. It is hoped the decrease indicates a trend rather than a happenstance. If it is a trend, it points up that our forest users are aware of the serious damage done by fire and are taking steps to prevent them.

On the night of August 24, 70 fires were set by a severe dry lightning storm which

passed over the north half of the forest. At this time there had been no trace of precipitation for almost 9 weeks, and forest fuels were tinder dry and explosive. Two of the lightning-set fires were raging infernos when the first firemen reached them. The Dry Creek fire was controlled within several days, after burning about 100 acres, while the Canyon Creek fire was not controlled until it had burned 1,025 acres and several hundred experienced firefighters from distant points in western Oregon had been called into the battle.

In the suppression of this rash of lightning fires, smokejumpers, aircraft, helicopters, tractors, pumps and other machines were used extensively in controlling the blazes. The smokejumpers made 38 jumps to 13 fires. Three helicopters were used in transporting men on the Canyon Creek fire and on several of the smaller fires. Several hundred men and almost 12,000 pounds of cargo was airlifted from the base camp to the firelines and to "heliports" and an air camp set near the top of the fire.

In addition, two conventional aircraft were used for dropping a total of 16,000 pounds of cargo to 5 fires which were remote from roads or trails. Air tankers were used on several fires and dropped 13,500 gallons of borate slurry and 700 gallons of wet water to aid in the control. This is a newer innovation in fire control technique and shows great promise for the future as the technique becomes perfected.

The 1958 fires did not destroy an exceptionally large volume of timber, but other resource damage resulted which makes them costly. In several cases where timber was killed, plans have already been made for salvaging it.

A new lookout tower and house was built on Indian Ridge this year as a replacement. Plans are now under way for a new lookout house on Fuji Mountain in 1959. This mountain is familiar to many of the Waldo Lake visitors.

Our achievements in slash burning were very gratifying in that we burned all of the areas of current slash as well as several areas which had been carried for several years. A total of 5,500 acres of clear-cut slash was burned by Forest Service and operator crews. In most cases, excellent burns resulted and the areas were left in an almost ideal condition for reforesting.

Private landowners having slash within the protective boundary were equally as successful in the handling of their slash areas.

As previously stated, most of the slash remaining on the reservoir projects was burned during the fall period. These two projects had a total slash acreage of 4,100.

ENGINEERING AND ROAD CONSTRUCTION

Road surveying and designing by Forest Service crews are now being accomplished for all of our major timber sale roads. We are getting started on the job of staking the location for construction by the timber purchasers. The doing of this work by Forest Service crews makes possible better estimating for all concerned. Also, it eliminates much of the delay in starting road construction after purchase of the timber.

Some work has been done in controlling roadside brush by spraying. It is hoped that the application of a dormant spray will prevent sprouting or leafing in the spring.

The Bureau of Public Roads has contracted for the paving of 11 miles of the Belknap Springs Forest Highway which was recently graded. It is hoped grading of the several miles remaining in the middle, and which was cleared this past year, will be accomplished this year. This will provide an all weather route between the McKenzie and the South Santiam Highways and a more direct route into much of eastern Oregon.

The following is a list of our 1958 accomplishments:

1. Road surveyed for Forest Service design, 187.
2. Road located for operator design, 20 miles.
3. Road built under timber sale contract, 144 miles.
4. Estimated value of road built by operators, $4,445,000.
5. Bridges built by Bureau of Public Roads, 9.
6. Bridges built by Forest Service, 2.
7. Major culverts bought, for installation by purchasers, 24.
8. Road maintained by purchasers, 650 miles.
9. Road maintained by Forest Service, 550 miles.
10. Trails maintained by Forest Service, 1,140 miles.
11. Telephone lines maintained by Forest Service, 600 miles.
12. Radios maintained, 175.
13. Vehicles maintained, 129 units.

WILLAMETTE NATIONAL FOREST DIRECTORY

Forest supervisor's office, Post Office Building, Post Office Box 1272, Eugene, Oreg. (DI 4–5291).

Robert Aufderheide, forest supervisor.
Edward L. Peltier, timber management.
Warren M. Pressentin, fire control.
Edwin C. Stout, engineering.
Loyd Bransford, recreation and other land use.
Clyde L. Quam, administrative officer.

District rangers: Alvin L. Sorseth, Detroit district (Detroit 552), Detroit, Oreg.; Orval Jess, Cascadia district (Sweet Home, Empire 7–2828), Foster, Oreg.; Raymond L. Hornbeck, McKenzie district (Blue River, Valley 2–3482), McKenzie Bridge, Oreg.; Edward W. Anderson, Blue River district (Blue River, Valley 2–3516, Blue River, Oreg.; Ralph L. Worstell, Lowell district (Lowell, Webster 7–2114), Lowell, Oreg.; Stanley I. Undi, Oakridge district (Oakridge, Sunset 2–1721), Oakridge, Oreg.; W. David Kolb, Rigdon district (Oakridge, Sunset 2–3051), Oakridge, Oreg.

Forest statistics

County:	Acres
Clackamas	914
Douglas	50,628
Jefferson	832
Lane	961,028
Linn	464,614
Marion	137,326
Total	1,615,342

Of this forest total, over one-third (620,300 acres) is in areas either reserved from timber cutting or not suited to timber production.

Willamette National Forest receipts and expenditures, fiscal year 1958

	Receipts	Expenditures	
		Operating	Investments
National forest protection and management (includes brush disposal)	[1] $181,982	$907,679	$102,529
Fighting forest fires		103,915	
Forest pest control		342	
Road and trail system, construction and maintenance		94,944	603,395
Cooperative deposits (including timber deposits for stand improvement)	217,071	103,868	129,286
National forest receipts to forest reserve fund	8,264,083		
Total	8,663,136	1,210,748	835,210
Total operating receipts and expenditures	8,663,136	2,045,958	
(1) a. Operating expenditures	1,210,743		
b. Estimated annual depreciation on roads, trails, and other improvements in place on June 30, 1958	806,572		
	2,017,320		
Amount by which receipts exceed operating expenditures, plus estimated depreciation	6,645,816		

[1] Brush disposal deposit.

NOTE.—During the fiscal year ending June 30, 1958, we cut 15,610,000 board feet of timber valued at $463,155 on lands having O. & C. status (formerly controverted) but which are administered by the forest service. This revenue is not included in this statement of receipts and expenditures but merges with other O. & C. receipts for distribution of 75 percent to the O. & C. counties.

Twenty-five percent of national forest receipts is distributed to the counties in which national forest land is located for roads and schools. Distribution from the Willamette National Forest receipts was as follows:

Clackamas	$1,169.19
Douglas	64,763.38
Jefferson	1,064.30
Lane	1,230,721.76
Linn	592,701.11
Marion	175,601.03
Total	2,066,020.77

The above payments amounted to approximately $1.25 per acre for each national-forest acre in each of the above six counties. Adding 75 percent of the $463,155 of revenue from the O. & C. lands gives a total return in excess of $1.50 per acre.

PORTLAND, OREG., *February 4, 1959.*

Mr. ROBERT AUFDERHEIDE,
Forest Supervisor,
Willamette National Forest,
Eugene, Oreg.

DEAR BOB: I want to express to everyone on the Willamette National Forest my appreciation for the wonderful job you have done during 1958. The annual report that you just sent to me gives good evidence of this excellence.

I particularly want to congratulate you on your timber sales accomplishments, which were in excess of your plans. That is a situation which did not prevail on every forest, and I think it is a real credit to the teamwork and leadership you have developed.

I am glad to see that you are making progress in recreational improvement work although I realize that the funds are not sufficient to do the necessary job.

I know that your fire-control record, while it suffered this year statistically, did not suffer in terms of the strong effort you must have made to control the 138 fires that you had to cope with.

Please accept my best wishes for 1959. I hope that you are fully recovered from your recent hospitalization and that you will now continue to enjoy good health.

Sincerely,

RICHARD L. NEUBERGER,
United States Senator.

A REACTION AGAINST TYRANNY

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, the latest issue of Human Events contains an article defining the term "reactionary." This article was written by Mr. John J. Synon, a California industrial accident commissioner, who, I understand, is a frequent contributor to California newspapers. His discourse on just what is a reactionary is worthy of the attention of all of us, and I ask unanimous consent that it be inserted in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A REACTION AGAINST TYRANNY—I'VE BEEN CALLED A NAME

(By John J. Synon)

I do a column for a downstate daily whose publisher recently told me I am one of the most reactionary characters he's ever known.

He runs my stuff, I think, because he gets a kick out of the occasional blue furies I manage whenever my nape is rubbed the wrong way. My low flashpoint, he says, stirs up his readers. Which is reason enough for him to print me—he sells papers for a living. But why call me a reactionary?

Literally, I suppose I am. Who isn't? Only the dead don't react.

Yet the stinging phrase rings in my ears, for there is nothing hidebound about me. Certainly I'm against indiscriminate foreign aid. Who in his right mind isn't—bucketing dollars all over the world like madmen slopping a billion hogs? And, yes, I am opposed to compulsory unionism. I think it outrageous, this forcing people against their will into private organizations. Conceding these views, are they enough to pin a label on me?

What is the definition of a reactionary? I don't know and I can't find out. I can tell you what an egghead is, a New Dealer, a mugwump, a know-nothing. I even remember what Democrats were. But I've never seen a definition of a political reactionary, one I'd accept.

I keep plowing around for a definition, for some little succinct phrase that will salve my editor-bruised feelings, but I can't find one. The best I can do is much too long. By whatever title, this is my creed: You let me alone and I'll let you alone.

Does that make me a reactionary? I call my publisher friend a Socialist and I can prove, by Webster's dictionary, that he's a Socialist. On the other hand, he calls himself a Democrat but I defy him to prove that.

I call myself a Republican, and when I want to emphasize what I am I call myself a "black Republican." I do that even though the blood of my Virginia relatives changes cycle whenever I do. The Republican Party was born to free men, our black people, and because I haven't forgot that historical fact I call myself—despite the wincing of those who are forced to associate with me—I call myself a black Republican.

I remember how my party came into being and I couldn't be anything else, for I believe with all my heart that every man should be free, the captain of his soul. Which, parenthetically, is why I oppose compulsory unionism. And since we prefer an orderly society (I suppose we prefer civilization), with freedom must go responsibility. The two are inexorably coupled. What sort of freedom is it when a person shucks responsibility? Somebody must assume the burden you dodge and if you refuse it, then you must—to maintain order—take direction from another.

The Socialists press for the abdication of responsibility, of personal liberty. They say, in return, you shall have a planned economy. This is a euphemism, you must know, for a much plainer phrase. It means, "Let uncle tell you what to do."

Who's uncle? "Uncle" is a bunch of egghead jerks who have no understanding of your problems as an individual and care less. They look at the broad picture, and you with your problems at home and at the butcher shop have no meaning.

Today they set the price of your pork chops and of your milk and they do it so as to make them prohibitively costly. How long since the butcher has given you a savory soupbone for the dog? Or a peppermint stick for Junior? And the sales Mama once knew are things long gone. There was a day when shopping, next to the honeymoon, was the greatest thrill in Mama's life. That bargain hunter par excellence could, in 2 days of cagy foraging, save Papa half the bill.

No longer. They've got Mama fair-traded nigh into schizophrenia.

When I was a boy, before the era of the common man, a workman labored and was paid. And what he got was his, brother, all his, for he had earned it. The man who worked for wages had no more connection with the tax collector than presently he has with sputnik.

When I was a boy, a man who worked for wages had heard of the tax collector, sure, but gave him no personal application for he knew no direct taxation and the indirect bite was so small as to make it inconsequential. Government meant little to him.

What happened? The man who presently works for wages, even the poorest, works 3 months every year, just to feed that insatiable Moloch, the Federal Government. The best he can expect in return is something they call social security. And, yes, you guessed it, I'm against that, too.

I don't remember the exact figures, I'm no statistician, yet I recall, for every dollar Joe the Drudge pays in he will take out 30, maybe 20, I don't know, some outlandish sum. There is nothing equal to that this side of Reno. Think of it, 30 to 1. Even the racetracks don't pay off like that, more than once or twice a meet—not if they want to stay in business. Then how does the Federal Government do it?

Easy. They've got the "broad picture" in mind so they steal it by the billions from others—and from the very beneficiaries they pay it to. Already the thing is dishing out more than it is taking in, and in the future the outgo will mount until the difference becomes astronomical. And where will the difference come from?

Why, through greater and greater taxation, by floated Government paper, paid for by the depreciated currency—where else?

And yet this thing was sold to the people, is being sold now, as a form of insurance. I oppose social security as we know it because I am opposed to my Government working a confidence game on the people.

That makes me a reactionary. So be it.

Every dispassionate person who ever tried to teach me something of life told me liberty is the greatest treasure of them all. And every bit of history I've ever read hammers home their meaning. I remembered their words in the twenties, when the Russian peasants by the millions starved to death because they were not allowed to fend for themselves.

And I remembered when our State Department issued its white paper trying to make me believe the Red Chinese were agrarian reformers, and I remembered and cheered the courage of the free Chinese when Chiang threw out old Vinegar Joe Stilwell. And later, in Laos and across the world in East Berlin and a bit later in Hungary, I remembered.

I remembered the words of Patrick Henry and never felt them outmoded. And I don't think them outmoded now, reactionary though I may be.

How can a person forget? Having remembered as the lights of the world grew dim, how can I forget as I see our homegrown tyrants stealing upon my own personal freedom? I can't, nor shall I. For it makes little difference to me how you steal my liberty so long as you steal it.

What essential difference is there between a labor camp and forced membership in a trade union? There is only a difference in degree, for in neither case is the individual allowed to exercise his "inalienable" right of free choice.

And to this I react.

I have no mind to harp on labor unions, to the exclusion of other infringers on our liberty. Their counterparts, the employers who conspire with union bosses to bilk the consumer, are no better. As the labor chiefs drive to compel every wage earner to join their ranks, so businessmen sometimes tell the bosses to cut down the number of firms in an industry, so that those left—those playing ball with the unions—can charge monopoly-sized prices.

There is but one hope, there has always been but one hope, and that is in the fight for the rights of the individual.

We must never quit.

If we give way to the cynic and wait for the ax to fall, then indeed there is no hope. For a number of reasons, material and moral, we have to keep on fighting. And if they beat us today, we'll beat them tomorrow.

I have no desire to be a plush cushion slave, as enticing as that may sound, for such slaves—having no voice of their own—have a way of losing their cushions. After all, these eggheads who do the planning are incapable of creating anything, and unless you create for them they won't have the wherewithall to slake old Moloch's thirst.

When the planners have reached the last farthing of your earned dollar, what then? Who is going to do the creating? Not me—there is nothing in it for me. And not you either, and for the very same reason. Yet the day will come when the last cent is controlled, unless we fight on.

This land of ours was built on hope and certain assurances. If a man worked, produced, he could keep what he earned, do as he pleased so long as he did not impinge on another. This was the meaning of the Declaration of Independence, the fireball that lit liberty's torch, that brought us to the top of the heap. Without hope of gain for effort expended, there is no hope. And without hope, no life worth the living.

Reactionary, indeed.

POLITICAL PARTIES

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, the latest issue of the Saturday Evening Post contains an editorial which I believe merits consideration of all those who seek political office and who are interested in the continued well-being of a political party. Significantly, the editorial bears the title "A Party Can Change Its Image; But Will the Public Buy it?"

The editorial notes that "there are millions of other people to whom the Republican Party looks like an organization of middle-of-the-road folks who are worried about what is happening to the dollar and wonder if we really need to give away quite so much money to foreigners." I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed at this point following my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A PARTY CAN CHANGE ITS IMAGE; BUT WILL THE PUBLIC BUY IT?

Some people are becoming increasingly restive over all this talk about images. Hardly a day passes without a newspaper columnist or a politician demanding that the Republican Party, the motion-picture industry, the Old South, United States Steel, and Vice President NIXON should do something about their images.

One trouble with becoming unduly concerned about one's image is that nobody is entirely sure what it is. The Democrats and leftwing propagandists, for example, have terrified a lot of Republicans into believing that their party's image is a fat old plutocrat who lives on dividends and hates the workers. This may be the image of the GOP as conveyed to some people, mainly liberal Democrats and some professors in college-economics faculties; but there are millions of other people to whom the Republican Party looks like an organization of middle-of-the-road folks who are worried about what is happening to the dollar and wonder if we really need to give away quite so much money to foreigners.

Anyway, while the leaders of various groups are busy revising their images, the public mocks up its own images of people and parties, relying less on clay from public-relations pottery works than on such information it can get on the subject being imaged, as Walter Winchell used to put it when printing a birth notice 4 or 5 months in advance. The leftwing effort to establish the image of Senator HARRY F. BYRD of Virginia as a slave driver in an apple orchard was a flop. People like or dislike the Senator according to their views on economy in government. The leftwing did manage to set up an image of Vice President NIXON which they used to stick pins in, and some of the Vice President's admirers think he should counter with an image more attractive to leftwingers. Actually, Mr. NIXON has done pretty well by just being himself.

Labor Leader George Meany's image is pretty good, not because of anything the image mongers have done for him, but because he has a mind of his own and lets people know it. The man who, when so many so-called leaders were slobbering over Mikoyan, indicated that he wouldn't give the Soviet slave driver the time of day makes his own image without professional help.

And speaking of labor leaders, look at Jimmy Hoffa. He has the worst possible image. Judges, grand juries, Senate committees, ordinary citizens denounce him daily. The jail door yawns, but does not slam on him. If all the smear experts in the Nation had gone to work to give Jimmy Hoffa an image that would stop a clock, they couldn't do any better than he has done for himself. But as far as we know, Hoffa has hired no men in gray-flannel suits to devise a new and nicer Hoffa image. He just lets the old mug ride.

The result is that the teamsters greet Hoffa whenever he emerges from a committee hearing or a grand-jury room with shouts of "He's our boy," and ballots to match. This creates an unpopular image for the Teamsters Union in the eyes of millions of Americans, but up to now nothing has been done to inconvenience Hoffa and his allies. If an image like Hoffa's upsets so few people, why should the G.O.P., or even the maneating shark, have its image lifted?

THE FEDERAL BUDGET

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, I have followed with great interest the controversy over the Federal budget during the past few weeks.

I think the debate is very useful. I hope it may lead to some reduction in nonessential spending which is so urgently needed.

To date these discussions have been useful primarily because they are beginning to show how Congress has lost effective control over the rate of Federal spending.

There are signs that the debate is throwing a little light in a few dark corners where tremendous back door spending and other expenditures outside of effective control are hidden.

In this connection I request unanimous consent that a statement I have prepared relative to authority to spend from public debt receipts be made a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

One such dark corner is the growing contrivance to evade both appropriation review and control by writing final authority to spend from Federal debt receipts directly into substantive law.

We can count upward of $200 billion provided for expenditure through this method—outside of appropriation control—since inception of the modernized version of this technique for Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

This total assumes the $6.1 billion budgeted for the current year, and includes $25 billion in unused authority remaining in unexpended balances, and $163 billion provided to Federal spending agencies as of last June 30—$97.7 billion in initial expenditures and $64.9 billion in refundings.

But this is not the whole story. Great sums of this money have gone into Federal spending programs financed out of revolving funds. Some of this money has been used over and over again—each time with neither appropriation control nor review.

In fact, it would be difficult to calculate gross spending out of these revolving funds financed out of the Federal debt, but the total runs to untold billions.

Authority to spend from debt receipts is only one of the numerous methods of bypassing effective appropriation control now in practice, but it rates first examination because its characteristics are doubly damnable.

It not only circumvents the appropriation process; but by its nature authority to spend from debt receipts is a statutory mandate to increase the Federal debt by every dollar drawn out of the Treasury under this type of spending authorization.

When use of debt receipts, instead of appropriations, is authorized by law to finance a spending program, the effect is to prohibit the use of other Treasury receipts, such as those from taxes; the debt must be increased under the law.

I suspect that many citizens of this Nation, and perhaps some Members of Congress would be surprised to learn that there never was an appropriation for the $3,750 million British loan.

Under this loan expenditures totaling $2,050 million were made in fiscal year 1947 and $1,700 million in 1948, at the convenience and desire of the British Government, and charged directly into the American Federal debt.

I am not quarreling with the purposes of the British loan. I cite it at this late date only as an example of one type of Federal spending outside the appropriation process.

And, like too many Federal loans of all kinds, payments on the British loan in terms of both principal and interest have been made neither in full nor on time.

It is contended that authority to spend from debt receipts is used largely to finance programs involving Federal loans, and when the loans are repaid the receipts may be used to reduce the debt.

In theory this may sound plausible. But I assure you that it over-simplifies the manner in which these programs work.

And, as chairman of the Senate Finance Committee which was called upon last year to raise the statutory debt limit twice within 6 months, I suggest that neither the Congress nor the American taxpayer should rely on this theory with confidence.

The nature of programs generally financed by this method raises questions as to whether, when, and if so by how much, the Federal debt is reduced by repayments from the agencies involved.

Agencies authorized to draw on Federal debt receipts are usually Government corporations or so-called business-type operations engaged in long-term loans or advances in the fields of housing, business, agricultural surpluses, foreign aid, etc.

In most cases, when the funds are drawn down from the debt, the money is deposited in agency revolving funds from which the loans, advances, etc., are made. But when the agency collects repayments the money does not go to the Treasury for reduction of the debt. It goes back into the agency revolving fund for reuse.

When the agencies do make payments to the Treasury, it is not unusual for them to be refunded, refinanced, or followed by requests for new debt spending authority.

Statements that these agencies cost the Government nothing, or that they are making money, should be accepted with caution.

In the first place the Government should not do business with taxpayers for a profit.

In the second place, the ultimate costs of these agencies are difficult to determine even in liquidation. You can measure a snake when it is dead, but the complex financial structure used for many of these programs defies determination of profit or loss.

The old Home Owners Loan Corporation is the example usually held up as a successful operation which paid back its loans. Patient examination of its complicated liquidation now is raising doubts despite the fact that it was accomplished under conditions of housing scarcity and rising inflation.

Except for administrative expense limitation, the appropriations committees have little reason to know most of these debt spending agencies exist—until they get in trouble.

But when they work themselves into a position where they cannot pay their debts to the Treasury, they hasten through the appropriations committees with requests to wipe out the debt.

They do this in one of two ways. They either request appropriations out of the general revenue of the Treasury to restore impaired capital, or they request cancellation of their notes held by the Treasury.

In either case, the effect is shotgun action through the appropriation process.

Since the establishment of RFC, $20.8 billion of debt owed to the Treasury by these agencies has been wiped off the books by this process—nearly $16½ billion in note cancellations, more than $4½ billion in restoration of capital. Cash recoveries against these note cancellations to date have totaled less than $3 billion.

More than $12 billion of debt owed the Treasury by RFC was canceled. Restoration of capital for Commodity Credit Corporation has totaled more than $4.5 billion, and $3.3 billion of CCC notes have been canceled.

These debt spending agencies can be financed through the orthodox appropriation control procedure. This fact is conclusively demonstrated by experience with Rural

Electrification Administration and Farmers Home Administration.

Both of these agencies make loans. Both are authorized to spend from public debt receipts, but the amounts they can spend are determined under regular appropriation bills, subject to annual review and control.

When repayments are collected by these agencies, the money goes directly into miscellaneous receipts of the Treasury. They are not allowed to accumulate collections for reuse outside of appropriation control in some autonomous revolving fund.

I am pleased to note that this practice of authorizing expenditures by Federal agencies outside of appropriation control is coming to light in the current controversy.

I commend Senator STROM THURMOND of South Carolina and Representative HOWARD SMITH of Virginia for introducing bills, in the Senate and House respectively, seeking to curb sub rosa financing.

There are other practices which contribute to ineffective expenditure control through the appropriation process, such as building up huge unexpended balances, permanent appropriations, contract authority, use of foreign currencies, etc.

A great deal needs to be done to bring order and responsibility out of the fiscal legislation jungle we have allowed to grow up.

I shall have more to say on these subjects and some proposals to make in the very near future.

RESPONSIBILITY OF THE INDIVIDUAL SENATOR—ITS DISINTEGRATION, PART II—THE DETERMINATION OF SENATE DEMOCRATIC POLICY

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The hour of 2 o'clock having arrived, morning business is concluded.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I make this speech in the spirit which I think was extremely well described by the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON], our majority leader, when he spoke a week ago last Saturday night. This is what he said:

> This does not mean that there should not be discussion, debate, dissension, and disagreement. That is the right and the strength of free men.
>
> This is in the Democratic tradition. It is in the great tradition of freedom to disagree. I pray it always will be. We have it in the U.S. Senate, and we have it in the Democratic Party. This is a part of our heritage.
>
> We have our fights; we keep them in the open and talk them out. Then united we stand.

In that spirit I should like to continue and say that this is the second in my series of speeches on the disintegration of the right and duty for all Democratic Senators to determine our party's programs and policies in the U.S. Senate.

On February 23 I contended that the decision of our leadership not to call caucuses in recent years of all Democrats for the purpose of determining a legislative program has destroyed this right and duty. The absence of Democratic caucuses is, of course, fundamental.

It is also widely recognized and conceded.

What has not been discussed is the way policy is in fact determined in my party in the Senate.

The cold fact is that Democratic policy in the Senate is made entirely on an ad lib, off-the-cuff basis. The initiative as well as the final decision is almost always resolved by the majority leader himself on the basis of his own judgment of what is desirable and what is possible.

This is not to say that the individual Democratic Senator doesn't play a part in determining policy. His individual vote and whatever influence he may have that goes beyond his individual vote is a factor in the majority leader's calculus. But it is the majority leader who does the computing of the possible. And the critical point is that he does it without the overall conscious guidance of Senate Democrats either in caucus or in policy committee. It is my position that this is an unnecessary delegation of responsibility by Democratic Senators. In the vast majority of democratic legislative bodies throughout this country and the world, no such delegation is found necessary for action.

I have found that to be the case in State legislatures in this country and in parliamentary bodies elsewhere.

So today I shall try to establish that the policy committee usually does not and the majority leader usually does in fact decide Senate Democratic policy. Secondly, I will discuss the consequences of this on the Senate as one of the world's great deliberative and educational bodies. Here, too, the rights and duties of individual Senators are seriously involved. And, of course, the consequences on the understanding of our Government by our own people and persons throughout the world is great.

THE POLICY COMMITTEE

Congress has made only one effort in recent years to create a law that would provide a framework within which the policies of our parties could be determined. Extremely exhaustive and thorough hearings were held by the Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress some 13 years ago. The legislative history of the law setting up policy committees that emerged from these hearings is a little complicated, because the bill introduced following the original committee report and which set up policy committees in both Houses of Congress was defeated in the House after having passed the Senate. After this rejection of policy committees in both Houses, policy committees for both parties were set up in the Senate.

Mr. President, what I am about to say is not intended in criticism or derogation of anyone. There is nothing personal in these remarks. These policy committees were set up before our present Democratic leadership was elected. Therefore, this is something established in the past. The members of our Democratic policy committee include men who are among the most illustrious who have ever served in this body. Their character and ability is beyond question.

But, Mr. President, it is a simple truth that there is no visible similarity whatsoever between the purposes of the policy committee as set forth in the committee report on which the idea of policy committees was originally conceived and what the Democratic policy committee appears to be doing.

Mr. President, I am going to read the preamble to the specific recommendations that proposed the creation of policy committees in the report of the Joint Committee on the Reorganization of Congress on March 4, 1946:

> Strong recommendations were made for formal expression within the Congress of the main policies of the majority and minority parties. These recommendations called for some mechanism which could bring about more party accountability for policies and pledges announced and made in the national platforms of the major political parties * * * only through the expression of the will of the people by their support of political parties on the basis of their platform pledges can the majority will be determined.

So a prime purpose of the policy committee according to the committee report was to serve as a mechanism for translating platform promises into law.

The report goes on to point out the role of the party caucuses within Congress to serve as an intermediate agency between the people who vote Republican or Democratic and the Republican or Democratic policy committees.

It then recommends that the policy committee:

First:

> Formulate the overall legislative policy of the two parties.

Second:

> Meet frequently to consider its role in expediting consideration and passage of matters pledged to the people by their party.

Third:

> On issues where party policy is involved the decisions of these policy committees would be formally announced in proceedings of Congress, and formal records would be kept of such decisions. No member of either party would be required to follow such announced party policy except as he chose to do so. Each member would be free to vote as he saw fit, but the record of his action would be available to the public as a means of holding both the party and the individual accountable.

Fourth:

> Membership on all policy committees would automatically expire at the close of each Congress.

Mr. President, there is no evidence that a single one of these recommendations has been followed even in part by the Democratic policy committee and there is ample evidence that all of them have been ignored.

Of course under the law the Senate policy committees can operate exactly as they see fit. They have no legal, and of course they have no moral obligation to follow the recommendations of the committee report I have quoted. This is because the Senate policy committees were set up after the original bill was defeated. I am sure the wise and experienced men on the policy committee are acting in complete accordance with their own excellent judgment—and I mean this sincerely—on how they can best serve their party and country. But it cannot be denied, Mr. President, that the great preponderance of testimony before the committee that recommended the establishment of policy committees in the first place, the recommendations

of the committee itself in its report and virtually all the visible and evident thinking that has been done on this matter supports a policy committee that would establish and—what is just as important—communicate to all party Senators—the party's policies. It is true that these policies according to the committee report were to have been broadly outlined in general in caucus. And of course no caucuses have been meeting to provide these broad general guidelines.

Now, Mr. President, let us consider how the Democratic policy committee does in fact operate. I said it was within the framework which was recommended in the committee report. It is not a discussion of how the policy committees should operate, because the Democratic policy committee operates privately. It is not easy to discover how it operates. But fortunately an unusually competent political scientist, Prof. Hugh Bone, of the University of Washington, has conducted a conscientious investigation of the policy committees and has published his findings in the American Political Science Review—that was in June of 1956, and more recently he has updated his study in a 1958 publication entitled "Party Committees and National Politics."

Mr. President, this is what Dr. Bone finds out about the policy committee:

First:

Nowhere have the Democrats set down the functions for their policy committee.

Second:

In talking with Senators and their assistants one finds, some Senators find the committees, particularly the Democratic committees, do very little, while others purport to see a few real achievements. This is because of the absence of standards for judging what the committees are supposed to do and can do.

Third:

The conclusion is inescapable that the policy committees are misnamed. They have never been policy bodies in the sense of considering and investigating alternatives of public policy, and they have never put forth an overall congressional party program. The committees do not assume leadership in drawing up a general legislative program but consider certain proposals on an ad hoc basis as they arise or are due for consideration on the floor. Some important policies receive little or no discussion in the committee, and only rarely have committees labeled their decisions as party policies.

This is the heart of the Bone finding. Professor Bone states:

Fourth:

On Capitol Hill the usefulness and accomplishments of the policy committees are recognized in three fields: Service and research—

The Democratic policy committee staff does this for the majority leader not individual Senators—

education—

Since the Democratic policy committee as such does not communicate with other Democratic Senators except in providing vote cards after roll call votes on the Senate floor, this function is limited—

and legislative scheduling.

In this respect Bone finds:

Scheduling in the real sense of the word involves discussion of strategy, decision as to sequence and consideration of timing. Neither policy committee as a committee, appears to have gone into these matters with any degree of regularity.

Fifth:

Policy committee sessions are meetings of some of the men of power in the Senate at which political strategy, policy, program, and adverse other matters are discussed.

Sixth. Meetings of the Democratic policy committee are private. No reports of any kind are made to other Democratic Senators.

I again quote Professor Bone:

Seventh:

Chairman LYNDON JOHNSON more than his predecessors has perceived the policy committee as a strategic device and weapon. The committee is used to set up issues in a way that will permit a maximum number of Democrats to go along with the position of the leadership.

Now, Mr. President, Professor Bone brings to this study the objectivity of an expert and disinterested observer. At the same time Professor Bone would be the first to agree that Senators who have served in this body and on the policy committee for many years could provide impressive contradiction of his description if they wish to do so. But in the absence of such refutation it would seem to me to follow that we should reexamine the argument that is, I admit, honestly made by a number of shrewd and experienced Senators and Senate observers that the party caucus should not make policy because the Democratic policy committee already does it and does it better than a caucus could. The fact is that the policy committee makes and purports to make no overall party policy.

In all fairness, Professor Bone and Dr. Malcolm Jewell, of the University of Kentucky, another political scientist who has devoted much time and study to the policy committee, far from being critical of the majority leader or the policy committee praise both. I think they would both contend that under Senator JOHNSON's leadership the policy committee has contributed more than ever before to the achievement of Democratic unity on critical issues and beyond this to broad bipartisan unity on issues.

And of course the members of the policy committee are indeed unusually important in determining the nature of Democratic policy in the Senate. Because they are influential men in the Senate they are prime factors in the majority leader's calculus. He, not they—and this is the absolute and vital distinction—takes the fundamental initiative to determine what in his judgment is possible in the Senate. He, not they, determines the overall program and the timing of that program in the Senate. He, not they, decides whether the Democratic party platform or the recommendations of the Democratic advisory committee should or should not become touchstones of party policy. And he, not they, determines that the whole membership of the Democratic Party in the Senate should not be called into the traditional caucus to pass on some or any of the party's policies.

Mr. President, this method of procedure is in direct contradiction to the great bulk of testimony that was heard before the Joint Committee on the Reorganization of Congress and the report and recommendations that grew out of that testimony.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield for a question.

Mr. MONRONEY. It is really not a question; it is a comment I wish to make.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield to the Senator from Oklahoma for a comment, without losing the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MONRONEY. I will defend to the last ditch the right of any individual Senator to speak about, to criticize, or to seek to correct the procedures of the Senate, or to strengthen any of the policymaking processes of the Senate. I am completely in agreement that the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin should exercise those rights and vigorously. I do not wish what I have to say to be in any way construed as denying this right to any Senator or as discouraging him from making such comments.

Since I was directly connected, together with the predecessor of the distinguished junior Senator from Wisconsin, the late Senator Robert La Follette, Jr.——

Mr. PROXMIRE. I am very happy that the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma is taking part in the colloquy, because he was the cochairman of the joint committee—the La Follette-Monroney committee—and it was the Senator from Oklahoma who had much to do with the hearings, perhaps more than any other Member of Congress, on the Legislative Reorganization Act.

Mr. MONRONEY. I must deny that compliment. The former Senator from Wisconsin was the moving force, and, as the Senator has said, was responsible for the passage of the bill by the Senate before the House acted.

I believe it should be made clear for the record that the suggestion and recommendation for a policy committee was contained in the bill of Senator La Follette which was passed by this body. It provided for policy committees in the Senate and in the House. The Senate accepted the bill with that provision.

There were some 60 or 70 innovations in procedure, as the bill was an omnibus bill. When the bill reached the House, it was my difficult job to try to get it to the floor in the closing days of the session. The then Speaker of the House, who is the present Speaker of the House, and the then minority leader, Mr. JOE MARTIN, took a strong

position against policy committees for the House of Representatives.

The bill was not defeated; it was amended. The section providing for policy committees was stricken from the bill. The mechanics were that the House bill was substituted for the Senate bill. But in so doing, not being able to legislate for the Senate, it was necessary for the House to strike out the entire paragraph, since it included the language relating to both the House and the Senate. It was too late in the session for the bill to go to conference; consequently, the bill was passed without the provisions for policy committees.

The Senate quickly adopted a resolution setting up a policy committee. It did not include any endorsement of the recommendation of the original committee. It was merely a rush job to give the Senate a chance to try out a policy committee.

I disagree with the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin that the policy committee has been an ineffective bit of mechanics. Certainly it has not reached the stratospheric position which the dreams of so many authors of bills sometimes contemplate. But I may say, based on my experience of some 21 years in watching the Senate operate, and some 8 years of membership in the Senate, that I have never seen a time when the policy as determined by the leadership—and by that I mean the majority Members of the Democratic Party—has been so clearly expressed, so easily identified, and so well known to the public as it has been during the years of the incumbency of the present majority leader.

I have served under other majority leaders. In those days it was difficult to learn what the Democratic Party policy was, because it was all over the lot. There was no focal point. There was no possibility of identifying it. That was one of the primary reasons why we had recommended for inclusion in the Reorganization Act provision designed to insure that party responsibility and party accountability should be identifiable on the floor of each House.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Would the Senator maintain that party policy is announced or indicated in any way by the policy committee at the present time?

Mr. MONRONEY. As an individual Member of the Senate, I have not had much trouble in learning what the party policy is. Sometimes the party leaders do not agree with my ideas, but that is partly my fault, because I have failed to avail myself of the opportunity of requesting to be heard by the policy committee.

Certainly the majority leader, who is our normal means of communication with the policy committee, is always open to me. I do not happen to be a member of the inner circle; I am a relatively junior Senator; but I have never found a day when I could not communicate with the majority leader. I have also found that such communications receive consideration; and later, when proposed legislation was reported, it would reflect, at least to some degree, those recommendations.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Can the Senator from Oklahoma cite to me a single example, in either the 83d, the 84th, or the 85th Congress, when the policy of the Democratic Party was expressed in any kind of communication to Senators, or can he give me an example or an instance in which party policy was declared in advance and was known?

Mr. MONRONEY. I think the party policy was rather clearly known to every Member of the Senate and everyone in the Press Gallery. The policy of the party was made known to the representatives of the press, especially the persons who report the proceedings of the two Houses.

During the years of the leadership of the distinguished Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON], I do not think anyone, from the page boys to the doormen to the members of the Press Gallery, Radio Gallery, and Periodical Gallery, has had much trouble in learning what position the leadership was taking on whether to bring up a civil rights bill, such as was done in 1957 for the first time in about 90 years, or to learn the stand of the party concerning other matters of proposed legislation.

When the majority leader tells me that he plans to call up an airport bill or some other bill, I can depend upon it that party action has been taken, and that the bill will come to the floor with the support of the Democratic Party policy committee.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I still ask that the Senator from Oklahoma give me a single instance of party policy which has been promulgated, expressed, communicated, or made known in any way. I ask him what our policy now is on the budget. Is it the policy of the Democratic Party to favor a balanced budget or an unbalanced budget? Do we want a surplus? Do we favor increasing taxes? Do we favor decreasing taxes? I have not heard any policy expressed by the Democratic policy committee this year or last year on those subjects.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield to the Senator from Montana.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator from Wisconsin attended the last two caucuses of the Democratic Party, at the opening of this session and the opening of the last session, did he not?

Mr. PROXMIRE. Yes; I did.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Did not the majority leader at both caucuses lay before all of us what our policy should be for the rest of the coming year, and enumerate the items one by one?

Mr. PROXMIRE. The Senator from Texas made an excellent speech, a speech which was released by him to the press. But I did not hear anyone say that it was the policy of the Democratic Party for the 86th Congress. Perhaps it was. It was an expression by the most influential man in the Senate of his viewpoint on the kind of program we should have. There was no request for discussion. There was no notion expressed that it should be approved or disapproved. It was not broken down in any way. There were no agenda for considering how we should proceed.

The majority leader made an excellent speech, but it seems to me it could hardly be said to be the policy of the Democratic Party.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Did not the Senator from Wisconsin, sometime in mid-November, after the election, endorse, in effect, what the majority leader endorsed as the program for this year?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I am delighted that the Senator from Montana has made this statement, because it is something which has been haunting me to some extent. I stated to Jack Bell, of the Associated Press, that it was an excellent program. I thought it was. But I had no idea that it was supposed to be "the" program; that that was all which was to be considered. There was no proposal for civil rights or for aid to education. I am very much interested in action being taken on those measures. But I would not expect the Senator from Texas to make a press release, which is communicated to the entire country, and which would be read by all Senators, and expect it to be understood that it was the Democratic policy for the 86th Congress.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Does the Senator from Wisconsin recall offhand what happened to the calendar last year, especially what bills, if any, were held back? Does he recall, most particularly, what was the action of the policy committee—so long as we are on that subject, and before we go to the standing committees—on the three Supreme Court bills concerning which there was much discussion and some dissension? Does the Senator from Wisconsin recall that the policy committee, under the leadership of the distinguished senior Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON], reported those three bills?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I recall that the bills were reported. They were on the floor for debate. I had no idea that there was an established Democratic Party policy on those bills. It seems to me that we came to a decision on them on the floor; no policy on them was communicated to me, although I heard rumors that the majority leader took a certain position or another position.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Did the Senator from Wisconsin understand that the position of the leadership was one way or the other on those bills?

Mr. PROXMIRE. Yes; but no policy was communicated to me.

I say the policy should be communicated to all Senators; but insofar as the fiscal program of the Government, and so forth, are concerned, I have not received any communication regarding what our policy is or what it should be.

Mr. MANSFIELD. If a policy were laid down, would the Senator from Wisconsin follow it?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I would be very, very much influenced by it. Once the policy is laid down, we can debate it and can amend it; and then the Democratic Senators will be in a position to do something about it.

Mr. MANSFIELD. But why do it in private or in caucus or behind closed doors? Why not do it in the open, in public, so all of us can debate it and discuss it?

Mr. PROXMIRE. Then let us do that. But I am pointing out that that is not being done on the floor of the Senate. The floor has historically been the place where matters are debated and decided. But now they are not decided on the floor. Instead, they are decided in private, over the telephone, with a few of the top Members, by and large. No doubt that is a very efficient procedure; but I believe such matters should be decided on a much broader basis.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Can the Senator from Wisconsin mention any proposals made to the policy committee which the policy committee did not bring to the floor for debate?

Mr. PROXMIRE. There were a number of bills; and I have particularly in mind one bill on which I felt the policy should have been handled on the floor. I should have liked to have an opportunity, somehow, in some kind of caucus, to express my position on that bill. I frequently stated my position on it on the floor. It is a bill providing for massive Federal aid for education.

Mr. MANSFIELD. We did report such a bill.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Oh, yes; and the bill was amended. The Senator from Michigan submitted his amendment, and it received some votes. Of course, on the floor we can always attempt to amend proposed legislation; but there is an enormous difference and a great disadvantage when one has to submit amendments against the committee and against the leadership, and when one must put himself in such a position that the leadership is pretty much constrained to go against him, because the leadership has to go along with the committees.

Mr. MANSFIELD. But if a bill does not suit an individual Senator, then, as the Senator from Wisconsin has said, such a Senator has a right to propose amendments to it on the floor. But certainly each Senator is equal, and has a right to do what he wishes to do on the floor, in the open, and to address the whole country.

Now let me ask about keeping back proposed legislation: Last year was the Senator from Wisconsin interested in getting the Chicago-Lake Michigan drainage bill brought to the floor for consideration?

Mr. PROXMIRE. The bill came on the floor for consideration, despite the fact that I did object to its coming on in quite the form in which it did. I did my best to oppose that bill. However, I do not contend that I have any more power than any other Senator has. In fact, I have far less than most have. I exercised my rights, under the rules, to do what I could to prevent the passage of a bill which I thought was against the public interest.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator from Wisconsin is too modest, because, as I recall the outcome of that particular measure, he was very successful in stopping it.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I thank the Senator from Montana.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wisconsin yield again, so that we may revert to the matter of policy committees versus caucuses?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Moss in the chair). Does the Senator from Wisconsin yield to the Senator from Oklahoma?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield.

Mr. MONRONEY. The Senator from Wisconsin seems to attribute to the Reorganization Act the fact that we put more trust and confidence in caucuses, and that because the caucuses have been so successful, the policy committee was to be an arm of the caucuses. I should like to clear up that point by stating that both Senator La Follette and I looked to the policy committeee as a means of centralizing and making known the party policy on individual issues as they came before the committee.

This was after we had observed the failure of caucuses to bring about anything except a further diffusion of party policy. This was voiced by all the Members who would announce to the press their own ideas and their own recollections about what was said in a private, closed caucus.

Mr. PROXMIRE. On that point, let me call attention to page 12 of the report of the La Follette-Monroney committee, in the sixth paragraph, where we find the following:

> Under the American party system there are always two main groups, each checking the other and offering the choice of alternative courses of action. Around these two groups Congressmen can rally and express themselves, helping in party caucuses to determine the policy for their group.

That is set forth in the report which was submitted by the committee headed by the Senator from Oklahoma and Senator La Follette; and it seems to me it is a rather emphatic expression of the desirability of having the parties meet in caucus and make responsible decisions and communicate them.

Mr. MONRONEY. If we had relied on the party caucus system, there would have been no reason for a policy committee. However, there was recognition of a failure to meet at regular intervals—let us say monthly—in caucus, to bring about anything other than utter chaos by such party caucuses, particularly in the case of the House of Representatives; and therefore we tried to formalize the system of party responsibility and accountability in party policy committees.

The one thing I believe we have failed to do is to provide that all policy committees shall automatically expire at the close of each Congress. The failure to make such a provision was a great disappointment to me. But, in view of the fact that such a provision was not included in the law, I think they have been entirely justified in using the old seniority system for everything that transpires in regard to committees.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Certainly, and I have said so.

Mr. MONRONEY. And I believe that if all members of the policy committees were to resign tomorrow, they would be reelected the next day.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Certainly; I do not question that for a moment.

Mr. MONRONEY. I believe we should concern ourselves with the election of new Senators to the policy committees, rather than allege a failure of the system. New Members should be elected to them, anyway.

I believe the present system is far better than the system of caucuses which once was used; and I think the action now being taken is helping, both formally and informally, to ascertain the views of Senators who are interested enough to communicate with members of the policy committee or with the leadership, in order to help establish the policy which Senators wish them to discuss.

Personally, I am going to ask the majority leader and the party policy committee to permit me to go before that committee. That is my duty. If I have an important issue, I certainly should request that privilege, in order to lay the matter before those who are the party leaders. I intend to urge that we take up the matters of high interest rates, tight-money policy, and the $2 billion excess in the public debt. I think these are matters on which the Democratic policy should speak, and should speak with firmness.

But I do not think we can come forth at the beginning of a session with some well-packaged, neatly wrapped decisions and say, "This is the Democratic Party policy for this year." All of us are reasonable, and we know that the policy and the situation change from day to day. We know that Senators on this side of the aisle are not able to get together instantly on all questions. They are no more able to do this than are the Senators on the other side of the aisle.

As for the Legislative Reorganization Act, I do not believe it proper for anyone to take the view that, because that act has not been applied in the way we recommended, it is a travesty of congressional reorganization. The Congress has already gone far more than half way toward the accomplishment of what that act was designed to do; and from my communications with the policy committee and with the majority leader, I know that all Senators have a right to go before them and to urge that their views be made parts of the party policy. Refusing this, we still have the right to advise on policy, as I intend to do on the tight money issue, and as I know the distinguished Senator will do on the tight money issue, or on the wasting of money in the President's budget while refusing school aid or aid for depressed areas. I believe the mechanism is there, and if the Senator will cooperate, it will be there to get a party voice on these important questions.

Mr. PROXMIRE. What the Senator has said is excellent. I am delighted to hear that all Senators who feel very strongly on legislation may go before the policy committee and make their position known. I did not know it before. It was not communicated to me. Perhaps it was known by other Senators. What the

Senator has said is constructive and helpful.

I should like to ask the Senator from Oklahoma if he would favor making the deliberations of the policy committee available to other Senators, so they can come into the policy committee when they wish, and so they can observe what is going on, or appear if they desire.

Mr. MONRONEY. My understanding is that the policy committee is open. It has always been open to me, and I am sure to others who have asked for the privilege.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I wish to corroborate what the Senator from Oklahoma has said. Any time the Senator desires to appear before the policy committee he may do so. That privilege is available to every other Member of the Senate, and always has been, so far as I know. I am a junior Senator, too. During the 6 years I have been in the Senate that has been the custom. I understand it will continue to be the custom. It applies to every other Senator.

Mr. PROXMIRE. To be realistic about this matter, as I understand, the policy committee meets on Tuesdays, or at least regularly on some day during the week. The committee meets for lunch. It would seem to me it would be an imposition, and be perhaps a little brash, for a junior Senator or for a Senator who has not been here long to invite himself to lunch with these distinguished Members of the Senate. I cannot see how all Members of the Senate on the majority side could be invited to come into the small dining room in which I understand the policy committee meets, and take part of the fare there available. I wonder what kind of notice the policy committee would want.

Mr. MANSFIELD. A Senator is invited to come at any time. So far as I am concerned, there is no difference between a junior Senator and a senior Senator. If one is a Senator, that is all the requirement necessary. Incidentally, we all pay for our luncheon ourselves. Many Members come after the luncheon is over and make their pleas or express their desires about a particular matter under discussion. There never has been steamrolling in the policy committee. Any Senator may express himself.

If the Senator will go back to the record of the last Congress, he will find there were very, very few bills that, once reported out of legislative committee to the policy committee, did not reach the floor. That includes every kind of controversial bill one can think of.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PROXMIRE. Before I yield to the Senator from Connecticut, I should like to say it is fine to learn that the policy committee is open and available to all Senators. A real contribution has been made, and it is gratifying to learn that is the situation. However, that does not modify the principal point I am making, which is that, on the basis of observations of objective persons who like the way the policy committee and the majority leader operate, the policy committee is not making policy. They are just not doing it. I am going to point out why there is no policy being made, and document that position.

I yield now to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, if I may speak in a slightly lighter vein for a moment, I wish to congratulate the Senator from Wisconsin today for the program he is advocating for our friends across the aisle, because he is advocating exactly what the Republican Senators have been doing for some time.

Mr. PROXMIRE. If the Senator will yield at that point, they have been doing it for some time——

Mr. BUSH. Let me complete my observation.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Very well.

Mr. BUSH. We simply have luncheon as a body every Tuesday. That is the time when any Senator may bring up a point with reference to our policy, and it is done.

Mr. MANSFIELD. But there are so few of them. [Laughter.]

Mr. BUSH. We get along all right. Let me say this: Since we have been doing it, in the past 2 years our number in the Senate has decreased from 46 to 34. [Laughter.]

Mr. PROXMIRE. Let me say to the Senator from Connecticut, before he finishes, this is the most compelling argument that I have heard against my position. It is very persuasive. [Laughter.]

Mr. BUSH. In view of our experience, let me wish the Senator from Wisconsin luck. [Laughter.]

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, one can see the results of the weekly caucuses held by the Republican Party Members of the Senate. Their number in this body decreased from 47 or 48 to 34. Let us hope, because of the caucuses they are continuing to have weekly, that come 1960, the Members of their party in this body will be still smaller in number.

The Senator from Wisconsin has stated that one of the points he wishes to emphasize is that the policy committee does not make policy. Of course it does not. The legislative committees make policy. Once a bill is reported out of a committee to the policy committee, it is up to the policy committee to get it to the floor. The Senator knows that under the law there are only seven members on the policy committee. If the Senator from Wisconsin wants to have that committee expanded, I suggest he introduce a measure to that effect. I assure him it will be given the most earnest and serious consideration. At the present time the committee is stymied as to the number of its members. So far as I am concerned, I am merely a file closer. I am an ex officio member.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I thank the Senator. I resume my prepared text.

THE STANDING COMMITTEES

Every Democratic Senator has at least two major standing committee assignments. It is widely recognized that the majority leader was responsible for proposing and carrying out the reform that made this policy possible. In doing this the majority leader, of course, permitted every Democratic Senator to play a substantial role in determining the content of the legislation that comes before the Senate. For this the majority leader deserves credit. But the role of the committee in determining policy is sharply limited, and, of course, the committee is not a partisan body. It is bipartisan. There is rarely an attempt to determine party consensus on legislation within the committee. Every man interrogates witnesses, if he wishes, speaks in executive session, and votes in marking up bills without any regard to a party program, because he has no way of knowing what the party program is. He is not told.

Let me illustrate what I mean by describing my experience with this year's housing legislation.

Perhaps the most significant and telling fact about what happened was that, as a member of the majority party, and as a member of the committee that conducted the hearings and reported out the bill, I was never informed, and I am still not informed, on the methods and procedures by which this year's Senate bill was handled by the majority leadership.

Superficially, the record shows that S. 57 was introduced on January 9; that the Banking and Currency Committee was given its full complement of members on January 14; that hearings took place during the period January 22 through January 28; that the bill was marked up during executive sessions on January 30 and February 2; debated on February 4 and 5; and passed on February 5.

As a member of the committee, I had an opportunity to question witnesses during open hearings, to participate in putting the bill together during executive sessions, and to state my separate views in the report on the bill. I have no quarrel with the committee procedures. And I have nothing but great respect and admiration for the expertness and fairness of the junior Senator from Alabama, who managed the bill through committee. But I still remember vividly the atmosphere of haste that permeated the committee's deliberations, first in scheduling the executive session within 2 days after the close of hearings, and again in rushing the bill to the Senate floor for debate 2 days after the committee completed its work on the bill, even though 5 out of the 15 members needed time for stating their separate views on various aspects of the bill. I will not say the bill was railroaded through, but it was like being in a railroad station, being assured by the stationmaster that the train will stop at the station to take on passengers, while right in front of your eyes you see the train barreling on by.

When the bill came to the floor, the senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE], the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], and I strenuously objected to this tremendous haste and pressure for speed, arguing that it was

pointless. The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] predicted accurately that the House would be unlikely to finish their housing bill for some time. But we were called into session the next morning at 11 a.m., and kept in session until 7:16 p.m., and the next day from 11 a.m. until 10:25 p.m., or for nearly 12 hours until the bill flashed through and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. What was the status of the FHA, financially speaking, at that time?

Mr. PROXMIRE. As I understand the status of the FHA, it was that the FHA would have been benefited if it had been possible to get the bill passed in a hurry.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The FHA was getting pretty close to the borderline in its cash; was it not?

Mr. PROXMIRE. The Senator is correct.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Was not the bill basically the same bill which was considered and passed in this body a year ago?

Mr. PROXMIRE. There were some extremely important changes.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Is it not true that at the time the bill was taken up it was the only bill on the calendar?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I do not know whether the airport bill was on the calendar then or not.

Mr. MANSFIELD. No; it was not.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I presume the assistant majority leader is correct.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I checked the matter, and at that time the housing bill was the only bill on the calendar. Naturally, in an endeavor to get a start, we scheduled consideration of the bill as soon as the bill was reported from the committee, so that the Members of the Senate would have a chance to vote on it. This may not be the type of bill the Senator from Wisconsin wants, and I can understand his point of view. Sometimes we cannot get all we want and we have to take the best we can get. The Senator knows, of course, what has happened to the bill since it passed this body and reached the House of Representatives.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Yes. That is my point.

Mr. President, the day after this enormously significant housing bill swept through, the airport bill was taken up and passed the same day. From that day, February 6, for a full month, not a single significant legislative matter came before this body.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator will recall—and I am sure the Senator has looked at the calendar every day—that for almost a month there were practically no measures reported from the committees.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Exactly.

Mr. MANSFIELD. If the Senator will look at the calendar now he will find that there are very few measures on the calendar, and most of those are of a private nature. A few of those are controversial. These private bills will be taken up at the first available opportunity.

As I look at the calendar, haphazardly, it seems to me that the first two pages cover measures of that kind, which are usually noncontroversial. There are some controversial measures on the third page.

I believe the majority leader did the same thing today before the Senate that he did before the policy committee last week, which was to announce what the program would be. I believe the majority leader has even gone so far as to indicate—and I stand to be corrected if I am wrong—some measures which have not yet been reported by the committees, as being scheduled for consideration before the Easter recess, if at all possible. I have in mind the bill for extension of the draft. I do not know that the bill has been reported by the committee. If it has not been reported, I know it is the intention of the majority leader to have the bill taken up as soon as possible. I believe the day mentioned was Wednesday or Thursday of this week.

So far as the calendar is concerned, I do not know what more one could ask. We have done the best we could. We give consideration to the bills as soon as the bills are reported.

I think, as the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma has said, the main function of the policy committee is, to get the measures to the floor as soon as possible, where all of the Senators will have an opportunity to express their views.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I will say, Mr. President, that the distinguished assistant majority leader has confirmed my whole point completely. My point was that there was nothing for the Senate to do for 1 month, during which time we could have had a thorough consideration of the housing bill.

The housing bill still has not passed the House of Representatives.

Mr. MANSFIELD. That is correct.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The bill—that has not passed—has not become law does not help the FHA.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I do not recall that the Senator from Wisconsin made an all-out fight that we should debate and debate and debate on the bill. The Senator has a right to do that. Of course, as the Senator knows, any Member of the Senate still has the right to unlimited debate, if he wants to use it for educational purposes.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The RECORD will show that the junior Senator from Wisconsin rose on February 4 and requested that the bill be held up for a day or so until we could get in our minority views.

Mr. President, one of the reasons why we were not able to go into a thorough discussion is that we felt the bill was hurried through.

As I said before, the Rains bill, the entirely separate and distinct House of Representatives bill still has not gone through the House. So that literally nothing was accomplished by this haste. It is true that there was a 1 week recess or vacation period for the convenience of Members during the Lincoln Birthday week. But, Mr. President, for all floor legislative purposes the Senate spent a month doing nothing. There was ample time during this period to permit a full perusal by all members of the committee report and the hearings on the housing bill. There was time for a week or even 2 weeks of debate and consideration of a complex bill deeply affecting the public interest and costing the taxpayer heavily.

Mr. President, I want to return for a few minutes a little later to the consequences on this body of the terrific pressure to hurry up and to rush through legislation.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield to the junior Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG. If the Senator really objects to the haste regarding legislation, and feels that the national interest is being prejudiced, he should be cognizant of the fact that every Senator who is a Member of this body, particularly if he has the talent and ability of the junior Senator from Wisconsin, has the ability to see to it that nothing is passed in undue haste. As a matter of fact, I can recall a number of times when Senators have felt that something was being rushed improperly. I have seen a number of Senators, when they had such an idea, demonstrate their ability to see to it that the rush was terminated, and that the Senate was held in session until it was willing to agree to correct the situation.

Perhaps the Senator does not recall, but I remember when one Member of the Senate felt we were being run over when a motion was made to table one of his motions. After the Senate tabled the motion the Senator informed the Senate that all other Senators could go home and get a good night's rest and come back the next day, when he would still be talking—and that is exactly what happened.

I believe the Senator will find that, while there are many things Senators may not be able to do, one of the things Senators can do is prevent anything from being rushed through in undue haste. That is one right I have tried to preserve in the Senate. A number of us have felt that way. I assure the Senator that is his right, and I hope it will always be.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Certainly, I may say to the junior Senator from Louisiana, any Senator may talk at length on a specific bill. But what I am talking about is what I think would be a great help to the country and to the membership of the Senate if the leadership would not put Senators in a position so that when they talked about legislation they would feel that they were holding up the Senate, standing in the way of an adjournment or a recess, and keeping the Senate in session until very late at night. We were put in this position artificially, so far as the housing bill was concerned, because there was no reason why the bill could not have been held over until after the Lincoln Day recess. That would not have affected the housing industry in any way. Then we could have come to the floor, without imposing

on any other Senators, for a lengthy discussion.

No Senator wants to offend another Senator by holding him away from an engagement he has, or from a speaking engagement he has to make, which would be affected, and affected adversely, by lengthy debate.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield.

Mr. LONG. I think the Senator will find that the housing bill, which the Senator says was rushed through so rapidly, actually was taken up by unanimous consent. If I recall correctly, under the rule it would have been necessary for the bill to lie over until the Senate adjourned and came back into session on another day. It was apparently not just Democratic policy, but by the unanimous agreement of the Senate, that the bill was taken up and its passage expedited.

Mr. PROXMIRE. That is exactly correct.

Mr. LONG. The Senator could have objected.

Mr. PROXMIRE. This is the difficult position a Senator does not like to be put in. Nobody likes to be put in the position of objecting to unanimous consent agreements and causing trouble for other Senators. One does not like to alienate his colleagues. It seems to me it is asking Senators to do something which is offensive, and which they simply will not do by following that procedure. That is not the way consideration of measures should be handled.

Mr. LONG. From time to time it has been done and, frankly, in my opinion we should do it more.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Why?

Mr. LONG. We should object when we think objection is proper. We should not sit and decline to object and then later upbraid somebody for doing something to which we had every right to object.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I am not making this speech or this argument simply because I think the housing bill was rushed through. I am using the housing bill as an example of a number of bills which went through like the wind before and which may go through quicker at this session. I am going to discuss a number of bills in terms of attendance and in terms of hours of rollcalls and all details as to what happened. I think we can see that there has been a definite and significant change in the U.S. Senate, a change no one Senator can expect to take responsibility for or should be expected to take responsibility for as an individual.

It seems to me that this is a leadership decision. That is why I am making this as a general statement, rather than specifically objecting to each bill as it comes up.

Mr. LONG. The Senator has certainly selected a poor example if he means to prove his case by the housing bill. He says that bill was rushed through the Senate. The bill was brought up by unanimous consent. When unanimous consent was given, we had the right to assume that every Senator, whether Democratic or Republican, was willing to expedite the process of getting to it immediately, although we were bypassing the Senate rules in doing so.

When the majority leader felt that he desired to keep the Senate in session and vote on the bill on a certain day, any Senator had the right to inform the majority leader, or anyone else, that the Senate would not pass the bill that night. Any Senator who objected to the passage of the bill could offer amendments and insist upon quorum calls, make speeches, and delay the passage of the bill. There were many measures open to him if he felt that consideration of the bill should not be expedited and that the bill should not be voted upon as early as circumstances would permit.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Of course, individual Senators can object, and stand in the way of leadership whenever they wish to do so. I am finding that it is not a particularly desirable or easy thing to do.

This drive to rush legislation through committee and to propel it to the floor with debate held to a minimum by night sessions and leadership pressure to meet a recess deadline not only contributes further to the disintegration of the rights and duties of individual Senators. It also prejudices the great role the Senate of the United States has traditionally played in our history as a deliberative and educational body.

Now, Mr. President, I return to the 1959 housing bill experience as an example of the impact of leadership on individual Democratic members of the committee.

S. 57, at the time of its introduction, was widely reported in the press as the Democratic bill. It was also made known by the majority leader that the bill had a high priority in the legislative scheduling of bills. I agree that housing is an important domestic matter. But so are education, and a host of other subjects.

It is also important for a responsible party leadership not only to find the party consensus on individual bills—the parts of the whole that make up the party's program for the year—but also to find and express the party position on vital overall issues, such as budget and fiscal aspects of an individual bill.

At the moment the housing bill is under attack not so much on its merits as a housing bill, but rather from the point of view of overall budget and fiscal policy. The administration is leading this attack on the basis of a comprehensive set of assumptions and theories.

But the majority leadership can far better meet this attack on the housing bill by formulating an alternative or competing approach, which not only supports the specific bill, in this case the housing bill, but also sets forth the majority party position on a variety of measures within the general framework of budget and fiscal policy.

The formulation of such an overall budget and fiscal policy to support the passage of a particular bill is an appropriate, in fact an indispensable, function of a party caucus.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I should like to obtain some information from the Senator from Wisconsin.

I gather that the Senator from Wisconsin is seeking more democracy in the Senate. I, too, should like to see more democracy in the Senate. When the Senator says that "the formulation of such an overall budget and fiscal policy to support the passage of a particular bill is an appropriate, in fact an indispensable, function of a party caucus." what does he mean? Does he mean that the party caucus should take a vote?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I think it would be desirable if the party caucus could take a vote, although that would not be essential.

Mr. NEUBERGER. How would a policy be formulated unless the caucus took a vote? Suppose the party met in caucus for 3 hours. Unless the caucus took a vote, how would a policy be formulated?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I am sure the junior Senator from Oregon has been present at meetings at which policies have been formulated without a vote. I do not pretend that in connection with something as important and controversial as the policy we are discussing, agreement can inevitably be reached without a vote. However, it is possible to obtain an expression from most of the members present, which shows what the general sentiment is. I agree that if a precise expression of sentiment is desired, there must be a vote; but not always.

The point is that a caucus is a desirable way to find out what the Democratic Party in the Senate thinks—whether or not it favors a balanced budget, for example. Suppose there were a vote on that question. It seems to me that would be a precise, logical, understandable subject on which there could be a vote.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Let us find out what the Senator is really talking about. I have read very carefully his speech of several weeks ago. I have been quite unable to determine just what policy the Senator wishes. First, I should like to ask this question: Does the Senator honestly believe, and will he state for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, that 64 men can meet and formulate a policy without voting upon it? The Senator used the word "formulate."

Mr. PROXMIRE. Under most circumstances, I think that is probably correct. Under most circumstances, it would be necessary to have a vote. However, as I previously stated—and I think it is perfectly sensible and consistent—there are certain subjects with respect to which a vote would not be necessary. If we had a caucus on some question like the Berlin crisis, I think it is perfectly understandable that it would be possible to obtain some kind of consensus that would be unanimous, without a vote. It may be that such circumstances are rare.

The distinguished Governor of a great State—not the State of Wisconsin—told me that whenever his administration had a bill or proposal which was considered to be essential, a caucus of the party in the State legislature was always called. He told me that never once did the party lose a vote on the floor. He said that it was not a matter of voting or binding the members of the caucus, but rather a matter of explanation, a question of all members of the party understanding what the position of the leadership was, and being informed as to the situation.

I agree that under many circumstances it would be desirable to have a vote.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I should like to pursue the inquiry a little further. The Senator is shifting the scenery on us. I am not talking about the Governor of a State, or a State legislature. I am talking about the language in the Senator's own speech. What I wish to know is how a Democratic Party caucus would formulate a policy on the budget, for example, or on other fiscal questions, without voting on such a policy. I wish the Senator would explain that to me.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I will tell the junior Senator from Oregon that we probably would have a vote upon it.

Mr. NEUBERGER. That is fine. There would be a vote. After the vote is taken, what is the situation? Let us assume that the vote might be to hold the line at $77 billion, or that $3 billion or $4 billion should be added to the budget. That is a purely hypothetical situation. After the vote is taken, is the majority leader bound to carry out the policy which has been formulated?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I should say that the majority leader can and should call a caucus whenever he thinks the situation is such that the party should reconsider or modify its position. I believe that the majority leader should not exercise his powers as the head of the party in the Senate unless he is reflecting the majority opinion of the Democratic Senators in caucus.

Mr. NEUBERGER. So the majority leader should carry out the policy which has been formulated, to use the Senator's own words. Is that correct?

Mr. PROXMIRE. That is correct.

Mr. NEUBERGER. What about individual Democratic Senators? What about the other 64 Senators, including the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE], the junior Senator from Oregon——

Mr. PROXMIRE. Let me say, in that connection, that I think the majority leader has every right—and this has been the practice in many State legislatures—to disagree with the position taken by the majority of members of his party. However, what he does under such circumstances is to step aside. He no longer acts as majority leader. The assistant majority leader takes over. He directs and leads the majority position on the floor. The majority leader votes in any way he desires. His conscience is not imposed upon. He votes according to his conscience. He is free to do so, as are all other Senators.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Does the Senator believe that when a caucus takes a vote in formulating a policy, that vote should be binding on members of the caucus?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I do not.

Mr. NEUBERGER. On February 23 the Senator cited to us with great approval the policies followed by the Democratic Party under Majority Leader John Kern, when Woodrow Wilson was President.

Mr. PROXMIRE. At the time I did so, I believe I said that it would be unwise for us to follow the practice of binding members in caucuses.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Let me read what the Senator said:

> I think Senators can hardly do better than go back to the period from 1913 to 1916 and consider how the Democratic majority operated; and it was a thin majority at that time. It was a majority which did not have the vast superiority we now have, a superiority, virtually, of two to one. The majority at that time was very close. It was also a majority having dissident groups, just as ours has, perhaps more so.
>
> The majority of that time was a majority confronted with a tremendously difficult situation, including a change in the Presidency. But it was a majority which fulfilled its responsibility by passing some of the most significant legislation this Nation has ever seen. The entire New Freedom program of President Wilson was passed in the period from 1913 to 1916. There were not occasional caucuses; there were frequent caucuses. The Democratic Senators operated as a unit. The Democratic leader, John Kern, who was a splendid majority leader, took his direction from the unified decision of all Democratic Senators.

The Senator goes on to cite with glowing approval that every Democratic Senator in that period, unless I am mistaken, was bound by the decision of the caucus.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I have said that. I have also said that I did not believe that under the present circumstances it would be practical, possible, wise, or necessary for the Democratic caucus to so bind Senators.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Why, then, did the Senator say we should take a lesson from that period?

Mr. PROXMIRE. Because they used the caucus. While I do not approve of everything they did in caucus, I approve of the general fact that all Senators should have an opportunity to express their position on the question of the leadership position, because the leadership position expresses the opinion of Democrats as a whole. I took exception to the technique that was used to bind all Members.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Is it not possible that the technique was at the root of the success that was achieved?

Mr. PROXMIRE. That is possible. However, there have been caucuses which have been effective without binding the Members. We had caucuses in the legislature in Wisconsin. We held them at weekly intervals. Toward the end of the session we held them daily. As a result, every Democratic pledge in the platform was introduced as a bill and was voted on by the legislature, and every one of them was supported by a majority of the Democrats. However, they were not bound under those circumstances.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I have read the Senator's earlier speech with interest, and I have read his present speech with interest.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I thank the Senator for reading my speeches. That is a real compliment.

Mr. NEUBERGER. It is commendable that this issue should be discussed by the Senator. However, I believe—and I hope my mind will be changed—that although the Senator hopes to have more democracy in the Senate, I feel that a return to a caucus system which would bind all Members would result in infinitely less democracy in the Senate. I believe it to be a system which the great liberals like the elder La Follette, from the Senator's State, and George Norris, who was the greatest modern Senator, and perhaps the greatest Senator of all time, have denounced as "King Caucus." I am saying this from memory, but George Norris, I believe, many times was critical, in speeches on the floor of the Senate and before civic bodies, of what he described as "King Caucus." I hope the Senator from Wisconsin is not proposing to take us back to what the illustrious liberals of the past fought so strenuously against.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. While the Senator from Wisconsin has used the term "caucus," does he not really intend to use the term "conference"?

Mr. PROXMIRE. That is correct. I believe there is a distinction. What I have in mind is a meeting of Senators to secure information in order to try to get together, and to see if it is possible to arrive at a party determination, and to use that understanding for the direction and guidance of the leadership.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am very glad that the Senator from Wisconsin has cleared up that matter. Historically I can remember that when I came to the Senate, in 1949, the then Democratic leader, my friend and colleague Scott Lucas, called, I believe, two conferences. One dealt with proposals for the revision of the Taft-Hartley law. It was made perfectly clear that no Senator was to be bound by any decision of the conference; indeed, it was made clear that there were to be no decisions reached, but that the issues would be discussed, and that an attempt, at least, would be made to see how much agreement there was within the party.

I believe that the discussion which went on at the conference was very helpful indeed. I believe it is this, rather than a binding, definite, iron-clad pledge, that the Senator from Wisconsin was advocating.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Exactly. I thank the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator a few questions. First, I should like to have him know that I have read his speech several times—both his former speech and

his speech today—and I have enjoyed the position he is taking about getting back to conferences or caucuses.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I should like to say that I could not be more flattered. There is no Member of the Senate who I would rather have read a speech of mine than the Senator from Montana. When he tells me that he has read a speech of mine more than once, I just cannot say any more.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I could not be more flattered. Getting back to conferences or caucuses, I believe that there is very little difference between them. However, I should like to ask the Senator whether he is advocating that conference or caucuses be held in secret or in the open.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I would prefer to have them held in the open. That would be a startling departure from the usual practice, I know. We have just started the practice in Wisconsin. I believe it would be a desirable practice to follow. However, whether it be in private or in the open, or whether it be called a conference or a caucus, every Senator should be given an opportunity to express himself for the benefit of all Democratic Senators and to provide guidance to the leadership. That would be very desirable in any event.

Mr. MANSFIELD. As I understand, the Senator is in favor of either secret or open caucuses or conferences. What does he call this session? This is an open conference, an open caucus. Every Member has the right to speak. I should like to point out, also, that if the Senator is asking for an open caucus, then what he has in mind is a repetition of what is done on the floor. I say that because once a measure is brought before us, every Senator is entitled to make his position known, and can make requests. Did I understand the Senator to say that he did not believe Senators are allowed long enough time for debate?

Mr. PROXMIRE. Let me say to the distinguished Senator from Montana that there is all the difference in the world between talking on the floor in an attempt to influence one's colleagues on the one hand and taking a part in determining the leadership position that will be taken on legislation, and what the overall leadership position is to be before the bill reaches the floor on the other. As the senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. MCNAMARA] has just pointed out to me, the timing also can be crucial.

When a bill reaches the floor of the Senate, the die is usually cast by the position the leadership takes.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Every time I ask the Senator a question he replies by saying that that is the point, and then he starts on something else. Does the Senator believe that there has not been enough debate on bills before this body?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I think there has not been enough debate in recent years; yes.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator, earlier in his speech, said:

> This drive to rush legislation through committee and to propel it to the floor with debate held to a minimum by night sessions and leadership pressure to meet a recess deadline not only contributes further to the disintegration of the rights and duties of individual Senators, it also prejudices the great role the Senate of the United States has traditionally played in our history as a deliberative and educational body.

May I ask the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin whether he believes in the right of unlimited debate and believes in that right for the purpose of educating his colleagues and the country at large?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I say to the Senator that I believe in the right of protracted, lengthy, thorough, and comprehensive debate, lasting even as long as 2 months.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator has proved my point.

Mr. PROXMIRE. That was the proposal made by the distinguished senior Senator from Illinois in his antifilibuster fight and I supported it.

Mr. President, the absence of such a party policy gives the leadership a blank check to exercise any kind of off-the-cuff, improvising direction for our party he chooses. In the absence of such a declaration of policy only the majority leader knows where our party is going and even he does not have to make up his mind in advance. The parts that add up at the end of the session to a Senate program are put together without any advanced plan or program that anyone knows about. It is a brilliantly instinctive performance by a man who has been called an authentic political genius. It has great verve and dash and appeal in what otherwise appears to be a leaderless National Government. We can describe it as glowingly as we wish, but we cannot describe it as responsible to: First, other Democratic Senators; second, our Democratic platform; third, the Democratic policy committee; fourth, or, even any advance pronouncement by the majority leader himself.

Mr. President, in the absence of such a party policy as a basis for Senators to cast their votes in committee and on the floor, we as Senators can have no idea of the direction in which our votes will lead us. We are evading our obligation to be responsible. And, Mr. President, the times shout out for responsibility.

Let me pose this question in the framework of the extremely grave crisis which our Nation—our very civilization in fact, faces today.

In his state of the Union message to Congress on January 9, President Eisenhower posed the central question before us in these words:

> Can government based upon liberty and the God-given rights of man, permanently endure when ceaselessly challenged by a dictatorship, hostile to our mode of life, and controlling an economic and military strength of great and growing power?

Mr. President, I submit that the President of the United States was entirely correct in posing the central question that confronts us in terms as strong and grave as this. This means to me that every step the Nation takes must be measured by the test of how well it will serve the Nation's needs in respect to meeting the grave challenge that confronts us.

No committee of the Senate is or can be vested with the responsibility of reviewing our overall national needs in any time—and certainly not in a time of crisis such as this—to establish a meaningfully comprehensive policy for the direction of our national efforts toward the principle objective which must dominate our Nation's life.

The Banking and Currency Committee, of which I am a member, includes many of the Nation's best minds in the field of housing policy. There may be no better qualified group of men in the country to evaluate the Nation's needs for housing legislation, and to write the most practical and efficient legislation to meet those needs.

But who is to determine the policy question of how the need for housing relates to our needs for other things? Who is to determine how much of the housing we need we can afford? Who is to determine whether other national needs are more urgent, whether in the light of the unprecendented dangers which confront us, we ought to afford other things with a higher priority of usefulness to our national fight for the survival of our civilization?

Congressional policy, as it is formulated through the uncoordinated action of diverse and autonomous committees, necessarily lacks the unified, comprehensive direction which is dictated by the needs of a nation that is locked in a deadly struggle for survival. It cannot be otherwise; the decentralized committee system by its very nature cannot, without the influence of overall policy direction, produce a comprehensive policy which is consistent with a central purpose related to the Nation's central needs.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield.

Mr. SPARKMAN. The Senator from Wisconsin very kindly supplied me with an advance copy of his speech. I have read it with great interest and with considerable sympathy for many of the points which he makes. This question is not new with me. I remember when LYNDON JOHNSON and I came to the House of Representatives together. I am certain he felt then, as I did, that there ought to have been more frequent caucuses. But as time went on and I observed the practical working of getting legislation through the House, I came to understand some of the reasons why there were not frequent caucuses in the House, under some of the ablest and, I think, most democratic legislators I have ever known.

Speaker Bankhead, when Senator JOHNSON and I came to Congress, presided over the House; then, after he passed on, SAM RAYBURN became the Speaker. Certainly they were two of the finest parliamentarians I have ever known. Both of them were always ready to take the individual Member, whoever he was, into his confidence, and to discuss legislative problems with him. Yet we did not frequently have Democratic caucuses in the House.

When I came to the Senate, I found the same thing to be true. The only

difference is that here the meetings are called conferences, while in the House they are called caucuses.

I was interested in some of the statements which the Senator from Wisconsin made with respect to housing legislation. I was particularly interested in them because he and I work together, as does the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] on the Committee on Banking and Currency. I have often thought of the question which the Senator from Wisconsin has just raised, namely, Who is to determine how this particular program fits into the whole? I think that is one of the great difficulties confronting Congress. It does not simply affect legislation; we know that it is true also of appropriations. Who will make the appropriations fit the revenues? Those are problems with which we are always confronted. I do not know how to solve them.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I think there is a way in which it can be done. It is the way in which it has always been done, or a way in which it has almost always been done, by the majority party. Usually the majority comes into office with a President of its own party. The President submits a budget which makes the entire program fiscally interrelated. Unfortunately, we do not have a Democratic President. The Republican President has submitted a budget which we Democrats have rejected. We do not think it is completely accurate. We do not go along with it. Most Democrats have rejected it. We have an overwhelming, decisive majority in the Senate of 64 to 34. Having rejected the standard of a relatively small minority, it is now up to us to set a standard of our own. I do not suggest that it is up to us to engage in the enormous research which only the executive department staff can do, but I think the policy committee ought to engage in some research and offer some recommendation, so that we can go forward with a fiscally responsible program.

The policy committee should have some notion of how much housing the Nation can afford. There would have to be give and take. But I think the result would be better understanding and a more responsible position.

Mr. SPARKMAN. The Senator from Wisconsin knows that there is a committee which is supposed to lead the way in that field. I refer to the Joint Economic Committee, of which the distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] is the very able chairman. I believe the report of that committee was filed with Congress today, or that it will be filed shortly. If the Senator from Wisconsin will examine that report, he will find that the Joint Economic Committee has tried to pull these things together. That is a part of the legislative procedure.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The Joint Economic Committee, as I understand, is a bipartisan committee; it is not a standing committee of the Senate.

Mr. SPARKMAN. That is true.

Mr. PROXMIRE. It is chiefly interested in the picture of legislation affecting the economy. It is not my understanding that the purpose of the Joint Economic Committee is to provide for a fiscally responsible program for the majority party of Congress.

Mr. SPARKMAN. No. It is supposed to provide information for Congress. But if the Senator will read the report, he will see that the majority joined in making the principal report, and then the members of the minority submitted what I suppose might be called minority views, but what are really supplemental opinions or differing opinions. They agreed in great part with the views of the majority.

It seems to me that what we have tried to do has been to draw together a general policy for Congress. We recommend it as one which we can follow.

I have long aspired to see the time when it might be possible for the Joint Economic Committee to lay down guidelines for Congress, very much as the Economic Council does for the President.

Mr. PROXMIRE. And then pull all Senators into it.

Mr. SPARKMAN. That does not mean that any individual Senator will be bound by what is contained in the report. That is true of caucuses, conferences, or any other assemblies. I reserve to myself, as I am sure every other Senator does, the right to make my own decisions as to how I shall vote on a particular measure.

I have my own viewpoint, for instance, with respect to housing. Let us go back to housing, since the Senator from Wisconsin is a member of the Committee on Banking and Currency and has used housing as one of his illustrations. The Senator knows the policy of the committee. He made a very fair statement, I thought, of the committee procedure. I do not believe he complains that he did not have ample opportunity in the committee to participate in the discussions, to present his own views, or to vote his own way.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Certainly not. I said so in the course of my speech.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I so interpreted it.

It was said on the floor that a great many persons were wondering why action was being hurried on the housing bill. I tried to make it clear, first, that the FHA was running out of insurance authorization. The administration thought the FHA would be in trouble by the middle of February. As a matter of fact, it is not in trouble yet. It appears now that it may be possible for the FHA to continue through March without difficulty. But it looked earlier as if the FHA would run out of insurance authorization.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Is it not true that a bill introduced by a colleague of the Senator from Alabama in the House, Representative RAINS, was at that time pending in the House? It was perfectly obvious then that that bill would not pass for 2 or 3 weeks, and it has not passed the House yet. Therefore, for the Senate to rush action on our bill would really accomplish nothing, because it would not provide any housing relief at all.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I was stating what at that time seemed to be the emergency situation. 'Way back last fall the majority leader, the Senator from Texas, was talking about what we should do. I recall that in one or two speeches he made, he said he thought it would be desirable to get legislation through quickly. He did not tell us to put through an omnibus bill or a "quickie" resolution.

As a matter of fact, 'way back last summer, when the housing bill failed to clear the Congress, it was announced that one of the first orders of business in this new Congress would be a housing bill. I know I was questioned about it from time to time, during the adjournment of Congress. I said I did not know what procedure the Senate would decide on, but that I certainly believed we should put through an omnibus housing bill quickly, instead of going through with a "quickie" resolution which would run things until June 30th, and then come along later with a regular housing bill.

The Senator will recall that when the full Banking and Currency Committee met, it was decided to proceed on that basis. We took all the housing bills which had been introduced up to that time. Fair notice had been given to the administration, and it had even sent its bill up here. That was not difficult to do, because last summer we thrashed out the whole matter. The bill I took up was no pet project of mine. But I took the bill as nearly as I could as it was passed by the Senate last year, after being worked out and agreed to between the two parties and passed without one dissenting vote.

But I think it fair to say that even the administration participated in working out that program. So I thought the bill we took up would be the least controversial one of all. We merely made changes in order to fit the changes which had occurred since that time. That is the bill which was presented here and was, largely, passed last month.

I "caught it" from both sides, because I was trying to get through a bill which the Senate had already agreed upon, and which I believed the President would sign. I did not want the Senate to pass a bill which would be vetoed. I wanted the Senate to pass a bill which would produce housing for American families. And that is the kind of bill I advocated all the way through.

Many persons did not like the bill. Some thought I was too conservative. On the other hand, some persons "shot" at me because they thought I was too liberal. But I still believe it was a good bill, even though it contained many provisions which were different from the ones I would have preferred to have seen included.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I agree; and I supported it enthusiastically.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Yes; and I think it was a good bill.

That bill was not rushed through. It is true that we had voluminous hearings, although we had had hearings last summer. But every person who wished to testify this time was given a chance to do so. In fact, if I recall correctly, we had 843 pages of hearings.

We obtained the printed hearings from the Printing Office at the earliest possible moment. We prepared the report

for the majority. But some of the committee members wished to submit supplemental views could be added to the of town. His airplane did not bring him back in time. So we had to wait until he returned, in order that the supplemental views could be added to the majority report. We did not print the majority report until the supplemental views were ready; we left them unprinted, in order to permit committee members who wished to submit minority views or supplemental views to do so.

That raised a little question, when the majority leader proposed that the bill be taken up the next day, because at that time the majority report had not been printed. But, as the Senator from Wisconsin knows, that was not the fault of the majority members of the committee; neither was it the fault of the committee members who wished to submit supplemental or minority views.

So all of us waited until the supplemental views were submitted; and then the majority report and the minority views and the supplemental views were printed, and were made available.

Therefore, when the bill was brought up, the next day, the report on the bill was available, the bill itself was available, and the hearings on the bill were available; and the bill was the one which had been thrashed out thoroughly last summer in almost exactly the same form.

I do not recall that the debate on the bill was hurried. A time limit may have been agreed to unanimously; but, if so, it was not forced on anyone.

Let me say that I certainly agree with what the Senator from Wisconsin says about the desirability of having thorough debate in the Senate. I believe that all bills considered by the Senate should be debated thoroughly. In fact, I go further: I am not in favor of limiting debate in any way, at any time.

But sometimes, when we are trying to accommodate the entire membership of the Senate, and when we can agree to limit debate on some particular proposal, we go along with such a proposed agreement. That was done with respect to several amendments to the housing bill, but not with respect to the bill as a whole.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield to me?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I do not have the floor; the Senator from Wisconsin has the floor.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield to the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. MONRONEY. I believe that the distinguished junior Senator from Tennessee and I had one of the most controversial amendments. Both of us agreed to unanimous consent for the closing of debate, inasmuch as we were given all the time we felt we could possibly use to add anything to the debate. The debate was rapid and succinct, and we had all the time we wanted.

The fact that we obtained only 28 votes for our side was our fault, not the fault of anyone else. After all, we had ample time. But the vote which was taken resulted in rolling us over. Certainly, after having been one of the "rollees," as a result of the decision of the Senate, I am not going to engage in any Monday morning quarterbacking and say we were treated improperly. The decision which was reached was the decision of the Senate; and the Senate was established for the purpose of reaching decisions.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wisconsin yield further to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Mr. DODD in the chair). Does the Senator from Wisconsin yield to the Senator from Alabama?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I believe the Senator from Oklahoma has brought out a very pertinent point, because in my opinion that was the most controversial issue in connection with the bill. As the Senator from Oklahoma knows, 'way down deep inside me I was in sympathy with the viewpoint he took. But I recognized the practicalities of the situation, and I said so from the first; and I voted in favor of increased interest rates, even though I did not favor them. But I realized that it was necessary for me to take that position if we were to be able to provide the housing which the veterans need. So I was willing to go along in that respect. But there was no railroading of that legislation.

We were trying to have the Senate pass the bill that week, because that was a practical matter, for we know that every year the Senate does not do any legislating during the week of Lincoln's birthday. That is an established tradition with the Senate. We on this side permit our Republican brethren to go out and try to convince the country they are the true disciples of Lincoln. [Laughter.] We know how unsuccessful they are in that attempt; but we are tolerant of the vanishing tribe. Therefore, the Senate does not do any legislating during Lincoln's birthday week. We do not suspend the sessions of the Senate during the week of Jefferson's birthday or during the week of Jackson's birthday; but in the case of Lincoln's birthday, the Senate takes off the entire week.

In this case, we were trying to have the Senate dispose of the bill before the Republican Members left town.

The debate turned out to be rather long—on a bill which had been passed unanimously by the Senate only a few months before.

Mr. President, I am not critical of the Senator from Wisconsin. I admire him; I think he has done a wonderful job during his service as a Senator. As a matter of fact, I think it is rather refreshing to have him bring up these matters for debate. But I believe that the enactment of legislation involves a great many practical matters which we simply cannot dispense with simply because it is good to theorize otherwise. I think we must be practical.

I admit that I had a hard time coming to that point of view. I want Senators to know that when I first came to Congress, I was about as idealistic as anyone, and I like to think that I still am. But I have learned something, and sometimes I have learned it in rather the hard way, that is, that the work here is highly practical.

Again to use the housing bill as an example, let me say that I think we followed the practical course in getting that bill through. I still believe it is a good piece of legislation, and that it will produce housing for American families, and that it will carry out the directive the Congress has, under the law, and the directive the Administration has, under the law, which was enacted in 1949, when we were told that we should devise programs which would help bring about a decent home and a decent living environment for every American family.

We cannot do that overnight. The Senator from Wisconsin, fine legislator that he is, recommended programs beyond which I was willing to go, not because I did not believe in them, but I was trying to be practical and to weigh the probability of having a housing law in view of the great program which has been announced throughout the country about balancing the budget, and so forth.

In other words, I believed we could put into effect a moderate bill, whereas, if we went as far as some of us thought we should go, we might not have any housing legislation. I still think we did the practical thing. I do not see how anyone can complain about the manner in which that particular piece of proposed legislation was handled.

The other bill to which reference has been made is the airport bill. Goodness knows, I had an idea of what I wanted in that bill. I had an opportunity to testify before the committee. I said there what I wanted to say.

I say to the Senator from Wisconsin, I think we must balance the idealistic with the realistic, and recognize that practical situations are involved, and that many times legislation has to be considered in the light of practicalities.

I should like to make a further statement about the housing bill. I do not know whether or not the majority leader made any suggestions to other members of the Housing Subcommittee, but I was chairman of the subcommittee, and at no time did the majority leader suggest any particular item he thought should go into the bill. That bill represented the handiwork of the Banking and Currency Committee, and I think the Senator from Wisconsin will admit that is true.

The Senator from Texas did say he hoped to get a bill through the Senate, and that we should pass it before Lincoln's birthday. As I recall, I told him we would have a bill ready by February 2. We would have had it ready by then if one Senator had not gone out of town. As it was, we had it ready by February 3. I think I am correct in my recollection of the dates.

So far as the contents of the bill are concerned, at no time was there any suggestion by the Senator from Texas of what the bill should contain. He said he hoped we would have a housing bill that would produce housing and would become law. That is as far as he went.

I cannot help but feel the housing bill—and that is the bill with which I

am most familiar—which passed the Senate this year, and one which the able Senator from Wisconsin has used so frequently throughout his speech as setting a pattern, represents the democratic processes certainly so far as it has gone in clearing the Senate. I am confident that as it goes through the House, and as it comes to conference between the two Houses, it will continue to represent the best of the democratic processes. Even though I do not get what I want all the time, I am happy to say these democratic processes work.

I came to the conclusion a long time ago that legislation at its best is a compromise. I know that idea does not fit in with what some persons say—that one must not compromise, that he must stand up for his principles, that he must stand up and fight for them to the bitter end, and not compromise. Legislation is not obtained in that manner. Legislation is not obtained by standing up and fighting to the bitter end and insisting that one get his way or that there be no bill at all.

After all, the Members of the Senate come from 49 sovereign States. I believe the States are sovereign. The House of Representatives is made up of 436 Representatives from 49 different States. I like to think that when a piece of proposed legislation has been hammered out by the 534 representatives of all the people, from all over the United States, and from each of the 49 different States, it has gone through the democratic processes. When that is done, it seems to me it represents legislation which has been arrived at in a democratic way.

Mr. President, I had not intended to take so long. I am appreciative to my friend from Wisconsin. He is a good Senator. I admire him. He has been an excellent member of the Committee on Banking and Currency, on which I have the pleasure of working with him. I appreciate his giving me this opportunity to make these few comments.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I am glad the Senator from Alabama has gone into the detail with which he has spoken. He is certainly the best qualified man in the Senate to discuss the housing bill. Nevertheless, the facts speak for themselves. We had nearly 8 hours of debate on February 4. We had nearly 12 hours of debate on February 5. We were up against a deadline. We had a night session. The fact is that there was no necessity for having the bill passed in such a hurry, since the House did not pass its bill in all of February and into March.

I agree with what the Senator has said about the need to compromise. That is one reason why I think we should have conferences and get together to arrange compromises. I am trying to be practical and businesslike.

Mr. President, with a two-thirds majority in the Senate of the United States, my party in the Senate has an obligation to adopt an overall fiscal policy, to pronounce it publicly, and to measure the legislation we propose—to spend or conserve the taxpayers' money or to raise or reduce taxes—against it.

Every kind of business does it. Every kind of organization adopts some kind of such plan to measure the amount it proposes to spend.

Without such a policy the majority party in the Congress is being backed into a fiscal corner by the plausible pleas of the President to balance the budget. We may think the President's budget proposals are wrong or even untrue; but we cannot escape the fact that it is the only budget that has been proposed by the responsible head of either party.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I think the Senator from Wisconsin would be the first to admit that what he is now proposing certainly relates to what is a very difficult problem to solve. He knows, as well as do the rest of us, that the President has a Budget Bureau which comprises somewhere in the neighborhood of 500 persons, and which works on a year-round basis. It gets the results of the findings of the various independent agencies, departments, and whatnot.

How would it be possible for the Senate, especially in caucus or conference assembled, to perform what the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin has in mind?

Mr. PROXMIRE. It seems to me the first thing we have to do is take the President's budget as the first point of departure, as the beginning. As the Senator has said, it is based on very careful examination by the most competent people available in the executive branch.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Not that I agree with it, because I think the President is wrong so far as the Defense Department is concerned.

Mr. PROXMIRE. We have to start somewhere. It seems to me this is where we should start. I am not saying we should come up with a precise dollar figure as to every department at all.

What I say is that by requesting every one of the 64 Democratic Senators to thoroughly consider this overall fiscal problem, I think we can arrive at a consensus—an informed and intelligent consensus as to whether we can responsibly favor a balanced budget or a surplus. If so, roughly what should be the level? Then we shall be in a position to fight for and defend our housing bill and to fight for and defend the position that we should be better prepared militarily. Now, every time we come up with a proposal for airports or housing or anything else which will cost money, the President steps up to us to say, "You are unbalancing the budget." This is an effective approach. What is the answer? The American people only know about one budget, the President's budget.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Having watched the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin for the past 2 years, I do not think anyone has to worry about his fighting for the things he believes in and making his views understandably and well known.

Has the Senator from Wisconsin thought about the possibility of a different procedure? Instead of considering the budget in conference, along the lines the Senator suggests or recommends, it might be possible, as some of our colleagues have stated, to have two sessions within each session of Congress each year. The first 6 months we could consider legislative matters and then for 3 months we could confine ourselves to matters affecting appropriations. It has been thought that in such a manner, instead of sandwiching in the appropriations between legislative matters, giving them little or no consideration, we could better acquaint ourselves with the situation. I am sure the Senator is not in favor of lack of consideration of appropriation bills, because I know he thinks appropriation bills should be given careful consideration. It might be possible in that way to break these things down. Six months could be purely legislative, and the last 3 months could be purely for appropriations. Then, perhaps, we could accomplish more, and do it more understandably.

The Congress and the Appropriations Committees of both Houses do not have at their command, no matter how they try, the knowledge which the President's Bureau of the Budget can furnish to him, because the Bureau of the Budget operates on a year-round basis. Consequently, the President has the edge on us. In that way we are at a great disadvantage.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I would add that I think we should spend at least several weeks considering this enormously important question of some kind of a fiscal framework, so that we may have some idea where we are going with a housing bill or an airport bill.

Mr. President, I very much appreciate the participation of other Senators. On the other hand, I have been yielding a lot. I am afraid I am imposing on some Senators who are present in the Chamber by continuing this discussion at too great a length. If other Senators want me to yield I shall be happy to do so, but I think we should keep that point in mind.

If this Democratic Party of ours, with its overwhelming congressional majority, is unwilling to propose an alternative budget which will tell where we intend to go, we are letting the President determine the only standard by which our own program and performance is going to be measured by the American people.

THE SENATE AS A DELIBERATIVE BODY

Mr. President, this vital process of relating the diverse tendencies of committees to the whole national responsibility has been a problem which has been reconciled in the Senate in past years in two ways.

Mr. President, this is extremely important. First, overall policy was determined in advance by a Senate majority party caucus or a President who represented the party that had the majority responsibility in the Senate. That is No. 1. Secondly, overall interests were reconciled after bills were reported to the Senate in debate on the floor, involving the Senate as a whole.

We have already seen how the death of our majority party caucus and the absence of a Democratic President has eliminated the first method of responsi-

bility: Determination of policy in advance.

What of the second method—The role of Senate floor debate after committees report legislation, as an instrument of national responsibility? Certainly debate in this historic body has served that purpose before.

This was a principal reason why in the 19th century the Senate earned the reputation as "the greatest deliberative assembly on earth." The Senate won that accolade through protracted debates like that on the Oregon bill in 1846, the Force bill in 1890, and the Silver Purchase Act in 1893. The tariff measures which bore the names of McKinley, Wilson, and Dingley were largely framed in the Senate after extended deliberations.

The Senate continued to function as a deliberative body in the early decades of the 20th century, when the great measures of the New Freedom era were hammered out on the anvil of debate in the upper chamber and during the bitter fight over the League of Nations. Senators like Borah, George Norris, and "Old Bob" La Follette helped to sustain the ancient tradition. The days of the Great Depression likewise produced great debates over the economic course which should be pursued to win our way out of economic despair.

During the Second World War, far from becoming an anachronism or a mere rubber stamp in providing funds and delegating powers, the role of Congress in the American system of government increased rather than diminished. After due deliberation, many difficult decisions were made by the National Legislature on organizing the resources of the Nation and on allocating men, money, and materials among competing claimants. Alternative choices and different standards of judgments gave rise to extended deliberations within Congress, and to recurring debates over such controversial issues as price control, consumer subsidies, war taxes, and reconversion.

These debates have served two great purposes. First, they have informed all Senators who cared to listen or to read the RECORD what was at issue. In doing this they provided the opportunity for all viewpoints to be heard and for an informed majority opinion to be determined, an informed opinion that could not have been achieved without debate. They provided also the chance for the Senate in floor session to resolve the diverse recommendations of committees with the necessities and interest of the whole Nation.

Secondly, the Senate through debate played a tremendous role in informing and shaping the very public opinion which is so basic in the determination of policy in a democracy. All the great issues of the political campaigns of the 19th century were formulated through senatorial debates. Prof. Lindsay Rogers of Columbia University in his book "The American Senate," concludes after long and careful analysis that prolonged Senate debates on pending legislation or treaties have been extremely useful in giving the country opportunities to form and express opinions. "The Senate," said Rogers, "is the only available forum that can draw any interest to its proceedings. The Senate can help the country to form opinions and by its eternal vigilance act as the real balance wheel of the Constitution."

Mr. President, what has happened to that balance wheel of the Constitution?

Let me read the observations of two thoughtful and able observers on how this great deliberative body has been operating in recent years. The first is from columnist Marquis Childs who wrote last January 16, in describing the attitude that has come to dominate my party in this body.

> Public controversy is bad—bad for the party and bad for the country. That is the heart of the Johnson conviction. You have to work things out in the cloakroom and then when you've got them worked out you can debate a little before you vote.
>
> In the politics of manipulation and manuever JOHNSON, as he proved once again, is a master. But this ignores the content, the substance, of political give and take. It draws off the fire, the fight, the conviction, the zeal.

And from the National Review of January 17 Willard Edwards describes what has happened to the Senate as follows:

> LYNDON JOHNSON has established speed, unanimity, curtailed debate and the elimination of record votes as the hallmarks of good legislation. He has elevated the unanimous vote to a legislative ideal. Under his leadership a system of backstage bargaining for votes has reduced debate on the Senate floor to a dull formality.
>
> The record of the last session shows what it means to reach "agreement without discord." It means brief and perfunctory debate; a lack of intelligent questioning; sparse attendance; the absence of quorum calls to summon absentees; the omission of record roll calls without which the public can never know which Senators were present and how they voted; the approval of legislation in obvious ignorance of its meaning.

Mr. President, I think this is a serious and honest indictment. It goes to the heart of my difference with the leadership.

My staff has gathered statistics for the last 12 years to check the accuracy of Mr. Edward's allegations; this is what they show:

The number of bills passed has sharply increased. Comparing the period from 1947 through 1952 with the period from 1953 through 1958, the number of bills has increased by a huge 40 percent. At the same time the number of roll call votes has dropped sharply. The number of quorum calls has fallen a great deal. And the number of hours and days in session have also dropped.

In relationship to bills passed: Rollcalls have fallen 40 percent; the number of hours in session has dropped off by one-third; and most decisive of all the number of quorum calls requiring attendance of absentees has fallen more than 60 percent.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG. I must point out to the Senator that he has a completely erroneous table to support his statement. For example, I ask the Senator to look at the table on the next page of his prepared text in view of the reference to hours in session having declined. The Senator will notice that, based on the 6 years from 1953 through 1958, the Senate was in session more hours, except for the period 1949 and 1950. As a matter of fact, the reason the Senate was in session such long hours during that period was that legislation was brought up which resulted in two long and successful filibusters, and that in each such case the Senator who was making the speech ended his speech by suggesting the absence of a quorum, and insisting upon a live quorum present. Perhaps the Senator did not look up that information. I think that accounts for the fact that the Senate was in session so many hours during the time referred to. I do not believe the Senator from Wisconsin is standing here advocating two successful filibusters.

Mr. PROXMIRE. It is true, of course, that during the 1949–50 period there was extended debate on bills which came before this body. It seems to me that, nevertheless, the facts speak for themselves. I shall be delighted to collaborate with the junior Senator from Louisiana in eliminating the period during which the two filibusters referred to took place. Having done so, I think we would still find that if we consider the hours in session, with relationship to bills passed, the number of hours in session declined.

I point out that the very excellent point made by the junior Senator from Louisiana does not touch the principal point I make, namely, that we are not having rollcalls in the same proportion as we did previously. The number of rollcalls has dropped very sharply. The most substantial, drastic, and dramatic change was in the number of quorum calls. A quorum call brings Senators to the Chamber, so that when there is extended debate they can hear it.

Mr. LONG. Unfortunately, the Senator has not had the experience with long sessions that some of us have had. I know of no greater waste of time than that which occurs when a Senator who has an amendment which has no chance whatever of adoption, and which he knows has no chance of adoption, insists on a quorum call, keeping the Senate in session for half an hour longer while a live quorum is attained, and then insisting on calling the roll to take a yea-and-nay vote, only to have the amendment defeated overwhelmingly. Often it is an amendment in which the public is not interested, and no one else is particularly interested. No other Senator really desires a yea-and-nay vote. I think it would be wiser, both for the individual Senator and for the Senate, not to insist on a yea-and-nay vote on such an amendment.

On occasion I have insisted on a yea-and-nay vote, only to lose by perhaps 8 or 9 to 1. The Senator perhaps does not realize how much such votes hurt. On occasion, I would have appreciated it if some Senator had suggested to me

that I permit the question to be decided by a voice vote.

Mr. PROXMIRE. It certainly does hurt to be defeated, and to have exposed the degree of defeat in a yea-and-nay vote. But that is a real public service. The people have the right to know where Senators stand. The only way they can know is by putting Senators on record. There have been a number of yea-and nay votes when I wished I could have evaporated. But we are here to make a record, and the only way we can make a record is by having yea-and-nay votes.

I believe that the evidence indicates that we have not made the kind of public record that we have made in the past.

Mr. LONG. It seems to me that there are many ways to spare the Senate a great deal of unnecessary labor, at a great saving to the public. One of them is for a Senator to place statements in the RECORD without reading it, when other Senators are not available to hear his speech, and no one particularly cares.

There are a great number of instances in which a Senator can accommodate itself and the Nation, and reduce expenses, by merely placing in the RECORD a Senator's views, rather than keeping the Senate in session for hours in order that he may deliver his speech on the floor.

We can expedite proceedings in the Senate if Senators will prepare their views in advance, and not delay the Senate unduly, and by avoiding unnecessary quorum calls. In such ways we can serve the public more expeditiously.

I do not for a moment concede that in earlier years the public was always enlightened when a bill was taken up and debated for 2 or 3 weeks before we ever got around to vote on it. In most instances, Senators would not remain to hear all the debate.

However, even based upon a comparison of the hours in session, if the Senator omits the two sessions in which there were two protracted and successful filibusters, he will find that the number of hours the Senate was in session during the 6 years referred to were greater, on the average, than the number of hours during the other two sessions.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a table showing bills passed, rollcall votes, quorum calls, and hours in session be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

	Bills passed	Rollcall votes	Quorum calls	Hours in session
1947–48	636	248	575	1,461
1949–50	913	455	851	2,410
1951–52	775	331	431	1,648
Total	2,324	1,034	1,857	5,519
1953–54	1,027	270	467	1,962
1955–56	1,159	218	156	1,361
1957–58	1,062	309	253	1,875
Total	3,248	797	876	5,198

Mr. PROXMIRE. It is perfectly obvious that the great process of reconciliation of diverse claims in national interest on the anvil of debate on the floor of the Senate did not take place last year as it has traditionally in the Senate, and experience this year suggests that debate is likely to be even more abbreviated. Unless we stop this trend, more and more crucial matters will be decided over the telephone, in the cloakroom, or almost any private place where dissent can be silenced without public knowledge. All too often this public ignorance of what is happening and why will be shared by many Senators with the consequence that important legislation will pass without Senators knowing what is in it.

The part the Senate can play in public education can hardly be overestimated. There have already this year been some nationally significant speeches delivered in the Senate, and I am sure there will be others. These speeches were a genuine service to our country. I believe the present Presiding Officer, the junior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD] made one of those speeches.

But, Mr. President, those speeches were not delivered on pending legislation. They did not involve the big proponents and opponents of the major legislation before this body. There was none—as Marquis Childs pointed out—of "the fire, the fight, the conviction, the zeal." This fighting attitude is the child of conflict. Any newspaperman will tell us that it is the clash of controversy that shakes the public out of comfortable boredom with TV and family chitchat and rivets its attention on public affairs. When the housing bill slipped through the Senate so slickly and quietly, the American people were robbed of an education on the big contradiction between the urgent need for housing on the one hand and the already cruel burden on the taxpayer on the other. That clash never really came off. The differences were patched up in advance. We lost the great value of an aroused public intelligence as well as an informed Senatorial intelligence.

Mr. President, what this adds up to is that not in a conference or caucus of all Democratic Senators, not in a policy committee of some of the very wisest and most competent Democratic Senators and not on the floor of the Senate will the great responsibility that all Democratic Senators share for the conduct of this majority of ours be discharged. The program that will be put together by the enormously gifted man who is the majority leader will be accomplished not only without any direction from majority Senators in advance, but without any opportunity for majority Senators to know in advance where they are being taken; and for most of us, Mr. President, this process of flying blind will continue right up until and including the final vote we cast on each piece of legislation.

In this business, Mr. President, a Senator's responsibility has to be measured as much by his understanding of what is going on as by his integrity. Of course, no Senator can expect to know all the details of all the thousands of bills the Senate passes on. But, Mr. President, the way the Senate is now operating it is not only difficult for the most diligent and intelligent Senator to know the major proposals in legislation that whizzes across the floor, it is impossible for him to know where each major bill fits in the framework of national demands which the President of the United States tells us gravely challenges all of our national resources.

Mr. President, the American people have handed the Democratic Party in the U.S. Senate a very great responsibility. I say we can only live up to that responsibility if we establish an honest, publicly declared policy that indicates at least the broad fiscal outlines upon which we will build our program.

As the majority party in this Congress, it is not enough for us to oppose or support the minority program offered by the President. It is not enough for us to grope instinctively along even though we follow a man of great and proven political genius, the majority leader. We must know and we must insist that the American people know to whom we are responsible and where we are going.

CONCLUSION

Mr. President, in my first talk I contended that regardless of who makes Democratic policy, how it is made, or whether it is good, bad, or indifferent, the typical Democratic Senator has nothing to say about it.

In this talk I have attempted to show that it is the majority leader who dominates the determination of Democratic policy. I have tried to show that this policy is determined instinctively, as we go along without any predetermined plan and that this has brought certain serious consequences. Furthermore, I have said that Democratic Senate discussion in committee, and more importantly on the floor, has not been fully responsible because it has lacked any framework of overall party responsibility. Finally, I have contended that the invaluable deliberative and educational role of the Senate has been short-circuited by the leadership policy of settling issues off the floor.

In the next of my series of speeches I intend to begin to discuss the consequences of Democratic Senate policies on the American people.

In conclusion, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks an excellent chapter entitled "The Senate Policy Committees," from a book entitled "Party Committees and National Politics," written by Prof. Hugh Bone.

There being no objection, the chapter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE SENATE POLICY COMMITTEES

The American penchant for organization has been reflected in the creation of still another set of national party committees, the so-called policy committees in the Senate. These differ from the national, congressional, and senatorial committees in at least three particulars. First, they are the only party committees that have statutory sanction, each committee receives a public appropriation of about $75,000 anually. Second, the major concern of the committees is not the

management and financing of campaigns. According to law, the committees are charged with "the formulation of overall legislative policy of the respective parties" and are given a staff "to assist in study, analysis, and research on problems involved in policy determinations."[1] Third, less is known about the policy committees than about any of the other national party agencies. This is not so much because they are the newest (they were created in 1947) as because they shun publicity and prefer to work in an unpublicized, subterranean manner.

The policy committees are an interesting paradox. Despite their title, they usually profess that they do not determine policy, and frequently they may shy away from doing so. Although they are presumably not concerned with campaigns, they are definitely conscious of the role, both direct and indirect, they may have in reelecting their own party's Senators. On at least one occasion the Republican policy committee issued a model campaign speech, which also carried details on the campaign school operated by the Republican National Committee. In 1956 the Republican policy committee had its staff prepare for use in the campaign an encyclopedic 250-page guide under the title "Election Issues of 1956." The chairman of the committee, STYLES BRIDGES, suggested that this background material could be used for radio and television, in campaign literature, or in newspaper messages. The book was arranged under sixteen subject headings such as agriculture, national defense, civil rights, immigration, veterans, small business, and domestic communism. To enhance its value further, a detailed index was included. It is perhaps remarkable that although the Republican policy committee is nominally not a campaign committee, it turned out a campaign document more comprehensive in scope of subject matter than anything published by the Republican national, congressional, or senatorial committees.

CREATION AND DEVELOPMENT

Right after World War II there was much discussion in and out of Congress about party responsibility. The Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress reported that strong recommendations had been made to it concerning the need for the formal expression within Congress of the main policies of the majority and minority parties.[2] These recommendations called for some mechanism capable of bringing about more party accountability for policies and platform pledges. The committee recommended the creation of policy committees, and the Senate accepted the proposal as it was incorporated in the legislative reorganization bill, forming such committees for itself by attaching an item in the Legislative Branch Appropriation Act. The House, however, deleted the provision.

Speaker SAM RAYBURN was strongly opposed to the proposal for party policy agencies in the House, and JOSEPH MARTIN was also reported to be unenthusiastic about it. RAYBURN has never made much use of the Democratic caucus or other institutional leadership devices, preferring to handle leadership problems in his own way. Although he is not formally a member, RAYBURN is generally consulted by the Democratic congressional committee on a variety of matters, and he has used the committee's staff from time to time.[3]

In 1949, for reasons that were not made public, the Republicans converted their steering committee into the House Republican policy committee. The floor leader serves as chairman, and the congressional committee chairman and the conference chairman, secretary, and whip serve ex officio. Seventeen others are chosen, three by the committee on committees and the remainder on a geographic basis. An elaborate resolution prescribes the function of this committee.[4] The policy committee serves as an advisory group for the leadership and meets on call before important action on the floor and reports its action and policy to the party conference or to the whip organization. Illustrative of what the House Republican policy committee may do was its calling for substantial reductions in President Eisenhower's budget for the fiscal year of 1958. JOE MARTIN said that no figure was given but that he considered $3 billion substantial. The committee said that it expected all Republican Representatives to support its stand at the next party caucus.[5]

No Republican is bound by the decisions of the policy body, but its actions are designed to guide Members in legislative policy. Many matters are not considered by the policy committee, and Representatives themselves are unwilling to speculate on how much real influence the committee has on party policy in the House. The House Republican policy committee differs from its Senate counterpart in that it has no statutory sanction, no funds, and no staff.

In the Senate, before the creation of the policy committees in 1947 the Republicans, under the leadership of the late Senator Robert A. Taft, made important use of the steering committee. This body was simply converted, with few changes, into the Senate Republican policy committee. Senator Taft became chairman of the new committee and retained the position until he became majority floor leader in 1953. Taft did not wish to hold both positions, and Senator William Knowland took over the committee chairmanship. Upon the death of Senator Taft a few months later, Senator Knowland followed the precedent he had set and relinquished the chairmanship to Senator Homer Ferguson.

Democratic practice has been quite different. The Senate floor leadership, the chairmanship of the Democratic policy committee, and the chairmanship of the Democratic caucus have been held by the same person, while with the Republicans the offices have been filled with three different persons. The first Democratic chairman, Senator Alben Barkley, made little use of the committee because he saw no need for it, handling policy and leadership matters to his own satisfaction. Senator Lucas, McFarland, and Johnson, who succeeded him, convened the committee fairly regularly. Both policy committees generally meet weekly while the Senate is in session.

The size and complexion of the Republican committee have undergone marked change. From the beginning, several officials have been ex officio members: the chairman and secretary of the Republican conference, the floor leader, the whip, the President pro tempore of the Senate—if he is a Republican—and, of course, the policy committee chairman. The remainder are nominated by the chairman of the conference and ratified by it. Senators have the privilege of sending suggestions for nominations to the chairman.[6] The fact that the party officials are on the committee has meant that persons with seniority and a generally conservative orientation dominate its membership. In response to complaints of freshman Senators, Senator Taft added two younger persons to the committee in 1949. There were 9 Senators on the first policy committee, and the number was increased to 11 during the 81st and to 12 in the 82d and 83d Congresses.

In 1954, Senator Ferguson's defeat, plus the loss of majority control by the Senate, led to considerable reorganization at the beginning of the 84th Congress. STYLES BRIDGES, who had been President pro tempore of the Senate during the 83d Congress, was chosen as chairman of the Republican policy committee. In a surprise move it was decided to make every Republican Senator up for reelection in 1956 a member of the committee, making a total of 23 on the committee. A major purpose of this change was to give the prestige of being on the policy body to each person running for reelection. With this move, which virtually doubled the size of the committee and put on it about half the Republican membership in the Senate, the body obviously could no longer be regarded as a small one concerned with legislative planning and scheduling. The composition of the committee insured that it would be an agency strongly sensitive to the political realities of the forthcoming 1956 election.

The committee's composition in the 84th Congress appeared to have one additional merit. It brought onto the committee, by coincidence, many ranking members of standing committees. Ten of the fifteen committee chairmen during the 83d Congress were included, thereby insuring that the policy body would be kept apprised of developments within many important committees.

Again in 1957, the Republican conference radically changed the composition of its policy committee.[7] As now constituted, nine members are on the committee by reason of ex officio positions. In addition to the six mentioned above, the respective chairmen of the senatorial campaign committee, the committee on committees, and the Republican personnel committee were added. Six

---

[1] U.S. Statutes at Large, vol. 60, p. 911, 79th Congress, 2d session (1946).

[2] For discussion of recommendations concerning the establishment of the policy committees, see Report of the Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress Pursuant to House Concurrent Resolution 18, 79th Cong., 2d sess., Report No. 1011, Mar. 4, 1946, pp. 12–13. A number of additional details on the policy committees will be found in the author's article, "An Introduction to the Senate Policy Committees," in American Political Science Review, L (June 1956), 339–59.

[3] Treatment of the general leadership problems of Congress is beyond the scope of this book. It should be noted, however, that RAYBURN along with Democratic Floor Leader JOHN W. MCCORMACK has run the Democratic party in the House to a great degree, and their views have had an extraordinary influence on the Democratic national and congressional committees. Many Democrats in Congress have privately criticized RAYBURN's leadership, but so fare none have been willing to wage an all-out battle with him over who is to run the House Democrats. For an account of this in the 85th Congress, see "Democratic Representatives Voice Discontent with Leaders," Congressional Quarterly Weekly Report, XV (Feb. 22, 1957), 224–25.

[4] The text of the resolution will be found in George B. Galloway, The Legislative Process in Congress (New York: Thomas Y. Crowell Co., 1953), pp. 334–335.

[5] See Congressional Quarterly Weekly Report, XV (Mar. 8, 1957), 317.

[6] See "Republican Conference Rules," January 11, 1955. See also "Functions of the Senate Republican Policy Committee and Its Staff," August 1953, obtainable from the Senate Republican policy committee. All the Republican party officers are chosen by the conference.

[7] The changes may be found in the Republican Conference Rules of January 10, 1957, the Senate Republican Memo of January 3 and 10, 1957, and in the resolution adopted by the conference January 12, 1957. It was reported that much discussion preceded the rules changes.

other persons were nominated and elected by the conference. This reduced the membership to 14[8] in the 85th Congress.

The six Senators elected by the conference serve on the Republican policy committee for 2 years and are eligible to succeed themselves only once, but they may be reelected after 2 years have intervened. However, since all of the party offices are on the committee ex officio, several have served many years. Senator Millikin, by reason of being conference chairman, served on the committee from its creation until he retired in 1957. Senator SALTONSTALL, who became the whip in 1949, and Senators YOUNG and BRIDGES have served several terms. During the 82d and 83d Congresses there was a fairly adequate sectional representation on the committee and a balance between the larger and smaller States.

In sharp contrast, membership on the Democratic policy committee has no terminal point and has tended to be self-perpetuating. Turnover has occurred when there were changes in the three ex officio members (the floor leader, the whip, and the caucus secretary) or when Members dropped out of the Senate. The number on the committee has remained at nine. Three who were appointed in 1947—GREEN, HILL, and RUSSELL—have served without interruption until the present. Senators JOHNSON and KERR were first put on the committee in the 82d Congress and have continued to serve ever since. Senator Clements was defeated for reelection in 1956 and was replaced by the new Democratic whip, MIKE MANSFIELD. The remaining three members on the committee in 1958 were Senators HENNINGS, MURRAY, and HAYDEN.

The six members appointed to the committee were chosen presumably on the basis of seniority, point of view, and geography. But its membership has lacked the broad sectional basis of its Republican counterpart. For instance, in the 85th Congress, despite Democratic representation from such large States as Illinois, Michigan, Minnesota, and Ohio, no Senator from the Midwest was on the committee. Senator GREEN was the sole member from the East. MANSFIELD and MURRAY, both from Montana, were members, the first by reason of being the newly chosen whip, MURRAY because he was on previously. It appears that once a member is appointed, his tenure is for the duration of his stay in the Senate, irrespective of logic or imbalance.

The southern and border States have always had six or seven of the nine seats. In terms of Democratic representation in the Senate, of course, the southern and border States can argue that they provide two-thirds of the membership and are entitled to the lion's share of the representation on the policy body. Nevertheless, the needs of certain important northern interests have no impressive voice on the committee. One member of the Democratic policy committee, however, sees it as operating in the "country as a whole" and as simply a part of the process of reconciling sectional and factional differences within the party. Extremists have been left off the committee and moderates compose the membership.

The policy committees have been personal rather than institutional leadership devices. When LYNDON JOHNSON was absent for several weeks in 1955 because of illness, the Democratic policy committee did not even meet. Later, after he had a heart attack, the committee met long enough to prepare a statement that it would carry out his policies. Most chairmen in both parties have used the policy committee at their own discretion. When Senator Scott Lucas of Illinois served as floor leader, he was confronted with the necessity of obtaining cooperation from southern Senators and made considerable use of the committee as an agent for broadening the basis of his leadership.

In Democratic circles on Capitol Hill, the Democratic policy committee is often spoken of as the "personal staff of Senator JOHNSON."[9] JOHNSON is very successful as a floor leader. He tries to foster a type of discussion among Democrats that will end in friendship rather than in splitting the party, and he uses the policy body to work for a large Democratic vote and to keep the party together. In recent years Democratic leaders have feared that the caucus would lead to quarrelsome debates and create party disunity, so one has been held only at the beginning of a session. In the interim the policy committee is used to a considerable extent to eliminate the need for convening the caucus. The fact that the floor leadership and policy committee chairmanship are held by the same person has tended to make the committee an instrument of the leadership. The staff of the Democratic policy committee serves also as the staff for the duties of the chairman as floor leader.

Although both party committees are instruments of personal leadership, the Republican body has been considerably less personal than the Democratic. After Taft gave up the chairmanship, the Republican policy committee gave more thought to its own nature as a corporate body and tried to institutionalize itself. By having its own chairman and by maintaining separate identities for its floor leader and conference chairman, the policy group avoids becoming exclusively the tool or personal staff of the chairman. Leadership of the Senate Republicans is pro forma more highly dispersed. Institutionalization has also been fostered by prescribing rules for democratic election and the composition of the committee's membership, by issuing a public statement on the functions of the committee and the staff, and by providing that none except the ex officio members are eligible to successive terms on the committee.

GENERAL OPERATION AND FUNCTIONS

From the foregoing discussion it is obvious that there is a substantial difference between the two policy committees. Nowhere have the Democrats set down the functions for their policy committee; the Republicans, on the other hand, have prepared a brief description of their work operations and functions.

The Republican conference rules include the statement, "The policy committee shall consider the legislative program in the Senate and the question whether any party policy is involved, shall prepare and present recommendations for action by the conference, and advise all Senators on legislative matters which they desire to present to the policy committee." In the memorandum prepared in August 1953, it was asserted that the following 12 types of operations were being performed by the committee in pursuance of the authority given to it in the conference rules: (1) consideration of legislative program to be scheduled for floor operations, (2) consideration of parliamentary procedure, (3) canvass of measures before standing committees, (4) cooperation with the President and White House staff, (5) preparation and issuance of statements on matters involving policy committee interests and actions, (6) advice on the undertaking of committee investigations, (7) consideration of questions arising out of presidential nominations, (8) discussion with individual Senators of matters of interest to them, (9) attempts to reconcile divergent views among Senators on legislation with the object of promoting party unity, (10) initiation of studies on legislative matters "to advance the national welfare, to implement the party platform, and to strengthen Republican leadership," (11) recommendation of occasions for calling the whole Republican conference, and (12) cooperation with House Republican leadership.

There is no reliable evidence from which to determine which of these functions is the most important. The last, cooperation with House Republican leadership, is no longer of significance. For a short while after the House Republican policy committee came into being, in 1949, it met in joint meetings with the Senate group, but these meetings were abandoned because of poor attendance on the part of the House Members. There is considerable informal relationship between House and Senate leaders, even though the formal policy body relationships no longer exist.

When the party was in the minority, the Republican Senate policy group considered certain of President Truman's nominations, but the screening of nominations was of little importance after Eisenhower's inauguration.

The staff of the Republican policy committee is composed of about 10 professionals and 5 secretaries. Virtually all the former possess bachelors or graduate degrees, and most of them are research workers. Although they are generalists, they tend to specialize in certain areas, such as agriculture, conservation, or public works. The staff serves the committee, the Republican conference, and the Republican calendar committee.[10]

The Republican staff produces a large number of publications and has tried to provide material Republican Senators will need for important legislation and policies. One of its best-known publications is the weekly memorandum entitled "Senate Republican Memo," intended for use in speeches, press releases, newsletters to constituents, and radio and television broadcasts. Illustrative titles include "The Dixon-Yates Contract," "The Political, Hypocritical $20 Tax Scheme," "More Evidence of Communist Influence in Democratic Administration," and "Republicans Sell Rubber Plants for Top Prices." In March 1955 the staff put out a 51-page analysis of the Yalta papers under the title "Highlights of the Yalta Papers and Related Data," which stirred up a considerable amount of Democratic ire.

The staff also assists Republican Senators in outlining and drafting speeches dealing with legislation and policy. It gives limited help on campaign speeches. At the end of each session of Congress the staff prepares a detailed report on the Republican record and performance that is published as a public document.

Upon request from Senators, the staff will conduct interviews with persons and organizations having an interest in legislation and will report the findings to the Senators. Other services include bill drafting on re-

[8] Since the Democrats gained control of the Senate, there has been no Republican President pro tempore to serve on the policy committee.

[9] Senator JOHNSON generally directs the staff work. In the Republican committee, allocation of the staff work is usually handled by the staff director and secretary, Lloyd W. Jones.

[10] The Republican policy committee has a suite of offices in the Senate Office Building. The Democratic staff, which includes six professionals and four clerks, is located near the Senate floor in the Capitol, in less spacious quarters. Turnover has been higher in the Democratic office, and none of the members has been with the staff from its beginning. Only one person has been a member since 1949; several of the professionals joined the committee when LYNDON JOHNSON became its chairman. As a result, there is no staff member who possesses firsthand knowledge of the history of the committee's work. In contrast, two staff members have served the Republican committee since its inception.

quest and the analyses of the legislative records and histories of Senators. Although the staff directors have broad initiative, the chairmen appear to have kept close control over most of the work done, exercising final direction and command. There have been only two staff directors, and each has served under more than one chairman. Nevertheless, there is undoubtedly a personal accountability to the chairman. The association of the staff with other Republican policy committee members is not nearly so close as with the chairman. In general, staff work for Republican Senators is contingent upon whether the material desired concerns party interests and principles or not. If help is requested outside this frame of reference, Senators are likely to be advised that their own staff aides and other sources should be used.

On nearly all staff publications put out for general distribution, the following printed disclaimer appears: "NOTE: Neither the members of the Republican policy committee nor other Republican Senators are responsible for the statements herein contained, except such as they are willing to endorse and make their own." The protective statement is used to cover situations in which the material was originated either by the staff director or by one of the members of the committee. It also absolves the Senators whose views might be at variance with those expressed in a staff study.

An interesting incident that occurred just before the national conventions in 1956 illustrates this point. The policy committee staff published a report charging that the Communist Party line was that "the Republicans must be defeated and all support thrown to the Democrats" in the election. On the Senate floor a steady parade of Democrats denounced the report and demanded that the members of the policy committee take responsibility for the action of their staff and repudiate the statement. A senior member of the Republican committee rose and announced that he had not seen the memorandum until the Democrats brought it up. He said: "I want to go on record as saying I disagree with it completely; it is shameful. I am overwhelmed with regret. As a member of the Republican Party I cannot tolerate this. I personally will take it up with the policy committee and I think I can assure you that this kind of thing will stop."[11] Knowland also said he publicly repudiated any effort to associate the Democrats with subversion.

Chairman BRIDGES was not in Washington, D.C., when the report was published, and when he returned he said he had no knowledge of it until it came out. This was despite the fact that the chairman is supposed to clear every report before it is published. BRIDGES said, "I know that responsible leaders in the Democratic Party both in and out of Congress repudiate any support from the Communist Party * * * and are all patriotic citizens and loyal Americans."[12]

The number and variety of publications by the Democratic policy staff are much less impressive than those of its Republican counterpart. Very little work is done for individual Senators. The staff does a good deal of spot research for the chairman and prepares legislative status reports. It compiles quorum records, noting Senators' presence or absence during rollcalls and votes, and prepares a vote card that goes to every Democratic Senator very soon after a vote is taken on the bill. It also prepares a list of expiring legislation, which goes to committee chairmen and Senators. Presidential recommendations and speeches are analyzed for partisan overtones.

As might be expected, the research of the policy committee staffs is politically oriented and partisan, being designed to document the party's record and find holes in the opposition's armor. It has been a function of the Republican policy staff in particular to take the raw materials it receives and to try to apply the party's position to them and point up the policy problems involved. The work of the Republican staff is clearer and more tangible than that of the Democratic staff.

On Capitol Hill the usefulness and accomplishments of the policy committees are fairly well recognized in three fields: service and research, education, and legislative scheduling. The services provided by the staff have been described. In addition, the Republican committee has helped Senators to secure administrative assistants, secretaries, and high-level staff members. Certain personnel procedures were systematized in 1947, and the new committee chairmen were supplied with names of qualified persons for committee staffs.

At the request of Senators the Republican staff prepares a considerable number of individual memorandums, sometimes as many as 100 per year. These may be used to accompany legislation or in answering letters. The Republican staff has also met with administrative assistants and other employees in the Senators' offices. During campaigns the staff sends research materials to the Republican National Committee and has done a limited amount of speechwriting. Some research is also done for the Republican senatorial committee. The Republican congressional, national, senatorial campaign, and policy committees exchange and make some use of one another's materials. In a general sense, all the materials put out are designed to be helpful to the party in defending its record and pointing to weaknesses in the Democratic record. Some Republican Senators believe that from 1947 to 1950 Senator Taft saw the policy committee as an instrument for electing Republicans.

The educational function of the Republican policy committee is significant. Committee chairmen have appeared before it to report on major problems and measures that are before their committees. This has helped the policy committee members to get a broader view of policies, program, and legislation, and committee leaders in turn have been helped by the policy members. During the first few months of the Eisenhower administration, several Cabinet Secretaries appeared before the committee. This made the Secretaries more aware of party considerations and provided the Senators with a greater understanding of departmental programs and wishes. The committee has helped the newer Senators learn their way around and has added to their knowledge of how the Senate really operates.

The Democratic policy committee has also served educational purposes, but its activities have been less obvious and narrower in scope. Its meetings are at luncheons, and other Senators and executive officials are seldom present. Yet its operation, as will be seen shortly, undoubtedly results in educating a number of Democratic Senators.

The policy committees perform useful functions in preparing for the call of the calendar, a procedure for the disposition of minor bills and resolutions. The policy committee of the party in power is of considerable importance at times in determining the general legislative schedule. Early in 1958, for example, the Democratic policy committee announced that it had decided to give top priority to proposals for dealing with Presidential disability. In reality, the determination of what will be brought up on the floor is a function of the leadership, but the policy committees may be an aid to it. There is sometimes a discussion of whether to bring up a bill at all. Quite often the floor leader simply brings in a legislative agenda for the ensuing week and asks the policy group if it has any questions. Members may then ask to have certain items included.

Some have compared the policy committees with the House Rules Committee. In terms of legislative scheduling, this is not an apt comparison. The latter enjoys the status of a standing committee with authority to issue specific rules, impose limitations, and bottle up measures, the policy bodies possess none of these powers. Scheduling in the real sense of the word involves discussion of strategy, decision as to sequence, and consideration of timing. Neither policy committee, as a committee, appears to have gone into these matters with any degree of regularity.

THE POLICY COMMITTEE AND THE EXECUTIVE

A perennial problem in the American system of government is the relationship between the President and the majority party in Congress. Among the matters given much consideration by the Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress during the 1940's was that of institutionalizing the communication between the two. This committee, popularly known as the La Follette-Monroney committee, recommended that majority policy committees of the two Houses "serve as a formal council to meet regularly with the Executive, to facilitate the formulation and carrying out of national policy."[13] It foresaw that this would result in "improved understanding of each other's problems" through consultation before the introduction of legislation to carry out pledged party promises, and also that it would give congressional leaders a chance to formulate policy instead of simply acting on programs prepared by the Executive.

When the Eisenhower administration first took office, its legislative program was formulated in a 3-day meeting between administrative and legislative leaders. The Republican policy committee took over the residuum of the meetings and more or less accepted it as Republican policy. Under Chairman Homer Ferguson (1953–54), there was a reasonably close relationship between the President and the Republican policy committee. The contact was due largely to Senator Ferguson. There is no record, however, of a single instance in which President Eisenhower met with all of the members of his party's policy committee. President Truman appears to have met once with the Democratic policy group at the suggestion of its chairman, Senator Ernest McFarland. McFarland expressed the hope for similar meetings, but none seem to have been held.[14]

Policy committee members have usually learned of wishes of the President or cabinet officers indirectly from their policy chairman. For example, Senator Taft, and often Senator Vandenberg, met with individual members of the Truman cabinet instead of bringing them before the Republican policy committee in the 80th Congress. Taft then simply reported to the committee what the officials had told him. As has been mentioned, Senator Ferguson had numerous Eisenhower cabinet officers appear before the committee, a practice that was well received. Several

[11] New York Times, July 3 and 4, 1956. Strictly speaking, the staff itself does not make memorandums public. All publications go to Senators, and if one of them makes it public then it becomes his responsibility.

[12] Ibid.

[13] "Report of the Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress," p. 13.

[14] New York Times, Jan. 28, 1951. Senator Elbert D. Thomas, in his evaluation of policy committees, felt that President Truman should have taken the initiative to convene the Democratic committee with his cabinet and himself. "Had he done so," writes Thomas, "there would have been no need for various clashes between him and several Members of Congress which have occurred." See "How Congress Functions Under Its Reorganization Act," American Political Science Review, XLIII (December 1949), 1183.

Senators said that the sessions were helpful in getting a detailed view on some forthcoming departmental legislative proposals. However, such meetings between administrators and policy members have been exceptional.

From the beginning of the Eisenhower regime, an important aspect of the almost weekly meetings of the Republican policy committee was the report of Senate leaders on their regular meetings with the President. An interesting development of relations between the President and his party in the Senate occurred early in 1956, when all Senate Republicans were invited to attend a weekly policy committee meeting for a briefing on White House legislative thinking.[15] The meetings were held the same day as the leaders' sessions with Eisenhower.

As is so often the case in politics, these arrangements were the outgrowth of intensely practical, rather than theoretical, considerations. The conference chairman, Eugene Millikin, was quite ill in 1956 and could not report to the conference on his meetings with Eisenhower as he had previously done. Senators BRIDGES and Knowland reported in his stead, and the policy committee and conference were, practically speaking, merged in order to hear the President's views. Some of the "Young Turk" Eisenhower Republicans felt that they had not been kept abreast of what the White House had been telling the more conservatively oriented BRIDGES and Knowland. These meetings also afforded them a chance to ask questions and to discuss Eisenhower's program. Further, when the arrangement was started, it was not known whether the President would run for a second term, and it was felt that these weekly meetings of all Senate Republicans would help to promote greater party unity. One Republican Senator expressed the view that these meetings served a real educative purpose and that the policy committee's greatest potential lay in this area.

In 1957, Senator LEVERETT SALTONSTALL replaced Millikin as conference chairman, and the size of the policy committee was reduced from 23 to 14. Nevertheless, it was decided to continue to invite all Republican Senators to meet with the policy committee. As a result the conference committee met much less frequently, since Republican Senators were brought together in the committee meetings. Observers of the Senate have privately expressed the feeling that the Republican policy committee is less effective than before it began the practice of inviting all the party members in the Senate to attend its meetings. More of the actual legislative strategy in the 85th Congress was settled by the top leaders and less by the policy committee. The Republican policy group has become, however, a far more important link with the White House than its Democratic counterpart.

The independence of the policy committee from the other national level committees is often noted. On several occasions the policy committee of the party in power or its chairman has been at variance with the President and has made it known obliquely or otherwise. Some Senate Democrats have said privately that their policy committee, in effect, worked against part of President Truman's civil rights program. Senator STYLES BRIDGES in 1957 more or less disassociated himself with the high Eisenhower budget, and the Republican conference on March 12 adopted a sharp resolution opposed to "excessive Federal spending under present conditions."

Again, in late autumn and early winter, 1955–56, Chairman BRIDGES and Floor Leader Knowland made repeated public statements that President Eisenhower should announce his intentions early in 1956 so that other aspirants could file in the New Hampshire and other primaries if he was not going to run. But National Chairman HALL and the White House staff repeatedly urged that there be no pressure on Eisenhower and said that he could and should take his time.

Another example of disagreement between the President and the Senate leadership occurred when the Republican policy committee issued a 32-page memorandum giving data on guided missiles, various weapons, and the numerical strength of the Armed Forces.[16] The Democrats and some of the press raised the cry that this made public classified information. Defense Secretary Wilson and other officials issued a statement asserting that "no security violation" was involved, but they found themselves, according to the press, "in the embarrassing position of defending publication of a summary of new American weapons by the Senate Republican policy committee while criticizing publication of such military information elsewhere."[17] President Eisenhower said he regarded the publication as a "blunder," and that he would not have given out such information.[18] The chairman of the committee, Senator BRIDGES, took to the Senate floor with the retort: "The President's reference to the national defense study by the staff of the Republican policy committee as a blunder is most unfortunate."[19] The incident shows that there was no consultation with the Executive prior to publication. It is but one of several that might be cited to demonstrate that policy committee leadership may be publicly at odds with the President.

On the other side of the ledger, it should be pointed out that nearly all the Republican policy committee's publications have attempted to equate Eisenhower's program with that of the Republican Party. This is especially interesting in light of the fact that of the three policy committee chairmen since 1953—Knowland, Ferguson, and Bridges—only Ferguson had the public reputation of being an "Eisenhower Republican."

POLICY AND POLICY COMMITTEES

At the outset, the conclusion is inescapable that the policy committees are misnamed. They have never been "policy" bodies in the sense of considering and investigating alternatives of public policy, and they have never put forth an overall congressional party program. The committees do not assume leadership in drawing up a general legislative program but consider certain proposals on an ad hoc basis as they arise or are due for consideration on the floor. Some important policies receive little or no discussion in the committees, and only rarely have the committees labeled their decisions as "party policies." There have been disagreements within the committees, and issues are rarely put to a vote. JOHNSON seldom makes a speech on the Senate floor, and he seems to follow the framed motto on his office wall: "You ain't learnin' nothin' when you're talkin'." Much legislation is worked out in casual meetings by groups of Senators who may or may not be members of the policy committees. Party policy is made by a large number of people. "As devices for coordinating legislative policy and strengthening party leadership," says George Galloway, "the Senate policy committees have thus far failed to fulfill their potential."[20]

Chairman LYNDON JOHNSON, more than his predecessors, has perceived the policy committee as a strategic device and weapon. The committee is used to set up issues in a way that will permit a maximum number of Democrats to go along with the position of leadership. JOHNSON'S philosophy is to meet Senators halfway, talk with them personally, and seek to understand their problems in terms of their own constituencies. Under JOHNSON the policy committee is an instrument for accommodating factionalism. His predecessors, as well as Republican chairmen, have used the committee to discuss the wisdom of bringing up an issue or leaving it alone and to work for unanimity and agreement among the members of the committee. If agreement is reached, the chairman often goes to the other members of his party and says, in effect, "It is the unanimous opinion of the policy committee that this action is wise (or unwise)." The Democratic policy committee in recent years has often discussed the wisdom of certain kinds of Democratic attacks on President Eisenhower, and it has not hesitated to make its views known, by word of mouth, to other Senate Democrats.

The Democratic policy committee is also used to formulate issues in a way that will embarrass the opposition. On the censure of Senator McCarthy, for example, the committee stated that it was not a party matter but concerned the morals of the Senate and that each Democratic Senator should vote according to his own conscience. This avoided giving Senator McCarthy an opportunity to build up strength among Republicans by arguing that censure had been formally made a partisan issue.

When President Eisenhower sent Congress the resolution on the Yalta agreements, it was quickly endorsed by the Democratic policy committee. The Republicans were divided on the issue, with many feeling that it did not go far enough. The action of the Democrats in endorsing the Eisenhower resolution left the Republicans arguing among themselves, and the resolution was finally buried in committee. Republican Senators were clearly put on the defensive in the matter.

After Senator WAYNE MORSE, of Oregon, supported Adlai Stevenson instead of General Eisenhower in 1952, he asked that he be assigned to committees as an Independent rather than as a Republican. He wished, moreover, to retain his seat on the Armed Services and Labor and Public Welfare Committees. He lost on three different votes on his assignments.[21] The Democratic policy committee took a position against MORSE on all three rollcalls. Despite this, several members of the committee supported MORSE on the second and third votes. The incident shows how the policy body may take a position on a Senate personnel matter but be unable to line up its membership for that position. In 1955, when MORSE became an avowed Democrat, Policy Chairman JOHNSON used his powers to restore him to a seat on more important committees.

In talking with Senators and their assistants, one finds widely varying views of the accomplishments and usefulness of the committees in the field of policy. This is undoubtedly due to the absence of criteria and

---

[15] Some details of this arrangement will be found in the Washington Post and Times Herald, Jan. 11, 1956.

[16] "National Defense Under the Republican Administration—Today and Tomorrow," supplement to "Senate Republican Memo," vol. I, No. 9 (Mar. 10, 1955).

[17] Washington Post and Times Herald, Apr. 27, 1955.

[18] Ibid., Apr. 28, 1955.

[19] CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 101, pt. 4, p. 5218. Debate on the issue is found in this edition, pp. 5218–5220, 5246–5247. When President Eisenhower expressed his willingness to attend a Big Four summit conference a short time later, Senator BRIDGES again took to the Senate floor to express his skepticism, if not disapproval, of such a conference. (See CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 101, pt. 5, pp. 6074–6084. See also New York Times, May 12, 1955.)

[20] The Legislative Process in Congress, p. 336.

[21] See Ralph K. Huitt, The Morse Committee Assignment Controversy: A Study in Senate Norms, American Political Science Review, LX (June 1957), 313–329.

standards for judging what the committees are supposed to do and what they can do. Some believe that the committees, particularly the Democratic committee, do very little, while others purport to see a few real achievements. A few Senators would like to see the committees turned into real policy bodies with all that the term connotes, but there is no great desire on the part of most for strengthening them in terms of tightening party discipline. The desirability of developing more party cohesion is sometimes admitted in the abstract but not in the concrete. While there is little evidence that a majority of Congress was enthusiastic about policy committees before their creation, a number of Representatives and Senators publicly testified in 1945 in favor of their establishment. It may be concluded that the majority of Senators today are not disappointed that the policy committees have failed to become effective instruments of party responsibility and discipline.

The decentralization and fragmentation of power, the prerogatives of individual power and seniority, the habits of individualism and independence are so well entrenched in the Senate that few Senators are interested in placing authority in the hands of a policy body. Many Senators wish to obtain support, if not sponsorship, of important legislation from Senators of the opposite party. This would be difficult to achieve if either party declared a measure to be party policy. Further, the environment of Congress is not conducive to the delegation to a party committee of the authority to lay down a party line that could serve as a public yardstick for judging a lawmaker's vote on an issue and embarrassing him at election time. If the party line is unknown, or obscure, a Senator has more latitude.

As noted earlier, the composition of the committees leaves much to be desired if policy is to be a major preoccupation of their efforts. The late Senator Walter George, for many years the generally recognized spokesman for the Democrats in foreign policy, never served on the Democratic policy committee, and the late Senator Arthur Vandenberg served only 2 years on the Republican policy committee. Some of the most influential committee chairmen and ranking Members are not on the policy bodies.

Despite the fact that Senators remain unenthusiastic about a more centralized legislative policy arm, there are some modest achievements that can be claimed for the policy committees. In the 83d Congress, the Democratic policy committee forged what might accurately be termed a party position on the proposal to tie together the Alaskan and Hawaiian statehood measures, on the recommitment of the Atomic Energy Bill to the conference committee, and on certain tax proposals. It actually formulated a compromise on the $20 deduction per dependent on the income tax in 1955 and was able to obtain the votes from all but five Democrats on the measure. The Republicans were able to get an almost unanimous vote, with only one dissent, on the same tax question.

The Democratic policy committee took a strong position against any use of sanctions to punish Israel for her refusal to withdraw from the Gaza Strip and admonished the Eisenhower administration against using coercion on Israel.[22] The way in which this position was formulated is typical of the committee's operation. Senator LYNDON JOHNSON sent a letter to Secretary of State Dulles setting forth his position. Later he put this letter before the policy group. Senator HENNINGS, the committee's secretary, moved that the letter be adopted as the committee's position, and a unanimous vote resulted in its endorsement. Often JOHNSON has taken a policy position on his own, and if no one has disagreed it has passed as Democratic policy.

The Republican policy committee spent much time trying to draft an acceptable compromise position on the Bricker amendment. Secretary Dulles and Attorney General Brownell attended several meetings where this was discussed. About two-thirds of the Republican Senators went along with the compromise. Also, the policy committee proposed a uniform code for senatorial procedure and requested the Senate Rules Committee to give it early consideration.[23] Chairman Ferguson led a drive for the adoption of these rules and brought committee chairmen together with the policy committee to discuss them. Nothing came of these efforts officially, but the discussion made the Republican chairmen aware that the leadership was concerned with the problem.

In many cases both party committees have looked at proposals before the Senate and decided that no party policy was involved. At other times they have reaffirmed a policy becauses it appeared in the party platform. On occasions committee chairmen have obtained help from policy committee members on legislation.

These examples of dealing with policies are not likely to impress advocates of party government and discipline either by their number or scope. But neither are they negligible. Many issues of importance are discussed in both committees even when no attempt is made at policy agreement. To some extent, policy discussions in the committee have helped to accommodate factionalism and to etch, for the party leadership, the areas of agreement and disagreement.

To be sure, the committees can bind no one. They can only consider, recommend, and attempt to persuade.[24] Yet some cohesiveness, especially in the Republican Party, has been obtained through the preparation of staff memoranda and statements of performance records and through the formulation of issues. In a few instances a definite stand has been taken on a policy that has commanded nearly unanimous support. Both committees have issued a number of broad statements of party policy.

Policy committee members try to make a distinction between program and policy—possibly a distinction without a difference. The members maintain that they do not make policy but take a program submitted by the executive branch or someone else and decide if it will be adopted as party policy. Democratic members in particular emphasize that they attempt to interpret programs and policies in line with historic Democratic policy. To the extent that this is the role of the policy committees, it is a function of sifting, evaluating, and ratifying rather than of originating and creating. In terms of Senate tradition, however, the role of reviewer is more acceptable than that of drafter and formulator of party policy.

There is a certain intangible psychological influence in the policy committees' activities that is not easy to measure. The label "policy" gives the appearance of leadership. When a pronouncement is made and presumably has the support of all or nearly all the members of the policy committee, it creates an impression of a party position. There are pressures for conformity in the Senate notwithstanding the extreme individualism of its Members. Policy committee members include many of the most respected and most powerful men in the Senate. The views of a Millikin, a Taft, a Russell, or a Hill, are highly regarded. When such men speak as members of the policy committee, one will not oppose them without important reasons. Emulation as well as individualism is the vital part of the totality of the Senate. To the extent that policy committees can be worked into this fabric of personal interaction, prestige, and interpersonal relationships in the Senate, they can achieve successes.

CONCLUSIONS

Experience with the Senate policy committees has led to very little public understanding of their role and, indeed, of their existence. Their immediate ancestors were the steering committees, and in a generic sense the policy committees are steering committees, a designation that probably connotes but little. They have been useful in monitoring the consent calendar, in considering certain matters of legislative scheduling and strategy, and in performing routine and other services needed by the floor leadership. Policy committee sessions are meetings of some of the men of power in the Senate at which political strategy, policy, program, and diverse other matters are discussed. As has been stressed several times before, the influence of the Senate policy committees and of the other party committees, cannot be successfully evaluated because so much influence in American party politics is personal in character. Influence cannot be determined by looking at the number of votes for what is presumably a party measure in the Senate. The personal influence of a Sam Rayburn or a Styles Bridges is not easy to measure, but it is known to be considerable. Taking the views of Senators both on and off the policy committees, evaluations of the committees' influence on party discipline and unity range from "negligible" to "perceptible," with, no one claiming impressive accomplishment. Unfortunately, there is no way to measure whether there would have been even less party cohesion had the committees not existed.

It is interesting to note the difference between the Republican and Democratic policy committee. William S. White, a keen student of Senate behavior, observes that the Republican policy committee will meet every week, but it will do so only upon carefully printed notices circulated to the committee's members officially to inform them that there is to be a meeting. The Democratic policy committee will meet, perhaps, once a week, and when it does the thing simply seems to happen and members will stroll in, usually late, with the air of a man dropping into another's office to have a drink and, having nothing better to do at the moment, to pass the time of day.[25]

The Democratic committee appears more casual and personal, its counterpart more institutionalized and formal. The Republicans frequently take votes in their policy committees; the Democrats rarely do so. Republican staff members turn out many more publications and, in general, give the press more to write about. The Republican committee, at least overtly, does more in a partisan way for its individual Senators and for its party and resembles a campaign committee more than is the case with the Democrats.

It is interesting to speculate on the reasons for this difference. Simultaneously with the creation of the first policy committees, the Republicans came into control of the Senate after a long period of being in the minority. Senator Taft and other leaders recognized the practical necessity for organization and were spurred on by ideological considerations to arrest the spread of the fair deal. There had been a growing

[22] See New York Times, Feb. 20, 1957.

[23] Christian Science Monitor, July 2, 1954.

[24] William S. White in a pictorial article writes, "The functions of the Senate Democratic policy committee * * * are roughly those of the board of directors of a powerful corporation." New York Times Magazine, July 10, 1955, p. 10. This analogy suggests powers that neither of the committees possesses.

[25] "Citadel: The Story of the U.S. Senate." (New York: Harper & Bros., 1957), p. 210.

recognition in the Senate, as there had been in the Republican National Committee, that the party unable to command the great staff resources of the executive branch needed a strong staff of its own and a broader basis of organizational leadership strength. The Republican policy committee possessed utilitarian value, at least in these terms. In contrast, Senator Barkley found the Democrats in very little need of this type of organization. It should be noted that Republican representation in the Senate was so marginal in 1953 that there was no disposition to curtail the staff or diminish activities.[36] Moreover, party splits over foreign policy and certain other Eisenhower proposals made it desirable to keep intact any instrument that might help to accommodate and compromise internal differences. At the same time the Republicans appear to be more concerned than the Democrats with attacking the opposition and providing their officeholders with appropriate ammunition.[37] This spirit was inculcated in part by Senator Taft and is characteristic of a party of opposition.

Democrats, in contrast, have had control or near control of the Senate for a quarter of a century. In large measure because of the long tenure of southerne s, the Democrats have possessed a very experienced group skilled in parliamentary and political procedures. The Republicans have seldom had more than a handful of such competent politicians at any one time. Members on the Republican policy committee in 1957, for example, had served an average of 9 years in the Senate, while members of Democratic committees averaged 16 years. The "old pros" in the Democratic Party have their own methods of doing things in the Senate and are reasonably well satisfied with both methods and accomplishments.

Although the Republican policy committee is more institutionalized and publicized, the assumption that it is a more useful and effective body than the Democratic committee is open to question. In terms of influence and effectiveness with its own membership, the Democratic committee may actually be superior. This paradox—if it is a paradox—needs further analysis before it can be verified.

The policy committees, like the other national level party committees, are hampered by preexisting limitations of custom, environment, and, to some extent, federalism. In the Senate the rules of the game and the encrusted traditions of that institution soon swallow up and absorb attempts at innovation. The personal operation of the Senate, the individualism of each Member, and the dispersion of power resulting from seniority tend to resist the idea of a party committee avowedly dedicated to integrating and formulating party policy. Too often there is just not a "senatorial party" to be led or integrated. Public law created a party policy committee but it did not create a senatorial party or bind the Senate membership to a party program.

Congressional and senatorial campaign committees help to provide the party's candidates with organizations, money, and a certain amount of managerial know-how during elections, but they do not discuss party program. The policy committees in the Senate help to supply certain ingredients that remain untouched by the senatorial committees. The former are useful forums for appraising political realities and rendering some political judgments of some of the party's men of power. They are an aid to the party's leadership in the Senate and provide a much needed staff for that leadership. In the absence of joint House-Senate policy bodies, there is little chance that the Senate bodies alone might offer much of a potential for party clearance of legislation in Congress. Since 1947 the margin of party control in the Senate has been relatively small, and prospects are that this may continue. In view of this, the need for some group that can influence even a few votes on crucial legislation is apparent. Perhaps this is the role that the policy committees are finding for themselves.

[36] Republican representation in successive Congresses, beginning with the 80th, was 51, 42, 42, 48, 47, and 47.

[37] The Democratic policy committee has been more restrained in attacking President Eisenhower than has the Democratic National Committee; the Republican policy committee was biting in its attacks on President Truman.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I agree with what I regard is the real purpose of the comments of the Senator from Wisconsin. I admit that normally I would have a certain reluctance to have the party tactics of the Democratic Party discussed on the floor of the Senate instead of at a party gathering, because I know that our friends on the other side have sharp eyes and alert ears, and are quick to seize upon what they fancy may be dissension within our ranks.

But, as the Senator from Wisconsin has said, we are the majority party, and therefore the problems which we face are, in a sense, the problems of the country; therefore, perhaps the desire for privacy can be waived in favor of an objective discussion.

Secondly, although the Senator from Illinois is in no sense an expert psychiatrist, I understand that modern psychiatrists believe that problems which concern us should be brought to the surface and discussed intelligently and dispassionately; that it is far better for us to face the issues which trouble us than for us to try to suppress them so that they may fester and rankle.

It is in that spirit, I believe, that the Senator from Wisconsin has spoken this afternoon. I found not one word of recrimination and not one word of personal bitterness in anything that he has said. We may differ with him on certain points, but his discussion, I believe, was in good temper; and it can be made very helpful, provided we are objective in considering the issues, and provided that we do not allow personalities to creep into our discussion, and that we observe charity toward those with whom we are dealing. The Senator from Wisconsin has done all these things. I shall try to follow that example in the brief remarks that I shall make.

I suppose that, fundamentally, our party difficulties arise from the fact that we are a national party. Our Republican friends are not members of a national party, and do not have appreciable strength south of the Mason-Dixon Line. Being a national party, we have our friends from the South who take one set of attitudes toward the color question and toward the status of Negroes, which is very different from that which most of us in the North adopt. They had slavery; we of the North did not. It seems hard for them to forget the bitterness of the Civil War. There are also differences in the attitudes toward basic economic issues as between some of our friends and fellow Democrats in the South and those of the North.

This makes the problem of party leadership and party conduct an extremely difficult one. I believe all of us are fully aware of the difficulties which any Democratic party leader in the Senate or in the House would have to face.

I wish to start my comments by making it perfectly clear that, while I have differed with the majority leader on certain very essential matters, such as the gas bill and the civil rights bill, he has never taken advantage of his position of leadership to exercise any reprisal upon me. I wish to acknowledge that fact. Everyone should know it. My own feeling, however, is that we should have more conferences. I do not believe, however, that individual members should be bound by any decision. On the contrary, conscience should be supreme in these matters.

Furthermore, I would couch my criticism of the policy committee and the steering committee, the latter of which the Senator from Wisconsin did not mention, in a somewhat different vein from that which the Senator from Wisconsin used in his approach.

I find two main faults with the present method of selection and composition of the policy committee and the steering committee. First, the members are appointed by the leader; they are not selected by the caucus. Second, if we analyze their composition we find that they do not adequately represent or even make any approach toward proportional representation of the industrial areas of the country or, indeed, of the Pacific coast. A part of this trouble is brought about by the seniority rule which we have adopted. However, whatever the reasons, the results are very unfortunate.

If Senators will pardon me, I should like to give them figures on this question which I had assembled a long time ago and which I tried to bring up to date this morning after I received a copy of the Senator's prepared remarks. Let us take the policy committee, which consists of nine members. It consists of one member from Texas, two from Montana, one from Missouri, one from Oklahoma, one from Georgia, one from Alabama, one from Arizona, and one from Rhode Island. There are nine members from eight States. I find that the population of those States amounts to approximately 22 million—22.5 million, to be precise—and that they represent only 80 electoral votes; that in terms of the total votes cast in those States for President in 1956, there were only 6,762,000.

Now let us take the main industrial States which are not represented on the policy committee. These are States which have Democratic Senators but which are not represented on the policy committee. They have no representation whatever on the policy committee: Maine, Massachusetts, Connecticut, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, West Virginia, Ohio, Michigan, Indiana, Illinois, Wisconsin, Minnesota, California, Oregon, and Washington.

If we look at that list and look at the figures, we find that these States have a total population of 68 million, and 255 electoral votes; that in the last presi-

dential election they cast 35,118,000 votes.

This fact is so significant that I believe it is worthwhile to dwell upon it. The representation on the policy committee is confined to 8 States, with a population of 22½ million, as contrasted with the main industrial States which have no representation whatever, with a population of 68 million; a representation of States which cast votes of 6,762,000, as compared to the industrial States which do not have any representation, with a population of 35,118,000. I repeat the few have all the representation, this many have none.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I should like to finish this one point; then I shall be happy to yield. In terms of electoral votes, 8 States which are represented cast 80 electoral votes, as compared with 255 in the States which have no representation at all. I now yield to the Senator from Montana.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, what the Senator says is correct. Of course the Founding Fathers, when they set up the Senate adhered to the doctrine of equality among the States, both large and small. I should like to recall to the Senator's attention that the State of New York has either 45 or 46 Representatives in the House, but only 2 Senators in the Senate; that the State of Vermont has 1 Representative in the House, but 2 Senators in the Senate. It is the way in which the small States receive a certain degree of protection, and it is the way which equalizes the preponderance based upon population and which the States with large populations have in the House.

I should like to ask the Senator a question. Prior to the last election, was a request ever made that the majority policy committee be based on population, so that the industrial centers in the Midwest and in the East—and the Senator has a point there—could be given consideration on that committee?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Let me say that States should not be given the overwhelming predominance in the Senate or in the governing bodies of our party but rather the matters, the issues, and the interests of people.

In answer to the Senator's question I am not certain that it was done before the election, but it is well known that the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] addressed a letter in November, almost immediately after the election, asking that consideration be given to those factors.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator is correct. The Senator is aware, is he not, that under the law the membership of the policy committee is set at a certain number?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I do not know how we could bring about the addition of a Senator from the highly industrialized region—and I think that region should be given representation on the policy committee—without asking one of the other Senators to leave the committee.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am glad the Senator has brought up this point. There is no intent on the part of any of us to have any of the present members get off the committee. I want to make that perfectly clear. But I think that if the Democratic leadership were to move that the total membership of the policy committee be increased, the motion would be agreed to. That, frankly, is what I believe should be done. I believe the membership should be increased, and that then the increase in the number of members should be so apportioned as to give adequate representation to areas which are now excluded from representation.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator from Illinois has a point—a valid point. But I repeat what I said to the Senator from Wisconsin during the course of the debate upon his very able speech: Why not offer a resolution to increase the membership of the committee? I assure the Senator from Illinois, as I did before, that it would be given consideration as early as possible.

Mr. DOUGLAS. We may do that, but we should prefer that the initiative come from the majority leader or the policy committee.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Why not have the entire membership take the responsibility?

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is a very good suggestion. We may take it up. But we do not wish to push the leadership too far or too fast. We should prefer a voluntary yielding to an outright strike.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Why not follow the regular procedure, which is to offer a resolution?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Would the Senator from Montana be willing to be a cosponsor of such a resolution?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I feel that I am in a position where I could not be a cosponsor; but I believe the Senator from Illinois has a point, and I would be glad to give it every consideration.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am delighted. If we can only agree on the principle, we can always devise methods to accomplish the objective.

Mr. PROXMIRE. At this point, I should like to make a comment concerning the suggestion of the Senator from Montana. This is our difficulty: The Senator from Montana is the assistant leader of the Democratic majority. He is ex officio a member of the policy committee and is a member of the steering committee.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Ex officio.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Proposals by the Senator from Montana and the Senator from Texas have a different cast and carry greater weight. I have been asked why I did not ask for a caucus. I had asked, first, to see the minutes of the previous caucus meetings. I was told that to see them I needed a caucus. I did not ask for a caucus because the nature of a caucus is predetermined. I would not have had a chance. Such a request would be considered a derogation of the leadership. It would be considered the kind of thing which should not be done.

What I am asking is that the leadership take the responsibility for providing regular caucuses, with agendas printed in advance and distributed among the members of the Democratic caucus, so that we will know what is to be taken up and will have an opportunity to propose other matters for the agenda, if the leadership feels they can be fitted in.

But we would take this responsibility, so that Senators could vote or at least determine in caucus on the kind or extent of policy we would have.

What I understand the Senator from Illinois to propose is that the leadership accomplish these things in the only way they are ever accomplished in the Senate, namely, by having the leadership make the decision. The leadership has done great things, and I agree fully that they have earned credit for what they have done. However, the leadership itself should consider this proposal and offer it. In that event, it will be adopted as a matter of course. But if the Senator from Wisconsin proposed it, it would have no chance.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Oh, no. I think the Senator from Wisconsin is mistaken. I would not want to see the majority leader become a dictator. I want to see the form of democracy we now have continued.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I am delighted with the statement of the Senator from Montana. I could not agree with him more. I want all Democratic Senators to act together in a conference.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Did the Senator from Wisconsin understand me? I said I would like to see the democratic procedure we now have continued. I would like to see all discussions of this kind held out in the open. I am not in favor of conferences or caucuses held behind closed doors. Let us disagree in the open, as the Senator from Illinois has said. We are a national party. We have enough disagreements now without having others come up from time to time.

The remarkable thing is that in spite of the fact that the majority leader has to deal with 63 prima donnas on this side of the aisle, and if he includes himself—and I think he should—the number is 64, we have been able to achieve the degree of unanimity we have. That is remarkable. It is testimony to the responsibility exercised by our party in the 6 years in which we have been the opposition party. Remember, in those 6 years we lost the Presidency twice. But so far as Congress is concerned, we have achieved a mere majority for 2 years and an outstanding majority this time. I think this was based on the responsible attitude which the leader took and the responsible attitude we took.

I think the record of Congress under Democratic leadership had much to do with the victories we have earned throughout the country and which have given us an overwhelming majority, as has been mentioned time and again, both in the Senate and the House.

The Senator knows that the policy committee is somewhat like the House Committee on Rules. It is a traffic cop for legislation. But unlike the House Committee on Rules—and I hope I am not violating any rule—no bills are held

up in the Senate. The Senator will recall that during the last 2 weeks of the last session, three very controversial bills relating to the Supreme Court were reported and considered by this body. To the best of my knowledge, no really controversial bill was held up by the policy committee during the previous sessions of different Congresses.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is the Senator from Montana maintaining that the policy committee has no authority or real function?

Mr. MANSFIELD. No; we exercise our function. We exercise our function as individuals. So far as the majority leader telling us what to do is concerned, if the Senator had attended those meetings, I think he would have had another guess coming, because there are times when we tell the majority leader unmistakably what we think should be done, and he always bows to the majority. Strangely, most of the decisions in the policy committee are unanimous. Is there any decision which the policy committee has made to which the Senator from Illinois or the Senator from Wisconsin objects?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I prefer to go into that matter privately with the Senator from Montana.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I thank the Senator.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I point out that of the committee of nine, four members are from the South and three are from the Mountain States. Four members are from States having populations of less than a million. The big industrial States are completely unrepresented, with the possible exception of Missouri.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Two members of the policy committee come from States having a population of less than 700,000.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is correct. That is the point I made.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. No; I should like to continue for a minute; then I will yield.

If one examines the list—and this holds good for the steering committee also—he will find that the New England States are completely excluded, except for Rhode Island; that the Middle Atlantic States are excluded; that what the census calls the East North Central States are excluded even if we include West Virginia, which is becoming a Middle Western State rather than a Southern State; and that the Pacific Coast States are excluded.

The representation is composed chiefly of Senators from the South and from the small Mountain States. We love these fellows very much; but I point out that the economic interests and beliefs of these sections of the country differ. The States which are excluded are primarily manufacturing States. To the degree that they are agricultural States, they are corn-producing States.

The States which are included are the cotton and the tobacco-producing States and the mining States.

I suppose our greatest cleavage comes over the question of what is loosely known as civil rights. The policy committee, and, indeed, the steering committee are composed primarily of Senators from States where the attitude toward what is called civil rights is unfavorable, or from Mountain States where the issue is not a present one and is not an immediate one in the localities, whereas, the States which are not represented are those which have a considerable Negro population and which therefore feel this as a national issue more acutely than do the others. So the industrial States are on the outside, looking in.

I believe that at this point I should yield to the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. MONRONEY. I am wondering about the composition of the policy committee to which the Senator from Illinois objects.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Let me make clear that I do not object to a single member. I refer simply to the question of the composition of the committee generally.

Mr. MONRONEY. Yes; and I refer, also, to the composition of the committee generally. The Senator's point is that it does not reflect properly the position and the sentiment of the country. The membership of the committee is now fixed by law, as the Senator from Illinois has said, at seven. Is it not a fact that as one of the outstanding liberals of the Senate, the distinguished senior Senator from Illinois recommended a senior liberal to be a member of that committee, when the present majority leader had a place to fill?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I recommended the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY].

Mr. MONRONEY. That is correct. The distinguished senior Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], who is one of the great liberal Members of the Senate and is one of the senior Members of this body.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes.

Mr. MONRONEY. The Senator from Illinois recommended his appointment because he wanted to have a proper balance or as near a proper balance as could possibly be achieved on the policy committee, as between the liberals and the conservatives and the middle group.

The other member the Senator from Illinois wanted appointed was the distinguished President pro tempore of the Senate, the senior Member of this body [Mr. HAYDEN], I believe that if any Member were to receive an appointment based on love, admiration, and affection, it would naturally be our President pro tempore.

Since the law provides that the committee shall be composed of only seven members, and since the Senator from Illinois does not favor having any of the present members removed from the committee, what is his proposal?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Again and again I have made clear that I am not making a reflection on any particular individual. Instead, I am proposing that the membership of the steering committee be increased—and that can be done very readily by means of a resolution—and that then the representation be made more in accord with the relative strength of the various sections of the country.

Mr. MONRONEY. I think the Senator from Illinois makes a fine point of that. But if I correctly understood him, he was saying that he wanted the majority leader to submit the resolution.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Well, that would make it much easier to secure the adoption of the resolution. [Laughter.]

Mr. MONRONEY. Then I think the Senator from Illinois is saying, first, that we have too strong leadership, and he objects to the leadership; but then he says that when he wants something he favors accomplished, he wants the leadership to be on his side.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is always desirable, of course.

Mr. MONRONEY. Certainly; of course it is always nice to have something one favors supported by the leadership. But I do not think one can have it both ways; in other words, complain about the leadership and its strength and then say, "But now we want papa to fix."

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, at this point let me say that I have never at any time said our leadership is too strong. I think it has to be strong and vigorous, and I think it has won the admiration of the country. The leadership of the Senate is outstanding.

But I think the leadership should take its direction from all Members of the party, in some kind of caucus or a party meeting at which all Democratic Senators could, as a matter of regularity, be present.

I do not object to strong leadership. Of course, strong leadership is necessary for the enactment of legislation. But I believe the initiative should come from the membership as a whole.

Mr. MONRONEY. In other words, the Senator wants the strong leadership to be applied in favor of the measures he wishes to have enacted into law. Of course that is all very good.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Oh, no; I say that when the majority of the Democrats differ with me, the decision of the majority should govern. But I want that position to be arrived at in a democratic manner.

Mr. MONRONEY. But I understand that the Senator from Illinois wants the majority to take us by the hand and give us the additional members.

I believe that one of the advantages and one of the glories of the system is that if Senators work hard, and attempt to persuade their colleagues and to cajole them into supporting certain measures, and if Senators are nice to the members of the press gallery, and persuade them to say that the proposed legislation under consideration is good and is badly needed, it may be possible to have such measures enacted into law. In that connection, I understand the Senator from Illinois to say that in the case of bills and other measures he favors, he is glad to have the support of the majority leader. In that respect, I wish to point out that if the Senator from Illinois is glad to have "papa fix" in some cases, he should not object to it in others.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, the Senator from Oklahoma is always subtle and seductive, and he has about persuaded me that the Senator from Wisconsin and I should submit such a reso-

lution. If and when we do, we shall come to the Senator from Oklahoma for help, so he can continue with the improvement of the policy committee and the steering committee—improvements which he began so illustriously 13 years ago, but which have languished by the wayside.

Mr. MONRONEY. Would the Senator from Illinois consider permitting me to join him in sponsoring the resolution—for the reason, as I have pointed out earlier, that it should include a provision that the members not be allowed to succeed themselves? I think it is even more essential to include such a provision.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Now we are getting a Proxmire-Douglas-Monroney resolution which both will increase the number of members and also will provide for rotation of membership. [Laughter.]

Mr. PROXMIRE. Certainly we are making real progress.

Mr. DOUGLAS. This debate is very constructive; and I think the Senator from Wisconsin has more than justified his speech—to judge from all these developments.

Now let me consider the membership of the steering committee. It has 13 members. One comes from Texas; one comes from Montana; one comes from Virginia; one comes from Arkansas; one comes from Louisiana; one comes from Florida; one comes from South Carolina; one comes from Delaware; one comes from Nevada; one comes from New Mexico; one comes from Rhode Island; one comes from Minnesota. Six members come from the South; three come from the Mountain States; five come from States with a population of less than 1 million. But I observe that the big States are not represented; there is no member from Massachusetts or from Connecticut or from New Jersey or from Pennsylvania or from West Virginia or from Ohio or from Indiana or from Michigan or from Illinois or from Wisconsin or from California. In other words, when the kissing takes place, somehow the Senators from those States are never under the mistletoe. [Laughter.]

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield to me?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I should like to ask the same question that I asked in regard to the policy committee: What decisions or assignments to committees which have been made by the steering committee since the present majority leader has been the leader of our party in this body—and that is over the last 6 years, and now going into the 7th year—would the Senator from Illinois find fault with or disapprove?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I should like to discuss that matter in private with the Senator from Montana and the Senator from Texas.

But I wish to say this—I said it on a national television program, and I am glad to repeat it on the floor of the Senate: I do not think the Senator from Texas has exercised reprisals against Senators who vote against him. But sometimes I think he gives favors to Senators who vote with him. [Laughter.]

Mr. MANSFIELD. Let me say that I have been accorded consideration by the majority leader which I did not seek and do not want.

But if I correctly interpret what the Senator from Illinois has said in respect to the question of both the policy committee and the steering committee, he does have some fault to find, but he wants to discuss that in private, perhaps in a caucus.

On the other hand, I want it discussed in public; and I want the answers to be given in public because I think there is more to be achieved in the open than in private, based on the speeches the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE] already has made, and which perhaps he will continue in the future.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator will notice——

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, may I say at this point I think there is a perfectly just and proper distinction between the position we have taken on principle on the caucus and on the policy committee as a whole—this has been an impersonal position. Specific examples of assignments of particular Senators would have to be personal. When we get into the personality area it seems to me it is not wise to discuss the matter on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I was merely asking a general question. It was a question which could have been answered yes or no, without having to be discussed in private.

For the information of the Senator, I have been trying to get on the Appropriations Committee for 2 years. To the best of my knowledge, the Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR] has been trying to get on the Appropriations Committee for some time. I believe the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] has been, for over a year, trying to get on the Foreign Relations Committee. We three have been unsuccessful in our efforts. We do not feel bad about it because some of the newer Members of the Senate have gotten assignments which they deserved. They have been treated by the majority leader in the same way as we were treated when we were new Members of the Senate.

So I think the record of both the policy committee and the steering committee is outstanding and excellent. So far as legislation is concerned, it has been routed, through its normal channels, to the floor of the Senate.

So far as committee assignments are concerned, I do not see how any Senator in the last 6 years, under the leadership of LYNDON JOHNSON, has had any right to complain. I think we have been treated better than we could have expected, and certainly better than we had a right to expect.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator from Illinois has no right to complain, and he has not complained.

Now, let me go to the next point, namely, the distribution of chairmanships in the 16 standing committees, which can be found in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Of the 16 standing committees, Members of the Senate from the South hold the chairmanships of 10. They include the most important ones, namely, the Foreign Relations Committee, the Finance Committee, the Agriculture and Forestry Committee, the Banking and Currency Committee, the Armed Services Committee.

Senators from the Mountain States hold four chairmanships.

A Senator from the Pacific coast holds one chairmanship.

A Senator from Missouri, which is part South, part North, part East, and part West, holds one chairmanship.

But once again, no one from Massachusetts, Connecticut, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Ohio, West Virginia, Indiana, Illinois, Michigan, Wisconsin, Minnesota, or California.

Now, I know that this situation grows out of the seniority system, but I want to suggest that the pure and unadulterated seniority system is getting our party into trouble. The States which run the Democratic Party in the Senate are not the States which can carry a presidential election. The presidential elections are decided in the States which are on the outside looking in, so far as the organization of the Senate is concerned. And, indeed, it has been the election of Senators from these large industrial States which has given us the balance of power—not merely the balance of power, but the preponderance of power in the Senate itself as well as in the House.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator from Illinois is the chairman of a joint committee, is he not?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Of a joint committee, that is correct.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Is not the chairmanship of the Senator from Illinois based on his seniority on that committee, as well as the ability which he has in great abundance?

Mr. DOUGLAS. No, it is not by seniority. The Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] is senior to me. He did not press his seniority for the chairmanship of that joint committee, but he chose to press his seniority on the Select Committee on Small Business. I have no personal complaints, and I have no personal ax to grind. This is not a covert movement to try to get on the steering committee.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I think the Joint Economic Committee is to be commended for having as its chairman such an eminent economist as the Senator from Illinois; but the Senator from Illinois will admit, will he not, that after the Senator from Alabama, he was second in line?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Had the Senator from Alabama not decided to continue as chairman of the Select Committee on Small Business, he would have, on the basis of seniority, been chairman of the Joint Economic Committee. It is because the Senator from Alabama did not so choose that the Senator from

Illinois, as the next member by seniority, was chosen to be chairman.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Does the Senator mean that if I claim the rewards of seniority, I should not object to the process?

Mr. MANSFIELD. It is just a coincidence.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator from Illinois is perfectly willing to resign as chairman of the Joint Economic Committee now, and then have the committee choose a chairman.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the Senator from Montana has made an excellent point, but, of course, he was not referring to 1 of the 16 standing committees. A joint committee does not have anything like the kind of rights or powers that a standing committee has.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I pointed out that it was a joint committee, and not a standing committee.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator is aware of the fact that a joint committee cannot initiate legislation. Legislation has to come through the standing committees.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator from Illinois has just stated he is willing to resign and then have an election for chairman of the Joint Economic Committee.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I should be glad to have a vote of confidence if such was the judgment of the committee.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I am sure the Senator from Illinois would achieve the chairmanship either as a result of seniority or because of an election. Although I know he is serious, I hope he will not go through with his suggestion. I think with him as chairman of the Joint Economic Committee we will be better off and get the kind of report we should get from that committee.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I thank the Senator. I did not want to put this debate on a personal basis. I wanted to point out the difficulty which the party and the voters face as a result of this situation.

We carried the House, and largely carried the Senate, because those of us who come from the industrial States advanced, generally, a declaration in favor of civil rights, a declaration in favor of liberal tax policy, a declaration to protect consumers of gas and oil, a declaration for liberal labor legislation, and so forth.

The voters, believing what we have advocated will happen, elect us to the Senate and to the House, and, in times past, have elected a President. Then we come to Washington and find that the machinery of the Senate, under the seniority system, is controlled by those who represent localities where the predominant opinion is very different from ours.

Very frankly, we go through a process of frustration. Not only do we go through a process of frustration, but the folks back home somehow feel they have been shortchanged.

I am perfectly frank to say I do not know how long the Democratic Party can continue with this situation. We know it exists. I submit we should do something about it. One way we can do something about it is to make our governing bodies, whether they be the conference, the policy committee, or the steering committee, truly representative.

I am not afraid of getting together with our good friends from the South. I am not afraid of getting together with them in conference. I am not afraid of getting together with them in committee. I have great respect for them as individuals. I have great respect for their skill. I believe that they are patriotic Americans. I think we can probably get a better agreement if we meet face to face than if one group has the seats of power and the other group is on the outside looking in.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. There is one thought I should like to state. A distinguished southern writer has said that the Senate in its organization and practices is "the South's never-ending revenge for Gettysburg." I do not want that to continue. Let me say that we in the North have no desire for revenge for Bull Run although at Bull Run the southerners gave us a terrific beating. We want to bury the bitterness of the Civil War and do so that we can go forward as a united Nation.

Whether the distinguished southern writer is correct or not, I do not want the impression to go out that the U.S. Senate is an instrument for sectional domination, yet this is the impression which is likely to be given under the present organization of the Senate.

While I do not agree with everything the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin has said, I think he has started a very healthy process of discussion.

I hope our distinguished majority leader will not feel that this is in any sense a personal attack on him. I think he is the most skillful floor manager that this Nation has seen in a long time. I want to say, on behalf of my liberal friends from the North, that he is in no sense illiberal. We differ upon occasion as to gas and oil, and we differ upon occasion as to civil rights and antifilibuster rules, but I am frank to say I think my Senator from Texas would be compelled to take the position which he takes. We do not ask the Senators from the South to cut their wrists in a suicidal act, but we do say that interests which are not now represented in the Government of our party should be more adequately represented, and that is all. I think that it is for this that the Senator from Wisconsin is contending. That is what I have tried in a very poor fashion to advance this afternoon.

I now yield to the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. MONRONEY. Is it not the fact that under the present leadership the steering committee was increased from 9 to 15, and that the first 3 Members named by the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON] were the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], and me? This year, to give even better balance, 4 advisers were named. They were the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. MCNAMARA], and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY].

Mr. DOUGLAS. I had not known about the advisers.

Mr. MONRONEY. That was done under a unanimous agreement, if I am correct in my understanding, although I am not a member of the steering committee or the policy committee, and not one of the "inner circle" of the Johnson group, so-called, if there is one. [Laughter.]

I certainly feel that the leadership has been trying to do the very thing the leader has the power to do, which is to increase the steering committee membership. The other cannot be done without legislation. It seems to me these things should have some recognition, with regard to their effect as to broadening the base of our democratic operation within the Senate itself.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I will say I compliment the leadership for any progress made in this direction. I hope this will be only the beginning of better things to come.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, before I yield the floor I should like to thank the distinguished senior Senator from Illinois for his statement. I think the Senator puts the case better than I do. If we disagree perhaps on some details, I do not think they are fundamentally important.

I could not agree with the Senator more that this is not in any sense a personal attack of any kind. I too have great admiration, as I have said repeatedly in this speech, as well as I have said before and as I will say afterward, for the enormous ability and great service which the Senator from Texas has given his party and his country. I simply feel the only possible way we can solve these problems is to begin to talk about them, and until we begin to talk about them we are not going to make progress. I think the discussion this afternoon has been extremely constructive and very helpful. I thank all Senators who took part, and I particularly thank the long-suffering Senators who were willing to sit through the discussion.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield to the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. MONRONEY. I should like to thank my distinguished colleague for the studied, dispassionate, and fair way he has brought attention to this matter. While I disagree with many of the things my colleague has advocated, I compliment him on his presentation and for keeping the fire and personalities out of it.

I should like to ask the Senator a question. In the opinion of the Senator, did the record written by the Democratic Senate under the present leadership have any effect as to increasing the majority we have today, which the Senator says in his speech has given us this responsibility for which he wishes new ways of achieving reflection of the thoughts of the present Members?

Mr. PROXMIRE. There is no question at all that the record of the present leadership has been helpful. Indeed it

has been. I think, to be completely frank about the matter, that the election of Democratic Senators was also enormously influenced by a protest against the administration in power. There is no question in my mind that both of these factors were influential.

I think also, as implied or stated by the Senator from Illinois, if we are going to elect a President of the United States in 1960 it is going to be necessary for our party to adopt a really national program, a program which reflects the will, viewpoints, and attitudes of Senators from States such as Wisconsin, Illinois, Michigan, Ohio, and Pennsylvania, as well as of Senators from the Southern States.

I think to a great extent our program does that now, but I believe it is perfectly possible that in a traditional institution such as the caucus, and with a much more liberal use of the policy committee, we can arrive at decisions which will permit our party to become the kind of national party it is becoming, and which I think it should become, if we are going to elect a President in 1960.

I should like to conclude, Mr. President, by saying that the junior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] who was the coauthor of the historic reorganization bill for the Congress of the United States, has been extremely helpful and very very effective in the colloquy we have had.

I know the Senator feels very strongly in opposition to the position I have taken, but I think the colloquy has been very helpful in bringing out my position and in stressing some of its weaknesses or some places where I may be incorrect, but also, I think, emphasizing some of the points I have made which I believe are true and right, which I am going to continue to pound home so long as I am a Member of the Senate.

Mr. MONRONEY. I thank the Senator. The process of the organization of this great legislative body must always be a continuing search to find better and improved methods. Reorganization of Congress did not stop in 1946. It must never stop, because the problems grow greater and the burdens heavier upon the 98 Members.

I wish to say in closing that I feel, apparently more than the Senator feels, the record made of the accountability and responsibility of the Democratic Senate has been a very great asset in increasing the number of Democrats from 49 to 64 in the Senate. It has given the country a focus on what the Democratic Party stands for. We in the Senate are the only visible part of the Democratic Party nationally. I do not think we would have increased the Democratic membership to this degree if the people had not accepted the courageous leadership and the ability to downplay partisanship when it needed to be downplayed in the national interest or to exercise partisanship when that was necessary to preserve the two-party system.

In conclusion I wish to say that in Oklahoma, when we win 6 years in a row, we simply do not consider changing the split-T formation. We rather like to win.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wisconsin yield?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield to the Senator from Montana.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I wish to join the Senator from Oklahoma in commending the Senator from Wisconsin for taking the floor to discuss these subjects, which are so important. I would point out to the Senator that in open session, rather than in conference or caucus, he is exercising a right which every Senator has. I should like to emphasize again that even though we have a majority leader, so far as each individual Senator is concerned he is equal to any other Senator, and has a right to express himself, to object to unanimous consent requests, to hold the floor as long as he can within the rules, and to conduct himself as a representative of a State, which right, of course, is based on the equality of States in the Union.

I think the Senator is performing a good service. There is room for differences, and there are differences, but I am certainly appreciative of the fact that this is being done openly, for all to see and hear.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Montana for his characteristic fairness and thoughtfulness in making the comments he has, in view of the fact that we do disagree on the caucus and on the importance of the caucus.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. DOUGLAS, and Mr. LONG addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas is recognized.

AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATION TO THE NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 73, S. 1096.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MCNAMARA in the chair). The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 1096) to authorize appropriation to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for salaries and expenses, research and development, construction and equipment, and for other purposes.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I did not hear the request, and I have not consented to it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Texas that the Senate proceed to consider the bill?

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, could the Senator inform us as to the amount contemplated by the bill?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. $48 million. It is an authorization requested by the administration, in the exact amount submitted by the President.

It is a deficiency item which is rather important. It is anticipated that there will be a yea and nay vote upon it. We do not expect a yea and nay vote today, because of the lateness of the hour. However, I wish to have the bill made the unfinished business.

I have not consulted the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS], but very likely consideration of the bill will go over, and the explanatory statement and speeches on the bill will be made tomorrow. I merely wish to make the bill the unfinished business at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Texas?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

DETERMINATION OF SENATE DEMOCRATIC POLICY

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, with reference to the presentation made by the junior Senator from Wisconsin today, I completely respect the Senator's right—in fact, I approve of his right—to criticize the leadership of the Senate when he believes that such criticism is constructive and helpful. However, I do not feel that the Senator, in the course of his presentation, should violate the rules of the Senate. I do not believe it should be necessary to do so. Nor do I believe that we have ever improved upon our process by violating the rules.

In the course of his speech the Senator used this language, which was quoted from the National Review. He read this language on the floor of the Senate, referring to our majority leader:

> Under his leadership a system of backstage bargaining for votes has reduced debate on the Senate floor to a dull formality.

That statement, as quoted from Mr. Willard Edwards, and as repeated by the junior Senator from Wisconsin here today, continues:

> The record of the last session shows what it means to reach agreement without discord. It means brief and perfunctory debate; a lack of intelligent questioning; sparse attendance; the absence of quorum calls to summon absentees; the omission of record rollcalls without which the public can never know which Senators were present and how they voted; the approval of legislation in obvious ignorance of its meaning.

If further statements of that sort are to be made, I shall personally feel it necessary to object to such statements, and call the Senator to order under the rules of the Senate. I have done so consistently while I have been a Member of this body, and I feel that I shall be required to do so in the future.

Furthermore, I do not believe the charge is justified. The Senator from Wisconsin placed certain figures in the RECORD to attempt to prove his statement, as follows:

> In relationship to bills passed: Rollcalls have fallen 40 percent; the number of hours in session has dropped off by one-third; and most decisive of all the number of quorum calls requiring attendance of absentees has fallen more than 60 percent.

The evidence which the Senator offered to prove his case does not prove it.

Not only does it fail to prove his case, but it disproves it.

I do not presently see the Senator from Wisconsin. I wish the Senator were present to hear this criticism of the advice contained in his speech. I hope he may read it in the RECORD.

The Senator from Wisconsin inserted in the RECORD a tabulation which he added up to attempt to prove that various things had happened in the years he tabulated, in an effort to show that the majority leader was impairing the processes and proper functioning of the Senate. He included years when the majority leader, the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON], was the minority leader. Certainly it would not be quite fair to blame LYNDON JOHNSON for Bill Knowland's conduct, any more than it would be fair to blame Bill Knowland for LYNDON JOHNSON'S conduct.

Therefore, the chart to which the Senator from Wisconsin has made reference should not include the years 1953 and 1954, because during that period of time the distinguished former senior Senator from California, Mr. Knowland, was in charge. His record of leadership differs in many respects, both in philosophy and in approach, from that of the senior Senator from Texas. Therefore, the years 1953 and 1954 should be left out of the chart. To include them does nothing more than to mislead Senators and others who read the RECORD.

The Senator from Wisconsin made reference to the point that the number of hours in session had been reduced. In that connection, apparently reflecting upon the Senator from Texas for reducing the number of hours during which the Senate was in session, the Senator from Wisconsin included the years 1949 and 1950. That happened to be a period during a previous Democratic leadership. The junior Senator from Louisiana was present. He can recall very well why the Senate was in session so many hours during that period. It was the result of two things. The primary reason was that there were two very lengthy and successful filibusters during those 2 years. I do not believe the Senator from Wisconsin would care to criticize our present majority leader because his leadership was so effective that there were no filibusters during the period of his leadership. In such a case, the record would only reflect credit upon him.

But other things happened during that period of time. At that time the Republican Party fought vigorously and successfully to retain the Taft-Hartley law, for example, and all that went with it. The Senate debated a bill to amend the Taft-Hartley law for a month and the bill died in the House.

A great number of things in the years 1949 and 1950 make the comparison inappropriate. I know that the junior Senator from Wisconsin would not care to bring in 2 years in which long and successful filibusters were waged, and then criticize the majority leader, by contrast, because during the time the present majority leader has occupied that office, he did not cause a filibuster—particularly a successful filibuster—to result on the floor of the Senate.

Therefore the years 1949 and 1950 have no place for purposes of comparison. If we wish to compare any years to show what has happened since LYNDON JOHNSON has been majority leader, it seems to me that the only fair comparison would be with a previous Democratic year, and also, perhaps, the two Democratic leaderships in the previous Congress, which would be the 80th Congress.

So we should take the years 1947, 1948, 1951, and 1952, in which there were no long filibusters. There was a filibuster during the 80th Congress, but even so, the hours in session were less than during the period of time the Senator from Texas was majority leader.

I have prepared a chart which I believe is fair for purposes of comparison. It compares the years 1947, 1948, 1951, and 1952 with the years in which the present majority leader, LYNDON JOHNSON, was occupying that office, namely, the years 1955, 1956, 1957, and 1958. I have now made a tabulation similar to that placed in the RECORD by the Senator from Wisconsin, using appropriate figures taken from his chart and I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Louisiana?

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, reserving the right to object—and I shall not object—I should like to ask the Senator if he is including in his tabulation quorum calls.

Mr. LONG. Yes, because I believe they are meaningful in connection with the point I have in mind.

Mr. MONRONEY. Under the theory of the Senator from Wisconsin, a majority leader could become the greatest majority leader in the history of mankind by having continual quorum calls, but no legislation would result. When I was a Member of the House, Representative Marcantonio delayed proceedings in connection with the call of the calendar by continually making the point of no quorum, which resulted in calling the roll all day long. I do not believe that any political scientists could ever measure the effectiveness of leadership or of a legislative body by the number of quorum calls.

Mr. LONG. Has my unanimous-consent request been granted?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The table, ordered to be printed in the RECORD, is as follows:

	Bills passed	Rollcall votes	Quorum calls	Hours in session
1947–48	636	248	575	1,461
1951–52	775	331	431	1,648
Total	1,411	579	1,006	3,109
1955–56	1,159	218	156	1,361
1957–58	1,062	309	253	1,875
Total	2,221	527	409	3,236

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, the comparison shows that during the 4 years which I consider to be a fair 4-year period to use for comparison purpose, 1,411 bills were passed. That is during the years 1947 and 1948, and 1951 and 1952. Under the Johnson leadership, in the years 1955 and 1956 and 1957 and 1958, 2,221 bills were passed. That shows an increase of approximately 57 percent.

With respect to rollcall votes during the 4 years to which I have referred, 579 rollcall votes were held, as against 527 under the Johnson leadership. That shows a reduction of approximately 10 percent.

Quorum calls under the previous leadership amounted to 1,006. Under the Johnson leadership, there were 409 quorum calls.

That is one point on which the majority leadership was criticized without cause. During my service in the Senate, which includes most of the years to which I have referred, I have seen no greater waste of time than the calling of a quorum insisted upon by a Senator in the effort to compel Senators to hear his speech. The result usually is that Senators answer the quorum call and immediately absent themselves, if they do not wish to hear the Senator's speech. The result is, as a rule, that no more Senators remain in the Chamber after the quorum call than were present in the first place.

In my opinion, there was no greater improvement in the efficiency of the Senate than that created by the reduction in the number of quorum calls, when those quorum calls were held for the purpose of trying to compel Senators to hear another Senator's speech.

Certainly greater efficiency is brought about in the conduct of the Senate's business when a Senator withdraws his quorum call after suggesting the absence of a quorum and after the quorum call has run for a certain period of time. It is obvious that no Senator can compel other Senators to hear his speech if they do not wish to hear it. What happens, as I have said, is that the other Senators merely come to the Chamber and answer their names, and then immediately absent themselves. The reduction in the number of quorum calls is an improvement for which the major credit should go to the majority leader.

It has always seemed to the junior Senator from Louisiana that one way in which we could improve the efficiency of the Senate would be to have someone tabulate some figures showing how many Senators are present on the floor at all times, and which Senators are present when certain Senators speak, thereby showing how many sessions of the Senate each Senator attends and how many hours he spends on the floor.

Perhaps such a tabulation would show that some of the Senators who keep the Senate in session the longest are Senators who have the fewest number of Senators listening to their speeches. Perhaps such Senators would be inclined to reduce the quantity of their remarks if they knew that a record was being kept of how many Senators were present during the time they spoke on the floor of the Senate.

By reducing the number of quorum calls, greater efficiency has been brought

about in the conduct of the Senate's business. Greater efficiency is brought about by the fact that we more often call off a quorum call after the call has proceeded for a certain length of time, instead of insisting that we conclude the call of the roll and compel Senators to appear in the Chamber even though those Senators do not care to hear the speech of a particular Senator.

A comparison has also been made of the number of hours in session. In the chart to which I have referred it will be seen that the hours in session are somewhat greater under the Johnson leadership than in the previous period to which I have referred. Under the Johnson leadership the hours in session in the period 1955 to 1958 were 3,236; in the previous period the hours in session were 3,109. Under the Johnson leadership the Senate stayed in session about 3 percent more hours and passed about 57 percent more bills than in the previous period to which I have referred.

I should like to say that the charts might well show the number of debated bills that were passed, instead of merely showing the total number of bills passed. It has never seemed to me to be a fair comparison to show or to take credit for the number of bills that were passed during a session, merely on a numerical basis that more bills were passed during one year than during another year. We all know that some bills are passed in 15 seconds or so when they are called up on the call of the calendar. Most of the work on those bills has been done by the committee before they ever reach the floor.

The great difference in the number of bills passed can be attributed in some measure to the tactics which the majority leader has used—very properly—with respect to bills to which no valid objection has been made. Oftentimes such bills are called up on motion immediately after objection to them has been made on their being called on the call of the calendar. When they are motioned up after the call of the calendar anyone who is opposed to such a bill must present his reasons for not wanting it passed. By calling up such a bill on the same day, immediately after the call of the calendar, or some day shortly thereafter it has been possible to persuade the objecting Senator to withdraw his objection or permit the bill to be passed in short order.

Therefore, on the basis of what I have seen, we are operating more efficiently and effectively under the system by which we are proceeding at the present time than was the case in previous years. I, for one, would not want to change that system, to return to the less effective and less efficient manner which I have observed during previous years.

Mr. MORTON. Mr. President, I have been in the Chamber since 12:30 o'clock. I have enjoyed the Democratic caucus. [Laughter.] It has not been my privilege to attend a Democratic caucus. I tried to listen in on one several years ago down in Kentucky, and I was very badly beaten up for trying to do so, and deservedly so, I suppose. This is the first opportunity I have ever had to attend such a caucus. I hope there will be many more of them. However I do not want to see them held on the floor of the Senate. I should like to make some remarks, the text of which I released to the members of the press about 8 hours ago.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky is recognized.

THE PRESERVATION AND DEVELOPMENT OF THE DOMESTIC FLUORSPAR INDUSTRY

Mr. MORTON. Mr. President, I should like to take a few minutes to comment on legislation introduced before this body last Thursday, March 5, by the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT]. The legislation, S. 1285, would establish a sound and equitable program for the preservation and development of our Nation's sadly sagging domestic fluorspar industry. It has been a pleasure to me to have joined with the Senator from Colorado and several other of my distinguished colleagues in cosponsorship of this important measure.

This legislation establishes quotas covering the importation of fluorspar. I am fully aware of the international trade problems which arise as a result of setting up import quotas. However, the situation in regard to fluorspar in somewhat unique. The procedure used in this bill is closely related to that involved in the Sugar Act, which has worked reasonably well throughout the years. Fortunately, the domestic use of fluorspar is increasing at a rate more rapid than the expansion of the economy generally. There is every reason to believe that this rate of increase will continue in the foreseeable future. Under the terms of the bill, a modest domestic base is established which leaves sizable tonnage for offshore procurement. The offshore producer is, in addition, given 75 percent of the new business resulting from the future increased consumption of fluorspar. After the offshore producer reaches a tonnage figure equal to his 1956 to 1958 base, which was his highest base, he then receives 60 percent of the annual increment. However, it should be noted that, in any case, the offshore producer has a greater share of the expanding U.S. market than the domestic producer.

The value of fluorspar consumed by American industry in 1958 is not spectacular, dollarwise, when compared with the value of other strategic and critical materials. For instance, the dollar value of fluorspar, both domestic and foreign, consumed in the United States in 1958 is estimated at $25.7 million, including purchases made under the old Public Law 733 program. These figures tend to belittle the importance of fluorspar products in our industrial peacetime economy and to seriously understate the essentiality of a critical mineral of vital need in compiling our defense arsenal.

The Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization has called domestic fluorspar production of metallurgical and acid grades an indispensable component of our domestic mobilization base. Unless immediate and adequate measures are taken to preserve the basic plant and mining capacity to produce in peacetime, then mobilizing the fluorspar industry to a wartime footing under emergency circumstances would be seriously, if not fatally, impaired.

The growth in fluorspar consumption has been maintained at a rapid pace in recent years, but imports of foreign fluorspar have continued their relentless assault upon the domestic producers. Expiration of the Public Law 733 program at the end of 1958 also meant virtual expiration of the fluorspar-producing industry in the United States because for the past several years domestic production had been sustained by the Government purchase programs.

The sharp increases in fluorspar imports can be traced largely to Korean war activities of the United States. Guided by the urgent necessity to maintain certain stockpile requirements which the domestic industry could not at that time provide, the Government invested in foreign production facilities in order that our defense position not be dangerously diluted. Now that the contract program is virtually ended, it is expected that these foreign facilities will produce for direct competition with the domestic industry for regular commercial markets.

Domestic production of fluorspar when added to imports creates a supply far in excess of domestic requirements. For instance, in 1951 the domestic industry provided 347,000 tons of finished fluorspar; foreign suppliers, 181,000 tons. The total exceeded industrial consumption of 497,000 tons by 31,000 tons. This disparity is rather modest when data of recent years are considered. In 1957, the supply exceeded demand by 315,000 tons, and last year it ran 227,000 tons ahead of consumption. The price advantage of foreign fluorspar is vividly illustrated by 1958 statistics which show that domestic shipments of 322,000 tons were valued at $15.8 million while imports of 390,000 tons were priced at $9.7 million. Both supply and consumption dropped sharply in 1958 from 1957 levels, but the industry anticipates that consumption will recoup to 650,000 tons in 1959 and possibly to about 700,000 tons in 1960.

The Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT], in introducing S. 1285, described the indispensability of fluorspar to the production of steel, aluminum, hydrofluoric acid, atomic energy, and fluorine gas. Both he and the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] commented on the importance of fluorine as an oxidizing agent in rocket and missile propellants, both solid and liquid. The thrust of missile engines is greatly increased by the use of fluorine.

The preservation of the domestic fluorspar industry is of vital concern to my State of Kentucky. Approximately half of the domestic production comes from a small area in western Kentucky and southern Illinois. The predominant counties are Hardin County in Illinois and Crittenden, Caldwell, and Livingston Counties in Kentucky. In addition, more

than half of the estimated reserve of higher grade fluorspar are located in this relatively small region.

The impact on this area has been startling. In 1951, 1952, and 1953, according to data supplied to the U.S. Tariff Commission by producers in 1956 the average number of workers in mines and mills employed approximated 520 with an annual total payroll of about $1.8 million. By 1955, this had dropped to 393 average employees with gross wages of $640,000. The fluorspar people in Crittenden County alone say that hundreds of people have left the county since 1953 as a result of the fluorspar slump.

This legislation would provide production stability, price stability to protect the consumer, restore employees to their jobs, and enhance our national security posture. The proposal to relate consumption requirements and the ability of domestic and foreign producers to fill these requirements, will, in my opinion, avoid the pitfalls of resorting to a mandatory type of program to restrict imports.

The domestic industry with its present production capacity is not able to provide the total domestic demand. Imported fluorspar has an extremely favorable price advantage, and, thus, has been able to capture the major proportion of the domestic market. Unless imports are in some way limited, the domestic industry will be destroyed. The program envisioned by S. 1285 would provide that the domestic industry produce a certain minimum tonnage proportion of the consumption requirements for acid and metallurgical grades. The balance would be reserved to foreign producers. Should the consumption requirements increase, the domestic industry would be allocated its proportion of the increase. The foreign supplier, also, would share in this increased demand on a percentage basis and within certain limits imposed by the legislation.

I understand that other minerals are watching this legislation with deep interest because it pilots a new approach to the solution of problems besetting their particular industries. In view of this and the beneficial aspects of the fluorspar bill per se, I am hopeful that it will be cleared by the Interior Committee at an early date for floor consideration.

THE TRANSPORTATION ACT OF 1958

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, earlier today, during the morning hour, several Senators, led by the very distinguished senior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE], introduced proposed legislation which is designed to change the Transportation Act of 1958. I completely sympathize with the situation in which the Senators sponsoring such proposed legislation find themselves. They are Senators who have with them the problem of commuters, and what to do about them, and whether we can afford to have the railroad and bus lines which are now serving those areas keep those commuter lines in existence.

The bill which they have introduced will be referred, undoubtedly, to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and will, in time, I presume, come to the Subcommittee on Surface Transportation, of which I am the chairman. Therefore, I would not wish to be in the position of prejudging the bill.

However, I gathered from newspaper articles published in the New York Times yesterday and from the statement by the able Senator from New Jersey today that the conclusion is that this difficulty probably originated with the passage of the Transportation Act of 1958. I think that is an unwarranted conclusion. As a matter of fact, the commuter problem is an old one. It is related to a problem which dates back to 1954, namely, the discontinuance of the operation of the Weehawken ferry, which is the particular action to which the Senator from New Jersey objects most strenuously.

An application was filed by the New York Central Railroad in 1954 to discontinue the operation of the Weehawken ferry, which operates between the New Jersey side and the New York side of the Hudson River. It was demonstrated at that time before the Interstate Commerce Commission that the operation of that one ferry had cost the New York Central Railroad, which owns it, in the neighborhood of from $1 million to $1,750,000 from 1954, when the application was first filed, until 1956, when the Interstate Commerce Commission found that the ferry should be discontinued and authorized its discontinuance. That, of course, was long before the passage of the Transportation Act of 1958.

That decision of the Interstate Commerce Commission subsequently was set aside by the circuit court of appeals, on the ground of a definition of the words "discontinuance and abandonment." The court ruled that the Interstate Commerce Commission had the authority to bring about the abandonment but not the discontinuance of the ferry, because, the court said, what was proposed in effect was a discontinuance. The court, therefore, threw the case out.

During the hearings on the bill which was passed last year, a number of persons came before the committee and spoke about the particular problem of commutation service. Everyone agrees that it is a tremendous problem. But the only persons who actually made any complaint whatever before the committee about the proposal to stop commuter service were a group who lived in Connecticut and were fearful that the commutation service between Connecticut and New York would be interrupted or reduced in some fashion.

The president of the New York Central Railroad stated last year that the reason he felt it was necessary for his company to stop the operation of the Weehawken ferry was that the ferry was not being patronized. If people would use the ferry, and if the railroad then could make any money out of its operation, obviously they wanted to do so. The railroad would not ask to have the service stopped if it were in any way profitable. But he went on to say that the operation of the ferry was so unprofitable that if the Government required the company to continue it, in time the whole railroad would be bankrupted, and all the service which it was providing in the eastern part of the United States and in the area of the Great Lakes would, of course, have to be ended.

He further stated that it would be cheaper for the New York Central to buy for each of its regular commuter passengers a new Chevrolet or a new Ford and give it to him, rather than to have to operate the particular commuter service involved, because the railroad was losing so much money from its operation.

So it is necessary to consider this matter in the light of whether the Federal Government will be asked to require a private company, a company owned by private individuals, to continue to lose money on an operation which is demonstrably nonprofitable, one which will not make a profit, certainly at any time in the foreseeable future; or whether the Government will say to the railroad, "You will have to reach into your pocket, give out your money to other citizens, and continue to operate the service, even though you are not a Government-owned corporation, even though you are a privately owned company." I do not know whether the time has come in this country when we want to go that far.

The committee has before it a resolution which was adopted by the Senate last week, providing for a study of the problem. I think a study should be made. Many public issues are involved. I think the time may come when the cities, counties, and States involved will have to provide some relief, because essentially this is more a local problem than it is a problem of the Federal Government. I think it may become necessary for the other respective agencies of government to get together. If they in their wisdom believe that the people who now patronize the commuter service are entitled to some continuance of it, then I think the local Government will have to arrange either to participate in the expense or, possibly, volunteer to take over the ownership.

The problem is not simple; it is complex. It involves more than the problems of commuters in New York and New Jersey. Some of them are in the Chicago and St. Louis areas. The problem is one to which our committee will give full consideration. I hope we can reach a solution. But I emphasize again that it has not arisen only since the passage of the Transportation Act of 1958.

It was agreed by everyone in August of last year, when the bill passed both the Senate and the House without a dissenting vote, that something should be done to try to relieve the railroads. The railroads had a passenger deficit of $726 million in 1957. The passage of the Transportation Act last year was one of the steps taken in the hope that it might be helpful to the railroads.

We would not, as a matter of procedure, want to create a situation in which people would not have their day in court. If it is the opinion of the Senators from New Jersey, New York, and Connecticut that they want another day in court, I certainly would be in-

clined to think that they are entitled to it. But I do not believe the answer to the problem, at the outset, will be to pass the stopgap bill which they have introduced today.

OBLIGATION OF THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT TO AMERICAN INDIANS

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I ask to be listed as a cosponsor of Senate Concurrent Resolution 12, which restates and clarifies the Federal Government's obligation to American Indians. It is high time we eradicated the completely false impression that Congress intends to abandon these citizens regardless of whether or not they are ready to care for themselves.

The resolution can be embraced on both sides of the aisle. It is in effect a bipartisan declaration. The senior Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] introduced it for himself and the junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER]. He was extremely candid and announced frankly that it was based on a speech by Secretary of the Interior Fred A. Seaton, the administration's spokesman on Indian policy. There will be no plagiarism suit filed.

Secretary Seaton delivered his speech in Arizona. I was with him at the time. We were visiting the Navajo country.

Both of us were concerned over the distorted interpretations of what Congress had in mind in 1953 when it adopted House Concurrent Resolution 108. He asked for my recollection of the debate on that resolution. I replied that I had no doubt that Congress was stating an objective, not an immediate goal, and that we certainly did not contemplate a headlong rush into ending the Government's relationship with Indian groups which still need Federal help.

The points listed in the resolution are taken virtualy verbatim from Secretary Seaton's speech. His remarks did much to clear up the misunderstandings that were circulating. Many leaders of Indian interest groups have applauded the views expressed in the speech. But some misunderstanding still exists. The speech had been viewed in some quarters as an announcement of a new policy, which it is not.

Instead it was a restatement of the policy which Congress enunciated in 1953. However, the fact that this misunderstanding exists is proof of the need for congressional clarification, and the resolution will accomplish it. It is an opportunity for Congress to put its stamp of approval on an expression which is so forthright and clear-cut that it would take a determined effort to misunderstand it.

The resolution will lay to rest the phony report that the Government does not intend to bother with consulting the Indians on their own fate. We are not dealing here with an abstraction, but with people's lives. We respect their opinions and want to have those opinions. Humanitarian considerations aside, there is a coldly practical reason for consulting with the Indians. It can be very expensive to ignore other people's views. We can find ourselves with a program that simply will not work without their cooperation.

Secretary Seaton said it was unthinkable to him that consideration would be given to forcing upon an Indian tribe a so-called termination plan which did not have the understanding and acceptance of a clear majority of the members affected. The resolution goes right down the line in support of that statement, and announces flatly that no consideration will be given such a proposal.

We all know Indian groups can continue to exist as cultural islands, isolated from the general public by language and custom barriers. Secretary Seaton raised a trenchant question on that. He asked:

> Does the majority of the population of such tribes prefer to live in that manner, or does it do so because there seems to be no other choice? Or, does it do so because there is no general awareness of the alternatives?

The key to developing an awareness of the alternatives is education. One of the most pleasing points of the resolution is the emphasis it places on Indian education. This is fully in line with the policy which this Administration has been pursuing since 1953.

Over the past 6 years many Federal schools for Indian children have been rehabilitated and enlarged. Arrangements have been worked out with local public school districts for the enrollment of thousands of additional children. The results are plain for anyone to see.

For example, on the Navajo Reservation, only about 50 percent of the school-age children were receiving an education in 1953. Today the enrollment is almost double what it was then. The school-age population is substantially larger, and approximately 90 percent of the children are in school.

In other Indian areas the need for educational facilities was not so drastic 6 years ago. Consequently the progress has been less striking. But it has been steady and consistent. Over the country the number of Indian children out of school in 1953 was nearly 20,000, or about 15 percent of school-age Indian population. Today that population is substantially larger, but the number out of school has been cut to less than 9,000, or some 6 percent of the total.

Why do I recite these gains?

Because, under the administration's guidance, we are witnessing a dramatic reversal. Just consider that, all the way back to the founding of this Nation, the Indians have been among the most underprivileged from the standpoint of educational opportunity. But now, I believe, more and more the Indian educational facilities are becoming comparable to—and often even superior to—those in non-Indian areas.

Educational opportunities are also being stressed for grownup Indians who missed the full benefits of schooling in their youth. On many of the reservations, as we all know, there are hundreds of men and women who have fine capabilities but are severely limited and handicapped by their lack of an adequate educational background. In a very real sense they are cut off by this handicap from full participation in the political life of their community and Nation and from full enjoyment of the benefits of modern American life. In recognition of this situation, an experimental program in adult education was launched about 4 years ago on five carefully selected reservations.

From that comparatively small beginning the adult education program has grown until today courses of this kind are being given in 75 different localities on Indian reservations or in the native villages of Alaska. In some of these areas Indian people, including many of middle age and beyond, are acquiring for the first time in their lives a basic skill in the English language. They are learning with great pride and immense satisfaction how to read and write and communicate with their non-Indian neighbors.

In other localities, where the problem is not so much one of illiteracy as of insufficient previous education, we are giving the people instruction in a variety of highly practical subjects. Just to mention a few, they are learning how to handle their personal or family incomes in line with a carefully planned budget, how to protect themselves and their children from ordinary health hazards around the home, how to take full advantage of their political rights and prerogatives as citizens of the Nation and of the several States. Their horizons are being broadened and their opportunities for personal growth and development are being tremendously enlarged.

Under the present administration, another comparatively young and closely related program is going forward in the field of adult vocational training. Here the need is also an intensely practical one.

For years one of the basic handicaps of large numbers of Indian people has been their lack of occupational skills. The fact that so many have had to present themselves on the job market as unskilled workers has severely limited both their opportunities for employment and the level of wages that they were able to command. It has been one of the more important causes for the distressing poverty we find on so many reservations.

Now effective action is being taken to equip our younger Indian adults with the kind of skills they need to realize fully their own inherent capacities and potentialities.

Under the provisions of Public Law 959 of the 84th Congress, the Bureau of Indian Affairs has entered into contracts with dozens of trade schools throughout the country. In these schools about 1,000 Indians mainly between the ages of 18 and 35 are enrolled at Government expense. They are being trained for all kinds of occupations. And they are building for themselves and their dependents a better, brighter and more secure kind of future in contrast with the grinding poverty to which most of their parents and grandparents were condemned.

But the Indian progress of recent years is by no means entirely due to governmental action.

Many of the tribes themselves have shown an increasing capacity to plan and carry out broad-scale programs for the benefit of their members. Again, an outstanding example is the Navajo Tribe. Eight or nine years ago the Navajos were widely regarded as one of the most economically depressed and severely handicaped groups in the entire country. In fact, some pessimistic observers even felt that there was no real long-range hope for these Indians and that a very large percentage of the population might have to be kept on a permanent kind of dole.

For a vivid, firsthand account of the situation on the Navajo Reservation today, I would refer any interested person to an article in the current issue of Reader's Digest magazine. As the writer points out, the Navajo people have been uncommonly fortunate since they have realized an income of over $50 million in the past few years from oil and gas leases on their tribal lands.

But the important, the truly encouraging part of the story is what the tribe is doing with this money.

With rare statesmanship the tribal leaders have been stressing capital improvements and practical programs that will produce continuing benefits for many years to come. For example, they have established a $5 million scholarship fund to provide financial assistance for young Navajos pursuing a higher education. They are investing in a new tribal sawmill which will greatly increase their annual income from the forest resources on their reservation under a plan of sustained-yield management. They are working in numerous ways to attract new industrial plants—and new job opportunities—into the general vicinity of the reservation.

These are only a few of the steps which this extraordinary tribe, among others, has taken during the last few years in its march from a past of almost incredible poverty and ignorance straight into the middle years of the 20th century. It is simply one more piece of evidence that Indian people can play an increasingly fruitful part in the broad pattern of our national life if we will just continue to provide them with the kinds of assistance and opportunities that are contemplated in Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 12.

Our American Indians on reservations can best confront their problems if they do not have to continually look over their shoulders to see whether we are trying to leave them.

Adoption of this resolution will give them the last measure of reassurance.

Mr. President, in closing, I wish to state from a lifetime of experience with American Indians that the American Indian has progressed farther and faster during the years of this administration than under any other administration, to my knowledge.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD, in connection with my remarks, an article entitled "The Navajos Feel the Wind of Progress." The article was written by O. K. Armstrong, was published in the Denver Post, and was condensed and published in the Reader's Digest for this month.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE NAVAJOS FEEL THE WIND OF PROGRESS

(Condensed from the Denver Post)

"A fresh wind is blowing across our reservation," said Paul Jones, chairman of the Navajo tribal council, as I sat in his office at picturesque Window Rock, Ariz. "It's the wind of progress for our people. Go see for yourself."

Accompanied by tribal leaders and by E. O. Whelan, Bureau of Indian Affairs' expert on industrial development, I traveled over the mesas and valleys of this biggest Indian reservation in the United States. We inspected shiny new schools; we heard the clank of roadbuilding machinery. We saw neat new homes going up to replace the hogans, those tiny log-and-mud huts so characteristic of Navajoland.

These are heartening results of a crusade that is helping these original Americans lift themselves from ignorance and poverty. The program, sponsored jointly by the Navajo Tribal Council and the Bureau of Indian Affairs, moves forward on two major fronts: Education and training for Navajos, young and adult; and the development of industries to create jobs and raise the standard of living, which until a few years ago was one of the lowest of any group in the Nation.

The Navajos now number some 85,000. Their reservation, about the size of West Virginia, covers 16 million acres in Arizona, New Mexico, and Utah. Most of this is arid and infertile, agriculturally fit only for grazing sheep and goats. For generations most families lived in hogans, cooked on open fires or primitive stoves, slept on sheepskins spread on the dirt floor. One sixth of the children died before they were 3 years old. Tuberculosis and diseases caused by malnutrition and lack of sanitation took a shocking toll. Few Navajos spoke English; few children attended school. Steeped in superstition, clouded by illiteracy, these neglected and impoverished people maintained an attitude of suspicion and distrust toward the white man.

Then finally, with the Navajos increasing rapidly in numbers, the very urgency of the problem forced action. In 1950, Congress authorized the appropriation of $88,570,000 for the Navajos and the 3,000 Hopi Indians who live on the Navajo Reservation, for social and economic rehabilitation over a 10-year period. In 1953, Glenn L. Emmons, a banker of Gallup, N. Mex., with a rare understanding of Navajo needs, became Indian commissioner. He secured additional appropriations for schools and industrial expansion. More important, he encourage the Navajo tribal council to unlock huge reservoirs of income by signing contracts with oil companies and other industrial firms to develop the natural resources of their reservation. Up to 1953, oil leases on only 218,860 acres had been let. Now 1,594,609 acres are under lease, bringing the tribal treasury some $50 million, with $2 million more annually from rents and royalties.

In 1954 rich deposits of uranium were discovered on the reservation. Leases for mining this and for coal production brought the tribe $800,000 last year. Development of forest resources will soon add to the total.

Chairman Jones and his council have stanchly resisted every pressure to divide the new riches among their fellow tribesmen and thus dissipate the funds. They are determined to use the money for permanent improvement of the tribe, through education, employment, and health programs. "We know that our people have a long way to go and we're not going to be detoured by quick prosperity," tribal secretary Maurice McCabe said to me.

Under the most ambitious program of schooling ever launched for American Indians, 24 modern schools have been completed and 25 others are on the way. Thirty-three old schools have been modernized. About 1500 children have been placed in public schools in towns bordering the reservation. To be sure that no Navaho youngsters were overlooked, schools were set up in trailers out on the great plateaus.

"The biggest problem," one member of the tribal education committee told me, "is to keep up with the Navajo stork, which is a very fast bird. We'll have 3,000 new kids reaching first grade next September."

A Higher Education Scholarship Fund established by the council provides 174 scholarships for high school graduates to continue their education. Officials hope that these young people will return to the reservation as teachers, doctors, engineers, chemists, to serve their tribe. In addition many teenagers who have completed a special training program can, through carefully organized job placement facilities, go into skilled trades.

The Navajos have eagerly joined the march of industrial progress. The Bureau has helped 2,970 members of the tribe to get jobs in urban communities in many States. "We are proud of the record of these Navajo people," says Robert Culium, the Bureau's area director of relocation. "Reports from their employers shows that they make exceptionally skilled workmen."

Thousands of new jobs must still be created, however, as the maximum number who can make a good living by farming and ranching on the reservation is estimated at only 40,000.

For 1958–59 the tribal council is appropriating $3 million for projects that will create employment for Navajo workers on the reservation and in adjoining towns. An experienced mining engineer, Kenneth N. Garard, has been hired to supervise production of mineral resources, and Leigh P. Hubbard, of Navajo descent, will direct industrial development. All firms developing reservation resources must agree to employ Navajos if they are qualified for the jobs. At a plant in Shiprock, N. Mex., where uranium is milled, 75 percent of the employees are Navajos, including two graduate chemists.

Geologists have long known that an immense deposit of coal lies under 26,000 acres near the eastern edge of the Navajo reservation. The Utah Construction Co. will mine this. The tribe receives up to $1 an acre in rentals and will be paid royalties up to 25 cents a ton.

"The Utah Co. will build an electric power plant to use the coal," Garard explains. "Hundreds of laborers will be needed for construction work. Within 5 years we expect to supply power to new industries that will support 3,000 Navajo families. Ultimately, allied industries will employ 10,000 people."

The tribal forest of pine stands majestically on almost half a million acres of plateau land straddling the Arizona-New Mexico border. In it are nearly 3 billion board feet of lumber. A sawmill north of Fort Defiance, Ariz., has been producing an average of 15 million board feet of lumber a year and employing around 175 men. But a new one will soon be built, capable of cutting 38 million board feet a year. The resources committee of the tribe has completed a plan to harvest the great forest. Following strict conservation methods, the cutters will take out the timber on a sustained-yield basis so that new trees will furnish a constant supply.

"Our income from this new industry should average over $2 million a year," says Reino Sarlin, expert forester. "And the best part of it is that 480 Navajo families will be permanently supported."

Navajo families who want to continue to farm and to raise cattle and sheep receive training and assistance. A tribal loan fund extends credit for contruction of farm homes and purchase of machinery and equipment. More than 4,000 acres of arid land have recently been placed under irrigation.

In a neat modern hospital at Fort Defiance I talked to a young nurse, spotless in her uniform her black hair and bronzed face gleaming under her white cap. "Just imagine," she said, "our babies used to be born in the hogans with chanting medicinemen in attendance. Now more and more of our women are coming here, grateful for the assurance that they and their babies will live."

As the rehabilitation of the Navajos moves forward, ignorance and superstition recede, diseases are conquered, and communities show a new cleanliness and well-being. But far more important is the moral and spiritual betterment that comes from self-support and the knowledge that Navajos are contributing their full share to the life of 20th-century America.

THE HAND OF REUTHER

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, not too many days ago a subcommittee of one of the Senate committees visited the great State of Michigan, in its attempts to gather information in regard to areas of unemployment or areas which may need distressed-area help. I believe it would have been well for the subcommittee to have read an editorial entitled "The Hand of Reuther," which was published in the Arizona Republic of February 19, as the subcommittee visited Michigan, because I believe from the editorial the subcommittee would have grasped many of the salient facts which lie at the bottom of the Michigan dilemma. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE HAND OF REUTHER

The cold and grasping hand of Walter Reuther has almost choked the economic life out of the State of Michigan. Only through advance payments of $35.5 million in taxes by industry was financial collapse of the State averted last Monday.

Reuther, that would-be dictator of the United States, made himself dictator of Michigan through the election of his puppet, G. Mennen Williams, better known as "Soapy," in the election of 1948. Since "Soapy" became Governor, Michigan has been stricken with a progressive anemia of the economy that has brought about the almost-fatal condition.

Through the period of the Nation's greatest prosperity—1950 to 1956—Michigan was the only State to show a loss in factory jobs, and this during a time when Michigan's greatest industry—automobiles—was in the midst of incredible prosperity.

Indeed, the loss of jobs continues in Michigan, for Chrysler has just announced that its new small car factory will be located in Ohio and not in Michigan. And this is no escape to a low wage State, for Ohio ranks third from the top of the list in factory wages.

During the years since "Soapy" Williams has come to the throne, Michigan has lost 29 new automobile plants to Indiana and Ohio. And the once booming chemical industry in Michigan has been fleeing the State. In 1956 and 1957, new industrial construction was $921,678,000 in Ohio, and $889,123,000 in Indiana. It was $199,176,000 in Michigan.

"Soapy" Williams' answer to the problems of Michigan is a typical Reuther answer. No thought of cutting spending. No thought of trying to rebuild Michigan's economic health. Just raise the taxes. And what will raising the taxes do but drive away more industry and further decrease the number of jobs? "Soapy" wants to raise the tax on business profits and boost the income tax bite on higher wage brackets. And there goes more capital out of Michigan. Anyone knows that only through the use of capital can jobs be created. Take away the capital, and you take away the jobs.

Of course, what you see in operation in Michigan is the ideal plan for creation of socialism for the Nation. The conclusion of such a process can only be the economic death of a State. The only place the State can turn is to the Federal Government. And if all States did the same, socialism would be an accomplished fact in these United States. And this plan is accentuated by strings in the hands of Walter Reuther, whose hands also strive for control of the entire Democratic Party and eventually control of the entire Nation.

The other 48 States would do well to watch this Michigan picture and learn from it the evil that can come through profligate use of the tax and spend theory. The evil that is so close to destroying Michigan could, as well, destroy the Nation.

SUPPORT OF THE BRICKER AMENDMENT

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, last July, in the course of hearings before the Senate Public Works Committee, I made an error when I stated that, in my judgment, Mr. Charles E. Martin had been a sponsor of the so-called Bricker amendment. I find that that is not correct.

I have prepared a letter of apology which I have sent to Mr. Martin; and I ask unanimous consent that my letter of apology be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MARCH 2, 1959.

Mr. CHARLES E. MARTIN,
Director, Institute of International Affairs, University of Washington, Seattle, Wash.

DEAR PROFESSOR MARTIN: On July 28, 1958, at hearings before the Senate Public Works Committee your name was cited by Senator NEUBERGER as an authority on the international aspects of the Lake Michigan diversion bill which was then before us.

At the time I stated that you were commonly believed to have been the author of the so-called Bricker amendment and that such authorship, among other things, would in my opinion, not qualify you as an eminent authority on international law.

I now find that my reference to you was one of mistaken identity and since my remarks were not complimentary I wish to withdraw them without prejudice.

I am sorry to have made such a mistake and while I, of course, disagree with you on the question of lake diversion and its international effects, I want you to know that my statements concerning your past authorship of the Bricker amendment and my opinion which naturally flowed from believing you to be the author, were wholly mistaken.

I hope you may take this as a withdrawal of those remarks and I am asking that this letter be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD so that all may know that I was mistaken in this respect.

With very best wishes to you and my apologies for any inconvenience my remarks may have caused you.

Faithfully,

PAUL H. DOUGLAS.

SENATOR KERR, OF OKLAHOMA

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, Oklahoma is lucky in having been the birthplace of Senator BOB KERR.

Not only has the fortunate circumstance of his birth in old Indian Territory given us strong and effective political leadership, from Governor to senior Senator, but his love for his native State has produced in him the greatest advocate and builder of Oklahoma in our history.

Political leadership is found in many men; but when it is coupled with a determined vigor, backed with millions of dollars of his own money to build industry within the State, it deserves special notice and appreciation. His benevolence in religious and charitable institutions; his drive for building up the State's resources, particularly in the field of water development; his constant attention, within his own huge company, and with others, in adding industrial payrolls to our economy, all mark him as true industrial statesman. His ever constant attention is to improving Oklahoma's agricultural and natural resources.

He has embellished this picture with his colorful style of debate, which has become a legend in the Senate, and in his nationwide reputation as an effective speaker.

Fortune magazine, with its great circulation among America's businessmen, has just published an article entitled "Senator BOB KERR, the Oklahoma Gusher." The article was written by Daniel Seligman, and I desire to read it to the Senate. It describes vividly the many sided career, the colorful personality, and the achievements of this distinguished native son of Oklahoma.

I read now the article published in Fortune magazine:

SENATOR BOB KERR, THE OKLAHOMA GUSHER

(By Daniel Seligman)

(As a businessman, the chairman of Kerr-McGee Oil, he has made millions. As a politician, he is a bogeyman to many businessmen and bankers. He is also the best rough-and-tumble debater in the U.S. Senate today.)

ROBERT SAMUEL KERR, of Oklahoma, is one of the most powerful men in the U.S. Senate. He is also that body's most successful and wealthiest businessman; he is the main founder and largest stockholder of Kerr-McGee Oil Industries, Inc., a fabulously successful company still expanding rapidly in several different directions. He has built up a personal fortune worth about $35 million, and his gross income in most recent years has run around $600,000. Considering KERR'S stature as a capitalist, it may seem odd that so many conservatives in the U. S. look upon him as a bogeyman. But the fact is that they do.

When, early last year, Senator HARRY BYRD announced that he would not run for reelection in 1958, a sizable number of KERR'S

fellow businessmen, and most bankers, were dismayed. BYRD's retirement would mean that KERR would take over as chairman of the powerful Finance Committee, which is concerned with legislation relating to Federal revenues and debt, tariffs and trade, and fiscal policy generally. After some strenuous appeals from conservatives, BYRD reversed his decision. This still leaves KERR the No. 2 man on the committee, and in a position he knows how to exploit. Why do so many fellow businessmen hold KERR in dread?

In some respects KERR is a throwback in American politics. He often seems to speak in the accents of the agrarian radicals who organized the Populist movement in the 1890's and who later gained control of the Democratic Party under the leadership of William Jennings Bryan. In his strictures against big eastern bankers, in his impassioned arguments against hard money and for the farmer's way of life, multimillionaire KERR often sounds oddly reminiscent of Bryan. KERR's father was, in fact, an ardent Bryan Democrat; and the Senator likes to tell the story about the time his father in refusing him permission to play football at college, wrote him, "I would rather have made Bryan's cross-of-gold speech than to have won every athletic contest staged on this earth since Cain and Abel ran their first foot race on the banks of the Euphrates."

Perhaps because he has been preeminent in so many different ways—his career also includes a term as Governor of Oklahoma—BOB KERR is a man of vast, almost breathtaking self-confidence. This confidence was not shattered even after his failure, in 1952, to win the Democratic nomination for the Presidency. KERR wanted the nomination badly and, rejecting the opinion of many friends, seriously thought he could win. "It would appear," he commented recently, with a broad smile, "that the people did not realize what a superior product was being offered them." But he is reluctantly persuaded now that an "oil millionaire" like himself stands no chance of winning the top office. He did not offer himself as a candidate in 1956, and he has stated that in 1960 he will be running for nothing except a third term in the U.S. Senate. He will then be 64, and can still entertain the hope of one day becoming chairman of the Finance Committee.

THE MASTER OF THE INSULT

Actually a very genial fellow, he can be as scary a figure on Capitol Hill as in the banking world. It would be possible to compile a long list of KERR's fellow Senators whose intelligence and capability he has, in the course of debate, compared very unfavorably with his own. He is able to get away with these breaches of senatorial courtesy for several reasons. For one thing, he tends to be in control of any discussion in which he participates, and any Senator who ventures to talk back runs the risk of being buried under an avalanche of wisecracks, ornately stylish rhetoric, and hard facts—KERR's mastery of detail is remarkable. His sheer physical presence is imposing: he stands 6 feet 3 and weighs 220 pounds. Even though his sallies are characteristically delivered in a bland, amiable, and altogether good-natured manner, and though he has the engaging habit of occasionally kidding himself, several Senators have as much as admitted that when KERR rises to argue with them, their instinct is to run for the cloakroom, Senator ALBERT GORE, of Tennessee, has paid KERR the ambiguous compliment of remarking that "the distinguished senior Senator from Oklahoma can take the least amount of information and look and act more authoritative than any man in the world." GORE cites the 1954 debate on atomic-energy legislation. "I came to the senior Senator from Oklahoma and suggested that we needed a speech made on the basic details of the patent questions, and the Senator said, 'What is it?' I had prepared about one page, and he spoke for 3 hours and a half, authoritatively." The late Senator Kenneth Wherry, of Nebraska, once paid KERR another dubious compliment when he noted that the latter was the only man he had ever met whom he could not outshout.

But, in general, KERR does not have to rely on shouting to silence his antagonists; most of the time he can rely on his superior talent for insulting them and for thinking faster than they do. In the course of a debate in April 1952, for example, KERR remarked that Senator Homer Ferguson, of Michigan, appeared to be confused about a pending bill. Another Republican rose rashly to Ferguson's defense and suggested that KERR was confused—and that his confusion might be related to the beating he had just taken in the Nebraska presidential primary. The ensuing avalanche is a fair example of KERR's rhetorical style: "The Senator from Oklahoma wishes to say that he is not confused as to what happened in Nebraska, nor was the result so detrimental that he is unable to recognize at this time another chapter in the continuing confusion of the distinguished Senator from Michigan. So far as I know, the Senator from Michigan has had no such jolt in the recent past as to justify the belief that the condition under which he labors at the present time is either temporary or that with reference to it there is any hope of recovery or improvement."

HIS CHERISHED COLLEAGUES

Senator PAUL DOUGLAS, of Illinois, who is something of a wit, has been one of KERR's principal antagonists over the years, and their exchanges on a wide range of issues have provided some memorable colloquies. KERR is an ardent protectionist, particularly with reference to Oklahoma industry, and during a debate on tariffs last year he began to read into the RECORD a list of industries that, he maintained, had been sorely damaged by foreign imports. DOUGLAS rose and inquired waggishly whether the Senator from Oklahoma was going to mention the Pregnant Mares' Urine Association (a trade group concerned with the manufacture of sex hormones) on his list of industries suing for tariff relief. "No, Mr. President," KERR responded, "but I know that the Senator from Illinois, being an authority on it, would be glad to inform the Senate about it—not that I think the Senator from Illinois would be an exhibit. I want it clearly understood," said KERR, raising his voice over the yawks that were echoing around the Chamber, "that I did not mean that."

Probably the greatest fuss KERR has stirred up in recent years stemmed from his assertion, made in the course of a 1957 debate on finance, that no man can help Eisenhower study the fiscal policies of this Government, because one cannot do that without brains, and he does not have them. This statement precipitated an uproar in the Senate, with HOMER CAPEHART, the Indiana Republican, leading the protests. After he had been advised by several of his Democratic colleagues that it might be wise to temper the statement somewhat, KERR amended it to read that the President had no fiscal brains. This emendation failed, understandably, to mollify CAPEHART—especially when KERR further clarified his stand by remarking: "I do not say that the President has no brains at all. I reserve that broad and sweeping accusation for some of my cherished colleagues in this body." Instead of leaving bad enough alone, CAPEHART persisted in voicing his outrage, and inquired of KERR as to the identity of those "cherished colleagues." It was a courageous but ill-advised move. KERR rose and asked that his remarks be further amended. "I desire to have the word 'some' changed to 'one,' and the word 'colleagues' changed to the word 'colleague.'" CAPEHART probably did not improve his situation by retorting that he "would rather be a friend of the President of the United States without any brains, than to be a friend of the Senator from Oklahoma with brains."

KERR alleges, with a smile, that he never gives it to others unless they ask for it. The view is widely held in the Senate, however, that you ask for it any time you cross BOB KERR. "I think he sometimes gets too personal in debate," says his junior colleague from Oklahoma, A. S. MIKE MONRONEY. "But I must say, he's absolutely fearless; he'll take on anyone. And he gets results. When he wants some Government department to do something for Oklahoma, he'll give them a rough time until he gets it. Actually, we work well as a team; BOB roughs them up and I smooth them down. We laugh about it sometimes."

FIFTEEN THOUSAND DOLLARS WORTH OF ARGUMENTS

Aside from "agrarian radicalism," it is hard to find a label for KERR's ideology. He is less likely than MONRONEY to vote with the northern liberals. In fact, he has shown virtually no interest in the issues that, in recent years, have been the main preoccupations of the liberals in both parties—e.g., segregation, McCarthyism, labor law, civil liberties, aid to underdeveloped nations. On most of these issues he votes routinely with the Democratic center—i.e., the moderates whose principal spokesman is the majority leader, Senator LYNDON JOHNSON of Texas. KERR is a good friend of JOHNSON'S, and is warmly advocating him for the Democratic nomination in 1960.

But if KERR is not a liberal, he is just as clearly not a conservative. In the majority of senatorial arguments between the spenders and the budget cutters KERR is firmly alined with the spenders. It is KERR's contention that last year's recession was brought on by tight money, excessive foreign imports, and Ezra Benson's program of flexible farm price supports. These views are, roughly speaking, the opposite of those upheld by the Eisenhower administration and the Federal Reserve Board—as KERR demonstrated, at considerable length, in the Senate's 1957–58 investigation of the financial condition of the United States. The hearings were presided over by Senator BYRD—who is a conservative—but most of the Finance Committee's time was taken up in listening to the wrangles between KERR, on one side, and officials of the Treasury (including George Humphrey) and several representatives of the FRB on the other. KERR was, as usual, carefully prepared—he had spent $15,000 to procure some exhaustive research—and, also as usual, he had the last word in all the arguments. At times KERR was outrageously demagogic in advancing his own point of view. At one point Marriner Eccles, of Utah, the former Chairman of the FRB, tried to argue that the damage done to some industries by imports was offset by gains to other industries dependent on exports, to which KERR responded: "Would you have any difficulty convincing the miners in Utah and Oklahoma of the validity of that equal benefit? * * * not that the convincing of their minds would relieve the pangs of hunger in their bodies * * *." But on balance, his performance was brilliant; and a reading of the transcript suggests that he had absorbed a staggering fund of information about the U.S. monetary situation and that, right or wrong, he had thought about it carefully. Some of the incidental flavor of the hearings may be conveyed by citing an exchange between KERR and William McChesney Martin, Jr., who is the present Chairman of the FRB, and normally a lucid and articulate man:

Senator KERR. You said in your report we had achieved a degree of economic stability in 1952.

"Mr. MARTIN. That is right.

"Senator KERR. Why are you saying now you were moving in 1953 to overcome the inflationary situation of 1952?

"Mr. MARTIN. It got out of hand here. Do you want to comment on this?

"Senator KERR. You are the one who made the statement.

"Mr. MARTIN. Well, I stand on the statement.

"Senator KERR. You can't stand on both of them, because they are in contradiction to each other.

"Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Riefler, I have gotten confused under the questioning. Will you bail me out on this?

"Senator KERR. Who are you?

"Mr. MARTIN. This is Mr. Riefler (assistant to the Chairman of the FRB).

"Senator KERR. I'll tell you, if you can bail him out of that one, I want to get acquainted with you.

"Mr. RIEFLER. I thought he wanted to correct himself. He was not saying in 1951–52 we were having active inflation.

"Senator KERR. You can say that is what he wanted?

"Mr. RIEFLER. That is right.

"Senator KERR. I tell you if you can read men's minds, I want you out of this room."

SCRIPTURES VERSUS REPUBLICANS

Like William Jennings Bryan, KERR is a deeply religious man of fundamentalist inclinations: he contributes 30 percent of his income, the deductible maximum, mainly to the Baptist church, and for many years he has made a practice of teaching a Sunday school class. His biblical learning is, in fact, one of his major resources in debating. On one famous occasion, in 1950, KERR used Hebrews 13 to the considerable detriment of a candidate running against MONRONEY. The candidate was the Rev. W. H. Bill Alexander, who one day announced to his congregation that, after communion with the Almighty, he had decided to enter the Democratic primary elections and run for the Senate. Soon afterward he switched over, and won the Republican nomination. Even though KERR was a good personal friend of Alexander's, he stumped the State for MONRONEY, and on every possible occasion raised this interesting question: "If the Lord told Bill Alexander to run as a Democrat, who told him to become a Republican? 'Remember them which have the rule over you, who have spoken unto you the word of God: whose faith follow * * * Jesus Christ the same yesterday, and today, and forever.'" The Reverend Mr. Alexander never had a chance. It is an indicator of KERR's broad political tolerance—or perhaps of Alexander's—that the two men are still good friends and often play gin rummy together.

A final parallel with the politics of the old agrarian era: KERR, like Bryan, is personally and politically a dry. (Prohibition is the law in Oklahoma, if not exactly the fact.) He feels intensely that liquor is an unmitigated social evil—several persons who are close to him have suffered from alcoholism—and he will not serve it in his home. This policy creates certain social problems in Washington, D.C., a notoriously wet city. Soon after KERR came to the Senate, he threw a huge party to which he invited virtually every prominent Democrat in town, including many (Truman among them) who like a drink. KERR spread the word that he would not provide any drinks. However, he had had the foresight to hold the affair at a local country club, rather than at his home; which meant that the guests could, if they wanted to, buy themselves drinks at an adjacent bar.

He does not smoke either, but he has a passion for sweets, and in consequence is engaged in a continuing struggle to hold his weight down. He is possibly the leading patron in all Oklahoma of the frozen custard stands which adorn that State's roadsides and, according to one of his drivers, "will not pass by a Dairy Queen even at 7 in the morning."

THE VIEW FROM OKLAHOMA

KERR's approach to most political problems is (unlike Bryan's) rather "provincial"; indeed, he volunteers that word himself, with no visible abashment. It appears that his principal criterion in gaging the merit of any political proposal is: What's in it for Oklahoma? His protectionist sentiments, for example, are based on the deleterious effect that foreign imports have had on the Oklahoma lead, zinc, and oil industries. His repeated sponsorship of legislation to expand social-security coverage is related to the fact that Oklahoma has a high proportion of pensioners and older persons. MONRONEY has been preoccupied much of the time with issues that are national in scope, e.g., foreign aid; KERR has not. (Ironically, he has been assigned, against his wishes, to the Senate's new Space Committee.)

There was even an "Oklahoma angle" in KERR's spirited defense of President Truman during the uproar that followed General MacArthur's dismissal in April 1951. At first, KERR was almost alone in the Senate in standing up for the Chief Executive; and he more than held his own against such redoubtable Republican opponents as Robert A. Taft, RICHARD NIXON, and William Knowland. KERR's attack on MacArthur was warmly applauded by the liberal press; and in a book called "Citadel, The Story of the United States Senate," William S. White praised KERR for upholding "the great democratic principle of civil control of the military."

But the liberals entirely misunderstood what KERR was up to. Much of his fury against MacArthur derived from his concern that the General's strategy might call for the use on the Chinese mainland of semitrained National Guard troops then en route to Japan; and about half of these troops were the men of Oklahoma's famed 45th (Thunderbird) Division. KERR had felt strongly that MacArthur was wrong even before the President fired him; in fact, KERR had publicly criticized him and privately asked the President to get rid of the General. His request carried some weight, for Truman owed KERR a real political debt at this time: a year previously, Truman had vetoed KERR's bill to free independent gas producers from regulation by the Federal Power Commission; he had exercised this veto under pressure from northern liberals in his party, and despite the fact that the Kerr bill had originally been "cleared" with the White House.

WIND AND WATER

Actually, the problem that has most engaged KERR's energies since he went into politics is one few citizens outside Oklahoma can be expected to know or care much about. The problem is the development of the State's natural resources, and KERR has dramatized his interest in it by adopting as his political slogan the phrase "Land, Wood, and Water." His opponents have long referred to it, derisively, as "Land, Wood, Wind, and Water," and even KERR's friends sometimes, absentmindedly, repeat the caricature rather than the original. In the last few years, however, the point of this little joke has been blunted by KERR's success in bringing what did, at first, have a visionary look about it somewhat closer to completion.

The principal element in the program is water. Soon after KERR was elected to the Senate, he introduced and secured passage of a bill providing for the establishment of an "Arkansas-White-Red Basins Interagency Committee." The AWRBIAC, as it is actually called, spent 5 years and $7 million devising a program for the development of water resources in Oklahoma and several adjoining States. The program includes some projects previously authorized by Congress; all together, the cost of the water program KERR is working for would be $2 billion, to be spent over about 20 years. The program is "fully integrated," i.e., the projects complement one another, and are intended simultaneously to solve several problems. They include a series of hydroelectric projects, which will give the State 933,500 kilowatts of power by 1980 (against only 166,500 kilowatts installed now); a vast increase in irrigation facilities, especially in western Oklahoma, much of which is now arid; a series of as many as 75 major reservoirs in the State by 1980; a substantial buildup in the State's inland-waterway system, part of which will be attained by making the Arkansas River navigable; upstream flood-prevention and water-control measures throughout the State; and a wide variety of other benefits, including recreational facilities, pollution abatement, and mosquito control.

OUR FUTURE WATCHDOG

Congressional appropriations for this program will have to come piecemeal; thus far, $286 million has been spent on completed projects in Oklahoma, and appropriations are currently running $60 million a year. As chairman of the Public Works Subcommittee on Flood Control, Rivers and Harbors, KERR is in a good position to fight for the program.

The program will, of course, meet considerable resistance from the hated "budget cutters," a fact to which KERR frequently alludes with heavy sarcasm in his Oklahoma speaking engagements. In many of these speeches he will tell this story: "Not long ago I was at a meeting where HARRY BYRD was introduced as the 'watchdog of the Federal Treasury,' and I was introduced as the man who wasn't. So I got up and told them that in all the years since our Federal Union was founded, there had been more U.S. Government money spent in the State of Virginia than in any other State. And I said that just as soon as I got it so that more was spent in Oklahoma than any other State—then I'd become the watchdog of the Treasury." Oklahomans seem to like this story a lot.

KERR is, understandably, a speaker much in demand in Oklahoma. When Congress is not in session he averages perhaps 25 speeches a month all over the State—he travels much of the time in one of several planes provided by Kerr-McGee—and he is ordinarily booked up for 4 to 6 weeks in advance. At 62, he is still a strong man physically, and he is one of those very rare individuals who are both completely relaxed and perfectly disciplined. He makes it look easy. When he flies into some small community in Oklahoma to deliver a speech he will, ordinarily, be met at the airport by several local Democratic personages. He will inquire briefly "what the folks want to hear about," digest the answer, chat for a while about local conditions, and then, on the drive into town, catch perhaps 20 minutes of sleep while sitting in the car. His talks begin and end on time, and consist precisely of what the folks want to hear about.

PARADISE MISSING

KERR is one of the few politicians around these days who was born in a log cabin. This was near Ada, in Indian Territory, 11 years before the Territory became the State of Oklahoma. He weighed 12 pounds at birth, and was the second of seven children (the eldest of five sons). His parents were both of Scotch-Irish extraction. Though KERR grew up in the era portrayed in "Oklahoma!" his boyhood bore little relation to the pastoral paradise celebrated by Rodgers and Hammerstein. Robert never had an overcoat until he was in college and a classmate gave him an old one in payment of a $1.50 debt. However, his father, who was a man of some eloquence and learning had big

plans for the boys. He encouraged them to go into politics, and KERR says that fairly early in life he had resolved that there were three things he wanted: a family, a million dollars, and the governorship—in that sequence. And that was the sequence he got them in.

In 1925, he married Grayce Breene, a pretty, soft-spoken woman, and over the next dozen years the Kerrs had three sons and a daughter. They are a close knit and very happy family. The young Kerrs seem to be neither awed by their father nor inclined to rebellion. The Senator's oldest son, Robert Jr., is a lawyer who, in partnership with the Senator's brother Aubrey, handles some of Kerr-McGee's legal business. Another son, Breene, is a geologist and engineer with Kerr-McGee. Both Breene and Robert Jr. are also directors of the company and, like the Senator's daughter Kay, who is married to a marketing man at Kerr-McGee, and the youngest son, William, who is still attending the University of Oklahoma, they are now substantial shareholders in the company: each of their families owns roughly 20,000 shares of the company's common stock, worth about $1,200,000 at recent prices. If all this has a look of nepotism about it, and it certainly does, there is the mitigating fact that the young beneficiaries are all obviously talented in their own right. (Two of the Senator's brothers also hold executive positions in the company, but one of them, Travis M. Kerr, devotes much of his time to horse racing; his Kerr Stable has been vastly successful, and in 1958 his horses—including the "horse of the year," Round Table—were second only to those of Calumet Farm in purses won.)

Getting his first million dollars took KERR a little more time than raising a family. Although he had never graduated from college, he passed the bar examination in 1922, and later became a law partner of a judge in Ada. He also tried his hand, during the early 1920's, at organizing a produce business in Ada, but his produce house went up in flames one night. When he married Grayce Breene, he was earning $125 a month from his legal business and was $10,000 in debt. KERR was always fearless about going into debt whenever he thought he saw a chance to make big money, and this policy of "aggressive borrowing" has characterized Kerr-McGee over the years.

THE FIRST MILLIONS

The origins of the company, and of KERR's fortune, may be traced back to 1926, when he undertook some legal work for a small contract-drilling firm. The firm's chief fieldman was James L. Anderson, who was married to KERR's sister Mildred. Soon afterward, KERR and Anderson borrowed $30,000 and bought out the local bankers who had the major interest in the firm. KERR gave up his law practice, and the firm, now called Anderson-Kerr Drilling Co., set up headquarters in Oklahoma City. Anderson had a nose for oil, and an ability to drill cheaper than his competitors; and KERR had a talent for finding investment capital, and separating it from its owners.

Their first breakthrough into the big money came in 1932, and was the result of a daring speculation. It had recently been established that there were fabulous oil reserves within the limits of Oklahoma City, but many oil companies refused to go into town lot drilling, because there was danger of serious damage to property and of accidents; the city itself required drillers to post a $200,000 bond for each well. Anderson-Kerr nevertheless borrowed enough money to get four such leases, and it got two more in partnership with a friend of KERR's. The firm did not have enough money to post the required bond, but got it when KERR sold Continental Oil Co. on this proposition: Continental would pay $360,000 for a half-interest in the six wells, and would advance another $15,000 apiece when they were drilled—a total of $450,000. Anderson-Kerr kept the other half-interest, but pledged that any revenues from half of their half-interest would go to paying off the $15,000 advances from Continental. As it happened, all the wells came in, Continental was soon reimbursed, and Anderson-Kerr cleared close to $2 million.

A JOB FOR PHILLIPS

KERR's next big break came in 1935, when he was visited one day by K. S. (Boots) Adams, now the chairman of Phillips Petroleum, but then assistant to President Frank Phillips. At that time Phillips Petroleum held a lot of valuable leases in Oklahoma City—or, rather, leases that would be valuable if the citizens of Oklahoma City could be persuaded to vote for permitting their exploitation. (After some early drilling accidents in the city, an ordinance was passed requiring the voters' approval of any extension of the drilling zone farther into Oklahoma City.) Adams asked KERR how much trouble he thought it would be to win an extension on the Oklahoma City field. KERR said it would be no trouble at all. Adams then asked if KERR would be willing to manage the campaign for extension. KERR said he'd be happy to. Adams then inquired what the fee would be and KERR said he wouldn't charge Phillips for his services—except, he added, there was one favor he would ask for Anderson-Kerr. That was an opportunity for the firm to have first chance, on a competitive basis, to bid for Phillips' drilling contracts in the city. Adams agreed to this condition, and KERR—in his first big venture into politics—ran a whirlwind campaign that ended with an overwhelming vote for extension. In 1936 he managed a campaign for a further extension of the drilling area, and won that too.

Anderson-Kerr made a small fortune drilling in Oklahoma City, and KERR also began his long and profitable history of collaboration with Phillips Petroleum. One immediate byproduct of this association was the acquisition of Dean A. McGee. In 1935, after Anderson had decided to cash in his chips and retire, KERR looked around for someone to take his place. He persuaded two men to leave Phillips; one of them was McGee, who had been Phillips' chief geologist. Both men were willing to leave Phillips because KERR offered them a partnership in his firm. It is a tribute to KERR's diplomatic talents that he was able to take both men and still remain on warm terms with Phillips Petroleum, which correctly regarded McGee as one of the greatest geologists in the oil industry, and felt his loss keenly. Some time later, KERR recalls, he was pressing Frank Phillips for a contribution to a Baptist orphans' home. Phillips agreed to give $100,000, but remarked that he'd "rather give $500,000 and have it that you'd left those boys alone." Over a period of about 10 years KERR's firm had an arrangement with Phillips which provided that the latter would get a half-interest in acreage acquired under McGee's supervision, but would pay three-quarters of the cost of his exploration, lease acquisition, and exploratory drilling. Phillips and Kerr-McGee (this became the company's name in 1946) have gone in together on oil ventures in, among other places, Alaska, Venezuela, and the Louisiana tidelands.

Since 1942, when KERR was elected Governor, McGee has been, in effect, running the company's operations. In 1954, when KERR was running for his second term in the Senate—and facing compaign charges that he was not spending enough time on his job in the Senate—he stepped down as president and McGee took over that title. KERR is still chairman of the board, however, and still participates actively in all policy decisions.

HOW THE CASH FLOWS

Both men are fervent expansionists, and in the pursuit of outside capital they have diluted their original equity in several public stock offerings. (KERR now owns 11 percent of the company's common stock. Mrs. Kerr owns another 8 percent, their children's families own a total of 3 percent, and McGee owns 6 percent.) KERR and McGee have also increased the company's cash flow, recently running about $18 million a year, by building up those parts of the business—for example, refining—that offered depreciation as well as profit possibilities. Kerr-McGee now owns or controls about a quarter of all known uranium reserves in the United States and has a large concentrating mill; it also has an 8-year contract with the Atomic Energy Commission providing for the sale of over $300 million worth of uranium, beginning this year. The company's cash flow from uranium alone over these years is likely to run over $10 million annually.

KERR and McGee, in general, have no interest in applying their growing cash flow against their $70 million of long-term debt; instead, they are looking for areas to expand into, especially new fuels. Boron and beryllium are among their major interests now, and they already have a sizable and intriguing investment in potash, in partnership with a rather incongruous capitalist. This was acquired after James Patton, president of the left-of-center National Farmers Union, called on KERR one day in 1954 and said his organization had acquired leases on over 20,000 acres of land in New Mexico's potash basin north of Carlsbad. The NFU wanted a partner to help it exploit a newly discovered potash deposit. McGee worked out the details with Patton, and Kerr-McGee soon had a half interest in 165 million tons of potash.

Not long afterward, KERR had dinner with his old friend Boots Adams, who said that Phillips might like to get in on the potash too. "I told him," KERR recalls, "that he shouldn't get in on any deal with the Farmers Union. I said he was a big businessman, and his company might not want to get in with people who go around organizing cooperatives, and fighting for public power. I was just needling him, see." When the needling was over, KERR agreed to let Phillips take over half of Kerr-McGee's interest and obligations in potash. KERR expects that even the quarter-interest that his company retains in the potash fields will be a big moneymaker beginning in a few years; it might, he guessed recently, net Kerr-McGee $100 million over a 25-year period. (McGee's estimate is much more conservative.)

HOW TO BECOME GOVERNOR

While he was first building up the company, KERR was also building up a political reputation. He went into American Legion politics and was elected State commander in 1925, and he used the office to make scores of public speeches in all parts of Oklahoma. Almost as soon as he made any appreciable sums of money, he became a steady contributor to the Democratic cause in the State; and by 1940 he was a major source of funds for the party and was elected a national committeeman. In 1935, KERR was asked by the Mid-Continent Oil and Gas Association to direct its public-relations activities in Oklahoma and Kansas. Characteristically, KERR offered to take on the job without pay—if the members of the association would allow Anderson-Kerr to compete for contract-drilling jobs. This deal was struck, and KERR became well known in the late 1930's as a spokesman for the gas and oil industries. When the association asked him in 1941 to serve another term on the job, he declined and informed several of its officials that he planned instead to run for Governor. "I told them," he says with a chuckle, "that

if I lost the election, they wouldn't want me, and if I won it, they wouldn't need a man in the job."

In the 1942 gubernatorial primaries, KERR ran as a Roosevelt Democrat, and beat the other contenders by a narrow margin. In the November election, his margin was again narrow; the majority, some 16,500, was the smallest given any Democratic Governor in 28 years. Its size reflected principally the strength of anti-Roosevelt and isolationist sentiment in the State.

Businessmen who react violently to KERR's current economic pronouncements may be surprised to know that his administration was rather conservative. He reduced the level of State expenditures and applied the surplus to retirement of the State debt. There was a minimum of pork-barreling.

Because of his talent for stemwinding oratory, and the generally favorable impression he was creating as Governor, Roosevelt picked him for keynote speaker at the 1944 Democratic National Convention. KERR seized with delight upon the opportunity to make a national impression. He speedily rejected the 40-page speech prepared for him by a platoon of Democratic writers, and holed up for 3 weeks in Minnesota, working on a new effort. "I saved one sentence from that ghost job they gave me," he says. "It was a good sentence." When he returned to Washington with his own speech, Paul A. Porter, of the Democratic National Committee, tried to make some changes in it. "All right, Paul," KERR said solemnly, "you make the speech." KERR, of course, ended up making his own speech in his own way.

BETTER THAN COTTON

When his term ended, in 1947, KERR was considerably more popular throughout Oklahoma than he had been when he came into office. He easily won the nomination for the Senate in 1948, and easily won the election; Republicans have always had a rough time of it in Oklahoma. In 1954, however, KERR was hard pressed to win the Democratic primary race. He was running this time against Roy Turner, who was also a popular ex-Governor—and who was also a millionaire (oil and cattle). It was widely forecast in Oklahoma, before the primaries, that a Kerr-Turner match would pour more money into the State than a good cotton crop. The spending was indeed fabulous. In this campaign, as in all his others, KERR spent a considerable amount just to buy himself a scientifically conducted survey of voter sentiment in advance of the election. He says his own polls have never been off by more than 1 or 2 percent.

The strands of business and politics have been interwoven in BOB KERR's career in a way that some observers—including some U.S. Senators—consider to be improper. KERR's business interests, after all, are vast and varied, and his fortunes can be seriously affected by the way issues are decided in Congress. Among the odds and ends in his capacious portfolio, for example, are interests in radio and television stations; and KERR must vote on nominees to the Federal Communications Commission. Kerr-McGee does business with the Atomic Energy Commission, whose nominees he also helps to decide upon. And, of course, the company's earnings would be affected by any legislation that reduced the depletion allowance on oil and other minerals. (Several northern liberals have already indicated that they will press for a reduction of the allowance in this session of Congress; KERR does not believe they have any chance of winning.) Since Kerr-McGee also produces natural gas, it had a stake in the Kerr bill, which Truman vetoed in 1950.

KERR AND THE PAUPERS

KERR is not the least bit unwilling to discuss his own situation, if the conflict-of-interest issue is raised with him, and he will cheerfully tell you that the issue is a lot of nonsense. First he will remind you that on the crucial votes affecting his big holdings, any Oklahoma Senator would vote as he does. Then he will point out that every Member of the U.S. Congress has some income that is affected by tax or other legislation; and that unless a man comes to Congress bearing a certified pauper's oath, he is bound to vote on some issues that affect his own property. Finally, he will point out that his own holdings are out in the open and so are his economic convictions; and the voters of Oklahoma have apparently seen nothing amiss about either of them.

He does not think it likely that the voters will reject him when he runs in 1960. Some have speculated that KERR might have trouble that year if Congressman ED EDMONDSON, backed up by his brother Howard, the new Governor—who is a brilliant campaigner—made a race for the Senate. But KERR is supremely self-confident about the race. As he is, in fact, about everything he takes on.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. YOUNG of Ohio in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR RECESS TO TOMORROW AT 10:30 A.M.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes its deliberations today it stand in recess until 10:30 a.m. tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I should like to inform the Senate that it is our plan to discuss S. 1096, the space bill, which is an authorization bill involving some $48 million. The distinguished Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] will explain the bill in detail, and some of my colleagues on the committee will also have remarks to make concerning the bill.

At the conclusion of discussion on the bill we shall have a yea-and-nay vote on passage of the bill.

We then expect to proceed to consider House bill 2260, to provide for an extension of the draft, which bill has been reported by the Committee on Armed Services. The report and the hearings will be available to all Members on their desks. The Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], the chairman of the committee, will present the bill. When discussions are concluded on the bill we shall have a yea-and-nay vote on passage of the bill.

It is very difficult to anticipate how long Senators may talk on any subject, but so far as we have been informed we expect to conclude action on both of those bills tomorrow—at least we hope we can—and then proceed to the consideration of S. 50, the bill to provide Hawaiian statehood. We expect to come in early on Wednesday and discuss Hawaiian statehood, and to stay on that until we have acted on the bill.

I shall try to give tomorrow a more detailed announcement about the bills to be considered later in the week.

Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

RECESS TO TOMORROW AT 10:30 A.M.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, in accordance with the order previously entered, I now move that the Senate stand in recess until 10:30 a.m. tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 26 minutes p.m.), under the order previously entered, the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, March 10, 1959, at 10:30 o'clock a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate March 9, 1959:

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE

Philip B. Taylor, of New Jersey, to be Assistant Secretary of the Air Force, vice Dudley C. Sharp, resigned.

U.S. ATTORNEYS

Kenneth C. Raub, of Indiana, to be U.S. attorney for the northern district of Indiana for the term of 4 years, vice Phil M. McNagny, resigned.

Edward G. Minor, of Wisconsin, to be U.S. attorney for the eastern district of Wisconsin for the term of 4 years. He is now serving in this office under an appointment which expires June 16, 1959.

U.S. MARSHALS

Curtis Clark, of Kentucky, to be U.S. marshal for the eastern district of Kentucky for the term of 4 years. He is now serving in this office under an appointment which expires March 16, 1959.

Lama A. De Munbrun, of Kentucky, to be U.S. marshal for the western district of Kentucky for the term of 4 years. He is now serving in this office under an appointment which expires March 21, 1959.

Robert E. Stockdale, of Ohio, to be U.S. marshal for the northern district of Ohio for the term of 4 years, vice Xavier North, deceased.

IN THE NAVY AND MARINE CORPS

The following-named (Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps) to be ensigns in the line of the Navy, subject to qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Peter D. Abbott	James M. Anglin
John W. Aber, Jr.	Larry G. Armstrong
William K. Abernathy	Roger W. Armstrong
Alan L. Abramsky	David A. Arnold
Jack J. Ackerman	Donald S. Atkins
Frederick R. Ackley, Jr.	Adrian A. Bahler
Richard W. Adam	Harold W. Bailey, Jr.
Douglas F. Adams	Herbert D. Baker
Lawrence R. Adkins, Jr.	Richard R. Baldwin
Michael G. Alden	Ronald F. Ball
David H. Allen	Hugh P. Barber, Jr.
Robert C. Allen, Jr.	Thomas G. Barksdale
Kenneth M. Allum, Jr.	David M. Barrett
John C. Altmiller	Basil B. Bartlow
Michael J. Ambrose	William H. Bast
David M. Amidon	Robert E. Baute
William B. Amis	James L. Beam
	Stanley A. Beattie
	Geoffrey C. Beaumont

Norton J. Beecher
Stephen D. Beguin
David E. Bell
Lyle N. Benson
Frederick L. Bergert
William A. Bernett
Vladimir V. Berniklau
Glenn E. Berryman, Jr.
Maxwell D. Biddle, Jr.
John H. Bingler, Jr.
Francis M. Bird, Jr
David R. Biren
Donald L. Black
Leroy G. Black II
John E. Blair
James B. Bleakley
John H. Blish
Donald G. Blodgett
Larry E. Blose
Gordon E. Blowers
Samuel C. Boatwright
Norman J. Bogar
Robert A. Bogle, Jr.
Frederick M. Bohen
Challen O. Bonar III
Douglas E. Bond
Timothy Booher
Robert L. Borlick
Robert F. Borrell
Robert L. Boshoven
Robert O. Bothwell
Joseph F. Boufford
Paul F. Bouril
Roy H. Boyd
Berkley R. Boyden
George W. Boynton III
John R. Brady
Thomas A. Brady, Jr.
Karl E. Brandt
Peter R. Bregman
Richard D. Brewer
Charles J. Brier
Otis H. Brinkley, Jr.
Edson C. Brolin
William H. Bromann, Jr.
Linton F. Brooks
William T. J. Brooks
Larry J. Brown
Jerry L. Bruemmer
Mark E. Buchman
Richard W. Budinger
William A. Bugg, Jr.
Robert D. Burke
Alan F. Burmester
John M. Burns, Jr.
Thomas M. Burns, Jr.
Jimmy L. Bybee
John C. Cade
William S. Cadow, Jr.
Christian E. Callsen
Colin C. Campbell
William W. Campbell
James M. Canavan, Jr.
Donald F. Caporale
John R. Capper
William C. Carlson
John M. Carmosky
Robert N. Carpenter
George C. Carter
Phillip R. Carter
Paul A. Casey
John D. Cate
Robert L. Caton
William H. Chadwick
James A. Chambers, Jr.
Michael K. Chapman
Claude K. Chappelear
Douglas O. Chidlow
Richard A. Christian
Gary S. Christensen
Peter C. Christensen
Gerald J. Churchill
John W. Ciboci
Warren E. Claflin
Gean P. Clapper
Jackson S. Clark
Robert L. Clark
Roger M. Clark
William S. Clark
Ronald B. Code
Michael M. Cohen
Dannie R. Coates
Richard L. Coats
Robert H. Coffin, Jr.
George C. Colias
John S. Cole
John B. Coleman, Jr.
Donald S. Collins
Charles F. Conley, Jr.
James J. Connors III
Arthur J. Cooke, Jr.
John B. Cooke III
Nicholas J. Cooke
Cameron P. Cooper
Edgar W. Copeland III
James W. Corey, Jr.
James D. Cossey
John J. Cox
Thomas T. Craft
Lewis A. Crawford
Peter P. Crooker
William G. Costello
Joel L. Crandall, Jr.
Thomas E. Curran
Robert D. Cushing
Philip A. Cyr
Robert A. Dakin
William A. Daley
William J. M. Dalgliesh
Bruce D. Daly
John L. Dailey
George L. Damoose
Craig E. Daniels
Edward C. Datemasch
Ralph W. Dau
Hartwell Davis, Jr.
Allen R. Davidson, Jr.
Jerome J. Day, Jr.
Milton D. DeBuhr
Robert E. Deck, Jr.
Edward J. Dempsey
Marc F. Denton, Jr.
Richard L. Desmond
Glen L. Dickey
Marvin D. Dietsch
Arunas Dirvianskis
Robert I. Dodge III
Daniel R. Donovan, Jr.
James R. Dougharty
John F. Dugan
William L. Duke
Larry N. Dupier
Richard B. Edgar
Richard E. Edic
Oliver J. Edwards, Jr.
Howard S. Eldredge
Gary H. Ellis
John C. Ellis
Robert P. Ellis
Joel D. Ellemeier
Donald E. Elson
John H. Embry
George H. Emmons
Allen E. Ertel
Phineas D. Evans
Thomas W. Evans
Oliver G. Everette
Perc A. Everitt
Christopher B. Fagan
Larry E. Faith
Paul R. Fallone, Jr.
Albert E. Fant III
Arthur G. Farley
William T. Farrar
James H. Farrell, Jr.
Edmund E. Faulk
Robert A. Fiddaman
George J. Fischer
William T. S. Fitch
Thomas J. Fitzpatrick, Jr.
Wayne M. Flood
Scott A. Florence
Eugene P. Fogarty
Fredric D. Fogle
Robert B. Folsom
Peter C. Foltz
William E. Fondren
James W. Foster, Jr.
Robert I. Foster
Jonathan M. Fox
Thomas G. Foxworth
Charles B. Fowler, Jr.
Donald S. Frank
John A. G. Fraser, Jr.
George D. Fraunces
Guy H. Freeborn
Donald K. Fry, Jr.
Donald A. Furtado
Robert L. Gabrielson
Donald P. Galamaga
William R. Gannon
Bruce Garand
Perry E. Gary, Jr.
John F. Gaudet
Thomas G. Geanopulos
Henry P. George
Don M. Gerboth
Frank P. Gersbacher
David L. Gibbs
Thomas V. Giles
James R. Gillen
Donald C. Gillies
Robert K. Giss
Bernard L. Gladieux, Jr.
Harvey W. Gleeksman
Barrett J. Gleixner
Robert L. Glenn
William D. Glenn, Jr.
Douglas R. Godshall
John W. Goetz
Ronald L. Goggin
Albert L. Goldsmith, Jr.
James A. Goldstein
Ralph S. Golt
Thomas F. Goodman, Jr.
Jaul M. Goorjian
Samuel J. Gordon
Francis W. Graham II
James B. Graham
Thomas S. Graham
Henry F. Gray
John R. Gray, Jr.
Willie F. Gray
James C. Griffin
William A. Griffin
James S. Grigsby, Jr.
John R. Grisso
David A. Hafford
Robert N. Haines
Arthur E. Hall
Dale G. Hall
Kenneth T. Hall, Jr.
Richard A. Hallahan
Michael J. Halpin
Richard M. Hamada
Allan J. Hamilton
Lyle F. Hansen
James S. Hardie
Earl L. Hardy
David M. Harrell
Raymond P. Harris, Jr.
Robert G. Harrison
William L. Harrison
Leonard W. Harry III
Ronnie R. Hart
Will H. Hartfeldt
Henry J. Hatzel
Gerald D. Hauxwell
John F. Hayward
Walter A. Hazelton III
James J. Hearn
James L. Heavey
Lyle H. Hedges
John R. Hedstrom
John D. Heinberg
John B. Helmer
George D. Henderson
Harvey H. Henderson
Daniel L. Hendrickson
David M. Hendry
John M. Herman, Jr.
Robert D. Heron
Walter E. Herrs
Henry G. Herzing
James C. Hickey
Donald L. Hickman
Darrell E. Higman
Charles E. Hill
Malcolm T. Hill, Jr.
Robert M. Hill, Jr.
Robin H. Hines
Joseph P. Hirl
Thomas J. Hoberg
John B. Hoch
Joseph M. Hogan
Stanley R. Holcomb
James F. Holmes
James R. Holmlund
Philip P. Holts
Karl B. Holtzschue
Tracey G. Homburg
John D. Hopkins
Fred B. Hover
Peter B. Howard
Edgar C. Howbert
Robert R. Howe
Russell S. Hubbard, Jr.
Charles T. Hudacko
Thomas K. Hudgens
Richard B. Hudspeth
James C. Hull, Jr.
John W. Humphrey
Charles R. Huntington
Michael J. Hurley, Jr.
Fred A. Hurvich
George C. Huskamp
Allie A. Hutchison
Charles H. Hutchison
James N. Jackson
William R. Jackson, Jr.
Frank M. Jaffe
David W. James, Jr.
Thomas M. James
Edward V. Jaycox, Jr.
Robert F. Jenner
Warren A. Jessen
Joseph A. Jockel, Jr.
Ronald J. Johanson
Alvie M. Johnson
Arlo J. Johnson
Charles L. Johnson
Dennis L. Johnson
Larry D. Johnson
Peter A. Johnson
Ralph H. Johnson
Robert A. Johnson
Willoughby C. Johnson
Abner C. Johnston, Jr.
Gordon S. Jones
Sheldon A. Jones
Thomas C. Jones
Wilbert C. Jones
James C. Jordan, Jr.
Dean D. Judd
Matthew A. Kass
David W. Kearney
Lawrence R. Keats
William W. Kehl
Clinton W. Kelly
Edward J. Kelly, Jr.
Michael A. Kelly
Alva E. Kemmer
Larry D. Kenworthy
John C. Kiefer
James D. Kieweg
Charles D. Kimble
James R. King
Richard J. King
Robert R. King
John W. Kinnier
Robert A. Kirchner, Jr.
Robert G. Kirk
Terry B. Kislingbury
John R. Kjerland
Anthony J. Klapp
Joseph A. Klein
Edwin R. Kling, Jr.
Keith R. Knoblock
Ralph B. Kocian
Herbert E. Koke
Ronald E. Kolar
Robert S. Koor
Charles B. Krieger
John A. Krol
Charles D. Krug
Joseph R. Kuenzli
Alan M. Kyle
Bruce W. Kubik
William L. LaGrand
Robert O. Lamar III
Charles E. Lamb
David L. Lane
Jay E. Langland
Douglas C. Lans
Tom B. Larsen
Arvid G. Larson
Phillip G. Larson
John P. Laschenski
Robert C. Lau, Jr.
Jack R. Laub
Wilburn P. Law
William H. Leinbach
Lennart C. Lekstrom
Mark D. Levin
John T. Lewis
William F. Lewis
James D. Leyerle
John E. Liebmann
Thomas O. Lind
Jules W. Lindau IV
David R. Linderman
Robert B. Livy
Donald E. Loew
Clyde A. Lofdahl
Salvatore E. LoGalbo
John H. Long
Norman E. Long
Ronald Lovitt
William P. Luce
Peter W. Ludwig
Robert W. Luebke
William H. Luesing, Jr.
John A. Lynch, Jr.
Fred M. Lyon
John F. McAnulty
William D. McCabe, Jr.
Edward P. McCall
William E. McCann, Jr.
Walter B. McCarty
James F. McClendon, Jr.
David J. McCloskey
Dwight M. McCracken, Jr.
Richard R. McDowell
James P. McElhenny, Jr.
Robert J. McGuire
William D. McIntosh, Jr.
Peter D. McKenna
Peter W. McKenney
Henry C. McKinney
Lawrence McKittrick
James P. McManus
John R. McNamara
John B. Mabry, Jr.
Kenneth A. MacGillivary
Charles R. MacVean
Jasper M. Maxwell
John Male
Steve A. Maragides
Richard Mardigian
Alan H. Maris
David "L" Markowski
William B. Marsh, Jr.
Bruce C. Marshall
Walter F. Martens
George H. Martin, Jr.
Joseph D. Mason
William D. Mathewson
Robert C. Mawhinney
Donald C. Meadows
Anthony J. Medaglia, Jr.
William A. Medcalf
Richard S. Merrell
John R. Mertens
Edwin C. Meslow
James A. Messegee
Robert O. Meyers
Alan C. Miller
John H. Miller II
Harlan B. Miller
Lee E. Miller
Richard L. Millikan
Bernard F. Minard
James E. Mischler
John J. Mitchell
Karl R. Mitchener
Michael D. Montgomery
Seth D. Montgomery
Stephen H. Morehouse
James R. Moody
John "L" "A" Moore
Temple C. Moore, Jr.
Alan B. Morrison
Robert J. Mullin
Terrence R. Murphy
John F. Murray
Daniel G. Muth
John R. Nankivil
Paul R. Neelon
Charles T. Nelson
Paul C. Nelson
Robert A. Nelson
James A. Newby
Errett D. Newman
William A. Newquist
William L. Nichol, Jr.
Daniel A. Nicholson
Charles L. Nissler
Richard A. Noble
Francis J. Noel III
Michael H. V. Nolan
Thomas E. Nolan
Stephen W. North
Jerold R. Ocker
James E. Ogburn
Thomas A. O'Keeffe
Julius A. Olita
Gerald D. Olson
Richard T. O'Neil
John T. Onuska
Delbert M. Osborn
Thomas H. Oswald, Jr.
Ernest E. Owen
David A. Page
Fritz R. Palas
Michael W. Palmer
Harold W. Parker
Robert M. Parks
Tom H. Parks, Jr.
Joseph L. Parrillo
Edward M. Passerini
Joe T. Patterson
Paul H. Paulsen
James W. Payne III
Roger L. Peck
William F. Pedler
Robert B. Pemberton
Dennis R. Penley
Paul D. Penman
Donald M. Penny
Joe R. Penny
Leroy F. Perry
James S. Person, Jr.
Loren R. Peterson
Eugene "M" Pfeifer III
Lawrence C. Pierce
James D. Pinkerton
Gerald K. Pitcher
James S. Poor
Michael H. Popernik
Robert P. Porter
Ernest G. Posner
Don P. Pound
Richard A. Powell
Robert E. Powers
Hugh M. Praetorius
David W. Pratt
William A. Press
Terry L. Preston
Stephen M. Prevost
Henry T. Price
Waldo E. Price
Stuart H. Pringle, Jr.
Lloyd E. Printup
Tom C. Putnam
Peter A. Qunit
Harold J. Radeke
Richard R. Rager
John C. Rahming
David E. Randolph

Thomas J. Ready III
Albert M. Redd, Jr.
David A. Reed
James F. Reed
John H. Reed
John A. Reeder
Roy M. Reeves
William F. Reidenbach
Charles P. Reilly, Jr.
Robert R. Reilly
Lyle F. Reimann
Ronald G. Renfer
Robert S. Rennard
Ernest A. Renner
Ronald E. Resare
James A. Reynolds
Joseph E. Richard
Grahame P. Richards, Jr.
David O. Rickson
Ronald R. Rickwald
Ted L. Ridings
Daniel M. Riess
Michael W. Riley
George W. Ringer
James R. Robert
James L. Roberts
John R. Roberts
Paul J. Roberts
Thomas M. Roberts
William E. Roberts
Armand J. Robertson II
James Robertson
Robert H. Robinson
Joel E. Rodgers
Richard A. Roeder
Leslie L. Rogers, Jr.
Will Rogers, Jr.
David R. Roscoe
Lawrence R. Rosen
Glenn C. Rosenberger
Alan G. Rosenthal
Frank R. Rossiter
Jon B. Roth
Charles R. Rowe II
Reed L. Royalty
Leo C. Rudegeair
James H. Russell
Reede H. Ryan, Jr.
William J. Ryan III
Paul S. Sakuda
Edward R. Salem
James M. Saunders
Robert L. Savage
James L. Sawhook
Mark Saylor
John W. Scanlan
Lee E. Shafer
Fred W. Schaefer
Timothy R. Scheck
James G. Schernecker
Bodin R. Schexnayder
Robert C. Schiffner
Richard D. Schneider
Frederic J. Schnoor
Gordon S. Schoen
Larry P. Schrag
Francis L. Schulte
Paul G. Schuyler
William G. Schwartz
Patrick J. Scollard, Jr.
Gerald F. Scoones
Albert T. Scott
William M. Scott, Jr.
Thomas V. Seessel
John E. Sells
James L. Seltzer
Clark B. Shafer
James E. Sharp
Harry A. Shaw III
Lawrence J. Sheya
Phillip W. Shopbell
Roy E. Short
Ronald A. Siders
Seymour S. Sidner III
John Siembieda
Donald J. Sifferman
Stevan Simich
Joseph F. Sinnott, Jr.
James C. Skroski
"L" Wilson Slocum
Larry L. Smalley
Charles A. Smith
David R. Smith
Douglas W. Smith
Eurie H. Smith III
James F. Smith
John S. Smith
Lee M. Smith, Jr.
Mark W. Smith
Thomas L. Smith, Jr.
Robert "V" Soderholm
Timothy E. Somes
John R. Sopko
Roger C. Sparks
William W. Sparrow
Lawrence G. Stabel
Rudolf S. Stahel
Bruce E. Stanford
David L. Stanford
Herbert M. Stebbins
Michael R. Steffenson
Gilbert D. Stein
Joseph B. Steinman
Alvin L. Stern
Albert L. Stewart II
Francis J. Stewart
John J. Stewart
William J. Stewart
Bruce G. Stiehm
William H. Stillwell
Ralph E. Strauch
Robert W. Street
Frederick A. Strommer
Robert E. Stubbs
William T. Stutzer
Norman F. Swanson
Douglas M. Swift, Jr.
Thomas M. Tait
Lenny J. Tasson
William S. Taylor III
Joseph M. Tamony
John W. Temple
Philip A. Tenkhoff
Gordon F. Theisz, Jr.
Larry A. Thelen
Harry A. Thomalla
James A. Thompson
Gerald J. Throop
John W. Tibbetts
Allan P. Tilton
Samuel J. Tindall, Jr.
Wallace E. Tobin III
Victor J. Tremblay
Charles G. Trimbach
Thomas N. Troidle
Richard G. Trollope
Thomas L. Trinley
Richard H. Truly
Arthur F. Tubridy, Jr.
Henry C. Tucker III
Raymond R. Tuleya
Robert W. Tull
Tom D. Turner
Peter F. Ulrich
Peter B. Ulrich
Joseph P. Valenti
Patrick C. Valenti
Charles H. Van De Mar
George W. Vandervoort
Melvin C. A. Ventura
Carl W. Von Dreele, Jr.
Anthonie M. Voogd
Lee W. Waddell, Jr.
Edward N. Wadsworth
Richard I. Wadsworth
Nicholas Wagner
Roger L. Waldman
James C. Waldrup
David R. Walker
George M. Walker, Jr.
Lee H. Walker
Ralph C. Walker
Ronald S. Walker
Michael W. Wallace
Harold D. Walls II
Arthur K. Walters, Jr.
Richard T. Wamser
John P. Ward
Richard F. Ward
Samuel R. Ward
Thomas C. Waterman
Kenneth D. Watjen
Robert E. Watson
Roger K. Weber
Thomas E. Weigel
John P. Weikert
Robert Weil
Thomas A. Welch
Christopher J. Welles
John deN. Wermecke
Albert L. Wertheimer
Carl R. West
Terence H. West
Robert M. Weston, Jr.
Edward J. Weyhing
William J. Whalen
Luke M. White
Wallace I. White, Jr.
Darnell M. Whitt II
Robert A. Wieczorek
Charles C. Wiggin
Warren C. Wildes
James D. Williams
James M. Williams
John H. Williams, Jr.
Wayne N. Williams
Mark H. Williamson
Paul W. Willihnganz
Frank R. Wilson
Paul L. Wilson
Jerrold C. Winter
David R. Witke
Arthur J. Witsmeer
Allan E. Witt
John R. Witt
Don C. Wolfe
William J. Woolley
Kenneth C. Worley, Jr.
James D. Worrall
Samuel M. Yancey, Jr.
John M. Yarborough, Jr.
Donald S. Yeaple
Max N. Yoder
Milton W. York
Peter T. Young
Willard I. Zangwill
Warren L. Zanzot
Donald R. Zatyko
Charles T. Zink

The following-named (Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps) to be ensign in Supply Corps of the Navy, subject to qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Ronald C. Allan
Ronald C. Arndt
Maurice G. Beto
Robert F. Blakely
Bernard D. Bogdon
Carl M. Cady
Scott G. Chrysler
Walter D. Coenen
Samuel R. Cummings III
James W. Drinnon, Jr.
Forrest R. England
Thomas L. Foster
Alexander F. Fournier III
Roger H. Frommelt
John O. Grettenberger
Gerry E. Hendershot
Vernon M. Hay
William L. Heubaum
William A. Hockenberger
Kenneth A. Jacoppi
Roy B. Johnson
Thomas R. Kenney
Eugene Koczur
John C. Krummel
Harvey T. McCumber
Earl K. Mandeville
Ronald L. Mann
Carl D. Martenson
Karl G. Norby
Jerry E. Payne
Harold P. Ray
Ted Rogers
Charles J. Schwartz
Robert L. Sharp
Gordon W. Sheill
Wayne B. Smithson
Thomas A. Stewart
Richard A. Sutterfield
Stanley P. Thompson
Thomas E. Thorpe
Conrad L. Villella
Samuel J. Walker

Robert E. Timby, Reserve officer to be a lieutenant in the Dental Corps of the Navy, subject to qualifications therefor as provided by law.

The following-named (civilian college graduates) to be permanent lieutenants (junior grade) and temporary lieutenants in the Dental Corps of the Navy, subject to qualifications therefor as provided by law:

James T. Clynes
Henry A. Stallworth

The following-named (Reserve officers) to be permanent lieutenants (junior grade) and temporary lieutenants in the Dental Corps of the Navy, subject to qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Meredith S. Burch
John M. Driscoll
Glenn E. Hamme
Edwin E. McDonald
Robert E. Moore
Jerome A. Smith
Charles G. Strange, Jr.
William E. Sugg, Jr.
Ernest T. Witte

The following-named officers to be lieutenants (junior grade) in the Dental Corps of the Navy and be promoted to the grade of lieutenant when their line-running mates are so promoted, subject to qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Robert D. Bennett
Henry C. Bright, Jr.
William B. Butler
Raymond L. Cavness
Vincent J. Cozza
Reuben A. Crowe, Jr.
Willis K. Harrison
Paul P. Hatrel
Norman L. Holloway
Alden W. Landel, Jr.
Antime J. Landry II
Ronald P. Morse
Gerald F. Preiner
Bertice Q. Scruggs, Jr.
Robert J. Stepnick
Gerald J. Tussing

Roger Boles (civilian college graduate) to be a lieutenant in the Medical Corps of the Navy, subject to qualifications therefor as provided by law.

The following-named (civilian college graduates) to be permanent lieutenants (junior grade) and temporary lieutenants in the Medical Corps of the Navy, subject to qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Normand P. Larocque
Richard H. Norton

The following-named (Reserve officers) to be lieutenants in the Medical Corps of the Navy, subject to qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Arthur E. Baggett, Jr.
James M. Brakefield
Wayne O. Buck
William E. Cusack, Jr.
Toshiyuki P. Kawaguschi
William A. Lista
Donald E. Potts
John D. Turco
Almon C. Wilson

The following-named (Reserve officers) to be permanent lieutenants (junior grade) and temporary lieutenants in the Medical Corps of the Navy, subject to qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Robert B. Andrew
Claude C. Atkins
Matthew K. Becker
Richard D. Brobyn
James E. Colburn
John R. Day, Jr.
James V. Flack, Jr.
Dennis B. Freilich
Harold H. Hedges III
Samuel J. Hightower
Helmer W. S. Huseby
George A. Jack
Dale R. Kollman
Rodney D. Moyer
Alvin L. Nickel
Bernard E. O'Brien
Larry K. Page
Ralph R. Palumbo
Nelson H. Parker III
Arthur J. Pearl
Lloyd F. Redick
Derle R. Riordan
Gerald P. Sierchio
Ronald W. Smith
Giuseppe Turchi
Richard L. Vaught
Ira J. Woodstein

The following-named U.S. Navy retired officers to be lieutenants in the line of the Navy, pursuant to title 10, United States Code, section 1211:

Charles L. Gibson
Keatinge Keays

Warren L. Price, U.S. Navy retired officer, to be a permanent chief warrant officer W–4, and a temporary lieutenant commander in the Navy, pursuant to title 10, United States Code, section 1211.

The following-named officers to be lieutenants in the Chaplain Corps of the Navy for temporary service in lieu of lieutenant (junior grade) as previously nominated and confirmed to correct grade:

Elbert N. Carpenter
Carroll R. Chambliss
William "J" Clifford
Leonard W. Dodson, Jr.
Donald F. Doxie
Hubert S. Goss, Jr.
Dennis C. Kinlaw
William C. League
Fred R. McAlister, Jr.
John G. Newton
David P. W. Plank
William R. Swenson
Maurice R. Vaningham, Jr.
Everett P. Wuebbens

Delbert R. Otto, U.S. Navy retired officer, to be a lieutenant commander in the line of the Navy for temporary service, pursuant to title 10, United States Code, section 1211.

The following-named officers to be lieutenants (junior grade) in the Medical Corps of the Navy, and to be promoted to the grade of lieutenant when their line-running mates are so promoted, subject to qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Richard E. Akers
Richard W. Akin
Ronald W. Alexander
Laurence I. Alpert
Richard A. Ames
Gaspar W. Anastasi
William C. Anderson
Robert B. Armstrong
Carter S. Bagley
Sidney B. Bellinger, Jr.
Philip E. Bently
Robert W. Berman
James J. Bernard
Joseph A. Besecker
Ivar W. Birkeland, Jr.
Paul L. Black
Donald R. Blocker
Donald V. Blower
Richard L. Brennan
John R. Briggs
Joseph T. Broderick
Charles L. Broadhead, Jr.
James W. Brough
John A. Brown
Lawrence L. Brown, Jr.
Bernard L. Bundy
Mike C. Campbell, Jr.
Robert C. Cefalo
Marvin J. Chapman

John K. Chesnut
Oran W. Chenault, Jr.
Robert E. Chmielewski
Armand J. Choquette, Jr.
William F. Cirmo
James D. Coleman
Richard L. Colson
Louis Copman
Paul J. Corcoran
Milam S. Cotten
Clement H. Darby, Jr.
David B. Davis II
Reginald M. Davis
Robert L. Daywitt
Robert B. M. DeLisser
Larry G. Dickson
Roger R. Dionne
John C. Dodgen
Rosario G. Dolce
Terry F. Dynes
Ronald G. Ebel
William R. Eddington
Harold A. Engelke, Jr.
Allan Erde
Thomas M. Evans
Kenneth J. Faust
Martin G. Field, Jr.
James V. Gainer, Jr.
Robert P. Gannon
John R. Gaskill
John H. Giles
William F. J. Gordon
Thomas W. Graves
Barry M. Green
Howard H. Green
Robert L. Green
Charles N. Griffin, Jr.
Gerald C. Griffin
Donald H. Gustafson
Eugene J. Haag
Jack W. Hall
Marvin K. Hall, Jr.
Franklin A. Hanauer
Hugh H. Harkins
Howard C. Harrison
Charles E. Hartford
Donald O. Hayen
Alan L. Heck
Robert P. Heldt
John A. Henderson III
Clifford M. Herman
Donald E. Hines
Thomas K. Hines
Robert W. Hood
Stephen E. Howery
Edward W. Hughes, Jr.
Darrell H. Hunsaker
Francis G. Hurite
James D. Imbrie
David R. James
Richard F. Johnson
Morton C. Jorgensen, Jr.
Thomas H. Joyce III
Henry A. Kallet
George W. Kaplan
Thomas J. Kardish
Harold V. Kelly
Joseph A. Kelly
Richard B. Kent
Robert S. Kepner
Kelvin F. Kesler
Thomas L. Ketchum
Donald L. Kettering
Robert J. Kinney
Waite S. Kirkconnell
Allan U. Klatsky
John E. Knowles
Ronald N. Kornblum
Harry F. Lenartz
Lonnie F. Leonard
Bruce H. Lloyd
James D. Long
William F. Lynch, Jr.
Richard J. Magenheimer
James M. Marlowe
James M. McEntyre
Philip R. McFadden
Robert L. McFarlin
Patrick M. McGuigan, Jr.
Paul E. McLean
John E. McMahon, Jr.
Robert H. Meaders
Robert K. Middlekauff
Morgan J. Moore
Arthur S. Morris, Jr.
Thomas E. Morris
John F. Mosher, Jr.
Julius H. Mueller
Donald E. Mulhatten
Wayne L. Murray
George R. Mushet
Bernard C. Musselman
Paul K. Nase
Rodger K. Nelson
Thomas M. Nichols
Bernard A. Nigro
Richard F. Noble
John P. Noury
Mose C. O'Bannon, Jr.
John B. O'Toole III
Norman G. Pare
Kenneth K. Pavlik
Albert C. Price
Jules B. Puschett
Nicholas R. Raffaelly
Paul H. Randels
Larry G. Ray
Sanford Reitman
John D. Riley
James A. Rogers
Jerry R. Rogers
John S. Romine
Ted J. Roper
James A. Routledge
Wilson B. Rumble
Ralph G. Sablan
Frederic A. Schulaner
Raymond L. Schweinefus
Charles I. Scott, Jr.
Joseph R. Shackelford III
Lee C. Sheppard, Jr.
Howard E. Shute
William W. Simmons
Edward P. Sirois
Raymond A. Sleszynski
Buren S. Smith
James W. Smith
Alexandre Solomon
William P. Stallworth
Charles S. Stone, Jr.
Robert M. Sullivan
Louis B. Swisher, Jr.
Waller C. Tabb
Terrell B. Tanner
Joseph C. Tatum
Thomas E. Taylor
David F. Thomas
Joseph J. Thomas, Jr.
John W. Thompson
James L. Thornton
John D. Tolmie
Stephen L. Tope, Jr.
Parker A. Towle
Mervin L. Trail
Grayden A. Tubb
Paul E. Tyler
James A. Usselman
Don B. Vollman, Jr.
Loren N. Vorlicky
Donald H. Wahl
Archie D. Walden
Donald R. Walk
John R. Warmolts
William F. Warrender
James E. Warrington
William S. Weil
Steven M. White
James T. Wilson
Frederick J. Witt
John M. Yarborough, Jr.
James A. Zimble

The following-named officer of the Navy for temporary promotion to the grade of lieutenant commander in the Nurse Corps, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

McGinniss, Sarah C.

The following-named officers of the Navy for temporary promotion to the grade of lieutenant in the line and staff corps indicated, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

LINE

Swenson, Nils A.
Willis, James L., Jr.

SUPPLY CORPS

Speer, John W.
Wilson, Donald E.

MEDICAL SERVICE CORPS

Miller, Earl F., II
Mozell, Maxwell M.

The following-named (Naval Reserve Officers Training Corps) for permanent appointment to the rank of second lieutenant in the Marine Corps, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Joe C. Adams, Jr.
John S. Allen, Jr.
John M. Amsler
Russell T. Antonille
Kenneth J. Babbs
Charles H. Bagwell
Jack F. Bartunek
Daniel M. Bergbauer
Alphonse A. Bernotas
Charles T. Bienvenu, Jr.
Wayne J. Bienvenu
Joseph D. Bizzano, Jr.
Samuel E. Black
Philip H. Bock
Edward H. Boyce, Jr.
James H. Brown
Charles W. Burns
Robert N. Burt
Charles A. Bush
John A. Calteaux
Frank L. Capin
Robert A. Carnes
Donald R. Carr
James R. Carrara
Herman G. Carroll, Jr.
Robert S. Carter
Richard G. Cashwell
Lawrence M. Cassidy
Oakley W. Cheney, Jr.
Donald L. Clarence
Arthur L. Clark
David C. Coleman
Richard S. Cooper
Ronald F. Coplan
Keith A. Costa
John D. Crain
Gordon J. Cupples
Philbrook S. Cushing
Louis J. Damore
Ray A. Daniel
Arthur F. Dauer
David N. Davis
Leonard N. Davis
Frank E. Deal
Anthony B. Dean
Jackie P. Dedman
Clarence W. Dennis
Clifton L. Deornellas
Louis Dickie
Thomas A. Dincher
Walter K. Dods
William J. Donovan, Jr.
John W. Dougherty
Nath C. Doughtie
William G. Dove, Jr.
Richard D. Dowling
James A. Ducote, Jr.
Charles R. Dunlap
William H. Edward
Keith E. Elliott
Jerome R. Epstein
James V. Fare, Jr.
Ross W. Farrar
James A. Farrier
Joe E. Faulkner
James R. Fenwick
Max C. Fischer
Walter M. Fitts
Charles A. Fleming
David A. Floyd
Jon I. Fox
Gary R. Froid
Robert A. Furtado
Wallace C. Gibson
Jan R. Gilbert
Bernard M. Gillespie
Vincent K. Gilmore
Carl L. Gipson
Allan D. Gochman
Herbert A. Grant, Jr.
Marshall M. Green
Robert C. Gregor
George R. Griggs
Robert O. Halbert
Ray L. Hanle, Jr.
Dean R. Harrer
Gary D. Harter
Ronald H. Hawkins
Stanley J. Heginbotham
David H. Henderson
Billy E. Henry
Jimmy L. Hicks
Robert A. Hokom
Thomas P. Huber
Norman W. Huddy, Jr.
Donald R. Hudson
John E. Hunnicutt
Kenneth M. Iversen
Hulen F. Jenkins
Raymond S. Jenkins, Jr.
James W. Jennings
Charles M. Johnson
Richard K. Joiner
Clyde J. Johnston
Donald E. Keesey
David L. Kemper
Donald G. Kempf, Jr.
Clyde W. Kitto
James F. Knestis
Alfred K. Koester
Victor A. Koury
Alfred L. Kruger
Patrick T. Kurtz
Bobby D. Lain
Michael W. Laing
Louis W. Lamar
William J. Lannes III
William C. Larowe
Dallas D. Laumbach
Thomas A. Lee, Jr.
Ralph E. Lemay, Jr.
Kenneth G. Lemmel
James H. Lewandowski
Lawrence S. Lewin
John W. Lewis
Frederick A. Libkie
Harry A. Ling II
Robert C. Liittschwager
Jules H. Long, Jr.
Francis A. Losik
Robert F. Luther
Perry D. Lyons, Jr.
Douglas J. MacEachin
William G. MacKenzie
David A. Maney
David G. Marr
John M. McCarthy
David K. McColl
John C. McDonald
Robert L. McLaurin, Jr.
Donald R. McLelland
Jack D. McNamara
James C. McRoberts
Ben A. Meharg
Robert A. Metry
Melvin M. Meyer
Philip C. Mikkelson
Dan G. Miller
Kenneth P. Miskow
Jerry W. Monroe
William S. Moore, Jr.
John B. Moran
Maynard R. Morris
Robert S. Morris
John T. Murphy
William A. Nash
Gary R. Nevins
Gary D. Norton
Kenneth W. Noteboom
Wallace E. Opdycke
George A. Osterman
Christopher Peet
Richard K. Perrin
Leo H. Phelan
Rayford L. Pittman
James M. Proctor III
Edwin B. Rector
Gerald D. Reed
Stewart C. Reiman
Tommy J. Richards
Jan D. Rietman
Lawrence A. Rolstad
Herbert C. Rule III
William H. Sedutto
Robert E. Searle
Mack D. Selby
David V. Shuter
James R. Skellenger
John W. Sledge, Jr.
Kirk W. Smith
Lynn A. Smith
Stanley R. Smith
Richard G. Sousa
Weston M. Stacey
George R. Stanford
James E. Stanton
John R. Stockwell
Glen S. St. Pierre
Ronald K. Swingen
Thomas M. Taggart
Zelma L. Taylor
William S. Thompson III
James H. Todd
James T. Topham
John B. Torinus, Jr.
Thomas B. Towers
Jan C. Tupper
Robert A. Turner
James M. Updyke
George H. Uzzelle III
Fredric M. Vann
Ralph J. Vecchio
Robert F. Walker
Michael J. Ward
Sanford D. Ward
Kenneth E. Warman, Jr.
David D. Warren
Edward M. Weber
Richard A. Wetzel
James E. Whelan
Martin R. P. Wilke
Wayne S. Williams
John R. Williams, Jr.
Winfield S. Wilmore II
John A. Windolf
Richard D. Winter
Charles J. Wolk
Richard M. Woods
David A. Wollard
Richard J. Wolpert
Mack E. Wood, Jr.
Lanford H. Woodward
Wilton Wright
Richard L. Yarmy

The following-named (Army Reserve Officers Training Corps) for permanent appointment to the rank of second lieutenant in the Marine Corps, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Gene C. Johnson

The following-named (former officer) for permanent appointment to the rank of captain in the Marine Corps, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

* Ramon S. Villareal

The following-named officer for permanent appointment to the rank of second lieutenant in the Marine Corps, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Ronald M. Losee

The following-named officer (from the temporary disability retired list) for permanent appointment to the rank of first lieutenant in the Marine Corps, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

*Charles H. White

The following-named officer (from the temporary disability retired list) for temporary appointment to the rank of captain in the Marine Corps, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

*Charles H. White

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps for permanent appointment to the rank of first lieutenant, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Ira C. Anderson
Loyal D. Combs
Harris J. Fennell
Edward R. Fullerton
Juan S. Griego
Morris W. Lutes
Dorsie D. Page, Jr.
Michael P. Sullivan
Jac D. Watson

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps for temporary appointment to the rank of first lieutenant, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Donald E. Andersen	Kaye M. Kynion
Curtis G. Arnold	David B. Peterson
James W. Ayers	Herman J. Rivella
Rodney I. Bown	Phillip E. Shaw
Walter N. Collison, Jr.	Frederick E. Sisley
Ernest T. Cook, Jr.	William J. Tebow
Harlan C. Cooper, Jr.	Russell B. Tiffany
Joseph D. Copeland	Charles "J" Weir
William G. Davis	James D. Wray

*Indicates ad interim appointment.

The following named (U.S. Military Academy graduates) for permanent appointment to the rank of second lieutenant in the Marine Corps, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Donald S. Baker	Jon A. Rindfleisch
Larned V. Bearce	Gary Simmons
John S. Grinalds	Otis P. Tibbetts

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate March 9, 1959:

INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION ADMINISTRATION

James W. Riddleberger, of Virginia, to be Director of the International Cooperation Administration, in the Department of State.

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

The following-named Foreign Service officers for promotion from class 1 to the class of career minister:

Lampton Berry, of Mississippi.
Foy D. Kohler, of Ohio.
Philip D. Sprouse, of Tennessee.
Clifton R. Wharton, of California.

The following-named persons, now Foreign Service officers of class 2 and secretaries in the diplomatic service, to be also consuls general of the United States of America:

John D. Tomlinson, of Illinois.
J. Raymond Vlitalo, of Minnesota.

The following-named Foreign Service officers for promotion from class 2 to class 1:

Loren Carroll, of Illinois.
John B. Holt, of Maine.
C. Montagu Pigott, of California.
George F. Wilson, of California.
Thomas K. Wright, of Florida.

The following-named Foreign Service officers for promotion from class 2 to class 1 and to be also consuls general of the United States of America:

Orville C. Anderson, of California.
Willis C. Armstrong, of Maine.
N. Spencer Barnes, of California.
Robert G. Barnes, of Pennsylvania.
Ben H. Brown, Jr., of South Carolina.
Norman Burns, of Ohio.
Sterling J. Cottrell, of Rhode Island.
Thomas S. Estes, of Maine.
Mose L. Harvey, of Maryland.
Sidney B. Jacques, of New York.
Edward A. Jamison, of Illinois.
Coburn B. Kidd, of Oklahoma.
Edwin M. J. Kretzmann, of the District of Columbia.
Raymond E. Lisle, of New York.
Robinson McIlvaine, of Pennsylvania.
Edwin G. Moline, of Maryland.
Jeremiah J. O'Connor, of the District of Columbia.
Robert J. Ryan, of Massachusetts.
Charles C. Stelle, of Maryland.
Philip H. Trezise, of Michigan.
H. Bartlett Wells, of New Jersey.
Lincoln White, of Maryland.

The following-named Foreign Service officers for promotion from class 3 to class 2:

John W. Auchincloss, of the District of Columbia.
Louis F. Blanchard, of California.
John A. Bovey, Jr., of Minnesota.
Mrs. Katherine W. Bracken, of Florida.
D. Chadwick Braggiotti, of Connecticut.
Howard E. Chaillé, of Virginia.
G. Edward Clark, of New York.
Wesley Harris Collins, of Mississippi.
James N. Cortada, of Florida.
Edwin M. Cronk, of Virginia.
Perry H. Culley, of California.
D. Eugene Delgado-Arias, of Virginia.
John E. Devine, of Illinois.
Juan de Zengotita, of Pennsylvania.
Dwight Dickinson, of New Jersey.
Joseph F. Donelan, Jr., of New York.
Donald P. Downs, of Nevada.
Louis Mason Drury, of Texas.
Philip F. Dur, of Massachusetts.
Nicholas Feld, of Mississippi.
E. Allen Fidel, of Wyoming.
John W. Ford, of Virginia.
William N. Fraleigh, of New Jersey.
Edward R. Fried, of Maryland.
Francis J. Galbraith, of South Dakota.
Raymond L. Harrell, of Connecticut.
John W. Henderson, of Iowa.
Russell B. Jordan, of Wyoming.
Joseph J. Jova, of New York.
M. Hollis Kannenberg, of Minnesota.
Henry L. T. Koren, of New Jersey.
Sylvain R. Loupe, of Louisiana.
Philip A. Mangano, of Maryland.
Robert M. Marr, of Ohio.
Roswell D. McClelland, of Connecticut.
Thomas W. McElhiney, of Maryland.
Kyle B. Mitchell, Jr., of Alabama.
Thomas G. Murdock, of North Carolina.
Trevanion H. E. Nesbitt, of Maryland.
David D. Newsom, of California.
Carl F. Norden, of New York.
Clinton L. Olson, of California.
James L. O'Sullivan, of Connecticut.
George M. Pollard, of Florida.
Leon B. Poullada, of California.
Herbert D. Spivack, of New York.
Nicholas G. Thacher, of New York.
Harold N. Waddell, of Georgia.
Miss Rebecca G. Wellington, of the District of Columbia.
Edward C. Wilson, of Florida.
Miss Marion W. Worthing, of Maryland.

Irvin S. Lippe, of Michigan, for appointment as a Foreign Service officer of class 3, a consul, and a secretary in the diplomatic service of the United States of America.

The following-named Foreign Service officers for promotion from class 4 to class 3:

Edwin M. Adams, of Illinois.
Oscar V. Armstrong, of North Carolina.
Powhatan M. Baber, of West Virginia.
Herbert W. Baker, of Montana.
Josiah W. Bennett, of Maryland.
Arthur P. Biggs, of California.
Warren P. Blumberg, of New York.
Philip S. Bogart, of New York.
David Eugene Boster, of Ohio.
Robert C. Brewster, of Nebraska.
Paul R. S. Brumby, of Missouri.
William H. Bruns, of the District of Columbia.
William B. Buffum, of New York.
Edward West Burgess, of Wisconsin.
Waldemar B. Campbell, of Washington.
Delmar R. Carlson, of Colorado.
William T. Carpenter, Jr., of Alabama.
Raymond Cary, Jr., of Missouri.
Frank E. Cash, Jr., of Florida.
Wilbur P. Chase, of Ohio.
James S. Cunningham, Jr., of California.
Donald M. Davies, of Montana.
Richard T. Davies, of Maryland.
Robert C. Davis, of Florida.
Frank J. Devine, of New York.
Enoch S. Duncan, of Texas.
Thomas J. Dunnigan, of Ohio.
James B. Engle, of Iowa.
Asa L. Evans, of Florida.
Richard T. Ewing, of Maryland.
Mrs. Florence H. Finne, of California.
John W. Fisher, of Washington.
Miss Selma G. Freedman, of the District of Columbia.
Robert C. F. Gordon, of California.
Robert H. Harlan, of Illinois.
Grant G. Hilliker, of Virginia.
Peter Hooper, Jr., of Massachusetts.
Ernest J. Hortum, of Virginia.
John J. Janke, of Ohio.
Alexander C. Johnpoll, of New Mexico.
Richard G. Johnson, of New Jersey.
William M. Johnson, Jr., of Florida.
Dallas L. Jones, Jr., of Louisiana.
Ralph A. Jones, of Pennsylvania.
John M. Kavanaugh, of Louisiana.
Stephen A. Koczak, of New Jersey.
William C. Lakeland, of New York.
Terrance G. Leonhardy, of North Dakota.
Edward T. Long, of Illinois.
Matthew J. Looram, Jr., of New York.
Paul D. McCusker, of Colorado.
Ralph J. McGuire, of the District of Columbia.
John Y. Millar, of New York.
Harry J. Milton, of Pennsylvania.
John H. Morris, of Arizona.
Thomas H. Murfin, of Washington.
Bernard Norwood, of New Jersey.
Albert V. Nyren, of Virginia.
Patrick O'Sheel, of West Virginia.
G. Etzel Pearcy, of California.
Rupert Prohme, of California.
Herbert F. Propps, of Wisconsin.
Albert A. Rabida, of Colorado.
Ernest E. Ramsaur, Jr., of California.
Thomas M. Recknagel, of New York.
Herbert Reiner, Jr., of the District of Columbia.
Ralph J. Ribble, of Texas.
Neil M. Ruge, of Virginia.
Joseph S. Sagona, of Maryland.
Peter J. Skoufis, of Maine.
Sidney Sober, of New York.
Charles G. Sommer, of Ohio.
Curtis C. Strong, of Oregon.
Frank D. Taylor, of Maryland.
George S. Vest, of Virginia.
John Patrick Walsh, of Illinois.
Temple Wanamaker, of Washington.
Hugh N. Whitaker, of Louisiana.
George D. Whittinghill, of New York.
Hugh W. Wolff, of Maryland.
Park F. Wollam, of California.
Donald L. Woolf, of California.
Sam L. Yates, Jr., of California.

Norman L. Smith, of Illinois, for appointment as a Foreign Service officer of class 4, a consul, and a secretary in the diplomatic service of the United States of America.

The following-named Foreign Service officers for promotion from class 5 to class 4:

Forest E. Abbuhl, of Ohio.
Thomas W. Ainsworth, of New Hampshire.
Miss Norah H. Alsterlund, of Illinois.
Robert Anderson, of Massachusets.
Nicholas G. Andrews, of New Jersey.
Howard J. Ashford, Jr., of Colorado.
John G. Bacon, of Washington.
Michael P. Balla, of Pennsylvania.
Robert J. Barnard, of Wisconsin.
Robert M. Beaudry, of Maine.
S. Cole Blaiser, of Michigan.
William P. Boswell, of New Jersey.
William G. Bowdler, of Virginia.
James W. Boyd, of North Carolina.
Edward T. Brennan, of Massachusetts.
William D. Broderick, of Michigan.
North C. Burn, of Washington.
William D. Calderhead, of Texas.
Thomas A. Cassilly, of Maryland.
Frederic L. Chapin, of New Jersey.
Miss Marjorie L. Cheatham, of Washington.
Edward R. Cheney, of New Hampshire.
Albert C. Cizauskas, of New York.
Miss Marian C. Conroy, of Pennsylvania.
Carleton S. Coon, Jr., of Massachusetts.
Mr. Lee Cotterman, of Ohio.
Franklin J. Crawford, of Ohio.
William R. Crawford, Jr., of Pennsylvania.
William E. Culbert, of Connecticut.
John E. Cunningham, of the District of Columbia.
Edmund A. da Silveira, of Virginia.
Robert D. Davis, of Oklahoma.
Robert W. Day, of Maryland.
Philbert Deyman, of Minnesota.

John R. Diggins, Jr., of Maine.
Miss Ollie G. Edmundson, of Missouri.
Athol H. Ellis, of Maryland.
Neis E. Ericksor., of Virginia.
Miss Sara G. Falkener, of North Carolina.
Charles B. Ferguson, of Indiana.
Joseph Ferdandez, of Pennsylvania.
James J. Ferretti, of Connecticut.
Emmett B. Ford, Jr., of North Carolina.
Weikko A. Forsten, of Washington.
Rockwood H. Foster, of the District of Columbia.
Theodore R. Frye, of Ohio.
Robert J. Gibbons, of Ohio.
William G. Gibson, of California.
Charles C. Gidney, Jr., of Texas.
William H. Gleysteen, Jr., of Pennsylvania.
Gerald Goldstein, of New York.
Raymond E. González, of California.
John L. Hagan, of Nevada.
William C. Hamilton, of Connecticut.
John H. Hermanson, of Massachusetts.
Harrison M. Holland, of Washington.
Wharton Drexel Hubbard, of New York.
Robert C. Huffman, of Washington.
Leaman R. Hunt, of Oklahoma.
Miss Margaret Hussman, of Idaho.
Borrie I. Hyman, of California.
Edward C. Ingraham, Jr., of New York.
Heyward Isham, of New York.
Charles K. Johnson, of California.
Miss Marie A. Johnson, of Minnesota.
Richard E. Johnson, of Illinois.
William C. Jones III, of Texas.
Abraham Katz, of New York.
Gordon D. King, of Texas.
Nicholas S. Lakas, of Connecticut.
Donald E. Larimore, of Illinois.
Raymond W. Laugel, of Ohio.
William W. Lehfeldt, of California.
Arthur C. Lillig, of Oregon.
Kenneth W. Linde, of Connecticut.
Mrs. Ruth A. Lovell, of California.
Hobart N. Luppi, of Connecticut.
Francis N. Magliozzi, of Massachusetts.
Edward E. Masters, of Ohio.
H. Freeman Matthews, Jr., of Virginia.
Walter M. McClelland, of Oklahoma.
Allan F. McLean, Jr., of Texas.
Francis J. Meehan, of Maryland.
Miss Anne W. Meriam, of Massachusetts.
Earl R. Michalka, of Michigan.
James D. Moffett, of Minnesota.
John A. Moran III, of New Jersey.
James F. Moriarty, of Massachusetts.
Clifford R. Nelson, of California.
Harvey F. Nelson, Jr., of California.
Howard F. Newsom, of the District of Columbia.
Harry I. Odell, of New York.
Glen S. Olsen, of Utah.
Mathias J. Ortwein, of Pennsylvania.
Miss Wilma C. Patterson, of Indiana.
J. H. Cameron Peake, of Connecticut.
Richard F. Pedersen, of California.
John M. Perry, of Massachusetts.
Hilding A. Peterson, of Minnesota.
Richard W. Petree, of Virginia.
Laurence G. Pickering, of Nebraska.
Joseph H. Quintanilla, of Texas.
Mrs. Virginia C. Ralston, of Washington.
Ralph C. Rehberg, of South Carolina.
Lloyd M. Rives, of New Jersey.
Arthur H. Rosen, of Missouri.
H. Earle Russell, Jr., of Michigan.
Irvin C. Scarbeck, of California.
Stanley D. Schiff, of New Jersey.
Irving I. Schiffman, of New York.
David Scott, of Maryland.
Talcott W. Seelye, of Massachusetts.
William C. Sherman, of Illinois.
Robert K. Sherwood, of Nebraska.
Thomas P. Shoesmith, of Pennsylvania.
Schubert E. Smith, of New York.
J. Harlan Southerland, of the District of Columbia.
Moncrieff J. Spear, of New York.
Heywood H. Stackhouse, of Virginia.
Andrew Stalder, of New York.
Monteagle Stearns, of Virginia.
Robert A. Stein, of New Jersey.
Godfrey Harvey Summ, of Virginia.
Miss Margarite H. Tanck, of South Dakota.
Mrs. Kathleen Clifton Taylor, of Washington.
Malcolm Thompson, of Massachusetts.
Miss LaVerne L. Thomsen, of Washington.
Vladimir I. Toumanoff, of New Hampshire.
William N. Turpin, of Georgia.
August Velletri, of Maryland.
Harold C. Voorhees, of Connecticut.
Miss Mary L. Walker, of Georgia.
Robert Gill Walker, of Pennsylvania.
Aloysius J. Warnecki, of Pennsylvania.
Miss Alice D. Westbrook, of California.
Robert A. Wooldridge, of Indiana.
Jean E. Zimmermann, of Missouri.

Louis A. Gallo, of New York, for appointment as a Foreign Service officer of class 5, a consul, and a secretary in the diplomatic service of the United States of America.

The following-named Foreign Service officers for promotion from class 6 to class 5:
John R. Barteit, Jr., of Massachusetts.
Henry E. Dumas, of California.
John D. Gough, of California.
Theodore J. C. Heavner, of Ohio.
Paul J. Hoylen, of Maryland.
Benjamin L. Sowell, of Maryland.
Anthony E. Starcevic, of California.
Francis M. Withey, of Michigan.

The following-named Foreign Service officers for promotion from class 6 to class 5: and to be also consuls of the United States of America:
Robert J. Allen, Jr., of the District of Columbia.
William G. Allen, of Vermont.
James F. Amory, of Virginia.
John W. Anderson, of Texas.
Miss Marion E. Anderson, of Connecticut.
Melvin J. Anthony, of Illinois.
Miss Alma M. Armstrong, of the District of Columbia.
Leroy C. Aycock, of Texas.
Miss Helen M. Bailey, of Virginia.
Robert M. Balthaser, of Pennsylvania.
Joseph P. Bandoni, of California.
John Daniel Barfield, of Tennessee.
Miss Edna H. Barr, of Ohio.
Jack Beni, of West Virginia.
Miss Helen Biggane, of California.
Carl A. Bischoff, Jr., of Missouri.
William W. Blackerby, of Texas.
Hyman Bloom, of the District of Columbia.
Richard W. Boehm, of New York.
Miss Eleanor R. Borrowdale, of California.
Rober C. Berwin, of Arizona.
Miss Dorothy V. Broussard, of Texas.
Edward H. Brown, of Pennsylvania.
Miss Eleanor A. Burnett, of Florida.
Max R. Caldwell, of Texas.
Mario Calvani, of Massachusetts.
Robert V. Carey, of Colorado.
Robert J. Carle, of California.
William L. Carr, of Massachusetts.
James L. Carson, of Oregon.
Harvey J. Cash, of Arizona.
Miss Marie C. Chabot, of Rhode Island.
Miss Ann Child, of California
Harold T. Christie, of New York.
Miss Kathryn O. Clark, of the District of Columbia.
Walter F. X. Collopy, of Connecticut.
Philip R. Cook, Jr., of Virginia.
Jeffery R. D. Crockett, of the District of Columbia.
John J. Crowley, Jr., of West Virginia.
John R. Davis, Jr., of California.
John G. Dean, of New York.
Thomas A. DeHart, of California.
Stephen A. Dohbrenchuk, of Massachusetts.
A. Hugh Douglas, Jr., of Rhode Island.
William J. Drew, of Massachusetts.
John T. Dreyfuss, of California.
John Dubois, of Massachusetts.
Donald B. Easum, of Wisconsin.
Edward L. Eberhardt, of Virginia.
Hunter L. Estep, of New Mexico.
Miss Marybel Eversole, of Illinois.
Stockwell Everts, of New York.
George Falk, of Maryland.
Miss Jean L. Farr, of Massachusetts.
James D. Farrell, of Kansas.
John E. Feissner, Jr., of the District of Columbia.
Arthur W. Feldman, of Washington.
Robert E. Ferris, of California.
Thomas W. Fina, of Florida.
Arva C. Floyd, Jr., of Georgia.
Robert T. Follestad, of California.
Richard T. Foose, of West Virginia.
Carl E. Forkel, Jr., of Texas.
Charles M. Gage, of Illinois.
Stephen G. Gebelt, of California.
Miss Bernice A. Goldstein, of Pennsylvania.
Miss Alice M. Griffith, of Maryland.
Robert P. Gywnn, of the District of Columbia.
Holsey G. Handyside, of Ohio.
Alfred Harding IV, of New York.
Richard C. Harmstone, of the District of Columbia.
William A. Hayne, of California.
George A. Hays, of Pennsylvania.
John D. Hemenway, of Washington.
Roy R. Hermesman, of Pennsylvania.
Henry L. Heymann, of Pennsylvania.
Martin B. Hickman, of Utah.
Deion L. Hixon, of Alabama.
Edward J. Holway, Jr., of Ohio.
Herbert M. Hutchinson, of New Jersey.
Samuel M. Janney, Jr., of the District of Columbia.
Anthony J. Jay, of Illinois.
William R. Jochimsen, of California.
Robert S. Johnson, of Michigan.
Lewis D. Junior, of Missouri.
Ralph M. Kearney, of Illinois.
William Kelley, of Florida.
Thomas A. Kelly, of Pennsylvania.
Earl A. Kessler II, of Oregon.
Hugh D. Kessler, of Florida.
Lucien L. Kinsolving, of New York.
Richard N. Kirby, of Ohio.
Charles A. Kiselyak, of Washington.
Elmer G. Kryza, of Michigan.
Miss Inez E. Larson, of Minnesota.
Malcolm Lawrence, of Maryland.
Myron Brockway Lawrence, of Oregon.
Mrs. Elvira L. Lawyer, of the District of Columbia.
Owen B. Lee, of Massachusetts.
Charles A. Lemmo, of Pennsylvania.
Joe Lill, of Kansas.
Eric G. Lindahl, of Michigan.
Ralph E. Lindstrom, of Minnesota.
Joseph A. Livornese, of Colorado.
Richard G. Long, of Illinois.
Mrs. Ingeborg M. Lueders, of Virginia.
John C. Mallon, of Kentucky.
Louis B. Marr, of Pennsylvania.
Mrs. Elvira P. Martin, of Connecticut.
Kenneth W. Martindale, of Florida.
William G. Marvin, Jr., of California.
C. Thomas Mayfield, of Wisconsin.
Charles W. McCaskill, of Virginia.
Francis P. McCormick, of Massachusetts.
William H. McLean, of Kentucky.
Miss Ruth A. McLendon, of Texas.
Thomas N. Metcalf, Jr., of Massachusetts.
Miss Gertrude M. Meyers, of Minnesota.
Miss Clorence A. Miller, of Texas.
S. Paul Miller, Jr., of California.
Miss Marion K. Mitchell, of New York.
William D. Morgan, of New York.
Miss Martha J. Moses, of Texas.
Paul Moy, of Illinois.
Charles G. Mueller, of Montana.
Miss Helen J. Mullen, of New York.
John Patrick Mulligan, of California.
Richard W. Murphy, of Massachusetts.
Philip C. Narten, of Ohio.
Marshall Hays Noble, of New York.
Robert C. Ode, of Michigan.
Kiyonao Okami, of Maryland.
Herbert S. Okun, of New York.
Waldemar A. Olson, of Wisconsin.
J. Theodore Papendorp, of New Jersey.
Miss Marjorie L. Pea, of Indiana.
Grover W. Penberthy, of Oregon.
Raymond L. Perkins, Jr., of Colorado.

J. Stanley Phillips, of Tennessee.
Charles H. Pletcher, of Minnesota.
Howard W. Potter, Jr., of New York.
John M. Powell, of Illinois.
John Reed, of California.
W. Courtlandt Rhodes, of California.
Robert E. Rosselot, of Virginia.
James T. Rousseau, of Florida.
William F. Ryan, of New York.
William W. Sabbagh, of Maryland.
Muneo Sakaue, of California.
Charles B. Selak, Jr., of Pennsylvania.
Goodwin Shapiro, of Maryland.
Miss Lucy A. Shults, of New York.
Peter Simon, of New York.
Robert W. Skiff, of Florida.
Miss Alice M. Smith, of North Carolina.
Jack M. Smith, Jr., of Georgia.
Robert P. Smith, of Texas.
Miss Cecil Sporn, of New York.
Paul K. Stahnke, of Illinois.
Denman F. Stanfield, of California.
Edward O. Stellmacher, of Wisconsin.
Mrs. Edith A. Stensby, of Tennessee.
Birney A. Stokes, of New Jersey.
George H. Strunz, of Arizona.
Harold C. Swope, of Missouri.
Edward H. Thomas, of New Jersey.
James M. Turner, of Tennessee.
Marcel van Essen, of New York.
Daroslav S. Vlahovich, of New Jersey.
Frank J. Walters, of the District of Columbia.
Miss Dorothy H. Webb, of California.
Miss Jessie L. Webb, of Tennessee.
Ralph H. Wheeler, Jr., of Florida.
John T. Wheelock, of Illinois.
Ray E. White, Jr., of Virginia.
Richard W. White, of Maryland.
William Marshall Wright, of Arkansas.
Charles T. York, of New York.
Eric V. Youngquist, of Illinois.
Hubert L. Zwald, of Pennsylvania.

The following-named persons for appointment as Foreign Service officers of class 6, vice consuls of career, and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

Miss Nannette Choate, of the District of Columbia.
Michael M. Conlin, of California.
Miss Eleanor S. Foote, of Colorado.
Mrs. Aasta B. Haugen, of California.
Bernard F. Piatek, of Illinois.

The following-named Foreign Service officers for promotion from class 7 to class 6:

John A. Anderegg, of New Jersey.
Curtis B. Brooks, of Vermont.
Carleton C. Brower, of California.
Davis S. Chamberlain III, of New Jersey.
Richard D. Christiansen, of Michigan.
Edward M. Cohen, of New York.
John C. Dorrance, of California.
Robert A. England, of Connecticut.
Charles E. Exum III, of North Carolina.
Louis P. Goelz III, of Pennsylvania.
Robert Earl Gordon, of Oregon.
Myles L. Greene, of Florida.
Mrs. Winifred T. Hall, of New Jersey.
George Berman High, of Illinois.
Robert W. Huddleston, of New Jersey.
Harry W. Jacobs, of Alaska.
George F. Jones, of Texas.
Edward E. Keller, Jr., of California.
Thomas F. Killoran, of Massachusetts.
William E. Knepper, of Kansas.
Dennis H. Kux, of New York.
Joseph P. Leahy, of the District of Columbia.
Herbert Levin, of New York.
W. Wyatt Martin, Jr., of Tennessee.
Jack F. Matlock, Jr., of Vermont.
Robert W. Maule, of California.
Richard H. Morefield, of California.
John J. Mullin, of California.
James C. Nelson, of Illinois.
Robert K. Olson, of Minnesota.
William B. Pounds, Jr., of Florida.
Robert F. Rogers, of California.
James D. Rosenthal, of California.
Thomas J. Scotes, of Pennsylvania.
Thomas W. M. Smith, of Massachusetts.
Miss Nancy L. Snider, of California.
Richard L. Springer, of Ohio.
Franklyn E. Stevens, of California.
Edward J. Streator, Jr., of New York.
Francis Hugh Thomas, of Pennsylvania.
Samuel H. Weaver, of New York.

The following-named persons for appointment as Foreign Service officers of class 7, vice consuls of career, and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

Andrew Andranovich, of Connecticut.
Charles A. Cariddi, of California.
Shelby M. Currie, Jr., of Oregon.
Edward J. Dolezal, of Illinois.
Miss Kathryn M. Geoghegan, of Colorado.
Mrs. Marcia L. Martin, of California.
Mrs. Wilma E. Mayo, of Florida.
Henry R. Mills, of Kansas.
Miss Jane M. Potter, of Maryland.
Jerry M. Reynolds, of Missouri.
Paul Roman, of California.
Miss Thelma R. Thurtell, of California.
Sidney L. Woollons, of Ohio.

The following-named Foreign Service officers for promotion from class 8 to class 7:

Madison M. Adams, Jr., of Alabama.
Philip M. Allen, of Pennsylvania.
Robert G. Anders, of Wisconsin.
Dexter Anderson, of New Jersey.
George A. Anderson, of Iowa.
Harry M. Angelus, of Massachusetts.
Alfonso Arenales, of New York.
Diego C. Asencio, of New Jersey.
Bryan H. Baas, of Texas.
Arthur C. Bauman, of Michigan.
Maxwell K. Berry, of Kentucky.
Gordon R. Beyer, of Florida.
Robert O. Blucker, of Arkansas.
Michael P. Boerner, of Maryland.
Harold A. Bratt, Jr., of Massachusetts.
Peter S. Bridges, of Illinois.
James E. Briggs, of North Carolina.
William A. Brown, of Massachusetts.
John R. Burke, of Wisconsin.
Harry A. Cahill, of Virginia.
Miss Martha C. Carbone, of Washington.
Vincent J. Cherry, of New York.
J. Chapman Chester, of Wisconsin.
Raymond C. Collins, Jr., of New Jersey.
Peter D. Constable, of New York.
Thomas E. Cummings, of California.
Walter L. Cutler, of Maine.
Curtis C. Cutter, of California.
William P. Deary, of New York.
Francis De Tarr, of California.
Robert P. DeVecchi, of Pennsylvania.
William C. Dixon, of California.
Charles E. Duffy, of Iowa.
John M. DuPont, of Maine.
Lawrence S. Eagleburger, of Wisconsin.
Rudy V. Fimbres, of Arizona.
Bruce A. Flatin, of Minnesota.
Robert S. Gershenson, of Pennsylvania.
William L. Givens, of Tennessee.
Leopold Gotzlinger, of Ohio.
Benson Lee Grayson, of New York.
Thomas Gustafson, of Oklahoma.
John T. Haldane, of the District of Columbia.
Kent H. Hall, of California.
Charles H. Hallock, of Virginia.
Richard R. Hart, of Indiana.
Douglas G. Hartley, of the District of Columbia.
Maxwell S. Heigho, of California.
John J. Helble, of Illinois.
Miss Evelyn R. Hessler, of New York.
Thomas J. Hill, Jr., of Massachusetts.
Marvin J. Hoffenberg, of Maryland.
Harold E. Horan, of Texas.
Robert E. Jelley, of California.
William P. Keasbey, Jr., of California.
Lowell C. Kilday, of Wisconsin.
Barrington King, Jr., of South Carolina.
George L. Kinter, of Vermont.
John W. Kizler, of Texas.
David Korn, of Missouri.
George M. Lane, of Massachusetts.
Alan Logan, of California.
Shepard C. Lowman, of Texas.
Arthur L. Lowrie, of Pennsylvania.
William H. Luers, of Illinois.
Miss Barbara J. Marvin, of California.
Richard C. Matheron, of California.
Frank A. Mau, of Wyoming.
Sherrod B. McCall, of Illinois.
Miss Mary E. McDonnell, of Massachusetts.
Carl H. McMillan, Jr., of Maryland.
Francis J. McNeil III, of Florida.
Alan G. Mencher, of California.
Miss Mary L. Merges, of Pennsylvania.
William H. Mills, of Maryland.
Richard B. Moon, of Missouri.
Richard M. Moose, of Arkansas.
Donald R. Morris, of New York.
Miss Dorothy H. Myers, of Maryland.
Theodore C. Nelson, of Connecticut.
F. Pierce Olson, of Minnesota.
Russell E. Olson, of Illinois.
Theodore K. Osgood, of Massachusetts.
Ross C. Parr, of Florida.
Douglas R. Perry, of Maryland.
Robert J. Perry, of Ohio.
John G. Peters, of Maryland.
Gerald S. Pierce, of Oklahoma.
J. Keith Powell, of Texas.
Robert G. Rich, Jr., of Florida.
Stephen E. Schneider, of Illinois.
Richard C. Searing, of New Jersey.
Peter Sebastian, of New York.
Walter John Silva, of Massachusetts.
Kenneth N. Skoug, Jr., of Minnesota.
Donnell D. Smith, of Rhode Island.
R. Peter Spicer, of Ohio.
Michael Sterner, of New York.
Ulrich A. Straus, of Michigan.
Joseph O. Streicher, of Illinois.
John J. Sullivan, of Massachusetts.
Herbert D. Swett, of California.
Francis J. Tatu, of California.
Harry E. T. Thayer, of Pennsylvania.
Richard H. Thompson, of Indiana.
Donald B. Wallace, Jr., of Indiana.
Harry Weiner, of New York.
Miss Winifred S. Weislogel, of New Jersey.
Miss Virginia A. Weyres, of Wisconsin.
James W. White, of Florida.
Kenneth D. Whitehead, of Utah.
William M. Woessner, of New York.
Robert G. Wright, of Illinois.

The following-named Foreign Service staff officers to be consuls of the United States of America:

Raymond E. Benson, of New York.
Philip W. Carroll, of Maryland.
Earl Blake Cox, of Washington.
Robert W. Crawford, of Ohio.
Duncan B. M. Emrich, of Nevada.
Arnold C. Hanson, of Maine.
Paul E. Kelly, of Pennsylvania.
Robert F. Lent, of New York.
Edward B. Maguire, of California.
Harold R. Thain, of Oklahoma.
Fred W. Welty, of Maryland.

The following-named Foreign Service Reserve officers to be consuls of the United States of America:

Leland C. Altaffer, of Ohio.
Leon Kelston, of New York.
Louis L. Kirley, of New York.
Boyce E. Powell, of Florida.
Casimir T. Zawadzki, of New York.

Wheaton B. Byers, of Connecticut, a Foreign Service Reserve officer, to be a vice consul and a secretary in the diplomatic service of the United States of America.

The following-named Foreign Service Reserve officers to be vice consuls of the United States of America:

Dale H. Baker, of Arkansas.
Warren P. Cleary, of Michigan.
Joseph O. Eblan, of Massachusetts.
Charles F. McKay, of Florida.
Jack M. Mangham, of Virginia.
William C. Mathers, of Virginia.
Dorwin M. Wilson, of Indiana.

Robert J. Baker, of California, a Foreign Service Reserve officer, to be a secretary in the diplomatic service of the United States of America. (This nomination is submitted for the purpose of correcting an error in the nomination as submitted to the Senate on June 20, 1958, and confirmed by the Senate on July 10, 1958.)

The following-named Foreign Service Reserve officers to be secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

John L. Bender, of Virginia.
F. Willard Calder, of Florida.
David L. Gilsinn, of Virginia.
Marcus J. Gordon, of California.
Jerome W. Greiner, of Michigan.
George T. Kalaris, of Montana.
Harrington Littell, of California.
Seymour I. Nadler, of the District of Columbia.
Richard Ober, of Virginia.
William P. Roessner, of New York.
Ted M. G. Tanen, of California.
John H. Terjelian, of Minnesota.
Robert B. Whittinghill, of New York.

POSTMASTERS

ALABAMA

Geraldine T. Forbus, Kellyton.

HAWAII

George T. Hara, Honolulu.

MONTANA

Virgil S. Davis, Anaconda.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, MARCH 9, 1959

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. Charles W. Holland, Jr., pastor, Fountain Memorial Baptist Church, offered the following prayer:

Eternal God, our Heavenly Father, we thank Thee for Thy Holy Word from which we are able to receive wisdom.

Teach us, dear God, to pray in a manner that is pleasing to Thee.

We pray earnestly this morning for Dr. Braskamp, the Chaplain of this great body, that he may presently be restored to health and active duty here where he serves in such a wonderful way.

We pray also, God, for our Speaker and every lawmaker who serves with him. Guide them and give them the wisdom that can be gleaned only through the leadership of the Holy Spirit.

Help us as members of this great and precious democracy to remember our Government leaders and men in high places prayerfully instead of critically.

These thanks we give and petitions we make in the name of Christ Jesus, our Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, March 5, 1959, was read and approved.

MEMBER-ELECT WILLIAM J. RANDALL

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri, Mr. WILLIAM J. RANDALL, Member-elect from the Fourth District, be permitted to take the oath of office today. The certificate of election has not arrived, but there is no contest, and no question has been raised with regard to his election.

I have conferred with both the majority and minority leaders.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

SWEARING IN OF MEMBER

Mr. WILLIAM J. RANDALL appeared at the bar of the House and took the oath of office.

CUTS IN THE MARINE CORPS AND THE REGULAR ARMY

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, it will not be news for you to hear me say that I have protested and will continue to protest the cuts in the Marine Corps and the Regular Army as requested again by the President. I have been introducing for 5 years amendments to the appropriation bill to restore these annual cuts. The House has been restoring the cuts, but the executive refuses to allocate the money to execute these acts of the Congress.

Now, today, on the first page of the New York Times, the Joint Chiefs of Staff have advised the other body in writing that they object to the present budget limitation and state specifically and in detail the reasons for their objections. They are consistent with their personal beliefs. The arm twisting by the Bureau of the Budget and by the Executive is responsible for the impression that the Joint Chiefs of Staff support the President on these cuts. It is my judgment that they do not. These cuts must be restored. I shall introduce the necessary amendments, and I know the House will support them.

JOHN P. TANSEY

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, word has just reached me of the passing of John P. Tansey, whose brother, Harry, has well and faithfully served the House for many years. John P. Tansey was my close and beloved friend for more than half a century, and it is my great regret that word of his death in Chicago reached me belatedly so that I was unable to attend the mass at Saint Thomas Aquinas Church and to accompany the remains to the burial place at Saint Joseph's Cemetery.

John P. Tansey was secretary of the Democratic Cook County Central Committee from 1906 to 1908. He was an Army captain in World War I and prior to his commission we served as members in the same company in the officers' training camp at Fort Sheridan. He was a man of tremendous ability and the heart of John Tansey was as big as the universe itself.

During the terrible years of the depression, when everyone was suffering and no one had any money, John Tansey changed his last dollar into 10 dimes and passed these dimes to 10 persons standing in the long lines of the unemployed. That was John Tansey.

Chicago has lost one of her sons that never quite can be replaced. I have lost one of my dearest friends. To his brother Harry, to his widow, Laurette, and to his sons, John P., Jr., and Robert F. goes my deepest sympathy. To these sons I would say that the last time I met with their father he talked of these two fine young men and of his great pride in them. In the memory of their father they have an inspiring and priceless heritage.

SUBCOMMITTEES OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. LIBONATI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that each subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary be permitted to sit this week during general debate.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO SOCIAL SECURITY ACT

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a bill which I hope will correct gross inequities in the Social Security Act. In the amendments to the Social Security Act during the 84th Congress it was made possible for a disabled worker to draw his social security at age 50. In the law the wording is like this: That a person must prove his or her inability to engage in any substantial gainful activity.

The bill I am introducing today will amend the law to read:

> The inability to continue in his normal and usual type of work.

I have found, under the wording of the act as it is today, many people who are physically disabled to perform the type work that they are qualified to do in order to make a living are ineligible to draw disability benefits. In other words, under the present law a man who has been a brickmason all his life, for instance, may still be physically able to operate a typewriter, if he knew how to perform office work, or even to be a bird watcher. In this case, if he is physically capable of doing that type of work, it has been ruled that he is not eligible

for disability benefits under social security.

Mr. Speaker, I hope my bill will be passed.

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS

Mr. McFALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Public Works may have until midnight tonight to file a report on the bill H.R. 1.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

PRICE SUPPORTS ON FEED GRAINS

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, like a number of my colleagues I am deeply concerned by the announcement on February 19 of this year that the Secretary of Agriculture was reducing price supports on most feed grains to 60 percent of parity. As I pointed out in a speech on the House floor last week, this will bring about grievous new losses to the American farmer on his 1959 crop. In my own State, based on 1958 crop yields, it will mean a loss of nearly $16 million. In view of the cost-price squeeze that has gripped the farm belt under the present administration, this recent announcement by the Secretary of Agriculture is indeed sad news.

On Friday of last week, I went with a group of my colleagues, including the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. BREEDING] to Secretary Benson's office. We plead with him to reverse this price-cutting action and to restore the feed grain support level. It is the intention of Congress in the present law that feed-grain prices be kept at their equivalent value in relation to corn prices. Since Secretary Benson refused to yield to our pleadings, I am joining with a number of my colleagues today in introducing legislation that will restore feed-grain support levels to a more reasonable point. I do hope that Congress will move quickly to pass this desperately needed legislation.

PERMISSION TO SIT DURING GENERAL DEBATE

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking and Currency may have permission to sit during general debate in the House today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA BUSINESS

The SPEAKER. This is District Day. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida [Mr. MATTHEWS].

SISTERS OF THE VISITATION, CORPORATE POWERS

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on the District of Columbia, I call up the bill (H.R. 4282) to supplement and modify the act of May 24, 1828 (6 Stat. 383, ch. CXII), insofar as it relates to the corporate powers of the Sisters of the Visitation, of Georgetown in the District of Columbia, and ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That in addition to rights, powers, duties, and obligations granted to and imposed upon the Sisters of the Visitation (hereinafter referred to as "the corporation"), of Georgetown in the District of Columbia, by the Act of May 24, 1828, entitled "An Act to incorporate the Sisters of Charity of St. Joseph and the Sisters of the Visitation of Georgetown, in the District of Columbia" (6 Stat. 383, ch. CXII, Little and Brown's edition), the corporation shall have the power—

(a) to appoint a board of trustees or a board of directors, consisting of such number of Sisters of the Visitation, or other persons, as may be desired; and to appoint a president, secretary, and treasurer for the corporation;

(b) to create, establish, and operate schools and colleges and departments of learning to be connected with and become a part of the corporation, such schools and colleges to be known as Georgetown Visitation Junior College and Georgetown Visitation Preparatory School and by such other name or names as may be appropriate; and to appoint a dean or principal for each of the same, and such professors and teachers and other personnel as may be necessary or desirable, and to displace any of them, as the interests of the institution may require;

(c) to fill vacancies which may happen by death, resignation, or otherwise among such trustees, directors, officers, professors, teachers, and other personnel;

(d) to prescribe and direct the courses of studies to be pursued at such schools and colleges; and the branches of the arts, sciences, literature, subjects, and courses which may be taught in such schools and colleges are the following: Philosophy, natural sciences, mathematics, history, belles-lettres, ancient and modern languages, library science, shorthand and typing, and allied subjects;

(e) to admit any of the students in attendance at the Georgetown Visitation Preparatory School and Georgetown Visitation Junior College, and such other schools and colleges so established, and other persons meriting academic honors, to any degree in the faculties, arts, sciences, and the liberal professions to which such persons usually are admitted in other and similar schools and colleges; and to issue in an appropriate form the diplomas or certificates which may be requisite to testify to the admission to such degrees;

(f) to establish such scholastic boards and offices as may be required for academic operation and direction in education;

(g) to enter into affiliation agreements with any institutions of learning, within or outside of the District of Columbia, for the purpose of making available to the students of such institutions the educational facilities of the corporation upon such terms as are mutually agreed upon by each of the affiliated institutions;

(h) to receive, invest and administer endowments and gifts of money and personal property absolutely, or subject to payments by way of annuities during the life of the donor, for the maintenance of educational work by the corporation and by any school, college, department, or chair thereof now established or which may hereafter be created or established by the corporation.

SEC. 2. (a) The corporation shall not employ its funds or income, or any part thereof, in banking or insurance operations, or for any purpose or object other than those expressed herein and in such Act of May 24, 1828.

(b) The limitation with respect to annual income from real estate, contained in the proviso at the end of section 3 of such Act of May 24, 1828, shall not apply hereafter to the corporation.

SEC. 3. No misnomer of the corporation, or of any of its schools or colleges, shall defeat or annul any donation, gift, grant, devise, or bequest to or from the corporation.

SEC. 4. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this Act or any part thereof, is hereby expressly reserved.

Mr. MATTHEWS (interrupting the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the bill be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 4, line 18, strike out the word "Act" and insert the word "Enactment."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this bill is to supplement and modify the act of May 24, 1828 (6 Stat. 383, ch. CXII), insofar as it relates to the corporate powers of the Sisters of the Visitation, of Georgetown in the District of Columbia.

The Sisters of the Visitation were incorporated by an act of Congress in 1828 because of the fact that at this time there was no general incorporation law. At the time this charter was granted, the original act of incorporation merely stated that certain named individuals should constitute a body corporate, should have the right to have a common seal and make bylaws and to sue and be sued and to acquire and purchase, by bequest, gift or otherwise land and personal property with a limitation on the land in the District of Columbia not more than 200 acres. The school has never owned more than approximately 35 acres and it is doubtful that they ever will.

The Sisters of the Visitation conduct two schools in Georgetown known as the Georgetown Visitation Junior College and the Georgetown Visitation Preparatory School.

The only purpose in this legislation is to modernize and streamline the charter under which these schools are now operating so as to bring them in purview of other schools accredited by the Middle

States Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools and the American Association of Junior Colleges, the National Commission on Accrediting.

These schools are required, under the provisions provided in this bill and the original incorporation act, to operate as a nonprofit, educational and religious corporation.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. AUCHINCLOSS].

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Speaker, there is no objection whatever to this legislation. We on this side of the aisle are in favor of it and we hope it passes unanimously.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MATTHEWS. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Am I correctly informed that this calls for no expenditure of Government funds?

Mr. MATTHEWS. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. GROSS. There is no obligational authority now or in the future?

Mr. MATTHEWS. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the author of the bill, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK].

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I want to express my appreciation to the distinguished gentleman from Florida, chairman of the subcommittee, and to the members of that subcommittee, for the action taken in connection with the hearings on this bill and reporting it to the floor for consideration; also to the chairman of the full committee and to all members of the full committee for their prompt action in reporting the bill to the House for consideration.

Mr. MATTHEWS. I thank the gentleman.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS TO CONDUCT STUDIES AND INVESTIGATIONS RELATING TO MATTERS WITHIN ITS JURISDICTION

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 182, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That, effective from January 3, 1959, the Committee on Ways and Means, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, is authorized to conduct thorough studies and investigations of all matters coming within the jurisdiction of such committee.

SEC. 2. For the purpose of this resolution, the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold such hearings, to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places within or without the continental United States, its Territories, and possessions, as the committee may determine, whether or not the House has recessed, or has adjourned, to require the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents by subpena or otherwise, to administer such oaths, and to take such testimony, as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee and may be served by any person designated by the chairman.

SEC. 3. The committee may report to the House at any time during the present Congress the results of any studies or investigations made under authority of this resolution, together with such recommendations as it deems appropriate. Any such report which is made when the House is not in session shall be filed with the Clerk of the House.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, after line 5, insert new paragraph as follows:

"*Provided*, That the committee shall not undertake any investigation of any subject which is being investigated by any other committee of the House."

Page 1, line 9, strike out "or without."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, this is the usual resolution. I know of no objection to it. I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN].

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, this resolution has the unanimous support of all members of the Rules Committee. I have no requests for time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING THE COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE TO MAKE CERTAIN STUDIES AND INVESTIGATIONS

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 93 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That effective from January 3, 1959, the Committee on Agriculture, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, is authorized to make studies and investigations into the following matters:

(1) The restoration and development of foreign markets for American agricultural products and of international trade in agricultural products, and the disposal of agricultural surpluses pursuant to Public Law 480, Eighty-third Congress, as amended;

(2) All matters relating to the establishment and development of an effective Foreign Agricultural Service pursuant to title VI of the Agricultural Act of 1954;

(3) All matters relating to the development, use, and administration of the national forests, including but not limited to development of a sound program for general public use of the national forests consistent with watershed protection and sustained yield timber management, and study of the forest fire prevention and control policies and activities of the Forest Service and their relation to coordinated activities of other Federal, State, and private agencies;

(4) Price spreads between producers and consumers;

(5) The formulation and development of improved price support and regulatory programs for agricultural commodities; matters relating to the inspection and grading of such commodities; and the effect of trading in futures contracts for such commodities.

(6) The administration and operation of agricultural programs through State and county agricultural stabilization and conservation committees and the administrative policies and procedures relating to the selection, election, and operation of such committees;

(7) The development of upstream watershed projects authorized by Public Law 156, Eighty-third Congress, and the administration and development of watershed programs pursuant to Public Law 566, Eighty-third Congress, as amended.

For the purposes of such investigations and studies, the committee or any subcommittee thereof is authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places within or outside the United States, whether the House has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, to make such inspections or investigations, and to require, by subpena or otherwise, the attendance and testimony of such witnesses, and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memorandums, papers, and documents, as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued over the signature of the chairman of the committee, or any member of the committee designated by him, and may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member. The chairman of the committee or any member thereof may administer oaths or affirmations to witnesses.

The committee may report to the House (or to the Clerk of the House if the House is not in session) at any time during the present Congress the results of its investigation and study, together with such recommendations as it deems advisable.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 2, line 25, insert:

"*Provided*, That the committee shall not undertake any investigation of any subject which is being investigated by any other committee of the House."

Page 3, line 6, strike out "or outside".

The committee amendments were agreed to.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I know of no objection to the resolution, and I now yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN].

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, the resolution as amended has the unanimous support of the Committee on Rules. I know of no objection to the resolution on this side, and I yield back the remainder of my time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RAILROAD RETIREMENT AND UNEMPLOYMENT BENEFITS LEGISLATION AND AIRPORT SAFETY

Mr. WIER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and include resolutions.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. WIER. Mr. Speaker, as part of my remarks I wish to include House Resolution No. 8 of the State of Minnesota Legislature, which requests Congress to enact railroad retirement and unemployment benefits legislation as incorporated in H.R. 1012. This resolution, adopted by the Minnesota House of Representatives on March 6, 1959, and signed by E. J. Chilgren, speaker, and G. H. Leahy, chief clerk, has my wholehearted support and I sincerely hope my col-

leagues in the House of Representatives will join me in pushing for early and favorable consideration of this much-needed legislation:

HOUSE RESOLUTION 8

Resolution requesting Congress to enact railroad retirement and unemployment benefits

Whereas a large number of residents in Minnesota are employed by railroads and are vitally affected by unemployment and retirement benefits of railroads; and

Whereas H.R. 1012 would provide an increase in retirement and unemployment benefits to employees of railroads;

Whereas we are informed that the retirement fund for railroad employees is actuarily sound and that the increase in retirement benefit proposed in H.R. 1012 would not adversely affect that fund and would not result in increased cost to the railroads or their employees: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Minnesota, That Congress be requested to enact H.R. 1012 as originally introduced without amendments; and be it further

Resolved, That the chief clerk of the house of representatives be instructed to mail each Member of Congress from the State of Minnesota a copy of this resolution.

E. J. CHILGREN,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.
G. H. LEAHY,
Chief Clerk of the House of Representatives.

Mr. Speaker, under permission granted me to extend my remarks, I wish also to include the resolution passed by the City Council of the city of Minneapolis, Minn., March 3, 1959, relating to Bethel Airport development, which was forwarded to me by Leonard A. Johnson, city clerk.

This resolution expresses the general concern felt by the city of Minneapolis, the users of our international airport, and the general Minnesota public, about a matter of grave importance involving the use and safety of our airport which originally justified the State of Minnesota, in conjunction with the Federal Department of Defense, in taking the preliminary steps to establish the Bethel Airport 25 miles north of the cities of Minneapolis and St. Paul.

RESOLUTION RELATING TO BETHEL AIRPORT DEVELOPMENT

Whereas the city of Minneapolis has been vitally concerned with the imposition of military uses on the Minneapolis-St. Paul Metropolitan Airport at Wold Chamberlain Field, originally established for civil and commercial operations; and

Whereas the growing use of military jet and other advanced types of aircraft increases the potential hazards affecting areas around our local civil airport and aggravates the fears of citizens created by crashes occurring in recent years; and

Whereas the growing needs of airport facilities for the military services continually intensifies the incompatibility of joint civil and military use of local airports; and

Whereas these problems have been recognized by the State of Minnesota in providing for land acquisition in the Bethel area for military airport purposes, and by Federal agencies in approving the Bethel Airport project; and

Whereas there appears to be undue delay in the completion of said Bethel project: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the City Council of the City of Minneapolis, That the Federal agencies and the Congress be urged to take all steps necessary to expedite the completion of the construction and installations required at the new Bethel Airport.

Further, that a copy of this resolution be transmitted to the Secretary of Defense, Secretary of the Air Force, and to each Member of the congressional delegation in the House and Senate from Minnesota.

Passed March 3, 1959.

GEO. W. MARTENS,
President of the Council.

Approved March 3, 1959.

P. KENNETH PETERSON,
Mayor.

LEONARD A. JOHNSON,
City Clerk.

PUBLIC BUILDINGS ACT OF 1959

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Public Buildings and Grounds of the Committee on Public Works I have today introduced a bill which, if enacted into law, will facilitate the early construction, at the least possible cost, of Federal buildings in the large number of communities scattered across the Nation for which an urgent need has been clearly demonstrated. My colleague, the distinguished Member from Wisconsin [Mr. WITHROW], the ranking minority member on the subcommittee, has introduced an identical bill.

This bill, in essence, would repeal the Public Buildings Act of 1926 while retaining, however, the features of that bill which have proved to be workable and essential for public buildings construction. It is, in short, a Public Buildings Act of 1959.

I am certain that the Members of this body are fully familiar with the public buildings situation but for the record I would like at this time to submit a short history of the public buildings program.

The first omnibus Public Buildings Act was approved by the Congress on June 6, 1902. The last of these so-called omnibus bills was passed on March 4, 1913. Then as a result of World War I for all practical purposes the entire building construction program was suspended. Not until 1926 was a bill for public building construction enacted into law. In that year the Congress passed and the President signed a bill which was to become known as the Public Buildings Act of 1926. From that day this has been the basic authority for direct appropriation construction of Government buildings.

This law had barely begun to move into full effect when the country was plunged into the great depression that began in the latter part of 1929 and which continued up until the advent of World War II in 1939. During this depression period most of the public building construction was done under emergency building legislation. This work was handled by the Public Buildings Administration. During World War II the entire building program came to a halt. Thus from the period of 1939 up to 1949 no work of any importance was accomplished in the Federal building construction program. During this same period the activities of the Government grew by leaps and bounds paralleling the tremendous increase in the Nation's business activities, complete with an above normal increase in population during the war and postwar years. As a result the Federal Government found itself with a highly inadequate physical establishment to carry on its multitude of activities in an efficient and businesslike manner. In 1949, the Congress enacted the Public Buildings Act of 1949, known as Public Law 105 of the 81st Congress and it further enacted Public Law 152 of the 81st Congress. Public Law 105, which in essence, provided as follows: An authorization of $40 million for acquisition of sites and preparation of plans for Federal public buildings outside the District of Columbia, and $30 million for improvement of existing federally owned buildings.

Public Law 152 created the General Services Administration headed by an Administrator, appointed by the President with the advice and consent of the Senate. The Federal Works Agency, the Public Buildings Administration, and the Office of Commissioner of Public Buildings, among others, were abolished and their functions were transferred to the General Services Administration.

The last significant change in public buildings construction law came about in 1954, when the Congress enacted the so-called lease-purchase program which, for all practical purposes, expired in July of 1957 when the Congress failed to continue it.

The brief history that I have just outlined shows that for a period extending back to 1929, a 30-year span, there has been no direct action taken by the Congress either to carefully examine the public buildings program of the Government or to enact into law a workmanlike procedure that will bring about a building program that will benefit all sections of the country. The bill I have introduced today aims to accomplish that purpose and I believe that it does. For the benefit of the Congress I have inserted a short explanation of the salient features of the bill in this statement.

The bill is given the short title of "The Public Buildings Act of 1959." It grants to the Administrator of General Services necessary authority to construct, alter, repair, and improve public buildings, including authority to acquire necessary buildings. It necessarily grants him authority to acquire sites for these public buildings where necessary. The authority granted the Administrator in this bill is in this respect similar to his existing authority which is contained in the act of May 25, 1926, and other provisions of acts relating to public buildings. For the purposes of this bill a public building is defined to mean any building including its grounds, approaches, and appurtenances necessary for the functioning of a Federal agency with certain exceptions, the principal ones being buildings on certain domain lands, buildings on military installations,

and buildings used as hospitals under the jurisdiction of the Veterans' Administration.

Section 7 of the bill represents a major change in the present law on direct appropriation construction of public buildings. It provides generally that no appropriation shall be made to construct, alter, or acquire any public building if the construction, alteration, or acquisition has not been approved by resolutions adopted by the Committees on Public Works of the Senate and House of Representatives. The Administrator of General Services would be required to submit to these committees detailed prospectuses for such approval. The Administrator would be permitted to increase the cost of a project above the approved cost, but not to exceed 10 percent, without further approval if increased construction costs require it. Further, the Committees on Public Works are authorized to rescind their approval if no appropriation has been made for an approved project within 1 year after the date of approval of the project. The Committees on Public Works are prohibited from approving any project at any time when there are more than 15 projects which have been approved for more than 1 year and for which appropriations have not been made, until, either by rescission of approval, or by reason of the fact that appropriations are made, the number of such approved, but unappropriated for, projects becomes less than 15.

The bill establishes boundaries within the District of Columbia within which the Administrator may acquire real property. It further provides that in carrying out the act in the District of Columbia it shall be done as nearly as practicable in harmony with the L'Enfant plan. Authority is also granted to close certain streets in the District of Columbia in accordance with agreements entered into with the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia and the National Capital Planning Commission. These provisions of the bill are substantially the same as existing law today.

The bill also contains a requirement of an annual report to Congress on uncompleted public buildings, and would permit the Administrator to perform his functions by contract, to employ on a temporary basis the services of established architectural or engineering corporations, firms, or individuals, and would require that he keep continually informed on the public building needs of the Federal Government.

Those public buildings for which direct appropriations were made in the Independent Offices Appropriations Act, 1959, and those lease-purchase projects specified in that act are not to be subject to the provisions of this bill but are to be completed in accordance with the laws presently applicable to them.

The last section of the bill repeals a number of laws which are obsolete, or are in duplication of, or in conflict or otherwise inconsistent with, the provisions of the bill.

I believe that this is a necessary bill. I believe it is one that the Congress wants and that the people want. I believe this bill sets up a method whereby a direct and effective program of public building construction can be brought about in the shortest possible time. I trust that when this bill is reported out from the Committee on Public Works and brought to the floor of this House, it will receive the support of all those Members who are anxious to once again activate a program that is now badly in need of a stimulus. This bill will give the public buildings program in this country the impetus that it now requires.

PRICE OF GRAIN SORGHUMS

Mr. BREEDING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. BREEDING. Mr. Speaker, I would like to rise and make a few remarks in behalf of legislation which I and other Members are introducing today in support of feed grain prices other than corn.

Last Friday, March 6, a delegation of 17 Members of the House and Senate, or their representatives, met with the Secretary of Agriculture in his office to protest the action taken by the Department of lowering price supports on barley, oats, and grain sorghums far below their actual feed value.

Mr. Speaker, I represent a grain sorghum area, and the Secretary of Agriculture stated flatly that the $1.52 grain sorghum figure would not be increased. This means that the only hope we have for saving farmers from economic disaster is to ask Congress to change the formula upon which the feed grain price support is figured.

Mr. Speaker, the feed grain price support should be related directly to corn through the comparative feed value of the commodities.

However, seven other factors were also considered by Mr. Benson in arriving at the $1.52 figure for grains. It is obvious, Mr. Speaker, that the feed value relationship did not receive the weight Congress intended it should.

Therefore, Congress should limit the discretion of the Secretary in considering other factors and direct him to rely more upon the feed value relationship.

Mr. Speaker, the new price support for corn is $1.12 a bushel, or $2 per hundredweight. Inasmuch as grain sorghums have 95 percent of the feed value of corn, the support price should be around $1.90 per hundredweight.

Yet, the Secretary fixed the support at $1.52—a reduction of 31 cents from the 1958 level.

Mr. Speaker, bankers throughout the Southwest are refusing to make production loans in view of the lower support price. The bankers are convinced the $1.52 price is lower than production costs.

Mr. Speaker, the lower price will mean economic disaster for many farmers.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I am sure that legislation should be enacted by this Congress to set feed grain prices in comparative relation to their feed value to corn.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include some remarks that I made to the Secretary of Agriculture on March 6, 1959.

The matter referred to follows:

Mr. Secretary, this meeting with you today is to discuss recently announced feed grain price supports for 1959.

All of these Members who are here today or represented here today, Senators and Representatives, are interested in these prices. We feel that it is a price support below the cost of production. Some of the Members here represent barley producing areas, others, oats production areas, and I myself represent a grain sorghum area. I come from an arid part of the United States where we have very little choice in the selection and growth of agricultural crops. Principally, my area grows wheat and grain sorghum.

I have had many letters from constituents and organizations in my district protesting your announced price support of $1.52 for grain sorghums for 1959. Just this morning I had a wire from the secretary of the Southwest Irrigation Association, which speaks for hundreds of dryland farmers and some 2,000 irrigation farmers, in protest of this price. Also, I have had similar wires from the chambers of commerce, other civic clubs, and many individuals in protest to this price.

I live on a farm myself, and my two sons operate my holdings in Morton County, Kans. Knowing the conditions that exist, and the cost of operating, we all are seriously interested in these prices.

In connection with the 1959 support prices for feed grains as recently announced, I believe the following questions are pertinent:

1. Why were grain sorghums subjected to a cut of approximately 18 percent while corn, for approximately 80 percent of the producers, enjoyed better than a 5-percent increase in the support price?

2. How does the Department justify a support price of $1.12 per bushel for corn against approximately 85 cents per bushel for grain sorghums? Both weigh the same number of pounds to the bushel and both have approximately the same feed value.

3. Does the Department take into consideration the freight and marketing differentials in the fixing of support prices on these two comparable grains? The large corn-producing States are also large livestock-feeding States and much closer to terminal markets for both. Producers of grain sorghums do not enjoy this advantage of location.

4. In fixing these prices, does the Department take into account these relative factors:

(a) That our major corn-producing areas are that because they enjoy abundant annual precipitation, enough in fact, to permit them to produce a wide range of crops. That in contrast the bulk of our grain sorghum production comes from the semiarid sections where producers have little or no choice as to what they plant.

(b) Corn production is no longer subject to planting restrictions, whereas wheat is produced under a strict penalty-loaded acreage allotment plan. Because of the production restrictions imposed by nature and the production restrictions imposed by law, is it fair then to further penalize the wheat-grain sorghum farmer through the medium of price?

Mr. Secretary, this is not a request to reduce the announced price of corn, but to

increase the price of other feed grains in line with corn based on relation of feed value and also save farmers of the grain sorghum area from economic disaster.

CONSTRUCTION OF NEW FEDERAL BUILDING, SPRINGFIELD, ILL.

Mr. MACK of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. MACK of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill to provide for the construction of a new Federal building for Springfield, the capital of Illinois. For the past 10 years the Government has had under consideration a proposal to build a new building in Springfield to house the Federal agencies which are scattered all over the city. These agencies occupy rental quarters, which are in some cases expensive and inadequate.

Some time ago I requested that the General Services Administration conduct a survey as to the amount of money being spent each year by the Federal Government for rental facilities in Springfield. This survey revealed that a total of $323,422.34 was spent last year. In view of this fact, it is imperative that the Government continue its plans to construct a Federal building at an early date.

This bill would direct the General Services Administrator to acquire and erect a suitable building for use as a U.S. post office, a Federal court building, and for other Federal offices, in accordance with plans and specifications approved by the Postmaster General, the Administrator of General Services, and the Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts.

Under this bill, the savings of rent through construction of such a building would be $300,000 a year, or $6 million over a 20-year period.

Mr. Speaker, I am hoping that the administration will move forward with the Federal building construction and that the building at Springfield will be one of the first orders of business.

DISCLOSURE OF EXPENDITURES BY MEMBERS OF CONGRESS TRAVELING OVERSEAS

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing legislation to require full disclosure of expenditures of Government and counterpart funds by Members of Congress traveling in oversea areas.

The bill provides that within 30 days after the return to the United States of any Member of the Senate or House, he or she must file a statement of expenses, including an accounting of counterpart funds used, either with the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate or the Committee on House Administration.

There has been a great deal of criticism in the Congress, and rightly so, of secrecy in the executive branch of Government. Last year I supported wholeheartedly the so-called right-to-know bill, which was designed to meet the problem of secrecy in the executive branch.

But what about Congress? Surely the public has a right to know how much Members of Congress, and persons accompanying them, spend on oversea junkets and the purpose of these expenditures. It is difficult for me to believe that any Member would object to scrutiny of his spending for any purpose from public funds.

Now before anyone tries to argue that this matter of secrecy with regard to expenditure of public funds by Members of Congress overseas has already been resolved, let me say emphatically that it has not been resolved.

A distinguished former Member of this body, Mr. Dawson, of Utah, tried his best to lift the lid of secrecy on this spending last year, at least as far as counterpart funds are concerned. An amendment he offered to the Mutual Security Act of 1958—H.R. 12181—was adopted by the House to require individual statements by Members of the Senate and House on the spending of counterpart funds.

However, when the bill came back from the conference committee his amendment had been watered down to the extent that it was practically meaningless.

As adopted by the conference committee and Congress, this provision in the Mutual Security Act of 1958 provides only that the total itemized expenditures of foreign currency by each committee and subcommittee are to be reported to the Committee on House Administration or the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate and published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

As an example of the type of reports submitted under this provision, I refer my colleagues to page 2905 of the February 24, 1959, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. These reports do not provide the information to which the public is entitled. Expenditures by individual Members are not itemized either as to appropriated or counterpart funds.

I am confident that Members who feel trips overseas are important and in the public interest have nothing to hide. I would hope, therefore, that they will lend their support to my bill and that it will be speedily enacted, because surely these Members would not want to deny the taxpayers of this country knowledge as to how they spend public funds in foreign countries.

WHERE TERROR REIGNS

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, a recent issue of Life magazine contained an editorial entitled "Where Terror Reigns." The editorial reads as follows:

Just who's running this country, anyway? Is it the legal government, elected by the citizens, or is it an invisible government of hoods, thugs, gangsters, terrorists, and murderers?

The question is raised anew by the testimony of Sidney Saul, owner of 22 Brooklyn jukeboxes, before the McClellan committee. Three thugs from one of Jimmy Hoffa's paper unions, seeking a cut on Saul's take, slugged him until his nose was bent "like a horseshoe." He surrendered.

This sounds like the treatment Hungarian patriots get in the dungeons of secret police cells. But it happened in America, in its biggest city, in a public place (a luncheonette called Wagon Wheels), and was observed by others who dared not interfere. They knew who was boss.

An unusual occurrence? Hardly. Last week Life showed in detail how the national crime syndicate muscles in on numerous essential services, from garbage collecting to towel supplies—and especially jukeboxes, easy to control and easy to damage. And last week Ralph Kelly, an Elgin, Ill. jukebox operator whose income was cut from $14,000 to $7,000 when gangster Rocco Pranno became his partner, sat cowering before the McClellan committee, too terrified to talk. The sinister-looking Pranno was right beside him. "This is a tragic state," said Senator SAM ERVIN, JR., as Kelly refused to testify, "when a man in the shadow of the Nation's Capital cringes in fear." Pranno, another witness testified, had threatened to put cement weights on Kelly's legs and drop him in the river.

Terror is nothing new in the world. Neither is crime. What is new, in the land of the free, is terror and crime organized on such a staggering scale that its overlords even hold their own secret conventions (as at Apalachin, N. Y. on November 14, 1957) and pass their own laws (one member, whose sentence was death, waited shuddering in the garage until he learned that it had been commuted to a $10,000 fine for trespassing somebody's jukebox shakedown territory).

That convention was flushed out only by the accident of a State policeman's curiosity at the sudden influx of expensive cars. But the accident revealed frightening facts about America's health, strength, and security. It revealed that a conspiracy, as secret as the Communist underground and certainly as dangerous, was operating without any of the surveillance and penetration which has all but destroyed the latter. The delegates came from all parts of the land, even from Cuba and faraway Italy. But nobody was following them. Nobody knew what they were up to. All the vaunted crime detection agencies—city, State, Federal—were equally in the dark and made to look equally impotent and foolish.

This has been going on for years, but a complacent public, conditioned by a prosperity, expense-account, tax-dodging psychology, seemed to think the rich racketeers were simply smarter than themselves, and even gave them a sort of envious admiration. Local officials, whose political bosses had alliances with the underworld, shut their eyes. Federal officials either lacked authority to break this invisible government or ducked it as too tough to tackle.

At long last Attorney General William Rogers is doing something about it. He has set up a special squad of prosecutors to go after the top 100 leaders of this syndicate,

and is planning also to use the antitrust laws as a special weapon against them (for example, where they have monopolized garbage collecting). But Congress ought to go further than this with appropriations and legislation for a permanent program of gangbusting, either by the FBI or some new agency assigned to penetrate the crime conspiracy as efficiently as the FBI has already penetrated the Communist conspiracy.

Even that will not be enough. When the people themselves drop their indifference and rise up in anger against this intolerable rottenness—when the Ralph Kellys of America not only have the courage to talk but to strike back at the goons of Hoffa and of Apalachin, then there will be a proper answer to the question:

Just who's running this country, anyway?

I think, Mr. Speaker, that the American people are becoming justly aroused against the revelations of organized crime and widespread corruption that are being exposed by an investigating committee of this Congress. I call upon the Judiciary Committee to consider legislation which would permit either the Federal Bureau of Investigation, as suggested by the editorial, or another Government agency to take direct action against this organized criminal conspiracy. I also call upon our Appropriations Committee to make available the necessary funds to combat this evil which is no less a threat to our American way of life than the international Communist menace.

URBAN RENEWAL

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include a report on urban renewal.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, while presented in relation to Dallas, this study of the urban renewal program is appropriate to other cities and urban areas in other congressional districts.

THE URBAN RENEWAL PROGRAM, MAY 2, 1958

Admittedly Dallas has need for improvement of some homes and other buildings, and perhaps whole areas. Most cities throughout the nation have such problems. Urban renewal, the improvement of homes and neighborhoods, is approved and applauded by everyone. Many cities are now engaged in slum clearance and rehabilitation through local private and public initiative without Federal aid. The lessons to be learned from these urban renewal programs and the others, using Federal funds, are quite clear. From these lessons all can benefit.

Since Congress acts as the city council for Washington, D.C., for 3 years I have been, in effect, a councilman studying an urban renewal program in progress in Washington. In addition, we study other projects throughout the Nation as part of the housing bills.

Even earlier, I was a realtor, land developer and builder, working in conjunction with the city, conforming to city restrictions on building and developing. I am interested in urban renewal by natural inclination and as a Member of Congress. A Member must study the effects and size of Federal expenditures to fulfill his oath to uphold the Constitution. I seriously doubt (1) the constitutionality of this law, and (2) that the Federal Government can afford urban renewal expenditure.

In Congress I observe, vote on, and report to the citizens of Dallas County the legislation considered, the Federal encroachment upon, and the violation of personal and States rights, the boondoggle and political tradeouts, the hasty and wasteful spending. My interest in Federal assistance programs was sharpened by the attack upon Dallas by a California Representative who accused Dallasites of grabbing greedily for Federal money for the fifth district. This erroneous attack was answered and laid to rest on only one test—the facts.

The facts and documentary evidence on urban renewal are here presented in several parts:

1. The Federal and State urban renewal laws.
2. Eminent domain—of the right and use.
3. The relocation problem (of people affected by urban renewal).
4. Cost and time factors.
5. A constructive plan—how to do it locally.

The question is how best to do the job. Do it we can, I am confident, in the spirit of Texas and Dallas. As our mayor said:

"Dallas' greatest resource is its people. Dallas will remain bright because of its people."

My hope is to see that job done, and done well, for our community, even to set an example for others who face the same grave problems. Everyone in Dallas has a part, if only as taxpayer.

Those who doubt the job can be done locally might listen to Representative CHARLES VURSELL, of Illinois, a member of the subcommittee responsible for urban renewal:

"Mr. Chairman * * * what I am questioning is the necessity of forcing the Federal Government to continue this program (urban renewal) that, in my judgment, and I believe in the judgment of most of those who understand it, never should have been started in the first instance.

"It is my judgment that the average small cities or the larger cities of the Nation generally are more able to build their own improvements than is the Federal Government, which has had to undergo the expense of financing the recent World War II, the Korean war, and now has to maintain the most expensive military force we have ever had to have in peacetime, because of world conditions, and the Russian threat of communism.

"It is unfair to extort taxes, so to speak, from millions of people who are housing themselves, and financing their own places of business, and force them to contribute to cities all over the land, hundreds of miles distant from the taxpayer.

"It is the responsibility, so to speak, of the officials in the city halls throughout the Nation, the mayors, the aldermen, the city commissioners, and the taxpayers to take care of their own community and housing needs. All cities, with the cooperation of their citizens, should take care of their own needs, and in the end will make the most progress. The citizens and public officials who turn to the Government deaden their own morale and the morale of the citizens of the community."

For those who say we must competitively get all the money back from Uncle Sam that we can, I quote President Eisenhower:

"The completely spurious argument is frequently advanced that because the Federal Government skims off so much of the valuable tax revenue, it must, as a consequence, bear more of the local expenditure. This is putting the cart before the horse. If local communities do their job, then there will be no need for additional centralized revenues for nationwide subsidies of an essentially local character; and we will avoid the certain pitfalls of extreme centralization.

"Very frankly, I firmly believe that the army of persons who urge greater and greater centralization of authority and greater and greater dependence upon the Federal Treasury are really more dangerous to our form of government than any external threat that can possibly be arrayed against us. I realize that many of the people urging such practice attempt to surround their particular proposal with fancied safeguards to protect the future freedom of the individual. My own conviction is that the very fact that they feel the need to surround their proposal with legal safeguards is in itself a cogent argument for the defeat of the proposal."

Before any referendum, I hope these matters will be carefully studied by all Dallas residents. This material is intended to be of some help.

THE LAW

The pamphlet, "Federal Laws Authorizing Assistance to Slum Clearance and Urban Renewal" contains the major pertinent Federal statutes involved, including public housing (pp. 74–76) and FHA mortgage insurance for rehabilitation and construction of privately owned homes (pp. 64–73). A helpful summary is contained on the page following the table of contents. The Federal loan and capital grant program for land clearance operations (title I of the Housing Act of 1949 as amended) which would be applicable to the project under discussion in Dallas, is contained on pages 2–25.

The mechanics under the Federal law are:

1. The Federal Urban Renewal Administration, bypassing the appropriations process of Congress, lends money (currently at 3½ percent interest) to a local authority authorized to accept Federal aid to make preliminary studies (sec. 109, Federal law).
2. The URA similarly lends additional money for detailed planning of a project.
3. The URA lends large sums, to acquire by condemnation under power of eminent domain and otherwise, land and buildings now belonging to private citizens and used for their homes and businesses.
4. The local authority generally demolishes and clears all the structures from the project area.
5. The cleared land is then offered for sale, generally at tremendous loss, for reuse by other private citizens for sites for their businesses and homes.
6. The loss (the difference between what the cleared land will bring when resold, and the cost of acquisition, demolition, preparation for reuse, plus all project overhead) is made up by the taxpayers. One-third of the loss is paid by taxpayers in their local taxes, as a so-called local grant-in-aid (sec. 104, Federal law). The other two-thirds is paid by taxpayers in their Federal taxes.

That Federal control and dictation follow Federal aid is abundantly clear. For example, section 109 on pages 15 and 16, details instructions for wage payments according to the United States Secretary of Labor in Washington under the Davis-Bacon Act, by which local officials must abide, and from which wage setting there is no appeal, no court protection. The Secretary of Labor is prosecutor, jury and judge.

"Aids to Your Community" lists the programs of the Housing and Home Finance Agency (HHFA), an attractive presentation, and explains the program more readably. The problem, planning, financing, housing for displaced families (public housing and FHA assisted private housing) and community facilities help (streets, sewers, schools, etc.) are presented. Lots of Federal aid is offered.

An HHFA news release outlining the seven-point workable program and the Dallas "Little Mexico" project, gives credit to Dallas

for having the Nation's first nonfederally assisted urban renewal project. Dallas already has a tradition to maintain.

The Texas urban renewal law (ch. 298, General and Special Laws of Texas, 55th Legislature) is the act enabling Texas communities to participate under the Federal urban renewal law. The law became effective August 22, 1957. The eminent domain sections are quite significant (see especially sec. 10 on p. 11 of the Texas law and sec. 2 of this statement).

EMINENT DOMAIN

Private ownership of property is a basic right to be jealously guarded, as we do personal freedom. We are most aware of this when confronted with the power of eminent domain, by which law, property can be condemned and taken. Basic protection is given individuals by the fifth amendment to the Constitution which says (1) "No person shall * * * be deprived of * * * property without due process of law; (2) nor shall private property be taken for public use, without just compensation." The Constitution thus assures protection of individuals and minorities from majority rule.

The Supreme Court upset this protection in 1954 in reinterpreting the traditional application of eminent domain. In this case, in a district court, the owner of a department store challenged the validity of the act which gives the local redevelopment authority the right to condemn property which is not substandard or slum property merely because the property is part of an overall redevelopment plan. The Supreme Court then upheld this right to take property because in its concept of public welfare "the values it represents are spiritual as well as physical, aesthetic as well as monetary. It is within the power of the legislature to determine that the community should be beautiful as well as healthy, spacious as well as clean, well-balanced as well as carefully patrolled." Losing your property through eminent domain because of someone else's judgment of these values seems quite contrary to the fifth amendment. Further, this decision means that the courts, generally the final repository of the peoples' rights against arbitrary action of the legislature, are not available to those whose property is taken and destroyed for redevelopment purposes. The remedy is in the legislature which may impose whatever restrictions on redevelopment authorities it may deem necessary. So the Court seems to switch the historic roles of legislature and judiciary.

As the district court said: "We are of opinion that the Congress, in legislating for the District of Columbia, has no power to authorize the seizure by eminent domain of property for the sole purpose of redeveloping the area according to its, or its agents', judgment of what a well-developed, well-balanced neighborhood would be. This amounts to a claim on the part of the authorities for unreviewable power to seize and sell whole sections of the city."

A congressional committee then commented about the inequities and injustices involved.

The Urban Land Institute editorialized on this new Supreme Court application of eminent domain, police power, public welfare, and public purpose rather sagely, summarizing the scope of legislative determination.

Later, the Richmond News Leader took "A Hard Look at Redevelopment" declaring "private property is losing its importance."

Very significant are the decisions of the supreme courts of Florida and Georgia, both of which declared eminent domain in urban renewal to be unconstitutional according to their respective State constitutions. While Georgia modified its constitution, the basic reasoning of the supreme court decision was not altogether set aside.

Finally, the statements of Marshall Heights residents demonstrate the unfairness and inequity of this application of eminent domain.

Another example which illustrates the inequities of eminent domain is provided by the Washington renewal agency which took property from one private business (Standard Oil) and transferred it to another (an auto parts dealer).

The major danger, therefore, is the taking of private property for private use.

RELOCATION AND PUBLIC HOUSING

Relocation housing is a basic requirement of the urban renewal law. The seven part workable program requests "the city's plans for relocating families to be displaced by slum clearance."

There are two basic types of housing available: (1) private construction through FHA insured mortgages; (2) public housing, existing or new units, constructed with Federal money. The FHA help (sec. 220) is specifically designed for help whenever urban renewal is involved or whenever any government action results in displacing families (FHA, sec. 221).

Public housing, the other alternative, may be used to relocate families, either in existing or in new housing units. The Housing Law of 1949 established urban renewal as title I and Public Housing as title III. In practice the two are closely linked, as the congressional hearings show, almost by definition.

Dallas now has 6,372 public housing units. At the national average of 30 percent yearly turnover Dallas would have 1,900 units available per year for dislocated families as new occupants. Further, there is a remarkable connection between urban renewal and more new public housing units. The attached list shows some urban renewal projects by location and date and the new public housing units which were contracted for shortly thereafter. That this may be more than coincidental is documented by the Chattanooga case. The mayor was given assurance from insurance, banking, and real estate leaders that private enterprise stood ready to supply the necessary housing. Yet the fieldman of the HHFA stated that they first must file an application for 1,000 public housing units before they could qualify for urban renewal funds (see p. 1002, congressional hearings, Appropriations Committee). This has been variously called the "entering wedge," the "shoehorn," the "blackjack," or "the trap," whereby urban renewal is used as the entree for public housing.

Texas law prohibits the use of the redeveloped land for public housing, but this does not prevent the construction of public housing on other sites. The net result could be Dallas being forced into the position of reluctantly accepting more public housing in order to get the Federal money for urban renewal. Federal aid means Federal control. This is the lesson taught by experience. Welfare programs by Federal Government are replete with "administrative determinations" or "decisions."

Why not have public housing? The lessons learned from approximately one-half million units do not make a pretty picture. The inherent weaknesses of public housing are sociological, economic, and political. The attached exhibits clearly state the case (19 through 31).

The Dallas public housing figures are rather interesting. The unused subsidy of $568,000 raises the question, Are these units presently housing the families in direct need, for whom the projects were intended?

Some communities have already decided against public housing. Attached are the articles recounting these expressions of disapproval of public housing in other localities. Shreveport, La., slum-property owners promised to clean up their properties; a Natchez, Miss., alderman applauded the rejections of the direct dole from government; a Rockford, Ill., alderman pointed out that public housing costs more to construct than private, and the newspaper declares Federal money shouldn't be taken just because it's available; the High Point Enterprise editorial on Federal housing says "socialism is socialism" and Federal housing does more harm than good; the South Haven (Mich.) Tribune editorializes that the city commission rescued the city from a welfare project of great expense and entanglement in rejecting public housing. These arguments are doubly applicable to public housing and to urban renewal with or without public housing.

There are inherent dangers in public housing unthought of by the average citizen. This is brought out by a former chairman of a housing authority himself. Further proof is seen in the fact that a number of former executive directors of public housing authorities are now in prison, including the former directors of Houston, Galveston, Los Angeles, Contra Costa County, Calif., and others.

COST AND TIME FACTORS

Cost and time factors are most revealing in the study of urban renewal. The cost is truly fantastic, almost without limit. Practically every community throughout the Nation has older buildings. Every building ages, and some have the built-in weaknesses of faulty construction. Inspection, repair, and rehabilitation are needed.

No matter who foots the bill the cost of complete and immediate urban renewal would be prohibitive, so redevelopment and rehabilitation must be accomplished gradually. The cost must be spread equitably. And this costly program is added to a long list of existing programs of all kinds at all levels of government demanding heavy expenditures of the taxpayers' money.

The Treasury isn't just broke; it has one-fourth trillion dollars less than nothing. It is a tricky job in fiscal management just to pay current operating expenses of Government. Only the borrowing power of Government makes possible the continuation of the deadly overspending spree. Federal bills are to be paid from future revenue, gambling on the continued high income of taxpayers. Simultaneously Congress adds to the Federal spending to help the financially drained taxpayers from whom the money is taken. Any sign of local financial trouble is the signal for more Federal spending with little thought that the aid distributed must first be taken from the same people in taxes. So the burden increases. (Tax cuts could be substituted for Federal spending.)

The cost of urban renewal authorized to date approaches $2 billion. The administrative expenses are running approximately $5,730,000 a year and increasing. The public housing bonds as of March 1957 total $2,268,723,000. The yearly cost to taxpayers who must pay the principal and interest on these bonds is $193,446,405. This means that the taxpayers over the 40-year program will pay $7,737,856,200 for projects which originally cost $2.2 billion.

The Federal grant contribution to urban renewal will be two-thirds of writedown or loss, the difference between the resale or reuse price and the expenses of acquisition, demolition, and clearing. This writedown of two-thirds will be paid by the citizens of Dallas as Federal taxpayers and one-third by citizens of Dallas as local taxpayers. And almost no one escapes being a taxpayer.

The slum clearance or land preparation is just the start of heavy expenses for the local community. True, if the job must be done, the cost must be borne. Yet the very costliness is all the more reason for trying to cut every corner, to exercise judgment and discrimination in how best to do the job. Other costs include the relocation housing

that will be added, either privately or publicly through public housing, the latter approach again on the taxpayer. Some of the folly of governmental invasion of private enterprise may be seen in castles in the air applicable to public housing and urban renewal.

The fiscal danger can be shown by the fact that if communities sought all the Federal money available under existing law, there wouldn't be enough to go around, not with printing presses running ceaselessly. The competitive inducement to States and communities to seek and bid for this money postpones realistic appraisal of the facts, and heightens the potential danger of complete socialism.

The write-down or shrinkage of value which occasions the Federal loan and grant is subject to serious question in itself. Why the excessive drop in value when raw land, strategically located, is cleared and ready for use. Generally, the availability for a higher use should enhance the land values sufficiently to offset the cost. At the least, an appreciable write-down suggests some question of judgment on the part of the urban renewal authority's setting a reuse value not in conformity with the highest and best use of the land. Misuse of land is always reflected in lower value.

Another financial danger is the windfall, the heavy profit which might be made by individuals in the private development after purchase of the land. Profit in free enterprise is one thing but profit off the taxpayer is another. Existing cases (see eminent domain sec. 2) show the inequities already occurring. Would it not be possible under this law to buy up older areas, as older downtown sections, sell them under eminent domain valuations with the possibility of tidy profit, then buy them back from the urban renewal authority at a written down price, to redevelop and make a handsome profit?

The time factor of Federal urban renewal is another drawback which is unlike the Texas and Dallas spirit of performance. Even if the people of Dallas were to overlook the unconstitutional, financial, and Government administration aspects, there would be the same old story of redtape and delay. For example, local initiative built a Dallas-Fort Worth highway in the time that Federal Government would have been preparing and signing forms. In Washington it took 7 years to get an urban renewal project under way (exhibit 41). Admittedly, this may be longer than some, but the pattern is there. It just isn't the Dallas pattern of doing business. In fact, it's worth a chuckle just to think of our first citizen, Mayor Thornton, trying to put up with Federal forms, endless consultations, and bureaucratic determination from Washington. No, the Texas spirit, seen in Bob Thornton, and the cut of all Dallas citizens is in performance, in "get the job done—now." It's one thing for the scope of the job to slow us down; it's entirely another to be delayed by redtape.

CONSTRUCTIVE PLAN AND SUMMARY

The job of urban renewal in Dallas can be done locally, even the most skeptical must agree. The proof—the accomplishments of the people of other cities who have met and overcome terrific slum problems—without Federal aid. What other communities can do, Dallas can do. Indeed, Dallas already is the pioneer, gaining nationwide recognition for the "Little Mexico" project, the first of its kind accomplished, without Federal funds. Let's not abandon our leadership. Even without this success in our background Dallas can match or outdo the efforts of those cities listed in the "Blueprint for Neighborhood Conservation" as the Tale of 7 Cities, which are New Orleans, Los Angeles, Charlotte, Chicago, Cincinnati, Newark, and Kansas City. These projects here mentioned were without Federal money.

Take Charlotte, N.C., for example. As of today 12,000 residences have been rehabilitated (10,000 bathrooms were added). Two thousand buildings could not be saved and were demolished, at the owners' expense. Meanwhile the city did its part by paving 65 miles of streets, adding street lights, and providing playgrounds, parks, and other needed improvements. Two thousand families were relocated in privately owned homes, rehabilitated or new. Two thousand new private housing units were built—all of this without Federal aid. Note also the financial impact with increased revenue to the city. There are expenses, but urban renewal also generates revenue.

The New Orleans story is much the same, so is the Los Angeles story and the others—each without Federal aid. In fact, the cases where there was no Federal aid involved suggest that the other areas getting Federal aid could have done it on their own.

The case of Memphis, Tenn., is another example of the local people—bankers, insurance men, builders, realtors, and citizens doing the job—without Federal aid, and without eminent domain. The power of eminent domain, the taking of private property, does not necessarily have to be used in urban renewal, where owners are given a chance to participate. True, they must be told to clean up, sell, or have the city clean it up at the owners' expense. The result is greatly increased property value so the owner can hardly object. Even in cases where property does not conform to the zoning requirements, the owner can be given a chance to abate the nonconformance through remodeling or removal of the building, still retaining the land ownership. The property is not taken away without his having a chance to participate.

In Gadsden, Ala., it is my understanding that no right of eminent domain was used in redeveloping a rundown area. Neither did this city have a proper housing code or proper enforcement (compared to Dallas). City teams talked to owners about rehabilitation. When the owners refused to clean up the slum-like property, the city teams went directly to the property tenants. Each tenant was asked if he wanted a new home in a nearby residential development to be built with FHA financing under section 221. When most tenants signed up the realtors, builders, mortgage men and bankers went to work. A lovely new development was completed. The tenants moved into the new homes. The old shacks were left vacant. The owners then agreed to cooperate.

The definition of bad housing and what can be done about it is meaningful to property owners, as outlined in the pamphlet, "The Real Estate Man and Housing Reform." Another good summary of a positive program without Federal aid is described in the Washington Star article entitled "Realtors Have a Plan for Better Housing." Their way is neighborhood conservation carried out by private enterprise. It requires areawide, communitywide planning embracing a good housing code, proper zoning, a suitable assessment and tax structure, health and safety code with the necessary enforcement inspection. This is simply good city operation, something understood by Dallas people and their officials.

Two pamphlets put out by the chamber of commerce entitled "Urban Development Guidebook" and "City Planning and Urban Development" further outline the necessary program to accomplish urban renewal—and without Federal aid, although such aid is recognized as available. The need for private enterprise and local initiative has been rediscovered by the residents of Gary, Ind., who have offered for sale Duneland Village, a complete public housing development of 165 units. Upon the sale of public housing these advantages would accrue: (1) Revenue from the sale would be realized, (2) Stop further Federal subsidy using the taxpayers' money, (3) The property would start to pay its full share of local taxes, (4) The morale of occupants would be greatly boosted, no longer ashamed over others helping to pay the rent, (5) And no political worry over being evicted if their salary is increased.

Section 406 of the Housing Act of 1954 permits a resolution or ordinance by the city council or a referendum by the citizens to call for the liquidation of a project. The city would then negotiate with the Federal Government and the project will be sold by the public housing authority to the highest bidder after public advertisement. The bonds supporting the project would be repaid and any receipts above the indebtedness would be paid to the city and Federal treasuries.

CONCLUSION

Urban renewal is a local problem, concerning local property, and local property owners. The local citizens, as property owners and taxpayers, also foot the bill in every instance. "That government is best beset that is closest to the people" is no empty axiom. Our mayor and city council backed by local judgment can better solve our local problems than the distant Federal Government. Further, Federal aid weakens local government, costs more to do the same job, and violates the individual and States' rights guaranteed by the Constitution.

We shouldn't try to transfer our problems to the Federal Government for solution. The Federal Government will accept them always and try to do the job; this is the politically expedient thing to do.

In our conscientious recognition of the need for slum elimination, a view we all share, we must beware of dubious means to a very justifiable end.

The matter of Federal regulation following the use of Federal funds will no doubt continue to be misunderstood by some in Dallas, just as in Washington. So let me point out examples of controls we must accept: (1) Forced integration is part of public housing, so the Court has ruled; (2) the wage rates on urban renewal land clearance will be set by the Secretary of Labor, not by local people or the local economy, and there is no legal recourse from such wage predetermination. These are just two examples of imposed control.

I believe the acceptance of Federal money for purely local projects to be wrong. So I oppose this use of Federal money. Can I take any other course than to oppose what I think wrong? If, in fact, Federal aid is wrong and those who think it is wrong fail to oppose it, what is our Nation's future?

As I see it, the truth is the job will be done locally. It is just a question of recognizing responsibility and properly labeling what must be done, and then doing it. This will require responsible property owners (and responsibility accompanies ownership); it will require a courageous mayor and city council; it will require an understanding and willing citizenry.

All these ingredients of success Dallas has, no less than any other city. We can do the job locally, without Federal aid.

SPECIAL MILK PROGRAM

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Speaker, I am today joining certain of my colleagues by introducing a bill which would increase the amount of funds made available for the special milk program for fiscal 1959 to cover expected deficits, as well as for fiscal 1960 and 1961, to provide for the larger school enrollments which these years will bring.

Under the extension of the Agricultural Act of 1954, which covers this and the succeeding 2 fiscal years, funds in the amount of $75 million annually were made available for this program. However, it has recently been brought to our attention that no less than 38 States are facing deficits for this fiscal year under their present allocation. With the increased numbers of children enrolled in elementary and secondary schools which the next 2 years will bring, even greater deficits will be forthcoming unless we prepare now for them.

Under the proposal which I am today introducing, an additional $5 million will be made available for this program during the remainder of this fiscal year. This will cover the present deficits. The proposal would then also amend the present allocation to provide for an additional $10 million in fiscal 1960 and $15 million in 1961 to provide for the increased enrollments for which we must be prepared.

The special milk program is a good program. Since its inception in 1954, it has provided increased numbers of children in nursery, elementary, and secondary schools, as well as those in child care centers, settlement houses, summer camps, and similar nonprofit institutions devoted to the care and training of children, with increased amounts of milk to satisfy their health needs. In 1954, almost 450 million half pints were consumed. In 1956, this consumption was increased to more than 1,394 million half pints. And this year over 2 billion half pints will be consumed under the plan.

We must provide for this increase in both children and milk consumption, for unless we do, this fine program will be severely curtailed to the extent that States will be required to tell their schools and camps to decrease the amount of milk provided for their children. And the health of these children demands this milk.

Not only is the special milk program a good program from the aspect of the health of our children, it is a successful program with regard to the dairy industry and our dairy products surplus. Taken together with the school lunch program, it represents 3.5 percent of all the fluid milk consumed by our nonfarm population. The choice we have to make is whether we want to continue to encourage this drinking of milk by our schoolchildren or use the money to purchase surplus dairy products under present price-support programs.

Because this program benefits both our schoolchildren and our dairy industry, I respectfully urge the early consideration and approval of this amendment.

SHOULD PUBLIC HOUSING BONDS BE TAX EXEMPT, WHILE FARM CREDIT BONDS ARE REQUIRED TO PAY TAX?

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, last week I called the attention of Congress to the glaring tax loophole created by federally assisted public housing financing and pointed out the public housing authorized in the proposed housing bill could result in a tax windfall of over $1 billion for wealthy investors.

Today I would like to direct the attention of Congress to the unfair competitive advantage which public housing financing is privileged to enjoy over other programs which the Congress has set up and in which the Congress takes great pride. I refer to five Federal agencies which sell their own securities in the private investment market but not on a tax-exempt basis. I hope Members of Congress from farming districts will give earnest consideration to this problem because three of the five Federal agencies affected are farm credit agencies; namely, the Federal intermediate credit banks, the banks for cooperatives, and the Federal land banks.

Last year, calendar year 1958, sales of federally assisted public housing securities in the private investment market totaled $1,856,964,000. That includes both short-term note and long-term term bond financing. That huge volume of financing was done on a tax exempt basis notwithstanding the fact that the basis of the credit was a pledge of Federal credit.

Last year, calendar year 1958, sales of Federal intermediate credit bank securities in the private investment market totaled $1,560,300,000. Those securities were short-term notes with 3- to 9-month maturities. Even though these securities represented credit of a Federal agency they all had to be sold on a taxable basis. Why should federally assisted public housing securities enjoy a tax exempt privilege status in competition with the taxable securities of this fine agency in seeking the private investors' dollars?

Last year, calendar year 1958, sales of the banks for cooperatives securities in the private investment market totaled $329,500,000. Those securities were notes with 7- to 9½-month securities. Why should the securities of this fine Federal agency, which must sell its securities on a taxable basis, have to compete for funds in the private market with federally assisted public housing securities sold on a tax-exempt basis?

Last year, calendar year 1958, sales of Federal land-bank securities in the private investment market totaled $800 million. Those securities consisted of both short-term notes and bonds, with maturities ranging from 6 months to 12 years. Again we have a fine Federal agency selling its securities on a taxable basis in competition with tax exempt, federally assisted public housing securities. Why do we permit such unfair competitive advantage to continue?

The other two Federal agencies which finance in the private market and have to sell their own securities on a taxable basis promote private enterprise housing. These are the Federal home loan banks, and the Federal National Mortgage Association. Members interested in the private enterprise approach to housing will find the situation here most interesting.

Last year, calendar year 1958, the Federal home loan banks sold $808 million of their securities in the private market—all on a taxable basis. Maturities ranged from 6 months to 5 years. These taxable securities had to compete in the private market for the investors' dollar with the tax exempt federally assisted public housing issues.

Last year, calendar year 1958, under the secondary market operations of the Federal National Mortgage Association, sales of taxable securities in the private market for this function totaled $1,100 million. Maturities ranged from 3 months to 10 years. It is the same story. Taxable securities of another of the Government's own agencies having to compete with tax exempt federally assisted public housing issues.

Think of it. The $1.85 billion of federally assisted tax exempt public housing financing almost equalled the $1.9 billion combined total of the financing of the two Federal agencies which have to do their financing on a taxable basis to obtain funds to assist private enterprise housing.

For the convenience of the Members I am summarizing the above-mentioned financing in the following tabulation:

Program	Securities issued, 1958	Tax status of securities
Public housing	$1,856,964,000	Tax exempt.
Farm:		
Federal intermediate credit banks	1,560,300,000	Taxable.
Banks for cooperatives	329,500,000	Do.
Federal land banks	800,000,000	Do.
Private housing:		
Federal home loan banks	808,000,000	Do.
Federal National Mortgage Association (secondary market)	1,100,000,000	Do.

Unfortunately the Congress cannot do anything about the tax-exempt status of existing federally assisted public housing securities or about those to be issued pursuant to already signed Federal assistance contracts. However, if the Congress is to approve any additional public housing authorization, the Congress certainly should plug this tax loophole on public housing securities to be issued in the future and thus make a start on wiping out the unwarranted, tax-free competitive advantage which otherwise would exist for such securities. In all fairness to our Federal agency farm and private housing programs the Congress can do no less.

UNJUST TAX DISCRIMINATION AGAINST DEBIT LIFE INSURANCE AGENTS

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the body of the RECORD in two instances explaining two bills introduced by me.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill, H.R. 5390, to recognize so-called debit life insurance agents as outside salesmen under section 62(2)(D) of the Internal Revenue Code. My bill is identical to H.R. 5122 introduced on March 2 by my distinguished colleague from Texas [Mr. IKARD]. As I shall explain, the purpose of these bills is to eliminate an unjust tax discrimination against debit life insurance agents.

Under section 62(2)(D), an outside salesman is permitted to deduct all of his ordinary and necessary business expenses from gross income in computing his adjusted gross income. Then, in computing his net income from adjusted gross income he can and does claim the 10 percent standard deduction where that exceeds the amount of his actual deductible nonbusiness expenses for taxes, interest, contributions, and the like.

Like so-called ordinary life insurance agents, who are correctly considered to be outside salesmen within the meaning of section 62(2)(D), debit life insurance agents are salesmen in every sense of the term. Both types of agents hold the same kind of licenses; both sell the same lines of insurance—except that only debit agents can sell what is known as industrial insurance; both conduct their activities away from their employers' places of business; and both are generally required to defray their business expenses out of their own pockets.

Yet, despite the fact that the functions of both types of agents are basically identical, the Internal Revenue Service has ruled that debit agents are not outside salesmen. As a result there are a number of business expenses which they can deduct only from adjusted gross income rather than from gross income. In order to do this, however, they must forego the right to claim the 10 percent standard deduction from adjusted gross income. In many cases this means that debit agents are in effect denied the full benefit of their business expense deductions and consequently have higher taxable incomes than ordinary life insurance agents and other salesmen with exactly the same amount of gross income and business expenses.

Actually the only real respect in which the debit agent differs from the ordinary agent is that normally the debit agent personally collects the premiums falling due on one type of insurance that he sells—that is, industrial insurance, which is sold on a weekly or monthly premium basis. It is because of his activities in collecting premiums on this one type of insurance that the Internal Revenue Service has ruled that the debit agent is not an outside salesman within the meaning of section 62(2)(D).

Now, many debit agents devote only a relatively small amount of time to these collection activities and derive the major share of their income from the sale of new insurance. Moreover, anyone familiar with the life insurance business will tell you that even when making his premium collections, a debit agent is actually still "selling" insurance. This is because the policyholders are under no legal obligation to pay their premiums and are completely free to let their insurance lapse if they choose not to pay. Thus, in order to collect a premium on an existing industrial policy, the agent very often has to make as thorough a sales presentation as was made when the policy was originally placed in force.

In summary I believe it to be beyond question that debit life insurance agents are outside salesmen and are entitled to the same tax treatment as all other such salesmen under section 62(2)(D). The bills introduced by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. IKARD] and myself are designed simply to give explicit statutory recognition to this fact. I might add that I am confident that this equitable result can be accomplished with a very insignificant loss of Federal tax revenue.

FLOOD CONTROL AND CONSERVATION

Mr. BREEDING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the body of the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. BREEDING. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of this distinguished body a resolution adopted by the Kansas State Legislature urging the continuance of sufficient appropriations necessary to the control of floods and conservation of soil and water in the State of Kansas.

The resolution is as follows:

"HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 20

"Concurrent resolution petitioning the Congress of the United States to take appropriate action to assure the continuance of surveys and planning and cooperation in the construction of projects in the State of Kansas that are vital and necessary to the control of floods and the conservation of soil and water by sufficient appropriations being granted for this purpose to the Bureau of Reclamation, the U.S. Department of Agriculture, and the Corps of Engineers, and other Federal agencies and Departments

"Whereas water and soil are the most valuable natural resources in Kansas; and

"Whereas the citizens, industries, farms, and cities of Kansas have always been subject to flood and drouth but more recently they have experienced severe hardships and great financial losses from floods and drouths during the years 1951, 1952, 1953, 1954, 1955, 1956, 1957, and 1958; and

"Whereas many cities, industries, and farms have recently suffered from a critical shortage of water and at the same time are exposed to the further hazards of flood and drouth; and

"Whereas the nature of rivers is such that storms occurring in headwater regions of a stream in one State frequently inflict damage to areas in other States, and the benefits of stream stabilization resulting in adequate and dependable water supplies in one State become beneficial to areas in other States; and

"Whereas it has become evident that we must use every means available and feasible to conserve and control all of the sources of water supply for agricultural, municipal, industrial, and recreational use; and

"Whereas land treatment and watershed development have been increasingly emphasized as vital to all programs for the conservation of water and soil by the executive and legislative branches of State government, the State water resources board, State department of agriculture and other agencies, and the program is lagging because of the insufficiency of Federal funds for planning purposes; and

"Whereas the Federal Government through acts of Congress has delegated to three agencies, namely, the Bureau of Reclamation, the Soil Conservation Service of the U.S. Department of Agriculture, and the Corps of Engineers the principal responsibilities for the conservation of water and soil, and more specifically, such matters as water supply, irrigation, pollution control, soil conservation and flood control: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Kansas (the Senate concurring therein)*: That we respectfully urge, request and petition the Congress of the United States to take such action necessary to assure (1) continuance of surveys, planning, and cooperation in the construction of projects in the State of Kansas that are vital and necessary to the prevention of floods and to the conservation of water and soil, and (2) that Federal funds for this purpose be appropriated in sufficient amounts to the Soil Conservation Service of the U.S. Department of Agriculture, the Bureau of Reclamation, and the Corps of Engineers, and also other Federal agencies and departments; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the secretary of state be instructed to transmit enrolled copies of this resolution to the President of the United States, the Vice President of the United States, each Member of Congress of the United States, and the Director of the Bureau of the Budget of the United States."

I hereby certify that the above concurrent resolution originated in the house, and was adopted by that body.

February 16, 1959.

JESS TAYLOR,
Speaker of the House.
A. E. ANDERSON,
Chief Clerk of the House.

Adopted by the senate February 27, 1959:

JOSEPH W. HENKLE, Sr.,
President of the Senate.
RALPH E. ZARKER,
Secretary of the Senate.

NATIONAL TRANSPORTATION WEEK

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a resolution which would authorize the President to annually proclaim a National Transportation Week.

National Transportation Week, to be celebrated for the fourth consecutive year, is sponsored by the Associated Traffic Clubs of America, a national organization of over 250 clubs located in cities from coast to coast with total individual memberships of 50,000 men and women engaged in transportation work with major shippers and all modes of carriers.

For 1 week each year it would be appropriate that the American people be reminded that the transportation system of the United States, which is indispensable both to continuing economic development and adequate national defense, is strong and vigorous and always stands ready with its services to meet the needs of the Nation.

Through this annual celebration, in which shippers, railroads, motor carriers, airlines, water carriers, as well as those who labor in transportation, will participate, it is hoped that Americans everywhere will gain a better understanding and appreciation of the vitally important role played by transportation, in our everyday lives, our national economy, and in the national defense.

We should be proud to recognize that this Nation has the finest transportation system in the world, and the only such system in the world privately owned and operated. Observance of a National Transportation Week should also remind Americans that all segments of our transportation system must remain strong if the maximum contribution is to be made toward maintaining a vigorous free enterprise economy in the United States.

This means that the carriers serving the inland areas of our country are to be maintained in full vigor. In addition, the national policy must be such that the American merchant marine will be able to carry the flag of the United States to all corners of the world, in both time of peace and in event of a national emergency.

The observance of a National Transportation Week will go far toward renewing in the minds of the American people the realization that adequate transportation is the lifeline of our existence. Likewise, it should reawaken the continued need for policies that will sustain the system.

B'NAI B'RITH WOMEN CELEBRATES ITS 50TH ANNIVERSARY

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the House to join me in a tribute to B'nai B'rith Women, which observes its 50th anniversary on March 9.

This group—137,000 strong—has long been devoted to educational, humanitarian, patriotic, and philanthropic causes. Although an organization of Jewish women, its benevolence has always been extended without reference to religion, race, or creed.

It is not surprising, then, that B'nai B'rith Women has chosen to cast fanfare aside and commemorate its anniversary in keeping with this tradition of service. No elaborate celebrations will be held, and instead of receiving anniversary gifts on March 9, the members will give one—the gift of blood. In cities throughout the United States and Canada, they will make mass donations through American National and Canadian Red Cross blood banks and other community facilities.

This worthy undertaking, especially as it occurs during Red Cross Month, may well serve as an example to other organizations—men as well as women.

Another outstanding anniversary project will be sponsorship of a youth conference in Washington, D.C., April 12–14, in which representatives of 150 women's organizations have been invited to participate. The conference is being planned in consultation with the White House Conference on Children and Youth and with the cooperation of leading organizations dealing with the problems of youth.

I should like to tell you a little about the remarkable evolution of B'nai B'rith Women during its half century. The organization was born inauspiciously of a handful of women in San Francisco. On March 9, 1909, they founded its first chapter as a ladies' auxiliary of a local B'nai B'rith men's lodge. Its stated objective was to promote sociability in the order of B'nai B'rith.

As time passed, similar women's auxiliaries sprang up in all parts of the country, and as it grew the nature of the organization changed. Most notable was the shift from sociability to philanthropy and community service as its predominant theme.

In the 1930's, the plight of the Jews in Europe, depression at home, and threat of another major war, combined to stimulate an explosive growth in the organization and its activities. In 1940, it officially became a national organization. By 1942 membership reached 50,000.

During the war years, B'nai B'rith Women earned its reputation as a national service organization. Activities were devoted almost exclusively to war and civil defense work, from selling war bonds to driving Red Cross trucks and working in war plants. For these and other undertakings the women were presented with many government and private citations.

The postwar period brought expansion rather than depletion of activities. The creation of the State of Israel opened new opportunities for service, and in 1949, B'nai B'rith Women established a home near Jerusalem for emotionally disturbed children. The organization has continued to maintain this home as one of its major projects.

At home, international tensions, campaigns to conquer disease, veterans' programs, care of helpless and handicapped, vocational guidance, and other youth activities have absorbed members' energies.

As it passes the half-century mark, B'nai B'rith Women has 856 chapters in the United States, Canada, and 15 other countries, with a membership of 137,000. In the last few years, it has raised more than $1 million annually for its widely varied programs, projects, and philanthropies.

When B'nai B'rith Women finally sit down to their golden anniversary banquet April 17, they will well deserve their celebration.

PASSPORT LEGISLATION TO FACILITATE THE CITIZEN'S RIGHT TO TRAVEL

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, during the past year there has been a considerable amount of discussion relating to the need for adequate passport legislation. In my opinion, the present laws are inadequate to provide for the travel needs of our citizens. In response to this need, I have this day introduced my bill, H.R. 5455, to establish a national policy relating to the United States citizen's travel abroad; to establish a service within the Department of State which shall be responsible for the direction, administration, and execution of passports and travel documentation for American citizens and nationals in the United States and abroad; to prescribe procedures relating to the issuance of passports; to establish terms of validity of passports; to establish fees for passports; and for other purposes.

Following the recent Supreme Court cases—Briehl, Dayton, and Kent—a plethora of legislation has been introduced in both Chambers of the Congress relating particularly to various types of limitation on the individual citizen's right to travel. In view of this, I think it incumbent upon us to give serious consideration to the nature of the individual's right to travel. In my opinion, the right to travel is of equal dignity with our basic freedoms set forth in the first amendment. The constitutional basis for this conclusion is the provision contained in the fifth amendment wherein it is provided that no person shall be deprived of life, liberty, or property without due process of law. Certainly "liberty" means that the individual citizen has the right to do what he wants, go where he wants, say what he wants as long as in so doing he stays within the respected mandate of "the general welfare of the people." It is only when a clash arises between the individual rights of a citizen on one hand and the collective rights of the citizen on the other, that the former must yield to the latter, but only to the extent that the former will, by so doing, more fully realize his rights as a member of the latter. This yardstick that is applied to measure the length and breadth of the individual rights of our citizens finds application in the area of this right to travel. We erect stop signs and street lights and promulgate rules of procedure for conduct in

and on our highways. We do this not with the express purpose in mind of encroaching on the individual's freedom to travel but we do so with the purpose of facilitating travel to enable the individual to more fully enjoy and make use of his individual right to travel.

Stop signs and street lights facilitate travel and passports facilitate travel. The real reason we require passports is because foreign countries require passports. These countries want to know just who the person is that seeks entry into their country. The passport, then, is really nothing more than an identification card indicating to the particular country that the bearer is a citizen of the United States. It is also a request from the traveler's country that the foreign country extend to its citizen the protection of its laws during the citizen's travel and sojourn in their country. So the passport, then, is an aid to travel. The issuance of a passport to a citizen permits the citizen to more fully enjoy his right to travel. The Government's refusal to issue a passport to an individual restricts and limits the citizen's right to travel, the effect of which is to deny to the citizen his constitutional and natural right of locomotion. It becomes apparent, then, that the Federal Government's right to limit or deny the full enjoyment of a constitutional and natural right is governed by the aforementioned general welfare of the people yardstick.

In my opinion, the promotion of international travel of U.S. citizens and the encouragement of our citizens to know and to understand all peoples throughout the world is in the individual and the public interest and conduces to a more amicable and understanding relationship between all peoples and their respective countries. This, of course, is a policy decision to be made by the Congress. It is certainly consonant with the prior congressional pronouncements relating to our country's international programs.

Travel by citizens abroad should be as free of governmental restraint as possible consistent with requirements of national security. The Government should facilitate such travel and should provide for the protection of citizens abroad by providing passports, by negotiating with other countries to minimize travel formalities, and by other appropriate means to implement this salutary principle.

In section 3 of my bill, H.R. 5455, there are certain findings and declarations made by the Congress. You will note that the Communist Party in the United States is characterized as not being a political party or a political philosophy as such, but it is defined as "an instrumentality of the world Communist conspiracy whose purpose is to overthrow the Government of the United States." It is further characterized as being under the direction, domination, and control of a foreign power whose aims are the overthrow of any legally constituted governments not Communist dominated.

A further finding is made by the Congress that all U.S. citizens who "knowingly and willfully participate in the world Communist conspiracy in effect repudiate their allegiance to the United States and transfer their allegiance to the foreign power in which is vested the direction and control of the world Communist conspiracy and the Communist Parties of the world." A final finding is also made by the Congress that the issuance of passports to U.S. citizens who support the world Communist conspiracy presents a "clear and present danger to the security of the United States."

In view of these findings, the provision is made that during any period when the United States is at war or during the existence of any national emergency proclaimed by the President, a passport shall not be issued to any U.S. citizen if such citizen is a member of the Communist Party or is a member of any organization which is registered or as to which there is, in effect, a final order of the Subversive Activities Control Board requiring registration with the Attorney General of the United States as a Communist action, Communist front, or Communist-infiltrated organization, or has terminated such membership under such circumstances as to warrant the conclusion that such citizen continues to act in furtherance of the interest of the Communist conspiracy. Prohibition is extended to those who knowingly engage in activities which support the world Communist conspiracy under such circumstances as to warrant the conclusion that such citizen continues to act in furtherance of the interest of the world Communist conspiracy. These findings are consistent and in accord with the Internal Security Act of 1950. This act makes it unlawful for any member of the Communist conspiracy to make application for a passport or the renewal of a passport to be issued or renewed by or under the authority of the United States or to use or attempt to use any such passport.

It is the opinion shared by many that before the Congress can lawfully limit a citizen's right to travel because of his affiliation with the Communist movement, it is necessary that the aforementioned findings of fact be made as conditions precedent to any such restrictions. You will note further that these prohibitions will only be effective under the Passport Act of 1959, during a time when the United States is at war or during a period of national emergency proclaimed by the President. It is my opinion that if further restrictions are found to be necessary by the Congress that it is more appropriate that these restrictions be contained in the Internal Security Act of 1950 as is presently provided rather than encumber the Passport Act of 1959 which is designed to facilitate the travel of U.S. citizens abroad.

In my bill, H.R. 5455, the Passport Act of 1959, is proposed the stated policy of the Congress of the United States "that the promotion of international travel of U.S. citizens and the encouragement of its citizens to know and understand all people throughout the world is in the individual and public interest and conduces to a more amicable and understanding relationship between all peoples in their respective countries. This policy dictates that travel by citizens abroad should be as free of governmental restraint as possible, consistent with the requirements of national security. In accordance with this overriding principle, in my opinion, passport facilities should only be denied in the following instances, to wit:

First. Where such travel would:

A. Further the world Communist conspiracy as provided in the bill;

B. Violate the laws of the United States or of any State or Territory thereof;

C. Would aid in the evasion of any order issued by any court of record of the United States or of any State or Territory thereof;

D. Aid in the evasion of any information or indictment for a felony duly found by the United States or any State or Territory thereof;

E. Be prejudicial to the national welfare, safety, or security; or

F. Permit such citizen to use a valid passport while there is outstanding any sum of money owed by such citizen to the Government of the United States for previous transportation back to the United States.

Section 5 defines the passport and section 5(b) contains a new concept in our passport laws. This provision provides that a passport issued under this act is nontransferable and becomes the sole property of the citizen to whom issued, but is valid only for the period for which issued. This provision is significant in that it is a break from the philosophy presently contained in the regulations expressing the Federal Government personal property concept. The present concept in my opinion is misleading. The right to travel belongs to the individual citizens subject, of course, to certain limitations as hereinbefore recited, but basically this right belongs to the citizen. A passport is an essential aid to travel abroad. In my opinion, the emphasis must be placed on the individual's right to exercise this freedom of locomotion. It is therefore a matter of emphasis. This new emphasis is based on what can we do at the Federal level to facilitate the individual's right to travel, rather than vesting a personal property interest in the individual citizen's passport in the Federal Government. This is important from the point of view of policy. The emphasis changes from the concept of a privilege granted by our Government to the free exercise of a constitutional right by the citizen.

My bill makes further provision for the issuance of regulation by the Secretary of State and significantly it provides for the establishment of "the United States Passport Service." Our present passport office, in my opinion, is doing an outstanding job. The United States Passport Service is established under this act as a service to the American citizen to facilitate the citizen's travel abroad and in aiding him to communicate with all people throughout the world.

There has been a great deal of discussion in the recent past relating to certain area restrictions imposed by the Secretary of State. Section 16 of my bill provides for restrictions of travel to,

first, places where armed hostilities are in progress; second, countries with which the United States is at war, and third, countries to which the President finds that travel should be restricted in the national interest. It is important, however, that certain exceptions be provided for and subsection (b) of section 16 provides that the Secretary of State may make exceptions to general travel restrictions for individuals and for classes of persons including the classes of professional newsgatherers, missionaries, and doctors on medical missions.

Before general travel restrictions can be imposed, however, section 17 of my bill provides that travel abroad of any citizen shall not be restrained and passports shall not be limited in validity with respect to any place unless the President has made an appropriate declaration under subsection (a) of section 16. In each such case, the President shall report the reasons for such declaration to the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives and to the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate and such declaration shall be effective for a period of not more than 1 year unless such time is extended by law.

In accordance with the provisions of my bill, certain serious limitations are placed on the citizen's constitutional right to travel. When a determination has been made that a passport should not be issued to a citizen it is absolutely essential that the Congress make certain that the review procedures provided will accord procedural due process to the passport applicant. In accordance with this belief, section 18(a) of my bill provides for the establishment of a Passport Review Board within the State Department consisting of five officers of the Department to be designated by the Secretary of State. Further provision is made that no person shall be eligible to serve on such Passport Review Board in any case under this section in which he shall have participated in investigative functions or in which he shall have participated in the original refusal to issue, renew, or extend such passport or in the original action of withdrawal, cancellation, revocation, limitation, or restriction of such passport.

The Passport Review Board shall establish its own rules of procedure which must be approved by the Secretary of State. Subsection (b) of section 18 requires that the rules accord the applicant or passport holder the right to appear personally, to be represented by counsel and to offer oral or documentary evidence. Applicant or passport holder must receive a copy of the transcript proceedings and be permitted to cross-examine all of the witnesses against him and examine all other evidence which is made a part of the open record in the case. In accordance with the overall policy, the Board must insure, consistent with national security, that all evidence and witnesses relied upon are produced and made a part of the open record.

In the event of an adverse ruling by the Review Board, provision is made that the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia shall have jurisdiction to hear and determine any appeal from a final decision of the Passport Review Board.

Mr. Speaker, these are the primary provisions contained in my bill. H.R. 5455, nominally called the Passport Act of 1959. In our society truth can be found in the full expression and enjoyment of the freedom of the individual. Free and unfettered travel will help the individual in his quest for truth. It should be the Government's position to encourage all of its citizens who are able to leave its borders and communicate with their world citizens abroad. It is this dynamic peoples to peoples approach that cuts through the restrictions of protocol and brings about an understanding that cannot be achieved from the executive directives of both sides of the waters. The Passport Department can be a real boon to this great peoples to peoples movement. Its fundamental purpose is service to the American citizen. The Department was not established to restrict this right to travel. On the contrary, it was established to facilitate the right to travel. When we think in these terms, many of the artificial rules and regulations and limitations proffered by some of our colleagues fall away and lose their alleged significance. It is with this great hope in mind of facilitating this worldwide movement of peoples that I have this day introduced my bill, H.R. 5455.

AS URGENT AS THE MOSCOW THREAT

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, it is obvious that part of our preparation for whatever might come in Berlin should be a strengthening of our NATO alliance. We cannot hope to meet the challenge of Berlin unless we are unified in our firm resistance to any step that would yield any part of the freedom of the people of West Berlin.

I hope that our Government is in the process of taking steps which will strengthen our military forces in being in Western Europe and providing reassurance to our European allies that we are fully willing to take whatever risk is necessary in the defense of Berlin.

Under unanimous consent, I include an article by Mr. Henry A. Kissinger from the New York Times of Sunday, March 8:

AS URGENT AS THE MOSCOW THREAT—THE IMMEDIATE TASK ARISING OUT OF THE BERLIN CRISIS IS TO STRENGTHEN THE UNITY OF NATO, FOR EUROPEAN DOUBTS OF AMERICAN DEPENDABILITY HAVE WEAKENED THE ALLIANCE

(By Henry A. Kissinger)

There can be little doubt that Western policy has reached a turning point. Soviet pressure, which began with Moscow's threat to turn over control of the routes to Berlin to its East German satellite, has placed into question some of the basic assumptions of Western policy. One of the most comforting of these has been that Western Europe was so vital to our security that the Soviet Union would not dare to menace it. Now that idea has been shattered and, in the process, a fundamental threat to the future of the Western alliance has arisen.

Strangely enough, in the debate about foreign policy in the United States, little attention has been paid to this challenge. The discussion has proceeded from the premise the western unity is a root fact of political life; that our basic problem is to develop flexibility and new approaches in our relations with the Soviet bloc.

A month's visit to Germany and France has convinced me that these assumptions are of very dubious validity. Conversations with political leaders of both government and opposition, editors of major newspapers, and representatives of the academic community, indicated that the Western alliance is in serious danger, partly because of confusion about our purposes. In the present situation strengthening the unity of the West is a task as urgent as Moscow's threat.

European criticism of the United States is not new, of course. What is new is that, for the first time, there exists grave doubt about our willingness to run risks on behalf of our allies, and even about our ability to understand what might constitute a threat. For purposes of immediate policy it is beside the point whether this attitude is justified; it is the psychological environment in which our actions will be interpreted and with which we must reckon.

The extent of the uneasiness in Germany and France about the future course of United States policy is striking. To take two examples: A French editor, to whom I remarked on what seemed to me the excessive suspiciousness of high officials, replied: "They think you are about to commit treason in a war that has already started." The moderate intellectual German weekly Die Zeit, which had been a frequent critic of the rigidity of Western policy in the past and an advocate of disengagement, carried a front-page headline: "How Soft Is the United States?"

Even if recent consultations have produced some agreement on immediate tactics, the underlying suspicion remains. These fears can be summed up in the following questions that are constantly being asked:

"Is the United States unwilling to run risks?"

Europe has suddenly awakened to the implications of our concept of massive retaliation. Until fairly recently, American strategic superiority was taken for granted as the chief deterrent to Soviet aggression. A greater European military effort was regarded as irrelevant or dangerous, because it might encourage the Soviets to believe that an attack on Europe might evoke only a limited, local response. As long as European security was thought to depend entirely on United States willingness to engage in all-out war, the European powers could rely on our nuclear capability without participating in it. They even could afford the luxury of criticizing us for alleged bellicosity.

With the Soviet's development of long-range missiles, the steady shrinking of the U.S. capability for limited war and the widely advertised "missile gap," confidence in American power and in our willingness to run risks has been gravely shaken. A high German official said in a television interview that 1959 was perhaps the last year in which the United States would risk war in defense of Berlin or even of Europe. Newspapers, officials, and opposition leaders in both Germany and France constantly raise the question: What objective in Europe would seem

to the United States worth the destruction of Washington and New York? This fear has already produced the conviction (particularly in France) that, in order to be able to assure their security, the European powers must develop a nuclear arsenal of their own. A U.S. policy that our European allies interpret as irresolute will inevitably result in a redoubled effort to develop a local deterrent; in other words, in a vain and therefore demoralizing attempt to make the United States strategically dispensable. And the political corollary will be an increasing tendency to loosen Atlantic ties.

"Is a separate United States-Soviet agreement possible?"

Whatever the effect of the Mikoyan visit in the United States, it accomplished a major Soviet objective on the Continent: It gave strength to the argument that direct Soviet-United States negotiations, to the exclusion of Europe, were possible. European press reports painted a picture of eminent American businessmen abjectly seeking to prove to a commissar that they were "regular" fellows; of conservative circles eagerly welcoming his presence and seemingly desiring agreement on almost any terms. An official summed up the European attitude in the phrase: "How could you behave this way, at this particualr time?"

This bewilderment, in turn, has been exploited by the Soviet Union. Soviet diplomats continually suggest direct talks to both Germany and France to forestall a separate American-Soviet arrangement. In short, Moscow seeks to split the Western alliance by citing to us the rigidity of our European allies while warning them of our unreliability.

"Has Britain a special position in NATO?"

The continental powers, especially France, resent what they consider Britain's special status within NATO. Since they ascribe this status largely to Britain's possession of her own atomic deterrent, an additional incentive is created for them to divert resources to the creation of nuclear arms.

Our continental allies fear that matters vital to European interests are being settled by direct United States-British negotiations, and, at the same time, that Britain has become the least resolute major partner in NATO. They are convinced that, with an election imminent, Britain will seek to avoid a showdown at almost any price; that it is exerting pressure on the United States to make concessions which would amount to a major western defeat. A prominent European said: "Britain is not conducting foreign but domestic policy."

"IS AMERICAN POLICY RELIABLE?"

The question that German and French editors, officials and political leaders asked most frequently was: What does the United States really want? There was concern that the U.S attitude toward Europe had become confused and uncertain. Even some of those who had criticized us most severely for rigidity were now troubled by the circumstances in which the clamor for flexibility has come about, policies which had been declared sacrosanct seemed suddenly in flux because of a Soviet threat to sever the lifeline to Berlin. The reiteration of slogans such as "elasticity" and "new approaches" seemed less a constructive policy than a panicky reaction to a Soviet menace. The impression was that we have neither a new policy nor the courage to stand by our previous convictions.

It is easy to share the dismay of many critics about our unimaginative foreign policy of the past 6 years. There is no doubt that we have defined our position more by what we oppose than what we stand for, that every Soviet initiative has drawn Western energies into essentially sterile, defensive countermoves. Neither German unity nor European security nor the problems of the emergent nations have evoked a dynamic, consistent American response. We seem to be prisoners of circumstances rather than their creators.

But in making these criticisms we stand in danger of overestimating the degrees of flexibility open to us in Europe. Our European allies would very likely interpret any basic shift in our policy now as a sign of American vacillation under stress. The common feature of such proposals as the substitution of German troops for those of the West in Berlin, disengagement, or the Rapacki plan for a neutral zone in middle Europe is that each of them became a subject of intense controversy only after the Soviet threat to Berlin.

Each of these schemes is based in some measure on the dubious premise that the danger to European security is Western rearmament even though the opposite proposition is more nearly true: Soviet pressure has become possible precisely because the Western defense effort has been all to inadequate. And each disengagement proposal would involve a withdrawal of American forces at a time of intense Soviet menace. Under current conditions, an American guarantee could not be substituted for the presence of American troops. If serious doubts already exist about our willingness to honor our commitments—at a time when United States forces are in the direct line of Soviet advance—a withdrawal in the face of what Europeans consider a Soviet ultimatum would inevitably be interpreted as a U.S. attempt to escape its responsibilities.

Because many Europeans doubt our steadiness and reliability, the repeated declarations that the United States will stand firm on Berlin have proved relatively ineffective, all the more so as our deeds are so inconsistent with our words. It is difficult to convey determination while reducing our Armed Forces and focusing the national attention on a balanced budget.

What, then, can be done to reestablish allied unity? Our most immediate task must be to strengthen the cohesion of the Western alliance. We should demonstrate that we are a reliable partner in time of stress. Only to the extent that we succeed in building confidence can we undertake the long overdue reexamination of Western policy.

In this sense, the present situation represents not only a threat but also a great opportunity. For while many of our European allies are uneasy about our course, they have no definite program of their own and are eager for American leadership. A diplomat of one of the smaller European countries said to me: "Do not come to us and ask what you should do. We do not know your resources and cannot assume your responsibilities. Whether you want to or not, you are the leader of the Western alliance."

In the absence of clear American purposes the demand for leadership has a demoralizing effect: some of our Allies develop proposals in which they do not fully believe in response to what they take to be American desires, while we, in turn, treat these proposals as expressions of European wishes.

On the other hand, if we behave imaginatively, as in the days of the Marshall Plan and the Greek-Turkish aid program, we can lay the basis for a new era of ever deeper Western cooperation—and not only in Europe. The Far East, the Middle East, Africa and Latin America all require "new approaches." But the area under attack is hardly the place to prove our flexibility.

The most crucial task before the West is therefore to get its own house in order. The challenge is not simply to devise a hurried proposal to meet a Soviet demand. We must not delude ourselves that a negotiating position can remedy the lassitude of nearly a decade or that clever bargaining can substitute for the effort and dedication that have been lacking heretofore.

While it is beyond the scope of this article to develop a detailed program, some general guidelines can be sketched:

The Berlin issue: Free access to Berlin will be the touchstone of all other measures. If the sequence of events initiated by the Soviet threat ends with what is interpreted by our Allies as an American defeat or withdrawal, NATO will prove no stronger than the French system of alliance in the interwar period.

To say that we will be firm on Berlin is not a policy. Our task is to give this term concrete content. We should make specific proposals defining guarantees of free access, to be given either by the Soviet Union or by a four-power agreement. The guarantee should be registered with the United Nations. With such a guarantee, it would make little difference whether Russians or East Germans man the check points. But in the absence of such an assurance we cannot escape the problem by designating the East Germans as Soviet agents.

At the same time, it is essential to make clear the seriousness of the situation to our people, to our allies and to the Soviet Union. During the Soviet warning period on Berlin, the West has been bemused with determining Soviet intentions, first by marking time until the Mikoyan visit, then waiting for the 21st Party Congress, then for the result of Prime Minister Macmillan's sojourn in Russia.

We are sliding toward a crisis for which the American people have not been prepared. Our allies are becoming nervous about the lack of a tone of urgency in the United States and the Soviet Union may be misled into the belief that the issue of Berlin can be pressed with impunity.

A congressional resolution affirming our determination to maintain our rights in Berlin and an increased alert of our Armed Forces would seem minimum requirements.

Negotiating tactics: We should always be ready to negotiate not only for substantive but also for psychological reasons: To convey our peaceful purposes to the rest of the world. Negotiations, even if they fail, can at least project to other nations the issues for which we are prepared to contend. At the same time, it is important that, rather than expend energies on debates over abstractions like rigidity or flexibility, we concentrate our efforts on developing a concrete program.

Rigidity is surely not helpful. But neither is flexibility an end in itself. Indeed, it may sometimes make agreement more rather than less difficult. If we base our negotiations on the principle that the West has an obligation to break any deadlock with new proposals, we shall encourage Soviet obstinacy, for we will nurture the belief that if Soviet negotiators hold out long enough they will elicit ever more favorable Western offers.

We have no obligation to make only proposals that the Soviet Union says it will accept, for this would turn diplomacy into a device for surrender. We do have a responsibility to make proposals that express our values and take into account legitimate Soviet security concerns. In short, the West requires a sense of direction more than negotiating skill. Only the purposeful can be flexible.

Western cohesion. The Western Powers should not confine themselves to issues raised by the Soviet Union; they should act boldly to strengthen unity among themselves. In particular, this time seems opportune to make another large advance toward European integration, especially in the field of foreign policy.

A permanent committee of European diplomats should be created charged with developing a common European foreign pol-

icy. To the extent that Western Europe considers itself a political unit, its policy will gain in assurance: Such an institution would counteract the persistent Soviet efforts to play off the allies against one another. With Great Britain's participation, it would remove the suspicions created by the alleged special British position within NATO.

At the same time, we should use this crisis to encourage creation of a Western European atomic force. The West could then negotiate much more flexibly about the precise location of nuclear arms. For then any threatened member would feel protected by the voice it has in the control of the overall Military Establishment. Such a force would also be the best, and probably the only, means to prevent the proliferation of national atomic forces, which is almost inevitable if present trends continue.

Toward a larger Europe: We should advocate the concept of a greater Europe, open to the Soviet satellites. This initiative might be particularly effective in the social and cultural field. But there are opportunities in the strategic area as well. NATO could immediately give Poland a military guarantee of the Oder-Neisse line, its postwar boundary, against German aggression. Such a move would lessen the Soviet ability to control Poland through its fear of Germany. I advanced this idea in many public talks in Germany and encountered very little opposition.

A reexamination of NATO strategy: A basic cause of allied disunity is the weakness of NATO and the ambiguity of its strategy. It is no doubt correct that we need not match the Soviets in every strategic category. But we are reaching a situation where we are not keeping up in any category. Against the background of this weakness, declarations of firmness ring hollow and the sense of insecurity of our allies must inevitably increase.

Moreover, NATO has never resolved the question whether it is a device to unleash all-out war or a means to prevent Soviet occupation of Europe should deterrence fail. By adopting an uneasy compromise, NATO is in danger of paralyzing itself. The doubts of our allies as to our willingness to risk all-out war for the defense of Europe while five U.S. divisions are stationed there underline the inherent lack of plausibility of the doctrine of massive retaliation.

In fact, current strategy has two contradictory but equally dangerous consequences—either it leads to resignation and hopelessness on the part of our allies or it causes them to make strenuous efforts to develop their own nuclear deterrents, a field where their own contributions can be marginal at best. Current strategy produces either inadequate effort or wasteful duplication.

Two sets of measures are, therefore, required: (1) An immediate strengthening of the U.S. overall deterrent with respect to its size, its mobility, and its dispersal (such a program is the prerequisite for all other measures); (2) a common effort to devise a defense of Europe which does not have the aspect of suicide. While we require the capability for massive retaliation to prevent a Soviet surprise attack on the United States, we should not rely on it as the sole deterrent to an attack on Europe or the chief means of defense against Soviet aggression should deterrence fail.

A defensive alliance which cannot protect the territory of its members without destroying them is inherently brittle. There is no reason why the United States and Western Europe, whose combined resources, human and material, still far exceed those of the U.S.S.R., cannot create an adequate force for a local defense of Europe. The obstacle is not capability, but lack of will.

These ideas indicate a direction and not a program. Nothing is possible, however, without a more dynamic conception by the United States of its role in the world. For too long we have treated our problems as technical ones; we have sought courses of action which involved the least effort and sacrifice.

As a result our military program is inadequate; continued at its present scale it will doom our diplomacy to futility by creating constant opportunities for Soviet pressure while reducing the means to resist them. Our economic program, both domestic and foreign, is too tentative and too conscious of the obstacles in the path. Our diplomacy lacks dynamism.

We are living through a period which, in retrospect, will undoubtedly appear to be one of the great revolutions in history. We cannot withdraw from it; we can only contribute to shaping it constructively. The great challenge of our time is that the self-sufficient nation-state is breaking down. No nation—not even the largest—can survive in isolation or realize its potentialities, material or spiritual, on its own.

In the past, the Soviet threat has often produced Atlantic unity. It may again. But ultimately the unity of the West depends on what we affirm rather than on what we reject. It must flow from our convictions and hopes, not our fears.

We of the West, who bequeath the concept of nationalism to others, must show the way to a new international order by initiative in setting our own house in order and by imagination in helping the newly independent states to realize their aspirations. Vacillating policies will prove disastrous to everybody. The West must raise its sights; it must develop policies which will make of it a true community.

NATIONAL MILK SANITATION LEGISLATION WOULD BENEFIT BOTH CONSUMERS AND FARMERS

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. JOHNSON] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, of the 2,000 and some items handled in a grocery store, milk is the only food sold in large quantities in the United States which is not allowed to move freely in interstate trade. Over the years, the various States and municipalities have set up and added to their milk sanitation regulations until we have a regular crazy-quilt of rules that hamper the free flow of high-quality milk from State to State. Unfortunately, human nature being what it is, some milksheds are using these health standards as an excuse to maintain a neat little milk monopoly for themsevles.

CONSUMERS COULD SAVE 1 TO 3 CENTS ON MILK

Like most monopolies, this one does not serve the public interest. In the areas affected, Mrs. Housewife is paying from 1 to 3 cents more per quart for milk than she would have to pay if the market was open and competitive.

In my home State of Wisconsin, the farmland is uniquely suited to the production of milk. Yet our class 1 milk, which meets the highest quality standards, is kept out of many markets because of health regulations that date back to the horse and buggy days. This class 1 milk is then relegated to lower price uses like the manufacture of cheese, butter, and dry milk—and as such is labeled surplus.

Mr. Speaker, class 1 milk testing 3.5 brings Wisconsin farmers $3.14 per hundredweight when it can find a market as bottling milk. However, because of these trade barriers I have just mentioned, much of this class 1 milk must be used for class 3 or manufacturing purposes. There it brings the farmers only $2.90 per hundredweight.

I use Wisconsin as an example, but the same thing has happened in Minnesota and Iowa and in other States where dairying is the logical choice for farmers. Sure, a dairy plant can ship milk to some out-of-State markets—but the plant and the milk have to meet a different set of standards for every market. One of the dairies in my district sends milk to 10 different markets—and has 10 different inspectors trooping through the place in the course of a year.

MAZE OF REGULATIONS FACE PLANT MANAGERS

Pity the poor plant manager, who has to weave his way through a real maze of regulations to satisfy each of the 10 inspectors. For instance, one city may demand that a plant's equipment be sterilized by steam, while another may say that the equipment must be sterilized chemically. Clearly, it is an imposition on the plant operator to make him sterilize the equipment both ways in order to qualify for both markets.

Then there is the case where a city refused to accept milk produced under the jurisdiction of another because one ordinance required four farm inspections a year, while the other required only three. California refused to take milk from farms approved by the Arizona health authorities because Arizona regulations permitted a one-room milk house, while California law required a two-room milk house.

To ship milk to Ardmore, Pa., Wisconsin producers must have a 2-inch outlet value on their bulk milk coolers. Certain parts of California have the same requirement, but in 46 other States, the 1½-inch valve is accepted.

In many cases, the cost of the multiple inspections is charged against the plant selling the milk. The plant in turn has to pass this charge on to the consumer or the farmer.

Naturally, we need sanitary regulations to protect the consumer against milk of dubious quality. But I protest the way some milksheds are using antiquated health rules to maintain a milk monopoly at the expense of the rest of the milk producers and the consumers.

U.S. MILK CODE WOULD BE QUALITY YARDSTICK

During the 85th Congress, I introduced a bill which would have made the proven U.S. Milk Ordinance and Code the single standard for fluid milk and fluid milk products shipped in interstate commerce. Hearings were held before the Health and Science Subcommittee of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. Following those hearings, the Association of State and Territorial Health Officers, formerly opposed to the idea of Federal legislation in this field, came out with a series of recommendations for Federal milk sanitation legislation. Also, at the request of the subcommittee, the U.S. Public Health Service furnished the committee with recommendations for legislation in this field. I have incorporated these two sets

of recommendations in my revised milk sanitation bill—H.R. 3840—which I introduced on February 2 of this year.

Mr. Speaker, in many respects, I feel that my revised bill is a much better bill than the original. The revised version does not insist that all fluid milk moving in interstate trade must conform with the U.S. Milk code. However, it does provide that milk which meets the requirements of the U.S. code cannot be kept out of interstate commerce on health grounds. Of course, milk shipped within the boundaries of a State would still be completely under the control of State and local sanitarians.

This bill would not add another layer of inspectors on the present inspection setup. Dairy plant inspections would continue to be carried on by the State and local health officials. They would be thoroughly trained in the application of the United States Code to insure uniform inspections all over the United States. The results of their inspections would be certified by the U.S. Public Health Service, which could also conduct spot checks from time to time. Milk from certified plants could move freely from State to State.

EIGHTEEN REPRESENTATIVES AND FOUR SENATORS HAVE INTRODUCED MILK SANITATION LEGISLATION

Mr. Speaker, the crying need for milk sanitation legislation is demonstrated by the fact that 17 of my colleagues have joined me by introducing companion bills in the House. They are:

H.R. 3841: BYRNES, Wisconsin.
H.R. 3842: FLYNN, Wisconsin.
H.R. 3843: LAIRD, Wisconsin.
H.R. 3844: NELSEN, Minnesota.
H.R. 3905: KASTENMEIER, Wisconsin.
H.R. 3916: QUIE, Minnesota.
H.R. 3919: REUSS, Wisconsin.
H.R. 3931: ZABLOCKI, Wisconsin.
H.R. 3986: WITHROW, Wisconsin.
H.R. 4003: BLATNIK, Minnesota.
H.R. 4037: O'KONSKI, Wisconsin.
H.R. 4062: COAD, Iowa.
H.R. 4102: VAN PELT, Wisconsin.
H.R. 4928: GROSS, Iowa.
H.R.5003: JUDD, Minnesota.
H.R. 5142: LANGEN, Minnesota.
H.R. 5264: WOLF, Iowa.

Over in the Senate, a similar bill is being sponsored by Senator HUMPHREY, of Minnesota, and cosponsored by Senator MCCARTHY, of Minnesota, and Senators WILEY and PROXMIRE, of Wisconsin. This bill is S. 988.

Since the revised bill was introduced, I have had mail from organizations and individuals who feel that this bill is the logical and long-overdue answer to the problem of these artificial trade barriers against high-quality milk. Among the organizations which have come out in support of Federal milk sanitation legislation are the Wisconsin Farm Bureau; the Wisconsin Farmers Union; the Wisconsin Grange, the Wisconsin Association of Cooperatives; the Wisconsin Conference on Intra-State Milk Shipments, and the Pure Milk Products Cooperative, of Fond du Lac, Wis.

Two of Wisconsin's leading farm magazines, the Wisconsin Agriculturist and Farmer and Hoard's Dairyman also favor the idea. W. A. Gordon, editor of the Dairy Record, St. Paul, Minn., has enthusiastically endorsed it.

WASHINGTON MILK SQUABBLE SHOWS USE OF SANITARY STANDARDS AS TRADE BARRIERS

We do not have to look any further than the current Washington milk squabble for a prize example of how health standards can be used—and are being used—to allow the establishment of a local monopoly. My interest in the present controversy relates to the charges made against the U.S. Milk Code and the charge that Wisconsin and Minnesota milk is inferior in quality to milk produced anywhere else. When anyone attacks the quality of class I fluid milk produced in Wisconsin and Minnesota, my fighting blood is up.

Mr. Speaker, I want to point out to Members of the House that the Ninth District of Wisconsin has more up-to-date, modern dairy plants than most areas of the country. Many of these plants cover more than a city block and are models for the industry.

Sale of milk in the Nation's Capital is governed by the Milk Act of 1925 and its regulations. Many of these regulations are outdated and do not take into consideration the tremendous technical advancements which have been made in recent years in the production, handling, and shipment of milk. These regulations, in effect, set up a trade barrier against high-quality milk from other areas and give a distinct advantage to producers in a restricted local area. This enables a small number of local operators to control 90 percent of the District of Columbia's milk supply.

Currently, Washington dairies are paying $6.62 per hundredweight for class I or bottling milk. In the past week, I have received letters from two modern dairy plants in Wisconsin's Ninth District. Each of them could deliver top-quality 3.5 percent class I bottling milk to Washington for $5.50 per hundredweight.

That price includes the cost of transporting the milk from Menomonie and Turtle Lake, Wis., to the District of Columbia. Even taking into account the $1.80 per hundredweight shipping charge, the Wisconsin milk would cost $1.12 a hundredweight less than the bottling milk now being purchased by local distributors. This would represent a saving of at least 2 cents a quart which could and should be passed on to the consumer.

WISCONSIN MILK IS CHEAPER IN PRICE BUT NOT CHEAP QUALITY

On March 3, the Maryland-Virginia Milk Producers ran a full-page ad in Washington papers—an ad which referred to the inadvisability of "importing cheaper milk from the outside which we believe to be of lower quality." The price of Wisconsin milk is cheaper, but there is nothing cheap about the quality.

Mr. Speaker, it is now possible to have any plant in the United States rated voluntarily according to the requirements of the U.S. Milk Ordinance and Code. The U.S. Public Health Service periodically checks and certifies the inspection, rating, and laboratory procedures of the reporting States. The purpose of such spot checks is to insure a uniform approach in certifying interstate milk shippers. The ratings are listed in a booklet called "Sanitation Compliance Rating of Interstate Milk Shippers." Plants all over the United States, including the District of Columbia, are rated in this booklet.

The sanitation compliance ratings for the two Wisconsin dairy plants I have just mentioned prove my point about the topnotch quality of Wisconsin milk. Wisconsin Cooperative Dairies, Inc., has the following ratings: Raw milk, 95; receiving station, 100; enforcement rating, 97.

Turtle Lake Co-op Creamery Association's ratings run as follows: Raw milk, 95; receiving station, 100; enforcement rating, 97.

These ratings are higher than the ratings of the two major dairies serving the Washington market. Chestnut Farms Dairy has the following rating: Raw milk, 91; receiving station, 100; enforcement rating, 94.

Thompson's Dairy rates as follows: Raw milk, 91; enforcement rating, 94.

HIGH-QUALITY MIDWESTERN MILK SHOULD BE ALLOWED TO BE SOLD IN NATION'S CAPITAL

I beg to differ with the newspaper ad on another point—that of importing milk. According to a reliable source—namely, Webster's Dictionary—import means "to bring wares from one country into another in commerce." Since when has Washington, D.C., not been a part of the United States? Matter of fact, if there is one place that does belong to all the citizens of the country, it is our Nation's Capital. I feel most strongly that if Wisconsin and other Midwest dairies are willing and able to ship high-quality milk to Washington, they should not be prevented from doing so by a set of local health rules that are as outdated as they are arbitrary.

Under leave to extend my remarks I would like to insert the letters I received from Wisconsin Cooperative Dairies, Inc., and the Turtle Lake Co-op Creamery Association in the RECORD at this point:

TURTLE LAKE CO-OP
CREAMERY ASSOCIATION,
Turtle Lake, Wis., March 3,1959.

Congressman LESTER JOHNSON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: We have been watching the problems that are arising in the fluid-milk markets throughout the country and notice with particular interest the arguments presented by the Maryland and Virginia Milk Producers Association.

Our farmers price for a better quality of milk receives less than one-half of what the producers in the Maryland and Virginia shed do.

It does not cost but a few cents more per hundred to produce milk in the East than it does out here. These costs are based on D.H.I.A. records.

We would like the privilege to ship milk into Washington, D.C., and could deliver milk that is approved for Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, New Jersey, and Ardmore, Pennsylvania U.S.P.H. the highest inspection in the country.

Our price delivered to Washington, D.C., is $5.50 per hundred weight of 3.5 percent milk with a 7.2 cents per point butterfat differential.

Yours very truly,

R. E. MILLER,
General Manager.

WISCONSIN CO-OPERATIVE DAIRIES, INC.,
Menomonie, Wis., March 5, 1959.

Hon. LESTER JOHNSON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. JOHNSON: We have checked the price necessary to deliver grade "A" milk from Menomonie, Wis. to Washington, D.C.

Price of milk to Washington, D.C., for March is $3.70 per hundredweight f.o.b. Menomonie. Transportation rates on 35,000 pounds load is $1.80 per hundredweight or $5.50 per hundredweight delivered at Washington, D.C.

Our sanitation compliance ratings:

(Chicago shed) raw milk, 94; receiving station, 99; enforcement rating, 96. November 26, 1958, survey.

(Wisconsin shed) raw milk, 95; receiving station, 100; enforcement rating, 97. November 5, 1958, survey.

This is all bulk tank pickup.

Thanking you for your continued interest in behalf of the dairy industry, I remain,

Very truly yours,

H. K. OLSON,
Manager.

Milk is either pure or it is not. There's no halfway in-between about it. By the same token, milk that is rated as pure in Wisconsin should be considered pure in Washington. That is why we need a single standard like the U.S. milk code as a yardstick for evaluating the quality of milk shipped from State to State. The national milk sanitation bill—H.R. 3840—provides this yardstick.

U.S. MILK CODE IS MODEL FOR THE INDUSTRY

The U.S. milk code, regarded as a model for the industry, was the result of the work of top technical experts in both the health and dairy fields. It was not a product of the U.S. Public Health Service alone, since the code was developed with the aid of an advisory board of experts in the fields of dairy technology, veterinary medicine, agriculture, and public health—in addition to State and local agencies who use the code, industry and interested Federal agencies, including the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which has approved the present edition.

Mr. Speaker, the code is revised frequently to keep pace with the rapid improvements in milk processing, handling, and shipment. Since the first code was published in 1924, it has been completely revised 12 times.

Currently, the U.S. milk code is being used as the basis for milk sanitation regulations in 35 States and has been voluntarily adopted by some 1,900 cities and counties. It is used as the quality standard for milk purchased for our Armed Forces.

At Walter Reed Hospital here in Washington, D.C., the milk served to patients must meet the specifications of the U.S. code rather than the District of Columbia's sanitary regulations. Many of this country's distinguished citizens have been treated at that hospital, and I have never heard of any of them suffering ill effects from the milk they drank there.

FACTS SPEAK FOR THEMSELVES ON DIFFERENCES BETWEEN U.S. CODE AND DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA REGULATIONS

Much talk has been floating around to the effect that the District milk regulations are superior to the U.S. code. Both sets of health rules deal with essentially the same sanitation items, but differ in detail. I would like to examine these differences on four specific items and let the facts speak for themselves.

First of all, it has been said that the District of Columbia regulations are superior because they call for annual testing of cattle for tuberculosis, whereas testing once every 6 years satisfies the U.S. Public Health Service. Early editions of the Public Health Service's milk code required annual testing for tuberculosis. In 1933, the code was changed to recognize and utilize the bovine tuberculosis control program of the U.S. Department of Agriculture.

Under this program, the incidence of positive reactors has dropped from 5 percent to less than one-fifth of 1 percent during the 40-year period from 1918 to 1958. Frequency of testing has been varied by the U.S. Department of Agriculture according to the need as shown by the occurrence of tuberculosis. The milk code now provides that milk may be accepted from herds located in accredited tuberculosis-free areas providing the herd is tested at least once every 6 years. If a herd is not located in an accredited area, annual tests are still required.

TWO TOWELS PER COW DO NOT INSURE CLEAN MILK

Secondly, it has been said that the District of Columbia regulations are superior because they require the cow's udder to be washed and wiped with two towels not used on any other cow. The U.S. milk code states that the cow's udder must look and feel clean and shall have been rinsed just prior to milking with an antiseptic solution approved by the health officer. In practice, this requirement is met by wiping the cow's udder with a cloth that has been dipped in an antiseptic solution before use on each cow. This solution provides an additional margin of safety if harmful bacteria are present. In addition, the U.S. code insists that the flanks, bellies, and tails of the cows be cleaned before milking. The District code is silent on this point.

Mr. Speaker, defenders of the District of Columbia regulations point out that they call for annual physical examinations of milk handlers on dairy farms. The U.S. code does not require these annual physicals for dairy farmers and their helpers because studies on the subject indicate this procedure is both expensive and ineffective from a public health standpoint. Diseases of significance in milk sanitation are the communicable diseases, and a milk handler who does not have one of these diseases at the time of the examination could very well get it during the ensuing year.

CODE HAS PRACTICAL METHOD FOR ELIMINATING SPREAD OF DISEASE THROUGH MILK

The U.S. milk code authorizes the health officer to impose control procedures, including laboratory examination of body specimens, if he has reasonable cause to suspect the possibility of transmission of infection from a person handling milk or milk products. It also prohibits a person having a communicable disease or any infected cut or lesion on the hands or arms from working in any capacity which brings him in contact with milk or milk equipment.

In the fourth place, the District regulations have been passed off as superior because their bacterial count standard for raw milk is 100,000 per milliliter, while the U.S. code limit is 200,000. The validity of the standard used in the U.S. code has been confirmed by the National Research Council's study on milk regulations and milk quality, published by the National Academy of Sciences.

I quote from page 123 of this report:

> A total bacterial plate count of not more than 200,000 per milliliter for raw milk is recommended as a standard—at the receiving plant. There is no exact scientific or public health basis for deciding on this bacterial standard other than the fact that experience has shown this common standard can be readily attained with reasonable facilities and good methods of production. Compliance of milk with this standard generally meant that the utensils, especially the milking machines, were given proper cleaning and antiseptic treatment and the milk was well cooled.

FARM COOLING TANKS ARE NOT USED EXCLUSIVELY BY WASHINGTON AREA PRODUCERS

Mr. Speaker, recent newspaper articles have made a great to-do over the fact that District of Columbia milk producers have gone to considerable expense to install farm cooling tanks in order to cool their milk more rapidly than in the past. Readers are led to believe that this is something unique, something that is not a common practice in other milksheds. The fact is you can find milk cooling tanks on farms all over the United States. Recent figures of equipment manufacturers show that more than 100,000 of these tanks have been installed in recent years.

I cannot leave the subject of the controversy over the District milk regulations without making one more observation. Although area milk producers claim the District of Columbia regulations are superior to the U.S. milk code, these producers nonetheless use the U.S. milk code as the standard when shipping surplus class I milk into other areas. So we end up with the peculiar situation where the U.S. code is ridiculed as being inadequate for milk coming into the District of Columbia but is considered amply adequate for milk being shipped out of the area.

Mr. Speaker, the whole milk controversy in the District of Columbia arose when certain dairies asked for a revision and modernization of the District Milk Code. Even if the District of Columbia Code is revised, this will only remedy the situation here—and the same situation exists in cities all over the United States. That is why we need Federal milk sanitation legislation. What is going on in Washington, D.C., today in regard to health regulations shows how the consumers of the country are being boxed in and, in my opinion, are paying more for the milk they drink than they would have to pay if high-quality milk could move freely in interstate trade.

One group of milk producers should not be allowed to use these trade barriers I have been talking about to profit at the expense of other milk producers. I am not opposed to farmer-owned milk marketing cooperatives. The bulk of the milk in my district is handled by farmer

cooperatives. I firmly believe in the cooperative bargaining technique. Farmers should be able to use collective bargaining just as the workers in the farm equipment factories are able to bargain collectively.

During the last session of Congress, I did a lot of work on a dairy bill—H.R. 13800—that would provide a way in which all dairymen could get together and develop nationwide bargaining power. In this way, they could earn and receive parity incomes on all the milk they sell.

After the election last fall, I was studying the poultry situation in the southern part of the United States. The manager of a poultry processing plant praised highly the Federal inspection law passed in the last session of Congress. He commented that with modern transportation and refrigeration methods, he was now shipping federally inspected poultry from Alabama to California. I pointed out that all the midwestern dairy farmers wanted was the same chance for the interstate sale of their top-quality milk. Our midwest farmers are interested in fair play for everyone.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, during the past few years we have been hearing a great deal of talk about eliminating trade barriers which have been built up between various countries of the world. It seems to me to be important that the trade barriers which have been built up right in the backyard of our Nation's Capital, through the use of unrealistic milk sanitation codes should be immediately corrected.

The so-called Laird-Johnson bill is a step in that direction and should be adopted. The monopolistic practices that have grown up within milk marketing areas in the form of trade barriers are not fair to the milk industry as a whole or are they fair to the consuming public in America.

The purpose of H.R. 3843 is simply to fix one clear and uniform standard for purity for milk in interstate commerce. It is a high standard but it is designed solely to assure wholesome milk and not to create artificial trade barriers. The U.S. Public Health Service in cooperation with the State public health officers have worked out a recommended uniform milk code. The legislation which is presently before the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee places this code in effect to cover the shipments of all milk and milk products in interstate commerce. Congressman JOHNSON and I are working cooperatively on this bill because we feel that no State or local government has the right to obstruct the free movement in interstate commerce of milk and milk products of high sanitary quality by the use of unnecessary sanitary requirements or other health regulations. The officers of the U.S. Public Health Service in testimony before the Health, Education, and Welfare Appropriations Subcommittee this past week clearly stated that the Milk Sanitation Code as is recommended by them will completely protect the health and well-being of the milk-consuming public throughout the United States.

I regret that in the last few weeks certain spokesmen for the Maryland and Virginia Milk Producers cooperative have levied unjustified criticism against the U.S. Public Health Service Milk Sanitation Code. This criticism has been a disservice to a large majority of America's dairy farmers. By raising misleading questions in the minds of the public on the quality of milk produced under this recommended code, the Maryland and Virginia Milk Producers are in effect unjustly attacking the milk producers under this sanitation code in 33 States that are producing the major portion of our fluid milk.

Consumers should have assurance that the glass of milk they drink anywhere in this country is a pure product. The adoption of H.R. 3843 will give every consumer that protection. The legislation merely points up the fact that the Congress recognizes that the sanitary control of fluid milk and certain milk products is necessary to protect the public health. The legislation recognizes that the sanitary regulations are primarily the responsibility of the State and local governments, but no State or local government, including the Board of District Commissioners, has the right to obstruct the free movement of high quality milk in interstate commerce by the use of unnecessary sanitary requirements or other health regulations.

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. I thank the gentleman for his statement. At this time, Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. BLATNIK].

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, I join our colleagues on both sides of the aisle from the Midwest and other parts of the country in support of the legislation to which our friend and colleague from Wisconsin [Mr. JOHNSON] has given such able, effective and reasoned leadership. I want to commend him for the fine work he has done and for the leadership he has taken to protect the public from unsanitary milk and milk products. This problem is coming to a head in several areas of the country already including, of course, the District of Columbia and immediate vicinity.

Mr. Speaker, facilitating the flow of high quality milk in interstate commerce and preventing the use of arbitrary, tailormade milk sanitation requirements to be used as trade barriers, are problems that justify and require the attention not only of the Federal agencies but of the Congress.

Recently the Association of State and Territorial Health Officers and the Conference of State Sanitary Engineers enlisted the cooperation of the United States Public Health Service in a study of these problems. I have worked very closely with these very same groups for the past 4 or 5 years on the problem of water pollution control and I can attest without qualification to their high standards, and to the sound, thorough and objective manner in which they go about studying the problems confronting them and the Nation.

The recommendations of these agencies are embodied in this legislation which we are sponsoring and which is being spearheaded by the gentleman from Wisconsin. This bill will give the American consumer the assurance that the milk they drink will be of dependable and uniform quality.

I urge that full hearings be held on this important problem which will only get more severe, and result in more crises developing in other areas of the country unless something is done.

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, at this time I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. O'KONSKI].

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend the gentleman from the Ninth District of Wisconsin for bringing this matter to the attention of the public. The need for Federal legislation in the field of milk sanitation is desperate. I join the gentleman from Wisconsin in supporting that type of legislation, and I am hopeful that this session of Congress will take some action along the lines suggested by him and others who have collaborated with him in introducing this legislation.

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman, and at this time yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BYRNES].

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, I think it should be said that dairy farmers, as much as anybody else in this country, are concerned that the milk that is sold on the market, and the dairy products that are sold on the market come up to high standards of wholesomeness. But what has happened in recent years has been the development of local regulations based, not on the necessities of health or wholesomeness or proper sanitary standards, but the development of local regulations for only one purpose; that is to create or to preserve a local monopoly. That is the only reason for many of these regulations and standards. They are simply efforts to create a local monopoly.

If we want to do something worthwhile and which will be of real help in solving the dairy problem, and if we want to do something for the consuming public, we will take action in this Congress to break up these monopolies that are maintained under the pretense of health standards and establish national uniform standards for the sale and transportation of milk. That is the objective and the sole objective of the legislation which a number of us have introduced in this Congress. We certainly do not want to break down any justifiable sanitary standards. We only want to make sure that the American consumers and the American farmers generally get the proper break and that the standards we have are needed for the purpose of providing the consumers with wholesome milk.

I would hope that the committee would see fit to give immediate attention to

this problem in order that we can move in the direction of giving the consumers the protection they deserve, while at the same time eliminating a lot of fictitious regulations which can only create monopoly and high prices to the consumers.

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. I thank the gentleman for his very fine statement.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I, too, want to commend the gentleman for the remarks he has made here today and for the legislation he has introduced, and which I have also had the privilege of introducing.

I want to reemphasize what the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LAIRD] and the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BYRNES] have said about the adoption of regulations which make it virtually impossible to sell milk from outside in the District of Columbia and other urban centers of the Nation. The Maquoketa Valley Creamery in northeast Iowa, one of the largest in the country, is now truckings thousands of gallons of milk each week to El Paso, Tex.—that is, from northeast Iowa to El Paso, Tex.—from northeast Iowa to St. Louis, Mo., and also into the State of Florida. That milk is good milk, grade A milk. There is no reason why the farmers of northeast Iowa, providing a pure, wholesome product, should be cut out of the market in the District of Columbia or anywhere else in the country.

The people of St. Louis, the people of El Paso, Tex., and the people of Florida know it is good milk. There is no reason why it is kept out of here, except for unreasonable regulations.

I would say further to the gentleman that I have inquired into the price of the product if it could enter the District of Columbia, and I am told by the Maquoketa Valley Cooperative in northeast Iowa that it could deliver good, wholesome milk to the District of Columbia for a maximum of $6 per hundred pounds and perhaps at a figure somewhat less.

I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, we see what has happened here in Washington, D.C., when sanitary regulations are used as an economic barrier. The dairy cooperatives got hoggish in the price they were asking; $6.62 is quite a high price when you compare that with prices of manufactured milk of about $3 per hundred and for class 1 milk in Minnesota at $3.72 per hundred. We in the Midwest can bring high quality milk into the District at a considerably lower price. A dairy cooperative in Minnesota has made an offer to furnish milk here in the District of Columbia market for $5.80 per hundred. Subtract the transportation expenses of $1.57 per hundred from that and it reflects a price in Minnesota of better than $4 per hundred. Nobody can say we would be trying to sell cut-price milk out there in the Midwest, for we could furnish milk at a lower price than District of Columbia plants have to pay right now.

Some say higher sanitary regulations prevail in the District than we have in the Midwest. This is not true except that milk must here be below a bacteria count of 100,000 under the District sanitary regulations, while the U.S. Public Health Service provides that it is to be below 200,000. Midwest milk can meet this standard even though it is shipped long distances. During the hot months of the year we sent milk to the southern part of the country, Dallas, Tex., and San Antonio, Tex., and the milk averaged a bacteria count of about 75,000, substantially below the sanitary regulations here in the District of Columbia.

We can send fluid milk of high quality to any part of the country and keep it below 100,000 bacteria count. It is further from Minneapolis to San Antonio, Tex., than it is from Minneapolis to Washington. We have plenty of milk out there and we can furnish high-quality milk. On my own farm, for example, the milk tests below 10,000 bacteria count as high quality as any milk produced near Washington, D.C. Minnesota has plenty of milk and there is plenty of milk between here and Minnesota that is of high quality that can come into the District of Columbia and provide more milk for the consumer at a lower price if sanitary regulations were standard. This would mean greater consumption and a lesser amount would have to go into manufacturing purposes if we could compete on an economic basis.

I would like to include in the RECORD also an article "Are Transportation Costs the Barrier to Milk Shipments?" appearing in Minnesota Farm Business Notes, prepared by the Department of Agricultural Economics and Agriculture Extension Service and published by the University of Minnesota Agricultural Extension Service. I urge at this time that the bills providing for uniform sanitary regulation for milk be given early consideration.

ARE TRANSPORTATION COSTS THE BARRIER TO MILK SHIPMENTS?

(By James H. Hammill and Willard W. Cochrane)

Minnesota dairy farmers have expressed concern over the difference between the fluid milk prices they receive and the prices received in other parts of the country. Milk prices in the East and South are higher than those in the Midwest. Many Minnesota farmers feel that returns to dairying would be increased if fluid milk could be shipped into these markets on a year-round basis.

On the other hand, transporting fluid milk is expensive. A recent study at the University of Minnesota indicates that transportation costs are sufficiently high to discourage milk shipments to eastern markets. However, higher milk prices in some southern markets make transportation costs less restrictive.

Barriers other than transportation costs also impede the shipments of Minnesota milk to other markets. The purpose of this study was to determine the extent to which transportation costs deter milk shipments. Other barriers, therefore, are not considered here.

Transportation costs are based on the use of tank trucks suitable for long-distance milk hauling. Tractors and insulated tank semitrailers provide the best means of delivering milk to distant markets without quality deterioration. Sleeper cabs on the tractors enable two drivers to make nonstop milk delivery. Costs have been determined for two sizes of tank trucks: A two-axle diesel tractor equipped with a 4,150 gallon tandem axle tank trailer, and a three-axle diesel tractor equipped with a 5,000-gallon tandem axle tank trailer.

TOTAL COSTS

The cost of operating these vehicles was estimated to be 29.11 cents per mile for the smaller truck and 31.42 cents per mile for the larger unit. Individual cost items are shown in table 1.

These costs are based upon the following assumed conditions: (1) the vehicles are operated 10,000 miles per month, (2) the tractors are driven a total of 600,000 miles, and (3) each trailer will travel a million miles. An additional cost is included to cover miscellaneous taxes, tolls, and road expenses.

These cost estimates compare favorably with actual operating costs incurred by private trucking firms engaged in long-distance milk hauling.

TABLE 1.—*Cost of operating a tractor-trailer combination suitable for long-distance milk*

Item	Cost per mile	
	Gross weight 59,000	Gross weight 65,000
Driver costs	$0.1062	$0.1062
Tractor costs:		
Fuel and oil	.0383	.0415
Maintenance	.0379	.0379
Depreciation	.0183	.0240
Tires	.0063	.0102
License	.0059	.0067
Insurance	.0138	.0162
Overhead	.0307	.0363
Trailer costs:		
Depreciation and maintenance	.0145	.0155
Tires	.0083	.0083
Insurance	.0048	.0051
License	.0001	.0001
Cargo insurance	.0010	.0012
Miscellaneous costs	.0050	.0050
Total costs	.2911	.3142

TABLE 2.—*Differences between average Twin City class 2 prices and blend prices in 3 cities, average June 1955 to May 1958, compared with transportation costs*

[In dollars per hundredweight]

Destination	Shipping cost per hundredweight, Twin City to destination	Differences between Twin City class 2 and blend at destination											
		June	July	August	September	October	November	December	January	February	March	April	May
Dallas, Tex.	1.73	1.62	[1].92	[1]2.01	[1]2.10	[1]2.17	[1]2.26	[1]2.13	[1]2.09	[1]2.02	1.69	1.65	1.62
Philadelphia, Pa.	1.88	1.34	1.75	1.79	1.82	[1]2.12	[1]2.17	[1]2.12	1.81	1.78	1.73	1.43	1.34
Baltimore, Md.	1.96	1.40	1.55	1.53	1.53	1.71	[1]1.97	[1]1.99	1.89	1.73	1.69	1.57	1.34

[1] Greater than transportation costs.

COSTS PER HUNDREDWEIGHT

The total cost per hundredweight of shipping fluid milk from the Twin Cities to each of three cities was estimated to be:

1. Philadelphia, Pa	$1.88
2. Baltimore, Md	1.96
3. Dallas, Tex	1.73

In these estimates it is assumed that no back haul is involved. Because of weight restrictions, the smaller truck is used for the trips to Philadelphia and Dallas. The larger unit can travel to Baltimore. Payloads to each of these cities are as follows: Dallas, 34,820 pounds; Philadelphia, 35,500 pounds; and Baltimore, 40,000 pounds. Toll charges are approximately $45 and $70 for the trips to Philadelphia and Baltimore, respectively.

In addition to trucking costs, a handling charge of $0.10 per hundredweight is added. This charge covers the cost of cooling, storing, and reloading milk into tank trucks. This charge is estimated for the following conditions: at least two truckloads of milk will be shipped per day for a year, with the possibility of further shipments after the year has elapsed. Moreover, milk from farmers is received in bulk, within an 8-hour time period which enables one man to operate the receiving station. The handling costs would probably be greater for plants not operating specifically for this purpose.

PRICES RECEIVED FOR MINNESOTA MILK

To determine whether or not transportation costs to the three cities are prohibitive, Twin City class 2 prices are compared with the blend price in each city on an average basis for the most recent 3 years (see table 2).

When the differences between these prices are compared to shipping costs, the advantages that might be realized by shipping milk is quickly seen. The eastern markets of Philadelphia and Baltimore offer only limited opportunities for shipping milk. The Baltimore blend price minus the Twin City class 2 price exceeds transportation costs only 2 months of the year. The Philadelphia market offers a return over transportation costs 3 months of the year.

The Dallas, Tex., market appears more favorable. Here returns exceed transportation costs 8 of the 12 months. The advantage resulting from shipping milk to Dallas ranges from 19 cents to 53 cents per hundredweight, depending upon the time of the year.

It must be recognized, however, that as milk is shipped into other markets, the blend price in those markets will decline. The magnitude of the decline will depend upon the quantities of milk moving into the market.

For example, it was found that the best returns to Twin City producers from shipping milk to Dallas would result from shipping 10 million pounds per month into that city. In this example the Twin City blend price would then increase 5.5 cents per hundredweight, and the Dallas blend price would decline 28.2 cents. Thus, advantage in shipping milk to Dallas is not as sizable as a first glance might suggest.

THE PRICE COMPARISONS

The question might be asked—are the appropriate prices being compared here? In the Twin Cities, some of the milk produced for the order market is consumed as fluid milk and is allotted the class 1 price. The remainder is used largely for manufacturing purposes and is allotted the lower class 2 price. Farmers receive the weighted average of these prices or a blend price.

All of this milk is grade A in quality. A higher price received for class 2 milk would increase the blend price and therefore increase returns to all Twin City producers. Therefore, if the returns resulting from shipping milk out of State are above the Twin City class 2 price, a price advantage accrues to Twin Cities producers.

The blend price in each of the out-of-State markets is assumed to be the attainable price for Minnesota producers. Class 1 price cannot logically be expected for Minnesota milk, since producers in these markets receive only the blend price. Therefore, the blend price in each city is compared to the Twin City class 2 price plus transportation costs, to see if these cities can be profitably supplied with Twin City milk. It is emphasized that this comparison is made under the assumption that milk is shipped on a year-round basis and other barriers impeding milk shipments do not exist.

CAN TRANSPORTATION COSTS BE REDUCED?

Some reductions in transportation costs are possible. Concentrating milk before shipment would result in considerable savings. Because of high concentration costs and consumer resistance to concentrated milk, few such shipments are made at the present time. But should concentration become feasible, transportation costs could be decreased by as much as two-thirds.

Transportation costs may also be decreased by carrying larger payloads per truck. For example, the truck going to Baltimore can be licensed in Minnesota for a gross weight of 72,500 pounds. If this weight were permissible in other States, it would mean an increase of 20 percent in payload capacity with very little increase in the costs of operation.

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. I thank the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. FLYNN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. I yield.

Mr. FLYNN. Mr. Speaker, it is with a deep sense of pride that I rise to join the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. JOHNSON] and my colleagues on both sides of the aisle in speaking in behalf of the greatest group of farmers in this Nation—the American dairy farmers. When I think of the great Southland, I think of land flowing with cotton. I think of peanuts, I think of oranges. When I think of the great West country that has contributed so much to these great United States, I think of flowing fields of wheat. I think of the products of the forest—timber; and a great fishing industry. When I think of milk, I think of Wisconsin which is truly the land of milk and honey. I think of green fields dotted with the Holsteins, the Jersey, and the Guernsey cows. I think these cows are herded and cared for by the most skilled dairymen that live any place in the world. They are producing a quality and sanitary product under a code more stringent than any in existence and a code which I helped to write in the Wisconsin State Legislature. A group of men in various parts of the country, in the South and in the East and various places, both producers and processors, have gotten together in various communities and have caused the city councils and the city fathers of these communities to write restringent regulations—fence me out bills, if you will—to keep the products of these dairy farmers of Wisconsin off the markets of the country. We would not think of keeping the western lumber out of Wisconsin nor the Florida or California oranges off our market. But, the milk of Wisconsin is kept off the markets from one side of the country to the other. For what reason, Mr. Speaker? The reason is that through this monopoly, they are able to charge the consumer higher prices than he should be paying. The price ups the profit both of the producer and the processors. According to one of the ads in the Washington Post that has been appearing here daily; to the one dairy involved in the District of Columbia case, this profit will mean more than $3 million on their financial statement in 1 year's time. I have in my hand a letter from the Pure Milk Association which is a national association with headquarters in Chicago. This association is joined and has as members most of the farmers in the producing area of Wisconsin, and this letter states that they can send milk into the District of Columbia at a price of $5.64 a hundred or less than $1 a hundred cheaper than they are getting it here and with approximately 47 quarts of milk in 100 pounds, this is more than 2 cents a quart cheaper than the dairies are receiving the milk here. These same ads show the dairies and the farmers' co-ops got together—God bless them, they are fine organizations—and agreed to share the excess charge with the dairy if they just would not start this trouble. But no, the dairy is insisting on the entire benefit of this 2 cents. They are insisting on a profit to which they are not entitled in excess of $3 million a year. This is in but one city. Multiply this by other cities in the Nation, in the South and in the East, and you see what is happening to the Wisconsin and Minnesota farmers.

I plead on their behalf that this product of the Midwest may be sold in the free market throughout the entire United States, just as the oranges of Florida and California and the products of your State are sold upon a free market. Let us terminate this monopoly in the interest of all of us.

I have a letter on this matter from Senator Lynn Stalbaum, of the Wisconsin Legislature, who also is secretary-treasurer of the Racine County Milk Producers Association, which I ask unanimous consent to include at this point in my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

(The letters referred to follow:)

WISCONSIN LEGISLATURE,
SENATE CHAMBER,
Madison, March 4, 1959.

The Honorable GERALD T. FLYNN,
New House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FLYNN: I am pleased to see that you are strongly supporting Congressman LESTER JOHNSON along with other of our Representatives and U.S. Senators in attempting to establish a more uniform method of inspection for the movement of milk throughout the country.

This is a subject which has long interested many of the agricultural groups in Wisconsin. A year ago, Congressman JOHNSON was kind enough to send me a copy of the hearing on this bill. The letters and resolutions which he had received read almost like an honor roll of farm organizations throughout our State, covering every political spectrum and all sizes of cooperative groups. Basi-

cally, the proposal he had at that time, which I understand has been modified and improved, is a sound one. The U.S. Public Health Service has established a model milk ordinance and code which has been used as a standard for local inspection ordinances for some period of time, dating back, I believe, to 1941. The Racine Board of Health has basically adopted this as their milk ordinance, as have Chicago, Milwaukee, Madison, and most of the other large communities in our area. Bear in mind that this is listed as a model milk ordinance and has been so designated on various occasions. We feel that it is truly that. While many of its requirements are not liked by certain producers, nevertheless, it has established standards at a very high level obtainable by a reasonably diligent effort. From time to time we in Racine have farmers who fail to comply with these standards and lose their market, some permanently and some only temporarily until they make the necessary corrections. This I know to be true on all of the other markets which use this as a model.

This brings us to the problems which the dairy farmer and dairy organizations of this area face. Actually, there are two problems: the first is a situation where certain markets will refuse to accept the U.S. Public Health Service ordinance and code as an inspection standard and insist that they make their own inspections. This activity on the part of a number of markets, particularly when an organization is attempting to expand its sales, does harass the farmers to a great extent. I have heard of one milk plant in Wisconsin that was visited by 10 different inspectors in a short period of time. With your background in farming, I am sure you can realize the reaction of a farmer when two or three, or more, different inspectors would call on him within a very short period of time, each asking for something different in some minor way. Small wonder that farmers at times become discouraged and leave the farming field.

Along with this there is sometimes the requirement that markets will not permit milk to be received unless they are reimbursed for the cost of this inspection. You can well realize the cost to bring an inspector to Wisconsin, let us say, from New York or Texas, or Washington, D.C.

The second obstacle, somewhat related to the first, is that in certain markets the refusal to adopt the model ordinance and code is deliberate, with the intent of limiting the source of supply of milk. Many of these markets have done this by requiring certain types of equipment which are not normally used (and certainly not needed) in the production of milk. I well recall the statements of some equipment manufacturers on this point. A Madison firm pointed out, for instance, that one Pennsylvania market and a California market required a 2-inch outlet on bulk milk coolers whereas the other 46 States only required a 1½-inch outlet. This is only one of a number of illustrations which have been cited by manufacturers, but it is a relatively easy one to understand to show this point. If I recall correctly, the Washington, D.C., market is one in which certain equipment items are required which apparently were placed in use only to limit the area or the patrons from whom the market obtains milk.

I could go on citing many more illustrations, but I trust that this letter has given you a good explanation of the broad basic reasons for supporting the bill. When we consider that Wisconsin is a surplus milk producing area with a great share of our sales outside of the State, you can readily understand why this matter is so vital to the fluid milk producing farmers and their organizations here in Wisconsin.

Any help you can give toward changing this will be of great potential benefit because it will not only open up markets which are restricted to us, but it will eliminate the harassment of milk producers by numerous inspectors calling upon them with varied requests.

Very truly yours,

LYNN E. STALBAUM,
Secretary-Treasurer, Racine Milk Producers Cooperative Association.

PURE MILK ASSOCIATION,
Chicago, Ill., March 5, 1959.

HON. GERALD T. FLYNN,
New House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: Following up our telephone conversation of Wednesday afternoon we are submitting the following information which we hope will be of value to you in your effort to break down barriers to the free movement of milk from the Middlewest to other markets.

The price of milk for bottling purposes in the Chicago market is based each month on the price of milk for manufacturing purposes. This in turn, as you undoubtedly know, is based on the support prices for butter and powder as announced by the Secretary of Agriculture. Milk used for bottling purposes receives a premium above the manufactured level.

During the period of March 1, 1958, through February 28, 1959, Pure Milk Association could have delivered grade A milk under the inspection of the Chicago Board of Health from a receiving station in the State of Wisconsin to Washington, D.C., at a price of $5.649 per hundredweight. This price would be for milk testing 3.5-percent butterfat and is based on a daily delivery of 36,000 pounds of milk—the limit allowed by law for transporting milk through States involved to get it to Washington, D.C. This averages out to 12.12 cents per quart.

Referring to information which we have available from the Fluid Milk and Cream Report put out by USDA for class I milk in the Washington, D.C., market, we have determined that the average price for this same period is $6.65 per hundredweight, or 14.27 cents per quart for 3.5-percent milk.

Assuming the margin taken by handlers in the market remained unchanged during this period of time, milk shipped into the Washington, D.C., market from our area could be sold to consumers in Washington, D.C., for 2.15 cents per quart below the prices which were paid.

In determining the retail prices of milk—home delivered and through stores—we referred to Fluid Milk and Cream Report above mentioned. These prices gave a range as to the resale price which we averaged together to arrive at a representative price for the market. The average price to the consumer was 26.83 cents per quart for milk delivered in glass to the homes and 25.85 cents per quart for milk sold out of stores in paper.

We trust that this information will be helpful to you. If we can be of further service to you please contact us.

Yours very truly,

H. L. EDWARDS,
Director of Sales.

Mr. FLYNN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include the letters referred to.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. NELSEN].

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, the legislation under discussion has a direct application to the situation that now exists in the immediate area.

In order that I might be fully advised as to sentiment at home and the provisions of the order for the District of Columbia, I personally contacted Alfred Stedman, of St. Paul, for information contained in this letter which I ask consent to insert in the RECORD with my remarks. Mr. Stedman was formerly with the Government and has long been recognized as a sound analyst of agriculture.

I would further like to insert a letter from the Land O' Lakes Creameries relative to prices and quality of milk handled by this organization in Minnesota and Wisconsin.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to further insert the testimony from the hearings before the Subcommittee on Dairy Products in the 84th Congress. This is very complete and detailed as to the objectives which we seek to gain in this measure.

Mr. Speaker, in support of the position advocated by Mr. JOHNSON, I wish to say that this legislation finds wide support in the dairy industry and wide support in both political parties as evidenced by the many authors among Democrats and Republicans, including myself. That is a healthy situation and I believe a heartening sign for the dairy industry.

I am very much concerned about the problem that we seek to correct in the measure referred to, representing a dairy State, a dairy district, and being a dairy farmer.

For 14 years I represented McLeod County in the State senate and for a number of years I was chairman of the Committee on Dairy Products and Livestock. In this committee we sought to propose legislation which would set up adequate standards which would guarantee to the consuming public quality milk and dairy products, and all of the time with proper regard to reasonable and fair competitive tactics in the field that we represented.

We set up provisions in our State for marketing areas, but sought also to protect the producers as well as the consumers. The result has been that Minnesota milk and dairy products today are of high quality and find wide acceptance all over the United States.

The premise that we should also seek to insure is adequate health standards to protect the consumer. However, today we find in isolated instances phony standards which go far beyond the requirements set up by the Surgeon General of the United States. Obviously these phony standards are inserted for the purpose of providing an economic monopoly for producers in certain areas.

The dairy industry has spent millions of dollars in research, in ways and means to provide for the consuming public palatable, low-cost products, and it is my understanding that under the proposed marketing order for the District of Columbia, obstacles will be placed in the way which will prevent a free flow of commodities to this area, denying the housewife and the consumer a product within his means to buy. If such a procedure is endorsed, there is little premium as a reward for research and

better merchandising and the public interest is lost in the shuffle.

The legislation the distinguished Congressman from Wisconsin has offered, along with many of his colleagues, including myself, seeks to set up proper, adequate national health standards, protecting the consumer and at the same time seeking to protect producers in all parts of the country in securing markets when they meet those standards.

I have had recent contacts with the dairy industry in the State of Minnesota and I can report that they are in unanimous agreement that this legislation has merit and should be considered by the Congress of the United States.

I am further advised that the proposed marketing order for the District of Columbia would even affect the sale of dairy products to the Department of Defense, and I believe there is no one who would deny that the military should be an open market to the people of the United States. The same could be said of the District of Columbia. We should and will appropriate millions of dollars for the District of Columbia. Thousands of people live here who work for all of the people of the United States. If the producers of other areas have quality milk they should be entitled to a part of this market.

Incidentally, I also have a personal reason for my interest—my son is milking 50 cows on our farm back home—it is grade A and would meet the tight standards required to protect the health of the consumer.

STATEMENT OF ALFRED D. STEDMAN, OF ST. PAUL

The nature of the proposed Washington milk order will be plain to anyone who has the patience to read it.

The order says that "with the increase of milk supplies locally and in adjacent markets, Washington handlers who purchase their milk on a classified basis have encountered increasing competition in their regular route distribution as well as on contract sales to Federal installations," which it says represent a substantial part of the class I sales in the market.

The order restricts, and authorizes surrounding municipalities to use their milk inspection regulations to restrict, this complained-of copetition from outside.

The order specifically covers sales of milk to all Government institutions, Federal, State or municipal, to all defense agencies, installations and bases, wharves, piers, docks and ships in the District of Columbia, Alexandria, Silver Spring and eight surrounding counties of Virginia and Maryland. It applies to milk except in hermetically sealed containers, to unfrozen or frozen concentrated milk such as has often been sold at economical prices to defense agencies, and to skim milk, buttermilk, and fresh cream.

The prices stipulated in the order are not the prices that milk buyers can be made to pay if the Federal system of restricting competition is placed and kept in effect. The order contains no requirement of any kind that the real prices charged in the area shall be those named in the order. The real prices will be based on exclusion or reduction of competition. They will be substantially higher than the order prices, as they are today.

Of course the 2,000 or so dairy farmers living nearest the District of Columbia have a natural advantage in that market due to location and hauling costs which nothing can take from them.

But why should the United States Government that claims to be dedicated to freedom of competition and of commerce, impose artificial restrictions on top of the natural ones?

In the past it has been considered prudent, right, and fair to all citizens, businesses, and taxpayers for the U.S. Government and its defense agencies to buy competitively and as economically as it can. Now the necessity for Government economy is driven home by the Federal Government deficits and resulting inflation.

Midwest farmers ask that the principle of free competitive enterprise be applied in the instance of milk for their National Capital and its defenses. These farmers are Americans, too. They pay taxes to support the National Government. Their sons help man its defenses.

They ask Congress to assure that the Government does not now, through this Federal milk order, discriminate harmfully against them and their farm products in ways that would be expensive to all District area consumers and to all U.S. taxpayers.

LAND O'LAKES CREAMERIES, INC.,
Minneapolis, Minn., March 4, 1959.

Hon. ANCHER NELSEN,
U.S. Congress, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. CONGRESSMAN: In response to your telephone conversation with me today, Land O'Lakes current price quotation on grade A milk from two sources follows:

1. We offer grade A milk from our plant at St. Michael, Minn., at the Federal order class 1 price for the month of March at $3.63 per hundredweight for 3.5 percent butterfat. Contract hauling charges would be $2.10 per hundredweight in loads of approximately 40,000 pounds. The total cost therefore to a purchaser buying this milk on a delivered basis would be $5.73 per hundredweight delivered Washington, D.C.

2. We offer grade A milk from our plant at Whitehall, Wis., quoted at $3.50 per hundredweight for 3.5 percent butterfat. This plant is not under Federal order regulation. The trucking charges from Whitehall, Wis., to Washington, D.C., would be $2.10 per hundredweight, making a total cost to a purchaser in the Washington, D.C., area of $5.60 per hundredweight.

The U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Public Health Service, in its "Sanitation Compliance Rating of Interstate Milk Shippers" shows the ratings of these plants. The Land O'Lakes plant at St. Michael, Minn., is shown on the bottom line of page 14 of the October 1958 Compliance Ratings Publication. Our St. Michael plant has a 94 percent compliance rating on raw milk, 98 percent on receiving station, 98 percent on pasteurization plant, 96.6 percent on pasteurizing milk, and an enforcement rating of 93 percent.

Our plant at Whitehall, Wis., is shown on page 30 of this same publication. It shows that we have a compliance rating of 95 percent on raw milk, 100 percent on receiving station, 96 percent on pasteurization plant, 95.6 percent on pasteurized milk, and an enforcement rating of 97 percent.

One hundred percent of all our producers receipts in each plant comes from bulk tank installations on grade A dairy farms in the respective areas. We are presently selling milk from both plants into areas such as St. Louis, Mo.; Omaha, Nebr.; San Antonio, Tex.; Shreveport, La.; Wichita Falls, Tex.; Houston, Tex.; Springfield, Mo.; Lake Charles, La.; New Iberia, La.; and other locations quite distant from our procurement area.

We would have available at present two tank loads a day from the two above-mentioned plants. We would also have another tank load a day available from our plant at Luck, Wis., on the basis of $3.58 per hundredweight f.o.b. Luck, Wis., plus trucking charge to Washington, D.C., of $2.10 per hundredweight. The USPH rating of our Luck, Wis., plant is shown on page 30 of the same Compliance Rating Publication and it shows that our raw milk has a rating of 95.9 percent, receiving station 100 percent, enforcement rating 97 percent.

This volume of milk, of three tank loads a day or approximately 120,000 pounds a day of grade A milk, would be available on a year-around basis rather than only during the surplus period of the year that we are now in.

Providing that there are no restrictive clauses in any Federal or State regulation governing the sale or purchase of milk in the Washington, D.C., area, we would be happy and willing to sell milk at the above-quoted prices and if the purchaser is willing to accept milk on the basis of U.S. Public Health Service compliance ratings.

Certainly during this time of the year when we are in the flush season, we would actually have available until the fall months at least double these quantities. Naturally, the price would change month by month from now until July 1; however, if there are no changes upward in support prices of dairy products from now until July 1, 1959, it would be reasonable to believe these prices would stay quite static during the months of March, April, May, and June 1959.

We thank you for the privilege of being able to quote our current grade A prices.

Your very truly,

R. H. BONDE,
Manager, Fluid Milk and Ice Cream Department.

[From serial M, pt. 2, hearings, Subcommittee on Dairy Products, 84th Cong., June 1, 2, 3, 1955]

STATEMENT OF C. M. DEGOLIER, DEERFIELD, WIS., PRESIDENT AND GENERAL MANAGER OF THE DEERFIELD CREAMERY CO., AND PRESIDENT, MADISON DAIRY PRODUCE CO., MADISON, WIS., PRESIDENT, WISCONSIN CREAMERIES ASSOCIATION

Mr. DEGOLIER. Chairman ABERNETHY and members of the subcommittee, my name is C. M. DeGolier. I am president and general manager of the Deerfield Creamery Co., Deerfield Wis., president of the Madison Dairy Produce Co., of Madison, Wis., and president, Wisconsin Creameries Association.

I am making this statement on behalf of the joint committee of the National Creameries Association and the American Butter Institute. This committee and its member units, has been described to you heretofore by other witnesses.

My purpose in asking the subcommittee for time to appear before you was in the belief that I may be able to give you information, developed from my own experience and my knowledge of the problem, which would add to the material already furnished this subcommittee by previous witnesses.

Let me say at the outset that I am not a dairy sanitarian. I operate a fluid milk (grade A) plant, which also manufactures dairy products, and am part owner of a plant at Madison engaged in large-scale packaging and merchandising operations for butter. In view of my experience, it is not my purpose to pose as an expert able to tell you what features should be incorporated in a sanitation code for milk—this has been quite capably handled by Mr. Dahlberg and others, and there is a significant amount of technical information available in reports published by the National Research Council, which has conducted several very fine, technical studies of this subject, and from many other sources. Rather, I desire to bring to you the experience and knowledge of a businessman who has had direct experience with this matter of sanitation regulations, and who, in the course of his business career, has had brought to his attention many ex-

amples of the manner in which these sanitation regulations operate.

I would like to state that the public is entitled to be fully safeguarded with regard to the sanitary qualities of its milk supply. No responsible persons in the dairy industry would recommend the adoption of procedures which do not give the public this assurance. Milk, which we think is the finest natural food for humankind, also may be the very efficient carrier of bacteria which are inimical to the health of the people. This means that we in the industry, public officials, and all connected in any manner with the production and distribution of milk for human consumption, must be ever alert and in fact must demand that we be subject to regulations regarding the sanitation of milk which will assure that the milk supply of the consuming public is safe and pure.

SANITATION REGULATIONS—THEIR ORIGIN AND JUSTIFICATION

There is no need to launch into a lengthy discussion of the justification of sanitation regulations applicable to milk and its products. We take it for granted that anyone involved in the matter would agree that a clean, pure, and wholesome milk supply is a factor of paramount importance in the health and well-being of our people. Since milk, in addition to being one of our finest foods, also is a very fine medium for the growth of harmful bacteria, it follows without further argument that we must be sure our milk is produced and handled so that it is pure and wholesome.

Sanitation regulations, it would appear, first were developed by cities and municipalities in order to assure that the milk supply for consumers in such cities and municipalities was pure and wholesome, and that the milk supply purity was so protected in both the farm production and the processing end that pure, wholesome milk reached the consumer, free from milk-borne diseases.

It is but natural that, due to the development of sanitation regulations by a multitude of cities and towns, looking largely to local conditions, there were and still are very material differences between sanitation regulations applicable throughout the country. For many years, the commerce in milk was very largely of a strictly local character. Techniques for the handling and shipment of milk long distances while still maintaining its purity and wholesomeness had not been developed. Therefore, it is not until comparatively recent years that variations between sanitation regulations, and the manner in which they were applied from market to market, have become factors of very great significance in impeding the flow of good quality milk between markets in the United States.

We can take it for granted, I believe, that local sanitation regulations were conceived solely for the protection of the consuming public in cities and municipalities. Unfortunately, it is my belief that quite frequently, local producer groups and others have endeavored to use such regulations, and have them interpreted and enforced, as a tool for the protection of the local market supply of fluid milk against legitimate competition from qualified milk producers and processors from other areas.

And here, I want to make it quite clear that, in those instances where it would appear beyond a reasonable doubt that sanitation regulations have been and are being used as trade barriers, it is not the fault of the local sanitarians. My experience with these officials is that they are primarily interested in seeing to it that the supply of milk in their area is pure and wholesome—not in seeing to it that their regulations have the effect of excluding pure and wholesome milk from other areas from their own area. The fault for such use of sanitation regulations, I feel quite certain, is the fault of local producer and processor groups who desire to limit the competition of qualified milk from other producers and other areas. In this respect, the dairy industry, I think, is to be criticized for not getting its own house in order.

Of one thing we can be sure, and it should be a matter of pride to all of us, that the milk supply generally throughout the United States is safe and pure. Epidemics of disease traceable to the milk supply have, to my knowledge, ceased to exist. When one considers that one can travel from one end of this country to another, and always be able to secure a supply of pure milk which one does not hesitate to feed his children, in spite of the various conditions of production in this country, we can truly state that we have something to be proud of that is perhaps unique in the world.

To summarize to this point: We have a fine milk supply, and it is through the efforts of our technical people, the milk sanitarians, and through the cooperation of milk producers and processors that this is so. I wish to emphasize this so that the subcommittee will understand that the interest of the people I represent is not to complain of sanitation regulations as such, nor to recommend anything that will reduce in any way or by one iota the degree of effectiveness of our sanitary control of the milk supply in the United States. Nor do I complain of the actions of sanitarians which have been the subject of court controversies, some of which I will treat as examples for the subcommittee in the following pages of this statement. These controversies are understandable when taken in their historic perspective. My statement is pointed toward showing the subcommittee certain features of sanitation regulations which need to be corrected and at the same time to point out that some promising strides have been made in recent years toward a more uniform, more widely applicable sanitation system.

INCREASED MOBILITY OF MILK—ITS RELATION TO SANITATION REGULATIONS

Some years ago, when I first started in the dairy business and particularly when my family developed the plant at Deerfield, Wis., milk was not very mobile. By this is meant the fact that techniques and equipment had not been developed which would permit the movement of milk for long distances and at the same time maintain its purity and quality so that it could be used by consumers as fluid milk.

In the dairy industry we have made steady progress in sanitation practices through the development of better equipment, more research, and better knowledge of the factors that cause the production of pure and wholesome milk, a more widespread understanding of the fact on the part of both producers and processors that the public—our customers—are entitled to purchase our commodity in the secure knowledge that it is pure and wholesome, and, last but perhaps of even greater importance, has been the development of our vast highway system and high speed refrigerated trucking industry which enables us to ship our milk longer and longer distances with the assurance that at destination the milk be pure and wholesome and entirely safe for consumption by the public.

The increased mobility of fluid milk was greatly encouraged by developments during the war. With the vast shift that took place in the population—the development of large plants, with their large numbers of workers in areas previously relatively sparsely settled—it became necessary, if these people were to have milk, to develop techniques for the movement of such milk from areas of heavy supply to areas of deficit supply. When I first started this business, it was quite unusual for milk to move much farther than from my plant at Deerfield to Chicago. During the war and for some time thereafter, it became commonplace for milk which had originated in Wisconsin, or Minnesota, to be transported by refrigerated truck to southwestern markets such as Dallas and Fort Worth, there bottled and loaded on refrigerated trucks, and shipped as far west as Las Cruces, N. Mex. I might add that, when the consumers in Las Cruces drank such milk, they found it pure, palatable, and wholesome.

In addition to the foregoing, there has been a phenomenal improvement in the quality of milk on our farms. More and more of our farmers are equipping their farms and following production practices that meet the requirements for grade A milk, or milk that meets the sanitation requirements recommended in the U.S. Public Health Service Milk Code. In Wisconsin, for example, we now have a law under which milk which meets our grade A requirements, based on the U.S. Public Health Service Code, may be shipped from city to city within the State without hindrance from local regulations. So far, all but four cities in the State have accepted this code, and we fully expect the remaining four cities to come into the program in the near future.

But from the viewpoint of the interest of the subcommittee, I think it important to note that due to the greater mobility of milk previously described and the ever-growing development of compliance of grade A ordinances which are based on the U.S. Public Health Service Milk Code the existence of barriers to the free movement of qualified milk from one market to another are becoming more important, and the need for greater standardization of sanitation codes and practices of inspectors thereunder is becoming more and more necessary if sanitation regulations are to fulfill their primary and I might say their only function of assuring that the milk distributed in the various areas is pure and wholesome, rather than to assume a secondary function of standing as barriers to the movement of qualified milk. This movement is becoming more and more important every day as our techniques for handling milk, and shipping it long distances while still maintaining its purity and wholesomeness, improves with the many technological developments in the field. I think it would be a wonderful thing that we could look forward to the day when the milk supply for any town or city in this country would be of such assured purity and wholesomeness that it would be readily accepted for distribution as fluid milk in any other town or city in the country. It is in the interest of promoting the early realization of such a state of affairs that I am appearing before this subcommittee.

PROGRESS IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF UNIFORM SANITATION CODES AND INSPECTION THEREUNDER

There has been considerable progress in the development of more uniform sanitation codes and inspection practices thereunder in recent years.

Sanitarians have taken a leading role in recent years in this development. Each year, there is held a National Conference on Interstate Milk Shipments, at which a great deal of attention is devoted to sanitation codes, methods of securing more uniformity in codes, inspection thereunder, and rules to be followed in developing a greater degree of reciprocal inspection, that is, where a municipality accepts the inspection techniques of another municipality in determining the eligibility of milk from the latter municipality to be distributed as fluid milk in the former. There can be little doubt that these conferences, and the actions following thereafter, are exerting significant influence

in developing a more uniform system of sanitation and inspection in this country.

TYPES OF SANITATION REGULATIONS THAT RESTRICT THE MOVEMENT OF MILK BETWEEN MARKETS

As I indicated heretofore, I do not claim to be an expert sanitarian. However, there are some features of sanitation regulations that I believe are restrictive in character, although the list of such restrictive types of sanitation set forth below may be far from complete. The list follows:

1. Many sanitation codes, or if not the codes, then the health authorities, limit the area wherein they will inspect plants and farms. While it might appear that there could be good reasons for such restriction of inspection area, say on the ground of cost of some other factor, the fact remains that judging from the court cases filed to invalidate such restrictions, the area limitation is one of the most important barriers to the movement of qualified milk between markets.

2. Refusal to accept reciprocal inspection. This makes the area limitation really very effective as a barrier to milk movement.

3. Requirements that milk must be pasteurized within a certain distance of the city. Judging from the list of court cases which we have compiled, this is the restriction that has been involved in litigation more than any other. Obviously, in this day of good refrigeration and rapid transportation, a regulation that provides that milk must be pasteurized a small distance from the city is ridiculous, and most assuredly restrictive.

ROUGH MEASURES OF GEOGRAPHIC SCOPE OF RESTRICTIVE DEVICES

I wish I could pinpoint for the committee the scope of these restrictive sanitation devices throughout the country, but researching the health codes in towns and cities of the United States is obviously beyond our powers.

It is my opinion restrictive devices such as those named above are a factor of paramount importance in slowing down or stopping completely the movement of milk from area to area and market to market. While no fully comprehensive research of this particular character has been done recently, the U.S. Department of Agriculture in a bulletin dated March 1939 entitled "Barriers to Internal Trade in Farm Products," found widespread evidence of the use of sanitation regulations as devices to restrict the entry of outside milk into milk markets. Both State governments and local municipal governments were so using their sanitation regulations, and such restrictive practices were found to be very widely spread throughout the United States.

Although this bulletin is quite old, and may therefore be assumed to be out of date in some respects, I have taken certain excerpts from this bulletin and have included them in the appendix. The findings are startling. We do not, however, have to rely entirely upon the bulletin just discussed for information concerning the current importance of the manner in which sanitation regulations are being used as devices to restrict the movement of milk between markets in this country.

Starting with the July 20, 1949, issue, I have had the weekly issues of the Dairy Record, a periodical devoted solely to news and information concerning the dairy business in this country, checked in order to list the cases brought before the courts regarding sanitation regulations. I do not claim that this list is a complete record of all the court cases regarding sanitation regulations that were started during the period since mid-1949, but in any event a number of them were reported in that magazine.

Since mid-1949, a total of 35 separate court actions were reported by the Dairy Record. These actions involved municipalities or States in 17 States and the District of Columbia. Other facts regarding these cases follow:

1. Eleven of the cases involved the refusal of the municipality to inspect plants and farms outside its usual area.

2. Thirteen of the cases involved suits brought to enjoin the local health authorities from enforcing rules in their ordinances which provide that milk for use in the municipality must be pasteurized within a given distance, usually a very short distance, of the market. The most important of these, as far as establishing legal precedent is concerned, was that brought by the Dean Milk Co., of Chicago, against the city of Madison, Wis.

I will go to No. 3 on page 10:

3. There were six cases involving the efforts of State governments to limit the entry of milk from other States, ranging from such activities as providing that out-of-State milk must be in its original containers as received from the farm up to dyeing out-of-State milk some color.

4. Two of the cases involved unspecified discriminatory practices.

5. One case turned upon the failure of the local authorities to permit reciprocal inspection.

6. Two cases could only be classified on the basis of miscellaneous objections. Practically all of these cases were won by the plants desiring to ship milk into the markets, previously forbidden them by the local health authorities.

In addition to the foregoing, the Dean Milk Co. gave us some information concerning suits it has brought against city and State authorities which had denied the Dean Co. permits to sell in the markets involved. The Dean Milk Co. secured the greater part of its milk supply from sources approved by the Chicago Board of Health.

The cases concerned a number of different complaints. Several of them were brought because the company considered the inspection fees levied against them were exorbitant. The regulation generally in these instances provided for the payment of a certain fee per hundredweight for all milk going over the weight deck of the Dean plant. When it is considered that in many of these instances the volume sold by Dean in the markets where these suits were brought was a small, sometimes almost an infinitesimal, portion of the total volume of milk received at the plant or plants involved, yet the Dean Co. under the ordinance would have had to pay a fee on large volumes of milk not intended for use in the particular market involved, the restrictive nature of the fee as levied is obvious. Many of these cases have been settled on the basis of payment of a relatively small annual fee, such as $275 per year in one case, as compared to the thousands of dollars the company would have had to pay on the basis of the original provision of the ordinances.

Other cases brought by the Dean Milk Co. involved provisions of ordinances, or practices thereunder, whereby inspection was refused outside the usual inspection of the particular health authority involved. Still other cases involved refusal of health authorities to grant the company a permit because the local ordinances required the milk to be pasteurized in or only a short distance removed from the market. There were other bases of some of the suits mentioned, but the above reasons cover the majority of the cases brought by this company. I think the important fact for this subcommittee to bear in mind is that there is one fairly large milk company which, in its endeavor to expand its marketing system to a number of different markets, and when the quality of the milk supply of the company was not open to question, found itself stopped by capricious and restrictive local health codes and practices thereunder. The company advised me that they have instituted a number of suits in recent years, and that 16 of these complaints actually became the subject of court trials. I have mentioned before that one case went clear to the U.S. Supreme Court before being resolved in favor of the company.

CONCLUSIONS

On the basis of the foregoing facts and considerations, I think we may well reach the following conclusions:

1. While much progress has been made in developing more uniform sanitation codes in this country and the practices under such codes, we still have far to go. Most assuredly we should do our best to encourage the milk sanitarians to continue and accelerate their good work in this connection.

2. The evidence indicates quite clearly that many sanitation regulations serve no useful purpose as far as purity of the milk supply is concerned, but rather serve as devices to restrict the entry of pure and wholesome milk into markets from areas outside their usual sources of supply. Such regulations tend to wall off the local markets from the legitimate competition of other areas and grant local producers a high degree of monopoly. This leads to arbitrary pricing, overproduction within the milkshed, reduced consumption in the markets, and greater surpluses of milk which must be manufactured into dairy products such as butter, cheese, and the like.

It seems to me that the evidence is so conclusive that it warrants notice and action by the Congress. I do not know what the action should be, but the goal of any action by Congress, in my view, should be that of securing more uniformity in sanitation regulations throughout the country and more uniformity of application by inspectors. The United States Public Health Service, in cooperation with milk sanitarians and many other persons, has developed a standard ordinance or code which is recommended for use in municipalities. Many of the States and municipalities have adopted this code or codes based very largely upon it. I firmly believe that the United States Public Health Service code is gaining in scope, but am equally firmly convinced that we should endeavor to speed up its acceptance and application throughout the country. Once this is done, sanitation regulations will revert to their original purpose—that of assuring the public a pure and wholesome milk supply as far as sanitary practices are concerned, rather than being perverted to use as devices which restrict the movement of high-quality milk between areas and markets.

Whether the bills now before the Congress, which provide that the United States Public Health Service code will be the determining factor in the quality of milk shipped in interstate commerce is the final answer, I do not know.

Most assuredly, however, this problem is of great importance, and we urge the Congress to take whatever action it deems advisable pointed toward its solution.

I wish to thank you for your courtesy in permitting me to make this statement.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include a letter from the Land O' Lakes Creamery quoting quality and price of milk, also to include the comments of a friend of mine, whom I recently contacted, asking of him information relative to the marketing order under consideration in the District of Columbia, and to also include testimony that appeared in the hearings before the committee in 1955.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. THORNBERRY). Is there objection to the

request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I yield to my colleague from Wisconsin [Mr. KASTENMEIER].

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to join with the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin and my other colleagues in proposing this legislation. I compliment the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. JOHNSON] in taking the initiative in this endeavor to establish more uniform standards to provide for the free flow of fluid milk in interstate commerce without unduly burdening such commerce.

I am favorably impressed by the reasonable aim of this legislation. Its effect will be, I am convinced, to benefit both the American consumer whose shopping dollar will buy more dairy products and the efficient dairy producer who will have an expanded market for his product.

This bill is designed to eliminate the use of arbitrary sanitation regulations as an economic barrier to control the shipment of sanitary fluid milk. Under provisions of this measure, State and local health authorities will be prohibited from denying the entry of milk which qualifies under the U.S. Public Health Service's milk sanitation regulations. Furthermore, the bill provides for many safeguards for the States and local communities which receive milk from plants qualifying under the code.

Mr. Speaker, I am confident that this amendment to the U.S. Public Health Service Act, if adopted, will have far-reaching and affirmative effects on the marketing of dairy products.

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from WISCONSIN [Mr. ZABLOCKI] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join with my distinguished colleague from Wisconsin [Mr. JOHNSON] in cosponsoring and supporting legislation to establish uniform sanitation standards and to encourage the free interstate flow of quality milk.

At the outset, I want to congratulate the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. JOHNSON] for his outstanding work on this legislation. He has worked tirelessly in an effort to break the artificial and discriminatory barriers which keep high quality Wisconsin milk and dairy products away from consumers in other areas. His endeavors in this direction are not only very important to the dairy farmers of Wisconsin, whose interests he has represented so ably in this House, but they are also important to the consumers of dairy products throughout our Nation.

Surely the consumers have a considerable stake in this legislation. There is no reason why the consumer should be penalized, through high prices on milk and other dairy products, for the benefit of a particular group of producers. The consumer is entitled to receive quality milk at the lowest possible price, and such a price cannot be achieved as long as deliberate barriers will continue to impede the free flow of quality milk in interstate commerce.

The legislation which I have cosponsored with the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. JOHNSON], and with other Members, would remedy this situation. It would protect the public health. It would assure that only quality milk would move freely in interstate commerce. And, further, it would make possible substantial reduction in milk prices to the consumers in various areas.

I believe that there exist ample reasons for the enactment of this legislation. I sincerely hope that it will be reported to the full House as promptly as possible. and enacted without delay.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, may I say to the gentleman that I do not have anyone who is sending milk into this area from my particular part of the country, so I do not have anything particularly at issue which is important to me. I ask questions at this point more in the public interest, being a member of the Committee on the District of Columbia, in order to see if some of these things could be clarified by questions and answers insofar as the public welfare of the District of Columbia is concerned.

It does appear from what I have been able to learn on the floor here today that Minnesota, Wisconsin, and that area have a surplus of milk which they can supply to other parts of the country.

My question is: Why is it that your milk can be supplied to Washington, as you say freight prepaid from that area to Washington, and still be able to sell at approximately 2 cents a quart cheaper than can the producers in Maryland and Virginia?

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. It is because our farmers are taking less for their milk than are the producers supplying this market.

Our Wisconsin farmers would rather supply fluid milk for the Washington area than make this milk into butter, cheese, and dry powder.

Mr. SPRINGER. They are taking less for their milk than those who are selling here?

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Yes. And they will take still less if that class I milk has to go into butter and cheese.

I referred in my speech to a letter that came from the Turtle Lake Creamery, in which it was stated that the milk coming to Washington would be sold as class 1 milk and the farmer would receive $3.14 per hundredweight, but if that milk had to go into butter and cheese, it would net the farmer only $2.90 per hundredweight.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. LAIRD. In answer to the gentleman's question, it might be well to point out that what we complain about more than anything else is the fact that the Virginia-Maryland milk producers are attacking sanitation standards recommended by the USPHS which 35 States of this Nation are using. They are using a separate set of standards here in the District of Columbia, from those recommended by the U.S. Public Health Service, in order to restrict the movement of milk into this area. My complaint is that Maryland-Virginia producers are in effect attacking the milk producers in other sections of the United States that are using the recommended standards of the USPHS. They are raising phony questions in the minds of the consuming public everywhere. This will hurt and not help milk consumption. We want to compete on the basis of price and not on phony standards.

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Let me tell the gentleman from Illinois this. The only reason we are using the District of Columbia as a example is that you have this going on right in front of the Congress of the United States. We could use other cities, such as New York and Philadelphia, where the same thing is taking place. However, we have a perfect example here in the District which is why I am referring to the District.

Mr. SPRINGER. May I ask, in connection with the standards set up for the District of Columbia, is there anything basically more secure or more safe in the regulations that have been provided for the District of Columbia than there would be in the milk standards which have been set up, we will say, by the U.S. Department of Agriculture?

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, standards are not set up by the Department of Agriculture. They are recommended by the U.S. Public Health Service. Last week, in testimony before the House Appropriations Committee, a similar question was asked. The committee was assured by the U.S. Public Health Service that in the standards which they have recommended and which have been agreed upon by the health officers in the various States, the health of the consuming public is adequately and effectively protected. This is the important point to keep in mind.

Mr. SPRINGER. Now, one further question. Will the gentleman tell me what, in essence, are these excess standards which you say burden the District of Columbia?

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. I covered them all in my speech.

Mr. SPRINGER. Can you wrap that up in just a bundle?

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. One is two towels to wipe each cow's bag. Another one is the annual health test for the men that work on the farm. Still another is the 200,000 per milliliter bacteria count. I did not take all the differences. I just took some of the outstanding ones.

Mr. SPRINGER. May I ask the gentleman if this is one, that the milk had to be inspected by somebody in the District of Columbia and that, in essence, excludes other milk from coming into the area?

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. That is true. That is done all over the United States. It is not only in the District of

Columbia, but it is done in other cities that want to keep milk out.

Mr. SPRINGER. Now, there is another question that has been raised publicly in the newspapers, so it ought to be discussed for a moment. At the present time, the surplus milk in the Wisconsin-Minnesota area can come into the Washington area and be sold at a cheaper price, and one thing that is disturbing some of the people in the District of Columbia is, Will this always be true?

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Are you referring to the editorial in the Post of last week?

Mr. SPRINGER. I think the Post incorporated that, but I have heard it from several other sources as well.

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. I do not believe the man who wrote that editorial is too well versed on the dairy business. There is too large of a spread between the price paid for class 1 of bottling milk and the price of class 3 or manufacturing milk. I doubt that those two prices would ever get close enough together so that Wisconsin and Minnesota farmers would willingly sell bottling milk for manufacturing purposes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include some letters.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

AREA REDEVELOPMENT AND DEPRESSED AREAS LEGISLATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. THORNBERRY). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ELLIOTT] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, five other Members and myself have secured for this afternoon equal periods of 20 minutes in which to discuss the area redevelopment and the depressed areas legislation which is now before the Congress. The area redevelopment bill was, as I understand, recently introduced in the Senate by some 39 Senators. It has also been introduced in the House by several Members who represent the areas that are afflicted by unemployment and the economic ills that go with unemployment. The leading proponent, or one of the leading proponents, of the bill in the House is the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD], whom all of us will remember for his valiant fight last year which led eventually to the passage of the bill.

My own bill on this subject is H.R. 5107.

These bills, Mr. Speaker, are based on the philosophy expressed in the Employment Act of 1946. This act recognized the continuing responsibility of the Federal Government to utilize its resources to establish conditions which would promote maximum employment, production, and purchasing power throughout the United States. Despite this commitment to a full employment economy certain areas of our country have not participated in the general economic growth and prosperity that has prevailed almost consistently in recent years.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. JONES].

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to see my colleague, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ELLIOTT], devoting his skill and legislative ability to a very trying and very important question which concerns our economic plight, which has sprung up in various sections of the country.

I know he will be interested to be informed that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. WITHROW] and I today have introduced a public buildings bill, which, by its enactment, will give job opportunities, if we can initiate this program and can have a uniform schedule of public buildings construction enacted during this session of Congress.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. JONES], for his statement that a public buildings program bill has been introduced by him. I would like to say that the 50 or so Members of the House who met this last week and week before last on this subject were most anxious to see such a bill introduced. As a matter of fact we passed a resolution urging that such a program be undertaken. I want to thank the gentleman for his announcement. It will bring hope to all areas where there is economic distress and unemployment. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. JONES], has always battled for full employment for his people. In his efforts in this direction he has been singularly successful.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELLIOTT. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate, of course, very deeply the very kind things the gentleman has just said in connection with my efforts last year on this bill. However, I want to make it clear that I was the humblest and merest house detective or traffic agent for a joint committee of Republican and Democratic Members. It was entirely a nonpartisan effort. There were the same number on both sides of the aisle who worked with this steering committee that we put together during the 30 days before the House passed the bill and after it passed the Senate.

So I would like to make it clear, and I am sure my friend hastens to join me in saying that at no time during the entire debate last year or in the hearings, was there any suggestion of partisanship or politics. And I am sure he hastens with me to emphasize again that that is our position; we who are the proponents of this legislation hasten to emphasize that that atmosphere prevails today and will prevail all through these debates to the successful passage of this legislation in the House again this year. Out of an abundance of caution we hasten to emphasize that.

Mr. Speaker, I might say as well that the hearings on this bill will start, as far as House Members are concerned, before the great Committee on Banking and Currency of the House tomorrow morning. I will have the privileges, I hope, of leading off for the Members of the House in support of this bill.

This is not a narrow piece of legislation. My friends from a dozen States have been active just as long as I have been active in support of this legislation.

I hope the gentleman will permit me another minute or two. I must leave for an appropriations hearing for the Department of Defense, and I will not have the advantage and the pleasure of hearing the extended discussion the rest of the afternoon that will go on among my colleagues.

I am particularly interested in pointing out to my colleagues the significance of the agricultural phase of this bill. There will be Members from both sides of the aisle, I am advised, who will discuss with great intelligence, great ability, and sincerity the important agricultural phase of this bill.

I should like to indicate in passing that of the four great farm agencies that we have known for many years, all great and all sincere in their efforts in behalf of farm legislation, the Farmers Union, Russell Newman, of the great National Grange, and the National Co-ops, those three great farm organizations are vehement in their support of this legislation. It is opposed by the United States Farm Bureau.

I heard Mr. Herschel Newsome say last year before the other body, and I am sure he will say it again before the Committee on Banking and Currency of this body, that he considers this legislation the most important piece of farm legislation that will pass this Congress this year. He said that last June 12. He went to some length to establish that. So did the spokesmen for the National Co-ops and the Farmers Union.

I believe in the integrity and the sincerity of the distinguished spokesmen for the Farm Bureau. I know their thinking is very much the same as that of the spokesmen for the United States Chamber of Commerce and the National Association of Manufacturers. At no time do we question the deeply felt sincerity or the complete integrity of the spokesmen of those bodies in behalf of their positions on this bill, but I say that their position resolves itself immediately down into a clear demarcating line of philosophy of government. Those gentlemen have a distinct and very clear and recognized philosophical position vis-a-vis this kind of legislation. Traditionally we recognize and respect it, but that it what it is. We respectfully beg to differ with them on that broad question.

I might add that the yardstick that has been introduced in this bill to examine the acceptability of the rural areas is not a gimmick. It is not a new thing. It is not something that we who support the bill thought up. This has been an old, tried and true yardstick in the Human Resources Bureau of the great Department of Agriculture for many, many years. The only trouble has been, and we hope we solve it in this

bill, that the Department of Agriculture has never presented an adequate or a proper program to permit the yardstick to be applied. This bill, borrowing the yardstick or measurement factor, provides such a program.

This is seed money. This is seed money for these rural areas. My friends who know the problem of the rural areas will develop the importance to them of this legislation.

As a Pennsylvanian, I should like to indicate this condition: It has been suggested in the other body that the administration figure of $50 million was not actually picked off the fence somewhere. The figure was the result of an investigation made by them in my home State. They went there and they say that from examining the Pennsylvania problem they came up with a figure of $707 which is necessary to provide a job; that is, the capital investment of $707 is the condition precedent to give birth to a job, which in turn will supply a service job to serve the man that you create the job for.

Well, the fact of the matter is that the distinguished secretary of commerce for the State of Pennsylvania, who was here many years in the Department of Commerce and who because of his great work here was recognized by the State of Pennsylvania and was named by Governor Leader for 4 years as the secretary of commerce has been renamed by Governor Lawrence because of his brilliant work, testified that for my State alone, sir, for Pennsylvania alone, a minimum of $57 million is the only way that we can attack this cancer. That is $7 million more than the total figure proposed in the administration bill. So the Pennsylvania figure of $707 was the cream on the top of the thing. They went into districts where we had already done the work for 20 years, and they used that figure as a yardstick. I point out to you, to refute that, that in the State of Pennsylvania the Governor in his budget, which is now before the general assembly, has asked for four times the amount that was the basic figure upon which my friends reached their conclusions. The Governor has asked for four times the amount, and he is asking for $10 million this year in his budget to help us in Pennsylvania to do what they want us to help them with. These are some of the problems.

The suggestion of the NAM is that the important thing here is what is known as business climate, that the business climate of a community must be good. There is no doubt about that. But, these areas which you and I are speaking of, sir, are not in any condition to be recognizable as having a business climate. They have exhausted themselves. Their resources are exhausted. They cannot pay their taxes. Their juvenile delinquency rates are going up. They do not have parks. They do not have public facilities. There is no business climate for a great American industrial resource to come in and build there. And in your town and in many other towns throughout these 20 States, we have heard testimony that a plant was about to locate there but the family or the wife of the president would come in and say, "I will never live here. There are no parks, look at the schools and look at the conditions. These are distressed areas. We cannot live here and we will not let you build your plant here." So you see there is no business climate.

This bill hopes to create that condition precedent. I am grateful for the time you have given to me, sir, and I regret that I cannot remain on the floor so that I may hear my colleagues develop this very important subject.

Mr. ELLIOTT. I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania. I want to reiterate what the gentleman has so well said that this is a bipartisan effort. That is indicated, among other things, by the fact that the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. MOORE], the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. SLACK], the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SILER], the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR], and the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. EDMONDSON] all join in this joint effort to discuss this very important problem this afternoon.

Mr. ANDERSON of Montana. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELLIOTT. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON of Montana. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ELLIOTT], particularly for recognizing me at this point as I must leave shortly to attend a meeting of the Armed Services Committee. Before I go I would like to associate myself with the position which the gentleman has taken this afternoon and to state that certainly there is a clearly evident need in my district and in my State for legislation which the gentleman is supporting. It is designed to meet a need which cannot be met except by the Federal Government.

There is chronic unemployment throughout my State, much of which does not appear in the statistical reports because it involves Indians, farmers, miners, and frontier-type individuals, many of whom eke out a precarious living.

One of the primary needs of my district, which has six of the seven Indian reservations in Montana, is employment for these people. These reservations, at present development, will not support the numbers of people living on them. A few do have resources.

These resources, generally speaking, have been known to pass into the hands of other people prior to their development, with little or no attempt to utilize the Indians as a labor force. They require carefully selected industries with specialized, on-job training.

Because of the low education level of these people, they need some real effort to secure them jobs. Many are drifting off the reservations because there is no work, and they are gathering on outskirts of our cities, near dumpgrounds, riverbanks, and newly created slum areas. Both the Federal and State Governments shun their support in this nether-nether land these Indians are drifting through. Still others, under a relocation program whereby they are shipped off to big cities along the Pacific coast and in the Midwest, are finding themselves unable to cope with urban life, and they, too, are drifting back to edges of Montana towns, because there is no opportunity for them to gain employment on their reservations.

Indian unemployment, while a large factor, is not the only one in Montana. We have economically depressed areas in our mining communities and the communities which depend on these mining activities. They have good, honest, hard-working people possessing many skills. They have the other natural resources available. Under the provisions of the pending legislation, I believe there can be a favorable new reemployment created.

I would like to commend for the consideration of my colleagues on the floor the position that the eminent economist, Mr. Galbraith, presents in his book, "The Affluent Society," in which he indicates that if we are to fully utilize both the manpower and the great natural resources of our country, the Federal Government must take additional responsibility in fields where local governments or private enterprise are unable to get the job done.

I think the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ELLIOTT] is doing a fine job for his area and for the whole country in pushing this legislation. The gentleman is recognized throughout America for his outstanding work in the field of education legislation. It is most encouraging to see the enthusiasm and skill which he is bringing to solve the problems of area redevelopment and depressed areas legislation.

Mr. ELLIOTT. I thank the gentleman from Montana for his very kind remarks.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DENT].

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the sponsor of this legislation who has been so kind as to yield to me now rather than to wait until the end of the presentation.

There is one piece of legislation I think all of us had better look at. Of recent date a group in the Senate offered an amendment to the Senate bill, which is intended to do the same thing as the House bill sponsored by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ELLIOTT] and others. The Senate bill carries the number S. 22. I wish to read just one part of the amendment to you and its purpose to set up a new classification of areas that will be eligible for funds coming from the developmental bill. I quote from the amendment:

> There shall also be included among the areas so designated any industrial area in which a substantial part of the employment is or most recently was in an industry adversely affected by the reduction of trade barriers under the Trade Agreements Extension Act.

Now I want to point out to you that it is difficult enough to subsidize an industry that cannot move, such as farming and agricultural pursuits. You cannot move a cornfield. Under another act that is before this House, however, it is entirely possible, not only possible but probable, because of recent history, that we can finance competitive industry abroad, be injured in our own domestic production facilities, and then

come before the Congress of the United States and get relief under this amendment.

I mention this because I am a sincere believer in area redevelopment legislation and do not want to see an amendment passed that will in my judgment completely destroy the whole intent of the legislation.

The field of international trade and reciprocal trade have absolutely no business being injected into an area redevelopment bill which is intended to help communities that cannot help themselves redevelop their areas so that they can induce, if possible, some kind of payroll to come to their area. I believe all of us had better take another look at this frank admission by the sponsors of what I have been talking about for the short year of my service here. They definitely now admit that we have to tax the citizens of these United States to aid communities that have been eliminated or their welfare injured.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. President, may I say to my friend from Pennsylvania, Mr. DENT, that his remarks are deeply appreciated. Though he has only been here a short time, he is proving himself to be a most able and valuable Member.

There are dozens of urban communities which have been classified as chronic depressed areas because of their persistently high level of unemployment. Many more rural communities have also been subjected to low income and low standards of living. The area redevelopment bill is designed to establish a constructive program to alleviate such conditions of unemployment in industrial areas and underemployment in agricultural areas as well.

Mr. Speaker, in line with what I have just said I wish to call the attention of the House to the fact that according to the latest report by counties and States for the distribution of surplus agricultural commodities that there are today, or were at the time of this report, as of the end of last November, 210 counties in 24 States in which the recipients of the commodities constituted 15 percent or more of the population. Six of the counties which I am privileged to represent here are on that list. It is with this background that I speak this afternoon. I urge the House to pass the distressed areas bill at the first opportunity.

AREA REDEVELOPMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAYLOR. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania for yielding me this time to join him in his support of this area redevelopment legislation.

Mr. Speaker, there is no doubt in my mind that the need for area redevelopment legislation is one of the most pressing problems confronting the 86th Congress. With national unemployment reaching over 4.7 million it is of interest to point out that there are 2,499,100 of the total number of the unemployed living in the 269 distressed areas of the Nation.

It is revealed by the U.S. Department of Labor that 76 of the 269 areas are classified as major labor surplus areas with 1,937,100 persons unemployed. It is in these 76 areas that unemployment has brought misery and despair to nearly 2 million good Americans and their families.

From the standpoint of unemployment in my own State of Pennsylvania as of January 1959 out of a labor force of 5 million there were 508,000 unemployed or an average of over 10 percent of the labor force.

Bringing the picture a little closer home, in my congressional district the Altoona area as of January 1959 had a labor force of 53,600 with 7,700 unemployed or an average of 14.4 percent of the labor force; while in the Clearfield-DuBois area in my congressional district out of a labor force of 37,000 there were 5,200 unemployed for an average of 14.1 percent.

Summarizing the unemployment situation in my congressional district, out of a labor force of nearly 91,000 there are 12,900 unemployed or 14.3 percent of the labor force.

In speaking of this chronic unemployment condition, in my congressional district there were periods during the past several years when the number of unemployed exceeded 18 percent of the total labor force.

Mr. Speaker, having closely observed for many years the ravages of unemployment I can assure you that like a deadly plague this chronic and persistent unemployment has had death-dealing effects since it destroys the faith and spirit of good American citizens, and in so doing, it is no respector of age.

Not only are our youth being robbed of their rightful heritage, to live in a nation traditionally known as the "land of opportunity," but older citizens, after years of toil and service, find themselves in the army of the unemployed.

It is pathetic to see vast numbers of good Americans trying to exist on public assistance and surplus commodities.

In this connection, nearly 22 percent of the 281,700 residents of my three-county area are recipients of surplus commodities.

One often hears the question: Why is it that these areas of chronic unemployment cannot help themselves?

The answer is that while some 1,800 communities throughout the country have active area redevelopment corporations, I can only speak for my own congressional district where such groups have been active for years and have enjoyed a measure of success.

For example, since 1946 in my home town of Altoona, Pa., a result of an active industrial redevelopment group that raised nearly a million dollars mostly through voluntary payroll deductions, 11 new industries have been brought into the Altoona area solely through community, State and Federal effort.

These new industries have provided 3,600 new jobs and a $12 million increased annual payroll.

Seventy percent of the new jobs are for men.

This highly successful effort stems from what is commonly known nationally as the Altoona plan.

Mr. Speaker, in attaining this remarkable record the Altoona group like other groups in my congressional district has borrowed at the banks to the legal limit.

In addition, the Pennsylvania Industrial Development Authority, as well as the Small Business Administration, have assisted to their legal limit.

Therefore, in my congressional district these area redevelopment groups are in need of further financial assistance such as is provided for in the area redevelopment legislation now before Congress.

I think I can speak for all area redevelopment groups in my congressional district when I say that they do not want any Federal handout.

What they need primarily is additional borrowing power which coupled with other forms of Federal assistance as contained in the pending bills will enable them to assist in wiping out these pockets of unemployment and their human wastage.

Mr. Speaker, before I conclude I should like to read a statement I made on the floor on February 24 concerning my compromise bill, H.R. 4878, and I quote:

Mr. Speaker, on February 23 I introduced H.R. 4878, a bill to aid depressed areas.

It might be said that what we need right now is not new bills to aid depressed areas but an act signed by the President which would bring Federal assistance to the scores of communities in the United States which have for years been plagued with chronic unemployment. I fully agree with this view.

My record in favor of depressed area legislation is crystal clear.

For years I have cooperated with my colleagues on both sides of the aisle interested in this type of legislation and my disappointment was as great as theirs when the President vetoed the Douglas-Spence bill last fall.

Mr. Speaker, on the subject of Federal aid to depressed areas there are some excellent bills pending before this session of Congress. In this connection, it would not be difficult for me to support the bill introduced by my colleague, Mr. FLOOD, of Pennsylvania, and its companion bill in the Senate introduced by Senator DOUGLAS, of Illinois.

At this point, however, it is pertinent to ask—and I do so in all sincerity—why solicit a repetition of last year's veto by having the Douglas-Flood bill given similar treatment since it resembles to a marked degree the Douglas-Spence bill in the 85th Congress.

Frankly, the possibility of another veto is cause for great concern.

While there is no one in the Senate or the House who would stoop to playing politics with the misery of unemployment, we cannot ignore the fact that unless a bill is enacted the suffering of the people in the depressed areas is not going to be alleviated.

Mr. Speaker, among the sponsors of depressed area legislation there exist two conflicting points of view.

To begin with, in principle the administration has endorsed aid to depressed areas.

In addition, the two great major political parties also endorsed the principle in their 1956 platforms.

Therefore, the question that Congress must resolve is the extent of aid to the depressed areas of the Nation.

In an effort to reach this common objective, it is imperative that reasonable people should be willing to compromise.

In this connection, it is my belief that the President will find it possible to accept a reasonable compromise between the administration bill and the Douglas-Flood version of the legislation.

In my plea for a reasonable compromise, it must be thoroughly understood that I am not presuming to speak for the administration nor have I had any consultations with administration leaders on the subject.

Mr. Speaker, let us be practical and face the facts concerning depressed area legislation.

In the event of a Presidential veto of the Douglas-Flood bill, I have been unable to find anyone willing to flatly predict that the veto will be overridden by the House of Representatives.

The fear of being unable to override a veto is based on the fact that it requires two-thirds of the votes cast to accomplish that purpose.

Therefore—looking the facts right in the face—when you review the position of those Members of the House today in relation to their last year's vote on the Douglas-Spence bill, one finds that the margin of victory would be insufficient to override a possible Presidential veto of the Douglas-Flood bill.

Mr. Speaker, to improve our chances of enacting depressed area legislation, I introduced H.R. 4878, a bill which represents a compromise between the administration's approach and the Douglas-Flood bill.

With a few exceptions, my compromise bill, H.R. 4878, offers the same types of aid contained in the Douglas-Spence bill vetoed last year.

For example, instead of making every depressed area eligible for the same types of assistance, my bill provides different degrees of Federal assistance based upon the level of chronic unemployment and the need in such areas.

In this connection, it is my belief that areas which have suffered greater levels of unemployment should be entitled to a greater degree of aid than those communities whose problems of unemployment are of a lesser degree.

Briefly, my bill, H.R. 4878, provides for the following programs:

(1) Technical assistance: Depressed areas would be eligible for technical assistance to help the communities to appraise their physical and human resources, which would prepare them to plan constructive programs to attract new businesses and expand existing businesses in these areas.

(2) Community loans: Depressed communities would be eligible to receive loans from a revolving fund of $100 million.

We know that the conventional lending facilities in depressed areas are not as venturesome as those in growing and expanding communities.

The fund would put the depressed areas on a more equal footing with other communities in attracting new jobs.

(3) Public facilities: Some communities need improvement in public facilities before they would become sufficiently attractive to new businesses which might desire to locate in these areas.

My bill provides for an establishment of a $25 million revolving fund from which these communities would be able to borrow.

While the figure may appear modest, attention is called to the fact that legislation is pending before the House which would establish special funds for community facilities.

Meanwhile, under my bill, H.R. 4878, a small fund would be allocated and earmarked to aid depressed areas.

In addition, the most depressed communities which do not have sufficient resources to borrow funds would be eligible to receive grants up to a maximum of $25 million.

At this point, let me stress that this is not an annual appropriation but is intended to be a $25 million revolving fund from which these communities would be able to borrow.

The administrator of the program would be expected to limit the grants only to communities with the greatest need for aid and which do not have sufficient resources to repay the loans in the foreseeable future.

It should be stressed that this is no giveaway program; under the provisions of my bill grants would be made only for projects which would provide lasting improvements and thus broaden the economic base of the communities.

(4) Vocational training and subsistence: One of the big problems of the people in depressed areas is the fact that many of their industries have declined or disappeared and, consequently, the demand for the skills acquired by the people in these areas has also diminished or vanished.

In order to enable these people whose skills have become obsolete to gain new employment, we must provide facilities to retrain them.

But many have been unemployed for a long period of time, and it would be unreasonable to expect that they could undergo an effective period of vocational training without any means of support.

Consequently, while the unemployed are undergoing training and if they are no longer eligible for unemployment compensation, they would be receiving subsistence payments equal to the average unemployment insurance in their State during the period while they are undergoing training, but not for a period exceeding 13 weeks.

Only the unemployed residing in the communities with the highest level of unemployment would be eligible for this type of aid and the total amount that would be appropriated for this program would be limited to $5 million a year.

Mr. Speaker, in brief, these are the provisions of my compromise bill, H.R. 4878.

They are modest, but at the same time will provide a sound program of Federal assistance to depressed areas.

All of us are deeply concerned by the latest reports about the rise of unemployment.

Experience has shown that the people in depressed areas are the ones that are mostly hit by any rise in unemployment and are the last to recover from the onslaught of recession.

Therefore, it is urged that we enact the program contained in my compromise bill, H.R. 4878, as a realistic means of providing an effective program to aid the chronically depressed areas of the Nation.

Since the cost of depressed area legislation has proved a stumbling block in the past and impeded our efforts, let me point out that the cost of the Douglas-Flood bill is $389.5 million as compared to the cost of the administration bill which is $53 million.

By way of contrast, my compromise bill, H.R. 4878 will cost $158 million or just about midway between the cost of the Douglas-Flood bill and the administration bill.

Mr. Speaker, in connection with depressed area legislation, let me state that I have no pride of authorship.

My sole desire is to aid the people in the depressed areas and to attain such a laudable objective the spirit of compromise should be dominant in our minds.

As one who represents two chronically depressed areas in Pennsylvania with unemployment as high as 14 percent of our labor force and which has plagued us for years, my goal is that Congress enact without delay an effective bill in a form acceptable to the President, thereby eliminating the prospects of another Presidential veto.

Mr. Speaker, the residents of the 269 depressed areas of the Nation are entitled to this type of legislation, and it is my sincere hope that we can compromise any differences and enact a depressed area bill without further delay."

This concludes the statement I made on the floor of the House February 24.

Mr. Speaker, in concluding my remarks on area redevelopment legislation, it is my firm conviction that as long as we have "pockets of persistent and chronic unemployment" in the Nation, the Federal Government has a responsibility to assist in alleviating the misery and despair that follow in its wake.

For that reason it is no longer possible to justify further delay by quibbling over the merits of this or that bill.

Therefore let us face the facts and in good conscience proceed to work out a reasonable bill that can be enacted into law at the earliest possible date.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAYLOR. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I desire to join the gentleman in stressing the importance of the various area redevelopment bills which have been introduced in the House and in the other body and to urge their very speedy approval.

Unemployment has become a very serious matter in the 32d Congressional District of New York, which I have the honor to represent, and while no individual can ever say with certainty which factors were responsible for his own election, I think it is safe to say that the failure of the distressed areas legislation, which passed both Houses in the last Congress, to be signed into law was one of the important elements in the dramatic change that took place in our district last November and saw the first Democratic Member sent to Washington in 42 years. The people of our area are disturbed about unemployment and they quite properly look to the Federal Government for some assistance in their need.

I desire to bring to the attention of the House one change which I have offered in the bill which has been introduced in this body by the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD], and in the other body by the distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS]. This change, which is incorporated in H.R. 3698, would make communities which have been suffering from 6 percent or more unemployment, a percentage which is defined by the Labor Department as substantial unemployment, eligible for relief after 12 months, rather than waiting for 18 months. In this type of relief, as in other forms of relief, a stitch in time often saves nine. Communities which today are continuing to suffer a level of unemployment as high as 6 percent are clearly undergoing serious, rather than temporary, conditions, because they are moving against the economic tide of the rest of the Nation, and it is, therefore, all the more important that the help which this bill provides should come quickly so as to be effective.

I was particularly happy to note that several distinguished Members of the other body have already offered their

own amendment to this legislation which would make this type of assistance available particularly to communities which have been hard hit because of foreign imports. The problem of low-wage competition from abroad is an increasing problem in my district, too, and in many other sections of the country, and it is important that the Government take steps to rectify the harm which has been done by this competition from overseas. I would heartily support such an amendment.

There is one other aspect of this depressed-areas legislation which I believe needs attention. While these bills do provide substantial assistance, I think it is also necessary that we create additional incentives to encourage new businesses to move into areas of heavy unemployment and also to encourage existing businesses to expand where they are rather than to move out to new locations. For that reason, I intend to introduce within the next day or so legislation to provide for fast Federal corporate tax writeoffs for businesses which construct new facilities in unemployment areas or which expand existing facilities in unemployment areas. At the present time, these provisions of our Internal Revenue Code as now applied sometimes actually make it cheaper for a manufacturer to build a new plant in another section of the country, rather than expand or modernize his existing plant. If we are to really help unemployment areas and help them keep their jobs, we need to reverse this process and give them special attractive features which any practical businessman will recognize. I believe that my bill will be a necessary companion of the other depressed-areas bills, and I urge the House to make it part of an overall legislative package to restore the economies of those communities which are today still suffering heavily from unemployment.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAYLOR. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, for some time I have been working to aid the plight of the unemployed in my district. Therefore, I have a vital interest in this legislation because I believe that it will be helpful in offsetting the chronic unemployment in surplus labor areas not only in my district, but in other parts of the country.

I cosponsored legislation of this kind during the 85th Congress and introduced a similar proposal at the beginning of the 86th Congress. I have also cosponsored the Douglas-Flood bill.

I represent the 26th Congressional District of Pennsylvania, comprised of Washington, Greene, and Fayette Counties. Under the provisions of this bill, Uniontown and Connellsville both in Fayette County, are eligible for aid. The average rate of unemployment in this area as of January 1, 1959, was 26 percent—the highest rate in the State.

The economy of Fayette County, as well as the other two counties in my district, is dependent in a large part upon the coal industry. During the past several decades, however, the coal mining employment has been steadily declining. As an example, in Fayette County in 1945 there were 14,433 people employed in the coal mining industry. Today there are 2,500.

The problem facing these communities in my district is the same problem which faces every community in the country—providing jobs for those willing and able to work and attracting and holding good employers who can supply these jobs.

Extensive efforts have been made by local groups to rehabilitate our depressed areas. They have had programs for industry promotion and plant building. They have had fund raising programs and other self-help activities. While these efforts have produced creditable results, they have not been sufficient to stem the rising tide of unemployment from continued job losses.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that legislation to establish an effective program to alleviate conditions of excessive unemployment in certain economically depressed areas, if passed, would be an incentive for communities with a surplus labor force to try to solve their problem. It offers the prospect of work, of new jobs and new industries and holds real promise of practical and effective assistance. It has my wholehearted support and I hope that the legislation will be adopted by Congress and enacted into law at the earliest practicable time.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, ample proof of the need for distressed-area legislation is contained in the report of the Surplus Labor Region published by the Department of Labor and the reports that have been submitted by various committees of Congress.

My remarks this afternoon will be brief. When the executive branch of Government's own figures justify the position that this bipartisan group of Members of the House is taking, I do not think it is necessary to go into detail and point out State by State and district by district these blotches upon the escutcheon of labor.

These people in the various areas are unemployed not of their own volition. They are able-bodied men and women, American citizens, who have rendered to their country a service in time of war and a great service to various companies in time of peace when they had employment. What they are saying to the American public now, through their duly elected representatives, is that having fulfilled their obligations as citizens to the best of their ability, they now find that they have no ability through their own means to get employment in order to support their families, to pay their taxes, to repair their homes, to make their contribution to the welfare drives in their own communities. They are asking that the Government not give them a handout in the same sense it is given to foreign lands, with no hope of ever getting anything back, they are merely asking that these people who live in the depressed areas be given a helping hand so that they once more can take their rightful place as citizens in this great land of ours and participate in every phase of the public endeavor.

I have previously appeared before the House on many occasions in support of this proposition. I have appeared before various committees of the House and Senate in support of bills to provide economic stimulation for distressed areas. I even arranged with the late Senator Neely, of West Virginia, who was a great champion of this cause, to go up into Pennsylvania and to hold a series of hearings throughout the length and breadth of that State, and have been constantly bringing this urgent need to the attention of Congress.

And, it is interesting to note that in the report which Senator NEELY filed following those hearings he stated that while he was convinced of the need for this type of legislation from having visited towns in his own State, that he was surprised to find a similarity existing between the problems in the State of West Virginia and the problems in the great State of Pennsylvania.

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAYLOR. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. FOLEY. I want to commend the gentleman for his presentation of the bipartisan approach to the solution of this pressing problem. Representing western Maryland, which I have the great honor of doing, I wish to join with your statement on this important problem and merely emphasize that the conditions that obtain today and did obtain in the great State of West Virginia and in the great State of Pennsylvania also obtain, sadly so, in the western part of Maryland. We have, as you well know, in our five counties, an economy very similar to yours. It is my hope that through your efforts and the efforts of your colleagues this Congress this year, and in the not too distant future, we will go back and ask ourselves the question: What did we mean in 1946 when the Full Employment Act was enacted? And, I call it the "Full Employment Act" because that is what the citizens of the United States expected it to be, and I hope that through your efforts and the leadership that you and your group are showing, a proper answer will be found. I will say that I introduced, to show my interest in this program, a companion bill to the Flood area redevelopment bill. And, if a better answer is found to take care of the 4.5 million unemployed folks who are out of jobs today—and multiply that by 3 or 4 to indicate the total number of people afflicted by this unemployment, which brings it up to 15 million, plus those youngsters coming out of school this year, hoping and expecting jobs in this land of the free and home of the brave—I say, if a better solution is offered, I am for the better solution, but if not, I am for this bill. I want to associate myself with the remarks the gentleman has made.

Mr. SAYLOR. I want to thank the gentleman from Maryland. I think that the bipartisan approach that my colleagues are presenting here this afternoon clearly indicates that no one has pride of authorship in the type of legislation or whose bill will be reported to the floor. This problem, I believe, is big enough that each person who supports it will be able to stand up and not only defend it, but speak about it proudly

in his home community. In the course of the speeches that you will hear here today you will hear numerous accounts of the widespread hardship, but is a proven fact that the mining and railroad centers in Pennsylvania and the other coal-producing States are in serious condition. Industrial idleness set in a decade ago, and except for a brief period during the Korean conflict, has persisted even through the peaks of general business activity elsewhere in the country. I can take you into home after home where there has been no paycheck for years. Here you will find the most willing and industrious people in all the world, skilled workers, intelligent workers, strong workers, solid American citizens, who through no fault of their own are without job opportunities. The majority of them are coal miners and railroad workers, but of course personnel in adjacent market places and service industries suffer a similar fate when these customers are deprived of buying power. You have heard theorists suggest that surplus labor in chronically depressed areas move elsewhere in search of employment.

I want to say to you in all sincerity that there is no more heartless approach to the problem of relieving unemployment and distress than to ask people to move into a new era. It is perfectly all right to ask the young folks, the young men who are not married, the young married people who have no children to worry about, to move. But after all, if you have lived in a community, were married in that community, brought up your family in that community, belong to the church and the lodges in that area, how in good conscience can you say to them, "Well, the solution to your problem is to move; your area is depressed and cannot be handled in the usual way."

That, to me, is completely unjustifiable and not in the best interests of the welfare of the people who live in this great nation of ours.

The district which I represent is rich in natural resources and ideally situated to maintain its vital role in a normal peacetime economy as well as in the great defense structure. A considerable part of the coal industry's ills, for instance, are directly attributable to Government policies which have deprived coal of a great deal of its traditional market. I do not propose to discuss the need for a restriction on residual oil imports at this time. I merely point out that a foreign product is displacing a domestic fuel, causing serious unemployment in our part of the country.

In the first two months of this year shipments of foreign residual oil entered the United States markets at an annual rate equivalent to an energy value of more than 70 million tons of bituminous coal.

For the sake of those persons who are in favor of free trade I might remark that for the first time, believe it or not, there was sold in the New York market in the first 2 months of this year residual oil that came from Russia. Even they are finding out that this country is an easy market to dump these foreign products.

When these conditions are corrected, our unemployment problem will, in a sense, disappear. In the meanwhile it is a sad commentary on this Government to permit wholesale unemployment to persist in these affected areas. We are spending billions of dollars to fight poverty in far off lands while many of our own people are destitute. More billions are being spent to broadcast and publicize the American story. But what I would like to know is how we explain away the fact that from four to five million of our own people are unemployed. How do our information experts convince the foreign people that everything is rosy among the ten or fifteen million American men, women and children who have no means of support?

It is the duty of Congress, Mr. Speaker, to provide for our own general welfare before undertaking any world welfare programs. I suggest that we now enact a program that has been neglected entirely too long. Depressed area legislation, regardless of what bill is approved, will go a long way to get our own communities back on the road to recovery. I solicit you to endorse before the House Committee on Banking and Currency this legislation, and I sincerely urge that the great chairman of that committee hold expeditious hearings. Let us go forward as quickly as possible to put this measure into law. Our people have waited a long, long time, and I know that they will appreciate Congress' early action in relieving their distress.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAYLOR. I am happy to yield to my colleague from Texas.

Mr. PATMAN. I think it should be pointed out that if any one of these distressed areas was in any other country of the world outside of the Iron Curtain countries, we have five agencies that would come to the aid and rescue of such a distressed community.

I refer to the World Bank, and we certainly have made a great contribution of billions of dollars that have gone to this bank. The International Cooperation Administration, 100 percent U.S. money. The Export-Import Bank, 100 percent U.S. money. The International Finance Corporation. That is substantially U.S. money. The Loan Development Corporation.

Any one of those agencies backed by billions and billions of dollars of our own money would go to the aid and rescue of any one of these distressed communities were it in any other country of the world except an Iron Curtain country. I think that is certainly worth consideration.

I agree with the gentleman that it is all right to have foreign aid. I am for a foreign-aid program. I voted for it in the past. I do not feel so good over it right now because we are denying our own people, just as the gentleman suggested, the same kind of aid that we are giving people in other countries. I am not going to vote against the foreign-aid program entirely on that account. I certainly will not do that. But it is certainly disappointing to the gentleman, I know from what he said, and it is disappointing to me that we have plenty of money to help similar communities under comparable circumstances in all other countries of the world outside of the Iron Curtain countries, except here in the United States. We cannot find money to help our own.

Mr. SAYLOR. That is correct. I may say that on several occasions groups of Congressmen have met informally to discuss what could be done. Although it was said in a joking manner, nonetheless it has a serious tone to know how our own country has ignored our own people. The suggestion has been made, Let us get together and withdraw from the United States for 48 hours, make an application for a loan to one of the five agencies the gentleman has mentioned, get the loan, and come back into the Union.

Mr. PATMAN. If any community the gentleman mentions that is a distressed area now were in Mexico or Canada it would be eligible for aid, or, as the gentleman suggested, it could secede and become a foreign republic for a temporary period of time and then would be eligible to receive aid from any one of these five agencies.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAYLOR. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I am very much interested in the remarks of the gentleman from Texas. Apparently he wants to have his cake and eat it too. I do not know how you can pour more money into foreign countries. I am sure he has been voting for it for years. How can we do that and take care of our own people, too? We cannot have it both ways, we have to have it one way or the other. I should like to see the gentleman from Texas join some of the rest of us around here in trying to cut off this flow of money to foreign countries.

Mr. PATMAN. We can have plenty. It is possible we might have to cut down on foreign aid, and if so we could do it, but we have enough money for our own people as well as the foreign people. We have billions of dollars. It is all right.

Mr. GROSS. No, it is not all right.

Mr. PATMAN. I say it is in certain respects, but I am going to look into this situation very carefully.

Mr. MEYER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAYLOR. I yield to the gentleman from Vermont.

Mr. MEYER. It seems to me very logical that when any of our actions in the field of foreign policy or defense policy or general American policy do contribute toward creating distressed areas or at least accentuating the problems of distressed areas, we should try to do something about it to help out those areas at home.

Mr. SAYLOR. I thank the gentleman.

THE CHRONIC UNEMPLOYMENT SITUATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BOLLING). Under previous order of the

House, the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. SLACK] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. SLACK. Mr. Speaker, there has been a great deal said today and in previous sessions of the House regarding the problem of consistent unemployment in those areas in which employment does not respond to the normal business cycle. I represent one of those areas, and the betterment of this problem is my No. 1 interest as a Member of this House. As a first-term Congressman, however, I will defer to my colleagues with greater experience for the discussion of the specifics, and confine my comments to the convictions I have reached after careful observation of the situation in my own district.

We have in our country today these several areas in which unemployment is chronic.

Most of us have heard the details of mechanization and its effect on employment in the coal industry, which on an industrywide basis, has been first and hardest hit. I do not intend to review those facts, but rather to try to define the scope of the situation.

The Congress has made several efforts to deal with the results of this trend. There have been enacted measures to provide surplus commodities for needy families, to liberalize school-lunch programs, to provide supplementary unemployment compensation and the like. These measures are a sign that we of the Congress are interested, and willing to lend our help. Unfortunately, we have not yet come to grips with the core of the problem. We have been devising temporary pain killers, but have not isolated the disease and undertaken a cure for it.

I believe we are dealing here with several kinds of a problem at once, and on the record to date the problem cannot be solved by a piecemeal approach, no matter how well intended.

In efforts to chart a course which will lead to a cure, we must recognize that this is a fiscal problem, a technical problem and a human problem, all combined.

As a fiscal problem, it has a bearing on inflation, and on our national budget, and on the economic stability of the several affected States and communities. It represents continuing and growing costs for surplus foods for the needy, for unemployment compensation, for direct relief payments. The money expended is unproductive in the sense that it adds nothing to our gross national product, and it is therefore another force encouraging inflation. It is a continuously growing charge against the budget, and consequently a demand note against the tax structure.

It is a technical problem because it is the direct outgrowth of a process which we support and actively encourage—the increase of technical skill and productivity in business and industry. Much has been said recently about the threats of our enemies overseas, and fear has been expressed that they will surpass us in technical skills. All of us know that we as a nation cannot afford to be second best in the international race for top industrial skill.

But some byproducts of this progress are, as in this case, problems in terms of displaced human beings. The advance of the machine adds musclepower to our national strength, but at the same time forces some of our people into permanent idleness. They become casualties of the battle for international survival, but with none of the protection afforded the casualties of any other type of conflict or disaster.

The generosity and humanity of the Congress in dealing with human problems has been demonstrated many times, and is already in evidence at this session.

We will again appropriate funds for more surplus commodities for needy families. To what purpose, if no long-term improvement is in sight?

We will appropriate funds for school-lunch programs. To what purpose if the children have no shoes and cannot attend school?

We will no doubt act to extend the supplemental unemployment compensation measure set up by the last Congress. Indeed, the honorable Speaker has stated publicly that this is "must" legislation, and is so important that, if worst came to worst, he would suspend the rules and bring up the measure at once. To what purpose, if each month additional thousands exhaust these benefits without hope of employment in sight?

In short we will be spending millions of dollars to deal temporarily with the undesirable results of the problem, but undertaking no general assault on the core of the problem itself.

Many of you who represent depressed areas have proposed legislation dealing with one or more aspects of the situation, as I have myself. I am not speaking today in behalf of any particular bill. Rather, I am attempting to emphasize the need for forceful and deliberate action, through the medium of such legislation as finds favor with a majority of the membership.

I am speaking strongly, however, in behalf of a total recognition by this House of the total circumstance, an expression of the need for Federal policy directed at its solution, and implemented by measures that promise adequate immediate temporary relief and long-term solution.

It is not accurate to think of such measures as spending devices. They are not spending measures at all. Whatever measures are adopted will require funds, of course, but such funds will be an investment in human beings, a support for our national strength, an amortization of a growing debt that requires more temporary adjustments each year.

The objective must be a transformation of the unemployed worker and his family who exist on a dole of surplus commodities, and who constitutes a drain on our economy and a black mark on our national status, into a taxpaying employed worker who contributes his share to our economic and social advancement as a nation.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SLACK. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to reemphasize what the gentleman has just stated about conditions in our State and others in different parts of the country.

The Second District of West Virginia consists of 15 counties—Barbour, Berkeley, Grant, Hampshire, Hardy, Jefferson, Mineral, Monongalia, Morgan, Pendleton, Pocahontas, Preston, Randolph, Tucker, and Webster.

Unemployment in the Second District is the highest now than it has been since the depression during the late twenties and early thirties. Many thousands are on relief and on the rolls for receiving surplus commodities. Others are trying to obtain at least some small aid from this source in an effort to keep body and soul—and family—together; however, they are declared ineligible for receiving this help inasmuch as they are "physically employable." They are certainly willing to work, but jobs are not available.

We are rich in natural resources and water supply—and have thousands of persons available to supply manpower.

Mr. Speaker, the importation of residual oil has indeed hurt the economy of the Nation. According to the Congressional Quarterly, as of February 20, 1959, residual oil imports were flowing into this country at a rate equivalent to 71,832,000 tons of coal produced during the average work-year of 200 working days. This amount of coal, if it were actually produced, would provide jobs for 32,650 coal miners whose pay would be $158,352,500 computed on the same annual basis. This would represent revenue to the coal producers and railroads which haul coal.

This also means an additional loss of many millions of dollars in tax revenue to the Government.

The importation of cheap residual oil not only hurts the people of the coal-producing State of West Virginia and the Nation, but also impairs the ability of the country to produce coal in the time of an emergency and means many of the railroads would not be prepared for transport of coal at the time of a national emergency.

There are many other items in the Second District of West Virginia which if proper attention could be given them, would be helpful in alleviating the desperate economic and unemployment situation now existing.

I would like to call attention to the following projects in the second district which, if funds are made available by Congress, will help alleviate the present economic and unemployment situation.

Rowlesburg Dam-Cheat River: I hope funds will be made available for the Cheat River resurvey, with the objective of building a dam for flood control in the Rowlesburg section of Preston County, W. Va.

This area is now considered one of the greatest depressed sections, not only in West Virginia, but in our Nation.

The Rowlesburg Dam project would not only help in providing flood control protection, but would assist greatly in helping to some degree the desperate economic situation in the area. It

would provide employment, attract industry to the section which has a wealth of natural resources, is on the main line of the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad, and would attract tourists who could enjoy the natural beauty of the area.

Hildebrand lock and dam project: The Department of Defense, Army Corps of Engineers civil works program, has requested approval of funds for continuing this project on the Monongahela River in Monongalia County.

The completion of this important waterway will provide an important link to the vast coal fields of West Virginia and Pennsylvania and will directly and indirectly render service to the whole United States in time of war or national emergency.

Opekiska lock and dam project: Approval for the construction of this project was given during 1957, and planning for the Opekiska lock and dam is ready to get underway as soon as funds are available.

I hope action may be taken to make funds available to cover the initial costs of planning and for beginning actual construction of this project on the Monongahela River, about 10 miles south of Morgantown, W. Va.

North Branch of Potomac River flood control program: Some study has already been made for this program. I hope action may be taken to provide approval and funds for a flood control program for the city of Keyser, Mineral County, W. Va., on the North Branch of the Potomac River.

Morgantown ordnance works: This chemical facility was constructed for the Federal Government by the Du Pont Co. It began operations in 1941 and terminated May 28, 1958. It is now in the hands of the General Services Administration for disposition.

I feel the U.S. Government has a moral obligation to see that the Morgantown ordnance works at Morgantown, Monongalia County, W. Va., is sold or leased to an industry which will put the $63 million plant back into operation immediately.

The small farmers: Attention must be given to the plight of the small farmers in West Virginia and the Nation. I believe the present program must be changed to alleviate the desperate circumstances of this worthy group which has been struggling to earn a livelihood for themselves and try to keep filled the "breadbasket" of the Nation. Believe it or not, many of them are now on lists for receiving surplus commodities because their families are so in need. I think some action must be taken in passing legislation to concentrate on this group of small farmers—and taken now.

As I have said many times, the small farmer is the fundamental strength of our Nation. History has shown that when small farmers get in trouble, sooner or later the rest of civilization is in trouble. Today the small farmers are at the danger point.

Many people in my area have been complaining about the billions of dollars in subsidies which are now being paid to the big-city absentee farmers—the farm barons of America. For instance, many of them are getting, and have been getting, tens of thousands of dollars for not farming their lands, or in subsidies—what the small farmer, in essence, feels is helping the man who least needs it in the Nation.

As I have said many times in the past few years—and I say it again—revision of our farm laws are going to have to be made, and now, aimed at correcting these inequities and to benefit the small farmers of the Nation who are so worthy and so in need.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SLACK. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WALTER. Ordinarily, the majority of the Members of this body would oppose legislation of the sort that we are discussing today because we do not like to see local communities endeavoring to shift responsibility to the Federal Government, but it seems to me that this legislation is an encouragement to local communities to take up where they have been unable to function heretofore. I know of many communities in the United States where the citizens in their desire to help themselves without appealing to any agencies of the Government or any political subdivision thereof have raised large sums of money in an endeavor to do something about the plight over which they have no control.

I hope we may be able to work out some kind of legislation that will fit these communities into a whole fabric so that the resources that our Republic enjoys can be made available for all of its people.

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SLACK. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, it is high time we take positive and constructive action to put people back to work by passing the area redevelopment bill.

All of us want to balance the budget and fight inflation. When we get the people back to work they can balance their personal budgets and this is the best road toward balancing the national budget. When we get people back to work they can start adding to national production and that is the best way to fight inflation. When we get people off the breadlines and onto the assembly lines, Mr. Speaker, that is the way to balance the budget and fight inflation.

Although my home town of Huntington, W. Va., is more than 400 miles away, in the 9 weeks that Congress has been in session I have been home on nine different occasions because my people are in economic trouble. Last week, I missed two quorum calls because I was in West Virginia participating with West Virginia's junior Senator, ROBERT C. BYRD, in Senate Banking and Currency Committee hearings on the area redevelopment bill which is so vital to the interests of West Virginia.

In the past few weeks I have visited hundreds of people in their homes, not only in the cities and towns but out in the rural areas. I have presented to the Senate Banking and Currency Committee tape recordings of what these people have said about their economic plight.

Mr. Speaker, these people want to work. They have worked in the past. They want to work in the future. They don't want a dole or handouts. They want jobs. But right now most of them are keeping body and soul together on surplus commodities.

Surplus commodities are not designed to provide a balanced diet, yet 15 percent of the total population of my State of West Virginia are living, subsisting is a better word, on surplus commodities. This is the highest percentage of any State in the Union.

I have had scores of letters from these people. They are deeply disturbed. They are crying out not for relief, but for work, useful productive work. Here is a letter written on February 11, 1959:

I am a young girl of 20 and I am writing on behalf of my parents and family. My father is a former coal miner and like all the rest has been unemployed for quite a while. I have a brother of 10 who goes to school. We are not as bad off now at least not at the present, but worry is the big burden and hope is something almost forgotten. We have been let down so many times. I have tried to find work in every place I have had a chance to. I'm trained to be a medical technician. We have lived on the same thing for so long we seem to get weaker as the days go by. Rice and cornmeal with a little butter is something you can soon grow tired of but because you are hungry you try to eat. If we could only have some meat or eggs even once a week it would help and give us the strength to hope for a better day.

Here is another letter from a man who wrote me on February 18, 1959:

There are six in my family. I haven't worked for 22 months. I have been everywhere, but it seems like there just are no jobs to be found. People holler about the taxes. I tell you if I had a job I could pay them. I wouldn't worry about taxes. I'd be thankful I could pay them.

And another letter from a lady who wrote February 18:

I am president of our PTA here and I know there are just plenty of people like my husband who have been out of work more than a year. We are in debt head over heels and still see no way out of the situation. We are fortunate in one way. I did a lot of canning from my garden last summer and we have some of it yet. People need shortening or lard for seasoning, also potatoes and beans, canned meat and fruits. They also need white meal. That yellow meal won't bake done and most of it stinks until you almost have to hold your nose while eating it. Something should be done. It's not our fault we are in this situation and that includes most of the people who are out of work. My husband has been everywhere he can hear of work but it's always the same comeback and you know you can just walk so far. And we lost our car last June. So I'm hoping something can be done.

I have many more letters, Mr. Speaker, which I will make available to the appropriate committee on a confidential basis, because I do not wish to embarrass any of these good people in their home communities by publishing their names and addresses.

Nearly 17 percent of the labor force in Huntington, W. Va., is unemployed. Huntington, West Virginia's largest city, the hub of the Tri-State area, a great

river port, located so strategically from the standpoint of natural resources, transportation, and markets, is today in serious economic trouble. Huntington has just been named an all-America city because the cooperative efforts of thousands of citizens pulled up the standards of this great municipality almost by the bootstraps—yet today Huntington is a sleeping economic giant, stricken by heavy unemployment.

Twenty-four manufacturing plants have closed their doors in the Huntington area in the past 10 years. The largest of these, the Sylvania Electric Products Co., closed down a year and a half ago and threw 3,200 men and women out of work. Many of them are specialists and technicians; now they are roaming the streets for work. Some leave their families to get jobs in other States.

Mr. Speaker, public and private relief agencies are working around the clock to alleviate these problems. State and local authorities and private individuals are doing their utmost. It is no answer to say that all of these problems must be solved by more local initiative because we have already overworked Old Man Initiative until his back is breaking. We need the area redevelopment bill to furnish loans for redevelopment financing. We need to modernize existing plants. We need technical assistance through studies and surveys of the area. The vocational training and retraining features of the area redevelopment bill would give new hope to thousands who are currently immobilized with no opportunity to work or to retrain for future usefulness.

This bill is not the magic wand which will bring us prosperity. It is not the final and complete answer. But it is a bold beginning.

In West Virginia we have the will. Now give us the way and pass the area redevelopment bill.

The Eisenhower administration has asked us to continue billions for foreign aid. I am heartily in favor of foreign aid. But I am tired of ignoring our people here at home, and I am tired of hearing that administration refrain which seems to say, "Billions for foreign aid, but not one cent for tribulation."

Mr. Speaker, West Virginia and the Nation need the area redevelopment bill. There have been threats that this bill will be vetoed unless it is watered down.

In these times of grave economic crisis there are timid men who cry out that half a loaf is better than none. But, I serve notice, Mr. Speaker, that if this bill is vetoed I intend to go out, up and down every creek and hollow in my district and pound the pavements of the cities, and 300,000 strong people of my district will tell the President and the Congress "We need this bill to put our people back to work again."

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SLACK. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I wish to associate my remarks with the remarks of the distinguished gentleman from West Virginia, Mr. STAGGERS, whose district parallels mine on the south side of the Potomac River. I wish to associate myself with him for the reason that many of his constituents come across the river to Cumberland, up and around Keyser, and at Western Port and to Hancock, and Hagerstown, and spend their money when they have jobs. Consequently, the small merchants and gasoline station owners in our district would like to see the West Virginia people back on their feet again. But, I want to associate my remarks particularly for the reason that we in the Sixth District of Maryland up in Washington County, now have a 15 percent unemployment ratio, which is one of the highest, sadly, in America. We hope that the folks in my district again can come back to the fine, prosperous condition that they had previously, and join with the West Virginians in sharing in a full measure of prosperity, but we cannot do it unless the Congress this year sees that jobs are created by enacting this legislation providing for area redevelopment.

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SLACK. I yield to the gentleman from Maine.

Mr. OLIVER. I would be remiss in my duty, Mr. Speaker, representing the southwestern district of the State of Maine, if I did not rise and take advantage of this opportunity to state that the people of my district are wholeheartedly in support of this area redevelopment legislation. It was only a couple of weeks ago that I made an appearance before a committee of the other body and made a similar statement. At that time I had associated with me a very strong and aggressive leader from a textile area in my State which is adversely affected to the extent of about 30 percent of unemployment to the total labor force. On March 3 I received permission from this House to include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD that statement that this constituent of mine made. It fully expresses the problem which confronts us and the great need for this legislation. And, I wish, Mr. Speaker, to take this opportunity to say the gentlemen from West Virginia that I heartily commend him for the initiative and the leadership which he has taken with reference to this particular problem that affects not only his own State, but many other areas of the country, including my own. I wish to associate myself with you, my good friend from West Virginia, in what you are doing, and I shall support you to the fullest extent of my ability.

Mr. SLACK. I thank the gentleman from Maine for his remarks.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SLACK. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, I want to compliment the freshman Congressman from the 6th West Virginia District for what he is doing here today in calling the attention of his colleagues in the Congress to the bad economic situation in certain areas of the country, which most certainly applies to the area he represents in central and southern West Virginia. It just so happens that my district adjoins that of the freshman Congressman, and I, too, encounter all kinds of difficulties, particularly in the area in which coal is king, where coal is the major activity and the major industry.

I want also to compliment the Members of Congress from all over the States that are affected at present by chronic unemployment and unstable economic conditions for joining in this program this afternoon and calling the attention of their other colleagues in the House and the attention of the admistration to the necessity for action and action at once. I am glad, Mr. Speaker, that we can do this on a nonpartisan basis; that we are participating here as representatives of the people and not as representatives of the Democratic Party or the Republican Party.

I am going to add one little item here to indicate to my colleagues here in the House just how serious this situation is. Following the close of the Korean war the State of West Virginia voted a bonus to pay the Korean veterans. Today 41 percent of all the checks going to veterans of the Korean war are being paid to people and mailed outside of the State of West Virginia. This is clear indication of what has happened in the State of West Virginia that 41 percent of your Korean veterans are now living in other States, who have left West Virginia in the hope of finding employment elsewhere.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from West Virginia has expired.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. (Mr. THORNBERRY). The time of the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. SLACK] has expired.

AREA REDEVELOPMENT LEGISLATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. MOORE] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOORE. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, I want to join my colleagues in this bipartisan effort to get some effective distressed-area legislation. For the past several years I have supported this legislation because I have distressed areas. It is very much needed. We are approaching this matter on a bipartisan basis. We have approached the relief which we have been able to give the unemployed on a bipartisan basis; namely, unemployment compensation, the distribution of surplus agricultural products, and the other things we have been able to give those people in need.

Certainly I am in favor of distressed-area legislation. I want to associate myself with my colleagues in the general remarks they have made, and especially

at this time with the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN], who pointed out that if these areas were outside the continental limits of the United States they would have a place to petition and they would get help.

Mr. Speaker, I commend each of the gentlemen who has spoken on this legislation today and associate myself with them in their remarks. I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, here today we have seen presented not only a bipartisan effort but certainly an effort which has been joined in by a number of different areas of this great country of ours, in an endeavor to bring to the attention of Congress the need for area redevelopment legislation.

Members in this House have heard on numerous occasions the plight of us in West Virginia. I think at this time they are entitled to know what, if anything, we have been doing over the past several years in an effort to help ourselves to get out of the serious situation which is now confronting our State.

Actually, while the majority of the country is responding to new vigor in the economy of the Nation, the State of West Virginia is still in economic doldrums. During the first 11 months of 1958 there was a decline in the value of manufactured products in our State of over 9½ percent which, in terms of dollars or manufactured prices, is approximately $196 million. This was much lower than during the same period of 1957, when the recession in our State was really being felt.

While other areas of the Nation have shown signs of steady and strong recovery my State apparently continues, as I have said, in the doldrums. The average monthly unemployment rate has increased by more than 35,000 workers; and, in view of this mirroring of our distressed condition, electric energy, which plays a major part in our economy, by reason of the great natural resource of coal that we have in abundance, has dropped 7.9 percent during the first 11 months of 1958.

These figures, I remind the Members of the House, come officially from the West Virginia Chamber of Commerce and were compiled by its experienced and its skilled statisticians.

Of the 707 retail reporting outlets in West Virginia that presented figures, they show that their sales during the same period were down by some 6 percent. Of the State's 95 largest banking institutions, some of which have assets of more than $100 million, checking transactions during these 11 months of 1958 were down by some 6 percent. Building permits in the State of West Virginia have been off during a like period of time by as much as 8 percent.

I believe it can therefore be readily seen that the economic situation in West Virginia is a blight, as we look at it, upon our overall economy.

Mr. Speaker, I represent a district in West Virginia that is perhaps the most economically diversified district of our congressional districts. We do not depend completely upon the coal industry as the backbone of our economy. But, even in the diversified area I represent, great companies and corporations producing steel and chemicals, aluminum, coal, and glass, to mention just a few, the problem of unemployment exists today. In two of my counties the seriousness of this situation of economic distress is evidenced by the sum of the unemployment figure. For instance, the figures bear out the fact that in Taylor County, W. Va., there is an employment factor of 22 percent of the total employable laborers, and I call to the attention of the Members of the House that Taylor County is not a large producing coal county, by any means. As a matter of fact, it produces little coal. In Marion County the percentage of unemployment today is approximately 18 percent, and this, in my opinion, is tremendous when you consider that this congressional district I have the privilege to represent is diversified industrywise.

We have certainly heard many times in the well of this House arguments against foreign-trade programs of this country and the ills that they are wreaking upon the various industries in West Virginia. I do not believe that reiteration of any one of the particular problems we confront as a direct result of that program and the manner in which it has been handled since its inception would serve any useful purpose today. However, we have shown a disposition in our State to handle our problems on a local basis, which seems to be the suggested approach to most problems, or a great defense to most problems that are presented to Congress by those who would like to see the States undertake their own particular problems and solve them rather than encourage Federal legislation of any sort.

Presently the Governor of our State has submitted to the legislature, now convening, an economic recovery program wherein he has asked for over half a million dollars for the purpose of attempting to study the problems of excess unemployment, and to bring about relocation of those where we find there are no jobs, and where the mineral wealth which has heretofore held them in that particular geographic location of our State has been depleted. Also in the State of West Virginia our legislature this past week passed and sent to the Governor another increase in our gasoline tax. We are one of the few States in the Union today whose people are paying 7 cents for every gallon of gasoline that is purchased in the State of West Virginia. We are trying to make a very objective effort to take care of this problem we have in West Virginia, which, I may say, does not contain itself as far as our problems of industry and jobs and employment are concerned. But we are also attempting to answer our problems of better schools and better roads. Nevertheless, the condition today is such that we are getting no help whatsoever nor encouragement from the Congress of the United States in answering any one of our problems, however earnestly we attempt to undertake answering these problems on a State or local basis.

Tomorrow and the following day in some of the great committee rooms of this Congress, legislation will be heard to increase the area of operation of TVA. Now, why should I inject that in an area redevelopment bill? I believe it is a classic example of what is happening to us in our State wherein we feel the abuse of existing Federal programs perpetrated which were passed and now expanded daily here in the Congress. A further expansion of the TVA prevents us, a great coal producing State, from using that very great magnet of ours, our mineral wealth, to bring additional industry into our State, however attractive our picture might be from the standpoint of available work force, our mineral wealth, and generally our tax structure. We cannot compete with Government-sponsored programs such as TVA. We lose industries daily to other areas served by TVA. Legislation to further increase the area and make possible the expansion of the TVA, all of which legislation, if it is eventually adopted, will further curtail the State of West Virginia that I am proud to be a native of and which I speak for partly in the Halls of Congress, along with the rest of my colleagues, in our effort to answer our own problems.

An example of what is happening to us. Some months ago a Chicago newspaper printed a series of articles relating to the social and humanitarian problems generated by wholesale immigrants of West Virginia mountaineers to that city, and I daresay there are a number of Members of Congress here today from such areas as the rubber industry of Akron, the steel mills of Pennsylvania, and the automobile factories of Detroit that are experiencing this mass migration of West Virginia mountaineers. With this legislation we can keep our problems at home and solve the problem of losing our population to our neighboring States. Today only a part of the story has been painted. A genuine effort is being made by the people in West Virginia to answer their problems themselves. The question of area redevelopment legislation will provide us with the key that we must have to actually and sensibly work out our problems ourselves.

Mr. Speaker, I do not want this time to go by without taking the opportunity to state that here this afternoon when so many areas of the country are being made a part of this presentation of the need for this legislation, that it is not simply the continual voice of the dire circumstances and the needs of the people of the State of West Virginia in this instance, but that generally you have here a presentation of a need of some 20 States across the country for the legislation in favor of which we are speaking here today. I would like to make this remark. I am interested in writing into the law of this country of ours an opportunity for the people of our State

with the aid of Federal legislation to answer their own problem. I am not interested in adopting any legislation that is going to be vetoed. I am not interested in adopting legislation that is going to be impossible to administer or which, for any reason whatsoever, the executive branch of the Government does not necessarily feel compatible with the type of government and system that we have. But, I am just as firmly interested that we here in the Halls of Congress shall write legislation which shall give us an opportunity, in the light of some of the programs that we have instituted in our State that we have legislation that we can use and which is of benefit to us here in 1959.

My colleague from the Sixth District of West Virginia, Mr. SLACK, made what I think is a very valuable contribution to the picture in West Virginia by a series of articles which I had the privilege of inserting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD calling attention particularly to the economic plight of the area of West Virginia which is the coal producing area. Approximately 5 counties of our State have 60,000 unemployed people. They are and they do represent the coal producing area of our State. The conditions pointed out in these articles are startling and should alert all that some of our people are not sharing the prosperity of our country. However sound the argument against a program providing help for the poor, the unemployed, the hungry children and the shoeless child, there is no substitution for the food, for the shoes and for the opportunity that this legislation could provide.

I believe the gentleman has performed a great service in pointing these matters out to us because it certainly shows that in this great land of plenty and prosperity there are dangerous circumstances and situations which can be read into the facts disclosed by his trip.

I want also to make this one observation, by reason of conditions in my State of West Virginia and several parts of our Nation. I have consistently opposed further expansion of and further additions to the foreign aid program, as enacted by this Congress, because I believe we have problems, as all of us see it and particularly as I see it, of aiding the people of our Nation in their economic problem. To me we have here today presented a more grave problem and presents us with a far greater problem in this country than any one of the problems that may arise from day to day in some one of the foreign lands across this great globe. If we do not do our best in this country to make sure that the beliefs of this great Republic are sown in the minds of the youth of our country and express to them that this land of plenty does have an interest in them and does hold promise for all of the people regardless of their race, their color, their creed, or their national origin. This we must do. Billions of dollars spent in an effort to bolster the bulwark of democracy without the continental limits of the United States and failing to do this at home, then we are going to lose the battle of the minds of our youth here at home.

I ask you to look at our budget today wherein $77 billion is presented and of this sum some $40 billion is for defense—I am reminded of the only other time in the history of the world when a similar situation arose: That was in the days of the great empire the Romans built some generations ago. They were prepared to meet any aggressor from without; they had the greatest weapons of their day; they had the ability and the know-how; they had the production facilities, and they were prepared to meet that aggressor from without; but they made one mistake, they were not able to meet, they were not capable of meeting the aggressor from within.

If we allow these circumstances that exist in the State of West Virginia and other parts of our Nation to multiply in that great country of ours, no jobs, no food, no promise for the future, I can think of no greater area for the growth of communism or communistic thinking to flourish than in these areas of economic distress. So while it is impressed upon us that there is great need for this country of ours to be defense-minded, to be cognizant of the fact that we are in a race for survival in the event of war with the Soviet Union, I think it is well in this day and at this time that we certainly alert the people of the United States to the fact that while we do have a duty to keep our defense system efficient and potent, that we certainly have an obligation to do everything we possibly can to safeguard within the continental limits of the United States this great system of government of ours.

I believe that area redevelopment legislation, as has been discussed here today, is as important to many of the economic parts of the United States and is as important to my State of West Virginia as any of the most necessary elements of the defense system of this country of ours. I therefore urge that this Congress immediately take up this much needed legislation for area redevelopment, that we certainly must and should do everything we possibly can as a Nation to help ourselves, to provide our States and communities with this necessary Federal legislation.

It is my belief that this discussion today may be fruitful in that our joint endeavors may result in something constructive in the way of legislation that might correct this grave problem confronting us.

This legislation will certainly provide us with a partial answer to the many problems which go far beyond the borders of simply the economy of West Virginia. This legislation is not only a must for West Virginia, but you have heard expressions here today from Congressmen representing other parts of the country, which certainly should lead one to believe that this is a problem that is shared by a great number of the people and areas of our country.

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOORE. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Speaker, I deeply appreciate the distinguished gentleman from West Virginia yielding to me in order that I might have the opportunity to join with him and my other colleagues here today in urging expeditious action by the Congress to provide assistance to areas suffering from chronic unemployment.

First, I want to congratulate the distinguished gentleman from West Virginia for his inspiring and forthright speech.

I have the honor of representing the 25th Congressional District in Illinois, comprising the 15 southernmost counties of the State. In my district we have approximately 20,000 able bodied persons unemployed. Mr. Speaker, this is frightening—to think that we live in a land of plenty where people are actually forced upon relief rolls and wards of the State through no fault of their own. In addition to the tremendous amount of unemployment existing at the present time, we have seen over 30,000 residents of southern Illinois say goodby to their loved ones and move to other parts of the country to find work, leaving behind home, family ties, local schools, and other things near and dear to them. This, Mr. Speaker, is not a good situation.

You may ask what are we doing to help ourselves. In answer to that I may say that through our chambers of commerce, Southern Illinois Inc., Southern Illinois University, and other industry-seeking groups, we have made some wonderful headway. However, the decline has been greater than the progress. Therefore, the Federal Government must give much needed assistance if this condition is to be remedied. We are using every resource available, but we need many projects to help make our communities more attractive to industry. We are not asking for doles or handouts but only the tools with which to help ourselves.

Getting back once again to necessity, I received in this morning's mail a petition signed by 217 persons concerning Government surplus food. Every signature represented from 1 to 12 in a family and pointed out that the meager allotment of cheese, butter, dry fat milk, flour, rice, and corn meal is not adequate to round out the needed diet under the Government's surplus food program. All of these people who signed this petition reside in the small communities of Colp and Carterville, Ill., and through no fault of their own are forced to subsist on Government surplus food. It is a crying shame. All that these people ask is a chance to earn a decent livelihood for their families. I hope that the Congress will see this need and pass area redevelopment legislation in the early part of this session. I have introduced a bill that is now pending before the House Committee on Banking and Currency and I would like to see this legisaltion, or any other that is adequate, passed without delay. The time is late, the need is urgent.

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOORE. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I was interested in the gentleman's comments concerning the migration of West Virginia workers to other parts of the country. It is true that many of these workers have come to the State of Michigan to find employment in the auto plants and associated industries and we are happy to have them. However, they are discovering, as are many others, that the hope of finding employment in Michigan is illusory.

Figures released last week by the Michigan Employment Security Commission indicate that Michigan has had an increase in unemployment for the third consecutive month in spite of a slight increase in automobile production. Our unemployment rate rose from 11.9 percent in January to 12.4 percent in February.

In the metropolitan Detroit area, unemployment stood at 229,000 persons, or almost 16 percent of the working force.

I believe that the Douglas-Flood area redevelopment bill will be a benefit to the people of West Virginia, to those natives of West Virginia now in Michigan and other places, and to the economic well being of all citizens of our great Nation. It is for this reason that I am supporting the Douglas-Flood bill to assist depressed areas. I hope that the Committee on Banking and Currency will soon be able to favorably report this measure and that it will be acted upon promptly by the Congress.

DEPRESSED AREAS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SILER] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. SILER. Mr. Speaker, I do not propose to take all of the 20 minutes granted to me by special order of the House for this date. However, I would like to call to the attention of this body the plight of some of the counties of our different States, and of my own congressional district in particular, in the matter of economic conditions and the unemployment situation existing in some of those various counties. I hope and trust that this session of Congress may produce some tangible, beneficial legislative efforts for the assistance of depressed areas and for the alleviation of unemployment pockets throughout the entire Nation. Abraham Lincoln once said our Nation could not continue to exist half slave and half free. And I feel that it should now be said in this year of 1959 that our country cannot continue as a great Nation of power and prestige if we are half poverty stricken and half prosperous or partly unemployed and partly employed.

INDICATED NEEDY FAMILIES

According to the U.S. Department of Agriculture, there are 24 States having counties in which 15 percent or more of the people are receiving Government commodities. Of these 24 States, my own State of Kentucky has the largest number of counties, 34 counties, in which 15 percent or more are receiving these commodities. Of the congressional districts in Kentucky, my own district has the largest number of counties, 11 counties, in which 15 percent or more are receiving these commodities. And of all the counties in the entire country, one of my own counties, Jackson County, has the second largest percentage of people, 44 percent of the people, receiving these commodities. These figures show the need, as I see it, for legislative help from Congress to stimulate prosperity and to decrease unemployment in a total of 24 States of our Nation and in 210 counties of those States and among the 5,947,036 people living in those needy counties. According to the same report from which I have been giving the foregoing statistics, there were a total of 1,298,201 recipients of free commodities in the mentioned counties as of last November. And in my estimation, there was perhaps nearly 1 million of those recipients that could be classified as poor people that were unemployed and yet employable had they had jobs. The Bible says, "He that hath pity upon the poor, lendeth unto the Lord; and that which he hath given will he pay him again." I think it would be well if the Congress would lend something to the Lord by helping to provide some jobs for our people in the depressed areas of our Nation. I am certain our Treasury Department will be repaid again by increased tax receipts from every one of the 210 counties where help may be extended through legislation that may be enacted by this Congress.

UNEMPLOYMENT

Unemployment is a blight. And it always produces a plight. There is too much of it in my district and in many other districts throughout the United States. Sometimes it comes from mechanization that puts a one man machine in place of a crew of 25 human workers. Sometimes it comes from supplanting the traditional products of a community with new and different and cheaper products that come from elsewhere. But whatever the cause, the blight of unemployment creates a real plight among the people. About 5 years ago 13,000 men worked in the mines of one of my counties, Harlan County, and each brought home $22 to $27 per day for family food or a family car or family furniture or family jackets and blue jeans or family permanent waves. But now the number of those employed men in that one county has dropped to about 5,500, which represents nearly a 60 percent cutoff. One or two other counties of my district that formerly had a dozen or more railroad mines have seen that same number of mines decline to zero and the number of unemployed people rise into the hundreds.

Now I know that no country can ever reach the Utopian perfection of having none unemployed, not any more than a man can reach perfection in his life and conduct, but I do feel that a country should continually strive for a uniform spread of employment among all of its people that are able and willing to work, just as a man should always strive to be a little better each day he lives.

REMEDY

I am not a socialist nor a political dreamer that would have the Government do everything for everybody. Therefore, I have proposed a very simple remedy for this entire situation that I believe would produce immediate results in many of the depressed areas across the country. My bill, H.R. 3696, would ask no Federal funds, would add no Federal employees to the payrolls at the taxpayer's expense, would create no new bureau or Federal agency, would move no industry so as to rob one area for the benefit of another, and yet would start operating at once against this bad situation. My bill would provide Federal income tax forgiveness up to 5 years for new industries or industries locating in labor surplus areas and producing employment for 200 or more people in each instance.

But, of course, if the majority of all those interested in this big problem of depressed areas should think that my bill is not the best remedy, then I will gladly join with others seeking to promote a good, sound piece of legislation for the good of our country and for the benefit of its various places of distress and unemployment. Let us all work together to help the unemployed workers so that they may "trace the rainbow through the rain and feel the promise is not vain that morn shall tearless be," in that good time when many of the jobless will again have jobs and many communities will see the sunshine of happiness once more.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SILER. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. BAILEY. I think the gentleman from Kentucky, who has made a very fruitful suggestion, might follow it up by asking to be heard before the Committee on Banking and Currency, which will begin hearings tomorrow on this legislation. I would like at this time to urge all of my colleagues who have problems connected with the distressed-area situation to appear before the committee, if at all possible. Time is short for them to qualify to be heard individually. The committee hearings start tomorrow, and I think they are hearing Congressmen tomorrow. How long they will continue those hearings I do not know, so if any Member has any intention of asking for time he had better ask for it immediately.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SILER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. The Committee on Banking and Currency actually started hearings today. We have just finished the first day's witnesses, from both labor and farm organizations. Members of Congress will be heard tomorrow and succeeding days. The hearings will continue through Friday of this week before Mr. PATMAN's subcommittee.

Mr. SILER. I thank the gentleman.

DISTRESSED-AREA LEGISLATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. EDMONDSON] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks; and I also ask unanimous consent that all Members may extend their remarks in connection with this discussion at the conclusion of my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Speaker, will gentleman yield?

Mr. EDMONDSON. I am happy to yield to my colleague from Missouri.

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Speaker, I want to associate myself with all the Members who have spoken this afternoon and who will speak in support of area redevelopment legislation. I am glad to have supported this legislation in the last session of Congress and want to call it to the attention of the whole membership for their serious consideration.

In my opinion, this legislation is one of the most important issues facing us at this session of Congress. In my opinion the legislation deserves your support on its own merits without any association with any other pieces of legislation. I direct it to your attention and invite your support of it and hope that the Congress will move toward the consideration of this legislation.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I believe the discussion this afternoon of the problem of distressed areas has emphasized two cardinal features about the problem. The first is that it is a national problem. It is a problem that we find in many States of the Union. The second is that it is a bipartisan problem. The unemployed are not confined to Republican districts or Democratic districts. We have them all over the United States and we find their champions in the ranks of both parties in this House. We must approach this problem as a national problem and we must approach it in bipartisan fashion if we are really to accomplish what needs to be done in this session of the Congress.

You do not have to examine very many statistics on unemployment to be convinced of the fact that the unemployment rolls are not respecters of regions or of political areas of the country. And you do not have to examine many of those statistics either to reach the conclusion that this situation has become chronic in many sections of our country. The fact of the matter is that the condition is chronic both with regard to unemployment and with regard to sagging farm income.

One of the strong features of this proposal as it is now written is the fact that it provides an answer in part at least to the problem of depression in the rural areas of the country as well as in the metropolitan areas where we have skilled labor unemployed in large numbers. This, I think, is as it should be, and I think this is a bill on which the Representatives of farm areas can join hands with the Representatives of metropolitan areas to try to accomplish something substantial in this field.

I was looking a few minutes ago at the statistics that show which of the counties in the United States meet the rural development test of the bill that was passed in the last Congress for aid under this bill. The rollcall of the States demonstrates the national character of the problem. Mississippi has 58 of its counties under the bill that passed the last Congress; Alabama, 44; Tennessee, 38; Kentucky, 35; Arkansas, 28; West Virginia, 17; North Carolina, 16; Georgia, 14; Louisiana, 11; Missouri, 11; Oklahoma, 11; Virginia, 11; South Carolina, 10; Texas, 5; Florida, 4; and Illinois, 2.

That is under the rural redevelopment section of this bill, and you find a number of other States that qualify under the urban redevelopment section because they have an unemployment problem and have had it for a long time.

Someone who lives in Michigan might be inclined to say, "We don't have any rural problem in the State of Michigan from an economic standpoint, so there is no reason to be concerned about the rural development section of this bill." But is there any doubt about the fact that the inability of the farmer down in the State of Louisiana or in Missouri or Oklahoma to buy an automobile or to buy a new pickup truck is contributing directly to the unemployment we find in Detroit, Mich., today?

Is there any doubt about the fact that the unemployment among the farmers of Alabama or Tennessee or Kentucky, the problem they have in getting enough income to meet their problems on the farm, is contributing directly to the unemployment that has existed in the steel industry or in the farm equipment manufacturing industry in other sections of the country?

This is a problem of national significance and of national import. I think unless we can meet it, unless we can solve it with an American approach, which this bill provides, we are not going to be in a position to carry the story of America across the world as effectively as we should in combating the propaganda of the Soviet Union and the Communist states.

A long time ago during the debate on the Underwood tariff bill in 1913 on the floor of this House the man who later became our beloved Speaker and who has served as Speaker longer than any other, had this to say:

> It is now my sole purpose here to help enact such wise and just laws that our common country will by virtue of these laws be a happier and a more prosperous country.

Mr. Speaker, this area development legislation affords an opportunity to all of us to adopt the national point of view with regard to the problem that is affecting the prosperity of this country. Let us act in that spirit as we approach this problem. Let us legislate not only for the depressed areas of the country, but let us legislate to make the people of those depressed areas stronger parts of our economy, contributing parts of a great, productive system the strength of which is the best guarantee of American security today.

May I call the attention of the Members of this House to one particular feature of the bill that is now under study by both the House and Senate committees, and that is an amendment I have had the pleasure of offering before the Senate committee and in the bill I introduced on this side, H.R. 3622, an amendment which adds as an additional qualification for rural redevelopment areas a standard by which any Member could determine readily the qualification of his county for participation under this program. This would in the suggested proposal provide that in any rural area where 12 percent or more of the population has been receiving public assistance, that county is eligible on the basis of the heavy percentage of people who are necessarily receiving assistance payments or welfare.

Some Members in discussing this bill in the last session had difficulty in determining whether or not a particular district contained counties that would qualify for the rural development program. There is an amendment which is being considered now in the other body and which I hope will receive consideration on the House side that would give us a standard, a yardstick under which we could determine the counties in our own States and our own districts which would definitely qualify for this program. I hope it will receive careful consideration by the House when we do consider this legislation.

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDMONDSON. I yield.

Mr. CARNAHAN. Under the bill, as passed last year, was there a ceiling on the number of counties that could be classified as eligible under the program?

Mr. EDMONDSON. I am unaware of any ceiling numerically that was placed on the number of counties. But, what we found was a standard in terms of living standards and income. That was a little bit difficult to pin down and determine as to just how many counties would qualify.

Mr. CARNAHAN. There is no such ceiling in the proposed legislation?

Mr. EDMONDSON. I am unaware of any ceiling at all although I have heard that discussed as something that should be given consideration. I have never heard of any ceiling mentioned as being present in this law except a ceiling that would necessarily be present by the amount of funds that were appropriated and the limitation that that would impose upon the scope of the bill.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDMONDSON. I yield.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I should like to compliment and congratulate the gentleman from Oklahoma for his fine presentation. I generally join with him in his remarks. I would like to ask the gentleman from Oklahoma whether his bill provides for outright grants such as the Douglas-Flood bill?

Mr. EDMONDSON. The bill which I have introduced is predominantly a loan bill, a bill, over three-fourths of which would be in the form of interest-bearing loans.

Mr. CONTE. Does it have any provisions for outright grants?

Mr. EDMONDSON. There are some provisions for grants, but they are a minor portion of the bill.

Mr. CONTE. Does the gentleman agree with me that it is certainly establishing a very bad precedent to make outright grants to States, counties, and towns for public facilities and thus destroying local initiative?

Mr. EDMONDSON. I think definitely the better procedure is to provide loans in the main part and to provide that those loans carry interest—and not on a subsidy level of interest, in this type of operation but rather a rate of interest that is commensurate with the rate of interest we are having to pay on our Government obligations.

Mr. CONTE. I am happy to hear the gentleman from Oklahoma take that position because, Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a bill together with Senator SCOTT to provide $200 million for an area redevelopment bill without any feature for outright grants, such as the Douglas bill which includes $75 million. We have a very serious situation in Massachusetts, especially in the First Congressional District which I represent, whose unemployment is about equivalent to West Virginia, Oklahoma, Pennsylvania, and the other States that have been mentioned here today. We have areas in the First Congressional District with unemployment up to 20 percent.

Mr. Speaker, most of these areas were depressed areas long before this so-called recession. The recession came about, Mr. Speaker, and my colleague from Oklahoma, as a result of the Southern States stealing our soft goods industries from New England such as cotton, wool, and leather. Mr. Speaker, as long as I have breath in my body, I will stand on the floor in this House and oppose any legislation which will give outright grants to any State to help induce industries to leave New England.

The danger of outright grants is borne out by recent statistics. The last statistics show that the amount of income tax paid by the State of Florida was $736 million. They received in grants $65 million. That is a ratio of 11 to 1. Georgia paid $650 million and received more than $92 million, or a ratio of 7 to 1. Louisiana paid $644 million and received grants of $95 million in return, or a ratio of 7 to 1.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Will the gentleman permit me to clarify one point? The gentleman, I am sure, is aware of the fact that the Douglas bill provision with regard to grants does not make provision for grants for the purpose of establishing an industry or a factory or any type of competing business.

Mr. CONTE. It is for public facilities.

Mr. EDMONDSON. It is for the establishment of public facilities of one kind or another strictly for the public facility usage, and this certainly would not be a subsidy of an industry competing with an industry in a neighboring State. As a matter of fact, there are provisions in the bill designed to prevent the use of these funds for drawing an industry from one State into a depressed area.

Mr. CONTE. I agree with the gentleman, but with the provision for outright grants the danger is always there.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I agree with the gentleman that this bill should not be written into law to create a more favorable situation in one area over another area with regard to the operation of a business or a factory. That certainly would be unfair, and I do not think you will find anybody supporting this bill who feels that that would be a sound national policy.

Mr. CONTE. I appreciate the gentleman's candid remarks; however the whole of the $75 million is for outright grants for public facilities which are to be used in designated industrial redevelopment areas for the express purpose of attracting industries.

I am pleased that the gentleman from Oklahoma agrees with me almost in toto because the next item I am going to mention is his own State of Oklahoma which paid $640 million in taxes and received $37 million in Federal grants, ratio of 7 to 1.

Now, listen to this: The State of Massachusetts which has been suffering and whose people have been unemployed for years because of the exodus of the soft-goods industries such as the cottons, wools, and leathers, paid in taxes $1,800 million and received back in grants $91 million, a ratio of 20 to 1. Compare that to the preferential treatment extended to the Southern States, Mr. Speaker. I think all of us on the eastern seaboard must raise objection to certain parts of the Douglas-Flood bill. We should be against this provision of outright grants in the bill. While we hope that an area redevelopment bill will be passed, and while we recommend this type legislation, we are opposed to the inclusion of direct grant provisions. Experience has shown that direct grants are all too often channeled into the Southern States which are competing directly to get our industries.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I will close by reading a statement made by Speaker RAYBURN in 1913:

> I have always dreamed of a country which I believe this should be and will be, and that is one in which the citizenship is an educated and patriotic people, not swayed by passion and prejudice, and a country that shall know no East, no West, no North, no South, but inhabited by a people liberty loving, patriotic, happy, and prosperous with its lawmakers having no other purpose than to write such just laws as shall in the years to come be of service to humankind yet unborn.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDMONDSON. I yield.

Mr. CONTE. Certainly we have no prejudice to the West, or the South; our interest is in the welfare of all Americans; it transcends the borderlines of Massachusetts. We are very sympathetic to the problems of the South and West. The only thing we ask of the South and the West is that you let our industries alone. All we ask is that in equity and good conscience Massachusetts be given back its proportionate share of the tax revenues paid by its citizens into the Federal Treasury.

Mr. MORRIS of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDMONDSON. I yield.

Mr. MORRIS of Oklahoma. I wish to commend the gentleman for his splendid presentation and also for the tireless effort he has made. I think this is an extremely important matter for the Congress to study. I know that the gentleman has done a lot of research, has spent a lot of time and energy in regard to this matter. I want to compliment him and commend him for what he has done.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I thank my friend from the Sixth District of Oklahoma, who has certainly been a stout champion of all progressive legislation during his distinguished career in Congress. I might say we have had wonderful help with regard to this bill from representatives of the Legislature of Oklahoma who have come to Washington to study it in order to be able to support legislation in the State Legislature that will correlate the State's efforts with those of the Nation to try to lift the living standards of the people in depressed areas.

Oklahoma is not proud of its depressed areas; I assure you of that. Oklahoma wants to do all in its power as a State to try to lift the standards of those areas and make them productive parts of our economy. Also we want to cooperate with our colleagues in other States. A number of them have spoken here today and have considered various facets of the problem as they affect other areas, New York, California, and from all over the country.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDMONDSON. I yield.

Mr. CEDERBERG. I recognize the problem that has been so ably presented by the gentleman from Oklahoma. I have only one comment to make, and that is to raise the question with regard to States that are in real financial trouble and expect to get needed relief under this bill, the kind of relief it is designed to give: Has anyone introduced legislation to raise the necessary funds to pay for the cost of this bill? Where are we going to get the money?

Mr. EDMONDSON. The gentleman is about as aware as I am, I know, maybe more so, of the conditions regarding appropriations. We do not introduce bills to finance particular authorizations. They are entirely separate and apart.

Mr. CEDERBERG. The gentleman recognizes that the Federal Treasury is depleted as far as finances are concerned. Should we not put as much emphasis on raising the money to do the job as we are in implementing the authorization legislation? I think we have to put the two together if we are going to be fiscally consistent.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I will not quarrel with the gentleman about the fiscal problem that we face in many States, as well as in Washington. But I will take issue with his position as to the relative importance of a balanced budget and either the problem of dealing with

unemployment or the problem of national military security.

Mr. CEDERBERG. It seems to me we have reached the point where ir our fiscal affairs we are going to have to get our house in order. If we are going to have these programs, and I am not questioning the merit of the various programs, we ought to have the willingness to raise the taxes, if necessary, to pay the bills, and I find very little sentiment in that area. I do not see how we can give money away that we have to borrow, on the other hand. It is not consistent to me. Maybe I am a little old-fashioned, but that is the way I see it.

Mr. EDMONDSON. The gentleman is always frank in stating his point of view, and I find a lot of merit in his views on many occasions.

Mrs. KEE. Mr. Speaker, the Fifth District of West Virginia—the Nation's second largest coal producing district—is in critical economic condition because of unemployment.

In accordance with official figures obtained from the Agricultural Marketing Service of the United States Department of Agriculture—as of November 1958—in six of my seven counties, with their 1950 population of 317,327, there were 82,419 individuals dependent in whole or in part on the distribution of surplus commodities to avoid actual starvation. We have approximately one out of every four citizens dependent upon surplus commodities, and it is distressing to have to report that each day unemployment continues to increase throughout this entire area.

In Mingo County alone, in my congressional district, 41 percent of the total population is dependent upon surplus commodities. Because of lack of adequate food, clothes, and other necessities of life, many of our children have been unable to attend school. McDowell County—the largest coal producing county in the United States—had a population of 98,887 persons in 1950. In November 1958, 31,981 persons were receiving surplus commodities—or 32 percent of the population as listed in the 1950 census. It is important to note that it is generally accepted that the population in this county has decreased to 90,000 or less. Therefore, it is reasonable to assume that the percentage of those individuals who are dependent upon these commodities is considerably higher than the 32 percent which is listed in this official report from the Agriculture Department.

Mr. Speaker, it is my understanding that these depressed conditions which have been existing—and constantly growing worse—for the past few years are now worse than at any time in the history of southern West Virginia.

West Virginia needs help both for immediate assistance and long range planning. Our West Virginians do not want a dole or a handout—they merely want job opportunities in order that they may provide the necessities of life for their families.

Therefore, I enthusiastically join in this effort to pass constructive legislation which will help our distressed areas throughout the United States to help themselves.

We must do this in order to justify the confidence placed in us by the American people.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

REPORT OF JOINT ECONOMIC COMMITTEE ON THE PRESIDENT'S ECONOMIC REPORT OF 1959

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, before beginning I might say that this topic has to do with the report of the Joint Economic Committee which was filed today in both the Senate and House on the President's Economic Report of 1959.

Because I am going to make some critical remarks on the majority report, I invited my colleagues of the House who are members of that committee and also because I was going to make some remarks in regard to a speech made on the floor by the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. BOWLES], in which other Members on the majority side joined, I invited them to be present when I make this talk today. I also refer to some of their remarks and I hope they are present in case they would like to have me yield after I have delivered these remarks.

Mr. Speaker, this noon the Joint Economic Committee filed its report on the President's Economic Report of 1959, as required by the Employment Act of 1946.

Regrettably this report was not unanimous, even for the majority side. The six Republican minority members felt constrained to file a minority view in order to present a clear report to the Congress to set forth "findings and recommendations with respect to each of the main recommendations made by the President in the Economic Report" as required by the statute.

The basic recommendation to the Congress in the President's Economic Report was to balance the budget. The President advised the Congress in his report that the economic indicators showed clearly that—

> A recovery (from the recession) began in May 1958, and by the end of the year most of the ground lost had been regained.

And—

> As 1959 opens, there is reason for confidence that the improvement in business activity will be extended into the months ahead.
>
> The revenues projected in the 1960 budget are substantially higher than those estimated for the current fiscal year, reflecting the confident expectation that economic recovery will be extended into the calendar year 1959 and beyond.

The staff of the Joint Economic Committee's analysis of the economic assumptions underlying the President's outlook include the following:

First. Gross national product for 1959 will be about $473 billion and the annual rate will reach the range of $480–$485 billion by the fourth quarter—page 49—of report.

In other words, that 1959 will set new records of prosperity based upon GNP. Implicit in the report is the assumption that properly nutured 1960 will be an even greater year of prosperity measured by this standard.

Now, what findings have the Democrats who control this committee by a ratio of 10 to 6 found in regard to the predicted prosperity in the President's report? On page 8 is this sentence "The projected balance in the budget for fiscal 1960 depends on a sufficiently large expansion of economic activity this year to add $9.1 billion to net budget receipts. The President's Economic Report is scarcely a month old but these optimistic estimates of increased revenue may not now be borne out * * *" Other than this snide and unsubstantiated remark, the majority neither affirms nor disaffirms its belief that the economic recovery will reach the growth figures projected in the President's report.

It is important for the Congress to have the finding of the Joint Economic Committee on this basic forecast. In fact, if the majority make no assumption of whether there will be this very rapid increased economic growth, how indeed can it make any appraisals of what should or should not be done to stimulate economic growth? Furthermore, just as a detail the majority in estimating what economic growth will occur in relation to the balanced budget should recognize the beginning date is July 1, 1959, not January 1, 1959.

Moving on to the major recommendation contained in the President's Economic Report, the need for a balanced budget, the majority of the committee have no recommendation to make to the Congress. The majority avoid grappling forthrightly with this question and try to hide this dereliction of statutory requirement by oblique attacks on whether the President's budget is really balanced or not.

The question for the Congress is not so much whether the President's proposed budget is balanced, but rather whether the Congress believes a balanced budget is essential to adequate economic growth, maximum employment, and price stability. If the President's budget is not balanced, and its so-called balance is a hoax, as I have heard some of my Democrat friends state, the question still remains: Does the Democrat Congress want a balanced budget? If so, let the Democrat majority on the Joint Economic Committee so advise the Congress and let the Democratic leaders of the Congress so state to the Congress and the people of the country.

The Republican minority of the Joint Economic Committee, unanimously with the modification that Senator JAVITS applies for his own views, does recommend to the Congress that a balanced budget in times when prosperity and full recovery seem clearly in the offing is basically necessary in order to have maximum employment, economic growth, and price stability.

The minority therefore do recommend to the Congress that the budget be balanced and if the Congress does not believe the President's proposal is in balance, then the Congress should balance it.

Second. The President has recommended on the expenditure side certain increased governmental expenditures within the balanced budget—

For research and development, an increase of $600 million.

For Federal programs to improve education, significant rises.

For conservation and development of land and water resources, an increase of $200 million.

Civil works programs, including grants to States, $700 million increase.

Other grants and long-term loans to foster community development, larger expenditure.

Federal airway system, increase of $100 million.

Economic and technical cooperation—foreign aid—higher expenditure.

The majority report blandly ignores all of these recommendations for increased Federal expenditures in these areas and discusses Federal expenditures in these areas with no reference point whatsoever as if nothing were being done at all. In a similar fashion the majority report seems to discuss the needs of our society as if nothing was being done if the Federal Government is not doing it.

In order for the Joint Economic Committee to make meaningful recommendations to the Congress in the area of Federal expenditures, it must refer first to what is being spent; second, to whether this is an increase over what has been spent; third, what is being done to meet the same needs in the private sector of the economy. This it has not done.

The minority approves the recommendations of the President's expenditure levels in these areas. The Joint Economic Committee, of course, should make no attempt to go beyond general expenditure levels and rates of increase or decrease into the specific aspects of these programs. That is a job for the legislation and appropriation committees of the Congress.

Third. The President has recommended certain actions by the Congress to give effect to the 1960 financial plan: First, in respect to taxes, and user charges; second, in respect to more flexible interest rates for various credit programs; third, improvements in appropriation procedures.

The majority report discusses the tax recommendations to a degree but fails to refer to the very important area of user charges. Neither the Joint Economic Committee, the Ways and Means Committee, nor Senate Finance Committee have gone into the question of Federal user charges, but it appears to be an important area on which the Congress should be getting some economic and political philosophy.

The majority report ignores the request in regard to maximum interest rates in Federal credit programs while skirting the question of tight and loose money. This is a specific area where the Congress is entitled to a recommendation from the committee. The minority of the committee strongly recommend more flexibility in interest rate in the various Federal credit programs.

The President's report emphasizes strongly the need for maintaining price stability in order to maintain economic growth and maximum employment. The majority has misrepresented this interest in maintaining price stability as being at the sacrifice of economic growth and maximum employment.

Here indeed is the nub of the difference between the left wing of the Democratic Party and the entire Republican Party. The majority report of the Joint Economic Committee is half horse and half jackass and its product is just as sterile. On one hand the report expresses a concern for inflation and the economic damage it causes and on the other hand it presents price stability as if it were removed from the field of economic growth and maximum employment and indeed was in competition with these goals.

On one hand, the report recognizes the need for savings and capital formation in order to finance economic growth and the need for incentives and on the other hand it blithely ignores the effect of high taxes and Government spending programs on private savings and capital formation.

The minority has recommended to the Congress the President's Federal fiscal program which recognizes price stability to be one of the most important factors in producing economic growth and maximum employment. Indeed, that is the most important aspect of price stability economically. Conversely it is price instability that stunts economic growth and gives rise to increased unemployment while at the same time causing decreased standards of living of the older citizens and those on fixed incomes.

Let us get the Democratic majority's position out in the open. Do those who compose this group believe that price stability is important to economic growth and maximum employment? If they do not then we are arguing in a vacuum. If they do, then we are talking about balance. The majority report should discuss balances, not opposites.

Now, Mr. Speaker, is the Democratic Party as we see it represented here in the Congress run by the horse or the jackass? Or is it a composite of the horse and jackass, a mule, a sterile coalition for power?

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I should prefer to complete my statement, but I shall yield to the gentleman at this time; yes.

Mr. PATMAN. The gentleman mentioned price stability.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Yes.

Mr. PATMAN. Does not the gentleman think that one of the main issues is whether or not price stability should be ahead of unemployment?

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. No; the gentleman has misunderstood what I am saying. It is like a three-legged stool. You have to have all three legs. What I am trying to point out is that continued economic growth and maximum employment are dependent upon price stability.

Mr. PATMAN. The gentleman misunderstood me. If it is a question of price stability or unemployment does the gentleman insist that we should have price stability despite 7 percent unemployment?

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. No; you see, the gentleman still has not listened or has not absorbed what I was trying to say.

Mr. PATMAN. I am sorry.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I am saying that you get increased employment through price stability and you will get more unemployment through price instability because through that process you discourage savings, you discourage capital formation and economic growth. Economic growth is where our new jobs come from, and economic growth comes, I might say to the gentleman—and I think he is aware of it—from business expansion; small business building new facilities, taking on more men. There is where your employment comes from. And that is why I am saying that economic growth and maximum employment are dependent upon price stability. They are not in conflict. They are part and parcel of an economic structure.

Mr. PATMAN. Suppose we have an emergency such as we have now, with 7 percent of our people unemployed. Are you going to wait for business recovery entirely along the process the gentleman has mentioned, or should you do something about it now? Should you put the unemployment ahead?

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. We are putting unemployment right up at the top, but we say we gain more employment by following out these fiscal programs. I may say to the gentleman everything is predicated upon what we anticipate is going to occur in this particular year in the way of employment. The prognosis is very encouraging. That is the first thing I said in my statement. Why did the majority of the Economic Committee not say something about whether they agreed or disagreed with the prognosis for rapid recovery, which is going on, which means more employment? We are taking care of that.

Mr. PATMAN. Will the gentleman yield for one further comment, and I will be through. I appreciate the gentleman's yielding to me. I have great respect for the gentleman. I know he is sincere in what he is advocating. However, with all due respect to the gentleman, he is advocating the trickle-down theory.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. No, that is the gentleman's theory.

Mr. PATMAN. I have heard that advocated many times back in the depression during President Hoover's administration. The gentleman's speech now is right along that line.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. The gentleman completely misunderstood.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. JENSEN. I am sure the gentleman will agree and I am sure everyone will agree who has studied economics that the ultimate consumer of goods pays all of the tax bills that are imposed on the people. He pays the whole bill.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. He naturally foots the bill.

Mr. JENSEN. Hence, every dime that we appropriate here in Congress and every dime that is appropriated by and spent by county governments, State governments, municipal governments and the Federal Government, must be paid by the ultimate consumer sooner or later. The laboring man, the wage earner, the little fellow, constitutes the greatest consuming group in America. Hence, it is the so-called little fellow who is going to pay ultimately most of the money which all the spending agencies of the Government, municipal, State, county, and Federal, spend, because it is their money. When people talk about trying to help the little fellow, they should be down here pounding the Congress and every Member of Congress to quit the spending that is not necessary for the proper business management of Government. Does the gentleman agree?

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I certainly do, and I thank the gentleman for those remarks.

The gentleman of course is emphasizing the deleterious impact of inflation upon the individual person. Of course, that is the emphasis that is usually made. I have been trying to point out that other area of damage inflation causes, which is equally bad and in the long run even worse.

That is in the manner in which inflation or price instability cuts into economic growth and cuts into maximum employment. And pointing out how continued economic growth and maximum employment depends to a large degree on the maintaining of reasonable price stability.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I simply want to join with the gentleman in stating not only for myself but my colleagues on this side that we have a very keen concern that inflation be brought to an end. I do not think that any Congressman cheerfully contemplates a rise in price level. Many of us are deeply aware of the impact that this does have upon anticipation, and I hope to address myself at some length to that in the future. I think in the context of the gentleman's remarks here, I would like to offer an observation at least and have your comments, sir, as to the significance and the relationship between price stability and economic growth. It seems to me that this may be a precondition, as you suggest, but I doubt it. We certainly managed to have a substantial amount of economic growth without price stability. Therefore, I am inclined to question whether it is as great a precondition as the gentleman assumes in the light of history since 1941; and secondly I think the concern on this side, if I may speak for my colleagues on this point, has to do with the nature of the policies being pursued by the administration in its very strong preoccupation with price stability, and that these policies have stood in the way of economic growth. Most recently, for example, the increase in interest rates by the Federal Reserve is going to make it still harder for small business firms of which you speak to find capital. Those firms which are self-financed can ignore what has happened to interest rates under this administration, but these small businesses in my district and elsewhere which must borrow find it more difficult and our concern is not with the very desirable goal of price stability, but our concern is with the method the administration pursues. It seems to us only two methods are regularly proposed. One has to do with raising the interest rates and making money harder to come by and the second has to do with balancing the budget. In a period of full employment, the budget should not only be balanced but probably should be overbalanced and some application to retiring the debt should be followed as a matter of public policy, but in a period when we still have almost 5 million people unemployed, it seems to us some concern about the unemployment ought to motivate our thinking about the budget.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I thank the gentleman. I would like to develop the theme that the gentleman is propounding there. If the gentleman would refer to my original remarks, he would find I started on the predication in the President's report that we were looking forward to a fiscal year beginning in June 1959 of prosperity and relatively high employment.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Perhaps I should confess that many of us on this side do not fully share that assumption.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. All right, now we are getting down to it. The statute requires the Joint Economic Committee to make findings and recommendations on this and my criticism of the majority report is that they skirt the issue. If your side does not believe that, then in fairness you should come forward and say, "We do not. We feel that the economic indicators do not point to that, and on that basis we are arguing this other and we do not recommend to the Congress a balanced budget." The President is recommending to the Congress a balanced budget predicated on the assumption and based upon these economic indicators that this is going to come about, and I must say in our hearings it looks as if most of the economists in the country seem to agree with that. These things are a matter of balance, as I have tried to point out, and not a matter of opposites. I think it is very basic in economic growth, and we are not talking about rapid upsurges in growth because you can stimulate what is an unnatural or artificial growth which is not healthy—we are talking about a sustained growth because this artificial growth can produce along with it the drops which then produce unemployment. That is why I say this price stability factor is very important in preserving that combination not just economic growth but also maximum employment. There are many people who argue and many economists argue that rapid growth actually has with it higher incidence of unemployment. I think there is a lot of merit to that argument.

I wonder if the gentleman will permit me to go on with the rest of my remarks and then, perhaps, we can have further discussion?

I read the report of the majority on the Joint Economic Committee and I read the remarks of the Congressman from Connecticut [Mr. BOWLES] of February 26, joined in by no less a person than the majority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK], and the gentlemen from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD and Mr. COHELAN], the gentleman from Wisconsin, and one of the majority on the Joint Economic Committee [Mr. REUSS], the gentleman from California, [Mr. ROOSEVELT], the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MCGOVERN]. The theme there is that balancing the budget at this time is not very important to economic growth and maximum employment.

The claim seems to be made that price stability is in competition with these goals rather than a basic necessity to attaining these goals.

This kind of thinking would have this Congress disregard the expenditures side of the ledger and promote economic growth and maximum employment through Federal expenditures. The effect this kind of program would have on incentives for private savings and capital formation let alone private investment in competition in many instances with the Federal expenditures is left up in the air.

Just where does the private sector of the economy fit in with this kind of economic thinking? Theoretically, according to Mr. REUSS it is to be the wellspring that makes all this possible, because the increased Federal expenditures are to be balanced off with increased taxes, and taxes of course come only from the private sector of the economy.

But maybe the speech of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WRIGHT] just a little before the speech of the gentleman of Connecticut [Mr. BOWLES] is the philosophy of the Democratic Party. Many Democrats in the Senate and the House join in with this line of thought, which says that a balanced budget is important, that paying off on the Federal debt is important, and that President Eisenhower already has been spending too much Federal money? That the charge President Eisenhower made that the Democratic Party is controlled by the spenders is untrue.

I will say one thing, Mr. Speaker. Both views cannot be the views of a party that wants to be a responsible party before the American people. Anymore than can the view that President Eisenhower should not have sent troops to Little Rock, as advanced by one segment of the party, also be the view that he should have sent the troops down there sooner than he did, as advanced by the other segment of the Democratic Party.

I want now to comment a little more in detail on the end of the Democratic Party which I regard as the jackass end, at least as far as economic policies are concerned. On the issue of civil

rights I am not certain either segment has demonstrated horsesense. I want to go over the philosophies of the gentleman from Connecticut's speech.

The speech of the gentleman from Connecticut, Mr. CHESTER BOWLES, on this floor, reflects the schism within the Democratic Party. Ever since the Eisenhower administration budget messages demanded that the American Congress take a stand against a runaway Federal expenditures, higher taxes, and crippling debts, the Democrats seem to have panicked. They zigzag between almost every political and economic philosophy imaginable.

The gentleman from Connecticut calls for a sincere and nonpartisan approach to both the foreign and domestic challenges. I suggest that he review his own speech for its many contradictions, because it illustrates the need to medicate the two-faced virus of their party.

The gentleman made some very refreshingly sound observations. At one point he noted the threat of a runaway economy:

> There are many mistakes that we may make in these coming years. But none, Mr. Speaker, would be more dangerous than to minimize the implications and the danger of inflation.

But then he flopped over to the opposite conclusion only a few moments later:

> Mr. Speaker, I believe that we have raised a dangerous hobgoblin out of our own fears and uncertainties about inflation.

It is shocking that Mr. BOWLES would call inflation fears a hobgoblin.

His hobgoblin caused the dollar to decline, with 1933 as a base, to 48 cents by 1953, when President Eisenhower took office and managed, with the help of the Republican-controlled 83d Congress, and the sounder thinkers in the 84th Congress, to harness the runaway economy. From 1953 to date, the dollar has lost only about 3 cents of its value, and this cheapening has been largely due to the expenditures of the Democrat-controlled Congresses.

The junior Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON] has said that he anticipates a genuine flight from the dollar both here and abroad if deficit financing is continued. If inflation continues at only 3 percent a year, he notes, the savings and life insurance of young people will be wiped out when they need them 30 years from now. This is Mr. BOWLES' hobgoblin.

If Mr. BOWLES continues to turn his economic platform into a seesaw by first calling inflation a major danger, and then a hobgoblin, he will confuse further both his perspective and that of the American people. The gentleman states:

> Let us boldly, honestly, and without partisanship examine where we have gone wrong and pledge ourselves not to repeat these mistakes at a time when we can least afford them.

He says that he wants to establish a perspective with which his colleagues might meet forthcoming legislation. Then discard the shackles of doubletalk, devoid of clear policies, and take one consistent stand. The gentleman should chastise those members of his party, for example, who vote against the President's balanced budget and at the same time say that the Republicans are the big spenders. The gentleman's initial comments about the importance of incentives are sound and wise indeed:

> Mr. Speaker, our economy needs incentives to lift it out of our paralyzing, self-induced fears. It needs incentives to encourage growth and to make competition palatable, just as consumers need the encouragement of fair prices and better values.

After this generalization, he apparently fears that specific recommendations on his part to maintain and increase incentives in our Republic would be embarrassing to his party. Indeed it appears that actually it is not more incentives that he wants for the American citizen, but that it is simply more Government spending that he desires.

How is this spending to be financed so that the financing will not kill incentives? These questions the gentleman zigzags around.

His associate, Mr. STEWART UDALL, of Arizona, has noted that:

> If the debt remains about the same and we follow current debt policies, by 1987 we will have paid out in interest the total amount of the debt—that we will still owe the debt.

The gentleman from Arizona [Mr. UDALL] continues a consistent position even though his stand may be embarrassing to the Democrat philosophy of unlimited deficit financing. He advocates increasing taxes. This, of course, would curb private spending, limit the growth of the markets, disperse capital formation, and kill the stimulus for a growing America.

Since the gentleman from Connecticut is concerned about increasing incentives at home as a means of meeting the Russian economic challenge, it is doubtful that he would subscribe to this high-tax theory of his fellow Democrat, the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. UDALL].

This leaves the gentleman from Connecticut with the highly controversial solution of Leon Keyserling, of the Democratic Advisory Council. The Keyserling anesthesia that our Government can blithely spend itself into a larger gross national product completely skips by the warnings of Democrat Representative UDALL and even worries Keyserling's fellow associates, Kenneth Galbraith and Arthur Schlesinger, Jr.

The nice thing about the Democratic Party's confusing and mutually conflicting financial philosophies is that each piece of quackery is answered by another member of the same party. Senator LYNDON JOHNSON has said: "We cannot afford to 'go broke' in tinkering with our economic system merely because an idea is appealing or attractive. The idea must be tested in the marketplace of ideas."

The Keyserling theory has been tested and has flunked. According to the Tax Foundation, total Government expenditures have risen almost 50 times since 1913. If Keyserling were right, the gross national product would have risen a hundred or so times within that period. The hard fact that the gross national product rose only 11 times during those years indicates that Keyserling's theories are delusions of grandeur.

Apparently, the gentleman from Connecticut subscribes to the Keyserling delusion. He cannot understand why the Republicans say that the greatest blunder we could commit in this cold war is to follow the concept that wild spending in all directions is the efficient way to meet the Soviet challenge.

He admonishes the Eisenhower administration by saying:

> More and more we see those who sincerely stress the critical need to meet the challenges of this nuclear age deliberately denounced as "spenders."

I say in all sincerity that the Republicans and those who believe with them should continue to denounce as spenders all those who think that spending is the way to meet the nuclear age threat. This is not partisan politics, for there are too many Democrats who decry the Keyserling delusion. I quote from Mr. WILBUR MILLS' subcommittee report—H.R. 647—of the Joint Economic Committee of the Democrat-controlled 85th Congress:

> The Congress and the administration, therefore, should increase their efforts to find means for reducing the scope of present Federal spending program. These efforts will have to go beyond elimination of waste and inefficiency. Close review of the substance of present programs, prospects for their future expansion or contraction, and their contributions to the Nation's economic progress compared with private uses of the resources they demand will be necessary to effect major reductions in Federal expenditures.

The Democratic congressional leadership seem to lose this objectivity, however, once it becomes enmeshed in the political tactics of opportunism. The Republican demands for a balanced budget in order to restore the healthful economic conditions necessary for accelerated national progress and prosperity have embarrassed the Democrats into camouflaging their efforts to sabotage the budget. Typical of these strategems is a letter that Mr. OTTO PASSMAN, of Louisiana, has distributed to his associates, including the spenders. After complimenting the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. BOWLES] on his speech, the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD] praised the Passman letter. In this burlesque, the Republican budget balancers are charged as being the big spenders. The letter read in part:

> When will the wild spending spree in which our Government is indulging be halted? Will we continue during this period of peace and prosperity to borrow money to give away, when our public debt exceeds the combined public debts of all other nations of the world, or will we work together to bring about a sound fiscal policy in Government before our Nation's economy has been totally wrecked?

Then Mr. BOWLES told Mr. HOLIFIELD that he agreed with his remarks; and, of course, his remarks had included the praise of the Passman letter. This schizophrenic approach one minute endorses Democrat spending and budget busting and the next minute condemns Republican spending, or what at least

existed in Mr. PASSMAN's imagination as Republican spending. And the gentleman from Connecticut says he wants to avoid partisan politics.

The numerous zigzags and equivocations in the February 26 speech reflect very well the subconscious of the Democrat Party. Riddled with squabbles and cross-purposes, this party has abandoned taking a constructive stand on the vital issues and has resorted to the tactics of dancing between issues to the tune of political expediency. Their prime Machiavellian feat seems to be to destroy the balanced budget while at the same time charging the Republicans with being the spenders.

The humor of the comedy, however, is destroyed by President Eisenhower's sobering remark recently that he could not imagine anyone unbalancing the budget for political reasons.

If the gentleman from Connecticut and his colleagues who think as he does are genuinely in search of a positive perspective for the challenging days ahead, they will find that perspective clearly reflected in the Republican philosophy, that the Government is to serve and not to dominate, to encourage and not to retard, to be economical and not to be extravagant. Applying this progressive philosophy, the Eisenhower administration in 6 short years is reversing the New Deal trend toward killing initiative and stifling private enterprise.

I want to stress one other aspect of the speech of the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. BOWLES] which is so typical of statements by the wing of his party which holds to his philosophy.

Underlying the speech is the bogeyman of Soviet economic and educational achievements. I say bogeyman because the picture of Soviet Russia accomplishments are couched in the same pat phrases repeated over and over again by people who have never taken the trouble to find out if the description is true or false. The gentleman states:

> Our educational system, which even now is turning out far fewer engineers and scientists than the Soviet Union.

Apparently this unsubstantiated bit of sensationalism is not enough, because later he states:

> While we are arguing about the inadequacy of our school system, the Soviets are turning out twice as many engineers and scientists.

Elsewhere he makes these statements:

> While we are debating the problem of maintaining a 2-percent annual growth rate, the Soviet Union is expanding at a rate of nearly 7 percent. While we are considering cuts in our economic aid to the critical uncommitted countries of the world—possibly Congressman PASSMAN, of the gentleman's own party is, but not the President—the Soviets are substantially expanding their loans and grants to these same countries.

The gentleman from Connecticut earlier stated:

> Anyone who attempts to spell out what needs to be done to meet the challenge at home and abroad and suggests the consequences of our failure to do it lays himself open to the charge of peddling gloom or undermining our national confidence.

I disagree with the gentleman. We need all the honest self-criticism we can get. But we certainly do not need exaggerations and unweighed statements about Soviet Russia's achievements. Anyone making statements about Russia's abilities without having carefully examined into what the truth of these statements are certainly does lay himself open to the charge of peddling gloom and undermining our national confidence. And, what is worse, these kind of statements play right into the hands of Soviet Russia's propaganda programs to wean away the uncommitted nations of the world.

As a result of these loose statements that seem to overwhelm this country, the following entry appears on page 20 of the Joint Economic Committee's report:

> The committee has approved a project requested by Congressman CURTIS to develop through hearings or other appropriate means further materials in the area of statistics and statistical comparisons examined in the Joint Economic Committee print on "Soviet Economic Growth," a comparison with the United States, a study published in September 1957.

I was one of the prime movers in having the 1957 study made and I suggest that anyone interested in fact rather than propaganda about the serious question of the extent and nature of the Soviet's economic growth read this document. On the subject of Soviet education I recommend the study "Soviet Professional Manpower, Its Education, Training and Growth, and Supply," by Nicholas DeWitt, Russian Research Center, Harvard University, published by the National Science Foundation in the fall of 1955. And then weigh the fact that since that date the Soviets have completely overhauled their educational system because of what they themselves thought were its basic inadequacies.

Finally, I want to call everyone's attention to an article appearing in the February 1959 American Federationist, a publication of the AFL–CIO, by George Meany, "Reply to Trud"—the central organ of the Soviet trade union federation. Mr. Meany does not sell America short. It is time all Americans stopped selling her short. Honest criticism based upon adequate research is one thing—we need plenty of that—and open debate on it, but mouthing Soviet Russia's own propaganda line about her prowess is something else again.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to place in the RECORD immediately following my remarks this article by Mr. Meany to which I have referred.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The matter referred to follows:

REPLY TO TRUD

(By George Meany)

Trud, the central organ of the Soviet "trade union" federation, has recently answered my article, "American and Soviet Economy—Contrast and Comparison," which was published in this magazine several months ago. Trud's reply, issued as a special supplement, seeks to refute my evaluation of Soviet economic progress and what it has actually meant to date for the working people and the peasantry of the U.S.S.R.

From the tone and substance of Trud's remarks, it seems that the Kremlin rulers have been quite irked by the contrast which I drew between the American and Soviet economies. Thus, in its attempted refutation, Trud boasts:

"Our Soviet industry is developing at a pace so fast that it is inaccessible to capitalist countries. A strong and healthy man will always overtake a sickly old man, however far ahead the latter may be. So will our Soviet economy certainly overtake American economy."

Bombastic bragging cannot make up for defects and imbalance in Soviet planning. Time and again whoever happened to be the top Soviet boss has made unfounded claims of economic successes, only to have his successor expose and disavow him as a purveyor of falsehoods.

For example, in his address to the plenary meeting of the central committee of the Soviet Communist Party last December, Nikita Khrushchev admitted that his former intimate friend and leader, his predecessor as party general secretary, Malenkov, "deceived the Communist Party and the Soviet people when he told the 19th party congress (1952) that the grain harvest in the country had reached 8 billion poods[1]—whereas, it actually had been less than 6 billion."

At the closing session of the Supreme Soviet in August 1953, Malenkov, in his report (for which Khrushchev and all the others in the Kremlin ruling clique voted), boasted before the entire world that "our country is assured of grain." But 6 months later Russia was in the throes of a grain crisis. Obviously, in the Soviet "paradise" not only do figures lie but lies also do figure.

Khrushchev, in his aforementioned report, confessed to the serious imbalance of Soviet planned economy. He admitted that by 1953 "Soviet industry had * * * made considerable headway, while agriculture was suffering from a number of major shortcomings. This gave rise to a certain disharmony between industrial and agricultural development, between the state's real requirements in grain and other products and their actual production."

The facts of life are stronger than the fancies of the most fanatical Communists. The fact is that the Kremlin was forced to abandon the 6th 5-year plan which the 20th Soviet party congress, under the leadership of Khrushchev, had adopted unanimously. To hide this abandonment and retreat, the Kremlin's new so-called 7-year plan now speaks only of "control figures for the development of the national economy for 1959–65."

The maximum projected increase in industrial production is 8.6 percent a year for 1959–65. In 1959 the Soviet gross industrial output is scheduled to rise 7.7 percent. This is a slower rate than the 13.1 percent claimed for the fifth 5-year plan (1951–55) or the 10.1 percent which had been envisaged in the abandoned sixth 5-year plan.

How much the Soviet rate of increase has been slowing down can be seen from the Official Soviet Index of the Annual Increases of Gross Value of Output. For 1948 it was 26 percent; in 1950 it was 23 percent; in 1951 it was 16 percent; in 1956 it fell to 11 percent; in 1957 it was 10 percent. (Pravda, Jan. 27, 1958.)

Thus, the rate of growth in 1957 was 60 percent less than in the early postwar years when Russia was rebuilding its war-ruined economy.

In recognizing the great expansion of Soviet industry, it would be false to conclude,

[1] One pood is the equivalent of 36.1 pounds.

as Trud has, that such a rate of expansion has not been equaled in non-Communist countries.

Alex Nove, of the University of London, has pointed out that "both France and Germany have been averaging more than this (8.6 percent annual increase) in the past decade." (Manchester Guardian Weekly, Dec. 4, 1958.)

Prof. Gregory Grossman, of the University of California, has cited the fact that: "Over even somewhat longer periods, South Africa (1911–40) averaged 9 or more percent and Japan (1910–37) 8.5 percent per year. Over shorter spans of time, Sweden equaled and (significantly) Russia herself approached the long-term Soviet rate in the late eighties and nineties of the last century." (Soviet Survey, October–December 1958, p. 17.)

Yet Trud persists in boasting:

"A comparison between the pace of economic development of the Soviet Union and the United States fully warrants our saying that in 15 years we shall overtake America and even leave it behind in the production of many key industrial items."

This is merely echoing one of the many Khrushchev prophecies. But let the U.N. Yearbook for 1957 give us some instructive comparisons—in figures, not percentages. Between 1937 and 1956, the United States increased its crude steel production by 53,142,000 metric tons. During the same period the Soviet increase was 30,860,000 metric tons.

According to the December report of the Central Statistical Board of the U.S.S.R. Council of Ministers, Soviet steel productive capacity and total production for 1958 were estimated at nearly 55 million tons. During this largely recession year the United States produced 86,167,000 tons of steel, according to the American Iron and Steel Institute. What is more significant is that in 1958, a poor year, the United States increased its annual capacity to produce steel by nearly 5 percent—from 140,742,570 to 147,633,670 tons.

Lenin and the succeeding Soviet rulers have put the expansion of electricity generating capacity in the foreground of their economic tasks. From 1950 to 1956—a period of frantic Soviet heavy industry expansion—the U.S.S.R. increased its installed electrical energy capacity by 23,186,000 kilowatts. During this period our country raised its electrical energy capacity by 54,408,000 kilowatts.

During these years the production of electrical energy in the United States increased by 295,396 million kilowatt-hours and in the Soviet Union by 100,774 million kilowatt hours. Our present total production is 683,970 million kilowatt-hours. The Soviet total is 192 billion kilowatt-hours.

Even if the Kremlin fulfills all its plans in the next 7 years, it will increase its capacity by 58 million to 60 million kilowatts and attain a maximum electrical power output of 500 billion to 520 billion kilowatt-hours. Thus, even by 1965 the U.S.S.R. will be well below the present American level. The projected Soviet goal for 1965 is only 73 percent of the 1957 output of electricity in the United States.

During the last 5 years the American rate of increase in electrical output has been higher than that of the Soviet. Furthermore, there are signs that the Kremlin cannot maintain its present rates of increase in the production of electricity. Khrushchev recently indicated that Moscow was considering the abandonment for 10 years of some of its plans for the construction of huge hydroelectric stations (Krasnoyarsk).

Let us now turn to coal. From 1937 to 1956 the United States increased its total coal production by 28,530,000 metric tons, while the Soviet increase amounted to 193,822,000 metric tons. Our present coal production totals 476,842,000 metric tons; that of the Soviet Union is 303,700,000.

These figures do not mean that American industrial development is lagging and that the Soviets are overtaking us. We must consider here an important phase of technological progress. In 1955 coal provided the U.S.S.R. with about 70 percent of all its energy. In contrast, during 1955, coal constituted only 33 percent of the energy sources used in the United States.

In our country much greater progress has been made in utilizing oil and natural gas as sources of energy. With American progress in industrial modernization, coal is declining in importance for our economy.

The continued greater dependence on coal as a source of energy in the U.S.S.R. is reflected in the figures we have cited. These figures attest to the backwardness of the Soviet economy in comparison with the American economy in a very vital respect.

On the basis of official Soviet statistics, it can be shown that the trend is not different in the production of oil, cement, textiles, and meat.

In all his talk about the Soviet economy catching up with and overtaking American industrial production, Nikita Khrushchev has been emphasizing that Russia's rate of output increase in coal and steel is greater than America's. But the omniscient Khrushchev must know that, as a result of the developing second industrial revolution (automation), coal and steel, while still very important, are no longer as decisive in the economy of highly developed countries.

Light metals, plastics, chemicals, oils, and natural gas are assuming increasing significance because of progress in electronics and automation. In these fields the Soviet Union is backward in comparison with the United States, which continues to be the world's pacesetter. Here we have another reason why Khrushchev is so eager to have American corporations export to the U.S.S.R. entire chemical and plastic plants—and technicians to teach the Russians what we already know. Moreover, the Soviet Union still suffers from an acute shortage of highly skilled workers, without whom there can be no automation.

When Josef Stalin launched his plan for speedy gigantic industrialization, it was clear that it could be carried out only through ruthless exploitation of the workers and at the heaviest human cost for the rural population. However, there were limits here, as shown in the shortage of capital and manpower by the time of the third 5-year plan (1938–40).

The postwar 5-year plans were made possible only through plundering the resources and manpower of the annexed territories and satellites. But then came the stormy Polish events and the Hungarian revolt in 1956. The deep-going discontent among the satellites forced Moscow to resort to less naked and more indirect, but nonetheless intense, forms of economic plunder and control.

Simultaneously, the Kremlin was faced with a critical dearth of Soviet manpower as a result of the low birth rate during the terrible purges in the thirties and in the war years, heavy war casualties, and high mortality among the slave laborers in the concentration camps. The combination of these factors meant very serious trouble for the sixth 5-year plan, which had to be scrapped.

This critical turn had more serious implications for Soviet economic plans and their targets than the recent recession in our country had for American economic development.

The Kremlin rulers soon launched a terrific propaganda barrage about great Soviet economic successes in order to hide their difficulties. Khrushchev made desperate efforts to overcome the bottlenecks. He resorted to sweeping industrial reorganization in order to eliminate redtape, paralyzing bureaucracy, and wastefulness which are inherent in the totalitarian centralized economic system of the U.S.S.R.

To overcome the shortage of industrial manpower and the deficiencies of Soviet agriculture, Khrushchev had the Kremlin adopt a sweeping policy of ordering the youth into the factories and to distant farmlands. This policy is, in effect, a reversion to child labor in the U.S.S.R. at a time when the trend in the so-called capitalist countries is away from it and is for keeping the youth longer in school.

This backward trend is confirmed by "Theses of the Central Committee of the Komsomol (Communist Youth Federation)" for the occasion of its 40th anniversary on October 29 of last year. Here we have a clear revelation of the current Kremlin policy to use juveniles—boys and girls—for work in the coalfields and similar occupations. We read:

"One of the most important tasks of Soviet youth in this struggle consists in the further active participation of juveniles in the construction of large industrial plants, power stations, coal pits, and ore mines in the east, in Siberia, in the north of the country, and in the Donets Basin. * * *

"The Komsomol organizations must guarantee that no youth brigade reaps less than 400 double hundredweight (about 40 tons) per hectare (2.47 acres) of green fodder from maize. By the year 1962 there must be laid out at least 500,000 hectares of gardens and vineyards to be used on a cooperative basis, as well as 200,000 hectares of forest belts." (Komsomolskaya Pravda, October 9, 1958.)

The above "Theses" also provide the "ideological" justification for such massive recourse to child labor by a State which boasts that it is the most advanced in the world.

We are told by the "theses" that "communism is a social order in which work constitutes the most vital requirement of man."

Admitting opposition to his plan, Khrushchev declared as follows in his recent memorandum on education:

"It will be necessary to break the bureaucratic redtape which prevents the employment of adolescents in our economy and to instruct GOSPLAN to draw up a long-term plan for the employment of adolescents who we leave the 8-year school." (Pravda, September 21, 1958.)

However, Khrushchev is not relying on "ideological" weapons alone. He has appointed Nikolaivich Shelyepin, former Communist youth leader, to replace General Ivan Serov as chief of the dreaded Soviet security organization.

Khrushchev means business in his massive child labor drive.

Trud repeatedly asserts that the American economy is "gravely sick and its disease is chronic" and that "a most serious crisis is again developing in America." Trud refuses to admit that economic recovery has been quite rapid and that the recession in the United States is almost over. Personal income in November of last year reached a new high of $360 billion per year. This was an increase of $14 billion from the recession low in February of 1958 and $8 billion over the previous high of August of 1957. Industrial production has recovered about two-thirds of the drop experienced during the recession, although there is still considerable unemployment in our country. Productivity is now increasing at a rapid rate—perhaps as much as 6 percent a year.

Our trade unions have continued to obtain substantial wage advances, while prices have remained relatively stable. For the first half of 1958 almost 55 percent of the wage adjustments provided an hourly increase of 10 cents or more. More than one-fourth of the hourly wage increases were 13 cents or more. Real wages are showing very significant increases. This means a continuously rising American standard of living.

For years it has been a favorite pastime of Soviet leaders and their Communist followers outside the Iron Curtain to prophesy the doom of American economy. But even Trud is now compelled to admit that the end is not yet in sight. And why? Said Trud:

"American economy is primed by intensifying the arms drive, by increasing military orders."

This is simply not true. The Department of Commerce and the Council of Economic Advisers have studied this question thoroughly and authoritatively. The United States in 1958 was actually spending less of its gross national product for national security than in previous years. Such expenditures have fallen from 14 percent in 1952 to 11 percent in 1954 and to 10 percent in 1957 and 1958. On the other hand, during these years in particular the U.S.S.R. military budget has been rising—absorbing about 25 percent of the Soviet gross national production. The Kremlin rulers continue to give top priority to arms production.

Trud laments that more than 108 million Americans do not earn even the subsistence minimum as calculated by the Heller committee of the University of California. What are the facts? Actually, the Heller budget is not a subsistence budget but a rather good standard of living budget for American families. This subsistence minimum of American families includes such items as a daily egg, 2½ quarts of milk for each member of the family, plus the normal meat and vegetables. It also includes a washing machine, an automobile, a refrigerator, movies every other week, etc.

Not even Trud should have compared the housing shortage in the United States with the dreadful dearth of decent and adequate housing in the Soviet Union. In the United States more than 60 percent of the homes are owned by the people who live in them. In our country over 90 percent of the homes do not have more than one person to a room.

The Moscow Government has yet to produce statistics depicting the true state of Soviet housing. Yet even from its own admissions and generalities about the present Soviet housing situation and boasts about the future, the world can see one of the most shameful consequences of the Communist dictatorship.

We would like to see all mankind enjoying freedom and well-being. We of American labor would like to see the Soviet workers become free and strong and struggle militantly for wages as high as we have in the United States.

We would like to see the Soviet workers attain a purchasing power to have, as we have in the United States, more than 38 million homes with television sets, more than 41 million homes with washing machines, more than 45 million homes with refrigerators, and more than three-fourths of the families owning automobiles.

It is in this spirit that I have criticized the Soviet economy and the paucity of benefits its technological progress has brought to the Soviet peoples. Trud has chosen to be silent about my specific criticism of the exploitation and plight of the Soviet workers and farmers. Trud simply ignores their fate.

Trud was just as silent about the regimentation to which the Soviet worker is subjected, the type of unions he is forced to join, the continued existence of slave labor camps, and my condemnation of the Soviet regime as a government by terror and dictatorship.

All Trud had to say in answer was:

"Our reality is inspiring the working folks of the bourgeois states to fight exploitation for a better future."

This is what the Kremlin rulers would like to have their subjects believe.

Long before the Communists seized power in Russia, American labor struggled militantly, using its democratic right to strike, picket, and organize unions in order to secure high wages, shorter hours, and better conditions of employment. Our fight "for a better future" is not at all inspired by the Soviet "reality." On the contrary, the higher standards of life and labor we of American labor have achieved are now being threatened by what Trud calls reality in Russia. This Communist "reality" in the U.S.S.R., with its very low wage economy and dumping of low-priced goods, is becoming a menace to the living standards of American and other free workers.

Furthermore, with the Kremlin government—which has a total monopoly of all Soviet economic life—foreign, even more than domestic, trade is not only an economic undertaking but also a political weapon. Recent Soviet dumping of tin, aluminum, and rice are revealing in this respect—as Burma, Indonesia, and Malaya have so recently and sadly learned.

The "reality" Trud boasts about may actually inspire some American employers to demand that labor in the United States accept lower wages and give up some of its fundamental democratic rights.

The Russian Labor Front which the Kremlin calls unions are under the thumb of the Soviet bosses (Communist state) and function primarily as agencies for promoting production. Some of our Nation's powerful employers would like to have our trade unions reduced to a similar status.

Let me cite the report of the American steel industry delegation which visited the Soviet Union last year and the remarks made by A. S. Glossbrenner, president of the Youngstown Sheet & Tube Co., on October 1, 1958, before the regional technical meeting of the American Iron & Steel Institute. Mr. Glossbrenner said:

"How did the Soviet Union gain this competitive advantage over us? The report of the American delegation clearly indicates the answer. The Russian state is operating one big steel company.

"The management of this company, the employees of the company and the union [sic] which represents the employees are all on the same team. All are beholden to the same supreme boss, the Communist state. As a result, there is no division of loyalty. * * *

"The American steel industry is facing its greatest challenge, competition to the bitter end with the slave steel industry of the Soviet Union. * * * If this challenge is to be met, this industry of ours, great as it is, must be in the hands of managers who are strong and who can make hard decisions without wavering.

"Above all, it must be in the hands of managers willing to turn away from the easy road in their relations with their employees—that road being appeasement for the sake of economic expediency."

Some American steel company employers are thus inspired by Soviet reality to make hard decisions without wavering and not to take the easy road in their relations with their employees.

We of the AFL–CIO believe in loyalty to trade unions which are free and clean, and we fight militantly for better conditions of life and labor for the working people. Loyalty to such unions is loyalty to the best interests and highest ideals of our Nation. Such trade union loyalty makes for a healthy, efficient American economy, an economy without low wages, inadequate purchasing power and cutthroat competition—an economy serving the entire American people.

The reduction, division, or transfer of such trade union loyalty would only hurt America's free economy and thus help the totalitarian Communists.

Of course, Mr. Glossbrenner stressed that he was not "advocating some similar system" for the United States. He realizes that "some similar system" would mean abolition of free enterprise in the United States.

Yet, along with some other bosses in our country, he does look with envy upon labor relations in Communist Russia where, as pointed out in the report of the American steel industry executive delegation to Russia, "a great deal of the union's time and effort is spent in developing and promoting plans for increasing steel production, and they indeed formed the opinion that this may be the union's most important function."

This reality of the Communist economic system—with its intense exploitation and enslavement of the Soviet workers—is no inspiration to freedom-loving American labor. This reality is a growing threat to American labor which enjoys the benefits of free trade unionism. This Soviet reality is a grave menace to the democratic rights and living standards of American labor and all other workers outside the Iron Curtain empire.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CRAMER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, any consideration of inflation comes down in the end to this question: Which party has done the better job of steadying prices and the value of the dollar?

The record clearly is in favor of the present administration.

The Truman administration's policies burned up about 50 percent of the dollar's value. Under this administration, the value shrinkage has been less than a nickel in practically the same number of years.

Under the preceding administration, prices soared approximately 50 percent. The rise in the cost of living under this administration, in sharp contrast, has been held to less than 9 percent and the present plateau of price stability is one of the longest on record.

I agree generally with the statement on AFL–CIO President George Meany in the February issue of the Federalist:

> Our trade unions have continued to obtain substantial wage advances while prices have remained relatively stable. * * * Real wages are showing very significant increases. This means a continuously rising American standard of living.

All this could be destroyed, of course, if the excessive spending indirectly and directly advocated in the majority Joint Economic Report of 1959 were implemented by an irresponsible Congress.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I wish to compliment the gentleman from Missouri on his very fine statement. As the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] was conducting his colloquy with the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] I could not help but hearken back to the days of World War II when there was a rather serious acci-

dent rate at one of the airfields at which I happened to be stationed, and the commanding officer put out an order which said:

There shall be no more ground loops in BT-13 aircraft.

I could not help but wonder if the gentleman from Texas was actually advocating that we should pass a law saying there shall be no more unemployment.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I might say to the gentleman that by ignoring this very basic economic factor that would be about what he would do.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I am actually serious in this remark, because I have noticed from the other side that there are people who decry unemployment, and we certainly are all of us against unemployment. That is just like being against sin; we do not like it. However, I found very little from the other side in the way of concrete examples, of concrete suggestions as to how we can best meet the unemployment situation that we have had. One idea is that we should spend more here and spend more there. As the gentleman from Missouri knows, this has been quite the vogue with the people on the other side. When a problem arises their only answer is to spend their way out of it.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. With Federal funds.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. With Federal funds. I suggest the possibility that instead of talking about the trickle-down theory, as the gentleman from Texas did, perhaps we should say that some of our friends on the other side are dedicated to a "drown-out" theory; in other words, to prime the pump to such an extent that the ignition of the motor gets wet and it never does work. So rather than face the economic facts of life and realize that this Government, powerful though it may be, is not powerful enough to repeal the law of supply and demand, and no government under the sun has ever been powerful enough merely to pass a law and say, "This economic fact will not be, and we will set up something else in its place," it is a much more complicated thing to keep an economy going.

I congratulate the gentleman from Missouri on his very basic knowledge of the economic facts of this Nation. I think he has delivered on this floor today a masterpiece on the United States of America, which I hope every Member of the Congress will take to heart.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. JENSEN. I am quite sure the country knows that early in 1933 there were a little over 12 million people unemployed. Then we went into a great spending spree, spending millions upon millions and billions upon billions. At the day of Pearl Harbor we still had over 11 million Americans not gainfully employed, but soon after that 12 million-plus Americans were given employment in uniform.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I think the gentleman's remarks are sound. I do not know whether or not the 11 million figure is exact. I have forgotten the exact figure, but certainly it is true that after years of this kind of expenditure we had a very sizable unemployment picture that was no comparison with what we are talking about here today. It was 14 or 15 percent, at least. It was World War II that eliminated the unemployment problem at that time.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I yield.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. The gentleman from Missouri has done a great service to the Congress and the Nation in his critique. I would add, however, one point to what he has said.

The strange economic proposals hinted at by the gentleman from Connecticut on February 25 are not new to the extreme liberals. Whether the gentleman from Connecticut is himself in that category I do not know, but I suspect that he probably is. Indeed, these theories are voiced frequently and boisterously by the financial angel of all leftwing political officeholders, Walter Reuther. In fact, he was so successful in peddling this propaganda in his native State that he has brought it close to bankruptcy.

If history means anything and if we can learn anything at all from the experiences Governor Williams has had, we will shy away from this character of proposal. In short, let us pray that the U.S. Government will be spared the fate of Michigan.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I thank the gentleman for his observation.

In regard to Michigan, one of the advantages, as Justice Brandeis has phrased it, of having 48 States, now 49, was that we have 48 or 49 laboratories to test out economic and political ideas. This is a good example, because Michigan has tested out this Keyserling formula to some degree and is now facing a situation of bankruptcy. I think it is a fortunate thing that it has been tested out in one area, one of the 48, rather than throughout the Nation. We can well learn from that. And I may say also that we can well afford to keep the 48, 49, maybe 50 laboratories in existence so that we can continue to experiment in the field of the unknown, because actually we still are innocent children in our knowledge of the laws of economics.

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I yield.

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. I was most interested to hear the State of Michigan called a laboratory for the economic theories of Walter Reuther. I am sure that the Republican Party of Michigan, which has controlled the State legislature during all the time that Mr. Williams has been Governor, will be surprised to learn that it has been cooperating with Mr. Reuther in a plan which we are told has brought Michigan near bankruptcy. The Republican-controlled legislature has passed all of the legislation, including the tax legislation during this period and was not too bashful to demand credit for much of it in the campaign.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Then I take it you are in the same position that we Republicans are in on a national level. We have the President and you all have the Congress or the legislative branch. Now will you apply the same formula that you are now offering in your explanation of what is happening in Michigan because you are now, I assume, blaming the Republican legislature for the situation. Will you, too, join in blaming the Congress for our ills because the Democratic Party has been in control here for the past three Congresses.

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Will the gentleman yield for a moment?

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Certainly.

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. I understood the gentleman who just spoke to say that the position of Michigan was much more perilous than that of other States or the Federal Government.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I take his word for it. He says it is in bad shape.

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. If so, it is because of the general recession that we have all felt and I am willing to accept the blame, along with the administration, for any part that the Congress has played. The important thing is that we act now to do something about it.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I yield.

Mr. CEDERBERG. It is true that the Republican legislature of my State has been controlled by the Republicans, but I suppose there have been few times in history when a legislature has been under such stress and strain by the Governor's office as this legislature in Michigan. As a matter of fact, the situation is that had they yielded to the Governor in all of his demands, our deficit would be not what it is, something like $115 million, but something like $240 million above the present deficit of $115 million.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. May I ask the gentleman then—the situation in Michigan has been quite the reverse. In Michigan the people in the legislature are trying to balance the budget while here we have the executive trying to balance the budget.

Mr. CEDERBERG. That is exactly correct. The public relations people from the Governor's office have spread the propaganda through the entire State of Michigan condemning the legislature for not having been more farsighted. Many of these programs would have cost additional millions of dollars. We are faced with this particular fact—that the State of Michigan is quite broke and we at the present time are trying to negotiate with the Governor's office, as I understand it, a sensible tax program to get us out of it. It seems to me what we are going to have to do not only on a Federal level but on a State level is to have a review of the spending in many of these areas. Certainly, we in Michigan are in very difficult straits financially at this time, but nothing compared to what we would have been if Soapy had had his way. In addition to that, he proposed a new budget for this year that

is several million dollars higher than the budget of last year. Then he has the fortitude, as long as this subject has been brought up, to come and testify before the committee of the other body, requesting additional billions of dollars to be spent on a given bill at the Federal level far and above that proposed by the President. I say to you if we listen to all of these ultraliberals, we will never get out of trouble. If we could spend ourselves into prosperity, then we would have the most prosperous State in the Union and certainly even the Federal Government ought to be in a pretty good condition, if that were the case.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Maybe he ought to confine his activities to the State of Michigan.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I yield.

Mr. CARTER. I have been very much entertained by your whole talk and by the discourses that have occurred here. But now I am wondering if you are suggesting anything new or anything different. To be objective—what are you specifically proposing to take care of the problems that confront the Federal Government at this time.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Did the gentleman not listen to my speech?

Mr. CARTER. I have listened very carefully.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I outlined that in effect what we are proposing is exactly what is contained in the President's economic report. The minority of the Joint Economic Committee have recommended to the Congress that the Congress follow the President's recommendation, No. one, in view of the prognosis of a very profitable year in 1959 that the budget should be balanced with the increased economic activity that is coming up. I might say that the economists who have testified before our Committee generally supported this prognosis.

In view of that, and if we will stimulate that growth and keep the economic climate healthy we will be providing the jobs that are necessary for maximum employment; in other words, it is the philosophy of this administration that, that the way you best get economic growth, sustainable economic growth, and maximum employment is through creating a good climate in the private sector of the economy. There are places where the Government can help, and I listed in my speech several areas, and pointed out that far from decreases in these areas of expenditure such as my Democratic friends—and I do not know which camp the gentleman falls into, those who want to spend more, completely ignore the fact that in these specific areas like public works we are spending more. In fact, there are some on our side of the House who contend we are spending too much. Now, the majority members of the Joint Economic Committee just ignore this question. Are they for a balanced budget in these times or are they not? Now, it is an easy question to answer and I think they owe it to the people to answer, but instead of that we have one segment of your people, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. PASSMAN] and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WRIGHT], complaining that we are great spenders, and this other segment of your party raising the question of whether we are spending enough. But I am saying that you are not going to have a united party or a consistent party with this double talk.

Mr. CARTER. I appreciate that. Let me ask the gentleman two questions, then I will not bother him further. Do I understand that the magic you are presenting here——

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Not magic, sir.

Mr. CARTER. Well, the device to satisfy all the problems that confront us is a balanced budget; is that it?

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. In these times, we are now in March of 1959, yes, and in view of President Eisenhower's policy a balanced budget is the device.

Mr. CARTER. The gentleman knows——

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Now, wait; that is not the sole thing; a budget is composed of expenditures and taxes; those are the ingredients that go to make up a budget. We need to have economic growth; we need to have maximum employment, but we feel that in these times price stability is one of the very basic things necessary in order to attain these ends. There is the way the picture shapes up.

Mr. CARTER. I do not believe any of your proposals are new at all.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I did not hear the gentleman.

Mr. CARTER. I said I did not believe any of your proposals are new at all, even the gentleman's statement that prosperity is just around the corner is an old phrase.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. No one made any remark like that.

Mr. CARTER. It goes way back to 1929.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I do not mind debating and arguing with the gentleman, but let us confine it to the issues here.

Mr. CARTER. I will. I will ask but one more question. The gentleman is advocating the trickle-down theory; that is what he is proposing. I do not believe there is anyone who can deny it.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I have denied it.

Mr. CARTER. The gentleman is proposing exactly the same things that were proposed in 1929. The issue is not any different. It is simple.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. The gentleman obviously has not been following what I have said or he would not make those remarks.

Mr. HIESTAND. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HIESTAND. I am very much impressed with the careful analysis that the gentleman has made of the Economic Report, and also of the comments by the gentleman from Connecticut. But there were some additional inconsistencies to which I feel the attention of the House should be directed. I wish to give credit, for instance, where credit is due and I point to a statement made by the latter which was completely accurate and which is swept under the carpet by others in the Democrat Party whenever economy, employment, and our labor force are mentioned. The statement appears at pages 3055–3056 of the RECORD of February 26, 1959. It is:

> But, Mr. Speaker, let us face the fact that the New Deal failed in its second major objective, which was to restore full employment and prosperity to our country. In 1940, more than 8 million Americans were still unemployed; 14½ percent of the working force.

Although others who belong to the political party represented by the gentleman from Connecticut have dodged and otherwise evaded this cold and glaring fact as long as I can remember, I must say he has displayed courage, or maybe naivete in making such an admission.

I repeat: His statement in this respect was absolutely accurate according to the Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census. I should add that this same authority reports that neither the unemployment figure mentioned or the percentage of work force idle has been equaled since.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I thank the gentleman because that is probably as good an answer to be given to the remarks of the gentleman from Iowa, referring back to the great depression, as can be given. I would say, too, I recall during the recession last year there was great talk about a tax reduction which was supposed to benefit the people who were hurt by the recession. My colleagues of the Democratic Party were on the floor of the House here talking about giving tax reductions to the taxpayers. I made the point at that time, and I make it again, that the people who were really hurt by the recession were not taxpayers at all. They were people who were unemployed. The best thing we could have done was to have created conditions and circumstances where they could have become employed again.

That was the key of the thing, and I say here today, that is the key of my remarks. The way you get employment is through encouraging growth within the private sector of our economy. That should be the discussion and the issue.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. PATMAN. The gentleman remembers that the Democrats on the Joint Economic Committee were against the tax reduction. I think that committee was the first committee in Congress to come out, and the matter was forthright, against a tax reduction.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I thank the gentleman, and I want to commend the committee for its attitude. I joined with the committee in this recommendation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who have participated in this colloquy may have permission to revise and extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

THE ULTIMATE IN DISCLAIMER OATHS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). Under provious order of the House, the gentlewoman from Oregon [Mrs. GREEN] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include editorials.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Oregon.

There was no objection.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, on February 4 I introduced a bill, H.R. 4066, to repeal section 1001(f) of the National Defense Education Act of 1958. This provision was added to the act by the other body after the House had completed its own careful and painstaking deliberations on the legislation. Because of the lateness of the time and the approaching end of the 85th Congress, it was allowed to remain in the act without the opposition which I sincerely believe it merited.

As the Department began to administer the program, the oath requirement began to jar on the sensitivities of a great many patriotic and intensely loyal men and women. This section of the bill requires two oaths. First, it requires the oath of allegiance to the United States. This is an oath which most of us have taken for many years, in a voluntary way. I took it, or one like it, in the classrooms when I was there as a student, and I administered and took one like it with my students in the classrooms as a teacher. It is a stirring oath, and one which I take with pride. Most of the scholars and students who have written to me have accepted the imposition of this oath as legitimate and within the context of the American tradition. The indignation expressed by those who have written me in regard to the oath requirement has been directed against the other oath requirement, the so-called negative disclaimer.

This requirement demands that every person otherwise eligible for payments or loans under the act must first file an affidavit to the effect that he does not believe in, and is not a member of any organization and does not support any organization that believes in or teaches the overthrow of the U.S. Government by force or violence or by any illegal or unconstitutional means.

This oath or affidavit, call it what you will, is the focus of most of the objections that have been raised. The provision, when found in this particular legislation, seems to affirm the contention—that was raised so often in an earlier fit of national hysteria—that teachers are somehow especially sensitive to the blandishments of communism, and that special care needs to be taken to see that these socalled "untrust" people do not receive any assistance from the Federal Government. Such an assumption, Mr. Speaker, is of course completely false. But in addition, it is especially incongruous when attached to a bill which was made possible by the belated realization that our brainpower is the best defense we have against external enemies, and that the cultivation and furthering of scholarship is at least as necessary a contribution to our national security as is drafting young men to learn close-order drill.

This disclaimer is especially painful to the scholars and students who must take it because it discriminates against them. Other persons receiving Federal assistance are not required to take such an oath. Yes, people on the Federal payroll are required to take it. But certainly there is a difference between persons who seek jobs from the Government, whether elective or appointive and those who merely seek to participate in a program which is supposed to be available for any qualified citizen.

Mr. Speaker, I believe it would be valuable to introduce, as evidence of the real nature of the opposition to this section, some of the correspondence, editorials, and other materials in my files regarding the oath.

REED COLLEGE,
Portland, Oreg., February 28, 1959.

Hon. EDITH GREEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MRS. GREEN: Recently, at a regular meeting of the faculty of Reed College, the following resolutions were proposed, discussed, and passed:

"*Resolved,* That the faculty urges the president and board of trustees to adopt the position that Reed College should not participate in a program which requires it either to administer to anyone a disclaimer affidavit such as that in the National Defense Education Act, or to assume responsibility for seeing that anyone has executed such an oath or affidavit.

"*Resolved,* That the faculty protests against the inclusion of the requirement of a positive loyalty oath in the National Defense Education Act of 1958 and requests that appropriate action be taken toward the elimination of such a requirement from this act."

Since the adoption of these resolutions it has come to our attention that you have introduced a bill for the purpose of removing the oath provisions from the Defense Education Act and that Senator KENNEDY has introduced a similar bill. We are very pleased to know of your interest in this legislation.

Several points raised by faculty members in discussing the oath problem have been summarized briefly as follows:

First: The inclusion of a disclaimer oath is an attempt to make conformity in belief a necessary condition for doing business with a Federal agency. This attempt is made even more objectionable by the ambiguous wording of both the oath and disclaimer so that an individual may unknowingly perjure himself because these statements will be subject to interpretation at some future time and in a manner unknown at present. It is difficult to see how anyone in good conscience could agree to such a commitment.

Second: The imposition of the disclaimer and oath is obviously discriminatory, as evidenced by the fact that other groups of citizens such as farmers, businessmen, and even taxpayers, all conduct transactions with the Federal Government without a requirement that they subscribe to some sort of loyalty oath.

A third point which was raised concerns the very practical matter of obtaining foreign language experts from other countries for the language institutes. It seems unlikely that they would be in a position to or care to subscribe to an oath of loyalty to this country.

Finally, there has been a long history from Socrates to the present of similar relationships wherein a State has attempted the imposition of an oath contrary to the individual conscience. Knowledge of this history and its significance leaves no alternative for any citizen with a firm belief in democratic government but to oppose such oaths wherever and under whatever guise they appear.

Respectfully submitted on behalf of the faculty of Reed College.

M. W. CRONYN,
Faculty Clerk.

[From Mail Tribune, Medford Oreg., Feb. 8, 1959]

OBJECTIONABLE LOYALTY OATH

Most Americans are patriotic, and completely dedicated to the welfare of their Nation. They abhor this Nation's enemies. And many of them cannot understand why anyone would object to taking a so-called loyalty oath.

They, in their patriotic fervor, would be willing to raise their right hands and swear that they never have, do not now, and never will, advocate the forceful or illegal overthrow of the U.S. Government.

And they can't understand why anyone else would.

Let's look at it this way:

If they were applying for a job, and one of the conditions of employment was that they swear they have never beaten a small child to death, and will never do it, they'd probably be mad as hops.

"What kind of a stinking bum do you think I am?" would be their rejoinder, as they stalked off in search of a job where they could hold up their heads in pride and dignity.

It is for very similar reasons that the teaching profession feels discriminated against when asked to take such a negative "loyalty" oath.

They have no objection to a "positive" oath—one in which they declare they will uphold and support the Constitution and the laws and the ideals of the Nation.

One of the most lucid explanations of this situation we have seen was in a recent editorial in the Eugene Register-Guard, which said:

"The idea of the loyalty oath is a direct slap at the intellectual community. It is a hangover from the know-nothingism that swept America before the Civil War and that recurs periodically in hte form of Ku Kluxism or McCarthyism. The target, in all cases, is the educated man.

"We do not think it can be shown that a loyalty oath has ever, ever, been used to trap a spy. Any spy worth his rubles will sign anything if his signature will help him in his dirty business. Those who refuse to sign have been persons of principle who objected to being singled out as unduly suspect because of their professions. If refusal to sign is taken as an admission of guilt—a 'fifth amendment Communist' kind of thinking—are we to believe that any really subversive person would refuse?"

The president of Reed College, Richard H. Sullivan, recently announced the college would turn down a $3,349 grant from the Federal Government for scholarships, because of the fact that beneficiaries must take a form of the "negative" and discriminatory loyalty oath.

Dr. Sullivan objected because "singling out teachers and students as people not to be trusted gets under my skin."

The objections can be summed up in two points:

1. It is useless.

2. It is a gratuitous insult to an honorable profession.

That is why teachers object to it, and we think they're right.

[From the Eugene (Oreg.) Register-Guard, Feb. 4, 1959]

REED COLLEGE AND A HIGH PRINCIPLE

Reed College, through its president, Richard H. Sullivan, has turned down a $3,349 grant from the Federal Government. The scholarship money, made available through the National Defense Education Act, is forthcoming only if beneficiaries of this largess sign loyalty oaths. Reed's president says he turned down the money because singling out teachers and students as people not to be trusted gets under my skin.

Good for Reed. Perhaps this action will call attention to Senate bill 819, introduced by JOHN KENNEDY, of Massachusetts. This measure would remove the loyalty-oath requirement from the act. It has the support of numerous Senators, including RICHARD L. NEUBERGER, of Oregon.

The idea of the loyalty oath is a direct slap at the intellectual community. It is a hangover from the know-nothingism that swept America before the Civil War and that recurs periodically in the form of Ku Kluxism or McCarthyism. The target in all cases is the educated man.

We do not think it can be shown that a loyalty oath has ever, ever been used to trap a spy. Any spy worth his rubles will sign anything if his signature will help him in his dirty business. Those who refuse to sign have been persons of principle who objected to being singled out as unduly suspect because of their professions. If refusal to sign is taken as an admission of guilt—a fifth-amendment Communist kind of thinking—are we to believe that any really subversive person would refuse?

The scholarship program that Reed will not be a part of costs the Federal Government $250 million a year. It is small potatoes, indeed, compared with the farm-subsidy program, which costs nearly $5 billion a year. Yet those who receive money under the subsidy program, 18 times as costly as the scholarship program, are not asked to sign loyalty oaths. For all that subversion on the farm is not a common problem, it is just as true that it is no great problem in the colleges and universities.

Oregon, alone among the States on the coast, has never required a loyalty oath of its professors. This is due in part to the intensive lobbying in legislative halls in 1951 by W. M. Tugman, former editor of this newspaper; Charles A. Sprague, editor of the Oregon Statesman; and State Representative Earl Hill. All are Republicans. They were joined by Democrats like Maurine Neuberger and Robert Holmes. It was a tough battle, fought in a year when McCarthyism was riding high. They found support for loyalty oaths in surprising places, but they persevered and they won.

It is fitting that Reed, an Oregon college which is badly in need of all the money it can get, holds firm to the high principle.

[From the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, Feb. 5, 1959]

AN OATH THAT HURTS THE NATION

Reed College in Portland, Oreg., one of the better small colleges, has refused to accept money under the National Defense Education Act because a loyalty oath is demanded of those receiving grants or loans. This positive action follows appeals by the presidents of Harvard, Yale, and Princeton for repeal of the oath provision. The Association of American Colleges meanwhile is polling its 750 members on the question.

Such oaths, said President Griswold of Yale, "seem to represent a lack of confidence in young people and in their future, as well as in the educational process itself. They tend to alienate the good will of the loyal citizens without gaining a corresponding advantage in protecting the public against the actions or intentions of the disloyal."

More concretely, the oath requirement is preventing the use of a good part of the $900 million made available under the legislation, and thus it is delaying the training of the scientists, mathematicians and linguists needed in the defense of the Nation. After all, this law was not passed merely to aid education, but to make educated persons available for national service. Without repeal of the oath requirement, it is partly self-defeating.

EASTERN OREGON COLLEGE,
La Grande, Oreg., February 27, 1959.

The Honorable EDITH GREEN,
U.S. Representative,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MRS. GREEN: Recently we received the application forms required of student applicants for loans under the new Defense Education Act. We are very disturbed to find that this legislation has revived an "old sore" in the form of a negative oath requirement on top of an affirmative allegiance requirement. I am sure no one objects to the affirmative allegiance but the negative oath has been and remains objectionable. This is particularly true when it singles out one profession and one group of people as opposed to other citizens.

It is my personal hope, and I am sure I express the desire of our entire faculty, that the act itself be amended to remove this objectionable requirement. I do hope you can use your good influence to this end.

Sincerely yours,

FRANK B. BENNETT,
President.

AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF UNIVERSITY PROFESSORS,
UNIVERSITY OF OREGON CHAPTER,
Eugene, Oreg., February 13, 1959.

The Honorable EDITH GREEN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MRS. GREEN: The University of Oregon Chapter of the American Association of University Professors unanimously passed the following resolutions concerning the disclaimer oath in the National Defense Education Act. A copy of our resolution is enclosed. We are particularly protesting the inclusion of the disclaimer oath and have no fault to find with the oath of allegiance similar to that taken by the President of the United States.

We urge that you use your influence to amend this act and until this is done, we are on record as favoring refusal of money under this act.

Respectfully,

EWART M. BALDWIN,
Secretary.

RESOLUTIONS PRESENTED TO THE GENERAL MEMBERSHIP OF THE UNIVERSITY OF OREGON CHAPTER A.A.U.P. BY THE TENURE, PROMOTION, AND SABBATICAL COMMITTEE, FEBRUARY 11, 1959

Whereas title X of section 1001(f)(1), of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 requires that a disclaimer affidavit be filed by any person receiving funds under the act; and

Whereas the Federal Government has disbursed millions upon millions of dollars to various business, financial, and agricultural enterprises without requiring such a disclaimer affidavit; and

Whereas the act seems thus to single out teachers and students as special objects of suspicion; and

Whereas the loyalty of students and teachers generally has been amply demonstrated: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the University of Oregon Chapter express approval of the actions taken by the national office of the American Association of University Professors (as reported in chapter letter No. VIII, of November 21, 1958) in protesting the disclaimer affidavit requirements; and be it further

Resolved, That the University of Oregon Chapter of the American Association of University Professors request the Congress so to modify the existing legislation as to remove the offending section; and be it further

Resolved, That the University of Oregon chapter respectfully request the administration of the university to refuse the acceptance and administration of any funds under the National Defense Education Act of 1958 unless and until the provision requiring a disclaimer oath in the form stated in title X, section 1001(f)(1) of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 has been deleted.

UNIVERSITY OF OREGON,
Eugene, Oreg., February 10, 1959.

Hon. EDITH GREEN,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MRS. GREEN: The National Defense Act spells the beginning of what may turn out to be a long era of needed participation by the Federal Government in education. It is of great importance that Congress shall make a right beginning. The beginning made under the present act insults the good faith and intelligence of American educators and their students.

The act assumes that we do not realize that the ordinary oath of loyalty taken by all of us, from the inauguration oath of the President down, binds us to reject and oppose disloyalty of every kind. It suggests that we do not know the meaning of good faith, and that our wits are not of common brightness.

The act assumes that our want of understanding comes from a treason virus which infects people connected with higher education and leaves other people alone. If this assumption of our special liableness to treason is not true, why are we, as a class, required to sign the disclaimer affidavit? This insult to our profession is disgusting.

The act also assumes that signing the disclaimer will guarantee the signer's loyalty. This assumption does not show sound judgment of men. There are men who may refuse to sign because the requirement insults their good faith and intelligence, precisely the men most likely to have good faith, conscience, and dignity of spirit. Not only may individuals refuse to sign but entire institutions may refuse. In fact, the Reed College faculty has already refused. Thus the very aim of the National Defense Education Act would be defeated. The Congress is not wise to put such men and institutions under a cloud.

Would the act's disclaimer affidavit prevent a traitor from signing? To suppose that is to misunderstand the traitor mind, particularly the mind of a traitor in whose philosophy of life an oath in the name of God is meaningless because he believes there is no God.

Title X, section 1001(f)(1) reflects a certain hysteria with which our country has had experience in the past. Once upon a time it was called know-nothingism. In the present case it takes the form of suspicion against people in higher education. Our profession is getting a taste of this in other countries where, under dictatorships,

higher education has been among the first casualties.

Such are among the reasons I ask you to support efforts to eliminate the disclaimer affidavit from the National Education Defense Act.

Yours faithfully,

QUIRINUS BREEN,
Professor of History.

UNIVERSITY OF OREGON,
COLLEGE OF LIBERAL ARTS,
Eugene, Oreg., February 11, 1959.

Congresswoman EDITH GREEN,
U.S. Congress,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN GREEN: The department heads of the College of Liberal Arts at their meeting last week requested that I write to you to ask your support of Senator KENNEDY'S amendment to repeal the negative oath requirement of the National Defense Education Act. As you know, the act contains two provisions respecting the oath:

1. An oath (or affirmation) of allegiance to the Constitution of the United States; and

2. A disclaimer oath that asks recipients of loans or fellowships to declare that they "do not believe in, and are not a member of and do not support any organization that believes in or teaches, the overthrow of the United States Government by force or violence or by any illegal or unconstitutional methods."

It is the second of these to which department heads object on the basis that the negative oath is wrong in principle, that it is unnecessary in view of the affirmative oath carried in the act, and that it sets apart and discriminates against a small segment of American people.

May I add that earlier in the week, Dean Charles T. Duncan and I jointly offered a resolution to the faculty in support of the Kennedy amendment. Under our faculty provisions, this resolution will not be acted upon until it has been reviewed by the senate and is presented to the faculty again at its March meeting.

I am confident that you will be sympathetic with our problem and shall, therefore, greatly appreciate your efforts on our behalf.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT D. CLARK, *Dean.*

AMERICAN CIVIL LIBERTIES
UNION OF OREGON,
Portland, Oreg., February 6, 1959.

Hon. EDITH GREEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MRS. GREEN: On behalf of the Executive Board of the American Civil Liberties Union of Oregon, I am writing to urge you to use your influence to secure the deletion of section 1001(f), title 10, of the National Defense Education Act of 1958, which provides for a disclaimer oath for all the beneficiaries of the act. These include young people seeking loans, fellowships, and grants and many teachers and consulting experts involved in foreign language institutes and in other activities authorized by the act.

The American Civil Liberties Union has for a long time opposed such negative disclaimer oaths on the grounds of their vagueness and the presumption of unreliability which attaches to those individuals and groups selected for this kind of treatment. Since there is no definition of the organizations which are proscribed by the act nor of the term "support," it becomes most difficult for an individual to determine whether he is in a position to subscribe to such an oath. Furthermore, we believe it most undesirable to single out for this invidious treatment some of the ablest and potentially most valuable citizens of our country.

At a time when public opinion is coming increasingly to recognize the importance of higher education, it seems most unfortunate that this kind of an oath should be required. The history of such oaths indicates that they do not achieve their stated objective but may interfere with the attainment of valuable goals such as those which the National Defense Education Act seeks to implement. We trust that you will use your best efforts to secure the removal of this obnoxious provision.

Sincerely yours,

JUDAH BIERMAN,
Chairman.

OBERLIN COLLEGE,
Oberlin, Ohio, February 6, 1959.

Hon. EDITH GREEN,
House Education and Labor Committee,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MADAM: I am writing for the faculty of Oberlin College to express strong opposition to title X, section 1001(f)(1) of the National Defense Education Act of 1958, which reads:

"No * * * funds * * * shall be used to make payments or loans to any individual unless such individual (1) has executed and filed with the Commissioner an affidavit that he does not believe in, and is not a member of and does not support any organization that believes in or teaches the overthrow of the United States Government by force or violence or by any illegal or unconstitutional methods."

Our opposition is not directed against the oath of allegiance [title X, sec. 1001(f)(2)] which the act includes, but only to the foregoing quoted provision which is, in effect, a test oath. Such test oaths have aroused resistance many times before in the course of English and American history. An individual is compelled to make a statement disclaiming objectionable associations and beliefs in order to gain the benefits of the program. In our view this is unnecessary and unreasonable.

The provision of the oath concerning belief is particularly repugnant. We object to the notion that an individual should be penalized because of a mental state where no overt act has occurred. We fail to see how justice can be done in any proceeding to enforce this provision concerning the content of a human mind. We agree heartily with the late Justice Jackson, who said:

"Our forefathers found the evil of free thinking more to be endured than the evils of inquest or suppression. They gave the status of almost absolute individual rights to the outward means of expressing belief. I cannot believe they left open a way for legislation to embarrass or impede the mere mental processes by which those expressions of belief are examined and formulated. This is not only because individual thinking presents no danger to society, but because thoughtful, bold, and independent minds are essential to wise and considered self-government."

Suspicion directed at the students and teachers in our colleges and universities is completely unwarranted. Their understanding of and devotion to freedom and the cause of democracy is not surpassed by any other group in our society. We concur in the statement of Mr. Bentley Glass, president of the American Association of University Professors, who commented on the test oath as follows:

"If an individual refuses to sign, he raises a suspicion that he is unworthy of public trust or benefit. If he signs, he endorses the pertinency of the general suspicion about him and his kind which is embodied in the requirement."

The stand now taken by the Oberlin faculty against the test oath in the 1958 act is fully in accord with its proudest traditions. In 1952 the faculty unanimously adopted a resolution which included these statements relevant to the present issues:

"Times of crisis present sharp challenges to the professed values of a democratic society. At such times it is tempting to measure all things by the rough standards of unity, loyalty, and orthodoxy. The inevitable tendency is to restrict such fundamentals of democracy as discussion and debate, and even to make divergence of opinion appear dangerous.

"The Oberlin College faculty regards all forms of interference with intellectual freedom, discriminatory loyalty oaths, censorship, and other restrictions on free speech and thought as inimical to the democratic way of life."

In view of the objections and considerations stated above, we earnestly request that the test oath incorporated in title X, section 1001(f)(1) of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 be immediately repealed.

Sincerely yours,

DONALD M. LOVE,
Secretary of the Faculty.

PORTLAND STATE COLLEGE,
Portland, Oreg., January 30, 1959.

The Honorable EDITH GREEN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR EDITH: I should like to call to your attention one aspect of the Defense Education Act passed last year. The oath which has been a requisite part is, I think, both contradictory and unnecessary. Under title VI, foreign language and area study programs, for example, teachers who might be asked to come from, say, Istanbul or Cairo, would be expected to take an oath which might easily affect their citizenship in their native lands, and such men and women might justifiably be as bitterly critical of our Government for making such a requirement as we would be were we required to take an oath before teaching in some foreign university. Indeed, we would lose our citizenship by taking such an oath. Secondly, I should like to point out that the oath required is negative. No public servant, I think, has any objection to making an affirmation; but I would suggest that a Communist would be perfectly willing to subscribe 10 times over and as many times in one day to such an oath if he could effect his objective. He would have no compunctions about swearing any oath, positive or negative. A true American is, I think, merely insulted by being asked to swear a negative oath.

I sincerely hope that you will take appropriate action regarding this one aspect of the Education Defense Act.

Sincerely yours,

HOYT C. FRANCHERE,
Chairman, Division of Humanities.

RESOLUTION CONCERNING THE NATIONAL DEFENSE ACT OF 1958, ADOPTED BY THE REED COLLEGE STUDENT COUNCIL ON FEBRUARY 2, 1959

Section 1001(f) of the National Defense Act of 1958, Public Law 864, passed by the 85th Congress, provides that each applicant for educational aid under the act must file an affidavit proclaiming that he "does not believe in, and is not a member of and does not support any organization that believes in, or teaches, the overthrow of the U.S. Government by force or violence or by any illegal or unconstitutional methods and has taken or subscribed to an oath or affirmation of the following form: I do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I will bear true faith and allegiance to the United States of America and will support and defend the Constitution and laws of the United States against all its enemies, foreign and domestic."

The provision of a loyalty oath requirement in this act, especially a negative oath such as the above, is contrary to American traditions of freedom and fair play.

The oath is vague. It requires the individual to make, upon pain of perjuring himself, sweeping statements about his beliefs and associations; and to disclaim affiliation with organizations which are not specified in the law.

The oath is insulting. Many groups in the United States receive Government economic aid without having to sign such oaths; the oath thus carries the implication that there is something about students which makes them particularly subject to disloyal influences, desipte the fact that some of America's great patriots were closely associated with the academic community.

Principally, however, the oath is a restriction on freedom of belief and association. It gives Government aid to students, not solely on the grounds of their need and qualifications for such aid, but also on the basis of the organizations to which they belong and the ideas to which they adhere. The Government has thus attempted to replace the longstanding academic tradition of free exchange in the marketplace of ideas with a program in which the Government dictates what ideas shall be presented, and by whom. Such a restriction has no place in a governmental system based on freedom of speech and thought.

Therefore, we, the Student Council of Reed College, resolve our opposition to the loyalty oath provision of this act, and urge that it be amended to remove this provision.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, a distinguished member of the President's Cabinet, has addressed himself to, among other things, the question of expense in a press conference statement. Under unanimous consent, I include the statement by Secretary Flemming at this point in my remarks:

In response to an inquiry, Secretary Arthur S. Flemming made the following statement:

"The Office of Education is developing regulations and procedures for administering the loyalty oath provisions of the National Defense Education Act as enacted by the Congress. As soon as these regulations and procedures have been completed they will be made public.

"I would like to make three points regarding this provision.

"1. All persons involved in the administration of this act would have been able to deny funds to persons who themselves seek, or who belong to organizations that believe in or teach, the overthrow of the Government by force or violence, even though this provision had never been inserted. It is clear that such persons are not entitled to and should not receive funds from the United States Government.

"2. Requiring persons who receive funds under this act to sign an affidavit and an oath of allegiance will not uncover any persons who themselves seek or who belong to organizations that believe in or teach the overthrow of the Government by force or violence. Such persons have no scruples about signing such an affidavit and taking such an oath.

"3. The inclusion of this requirement in the National Defense Education Act will make it necessary for educators and students to go through a procedure that results in unnecessary expenditures on the part of the Government without making a contribution to national security."

Mr. Speaker, I find the loyalty oath provisions of the Defense Education Act, and for that matter, all of the negative disclaimer requirements with which we have filled our statute books in recent years, a basic denial of the American tradition. In the Constitution of the United States, as drafted by the Founding Fathers, to whom so much lip service is paid these days, at the end of the very last article, there occur these words:

The Senators and Representatives beforementioned, and the members of the several State legislatures, and all executive and judicial officers, both of the United States and of the several States, shall be bound by oath or affirmation, to support this Constitution; but no religious test shall ever be required as a qualification to any office or public trust under the United States.

To be sure, Mr. Speaker, these words do not expressly disallow such test oaths as are required by section 1001(f)(1). But they are clear evidence of the hostility to the principle of the test oath which was a vital part of the principles of the courageous and imaginative men who wrote this great Constitution of ours. They hated and despised the only test oaths with which they were familiar in the age of autocracy in which they lived. That age was an age of intolerance in the religious field, and the religious orthodoxies which European nations established were a part and parcel of the political structure of the nations involved. The test oaths were designed to eliminate from public life and from the benefits of citizenship in these countries, not only adherents of other religions than the locally approved one, but adherents of the tenets of toleration, the possessors of thin-skinned consciences, as well.

The Founding Fathers knew bitterly the lessons which they thought humanity had learned during the age of religious wars, and they were determined that no such nonsense would plague the country they had founded and which they loved.

It has remained for our time to revive the principle of the test oath, not attaching it to religion, but to patriotism, an equally sacred emotion, and one which, like religion, is too fine an expression of man's highest aspirations to be made a vehicle for the fears of the insecure.

Mr. Speaker, I love my country. But, Mr. Speaker, were I a private citizen, not seeking a public office, I would bitterly resent the insinuation by any legislator or bureaucrat that my loyalty was questioned and that I should purge myself or someone else's suspicion by signing an oath. An oath, Mr. Speaker? Not one, but two oaths.

We have heard a great many lectures on this floor, read much in the public prints, and heard much in private discussions in recent years about the nature of the Communist conspiracy. Its objectives, its contempt for what it terms "bourgeois morality," its ruthlessness, all these things have been exposed for every thinking person to see. And in all these exposures, we have been again and again reminded that the Communist has no scruples when it comes to attaining his distorted dreams of a proletarian millenium. He is bound in conscience by no oaths. He is a man who places his cause above his country, above his honor, above his family. How, then, Mr. Speaker, can we believe that such oaths as are contained in the Defense Education Act and in other acts on the statute books would be for one second a deterrent to any Communist? It is not the Communist who refuses such oaths, Mr. Speaker. It is the dedicated American, true to the grand oath which Jefferson swore, and by which we, his spiritual children, are still bound—the oath of eternal hostility to every form of tyranny over the mind of man. These loyalty oaths are meaningless, Mr. Speaker, as weapons against communism. But they are tragically potent as weapons against our own self-confidence, as attacks upon our devotion to freedom, as stresses and strains on the ancient belief of free men that men shall be held accountable to society for their actions, and to God alone for their thoughts.

Realizing this, scholars and students throughout this great Nation of ours have protested against the imposition of these futile and un-American oaths.

In my own district, a great college, Reed College, has refused pointblank to participate in the National Defense Education Act programs as long as these oath requirements are retained. At least six other distinguished American colleges have refused to participate, or have withdrawn their applications for participation under the act. These American colleges have not been afraid to risk criticism and have been willing to put principle ahead of monetary considerations. This honor roll is a list of some of the outstanding educational institutions of our time.

Listen to these names. They are the names of centers of courage and devotion to real Americanism, as well as centers of intellectual activity: Bryn Mawr College, Swarthmore College, Oberlin College, Reed College, Haverford College, Wilmington College in Ohio, and Goucher College. Other universities and colleges have expressed real concern, but have not yet actually refused.

Mr. Speaker, this country desperately needs the brainpower and the imaginative devotion to the search for truth that characterizes these colleges, their distinguished faculties and their alumni everywhere. It needs these things far more than it needs further accumulations of meaningless files of loyalty oaths.

Under unanimous consent, I include at this point in the RECORD a memorandum from the distinguished president of Reed, Mr. Richard H. Sullivan, concerning the intellectual contributions which Reed College has made to the Nation:

In the early years of this decade Robert H. Knapp and H. B. Goodrich undertook a very careful survey of American colleges and their records in producing scientists of distinction. Their findings were published by the University of Chicago Press in 1952 in the volume "Origins of American Scientists." They wrote in part as follows:

"The record of Reed College in the production of scientists is altogether remarkable. Its index for the year 1924–34 shows Reed's composite rate of production to have been 132 male scientists per 1,000 male graduates; its index for the period 1930–41 * * * was 98 scientists per 1,000 graduates. * * *

Reed undoubtedly ranks first in the production of scientists for both periods among all American institutions. Its closest rival for the earlier period had a rate of production only half that of Reed. A further examination of Reed's record reveals that this extraordinary effectiveness arises from the superior performance of all departments in the institution rather than from exceptional achievements by one or two. Of the five science departments maintained, three rank first in the Nation in their respective fields, and the remaining two rank among the first eight.

Of the 12 Rhodes scholars produced by this small institution between 1925 and 1940, 10 had concentrated in 1 of the social sciences, and only 1 in a natural science. We must recognize from this and other evidence that Reed's claim to distinction is generalized, not confined to the sciences alone."

In 1953 a further study was published by Robert H. Knapp and Joseph J. Greenbaum, "The Younger American Scholar: His Collegiate Origins." A more recent chronological period, the origins of younger scholars, and all fields of major study were scrutinized. A male index of collegiate productivity was developed, and on this Reed College was ranked second in the entire Nation.

Similar indexes were provided separately for the three broad areas of study: science, social science, humanities. Only two colleges were listed among the first 10 in all 3 areas, and Reed College was 1 of these.

Comparable findings and conclusions have been presented in other studies. Moreover, Reed graduates are continuing to be awarded national and international fellowships for graduate and professional study entirely out of proportion to the size of the institution. The graduating class of 1957, with 99 members, received 40 awards for continuation of their studies. These included:

One Rhodes scholarship.

One four-year fellowship of the Rockefeller Institute for Medical Research.

One Social Science Research Council fellowship.

Two National Science Foundation fellowships.

Two Fulbright fellowships.

Six Woodrow Wilson fellowships.

Thirteen members of that class planned to enter medical school in the fall of 1957, and 48 were planning to continue in graduate schools of arts and science (38 of them with national or institutional fellowships and assistantships). Ten more planned to take scientific positions immediately after college.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I am quite aware that my position on this issue is not one which is precisely unanimous in the House. I am sure, as one Member warned me when I sought to discuss this issue, that there will be quite a fight if this bill is reported and debated. A few of my constituents have written letters in opposition to my position on this bill.

Recently I did receive one letter which planted some seeds of doubt in my mind. The letter said, in effect, we have to show these college "perfessors" that they aren't anything special and that they are going to be treated just like everybody else. "Just like everybody else," Mr. Speaker. Well, there is more than one way to treat college professors "just like everybody else." We could repeal this discriminatory and nearly unique loyalty oath provision and assume that college professors, like bankers, dentists, hod carriers, and farmers, are loyal, until we at least have some evidence to the contrary. But that might be too direct an approach. There has occurred to me another method of treating teachers as we treat other people and, at the same time, utilizing the oath technique, if we continue to have confidence in it, as a weapon against other forms of antisocial behavior.

I have prepared a number of bills, Mr. Speaker, which I would like to discuss before introducing them. They are not yet in bill form, since my legal advisers are finding certain difficulties. Yet I would like the opportunity to discuss them and to hear from my colleagues such suggestions as they may have to further utilize the shining sword of the oath as a weapon against the ills that beset our society.

The first of these bills, and one which will go a long way toward treating teachers as we treat other people is a bill requiring every person who receives any payment or loan from the United States, or makes any payment to the United States, to file with whatever agency may be concerned, an affidavit to the effect that he does not believe in, or belong to or support any organization which believes in the right to advocate or teach the violent overthrow of the Government or alteration of the Constitution by illegal or unconstitutional means. Each such person should also swear that he does not belong to or support any organization based upon blood descent from any person who advocated or engaged in attempts to overthrow or alter any established Government within the present limits of the United States by force or violence.

Then we could have a special fire prevention oath to be sworn to by all U.S. Forest Service employees, denying membership in any organization which advocates arson.

The newest contributions of science also offer a field for expansion of the oath principle which we have never begun to exploit. Naturally, all the employees of the new National Astronautics and Space Agency will be required to take the usual plenitude of loyalty oaths and disloyalty disclaimers. But, Mr. Speaker, think of the special circumstances. Men will soon be sent into outer space and, in all probability, outside of the Earth's atmosphere. Would it not be the better part of valor to require an oath from each of these returning space voyagers that they have not become associated with unterrestrial organizations, and that they have not become infected with any Martian, Lunar, or other unearthly ideologies? While we are at it, it might be desirable to require such intrepid spacemen to sign oaths before going up, to the effect that they promise to come down.

Mr. Speaker, let us not rest content with oaths simply guaranteeing the law-abiding character of our citizenry. Let us fortify their sincerity as well, with a series of sincerity oaths, designed to cover as large a segment of the population as possible.

Our farmers have been berated from every direction for accepting the farm subsidies which the Congress has voted for them. In addition to the disclaimer and loyalty oaths, let us require them to sign an affadavit that they sincerely need the payments which they are receiving, and that their reception of such payments is sincerely in keeping, not only with the letter of the law, but with its spirit and intent as well.

To tidy up the whole business, let us enact three other bills. The first would be required of all executive officials appearing before any Appropriations Committee or Subcommittee hearings, and would be to the effect that the sums they sincerely say their agency needs are sincerely supported as adequate and as necessary, both by the agency and by the Budget Bureau, that new guardian against administrative heterodoxy.

Let us require veterans to sign loyalty oaths before receiving any VA payments. Some do-gooders might suggest that veterans, especially those who have been disabled in their country's service, have given ample proof of their loyalty. I personally think this is true beyond any doubt. Let us, above all, be sure.

My last bill is giving my legal counsel the greatest amount of trouble, but it is worth it. It is an oath to be taken by everyone who, under any statute must take any sort of oath, and this new oath would provide that the previous oath was taken in good faith. My legal advisers are having a bit of trouble devising the language which would make perfectly clear that a subsequent oath must be taken as to the accuracy of the preceding oath. Thus far, they have language which still leaves one final oath unsupported by a further oath. If my legal advisers are equal to the task, however, I hope eventually to introduce a bill which will require a literally endless cycle of oaths, each one guaranteeing to the public and the agency which has custody of these oaths that the previous one was true. It may require money to administer, to file, to investigate and to store these oaths, but Mr. Speaker, just think how safe we will be when everyone has begun to sign them.

And in this matter of expense, Mr. Speaker, I am preparing a bill to authorize the appropriation of $5 billion to pay for the costs of personnel, printing equipment, and storage of these new oaths. But I would hasten to assure my colleagues that this appropriation will not unbalance the budget. If this entire package of oath bills is accepted we can, after all, reduce the budget by far more than this program will cost. We can save vast amounts of money and services now rendered by the United States to farmers, publishers, veterans, forest rangers, spacemen, and other people who fail to complete the cleverly endless cycle of oaths which the proposed legislation requires. We can thus, Mr. Speaker, not only have a self-financing program, but also achieve the perfect safety that a paper curtain of oaths can best provide for the land of the free and the home of the affidavit.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. I yield.

Mr. BAILEY. I sincerely hope the gentlewoman from Oregon will not find it necessary to rewrite all the Federal statutes in order to get some action. The Subcommittee on Education of which I happen to be chairman and the

second Subcommittee on Education of which the gentleman from Alabama is chairman have plans for an executive session of the two committees to consider the possibility of offering some amendment to the Defense Education Act which was passed by the 85th Congress, and I am sure that in that event we will give careful consideration to your proposal and your legislation and the possibilities are that the gentlewoman may be invited to come in and deliver this oration again.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. I thank my colleague from West Virginia, especially as chairman of that very important committee. He has shown wonderful leadership in the Congress over the years in regard to educational matters. No one has shown a greater grasp of the needs and the potential of the Nation's educational system.

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from North Dakota.

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend the gentlewoman from Oregon for her very fine and able presentation. I want to associate myself with the position the gentlewoman has taken and I want to assure her that I will support H.R. 4066.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. I thank the gentleman from North Dakota.

Mr. DIXON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. I am glad to yield to my colleague, the gentleman from Utah.

Mr. DIXON. Mr. Speaker, the gentlewoman has reduced this question of oaths to a ridiculous absurdity and she has done so very logically. If you support the provisions in this Defense Education Act to require the teachers to take an oath, you must then carry it to the extreme that the gentlewoman has suggested. And like the gentlewoman, I resent very much the inference in the clause that our school people need discipline and that they are less loyal to this country than other people. On the contrary, a lifetime experience with our school people convinces me that our universities and our colleges are nurseries of principle and honor. There is little, if any, graft there. They are wonderful Americans. Of course, there are a few exceptions, but that cannot be handled through shotgun oaths. I also appreciate the statement of the gentleman from West Virginia who is a fine champion of education and whom I admire when he says that his committee is going to give consideration, to the cause of the gentlewoman.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. I thank the gentleman from Utah. It has always been one of my regrets that the distinguished gentleman and scholar does not serve on the Committee on Education and Labor of the House.

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. I am happy to yield to my colleague.

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, I find it extremely difficult to take the floor to disagree with some of my colleagues who have spoken this afternoon, especially my friend the gentleman from Utah and certainly the most charming Member of the House who now has the floor [Mrs. GREEN]. However, I am not just sure as to where the gentlewoman started to be facetious in her speech and where she was serious. Thinking over what I understood her to say, at first it all seemed very logical and clear to her that employees of the Federal Government should be required to take a loyalty oath, and yet she thought that we were being inconsistent or not being entirely fair and realistic in requiring a schoolteacher to take a loyalty oath. Now, what is the distinction? Certainly an employee in the gentlewoman's office, for instance, is indirectly an employee of the Federal Government. I do not think it is any more of an unfair requirement for that employee to take a loyalty oath than the employee of her local school board who is teaching the children of her own community. Can there ever be a more sensitive area in America than the question of what ideology or what philosophy might be advanced to the children in a classroom? What is the distinction? I want to pinpoint my question which is—What is the distinction?

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. I regret first of all that the gentleman did not know where I ended the serious part of my speech and where I started the facetious part because, frankly, though I may have spoken in facetious terms, I am serious about it all. If you are going to require a loyalty oath of teachers then I think you should expand it to require loyalty oaths of other people.

You ask whether there is any difference between people on the Federal payroll taking an oath and a teacher. I think there is a difference. A person who is working for the Government has the employee-to-employer relation to the Government; the student, the veteran, the farmer—even when receiving money from the Government under an act of Congress—has the status of citizen boss in relation to the Government—not employee. I might also say to the gentleman that no oath will ever defend us against any Communist. A Communist would not hesitate to sign it for one moment.

I would submit that what we need is free men in this country; a reaffirmation of our faith in freedom. There can be no better way to defend this country than to rely on its own inherent superiority to communism. That is our greatest hope, not a meaningless paper oath.

Mr. MEYER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. I yield to the gentleman from Vermont.

Mr. MEYER. I would like to answer the gentleman from Kansas and also compliment the gentlewoman from Oregon most highly on what she has had to say.

As a career employee of the United States Department of Agriculture many years back I was required to take an oath of this nature which at the time I resented very much. At the time I made a written protest, I was one of two in my region, the Northeastern Region. I still do not believe that it was sensible. I still do not believe that there was any reason to have it, and I can tell you the effect: Because I objected, and was only one of two to do so in writing; because I followed my own conscience in objecting to it, perhaps I displeased some of the administrators who were my superiors. Some of my superiors doubtless thought that I was kind of an "odd ball." I do not think I was an "odd ball." I do not think there was a need for that oath for Government service or for schoolteachers or for anything else.

If we in this country cannot depend on the people of this country and on our way of doing many things, then we cannot depend on anything. Are we now going to inject this aspect of a police state? Are we going to follow this path to the Gestapo? That is the way we are headed, and it is about time we realized it. We talk about these un-American theories we are fighting. It seems to me this loyalty oath is just about as un-American as anything we have, and as long as I am here in this Congress I am going to protest against such things because I am convinced that they are wrong, not only partly wrong, but completely wrong.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. I thank the gentleman from Vermont. I would ask the gentleman from Vermont if he knows of any individual or any organization which has ever made a study of communism which has ever come out with a report that an oath is a successful—an effective device against Communists or against communism in general?

Mr. MEYER. I do not see how it could be, for if they are as dishonest as they are said to be, what does an oath matter? It is only to a man who has a conscience or belief in himself that an oath means anything.

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield further?

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. I yield.

Mr. AVERY. I believe we got off the subject just a little. I was not advocating that the taking of an oath be required in any or all of those situations; my question was what was the distinction? I would like to inquire of the gentleman from Vermont if he would follow his reasoning a little further, would he support the resolution that has been introduced in Congress to terminate the Un-American Activities Committee?

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. I believe I have the floor. If the gentleman from Kansas would follow the logic of my remarks a little further, would he advocate an oath for teachers and professors, and then would he also require an oath for applicants for farm subsidy, for veterans or from anyone who receives other types of benefits?

Mr. AVERY. There is not anything wrong with it along the lines we are talking about if it would strengthen national security.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Would a paper curtain of oaths really strengthen our national security? If so, shall we have several? First you have an oath of affirmation, an affirmative oath; then the oath we have just talked about is the negative disclaimer. Should that be re-

quired of teachers, professors, and scholars? Many of the universities of the country have objected to it very strongly.

Mr. AVERY. Not if it is the conventional disclaimer oath. If we are to be consistent about this, I would like to ask the gentlewoman from Oregon then would she suggest that we lift the loyalty oath requirement of our own employees? We should be consistent about it either way.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. I am trying, sir, to be consistent by saying that if we now require disclaimer oaths for teachers, for students, then we must be consistent and require that same oath from applicants for veterans' pensions, for farmers, for space jockeys, and so on.

That is the very thing I am pointing out.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. I would like to present a little different point of view for the record perhaps. I find the gentlewoman's speech most interesting and I know there is no more conscientious Member of the House. But I say, with due respect, that to my way of thinking this is a tempest in a teapot. I am inclined to agree with her that the oath accomplishes very little; on the other hand, it is beyond me to understood how any loyal American can object to swearing that he is a loyal American and does not advocate the forcible overthrow of our form of government.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. We are objecting to the series of oaths. We require them to sign one oath that they will uphold the Constitution, then we require them to sign a second oath. Then should we not require a third oath that they meant what they said in the preceding oath and the oath preceding that?

Mr. TEAGUE of California. That is carrying it to an extreme. Many examples the gentlewoman gave are interesting. I would be inclined to say that it would add an awful lot of cost to the Government, and I am endeavoring to avoid that. But I do not see how anyone could object to signing such an oath.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I first want to compliment the gentlewoman on a very beautifully constructed argument, and I hope she will present it before the various committees and that she will have the opportunity to present it before the full House at the time the bill comes on for consideration, because I believe it is worthy of the attention of this body.

I should like to offer one shred of evidence, and refer to an Illinois case where an oath was required. After some time they found one janitor who refused to sign the oath. He said very simply that when he became a citizen of the United States some 40 years earlier he had taken the oath of citizenship and he did not thereafter wish his loyalty to be brought into question. So he resigned from the school system. That is the kind of person who is proud of his own integrity, his own humanity, his own Americanism, and he resents the suggestion. This is not a matter to be taken lightly. About all it can do is have the most conscientious take the oath, but it will never catch a thief.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. I thank the gentleman for his usual very excellent contribution.

TRIBUTE TO HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Utah [Mr. DIXON] is recognized for 40 minutes.

Mr. DIXON. Mr. Speaker, the members of the 45th Club of Congress have asked me to request this time for two purposes. The first one is to show the appreciation of the group to the committee that conducted our most inspirational Lincoln Day program, and the second is to fortify the move that is now on foot to appoint a centennial commission commemorating the 100th anniversary of the establishment of the U.S. Department of Agriculture and the land grant colleges and universities.

If the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SCHWENGEL] is here, I would like him to stand, as well as the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MACK], the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BRAY], and the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. DENTON]. We extend to this committee our congratulations and our sincerest thanks for a wonderful job well done.

It is indeed a pleasure for me to briefly present information on the splendid leadership of Congressman SCHWENGEL, of Iowa, current president of the Lincoln Group of the District of Columbia, who has for more than 2 years been a leader in developing the Lincoln Sesquicentennial.

The Lincoln Group has for more than 25 years been a continuing nonpolitical organization devoted to honoring Abraham Lincoln and to promoting the great American ideals exemplified by his life. It is composed of many of the Nation's most eminent Lincoln authors and scholars, as well as of people with a general interest in Lincoln's life and achievements. In addition to Congressman SCHWENGEL, a number of other patriotic Americans have become permanently identified with the group's Lincoln tradition and activities. Among these individuals is Bruce Caton, popular historian-author of "A Stillness at Appomattox" and editor of American Heritage magazine; Gen. U. S. Grant III, grandson of the famous Union general and who later became President; Dr. R. Gerald McMurtry, author of many publications dealing with the Lincoln history; Dr. William H. Townsend, Kentucky Lincoln authority and now chairman of the Kentucky Lincoln Sesquicentennial; Hon. George A. Dondero, for many years Congressman from Michigan and who is a Lincoln enthusiast; and Miss Josephine Cobb, Chief of the Still Picture Branch of the National Archives, an authority on Brady and Civil War photography.

It was in Congressman SCHWENGEL's office on the evening of April 19, 1957, that the local Lincoln group decided to sponsor the creation by the Congress of a Federal Lincoln Sesquicentennial Commission. A committee was appointed at that time, and it became the nucleus organization which was instrumental in the passage of legislation which led to the establishment of the Lincoln Sesquicentennial Commission.

Among those who had joined in sponsoring the creation of the National Commission in the House of Representatives were, in addition to Congressman Schwengel, Representatives Peter F. Mack, Jr., Leo E. Allen, of Illinois; F. Jay Nimtz, of Indiana; Hugh Scott, of Pennsylvania; Winfield K. Denton, of Indiana; and William G. Bray, of Indiana. For the same purpose, a Senate legislation was introduced by Senator John Sherman Cooper, of Kentucky, joined by Senator Thruston B. Morton, of Kentucky, and Everett M. Dirksen and Paul H. Douglas, of Illinois, and Homer E. Capehart and William E. Jenner, of Indiana.

Congressman SCHWENGEL was also an important instrument in the creation of the Federal Civil War Centennial Commission. He was appointed a member of that Commission by House Speaker SAM RAYBURN. Throughout all of these legislative moves and accomplishments, he has steadfastly and continuously supported the development of Lincoln group and Lincoln sesquicentennial objectives. As a consequence of the establishment of the Lincoln Commission, which law—House Joint Resolution 351—was approved by the President on September 2, 1957, the President did issue on December 29, 1958, a proclamation which in part reads as follows:

> Now, therefore, I, Dwight D. Eisenhower, President of the United States of America, in accordance with the purposes of the Congress, do hereby call upon all agencies and officers of the Federal Government, upon the Governors of the States, and upon the American people to observe the year 1959 as the Abraham Lincoln Sesquicentennial Year, and throughout this period—and especially during the week February 5 to 12—to do honor to Lincoln's memory by appropriate activities and ceremonies, by a restudy of his life and his spoken and written words, and by personal rededication to the principles of citizenship and the philosophy of government for which he gave the last full measure of devotion.

As the fall of 1958 approached, Congrssman SCHWENGEL unselfishly gave of his time, devotion, and substance to the organization of a program to significantly recall the greatness of President Abraham Lincoln, 16th President of the United States. He organized, was master of ceremonies at, and otherwise led the Nation in the successful arrangement of the national Lincoln sesquicentennial dinner held in Hotel Statler, Washington, on the evening of February 11, 1959. The following day a historic joint session of Congress was held in this very Chamber, which had been arranged under the chairmanship of Congressman SCHWENGEL. The main address at the dinner was delivered by Rev. Richard S. Emrich, S.M., bishop of Michigan.

President Eisenhower favored the distinguished nonpartisan gathering by making a few remarks, and among the other dignitaries at the head table on the dias were Vice President Richard M. Nixon; Mr. Victor M. Birely; Hon. Frank Church, of Idaho; Hon. John Sherman Cooper, Chairman of the Lincoln Sesquicentennial Commission; Rev. Frederick B. Harris, Chaplain of the U.S. Senate; Rev. George M. Docherty, pastor of the New York Avenue Presbyterian Church, which Lincoln attended; Gen. U. S. Grant III; Mrs. J. Borden Harriman, former Ambassadress to Norway; and Mr. Melvin D. Hildreth, of Washington, D.C.

Many news reports were released which in some detail described the address of Bishop Emrich at the historical dinner. Among those releases was an article published in the Washington Post and Times Herald on Thursday, February 12, 1959, as follows:

IKE, PRELATE LAUD LINCOLN

(By Harry Gabbett)

Worldwide celebration of this 150th anniversary year of Abraham Lincoln's birth got underway ceremonially here last night with national and international leaders attending a Lincoln dinner in the Statler Hotel.

Guests were treated to a varied program which included President Eisenhower's brief résumé of the homage statesman the world over have paid the Civil War President, and an address by the Right Reverend Richard S. M. Emrich, Episcopal bishop of the diocese of Michigan.

The President cited among the international marks of respect for Lincoln a New Delhi museum in his honor; Tolstoy's description of Lincoln as the only giant among world statesmen; Sun Yat-sen's recourse to the Gettysburg Address for his three basic principles of government, and Prime Minister Nehru's personal attachment to Lincoln's memory.

He cited among Lincoln's words having applicability today:

"The tendency to undue expansion is unquestionably the chief difficulty. How to do something and still not do too much, is the question. * * * I would not borrow money. I am against an overwhelming, crushing system. Suppose that at each session Congress shall first determine how much money can, for that year, be spared for improvements; then apportion that sum to the most important objects."

The words were taken from a Lincoln speech in the House June 20, 1848, on internal improvements.

Bishop Emrich chose for his theme "Lincoln and the Judgments of the Almighty."

He opened with a plea to sesquicentennial year Lincoln orators to speak not on Lincoln generally, but on some aspect of his great and mysterious person. Let them drill * * * into a small surface, and bring up the riches beneath.

The small surface into which the cleric drilled appears toward the close of Lincoln's Second Inaugural Address, in which the Great Emancipator proclaimed:

"If we shall suppose that American slavery is one of those offenses which, in the providence of God, must needs come, but which, having continued through His appointed time, He now wills to remove, and that He gives to both North and South this terrible war, as the woe due to those by whom the offense came, shall we discern therein any departure from those divine attributes which the believers in a living God always ascribe to Him.

"Fondly do we hope—fervently do we pray—that this mighty scourge of war may speedily pass away. Yet, if God wills that it continue until all the wealth piled by the bondsman's 250 years of unrequited toil shall be sunk, and until every drop of blood drawn by the lash shall be paid by another drawn by the sword, as was said 3,000 years ago, so still must it be said, the judgments of the Lord are true and righteous altogether."

In that passage, Bishop Emrich continued, Lincoln saw the war as God's judgment on America for slavery, that America must pay. What he said about judgment was the teaching of the Scriptures; it was old-time religion; it was a far remove from some of the effeminate and sentimental religion of a comfortable suburb. It was fearful and awful. He saw God's hand in the darkness. He does not say that perhaps this is true; but that it is true; and the first question to which we address ourselves is, Did Lincoln really believe this, or was he saying something that he felt ought to be said? Was it profound conviction or was it rhetoric?

Bishop Emrich went on to cite subsequent Lincoln writings in support of his contention that it was profound conviction. Moreover, that it was not a popular thing to say—and he knew it.

The dinner, sponsored by the District of Columbia Lincoln group in cooperation with the Lincoln Sesquicentennial Commission, also featured a film presentation of "Meet Mr. Lincoln."

President Eisenhower's brief remarks show his reverence for the memory of a distinguished predecessor. His remarks were as follows:

Mr. Chairman, Mr. Vice President, and distinguished guests, it is natural, I think, that speaking last in such a program as this, that we should expect some duplication and repetition. But I should reassure you as I begin, by saying that my talk is only 5 or 6 minutes, so if there are these inevitable duplications, I may hope and pray that you do not find them lengthy or too boring.

Ninety-eight years ago the President-elect of the United States boarded a train in Springfield, Ill., to start the long journey to his Nation's Capital. That same day a Washington newspaper reported the election in Montgomery, Ala., of another President, Jefferson Davis, and from Fort Sumter came a report of preparations for attack.

In bidding farewell to Springfield, Lincoln shared his innermost thoughts with old friends. In part, he said, "I now leave, not knowing when or whether ever, I may return, with a task before me greater than that which rested upon Washington. Without the assistance of that Divine Being who ever attended him, I cannot succeed. With that assistance I cannot fail."

Four years and two months later Abraham Lincoln was dead—but the Union again united. Now, said Secretary of War Stanton, "he belongs to the ages."

But Abraham Lincoln belongs not only to the ages, but to all humanity. Immortality is his in the hearts of all who love freedom everywhere in the world.

Each year 2 million people visit the Lincoln Memorial in Washington.

In New Delhi, a Lincoln society is establishing a museum in his honor. High school students in Tokyo last summer ranked him as the most respected of all world figures.

"Of all the great national statesmen of history," Russia's Tolstoy thought, "Lincoln is the only giant."

In the Caucasian Mountains, a wild chieftain asked of a visitor, "Tell us about the greatest ruler in the world. We want to know something about this man who was so great that he even forgave the crimes of his greatest enemies and shook brotherly hands with those who had plotted against his life."

The first President of modern China, Sun Yat-sen, found his three basic principles of government in Lincoln's Gettysburg Address.

For many years India's Prime Minister Nehru has kept, on the study table, a brass mold of Lincoln's right hand. "I look at it every day," Nehru tells us; "it is strong, firm and yet gentle * * * it gives me great strength."

The birth, 150 years ago, which we here honor, gave the Nation a son who a half-century later was summoned to lead our Republic through the tragedy of civil war. And as Lincoln fought for union and liberty he insisted always that "The struggle of today is not altogether for today—it is for a vast future also."

As we turn our eyes to that future, other words of his seem applicable. He said: "The tendency to undue expansion is unquestionably the chief difficulty. How to do something, and still not do too much, is the question. * * * I would not borrow money. I am against an overwhelming, crushing system. Suppose, that at each session, Congress shall first determine how much money can, for that year, be spared for improvements; then apportion that sum to the most important objects."

That the spirit of Lincoln be close at hand as we meet each successive challenge to freedom is the earnest hope of all Americans—indeed it is the hope of freedom's sentinels wherever they stand.

Pushing always ahead in our quest for a just peace and freedom for all men we can do no better than live by his prescription: "by the best cultivation of the physical world, beneath and around us; and the intellectual and moral word within us, we shall secure an individual, social, and political prosperity and happiness, whose course shall be onward and upward, and which, while the earth endures, shall not pass away."

Thank you very much.

Americans from all stations of life have reason to be grateful to Congressman SCHWENGEL, to whom special tribute is today being paid. Certainly the National Lincoln Sesquicentennial Dinner and the joint session of Congress will ever remain in the record attesting to energy, ability, and his resourcefulness. He first became interested in Lincoln during his college days and these recent Lincoln events have served to in a sense cap his efforts here in Washington in behalf of Lincoln. He has in his library about 400 books on the Lincoln theme and there is perhaps no one more devoted to the ideals and achievements of the Great Emancipator than is FRED SCHWENGEL. In a sense, his Lincoln headquarters has been an old roll-top desk which stands in the corner of his office and which is believed to be more than a hundred years old. Congressman SCHWENGEL found that desk, used by a Congressman of that period, on a tour through little-used rooms in the Capitol Building. He was looking for a scroll broken from the hand of a Lincoln statue on which was written the Emancipation Proclamation.

Among the brief summaries which have been made by distinguished Americans in describing their views of Lincoln is one by former President Woodrow Wilson. It appealed to Congressman SCHWENGEL, and deals with what President Wilson said on the question of the possibility of other Lincolns arising. President Wilson said:

We cannot do without them. * * * We must have the leadership of sane, genial men

of universal use like Lincoln to save us from mistakes and give us the necessary leadership.

I thank John E. Allen, assistant executive director of the Lincoln Commission, for his help in the preparation of this speech.

Mr. DIXON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Utah?

There was no objection.

Mr. DIXON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Utah?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege to serve under the chairmanship of my colleague from Iowa [Mr. SCHWENGEL] on the Committee on Arrangements for the Joint Session of Congress honoring the 150th Anniversary of the birth of Abraham Lincoln. Mr. SCHWENGEL, a long-time student of Lincoln, has shown great and unique knowledge and experience in the subject of our 16th President and, having served on this committee, I am aware of the unusually and energetic leadership Congressman SCHWENGEL provided.

I came to this work rather late, inasmuch as I was appointed to the Committee on Arrangements just a few weeks before the joint session. It was apparent that much ground work had already been undertaken by Congressman SCHWENGEL. He and the Honorable J. Nimtz, a Member of this body in the 85th Congress, has done much of the work in planning and preparing the joint session. They had secured the legislative authorization for the session. It was already formed in their minds to such an extent that the Committee on Arrangements had merely to put into final form the plans for this observance.

Prior commitment took me home to Indiana on the day of the 12th. I regreted being unable to attend the joint session, for it was obvious beforehand that it would be an occasion of great historical significance. From every account that I have heard, the joint session was a success and honorably served to mark this important anniversary of one of our greatest Americans. There has been great interest in accounts of the proceedings of that day. As time goes on, I am sure it will be a significant event in the story of Abraham Lincoln.

For the taste and simplicity with which the program was planned, and for the effective forethought which made its realization simple and harmonious, this body owes greatful thanks for the direction and leadership and forceful energy of Congressman SCHWENGEL.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIXON. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join with the gentleman from Utah in commending the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SCHWENGEL] for the splendid job that he did in acting as chairman of the committee which planned the program here in the Congress on the anniversary of the birth of Abraham Lincoln. It has been my privilege to serve on the Committee on Public Works during the past 4 years with the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SCHWENGEL]. The citizens of his district are fortunate in having such a dedicated and devoted representative here in the Congress. I have come to respect him deeply during this period of time; come to respect him for the attitude that he has toward the work of the Congress, the deep faith he has in America, and the tremendous respect that he has for Abraham Lincoln. It was an inspiration to all of us here in the House to see the outstanding job he did in planning this 150th anniversary of the birth of President Lincoln. I think it was an inspiration to the people of this country, and I would like to commend the gentleman from Iowa on his leadership.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WRIGHT] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I should like to join in this expression of appreciation for the monumental work performed by our colleague, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SCHWENGEL] and his committee which planned and carried out the memorable and fitting observances on the 150th anniversary of the birth of President Lincoln.

Having served for the past 4 years with the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SCHWENGEL] on the House Public Works Committee, I know of his continuous dedication to duty and his reputation for giving of his whole efforts to those causes in which he deeply believes.

His dedication and ability have never been more evident, however, than in the altogether appropriate commemorative services which he and his committee have directed during the course of this sesquicentennial.

The 150th anniversary of the birth of Abraham Lincoln was an event which richly deserved to be commemorated by tasteful and impressive ceremonies. Thanks to the many hours of well directed work on the part of FRED SCHWENGEL and others, it was.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIXON. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Speaker, I, too, would like to join in these well-deserved words of praise for the splendid job that the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SCHWENGEL] and others performed in connection with that very fine joint session of the Congress held on Lincoln Day this year.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIXON. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN].

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, the spirit of Abraham Lincoln is still a great force throughout the land. Each year when his birthday is celebrated, there is renewed interest in this great patriot not only in the land of his birth, but throughout the world where he has become the best known American.

Lincoln's spirit reigns because men from all walks of life have been attracted to the ideals of this man. As they read and discuss his statements, his policies, and his warm interest in his fellowman, they become imbued with the desire to see that more people know and appreciate Lincoln's greatness.

The fact that some men catch Lincoln's spirit and perpetuate it more than others is understandable. It has been ever thus whenever great men walk the land and leave an imprint upon all humanity.

Such a follower of Lincoln is our colleague, FRED SCHWENGEL, and that fact that the sesquicentennial observance of Lincoln's birthday on February 12 of this year was perhaps the most notable of all Lincoln birthday celebrations can be attributed to the esteemed gentlemen from the First District of Iowa, Representative FRED SCHWENGEL.

All who attended the sesquicentennial banquet on February 11 at Washington's Hotel Statler where Representative SCHWENGEL was the master of ceremonies for a colorful and historic tribute to Lincoln can attest to SCHWENGEL's leadership.

Any Member who sat in this Chamber on February 12 when a joint session was convened to mark this anniversary was treated to what may go down as one of the most moving of all Lincoln tributes. As they heard Fredric March read the Gettysburg address, those words took on new meaning. Then in measured cadence with the delicate vocal nuances of the poet he is, Carl Sandburg, Lincoln's biographer, and best known of all the Lincoln scholars, delivered an address which is destined to take its place among the classics of our time.

Anyone who sat in the Chamber, or listened on the radio, or watched on television, could not help but feel the significance of this historic occasion. It will be imprinted on our memories for years to come.

These two events—the banquet and the joint session—were just two of the many observances throughout the land which marked Lincoln's birthday this year. In each instance the actual program time for the ceremonies was relatively short, just a fraction of the days, weeks and months of planning which went into each event.

Always active in this planning, and assuming a place of leadership because his coworkers wanted it that way, was our colleague, FRED SCHWENGEL. It was his joint resolution, adopted by the 85th Congress, and signed by the President, which authorized the joint session. He was selected by our beloved Speaker to serve on the Committee on Arrangements and was chosen by the other members of this committee to serve as its chairman.

Representative SCHWENGEL serves as president of the Lincoln Group of the District of Columbia which sponsored the banquet on February 11, at which

President Eisenhower and Vice President NIXON was honored guests. This impressive ceremony served as the kickoff for the Lincoln birthday celebrations across the land.

Congressman SCHWENGEL's leadership in these historic events is natural when you consider his dedication to the life of Lincoln. It goes back to his school days when he first studied history and learned that a young man from the Midwest with the barest of resources but a man of the people could, through a dedication to what is right and decent, elevate himself to the highest office in the country. Later when SCHWENGEL went into politics, he had the pattern of a great man to emulate. Lincoln's thoughts and teachings have guided SCHWENGEL's action in the Iowa Legislature where he served with distinction for 10 years. When he came to Washington as a Member of the 84th Congress, he moved into an atmosphere where he could be closer to the spirit of Lincoln than ever before. His interest and devotion have found many avenues for expression in the Capital where Lincoln rose to his eminence.

Our colleague does not wear this attachment lightly and exhibit it as a sometime thing. Lincoln doesn't dominate him—but the spirit of Lincoln is always with him. His extensive library has some 400 careworn volumes on the life of Lincoln. They are a ready reference for guidance and for further whetting the appetite to know and understand more of the philosophy of our 16th President whose approach to the affairs of state has many present-day applications.

In addition to the volumes on Lincoln, Congressman SCHWENGEL has what is probably the most extensive library in the country on women of the Civil War period. This interest started with a desire to know more about Annie Wittenmyer, one of the leading feminine figures of the Civil War period. She had many ties in the district Congressman SCHWENGEL serves and an orphanage in SCHWENGEL's home city of Davenport, Iowa, bears her name.

SCHWENGEL's office and home are decorated with pictures of Lincoln and other memorabilia which gravitate to a devout follower of this man. In his office in the House Office Building, he has one of the desks which were used by Members of Congress at the time that Lincoln served in the House. It serves as a focal point for material on Lincoln which grows with each passing day.

Our distinguished colleague from Iowa accepts every opportunity to speak on the life and deeds of Abraham Lincoln. Since he has been in Congress he has been called back to the Iowa Legislature twice to deliver a Lincoln Day address to the biennial joint session which the Iowa bodies hold in honor of Lincoln. SCHWENGEL is the only person to be honored with this privilege.

Each year he joins his Republican colleagues in speaking in various sections of the country to honor Lincoln's memory. This year, following the joint session, he spoke at the Loyal Legion observance in Washington. In typical fashion, he rushed to Springfield, Ill., to take part in the international observance in that city and then proceeded to Harrogate, Tenn., for an address at Lincoln Memorial University.

As SCHWENGEL's interest in Lincoln continues to manifest itself in ever widening circles, he has a constant reminder of that February 12th anniversary within his own family circle. His daughter, Dorothy, shares the birthdate with the man her father reveres so much. She was born on February 12, a little over one score years ago.

As we pay tribute to the good works of our colleague today, we must keep in mind that he will continue taking leadership in Lincoln observances for years to come. He has been named as a member of the Civil War Centennial Commission and as the centennials of the events of that era are brought back into focus, we can expect to see Representative FRED SCHWENGEL take active leadership in formulating the plans and celebrations which will recognize Lincoln's part in this historic period.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIXON. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HOEVEN].

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, I want to join in the splendid tributes that are being paid my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SCHWENGEL],

It is said that when Members of Congress come to Washington it is expected of them that they shall be statesmen and scholars. I am very happy to report that our distinguished colleague from Iowa has demonstrated that he is a statesman and furthermore that he is a scholar. He has been a profund scholar of Lincoln lore, of the Civil War period. It is no longer a hobby with him but has become in reality a public service.

The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SCHWENGEL] has contributed much to bringing to our attention some of those matters that should be brought to the attention of Congress as they related to the Lincoln era. I am very happy, in behalf of the Iowa delegation, I know, and all of the people of Iowa, to express our deep appreciation for the splendid service our colleague, Mr. SCHWENGEL, is rendering not only to his district but to his State and the Nation as well.

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIXON. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I should like to join with our colleagues this afternoon in complimenting the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SCHWENGEL] on the fine service he rendered in his work in connection with the 150th anniversary of the birth of Abraham Lincoln, and I also want to compliment the other members of his committee, who joined with him. The result was an observance of which we are all justly proud. The work he performed as chairman of that committee is characteristic of the remarkable service he has rendered here in this House to his colleagues in providing them with information, and also to the people of his district, his State, and the Nation.

Mr. WEAVER. Mr. Speaker will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIXON. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. WEAVER. Mr. Speaker, the joint session of Congress on Thursday morning, February 12, in honor of the 150th anniversary of the birth of Abraham Lincoln was not only a memorable incident in legislative history, but a moving experience for everyone permitted to participate in it. The scene itself, the music, the words repeated, the dramatic climax of the eloquent tribute, all combined to lift it above the commonplace and invest it with a special meaning.

This is generally recognized and generally agreed. But it is not so well known that it stemmed from the ideas, energies, and dedicated imagination of one man to whom full credit for that solemn celebration is almost singly due.

One evening, last summer, our colleague, the Honorable FRED SCHWENGEL, of Iowa, in his studies of his foremost hero, chanced to read how 92 years ago, on that same birthday, the two Houses of Congress came together to honor their lamented leader. Mr. SCHWENGEL determined that the sesquicentennial should be comparably commemorated. Accordingly, on July 8, he introduced in the House of Representatives, House Joint Resolution 648 calling for a joint session. He persuaded others to adopt it. He arranged for its introduction in the Senate. He had it reported out of committees. With bipartisan support as completely generous as it perhaps was unusual, he directed its passage. The President approved it on August 27.

His appointment as chairman of the joint committee on arrangements was as fortunate as it was natural. Under his hand, the program was steadily developed and perfected. His associates on the committee were cordial and unanimous. But more than this, musicians gladly consented to perform. A distinguished actor accepted an invitation to read the Gettysburg Address. Carl Sandburg, the best known Lincolnist of our own or any time, promised his presence and the preparation of the public acknowledgment of Mr. Lincoln's place in the hearts of a later generation. Said Mr. Sandburg: "For this I have been in training for 81 years."

There were no flaws to be found in the proceedings. They ran smoothly, succintly, gracefully. But this was because—almost entirely because—of the firm grasp and applied wisdom of FRED SCHWENGEL. When problems arose in the days before the session, they were confronted bravely and seriously until they had been finally and permanently resolved. When time called for prompt decisions, they were promptly forthcoming. When choices had to be made, they were made with honesty and taste and always in the public interest. These were and will remain invisible and unrecorded. But it is well to know that Mr. SCHWENGEL's sagacity and high purpose alone have kept them so.

If Mr. Lincoln's anniversary has been observed with fine feelings and high hearts in the Congress, which once he served, he must look down from his Elysium and give thanks, as we give

thanks, for the splendid response of FRED SCHWENGEL, to a splendid opportunity.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIXON. I yield.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I too would like to express my very deep appreciation for the very great service the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SCHWENGEL], has rendered not only to the House of Representatives but to the country in connection with the very fine exercises commemorating the birth of Abraham Lincoln. It was a very wonderful thing. I am glad that through television the entire country could see and hear it.

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIXON. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. AVERY. I thank my friend from Utah for yielding to me. Naturally I want to associate myself with other colleagues in paying tribute to our most esteemed colleague from Iowa [Mr. SCHWENGEL], on his fine performance as chairman of the Lincoln Commission last month.

Further I should like to associate myself with the gentleman now in the well in his remarks concerning the 100th anniversary of the Department of Agriculture and the land-grant colleges. Since the undisputed leader in the field of land-grant colleges is located in my own congressional district, naturally I have more than just a casual interest in this resolution. I certainly hope the House will see fit to expedite its passage.

It is most appropriate that the Department of Agriculture and the land grant colleges of America should officially observe their 100th anniversary. The chairman of the Judiciary Committee is to be commended on his prompt attention to the resolution authorizing the creation of a Commission to make the necessary arrangements for this anniversary which will occur in 1962. Since the occasion is but 2 years hence, preliminary arrangements for its proper recognition should commence immediately.

I do not think it necessary to dwell at length on the vast contribution that the Department of Agriculture has made to the development of this country. As the country grew, agriculture became the basis for the economy in the Middle West. Even though we are presently plagued with surpluses of some commodities, certainly an abundance of agricultural production, even if it is a surplus, is to be desired over the lack of an adequate food supply. It is only by an assured supply of food that we can maintain and raise our present standard of living.

The Department of Agriculture and the land grant colleges have a natural relationship in their growth and development over the years. It has been the responsibility of the Department of Agriculture to research crop improvement and marketing, but it has been the agricultural or land grant college that has made practical application of this knowledge. The college provides a medium whereby the average farmer can avail himself of the improvement in methods of agricultural production and marketing made by the Department.

It is an honor to represent the First District of Kansas which contains the outstanding land-grant college of the Nation. There are several reasons why Kansas State remains the undisputed leader in the field of land-grant colleges, but probably the main reason is that of experience. A college dedicated to agriculture had been established at Manhattan, Kans., 2 years before the Morrill Act was passed in 1862. This original college was known as Old Bluemont College, and founded in 1860 by the Methodist Church. From a meager beginning of 53 students and 2 faculty members, this institution, officially designated as Kansas State Agriculture College by the Kansas Legislature on February 13, 1863, has expanded to its present enrollment of approximately 8,000 students and 1,200 faculty members, including representatives of the off-campus extension department.

Although these colleges throughout the land are still designated as agricultural colleges, their contribution in the field of education has not been confined strictly to agriculture. In assessing the contribution these schools have made, it is of course necessary to recognize the instruction they have provided in fields other than agriculture. In addition to agriculture, instruction is available in the arts and sciences, engineering and architecture, and in many cases professional courses such as veterinary medicine.

These institutions conceivably might have developed to their present size and stature without the benefits that have accrued as a result of the Morrill Act. The security and supplemental financing that became available with the passage of this act accounted for an early growth and development which otherwise might not have occurred until 50 years later.

The public benefit from these institutions, particularly Kansas State College, has not been confined to the student body alone. Through the extension department, technological advances and production knowledge has been made available to the farmer at the county level. Besides the dissemination of information through the extension department, for many years the college has been host to innumerable conferences and meetings of special interest groups for training courses and seminars. These groups include 4–H clubs, livestock organizations and extension council members.

Another segment of college activity that should not be overlooked is the contribution that land-grant colleges have made to our national security. As a requirement for qualifying to the benefits granted under the Morrill Act, these colleges were required to include military training as a part of their regular curriculum for all male students. This is not an uncommon program in modern education, but previous to World War I and between World War I and World War II, land-grant colleges were among the few institutions of higher learning that required military training. It would be interesting to know how many officers in World War II received their commission as a result of military training received by them at one of the land-grant colleges we are going to honor in 1962. Kansas State College at Manhattan has trained thousands of reservists for the Army and the Air Force, over the years.

It is not possible of course on an occasion such as this to enumerate the many advantages and achievements of our land-grant colleges. I do want to associate myself with the gentleman from Utah [Mr. DIXON] in urging the early appointment of this Commission.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIXON. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I too want to join with those who are commending our great land-grant colleges for the fine service they have rendered to America. As you know, we have in the State of Iowa a great agricultural college at Ames. Of course, in the opinion of us from Iowa, it is the best in the Nation. Great things are done at that college and for the many services that that college has rendered not only the farmers of Iowa but the farmers of all of America and all of the people of this great Nation have greatly benefited.

LINCOLN LIGHTED A CANDLE DURING THE DARKEST DAYS OF THE CIVIL WAR—WE COMMEMORATE THE CENTENNIAL IN 1962

Mr. DIXON. Mr. Speaker, May 15, 1962, marks the 100th anniversary of the Department of Agriculture and July 2, 1962, marks the 100th anniversary of legislation providing for the establishment of land-grant colleges and State universities.

On July 1, 1862, the day before Lincoln signed the Morrill Act, which established our system of land-grant colleges, General Lee cut McClellan's communication lines from his base of supplies and McClellan retreated to Malvern Hill. On that 1st day of July 1862, 5,000 men were lost to the South and approximately 1,600 to the North. On that same July 1, 1862, the Treasury in desperation sent out an order saying, "Wherever you find an article, a product, a trade, a profession, or a source of income, tax it."

Yes, those were among the darkest days of the Civil War. Yet President Lincoln, our inspired emancipator, lighted a candle in the darkness. Little wonder that is known as a magnificent act of faith. Would that he were alive today to enjoy the blessings of his vision and to help us plan the commemoration of the 100th anniversary of the founding of the USDA, the land-grant colleges, and the State universities.

The Judiciary Committee of the House of Representatives has fittingly introduced and last week approved H.R. 4012, which if enacted into law will authorize a commission to be known as the Commission for the Commemoration of the 100th Anniversary of the Enactment of Legislation for the Establishment of the

Land-Grant Colleges and State Universities and for the Founding of the United States Department of Agriculture.

It will be the function of the Commission to coordinate and approve suitable plans for celebrating the 100th anniversary of these institutions and to do all things fitting and proper to give support and coordination to the commemoration activities anticipated by the act, including cooperation with States, local and civic bodies, and interested organizations in appropriate local celebrations and participation in regional and national celebrations.

The story is told about Lincoln stopping on a crowded street to pick up a beetle that was on its back and struggling to get on its feet. When he was chided by his companion for causing such a stir he said:

> I wanted to give that beetle the same opportunity as all other beetles.

This great emancipator not only detested African slavery, but the far commoner bondage—that of ignorance. That same Abe Lincoln during the Civil War in 1862 when the Union defeats were pressing the North signed the Morrill Act—which Buchanan had vetoed because the Nation could not afford more colleges and because the land-grant colleges would compete with the liberal arts colleges—and founded the land-grant college for the "liberal and practical education of the industrial—as distinguished from the professional—classes."

Dr. John A. Widstoe, former president of Utah State University and the University of Utah, said:

> For the first time in the history of the world the common man, to which class we all belong, was given access to the great heritage of learning of the ages, and for the first time an attempt was made to lift the common necessary pursuits of life to a professional dignity.

The American tradition of higher education is distinctly different. It had its legal beginning in the signing of the Morrill Act by Abraham Lincoln, the hundredth anniversary of which we are now making plans to celebrate in 1962.

The second tremendous step toward "giving the common man," to which class we all belong, "access to the heritage of the learning of the ages," was and is being made by the 667 comparatively new junior and community colleges which now enroll one out of every four students on the college level and which may soon absorb the bulk of the increase in higher education during the coming decade.

Fortunately for America, our concept of equality of educational opportunity is a far cry from the program of European universities, which are essentially concerned with preparing youth for the learned professions, and whose student bodies are a highly select group. The selection begins toward the close of the elementary school at which time not more than 20 percent of any age group is privileged to attend the preuniversity schools and thence to college, and the selection is often influenced by the class system. The remaining 80 percent, except of a comparatively few, go to work and complete their full-time education at age 14.

As a result, only about one out of every five or six European boys and girls attend college, whereas one out of approximately every three American boys and girls attend college. At the same time, Europe is turning out about the same percent of doctors, lawyers, engineers, scientists, teachers, and scholars as we are, namely, around 6 percent—a surprisingly small percent.

Dr. Conant, in his splendid book, "The American High School Today," points out the tremendous waste in undeveloped talent in Germany, France, Italy, and Switzerland as a result of the selective character of their higher institutions of learning. This is a waste which America cannot afford. In fact, we cannot afford the waste of our own present system, in which fully one-half of the top 25 percent of our high-school graduates never even reach college.

Equality came to mean not only political equality, but equality of educational opportunities, as far as the individual could profit from such opportunity. Unless we build institutions of higher learning and prepare college teachers more rapidly than we are doing today, one out of every three students applying for higher education in 1970 will be turned away, and our American dream of equal educational opportunity will be reduced from a bright light to a mere glimmer.

The land-grant system enrolls one in every five of America's college population. One hundred percent of U.S. doctorate degrees earned in agricultural subjects are conferred by these institutions which on occasion have been described as "cow colleges."

This description is far from displeasing to me, although it is woefully incomplete.

The relationship of these institutions to the Nation's agricultural life is unique. Through their research experiment stations, adult education programs, and their down-to-earth working relationships with State extension services and the Federal Government, the land-grant universities and colleges benefit every U.S. farm family directly.

The fact that the productivity of our agriculture is unparalleled in world history, the fact that our problem in America is how best to use our abundance rather than how to prevent starvation, the fact that we are sharing our plenty with the hungry of this earth—all of these blessings are due in immeasurable degree to our land-grant colleges. The direct influence of these institutions, however, extends far beyond the farm into the homes and working lives of all Americans, and of many peoples around the world. The land-grant colleges—their faculties and graduates—are the principal recruiting ground for men and women of ability and high character who develop and manage our technical assistance programs abroad.

The discovery of streptomycin at a land grant university brought the first sharp breakthrough in control and treatment of tuberculosis. Stilbestrol came to us from another of these universities, and also the first cyclotron. Pioneering research in television and the transistor was done at still another land-grant institution. Soybean procession, the woodpulp and ceramics industries were developed at these colleges—to mention only a few of the many ways they serve us all.

While these institutions enroll 20 percent of U.S. college students, they confer twice that proportion of doctorate degrees or 40 percent of the total in all subjects. In the areas of study considered so vital to our defense, the sciences and engineering, the land-grant colleges award more than half of all U.S. doctorate degrees. They also confer more than half of those in the health professions, and approximately one-fourth of those in the arts and languages, in business and commerce, and in education itself. Through the ROTC programs these colleges provide almost one-half of all the Regular and Reserve officers in our Armed Forces.

Today there are 68 land-grant colleges and universities; at least one of them in every State, Hawaii, and Puerto Rico.

Mr. Speaker, our system of land-grant colleges could hardly have come into being under more forbidding circumstances. The date was July 2, 1862. We were driven asunder from east to west, North against South and brother in arms against brother.

The Confederates attacked on the morning of that 1st of July in 1862. It was a day of fierce and bloody fighting.

On the next day, the 2d of July in 1862, Lincoln affixed his signature to the Morrill Act establishing the land-grant system of colleges.

Little wonder that Lincoln's action has been described as a magnificent act of faith.

That faith, Mr. Speaker, was the faith that higher education for the many—and not only for the few—was the means of making democracy work. The Morrill Act opened the way to equality of opportunity in education, the right of every American to learn what he can. The act, in effect, abolished the caste system in higher education; it has made college possible for people who work for a living.

This was not a new idea in Lincoln's day. It had been much on the minds of the Founding Fathers, although almost a century was to pass before we parted sharply from the traditional European concept of higher learning as the prerogative of an aristocratic few.

In a letter to George Wythe, dated August 13, 1786, Thomas Jefferson wrote:

> I think by far the most important bill in our whole code is that for the diffusion of knowledge among the people. No other sure foundation can be devised for the preservation of freedom and happiness. * * * Preach, my dear sir, a crusade against ignorance; establish and improve the law for educating the common people. Let our countrymen know that the people alone can protect us against these evils, and that the tax which will be paid for this purpose is not more than the thousandth part of what will be paid * * * if we leave the people in ignorance.

That is what Jefferson said, but he did not then see the extent of popular education as we know it today.

The Morrill Act—

Writes Earle Dudley Ross, professor of history at Iowa State—

was the culmination of the evolving idea to that stage and point of departure for the new education of the new industrialized nation. In this body of principles, written and unwritten we have then the Magna Carta of this type of higher education. * * *

First and foremost—

Professor Ross goes on—

the act committed the expanding and consolidating Nation to mass higher education. Historically the provision marked the extension of the public elementary and secondary school systems to the collegiate realm. It thus brought the nearest approach to Jefferson's educational pyramid in the State realm, but with much broader apex than he had envisioned. The conforming State universities, dominated largely by the old traditions in aim and subject matter, had never made such an appeal. Here indeed was "democracy's college"—in design and aspiration. The opportunity was clearly open to all aspiring young people who found existing institutions and courses of study unavailable or unacceptable.

That is how Professor Ross described the basic idea in his excellent book published last year, "The Land Grant Idea at Iowa State College."

The land-grant colleges and universities are so called because the Federal Government under the Morrill Act gave grants of land to the States. Proceeds from sale of the land were to provide endowments to be used for instruction in colleges which would stress agriculture and the mechanic arts as then neglected fields, but also providing liberal and practical education for the industrial classes in the several pursuits and professions of life.

The industrial classes as the term was used 100 years ago included practically everybody who worked for a living, in whatever capacity—and the words did not have the more limited connotation that surround them today.

The principles of the Morrill Act have been extended in two additional laws—the Hatch Act of 1887 providing for joint Federal-State research in agriculture at land-grant institutions, and the Smith-Lever Act of 1914 establishing our present system of extension services, a venture in adult education that has been studied and adapted in varying forms by other countries.

From time to time, Mr. Speaker, unthinking critics have charged the land-grant institutions with being "degree factories." Unfortunately, I believe, this has given some people the picture of a sort of educational beltline on which material of indifferent sort is placed, emerging in due time at the end of the line bearing some polish but otherwise little changed for the better.

The evidence argues to the contrary, and in fact indicates that the quality of education at our public institutions of higher learning is of the highest order. Of the 35 living American Nobel Prize winners who attended college in the United States, 21 have earned degrees from land-grant colleges. That amounts to 60 percent of Nobel winners from institutions which enroll 20 percent of our total college population.

Mr. Speaker, there is a side to this sort of criticism that troubles me deeply. To argue against higher public education for the many and hold that it should be for the few is to say in effect that democracy cannot work and will not last.

If people are to manage their own affairs for themselves they must be informed—and the more of them that are informed, and the better they are informed, the longer self-government will last. Or so it seems to me and, I am happy to say, so it has seemed to many who have gone before us.

Senator Justin Smith Morrill, that great citizen of Vermont, and author of the Morrill Act, was a largely self-educated man. His schooling stopped at the age of 14 years. His many years of work to develop and pass the land-grant legislation is a testimony to his vision, a vision that was unembittered by the meager character of his own formal education.

Many men in all the States, Mr. Speaker, share the credit for the land-grant concept and its practical development in this country. One of the most important of a century ago was Thomas Green Clemson, a man of very different background from that of Mr. Morrill, but who believed with him that education in a democracy must be both broad and deep.

Clemson was trained in the best schools of Europe. A recognized authority in science and economics, he was also expert in the arts, music, and literature.

This benefactor of Clemson College in South Carolina, and son-in-law of John Calhoun, was a leading advocate of the land-grant idea.

Mr. Speaker, it also has been said from time to time that our land-grant colleges are "trade schools" which at their best may turn out competent scientists and technicians, but seldom leaders, or deep thinkers, or philosophers and serious writers.

This banal assertion is readily belied by the long list of Americans who have studied at land-grant colleges and yet somehow survived to be outstanding leaders and thoughtful citizens. Yet, again, there is something deeply disturbing to me about such loose talk.

It is true that technical skills and scientific competence are nothing if we fail in providing avenues to knowledge that makes for vigorous leadership, for the best use of strong minds, and which helps to give us the creators of the art, literature, music that give life its inner meaning.

The central purpose of the land-grant colleges and universities, Mr. Speaker, as I trust it is of our other institutions of higher learning, is to build whole men. Since when, I would like to know, has it been inconsistent with high intelligence to possess skills and acquire training in technical subjects, and in matters of practical consequence? The two things go together in my experience as the president of Utah State University at Logan, a land-grant institution.

What good, you may ask, will a centennial observance do the cause of higher education. Mr. Speaker, we are again today at a time of decision as to essential character of our future educational system. Our existing facilities and staffs for higher education are woefully short of future needs.

College enrollments must double in the next decade, providing we want to give the same relative number of our young people the chance for higher education that we have had. Today, as there were in the day of Lincoln and Morrill, there are citizens among us who insist we should reduce the proportion of our young people who go to college.

Their argument, Mr. Speaker, is based on the premise that fewer opportunities for education will somehow give it higher quality. This is a demonstrably false premise, in my opinion, but one that I fear is being given considerable credence despite its essentially antidemocratic character.

If we hold that all men are created equal—but fail to provide equal opportunity for every man to be educated to the limit of his capacity—we simply do not mean what we say. I believe that we do agree the one logically follows the other in a democratic society, but I also believe that the fundamental importance of it, the daily meaning of it in our lives, has been obscured by time, the mounting complexities of life in this new and eventful age, and by the shallow preoccupations associated with prosperity.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to quote from a speech by John Cowles, president of the Minneapolis Star and Tribune, before an audience at the centennial convocation of Pennsylvania State University on October 21 in 1955. Mr. Cowles, a Harvard man himself, said at that time:

If the quality and the quantity of our mass education in the past half century had not been approximately as good and as widespread as it was, if we had not given each succeeding generation a better education than its parents received, I seriously doubt that our Nation would have been able to preserve its free institutions through the stresses of the past quarter century. * * *

Great as the contribution of the land-grant institutions has been in the past three generations, I venture two predictions—

Mr. Cowles went on in that Pennsylvania speech—

First, it is inevitable that in the immediate and continuing future the responsibilities and the scope of the land-grant institutions are going to be immeasurably larger than they ever have been, not only actually but also in relation to the other segments of our overall educational system. Second, if the land-grant institutions should fail, quantitatively or qualitatively, to play to the full the role which destiny is assigning them, I doubt that we will have a free society and a democratic form of government in the United States a century hence.

Those are strong words from one of our Nation's leading publishers, and I believe they do not overstate the case.

Mr. Speaker, the land-grant colleges are not planning to observe their centennial in 1962 in order to build bonfires and stamp out some self-congratulatory buttons. The purpose of the commemoration is to dramatize the vital connection between democracy itself and our democratic system of higher education.

Another and related purpose of this centennial observance is to review the past in order to secure and improve the

future. Now is the time, if ever there was one, for the colleges and universities of this country to reappraise their way of doing things—and devise and propose better ways of doing them.

It is for the rest of us to assist them in this task, not only by words of advice but with the means to accomplish it.

Unless we expand our support for the colleges consistent with the Nation's population growth, our democratic system of higher education for the many—instead of only a chosen few—just will not last.

Mr. KING of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I should like to join my distinguished colleague and fellow Representative from Utah in commenting upon the great benefits derived by my State, and my district, from the services of the experiment station and extension service of the Utah State University of Agriculture and Applied Sciences, and of the Department of Agriculture.

I have been reliably informed that the experiment station and extension service alone have saved the State of Utah more money every year than their total cost of operation incurred since their establishment many years ago. There was a time when smut was taking some 95 percent of our wheat and barley crop, in some areas. The university has developed smut-resistant varieties which have virtually overcome our problem.

I might also mention turkeys. There was a time when the diseases which attacked our turkeys, and the ensuing mortality, made turkey growing unprofitable. This problem was solved by the experiment station, and today turkey raising is a very important factor in our agricultural economy. Moreover, it used to take 5 pounds of feed to produce 1 pound of broiler chicken meat. This has now been reduced to 2½ pounds.

The members of the Utah Second Congressional District join in expressing thanks for the splendid services of this great university and the Department of Agriculture.

THE CENTENNIAL YEAR OF THE U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE—1962

Mr. DIXON. Mr. Speaker, on March 4 the Committee on the Judiciary reported favorably on H.R. 4012. This legislation would provide for the centennial celebration in 1962 of the establishment of the land-grant colleges and State universities, and the establishment of the Department of Agriculture. In giving my wholehearted endorsement to this bill, I would like to call attention to some outstanding accomplishments made by these institutions in the growth and development of our country.

The Founding Act of the Department of Agriculture was signed by President Abraham Lincoln on May 15, 1862; and the first Morrill Act, approved on July 2, 1862, authorized the granting of public lands in the States and Territories in support of colleges. Out of these beginnings has grown a totally new concept of education, of publicly supported research, and of Federal-State cooperation.

Working together, the Department of Agriculture and the land-grant colleges and State universities have given to the farmers of this country the knowledge that has made them the most efficient agriculture institution the world has ever known. When we see today that 1 farmer produces enough for himself and 23 others, we see the results of applied technical knowledge. For back in 1862 one farmer produced enough for himself and only four others.

In the total perspective, agricultural progress was slow but steady as the research knowledge accumulated, and more and more of our farmers could take advantage of educational opportunities offered through adult extension work, or by taking the full course of academic work offered at the colleges and universities.

This accumulative knowledge reached fruition at a time when it was critically needed, at the beginning of World War II. Farmers were called upon to meet production goals that seemed practically impossible. But they met them. Our greatest progress has come since 1940, and we are far from reaching our potential. Again in terms of production, the farmer in the first 80 years of the past 100, had increased his efficiency so that he could produce enough for himself and 11 others. This was a little more than double the figure for 1862. In the last 20 years, he again has doubled his production output so that he produces enough for himself and 23 others.

The farmer and his acquired knowledge has considerable significance in this agricultural revolution. But education alone is not enough. Even with the best knowledge of techniques, the farmer must have crops scientifically bred to reach a full environmental potential. He must have livestock that produces efficiently the meat, the wool, the milk the consumer wants. He must have the agricultural chemicals to control pests and diseases of both crops and animals. Finally, he must have technical assistance in husbanding his soil and water resources. No one man can master the knowledge necessary to pursue and carry out all of these tasks.

The individual research accomplishments of the Department of Agriculture, and the State experiment stations would make far too long a list to publish here. But the development of hybrid crops and animals alone has more than paid for all the money invested in agricultural research.

Results are not always determined in dollars, nor should they be. Discovery of the cattle tick as the carrier of the so-called Texas fever was the first time that man knew that a disease could be carried by an insect. This led to the discovery that yellow fever was carried by the mosquito, and set a new milestone in the control of human diseases.

Perhaps the greatest tribute to our system of agricultural education and research comes from our many friends in other countries. Not only in the underdeveloped countries, but in Europe as well, they seek to establish systems such as ours.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIXON. I yield.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, to say that I am grateful for all the remarks that have been made here today would be putting it very, very mildly. I want to take this opportunity to say that I am pleased that the celebration on Lincoln has gotten off to such an impressive start. I did have a part in it, but I want to assure you that these things like any other significant move or happening did not just happen without the help of other people. It was my pleasure to enjoy the help of many, many people to make this event on the 11th and 12th of February the success that it was. With reference to the 12th of February, I want to particularly mention the Members of Congress—those of you who were Members on both sides last year who had a part in this because you voted for it and the resolution providing for the joint session carried unanimously. Then, I would be remiss if I did not mention some other people who were very prominent in this. Particularly do I want to mention David Burns, of the Library of Congress, whose invaluable help was very much appreciated in preparing the proper resolution and doing additional research work. And in regard to the members of the committee, one of the members who is not with us at this moment, Congressman Nimtz, did splendid work. The meetings we had were attended almost 100 percent. I think there was only one meeting that we had one absentee. So this was the result of the work of a lot of people who cooperated wonderfully. Within this organization or as a part of this group, there was another man I should mention whose work went far beyond the call of duty. He is one of the important people in the Office of the Clerk of the House, Mr. Harry McGill, who had much to do in helping us with the details and in developing the program.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may extend their remarks at this point.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. DIXON. I thank you, Mr. Speaker, and I thank the Members who participated in the discussion.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

THE FEDERAL RESERVE AUTOCRACY: MAKES ECONOMIC POLICY TO SUIT ITSELF; GOES UNAUDITED FOR 46 YEARS; INVESTIGATES ITS OWN SCANDALS IN THE GOVERNMENT SECURITIES MARKET; NEEDS ATTENTION OF CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. THORNBERRY). Under the previous order of the House the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, the Federal Reserve Board's action last Thursday has come as a shock to many of us. By raising the discount rate from 2½ to 3 percent, the Federal Reserve drove home the point that it has embarked on another tight-money squeeze.

Actually, this sudden and large jump in the discount rate does not do a great deal more than confirm what the Federal Reserve System had already accomplished, but with little notice, during the preceding several weeks. It had already been putting the country back into a period of tight money and high interest.

A discount rate of 3 percent now is exactly the same as the discount rate of 3 percent which was maintained in the first 7 months of 1957. This was the period when money was made tightest and finally brought on the recession which began in August of 1957. We may not expect that credit will be of about the same stringency as then, but long-term interest rates on Government bonds will undoubtedly go even higher than in 1957. The Treasury has recently had great difficulty in marketing its securities. And the President has warned that he expects to ask Congress to raise the legal ceiling on the rates at which the Treasury can issue long-term bonds. This ceiling is now 4¼ percent and has been in effect since shortly after the end of the First World War.

I have no doubt that many Members of the Congress will be demanding an investigation of the Federal Reserve's latest action. To tighten money and choke off the business recovery now, when almost 7 percent of our labor force is unemployed, seems to many of us almost an irrational action. Furthermore, this action, which promises to bring on a new "space age" of high-interest rates on Government securities, is one which will not go unchallenged.

I wish now to point out to the Members as they consider the need for an investigation into these matters that there are some other conditions and practices, both in the Federal Reserve System and in the Treasury Department, which are crying for investigation. These are all part of the same cloth.

For example, the Members may have noted the news story carried by the Washington Post and Times Herald this morning entitled "U.S. Bond Market Speculation Probed." In this article, which is by Joseph R. Slevin, of the Herald Tribune News Service, it is reported that the Treasury Department and the Federal Reserve System said yesterday they have begun a joint investigation of the Government bond market. The two agencies are reported as saying they want to prevent excessive speculation.

It is further stated that this investigation is a direct outgrowth of a speculative buying spree and subsequent market collapse in 1958, which, according to this article, was the worst debacle in the history of the United States public finance.

Now, I would call your attention to the fact that this debacle occurred early in June of last year. The investigation should have been made long ago. The investigation should not have been delayed until such time as it is apparent that the Federal Reserve's new tight-money policy is going to drive U.S. Government bond prices down, and the yields on these bonds up.

This investigation is still needed, yes. It is needed very badly. But how in the name of heaven can we expect the Federal Reserve and the Treasury to come out with findings which will condemn themselves, their own practices, and their own contribution to these wild speculations in Government bonds that have been taking place in recent years. An investigation is needed, yes, but not an investigation made by the people who have had a major part in the crime. The investigation should be made by Congress.

These runaway speculations in the Government securities market are the faults of the Treasury and the Federal Reserve System. They have been caused specifically by a combination of three factors: First, an unregulated market in Government securities with gambling on very low margins, and recently with no money down at all. Both the Federal Reserve and the Treasury have resisted any regulation of this market although such regulation has been proposed—by me for one—for many years.

Second, a long history of Treasury giveaways has caused speculation. It has been the practice almost throughout this administration for the Treasury to issue fixed-interest securities at artificially high interest rates. The result has usually been that the securities were reselling in the open market at premium prices immediately after the Treasury issued them. And the result has been that a great many speculators have made killings.

Third, each change in direction of the Federal Reserve's monetary policy drives the Government bond market up or down, and there have been quite a few instances where all the evidence has pointed to leaks before new policies were announced. And the fact is that the professional bond dealers and other big-time money speculators are close enough to observe the Federal Reserve's course of zigzagging to make shrewd guesses about which way it is going, even without having the benefit of an inside tip.

I do not want to prejudge an investigation by the Treasury and the Federal Reserve, but I think those of us who have tried to do something over the years with this situation will be very much surprised if it is not a whitewash.

TEAPOT DOME SCANDAL IS PEANUTS COMPARED TO SCANDAL IN GOVERNMENT BOND MARKET

The first thing that should be done with the Government securities market is take the loaded dice away from the pet dealers in securities and the favorites of the administration. The Teapot Dome scandal was peanuts compared to the scandals involved in the Government bond market.

Over the years, I have supported resolutions calling for an investigation and audit of the Federal Reserve System. On May 5, 1953, during the 83d Congress, when a hearing was being conducted before the Committee on Banking and Currency of the House of Representatives on H.R. 4605, I interrogated the Chairman of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, Mr. William McChesney Martin; commencing on page 18 of the printed hearings of that date, there is the following:

Mr. PATMAN. Is it not a fact, Mr. Martin, that the Federal Reserve Act is 40 years old this year, 1953, and that during that time the United States Government has never made any audit of the Federal Reserve System, or any Federal Reserve bank?

Mr. MARTIN. Well, the Board of Governors is part of the Government of the United States.

Mr. PATMAN. I know, but it is part of the Federal Reserve System, too.

Mr. MARTIN. It is part of the Federal Reserve System.

Mr. PATMAN. But I am talking about any independent audit. No independent audit has ever been made by any agency of the Federal Government—that is, independent audit. Of course you are a part of the Federal Reserve System. I am speaking about Lindsay Warren's group, or anybody like that?

Mr. MARTIN. If you are talking about the Board, that is correct, sir.

Mr. PATMAN. Or the Federal Reserve banks, either, I mean the regional banks.

Mr. MARTIN. That is correct.

Mr. PATMAN. Never in 40 years.

Now, although we know that the gold is over there in Fort Knox, and we have no reason to believe that the gold certificates and the money is not just exactly as it should be, just like the gold, yet we have had no audit of them, have we?

Mr. MARTIN. There has been no audit.

Mr. PATMAN. In 40 years.

Mr. MARTIN. No audit of the Federal Reserve banks.

In addition, the following questions and answers between Mr. Martin and me appear commencing at page 19 of the hearings:

Mr. PATMAN. You have had audits annually, haven't you?

Mr. MARTIN. We are required by law to have annual audits.

Mr. PATMAN. That is right, but the reports are made to you. Do you not think it would be within our discretion as Members of this committee to have access over those audits over the past few years, and let us see what the situation is? We think everything is all right, and you think it is, too, but you know, as an agency of this body, do you not think those audits should be made available to the members of this committee?

Mr. MARTIN. Would you care to come down and look at them?

Mr. PATMAN. No; why not bring them up here?

Mr. MARTIN. Because there are so many confidential items in there, and I question very much whether they should be made a matter of public record.

Mr. PATMAN. But the members of this committee are responsible persons, and the chairman is certainly a very responsible person, and they would be in the charge of the chairman and the clerk, who is also a very responsible person.

Mr. MARTIN. We went all through this with your committee. I would be very glad to have you or the whole committee come down and look at the audits.

Mr. PATMAN. What about bringing them up here, Mr. Chairman; do you not think that would be a reasonable request.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. WOLCOTT of Michigan). I doubt very much whether it is germane to this bill.

Imagine, in a country like ours, the Congress permitting a situation like this to go on for 46 years. The conspicuous thing about the answers of Mr. Martin, stated above, is the fact that he acts like an autocrat. He speaks like an autocrat would speak. His agency is a servant of the Congress; not the master. Imagine the servant of the Congress telling a committee of the Congress that if the members want to see the audits by their own private auditors and never made public to come down to the offices of this sacred cow and they will be permitted to see parts of the audits. He politely gave us notice that certain parts were confidential and we would not be able to see those parts. We almost have to pinch ourselves to see if we are living here in a democracy in a civilized country when things like this are disclosed.

Now, back to these audit reports. Last year I did finally succeed in obtaining them—or rather in obtaining portions of them. I have succeeded in obtaining selected parts of all the reports going back for several years. Mr. Martin gave in to a certain degree and sent up to the House Committee on Banking and Currency a portion of each report for each Federal Reserve bank for a period of 6 years. He still insisted, however, that those portions of these reports which deal with the conduct of the officers of the banks and investments and possible market speculations are confidential. He would not permit these portions of the reports to be seen.

Even so, those parts of the report which he did send up contained many shocking things. Yes, shocking.

Yet all I have seen are audit reports made by the Federal Reserve itself—by its own personnel—and only the uncensored portions of the reports at that.

Early last year I pointed out to the House Committee on Banking and Currency some of the shocking misuses of money and shocking mismanagements of the Government's business which turned up in these reports for the earlier years. I have now gone through the reports made just last year. I believe the Members would be most disturbed to know of some of the things these reports reveal.

SUPPOSE POSTMASTERS SPENT GOVERNMENT MONEY LIKE THE FEDERAL RESERVE

The Federal Reserve banks are as much a part of the Government as the post offices and postmasters. Suppose it should be discovered that a postmaster used the money that he takes in from stamp sales and for other purposes to buy himself a membership in a golf club; or to entertain groups of friends at the expense of the post office funds; or to subsidize the meals of his employees up to 50 percent; or to make contributions to different associations at the expense of the funds, and expend money in many other ways as a private business in the locality might spend money. Do you think that Congress would put up with it? Of course not.

In the case of the postmaster or the Post Office Department, Congress has a remedy. The Congress can place limitations on the appropriation bills and place limitations and restrictions on the expenditures of the funds handled by the postmaster and the Post Office Department.

In the case of the Federal Reserve, however, this is different. Congress permits the Federal Reserve banks to take money, free of charge, from the Bureau of Engraving and Printing and trade this money, which is a noninterest-bearing Government obligation, and exchange it for U.S. Government securities that are interest bearing. The 12 Federal Reserve banks keep these securities—at least, the New York Bank keeps them—and they collect the interest on them. In this way the System collects enough money to spend for all desired purposes without coming to Congress for money. In this way, the Federal Reserve receives about $600 million a year paid by the taxpayers. And after the Federal Reserve officials spend all of this income they desire to spend, including spending for purposes wholly unrelated to the public business, they hand back 90 percent of the remainder to the U.S. Treasury.

I wonder how much longer Congress will permit this situation to continue without investigating to find out what is being done and by whom?

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald, Mar. 9, 1959]

U.S. BOND MARKET SPECULATION PROBED

(By Joseph R. Slevin)

The Treasury Department and the Federal Reserve System said yesterday they have begun a joint investigation of the multi-billion-dollar Government bond market.

The two agencies declared they want to prevent excessive speculation and to improve the functioning of the market. They said that the inquiry will be factual.

The investigation is a direct outgrowth of a speculative buying spree and subsequent market collapse in 1958. The agencies said their study will focus on those developments.

The 1958 fiasco was the worst debacle in the history of U.S. public finance. Thousands of investors lost money. The Government bond market became demoralized and has not yet regained public confidence.

The Treasury and the Federal Reserve said they expect to complete their joint study in time to make it public about midyear. The findings presumably will be laid before congressional committees.

A Herald Tribune News Service investigation last summer disclosed that loose corporate, bank, and Government bond dealer lending practices made it possible for speculators to obtain huge quantities of Government bonds without making a down payment and without paying interest. Some of the Nation's biggest corporations and banks financed the speculators and simultaneously speculated heavily on their own.

The Treasury and Federal Reserve made it plain that the plungers' credit deals will be a prime target of their probe.

They said they will ask for data from major lenders and participants in the Government bond market including banks, corporations, dealers and brokers.

The news service investigation revealed that banks and corporations financed hundreds of millions of dollars of speculative activity by buying securities that they then agreed to resell at a future date to a speculator or to a money broker who acted as the speculator's middleman. These arrangements were called repurchase agreements and buybacks.

A number of banks violated the precepts of sound banking by lending money to speculators they didn't know. Direct loans were often granted without margin.

The bubble burst in mid-June after the plungers had joined with legitimate investors in buying more than $7 billion of new 2½ percent 7-year Government bonds. The bond market faltered with signs that the recession was ending. It broke sharply when speculators began to dump huge holdings of Government obligations.

Net free reserves of member banks[1]

[In millions of dollars]

	1957	1958
January	$117	$122
February	−126	324
March	−316	495
April	−505	493
May	−444	547
June	−508	484
July	−383	546
August	−471	383
September	−467	95
October	−344	96
November	−293	20
December	−133	−41

	1959
Jan. 7	−$83
Jan. 14	−152
Jan. 21	[2] +84
Jan. 28	[2] −111
Feb. 4	[2] −11
Feb. 11	[2] +18
Feb. 18	[2] −138
Feb. 25	[2] −81
Mar. 4	[2] −177

[1] Excess reserves minus borrowings from Federal Reserve banks.
[2] Preliminary.

Source: Federal Reserve bulletins and weekly releases.

SPECULATION IN U.S. BONDS

(By Joseph R. Slevin, national economics editor, New York Herald Tribune)

FOUR HUNDRED MILLION DOLLARS LOST BY U.S. SPECULATORS SINCE JUNE—EFFECTS TO BE FELT FOR MONTHS YET

WASHINGTON, September 1.—The Treasury Department said $7,388,000,000 of new bonds last June and the dust hasn't settled yet. It was the worst debacle in the history of U.S. Government borrowing. The bonds have been declining in value since the day the subscription books closed and they still were edging lower last week.

Individuals bought the bonds. So did banks, corporations, brokers, dealers, and insurance companies. Some bought the bonds as permanent investments. But an astonishingly large number bought the bonds for speculation. The real and paper losses of the buyers totaled almost $400 million when the Labor Day weekend began.

The loss is the largest that ever has been suffered by the buyers of a new issue of securities in so short a time. Every fresh decline in the bond market adds to its size.

Some lose millions

The real dollars-and-cents losses are being borne by the speculators who bought the bonds to make a quick profit and instead have been selling them out at strapping losses. There are some individuals and syndicates who now count their losses in the millions.

The paper losses are on the books of the investors who bought the bonds for the 2½ percent interest that they pay, still have them, and plan to redeem them for 100 cents on the dollar when they mature on February 15, 1965. They will be hurt only if they are forced to sell at depressed prices before the bonds come due.

No one is wise enough to say how much of the drop was caused by the speculators overbuying the 2½s and then hastily dumping

them when the market broke. The bond market was ready to turn down, and the skid in the new bonds has been accompanied by a steep slide in the prices of other Government securities. But there is general agreement among financial experts that the entire U.S. Government securities market has plummeted far more swiftly than it would have if the speculators had not moved in.

The magnitude of the speculative activity was staggering. The best guess now is that speculators bought more than $3 billion of Government bonds during the June refunding. That represents the difference between the $7,388 million total issue and an advance Treasury estimate that the true investor demand for the new 2⅝s would total between $3 billion and $4 billion.

"These guys must have thought they were playing with marbles," a leading investment banker said recently. Guys who had never owned more than a few stocks and bonds found that they had signed up to take millions of dollars of Government bonds."

Will be felt for months

The impact of the June fiasco will be felt for many months to come. It is a matter of profound national concern.

The market for United States Government securities has been disrupted and it has become measurably more difficult for the Treasury to finance the Government debt in a sound and orderly fashion.

The Federal Reserve System, which is charged with regulating the national money and credit supply, found its activities limited this summer by a need to be solicitous of the weakened Government securities market.

The persistent decline in bond prices has scared off the big Government bond houses that are supposed to make a market by buying, selling, and owning Government securities. They are reluctant buyers for they fear that further price declines—and further losses—are ahead. The new bonds plunged from a peak price of just over 100 13/32 on June 5 to a low of 93 28/32 last Friday—a drop of $6.54 in the value of every $100 bond.

Separate investigations of the June break are being made by the Federal Reserve and the New York Stock Exchange. Whether they can or will find solutions that will make it more difficult for the speculators to come into the Government bond market in the future remains to be seen.

There is a widespread conviction that it must not be allowed to happen again.

The damage to the market, to credit policy, to investors, and to the financial integrity of the country has been too great.

The full story of what happened has not been told and perhaps it never will be. But the major pieces now can be fitted together.

It is easier to single out those who played a part in the events leading to the collapse than it is to parcel out responsibility. Many people were involved. Many forces were at work. Some of the biggest corporations and banks in the country did things they intend never to do again.

But there is no one scapegoat.

The responsibility must be shared among:

Individual, corporate, bank, and broker-dealer speculators who unsuccessfully tried to make a killing in the Government bond market;

More than 100 leading corporations that supplied hundreds of millions of dollars to the speculators to finance their bond purchases;

Dozens of substantial banks that financed security purchases at little or no cost to the speculators;

A money broker who financed more than $500 million of the bond purchases by acting as go-between for the corporations and the banks on the one side, and brokerage houses and individual speculators on the other;

Brokerage houses, including stock exchange firms, that speculated in Government bonds for their own account and encouraged their customers to do the same.

Government bonds houses and banks that sold securities to stock exchange firms on terms that permitted the buyer to delay payment until a date in the future;

The Federal Reserve System, which made money so cheap in pursuit of its anti-recession policy that the speculative deals became tempting to corporations and banks that were in search of income;

The Treasury Department, which shared the general blindness about the events that were taking place and thus arranged the refunding on terms that tempted the speculators to make their play.

A minority caused the trouble—a minority of the corporations, a minority of the stock exchange houses, a minority of the investors.

The speculative fever burned its hottest in Wall Street, but it fanned out across the country and blinded the speculators and the lenders to the risks that they were taking.

It was a classic speculative surge. Hardened professionals and naive clerks all reached the same happy conclusion: the Government bond market could go only one way—"up"—and there was money to be made for the asking.

But they were wrong.

BIG PROFITS MADE IN FEBRUARY PURCHASES LURED PLUNGERS INTO JUNE DEBACLE

WASHINGTON, September 2.—Wall Street now holds the "gay '90's" party responsible for last June's big speculative purchases of the Government's new 2⅝ percent bonds.

The financial center is not talking about the colorful decade that ended the 19th century. Instead, it is pointing directly at a $1,727 million issue of 3½ percent bonds—due in 1990—that the Treasury sold in mid-February.

These were the "gay '90's." They soared to a peak price of 107 10/32s during the weeks after they were issued. Speculators had been heavy buyers at the offering price of 100 and the big paper profits whetted their appetities for more when they looked ahead to the $9,550 million refunding that the Treasury would have to carry out in June.

But one episode

The "gay '90's" were but one glittering episode in a story of huge speculative profits that began when the Federal Reserve System abandoned its tight money policy in mid-November of last year. The shift to an antirecession, easy-money policy and the impact of the business downturn on market expectations led to the sharpest drop in interest rates—and the steepest rise in bond prices—in history.

That was when the professionals began to make big money.

They reaped enormous profits by buying outstanding Government bonds and holding them while prices rose. They made millions more by buying 3⅞ percent, 17-year bonds that the Treasury sold in December and 3 percent, 6-year bonds that it sold with the 32-year "gay '90's" in February.

It was against this background of a pell-mell price rise and confident expectations of further increases to come that the speculators began to build their positions for the June refunding. It seemed certain that the recession would continue for many more months and that bond prices would continue to climb as interest rates fell. It didn't look like a gamble. The word went out: There's no risk. It's a sure thing. It's a free ride. Get on board.

Bonds prices customarily are pushed to higher levels when business activity declines. The supply of money grows while the demand for funds weakens. People bid against one another to buy the available supply of bonds.

The biggest plungers—and the heaviest losers—are believed to have been a Miami, Fla., family group. They are known to have had close to $90 million of new bonds and there are some indications that their purchases were substantially larger. They held on to their bonds after the market broke in June, kept hoping that a fresh rise would get under way, and didn't begin unloading in earnest until August.

They sold many millions out at 96 cents on the dollar and sold millions more at 95. Their losses have been estimated at almost $5 million—and just last Thursday a dealer found evidence that they still were selling.

The "Miami crowd," as they now are known in Wall Street and other giant speculators could operate on a magnificent scale because a money broker arranged to give the speculators access to the idle cash of some of the country's biggest corporations. The speculators paid no interest, usually did not put up any money of their own, and gave the corporations temporary title to the bonds to protect the loan.

They called the deals repurchase agreements. Sometimes they did them with banks and called them buybacks.

A Boston broker arranged $73 million of loans for his customers through the money broker. A prominent oil industry official came to the money broker. So did the head of a Midwest brewery, the lawyer for a big mutual fund, a top officer of a big defense company, and many, many others.

Bank officials got caught up in the rush and in at least two instances they approached Government bond dealers for special credit arrangements. The big foreign agency banks in Wall Street helped to finance the speculators, and substantial foreign interests, including Greek shipowner money, joined the profit-hungry throng.

The speculative excitement spread during May from the big Government bond operators to brokerage houses and through them to thousands of little people who had never bought a marketable Government bond in their lives. The stock market showed signs of weakening and brokers talked up the rising Government bond market as a smart hedge against the threat of a stock market break.

Where $100,000 deals always have been looked on as small potatoes in the Government bond market, some brokerage houses pushed the bonds in $5,000 and $10,000 blocks.

Some asked margin. Others didn't. One novice speculator bought $1 million of the new bonds by putting up only $1,500—a margin payment of exactly three-twentieths of 1 percent. He sold out at a profit of $180 before the market broke. If he had waited just a little longer, he would have lost $7,000.

The public had missed out on the "gay '90s" and the big profits of the winter and early spring. The public came in during the last days of May and the first days of June—in time for the crash landing.

Toward the end of June, about 10 days after the market broke, a preoccupied trader for one of the leading Government bond houses stopped at a cigar stand and absent-mindedly asked for "a pack of 2⅝s."

"How are they doing?" the clerk asked. "I've got a hundred of them myself."

Another major dealer received a call at about the same time from a man who asked the price of the 2⅝s. When the dealer said they were selling at 99½, the caller said he would like to sell some.

The big bond houses trade with other dealers, banks and brokerage houses but don't usually trade with individuals.

"What's your name and how many do you have?" the dealer asked. "Five million," replied the caller and gave a name that the dealer didn't recognize.

"Who are you?" the puzzled dealer inquired.

"A used car dealer in Jersey City," the man replied.

PLUNGERS WAITED IN VAIN FOR RALLY

WASHINGTON, September 3.—Professional speculators, commercial banks, big corporations, bond dealers and stockbrokers got caught with the dress manufacturers, real estate salesmen, storekeepers, stenographers and ribbon clerks when the Government's new 2⅝-percent bonds broke par June 19.

Some people got out in time, but most didn't. A few Government bond dealers had sensed that a change was coming and had been quietly reducing their inventories for some days before the market broke. But many speculators wouldn't believe that the turn had come and hung on to their bonds—hoping that the slump would be brief, hoping that a rally would carry the bonds back above par and at least let them get even.

The rally never appeared.

The 2⅝s were in weak hands. Too many 6-year 8-month bonds were owned by individuals and corporations who didn't want to own marketable governmental bonds, had no business owning them—and couldn't wait to get rid of them.

They were speculators. They were not investors. They had bought the bonds in the hope of a quick profit. Now that the bonds were going down instead of up, they wanted out.

Price changes in the Government bond market customarily are small and the speculators signed up for huge quantities of the 2⅝s in their attempt to make a profit. They had to buy in on little or no margin to get the leverage they needed.

A composite case in point would be a speculator of modest means who bought $1 million of bonds on credit, made no down payment, and was startled to realize that he had, in effect, signed a pay-on-demand note for $1 million.

A speculator who dealt with one of the New York Stock Exchange firms that lived up to the N.Y.S.E. rules by charging the full 5-percent margin that the exchange requires would have had to put up $5,000 on a $100,000 deal.

He still had powerful leverage. A one point rise would have returned a $1,000 profit. That figures out to a 20 percent return on a $5,000 investment within a few short weeks.

It was a different story when the market broke. Every point decline meant a $1,000 loss to the small speculator who had $100,000 of bonds. It meant a $10,000 loss to the speculator who had $1 million of bonds.

Speculators sell

The speculators had no stomach for that kind of pounding. They didn't plan to keep the bonds for 6 years 8 months and couldn't have paid for them if they had wanted to. One after another, the speculators began to sell out.

Some of the largest corporations of the country contributed to the debacle by speculating heavily in the 2⅝s. Corporations normally invest their funds in short-term securities that mature in a year or less. They know they will need the money within a short time for taxes, dividend payments or equipment purchases and choose temporary investments that can be liquidated quickly.

But the 6-year 8-month bonds were too tempting. The corporate treasurers knew about the big profits that had been made in the Government's February issue of "gay '90's" and they thought that bond prices still were rising.

Treasurer after treasurer threw caution to the winds and decided that he would buy the 2⅝s, hold them until they rose to a premium of 101, 102, or perhaps even 103, then kick them out at a profit and switch to the 1-year and under securities that he should have bought in the first place.

The 2⅝s didn't go up. Some corporations sold out at a loss and added to the pressures that depressed the bond market. Others still are carrying the 2⅝s on their books in red ink. It's a safe guess that many red-faced corporate treasurers have spent uncomfortable hours explaining their June gambling enthusiasm to company presidents and boards of directors.

The startling fact is that corporations directly and indirectly financed more than $1 billion of the speculative purchases of the 2⅝s. A Treasury survey shows that corporations—which had been expected to buy only a handful of the bonds—actually took $1,045 million worth.

The corporations didn't buy the entire $1,045 million of bonds for their own speculative operations. A sizable share—certainly many hundreds of millions—represents bonds that the corporations took for the individual speculators that they were financing through the "repurchase agreements."

Corporations were tempted to speculate in the 2⅝s partly because they were unenthusiastic about a 1¼ percent interest rate that the Treasury attaches to a 1-year certificate that it issued at the same time as the 2⅝s. The corporations normally would have gravitated toward the 1-year security to meet their short-term investment needs, but the Treasury survey reveals that they bought a relatively meager $570 million of the certificates while taking the incredible $1,045 million of intermediate bonds.

Commercial banks speculated heavily, too. They were expected to be substantial buyers of the 2⅝s since a 6-year 8-month bond is an attractive investment for many commercial banks. But the banks bought many more than they needed for their own portfolios.

The Treasury breakdown shows that commercial banks took $4,031 million of the 2⅝s. The bank takings alone thus exceeded an advance Treasury estimate that total subscriptions to the 2⅝s by all comers would total somewhere between $3 billion and $4 billion and played a significant role in boosting the total bond issue to $7,388 million. Where the Treasury had expected to sell $5 to $6 billion of the 1-year certificates, it received orders for only $1,817 million.

The bank figures undoubtedly exaggerated the volume of direct bank speculation just as the corporate figures exaggerate the amount of direct corporate speculation. The bank total includes the 2⅝s that the banks bought for speculators who had arranged direct loans and for speculators who had arranged "buy-backs."

Ironically, commercial banks from one end of the country to the other were steadily—and injudiciously—buying the 2⅝s during the delicately balanced mid-June weeks when the Government bond dealers were cautiously liquidating their own holdings.

The bank purchases helped give the Government bond market a deceptive appearance of stability in mid-June just as heavy specualtive buying in May had made the market look stronger than it really was.

The commercial bank speculation didn't add directly to the downward pressures after the market broke because the banks kept their 2⅝s in preference to selling them out at a loss. Normally, though, the banks would have bought up some of the 2⅝s as they were released by the speculators. But the banks were overstuffed and wanted none of them. An important cushion was missing when the speculators began to unload.

MONEY BROKERS TAP IDLE RESERVES OF FIRMS, BANKS TO PLAY MARKET

WASHINGTON, September 4—One day in late February a New York investment banking house called a prominent money broker and asked him to arrange a $30,000,000 "loan" for an unidentified individual. The money broker quickly complied. It was the first of many such "loans" that ultimately led the money broker to set up the financing for more than $500,000,000 of speculation in the Treasury's June issue of 2⅝ percent bonds.

The initial deal was arranged for tax rather than for speculative purposes. So were a number of the other transactions that the money broker negotiated during the following months. But the method that he used was peculiarly well adapted to financing speculation in Government bonds.

The word spread rapidly and the demand for the "loans" mounted. The money broker arranged some deals for big individual speculators including the Miami crowd that bought about $90,000,000 of bonds. Most of his deals were negotiated for members of the New York Stock Exchange and for other brokers who wanted financing for themselves or for their customers.

He wasn't the only money broker who participated in financing the June speculation but he was the most active. He showed speculators how they could tap the huge reserves of idle corporate and bank money to play the Government securities market.

The money broker called his deals "repurchase agreements" when he made them with corporation and "buy-backs" when he made them with banks.

Speculators liked the deals because they obtained millions of dollars of Government bonds without paying any interest and without putting up any money of their own.

Corporations and banks liked the deals because they held Government obligations as security and collected more interest than they could have obtained through conventional financing techniques.

The first $30,000,000 deal set the broad pattern that the others followed. Here is how a typical repurchase agreement worked:

Acting on the instructions of the money broker, a big corporation with idle cash bought $30 million of 2⅜ percent Government bonds that were scheduled to mature June 15. The money broker agreed to buy the bonds from the corporation by the maturity date and contracted in turn to sell them to an individual or a brokerage house that had placed the original order.

Pockets interest

The corporation pocketed all or most of the 2⅜ percent interest that the bonds paid. Frequently it agreed in advance to accept only 2 or 2⅛ or 2¼ percent and the money broker kept the rest.

It was an attractive deal because the corporation received about twice the income it would have obtained by the traditional device of investing its funds in short-term Treasury bills. The bills yielded about 1 percent during most of the spring.

The money broker collected 1/32 of 1 percent commission on the bond transaction.

The speculator was assured delivery of the bonds on the date that he wanted, at the price the corporation had paid, and at a cost of only the 1/32 commission that he would in any event have had to pay a broker for buying the bonds.

Banks found the buy-backs even more lucrative than the corporations did. The interest they received from the 2⅜s contrasted sharply with the ⅛ to ¼ of 1 percent that they could have obtained by lending their surplus "Federal funds" to other banks during the period in late May when the speculative fever was at its peak.

The wide spread in the interest rate structure was responsible for the strong appeal that the speculative loans had for both the corporations and the banks. The spread had developed in large part because of the aggressive manner in which the Federal Reserve System had been pursuing its antirecession easy-money policy.

Biggest is $84 million

The biggest repurchase agreement that the money broker arranged totaled $84 million. It was negotiated with a mutual fund.

One corporation made $70 million available. Another provided $60 million. More than 100 other corporations and some two dozen banks provided substantial but lesser amounts.

The speculators used the money to have the corporations and banks buy "rights" to the new securities that the Treasury would issue in its $9,550 million June refunding. "Rights" are maturing obligations that the Treasury encourages investors to exchange for new Government securities. Some speculators chose the 2⅜ percent bonds that matured June 15 while others bought the 2⅞ percent notes that came due the same day.

Most of the wealthy individuals who originally came to the money broker for tax reasons stayed to gamble. They got caught up in the speculative excitement of late spring and failed to sell out in time to achieve their tax objectives.

One affluent citizen brought $22,825,000 worth of rights for tax purposes through a repurchase agreement. He acted on the advice of a prominent New York accountant who told him that $22,825,000 was the exact amount that he needed. He bought the rights at a premium and gave orders that they were to be exchanged for the 2⅝s, which then were to be sold out immediately.

But he heard that the 2⅝s were going up canceled the sell order, and finally sold at a heavy loss after the 2⅝s broke par.

Didn't sell in time

Another individual bought $25 million of the rights, then became more interested in speculation than in taxes and bought an additional $36 million—a total repurchase deal of $61 million. He didn't sell in time, suffered a substantial loss, and is mad as a wet hen at the money broker that he dealt with.

The tax plan was only for people in the upper brackets and only for people who had substantial losses on other investments.

Take the hypothetical case of a man in the 70 percent income-tax bracket who bought about $30 million of rights and paid 100$^{30}/_{32}$s for each bond. The premium payments of eight thirty-seconds totaled $75,000. A taxpayer is permitted to deduct premium payments from ordinary income. This means the taxpayer could subtract the $75,000 from his taxable income. The saving for a man in the 70 percent bracket amounted to $52,000.

He still had to take two more steps. He had to convert the rights into the new Treasury securities and had to sell out the new securities immediately to get his money back.

The market was rising. The taxpayer assumed that he would be able to get back his $75,000 of premium money by collecting at least as big a premium on the new June security as he had paid on the rights.

But he would lose his tax saving if he had to pay a 70 percent tax on the premium that he collected. The scheme therefore provided for writing off the premium income against carryover losses that the taxpayer had suffered from unfavorable investments in previous years.

The market remained strong for a brief period after the tax operators converted their rights into the 2⅝s. But most waited too long to sell.

MONEY BROKER TRADED ON NAME TO BACK HALF-BILLION IN DEALS

WASHINGTON, September 6.—The Wall Street money broker who arranged the financing for more than $500 million of speculation in the Treasury's June refunding didn't invent the techniques that he used but he polished them up and put them to work on a scale that had never been seen before.

Individual speculators and brokerage houses, who could not have swung the deals on their own, obtained interest-free, no-downpayment access to huge quantities of corporate and bank credit for speculating in the U.S. Government securities market.

Broker's good name

The money broker got them the money by putting his own name instead of theirs on the repurchase agreements and buybacks that he negotiated with corporations and banks. He traded on his high reputation and solid credit-standing to make deals that corporate treasurers and bank lending officers would not have made with his clients.

At the peak of his operations, he had commitments to buy more than $500 million of Government bonds from corporations and banks. Individuals and brokerage houses in turn had promised to buy the bonds from the money broker.

But people up and down Wall Street shudder today to think of what might have happened if the Government bond market break had been sharper than it was—and if a number of the speculators had reneged on their contracts with the money broker.

He lost a large sum of money but he met all of his commitments and disappointed some Wall Street bankers who had been confidently predicting that he would go under.

The New York Stock Exchange has been auditing the money broker's books and is conducting a wide-ranging investigation of his operations in an attempt to find out whether any of its rules have been violated. It began looking into the situation after the 2⅝s came on the markets June 15. In early July it ordered him to liquidate $376 million of "repurchase agreements" and "buy backs" that he still had in force.

Wall Street plan

The methods that the money broker used had been developed in the last few years by the big Government bond houses to finance their portfolios of Government securities at lower interest rates than they would have had to pay the Wall Street banks.

The bond dealers tapped corporations and banks all around the country and one result was that corporate treasurers and bank lending officers felt at home in negotiating repurchase agreements with the money broker. They were working with a type of transaction they had come to know well.

The money broker for his part had been using the same devices on a smaller scale to finance tax savings deals and elaborate arbitrage transactions for his clients. He had established a special place for himself as a clearinghouse for banks that wanted to buy and sell Federal funds. On his biggest day, his transactions fell just $30 million short of an even $1 billion.

Bank lending officers in large- and medium-sized communities all around the country knew him. Borrowers came to him for he could obtain money much more cheaply than they could get it for themselves. Because of his dealings in Federal funds, he always knew which banks had extra money they were anxious to lend.

It only gradually dawned upon the banks and the corporations that the deals they had made with the money broker were riskier than their customary transactions with the Government bond houses. Some lenders were less knowledgeable than they might have been. Others had bee lulled by eager talk of a rising bond market and riskless transactions.

Those who came in at the beginning started out with one type of commitment and ended with another. But even so they probably would not have become nervous if the bond market had not weakened.

June redemptions

The original repurchase agreements and buybacks covered the 2⅜-percent rights that matured June 15. Banks didn't fret about entering into deals secured by a Government bond that could be redeemed at par in mid-June. Neither did the corporations.

But, when the speculators told the lenders to exchange the rights for the new 2⅝s, the character of the deal changed profoundly. Instead of holding riskless securities, the banks and corporations now had title to Government bonds that would not mature until February 15, 1956, and that would fluctuate in price.

The lenders had not thought to obtain a promise of collateral from the money broker to protect them against a decline in price. He in turn had not obtained margin from his clients for he did not consider them brokerage customers who would be subject to the Stock Exchange requirement of a 5-point margin payment.

Bank examination officials maintain they are not disturbed by the buybacks since they know of no bank that suffered a substantial loss. Many bankers vigorously disagree. They consider it unsound banking to lend money on a 6-year, 8-month bond without at least 5 percent margin.

As the 2⅝'s rapidly lost their premium value before breaking par on June 19, the lending officers of the big New York banks received call after call from the worried treasurers of big corporate depositors. Some had loans they could call on short notice. Others were committed for fixed periods such as 30 days. One corporation had agreed to hold $5 million of bonds until August 15 and $5 million more until September 15.

Needed collateral

The bank lending officers shook their heads and advised the corporations to demand collateral to cover the decline in the price of the bonds. The margin calls mounted. The money broker had to get collateral to cover his contracts. Banks and brokerage houses demanded more margin from their customers. Each day brought additional liquidation of the 2⅝s. Each day saw more speculators shaken out.

The heavy volume of corporate financing and the insistent margin calls were ominously reminiscent of the 1929 stock market crash. Billions of dollars of speculation had been financed by corporate call loans in 1929. When the market broke, the corporations demanded their money and touched off a torrent of distressed liquidation.

The dimensions of this summer's break were not comparable to the 1929 crash.

But the country has had a blunt reminder that it is dangerous to finance speculation through bank and corporate call loans that are protected by little or no margin.

"NO DOWNPAYMENT" SAID WALL STREET IN FINANCING OF TREASURY OFFERING

WASHINGTON, September 7.—Some of the big Wall Street banks and large Government bond dealers helped finance speculation in the Treasury's $9,550 million June refunding by carrying securities for their customers without a downpayment and without an interest charge. The chief beneficiaries were leading New York Stock Exchange firms. But other brokerage houses and some individuals obtained the 100 percent "loans" too.

The "free carries" were a departure from the normal operating practices of the few dealers and banks who made the generous credits available. They acted under pressure from good customers and because they had a chance to earn a comfortable return on a riskless transaction.

"It wasn't something we went after," a bank official said recently. "We only did it for the substantial houses. We were careful which stock exchange firms we did it with. They came to us."

What the banks and the dealers did was to grant their customers delayed delivery in selling them the 2⅜ percent and 2⅞ percent rights that matured June 15. A stock exchange house that bought, say, $5

million of the 2⅜s on May 15, didn't have to put any money up until it took delivery of its securities in June. Normal Government bond market practice would have called for payment either the next day or on the second day following the sale.

Most of the delayed delivery contracts were made as the speculative excitement mounted from mid-May on. They called for delivery in early June for that was when the Treasury was expected to open its refunding books. A speculator who planned to exchange his rights for new Government obligations would have to act at that time.

Two to five million dollar blocks

A substantial number of the delayed delivery sales of rights to the stock exchange firms were in blocks of $2 to $5 million. A few were larger. One well-known member firm took more than $50 million of the rights from a bank under a delayed delivery contract.

The stock exchange houses eagerly sought the delayed delivery contracts for the same reason that they embraced the repurchase agreements and buy-backs that they arranged for themselves or through a money broker. Delayed delivery was one more way in which they could obtain rights without an interest charge and without a down-payment.

The banks and the dealers found the delayed deliveries tempting because they were able to sell the 2⅜s at the premium prices of mid-May while they continued to collect the 2⅜ percent interest until their customers took delivery in June. It was a shade less profitable for the dealers than for the banks, since the dealers had to borrow money at about 1 percent to carry the "rights."

Many dealers refused to make delayed deliveries. The refusal often meant a lost sale, because the stock exchange firm then shopped around until it found a dealer or a bank that would give it the free credit it wanted.

"We said, 'No thanks,'" a prominent Government bond dealer recalled. "We're not in the money lending business."

The loan officer of one of the big financial district commercial banks said flatly: "We're clean. We didn't finance any of the rights. We had the answer from the beginning: 'No.'"

The delayed deliveries, like the "buy-backs," seemed sound from a banking standpoint. The collateral was the best. The 2⅜s came due on June 15. If the buyer reneged, the bank could exercise the rights itself or turn in the maturing securities for cash. It could lose no more than the premium it would have collected if the deal had not fallen through.

Not good for United States

But the easy credit deals contributed to the excessive speculation in the Government bond market. What may have been good for the banks was not good for the country.

The Treasury closed its subscription books on June 6, and the people who had bought the 2⅜s on delayed delivery contracts elected overwhelmingly to exchange their securities for the new 2⅝-percent 6-year 8-month bonds. The dealers demanded payment, but the banks extended the "free carries" for 10 days until June 16—the day when the rights were to be replaced by the new bonds. June 16 was the exchange date because June 15 fell on a Sunday.

The additional 10-day delay pushed further into the future the moment when the speculators would have to arrange loans and put up margin to finance their bonds. At least one bank carried the new bonds for insistent customers to July 1—without interest and without a margin payment.

Brokers pressed banks for liberal credit terms and many banks and brokers carried the speculators with little or no margin partly because they were convinced that the market was rising and there was no risk—and partly because they were in competition with one another.

A broker who meticulously observed the stock exchange's 5 percent margin requirement was aware that he might lose a customer to another broker or to a bank that charged no margin. Money was easy. The borrowers held the whip hand.

Many banks financed the speculators through standard security loans but granted more liberal terms than they normally would have provided. Where one Wall Street bank, for example, held fast to its regular 3½ percent interest charge for "street accounts," another planned to ask 2¾ percent but trimmed its fee to 2⅝ percent because that was the rate a big competitor charged.

Zero to 5 percent margins

Margin requirements in New York ranged from 0 to 3 percent on the rights and from 2½ percent to 5 percent on the 2⅜s.

The Wall Street division of one major bank had a larger volume of loans on its books after the 2⅜s were issued than at any other time in its history. Significantly, the bulk of the loans were to stock exchange firms that had never been active in the Government securities market before. Like many others, the stock houses found themselves doing something new—and took a licking.

A large number of banks outside of New York financed speculators on as little as 1 or 2 percent margin. They usually made the loans through money brokers directly to individual spectators.

They loaned hundreds of millions of dollars to people they didn't know and they had some frantic moments trying to get hold of speculators in New York and other cities to raise additional margin as the market went down.

One worried out-of-town banker came to New York in late June carrying a three-page, single-spaced list of unknown New Yorkers to whom he had casually loaned an average of about $200,000 each on the new 2⅜s. Along with other bankers throughout the country he had thought the bond market would remain strong and his loans would rest quietly until they were paid off. To their dismay, the bankers discovered that they had acquired thinly protected, highly active Wall Street accounts.

TREASURY AND WALL STREET DIDN'T KNOW THAT BREAK IN MARKET WAS AT HAND

WASHINGTON, September 8.—The mid-June break in the Government bond market and the steepness of the decline took Wall Street and Washington by surprise. They had known that trouble was brewing, but they hadn't suspected that the situation was as grave as it proved to be. Top Government financial officials and some of the keenest bond dealers in New York only gradually abandoned hope that the drop could be held within narrow limits.

The ironical fact is that Government bond prices had hit their peak in April, but the speculators didn't know it. They streamed into the market during May and early June to bet on a further rise in a market that had already started to drift lower.

The Treasury Department didn't know the turn was at hand. Neither did its expert advisory committees of top commercial and investment bankers. They came to Washington in the last week of May to advise the Treasury on the terms of its $9,550,000,000 June refunding and all of the discussions began and ended with an assumption that the market would remain strong.

Knew of speculation

The bankers and bond dealers knew that people were speculating in the rights that matured June 15. But they had no notion that the speculation was as widespread as it was. Neither did the Treasury or the Federal Reserve System.

The advisory committees warned the Treasury that speculative demands would make it dangerous to include a long-term bond with the securities that it would offer in exchange for the rights. But they stopped there. The Treasury accepted the committees' general recommendations and announced on May 29 that it would sell about $1 billion of 3¼ percent, 27-year bonds for cash and would give the holders of the rights a choice between 2⅝-percent, 6-year, 8-month bonds and 1¼-percent, 11-month certificates.

Speculators never had gambled by buying 6-year, 8-month bonds before. No one thought that they would now.

But the danger signs multiplied in the days that followed. The premium on the "rights" went up after the Treasury announcement. It had been expected to decline for it had been thought that the speculators would dump their "rights" once they found that the refunding package would not include a potentially lucrative long-term bond. Instead, they held tight. The rise in the price of the "rights" was a tip-off that the ranks of the plungers were growing.

The alarm rings

The subscription books closed on June 6, and on Tuesday, June 10, an alarm bell clanged loudly. The Treasury made public a preliminary finding that investors had taken about $7,250 million of the new 2⅝s—instead of the $3 billion to $4 billion it had anticipated.

But commercial banks were buying in the market and the price of the 2⅝s edged up 1/32 the next day. The dealers and the Treasury agreed that it would take several months but the market could absorb the extra $3 billion to $4 billion of bonds. The consensus was that the job was manageable.

Disquieting rumors circulated during the rest of that week. The speculators had to take delivery of the 2⅜s on Monday, June 16, and the market heard that a money broker had some commitments that he was finding it difficult to finance. On Friday, June 13, there were reports that he had asked that some deliveries be postponed beyond the Monday deadline.

The market became jittery. The 2⅜s slipped from a peak of 100 13/32s on June 5 to 100 9/32s on Friday, June 13. They dipped to 100 7/32s on Monday.

People who had had "free carries" had to obtain bank loans and had to put up margin when they took delivery of the 2⅜s. Some sold out instead.

The money broker delivered $126 million of the new bonds to his clients. Many corporations had taken repurchase agreements on the understanding that they would get their money on June 16 in time to pay their quarterly tax installments. A number of speculators had mistakenly believed their interest-free, no-down-payment corporate credit arrangements would continue. Some reluctantly placed their bonds in bank loans. Others wouldn't or couldn't put up the margin that the banks were asking and they, too, sold out.

The 2⅝s slipped to 100 2/32s on Tuesday and to par on Wednesday. The next morning the New York Herald Tribune reported from Washington that the "Federal Reserve System had reached a major turning point in its antirecession drive and is slowing the pace at which it has been pressing toward easy money." The speculators leaped to the twin conclusions that the central bank soon would be shifting toward tight money and that a decline in bond prices was imminent.

The 2⅝s broke par. The general decline in the Government bond market was under way.

The Herald Tribune story triggered the decline. It had the impact that it did because it hit a nervous, speculative market at a time when business activity was be-

ginning to improve and market expectations were shifting.

The recession was ending sooner than the plungers had anticipated. Speculative buying had helped bring about a recordbreaking rise in bond prices after the Federal Reserve shifted to easy money last fall. Now the speculators started to dump their holdings and bond prices plummeted during the following weeks.

The market broke because business activity unexpectedly began to rise. It broke as dramatically as it did because it was shot through with speculation.

Each fresh report of an improvement in business activity made it seem more certain that higher interest rates and lower bond prices were ahead. Each new sell order from an individual or a corporate plunger aggravated the downward pressures.

When the New York Stock Exchange in early July ordered the money broker to liquidate $376 million of repurchase agreements and buy-backs that still were in force, it added to depressing influences that led the Treasury to buy up $589,500,000 of the 2⅝s from June 18 to July 9 in a vain attempt to stem the decline in bond prices.

Hindsight makes it plain that the Treasury should not have made an unlimited offering of 6-year, 8-month bonds to holders of $9,550 million of maturing Government securities. It feared speculation in the 27-year bonds that it simultaneously sold for cash and it imposed stiff downpayment and allotment limits that kept most of the speculators out of the long bonds.

The $9,550 million refunding would have been far harder to control since every holder of a maturing security had a right to one of the new Government obligations. But there were steps that the Treasury could have taken if it had known that the speculators were lying in wait. It could have offered only short-term securities, for example, or it could have restricted the offering of 2⅝s to an amount that it was sure the market could digest.

But its suspicions were not aroused and it walked in with its guard down and its chin out. Even so, there is widespread agreement among market experts that the Treasury still would have come through unscathed if the speculators had not chosen to make their big play just at the time when people were becoming aware that the recession had ended.

PLUNGERS CAN BE A PROBLEM AGAIN IF ACCESS TO EASY CREDIT IS LEFT OPEN

WASHINGTON, September 9.—Speculators raised hob with the bond market this year and they can do it again unless corrective steps are taken.

The plungers turned the Treasury's $9,550 million June refunding into the worst fiasco in Government financial history. The bond market is wide open for another foray any time they care to get it started.

Speculative activity has become a major problem because the character of the Government bond market has changed profoundly in the past 10 months. It has become a market where prices swing widely and dramatically enough to attract mass speculation. It no longer is a market where all price changes are small.

Government bond prices rose at a record pace after the Federal Reserve System abandoned its tight money policy in mid-November of last year. They dropped almost as violently this summer when it became apparent that the recession was coming to an end. Professional operators aggravated the upswing by buying bonds and professionals and amateurs alike aggravated the downturn by dumping them.

Psychology changed

Market psychology has changed. Investors now expect drastic price movements. When the market broke in June, investors stopped buying and withdrew to the sidelines to wait for prices to stabilize at new and sharply lower levels.

The odds are against another speculative binge in the near future. The speculators were badly burned when the market broke and all except the toughest professionals will be nursing their wounds for a long time to come.

Market conditions at the moment are unfavorable for mass speculation. Business activity is rising and the dominant pressures on bond prices during the coming months are expected to be in a downward direction—not in the upward direction that attracts the speculators.

A shakeout as violent as the one that took place this summer temporarily provides its own correctives. Corporate treasurers who have large amounts of cash locked up in 2⅝-percent bonds that are below par won't soon again gamble with short-term money by using it to buy bonds. Corporations and banks that financed the speculators through repurchase agreements and buybacks will be more careful about the people they do business with—for a while, anyway.

But even the most painful memories eventually fade. The plungers will become a problem again the next time a recession develops and a sharp rise in bond prices seems to be a prospect. Now that the speculators have found the way, they will come back.

Easy credit made their operations possible. If they are to be stopped, it will have to be made more difficult for them to obtain funds to finance their purchases of Government bonds.

Same pressure likely

The opportunity for big profits would not have arisen if the Federal Reserve System had not made money so easy that corporations and banks were hungrily looking for loans. And the opportunity would not have arisen if easy money had not driven short-term interest rates down so far that the lenders were searching for a more attractive return than they could obtain from normal short-term investments such as 91-day Treasury bills.

The Federal Reserve made money cheap in aggressively pursuing an antirecession, easy-money policy. It was trying to restore liquidity to the country's financial structure and thus to prepare the way for a business recovery. It will be under pressure to follow the same course in another recession. Even if it decides to move more cautiously, money may still become cheap enough to support a heavy volume of speculation.

A more direct approach to the problem of controlling speculation would seem to be in order.

The most commonly heard proposal is that Federal margin requirements be imposed on purchases of Government bonds. Along with State and local government obligations, Government bonds now are exempt by statute from the downpayment and other credit regulations that the Federal Reserve Board maintains on stocks.

Margin requirements would not have deterred the corporate and bank speculators who used their own money last spring and paid for their bonds in full. But the need to post a downpayment doubtless would have deterred many of the individual speculators and brokerage houses that put up little or no margin to carry huge quantities of the rights that matured on June 15 and of the 2⅝-percent bonds that were issued in exchange.

Less eager to gamble

An individual who had a "free carry" on $1 million of "rights" might have been less eager to gamble if he had been faced with a 10-percent margin requirement and had had to put up $100,000—or with a 25-percent margin requirement and had had to put up $250,000.

The downpayment requirements on stock were set at 50 percent in June and now are pegged at 70 percent.

Banks could not have made "buy-backs" without margin if Government bonds had been subject to the existing regulations. Corporate money perhaps could have flooded in through "repurchase agreements" under the present rules but the margin laws would give the Board power to control the "repurchase agreements" if the exemption were repealed.

An across-the-board imposition of margin regulations on Government bond transactions would create difficult problems for the big Government bond houses. They have to carry large inventories of securities and would be severely hampered by a regulation that required brokers and dealers to put up margin when they borrow against Government bonds.

New York Stock Exchange specialists and odd-lot dealers are exempt from the present stock margin requirements. It has been suggested that the Government dealers could be treated similarly.

An exemption could be granted only if standards were adopted to distinguish the 10 to 16 houses that make a market in Government bonds from the dozens of other brokers who call themselves Government dealers but actually do no more than execute, buy, and sell orders for customers.

It has been proposed that the Federal Reserve Board be authorized to establish the criteria. Alternately, it has been suggested that the dealers be given authority to set up a self-regulating association that would lay down rules as the stock exchange defines and supervises its specialists and odd-lot dealers.

Other margin recommendations have been made that stop short of new legislation. One is that the stock exchange increase its present 5 percent rule to a higher figure—and see to it that it is enforced. One objection that brokers voice to this, as to many proposals for stiffening the exchange rules, is that it might drive customers into the arms of more lenient banks and nonmember brokers.

It has been urged, too, that the exchange make Government bonds subject to its net capital requirements and there are some indications that it may take this step. Two Government bond houses are members of the exchange and presumably would insist upon special treatment that would enable them to continue to finance their inventories of Government securities.

The exchange has steadily broadened its net capital rules as abuses have developed. It made commodity futures subject to net capital requirements in 1946 and it brought in tax-exempt State and local government obligations in 1953.

Brokers could not have made some of the deals that they made in June if Governments had been subject to the net capital rules.

The exchange says that a firm must have a net capital equal to 20 percent of its aggregate indebtedness and must have a minimum of $50,000. A broker who buys stock must deduct 30 percent of its value from his net capital. If he buys a municipal bond, he must deduct 2½ to 10 percent depending upon the bond's rating.

Enforcement of a comparable deduction for Government bonds would have limited the capacity of the brokers to take on bond commitments last spring.

No complete answer

The Securities and Exchange Commission has a similar rule that covers all brokers and dealers but the regulation does not apply either to Government bonds or to municipal securities. Both sets of obligations enjoy a statutory exemption from SEC rules. Repeal of the exemption would enable the

SEC to subject Government bonds to its net capital requirements.

There is no complete answer to the problem of preventing excessive speculation in the U.S. Government securities market. But measures can be taken that will help to keep the speculators within bounds.

Last spring's speculative activity disrupted the market so badly that the Federal Reserve had to buy $1,090 million of Government securities to support an essential Treasury cash borrowing during the Mideast crisis in late July. The Government can't afford to give the speculators another field day. The risks are too great.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

THE MISSOURI RIVER—NO. 1

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I have been saddened and shocked by the foul, unsanitary, and downright dangerous condition of our polluted and dirty rivers. One of America's great rivers is the Missouri, known as Big Muddy, rising in Montana and flowing through the Dakotas, Iowa, Nebraska, Missouri, Kansas, and into the Mississippi, at St. Louis.

Conferences preliminary to enforcement procedures under Public Law 660 of the 84th have been held on the Missouri River. It would be fair to say that these conferences are not held until the situation becomes desperate or worse.

From some of these conferences recently held I take extracts to insert into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

I hope our people, as yet unaware of the danger and the need, will read these remarks and will come to understand the horrible conditions in this river, not just from the standpoint of fish and wildlife but from the aspect that citizens living along and around this river are actually in danger from the filth and disease therein.

I am sure anyone who finds his home or business flooded with this kind of water when this mighty river hits the flood stage will have reason to understand more fully the danger and the disgusting nature of the water.

These are the first remarks I intend to make on the Missouri and deal with the Sioux City-Omaha segment of the Missouri River. The remarks here chronicling the nauseating conditions of the river will be equaled if not exceeded by a description of the water to appear in my second set of remarks on this once delightful river dealing with other stretches downstream.

THE MISSOURI RIVER—I

The Missouri is a big, impressive, turbulent river. "Big Muddy," as some call it, carries tons of water in a swift torrent from its headwaters in Montana, down through the Dakotas, continuing on to form the State borders between Iowa-Nebraska, Missouri-Nebraska, Missouri-Kansas, thence through the State of Missouri and into the Mississippi River at St. Louis.

The river was wild and hard to use until fairly recent times when the Corps of Engineers, U.S. Army, began a program to tame it and stabilize its banks. Impoundments, concrete bank supports, and other devices have been erected at great cost to make the river navigable and otherwise useful along its great length.

These devices proved fairly effective in the stretch between Sioux City and Omaha, and water-hungry midwesterners rushed to use it for recreational purposes. What they saw when their boats hit the water at Sioux City was shocking:

"At the mouth of the Perry Creek sewer, just below Combination Bridge, the water appeared gray; floating feces and other sewage solids were obvious, and gas bubbles from sludge deposits rose to the surface. An odor typical of stale sewage could be detected for some distance from the mouth of the sewer.

"The mouth of Floyd River (at its juncture with the Missouri) appeared almost clogged with the untreated packing plant wastes. Floating masses of grease and solids, apparently from paunch manure, lined the banks, extended well into the stream, and clung to every solid object on the surface of the water. Where the water was not red with bloody wastes it was gray with decomposing organic wastes. Gas bubbles rose from sludge deposited on the bottom. Offensive odor filled the atmosphere."

These water conditions, caused by the raw discharge of some 10 tons of human feces per day, plus wastes from the stockyards and cattle slaughtering industries in Sioux City, do not create the most attractive environment for the fishermen, hunters, and boaters in the areas downstream. They, however, are not compelled to be on the river. Employees of the Corps of Engineers who are continuing their efforts to stabilize the stream for flood control and other purposes, must live and work in these surroundings. This is likewise true of persons engaged in commercial navigation on the river. The polluted water daily threatens the health of these workers. We can only hope that they have somehow adjusted their sensibilities to the disgusting sights and odors that constitute their environment.

Let us now move about 135 miles downstream to Omaha, Nebr. Between Sioux City and Omaha there are mainly farms and open country. One would think that the river, having traversed this distance, would have purified itself. This process does take place to a certain extent. But operators of the Omaha water purification plant, which draws its water supply from the Missouri, observe that considerable artificial means must be employed to render the water acceptable for public use.

According to the testimony of a Public Health Service engineer, "Some of the solid materials (from Sioux City) carry downstream as far as the Omaha waterplant intake. Here, at times, the metal screens that protect the raw water pumps against large floating objects become covered with grease containing animal hairs. Some of the grease passes into the water-treatment plant to float on the water surface and to coat the walls of concrete basins used in treating the water.

"At times large numbers of condoms accumulate on the Omaha water intake screens. Some of these also pass through the screens to enter the water-treatment basins. Sometimes it is necessary to assign one of the plant operators responsibility for dipping the condoms from the basins."

In addition, "There are soluble, unseen materials in the river that also reach Omaha. It is estimated that a little more than one-half of the 10 tons of human feces discharged into the river daily in the Sioux City area reaches Omaha in solution in the river under normal summer conditions."

Sioux City's reaction to the disclosure of these shocking facts was to defy the Public Health Service and a group of officials representing the States of South Dakota, Nebraska, Iowa, Kansas, and Missouri who recommended that it take remedial action to abate its polluting discharges. And so, until the slow wheels of governmental administrative and legal actions grind out their findings and press the city to take the necessary steps, Omaha waterplant operators will have to maintain their alert to avoid any water-processing deviations in order to protect the health of consumers. And the hardy water sports "aficionados" will just have to cope as best they can with the pollution hazards surrounding their "enjoyment" of these activities.

Below Omaha, the river is in just as bad condition as it is below Sioux City because of Omaha's discharge of sewage and packinghouse wastes. An official of the Iowa State Conservation Commission described it in these words:

"I have been on the bottoms when the stench from the stream could be smelled long distances. I have seen patches of floating grease solid enough for crows to ride on it in the current. I have tasted catfish taken from the stream below Omaha that were inedible because of a kerosene-like taste."

He tells of reports made to him by another Iowa conservation officer:

"Many hunting, boating, and fishing enthusiasts are pinning more and more hope on the river as a place for recreation, now that the river work has cleared up much of the silt, but that industrial and domestic pollution has become more and more apparent, with raw domestic sewage and industrial wastes, including oil, grease, chemical residue, and stockyard wastes making the stream practically unuseable.

"He advises that the river actually smells, that the pollution is visible, that the commercial fishermen's nets are filthy when they are raised and festooned with toilet paper and covered with slime and that the fish have a disagreeable oily taste."

Unlike Sioux City, the voters of Omaha have approved a bond issue to finance the first part of the construction of sewage treatment facilities. If they are not discouraged by the obstruction of Sioux City, they plan to continue this program for the abolition of the water conditions which presently exist below Omaha.

THE MISSOURI RIVER—NO. 2

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, my earlier remarks on the Missouri River treating the Sioux City-Omaha segment were quite shocking to anyone who has not been around the "Big Muddy." I now intend to treat the lower Missouri from Omaha on down.

It is no news that the filth and dirt in this river renders it unfit and unsafe in most of its stretches for sporting and recreational use. What is news is the really disgusting nature of the filth defiling the water.

It has gotten so bad that industry will shortly look for other sites on which to locate.

THE MISSOURI RIVER—II

In section I of this Missouri River discussion, relating to the Sioux City-Omaha segment, a fundamental cause of continuing, growing water pollution was touched upon. There we saw how pollution from Sioux City interferes with Omaha's use of the river water while, at the same time, Omaha itself pollutes the river. This two-sided victim-offender role is characteristic of most communities on the Missouri stretching in a long chain from Sioux City to the river's mouth at St. Louis, as indeed it is on a number of other large streams in other parts of the Nation. Thus, although each city would like to see upstream pollution abated, it is reluctant to take the initiative in treating its own. And the result is—a polluted river, growing more polluted as time goes by and as each polluter eyes the offender upstream hoping he will do something first.

St. Joseph, Mo., is in the middle of the middle of the Missouri River chain. Like other major communities, it is contributing sizable quantities of waste to the stream. It, too, has a packinghouse industry which is, however, located outside the city limits. The combined effect of city sewage and industrial wastes from the stockyards creates a deplorable water condition.

A State of Missouri engineer, discussing water quality in the St. Joseph area, stated: "Pollution is so obvious that one does not need to do more than view the stream to arrive at the correct conclusion that the river is a combination of city dump and open sewer."

Downstream from St. Joseph the communities of Atchison, Leavenworth and Kansas City, Kans., use the river's water as a source of public water supply. Atchison city officials, on numerous occasions, have requested the assistance of the Kansas State Board of Health in solving their water treatment problems. Grease and wax have entered the filters; eggshells and other materials have complicated the water treatment plant operation. In addition, sportsmen have complained about the effects of the pollution on fish and wildlife. Grease has been stranded on sandbars for many miles downstream from St. Joseph and livestock watering has been impaired.

Kansas City, Kans., and Kansas City, Mo., use the waters of the Missouri for their drinking supplies. Although their job of purifying this water has been complicated and the risks of error multiplied by upstream pollution, here again are communities discharging such massive quantities of human and industrial wastes as to affect the quality of the stream 367 miles away at St. Louis. All along the river between these two metropolitan centers, smaller Missouri communities such as Lexington, Glasgow, Boonville, and Jefferson City, must use the filth-laden waters of the Missouri for their water supplies. In all, some 1,500,000 people are dependent upon this doubtful source of supply.

The water plants of the downstream communities have had serious problems in attempting to cope with the taste and odor problems in the raw water. At times pollution in the river has been so severe that these plants have simply closed their intakes and stopped pumping until the heavy slugs of waste material passed by. Scientists employed by the St. Louis County Water Co. which supplies drinking water to people in St. Louis County, Mo., separated a quantity of organic material from the water supply after it had been purified. This is what the plant manager had to say about it:

"I have here a sample of organic material removed from the finished drinking water supply in St. Louis County and from the finished drinking water in Lexington, Mo., by this carbon filter procedure. This material was extracted, in each case, from about 2,000 to 3,000 gallons of water. Water treatment processing as now practiced at these plants, or for that matter at any other Missouri River water treatment plant with which I have familiarity, will not remove such pollution. To those of you who are interested, I invite a cautious smelling. I strongly advise that you do not taste the material, because one member of our laboratory staff became ill when he experimented by tasting. If this type of pollution increases in quantity in the Missouri River, the use of the Missouri River for public water supply will become dangerously impaired."

Pressure continues to mount for a clean-up on the Missouri. Sportsmen, citizens who can see a few years into the future, and public officials are urging action. But still, one community eyes the other tentatively, for each fears it may spend the large sums necessary for sewage treatment facilities while the others procrastinate. Until a movement is made away from this dead center, life on the Missouri will continue to be hazardous.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN (at the request of Mr. WAINWRIGHT), for the week of March 9, 1959, on account of illness in family.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon, for 30 minutes, today.

Mr. PATMAN, for 30 minutes, today, and to revise and extend his remarks and include certain extraneous matter.

Mr. DIXON (at the request of Mr. WEAVER), for 40 minutes, today.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi (at the request of Mr. MCCORMACK), to cancel the special order he had for today.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts, for 30 minutes, on tomorrow.

Mr. PATMAN, for 30 minutes, on Thursday next.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mrs. KEE in four instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia and to include an address by Mr. DAVIS of Georgia in Richmond on March 7.

Mr. PILLION.

Mr. ALGER in four instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM.

Mr. SHORT.

Mr. BERRY in three instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. WALLHAUSER (at the request of Mr. ARENDS).

Mr. MCGOVERN.

Mr. MCCORMACK in two instances.

(At the request of Mr. MCCORMACK and to include extraneous matter, the following:)

Mr. CELLER in two instances.

Mr. MULTER in two instances.

Mr. KING of California.

Mr. GALLAGHER (at the request of Mr. BOLLING) and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. COOLEY (at the request of Mr. BOLLING) and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. BOLAND (at the request of Mr. BAILEY) and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. FLOOD (at the request of Mr. BAILEY (in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. BRAY (at the request of Mr. MOORE) and to include extraneous matter.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 36 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, March 10, 1959, at 12 o'clock noon.

OATH OF OFFICE, MEMBERS AND DELEGATES

The oath of office required by the sixth article of the Constitution of the United States, and as provided by section 2 of the act of May 13, 1884 (23 Stat. 22), to be administered to Members and Delegates of the House of Representatives, the text of which is carried in section 1757 of title XIX of the Revised Statutes of the United States and being as follows:

> "I, A. B, do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic; that I will bear true faith and allegiance to the same; that I take this obligation freely, without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion; and that I will well and faithfully discharge the duties of the office on which I am about to enter. So help me God."

has been subscribed to in person and filed in duplication with the Clerk of the House of Representatives by the following Member of the 86th Congress, pursuant to Public Law 412 of the 80th Congress entitled "An act to amend section 30 of the Revised Statutes of the United States" (U.S.C., title 2, sec. 25), approved February 18, 1948:

MISSOURI

Wm. J. Randall.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON COUNTERPART FUNDS

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, the Mutual Security Act of 1958, chapter IV, section 401(a), requires the Committee on House Administration to publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, within 10 legislative days after receipt, the consolidated report of each committee of the House using foreign currencies—counterpart funds—during the preceding year. Accordingly, there is shown herein, within the prescribed time limit, the consolidated reports of the Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on Education and Labor, the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the Committee on the Judiciary, the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, and the Committee on Ways and Means.

MARCH 7, 1959.

Counterpart funds

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

[Foreign currency and U.S. dollar equivalents expended between July 1, 1958, and Dec. 31, 1958]

Country	Name of currency	Transportation		Lodging		Meals		Gratuities		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollars	Foreign currency	U.S. dollars	Foreign currency	U.S. dollars	Foreign currency	U.S. dollars	Foreign currency	U.S. dollars	Foreign currency	U.S. dollars
Austria	Schilling	1,160	46.00	3,020	118.00	2,506.50	100.00	1,086.50	41.00			7,773.00	305.00
Belgium	Franc	3,400	68.00	10,359	205.18	12,112	241.44	1,250	27.80			27,121	542.42
Belgian Congo	do			5,000	100.00							5,000	100.00
Denmark	Kroner	157.60	27.35	2,132.20	319.49	2,124.60	296.20	537.00	70.19	422.60	57.38	5,374.00	770.61
France	Franc	745,151	1,773.56	622,573	1,479.89	588,769	1,399.96	126,020	299.61	291,222	692.16	2,373,735	5,645.18
French West Africa	do			10,000	47.62							10,000	47.62
Germany	Deutsche mark	7,431.97	1,769.42	1,947.78	470.17	3,242.45	780.78	540.43	131.18	915.94	222.31	14,078.57	3,373.86
Ghana	Pound	14-6-9	12.32									14-6-9	12.32
Greece	Drachma	180	6.00	3,561	118.70	5,340	178.00	1,140	38.00	2,202	73.40	12,423	414.10
Italy	Lire	2,482,205	3,983.46	513,013	814.80	699,118	1,084.32	104,090	166.55	265,785	428.33	4,034,212	6,477.46
Japan	Yen					9,000	25.00	18,000	50.00	9,000	25.00	36,000	100.00
Hong Kong	Dollars	29	5.00	744	128.92	542	94.17	174	30.00	231	40.00	1,720	298.09
Kenya	Schilling			350	49.43							350	49.43
Morocco	Franc			6,950	15.17							6,950	15.17
Netherlands	Guilder	873.36	229.73	529	138.95	687	180.22	35	9.19			2,124.36	558.09
Norway	Kroner	309.29	38.20	600	87.00	800	116.00	200	29.00	320	52.00	2,229.29	322.20
Sweden	do	80	7.00	600	99.00	800	134.00	200	33.00	320	60.00	2,000	333.00
Philippines	Pesos	94.76	47.38	365.74	182.87	216.50	108.25	304.00	152.00	219.00	109.50	1,200.00	600.00
Spain	Pesetas	1,685	32.31	25,835	498.00	30,905	592.00	5,945	115.60	5,890	118.00	70,260	1,355.91
Sudan	Pound			12-0-0	34.56							12-0-0	34.56
Switzerland	Franc	747.55	173.37	1,072.50	245.99	1,343.05	319.26	199.65	45.51	27.00	6.28	3,389.75	790.41
Taiwan	Dollars			1,298	36.29	946	26.00	182	5.00	182	5.00	2,608	72.29
Thailand	Baht			2,400	114.29	315	15.00	315	15.00	105	5.00	3,135	149.29
Turkey	Lire			414	46.00	401.70	44.64	16.35	1.82	23.25	2.58	855.30	95.04
United Kingdom	Pound	376-0-4	1,043.58	594-6-6	1,673.93	218-8-6	612.45	50-6-6	139.31	142-11-6	399.61	1,381-13-4	3,868.88
Vietnam	Piaster					4,975	69.10	3,530	49.13	2,520	35.00	11,025	153.23
Total			9,262.68		7,024.25		6,416.79		1,448.89		2,331.55		26,484.16

CARL VINSON, *Chairman,*
Committee on Armed Services.

FEBRUARY 27, 1959.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR

[Foreign currency and U.S. dollar equivalents expended between Jan. 1, 1958, and Dec. 31, 1958]

Country	Name of currency	Transportation		Lodging		Meals		Gratuities		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollars	Foreign currency	U.S. dollars	Foreign currency	U.S. dollars	Foreign currency	U.S. dollars	Foreign currency	U.S. dollars	Foreign currency	U.S. dollars
France	Francs											590,463	1,405.86
Germany	Deutsche mark											11,305.56	2,591.50
Switzerland	Francs											8,451.60	1,965.47
Belgium	Francs											10,000.00	200.00
Norway	Kroner											18,124.15	2,545.52
United Kingdom	Pounds											447.13.00	1,253.42
Sweden	Kroner											41.40	8.01
Denmark	Kroner											3,604.66	522.32
Peru	Sols											2,685.00	106.97
Austria	Schillings											5,182.00	200.00
Italy	Lire											1,040,192.00	1,664.31
Spain	Pesetas											26,900.00	463.79
Brazil	Cruzeiros											55,400.00	362.06
Total													13,289.23

GRAHAM A. BARDEN,
Chairman, Committee on Education and Labor.

FEBRUARY 27, 1959.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS

[Foreign currency and U.S. dollar equivalents expended between July 1, 1958, and Dec. 31, 1958]

Country	Name of currency	Transportation		Lodging		Meals		Gratuities		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollars	Foreign currency	U.S. dollars	Foreign currency	U.S. dollars	Foreign currency	U.S. dollars	Foreign currency	U.S. dollars	Foreign currency	U.S. dollars
Belgium	Franc	2,305	46.10	16,062.5	321.25	5,858	117.16	2,645	52.90	1,631	32.62	28,501.5	570.03
France	do	118,261	281.57	2,066,455	4,920.12	227,264	541.10	10,000	23.82	30,240	72.01	2,452,220	5,838.62
Germany	Deutsche mark	5,906.35	1,406.20									5,906.35	1,406.20
Greece	Drachma			1,300	43.33	418	13.93					1,718	57.26
Italy	Lira	93,480	149.57	775,624	1,241.00	593,800	950.08	19,410	31.05	3,450	5.52	1,485,764	2,377.22
Netherlands	Guilder	1.35	.35	115.5	30.26			5	1.31			121.85	31.92
Norway	Kroner	7,136.09	1,002.60									7,136.09	1,002.60
United Kingdom	Pounds	68.11.9	191.96	541.10.0	1,516.20	286.6.9	801.80	94.15.6	265.38	52.2.10	145.98	1,043.6.10	2,921.32
Spain	Peseta	3,192	57.00	9,800	175.00	6,720	120.00	1,624	29.00	1,533	27.37	22,869	408.37
Switzerland	Franc	242.01	56.44	836.79	194.85	638.15	148.82	53.0	12.29	274.8	64.50	2,044.75	476.90
Turkey	Lira			280	31.11	223	24.79	20	2.22			523	58.12
Total			3,191.79		8,473.12		2,717.68		417.97		348.00		15,148.56

(Signed) THOMAS E. MORGAN,
Chairman, Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Counterpart funds—Continued

MARCH 2, 1959.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

[Foreign currency and U.S. dollar equivalents expended between July 1, 1958, and Dec. 31, 1958]

Country	Name of currency	Transportation		Lodging		Meals		Gratuities		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollars	Foreign currency	U.S. dollars	Foreign currency	U.S. dollars	Foreign currency	U.S. dollars	Foreign currency	U.S. dollars	Foreign currency	U.S. dollars
Belgium	Francs			5082	101.64	6776	135.52	2541	50.82	[1] 1694	33.88		
										847	16.94	16,940	338.80
France	do	1,941,126	4,621.73	676,707	1618.35	902,276	2,157.80	338,354	809.17	[1] 225,569	539.45		
										112,784	269.72	4,196,816	10,016.22
Israel	Pounds			369	205.00	492	273.33	184.50	102.50	[1] 123	68.33		
										[2] 90	50.00		
Italy	Lira	2,648,574	4,237.72	497,010	495.34	662,680	660.45	248,505	247.67	61.50	34.17	1,320	733.33
										[1] 165,670	165.11		
										[2] 242,299	387.68		
										82,835	82.55	4,547,573	6,276.52
Netherlands	Guilders	3,245.20	854.00									3,245.20	854.00
Portugal	Escudos			2730	95.45	3510	122.73	1170	40.91	390	13.64	7800	272.73
Spain	Pesetas			32,449.16	560.35	43,265.54	747.13	16,224.58	280.17	[1]10,816.38	186.78		
										5,408.19	93.39	108,163.85	1,867.82
Switzerland	Francs	2,348	546.23	3,404.47	791.75	4,539.30	1,055.66	1,702.26	395.87	[1] 1,134.82	263.91		
										[2] 691.20	160.74		
										567.40	131.96	14,387.45	3,346.12
United Kingdom	Pounds			118-16-0	332.79	158-8-0	443.72	59-8-0	166.40	[1] 39-15-8	110.94		
										[2] 9-6-3	26.08		
										19-16-0	55.46	405-9-11	1,135.39
Total			10,259.68		4,200.67		5,596.34		2,093.51		2,690.73		24,840.93
Cash refund													−675.00
Total													24,165.93

[1] Inter-European travel.
[2] Car hire.

EMANUEL CELLER, *Chairman,*
Committee on the Judiciary.

FEBRUARY 24, 1959.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE

[Foreign currency and U.S. dollar equivalents expended between July 1 and Dec. 31, 1958]

Country	Name of currency	Transportation		Lodging		Meals		Gratuities		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollars	Foreign currency	U.S. dollars	Foreign currency	U.S. dollars	Foreign currency	U.S. dollars	Foreign currency	U.S. dollars	Foreign currency	U.S. dollars
England	Pound sterling	12	33.84	44	124.08	30	84.60	4	11.28	10	28.20	100	282.00
Belgium	Franc	800	16.16	2,000	40.40	1,600	32.32	500	10.10	100	2.02	5,000	101.00
Netherlands	Guilder	1,866.80	[1] 497.60	180	48.00	210	56.00	40	10.67	70	18.67	2,366.80	630.94
Germany	Deutsche mark	125	30.00	125	30.00	500	119.63	70	16.75	10	2.40	830	198.78
France	Franc	218,820	[2] 521.25	20,000	48.10	74,407	177.91	17,400	41.65	10,500	25.00	339,127	813.91
Denmark	Kroner	318.97	44.80									318.97	44.80
Italy	Lire	46,950	70.88									46,950	70.88
Total			1,214.53		290.58		470.46		90.45		76.29		2,142.31

[1] Includes 1-way transatlantic passage.

[2] Includes 1-way transatlantic passage.

TOM MURRAY,
Chairman, Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

MARCH 2, 1959.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS

[Foreign currency and U.S. dollar equivalents expended between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1958]

Country	Name of currency	Transportation		Lodging		Meals		Gratuities		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollars	Foreign currency	U.S. dollars	Foreign currency	U.S. dollars	Foreign currency	U.S. dollars	Foreign currency	U.S. dollars	Foreign currency	U.S. dollars
Belgium	Francs			9,115	179	14,135	283	2,750	58	1,500	30	27,500	550.00
Brazil	Cruzeiros	8,750	145.00									8,750	145.00
France	Francs			306,600	734	290,400	685	63,000	155	10,000	25	670,000	1,599.00
Germany	Deutsche marks	17,455	4,146.00	310	72	640	154	130	31			18,535	4,403.00
Norway	Kroner	7,506	1,054.29									7,506	1,054.29
Switzerland	Francs			480	111	520	122					1,000	233.00
United Kingdom	Pounds			250	609	166	466	45	125	9	25	470	1,315.00
Total		9,299.29	5,345.29		1,795		1,710		369		80		9,299.29

WILBUR D. MILLS,
Chairman, Committee on Ways and Means.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

673. A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend section 377 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, concerning the preservation of unused acreage allotments"; to the Committee on Agriculture.

674. A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend section 335(f) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, to eliminate the 30-acre limitation on the amount of wheat exempt from wheat marketing quotas where all the wheat produced on the farm is used on the farm for feed, food, and seed"; to the Committee on Agriculture.

675. A letter from the President of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend section 13 of the District of Columbia Redevelopment Act of 1945, as amended"; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

676. A letter from the President of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to repeal the act approved March 3, 1897, and to amend the act approved December 20, 1944, relating to fees for transcripts of birth and death certificates in the District of Columbia"; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

677. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting the annual report of the activities of the Division of Coal Mine Inspection, Bureau of Mines, for the calendar year January 1 through December 31, 1958, pursuant to the Federal Coal Mine Safety Act; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

678. A letter from the Under Secretary of Commerce, transmitting the quarterly report of the Maritime Administration on the activities and transactions of the Administration under the Merchant Ship Sales Act of 1946, from October 1, 1958, through December 31, 1958, pursuant to section 13 of that act; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

679. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to repeal and amend certain statutes fixing or prohibiting the collection of fees for certain services under the navigation and vessel inspection law"; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

680. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to clarify a provision in the Black Bass Act relating to the interstate transportation of fish, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

681. A letter from the Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1945, as amended, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

682. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, to provide for reimbursement of services performed at foreign stations, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

683. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders entered in the cases of certain aliens who have been found admissible into the United States, pursuant to the Immigration and Nationality Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

684. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders entered under the authority contained in section 13(b) of the act as well as a list of the persons involved, pursuant to the act of September 11, 1957; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

685. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, relative to the case of Pasquale Auricchio, A–1310516, involving suspension of deportation, pursuant to the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

686. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, relative to the case of Wah Sing Hou, A–10493013, involving the provisions of section 6 of the Refugee Relief Act of 1953; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

687. A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting a report relative to the Career Compensation Act of 1949, as amended, for the calendar year 1958; to the Committee on Armed Services.

688. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to set aside and reserve Memaloose Island, Columbia River, Oreg., for the use of the Dalles Dam project and transfer certain property to the Yakima Tribe of Indians in exchange therefor"; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey: Joint Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 185. Report on the disposition of certain papers of sundry executive departments. Ordered to be printed.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey: Joint Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 186. Report on the disposition of certain papers of sundry executive departments. Ordered to be printed.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on Un-American Activities. Annual report for the year 1958. (Rept. No. 187). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mrs. PFOST: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 2154. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to acquire certain additional property to be included within the Independence National Historical Park; without amendment (Rept. No. 188). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana: Committee on Science and Astronautics. H.R. 4913. A bill to amend the National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958 to authorize the National Aeronautics and Space Administration to lease buildings in the District of Columbia for its use; with amendment (Rept. No. 189). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mrs. PFOST: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 318. A bill to authorize a revision of the boundaries of the Edison Laboratory National Monument, N.J., and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 190). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BLATNIK: Committee on Public Works. H.R. 1. A bill to require a study to be conducted of the effect of increasing the diversion of water from Lake Michigan into the Illinois Waterway for navigation, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 191). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANDERSON of Montana:

H.R. 5373. A bill to amend section 105(b) of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, relating to price support for oats, rye, barley, and grain sorghums; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BASS of Tennessee:

H.R. 5374. A bill to repeal the excise tax on amounts paid for communication services or facilities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 5375. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide a more liberal definition of the term "disability" for purposes of entitlement to disability insurance benefits and the disability freeze; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BENTLEY:

H.R. 5376. A bill for the establishment of a temporary National Advisory Committee for the Blind; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BERRY:

H.R. 5377. A bill to provide for special roll of correction classifying and grouping as follows: Landless and retaining trust property; certain bands of the Sioux Tribe of Indians to determine who is Indian and who is not; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 5378. A bill relating to acreage allotments for durum wheat; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BLATNIK:

H.R. 5379. A bill to amend the Social Security Act and the Internal Revenue Code so as to provide insurance against the costs of hospital, nursing home, and surgical service for persons eligible for old-age and survivors insurance benefits, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 5380. A bill to extend by 6 months the period for which additional benefits may be paid under the Temporary Unemployment Compensation Act of 1958; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 5381. A bill to establish an effective program to alleviate conditions of substantial and persistent unemployment and underemployment in certain economically depressed areas; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 5382. A bill to expand the public facility loan program of the Community Facilities Administration of the Housing and Home Finance Agency, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. BONNER (by request):

H.R. 5383. A bill to amend section 216 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, to clarify the status of the faculty and administrative staff at the U.S. Merchant Marine Academy, to establish suitable personnel policies for such personnel, and for other purpposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. BREEDING:

H.R. 5384. A bill to amend section 105(b) of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, relating to price support for oats, rye, barley, and grain sorghums; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BROCK:

H.R. 5385. A bill to amend section 105(b) of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended,

relating to price support for oats, rye, barley, and grain sorghums; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BROYHILL:

H.R. 5386. A bill to provide for Government contribution toward personal health service benefits for civilian officers and employees in the U.S. service and their dependents, to authorize payroll deductions for participants, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 5387. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act to provide that certain service in the Coast and Geodetic Survey shall be considered to be military service for the purposes of such act; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BURDICK:

H.R. 5388. A bill to amend section 105(b) of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, relating to price support for oats, rye, barley, and grain sorghums; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. CUNNINGHAM:

H.R. 5389. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to provide that "equal time" provisions shall not apply to news programs; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CURTIS of Missouri:

H.R. 5390. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that certain insurance agents shall be treated as outside salesmen for purposes of computing adjusted gross income; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DAVIS of Georgia:

H.R. 5391. A bill to create a joint congressional committee on salary adjustment; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. DENT:

H.R. 5392. A bill to amend chapter 15 of title 38, United States Code, to provide for payment of a pension of $100 per month to World War I veterans who have attained the age of 60 years; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. DURHAM:

H.R. 5393. A bill to authorize the grades of major general and brigadier general in the Medical Service Corps of the Regular Army, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 5394. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to eliminate the requirement that an individual must have attained the age of 50 in order to become entitled to disability insurance benefits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FISHER:

H.R. 5395. A bill to amend the Foreign Service Act of 1946 to authorize the retirement of participants under the Foreign Service retirement and disability system after completion of 20 years of service irrespective of age; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. FORRESTER:

H.R. 5396. A bill to amend title 28 of the United States Code to provide for transfer of cases between the district courts and the Court of Claims; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GALLAGHER:

H.R. 5397. A bill to increase the annual income limitations governing the payment of pensions to certain veterans and their dependents; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 5398. A bill to provide for the payment of pensions to veterans of World War I and their widows and children at the same rates as apply in the case of veterans of the Spanish-American War, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. GRAY:

H.R. 5399. A bill to amend section 3(c) of the Armed Forces Leave Act of 1946 to provide for the granting of graduation leave to members of the ROTC who are commissioned in the Regular components and placed on active duty upon their graduation from college; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 5400. A bill to provide for the preservation and development of the domestic fluorspar industry; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. GROSS:

H.R. 5401. A bill to require full disclosure of expenditures of Government and counterpart funds by Members of Congress traveling in oversea areas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. HERLONG:

H.R. 5402. A bill to amend the hospital survey and construction provisions of the Public Health Service Act to provide special assistance for hospital construction in areas of severe Federal impact; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. IKARD:

H.R. 5403. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a taxpayer a personal exemption for a foreign student who resides in his home while in the United States attending high school; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JONES of Alabama:

H.R. 5404. A bill to provide for the construction, alteration, and acquisition of public buildings of the Federal Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. KASEM:

H.R. 5405. A bill to equalize the pay of retired members of the uniformed services; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 5406. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to prohibit the discrimination in employment against individuals on account of their age; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. KASTENMEIER:

H.R. 5407. A bill to increase the authorized maximum expenditure for the fiscal year 1959 under the special milk program; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 5408. A bill to increase the authorized maximum expenditure for the fiscal years 1959, 1960, and 1961 under the special milk program; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mrs. KEE:

H. R. 5409. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to exempt a corporation from the corporate income tax where its operations are carried on in an economically depressed area and provide employment for a specified minimum number of persons in that area; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 5410. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to acquire additional food commodities for distribution to needy persons; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. KING of California:

H.R. 5411. A bill to provide financial assistance for the support of public schools by appropriating funds to the States to be used for constructing school facilities and for teachers' salaries; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. KING of Utah:

H.R. 5412. A bill to amend the act of June 14, 1926, as amended, to provide that lands conveyed under such act for State park purposes shall not be subject to the 640-acre limitation contained in such act; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. LAIRD:

H.R. 5413. A bill to increase and extend the special milk program for children; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. LANGEN:

H.R. 5414. A bill to increase and extend the special milk program for children; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. McCORMACK:

H.R. 5415. A bill to authorize the President to issue posthumously in the name of George Washington a commission as General of the Army, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. McGOVERN:

H.R. 5416. A bill to provide evaluation of rehabilitation potentials and rehabilitation services to handicapped individuals who as a result thereof can achieve such ability of independent living as to dispense with the need for expensive institutional care or who can dispense with or largely dispense with the need of an attendant at home; to assist in the establishment of public and private nonprofit workshops and rehabilitation facilities; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 5417. A bill to provide economic assistance to the American Indians; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 5418. A bill to amend section 105(b) of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, relating to price support for oats, rye, barley, and grain sorghums; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 5419. A bill to amend section 21 of the Second Liberty Bond Act to provide for the retirement of the public debt; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MACDONALD:

H.R. 5420. A bill to establish a temporary Presidential commission to study and report on the problems relating to blindness and the needs of blind persons, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 5421. A bill to provide a program of assistance to correct inequities in the construction of fishing vessels and to enable the fishing industry of the United States to regain a favorable economic status, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. MACHROWICZ:

H.R. 5422. A bill to amend section 501(c) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to exempt from the Federal income tax certain nonprofit voluntary employees' beneficiary associations where admission is limited to individuals who are officers or employees of State or local government; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MACK of Illinois:

H.R. 5423. A bill to provide for the construction of a new Federal building in Springfield, Ill.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. METCALF:

H.R. 5424. A bill to promote the economic use of Indian lands, alleviate and adjust the heirship problem involved in Indian trust or restricted allotments, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. CLEMENT W. MILLER:

H.R. 5425. A bill to repeal the excise tax on amounts paid for communication services or facilities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER:

H.R. 5426. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to provide that any territory over which the United States has jurisdiction under a treaty shall be regarded as a separate quota area; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MONTOYA:

H.R. 5427. A bill to amend section 105(b) of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, relating to price support for oats, rye, barley, and grain sorghums; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MORRIS of New Mexico:

H.R. 5428. A bill to amend section 105(b) of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, relating to price support for oats, rye, barley, and grain sorghums; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MORRIS of Oklahoma:

H.R. 5429. A bill to amend section 105(b) of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, relating to price support for oats, rye, barley, and grain sorghums; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. NELSEN:

H.R. 5430. A bill to increase and extend the special milk program for children; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. OLIVER:

H.R. 5431. A bill to provide a further increase in the retired pay of certain members of the former Lighthouse Service; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. POAGE:

H.R. 5432. A bill to amend section 105(b) of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, relating to price support for oats, rye, barley, and grain sorghums; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. QUIE:

H.R. 5433. A bill to increase and extend the special milk program for children; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. REECE of Tennessee:

H.R. 5434. A bill authorizing the transfer of certain property of the Holston Ordnance Works (at Kingsport, Tenn.) to the State of Tennessee; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina:

H.R. 5435. A bill to extend the Federal Tort Claims Act to members of the National Guard when engaged in training or duty under Federal law, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RHODES of Arizona:

H.R. 5436. A bill to provide for a register in the Department of Commerce in which shall be listed the names of persons refused a motor vehicle operator's license or who have had such licenses revoked; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts:

H.R. 5437. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to provide a 1-year period during which certain veterans may be granted national service life insurance; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. ROGERS of Texas:

H.R. 5438. A bill to amend section 105(b) of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, relating to price support for oats, rye, barley, and grain sorghums; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ROOSEVELT:

H.R. 5439. A bill to amend the Social Security Act and the Internal Revenue Code so as to provide insurance against the costs of hospital, nursing home, and surgical service for persons eligible for old-age and survivors insurance benefits, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SAYLOR:

H.R. 5440. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to exempt a corporation from the corporate income tax where its operations are carried on in an economically depressed area and provide employment for a specified minimum number of persons in that area; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SCHWENGEL:

H.R. 5441. A bill to provide for further research relating to new and improved uses which offer expanding markets for farm and forest products, to assist the States to provide additional facilities for research at the State agricultural experiment stations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 5442. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to sell and convey certain lands in the State of Iowa to the city of Keosauqua; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SHORT:

H.R. 5443. A bill relating to acreage allotments for durum wheat; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. STAGGERS:

H.R. 5444. A bill to encourage and stimulate the production and conservation of coal in the United States through research and development by creating a Coal Research and Development Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. STRATTON:

H.R. 5445. A bill to regulate the foreign commerce of the United States by amending section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas (by request):

H.R. 5446. A bill to provide for the recovery of costs of building space utilized by the Veterans' Canteen Service in the Veterans' Administration; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 5447. A bill to extend the authority of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to maintain offices in the Republic of the Philippines; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By THOMPSON of New Jersey:

H.R. 5448. A bill to amend chapter 27 of title 35 of the United States Code with respect to the rights of the United States in certain patents; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TOLLEFSON:

H.R. 5449. A bill to regulate the foreign commerce of the United States by amending section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ULLMAN:

H.R. 5450. A bill to amend section 105(b) of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, relating to price support for oats, rye, barley, and grain sorghums; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. UTT:

H.R. 5451. A bill to require that at least 50 percent of the passengers and cargo air transportation requirements of the Government of the United States be obtained from civil air operators, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 5452. A bill to regulate the foreign commerce of the United States by amending section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WITHROW:

H.R. 5453. A bill to provide for the construction, alteration, and acquisition of public buildings of the Federal Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BELCHER:

H.R. 5454. A bill to permit Indians to secure refunds of income taxes paid to the United States on income which was from allotted and restricted lands held in trust by the United States and which has been held exempt from Federal income tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CURTIS of Missouri:

H.R. 5455. A bill to establish a national policy relating to the U.S. citizens' travel abroad; to establish a service within the Department of State which shall be responsible for the direction, administration and execution of passport and travel documentation for American citizens and nationals in the United States and abroad; to prescribe procedures relating to the issuance of passports; to establish terms of validity of passports; to establish fees for passports; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DAWSON:

H.R. 5456. A bill to provide for the relocation of the National Training School for Boys, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H.R. 5457. A bill to establish a minimum reward for information leading to the apprehension and conviction of violators of the Federal narcotic laws, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MACK of Washington:

H.R. 5458. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to make it clear that the tax on transportation of persons does not apply to ferry service provided by State-operated ferryboats; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CLEMENT W. MILLER:

H.R. 5459. A bill to increase the amount of Federal aid to State or Territorial homes for the support of disabled soldiers, sailors, and airmen of the United States; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. MORRIS of New Mexico:

H.R. 5460. A bill to donate to the pueblo of Isleta certain Federal property in the State of New Mexico; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MOULDER:

H.R. 5461. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to promote the safety of employees and travelers upon railroads by limiting the hours of service of employees thereon," approved March 4, 1907; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ROOSEVELT:

H.R. 5462. A bill to provide a program of national health insurance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SHIPLEY:

H.R. 5463. A bill granting the consent and approval of Congress to the Wabash Valley compact, and for related purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas:

H.R. 5464. A bill to amend section 138 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 so as to provide for the reduction of the public debt by at least 10 percent of the estimated overall Federal receipts for each fiscal year; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. FULTON:

H.R. 5465. A bill to provide for the establishment of a U.S. Foreign Service Academy; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H.R. 5466. A bill to amend chapter 69 of title 10 of the United States Code to provide for advancement on the retired list of members of the Armed Forces who have been specially commended for performance of duty in combat; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. DIXON:

H.R. 5467. A bill to provide assistance to the States in certain surveying and planning with respect to college facilities; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BRAY:

H.J. Res. 292. Joint resolution to establish a commission to investigate the utilization of the radio and television frequencies allocated to the agencies and instrumentalities of the Federal Government; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CHIPERFIELD:

H.J. Res. 293. Joint resolution to establish in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare the National Advisory Council for International Medical Research, and to establish in the Public Health Service the National Institute for International Medical Research, in order to help mobilize the efforts of medical scientists, research workers, technologists, teachers, and members of the health professions generally, in the United States and abroad, for assault

upon disease, disability, and the impairments of man, and for the improvement of the health of man through international cooperation in research, research training, and research planning; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HARRIS:

H.J. Res. 294. Joint resolution authorizing the President to proclaim the week in May of each year in which falls the third Friday of that month as National Transportation Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POFF:

H.J. Res. 295. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States reserving to the States exclusive control over public schools; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PATMAN:

H. Con. Res. 99. Concurrent resolution authorizing the Joint Economic Committee to conduct studies and investigations into problems of providing maximum employment, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. LIPSCOMB:

H. Res. 201. Resolution authorizing the printing of a report entitled "U. S. Foreign Aid, Its Purposes, Scope, Administration, and Related Information"; to the Committee on House Administration.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States concerning the establishment in California of a soil and water conservation laboratory; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States that the necessary action be immediately taken to compensate certain livestock operators for the loss in grazing privileges, and for the damage sustained in the withdrawal of certain lands in the Atomic Energy Commission area of the Idaho Falls site; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to requesting statehood for Hawaii; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Kansas, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to take appropriate action to assure the continuance of surveys and planning and cooperation in the construction of projects in the State of Kansas that are vital and necessary to the control of floods; to the Committee on Public Works.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Massachusetts, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to establish a Federal domiciliary hospital in New England; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Montana, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to requesting the establishment of a Federal Indian policy which recognizes the duty of the Federal Government to the American Indian; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of New Mexico, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States against discrimination in price supports in similar farm commodities by the Secretary of Agriculture of the United States; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of New Mexico, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to decline passage of a bill establishing a national wilderness preservation system and designating certain areas to be maintained as a wilderness; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to refuse to enact any increase in the Federal gasoline tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to the rapid progress now being made toward the granting of statehood to Hawaii, and petitioning them to continue in their efforts; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BERRY:

H.R. 5468. A bill to provide for the issuance of patents in fee simple covering certain property now held in trust for Indians or Indian tribes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BOYLE:

H.R. 5469. A bill for the relief of Joe Ho Kwong and Alverne Joe (Goon) Kwong; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan:

H.R. 5470. A bill for the relief of Capt. Oren E. De Haven; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H.R. 5471. A bill for the relief of Dr. Jose Jimenez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANKFORD:

H.R. 5472. A bill for the relief of Anthony Cono; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. METCALF:

H.R. 5473. A bill for the relief of Albert Dance; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5474. A bill for the relief of W. R. Wade; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MULTER:

H.R. 5475. A bill for the relief of Giuseppe Aniello; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REECE of Tennessee:

H.R. 5476. A bill for the relief of Magdaleno Duenas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STRATTON:

H.R. 5477. A bill to authorize Maj. Gen. Bernard W. Kearney, U.S. Army (retired), a former Member of Congress, to accept and wear the Philippine Legion of Honor in the degree of commander, conferred upon him by the Government of the Philippines; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. TAYLOR:

H.R. 5478. A bill for the relief of Gee Lai Ting; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TEAGUE of California:

H.R. 5479. A bill for the relief of Jose F. Macabantad; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas:

H.R. 5480. A bill for the relief of Maria Papaconstantinou; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WAINWRIGHT:

H.R. 5481. A bill for the relief of Julia S. Lee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5482. A bill for the relief of Gennaro Prudente; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WHARTON:

H.R. 5483. A bill for the relief of Francesco Aiello; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. YATES:

H.R. 5484. A bill for the relief of Carmen Alicna Campos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BATES:

H.R. 5485. A bill for the relief of Maria Sebbio; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

98. By Mr. HORAN: Petition of 2,142 citizens of Stevens County, Wash., urging the Congress to confine their expenditures to existing sources and limits of revenue and not to increase taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

99. Also, petition of 44 citizens of Spokane, Lincoln, and Stevens Counties, Wash., urging the Congress to enact legislation clearly and concisely establishing single tax liability upon patronage refunds of farmer cooperatives by taxing them at face value in the hands of the member in the year of issuance or notification, disregarding the actual or market value thereof for tax purposes, and, urging Congress to reject any attempts to fix the interest paid or payable on such patronage refunds or the period of redemption thereof by such farmer cooperatives; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

100. Also, petition of 307 citizens of Lincoln County, Wash., urging the Congress to confine their expenditures to existing sources and limits of revenue and not to increase taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

101. By Mr. KASEM: Petition of 38 members of the Veterans' Club, Citrus Junior College, Glendora, Calif., petitioning favorable consideration of H.R. 712, relating to a 10-percent increase in the education and training allowances paid to individuals pursuing educational programs under laws administered by the Veterans' Administration; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

102. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the resolutions committee chairman, Red Oak Ruritan Club, Alberta, Va., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the rights of States in the field of education, and other enumerated grievances; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

103. Also, petition of Ophelia Beard, Chicago, Ill., relative to redress of grievances and restoration of full citizenship; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

104. Also, petition of the clerk of the Board of Supervisors, County of Erie, Buffalo, N.Y., relative to proposing an amendment to the Old-Age and Survivors' Insurance Benefit Act by reducing from 62 years to 55 years the age at which women may qualify for the benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

105. Also, petition of Fil-American Guerrilla Brigade, ECLGA, Manila, Philippines, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the request for granting compensation to Philippine claimants who rendered services in World War II, and enclosing some of the members' individual records; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

106. Also, petition of Lester Higa and other students of Roosevelt High School, Honolulu, T.H., relative to requesting prompt and favorable legislation admitting Hawaii into the Union and granting full statehood; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

National Security

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 9, 1959

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include a very fine letter which I have received from John W. Mahan, commander in chief of the Veterans of Foreign Wars together with a copy of my reply to Commander in Chief Mahan:

VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS
OF THE UNITED STATES,
Kansas City, Mo., March 3, 1959.

The Honorable JOHN W. McCORMACK,
U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: As commander in chief of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, I recently had an opportunity to meet with leaders from your State during our annual legislative conference in Washington, D.C. Since talking with your constituents, I thought it advisable to write you on a matter that concerns all of us—national security.

The VFW, by resolution and by unanimity of opinion, feels that our country is losing basic military strength through proposed plans to reduce our Defense Establishment. We believe, and we are on record, that our country should have a balanced defense which is ready to move at a moment's notice whether on the ground, on the seas, or in the air. We further believe that a reduction in our ground forces in the face of the Khrushchev challenge over Berlin is unthinkable. Even though the Berlin situation might be settled peaceably, there are still many trouble spots in the world where American support has already been committed.

It is our understanding that unless plans to reduce forces are halted, the Army will lose one division and the Marine Corps will suffer drastic cuts in its combat strength. Our military strength must be great enough to insure peace.

We are told that Russia has 25 divisions on the borders of Western Europe alone. Instead of a reduction of forces, the VFW knows that the American people are willing to pay more for defense, if necessary, and we should keep our ground forces at least at the level recommended by the Congress which was 900,000 in the Army and 200,000 in the Marine Corps.

We would appreciate hearing from you on this matter and if you agree with us, I sincerely hope that you will lend your influence and support toward maintaining our military and naval forces at the above strength.

Sincerely yours,
JOHN W. MAHAN,
Commander in Chief.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., March 6, 1959.

JOHN W. MAHAN,
Commander in Chief, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, VFW Building, Kansas City, Mo.

DEAR COMMANDER IN CHIEF MAHAN: I am in receipt of your letter of March 3 which I have read with special interest and pleasure. Your views, as expressed in your letter, are completely consistent with my views on the question of national security. I am sure that you have read in the papers recently my statement that I would be happier if the President would recommend more taxes for greater national defense. It would be good leadership for our people to make that sacrifice rather than holding up a reduction in taxes, which is leadership along the lines of complacency. I think that if you will examine my record in Congress, you will find that while there are other Members who are just as strong as I am for a powerful military force, there is no Member who has a stronger feeling on this question than I do. I have repeatedly said, "the only thing that those in the Kremlin respect is what they fear" and that is military strength and power greater than they possess themselves.

I know that you are aware of the fact that Congress last year appropriated money to maintain an Army of 900,000 officers and men; and the Marine Corps, 200,000 officers and men but the President did not maintain this force. The Army has been reduced, as you know, to about 870,000 or it is in the process of being reduced. The Marine Corps is now down to about 184,000 with the objective to reduce it to 175,000. The money has been appropriated but the President has frozen same. We also appropriated money for greater defense in other directions and most of the money that Congress appropriated last year under the President's budget estimates has been put in a deep freeze.

With kind regards, I am,
Sincerely yours,
JOHN W. McCORMACK,
Member of Congress.

P.S.—The only one who can stop the reduction of the Army and Marine Corps is President Eisenhower. In fact he could increase the Army and Marine Corps to 900,000 and 200,000 respectively. The money has been appropriated and is available until June 30 of this year.

Thomas G. Masaryk: Democracy's Advocate

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 9, 1959

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday, March 7, we honored Thomas G. Masaryk, the founder of the Czechoslovak Republic, and its first President. It was 109 years ago that this great Democrat and friend of the United States was born. Yet today the people Thomas Masaryk inspired just over four decades ago are banned from joining us in paying tribute to this great man.

The reason for this is quite simple. Those who rule Czechoslovakia today represent the negation of everything Thomas G. Masaryk stood for. He stood for truth; they stand for falsehood. He stood for liberty; they stand for oppression. He stood for a religious, moral way of life; they stand for atheistic materialism. Masaryk was a man of principles. The dignity of the individual, protection of minority rights, and sincerity in politics were among his basic convictions. The acceptance of even one of these beliefs would undermine the foundation upon which the Soviet empire, under whose domination Czechoslovakia has been chained, is based.

Thomas Masaryk was a friend of America. In America, he saw much to be copied in the field of technology. More important, however, he saw deeper into the workings of the American civilization than just technological innovations. Thomas Masaryk realized that at the heart of America lie the seeds of democracy that bud into the flowers of independence, justice, and freedom.

In America—He said—

We can and should learn * * * love of freedom and individual independence.

On this 109th anniversary of the birth of Thomas G. Masaryk it is, therefore, fitting that all America should join with the friends of this great Czechoslovak patriot in commemorating this historic occasion. Let us rededicate ourselves to those higher democratic ideals which are exemplified so much by the spirit of Thomas G. Masaryk.

Establishment of a U.S. Foreign Service Academy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 9, 1959

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, on March 2, 1959, I introduced a bill in the House of Representatives, for the establishment of a U.S. Foreign Service Academy. This school will provide the corps of well-trained, devoted foreign service officers required by America's position in world affairs.

For 10 years, the United States has been engaged in an uneasy peace—really a war with different weapons. This means, simply and fortunately, that the shots are not yet being called by the generals, but rather by our diplomats and policymakers. Important and far-reaching policy decisions are being made, based upon the assessment of local situations by our official representatives abroad. Their conduct, attitudes, and knowledge strongly influence the opinion which foreign nations hold of us. Frequently, the difference between a stunning diplomatic success and abject failure turns upon the effectiveness of our diplomatic representation. Yet, in this day and age, the Government of the United States still does not maintain any school, adequate for training our career Foreign Service officers.

Let us look at only one aspect of the need for such training. Fifty percent of the entire Foreign Service officers

do not have even a speaking knowledge of any foreign language. Seventy percent of the new recruits coming into the service suffer the same deficit. Many of our Ambassadors cannot speak the language of the country to which they are at present accredited. In nine Arab Nations only two of our Ministers speak Arabic. In Japan, Korea, Burma, Thailand, Vietnam, and Indonesia, our Ambassadors must speak through interpreters.

Effective representation abroad requires proficiency not only in foreign languages, but a thorough knowledge of the history and culture of foreign lands, an understanding of international and local economics, a thorough familiarity with diplomatic practices and procedures, and a working knowledge of the political systems of other nations. Yet, many of these essential subjects are giving way to sciences and mathematics in our universities. In the interest of world peace, we must have a balance between emphasis on general education and emphasis on science. Scientists do not make policy and policy is what we sadly lack today. Good policy is born out of knowledge and training.

Training for our Foreign Service should be maintained by a Foreign Service Academy administered with the discipline present in our military service academies. Such an Academy would attract capable young people into the diplomatic service, who might otherwise go into other professions. Thus, the education of our future ambassadors would be begun at the receptive age of college freshmen and this would provide sufficient time for broad background studies and special training. Academy training would also generate the esprit de corps which every first-rate organization must have.

Under the provisions of my bill, students would be selected for the Academy upon competitive entrance examinations as prescribed by the Secretary of State. Each diplomatic cadet will be expected to sign an agreement signifying his willingness to accept an appointment and serve as an officer in the Foreign Service for at least 3 years following his graduation.

The establishment of a Foreign Service Academy will be a significant step forward in vitalizing the diplomatic service of the United States. This should not be the end, but rather the beginning. Congress must also consider granting realistic and adequate funds for the maintenance of our Foreign Service, so that capable Foreign Service officers will not be impoverished in the performance of their duties.

The text of the bill follows:

A bill to provide for the establishment of a United States Foreign Service Academy

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "United States Foreign Service Academy Act".

SEC. 2. The Secretary of State is authorized and directed to establish and maintain, in or near the District of Columbia, a United States Foreign Service Academy (hereinafter referred to as the "Academy") for the instruction and training of diplomatic cadets in preparation for service as officers in the Foreign Service of the United States.

SEC. 3. (a) The Academy shall be under the general supervision of the Director General of the Foreign Service Institute and under such regulations as the Secretary of State may prescribe.

(b) The course of instruction and training for diplomatic cadets at the Academy shall be prescribed by the Secretary of State and shall be the equivalent of the curriculum prescribed by accredited colleges and universities as a prerequisite to the granting of a master's degree. Upon satisfactory completion of the prescribed course of instruction and training, diplomatic cadets shall be granted a master's degree.

(c) The Secretary of State may appoint or assign such officers and civilian instructors as the needs of the Academy require.

SEC. 4 (a) The corps of diplomatic cadets shall consist of such individuals as may be selected and admitted to the Academy upon competitive entrance examinations as prescribed by the Secretary of State.

(b) Diplomatic cadets while in attendance at the Academy shall be entitled to quarters and subsistence.

SEC. 5. There shall be appointed each year a Board of Visitors to the Academy which shall consist of five members from the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate and five members from the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives, to be appointed by the respective chairmen of such committees. The Board of Visitors shall exercise the same functions and be entitled to the same expense allowance as is provided in the case of the Board of Visitors to the United States Military Academy.

SEC. 6. Each diplomatic cadet selected for admission to the Academy shall sign an agreement that, unless sooner separated, he will—

(1) complete the course of instruction at the Academy; and

(2) accept an appointment and service, as an officer in the Foreign Service for at least the three years immediately following the granting of his degree from the Academy.

SEC. 7. There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act.

Layman's View of the Life Insurance Company Income Tax Act of 1959

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 9, 1959

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, this is in response to numerous constituent requests for a plainly worded, nontechnical explanation of the Life Insurance Company Income Tax Act of 1959 (H.R. 4245) which recently passed the House. It was the year's first tax bill considered by the House of Representatives and was the first major legislation prepared by and reported from the Ways and Means Committee in which I participated as a committee member.

Background information includes the following considerations: There are approximately 1,300 insurance companies consisting of 300 mutual and 1,000 stock companies. There are big and small companies of each kind. Mutuals have 63 percent of insurance in force, hold 75 percent of the assets, pay 75 percent of the income tax, and had an estimated gain of 58 percent of all insurance business in 1958. Stock companies, therefore, are 37 percent, 25 percent, and 42 percent, respectively.

The kinds of taxation possible are based on insurance company income of two kinds: First, investment income—yield from investment of policyholders' money in 1958 was $3.25 billion—and, second, underwriting income—chiefly gain from margin in premiums charged, fewer death benefits paid than expected. Correct profit determination is complicated by the need for accumulation of various reserves to provide available assets or money to make good the promised payout later in death or retirement. Tax formulas, therefore, must include these factors and recognize analyses involving industrywide averages and/or company-by-company experience. All these considerations spell out the uniqueness of the insurance industry compared to other corporations in the context of a proper determination of taxable income.

The peculiar difficulties of taxation of insurance companies, therefore, are threefold:

First. Contracts are made with policyholders wherein profit may not be known for periods up to as much as 100 years.

Second. In investing policyholders' premiums insurance companies have a bank-like function, so intertwined with pure insurance operation, that it is difficult to determine what investment income does go to the policyholders and what part to the company.

Third. The greatest volume, approximately 75 percent, of life insurance is done by mutuals, that is, cooperative organizations and it is difficult to measure their income. It is maintained that mutuals refund profits or overcharges to policyholders while stock companies competitively at time of policy sale offer lowest possible premium charges without any overcharge refundable cushion on nonparticipating business.

A complicated three-step formula attempts to fairly spread the insurance company tax burden and in many ways is an improvement over earlier formulas.

THE PROPOSED TAX FORMULA

The regular 52-percent corporate rate—30-percent normal tax, 22-percent surtax on incomes in excess of $25,000—applies to the insurance company income tax base. The 25-percent alternative capital gains tax is applicable to capital gains.

The tax base consists of computations under a three-phase formula.

The first phase is concerned with investment income. Gross investment income consisting of interest, dividends, rents, royalties, and so forth, is aggregated and deductions are taken for such things as investment expenses, tax-free interest, a percentage of dividends received, and a special deduction to benefit small insurance companies. The net investment income is determined and further deductions are allowed with respect to reserve requirements, investment income on qualified pension plan reserves, and certain interest paid items.

The deduction for net investment income required to be set aside in life insurance reserves to meet future policy obligations is determined pursuant to what is called the modified-Menge formula. This basic deduction is computed by adjusting the reserves in terms of earned interest predicated on an average industry assumed rate or an individual company's assumed rate, whichever is higher.

The second phase in the computation of the tax base is a determination of the net gain or loss from operations. Gross receipts takes into account investment income, income premium income, and other receipts. Deductions are allowed for benefit payments and expenses pertaining to investment and insurance company operations. Deductions are also allowed for additions to reserves, certain dividends and credits to policyholders, certain group insurance premium income, and a special deduction for nonparticipating insurance equal to 10 percent of the increase in such life insurance reserves.

By deducting taxable investment income which has already been subject to tax in phase one from the aggregate determined under phase two, the underwriting gain or loss is determined. If there is an underwriting gain, one-half of that amount is added to the taxable investment income to establish a combined tax base under phases one and two. In the case of underwriting loss, such loss is offset in full against the phase one tax base.

The phase three tax base computation relates to stock companies and provides that for calendar year 1959 and subsequent years, income distributed to stockholders in excess of amounts already taxed on a current basis is to be included in the regular tax base of the company at the time of such distribution or at the time the company elects to be taxed on part or all of such previously untaxed amount.

ARGUMENTS FOR THE PROPOSED FORMULA

First. Loss would be fully deductible and could be carried forward or back.

Second. One hundred and ten percent deduction would be allowed for profit payment into reserves.

Third. Pension trust reserves investment yield would be deductible.

Fourth. Interest on tax-exempt securities would be deductible.

Fifth. The discriminatory 1942 formula would become effective if H.R. 4245 is not passed.

ARGUMENTS AGAINST THE PROPOSED FORMULA

First. Economic impact on the industry of 90 percent tax increase for 1958 over 1957 has not been sufficiently studied by the Committee or Treasury Department.

Second. State taxes of $300 million plus estimated $545 million of this bill make insurance companies the most heavily taxed thrift institution.

Third. Inflation and taxation are causing the trend to pure protection and away from savings through insurance.

Fourth. Federal Social Security program with no tax liability on investment income will be given discriminatory advantage over private efforts to provide for future security.

Fifth. There is an approximate 5 percentage point shift of taxload from mutuals to stock companies. Because of the preponderance of arguments against the bill, I could not agree to the bill in its entirety.

True, this bill is far superior to the 1942 formula, which was not intended to become effective and which we were warned would come into effect for 1958 if we failed to pass this bill. There is an alternative to the 1942 law which we could have used, namely, continuation of the 1955 Mills-Curtis formula with appropriate amendments plugging any loopholes until the full economic impact of this bill could be studied.

My objection and concern is best expressed in the Committee Report's Supplemental View—pages 87 to 88. I am a signatory to these views which state in part:

Individual economic security is now being provided the public by life insurance companies, other thrift institutions, and through the social security system. It is sound public policy to encourage everyone to provide for his own security on a voluntary basis and our tax laws should encourage, not deter, such efforts. This bill, however, makes voluntary provision for one's own economic security relatively less attractive since it increases the tax on life insurance while investment earnings under the social security system are free from either Federal or State tax. This incerases the advantage of the social security system over voluntary individual protection offered by life insurance companies, particularly if the latter must absorb taxes of the magnitude provided in the bill. Public awareness of this differential in cost will most certainly lead to incerased demand for larger social security benefits and less incentive to build security on a voluntary basis.

I feel that our haste precluded the full economic study that is still needed before evolving a permanent formula for life insurance taxation. Perhaps, my relative inexperience as a new members of the Ways and Means Committee in dealing with an extremely complex subject has made me overly cautions.

Program for Relief in Areas of Unemployment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELIZABETH KEE
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 9, 1959

Mrs. KEE. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include copy of my newsletter which was released today:

KEENOTES

(By Representative ELIZABETH KEE)

Last week I joined 51 of my colleagues from both parties and from all sections of the country in proposing a three-part program which would bring both immediate and long-range relief to those areas which are suffering from persistent and heavy unemployment. The action of the 52 Members dramatizes the gravity of the economic situation facing many areas and the need for immediate action by the Federal Government.

Here is what the 52 Members of Congress proposed:

1. Immediate expansion of the surplus food distribution program, upon which thousands of families throughout the country depend in whole or in part for subsistence.

2. Immediate appropriation of funds by Congress for flood control, reclamation, rivers and harbors development, and other public works in depressed economic areas.

3. Immediate passage by Congress of area development legislation to provide a long-range relief measure which will assist local communities in helping themselves.

Many Members of Congress, especially those from areas which have not suffered severely from the recent economic downturn, do not fully realize just how widespread and intense this economic distress is. Also, the administration has failed to face up to this problem. Perhaps these figures will change their minds—21 percent of the total population in 210 counties in 24 States are now receiving surplus agricultural commodities; 269 different locations, suffering from 6 percent unemployment, are classified as distressed areas; 73 areas, with 15 percent or more unemployment, are acutely distressed.

In the Fifth District of West Virginia, six of the seven counties have 15 percent or more of the total population receiving surplus foods from the Government. In one county, the percentage is 41 percent of the total population.

The 52 House Members who are working together on this problem believe the surplus food program should be expanded to bring immediate relief, that additional foods should be acquired by USDA to bolster the subsistence diet of these people and that greater quantities should be distributed to each family.

Immediate construction of flood control and other public works projects is needed in these distressed areas to provide immediate jobs for men who are unable to find employment. This part of the program would only apply to projects which have already been authorized by Congress but for which no money has been appropriated.

These projects are economically feasible. They are needed. If Congress would make the money available, work could start in about 3 months, thus creating thousands of desperately needed jobs. It is my understanding that foreign aid funds, voted by Congress, are supporting about 100 public works projects abroad but the President does not advocate one new start in this country.

The most important part of the program, in the opinion of many of the 52 Members, is that dealing with area redevelopment. There was unanimous agreement that permanent solutions must be found to rebuild the depressed areas economically. We hope that action by the 52 Members will clearly show the rest of Congress just how urgent this problem is.

The House Banking and Currency Committee plans to open hearings later this month on this legislation. A Senate subcommittee has already started hearing witnesses.

The action of the 52 House Members should serve to indicate the strong support for such legislation in both parties. Perhaps it will speed up final consideration.

The three-point program is urgently needed: (1) More and better surplus foods for the 1,298,201 people forced to subsist on this handout from the Government because of the lack of job opportunities; (2) an immediate public works program to build needed projects and create urgently needed

jobs; and (3) area development legislation to rebuild these areas and provide new and permanent employment.

I was happy to join 51 of my colleagues in setting forth this program and in working for its enactment.

Synopsis of Resolutions Adopted by Governor's Interstate Indian Council

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. Y. BERRY
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 9, 1959

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, in October of 1958 the Governor's Interstate Indian Council, composed of 18 States, passed a number of resolutions. The States represented at the council include: Arizona, California, Florida, Idaho, Kansas, Minnesota, Montana, Nebraska, New Mexico, New York, North Dakota, Oklahoma, Oregon, South Dakota, Utah, Washington, Wisconsin, and Wyoming. A synopsis of these resolutions is as follows:

(a) Resolution 3: The Governor's Interstate Indian Council favors legislation to amend Public Law 568, 83d Congress, the Indian Health Program Transfer Act. The primary purpose of the proposed legislation was to clarify the authority of the Surgeon General to institute a program for the provision of Indian sanitation facilities as a part of its overall health program, and S. 3694 will be a great aid in assisting the Public Health Service in carrying out its sanitation program.

(b) Resolution 4: The council strongly urges that Congress double the appropriation for vocational training for Indians to the amount of $7 million a year, and wholeheartedly endorses the philosophy of extending this vocational training program to nonreservation Indians.

(c) Resolution 5: The council requests the Secretary of the Interior and the Commissioner of Indian Affairs to adopt a program to extend certain health and welfare services to Indians residing off the reservations who would otherwise have been entitled to receive such services and benefits had they remained on the reservations.

(d) Resolution 6: The council resolved that the Secretary of the Interior be petitioned to present to Congress more clearly defined statutes to assure that no termination procedure be consummated without direct acceptance of the terms by the tribe and the consent of the State legislature.

(e) Resolution 7: The council resolved that the Secretary of the Interior be petitioned to inaugurate procedures for determining the status of those who claim to be Indians, and establish a roll on that basis in every tribe.

(f) Resolution 8: The council reaffirms its Resolution XI passed in 1957, requesting Congress to provide adequate appropriations for Indian education.

(g) Resolution 9: The council resolved that Congress effect passage of proper legislation amending the Claims Commission Act to clearly define just what matters constitute a valid and equitable offset to aid the Commission in making a fair and just adjudication in an instance when the Government by way of counterclaim and setoff, charges the tribe with certain services and benefits extended to the tribe in the past and other offsets such as for the operation and maintenance on old USIS irrigation projects against individual allottees and old unsettled obligations of renters of said lands belonging to the individual allottee—not obligation of the allottee or Indian tribe.

(h) Resolution 10: The council resolved that the Bureau of Indian Affairs be requested to initiate a more vigorous Indian reservation road improvement program in the immediate future, as good roads on a reservation are the lifeblood of educational and economic development.

(i) Resolution 12: The council resolved that the Bureau of Indian Affairs be urged to place more emphasis upon the secondary high school education program and make the facilities and opportunities for this kind of education more widely available to Indian youth on reservations, because the educational program on Indian reservations is the basic foundation on which the solution of all problems confronting Indian people will be based.

Thomas Masaryk: Man of the Ages

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 9, 1959

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, March 7 marked the anniversary of the birth of Thomas G. Masaryk, the founder and first President of the Czechoslovak Republic.

I want peace, but that does not mean that I am going to meet aggression unarmed; rather the contrary. I want practical, not Utopian, peace.

These were the words of Thomas Masaryk more than a generation ago. And these words alone would link him to America today, if nothing else did. The founder and first President of Czechoslovakia combined practical idealism with realism. Actually, however, we in the United States honor Thomas Masaryk because of the qualities of the political philosopher and the statesman, which link him with the men of all time. He was a man of stature, intellectually, politically, philosophically.

He arose in a day when western civilization was prepared to welcome a man of the people who promoted respect for the individuality of the common man. Not in the sense of Marxism did he plead the cause of the masses; for he rejected Marx. He also rejected Kant, Hegel, Nietzsche. In the truly democratic sense he followed the philosophers Plato, Hume, Mill, Spencer, but, above all, Comte.

His humble birth and struggle to secure an education made him sympathetic with the difficulties of the poor. His zeal for an education and his diligence as a tutor brought to him the realization of the value of the things of the mind and the things of the spirit. His experience as a member of the Austrian legislature gave him political insight. Because of his independence in that capacity he was recognized as a figure of remarkable political, philosophical, and ethical stature. His democratic thought and spiritual freedom were incorporated in his political actions.

When he had been for only 5 years President of the new Czechoslovak nation, of which he was the founder, laudatory messages came from Paris, from Brussels, from London. In them stress was laid upon the fact that the success of his leadership was due to the idealism with which he guided the young state. Comprehension of the kind of freedom desired by the nations in revolt at the time of World War I and a faith in the strength of the democratic feeling within them dominated all of his actions, and gained for him a reputation of rare insight and unusual political honesty.

He believed that Czechoslovakia had a special and unique message for mankind. Marked by religion and spiritual culture of a high order, the mission of the Czechoslovak soul as Masaryk saw it was independence and originality of thought. The shadow of this man stretched not only across and beyond the borders of Czechoslovakia. It has stretched down the decades since his death; and will, no doubt, continue to do so as long as there is a free world to recognize his great contribution to western civilization.

Washington Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 9, 1959

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following newsletter dated March 7, 1959:

WASHINGTON REPORT
(By Congressman BRUCE ALGER, Fifth District, Texas)

"If Patrick Henry thought taxation without representation was so terrible, he should see it with representation." How often great truths are spoken in jest.

The Ways and Means Committee, of which I am a member, continues its almost daily all-day tax hearings. Simultaneously, the House meets to consider legislation already cleared by House committees for floor action. Daily mail and office casework (constituents with need for help in Government contact) continue heavy as ever. Beyond these activities are the necessary studies of issues, meetings, speeches, and papers for the RECORD with somewhere in here, a bite of lunch—these are full days, and had better

be, considering the problems confronting this Congress. Necessarily, my efforts in other legislative fields are limited in view of my increased duties and responsibilities in tax matters. Hearings on technical tax changes to the Internal Revenue Code concerning subchapters C, corporate distributions; J, estates and trusts; and K, partners and partnerships, are completed. Now we are holding hearings on depletion allowances. Oil and gas are not yet a part of these hearings. The depletion question is twofold. (1) The point of cutoff (point up to which depletion allowance is computed, a point between mining and manufacturing in developing a marketable product), and (2) the percentage rate. There are many minerals now benefiting by depletion allowances. Problems to resolve: Court reinterpretation of congressional intent and heavy litigation; and (2) mineral industries are each striving for maximum allowance; (3) a complicated new Treasury suggestion to replace existing law, disturbing to each industry, each of which is unique; (4) are the depletion allowances justifiable capital return, therefore tax free, or subsidy?

A bill to end the tax-exempt status of Federal public housing bonds was my legislative contribution this week. The Federal Government by law cannot sell its own tax-exempt bonds. Yet a practice has grown up whereby these bonds are sold in the open market by a shell or front agency designated by the local public housing authority, and Federal interest payments go directly to this front agency. This is simply a dodge or ruse, as many see it. As such, it is illegal. Further, compare this sale to that of a true municipal bond which is sold by a city such as Dallas. This bond is backed by local credit (not Federal), secured by property taxation, ad valorem taxes. These bonds, too, are tax exempt. Competitively, what chance has a city bond in open sale against a Federal bond? And how about the different Federal bonds? Public housing bonds will pay 3.4 percent tax-free to the wealthy investor, when Joe Doe's Government savings bond earns 3¼ percent, and on this he must pay income tax. Is that fair? It is obvious to me that ending the tax-exempt status of public housing bonds is legally and morally right.

Roundup of current items of interest: (1) The AFL–CIO Machinist published an analysis of the purchasing power of wages today compared to 1938 and found it takes fewer hours of work to earn food, clothes, furniture and other needs; simultaneously, the AFL–CIO's Meany lampooned Russia's claims of "workers' paradise" by comparing the lot of the worker in the United States and Russia. Unanswered: When will labor leaders recognize that the productive capacity of our industry joined with incentive, ingenuity, and sweat of our people is the cause of wage-earner prosperity and not Federal aid, which labor leaders incessantly demand. Unanswered, also, when will the wage earners wise up to inflation that waters the purchasing power of their earnings, inflation caused by big Government spending as demanded by labor leaders. Are the labor leaders trying to create problems for wage earners or solve them? (2) How about a Federal taxpayers' revolt? Taxpayers in the State of Washington have signed a petition pledging they'll seek no new State services. A Dallas taxpayer returned to me a Government check as his contribution to reducing the demand for Federal aid, reversing the trend. It wouldn't take many protests of long-suffering taxpayers across this land, in each congressional district, to make Members of Congress cut back on the big spending. (3) A fearless stay-put attitude on the U.S. part is the only answer to the Berlin crisis or to Khrushchev in any negotiation, and if that fails, as have all other contractual obligations been broken by Russia, then we'd better deny recognition to Russia, tighten our belts and be prepared for anything. Further, it's time, as I see it, to think about another defense attitude than our "let the other fellow strike the first blow" policy. In all-out nuclear war there might not be a counterpunch, let's face it. (4) Balanced budget department: We're just before having the financial roof cave in—fantastically expensive Democrat programs in housing, depressed areas aid, airports, farm subsidy, in the multibillions beyond the administration's budget, are facing us. So we are confronted again with fiscal responsibility versus the political "I'm for the people by spending more of their money" boast. Is it more courageous to spend someone else's money, and politically take credit for allegedly doing good, or to say no, we must live within our income and protect the value of our currency? The right course is not always the easy one. To the big Government planners, I quote former Speaker Cannon: "America is a hell of a success. Why tinker with it?"

Needed: Leadership for Our Economy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. DODD
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, March 9, 1959

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, last Saturday, March 7, 1959, in Clarksburg, W. Va., the distinguished Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] spoke to a large audience of more than 400 people gathered together at a great West Virginia Democratic victory dinner.

I ask unanimous consent that the remarks of the able Senator from Missouri be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I suggest that my colleagues take the time to carefully read this speech, because it is a serious, brilliant, and responsible address concerning some of the gravest problems which confront this Nation.

I was told by my friend and colleague, the able Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH], who introduced the Senator from Missouri, that the effect of this speech on the audience was electric, and that it evoked a remarkably enthusiastic response.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEEDED: LEADERSHIP FOR OUR ECONOMY

(Address by Senator STUART SYMINGTON, at Democratic victory dinner, Clarksburg, W. Va., March 7, 1959)

I am most happy to be with you at this fine victory dinner tonight. I bring greetings from the State of Missouri, which shares with you some beautiful mountain country, and also shares your faith in the Democratic Party.

We Democrats in Missouri, and throughout the country, are mighty proud of the Democrats in West Virginia. Last November, you led the entire country by electing not one, but two Democratic Senators; and five Democratic Congressmen.

No one could help admiring the spirit with which the Democrats of West Virginia have tackled the problems of your State. There is a big job to be done; and by their votes last November, the people demonstrated the extent to which they are behind you, and are working with you, for a greater, more prosperous State.

You can always tell a Democrat by his faith in the future—and by his willingness to work with the people to make the hope of the future come true.

For the past 2 months in the Senate I have watched your two fine Senators working together for their and your State—and for the Nation. There was never a better example of teamwork than that between JENNINGS RANDOLPH and BOB BYRD. Together, they have introduced bills to aid depressed areas, expand community facilities, research new uses for coal, and release more farm surpluses to feed hungry families.

They are joined in this effort by your Congressmen, my friends, including the beloved dean of your delegation, CLEVE BAILEY—and fine Congressmen and Congresswoman, ELIZABETH KEE, HARLEY STAGGERS, KEN HECHLER, and JOHN SLACK. These men and women are working to build a better future for West Virginia. They are doing everything in their power to restore prosperity to this State—so that your young people need not leave their homes and go to other States to obtain work. Surely this is a righteous cause which deserves everyone's support—and I intend to do everything possible to support it.

Your victory last fall was not easy. The Republicans poured everything they had into the West Virginia campaign. Someone said there were so many high Republican officials speaking and working out here last October, it would have been easier to get a Cabinet meeting together in Charleston than in Washington.

I wonder what has happened to all those Republican smiles and all that solicitude you saw in West Virginia, before last November 4. There was a lot of sunshine around here then, but it has all disappeared now. And it has disappeared from Washington, too.

I don't know what has become of all those bright Republican promises of the last campaign. The Republican administration does not seem so interested now in helping the people. We Democrats in the Senate passed a bill to provide more and better housing for people everywhere. The Republicans don't like it; they say it's too much, and that the President may veto it. We passed an airport bill, to keep our airports abreast of the rising tide of air travel, and to reduce the danger of airplane crashes. The Republicans don't like it; they say it's too much, and the President may veto it. And so it goes.

We Democrats want to do something about the growing shortage of school rooms and teachers. The President proposes to cut down on what little aid the Federal Government gives now to some school districts; and as for new schools, he comes up with a proposal that is about as helpful as trying to bail out a flooded cellar with an eyedropper.

The Republicans have their eye on the ball, all right, but it is the wrong ball. They are concentrating on the old dollar sign, and not on what the country needs to grow and prosper.

The Republicans' indifference to our needs at home is matched by their failure to properly recognize the growing grave dangers abroad.

We are faced with an immediate threat to our national security by the most ruthless and most powerful dictatorship the world has ever known. There is a real danger of a shooting war or a shameful surrender. But the Republicans seem more worried about a possible deficit in the budget.

Our Nation, which has increased by 30 million persons in a little more than 10 years, is bursting with needs for education, transportation and housing. But the Republicans are more worried about our gold supply.

In our mountains, fields, forests and streams, we have enough untapped abun-

dance to double the standard of living of the American people. But the Republicans tell us we are practically bankrupt, and worry about whether we are living precisely within our income.

If William McKinley had told us that schools and public facilities and housing were not within our income, perhaps we could have understood it. In his day, the American economy was not the mighty giant that it is today. But today we stand at the dawn of the space age, with science adding a hundredfold to the skill of our people; and for the Republican leadership to tell us that we cannot afford these investments shows a lack of vision which surpasseth all understanding.

My friends, with the countdown having already started toward a possible crisis next May 27 in Berlin, we must stop talking of what we cannot afford to do, and start talking of what we must afford to do. The brutal realities of the world in which we live today demand that we start marshaling our national strength—all our resources—so as to protect our country, preserve our freedom, and lead the world to peace. This kind of effort requires leadership. And if the last 6 years have taught us anything, it is that you do not get real leadership from the Republicans—but you do get it from the Democrats.

Let me talk tonight about one aspect of our Nation—our national economy—and what adequate Government leadership can do about that. All of us agree that economic strength rivals in importance our defense strength. For if we allow recession to permanently fasten its claws on our economy, undernourishing our people, lowering their morale and weakening their faith in the free American system, no amount of armament could prevent the present onward march of communism.

Here in West Virginia, as in many other parts of the country we are faced with just that kind of threat. A chronic condition of high unemployment is keeping you from the full benefits of the wealth that lies in your mountains and the skill of your people.

One thing is certain: A depression is not the fault of the people who suffer from it. Depressions are comparable to earthquakes. They are caused by deep-seated faults and shifts in the underlying structure of the country. Like earthquakes, tornadoes, or floods, they are beyond the power of any single individual to prevent.

But there is one difference. The people, acting together, through their Government, can prevent depressions. Let us look at what could be done—and should be done—for States where there is continuous high unemployment, in this, the richest country in the history of the world.

I spent many years in private business, most of them in effort to improve various companies.

When a business lags over a period of time, three things have to be done. First, emergency measures must be established in order to continue operating. Then invariably there must be a reorganization of plant setup and personnel. Finally, working as a team, the reorganized setup must work out comprehensive long-range plans, looking toward permanent growth and prosperity.

Let us apply these techniques to the situation now current in this great State of West Virginia.

For the emergency, there must be an immediate transfusion of the necessities of everyday life. Food is needed, especially proteins and calories, in order to bring the daily diet of the people up to minimum nutritional standards.

Our surplus agricultural commodities already total over $8 billion. The President himself estimates that next year the value of this stored surplus will be over $10 billion. Surely we can, and should, dip into this great ocean of food on an emergency basis, so as to give a more adequate diet to the victims of distress. We do this for the citizens of other nations. As example, right now we are shipping 450,000 tons of wheat a month to one country. I do not say this is wrong. But if it is right abroad, why is it not also right for our own needy people at home?

As a second step, our depressed areas must also be retooled, so as to increase income and employment. In industries where workers have been replaced by machines, they must be trained for new jobs. Where the flow of commerce and industry through the State is slowed by poor roads and inadequate airports, these, too, must be improved.

Such readjustment cannot be done solely by private hands, any more than can flood or tornado relief. There must be action by our Government to bring the men and the jobs together. Such action over here is essential if we are to counterbalance similar action now being taken by the two great imperialist empires which have sworn to destroy us—Russia and China.

A good example of the action required is the area redevelopment bill. I cosponsored this bill last year, and again this year, because America needs it far more than it needs further retrenchment and further unemployment.

Experience has shown that if it is to attract industry, a community must offer good living as well as good business. It takes more than a new factory building, ready for occupancy. It takes roads, schools, sewers, playgrounds, plus all the other things which make any town a good place in which to live and work.

And it also takes water supply development. Here in West Virginia, you have the greatest reserves of coal in the Nation. If nearby sources of water were readily available, it could be used in the process of generating power from coal. Generating plants could be built at the mouth of the mines. This would provide attractive industrial sites for more of the metal, chemical, and petroleum plants you need for your prosperity.

Can communities do this by themselves? Let's be realistic. Local government finances in many of our localities have been drained by the recession until there is barely enough left to meet payrolls. How, therefore, can they afford, on their own, to make the additional investment needed to attract industry?

Where necessary and right, loan capital should be furnished by the Federal Government. And that is exactly what this area redevelopment bill will do.

It was passed before, but vetoed by President Eisenhower. This year it should be passed over any veto.

Now there is something else which can be done that would help not just areas of high unemployment, but the whole country. For a number of years there has been increasing disagreement among certain segments of our economy—especially management, labor, and capital—on some of the most important problems incident to our growth and prosperity. There is disagreement on taxation, interest rates, hours of work, automation, the cause of inflation, and just how far the Government should go into the management of our economy. You have only to read the Chamber of Commerce Washington Report, the AFL–CIO News, and the newsletter of any large New York bank, to see how wide these gaps have now become.

Now, differences of opinion are all right. But these are not mere differences of opinion. These are hardening into battlelines. Like soldiers at the front, each group has stockpiled economic arguments to support its own position; and they spend a good deal of effort lobbing propaganda shells into the trenches of the enemy, each blaming the others for inflation, for recession, and for other economic woes. There is a lessening of the understanding and good will, the ability to see the problems of the other side, that has often characterized relations between these groups in the past.

Ninety-nine percent plus of the members of these various segments of our economy are good Americans who cherish freedom and our way of life. They know that this kind of internal quarreling isn't helping to solve any economic problems, or to cure the recession. It is just making it harder to work out a sensible policy.

I believe there is a much wider area of agreement among these groups than some of them would appear to admit. Why shouldn't these domestic differences be ironed out, face to face? We have heard a lot about summit meetings for international affairs. Why doesn't this administration sponsor a summit meeting for domestic affairs? Real leadership could reconcile most of the differences, find ways to curb inflation, and persuade capital, management, and labor to pull together for the good of America.

Benjamin Franklin said: "We must, indeed, all hang together, or, most assuredly we shall all hang separately." That observation was never more true than it is today.

We must all put aside our unilateral interests, and strive together for full production in our national economy. By full production, I mean the proper use of the great capacity of America, so that every able-bodied man and woman anxious to work can find work, at a wage compatible with self-respect.

Today, 20 percent of America's industrial capacity lies idle. This is not just a West Virginia problem. It is rapidly becoming a national problem. With the some thousand million people of the Sino-Soviet empire now working around the clock to surpass us, this nation can no longer allow a large percentage of its own production capacity to stand unused.

Therefore I recommend:

Interest rates which are low enough to allow businesses to borrow and expand, and homeowners to borrow to build.

A rise in the spendable income of the 7½ million people who still earn under $2,000 a year. (The per capita income from farming of our millions of farm citizens is only $770 a year.)

If we can combine the increased investment opportunity of business with increased purchasing power, our economy will continue to grow and prosper.

So again, let me urge this administration to promote the general welfare by calling a summit conference of banking, business and labor leaders, in an effort to iron out the growing differences among them. These differences can only please the Kremlin.

Now, I want to talk with respect to one more thing that you have been hearing about, this wonderful "balanced" budget of the Republican administration. I am for a real balanced budget. But this is a phony balanced budget. It hopes to be balanced by a margin of $100 million. That leaves a margin of error of just a little over one-tenth of 1 percent. But that's not all. It relies for its balance on a $9 billion increase in revenues that nobody is sure will happen, including higher gasoline and postage stamp taxation we know won't happen.

If a bunch of stock promoters got out a prospectus as misleading and as shaky as the so-called balanced budget of this administration, the SEC would be after them before they knew it. The budget this year is just as phony as it was last year, when they first claimed it was almost in balance, and then ran up a $10 billion deficit.

To slash into the needs of the Nation in order to conform to this phony budget is to sacrifice our opportunities, our future, and

our national security on the altar of politics—and Republican politics at that.

You know better than I what the administration's phony budget will do to West Virginia. It will mean no depressed areas legislation; no help for the coal industry; no relief from unemployment. It will therefore add 12 more months of stagnation to your economy and 12 more months of suffering to your people.

It is now becoming increasingly clear that only the Democrats are willing to take the bold measures equal to the times we face. With Democratic leadership, following Democratic principles, we can break the bonds of economic stagnation. More than anything else, we want a just and lasting peace. To that end nothing is more important than a strong and vigorous economy. Because in addition to our physical strength, we know we must be strong morally and economically, by utilizing to the fullest the great natural resources which have been given us.

If we follow that course, and remain strong in our convictions, we know that we can remain a free people.

Encouraging Development in the Coal Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELIZABETH KEE
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 9, 1959

Mrs. KEE. Mr. Speaker, the action of the President in imposing mandatory quotas on the imports of residual fuel oil was an encouraging development for the coal industry. Certainly, it is not the complete answer to the very serious problem of unfair competition offered to the coal industry by this cheap, foreign produced fuel.

Mr. Speaker, this is the first time we have been able to persuade the Federal Government to recognize the threat to coal posed by these imports, and it took strong and definite action and persuasion by the West Virginia congressional delegation. It is true, that in the past, Government officials and agencies have cited residual oil imports as a threat and recommended action. The important difference is that this time the Government acted.

Imports will be limited to the amount brought into the country in 1957. In that year, about 475,000 barrels daily entered the country from abroad. This amount of foreign residual fuel oil represents the equivalent of more than 110 million tons of coal. It would have been far preferable if the 1954 base, which has been suggested as more suitable, had been selected.

The pegging of imports at this high level will not win back many, if any at all, of the jobs in coal mines which have been lost because of the competition with foreign fuels oils. But at least it means that no additional jobs will be lost.

During the first 2 months of 1959, imports have been unusually heavy, running at an annual rate of the equivalent of 191 million tons of coal. I am hopeful that in carrying out the order, the Government will make the 1959 quota retroactive to January 1 and will not agree to an effective date of April. Otherwise, these extremely heavy imports will act as a drag on the coal market.

Mr. Speaker, the President's order for mandatory quotas was extremely gratifying to the West Virginia congressional delegation. The two West Virginia Senators and all Members of the West Virginia congressional delegation worked hard as a unit to convince the executive department of the compelling need for controls of some type on the ever-increasing flow of foreign residual oil into this country. The delegation appeared before every department and agency in Washington concerned with the foreign trade problem, arguing that the great domestic coal industry was being slowly but surely liquidated.

I was extremely gratified to have a colleague from a non-coal-producing State tell me that it was this untiring work by the West Virginia delegation which led to this victory. Perhaps this is an overstatement of the situation, but I know I speak for the entire delegation when I say that no development of recent years has been as welcomed as this.

Mr. Speaker, we have won a battle. However, the war to create a climate in which the coal industry can prosper and expand will be long and difficult, and there will be many battles to fight.

The Birthday of Amerigo Vespucci, 1959

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 9, 1959

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, today we celebrate the birthday of Amerigo Vespucci, though it is not quite certain that he was born on March 9, and even the year of his birth, thought to be 1652, does not go without question by the historians. But these doubts are quiet, peaceful matters compared to the controversies that have raged as to what discovering the famous explorer ever actually did, and whether discrepancies that appear in his accounts of his voyages are due to falsification, faulty memory, or several slips of Vespucci's pen, or whether transcribers and editors of Vespucci's letters, the originals of which no longer remain for our inspection, may have mistranscribed his figures so as to make him seem to sail right through the Isthmus of Panama into the Pacific, without benefit of canal, and southward well into the Continent of Antarctica. But for all that, we honor the one whom we may call our national and continental godfather, the navigator and explorer, who, like Columbus, was of Italian birth and sailed in the service of Spain—except for one voyage for Don Manuel of Portugal. If, like Captain John Smith after him, he constructed a magnificent myth with himself as its hero, let us still gladly recognize the magnificence of the myth, and the narrative skill and geographic grasp of the writer. For it was surely Amerigo Vespucci who, by his writings as popularized by Martin Waldseemüller, brought home the new world to the hearts and minds and imaginations of the people of Europe, and roused the young ambitions of the boys who became the explorers and colonists of the next generation.

Unborn Americans Cannot Vote

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 9, 1959

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, like many million other Americans, I have fought in a war. Modern warfare has a single basis of comparison with that of ancient times. It consists of 10 percent doing and 90 percent waiting.

During my time of waiting, I had a lot of hours, days, weeks of thought.

I thought, "Do I hate these Japanese people whose property I am going to destroy, whose lives I am going to snuff out?"

This was no easy question. It required the searching of my soul. It demanded that I look into myself, my family teachings, my religious experiences, my formal education.

My answer finally came: "No. I do not hate these Japanese people, whose property I will be called upon to destroy, whose lives I will be called upon to snuff out. I do hate their ideas—that they were justified in their massacre at Pearl Harbor; that they are supermen, accountable only to their leaders; that inhuman cruelty to those other than their own countrymen was natural, even praiseworthy."

I am glad I thought this problem out for myself so many years ago, because, now, I find that I must dedicate my every effort to destroy an idea while respecting and admiring many of the men who hold that idea.

I refer to the idea that it is right to continue one's self in office by providing luxurious Government services which will not alter the present tax structure materially, but which will so increase the national debt that a child born in the United States of America in 2059 will be paying for what is done today.

I am quite confident that no Member of the 86th Congress will be running to retain his same seat in the 136th Congress. The voter of 2059 will have no opportunity to express his resentment of the tax burden we put upon him by using his ballot to defeat any of us.

In my book, it is cowardly, unsportsmanlike, and un-American to injure someone whom you are dead certain will not be able to fight back.

Balance our national budget by cutting all unnecessary expenses to the bone.

Meet present-day problems in the present—do not defer paying for what you get until the next century.

It is not liberalism to promise everything to your contemporaries while leaving your descendants the responsibility of footing the bill.

That, to me, is liberality. That, to me, is the philosophy of the libertine.

Can you still be brave and live with yourselves when you remember, "Taxpayers of today can vote. Taxpayers as yet unborn cannot"?

Amerigo Vespucci

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 9, 1959

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, today, March 9, marks the anniversary of Amerigo Vespucci, a great Italian who left his mark as well as his name on our country.

Amerigo Vespucci, the merchant and adventurer to whom America owes its name, was born in Florence on March 9, 1451. This is the date given for Vespucci's birth in the "Encyclopaedia Britannica." The "Encyclopedia Americana" gives March 18, 1452, and variant dates in other sources include the year 1454. He was the third son of Nastagio Vespucci, a notary, and Elizabetta Mini. His uncle, Fra Giorgio Antonio Vespucci, to whom he owed his education, was a scholarly Dominican. Amerigo was particularly devoted to the study of geography, and is believed to have encountered frequently the celebrated Toscanelli. For a time he was employed by the great commercial house of the Medici, then the ruling family in Florence. He made an avocation of the collection of maps and charts and became a skilled map draftsman.

Sometime between the middle of 1489 and the end of 1491 he went to Barcelona, probably in connection with the Spanish business interests of the Medici. In 1493, he became connected with the commercial house of Berardi at Seville. Berardi, in the employ of the Spanish Crown, engaged in fitting out vessels for expeditions across the Atlantic. In this position it is probable that Vespucci participated in the fitting out of Columbus' second voyage.

Knowledge of Vespucci's own voyage is based on two letters written by him. One was written in 1503 to Lorenzo di Pier Francesco de'Medici, and the other was addressed in 1504 to his boyhood friend, Piero Soderini, gonfaloniere of Florence. The latter gives an account of four voyages in which the writer took part, the earlier two in the service of Spain and the latter two in that of Portugal. According to this account the first expedition sailed from Cadiz on May 10, 1497. Thus Vespucci visited the American Continent a year before Columbus, touching land at several points, including one not far from Cape Canaveral, Fla.

The letter to Soderini appeared in print in at least two editions, probably without Vespucci's knowledge. A Latin translation was published at St. Dié in Lorraine in April 1507. Martin Waldseemüller made use of it in his "Cosmographiae Introductio," published in St. Dié in the same year. This work contained perhaps the first suggestion in print that the newly discovered fourth part of the world should be called America, because Americus discovered it.

Statehood for Hawaii

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAIR ENGLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 9, 1959

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, last week the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee unanimously recommended passage of the bill of the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] to admit the Territory of Hawaii into the Union as a State. I hope that this legislation receives as prompt and as favorable action on the Senate floor. On February 25 I testified before the Territories and Insular Affairs Subcommittee in behalf of this legislation, of which I am a cosponsor, and I ask unanimous consent that the statement I made at that time be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF SENATOR CLAIR ENGLE, DEMOCRAT OF CALIFORNIA, BEFORE THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON TERRITORIES AND INSULAR AFFAIRS OF THE SENATE COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS ON HAWAII STATEHOOD, FEBRUARY 25, 1959

I am very grateful that this will be my last appearance before a congressional committee in behalf of Hawaii statehood.

It is not my intention today to go into any lengthy documentation of the case for Hawaii statehood. The record is formidable. It is replete with testimony that demands that the 86th Congress act without fail to make Hawaii our 50th State. For a number of years, as a member of the House committee dealing with Territorial matters and as its chairman for 4 years, I was deeply involved in the question of statehood. I am convinced without question that the Territory of Hawaii has long been ready for statehood and that we will be guilty of grave dereliction if we delay any longer to bring it about.

The smoke screen of spurious arguments advanced by the opponents of Hawaii statehood has been thoroughly pierced, and in its disintegration it has been shown up for what it is—a device to hide the personal motives of the opponents of statehood.

The favorite line of the opposition has been to impugn the loyalty of Hawaii's citizenry, but the evidence shattering their accusations continues to grow in volume and strength. In June of 1953, Senator HUGH BUTLER, one-time foe of statehood because of possible Communist influence, made this statement at a Senate hearing:

"I believe the residents of Hawaii during the past 4 years * * * have demonstrated by positive action their awareness of the Communist danger and their determination to face it frankly and never let it strengthen its foothold. During those years they have fought it boldly, have restricted its influence, and to some degree have driven it underground. I believe they have shown that they are as well able as the Federal Government to cope with this measure."

James Michener, in his article in the December 1958 Reader's Digest, came to this conclusion after an extensive study:

"Hawaii does suffer from a Communist threat. So do San Francisco and Baltimore—and all America. Hawaii's problem is no different from that of any other area. * * *

"Hawaii is not a captive of the Communists. It is fighting back exactly like any mainland community. Its record is impressive."

It is no longer necessary to answer the argument of noncontiguity. It was answered firmly and finally when Congress last year made Alaska our 49th State. And there is no need to dwell on the argument of small population. It has been soundly refuted by the fact that Hawaii's 550,000 population exceeds that of five of our present States.

There remains then the basic question of whether Hawaii is economically, socially, and politically ready to become a State. These tests have all been met. There is no disputing the cold hard facts and figures that point up the economic prosperity of Hawaii. There is no mistaking the American culture and philosophy that dominates the lives of Hawaii's polyglot mixture. And there is no disputing the political maturity of the men and women in the legislative halls and the executive corridors of the Territory of Hawaii.

Last fall a joint congressional committee visited Hawaii. It went there with open eyes and open mind, self-consciously aware of the need to keep itself free of preconceived ideas and foregone conclusions. Members of the committee walked and rode and flew around the islands talking to people in every phase of life and meeting with labor and business groups and with fraternal, political, and community organizations. The committee came back enthusiastic. It came back secure in its conviction that Hawaii must become a State. In its report, the House members of the committee concluded that "admission of Hawaii, with its mixed races and its geographical position will vastly improve our posture and relationship throughout the vast Pacific area, where we are striving with all our might and means to keep 800 million free and friendly."

Hawaii will, of course, benefit immeasurably from statehood. But let us not underestimate the economic, political, and diplomatic advantages that the United States as a nation will gain in having as a strong outpost in the Pacific a member of its "family of states." And let us not underestimate the fact that if we fail to bring Hawaii into this family we face the possibility of the Territory becoming a Commonwealth and all that that implies—a nation that belongs to us and yet does not.

In conclusion, I want to emphasize that the question of Hawaii statehood is as much an international issue as it is a domestic issue. The nations in the Far East and elsewhere are watching us very closely on this. If we want to maintain their faith and confidence in us as a great democracy, we cannot afford to equivocate on this matter. There is a gap here between our pretensions and our performance. Let us close the gap by waiting no longer to make Hawaii our 50th State.

Need for Assistance in Economically Distressed Areas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELIZABETH KEE
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 9, 1959

Mrs. KEE. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include a copy of my newsletter "Keenotes":

KEENOTES

(By Representative ELIZABETH KEE, of West Virginia)

Recently I filed with a Senate Banking and Currency Subcommittee a statement in support of legislation introduced by myself and other Members of Congress to assist economically distressed areas.

This legislation is similar to that passed by the Congress last year but vetoed by the President. There seems to be even more support for the proposal this year and I am confident the bill can be passed by such a large majority that it will not be vetoed.

The bill would establish a Federal loan program under which States and local communities would act to create new job opportunities. The need for such a program is urgent in areas where unemployment has existed for a number of years. In the case of West Virginia, workers have lost their jobs in the coal mines and there is little chance they can ever go back to work there.

The answer is to attract new industries. States and local communities cannot do the job alone. They need the type of financial and technical assistance from the Federal Government which this bill would make possible.

The main financial burden would be borne by the States and local communities over a long period. Local resources simply are not available now with which to do the job. That is why Federal funds would be made available on a loan basis. Cities in the Fifth Congressional District have attacked the problem of lack of job opportunities with vigor and intelligence. Yet, a larger and better financed program is called for.

Some people have criticized the proposed programs as too costly. These people fail to take into consideration the fact that States are paying out hundreds of millions of dollars in unemployment benefits. In West Virginia, these benefits amounted to $50 million in 1958. Is it not more sensible to invest in new job-producing enterprises that will do away with the need for unemployment benefits? No cost tag can be attached to the misery and heartache of a family which is forced to subsist upon handouts because jobs simply do not exist.

The Federal Government is spending billions of dollars abroad to assist underdeveloped countries to build up their economies. Much of the activity financed abroad with tax money from the United States is similar to the type of activity envisioned in the area redevelopment program. Why is it right to do these things abroad and wrong to do them at home?

West Virginia has suffered grievously during the last 5 or 6 years. Coal mines have cut back on production as imported residual fuel oil has taken over more and more of the market. Technological improvements in the coal industry have reduced the number of jobs.

We can go on paying out unemployment benefits and welfare payments and distributing surplus agricultural commodities indefinitely without getting at the root of the problem. The men of West Virginia want jobs. If they cannot find them in the mines and plants for which they once worked, let us start a determined effort to bring in new industries. In the interim, we can build community facilities to provide jobs while the program is getting underway.

No doubt it will be charged that the area redevelopment legislation is a part of the program of the spenders. I insist it is an economically sound program, one that is absolutely essential to many areas all over the country. Soon the House must act upon an administration request for $235 million additional for loans to foreign countries for overseas redevelopment projects. The program we are trying to get for the unfortunate people in this country would not cost as much altogether as this one supplemental foreign aid program.

New York Bank Bill Fosters Monopoly

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 9, 1959

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, the bank bill recommended by the New York joint legislative committee would lead to monopolization of the State's banking resources by a handful of giant banks which, for years, have sought to achieve domination over the banking system of the State and for years have been pressing for such legislation.

It is deplorable that the joint committee reported out this bank monopoly bill without public hearings or without opportunity for its opponents to present their views. It is curious, indeed, that the New York superintendent of banks, G. Russell Clark, gave his enthusiastic endorsement to this measure after having been in office for but 1 day. The unseemly haste of the New York superintendent of banks in rubber-stamping this monopoly bill bodes ill for independent banking in New York State and for future vigorous, effective banking competition.

The bill recommended by the joint committee has two main provisions. First, it would obliterate the bank branch district line between New York City and the outlying suburban areas of Nassau, Suffolk, and Westchester Counties. Second, it would establish two bank holding districts in the State, the first consisting of New York City, Long Island and Westchester and Rockland Counties, the second, of the balance of the State. The bill would allow a bank holding company to acquire banks anywhere within the district. Beyond that, a holding company formed by a bank in the second district could acquire banks in the first district if these first district banks constituted 45 percent or less of the holding company's total assets. Thus, the bill would end the present legislative freeze on bank holding company expansion which was enacted principally to prevent First National City's proposed acquisition, via the holding company device, of the County Trust Co. of Westchester County.

The banking system of New York State traditionally has relied for its vitality on vigorous competition by a multitude of independent banks, locally organized, locally financed, and locally managed. Nevertheless, there has been in recent years a discernible trend in New York State toward concentration of the banking business into fewer and larger hands. Indeed, in New York City, the four largest banks now control over 60 percent of all commercial bank assets. What is more, the two largest—Chase Manhattan and First National City—control almost 42 percent of the city's banking assets.

Present statutory branch bank district lines were drawn 20 years ago in the shadow of the bank holiday in order to arrest undue concentration of banking facilities. The single most important reason for such geographical restrictions was to prevent banks with head offices in New York City from establishing branches in the suburban counties of Westchester, Nassau, and Suffolk and thus to protect independent unit banks outside of New York City from the encroachment of the giant money-market institutions located in the city.

Owing to the increase in concentration among the city's banking institutions in the past 20 years, it is even more important now to guard against the encroachment that would be permitted by the bill. There seems to be little doubt that if giant banks in New York City are allowed to penetrate into the suburban areas, the small unit banks there would be placed in far greater jeopardy. For one thing, their means of competing would be hardly comparable to those available to their huge city rivals. Indeed, to suppose that entry by the giant financial institutions of New York City into the suburban areas might have no adverse competitive effect on the independent banks located in these areas is to suppose that a chicken could dance with an elephant and come out unharmed. With the present district line obliterated, the suburban banking communities would soon be transformed into an area overwhelmingly dominated by a few large city institutions.

As to the second provision dealing with formation of two new bank holding company districts, certainly its most immediate effect would be to place New York State legislative imprimatur of approval on plans like that of the First National City Bank which unsuccessfully sought to form a bank holding company in order to acquire the County Trust Co., of White Plains, N.Y., the dominant bank in Westchester County. It will be recalled that the Federal Reserve Board, after hearing exhaustive testimony on this proposal, concluded that approval of such transaction would be detrimental to competition and contrary to the public interest. Should the State legislature ratify the bill recommended by the joint committee, there would be ignited, as Governor Harriman observed on November 20, 1956, what may be the greatest chain reaction in recent banking history the effects of which will go to the very roots of the entire banking structure of New York State with the distinct possibility of concentration of banking assets in the hands of a few institutions.

Commenting on a holding company proposal similar to the one now contemplated, Mr. George A. Mooney, the former superintendent of banks of the State of New York, had this to say on December 12, 1956:

The very existence of a number of large bank holding companies would create competition amongst them for future expansion in other communities. If the many unit banks found it impossible to resist the holding company movement, we could expect in short order a heavy concentration of banking assets, facilities, and credit in a handful of giant statewide bank holding company systems.

It is crystal clear that adoption of either provision of this bank monopoly bill would amount to capitulation to a few powerful banking institutions in New York City. If the New York State Legislature desires competition rather than monopoly in banking, it should reject this measure out-of-hand.

Fiscal Responsibility

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 9, 1959

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, shortly after the adjournment of the 85th Congress, this short item—without attribution—became widely circulated in the press:

If Patrick Henry thought taxation without representation was so terrible, he should see it with representation.

How often great truths are spoken in jest.

Section 7 of the Constitution places the responsibility of originating all revenue-raising bills with the House of Representatives.

No matter how many times in the past we have failed to live up to it, it is still our constitutional responsibility.

If we must collect the money to meet the expenses of our Federal Government, we must, at the same time, be seriously concerned with the cost of that Government.

There are numerous governmental luxuries which we would like to provide for the American people. But we can't afford them.

Many an American family would like to live in a penthouse. But, because they can't afford it, they settle for their mortgaged bungalow.

Many an American family would like to eat steak regularly. Instead, because they can't afford it, they get along with more ham hock than steak.

Many an American family would like to have a new car every year. Yet, because they can't afford it, they make the old jalopy do.

It would be a matter of wisdom for the Members of the House of Congress designed to be closer to the people to follow the example of the people.

It would be a matter of wisdom for us to legislate against those Government services which, while they may seem helpful, are actually luxuries.

Abraham Lincoln provided a most useful yardstick for such services when he said on July 1, 1854:

The legitimate object of government is to do for a community of people whatever they need to have done, but cannot do at all, or cannot so well do, for themselves, in their separate and individual capacities.

In all that the people can individually do as well for themselves, government ought not to interfere.

We are not alone in our making-ends-meet problem. Sweden has its problem, too. Let us look at Sweden's problem in the words of the U.S. News & World Report for January 23, 1959:

Swedes got a jolt from their Socialist-dominated government. The 1959 budget called for heavy boosts in * * * spending, indicated a deficit of $500 million. The alternative: higher taxes in a land where a couple with two children and $300 a month income pay out nearly $100 a month in taxes and social contributions.

Sweden's Socialists have still another way out—a way which is, even now, being suggested to them by American liberals.

As you well know, both Socialists and liberals enjoy thinking of themselves as being interested solely in people; not things.

Our liberals are not concerned with increasing current taxes to pay for the governmental services they so glibly advocate. They reserve the privilege of increased taxes for your children and mine; for your grandchildren and mine. Taxpayers today can vote. Taxpayers as yet unborn cannot.

I say, "Cut governmental luxuries to the bone. Balance the budget."

I thoroughly agree with the late Joseph G. "Uncle Joe" Cannon, of Illinois, former Speaker of the House of Representatives, in his most frequently quoted remarks:

America is a hell of a success. Why tinker with it?

H.R. 5464: A Bill Providing for a Patent-in-Fee-Simple Covering Rosebud Tribal Land

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. Y. BERRY
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 9, 1959

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced legislation similar to H.R. 5468, directing the Indian Department through the Secretary of Interior to issue a patent-in-fee-simple to Bartley M. Mills, covering Rosebud tribal land he should receive in exchange for deeded land.

In this instance Mr. Mills made application for trade with the Rosebud Tribe in 1950. At that time both tracts of land were appraised at equal value by Indian Bureau appointed appraisers. Mr. Mills proposed to exchange 160 acres of his land in Todd County for 80 acres of tribal land located in Tripp County.

On January 10, 1950, Mr. Mills conveyed his patented land to the United States in trust for the Rosebud Sioux Tribe. The deed was recorded in the register of deeds office in Tripp County on September 20, 1950. Since that time the Rosebud Sioux Tribe has had title to Mr. Mills' 160-acre tract, has collected lease rentals from both pieces of land, and Mr. Mills has been waiting to receive title for the N½NW¼ S. 32, T. 100 N., R. 75 W., Fifth Principal Meridian, in Tripp County, S. Dak., which is the land he was to receive for his land.

Both tracts of land have been off the tax list since 1950. The local governments have been deprived of tax revenues from both tracts. All steps in the transaction have been handled and approved by the Department. There is no excuse for the delay other than abnormal Bureau redtape.

The transaction was never completed, however, and on March 5, 1958, the Rosebud Sioux Tribe adopted a resolution disapproving all exchanges involving tribal lands.

Commission To Study Government Uses of Radio Frequencies Proposed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 9, 1959

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a joint resolution which proposes the creation of a Commission to study the utilization of those areas of the radio frequency spectrum which are assigned to the Federal Government.

I sponsored similar legislation in the 85th Congress, and a companion bill in the Senate was introduced by Senator Potter. The Potter bill was reported by the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, passed by the Senate and then reported by the House committee in the last days of the 1958 session. It appeared for a while that this Commission would become a reality before adjournment last year, but a variety of circumstances contrived to defeat it.

Essentially my purpose remains unchanged. I would establish a Commission composed of experts in the communications field, but men who are not employees of the Federal Government. The idea is to allow persons outside of the Federal Government, but competent in the field, to see how well the frequencies reserved for Government use are being used. The Commission, in addition, might make some assessment about the future requirements for Government use of radio frequencies.

When this bill was introduced 2 years ago the Bureau of the Budget reported adversely on it and endorsed the views set forth in a letter from the Director of the Office of Defense Mobilization to the chairman of the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. The Director of Defense Mobilization stated

that such an undertaking would require the work of many experts over an extended period of time, and pointed out that a study of only a portion of the spectrum required the efforts of more than 50 experts for an estimated equivalent of 2½ man-years. At that time the reaction of the executive department was that such a report would be impossible to achieve and, if achieved, unnecessary.

A year later the Director of OCDM reported to the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, when it was considering the Senate-approved resolution, that he favored the establishment of the Commission but wished to see it encompass a thorough study of the problems concerning frequency allocation and of the utilization of spectrum space, not only by the Federal Government but by all private users as well. These suggestions were incorporated into the bill as it was reported by the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Now, in 1959 the chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce has proposed that a subcommittee of that group study the utilization of those areas of the radio frequency spectrum which are assigned to the Federal Government. I believe this is a worthwhile endeavor and I hope that the subcommittee will make such an investigation. I believe this study can logically be carried on by the legislative branch; my only hesitancy has been would they have the time and opportunity to give to such a large-scale undertaking in addition to their many other duties.

The President, through the Director of OCDM, has suggested a new proposal to establish a Commission. The administration proposal requests legislative authority for a five-man Commission, appointed by the President, which would study the entire field of frequency allocations, the methods for making allocations, utilization of allocations, and would propose sweeping changes in the management and control of spectrum problems. This seems to me a full reversal of the opinions held by the executive branch 2 years ago, when I first sponsored legislation on this subject.

I still feel that a study is necessary. My central interest has been and still is utilization. I would like to see a thorough and impartial study of spectrum utilization before attempts are made to change the entire structure of spectrum allocation and control. I believe that the proposal of Representative HARRIS for a subcommittee study is of more immediate value than the Commission proposal as it was delivered to Congress. Or, if the Commission proposal were amended back to the form of the Potter-Bray resolution which was before us last year, which provided for legislative selection of some commissioners and which directed a study of the utilization of the spectrum reserved for Government use, then I would support it wholeheartedly. To have this proposal before the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce I have introduced this measure again.

It provides that a Commission of five members, not officers or employees of the Federal Government, be established to investigate the utilization of the radio and television frequencies allocated to the agencies and instrumentalities of the Federal Government. Two of the Commissioners would be appointed by the President, one by the President of the Senate, one by the Speaker, and one by the Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission.

I am pleased to see the increasing interest in this problem evinced in both the executive and legislative branch. Whereas 2 years ago it was difficult to get support for a study commission, it now appears we might have both a legislative and an executive study of spectrum use. Spectrum problems are likely to become more acute as time goes on. The minimum requirements for solving these problems is understanding and impartial knowledge and analysis. To the extent that these studies can contribute in laying such a foundation, these are eminently worthwhile.

Thomas Masaryk: Champion of Democracy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CORNELIUS E. GALLAGHER
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 9, 1959

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege to have a part in honoring a man of the stature of Thomas Masaryk. One cannot overpublicize the contribution that this man made to the cause of democracy. His is a name that is likely to endure as long as the world has a place for the cause of individual freedom.

Yet his position of prominence was of relatively short duration in the scheme of things. As President of the Czechoslovak Republic—whose existence as an independent state was itself short-lived—Thomas Masaryk, in a brief 17 years, promoted the true ideal of democracy as few men have been able to do in the space of a lifetime.

Thomas Masaryk founded the Republic of Czechoslovakia. When he became its first President, in 1918, he was chosen for the post because of his ideals, his devotion to them, and his willingness to make sacrifices for them. This characteristic idealism had marked his life.

As a youth of lowly parentage, but encouraged by his mother, he had struggled to achieve an education. As a young man his talent and dedication to high principles was recognized; he was encouraged and assisted to become a teacher. As a teacher he developed an independence of spirit and devotion to mankind that gained for him a place in the legislature of his then mother-country, Austria. As a legislator his chief contribution to his fellowman derived from his independence of spirit. He had sufficient courage and consecration to principle to fight the reactionary government, to insist on the rights of the individual against the state.

Then when World War I liberated his compatriots and generated an independent state, it was he who guided it to the fruition of a faith. He led this new nation for more than half of its independent existence, and his idealism persisted.

As long as the free world shall endure it will be appropriate to recall that whatever the fate of this one-time Republic of Czechoslovakia, now fallen behind the Iron Curtain, its very existence was the culmination of an idea—the idea that men should be allowed to live in freedom and in peace, with emphasis upon the individual, his rights, his dignity, and his high promise.

Thomas Masaryk, Czechoslovakian leader, was the very embodiment of this idea. In his promotion of it he made a contribution to the world which will not be forgotten.

Inflation—Take It With a Smile—But It Is Still Just as Deadly

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL E. MUNDT
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, March 9, 1959

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, economists throughout the Nation, students of our fiscal system, and thoughtful leaders in our Government, have continually warned against the dangers of inflation.

Another viewpoint has been offered in the writings of Elmer Roessner, business writer for the McClure Newspaper Syndicate. His approach is in a humorous vein, but nevertheless, Mr. Roessner recognizes the deadly, inevitable results—complete crippling of our economic system—should inflation fail to be controlled.

Although Mr. Roessner has written his articles with tongue-in-cheek, it does not take much reading between the lines to understand that while today we can look at these problems with some humor, there will not be any laughing tomorrow for the millions of elderly people and salaried persons on fixed incomes who will suffer the most if we fail to halt inflation.

Added to the persuasive words of wisdom and economic science Mr. Roessner has brought out a statement of sarcasm, cynicism and humor in an effort to alert Americans to the perils of inflation as they exist today.

Mr. President, I ask permission to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD my weekly newsletter, which includes one of Mr. Roessner's columns, and a second column by Mr. Roessner.

There being no objection, the newsletter and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FISCAL SOUNDNESS AN ESSENTIAL CONDITION OF ECONOMIC HEALTH

Sharpest debate in the Congress these days concerns the effect that inflation has

on the economy. This concern over the dangers of inflationary practices is also reflected in the statements by many economists and leading administration spokesmen. The debates are not without humor, and for one tongue-in-cheek observation, I refer your attention to an article written by Mr. Elmer Roessner, noted business writer for the McClure Newspaper Syndicate. His article follows:

"BUSINESS TODAY—INFLATION HAS GOOD POINTS—RUNAWAY ECONOMY BOOSTS INCENTIVE

"(By Elmer Roessner)

"NEW YORK.—Inflation is good.

"It is the cocktail of democracy.

"Yeah, I know. For years your boy has been denouncing inflation. He has called it the hole in the dike of business, the leukemia of the economy.

"Now your columnist, with a switch typical of his addled thinking, espouses inflation.

"Like lanolin, filtertips, and hexochlorophene, inflation is good for you. Here are some of the benefits:

"1. It rewards the smart. The wise ones who put their money in growth real estate and growth stocks gain more than the saps who store the cash in banks, Government bonds, or insurance.

"Robin Hood angle

"2. Inflation penalizes the rich and helps the poor as far as it diminishes the real indebtedness of those who owe money and diminishes the equities of those who lend it.

"3. Inflation is an incentive for simple people to work harder. The only way they can keep up with rising food prices is by swinging the ax faster or hitting the gong harder.

"4. It gets lazy wives off the sofa. Since inflation constantly increases the cost of living, more wives have to go to work to get more income to support their families. Government statistics show that the number of working females has risen directly with inflation."

"5. It encourages private enterprise. Workers often get weary of the wage-price rat race, in which they must strike once every year or so to get enough to keep even. They go into business for themselves, adding to the number of free enterprises in the country and eventually to Dun & Bradstreet statistics.

"Ants punished

"6. Inflation penalizes those who imitate the ants. It reduces the buying power of hoarded money and rewards the grasshoppers who, living for the day, spend their income.

"7. It keeps oldsters out of mischief. Because their savings are attenuated and social security benefits rise slower than prices, old people must keep to their grindstones. This keeps old gaffers from wasting their time flirting with girls.

"8. It keeps the younger generation alert. Youths realize that if they do not learn the economics of inflation along with reading, 'riting, 'rithmetic, and fingerpainting, they will be the knuckleheads of tomorrow.

"If a young man can't parse inflation, he's likely to spend his later years washing dishes—either in a hashhouse or in a jail for income-tax law violators.

"So, it's obvious that inflation is good for the Nation and anyone against it is in a class with those opposed to mother, clean fingernails, bright teeth, and the Boy Scout oath."

ANDERSON SOUNDS WARNING

Secretary of the Treasury, Robert B. Anderson, testifying before the Joint Congressional Economic Committee, illustrated fully why inflation is not merely an "opportunist political slogan," but is a stark dangerous reality that seriously threatens our economic stability.

In clearly defining the need for a balanced budget, Mr. Anderson said he is fearful "that price pressures may eventually revive, if we do not * * * close the budget gap," and expressed the belief that a nation as rich and productive as the United States, in times of prosperity, must "at least pay its way."

He said, "The fact of the matter is there is almost nothing which is more positive and more important * * * than fiscal soundness. This is an essential condition of our economic health, without which we can have neither adequate military security nor the adequate provision of other needed governmental services. Meeting our expenses currently and all that that means in the way of fiscal soundness and a healthy economy is a highly positive objective which deserves the support of everyone."

DEFICIT SPENDING FANS FIRES OF INFLATION

Dr. Don Paarlberg, administration economist, said, "* * * deficit spending is far more likely to fan the flames of inflation than to add substantial increments to economic growth. Little good and much harm can come from a price rise which is the result of fiscal irresponsibility or a speculative orgy."

Dr. Paarlberg rejects the contention that inflation is necessary for economic growth. Faster growth results primarily from actions undertaken in the private sector of the economy and by Federal measures to encourage and unleash private enterprise—not by Federal deficits. He said, "Historically, economic growth has been achieved by such methods as improving efficiency, accumulating savings, and encouraging investment. Solid and continued economic growth cannot be achieved by having the Federal Government continuously live beyond its means."

MASSIVE IRRESPONSIBILITY MEANS BANKRUPTCY

Senator BARRY GOLDWATER, Republican, of Arizona, in a Senate floor speech, said, "We are witnessing the spectacle of massive irresponsibility by those who believe that spending funds we do not have will bring an unprecedented prosperity." He warned that if inflation is not halted, there will be nothing to prevent Americans from hauling a wheelbarrow full of dollars to the grocery store to buy a loaf of bread.

"The four horsemen of bankruptcy ride again—deficit, debt, inflation, and waste—spurred on by the disciples of massive irresponsibility, and if their mad gallop is not stopped, their devastation of our money and the future of world peace will be complete," GOLDWATER said.

BUSINESS TODAY—HERE'S HOW TO GIVE THE PEOPLE WHAT THEY WANT WITHOUT INCREASING TAXES

(By Elmer Roessner)

Things were tough in the republic of Democrastan. The people were clamoring for new schools with swimming pools, government sponsored art shows, and classier pensions.

But income taxes had reached 90 percent in top brackets, every thing from autos to light bulbs carried excises, and milk was taxed so much that the people would have drunk whisky instead if it were not for the fact it was taxed even more.

The President called in his Chancellor of the Exchequer and the head of his Federal Reverse Board. "We have taxed everything to raise money," he said. "Nothing is made, nothing is done without the payment of a tax. We tax the dead, we tax the unborn—the former with estate taxes, the latter by loading them with a share of the national debt. We tax everything. Well, everything except savings."

An idea

"Hm." said the Chancellor. "Not savings? How did that escape us?"

"We wouldn't dare," said the President. "Thrift—the ant and the grasshopper—Benjamin Franklin and all that. It would undermine our cultural and ethical concepts. Besides the banks, the insurance companies, the savings and loan associations and all the other savings institutions would raise hell. We can't afford to have trouble with them if we ever hope to get elected again."

"Right," said the Federal Reverse man. "We couldn't just tax savings. People would say," his eyes twinkled, "that it would be confiscatory. But perhaps we can dip into the people's savings without calling it a tax, without even letting them know it's happening."

"It doesn't sound honest—I mean I don't think we could get away with it," said the President. "How would we go about it?"

The old formula

"It's easy," said the Fed man. "We just give the people all the things they want, even the swimming pools. But instead of increasing taxes, we borrow the money."

"Couldn't we just print more?" asked the President.

"Of course not," said the Fed man. "That would be debasing the currency. People wouldn't stand for it. We'll borrow the money from banks, giving them bonds to hold. Then whenever they need money, they can put up the bonds as security, thus increasing the supply of credit."

"How will that tax the savings?" asked the President.

"By doubling the amount of credit, the plan will simply cut the buying power of savings in half," the Fed man answered. "The plan takes away half the real value of the savings and uses it to build swimming pools—or highways, apartment houses, or whatever the people want."

"Won't the savers object?"

No one alarmed

"Not very much. In the first place, this plan works fairly slowly. It will be years before they realize that half their savings are gone. Even then, what they have left will have the same name as their savings used to have—a thousand pesos, 10,000 marks, a hundred thousand dollars, a million pounds, or whatever the label was.

"Besides, those who own real estate or stocks will think they are richer, because the name of the prices of those things will have gone up. A one-hundred-simoleon stock will be worth 200 simoleons; a 10,000 bucko house will be priced at 20,000 buckos. Of course, they won't be any more valuable. It will just seem so because there is so much more credit bidding for them."

"Say, this is a great system," exclaimed the President. "We raise the money and the people we take it from never know its gone until it's too late. Something as good as this ought to have a name."

"It already has a name," said the Chancellor of the Exchequer. "It's called inflation."

"Nice boomy sound to it," remarked the President. "I have only one other question. Is it honest?"

Greater Safety in the Mining Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELIZABETH KEE

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 9, 1959

Mrs. KEE. Mr. Speaker, the action of the Public Health Service in approving a research grant of $79,775 for the Beckley Memorial Hospital at Beckley, W. Va.,

for studies in cardiopulmonary diseases is a well-deserved recognition of the fine hospital and medical system created by the miners welfare fund.

The Federal grant will go to build and equip a health research laboratory, supplementing existing facilities, for studies in the disease which is prevalent in the West Virginia mining area, much of it being pneumoconiosis presumably related to coal dust.

The facility will provide for biochemical studies, microbiological studies, morphologic pathology with a limited amount of space for animal quarters.

This facility represents another step forward in the program to bring greater safety into the mining industry.

West Virginia University received a grant of $56,328 for equipping a new medical center building, and for this we are very grateful, Mr. Speaker.

H.R. 10—Equality for the Professional or Self-Employed Citizen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE S. McGOVERN
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 9, 1959

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I feel constrained to speak out against a present inequality in the tax treatment of our self-employed citizens. The Congress can proudly point to its legislative record of providing financial security for our growing elderly population. One of the milestones in this record is the tax exemption to encourage employee retirement plans. Unfortunately, however, we have discriminated against the industrious self-employed individual by not extending to him a similar opportunity and encouragement to invest in his retirement.

Under private pension plans, which now cover over 15 million workers, the employer's contribution to the individual worker's pension plan is deducted as a business expense by the employer and is not currently taxable to the employee. However, there is no provision in the law for a similar partial tax exemption for retirement contributions made by the self-employed.

H.R. 10, reported out favorably by the Ways and Means Committee, would rectify this inequity by permitting a self-employed person to take a tax deduction for strictly defined types and amounts of retirement investments. This bill is extremely well drafted to insure that it actually will do those things for which it is designed, while precluding abuses. It has had the benefit of exhaustive hearings during the 7 years it has been under consideration.

All self-employed persons who fall within this definition in the Social Security Act, plus doctors and ministers, would be permitted to deduct for retirement investments 10 percent of their annual earnings with a ceiling of $2,500 a year and $50,000 for a lifetime. So that older persons would have an opportunity to build up retirement plans within a shorter period, the annual deduction could be higher for persons over 50 years of age on January 1, 1959.

In simplest terms, the principle of the bill is to permit—for example—the small businessman to spread out his income over a greater number of years. During his middle years, when his income is normally the highest, the greatest bite is taken from him under our progressive income taxes. Spreading consists in earmarking a part of his peak earnings for future taxation when his income will be less and consequently the tax will be reduced.

Since 1951, when Representatives KEOGH and REED introduced a bill to correct this tax discrimination, bipartisan attempts by Representatives Keogh, Simpson, Jenkins and the late Representative Reed have been made, without success, in each Congress to pass the necessary legislation. Last year the House passed the bill but it languished in the Senate.

This bill has been tested in practice. Both Great Britain and Canada have with success put similar schemes into operation.

Although previously supporting it, the administration is now opposed to this bill because of the revenues which will be lost to the Treasury. The administration estimates that H.R. 10 may result in a loss of revenue of $320 million for fiscal 1960 and $365 million for the first full year of operation. While $365 million may indeed be the loss in 5 years or so, based on experience in Canada and Great Britain, and on analogy with other forms of saving programs, it appears highly unlikely that the loss will even begin to approach this figure in 1960.

Furthermore, if revenue loss is to be the criterion by which a law is judged good or bad, then I submit that few inequitable laws will be corrected. It seems to me that we would recover many times the funds lost by this bill, if we applied the criteria of both revenue gain and equity to our present revenue codes and plugged some of the more glaring loopholes. I urge the passage of this measure instituting tax equality for the self-employed.

New Bill Would Give Durum Separate Consideration It Deserves

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DON L. SHORT
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 9, 1959

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, at the request of Durum growers in North Dakota, Senator YOUNG of North Dakota has introduced a bill consponsored on the Senate side by Senator LANGER, and by Senators MUNDT and CASE of South Dakota. I am today introducing a similar bill on the House side and I have some hopes that it will be included among the bills our Agriculture Subcommittee will consider during the next several days. One of the problems in promoting Durum legislation has been that Durum is just a subdivision under wheat, as far as a lot of people are concerned, and they want to treat it as such. Macaroni products made with our North Dakota Durum are superior, but that fact—so far, at least—is not appreciated here in the East.

Under the bill I am introducing today, it should be pointed out, is the provision that farmers cannot raise hard wheat on their farms if their Durum allotment is increased. Durum growers would be allowed to grow enough of their product to satisfy the demand. Under the mechanics of this bill, the allotment would be lessened if at any time the demand for Durum lessened.

I hope the Durum growers, who neither create nor add to the surplus—which is in other classes of wheat—will receive the serious and separate consideration they deserve. That is all we ask in this bill.

A Bill To Amend the Social Security Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE M. WALLHAUSER
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 9, 1959

Mr. WALLHAUSER. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday of last week, I introduced in the House of Representatives a bill (H.R. 5219) that would amend the Social Security Act to permit those receiving social security benefits to earn up to $150 a month and $1,800 a year, rather than the present limit of $100 a month and $1,200 a year.

I have taken this step as the present earnings limitation imposes undue hardship on many retired people because of the loss of benefits that results when the $100-a-month figure is exceeded through their part-time employment.

Since my election to Congress last year, many of my retired constituents have explained to me the plight in which they find themselves because of the low earnings limitation imposed by the Social Security Act.

From the information given me, it appears evident that many of our retired people are suffering because of the $100-a-month and the $1,200-a-year earnings limitation. Many do not receive enough in social security benefits to take care of their most basic needs. When, through their own willingness and desire, they undertake part-time employment to bolster their incomes they find themselves denied benefits because they overstep the $100-a-month limitation.

The modest increase in the earnings limitation that I propose will enable many retired people to keep on with their part-time employment and thus maintain the independence they so earnestly desire and which they so justly deserve. In many instances, the $150-a-month and $1,800-a-year limitation that I propose will make the difference as to

whether or not our retired people can enjoy even the most modest necessities and comforts of life. This is particularly true in the great metropolitan district that I have the honor of representing.

The raising of the earnings limitation cannot in any way be regarded as a handout for our retired citizens. Through their years of regular employment, they earned their right to social security benefits. Now, they are willingly seeking to bolster sometimes meager benefit payments through part-time employment, but are thwarted in part by the low earnings limitation. They are more than willing to help themselves and we in the Congress should be willing to help them. Their willingness is in the tradition of true Americanism.

The statistics of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare that I obtained this week show that the average monthly social security benefits now paid are: Retired man with wife, $119; retired single worker, $67; and eligible widows of deceased workers, $56.

Certainly, those average figures show the need for the legislation that I propose, and particularly when it is borne in mind that there was a great increase in the cost of living both during and since the days of World War II.

It is my sincere hope that this very necessary amendment to the Social Security Act will be enacted at the earliest possible date.

Peanuts and People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD D. COOLEY
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 9, 1959

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, the peanut is more closely associated with fun and pure enjoyment than any other crop.

It is as American as baseball.

What would a circus be without a peanut vendor?

The peanut is a symbol of America at play—with children and grownups alike. It tempts the palate. It gives us energy. It is a solid food on our table. It is the constant companion of good appetite and good humor everywhere.

Versatility vies with taste to give the peanut its standing not only in America but throughout the world.

Its flavor is beyond challenge in the crunchy whole nut, or in spreads and confections. It has an affinity both for salt and for sugar. Throughout many areas of the world it is the most common substitute for meat, answering also the need for oil in the diet. The oil is used widely in chemistry and in commercial enterprises. Not only is the peanut a direct human food, but fed to hogs it makes the tastiest hams; and when the hay of the vine is eaten by cows, we get the sweetest milk.

Only perfect peanuts are used for edible purposes. Others are crushed for oil. The oil is ideal for frying because of its high smoke point of 450°. It does not scorch easily. It does not absorb flavors and can be strained and used repeatedly. The oil is best for salads because its tastes, it clings, it sparkles. It has many other aptitudes. It is the basis for many cosmetics, shaving creams and hair lotions. I am told that the energy value of 1 pound of peanuts equals 4 pounds of beefsteak, or 21 pounds of cheese, or 10 quarts of milk, or 33 eggs.

Mr. Speaker, it is fitting that we should be reminded occasionally of those things so often overlooked but which mean so much in our daily lives.

Peanuts are found on every continent and in almost every country where climatic conditions are suitable for their cultivation. They are a major source of food throughout the world.

The United States ranks fifth of all the countries of the world in the production of peanuts and produces a little more than 5 percent of the total world supply of 14 million tons. About one-third of all peanuts are grown in India. China produces a little less than a tenth of the total world supply and sizable quantities are produced in French Equatorial Africa and Nigeria.

Like many cultivated crops, plants similar to the domesticated peanut cannot be found in the wild state. Selection and cultivation of the plant have changed its characteristics until it can be scarcely identified with the wild form.

For a time it was thought that the peanut was a native of Brazil, but later it was found that the wild forms were grown extensively in Paraguay and Uruguay and the northeastern part of Argentina. It is assumed that the peanut came to the United States in the colonial days from Africa which had in turn received it from South America.

In the early part of the 19th century the cultivation of peanuts in the United States was limited to a small portion of eastern Virginia. The expansion of the crop to other areas and its development into an important agricultural commodity occurred, for the most part, in the early part of the 20th century.

During World War II, in response to the vast need in this country for vegetable oil, almost 5 million acres were devoted to peanut production. Much of the problems of the peanut industry today stem from the necessity for reducing this wartime level of production to that required to meet peacetime domestic demand. Peanut acreage has now been reduced to between 1½ to 2 million acres, but with the increased yields per acre annual production at the present time is near a million tons.

Peanut production is an important source of cash income to almost 200,000 farmers. It is particularly important in areas of Virginia, North Carolina, Georgia, Alabama, Texas, and Oklahoma, where soil and climatic conditions favor its production.

This is a brief chronicle. But I cannot close it without mentioning the wonderful work of the National Peanut Council in building markets. The work of this organization is beneficial not only to producers, but also to consumers as well, for the more peanuts we eat and the more we use, the healthier and happier we all will be.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the House joining, with its attention, in this salute to the most versatile, the most convivial, of all the products of our farms, the peanut.

The Place of Government in Agriculture

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 9, 1959

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a very thoughtful speech by the Honorable HAROLD D. COOLEY, chairman of the House Agriculture Committee, summarizing the farm situation. I think it is of such a character as to provoke discussion on one of the most important problems of our times, and it summarizes the very difficult situation that faces America's agriculture.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE PLACE OF GOVERNMENT IN AGRICULTURE

(Address by Representative HAROLD D. COOLEY, Committee on Agriculture, U.S. House of Representatives, before the National Farm Institute, Des Moines, Iowa, February 21, 1959)

Mr. Chairman, farmers and friends of farmers, I am indeed honored and I am bound in gratitude to you for the opportunity to speak before this great gathering of agrarian intelligence which is mingled here with the business leadership of this vast Midwest. I am always happy to visit this region where your economy rests fundamentally upon your agriculture, and where the farm people are making such a tremendous contribution to the health and strength of our Nation.

My mission today is to present to your attention, and to the conscience of the Nation, the troubled conditions on our farms and to make common cause with you to search out the approaches to solutions of our problems.

I am going to talk about the place of Government in agriculture. But, at the outset, I want to emphasize to you that it is people such as you here within the sound of my voice—students, thinkers, and leaders—who must discover the way out. You must master the means of unity among us. You must amass the Nation's opinion to solid solutions for these baffling problems which confront us.

In dealing generally with my subject, "The Place of Government in Agriculture," I shall endeavor to be impersonal and entirely objective. However, all of us must realize that it is hardly possible in these times to take any affirmative position on any matter relating to farm policy without exposure to the charge of political motivation.

THE PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE

The President has submitted his farm message to the Congress. Mr. Ezra Taft Benson has made his statement before our House and Senate Committee on Agriculture. The President and his Secretary of Agriculture have proposed further withdrawal of the Government from responsibility in the

price stability of agriculture and from farm production adjustment undertakings.

Mr. Eisenhower called in his latest message for outright repeal of the parity principle, which is the only means under law to determine a fair relationship of farm prices and income with farm costs and the total of the Nation's economy.

These proposals by the President and the Secretary relate fundamentally to our subject, "The Place of Government in Agriculture." My views are vastly different. They represent my studied and sincere convictions. I am a farmer and I have lived close to agriculture all my life. My views are not political convictions. These convictions are of my mind and of my heart.

I am deeply persuaded that the parity concept, which the Nation had come to accept as sound and just, embraces the aspirations of the farm people for a decent sort of life, that they may walk in equal dignity with the people working in industry, in business, and in the professions.

Of course we should constantly seek the soundest and fairest standards for parity determinations. But we are told now that the principle of parity is old and outmoded, that its overall standards date back before 60 percent of our present population was born. It occurs to me that if mere age of a principle is sufficient to condemn it, why then cannot it be put forth, with equal force and persuasion, that we repeal the Bill of Rights, the Ten Commandments, or the Sermon on the Mount?

The Congress is called upon to scrap the parity principle and to provide price supports for our major crops at 75 to 90 percent of average prices in the market place for previous years. The proposition obviously would withdraw the Government from effective responsibility in the price structure of agriculture.

Why, now, is it not proposed that the Congress repeal the minimum wage and collective bargaining laws, and that labor be paid 75 to 90 percent of its average wage of preceding years?

Why is it not suggested that the Nation's greatest industrial plants, performing on multibillion-dollar Government contracts with profits guaranteed, henceforward be paid on these contracts at only 75 to 90 percent of the former price?

Why is it not now proposed that Federal and State regulatory bodies abandon the fair earning standards and fix the rates of railroads, airlines, and all the great utility and service industries, at 75 to 90 percent of their accustomed charges to the public?

THE FARMER'S PRICE—PAID AND RECEIVED

It is clear that the increases in prices paid by farmers for items required in farm production are no longer determined by supply and demand in the marketplace. The price tags on farm trucks, steel, farm machinery and other things bought by farmers represent "administered prices." This means that the prices are set by officials of the firms manufacturing these things and they proceed to "administer" those prices in making sales to their customers, limiting supplies as necessary to maintain these prices. The concentrated industries have the economic power to modify supply-and-demand substantially in fixing their prices.

This is the simple explanation why, in 1948, a farmer out here in the Midwest could sell 686 bushels of corn and buy a two-row cornpicker, but in 1958 it took 1,972 bushels of corn to buy a two-row corn picker; it is why a farm truck cost 1,080 bushels of corn in 1948 and 2,813 in 1958; and why 1,133 bushels of corn would buy a tractor in 1948 but it took 2,897 bushels to buy a similar tractor last year.

And I make this prediction on the basis of staff studies: If the Government withdraws from the wheat program as it has from feed grains, within a few years it will take at least 2,600 bushels of corn to buy the cornpicker, 3,800 bushels to buy the truck, and 3,900 bushels of corn to buy the tractor.

Why is the farmer singled out?

Others rely upon Government protections, or upon concentrations of economic power, to protect their wages and profits, but the farmer is told to find his price in the naked competition of the marketplace.

That is where he was bankrupted in the late 1920's and early 1930's and thus he entered the whirl of the economic storm that brought on the great depression. That is where—helpless without bargaining power—the farmer is unable to set a price on what he produces but takes what is offered him. This is where, before we had a farm program in America, he was reduced to a lesser economic position so that others in our society treated him with mirth, calling him a yokel, a hayseed, a country bumpkin.

THE INHERITED PROGRAM

Mr. Chairman, I feel compelled here to identify myself as an advocate and a defender of the basic philosophy and purpose of our past farm program. In recent years the critics have been so numerous that I am sure you will welcome the words of one who is proud of this old program that it now is so fashionable to condemn.

The President, in his recent message to the Congress, gave support to efforts now abroad to convince the country that all of our present troubles in agriculture—with all the surpluses and all the costs to taxpayers—are caused by inherited programs.

To view agriculture with any perspective, we must look first at the program prior to 1953, and we must then make some comparisons with the program as it has been operated for the last 6 years. How can we truly examine the place of government in agriculture without asking questions and without making comparisons?

In 1953 we had a farm program under which for 11 consecutive years farm prices generally had averaged 100 percent of parity or higher. The Commodity Credit Corporation price support program for 20 years had cost only $1,064 million. Programs for the basic crops—corn, cotton, tobacco, wheat, peanuts and rice—actually showed a small profit of $13 million. In contrast, for the last 6 years net farm income has been almost $20 billion less than in the previous 6 years. CCC losses in these 6 years have been five times the total of the previous 20 years. CCC had commodities in inventory and on loan of a value of $2,452 million on January 1, 1953; as of January 1, 1959, the figure had reached the staggering sum of $8,716 million. Expenditures of the Department of Agriculture have increased from $1,800 million in 1952 to around $7,300 million for fiscal 1959.

It is true that war stimulated the farmers' markets during some of those 11 years when prices stood at 100 percent of parity or above; but it is true, also—though little noted—that during the last 6 years, because people generally have had more money to spend, the demand for what the farmer produces has been substantially greater than in wartime.

But here is the difference. In 1957, American consumers, with 13 percent higher per-capita incomes than in 1952, bought 11 percent more food from farmers, including more high cost animal products. Yet in 1957 the farmers received $600 million less than in 1952, although consumers paid $6,100 million more for the food in 1957 than in 1952.

The costs, to farmers and to taxpayers, during the last 6 years are not the costs of the farm program which was in operation prior to 1953. They are the costs of the program which has been recommended in the last 6 years and which the Congress reluctantly has allowed to be put into practice.

With misgivings, the Congress in 1954, allowed the sliding scale price supports to become effective. So did the Congress put into operation the soil bank of 1956. Then in 1958, with reluctance and grave doubts, the Congress authorized the reduction in support levels on corn and other feed grains and on cotton and rice.

The program we have today is not an inherited program. It is a completely redone program meeting every major request that the administration put to Congress in the past 6 years except the proposal to remove the minimum 75 percent of parity support level for all crops.

TWO PHILOSOPHIES

The great difference between the past and the present program is the basic philosophy for bringing production to reasonable balance with market requirements.

There are two main roads—two vastly different philosophies—to the accomplishment of essential balancing of supplies with available market outlets in agriculture.

The first is to set up machinery whereby farmers, at their own election, may bring their marketings into balance with assurances, as a matter of national policy, that they will receive, through price supports or other operations, profitable returns for their ample but not excessive supplies going to market.

The second course is to let farm prices decline—in the competitive marketplace—thus driving enough farmers off the land, and diminishing and weakening the productive resources of those who remain, so that total output will adjust itself to demand, in a mistaken expectation that prices may become and remain satisfactory to those who survive.

The old farm program took the first route. This program, based upon the parity principle, set up machinery for farmers to pattern their production to their markets and to give to farmers a voice—bargaining power—in the prices of their commodities as they delivered them into the markets. These are the requirements of any successful industry in a free enterprise economy. This program simply sought to place in the hands of farmers the tools for profit—control of their own supplies and price bargaining power—which have been used by industry since free enterprise was commenced.

Admittedly this program needed some changes in recent years, to adjust to the great technological advances in agriculture and thus to achieve the goals set for it. Adjustments were imperative, but never a change in the basic philosophy.

It is my opinion, it is my deep fear, that the policy we now follow surely will lead to the destruction of the family farm system which was our strength in the founding of our democracy, and it will wreck fine rural trading centers here in the Midwest and elsewhere throughout this great Nation.

Who would say that the Government has no responsibility in this?

FARM POLICY AND FARM INCOME

Let us assess for a moment the part farm policies have played in farm income.

Government programs in the past quarter of a century have increased farmers' net incomes by as much as 20 to 50 percent, in the years when these incomes otherwise would have been lowest due to excessive production in relation to market demand.

And hear this:

Government programs—even in time of dwindling effectiveness, probably have held net farm income at least one-third—$24 billion—higher than it otherwise would have been—in the last 6 years.

These figures and facts are on the authority of competent economists.

Government programs have reduced price and income uncertainty. They have accelerated the adoption of technological advances.

On a national basis they have been a positive force for increased efficiency in agriculture.

Statisticians in the Department of Agriculture find that agriculture's efficiency has been increasing twice as rapidly in the past 25 years when farm programs were in operation, as in the previous 20 years.

Preliminary estimates indicate that the Commodity Credit Corporation by its loan and surplus disposal operations on a net basis removed $1.5 to $2 billion of farm products from commercial market channels in 1958. Without the soil bank payments and, had this additional $1.5 to $2 billion been pushed through commercial markets, it is reasonable to assume from past supply-price relationships that farm income in 1958 would have been $4 to $6 billion lower. Except for the price support operations net farm income in 1958 might have been only $7 to $9 billion, instead of $13 billion.

WHERE WOULD THE MIDWEST BE?

What would be the financial situation of Midwest farmers today if there had been no farm program since World War II? It is my considered judgment that most of you, and most of your financial and farm service institutions in the Midwest, would be flat broke.

What if the $8 to $9 billion of farm products now in Commodity Credit Corporation hands, or on loan, had been forced through commercial market channels in the last few years? What if the $1 to $2 billion of farm products sent abroad under Public Law 480 in each of the last few years instead had been channeled through commercial markets at home and abroad?

The questions go directly to "the place of Government in agriculture," the subject your program committee asked me to discuss.

You know the answers, and I am sure you understand my bewilderment when people who call themselves farm leaders, and who pretend to represent the Midwest farm opinion, come to Washington and tell us to destroy the parity principle, to scuttle what is left of the farm program and, as I must interpret it, to restore the farmer's freedom to go again into the marketplaces and, hat in hand, meekly accept in price not what he asks but whatever is offered him.

Is that what the great Midwest wants? Do you people out here want agriculture to be cast adrift again in the economic stream, while others, enjoying the protection of Government on utilizing the raw force of economic concentration, bargain away our profits, denying us fair rewards for the unmatched contribution our farm families are making to our great Nation?

I'll never believe it.

I say to the farmers of this great Midwest: Let your voice be heard. Let us know who speaks for you.

TRUE NATURE OF FARM INCOME PROBLEM

The critical elements in the farm problem today should be clear to everyone by now. Farmers are introducing new technology at such a rapid rate that they are fully replacing the labor which leaves the farm and in addition they are expending output faster than market outlets can be expanded.

Utilizing both a smaller crop acreage base and a shrinking labor supply, farm output increased 23 percent between 1950 and 1958 while total population increased only 15 percent. This increase in total farm output is largely the result of our excellent research and educational programs for farmers. It is a product of science and technology. We planned it that way. It is a wonderful blessing to American consumers, to the American economy, and to the hungry people of the free world.

But here is the rub. Individual farmers find it profitable to introduce these new production techniques, to expand their output even though the increase in total output outruns available markets, forces prices down, and reduces the total income to be divided among all producers. It is this feature of our agricultural economy which makes what is a blessing to consumers, economic suicide for farmers.

Other groups in our economy who manufacture and sell the supplies purchased by farmers, and those who process and market farm products have various degrees of market power. In the absence of marketing agreements and farm price supports the commercial farmers have virtually none.

Furthermore, this technological advance which tends to bankrupt farmers in the absence of an adequate farm program, would be substantially the same as it is today even though the current decline in farm numbers continues until there are only half as many commercial farmers in the United States as at the present and even though farms were increased to twice their current size.

As long as improved technology is available and farmers on an individual basis find it profitable to increase output more rapidly than markets can be expanded, it does not matter whether there are 5 million farmers, 1 million, or even 500,000, prices will fall faster than costs. In the absence of programs giving farmers bargaining power in relation to other groups in our economic society farm prices and incomes will be forced to disastrously low levels.

Any group, if it is to exercise bargaining power in the marketplace, must have a measure of control over its supplies. This is the key consideration in the formulation of an effective Government program giving farmers increased bargaining power.

THE ROAD AHEAD

Now where are we—the farmers of America—where are we headed?

We in Congress who have the well-being of farmers at heart are working on every conceivable approach to the problems now carying for remedies. But I must be frank with you. We shall never have another sound and effective farm program until a substantial majority of farmers—people like you who are gathered here—make up your minds. We shall never impose a program upon farmers. We are eagerly responsive to the will of farmers.

Now I have tried here to shed some light on the circumstances of agriculture and to illuminate the magnitude of the problems which confront us. It is far easier, of course, to reach an understanding on what is wrong in any particular situation than it is to agree on appropriate remedies.

But surely there can be no disagreement that the basic source of farmers' economic difficulties today in the rapid rate of technological advance in agriculture.

Surely there can be no disagreement that in the absence of a farm program in recent years farm income would have dropped precipitously.

Surely there can be no disagreement that current farm program costs are excessive in relation to the income of agriculture.

Surely no one will disagree that current stocks of storable farm products are excessive.

But can we agree on new approaches for dealing with the farm income problem I have described?

I have been bitterly disappointed in recent years in the wide differences in the recommendations of our national farm organizations. I was discouraged by the absence of constructive ideas in the President's farm message to the Congress last month.

Some basic determinations must be made. These determinations must precede any action by the Congress on a sound, long-range farm program. Our course must lie in one of a number of directions.

We can rebuild the old program, with more efficient means of production adjustment, more of the storable crops made eligible for such adjustment—all programs, as heretofore, subject to the election of farmers themselves—and provide assurance of reasonable prices for farmers who willingly adjust their outputs to market requirements.

We can provide a system of production payments or parity payments by the Government to pay to farmers the difference between the market price and a reasonable price, on all or part of what they produce.

We can formulate a program embracing a combination of production adjustment and price support, with supplemental production payments.

Or we can, if you desire it, employ either or both of these approaches to devise a program of tolerable security, as a shield behind which farmers may organize programs of their own for specific commodities, through marketing agreements, self-help plans or similar machinery designed to assure the producers increased bargaining power by creating an ability to regulate the flow of their commodities into the market. Producers of each commodity should be allowed a wide latitude to develop a program which would give them as much bargaining power as can be developed in the market.

Of course we must continue such programs as those making part of our overabundant supplies of food available to other countries in the operation of our foreign economic assistance program, and the programs of research into better distribution and utilization of food and more extensive industrial uses of farm commodities.

Those are perhaps the most discussed approaches. There are many other suggestions for the direction a farm program should take.

Now, what do we do? Where do we go?

Specifically, you have asked me: What is the Government's responsibility in agriculture? It is this:

The nature and the structure of agriculture are a matter of concern to all the people. I say to you that this exploding technology on the farm is creating a disastrous economic situation for agriculture. Our Government research and educational programs, mixed with the intelligence and labor of our farmers, have given us the most efficient agriculture in the world. They are giving consumers the cheapest food—in relation to wages—on record. Government cannot now stand idly by, wringing its hands, crying all old programs have failed and all new programs are doomed to failure. Government cannot say there is nothing we can do to avert the impending economic misery of the farmer resulting from this rapid rate of technological advance in relation to available market outlets. The Government has a moral, an ethical, an inherent, a constitutional obligation to create public policies that will open to the operators in agriculture the opportunities of due rewards for their management and their labor on a parity with the workers in all other undertakings in this free enterprise economy and in this democratic society. The safety, the health, the aspirations of all the people—the strength of our Nation—demand this.

This is my creed. It is the starting point.

The Government has given labor the minimum wage law and the collective bargaining law. It has given industry the corporate structure, the tariff and the many statutes that soften the perils of unregulated, unrestrained competitive enterprise. How, then, can the modern, highly mechanized farmer survive, ever selling in a free market and buying in a protected market? Where can there be doubt of the Government's obligation to agriculture?

I pledge common cause with the farmers of America to the fulfillment of this obligation, in public policies farmers themselves shall devise, and which will be fair alike to our farm people and to our great consuming urban populations.

Address by Hon. James C. Davis of Georgia at the Virginia Democratic Jefferson-Jackson Day Dinner, Richmond, March 7, 1959

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOWARD W. SMITH

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 9, 1959

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I present a speech delivered by Representative JAMES C. DAVIS of Georgia at the Virginia Democratic Jefferson-Jackson Day dinner in Richmond on March 7, 1959.

Today our Government and the Constitution upon which it is founded are under heavy attack. It comes in a form which was anticipated by one of your greatest fellow citizens, the Father of our Country, General and President George Washington. In his farewell address on September 17, 1796, he said:

"If, in the opinion of the people, the distribution or modification of the constitutional powers be, in any particular wrong, let it be corrected by an amendment, in the way in which the Constitution designates—but let there be no change by usurpation; for though this, in one instance, may be the instrument of good, it is the customary weapon by which free governments are destroyed."

The threat to our Constitution comes from activities of the Federal Supreme Court. The trend of the Supreme Court, as presently constituted, has been to flaunt the law and the Constitution; to regard the whole body of the law as an uncharted sea; to arrogate unto themselves complete authority to make law as they think it should be made. These would-be reformers want to write the law to conform with their own perverted ideas of what law should be instead of what it is. They want to read into the Constitution alleged meanings which no lawyer or judge or layman ever read into that document in the history of the country before.

In the 17-year period beginning with 1929, that Court rendered 28 favorable decisions to defendants who were either Communists or charged with subversive activities. This is the Court which struck one of the hardest blows at our Constitution in the school segregation decision of May 17, 1954. I want to talk some tonight about this case, where all pretense at following the law was dropped; where its decision was in effect that changing times and conditions required a changed interpretation of the 14th amendment, and, they said we therefore change it. The people of my State, and I believe the people of your State, do not intend to see our constitutional rights struck down by judicial dictatorship. We shall resist it by every legal means.

I have not come tonight to talk about what cannot be done. I have come to speak of what can be done—what is being done—and to repeat the age-old truism that where there's a will, there's a way. I know of no better philosophy than the motto of David Crockett: "Be sure you are right, and then go ahead." I am convinced that when right is challenged by arrogant authority, a bold defense of that right will rally to its cause the support of the people. I well remember the occasion in Georgia when a President of the United States declared himself against the reelection of our senior Senator who had refused the demand of that President to pack the Supreme Court. In ringing words, the Senator said: "Mr. President, I accept the challenge." The people of Georgia rallied to his side and returned him to the Senate with a tremendous majority.

The arrogant brutality of Mr. Eisenhower in running roughshod over the citizens of Little Rock with his paratroopers so crystalized sentiment in Arkansas that they did the almost unheard of thing to re-elect a Governor of the State for a third term, and to defeat an eight-term Member of the United States Congress with a write-in candidate. For the first time in the State's history the gubernatorial candidate carried all its 75 counties.

The answer to the threat which you people face in Virginia, and which my people in Georgia face, is first, to satisfy ourselves that we are in the right; second, to firmly resolve that we will support and defend that right; and third, to organize with all who believe as we do and then work together with all the energy and determination we possess to win the battle.

The most effective method, I think, of protecting ourselves against the fraudulent destruction of our constitutional rights is for the great mass of American people who believe in constitutional government to organize for the purpose of preserving it, to alert and convince our people of the need for active, continuous, cooperative effort to stop this encroachment upon our liberties. It is of the utmost importance that we all realize this need for organized, unending, cooperative effort, and that we make it our number one goal and objective until we have brought a stop to this Federal encroachment upon our States' rights and local control of our own affairs.

I can tell you, and I do tell you, that our people in Georgia have resolved that we will never surrender the control of our schools to a judicial dictatorship operating in Washington. When the fraudulent and outrageous school desegregation decision was foisted upon us in 1954, Georgia's people said—there will be no integration in Georgia schools. To this day there has not been the first instance of integration in Georgia schools. The determination to resist is as strong in the hearts of Georgians today as it was when they resisted the carpetbaggers of the Reconstruction Era, and again when they declared their determination to resist modern carpetbaggers and modern reconstruction in 1954.

You Virginians do not have to look to Georgia, however, or to Arkansas, to point you the way. Within the borders of your own State, the determined people of Front Royal, Va., have shown you and the country one solution to the problem. The Communists, the NAACP with its multitude of Red front officers and members, that queer aggregation known as the ADA, aided and abetted by the local quislings and traitors, have all been loudly proclaiming that Front Royal children must go to integrated schools. But the good people of that community are going right along day by day operating their own schools in the way they have chosen to do. It is to their everlasting credit that, when the day came upon which the judicial dictatorship said Negro children would mix and mingle with white children in their high school, not one white child entered the schoolhouse door. The pickaninnies found themselves still as far from association with the whites as they were before the Supreme Court undertook to amend the Constitution in 1954.

The Front Royal people have simply accepted a fact which we all will realize when we look it in the face. It is this: that in the long run, whether public or private, the cost of operating schools is going to have to be paid by the white people of the country.

If the worst comes to worst, and the public schools are closed, white people will adjust themselves to the situation and educate their children in private schools, and bear the cost of operating them. There may be some Negro private schools set up. I am confident that good white people will help the Negroes whose aim is an education for their children and not social equality. I am confident also that Negroes of the NAACP persuasion, whose aim is not education, but social equality, will have to go someplace like Philadelphia, Chicago, New York City, or Washington. And when they get there, they will still find that the same feelings of race pride exist, that white people will move out rather than accept race mixing, and that they have been following a will-o-the-wisp and have been led astray by the false doctrine first expounded by the Communist Party when it proclaimed its platform at its national convention on May 26, 1928.

You will recall that just 8 days after the Supreme Court's constitutional amendment on May 17, 1954, the District of Columbia School Board ordered the schools to be opened the following September as integrated schools. President Eisenhower, eager to pander to those he thought controlled the Negro bloc vote, announced that Washington integrated schools would be a model for the Nation, a showcase for the country. The schools were integrated as ordered. But that which was advertised to be a model for the Nation to follow when and if it knuckled under to the judicial dictators turned out to be a monumental failure, a horrible nightmare.

Appalled by the tragic possibilities which they knew awaited their boys and girls under this rotten social experiment, white fathers and mothers of school-age children began a mass exodus out of the District of Columbia. They began to flee into the white suburbs in 1953 when the leftwing sociological Supreme Court turned the Negroes into the Washington restaurants and hotels in the Thompson Restaurant case. The handwriting on the wall was clear. The school cases were pending, and the first year 20,000 white people moved out. The next year the mass exodus increased to 33,000; the following year the outmigration had swelled to 42,000. In 1957, only 6,000 fled but by July 1, 1958, another 22,000 moved out, making a total loss to the District of Columbia of 123,000 white residents in 5-year period following the Supreme Court-Eisenhower forced integration program in Washington. In the same 5-year period, while Washington's white population was decreasing 123,000, its Negro population was increasing by 98,000. The Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia finally got around to the point of facing facts, and on Monday of this week they issued a statement acknowledging that 53 percent of the population of the Nation's Capital are Negroes. Washington is rapidly becoming a second Harlem.

It was evident from the first that this sociological experiment was a miserable failure.

One of the immediate and obvious results of mixing the schools in Washington was that white children were held back in the schools because the Negro children showed they could not keep the educational pace. As early as June 10, 1955, the U.S. News & World Report announced that white people were moving out of Washington to nearby Virginia in great numbers; the exodus of white people from Washington had resulted in a public school system in June 1955, of 61 percent

Negro pupils and 39 percent white. The same magazine, 6 months later on November 25, 1955, reported that Negroes were pouring into Washington and white families leaving in droves, with the result that at that time 64 percent of the students were Negroes and only 36 percent white.

In 1956, 2 years after the schools were mixed, the House District of Columbia Committee set up a subcommittee and charged it with the duty of investigating the District of Columbia integrated public school system. I was chairman of that subcommittee. The tragic facts of the school situation had been concealed behind an iron curtain in Washington. The radical NAACP and other sponsors of integrated schools, including the notoriously radical newspaper, the Washington Post, wanted desperately to keep the facts concealed. They made frantic efforts to prevent our subcommittee from functioning. The NAACP sent telegrams of protest to the President, to the Democratic candidate for President, to the Speaker of the House, to the Democratic and Republican floor leaders in the House, to each member of the House District of Columbia Committee and others. The NAACP held protest meetings in Negro churches in Washington. Never have I seen such desperate and frantic efforts made to prevent a duly constituted committee of Congress from performing its function.

We let nothing stop us, however, and when the facts were uncovered, it was easy to see why proponents of mixed schools wanted to keep the facts secret. We brought before us witnesses best qualified to give the facts.

Our witnesses consisted solely of members of the school board, officials such as the superintendent of the school system, assistant superintendents, principals, and teachers. We had white witnesses and Negro witnesses. We had witnesses in favor of integration and witnesses opposed to integration. The testimony showed that, from the standpoint of mentality, the Negro pupils were not able to keep pace with the white children in the schools. That resulted in lowering the education standards.

We learned from accurate comparisons based upon recognized achievement tests, known as the Iowa Achievement Test, Standard Achievement Test, and IQ tests, that there was a very wide difference in scholastic achievement and mental ability between white and Negro pupils. To illustrate, we found that in Cardozo school, with 6 white and 1,694 colored pupils, there were 512 pupils in the tenth grade; 230 of that 512 were able to read only from fourth grade to seventh grade level; more than 300 were able to work arithemetic only at seventh grade level or below; and 283 of the 512, which is 55 percent, were classified as being in a category which would never be able to achieve beyond the sixth grade level.

One teacher in Roosevelt High School, with a class about 75 percent colored, said she had more failures in 1 year of integrated teaching than she had in 10 years of teaching in a segregated school.

The assistant superintendent in charge of all high schools testified that in 4 high schools, with a total of 8 white students and 5,011 colored students, these 4 colored high schools tested under the Iowa Achievement Test rated or scored in the lowest 5 percent of schools taking this test across the entire Nation.

Time does not permit me to give you the detailed results of these achievement and IQ tests. They are set forth in detail in the committee report, and it will be my pleasure to send a copy of that report to anyone furnishing me his name and address.

Testimony of many of the teachers showed that the Negro pupils, because of low achievement and mental ability, required so much time and attention that the white pupils had to be neglected, and failed to receive the time and attention they would have had otherwise.

I have given you just a few examples of testimony concerning scholastic achievement and mental ability of Negro pupils in the Washington schools. This testimony is typical of the bulk of testimony we took for 9 days from school officials, principals, and teachers.

Such conditions, of course, retard able pupils. They have a disastrous effect upon children from an educational standpoint. Yet, there is far more involved in this matter than just the educational problem. There is a human side and a moral side. This means even more in shaping and influencing the lives, the character, and the future of our children, which furnishes additional and imperative reasons for our insisting upon segregation in schools.

Among other objections to this close association with Negro children are the important matter of health, the Negroes' high crime rate and disrespect for law, the lower mentality level, and the high rate of illegitimacy among Negroes. It is well known that the crime rate among Negroes far exceeds that of whites. Washington, D.C., is noted for the great number of serious crimes committed within its limits. Its crimes of violence are more than twice the number committed in Boston, a city of comparable size; more than twice of those committed in Milwaukee; and, nearly twice those in New Orleans, La.

Negroes are responsible for this high crime rate. Over the years, they have averaged committing 82 percent of the major crimes in Washington, and during some periods the percentage has gone as high as 88 percent. The current rate of Negro illegitimacy in Washington is that more than one out of four births is illegitimate: Negroes constitute 87.1 percent of the names on the relief rolls, and the current reports of venereal disease in the District of Columbia show that, of total cases reported during the past year, 220 were white and 9,126 were colored.

These are repulsive statistics, but they show some of the impelling reasons for segregated schools. They show what an unspeakable tragedy it is for white children to have integration forced upon them.

We asked about personal relations between white and colored pupils, both as to pupils of the same sex and pupils of the opposite sex.

Practically without exception, the testimony was that dances, plays, senior proms, picnics, and similar social functions were discontinued when the schools were integrated.

At Roosevelt High School, where white and colored were about equally divided, it was necessary to discontinue girl cheer leaders and use only male cheer leaders because of remarks and incidents which occurred at the basketball games.

The testimony was that Negro girls were antagonistic to white girls, and did such things as stepping on their heels in the halls, sticking pins in them; a Negro girl would stand in the aisle and dare a white girl to pass her. A group of Negro girls attacked a white girl on the way home from school and inflicted personal injury upon her.

They testified that similar personal antagonism existed between Negro boys and white boys. At McKinley High School a group of Negro boys attacked two white boys who had been circulating a petition opposing an integrated prom. They beat them horribly and left one of the boys unconscious on the sidewalk. Fourteen stitches were required to sew the wounds inflicted inside this boy's mouth. His father brought him to the Capitol so that I could see the serious injuries he received.

There were numerous fights, beatings, stabbings, etc. The principal of McFarland Junior High School testified that, although it was never necessary to call for police assistance when operating segregated schools, in the last school year in his integrated school, he had to call for police assistance approximately 50 times to prevent fights and keep order.

Many of the witnesses testified as to obscene remarks, obscene literature, indecent proposals, indecent handling, and indecent approaches of Negro boys to white girls.

The principal of Roosevelt High School testified that she had two cases of Negro boys approaching white girls in her school the same week she was testifying as a witness. She said she had this trouble the preceding year, and the year before that, which was the entire period of integrated schools at the time of her testimony.

The former principal of Eastern High School swore that he retired the preceding year because of ill health brought on by conditions resulting from integrating the schools. He testified that it was necessary to require that all teachers leave their desks when the bell rang to keep order in the corridors. He said he heard colored girls at times use language that was far worse than any he had ever heard, even in the Marine Corps.

He said that fighting, including several knifings, went on continuously—that such incidents became more or less commonplace following integration; that there were more thefts in his school in 2 years of integration than he had known in all his 30-odd years of experience before; that there were many sex problems following integration; that colored boys wrote notes to white girls giving their telephone numbers and asking for the girls' telephone numbers; that colored boys touched white girls in a suggestive manner when passing them in the halls and made obscene remarks about them.

He stated that one white girl was surrounded by a group of colored students after leaving school one afternoon; that a colored boy put a knife to her back, forced her down an alley and against a wall, and while they were debating making her take her clothes off, she broke away and ran home. The principal stated that a dozen or more colored girl students became pregnant at his school during his last school year.

The principal of Jefferson Junior High School testified to 27 pregnancies in his school during the preceding year, 2 white and 25 colored.

The number of pregnancies among the colored girl pupils has created a serious problem in the high schools and the junior high schools.

The official report of the doctor at Southwest Health Center Clinic in Washington of illegitimate pregnancies during the 1956–57 school year in the junior high schools of the city of Washington is a shocking thing. Among other things that report stated that there was a rise of over 1,000 percent in the number of junior high school pregnancies in comparison with 1948–49 school year figures.

The report further states: "In the early part of the 1956–57 school year one school in Southwest reported over half of the 240 children enrolled were illegitimate." The report and exhibits attached to it tell a story of almost unbelievable and shocking conditions of health, illegitimacy, venereal disease, and assembly-line production of illegitimate children who promptly go on the relief rolls at the expense of the taxpayers.

These reports are made annually, and the last one available is almost a repetition of the report made available to the school investigating committee in 1956.

Mr. Howard West of the District of Columbia Department of Public Health stated that in the year preceding the school investigation there were 996 illegitimate babies born to girls of school age in Washington; further that it was a close estimate to say

that one out of every four colored schoolchildren in the District of Columbia public schools was an illegitimate child. He further there stated from the records of the District of Columbia Department of Health that in the year in question the total number of cases of venereal disease reported to the Department by persons of school age was 854. To bring the figures down to date, the records of that Department for 1957 show that of Negro birth more than one out of four was illegitimate.

For a long time the NAACP veiled their aims with the pretext that they wanted integrated schools for purposes of better education. They have now become so bold as to cast that pretext aside and boldly state that their objective is complete social equality. One of the Negroes who claims to represent the views of the NAACP stated in a magazine article as long ago as 1952, that the aim of the Negro is intermarriage with white people. It is a blind person indeed who is not now aware of that purpose.

School conditions in Washington for white children and white parents are pathetic today. They are worse than in 1954 and 1956. Some 10 days ago I heard a rumor that a Negro teacher in one of the Washington elementary schools had staged a play in the school in which two of the characters were husband and wife. The Negro teacher cast a little white girl in the role of the wife and a Negro boy in the role of the husband. I investigated the rumor and found it to be true. I obtained a copy of the fourth grade reading book which contained the play. This is it.

A few weeks ago, a worried father told me that a Negro boy tried to kiss his daughter; that she was able to fight him off, but he did succeed in kissing her girl companion.

One parent of a daughter in one of the Washington schools brought me this valentine from a Negro boy to his daughter, and this valentine from another Negro boy to another white girl in the same school.

It is distasteful to speak of such repulsive happenings, but you should know that if you permit this integration program to get a foothold in your State, you are opening your doors to a revolting systematic, progressive, disgusting campaign of race amalgamation.

By 1957 the mass exodus of white children out of Washington schools had become so great, the promoters of forced integration saw the need for desperate measures to stem the tide. Carl F. Hansen, then assistant superintendent of the District of Columbia school system, permitted a pamphlet to be issued in his name by the Anti-Defamation League. It was entitled "Miracle of Social Adjustment: Desegregation in the Washington, D.C., Schools, by Carl F. Hansen." It consisted of 70 pages of drivel and slanted propaganda in a labored effort to present the miserable District of Columbia integrated public school system as a system where everyone was happy and integration a huge success.

When we had our school investigation in 1956, it was obvious then to anyone with a thimbleful of brains that the parents of white children would move out of Washington as soon as they were able to, and that public schools would soon be segregated again because the pupils would all be Negroes. I so stated at the time of the investigation.

On Thursday of this week, the same Carl F. Hansen, the alleged author of "Miracle of Social Adjustment," said in a speech in Nashville, Tenn., that the Washington school system, pressured by powerful social and economic forces, is drifting back to a form of segregation.

He is quoted as saying among other things that "83 percent of the elementary schools are predominantly white or Negro, indicating clearly that if a numerical balance in enrollments does occur, it does not remain for long."

Even the notoriously radical newspaper, the Washington Post, one of the most zealous and fanatical promoters of integration in all phases of life in Washington has been forced to acknowledge, although most reluctantly, that the result is being attained which sensible people saw and tried to prevent, namely, that integrated Washington is slipping into the gutter. On Wednesday of this week, that pink newspaper, in a long editorial headed "New Form of Segregation," made this statement:

"The present problem arises because the District proper is moving very rapidly toward becoming largely a Negro city. We do not think that this sort of imbalance is good for either the white or the colored race. Certainly it is not good for the National Capital or for the District as a civic community."

Further along in the editorial, they say:

"Fortunately, there are many steps that can be taken to curb the trend toward an all-Negro District and an all-white suburbs."

They then suggest that the suburban communities share the blessings of integration by building a lot of Negro houses for Washington Negroes to move into, and to provide mass transportation to carry them to and fro.

It is unfortunate, but also true, that the integrationists' chickens are coming home to roost on the doorsteps of the radical zealots who disregarded all warnings, and who resisted all efforts to prevent the disastrous consequences of integration, which they now recognize with wails of anguish, and for which they seek to blame everyone else but themselves.

I warn you tonight that we must not accept this integrated school plan. We must defeat this fraudulent, strong-arm attempt to cram this integrated school plan down our throats. Unless we reject this school decision in toto, as certain as night follows the day, this sociological Supreme Court is going to hand down another decision holding that our marriage laws violate the 14th amendment. That decision will be the final step to mongrelize this country. The groundwork has already been laid for that decision, and it was laid in Virginia. Your State law prohibits interracial marriages. This was the case I believe in 28 of the States in this Union until Tuesday of this week, March 3, when the State of Idaho repealed its law banning interracial marriages in that State. In the Virginia case of *Naim v. Naim*, 87 S.E. 2d, 749, 350 U.S. 891, the Virginia Supreme Court, pursuant to Virginia law, declared invalid a marriage between a Chinese seaman and a white woman and annulled the marriage. The case was appealed to the U.S. Supreme Court, and appellant asked that Virginia's marriage law be declared unconstitutional in violation of the 14th amendment.

I do not think the Federal Supreme Court would hesitate a moment to strike down the marriage laws of Virginia and the other States now, if these sociological experts felt that public opinion would accept such a shocking decision now. They know that public opinion will not accept it now, but they saw in this case an opportunity to kick the question back and forth for a while between Washington and Richmond, to give the Communist Daily Worker, the so-called liberal press, the NAACP, the Americans for Democratic Action, the American Civil Liberties Union, and other integrationists and mongrelizers some time in which to condition the public mind for a judicial decision striking down the last legal barrier which stands in the path of mongrelization. The Federal Supreme Court entered an order vacating the State court judgment of annulment, and sent the case back to the State court for further action, saying that it wanted additional evidence as to whether Virginia's court had jurisdiction in the case.

In rejecting this further attempt of the Federal Supreme Court to meddle in affairs belonging exclusively to the State, the Supreme Court of Virginia joined the Supreme Court of Georgia in refusing the recognize the right of the Federal tribunal to remand cases to State courts for further action where no ground for reversal was shown in the record. The Virginia Supreme Court on January 18, 1956, notified the Federal Supreme Court that it refused to take further action and closed the case.

But you may be sure that if the school integration question is finally settled against us, there will quickly come a Supreme Court decision declaring our marriage laws invalid.

There are some faint-hearted souls among us who say "Let's accept token integration. Let's keep our schools by admitting a few Negro children to white schools."

Do not be lulled into a sense of security by any statement we can have token integration and continue with segregated public schools. There will be no such thing as token integration. Token integration will not be approved by the Supreme Court. It will not be accepted by the NAACP. If you have any doubts on that score, settle them quickly. You are familiar with the fact that North Carolina 2 years ago inaugurated a token integration plan by admitting 11 Negro children to white schools in Charlotte, Greensboro and Winston-Salem.

On February 11 the Associated Press sent out a story headed "NAACP Trained Guns on Token Integration." It began with this paragraph:

"Negroes launched new attacks on North Carolina school laws Tuesday, filing integration suits in Federal courts at Charlotte and Greensboro, and promising more suits."

The news story further states:

"The presence of Thurgood Marshall, NAACP general counsel in both suits, hints that North Carolina—despite its token integration—may be the NAACP's next school segregation battleground."

The lengthy article concludes with this statement:

"The suits assert that the North Carolina Pupil Assignment Act, is designed to impede, rather than carry out Supreme Court integration edicts and therefore is unconstitutional."

The Richmond News Leader of February 17, 1959, carried a news item headed "Limited Integration Held Mistaken Motion." It reported a speech by the executive secretary of the NAACP to a Negro audience of more than 2,000 in Portsmouth, Va. He urged Negro children in Virginia to apply for transfer to white schools by the hundreds. The news item stated:

"He called on them to proceed under pupil assignment laws not by twos and threes, but by hundreds. The laws can stop only so many, else they will be declared unconstitutional; so the more who apply, the more who will have to be transferred."

The notoriously radical Washington Post carried a story on February 28 headed "Wilkins Scorns Token Integration." The article stated:

"Roy Wilkins, executive secretary of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, declared last night that the admission of 4, or 12 or 20 Negro students can be regarded only as a beginning of school desegregation in Virginia.

"Speaking at the annual dinner at All Souls Unitarian Church, Wilkins said that it is not reasonable to expect Negro citizens to accept a few Negro students as full satisfaction of the Supreme Court ruling."

Let us not delude ourselves with any mistaken notion that this problem will be settled by token integration. Make no mistake about it; we will either have segregated

schools with white students and white teachers, or we will have mixed schools with mixed students and mixed faculties. It is a decision which cannot be dodged. It must be made. When it is made, it must be carried out.

Egypt was once the center of the world. Its pyramids, the Sphinx, the tombs of its monarchs marked the grandeur of that once great nation which existed until their people became a mongrel race. The greatness of Egypt is gone forever.

Egypt will never again have the opportunity to make the choice which we have in America today. Throughout Virginia today are memorials to the courage and bravery of American patriots who struck the blow which brought freedom to the land. Almost within the sound of my voice is historic St. John's Church where Patrick Henry, speaking to men who were smarting under tyranny and oppression, with his eloquence fanned the spark of resentment smouldering in their breasts into revolution against the strongest world power of that date. In Virginia are Mount Vernon, Gunston Hall, Kenmore, Monticello, Stratford, Williamsburg, and many monuments to remind us of the architects of this Republic who, down to this day, have given us as great a degree of human liberty as mankind has ever known.

I am confident that the Virginians of today will make no decision which will stamp them as being unworthy descendants of their forebears. I am confident that we of this generation will no more accept oppression or dictatorship than they did. This principle which has come down through the ages rings as loudly in our ears as it did in theirs, that resistance to tyranny is obedience to God.

Let me say to you again that the fight is ahead of us, not behind us.

Address by Speaker of the House Sam Rayburn at Democratic National Victory Dinner, February 28, at Sheraton Park Hotel, Washington, D.C.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 9, 1959

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, in my extension of remarks, I include an address of Democratic accomplishments made by the great American and Mr. Democrat, our beloved Speaker, the gentleman from Texas, Mr. RAYBURN.

The Speaker's address, made at the Democratic national victory dinner, the evening of February 28, 1959, in Washington, D.C., clearly shows the Democratic Party is the "party of the people."

As Speaker RAYBURN well said: "It was our party that wrote into law the great reforms of the 20th century, beginning with Woodrow Wilson's "new freedom" and going forward under the New Deal and the Fair Deal.

"It was our party which successfully piloted this Nation through the dark days of the depression and the fateful struggle of World War II and its aftermath.

"And let us never forget that it was the Democratic Party, under Woodrow Wilson, Franklin D. Roosevelt, and Harry S. Truman, which moved this great Nation from isolation to the leadership of the free world."

There is no Member of Congress whose views carry greater weight with the people than those of Speaker RAYBURN.

ADDRESS BY SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE SAM RAYBURN

I'm mighty happy to be here tonight.

I'm always happy to break bread with Democrats of all shades of opinion and beliefs—but Democrats with a single, guiding purpose—the safety and well-being of the American people.

I never come to one of these great gatherings without a feeling of humility and gratitude for your friendship and your support through the more than half a century that I have labored as a loyal Democrat and an American lawmaker.

And I might add that the longer I serve under the Republicans, the prouder I am to be a Democrat.

I am proud to be a Democrat for many reasons.

Let me list a few:

First, our party is a party with a heart.

It was our party—the Democratic Party—that created the ideal of humane government on this continent way back in the days of Thomas Jefferson and Andrew Jackson.

It was our party that wrote into law the great reforms of the 20th century, beginning with Woodrow Wilson's new freedom and going forward under the New Deal and the Fair Deal.

It was our party which successfully piloted this Nation through the dark days of the depression and the fateful struggle of World War II and its aftermath.

And let us never forget that it was the Democratic Party, under Woodrow Wilson, Franklin D. Roosevelt, and Harry S. Truman, which moved this great Nation from isolation to the leadership of the free world.

There is another reason I am proud of the Democratic Party.

It has always been—it is today—and it will continue to be—the party of responsibility. It acts and works responsibly when it is in power, and when it is in the minority it still works responsibly for the good of the American people.

Regardless of party advantage, regardless of who is in the White House, the Democratic Party puts its responsibility to the American people first. We do not dislike the Republicans; we do not dislike Republicans who happen to be President. When we think they are acting for the good of our country, we help them; when we think they are wrong or unwise, we try to correct them.

The Republicans could profit by our example.

Today, under a Republican President, the Democratic majorities in the House of Representatives and in the U.S. Senate are still working as always as the party of responsibility.

We are charged by the American people with a heavy, and sometimes we feel a terrible, responsibility for their safety and their welfare.

We gladly accept this burden.

We are ready to meet the challenge of our times.

We welcome the opportunity to write sane, financially sound legislation to meet the needs of a rapidly growing population which has a rising productivity, requiring more homes, more highways, more schools, more factories, and more food.

We have taken, and we will continue to take, the responsibility for building the framework of laws under which we develop the atomic age and the space age.

The Democratic Party is ready to act responsibly to help our young families, our veterans, our elder citizens, and our poor to have decent homes that they can afford. We know that good homes make good citizens.

We accept the task of saving the independent farmer, of conserving our soil and water and natural resources, of bringing the blessings of electricity and good roads to those who till the soil which feeds our Nation and many underprivileged peoples in other lands.

We accept the responsibility to help the aged, the disabled, the sick, and the unemployed.

We gladly undertake the task of helping our cities to clear their slums, unsnarl their traffic, and modernize their facilities.

We have always made the promotion of trade with other nations a cardinal tenet of our democratic faith.

And let all the world know this—both inside and outside the Iron Curtain—the responsible Democratic Party is going to give the Republican President such sinews of defense that, if wisely used, this Nation cannot be driven from position to position by any power on earth, however strong. Our military posture will be made so mighty that troublemakers everywhere will decide that peace, not aggression, is the path of wisdom.

And let me make something else crystal clear.

The Democratic Party has been, and will continue to be, the party of financial responsibility. The air is full of deliberate political propaganda about reckless spending and liberal spendthrifts.

Let's look at the record:

In the Democratic 85th Congress, we appropriated $5,600,000,000 less than the Republican President asked us for.

And in the Democratic 84th Congress, we appropriated $2,300 million less than the Republican budget requested.

In the last 4 years of Democratic Congresses, we have cut $8 billion out of the Republican President's budget.

And the Washington Post on February 9 carried a news item that the President's director of the budget admitted to the House Appropriations Committee that President Eisenhower actually has asked Congress for more money than it has been willing to give him.

Now, I ask you, which party has been the party of financial responsibility?

As usual, it has been—it will continue to be—the Democratic Party.

Now let me say this: The rate of progress which we make in meeting all the Nation's problems never satisfies everybody. A lot of people say that we are going too slow; a lot of other people think we are going much too fast.

But I think the American people have proved, by their vote at the polls in three successive elections, that they like the rate of forward progress which the Democratic Congress has been making.

After only 2 years of a Republican-controlled Congress—the 83d—the American voters in 1954 elected the Democratic 84th Congress.

When it had written its record of responsible, forward-looking legislation the people voted for a Democratic 85th Congress in spite of the fact that they at the same time selected a Republican military hero as President.

Two more years we worked hard, responsibly, effectively, and submitted our record of legislation to the people. Last November they overwhelmingly elected the Democratic 86th Congress.

I think these election results prove that the American people like to have the responsible party—the Democratic Party—to make their laws, and they like the rate of

speed at which we have been moving forward to meet the needs of a growing, sound and strong America.

At the polls the American voters have voiced their enthusiastic approval of the Democratic congressional program planned and put through by the splendid House leaders—JOHN MCCORMACK, of Massachusetts, CARL ALBERT, of Oklahoma, and the great committee chairmen, and by the brilliant leadership of LYNDON JOHNSON of Texas, MIKE MONRONEY, of Montana, and the great committee chairmen.

You know, this new Republican line about reckless spending reminds me of their old propaganda line which has fallen flat. They went up and down the land in 1952 crying alarm about all the socialistic laws enacted under the New Deal and the Fair Deal. Well, they have been in the White House for 7 years now and, my friends, they have not even tried to repeal a single one of those laws that they made such a commotion about. If the Democrats were socialistic for putting them on the statute books—then the Republicans are just as socialistic for leaving them there.

I want to say something else.

Ours is the only national party, strong and active in every State, embracing people of every type of economic and political interest. All shades of opinion and belief are represented and considered in our party councils.

Being responsible men and women dedicated to our Nation's welfare, we cannot be expected to agree on everything, but we do agree on the basic fundamentals that have been the tenets of the Democratic Party from its earliest days.

So I have no patience with people who claim to be Democrats who say they want to run other people who claim to be Democrats out of the party. Let us differ; let us debate; let us struggle to have our views prevail in the party's councils.

But after that is done, and the will of the majority of Democrats is freely expressed, we will do—we must do—as we have always done. We will be good soldiers, and we will live up to the meaning of the word "democracy" by accepting the will of the majority.

I want to give you an example of how we can work together. In 1952 and again in 1956 after full discussion and arguments, the Democratic Party under wise management was able to write a platform on which all good Democrats could stand. If all of us are wise enough and generous enough, we can write such a platform in 1960, and I want to make the prediction that when we do this and when the 86th Democratic Congress writes its record of sane, financially sound legislation, the American people in 1960 will overwhelmingly elect a Democratic President and a Democratic Congress.

The responsibility of leadership of a great Republic is a fearful thing anytime. Particularly is it an awesome task today, when, in my opinion, there are more forces of evil and destruction stalking the earth than at any time in 20 centuries.

But I am an optimist; if I were not, I could not have carried my burdens all these years.

I want to close on this note of faith:

We accept the responsibility for guiding this great land and its friends into the wonderful world of tomorrow.

Inspired by the memory of Jefferson, Jackson, Woodrow Wilson, Franklin D. Roosevelt, and Harry S. Truman, we Democrats gladly face the challenge of leading a prosperous, strong, solvent America—and with it free men everywhere—into what Woodrow Wilson foresaw long ago—"pastures of quietness and peace such as the world never dreamed of before."

United as good soldiers, we cannot fail.

Patents-in-Fee-Simple to Certain Lands on Indian Reservations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. Y. BERRY
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 9, 1959

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced legislation directing the Indian Department through the Secretary of Interior to issue patents in fee simple to certain lands on various Indian reservations in my district, most of which have been approved and should have been issued years ago, but because of redtape, continuous delays, and lack of decision, have never been issued.

In each instance there was an exchange of lands with Indian owners. In each instance the exchange was approved by the Indian, it was approved by the tribal land committee, it was approved by the Indian Department, and in most instances those involved in the deals expected that title would be transferred in a very short time. However, years have gone by, in many instances as many as 10 years, and nothing has been done and probably never will be done, unless and until the Congress takes action to direct action.

It is my purpose to herein explain briefly the transaction involved in each of the land exchanges described in the bill I am today introducing.

1. ROSEBUD INDIAN RESERVATION—EARL ADRIAN

In the first case I am asking a patent to be issued to Earl Adrian on the SE¼ 27 and NW¼ 34–40–31, which was in exchange for the NW¼ 32–40–28. Application for this exchange was submitted in September 1949. The tribal committee approved the exchange November 9, 1949. Mr. Adrian conveyed his land with improvements, including a dwelling, shed, chickenhouse, and so forth, by deed in trust for the tribe at the time of making the application, September 22, 1949. The two tracts were appraised, each being appraised at $1,128, and as such determined to be of equal value. The Billings area office requested a patent to be issued to Earl Adrian by the Bureau of Land Management in Washington on August 8, 1950. No apparent reason has ever been given why such patent was not then issued, however, it dragged along year after year. Mr. Adrian feeling that his Government would protect him, did not press for patent until on March 5, 1958, the Rosebud Sioux Tribal Council adopted a resolution which would prohibit all pending land exchange applications.

Mr. Speaker, these cases would not be so serious were it not for the fact that there is more involved than just the deal between the Indian and his guardian, the Indian Department, and the non-Indian who has entered into this exchange. In this case, as in nearly every other case, the Indian Department required the applicant to transfer his land by warranty deed to the tribe, or to the Federal Government in trust for the individual, at the time of making the application for transfer. The deed was recorded which took the land off the tax list. The local governmental units have not had the benefit of taxes either from the originally patented land nor from the tribal or allotted land. Local governments have lost 10 years of taxes on this and practically all of the other land exchanges set forth in this bill. Another thing, in most instances the non-Indian rancher has been required to pay lease on the Indian land he has been using all down through the years, regardless of the fact that he has turned his land over to the Indian Department without consideration and without credit for the use of such land.

My bill simply asks that the Congress direct patents to be issued on this and other exchanges in order to straighten out some of these messes.

2. ROSEBUD INDIAN RESERVATION—JOHN FERNEN

In this case application was made in 1948, wherein Mr. Fernen agreed to exchange lands with the tribe on the basis of two acres for one acre he was receiving of tribal land. The Rosebud Land Committee approved the exchange November 17, 1948. Mr. Fernen was advised by the superintendent that everything was in order and that the land he was receiving was his and that title soon would be in his name. He has been using this land for the past 10 years and has spent thousands of dollars putting improvements on it, including a large quonset granary, a machine shed, a new well with pressure pump and tank, fences, and so forth. He has planted 30 acres to trees. In the meantime, the tribe has been leasing the land, which Mr. Fernen deeded to them in exchange, to another individual. It seems that part of the delay in this case has been occasioned by the fact that it was discovered that the tribe did not hold full title to one of the parcels involved, that the tribe finally acquired title and apparently everything was in order except that no one got around to issue the patent to Mr. Fernen, and then the Rosebud Tribal Council adopted a resolution disapproving all pending land exchanges.

If this resolution of the Rosebud Tribal Council, adopted March 5, 1958, is to serve as a complete bar to justice, Mr. Fernen stands to lose thousands and thousands of dollars, because he trusted, because he had faith that the word of the Department of Interior was good and that he would be protected if he went in and improved this land for which he was exchanging.

3. ROSEBUD INDIAN RESERVATION—ROY J. KELLEY

In this instance, Mr. Kelley returned from the military service, and being anxious to get started in the farming and ranching business, entered into an agreement with Simon Thunder, an allotted Indian, wherein Mr. Kelley was to buy a house for Mr. Thunder in exchange for his quarter of land. All negotiations were handled in the agency office. The house was appraised before Mr. Kelley bought it. The house was

purchased by Kelley and moved where the Superintendent agreed it should be moved for Mr. Thunder's use. Mr. Kelley advanced $2,086 to Mr. Thunder for him to purchase his father's interest in Tribal Land Enterprise shares so that full title could be transferred to Mr. Kelley. Mr. Kelley made other advances from time to time and has a sizable investment in this property.

The application for exchange was submitted in 1951. The Rosebud Land Committee approved the exchange February 16, 1951, determining both the house and land of approximately equal value. Kelley conveyed title to the house to the United States in trust February 15, 1951. Since that time Simon Thunder has had the house, has used it without rent, has permitted it to depreciate in value. Today Mr. Kelley has nothing except a lot of promises by the Indian Department and a sad experience.

4. ROSEBUD INDIAN RESERVATION—MRS. FRANCES MULLEN

Application was submitted in February 1949 for the exchange of 8 quarters of land for 10 quarters of land belonging to the Tribe. This land was appraised at almost equal value, and in order to make up the difference, Mrs. Mullen paid the tribe $383.14. The exchange was approved by the Rosebud Land Committee March 30, 1949 and August 17, 1949. The exchange was never completed and again was blocked by the resolution of the tribal council, April 24, 1957. Again in this instance, title to the Mullen land was transferred to the tribe years ago. The tribe has title to all the land, the difference in the consideration, et cetera, and nothing is being done.

5. ROSEBUD INDIAN RESERVATION—THOMAS F. ARNOLD

In this case an exchange was worked out through the Indian office in Rosebud with the Indian landowner, Frederick White Face Woman, and $300 was paid by Mr. Arnold to balance the difference in the appraised values of the properties. This was in 1949. Mr. Arnold went into court and quieted the title in the land, and recorded the title in the United States in trust for the Rosebud Sioux Tribe on April 26, 1952. The exchange was never completed. The tribal council by resolution protested the exchange being completed under date of February 24, 1957. The tribe has Mr. Arnold's land, has the White Face land, has the cash, and no one is doing anything to correct the situation.

6. PINE RIDGE RESERVATION—DANIEL HOLCOMB

Application was submitted for land exchange in 1954. The executive committee of the tribal council approved the application August 26, 1954. The properties were appraised and it was determined that there was $500 difference in the value, which amount Mr. Holcomb deposited at the agency office in 1954. On October 29, 1957, the Aberdeen area office disapproved the exchange for the reason that it was then decided that there was more than $500 difference in value. The area office decided that the difference in value was $680 instead of $500. No action has been taken, however, although more than ample time has elapsed in which the deal could have been consummated.

The So-Called Equal Time Section of the Federal Communications Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GLENN CUNNINGHAM
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 9, 1959

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, section 315(a) of the Federal Communications Act has been termed "impossible" and "broadcasting's biggest headache." This is the so-called equal time section, which reads:

If any licensee shall permit any person who is a legally qualified candidate for any public office to use a broadcasting station, he shall afford equal opportunities to all other such candidates for that office in the use of such broadcasting station: *Provided*, That such licensee shall have no power of censorship over the material broadcast under the provisions of this section. No obligation is imposed upon any licensee to allow the use of its station by any such candidate.

I am introducing a bill today which will add the following sentence and exempt regular newscasts and news commentaries from this provision:

Appearance by legally qualified candidates on any news program, including news reports and news commentaries, where the format and production of the program are determined by the broadcasting station, or by the network in the case of a network program, and the candidate in no way initiated the recording or the broadcast, shall not be deemed to be use of a broadcasting station within the meaning of this subsection.

In my mind there are good and bad things about section 315(a) as it now stands. It is good to have the equal time requirement for programs or announcements purchased by a candidate. The provision is also fair as it pertains to major candidates who appear on forum or debate programs.

The section is poor because it does not differentiate between a major party and a very minor party whose candidate or candidates have no possible chance of victory. It is poor because a station cannot delete libelous material but can be held liable. It is poor because it has been interpreted to apply to pure news reports.

My bill does not attack the problem of minor party candidates, because Congress refused several years ago to try to define this question, and it is a knotty one. My bill does not change any of the provisions pertaining to purchased programs or spot announcements nor to panel, interview or town meeting type programs. Nor does it change the "no censorship" provision.

My bill would merely ease the requirement as it pertains to legitimate news reports and news commentary. These two types of programs are the types that the Federal Communications Commission considers news programs, as defined in the report to be made by licensees to the FCC.

Many of my colleagues are aware of the recent interpretation given section 315(a) by the FCC. The Commission ruled that a Chicago television station must provide time to a mayoralty candidate in Chicago equal to the time provided the incumbent mayor—a candidate for reelection—when the mayor was shown on regular television news programs opening a charity drive and welcoming the visiting President of Argentina at the airport.

Strangely enough, this is a reversal of the FCC policy in a similar situation, in which the Commission refused to order equal time and held that—

The facts clearly showed that the candidate had in no way, directly or indirectly, initiated either filming or presentation of the event, and that the broadcast was nothing more than a routine newscast by the station in the exercise of its judgment as to newsworthy events.

It has been suggested that the Commission's recent ruling is an effort on the part of the Commissioners to force Congress to clarify this section. I have no proof of such a motive, but I do believe Congress should act to clarify the situation.

The Public Hazard of Nuclear Blasting in Oil Shale

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 9, 1959

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, the whole realm of nuclear energy is one of great interest and vital importance to our country, as well as to the world.

Several weeks ago in an extended talk on this subject I said "As goes the atom so goes the world."

In my pursuit of this arresting subject, I have become increasingly concerned with the proposed nuclear blasting of oil shales in the Rocky Mountains.

I feel it is a fortunate development for the United States that among the scientific fraternity there is one man who took a second look at this proposed nuclear blasting of oil shale and entered a strong dissent. I refer to Morgan G. Huntington, Salt Lake City engineer, former engineer of the U.S. Bureau of Mines, and a specialist in the construction of nuclear reactors.

Thanks to Mr. Huntington, the American public is becoming acquainted with the hazards to public safety of the proposed nuclear blasting of oil shales. It has been my privilege to have championed Mr. Huntington's lone dissent and although the odds were very heavy against us, it appears we have been successful in making the Atomic Energy Commission stop, look, and listen. I now make so bold as to venture the prediction that the nuclear blasting of oil shales

will never be made. This phase of "Operation Plowshare," I am certain will be scratched. Already we have had the admission from Chairman McCone of the AEC that the blast will produce no oil for the commercial market, although original publicity for the project was cast in terms of 25 million barrels of oil from a single nuclear blast.

Today, I am privileged to bring before you a specially prepared hazards report on the proposed nuclear oil shale blast. I urge each and every one of you to read it and carefully consider its import. Mr. Huntington shows his complete mastery of the subject, and his analysis of the problem at hand constitutes a distinguished public service which places his countrymen in his debt.

If the AEC should by any chance set off the nuclear explosion of a 10-kiloton device in the oil shales, Mr. Huntington describes the following results:

Within 6 hours following the nuclear blast in oil shale (described in the January 1959, AEC-distributed brochure entitled "Application of Nuclear Explosions to Oil Shale Utilization") borne by the prevailing westerly winds, a huge dust cloud will settle out on Denver and its environs and how long the city will remain a scene of desolation during decontamination is speculative. To subject a population to such a risk is certainly foolish if not downright criminal.

Huntington also shows scientifically that a huge crater will be formed by the blast, millions of tons of rock, much of it radioactive, will be flung far and wide, and that after all of this, no oil will be forthcoming.

Mr. Speaker, I am equally concerned with another aspect of this whole project. It has been given intensive and fanciful publicity. The whole thing smacks of a well-conceived promotional campaign. All of this could have been done unwittingly out of an overabundance of enthusiasm, but nevertheless, we can readily see how such dramatic presentation could well cause lively speculation in oil leases and oil stocks. These are matters that are the concern of government, for the public interest, I submit, is paramount. We are all for progress, sound substantial progress, but we don't want the American investing public taken for a sleigh ride. I would suggest that certain agencies of Government, the Department of Justice and the Securities and Exchange Commission give this matter their attention.

I now submit for the RECORD at this point, Mr. Huntington's carefully prepared and persuasive findings on the hazards report of proposed nuclear oil shale blast along with Mr. John A. McCone's letter to me of February 11 and my reply of February 14.

UNITED STATES
U.S. ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION,
Washington, D.C., February 11, 1959.

DEAR MR. FLOOD: I am pleased to reply to your letter of January 17, 1959, asking for information concerning the Commission's plowshare program and raising certain questions concerning the proposed oil-shale experiment.

The Commission's plowshare program is an attempt to encourage the development and utilization of nuclear explosives for peaceful purposes. The Commission and its staff have considered a number of experiments to utilize the phenomena associated with nuclear explosions to open the way for greater public benefits from our natural resources. Our present knowledge indicates that nuclear explosives might be used in large civil engineering projects, power production, isotope production, and in basic research studies, as well as natural resource development.

As a specific part of the plowshare program the Commission, in cooperation with the U.S. Bureau of Mines, for some time has been studying the feasibility of using nuclear explosives in recovering oil from oil shale. It is our expectation that the shock and rock crushing effects of an underground nuclear explosion would provide a means for breaking up the shale so that oil can be extracted with an in-place recovery process. The proposed oil-shale experiment is a research project to determine the possibility of developing thereby a process for economic extraction of oil.

This plowshare project has progressed to the point where a meeting was conducted on January 6–7 by the Bureau of Mines with representatives of industry to review proposals for an experiment. The Commission and its contractor, University of California Livermore Radiation Laboratory, presented data on Commission experience with underground nuclear detonations and results theoretically to be expected from a 10 kiloton, or smaller, detonation in the Green River shale. Copies of technical papers presented are attached for your information.

At the Dallas meeting the Government offered to consider the experimental detonation of a device, providing conditions of health and safety could be guaranteed, and providing industry would arrange for emplacement and the making available to the public of important technical information resulting from the experiment. As yet the Commission has not given firm authorization for such an experiment, nor has a site been selected. The next step will depend largely on how industry reacts to the proposal and this phase of the matter is being investigated by the Bureau of Mines.

So far as the public health and safety of such a project is concerned, the Commission will not approve any action that would endanger human or animal life, vegetation, water systems, or property. If there should be enough industrial interest to warrant concluding feasibility studies which are now in their initial phases, complete data on public health and safety would be compiled with the assistance of independent experts before the Commission would authorize a project.

In your letter you raise the following specific possibilities which were suggested to you by Mr. Morgan G. Huntington. I would like to comment on each in some detail.

1. A conical crater will be blasted about as wide as the explosion is deep.

Comment: The AEC is advised by its best technical experts that no such crater would be formed. On the basis of six nuclear underground shots that have been fired in Nevada and on the basis of experience in underground high explosive detonations, it is believed that the cratering effect of nuclear shots can be predicted with reasonable accuracy by our staff. The direct evidence from nuclear shots relate to tuff only and not to oil shale but the HE high explosive experiments relate to many kinds of materials including Green River oil shale. Mr. Huntington argues that the rock heaving gases formed in an explosion in oil shale will have more serious effects than hitherto encountered. Actually, the detonation of high explosive produces by its own combustion more rock heaving gas than can be obtained from an equivalent nuclear explosion in oil shale. Therefore, existing experimental results are sufficiently conclusive to assure us of the necessary safety of a particular nuclear detonation in oil shale with respect to cratering.

2. Millions of tons of rock will be thrown over the countryside, much of it radioactive.

Comment: As has been mentioned already, it is the intent of the Commission to insure that, before authority to proceed is granted, safety is guaranteed. Under such conditions this eventuality would not occur.

3. The huge dust cloud so formed will consist largely of carbon black from the destruction of shale oil.

Comment: Here the answer is similar to that of 2 above.

4. No oil whatever will enter commerce as the result of such a blast.

Comment: This is probably true in fact. This particular nuclear explosion and consequent technical investigation is planned as an experiment. Our hope is that it will show whether or not such extraction is technically and economically feasible.

5. The direct cost of this proposed nuclear blast will be in the order of $10 or $15 million, aside from the liability incurred from damages.

Comment: According to preliminary estimates the experiment over all would cost about $3 million. This sum will be spent partly on the nuclear detonation and partly on investigation by the Bureau of Mines of an oil extraction process. During the meeting on January 6–7, it was proposed that the petroleum industry share in the costs of this experiment.

Attached to your letter to me was a letter from Mr. Huntington setting forth certain more technical questions bearing on the above matters. I am attaching, as enclosure 1, detailed answers to his questions.

Your letter mentions that Mr. Huntington has not received an answer to his January 9, 1959 letter to Dr. Potts. This letter is being answered simultaneously by Dr. Potts.

I trust we have adequately replied to the questions you and Mr. Huntington have presented. If you should want further information I shall be pleased to send it to you or should you desire to discuss this matter with the technical experts, we will be pleased to arrange for them to meet with you during their next visit to Washington, or if you wish Commissioner Libby will be glad to discuss this matter with you. In addition, should Mr. Huntington desire to visit the University of California E. O. Lawrence Radiation Laboratory, Livermore, to explain his ideas we will arrange for the proper people to discuss the matter with him.

I assure you that the Commission will undertake plowshare projects only after determining that they can be carried out without endangering public health and safety and that the project is justifiable from the standpoint of opening the way to greater public benefits.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN A. MCCONE, *Chairman.*

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., February 14, 1959.

Mr. JOHN A. MCCONE,
Chairman, Atomic Energy Commission,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. MCCONE: Your letter of February 11 replying to mine of January 17 has been read with interest.

I have seen your January 31 announcement to the public press that you would detonate the first of a series of nuclear devices in Rocky Mountain oil shale sometime during the fiscal year beginning July 1. Now, less than 2 weeks later, you tell me that you won't explode any such weapons in oil shale unless industry asks you to do so.

I am greatly surprised and alarmed by your letter to me in which you state that

you have not yet investigated the public hazard of nuclear blasting in oil shale.

It appears that your many press releases have lead a great number of people to believe that large scale nuclear blasting is the solution to the winning of oil from oil shale. Yet, you tell me in your February 11 letter that probably no oil would enter commerce as the result of your proposed 10-kiloton oil shale blast.

The data presented by Mr. Morgan Huntington, president of the RNB Corp. of Salt Lake City, Utah, clearly shows that no sizeable nuclear blast in oil shale can be contained beneath the surface because the great amount and pressure of the gases generated will inevitably blast a crater. Isn't this exactly what caused your small (100-ton) Neptune blast to heave out thousands of tons of rock October 14, 1958?

Because of the probably great public hazard involved and the apparent carelessness of your staff, I feel it my duty to ask several specific questions:

1. Why do you permit to be published under your name articles carrying the specific size, placement and geographical location of a nuclear blast in oil shale without first preparing the usual hazard report, i.e., your best estimate of the maximum credible accident?

2. Do you yourself consider the nuclear blasting of oil shales a safe and reasonable experiment when you consider that each ton of TNT equivalent could instantly liberate some 50,000 cubic feet of hydrogen at 25 tons per square inch pressure? Didn't your October 8 1958 Tamalpais 50-ton blast produce about half this amount of highly explosive hydrogen with only a small amount of paraffin present? In the words of your own A.E.C. report, "the explosives gases were in such concentrations and amounts as to create a hazardous situation."

3. Since you tell me in your letter that the Atomic Energy Commission will not undertake the nuclear blasting of oil shale unless the oil industry requests it, I am compelled to ask: Can you name any major oil company executive who considers the nuclear blasting of oil shales an entirely safe and reasonable experiment?

4. Please identify the individual proponents of oil shale nuclear blasting in Government as well as in industry.

Because you have not yet compiled your usual "nuclear hazards report" on the blasting of oil shale, I have requested that Mr. Huntington prepare for publication a "maximum credible accident" report on the nuclear blasting of oil shales.

I shall appreciate an early answer to the questions posed in this letter as well as to my letter of February 11.

Sincerely yours,

DANIEL J. FLOOD,
Member of Congress.

RNB CORP.,
Salt Lake City, Utah, March 3, 1959.

Re The public hazard of nuclear blasting in oil shale as proposed by the AEC.

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD,
Committee on Appropriations,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. FLOOD: At your request, I have prepared the following estimate of the maximum credible explosion which could be expected from the detonation of a 10,000 ton TNT equivalent nuclear weapon 900 feet deep in oil shale.

The conditions, placement and size of the device are specified in the January 1959 unsigned, unidentified brochure currently circulated by the Atomic Energy Commission entitled "Application of Nuclear Explosions to Oil Shale Utilization." Although this AEC-circulated brochure is widely accepted as an official Bureau of Mines publication because "Bureau of Mines Laramie Petroleum Research Center" appears on the cover, its authorship remains uncertain.

To summarize my estimate of the hazard of nuclear blasting in oil shale or other rich hydrocarbon impregnations, I find that not even 1/10 of the AEC's proposed 10-kiloton device could safely be detonated in such hydrogen rich rocks 900 feet beneath the surface. Whether this 10,000-ton TNT thermal equivalent explosive is in the form of conventional dynamite or whether the heat is released from a nuclear device, a crater would surely result. However, it is true that a conventional explosive would probably be very much less hazardous than the nuclear device for three reasons:

The conventional explosive cannot produce the tremendously devastating subsequent aerial explosion; and secondly, the power of conventional explosives can be precisely predicted while the energy of nuclear devices cannot be estimated nearly so accurately; also, the conventional explosives are completely free of the virulently poisonous radioactive isotopes generated by all nuclear blasts.

The 300,000 ton weapon described as containable in oil shales by Dr. Herbst of the AEC at the January 1959 Dallas oil shale meeting could completely pulverize the material blown from its crater. The power of such a weapon exploding in oil shale is so fantastic that I am reluctant to believe such a proposal could have been seriously made, particularly to such a gathering.

Given certain conditions of geological structure, somewhat less than a 1-kiloton nuclear explosive could very likely break the surface and heave a considerable tonnage of rock and dust into the air. From any nuclear blast in oil shale which should erupt through the surface, a highly spectacular aerial explosion of the hydrogen generated by the thermal destruction of hydrocarbons could be expected. The energy generated by this subsequent aerial explosion of hydrogen could yield more than double the heat of the initial nuclear blast.

Quite definitely, no sizable (10 kiloton or greater) nuclear device could safely be detonated anywhere in the Rocky Mountain oil shales because at no point could the depth of burial afford sufficient weight of overburden to contain the great volume of high pressure gases inevitably produced. Even a single kiloton weapon in oil shale would probably disrupt the surface at a depth of 900 feet. Certainly, the hydrogen generated from even this modest device could produce a devasating aerial explosion.

On page 2 of Chairman McCone's February 11 letter to you, he contests my prediction that, should a 10,000-ton-TNT-equivalent nuclear device be detonated 900 feet beneath the surface in Rocky Mountain oil shale, "a conical crater will be blasted about as wide as the explosion is deep." Mr. McCone comments as follows: "The AEC is advised by its best technical experts that no such crater would be formed. On the basis of six nuclear underground shots that have been fired in Nevada and on the basis of underground high explosive detonations, it is believed that the cratering effect of nuclear shots can be predicted with reasonable accuracy by our staff. The direct evidence from nuclear shots relate to tuff only and not to oil shale, but the high explosive experiments relate to many kinds of materials including Green River oil shale."

Apparently, Mr. McCone's best technical experts hold that 10,000 tons (two miles of fully loaded freight cars) of conventional explosive 900 feet deep in oil shale would not blast a crater.

It is respectfully suggested that AEC Chairman McCone consult with the experienced staffs of such explosive manufacturers as Du Pont, Monsanto, Atlas, or others who do have extensive background in explosive engineering. It is further suggested that Mr. McCone specifically ask what size crater would probably result from the thermal equivalent of 10,000 tons of TNT in the form of, say, 60 percent ammonium dynamite exploding 900 feet deep in oil shale. (This is an explosive ratio of only 100 to 300 tons of rock per ton of dynamite.)

I must also refute the contention of Mr. McCone that "the detonation of high explosive produces by its own combustion more rock-heaving gas than can be obtained from an equivalent nuclear blast in oil shale."

The facts are that 4 million B.t.u. (AEC's arbitrary thermal equivalent of a ton of TNT) transferred to nearly pure hydrocarbon can instantly generate at least twice the rock-heaving gas produced from TNT. (Parts of the oil shale are 40 percent pure kerogen.)

It is abundantly evident that the Atomic Energy Commission's technical staff have considered carefully neither the public hazard nor the feasibility of this highly publicized project. Atomic Energy Commission Chairman McCone has freely admitted these facts to you in his letter to you February 11.

The scanty amount of time and thought so far devoted by the staff of the AEC to this widely discussed phase of "Operation Plowshare" is apparent throughout the voluminous press releases and other literature on the subject. The purpose of the Atomic Energy Commission in widely advertising this very unlikely oil shale blast is open to speculation.

For instance, opposite page 16 in the January 1959 AEC-circulated brochure is a graphic summary of the assumptions presented in that text. Specifically shown, 900 feet of rock capping exerting a maximum rock pressure of 900 pounds per square inch contains in equilibrium 10 million standard cubic feet of gas at a pressure more than six times as great, or approximately 6,000 pounds per square inch. It should be obvious even to the layman that there is no restraining force sufficient to prevent such high pressure gas from expanding to rock pressure with explosive force.

It is impossible for me to agree with Dr. Libby and with his assistant, Dr. John Potts, that even in this relatively mild, unrealistic case (10 million cubic feet of gas is but one-fifth to one-twentieth of the volume of hydrogen which would probably be produced under the conditions described by the AEC) that the surface of the earth would remain undisturbed and all fission products would be contained.

In Chairman McCone's February letter to you, he states that public hazards of nuclear blasting would be evaluated only after feasibility studies were affirmatively completed. One cannot help but wonder why public safety is considered by the A.E.C. to be of secondary importance in this completely unexplored, highly dangerous concept of exploding nuclear weapons within hydrocarbon impregnations. (The building of even the smallest research reactor is always preceded by a full-dress public hearing on all conceivable credible accidents and a detailed hazards report is published.)

In projecting "Operation Plowshare," of which oil shale blasting is a part, the Atomic Energy Commission leans very heavily upon the results of the six underground nuclear explosion tests conducted in Nevada in September, 1957 and in October, 1958. These are described in a report to the Atomic Energy Commission by the University of California Radiation Laboratory Report, UCRL—No. 5124, Rev. 1, dated December, 1958.

It is clearly apparent to me that the A.E.C.'s staff has grossly misinterpreted the results of these underground tests in a number of respects and that the erroneous conclusions so drawn lead directly to the questionable assumptions that nuclear blasting of

hydrocarbon impregnations is feasible and safe and that the commercial production of petroleum can be achieved thereby.

I shall now explain why the effects of nuclear explosions in the porous, permeable, weakly-consolidated volcanic ash of Nevada are radically different from what can be expected of nuclear blasting in the dense, completely impervious oil shales of the Rocky Mountains:

First let me say, that in my 20 years of experience as a mining engineer, I have found very "fast" [1] high explosives to be relatively ineffective in breaking spongy rock, such as volcanic tuffs. On the other hand, a comparatively small amount of such explosive is fairly effective in shattering, heaving and breaking the dense hard rocks, such as granite, limestone and tightly laminated shales.

Volcanic ash of high porosity does readily absorb, without heaving, considerable kinetic energy imparted by high explosives. Dense, nonporous, noncompactible rocks such as oil shale can absorb relatively little kinetic energy without shattering and erupting.

Volcanic tuff is readily compactible to the extent of 20 or 30 percent while high grade oil shale is not at all compactible beyond about 1 percent.

In the Rainier blast in volcanic tuff (September 1957), a 110-foot spherical chamber was formed as a result of the compaction of the surrounding porous rocks. To provide the volume of the 110-foot cavity, 120,000 tons of the volcanic ash must necessarily be compacted to the extent of 25 percent. However, to produce such a cavity in oil shales, more than three million tons of rock surrounding the blast must be totally compacted. Moreover, the crushing strength of the Rainier volcanic tuff is only about 5,000 pounds per square inch while the compression strength of oil shale in test specimens is generally about 25,000 pounds per square inch. En masse, this compacting strength of oil shale is probably somewhat greater.

It is, therefore, patently impossible to spring [2] any comparable cavity in oil shale 900 feet deep without violently disturbing the surface.

Before examining in detail the relative differences of nuclear blast effects in volcanic tuff and oil shales, let me briefly criticize the AEC's claim of feasibility and appraise the possibility of producing any oil from oil shales through nuclear blasting:

The total heat generated by an AEC rated 10-kiloton device would pyrolize [3] no more than 40,000 tons of oil shale and free (if no violent explosion were to occur and if the 2,000,000° fireball somehow failed to destroy any hydrocarbon) no more than 30,000 barrels of shale oil, and the direct cost therefor would amount to $100 a barrel. (Oil shale is worth about $2 a barrel.)

The heating effect of nuclear devices is evidently unimportant in this particular application, except for the explosive effect of the hydrogen instantly produced at high pressure.

In the Rainier experiment, no rock was shattered nor fragmented save the 50,000 tons which caved of its own weight above the 110-foot cavity.

In the much-quoted Rainier experiment, the surrounding rock which was originally permeable and highly porous to the extent of 30 percent of its original volume, was compacted by the blast to practically zero permeability.

In blasting oil shale, because of its almost complete incompactibility, no sizable chamber can be sprung without heaving the surface and because of its strength, very little oil shale could be expected to cave. How, then, do the proponents of such a project expect to make large tonnages of impermeable oil shale freely pervious, and yet contain all fission products within the ground and not disturb the surface of the earth?

When solid rock in place is fragmented by blasting, it normally occupies at least 125 percent of its original volume. If this completely nonporous, entirely impermeable oil shale is to be shattered by nuclear blasting and to become freely pervious, from where is this extra space to come if the surface is to remain undisturbed? This I cannot explain nor has anyone been able to explain it to me.

Please refer to the appended "Comparison of the More Obvious Physical and Chemical Properties of the Rainier Volcanic Ash With Rocky Mountain Oil Shales and Tabulation of the Relative Effects of Thermally Equivalent Nuclear Blasts in the Two Different Rocks."

From this tabulated comparison of the corresponding characteristics of the spongy volcanic ash with those of the incompactible, impervious oil shale, a number of paramount differences become immediately apparent. Among these are:

1. In the nuclear blasting of volcanic tuff, because it contains 10 to 20 percent of water, steam is the principal gas produced and this can exert a maximum pressure of about 3,000 pounds per square inch at 700° F. (Compare this with the maximum pressure of hydrogen at this temperature. There is, of course, some disassociation of the water molecule to hydrogen and oxygen, and no doubt, some monatomic gases exist in the first instant of detonation. However, beyond the initial shock, the effects of gases other than steam are minor.)

2. So long as the surrounding rock temperature is below the boiling point of water, steam is instantly condensed upon passing into the porous cold rock and no effective amount of expanding gases remains to crack and heave the rock. Thus, the total destructive force of a nuclear blast in such saturated, spongy volcanic tuff is very much less than an equivalent nuclear blast in air.

3. Because hydrogen is the principal gas produced by the blasting of hydrocarbon impregnated rocks such as oil shales, the rock heaving capacity is enormous. Should pure hydrocarbons (containing from 10 to 15 percent of hydrogen) be exposed to the thermal radiation from the nuclear fireball, some 40,000 standard cubic feet of hydrogen would be instantly liberated at an initial pressure in the order of 25 tons per square inch. In this case, evidently (because hydrogen occupies about 14 times the volume of air per unit weight) the explosive force (pressure times volume of the gases) of a nuclear device is very substantially greater than an equivalent nuclear blast in air.

In order to calculate this maximum possible explosive effect, the following criteria are employed:

1. Per ton of TNT equivalent the heat radiated to the surroundings is 4 million B.t.u.

2. What the AEC rates as a 10 kiloton device may yield as little as 3,000 tons of TNT equivalent, or under completely favorable conditions of detonation, as much as 30,000 tons of TNT equivalent.

3. All the heat radiated is immediately absorbed by kerogen, the hydrocarbon in oil shale.

4. Some 40,000 standard cubic feet of gas is instantly generated at a pressure in the order of 25 tons per square inch.

5. More than 1 billion cubic feet of hydrogen at 25 tons per square inch would be instantly generated in a lateral area 100 feet square.

6. Vertical joint cracks occur in the oil shale with reasonable frequency, say on a hundred foot grid. Thus, the shearing strength of the rock is no factor.

From these several criteria, the following results appear credible:

1. A plug of about 600,000 tons could be ejected straight up at high velocity.

2. At least 3 million additional tons would be heaved and broken and a large portion of this would be scattered laterally over the surrounding area.

3. Instantly following the ejection of the central plug an aerial explosion of more than a billion cubic feet of hydrogen would generate more heat energy than the initial nuclear blast.

In conclusion, I must state that no sizable nuclear blast in Rocky Mountain oil shale can be considered completely and absolutely free from any likelihood of jeopardizing the public safety.

Yours very truly,

MORGAN G. HUNTINGTON,
President, RNB Corp.

[1] Very fast explosives are considered to be those with a propagation rate above 20,000 feet a second.

[2] Fast explosives are commonly used in small amounts to spring or chamber the bottoms of small diameter blast holes in order to accommodate sufficient amounts of slower explosives with more suitable rock breaking and heaving characteristics.

[3] The pyrolysis of oil shale begins about 400° F. To effect complete destructive distillation, the oil shale must be heated to above 800° F.

ENGINEERING ANALYSIS OF THE EFFECTS OF NUCLEAR BLASTING IN TUFF AND IN OIL SHALE

Comparison of the more obvious physical and chemical properties of Rainier volcanic ash with Rocky Mountain oil shale, and tabulations of the relative effects of thermally equivalent nuclear blasts in the 2 materials

	Rainier volcanic ash	Mahogany bed, Rocky Mountain oil shale
Crushing strength	About 5,000 pounds per square inch	Greater than 25,000 pounds per square inch absolute (en masse).
Attainable compaction	At least 25 percent	Nil.
Porosity	30 percent	Do.
Moisture	20 percent	0.5 percent.
Gas per ton evolved at 2,000° F.	8,000 standard cubic feet of steam plus small amount of H_2–O_2.	Pure kerogen yields some 40,000 standard cubic feet of hydrogen when destroyed by heat of 1 ton TNT equivalent.
Rock-heaving gas pressure at rock temperature.	Nil (atmospheric), at 200° F. Volume, nil; some H_2–O_2 probably remains unrecombined.	Above 15,000 pounds per square inch at 200° F. Standard volume unchanged.
Effect of nuclear blast	Highly compactible; absorbs large amounts of kinetic energy. Spherical chamber results from the compaction of the surrounding porous rock.	Not appreciably compactible; absorbs relatively little kinetic energy. Horizontal splitting along bedding planes followed by vertical cracking normal to bedding planes.

Communism, Hawaii, Statehood

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN R. PILLION

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 9, 1959

Mr. PILLION. Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert a statement which I made before the House Rules Committee on March 5, 1959, on the subject of Hawaii statehood:

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, in my humble opinion, the issue of statehood for the Territory of Hawaii ought to be deliberated from three broad aspects. This statement will deal with the subject in the following order:

First. The grant of statehood to Hawaii will expropriate sovereign personal political power from one segment of our population and bestow that power upon another segment of our citizens.

Second. The next phase of this discussion will attempt to refute the arguments advanced in favor of statehood. I will try to demonstrate that the reasoning for statehood is based either upon political error, or is of minor importance, or is irrelevant, or is of an emotional origin.

Third. The concluding portion of this statement will deal with communism in Hawaii and its dangerous political consequences.

THE POLITICAL POWER ASPECTS OF STATEHOOD

There is a mistaken popular notion that the people of the Territory of Hawaii are being deprived of their right of self-government. There are some differences between the powers of the governments of the 49 States and the powers of the Territorial Government of Hawaii. But, these differences are insignificant.

Essentially, under the Organic Act, the Territory of Hawaii possesses full power to enact laws relating to its property, affairs, and government. Its powers in relation to the conduct of its affairs are substantially as extensive as the powers of the State governments of the 49 States.

Although Congress has reserved the right to disapprove Territorial legislation, no law passed by the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii has ever been invalidated by Congress.

Although the Governor of Hawaii is appointed by the President, there has never been any substantial complaint that the administration of the Governor's office has been contrary to the best interests of the people of that Territory.

To my knowledge, there has been no complaint by the Territory of Hawaii of a lack of power in the Territorial Legislature to adequately deal with its problems on the basis of home rule.

The concern of the proponents of statehood lies not in their need or desire for power to conduct the affairs of the Territory, but rather, in their desire for power to conduct the affairs of the 49 States. They seek the power associated with the election of two U.S. Senators, two U.S. Representatives, and four electoral votes in the choice of a U.S. President.

THE TRANSFER OF POLITICAL POWER FROM THE PEOPLE OF THE 49 STATES TO THE PEOPLE OF HAWAII

As you gentlemen know, all governments, good or bad, are mere organizations of political power.

It is a fundamental principle that our constitutional representative form of government shall give every citizen an equal voice in the conduct of our Government. The right of a citizen to participate in our Government, almost exclusively, rests with his right to vote. The importance of the right to vote lies in the effectiveness of this right to vote.

Although the Russian voters are granted the equal right to vote, it is not effective political equality in our estimation.

Senate representation

Statehood would entitle the people of Hawaii to two U.S. Senators. It is our responsibility to decide whether this amounts to an equitable apportionment of legislative power.

The population of Hawaii, according to the census estimate as of July 1, 1957, was 613,000. Of this population, 59,000 were military personnel. An additional 25,000 people are civilian Federal employees. If we consider these 84,000 Federal civilian and military personnel to each have only 1 dependent, then the basic population figure should be reduced by 168,000. This would reduce the Hawaiian citizen population to 445,000.

With the grant of statehood, the people of Hawaii will be represented by 1 U.S. Senator for each of its 223,000 citizens.

The 2 Hawaii Senators representing 445,000 citizens would nullify the will and the representation in the U.S. Senate of: New York's 16 million people; California's 14 million people; Georgia's 4 million people; and of the voters in each of the other 49 States.

The framers of our Constitution founded a Republic, combining the features of both a federal and a national type of government.

The plan to give each State two Senators conforms to a pattern suitable to a Federal Government, with limited powers, where the bulk of the sovereign power is reserved to the States.

The plan to apportion representatives on the basis of population conforms to the framework of a National Government where all power is concentrated in a Central Government.

The grant of equal representation, that of two U.S. Senators, to each State was adopted for the protection of the sovereign powers of the States from encroachment upon their powers by the Central Government. In furtherance of this purpose, it was provided that the U.S. Senate be chosen by State legislatures.

The framers of our Constitution repeatedly stated that the U.S. Senate would represent the States in their corporate governmental capacities. The election of Senators by the legislatures was an integral part of that historic compromise under which each State became entitled to two U.S. Senators.

The 17th amendment to our Constitution was adopted on April 8, 1913. This amendment fundamentally altered the basis for the allotment of two Senators to each State. This change in the mode of the selection of our Senators to that of popular suffrage totally destroyed the justification, the rationale, for equal representation for each State in the U.S. Senate.

There have been drastic changes in our Republic. The framers of our Constitution envisioned a Central Government of limited powers, with the bulk of the residual sovereign power being reserved to the States.

There is no mathematical formula for the measurement of the division of power between the States and our Central Government. However, we can measure the exercise of power by the expenditures of our governments.

In the year 1957, our total gross national product amounted to $440 billion. Of this sum, $79 billion, or 18.1 percent, was expended by the Central Government. The State and local governments expended $34 billion, or 7.7 percent.

It is evident that there has been a continuing erosion of power out of the States and a continuing concentration of power in our Central Government. We have become a National Government wherein the States are being relegated to mere provinces. We have evolved from a Federal Republic into a national democracy.

Twenty-five States, with a population of 31 million people, constituting only 18 percent of the Nation's population, control 50 votes and have a majority power in the U.S. Senate.

This imbalance of power is a prime factor in our huge Federal bureaucracy, its wastages, and the consequent huge Federal taxes. Our bankrupt agricultural program with Federal subsidies for surplus products and Federal subsidies paid to reduce crops is an example of the inconsistency between the possession of power and the accountability for that power.

The U.S. Senate is accountable to the pressure of their constituents rather than to the preservation of State powers. Their prime interest must lie in expanding national power.

The alarming growth of Federal aid is another example of the inequitable distribution of Senate power. These programs are a practical means of socializing the wealth of the State based upon the political combinations of State powers in the U.S. Senate.

Statehood for Hawaii will reduce the effectiveness of the right of suffrage of every citizen in the 49 States. It takes away the right of representation and transfers an excessive amount of representation to the people of Hawaii.

The average representation in the U.S. Senate is one Senator for approximately 1,700,000 citizens. Hawaii will have one Senator for each 223,000 citizens.

POWER IN THE EXECUTIVE BRANCH

In the event of statehood, Hawaii will become entitled to 3 electoral votes toward the election of a President of the United States in the 1960 elections. This can be reduced to 1 electoral vote for each 145,000 of its population. The voters in the 49 States will only have 1 electoral vote for about each 320,000 citizens.

Again, the voting rights of the people of the 49 States are reduced in order to transfer excessive voting power to the people of Hawaii.

REPRESENTATION IN U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Under the present bill, Hawaii becomes entitled to one member in the House of Representatives. Actually, under the Census estimates, Hawaii would be entitled to two Representatives.

The proponents are waiving their entitlement of two Representatives on the theory of "don't raise any controversy now, we'll get two Representatives anyway, right after the 1960 Census reapportionment."

Since the membership of the House of Representatives is fixed at 435, the two U.S. Representatives from Hawaii and the one Representative from Alaska will displace three U.S. Representatives from the 48 States after the 1960 reapportionment. The voting effectiveness of the voters of the 48 States will be, thus, further reduced.

STATEHOOD FOR OTHER POSSESSIONS

Statehood for Hawaii will intensify the demands for representation in Congress for the citizens and inhabitants of all other possessions of the United States.

If Alaska is admitted with a resident population of about 100,000 people, why isn't Guam entitled to statehood with its population of 59,000 citizens?

If the psychological impact upon the Oriental countries is a valid reason for admitting Hawaii, then Guam should be admitted because it is farther west and closer to the oriental cultures.

I received this invitation which is postmarked February 27, 1959, from the National Association for the Statehood of Puerto Rico. If Puerto Rico seeks admission, shall we admit her to statehood in the interest of reducing the possible enmities of South American countries.

Senator CASE recently introduced a bill to grant three delegates in the House of Representatives to the District of Columbia. Are its 900,000 citizens less entitled to two U.S. Senators than 445,000 citizens of Hawaii?

The Virgin Islands has a population of 30,000. Shall we admit the Virgin Islands on the ground that it will improve our relations with the African countries?

Before we further distort the structure of our Government, we ought to be prepared to deal with these prospective troublesome problems on the basis of a principle that is equally just and fair to all of these people and is also just and fair to the people of the 49 States.

EXTRANEOUS ISSUES

Just about any and every conceivable argument has been advanced by the proponents of statehood. The Territory of Hawaii has carried on a high-powered, soft-sell, campaign for the past 12 years. The Hawaii Statehood Commission is the official agency for the promotion of statehood. Since 1947 it has spent more than $1 million for public relations and lobbying. This sum far exceeds the spending by any other lobbying group.

I would like to comment on some of the arguments being advanced by this Commission.

They have raised the slogan of "taxation without representation." Taxation has never been the test of voting rights. The person who pays no taxes is entitled to one vote just as the citizen who pays $1 million of taxes per year. The alien resident who has no voting rights is still duty bound to pay taxes.

The taxes paid by the Hawaiian people just as the taxes paid by the residents of the 48 States was spent to protect all of us, equally, from foreign invasion. The Hawaiian people received from their taxes substantially the same benefits as the people of the 48 States. This is language of incitement.

No one has disparaged the bravery of Hawaiian troops in World War II and in the Korean conflict, except the Hawaii Statehood Commission. They have raised this issue by attributing it to the opponents of statehood. It is inflammatory, emotional language that puts the opponents on the defensive and furnishes an emotional impact in Hawaii, coupling statehood with a defense of honor.

The loyalty of the Hawaiian people is conceded but it cannot and should not be the basis for the equitable apportionment of representation in Congress.

I might remind our fellow citizens in Hawaii that the people of the 48 States did not hesitate to bravely and completely repel the inglorious attack by Japan, not upon the U.S. mainland, but their attack upon Hawaii. The United States discharged its obligations to its fellow citizens in Hawaii in full measure.

The proponents say that denial of statehood would cause an unfavorable psychological impact upon oriental countries. This reasoning is a political mistake. It is an admission of weakness. This is a domestic problem that should not be decided by an emotional foreign opinion.

The Hawaiian Statehood Commission advances the argument that Hawaii has met every test of statehood. The Constitution provides no tests for statehood. Congress has not enacted any tests for statehood. The proponents refer to dicta emanating from the Supreme Court.

The opinion of the Supreme Court in this matter is another unwarranted intrusion upon the constitutional powers of Congress.

The height of irrelevancy was attained by a prominent proponent of Hawaiian statehood. He advanced this argument: "The delectation of visitors, the sweetness of Hawaiian music, and the rhythm of its dance." The muscular gyrations of the hula dance is certainly far afield from the crux of the statehood problem.

I received a rather strange Christmas card during this last holiday season.

It contains the words "Mele Kalikamaka." I do not know the meaning of this language nor do I care. It contains no Christian or religious sentiment.

This card is an irreligious and clever, too clever, attempt to associate, in the subconscious mind of the recipient, his regard for the Christmas holiday and his image of a feminine form wrapped in a sarong, with a favorable response to statehood. Since Mrs. William Howard III, uses her stage name of Dorothy Lamour, this card should be regarded merely as advertising fiction.

These are some of the soft-sell techniques of the Hawaiian Statehood Commission. The Madison Avenue advertisers could learn a great deal from the Hawaiian Statehood Commission about the motivation of the masses.

COMMUNISM IN HAWAII

Mr. Chairman, I have said, in and outside Congress, that in granting statehood to Hawaii, we actually invited four Soviet agents to take seats in the U.S. Congress. I repeat this statement.

Oh, yes, they will be carefully selected by Communist agents. They will bear no visible brand marks. They will not be Communist Party members. All that the Communists demand of them in return for political support is to cleverly follow the Soviet party line, although always appearing to be merely liberal.

The infiltration of communism in Hawaii continues to influence every phase of territorial activity to an alarming degree.

The Communist network is centered in two unions, the International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union (ILWU) and the United Public Workers (UPW). From these centers, their influence spreads into both the Republican and Democratic Parties, into the territorial legislature, into the county and city governments, into the newspapers, the radio, the television, and into every home.

The ILWU has a membership of about 25,000 workers. The UPW has a membership of about 2,700 employees.

Both of these unions were expelled by the CIO in 1950 on the ground that "their policies follow the Communist Party" and that "Communists control these unions."

Gentlemen, the policies of these unions have not changed one iota. I quote from the report of the Territorial Commission on Subversive Activities which was submitted to the Governor this last Monday, March 2, 1959 (p. 16):

"The propaganda line disseminated by the ILWU has continued to follow and further the Russian international and domestic viewpoint."

These unions continue to be dominated by the same Communist officials as in 1950. The ILWU in Hawaii is known as local No. 142. The international president is that most dangerous and effective Communist agent, Harry Bridges.

Since last August, Harry Bridges has been actively engaged in promoting an alinement of American labor unions with foreign Communist unions. This, of course, is part of the U.S. Communist Party's and the Soviet Communist Party's present program.

Since August 1958, Harry Bridges has made overtures to: (a) The all-Japan Dock Workers Union; (b) the Waterside Workers of Australia; (c) the Madras Harbor Workers of India; (d) the Waterside Workers of Indonesia. These unions are all Communist dominated.

Since January 1, 1959, Harry Bridges has had conferences with the Communist leadership of unions in London, Paris, Hamburg, Prague, Moscow, Leningrad, and Helsinki. I quote from a newspaper article in the Buffalo Evening News dated February 13, 1959.

"Bridges Lauds Democracy in Russian Unions.

"Bridges has also alined his union with the International Brotherhood of Teamsters, headed by James R. Hoffa.

"Jack Hall is regional director of the Hawaii ILWU, Local No. 142. He and six other Hawaiian Communists were convicted in 1953 for conspiracy to overthrow our Government by force and violence. These cases were reversed under the authority of the series of shocking Supreme Court pro-Communist decisions.

"The UPW's officers are Henry Epstein, Stephen Murin, Max Roffman, and Jeanette Nakama Rohrbough, all identified Communists.

"Both the ILWU and the UPW have exploited its members and continue to use the dues and the membership to further the Communist Party line.

"The UPW has 235 public employees employed by the government of the Territory of Hawaii. The city and county of Honolulu have 567 employees belonging to the UPW including 37 members of the sheriff's department.

"The county of Hawaii has 279 UPW, public employees; the county of Kauai has 203; and the county of Maui, 537.

"The ILWU and its conspiratorial Communist partner, the UPW, share the same large ILWU office building. This nonpublic building was recently exempted from public taxation by the Hawaiian Legislature.

"These two unions continue to spend upwards of $200,000 annually for propaganda and agitation.

"Although the English evening broadcasts by their chief English-speaking propagandist, Robert McElrath, have been discontinued, it is a mere tactical shift.

"The radio broadcasts in the Ilocano and Tagalog, Filipino dialects, continue every weekday.

The Japanese broadcasts are continued on three stations every Sunday.

"The Commission on Subversive Activities monitored 350 ILWU radio broadcasts from Honolulu alone in 1957–58.

"The ILWU continues to operate another propaganda apparatus. It has a book lending library service that disseminates nothing but Communist literature featuring class conflict and other Communist doctrine. It has a Communist movie loan service. These Communist films are stored and checked in and out by the Public Library of the Territory of Hawaii. This Communist service is paid for by the Hawaii and the U.S. taxpayers."

Although the weekly Communist newspaper, the Honolulu Record, has discontinued publication, the ILWU has announced that it will publish a daily newspaper to take the place of the weekly Honolulu Record.

To demonstrate the growing and expanding power of the Communist ILWU, I show you two newspaper clippings.

The Honolulu Advertiser of November 26, 1958, reports the union election among the Foodland Super Market meatcutters.

The ILWU vote was 205.

The AFL–CIO vote was 14.

I show you a report of the Honolulu Advertiser of March 1, 1959, last Sunday, re-

porting on an election among the clerks of the Foodland Super Market: "The ILWU won with 134 votes. The AFL–CIO union received 42 votes."

This result is in spite of the fact that the Communist control and the 100 percent Communist propaganda efforts of the ILWU have been broadcast by newspapers, radio, television, hundreds of times to every citizen of Hawaii.

This certainly does not show any lessening of the influence of the Communist Party in Hawaii.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to describe just one incident to show how the Communist Party infiltrates the cultural activities of a community.

The Honolulu Community Chorus is a civic musical organization. It has planned to produce a festival of folk songs this spring in conjunction with the Honolulu Symphony Orchestra. More than 300 vocalists and musicians are to participate.

The choral chairman, Mr. John M. Kelly, Jr., is insisting that the symphony orchestra present the "Song of the Forests," by the Communist composer, Dmitri Shostakovich. This music and words were written in praise of Dictator Joseph Stalin.

Mr. Kelly also insists upon the rendition of "The Lonesome Trail." This music is by Earl Robinson and Millard Lampbell. Both of these men have Communist affiliations for 20 years.

Mr. George Barati, the director of the Honolulu Symphony as of today, still refuses to play these two numbers on the ground that they are of poor musical composition.

The wife of Mr. Kelly is the former secretary to Jack Hall, the Communist director of the ILWU. The secretary of the choral group is Mrs. An Qwon Leong McElrath, the wife of the Communist ILWU propagandist.

There has been a recent change in the Communist tactics in Hawaii. They are now using the soft velvet approach to gain respectability and complete acceptance.

Last year, Mr. Newton Miyagi, secretary of the ILWU, was appointed to the Red Cross board. Mr. Miyagi is a die-hard Communist who took the 5th amendment more than 30 times on questions relating to his Communist affiliations before the U.S. Senate Subcommittee on Internal Security. Mr. Blissard, the U.S. Federal attorney, was so outraged that he resigned as a member of the board.

Strangely, the Federal judge, there, also a member of the board, criticized Mr. Blissard and defended Mr. Miyagi's appointment. The Federal judge was seeking Presidential reappointment.

On November 8, 1956, Gov. Wilder King forced the resignation of his attorney general for attending a testimonal dinner for Jack Hall. Governor King was not reappointed.

Judge Stainback, a former Democratic Governor, vigorously opposed to the Communists, was also refused Presidential reappointment.

In the 1956 elections, Mr. William F. Quinn accepted the ILWU endorsement for the Territorial senate on the Republican ticket. He is now the Republican Presidential appointed Governor of Hawaii to replace Governor King. I show you newspaper clippings of Governor Quinn tendering a public office appointment to Jack Hall, the prominent Communist leader, as a member of the Hawaii Traffic Commission.

It is a well known political fact of life, that you can't receive the recommendation of the Department of the Interior today under a Republican administration or yesterday under a Demrocatic administration for a Presidential appointment in Hawaii without the blessing of the Communist ILWU.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to conclude my remarks by brifly reviewing the political power that is exercised by the Communist apparatus in Hawaii.

In the 1954 elections, the ILWU gave its endorsements to 71 candidates. A total of 58 of the 71 ILWU-endorsed candidates won. Of these candidates, 22 out of 28 candidates for the Hawaii Legislature won.

In the 1956 elections 21 ILWU-endorsed candidates won out of 30 representatives in the Hawaii House of Representatives.

In this last election of November 1958, there were 69 offices to be filled by election. For these offices, 57 candidates were endorsed by the ILWU. Four of these candidates rejected the ILWU endorsement. Fifty-three candidates accepted these Communist dominated ILWU endorsements.

Thirty-seven of the ILWU-endorsed candidates won their elections.

Thus the ILWU succeeded in electing 37 out of 69 elective positions in the Hawaii Territorial Legislature for a winning percentage of 55 percent out of all public elective offices.

The ILWU succeeded in electing 37 out of 53 candidates whom it endorsed and who accepted this Communist support for a winning percentage of 70 percent.

It must be remembered that four identified Communists sit on the ILWU political endorsement committee that handed out these endorsements. Their long standing Communist affiliations are well known to every person in Hawaii. These four Communists are: Thomas Yagi, Newton Miyagi, Castner Ogawa, and "Slim" Shimizu.

Mr. Newton Miyagi is the same gentleman whose recent appointment to the Red Cross board raised such a furor. During the 1956 U.S. Senate committee hearings on internal subversion, Mr. Miyagi invoked the fifth amendment 71 times and declined to answer when asked if he had been in contact with Russian military and intelligence agents.

These are the men whose political endorsements are sought for and accepted in order to attain public office. These are the same Communists who will pass upon and either reject or give political endorsement to the two U.S. Senators and the two U.S. Representatives to be elected in Hawaii and sent to our Congress. Is there any reason to believe that their self interest will be any less or any different than the 70 percent of those candidates who received, accepted, and were elected with this Communist support?

We can best judge the political power of the ILWU by comparing the results of their endorsements with the results of the endorsements of the Republican Party.

Out of the 69 offices in which the ILWU endorsed candidates, 37 won seats, the Republican-endorsed candidates won only 24 seats. In other words, the ILWU endorsement is much more valuable than the Republican Party endorsement.

Mr. Chairman, I reiterate that the power of the Communist Party continues to be so potent that it is a menace to the people of Hawaii and to the people of the 49 States. There is no evidence of the lessening of that power.

In the event of statehood, the Communist Party will, in all probability, exert a continuing tremendous influence on the election of Hawaii's two Senators and two Representatives. The probable election of ILWU-endorsed representatives to the U.S. Congress will mean that the Communist Party will exert a substantial influence upon these Members of Congress.

The Communist Party will have succeeded in infiltrating the U.S. Congress and establishing a fifth column in this last defense of the free world.

Mr. Chairman, I respectfully suggest that this committee refuse to grant a rule on this bill. There will be no harm done. The sponsors of this bill can bring this measure to the floor of the House without a rule. This committee might prefer not to lend its implied approval to this proposal by the grant of a rule.

Thank you.

H.R. 5123, a Bill To Extend and Amend the Renegotiation Act of 1951

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CECIL R. KING

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 9, 1959

Mr. KING of California. Mr. Speaker, toward the end of the last session of the Congress, I introduced a bill, known as H.R. 13092, proposing amendments to the Renegotiation Act of 1951. Time did not permit a full study of this and other bills proposing much-needed reforms in the procedures which now govern the renegotiation of defense contracts. One of the proposed amendments, providing for the judicial review of Tax Court decisions in renegotiation cases, was passed unanimously by the House of Representatives. In reporting favorably the bill incorporating this provision, the Ways and Means Committee announced that it was limiting the extension of the Renegotiation Act to a period of 6 months, because the committee intended to undertake a broad review of the entire subject of renegotiation early in this Congress. The report stated that at that time—

> Consideration will be given to the scope, objectives, and procedures of renegotiation and to possible amendments, including those proposed at the hearing on the present bill.

INFIRMITIES OF ACT SHOULD BE ELIMINATED

Since the last session of the Congress there has been considerable study of the problems of renegotiation. I believe, as a result of what we learned during the last session and from the studies made since that time, that certain basic factors indicate quite clearly the course we should follow in providing the necessary reforms in the conduct of renegotiation. In the first place, renegotiation of contracts with the United States was initiated as a temporary wartime measure, because the exigencies of a national emergency required the expeditious procurement of property and services under conditions which precluded the safeguards attendant upon normal contracting procedures within the Government. At that time it was not expected that the renegotiation of Government contracts would last beyond the emergency. Nevertheless, we have now found that, despite the implication of a temporary existence inherent in usual provisions for a short extension of the act each time it expires, renegotiation has been a part of defense procurement for almost the entire period since the war. Many infirmities have remained in the act from the beginning, on the theory that it is purely temporary. As a result, controversies arise as to the reasonableness of the Board's action, particularly in view

of the wide discretion given to the Board in determining excessive profits in individual cases and the secrecy which surrounds its deliberations and findings. Under the present act the Board is permitted to operate in a manner that is foreign to any other administrative agency of the United States having quasi-judicial powers.

CONTINUATION OF RENEGOTIATION IS NECESSARY

It may be that the continuation of renegotiation is necessary, because recurring threats to peace still require the expenditure of large sums of money for the national defense. However, I believe that contracting procedures within the Government are now adequate to prevent the accrual of profits beyond those contemplated by the parties in most cases, but the Government should be provided a means of recouping profits which may be considered excessive by appropriate standards. In other words, we should guard against windfall profits, which was the objective of statutory renegotiation in the first place. It is important to emphasize that the head of the department or agency of the Government negotiating a contract has the primary responsibility for preventing the accrual of excessive costs and profits by the effective use of available contracting procedures, and when this responsibility has been properly discharged, the integrity of Government contracts must be preserved to the same extent as contracts between private individuals. In my opinion it is morally wrong for the United States to contract in good faith with a person and years later, after performance has been satisfactorily completed, permit the Renegotiation Board to change the contract and take away profits that were openly and fairly negotiated by the parties in the first place.

EMPLOYEES DEPENDENT UPON SOUND DEFENSE INDUSTRY

I am especially concerned with renegotiation as it presently exists, because in California, and particularly in my district, there are thousands of employees who are dependent upon the soundness of the defense industry for their livelihood. Throughout the country there are millions of employees in the same position. In a situation as important and as serious as this, a maximum of publicity should accompany the findings of the Board to guard against unreasonableness and discrimination, and to allay suspicion of such shortcomings in the conduct of the Board's operations.

OBJECTIVES OF H.R. 5123

Accordingly, H.R. 5123 has four principal objectives:

First. The bill would add to the statutory factors which the Board must take into account under section 103 of the present act, the need for financial stability and incentives to efficiency and economy in the defense industry, and the desirability of comparing costs and profits of the defense industry with other industries in determining the reasonableness of profits.

Second. The bill seeks to preserve the integrity of contracts fairly negotiated with the Government by rendering subject to renegotiation profits in any year which exceed by more than 10 percent a portion of the profits contemplated by the parties.

Third. The bill seeks to give the Congress, the public and the individual who is affected thereby, more information on the reasons for the Board's decisions and the results of its determination in important cases. Freedom from congressional and public scrutiny has been a privilege enjoyed by the Board for reasons which do not appear on the surface, and in this age, which demands that Government activities be carried on in the light of day, a change in this respect is badly needed.

Fourth. The bill also provides for appeals from Tax Court decisions in renegotiation cases to the same extent as in ordinary Tax Court cases. In view of the favorable reception given to a similar proposal during the last session, the justice of this amendment seems obvious.

TWO-YEAR EXTENSION OF THE RENEGOTIATION ACT

During the last session of the Congress, the Renegotiation Act was extended for only 6 months to June 30, 1959. Section 1 of H.R. 5123 provides for a 2-year extension of the act to June 30, 1961.

AMENDMENTS PROVIDING ADDITIONAL STATUTORY FACTORS TO BE CONSIDERED IN DETERMINING EXCESSIVE PROFITS

Section 2 of H.R. 5123 amends section 103(e)—title 50, United States Code Appendix, section 1213(e)—to insert new statutory factors among those which the Board must now take into account in determining excessive profits. In subsection A, it is provided that the Board must take into account, in addition to those items now set forth in the comparable provision of the present act, "a comparison with the costs and profits of other industries." Since the defense industry is in competition with industry generally, it is appropriate that the reasonableness of costs and profits be determined in the light of costs and profits incurred and enjoyed by other industries. Whether or not the Board now takes this into account is problematical. It is believed appropriate that it should be directed to give this factor due weight.

A new statutory factor is included in subparagraph F, which requires the Board to take into account in determining excessive profits:

The need for financial stability in the defense industry and for proper financial incentives under a system of free enterprise in order to produce the highest degree of efficiency and economy in the performance of contracts with the departments and related subcontracts.

The defense industry has become a permanent part of the economic life of the Nation. The need for financial stability to the same extent as other industry forming part of our national life would seem apparent. The proposed statutory factor would require the Board to take this into account in determining excessive profits.

At the present time, section 103(e) enables the Board to take into account, in determining excessive profits, such other factors the consideration of which the public interest and fair and equitable dealing may require which factors shall be published in the regulations of the Board from time to time as adopted. The Board has not seen fit in its entire history to adopt any additional statutory factors by regulation. It would seem appropriate to direct the Board to take into account other factors if the public interest and fair and equitable dealing require it regardless of whether it is constrained to adopt regulations with respect thereto. By eliminating the requirement of a regulation a person subjected to the Board's jurisdiction would, if this amendment were adopted, be able to urge matters consistent with the public interest and fair and equitable dealing, which he is now precluded from presenting under the existing act.

PROTECTION OF AGREED PROFITS

Section 2 proposes a further amendment which is designed to encourage efficiency and cost reduction and at the same time give some support to the integrity of contracts entered into in good faith by the U.S. Government.

In substance it provides that the Board's determination of excessive profits cannot reduce the contractor's retained profits below the sum of the aggregate of agreed profits plus 10 percent of such agreed profits. The proposal includes a definition of the term "agreed profits" which is designed to produce an amount of such agreed profits generally less than those actually agreed upon. This amendment places renegotiation in its proper perspective, namely a method whereby "windfall" profits are recouped. Renegotiation is not the equivalent of an excess profits tax. Congress has not set up a formula or any real standards to enable the Board precisely to determine what profits are excessive. As a result controversies and inconsistencies appear to exist which should be eliminated to the greatest possible extent. The proposed amendment is designed to accomplish this end. This particular amendment will operate with respect to those contracts in which the profit negotiated by the parties is ascertainable either by specific reference in the contract or by other proof. It is to be noted that the departments may adopt rules where appropriate to identify the profits agreed upon by the parties.

PUBLICITY OF BOARD'S FINDINGS AND DETERMINATIONS

Section 3 entitled "Renegotiation Proceedings" is designed to provide the contractor with a full exposition of the reasons for a determination of excessive profits by the Renegotiation Board and the facts used by the Board in arriving at its decision before an order is actually issued. At the present time, not until an order is issued fixing excessive profits is a contractor entitled to any statement explanatory of the Board's position. Moreover, the statement itself cannot be used in the Tax Court for any pur-

pose. There is a specific provision in the proposed amendment that such statement may not be used in the Tax Court as proof of the facts or conclusions stated therein but may be used as proof of the reason for such determination. The proposed amendment would also require the Board to make available for inspection by the contractor all data relating to the renegotiation proceeding and to supply the contractor, upon request, with copies of any part thereof which may be requested by the contractor. All of this is designed to give more attention to the basic principles of fair play to the end that the contractor may be fully apprised of the basis for any determination alleging excessive profits.

EXEMPTION OF STANDARD COMMERCIAL ARTICLES

H.R. 5123 in section 4 proposes an addition clarifying one of the criteria in the definition of a standard commercial class of articles.

JUDICIAL REVIEW OF TAX COURT DECISIONS IN RENEGOTIATION CASES

Section 5 permit appeals from Tax Court decisions in renegotiation cases to the same extent as other tax cases. It also removes any presumption of correctness in the determination of the Board from which an appeal is being taken. The act now provides that a proceeding before the Tax Court is a proceeding de novo. In such a proceeding the contractor and the Board should have equal status with respect to the controversy since the Board's determinations are not made in accordance with the Administrative Procedures Act. It is not a true de novo proceeding if the Board's findings are entitled to a presumption of correctness. The proposed amendment is designed to eliminate the possibility of such an interpretation of the present act.

REPORTS TO CONGRESS

Section 114 of the act now provides for a report to the Congress by the Renegotiation Board. The report contains no information with regard to the specific determinations of the Board in individual cases. As a consequence, the Congress, the public, and the adversaries before the Board are unaware of inconsistencies which may develop in the administration of the act resulting in unfairness and discrimination regardless of an innocent motive. There should be no objection to exposing findings of the Board to the light of day. The requirements of the proposed amendment simply provide that certain information already made available by the Board to the specific contractor involved be made public in its report to the Congress in all cases where the renegotiable business of a contractor exceeded $20 million in the year in question. I believe the public is entitled to know, where these vast sums of Government money are involved, how the Board has interpreted this law which is designed to eliminate excessive or windfall profits. The consolidated statistics that are submitted under the present law do not permit me or the public to learn how the Board is exercising its broad discretionary powers. It would seem to be a help to all—the Renegotiation Board, the Congress, procuring services, the public, and the companies who are receiving such large amounts of Government money—to open these actions to the light of day. Not only will this information be of interest to the Congress and the public but it will be in such form as to assure its use in Tax Court proceedings involving renegotiation determinations.

CONCLUSIONS

The amendments proposed by H.R. 5123 are designed to accomplish a greater degree of due process than is now the case and to surround the Board with the same safeguards against unreasonableness, discrimination, and abuse that apply to other administrative agencies with the power and authority similar to that conferred by the Renegotiation Act. Their adoption will tend to bring about stability in the defense industry to the advantage of the Government, the public, the defense industry, and its employees.

SENATE

TUESDAY, MARCH 10, 1959

(Legislative day of Monday, March 9, 1959)

The Senate met at 10:30 o'clock a.m., on the expiration of the recess.

Rev. William Gowland, president of Luton College for Industrial Evangelism and chaplain of Luton Industrial Mission and Community Center, Luton, England, offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, our Heavenly Father, we thank Thee for this new day with all of its possibilities for glorifying Thy Holy Name. We ask that in all our concerns we may seek Thy will.

We bring before Thy throne this day all those who represent the people of this great Nation. As we thank Thee for all the rich heritage of the past, we pray that our hopes and aspirations in this day and generation shall be according to Thy Holy will.

Teach us how to promote true righteousness, freedom, and justice throughout the whole world, and to face with courage and true insight those principalities and powers of darkness which would bring disaster to the whole of Thy family. Save us from holding lightly and defending halfheartedly the basic beliefs of all free peoples. Recalling the cost to our forefathers in their struggle for liberty and freedom from tyranny, grant that our sacrifices shall be no less than theirs.

All this we ask in Thy Holy Name and only for Thy sake. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, March 9, 1959, was dispensed with.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS—LIMITATION OF DEBATE

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be the usual morning hour for the transaction of routine business, and that statements in connection therewith be limited to 3 minutes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING THE SESSION OF THE SENATE

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, the Committee on Foreign Relations, the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and the Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly of the Committee on the Judiciary were authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

On request of Mr. STENNIS, and by unanimous consent, the Military Construction Subcommittee of the Committee on Armed Services was authorized to meet today during the session of the Senate.

On request of Mr. MAGNUSON, and by unanimous consent, the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate tomorrow.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the junior Senator from Iowa [Mr. MARTIN] be granted a leave of absence for today and the remainder of the week. He is on official business with the Aeronautical and Space Sciences Committee in California.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, leave is granted.

ORDER FOR RECESS TO 10 O'CLOCK A.M. TOMORROW — LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes its business today it stand in recess until 10 o'clock a.m. tomorrow.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I make that request for this reason: There are 98 Members of the Senate. The Senate has one of the most dedicated and efficient staffs I have ever worked with. When business is pending, we like to consider it thoroughly and get action upon it.

We all wish to be as accommodating as possible to individual Senators and to the employees of the Senate. We do not wish to have sessions 6 days a week, if that can be avoided, because we find that a part of our senatorial duties is to keep

in touch with our constituents throughout the Nation, and in order to do so we must return to our States at frequent intervals.

I have received numerous requests that no bills be scheduled for a vote on Thursday, Friday, or Saturday of this week. Of course, I could not comply with such requests, because if every time a Senator asked me not to schedule a vote I complied the Senate would never vote.

Our policy will be to try to accommodate Senators as much as possible, without making any commitments with respect to votes. It would be very difficult to obtain a vote in the Senate on Monday. Tuesday will be St. Patrick's Day, and a substantial number of Senators have engagements out of the city.

The Senate would probably be in session later than usual tomorrow evening were it not for the fact that there will be congressional night at the Press Club. We wish to be understanding in that connection, too.

Tomorrow there will be a joint meeting of the two Houses, which will consume some time. It is our plan and hope before this weekend to dispose of three pieces of legislation now before the Senate. Printed hearings, reports, and bills are available for all Senators to read and study. We may not be able to get action on these measures. It will depend upon how long Senators desire to talk. I have no desire to curtail discussion. One Senator told me only Thursday at the policy committee meeting that he anticipated that the consideration of a certain bill would require 4 or 5 days. Yesterday it was reported that no speakers desired to discuss the bill at any such length. So we must adjust our plans accordingly.

It is our intention to hold the Senate in session until late this evening, and to consider bills in this order:

The unfinished business, which is the space bill. To be followed by the draft bill, which will be presented by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL]. That will be followed by the Hawaiian statehood bill. I expect quorum calls and yea-and-nay votes during the day. I should like to have the attachés of the Senate locate any absent Senators, and keep themselves informed as to where they are, so that there will be no unusual delay, and so that 75 Senators will not be kept waiting for 2 to reach the Chamber. There will be a yea-and-nay vote on the space bill, and a yea-and-nay vote on the draft bill, as well as on the Hawaiian statehood bill.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business, beginning with new reports.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. FULBRIGHT, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

T. Graydon Upton, of Pennsylvania, to be U.S. Executive Director of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development; and

Henry J. Heinz II, of Pennsylvania, to be representative to the 14th session of the Economic Commission for Europe of the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations.

By Mr. MURRAY, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

Elmer F. Bennett, of Colorado, to be Under Secretary of the Interior;

George W. Abbott, of Nebraska, to be Solicitor for the Department of the Interior; and

Edward Elliott Johnston, of Hawaii, to be Secretary of the Territory of Hawaii.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BARTLETT in the chair). If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the calendar, beginning with new reports.

THE ARMY

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Army.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the nominations in the Army be considered en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered; and, without objection, the nominations are confirmed en bloc.

THE AIR FORCE

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Air Force.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that nominations in the Air Force be considered en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered; and, without objection, the nominations are confirmed en bloc.

THE NAVY

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Navy.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that nominations in the Navy be considered en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered; and, without objection, the nominations are confirmed en bloc.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of all nominations confirmed this day.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

ADDRESS BY PRESIDENT JOSE MARIA LEMUS, OF EL SALVADOR, BEFORE JOINT MEETING

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I announce for the information of Senators that President Jose Maria Lemus, of El Salvador, will address a joint meeting of Congress tomorrow at 12:30 o'clock p.m.

I ask unanimous consent that it be in order for the Chair to declare a recess tomorrow at approximately 12:15 o'clock p.m., subject to the call of the Chair, and that Senators assemble and proceed to the Chamber of the other body.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. ENGLE:

S. 1348. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Folsom south unit, American River division, Central Valley project, in California; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. McCARTHY:

S. 1349. A bill for the relief of Song Song Tai; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GORE:

S. 1350. A bill to provide for the registration of finance companies; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BEALL:

S. 1351. A bill to authorize assistance under the Small Business Act of 1953 to certain small-business concerns displaced as a result of urban renewal activities under the Housing Act of 1949; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota:

S. 1352. A bill to authorize enrolled members of the Three Affiliated Tribes of the Fort Berthold Reservation, N. Dak., to acquire trust interests in tribal lands of the reservation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BUTLER (by request):

S. 1353. A bill to amend the Interstate Commerce Act to remove certain restrictions as to persons who may engage in the business of a motor carrier and upon the issuance of certificates or approvals for engaging in such business or acquiring control of another engaged therein;

S. 1354. A bill to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act to remove certain restrictions as to persons who may engage in the business of an air carrier and upon the issuance of certificates or approvals for engaging in such business or acquiring control of another engaged therein; and

S. 1355. A bill to amend the Interstate Commerce Act to remove certain restrictions as to persons who may engage in the business of a water carrier and upon the issuance of certificates or approvals for engaging in

such business or acquiring control of or an interest in another so engaged; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. BUTLER when he introduced the above bills, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. COOPER (for himself, Mr. MORTON, Mr. RANDOLPH, and Mr. BYRD of West Virginia):

S. 1356. A bill to amend the act authorizing the disposal of certain obsolete Federal locks and dams in order to increase a certain authorization in such act relating to dam No. 3 on the Big Sandy River, Ky.; to the Committee on Public Works.

(See the remarks of Mr. COOPER when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

S. 1357. A bill to extend the copyright provisions of title 17 of the United States Code to musical compositions produced without the use of a conventional system of notations; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MURRAY (by request):

S. 1358. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to provide a headquarters site for Mount Rainier National Park in the general vicinity of Ashford, Wash., and for other purposes; and

S. 1359. A bill to revise the boundaries of the Montezuma Castle National Monument, Ariz., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. LANGER (for himself and Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota):

S. 1360. A bill to authorize Dunn Center Special School District No. 29, North Dakota, to apply and receive payments for certain fiscal years under the provisions of Public Law 874, 81st Congress, providing financial assistance for local educational agencies in areas affected by Federal activities; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. WILEY:

S. 1361. A bill for the relief of Henrique Ferreira Das Neves; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ALLOTT:

S. 1362. A bill to encourage and stimulate the production and conservation of coal in the United States through research and development by authorizing the Secretary of the Interior, acting through the Bureau of Mines, to contract for coal research, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. ALLOTT when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. ALLOTT (for himself and Mr. CARROLL):

S. 1363. A bill providing for the appointment of an additional district judge for the district of Colorado; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. ALLOTT when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. ALLOTT (for himself and Mr. BENNETT):

S. 1364. A bill to amend part IV of subtitle C of title 10, United States Code, to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to take possession of the naval oil shale reserves, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. KEATING (for himself and Mr. WILEY):

S. 1365. A bill to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 to authorize the disposal of surplus property to certain welfare agencies; to the Committee on Government Operations.

(See the remarks of Mr. KEATING when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. SALTONSTALL (for himself and Mr. KENNEDY) (by request):

S. 1366. A bill for the relief of Laura Irene de Courten, Candida Rommel, Selina Rommel, and Nikolaus Rommel; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAGNUSON (by request):

S. 1367. A bill to amend title 14, United States Code, entitled "Coast Guard," to authorize the Coast Guard to sell supplies and furnish services not available from local sources to vessels and other watercraft to meet the necessities of such vessels and watercraft; to the Committe on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. MAGNUSON when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. JAVITS:

S.J. Res. 75. Joint resolution to provide for the designation of the month of May of each year as Senior Citizens Month; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. JAVITS when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

S.J. Res. 76. Joint resolution to establish a commission to study and report on the U.S. telecommunication resource with special attention to the radio spectrum; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. MAGNUSON when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION

Mr. HARTKE submitted a concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 15) relating to priority in temporary employment of persons in taking the 1960 census, which was referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

(See the above concurrent resolution printed in full when submitted by Mr. HARTKE, which appears under a separate heading.)

PROPOSED LEGISLATION RELATING TO INTERSTATE COMMERCE

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, by request, I introduce, for appropriate reference, three bills which would remove the restrictions now imposed by Federal statute upon the entry of American railroads into water, motor, and air transportation.

I am introducing these bills specifically at the request of the railroad industry. By this means the railroad industry will be afforded an opportunity to present to the Congress the various arguments and circumstances which it believes make it necessary and appropriate for the railroads to be freed of these restrictions.

Furthermore, at hearings incident to these bills, other transportation industries will be given an opportunity to present their views also. Introduction of this proposed legislation does not indicate any preconceived conclusion on my part. It is essential, in my opinion, however, that the American railroads be given this opportunity to express their views on the basis of specific legislative proposals without delay.

I ask unanimous consent that a memorandum prepared by the railroad industry describing the purposes of these bills be printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bills will be received and appropriately referred.

The bills, introduced by Mr. BUTLER (by request), were received, read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, as follows:

S. 1353. A bill to amend the Interstate Commerce Act to remove certain restrictions as to persons who may engage in the business of a motor carrier and upon the issuance of certificates or approvals for engaging in such business or acquiring control of another engaged therein;

S. 1354. A bill to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act to remove certain restrictions as to persons who may engage in the business of an air carrier and upon the issuance of certificates or approvals for engaging in such business or acquiring control of another engaged therein; and

S. 1355. A bill to amend the Interstate Commerce Act to remove certain restrictions as to persons who may engage in the business of a water carrier and upon the issuance of certificates or approvals for engaging in such business or acquiring control of or an interest in another so engaged.

The memorandum presented by Mr. BUTLER is as follows:

MEMORANDUM ON TRANSPORT DIVERSIFICATION

Under existing law, as it has been interpreted by the Interstate Commerce Commission and the Civil Aeronautics Board, special restrictions have been imposed upon the entry of railroads into motor and water transportation and upon the entry of any surface carriers into air transportation. These special restrictions grow out of certain language found in various sections of the Interstate Commerce Act and the Civil Aeronautics Act and are in addition to the general restrictions of those two acts that no one may begin new carrier operations, or acquire control of existing carriers, by motor or water without the approval of the Interstate Commerce Commission or by air without the approval of the Civil Aeronautics Board.

As a result of the special restrictions referred to: (1) Except where unusual circumstances prevail, permission to railroads or railroad affiliates to operate as motor carriers has been generally restricted to service that is auxiliary or supplemental to train service; that is, in general, to transportation by truck of the rail traffic of the railroad, at railroad rates and on railroad bills of lading, to and from only such points as are located on the rail line of the railroad and with either a requirement for prior or subsequent movement by rail or a key-point condition (movement only between certain specified key points on the railroad); (2) surface carriers, including railroads, and their affiliates have been almost totally excluded from air operations; and (3) railroads were compelled years ago to cease water carrier operations on the Great Lakes, and have been deterred from instituting operations on other inland waterways or from reinstituting various coastwise ocean operations conducted by them prior to World War II.

The evolution of these restrictive policies which, especially in the case of motor and air operations, have come about almost entirely by reason of administrative interpretation and construction of the statutes, rather than because of the specific terms of the statutes themselves, is briefly reviewed in the appendixes accompanying this memorandum.

It would be in the public interest to permit railroads and their affiliates to enter into, or acquire existing rights to engage in, motor, water, or air transportation on the same basis as any nonrailroad operator.

In the first place, the shipping public would benefit from transport diversification. Greater freedom for the railroads to engage in other forms of transport would make it possible to do away with much unnecessary duplication of facilities, and would result in improved service and lower cost, to the ultimate advantage of the shipper. If the management of one form of transportation also managed other forms, a shipper could arrange through one manager for the complete service he needed and be directed to the most efficient and most economical means of handling his particular traffic either by one mode or a combination of modes.

Furthermore, it should be borne in mind that the railroads are admittedly the backbone of our transportation system. If they are to remain progressive and be given opportunity to regain their financial health, in the interest of the preservation of a strong national transportation system for the benefit of the economy as a whole as well as for the national defense, they should be allowed to diversify their operations just as other businesses do. In industry generally, diversification has been demonstrated to be sound economic practice. Diversification for the railroads means making use of technological developments in other fields of transportation. Special restrictions in this regard, applicable to the railroads but not to others, should be wiped out.

Aside from the obvious benefits that could be expected to flow from transport diversification as such, removal of the special restrictions upon railroad use of other forms of transportation would enable the railroads to share in the use of facilities furnished their truck, water, and air competitors through tremendous public subsidies to which the railroads, as important taxpayers, contribute. As it is, the railroads not only must provide their own comparable facilities out of their own pockets but, as large taxpayers, must share heavily in the cost of expensive projects vitally benefiting competing transportation agencies. It is only fair that this indefensible situation be ameliorated.

What is sought by the railroads in the way of freedom to engage in other forms of transportation is not in the nature of a one-way street, but is intended to be equally applicable to the right of each of the several forms of transport to engage in other forms. It is proposed that the Interstate Commerce Act and the Civil Aeronautics Act be so amended as to make it clear that none of the several forms of transportation when seeking to engage in another form is to be subjected to special standards or limitations or restrictions merely by reason of the circumstance that it is a different form.

It should be understood that even with removal of the special restrictions the railroads, like any other applicant, would still have to prove to the satisfaction of the regulatory authorities that their entry into another transportation field is required by public convenience and necessity or is consistent with the public interest as the circumstances may require. In such cases, whether a new entry or an acquisition of existing facilities were to be involved, the regulatory agency would consider the competitive effect upon existing carriers in the field.

APPENDIX A

MOTOR CARRIER OPERATIONS

In the early days of motor carrier operation and before its regulation, the Interstate Commerce Commission conducted two independent investigations of the situation. In the first, motorbus and motortruck operation (140 ICC 685 (1928)), the Commission found that certain railroads were already making use of motor transport in their operations, and recommended that the railroads should be authorized to engage in interstate commerce by motor vehicles on the public highways subject to existing provisions of the Interstate Commerce Act. In the second investigation, coordination of motor transportation (182 ICC 263 (1932)), the Commission directed its attention to the particular question of the use of motor transport by other transportation agencies. After an extensive study the Commission found that there had already been a great deal of diversion of highway traffic from the railroads to the motor carriers and concluded with the recommendation "that railroads, whether steam or electric, and water carriers, should be specifically authorized to engage in transportation of both persons and property by motor vehicles in interstate commerce over the public highways." Thus, prior to enactment of the Motor Carrier Act of 1935 the Interstate Commerce Commission was of the view that railroads should be allowed to diversify their operations into other forms of transportation.

The Motor Carrier Act of 1935 did not follow the recommendation of the Interstate Commerce Commission that railroads should be specifically authorized to engage in interstate motor transport.

In section 206 it did provide for so-called grandfather rights so that any carrier already engaged in motortruck operation could be issued a certificate to continue its operation without further proof of public convenience and necessity.

Section 207, pertaining to the issuance of certificates for new motor carrier operations, did not then nor does it now make any distinction whatsoever as to what type of carrier the applicant may be. It merely required and still requires that there be a finding that the applicant is fit, willing, and able properly to perform the service proposed, and that the proposed service is, or will be, required by the present or future public convenience and necessity.

In section 213 pertaining to authority for consolidation, merger, acquisition and control of an existing motor carrier, however, it was provided that if the applicant for control or merger of an existing motor carrier was a carrier other than a motor carrier, "the Commission shall not enter such an order unless it finds that the transaction will promote the public interest by enabling such carrier to use service by motor vehicle to public advantage in its operations and will not unduly restrain competition."

It will be noted that the Motor Carrier Act of 1935 as originally enacted did not single out the railroad industry for specific discriminatory limitations in this respect, but made the same conditions applicable to other carriers as well. By the Transportation Act of 1940 section 213 of the Motor Carrier Act was repealed but its substance was carried into section 5 of the Interstate Commerce Act, with one important change: It was provided by the 1940 Act that only in cases where a railroad is the applicant for control or merger of a motor carrier will the limitations apply. Section 5(2)(b) of the Interstate Commerce Act provides that in the case of any railroad acquisition of an existing motor carrier the Interstate Commerce Commission must determine that the proposed control or ownership of the motor carrier by the railroad "will enable such [rail] carrier to use service by motor vehicle to public advantage in its operations and will not unduly restrain competition."

It should be noted, too, that neither the provisions of the act of 1935, imposing special limitations on other forms of carriers entering into the motor carrier field nor the superseding provisions of section 5(2)(b) of the present act, imposing those limitations on railroads alone, specifically indicate or require in terms that the present type of restrictions (to be shown later) be imposed practically as a matter of routine as conditions for approval of railroad control or acquisition of a motor carrier. It remained for intepretation or constuction by the administrative agency to accomplish that effect.

The first proceeding in which the Commission dealt with the question of acquisition of control of motor transportation operations by a railroad or a railroad controlled subsidiary was *Pennsylvania Truck Lines, Inc., Control-Barker*, 1 M.C.C. 101, 5 M.C.C. 9, in which an affiliate of the Pennsylvania Railroad sought authority to acquire control over Barker Motor Freight. Although the railroad's professed intention in acquiring the operating rights of the motor carrier was to facilitate the establishment of a coordinated truck and rail service in Ohio similar to that already furnished in its eastern territory, it did not propose to abandon or dispose of those portions of the acquired motor operations which would not necessarily contribute to coordinated truck-rail service. On the contrary, it maintained that its greater financial resources would permit it to give improved and more frequent motor service over all the routes previously operated by Barker, including those not adjacent to its rail lines. Division 5 of the Commission, however, after first finding that some of Barker's route could indeed be used by the railroad to public advantage, indicated disapproval of any proposal by railroads "to go into the kinds of truck service which were not auxiliary and supplementary to their railroad operations." In a later report, 5 M.C.C. 9, the Commission's position and intent were clarified and restated as follows: "* * * Approved operations are those which are auxiliary and supplemental to train service. Except as hereinafter indicated, nonapproved operations are those which otherwise compete with the railroad itself, those which compete with an established motor carrier, or which invade to a substantial degree a territory already adequately served by another rail carrier."

Thus, in this initial decision on the question, the Commission established the general principle that railroads would only be permitted to make use of motor transport to the limited extent that such was auxiliary or supplemental to rail service and would not be permitted to compete generally with established motor carriers. Motor carriers were thus given absolute protection from general competition by railroads by use of motor transport and the principle of competition as between various forms of transportation, which has subsequently proved to be both inefficient and ruinous, was established as the controlling principle in the transportation industry.

The statutory restrictions upon which the Commission relied in the Barker case were those in section 213 of the act pertaining to acquisition by purchase or merger of existing motor carrier rights. The Barker case was, of course, such an acquisition. This same policy, however, was early carried over as controlling also in the disposition of applications by railroads or their affiliates for new certificated motor carrier rights under section 207, which does not specifically contain any such restrictions for acquisition of rights by other agencies of transportation. In *Kansas City Southern Transport Company, Inc., Common Carrier Application*, (10 M.C.C. 221, 28 M.C.C. 5), a rail affiliate sought new motor common carrier rights over certain routes which it represented would be

auxiliary to and supplementary to its rail service and coordinated therewith. However, it asked to move some shipments entirely by truck. Division 5 of the Commission applied the Barker case principle and made the authorizations subject to the five following conditions which, with one later modification, have grown to be standard and customary in cases of this kind.

1. The service to be performed shall be limited to service which is auxiliary to, or supplemental of, rail service.

2. No motor service shall be rendered to or from any point not a station on a rail line of the railroad.

3. Shipments to be transported shall be limited to those on a through bill of lading, including a prior or subsequent movement by rail.

4. All contractual arrangements between the applicant motor carrier and the parent railroad shall be reported to the Commission and shall be subject to revision.

5. The motor service shall be subject to such further specific conditions as the Commission in the future may find it necessary to impose, in order to insure that it will remain auxiliary and supplemental to the rail service.

This decision was rendered on November 12, 1938, and from that date to the early part of 1940 it was followed consistently and substantially identical restrictions were imposed in disposing of numerous railroad applications for motor carrier operating authorities.

In 1941, on reconsideration in the same proceeding, the entire Commission substituted a different requirement for condition No. 3, which required a prior or subsequent movement by rail. In the case *Kansas City Southern Transport Company, Common Carrier Application,* 28 M.C.C. 5, a new type of condition was substituted; namely, a so-called key point condition. This permitted the movement of some shipments entirely by motor, but only between local way points on the railroad, and then only provided that such shipments did not move by motor between any two usual break bulk key points. The remaining conditions were left unchanged.

With rare exceptions confined to very unusual circumstances these restrictions, including either a prior or subsequent movement by rail or a key point restriction, have been uniformly imposed alike upon later railroad applications for both acquisition of existing and for new motor carrier rights.

The result of these restrictions has been to limit railroad or railroad affiliate operation of motor transport entirely to that which is auxiliary and supplementary to railroad operation, and prevents any general motor competition whatever with existing motor carriers. This policy of restriction that has been practiced by the Interstate Commerce Commission does not per se protect the inherent advantages of the mode of transportation by motor vehicle, but rather protects the business of the motor carriers engaging in that form of transportation. The Commission has limited the effective use of motor transport solely to motor carriers as such and has forbidden it to be used by other forms of transportation companies where the inherent advantages of such transport might fit in well with the operations of such company.

If the matter had not been already determined to the contrary, the railroads could point out that there is nothing in the statement of policy in the Transportation Act of 1940, nor in the express provisions of section 5(2), the successor to section 213 in the original Motor Carrier Act of 1935, which requires that railroad operation of motor equipment on the public highway be limited to that which is merely auxiliary or supplemental to rail service. The national transportation policy expressed in the act of 1940 refers simply to the public interest and the preservation of the inherent advantages of each mode of transportation. The railroads submit that it would be in the public interest, and it would further promote the inherent advantages of each mode of transportation, if the railroads were permitted to offer a diversified transportation product to the public as it would strengthen all functions of the transportation company and put it in a better economic position to offer all services to the public.

Furthermore, the only direct statutory restrictions on railroads and their affiliates are those contained in section 5, applying to acquisition of existing motor carrier rights by merger, purchase, or otherwise. There is nothing expressed in sections 206 and 207, concerning applications for new motor carrier authority, which necessitates discrimination against railroads and affiliates in the granting of such authority, and it is only through the Commission's interpretation of the law that they are imposed.

As stated heretofore, the Commission has, in some cases, held that where special circumstances are present, a rail affiliated applicant can obtain unrestricted motor carrier authority. In the absence of such special circumstances, the Commission has not issued unrestricted motor carrier rights to rail affiliates. It has been the Commission's view that a railroad applicant for authority to operate as a common carrier by motor vehicle, although required by statutes to do no more than prove as any other applicant that the service is required by public convenience and necessity, nevertheless has a special burden by reason of the fact that it simply is a railroad. The Commission has used the words of the national transportation policy to carry over the language from section 5 of the act into section 207, and this requires railroads in certification cases to show circumstances negativing any disadvantage to the public because the applicant is a railroad. This policy of the Commission was approved by the Supreme Court in *U.S. v. Rock Island M. Transit Company* (340 U.S. 419, 427–428).

The Commission's policy of granting rail affiliates unrestricted motor carrier rights in situations where special circumstances exist has been given legal sanction by the Supreme Court in *American Trucking Associations v. U.S.,* 355 U.S. 141 (1957). The net effect of the decision, however, is not only to limit the area in which a rail affiliate can engage in unrestricted motor carrier operations but also to constitute a straitjacket for the railroads rather than an avenue permitting further motor operation. In the case, the Rock Island Motor Transit, a subsidiary of the Rock Island Railroad, had authority from the Interstate Commerce Commission to operate interstate motor carrier service between certain points in Illinois, Iowa, and Nebraska, subject to restrictions designed to limit the service to that which was auxiliary to or supplemental of the Rock Island's rail operations (keypoint restrictions, forbidding transport to stations not on the rail lines), and filed an application for a certificate under section 207 to serve without the restrictions several of the communities under restriction. The authority was granted in part by the Commission when it was found that the applicant was willing to provide services which other trucking companies would not provide. The Court stated that the rigid requirement of section 5(2)(b) of the act applicable to acquisition cases applied also to proceedings for new certificates under section 207 and that the auxiliary or supplemental conditions applied unless the special circumstances were present, as they were in the instant case. The case seems to approve only those unrestricted motor operations by a rail affiliate in situations where trucking companies do not want the traffic.

APPENDIX B

AIR CARRIER OPERATIONS

There are two provisions of the Civil Aeronautics Act[1] that must be considered in any discussion of the performance of air carriage by surface transportation forms. One is section 401, providing that no air (common) carrier may operate in air transportation without a certificate issued by the Civil Aeronautics Board upon a finding that the transportation proposed is required by public convenience and necessity. Section 408 of the Civil Aeronautics Act gives the CAB control over the consolidation of two or more air carriers and over transactions in the nature of consolidations, mergers, acquisitions and the like between air and surface carriers or their affiliates.

Proposed consolidations of air carriers are required to be approved unless the CAB finds that they would not be consistent with the public interest. This standard is also applicable where unification of air and surface carriers is involved, but in transactions where a surface carrier is the applicant the following additional requirement of section 408 of the Civil Aeronautics Act must be met:

"That if the applicant is a carrier other than an air carrier, or a person controlled by a carrier other than an air carrier or affiliated therewith within the meaning of section 5(8) of the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, such applicant shall for the purposes of this section be considered an air carrier and the authority shall not enter such an order of approval unless it finds that the transaction proposed will promote the public interest by enabling such carrier other than an air carrier to use aircraft to public advantage in its operation and will not restrain competition."

There has been very little common ownership as between railroads and other surface carriers on the one hand and air carriers on the other. Before the Civil Aeronautics Act became law in 1938, a substantial interest in a New England air carrier was held by certain railroads, but the CAB early indicated that it would probably not look with favor on any increase in the railroads' control of this air carrier or on expansion of the air carrier's operations so long as it remained railroad-controlled (*Railroad Control of Northeast Airlines,* 4 C.A.B. 379 (1943)). Subsequently the railroads involved sold their holdings. Furthermore, when subsidiaries of two other railroads made application for authority to operate as common air carriers, those applications were denied (see Interstate Commerce Commission, Bureau of Transport Economics and Statistics, Historical Development of Transport Coordination and Integration in the United States (1950), p. 177).

The philosophy of the Civil Aeronautics Board is perhaps best expressed in certain cases relating to efforts of overseas steamship operators to particpate in foreign air service. The language used in these cases is at least indicative of the Board's attitude toward any future cases involving common

---

[1] The discussion in this appendix is couched in terms of secs. 401 and 408 of the Civil Aeronautics Act. Actually, these two sections were repealed by Public Law 85–726, August 23, 1958; but they were reenacted as secs 401 and 408 of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958. Administration of these two sections still rests with the Civil Aeronautics Board.

ownership in respect of air carriers and surface carriers engaged in domestic transportation.

The first line of decisions involved an attempt by American Export Lines, an ocean steamship company, to organize and then control an air carrier subsidiary in order to engage in foreign air transportation. The Board denied the application of the steamship company to control the air line because, it said, the requirements of section 408 (above quoted) were not met. The Board went on to say that section 408 applies not only when a surface carrier organizes a subsidiary to engage in air transportation but also when a surface carrier seeks to enter the field of air transportation directly by obtaining new operating rights under section 401 (certification) of the act.

At the request of several steamship companies the CAB later reconsidered its view that the provisions of section 408 apply in certificate proceedings (e.g., *North Atlantic Route*, 6 C.A.B. 319 (1945)). The conclusion of the Board, based on a different interpretation of the statute and the congressional intent, amounted to a reversal of its previous holding in the American Export case, since it was found that compliance with the restrictive requirements of section 408 could not properly be held a condition to the granting of air carrier operating rights to a surface carrier.

Importantly, however, the majority of the CAB indicated that the fact that an applicant was a surface carrier would nevertheless necessarily be weighed in reaching a rounded judgment on the question of fitness, willingness, and ability to engage in air transportation.

APPENDIX C

WATER CARRIER OPERATIONS

Under the Panama Canal Act of 1912 (now section 5(14–16) of the Interstate Commerce Act), restrictions are imposed on the ability of railroads to engage in water transportation whenever the water transportation in question does or may compete with the rail carrier itself. Where water transportation that is competitive with a rail carrier is carried on through the Panama Canal, the railroad is absolutely prohibited from having interest in the water carrier.[1] Where the water transportation is carried on elsewhere, a railroad may, even where the water service does or may compete with its own rail service, be allowed by the Interstate Commerce Commission to engage in water operations if it can be shown that this will not prevent such service "from being operated in the interest of the public and with advantage to the convenience and commerce of the people, and that it will not exclude, prevent, or reduce competition on the route by water under consideration."

As a result of this legislation and the refusal of the Interstate Commerce Commission, apparently as a matter of continuing policy, to find very much control of water carriers by railroads to be in the public interest, many railroad-water carrier relationships (principally on the Great Lakes) had to be dissolved; and in the view of many the Panama Canal Act has been and continues to be a rather effective bar to any new large-scale railroad participation in domestic water transportation.

[1] The railroads do not seek repeal of the specific and absolute prohibition as to the transportation through the Panama Canal.

INCREASE OF AUTHORIZATION FOR THE RESTORATION OF LOCK AND DAM NO. 3, BIG SANDY RIVER

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, for myself, my colleague, the junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON] and the Senators from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH and Mr. BYRD], I introduce for appropriate reference a bill which would increase the authorization of the Corps of Engineers for the restoration of lock and dam No. 3 on the Big Sandy River at Louisa, Ky., and Fort Gay, W. Va., from $50,000 to $90,000.

This restoration and authorization of $50,000 was approved in 1956 by Public Law 966 of the 84th Congress. Subsequently it has been ascertained that the information upon which the $50,000 figure was based was not obtained by the usual study of the Corps of Engineers, but was furnished as an estimate. It has now been determined by the Corps of Engineers that more than $90,000 is required for the project.

The local communities are willing and able to provide necessary rights of way and to maintain the lock and dam, as required in the original legislation. Their financial circumstances are such, however, that they are unable to contribute more to the restoration costs.

Of great importance, I think, is the fact that the Congress intended in its original action to authorize an adequate sum of money to complete satisfactorily the restoration of the dam. I believe, therefore, that we have the obligation to adjust the authorization to the correct and detailed estimate of cost. The bill which we are introducing today undertakes to do that by increasing to $100,000 the amount that is authorized for the lock and dam No. 3 project. The benefits to the two communities in providing a year-round water supply and recreational benefits, as contemplated in the original legislation, require prompt and favorable action.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1356) to amend the act authorizing the disposal of certain obsolete Federal locks and dams in order to increase a certain authorization in such act relating to dam No. 3 on the Big Sandy River, Ky., introduced by Mr. COOPER (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Works.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, I, too, am a cosponsor of the proposed amendment, and would like to speak in support of it.

I want to stress that the myriad of benefits to the Big Sandy Valley, which my colleague has outlined, was the original objective of the 84th Congress when, in the passage of Public Law 996, it provided a sum of $50,000 for the restoration of Dam No. 3. This restoration might already have been carried out if it had not been for the fact that a subsequent reevaluation of the project has shown that the original appropriation was inadequate.

The original cost estimate of $50,000 was incorporated into the measure on the assumption that the dam might be restored as a lock-type structure. Since that time, however, it has been decided that this method of restoration would be ill-advised, due to the deterioration of the dam. It is now suggested that a cutoff wall be built across the lock chamber, and that other rebuilding be carried out at a cost of nearly $100,000.

Therefore, Mr. President, you see that the proposed amendment now before us is not a new project in itself, but merely a rectification of an inaccuracy in the previous act. By approving this amendment, we will allow the original intention of the portion of Public Law 996 applying to Dam No. 3 on the Big Sandy River to be brought to fruition.

Therefore, I, too, express my wholehearted endorsement of this proposed amendment, and respectfully invite my colleagues in this body to join in its support.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I have today joined with the senior Senator from Kentucky in cosponsorship of an amendment to the act authorizing the disposal of certain obsolete Federal locks and dams, in order to increase a certain authorization to provide for the restoration of dam No. 3 on the Big Sandy River between West Virginia and Kentucky, and I wish to make a short statement in support of the amendment.

Dam No. 3, between the cities of Louisa, Ky., and Fort Gay, W. Va., is virtually useless in its present state. It is on the Government's obsolete list and is not used for navigation purposes. It merely sits in the Big Sandy River untended, with the unchecked stream coursing through it.

However, if the proposed restoration which is provided by this amendment could be carried out, dam No. 3 would again be of great benefit to the residents of the area. A large, beautiful reservoir of water would be created to enhance the region. It would assure the surrounding cities of an adequate water supply. It would serve as an attractive recreation spot. It would make possible the establishment of industries dependent upon water resources. It would contribute to flood control in the Big Sandy Valley. And it would bring to the area the many other advantages of a developed and controlled watercourse.

Therefore, Mr. President, I urge and recommend the prompt passage of this measure which would bring such benefits to the people of this border region of West Virginia and Kentucky.

PROMOTION AND CONSERVATION OF COAL RELATING TO COAL RESEARCH THROUGH CONTRACTS

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I am one of the several cosponsors of Senate bill 49, introduced by the Senator from

Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] to establish a Coal Research and Development Commission in order to encourage and stimulate the production and conservation of coal in this country. The program which would be authorized by that bill is an important one. I hope, and have reason to believe, that it will receive serious consideration by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

In order that our committee may consider a somewhat different approach to the same problem, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to carry out a research program through the existing staff of the Bueau of Mines, by contract, or otherwise. This bill is a companion measure to one offered in the other body on January 26 by my good friend Representative SAYLOR, of Pennsylvania, H.R. 3375.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in full at this point in my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1362) to encourage and stimulate the production and conservation of coal in the United States through research and development by authorizing the Secretary of the Interior, acting through the Bureau of Mines, to contract for coal research and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. ALLOTT, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Interior, acting through the Bureau of Mines shall—

(1) develop through research, new and more efficient methods of mining, preparing and utilizing coal;

(2) contract for, sponsor, cosponsor, and promote the coordination of, research with recognized interested groups, including but not limited to, coal trade associations, coal research associations, educational institutions, and agencies of States and political subdivisions of States;

(3) establish technical advisory committees composed of recognized experts in various aspects of coal research to assist him in the examination, evaluation, of research progress on all research proposals and contracts and to ensure the avoidance of duplication of research; and

(4) cooperate to the fullest extent possible with other departments, agencies, and independent establishments of the Federal Government and with State governments, and with all other interested agencies, governmental and nongovernmental.

SEC. 2. Research authorized by this act may be conducted wherever suitable personnel and facilities are available.

SEC. 3. No research shall be carried out, contracted for, sponsored, cosponsored, or authorized under authority of this act, unless all information, uses, products, processes, patents, and other developments resulting from such research shall be available to the general public. Whenever in the estimation of the Secretary of the Interior the purposes of this act would be furthered through the use of patented processes or equipment, the Secretary is authorized to enter into such agreements as he deems necessary for the acquisition or use of such patents on reasonable terms and conditions.

SEC. 4. (a) It is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to remain available until expended, not to exceed $20,000,000 to be used to carry out the purposes of this act for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1959.

(b) There is hereby authorized to be appropriated for each fiscal year beginning after June 30, 1960, such sums as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this act.

ADDITIONAL DISTRICT JUDGE FOR DISTRICT OF COLORADO

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, and my colleague, the junior Senator from Colorado [Mr. CARROLL], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill providing for the appointment of a third district judge for our State. The need for another judge is critical; the backlog of cases which continues to mount because of this void is appalling. And there is no slackening of this caseload in sight.

Our citizens are forced to wait endlessly between the time a case is filed and the time it is heard in court. Oftentimes, in Colorado, our people are forced to await their day in court for as long as 3 or 4 years.

Even in comparison with the national picture, the situation in Colorado stands out as singularly critical. The average time from filing to disposition of civil cases in Colorado is 21 months, compared with the national average of 14. Forty-six percent of the trials during recent years had to be conducted by visiting judges. This means that half of Colorado's judicial business in Federal courts was handled by visiting judges. The problem is compounded when we realize the time these good men had to take from their own areas in order to lend a hand in our State.

Mr. President, an injured claimant whose earning power has been terminated can run into terribly hard times without compensation when the decision is delayed for years as so often happens now. I know that my colleagues agree with me wholeheartedly that justice delayed is no justice at all and may even amount to injustice.

The appointment of a third judge in Colorado has long been a recognized necessity. It was recommended by the Judicial Conference in March 1955, and again a year later. We no longer can delay. It is our responsibility to provide this needed help. Congress no longer can turn its back on our people.

Mr. President, Colorado is one of the Nation's fastest growing States. We are forced to drop further and further behind in our efforts to give fair play to those of our citizens who seek recognition in the Federal courts. What a pathetic commentary on our Federal judicial system.

I ask that this bill receive the speedy attention of my colleagues so that the citizens of Colorado will no longer be denied the full advantage of our great system of justice, an advantage to which they are fully entitled.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1363) providing for the appointment of an additional district judge for the district of Colorado, introduced by Mr. ALLOTT (for himself and Mr. CARROLL), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the President shall appoint, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, an additional district judge for the District of Colorado. In order that the table contained in section 133 of title 28 of the United States Code will reflect the change made by this act in the number of judgeships for the District of Colorado, such table is amended to read as follows with respect to such district:

"Districts	Judges
* * * * *	
"Colorado	3
* * * * *	

ELIGIBILITY OF WELFARE AND RECREATION AGENCIES FOR FEDERAL SURPLUS PROPERTY

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 to authorize the disposal of surplus property to certain welfare agencies.

Under the present law, such surplus property can go only to medical institutions, health centers, schools, colleges, and related organizations. The proposed bill would broaden eligibility to include agencies such as the Salvation Army, Y.M.C.A., Y.W.C.A., Travelers Aid, and other similar organizations.

The bill grows out of recommendations drawn up by a national welfare assembly committee, which included members drawn from American Foundation for the Blind, Child Welfare League of America, Council of Jewish Federations and Welfare Funds, Council on Social Work Education, Girl Scouts, National Council of Churches of Christ in America, National Federation of Settlements and Neighborhood Centers, National Jewish Welfare Board, National Recreational Association, Salvation Army, United Community Funds and Councils, Young Men's Christian Association, and Young Women's Christian Association. In addition, the following organizations have expressed their interest in this subject: American Hearing Society, Board of Hospitals and Homes of the Methodist Church, National Catholic Community Service, and United HIAS Service.

My proposal contains carefully formulated language to insure that only tax-supported or tax-exempt welfare or recreation agencies would be eligible for this property. Also, a tax exempt voluntary agency would have to have a license from a State standard-setting agency, or receive funds through a State or local community fund, or be affiliated with or a part of a national standard-setting organization.

The present law, which limits eligibility for surplus Government property to educational and health organizations, should be expanded to include worthy welfare and recreational agencies. These include settlement houses, homes for the aged, youth centers, character building agencies, and adoption centers.

These agencies are doing a magnificent job of helping our young people, our aged, and many of our needy citizens. They need and can make good use of surplus property in their work.

Since the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare cooperated with the National Welfare Assembly Committee in drawing up the agreement out of which this bill grew, the bill deserves wide support and should be acted upon as soon as possible.

We should endeavor to help these worthy organizations in every possible way, for through them we will all be building a better America.

Mr. President, there was a great deal of interest evidenced in the proposed legislation in the last session of Congress, and I therefore ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed in the RECORD, and lie on the table for a period of 1 week, in order to give other Members the opportunity to cosponsor it if they desire to do so.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD, and lie on the desk for 1 week, as requested by the Senator from New York.

The bill (S. 1365) to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 to authorize the disposal of surplus property to certain welfare agencies, introduced by Mr. KEATING (for himself and Mr. WILEY), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Government Operations, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That paragraph (1) of subsection (j) of section 203 of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 (40 U.S.C., sec. 484), is amended by inserting immediately after "or for research for any such purpose" the following: ", or for utilization by welfare or recreation agencies".

SEC. 2. Paragraph (3) of such subsection (j) is amended—

(1) by inserting immediately after "or for research for any such purpose" the following: ", or for utilization by welfare or recreation agencies";

(2) by striking out "and (B)" and inserting "(B)"; and

(3) by inserting immediately after "Internal Revenue Code of 1954" the following: ", and (C) welfare or recreation agencies".

SEC. 3. Paragraph (2) of subsection (k) of such section 203 is amended—

(1) by striking out "or" at the end of subparagraph (D);

(2) by striking out "law," in subparagraph (E) and inserting in lieu thereof "law; or"; and

(3) by inserting immediately after such subparagraph (E) the following:

"(F) the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, in the case of property transferred pursuant to this act to welfare or recreation agencies—".

SEC. 4. Such section 203 is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(p) As used in this section, the term 'welfare or recreation agencies' means tax-supported or tax-exempt welfare or recreation agencies which serve people in institutions and in groups, but in the case of any such agency which is a tax-exempt voluntary agency, includes only an agency which meets at least one of the following criteria—

"(1) such agency is licensed by a State standard-setting agency;

"(2) such agency receives funds through a State or local community fund or similar federated fund-raising body; or

"(3) such agency is affiliated with, or is a part of, a national standard-setting organization."

AMENDMENT OF TITLE 14, UNITED STATES CODE, ENTITLED "COAST GUARD"

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, by request of the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend title 14, United States Code, entitled "Coast Guard," to authorize the Coast Guard to sell supplies and furnish services not available from local sources to vessels and other watercraft to meet the necessities of such vessels and watercraft. I ask unanimous consent that the letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, requesting the proposed legislation, be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letter will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1367) to amend title 14, United States Code, entitled "Coast Guard," to authorize the Coast Guard to sell supplies and furnish services not available from local sources to vessels and other watercraft to meet the necessities of such vessels and watercraft, introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

The letter presented by Mr. MAGNUSON is as follows:

MARCH 4, 1959.

The PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE:

SIR: There is transmitted herewith a draft of a proposed bill, "To amend title 14, United States Code, entitled 'Coast Guard,' to authorize the Coast Guard to sell supplies and furnish services not available from local sources to vessels and other watercraft to meet the necessities of such vessels and watercraft."

The purpose of the proposed legislation is to provide basic legislative authority similar to that possessed by the Navy in title 10, U.S.C. 7228, to authorize the Coast Guard to furnish necessary fuel, supplies, and services to vessels and watercraft that (1) are unable to procure the necessary supplies or services at their present location; and (2) are unable to proceed to the nearest port where they may be obtained without endangering the safety of the vessel or watercraft, the health and comfort of its personnel, or the safety of the property aboard.

The proposed legislation is not designed to impair or change the traditional giving of assistance and comfort by the Coast Guard to those found in distress whose pressing condition warrants immediate succor. It is intended rather to allow a reimbursement of costs to the Government in those cases where furnishing of a material or service is in the nature of a humanitarian gesture.

It would be appreciated if you would lay the proposed bill before the Senate. A similar bill has been transmitted to the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

The Department has been advised by the Bureau of the Budget that there is no objection to the submission of this proposed legislation to the Congress and that its enactment would be in accord with the program of the President.

Very truly yours,

A. GILMORE FLUES,
Acting Secretary of the Treasury.

SENIOR CITIZENS MONTH

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President I introduce, for appropriate reference, a joint resolution requesting the President to proclaim the month of May every year as Senior Citizens Month during which appropriate ceremonies and activities will be held in recognition of the contribution and capabilities of the growing number of citizens age 60 and over in the United States.

Slowly but surely, the attitude of our Nation toward its more than 21 million senior citizens past 60 is itself coming of age. No longer in our mind's eye do we automatically exile the aging to a quiet and unproductive retirement. We cannot afford to, for the advances of medical science resulting in a lengthening life span for all of us indicate that by 1980, nearly 35 million Americans—15 percent of our total population—will be 60 years or over. It is highly probable that this vast human resource of experienced and trained manpower at many levels of business and industry will constitute an indispensable element in the U.S. economy which must expand tremendously to keep pace with the needs of its own population and the demands of world markets.

However, if our senior citizens are to have an opportunity to play their role to the full—if we are to erase the old habit of thinking of them in the past, rather than in the present and future tense—I believe we should direct national attention to the problems confronting the aging as well as their contributions, their needs as well as their capabilities. Therefore, I am introducing this joint resolution which asks the President to proclaim May each year as Senior Citizens Month.

In the next two decades, the proportion of our population past 60 will increase more than 65 percent. This

means that all of us must be made aware now of the need to initiate and support legislation and promote programs aimed at preventing discrimination because of age in employment—only a handful of States presently have such a law on their books—and of equal importance providing special housing for older people including those who have retired and often live on sharply reduced incomes. The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare reports that less than 5 percent of the housing problems of the aged have actually been met so far by existing State and Federal efforts.

However, some progress has been made in the area of broadened social security for the aged which was passed by Congress last year, although further steps need to be taken. In 1957 the Center for Aging Research in the National Institutes of Health was established, marking a real step forward.

The appropriate ceremonies and activities to be held by States and localities in celebration of Senior Citizens Month should also focus on the tremendous desire of our aging to expand their horizons, to train for new tasks and to cultivate fresh interests. Nearly 3 million Americans past the age of 50 are attending adult education courses, including more than 50,000 Americans over 75 years of age. Their deep interest in courses in civic and public affairs, general education, trade courses, and classes offering business, technical, and agricultural training reflect the healthy, vigorous outlook of the great majority of our senior citizens who wish to continue developing their manual skills and mental capacity to benefit themselves, their families, and their Nation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 75) to provide for the designation of the month of May of each year as Senior Citizens Month, introduced by Mr. JAVITS, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

COMMISSION TO STUDY TELECOMMUNICATION RESOURCE

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a joint resolution to establish a commission to study and report on the United States telecommunication resource with special attention to the radio spectrum. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter from the Director, Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization, Executive Office of the President, relating to the proposed legislation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letter will be printed in the RECORD.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 76) to establish a commission to study and report on the United States telecommunication resource with special attention to the radio spectrum, introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

The letter presented by Mr. MAGNUSON is as follows:

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT,
OFFICE OF CIVIL AND DEFENSE MOBILIZATION,
Washington, D.C., March 3, 1959.

The Honorable RICHARD M. NIXON,
The President of the Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: The President, in his letter of March 3, 1959, recommended that the Congress establish a five-member commission on telecommunication to conduct a thorough and comprehensive study of certain problem areas of telecommunication management and allocation of radio frequencies which could not be examined by the Special Advisory Committee in the time available.

I believe that the President's purpose could be accomplished by the establishment of the recommended commission with the duty to conduct a thorough and comprehensive study of:

1. The role of the Federal Government in the management of the U.S. telecommunication resource.

2. The administrative organization for discharging the Government's responsibilities, with particular reference to the division of responsibility under the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, with a view to determining what changes, if any, should be made in the existing administrative organizations or statutes to improve the management of that resource.

3. The existing methods and procedures for allocating (apportioning) radio frequencies and bands of radio frequencies as between Federal Government and non-Federal Government users, with a view to determining what changes, if any, should be made to insure, insofar as practicable, the allocated frequencies may be utilized to the maximum degree possible, and to facilitate planning to take advantage of technological change in achieving maximum return from the use of the radio spectrum.

4. The existing national table of radio frequency allocations with respect to the apportionment of the various parts of the radio frequency spectrum as between Government and non-Government users, with a view to determining whether the current division of the spectrum serves the national interest to an appropriate degree and whether any frequency space (and if so, how much of such space) may, in the public interest, be reallocated to other uses.

The commission should be required to submit to the President for transmission to Congress within 12 months after the appointment and qualification of its members a report of the results of the study, together with such recommendations as the Commission may deem desirable and applicable. There is attached for your consideration a draft joint resolution designed to accomplish the foregoing.

I am addressing a similar letter to the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

Sincerely,

LEO A. HOEGH.

PRIORITY IN TEMPORARY EMPLOYMENT OF PERSONS IN TAKING 1960 CENSUS

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, the time is once again approaching when we must make preparations for taking a national census. Never before, Mr. President, has this Nation approached a decennial census task with so many unemployed, or so many people receiving social security benefits.

Mr. President, this is the responsibility of the executive branch to plan and execute the census. Those who do the actual interviewing and counting of heads throughout this great Nation are usually chosen because of certain political loyalties.

However, Mr. President, it is my observation that unemployment and social security coverage know no political bounds. In these trying days of making ends meet on a limited income we must take every possible step to make available employment opportunities to those persons receiving such incomes.

It is for this reason then, Mr. President, that I submit a concurrent resolution to express the sense of the Congress that the President take such action as is necessary to cause the Bureau of the Census to give priority to the recipients of social security when selecting individuals for temporary employment in connection with taking the 1960 census.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The concurrent resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 15) was referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That it is the sense of the Congress that the President take such action as may be necessary to cause the Bureau of the Census, in selecting individuals for temporary employment in connection with the taking of the 1960 census, to give priority, insofar as may be practicable without jeopardizing any priority that disabled veterans or others may now enjoy with respect to obtaining such employment, to applicants for such employment who are recipients of insurance benefits under title II of the Social Security Act; except that such priority shall not be accorded to such applicants in areas determined by the Secretary of Labor to be surplus-labor areas.

THE TEMPORARY UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION ACT OF 1959—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILL

Under authority of the order of the Senate of March 9, 1959, the names of Senators PASTORE and HARTKE were added as additional cosponsors of the bill (S. 1323) to authorize temporary unemployment benefits for individuals who exhaust their benefit rights under existing unemployment compensation laws, and for individuals who were employed in noncovered employment, introduced by Mr. MCNAMARA (for himself and other Senators) on March 9, 1959.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were

ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

Address entitled "The Need To Know," delivered by him at the national debate banquet held at Northwestern University, Evanston, Ill., on February 13, 1959.

By Mr. ENGLE:

Statement by him before Subcommittee on Education of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare on proposals for Federal aid to education.

By Mr. TALMADGE:

Editorial entitled "Can TALMADGE Bail Out U.S. Farm Program?" and letter from him to the Wall Street Journal published on February 26, 1959.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF OGDEN ROGERS REID TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY TO ISRAEL

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, as chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, I desire to announce that the Senate today received the nomination of Ogden Rogers Reid, of New York, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States to Israel, vice Edward B. Lawson.

In accordance with the committee rule, the pending nomination may not be considered prior to the expiration of 6 days.

AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATION TO THE NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1096) to authorize appropriation to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for salaries and expenses, research and development, construction and equipment, and for other purposes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I have a very brief statement to make at this time. I am obliged to be absent from the Chamber for a time, and for that reason I make the statement now.

First of all, I should like to commend the very able, distinguished, and dedicated Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] and the members of his subcommittee, who will very shortly present the bill in all its details. The members of the subcommittee are the very gracious and intelligent lady from Maine [Mrs. SMITH], the very able Senator from Ohio [Mr. YOUNG], the very able Senator from Iowa [Mr. MARTIN], the very able Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], and the very able Senator from Nevada [Mr. CANNON].

This subcommittee, ably assisted by its professional staff member, Max Lehrer, has done a thorough and expeditious job in handling the NASA supplemental authorization bill for 1959. All the pertinent facts were developed during the committee's hearings and the important highlights are set forth clearly in the committee report.

In introducing this bill, the senior Senator from New Hampshire and I were anxious to see that the National Aeronautics and Space Administration was provided with necessary supplemental authorization for fiscal year 1959. To assure that there would be no delay in the program due to any lack of funds, the 1959 requirements were separated from the requirements for 1960. The speed and thoroughness with which the committee has done the job is therefore most gratifying.

In considering the authorizations requested for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, there was complete agreement on the part of all members of the committee that we must be guided by only one standard—and that is to take whatever action is necessary in the national interest.

If that meant adding money, we were prepared to do so. If we could find places to economize, we were also prepared to do so.

The end result of the committee's consideration has been to recommend the authorization of supplemental appropriations for 1959 totaling $48,354,000. That is the exact amount requested.

This does not mean that the committee has simply rubber stamped the administration's request. The record of the detailed hearings and the comprehensive committee report amply demonstrate the thoroughness with which this supplemental request has been handled.

It was the considered judgment of the committee that the justifications presented for the 1959 supplemental authorization were sound and well supported.

Furthermore, while there are a number of problem areas that must be explored in connection with the 1960 program, the committee believes that the items covered by the 1959 supplemental authorization can be approved now with assurance that they will fit in with the program ultimately approved for 1960.

We may be sure that the Senator from Mississippi and his subcommittee will examine the 1960 NASA authorization request with the same completeness and dispatch with which they handled the 1959 bill. Before they complete their action, we hope they will have the benefit of the findings of the new subcommittee, headed by the junior Senator from Missouri, which we have appointed to look into Governmental Organization for Space Activities.

Mr. President, the Aeronautical and Space Sciences Committee has considered this bill with the widespread viewpoint of being as prudent as possible, yet providing fully for all essential requirements. This bill meets that test.

That was the recommendation of the subcommittee, and the subcommittee's recommendation was approved by each member of the full committee, of which I have the honor to be chairman.

The Aeronautical and Space Sciences Committee recommends that the bill be given favorable consideration, as reported. I shall await with great interest the details of the report to be presented by the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed a bill (H.R. 4282) to supplement and modify the act of May 24, 1828 (6 Stat. 383, ch. CXII), insofar as it relates to the corporate powers of the Sisters of the Visitation, of Georgetown in the District of Columbia, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H.R. 4282) to supplement and modify the act of May 24, 1828 (6 Stat. 383, ch. CXII), insofar as it relates to the corporate powers of the Sisters of the Visitation, of Georgetown in the District of Columbia, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

AUTHORIZATION OF SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION FOR THE NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION FOR FISCAL YEAR 1959

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business which is S. 1096.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1096) to authorize appropriation to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for salaries and expenses, research and development, construction and equipment, and for other purposes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. (Mr. MCGEE in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, S. 1096 is the first bill which has been reported to the Senate concerning legislation for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, which was created only last July 29. The hearings on the bill marked the first appearance before Congress of Dr. T. Keith Glennan and his able staff directly concerning proposed legislation for their Administration.

At the subcommittee hearing, there were present Dr. T. Keith Glennan, who is the Administrator; and also Dr. Hugh L. Dryden, the Deputy Administrator of NASA. Dr. Dryden was formerly Administrator of the NACA. Also present were Dr. Abe Silverstein, Director of

Space Flight Development; Mr. Edgar M. Cortright, chief of the advanced technology program; Dr. Homer E. Newell, Jr., Assistant Director for Space Sciences; Mr. DeMarquis D. Wyatt, Technical Assistant to the Director of Space Flight Development; and Mr. Ira H. Abbott, Assistant Director of Research—Aerodynamics and Flight Mechanics. I mention them by name because this is a new agency, and the presentations these gentlemen have made constitute their first presentation of proposed legislation. They have been organized as a staff and an administration for only a few months. We were very greatly and most favorably impressed with their ability, their dedication, and their very fine knowledge of the subject matter. The pioneer work they are doing seems to be well handled.

Mr. President, Senate bill 1096, which now is being considered by the Senate, authorizes supplemental appropriations totaling $48,354,000 for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for the fiscal year 1959. Copies of the hearings, together with a detailed committee report, are on the desks of Senators. I propose to cover the highlights of the bill, for the record.

Mr. President, the record of the hearings, which includes the testimony given in this case, sheds very interesting light upon this little known subject. I refer particularly to the Appendix, beginning on page 135 of the hearings, which includes remarkable photographic reproductions of a number of exhibits with reference to space flight, illustrations of a man placed in the instrument, reproductions of weather satellite pictures, and related matter. I think these will be of special interest to the Members of Congress and to the general public.

At this time I should like to state that the bill and the report were unanimously recommended by the subcommittee on which it is my privilege to serve as chairman. The bill and report have also been approved unanimously by the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences. So there are no real differences of opinion concerning the authorization covered by the bill.

In considering the bill, the committee addressed itself to three questions: First, are the projects sound and essential?; second, are the amounts requested enough to do the job?; third, are these amounts requested excessive at this time?

Before proceeding, it should be made clear that the bill covers only the supplemental requirements of NASA for the current fiscal year. While the bill incorporates the exact amounts requested by the Administration, the bill is not in the form originally requested. In January, the Administrator of NASA, with the approval of the Bureau of the Budget, submitted a draft authorization bill covering both the fiscal year 1959 and the fiscal year 1960, and requested its introduction. In view of the need for thorough examination and careful consideration of the overall space program proposed for the fiscal year 1960, and of the $485,300,000 requested for NASA for its part of that overall program, it was clear that combining the supplemental request for the fiscal year 1959 with the authorization for the fiscal year 1960 would involve needless delay for the former.

To assure expeditious provision of additional authorizations required for present needs, the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences separated its consideration of NASA needs for 1959 from its requirements for 1960. On behalf of the committee, Senators JOHNSON and BRIDGES introduced Senate bill 1096, which covers NASA's supplemental needs for 1959; and it is on this bill that the committee has held its hearings.

Mr. President, I may point out that under present law, and for another year, all authorizations for NASA, not only for new construction, but also all authorizations, including those for salaries and expenses and research and development, have to come before the Senate.

As shown on page 1 of the committee report, the total authorization of $48,354,000 breaks down into three major categories, as follows:

Salaries and expenses	$3,354,000
Research and development	20,750,000
Construction and equipment	24,250,000

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

The $3,354,000 supplemental item for salaries and expenses is required to cover the cost of salary increases enacted last year, but for which no funds were requested by the executive branch. This is essentially a mathematical computation, and involves no policy issue.

RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

The $20,750,000 supplemental for research and development is earmarked entirely for the manned space-flight program, known as project Mercury. These funds are needed in order to permit rapid progress to be made in developing our capability to put man into space.

At the present time, most of our research in the space field involves the development of incredibly complex devices to perform the complicated tasks necessary for the mastery of space. The capabilities and complexity of many of these devices stagger the imagination. Nevertheless, no machine devised can substitute for the analytical and decision-making abilities of the human mind. All our scientists are in agreement that space exploration and exploitation will require the participation of human beings, in order to cope with unanticipated problems and provide the flexibility of action that is beyond the capabilities of machines.

For this reason, we are engaged in an aggressive program to develop our capabilities for manned space flight. The 1959 budget for NASA already contains some $37,660,000 for project Mercury. The $20,750,000 additional authorization in this bill will increase the 1959 program to $58,400,000. The budget request for 1960 for project Mercury is $70 million; and Dr. Glennan, the Administrator of NASA, has testified:

> Before we have completed this first U.S. effort to put man into space, the bill will have exceeded $200 million.

It is clear that the development of capabilities for space flight will be an expensive proposition; and Dr. Glennan is to be commended for his candor in putting the facts before us. However, even the reference to a $200 million cost for completing the first U.S. effort to put man into space does not tell the full story.

If project Mercury is successful—and it is essential that it be successful—we can soon expect to be spending billions of dollars a year on various types of space vehicles, unless there is a drastic change in the world situation.

We must make no mistake about this: Space flight is of the highest importance and of the highest practicality. Very properly, NASA is stressing the peaceful, scientific aspects of space flight, of which project Mercury is the first major step.

Even more significant, however, are the military potentialities of successful space flight.

At the present time, our national security is primarily dependent upon our nuclear deterrents. With every passing day, we are placing more and more reliance on ballistic missiles. Of course, Soviet Russia has been doing the same thing. At best, we can hope that this will result in a nuclear standoff.

Consider, however, what would happen if any adversary outstripped the United States in the development of manned space vehicles that could deliver nuclear weapons. The effect on our security could be disastrous. For this reason, we must continue to press forward with the development of manned space vehicles.

On page 2 of the report will be found a breakdown of the $20,750,000 requested for project Mercury in 1959. Four million dollars of this is for the design, engineering, and early construction phases of a program involving the delivery of 12 satellite capsule systems.

On page 146 of the hearings on the pending bill will be found a picture of just what a capsule system is.

Sixteen million dollars is for four Redstone and four Atlas boosters, which will be used for short-range test and qualification flights. Two hundred thousand dollars is for data acquisition and handling equipment, $500,000 is for simulators and other training equipment, and $50,000 is for miscellaneous research and development costs.

CONSTRUCTION AND EQUIPMENT

The third principal segment covered by the bill is for $24,250,000 for construction and equipment. As shown on page 2 of the report, this, in turn, consists of three major items: $9,000,000 is for expansion and relocation of facilities at the Jet Propulsion Laboratory, Pasadena, Calif.; $12,050,000 will provide for the expansion of tracking facilities needed to cover the satellites and space

vehicles to be flown during the next 12 to 18 months; $3,200,000 will cover the cost of additional propulsion development facilities needed for the development and test of the 1-million-pound-thrust, single-chamber rocket engine.

Since the committee report and the hearings cover the individual items covered by these amounts in considerable detail, I will not attempt to go into them at this time. I will, however, touch upon a few of the additional highlights. For example, page 3 of the report gives a breakdown of the $9 million required for relocation and expansion of the facilities at the Jet Propulsion Laboratory, and the individual line items covered by these amounts are listed on pages 35 through 37 of the report. The committee went into this in some detail, and the hearings developed the fact that this expansion was necessary to permit the outstanding work being done at the Jet Propulsion Laboratory to continue.

This is another story, Mr. President, of very small beginnings of the Jet Propulsion Laboratory at the site in Pasadena, leading to a greatly expanding program and new developments. Now, in connection with the present need, the laboratory must be expanded, the grounds must be enlarged, and additional buildings must be constructed.

The $12,050,000 for tracking facilities is discussed on pages 3, 4, and 5 of the report. A summary of the amounts requested is shown on page 5 and the specific line items are listed on page 37 of the report.

Mr. President, with reference to many of our warning systems, as a member of the Armed Services Committee, I am familiar, at least to a degree, with the very expensive installations that are necessary for the different systems, with the possibility of duplication as between those programs and other programs, and the possibility of duplication in the new programs for the development of satellite and space vehicles. We are certainly trying to avoid the duplication of systems or the duplication of expenditures.

The additional tracking facilities will involve nine new tracking sites. Only two of these are in the continental United States, while the remaining sites are planned to be located in Alaska, Newfoundland, Europe, Australia, South Africa, Hawaii, and Bermuda. Senators will all be interested to know that it is hoped to locate these new stations either on existing United States property or on leased land, so that no new land purchases will be involved. Each of the tracking stations will require an area of some 30 to 50 acres for initial installation, plus an additional 30 to 50 acres to allow for possible future expansion. However, these stations will not require many people to operate them. Present plans call for the employment of an average of 20 to 25 persons at each of these tracking stations.

Even though the number of personnel seems small—and it is hoped it will be kept small—it illustrates the ever-increasing need of money to operate our present military systems, in which more and more areas of development, more and more instruments, and more and more manpower, are required. Our concern is not so much the initial cost of the project, which is large, as will be the cost of operations in years to come.

On pages 5 through 10, the committee report devotes considerable space to the $3,200,000 requested for propulsion development facilities required for the 1 million pound thrust engine—a highly important part of our entire space program.

Simply stated, the committee encountered what appears to be some confusion in the assignment of funding responsibility between the various governmental agencies involved in the space program. In view of the urgent need for providing funds for these development facilities now, the committee has not attempted to resolve the basic problems involved, since considerable time will be required to do so. The committee is satisfied, however, that an appropriate interim solution has been effected, and intends to review the situation in considerable detail in connection with consideration of the 1960 authorization request.

While the committee did not examine the 1960 NASA program in any detail, it did consider it sufficiently to assure that the items and amounts recommended for 1959 were necessary and were consistent with the overall program planned for 1960. Needless to say, the space program involves many uncertainties, and any estimates of timing and costs in this area are subject to some variation.

Mr. President, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration did not come into being in time for it to have available the usual number of weeks and months which are considered necessary, as a minimum, to give an agency an opportunity to prepare its budget properly.

However, we believe the hearings demonstrate that the program presented for 1959 is sound and well conceived, and that the cost estimates are as reliable as is to be expected in a program of this sort.

As indicated at the outset of my remarks, the committee was concerned with three questions: First, are these sound and essential projects; second, are the amounts requested enough to do the job; and, third, are the amounts requested excessive at this time?

The testimony given to the subcommittee leaves no doubt about the essentiality of the items covered by this supplemental authorization bill.

With respect to the adequacy of funds, Dr. Glennan, the Administrator of NASA, has stated categorically that the supplemental authorization bill provides the amounts needed to do the job and that he could see no additional funding requirements for fiscal year 1959.

With respect to the need for the funds, the committee examined the programs in some detail and could find no basis for either reducing or deferring any of the amounts requested.

DUPLICATION

We are all aware of the waste and unnecessary expenditure of funds that has arisen from unnecessary duplication in the military missile programs. We must not permit these same mistakes to be made in the new missile programs. To meet this situation, the chairman of the Aeronautical and Space Sciences Committee, the distinguished majority leader, has appointed a Subcommittee on Governmental Organization for Space Activities, under the chairmanship of the distinguished junior Senator from Missouri. The findings of this subcommittee will be very helpful in acting on the authorizations for fiscal year 1960.

In considering the 1959 supplemental authorizations, the committee was concerned about any possible duplication with the military departments with respect to any of the items covered by the supplemental request. Accordingly, this was gone into in considerable detail in the subcommittee hearings. In addition, to assure that there would be no possible misunderstanding in this matter, a letter was sent to the Secretary of Defense and each of the service Secretaries, asking them to examine the record and to inform the committee whether they agreed with the NASA witnesses that there was no such duplication. The Secretary of Defense and each of the military departments affirmed that no such duplication existed. These letters appear on pages 25 through 27 of the report, and a number of significant excerpts from the hearings are shown on pages 13 to 18 of the report. I mention this in some detail because I believe this information will be helpful in answering letters from the public expressing their valid concern about possible duplication in this field.

VALUE OF SPACE PROGRAM

In view of the large prospective costs involved in the space program—involving the expenditure of billions of dollars per year within the next few years—we must obviously consider whether such expenditures are justified. I have already mentioned, in connection with project Mercury, one overriding aspect of the potential military significance of space vehicles. It is important to note that there are also important nonmilitary advantages that may result from the space program. Direct advantages, involving demonstrable benefits involving hundreds of millions and perhaps billions of dollars, can be expected from the application of space technology to such areas as meteorology, communications, and navigation. Satellites may also play an important role in the detection of high altitude nuclear explosions, thus making a vital contribution to our national security. In order to provide material that might be useful in answering public questions on this matter, the report contains, on pages 20 through 24, a number of excerpts from the testimony before the subcommittee concerning the value of the space program.

Mr. President, we emphasize this at this point because it is a new program, and there needs to be a further dissemination of knowledge and information as to the practical aspects and practical values, military as well as nonmilitary.

For example, there is this statement by Dr. Glennan quoted on page 21 of the report:

> The cost of our space programs will continue, year after year, and it will increase, year by year.
>
> I couldn't begin to say precisely what the payoffs will be, or how soon they will be realized. We expect that in the relatively near future satellites will be widely used in meteorology—witness this Vanguard II cloud cover experiment—and in worldwide communications.
>
> Experts in those fields have estimated that the value of such advances will be counted in the billions of dollars.

On that same page of the report, there is quoted the following statement by Dr. Glennan:

> The things that we expect to find in those areas, which thus far have been identified as possibly to be of use commercially or in a military sense, such as the weather forecasting business, many people have estimated that these would pay many times over the cost of the programs on which we are embarking.
>
> Communications the same way. It may, indeed, be some way, the only way, in which we will be able to handle communications in the future may be through satellite channels.
>
> The return in general scientific information is never possible of pricing, but throughout the time that we have been pursuing scientific investigations of this sort, we have always found that there was a payoff at some point along the line.

The Vanguard II satellite which was launched on February 17 was the first of a series of satellite experiments designed to obtain truly worldwide weather observations. I should like to read a portion of the testimony given to the subcommittee by Mr. Edgar Cortright in this planned use of satellites. This appears on pages 60 and 61 of the subcommittee hearings:

> Now the reason the earth satellite will be so beneficial to meteorology, we feel, is twofold: One, it enables us for the first time to get truly worldwide weather observations, and secondly, by virtue of its position above the earth's atmosphere, the satellite will make possible measurements which have never been possible before.
>
> Now, some of these measurements are indicated in the first chart here. They include, most obviously, observations of the clouds over the earth's surface. From these observations we hope to be able to determine the extent of cloud coverage, the types of clouds, their layers, thicknesses, heights above the earth, and that sort of thing.
>
> And then we would hope to be able to measure precipitation, associated with the clouds, and the location of the thunderstorms under the blanket of clouds by the electrical disturbances resulting from lightning flashes.
>
> Another set of measurements would be directed to the determination of temperatures of the stratosphere, tropopause, cloud tops, and surface of the earth. I think it is interesting to point out here that we feel ocean currents may be tracked by surface temperatures, and these are related to weather, in general.
>
> There is also hope of being able to determine some of the constituents of the atmosphere, and their distribuiton, such as water vapor, ozone, and carbon dioxide.
>
> Then there is a whole set of experiments which can be related to what is frequently referred to as the heat budget of the earth. This is essentially the local imbalance between incoming solar radiation, reflected solar radiation, and outgoing radiation from the atmosphere and the earth.
>
> Now, all of these measurements are detected by radiation sensing devices such as television cameras, radar, photocells, and thermistor bolometers.
>
> There has been one practical demonstration of this utility.
>
> A photograph was obtained from a rocket a hundred miles over White Sands, and in the outer region of the photograph was a rather severe cyclonic disturbance building up over the gulf coast of Texas. Now, interestingly enough, the Weather Bureau stations in the area were not able to detect this disturbance, and yet the high altitude photograph shows it very clearly. This disturbance did develop into a severe one causing considerable damage from heavy rainfall.

It is obvious that improved knowledge of weather conditions will be important from the viewpoint of increasing the comfort and safety of the American people. Perhaps not as obvious is the fact that it will provide definite benefits which can be measured in dollars and cents, particularly in the field of agriculture.

Before concluding, Mr. President, I should like to invite my colleagues' attention to the fact that the hearings contain a series of striking pictures and illustrations of a number of significant elements of the space program. This is contained in an appendix to the hearings which starts on page 135. Many of these pictures have not been published previously and will be of considerable interest to the public, as well as to the members of this body.

In conclusion, Mr. President, I should like to express my appreciation to the other members of the subcommittee, the Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. YOUNG], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MARTIN], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. CANNON].

I think every single one of the members of the subcommittee was present at each of the hearings, except for a part of one of the hearings when one Member had to be away. Every member was present at the markup of the bill, as I recall; and every member except one, who was unavoidably detained, was present for the full committee consideration of the bill. I especially appreciate their fine attitudes and their wonderful help in grasping this subject, in writing up the bill, and in presenting it to the full committee and presenting it today to the Senate.

Mr. President, the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences recommends the bill be given favorable consideration, as reported.

Mrs. SMITH. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BARTLETT in the chair). The Senator from Maine is recognized.

Mrs. SMITH. Mr. President, the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee has made his usual able and comprehensive presentation of the pending bill. I see no need, therefore, to go into any further detail on this matter.

I do want to say that I am in complete accord with the remarks of the chairman, and join with the other members of the committee in recommending approval of the bill as presented to the Senate.

The committee has made a rather painstaking review of the items covered in the supplemental authorization, and concluded that the programs which were presented merited the wholehearted support of the Congress and the American people. We must be frank to say, however, that it is impossible for any individual to state categorically that each and every item is of equal soundness and that each and every cost estimate is correct.

We are all keenly aware of the rapid progress and change which are occurring in all areas of technology today. In no field is the rapid change more pronounced than in the area of space activities.

As is customary in hearings of this sort, the witnesses from NASA were sworn in at the beginning of their testimony. Dr. Homer E. Newell, the Assistant Director for Space Sciences of NASA, prefaced his testimony with these remarks:

> Now when we first came in here you asked all of us to swear to tell you the truth. One of the difficulties in this discussion is going to be that we do not always know the truth.

Obviously when we are dealing in a field in which even the most competent scientists cannot be sure of what the facts are, the individual members of the committee have no basis for interposing technical judgments of their own. We can, however, judge the competence of the witnesses appearing before us, and examine the rationale and methodology underlying the estimates their programs presented to us. This we have done.

I am sure I speak for the committee as a whole when I say that we were encouraged and impressed by the ability and the candor of Dr. Glennan, Dr. Dryden, Dr. Silverstein, and the other witnesses appearing before our committee. We believe that the program which has been presented is logical and has been prepared carefully. The witnesses have indicated that they recognize the need for getting the maximum return from every dollar spent on this program.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, we on the NASA authorization subcommittee feel that we are very fortunate indeed in having the distinguished Senator from Mississippi as chairman of our subcommittee. What I say today will be brief, and to the point, I hope.

At the outset I wish to express my complete agreement with the remarks made by the Senator from Mississippi. Also, I listened with great interest and with complete agreement to the remarks

of the distinguished Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH].

On our authorization subcommittee, as well as in the full Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences, of course politics cuts no figure whatever. We are all trying to render real and needed service to our country in this grim period of international anarchy.

The bill involves a total of $48,354,000. However, this is only a downpayment on a program that will inevitably grow in size, cost and importance in the years ahead.

The Senator from Mississippi has stated that in the not-too-distant future we may expect to be spending billions of dollars a year for space activities. This is certainly a sobering thought.

What the Senator from Mississippi and the Senator from Maine have had to say certainly furnishes a subject for sober thought on the part of all of us, as well as on the part of the American people as a whole.

In the very short time that it has been my privilege to serve as a member of the Space Committee, I have been asked a number of times: "Why spend money on space activities when there are so many important things to do here in the United States?" I may have asked the same question myself at the outset.

The distinguished Senator from Mississippi has already mentioned a number of the military and nonmilitary applications of satellites and other space vehicles. Informed estimates have been made that the increased knowledge about the weather that may be obtained through meteorological satellites may result in ultimate savings of billions of dollars—not millions, but billions. Similarly, any price tag put on the potential value of communications satellites at this time would probably be far too small.

Despite some of the obvious benefits from the space program that we can see now, I do not believe we can consider the problem on this narrow basis. In this connection, I should like to quote from a colloquy between the distinguished Senator from Nevada [Mr. CANNON] and Dr. Dryden, which appears on pages 53 and 54 of the hearings:

Senator CANNON. Doctor, yesterday you heard me ask Dr. Glennan about the value of this program in view of the fact that the American public is going to be very vitally concerned with having approximately a billion dollars a year spent on a space program.

Dr. DRYDEN. Yes, Senator.

Senator CANNON. In view of budgetary problems at the present, I would like to have you state your views as to the value of this program, compared to its cost, in our overall budget picture today.

Dr. DRYDEN. Yes, sir.

I think I mentioned that the situation is a little bit like determining the value of the airplane at the time of the Wright brothers. We have the utmost confidence, based on the past, if nothing more, that man is going to be in space, find useful things to do in space; that we must begin to study the problems associated with that.

This project, in my mind, will advance the general technology of space at a faster rate than almost anything else that I can think of.

If you do not have such an integrating project, what you get engaged in is a lot of research in various directions but not concentrated on accomplishing a mission, and we found in the X–15, for example, that this enabled a much greater integration and advance in the technology of high-speed flight than you could get by all sorts of general research.

Now, basic research is necessary, but this must be followed by research directed toward a mission to work out the applied research and the development problems, and this, I think, is one of the great returns which will come.

A secondary result of all of this work already reflected rather widely throughout our industrial structure or the developments in materials, devices, fabricating methods which come because this is at the forefront of our technology. The most difficult jobs that you could possibly think of.

Take the rapid development of transistorized and miniaturized equipment. To do these early satellites you have to make those developments.

Now as a byproduct, this has given you hearing aids that are in your spectacles. I do not mean to imply the space program has done this. The electronics program which was certainly stimulated by our missile program in this direction, has brought you such devices, and very small radios and all the rest of it.

The things developed in our ballistic missile program and space program have a tremendous influence in directions that you would not think of at the start.

Now, from a purely practical point of view, as I mentioned in the beginning, I do not think you could go to a banker and sell him on security and prove to him that you know just how he is going to get his money back. But again I say, if you look back at the airplane you could not have proved, in fact I mention that as a result of the lack of faith in our own country, the airplane was taken abroad and developed in other countries, and we entered the First World War without an airplane of our own and we had to buy them from other countries.

Now, you couldn't prove at that time the industry that you see today. No one looking at the wire and wood over here in the Smithsonian could contemplate, it is amazing now, that in 50 years you have gone from that to the big bombers, to the jet transports that we see today.

I think there is every confidence that space is going the same way. I don't know how fast; how fast depends on how much money you put into it.

I think Dr. Glennan made this point: that if it were not for the competitive aspect of the situation, perhaps it wouldn't go this fast, it wouldn't put this much money into it, but you would go in this direction, and if we don't someone else is.

Of course I refer directly to the Soviet Union. I emphasize Dr. Dryden's last few words: "If we don't, someone else is." This is really the heart of the problem. This program will be increasingly costly—but it would be even more costly to us as a Nation if we failed to devote our resources, skill, and determination to the new and vital dimension of space.

In short, we have no other alternative but to pursue this program with all the energy at our command. Since this is so, we must also assure that costly duplication is avoided, so that every dollar invested in the program brings us a full dollar's return.

Obviously we must promote and accelerate our space program so that we shall not lag behind.

In spite of the obvious benefits from the space program apparent to all, I suggest we should not consider the problem on a narrow basis.

Our military potential is only one of a variety of elements upon which the safety of this Nation and its people depends.

Today, in our efforts to halt the aggression of the Soviet Union and of Soviet expansion throughout the world, we find ourselves engaged in a tremendous struggle for the minds of mankind.

More than half of the people of this world live in abject poverty and in ignorance.

Every night more than half of the world's people go to bed hungry.

To such hundreds of millions of people we should demonstrate that our way of life and our system of government is the way of liberty and peace in this troubled world.

This is an age of challenge. This Nation must be in the forefront of all the nations of the world in fields of science.

We take a forward step by today voting in the affirmative and passing this bill. In fact, we have no alternative but to pursue this program with all the energy at our command.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, I very heartily concur with the report of the committee on the NASA authorization bill and with the explanation of the committee's action set forth so lucidly by the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS]. I consider it a privilege to be associated with him and the other members of the subcommittee in dealing with this important field.

I do not intend to discuss further the various specific items covered by the $48,354,000 authorized by this bill, since they have already been covered fully and adequately. I would like to comment briefly, however, on one particular matter that I believe will be of interest to the Members of this body.

The $9 million authorized for relocation and expansion of the Jet Propulsion Laboratories at Pasadena, Calif., includes $375,000 for the acquisition of approximately 68 acres of land. The committee hearings developed the fact that 7 acres of this land is proposed to be acquired at a cost of $75,000 in order to prevent it from being used for commercial or housing purposes when a current lease expires on July 1, 1959. This is the last parcel of land contiguous to the site of the Jet Propulsion Laboratory that could be used for future expansion.

This proposed transaction raised in the committee's mind the question of the future role of the Jet Propulsion Laboratory. Certainly we did not want to be in the position of investing $9 million at this site now, only to find in a few years that the Laboratory could no longer function because of its inability to expand further, so that it would then be necessary to scrap our investment and rebuild at a new site.

The committee has been assured that this will not be the case. With these land acquisitions, the Jet Propulsion Laboratory will be able to continue its outstanding work in the years ahead.

There will be certain experiments, particularly those involving hazardous types of fuels, which will not be able to be carried out at the site of the Jet Propulsion Laboratory. However, the 1960 program for NASA includes provision for a new propulsion development facility, remote from urban areas, which will be used for research involving toxic high energy propellants. Even though such experiments will be carried out at this new, and as yet undetermined, location, the NASA expects to continue important work at the present site of the Jet Propulsion Laboratory for many years to come.

I very heartily concur in the report presented by the able chairman of the subcommittee and urge immediate action on the bill.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, my remarks will be brief, since the basic considerations involved in the bill before us have already been presented fully and clearly by the very able chairman of the subcommittee, the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] and by the succeeding speakers.

To a very large extent, I believe that the unanimity with which the subcommittee has spoken and given its approval to the bill is an expression of confidence in our chairman.

As a member of the subcommittee that considered and unanimously approved S. 1096, I should like to express my support of this measure and join in the remarks that have been made by the other members of the committee.

The unanimous committee vote in favor of the NASA supplemental authorization bill was an expression of Senate determination to give our scientists all the help we can give them as they struggle with the problems of outer space technology.

We are not scientists. We have no yardstick by which to measure the needs of this unprecedented program. But we do know of the fearful responsibility which rests upon the staff of NASA. And we know the men of NASA. We have had a chance to observe them and to talk with them, and to hear their testimony. I believe I speak for all members of the subcommittee when I say that they have inspired confidence in us. They have our confidence in their ability and their dedication.

Our space program, as has been suggested, is an indispensable element in our national survival in this awesome era, when one technological development might well spell freedom or slavery for this planet.

But, more than that, we dimly see the broad vistas of peaceful progress that conquest and exploration of outer space open before us.

We all want to help this program in every way possible.

Mention has already been made of the committee's concern about possible duplication in space activities. This is something that cannot be stressed too strongly. While we must invest the amounts that are necessary to pursue these important space programs, we cannot afford the luxury of waste and duplication.

Because of the doubts as to whether the various space programs are organized properly to avoid costly duplication, the distinguished majority leader has created a new Subcommittee on Governmental Organization for Space Activities to study and review this problem area. I consider it a privilege to serve on this new subcommittee.

Dr. Wernher von Braun pointed out in a recent hearing that it is time to be rethinking our national philosophy as regards space exploration. Up to now, space exploration has been a sort of by-product of our ballistic missiles programs. We have now reached the point where the space program must be set up on its own feet with an organization and appropriations equal to its great task.

But reorganization lies in the future. Right now we can best help by giving to the men of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration an expression of our confidence and our encouragement, and by voting the money which this agency needs for the next few months.

I join with the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS], the chairman of our subcommittee, and my other distinguished colleagues, in urging the passage of this measure.

TRAGIC CONDITIONS OF UNEMPLOYMENT IN WEST VIRGINIA

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, the matter about which I rise to speak is one of crucial importance to our Nation, and one which, although often brought to the attention of Congress, I feel needs to be raised again and again until it is eventually resolved.

I refer to the tragic and disgraceful economic conditions which have settled upon America's regions of chronic unemployment.

On last Wednesday, Thursday, and Friday, I returned to my State of West Virginia in order to hold public hearings, as a member of the Senate Subcommittee on Production and Stabilization, on aid-to-depressed-areas legislation. For 3 days, from morning until late evening, the subcommittee viewed a grim and disheartening picture of the suffering which has come to once-prosperous coal-mining areas, glass producing cities, agricultural counties, and other portions of the State. Even though the desperation of the unemployed has long been known to me, I came away more appalled than ever that such senseless and purposeless hardship could be allowed to exist in our booming, thriving Nation.

In the course of the hearings, the evidence of the painful dilemma of economic desperation was repeated again and again. The bleak story was told and retold of how thousands of strong-bodied men who are able to work and eager to work are being forced to stand idle and watch themselves and their families sink deeper into terrible destitution.

Although this disheartening situation exists in many scattered regions of the United States today, I should like to present just the West Virginia picture, as it was exhibited to me at the hearings.

I may say, Mr. President, that I was fortunate in having attending with me at the hearings the distinguished senior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH], who is a cosponsor of S. 722, introduced by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] and cosponsored by 37 additional Senators. I was very much pleased that the senior Senator from West Virginia could attend the hearings for the 2 full days. He participated in the questioning of the witnesses and made statements concerning the proposed legislation. I am confident that he will verify the conditions which I am about to reveal.

Government officials testified that an estimated 89,700 West Virginians have lost their jobs and have been unable to find new work. This means that 13.6 percent of West Virginia's working men and women—or more than one person out of every eight—is without a means of livelihood. Of this large number, a total of 53,331 men and women are now receiving small unemployment benefits of one sort or another under various programs, while the rest—who have exhausted their benefits or could not qualify for them in the first place—are receiving nothing at all. This high rate of unemployment, coupled with a serious degree of only part-time employment in many of the industries, has had agonizing, far-reaching effects which have touched many corners of the State's way of life. Welfare officials testified that a total of 278,000 West Virginians are receiving surplus Government foods in an effort to stave off hunger, even though these commodities provide only a fraction of the minimum nutritional needs. Business officials testified that retail sales have slumped considerably—as much as 35 percent in some items in some cities—causing the pinch of declining profits to be felt by many, and causing hundreds of smaller business establishments to go under. Law enforcement authorities testified that lawlessness and theft of food and clothing are growing in the seriously affected areas. Welfare officials said doctors are finding rickets among children; and other diseases long thought to have been eradicated are making their reappearance. One welfare worker reported that in many instances the fathers of families had deserted the families, in order that the wives and children would become eligible for welfare support under the State public assistance program. One sheriff testified that many men in his county are turning to moonshining as a means of earning a meager income. Throughout the State, witnesses said, time and again, that the blight which has come to their respective communities is as critical as that during the terrible depression of the 1930's. Even some cases of actual starvation were reported.

Mr. President, this is nearly a life or death matter in those stricken, helpless communities. It is a matter of children going hungry to school in the morning, and then finding that the school hot-lunch program has been canceled because

too few youngsters are able to pay for it. It is a matter of conscientious, hard-working couples who have spent much of their lives paying for a home suddenly seeing that home lost to them. It is a matter of families watching their automobiles, appliances, and furniture being repossessed or sold in a desperate effort to obtain money for day-to-day necessities.

Therefore, Mr. President, I feel that it is imperative that bold steps—both emergency and long range—be carried through to alleviate these evil conditions, before the damage now being felt is imparted to coming generations.

On the basis of those hearings, it is my belief that this grave menace must be attacked from two fronts. First we must concentrate on emergency measures to sustain the unfortunate persons who are caught in the jaws of unemployment. Second, we must work for long-range measures that will provide a healthy rebuilding in the economic sore spots, and will prevent future recurrences of hardship. This will give us a one-two approach to the problem, allowing us to aid the stricken areas now, and giving them a chance for better conditions in the future.

Among the emergency measures now before us which I feel are desperately needed by the regions of hardship are the following:

First, an extension of the Government's temporary unemployment compensation program. This vital program, which presently is saving hundreds of thousands of American families from serious hunger, is due to expire March 31, just 3 weeks from today. My senior colleague from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH] and I have joined with other Senators in cosponsoring proposed legislation which will permit a continuation of this very vital legislation.

Mr. President, if the Congress allows this most necessary relief effort to lapse, it will stifle the hopes of these families, and perhaps will prolong the economic recession in their regions.

Second, I believe that the emergency foods bill which my colleague from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH] and I, together with 24 other Senators, have introduced, is a badly needed emergency measure. The 278,000 West Virginians to whom I referred earlier are only a portion of the 5.2 million Americans who are dependent upon Government surplus commodities; and these commodities provide only a meager fraction of the nutritional needs for even the lowest standards of health. By permitting the purchase of additional, more varied, foods to supplement the diets of these people, we shall be insuring that they and their children will not fall victim to the infirmities of the impoverished, backward countries of the world.

Third, another emergency measure that is sorely needed is one for a public works program that will create jobs for the idle men in our depressed areas. If we can put them to work on projects to serve their fellow citizens, we shall not only utilize for good ends their now unused abilities, but we shall also make it possible for them to support their families without the stultifying onus of receiving free handouts.

These are some of the temporary, emergency steps that may be taken, Mr. President. On a long-range, lasting basis, however, it is my belief—and I am sure that my senior colleague from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH] joins me in this—that the salvation of our Nation's depressed areas must lie in area redevelopment legislation such as that now being considered by the Banking and Currency Committee's Subcommittee on Production and Stabilization.

It is evident that the immediate need for this type of legislation is recognized throughout Congress, judging by the large number of bills for area redevelopment which have been introduced. But it is my belief that only the most forceful and far-reaching of the measures is adequate to deal with the tremendous task at hand. Thus it is that I have given my support and cosponsorship to the most ambitious of the bills—that produced by the genius and insight of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS]. I believe that, if our areas of economic blight are ever to be restored to health, it must be done through a bold program which will bring in new industries and new jobs and will stimulate private initiative and private enterprise in the depressed areas, as only the Douglas bill is equipped to do.

It is interesting to note that, among the learned leaders of my State who were given opportunity to study the various area-redevelopment proposals which have been made, virtually all of them—and I speak of the Governor of West Virginia, the director of the department of employment security, the director of the department of public assistance, and the many other government officials of West Virginia—gave unanimous endorsement to the Douglas bill in their testimony before the hearings in West Virginia last week. These men, who live with this problem every day, evinced nearly unanimous belief that only the strongest and most energetic program would be capable of meeting the needs of a region that has suffered economic atrophy due to a long-term decline in employment.

In conclusion, Mr. President, I wish to reemphasize that the need is so great in our Nation's areas of chronic unemployment that it can be met only by a forceful program of both emergency and long-range measures. All these steps, and perhaps many others, must be taken without delay if America is to aid her citizens who have fallen victim to unemployment, and who have been allowed to languish all too long in their plight.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, will my esteemed colleague from West Virginia yield?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, it is a pleasure for me to yield to the senior Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, if I were to indulge in a pleasantry, it would not be appropriate. Sometimes, when reading the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and finding that a Senator has spoken well of another, one is inclined to feel that such a remark falls in the category of courtesy or easy compliment. But I assure my colleagues on both sides of the aisle that last week it was my privilege and my responsibility to associate myself with the able junior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. BYRD]. He conducted the hearings to which he has made reference in the course of his remarks here today—remarks not only of clarity, but also of the utmost challenge.

Mr. President, the urgency of this problem cannot be disregarded. Earlier, in this Chamber, we heard the statement of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. YOUNG], who spoke about the starvation or near starvation of millions of people throughout the earth.

Let me say—with no attempt to overdramatize the seriousness of the situation—that in the valleys and on the hillsides of our State of West Virginia, people are desperately in need of food.

My colleague [Mr. BYRD] will recall the testimony of Sheriff Howard Chambers of Mingo County. His language was forthright as he told of the plight of the people in that area. He indicated to us that 41 percent of the population of that county is wholly dependent upon surplus food commodities—provided free of charge by the Federal Government—in order to maintain a bare existence.

I congratulate my colleague from West Virginia [Mr. BYRD] on bringing to the attention of the Senate the acuteness of this situation.

Mr. President, the pitiful plight of these West Virginians and the dire distress in which they find themselves are matters which my colleague well understands.

I am sure that if he desires to take the time to do so—although, under the allotment of time we have today for debate on this subject, the time is running out—my colleague could appropriately state that he was reared in an area of mining production, where coal has been the basic industry. I am sure that the conditions of the 1930's are being matched and even exceeded by the more critical conditions in 1959.

Would my colleague care to comment about the present problem, as compared with that in the 1930's, in that section of West Virginia with which he has been closely associated?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I thank the senior Senator from West Virginia for his contribution.

In answer to his suggestion that I comment on the conditions which exist today, as compared with those of almost 30 years ago, at a time when the Federal Government quickly instituted programs to absorb the unemployment and to put people to work and to spare the suffering millions from continued penury, poverty, and want, I wish only to say that I grew up in the home of a coal miner. I came to know early in life what it is to do without the everyday necessities. I knew what it was, in those days, to wear tennis shoes in the snow, and to see Christmas come and go without a stick of candy in the house.

Somehow or other, there did not seem to exist in those blighted communities,

at that time in our Nation's history, the desperation, the feeling of frustration, that we find today in West Virginia.

I think I can truthfully say, Mr. President, that in West Virginia today there are communities and people who have sunk to a lower position, insofar as the standard of living is concerned, than they ever endured in those days of the early 1930's.

I am afraid, Mr. President, that we cannot readily assess the disastrous and the permanent effects which these conditions will have upon our people. They contribute to a lowering of the morale, to a lowering of morality, and to a lowering of the mentality of the next generation.

We are concerned today because the Russians are seizing the lead in the scientific race. Yet here in our own country children are going to school hungry. And I would only ask this question: What can a child's mind concentrate upon when his stomach is empty, and when he remembers that his baby brother or baby sister at home is hungry, that his father is out of work, or that his father has even deserted the family in order that the family can qualify under the State program for public assistance? What is this doing to the next generation? How can our children learn the rudiments of science, how can they memorize the multiplication table, what care they about Gresham's law or Boyle's law, or what interest have they in Newton's theory of gravitation when they are hungry and ill-clothed?

I am grateful for the opportunity I have been given to go into these communities with the Subcommittee on Production and Stabilization, joined by my colleague, the Senator from West Virginia, to talk to these people, and to give them an opportunity to give their testimony in behalf of this vitally needed legislation.

I can assure you, Mr. President, that this will not be the last time this subject will be called to the attention of the Congress. I know that my senior colleague will join me in continuing from day to day to bring this matter to the attention of the Congress and to the attention of the people of the United States—yea, to the attention of those leaders in this administration upon whose shoulders rests the responsibility to make it possible for upstanding, loyal, patriotic citizens to live, and to live well and comfortably, and to work and to enjoy the pursuit of happiness.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, the junior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. BYRD] has indicated that it will be not only our desire, but, sir, it will be our purpose to rise in this body, almost on a daily schedule, and bring to the attention of our colleagues, and the country as well, the scope of this matter.

I again indicate that I associate myself with the junior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. BYRD] in this factual presentation.

I do not want to seem to detract from what my colleague has so well said; but, Senator BYRD, you saw last week the pinched faces of little children in West Virginia, and you realize that many children were in school without hot lunches. You know too, that hunger was the uninvited guest at tens of thousands of tables in West Virginia.

When we find these conditions existing today, it augurs well for this body to think carefully and constructively about the challenging words which have been spoken today by the junior Senator from West Virginia.

I assure my colleague [Mr BYRD] that I join with him vigorously in bringing to fruition, I hope with the assistance of our colleagues, a measure such as you have discussed today, in which you are a leader for its passage—the area redevelopment bill.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I thank the Senator.

AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATION TO THE NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1096) to authorize appropriation to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for salaries and expenses, research and development, construction and equipment, and for other purposes.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I, as the acting majority leader, will now ask for a quorum call, with the hope that at its conclusion we may have the yea and nay votes on the pending measure.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I wonder if the Senator from Mississippi will yield now for a question.

Mr. STENNIS. On the bill?

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes.

Mr. STENNIS. Very well.

Mr. ELLENDER. I am very sorry I was unable to be present to hear what the Senator from Mississippi had to say; but, as I understand, when the original bill was enacted there was a provision placed in it whereby there would have to be an authorization each year for the operation of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

Mr. STENNIS. An authorization each year; yes.

Mr. ELLENDER. Can the Senator tell us why that was necessary?

Mr. STENNIS. The provision was enacted in a supplemental appropriation bill. Public Law 85-766 has this paragraph:

> No appropriation may be made to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for any period prior to June 30, 1960, unless previously authorized by legislation hereafter enacted by the Congress.

As the Senator from Mississippi recalls, that provision was put in the law as a part of an agreement with the House. The amount to be appropriated last year was in disagreement. There was also disagreement on the provision of the Senate bill which required specific authorization for all appropriations to be made to the administration. It was suggested, as a part of an agreement by the conferees on a figure, that there would be no further appropriation, except by express authorization, until June 30, 1960.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senate insisted on that provision; is that correct?

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator is correct. The Senate bill provided that all appropriations must be specifically authorized while the House bill contained no such requirement. It was agreed to compromise to require specific authorizations through June 30, 1960. This would permit ample time for further review of the desirability of making this authorization requirement a permanent one.

Mr. ELLENDER. Is it the hope that after 1960 a general authorization will be made for this agency, except for construction, which would be specifically authorized, so that it will be in the same category as any other arm of the armed services?

Mr. STENNIS. We are glad to have the Senator's interest shown. The entire matter will be taken up in the 1960 authorization bill. The committee expects to consider that very point.

Mr. President, before I suggest the absence of a quorum, may we have the third reading of the bill?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading and to be read the third time.

The bill was read the third time.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, on the question of final passage of the bill I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. We have promised other Senators that if they would not speak we would have a vote.

Mr. BUSH. Very well.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Fulbright	Morton
Allott	Goldwater	Moss
Anderson	Gore	Mundt
Bartlett	Green	Murray
Beall	Gruening	Muskie
Bennett	Hart	Neuberger
Bible	Hartke	O'Mahoney
Bridges	Hayden	Pastore
Bush	Hickenlooper	Prouty
Butler	Hill	Proxmire
Byrd, Va.	Holland	Randolph
Byrd, W. Va.	Hruska	Robertson
Cannon	Humphrey	Russell
Capehart	Jackson	Saltonstall
Carlson	Javits	Schoeppel
Carroll	Johnson, Tex.	Scott
Case, S. Dak.	Johnston, S.C.	Smathers
Chavez	Keating	Smith
Church	Kennedy	Sparkman
Cooper	Kuchel	Stennis
Cotton	Langer	Symington
Curtis	Lausche	Talmadge
Dirksen	Long	Thurmond
Dodd	McCarthy	Wiley
Douglas	McClellan	Williams, N.J.
Dworshak	McGee	Williams, Del.
Eastland	McNamara	Yarborough
Ellender	Magnuson	Young, N. Dak.
Engle	Mansfield	Young, Ohio
Ervin	Monroney	
Frear	Morse	

Mr. MANSFIELD. I announce that the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. JORDAN], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR] are absent on official business.

I further announce that the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] is absent attending the funeral of the late Senator Joseph F. Guffey of Pennsylvania.

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MARTIN] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business of the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences.

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE] is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass? On this question, the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I announce that the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. JORDAN], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], is absent attending the funeral of the late Senator Joseph F. Guffey, of Pennsylvania.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. JORDAN], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], would each vote "yea."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MARTIN] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business of the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences, and if present and voting, he would vote "yea."

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE] is necessarily absent, and if present and voting, would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 91, nays 0, as follows:

YEAS—91

Aiken	Eastland	Lausche
Allott	Ellender	Long
Anderson	Engle	McCarthy
Bartlett	Ervin	McClellan
Beall	Frear	McGee
Bennett	Fulbright	McNamara
Bible	Goldwater	Magnuson
Bridges	Gore	Mansfield
Bush	Green	Monroney
Butler	Gruening	Morse
Byrd, Va.	Hart	Morton
Byrd, W. Va.	Hartke	Moss
Cannon	Hayden	Mundt
Capehart	Hickenlooper	Murray
Carlson	Hill	Muskie
Carroll	Holland	Neuberger
Case, S. Dak.	Hruska	O'Mahoney
Chavez	Humphrey	Pastore
Church	Jackson	Prouty
Cooper	Javits	Proxmire
Cotton	Johnson, Tex.	Randolph
Curtis	Johnston, S.C.	Robertson
Dirksen	Keating	Russell
Dodd	Kennedy	Saltonstall
Douglas	Kuchel	Schoeppel
Dworshak	Langer	Scott
Smathers	Talmadge	Yarborough
Smith	Thurmond	Young, N. Dak.
Sparkman	Wiley	Young, Ohio
Stennis	Williams, N.J.	
Symington	Williams, Del.	

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—7

Case, N.J.	Jordan	Martin
Clark	Kefauver	
Hennings	Kerr	

So the bill (S. 1096) was passed.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE] is unavoidably absent from the session today. Therefore, he could not be recorded when the vote was taken on Senate bill 1096, the bill to authorize appropriations for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. However, if he had been present, he certainly would have supported the bill; and I should like to have that fact noted for the RECORD.

EXTENSION OF THE UNIVERSAL MILITARY TRAINING AND SERVICE ACT

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 89, H.R. 2260, the draft extension bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 2260) to extend until July 1, 1963, the induction provisions of the Universal Military Training and Service Act, the provisions of the act of August 3, 1950, suspending persomnel strength of the Armed Forces, and the Dependents Assistance Act of 1950.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Texas?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Armed Services with an amendment on page 2, after line 10, to insert a new section, as follows:

SEC. 5. Section 203 of the Career Compensation Act of 1949, as amended, is amended by striking out "July 1, 1959" wherever such date appears therein and inserting "July 1, 1963" in lieu thereof.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I announce for the information of the Senate that several Senators desire to make statements. Then the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, will give an explanation of the bill. There will then be further discussion of the draft bill. The committee feels that a vote can be had on the bill this afternoon. There will be a quorum call before the vote.

Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the passage of the bill.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, at the conclusion of action on the draft bill, it is planned to start the discussion of the Hawaiian statehood bill.

INFLATION, THE NATION'S NO. 1 PROBLEM

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, for a few years after the end of World War II, the demands of the American market were so great that it was possible to raise costs and prices and still sell all the products our industry could produce.

Today, it is becoming increasingly clear that foreign competition is not only invading our oversea markets but is becoming an increasingly important factor in our domestic markets.

President Eisenhower in his Economic Report said:

> It is not the function of Government in our society to establish the terms of contracts between labor and management; yet it must be recognized that the public has a vital interest in these agreements. Increases in money wages and other compensation not justified by the productivity performance of the economy are inevitably inflationary. They impose severe hardships on those whose incomes are not enlarged. They jeopardize the capacity of the economy to create jobs for the expanding labor force. They endanger present jobs by limiting markets at home and impairing our capacity to compete in markets abroad. In short, they are, in the end, self-defeating.
>
> Self-discipline and restraint are essential if agreements consistent with a reasonable stability of prices are to be reached within the framework of the free competitive institutions on which we rely heavily for the improvement of our material welfare. If the desired results cannot be achieved under our arrangements for determining wages and prices, the alternatives are either inflation, which would damage our economy and work hardships on millions of Americans, or controls, which are alien to our traditional way of life and which would be an obstacle to the Nation's economic growth and improvement.

In these statements when the President refers to productivity, he is referring to the productivity of the economy as a whole and not to the productivity of any particular firm or industry.

I have been greatly disturbed that in recent weeks many labor leaders have urged wage increases which they state would generate purchasing power for other industries. In effect, they suggest that we attempt to raise ourselves by our bootstraps.

More and more we are face to face with the fact that our price and wage structure is becoming less competitive in terms of world markets. Before this year is over the steel industry will once again negotiate a new contract with its employees.

Mr. President, two editorials from the magazine American Metal Market are worthy of the attention of my colleagues. I ask unanimous consent that they may be printed in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From American Metal Market, Jan. 28, 1959]

FRUSTRATING AND DISTURBING

There is something utterly frustrating and disturbing about the reaction in the highest echelons of organized labor to the President's economic message. With racketeers ensconced in high labor offices openly defying public indignation and arrogantly

daring the Congress to do its damnedest, and with demands for stratospheric wages and for basic hours that constitute little less than subsidized idleness, running almost rampant, one might have hoped for a different response to the President's urgent recommendations, from the more respected officials of the labor movement. The integrity of these latter officials is deservedly undisputed, but the irresponsibility of their criticism strongly suggests that the country may have more to fear from their sophistry than from the palpably unsavory elements who almost unfailingly overreach themselves.

All during the postwar years the country has heard business admonished on prices with as much or greater severity than labor has been urged to be temperate in its demands. In fact, the usual pattern has been for our highest officials to plead with business and labor to be moderate—after labor has exacted concessions from business. This appearance of impartiality has inevitably misled millions to blame business alone for price increases. Among this unsuspecting multitude, labor has escaped even contributory responsibility for price increase, because labor has already got theirs before officialdom in Washington has expressed its concern, whereas the price increases forced by cost increases have followed the appeals.

A conspicuous example of a congressional contribution to this deceptive practice was the hearings held last spring in anticipation of steel price increases after last July 1. The investigators carefully ignored the scheduled substantial wage increase that was automatically to go into effect on that date, pursuant to the agreement of July–August, 1956. They also piously refused to consider the possible effects of the already-demanded wage increases in the automobile industry (which had not by then been granted) and which, if denied, would have deprived the industry of justification for the price increases of last fall that followed the ultimate granting of the uninvestigated wage demands.

This seeming immunity of labor to accountability for the effect of higher wage costs on the national economy would appear to have led the leaders of the labor movement to expect continuing exemption from official comment in advance of their obtaining current demands. Restrained as the President's admonition was, it has been bitterly resented, not only because it would obviously forestall the additional demands on industry that are clearly in the making, but because, at long last and for once, the President has sought to brake the inflation at its source, before the spiral is launched.

There will be virtually no one, outside the small circle of labor leaders and the advocates of some constant inflation, to dispute the fact that, in the effort to stop the corrosion of the dollar and the destruction of savings, "leaders of labor have a particularly critical role to play, in view of the great power lodged in their hands." Nor is it to be doubted by any impartial observer, that "the terms of agreements * * * will have a critical bearing * * * in attaining * * * economic growth with stable prices." Nor will any informed person be likely to dispute the assertion that "increases * * * not justified by the productivity performance of the economy are inevitably inflationary."

Yet the leadership of our most powerful unions declares that stable prices mean "stagnation and perhaps depression" and that the unions' drives for wage increases will go forward. Mr. McDonald, president of the United Steelworkers, has publicly appealed to the automobile industry to support his forthcoming demands, so as to provide his membership with $1 billion to buy automobiles. Yet, if the past is any guide to the future, Mr. McDonald will hold that the steel industry will have no excuse to raise prices if it raises wages by $1 billion. One marvels at the mental process which can conceive of an industry supplying another with $1 billion of undiluted purchasing power without first having to earn it. Obviously, the application of this logic, by which wages would be arbitrarily raised in industry after industry to provide purchasing power for the goods of other industries, would soon reduce the value of the dollar to that of trading stamps.

In its arrogance, labor leadership has come to the stage where it preempts the right to tell management and industry to augment productivity by whatever margin is needed to compensate for the demands it chooses to impose from year to year. It not only assumes the capacity of management to accomplish this miracle, but it takes for granted labor's exclusive right to all the fruits of increased productivity (in practice it demands even more), and denies the right of management, of ownership, and of consumers to any share in the greater abundance brought about by the greater efficiency of industry, in which greater efficiency labor, per se, plays so infinitesimal a part in a modern plant. If this is not a very clear indication of the great power lodged in the hands of labor leadership, there is no explaining it. And it is frustrating and disturbing that this great power should be exercised with such irresponsibility, in defiance of all known methods for operating a solvent economy, by those from whom the public have a right to expect enlightened and responsible leadership.

[From American Metal Market, Feb. 27, 1959]

THAT BILLION DOLLAR BUNDLE

The contract between the steel industry and the 1¼ million employees marshaled under the banners of the United Steel Workers still has another 4 months to run. In these changeable times, it would be hazardous, this far in advance, to attempt to say just what the issues will have proved to be when the contract is extended. But it is certain that the billion dollar bundle will loom large in the negotiations, because Mr. McDonald and his associates have deliberately put it on the line already.

In costly and widely distributed full-page newspaper advertisements, the USW has been propagandizing other industries, the ranks of labor, and the general public to support its demand for this additional purchasing power from the steel industry. They have painted alluring pictures of what they would do with this new income, buying automobiles, building new homes, buying groceries, patronizing moving picture houses and generally administering a blood transfusion to the U.S. economy. There will, unfortunately, be many who will think it a good idea—and not necessarily only those who would benefit directly. But, of course, as has already been asked, if this is a sound idea, why should Mr. McDonald and his partners want to keep it to themselves? Isn't this being a bit selfish? Why shouldn't all of us workers get in on this so-simply created prosperity? Why not, as the chairman of the United States Steel Corp. asked the other day, cut everybody in, take care of all 65 million gainfully employed workers on the same basis, and create not $1 billion of new money, but $52 billion so all might enjoy the good times?

These are questions well worth asking. It would be a mighty good idea if they were asked of every Tom, Dick, and Harry that thinks the picayune $1 billion proposition is a good idea. Possibly, in that way, some of the effects of this proposal might be brought home to those who still think that it is, and should be, only necessary for labor to demand in order to receive. It cannot be expected that those who swallow the specious arguments behind the demand will be impressed with orthodox refutations, based on the time-proven economic principles which have confirmed again and again, since time immemorial, that you can't get something for nothing. But there are a couple of other relevant points that we would like to bring up at this time.

The first is to ask, just what have the steelworkers done to justify an increase of $1 billion a year in wages and benefits? Isn't that a fair question? Or has money become so inconsequential that a group leader is entitled to ask for a handout of any figure that first comes into his head—particularly if it has a lilting sound to the ear, like a billion dollars? When he has done so, are we not to anticipate that the next step—possibly following a diffident hesitation by industry, instead of yielding with alacrity—will be to accuse industry of endangering industrial peace by being unreasonable? Where have we seen such tactics worked by others in a different field of negotiation? They are identical with the practices of another group also having power that is much too great for their own good, in international affairs. Time was, of course, that most people felt they had to perform some useful service to justify better recognition. Is this billion dollar bundle not suggestive of the idea that industry is no longer built up and conducted with some consideration for those who have directed and financed an operation, but that it exists primarily to meet the demands—whatever they may be—of those who control the working staff? Have we arrived at this concept of what industry really is?

Secondly, Mr. McDonald and his friends are not looking for any token or symbolic advantages. They want something substantial—something that will buy automobiles, build houses and provide their members with genuine purchasing power. Although one would never think it to be the case from U.S.W. propaganda, this implies that the steel industry has this additional $1 billion current purchasing power available for distribution—for the asking. Now it so happens that automobiles are made mostly of steel and that, in order to get what it takes to make the cars Mr. McDonald says his boys will buy, the automobile makers will have to come to the steel mills for supplies (just as the steel mills have to go to the coal mines, the iron mines, the limestone quarries, the railroads and many other sources for raw materials to make steel).

The question naturally arises as to whether, after providing Mr. McDonald's boys with $1 billion in new money, the steel mills are to supply steel to the auto companies at old prices, so that the boys will not find a higher cost of steel reflected in the price they pay for all those new cars? Or does he expect the steel companies to get the $1 billion from the auto companies, without having them include the higher steel cost in the price of the cars the boys buy?

If it is one case or the other, what he is asking is that his boys be given the billion dollars, at the expense of others. That is, if he sincerely believes that the $1 billion (or the $52 billion, if all the workers are counted in) can be magically produced from the ether without impairing the purchasing power of everybody's dollar and without ultimately bankrupting industry. We are quite confident that everyone knows that every one of the U.S.W. leaders knows better.

LIBERALIZING "EXTRA EARNINGS" ALLOWANCES FOR SOCIAL SECURITY BENEFICIARIES

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, today, I should like to discuss a problem which

is confronting a growing number of our people—that is, our senior citizens. Particularly, I am speaking of those folks receiving benefits under the social security program.

Today, there are over 12½ million people eligible for benefits under this program. During 1959, it is estimated that these folks will receive payments of about $10 billion. In Wisconsin, over 281,000 persons are now receiving benefits.

For the future, it is estimated that 9 out of 10 of the Nation's workers—who are now contributing to social security—will be able to look to this program to help meet the needs of their retirement.

A big question is: Will it be adequate? Too, is it being kept up to date?

We recall that during the 2d session of the 85th Congress, these folks under social security were granted a 7 percent increase in benefits.

At the time, I felt—and still feel—that the increase was indeed very modest in view of the increased costs of living.

Consequently, I believe that a continuous effort must be made to improve the program.

Now, I should like to comment on a particular provision of the program which I believe should be liberalized to enable our maturing folks to better meet their economic needs. Specifically, I refer to the unrealistic limitation on extra earnings—now restricted to $1,200 annually—which folks can earn in addition to social security benefits.

Unfortunately, this limitation obstructs—and often prevents—our aging folks from supplementing their social security benefits to the degree that might otherwise be attainable.

We recognize, of course, that it is not always easy for folks, 65 or over, to find a job. When work is available, however, I believe it is absolutely unrealistic and undesirable to unwisely restrict their earnings and, as a consequence, their ability to improve their standards of living.

Today, the costs of food, rent, clothing, and other necessities of living are high, very high. To many of our folks in the upper-age brackets, prices are just out of reach of their often too-low incomes.

The liberalization of the limitation—from the present $1,200 to at least $1,800 annually, for example—would enable many of our maturing folks to maintain better standards of living.

This action—in keeping with our spirit of encouraging individual initiative—would be in the best interests, not only of our senior citizens, but also of the Nation.

During the 85th Congress, I introduced proposed legislation to have the limitation lifted to $1,800 annually. At that time, I was pleased to note widespread support for the measure, both in Wisconsin and elsewhere in the country. For example the National Federation of Independent Business, by poll, learned that 81 percent of its 100,000 independent business and professional members were in favor of my proposal.

Currently, there are a number of bills before the Finance Committee in the Senate, and before the Ways and Means Committee in the House to allow increased earnings. We recognize of course that the House Committee will need to take initial action on these legislative proposals.

I would hope, however, that at the earliest opportunity Congress will take action to liberalize the limitation for folks on social security.

From time to time, I receive messages for contributions stressing the need for liberalization of this social security limitation.

I ask unanimous consent to have two of these communications printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MILWAUKEE, WIS., *January 4, 1959.*

Hon. ALEXANDER WILEY,
U.S. Senator, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: I take the privilege of writing to you about the limited earnings of people receiving social security pension.

First, because of age limits and other reasons, we are forced to give up our jobs. Many of us like to work, and rightly so. It is better for mental, physical, and spiritual welfare. Under existing conditions it is difficult to hold a job for the simple reason that many times we cannot put in the time that is required on the job.

Because of these circumstances many people are made unhappy. After all, it is better for those who desire to do so, to carry on. That is the way God intended it to be.

May I urge you, therefore, to make every effort to increase the amount of yearly earnings for the people receiving social security pension.

Thanking you in advance,
Sincerely,

SUN PRAIRIE, WIS.

Senator ALEXANDER WILEY,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. WILEY: I hope you lawmakers will do something this session to change the social security law so I can earn all I am able to and still collect my social security payments.

This year I will be 70 and this means 2 more years of $1,200 net under the present law, before I can earn enough to keep up with inflated prices.

Surely many of our elder citizens must feel the way I do about this. It works a hardship on me, as I work on a commission job, and could make enough to get along in good shape if I were allowed to do so.

With kindest regards,
Yours truly.

THE REMOVAL OF CHEESE FROM THE LIST OF PRICE-SUPPORTED COMMODITIES

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I received today from the Wisconsin Cheese Makers' Association a copy of a letter which was addressed to the Honorable Ezra Taft Benson, Secretary of Agriculture, which I now read:

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: Statistical reports from your Department showing cheese production, consumption, cold storage stocks, and Government purchases under the price support program for the past year, show ample justification for the removal of cheeses from the list of price-supported commodities, and we so recommend.

Until such action is taken, we urge you to continue the present support price of cheese after April 1, 1959.

This recommendation is by order of our board of directors.

Respectfully submitted,

GEO. L. MOONEY,
Executive Secretary.

At the bottom of the letter is written:

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: The above copy is self explanatory. We hope you agree with us, and will promptly use your office to effectuate the recommendations of our directors. In haste and

Very sincerely,

GEO. L. MOONEY.

On receipt of this letter I called Secretary Benson's office and read the letter to his secretary. Mr. Benson was busy in consultation. The secretary stated that she would take the matter up at once with the Secretary of Agriculture and that very definitely in the near future I would hear what was the Secretary's reaction to the letter.

INVENTORY OF DELINQUENT FEDERAL TAXES

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, today I shall incorporate in the RECORD the fifth annual report of the inventory on delinquent Federal taxes.

Five years ago upon my request the Treasury Department initiated an annual inventory of all types of delinquent taxes as of the end of each year, with this inventory broken down as to districts and types of tax delinquencies.

The 1958 report will be incorporated in the RECORD along with a statistical breakdown showing the percentage change in total tax delinquencies and in employment tax delinquencies for each of the 65 districts.

A comparison of this 5-year report gives a clear picture of the trend of these delinquencies with special emphasis upon those districts which are showing good progress in collections as well as pointing out those districts in which collections were poor.

The total amount of delinquent taxes has declined for the 3d successive year, with this year's decline being from $1,504,709,000 to $1,375,737,000, or 8.6 percent. This compares with a 7-percent decline last year. Employment taxes—social security and income taxes withheld by employers from their employees—which last year showed a 7.6-percent increase, declined 12.5 percent this year, or from $300,678,000 to $263,186,000. The employment tax collection was assisted this year by the enactment of a law providing additional penalties on employers refusing to forward to the Treasury Department these taxes which were withheld from the employees' pay envelopes.

The Treasury Department in submitting this report has recognized the need for additional effort to reduce these delinquent accounts; however, they very properly in their letter take credit for improvements in many of the former

troublesome areas. For instance, in last year's report I was critical of the Chicago office, which had shown a 56.9-percent increase in employment tax delinquencies and a 27.3-percent increase in total tax delinquencies. Those increases came on top of substantial increases in the 2 preceding years, and the Treasury Department was requested to give special attention to that area. As a result, their report this year shows a substantial improvement, which will be mentioned later in this statement.

Offices in which major changes have occurred in the amount of delinquencies during the past year are as follows:

In Augusta, Maine, the total tax delinquencies were reduced 22.7 percent although employment tax delinquencies were increased 8.3 percent.

Burlington, Vt., is still a troublesome spot. Employment tax delinquencies for the 3d consecutive year showed a substantial increase. In 1956 the increase was 38.6 percent; in 1957, 17.4 percent; and in 1958, 36.4 percent. In 1958 their total tax delinquencies increased 67.1 percent. This office should be given special attention by the Department.

Albany, N.Y., shows a reduction of 26.5 percent in total tax delinquencies and a reduction in employment tax delinquencies of 4.9 percent.

Brooklyn, N.Y., shows a decline in both employment tax delinquencies and total tax delinquencies of 12.5 percent and 27.6 percent respectively.

Buffalo, N.Y., likewise shows a decline in both categories, with a reduction in employment tax delinquencies of 13.5 percent and a reduction in total tax delinquencies of 20.9 percent.

Lower Manhattan, N.Y., shows a 25.8 percent reduction in employment tax delinquencies and a 5.5 percent reduction in total delinquencies.

Baltimore, Md., has turned in an excellent report, with a 21.4 percent reduction in employment tax delinquencies and a 28.7 percent reduction in total accounts.

In Camden, N.J., the employment tax delinquencies have risen for the fourth consecutive year, with this year's increase being 16.8 percent. I reemphasize that these employment taxes are, in effect, trust funds. They represent cash which has been withheld by the employers from the pay envelopes of the employees; and there can be no justification for allowing a diversion of these funds to the use of the employer. Employment tax delinquencies in the Camden office have doubled within the past 5-year period, while at the same time the total tax delinquencies have increased nearly 50 percent. This trend of continuous increases in the Camden office should be checked.

Newark, N.J., has a good report. This office has reduced the employment tax delinquencies for the fourth consecutive year, and the total tax delinquencies have been reduced from $92,962,952 in 1954 to $44,825,000 in 1958. These reductions represent a 22.6 percent decline in employment tax delinquencies and a 19.5 percent reduction in total delinquencies.

The Philadelphia office, of which I was critical a few years ago, also has a good report. It has reduced the employment tax delinquencies from $15,700,488 in 1954 to $8,944,000 in 1958, with last year's reduction being 13.3 percent. During the same 5-year period total tax delinquencies have dropped from $63,450,420 in 1954 to $42,563,000 in 1958.

The Pittsburgh, Pa., office, which last year showed a commendable drop in both employment tax and total delinquencies, has this year reversed that trend, and reports a 27.5 percent increase in delinquent employment taxes and a 10.8 percent increase in total delinquencies.

Scranton, Pa., last year showed a reduction of 22.2 percent in employment tax delinquencies, and a 23.3 percent reduction in total tax delinquencies.

Wilmington, Del., reduced the total delinquent accounts last year by 13.5 percent, and showed the total tax delinquencies to be at an all-time low for the past 5 years, having brought the figure down from $22,009,168 in 1954 to $3,296,000 in 1958. However, it reports a 27.6 percent increase in employment tax delinquencies, bringing that item to an all-time high for the past 5 years.

Cincinnati, Ohio, shows a reduction of 22.8 percent in employment tax delinquencies, and a 5.3 percent reduction in total delinquencies. It should be noted that the total tax delinquencies in this office have dropped for the fourth consecutive year, or from $15,128,835 to $9,681,000.

Cleveland, Ohio, has a good report. It shows a 34.5-percent reduction in employment tax delinquencies, against a 20.1-percent reduction in total accounts. Cleveland, too, has a good 5-year report, both in the reduction of employment tax delinquencies and in the reduction of total delinquencies—from $5,272,650 in 1954, to $3,794,000 in 1958; and from $42,963,755 in 1954, to $29,076,000 in 1958, respectively.

The office at Columbus, Ohio, however, needs the Department's attention. For 4 consecutive years the employment tax delinquencies have risen from $594,431 in 1954 to $1,087,000 in 1958, with last year's increase being 23.8 percent. During the same 5-year period the total tax delinquencies in that office have increased from $6,652,735 to $10,244,000, with last year's increase being 12.8 percent.

Indianapolis, Ind., shows reductions of 14.1 percent in employment tax delinquencies and a reduction of 25.4 percent in total delinquent taxes.

Louisville, Ky., shows a 19-percent reduction in employment tax delinquencies and a 23-percent reduction in total delinquent accounts.

Parkersburg, W. Va., shows a 3.6-percent reduction in employment tax delinquencies and a 21.7-percent reduction in total delinquencies. This office has reduced total delinquent accounts from $12,931,609 in 1954 to $5,372,000 in 1958, which is very commendale.

Richmond, Va., likewise has turned in a good report. Last year it reduced employment tax delinquencies another 14.8 percent and total tax delinquencies 21.4 percent. This brings the 5-year total of delinquent accounts in that office from $20,986,659 down to $12,333,000.

Toledo, Ohio, reduced its employment tax delinquencies by 21 percent, and shows a reduction of 25.4 percent in total delinquent accounts.

Greensboro, N.C., is another office which has turned in a good report. In 1958 the delinquent employment accounts were reduced 32.8 percent, while the total delinquent accounts were brought down another 14.5 percent. In the past 5 years the total of all delinquent taxes in that office has been reduced from $26,395,319 to $12,716,000, while during the same period delinquent employment taxes have been reduced from $2,016,860 to $1,359,000.

Jackson, Miss., shows a 24.6-percent increase in delinquent employment taxes for 1958, but a 19-percent reduction in the total amount of all delinquent accounts.

Nashville, Tenn., shows a reduction in both categories, with a 23.3-percent reduction in delinquent employment taxes and a 25.3-percent reduction in total delinquent accounts.

The Chicago, Ill., office, which last year was subjected to special criticism for having shown alarming increases in its accounts, does show a reduction this year. It has reduced employment tax delinquencies by 29.7 percent and total accounts by 21.9 percent. This is good progress; however, it should be noted that in that office the total of their employment tax delinquencies is still $22,996,000, as compared with $12,802,486 5 years ago. At the same time, even with this year's reduction in the total delinquent accounts, the outstanding balance still shows nearly a 50-percent increase over the 1954 total. The Department in its report points out that it has given this office their special attention, and the office certainly shows progress; but it still needs watching. These accounts should continue their downward trend.

Springfield, Ill., has shown a commendable reduction both in employment tax delinquencies and in total delinquent taxes, with reductions of 31.3 percent and 24.5 percent, respectively.

Aberdeen, S. Dak., reports sizable reductions in both categories, with a 20.8 percent reduction being shown in employment tax delinquencies and a 30.2 percent reduction in the total of its delinquent accounts.

Employment tax delinquencies in Cheyenne, Wyo., have increased 28.8 percent, thus erasing last year's decline and bringing these accounts to a 5-year high for that office. At the same time it reports a 4.7 percent increase in the total of all delinquent accounts.

Des Moines, Iowa, has brought its total of all delinquent accounts down to less than half of what they were 5 years ago, or from $9,737,729 to $4,564,000, with this year's reduction being 39 percent. Employment tax delinquencies in this office, however, have not done so well, for

while they do show a 10.2 percent reduction for last year, they are still higher than they were 5 years ago.

In Fargo, N. Dak., employment tax delinquencies have increased 30.1 percent, bringing them close to a 5-year high. The total of all delinquent accounts was reduced by 5.1 percent.

Omaha, Nebr., while showing a 1.5 percent increase in overall delinquencies, still has a good report. Its total delinquent accounts in the past 5 years have been reduced from $4,180,447 in 1954 to $2,770,000 in 1958. During the past 12 months it has reduced their employment tax delinquencies by 54.4 percent, bringing this item to a 5-year low, or from $548,945 in 1954 to $267,000 in 1958.

Dallas, Tex., shows a reduction of 32.1 percent in employment tax delinquencies and a reduction of 17.3 percent in total tax delinquencies.

Little Rock, Ark., reports a tremendous increase in total tax delinquencies, being 181.1 percent above the 1957 figure, or from $2,465,000 to $6,930,000 in 1958. In fairness to this office, it should be pointed out that the big increase is in its inactive accounts, which are the accounts on which collection has been deferred pending the outcome of court decisions, audit examinations, or other contingent actions. This does not mean that the substantial increase should not be given attention. The office did report for 1958 a 23.5 percent reduction in employment tax delinquencies.

Boise, Idaho, reported a 23 percent reduction in employment tax delinquencies and a 2.9 percent reduction in total outstanding accounts.

Honolulu, T.H., reduced its employment tax delinquencies by 21.5 percent and its total tax delinquencies by 12.4 percent. This is the fourth consecutive reduction in the total of outstanding delinquent accounts for the Honolulu office.

Seattle, Wash., reported 17.8 percent reduction in delinquent employment taxes, and a 15.3 percent reduction in total delinquent accounts.

Puerto Rico, which has been a troublesome area from the standpoint of tax collections, does report a reduction in both employment tax delinquencies and total tax delinquencies. These reductions are 22.6 percent and 17.8 percent, respectively.

Under international operations, which is a category started in 1956, representing the delinquent accounts of taxpayers abroad and out of the reach of the respective offices, jumped 139.8 percent, or from $17,443,000 to $41,823,000. The Treasury Department explains this enormous increase as being the result of having had the district offices transfer to this division the delinquent accounts of all taxpayers known to be out of the country and out of the reach of those offices. While this explains the increase in the international operations category, it could also offset some of the reported reductions in the various district offices.

In conclusion, while it is pleasant to note that the amount of total delinquent accounts has declined approximately $240 million from the total of 5 years ago, these accounts are still too high. Also, the employment tax reduction of 12.5 percent this year, while being a trend in the right direction, nevertheless is still $9 million higher than 5 years ago.

It must be remembered that when speaking of employment tax delinquencies, we are speaking of income and social security taxes which have been withheld by the employer from the pay envelopes of his employees. They are in effect trust funds, and under no circumstances should they ever be considered as belonging to the employer or as representing funds which he can divert to his own use.

I am glad to report last year's progress of the Treasury Department in reducing these outstanding accounts, and again express my appreciation to them for their cooperation in furnishing statistics for this report.

I ask unanimous consent to have the report submitted by the Treasury Department under date of March 2, 1959, along with my own statistical breakdown of the 5-year report of the various offices, together with a letter from the Commissioner of Internal Revenue incorporated at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. TREASURY DEPARTMENT,
Washington, D.C., March 2, 1959.

Hon. JOHN J. WILLIAMS,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR WILLIAMS: In answer to your request of January 22, 1959, we are enclosing a tabulation pertaining to the inventory of taxpayer delinquent accounts. The tabulation shows a breakdown of the total number of delinquent accounts by income, employment, and other taxes as of December 31, 1958, and December 31, 1957. Data relating to total number and amount of inactive accounts are also provided.

The overall picture in the taxpayer delinquent accounts area shows that a great deal has been accomplished in the past year. During 1958 the number of delinquent accounts was reduced from 1,554,876 to 1,280,642, a reduction of 18 percent, and their dollar value was decreased from $1,505 million to $1,376 million, a reduction of 8.6 percent. Each of the tax groups, income, employment, and other, shows a decline in inventory both as to number and dollar value. Confining ourselves to dollars, the percentage reductions were 6.7 percent in income, 12.5 percent in employment, and 15.3 percent in all other classes of tax. We feel that this general overall improvement is particularly noteworthy in view of the adverse economic conditions prevailing in certain areas during 1958.

These improvements were widespread, with nearly all offices accomplishing a percentage reduction in dollar amounts outstanding. Looking first at the total closing inventories of each office as compared to a year ago, we find that 46 of our 65 offices have reported gains, the highest being a 39.0 percent reduction. The employment tax area, in which you have expressed a particular interest in the past, reflects an even brighter picture, with 50 of our 65 offices contributing in varying degrees to the overall reduction of 12.5 percent. The greatest district office reduction was 54.4 percent.

Also, particularly gratifying is that substantially all of the offices about which you expressed concern a year ago are among those which made material gains in the reduction of dollar amounts outstanding. For example Chicago's overall inventory went from $154.1 million to $120.3 million, a reduction of 21.9 percent. Its employment tax inventory declined from $32.7 million to $23 million, a 29.7 percent gain.

The offices reflecting higher dollar inventories are for the most part the smaller offices, although a few of the larger offices are among those which lost ground during the year. In this connection, it is pertinent to mention that percentage increases, and in some instances even relatively high percentage increases, can be due to normal fluctuations. Further, it can and will happen that one or two large accounts going into a delinquent status late in the year can distort the picture when endeavoring to evaluate the performance of a particular office. Conversely, high percentage declines in inventories are often reflected solely as a result of normal fluctuations or the closing of one or two particularly large accounts. Individual office inventories also rise or decline, depending upon the economic conditions in the area. It is for this reason that we normally prefer to look at the inventories from a regional or national point of view. Incidentally, the increase of 139.8 percent in the International Operations Division is the result of our having had the district offices transfer to this division the delinquent accounts of taxpayers known to be abroad and out of their reach.

The additional table which follows contains a summary as of December 31, 1957, and 1958, of the taxpayer delinquent accounts broken down as to those in an active and an inactive status. As we have previously advised you, inactive accounts are those on which collection action has been deferred pending the outcome of court decisions, audit examinations or other contingent actions. It is to be noted that there is a reduction in the number and dollar value of both active and inactive account inventories as of December 31, 1958.

	Active	Inactive	Total
Amount (thousands):			
Dec. 31, 1957	$944,256	$560,453	$1,504,709
Dec. 31, 1958	868,509	507,228	1,375,737
Change from Dec. 31, 1957 to 1958	−75,747	−53,225	−128,972
Number:			
Dec. 31, 1957	1,395,035	159,841	1,554,876
Dec. 31, 1958	1,122,137	158,505	1,280,642
Change from Dec. 31, 1957 to 1958	−272,898	−1,336	−274,234

In previous years we found it necessary to give you a separate accounting of taxpayer delinquent accounts which had not been issued. This year our offices are current in the issuance of their delinquent accounts with the result that the enclosed table includes all accounts which had reached a delinquent status as of December 31, 1958.

Even though we feel that we have substantially improved our position in the delinquent accounts area, we do not want to leave you with the impression that we are complacent about this situation. We are keenly aware of the necessity of reducing our inventories to the lowest possible level. You may be assured that we will continue to exert every effort toward that end.

Sincerely yours,

DANA LATHAM,
Commissioner.

Enclosure.

Inventory of taxpayer delinquent accounts, December 1958 and 1957

Region and district	Tax groups [1]																Inactive			
	Income				Employment				Other				Total				Number		Amount (thousand dollars)	
	Number		Amount (thousand dollars)		Number		Amount (thousand dollars)		Number		Amount (thousand dollars)		Number		Amount (thousand dollars)					
	1958	1957	1958	1957	1958	1957	1958	1957	1958	1957	1958	1957	1958	1957	1958	1957	1958	1957	1958	1957
National total	898,232	1,112,989	1,005,270	1,077,348	329,457	377,253	263,186	300,678	52,953	64,634	107,280	126,683	1,280,642	1,554,876	1,375,737	1,504,709	158,505	159,841	507,228	560,453
Atlanta	78,113	87,299	69,535	76,318	31,264	33,845	18,274	19,453	6,511	8,354	13,212	15,785	115,888	129,498	101,022	111,556	11,693	14,896	41,929	46,536
Boston	51,316	53,920	36,952	33,821	19,159	18,842	15,427	15,398	2,752	2,353	3,040	2,594	73,227	75,115	55,418	51,812	7,884	9,667	22,684	21,820
Chicago	159,966	236,227	143,220	167,148	50,324	64,000	41,528	52,424	7,360	10,350	18,408	27,289	217,650	310,577	203,155	246,861	60,109	23,860	91,143	72,202
Cincinnati	83,411	108,497	69,532	85,975	21,971	26,082	13,939	17,424	4,332	5,618	10,382	10,873	109,714	140,197	93,854	114,272	11,835	16,963	45,803	59,069
Dallas	54,630	65,539	40,797	39,298	21,344	26,774	12,081	14,496	3,614	5,167	5,453	6,825	79,588	97,480	58,331	60,619	6,981	8,809	23,395	19,186
New York City	178,824	207,733	315,809	344,500	83,089	98,360	75,873	85,056	10,721	12,477	23,141	27,110	272,634	318,570	414,823	456,666	19,539	25,233	107,181	147,516
Omaha	43,535	46,095	40,764	44,833	18,922	18,072	9,836	10,527	3,596	3,357	5,337	4,684	66,053	67,524	55,938	60,044	8,645	11,867	28,018	32,176
Philadelphia	109,989	144,770	101,299	122,095	34,994	40,922	37,010	42,158	6,493	8,314	16,689	18,388	151,476	194,006	154,999	182,642	12,438	23,830	64,163	78,264
San Francisco	130,354	150,798	146,459	146,509	46,523	48,472	38,807	43,298	7,447	8,593	11,106	12,987	184,324	207,863	196,373	202,794	19,061	24,276	82,603	83,251
Atlanta region:																				
Atlanta	16,578	18,054	9,696	12,479	5,981	5,864	3,948	3,829	1,316	1,410	1,744	2,664	23,875	25,328	15,388	18,972	2,219	2,900	6,778	6,253
Birmingham	9,529	10,871	10,130	11,011	3,653	3,826	1,735	1,772	948	1,289	5,201	6,106	14,130	15,986	17,066	18,889	1,948	2,614	10,865	13,044
Columbia	8,056	9,201	3,032	2,924	2,773	2,938	1,064	948	744	1,200	375	590	11,573	13,339	4,471	4,462	805	1,570	1,118	1,300
Greensboro	10,576	11,279	10,631	11,989	4,186	4,922	1,359	2,023	944	1,397	727	860	15,706	17,598	12,716	14,872	1,492	2,463	7,132	8,702
Jackson	3,845	5,042	1,345	1,830	1,774	1,634	852	684	380	553	214	461	5,999	7,229	2,411	2,975	569	530	824	901
Jacksonville	22,038	23,650	27,469	26,902	10,375	11,447	8,029	8,519	1,525	1,673	4,417	3,850	33,938	36,770	39,915	39,272	3,351	3,059	11,796	12,912
Nashville	7,491	9,202	7,233	9,182	2,522	3,214	1,287	1,679	654	832	533	1,254	10,667	13,248	9,053	12,115	1,309	1,760	3,417	3,424
Boston region:																				
Augusta	2,539	2,566	915	1,421	1,176	1,185	588	543	271	276	66	68	3,986	4,027	1,569	2,032	3,521	478	458	241
Boston	24,426	26,336	23,950	20,400	9,372	8,826	8,456	8,597	1,194	1,077	1,701	1,258	34,992	36,239	34,107	30,255	989	6,191	15,567	14,054
Burlington	1,516	1,271	516	339	762	510	322	236	236	155	171	29	2,514	1,936	1,009	604	195	176	306	85
Hartford	16,643	17,485	9,219	9,358	4,836	5,156	4,370	4,317	643	547	813	897	22,122	23,188	14,402	14,572	1,925	1,443	4,848	5,617
Portsmouth	1,897	1,703	499	529	779	718	307	347	109	135	105	142	2,785	2,556	911	1,018	382	358	335	298
Providence	4,295	4,559	1,853	1,774	2,234	2,447	1,383	1,358	299	163	186	199	6,828	7,169	3,421	3,331	872	1,021	1,170	1,526
Chicago region:																				
Chicago	92,515	139,568	84,047	105,805	25,352	35,678	22,996	32,698	4,205	5,550	13,280	15,582	122,072	180,796	120,323	154,085	46,508	13,234	56,006	35,326
Detroit	55,011	72,433	45,355	48,832	18,337	20,538	14,121	15,168	2,095	2,578	2,812	4,370	75,443	95,549	62,288	68,369	8,441	4,095	26,185	25,926
Milwaukee	6,910	12,457	5,442	6,566	4,608	4,529	3,033	2,551	547	1,417	942	5,847	12,065	18,403	13,418	14,964	3,431	3,706	6,732	7,715
Springfield	5,530	11,769	4,376	5,945	2,027	3,255	1,378	2,007	513	805	1,373	1,491	8,070	15,829	7,126	9,442	1,729	2,825	2,220	3,235
Cincinnati region:																				
Cincinnati	13,440	21,104	6,573	6,773	2,764	3,349	1,529	1,980	335	542	1,379	1,474	16,539	24,995	9,681	10,228	1,187	1,790	4,404	2,910
Cleveland	19,412	28,727	23,435	29,104	5,951	7,431	3,794	5,788	843	1,473	1,847	1,479	26,206	37,631	29,076	36,371	2,380	4,337	9,807	19,747
Columbus	10,892	11,281	8,575	7,505	1,714	1,625	1,087	878	310	311	582	697	12,916	13,217	10,244	9,079	842	820	5,747	5,764
Indianapolis	11,010	14,295	10,548	15,579	3,594	4,667	2,907	3,386	907	990	2,942	3,028	15,511	19,952	16,397	21,993	2,249	3,051	10,591	12,522
Louisville	6,324	7,984	5,413	7,071	1,696	2,468	1,117	1,380	705	915	1,848	2,425	8,725	11,367	8,378	10,876	2,333	2,571	5,878	6,138
Parkersburg	5,597	4,840	3,930	5,374	1,769	1,574	1,077	1,117	428	463	366	369	7,794	6,877	5,372	6,860	843	1,130	2,514	3,600
Richmond	11,456	15,051	9,482	12,242	3,502	3,988	1,929	2,263	616	791	921	1,182	15,574	19,830	12,333	15,687	1,491	2,636	6,266	7,766
Toledo	5,280	5,215	1,577	2,328	981	980	500	633	188	133	297	220	6,449	6,328	2,373	3,180	510	628	597	622
Dallas region:																				
Albuquerque	3,756	4,088	2,037	2,317	2,077	2,378	1,075	1,192	252	311	120	426	6,085	6,777	3,233	3,935	698	807	710	1,031
Austin	14,368	16,638	8,157	8,993	4,445	5,664	2,797	3,336	624	1,049	1,292	2,056	19,437	23,351	12,246	14,386	1,568	2,344	4,019	4,092
Dallas	17,123	20,908	12,841	15,005	5,530	8,225	3,225	4,750	967	1,393	2,155	2,267	23,620	30,526	18,221	22,022	1,546	1,971	7,187	6,903
Little Rock	2,876	3,685	6,203	1,361	975	1,209	374	489	264	444	262	615	4,115	5,338	6,930	2,465	814	904	5,580	883
New Orleans	9,876	10,838	5,884	6,790	4,342	4,300	2,420	2,489	533	713	945	902	14,751	15,851	9,249	10,182	946	1,082	2,738	4,108
Oklahoma City	6,631	9,382	5,584	4,832	3,975	4,998	2,189	2,239	974	1,257	679	557	11,580	15,637	8,452	7,629	1,409	1,701	3,162	2,169
New York City region:																				
Albany	8,629	10,930	5,018	7,976	4,177	3,960	3,200	3,366	607	708	770	881	13,413	15,598	8,988	12,223	1,278	1,668	3,162	4,279
Brooklyn	51,836	70,027	64,425	93,159	28,275	35,112	21,773	24,882	3,062	3,680	4,578	7,340	83,173	108,819	90,776	125,382	5,502	7,870	11,176	17,232
Buffalo	12,400	13,541	5,642	7,990	4,031	4,836	2,969	3,436	590	807	1,563	1,443	17,021	19,184	10,174	12,869	1,164	1,665	3,203	5,032
Lower Manhattan	15,146	17,461	97,304	101,012	13,497	17,600	13,689	18,495	1,917	1,902	6,298	4,671	30,560	36,963	117,290	124,178	4,529	4,328	47,417	71,737
Syracuse	8,388	11,263	2,804	3,011	2,974	4,593	2,044	2,411	497	762	567	500	11,859	16,618	5,415	5,921	1,372	2,737	2,064	1,971
Upper Manhattan	82,425	84,511	140,615	131,353	30,135	32,259	32,199	32,466	4,048	4,618	9,367	12,275	116,608	121,388	182,180	176,094	5,694	6,965	40,159	47,265
Omaha region:																				
Aberdeen	1,215	1,834	662	1,081	515	788	209	264	135	222	99	45	1,865	2,844	971	1,391	155	332	452	576
Cheyenne	1,507	1,336	932	895	616	490	264	205	182	187	130	167	2,305	2,013	1,326	1,266	218	284	221	333
Denver	7,579	7,598	5,815	5,254	2,917	2,346	1,586	1,475	450	392	537	433	10,946	10,336	7,938	7,163	970	1,220	3,426	2,859
Des Moines	2,822	3,628	3,218	6,177	1,730	2,069	850	947	549	654	497	355	5,101	6,351	4,564	7,480	870	1,115	2,278	4,362
Fargo	1,468	1,361	934	1,092	729	628	307	236	123	146	102	86	2,320	2,135	1,342	1,414	115	145	404	508
Kansas City	6,660	7,231	6,108	5,638	2,882	2,591	1,454	1,497	347	346	1,258	752	9,889	10,168	8,820	7,887	1,018	2,217	3,720	3,353
Omaha	1,462	1,950	2,046	1,734	601	834	267	585	171	100	457	411	2,234	2,884	2,770	2,729	409	689	1,385	1,589
St. Louis	9,579	7,987	7,329	8,046	2,665	2,202	1,302	1,308	631	389	817	677	12,875	10,578	9,447	10,031	1,551	2,179	4,336	6,100
St. Paul	6,859	8,123	8,477	9,390	3,969	3,830	2,494	2,711	646	559	1,168	1,499	11,474	12,512	12,139	13,600	2,143	2,454	7,426	8,374
Wichita	4,384	5,047	5,243	5,526	2,298	2,294	1,104	1,299	362	362	274	259	7,044	7,703	6,621	7,084	1,196	1,232	4,370	4,122

[1] The number and dollar value of inactive accounts, shown separately in the columns to the right, are included in these tabulations.

Inventory of taxpayer delinquent accounts, December 1958 and 1957—Continued

Region and district	Tax groups																Inactive			
	Income				Employment				Other				Total				Number		Amount (thousand dollars)	
	Number		Amount (thousand dollars)		Number		Amount (thousand dollars)		Number		Amount (thousand dollars)		Number		Amount (thousand dollars)					
	1958	1957	1958	1957	1958	1957	1958	1957	1958	1957	1958	1957	1958	1957	1958	1957	1958	1957	1958	1957
Philadelphia region:																				
Baltimore	25,302	36,164	19,778	29,444	5,965	7,246	4,010	5,100	1,202	1,572	1,916	1,526	32,469	44,982	25,705	36,069	1,549	3,853	9,704	17,325
Camden	10,730	13,595	9,805	9,867	4,379	4,876	4,194	3,590	1,078	905	1,040	1,424	16,187	19,376	15,040	14,881	981	2,549	1,479	3,015
Newark	23,649	38,431	28,056	33,561	10,929	14,575	13,291	17,170	1,470	2,716	3,478	4,936	36,048	55,722	44,825	55,667	3,383	7,208	17,754	19,409
Philadelphia	22,830	32,945	25,432	29,099	5,816	7,564	8,944	10,317	1,206	1,745	8,187	9,038	29,852	42,254	42,563	48,455	3,527	6,422	24,609	24,536
Pittsburgh	20,862	16,308	11,795	11,063	5,976	4,592	4,569	3,583	983	859	1,011	1,037	27,821	21,759	17,374	15,683	2,003	2,446	5,364	6,439
Scranton	3,313	3,165	4,389	5,806	1,598	1,547	1,655	2,127	482	384	153	142	5,393	5,096	6,196	8,075	743	957	3,068	5,433
Wilmington	3,303	4,162	2,045	3,254	331	522	347	272	72	133	904	286	3,706	4,817	3,296	3,811	252	395	2,185	2,108
San Francisco region:																				
Boise	1,812	2,406	1,552	1,504	760	842	395	513	240	311	266	263	2,812	3,559	2,213	2,280	390	422	1,273	787
Helena	2,318	2,793	1,228	1,214	1,040	1,122	550	624	214	221	246	209	3,572	4,136	2,024	2,047	269	361	269	478
Honolulu	2,330	2,827	1,961	1,963	989	1,095	606	772	129	179	320	562	3,448	4,101	2,887	3,297	468	686	1,361	1,246
Los Angeles	59,388	66,415	60,510	50,469	19,895	19,853	18,723	20,762	2,400	2,746	4,678	5,448	81,683	89,014	83,911	76,679	9,195	13,466	25,040	21,296
Phoenix	4,070	4,397	2,721	2,836	1,961	2,039	1,288	1,396	187	324	267	221	6,218	6,760	4,276	4,452	485	514	812	887
Portland	6,542	7,203	10,756	10,506	2,410	2,554	1,766	2,073	544	538	356	559	9,496	10,295	12,879	13,139	1,383	1,375	3,478	5,121
Reno	2,258	2,584	5,124	4,447	717	928	1,174	1,393	177	227	506	484	3,152	3,739	6,804	6,324	349	313	3,767	4,153
Salt Lake City	3,025	3,094	3,134	2,915	1,344	1,527	807	861	203	257	142	130	4,572	4,878	4,084	3,906	520	567	1,772	1,688
San Francisco	36,143	44,635	51,157	61,292	12,169	12,797	9,562	10,119	2,635	3,009	3,115	3,370	50,947	60,441	63,834	74,781	4,231	4,778	40,188	41,919
Seattle	12,468	14,444	8,317	9,303	5,238	5,715	3,935	4,786	718	781	1,209	1,741	18,424	20,940	13,462	15,890	1,771	1,794	4,642	5,676
International Operations Division	8,094	12,111	40,903	16,852	1,867	1,884	410	444	127	51	510	147	10,088	14,046	41,823	17,443	320	440	310	433
Puerto Rico	835	916	283	316	1,612	1,755	290	375	4	3	21	30	2,451	2,674	593	721	320	440	310	433
All other	7,259	11,195	40,620	16,535	255	129	120	69	123	48	489	117	7,637	11,372	41,230	16,722				

NOTE.—Owing to rounding, components do not always add to totals.

Delinquent taxes

District	Employment tax		Percent increase or decrease over preceding year	Total taxes		Percent increase or decrease over preceding year
	Number	Amount		Number	Amount	
Augusta, Maine:						
1954	1,145	$665,410.01		3,478	$2,582,660.00	
1955	1,119	489,363.35	−26.4	3,018	1,915,961.28	−25.8
1956	1,138	543,000.00	+11.0	3,582	1,489,000.00	−22.2
1957	1,185	543,000.00		4,027	2,032,000.00	+36.4
1958	1,176	588,000.00	+8.3	3,986	1,569,000.00	−22.7
Boston, Mass.:						
1954	15,058	11,226,932.85		57,082	41,306,294.00	
1955	11,122	10,000,411.94	−10.9	39,723	37,835,356.26	−8.4
1956	9,477	9,632,000.00	−3.6	36,337	36,896,000.00	−2.4
1957	8,826	8,597,000.00	−10.7	36,239	30,255,000.00	−17.9
1958	9,372	8,456,000.00	−1.7	34,992	34,107,000.00	+12.7
Burlington, Vt.:						
1954	619	241,083.40		1,424	644,129.00	
1955	441	145,096.27	−39.8	1,245	409,970.49	−36.3
1956	421	201,000.00	+38.6	1,714	685,000.00	+67.0
1957	510	236,000.00	+17.4	1,936	604,000.00	−11.8
1958	762	322,000.00	+36.4	2,514	1,009,000.00	+67.1
Hartford, Conn.:						
1954	4,232	2,831,137.07		22,554	15,271,158.00	
1955	5,079	3,298,977.26	+16.5	21,219	15,348,135.93	+.5
1956	4,079	3,202,000.00	−2.9	21,783	11,445,000.00	−25.4
1957	5,156	4,317,000.00	+34.8	23,188	14,572,000.00	+27.3
1958	4,836	4,370,000.00	+1.2	22,122	14,402,000.00	−1.2
Portsmouth, N.H.:						
1954	1,017	460,773.21		2,854	3,252,731.00	
1955	840	310,676.22	−32.5	2,347	2,179,031.04	−33.0
1956	829	315,000.00	+1.2	3,144	1,948,000.00	−10.6
1957	718	347,000.00	+10.1	2,556	1,018,000.00	−49.7
1958	779	307,000.00	−11.5	2,785	911,000.00	−10.5
Providence, R.I.:						
1954	1,847	1,204,162.49		8,060	7,389,895.00	
1955	1,259	894,222.10	−25.7	5,985	7,173,805.25	−2.9
1956	1,874	1,254,000.00	+40.2	7,329	6,041,000.00	−15.7
1957	2,447	1,358,000.00	+8.2	7,169	3,331,000.00	−44.8
1958	2,234	1,383,000.00	+1.8	6,828	3,421,000.00	+2.7
Albany, N.Y. (14th):						
1954	4,679	3,559,687.55		13,822	15,061,055.00	
1955	4,770	3,454,402.53	−2.9	14,246	11,274,930.84	−25.1
1956	3,818	3,368,000.00	−2.4	14,296	11,142,000.00	−1.1
1957	3,960	3,366,000.00	0	15,598	12,223,000.00	+9.7
1958	4,177	3,200,000.00	−4.9	13,413	8,988,000.00	−26.5
Brooklyn, N.Y. (1st):						
1954	28,903	18,534,016.93		88,274	106,522,490.00	
1955	37,482	24,523,884.76	+32.3	100,932	133,339,786.92	+25.1
1956	33,648	23,624,000.00	−3.6	105,604	129,428,000.00	−2.9
1957	35,112	24,882,000.00	+5.3	108,819	125,382,000.00	−3.1
1958	28,275	21,773,000.00	−12.5	83,173	90,776,000.00	−27.6
Buffalo, N.Y. (28th):						
1954	4,664	2,351,768.77		21,869	12,368,574.00	
1955	4,756	2,916,655.39	+24.0	18,203	12,058,317.23	−2.5
1956	4,141	2,778,000.00	−4.7	20,172	12,309,000.00	+2.0
1957	4,836	3,436,000.00	+23.6	19,184	12,869,000.00	+4.4
1958	4,031	2,969,000.00	−13.5	17,021	10,174,000.00	−20.9
Lower Manhattan, N.Y. (2d):						
1954	22,636	17,622,534.10		48,155	171,309,518.00	
1955	25,952	20,573,162.41	+16.7	53,341	169,476,849.31	−1.0
1956	19,669	21,087,000.00	+2.4	44,725	153,697,000.00	−9.3
1957	17,600	18,495,000.00	−12.2	36,963	124,178,000.00	−19.2
1958	13,497	13,689,000.00	−25.8	30,560	117,290,000.00	−5.5
Syracuse, N.Y. (21st):						
1954	3,046	1,552,242.81		12,486	5,650,017.00	
1955	2,565	1,664,304.71	+7.2	9,308	5,395,848.85	−4.4
1956	3,341	2,019,000.00	+21.3	13,955	6,443,000.00	+19.4
1957	4,593	2,411,000.00	+19.4	16,618	5,921,000.00	−8.1
1958	2,974	2,044,000.00	−15.2	11,859	5,415,000.00	−8.5
Upper Manhattan, N.Y. (3d):						
1954	24,420	26,447,055.62		67,328	158,538,468.00	
1955	31,922	32,691,187.54	+23.6	109,567	195,098,775.26	+23.6
1956	33,586	31,514,000.00	−3.6	124,641	202,676,000.00	+3.8
1957	32,259	32,466,000.00	+3.0	121,388	176,094,000.00	−13.1
1958	30,135	32,199,000.00	−.8	116,608	182,180,000.00	+3.4
Baltimore, Md. (Maryland and District of Columbia):						
1954	12,249	6,296,683.87		120,870	68,663,284.00	
1955	9,577	5,733,385.50	−8.3	95,861	62,497,224.45	−8.9
1956	6,963	4,402,000.00	−23.7	60,642	42,778,000.00	−31.5
1957	7,246	5,100,000.00	+15.8	44,982	36,069,000.00	−15.6
1958	5,965	4,010,000.00	−21.4	32,469	25,705,000.00	−28.7
Camden, N.J. (1st):						
1954	3,526	2,090,781.97		16,986	10,638,780.00	
1955	3,684	2,657,984.25	+27.1	16,958	16,896,707.75	+58.8
1956	4,709	2,950,000.00	+10.9	19,659	14,015,000.00	−17.0
1957	4,876	3,590,000.00	+21.6	19,376	14,881,000.00	+6.1
1958	4,379	4,194,000.00	+16.8	16,187	15,040,000.00	+1.1
Newark, N.J. (5th):						
1954	37,438	24,083,886.58		122,953	92,962,952.00	
1955	23,673	22,244,526.78	−7.6	84,883	79,793,942.61	−14.1
1956	17,240	18,193,000.00	−18.2	71,578	79,913,000.00	+.1
1957	14,575	17,170,000.00	−5.6	55,722	55,667,000.00	−30.3
1958	10,929	13,291,000.00	−22.6	36,048	44,825,000.00	−19.5
Philadelphia, Pa. (1st):						
1954	18,014	$15,700,488.83		95,824	$63,450,420.00	
1955	17,918	17,060,134.24	+8.6	87,594	74,744,336.73	+17.7
1956	11,923	12,342,000.00	−27.6	55,994	66,115,000.00	−11.5
1957	7,564	10,317,000.00	−16.4	42,254	48,455,000.00	−26.7
1958	5,816	8,944,000.00	−13.3	29,852	42,563,000.00	−12.2
Pittsburgh, Pa. (23d):						
1954	4,880	3,800,921.84		40,973	28,955,774.00	
1955	6,651	5,079,938.43	+33.6	34,891	30,144,327.73	+4.1
1956	5,251	4,858,000.00	−4.5	28,534	23,103,000.00	−23.3
1957	4,592	3,583,000.00	−26.2	21,759	15,683,000.00	−32.1
1958	5,976	4,569,000.00	+27.5	27,821	17,374,000.00	+10.8
Scranton, Pa. (12th):						
1954	2,134	2,345,338.27		9,414	7,948,754.00	
1955	1,743	2,324,223.08	−.8	6,659	7,233,268.19	−9.0
1956	1,397	2,220,000.00	−4.4	4,975	6,516,000.00	−9.9
1957	1,547	2,127,000.00	−4.1	5,096	8,075,000.00	+23.9
1958	1,598	1,655,000.00	−22.2	5,393	6,196,000.00	−23.3
Wilmington, Del.:						
1954	571	303,208.25		5,460	22,009,168.00	
1955	683	327,924.93	+8.2	4,586	3,639,928.73	−83.4
1956	621	301,000.00	−8.2	5,522	3,722,000.00	+2.2
1957	522	272,000.00	−9.6	4,817	3,811,000.00	+2.3
1958	331	347,000.00	+27.6	3,706	3,296,000.00	−13.5
Cincinnati, Ohio (1st):						
1954	3,431	1,784,096.72		26,545	15,128,835.00	
1955	3,630	1,947,441.26	+9.1	24,423	12,685,909.21	−16.1
1956	3,060	1,801,000.00	−7.4	22,534	11,410,000.00	−10.0
1957	3,349	1,980,000.00	+9.9	24,995	10,228,000.00	−10.3
1958	2,764	1,529,000.00	−22.8	16,539	9,681,000.00	−5.3
Cleveland, Ohio (18th):						
1954	7,958	5,272,650.40		49,841	42,963,755.00	
1955	8,720	5,523,283.73	+4.7	46,546	35,547,838.73	−17.4
1956	8,219	5,924,000.00	+7.2	39,521	42,590,000.00	+19.8
1957	7,431	5,788,000.00	−2.2	37,631	36,371,000.00	−14.6
1958	5,951	3,794,000.00	−34.5	26,206	29,076,000.00	−20.1
Columbus, Ohio (11th):						
1954	1,207	594,431.23		13,054	6,652,735.00	
1955	1,290	657,347.06	+10.6	11,010	6,624,801.15	−.4
1956	1,517	845,000.00	+28.6	12,340	9,972,000.00	+50.5
1957	1,625	878,000.00	+3.9	13,217	9,079,000.00	−8.9
1958	1,714	1,087,000.00	+23.8	12,916	10,244,000.00	+12.8
Indianapolis, Ind.:						
1954	3,420	2,477,333.39		23,475	19,133,272.00	
1955	4,767	2,953,720.13	+19.2	22,273	20,760,250.92	+8.5
1956	3,959	3,120,000.00	+5.6	20,007	20,574,000.00	−.8
1957	4,667	3,386,000.00	+8.5	19,952	21,993,000.00	+6.8
1958	3,594	2,907,000.00	−14.1	15,511	16,397,000.00	−25.4
Louisville, Ky.:						
1954	2,019	1,035,518.05		12,161	11,834,161.00	
1955	2,934	1,228,281.32	+18.5	12,963	13,172,969.14	+11.3
1956	2,457	1,343,000.00	+9.3	12,331	12,930,000.00	−1.8
1957	2,468	1,380,000.00	+2.7	11,367	10,876,000.00	−15.8
1958	1,696	1,117,000.00	−19.0	8,725	8,378,000.00	−23.0
Parkersburg, West Va.:						
1954	3,221	1,952,988.54		15,917	12,931,609.00	
1955	2,257	1,376,158.66	−29.5	11,094	10,627,103.44	−17.8
1956	1,533	1,064,000.00	−22.6	8,357	9,032,000.00	−15.0
1957	1,574	1,117,000.00	+4.9	6,877	6,860,000.00	−24.0
1958	1,769	1,077,000.00	−3.6	7,794	5,372,000.00	−21.7
Richmond, Va.:						
1954	4,692	2,239,122.31		32,611	20,986,659.00	
1955	5,147	2,663,135.29	+18.9	29,332	21,881,829.41	+4.2
1956	4,118	2,420,000.00	−9.1	26,199	23,932,000.00	+9.3
1957	3,988	2,263,000.00	−6.4	19,830	15,687,000.00	−34.4
1958	3,502	1,929,000.00	−14.8	15,574	12,333,000.00	−21.4
Toledo, Ohio (10th):						
1954	929	392,720.71		6,072	3,317,067.00	
1955	785	393,421.06		4,855	2,896,973.94	−12.6
1956	1,078	617,000.00	+56.9	6,277	2,471,000.00	−14.7
1957	980	633,000.00	+2.5	6,328	3,180,000.00	+28.6
1958	981	500,000.00	−21.0	6,449	2,373,000.00	−25.4
Atlanta, Ga.:						
1954	4,963	2,947,046.64		26,021	20,972,739.00	
1955	5,889	3,572,771.07	+21.2	24,979	18,809,469.18	−10.3
1956	5,540	3,432,000.00	−3.9	24,713	17,080,000.00	−9.1
1957	5,864	3,829,000.00	+11.5	25,328	18,972,000.00	+11.0
1958	5,981	3,948,000.00	+3.1	23,875	15,388,000.00	−18.9
Birmingham, Ala.:						
1954	4,874	2,299,185.29		19,506	19,488,687.00	
1955	3,655	1,965,215.06	−14.5	16,003	17,636,819.66	−9.5
1956	3,658	1,880,000.00	−4.3	16,780	21,969,000.00	+24.5
1957	3,826	1,772,000.00	−5.7	15,986	18,889,000.00	−14.0
1958	3,655	1,735,000.00	−2.1	14,130	17,066,000.00	−9.7
Columbia, S.C.:						
1954	3,727	1,078,658.03		14,246	7,201,701.00	
1955	3,318	822,119.84	−23.8	12,972	6,511,429.28	−9.5
1956	3,311	850,000.00	+3.4	13,202	5,413,000.00	−16.8
1957	2,938	948,000.00	+11.5	13,339	4,462,000.00	−17.5
1958	2,773	1,064,000.00	+12.2	11,573	4,471,000.00	+.2
Greensboro, N.C.:						
1954	5,332	2,016,860.03		22,459	26,395,319.00	
1955	4,318	1,998,267.92	−.9	15,687	21,018,680.09	−20.3
1956	4,336	1,957,000.00	−2.0	17,696	22,222,000.00	+5.7

Delinquent taxes—Continued

District	Employment tax		Percent increase or decrease over preceding year	Total taxes		Percent increase or decrease over preceding year
	Number	Amount		Number	Amount	
Greensboro—Con.						
1957	4,922	$2,023,000.00	+3.3	17,598	$14,872,000.00	−33.0
1958	4,186	1,359,000.00	−32.8	15,706	12,716,000.00	−14.5
Jackson, Miss.:						
1954	1,500	636,230.21		5,563	4,717,712.00	
1955	1,526	596,553.02	−6.1	5,231	2,957,931.29	−37.3
1956	1,321	656,000.00	+9.8	5,371	2,744,000.00	−7.2
1957	1,634	684,000.00	+4.2	7,229	2,975,000.00	+8.4
1958	1,774	852,000.00	+24.6	5,999	2,411,000.00	−19.0
Jacksonville, Fla.:						
1954	8,451	4,686,224.83		31,020	47,883,435.00	
1955	8,239	4,996,151.87	+6.6	30,918	49,361,697.11	+3.0
1956	10,203	6,562,000.00	+31.3	36,962	41,546,000.00	−15.8
1957	11,447	8,519,000.00	+29.8	36,770	39,272,000.00	−5.4
1958	10,375	8,029,000.00	−5.8	33,938	39,915,000.00	+1.6
Nashville, Tenn.:						
1954	3,721	1,775,100.45		15,763	12,463,047.00	
1955	3,181	1,601,697.63	−9.7	12,971	13,220,012.32	+6.0
1956	3,100	1,587,000.00	−.9	13,320	11,457,000.00	−13.3
1957	3,214	1,679,000.00	+5.7	13,248	12,115,000.00	+5.7
1958	2,522	1,287,000.00	−23.3	10,667	9,053,000.00	−25.3
Chicago, Ill. (1st):						
1954	21,439	12,802,486.63		136,532	81,659,860.00	
1955	22,891	15,915,033.71	+24.3	119,822	87,843,509.34	+7.5
1956	24,597	20,829,000.00	+30.8	143,457	120,971,000.00	+37.7
1957	35,678	32,698,000.00	+56.9	180,796	154,085,000.00	+27.3
1958	25,352	22,996,000.00	−29.7	122,072	120,323,000.00	−21.9
Detroit, Mich.:						
1954	11,891	7,782,350.72		68,809	44,787,225.00	
1955	16,325	10,808,182.55	+38.8	81,569	68,904,225.44	+53.8
1956	16,871	13,328,000.00	+23.3	93,782	70,964,000.00	+2.9
1957	20,538	15,168,000.00	+13.8	95,549	68,369,000.00	−3.6
1958	18,337	14,121,000.00	−6.9	75,443	62,288,000.00	−8.9
Milwaukee, Wis.:						
1954	3,759	1,704,809.43		16,962	16,592,839.00	
1955	3,781	2,087,500.52	+22.4	14,322	16,279,604.79	−1.8
1956	4,534	2,314,000.00	+10.8	14,936	13,455,000.00	−17.3
1957	4,529	2,551,000.00	+10.2	18,403	14,964,000.00	+11.2
1958	4,608	3,033,000.00	+18.9	12,065	13,418,000.00	−10.3
Springfield, Ill. (8th):						
1954	4,563	1,903,972.63		19,192	9,101,127.00	
1955	3,381	1,627,535.26	−14.4	12,885	8,723,856.07	−4.1
1956	3,374	2,171,000.00	+33.3	15,117	8,526,000.00	−2.2
1957	3,255	2,007,000.00	−7.5	15,829	9,442,000.00	+10.7
1958	2,027	1,378,000.00	−31.3	8,070	7,126,000.00	−24.5
Aberdeen, S. Dak.:						
1954	734	282,200.82		3,092	1,255,504.00	
1955	694	248,973.89	−11.7	2,488	1,613,977.06	+28.5
1956	823	248,000.00	−.4	2,948	1,441,000.00	−10.7
1957	788	264,000.00	+6.4	2,844	1,391,000.00	−3.5
1958	515	209,000.00	−20.8	1,865	971,000.00	−30.2
Cheyenne, Wyo.:						
1954	688	248,463.42		2,445	1,629,689.00	
1955	727	256,547.69	+3.6	2,215	1,344,230.40	−17.5
1956	639	264,000.00	+2.7	2,126	1,077,000.00	−19.8
1957	490	205,000.00	−22.3	2,013	1,266,000.00	+17.5
1958	616	264,000.00	+28.8	2,305	1,326,000.00	+4.7
Denver, Colo.:						
1954	2,754	1,319,176.85		9,888	7,552,576.00	
1955	3,056	1,642,399.55	+24.4	9,748	7,960,670.88	+5.4
1956	2,483	1,402,000.00	−14.6	10,236	8,142,000.00	+2.2
1957	2,346	1,475,000.00	+5.2	10,336	7,163,000.00	−12.0
1958	2,917	1,586,000.00	+7.5	10,946	7,938,000.00	+10.8
Des Moines, Iowa:						
1954	1,781	770,935.98		5,810	9,737,729.00	
1955	1,596	749,072.00	−2.8	5,207	8,200,182.84	−15.7
1956	1,989	989,000.00	+32.0	6,729	9,118,000.00	+11.1
1957	2,069	947,000.00	−4.2	6,351	7,480,000.00	−17.9
1958	1,730	850,000.00	−10.2	5,101	4,564,000.00	−39.0
Fargo, N. Dak.:						
1954	843	310,419.75		2,352	1,353,482.00	
1955	578	217,937.13	−29.6	1,607	1,011,136.65	−25.2
1956	563	228,000.00	+4.5	2,199	1,336,000.00	+32.1
1957	628	236,000.00	+3.5	2,135	1,414,000.00	+5.8
1958	729	307,000.00	+30.1	2,320	1,342,000.00	−5.1
Kansas City, Mo. (6th):						
1954	1,783	884,557.15		8,155	9,021,864.00	
1955	2,030	1,146,641.36	+29.6	7,615	9,433,477.26	+4.5
1956	2,522	1,466,000.00	+27.8	8,650	8,673,000.00	−8.0
1957	2,591	1,497,000.00	+2.1	10,168	7,887,000.00	−9.0
1958	2,882	1,454,000.00	−2.9	9,889	8,820,000.00	+11.8
Omaha, Nebr.:						
1954	810	548,945.99		3,932	4,180,447.00	
1955	638	480,083.97	−12.5	2,697	3,364,445.91	−19.5
1956	770	528,000.00	+10.0	3,441	3,544,000.00	+5.3
1957	834	585,000.00	+10.7	2,884	2,729,000.00	−22.9
1958	601	267,000.00	−54.4	2,234	2,770,000.00	+1.5
St. Louis, Mo. (1st):						
1954	1,958	974,386.01		11,539	12,267,505.00	
1955	2,686	1,323,248.26	+35.8	9,999	10,085,650.90	−17.7
1956	2,001	1,119,000.00	−15.4	8,997	9,606,000.00	−4.7
1957	2,202	1,308,000.00	+16.8	10,578	10,031,000.00	+4.4
1958	2,665	1,302,000.00	−.5	12,875	9,447,000.00	−5.8
St. Paul, Minn.:						
1954	3,096	$1,929,020.99		10,916	$9,725,868.00	
1955	3,110	2,093,897.27	+8.5	9,616	9,270,700.41	−4.6
1956	3,590	2,546,000.00	+21.5	12,035	11,203,000.00	+20.8
1957	3,830	2,711,000.00	+6.4	12,512	13,600,000.00	+21.3
1958	3,969	2,494,000.00	−8.0	11,474	12,139,000.00	−10.7
Wichita, Kans.:						
1954	2,405	939,301.24		10,542	7,316,879.00	
1955	2,912	1,018,508.27	+8.5	10,279	6,757,858.90	−7.6
1956	2,300	1,269,000.00	+24.5	9,038	8,047,000.00	+19.0
1957	2,294	1,299,000.00	+2.3	7,703	7,084,000.00	−11.9
1958	2,298	1,104,000.00	−15.0	7,044	6,621,000.00	−6.5
Albuquerque, N. Mex.:						
1954	1,911	741,103.41		5,491	2,824,810.00	
1955	1,994	853,894.55	+15.2	5,078	2,960,729.62	+4.8
1956	1,957	1,062,000.00	+24.3	5,888	3,926,000.00	+32.5
1957	2,378	1,192,000.00	+12.2	6,777	3,935,000.00	+.2
1958	2,077	1,075,000.00	−9.8	6,085	3,233,000.00	−17.8
Austin, Tex. (1st):						
1954	5,609	3,021,818.39		22,355	20,202,903.00	
1955	6,580	2,702,774.57	−10.5	18,391	12,754,005.75	−36.8
1956	5,283	3,080,000.00	+13.9	19,534	15,230,000.00	+19.4
1957	5,664	3,336,000.00	+8.3	23,351	14,386,000.00	−5.5
1958	4,445	2,797,000.00	−16.2	19,437	12,246,000.00	−14.9
Dallas, Tex. (2d):						
1954	9,311	5,077,118.14		31,244	23,748,778.00	
1955	6,816	3,608,220.71	−28.9	22,420	16,337,067.48	−31.2
1956	6,158	3,642,000.00	+.9	25,793	20,822,000.00	+27.4
1957	8,225	4,750,000.00	+30.4	30,526	22,022,000.00	+5.7
1958	5,530	3,225,000.00	−32.1	23,620	18,221,000.00	−17.3
Little Rock, Ark.:						
1954	1,801	462,058.04		5,431	2,315,863.00	
1955	1,259	319,961.69	−30.7	4,182	2,108,438.18	−8.9
1956	1,179	453,000.00	+41.5	4,781	2,355,000.00	+11.7
1957	1,209	489,000.00	+7.9	5,338	2,465,000.00	+4.6
1958	975	374,000.00	−23.5	4,115	6,930,000.00	+181.1
New Orleans, La.:						
1954	4,566	1,948,046.72		19,566	17,472,965.00	
1955	4,261	2,260,578.68	+16.0	14,225	13,613,589.17	−22.0
1956	4,097	2,214,000.00	−2.0	15,298	11,536,000.00	−15.2
1957	4,300	2,489,000.00	+12.4	15,851	10,182,000.00	−11.7
1958	4,342	2,420,000.00	−2.8	14,751	9,249,000.00	−9.2
Oklahoma City, Okla.:						
1954	3,311	1,790,406.03		9,994	9,043,216.00	
1955	3,123	1,825,878.19	+2.0	9,455	9,421,064.41	+4.1
1956	3,764	2,167,000.00	+18.6	12,886	8,737,000.00	−7.2
1957	4,998	2,239,000.00	+3.3	15,637	7,629,000.00	−12.6
1958	3,975	2,189,000.00	−2.2	11,580	8,452,000.00	+10.8
Boise, Idaho:						
1954	1,050	470,289.14		3,115	2,083,834.00	
1955	1,099	472,819.51	+.6	2,949	1,988,294.11	−4.6
1956	860	411,000.00	−13.1	3,211	2,155,000.00	+8.4
1957	842	513,000.00	+24.8	3,559	2,280,000.00	+5.8
1958	760	395,000.00	−23.0	2,812	2,213,000.00	−2.9
Helena, Mont.:						
1954	1,064	436,666.55		3,214	2,863,290.00	
1955	831	333,265.41	−23.7	2,912	2,575,503.61	−10.0
1956	1,035	527,000.00	+58.2	3,299	1,799,000.00	−30.1
1957	1,122	624,000.00	+18.4	4,136	2,047,000.00	+13.7
1958	1,040	550,000.00	−11.9	3,572	2,024,000.00	−1.1
Honolulu, T.H.:						
1954	1,338	898,188.84		4,682	4,620,939.00	
1955	1,196	876,086.14	−2.4	3,835	4,345,619.31	−5.9
1956	1,047	668,000.00	−23.7	3,800	3,929,000.00	−9.5
1957	1,095	772,000.00	+15.5	4,101	3,297,000.00	−16.0
1958	989	606,000.00	−21.5	3,448	2,887,000.00	−12.4
Los Angeles, Calif. (6th):						
1954	16,989	13,396,011.75		86,733	88,047,147.00	
1955	22,429	19,706,004.78	+47.1	105,039	83,679,336.98	−4.9
1956	17,151	16,600,000.00	−15.7	92,176	68,937,000.00	−17.6
1957	19,853	20,762,000.00	+25.0	89,014	76,679,000.00	+11.2
1958	19,895	18,723,000.00	−9.8	81,683	83,911,000.00	+9.4
Phoenix, Ariz.:						
1954	2,188	1,384,417.91		8,957	5,510,061.00	
1955	2,059	1,327,348.74	−4.1	7,023	5,057,757.70	−8.2
1956	1,533	1,169,000.00	−11.9	5,871	4,095,000.00	−19.0
1957	2,039	1,396,000.00	+19.3	6,760	4,452,000.00	+8.7
1958	1,961	1,288,000.00	−7.7	6,218	4,276,000.00	−4.0
Portland, Oreg.:						
1954	4,059	2,053,716.03		14,799	15,351,352.00	
1955	3,950	2,281,809.97	+11.1	11,636	12,429,142.29	−19.0
1956	2,767	1,934,000.00	−15.2	10,300	13,215,000.00	+6.3
1957	2,554	2,073,000.00	+7.1	10,295	13,139,000.00	−.5
1958	2,410	1,766,000.00	−14.8	9,496	12,879,000.00	−2.0
Reno, Nev.:						
1954	1,455	1,480,023.56		4,576	6,043,359.00	
1955	1,195	1,470,181.47	−.6	3,782	6,697,953.56	+10.8
1956	1,038	1,574,000.00	+7.0	3,545	5,995,000.00	−10.4
1957	928	1,393,000.00	−11.4	3,739	6,324,000.00	+5.4
1958	717	1,174,000.00	−15.7	3,152	6,804,000.00	+7.6
Salt Lake City, Utah:						
1954	1,671	925,535.77		5,554	4,649,780.00	
1955	1,491	809,124.82	−12.6	4,668	3,560,853.41	−23.4

Delinquent taxes—Continued

District	Employment tax		Percent increase or decrease over preceding year	Total taxes		Percent increase or decrease over preceding year
	Number	Amount		Number	Amount	
Salt Lake City—Con.						
1956	1,374	$778,000.00	−3.8	4,505	$3,771,000.00	+5.8
1957	1,527	861,000.00	+10.6	4,878	3,906,000.00	+3.5
1958	1,344	807,000.00	−6.3	4,572	4,084,000.00	+4.6
San Francisco, Calif. (1st):						
1954	17,616	10,597,430.98	------	85,750	66,858,096.00	------
1955	17,509	11,951,569.42	+12.7	73,245	88,983,217.30	+33.0
1956	11,473	9,214,000.00	−22.9	61,138	77,550,000.00	−12.8
1957	12,797	10,119,000.00	+9.8	60,441	74,781,000.00	−3.5
1958	12,169	9,562,000.00	−5.5	50,947	63,834,000.00	−14.6
Seattle, Wash.:						
1954	5,932	4,324,875.05	------	27,707	19,804,603.00	------
1955	6,417	5,409,549.97	+25.0	22,634	18,285,409.85	−8.1
Seattle, Wash.—Con.						
1956	5,937	$5,687,000.00	+5.1	20,852	$16,441,000.00	−10.0
1957	5,715	4,786,000.00	−15.8	20,940	15,890,000.00	−3.3
1958	5,238	3,935,000.00	−17.8	18,424	13,462,000.00	−15.3
Puerto Rico:						
1954	1,530	147,286.62	------	2,020	273,843.00	------
1955	1,853	252,580.38	+72.1	3,249	622,244.65	+127.4
1956 [1]	1,307	296,000.00	+17.1	2,509	624,000.00	+.2
1957 [1]	1,755	375,000.00	+26.6	2,674	721,000.00	+15.5
1958 [1]	1,612	290,000.00	−22.6	2,451	593,000.00	−17.8
International operations:						
1956	1,504	442,000.00	------	14,321	17,328,000.00	------
1957	1,884	444,000.00	+.4	14,046	17,443,000.00	+.6
1958 [2]	1,867	410,000.00	−7.7	10,088	41,823,000.00	+139.8

[1] Puerto Rico figures are included in international operations for 1956, 1957, and 1958.

[2] Result of district offices' transferring to this division delinquent accounts of tax payers known to be abroad and out of reach.

TOTALS

Year	Employment tax		Percent increase or decrease over preceding year	Total tax		Percent increase or decrease over preceding year
	Number	Amount		Number	Amount	
1954	390,398	$254,062,301.79	----------	1,725,474	$1,614,494,287.00	----------
1955	399,269	284,803,237.04	+12.0	1,596,615	1,646,383,973.95	+1.9
1956	356,748	279,183,000.00	−1.9	1,560,685	1,619,629,000.00	−1.6
1957	377,253	$300,678,000.00	+7.6	1,554,876	$1,504,709,000.00	−7.0
1958	329,457	263,186,000.00	−12.5	1,280,642	1,375,737,000.00	−8.6

FISCAL POLICY

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, in view of the great debate over our Nation's fiscal policy, and whether there should be in effect a hard money or tight money-unemployment policy, or whether there should be in effect a soft money-high employment policy, I believe Senators will find an article which was published in last Sunday's New York Times magazine, entitled, "Argument for Creeping Inflation," both stimulative and informative.

I ask unanimous consent that the article may appear in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ARGUMENT FOR CREEPING INFLATION

(By Sumner H. Slichter)

The principal economic issue dividing the American people today is the issue of growth of the economy vs. stability of the price level. Mr. Eisenhower has declared that a stable price level is an indispensable condition for achieving vigorous and continuing economic growth and has placed strong emphasis on the prevention of inflation in his state of the Union message, his budget message, and his economic report.

His critics accuse him of discouraging growth in order to stabilize the price level. The AFL–CIO economic policy committee has charged that Mr. Eisenhower's program is a sure-fire prescription for stagnation. The Joint Congressional Economic Committee, under the chairmanship of Senator PAUL H. DOUGLAS, of Illinois, is about to start hearings on the problem of reconciling full employment, an adequate rate of growth, and price stability.

Is it true, as Mr. Eisenhower says, that there is no conflict between vigorous economic growth and a stable price level? Or must permanent inflation be accepted as a necessary condition to maximum growth? And if maximum growth entails creeping inflation, what will be the consequences for the economy? Will the United States price itself out of world markets? Will confidence in the dollar be undermined and will there be a disastrous flight from the dollar with creeping inflation developing into a gallop? Will creeping inflation produce great suffering among recipients of fixed incomes? Or are the consequences of creeping inflation greatly exaggerated?

The recent inflation in the United States has been caused by a mixture of strong demand for goods and a strong upward push of costs, but the principal reason the price level has increased and slow inflation must be expected to continue more or less indefinitely is the strong tendency for labor costs to rise faster than output per man-hour. During the past 10 years, for example, hourly compensation of employes in private industry outside agriculture has risen more than twice as fast as output per man-hour.

The unions explain this by asserting that wages were simply chasing prices up, but the facts refute the claims of the union spokesmen. In every one of the past 10 years the percentage rise in the hourly compensation of workers exceeded the percentage rise in the consumer price index. Furthermore, in 9 out of the past 10 years, the rise in hourly compensation of workers exceeded the rise in the wholesale prices of finished goods. Wages were not chasing prices up; on the contrary, prices were chasing wages, and were falling behind each year.

The tendency for wages to outrun output per man-hour is bound to occur in an economy of private enterprise and powerful trade unions whenever the demand for goods is strong—that is, whenever the conditions are favorable for rapid growth. Wages could be prevented from outrunning output per man-hour if the bargaining power of unions were weakened and the bargaining power of employers strengthened by the maintenance of a fairly high rate of unemployment.

Some members of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, some members of the Council of Economic Advisers, and some private economists have proposed that tight credit policies be used to create the amount of unemployment necessary to keep wages from rising faster than productivity and to keep the price level steady. The amount of unemployment needed would vary with the phase of the business cycle, the vigor of foreign competition and the year-to-year fluctuation in the size of crops, but recent experience indicates that an unemployment rate of 5 to 8 percent would be required.

Fostering unemployment in order to keep wages from outrunning productivity, however, would mean retarding the growth of the economy. Hence the conflict between maximum growth and stable prices is real—the community must decide which it prefers. There is little doubt which way the decision will go because the loss to the community from a retarded rate of growth would increase at a compound rate and would soon become intolerably burdensome. Suppose that the economy, which is capable of increasing its productive capacity at the rate of 4 percent a year, were held to a growth of only 2 percent a year in order to keep the price level steady. At the end of 10 years the economy would have a productive capacity more than 26 percentage points less than it would have had at the greater rate of growth.

What about the longrun effects of creeping inflation? Would not creeping inflation bring frequent recessions, so that in the longrun more real growth would be achieved under a stable price level? There is no doubt that rapid growth entails the risk of recession, but the occasional recessions that accompany a high rate of growth need not be severe. Much progress has been made in building up resistance of the economy to contraction. The recession of 1958 illustrates

this progress. The drop in business investment and the liquidation of inventories were moderately severe, but personal income and retail sales remained remarkably steady. As a result, the recession was both mild and short. In view of the growing capacity of the economy to resist contraction, one must reject the view that a stable price level is a necessary condition to the maximum rate of growth.

Are not changes possible in our institutions, policies, or business practices that would enable us to avoid creeping inflation and at the same time realize our maximum growth potential? There are many changes that would diminish the tendency for prices to rise, but none of them would assure that unions would not push up wages faster than industry could raise output per man-hour in the strong sellers' markets that would characterize a rapidly growing economy.

The possibility of price and wage controls may be dismissed, partly because the people would not tolerate controls in time of peace and partly because controls are easily evaded by changing the quality of goods and by introducing substitute goods. Strong public hostility to excessive union wage claims will have some effect on wages, but not much. Union members expect their officers to get all that they can for the members and would displace officers whom they suspected of failing to represent them faithfully. Union members, however, are not immune to public opinion, and strong public hostility to excessive demands will tend to weaken by a small amount the upward pressure of unions on wages.

What about the possibility of curbing the power of the trade unions by organization on the part of employers, by depriving unions of some of their present privileges and immunities, or by imposing new restrictions on unions? More organization among employers would help, but too much should not be expected from it. The employers are organized for dealing with unions in the steel industry, the coal industry, the railroad industry, and at the local level in many of the building trades, but in none of these industries have employers been able to prevent wages from outrunning output per man-hour.

Depriving unions of some of their present extraordinary privileges, such as the use of coercive picketing to force people to join or the conscription of neutrals in labor disputes, would remove some glaring injustices, but would have little effect upon the bargaining power of most unions. Breaking up some of the large unions, as has been suggested by George Romney and others, would have consequences that are hard to predict. Unions would lose some of their present ability to support strikes by some members while other members work and pay special assessments into a strike fund. Nevertheless, the new unions might drive hard bargains. There would be rivalries among them and each would have a strong desire to make a good showing.

Thus, if there were three or four unions in the automobile industry, each might feel a strong urge to make a better settlement than any of the others. Hence, breaking up the unions might increase their militancy and make reasonable settlements with them more difficult.

But whatever the possible results of the breaking up of unions, that step is not going to be taken. The American workers want their unions, and any effort to destroy or seriously weaken organized labor would cause the workers to rally to the support of the unions and make them stronger and more aggressive than ever.

The most promising methods of checking the tendency of rising labor costs to push up prices are new methods of management that enlist the ingenuity and imagination of the men at the machines and benches in reducing the ratio of labor costs to income from sales. Experience in more than a score of plants shows that amazing things begin to happen when workers share in a plant-wide bonus, based upon their success in narrowing the ratio of labor costs to income from sales, and are given good opportunities to discuss their ideas regularly with management. The common interest that everyone in the plant has in reducing labor costs produces an almost startling degree of teamwork and cooperation.

The new methods of management were introduced a few years ago by the late Joseph Scanlon, and his work is being carried out by his followers. But a generation or more will probably be required to spread the new methods throughout industry and adapt them to enterprises of various sizes and kinds. Eventually American industry will drastically modify its methods of handling labor and draw on the great capacity of rank and file workers to contribute to improvements in technology.

The new methods of management may or may not be adequate to prevent wages from outrunning productivity, but they hold more promise for checking rising labor costs than any device that has yet been developed.

If a generation or so will be required for new methods of management to check the rise in labor costs, what will happen in the meantime? Fears that the United States will be priced out of world markets are far-fetched. Prices in most other important industrial countries have been rising in recent years even faster than in the United States. Between 1950 and 1957, for example, the increase in the index of wholesale prices in Britain was more than twice as large as in the United States. In Sweden and Norway it was more than three times as large, in France almost three times as large, in West Germany almost twice as large, in Austria four times as large.

No one knows, of course, whether prices in other industrial countries will continue to rise faster than in the United States. Since the principal industrial countries are in competition with one another and since they all are more or less subject to the same influences (such as powerful trade unions and an insistent popular demand for social services that precludes important reductions in taxes), all of the industrial countries are likely to experience about the same movement of the price level.

The competitive position of the United States is very strong, especially in manufacturing. This is indicated by the fact that our exports of finished manufactures are nearly three times as large as our imports. But if important industrial countries were to succeed in underselling us on a broad scale, that would not be a calamity for us. On the contrary, it would help us check inflation by stiffening the resistance of American employers to union demands and by encouraging employers to cut prices.

Also ill-founded are fears that creeping inflation will precipitate a flight from the dollar and that creeping inflation will sooner or later become a gallop. Every country in Europe has had creeping inflation during the past 10 years. The idea has become pretty well accepted that a continued drop in the purchasing power of money is to be expected. And yet in virtually all countries the rise in prices between 1953 and 1957 was considerably less than in the period 1948 to 1953.

As for a general flight from the dollar, the practical question arises: "Where is the money to go?" Other currencies have limited attractiveness because almost any country one might name has economic and political problems as formidable as those confronting the United States. Flight into commodities is not satisfactory because the future price of each commodity depends upon specific market conditions (supply, demand, competition of substitutes) far more than on what happens to the general price level. Some shifting of investment is bound to occur and already has occurred, but the process tends to limit itself.

For example, if the price level is expected to rise 2 percent a year, a good bond yielding nominally 5 percent has a true yield of 3 percent. Such a bond may be as attractive as a stock that has been bid up so that it yields only 2.5 percent.

Our conclusion is that there is no immediate prospect that conflict can be avoided in advanced industrial countries between the desire for the maximum possible economic growth on the one hand and a stable price level on the other hand. This conflict is created by the rise of the relatively new institution of collective bargaining which is too well established and produces too many important benefits to be disturbed simply because it produces creeping inflation.

But the prospect that we shall be living under creeping inflation does call for various commonsense adaptations and adjustments. Efforts should be made to speed the adoption of new methods of management that automatically reward workers for helping reduce the ratio of labor costs to sales income. Pension plans, including the Federal old-age and survivors insurance plan, should be adapted to creeping inflation. This means that they should either be fitted with escalator clauses or revised every now and then to compensate for the rise in the price level.

People should review their investment policies and should not hold long-term bonds or other long-term fixed-income investments unless the yield is sufficient to compensate them for the probable annual loss in purchasing power. Long-term wage contracts should cotain escalator clauses. But, in general, people should realize that living under creeping inflation in the future will not be essentially different from living under creeping inflation in the past—in fact, prices will probably rise considerably less in the next 10 years than in the past 10.

Most important of all, people should realize that the alternative to creeping inflation is a fairly substantial amount of chronic unemployment. The problems of creeping inflation are a small price to pay for avoiding the much greater problems of unemployment and a rate of growth that falls far short of our potential.

SPENDING AUTHORIZATIONS

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, the effect of the two major bills as passed by the Senate thus far in the current session of Congress would be to provide for back door expenditure of $3.3 billion before the first appropriation bill is even reported from the House Appropriations Committee.

The housing bill, as passed by the Senate, would completely by-pass the appropriation process by authorizing $575 million in expenditures from public debt receipts, and circumvent effective appropriation control over $2,250 million in contract authorizations. Likewise the airport bill, passed by the Senate, would provide $465 million in contract authorizations.

And as HHFA Commissioner Norman Mason has pointed out, the public housing provision in the housing bill virtually commits future appropriations running into multi-millions of dollars in Federal contributions to projects under this program. Federal contributions to public housing projects in existence are now running at a rate of more than $100 million annually, and increasing every year, and to date they have totaled ap-

proximately $0.5 billion, exclusive of loans.

These two bills, as passed by the Senate, exclusive of further commitments such as those for public housing, represent an increase of $1.3 billion over administration requests for new spending authorization.

No one can foretell at this date what the effect of these bills would be on expenditures in the coming and subsequent fiscal years, but this type of fiscal legislation outside of annual appropriation control makes a shambles of orderly efforts to keep the budget in balance.

Assuming enactment of the Senate housing bill, $11.9 billion would be available for expenditure in Federal housing programs, including $9 billion in unexpended balances remaining in prior authorizations. Assuming enactment of the Senate airport bill, $610 million would be available for expenditure in the airport program, including $145 million in unexpended balances remaining in prior authorizations.

In addition to the $2.8 billion in new cash spending authorizations outside of effective appropriation control, the housing bill as passed by the Senate would further commit public credit for the insurance of private housing mortgages by a total of $10 billion.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point tables showing the status of these bills to date.

There being no objection, the tables were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TABLE 1.—*Federal credit and money available for housing and related programs under pending bills as compared with administration requests*

[In thousands]

	Authority to insure and guarantee			Authority to expend from public debt receipts			Contract authority and other authority to appropriate			Total		
	Administration request, S. 65 and S. 612	Passed by Senate, S. 57	House committee, H.R. 2357	Administration request, S. 65 and S. 612	Passed by Senate, S. 57	House committee, H.R. 2357	Administration request, S. 65 and S. 612	Passed by Senate, S. 57	House committee, H.R. 2357	Administration request, S. 65 and S. 612	Passed by Senate, S. 57	House committee, H.R. 2357
Federal Housing Administration: Authority to insure mortgages:												
Fiscal year 1959	$6,000,000	$5,000,000	$6,000,000							$6,000,000	$5,000,000	$6,000,000
Fiscal year 1960	(1)	5,000,000	4,000,000							(1)	5,000,000	4,000,000
Subtotal	6,000,000	10,000,000	10,000,000							6,000,000	10,000,000	10,000,000
Urban renewal:												
Authority to enter into contracts with local public agencies:												
Capital grants:												
Fiscal year 1959							[2] $200,000	$350,000	$500,000	[2] 200,000	350,000	500,000
Fiscal year 1960							250,000	350,000	500,000	250,000	350,000	500,000
Fiscal year 1961							250,000	350,000	500,000	250,000	350,000	500,000
Fiscal year 1962							250,000	350,000		250,000	350,000	
Fiscal year 1963							250,000	350,000		200,000	350,000	
Fiscal year 1964							200,000	350,000		200,000	350,000	
Fiscal year 1965							200,000			200,000		
Additional, determination of Administrator with President's approval								150,000			150,000	
Subtotal							1,550,000	2,250,000	1,500,000	1,550,000	2,250,000	1,500,000
Loans to local public agencies for advance land acquisition and rehabilitation					(3)						(3)	
Loans for urban renewal				(3)		(3)				(3)		(3)
Urban planning, grants for small communities							10,000	10,000	10,000	10,000	10,000	10,000
Subtotal, urban renewal							1,560,000	2,260,000	10,000	1,560,000	2,260,000	1,510,000
Loans for rental housing and related facilities for the elderly									100,000			100,000
College housing:												
Loans for college housing				$200,000	$300,000	$400,000				200,000	300,000	400,000
Loans for construction and rehabilitation of facilities, etc.:												
Loan guarantee program												
Direct loan program					125,000						125,000	
Subtotal, college housing				200,000	425,000	400,000				200,000	425,000	400,000
Farm housing research:												
Fiscal year 1960								75	50		75	50
Fiscal year 1961								75	50		75	50
Fiscal year 1962								75			75	
Subtotal, farm housing research								225	100		225	100
Veterans' Administration: Direct loans to veterans					150,000	(4)					150,000	(4)
City planning scholarships and fellowships:												
Fiscal year 1960								500			500	
Fiscal year 1961								500			500	
Fiscal year 1962								500			500	
Subtotal								1,500			1,500	

[1] After fiscal year 1959 authorization would be open end.
[2] Includes $100,000,000 to reestablish President's reserve.
[3] Authority could exceed $1,000,000,000 by any amount at President's discretion.
[4] An additional $300,000,000 passed by House in H.R. 2256.

TABLE 1.—*Federal credit and money available for housing and related programs under pending bills as compared with administration requests*—Continued

[In thousands]

	Authority to insure and guarantee			Authority to expend from public debt receipts			Contract authority and other authority to appropriate			Total		
	Administration request, S. 65 and S. 612	Passed by Senate, S. 57	House committee, H.R. 2357	Administration request, S. 65 and S. 612	Passed by Senate, S. 57	House committee, H.R. 2357	Administration request, S. 65 and S. 612	Passed by Senate, S. 57	House committee, H.R. 2357	Administration request, S. 65 and S. 612	Passed by Senate, S. 57	House committee, H.R. 2357
Defense Housing and Community Facilities and Service Act of 1951: Hospital construction:												
Fiscal year 1959								$7,500	$7,500		$7,500	$7,500
Fiscal year 1960								7,500	7,500		7,500	7,500
Subtotal								15,000	15,000		15,000	15,000
Federal National Mortgage Association: Special assistance functions:												
Fiscal year 1959						$25,000						25,000
Fiscal year 1960						50,000						50,000
Subtotal						75,000						75,000
Grand total	$6,000,000	$10,000,000	$10,000,000	$200,000	$575,000	475,000	$1,560,000	2,276,725	1,625,100	$7,760,000	12,851,725	12,100,100

TABLE 2.—*Funds available for Federal airport programs under pending bills as compared with administration request*

Fiscal year	Administration request S. 674	Passed by Senate, S. 1	House committee, H.R. 1011
1960	$65,000,000	$100,000,000	$63,000,000
1961	55,000,000	100,000,000	83,000,000
1962	45,000,000	100,000,000	78,000,000
1963	35,000,000	100,000,000	73,000,000
Discretionary fund	(1)	65,000,000	(2)
Total	200,000,000	465,000,000	297,000,000

[1] Bill would authorize 50 percent of amounts for States to be transferred to a discretionary fund.
[2] Included in figures above as follows:

Fiscal year 1961	$20,000,000
Fiscal year 1962	15,000,000
Fiscal year 1963	10,000,000
Total	45,000,000

THE NATION'S HIGHWAY PROGRAM

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, last month the National Crushed Limestone Institute, Inc., held its annual convention at the Statler-Hilton Hotel, here in Washington, on January 21 and 22. The luncheon address delivered at the convention on Thursday, January 22, concerns the question of the scope and adequacy of the Nation's highway programs. It was delivered by Dr. Robinson Newcomb, who has served as an economic consultant for several congressional committees, and as an economist in governmental agencies.

I ask unanimous consent that the address be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HIGHWAY PROGRAM IS BIG, BUT IT'S NOT BIG ENOUGH

(Address by Dr. Robinson Newcomb presented at the annual convention luncheon of the National Crushed Limestone Institute, Inc., January 22, 1959, Hotel Statler-Hilton, Washington, D.C.)

Mr. Chairman, ladies, and gentlemen, the one thing about which I am fairly certain is that our highway program has to be bigger. Each of you has a simple one-line chart No. 1 in front of you. I hope this chart gives my story. I hope it tells all I want to say. If it does, any of you can leave this minute without missing anything, because you'll have the idea. This chart shows that in constant dollars, if there were such a thing, the economy has grown from 3 to 3½ percent year in and year out including the depression years—including the 30's. I believe—and most technicians in the field believe—that the economy in the future can grow at least this fast and very possibly slightly faster. The economic report the President issued last Tuesday goes into some detail in explaining why and how we've been able to reduce the likelihood of serious recessions in the future. So, if the economy has grown this fast with serious recessions, it certainly should grow this fast without them and very likely faster without them.

There's another simple reason why the economy should grow at this rate in the future. Unless we think our kids are dumber than their parents, we should expect them to progress as fast as our parents and as fast as we progressed. If your children are as smart as I think my children are, we "ain't" seen nothing yet. So, if you will agree with me that this country will grow in the future as least as fast as it grew in the past, may I pass on to the next point?

Traffic has to grow faster than business as a whole. If business as a whole grows 3½ percent per year, traffic has to grow faster—at least 4 or 5 percent per year. Advancing culture and the increasing complexity of civilization require a greater and greater interchange of materials and of services. The self-sufficient peasant may make cloth for his own needs, and provide most of the materials and labor for his own food and shelter. He may depend on others for very little more than salt and the simplest of tools. He needs little in the way of roads or other transportation. But, with the onset of specialization, one of the essentials of increasing productivity and rising standards, must come more transportation. A man who weaves more cloth than he uses tries to exchange it for food and other things that he needs. Roads or other means of transportation must be developed if he is to exchange his cloth for what he considers the necessities of life. Otherwise, he must go back to a pastoral or a hunting economy.

Specialization means exchange—exchange means traffic—and the type of mass traffic which has been growing most rapidly is highway traffic. And that highway traffic requires facilities in the form of better highways. Highway traffic for all except basic commodities, such as coal, steel, timber, and grain, is proving the most efficient transport when all things, including time, are considered. So, if traffic as a whole grows faster than the economy, highway traffic particularly grows faster than the economy. Vehicles traveled twice as many miles over highways for each given value of business done in 1929 as they traveled for the same volume of business transactions in 1922. Or to put it differently, there were twice as many vehicle miles per dollar of business done in 1929 as there were for the same volume of business done in 1922. This is all, of course, in constant dollars.

The growth in business about which I have been talking, this chart you hold in your hands, represents an increase in real, not inflated, dollars. The highways, no matter how you look at it, have to be improved. The growth in highway traffic during the twenties followed the normal growth pattern of most healthy new industries. Traffic grew 11 percent per year compounded annually, more than did business during the twenties. And, traffic grew even during the depression in relation to the volume of business. From the peak of prosperity in 1929 to the depths of depression in 1933 traffic per volume of business done grew at an annual rate compounded at about 10 percent per year. That's almost as much during the recession as it grew in the prosperous years of the twenties. Even the depression did not stop the growth in relative highway use.

Here the story begins to get a little complicated, and if it's hard to follow, don't worry because the concept is basically the same one. If the economy continues to grow then highway traffic should grow somewhat more.

New industries tend to show a standard growth pattern. They tend to grow slowly at the onset, then the rate speeds up, then the rate of growth finally declines. But in any basic industry the rate of growth does not suddenly stop. As a new industry is replaced by an old one, as the railroads were replaced by highways, or canals were replaced by railroads, the rate of growth in these industries slowed down. But it didn't suddenly reverse itself. The growth of highway traffic did not follow this historic, yet basic economic pattern. The growth of highway traffic did not taper off as normally happens. It stopped abruptly. It shifted from a positive rate of growth of 10 percent per year even during the depression years to a sharp decline. Such a sharp reversal in trend from a high rate of growth to a nega-

tive rate is unusual. In no basic industry can I recollect this having occurred except in highways.

What happened is fairly obvious. Highway construction was fairly well maintained through 1931. Real expenditures on a constant dollar basis rose about 10 percent per year from 1921 to 1931. This according to the Bureau of Public Roads studies provided a capital investment in 1931 that was about 4.6 times as great as it was in 1921. As the highway traffic was about 4 times as great in 1931 as it was in 1921, highways were about as well equipped to carry the higher volume of traffic in 1931 as they had been equipped to carry the lower volume of traffic in 1921. But, highway construction stopped almost completely in 1932. Construction dropped over 10 percent in real terms from 1931 to 1932 and another 30 percent from 1931 to 1933. Highway capacity, as measured by depreciated investment, stopped rising at a rate which would permit highway traffic to grow as it should grow. Roads became congested. Hardening of traffic arteries appeared. When many roads were carrying capacity traffic, an increase in demand for traffic in normal times could move only by displacing existing traffic.

Chart No. 2 was prepared for me by the Bureau of Public Roads using Public Roads' data on investment in highways and on traffic. It is drawn as an index of inadequacy. If it is turned upside down, it becomes an index of adequacy. This chart shows that roads became more adequate from 1921 to 1930, that is, we built more capacity in 1921 to 1930 than we added to our traffic. So the roads were better and better able to handle traffic up until about 1932. But from then on adequacy dropped. Of course, the roads were able to handle the traffic during the war years because we held traffic down. At the end of the war, the roads were freed again and traffic was allowed to grow. The chart shows what happened. Adequacy, on the basis of 1939–40 equals 100, dropped to 61 in 1955. We haven't been building roads fast enough to keep up with traffic. That is why in part it takes you so long to get from your house to your work.

The next chart, No. 3, was also prepared by the Bureau of Public Roads. It shows annual expenditures on highways per vehicle mile traveled. This was determined using 1947 and 1949 construction dollars, calculated by the Department of Commerce. What was done was to divide the number of dollars spent each year, in constant terms as calculated by Commerce, by the number of vehicle miles as estimated by the Bureau of Public Roads. If we look at the figures for the beginning of the twenties we spent almost 1.2 cents for each mile traveled. In 1958 money, that would be about 1.9 cents. We spent this down through 1929 for each mile traveled. But during the early years of the Hoover regime expenditures on highways were increased. We sometimes forget that public and highway expenditures rose in 1930. They were higher in 1931 and in 1932 than they were in 1929. They continued to rise more than traffic during these years. We fixed up our roads fairly well through 1932, as you may remember from the index of adequacy or of inadequacy which we just saw. But in 1933 we checked our spending on roads. Outlays went down to something like six-tenths of a cent a mile or thereabouts by 1935. Then appropriations were increased again and public roads construction was revived. Expenditures rose to about nine-tenths of a cent per mile. Then they went down and with the war, to something like 0.2 to 0.3 cents. By 1955 we were back up to something like 0.6 and now they are something less than 0.7 compared to 1.2 cents in constant dollars in the 1920's. In spite of all we spent last year, we are still spending less per vehicle mile than we spent even in 1933 and far less than we spent back in 1925–29.

Today's program seems big. You've been told many times it's a big program. But in relation to the size of the country and in relation to the volume of traffic, it isn't a big program. It's six-tenths as big a program as it was 20 years ago. We forget how big we are, we forget that this is a growing country, a country growing ¾ percent per year. If the country grows this fast, obviously its expenditures for utilities must grow to keep abreast. We don't get excited when the A.T. & T. issues another big bond issue and spends more money for lines or switchboards. We don't get excited when the Potomac Electric Power, or your local utility, spends more money to increase its capacity for generating electricity. The only time we worry about spending to improve public utilities is when we talk about something like public roads. Payment for this utility comes out of the public exchequer instead of the private pocketbook. You men won't sell your limestone to the road program unless the money is available to build this program which I hope you won't call a big program, but more or less a normal program. Nothing comes without some effort and it won't take an awful lot of effort on your part to get the appropriations through, I am sure, for this normal highway program.

If economy is to grow 3½ percent per year, highway traffic will have to grow roughly 5 percent per year for the next decade. The heavy dotted line on top on the last chart, No. 4, indicates what traffic might have been had we continued to build highways and had we avoided the recession. The heavier dotted line on the right suggests what traffic may be if we continue to build adequate highways now. The rate of growth which may be necessary for economy growing at 3½ percent to 4 percent a year would yield a traffic volume of about a trillion, two hundred billion miles by 1970.

I'm throwing this in because pretty soon we will have to learn to talk in terms of trillions. By 1970 a high employment volume of business, in 1958 dollars, would be something like $750 million. But by 1985, maybe, it will be something like $1 trillion. Now, most of us hope to be alive in 1980, so we will have to learn to talk in terms of trillions. We are approaching an era in which, in the highway field, we will have to talk in terms of trillions earlier than we do in the terms of the national economy. But we won't have a national economy of $750 billion by 1970 unless we have highways which will permit traffic growth of a billion vehicle-miles and probably 1.2 billion by 1970. Those who would suggest that we hold back on highway expenditures are actually then suggesting that we should restrict the rate of growth of the economy. That would mean that we would not need highways to transport goods which the unemployed are not producing. If we permit the economy to grow and the unemployment to remain relatively low, we must provide the capacity to move the goods our higher rate of economy will create.

A calculation of the capacity required for the sort of traffic I have been discussing, suggests that something over $8 billion per year would be needed for construction between now and 1965. About another $4 billion might be needed for maintenance, debt service, police costs, and so on. This $8 billion estimate may be compared with a construction outlay of approximately $5,350,000,000, as estimated by the Department of Commerce for last year. This would suggest that during the next decade the average should be increased about 50 percent. The estimated outlay for 1959 is about $6 billion, or an increase of over 10 percent. For the decade 1966 to 1975, construction expenditures needed may approach $11 billion. That's double last year's expenditure. This would suggest your sales then may be double what they are now.

Once we have provided adequate highways, the capacity needed may grow but little more than the economy as a whole—approximately 4 percent per year. In the meantime, let's not create unemployment in order to avoid the expense of creating highways.

INTERNATIONAL WAR ON DISEASE CHALLENGE TO U.S. LEADERSHIP

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, few battles can be waged with gains for all participants assured: an exception is the fight against disease.

Today the United States has a dramatic opportunity to assume international leadership in the struggle to decrease human suffering. Our great resources of skill and technology have enabled us to perform modern medical miracles within this country. Sharing of these gains—and assimilation of the gains made by those of other nations—will free for useful endeavor millions of persons fated to live their lives as cripples or doomed to a premature death because of cures that now lie beyond medical understanding.

From 1937 through 1955 the death rate in the United States was reduced by 18 percent. In the 10-year period 1945 and 1955 alone, the rate declined 12 percent.

In the 17 years between 1937 and 1954, the life expectancy of U.S. citizens increased almost 10 years; 4.4 years were added in the period between 1944 and 1954 alone.

MORE THAN 3 MILLION LIVES SAVED

The 18 percent decline in the death rate represents a saving of over 3 million lives. If the 1937 death rate had prevailed from 1937 through 1955, this many more people would have died.

These statistics, compiled by the National Health Education Committee, Inc., from data available through the National Office of Vital Statistics, reveal the magnitude of medical research progress in the United States and the rewards in terms of human lives.

Estimates of the relief of nonfatal but crippling diseases in the United States indicate similar massive steps forward. Eighty percent of all epileptics now lead normal lives due to neurological research. Salk vaccine has drastically reduced the incidence of paralytic polio. Because of the discovery of certain antibiotics, a number of blinding eye diseases have virtually disappeared in the United States.

RESEARCH BENEFITS WORLDWIDE

Benefits of research have spread to other countries. Due to antibiotics, within 3 years the incidence of yaws in Haiti was reduced from 1 in 6 of the populace to 1 in 3,000—at a cost of 30 cents per capita. In some parts of the world two-thirds of the people have trachoma; the antibiotic aureomycin can provide dramatic improvement within a few days. From 1942 to 1949, Greece reduced the sickness rate from malaria to one-fortieth of the 1942 rate through use of DDT control measures.

These statistics indicate the value of medical research. In dry, dispassionate

terms, they show achievements won and argue for further effort.

Our scientists have made great progress in discovering the cause and cure of many illnesses. I have been proud to play a small part in this forward movement through our successful efforts, under the leadership of the distinguished senior Senator from Alabama, Senator LISTER HILL, to secure increased appropriations for the National Institutes of Health, and other federally sponsored research activities. We have instituted public health programs which aid in implementing in other countries the knowledge gained by research. But we have not yet taken the ultimate step—inauguration of a worldwide war against disease.

HERBERT LEHMAN DESCRIBES CHALLENGE

Mr. President, recently a respected and eminent former Member of this body, Senator Herbert H. Lehman, delivered an address before the American Social Hygiene Association in New York City which vividly describes the challenge to the United States. I should like to read a portion of that speech to the Senate today. Senator Herbert Lehman said:

I would like to see the day, and soon, when the largest single item in our national research budget would be for study of the ways and means of saving rather than of destroying life.

Our Government does make appropriations for medical research, mostly through the National Institutes of Health. These appropriations are still far from enough. But the chief bottleneck, the principal shortage today is not of money but of trained research scientists and technicians.

There is a similar shortage in most countries where research is going on.

Yet at the same time, there is a great duplication of research effort, as between our country and others. The world supply of its most precious scientific resources—brains and skills—is being wastefully expended.

The exchange of medical research information between our country and other countries is tragically inadequate.

I have heard it said that if all the existing bits and pieces of information bearing on cancer to be found in the various laboratories of the world could be pooled, sifted and correlated, a major breakthrough with regard to this disease would be virtually assured.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the portion of Senator Lehman's address dealing with international cooperation in medical research be included in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the extract was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXCERPTS FROM AN ADDRESS BY THE HONORABLE HERBERT H. LEHMAN BEFORE THE AMERICAN SOCIAL HYGIENE ASSOCIATION

Let me present a specific program which could, I think, arouse the enthusiastic support of the American people and strike a deeply responsive note throughout the world. I suggest it as a path to peace. I refer to the desirability of an international cooperative attack on the problem of disease and disability—those common enemies of all mankind which recognize neither national boundaries nor national interests, but constitute, along with the threat of war, the chief menaces to the human race.

What a thrill would go through the ranks of mankind if our Government sent out a clarion call for an international crusade against these age-old enemies, and pledged the resources necessary to help organize such a crusade.

Of course, this alone would not solve the complex problems of our world relationships; nor dare we turn our back upon the efforts of Soviet communism to undermine the world's forces of freedom and spread its power throughout the earth. But I am convinced that in the breakneck race we are now running against the Soviet Union on a predominantly military course, it matters increasingly less to a growing number of the common people of mankind whether the Soviet Union or the United States is ahead; they feel that humanity is falling behind.

And so I suggest that we try to change the focus of the world's attention from some of the differences which divide us to some of the problems which unite us. Surely one of them is the problem of disease and disability.

Proposals pointing in this direction have already been made in the Congress, and, I am sure, elsewhere. President Eisenhower has made passing reference to it, and his brother, Dr. Milton Eisenhower, spoke of it before the World Health Assembly in Minneapolis early this summer.

I am told that the administration in Washington is even now giving consideration to an expansion of our Government's activities in international health cooperation. I do not know in what magnitude.

I take this occasion to urge that the various proposals pointing in the directions I have mentioned be given the widest possible public discussion with a view to their most comprehensive possible implementation.

I utter a sober warning that these undertakings must not be publicly presented as merely new propaganda weapons in the cold war. If so, they will fail in their purpose. They must be presented as a new departure in policy, part of an entirely different approach to the problem of peace and understanding in the world. But beyond that, the program of international cooperation in the war against disease must be viewed as valid for its own sake. It is.

* * * * *

I would like to see the day and soon, when the largest single item in our national research budget would be for study of tne ways and means of saving rather than of destroying life.

Our Government does make appropriations for medical research, mostly through the National Institutes of Health. These appropriations are still far from enough. But the chief bottleneck, the principal shortage today is not of money but of trained research scientists and technicians.

There is a similar shortage in most countries where research is going on.

Yet at the same time, there is a great duplication of research effort, as between our country and others. The world supply of its most precious scientific resources—brains and skills—is being wastefully expended.

The exchange of medical research information between our country and other countries is tragically inadequate.

I have heard it said that if all the existing bits and pieces of information bearing on cancer to be found in the various laboratories of the world could be pooled, sifted and correlated, a major breakthrough with regard to this disease would be virtually assured.

For these and other reasons, leading medical scientists believe that the greatest single need in the field of research today is international cooperation and coordination in the training of skilled research workers, in the exchange of information, and, of course, in the actual conduct of research.

An international program is called for.

There is already in existence international machinery which could be utilized to help carry out such a program.

I mean the World Health Organization. This body has already worked miracles in helping to control such diseases as malaria and tuberculosis in many parts of the world.

It operates on a miniscule budget, $13½ million annually, about half the budget of the New York City Health Department. Thus it has never been able to concern itself with basic medical research. Yet it could well function at the center of the international research program I have been discussing.

Our Government must greatly increase its financial contributions to the WHO to permit this organization to utilize its full potential in the world war against disease and disability.

But the need is not just for bigger appropriations. We need a comprehensive plan, and a governmental mechanism in the United States to help enlist and mobilize the scientific personnel and resources of our country for the great undertaking I have sketched.

A comprehensive proposal to meet percisely this need has been presented by Senator LISTER HILL, who is the Senate's leading and most effective fighter for medical research and for public welfare measures generally.

Senator HILL's plan would authorize an annual appropriation of $50 million to effectuate the purposes I have described—to mobilize the health resources of America, and to stimulate their mobilization abroad—for a world crusade against disease and disability.

I do not have the time today to discuss the details of the Hill proposal. But I commend this measure to the sympathetic consideration of this organization and of every individual present here today.

I hope that Senator HILL's bill will be enacted by the next Congress. But as with all such proposals, this can only happen if public interest groups such as yours, and the public at large, mobilize their support behind this program.

I can think of no more stirring cause than this, and none more truly worthwhile. This project embraces the most primary concern of human beings. It can evoke a world enthusiasm based on the ancient and universal respect for the healer, who can make the blind see and the lame walk.

Undertakings of this sort hold the only promise I can see for the world to emerge from the present age of confusion and brink of catastrophe.

Being basically an optimist, I have great faith in the resources and indestructibility of the human spirit. I believe—because I must believe it—that far from being at the beginning of an age of darkness, we are actually near its end, and that a true renaissance of the free spirit of mankind shortly awaits us.

As part of this renaissance, I believe there will be a revival and renewal of the spirit of humanitarianism.

I believe that America will help lead the way in this historic development.

I have faith and I have hope. But the progress which we impatiently await will be made only if all of us join to help bring it about.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, despite significant victories in the field of medical research, tremendous challenges remain. Eighty-eight million Americans now living will die of heart diseases unless new treatments and cures are found. About 26 million will die from cancer. As former Senator Lehman points out, the key to the cause of cancer may now lie in a laboratory test tube in Japan, Poland, or Brazil. But this magnificent achievement might be delayed for years because scientists in

other nations—who might realize the implications of this information due to their own studies—lack the necessary means of communication to obtain these findings. The magnitude of the problem is indicated by the fact that many scientific investigators find it less expensive and time-consuming to conduct laboratory experiments anew than to search for previously reported data—even though such data are known to exist.

Mr. President, the outstanding political leader in the field of public health is the senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL]. His effective leadership in the Senate has been a major element in the significant appropriation increases which we have been able to secure for the vital work of the National Institutes of Health. The Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] has recognized the moral responsibiilty of the United States to launch an international crusade against disease by introduction of Senate Joint Resolution 41, a bill to establish the domestic machinery which will facilitate the international cooperation in medical research. Enactment of this resolution would further signify to the world, the United States desire for cooperation, not conflict. It would help prepare the way for an International Medical Year in which scientists, doctors, and technicians of all countries could combine to launch a global battle against disease. I am proud to be a cosponsor of this proposal, on which Senate hearings are now being held. I hope that it will receive speedy consideration by Congress.

REPORT LISTS ADVANTAGES FOR UNITED STATES

In the 85th Congress, the Senate passed Senate Concurrent Resolution 99 urging the President to initiate action leading to U.S. participation in a world Health and Medical Research Year. This declaration of support by the Senate should receive the urgent consideration of the administration. I ask unanimous consent that part of the cogent Senate report on that resolution—which was prepared by the distinguished Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], who has so vigorously and effectively supported the International Medical Year concept in this country and abroad—be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the excerpt from the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE

Major health and medical progress has been achieved within recent years throughout the world, thanks to scientific discovery and other efforts. However, widespread disease and disability still beset the world, including particularly the underdeveloped areas.

The goal of these resolutions is, therefore, to encourage the acceleration and broadening of mankind's battle against its afflictions. One possible medium which would be studied by means of this resolution would be international participation in a Health and Medical Research Year, which might be comparable in some respects to the current successful International Geophysical Year.

The President of the United States would be invited to extend, principally through the World Health Organization, an invitation to the nations of the world to designate representatives to meet and discuss the feasibility of such a Health and Medical Research Year, which might, if approved, occur at some indefinite time in the future. In addition, alternative methods would initially be explored, looking toward intensified international cooperation in the field of health.

BACKGROUND

In January of 1958, in his state of the Union message, President Eisenhower conveyed a recommendation for "works of peace," including an offer for a pooling of efforts with the Soviet Union "against the diseases that are the common enemy of all mortals—such as cancer and heart disease."

At the Eleventh World Health Assembly, held in Minneapolis in May–June 1958, a United States offer of $300,000 was accepted for the purpose of exploring expanded health research efforts.

The Executive Board of the World Health Organization will be directing this study, one of the possible phases of which might be the question of a Health and Medical Research Year, as contemplated under these resolutions.

ADVANTAGES TO THE UNITED STATES

The United States has a long and honored record of advancing and exchanging scientifio knowledge, among other ways, through the means of specially designed international scientific years. By means of the present resolutions, our Government would be maintaining the initiative in the forum of world opinion in advancing constructive programs for the alleviation of the health problems of mankind.

Experience under the International Geophysical Year demonstrates that there are impressive advantages in a universally designated period of intensified research and cooperation. Public recognition is heightened, governments are encouraged to optimum efforts, and barriers to the flow of scientific information tend to be relaxed.

Disease, of course, recognizes no national boundary line. Illness exacts a grim toll on all mankind—directly and indirectly.

No country is immune from the ravages of such scourges as heart disease, cancer, arthritis, rheumatic diseases, and neurological disorders, to name but a few common afflictions.

The findings from expanded research findings which might be stimulated by means of these resolutions would become available for the benefit of the population of the United States, as well as for all other peoples.

Coping with disease involves the complex processes of discovery, diagnosis, treatment, and rehabilitation—to all of which tasks scientists, physicians, and other health workers of all nations can fruitfully contribute.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, on February 3, 1959, the Senate approved a resolution presented by the Senator from Minnesota which will permit the Committee on Government Operations to continue its study of international activities of the executive branch in the field of medical research. This study has already yielded valuable information. During the coming year publication of further findings will provide guidelines for necessary congressional and executive action as we seek to insure fullest efficiency and coordination in international research efforts.

NEED DICTATES INTERNATIONAL CRUSADE

Mr. President, the war against disease is not an abstract principle for me. In August I underwent surgery for cancer. Only a few weeks ago I ended precautionary cobalt radiation treatments. Medical research saved my life. Millions of persons live useful and productive lives today because of the efforts of dedicated researchers who successfully searched out the cause of death and disability—"those common enemies of all mankind which recognize neither national boundaries nor national interest, but constitute, along with the threat of war, the chief menaces to the human race."

Herbert H. Lehman said:

What a thrill would go through the ranks of mankind if our Government sent out a clarion call for an international crusade against these age-old enemies, and pledged the resources necessary to help organize such a crusade.

I can think of no more stirring cause than this, and none more truly worthwhile. This project embraces the most primary concern of human beings. It can evoke world enthusiasm based on the ancient and universal respect for the healer, who can make the blind see and the lame walk.

It is my hope that our Government will heed these words from a wise counselor and a great humanitarian.

Before I conclude, Mr. President, I wish to say I am pleased to observe present in the Chamber with us the distinguished senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] who has been very persistent and effective as an advocate of international progress in the field of medicine. Today all too few studies and findings with respect to medical research are translated into other languages so that they can be shared by people in all countries. In addition, there are many backward nations which have great scientists and brilliant minds but lack the financial means to use the physical resources such as drugs and various elements in those countries, so that they can make the medical findings which would be possible if the programs could be supported financially.

I am pleased that the Senator from Minnesota has been present during the delivery of my address, so that he can share in what I have had to say and so that I can acclaim his leadership in this important field.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. NEUBERGER. I am happy to yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I wish to thank the distinguished Senator from Oregon for his very kind and gracious remarks.

One of the most thrilling experiences of my life took place last year in November or December, when under the terms of the Senate resolution to which the Senator from Oregon has referred, the resolution to look into medical research as conducted by the executive branch of the Government, I visited some nine nations to study the hospitals, laboratories, and pharmaceutical establishments in the field of health and medical research. It was an experience, I will say to the Senator from Oregon, that will live in my memory from now on.

I recall, for example, being in the Radium Institute in Paris, in the presence of a very great doctor, who is in the United States at this moment, Dr. Latterjet, an excellent scientist who

headed the Radium Institute. While I was there the seven Yugoslavs who were the victims of a nuclear plant explosion were brought in for treatment, and we were able to observe the importance of more progress in the field of what we might call radioactive medicine or medical treatment and medical research in the field of radioactivity. We know very little about that.

Other doctors to whom I talked were keenly concerned in the problems of air pollution.

I visited the children's hospital in Paris, where Dr. Minkowsky, an eminent specialist in children's diseases, took me through all the laboratories and all the experimental wards to show me what was going on, particularly with respect to the care of children born prematurely.

These were a few of my experiences, and I had some others at Oslo and Stockholm and the great Karolinska Institute in Finland, and the World Health Center in Geneva.

In Moscow we visited the Soviet Academy of Sciences and the great Cancer Institute, where we visited with the top specialists in the field of cancer research and cancer treatment. Dr. Blocheim is one of the leading specialists in Russia, and has been the same in the United States, under the American Cancer Institute.

I want to say to the Senator that his support of this great endeavor currently being sponsored by the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] and others—the Senator from Oregon is a cosponsor—will be of inestimable value, because the Senator speaks not only with the mind of a great legislator but with a heart which is filled with experience in this field of medicine and knowledge of what medical research can provide for us.

I am happy to associate myself with the remarks of the Senator from Oregon, and I am very appreciative of the Senator's very generous comments relating to my activities.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I thank the Senator from Minnesota, who should not belittle or deprecate his own role, because it is a very important role. I have often thought, particularly since my own serious illness, how much disease and health problems are the levelers which unite all mankind. We may disagree on ideologies, economic systems, politics, military problems, international borders or international frontiers, but all mankind—living in the United States, in the Soviet Union, in the British Empire, in France, in Italy, or in Turkey—is heir to the same ills.

I am sure the hearts of mankind everywhere have been stirred by the heroic fight for life of our Secretary of State, John Foster Dulles. I feel certain, whether people agree or disagree with his policies in the international field, they pray and hope for his recovery, and they are stirred by the valor and bravery with which he is facing his illness.

I should like to say further that it is my hope that when we pass the joint resolution of the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], of which the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] and I are cosponsors, to further medical research internationally, perhaps we can dedicate the passage of that measure to the ultimate recovery of our distinguished Secretary of State.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there appear at the conclusion of these remarks an article which I prepared for the Progressive magazine, and which appeared in the October 1958 issue of that publication, together with editorials from the Eugene Register-Guard, the Arizona Star, and the New York Times endorsing an International Medical Year.

There being no objection, the article and editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Progressive, October 1958]

NEXT THE INTERNATIONAL MEDICAL YEAR

(By RICHARD L. NEUBERGER)

"The groundwork of all happiness is health."—Leigh Hunt, 1821.

I have a proposal which I believe might stir all mankind. We have just concluded the International Geophysical Year, during which the nations of the world spent some 18 months studying the earth and its environment. This ranged from outer space to caves and crevasses, from Antarctica to the steaming jungles of the Amazon and Congo. New mountains of ore were discovered, to say nothing of 40 percent more ice than anybody thought existed in the polar regions.

Now, what of an International Medical Year, to be held beginning early in 1961, under the auspices of the newly inaugurated President of the United States? This would afford time to prepare for the undertaking.

Such a project could mobilize all the world's skills, knowledge, and facilities for an all-out onslaught against heart disease, against the grim series of malignant diseases known as cancer, against malaria, against the blinding glaucoma which plagues the Orient, and against all the other sinister maladies that kill and torment members of the human race.

An International Medical Research and Health Year was proposed by Adlai E. Stevenson in an eloquent commencement address to the students of Michigan State University last June. The vast potential significance of this idea was brought home to me recently when I read the letter of a young American doctor, Thomas A. Dooley, treating natives in the swamps of Vietnam. He wrote that the effect of tender medical care on these forsaken people could be "Christlike in power and simplicity." The idea occurred to me again when I noticed that, during both 1956 and 1957, not more than 1 percent of our foreign-aid funds were used for health measures. Yet what could have a more favorable and enduring impact on our friends overseas than clinics to reduce the tragic rate of infant mortality, to cope with malaria, to eliminate the bacteria-nurtured diseases which snuff out so many young lives in Asia and Africa before even the age of 35 is reached?

Nor would an IMY—meaning International Medical Year—be without immense potential benefits to America itself. Despite our vaunted standard of living, the male residents of the United States have a shorter life expectancy than the males of no fewer than seven other countries—Holland, Great Britain, New Zealand, Israel, Norway, Sweden, and Denmark. And, although Soviet medical education is quite a bit less thorough than ours, Russia today is producing four times as many doctors annually as we do: about 25,000 as compared with 6,000. Russia has 164 doctors for each 100,000 people as contrasted with our 130 per each 100,000. And we in the United States cannot afford to ignore the increasing number of deaths in this country each year from cancer, climbing steadily from 211,000 in 1950 to 250,000 in 1957.

Furthermore, I believe the political climate is right in the United States for such a proposal as IMY. In a world racked by war and rumors of war, hopeful tidings often escape public notice. This is particularly true in the realm of politics, where Cassandra-like wailing can become an occupational disease.

Yet, I would confidently declare that one of the truly auspicious events of our era is the ever-increasing support of research on the frontiers of medical science by the U.S. Government. Indeed, it is little short of miraculous that Congress has been able to achieve this goal during a period when the executive branch of Government is headed by a President whose budget actually had discouraged such a program.

Perhaps this overwhelming challenge helps to explain my answer when people ask for my opinion of the outstanding legislative feats with which I have been associated. They expect me to enumerate spectacular bills such as statehood for Alaska, repeal of the Federal freight tax, or funds for the 1-million-kilowatt John Day Dam on the Columbia River. Instead, I reply:

"The vast increase in appropriations for medical research generally and cancer research in particular."

The efforts of the Government in this category center at the National Institutes of Health, in the green Maryland countryside near Bethesda. Research is carried on here by some of the Nation's most eminent medical scientists. I rejoice that some of us recently were able to secure congressional approval of adequate salaries for these gifted men and women. In addition, the National Institutes provide substantial grants to medical schools, clinics, private laboratories, hospitals, and other places throughout the 48 States where promising avenues of medical exploration have been opened.

Here is how Federal funds for the various separate divisions of the NIH have been progressively expanded in the 4 fiscal years since I came to the Senate:

	1955 *Million*	1959 *Million*
Mental health	$14.1	$52.4
Heart	16.6	45.6
Cancer	21.7	75.2
Dental health	1.9	7.4
Arthritis	8.2	31.2
Allergy, etc	6.1	24.0
Neurology and blindness	7.6	29.4

Shamefully enough, the budgets of the Eisenhower administration literally, on occasion, have recommended reductions in appropriations for the National Cancer Institute. But Senators who had seen such illustrious colleagues as Vandenberg, Taft, McMahon, and Neely die lingeringly of cancer, would not hold still for this kind of economy. They rallied behind the Nation's premier political figure in the field of public health, Senator LISTER HILL, of Alabama, to make available for research into cancer, heart disease, and blindness at least a fraction of what we invest in armaments and other weapons of destruction.

This reveals why Senator HILL is my first choice to be American chairman of IMY. Few people outside the inner citadel of medical science are such symbols of concern for health as this southern liberal, who has served in Congress since 1923 and whose grandfather and father before him were eminent physicians. The author of the Hill-Burton Hospital Act and other medical legislation comes by his interest as a matter of rightful legacy. His father, Dr. Luther L. Hill, was the first American surgeon to perform a successful suture of the human heart.

He had studied in London under the great British scientist, Sir Joseph Lister, and this is how Dr. Hill's son received his name.

LISTER HILL works successfully with other people, for a humorous and kindly disposition affirms the sincerity of his solicitude for human suffering. He has rallied bipartisan support for his pioneering efforts in health legislation from such responsible Republicans as Senator MARGARET CHASE SMITH, of Maine. Another effective lieutenant is Mrs. Mary Lasker, the beautiful and wealthy founder of the National Health Education Committee, whose presence in Washington is almost invariable when Senator HILL and some of the rest of us are fighting for adequate funds to support the National Institutes of Health.

These citizens—and many others—could give vitality to America's participation in an International Medical Year. And IMY, originating in the United States, might help to instill in Americans a renewed appreciation for the wonders of medical research. I remember a day in the Senate, some months ago, when some of the lack of this appreciation was vividly impressed upon me.

I had recently passed the great Senate caucus room where a hearing was under way of the Senate Rackets Committee. The huge marble hall was crowded. At least two dozen reporters thronged the press tables. The klieg lights of television flooded the place. Radio microphones were placed at strategic intervals to catch every word. Some wretched racketeer from a strife-ridden labor union was on the witness stand, testifying reluctantly to his thefts from the union membership.

My wife and I had as our guests two nurses from the fine teaching hospital at the University of Oregon Medical School. We thought they would be interested in attending a hearing before Senator LISTER HILL'S subcommittee on National Cancer Institute appropriations, in the basement of the Capitol Building. The witnesses were two of America's foremost doctors, Sidney Farber, of the Children's Cancer Research Foundation, and Isador Ravdin, of the American College of Surgeons and University of Pennsylvania. Quietly, they talked of a possible breakthrough employing chemotherapy as a method of treating cancer, and of the fact that viruses might be the etiological agent for cancer in human beings. They described the direction which cancer research ought to follow during the years directly ahead.

In that room, besides four or five of us from the Senate, were our two Oregon nurse guests and Mrs. Mary Lasker and a few of her personal friends. There was not one newspaper reporter, not one TV camera, no microphones, no flash bulletins, no communication to the public from the green felt table where Drs. Ravdin and Farber were somberly testifying.

I thought of the past panoply of communication which has been brought to bear on a labor racketeer's testimony upstairs. And I thought, too, of the 250,000 Americans who had died agonizingly of cancer in 1957, and of the hundreds of helpless child patients under Dr. Farber's care for leukemia, the deadly cancer of the blood. It seemed to me, in this moment, that an International Medical Year, centering in our own country where skills exist so abundantly in the realm of medicine, might help to achieve many purposes. One of these could be a greater talent for separating the things of lasting value from those of only transitory importance.

[From the Eugene (Oreg.) Register-Guard, Dec. 21, 1958]

NOW AN INTERNATIONAL MEDICAL YEAR?

The International Geophysical Year, which lasted 18 months, ends December 31. Now the proposal is made by Senator RICHARD L. NEUBERGER that another year be proclaimed. He calls for an International Medical Year to begin in 1961. The idea of stimulating medical research is appealing. But it pays, also, to examine the nature of such years. What may they accomplish that might not be accomplished otherwise—or that might take much longer?

The Geophysical Year was a profitable one. Among the worthwhile scientific achievements were the lofting of the first and succeeding sputniks (and those were remarkable scientific feats regardless of their political ramifications), extensive navigation under the polar ice, discovery of a new mountain range on the Pacific floor, new ideas about the real character of the Antarctic continent, and many discoveries about weather. Some of these discoveries undoubtedly would have been made even if there had been no IGY.

Where the IGY did help was in focusing public attention on fields that often fail to make headlines. It is likely that some money was pried loose for geophysical research. Some of this money might not have been forthcoming had not the year been proclaimed. In this respect the IGY was a promotional scheme, not greatly different from cheese week, book week, fire prevention week, education week, newspaper week, and a hundred other weeks that are more or less celebrated annually.

The IGY has been a success because it had the widespread support of the world's scientists, the only men who could make it work. Before an International Medical Year, or IMY, could be organized, we should have to be assured of the support of the medical research people and of many of the practicing physicians. And they're skittish about promotions. It's one thing for a scientist to take active part in a program conceived by scientists. It is quite another to expect that a scientist will take part in a program that had its genesis in the mind of a political figure, even one so genuinely sympathetic to medical research as Senator NEUBERGER.

But it might be worth trying anyhow. As the Senator says, we in America should be enthusiastic about it. He points out that American men have a shorter life expectancy than men living in Holland, Great Britain, New Zealand, Israel, Norway, Sweden, or Denmark. This is so, despite the high standard of living that we brag about. And a mobilization of medical skills in an all-out assault on such diseases as cancer, heart disease, and mental illness would be made more feasible if the promotional force of an IMY were present to pry out the money such projects need. Supplies must be bought. Scientists must be freed of bread-and-butter jobs so that they can spend their time in research of a type that gives no assurance of money profit. New scientists must be trained. Hospitals and schools must be established and supported.

This newspaper, without using such a term for it, has long believed that the IMY approach is the right one. It has seemed wiser to work on the general problem of human health and fitness, concentrating as experts felt wise, than to spin our wheels by multiple appeals for specific illnesses, some of which are relatively minor in the whole medical picture. The Senator's idea, while it may have some bugs, appears to be worth serious consideration.

[From the Arizona Daily Star, Tucson, Ariz., Nov. 17, 1958]

AN INTERNATIONAL MEDICAL YEAR

Senator RICHARD L. NEUBERGER, a narrow escapee from death by cancer, came up with an idea during his convalescence which he believes might stir all mankind. It is for an International Medical Year to start early in 1961, in the same pattern as the vastly successful International Geophysical Year now in its closing weeks.

In his proposal, NEUBERGER points out that "despite our vaunted standard of living, the male residents of the United States have a shorter life expectancy than the males of no fewer than seven other countries—Holland, Great Britain, New Zealand, Israel, Norway, Sweden, and Denmark."

He points out that setting the IMY for 1961 would provide time to prepare for the undertaking. He adds:

"Such a project could mobilize all the world's skills, knowledge, and facilities for an all-out onslaught against heart disease, against the grim series of malignant diseases known as cancer, against malaria, against the blinding glaucoma which plagues the Orient, and against all other sinister maladies that kill and torment members of the human race."

It should be remembered that some of the great medicines of today have been known in other parts of the world for centuries, and that an IMY a generation ago might have effected the simple exchange of information which would have saved, for example, hundreds of thousands of hypertensives from eye hemorrhages, breakages of blood vessels elsewhere including in the kidneys and the brain, suffering and death. Mahatma Gandhi was chewing snake root daily for many years before doctors in the United States even knew it existed.

Research designed to whip some of the great killers has proceeded to the place where perhaps an International Medical Year might bring the climactic victory.

[From the New York Times, Dec. 8, 1958]

FOR A WORLD HEALTH YEAR

What may in the long run prove to be one of the most important actions of the present session of the General Assembly was taken last Friday. By a unanimous vote the Assembly invited the World Health Organization to carry out plans for the observation of an International Health and Medical Research Year, preferably in 1961.

The basis for this renewed effort would be primarily national, just as the World Health Organization works through regional and national groups with no attempt to supplant them. But the great aim is a better coordination of effort in some fields where international operation is imperative.

First of these, obviously, is the spread of existing knowledge in the field of fighting epidemic and endemic disease. The accomplishments of the World Health Organization in its first 10 years in the campaign against such scourges as malaria, tuberculosis, and yaws have been spectacular. An internationally supported health year should make it possible greatly to increase and accelerate these campaigns.

Of equal importance is a projected program for the coordination of research in these fields in both prevention and treatment. This is the point at which international cooperation is essential and at which immediate results can be obtained. Legislation to place the United States in the forefront of such a program will come up in our next Congress and it would be a logical part of this worldwide effort.

By far the largest possibility in this planning, however, is the opportunity to focus worldwide attention on the problems and how they can be solved. We still need to bring closer together the obscure village and the great laboratory. We still need to take to every part of the world the electrifying knowledge that if only we have the will and the imagination, these great battles can be won.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DODD in the chair) laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

NEW INTERNATIONAL WHEAT AGREEMENT

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an article from the New York Times of March 10, announcing a new international wheat agreement as approved by the United Nations Conference of Exporters and Importers, be inserted in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the article may be printed as requested.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. HUMPHREY. This announced agreement is the culmination of some six weeks of hard and serious work by fifty nations in Geneva, Switzerland. I am pleased to note that it is expected that many more nations than were included in past agreements are expected to agree to this new pact. Among the expected new signatories are Great Britain, as an importer, and Italy and Mexico, joining the six major exporters—Canada, the United States, Australia, Argentina, Sweden, and France.

This international agreement on wheat is but one more example of the fine and constructive work which is being done through the medium of the United Nations. Although the headlines most often reflect crises and tragedy, it is well for us to keep a proper perspective and to realize that greater cooperation between nations is being made.

In the work of the United Nations lies the great hope for a just and lasting peace, and a world in which mankind may live in freedom and dignity and enjoy a decent standard of living.

EXHIBIT 1

[From the New York Times, Mar. 10, 1959]

NEW INTERNATIONAL WHEAT PACT DRAFTED BY U.N. BODY IN GENEVA

GENEVA, March 9.—A new international wheat agreement was approved here today by the United Nations Conference of Exporters and Importers. The Conference of 50 nations has been meeting in secret here for 6 weeks. The Conference will hold its last formal meeting tomorrow morning. Conference sources said that many more countries than previously would adhere to the new agreement. This would replace the existing agreement at the end of July.

The agreement establishes quotas and prices among its signatories.

Among the new signatories would be Britain, as an importer, and Italy and Mexico, joining the six major exporters—Canada, the United States, Australia, Argentina, Sweden, and France.

The special working group that has been discussing the problem of maximum and minimum prices submitted its report today to the main Conference. The approval of this report was the Conference's last main task.

Conference sources said that the minimum price of $1.50 Canadian ($1.54) a bushel remained unchanged but there had been a slight reduction of the maximum price of $2 Canadian ($2.06) a bushel.

The main difference between the old and new agreements is that the new arrangement is based on consented percentages, while the old one was based on guaranteed quantities.

An annex to the agreement lays down the percentages of normal wheat transactions that importers will cover from exporters.

BRITISH APPROVAL SEEN

LONDON, March 9.—A spokesman for the Government said today there was every chance the Geneva Wheat Conference would end in a new international wheat agreement to which Britain could adhere.

Joseph Godber, parliamentary secretary to the Ministry of Agriculture, told this to the House of Commons in reply to a question.

VISIT TO THE UNITED STATES BY PRESIDENT JOSE MARIA LEMUS OF EL SALVADOR

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, this week we in the United States are honored by having as a guest the distinguished President of El Salvador, Jose Maria Lemus.

President Lemus has been engaged in a most commendable program to raise the standard of living of the people of his fine democratic country. Under his leadership, programs have been undertaken to improve in particular rural housing, sanitation and education.

The people of El Salvador have reason to be proud of their country which is one of the most highly cultivated in the whole of Latin America. To President Lemus we extend a glad welcome and assurances to him and his people of our friendship.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that an editorial from the New York Times of March 9, 1959, entitled "Visitor from El Salvador" be inserted at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

VISITOR FROM EL SALVADOR

The visit of President José Maria Lemus of El Salvador to the United States has some especially pleasant aspects. It gives us a chance to show that the head of the smallest nation in the Western Hemisphere is just as welcome as if he were president of one of the largest.

El Salvador is a democracy, politically quiet and financially sound, although hard hit by the fall in coffee prices. President Lemus said in San Salvador that he was coming here solely for the purpose of cementing the friendly relations between our two countries and not for a loan or a handout.

This is certainly true, but it does not mean that the United States should fail to encourage the ambitious Campesino program which President Lemus is trying to put into effect. The one socially bad feature of Salvadoran life is the enormous disparity between the few wealthy families and the great mass of the people, who are very poor. The ruling class, to give it credit, has a social conscience. El Salvador is more than 90 percent mestizo, of mixed Spanish and Indian blood. The Government program aims primarily at rural housing, sanitation and education.

It is a long time since a Central American statesman came to the United States, and this, too, is a special reason to welcome President Lemus today.

FORTHCOMING WORLD YOUTH FESTIVAL IN VIENNA, AUSTRIA

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, on August 24, 1957, I commented in the Senate about the Moscow World Youth Festival and the role that American youth played in it. This summer, a world youth festival will be held again, this time in Vienna, Austria. I would like to bring to the attention of the American people the significance of this gathering and the challenge which it presents.

This carnival-like meeting will be the seventh in a series of mass propaganda events sponsored since World War II by two of the most active and formidable Communist international front groups—the World Federation of Democratic Youth and the International Union of Students. The festivals are highly organized and controlled events which aim to provide a glorified picture of Soviet society and of Russian foreign policy, and conversely a distorted view of what Western society stands for. These gatherings also serve as an effective means of bolstering the prestige of the two sponsoring Communist-front groups, and thus strengthen their full-time program, pursued relentlessly in all areas of the globe, to win the allegiance of young people to the Soviet cause.

The representative and democratically elected student and youth groups throughout the free world, having learned through bitter experience of the nature of these festivals and their organizers, have determined to have no official connection whatsoever with the Vienna gathering. They fully realize the degree to which any type of official or representative recognition will be skillfully exploited to add to the prestige of the festival in the eyes of young people throughout the world. It is significant that all representative student and youth groups in Austria have vigorously protested and are opposed to the policy of their government in permitting the festival to be held for the first time in a non-Communist nation. Similar groups in this country, such as the U.S. National Student Association and the Young Adult Council, are avoiding all official connection with the festival.

But the fact cannot be overlooked that some 20,000 young people from all over the globe will be at the Vienna meeting. Many of these participants will be open-minded individuals who will be eager for, and can profit from, rational discussion and a genuine exchange of ideas. A large number, particularly those from Asia, Africa and Latin America, harbor a distorted view of America and of the American people because of their limited and often inaccurate knowledge of us, and I may add, because of the effec-

tiveness of Communist propaganda. Unless positive action is undertaken by informed young Americans, not only will an opportunity be lost for rectifying such misleading attitudes, but the environment of the festival and the nature of its activities will insure that such misconceptions become confirmed and more deeply etched.

Many Senators will recall that in a speech about the Moscow Festival several years ago, I commented on certain young Americans who had entered into extended public debate on disarmament and the Hungarian situation with Russians in Red Square. Although they realized that the festival was an instrument of Communist propaganda, these young people also saw the unusual and dramatic opportunity offered for presenting an honest picture of our society and point of view, and for rebutting Soviet propaganda.

The effectiveness of their courageous actions showed that we have little to fear from the participation in such festivals of informed, intelligent, and articulate young Americans who, in their individual capacity, are able to speak out in a candid, rational and persuasive manner. Unfortunately, this group of dedicated and patriotic Americans constituted only a handful of people at the Moscow Festival.

I differentiate between individual participation and any type of official participation by representative established student or young people's groups. As I have indicated in my remarks, the established young people's groups of our country are not associating themselves with this festival. They are keeping their record clean; but they are also aware of the challenge which the Communist-sponsored festival poses to free men and women everywhere.

The Vienna Festival now provides us with a challenge and an opportunity which must not be permitted to slip by—that of mingling freely and of exchanging ideas frankly with young people from all over the globe. The Moscow Festival provided Americans with the chance to make an impact on the indigenous population; the Vienna Festival, because of the freer atmosphere of the non-Communist host country, offers the opportunity of making significant contact with individuals from the vast uncommitted areas. I should add, on the other hand, that this opportunity can be lost, or even worse, turned to disaster unless careful thought and preparation is given to the manner in which young Americans should participate in the festival.

First of all, such participation should be by individuals in their personal capacity, making face-to-face contact. Past experience has demonstrated that participation in a representative capacity by persons active in non-Communist organizations, in academic institutions, or, indeed, in respected groups of any kind, is used for propaganda purposes by the festival sponsors and the worldwide Communist apparatus. To promote understanding, one need not appear in Vienna as a representative; nor is it essential to participate in all the official events of the festival. Real understanding will flow from informal, unplanned, personal conversations and contacts among those at the festival, and such contacts in large measure will take place in coffeehouses and cafes, and wherever else young people gather to ask questions and to discuss the problems which trouble them. Americans in Vienna will encounter no difficulty in breaking the ice. Young people from other nations feel too deep a curiosity and concern about this Nation for any American to escape without many opportunities to exchange ideas and make friends.

Secondly, Americans at Vienna must be well informed about the character of the festival and its organizers. That is why I am making this address today, namely, that it may be a part of the RECORD of the Senate, and that young people in colleges and universities who might be interested in the Vienna Festival will at least have some idea of what it is all about and how they might guard themselves from any unfortunate participation under auspices which could be anything but helpful to them. They must be aware of the manner in which the festival will operate, and of the ways in which attempts will be made to exploit their presence and statements. They must fully understand that they are in the midst of the most heavily financed and the ranking propaganda show in the Soviet arsenal, and that pitfalls abound.

I am entering into the RECORD the comments of one of the participants at Moscow which, I think, tells a great deal about the nature of these events. Unfortunately, most Americans who have attended previous festivals have been uninformed, or even misinformed, about what they were becoming involved in.

In other words, I am trying to put up a warning sign and am trying to advise these fine young men and women as to some of the problems and pitfalls they might encounter. Because I believe that young Americans should be courageous and not be fearful, and because I believe they should join the issues and be willing to debate these points with young men and women from other parts of the world, I should like to say these words of encouragement to them on the one hand, and some words of prudent warning on the other.

Some of the organizers of the so-called American delegations have presented an incomplete and misleading picture of the festivals, and have thereby often served the purposes of Communist propaganda.

Third, and most important, Americans who decide to attend the festival must be well informed about all aspects of American society, and about our foreign and domestic policies. Queries concerning our educational system, our labor and social welfare programs, or our system of free enterprise, including our cooperatives and public ownership, and individual initiative, cannot be answered satisfactorily by vague generalizations. Neither can the widespread and genuine concern about racial discrimination, military pacts, disarmament, and nuclear testing be met constructively without a deep understanding of both the fundamental principles and facts which underlie our policies. Nothing constitutes a greater obstacle to improving international understanding among individuals than the lack of relevant information—the failure to have at one's fingertips a sound and penetrating command of the facts. International understanding is not promoted merely by recourse to well-intentioned platitudes and sentimentalism.

Young Americans who are thoroughly informed on the matters which I have mentioned—and there will be many others—can make a positive contribution. However, unless they take the trouble and time to acquire such information, it would be better if they did not attend the gathering in Vienna. An exhibition of good faith, love, and understanding is not enough. I am confident that the young Americans who will attend any of the meetings will want to be prepared to engage in discussion with anyone who may be interested. I make this address today after consultation with a number of the fine young Americans who have encouraged me to speak out in the Senate so that their fellow students throughout the land will at least get some feeling of what is to be offered and what they will be confronted with at Vienna. For Americans, this festival cannot be viewed as just another opportunity to have a good time.

Assistance is available for those young Americans who wish to respond realistically and with determination to the challenge at Vienna. Several days ago, I learned that a number of young Americans experienced in international youth and student affairs, including some of those very people who performed so admirable a service at the Moscow Festival, have formed an organization to be known as the Independent Service for Information on the Vienna Youth Festival. Located in Cambridge, Mass., at 1430 Massachusetts Avenue, the Independent Service, with the cooperation of large numbers of national organizations, has undertaken to prepare the materials which are required to provide American participants in the Vienna meeting with an informed understanding of the festivals and of American policies and problems. The service plans to provide those Americans who have an interest in the festival, and who may wish to attend the meeting in their individual capacity, with a good deal of the essential background material.

I believe our Government owes a debt of gratitude to this voluntary organization of American students who are eager to help prepare fellow students who may wish to visit the festival for this important mission.

I am personally acquainted with some of the organizers of the Independent Service and believe them to be highly motivated and competent. It is my strong recommendation that all young Americans who are interested in learning more about the festival, or who are contemplating attending the gathering while traveling in Europe, contact the service for further information and assistance.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD a statement published by the Independent Service describing its objectives and program,

and excerpts from an article by Mr. George Abrams entitled "Talking With Russians" which appeared in the New Republic of October 14, 1957, and which tells a good deal about the character and activities of the Moscow Youth Festival.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXHIBIT 1

INDEPENDENT SERVICE FOR INFORMATION ON THE VIENNA YOUTH FESTIVAL

WHY AN INFORMATION SERVICE?

The service has been organized for the purpose of providing American young people with objective data regarding the Communist-sponsored Seventh World Youth Festival to be held in Vienna next summer (July 26–August 4). In the past, knowledge of the nature and purpose of the festivals has been limited largely to information derived from a flood of misleading literature with which the Communist organizers have deluged American college campuses and youth organizations. Consequently, a number of Americans have attended past festivals without possessing a full understanding of these events and of the consequences flowing from participation. Furthermore, they have sometimes lacked the information necessary both to lessen the exploitation of their presence and their actions for propaganda purposes, and to correct the misconceptions and distortions of American society which have characterized such gatherings:

WHAT ARE THE WORLD YOUTH FESTIVALS?

Next summer's festival is the latest in a series of mass youth events organized since World War II by two leading Communist international youth fronts: The World Federation of Democratic Youth (WFDY) and the International Union of Students (IUS). Long discredited in the eyes of representative national student and youth bodies throughout the world, these front groups have used the festival as a principal weapon in their continuing propaganda program. Their activities are designed to further the objectives of Soviet policy and to gain adherents to the Soviet cause from among young people, particularly those in the underdeveloped areas.

This strategic aim is furthered by a variety of techniques employed at the festivals. These include utilizing the emotional environment of mass gatherings and promoting the uncritical acceptance of ambiguous and propagandistic slogans, such as the "solidarity of youth," "peace and friendship," "the horrors of nuclear war," etc. Likewise, the festival organizers have shown themselves capable of skillfully exploiting the views of uninformed participants and of asserting misleading claims as to the representative nature of individuals in attendance. By conducting a highly developed and centrally controlled program of activities, the organizers aim to present a selective and flattering view of Soviet cultural achievements and policies.

The festival's objective is to implant an impression of the strength and rectitude of of the Soviet cause in the minds of the participants and those millions throughout the world to whom news of festival activities is communicated before, during, and after each gathering. Its organizers attempt to demonstrate that the Soviet system is superior morally, politically, economically, and culturally; and that world tensions are the product solely of the machinations of Western powers. In addition the festivals serve to further the pretension of the two sponsoring Communist-front groups that they are internationally representative and nonpartisan in character. This in turn strengthens the prestige of their local affiliates.

The open propaganda aspect of the festivals has been toned down from the days of the Stalin era when explicit anti-Western sentiment was a primary feature. However, it is clear that the shift in tone at more recent festivals is no more than a change in format.

Judging from past experience, both the International Preparatory Committee (IPC), which has the immediate administrative responsibility for organizing the festival, and U.S. Festival Committee, which has been stimulated in this country by the IPC for the purpose of recruiting an American delegation, will shortly begin to distribute vast quantities of literature to American campuses and youth organizations. Material already circulated indicates that the festival will be depicted as a neutral and nonpolitical affair designed to further international fellowship and understanding by bringing together the youth of all countries in a spirit of good will. The organizers will attempt to imply that the 17,000 individuals they hope to attract to Vienna are representative leaders covering all areas of the world and every shade of political opinion in it.

A misleading and highly incomplete picture will be given of what goes on at a festival and of the motivations of its promoters. It may be regarded as certain that the festival promoters will not shed any light on such interesting questions as where the $100 million spent on the 1957 Moscow festival really came from or the true nature and background of the IUS and WFDY.

The holding of the forthcoming festival in Vienna marks the first time that it will take place outside the Soviet bloc. Austrian Chancellor Raab has compared his government's policy in permitting the festival to be held in Vienna with the action of neutral Sweden in allowing a meeting of the World Peace Congress, a well-known international Communist front. Raab displayed a marked lack of enthusiasm when he stated that "fortunately, on occasions such as this, the Austrians show themselves sufficiently disciplined, capable of ignoring events they don't appreciate."

SHOULD ONE PARTICIPATE?

In a representative capacity

Each of the festivals has raised the question of participation for youth and student organizations throughout the world. In general, representative groups in the non-Communist countries have declined to send delegates because they felt that participation would be utilized to lend official prestige to a propaganda show, and thus would buttress the claims of the festival organizers to the universal representative character of the meeting. This strengthens not only the effectiveness of the festival but also the day-to-day activities of WFDY and the IUS.

This policy of nonparticipation has been adopted by U.S. student and youth groups such as the U.S. National Student Association and the Young Adult Council. Similar positions toward the festival have been taken by representative student and youth groups in many other countries. Of particular importance is the fact that the Austrian national union of students and the Austrian federation of youth groups both have strongly protested the festival being held in their country and have called on their counterpart groups in other parts of the world to enforce a boycott of representative organizations against the event.

The information service supports such a policy and urges that no American attend the festival in any representative or official capacity, even as the spokesman of a college or local community organization.

In an individual capacity

The information service expects that there are many intelligent and patriotic Americans who will wish to attend the Vienna meeting in an individual and nonrepresentative capacity which would not lend the event any official prestige. Most will probably be interested in observing the various events and in making personal contact and exchanging views with the large number of young people from many areas of the world who will be present.

The organizers of the information service believe that such participation can be valuable only if the individuals attending are fully informed as to the nature and purpose of such a meeting so as to lessen the propaganda use of their presence and actions. The service further thinks that American participants should be prepared for the great interest and curiosity, both friendly and hostile, which will be expressed regarding our Nation and its policies. They should be equipped to effectively present a democratic viewpoint, dispel particular misconceptions of American society, and thus promote understanding with the participants drawn from over the globe.

Such well-informed individual participation requires considerable preparation. The problems confronting the world today and the aspects of American life in which young people overseas are most interested are complex. Similarly, objective material regarding the world youth festival is difficult to obtain. It is the purpose of the information service to facilitate the gathering together and distribution of such information.

HOW CAN THE INFORMATION HELP YOU?

The service is prepared to answer inquiries regarding the Vienna festival and to provide current information both to those who desire a greater understanding of such meetings and to those who may be seriously considering attending the festival.

Present plans call for the preparation of documented studies on the history and operation of past festivals and the character of their sponsors. Preparations of the Vienna gathering and the activities of its organizers will be continually analyzed and periodically reported.

In addition, the service will provide background data on U.S. and world affairs and indications on what may be expected in Vienna. Information on transportation and accommodations as well as other practical data as to means of participation in the festival will also be made available.

WHO ARE THE ORGANIZERS?

The Independent Service for Information on the Vienna Youth Festival has been organized by a number of students and recent university graduates in the Boston area. Most have had personal experience in national and international youth and student affairs, and several have had the opportunity of observing past festivals in operation. Many have held elected positions in representative U.S. student and youth groups, and some now hold elective campus posts. They have been joined in their work by interested young Americans in various parts of the country who recognize the important role played by young adults in world affairs today.

The service is now establishing contact with a large number of national youth and student organizations including educational, political, religious, academic, and social service groups. Among these groups are the Council on Student Travel, National Young Democrats, National Young Republicans, U.S. National Student Association, World University Service, and the Young Adult Council. Liaison has developed with a number of these groups who plan to utilize the facilities provided by the information service.

Attempts are being made to raise funds for the operations of the service, and some support has already been received from public spirited citizens in the Boston area. Further financial assistance from those in-

terested in furthering our activities would be welcomed.

WHAT SHOULD YOU DO?

If you have any questions concerning the Vienna Youth Festival or desire further information about it, please communicate with the service at its Cambridge offices. We will be pleased to place you on our mailing lists to receive items appropriate to your interest.

EXHIBIT 2

The attempt of the Russian Government to use the Youth Festival for propaganda turned out to be far more subtle than we had first anticipated. Past youth festivals had been very carefully calculated propaganda efforts against the West—and the United States in particular. In 1947 and 1949, the theme was antifascism; in 1951 and 1953 the festival passed resolutions condemning "United States aggression and germ warfare in Korea"; in 1955 at Warsaw, the pitch was peaceful coexistence. Peaceful coexistence was again the main theme of the Youth Festival this year. But resolutions were incidental to demonstrations of peace and friendship. Everywhere the delegates went thousands of Russians greeted them with flowers and gifts and apparently genuine affection.

It became obvious to us that the Russian Government was directing its greatest effort toward the African and colonial countries, and the Arab nations. For instance, many of the large Russian stores had set up display windows. The clothing dummies were always mixed white and Negro and carefully arranged in each window. Dummies of black-skinned children were used to display the best of Soviet youth wearing apparel, and display windows for the most expensive women's clothes all had at least one Negro dummy. One of the most spectacular displays in Moscow was of a giant magic carpet about 30 feet above one of Moscow's largest squares. On the magic carpet were three model children, arm in arm: a Negro child, a Caucasian child, and a child representing the yellow race.

The dark-skinned and the Arab delegates to the festival seemed to be given special treatment by the Russian crowds and officials. These delegates were deluged with flowers and gifts, and were carefully shepherded to numerous meetings along with other supposedly exploited people. Although every delegation was given the red-carpet treatment, the colonials found themselves living in somewhat better conditions. Instead of five to a room (in the American and British hostels), the Indians and Africans and Arabs were put in rooms with two or three people. Instead of cafeteria-type, self-service meals, the Russians gave the delegates of the uncommitted countries their own dining halls and waiters and candlelight service. The rooms of each of these delegations were equipped with telephones.

Most of the Indian delegates to whom I spoke saw through this preferential treatment. A good many of them laughed and joked over the whole thing and explained that I too could be better treated if I would only give up my American citizenship and become an Indian or an African. But undoubtedly all the Soviet efforts along this line were not in vain. It is pretty hard to forget the almost hysterical screaming of the Syrian and Egyptian delegations every time the opportunity came to praise Russia and the Russian leaders. Or the way the Arab delegates prostrated themselves before Khrushchev and the Presidium on the day of the opening ceremonies. The chant of "Syria and Russia, friendship forever," echoed throughout Moscow wherever the Syrian delegation went.

* * * * *

In many respects I was impressed with the careful, methodical planning and general organization of the Youth Festival activities. Thirty thousand young people from all over the world and all speaking different languages poured into Moscow. One hundred thousand youths were brought to Moscow from all parts of the Soviet Union. All of these people had to be housed, fed, transported around the city. Although there were a number of mixups and sometimes complete confusion, by and large, the Russians were able to run the whole production smoothly.

It might be worthwhile to note that the Russians were able to find top-rate interpreters for each language spoken by the festival delegates. Not one, but several. I asked some of the Russians whether it was difficult to find interpreters for some of the dialects and lesser known languages. The answer was no. "We make sure that we have enough people studying all the different languages to provide for our language needs whenever such things as the Youth Festival come up." "But suppose you have no students who want to study a particular dialect?" I asked. "We find them," came back the answer.

The food problem at the festival must have been immense. The Russians provided from three to five main courses for each meal. One course was always served for vegetarians. Arabs received food in line with their national eating habits; Chinese food was available, and so on down the line.

The problem of equitably providing tickets for the cultural performances during the festival was gigantic. Thirty thousand foreign youths and 100,000 young Russians were in Moscow all clamoring to be entertained. Thirty, forty or fifty theaters would be in operation in one night, and somehow each would be filled to capacity with festival delegates. Mistakes were made in the ticket allocations, but the big surprise was the apparent ease with which this difficult problem was handled.

Sometimes, however, the Soviet technical and organization competence fell down completely. The most serious example of this from the Russian point of view was the carefully ballyhooed evening demonstration on Hiroshima Day. The Russians were quite obviously planning to make their big propaganda push of the festival. "American mass murder" was one term being bandied about as the big rally drew near.

But the rally was a complete failure. The Russians made several crucial mistakes in its staging. For some reason they decided to make it a rally of only youth delegates to the festival. Cordons of police were set up to keep the Russian people out. This was a festival rally, they explained. The sudden shift from 10 days of howling masses of people to the comparatively few festival delegates put a real damper on festivities.

The total cost of the festival to the Russian Government has been estimated at anywhere from $20 million to $200 million. The most reliable figure seems to be somewhat in the neighborhood of $125 million. The bulk of this money went into building construction, housing facilities, and food transportation, and entertainment. From all accounts in the Russian press since the Youth Festival, it seems pretty apparent that the Russian Government is having a good many qualms as to whether the money was well spent or not. Russian youth leaders have had to issue statements telling the young people of Russia to throw off the subversive ideas spread at the festival by non-Communist delegates, to ignore the lies spread by certain youth delegates, and to join together once again in their full support of the Communist Party and the Soviet leaders. Hitherto taboo subjects have found their way into the Soviet press, such as the defection of Howard Fast from the Communist Party and the contents of the United Nations Report on Hungary.

VISIT TO THE SENATE BY HON. HENRY L. J. MAY, MEMBER OF PARLIAMENT OF NEW ZEALAND

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, we have with us on the floor of the Senate a very distinguished visitor. At this time I present to the Senate Hon. Henry L. J. May, a Member of the Parliament of New Zealand. Mr. May is the chief government whip in the Parliament of New Zealand. He is chairman of the Parliament's local bills committee, and also a member of the Committee on External Affairs, which corresponds to our Foreign Relations Committee.

It is a pleasure to have Mr. May with us, and I am delighted to present him to the Senate at this time. [Applause, Senators rising.]

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks a statement prepared in the Office of International Labor Affairs of the Department of Labor containing a brief biography of our distinguished visitor.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF LABOR,
OFFICE OF INTERNATIONAL LABOR AFFAIRS,
Washington, D.C.

Mr. Henry L. J. May is visiting the United States as a participant in the foreign leader program of the International Educational Exchange Service of the Department of State. The Office of International Labor Affairs of the Department of Labor has been assigned responsibility for his program.

Mr. May is a Labor Party Member of Parliament, and has been for approximately 5 years. He is a member of the National Executive for the New Zealand Labor Party. Mr. May is president of the Wellington, Nelson, Westland, and Marlborough local bodies, other laborers, and related trades industrial union of workers. He has been a borough councilor and a member of a river and valley power board. He has been associated with the New Zealand railroads for approximately 18 years. Mr. May has also been very active in sports and belongs to a number of sporting clubs, such as rifle shooting, football, and tennis. He is a member of the National Geographic Society. Mr. May is chief government whip, chairman of the Parliament's local bills committee, and a member of the Committee on External Affairs. He has acted as chairman of some of the most important committees of the New Zealand labor conferences.

Mr. May is keenly interested in studying various aspects of U.S. Federal, State, and municipal government. He is particularly interested in all aspects of the political scene; for example, the methods used for running for office, and the organization and methods of Congress, especially the administration, functions, and authority of congressional committees. Because of his long association with administration of his borough, he would like to see as much as possible of American practices in traffic control, laws and codes, public transport, housing administration, soil conservation, irrigation, and fire department organization. As a member of Parliament representing the interests of his constituents and an industrial and manufacturing area that is growing fast, he would like to learn about something of union attitudes toward automation, the meatpacking industry, methods of attracting industry, and the peaceful uses of atomic energy. He would like to visit one or two automated plants.

As a framework to his particular purposes, Mr. May is generally interested in the recreational, cultural, social, political, and economic aspects of the United States.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HARTKE in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXTENSION OF THE UNIVERSAL MILITARY TRAINING AND SERVICE ACT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 2260) to extend until July 1, 1963, the induction provisions of the Universal Military Training and Service Act; the provisions of the act of August 3, 1950, suspending personnel strengths of the Armed Forces; and the Dependents Assistance Act of 1950.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, the bill now before the Senate, H.R. 2260, involves a 4-year extension of five separate authorities, all of which relate to the maintenance of the strength and health of the Armed Forces of the United States. I should like to discuss each one of the five authorities briefly; then I shall be glad to yield for questions concerning the bill.

REGULAR DRAFT

The first and perhaps the most important objective of the bill is to extend the authority to induct persons into the Armed Forces. Unless extended this authority would expire on July 1 of this year. The pending bill contemplates a 4-year extension, until July 1, 1963.

Under the Universal Military Training and Service Act young men must register with their local boards at the age of 18, although they are not liable for induction until they reach the age of 18½. After registration these young men are classified by their local boards. Unless they are eligible for the various deferments and exemptions authorized under the basic law, the young men are classified I–A. Persons classified I–A are called in a sequence that results in the induction principally of nonfathers between the ages of 19 and 26. Draft calls presently are relatively low. Approximately 115,000 men will be inducted during the current fiscal year, and over the next 4 fiscal years annual inductions are estimated to average 90,000. The current average age at induction is about 22½, and over the next 4 years this average age probably will increase to 23.

Under existing conditions only the Army requires inductees, but the existence of the draft machinery operates as a powerful inducement to enlistments in the other Armed Forces.

More than 1,200,000 young men will reach the age of 18½ during each of the next 4 years. This fact coupled with the relatively low rate of inductions has caused some observers to believe that the manpower pool is excessive and that many young men are reaching the age of 26 without having performed military service. A comprehensive study conducted by the Department of Defense and participated in by other Federal agencies having manpower responsibilities tends to counter such an impression. The results of this study, which are discussed in the committee report, show that only a negligible number of qualified nonfathers have avoided military service or are likely to avoid military service by 1963.

Although this result may seem paradoxical, it is understandable when one analyzes the manpower supply in any particular age group. It must be remembered that, in addition to the approximately 100,000 inductions, about 400,000 other young men enlist in one or another of the Armed Forces. Another large chunk of a year group is made up of fathers. Still another explanation is the high rate of rejection for failure to meet mental and physical qualifications. The current rejection rate for an age group as a whole is about 33 percent. Since many members of an age group voluntarily enter service, the rejection rate for the effective manpower pool is approximately 45 percent of all registrants.

Before giving the committee justification for extending the draft authority, I should like to discuss the other authorities included in the bill.

SELECTIVE CALLS FOR PHYSICIANS AND DENTISTS

Despite some special inducements for physicians and dentists, the Department of Defense has been unable to recruit enough Regular doctors and dentists to meet the needs of the Armed Forces. For this reason, it is necessary to provide for the temporary service of a sufficient number of doctors and dentists to bridge the gap between the numbers of Regulars and the requirements of the Department.

Persons deferred under the Universal Military Training and Service Act remain liable for induction until they reach the age of 35. Since most physicians and dentists are deferred to continue their professional education, they incur a liability for induction until age 35.

Originally there was no authority to select persons for induction on the basis of their professional abilities or skills. When world conditions required the Government to summon increasing numbers of men to the colors, they could not be called from their homes and placed in the Armed Forces without being afforded adequate medical and dental care. The necessity for that care required that unusual steps be taken.

To permit such selective induction without also inducting unneeded persons, a 1957 act authorized the President to levy special calls for medical and dental officers and allied specialists. This law also provided authority for ordering physicians and dentists who were members of Reserve components to active duty for 24 months if they had not already served on active duty for at least 1 year.

The combination of authority for selective induction of physicians and dentists and the authority for ordering Reserve physicians and dentists to active duty has caused this special authority to operate by indirection. No inductions have been made under this authority because the physicians and dentists who are subject to it have accepted Reserve commissions and have been ordered to active duty as needed. The pending bill contemplates a 4-year extension of this special authority to induct physicians and dentists and to order Reserve physicians and dentists to active duty for 24 months.

Despite the fact that the strengths of the Regular medical and dental corps have increased in each of the three military departments, about 50 percent of all physicians and about 60 percent of all dentists on active duty on June 30, 1959, are noncareer officers. If this special authority is permitted to expire, it will unquestionably reduce to unacceptable levels the number of physicians and dentists on active duty.

DEPENDENTS ASSISTANCE ACT

Another feature of the bill is a proposed 4-year extension of the Dependents Assistance Act.

This act was approved in 1950, and had as its purpose the authorization of dependency allowances that were necessary under the peacetime structure of the Armed Forces.

The peacetime policy of the Armed Forces would not involve acceptance by persons with dependents of enlistments in the lower three pay grades and a part of the fourth. Since persons with dependents were not enlisted in these lower pay grades, there was no authorization to pay a quarters allowance to them. The partial mobilization, following hostilities in Korea, required the utilization on active duty of members of the lower pay grades, even though they had dependents. Consequently, the Congress in 1950 prescribed a system of quarters allowances for all enlisted grades. These allowances are graduated according to grade, and they are somewhat more liberal than the allowances provided under the permanent law, even for the persons who are entitled to quarters allowances under the permanent provisions of the Career Compensation Act. At a time when it is important to emphasize voluntary enlistments, it obviously is necessary to continue provisions for dependency allowances for all of the enlisted grades.

SUSPENSION OF STRENGTH LIMITATIONS

Another of the authorities contained in House bill 2260 would continue in effect a suspension of ceilings on the authorized personnel strength of the Armed Forces.

The permanent authorization of the Armed Forces total somewhat more than 2 millions persons, but less than the active duty strength of the Armed Forces today or at any time since 1950. These ceilings have been suspended since 1950; and I am sure that the necessity for continuing the suspension is apparent to everyone who has any familiarity with the conditions which exist today.

The Air Force furnishes a good illustration of the necessity for continuing

suspension of these ceilings. The permanent personnel authorization of the Air Force is 502,000. It is estimated that its strength on June 30 of this year will be about 850,000. Failure to continue this suspension would result in a loss of almost 350,000 members of the Air Force. Of course, Mr. President, such a condition as that is unthinkable.

For the period that the permanent limitations are suspended, a secondary ceiling of 5 million persons on the total personnel of the Armed Forces comes into play. This secondary limitation will be effective during the period of suspension of the permanent limitations involved in this bill. Of course, in the light of the present strength of our Military Establishment, that limitation is not likely to come into effect.

SPECIAL PAY FOR PHYSICIANS, DENTISTS, AND VETERINARIANS

The committee has amended the bill by adding to it a legislative proposal by the Department of Defense that continues eligibility for special pay by physicians, dentists, and veterinarians entering on active duty after July 1, 1959.

In an attempt to procure more physicians and dentists, and to make military medical compensation more competitive with civilian incomes by persons with similar experience, there has been in effect for several years a system of special pay for physicians, dentists, and veterinarians. The amount of this special pay is graduated in accordance with the length of service. Medical and dental officers with less than 2 years of active duty as such officers are eligible for special pay of $100 a month. Those with more than 2, but less than 6, years of service are eligible for $150. Those with more than 6, but less than 10, years of such service are eligible for $200 a month. Those with more than 10 years may receive $250 a month. Veterinarians are eligible for $10 a month in special pay, irrespective of their length of service.

Physicians, dentists, and veterinarians already on active duty, or entering on active duty before July 1, 1959, would continue to receive this special pay, even if this amendment were not adopted. The amendment is offered to permit those officers in these categories who enter on active duty between July 1, 1959, and July 1, 1963, to be eligible for these special payments in the same manner and amount that officers already on active duty are now eligible.

JUSTIFICATION FOR THE BILL

Mr. President, in 1948 we could not raise the strength of the Armed Forces to 2 million men without having a selective service or draft law in operation. Today, the active duty strength of the Armed Forces is more than 2,500,000. In today's troubled world we simply cannot risk a reduction in this strength that unquestionably would result if the authority to induct were not extended.

Of course, there is nothing sacrosanct about the 4-year period of extension. However, the last two extensions of this authority have been for 4 years; and I regret to say that I see nothing that would support a hope that we may dispense with the draft within the next 4 years. Since this is true, Mr. President, I believe that a shorter extension would only offer a false hope to some young men, and perhaps it would cause them to plan unrealistically for their future.

The committee has had some earnest suggestions from church groups that the draft should be stopped. While conceding their good faith, I confess that I am unable to understand their reasoning. The Communists admittedly are atheistic. In my opinion, failure to extend the draft would make this country most vulnerable to the onslaught of atheistic communism. Until the Communists demonstrate some of the same religious characteristics that we are urged to show by those who would suppress and stop the operation of the draft, I think that failure to extend the draft would tend to suppress a religious outlook, instead of strengthening such an outlook.

Nor have I been impressed by the argument that uncertainties about when a young man will enter the service are contributing to confusion of and delinquencies by our youth. Whatever the defects of the present system may be, and I would be the first to concede that there are defects in the system—it certainly offers a wide choice to the young men vulnerable for the draft. There are more than 30 ways in which a young man may discharge his military obligations to his country. There is a wide variety of choice of branch of service, as well as a choice as to whether the person will enlist in the Regular forces or in the Reserve forces, and also as to the length of his total service.

For young persons who desire to complete college before discharging their military obligations, this opportunity exists, since the average age of induction is now about 22½. For those who desire to discharge their obligation before attending college, this opportunity also exists. These persons may volunteer for induction, or they may enter one of the 6-month training programs. For those who are seriously disturbed about the uncertainty, I would suggest that they consider the wide variety of choices available to all young men who desire to discharge their military obligation to their country.

I also should like to disabuse some persons of an impression that military service is in some way degrading or that it tends to militarize our youth. The many millions of veterans in our society today completely refute these contentions. Anyone who has any apprehension that men who have served in the military forces are likely to produce a military dictatorship in this country have only to talk to those completing their military duties to find that, instead of giving him any such impression as that, he will find they are more devoted than ever to the idea of civilian control of our Military Establishment.

Mr. President, I would urge the responsible community, church, and civic leaders to emphasize the opportunity and privilege of participating in the defense of this country, instead of harping on the inconvenience and disadvantages of military service. This country cannot survive in today's troubled world without determination and a willingness on the part of our people to make some sacrifice. I believe there is need for a renewed awareness that military service is necessary. Mr. President, I believe that in today's world, when all that we have and hold dear is threatened, there should be a feeling of pride in being able to render military service, instead of considering it as something to be avoided as if it were a disease or a plague.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. As the senior member of the Armed Services Committee on this side of the aisle, I want to join with the chairman of the committee in supporting the position of the committee in extending the Draft Act or the Selective Service Act for 4 years.

The committee has recommended that the bill be passed, with no amendments or changes in the present law, for 4 years. In other words, the committee has recommended the continuation of the Selective Service Act for 4 years.

The committee has recommended the continuation for 4 years of the provisions relating to doctors, dentists, and veterinarians, with increased salaries.

The committee has recommended the continuation for 4 years of the provision relating to dependents.

The committee has eliminated for 4 years the ceilings which may be placed on the size of the Armed Forces.

As the chairman of the committee has so well pointed out, we need the benefits and the provisions of this act in order to maintain the strength of our armed services. Many volunteers are obtained for service in our Armed Forces, but we must not deceive ourselves into believing that the Armed Forces would obtain all those volunteers if there were not in effect the provisions of the Selective Service Act.

Undoubtedly there will be questions asked of the chairman of the committee as to why the committee did not adopt a particular amendment or amendments which had been recommended. The difficulty with amending the Selective Service Act, as I see it, is that we could not tell what the effect would be if an amendment of the law were adopted, and that if the committee adopted one amendment, it might only be fair to adopt several more.

The committee decided that, as long as the act had been administered in a fairly satisfactory manner, it should be continued. Of course, the administration of the act has not been entirely satisfactory, because no compulsory law of that kind will ever be administered in an entirely satisfactory manner. We believed that there was involved a question of administration of the act rather than a need for a change in the law.

As General Hershey pointed out in his testimony, in his work as head of the Selective Service System there have been many administrative changes made since the original Selective Service Act was put into operation. Those changes have affected very considerably the responsibilities of the young men

who have gone into the military service, the time they would spend in the service, and many other matters. As General Hershey stated to the committee, if conditions change again, as they have changed from time to time, the law is sufficiently flexible so changes can be made in an administrative way.

I would say the chairman of the committee has stated accurately the general opinion among the committee members that the act should be extended for 4 years rather than 2 years, because there will be no change in conditions that we can foresee which would allow us to eliminate the law at the end of 2 years. So it was thought wiser to extend the law for 4 years rather than 2 years.

As the senior member of the committee on this side of the aisle, I join with the chairman of the committee in recommending and hoping that the Senate will pass the bill without amendment. In my opinion, that will be the fairest way to pass the bill and the fairest way that an act of this character can be administered. Any law which is compulsory as regards young men cannot, of course, be entirely fair to all of them, and it is not fair to all. However, it is the best we can do in the way of legislation, so long as a Selective Service Act is required.

I am happy to join the Senator from Georgia for the second time, since he and I have been working on the committee, in urging that the law be extended.

Mr. RUSSELL. I thank the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts, who is the ranking Republican member of the Armed Services Committee, and who, in those unfortunate periods when the Republican Party was in the majority, served as chairman of the committee.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. At that time the Senator from Massachusetts was ably assisted by the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. RUSSELL. I am always glad to help the Senator from Massachusetts. If there has ever been any partisanship in this committee in either administration, I have not seen it.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. ELLENDER. As the Senator from Massachusetts has just stated, the pending measure contains no substantive change in the act which is now in effect, and no amendments to the act, as such, were considered by the committee.

Mr. RUSSELL. The committee considered some amendments.

Mr. ELLENDER. I am sure the distinguished Senator from Georgia will remember that prior to his committee's consideration of the measure I spoke to him, as chairman of the Armed Services Committee, in an effort to have him accept an amendment fixing the strength of the Army at not less than 900,000 men, which would retain the Army at its current strength and would not necessitate the closing of any Army installation.

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes. The distinguished Senator from Louisiana did discuss that matter with me. He of course knows that the Senate had adopted a provision for 900,000 men in the Appropriations Act for the current fiscal year, and that there had been a difference of opinion between the legislative and the executive branch as to what the size of the Army should be. There had never before been substantive legislation fixing a definite floor on the strength of an armed force.

Mr. ELLENDER. As I recall, the distinguished Senator stated to me at the time of the discussion that that had never been done in the past, and he did not believe it was practical to amend the act at this time in order to fix a floor for the number of men in the Army. Therefore, upon learning of Senator RUSSELL's position on this matter, I saw no future in pursuing this tack.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator has quoted me almost verbatim. I made that statement. I still think it would be unfortunate and an unwise thing to undertake to do so in the legislation now being considered. We are having enough difficulty at present in holding the Army at its present strength, without endangering the proposal by inviting a veto. The Army can still further shrink below its present size.

Mr. ELLENDER. As the Senator stated, this cntire problem was discussed before the Senate Committee on Appropriations last year, and the Committee on Appropriations went on record as stating that in its opinion, a 900,000-man Army, at least, was necessary for the protection of the country. Pursuant to that viewpoint, we provided sufficient funds to maintain a 900,000-man Army.

Mr. RUSSELL. The distinguished Senator from Louisiana is one of the senior members of the Committee on Appropriations, and one of the most active members of that committee. The Senator has correctly stated that the committee last year approved appropriations for an Army of 900,000 men. The Senate, as I recall, confirmed that act without any substantial discussion. The appropriations for an Army of 900,000 men were actually made.

Mr. ELLENDER. As a matter of fact, I believe the Senator will recall that the distinguished Senator from South Carolina presented an amendment to the bill to fix the Army at 900,000 men and the Senate subsequently adopted this amendment unanimously. However, when the matter was taken to conference, the House refused to accept the mandatory Army limit placed in the bill by the Senate.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator is correct. The size of the Military Establishment in this country historically has been fixed in the appropriation bills rather than in other legislation. When the Armed Services Committee considers personnel strengths it usually establishes an authorization or a ceiling, which is based upon the testimony in the hearings before the committee. However, as between one man and the ceiling, whatever it may be, the number is fixed by the Committee on Appropriations. The Senator from South Carolina did offer such an amendment, which would have placed language in the law that the Active Army should be not less than 900,000, and the Senate approved the amendment.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. RUSSELL. However, when the bill went to conference, the other body was adamant in opposition to the amendment. It so happens I was one of the conferees on the bill, and the House refused to accept the amendment, so the Senate was compelled to yield on that very wise provision.

However, the Senate did not abandon the position completely, because the committee on conference did state that the Army strength should be 900,000. It was the position of the other body that the matter had been handled historically in the conference report. Strong language was placed in the conference report, but that clear intent has been disregarded.

Mr. ELLENDER. I agree with the Senator and would like to point out that, specifically, the will of Congress has been disregarded by the President.

Does the Senator know of any manner in which now or in the near future we could present a measure which would compel the President, at least, to recognize that the Congress has something to say and to do about fixing a minimum size for the Army? Certainly, considering all the information which was presented for the RECORD yesterday by the distinguished majority leader and by others, there is an indication to me that under the Constitution the Congress has the power to raise and support armies. Considering the facts brought before us by the Joint Chiefs of Staff, it strikes me that a powerful case has been made for a larger Army than has been ordered by the President. Yet we are confronted with this direct opposition to the wishes of Congress from the President. I wonder if the distinguished Senator will comment on this.

Mr. RUSSELL. I, of course, realize how keenly the Senator from Louisiana feels that the Army should be maintained at not less than 900,000 men, because I have heard him discuss the matter in the committee, as well as in the conferences he has held with me in my capacity as chairman of the Senate Committee on Armed Services.

The Senator, of course, knows this is not a new issue. There have been questions between the Congress and the executive branch of the Government for more than a century—for almost a century and a half—with respect to the appropriations which have been made by the Congress, when the Executive has not thought it wise or prudent to make the expenditures. Very frankly, I know of no recourse which the legislative branch of the Government has in such a situation as that, unless the situation is so bad that the Congress feels it is justified in resorting to the impeachment powers which are conferred on the legislative branch in the Constitution of the United States. Otherwise, we have no powers that would compel the President of the United States to spend any appropriations made for the Armed Forces.

Mr. HOLLAND and Mr. LONG addressed the Chair.

Mr. RUSSELL. Of course, we realize impeachment is manifestly impossible. There is a difference now between Congress and the executive branch. I do not question the good faith of the Executive. I know the Congress is acting in good faith.

This is not a new question. Other Senators in other days have sought to devise ways and means to require an Executive to carry out the intent of Congress as to the expenditure of funds. So far as I am advised, none of them have ever succeeded.

Mr. ELLENDER. I am aware of what has happened in the past, I will say to my good friend from Georgia.

Mr. RUSSELL. If the President is willing to take the responsibility before the people of the country for refusing to spend the funds, it does not seem that much can be done.

Mr. ELLENDER. As I have stated, I am aware of that, and that is why I discussed with my good friend from Georgia the possibility of getting something done by the Armed Services Committee which would compel the President to maintain an Army of 900,000 men.

Mr. RUSSELL. If we provided the money, action still would not be required, I will say. That would not strengthen what the Congress did last year.

Mr. ELLENDER. I understand.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. I was reassured by the statement of the distinguished Senator that no substantial change has been recommended in the existing law. Do I correctly understand that the provisions of the existing law provide that the Governors of the respective States shall name the Directors of Selective Service in their States and shall name the members of the local draft boards; and that those provisions are to continue?

Mr. RUSSELL. Of course, the Senator from Florida well knows that under the law the President appoints the State Directors on the recommendation of the Governors. The President appoints the local boards but on the recommendation of the Governors. That has been the case since the first Selective Service Act was passed, I believe in 1939. That system will be carried over in the extension, if the Congress sees fit to extend the law.

Mr. HOLLAND. I think that is a very important part of the law, and I am sure the chairman of the committee agrees.

Mr. RUSSELL. I could not agree more. There have been injustices in regard to certain individual draft boards, but there has been a feeling on the part of all the young men in this Nation that their cases have been considered by neighbors in the community. I think that has had a beneficial effect. It is one of the things which dramatizes the difference between selective service as applied in a democracy such as ours and as applied in a military system such as obtained in Prussia, or in Germany. The question of passing upon deferments is taken to the grass roots, and the many human elements enter into the question of when and how the military service is to be rendered. It is one of those things which cause me to believe there is no need to be worried about Prussianization or militarization of this country so long as we keep the program so close to the people.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. I could not agree more heartily with the distinguished Senator than upon the last statement. I think the details which we have just discussed help to give the earmarks of democracy to selective service in a way which could not be accomplished otherwise.

I have one more question to ask the Senator on that subject. Will the discretionary powers of the local boards be affected or diminished in any way by the proposed extension?

Mr. RUSSELL. They are not touched at all by the proposed extension. Frankly, they very largely grew out of regulations under the law, rather than the law itself. This bill in no wise affects the present powers or discretion of the local boards. There is some variety in the application of the law. Some boards do not hesitate to draft young men who are married. Others give them deferment under the regulations. The discretionary powers represent an intangible, related to the community rather than to the hard and fast letter of the regulations.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the distinguished Senator. Speaking for one Senator—and I think I speak the sentiments of a great many others—I am happy that the responsibility in this vastly important matter in our Republic rests in hands so capable and so patriotic as those of the distinguished Senator from Georgia, who speaks for Senators on this side of the aisle, and the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] who speaks for Senators on the other side of the aisle. We know with what complete patriotism these questions are handled. We compliment those two distinguished Senators, as well as every other member of the Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator from Florida. I would not like to have this occasion pass without saying that the committee is very fortunate in the caliber of its staff. It is not a large staff, but it is very able and efficient.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. RUSSELL. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG. First, let me join other Senators in paying my respects to the distinguished chairman of the committee. There is no person in Government service for whom I have greater admiration and respect.

I should like to ask the Senator a question on the subject of deferment and exemptions. Is it the opinion of the Senator from Georgia that it might be desirable to have a committee of Congress, or perhaps a joint committee, enter into some study of this subject during the next 2 or 3 years, to see if there is some way by which we can bring about more of an organized pattern to insure that every young man performs some useful service, rather than having large numbers of qualified men escape service.

Mr. RUSSELL. Let me say to the Senator that the idea that a large number of qualified men escape service is not well founded. The President has raised the mental standards. Testimony before the committee was to the effect that not more than 1 in 10 qualified young men in this country have avoided military service. About 45 percent are not qualified, either for physical reasons or because their aptitude is not adequate to qualify them. However, about 9 out of 10 of those who are qualified have rendered military service to the country.

There have been inequities, and we have conducted a number of studies. The Senator from Louisiana is a former member of the committee. He was a very active and useful member of the committee. He will recall that a commission was appointed to deal with this subject. When it was first established it was presided over by former Senator Wadsworth, of New York, who was an expert in that field. Later General Sarnoff was Chairman of the Commission. It held lengthy hearings and filed a large number of reports and recommendations dealing with this subject.

Many commissions have studied this field. Of course, we have improved the machinery. It is much better than it was in the early stages. We learned as we went along.

We also discussed in the committee the desirability of having a subcommittee that would consider this question very closely, as well as the question of utilization of military manpower. It is always a difficult problem to determine the best utilization of the manpower we now have.

Mr. LONG. One point which occurs to the junior Senator from Louisiana is the fact that the people of this Nation are weak in the understanding of foreign languages. The Armed Forces have a good language school. However, I noticed, in visiting Russia, that that nation exempts certain young men from service in the armed forces in order to permit them to go to language schools. They concentrate on the study of languages, to the extent that large numbers of their people are trained to speak foreign languages very fluently. It seems to me that that is one area in which this Nation is not laying the proper stress.

Mr. RUSSELL. Let me say to the Senator that I hold the same opinion. However, at the present time the armed services have a better record with respect to teaching attachés the languages of other countries than has the State Department.

One can go to almost any country, including Finland, Russia, Sweden, and other countries which have difficult languages, and find that the Army attachés speak the various languages fluently, because they are given very rigid indoctrination in the language for 6 or 8 months. They may not be as fluent as

they might be, but they understand the language, and they can make themselves understood. I think the armed services are improving in that respect much faster than is the State Department.

Mr. LONG. The Senator is entirely correct. But, to offset some of the glaring weaknesses in the State Department, it seems to me that if the armed services could train a considerable number of their members to speak foreign languages, there would be a wider reservoir from which the State Department might draw subsequently.

Mr. RUSSELL. I agree entirely. As a member of the Board of Visitors to various service academies, I have discussed that subject. There has been great improvement in the language courses available in the service schools, and in the schools operated by the services. If I were as well satisfied with the progress we are making in all other branches of the military service as I am with the teaching of languages to the men who are to serve as military attachés overseas, I would be much more optimistic. I believe the improvement has been most spectacular in the past 5 years.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. With relation to the State Department, the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] and I have joined for several years in trying to stimulate a greater degree of language study in the Foreign Service Institute of the State Department.

With relation to the armed services, I agree with what the chairman has said. In the service academies as much time is now devoted to the humanities as it is possible to give, when we consider all the science studies which must be pursued.

With relation to the men brought into the armed services, I believe I am correct in saying—although I am not sure of the accuracy of the statement—that there are opportunities for language studies in almost any place where a man may be situated, if he wishes to pursue such studies. It is on a voluntary basis.

The armed services are making an excellent record. The State Department can do better. As a member of the Foreign Relations Committee, I express the hope that the Senator from Louisiana will support the bill of the Senator from Montana and myself.

Mr. LONG. It does seem to me that, in the national interest, something must be done toward providing better qualifications generally in the language field for our Foreign Service. Perhaps it might be well to consider at some time in the future means by which it would be possible to work out some kind of deferment or even exemption for those who are attempting to qualify themselves for the Foreign Service, so that we may have available persons in the diplomatic service, who, with their knowledge of foreign languages, will help avert war, if that is possible—and to help win it if we must fight it.

It seems to me that some kind of deferment or even exemption should be provided for persons who are willing to develop a knowledge of foreign languages.

Mr. RUSSELL. It is possible to do that under existing law. It is possible under existing law to give a deferment. A very liberal system of deferment is available for students in colleges who wish to study foreign languages, as well as many other courses, as long as they maintain certain grades and do a certain amount of work in those fields.

The Senator is undoubtedly correct that this is one of our great weaknesses in our battle to win the minds and hearts of men. The Russians have a tremendous advantage over us in that regard. He and I have traveled in Russia, and no doubt he has been amazed by the number of people in Russia, many of whom have never traveled outside their little home communities, who can speak a foreign language.

Mr. LONG. It is worse than amazing; it is distressing.

Mr. RUSSELL. It is certainly very impressive on the visitor. Russian children must study a foreign language, and must begin the study of a foreign language in what is the equivalent of our second, third, and fourth grades. That is when they must begin their study of a foreign language.

When I was in Russia, I was told that before World War II, the German language had been the favorite foreign language. Now, since the war, and since the expansion of their language courses, English has become the most popular language study in the Russian schools.

The Russians not only train people in a particular language, but also in the various dialects of a language. There is no place in the world, regardless of what its language or the dialect of the language may be, into which the Russians cannot send a qualified person who is capable of speaking that language and dialect, so that he can converse with those people. That is giving the Russians a tremendous advantage over our country. That situation certainly should be corrected, and I thoroughly agree with the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG. I thank the Senator. I should now like to ask a question or two along the line of the questions asked by my senior colleague from Louisiana. I should like to ask first a question relating to the proposed cutback in the military strength, which, I believe, would amount to about 30,000 in the Army and about 20,000 in the Marine Corps.

Mr. RUSSELL. About 25,000 in the Marine Corps and 30,000 in the Army. That is what is proposed to be done at the moment, but I understand that consideration has been given to a larger cut.

Mr. LONG. Do I understand that under the proposed Army cutback, the Army would lose one full division? I understand that at the present time we have two divisions in the Far East and about five divisions in Europe. I also understand that we have divisions which are now training in this country, and that those divisions will rotate with the divisions in foreign areas when trained. However, I understand that that leaves only about two trained divisions in the United States as of now. I should like to know if that is also the understanding of the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. RUSSELL. There will be one less division in the U.S. Army when the reduction is effectuated. I understand that the division will be taken from what is called the STRAC, the strategic reserve of the Army, which has been composed of four divisions. It would be reduced by one division if the reduction is made.

Mr. LONG. So far as I am able to determine, my impression at the moment is that if we look at the Reserves in this country which would be available to go to an area of disturbance, we would have only two or three divisions in this country which could be sent, let us say, to Europe, if trouble should break out there, or to Asia, or wherever trouble might arise, based upon our present reserves. Is that in accord with the Senator's understanding?

Mr. RUSSELL. I doubt that in this country we have more than two divisions which are fully trained and equipped and ready to go at the present time. A third division is somewhat less ready.

Mr. LONG. That is, in this country.

Mr. RUSSELL. There may be another one. There are other divisions, but they are largely training cadres. I know of no divisions as such other than the two the Senator has in mind that would be ready to go.

Mr. LONG. The point I have in mind is that the proposed cutback in the Army strength may well mean, if it is made, a reduction of 30 or 50 percent of the actual available reserves which could be shifted to wherever trouble may arise.

Mr. RUSSELL. From within this country; yes.

Mr. LONG. That is my impression.

Mr. RUSSELL. At least 25 percent, I will say.

Mr. LONG. That is a very serious reduction in our ready reserve, which must back up our forces in position in the event trouble breaks out.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator well knows that Congress has consistently refused to put all of its congressional eggs into the massive retaliation basket or in the Strategic Air Command. We have supported the Strategic Air Command at a strength greater than requested in the budget. At the same time we have been apprehensive about the danger of a war less than total war breaking out. Such a development would require considerable ground forces. All I can do is try to imagine what a potential enemy would do, and I try to consider what I would do if I were in his place.

Mr. LONG. I am sure the Senator shares my hope that the United States will not find itself in such a position that our only recourse will be to engage in an all-out thermonuclear war. In other words, if we run into trouble in Berlin or in the Middle East or in Korea, I would hope that we would not find ourselves in the position where our only course would be to engage in thermonuclear warfare.

Mr. RUSSELL. I would certainly hope so. I will give another illustration of what I have in mind. If the Russians

were to pull back 25 miles from around Berlin, and the East German forces were to undertake to blockade all the means of ingress and egress to and from Berlin, I do not know exactly how we could use nuclear weapons to resolve that difficulty. Would we attack the East Germans or would we attack the Russians, who had pulled back and had disengaged?

Somehow we would have to get into Berlin to feed the people or to rescue them or to relieve them. The principal way we could do that would be with our Army on the ground. I do not believe that nuclear superiority would function under that assumed situation any more than it did in Korea.

Mr. LONG. The Secretary of Defense appeared on a television program over the weekend, and he laid great stress on the fact that if trouble broke out in the world, we could rely on our allies, and that with their divisions, plus our divisions, we would have a considerable force in the area.

Mr. RUSSELL. Did the Secretary of Defense suggest how long it would take France to get its army out of Algeria?

Mr. LONG. No; he did not dwell on that point at the time. However, if this Nation is to make a reduction of a full division in its Armed Forces, I wonder what the effect would be on the French, the West Germans, the Belgians, the Dutch, the English, and our other allies, who are in the affected area, and how we can expect them to maintain their forces in readiness.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator has not mentioned what distresses me even more than that, and that is the effect it would have on the men in the Kremlin, particularly as to whether they will believe we are serious in our talk at a time when we are reducing our military forces. That is what concerns me most of all.

Mr. LONG. That very much concerns the junior Senator from Louisiana also. I wish to explore a matter of congressional policy with the Senator from Georgia. I doubt that he need look at the manual to answer this question. I am referring to article I, section 8, of the Constitution, which provides that Congress shall have the power to lay taxes, and so forth. I skip to the provision: "To raise and support armies, but no appropriation of money to that use shall be for a longer term than 2 years; to provide and maintain a Navy." My interpretation of that constitutional provision is that Congress shall have the power to raise and support an Army and Navy in addition to its power over the purse strings, because in the beginning of the section reference is made to laying taxes to provide for the common defense. I wonder whether the Senator from Georgia interprets that section the way I do, namely, that it means that it is both the duty and the responsibility of Congress to raise and support an Army and a Navy.

Mr. RUSSELL. In my opinion there is no question that that is the responsibility of Congress. It is my belief that when the Founding Fathers were writing the Constitution, they intended to entrust to Congress the responsibility of determining the size of the Military Establishment. In the division of powers, they gave to the President of the United States the power of the Commander in Chief over whatever Army and Navy Congress raised. They divded the powers in that fashion, so that the Commander in Chief would not have complete control over the size of the Armed Forces, because they were opposed to a military regime in this country and to the complete seizure of power by one man.

I interpret the Constitution just as it is written. That Congress has the power to maintain a Military Establishment, to provide for it, and to provide for the means to establish the size of it. But it has not always worked out that way.

Mr. LONG. The last Congress appropriated money, and the committee report contained language indicating that the purpose of the money was to maintain a 900,000-man Army. I heard the Secretary of Defense explain his view of that matter on the television program on Sunday. He said he regarded it as a mere invitation to the Executive to provide more defense than the Executive cared to provide, in the event the Executive was so disposed.

It seems to me that if Congress should write into some particular bill—an appropriate one, I would hope—language requiring the Executive to maintain a certain sized Army or Navy, since Congress clearly has the duty to raise and support an Army and a Navy, I should imagine the Executive would perhaps recognize that it was more than an invitation, but was an actual matter of law which he was obliged to carry out.

Mr. RUSSELL. I should hope so; but there is nothing I know of anywhere which would require him to do so, unless he wanted to do it.

Mr. LONG. We cannot require the Executive to abide by a law, although he can be impeached. I hope the Senator will agree that it would be desirable, first, to try a legislative proposition to maintain the strength of the Army and the Marine Corps rather than seeking to impeach the President.

Mr. RUSSELL. Oh, yes. Of course, the Senate cannot originate the impeachment. Even if the Senate were unanimous in believing that the President should be impeached, we could not initiate the action. The body on the other side of the Capitol would have to sit as a grand jury and prepare the indictment of impeachment.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I wish to aline myself with the statements made by the distinguished Senators from Louisiana relative to the intent of Congress, when that intent is made clearly known through the necessary language in appropriation bills. The impounding of funds by the executive branch is applicable both to Republican and Democratic administrations, because we all remember that before the Korean war, Congress voted for a 70-group Air Force. Then the President, Mr. Truman, and Secretary of Defense Louis Johnson impounded the extra funds above those needed for a 48-group Air Force.

We know that 4 years ago, when the distinguished Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] offered an amendment, which was agreed to, raising the appropriations for the Marine Corps by $40 million, that money was impounded by the present administration, and the then Secretary of Defense, Mr. Wilson, tried to spend that money in other ways, until the distinguished Senator from Georgia, the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, got wind of it and called Mr. Wilson before the committee. Since the administration did not plan to use the money for the Marine Corps, I think the money reverted to the general Treasury; did it not?

Mr. RUSSELL. A part of it did.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The latest example is what Congress did last year in stating specifically that the National Guard should be maintained at a strength of, I believe, not to exceed 300,000.

Mr. RUSSELL. It was 400,000 in the National Guard and 300,000 in the Reserves.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Army Reserves were to be maintained at 300,000; the Marine Corps at 200,000; and the Army at 900,000.

How is it that the intent of Congress, which I thought was clearly spelled out in those four categories was carried out only in the fields covering the Army, the National Guard, and the Army Reserves, but not in the fields of the Marine Corps and the Army itself?

Mr. RUSSELL. In the case of the National Guard and the Reserves, the appropriation bill itself provided language that the numbers should be not less than those indicated by the Senator from Montana; whereas in the case of the Regular Army and the Marine Corps the money for the larger force was appropriated and the congressional intent was expressed in the committee report. That was the justification given by the Department of Defense for differentiating between the items.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Am I correct in stating that it is the intention of the Department of Defense this year, again, to request that the strength levels of the Army, the National Guard, and the Army Reserves be cut?

Mr. RUSSELL. The budget for fiscal year 1960 contemplates reducing the strength of the Army Reserves and the National Guard. The reduced strength of the Active Army and the Marine Corps would be continued.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Is this one way in which we can circumvent the impounding power of the executive branch of the Government: namely, to write into the appropriation bills, as was done for this fiscal year in the case of the Army, the National Guard, and the Army Reserves, identical provisions for the Marine Corps and the Army?

Mr. RUSSELL. We can try, I may say to the Senator from Montana, but it still will not compel the President of the United States to spend the money if he decides he will not spend it. In this instance, the Department of Defense undertook to draw a distinction between the

forms of congressional action; but heretofore the numbers both of the Army Reserves and the National Guard, and of the Army and Marine Corps, as well, were determined by the amount of the appropriation for each organization. In this case, the Senate made a determination in the case of all four. We provided in the bill for an Army of 900,000; for 200,000 marines; for 400,00 in the National Guard; and for 3,000 in the Army Reserves.

When the bill went to conference, the other body refused absolutely to accept our proposal so far as the regular establishment was concerned, because they said the intent had always been carried in the committee report.

In order to get a bill, the Senate finally receded from its provision and placed the figure in the report. But we appropriated money for 900,000 in the Regular Army and 200,000 in the Marine Corps, just as we did for the 400,000 in the National Guard and the 300,000 in the Army Reserves. But the Department of Defense saw fit to draw a distinction between them.

Of course, this year, if Congress in its wisdom considers this desirable, we can state in the appropriation bill the numbers for the Army, the Marine Corps, the National Guard, and the Reserves. We can say that each of these branches shall be maintained at a certain number or at not less than a certain number, and see then if the Department of Defense will accept the figures when they are set forth in the text of the bill any better than it did when the figures were contained in the committee report.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Evidently the administration has its wind up on the matter of reducing forces. They did not put the Marine Corps and the Army cuts into effect at the time of the Lebanon crisis, did they?

Mr. RUSSELL. They had already announced them, but they delayed putting the cuts into effect when the Lebanon crisis arose.

Mr. MANSFIELD. They did not do so at the time the crisis arose affecting the islands off the shore of the mainland of China last September and October, did they?

Mr. RUSSELL. They have not done so completely as yet.

Mr. MANSFIELD. But they are planning to make cuts just before the deadline on Berlin, May 27.

Mr. RUSSELL. They are reducing to the levels they desire.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Did I understand the Senator from Georgia to say or indicate that in addition to the cuts in the Marine Corps and the Army, which are now going into effect, and which I think certainly are open to question, further cuts in these two outfits are in the offing?

Mr. RUSSELL. There has been no direct statement or request in the budget for any lower numbers. But at the time it was first decided to reduce the size of the Army by 30,000 in fiscal 1959, other studies were conducted looking to a still further reduction in fiscal 1960.

Although Congress appropriated funds for the full 900,000-member Army in fiscal 1959, the Department has not yet reached the level of 870,000 which it sought for fiscal 1959, and no further reduction below 870,000 has been planned for 1960. So there has been no further reduction for 1960. But what I intended to say was that studies looking to even greater reductions than those being sought at the present time have been conducted. I do not say the decisions have been reached, but studies looking to even greater reductions have been conducted.

Mr. MANSFIELD. But it is not true that orders have been issued to reduce the Marine Corps to 175,000 men and the Army to 850,000 men by June 30 of this year?

Mr. RUSSELL. That is correct.

Mr. MANSFIELD. That means that, roughly, the total reduction will amount to 55,000, because I believe the marines are now approximately 185,000 in number.

Mr. RUSSELL. And the Army is around 900,000 at the present time. So the reduction by means of such orders will not be quite that large, because some reductions have been achieved by chips and whitstones, by not replacing losses.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Well, let us assume that the cut in the case of the Army would amount to 45,000 trained men. We realize that the Government has made a large investment in their training. We are discussing the Draft Act. How many men are drafted over the period of 1 year? Would the number be 110,000?

Mr. RUSSELL. Between 100,000 and 120,000. Of course, that number will be reduced to approximately 90,000 in 1961.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes. But it seems to me that what we are doing is making it mandatory that by June 30 of this year at least 40,000 well-trained men, in whose training the Government has invested a great deal of money, will leave the Army and the Marine Corps.

Mr. RUSSELL. Reductions to that extent will be made. Of course, in any event there would have been a turnover, and some of them would have left the services. But undoubtedly there would then be that many less trained men in the military services.

Mr. MANSFIELD. And the Government, in this year of "the balanced budget," will suffer a subsequent loss, because the replacements which will have to be made will be made of new men who will have to be trained accordingly.

Mr. RUSSELL. I cannot subscribe completely to that statement, because if the terms of service of 40,000 men have expired, that many men will be separated from the service, if they wish to be. But we would have 40,000 men to take their places, and thus we would incur the cost of training the 40,000 men who would replace the 40,000 who had been separated from the services.

But undoubtedly the total overall strength will be 40,000 men less on July 1, as the Senator from Montana has indicated. In fact, it will be nearer 50,000 men less.

Mr. MANSFIELD. At that time we shall have 14 divisions, I believe. Will all of them be combat ready?

Mr. RUSSELL. Oh, no; some of them will be training divisions.

Mr. MANSFIELD. How many divisions will the Soviets have?

Mr. RUSSELL. We attribute approximately 175 divisions to the Soviet Union. However, I wish to say that the matter is not as simple as it would appear to be. Different countries have divisions of different sizes. In some countries, a division is 7,000 or 8,000 men; in other countries, a division is 12,000 or 14,000 men. But of course the Soviet Union divisions have overwhelming strength in ground forces, including tanks. Worst of all, our country, which has the greatest industrial establishment on earth, has not modernized its divisions properly. The Soviet ground forces are equipped with better weapons than our forces have today. Our forces have a great amount of obsolescent and obsolete equipment. That is one of the most alarming aspects of this entire situation—namely, the fact that we have not kept up with technological advances, in terms of supplying our men and our military forces with the very latest weapons.

Mr. MANSFIELD. How does the United States compare with the Soviet Union, in the case of submarines?

Mr. RUSSELL. Of course, the Soviets have three or four times as many submarines as the United States has. Our estimates attribute more than 400 submarines to the Soviet Union; and the United States has slightly more than 100.

Mr. MANSFIELD. How does the United States stand vis-a-vis the Soviet Union in the field of naval power, exclusive of submarines?

Mr. RUSSELL. I think the United States has a far stronger navy, exclusive of submarines, than the Soviet Union has. Since the end of World War II, the Soviets have built quite a few fast 10,000-ton cruisers, and they have some other modern ships. But in overall naval strength, there is no question in my mind that our Navy is far superior to the Soviet Navy. Of course, the carrier strength of the U.S. Navy gives us a great advantage. So far as we know, the Soviets have no aircraft carriers.

Mr. MANSFIELD. How does the United States compare with the Soviet Union, generally speaking, in the air?

Mr. RUSSELL. I can give the distinguished Senator from Montana my opinion, which is based on the hearings we have from time to time. I believe the Soviet Union has more airplanes than the United States has; but I think the United States has a much superior operating personnel, as compared to that of the Soviet Union; and I believe that our best planes, although very few in number, are better than the best of the Soviet planes.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Would the Senator from Georgia say that the relationship would constitute a standoff?

Mr. RUSSELL. Leaving out the area of missiles, and talking about the operational planes, I would say the United States is superior to the Soviet Union. I do not believe the Soviet long-range bomber command is anywhere near comparable to our Strategic Air Command.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I note that there is public information to the effect that at the present time, in the field of missile power, the United States has no ICBM's, and neither does the Soviet Union; that in the field of IRBM's, the United States has 10, and supposedly the Soviet Union has somewhere between 500 and 1,000. Those figures, which come from the public prints, indicate that the United States is in a very delicate position; and certainly that position is made more delicate by the approaching deadline of May 27, June 27, July 27, or next autumn, depending on whatever date Mr. Khrushchev wishes to use.

I am very much disturbed over the fact that our Army is being reduced in size. I am extremely disturbed over the fact that the Marine Corps, the only one of our services which has a floor under its strength, will not have enough men, under this year's budget, despite the expressed intent of Congress, to maintain three combat divisions and three air wings. I am sure the Senator from Georgia recognizes that situation, and also recognizes the consequent danger we are in.

Mr. RUSSELL. I have discussed it here on the floor and wherever else I could make myself heard. Whenever I have been invited to attend councils where the highest Government officials were present, I have expressed my unwillingness to see our Military Establishment weakened in any respect, in view of the situation which obtains today in the world.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I thank the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Moss in the chair). Does the Senator from Georgia yield to the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. When I came to the floor, the Senator from Georgia stated, so I understood, that objections had been made by means of letters, and probably also by witnesses, to the extension of this law.

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes.

Mr. LAUSCHE. With respect to the opposition voiced to this measure, I take it that the committee intends to develop in our military forces a personnel strength which at least will in some way be able to cope with the threats that are facing us today.

Mr. RUSSELL. Certainly we want to have the means of providing all the military strength which will be authorized by the Congress and approved by the executive branch of the Government. But certainly we could not do that without the enactment of this bill, because, in the first place, on July 1, in the absence of the enactment of this bill, the ceilings on all the armed forces would be just above 2 million men. So there would have to be a reduction of all above the 2 million men on the 1st of July; and 325,000 of those would come out of the Air Force.

Mr. LAUSCHE. If that were done, the number of personnel would be reduced from the present figure of how much to a new figure of how much?

Mr. RUSSELL. The overall number of 2½ million would be reduced to slightly more than 2 million.

Mr. LAUSCHE. In other words, there would be a reduction of 500,000; is that correct?

Mr. RUSSELL. That is correct.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Am I correct in my understanding that the primary purpose of the committee members, in their consideration of this bill, was to preserve to the maximum degree the security of our country?

Mr. RUSSELL. If it were not necessary to preserve the security of the United States, in my opinion, and, I will say, in the unanimous opinion of the committee, this bill would not be before the Senate today, because no one is enthusiastic about any compulsion in the matter of military service in this land of ours, unless all that we hold dear is threatened.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I understand that normally the wish and the desire of the committee would be to eliminate, insofar as possible, this universal draft law.

Mr. RUSSELL. Indeed, whenever the public safety would permit. we would like to see the compulsory element of it eliminated. There are members of the committee—including myself—who at times have believed in a system of universal military training. But I must say that the changes in weapons systems now have caused me to modify my feelings and views in that regard.

So far as the draft act is concerned, it is designed to enable this country to meet the emergencies of this hour and the threats of the cold war with the Soviet Union, in which we have been engaged over the past 12 or 14 years.

The draft ended at the conclusion of World War II, but in 1948, when the cold war began, we could not get into the armed services the number of men we needed, and we had to revive selective service. The act has been in effect since 1948.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Would it be fair to interpret the mental attitude of the committee in this way? The committee is saying to the people of Ohio and the people of the Nation that, if it were possible, the committee would have gladly recommended a reduction in the number of persons needed to serve in the military forces; but, in the face of the threat facing us, the recommendations of the committee are an absolute minimum of the needs of the military services of the country?

Mr. RUSSELL. The position of the committee is that unless we have the manpower that this authority will provide, the security of the country and the freedom of its citizens will be gravely imperiled. It is the position of the committee that this authority to provide the manpower is necessary in order that the security of the country and the freedom of its people may survive.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The questions I am about to ask may be somewhat personal, but I should like to ask the Senator from Georgia how long he has been a member of the Armed Services Committee.

Mr. RUSSELL. When I came to the Senate there were two committees relating to the armed services, the Committee on Naval Affairs and the Committee on Military Affairs. I became a member of the Committee on Naval Affairs in January 1933. I have been a member of the Committee on Armed Services and its predecessors for over 26 years.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Based on that experience of 26 years of service on those committees, the Senator from Georgia recommends, does he not, to the Members of the Senate and to the people of the country that, for the security of the country, the draft law which is now in effect should be extended?

Mr. RUSSELL. I do, unqualifiedly and unhesitatingly. In 1948, when the draft law was not in operation, we could not raise the 2 million men needed. There is no way to get the manpower to meet the present crisis without having the existing machinery of the Selective Service Act in effect.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Was the recommendation of the committee unanimous?

Mr. RUSSELL. It was as to the extension of the authority to induct. One or two members of the committee thought the act should not be continued for more than 2 years, but the committee was unanimous in recommending that the act be continued.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. ALLOTT. I should like to preface my questions by saying that a reading of the report and the recommendations of the committee leads me to the same conclusion the committee has reached. I think an extension of the draft law is a necessity which cannot be avoided. However, I should like to ask the Senator a few questions.

Last fall, when I was in my own State, I talked personally with thousands of young men, and to several hundred groups. One question constantly recurred. These young men had the attitude that they did not seek to avoid military service. However, they repeatedly came up with the thought that if they were drafted, they would go into the military service for 2 years. Perhaps some young men do not object to being drafted, which is all right, but the group I am talking about would rather enlist than go into the service through the Selective Service program.

They pointed out that if they enlisted, they would have to enlist for a 3-year or a 4-year period.

I notice, on page 4 of the report of the committee, under subsection (2), it reads:

> Volunteers under the age 26, in the sequence of their volunteering for induction.

In other words, these young men would volunteer to the draft board, and they would still go through selective service. Is my understanding correct?

Mr. RUSSELL. That is correct.

Mr. ALLOTT. Has the committee given any consideration or has it had any reason or cause to give consideration to the situation of young men who do not seek to avoid service, and yet, by volunteering their services, are subjected

to a 1- or 2-year period of longer training and service than those who are inducted under the Selective Service Act?

Mr. RUSSELL. If they serve more than 2 years, it means they have elected to go into the Navy or the Air Force. They can go into the Army for a 2-year period of service at the present time.

Mr. ALLOTT. Perhaps most of the young men to whom I talked wanted to go into the Navy or Air Force.

Mr. RUSSELL. If the young men choose to go into the Air Force, they will have to weigh whether they want to serve 4 years in the Air Force rather than 2 years in the Army. Many of them do. There is no trouble in obtaining volunteers in the Air Force. Some young men may prefer to serve 3 years in the Navy rather than 2 years in the Army. There are still others who get 6 months' training and then participate actively in the Reserve, in which they must perform 48 Reserve drills and 2 weeks of active duty for training annually. There are many different ways of performing military service. If the young man choose to go into the Air Force, they have to pay the price of serving 4 years.

Mr. ALLOTT. Has the committee discussed this particular question?

Mr. RUSSELL. We have discussed this question for hours. Without attempting to make a disparagement as between the different branches of the service, I point out that there is required a greater degree of skill in the Air Force than is required in some of the other branches of the service. If a man were going into the Air Force, and were required to serve only 2 years, by the time he would be trained, he would then be lost to the service. In the infantry, if a young man is a strong boy, with good reflexes, and can carry a gun and learn how to use it, he can be trained in 4 months, and the Army will still obtain 20 months' service from him, even though he has to serve only 2 years.

More highly developed skills required in certain branches of the Army—in electronics, for example—that are just as demanding as are skills in the Air Force; but these positions should be filled by career personnel.

I must say there has been an increasing tendency—although I understand it, I deplore it—for young men to try to get out of having to march and sweat it out with a rifle on their shoulders. Some young men are willing to serve for a longer time in order to avoid having to do it. However, it must be pointed out that the foot soldier is an extremely important member of the armed services, and we must have him. In the last analysis, the man who has won every war from the time man carried sharp sticks to the day of modern weapons has been the foot soldier.

Mr. ALLOTT. Has the Senator's own experience prompted his allegiance to the foot soldier?

Mr. RUSSELL. I was in the Navy.

Mr. ALLOTT. I may say for the young men, in whom I have a great deal of faith, that in the Air Force——

Mr. RUSSELL. The Air Force has no problem in obtaining enlistments. It sometimes has more applicants than it can absorb. The Navy has more applicants than it can absorb. That is not where the difficulty is. The Army is the only branch which has to use the draft to fill its needs.

Mr. ALLOTT. The problem arises in filling the needs of the Army. Is that correct?

Mr. RUSSELL. That is right. It is the only branch which today has to use the selective service to obtain its needed personnel.

Mr. ALLOTT. The reasons for the longer service with respect to the volunteers are, first, the greater amount of technical training required and, secondly, perhaps, the committee feeling that if a man is to have a right to select his branch of service then he should be willing to spend a longer period in service. Is that stating the matter fairly?

Mr. RUSSELL. That feeling undoubtedly enters into it. It has been completely justified by the facts, as stated.

Mr. ALLOTT. I should like to ask one other question on a subject which to me appears to be very shocking. On page 5 of the report, in the paragraph the third from the bottom of the page, it is stated:

> The current rejection rate for an age group as a whole is about 33 percent. Since many members of an age group voluntarily enter service, the rejection rate for the effective manpower pool is approximately 45 percent.

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes. That is a tremendously high percentage. I think I stated earlier that the services have raised mental qualifications since the end of World War II. A much higher degree of mental competence is required now.

To be perfectly frank about the matter, if we became involved in an all-out war we would have to lower the standards, and more young men would be available. We have heard a great deal of discussion over the past few weeks about the strength of our Armed Forces. The services want the strongest bodies and, above all, the most efficient minds they can get in those bodies, to make up for the disparity in numbers as between the men in service in our country and those in service in the Soviet Union.

Mr. ALLOTT. Then this percentage could not necessarily be interpreted in the same light with the inductions prior to World War II?

Mr. RUSSELL. Oh, no.

Mr. ALLOTT. Or inductions prior to the Korean War, because of the raising of the physical and mental standards.

Mr. RUSSELL. That is correct. This does not reflect any depreciation in the mental and physical qualities of our young manhood, but reflects instead an increase in standards.

Mr. ALLOTT. What this really means is that the services have set a goal of a certain number of men. In order to attain what is desired, the services have turned down approximately 45 percent.

Mr. RUSSELL. I think that is a fair statement.

Mr. ALLOTT. The services require certain standards.

Mr. RUSSELL. I think that is a fair statement. I was very reluctant to approve those higher qualifications, because in a sense they were a limitation on the equal distribution of services.

Mr. ALLOTT. Of the burden of service.

Mr. RUSSELL. Of the burden of military service. The Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of the Army, and all the ranking generals in the Army, were most insistent that since there was a reduction in personnel in the Army there was a requirement for the higher standards. The Army has been reduced from about 1½ million to 900,000 men, and in the light of that reduction these military men felt it was imperative that they have persons with higher mental capacity, because they could train those men much easier, and those men could do many more things and absorb training in a much shorter period of time.

In addition, this program has greatly mitigated the disciplinary problems of the Army. I first would not accept the relationship of the disciplinary problems to the somewhat lower intelligence quotients, but since we have authorized the President to raise the mental standards the Army has closed two of its disciplinary barracks. There has been that much reduction in the disciplinary problems of the Army.

Mr. ALLOTT. That is wonderful news. I think this is an area to which we have to pay some attention.

Mr. RUSSELL. I can assure the Senator it has been a matter of great concern to the members of the committee.

Mr. ALLOTT. I am sure it has been. In this respect what we are really doing is not having a selective service in one sense; we are putting the burden of service only upon those who have the highest physical qualifications and the highest mental qualifications.

Mr. RUSSELL. I must confess there is a great measure of justification for the Senator's statement.

The distinguished Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] will bear witness to the fact that for two sessions I held up the proposed legislation to increase the standards because it looked to me as though it would be unfair to the young men who were more intelligent and stronger.

After all, standards are all a matter of degree. We had standards before. It was all a matter of degree as to how high we should raise the standards.

Our need for a strong military force was so great that I finally capitulated. We passed the bill last year. I must admit the program has produced results far beyond anything I anticipated at the time.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me and permit an interruption at this time?

Mr. RUSSELL. I am glad to yield to the Senator from South Dakota, if the Senator from Colorado does not object.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I think the correct thing to say is that the program has increased the selectivity and reduced the universality.

Mr. RUSSELL. That is correct.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. We used to talk in terms of universal military

service, and now the emphasis is upon selectivity. The changing of the standards has entirely shifted the burden of responsibility.

Mr. RUSSELL. A number of things have contributed to that effect. The weapons of war have become more complex in the last 20 years. I think the complexity has increased in the last 20 years more than in the two centuries before that. Weapons are so complex today that I have almost despaired of being able to observe an ordinary military outfit operate one of the missile batteries. It requires a very high degree of training and a very considerable basic education simply to get the count-down handled exactly as it should be.

That is one reason I have not been too much frightened by the claims of Russian missile superiority. If the Russians have the missiles operational everywhere, they must be sadly depleting the faculties of their educational institutions. It takes almost a team of college professors to operate one of those missile batteries. If the Russians have the missiles operational everywhere, they have had to use many highly competent persons.

Mr. ALLOTT. I appreciate very much the answers the Senator has given. I knew perhaps all of these things had been considered by the committee, but I think it is worthwhile to point out, as the Senator from South Dakota has indicated, that the emphasis has been changed, probably of necessity, from a selective service system of universality to a selective service system of selectivity.

Mr. RUSSELL. The standards have been changed from time to time. They were changed drastically from 1940, when we passed the first bill, to 1942.

Mr. ALLOTT. The Senator is correct.

Mr. RUSSELL. In 1940 the standards were about as high as they are today, but by 1942 if a man could walk, the services carried him off, gave him a gun, and put him in the armed services. We needed 14 million men. This has never been a universal program.

Mr. ALLOTT. I realize that.

Mr. RUSSELL. There has always been a degree of selectivity.

Mr. ALLOTT. I realize there has never been a time when the Army or the military forces were in that category completely.

I thank the Senator for answering my questions.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield so that I may ask a question?

Mr. RUSSELL. I shall be glad to undertake to answer the Senator's questions.

Mr. KEATING. Would it be fair to say that in the committee the only substantial dispute regarding the bill was with relation to the length of time the draft should be extended?

Mr. RUSSELL. As a practical matter, I will say to the distinguished Senator from New York, no motion was made to change the 4-year provision. The committee was unanimous in agreement that it was necessary to extend the authority to induct. One or two members of the committee expressed the wish that the law might be extended for 2 years instead of 4 years, but after full discussion there was no formal vote on that suggestion.

Mr. KEATING. Of course, it is my intention to support the extension of the draft law. I have been debating in my own mind, although my knowledge is much less extensive than the knowledge of members of the committee, whether the extension should be for 2 or 4 years.

Is it not a fact that if it were extended for 4 years, and the world situation should change, and the need for the draft should become less apparent during that period, the Congress at any time could end it, even if it were extended for 4 years?

Mr. RUSSELL. Not only could the Congress end it, but the executive branch of the Government, if it did not need the men, could declare the draft inoperable at any time. Congress would not have to be in session. There could be a cessation of the draft at any time, if men were not needed in the Armed Forces. As pointed out by Assistant Secretary of Defense Finucane, who is in charge of manpower, it is a great clarification to the young men of the country to know that the draft will be in operation for 4 years. This will prevent them from building up false hopes and making their plans for the future based on the illusion that the draft may end, when we really do not see any hope of its ending.

Mr. KEATING. I think there is much merit in that position.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, in connection with the point which the Senator from New York raised, there was a feeling on the part of several members of the committee that the draft was not operating perfectly, that there was some room for improvement, that the reserve liability was unequal, and that the values for dollars expended might be increased with longer terms of enlistment, rather than a period of 2 years.

I would not want the Senator from New York to think that the only question considered was whether the extension should be for 2 years or 4 years. In that connection, let me say that I intend to to speak on some of these points, and also to discuss 2 amendments which were discussed within the committee. I shall offer one of them.

One of the amendments had to do with simplifying and clarifying the period and conditions of liability, both as to active duty service and as to the Reserve.

The second amendment had to do with the possible creation of a manpower commission for studying the manpower needs currently and making such recommendations as its studies might lead it to make.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. Does not the Senator from South Dakota share my feeling, which is apparently the feeling of the Senator from Georgia, that it would be wise to extend the draft for 4 years, because of the fact that either the Defense Department or the Congress could act at any time, if it should be found that it was not needed?

Is it not better, at this crucial time, to err, if we err at all, on the side of too long an extension, rather than on the side of an extension which is not long enough?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Two or three arguments were made for the 4-year extension. The first was that the last time the draft was extended, it was extended for 4 years.

The second argument was that the 4-year extension would perhaps provide a great show of determination for our allies, even recognizing the fact that one of them, England, has indicated that she intends to discontinue conscript service in a year or two.

The argument which was cited as being most persuasive was that the 4-year extension would give to the young men who would be affected a certain sense of definiteness, and they would have the knowledge that the draft would be extended that much longer. All those arguments were mentioned as reasons for an extension of 4 years rather than 2.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, it has been a great privilege for me as a freshman Member of the Senate and as a newcomer to the Armed Services Committee, to work under the leadership of the distinguished Senator from Georgia, in the preparation of the legislation now proposed. I have been impressed by the unanimity of opinion among my colleagues on the committee regarding the necessity for extending the draft. Surely it is apparent that at the present hour there is no alternative to such an extension.

At the same time, Mr. President, I would be remiss in my obligations and in my responsibility as a Member of the Senate to promote the national security, if I did not rise now to voice certain doubts which I feel concerning the draft program.

Chiefly, my doubts are whether our present manpower policies are giving this country true security in the missile age—or the illusion of security only. Therefore, it is my hope that Senators will consider on a continuing basis our manpower policies so that if workable alternatives to the draft exist we will know that they exist, and will put them to work for the safety of America.

If the answer to our manpower need is universal military training, we must find this out and adopt some plan of universal service at once.

If it be a professional Military Establishment, increased in size and equipment, we should know that, too.

Perhaps there is a solution which would utilize in the fullest degree in the service of their country the talents and energies of thousands of young men not fit for, or not needed in, the Military Establishment.

If the answer is found to be the current selective service, that system should be continued. But in that event, it is the duty of Congress to look into the practicability of some of the improvements which suggest themselves.

One reason given by witnesses who appeared before the commitee for an extension of the draft for 4 years is that

failure to extend it for that period of time would dishearten our allies. I am troubled by the implication, if it be a fact, that our alliance is so tenuous as to require us to maintain a static military manpower policy that may not be best calculated to shore up the security of the United States of America.

That there must an extension now of selective service, should be or ought to be obvious. My personal preference after hearing much of the testimony given by the committee would have been for a 2-year instead of a 4-year extension. It was and is my thought that an extension for this shorter period would point up the necessity for proceeding with an overall study of military manpower utilization and our manpower needs. However, I realize that I am of the newest of the new, having entered the Senate and having gained a place on the Armed Services Committee only in January of this year. I have yielded to the accumulated experience and wisdom of my elders in service on the committee and I voted to report the 4-year extension and I shall vote for it on the floor. Notwithstanding, I believe I have a duty to perform in calling to the attention of the Senate my views relating to an imperative need for an honest-to-goodness, down-to-earth study of this big and vital subject. I cannot believe that the shorter extension would have frightened our allies. Indeed, is it not altogether likely that they will be far more concerned with the announced reductions which are to be made in our existing military organization? That is almost surely to be of grave concern to them as it is to me and to so many other Americans.

There must be on our part no hint of weakness or fear. The Russians must see in us a determined unity with which we face whatever may befall. But, in the face of so grave a military danger, it would be folly and negligent not to examine the manpower situation thoroughly in the light of current facts.

I raise these questions today because they suggest serious problems which, unattended, could undermine our security. Now I am no military strategist, but the overall impact of these questions seems to me to indicate an urgent need for a frank and full study by a congressional panel or an independent commission. I reserve the privilege of submitting at a later date a formal proposal for such a study.

The more I consider the question, the more advisable it seems to me to have the study carried out by a subcommittee of the Senate Armed Services Committee, rather than an independent group not associated with the Senate.

During such an inquiry, no slightest delay for complexity would impede the continuation of the present system. And if the present system is found to be adequate, or no better alternative has been worked out, there need be no change and no delay in the implementation of the draft.

Let us think of the changes in the military situation which have occurred since the last time the draft was examined by the Congress—changes in warfare perhaps more extensive than those that occurred in all the centuries of human history—sputniks and luniks and intercontinental missiles and missile-bearing submarine fleets; and sooon man to be sent into the heavens, too. Can it be sensible to assume that in the midst of so vast a redoing, manpower procurement policies alone must remain static, unimproved, even unquestioned?

Surely it is now clear how directly our international posture is affected by our manpower policies. It is no slight to these policies nor on the men who have carried them out so faithfully. To suggest that these policies, too, need periodic reexamination. Perhaps the study for which I speak today would find that we need a larger Army and that the best way to get it is a larger draft call. This, too, the American people must know and, knowing, would gladly accept.

Indeed, we must know how our Reserve program is standing up under the new strains and needs, how our pentomic divisions are faring—how nearly ready we are, in short, for any type of onslaught. If we are anything less than ready, the degree of difference may be the measure of our demise. If anything is plain, it is that the situation is just that ominous.

In 1941, in the face of a grave military threat from abroad, at a time when the nature of warfare more certainly justified a draft program than does the nature of warfare in the missile age, and when the totalitarian threat was no less immediate, one vote in the House of Representatives saved the draft. That vote may well have been the margin of our survival in the dark days of 1942. Statesmanship in the House of Representatives in 1941 saved America. Statesmanship in the 85th Congress by Members of the U.S. Senate may again save America in the face of the grave military threat from abroad. That statesmanship requires us not merely to enact a draft extension, but also to commit ourselves to a careful reappraisal of our present manpower policies. In the context of new weapons, old answers are not adequate. Complex new weapons demand complex new skills and we ignore these demands at the peril of our existence.

Even if we have adequate missiles in our arsenals and adequate pentomic divisions on the charts, well-trained, highly motivated men remain the lifeblood of the whole structure. Missiles do not fire themselves. Atomic artillery do not maintain themselves. Technology does not advance or explain itself. Is it really inconceivable that the draft—so necessary to meet our manpower needs in 1940—may no longer be adequate to the needs of 1960?

It is in this spirit, Mr. President, that I now raise for the consideration of my colleagues in the months to come what I submit may well be life-and-death questions.

First. Is conscription a permanent feature of U.S. defense policy, according to present military plans?

Second. If conscription is likely to continue indefinitely, are major efforts being made now by the Defense Department to improve the Selective Service System to eliminate such inequities and inefficiencies as may currently be a part of it?

Third. If conscription is not to continue indefinitely, what plans are being made now by the Defense Department to lessen our dependency on and eventually to eliminate conscription?

Fourth. Might now such a study of manpower policies have value in ascertaining such facts as our overall manpower requirements; the most effective way to retain trained men in service for longer periods of time; possible nonmilitary uses of men of draft age; the possibility of reducing the number of men constantly involved in training soldiers who do not intend to stay in the armed services, and so forth?

Fifth. Can men be trained in (a) 6 months, (b) 2 years to operate the more complex weapons of modern warfare?

Sixth. Is this training of much value to the Nation if men are separated soon after they become proficient in the use of such weapons?

Seventh. How many draftees receive continuing combat training after their initial 8 or 16 weeks?

Eighth. Are we training an adequate number of men to fight limited nonnuclear wars in which mass armies are engaged?

Ninth. If draftees are not trained to operate the complex instruments of modern warfare, can we risk using them in combat situations, even if nuclear weapons are not immediately involved?

Tenth. In a limited war in which nuclear weapons are used, would a mass army untrained in nuclear warfare be adequate to our needs?

Eleventh. In an all-out war decided by a nuclear exchange between the United States and the Soviet Union, would a large army or large reserve force, especially a reserve force derived from the 6-month program, be of great value to the United States?

Twelfth. In short, is the training received by 2-year draftees adequate for any kind of war, be it total, limited nonnuclear, or limited nuclear?

Thirteenth. Is it possible that the manpower needs produced by new weapons cannot be met adequately without a substantial increase in the number of men who stay in the service for a minimum of 4 years?

Fourteenth. Is the training that men are getting in the 6-month program or in the 10-week Air Force training program adequate for any kind of war?

Fifteenth. If the 6-month training program is not adequate to prepare men for combat and other military assignments, should the program be continued?

Sixteenth. If the 6-month training program is adequate, should we not put it on a universal basis, and couple it with incentives designed to keep the requisite number of men in the Armed Forces for minimum periods of 4 years?

Seventeenth. How effectively are the (a) 6-month, (b) 2-year selectees being integrated into Active Reserve units?

Eighteenth. Might an adequate Reserve program provide an acceptable substitute for a large standing army, a large

percentage of whose personnel are not prepared for nuclear combat?

Nineteenth. Is it not possible that the arbitrary limitation imposed on the size of our Armed Forces by budgetary considerations has handicapped international negotiations looking toward disarmament?

Twentieth. Is it not possible that actually a larger standing Army could be maintained at less cost by an improved incentive system?

Twenty-first. In fact, regardless of size, might not the replacement of conscription with a system of incentives designed to attract and keep a competent and motivated professional armed force save money and produce a better nuclear-age defense system?

Twenty-second. But if the size of the Army is to be limited, might it not be wise to speed the replacement of soldiers by civilians in noncombat positions?

Twenty-third. Could not many such noncombatant jobs be filled more economically and more efficiently by civilians?

Twenty-fourth. In the long run, might it not be wise to employ civilians even in certain technical positions, if some way cannot be devised to retain service personnel for considerable periods of time after their training has been completed?

Twenty-fifth. Does not the fact that almost three-quarters of all enlistees leave the service after their first hitch seriously limit the value of conscription in filling the manpower needs of the service?

Twenty-sixth. Might not the $14,000-per-man cost of training and maintaining draftees, 96 percent of whom leave the Army after their 2 years, and of training the one-hitch enlistees, be adequate to provide the kinds of salaries and benefits necessary to maintain an adequate professional force?

Twenty-seventh. Is part of the problem of attracting and keeping bright technicians in the Armed Forces derived from the fact that personnel are subject to certain conditions left over from an earlier military tradition which do not comport with the type of mental and technical initiative now required of military personnel?

Twenty-eighth. Is a system under which some men serve their country involuntarily up to 8 years while others do not serve at all the fairest that can be devised?

Twenty-ninth. Is a system which continually occupies a large percentage of our military personnel in the basic training of transient recruits the most efficient use of manpower that can be devised?

Thirtieth. Is such a system an adequate alternative to a combat-ready fighting force with a low turnover and a high proficiency in the use of modern weapons?

Thirty-first. Does the confidence of our allies in American leadership require us to maintain a manpower policy that may no longer be adequate to our own security?

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, will my colleague yield?

Mr. BARTLETT. I yield to my colleague from Alaska.

Mr. GRUENING. I wish to commend my colleague highly for his very thoughtful and comprehensive analysis of this question. It shows how well he has taken advantage of his relatively brief membership on the Committee on Armed Services. What he has presented to the Senate is a wonderful blueprint for study by the commitee during the coming years.

Needless to say, like my colleague from Alaska, I feel in duty bound to support the bill which, after extensive hearings, has the recommendation and the stamp of approval of the Committee on Armed Services, headed by a Senator who, more than any other Member of the Senate, is experienced in this extremely important field. I was privileged a few weeks ago to attend a testimonial banquet in honor of Senator RUSSELL. I felt privileged to be there and to join with the large group of military and civilians in approval of the citation and the testimonial which was given to him for his magnificent contribution to national defense.

Certainly at this time there is need for the expert opinion by which the rest of us who are necessarily less familiar with this subject have to be guided; and I may say that we in Alaska have been peculiarly sensitive to the needs of national defense. We have lived through a period when there were no defense plans for that area.

I recall that 24 years ago testifying before a Military Affairs Committee of the House, the late great Billy Mitchell emphasized that the importance of Alaska strategically was something we could not afford to overlook. He said at that time: "He who holds Alaska holds the world." His wisdom on that subject was as much disregarded as was his wisdom concerning the importance of aircraft in war.

I have lived through the years when the sole efforts to get defenses for Alaska were confined to Alaskans. I recall how Senator BARTLETT'S predecessor as Delegate from Alaska, in the House, Anthony J. Dimond, strove for years to get some defense measures for Alaska enacted. I recall his prophecies both on the floor of the House and in the committee that the Japanese would attack Alaska without warning. I have in my possession a letter written to him as late as 1937, by Gen. Malin Craig, who was then Chief of Staff of the Army, after Delegate Dimond had urged the establishment of an Air Force and Army post in Alaska, in which General Craig replied, that the idea was fantastic; that Alaska was so remote from any possible theaters of conflict that the idea of spending any money for defense there was ridiculous.

I recall that away back in 1904 the Navy sought to establish a naval base in the outer Aleutian Islands, on the Island of Kiska. Year after year the Navy Department presented a request for an appropriation so that that island could be fortified. But the navy which first occupied the Island of Kiska was not Uncle Sam's navy, but the navy of the Mikado. In consequence of the lack of understanding of Alaska's strategic importance and the consequent failure to provide for its defense, Alaska was the only part of America invaded and for a time held by the enemy.

I could continue almost indefinitely to give examples of how sensitive and how keenly aware we are of the importance of national defense and of Alaska's role in national defense. We Alaskans believe that an important part of Alaska's destiny is to serve as a bulwark of defense for the continent. I shall vote for this measure though with substantial doubts. I think my colleague is to be greatly commended for raising in categorical form as questions, some of the doubts which some of us have.

I myself would have preferred a 2-year extension. I listened to some of the arguments against that modification. I noted particularly the comment made by the distinguished senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL]. I am sorry he is not in the Chamber now. He said that one reason why he did not favor a 2-year extension, but rather favored a 4-year extension, is that there would be no appreciable change in the situation during those 4 years. I assume he meant by that that there would be no appreciable change in our relations with the totalitarian power which now menaces the freedom and peace of the world.

But I call his attention to the fact that there may be one very fundamental change in 1960, namely, a change in the Executive power of the Nation. Therefore, I think the time may come, even though we shall have extended the act for 4 years, when we will want to revise this law together with our other defense measures, as was so ably discussed and criticized in the Senate yesterday, and to take a new look at our needs for national defense and the strengthening of our national security.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARTLETT. I yield.

Mr. RUSSELL. I wish, first, to express to the distinguished junior Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING] my appreciation for his very complimentary references to me.

I am delighted to have the distinguished senior Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT] as a member of the Committee on Armed Services. I particularly appreciate the fact that he brought an inquiring mind with him to the committee. At times we have dealt with these problems for so long that we have become somewhat set in our views and our opinions. So it is always well to have someone asking new questions and generating new thoughts in the committee.

I have been so much impressed by the capacity of the senior Senator from Alaska to serve on the Committee on Armed Services that I regard it as being of vital importance that he has been assigned to the Subcommittee on Military Preparedness, where he will have a great many opportunities to exercise this sense of questioning which is in his mind, and to undertake to get answers from the military authorities and the civilian officials of the country who are charged with the responsibility in this area.

I am glad he has asked the questions he has propounded. I think I could answer some of them, but I shall not undertake to do so now. I do not know

that I could answer all of them to his satisfaction, but I certainly welcome him on the committee and appreciate the fact that he has fallen right into the work. I know he will make many valuable contributions to our national defense and to eliminating some of the admitted inequities in our present system of service.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, I know of no one anywhere who is more capable of answering my questions than is my able chairman. I join with my colleague from Alaska in praising the effective work for his Nation which the distinguished Senator from Georgia has performed throughout the years. I thought only this afternoon that it was rather remarkable that he stood here and answered, without reference to a book, a note, or a piece of paper, the many technical questions which were put to him during the consideration of the bill. It was really a remarkable demonstration, one which few persons anywhere could have accomplished. We owe him much, and we recognize the fact, with pleasure and with pride.

Mr. RUSSELL. I thank the Senator from Alaska.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alaska yield?

Mr. BARTLETT. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I have listened with great pleasure and pride to the very able statement made by the distinguished senior Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT]. I was privileged to know him when he served as a Delegate from Alaska in the other body. I am very happy that he sought membership on the Committee on Armed Services, where I have served ever since I entered the Senate.

I think the contribution which the senior Senator from Alaska has already made, in the thorough way in which he covered the subject and the diligent manner in which he attended the committee hearings, is something which will please all Members of the Senate. All of us who are members of the Committee on Armed Services are very fortunate to have the privilege of serving under the chairmanship of the distinguished senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL]. I do not think I have ever known a greater legislator, a man of more ability, or a wiser or better man. So when the senior Senator from Alaska sought membership on the Committee on Armed Services, I thought then that he would have an opportunity to render the type of service which he has demonstrated today he is capable of rendering.

I had a chance to visit his State in the early days of World War II, in 1942, and I was greatly impressed with the loyalty, the patriotism, and the dedication of the people who live in Alaska.

Mr. President, nothing has given me more pleasure than to observe the competence, the teamwork, and the patriotism of the two Senators who work side by side in representing the largest State in the Union.

Mr. BARTLETT. I am grateful to the distinguished majority leader. It is a privilege to serve under two such great leaders as the Senator from Texas and the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARTLETT. I yield.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I wish to associate myself with the remarks made by the distinguished senior Senator from Alaska. I do not have the benefit of membership on the Committee on Armed Services, and I am not so familiar with this very difficult and delicate issue as he is. However, I share with him the view that the extension of the act should have been for 2 years only. I also have in common with him the opinion that there should be a very detailed, extensive thorough, and painstaking review of our military manpower policies, particularly with respect to the draft.

Mr. President, I believe both suggestions which have been made by Delegate BARTLETT should be considered by the leadership. I should have said "Senator BARTLETT." I have known him affectionately and personally as Delegate BARTLETT for so long that I am afraid I have gotten into the habit of addressing him as "Delegate."

Mr. BARTLETT. I am used to it; I like it.

Mr. NEUBERGER. It is a very illustrious title.

I think both of the proposals made by the Senator from Alaska should be considered not only by the chairman and other members of the Committee on Armed Services, but also by the leadership of both the Senate and the House.

I think few Members of the Senate are as familiar with the policies of our Armed Services, as a result of long experience, as are the two Senators from Alaska. I had the privilege and the experience of serving in the Army in Alaska and the Yukon during World War II. At that time the junior Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING] was the Governor of Alaska; and the senior Senator from Alaska Mr. [BARTLETT] was, part of the time, Secretary of the Territory of Alaska, and then he succeeded the very eminent Anthony J. Dimond as the Delegate from Alaska. It was while they were the civilian officials in charge of the Territorial government of Alaska that, if I am not mistaken, Alaska became the only portion of the North American continent under the sovereignty of the United States to be invaded in well over a century of American history.

Mr. BARTLETT. The Senator from Oregon is correct.

Mr. NEUBERGER. So, for example, they have had experience with military policies which were not wise—because, if I am not mistaken, at the beginning of World War II, during which Alaska was invaded by the forces of Imperial Japan, the only guns in Alaska pointed toward our good ally, Canada, which fought side by side with us during that war. Furthermore, if I am not mistaken, at the beginning of World War II the only artillery in Alaska was at Chilkoot Barracks; and the guns were pointed, not toward Imperial Japan, which invaded Alaska, but toward the little border post of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police near Pleasant Camp, British Columbia, if I am not mistaken.

Mr. BARTLETT. The accuracy of the Senator's memory cannot be challenged and is greater, I am sure, than the accuracy of the guns he mentions.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I suppose the assumption was that in World War II our enemy would be Canada, rather than Japan.

So it is obvious that correct forecasts have not always come from the Pentagon or its predecessor.

I should like to mention one thing about the policies in connection with our military services that has disturbed me: I believe that many times we repeat mistakes which previously have been made in the course of our history. I remember that when I was in high school, the statement was made again and again, by many persons, "In the next war, both capital and men will be drafted; and no one will become a millionaire at the cost of blood, sacrifice, and suffering." If I heard that said once, I heard it said a hundred times. It was repeated on the Fourth of July, in conventions of the American Legion, conventions of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, and in other conventions, and here in the Congress, and generally throughout the country.

But let us consider the situation which exists today: The Congress is considering an extension of the draft law. I will vote with some reluctance for that measure, as will the two able Senators from Alaska. But 2 weeks ago there appeared in the business section of the New York Times a very interesting article which pointed out that on the New York Stock Exchange many of the leading stocks were those of companies which were making missiles, jet plane fuels, electronic equipment for the Armed Forces, and all the other military items that our boys will have to use, perhaps in mortal combat. These stocks have had record rises.

Today we are spending annually on armaments more than we spent each year during the Korean war. Yet the excess-profits tax on the manufacturers of armaments, which was invoked during the Korean war, has been suspended.

Last week I introduced four tax bills. One was to restore the excess-profits tax. If we are going to vote for a 4-year extension of the draft, with all that this implies for the young men of this country, then I think the Senate and the House of Representatives—although of course such legislation must originate in the House of Representatives—certainly should study the imposition of some ceiling on the profits of those who will manufacture the jet planes, the tanks, the nuclear submarines, and the nuclear aircraft carriers in which some of our boys may unfortunately lose their lives or be maimed.

Recently, I noticed that the workhorse airplane of World War II—the B–17 Flying Fortress—was stated as costing $188,000. The jet planes which have replaced it in the bombing field today cost approximately $7 million. Just compare $7 million with $188,000. The largest submarines we had in World War II cost approximately $8 million or $10 million, whereas the nuclear-powered *Nautilus* cost approximately $65 million.

If I am not mistaken—and I speak entirely from memory—the great aircraft carrier *Lexington*, of World War II, cost approximately $90 million. We have on the drawingboards at this time aircraft carriers which will cost between $350 million and $400 million.

The other day I saw a statement by one of our leading military officials—and again I speak from memory—that a jet fighter plane costs the Government more than if it were made entirely from solid silver, at the prevailing market price of silver.

So I say that if we vote for an extension of the draft of the young men of the United States, certainly we should consider placing some ceiling on the profits of the manufacturers and industries who are making the weapons of war.

There has been a great deal of oratory about this matter, but there has been relatively little action in connection with it. I recognize that the distinguished chairman [Mr. RUSSELL] and the other members of the Armed Services Committee cannot do anything directly about it, any more than the rest of us can, because this subject comes within the jurisdiction of the Finance Committee and the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives.

But I call the matter to the attention of the Senate because I believe it involves a moral issue of great proportions. It also involves an economic issue, because today the bulk of the $77 billion budget, which is so controversial, goes for military weapons and military hardware of one kind or another. Under these circumstances, I believe we should restore the excess-profits tax on the manufacturers of the weapons of war. It certainly would help our taxpayers.

I wish to thank my good friend, the Senator from Alaska, for bearing with me and for being so sympathetic and indulgent with his time.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a brief statement I have prepared on my views on the draft—which I am happy to say are similar to those of the Senator from Alaska—and an editorial entitled "A Look at the Draft," which was published on February 4 in the Washington Post, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement and the editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR NEUBERGER

Critics of the draft have contended that it—

1. Creates a cloud of uncertainty which hangs over the heads of young men 18½ through 26 years of age, prohibiting them, in many cases, from making firm vocational, educational or matrimonial plans.

2. Causes inequities as between young men eligible for selective service. It is pointed out that there are approximately 2,200,000 1A's in the pool now and that about 1,200,000 youths reach the minimum draft age annually. In 1960, this figure is expected to reach 1,300,000. By 1965, it is predicted that it will be nearly 2 million. Some 660,000 persons enter the services each year; 180,000 are inductees. The St. Louis Post-Dispatch noted recently: "Thus, chances are excellent the vast majority of the class that attains military age will not see service. This is not fair to those who are drafted or who volunteer."

3. Fails to provide the services with the type of personnel they require—persons with an aptitude for special training and who intend to make a career of the military—but instead encourages manpower waste, lowers troop morale, reduces leadership quality, and fosters complacency about the system.

I am not a member of the Senate Armed Services Committee and do not have the background of service with that group which would enable me to assess confidently the validity of these claims. However, I have observed that many persons with a professional competence to analyze these questions have attested to the need to explore in depth our present military manpower policies. I believe that such an investigation would be highly beneficial. Although I intend to vote for the extension of the draft, because I believe that it would not be wise to repeal this law at such a crucial time in the affairs of our country unless a substitute is provided, I wish to state that I will support legislation which would establish a detailed and comprehensive study of military personnel procurement policies and alternatives to the draft; and if such a group should find that basic alterations are necessary or desirable, I will then urge their enactment.

[From the Washington Post, Feb. 4, 1959]

A LOOK AT THE DRAFT

Before Congress automatically adopts a long-term extension of the military conscription law, it ought to take a careful and critical look at the way in which the draft has been operating. When draft calls take only a small fraction of the total number of eligible young men and the great majority avoid military service, a very serious question of fairness arises. John Graham notes in a study for the Fund for the Republic that "because of either disability or fatherhood, more than 60 percent of all nonprior servicemen" were being deferred in early 1957 and "there is no reason to believe the picture has changed since then, or will change in the future."

Actually, the Army is the only one of the military services using the draft. It calls approximately 8,000 a month, of whom fewer than 7,000 are inducted for the 2-year period. Some 90,000 young men each year take advantage of the plan for 6 months of active training and 5½ years of Reserve or National Guard service; and of course there are many thousands of others who volunteer for service in the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marines. All in all, however, the burdens and obligations are distributed very unequally among the 1.2 million young men who come of military age each year. Some have their education, career, or family plans disrupted while many others make no national sacrifice at all.

The House Armed Services Committee has reported a simple 4-year extension of the draft beyond June 30. There is something to be said for using such means to avoid harangue over new plans for additional deferments and special-interest concessions. But there is a great deal more to be said, in our opinion, for the approach of Representative WOLF, of Iowa. Mr. WOLF's bill would provide for a 2-year draft extension, but a concurrent resolution would require an intensive study by a joint congressional committee of military manpower procedures and alternative methods of meeting the needs.

This newspaper has long supported both the draft and the concept of national service. It does not share the views of those who feel that the country's youth is being stereotyped or "prussianized"; indeed, it believes that most young men benefit in one way or another from their military service. But it recognizes also that there is now no chance of fulfillment of the universal military training plan which Congress approved 8 years ago. With the changing character of war, UMT probably has been outmoded; moreover, it would be extremely costly.

Now, the Army makes some compelling arguments, in which it is supported by the other services, that a draft law is necessary on the books whether or not it is fully utilized. A recent study shows that the Air Force and Navy benefit notably in the caliber of their volunteer enlistees because of the draft; and the Army obtains higher quality men than might otherwise be the case.

Furthermore, the contention that there will be no more Koreas is highly dubious. It is impossible to predict the exact needs of limited war. If the Reserves and National Guard are worth anything, their requirements cannot be overlooked. The assertion that higher rates of pay for the lower ranks would attract an all-volunteer force rather begs the question of national obligation. Does the United States really want to abandon the concept that each young man owes some service to his countrymen? What would be the effect of higher pay scales in the countries where American forces are stationed abroad? And what would be the result in NATO, which is having trouble maintaining its strength, of an American decision to end the draft?

Plainly such questions demand thoughtful consideration, and we think there is strong reason for Congress to extend the draft temporarily. But the country also needs to determine whether the draft is the best way of meeting the problem—and whether, alternatively, if there is value in the concept of national service, it ought to be expanded beyond military conscription to include an oversea technical service corps, a scientific corps, a civil defense corps, a conservation corps and the like. It is a delusion to think that there is an easy or even a wholly satisfactory answer. Surely, however, while Congress is attending to the immediate need, it ought to provide for conscientious, unemotional examination of the possibility of some less wasteful and more equitable method than mere indefinite reliance upon the draft.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Oregon for his helpful contributions to the debate; and I commend him for his wise observations.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. CASE of South Dakota obtained the floor.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President——

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I desire to yield to the Senator from Maryland, for as long a time as he may need, without losing my right to the floor.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from South Dakota may be recognized immediately following the statement of the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER].

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I believe we should run the Senate one way or the other. If we are going to have a list of Senators to be recognized, we ought to abide by that list. If we are not going to have a list, Senators ought to be recognized as they address the Chair. I tried to be recognized for a half hour. I was not recognized. Then I was put on the list. Then the Chair did not use the list. The Senate should be run one way or the other.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I renew my request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none. Without objection, it is so ordered. The Senator from Maryland is recognized and may proceed.

APPEASEMENT

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, today we are reminded of one of the most disgraceful acts of appeasement in contemporary history. Some 20 years ago a tall, angular man in a bowler hat, carrying the familiar umbrella, returned to England from Munich proclaiming "peace in our time." Shortly thereafter the world erupted into World War II and the black umbrella became a universal symbol of submission to a power-crazed former corporal in the German Army who sought to Prussianize the earth.

The grave question we must face in this the year 1959 is: "Will history repeat itself?" Prime Minister Macmillan has just returned from conferences in Moscow with Nikita Khrushchev. And, although he was subject to snubs and insults from the Soviet chief of state, it would appear that, through fear, he is now preaching "disengagement" and "flexibility" in the solution of the Berlin problem. He is currently trying to sell this appeasement line to De Gaulle, and when he comes to the United States next week it is clear that he will try to get the President of the United States to buy it.

Now, Mr. President, please do not misunderstand me. I believe Mr. Macmillan is completely sincere in his endeavor to lessen the tensions which prevail between East and West on the subject of Berlin. But I also think it is vitally important that the initiative, so far as any negotiations are concerned, remain with this Nation. I respectfully submit that we must not make the same mistake a Briton by the name of Neville Chamberlain made two decades ago. The Berlin situation, if mishandled, could touch off the most hideous war in the history of civilization. It could, indeed, prove to be the end of civilization as we know it.

To prevent such a holocaust we must stand fast. To retreat on Berlin would be just as disastrous as was the retreat from Munich. Our President has called for no surrender, and it behooves every Senator, every Representative, and every American citizen, to aline himself squarely behind him and back his stated position. He has left the door open for peaceful solution of the powder-laden Berlin issue, but he has stoutly refused to be browbeaten into submission to the ruthless Communists. The President's position is the right position. He will negotiate, but he will not surrender. He will not forsake principle in the face of saber-rattling and veiled threats. He will steadfastly respect the commitments made in good faith by this Nation. To do otherwise would be to sell the entire free world out to international communism.

Mr. Macmillan has arrogated to himself the right to speak, not only for Great Britain, but for these United States, and France, and the West German Republic, and all other countries allied with us to stem the Red tide. I do not believe that a man who has indicated his willingness to make concession after concession at the conference table is representative of either our point of view or the viewpoints of our other friends. The American people have every right to resent being spoken for by a man from another land. American taxpayers, after all, have been carrying that part of the world on their backs for some time.

It is only logical—yes, it is in the best interests of world peace—that Dwight David Eisenhower be recognized as the chief spokesman for the West. When the time comes to sit down and negotiate with the Russians, there will be no room for doubt as to where he stands. There is no such word as "retreat" in his vocabulary, and it is fortunate for the Western World that this is so.

Let us in the Congress, then, give him the unqualified support he richly deserves not only as President, but also as the world's most outstanding military leader. Let us resist with all our might suggestions, from whatever source, that smack of appeasement. Let us not be deceived by the innocuous words "disengagement" and "flexibility," for actually their definition is retreat. Indeed, Senators, retreat can spell disaster.

ACHIEVEMENTS OF COLORADO BLUE CROSS

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I believe that the people throughout this country will be interested in the progress of Colorado's pioneering effort to establish a medical care program for our public assistance beneficiaries. The administration of this excellent plan has already attracted nationwide attention from health and welfare agencies. Our State welfare department utilized the Blue Cross administrative facilities and their participating hospital agreements to implement the plan.

I feel that their record is one which will interest my colleagues. I ask unanimous consent that the 21st annual report of the executive vice president, Thomas Tierney, be reprinted in the RECORD at this point, together with a letter from Mr. Tierney, so that Senators may more easily study it.

There being no objection, the report and letter were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TWENTY-FIRST ANNUAL REPORT OF THE EXECUTIVE VICE PRESIDENT, COLORADO HOSPITAL SERVICE

The year 1958, which marked the 20th anniversary of the founding of the Colorado Blue Cross plan, was a year of significant plan progress and achievement. It is a privilege to report that progress and achievement to the people of the State of Colorado.

Continued public acceptance and approval of the Blue Cross philosophy of prepayment was evidenced by the increase of our membership to embrace a total of 616,715 residents of the State. Continued service to our 84 participating hospitals was apparent in our total payment of $15,125,263 for hospital services—an increase of almost $2½ million over the payments made in 1957.

From the standpoint of the staff, the outstanding event of the year was the occupation of our new office building. Despite the expansion of our services, and the additional personnel required in the administration of the State's medical care plan for pensioners and the Federal Government's hospital benefit program for servicemen's dependents, the increased efficiency afforded by the new building made it possible for us to reduce our operating expense ratio to 4.7 percent of income; so that 95.3 percent of every dollar we received was returned to our members in the form of hospital payments or in additions to minimum required reserves for future hospitalization. The building is, in a very true sense, a tribute to the subscribing public, to the voluntary hospital system, and to the members of the medical profession who, through mutual cooperation and effort, have found in Blue Cross and its companion plan, Blue Shield, a reasonable and realistic method of financing the health requirements of the community.

It seems to have become a vogue in recent months to level criticism at the voluntary hospital system of America. While an objective analysis of the various articles which have appeared during the last year indicates that the alleged complaints have little relationship to the basic health care provided in modern hospitals, still the publication of such articles continues. Those of us who are privileged to work closely with the hospitals and with their administrative personnel know the complexities of modern hospital administration. Hospitals today are tremendous health centers to which sick persons go to secure all of the benefits of modern medical science, and from which they emerge restored to sound health and a productive role in the community. The costs are high, but the life-saving and health-restoring services are worth every cent involved. It seems only appropriate that we salute the hospitals whose services our members utilize, for their constant effort to make every facility which modern medical science devises available to all of the people at a price which they can afford.

To the hospitals of Colorado we pledge our continued support, and to the people of Colorado we pledge our continued effort to render an ever-expanding service.

Respectfully submitted.

THOMAS M. TIERNEY.

COLORADO BLUE CROSS,
COLORADO HOSPITAL SERVICE,
Denver, Colo., February 25, 1959.

Senator GORDON L. ALLOTT,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR GORDON: For the past several years, it has been my pleasure to furnish you each year with a copy of our current annual report. You will find the report of our 1958 operations enclosed. Without question, the most significant development in the field of health care financing, not only locally but nationally, during the past year was the inaugural of Colorado's old-age pension medical care program. It has already attracted nationwide attention, and will undoubtedly be watched with great interest by health and welfare agencies throughout the country. We are very proud of the fact that the State welfare department saw fit to utilize our administrative facilities and our participating hospital agreements in the implementation of the plan and I think the record, to date, amply supports the wisdom of their judgment.

During the year 1958, we paid out the total sum of $3,804,970.84 to the hospitals of Colorado for the care of 16,652 hospitalized pensioners. The total cost of our administration

of this hospital care program was approximately eight-tenths of 1 percent of the total hospital expense involved, and even this minimum expense was virtually erased entirely by our being able to refund to the State welfare department its proportional share of the adjustment amounts derived from our routine semiannual audits of the participating hospitals operating costs. Certainly Colorado has led the Nation in developing at least a partial solution to the ever-growing problem of providing basic health care for the constantly increasing number of old persons.

Over 700,000 persons in our State, including the old-age pensioners and the servicemen's dependents for whom we administer the Government's Medicare plan, now enjoy the benefits of Blue Cross membership. I suppose it is true that few businesses in the State have as many people directly interested in their operations as we do. Let me assure you that we are very vitally aware of the tremendous responsibility that such widespread public acceptance entails. If there is ever any occasion when you might have a question with regard to our organiaztion or its administration, it will be a privilege for me to provide the answers for you.

Very truly yours,

THOMAS M. TIERNEY,
Executive Director.

AGITATION OF ANTI-U.S. RIOTS

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD an article entitled "Red Student Agitators Seen Fomenting Anti-U.S. Riots," written by David Lawrence, and published in the New York Herald Tribune of March 4, 1959.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RED STUDENT AGITATORS SEEN FOMENTING ANTI-U.S. RIOTS

(By David Lawrence)

WASHINGTON, March 3.—And now it's trouble in Bolivia. Yesterday it was in Cuba, and before that in other Latin-American countries where hostility against the United States was artificially intensified by the Communists.

Unfortunately, maneuvers of the Communists in the cold war are usually poohpoohed by too many people in this country, despite bold propaganda operations that are obviously planned with care. When the anti-Nixon incidents occurred on the Vice President's tour of South America, it was conceded, of course, that an antagonism such as was manifested against the United States could readily have been brought into the open without the slightest stimulus by the Communists. But this was no reason to ignore the impetus given anti-American sentiment there or anywhere else in the world by the Communists.

It so happens that this week an article reporting an alleged remark by a minor American official was published in a magazine reaching Bolivia from the United States. The idea that a chance comment in a magazine, circulating a relatively small number of copies in that country, could produce a riot against the U.S. Embassy and cause the evacuation of its personnel is too fantastic to believe. Only an organized conspiracy by those malcontents with a desire to focus international attention on relations between the United States and an important South American country could have brought about the tragic episode.

CITES DEMANDS BY PANAMA

The other day in Congress, Representative DANIEL J. FLOOD, Democrat, of Pennsylvania, declared that Communist influence is back of some of the demands being made by the Government of Panama for an extension of its territorial waters which would adversely affect American rights in the Canal Zone. He said:

"Those in charge of the Communist movement in Latin America, and especially in the Caribbean area, have undoubtedly focused their conspiratorial activities on the Panama Canal with the purpose of causing destruction of amicable relations between the United States and Panama, with complete liquidation of United States control over the Canal itself."

Nor is Communist activity confined to any one part of the globe. It is noticeable just now in Africa, where fuel is being added to the flames of nationalism. It is operative also in the Far East. A few days ago a United Press International dispatch dated Manila said:

"The Foreign Office warned yesterday it has received reports pointing to growing infiltration by Communists among the Philippine student population.

"Foreign Secretary Serrano conveyed the warning to Representative Lenardo Perez, chairman of the house committee on anti-Filipino activities, and told him to put his committee on alert."

REDS AMONG STUDENTS

The pattern of student infiltration is worldwide. In Latin America, in particular, many of the anti-American demonstrations have originated in the colleges. To plant young leaders who will use any provocation to work up passionate outbursts is a relatively easy device. It has been revealed in Cuba in the so-called youth movement. While the top officials there vehemently deny that the Communists have anything to do with the Fidel Castro regime, it is an open secret in Havana that the Communists are busy causing mischief wherever they can in the little Republic which is struggling to recover from the ill effects of the Batista dictatorship.

In the Middle East the Communist plotters have been more successful than anywhere else. Everyone who has watched the situation in Egypt is aware that the Communists have played an active part there in anti-Western demonstrations. The Nasser government, which at first welcomed such supporters, now is troubled by them. Iraq is an example of a successful conquest by the Communists of a country which until recently was one of America's stanchest friends.

Despite the denunciations of anything that even remotely resembles an intervention in their own domestic affairs, the Soviets are spending hundreds of millions of dollars fomenting internal trouble inside many of the countries sympathetic with the West.

In the United States, the effects of some of the insidious operations by Communists are more and more noticeable. Having won many a big battle in the courts through the aid of legal technicalities, the Communists have continued to plant their propaganda in important places and among groups which are gullible and naive, thus enlarging the scope of the Soviet propaganda drive.

Sooner or later the American people will come to realize that the Communists are succeeding in their infiltration of many countries and are dangerously impairing the relations between the United States and peoples in different parts of the world who normally would be very friendly to the people of this country. It's a significant type of fighting in what has been misnamed the cold war.

RURAL ELECTRIFICATION SUBSIDIES

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD an article entitled "Rural Electrification Subsidies," which was published in the March 1959, First National City Bank monthly letter on business and economic conditions.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RURAL ELECTRIFICATION SUBSIDIES

The controversy over President Eisenhower's plan to help balance the budget by eliminating the Federal interest rate subsidy to borrowers from the Rural Electrification Administration (REA) provides a compelling illustration of how hard it is to withdraw Federal assistance once people have become used to it. The President's proposal, made in his January budget message, was simply that "the present statutory interest rate of 2 percent for loans made by the Rural Electrification Administration be replaced by a rate which will cover the current cost to the Treasury of equivalent-term borrowing and other reasonable costs." The Treasury, which provides the funds which the REA lends, has recently been paying up to 4 percent to sell its securities.

The President's proposal immediately drew fire and in a speech before the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, whose members borrow from the REA, he gave assurances that "this recommendation would not raise interest rates * * * on outstanding REA loans" and that it was not intended to be harmful in any way to rural electric cooperatives. Nevertheless, the association adopted resolutions asking Congress to protect the 2 percent rate on REA loans and calling for still more Government aid.

Congressional leaders gave warm support to the association's position. A New York Herald Tribune dispatch reported that Senate Majority Leader LYNDON JOHNSON urged the Members to "fight with beer bottles" if necessary to keep their advantages. Speaker of the House SAM RAYBURN said flatly: "If 2 percent interest is a subsidy, then I am for a subsidy for that." Explaining his stand, he added, "why not a little subsidy for the millions who, until a few years ago, were the underprivileged?"

The answer to Speaker RAYBURN's question was given by the President in his speech to the Rural Electric Cooperative Association. He pointed out that Government benefit programs are designed to insure that no group of citizens is unfairly handicapped. Once the handicap is overcome, justification for Federal assistance is no longer there.

THE REA'S ACCOMPLISHMENTS

The fact is that the Rural Electrification Administration has done its work so well that the underprivileged it was designed to serve are underprivileged no longer. The REA was set up in 1935 in the midst of the great depression to put up money for local cooperatives to finance rural electrification. At the time only 10.9 percent of the 6.8 million farms in the United States were receiving central-station electric service.

Today, 24 years later and after the provision of $3.8 billion, REA electrification loans and a vast expansion of service by private utilities, most of the rural electrification job has been done. More than 95 percent of U.S. farms now have central electric service.

Recentaly REA has been enlarging on its original purpose of financing the distribution of power to rural consumers. Thus, loans to finance distribution and consumer facilities accounted for no more than 65 percent of the $242 million REA electric loan total in fiscal '58. Financing generators for cooperatives, once rejected as a last resort by REA in favor of encouraging the purchase of private power, and construction of transmission lines took $86 million in fiscal 1958.

With the growing emphasis on generating and transmisison facilities has come a tendency of REA borrowers to compete with existing privately owned utilities for industrial and commercial customers. In the past 5 years the commercial and industrial business of all REA cooperatives has doubled. Three out of four new customers are nonfarm.

Meanwhile, under a 1949 congressional authorization, the REA has taken on the additional task of financing rural telephone service and through June 30, 1948, had made available $478 million for this purpose.

Borrowings of the cooperatives regularly exceed repayments so that their financing has involved a continuing drain on the Treasury. The President would make available, in his fiscal 1960 budget proposals, $268 million to increase loans to the electric cooperatives and $104 million for new telephone loans, as well as $9.6 million for REA administrative expenses. But, as stated earlier, he believes that the rate of interest paid should measure up to the Government's own cost of borrowing. Though the administration has recommended tightening up on tax treatment of cooperatives, the rural electric cooperatives do not at present contribute significantly to Federal tax revenues. Financing their needs represents a part of the staggering burden of farm subsidies.

Meanwhile, the rural electric cooperatives have become sizable businesses. As early as 1946, REA Administrator Claude Wickard cited as the most important development of the year the fact that REA borrowers have become well-established, stable, mature business enterprises:

"Locally owned and locally operated cooperative groups—which numbered 918 of the 996 REA borrowers as the year ended—exemplify the ability and determination of America's farm people to solve their own problems. Many of these cooperatives are the largest business enterprises in their communities."

The biggest growth has occurred in the postwar period. Net worth of REA electric borrowers increased sevenfold from 1947 to 1957, from $63.6 million to $436.9 million. Although more recent figures have not yet been published, their net worth is undoubtedly higher today. In comparison, the net worth of privately owned electric utility companies doubled.

It is hard to deny the President's conclusion that we have reached a point where REA is no longer an infant enterprise.

BREAKING FAITH?

A question of integrity was raised by Senator JOHN KENNEDY when he assured the resentatives of the rural electric cooperatives that Congress would not go back on our word by raising the 2 percent interest rate on REA loans. It is always desirable to have emphasis on integrity in public as well as private affairs. The fact is that, in the original Rural Electrification Act of 1936, the intent of Congress was that "all such loans * * * shall bear interest at a rate equal to the average rate of interest payable by the United States of America on its obligations, having a maturity of 10 or more years."

The tendency of beneficiaries of Government benefits to perpetuate their favored status is what creates suspicion of new Government programs, however meritorious. They tend to go on and on, and cost more and more, as long as the taxpayer will stand for it. The President has set out the proper approach: "Ideally, in a federally sponsored and financed undertaking, it should be possible for the Government to step progressively aside as they reach the stage of self-sufficiency which enables them to move forward under their own sound management, ownership and financing."

The President's objective in curbing subsidies and balancing the budget is to avoid breaking faith with the American people in the most fundamental sense. As he put it to the Rural Electric Cooperative Association:

"Shall Government live within its means, shall our citizens, in a prosperous time, meet the cost of the service they desire of their Government?

"Or is it to be our established policy to follow the ruinous route of free republics of the ages past, the route of deficit financing, of inflation, of taxes ever rising, until all initiative and self-reliant enterprise are destroyed?"

EXTENSION OF THE UNIVERSAL MILITARY TRAINING AND SERVICE ACT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 2260) to extend until July 1, 1963, the induction provisions of the Universal Military Training and Service Act; the provisions of the act of August 3, 1950, suspending personnel strengths of the Armed Forces; and the Dependents' Assistance Act of 1950.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I wonder if it will be agreeable to the majority leader to have the committee amendment acted on at this time.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Yes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment to add a new section, on page 2, beginning in line 11.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, are there any further committee amendments? If not, I desire to offer an amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The only other amendment of the committee to be acted on is the amendment of the title.

The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, copies of my amendment have been placed on every desk. I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with and that it be printed in the RECORD at this point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the amendment was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Add at the end of the bill the following new section:

"COMMISSION ON MILITARY MANPOWER

"SEC. — (a) There is hereby established a Commission to be known as the 'Commission on Military Manpower' (hereinafter in this section referred to as the 'Commission') whose function it shall be to carry out the provisions of subsection (f) of this section.

"(b) The Commission shall be composed of seven members who shall be appointed by the President within 60 days after the effective date of this Act. Four members of the Commission shall be appointed from civilian life and three from personnel of the Armed Forces serving on active duty. The President shall designate one of the members of the Commission appointed from civilian life as Chairman.

"(c) Any vacancy in the Commission shall not affect its powers, but shall be filled in the same manner in which the original appointment was made. Four members of the Commission shall constitute a quorum.

"(d) (1) Each member of the Commission who is not otherwise in the service of the Government of the United States shall receive $50 per diem when engaged in the performance of duties vested in the Commission plus reimbursement for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by him in the performance of such duties.

"(2) Each member of the Commission who is an officer or employee of the United States shall receive no additional compensation for his services as a member of the Commission, but he shall be reimbursed for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by him in the performance of the duties vested in the Commission.

"(e) The Commission is authorized to appoint and fix the compensation, without regard to the civil service laws and the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, of such personnel as it deems necessary to carry out its duties.

"(f) It shall be the function of the Commission to make a comprehensive study and investigation of—

"(1) the operation of the Universal Military Training and Service Act, the Reserve programs, and the programs of procurement of military personnel by the Armed Forces;

"(2) means and methods of improving utilization and assignment of personnel of the Armed Forces; and

"(3) alternatives to the system of induction of civilians for military training and service as a method of maintaining the required strength of the Armed Forces.

"(g) The Commission is authorized to secure directly from any department, agency, or independent establishment of the Government information, statistics, data, suggestions, and other matter for the purposes of this section; and each such department, agency, or independent establishment is authorized and directed to furnish any of the foregoing matter directly to the Commission upon request of the Chairman of the Commission.

"(h) The Commission may from time to time report to the President and shall, not later than January 31, 1961, submit to the President for transmittal to the Congress the results of its study and investigation together with such recommendations as it deems advisable. The Commission shall thereafter from time to time make such further reports and recommendations as it deems advisable. The Commission shall cease to exist on July 1, 1963.

"(i) Expenditures of the Commission shall be defrayed out of funds appropriated to the Executive Office of the President."

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on my amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. MORTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for the purpose of my suggesting the absence of a quorum, with the understanding that the Senator will not lose his right to the floor?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I will yield with that understanding.

Mr. MORTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from South Dakota may yield to me for the purpose of suggesting the absence of a quorum, and that the Senator may not lose his right to the floor thereby.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Kentucky? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. MORTON. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceed to call the roll.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MUSKIE in the chair.) Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, the bill pending before the Senate deals with the lives of some 10 million men who are at present registrants under the Selective Service Act, and, prospectively, in the 4 years ahead, for which the act would be extended, would deal with another 4 million young men.

In addition, it deals with the life of the Nation, which is to be secured by the implementation of the act in our Military Establishment.

That the draft should be extended under the present world circumstances seems beyond practical dispute or debate. The act now on the statute books will expire the 1st of July 1959. I have heard no particular argument—within the committee, at least—proposing that it not be extended. There was some difference of opinion as to whether the extension should be for 2 years or 4 years, but the major question discussed within the committee, in our executive hearings, had to do with the operation of the draft.

It is my personal feeling that the operation of the draft law could be improved, that a better use could be made of our manpower, and that a fairer administration could be obtained. It is for those reasons that I have offered the amendment which is now pending.

My amendment would create a Presidential commission, to be paid for out of the funds of the President, for a study of our manpower needs and problems and the administration of the Selective Service Act.

The amendment provides as follows:

(f) It shall be the function of the Commission to make a comprehensive study and investigation of—

(1) the operation of the Universal Military Training and Service Act, the Reserve programs, and the programs of procurement of military personnel by the Armed Forces;

(2) means and methods of improving utilization and assignment of personnel of the Armed Forces; and

(3) alternatives to the system of induction of civilians for military training and service as a method of maintaining the required strength of the Armed Forces.

The Commission would consist of seven members, to be appointed by the President within 60 days after the effective date of the act. Four members would be appointed from civilian life, and three from personnel of the Armed Forces serving on active duty.

Also, there are the usual provisions with regard to the employment of stenographic help and clerical assistants.

It is difficult for me to understand why anyone should hesitate to support this kind of proposal. I do not claim originality for it. The language I have submitted actually was drafted at the request of the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL]. I have changed it only in one particular, I believe, namely, to give the Commission the power to report from time to time to the President, along with the requirement in the original draft that a final report be submitted by a specified date. The senior Senator from Massachusetts knows that I am offering the amendment, and I am doing so with his assent in that respect. Because of the consideration of the 2-year and 4-year angle, I believe, he decided, not to offer the amendment in committee, although he did present it there for discussion.

In consideration of the urgency of the amendment, I invite the attention of Members of the Senate to comments which have been made during the consideration of this subject in the other body and during the hearings before our committee.

When the House of Representatives voted the extension of the Draft Act, Mr. John T. Norris, staff reporter for the Washington Post and Times Herald, carried this paragraph in his report on the action:

There was some support within the Pentagon before its submission to Congress for changes in the draft law because the manpower pool is steadily mounting, but administration chiefs and congressional leaders decided a simple extension of the law was preferable to opening up the complex law to legislative changes that might prove more troublesome than present defects.

In the face of it, if it was recognized that there were defects in the operation of the present draft law, who should have the responsibility of trying to amend it or improve it? If we are to extend it for 4 years, what is the logic of saying that we will not consider improving it because the changes might prove more troublesome than present defects, unless we make some effort to determine how and in what manner the law might be improved?

I recognize that there has been some argument of urgency in connection with the extension of the act. It is true that the act does not expire until the 1st of July. However, the great powers of the world today are considering their strength in an important crisis. There is value in the logic that at this particular time we should make sure that we have the strength we might need. It is good logic to say that we want to reassure our allies in this present world crisis, that we are standing in a firm position, and that we propose to be in a position to carry out whatever decision may be made.

That logic, however, has led to this situation: A bill for the extension of the draft was considered in the House committee for only a very short time, reported to the House, and there passed after 1 or 2 days' consideration.

In the Senate we have the situation that we held 3 days of hearings last week. Yesterday the bill was presented before the committee in executive session for markup. At the time I understood that it would not be brought to the floor of the Senate before Wednesday. Today we learn by the radio and the press that, because of the Legislative Calendar, it was decided to bring up the bill today.

Obviously, under those conditions, Members of the Senate have not had an opportunity really to review the printed hearings, which became available only today, the day the bill was brought to the floor of the Senate. Reporters, the press, columnists, and the people of the country generally have had no opportunity to learn that the Senate Committee on Armed Services had reported the bill, and react in time to suggest to Members of the Senate whatever opinions they may have before the bill comes before the Senate for final consideration.

It seems to me that all those arguments point to the fact that, if there are defects, if there are imperfections in the present law, or in its administration or operation, we should guarantee that there will be an opportunity for study of the operation of the act, and that recommendations will be brought to the attention of the President and the Congress. That is what the pending amendment proposes.

I find the following in Time magazine for January 26, 1959:

The most valid criticism of the draft as now operated is that it is inequitable. Of the Nation's 2,200,000 physically fit men in the 18½-to-26-year-old bracket, only 120,000 get grabbed by the draft each year. Thousands of others volunteer, but the fact is that in the skimpy-quota peacetime era it requires little imagination to think up a reason to be deferred, e.g., as a student, a farmer, a scientist, or a hardship case. Thousands of 17- and 18-year-olds exercise their alternative right of fulfilling military obligations with 6 months of active duty and 7½ years of weekly drill and summer camp in the Reserves or National Guard.

If we stop to think about it, the very fact that a national news magazine can print such a statement as "the most valid criticism of the draft as now operated is that it is inequitable," raises the question as to what argument can be presented against trying to remove some of the inequities, in a bill which deals with the lives of more than 10 million young men? In the very critical age period between the ages of 19 and 26, or 18½ and 35, depending upon how one looks at the period of liability, what would be more proper than that we should attempt to remove the inequities?

The Washington Post and Times Herald, in its February 4 issue said:

Plainly such questions demand thoughtful consideration, and we think there is strong reason for Congress to extend the draft temporarily. But the country also needs to determine whether the draft is the best way of meeting the problem—and whether, alternatively, if there is value in the concept of national service, it ought to be expanded beyond military conscription to include an oversea technical service corps, a scientific corps, a civil defense corps, a conservation corps, and the like. It is a delusion to think that there is an easy or even a wholly satisfactory answer. Surely, however, while Congress is attending to the immediate need, it ought to provide for conscientious, unemotional examination of the possibility of some less wasteful and more equitable method than mere indefinite reliance upon the draft.

Again, Mr. President, I ask the question: If an editor of a nationally read newspaper can make such a proposal,

surely Congress ought to provide for a conscientious, unemotional examination of a possibly less wasteful and more equitable method than mere indefinite reliance on the draft as it is presently constituted.

The proposal I make would make sure that such an unemotional and objective study would be made of the problem, and the Commission appointed would be directed to present its recommendations and reports to Congress.

Mr. MORTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield.

Mr. MORTON. The Senator has been a Member of Congress, either in the House or in the Senate, for some time. Is it not true that every time we are considering an extension of the draft act we are in a period of crisis?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. That is true. It seems that the one produces the other, or the one occasions the other. I do not know which it is. We generally act under the compulsion of a critical situation.

Mr. MORTON. I realize that we must make some improvements. I realize, also, that we have made improvements in the past when the law was extended. As the Senator has so ably stated, certain defects are contained in the present act. I agree with the Senator that Congress should correct those inequities. It seems clear that Congress will not do that at this time; that it will not take the time to take such action now.

Therefore I believe the amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from South Dakota is an excellent amendment. If a group will objectively study the problem, I feel sure that a more equitable plan can be devised than the present one.

I agree we must extend the act. However, I believe also that it could be extended in a way so that we would not upset the lives of so many young people and the lives of so many young families. At the present time the draft act is a kind of Damocles sword hanging over the heads of many young men.

The Danes have a universal military training system. However, I understand that Denmark uses a system under which the option is left to the young man as to when he will perform his service. The young man knows he must serve. He is given the freedom of deciding whether he will serve before he goes to college or after he goes to college, before he gets married or after he gets married, before he goes to law school or after he goes to law school. He can plan his life, and the choice rests with him, even though he knows he must serve. There is no sword of Damocles hanging over his head.

I understand that the system works fairly well. I understand that Denmark gets the right number of men in the various age groups into its armed services. Of course, I do not know whether it would work effectively in this country. However, it seems to me that we could work out a more equitable way of getting the manpower we need. I admit that we need a draft, and that volunteers will not take care of the situation. I repeat, I believe that we should devise a system which will not upset the lives of so many young men and the family life of so many young people. For that reason I believe the approach the Senator from South Dakota is taking is a good one.

It is clear that we should set up a commission to study the problem and that then Congress should set up a system of drafting manpower which will not completely disrupt the lives of so many of our people. I commend the Senator, and I intend to support him.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I appreciate the statement of the Senator from Kentucky. The Senator has put his finger on what we seek to do. It is to provide a way in which someone can unemotionally and in good time study the problem and come up with a better way of taking care of the situation.

With regard to the observation he has made about the inequity of the service, I should like to call his attention to the fact that at the end of fiscal year 1958, June 30, 1958, there were 9 million registrants under 26 years of age.

Of that 9 million, about 4¼ million were in service or in the Active Reserve service or had obligated service. The remaining 4,750,000 were still without training. Many of the 4¾ million who were without training, or 2.93 million, were nonfathers. Therefore only 3 million of the 9 million registrants under 26 years of age, as of June 30, 1958, were nonfathers and were not sharing the burden of responsibility of universal service.

It seems to me that the point the Senator has made about the system used by the Danes is a good one. Under it everyone makes the same contribution, and the individual can fit the responsibility into his own plans for life. It is certainly something that should be considered by the Commission, if one is set up.

That the authorities who testified before the committee recognized the inequities is evidenced by the fact that the chairman of the committee, the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], in his questioning of General Harrison, made this statement:

> So there are a great many inequities in the program. I think it is beyond the power of mortal man to eliminate all the inequities in a program of this magnitude, but it certainly is incumbent on us to do as much as we can to see that this responsibility for the defense of the United States is distributed as widely as possible and is evenly imposed as we can on the young manhood of this Nation.

I see the distinguished Senator from Georgia nodding his head. I am sure he believes that inequities should be eliminated to the extent it is humanly possible to do so.

The Senate and the country have heard about the Cordiner report. Mr. Ralph Cordiner, who headed that committee of study for 18 months, dealt with pay and matters of that sort related to the armed services, and he made the statement that we devoted 25 percent of all military effort to training men who do not stay in the service. He was concerned with the waste under the present system.

At another point he said that he had found antagonism and bitterness over the draft and that men were checking off the days until they got out of the service.

Another aspect of the problem was suggested by Dr. Howard A. Meyerhoff, executive director of the Scientific Manpower Commission. In his statement he told the committee that his organization was a private organization founded in 1953 by the major scientific groups of the Nation. The work of the Scientific Manpower Commission had been recognized many times for the great contribution it had made in the study of the need for agricultural scientists, astronomers, biologists, chemists, earth scientists, mathematicians, physicists, and phychologists practicing in the clinical and experimental fields.

Dr. Meyerhoff testified before our committee last week. He said that the power granted to the Selective Service System to induct the young men must be extended. He also stated:

> We further believe a 4-year extension is to be preferred over a 2-year extension. We do urge, however, that H.R. 2260 be amended so as to broaden the powers of the Selective Service System and to enable it, by statutory provision, to select men with critically needed skills for assignment to civilian activities that are essential to the national welfare and security.

Then he continued in some detail by supporting his recommendation that the system be given authority for the assignment of personnel to essential selective activities.

At the time the committee was considering the bill, I attempted to design a program which would equalize the service somewhat and would clarify the responsibility of the young men who register. I wrapped that up in an amendment, on which we did not have an opportunity to get opinions from the Department of Defense in any detail. However, it was suggested that the amendment be referred to the Secretary of Defense for comment.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that that amendment, which I had tentatively drafted, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the amendment was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

> SEC. 5. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, a person may be inducted into an armed force (other than as a physician, dentist, or allied specialist), or enlisted into an armed force, after the date of enactment of this act and before July 1, 1963, only under one of the following programs which the Secretary of Defense is hereby authorized to provide:
>
> (1) A critically skilled person may be enlisted for 10 years, the first 3 months of which shall be served on active duty for training and the remaining 9¾ years shall be served in the Standby Reserve.
>
> (2) A person may be enlisted for 7 years, the first 6 months of which shall be served on active duty for training and the remaining 6½ years shall be served by satisfactory participation in the Ready Reserve.
>
> (3) A person may be inducted for 5 years, the first 2 years of which shall be served on active duty, the next 2 years shall be served by satisfactory participation in the Ready Reserve, and the last year shall be served in the Standby Reserve.

(4) A person may be enlisted for 5 years, the first 3 years of which shall be served on active duty, the next 1 year shall be served by satisfactory participation in the Ready Reserve, and the last year shall be served in the Standby Reserve.

(5) A person may be enlisted for 4 or more years of active duty and if he so serves for 4 or more years, he has no additional obligation to serve.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, the amendment sought to establish a fair relationship between the active duty time and the Ready Reserve liability and the Standby Reserve liability for the registrants under the act. At present, I think the chairman said, there are 30 different ways in which a young man might discharge his responsibility under the present act. Those ways are confusing and overlapping.

The period of liability varies, depending on whether one takes 6 months of active duty training before he is 18½ years of age, or takes it after he is 18½. The liability varies from service to service. It may be that there should be some distinction among the different services. But it has seemed to me that it would improve the situation if there were certainty, definiteness, and a clear statement of the responsibility, so that a young man might choose with his eyes open, so to speak.

The particular proposal embodied in the amendment which I am not now offering, but which I have had printed in the RECORD, so that it might be studied, would create a class A, in which one might enlist for 3 months of active duty and then go into the Standy Reserve for the balance of the 10-year period, during which he would be available for assignment in a number of employments in the scientific or technological field.

Class B would be the group which would take 6 months of active duty and then go into the Ready Reserve for 6½ years. This is comparable to the program which the National Guard now has, but makes the period 7 years total rather than 8.

Class C would embrace a 2-year enlistment or a 2-year induction with a Ready Reserve liability of 2 years following the 2 years of active duty, and 1 year of standby, but would give assurance that at the end of 5 years, under those circumstances, the liability would have been discharged or liquidated.

Class D would provide for a 3-year enlistment with 1 year of Ready Reserve liability and 1 year of standby following that. That would reduce the Ready Reserve liability by 1 year, but it would get for the Government 1 additional year of active duty.

It should be pointed out that this is important because the first 5 or 6 months of service goes into training. Under a 2-year enlistment or 2 years of active duty, a man gets only 18 months of actual active duty. With a 3-year enlistment, he gets 29 or 30 months of actual active duty. The Defense Department estimated that a 3-year enlistee costs a total of $17,474. Estimating 29 months of effective service, his average cost for an effective month is $603. Whereas a 2-year inductee provides only 17 months of effective service, his average cost for an effective month being $706. In other words, the 2-year inductee costs more than $100 a month more for his actual service than does the 3-year enlistee. That means it costs something more than $3,000 more to obtain the same period of effective service.

The amendment on that point would also provide that if one served 4 years of active duty, he would have no reserve liability either in the Standby or the Ready Reserve.

I hope that Senators who are interested in the total problem will note the amendment as it appears in the RECORD and will compare it with the present service.

For that purpose, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a table which was prepared by a staff member of the committee, I believe, and dated February 6, 1959, showing methods of fulfilling the military obligation, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Methods of fulfilling the military obligation

Major programs now in use	Age	Minimum active duty	Ready Reserve participation [1]	Total military service [2]
Selective service (voluntary or involuntary induction).	18½ to 25 years	2 years	2 years	6 years.
	26 to 35 years	do	None	2 years.
Enlistmen: in active forces:				
Army	17 to 34 years	3 years	1 year	6 years.
Navy	17 to 31 years	4 years	do	Do.
Air Force	17 to 34 years	do	do	Do.
Marine Corps	17 to 28 years	3 years	2 years	Do.
Coast Guard	17 to 5 years	do	do	Do.
6 months' active-duty-for-training program:				
Army National Guard and Army Reserve.	17 to 18½ years	6 months	3 years	8 years.
	18½ to 25 years	do	5½ years	6 years.
	26 to 35 years	do	2½ years	3 years.
Air National Guard and Air Force Reserve.	17 to 18½ years	do	7½ years	8 years.
	18½ to 25 years	do	5½ years	6 years.
Marine Corps	17 to 18½ years	do	4½ years	8 years.
	18½ to 25 years	do	5½ years	6 years.
Coast Guard	17 to 18½ years	do	7½ years	8 years.
	18½ to 21 years	do	5½ years	6 years.
Other Ready Reserve enlistment programs:				
Air National Guard	17 to 18½ years	11 weeks	Until age 28	Until age 28.
	18½ to 25 years	do	5 years, 41 weeks	6 years.
	26 to 35 years	do	2 years, 41 weeks	3 years.
Army Reserve	17 to 25 years	2 years	2 years	6 years.
Naval Reserve	17 to 31 years	do	3 years	Do.
Marine Corps Reserve	17 to 25 years	do	do	Do.

[1] Participation in Ready Reserve training is mandatory for members of the Army's Reserve components at the present time. The other services encourage voluntary participation on the part of members who have served 2 or more years on active duty. Members who do not participate may be retained in the Ready Reserve for the full military obligation if needed.

[2] Those personnel 26 years of age or older at time of enlistment do not incur a military service obligation under the provisions of the Universal Military Training and Service Act, as amended, but do obligate themselves to serve for the period of time set forth in the enlistment contract.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, just at a glance, anyone can see how much more complex and confusing, and possibly discriminatory, the present plan is as compared with the more simplified plan.

I ask unanimous consent, also, that a statement which I have prepared on the operation of the Reserve Forces Act under administrative decisions may be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR CASE OF SOUTH DAKOTA

Because of some administrative decisions since enactment of the Reserve Forces Act of 1955, I believe it is possible that an inequitable situation has developed in connection with the length of Active Reserve participation required by persons in various categories of service. Certainly, there is a degree of indefiniteness about the Reserve participation and I suspect that it might be desirable to legislate more particularity into the Reserve program.

One of the objectives of the committee has been the creation of a trained Reserve composed largely of persons who have not fought in a war or served long periods on active duty. This objective was accentuated by the inequities of recalling veterans for duty after Korea because there simply were no other trained people to call.

The Reserve Forces Act of 1955, which initiated the 6-month training program, offered the opportunity to create a Reserve of this type. When the committee approved that act, it was our understanding that the inductees who served 2 years on active duty would participate actively in the Reserve for 3 years and then have 1 additional year of vulnerability in the Standby Reserve, for a total obligation of 6 years. The persons who voluntarily entered the 6-month training program before reaching the age of 18½ were to participate actively in the Reserve for 7½ years. This longer Reserve participation period was in exchange for their shorter period of active duty for training.

A Selective Service ruling that any person participating satisfactorily in a Reserve unit would not be inducted, had the effect of opening the 6-month training program to persons over the age of 18½. To make a distinction between persons who entered the 6-month training program before they were draft liable, the Department of Defense adjusted the period of active participation required. Inductees had their period of active duty participation reduced to 2 years. Persons who entered the 6-month training program before reaching the age of 18½ had their period of Active Reserve participation reduced to 3 years. Persons who entered the 6-month training program after reaching the age of 18½ were required to participate actively in the Reserve for 5½ years.

After the 6-month training program was opened to persons over the age of 18½, the number of young men deciding to enter this program was substantial. The Department of Defense did not accept enlistments in the 6-month training program up to the full potential of the program. The fact that the

6-month training program has not been utilized to the maximum raises some questions about the fairness of requiring Active Reserve participation by the relatively few persons who are inducted into the Armed Forces.

This situation, coupled with the administrative adjustments of the period of Reserve participation, has introduced an element of uncertainty into the Reserve problem.

For this reason, I have prepared a draft bill that I had thought I might offer as an amendment to this bill. Because the several provisions of law bearing on this problem are somewhat complex and interrelated, I have decided to seek the views of the Department on my proposal before pressing for its adoption.

I am aware that the authority for the 6-month training program for persons under the age of 18½ will expire this year and that a bill to extend it is liable to be considered. Before the committee acts on this bill, I hope that we may have an opportunity to consider carefully the equities of the several Reserve and active service programs, and that we may be able to introduce a greater degree of certainty to them so that the young men who must make the choice can do so on a more informed basis.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I could have read the statement, but in the interest of saving the time of the Senate this afternoon I have placed it in the RECORD. I may say, frankly, that it is impressive because of the confused state of mind in which it leaves one after he has read it. As a result of administrative decisions, the operation of the present law is very uneven.

During the past year, I point out, when the change was made in qualifications, some 79,000 men were discharged from active duty because of the raising of the mental requirements. It is true that one or two disciplinary barracks have been closed because of the higher quality, mentally, of the men who are now being taken into the service. But it must be obvious that that represents a shifting of the burden of liability for service. Not all of the 79,000 men who were dropped would have gone into disciplinary barracks; in fact, they were not in disciplinary barracks when they were released. They were doing the chores to which they were assigned. But when we get to the point that half the men who are registrants can look forward to not being called, it must be obvious that many men who are qualified do not share the burden equally with those who actually are called.

A Defense Department official—I think it was Mr. Finucane—testified that by the time they reach the age of 26, 9 out of 10 of those considered fit will have served in some capacity, but that situation will change in the next year by reason of the greater number of men who are coming on. It will be about 8 out of 10 of those who are regarded as fit under the new standards. Under the present rejection standards more than half the men have no prospect of being called. They will be eliminated by the increased standards.

It seems to me there are at least six ways in which the present law is defective. First, it is inequitable in its call. Second, it is inequitable in the reserve liability. Third, there is a failure to insure the meeting of the needs for scientific and technological talent. Fourth, there is a failure to get the most active duty service for the dollars spent, which could be had if there were longer periods of voluntary enlistment. Fifth, there is a waste in manpower by the use of men for jobs for which they are not employing their best talents. Sixth, there is an economic and social loss in the life of the individual himself.

I certainly agree with the statement of the chairman of the committee earlier this afternoon that it becomes an easy excuse to say that there is some moral delinquency or delinquency of youth which is perhaps charged to the operation of the draft law, but which ought not to be so charged. At the same time, I think that in some individual lives there may be created a recklessness in attitude because of the feeling: "Oh, well; I am going to be drafted shortly anyway." I think there may be a delay in making plans. There may be a delay in accepting jobs. Certainly there are young men today who cannot get jobs because when they go to a prospective employer, he asks them, "Where do you stand under the draft?" If a man is unable to give a firm answer the employer—particularly the employer of a small number of persons—cannot afford to take the liability of restoring a man to his job after he returns from the service, if he is to be taken away at just about the time he has learned his job. That is certainly an economic loss.

There is an effect upon the young man himself. While I would not charge, nor do I believe, that juvenile delinquency is primarily attributable to the draft law, I think that in the lives of some young men the attitude of recklessness or the devil-may-care attitude is created, which results in a lower moral standard or a lesser determination to accomplish something than would be the case if he felt he could plan his own life.

It is because there are at least those six areas in which there is an inequity or a loss to the Nation or a loss to the individual or a loss to society that I feel someone should be studying the manpower problem, taking a look at it prior to the time when the time arrives for renewal of the law on the floor of Congress. A commission should be created, as suggested in the pending amendment, which would report from time to time to the President, and ultimately present to the President its specific recommendations for improvement.

Let us not delude ourselves into believing that the country is unaware of the need for improvement of the Draft Act. There is a sort of hopelessness, a sort of feeling, "Well, there is nothing that I, individually, can do about it." I know that is expressed in some of the letters I receive. But other Members of the Senate must receive, as I do, letters which implore us to do something about this matter, letters which indicate that the people feel that we have a responsibility in connection with it.

Recognition that the act is not perfect at the present time was given even in the testimony of Lieutenant General Hershey, the Director of Selective Service. In the course of his prepared statement he said:

I feel uneasy over our manpower situation.

Mr. President, these statements by General Hershey were made in the course of the formal, prepared statement he presented to our committee. They were not made in response to questions. Instead, they were made in the course of his formal statement to the committee.

He also said:

Millions of our young men have been told they have little, if anything, to contribute to their Nation's defense—because of physical or mental conditions. Others, fewer in number, while deferred in the national interest, are not fitting themselves to meet the day when their lives and the Nation's survival may be at stake.

We are not doing all we should do in preparation against possible nuclear attack. Our training for civil defense lags. Our reserves must be made ready. Our need to do things in preparation is great. Many of them we are not doing.

Much needs to be done, but many are doing nothing. We cannot afford to waste our manpower. There are services vital to survival which do not require a man to wear a uniform. It will add immensely to our chances for survival if we find a way to induce our citizens to give those services, especially those who for various reasons cannot now make their contribution within the military forces.

Mr. President, I do not know how anyone could make a statement which I would endorse more than that one by General Hershey, nor could I offer a statement which would be better evidence of the need for a manpower study commission.

It seems to me that such a study by the proposed manpower commission is the least we can provide for. If we do not have the time that is needed—if we must consider a bill at hearings, one week, and must mark up the bill the next week, and the next day must bring up the bill on the floor of the Senate, before Members of the Senate who are not members of the committee can familiarize themselves with the testimony taken at the hearings—then the least we can do is establish a study commission on manpower, which will be charged with the responsibility of studying the operations of the act and the provisions of existing laws, and then coming forward with recommendations for the improvement of our handling of the most precious resource we have—namely, the young men of our country, upon whom we depend in time of crisis.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I intend to vote for the bill to extend the draft, without any weakening amendments.

I believe that today our military posture is so weak, and the determination of the administration to put money savings ahead of adequate defense is so strong, that at this time the Congress must demonstrate very definitely how it feels in rgard to the manpower problem. With each succeeding day the clock ticks off the minutes and brings nearer the end of the "count down" on meeting the Berlin crisis.

It is gratifying to be able to present a united front in our refusal to abandon West Berlin. I am sure that our allies are heartened by the unanimous voice of the leaders of Congress over our determination not to sacrifice this island of freedom to the Communists of East Berlin or of Moscow.

This month is the 20th anniversary of Hitler's repudiation of the agreement reached with Chamberlain at Munich. Hitler violated it and abrogated it in March 1939. No one in this country wants another Munich.

While we must be willing to negotiate at the foreign ministers level, or even at the summit, experience dictates that in dealing with the Communists, as in dealing with Hitler, the effectiveness of such talks depends, not on the strength of our arguments, but on the strength of our armaments.

It is far, far later than we think in preparing for this crisis. Precious weeks have been wasted, and millions of words have been spoken about our good intentions and our right to stay in Berlin under our treaties with the Russians. But intentions or treaty rights are not enough.

On Sunday, I listened with great interest to the "Meet the Press" program in which Defense Secretary McElroy was interviewed by an able panel of newspapermen. If the opinions voiced by the distinguished Secretary represent the thinking of this administration—the President, the Chiefs of Staff, and the civilian heads of the Department of Defense—then we are pursuing a policy of complacency that will weaken dangerously our hand in any negotiations, whether at the summit or elsewhere.

I was particularly surprised and disappointed to hear Secretary McElroy minimize the importance of having an adequate airlift instantly available, should an emergency result as Russia turns over to the East German Communist Government control of access to West Berlin.

If I correctly understood the plain import of his statement, then our present policy is to rely primarily upon the capabilities of the Strategic Air Command to deliver a hydrogen bomb as our answer to any resistance we might meet on the road to Berlin.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MUSKIE in the chair). Does the Senator from Oklahoma yield to the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield to my distinguished colleague, the Senator from Missouri, who long has advocated an adequate airlift, and for months has been the champion of that effort.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I thank my able colleague from Oklahoma. As is known by all Members of the Senate, he is the authority in this body on civil aviation.

I am very much interested in his reference to the program of last Sunday, in which the Secretary of Defense participated. My impression was that, in effect, the Secretary enunciated a reversal, and a return to the theory of massive retaliation, which was originated in January 1954, and later, to the best of my knowledge, was abandoned. Am I correct in my impression? Did the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma receive a similar impression?

Mr. MONRONEY. Yes; I was frightened and surprised to hear the Secretary of Defense imply that an end has come to our previous policy of trying, of attempting to confine any conflict to a limited war, and to use only conventional forces, if necessary, so as to make sure that world war III would not be triggered off. I believe such a change in policy to be very dangerous, indeed; and I thank my colleague, who apparently received the same impression that I did from the Secretary's interview. The clear implication was that the Secretary of Defense virtually rules out the concept of a limited conflict and the possible use of conventional forces, should the access road to Berlin be closed. Certainly that is the strong impression that I received.

As Mr. Reston, of the New York Times, so ably pointed out, that represents a reversal of our time-honored policy of trying to keep all conflicts in the limited war category and to use conventional forces, rather than all-out hydrogen warfare, with its catastrophic results. The only sane policy for the United States to follow is to prevent, rather than trigger, such a conflict.

I am alarmed by the growing evidence of the administration's neglect of our conventional ground forces, discussed so ably yesterday by the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS]. I submit that not only do we lack adequate forces to meet local emergencies, but we are not developing the airlift capability required to insure that we can rapidly and efficiently apply conventional forces at points of danger.

That is why the distinguished Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON], formerly the Secretary of the Air Force, not only has spoken eloquently, but also succeeded in having $140 million added to the appropriations made last year—as a result of his recognition of this very grave deficiency in our airlift capabilities.

A flagrant example of the failure to appreciate the importance of our military airlift potential is the postponement of the tactical airlift exercises—which were to be conducted jointly by the Military Air Transport Service and the Army, this month—due to lack of operational and maintenance funds in the MATS budget.

Now I yield to my distinguished colleague from Missouri.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, thanks to the very able chairman of the Armed Services Committee [Mr. RUSSELL], who happens to be present on the floor, and the able chairman of the Preparedness Investigating Subcommittee, the majority leader, we did put in the last appropriation bill an item for $140 million for airlift. That was done after extensive hearings, which my friend from Georgia will remember.

This administration, despite the possibility that something might happen, as has happened now with regard to Berlin, not only did not spend one cent of that money, but, at least up until a few days ago, had no plans for spending it. I am sure that is what the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma has reference to.

Mr. MONRONEY. I have. I think it is a shame that we have not developed a more adequate airlift with which to deliver forces at points of emergency. That aspect of defense has been completely disregarded, despite the determination of the very distinguished chairman of the Armed Services Committee and the distinguished Senator from Missouri. Now, in view of the neglect to spend the $140 million to make plans to buy the airplanes we need, the cancellation of the exercise to test the airlift capability which was scheduled for March seems to me to be reaching a new low in defense planning.

This exercise was to test the combat capabilities of the Military Air Transport Service to reach a simulated area of combat with men and supplies at the earliest possible moment. The exercise also was to include the calling up without notice of the planes and crews of regularly scheduled airlines and other nonscheduled carriers to supplement the MATS airlift on a reserve basis.

I do not believe that MATS ever has had a chance to engage in such pretraining for its combat mission. I further doubt that MATS will be able to handle efficiently, on a D-day basis, the vast number of movements required without the practice provided by such tactical exercises.

The Air Reserve fleet, composed of dozens of planes listed by airlines, and their crews, has never undergone such exercises to determine whether they could be assembled and placed on the job under simulated mobilization conditions.

This exercise is as essential to training the MATS organization as it is for the Marine Corps to train in amphibious landings, or for the infantry to engage in war games.

The current cancellation also bears out my feeling that the genuine mission of MATS, and its combat capabilities, has been subordinated to the job of running the world's largest airline to the neglect of its combat readiness. Actual training, under simulated emergency conditions, is necessary if MATS is to be ready for the herculean task that would be thrust upon it if a limited war should break out in some distant part of the world.

When I asked questions as to what it would cost, I was told it would run as high as $1 million. I pointed out that the planes are available, as are the crews and the pilots, in the MATS fleet. I pointed out everything is available except the scheduling of the exercises. I was told MATS could not afford it because it would require MATS airplanes to be in the air 8 hours a day, and they could not afford the cost out of the gasoline, maintenance, and operating funds which MATS has.

I expect we shall go along and be satisfied with an airlift that has never been tried under simulated combat conditions or that has never been tried so far as

supplying necessary equipment to support our troops as would be necessary if they had to be deployed in a trouble spot somewhere in the world.

It is my earnest hope that we can maintain conventional forces, and the airlift to deliver them, to provide an alternative both to doing nothing and to a hydrogen war. That is our choice today—to have nothing or to have a hydrogen bomb war—and I do not think America wants to make that choice.

America's airlift potential might be the determining force in peaceful settlement of the Berlin dispute. Yet we weaken our hand in the cold war for lack of the extra $1 million which would have been required for extra gasoline, maintenance, and other operating costs.

The dominating position occupied by Khrushchev does not arise from the strength of any moral position, nor from any treaty rights. It arises from Russia's apparent superiority both in the field of intercontinental ballistic missiles and of intermediate range ballistic missiles, and from their superiority in conventional ground forces in readiness.

For budgetary reasons we have taken a second place in the first category of weapons, and for manpower and budgetary reasons, a second place in conventional forces. Thus, we might be forced to a conference with the Communists at the real summit and the United States and free world in the valley.

We must not reduce our bargaining power further by continuing dangerous cuts in our military strength. By these economy moves, we run the risk of costs of millions of lives and hundreds of billions of dollars should our weakness lead to the outbreak of world war III.

The memory is too keen today of Munich and its disastrous results in accelerating, rather than preventing World War II, for us to follow the Chamberlain route and put a balanced budget ahead of balanced defense forces.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield to my distinguished colleague.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I think the Senator from Oklahoma has made a great contribution in this important field. The Secretary of Defense, as I understood him, said that the Joint Chiefs of Staff felt that the airlift we now have is adequate. I look forward to questioning members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff on that subject, as I do not believe that conclusion is accurate. Certainly, all the members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff do not think the airlift we now have available is adequate.

I should like to ask the Senator from Oklahoma if it is not possible that one of the reasons why the Secretary of Defense was forced to fall back to the theory of massive retaliation, as he did in last Sunday's telecast, was that he knows that our Army is neither mobile nor modernized. By "mobile" I mean capable of being moved by air, with their combat equipment and their support. In effect, the Secretary is now admitting that the only thing we are probably in a position to do, if the Russians push their aggression with regard to Berlin, would be to have a nuclear war. Is that what the Senator understood?

Mr. MONRONEY. That is exactly what I understood. The Secretary could not—and I was ashamed for him—tell Mr. Reston the number of divisions which would be available to NATO. If the Secretary of Defense does not know the number of divisions available to the free world, somebody ought to be doing night work and studying his lessons. If the Secretary of Defense does not know the small number of planes we have available for an airlift, somebody ought to be studying his lessons at night. If the Secretary does not know that the MATS organization has never been trained to move troops and equipment under emergency conditions, somebody ought to be studying at night and doing his lessons. America is in a distressing posture. We would go into a meeting in an even lower posture, whether it be a meeting of the foreign ministers or a meeting with Mr. Khrushchev, if we went to that meeting and had to look at two guns pointed at us, one being a deficiency in the missile field—which the Senator from Missouri has pointed out again and again—and the other gun being Russia's superiority in ground troops, with the capacity to have them in readiness.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield to my distinguished colleague.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, a few weeks ago the Chief of Naval Operations, Admiral Burke, made a talk in which he said that in all probability the next war would not be a nuclear war. The President of the United States went out of his way later on to single out that talk for praise. At least by implication, it would appear that he was agreeing with the statement of the Chief of Naval Operations, Admiral Burke, that the next war in all probability would not be nuclear war.

Last Sunday the Secretary of Defense implied that if there were a war in all probability it would be a nuclear war.

I should like to ask my friend from Oklahoma, who has had more experience in the House of Representatives and the Senate of the United States than most, does he think the American people have a right, as they approach these problems from the standpoint of "We will not give an inch" to at least be clear as to whether this administration believes we should have a nuclear war in case we have to live up to our commitments or believes we should not have a nuclear war in case we have to live up to our commitments?

Does the Senator agree that we should not have conflicting statements particularly on such vital matters emanating from high civilian and military authorities of the Government?

Mr. MONRONEY. It seems to me instead of confusing our opponents, the Communists, we are confusing ourselves. It depends upon which paper we read whether we are going to be ready and prepared for the beginning of world war III—for the beginning of the awful and catastrophic type of world war III we have historically sought to prevent and, in the event of hostilities, have sought to limit.

I think the only implication we can take from the statement of the Secretary of Defense is that we are putting our loaded six-shooter on the table, when there is an argument about whether deuces were wild or were not wild on the last hand.

I certainly feel that this is no time to be creating an aura of uncertainty. The President in his press conference opposed the cries on the floor of the Senate for even a slight mobilization of our Reserves and for a discontinuance of the reduction of the Marine Corps, about which the able Senator from Missouri has spoken, as being saber rattling. I would rather rattle Marine Corps sabers than do atomic muscle flexing such as was done on the program by the distinguished Secretary of Defense. Which is the more dangerous? Is it more dangerous to call up a few Marines Reserves and to stop decimating those we have, or to have the Secretary of Defense so clearly imply—as I thought he did, and as I believe everyone who heard him to whom I have talked felt he did—that our reliance is on nuclear weapons if it becomes necessary to keep open the road to Berlin.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I concur with the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma and congratulate him for the clarity and soundness of the position he has taken this afternoon. Not too long ago one of the finest generals of the Army stated that we did not have half enough airlift capacity to handle a single local or limited defense action abroad. The general has now been retired from the Army. It is obvious that if we do not have half enough capacity to handle one problem in one place it would be relatively difficult to handle two or three problems in two or three places. Such a situation may well be what we shall soon face.

Mr. MONRONEY. And which the Secretary of Defense only Sunday said was a possibility we might face.

Mr. SYMINGTON. The Senator is correct.

I hope the able Senator from Oklahoma, who has been such a champion of military airlift, as well as a champion of an adequate civilian airlift, will continue to present this problem to the American people. In my opinion we are as short of airlift as we are of any other vitally needed defense equipment.

Mr. MONRONEY. I thank my distinguished colleague. I appreciate his leadership in this field as he has so ably demonstrated it in his support of the appropriation which was frozen.

Incidentally, while the armed services secured the $140 million for airlift, it is said that we cannot afford to spend the money. We can afford, however, three $5 million 707 jet planes which can be "plushed up" and used one for the President, one for the Secretary of State, and one in reserve.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield to me I should like to state it was the committee under the chairmanship of the distinguished senior Senator from New Mexico which took the action to which I have referred. Thanks to the leadership of the Senator from New Mexico, the committee approved the $140 million for the airlift. I was a junior member of that committee. Though the action had the full approval of the committee, not one cent of the money was expended. I believe that is a correct statement.

Mr. CHAVEZ. That is the point I wanted to make. Someone is at fault, but surely it is not the Congress of the United States. The committee was not the only group to take that action. There was a unanimous judgment of the committee, and the Senate of the United States provided the airlift, which was supposed to be necessary.

Of course, all we can do is make the money available. We cannot make the administration spend the money, and it did not.

I feel that the Senator from Oklahoma is making a very great contribution. The best point is the fact that Congress itself has never been reluctant to proceed.

Mr. MONRONEY. The Congress is charged under the Constitution with the duty of raising armies and supporting them. That job has been done with the help of the Subcommittee on Defense Appropriations, under the chairmanship of the distinguished Senator from New Mexico. Yet there is a production line at Long Beach, Calif., manufacturing the most modern cargo planes which our military people have today, operating on a half-time basis. The crisis in Berlin is not approaching us on a half-time basis; it is coming with the speed of sound. No one in the Pentagon, apparently, recognizes the present danger or is taking steps to meet it.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I should like to go a little further than the Senator is going in the present discussion. The Congress tried to provide, as was necessary, support for the National Guard. All the previous wars have been fought by men from the National Guard, from all the States of the country, and by men from the Reserves. So far as the Pentagon is concerned, those forces would be cut down, notwithstanding the fact that Congress provided enough money in the appropriation bill to take care of 400,000 National Guardsmen, whom the services are now trying to cut down to 370,000. The same is true with respect to the Reserve forces.

This not only affects missiles and airlift, but it affects the National Guard and the Reserves, which mean so much to the defense of our country, to our security, and the security of the individual States.

Mr. MONRONEY. I appreciate very much what the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee has said. I only wish there were some way the Congress could make known the feeling which I believe is almost unanimous on both sides of the aisle, that this administration must wake up; that it is later than we think; that America's danger is present, and upon us.

The best way to meet the problem is by beginning to at least get our muscles in a state of activity, so that we will have a position from which to bargain at the summit or at the foreign ministers' conference, instead of occupying a position of abject weakness.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield to my distinguished friend from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG. In line with the argument the Senator is making, I wonder if the Senator agrees we should seek to avoid having to be constantly threatening to engage in a thermonuclear war. Such a war is likely to be a war of complete extermination of both sides. For us to go along reducing our conventional strength, leaving ourselves in the position where we may have to resort to desperate means, constantly putting ourselves at a greater and greater disadvantage, may cause an aggressor to feel we are only bluffing. When we talk about engaging in the ultimate war of extermination between two nations, any person should be and would be extremely reluctant to take such a step as that, and that is true of the Soviet Union as well as of this country.

Mr. MONRONEY. Anycne who does that may be called upon to put up or shut up at some place in the discussion.

Mr. LONG. Yes.

Mr. MONRONEY. I do not believe that a religious country such as America, with the background of never having fired the first shot in a war, is going to be the first country to release the horror of the catastrophic deaths of tens of millions of people to keep the road open to Berlin. I should like to see us maintain a capacity to keep the road open to Berlin with conventional weapons and with an airlift, if necessary, because I would back up West Berlin. However, we fence ourselves in a corner from which there is no escape, when the Secretary of Defense talks about the overwhelming manpower superiority of the Sino-Russian group and admits our only weapon which might equal them is thermonuclear warfare.

Certainly Russia is not going to ignore the ability to put several divisions of good, well-equipped and well-prepared troops in the field, or to airlift other troops, equipped and ready to fight, in a Berlin emergency.

We do not have to go to the catastrophic route which would insure the outbreak of hydrogen world war III, but we have put more emphasis on a balanced budget than we have on a balanced national defense. Before it is too late, almost daily on the floor of the Senate I think we must call attention to the failures which we are experiencing, to keep this Nation strong enough to sit down with Khrushchev on a basis approaching equality, and bargain for the kind of open avenue to Berlin which will maintain treaty rights and the moral and ethical right we have to keep our troops there.

Mr. LONG. The Senator heard the President's state of the Union message, as I did. I gathered that the logic of that message related to limited wars, and that the President was suggesting that we should try, if possible, to limit the size of any war which might break out. I hope he did not have in mind that the only way to limit it would be by our losing.

Mr. MONRONEY. Or by another Munich. This month is the 20th anniversary of Munich. We know from experience that when Chamberlain went to Munich, Hitler had the vision. He had an air corps. He had in being a tank corps, and Mr. Chamberlain and his umbrella made what he hoped would be "peace in our time." That was on September 30, 1938. Yet 6 months later, on March 15, Hitler completely abrogated the treaty of Munich and began his march.

We know that conferences are not won by weakness, and that no matter how great the diplomatic ability of our negotiators, when the chips are down, the question which is decisive is, "How many divisions have we? Can we get them there ready to fight at the point of attack?" I do not wish to rely, as the Secretary of Defense apparently does, on only one weapon, namely, the hydrogen bomb and the Strategic Air Command.

Mr. LONG. Is it not usually the case, in conferences between two contending sides as far apart as communism and capitalism happen to be, the side which wins the conference is the side which has the most power when it goes into the conference?

Mr. MONRONEY. I agree completely with my distinguished colleague.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDENT'S PLAN FOR LIMITATION OF OIL IMPORTS

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I call the attention of the Senate to the program announced by the President for limitation on the importation of petroleum and its products into the United States.

I read from a press dispatch which has recently been written:

President Eisenhower today ordered mandatory controls on imports of crude, unfinished, and finished oil products.

The new order replaces a system of voluntary import controls which expires at midnight. Domestic producers complained the voluntary program failed and forced them to cut back their own production.

Capt. Matthew V. Carson, who will administer the new program, said it provides that, starting tomorrow, no crude or unfinished oils may be imported into the United States unless by authorization of the Secretary of Interior.

Effective April 1, he said, no finished products, including residual oil used for burning, may be imported except by Government authorization.

Carson said finished products such as gasoline and jet fuel will be limited to 1957 levels. The program should substantially decrease the amount of oil and oil products imported into this country in the past.

The order was issued after the New York Stock Exchange had closed for the day.

The President said the great majority in the oil industry had cooperated with the Government in the voluntary quota system.

But some importers, he said, had made it necessary to apply mandatory controls.

"The new program," Eisenhower said, "is designed to insure a stable, healthy industry in the United States capable of exploring for and developing new hemisphere reserves to replace those being depleted."

The President said national security requirements made it necessary to adopt the controls. A surplus of oil, he said, has disrupted free world markets and would have spread to the United States except for the cutbacks in domestic production.

"Voluntary controls have been and a mandatory control will be flexibly administered with the twin aims of sharing our large and growing market on an equitable basis with other producing areas and avoiding disruption of normal patterns of international trade," Eisenhower said.

Carson said he did not believe the new program, of itself, would force price increases to motorists and consumers of fuel oil.

Eisenhower instructed the civil and defense mobilizer Leo Hoegh to advise him if price increases occur while the program is in effect and whether such increases are necessary to protect national security.

The new program announced by the President is the result of much study by the President's Cabinet Committee and has been concurred in by the President. I sincerely hope that it will work.

I hope that the industry and all concerned will make every effort to insure the successs of the President's program. Certainly that will be my purpose.

If this program does not work, I believe the Congress itself must assume the responsibility to pass legislation that, by law, will limit total petroleum imports to the 1954 ratio between such imports and domestic production.

This program is in response to the authority and direction of the Congress on this subject first passed as an amendment to the extension of the Trade Agreements Act of 1955. This act was further amended in the extension of 1958.

The Congress passed these two laws in lieu of proposals that were being made to the Congress for a more definite and specific restriction on these imports. I supported each of these proposals with the hope that, although they were not as specific as I had proposed, the solution to this problem could be accomplished through administrative effort.

I have been disappointed that the voluntary program established by the President did not accomplish this purpose. In fact, despite administration efforts, imports continued to increase under this system instead of decrease. As a matter of fact, currently imports are at an all-time high level.

At the time the first of the amendments attempting to establish this method was passed by the Congress in 1955, total imports were then in the neighborhood of 1¼ million barrels. Currently, total imports are more than 2 million barrels a day.

After a long and earnest study by the President's Cabinet Committee, resulting in a report in 1955, that Committee said imports in excess of their relationship to production that existed in 1954 would be harmful to the security of this country. Currently, imports are far in excess of this relationship.

Past experience has shown the voluntary approach is not effective. Thus, it is encouraging that the President has made the program mandatory and included refined products.

It is being reported that there is great consternation in our Western Hemisphere neighbors over establishment of this program. It is argued that such a program would have seriously damaging effects on the petroleum industries of Canada and Venezuela and as a result bring about reduced revenues to these countries.

I would like to point out that the current program does not determine where a company may purchase its foreign crude. If a company which has been importing oil from the Middle East would decide to shift its source of supply to Canada or Venezuela, there would be nothing in the program to forbid him to do so.

During the past year, however, the trend has been in the opposite direction, not because of any program instigated by the United States, but because economic advantage dictated that the cheaper Eastern Hemisphere crudes be substituted for previous purchases of Canadian and Venezuelan oil.

In 1957 importing companies brought into the United States 151,000 barrels daily of crude oil from Canada. During the last few months, however, these imports have declined to around 65,000 barrels daily. This reduction in the amount of oil imported from Canada has a direct relationship to the price paid for Canadian oil and that imported from the Middle and Far East.

This preference for foreign crude oil other than from Canada is even more pronounced when you consider that in 1957 imports into the west coast from Canada totaled 95,000 barrels daily. In 1958, this total dropped to 25,000 barrels daily despite the fact the Government's crude oil allocation for companies in that area normally importing from Canada was more than 75,000 barrels daily. In the last quarter of 1958 imports from Canada into the west coast totaled only 11,000 barrels daily, more than 65,000 barrels daily below the allocation. This decline took place despite the fact two of the importing companies have pipelines from Canada to their refinery gates.

Correspondingly, imports of crude oil from Venezuela were 531,000 barrels daily in 1957 and 433,000 in 1958. Whereas such imports from the Eastern Hemisphere increased from 304,000 in 1957 to 407,000 barrels daily in 1958. During the last 2 years, imports of refined products have steadily increased from all foreign sources.

The domestic industry has very greatly deteriorated—in direct relationship to the increase in these excessive imports—until today the ability of the domestic producer to drill needed wells has been greatly restricted and the number of wells drilled has, during this period, been greatly reduced. The trend has been fewer and fewer wells each year at a time when our demand is increasing. In Kansas, alone, in 1958, 700 fewer wells were drilled than in 1954.

Mr. President, again I state I sincerely hope the program will work.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CARLSON. I yield.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, can the Senator inform me how the present mandatory plan will compare, in the volume of the importation, with the 1954 ratio?

Mr. CARLSON. I regret to state that I cannot answer the Senator's question exactly. However, if I understand correctly, it goes back, according to the statement, to the 1954 level, with some exceptions.

Mr. LONG. As I understand, it would permit, according to the Senator's statement, a level of jet fuel and gasoline in line with the 1957 import quotas.

Mr. CARLSON. Finished products and jet fuels would be on the 1957 basis, but crude would go back to the 1954 level.

Mr. LONG. Ever since the plan to control imports was put into effect, as the Senator knows, the plan did not control finished products, and there were tremendous increases in the importation of finished products from that date forward. I wonder how the overall ratio would compare with the 1954 situation, and what percent the new mandatory plan would control.

Mr. CARLSON. I should like to read the first sentence of the press release:

President Eisenhower today ordered mandatory controls on imports of crude, unfinished, and finished oil products.

Knowing the junior Senator from Louisiana and his interest in this subject, having served with him on the Committee on Finance, I can state that he and I are in accord on this matter. I certainly hope that the new program will take care of the problem.

Mr. LONG. I hope it is in line with what Congress has recommended and with what the President's Cabinet Committee has recommended.

Mr. CARLSON. I agree. He and I have discussed this subject both in committee and on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. LONG. I commend the Senator for his statement.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CARLSON. I yield.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I appreciate the statement made by the distinguished Senator from Kansas. The administration has taken the right step in ordering mandatory controls. Many of us from States where the production of oil is a major industry have seen that industry decline and tens of thousands of people thrown out of employment by the flood of foreign oil importations. At first the administration put into effect some voluntary controls, which I believe was in the middle of 1957. As the distinguished Senator from Kansas has said, the voluntary import program did not work, because some oil companies did not voluntarily go along with the restrictions on their imports.

Does the Senator from Kansas have the figures showing how the imports will be limited?

Mr. CARLSON. No; I regret to state that I have just picked this statement off the ticker. Therefore I have no actual knowledge as to distribution of the

quotas. However, as has been stated in the colloquy with the Senator from Louisiana, I sincerely hope it will take care not only of the crude and finished and unfinished products, but that we will get back to somewhere near the 1954 basis.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I do not know of any person in an oil-producing State who wishes to cut off entirely the importation of oil, and thereby eliminate our trade with other nations. However, the importation of petroleum and petroleum products has gone forward at such an accelerated rate in the past 3 or 4 years, that the petroleum industry, particularly the independent producers, who have created the competitive situation in this country which permits American motorists to buy gasoline at 30 cents a gallon, whereas in Italy the motorist must pay 75 cents a gallon—and this in spite of the fact that the refineries are near the sources of supply in the Middle East—have been seriously injured by the flood of oil imports.

I wish to commend the administration for ordering mandatory controls. However, unless the mandatory controls are followed by restrictions on the domestic market, there will still be need to impose mandatory controls on the amount received from foreign producers; and as a cosponsor of the O'Mahoney bill I would urge the enactment of that bill to permit Congress to declare the degree of mandatory controls, unless the Executive order is enforced. Therefore, I believe it is still incumbent to pass a law to provide mandatory controls. Nevertheless the step the administration has taken is a step in the right direction, and is a step which many of us have long advocated. Therefore I commend the administration for taking this step. I hope the effect will be not to stop all foreign trade, but to cut the situation back to about to where it was 2 or 3 years ago before the tremendous flood of oil came into this country.

Mr. CARLSON. I thoroughly agree with the statement made by the distinguished Senator from Texas. Personally I have always favored voluntary controls. I have always hoped that they would work. In view of the fact that apparently we must have mandatory controls, I hope that the mandatory controls will be effective, particularly for this reason, namely, that they can be changed under Executive order. If Congress acts, on the other hand—and it may well have to act in the matter—a change is more difficult to bring about. For that reason I hope we can have the cooperation of the oil companies with the Executive order.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CARLSON. I yield.

Mr. ALLOTT. I wish to commend the Senator from Kansas for his statement on the proposed legislation, and to commend the President for acting in this situation.

This is a situation which all of us who live in oil-producing States know has been getting worse with the passing months. It is unfortunate that a comparatively few oil companies have thwarted the voluntary oil importation program, including that of finished products.

I believe the most significant statement in my opinion, and the one that I should like to underscore, if I may, with respect to this program, is the fact that during this period new exploration for oil and new wells drilled have dropped fantastically in the last 3 or 4 years. That situation is applicable not alone to the oil industry, but also to the mineral industry in general. The development of known reserves of minerals, and the searching out of mineral reserves and the finding of new reserves of minerals have fallen off, primarily because of the rather sick condition of our mineral industry in general. The same thing applies to the oil industry. I particularly underscore and applaud what the Senator has said with respect to the fact that the effect of all of this has not been just to make it hard on our independent oil companies to compete, and has made it hard on the whole oil industry, but that it has also served to stop exploration for new reserves in this country, which, in my opinion, is one of the worst effects it could possibly have.

Mr. CARLSON. I compliment the Senator from Colorado for the statement he has made. He is familiar with our problem in the Midwest, and we in the Midwest know how much the importation of oil has affected drilling, which is important not only for the future of the Nation but for our national defense as well. The Senator from Colorado has always taken a very active interest in this problem, and I commend him for it.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CARLSON. I yield.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I commend the distinguished Senator from Kansas upon the excellent statement he has made. I should like to ask him if the Presidential order imposing mandatory quotas applies to the imports of residual oil.

Mr. CARLSON. I read from the release, which is all I have to speak from:

> Effective April 1, no finished products, including residual oil used for burning, may be imported except by Government authorization.

That is all I have on the subject.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I thank the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kansas yield?

Mr. CARLSON. I yield.

Mr. GORE. The distinguished junior Senator from Kansas has called to the attention of the Senate an important action by the President of the United States. I do not wish at the moment to express any view with respect to this action except to call to the attention of the Senator from Kansas the fact that the foreign tax credit operates as a subsidy to the processing and importation of oil from foreign sources. This tax loophole, this tax favoritism, is a subject to which Congress should give immediate attention. Not only does it affect oil; it affects the operations of many of our corporations in the foreign field.

The able Senator from Kansas and I serve on the Committee on Finance together. He and I together have learned of tax returns which show that some corporations have been making millions of dollars a year in foreign operations, but are paying not a single dollar to the United States Government in taxes. I hope this disclosure will serve to call attention to the unjustified treatment of profits earned in foreign countries.

Mr. CARLSON. The distinguished junior Senator from Tennessee has brought up a subject which has received considerable discussion in the Committee on Finance. I assure him it will have more. The Senator from Tennessee is entitled to much credit for pursuing this matter diligently, not only in the committee but outside the committee. I commend him for it.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kansas yield?

Mr. CARLSON. I yield.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I again commend the distinguished junior Senator from Kansas for his original report and for his comment on the situation, which is brought to the attention of the Senate again by the distinguished junior Senator from Tennessee.

We know the nature of the arrangement worked out in Saudi Arabia between the Arabian-American Oil Co. and the Government of Saudi Arabia. The company pays no royalties, but is taxed at the rate of 50 percent of its production. That 50 percent, by arrangement with the U.S. Government, is credited on the income tax in the United States. So although ordinary corporations in the United States pay a 52-percent tax on income; while domestic independent oil producers in the United States pay a 52-percent tax on their income; the tax on the income paid to the United States by Aramco is 2 percent.

We sent our Navy and Air Force to that region to protect the investment of Aramco, but their taxpayment to the U.S. Government, if anything, is not in excess of 2 percent. Is that not correct?

Mr. CARLSON. The Senator from Texas has well expressed the situation. I assure him it will receive greater consideration in the committee.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Therein lies a great injustice. It works to the detriment of the small, independent companies in the United States. The companies producing oil in foreign countries are not paying their fair share of taxes to the United States. They are paying virtually no taxes to this country. It is an unfair condition. I hope Congress will remedy it before the end of the session.

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kansas yield?

Mr. CARLSON. I yield.

Mr. McGEE. I should like to join with those who have complimented the Senator from Kansas on his contribution to the solution of a problem which is important to many portions of our land and, I think, to the Nation as a whole.

In my State of Wyoming, where oil provides us with our largest single income, it is also critical in the State's economy. In the matter of the last 3 or 4 days, I have just learned, from a quick swing around the State, and can report first hand, if any more reporting is needed, that the independent producers in particular are suffering because of what has been the policy of the Government up to this time. We hope we can pursue this effort, because of what is suggested by implication in the mandatory policy outlined by the administration.

We compliment the Senator from Kansas for his presentation, and the administration for its stand on the problem.

I call attention to that which the Senator from Kansas knows even better than I; namely, that when the chips are down, as we say, we cannot, on the floor of the Senate, suddenly announce that we must have more oil, when we are cut off from our overseas supply of oil. Oil is brought in only after many years of exploration. For that reason, we must plan ahead.

We stress again the importance of projecting a farseeing policy which will not find us wanting or cut short in days of a more critical nature which may face us 2, 5, or 10 years from now.

I wish to associate myself with this meritorious action today.

Mr. CARLSON. The Senator from Wyoming has very well described the situation which prevails in all the oil-producing States. In the interest of the welfare of the Nation and from the standpoint of its defense and economy it is important that we have a program which will permit continued exploration for oil.

EXTENSION OF THE UNIVERSAL MILITARY TRAINING AND SERVICE ACT

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I should like to ask the distinguished senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] what is the parliamentary plan of the leadership for tonight?

Mr. RUSSELL. I regret to advise the distinguished Senator from Oregon that I have not discussed it with the leadership. Earlier in the day it was suggested by the leadership that it was hoped to conclude action on this bill today and to make the Hawaiian statehood bill the unfinished business. Whether that is still the plan of the leadership, I am not advised.

The Senator from Oregon can suggest the absence of a quorum, get the majority leader to the floor, confer with him and the leader of the minority, and perhaps obtain a more definitive statement of the aims and purposes of the leadership. I have not consulted with the leadership concerning how long it is planned to have the Senate remain in session this evening.

I apprehended, when I saw the podium placed over the desk of the Senator from Oregon, that it might take some little time longer to conclude action on the bill than I had hoped. I say that without disparaging the quality of the Senator's remarks, which are always erudite and informative.

Mr. MORSE. I should be glad to accommodate the Senator from Georgia and have him listen to my speech tomorrow.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I think I can say with some authority that it was hoped to finish action on the draft bill today and to make the Hawaiian statehood bill the next order of business for tomorrow. The order to have the Senate convene at 10 o'clock tomorrow has already been agreed to.

Let me respectfully ask the distinguished Senator from Oregon whether he anticipates speaking at considerable length.

Mr. MORSE. Well, the word "considerable" is a very flexible one. I shall speak at some length.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Let me ask, with all proper deference, whether the Senator from Oregon will speak for more than 1 hour?

Mr. MORSE. At the present time I expect to speak for an hour, and I do not know how much longer. That will depend on what develops during that time.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Would the Senator's remarks possibly last 2 hours?

Mr. MORSE. The best judgment I can give the Senator from Illinois is that my remarks will take at least 1 hour. But I want the Senator from Illinois to understand that I am not making any commitments or giving any assurances.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I do not want commitments or assurances; but I thought that, for the convenience of all Members, it might be well to have the Senator from Oregon state what he anticipates.

Mr. MORSE. That is why I said that, only for the convenience of the Members—since it is now 6 p.m.—the leadership might wish to have the action on the bill concluded tomorrow.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Will the Senator from Oregon yield, without losing the floor, in order that I may suggest the absence of a quorum—in the hope that we can take a moment to dispose of this question?

Mr. MORSE. Only for future reference, because I have no expectation of participating in debate of that kind. But in order to avoid the establishment of a precedent which might be cited in the future, I should like to obtain a parliamentary ruling on the question of whether, if I yield at this point, what I have said thus far will count as one speech by me on the bill?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MUSKIE in the chair). That might be prevented by the giving of unanimous consent that it not be counted as one speech.

Mr. MORSE. I understand that the Senator from Illinois will ask unanimous consent that I not lose my right to the floor if I yield for the suggestion of the absence of a quorum.

Let me make it perfectly clear that I do not intend to engage in a prolonged debate on this subject. But, Mr. President, in my 15 years in the Senate I have never had as heavy a heart as I have when I speak tonight.

So far as I am concerned, it makes no whit or bit of difference to me how many Senators remain to listen to my remarks, because I shall be speaking for the RECORD. But, as the leadership knows, I always try to accommodate my colleagues, particularly when the hour is late.

Unless there is some reason why the bill must be voted on tonight, then, for the accommodation of my colleagues, I suggest that I make my speech tonight, and that the vote on the bill be taken tomorrow. I am always willing to enter into such an understanding.

But before any vote on the bill is taken, I wish to state, for the RECORD, some of the facets of the subject matter. I propose to raise them in the course of my speech tonight, as a member of the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate, because I believe the RECORD should show perfectly clearly that, at least, these points were raised before the vote on the bill was taken.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, at this point will the Senator from Oregon yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the distinguished Senator from Oregon may be permitted to let a quorum call intervene, and that he will not thereby lose the floor, and that such remarks as he has made and the fact that he has been recognized by the Chair will not constitute recognition for the purpose of one speech, under the Senate rule.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Then, Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Oregon yield to the Senator from Texas?

Mr. MORSE. I yield, provided I do not lose the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I am informed that the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] desires to speak on the pending amendment. The yeas and nays have been ordered on the question of agreeing to this amendment. The Senate will also take a yea-and-nay vote on the question of the passage of the bill.

I am informed that the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] will speak at some length.

Therefore, in view of the fact that there has already been entered an order for the Senate to convene at 10 a. m. tomorrow, I believe I should announce,

for the information of the Senate, that we do not expect to have any yea-and-nay votes taken this evening. We expect to have the Senate vote as early as possible tomorrow on the amendment of the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], and then to proceed with the further consideration of the bill.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I shall proceed when there is order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order.

COMPARABLE ISSUES DEBATED IN 1948

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, as I said a few minutes ago, I speak with a heavier heart tonight than at any other time when I have risen on this floor for a discussion of any subject matter in my 15 years of service in the Senate.

In 1948 we also had before the Senate a bill for the extension of the draft. I shall not take the time of the Senate to read all the excerpts from a series of three speeches which I made in 1948 in that debate.

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] is present. I remember very well that I was sitting on his side of the aisle at that time. We discussed some of the same issues that I intend to raise in this debate in 1959, which present an interesting comparison, and also show, sadly enough, how little we have progressed in the field of this subject matter since 1948.

At that time, as a member of the Armed Services Committee, I offered a series of amendments. The RECORD shows that in connection with the subject matter of some of those amendments, we reached some compromise positions here on the floor. The chairman of the Armed Services Committee, as the RECORD shows, was kind enough to express his gratitude and appreciation for my position and the help I sought to render in respect to some of the 1948 problems.

In order to save time from any lengthy reference now by way of quotations from the 1948 RECORD, I ask unanimous consent that there may be published as a part of this speech certain excerpts from the debate in 1948 on the issue of extending the draft at that time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, it is a rather fitting background to the speech that I shall make tonight to take the Senate back to the RECORD of June 9, 1948, in the course of which speech I said:

I desire to say at the outset, Mr. President, that I hope I have made clear that I think a draft is necessary in order to meet an emergency in international affairs which I believe exists at the present time. Unless I were convinced that a serious emergency exists, I know of nothing that could possibly persuade me to vote for a draft in peacetime. I said a few moments ago in colloquy with the Senator from Maryland that I believe the draft bill should be put into effect now and that we should not wait for any future declaration of the President for putting it into effect, because after spending the weeks that those of us in the Armed Services Committee spent, both in public hearings and in executive conferences, with men high in our Government, including both civilian and military officials of our Government, I reached the conclusion—and it was very difficult for me to reach it, for I would like wishfully to think that there is no real danger of war—that there is actually a great danger of war. If I did not think there was a great danger of war at the present time I would not vote for any draft bill.

I am inclined to think a great many millions of American people are enjoying a false sense of security in America tonight, because I am one who honestly believes that our defenses are so weak today that our national security demands their strengthening as rapidly as we can possibly strengthen them. Why do I say that, Mr. President? I say that because in my judgment the record of Soviet Russia since V–J Day is clearly a record of noncooperation with the United Nations in the interests of promoting world peace.

Furthermore, I think the record of Soviet Russia certainly raises the presumption that she does not have friendly intentions toward the United States. Therefore, it is my opinion that unless we proceed to make ourselves sufficiently strong to protect our national security and enforce the peace, if necessary, we may wake up in the not-too-distant future to discover that Russia is taking aggressive acts toward us that will force upon us a state of war.

On the other hand, Mr. President, I am convinced that if the American people will unite behind a program for the strengthening of our national security to the point that we can defend the peace, that will greatly alter Russia's attitude and policies in the field of international relations.

Therefore, I lay that down as the major premise of this speech. I reiterate it in this sentence: I am supporting a draft in peacetime because I am convinced that a strengthening of our national security is necessary in order to make perfectly clear to Russia that we shall remain united in a determination to resist any aggressive attitude or policies or acts on her part toward disrupting world peace.

The second premise to which I wish to move in this argument is that I am also cognizant of the fact that an emergency never remains in a status quo condition. Human events and international events do not stand still. I think we must face the fact most solemnly tonight that we are either going in the next 2 or 3 years to solve most of the problems that are endangering the peace of the world today or by the end of that time we shall find ourselves much nearer to war than we are even tonight.

I digress from the quotation to say that not long after that we were in the Korean war.

To continue from my speech of June 9, 1948:

I shall put that in a different way, because unless that viewpoint of mine is understood, it is impossible to understand my position on the pending bill or on the amendment. I restate it this way: I do not think that human events or international relations ever stand still. We are moving in the direction of something. We are going to move in the direction of something during the next 2 or 3 years so far as international relations are concerned, and that something is going to be either more peaceful relations with Soviet Russia or more warlike relations with Soviet Russia.

I do not take, and have never taken, the position that the full responsibility for working in the direction of peace at the present time rests upon Soviet Russia. I think we also have a great responsibility. I think it is too easy for us to see ourselves as we like to think we are, and it is too easy to see the Russians as we imagine them to be. I believe there are many things we must do in international conferences, in our relations with Russia, which we have been inclined stubbornly to resist in some of our international conferences with Russia. I think we must get over the idea of giving to the American people the impression that we are completely right and Russia is completely wrong on all matters.

I am convinced that the record is perfectly clear that the overwhelming responsibility for the strained relations existing between those two great powers has been Russia's noncooperation in the United Nations and in international conferences in Europe. We have only to look to her negative attitude and the constant use of the veto to establish my point.

I think it is also clear that there is considerable evidence available to us at this time that was not available as short a time as 120 days ago. That is not a long time. The Russian leaders finally started to understand that they could push our country just so far until we would finally say, "that is as far as we shall go." I think Russia is beginning to read the stop signs which we have placed on the highway of international relations. I think one of those stop signs which has had a very persuasive and convincing effect upon the Russian leaders is the action we have already taken in the Congress of the United States in connection with national security. I believe Russia discovered that we meant business, so far as defending ourselves and strengthening ourselves so that we could defend the peace, when we voted appropriations for a great increase in the Air Force.

I think Russia read another stop sign when it learned we intended to vote the necessary appropriations for Navy improvement.

I think Russia read another stop sign, Mr. President, when it realized we were going to pass in this session of Congress substantial military manpower legislation.

I believe, Mr. President—and this is the third premise I want to lay down—that Russia will thoroughly understand that a draft bill passed at this session of Congress, with a provision in it that it will not be continued after 2 years, without affirmative action of the Congress, and that we shall not take men for more than 18 months, if my amendment should be adopted, will be a strong indication that we intend to remain united in support of an adequate national defense program, but at the same time, to frame a law and pass it in a form which also shows that we are working for peace and not for war.

That is why, Mr. President, I fought yesterday as hard as I did for the adoption of an amendment which would require affirmative action on the part of Congress after 2 years. I said in the course of my speech in support of that amendment that I felt a 2-year provision instead of a 5-year provision would serve clear notice not only on Russia, but on our friends in freedom-loving countries, that we do not have any intention to build up over a 5-year period or a longer period a powerful military machine, with the danger that once it is put into operation it may follow the course which military machines have so frequently followed in the course of history, of ultimately leading countries into war because of the power of the military machine itself. I said, in the course of my speech in support of that amendment, that in the United States we need to guard against the development of a military psychology. We need to recognize always that there is a clear line of distinction between preparedness to protect the national security of the Nation and preparedness to conduct a war. I want to repeat that, Mr. President, because that sentence, too, sheds a great deal of light on my thinking about our Military Establishment. There is a great difference between developing military preparedness necessary to protect the national security of the

country and developing a military preparedness program for war.

I think we must constantly recognize that our self-assurance that our ideals and objectives are peaceful is not always shared by peoples in other countries. We have only to go to other countries to hear disturbing and alarming discussions with reference to American imperialism and American military plans and objectives. We can travel in parts of Europe today and find people who are convinced that it is only a matter of time before they will be caught in the middle of a war between Russia and the United States. Although we know we seek only peace, that is not agreed to and accepted as a fact by a great many people, who are not in the satellite countries, but are in countries which are still free and friendly to the United States.

What I am trying to point out in this part of my remarks is that we have a duty, it seems to me, in the interest of peace, to develop a draft law which will strike that happy balance, giving to us the manpower protection we need to protect the national security and prepare us to defend ourselves in case of aggressive attack, and the type of manpower legislation which might create the impression, and would be inclined to create it, that our endeavor is not an endeavor to prepare for peace, but to prepare for war. There is quite a difference.

Mr. President, that was June 9, 1948. Those words are as applicable today.

In an analysis of some of the things which have and have not happened since 1948, there will be found at least part of the explanation as to why the world tonight is alarmed about the possibility of war.

There were other statements in the debate of 1948, which, under the agreement I have already obtained, Mr. President, I shall put in the RECORD later. I shall discuss them in the light of some of the things which have transpired in the last few weeks in the Congress, through the briefings we have received in the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate. They give me great cause for concern as to whether America's policies will avoid war.

Now is the time to analyze America's policies, irrespective of the tempo of public opinion and disregarding the propaganda of America's Military Establishment, because on the shoulders of 98 Members of this body and on the shoulders of the Members of the House of Representatives, I believe, rests the greatest power for peace in our country and possibly in the world.

DEFENSE NEEDS REQUIRE CAREFUL STUDY, NOT HASTE

But it calls for reflection by Congress. It calls for an insistence upon the adoption of a "stop, look, and examine" attitude on the part of the Members of Congress.

I think we have a bill before us tonight which calls for much more examination by the Members of the Senate before they vote than has been given to it up until this hour.

As this draft extension bill has proceeded rapidly through the legislative mill, I have regretfully come to the conclusion that once again we are being confronted with the ultimatum-type legislation. We are being told that we must pass a 4-year extension of the draft because the Berlin crisis threatens, and the Congress must not show any signs of retreating in the face of force.

Yet, in extending the draft for 4 more years without change or correction of its critical inequities because of a crisis which threatens us momentarily, the Congress is, in effect, being stampeded. We are expected to write something into law for 4 more years because of conditions which prevail at the moment, and may or may not prevail for the next 3 months.

I find little in the hearing record placed upon our desks to justify the bill in its present form as an essential long-run component of America's national defense. In the House hearings the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Manpower Personnel and Reserve, Mr. Finucane, was asked why the 4-year period was requested, rather than a shorter one of perhaps 2 years. He replied:

I think your question is a good one, sir. Historically, the draft has, in the wisdom of Congress, been extended for 4 years; and we would like, simply for conformity's sake, to carry on with the habits of the past.

I have come to expect that mental attitude from those in the Pentagon Building. But it should not prevail in the Senate. I am not interested in the extension of any legislation at any time for conformity's sake. Legislation should be extended on its merits, or it should not be extended at all.

We had this issue before us in 1948. Before concluding, I shall offer two amendments to the bill. The first leaves no question in regard to the termination date.

I now send to the desk the first amendment, and ask that it be printed and lie on the table, and be made available to Senators tomorrow. It is an amendment to House bill 2260, in line 6 on page 1, to strike out "1963" and insert "1961."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be printed and lie on the table.

Mr. MORSE. The purpose of the amendment is to tie down with certainty the duty of the Congress to reexamine the draft law in 1961. I fought this fight in 1948, when the Senate approved my amendment reducing the extension to 2 years. I am satisfied that in the years ahead, as we look back over the record in support of a 2-year extension and a 2-year extension only, history will justify the recommendation I make tonight.

We have no stronger evidence than the record of the House Armed Services Committee from which it recommended a 4-year extension of the draft, with no review required by the Congress before 1963.

INDICATIONS ARE THAT DRAFT IS OBSOLETE

In my judgment, we are being asked to take a legislative course of action which is not in the best interests of peace nor in the best interests of the security of my country, nor in the best interests of the millions of young men who will be brought under an obsolete system of military manpower.

I am at a loss to understand why we have a proposal for a 4-year extension of the draft, when even the printed record shows that the spokesman for the Pentagon, when asked why a 4-year extension was being requested, rather than a 2-year extension, replied:

I think your question is a good one, sir. Historically the draft has, in the wisdom of Congress, been extended for 4 years; and we would like, simply for conformity's sake, to carry on with the habits of the past.

That reason is not good enough for the senior Senator from Oregon, and I do not think it is good enough for the American people. We should do a better job of representing the American people and legislating for them than that kind of reasoning would premise.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Does the Senator's proposal also include a manpower study commission during the 2-year period? I know that the proposal of the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] relates to that subject; and the Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT] addressed himself to the same subject matter. It had been my intention to suggest such a proposal. I have in my folder a draft of a proposed amendment. I am deeply moved by the evidence before the committee. I read the record of the hearings before the Senate committee, as well as the record of the hearings in the other body. There were extensive hearings in the House of Representatives.

I have been concerned over the use of manpower by the military, and by what are considered to be the inequities of the system, as well as the inadequacies of the system in terms of manpower utilization.

I believe, if I am correctly interpreting the purpose of the Senator from Oregon, that what he is recommending is that the draft be extended for 2 years, and that during that period of time there be a critical and constructive reexamination of the manpower policy relating to our national security. Is that correct?

Mr. MORSE. The Senator is absolutely correct. That leads me to a subject which I did not intend to discuss at this time. I shall refer to it only briefly now, and discuss it later in my speech in greater detail.

My second amendment is an amendmen to the Case substitute. The Senator from South Dakota has just offered a modifying amendment to his amendment, which in my judgment makes the amendment better, but not good enough. I shall offer an amendment—and I will put it in proper form to send to the desk later—to eliminate entirely from section (b) of the amendment of the Senator from South Dakota, which calls for the creation of a Commission on Military Manpower, and provides that certain members—six, I believe—are to be appointed from civilian life and confirmed by the Senate, the provision that one member shall be appointed from the Armed Forces in active military duty.

For reasons which shall be expressed in some detail later in this speech, I am opposed to the appointment of a

single member of the Commission on Military Manpower from those in active military duty. The job of those at the Pentagon Building is to carry out the policies of the Government, not to create them.

CIVIL CONTROL OF MILITARY AND FOREIGN POLICY SHOULD BE MAINTAINED

As I shall show in greater detail later, I am greatly concerned about the degree to which, in this democracy, we are turning over policymaking to those in the Pentagon Building. Such a trend must be stopped, in my judgment, in the interest of self-government.

It must be stopped in the interest of preserving democratic procedures and processes. It must be stopped if we are to keep faith with the spirit and intent of the Constitution of the United States in regard to the place of the active military in the operation of this Government. I am very fearful that we are much further down the road toward undue military influence in operating the Government than is good or safe for democracy.

I will not support the extension until at least I have done my best to eliminate military policymaking from the organization of any manpower commission, because a manpower commission will use the Pentagon and its personnel for information and witnesses. They should not be given a vote in determining the policy of this Government while they are actively engaged in the military. I am not going to do it even to the extent of one member.

The Senator from South Dakota has greatly improved his proposal by changing it so that of the seven members of the Commission, only one will be an active military official. My amendment would eliminate that one, for reasons which I shall discuss later in my speech.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I have listened to much of the presentation of the able Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE]. I feel that the suggestion he is making, that is, the theme and the purpose of his Commission, is surely very creditable and desirable, and something that we should put into effect. As the Senator from Oregon has so well pointed out, the basic manpower policy relating to our national security, which goes deeper than merely the military, is something which ought to be decided by civilian authorities of the Government. In the instance of the Commission, it seems to me that at least the Commission ought to have full civilian orientation.

The Senator's amendment for a 2-year extension surely should be understood as being designed to provide adequate manpower for our defense. I would not want the RECORD in any way to indicate that the limitation of 2 years would in any way weaken our military strength. In fact, I believe that the Senator from Oregon and the Senator from Minnesota both agree that the military at the present time is inadequate to the responsibilities our Nation faces.

I regret that yesterday I was not on the floor of the Senate to associate myself with the remarks of some of our distinguished colleagues on the importance of having adequate plans for the forces in our Military Establishment, and the importance of the administration keeping the Army, the Navy, the Marine Corps, and the Air Force up to the strength authorized by Congress.

On the one hand, Congress lays down what it believes to be policies which are required for the defense of the Nation—and that is the prerogative of the Congress under the Constitution—and on the other hand, the President, acting through the Bureau of the Budget, cuts the military forces, even though Congress has determined, after extensive hearings, what the size of such forces must be for the national security.

I, for one, protest that kind of false economy, that kind of rationalization, that kind of economics in connection with our national security, and that kind of putting the so-called threat of inflation ahead of the threat of the power of the Communist military and economic machine.

It is deplorable and indefensible. I do not wish my remarks today, in support of the thesis and proposal of the Senator from Oregon, to be interpreted as anything but a desire basically to strengthen our manpower policies, rather than to weaken them.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Minnesota for his constructive contribution to my discussion of the matter. The Senator from Minnesota knows me well enough to know that I completely share his point of view that whatever we do on the military manpower issue should be done with the objective in mind of strengthening the security of our country, not weakening it.

Let me say to the Senator from Minnesota that the proposed amendments I am offering are offered on the basis of my very deep conviction that my amendments will give us a stronger security than we would have if we were to pass a bill which did not require a reexamination and affirmative action at the end of 2 years, and instead perpetuates an inadequate system for 4 more years.

When I get to that section of my speech I intend to say something about the proposals of the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE]. In view of what the Senator from Minnesota has said about the comments of the Senator from South Dakota earlier this afternoon, I wish to say that I believe the Senator from South Dakota has made a great contribution on a high level of statesmanship in the debate on military manpower in his remarks today.

The proposal of the Senator from South Dakota for a Commission on Military Manpower has an objective which ought to receive the enthusiastic support of Congress. We may differ—as I have expressed my difference— on some procedural details for the establishment and the operation of the Commission, but I do not see how we can think of not adopting some such program, perfected, if we can perfect it, as recommended by the Senator from South Dakota.

In my judgment, the Senator's proposal ought to set a termination date for the draft and require reaffirmation by Congress at the end of that termination date of 2 years.

On page 2 of his proposal the Senator from South Dakota states:

> (h) The Commission may from time to time report to the President and shall, not later than January 31, 1961, submit to the President for transmittal to the Congress the results of its study and investigation together with such recommendations as it deems advisable. The Commission shall thereafter from time to time make such further reports and recommendations as it deems advisable. The Commission shall cease to exist on July 1, 1963.

AMENDMENT FOR 2-YEAR EXTENSION

It may be said with some merit that obviously that language implies that on January 31, 1961, Congress will have before it at least the subject matter of the report which will make it easy for it to proceed to reexamine the draft. However, I much prefer that we get specific language into proposed legislation which automatically ends the draft, as the amendment I have sent to the desk would do, in modification of the bill before us, and then decide, at the end of that 2 years, what kind of manpower program we ought to have, taking into account the report of the Commission which the amendment of the Senator from South Dakota would create.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. First of all, I should like to say that I appreciate the comments which the Senator from Oregon and the Senator from Minnesota have made with respect to the purpose of my amendment. What bothered me about the consideration of the extension of the draft, both in the House and in the Senate, was that it seemed to me it was being moved forward without as much time as I should like to have seen devoted to the study of the subject in committee, and without allowing reaction time, so to speak, for the country to realize that this matter was being considered and presumably would be disposed of. Therefore I felt it was important to say something about the imperfections of the Draft Act in its operation and administration, with the view of at least getting an opportunity for the Senate to register an opinion that there ought to be an improvement and that we ought not merely affirm the need for improvement and the existence of errors or inequities in the administration, without taking some step toward correcting them.

Personally I have no objection to having the entire Commission a civilian Commission. The draft of the amendment originally, as I said, came from another member of the Committee on Armed Services, and in his form he proposed a Commission to consist of four civilian members and three military members from the Pentagon. In deference to the idea that he had in mind, and in the hope that perhaps it might develop a little more support, I felt that changing the composition of the Commission to six civilian to one military would be much better than a relationship of 4 to 3.

So far as I personally am concerned, I would prefer to see it an entirely civilian commission; and as to that portion of the amendment suggested by the Senator from Oregon, I would support it. However, I think in view of my discussion with some other Senators on the floor, I should leave the amendment as I now have it modified—6 to 1.

While I am on my feet, I should like to say also that I listened with interest to the first part of the Senator's discussion this evening, when he reviewed some of the things he said in 1948 concerning the wisdom of our taking a new look at the developing strength, the developing military intelligence, and the attitude of the Russians generally. I think we would have been wise had we heeded that advice at that time. I do think that some of our problems today are an outgrowth of our failure to recognize a development which was taking place in Russia—educational development, scientific development, and industrial development. Had we properly educated ourselves or recognized, perhaps, what was there for us to see at that time, some of our problems today would be small.

Mr. MORSE. I thank the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. McNAMARA. I should like to ask either the Senator from Oregon or the Senator from South Dakota: Did the Committee on Armed Services consider this proposal, and did they vote on it? The Senate has a unanimous report from the committee. I should like to know from the Senator from South Dakota if his proposal was considered and voted on by the committee.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The matter was discussed within the committee. There were more than two members of the committee—perhaps 3 or 4 members, at least—who by discussion indicated some support for the idea. But the amendment was not put to a formal vote. It was not formally presented for a record vote or for a yea-and-nay vote in the committee. I think the discussion indicated that it would not carry, and the person who brought up the matter decided not to present it formally in the committee for a vote.

Mr. McNAMARA. I think that was unfortunate, because there is a good chance that it might have been adopted had it been presented in the light in which it is now presented in the Senate. I for one certainly hope the chairman of the committee, the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] will consider accepting the amendment.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. COOPER. The distinguished Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] and the distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] are rendering a service to the Senate and to the country in developing the subject of the continuation of the draft. I remember, in 1948, at about this time of the day, hearing the able Senator from Oregon speak eloquently upon this subject. On that evening he expressed his concern that the Senate was coming to believe it inevitable that the draft should be continued.

I remember that I spoke that evening against an indeterminate draft period, saying that the draft was not a part of the American tradition. As I remember tonight, I voted with the Senator from Oregon to limit the extension of the draft to 2 years.

Today we are in a much more difficult world situation, but whatever my vote will be—and it must be for extension—the considerations which these two able Senators have brought before the Senate and the country this evening are important, for they bear on our total foreign policy. Whatever may be the outcome of the vote, whatever may be the gravity of our situation in the world today, I am glad that the Senators are rendering this service to our country.

Mr. MORSE. I remember very well the great contribution which the Senator from Kentucky made to the debate in 1948. I appreciated then, as always, his support on an issue which I felt was not fully understood within the Senate, and, therefore, at the moment was not very popular.

The Senator from Kentucky did support me in the position I took in 1948. I think our debate was helpful in many ways which do not show on the surface in connection with the military manpower policies of this country.

I quite agree with the implications in the statement of the Senator from Kentucky that when a question such as this one is raised, which is all mixed up with feelings about national security and the threat of Russia, it is very easy to be misunderstood. Therefore, his words of commendation for raising the issue tonight are very much appreciated by me.

The Senator from Kentucky is one of the fair-minded Members of this body, before whom I always feel I will get a hearing on the merits. He and I may end in complete disagreement on the merits; but I always feel that when the Senator from Kentucky listens, I am talking to an open mind which is perfectly willing to give fair consideration to the point of view I wish to express.

I am not sure but what we have already just about reached the point in our country where it is almost impossible to get reasoned judgment on the part of many of our people on an issue which is so pregnant with deep psychological reaction, namely, the matter of national security in relation to Russia. I shall say something about that general problem later, because these things are all intertwined.

The fact is that we have on the floor of the Senate tonight not only an armed service problem but a foreign policy problem, as well. We cannot separate the work of the Committee on Armed Services and the work of the Committee on Foreign Relations on at least 95 percent of the subject matters with which those two committees deal.

That is why now, as a member of the Committee on Foreign Relations, with my background of experience as a member of the Committee on Armed Services for a good many years, I want to try to focus attention on what I think are some of the interrelationships. Even in our era we can follow a course of action which will result in our winning a horrible war and losing our destiny. That is why I do not favor quick action on any of these subjects.

Returning to the bill, because of the crisis atmosphere in which the bill is being considered, it is proposed to freeze for 4 years a totally inadequate defense manpower situation.

Every careful study of national defense about which I know—at least, those we have been permitted to know about—has stressed the inadequacy of the present selective service program in furnishing the manpower which will be needed by our country over the next several decades.

The kind of manpower which we need is that which is highly skilled and trained in the complex instruments of modern warfare, and which is best furnished by career servicemen. The truth of the matter is that the draft has been a military manpower expediency crutch on which the country has been leaning for too long a time.

The cry is raised one must vote for this bill or be universally condemned as being soft on communism. I am surprised at the editorial slant of many of America's newspapers in the last several days.

STRONG DEFENSE NOT ACHIEVED BY DRAFT

Mr. President, it has reached the point where a Senator who disagrees with the policies recommended by the administration in the field of defense or in the field of foreign policy must expect to be hit with the charge that he must be soft on communism.

But the fact is that those of us who are asking for the most penetrating, critical analysis of the policies of the Government in respect to our armed services and our defense problems and our foreign relations are doing so because we want our country to be strong enough at all times to meet the Russian threat, and to be able to do so by means of a course of conduct which will strengthen the peace, and will not necessarily bring on a war.

I am very fearful that many of the policies of my Government do not at this time strengthen the chances of peace, but that, instead, they increase the danger of war. That is why I speak out.

Mr. President, I challenge the contention that those of us who raise questions about extension of the draft are soft on communism, because I do not think the needs for the national defense are being adequately served at all by the draft.

There is nothing wrong with those who are drafted; but there is a great deal wrong with a system which brings them into the military service at the lowest possible level, usually without regard to their skills, gives them the elements of military training—but not the kind of proficiency in modern warfare that the Nation really needs its Armed Forces to have—and at the end of 2 years returns them to civilian life, from which they have lost 2 valuable years, without even

making provision for their education and training following that service.

From the point of view of the young men who are involved, I think it is a sheer scandal to continue to draft men into the armed services without providing them with education and training benefits when they leave.

But from the point of view of the country and its long-range defense needs, I see in the bill, as it is now before us, provisions for a 4-year extension of a system which we shall rely on only at our peril, inasmuch as the bill makes it impossible to obtain, during those 4 years, a manpower program which will assure the Nation strong, well-trained Armed Forces capable of protecting the Nation and its interests over a period of many years, and probably decades, of Communist threat and menace.

What I want for our country's armed services is skill and expertise. But under the draft, such skill is not provided, because the drafted men serve for only 2 years. The proposed extension of the draft is, of course, a penny-pinching way of providing for the national defense. The military forces thus obtained can be obtained more cheaply than it is possible to obtain well-trained career forces of equal numbers.

It is no reflection on the young men we are discussing to point out that they could give the country better service as career soldiers than they can as drafted soldiers, to whom military service is but a duty to be performed and gotten out of the way as quickly as possible and as easily as possible.

The obsolescence of the draft should cause us to stop, look, and investigate, and to ask whether this is the time—at this hour of new emergencies arising on the international horizon—for us to do no more than extend the status quo, or to face up to the military manpower needs of the country, and to proceed with a proper program and the funds it requires, so as to obtain the skilled military personnel we shall need if we are to meet the continuous threat from Russia on the military front.

I think the story we find is a pitiful one, when we make a case study of the men drafted, and see what is done under the draft with the potential skills of those who are in our Military Establishment.

If we were to translate those losses into dollars—and, of course, they are subject to some evaluation from the standpoint of financial value and financial loss—I am satisfied that we would find that with each year's operation of the draft, we waste hundreds of millions of dollars in terms of lost personnel services in relation to the potential competency of those who are drafted. In many, many cases—in fact, in tens of thousands of them—the manpower drafted is not used where it should be used.

This criticism has been before us for years. It will be found in the 1948 debates. But the record of the Pentagon since 1948 is one of gross failure to bring about the reforms which should be made in respect to this problem.

We remember that in the 1956 campaign, a few of us discussed the need for a great revision of the country's draft policy. Adlai Stevenson discussed it. I discussed it many, many times in the course of my campaign—as did other candidates in 1956. Of course, it was supposed to be impolitic, but I asked, "So, what?"

THE STATUS QUO IS NOT SUFFICIENT

It is a matter of vital concern to the people of the country and to the national welfare. But here we are in 1959; and what we have before us now is, to all intents and purposes, a proposal to continue the same errors—not a proposal that augurs well for any reform in our military manpower policy, but a proposal to continue the status quo.

A great paradox is to be found in the argument that we must do this because we must show Russia that we mean business. I have no doubt that the Russian leaders probably know better than most of the people in our country the shortcomings and inefficiencies and deficiencies of the American draft system. I am satisfied that if the draft is extended, tomorrow, for 4 years, no concern will be caused in Russia. Extension of our draft is not going to put Russia in any greater jeopardy than she is now, and I think Russia knows that perfectly well.

If we really want the Russian leaders to raise their eyebrows about America's military defense program let us proceed with a military manpower program, not with a draft, but one that will build up a skilled, career American military service of able technicians, well trained, on a career basis, for the development of our country's defenses. That is essential, because in the field of science those defenses are ever changing.

That kind of career military personnel would make some impression on the Russian leaders.

RECOMMENDATIONS BY EXPERTS SHOULD BE IMPLEMENTED

All this talk in the debate as to how important this draft bill is, from the standpoint of Russia, is highly fallacious. I think it is, for the most part, a discussion that will lull the American people into a false sense of security. I do not think the 4-year extension of the draft is going to give the American people the security to which they are entitled; but the correction of our military manpower policies, which have been recommended now for some years by various experts who have gone into it, is the line of approach which I recommend to the Congress.

"Oh," it will be said, "Mr. Senator, why do you go along with any extension of the draft, then?" I would not if we had the manpower proposal before us that we ought to have before us, and which ought to have been prepared by now. I think the Commission called for by the Senator from South Dakota ought to have been established by now. Then we would be passing, tomorrow, on a military manpower bill that would really come to grips with the needs of this country's defenses so far as military manpower is concerned.

But certainly, Mr. President, I do not think we ought to extend the draft beyond the 2-year period. Instead, I believe we should use the next 2 years to revamp our military manpower program, as called for in the amendment of the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], and put the recommendations into effect even before the end of the 2-year period, if possible.

Mr. President, under authority previously granted, at this point in my remarks I ask that there be printed a portion of my argument which appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 94, part 6, page 7325. This is a summary statement of my position on my amendment at tha ttime to limit to 2 years the extension of the draft legislation.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I desire to summarize my position on the amendment by briefly answering the major arguments used against my amendment this afternoon. They were rather interesting arguments, but if I were trying a case I would say most respectfully that most of them would fall under the objection of being irrelevant, immaterial, and inconsequential.

One of the arguments made earlier in the debate this afternoon was that 2 years from now might find us at the end of the session with such a congested calendar that we could not give careful consideration to the question of whether or not we should continue the draft. I think that is not a very sound argument, because I do not know how a bill could receive any more careful consideration or go through a longer hearing, or receive more hours of attention from committee members than we have given to this bill. I answer the argument that we may not have time 2 years hence to consider this problem, Mr. President, by offering a record of the Armed Services Committee over weeks and weeks of hearings on this bill in this crowded session of Congress as my exhibit A in complete rebuttal of that argument. We can take judicial notice that this issue will always receive thorough attention by Congress.

Second, I am privileged to say, because several Senators have said to me in the cloakroom they are inclined to go along with the committee report, that a good many members of the Armed Services Committee, of which I also am a member, have reconsidered very carefully the provision of the bill for a 5-year draft and have decided to vote for my amendment. I am privileged to say that at least five of us on the Armed Services Committee intended to vote for my amendment for a 2-year period instead of a 5-year period. I say that because I want the Members of this body to know that there has been a considerable amount of rethinking about the provision within the Armed Services Committee, and there is not on this provision, as there is on most sections of the bill, a unanimous report of the Armed Services Committee.

* * * * *

I want to see the obligation and responsibility placed upon the Congress to review at the end of 2 years the policy now being adopted, and at that time decide whether or not we want to continue the draft. I think it will be found that after 2 years our reserves will have been built up, and that we shall have done a pretty good job of educating the American people to an understanding of the need for supporting an adequate Military Establishment.

* * * * *

The last point is, my amendment is in line with action already taken by the House. The House voted a 2-year provision. I think, Mr. President, we should follow in this instance the action taken by the House, and adopt my amendment.

* * * * *

Following this statement of my position there appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 94, part 6, page 7326, the rollcall votes by which the Senate adopted my amendment limiting the extension of the draft to 2 years. It reads as follows:

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question recurs on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Oregon. The yeas and nays having been ordered, the clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll.

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. Baldwin], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. Bricker], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. Bushfield], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. Jenner], and the Senator from Maine [Mr. White] are necessarily absent. If present and voting, the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. Baldwin] would vote "nay."

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. Tobey] is absent on official business.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] is detained on official business. If present and voting, the Senator from New Hampshire would vote "nay."

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. Barkley], the Senator from Texas [Mr. Connally], and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. Taylor] are absent on public business.

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. Hatch] and the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from California [Mr. Downey], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCarran], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. Thomas], and the Senator from New York [Mr. Wagner] are necessarily absent.

If present and voting, the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. Barkley] and the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. Hatch] would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 47, nays 33, as follows:

YEAS—47

Aiken	Ives	Pepper
Brooks	Johnson, Colo.	Revercomb
Buck	Johnston, S.C.	Robertson, Va.
Butler	Kem	Russell
Byrd	Kilgore	Sparkman
Capehart	Langer	Stewart
Chavez	McCarthy	Taft
Cooper	McClellan	Thomas, Utah
Dworshak	Malone	Umstead
Eastland	Maybank	Watkins
Ferguson	Millikin	Wherry
Flanders	Moore	Wiley
Fulbright	Morse	Williams
George	Murray	Wilson
Hill	O'Conor	Young
Hoey	O'Daniel	

NAYS—33

Ball	Hawkes	Martin
Brewster	Hayden	Myers
Cain	Hickenlooper	O'Mahoney
Capper	Holland	Reed
Cordon	Knowland	Robertson, Wyo.
Donnell	Lodge	Saltonstall
Eaton	Lucas	Smith
Ellender	McFarland	Stennis
Feazel	McGrath	Thye
Green	McKellar	Tydings
Gurney	McMahon	Vandenberg

NOT VOTING—16

Baldwin	Downey	Thomas, Okla.
Barkley	Hatch	Tobey
Bricker	Jenner	Wagner
Bridges	McCarran	White
Bushfield	Magnuson	
Connally	Taylor	

So Mr. MORSE's amendment lettered "G" was agreed to.

To continue, Mr. President, in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 94, part 6, page 7568, there appears the following exchange:

Mr. MORSE. I want to make one statement in connection with the remarks of the Senator from Maryland, because I know his devotion to accuracy. I think the comment he made concerning the reduction of the life of the bill by my amendment yesterday, from a 5-year to a 2-year basis, with the right of Congress at the end of the 2 years to vote to continue the draft if it was considered that an emergency existed at that time, seems to give the impression that the majority of the Armed Services Committee was against that amendment. The record is perfectly clear that 7 of the 13 members of the Armed Services Committee voted for the 2-year amendment.

Mr. TYDINGS. In the House?

Mr. MORSE. No; in the Senate yesterday afternoon. A majority of the members of the committee, after thinking over the matter, decided to support the amendment.

Mr. TYDINGS. I find the Senator from Oregon is correct in that statement. I had assumed before the Senator from Oregon corrected me that such was not the case. I find I was in error.

Mr. MORSE. I have talked also to those men, and they have told me that after thinking the whole thing through, with the right of the Congress to continue the draft after 2 years they thought the amendment was a good amendment. They represent a majority of the Armed Services Committee. The fact remains that a majority of the Armed Services Committee voted for the amendment.

To conclude the excerpts from the 1948 RECORD, Mr. President, I cite now, in part, my remarks which may be found in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 94, part 6, pages 7579–7580, as follows:

I desire to say at the outset, Mr. President, that I hope I have made clear that I think a draft is necessary in order to meet an emergency in international affairs which I believe exists at the present time. Unless I were convinced that a serious emergency exists, I know of nothing that could possibly persuade me to vote for a draft in peacetime. I said a few moments ago in colloquy with the Senator from Maryland that I believe the draft bill should be put into effect now and that we should not wait for any future declaration of the President for putting it into effect, because after spending the weeks that those of us in the Armed Services Committee spent, both in public hearings and in executive conferences, with men high in our Government, including both civilian and military officials of our Government, I reached the conclusion—and it was very difficult for me to reach it, for I would like wishfully to think that there is no real danger of war—that there is in actually a great danger of war. If I did not think there was a great danger of war at the present time I would not vote for any draft bill.

I am inclined to think a great many millions of American people are "enjoying" a false sense of security in America tonight, because I am one who honestly believes that our defenses are so weak today that our national security demands their strengthening as rapidly as we can possibly strengthen them. Why do I say that, Mr. President? I say that because in my judgment the record of Soviet Russia since V–J Day is clearly a record of noncooperation with the United Nations in the interests of promoting world peace.

Furthermore, I think the record of Soviet Russia certainly raises the presumption that she does not have friendly intentions toward the United States. Therefore, it is my opinion that unless we proceed to make ourselves sufficiently strong to protect our national security and enforce the peace, if necessary, we may wake up in the not-too-distant future to discover that Russia is taking aggressive acts toward us that will force upon us a state of war.

On the other hand, Mr. President, I am convinced that if the American people will unite behind a program for the strengthening of our national security to the point that we can defend the peace, that will greatly alter Russia's attitude and policies in the field of international relations.

Therefore, I lay that down as the major premise of this speech. I reiterate it in this sentence: I am supporting a draft in peacetime because I am convinced that a strengthening of our national security is necessary in order to make perfectly clear to Russia that we shall remain united in a determination to resist any aggressive attitude or policies or acts on her part toward disrupting world peace.

The second premise to which I wish to move in this argument is that I am also cognizant of the fact that an emergency never remains in a status quo condition. Human events and international events do not stand still. I think we must face the fact most solemnly tonight that we are either going in the next 2 or 3 years to solve most of the problems that are endangering the peace of the world today or by the end of that time we shall find ourselves much nearer to war than we are even tonight.

I shall put that in a different way, because unless that viewpoint of mine is understood, it is impossible to understand my position on the pending bill or on the amendment. I restate it this way: I do not think that human events or international relations ever stand still. We are moving in the direction of something. We are going to move in the direction of something during the next 2 or 3 years so far as international relations are concerned, and that something is going to be either more peaceful relations with Soviet Russia or more warlike relations with Soviet Russia.

I do not take, and have never taken, the position that the full responsibility for working in the direction of peace at the present time rests upon Soviet Russia. I think we also have a great responsibility. I think it is too easy for us to see ourselves as we like to think we are, and it is too easy to see the Russians as we imagine them to be. I believe there are many things we must do in international conferences, in our relations with Russia, which we have been inclined stubbornly to resist in some of our international conferences with Russia. I think we must get over the idea of giving to the American people the impression that we are completely right and Russia is completely wrong on all matters.

I am convinced that the record is perfectly clear that the overwhelming responsibility for the strained relations existing between those two great powers has been Russia's noncooperation in the United Nations and in international conferences in Europe. We have only to look to her negative attitude and the constant use of the veto to establish my point.

I think it is also clear that there is considerable evidence available to us at this time that was not available as short a time as 120 days ago. That is not a long time. The Russian leaders finally started to understand that they could push our country just so far until we would finally say, "That is as far as we shall go." I think Russia is begining to read the stop signs which we have placed on the highway of international relations. I think one of those stop signs which has had a very persuasive and convincing effect upon the Russian leaders is the action we have already taken in the Congress of the United States in connection with national security. I believe Russia discovered that we meant business, so far as defending ourselves and strengthening ourselves so that we could defend the peace, when we voted appropriations for a great increase in the Air Force.

I think Russia read another stop sign when it learned we intended to vote the

necessary appropriations for Navy improvement.

I think Russia read another stop sign, Mr. President, when it realized we were going to pass in this session of Congress substantial military manpower legislation.

I believe, Mr. President—and this is the third premise I want to lay down—that Russia will thoroughly understand that a draft bill passed at this session of Congress, with a provision in it that it will not be continued after 2 years, without affirmative action of the Congress, and that we shall not take men for more than 18 months, if my amendment should be adopted, will be a strong indication that we intend to remain united in support of an adequate national-defense program, but at the same time, to frame a law and pass it in a form which also shows that we are working for peace and not for war.

That is why, Mr. President, I fought yesterday as hard as I did for the adoption of an amendment which would require affirmative action on the part of Congress after 2 years. I said in the course of my speech in support of that amendment that I felt a 2-year provision instead of a 5-year provision would serve clear notice not only on Russia, but on our friends in freedom-loving countries, that we do not have any intention to build up over a 5-year period or a longer period a powerful military machine, with the danger that once it is put into operation it may follow the course which military machines have so frequently followed in the course of history, of ultimately leading countries into war because of the power of the military machine itself. I said, in the course of my speech in support of that amendment, that in the United States we need to guard against the development of a military psychology. We need to recognize always that there is a clear line of distinction between preparedness to protect the national security of the Nation and preparedness to conduct a war. I want to repeat that, Mr. President, because that sentence, too, sheds a great deal of light on my thinking about our Military Establishment. There is a great difference between developing military preparedness necessary to protect the national security of the country and developing a military preparedness program for war.

I think we must constantly recognize that our self-assurance that our ideals and objectives are peaceful is not always shared by peoples in other countries. We have only to go to other countries to hear disturbing and alarming discussions with reference to American imperialism and American military plans and objectives. We can travel in parts of Europe today and find people who are convinced that it is only a matter of time before they will be caught in the middle of a war between Russia and the United States. Although we know we seek only peace, that is not agreed to and accepted as a fact by a great many people, who are not in the satellite countries, but are in countries which are still free and friendly to the United States.

What I am trying to point out in this part of my remarks is that we have a duty, it seems to me, in the interest of peace, to develop a draft law which will strike that happy balance, giving to us the manpower protection we need to protect the national security and prepare us to defend ourselves in case of aggressive attack, and the type of manpower legislation which might create the impression, and would be inclined to create it, that our endeavor is not an endeavor to prepare for peace, but to prepare for war. There is quite a difference.

With the precedent of 1948 as my background, Mr. President, I shall urge tomorrow the adoption of my similar amendment this year to limit to 2 years the extension of the draft.

Mr. President, I now send to the desk another amendment, amending section (b) of the amendment of the Senator from South Dakota to H.R. 2260, and ask to have it printed and available to the Senate tomorrow. I will say to the gentlemen at the desk, that if it needs any perfecting, it will be understood that I shall do so when I close my speech.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Oregon wish to offer his amendment?

Mr. MORSE. I do not want it called up; I want it printed and at the desk, ready to be called up tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment of the Senator from Oregon to the amendment of the Senator from South Dakota, as modified will be received, printed, and lie on the desk.

CONGRESS LOSING ITS EXCLUSIVE WARMAKING POWER

Mr. MORSE. Now, Mr. President, I want to discuss this problem in relation to a broader facet, because I do not see how we can come to grips tomorrow with a military manpower piece of legislation and not give some thought to the relationship of it and our other defenses to present trends in American foreign policy.

Every Member of the Senate knows, but it ought to be restated and emphasized for the RECORD, that article I, section 8 of the Constitution of the United States provides the powers of Congress, and one of them is that Congress shall have the power to declare war. I am afraid, however, Mr. President, there is a great danger that that section of the Constitution may become a dead letter.

As I listen to witnesses from the Pentagon Building and witnesses from the State Department before the Foreign Relations Committee, I am filled more and more with the fearful thought that we have already reached the point in our history where there is a lack of full appreciation of the meaning of that section of article I, section 8, of the Constitution—that it is the Congress which has the power to declare war.

I am very fearful that there are forces of subterfuge at work in America today in regard to article I, section 8, of the Constitution. I am fearful that there is not a full appreciation, either at the Pentagon Building or in the State Department, or the White House, of the meaning and full implications of article I, section 8, of the Constitution—that the Congress shall have power to declare war.

That language becomes empty, Mr. President, if officials in the Pentagon Building and the State Department follow policies under which we shall wake up, some second, to discover we are at war, and that the Government comes to Congress only to ask Congress to make it official.

It has been said among my colleagues that war is inevitable. They have not said it for the RECORD yet, but I have heard colleagues take the position, as recently as this morning, that we are not entitled to know what the policies of the Pentagon Building and the State Department are in respect to the Berlin crisis.

Yet, those policies mean the difference between war and peace, and those policies can determine whether or not we will be at war at any given moment.

So long as I am in this body, I do not intend to remain silent when I believe any section of the Constitution is being defeated by subterfuge on the part of any executive agency of this Government. When I sit in the Foreign Relations Committee and listen to some of the testimony given in recent weeks by high officials of both the Pentagon Building and the State Department, I find it impossible to escape the conclusion that the American people ought to know. And the American people are not being told. But they will be the ones who will be dying by the millions if we get into a war through an administration's back door rather than as a result of open debate on the facts prevailing at the time consideration is given to a resolution for a declaration of war.

Of course, not one of us would fail to vote for a declaration of war after any horrendous act of aggression had been committed against us. We all know that.

But this is a different world from even the world of 1917. This is a different world from even the world of Pearl Harbor. We are now living in a time when one miscalculation by the generals at the Pentagon Building or by the State Department might place us in a war situation, so far as acts are concerned, and I think we have just about reached the point tonight where we are suffering from the bankruptcy of the massive retaliation policy of the Secretary of State.

Last Thursday in a speech in the Senate I said that no one could pray more sincerely than I for the recovery of the Secretary of State from his illness, because I wish no misfortune to any man. But, Mr. President, I am as much opposed to the policies of the Secretary of State in the field of foreign relations as I have ever been, and we are being treated now in the Berlin crisis to a part of the inevitable cost of that course of action. Time and time again his policies have been American unilateral policies. Those policies on the part of the United States time and time again have been policies circumventing the United Nations, and they have been policies, on on some occasions, as I think history will show, outside the framework of international law.

WHOLE WORLD HAS A STAKE IN BERLIN

They have been policies which have alienated millions and millions of people throughout Asia and Africa, some of whom are beginning to make known their views.

Those people, too, have rights in Berlin. They do not have treaty rights, Mr. President, but they have rights to peace. They have rights to live, which the course of action which Russia and the Western Powers follow may very well take away from them.

I say to the leadership of India and the leadership of the free nations of Asia and Africa tonight, "Make your voices heard before it is too late. Raise your voices, and quickly, because the danger is that the leaders of the Western Powers and of Russia may take a course of

action in the next few weeks which history will record as the most immoral chapter in the history of mankind."

I weigh my words solemnly tonight, Mr. President. A nuclear war cannot be justified by my country or by Russia. It is immoral, and it cannot be squared with the Almighty's wishes. After all, the greatest allegiance we owe is to God, and the generals in the Pentagon Building of the United States have no right to follow an ungodlike course of action.

When I listened to an American general sit in a committee room and tell me and the other members of the committee that we should be more cynical about Russia, that we should recognize that it is impossible to negotiate, and that we must face up to the fact that sooner or later we shall probably have to drop everything we have—meaning, of course, our nuclear weapons—I was aghast, I replied to him, "If we follow that philosophy and that course of action, then the only group ahead in this great struggle will be the archeologists 1,000 years from today when they dig up the ruins of the sorry record we made in 1959."

Of course, I am for making clear to Russia, Mr. President, that we do not intend to be intimidated by her threats. I am for making clear to Russia that if she makes an attack upon us in connection with the Berlin crisis, we shall meet force with force. Although we have some shortcomings in our defenses, I want to say, in support of the generals at the Pentagon Building, that I think we are in a military posture where Russia is not going to win a war of any type, conventional or nuclear.

Of course, we will not win in one sense, either Mr. President, as I indicated the other day, when we are through with all the destruction, and when we shall have let loose the awful nuclear destruction in storage today, the resulting radiation will irreparably damage human life and animal life in a large part of the world—undoubtedly practically all of Russia, all of Europe, probably all of the United States and Canada and at least the north tier to the south of us, and part of Asia—for several thousand years.

NUCLEAR WAR IS A MORAL ISSUE

That raises the moral issue. That raises the question of the rights of the peoples of Asia and Africa. Those people are not involved in the dropping of those bombs, Mr. President.

They have a right to insist, I submit, that Russia and the Western Powers proceed now with a course of action which will reduce the danger of letting that terrible radiation loose on the face of this earth, which radiation will linger on, so the scientists say, for several thousand years doing damage to all forms of animal and plant life.

I do not know of any time when all of mankind was ever confronted with a moral issue of such proportions. So it raises, from a philosophical standpoint, the issue of sovereignty. Oh, how easy it is in our country for people to wrap our great flag around them or wave it to tatters, in a great, superpatriotic appeal about sovereignty. We had better recognize, before it is too late, that there is really a greater sovereignty. I would call it the sovereignty involved in the reign of peace. Mankind has reached the point of scientific development where each individual owes it to society to follow a course of action that leads to peace, and not to war.

What is the position our Government takes today? Who knows? However, I think it is fair to say that the best we know is that we are going to play it by ear. We are going to consult with other Western Powers. We are going to be willing to negotiate; and we are going to give them the works if necessary.

The first atomic bomb that Russia or the United States, or any of the Western Powers drops will for centuries alienate the friendship of those who survive in Asia and Africa. That is why I say to the leaders of the nations not involved in Berlin, "Raise your voices now. Now is the time for you to speak out to the Western Powers and to Russia. Now is the time for you to make clear to the Western Powers and to Russia that they have no moral right to follow the policies they are already following in regard to Berlin."

In my judgment the Western Powers and Russia have no right to treat the Berlin crisis as their problem. It has become the problem of mankind. It has become the problem of all civilization.

UNITED STATES SHOULD HAVE PROGRAM FOR PEACE THROUGH UNITED NATIONS

When we speak with high officials in the State Department and respectfully ask, "What about the United Nations?" what reply do we receive? "Eventually we may get to the United Nations." My question is, "If eventually, why not now? Why not now?"

I think we have seen enough to know that the policy of brinkmanship is too dangerous when we wait upon the maneuverings between the Western Powers and Russia, because I believe that both Russia and the Western Powers are following a policy of brinkmanship; and it is slippery, dangerous business.

Incident after incident may occur. We cannot have this kind of jockeying; we cannot have this maneuvering for position; we cannot have armed forces in the air maneuvering as they are now maneuvering, without the danger of falling into the possible catastrophe which I heard the Prime Minister of India, Mr. Nehru, speak about in December 1957, in New Delhi, India, at the Parliamentary Conference of the Commonwealth Nations, when he pointed out, in a memorable speech, that one of those bombs may go off either by design, by reason of disobedience of orders, or by accident. But once one goes off, there will be no time to find the answer to the question "Why?" The nuclear war will be on, and Russia and the Western Powers for all of history will be convicted by their own mutual acts—inexcusable immorality and crime against mankind.

Neither the United States nor Russia can under any circumstances justify the dropping of an atomic bomb, in view of the nuclear power now in storage under the control of Russia and the United States. No moral nation can justify it; and our people are both moral and deeply religious.

I say to the State Department that underneath this great crisis is a deep spiritual issue. It is an issue involving our faith and spiritual values. No man-made misbehavior, demonstrated through the official acts of any nation, can justify, on moral grounds, letting loose on the face of this globe nuclear radiation which for several thousand years would visit upon mankind the horrendous consequences about which I have spoken.

There is the spiritual problem. I know the kind of rebuttal to expect. But it will be a rebuttal of rationalization. It will be a rebuttal of moral escapism. It will not be a rebuttal that one can take into the confessional of his own conscience and, in the presence of his God, offer as either an excuse or an explanation for such an immoral course of conduct.

I apply this thesis to what is a great danger in my country tonight—that we have within this Government men who, I believe, think that a preventive war is unavoidable.

I do not propose to give such military officials any policymaking power. That is one of the reasons that I shall offer an amendment to the amendment of the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], to make any manpower commission 100 percent civilian. We must make clear to the American military, in the weeks of crisis immediately ahead, that this Government is to be controlled by civilian policies, not by military policies.

We must insist, in my judgment, that we be told more of the facts, if the military have any facts, in regard to what their plans may be in respect to meeting the Berlin crisis.

I suggest that a much more moral course of action than the one we are now taking would be one in which my Government would issue a call to the leaders of the world to put into operation immediately the procedures of the United Nations. We have a great opportunity to demonstrate to the millions in Asia and Africa who doubt our protestations of peace that we are now ready to submit the whole case to the United Nations. The procedures are available in the United Nations.

When officials of the State Department tell me that at some time in the future they may consider a step which takes into consideration the procedures of the United Nations, my answer is, "That is not good enough for my country."

Now is the time to use the procedures of the United Nations. It is said, "You must go through the procedural steps of the Security Council." Yes; that is correct. Let us go ahead and do it. We might be surprised, although I do not think so. However, let us get that behind us.

Let us get Russia into the position where she throws her veto on the Security Council. That will be of great value in the formulation of world opinion. Assuming that she does—and I believe in all probability she will, judging by the past record of Russia

walking out on her moral obligations time and time again as a member of the Security Council—we shall then have available the General Assembly and the peaceful procedures which the sections of the charter provide in relation to the workings of the General Assembly.

I believe that the best forum for the discussion of the Berlin crisis is not behind the closed doors of secret diplomacies, but out in the General Assembly of the United Nations, where other peoples from other countries have an opportunity to speak for peace in support of their rights.

INTERNATIONAL COURT SHOULD TRY BERLIN CASE

Then we have the judicial processes of the United Nations. When we are told by the State Department that international law supports our decision, they are right; it does. That is all the more reason, Mr. President, why we should use the judicial processes of the United Nations to pass judgment on such agreements, and proclaim to the world who it is that is violating the agreements in respect to Berlin.

Of course, Mr. President, when we stand before the bar of justice as a litigant or as a party advocate, we are in a somewhat different position than we are when we go into a closed-door session of international secret diplomacy and engage in an attempt to obtain from our opponent on the other side of the table an agreement affecting the entire world, without the rest of the world having a voice in the agreement which is worked out.

I believe that era of international negotiations has just about come to an end. The time when powerful nations—in this instance, to use an example involving the Berlin crisis, Russia, Great Britain, United States, France, and Germany—think they can get into a negotiation situation and enter into some kind of understanding which will affect millions of people who are not parties to that understanding, or, failing to reach such an agreemnet, breakdown in those negotiations and lead the world into nuclear war, is long past, and that idea has already been repudiated in history.

The world certainly is one in relation to the issue of war and peace, and no two nations can any longer fight unto themselves alone; nor will they.

FOREIGN POLICY PROGRAM FOR AMERICA

Therefore, I believe we should make clear that we do not propose to be intimidated by Russia. I also believe that we should make clear that we intend to lay this problem immediately before the United Nations for exercise of its procedures. We ought to make clear that we would welcome support for that approach from other nations. I am sorry that I think it is true—and it is true—that there are leaders in other nations who will remain reticent, who will hold back, and who will not make their views known so long as the United States and our Western Allies and Russia talk about trying to negotiate some understanding of the Berlin crisis.

But I think they would welcome an indication on the part of the Western Powers that their services for peace through the operation of their rights in the General Assembly of the United Nations would be appreciated.

My views on this subject can be summarized by saying that I believe the State Department has put the cart before the horse, so to speak, in regard to the approach it is making to the Berlin crisis. We are putting the last extremity, first, when the steps we ought to be taking now are United Nations steps.

Here we are illustrating once more that this great organization, which was chartered by its signatories to do what it could to prevent war and promote peace, is not being given primary consideration.

The appeal should be made to it now. It should not be kept in the background until the situation becomes so bad that no organization could save the peace. Then there would be those who would say, "You see, any association of nations for promoting peace is a mistake. No association can prevent war. It cannot prevent war." It is true that it cannot if the powers proceed with a course of action which will get us into war, in reality, through the back door before an appeal can be made to have the United Nations use its procedures, reach decisions, and place restrictions upon the wrongdoers.

FOUR-YEAR DRAFT EXTENSION OFFERS ONLY FALSE SECURITY

One more word, and I shall be through. What does this subject have to do with the draft bill? A great deal. I think the draft bill itself is being offered really as a part of a mistaken policy on the part of our country that war can be prevented by seeming to take warlike steps. But war will be prevented only when we carry out the great teaching of Arthur Vandenberg, who used to plead on the floor of the Senate for the establishment of an international system whereby the rule of law would settle our disputes.

I say frankly that up to this hour, my conclusion in regard to the attitude of both those in the Pentagon Building and those in the State Department is that they give only lipservice to the idea of settling international disputes which threaten the peace by the application of a rule of law, because the State Department cannot point to a single instance in which the peace of the world has been threatened, and in which it has proposed and urged that the dispute be submitted to the judicial process of the United Nations for a binding determination for or against us, or even an advisory opinion.

That is one of the reasons why the leaders of the Asian and African nations to which I have referred tell us quite bluntly, and into our teeth, when we meet with them, that there is much difference between our record as a nation in the field of following the rule of law and our record in professing it.

Oh, Mr. President, if we followed such a course of action as I have suggested, who knows what system might be developed through the application of the rules of reason to Berlin?

I do not intend to discuss on this occasion, but shall on another, the national psychological problems which are involved in such a crisis as this; the face-saving problems; the necessity for compromise; the part that a request for time and the adoption of a program based upon the passage of time plays in the ultimate settlement of international disputes.

All those practicalities exist, Mr. President, but I also know that when we get issues out into the open for public disclosure through a body which has jurisdiction, and when rules of reason can be applied to them, the chances of a settlement leading to peace are greatly improved.

So I offer as a hope, perhaps, that such an approach as I have suggested may eventually lead, for example, to the formation of a United Nations trusteeship—any other descriptive term may be used—for the administration of a tinderbox spot of the world, such as Berlin. We have missed too many great opportunities in our country in recent years to apply such a principle. That is why in 1955, together with former Senator Herbert Lehman, of New York, I made a plea for the application of such a program to Formosa. We had an opportunity then to propose the proper procedure for the administration of Formosa, with the United States undertaking the caretaker duty of defense until such time as the United Nations found it possible to dispense with the trusteeship, whether it required 25, 50, 75, or even 100 years. I think we missed a great opportunity there, as we have in other parts of the world.

There has been such an accumulation of mistakes of that nature that now we may be confronted with our last opportunity to make a plea to the leaders of the nations of the world for the adoption of United Nations jurisdiction over all the countries involved in the Berlin crisis concerning their respective interests in Berlin.

But if we do not follow that course of action, and if what I consider to be the present mistaken policies of the State Department or the Pentagon continue, then I pray, at least, that we shall have heard the last of any talk in our country against the leaders of Russia and of the Western Powers getting together directly and personally with their foreign ministers to try to settle the dispute.

The other nations of the world are entitled at least to that privilege. The other nations of the world have certain rights of peace, to which I have alluded. To the head of state of my country and of any other Western Power and of Russia, I say that not a single one of them, alone or collectively, has the moral right to fail to sit down together in a meeting with their foreign ministers. I do not care whether it be called a summit conference or whatever else it may be termed. But they had better get together rather than waste precious time with international diplomatic maneuvering while all mankind is poised on the brink of a precipice from which, if it falls, most of civilization will fall with it.

Many of the thoughts which I have expressed in my speech tonight are inherent in any intelligent consideration of

the kind of military manpower bill which the Senate will pass tomorrow, because such legislation will be inseparably entwined, so far as its implications and effects are concerned, in the foreign policy of my country for the next few years.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Although there are some points in the speech of the distinguished Senator from Oregon with which I might find myself in disagreement in some respects, I think the Senator has made a very outstanding contribution to the current debate upon the foreign policy of the United States and upon the debate, which is worldwide, on the subject of the future of civilization—certainly the future of peace in our time.

I regret that there was not a larger attendance at this time of the day to hear what the Senator from Oregon said. With his indulgence, and the indulgence of the employees of the Senate, who have patiently waited until this hour. I should like to make a few observations concerning some of the things which the Senator from Oregon has said.

Mr. MORSE. I will yield the floor, so that the Senator from South Dakota may proceed in his own way. I thank the Senator for listening to me until the end of my speech. As he knows, I never ask for agreement. It is not agreement that I ask, but that the American leaders and the American people, before it is too late, think about the problems which are involved, and about what I think is the greatest threat to my country which we have ever faced. This is how serious I think the situation is.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, first, in commenting on the direct issue presented by the Senator from Oregon, I wish to state that I am glad he raised the moral issue, for I, for one, agree completely with him that a moral issue is involved in the questions confronting the United States, Great Britain, France, Russia, and the other nations of the world.

I am also glad the Senator from Oregon pointed out that nations other than the so-called Big Four have a stake in the decisions made with respect to Berlin. I hope that those who are in a position to do so will convey to the leaders of those nations, such as India, Pakistan, Indonesia, and the countries of Africa, the point the Senator from Oregon has expressed tonight, namely, that they, too, have a stake in these issues and have a right to express their interests to the countries which are perhaps directly involved in the initial decisions made.

I believe a moral issue is presented, inasmuch as the world might be thrown into a nuclear war. I have that feeling not merely with respect to the Berlin crisis; I had the same feeling with respect to the Quemoy crisis of a few months ago. To me, it came as a distinct shock when I heard representatives of the Defense Establishment say that, under certain circumstances, the thing to do, if the shelling of Quemoy continued, would be to go all out in a nuclear war; that a conventional war would be merely a war of attrition which we might win or we might not win or, at least, we might not win decisively. Personally, I was shocked to hear the suggestion that the only thing to do at the outset would be to go into a nuclear war.

I do not know on what authority those whom I heard make that statement were speaking, or whether they were expressing only their own opinions. But, to me, it was unthinkable that we should unleash a nuclear war over Quemoy or over whatever Quemoy might represent in its relationship to Formosa, for I, too, agree that our country could never escape the moral judgment of this generation if our country were the first to use nuclear weapons at the present time, whether over Quemoy or over Berlin.

So I hope the moral implications of such a decision are kept in mind by whoever makes the decision in this instance.

Second, I wish to say this with respect to the leadership of Mr. Dulles: I am familiar with the statements the Senator from Oregon has made on prior occasions with respect to the policies followed by Mr. Dulles and those followed by the President of the United States in conducting our foreign policy. I wish to say that it should be to the everlasting credit of Dwight D. Eisenhower and John Foster Dulles that they took the position they did in the Suez crisis. I felt that those two gentlemen, as the leaders of our country responsible for our foreign policy, said, as it had never before been said, that the rule that territory taken by aggression should not be recognized should apply to our friends, as well as to those who have not been our friends. I think that is one of the landmarks in the development of international policy by justice and fair play.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Dakota yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McCARTHY in the chair). Does the Senator from South Dakota yield to the Senator from Oregon?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I want the Senator from South Dakota to know that I completely supported the position the President and the Secretary of State took on the Suez crisis. We remember that at that time they also pointed out to the then belligerents that they were acting outside their responsibilities in relation to the United Nations. I thought that position was unassailable. I only wish they had taken the same position in regard to some matters in which the United States was directly interested.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I have the feeling that when the long story of man's attempt to establish in international relations the rule of law and the principles of justice is written, our policy in regard to the Suez crisis will be hailed as one of the great steps forward, and something from which future leaders can take encouragement.

Third, I wish to mention the policy of the President of our country. I am glad that Dwight D. Eisenhower, rather than some other persons I might mention, is President of the United States, if chances of using nuclear weapons are involved in some of the decisions that are made.

Personally, I am convinced that he has shown more restraint that some others might have shown, or more than some others might use or show in future situations.

With regard to the Formosa resolution, I shared to some extent the feeling that we should have written into that resolution a more positive reliance upon the procedures of the United Nations. However, I recall that the night when we voted on the Formosa resolution, I stated that one reason why I would vote for the resolution was the letter the President had written, in which he stated that he would use the processes of the United Nations so far as possible in that connection.

Next I wish to mention the Berlin situation. I shall do so only briefly.

The able Senator from Oregon has made an interesting suggestion tonight, although not necessarily a new one; namely, that the procedures of the United Nations be applied to the Berlin problem. But certainly he has presented that matter in a more forceful way than I have heretofore heard it presented. By what I am about to say, I would not detract one iota from his presentation.

The Berlin situation cannot be considered entirely apart from the historic background in which it was created. The quadripartite administration of Germany, following World War II—the plan under which the land of Germany was divided into four zones, and the capital city of Berlin divided into four sectors, with one zone assigned, respectively to Great Britain, France, Russia, and the United States, and one section of the city similarly assigned—cannot be wholly ignored; nor can the modification of that quadripartite agreement—namely, when Britain, France, and the United States decided to proceed with the recognition of West Germany, even though at that time Soviet Russia was not ready to enter into a peace treaty with East Germany—or the step toward solution taken with the abandonment of occupation by the Four Powers be wholly ignored.

However, after we made our unilateral decision—unilateral insofar as the West was concerned—Russia then made her decision to create the puppet government in East Germany. At that time we could hardly protest too much on that score, because we had already recognized the West German Government.

I may have an imperfect recollection in regard to the next phases of those matters—namely, the questions which in both instances were left undecided. Among those, my memory suggests that the status of Berlin, as such, was left undecided; and the unification of Germany or any method for its unification was left for future determination; and the question of how, and in what manner, communication between the West and the Western sectors of Berlin might be preserved was left for future determination.

Because a solution of the present Berlin problem hinges upon finding some answers to those questions which were unresolved at the time when West Germany and East Germany were established, it seems to me only natural that the State Department should initially seek to arrive at answers to those questions among the powers which, following World War II, were parties to the original Four-Power handling of the German question.

So I trust that the Senator from Oregon will not be too impatient if the first and initial exploration of a solution of the problem is sought among the Four Powers, rather than through a procedure of the United Nations. The problem was started within the Four-Power agreement, and it would be natural that the first solution should be sought there.

Reverting to the general theme of the major part of the remarks of the Senator from Oregon tonight, I wish to express a hope. It is that when the Prime Minister of Great Britain, Mr. Macmillan, comes to this country, the attitude, the climate of opinion in the United States will be receptive, and not hypercritical. I express the hope that when the Prime Minister comes here and gives us the benefit of his recent trip to Russia, we shall not take umbrage at the fact that a leader of another great power should have taken the initiative in making an exploratory trip to Russia.

I personally hope when he comes he can bring to the people with whom he will confer some information which has not appeared in the front pages or has not been publicly discussed, and that will indicate the avenues through which agreement and solution of the problems confronting the world at this time may be reached.

If it is not carrying the deep sentiment which I felt was expressed in reference to the moral issues involved too far, I should like, in connection with my reference to Mr. Macmillan, to recall that on an occasion in the history of England when people were disposed to think that the answers to problems should be found in politics and great navies, a poet philosopher of England wrote some words which, it seems to me, the world might well read today. I read them now. It was in the "Recessional" that Rudyard Kipling wrote:

God of our fathers, known of old—
Lord of our far-flung battle line—
Beneath whose awful hand we hold
Dominion over palm and pine—
Lord God of Hosts, be with us yet,
Lest we forget—lest we forget!

The tumult and the shouting dies—
The Captains and the Kings depart—
Still stands Thine ancient sacrifice,
An humble and a contrite heart.
Lord God of Hosts, be with us yet,
Lest we forget—lest we forget!

Then this stanza, Mr. President:

Far-called our navies melt away—
On dune and headland sinks the fire—
Lo, all our pomp of yesterday
Is one with Nineveh and Tyre!
Judge of the nations, spare us yet,
Lest we forget—lest we forget!

To all who may hear or read in these days discussions about massive retaliation and power politics, I recommend this stanza:

If, drunk with sight of power, we loose
Wild tongues that have not Thee in awe—
Such boastings as the Gentiles use,
Or lesser breeds without the Law—
Lord God of Hosts, be with us yet,
Lest we forget—lest we forget!

To those of us who may occasionally be a bit self-righteous and think that the only wisdom and the only concern of the world and of humanity rests with the so-called Christian nations, I read the final stanza:

For heathen heart that puts her trust
In reeking tube and iron shard—
All valiant dust that builds on dust,
And guarding calls not Thee to guard
For frantic boast and foolish word,
Thy Mercy on Thy People, Lord!

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I say to the Senator from South Dakota that if my remarks did no more than elicit from him the contribution he has made to the RECORD tonight, I shall be well repaid for the speech I have made. Such disagreement as I may have with the Senator from South Dakota in regard to the Berlin situation I think can be stated very simply as follows:

I am well aware of the fact that the misunderstandings or differences which have arisen among Russia, France, Great Britain, and the United States, and now Western Germany, grow out of the agreements which the powers entered into. Of course, it is understandable that an attempt should be made to resolve the disagreements which have arisen over the agreements. My point is that I think the parties have already reached the point where the rights of other nations now must be recognized and where other nations should intervene.

That is the reason for my suggestion that Russia, the United States, Great Britain, France, and West Germany should present their case now, on the basis of any agreements they can reach, to the only tribunal which, in my judgment, exists for the settlement of this dispute in the interest of peace, namely, the United Nations. Raising this question with the United Nations now would not prevent the leaders of Russia, Great Britain, France, West Germany, and the United States from reaching any new agreement they can.

Many of us have seen party litigants over a boundary dispute almost reach the point of carrying guns, unable to reach any agreement even with the aid of counsel, but in the judicial atmosphere of a courtroom, where they must appeal to the rule of reason and present evidence to support their case, we have often seen them reach a settlement. If the United Nations were to make it clear that it proposed to exercise jurisdiction, it might provide the greatest enhancement to the prospect of the party litigants themselves reaching agreement over the Berlin crisis.

Mr. President, I appreciate very much the fine contribution which the Senator from South Dakota has made. No greater reference in literature could be found than his reference to Kipling and to the rich philosophy entailed in that beautiful piece of poetry.

During the delivery of Mr. MORSE's speech:

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I should like to extend a courtesy to the Senator from South Dakota and have him take the floor at this time, without my losing it, so he can modify his amendment, with the understanding that his statement will either follow or precede my statement in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING CFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent, notwithstanding the fact that the yeas and and nays have been ordered on my amendment, that my amendment may be modified in this respect:

In subparagraph (b), after the first word, "President," insert "by and with the advice and consent of the Senate."

Then, in the same paragraph, to change "four" members to "six" members, and change the figure "3" to "1."

The effect of that modification is to make sure that six members of the Commission shall be appointed from civilian life, and only one from the Armed Forces, and that all seven members shall be subject to Senate confirmation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, the modification will be made, and the amendment, as modified, will be printed.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I make that request at this time in order that my amendment, when printed tonight, may appear on the desks of Senators in its modified form.

I also ask unanimous consent that these remarks follow the colloquy with the Senator from Oregon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PROMOTION OF MINING AND DEVELOPMENT RESEARCH FOR BERYL, CHROMITE, AND COLUMBIUM-TANTALUM FROM DOMESTIC MINES — ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF THE BILL

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the Senator from California [Mr. ENGLE] may be added as an additional cosponsor to the bill (S. 1245) to promote mining and development research for beryl, chromite, and columbium-tantalum from domestic mines, introduced by me on March 2, 1959, the next time the bill is printed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RECESS TO TOMORROW AT 10 O'CLOCK A.M.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, in accordance with the order previously entered, I move that the Senate stand in recess until 10 o'clock tomorrow morning.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 8 o'clock and 22 minutes p.m.) the Senate took a recess, the recess being, under

the order previously entered, until tomorrow, Wednesday, March 11, 1959, at 10 o'clock a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received March 10 (legislative day of March 9), 1959:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

Ogden Rogers Reid, of New York, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Israel, vice Edward B. Lawson.

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY

Cecil P. Milne, of Wisconsin, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Navy.

U.S. TARIFF COMMISSION

J. Allen Overton, Jr., of West Virginia, to be a member of the U.S. Tariff Commission for the remainder of the term expiring June 16, 1962, vice Edgar Bernard Brossard, retiring.

COMMISSION ON CIVIL RIGHTS

George M. Johnson, of California, to be a member of the Commission on Civil Rights, vice J. Ernest Wilkins, deceased.

U.S. CIRCUIT JUDGE

Henry J. Friendly, of New York, to be U.S. circuit judge for the second circuit, vice Harold R. Medina, retired.

U.S. DISTRICT JUDGE

Lloyd F. MacMahon, of New York, to be U.S. district judge for the southern district of New York, vice Lawrence E. Walsh, resigned.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate March 10 (legislative day of March 9), 1959:

IN THE ARMY

The following-named officers for temporary appointment in the Army of the United States to the grades indicated, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3442 and 3447:

To be major generals

Brig. Gen. Isaac Sewell Morris, O18806, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Christian Hudgins Clarke, Jr., O18213, U.S. Army.

Brig. Gen. Charles Hartwell Bonesteel 3d, O18655, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Lyle Edward Seeman, O17082, U.S. Army.

Brig. Gen. Jack William Schwartz, O17823, Medical Corps, U.S. Army.

Brig. Gen. Roy Tripp Evans, Jr., O19140, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

To be brigadier generals

Col. Franklin Fearing Wing, Jr., O18107, U.S. Army.

Col. Clarence Renshaw, O17708, U.S. Army.

Col. William Warner Harris, O18170, U.S. Army.

Col. Chester William Clark, O41908, U.S. Army.

Col. Gines Perez, O30126, U.S. Army.

Col. Elmer Louis Littell, O29823, U.S. Army.

Col. Harvey Julius Jablonsky, O19390, U.S. Army.

Col. James Leslie Snyder, O19627, Medical Corps, U.S. Army.

Col. John Farnsworth Smoller, O19416, U.S. Army.

The following-named officer to be placed on the retired list in the grade indicated, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 3962:

To be general

Gen. Henry Irving Hodes, O12845, Army of the United States (major general, U.S. Army).

The following-named officers under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 3066, to be assigned to a position of importance and responsibility designated by the President under subsection (a) of section 3066, in rank as follows:

To be general

Lt. Gen. Clyde Davis Eddleman, O15842, Army of the United States (major general, U.S. Army).

To be lieutenant general

Maj. Gen. Paul DeWitt Adams, O17306, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

IN THE AIR FORCE

The following-named officer to be assigned to position of importance and responsibility designated by the President in the rank indicated, under the provisions of section 8066, title 10 of the United States Code:

To be general

Lt. Gen. Samuel E. Anderson, 92A (major general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

The following-named officer to be placed on the retired list in the grade indicated under the provisions of section 8962, title 10 of the United States Code:

To be general

Gen. Edwin W. Rawlings, 95A (major general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

IN THE NAVY

Having designated, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 5231, the following-named officers for commands and other duties determined by the President to be within the contemplation of said section, he has nominated them for appointment to the grade indicated while so serving:

To be admiral

Vice Adm. Robert L. Dennison, U.S. Navy.

To be vice admirals

*Vice Adm. George C. Towner, U.S. Navy.

*Vice Adm. Hyman G. Rickover, U.S. Navy.

Rear Adm. William R. Smedberg III, U.S. Navy.

The following-named officers for appointment to the grade indicated on the retired list pursuant to title 10, United States Code, section 5233:

To be admiral

Adm. James L. Holloway, Jr., U.S. Navy.

To be vice admiral

Adm. Byron H. Hanlon, U.S. Navy, retired.

NOTE.—Asterisk (*) indicates ad interim appointment issued.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, MARCH 10, 1959

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. Charles W. Holland, Jr., pastor, Fountain Memorial Baptist Church, Washington, D.C., offered the following prayer:

John said of Jesus—John 1: 3: *All things were made by Him, and without Him was not anything made that was made.*

Most Holy God, creator of the universe, the world, and all that is in the world, keep us ever mindful of Thy omnipotence.

We know, dear Heavenly Father, that it took a miracle to put the stars in space, and a supernatural act to put the worlds in place.

Dear God, as we realize Thy power, may we also appreciate the fact that Thou art a personal God—so personal as to one day wipe away every tear from our eyes.

May we be cognizant of Thy power and yet also realize that Thou art concerned with our well-being. May this knowledge keep us humble, whereby we do our best work.

This petition we make in Thy name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

WATERSHED WORK PLAN FOR LICK CREEK, TENN.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication, which was read and referred to the Committee on Appropriations:

MARCH 6, 1959.

Hon. SAM RAYBURN,
The Speaker, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the provisions of section 2 of the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act, as amended, the Committee on Public Works has approved the work plan transmitted to you which was referred to the committee. The work plan involved is:

State: Tennessee.
Watershed: Lick Creek.
Executive communication No. 515.
Committee approval: March 4, 1959.

Sincerely yours,

CHARLES A. BUCKLEY,
Member of Congress,
Chairman, Committee on Public Works.

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Public Works be permitted to sit today and tomorrow during general debate while the House is in session.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking and Currency may be permitted to sit during general debate for the remainder of the week.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA MUST MOVE FAST IN TWO VITAL AREAS OF FOREIGN POLICY

Mr. IRWIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. IRWIN. Mr. Speaker, the tension in the world today is great and the manner in which we resolve the tremendous problems of foreign policy may well decide the fate of our Nation.

It is to our advantage, therefore, that we move cautiously and think carefully about the steps we should take to protect the position of world leadership so long enjoyed by the United States.

Along these lines, I think the following story from the Westchester Herald's weekend edition February 26 to March 2 should be weighed thoroughly by those responsible for determining our foreign policy.

The article was written by the Herald's editor-publisher, Mr. J. Spencer Gray. The newspaper is published in White Plains, N.Y.:

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA MUST MOVE FAST IN TWO VITAL AREAS OF FOREIGN POLICY

(By J. Spencer Gray)

The United States of America must take immediate action in two major areas of its foreign policy: First, provide more generously for its Foreign Service and other emissaries abroad; second, take a long, hard look at its present disorganized patchwork programs of foreign aid to greatly improve their effectiveness, reduce the load on American taxpayers, and at the same time provide more practical aid to our friends abroad who desperately need help.

The foregoing is the consensus of officials of foreign governments interviewed by the writer during recent tours of Europe, as well as foreign-affairs students—inside the Government and out—with whom the two interrelated problems have been discussed since that time.

The conclusion of many of these trained observers of overall U.S.A. policy is that present appropriations for foreign aid might well be scaled down by approximately 10 percent and the funds used for two main purposes: First, more generous salaries and expenses for Foreign Service personnel in all categories; second, a thorough study of the foreign-assistance programs and whether they are really doing the job they were designed to do.

Those who favor a fractional reduction in foreign-aid funds do not do so out of any reactionary desire to injure our underprivileged friends abroad, although they do point out, as the Springfield (Ill.) State Journal said recently, "We can't go on giving away money forever. We would go broke in time."

The general opinion among knowledgable sources appears, however, to be that a firm new approach is needed to planning assistance sent abroad by the United States of America and that we have entered an era where dollar and material aid—though still essential—are not as crucial as the type of personnel we send overseas to represent our Nation, and the effectiveness with which these emissaries tell our story and work with foreign peoples.

The point was recently emphasized to this writer that changing world conditions have also brought a change in the role that should be played by the United States of America as the world's leading force for peaceful progress, rehabilitation of nations crippled by war, and development of backward nations.

In the case of West Europe, for example, "the desire to trade is (now) greater than the need for aid," as one observer puts it. Of much greater value to our European friends than large-scale assistance would be the maintenance of a high level of trading activity between nations.

The needs of our Western Hemisphere neighbors are similar: Rather than putting major emphasis on handouts from the United States of America, the Rockefeller Brothers' recent report, "Foreign Economic Policy for the 20th Century," suggested that four major points be explored at a proposed economic conference bringing together the nations of North, South, and Central America.

The object of the conference would be:

1. To find procedures for moderating commodity-price fluctuation.

2. To promote economic growth and development with increasing living standards.

3. To prepare the ground for a regional common market.

4. To establish an Inter-American Development Union.

The mere expenditure of dollars is not a solution, whether in Latin America, Africa, Asia, or Europe.

What the United States of America needs is a consistent set of objectives regarding our economic role overseas, and highly qualified personnel to translate these objectives into reality.

Those who hold to this view are not of the shortsighted opinion that foreign aid should be reduced merely for the sake of saving money, desirable though this might appear. They recognize that the United States of America must continue to be willing to finance its preeminent role in world affairs or face the possibility of chaos and catastrophe.

But, they do believe that the present variety of foreign aid programs have too much of a patchwork character, and that without more planning and more liberal provisions for personnel to plan and direct these programs, much of our overseas altruism will be wasted.

FEDERAL RESERVE BOARD DISCOUNT RATES

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker in accordance with its established practice of announcing controversial policies at the weekend, the Federal Reserve Board has again juggled a discount rate increase from 2½ percent to 3 percent. Again, at the very moment our economy is beginning to renew hope in recovery, the Federal Reserve Board is repeating the procedures which extended the current recession. This discount rate juggling generally results in less available borrowing at higher and inflated rates. The ostensible purpose of this action is to reduce inflationary pressures by drying up the resources for enterprise expansion.

It may be entirely coincidental, but the record points up Federal Reserve action to increase interest rates just before the American Government must enter the money market for the handling of large issues of its own debt. The increased interest rates which result are more costly to the Government than to all other enterprise—both private and corporate—combined. Thus the Federal Reserve Board acts with almost open hostility to the Government which gives it life. If this process continues, the rising cost of artificially increased interest of the public debt may completely unbalance the Federal structure. The Federal Reserve Bank Board is thereby threatening economic patricide of the Federal structure.

Is the Federal Reserve action truly designed to help the current refunding of the Federal debt? Is it easier to sell $15 billion in new issues to replace maturing Federal securities in a market of higher interest rates—when even higher interest rates and higher investment profits result from private or corporate avenues of investment?

How much higher can interest rates be permitted to rise? Current business expansion in my community is available at short-term 6-percent rates plus shameful discounts or bonuses which must be added to the cost of the loan. Interest rates have already pushed up to the full limit of moral decency. How much pressure are we exercising on the legal limits of usury? When does the cancer of usury begin its evil and ultimate destruction of our economy?

The Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board stated last month that the inflammable tender of inflation is all around us. However, except for the price of interest on borrowed money, prices have been relatively stable since April 1958. The inflammable tender to which the Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board apparently refers is the threat of higher steel prices after a possible steel strike this summer. It is difficult for me to determine how inflating the price of borrowed money will in any way chill the current expanded production of steel—current steel industry profits—or the desire of steel workers to participate in them.

THE BUDGET, THE NATIONAL DEBT, AND INFLATION

Mr. BUDGE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Idaho?

There was no objection.

Mr. BUDGE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to talk today about something that affects all Americans, the budget of the U.S. Government.

In connection with the budget for fiscal year 1960, which is the administration's financial plan for the period from July 1, 1959 through June 30, 1960, I want to stress the ever-growing impact on all of us of one portion of that budget, our interest payments on the national debt, and why we, as a Nation, must live within our means. In other words, why we must maintain a balanced budget.

President Eisenhower has called on the Congress for a balanced budget of $77 billion for fiscal year 1960. Of that total, the President earmarked $45.8 billion, or 59 percent, for national security, including defense, atomic energy, and military assistance to friendly foreign nations.

The second largest single item in the budget is $8.1 billion—that is eight thousand one hundred million dollars—in interest payments on our astronomical national debt of some $285 billion. This figure of $285 billion is $2 billion in excess of the present permanent debt limit.

Following that are allocations of $6 billion for agriculture and $5.1 billion

for veterans' services and benefits. All other functions of the Government are lumped together in the remaining 16 percent, or $12.1 billion.

To pay for this, Americans, through their income-tax payments alone, will contribute $40.7 billion—some 53 percent of the total. They will also pay $21.5 billion in corporation income taxes and $8.9 billion in excise taxes. All other revenue measures will account for the remaining $6 billion needed to make the books balance.

Let us go back now and take a closer look at that second item—interest on the national debt—and the debt itself. As I said a moment ago, our national debt is $285 billion. If we maintain a balanced budget in fiscal year 1960, that debt will still be $285 billion on the 30th of June 1960. However, due to anticipated heavy borrowing requirements during the first half of fiscal year 1960, the temporary debt limit will probably be increased.

May I add right here that I shall oppose such an increase. I opposed, and voted against, the spending measures which will probably necessitate the debt increase, so I seen no reason whiy I should not oppose and vote against the increase itself. I would not be consistent were I to do otherwise.

And now I would like to make a comparison—a comparison that, to me, is extremely interesting and informative. As noted before, our national debt interest payments will amount to $8.1 billion for fiscal year 1960. Compare that figure to the figure $3,780,719,647—which was the total administration budget for fiscal year 1930. Think of it. We now have to pay more than twice as much in interest on our national debt as it cost to run our entire Government just 30 years ago.

I have said many times in the past that I would know, were I living beyond my means, when I was approaching the end of the line—when my credit was becoming exhausted—but that there would be no similar yardstick where the Federal Government is concerned. I now think that perhaps I was mistaken in the second part of that statement.

For just recently—within the last month—there have been indications that Uncle Sam, the world's best credit risk, is losing his popularity with investors.

The situation was this. Nine billion dollars of loans supplied by private lenders came due—and Uncle Sam just did not have the cash on hand with which to pay them. Instead of paying them off, he tried to renew them and, as an added inducement, offered to increase the interest rate to as high as 4 percent which, in some cases, was more than double the interest paid on the original loan.

He was partly successful. He succeeded in raising $7 billion, which left him $2 billion short. And this was $2 billion that could not be shrugged off with a statement, such as was made on the floor of the House in the last Congress during debate on a spending measure of, and I quote, "Why quibble about a couple of billion dollars?"

The Government got the money it needed, but only after a second appeal for an extension of its credit, a situation crowded with foreboding overtones.

Also, the Treasury Department has reported that it is now redeeming more savings bonds than it is selling, another indication that investors are losing faith in Uncle Sam as a good credit risk, another indication that his creditors feel that he has lived beyond his means for too long a time.

The answer to the question, "Why is the Government having trouble in borrowing the money it needs?" is simple. It is fear of inflation, even though there are those who say that inflation is not harmful.

As living costs, through inflation, advance, the market value of bonds drops because the dollars represented by those bonds are losing value. In other words, what good is an interest payment of 4 percent on a $100 bond if the $104 will buy only $90 in merchandise due to inflated dollars?

During inflationary periods investors are much more prone to put their money in common stocks, or in real estate, in the hope that the value of the stocks and real estate will keep pace with the inflation.

In spite of indications of financial trouble for the Federal Government, liberals in the Congress are pressing for ever-increasing Government spending, which, without increased taxes, would simply mean increased borrowing by the Government. And this at a time when the Government is having trouble meeting its current obligations.

To keep a balanced budget, which we must do if we want sanity in Federal fiscal policies, we must eliminate the gingerbread, we must eliminate services for which all of the people must pay, but which a vast majority of the people do not want.

Anyone who manages a budget knows that you cannot spend what you do not have without ending up bankrupt.

RETURN TO SANITY IN GOVERNMENT SPENDING

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, I have here a check from the U.S. Government to a Dallas constituent who is returning it to the Federal Government. The endorsement on the check reads "Payable to the Treasury of the United States in the interest of a return to sanity in Government spending." The letter accompanying the check presents this constituent's views, and I am pleased to insert this in the RECORD for the perusal of my colleagues.

Though it was just one letter, among the many, and signed by just one person, I firmly believe it represents the quiet, down-to-earth and commonsense thinking of most citizens. I think the majority of Americans in every congressional district would have signed it gladly.

I am returning the Government check he enclosed to the Treasury, just as Mr. J. C. McCormick, of 9135 Longmont Drive in Dallas, requested.

I am placing his letter in the RECORD, just as it came to me, for the thoughtful consideration of all in this House who would presume to be leaders among such Americans.

Congressman BRUCE ALGER,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN ALGER: Like you, I am deeply concerned with the overpowering growth of the Federal Government in our private affairs. I am even more concerned over the apathy of our people toward this, the most serious problem that America faces today. There seems to be an illusion of well-being associated with staggering Government spending, bigger handouts and more dollars which buy less and less, which has sort of hypnotized us all into complacency.

Before I go further I should tell you something about myself. I am 34 years old, married and have three children. I served in the Air Force during World War II, was educated under the G.I. bill and am now one of America's big "middle group" of citizens. In short, my family is very average and is probably representative of millions of other American families. As a matter of fact, I am afraid that it is quite possible that we fall into a category of perhaps 100 million Americans who are, for the most part, the least vocal group in the country when it comes to Government affairs. True, we always show up at the poll at voting time, but as important as that it is, I am afraid that our silent vote is the loudest request we ever made for a return to sanity in government. I am sure that you must get hundreds of letters daily and that 99 percent of them are some form of request from constituents. Everywhere I go it seems that I am hit head-on with the ridiculous insanity that has possessed us in our Government affairs. In the past 2 days the Nation's papers have revealed that a good percentage of our Congressmen are practicing nepotism. I read where our tax dollars are paying 19 year old Congressmen's sons as much as $12,000 a year for routine office jobs. If the picture from here is as bad as it appears, I can imagine what it must be from your vantage point.

After a great deal of serious thought on the subject during the past few weeks, it has finally dawned on me that it must be nigh impossible, from where you sit, to get an objective view of the desires of America's masses. Since the only people who ever contact you in any way are asking for something (even though they may be giving lip service to small government and free enterprise) you, in Washington, must get the feeling that the American people do not really want the give-away program stopped. This is my fault and the fault of millions of people like me for keeping our mouths shut too long in the blind hope that the situation would ultimately correct itself. It is high time that we let ourselves be heard from. In fact, it appears that we may have already waited too long.

I have decided that the only hope for a return of sanity to government is for each of us to act * * * to quit waiting for group action, because this is obviously never going to come. Last fall I spent a week in the wheat country of western Colorado and heard scores of farmers speak derisively about the Government farm program which apparently has reached the Laurel and Hardy stage * * * with the Government building grain bins and then letting them stand empty because of political pressure from local elevator owners. One man in particular seemed to

express the opinion of the majority with "I would welcome the Government getting out of my affairs if they would make a clean sweep of it, but I don't want them to get out of the wheat business and stay in the peanut business." This man is never going to say "Take my subsidy check back."

I firmly believe, however, that this is exactly what must happen if we are to ever stop the government Frankenstein that has been created in the last 25 years.

In view of this, let me be the first to start where it hurts—in the pocketbook. To the best of my knowledge, the only direct Government benefit I get is an annual dividend check on my G.I. insurance. So I say to you, Mr. Congressman, take it back and reduce my taxes. Let me assure you that this is not a spur of the moment decision. It came after a great deal of soul-searching because I could certainly use the money. However, if we are going to curtail this thing we must act as individuals.

I believe strongly in America and I hate to see her being sold down the river.

Very sincerely yours,

J. C. McCORMICK.

DALLAS, TEX.

(Enclosure: One Government check—to be placed back in the U.S. Treasury.)

AMENDMENT OF INTERNAL REVENUE CODE OF 1954

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I have introdueed today a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a longer period for claiming refund or credit of income tax where the claim is based upon a judicial decision affecting tax liability in a similar case.

It has been brought to my attention and I am sure to many other of the Congressmen that there have been many instances where a judicial decision affecting tax liability may tend to extend or to explain a credit or refund right, and which may give many other persons a lawful refund or credit of income tax but whose claim under the new judicial decision, has been barred by the statute of limitations.

I am therefore proposing, Mr. Speaker, that if the claim for credit or refund relates to an overpayment resulting from a decision of any court of the United States, which changes the basis or extent of tax liability under subtitle (a); and if a case involve facts substantially similar to those upon which such claim is based; and the Secretary or his delegate does not institute an appeal from such decision within 1 year after it is rendered; in lieu of the 3-year period of limitations prescribed in subsection (a); the period shall be 10 years from the date prescribed by law for filing the return for the year with respect to which the claim is made.

I believe the passage of this bill will assist in equalizing the rights of our citizens and the duties and obligations of our tax collecting agencies. I am hopeful that this bill will be passed this year.

TURNING CHECKS BACK TO THE U.S. GOVERNMENT

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, a moment ago the gentleman from Texas talked about a constituent of his who had turned a check back to the U.S. Government. If I am correct about it, I believe that the endorsement which his constituent placed on the check is restrictive and it will do the Government no good. I suggest that if he wants to turn the funds over to the Government, he should make the proper endorsement on the check so that the Federal Government can use this money.

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VANIK. I am delighted to yield to my colleague.

Mr. ALGER. I am not sure that this gentleman, my constituent, knows as much about governmental procedure as we do here in the House of Representatives, but I believe he knows an awful lot about such things as what we should spend government money on in his name as a taxpayer.

Mr. VANIK. I will wager that the gentleman knows his endorsement of the check is restrictive and he will not lose his money.

Mr. ALGER. I will wager that the constituent will be surprised when he reads these remarks in the RECORD.

THE ANIMAS RIVER

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD in two instances.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusett?

There was no objection.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, one of the most shocking and willful cases of wanton water waste in this country is seen in a study of the Animas River in Colorado and New Mexico.

The city of Silverton, Colo., is guilty of some of the most shameful kinds of unscrupulous dumping into this stream.

The excerpts below are taken from the record of a conference held pursuant to Public Law 660 of the 84th Congress, which must by law precede Federal action to clean up our interstate waters. To aggravate the generally unsanitary nature of the stream, the uranium-processing mill at Durango, Colo., has been polluting the Animas River through depositions of highly radioactive material. The excerpts follow:

ANIMAS RIVER

When the Far West is mentioned, most people have mental images of deep blue skies, a hot sun, and clear, sparkling streams in which trout swim and leap. The Animas River which flows from the southwest corner of Colorado to northwest New Mexico was such a stream. Now, however, the beautiful picture has darkened. The skies are still blue and the sun is still hot, but the once clear, sparkling waters are laden with filth and the trout are gone.

So bad has the situation become that the Public Health Service has been compelled to hold a conference to look into the possible deleterious effects of this stream's contamination on the health of people who use it. The story told by witnesses, both lay civilian and official, at that conference, details the degradation of this river caused by the careless expansion of our so-called civilization.

A Colorado State Game and Fish Department official stated that approximately one-half of the section of this river, representing its most valuable part from the trout fisheries standpoint, has been largely destroyed by pollution coming from the Vanadium Corp. of America mill at Durango, Colo.

Another witness, W. L. Bruce, secretary of the Animas River Water Users Association, provided a more vivid account of the stream's condition:

"For the past 35 or 40 years the town of Silverton, Colo., has been using a flat piece of ground on the bank of the Animas River as a city dump, and the raw sewage from the town has been emptying into South Mineral Creek since the sewer system was installed. South Mineral Creek connects with the Animas River a short distance from where the mouth of the sewer is.

"Every conceivable kind of garbage has been found in the city dump from household refuse to carcasses of dogs, cats, deer, elk, and butcher shop, hotel and restaurant meat scraps. The city takes a bulldozer and pushes this garbage to the bank and into the Animas River to be washed away and finally destroyed by decomposition. The same condition exists at Durango, Colo., as regards sewage disposal. It is common practice for all residents and businesses along the Animas River at Durango to dump their garbage and refuse into the river."

The revulsion felt by this witness in viewing this disgraceful situation is reflected in his statement:

"After checking the carcasses from the dump that are bulldozed into the river and the sewage that comes from the sewer outlet, it is our contention that the animal carcasses do not disintegrate very quickly. Every time you take a drink of water the thought comes up that you may be drinking somebody's unborn child."

More along the same lines was described at the conference. But what may prove most serious is the fear, indeed the probability, that wastes of high radium content flowing into this stream from the uranium processing mill at Durango, Colo., are polluting the Animas through the deposition of this highly radioactive material. It is probable that persons in communities downstream are ingesting considerable quantities of radioactivity with their drinking water taken from the stream. Principally threatened are ranchers in Colorado and inhabitants of the two thriving communities of Aztec and Farmington, N. Mex.

Dr. Tsivoglou, a Public Health Service scientist, testified that limited prior stream samples "indicate a definite gain in stream radioactivity below the mill." He felt, however, that the significance of this radioactivity increase was in doubt because of the very few analytical survey results that were then available. Nevertheless, he believed the radium discharged to the Animas River might constitute a threat to those who used its waters for drinking and household purposes. He stated, "The limited available data indicate that existing levels of radium, alone, in the Animas River may be at or near recommended safe concentrations for public water supplies." He went on to describe the serious effects of excessive intake of radioactive materials, and proposed that the Public Health Service inaugurate an intensive study

of the radioactive contamination of this river. Such a study is now in progress.

We can only hope that such radioactivity as has been deposited in this stream will be insufficient to damage the health of those who have been using it. The radium that is presently in the stream is extremely long-lived and will undoubtedly remain there for hundreds of years.

People now using this water for domestic needs have no other available supply. An official of the New Mexico Department of Public Health stated, "I would like to bring out the point that in this area one of the things that makes it serious in regard to pollution of any sort, is the fact that there is a very poor quality of ground water. It is not obtainable to the entire area; they have to depend on surface water."

Thus we see how a stream, once beautiful and useful, has been seared and blighted by the wanton dumping of sewage and industrial wastes. This condition may not be permanent. Water pollution abatement through installation of sewage treatment facilities and hygienic garbage disposal methods in upstream communities and industries can restore this stream close to its original state. As to the radium, however, although further increases can be terminated, what is there now will remain there in the foreseeable future. We can only hope that too much has not found its way into this water.

THE BEAR RIVER

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, the dirty, foul, and unsafe condition of our waters in this country is a matter of grave concern for many reasons.

To the hunter, the fisherman, and the conservationist it is a matter of prime concern. To the Public Health personnel it is a source of constant worry since our foul waters may very well be the genesis of a sweeping epidemic of one of many different diseases. To those concerned with purifying our municipal water supplies it is a source of never-ending concern and is a problem which compounds itself each year.

We know that industries are very often now refusing to locate in many areas because of the lack of pure water for industrial purposes.

The Bear River in the West presents a new problem, one met by the farmer. The waste matter in long stretches of the Bear River coming from both municipal sewage and effluent from meatpacking plants and sugar beet refining industry gravely affects the quality of food products and the nature of edible crops grown on lands irrigated by that river.

THE BEAR RIVER

Many people have not heard of the Bear River, yet it is unique and a fairly important member of our family of rivers. It is the Western Hemisphere's largest stream which does not reach an ocean, and it virtually forms a gigantic circle in its flow from origin to mouth.

Originating in the high Uinta Mountains of Utah, the Bear flows northward into Wyoming, west into Idaho, then south back into Utah where it empties into the Great Salt Lake about 90 miles from its source. For most of its 500 miles the river is a clean and beautiful mountain stream. But, as it enters the Cache Valley in Idaho and approaches the Utah border, ugly things begin to happen to it.

First, a community in Idaho casts in its sewage, reduced in strength by some treatment, from the equivalent of 4,000 to 3,000 persons. Then the big guns begin to boom. Industrial wastes from meatpacking, vegetable packing, dairy, and beet sugar refining plants are discharged in massive quantities into the Bear or its tributaries in a 35-mile stretch between Preston, Idaho, and the Cutler Reservoir in Utah. Added to these is the raw sewage from several Utah communities.

Let's face it. The river is handy for a very useful purpose. It takes the repulsive materials society casts off, mixes them with water, and moves them away. And it doesn't appear to cost a cent. But is this really true? Not according to the Public Health Service engineer who, in the impersonal technical phrases of his profession described the damages caused by the pollution:

"Fish kills have been experienced in the lower Bear River below the two sugar refineries in the Utah-Idaho area. The most recent kill reported was in November 1953, and was estimated to have caused a loss of $10,000."

Apparently this is not the only cost. There is a bird refuge which was set up at considerable expense by the Federal Government at the mouth of the Bear River. The refuge manager has been having trouble protecting the wildlife in the area. At a recent Public Health Service conference on water pollution he stated that "in years past we have lost hundreds of thousands of ducks and geese which I'm sure the State agencies are interested in protecting and propagating. * * *

"The Federal Government * * * is spending considerable money carrying on investigations at the present time as to the cause of the loss of birdlife which is known as botulism poisoning. It seems that we are working at cross-purposes if we don't do something to clean up the source of contamination or conditions which cause this loss of birdlife."

So the "doesn't cost a cent" contention is falling apart at the seams. Going deeper, we find that the principal established use of waters of the Bear River and its tributaries in the Cache Valley is for irrigation, including dairy pastures. It is difficult to measure the damages resulting when edible crops are grown in the sewage from upstream pollution sources. It is also difficult to calculate the cost of injury or disease to dairy cattle that drink this water, eat grass soaked in it, or dangle their nether parts in it as they graze.

And what of the fish and wildlife that inhabit this used-to-be water environment? A Cache Valley citizen who has been active in trying to restore cleanliness to the river, Merrill Peterson of the Cache Chamber of Commerce, described water conditions as they affect fish and wildlife, "Your water is so polluted that nothing but trash fish can live in it. I remember when we had some good bass fishing in the bottom land in the valley. At the present time a lot of your areas in the bottom of the valley are so highly polluted that they won't even support trash fish. I'm sure that nobody likes to hunt ducks in water that is untreated sewage. Not only that, but it isn't safe for boating or any other type of recreation."

Certainly pollution is costing a little more than a cent to citizens of the area who used to enjoy fishing, hunting, and boating on the Bear River, but who now must travel to as yet unsullied waters to engage in these sports.

Aside from comparative cost calculations, can this Nation afford to continue the progressive degradation of its waters? At what point does it become economically feasible to stop pollution? Must we wait until every stream is utterly filthy, when we have no place to travel where there are fish, wildlife, or the possibility of enjoying other water sports? Now, not tomorrow, not when noisome odors nauseate us and scavenger birds walk on the solids in our rivers—now, today, is the time to take action. Communities must install adequate waste treatment plants and industries must face up to the costs of abating their waste discharges if we are not to witness the complete destruction of irreplaceable natural resources.

FOREIGN STUDENTS

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, my colleague, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. TOLLEFSON], introduced H.R. 4747, a bill to allow a taxpayer a personal exemption for a foreign student who resides in his home while in the United States attending high school. Several of our other colleagues have introduced companion bills. These bills have been assigned to the Ways and Means Committee, on which I serve.

I have been familiar with the programs sponsored by groups of our private citizens under which foreign students attend high schools in the United States for 1 year. Several American organizations such as the American Field Service, the Grange, International Christian Youth Exchange, National Catholic Welfare Conference, American Friends, and Michigan Council of Churches have such programs. My colleague, Congressman JUDD, who serves on the Foreign Affairs Committee, has stated to me that these programs are of very great benefit in promoting understanding with the peoples of the various countries abroad. I have been impressed with these programs because they are person-to-person programs with the political governments out of the picture.

These are the kind of programs which, in my judgment, do the most good. And they are the kind of programs which are the least costly. Our private citizens should be encouraged to continue supporting these programs and indeed to expand them. Through this method the demands on the Federal Treasury for Government programs trying to achieve the same results, but in a much more ineffective and costly way, can be minimized.

The tax loss to the Federal Government for the programs at the size they are under this bill would be $182,760. The savings to the Federal Government from cutting down on the expensive and ineffective programs can be measured in the millions not the hundred of thousands of dollars.

I am happy to introduce a companion bill and trust that we can enact it into law.

THE BERLIN CRISIS

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, on this beautiful morning of blue sky and sunshine, there is a dark, black cloud on the horizon. In the cheer and bloom of this approaching springtime, we must not overlook the

torrent of destruction contained in that black cloud. Its full meaning and comprehension must be brought to the attention of the American people. This is a serious moment, not because that black cloud might be composed of spring rain, but because it is composed of the devastation and tragedy of war. It threatens the peace and security of our country.

Last fall on several occasions I stated the most important issue facing America was the preservation of peace. In the Congress I said I shall strive to prevent war and maintain peace. In view of the serious crises now facing our country I believe the time has come for positive action to insure the peace. This is the reason, Mr. Speaker, as a senior Member of this House, I am impelled at this time to make some positive suggestions of affirmative action which if adopted I believe, and I know many will agree, will definitely help to prevent the outbreak of war.

An ultimatum has been fired by the Russian Soviet Union at the free world with particular emphasis on the United States of America, Great Britain, and France. On November 27, 1958, and again on January 10, 1959, the Communist Russian Government has, in reality, told the United States and our associated nations to get out of Berlin by the 27th of May 1959. This Nation has been told that on this day, the doorway to Berlin will be closed. After this date, no communication or traffic with Berlin can take place except by permission of the Communist Russian-dominated East German puppet government.

Under various agreements, the United States, Great Britain, and France have certain responsibilities and duties in Berlin, and particularly the Western Sector of Berlin. In the fulfillment of these responsibilities exists the honor of the United States of America and the free world. To obey the Russian Communist ultimatum and withdraw from Berlin would constitute turning away from responsibilitiy and duty with the consequent loss of honor and respect throughout the world association of nations. Our country will not do this.

Since our establishment as a Nation, since the days of Lexington and Concord and Valley Forge, America has lived up to all of its agreements. Our country never has turned its back to duty or responsibility. When duty is involved, duty commands the course of conduct of our Nation. If civilized life in this world of nations is to have order rather than chaos, then international agreements defining responsibilities and duties must be honored. The United States has always honored its agreements and will continue to do so.

This Communist Russian Soviet ultimatum is a very serious matter. It is always a serious matter when one nation sends an ultimatum to another nation. In this Communist ultimatum, the United States and the Western Powers are notified they no longer have any access to West Berlin over East German territory without the express approval of the Russian-dominated East German puppet government. America is informed that if, in the performance of our duties and responsibilities, we make any attempt to maintain our right of access to West Berlin over East German territory, that that attempt will be stopped. We are told that if America goes ahead with its attempt to reach West Berlin, any and all efforts to do so will be terminated by force. American personnel will be fired upon.

Now here is the crux of the whole problem. The Communist Russian ultimatum states that if our forces fire back and defend themselves and their right of access to West Berlin, Communist Russia will call such an act of defense an act of war and will immediately march to the defense of the East German puppet government.

The significance of this ultimatum is very grave. Without any fluff or window dressing, its precise meaning is war if America as a nation continues to carry out its duties and responsibilities in West Berlin. Unless Communist Russia withdraws this ultimatum challenging the honor and respect of America and the Western Powers, the only result that can take place is world war III.

War is a frightful thing to contemplate. It is a complete breakdown of constructive effort for the benefit of mankind. In view of the present scientific development of modern weapons the consequences are almost beyond the comprehension of human beings. I hate war, and God forbid that it should ever occur again. On the other hand, I refuse to be a slave. As a member of the Government of this great United States of America, I refuse to allow the Communist slave government of Russia to gain domination over my country. I prefer death to any such reality.

This ultimatum is indeed a black cloud on the horizon. It presents a grave challenge. We cannot surrender to the Communist demands, yet we must labor and strive and pray to avoid war. Within this dilemma is the possibility of bungling into war. This we must not do. This situation, however, cannot be resolved by hope. It requires positive, decisive action. Before suggesting certain steps our country should take, however, it is necessary to briefly refute the Communist Russian accusation that America is trying to bring about world war III. Nations throughout the world and people everywhere should know the lie of these careless statements by the leadership of the Communist Russian Government. The truth is quite different. Communism fears truth.

Consider if you will for a moment the recorded acts of this great America, this great country of ours, in its struggle to establish peace in the world.

No nation in the world has labored so diligently or worked so constructively for the maintenance of world peace. Never before in the course of human conduct has any nation or group of people contributed so much to the cause of peace. Never has any nation made such sacrifices for peace.

In the entire history of human affairs, never has one nation worked so consistently and beneficially for the improvement of mankind as has the United States of America. No nation has been so liberal with its substance. No nation has contributed so much of its material and human and spiritual resources to help people in all lands. No nation has given so much of its life and leadership. No nation possesses such a record of unselfishness. No nation can challenge this record of America. It stands alone.

This is not the picture, however, painted of America to the rest of the world by Communist Russia. Communist Russia, employing its gigantic propaganda machine, has described America to the rest of the world as an aggressor Nation, determined to invade the sovereign territories of other countries. It spreads the lie that America is determined to start world war III. According to communism and the Communist Russian slave government, America is either determined to dominate the world or destroy it in devastating war. This is all part of the Communist plan to destroy respect and prestige for America and to spread communism in its gigantic effort to gain control and domination of the whole world.

How untrue, how completely false, how terribly tragic are these accusations. The record is contrary and speaks for itself. By invitation American engineers have gone forth to other countries to help those nations construct great dams, harness enormous hydroelectric power potential, and perform many other complicated construction feats. By invitation, American doctors have gone forth to many countries, improving health conditions in those lands, making the blind see again, making those afflicted with disease well, and making life bearable and worth living. By invitation, educated Americans have gone forth to many lands, molding, directing, and pointing out the way to a new and better life. In times of disaster, in whatever land disaster strikes, America has immediately responded with its help. Only a few short years ago, when tragic famine spread over the steppes and plateaus of Russia, in her great cities and villages, in her mountain hamlets and valleys, a generous America came to the rescue not only with food and clothing to care for the immediate crisis, but also with scientific knowledge, materials, and method to prevent it from occurring again. Thousands of tons of food and clothing were given by the American people, carried to Russia in American ships, distributed throughout Russia with American transportation in order that the Russian people might survive this tragic crisis of famine. This is the record of America. This is the record of your land and mine.

Well do I remember this tremendous Russian crisis which a generous America saved from becoming a gigantic catastrophe. It was in 1921 and 1922 and 1923. Our distinguished Speaker, together with my late husband, John Jacob Rogers, and a few others here today were Members of that Congress. The former President of the United States, the Honorable Herbert Hoover, was then the Secretary of Commerce. Twenty-five million Russians were starving to death when the Communists turned to a generous America. During the heart of the

crisis, the American Relief Administration was feeding close to 20 million Russians per day, over 7 million of which were children. In this operation, America spent and gave to Russia over $100 million, and bear in mind, these were dollars having a 1920 valuation. In this successful rescue of the Russian people in the greatest crisis of modern times, the lives of over 15 million Russians were saved. In their expression of gratitude, the Russian leaders at that time assured Mr. Hoover:

All the people inhabiting the U.S.S.R. never will forget the aid rendered by the American people.

After the crisis was over, at a great banquet given by the Russians for the entire American staff of the American Relief Administration, Russian leaders said that the lives of 20 million Russians had been saved by American generosity. A scroll was presented to President Hoover which said in part:

Be it resolved by the Council of Peoples Commissars in the name of the millions of people who have been saved * * * to express the most deeply felt sentiments of gratitude, and to state that all the people inhabiting the U.S.S.R. never will forget the aid rendered to them by the American people, holding it to be a pledge of the future friendships of the two nations.

This is what happened well over 35 years ago. Today the Russian leadership and the Russian people have forgotten. Perhaps some of the Russian leaders of today might search their memories, for it could be that Malinkov, who was a young boy in Orenburg, one of the most disastrous famine centers, could have received American food and clothing. It could be that Gromiko, a teenage child of 12, was among those 7 million children saved by American food and generosity. Yes, even Mr. Khrushchev should look back into memory, for he too might have been saved during this great crisis by the American people. This is the true record. This is the record of America. This is the record of your land and mine.

Can a great country, possessing such a record of generosity, be a nation determined to create a devastating war? Does this record of human benefit, reaching out to all the people of the world, represent a path of war or a path of peace and good will toward men?

Never has America absorbed another sovereign nation. Never has America denied another nation freedom and independence. Never has America ground its heel into the throat of another nation and crushed out its life. Never has America denied to anyone the right to worship according to his own desire and choice. Never has America been guilty of an act of aggression against any other nation in the world. This is the record of America. This is the record of your land and mine. Can this be the record of a nation determined to destroy the world by atomic war?

Mr. Speaker, the hour is late. Time is quickly slipping by. The Russian ultimatum stands squarely in front of us. It is that black cloud hovering over the far horizon. The deadline set is only a few weeks away. The countdown has started. It is time for action. It is time at this very hour for the leadership of this great Nation to be thinking of the security of America and the free world. It is time we announce our answer to this Communist Russian ultimatum.

Every Member of this Congress knows the answer. Every Member knows the answer of the American people whom we represent. Every Member knows the answer of our national leadership. This answer is, America will not surrender to the Communist Russian ultimatum. This answer states, America will continue to maintain its right of access to West Berlin. This answer is in plain language, If Communist Russia wants war, then let it begin here in the defense of our honor, our respect, and our duty.

Yes, this Communist ultimatum requires positive, decisive action. This action must be taken immediately. In view of the seriousness and gravity of this crisis, time is becoming more and more precious. In an effort to be constructive, I submit to the Congress for its consideration the following concurrent resolution, calling for specific, decisive steps of action.

Mr. Speaker, I should like the Clerk to read the resolution.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Clerk read the resolution referred to by the distinguished gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. IKARD). Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the concurrent resolution, as follows:

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION TO EXPRESS THE SENSE OF THE CONGRESS WITH RESPECT TO THE POSITION OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA IN THE BERLIN CRISIS

Whereas the United States of America, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the Republic of France, and the Union of Russian Soviet Socialist Republics are equal members of a quadripartite agreement for the administration of the city of Berlin; and

Whereas the United States of America has consistently fulfilled its responsibilities, obligations, and duties under this agreement since it has been in force; and

Whereas the Union of Russian Soviet Socialist Republics has denounced this agreement and, on November 27, 1958, actually ordered the United States of America, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, and the Republic of France to abandon West Berlin and all access thereto, or suffer the consequences of war; and

Whereas the Union of Russian Soviet Socialist Republics again on January 10, 1959, repeated its order of November 27, 1958, and its threatened consequences of war; and

Whereas the Union of Russian Soviet Socialist Republics again through its chief officer of government on March 3, 1959, emphasized the order to the United States of America, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, and the Republic of France to cease all operations in connection with West Berlin without the approval of the East German Democratic Republic, a puppet of Russia; and

Whereas the Union of Russian Soviet Socialist Republics has notified the United States of America that any attempt by the United States to maintain its right of access to West Berlin without the approval of the East German puppet regime, the forces of the United States of America represented in this attempt will be fired upon; and

Whereas the Union of Russian Soviet Socialist Republics has notified the United States of America that, if the forces of the United States defend themselves if fired upon, the Union of Russian Soviet Socialist Republics will call such defense an act of war and will rush to the defense of the East German Democratic Republic; and

Whereas this threatened action of the Union of Russian Soviet Socialist Republics could possibly and presumably be the beginning of world war III; and

Whereas the Union of Russian Soviet Socialist Republics has specifically named a deadline for the abandonment of West Berlin by the United States of America, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, and the Republic of France; and

Whereas this demand of the Union of Russian Soviet Socialist Republics actually constitutes an ultimatum, since it requires the United States to conform or suffer the consequences; and

Whereas the deadline stated by the Union of Russian Soviet Socialist Republics is May 27, 1959: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the Congress of the United States of America will support the decisions of the President of the United States in the Berlin crisis. It is the sense of the Congress that the President should consider the advisability of taking any or all of the following actions in such crisis:

(1) Call to active duty necessary Ready Reserves.

(2) Activate immediately the United States Navy, bringing all carrier task forces, submarine and antisubmarine forces to full operational complements.

(3) Restore immediately United States Marine Corps authorized strength and completely activate the United States Marine Corps.

(4) Place the entire United States Air Force and its facilities on an alert basis.

(5) Examine for the purpose of making ready all missile facilities of the United States Army, United States Navy, and United States Air Force.

(6) Alert the National Guard and the Organized Reserve forces of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Air Force.

(7) Order all United States military forces in Europe into a position of readiness.

(8) Alert all North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) member nations.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. IKARD). Does the gentlewoman from Massachusetts yield for a parliamentary inquiry?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Yes; I would be glad to yield for a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HOEVEN. This is a most unusual procedure, to say the least. My parliamentary inquiry is, There is no resolution before the House?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will advise the gentleman that the resolution was read for the information of the House.

Mr. HOEVEN. Only for the information of the House, in accordance with the unanimous-consent request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK]?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. That is correct.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentlewoman wanted the resolution read as part of her remarks, and had requested it. This is done by unanimous consent, so a unanimous-consent request was made that the Clerk read the resolution being introduced by the gentlewoman from Massachusetts. That does not mean it is before the House for consideration.

Mr. HOEVEN. I just wanted to clarify the RECORD on that. I do say it is a rather unusual procedure.

Mr. McCORMACK. Unusual, but provided for by the rules.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. It is customary to put into the RECORD a copy of a resolution that is placed in the hopper, if you want to have it considered as soon as possible. It is not a privileged resolution, I know that very well, because I have introduced privileged resolutions before.

Mr. Speaker, I urge that this concurrent resolution receive immediate consideration. In this resolution I have asked the President to call to active duty Ready Reserves and to activate immediately the U.S. Navy, bringing all carrier task forces, submarine and antisubmarine forces to full operational complements. I have asked the President to immediately restore the authorized strength of the U.S. Marine Corps.

This is not the time to trim sails. This is not the time to reduce the strength and capabilities of the U.S. Marine Corps.

This is not the time to close vital naval facilities all over the country. This is not the time to close the South Boston Naval Shipyard, the Hingham Ammunition Depot, and other important defense facilities on the eastern seaboard. This is the time when these facilities should be employed at full capacity.

This is a time of showing strength rather than weakness. This is a time of preparedness. This is the time to get ready. This is a time approaching national emergency.

Russia has thousands of airplanes, including many great superbombers. Dependent upon fixed airbases, tied to the same location, Russia knows her entire air force is obsolete and of very questionable value. The Communists know their great land-based superbombers can be blasted out of the air long before they reach any American targets. As the distance of the targets increases, so does the vulnerability.

Russia knows the efficiency and effectiveness of a superbomber air attack is completely dependent upon secrecy and surprise. The Communists know superbombers traveling thousands of air miles from fixed land bases cannot do so in secrecy and cannot successfully make a surprise attack on any American targets.

Likewise the Communists know American land-based superbombers cannot make a surprise attack on Russian targets. Because of their advance knowledge the Russians know they can destroy any American superbomber long before it reaches vital Russian territory. They know the American superbomber is no more effective than their own and is just as obsolete. It no longer causes any fear or represents a retaliatory power of sufficient magnitude to prevent an initial enemy atack and thus prevent war. This fact should cause very sober thinking regarding the future development of our military forces.

At this time, however, at this moment of crisis America does possess the power potential to prevent Communist Russia from making the mistake of launching an atomic attack against this country. Russia is well aware of the tremendous devastation potential in America's balanced sea power. The Communists know that from America's huge aircraft carriers, representing great mobile airbases at sea constantly moving from one area to another, that in the darkness of the night the fast hydrogen bombers of the U.S. Navy are capable of striking a devastating retaliatory blow, so effective on Russian targets that many areas in their country would be totally destroyed. Their movements surrounded with secrecy Russia knows she possesses no defense to surprise atacks launched by the fast moving U.S. naval carrier fleets. Russia knows she can be hit a devastating blow. This fact, more than any other, is the force that prevents the Communists from striking.

This balanced sea power, possessed only by the United States, is the barrier at this time which prevents war. It is the best insurance for peace. It is a powerful offensive and defensive force America possesses which the Russians do not have. This power should be completely developed and greatly increased. This power should be receiving the greatest of our military emphasis. This power should be greatly expanded.

This power should be doubled in potential as soon as possible. Rather than one new carrier at least six new high-speed atomic carriers should be authorized and constructed as soon as possible. These great mobile airbases at sea, completely under American control, would insure the peace for the next 20 years. Instead of a few atomic submarines we should be thinking in terms of a hundred designed for certain purposes, including the Polaris type of missiles. All supporting ships necessary should be authorized. In balance with this development, the authorized Marine Corps should be expanded to meet the needed requirements.

Within the complete effectiveness of balanced seapower rests the complete security of America and the free world. This balanced seapower is concentrated in our great mobile aircraft carriers, our submarine and antisubmarine forces. American military emphasis must be changed and concentrated in this area if our security is to be assured and maintained.

Throughout history, the influence of the United States of America abroad and American command of respect from enemy nations has fluctuated in proportion to the strength and power of the U.S. Navy. Organized as it is, the U.S. Navy, together with the U.S. Marine Corps, has molded together a powerful offensive and defensive force which can completely destroy any possible enemy. Communist Russia can never defeat America as long as America possesses control of the seas exercised through balance of seapower.

It is for this reason I believe it is imperative immediate steps should be taken to activate the U.S. Navy, its carrier task forces, its submarine and anti-submarine forces, and to completely restore to authorized strength and if need be increase the authorized strength of the U.S. Marine Corps.

If war is to be prevented in this crisis it can only be prevented by strength. On the contrary war will be invited by weakness. Every step must be taken, every move must be made to prevent the outbreak of war, if this is possible.

The crisis is West Berlin. The principle is one of justice. The issue pertains to duty. A decision must be made. This decision can never be surrender. If that great black cloud that now hovers over the horizon is to be disintegrated, permitting the blue sky to shine through, it is necessary for this Government to halt the present program of cutting, trimming, and squeezing the vital military forces upon which so greatly depend our national defense and national security.

It is necessary we change this procedure. It is necessary that we turn about face. It is necessary that we build up our military forces, capable of striking a devastating, crippling blow on our enemy such as the great mobile carrier fleets representing as they do an integral part of our balanced seapower. It is necessary we take this positive action to show Communist Russia America is getting ready to meet the challenge of the ultimatum, the deadline of May 27, 1959. This positive action is necessary to show Communist Russia the United States of America will never turn its back on its responsibilities and duties. This action is necessary to let Communist Russia know America will never surrender.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 minutes, to revise and extend my remarks, but before taking my time I will yield to other Members to submit consent requests.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

AID TO AND REHABILITATION FOR THE BLIND

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include my statement before the House Subcommittee on Special Education in support of my bill, H.R. 187, and similar bills to protect the right of the

blind to self-expression through organizations of the blind.

STATEMENT BY THE HONORABLE THOMAS J. LANE BEFORE THE HOUSE SUBCOMMITTEE ON SPECIAL EDUCATION IN SUPPORT OF H.R. 187 AND SIMILAR BILLS TO PROTECT THE RIGHT OF THE BLIND TO SELF-EXPRESSION THROUGH ORGANIZATIONS OF THE BLIND—MARCH 10, 1959

Mr. Chairman and members of the Subcommittee on Special Education, it is a well-known characteristic of American society that persons sharing a common interest or concern form organizations to give greater force to their opinions. To freely meet and discuss, to arrive at conclusions and to make these conclusions known is an unquestioned right, sanctioned both by our constitutional determinations and the customs of our people established through our history. But, to have value and force, these conclusions must be listened to and considered by those entrusted with a responsibility of serving all the people or any particular group of the people.

In 45 States of the Nation, blind men and women have exercised this right to assemble, to organize, and to make known their views on matters which are of particular concern to the blind. These organizations are joined together in the National Federation of the Blind, the only countrywide organization which any blind person may join.

But in some parts of the United States the right of the blind to join this organization has been questioned. Officials of agencies created for the sole purpose of serving the blind, and financed in part by Federal funds, have used their position to intimidate, coerce, and threaten blind persons who have joined the local affiliates of the National Federation of the Blind.

The blind of the Nation have long been a vital concern of the Congress of the United States. Programs of aid and rehabilitation have been adopted so that these blind persons might better contend with the problems incidental to living in a sighted community.

On January 7, 1959, I introduced H.R. 187, a bill to protect the right of the blind to self-expression through organizations of the blind.

On the 5th of last July, it was my happy privilege to attend the convention banquet of the National Federation of the Blind held in Boston, Mass. I was invited to it by the members of the Greater Lawrence Association of the Blind, whom I know, and with whom I have worked on occasions to assist them in their projects.

Massachusetts is not one of the States where the organized blind—the Associated Blind of Massachusetts—are struggling for the rights of blind people against the State agency for the blind. John F. Mungovan, director of the Massachusetts Division of the Blind, was also a guest at this same banquet. He was a speaker during the course of the convention.

In 1957, at the New Orleans convention of the National Federation of the Blind, Mr. Mungovan received the highest award of this organization for distinguished service to the blind.

On the 14th of August 1958, Mr. Mungovan was reappointed by the Governor of Massachusetts for a new term as director of the State agency for the blind. The Associated Blind of Massachusetts had worked long and hard for this reappointment and were responsible, in great measure, for the ultimate action of reappointment.

Blind men and women of all the States should have the same opportunity to organize and be consulted by the professional workers for the blind as they have in my own State of Massachusetts.

I sincerely hope this subcommittee will act favorably on H.R. 14, H.R. 187, and similar bills now before it. I believe that programs for the blind of the Nation will benefit greatly when the administrators of these programs consult with representatives of organizations of the blind on the formulation, administration, and execution of programs designed to benefit the blind. For the views of the blind of America to be of worth, they must be arrived at freely. No blind person should be denied, dissuaded, or prohibited from joining with others possessing a similar disability. Your favorable action on H.R. 14, H.R. 187, and like bills will assure this.

LABOR STANDARDS LEGISLATION

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Speaker, this bill meets the great need in the field of labor standards legislation for a single general hours act to revise and replace the group of complicated and overlapping statutes, dating back to 1892, which are known as the 8-hour laws. The President, in his 1959 Economic Report, recommended the enactment of "legislation to revise the ambiguous and outmoded provisions of the 8-hour laws applying to Federal and federally assisted construction projects." A similar recommendation is contained in his 1959 budget message. The proposals embodied in this draft bill are designed to carry out these recommendations of the President and are a part of the legislative program of the Department of Labor.

The draft bill would improve the present 8-hour laws in three major respects: First, by replacing the uncoordinated and confusing series of laws enacted at different times with a single statute simplifying and clarifying the present provisions; second, by modernizing its hours standards through addition of a provision for a standard workweek of 40 hours with not less than time and one-half pay for work in excess of 40 per week; and third, by making the laws' standards applicable not only to direct Government contracts, but also to those federally financed and assisted contracts with respect to which existing Federal legislation provides for the payment of prevailing or minimum wages.

SIMPLIFYING AND CLARIFYING THE EXISTING LAW

The present 8-hour laws, which govern hours of work and overtime pay of laborers and mechanics employed on public work by the Federal Government and its contractors and subcontractors, were enacted at different times between 1892 and 1940. The 1892 statute replaced a statute dating back to the Civil War period. Certain provisions of these laws make it a crime for Government officials or Government contractors and their subcontractors to employ laborers or mechanics more than 8 hours a day. Others, which apply only to contractors and subcontractors, provide a separate and additional contract penalty of $5 for each day's violation with respect to each worker permitted to work more than 8 hours. Many workers are covered by both provisions but there are some who are subject to the criminal statute only and others only to the statute providing the $5 penalty. This bill would consolidate the existing laws into a single statute with simplified provisions which apply in the same way to all contractors and subcontractors performing work coming within its terms.

The bill would also eliminate the confusion and inequities which result from a number of conflicting and ambiguous exception provisions contained in the present laws. Some of the exceptions taking particular work out of the laws' coverage are canceled out by exceptions to the exceptions which put it back in again. And although the language of these laws prohibiting more than 8 hours' work in a calendar day has not been changed, there is still another independent statute that has the effect of relieving most contractors and subcontractors from this prohibition if they pay time and one-half overtime compensation for all work over 8 hours a day. The courts and the Comptroller General are in disagreement as to whether the present language of this law also gives the employees who work overtime the right to collect, by administrative or judicial action, the time and one-half compensation if the employer fails to pay it. This bill would make clear the liability of the contractor to reimburse laborers and mechanics to whom he has failed to pay time and one-half for overtime work as required by the bill.

FORTY-HOUR-WEEK PROVISION

In addition to a need for revising the language of the 8-hour laws to eliminate complicated and overlapping provisions, the present overtime provisions need amendment. Congress has established a straight-time workweek of 40 hours for Federal employment, for work connected with interstate commerce under the wage and hour law, and for work on Federal supply contracts under the Walsh-Healey Act. Many responsible contractors who perform Government contract work covered by the 8-hour laws have adopted this 40-hour standard. However, there are other contractors performing Federal work who require laborers and mechanics to work up to 56 hours a week—seven 8-hour days—without paying them overtime compensation. The bill would modernize the hours' standards of the 8-hour laws by adding a requirement for the payment of time and one-half for work in excess of a 40-hour week.

CHANGES IN COVERAGE

The third needed improvement in the 8-hour laws is an extension of their scope to include work financed in whole or in part by the Federal Government under statutes which require the payment of prevailing or minimum wages. The contract work presently covered by the 8-hour laws is work contracted out directly by the Government. When these laws were developed, this coverage made the hours standards applicable to substantially all the work for which Federal funds were expended. This is no longer so. Many non-Federal agencies now do the actual contracting for work that is financed in whole or in part with Federal funds or with the aid

of Federal guarantees but which is nevertheless subject to Federal supervision or participation in details of spending the funds, and to Federal laws providing for payment of predetermined prevailing or minimum wages. The coverage of a revised hours law should extend to this federally aided work.

Extension of Federal standards with respect to hours of work and overtime compensation to those contracts already subject to Federal wage standards would not impose any undue burden on the Federal financing agencies, the non-Federal contracting agencies, or the contractor. The draft bill, therefore, provides that its hour standards shall apply to all contracts for work financed in whole or in part by loans or grants from, or loans insured or guaranteed by, the United States or any agency or instrumentality thereof under any statute of the United States providing wage standards for such work, which provisions of law are in effect on the date of enactment of the proposed legislation. Section 105 of the draft bill grants the Secretary authority sufficiently broad to issue rules and regulations conforming the Federal standards with respect to hours of work and overtime compensation to the dollar limitation on coverage of such statutes as the Davis-Bacon Act and the Federal Airport Act.

Since the labor standards provided in the bill would be applicable only to contractors and subcontractors, its enactment would terminate the application of the 1892 statute to employees of the Federal Government and the District of Columbia. For this reason a necessary amendment to existing legislation relating to Federal employees is included in section 201 of the bill.

COORDINATION OF ENFORCEMENT BY FEDERAL AGENCIES

Inasmuch as the proposed legislation would take the place of labor standards laws with respect to which the Secretary of Labor is given coordinating authority under Reorganization Plan No. 14 of 1950, a provision continuing this authority is included in the bill. There is also a provision affirming the applicability, in accordance with its terms, of section 2 of the Copeland Act, as amended, giving the Secretary of Labor certain authority to issue regulations for contractors and subcontractors on work of a character similar to that covered by the bill.

ADMINISTRATION AND ENFORCEMENT

The bill would make it clear that contractors and subcontractors responsible for violations will be liable to employees for the unpaid wages, as well as liable to the Government for liquidated damages in the amount of $5 for each calendar day in which the employee is required to work in excess of the specified hours without payment of the statutory overtime compensation. This latter provision corresponds to the penalty provision of the 1912 act. A criminal penalty is provided for intentional violations, as is now done by the 1892 act.

The draft bill provides for the withholding by the Federal agency concerned of sums due a contractor in such amounts as are administratively determined to be necessary to satisfy liabilities for unpaid wages and liquidated damages. Similar withholding of funds is now authorized under existing law and standard contract provisions. In addition, under the bill the Comptroller General is authorized to make direct payment of such sums withheld for unpaid wages to reimburse underpaid employees.

As is now the case under the 1912 act, contractors would have the right to appeal to the head of the agency for a review of the administrative determination of sums withheld for liquidated damages. The bill is somewhat less rigid with respect to liquidated damages than the 1912 act, which provides no relief from the $5 a day penalty once violations are established, except by action of the President under authority limited to a very narrow category of situations. The bill provides that the agency head, in the event of appeal, may issue a final order affirming the administrative determination or, in a proper case, may recommend to the Secretary of Labor that an adjustment be made in liquidated damages or that the contractor be relieved of liability. It is provided that the Secretary of Labor may issue a final order affirming or rejecting this recommendation. Final orders of the agency head or the Secretary would be subject to judicial review by the Court of Claims upon a proper showing.

While no special provision for a similar review of the liability for unpaid wages is contained in existing law or in the bill, where sums are withheld for unpaid wages appropriate provision may be made by regulations under the bill for protecting interests of the respective parties which may depend on determinations of violations or other issues involved in any pending statutory review of liability for liquidated damages. The bill, like the Walsh-Healey Public Contracts Act applicable to Federal supply contracts, would authorize the Secretary to issue regulations under which adjustments in the application of the act may be made in instances where he finds it "necessary and proper in the public interest to prevent injustice or undue hardship or to avoid serious impairment of the conduct of Government business."

NATURAL GAS BILL

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, I should like to comment on H.R. 366 which would amend the Natural Gas Act to exempt producers of natural gas from regulation as public utilities.

There is an attempted justification of this bill to provide an incentive for producers to explore and develop new gas fields—the fact of the matter is that exclusion from regulation would provide an incentive to exploit.

The customers of natural gas as captive consumers on the end of a network of gas lines have a right to a fair price, and this bill will cost these consumers an additional $1 billion annually for it destroys effective regulation.

The natural gas consumer with $12 billion invested in equipment would be trapped in a price squeeze from which there would be no avenue of escape.

Furthermore, not 1 additional cubic foot of gas would be produced by passage of this bill. The gas-producing industry is healthy and vigorous, with profits at an alltime high. Reserve supplies are ample. Certainly, this does not indicate any lack of incentive under the present system.

H.R. 366 has built-in price-increase provisions to the benefit and unjustified enrichment of a few giant corporations who own 90 percent of the natural gas production in our country. The gas consumer is caught in the vicious circle between the producers, transporters, and distributors of the gas he burns.

The gas companies of our country have all the benefits of a utility—monopoly rights to serve an area, a guaranteed rate of return on investment, power of eminent domain for purposes of laying pipelines and they seek to be absolved from all the regulations and responsibilities of a monopoly.

The lack of consumer safeguards in this bill, due to the fact that no consumer organizations were consulted in drafting the bill, will permit price increases which will add fuel to the inflationary fires and provide another step in the cycle of price and profit gouging.

In the case of natural gas, the consumer can exercise no effective choice.

Cook stoves, water heaters, and gas furnaces are linked by a network of pipelines to the producing wells. If these producers are not regulated and restrained, there is hardly any limit to what they may charge for cooking, washing, and heating.

If H.R. 366 passes, free competition, with all of its consumer advantages, is impossible.

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Special Education of the Committee on Education and Labor may be permitted to sit during general debate today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. IKARD). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON RULES—LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM FOR BALANCE OF WEEK

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules may have until midnight tonight to file certain preferential reports.

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may I inquire of the majority leader what the possible program is for the balance of the week.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, we already have a definite program for the rest of the week, but more or less on a contingent basis. There will be a joint meeting tomorrow, Wednesday, to receive His Excellency the President of the Republic of El Salvador. If the Rules Committee reports out a rule on the Hawaiian statehood bill, it will be brought up tomorrow. If not, and if the Rules Committee reports a rule on H.R. 1, the Michigan diversion matter, that will be brought up tomorrow. As a rule has been reported on S. 79, relating to the coloring of oranges, that will be brought up.

There are two bills from the Committee on Armed Services, H.R. 3368 and H.R. 3293, which are programed for this week.

If the Committee on Rules does not report a rule out on the Hawaii statehood bill today and they do report rules out on any one of the three bills I have mentioned—there being a rule out already on S. 79—they will be programed for tomorrow. If they are not disposed of—here is where the contingency comes in, and yet there is a definite program, if you will note my words—and if the Hawaii statehood bill is not reported out today but is tomorrow, then the leadership will bring it up on Thursday, and all the bills not acted on tomorrow will follow the Hawaii statehood bill. I hope I have expressed myself clearly, or as clearly as possible under the circumstances.

Mr. SMITH of California. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of California. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. HARRIS. I rise for the purpose of asking our distinguished majority leader, since S. 79 has a rule already, and should the Committee on Rules not report a rule on Hawaii statehood, would he agree to call it up the first thing tomorrow?

Mr. McCORMACK. Might I suggest to my friend, if there is no rule on Hawaii reported out today, S. 79 will come up tomorrow. If there is a rule reported out on H.R. 1, the Lake Michigan diversion bill, TOM O'BRIEN's bill, why, I would have to put TOM O'BRIEN's bill on first. But, I am sure that your bill will be reached tomorrow if the Hawaii bill does not come up.

Mr. O'NEILL. The rule has been reported out.

Mr. McCORMACK. The Hawaii bill has been reported out, I understand.

Mr. YATES. How many hours of debate?

Mr. O'NEILL. Six hours.

Mr. McCORMACK. If a rule is reported out, the Hawaii bill will come up tomorrow. The Hawaii bill will come up first. The others will then follow as I have announced.

Mr. HARRIS. Is it contemplated, I might ask the distinguished majority leader, that the Hawaii bill will be completed in 1 day?

Mr. McCORMACK. No.

Mr. HARRIS. Then that would mean Wednesday and Thursday, and very likely you could not get to S. 79 this week; is that right, with that bill coming up?

Mr. McCORMACK. Oh, yes. If we get through with the Hawaii bill on Thursday, why, I would reasonably expect that we would get to the Lake Michigan diversion bill and the orange bill and maybe the others on Friday.

Mr. HARRIS. Very well. There is somewhat of an emergency insofar as the fruit growers are concerned with reference to S. 79, and that is the reason I press the matter a little bit. Several of those plants have closed down, beginning just a few days ago, because of the present situation.

Mr. McCORMACK. I think the chances are very good that the bill will be reached this week. I might say, since the gentleman is on his feet, that we had a conversation about the airport bill, and I announced that if a rule is reported out, it will not be programed this week. Even if a rule is reported out, which I doubt, but if one is, the bill will not come up this week.

Mr. SMITH of California. Might I ask, does the gentleman contemplate working on Friday?

Mr. McCORMACK. Oh, yes; if necessary.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of California. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I would like to ask the majority leader if he has any idea when the deficiency appropriation bill will come up.

Mr. YATES. It has not gone to the full committee yet.

Mr. McCORMACK. I cannot answer the question, but I will make inquiry.

Mr. YATES. The subcommittee is marking that bill up today. It has not gone to the full committee yet.

Mr. McCORMACK. I will be better able to answer the question tomorrow. Will the gentleman ask me then?

Mr. GROSS. Yes.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of California. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VANIK. I would like to ask the distinguished majority leader when we can expect action on the housing bill. My whole community is anxiously waiting for this bill, because the building season will soon be under way, and I would like to know what plans are being made on the housing bill.

Mr. McCORMACK. Well, the gentleman is no more anxious to have the housing bill brought up than I am, but again that is dependent upon a rule being reported out of the Committee on Rules. All I can say to my friend is this, that as quickly as possible after the rule is reported out of the Committee on Rules, I shall program the bill. It is impossible to say now, because the Committee on Rules has not acted, but as soon as a rule is reported out, I will program it as quickly as possible thereafter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. TUCK (at the request of Mr. SMITH of Virginia), on account of official business.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to Mr. BAILEY, for 30 minutes, on Tuesday next.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. MACHROWICZ.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. VAN ZANDT.

(At the request of Mr. McCORMACK, the following Members to revise and extend their remarks in the RECORD:)

Mr. WOLF and to include extraneous matter.

(At the request of Mr. SMITH of California, and to include extraneous matter, the following:)

Mr. UTT.

Mr. METCALF in two instances, in each to include extraneous matter.

The following Members (at the request of Mr. McCORMACK) and to include extraneous matter:

Mr. FLOOD.

Mr. BOLAND.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 55 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, March 11, 1959, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

689. A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, relative to a notice of a proposed disposition of approximately 15,902 short dry tons of zircon concentrates now held in the national stockpile, pursuant to the Strategic and Critical Materials Stockpiling Act (53 Stat. 811, as amended, 50 U.S.C. 98b(e)); to the Committee on Armed Services.

690. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Supply and Logistics), transmitting reports on Army, Navy, and Air Force prime contract awards to small and other business firms, pursuant to Public Law 85–536; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

691. A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting a report on contracts negotiated for experimental, developmental, or research work, or for the manufacture or furnishing of property for experimentation, development, research or test during the 6-month period ending December 31, 1958,

pursuant to Public Law 152, 81st Congress, as amended; to the Committee on Government Operations.

692. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, the National Institute of Arts and Letters, transmitting the official report of the National Institute of Arts and Letters for the year 1958, pursuant to section 4 of their charter; to the Committee on House Administration.

693. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend section 152, title 18, United States Code, with respect to the concealment of assets in contemplation of bankruptcy"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

694. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, relative to certain cases involving suspension of deportation, and requesting that they be withdrawn from those now before the Congress and returned to the jurisdiction of this Service, pursuant to the Immigration and Nationality Act, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina: Committee on Armed Services. H.R. 5132. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, with respect to active duty agreements for Reserve officers, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 192). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. FORRESTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 2237. A bill to amend chapter 13—wage earners' plans—of the Bankruptcy Act; without amendment (Rept. No. 193). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. FALLON: Committee on Public Works. H.R. 4695. A bill to amend section 108(a) of title 23 of the United States Code to increase the period in which actual construction shall commence on rights-of-way acquired in anticipation of such construction from 5 years to 7 years, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 194). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MADDEN: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 202. Resolution for consideration of H.R. 1, a bill to require a study to be conducted of the effect of increasing the diversion of water from Lake Michigan into the Illinois Waterway for navigation, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 195). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BOLLING: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 203. Resolution for consideration of H.R. 3293, a bill to authorize the construction of modern naval vessels; without amendment (Rept. No. 196). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. DELANEY: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 204. Resolution for consideration of H.R. 3368, a bill to extend the special enlistment programs provided by section 262 of the Armed Forces Reserve Act of 1952, as amended; without amendment (Rept. No. 197). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. O'NEILL: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 205. Resolution for consideration of H.R. 4221, a bill to provide for the admission of the State of Hawaii into the Union; without amendment (Rept. No. 198). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ALEXANDER:

H.R. 5486. A bill to provide for the enforcement of support orders in certain State and Federal courts, and to make it a crime to move or travel in interstate and foreign commerce, to avoid compliance with such orders; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ANDERSEN of Minnesota:

H.R. 5487. A bill to increase and extend the special milk program for children; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BONNER:

H.R. 5488. A bill to revise the boundaries of Wright Brothers National Memorial, N.C., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BOYLE:

H.R. 5489. A bill granting the consent and approval of Congress to the Wabash Valley Compact, and for related purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROYHILL:

H.R. 5490. A bill to provide for the licensing of persons engaged in budget planning in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. CURTIS of Missouri:

H.R. 5491. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a longer period for claiming refund or credit of income tax where the claim is based upon a judicial decision affecting tax liability in a similar case; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 5492. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a taxpayer a personal exemption for a foreign student who resides in his home while in the United States attending high school; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DAVIS of Georgia:

H.R. 5493. A bill to repeal the excise tax on amounts paid for communication services or facilities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H.R. 5494. A bill to provide for the recognition of the Polish Legion of American Veterans by the Secretary of Defense and the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. ELLIOTT:

H.R. 5495. A bill to encourage and stimulate the production and conservation of coal in the United States through research and development by authorizing the Secretary of the Interior, acting through the Bureau of Mines, to contract for coal research and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 5496. A bill to encourage and stimulate the production and conservation of coal in the United States through research and development by creating a Coal Research and Development Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. GLENN:

H.R. 5497. A bill to amend section 201 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, so as to provide that all quota numbers not used in any year shall be made available to immigrants in oversubscribed areas in the following year, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5498. A bill to prohibit certain acts involving the importation, transportation, possession, or use of explosives; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GUBSER:

H.R. 5499. A bill to provide for the joint development of the waterpower resources of the Trinity River division, Central Valley project, California, by the United States and Pacific Gas & Electric Co., to reduce expenditures of the United States, to increase revenues of the United States, to encourage the most widespread use of the power generated at the lowest possible rates to consumers consistent with sound business principles, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HAGEN:

H.R. 5500. A bill designating the first day of May in each year as Friendship Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5501. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct the San Luis unit of the Central Valley project, California, to enter into an agreement with the State of California with respect to the construction and operation of such unit, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HECHLER:

H.R. 5502. A bill to amend the act authorizing the disposal of certain obsolete Federal locks and dams in order to increase a certain authorization in such act, relating to dam No. 3 on the Big Sandy River, Ky.; to the Committee on Public Works.

H.R. 5503. A bill to amend the Employment Act of 1946 to include the promotion of maximum purchasing power at stable price levels as a continuing policy and responsibility of the Federal Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. KEARNS:

H.R. 5504. A bill to establish standards for hours of work and overtime pay of laborers and mechanics employed on work done under contract for, or with the financial aid of, the United States, for any Territory, or for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 5505. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide an exemption from income tax for certain nonprofit clubs organized and operated for the purpose of paying benefits to the members and their dependents; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MERROW:

H.R. 5506. A bill to provide for the recognition of the Polish Legion of American Veterans by the Secretary of Defense and the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 5507. A bill to amend the Federal Employees' Compensation Act to provide that compensation paid thereunder shall be based on wage rates currently in effect; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. MILLS:

H.R. 5508. A bill to provide for the free importation of articles for exhibition at fairs, exhibitions, or expositions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 5509. A bill to provide for the free importation of articles for exhibition at fairs, exhibitions, or expositions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MONTOYA:

H.R. 5510. A bill to authorize States to select certain public lands in exchange for State lands acquired by the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 5511. A bill to provide that all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to certain real property acquired under title III of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act shall be granted to the State wherein the land is located; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MOORE:

H.R. 5512. A bill to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 to permit donations of surplus property to volunteer firefighting organizations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. MORRIS of New Mexico:

H.R. 5513. A bill to authorize States to select certain public lands in exchange for

State lands acquired by the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 5514. A bill to provide that all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to certain real property acquired under title III of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act shall be granted to the State wherein the land is located; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. PERKINS:

H.R. 5515. A bill to amend the 1956 act authorizing the disposal of certain obsolete locks and dams on the Big Sandy River, Ky.-W. Va., for the purpose of increasing the authorization relating to dam No. 3 on the Big Sandy River, Ky.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. RAINS:

H.R. 5516. A bill to repeal the excise tax on amounts paid for communication services or facilities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROBISON:

H.R. 5517. A bill to establish a Commission on Country Life, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts (by request):

H.R. 5518. A bill to make eligible for retirement benefits, under certain conditions, former officers of the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps of the United States, other than officers of the Regular Army, Navy, or Marine Corps, who incurred physical disability while in the service of the United States during World War I; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. ULLMAN:

H.R. 5519. A bill to authorize the use of the revolving loan fund for Indians to assist Klamath Indians during the period for terminating Federal supervision; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 5520. A bill to establish reciprocity between members of the Umatilla Indian Tribes and other Indian tribes in the matter of succession by will or inheritance to certain types of restricted or trust properties, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. UTT:

H.R. 5521. A bill to provide for the joint development of the waterpower resources of the Trinity River division, Central Valley project, California, by the United States and Pacific Gas & Electric Co., to reduce expenditures of the United States, to increase revenues of the United States, to encourage the most widespread use of the power generated at the lowest possible rates to consumers consistent with sound business principles, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. VINSON:

H.R. 5522. A bill to provide for certain survivors annuities in additional cases under the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. ANDERSON of Montana:

H.R. 5523. A bill to establish a National Wilderness Preservation System for the permanent good of the whole people, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HAGEN:

H.J. Res. 296. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McMILLAN:

H.J. Res. 297. Joint resolution directing the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to cause a study to be made of all factors involved in the establishment, construction, and operation of heliports within the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. RAINS:

H. Con. Res. 100. Concurrent resolution authorizing and requesting the President to set aside and proclaim an appropriate day as a national day of prayer for a cure for cancer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts:

H. Con. Res. 101. Concurrent resolution to express the sense of the Congress with respect to the position of the United States of America in the Berlin crisis; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MILLS:

H. Res. 206. Resolution providing for expenses of studies and investigations authorized by House Resolution 182; to the Committee on House Administration.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. ASPINALL: Memorial of the 42d General Assembly of the State of Colorado memorializing the Congress of the United States to grant statehood to the Territory of Hawaii; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. EDMONDSON: Memorial of the State Senate of Oklahoma commemorating the life and service of Charles Curtis; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. PRICE: Memorial of the State of Illinois 71st General Assembly calling upon the Congress of the United States to adopt House bill No. 1, the Lake Michigan water diversion bill; to the Committee on Public Works.

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Montana, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States urging that 15 percent of all Federal income taxes paid into the Federal Treasury by the public in the State of Montana and the various other States be retained in Montana and the respective States to be placed in the general funds of the respective States: to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of New Mexico, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to further the examination and revision of the powers of the Federal Power Commission which are erroneously purported to authorize agency regulation of the wellhead and delivered prices of natural gas; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of New Mexico, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to review and revise the policies which permit the excessive importation of petroleum into the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Utah, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States proposing amendment of that part of Public Law 85–868 which may adversely affect or deprive the State of Utah of the mineral rights to certain lands within the State of Utah; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Utah, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to oppose proposed National Wilderness Preservation Acts; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BENTLEY:

H.R. 5524. A bill for the relief of Stanley Yankus; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOLAND:

H.R. 5525. A bill for the relief of Giuseppe Delina; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CLEMENT W. MILLER:

H.R. 5526. A bill for the relief of Christos Kekrides; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H.R. 5527. A bill for the relief of Ber Rabinowicz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HERLONG:

H.R. 5528. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Elsie E. McLaren; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PRICE:

H.R. 5529. A bill for the relief of George Angelos (Filis) Philles; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROGERS of Colorado:

H.R. 5530. A bill for the relief of Peter Clemens August Grauert and Hans Herbert Grauert; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Our Schools Must Be Helped

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAIR ENGLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 10, 1959

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, Congress failed last year to enact the Murray-Metcalf "Federal aid to education" bill, a bill which would have gone a long way toward eliminating the serious inadequacies in our elementary and secondary schools. The Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] reintroduced his bill this year, and I joined with a number of other Senators in cosponsoring it.

Today we are involved in a headlong race for supremacy in missiles and satellites, and our education problem has gone from the critical to the crucial stage. If we do not lend a hand to our schools, we will be shirking our responsibilities to our children and jeopardizing the very security of this Nation. On March 6 I submitted a statement to the Subcommittee on Education in support of Senator MURRAY's bill. I ask unanimous consent to have the statement printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR CLAIR ENGLE, DEMOCRAT OF CALIFORNIA, BEFORE THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON EDUCATION OF THE SENATE COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND PUBLIC WELFARE ON PROPOSALS FOR FEDERAL AID TO EDUCATION, MARCH 6, 1959

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate this opportunity to present to the committee my views on Senate bill 2, the Murray bill, which

should alleviate our critical shortage of classrooms and remedy the inadequacies in the salaries of our teachers. As a cosponsor of this legislation, I am anxious to go on record as being wholeheartedly in support of the effort to wipe out substandard schools and substandard education.

Presenting the case for Federal aid to education has been made somewhat easier these days. After the Russians launched Sputnik I, the people of the United States were made aware for the first time that the scientific education of this country was not what it should be. This also reflected on the state of education in general. The continued manifestations of Russia's success in the field of missiles and satellites has done as much to argue the case than has the compelling testimony of our legislators and educators. It is indeed regrettable that it has taken an affront to our competitive spirit to arouse us to a sense of urgency about a situation that has existed for some time.

The resistance of the vocal opponents of Federal aid to education is beginning to break down. The passage of the Defense Education Act in the 2d session of the 85th Congress, and the great success of the programs created by that act, has done much to undermine opposition. There are still features of the legislative proposals that are vigorously objected to, but the major objection now seems to be the extent of the Federal obligation to provide assistance.

With regard to general objections to S. 2, the case has been built on the three-pronged thesis that such aid destroys local initiative; that it results in Federal control over the school operation; and that it places on the shoulders of the whole Nation a tax burden that should be carried by the respective State and local governments.

These arguments have been thoroughly penetrated and shattered. Testimony before this committee by responsible educators has exposed the first two themes as pure myths. The facts clearly show that State and local governments receiving Federal assistance for education have strained themselves to a greater degree than has the Federal Government. The facts show that school districts receiving such aid are not beholden to their benefactor in making up their curriculums, in choosing their teachers, in setting up their operation. The evidence plainly shows that the schools are free to run their own shops, that they are free to stick to the three R's or to encourage handicrafts or homemaking. We need no better proof that there is no validity to the argument of Federal intervention than to take a look at the educational program in federally impacted areas under Public Law 874. The tax argument offered by the opponents of Federal aid to education is perhaps the most illogical of the three. It indicates, first of all, a refusal to recognize the severe limitations of the local tax structure. And, it indicates a failure to recognize that the effects of education cut across State and local boundaries. Certainly, with the tremendous interstate movement of the American people, the educational achievements in each State are the concern of all the States. And, certainly, in the face of Russia's startling success in satellites and missiles, we cannot afford to take the short-sighted attitude reflected in this argument.

Questions of a budgetary nature must be resolved before we can come to grips with the education problem. With rising concern over the size of the national debt and a corresponding effort to maintain a balanced budget, we must make hard decisions on how to finance the level of school support we believe essential. Of one thing I am certain—that the American economy can afford to invest a higher percentage of the gross national product in education than it does at the present time. And this is an investment which should pay the highest dividends in terms of future national income as well as national security. For this reason, our major efforts should be aimed at awakening the public to a sense of urgency about the situation. These efforts should be aimed at awakening the American people and our legislators to a realization that time is very short if we are to preserve the American way of life. There is an appalling slackness in our public school education that must be overcome immediately if we are to keep pace in the space age. We are becoming more and more aware of the vigorous education the Soviets are giving their youngsters. But we still need to impress upon our legislators that our educational needs represent a crisis at least as worthy of financial assistance as our highway or housing or airport needs.

Just what are the dimensions of the problem? We have, first of all, a shortage of some 140,000 classrooms—resulting in the deplorable situation of 9 million children exceeding the present school capacity. (While approximately 2 million children are forced to part-time sessions because of lack of adequate classrooms, when we consider the ideal class size of 30 pupils per teacher, we have 9 million children exceeding our school capacity.) We have, next, a critical shortage of teachers. It has reached the figure of 132,000 and continues to move upward. It is superfluous for me to stress the point that this is due largely to the pitiful salaries teachers in many school districts receive. We have, in short, the situation of hundreds of thousands of children getting a part-time education, and hundreds of thousands more being cheated of effective instruction because classes are too large.

While California is doing a great deal to meet the problem locally, we still have a vital interest in the enactment of the Murray bill, S. 2. There is a great influx of people coming to California and the contribution they can make to the State's welfare depends on the level of their education. It is just as much to our interest to aid them in their home States as it would be if they were natives of California. In any event, we are one Nation, and the fate of all of us depends on the educational level maintained in the poorest States.

These are the tangibles. But there is a more insidious aspect to the problem. It is in the shocking number of teachers of substandard qualifications that our poorer communities are forced to hire. This is not because they are less aggressive or less imaginative than other communities. It is because they are trapped within the narrow confines of a limited, inflexible tax structure and they must stand by helplessly as their qualified men and women turn away from the teaching profession to take jobs that will pay them a living wage.

It is a serious situation, and unless the Federal Government does something about it we stand a good chance of becoming a nation of schools without scholars. The consequences will reach far into the future and they will be felt in the caliber of the scientists and engineers and researchers who emerge from our colleges. College graduates of high quality are, after all, not merely the product of their college training. They represent the evolvement of layer upon layer of education and training beginning in the elementary and secondary schools.

There is an answer to the situation. It lies in the realization that it is unrealistic to expect that State and local sources of revenue can maintain and build the kind of educational system we want and need for our children. It lies in the realization that the situation demands the breadth and strength and flexibility of a financial structure that only the Federal Government possesses. It lies in the realization that we cannot do the job with halfway measures. We must provide for an adequate program that makes adequate financial assistance available. If we do not accept this thesis, millions of children in this country will be cheated out of their basic rights and the harm done will be irreparable. Losses in education suffered in the formative years cannot be made up. If we allow the Federal Government to default on this responsibility we stand to risk our national economic strength, our security, our very survival.

We need, I repeat, to awaken our legislators and the American people to the urgency of the situation, and to make a concerted effort to convince them that the Murray bill now under consideration meets the two most critical problems in our public school system—the shortage of classrooms and the inadequacy of teachers' salaries.

In passing, I would like to comment on the Murray bill's provision to reduce the annual grant by the percentage by which the State's school effort is below the national average. This provision creates a formula to measure effort, and should do much to encourage States to go to the limit of their local financial abilities in meeting the challenge.

I should like to remind the committee, in closing, that in the Soviet Union there is a total commitment to education; that if our free society is to prevail we must maintain a system of education that serves us as well as the Soviet educational system serves the purposes of it social order. In short, if we are to prevail as a free society we must become as interested in launching educated men and women as we are in launching satellites.

The Need To Know

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, March 10, 1959

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, it was my privilege to speak at a banquet held in connection with the Northwestern University Owen L. Coon Memorial Debate Tournament at Evanston, Ill., on February 13, 1959. On this occasion I was honored by receiving the Speaker of the Year Award as presented by the Northwestern University debate squad.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that the speech which I delivered at this banquet be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE NEED TO KNOW

(Excerpts from address prepared for delivery by Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, Democrat of Minnesota, upon receiving Speaker of the Year Award, at national debate banquet, Northwestern University, Evanston, Ill., February 13, 1959)

I am deeply grateful for the award you have bestowed upon me tonight.

To be cited as a person who has, in your opinion, done a commendable job to stimulate discussion and thought on current public issues is indeed a great honor. It is the more so because it is presented by a group which has so much experience and talent in the art of public discussion and debate.

Your award places me in the position of having earned a reputation which I must continue to deserve. But since you have presented me with this citation it is fitting that I use the occasion to speak briefly on the importance of discussion and debate, and on the essentiality of having the necessary

information on those subjects chosen for discussion.

DEBATE ESSENTIAL TO THE DEMOCRATIC PROCESS

It is axiomatic that without lively discussion of current public issues, our political system—with its inestimable democratic process—would not survive. It would atrophy through lack of an essential ingredient in its diet, public discussion and debate.

* * * * *

Public debate and discussion, although imperative if our society is to survive and retain its vitality, must also have substance. If debate and discussion mean an exchange of ignorance, or prejudice, then certainly our people will be fooled into approving policies, and our legislators will be misled into passing laws, which are wrong from the standpoint of our national security and the well-being of our citizens.

On domestic matters, reliable information can and does emanate from a variety of sources. Our universities, our research institutions, our inquiring press, and the well-informed voter all make priceless contributions to the evaluation of proposed solutions to problems facing the body politic.

On the foreign front, however, our store of reliable information is sometimes more limited.

I do not mean that private institutions and private citizens do not and cannot make a contribution in the field of foreign policy. They can and they must. But on certain aspects of our national security, the information that is necessary to have for making decisions and rendering judgments is contained within the executive branch of our Government.

Let me cite an example which is very familiar to you, the problem of controlling and reducing armaments, and particularly the question of the prohibition of the further development of nuclear weapons.

You have been debating this question for the past several months. In order to prepare your cases, you have needed information. Without knowing what your various sources were, I am willing to bet that many, if not most, came from hearings and studies held and conducted by our Senate Subcommittee on Disarmament. Or, if they did not come directly from the subcommittee, many of your sources were stimulated as a result of the subcommittee's work.

LACK OF INFORMATION ON THE DETECTION OF NUCLEAR TESTS

Last year it took us literally months to find people in the executive branch of the Government who were willing and prepared to discuss the problem of the detection of nuclear weapons tests. Once we had some knowledge of what was involved in the detection problem, we could go outside the Government for additional views. But basically, we had to start with information that only the executive branch of the Government could supply. Until the Government agencies involved could be persuaded to release more information, intelligent discussion of the control and inspection aspects of prohibiting nuclear weapons production and stopping nuclear weapons tests could not progress.

But there is still a great deal of information that is classified on this matter, and some of it for reasons that are difficult to understand.

The Disarmament Subcommittee has been holding hearings the past couple of weeks on many aspects of the disarmament question. Many of these hearings the subcommittee felt required to hold in executive session. The reason for this was only so that the executive officers could speak frankly before the subcommittee. An executive session means that no witness can refuse to speak or discuss a matter on grounds that the matter is classified. However, the subcommittee requested each witness to go over his testimony carefully so that the maximum portion of it could be made public, and thus contribute to the public's understanding of the issues involved.

CONTINUED GOVERNMENT CLASSIFICATION OF ARMS CONTROL DATA

But getting information that has been presented in executive session released to the public is a frustrating and time-consuming job.

Le me give you some examples, all of which have come out of my recent experience with the Disarmament Subcommittee hearings. * * *

QUESTIONABLE WITHHOLDING OF INFORMATION

Weapons information

Case No. 1: Information relating to the weight of atomic weapons relative to their yield, their power, is classified. This, I think you will agree, is clearly sensitive. I have no quarrel with this type of classification.

Disagreement among executive agencies

Case No. 2: A private witness who has been serving the Government in a specific capacity makes recommendations to the executive branch regarding future policies on the relationship of disarmament matters to the prevention of surprise attack. These recommendations are agreed to by one agency, but may be opposed by another agency and, therefore, the recommendations are classified.

This case I would call highly questionable.

It is understandable that the executive branch prefers to coordinate policy and reach agreement with all agencies concerned before a given policy is stated to the public. But such an attitude assumes that the public should not be privy to the formulation of policy, that the public should only know of policy after it has been set and determined.

It is reasonable to wait for policies to be coordinated among the various agencies of the Government if eventually a decision is made which the public can then discuss and debate. But what we are witnessing today is a Government in which decisions are not being made. There is a lack of leadership at the top to resolve the differences of opinion among the various executive agencies.

Oh, yes, I am aware that this is somewhat a partisan remark.

But I would be dishonest if I tried to gloss over this problem. It's a fact. I can understand that the Department of Defense, the Department of State, and the Atomic Energy Commission as well as other agencies in the Government have different views on such a question as to whether the United States should attempt to negotiate with the Soviet Union on questions of armaments control.

These differences of opinion are legitimate.

But, if our Government is to be a positive force in this world, if our national security is to be preserved, if we are to earn the respect and confidence of the peoples of other nations, and if we are to know what kind of policies we should follow in dealing with the Soviet Union and other countries of the Soviet bloc, then these differences of opinion must be resolved. And they must be resolved within a reasonable period of time.

* * * * *

SEISMOLOGICAL RESEARCH

Case No. 3: Scientific research is now going on regarding the study of the earth, how to distinguish earthquakes from nuclear explosions, and how to perfect instruments to identify earthquakes and explosions. This research is still classified. I fail to comprehend why the nature of the research is withheld. The research does not deal with weapons; it deals with seismology. We are told that if instruments are placed deep in the earth, this may be an excellent means of detecting and identifying nuclear explosions and earthquakes. But you cannot be told how the experiments will be conducted, where they will be conducted, who is responsible for carrying on the research, and when it is expected to be completed. Yet, the experiments would have great interest for seismologists the world over, and even more important at this particular time, the results could have a significant impact on negotiations now under way in Geneva for a controlled suspension of nuclear weapons tests.

Case of Executive privilege

Case No. 4: Certain portions of testimony are deleted on the ground that the witness is a consultant to an advisory body to the President and, therefore, the information should not be given out. Not only is it contended that this is privileged information, but it is contended that since the testimony of the witness may conflict with the views of another executive agency, that this matter should be left to be ironed out within the executive branch of the Government.

What this amounts to is that a regular executive department can air its views in public, even if these views conflict with declared public policy, but a consultant to a Presidential advisory body cannot make some of his views public, even if they agree with declared executive policy. Now this is a strange situation. Let me be a little more explicit.

The stated policy of the Government at the moment is that we shall try to reach agreement with the Soviet Union on the discontinuance of nuclear weapons tests, provided an effective control and inspection system is included in the agreement.

The Department of Defense and the Atomic Energy Commission question the advisability of this policy, and say so publicly.

However, all the private evidence is that the President's Science Advisory Committee, headed by Dr. James R. Killian, formerly head of Massachusetts Institute of Technology, approves the policy.

Yet, neither Killian nor any of the members of the Committee can publicly say they agree with the policy if their statements imply they are speaking as a member of the Committee.

So what we have is a policy, the defenders of which are gagged and those who oppose it have a relatively free hand in expressing their opposition.

All I can say is that this is a rather peculiar way to run a government.

* * * * *

Before I leave this point, I wish to stress I do not disagree with the right of the President to have advisers who have a confidential role. But this prerogative can be carried too far, so far that whole segments of informed opinion are constantly being bottled up. They are stored away and saved for the infighting of the executive branch but the benefit of their views and wisdom are hidden from the public.

Dr. Killian and his Science Advisory Committee is not the only group which has been sheltered from congressional and public inquiry. When Mr. Stassen was Disarmament Adviser to the President, all of his work and the studies conducted for him, were classified under the label of Executive privilege.

When Clarence Randall was the President's adviser on foreign trade, he was prohibited from testifying before Congress because of his role as Presidential adviser.

Nelson Rockefeller, when he was advising the President on matters of psychological warfare, could not tell the public what his views were and that they were not being accepted.

William Foster, as able and conscientious a public servant as one can find, served as vice chairman of the famous Gaither report on our national defense. The Gaither report was completely classified, even from Members of Congress. Mr. Foster, it is reported, felt so strongly about his views that he wrote a book, but even this was labeled secret by the White House. Mr. Foster is a patient man, far more than I would be under such circumstances.

As an illustration of a recent success we have had in getting executive witnesses to declassify testimony which they had labeled "classified" when they first edited it, let me cite our experience with the Army in regard to the testimony of Gen. Maxwell Taylor, the Army Chief of Staff. On the first time through the Army's security office, we were told that certain portions of the general's testimony could not be released. Actually this was only a small portion of the entire record of the hearing. However, it seemed to us that what the Army had red-penciled was in many cases the result of over-caution rather than of genuine security concern and we challenged them on it.

The Army security office reviewed it again. On the second round they restored over 90 percent of what they had taken out the first time. It would be of interest to you I am sure to have an idea of the kind of thing they restored and the sort of data they decided just could not get a declassified stamp. Among the passages they finally declassified were those containing general discussions of new nuclear weapons development and the tactical uses of these weapons. They also put back statements the general had made on the necessity of improving our nonatomic or conventional weapons capabilities if a test ban should go in effect, general information on the fabrication of nuclear weapons, expressions of opinion regarding the reliability of agreements with the U.S.S.R., views on the psychological impact of a nuclear test suspension on people around the world, and the effects of nuclear fallout. They retained a classified stamp, however, on data specifically dealing with dimensions and yields of nuclear weapons, on specific details regarding fabrication of weapons, statements regarding our intelligence capabilities, and data on the Sagebrush maneuvers in Louisiana several years ago. In this case our declassification campaign was a marked success.

Validity of Soviet positions

Case No. 5: Another type of information that the Government classified in our recent hearings has to do with the validity of arguments presented by the Soviet Union. A Government witness in the course of his testimony suggested that the Soviet Union possibly had a valid objection to one of our arguments, but the executive branch decided this ought to be censored.

Now, there is considerable merit in not conceding too many points to your opponent in the course of a debate or in the course of delicate negotiations. On the other hand, if the American people are constantly fed the line that every Soviet proposal is by definition full of evil for us or that every Soviet fear is "a trumped up Communist plot," then how shall we ever judge the genuine points of view of that nation and its people?

I am not suggesting here that the Soviet Union is a country to be trusted.

I am suggesting, however, that occasionally the Soviet leaders have made arguments that are legitimate from its security interests, and that it is to the interests of the American people to be aware of what those points of view are. I think we should be sufficiently mature to allow witnesses to release remarks which indicate that a particular Soviet position has some merit, and ought to be studied and given some consideration.

* * * * * *

DIRECTION OF AMERICAN FOREIGN AND DEFENSE POLICIES

* * * * * *

Since about the time of the Korean war, in 1950, our foreign policy took the form of building national defense so that when the time came, we could negotiate from a position of strength. This was the theme, adopted in the late forties or early fifties, and carried on until the present.

I have no objection to this principle—negotiating from positions of strength. In fact, I would say that the principle is a fundamental prerequisite to any kind of negotiation.

But I doubt that we have followed and abided by this concept. We have allowed certain aspects of our national defense to be weakened considerably, and we have forgotten that we wanted to achieve positions of strength so that we could engage in meaningful negotiations.

On the one hand, we have acted as though we could engage in some unilateral disarmament at home, directed by the Bureau of the Budget and motivated by a desire to save money at the expense of national security.

And on the other hand, we have forgotten that the positions of strength we wanted to build were to be used as the basis for serious bargaining and negotiation.

We have spent billions and billions of dollars for weapons of destruction and annihilation.

We have put most of our knowledge and efforts in the nuclear weapons field into weapons of the very large yield.

By comparison, we are spending all too little on problems of arms control. We are spending very little on the problem of defense against probing actions of the Soviet Union, and on the problem of limited military conflicts and the war of economic competition.

We have also used the vast majority of our foreign aid expenditures to supply other countries with military hardware.

We have joined with as many nations as we could in signing military defense pacts.

We have responded to an increasing degree to the problem of competition from foreign markets by establishing import quotas and raising tariffs. We have accumulated large amounts of foreign currencies through the sale of surplus agricultural products, currencies which now sit idle and which day by day depreciate in value and are not used for productive projects.

These are some of the things we are doing in the field of defense and foreign policy. I submit that the direction of this approach is wrong, misguided, and lacking in vision and creative leadership.

POSITIONS OF MILITARY, POLITICAL, ECONOMIC STRENGTH LACKING

The direction of our policies is not making for positions of strength. They are going in the direction of retrenchment.

Too often we appear to be saying, that we, the richest nation the world has ever known, cannot afford to spend the money to have a balanced defense establishment. Too frequently we give the impression that we dare not sit down at the bargaining table with the Soviet Union because our representatives cannot bargain as effectively as the Soviets.

Too many times do we seem to be saying that the great American market cannot take the competition of foreign made goods.

And, finally, too often does our answer to the problem of need abroad seem to be in terms of military equipment—and not enough in terms of the implements for economic well-being and the expansion of opportunities for human growth and happiness.

But I do not propose to dwell on the inadequacies of our policies. It is more important to stress what we should be doing, what we can be working for as citizens of a free government and a rich and prosperous society.

PROGRAM FOR THE FUTURE

1. We need to have a much more balanced defense establishment than we now have. Tthe threats to security and peace today exist in such areas as the island of freedom of Berlin, Communist subversion and infiltration in the Middle East, and probing actions along the periphery of Asia. If we do not have the know-how, the fortitude, and the equipment to face these situations, then the Soviet bloc will gradually nibble away the free world, bit by bit.

2. We must engage in serious study and preparation for the purpose of bargaining with the Soviet Union on all areas—exchange of persons, joint participation of international health activities, solution of the division of Europe, trade in goods, and the control of armaments. We should not be fearful of negotiating, but whenever we negotiate we should know what we are after, and we must be well prepared and select the best of negotiators to represent us. In none of these areas should we expect quick results.

3. We should focus more on the potential of the economic and political power of the newly developing countries of Asia, Africa, and Latin America. In this power-conscious world we have tended to look primarily where power is today and not enough where power may be tomorrow. * * *

4. The direction of our foreign economic policy should be one of expansion, not one of caution and retrenchment. As we have grown rich and wealthy in our economic system, we have lost to some extent the spirit of competition and the spirit of risk in conducting our economic affairs. If we are to promote and extend ideas of a free economy, I believe we must look outward, not inward. But we cannot expand and strengthen international trade and international economic development without meeting some competition from abroad and without subjecting our capital to some risk.

5. The focus of our cultural policy should be one of opening up our shores for the people of all nations to observe the operation of our political, economic, and social system.

We know there are many aspects of our way of life that require vast improvement. But what is and can be exciting and challenging about our free society is that if we have the vision, the will, and the leadership, the sores and the defects can be removed.

Our society is constantly changing, and it is the art of statesmanship and politics to have this change be for the good and not the bad.

I could go on at considerable length elaborating on these points and adding more.

But on all these matters, much more public discussion and debate are needed.

You have done a masterful job in weighing the pros and cons and the various courses of action on one of the crucial issues that face us, that of the direction of our arms control program and policies.

I cannot help but have the feeling that whatever views you come out with on this issue, the country will be better served as a result.

I am pleased to have had a small part in your deliberations tonight, and I can only hope that through the deliberations of you and your fellow students, U.S. policy will evolve to serve the Nation in the cause of a better and more peaceful future for all of us.

Congress Should Enact Without Further Delay an Effective Area Redevelopment Bill Designed To Eliminate the Prospects of Another Presidential Veto

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 10, 1959

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, following is the statement I made this morning before the House Banking and Currency Committee in support of area redevelopment legislation:

STATEMENT BY JAMES E. VAN ZANDT, MEMBER OF CONGRESS, 20TH DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA, BEFORE THE HOUSE BANKING AND CURRENCY COMMITTEE, ON MARCH 10, 1959, IN SUPPORT OF LEGISLATION TO PROVIDE FEDERAL AID TO DEPRESSED AREAS

Mr. Chairman, over a period of years it has been my privilege to appear before this committee several times in support of area redevelopment legislation.

As a matter of fact, I am among a group of Representatives in Congress who are recognized as pioneers in this particular field.

As many of you know, my congressional district in Pennsylvania, comprising the counties of Blair, Centre, and Clearfield, has been plagued with chronic unemployment for years due to depressed conditions in the coal and railroad industries. At times as much as 18 percent of our total labor force has been unemployed.

Therefore, we know the meaning of "ghost towns" and the misery that follows in the wake of unemployment as we watch good American families being forced to exist on public assistance and surplus commodities.

Speaking of surplus commodities, in my three-county area there are 57,323 persons eligible for surplus food or 18.8 percent of the overall population.

In fact, in Clearfield County nearly 23 percent of the population are recipients of surplus commodities and dependent upon them for the necessities of life.

Mr. Chairman, at the present time in the two labor forces in my congressional district, here is the picture.

As of January 1959 in the Altoona area, out of a labor force of 53,600 there were 7,700 unemployed or an average of 14.4 percent of the labor force; while in the Dubois-Clearfield area, out of a labor force of 37,000 there were 5,200 unemployed or an average of 14.1 percent of the labor force.

Therefore, the unemployment situation in my congressional district is simply this. Out of a labor force of nearly 91,000, there are 12,900 unemployed or 14.3 percent of the labor force.

As I have said before, unemployment in my congressional district has been as high as 18 percent of the labor force. One point I want to emphasize is that unemployment conditions are not temporary or seasonal nor can we see any improvement in the coal and railroad industries.

As a matter of fact, employment in these industries is still on the downward trend and nobody dares to predict when employment will level off.

For an illustration, my hometown of Altoona is principally a railroad town because it is the site of the largest railroad shops in the world operated by the Pennsylvania railroad company.

Early in 1951 these shops employed 14,361; while last August employment dropped to 2,050.

According to information released on March 1 of this year, employment reached 6,000 and by the middle of April employment is expected to level off at 7,000. This means that in the city of Altoona alone, there has been a loss of over 7,000 jobs.

Mr. Chairman, this situation in Altoona is duplicated in the city of Dubois where hundreds have been furloughed by the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad.

Instead of having around 1,200 employees, as of March 1, 456 were employed with the expectation that employment in Dubois will level off at 600, which means that 50 percent of the B. & O. labor force will be jobless.

I have been pinpointing unemployment in the railroad industry in an effort to show the permanent loss of jobs. Similar facts reveal that the same condition exists in the coal, brick, and related industries in my congressional district.

We residents of central Pennsylvania recognized this chronic unemployment situation years ago and through local community effort, area redevelopment groups were organized for the purpose of diversifying the economy by attracting new industries.

To date we have enjoyed a measure of success, but it is such a mammoth task that we are convinced we cannot do it alone.

Before substantiating this statement, let me emphasize that we are not looking for a Federal handout. What we need primarily is additional borrowing power which, coupled with other forms of Federal assistance as contained in pending bills, will enable us to abolish unemployment in our midst.

In achieving this objective, we will not only rehabilitate our economy through diversification of industry, but we will, in effect, be barring a repetition of this chronic unemployment that we have been faced with for years.

Before giving you the highlights of my compromise bill, H.R. 4878, I should like to repeat a question constantly asked by many of my constituents—"Why is it that Congress sends billions of dollars to so-called underprivileged nations yet ignores the plight of good American citizens who through no fault of their own are unemployed?"

Mr. Chairman, the answer to this question is that Congress too long has ignored "the pockets of unemployment" that have brought suffering and despair despite national prosperity.

I hold no brief for the action taken by President Eisenhower in vetoing area redevelopment legislation last year. In my opinion, he was poorly advised.

Nor do I hold any brief for those who quibble and employ delaying tactics over the cost of area redevelopment legislation. Since we have billions to pour into foreign aid, we certainly have a moral obligation to care for the needs of America's unemployed.

Mr. Chairman, the fact that area redevelopment legislation is fully justified makes it pertinent to ask—"Why solicit a repetition of last year's veto by having the pending Douglas-Flood bill given similar treatment since it resembles to a marked degree the Douglas-Spence bill of the 85th Congress?"

Frankly, it will not be difficult for me to support the Douglas-Flood bill, but I must confess the possibility of another veto is a cause for great concern.

While there is no one in the Senate or the House who would stoop to playing politics with the misery of unemployment, we cannot ignore the fact that unless a bill is enacted the suffering of the people in the depressed areas is not going to be alleviated.

Mr. Chairman, among the sponsors of depressed area legislation there exist two conflicting points of view.

To begin with, in principle the administration has endorsed aid to depressed areas.

In addition, the two great major political parties also endorsed the principle in their 1956 platforms.

Therefore, the question that Congress must resolve is the extent of aid to the depressed areas of the Nation.

In an effort to reach this common objective, it is imperative that reasonable people should be willing to compromise.

In this connection, it is my belief that the President will find it possible to accept a reasonable compromise between the administration bill and the Douglas-Flood version of the legislation.

In my plea for a reasonable compromise, it must be thoroughly understood that I am not presuming to speak for the administration nor have I had any consultations with administration leaders on the subject.

Mr. Chairman, let us be practical and face the facts concerning depressed area legislation.

In the event of a Presidential veto of the Douglas-Flood bill, I have been unable to find anyone willing to flatly predict that the veto will be overridden by the House of Representatives.

The fear of being unable to override a veto is based on the fact that it requires two-thirds of the votes cast to accomplish that purpose.

Therefore—looking the facts right in the face—when you review the position of those Members of the House today in relation to their last year's vote on the Douglas-Spence bill, one finds that the margin of victory would be insufficient to override a possible Presidential veto of the Douglas-Flood bill.

Mr. Chairman, to improve the chances of enacting depressed area legislation, I introduced H.R. 4878, a bill which represents a compromise between the administration's approach and the Douglas-Flood proposal.

With a few exceptions, my compromise bill, H.R. 4878, offers the same types of aid contained in the Douglas-Spence bill vetoed last year.

For example, instead of making every depressed area eligible for the same types of assistance, my bill provides different degrees of Federal assistance based upon the level of chronic unemployment and the need in such areas.

In this connection, it is my belief that areas which have suffered greater levels of unemployment should be entitled to a greater degree of aid than those communities whose problems of unemployment are of a lesser degree.

Briefly, my bill, H.R. 4878, provides for the following programs:

1. Technical assistance: Depressed areas would be eligible for technical assistance to help the communities to appraise their physical and human resources, which would prepare them to plan constructive programs to attract new businesses and expand existing businesses in these areas.

2. Community loans: Depressed communities would be eligible to receive loans from a revolving fund of $100 million.

We know that the conventional lending facilities in depressed areas are not as venturesome as those in growing and expanding communities.

The fund would put the depressed areas on a more equal footing with other communities in attracting new jobs.

3. Public facilities: Some communities need improvement in public facilities before they would become sufficiently attractive to new businesses which might desire to locate in these areas.

My bill provides for an establishment of a $25 million revolving fund from which these communities would be able to borrow.

While the figure may appear modest, attention is called to the fact that legislation is pending before the House which would establish special funds for community facilities.

Meanwhile, under my bill, H.R. 4878, a smaller fund would be allocated and earmarked to aid depressed areas.

In addition, the most depressed communities which do not have the sufficient resources to borrow funds would be eligible to receive grants up to a maximum of $25 million.

At this point let me stress that this is not an annual appropriation, but is intended to be a $25 million revolving fund from which these communities would be able to borrow.

The administrator of the program would be expected to limit the grants only to communities with the greatest need for aid and which do not have sufficient resources to repay the loans in the foreseeable future.

It should be stressed that this is no giveaway program. Under the provisions of my bill, grants would be made only for projects which would provide lasting improvements and thus broaden the economic base of the communities.

4. Vocational training and subsistence: One of the big problems of the people in depressed areas is the fact that many of their industries have declined or disappeared, and, consequently, the demand for the skills acquired by the people in these areas has also diminished or vanished.

In order to enable these people whose skills have become obsolete to gain new employment, we must provide facilities to retrain them.

But many have been unemployed for a long period of time, and it would be unreasonable to expect that they could undergo an effective period of vocational training without any means of support.

Consequently, while the unemployed are undergoing training and if they are no longer eligible for unemployment compensation, they would be receiving subsistence payments equal to the average unemployment insurance in their State during the period while they are undergoing training, but not for a period exceeding 13 weeks.

Only the unemployed residing in the communities with the highest level of unemployment would be eligible for this type of aid and the total amount that would be appropriated for this program would be limited to $5 million a year.

Mr. Chairman, in brief, these are the provisions of my compromise bill, H.R. 4878.

They are modest, but at the same time will provide a sound program of Federal assistance to depressed areas.

All of us are deeply concerned by the latest reports about the rise of unemployment.

Experience has shown that the people in depressed areas are the ones that are mostly hit by any rise in unemployment and are the last to recover from the onslaught of recession.

Therefore, it is urged that we enact the program contained in my compromise bill, H.R. 4878, as a realistic means of providing an effective program to aid the chronically depressed areas of the Nation.

Since the cost of depressed area legislation has proved a stumbling block in the past and impeded our efforts, let me point out that the cost of the Douglas-Flood bill is $389.5 million as compared to the cost of the administration bill which is $53 million.

By way of contrast, my compromise bill, H.R. 4878, will cost $158 million or just about midway between the cost of the Douglas-Flood bill and the administration bill.

Mr. Chairman, at this point in my remarks I should like to include the following comparative analysis of the provisions and costs of the Douglas-Flood, administration, and Van Zandt bills. [Not printed in the RECORD.]

In connection with depressed area legislation, let me state that I have no pride of authorship.

My sole desire is to aid the people in the depressed areas and to attain such a laudable objective the spirit of compromise should be dominant in our minds.

As one who represents two chronically depressed areas in Pennsylvania with unemployment as high as 14 percent of our labor force and which has plagued us for years, my goal is that Congress enact without delay an effective bill in a form acceptable to the President, thereby eliminating the prospects of another Presidential veto.

Mr. Chairman, the residents of the 269 depressed areas of the Nation are entitled to this type of legislation, and it is my sincere hope that we can compromise any differences and enact a depressed area bill without further delay.

Talmadge Farm Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HERMAN E. TALMADGE

OF GEORGIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 10, 1959

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the column of Holmes Alexander commenting on the Talmadge farm plan as it appeared in the Fort Myers (Fla.) News-Press of March 2, 1959; the editorial, "Can Talmadge Bail Out U.S. Farm Program?" from the March 3, 1959, issue of the Atlanta, (Ga.) Constitution; and my letter to the Wall Street Journal which appeared in the February 26, 1959, issue of that paper.

There being no objection, the column, editorial, and letter were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Fort Myers (Fla.) News-Press, Mar. 2, 1959]

SENATOR TALMADGE HAS A SWORD

(By Holmes Alexander)

Senator HERMAN TALMADGE, Democrat, of Georgia, has a sword (S. 306) and it might cut the Gordian knot which binds the once-proud giant—the American farmer.

As things stand today, the producer of our basic foods and fibers has been bound hand and foot with ruinous redtape. His pockets have been picked by our economic system. He stands, in a state of shame which he never earned, as the object of public ridicule and abuse.

The Talmadge bill, cited as the Agriculture Income Equalization Act of 1959 is just that—an equalizer. It suffers from its nature of being an economic leveler, but it has the virtues of leveling up, not leveling down; of junking much redtape while creating only a little bit more; of paying for production rather than for nonproduction. And while the Senator doesn't pretend to the patience and dexterity that would be required to untangle the snarls, he is offering a sharp weapon to sever the cords for good and all.

There should be no further effort at this late hour to demonstrate the need for a new farm policy. As one who believes that the farm picture has been smudged and the American farmer himself dehumanized by the overuse of statistics, this reporter refuses to rehash the oft-told figures. Suffice it to say that corporation farming draws the six-digit subsidies, while the person we call the American farmer gets the bad reputation of being a public charge. He earns less money every year. He works below minimum wages, and above maximum hours. He has no place at the collective bargaining table. He is the victim of the kind of big brother bureaucracy which could devour us all, unless soon mastered by the people.

Senator TALMADGE is not the only farmer in the upper House, but he is very likely the only one who could be called postwar. He commenced raising household crops and meat animals shortly after his 5-year hitch in the World War II Navy. Like nearly all postwar farmers, he is a part-timer, since the land will hardly yield a decent living to the individual or family producer. The Senator counts himself lucky, he tells me, if his farm makes expenses, pays taxes, and keeps a good table. A man has a better chance today at rolling dice, he adds, than at farming. The dice occasionally turn up right; farming never.

The Senator's bill is a refined Brannan plan, according to its author. It frankly provides that the Federal Government pay the difference in cash between what the farmer gets for the domestic purchase of his basic crops and what he ought to get by American standards of livelihood.

In farm legislative language, the farmer would receive 100 percent parity on his produce, but no producer would receive more than $25,000 a year. (Many corporations now receive 10 to 20 times that much.) The basic crops, with corn figures unavailable, under the Talmadge plan would yield an estimated total subsidy of $1.8 billion. But the savings to the public would be several times that amount by elimination of all Government controls and loans, all Government purchase and storage of crops, much Government personnel and property that makes up the present system.

It won't do to present the Talmadge plan as utopian or even wholly satisfactory. It would require a vast staff of paper shufflers to assign each farmer a domestic production quota and to pay to each farmer a sales price support. The farmer himself would be required to submit a bill of sale with his application for sales-price support payments. And without doubt a large crop of inspectors would be on the rolls to check the farmers, and another corps to check the inspectors.

The Talmadge plan would not bring about free enterprise, but it would allow the farmer to raise whatever he wants and sell it for whatever it brings, knowing that there is a Federal floor under the prices. Thus the farmer would be equalized under the same economic protection as the industrial worker, the metals producer, and the numerous other segments of the population.

Secretary Benson's 6-year scheme of reducing price supports and reducing acreage has a negative quality which may be at the heart of its failure. In any event, it is a discredited cause and should be abandoned. The Talmadge proposal, which had a trial flight last year, has many friends in the Senate.

[From the Atlanta (Ga.) Constitution, Mar. 3, 1959]

CAN TALMADGE BAIL OUT U.S. FARM PROGRAM?

Georgia's able commissioner of agriculture, Phil Campbell, told a television audience on the "Constitution's Press Gallery" program Sunday that Senator TALMADGE'S proposed farm legislation offers the Nation's agriculture relief from the expensive and destructive policies of the Eisenhower administration and of Secretary of Agriculture Benson.

He is not alone in his attitude. There are increasing signs of congressional revolt against continuation of a program which is destroying the small farms, drying up the Nation's export markets, and costing the taxpayers more and more every year.

Senator TALMADGE'S proposed legislation, first introduced last year, would tend to reverse the trend to bigger and bigger farm units. It would cost much less than the Benson program. Products would be sold on

a free market at home and abroad with farmers receiving parity payments on certain basic commodities consumed in this country. There would be a limit on such subsidy payments.

Such a program would tend to curb inflation in farm prices and restore competitive conditions in world markets. It would reduce Government-held subsidies which have reached the astronomical total of $9 billion costing a billion and a quarter a year for storage alone. Reportedly, Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY, of Minnesota; Senator SYMINGTON, of Missouri; and Senator PROXMIRE, of Wisconsin; are working with the Georgian to iron out further details of the proposed program. While it may not pass at this session of Congress, it forms the outline of what very likely will become the Nation's future farm program.

Supporting the Talmadge plan is the obvious fact that farmers must have some sort of protection in a protected economy to maintain a competitive position with other groups.

It is quite plain the Benson program has been a failure. There is need for a change and a version of the Talmadge plan offers the opportunity.

[From the Wall Street Journal, Feb. 26, 1959]

TALMADGE FARM PLAN

EDITOR, THE WALL STREET JOURNAL:

In your editorial of February 3, "And a 'New' Farm Plan," your characterization of the farm bill which I am sponsoring in the 86th Congress as a new version of the Brannan plan is not supported by the facts of the matter.

If it is the intent of that language to equate the compensatory payment feature of my idea with the so-called Brannan plan, by the same logic it also could be called the Eisenhower plan, the Benson plan, or the Seaton plan because officials by those names have advocated a similar application of the compensatory payment idea to growers of wool and sugar and producers of metal.

The purpose of the Talmadge farm plan is simply to put American farming back on a free enterprise basis again with protection equivalent to that received by labor through organized bargaining and the minimum wage, and industry through the tariff and various Government contracts and subsidies. It attempts realistically to take into account that with all other segments of the American economy being dependent to some degree upon Government support and protection, the farmer, cannot be left as the only person without a legislative guarantee of his proportionate share of the national purchasing power.

The only way in which the American agricultural economy can be restored to its rightful place in the national economy is through removing the Federal Government from the business of buying, selling, storing, and transporting agricultural commodities and putting American agricultural commodities back on the world markets at competitive prices. It would be ideal if that could be achieved by repealing all farm laws and letting agricultural prices seek their own level, but to do so would place the American standard of living, which is the world's highest, in competition with living standards in other countries which are mere fractions of ours.

Therefore, it logically follows that the only sensible and economically alternative compatible with our American concept of free enterprise economy is to support the American standard of living for farmers on that portion of their output consumed in this country and let the law of supply and demand come into play with respect to the remainder.

I do not share the pessimistic view of some that the American farmer cannot conduct his operations responsibly without Government planting and marketing controls. I am convinced that, given an opportunity, the American farmer will prove that he can intelligently regulate his production and marketing in accordance with natural economic laws once the responsibility for making his own decisions with respect to them is returned to him.

The farmer is the backbone of this Nation's economy. To give him less consideration than is accorded all others will create a double economic standard which canont help but have the eventual result of adversely affecting every phase of our economy.

HERMAN E. TALMADGE,
U.S. Senate.

WASHINGTON, D.C.

Thomas G. Masaryk, Founder and First President of Czechoslovakia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEONARD G. WOLF
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 10, 1959

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, March 7 was the 109th anniversary of the birth of a man of great ideals, a great champion and a symbol of human freedom, the George Washington of Czechoslovakia—Thomas G. Masaryk.

As Mr. Joseph Mekota, one of the great leaders of Iowans of Czechoslovakian descent in the city of Cedar Rapids, recently wrote to me:

> Thomas Masaryk is regarded in the hearts of all Americans of Czech origin—and by the people who live today in subjugated Czechoslovakia—as the Great Liberator, an outstanding teacher and statesman.

Thomas Masaryk worked unceasingly during the First World War to gain support for Czechoslovakia's longing for independence. He came to the United States in 1918 and convinced President Woodrow Wilson of the justness of his cause. On October 18, 1918, the Czechoslovak Declaration of Independence was formally published in Washington, D.C., and the constitution of the Republic of which Masaryk was the first President, was based in large part on our own Contitution.

Perhaps the spirit of freedom is catching—at any rate, Mr. Masaryk married an American lady, and his devotion to freedom never wavered. The bond and spirit of friendship between the peoples of Czechoslovakia and the United States have always been very strong.

Unfortunately, the new area of democracy for all the world which was the hoped-for result of the allied victory in World War I did not become a reality. The Czechoslovakia Republic, the first fruit of that victory, was short-lived. Nevertheless, the memory of the freedom enjoyed by the Czech people from the date of the adoption of the constitution in 1920 until the Nazi occupation of Czechoslovakia in 1938, has not, and will not, be forgotten.

Mr. Speaker, I visited Czechoslovakia in the summer of 1957. It is a tragic thing to see the work of Thomas Masaryk set aside now by a Communist state. But freedom still burns in the hearts of the Czech people. We must keep it burning so that some day soon, with God's help, it can begin to glow and burst into the flame of liberty once more. We must dramatize here in America that we are conscious of their sacrifice. For this reason, I am happy to join tomorrow with those Americans who claim kinship with Thomas Masaryk in the hope and prayer that the light of liberty will again shine in the lives of the subjugated nations of the world. I propose, also, that we resolve to honor him every day in 1960—the 110th year of his birth. We can do this by issuing in his honor one of the champions of liberty stamps.

The champions of liberty series of stamps were conceived for the purpose of doing honor to leaders of other lands, and I think it would be a highly proper and desirable action to honor in this way one of the greatest statesmen and democratic leaders of this century on the 110th anniversary of his birth.

Mr. Speaker, I have today written to the Postmaster General of the United States, urging that one of the two champions of liberty series stamps to be issued in the year 1960 be issued in honor of Thomas G. Masaryk.

It is my earnest hope that the Members of the House and of the Senate will see fit to express to the Postmaster General their endorsement of the issuance in 1960 of a Thomas G. Masaryk postage stamp.

Dr. Flemming's Formula

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEE METCALF
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 10, 1959

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, Dr. Flemming, Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare has perfected the formula under which he alleges that the classroom shortage can be eliminated if only the States will cooperate by changing the constitutions and the States and local districts by changing their rules as to the incidence of taxes and debt limits for bonds on property.

Application of Dr. Flemming's formula to the Congress of the United States would reveal much to Mr. Alcorn's surprise that the Republicans actually won the last election. A minor change in the Constitution and rules of the House and Senate would give the Republican Members two votes for each single Democratic vote.

Under the Flemming formula the Republicans would organize the House of Representatives by a vote of 306 to 283; the Senate by a vote of 68 to 64. Of course, that is a very narrow margin and anticipating further losses in the next election perhaps it would be well for Dr. Flemming to make his ratio of Republican votes three to one Democratic. Mi-

nor obstacles to effecting this change are the Constitution of the United States, the rules of the House and Senate, but with the cooperation of the Democratic Members these minor obstacles can be overcome.

Immigration Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 10, 1959

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, the distinguished junior Senator from Massachusetts, JOHN F. KENNEDY, is now in the process of drafting immigration legislation which would replace the rigid national origin quota system which has been the criteria for admission into the United States as an alien for decades.

In a letter to the editor of the New York Times today, Senator KENNEDY lucidly explains the desirability and his reasoning for sponsoring immigration legislation that would reunite blood relatives in the United States and provide for the entry of nonrelatives without a quota limitation based on country of origin.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I ask that Senator KENNEDY's letter appearing in the New York Times of today be printed in the RECORD.

The letter follows:

ADMITTING IMMIGRANTS—SENATOR KENNEDY EXPLAINS PROVISIONS OF BILL FOR ENTRY OF NONRELATIVES

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

A letter to the editor of the New York Times by Richard Robbins, printed in your issue of March 4, has been called to my attention. It is a thoughtful and cogent statement of the undesirability of replacing the rigid national origins quota system in our immigration policy with merely a blood relationship formula. I wholly agree with the basic conclusions expressed by Mr. Robbins.

Insofar, however, as he assumes that the bill I am preparing would be limited in the way he describes, he is mistaken. At the press conference called by the Anti-Defamation League to announce the publication of a booklet I wrote entitled "A Nation of Immigrants," I emphasized the point that I planned to introduce a bill to replace the national origins quota system, and that preferred status in immigration would be given to relatives of American residents. But I also stated—and this has been overlooked in many of the comments upon my position—that the bill I was working on would retain provisions for the admission of nonrelatives.

The proposal for the elimination of the national origins quotas has two phases: First, it will admit relatives for the purpose of reuniting families that have long suffered from unnatural separation. They will be admitted without the rigid restrictions of the national origins formula which currently imposes tiny unworkable quotas on many countries.

REDUCING BACKLOG

Thus we would reduce the huge backlog of applications by brothers, sisters and other close relatives of American citizens. (It is estimated that currently this backlog exceeds 200,000 relatives who have been waiting for many years.) It would render unnecessary many of the private bills introduced in each session of Congress to ameliorate particular hardship. Finally, the natural desire of members of the same family to help each other would assist the assimilation process.

Second, the proposal would provide for the admission of nonrelatives—refugees and so-called new-seed immigration—under a flexible formula that would take into account America's needs, our historical position as a home for the persecuted, and our standing as a world leader.

While the statistical formulas to govern the various categories of admission are still to be worked out, at least as many nonrelatives as we now admit annually would be eligible for admission under the new program. There would be one important difference—quota limitations based on country of origin would be largely eliminated.

This is one of 10 proposals I mentioned at the press conference. It is by far both the most difficult and the most delicate. I am confident, however, that we will ultimately be able to enact a law which is consistent with our position of leadership in the free world.

JOHN F. KENNEDY.

WASHINGTON, *March 6, 1959.*

The Story of "Mr. Peanut"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 10, 1959

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following brief history of the founding and development of the immensely successful Planters Nut & Chocolate Co., Wilkes-Barre, Pa., the city of its founding and where its main offices are located. This history takes the form of a letter, which I sent to each Member of Congress this week:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., March 11, 1959.

DEAR COLLEAGUE: Peanuts, one of the Nation's six basic farm commodities, have long been America's favorite snack—at baseball games, at the circus, and to add taste and enjoyment to parties of all kinds.

And possibly the most important contribution to the peanut industry as we know it today has been made by Planters peanuts, founded in Wilkes-Barre, Luzerne County, Pa., in 1906.

The development of Planters is the story of Amedeo Obici, an Italian immigrant, who came to this country as a boy of 11. At the turn of the century, he soon found himself the proprietor of a fruit stand with the conventional peanut roaster. Young Amedeo, however, foresaw a future in the peanut business and soon had two floors of an old frame building in Wilkes-Barre devoted exclusively to the processing of blanched Virginia salted peanuts which Amedeo and his new partner, Mario Peruzzi, called Planters peanuts.

The next step was the creation of Mr. Peanut, the company's popular trademark, and today, this insignificant beginning has resulted in a worldwide organization with factories in Suffolk, Va., San Francisco, Calif., and Toronto, Canada.

However, the headquarters of Planters still remains in Wilkes-Barre. From there, over 300 Planters salesmen are directed and controlled. All sales and promotional plans are developed in Wilkes-Barre, where Planters president, Mr. Frank A. English, maintains his office and executive staff.

Premiums have been basic Planters selling tools for many years—the pen and pencil set enclosed herewith is the latest in a long line of Mr. Peanut premiums, which is for your use with our compliments.

Sincerely yours,

DANIEL J. FLOOD,
Member of Congress.

A Day of Mourning of the Rumanian Nation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THADDEUS M. MACHROWICZ
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 10, 1959

Mr. MACHROWICZ. Mr. Speaker, the 6th day of March was a day of mourning of the Rumanian nation. It was 14 years ago that Rumania was subjugated by Soviet Russia.

On March 6, 1945, the late abject executioner of Soviet crimes, Vishinsky, installed with the help of Marshal Malinovski's guns and tanks a puppet government in Bucharest.

The circumstances of this act of interference and brutality are fairly well known, but insufficient stress is laid on its political consequences. The plight of Eastern Europe is too often represented as the product of an implacable destiny, in the decrees of which the Western World had no share. It is a misconception that our only relation to the problem of subjugated Europe is merely one of a remote moral character, a matter of pure generosity. The truth is that the Western Powers have contracted very definite obligations regarding the freedom and independence of the Eastern European nations. The binding legal character of these obligations originates both from the declarations of principle and intention made during the war—like the Atlantic Charter and the Yalta declaration—and from the guarantees recorded in the so-called peace treaties signed by the United States, the United Kingdom and the Soviet Union.

The puppet Government of Rumania has continuously infringed the provisions of the peace treaty. All the nonrepresentative governments recognized in East Europe have done the same. Being under Soviet control and direct military pressure the occupied countries have been transformed in Soviet bases and domains of ruthless economic exploitation. Rumania's fertile agricultural country, with the richest deposits of oil in Europe, is now in a permanent state of alimentary crisis, her population is impoverished and public health is reaching its lowest ebb. But despite these horrible hardships, the resistance

against communism is ever present in Rumania, the sabotage widespread over the country and the deep allegiance of the people to the West stubbornly manifest. The situation is characteristic of the whole area of Soviet dominated Eastern Europe.

At this critical historical juncture it will be a tragic error to ignore, or gloss over this state of things in such a vital strategic point. By their old and proud traditions of freedom, by their economic and human resources, the nearly one hundred million of enslaved Eastern Europeans appear as a potential political force of the first magnitude. It is amply proved by now, that the Russians are intensely conscious of this fact and try by every means to annihilate this pro-Western potential and its dangerous implications for Soviet imperialism.

The offensive of Khrushchev through the Berlin maneuver to achieve a settlement in Europe, with the final recognition of the Communist controlled area, indicates the urgency and importance the Soviets attached to this problem. The freezing of the status quo of Russian domination in Central and East Europe, would mean indeed the decisive step toward an ultimate Soviet control over the whole of Europe.

The two main ideas of the Russians in this campaign are to get rid of American military bases and what we call psychological bases; namely, the American presence in Berlin with its powerful psychological impact on the whole of Eastern Europe. These psychological bases should at no price be weakened, but on the contrary, a clear indication should be given that no deal will be made regarding the status quo. The best policy in this matter would be to actually raise the issue of Soviet domination of the entire East European area. Any negotiations in the Berlin crisis offer ample opportunity to counterattack on this vital matter and the most vulnerable point in the Russian offensive.

Dr. Flemming's Famous Formula

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEE METCALF
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 10, 1959

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, Arthur S. Flemming, Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, proposes to build 75,000 classrooms by the simple device of altering State constitutions, State debt-limitation statutes, and basic State tax principles. Secretary Flemming has been so successful in his crusade to doctor the laws of the States that he has been given an honorary doctor of laws degree by Georgetown University.

Dr. Flemming, in the process of doctoring the laws under his new franchise, could help the medical doctors of the Nation solve the Nation's health problems and stave off the awful specter of socialized medicine at the same time he is building classrooms. Simple extension of Dr. Flemming's formula would have the States that are rewriting their constitutions or their statutes in order to build classrooms also incorporate a provision that all germs, viruses, bacteria, and Ezra Taft Benson are persona non grata in those States.

Comments on the Extension of the Draft

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 10, 1959

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to call to the attention of my colleagues an editorial which appeared in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of Sunday, February 8, 1959, "The Draft Is Outmoded":

THE DRAFT IS OUTMODED

If the Armed Forces are to have the newest and best weapons that science and industry can provide, they should have men who are fully qualified to use them. Therein lies a manpower problem. A vastly improved National Defense Establishment could be had if a way were found to solve this manpower problem, the crux of which is the draft. The draft simply is not supplying the type of recruits that are needed, nor is it fair to the youth of the land.

As matters stand right now, military conscription is necessary until some better substitute can be devised. The draft inspires many to volunteer so that they can pick their own branch of service as well as the time they want to begin serving. If there were no draft, there would be insufficient volunteers. This is proved by the fact that during 1948–49 the armed services tried to maintain a combined force of less than 2 million men without draft quotas, and failed miserably.

There is little chance to devise a substitute for the draft between now and June 30, when the law will expire unless extended. It seems certain to be extended. The House voted last Thursday, 381 to 20, to extend it for 4 years.

Why would it not be wise to extend the bill just for 2 years, and during that time have a joint congressional committee, or a civilian-military committee, study the manpower problem seriously in an effort to reach a solution?

A good long look at the draft and how it has been functioning is badly needed. The Army is the only service using the draft. In recent months it has called about 8,000 men per month; less than 7,000 are inducted for the 2-year period of duty. About 90,000 sign up annually for a 6-month period of service followed by 5 years in the Reserve or the National Guard. Thousands of others volunteer for duty in the Air Force, Navy, Marines, and Coast Guard, which do not depend on draftees.

Some 1,200,000 youths come of military age every year. According to the Pentagon, some 660,000 persons enter the services, only 180,000 being inductees. Thus the chances are excellent the vast majority of the class that attains military age every year will not see service. That is not fair to those who are drafted or who volunteer.

Reference is sometimes made to the military pay increase bill which was passed last year by Congress after it had somewhat watered down the Cordiner report which stressed the need for better pay to keep the best men in the service. The matter of higher pay begs the question for those who enter in the lowest ranks. And even the higher pay now permitted is not sufficient to retain many of the very best and most badly needed men.

Surely a group of men such as those who turned in the Rockefeller and Johnson committee reports should be able to find a better solution to the manpower problem. The draft, as it stands now, is badly outmoded in this era of atomic-powered submarines, radar, ballistic missiles and space satellites. A thoughtful study to devise a space-age substitute is needed.

On March 3, 1959, I appeared before the Senate Armed Services Committee to testify on the very serious question of the extension of the induction provisions of the Universal Military Training and Service Act. A statement of my views on the subject follows:

STATEMENT OF HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS, OF MISSOURI, BEFORE SENATE ARMED SERVICES COMMITTEE, MARCH 3, 1959

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the opportunity to testify before this committee on the very serious question of the extension of the induction provisions of the Universal Military Training and Service Act.

This act had a difficult birth and its life has been a strange one. If anyone doubt it let him ponder over its title. It is probably neither universal, military, nor training. It is theoretically a draft act, as it is popularly called.

I would like to review the legislative birth of this act from the time it received its undescriptive title if I had the time. Instead I will refer to the remarks I made on the floor of the House during various debates upon it. The first, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 97, part 3, pages 3220–3222, 3786–3787; volume 98, part 2, pages 1674–1678; volume 101, part 5, pages 6497–6498, and stress the highlights.

Before doing this I would like to refer to the testimony I gave before the House Subcommittee on Education and Labor which reported out its version of the National Defense Education Act of the last Congress, an act which also does not live up to its title.

I quote: "Before Congress undertakes to extend the Federal Government's authority in the field of education it is essential that it thoroughly appraise the Federal Government's present role in this important area to determine whether its role is proper and conducive to the growth and stability of the educational system. Regrettably, this appraisal has not been made to any great extent to date. I am convinced that the greatest damage that is occurring in our educational system today stems from the role of the Federal Government during the past 8 years.

"Under the guise of a peacetime draft law the Military Establishment has effectively disrupted for the past 8 years the education and training of every youth in America. Even those who have not been drafted have had their plans disrupted by uncertainty. Those who have been drafted include potential teachers, engineers, scientists, and indeed any potential professional man or technician who have had 2 to 3 years taken out of the most crucial periods of their education. Their time has been devoted to largely sitting on their hands in a military uniform. If the military utilizes the peacetime draft system for its intended purpose, i.e., acquiring the personnel needed to carry out its functions, it would be an entirely different matter. Unfortunately, the peacetime draft law is being used to carry out the specious, impractical, and rejected philosophy that 'every American boy should have military training.' I say rejected philosophy because the Congress rejected the Military Establishment's request for universal military training. It was rejected, in part, be-

cause the military could never define by curriculum or even in general terms what constituted military training. During the debates on the various bills, members of this Committee on Education and Labor raised the point that if the bill really was to be a training bill it should be referred to the Committee on Education rather than to the Committee on Armed Services. Members of your committee warned, and I joined in that warning, that UMT would badly damage our educational system. I charge that the peacetime draft has been perverted in its use to a quasi-universal training program and indeed it has badly damaged our educational system and is continuing to do so.

"The first step that should be taken by this committee is to examine into this charge to see if it is substantiated. If it is, then it should recommend to the Congress what steps must be taken to require the Military Establishment to carry out the intention of the peacetime draft law and not subvert it. Such positive action should bring positive results, to wit: (1) We would improve our educational system, particularly in the area of scientists and technicians; (2) we would improve our defense strength because we would be getting our men trained in military science back to the jobs they are trained for and away from education for which they are not trained; (3) we would save billions of dollars that are presently being wasted on inadequate training and usage of personnel.

"In the 1920's and 1930 the American Legion sponsored a universal military training bill that was based upon an extension of the high school ROTC program. It had proved quite effective in training men for wars like World War I and to some degree World War II. The basis of this plan was the proper utilization of the educational facilities already existing in the society, rather than an attempted duplication of these facilities in the military.

"The need in modern warfare for technical skills, as opposed to close order military drill skills indicates that we should be utilizing the educational facilities that exist in the society in the field of vocational education, instead of having the Military Establishment duplicate them at the cost of billions of dollars.

"We achieve at least three things by following a program based upon utilization of the educational plant already in existence, to wit: (1) We get better trained technicians; (2) we get these technicians at one-tenth the cost; (3) we work with rather than foul up the civilian educational system.

"Fortunately, this is not a matter of theory. It is a matter that was proved conclusively in World War II by the Seabee personnel procurement system. To illustrate, the Seabees needed bulldozer operators. They did not take 18-year-old boys with a couple of weeks boot training camp experience and send them for a few months to a bulldozer operating school set up by the Navy. Instead they offered enlistment opportunity with a suitable rating to the experienced bulldozer operators in the civilian society and accepted them even though they were fat and 40—if they really knew how to operate a bulldozer. The accomplishment of the Seabees in World War II is fabulous and resulted essentially from this personnel system.

"The Seabee formula was abandoned when the war was over. The Navy now operates a bulldozer operators school and takes young men, whether they want to be bulldozer operators or not and sends them to this school for a few months. The results are obvious: (1) You don't have a very good bulldozer operator; (2) after the enlistment period is up the man involved may or may not take a civilian job operating a bulldozer * * * likely not * * * so the skill is lost * * * (the Reserve program has not been carried out successfully to retain these skills); (3) the cost to the Navy of running the school is considerable; (4) the talents of the naval personnel who run the school are taken away from the fields where they could be efficiently utilized."

Unfortunately the House Subcommittee on Education and Labor did not make the studies I recommended. No committee in the Congress or executive agency to my knowledge has made such studies. Yet the truth of my basic observations is borne out by our common experiences and requires some pretty strong evidence to rebut.

The reason I am before this committee in the Senate is because the House Armed Services Committee made no study into these important charges. In hearings covering a period of 4 days and lasting only 7 hours and 13 minutes according to the committee's own records the extension of this draft act was passed out unanimously by the committee. An examination of the hearings demonstrates that it received the most cursory type of study. Not one educator testified. Not one person in the field of technical training testified. The testimony was exclusively that of representatives of the armed services and various church and other groups who were concerned with the spiritual aspects of the draft law.

I am concerned with the efficacy of the draft law in providing the type of defense this country needs. Not so strangely the most efficacious measure to provide the strongest defense happens to be the least costly. A fat man never could fight with efficiency and a fat Military Establishment can't fight any better.

The speeches I referred to in my opening remarks give sufficient detail to follow up the points I shall now state. If this committee undertakes to make a real study of these points I should be happy to supply to your committee staff the many reference books and other materials I have accumulated on this subject, hoping that some day some committee or even executive commission would undertake this important study.

The points:

1. An enlistee is considerably more valuable than a draftee. Enlistees are obtained by making the military service as attractive as possible.

2. Draft laws are necessary if there are insufficient volunteers. Yet relying on the draft law to meet personnel needs tends to weaken the efforts to attract volunteers. It is like getting used to relying on a crutch.

Therefore, drafting as a basis for getting personnel should be abandoned just as soon as possible. Indeed, it should be abandoned on a trial basis—just as a crutch should be abandoned—to see if a system of attracting volunteers will not work. And to test different methods of attracting volunteers.

3. To defend our way of life without having the very defense we set up destroy our way of life we must rely on a small standing military force backed by Ready Reserves:

(a) To make a Reserve system work the regular Military Establishment must try to make it work. One good test of whether they have tried to make it work is whether they are in a position to testify in detail as to why it does not work. The testimony of the leaders of our Military Establishment over a period of years on the inadequacies of the Reserve and National Guard systems demonstrate beyond much doubt to one who looks a little beneath the surface that they have not tried to make either system work.

4. Modern warfare (even the World War II variety) requires 90 percent noncombatant skills and of these noncombatant skills an increasing proportion are technical skills:

(a) Most of these skills have their civilian counterparts and these civilian type skills are readily adaptable to their military counterparts.

(b) The civilian educational system, including the vocational, trade, industry, etc., schools, has the specialists in the field of education and training.

(c) The leaders of the Military Establishment are specialists in the field of military science. Military science is a different field from education and training.

Therefore, the 90-percent noncombatant skills needed by the Military Establishment should be taught through the civilian educational system. The 10-percent combatant skills should be taught by the Military Establishment.

Corollary: The 10 percent needed for combatant duties could undoubtedly be procured through volunteer enlistment, particularly if the bright uniforms, medals, honors and veterans' benefits were reserved for this group.

Corollary: The 90-percent noncombatant skills could be procured through voluntary enlistment inasmuch as the men would be moved by the greatest incentive there is to be employed in skills they know and like.

5. A–1 physical specimens are not needed for noncombatant skills. A one-legged man can be a stock clerk. A midget an airplane mechanic. Only one thing seems to serve as a check on utilization of personnel with physical limitations: the cost of veterans' benefits. But if veterans' benefits are reserved for combatants this problem is eliminated.

6. Military law and discipline is required for combat and those who might be in combat. It is not the best or most efficacious system for utilizing noncombatant skills.

The Code of Military Justice of World War II evolved from centuries of battle experience was found to be inadequate when applied to the 90-percent noncombatant personnel. Without appreciating the fact that the error lay in trying to apply a system of discipline and law in an area where it was inappropriate we junked this time-tested code for a watered-down code which is no longer effective for combatant activity and doesn't do very well in the noncombatant area.

We should take a new look at the code for military justice. Set it up for combatant activities and combatants and withdraw it from noncombatant activities.

In other words, there is no sense in putting a military uniform on a Pentagon clerk. In fact, we cut down on the ability to recruit good clerks by subjecting them to military law.

7. A thorough job analysis of the technical skills needed by the Military Establishment should be done. At the same time an inventory of the civilian counterpart skills should be taken. Match the two groups to determine what may be lacking and set up an incentive system to encourage the training and the enlistment for training through the civilian educational system in those areas where there are skill shortages. Have a reserve system set up geared to receive these skills to keep them from becoming rusty and to keep them up to date with the needs of the military. Have a stepped-up civilian-type law during war or emergency to deal with absenteeism and malingering and I believe we will have a strong defense system.

Gentlemen, these are the points that have not been studied. I am satisfied a study of them would give a sensible answer to what some have looked upon as insoluble problems of how we are to have defense in modern warfare and sustain its cost, how we are to preserve and strengthen the educational system that will continue our advance in science and technology and yet have the manpower necessary to man the defenses, how to defend our way of life without destroying it, or setting it aside for the nonce saying we will reset it up after the emergency.

This committee has several months to study this serious matter. I pray that you take the time to make this study.

Adverse Witnesses

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES B. UTT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 10, 1959

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, I rise as one of a growing group who advocate: First, a balanced budget; second, economy in the Federal Government; and third, the continued control of the constitutional powers of the House of Representatives to originate money bills.

I call to my support four adverse witnesses.

First, I call Thomas Jefferson.

He wrote to Samuel Rerchibal in 1816:

To preserve our independence we must not let our rulers load us with perpetual debt. We must make our election between economy and liberty, or profusion and servitude.

And, again in 1816, he wrote to Governor Plumer of New Hampshire:

I place economy among the first and most important of republican virtues, and public debt as the greatest of the dangers to be feared.

Second, I call Andrew Jackson.

In his fourth annual message to Congress, in 1832, he declared:

The soundest maxims of public policy and the principles on which our republican institutions are founded recommend a proper adaptation of the revenue to the expenditure, and they also require that the expenditure shall be limited to what, by an economical administration, shall be consistent with the simplicity of the Government and necessary to an efficient public service.

Next, I call Grover Cleveland.

In his 1893 second inaugural address, he declared:

The lessons of paternalism ought to be unlearned and the better lesson taught that while people should patriotically and cheerfully support their government, its functions do not include support of the people.

And I call Woodrow Wilson, who, 40 years later said:

The duty of economy is not debatable. It is manifest and imperative.

Mr. Speaker, I have additional evidence to submit.

The Democratic national platform of 1932 asserted:

We advocate an immediate and drastic reduction of governmental expenditures by abolishing useless commissions and offices, consolidating departments and bureaus, and eliminating extravagances, to accomplish a saving of not less than 25 percent in the cost of Federal Government.

Franklin Delano Roosevelt, running on that platform, included this in one of his campaign speeches:

Any government—like any family—can for a year spend a little more than it earns. But you and I know that a continuance of that habit means the poorhouse.

Also, it is appropriate at this time to recall that in 1943 Senator Harry Truman declared on the Senate floor:

It seems that when public funds are to be expended no one has any interest in what happens to them, no matter what his responsibilities may be under his oath of office.

I dislike to make such a statement, but unless this body and the House of Representatives exercise their prerogatives in connection with the pursestrings of the Government, much of the money appropriated will be thrown away for no good purpose whatever.

It seems that—in the past—the Democratic Party openly advocated that stand which I take today. I want a balanced budget, economy in the Federal Government, and the continued constitutional control of money bills by this House.

Certain liberal gentlemen may say that times have changed.

Indeed, they have—for them.

I have used many quotations. I close with one.

Patrick Henry flung this challenge on May 29, 1765:

If this be treason, make the most of it.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, MARCH 11, 1959

(Legislative day of Monday, March 9, 1959)

The Senate met at 10 o'clock a.m., on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father God, Thou hast made all the highways of our hearts to lead to Thy love, which faileth never. Thou hast so fashioned our being that its deepest cravings are satisfied only in Thee.

We confess that in the conceit of our self-sufficiency, too often with our burning thirsts we have turned to the broken cisterns of worldly wisdom and of our own sophisticated cleverness. That delusive way has brought us and our anguished generation to tragedy and agony. We see now, with contrition, that darkness broods upon our path and we have missed the way to the peace which is to be found only in Thy will.

In this dangerous, yet glorious, day of challenge, when we must choose for ourselves and our civilization, life or death, the blessing or the curse, grant us the grace, in scorn of consequence, to set our wills and to base our decisions on things worth living for and, if need be, worth dying for.

We ask it in the ever blessed name of the Redeemer. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, March 10, 1959, was dispensed with.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Preparedness Investigating Subcommittee of the Armed Services Committee may meet during the sessions of the Senate today and tomorrow.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the majority leader yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, there are pending some other requests for committee meetings during the session of the Senate. However, I think the Preparedness Investigating Subcommittee is in a different category. It has scheduled some important witnesses to be heard.

Other committees—notably the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare—are considering proposed legislation.

However, in view of the fact that three amendments are pending to the bill now before the Senate and a joint meeting with the House is to be held today at noon, I felt that I was constrained to object to the holding of other committee meetings during the session of the Senate. I wish the RECORD to show the reason for the objection.

But I have no objection to having the Preparedness Investigating Subcommittee meet during the session of the Senate.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, we have received a request that the Banking and Currency Committee be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today. I wonder whether the Senator from Illinois has objection to that.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I have just talked to one of the members of the committee. I understand that this morning the full committee is going to mark up the area redevelopment bill. Mr. President, in view of the requests coming from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare and the District of Columbia Committee, I would be in a rather awkward position if I were to accede to this request, since no witnesses are scheduled to appear before the committee. I trust that it will not prove offensive to the majority leader if I do interpose objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The Senator is perfectly within his rights.

Therefore, Mr. President, I now ask unanimous consent that the Banking and Currency Committee, the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and the Public Health and Education Committee of the Committee on the District of Columbia be permitted to sit today during the session of the Senate.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, to those requests, I must object today.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I thank the Senator.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Banking and Currency Committee may meet today. I understand the members of the committee are prepared to consider in executive session a very important piece of proposed legislation. I am hopeful that they may be able to do so and report it to the Senate and have it placed on the calendar, so that the Senate may consider the area

redevelopment bill before the Easter recess.

I have talked with the distinguished minority leader, and I know of no individual members of the Banking and Currency Committee who have made objection to this meeting. I hope it may be possible to permit the committee to continue with its planned program today.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, if the majority leader will yield, I have talked to the ranking minority Member on the committee. The committee is in the markup stage. It has completed hearing witnesses. I can readily understand the desire of the members of the committee to move their considerations along to a conclusion. I withdraw my objection.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Texas? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly of the Committee on the Judiciary was authorized to meet today during the session of the Senate.

UNVEILING ON MARCH 12 OF PORTRAITS OF FIVE OUTSTANDING SENATORS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I should like to announce that tomorrow, Thursday, March 12, 1959, at 12:30 p.m., in the Senate reception room, there will be held the proceedings of the unveiling of the portraits of five outstanding Senators, as follows: Henry Clay, of Kentucky; Daniel Webster, of Massachusetts; John C. Calhoun, of South Carolina; Robert M. La Follette, Sr., of Wisconsin; and the late, beloved Robert A. Taft, of Ohio, who served with so many of us in this body.

The Senate will recall that, pursuant to a resolution of the Senate, a special committee was created in 1955 to choose the Senators whose portraits should be placed in the reception room. It made a very careful and thorough study, under the leadership of the very able Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY].

Tomorrow the chairman of the Committee on Rules and Administration will preside at the unveiling ceremonies. The distinguished Vice President will make some comments on the historical significance of the occasion. The chairman of the committee, the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], will make a statement concerning the selection of the five outstanding Senators; and the majority leader and the minority leader will participate.

I invite all Members of the Senate to be available for these proceedings.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there may be the usual morning hour for the transaction of routine business, subject to a 3-minute limitation on statements.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to consider executive business, beginning with the nomination in the Post Office Department. I do this for the reason that shortly I must attend a committee meeting.

After considering the new reports on the Executive Calendar, we shall return to the consideration of the nomination to the Federal Aviation Agency. The distinguished junior Senator from California [Mr. ENGLE] desires to make a statement in connection with that nomination.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr ROBERTSON, from the Committee on Banking and Currency:

George Harold King, Jr., of Mississippi, to be a member of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System; and

Karl Brandt, of California, to be a member of the Council of Economic Advisers.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If there be no further reports of committees, the nominations on the calendar will be stated.

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT—NOMINATION PASSED OVER

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Rollin D. Barnard, of Colorado, to be an Assistant Postmaster General, which nomination had previously been passed over.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this nomination go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The nomination will be passed over.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I inadvertently asked the Senate to consider first the nomination in the Post Office Department. We shall have to hold up our action on that nomination. I trust that we can bring up the nomination at a later time.

UNITED NATIONS

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Henry J. Heinz II, of Pennsylvania, to be a representative of the United States of America to the 14th session of the Economic Commission for Europe of the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

INTERNATIONAL BANK FOR RECONSTRUCTION AND DEVELOPMENT

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of T. Graydon Upton, of Pennsylvania, to be U.S. Executive Director of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development for a term of 2 years.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Elmer F. Bennett, of Colorado, to be Under Secretary of the Interior.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of George W. Abbott, of Nebraska, to be Solicitor for the Department of the Interior.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

HAWAII

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Edward Elliott Johnston, of Hawaii, to be Secretary of the Territory of Hawaii for a term of 4 years.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of these nominations.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

FEDERAL AVIATION AGENCY

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask that the Senate now proceed to consider the nomination in the Federal Aviation Agency.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The nomination will be stated.

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Elwood R. Quesada, of California, to be Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency, which nomination had previously been passed over.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, it was with some misgivings that I voted, as a member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, to report to the Senate the nomination of Mr. Quesada to be Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency.

I hope General Quesada will be a good Administrator. I have not been able to find in his conduct as temporary appointee objectionable actions which would justify opposition to confirmation of his nomination.

On the other hand, I know that very often the actions taken by public officials after the confirmation of their nominations are quite different from the actions taken by them before their nominations have been confirmed. I do not say that will be the case with General Quesada.

There are, however, in my mind questions regarding his approach to the problems he will be called upon to deal with as Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency.

First, I am concerned about the fact that General Quesada has a military background, whereas the agency over which he is to exercise authority is basically civilian in character. The new Federal Aviation Agency contemplates the participation of the military; but what we would like to know is how far General Quesada intends to go in allowing the military to dominate the thinking of the Federal Aviation Agency. I believe it is natural for a general to lean

heavily toward military thinking and the views of his former comrades-in-arms.

At the hearings before the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, General Quesada stated that only a small percentage of the top officials of the Federal Aviation Agency would be military officers. However, the question is not one of numbers. Instead, it is one of influence and authority inside the organization. A handful of military persons in key spots could direct the policy of the entire agency.

Moreover, I understand that the military officers serving with FAA are on loan from their respective services. In other words, they will go back to the Air Force, the Army, or the Navy when their service with FAA is over. Their opportunities for advancement in their chosen service can be affected by the attitudes they have taken in the FAA. The idea that a military officer, beholden to his own service for the future of his career, will argue very strongly on policy matters with the top men in his career service is, to my way of thinking, naive. The Federal Aviation Act requires a report from time to time on the number and the positions held by military personnel in the FAA. This is the field which will be watched very closely not only by our committee but by those interested in general aviation.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ENGLE. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. I am very much interested in this subject. I wonder if the Senator will yield to me in order that I may suggest the absence of a quorum, so that other Senators may hear his statement.

Mr. ENGLE. I have no objection, but my statement will take only about 5 minutes. I understood the leadership wanted to proceed expeditiously to the next order of business. If my distinguished friend desires to make a point of no quorum, I have no objection, but I know the pressures which are on the leadership at this particular time to proceed as rapidly as possible.

Mr. LANGER. Most certainly, if objection is being made——

Mr. ENGLE. I am not going to oppose the confirmation of the nomination of General Quesada. I am simply pointing out some areas to which I desire to direct his attention when his nomination as Administrator is confirmed.

Mr. LANGER. I see.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, my second subject is "General Aviation." General aviation represents 51 percent of the total traffic recorded by FAA towers in the 196 U.S. airports busy enough to warrant such control towers. Commercial airlines represent 28 percent, and the rest is military. There are thousands of pilots in general aviation throughout the United States who share my concern regarding General Quesada's views with respect to the importance of general aviation. In this country aviation is divided into three parts: Commercial carriers, military aviation, and what is called general aviation, which consists of private and business flying.

The Federal Aviation Agency should not be operated for the exclusive benefit of the commercial carriers and military flying. I am informed that General Quesada at one time had the idea that a private airplane had no business going into a major airport such as Washington's National, New York's LaGuardia, or Los Angeles' International, but that such airports should be reserved exclusively for commercial carriers and military use. In his testimony before the committee, General Quesada denied that he had that viewpoint. But if he has it, or even leans that way, general aviation in this country will be in trouble.

Third. I am concerned about General Quesada's attitude toward safety. A good deal of "hokum" has been generally accepted about the operation of today's airplanes. The people have been led to believe that airplanes fly so fast that a pilot cannot see out of them, that it is unsafe to fly an airplane unless it is under rigid control from the ground, and that air accidents are caused by everything except the pilots themselves. Some of us believe that the most dangerous thing about the airplane is the nut that holds the wheel, and that although positive control is absolutely necessary in congested areas, it is not necessary in visual flight operations outside of these congested areas. The way, of course, to establish complete air safety is to put everybody on the ground. Some of us are concerned that the regulations and requirements for equipment will get so heavy that most general aviation will in fact be grounded. Then, along with the rest of the taxpayers, we will pay the cost of high-priced electric "gismos" and thousands of FAA employees to chaperon the airline and military pilots through thousands of miles of bare airspace.

Fourth. There is constant pressure for further restrictions of the airspace. At the present time restricted areas encompass 22 percent of the State of California south of San Francisco, and flight-test areas encompass 73 percent of the State. We have two controversies in progress in California today where additional areas are to be reserved. The designation of restricted areas for certain types of flying is certainly necessary, but it ought to be considered in connection with the other flying requirements of the Nation, including the air carriers and general aviation. We are not very comfortable with a general making these decisions.

Fifth. General Quesada, in his testimony before the committee on the pending airport bill, supported the view of the administration that the Federal Government ought to get out of the business of building airports. Our committee and, I believe, this Congress vigorously disagree with this viewpoint. I would certainly not blame General Quesada for adopting the policy laid down by the administration. He stated before the committee that he would follow the law enacted by Congress even though he disagreed with it. However, many roadblocks can be thrown in the administration of the law. For instance, the airlines use a total of 560 of the country's 7,000 airports. In other words, there are 6,440 airports not used by the commercial carriers at all. We need many small civilian airports. The airport program should not be cut off just because the commercial carriers have gotten what they need, nor should the heavy proportion of the funds allowed by Congress be allocated at the air-carrier-used airports. We would feel a little more comfortable about General Quesada as FAA Administrator if we believed that either his background or his viewpoint was more in the direction of continuing to build this necessary link in our transportation system. Both his military background and his stated views before our committee are exactly the opposite.

These are the particular areas in which I have some misgivings regarding the confirmation of the nomination of General Quesada. I want to see both the air carriers and military flying given fair consideration. On the other hand, I know that there has been a tendency to downgrade general aviation—the importance and the future of general aviation. We have become the greatest flying nation in the world because we have permitted general aviation to grow and to prosper. The amount of business and pleasure flying has increased immensely in this country since the end of the Second World War. Today there are approximately 70,000 airplanes owned and operated by individuals and by business corporations. Commercial aircraft add up to about 1,834. Active general aviation aircraft outnumber the commercial airlines by almost 40 to 1. Even among multiengined aircraft, general aviation outnumbers the commercial airlines by 7,300 to 1,741. The commercial airlines serve only 560 of the country's 7,000 airports; general aviation serves all of them. General aviation flies three times as many hours and, I am informed, carries several times the number of passengers as do the commercial airlines.

I hope that General Quesada will bear these facts in mind as the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency and that it will not be necessary for me at some later time to call attention to the misgivings I have stated here on the floor today.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Elwood R. Quesada, of California, to be Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency?

The nomination was confirmed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of the nomination.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the nomination on the Executive Calendar of Rollin D. Barnard,

which was passed over when the Executive Calendar was considered earlier today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Texas? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the nomination heretofore passed over.

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Rollin D. Barnard, of Colorado, to be an Assistant Postmaster General.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of the nomination.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

NOMINATION OF THE HONORABLE CLARE BOOTHE LUCE TO BE AMBASSADOR TO BRAZIL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, there has been some talk of late about the desirability of holding up the nomination of the Honorable Clare Boothe Luce to be Ambassador to Brazil. In my opinion this would be a mistake.

Of course, no one can condone the flippant remark contained in Time magazine which had much to do with stirring up anti-American riots and demonstrations in our neighboring and friendly Republic of Bolivia, but certainly that cannot be laid at the door of Mrs. Clare Boothe Luce.

I speak in this way because Mrs. Luce and I came to the Congress together in 1943 and, Mr. President, she was a good Congresswoman. Mrs. Luce performed in an extraordinarily able fashion as the Ambassador of our country to Italy, and she was a good Ambassador. Of this I speak with some personal knowledge. Despite harsh handicaps and under great difficulties she made many contributions to the welfare of the Western World and to good relationships between our country and the country to which she was sent to represent us. I express the hope, Mr. President, that the nomination of this woman of extraordinary ability, great capacity, and undoubted devotion will be given serious consideration and approval, and that her nomination to be Ambassador to Brazil will be confirmed at the earliest opportunity. I know if this is done, as was true with regard to Italy, she will represent us very well and capably as our Ambassador to the Republic of Brazil.

I make these remarks, Mr. President, in the hope that this matter will be brought to a head, that the nomination of Mrs. Luce will be reported by the Committee on Foreign Relations, and that it will be approved by the Senate, as I am sure it will be. Thereby Mrs. Luce will be able to undertake her most difficult assignment in Brazil.

I repeat, Mrs. Luce will render excellent service on behalf of our country. She has proved her capabilities on the basis of achievements which are in her record at this time.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

MORNING BUSINESS

The VICE PRESIDENT. Routine morning business is now in order.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

PUBLICATION OF NOTICE OF PROPOSED DISPOSITION OF CERTAIN ZIRCON CONCENTRATES

A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a copy of a notice to be published in the Federal Register of a proposed disposition of approximately 15,902 short dry tons of zircon concentrates now held in the national stockpile (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON MILITARY PRIME CONTRACTS WITH BUSINESS FIRMS IN THE UNITED STATES FOR EXPERIMENTAL, DEVELOPMENTAL, AND RESEARCH WORK

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Supply and Logistics), transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on military prime contracts with business firms in the United States for experimental, developmental, and research work (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORT ON CONTRACTS NEGOTIATED FOR EXPERIMENTAL, DEVELOPMENTAL, OR RESEARCH WORK

A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on contracts negotiated for experimental, developmental, or research work, or for the manufacture or furnishing of property for experimentation, development, research, or test during the 6-month period ended December 31, 1958 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

SALE OF CERTAIN LAND TO FIRST BAPTIST CHURCH OF PLYMOUTH, MASS.

A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to repeal the act of May 27, 1912, which authorized and directed the Secretary of the Treasury to sell certain land to the First Baptist Church of Plymouth, Mass., (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Government Operations.

AMENDMENT OF TITLE XI OF MERCHANT MARINE ACT, 1936, RELATING TO INSURANCE OF SHIP MORTGAGES

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend title XI of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, with respect to insurance of ship mortgages, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

CONCEALMENT OF ASSETS IN CONTEMPLATION OF BANKRUPTCY

A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 152, title 18, United States Code, with respect to the concealment of assets in contemplation of bankruptcy (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

TRUST ASSOCIATION OF H. KEMPNER *v.* THE UNITED STATES

A letter from the clerk, U.S. Court of Claims, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a copy of the order of that court in the case of the *Trust Association of H. Kempner, etc.* v. *The United States*, Congressional No. 15–56 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF ALIENS—WITHDRAWAL OF NAMES

A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, withdrawing the names of Zeniche Nakamura, also known as Taichi Higashi, and Bung Kun Sah, from reports relating to aliens whose deportation has been suspended, transmitted to the Senate on April 1, 1958, and April 15, 1958, respectively; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

RATIFICATION OF 15TH AMENDMENT TO CONSTITUTION BY LEGISLATURE OF OREGON

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Oregon, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"ENROLLED SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 7

"Whereas the 15th amendment to the Constitution of the United States was proposed by Congress on February 26, 1869, for ratification by the several State legislatures; and

"Whereas the 15th amendment provides as follows:

" 'Section 1. The right of citizens of the United States to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of race, color, or previous condition of servitude.

" 'Section 2. The Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation.'; and

"Whereas the 15th amendment was rejected and not subsequently ratified by the Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate of the State of Oregon, the House of Representatives jointly concurring, That the 15th amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America hereby is ratified, and that a certified copy of this resolution be forwarded by the Governor of this State to the Secretary of State of the United States and to the Presiding Officer of the U.S. Senate and to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States.

"Enrolled Senate Joint Resolution No. 7.

"Adopted by senate February 2, 1959.

"MEDA COLE,
"Chief Clerk of Senate.

"WALTER J. PEARSON,
"President of Senate.

"Adopted by house February 24, 1959.

"ROBERT B. DUNCAN,
"Speaker of House."

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of New Mexico; to the Committee on Finance:

"SENATE JOINT MEMORIAL 8

"Joint memorial memorializing the President of the United States, the Secretary of the Interior, the Speaker of the House and the President of the Senate of the Congress of the United States, and the New Mexico congressional delegation to review and revise the policies which permit the excessive importation of petroleum into the United States

"Whereas the entry into the United States of execessive imports of foreign oil services to inhibit the investment of funds for oil exploration in the continental and peninsular United States; and

"Whereas the prompt discovery and orderly development of adequate crude oil reserves is essential to the continued well-being and safety of the United States; and

"Whereas current importation policies have contributed to a stagnation of investment in basic exploration and development by major and independent oil companies of the United States; and

"Whereas proven reserves in the United States have failed to increase during the recent period of heavy importation of crude oils; and

"Whereas this condition is detrimental to the economy and dangerous to the national defense; and

"Whereas New Mexico is a Western publiclands State which relies heavily upon the normal development of its oil and gas resources for the maintenance of its economy and in which the industry is particularly essential to the financing of its public schools: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Legislature of the State of New Mexico*, That responsible officials of the United States and the Congress and the New Mexico delegation to Congress be respectfully urged and encouraged to initiate and continue all measures necessary to limit the importation of crude oil to the end that the domestic industry will be fostered and developed; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of this memorial be delivered to the Honorable Dwight D. Eisenhower, President of the United States; the Honorable Fred A. Seaton, Secretary of the Department of the Interior; the Honorable Richard M. Nixon, President of the Senate of the U.S. Congress; and the Honorable Sam Rayburn, Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of this memorial be delivered to the Honorable DENNIS CHAVEZ and the Honorable CLINTON P. ANDERSON, U.S. Senators from New Mexico; and the Honorable JOE M. MONTOYA and the Honorable THOMAS G. MORRIS, Representatives at Large from the State of New Mexico.

"ED V. MEAD,
"President, Senate.
"HAL THORNBERRY,
"Chief Clerk, Senate.
"MACK EASLEY,
"Speaker, House of Representatives.
"ALBERT ROMERO,
"Chief Clerk, House of Representatives.

"Approved by me this 4th day of March 1959.

"JOHN BURROUGHS,
"Governor, State of New Mexico."

A resolution of the House of Representatives of the State of Montana; to the Committee on Finance:

"HOUSE RESOLUTION 12

"Resolution to be forwarded to the honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States in Congress assembled urging that 15 percent of all Federal income taxes paid into the Federal Treasury by the public in the State of Montana and the various other States be retained in the State of Montana and the various other States to be placed in the general funds of the respective States and that a reduction of 15 percent be made in Federal grants-in-aid connected with State legislative appropriations, to the State of Montana and the various other States

"Whereas we, the House of Representatives of Montana, as assembled in its 36th session, do respectfully represent: That,

"Whereas the State of Montana and the other States of the United States of America are confronted with difficult fiscal problems in connection with their respective general funds because of the loss of revenue potential which has been precipitated by the heavy taxloads enacted by the U.S. Congress on the taxpaying public of the various States; and

"Whereas the tax sources have been thoroughly exploited to the saturation point; and

"Whereas the State governments are unable to match many of the Federal funds available to the States because of insufficient State revenue income for matching funds; and

"Whereas the States have very little or no control in the manner in which these matching funds are appropriated and expended; and

"Whereas a reduction in Federal expenditures would be accomplished, and at the same time make available urgently needed funds to the general fund of the State of Montana, and the general funds of the various other States of the United States: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Montana*, That we most respectfully urge upon the Congress of the United States of America that 15 percent of all Federal income taxes paid into the Federal Treasury by the public in the State of Montana and the various other States be retained in the State of Montana and the various other States to be placed in the general funds of the respective States; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That a reduction of 15 percent be made in Federal grants-in-aid connected with State legislative appropriations, to the State of Montana and the various other States; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the House of Representatives of the State of Montana respectfully requests that the Governors of the various States urge their respective States to take similar action; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the chief clerk of the House of Representatives of the State of Montana be authorized and he is hereby directed to immediately forward certified copies of this resolution to the Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States of America, to the Senators and Representatives in Congress from this State, and to the Governors of all of the 49 States and the Territory of Hawaii.

"In testimony whereof, I have hereunto set my hand this 6th day of March 1959.

"ALLEN DONOHUE,
"Chief Clerk, House of Representatives."

The petition of Charles G. Rennar, of Jersey City, N.J., praying for the enactment of legislation to relieve unemployment; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

The petition of Frank Marasco, of Portland, Oreg., relating to a bulletin received by him in the mail entitled "Unemployed To March on Washington, D.C.," issued by the United Auto Workers, AFL–CIO, of Detroit, Mich.; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. LANGER:

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of North Dakota; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION B

"Concurrent resolution urging the President, Director of the Bureau of the Budget, and the Secretary of the Interior to make early transmittal to Congress of the project plan report on the Garrison diversion unit

"Whereas the regional director, region 6, Bureau of Reclamation, on January 29, 1957, submitted to the Commissioner, Bureau of Reclamation, a project plan report on the engineering and financial feasibility of the Garrison diversion unit, Garrison diversion, North and South Dakota, Missouri River Basin project, and recommended its approval; and

"Whereas the Commissioner approved and transmitted the same to the Secretary of the Interior on April 19, 1957, which action gave hope to every interested North Dakotan that the report would go to the 85th Congress in time for hearings and action thereon; and

"Whereas after a further study and review thereof, the Secretary on June 12, 1957, approved the report which was thereafter transmitted to the Bureau of the Budget where it still remains; and

"Whereas it is of the utmost importance that the report be sent to Congress as soon as possible so that hearings and action thereon may be scheduled and taken at the earliest practicable time during the 1st session of the 86th Congress: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Senate of the State of North Dakota (the House of Representatives concurring therein)*, That the President of the United States, the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, and the Secretary of the Department of the Interior be, and they are hereby, respectfully urged to transmit to the 1st session of the 86th Congress the project plan report on the Garrison diversion unit at the earliest practicable date; be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies hereof be mailed by the secretary of state to the President of the United States, the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, the Secretary of the Interior, to Senators WILLIAM LANGER and MILTON R. YOUNG, and to Representatives QUENTIN N. BURDICK and DON L. SHORT.

"C. P. DAHL,
"President of the Senate.
"VIC GILBREATH,
"Secretary of the Senate.
"HJALMAR C. NYGAARD,
"Speaker of the House.
"GERALD F. STARR,
"Chief Clerk of the House."

RESOLUTION OF CALIFORNIA ASSEMBLY WELCOMING ALASKA AS THE 49TH STATE IN THE UNION

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, the Assembly of the California Legislature, at its 1959 regular session, has generously adopted a resolution welcoming Alaska as the 49th State of the Union. The resolution pays a particular tribute to our distinguished colleague, the Senator from California [Mr. ENGLE], who

worked so effectively in behalf of statehood as chairman of the House of Representatives Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs during the 85th Congress, when the House enacted the Alaska statehood bill.

Needless to say, I join in hearty approval of this deserved recognition accorded our able colleague, the Senator from California. Alaskan statehood was a crowning achievement of his 16 years of great service and leadership in the House of Representatives.

However, I should like to go beyond this tribute and accord similar acclaim to others among the outstanding citizens of California who, for years, have warmly supported statehood for Alaska, and contributed to its ultimate realization.

Some 11 years ago, Mr. President, I organized a nationwide committee of 100 in behalf of statehood for Alaska. It contained many distinguished men. Included in it were such outstanding figures as the late H. H. "Hap" Arnold, general of the Air Force; Douglas MacArthur, General of the Army; Fleet Adm. Chester Nimitz; Rear Adm. Richard Evelyn Byrd; Maj. Gen. William J. Donovan, whose recent passing is widely mourned; former Vice President John Nance Garner, and many other figures distinguished in public life and in the professions. Among them was Earl Warren, then Governor of California, who, in that capacity, missed no opportunity to exercise his great influence on behalf of statehood for Alaska and Hawaii.

In 1950, when the first Senate hearings on statehood for Alaska were being held, under the able and devoted leadership of our distinguished colleague, the senior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], then chairman of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, Gov. Earl Warren, at his own expense, flew from Sacramento to Washington to be the first witness before the committee, testifying warmly in favor of both Alaskan and Hawaiian statehood.

To that same hearing, Vice President NIXON, then a Representative in the House from the 12th California District, sent a telegram, which although written 9 years ago is today so pertinent and so valid that I desire to read it:

> Urge immediate passage of Hawaii and Alaska statehood bills. Hawaii and Alaska represent outer defenses of west coast, and all other arguments fade away when we face that uncontrovertible fact. They are the bulwark between the mainland and enemy invasion. These outer defenses will be much better manned when they become full-fledged States, and it is imperative to our security that west coast defenses are immediately and strongly built up.

In the battle for statehood in the 85th Congress, unstinting and effective support was likewise furnished by another distinguished Californian, its able senior Senator, now the minority whip [Mr. KUCHEL], who, though no less devoted to the cause of Hawaiian statehood than to that of Alaska, had the wisdom to oppose the tying together of these issues in order that each might prevail.

California and Alaska have had throughout their history, and will ever continue to have, much in common, and it gives me great pleasure, therefore, to present for publication in the RECORD at this point the resolution of the California Legislature, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOUSE RESOLUTION 26

Resolution relative to welcoming Alaska as the 49th State in the Union

Whereas the people of the Territory of Alaska, in the special referendum of August 26, 1958, declared their ardent desire for admission, as a State, to the Union of the United States of America; and

Whereas with the firmness and straightforwardness characteristic of America's pioneer people, the people of the Territory of Alaska reaffirmed their desire for statehood in the prestatehood election of November 25, 1958; and

Whereas the President of the United States, Dwight D. Eisenhower, signed the proclamation admitting Alaska to statehood on January 3, 1959; and

Whereas California, as a fellow-western State, is particularly pleased to welcome and congratulate Alaska; and

Whereas Californian CLAIR ENGLE was chairman of the House of Representatives Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs at the time that committee recommended statehood for Alaska during the 1958 session of Congress: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Assembly of the State of California, That this House takes pleasure in welcoming and congratulating Alaska as the 49th State in the Union; and be it further

Resolved, That the chief clerk of the assembly is directed to prepare and transmit a suitably prepared copy of this resolution to the following distinguished officials of the State of Alaska: The Honorable William A. Egan, the first Governor of the State of Alaska; the Honorable Hugh J. Wade, first Secretary of State of Alaska; the first U.S. Senators from Alaska, the Honorable Edward L. (Bob) Bartlett and the Honorable Ernest Gruening; the Honorable Ralph J. Rivers, the first Member of Congress from Alaska, and to the Alaska State Legislature; to the Honorable Clair Engle, U.S. Senator from the State of California.

RALPH M. BROWN,
Speaker of the Assembly.
ARTHUR A. OHNIMUS,
Chief Clerk of the Assembly.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GRUENING. I yield to the Senator from California.

Mr. ENGLE. I wish to express my deep appreciation to the distinguished Senator from Alaska for introducing into the RECORD the resolution adopted by the California Legislature, which particularly refers to my activities as chairman of the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs in furthering the passage of the Alaskan statehood legislation. I am also delighted that the distinguished Senator has taken this opportunity to catalog for the RECORD, in general terms, at least, those Californians who were all actively participating in trying to bring Alaska into the Union as a State. It was a fitting tribute to each and all, and it demonstrated that there was a bipartisan effort by the great State of California in the interest of the Territory of Alaska at that time.

In the same spirit we are supporting statehood for Hawaii. I thank the Senator for his kindness in placing the resolution in the RECORD.

Mr. GRUENING. One of the things which heartened us most in our fight for statehood was the support of the leading men of the State of California, of whom the distinguished Vice President was certainly one.

Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Alaska.

STATEHOOD FOR HAWAII—CONCURRENT RESOLUTION OF HAWAII LEGISLATURE

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, a week ago last Tuesday the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, under the able chairmanship of the distinguished senior Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], and, so far as the proposed legislation under consideration is concerned, under the immediate management of the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Territories, the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], voted out the Hawaiian statehood bill unanimously. Correspondingly rapid action has been taken in the House of Representatives. With a speed that reflects the highest credit on the leaderships of both Houses of Congress, the two Houses appear to be engaged in a race to see which can act on Hawaiian statehood first.

The destinies of Alaska and Hawaii, in their determination to achieve statehood, have been closely linked through the years. The people of Alaska greatly appreciate the support that was given us in the last session of Congress through the statesmanlike course of Delegate John A. Burns, of Hawaii. Now, we have before us a Senate concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii, congratulating the new State of Alaska, and extending the aloha of the people of Hawaii to the people of Alaska. We are grateful to Hawaii for its aloha. We hope to reciprocate with skookum performance in regard to Hawaii's statehood bill.

The list of Hawaii senators who sponsored this resolution, which was adopted by both the territorial senate and the house, is headed by none other than Oren E. Long, distinguished former Governor of Hawaii under the Truman administration.

In view of the coincidental synchronizing of the action of the California Legislature in saluting the entry of Alaska into the Union and the action of the Hawaiian Legislature in doing likewise, and the imminence of statehood for Hawaii, I ask unanimous consent that the Hawaiian Legislature's resolution be inserted in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 2

Concurrent resolution congratulating the new State of Alaska and extending the aloha of the people of Hawaii

Whereas Alaska has achieved her rightful place as the 49th State of the United States of America; and

Whereas the State of Alaska, the largest in the Union, blessed with Nature's bounties and with men and women of pioneering spirit and skills, richly deserved statehood and will henceforth enjoy an era of accelerated growth and prosperity and will contribute mightily to the welfare of our Nation; and

Whereas the people of the Territory of Hawaii are especially cognizant of the great pride and elation and the feeling of great promise with which the citizens of the State of Alaska assume their full responsibilities and privileges of first-class American citizenship: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate of the 30th Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii (the House of Representatives concurring), That the people of the Territory of Hawaii take this means to express their heartfelt congratulations and aloha to the people of the new, great State of Alaska; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this concurrent resolution be sent to the Governor, the speaker of the house of representatives and the president of the senate of the State Legislature of Alaska, and to the Senators and Representatives to the U.S. Congress from the State of Alaska, so that this message of congratulations and aloha may be transmitted to the people of the State of Alaska.

JOINT AND CONCURRENT RESOLUTIONS OF UTAH LEGISLATURE

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, the Legislature of the State of Utah is now in session, and has forwarded to me and to the Vice President, for the consideration of the Senate, Senate Joint Resolution 1, and House Concurrent Resolution 3.

I ask unanimous consent that these resolutions be printed in the RECORD, and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the joint and concurrent resolutions were referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and, under the rule, ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 1

Joint resolution of the Senate and House of Representatives of the 33d Legislature of the State of Utah to the Congress of the United States proposing that the Congress of the United States amend that part of Public Law 85–868 which may adversely affect or deprive the State of Utah of the mineral rights to certain lands within the State of Utah

Be it resolved by the Legislature of the State of Utah—

Whereas a large portion of the revenue for the support of the school system of the State of Utah is derived from royalties and rentals from the leasing of natural resources on public lands located within the State of Utah; and

Whereas in recent years oil and gas reserves have been discovered in the State of Utah from which the State school fund may receive in the future sufficient funds to relieve the taxpayers of the State of Utah of a great portion of the tax burden they must now bear for the support of the schools; and

Whereas Public Law 85–868, enacted September 2, 1958, is construed by the Department of the Interior and the Navajo Indian Tribe as depriving the State of Utah and its public schools of many millions of dollars in future school revenues from royalties on oil and gas already proven, and from the possibility of many millions of dollars additional revenue on yet undiscovered reserves; and

Whereas it was the announced purpose of the proponents of Public Law 85–868, prior to its enactment, that it would not affect the State of Utah or the rights of persons who otherwise would be entitled to the minerals in the lands described in the said law, and Utah Representatives in Congress were assured that the oil, gas, and mineral rights would not be affected in any way: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Representatives of the State of Utah in the Congress of the United States be, and they are hereby, requested and urged to take all action necessary to protect the interests of the State of Utah and of its citizens in the rights to the oil, gas, and minerals within and upon the lands affected by Public Law 85–868; be it further

Resolved, That certified copies of the above be promptly transmitted to the President and Vice President of the United States, Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress, chairman of the U.S. Senate and House Committees of Interior and Insular Affairs, U.S. Senator WALLACE F. BENNETT, U.S. Senator FRANK E. MOSS, U.S. Representative HENRY A. DIXON, and U.S. Representative DAVID S. KING.

(The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a joint resolution of the Legislature of Utah, identical with the foregoing, which was referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.)

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 3

Concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to oppose proposed National Wilderness Preservation Acts

Be it resolved by the Legislature of the State of Utah, the Governor concurring therein—

Whereas on January 9, 1959, a bill was introduced in the House of Representatives of the United States of America, 86th Congress, 1st session, to establish a national wilderness preservation system, and it is anticipated that an identical bill will be introduced in the Senate of the United States of America during the same session; and

Whereas said bills, each to be known as a National Wilderness Preservation Act authorize the immediate withdrawal of approximately 50 million acres of federally owned lands and the continued withdrawal of federally owned or controlled lands in the future, upon decision of Federal officials, into a national wilderness preservation system to be so protected and administered as to preserve the wilderness character of the lands withdrawn and contained therein; and

Whereas approximately 72 percent of the land in the State of Utah is owned and controlled by the Federal Government and is subject to withdrawal under the act; and

Whereas any development of lands withdrawn inconsistent with the preservation of said lands for the single purpose of wilderness areas is prohibited by the act; and

Whereas Utah stands at the threshold of a new era of prosperity through the multiple development of mineral, water, agricultural, industrial, recreational, and wilderness resources on its federally owned lands as presently permitted under law; and

Whereas there was in fact legislation enacted in 1957 by the Congress of the United States establishing an Outdoor Recreation Resource Review Commission to inventory our wilderness resource and report to the Congress in 1961: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the 33d Legislature of the State of Utah (the Governor concurring therein), That the 86th Congress of the United States of America be and is hereby memorialized to oppose and vote against any proposed National Wilderness Preservation Act as inimical to the future development of the State of Utah and the prosperity of those U.S. citizens residing therein, and as premature and unnecessary legislation; be it further

Resolved, That certified copies of the above be transmitted to the President and Vice President of the United States, the President of the Senate of the Congress, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress, U.S. Senator WALLACE F. BENNETT, U.S. Senator FRANK E. MOSS, Representative HENRY ALDOUS DIXON, Representative DAVID S. KING, Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and the Governors and legislatures of the following States: Arizona, California, Colorado, Idaho, Montana, Nevada, New Mexico, Oregon, Washington, and Wyoming.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Utah, identical with the foregoing, which was referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

JOINT RESOLUTION OF MONTANA LEGISLATURE

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I present, for appropriate reference, House Joint Memorial 2, adopted by the Montana State Legislature and approved by Gov. J. Hugo Aronson on February 20, 1959. I send to the desk the memorial, together with the official certification of the secretary of state of Montana, and ask that they be printed in the RECORD.

This joint memorial calls for the appropriation of $10 million to start the construction of Yellowtail Dam on the Big Horn River in Montana.

In 1957 the Congress authorized a settlement with the Indians for the damsite which the President vetoed. Last year we modified the settlement a little to accord with the President's views and again passed it. The President signed this authorization bill, but he has provided no funds in the current budget to start construction. Every effort will be made, of course, to add funds to the appropriation bill for beginning construction of this great project. As the legislative resolution points out, the project is needed and it will be false economy to delay in building it.

The joint memorial reflects the unanimous desires of the members of the legislature and of the Governor of Montana to end the delays and get on with the work. Every member of the Montana delegation in Congress holds the same view.

There being no objection, the joint resolution was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and, under the rule, ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"HOUSE JOINT MEMORIAL 2

"Joint memorial of the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Montana to the President of the United States, Dwight D. Eisenhower; Senator James E. Murray, of Montana; Senator Mike Mansfield, of Montana; Congressman Lee Metcalf, of Montana; Congressman Leroy Anderson, of Montana; the Committee on Appropriations of the U.S. Senate; the Committee on Appropriations of the U.S.

House of Representatives; the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of the U.S. Senate; the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of the U.S. House of Representatives; the Committee on Public Works of the U.S. House of Representatives; the Secretary of the Interior, Fred A. Seaton; the Commissioner of the Bureau of Reclamation, Wilbur A. Dexheimer; the Secretary of the Army, Wilber M. Brucker; the Director of the Budget, Maurice H. Stans, requesting the introduction and enactment into law of the necessary and proper legislation to authorize and provide funds to start the construction on Yellowtail Dam on the Big Horn River in the State of Montana for 1959

"Whereas since the turn of the century men of good will and great vision have labored long and wisely to bring Yellowtail Dam into being; and

"Whereas many and high were the hurdles and obstacles that had to be overcome before construction of the Yellowtail Dam could be started; and

"Whereas one by one these many obstacles preventing the construction of Yellowtail Dam were overcome, until one alone remained, and that one was the acquiring of the damsite, upon which the proposed Yellowtail Dam would in time be built, from the Crow Indian Tribe; and

"Whereas that one remaining obstacle, the acquiring of the Yellowtail Dam site, has, due to the wise action of the last Congress, been overcome with the paying of $2,500,000 to the Crow people for this valuable piece of property; and

"Whereas the American people have a large investment in the proposed Yellowtail Dam; and

"Whereas no returns can be had from the moneys already invested in Yellowtail Dam until said Yellowtail Dam is constructed: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the 36th Legislative Assembly of the State of Montana now in session (the senate and house of representatives concurring)*, That the Congress of the United States be requested and urged to appropriate the sum of $10 million so that the construction of the sorely needed Yellowtail Dam project may begin at once; be it further

"*Resolved*, That the amendment include reservation of a block of power for Montana; be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of this memorial be submitted by the secretary of the State of Montana to each of the individuals, and to the chairmen of each of the committees mentioned in this memorial, as well as to the Presiding Officers of both Houses of the U.S. Congress, RICHARD M. NIXON and SAM E. RAYBURN.

"JOHN J. MACDONALD,
"Speaker of the House.
"PAUL CANNON,
"President of the Senate."

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
State of Montana, ss:

I, Frank Murray, secretary of state of the State of Montana, do hereby certify that the foregoing is a true and correct copy of an act entitled "House Joint Memorial 2, a joint memorial of the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Montana to the President of the United States, Dwight D. Eisenhower; Senator James E. Murray, of Montana; Senator Mike Mansfield, of Montana; Congressman Lee Metcalf, of Montana; Congressman Leroy Anderson, of Montana; the Committee on Appropriations of the United States Senate; the Committee on Appropriations of the United States House of Representatives; the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of the United States Senate; the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of the United States House of Representatives; the Committee on Public Works of the United States House of Representatives; the Secretary of the Interior, Fred A. Seaton; the Commissioner of the Bureau of Reclamation, Wilbur A. Dexheimer; the Secretary of the Army, Wilber M. Brucker; the Director of the Budget, Maurice H. Stans; requesting the introduction and enactment into law of the necessary and proper legislation to authorize and provide funds to start the construction on Yellowtail Dam on the Bighorn River in the State of Montana for 1959" enacted by the 36th session of the Legislative Assembly of the State of Montana, and approved by J. Hugo Aronson, Governor of said State, on the 20th day of February 1959.

In testimony whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the great seal of the State of Montana.

Done at the city of Helena, the capital of said State, this 24th day of February A.D. 1959.

FRANK MURRAY,
Secretary of State.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. BARTLETT, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, without amendment:

S. 175. A bill to provide transportation on Canadian vessels between ports in southeastern Alaska, and between Hyder, Alaska, and other points in southeastern Alaska, and between Hyder, Alaska, and other points in the United States outside Alaska, either directly or via a foreign port, or for any part of the transportation (Rept. No. 99).

FINAL REPORT OF SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON SPACE AND ASTRONAUTICS (S. REPT. NO. 100)

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, from the Special Committee on Space and Astronautics, pursuant to Senate Resolution 256 of the 85th Congress, I submit the final report of that committee, and ask that it be printed, with illustrations.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report will be received and printed, as requested by the Senator from Texas.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. ENGLE:

S. 1368. A bill to amend sections 503(a)(2) and 504 of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 to facilitate financing of new jet and turboprop aircraft; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CHAVEZ:

S. 1369. A bill for the relief of Yukie Arita Hale; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BIBLE (by request):

S. 1370. A bill to amend section 13 of the District of Columbia Redevelopment Act of 1945, as amended;

S. 1371. A bill to repeal the act approved March 3, 1897, and to amend the act approved December 20, 1944, relating to fees for transcripts of birth and death certificates in the District of Columbia; and

S. 1372. A bill to extend the jurisdiction of the Domestic Relations Branch of the Municipal Court for the District of Columbia to cover the adjudication of the interests of husband and wife in personal and real property in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. SALTONSTALL (by request):

S. 1373. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to transfer to the Massachusetts Port Authority, an instrumentality of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, certain lands and improvements thereon comprising a portion of the "E" Street Annex, so-called, South Boston Annex, Boston Naval Shipyard, in South Boston, Mass., in exchange for certain other lands; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. SALTONSTALL (for himself, Mr. KENNEDY, Mrs. SMITH, Mr. MUSKIE, and Mr. MAGNUSON):

S. 1374. A bill to provide a program of assistance to correct inequities in the construction of fishing vessels and to enable the fishing industry of the United States to regain a favorable economic status, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. SALTONSTALL when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MURRAY (by request):

S. 1375. A bill to set aside and reserve Memaloose Island, Columbia River, Oreg., for the use of The Dalles Dam project and transfer certain property to the Yakima Tribe of Indians in exchange therefor; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. JAVITS:

S. 1376. A bill to provide an additional income tax exemption for certain physically handicapped taxpayers; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. JAVITS when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

S. 1377. A bill for the relief of Blagoje Popadich; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EASTLAND (by request):

S. 1378. A bill relating to the maintenance and travel expenses of judges; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEATING:

S. 1379. A bill for the relief of Francis M. Haischer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAGNUSON (for himself, Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. JACKSON, Mr. KEFAUVER, and Mr. MORSE):

S. 1380. A bill to incorporate the Sea Cadet Corps of America, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina (by request):

S. 1381. A bill to amend the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1945, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 1382. A bill to amend the Interstate Commerce Act with respect to certain services provided at terminals operated jointly by a common carrier subject to part I and a railroad operating in an adjacent foreign country; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

S.J. Res. 77. Joint resolution authorizing the President to proclaim the week in May of each year in which falls the third Friday of that month as National Transportation Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION

Mr. BYRD of Virginia (for himself and Senators ALLOTT, ANDERSON, BENNETT, BRIDGES, BUSH, BUTLER, CAPEHART, CARLSON, COOPER, CURTIS, DIRKSEN, ERVIN, GOLDWATER, HARTKE, HENNINGS, HICKENLOOPER, HRUSKA, KENNEDY, KUCHEL,

LAUSCHE, MARTIN, MUNDT, MCGEE, ROBERTSON, SALTONSTALL, SCHOEPPEL, SMATHERS, SMITH, THURMOND, WILEY, WILLIAMS of Delaware), submitted a concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 16) providing for one general expenditure authorizations act for each fiscal year, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

(See the above concurrent resolution printed in full when submitted by Mr. BYRD of Virginia.)

FEDERAL FISHERIES ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1959

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, my colleague, the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senators from Maine [Mrs. SMITH and Mr. MUSKIE], and the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], I introduce a bill to provide a program of assistance to correct inequities in the construction of fishing vessels and to enable the fishing industry of the United States to regain a favorable economic status, and for other purposes. I request that the bill be appropriately referred.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JORDAN in the chair). The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1374) to provide a program of assistance to correct inequities in the construction of fishing vessels and to enable the fishing industry of the United States to regain a favorable economic status, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. SALTONSTALL (for himself, Mr. KENNEDY, Mrs. SMITH, Mr. MUSKIE, and Mr. MAGNUSON), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, it has been clear for many years that the domestic groundfish industry faces a grave economic problem. And the problem is of no small consequence to New England, for over 60,000 people depend on this industry for their livelihood.

Twice in recent years President Eisenhower has been constrained for reasons of national security to reject two recommendations by the Tariff Commission for the relief of the New England groundfish industry. The industry has established economic justification before the Tariff Commission and demonstrated that it cannot maintain competition against foreign imports without tariff relief or some other measure of assistance. But security considerations have precluded relief; and the industry's condition continues to worsen.

We, therefore, ask only this: Is it equitable to assume that one industry should bear the entire brunt of our national security policies with respect to friendly nations engaged in fisheries commerce? Should this industry be forced to suffer economically for national security considerations which affect us as a nation as a whole?

Some measure of assistance is clearly in order. On this all are in agreement.

The legislation now proposed will meet the immediate needs of the distressed segments of this vital industry. It will enable shore processors to regain a measure of economic stability and to strengthen their competitive position, greatly damaged in recent years by heavy imports of groundfish. It further provides that construction differential payments will be made to fishing vessel operators who are now required under existing regulations to build new vessels in this country.

Oftentimes vessels can be built 30 to 50 percent cheaper in a foreign yard, but the operator is precluded from taking advantage of this saving.

Yet he must go out and fish sometimes just a few yards away from his foreign competitor whose vessel was built at this reduced cost. If there are tariffs to protect the domestic operator then he is unconcerned that the foreign boat was built at much less than the cost of his own.

But in view of the present tariff situation the fisherman is compelled to compete in the open market with the foreign producers. Thus the requirement that he build his boat in this country makes it virtually impossible for him to compete on fair terms with his foreign counterparts. If we cannot raise tariffs—and it is clear that we cannot under present international conditions—then we must permit fishermen who are in direct day-to-day competition with fishing fleets of foreign nations to overcome this inequity, just as the Maritime Act contemplated, and just as the Maritime Act now permits with our merchant marine. There is no distinction in the justification of the two, and it is time that Congress remedied the patent injustice.

ADDITIONAL INCOME TAX EXEMPTION FOR CERTAIN PHYSICALLY HANDICAPPED TAXPAYERS

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill granting to the physically handicapped the same $600 Federal income tax exemption now given to the blind. An estimated half a million people would be eligible for the exemption under the legislation.

By at least partially easing the present tax burden on these disabled persons, we shall help many of them to stay off public assistance rolls, thus encouraging them, as well as others benefited by the bill, to continue their efforts to become or remain self-sustaining.

The U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare reports that nearly 3 million persons under 64 years of age are afflicted by disabilities lasting for more than 6 months. It is further estimated that an additional 250,000 persons in this country become disabled each year.

The loss in earning power sustained by those who become disabled, the medical costs, lengthy rehabilitational training periods, and any special equipment or devices necessary, put a severe drain on family finances. Certainly these persons should be eligible for income tax consideration from the Federal Government at least to the extent called for in this bill.

The proposed legislation, which would amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, defines a physically handicapped person as one who, because of injury, disease, congenital deformity, or defect, is substantially handicapped in obtaining or keeping employment, is unable to get to and from a job on public transportation without undue hardship or danger, or must use a prosthetic device in this employment. The bill further provides that any taxpayer seeking this exemption must submit proof in support of his claim. The exemption will not be allowed to any taxpayer already entitled to the $600 exemption for blindness.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1376) to provide an additional income tax exemption for certain physically handicapped taxpayers, introduced by Mr. JAVITS, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

ONE GENERAL EXPENDITURE AUTHORIZATIONS ACT FOR EACH FISCAL YEAR

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, Congress has lost control over Federal expenditures, and it acts on spending bills without providing itself with means of knowing whether it is creating a deficit or a surplus.

It authorizes vast backdoor spending and other expenditures outside of the appropriation process.

It splinters its consideration of the expenditure authorizations which do go through the appropriation process.

It does not exercise effective control over the annual rate of expenditures.

It authorizes expenditures without relating them to revenue.

Deficit financing has been the rule—not the exception—for more than a quarter of a century.

The deficit in the current year is estimated at nearly $13 billion.

We are confronted with the greatest debt in all our history, and with spending and deficit exceeded only for the World War II emergency.

The best experts concede that deficit financing in present circumstances is a heavy factor in our continuing inflation.

We have reached a point where it is difficult to sell the bonds of the U.S. Government.

Major reform in congressional procedures for enactment of spending legislation is needed. The need is obvious. It is serious. It is urgent.

I now submit a concurrent resolution designed to meet this need. In short, the resolution would enable Congress to:

Act on the spending side of the Federal budget as a whole, as well as in segments;

Control expenditures, as well as appropriations and other spending authorizations; and

Enact the spending side of the budget in full view of the latest official revenue estimates revised at each stage of the legislative process.

These reforms would provide for recapture of annual spending control by Congress, through the appropriation procedure. And in the process, spending would be related to revenue.

The concurrent resolution would enable Congress and the public to know for each fiscal year whether current spending action would result in a deficit or a surplus.

These are fundamental requirements for orderly, intelligent enactment of spending legislation. They are not met under present procedures, which have grown up in the complex of multi-billion-dollar budgets.

In present practice, the President submits the budget in January; and it is never seen again as a whole until the Budget Bureau compiles the midyear review, after Congress adjourns.

It is strange, but when people talk about the budget they are usually referring to Federal expenditures. They overlook the fact that every budget has a revenue side. And in the legislative process, we seldom consider spending legislation with revenue estimates in view.

Likewise, current appropriations and annual expenditures are frequently confused. Other sources of funds, including other types of direct spending authorizations, are overlooked.

There may be a vast difference between current regular appropriations and expenditures. Last year, appropriations totaled $61.8 billion, but expenditures totaled $71.9 billion. Revenue totaled $69.1 billion. The deficit was $2.8 billion.

It is annual expenditures—not current appropriations—against annual revenue, which determine whether there is to be a deficit or surplus, whether the debt is to be increased or not. But under present procedures, Congress does not act directly or effectively to control annual expenditures.

When Congress gets the President's budget, it splits off the spending side, and breaks up the spending authority into little pieces.

Some of it, like authorizations to spend out of debt receipts, may be enacted finally and directly in substantive legislation completely outside of the appropriation process.

Approximately $6 billion of this type of spending authority is budgeted for the current year. We can count nearly $200 billion of this type of spending authorization since inception of the technique for the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. Most of it has been outside of the appropriation process.

This money is drawn directly from the Federal debt. The law does not authorize expenditure from any other receipts in the Treasury. Much of it goes into revolving funds of so-called business-type agencies, and so forth; and there it is used over and over again, each time with neither appropriation control nor review.

Contract authority is another type of spending authorization established directly by basic law. In this case, subsequent appropriations are required; but they are virtually mandatory.

Permanent appropriations, also fixed by law, go through the appropriation process; but annual appropriation review is perfunctory.

The Senate this year passed $3.3 billion in direct spending authority, before the first appropriation bill was reported in the House.

Regular appropriations are broken up into a dozen or more bills. These are considered separately over a period of 6 months or more, without relating one to the other.

Large portions of the appropriations enacted in these bills are for actual expenditure in some future year.

Reduction in such appropriations does not necessarily affect expenditures in the ensuing year. All of the reduction may be applied to funds for use in future years. Such reductions may be restored in supplementals.

In all of this patchwork, Congress acts only to authorize expenditures. Authorizing expenditures under present practices is something far short of exercising annual expenditure control. Budgetary effect of action taken cannot be determined.

In fact, under current procedures Congress does not act positively, directly, or effectively to control annual Federal expenditures.

It does not act annually to control expenditures under permanent appropriations which are fixed by law in advance.

It does not control annual expenditures under contract authority which are determined by performance under contracts authorized in basic law.

It does not control annual expenditures out of debt receipts, which, with few exceptions, bypass the whole appropriation process.

It does not control annual expenditures out of regular, current appropriations, to the extent that distinction is not made between funds to be spent currently and those for use in future years.

Under existing procedures, Federal spending agencies build up unexpended balances from spending authority enacted in prior years practically equal to new spending authority requested each year.

Assuming enactment of the new spending authority requested in the budget for the fiscal year 1960, the spending agencies will have at their disposal nearly $150 billion.

The new spending authority requested in the budget for the fiscal year 1960 totals $76.8 billion. Unexpended balances under old authorizations are estimated at $73 billion.

Under present congressional practices and procedures, it is practically impossible to limit annual expenditures out of these tremendous balances.

These are fundamental deficiencies in congressional procedures and practices for enactment of spending legislation. There are more.

The need for reform is urgent and immediate.

The need to recapture expenditure control is critical.

These are the objectives of the concurrent resolution I now submit.

Under the terms of the resolution, this fundamental reform for recapture of Federal expenditure control would be accomplished by:

Bringing all spending authority, instead of appropriations alone, under jurisdiction of the Appropriations Committees;

Acting on all new spending authority in one bill, to be known as the general expenditure authorization bill—with provision, of course, for necessary supplemental and deficiency bills;

Requiring annual expenditure limitation on each item in the bills;

Providing that the committee reports, including conference reports, on general expenditure authorization bills carry tabular presentations with totals of both expenditures and expenditure authorizations allowed under the bills; and

Requiring the latest revenue estimate by the Secretary of the Treasury to be inserted in the general expenditure authorization bills at each stage of the legislative procedure on them.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the concurrent resolution be printed in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The concurrent resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 16), submitted by Mr. BYRD of Virginia (for himself and Senators ALLOTT, ANDERSON, BENNETT, BRIDGES, BUSH, BUTLER, CAPEHART, CARLSON, COOPER, CURTIS, DIRKSEN, ERVIN, GOLDWATER, HARTKE, HENNINGS, HICKENLOOPER, HRUSKA, KENNEDY, KUCHEL, LAUSCHE, MARTIN, MUNDT, McGEE, ROBERTSON, SALTONSTALL, SCHOEPPEL, SMATHERS, SMITH, THURMOND, WILEY, and WILLIAMS of Delaware), was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That, effective on the first day of the second regular session of the Eighty-sixth Congress, the joint rule of the Senate and of the House of Representatives contained in section 138 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsections:

"(c) (1) All new expenditure authorizations for each fiscal year shall be contained in one general expenditure authorization bill to be known as the General Expenditure Authorization Act of ———— (the blank to be filled in with the appropriate fiscal year). The general expenditure authorization bill may be divided into separate titles, each title corresponding so far as practicable to the respective regular general appropriation bills heretofore enacted. As used in this paragraph, the term 'expenditure authorizations' shall not include deficiency or supplemental expenditure authorizations, expenditure authorizations under private acts of Congress, or rescissions of expenditure authorization.

"(2) The general expenditure authorization bill for each fiscal year and each deficiency and supplemental general expenditure authorization bill containing expenditure authorizations available for such fiscal year, shall contain provisions limiting the total net expenditures during the fiscal year against each expenditure authorization made therein; and the general expenditure authorization bill for each fiscal year shall contain provisions limiting the total net expenditures during such fiscal year against each expenditure authorization available from prior years. In each case in which an expenditure authorization for any fiscal year for any purpose is provided in any such bill and any other expenditure authorization or authorizations for the same general purpose are available during such fiscal year, the

limitation shall be against total expenditures from all expenditure authorizations available for the same general purpose during such fiscal year. The foregoing provisions of this paragraph shall not be applicable to expenditure authorizations made solely for the payment of claims certified by the Comptroller General of the United States or of judgments to appropriations for the payment of interest on the public debt, or to expenditures from intragovernmental revolving and management funds. Nothing in this subsection shall be deemed to preclude the inclusion in any general expenditure authorization bill or in any deficiency or supplemental expenditure authorization bill of such provisions as may be deemed appropriate with respect to transfer of expenditure authorizations or expenditure limitations.

"(3) The committee reports accompanying each general expenditure authorization bill, and the statement of managers accompanying any conference report thereon, shall show in tabular form for information purposes, by items and totals—

"(A) the amount of each new expenditure authorization available for expenditure in the fiscal year;

"(B) estimates of the balances of expenditure authorizations as of the beginning of the fiscal year;

"(C) estimates of the net expenditures in the fiscal year;

"(D) estimates of the net expenditures in the fiscal year from the balances of expenditure authorizations referred to in clause (B), except expenditures from intragovernmental revolving and management funds;

"(E) estimates of the net expenditures in the fiscal year from intragovernmental revolving and management funds;

"(F) the totals of the amounts referred to in clauses (C), (D), and (E); and

"(G) estimates of the total amount which will be available for expenditure subsequent to the close of the fiscal year from the expenditure authorizations referred to in clauses (A) and (B).

"The committee reports accompanying each deficiency and supplemental expenditure authorization bill containing expenditure authorizations available for obligation or expenditure during the fiscal year, and each expenditure authorization rescission bill, and the statement of managers accompanying any conference report on any such bill, shall include appropriate cumulative revisions of such tabulations.

"(4) The information reported under paragraph (3) shall be accompanied by (i) data on intragovernmental revolving and management funds and public enterprise funds (including the funds of wholly owned Government corporations) which shall show the gross amounts from which the net amounts estimated to be expended are derived, and information on estimated investments, repayment of capital, payment of dividends, and other cash transactions which do not affect net expenditures; and (ii) such supplemental data as may be considered desirable by the committee making the report.

"(5) No general expenditure authorization bill shall be received or considered in either House unless the bill and the report accompanying it conform with this rule.

"(6) For the purposes of this subsection, the amount of expenditures shall be determined upon a checks issued basis.

"(7) As used in this subsection (c), the term 'expenditure authorization' shall apply to all current appropriations, permanent appropriations, contract authorizations, authorizations to expend from public or corporate debt receipts, cancellation of obligations of Government agencies to the Treasury, reappropriations, reauthorizations, and any other authorizations to withdraw moneys from the Treasury of the United States. The term 'expenditure authorization' shall not apply to appropriations of trust funds, deposit funds, transactions involving public debt retirement, or appropriations made solely for payment of refunds and drawbacks.

"(8) The Appropriations Committees of the two Houses may hold hearings simultaneously on each general expenditure authorization bill or may hold joint hearings thereon.

"(d) The general expenditure authorization bill for each fiscal year, and each deficiency and supplemental general expenditure authorization bill containing expenditure authorizations available for expenditure during such fiscal year, shall at the time the bill is reported to the House of Representatives and to the Senate contain in the body of the bill or in the preamble thereto, as the respective committees may deem appropriate, a current estimate by the Secretary of the Treasury of the overall Federal receipts for such fiscal year."

SEC. 2. (a) The Senate, recognizing the necessity for an amendment to its Standing Rules in order to make effective the amendment to the joint rule made by the first section of this resolution, hereby adopts the provisions of subsection (b) of this section as an exercise of its rulemaking power.

(b) Effective on the first day of the second regular session of the Eighty-sixth Congress, but only if prior thereto this resolution is adopted by both Houses of Congress, subsection (b) of rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate is amended to read as follows:

"(1) Committee on Appropriations, to consist of twenty-seven Senators, to which Committee shall be referred all proposed legislation, messages, petitions, memorials, and other matters relating to the following subjects:

"1. Expenditure authorizations: As used in this paragraph the term 'expenditure authorizations' means current appropriations, permanent appropriations, contract authorizations, authorizations to expend from public or corporate debt receipts, cancellation of obligations of Government agencies to the Treasury, reappropriations, reauthorizations, and any other authorizations to withdraw moneys from the Treasury of the United States except authorizations to withdraw moneys from the Treasury of the United States for the payment of private claims."

Mr. LAUSCHE subsequently said: Mr. President, as a cosponsor of Senate Concurrent Resolution 16 to provide for a general expenditure authorization bill, containing separate titles corresponding to the general appropriation bills now enacted, submitted this morning by the senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], I have asked him certain questions with respect to the bill, and he has supplied me with the answers.

I ask unanimous consent to have these questions and answers inserted in the RECORD at the end of the remarks of the Senator from Virginia.

There being no objection, the questions and answers were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Question. I am a cosponsor on this concurrent resolution. I understand that it is in the nature of an amendment to the rules. Is this correct?

Answer. Yes. It amends the joint rule of the Senate and the House of Representatives contained in section 138 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946. The language of this resolution would be added at the end of that joint rule.

Question. Consideration of this resolution clearly points up the fact that tremendous expenditures are authorized directly in substantive law, such as the practice of authorizing expenditures out of public debt receipts. It also points up the fact that other expenditures are authorized in a manner precluding effective appropriation review, such as contract authorizations. If I understand the terms of the resolution, it would require appropriation committee action with respect to all expenditure authorizations. Is this correct?

Answer. Yes. The resolution contemplates that procedures now followed for so-called current appropriations would be applied to all expenditures authorizations. In other words, committees with jurisdiction over substantive legislation would still determine the basic law authorization, but it would not be finally effective until it is implemented by regular appropriation action.

For instance, the basic law might provide that a program be financed out of public debt receipts, but the public debt receipts would be available only upon direct authorization through the appropriation process. The same would be true for contract authorizations, etc.

Question. The resolution first would apply the appropriation procedure to all expenditure authorizations. Then, as I understand it, all expenditure authorizations would be included in a single expenditure authorization bill.

Do I understand the terms of the resolution in this respect correctly?

Answer. Yes. At present, as you know, we consider a dozen or more bills providing for so-called current appropriations. For instance, there is the Treasury-Post Office bill, the bill appropriating for State-Justice and Commerce, the Defense Department bill, etc. All of these would be combined in one general expenditure authorization bill. And under the resolution other expenditure authorizations which now bypass the appropriation procedure would be included as well.

Question. The single general expenditure authorization bill, under the resolution, would also limit expenditures out of both the current authorizations and from any other funds available. Would you tell us how this would be done?

Answer. As I visualize the proposed single expenditure authorization bill, for each item it would first set forth the new authorization figure and then, in an added phrase, fix a limitation on expenditures out of all funds available in the account for the fiscal year in question.

For instance, take the case of an agency which was carrying over an unexpended balance of $1 and was requesting new authorizations of another $1, and planned, with congressional approval, to spend some of both dollars in the ensuing fiscal year. The expenditure authorization bill in the usual way would appropriate the new $1, and then add a phrase saying in effect that out of the new authorization and any other funds available the agency in that fiscal year could spend not more than $1.50 or such other overall amount as the committee might determine. The bill would not attempt to limit the amount of money that could be spent out of first the new authorization and second out of balances.

Question. It is obvious that by limiting annual expenditures, as provided in the resolution, Congress would literally recapture annual expenditure control. Are there any other advantages in this innovation?

Answer. Yes. For each budget account the bill would set forth two figures—one for new authorizations, and the other would establish the expenditure limitation. All of these figures would be in one bill. At the end they could be added up in two columns. The sum of one column would be the total new authorizations provided and this would be done in the committee report. The sum of the second column would be the maximum expenditures allowed for the year. There would be no doubt about either figure. The expenditure total could be compared with the estimate of revenue. The Congress and the country

would know exactly what the prospects would be for a surplus, a balanced budget, or requirement for deficit financing.

Amendments to the bill might change either or both of the figures for an item.

Question. Do I understand that the resolution would provide also for a revised estimate of revenue by the Secretary of the Treasury at each stage of the general expenditure authorization bill?

Answer. That is correct.

Question. In your opinion, would adoption of the single general expenditure authorization bill require any change in the present appropriations subcommittee organization?

Answer. I do not presume to speak for the Appropriations Committee, but I personally see no necessity for any change. As I visualize organization of the single bill, it could be divided into titles corresponding generally to the separate bills as we know them today. As I visualize consideration of the single bill, I know of no reason why each title could be considered by the subcommittee to which the corresponding bills are now assigned. And I would assume that each title could be managed on the floor by the chairmen of the respective subcommittees.

Question. The single bill idea has been criticized on the grounds that it would consume a great amount of time. Have you considered this point?

Answer. Yes. In 1950 the Congress enacted a single appropriation bill. Unfortunately, it was not given a fair trial because it was under consideration at the time the Korean war broke out. But I have checked the record and, as nearly as I can tell, in both the House and Senate more people participated in the debate on that single bill than participated in the debates on the numerous bills in the years immediately before and after the 1950 trial. And, although more people participated in the debate on the bill, the cumulated time used was less than was consumed in consideration of the numerous bills during the years immediately before and after. This measurement represents the best that can be done from analysis of the record.

Provisions in the resolution introduced today contemplate the desirability of joint sessions by the House and Senate Appropriations Committees for original hearings on the various titles, as a means of conserving time in the committee stage.

More important, I have no objections to any reasonable amount of time spent in consideration of expenditure authorizations. I do not think we spend enough time on bills authorizing huge expenditures. The Congress does nothing that is more important. In the first place, Federal programs cannot operate without Federal funds. In the second place, expenditure of taxpayers money is a prime responsibility of the Congress reserving utmost attention.

Question. The Congress enacted a single bill in 1950. Could the procedure set forth in the concurrent resolution be adopted without this proposed change in the rules?

Answer. I personally think it could. But there may be some who would disagree. For instance, possibly it could be argued that the Appropriations Committees have jurisdiction only over appropriations, to the exclusion of other types of expenditure authorizations. This would require a narrow construction of the rules establishing jurisdiction of the House and Senate Appropriations Committees.

I have seen it contended, for instance, that authority to spend out of the debt is not an appropriation. But I submit that article I, section 8, of the Constitution provides, "No money shall be drawn from the treasury, but in consequence of appropriations made by law." No one can deny that money has been drawn from the Treasury in consequence to authorizations to spend from debt receipts.

Question. Has a resolution similar to this been introduced before?

Answer. Yes. I have introduced resolutions for the so-called single appropriation bill in every Congress since 1947. The previous resolutions have been reported favorably by the Senate Rules Committee on four occasions, and they have been passed by the Senate twice, each time without objection. But there has never been any House action on the proposal.

The resolution this year is substantially different from those introduced in the past in one respect. Previously, the resolution covered only appropriations. The resolution introduced today is expanded to cover not only appropriations but all expenditure authorizations.

Question. In the past similar resolutions have been referred to the Senate Rules Committee. Would it be more desirable to have this one considered by the Appropriations Committee?

Answer. On its face the resolution would amend the rules. In application it would affect the Appropriations Committee. I would have no objection to its consideration by either the Rules Committee or the Appropriations Committee or both. I think its importance merits fullest consideration.

Question. The Congress recently enacted legislation authorizing at least a trial of the accrued expenditure proposals. Would this resolution be in conflict with any developments under that legislation?

Answer. The accrued expenditure technique is proposed for several accounts in the President's budget for fiscal year 1960. I understand that application to several more accounts is contemplated for inclusion in the budget for fiscal year 1961. The accrued expenditures authorization expires after next year.

Answering the question specifically, I am advised that technically proposals in this resolution would not be in conflict with action taken under this prior legislation. Practically speaking, it would require additional accounting in cases where accrued expenditure limitations are being applied. The difference between the two is the difference between accrued expenditures and expenditures on a checks-issued basis.

Under this resolution there could be no question about the limitation on expenditures. This resolution clearly and definitely limits expenditures on a checks-issued basis.

If this resolution were adopted I would assume that it would supersede the previous legislation which would be allowed to expire.

Question. Would the resolution involve any additional costs?

Answer. I have raised this question with officials of the Treasury Department. It must be assumed that necessary changes in accounting procedure, certainly in some of the larger agencies such as the Department of Defense, would require some incidental expense.

I doubt if the costs would be great and I would hope that they would be more than offset by the savings which would result.

Question. Does the resolution have administration approval?

Answer. As in the past, technical advice in the drafting of the resolution has been requested and received from each of the fiscal agencies.

In the past the administration has not officially taken a position on the proposal on the ground that it was in the nature of an amendment to the rules under which the legislative branch works. Informally, high officials in the executive branch have favored the objectives of the resolution.

To answer the question more specifically, I quote from the President's budget message, page M22, Budget Document, as follows:

"The procedure used by the Congress for the review of fiscal matters is one which only the Congress itself can determine. Nevertheless, I believe that achievement of any overall fiscal objective is handicapped by the absence of arrangements under which the Congress can look at the fiscal situation as a whole. Such an arrangement was contemplated under a procedure established in the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, but apparently did not prove satisfactory to the Congress. Over the years since that arrangement fell into disuse, the executive branch has made considerable progress in achieving a more comprehensive consolidated executive budget which sets forth a financial plan, including the effect of proposed legislation. I sincerely hope that the Congress will again consider ways by which it can more effectively overcome the diffused consideration which results from separate appropriation bills, the provision of new obligational authority outside of the appropriations process, and the separate deliberations on revenue bills and the debt limit."

Question. I understand also that the administration favors provision for item veto authority. Should this be coupled with this resolution?

Answer. I favor the item veto because, from my experience as Governor, I know that it can be used constructively. I have advocated it in the Federal Government since 1937 when I joined with the late Senator Vandenberg in proposing it. In the current session Senator BUSH and I are proposing it. The senior Senator of Ohio is also a cosponsor of this resolution.

But to answer the question specifically, I believe it should be considered separately from this resolution. In the first place, this is simply a concurrent resolution within the Congress to amend the rules. In contrast, the item veto may require the full procedure of a constitutional amendment.

Question. Would the resolution result in substantial savings?

Answer. I confidently hope and believe it would, but I cannot make an estimate in dollars.

The great value in this resolution would lie in the fact that it would provide both the Congress and the people with full and accessible knowledge of the amount involved in spending legislation and its effect on the Nation's fiscal situation.

With such intelligence I would rely on the judgment of the people and those who represent them in Congress.

EXTENSION OF SPECIAL MILK PROGRAM FOR CHILDREN—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the name of my distinguished fellow member of the Senate Agriculture and Forestry Committee, the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], be added as a cosponsor to the bill (S. 1289) to increase and extend the special milk program for children, introduced by me on March 5, 1959.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT OF AGRICULTURAL ACT OF 1949, RELATING TO PRICE SUPPORTS FOR OATS, RYE, BARLEY, AND GRAIN SORGHUMS—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Under authority of the order of the Senate of March 9, 1959, the name of the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MCCARTHY] was added as an additional cosponsor of the bill (S. 1343) to amend section 105(b) of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, relating to price support

for oats, rye, barley, and grain sorghums, introduced by Mr. YARBOROUGH (for himself and Senators CHAVEZ, CARLSON, KERR, HUMPHREY, MANSFIELD, and MURRAY) on March 9, 1959.

PRINTING OF INTERIM REPORT ON MISSISSIPPI RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES, WITH RESPECT TO HARBOR IMPROVEMENTS AT GREENVILLE, MISS. (S. DOC. NO. 15)

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I present a letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a report dated August 5, 1958, from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on an interim review report on Mississippi River and tributaries with respect to harbor improvements at Greenville, Miss., requested by a resolution of the Committee on Public Works, U.S. Senate, and in response to an item in section 203 of the Flood Control Act of 1958. I ask unanimous consent that the report be printed as a Senate document, with illustrations, and referred to the Committee on Public Works.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. ENGLE:

Excerpts from speech delivered by him at western space age conference, Los Angeles, Calif., March 5, 1959.

ABOLITION OF FISH TRAPS IN ALASKA COMMERCIAL FISHERIES

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, news which will be greeted enthusiastically by Alaskans was contained in an announcement this week by the Secretary of the Interior Fred A. Seaton, that he has included in Alaska commercial fisheries regulations this year a provision abolishing use of a device known as the fish trap. This fish trap abolition order is for Alaskans the best news to come out of Washington—I mean Washington, D.C., and not the State of Washington—the best news since the Congress passed the Alaska Statehood Act last year.

The departure of the fish trap from our waters is long overdue.

The fish trap in the almost unanimous view of Alaskans is a monopolistic device which more than any other thing has led to the tragic depletion of what once was Alaska's greatest natural resource and the greatest national fisheries resource, the Pacific salmon.

For some 50 years Alaskans have watched helplessly while the great salmon fisheries administered 100 percent by the Federal Government has gone down, down, down.

Alaska was the only Territory that by the Organic Act passed in 1912 was denied the right to manage and control its fisheries. Lacking jurisdiction over this resource, Alaskans could only urge and plead for the abolition of the traps. The same device, the fish trap, was long since abolished in the other Pacific salmon areas—British Columbia, Washington and Oregon, where the people, and not a distant Federal bureau had control over their resources. In those areas, while the same resource was originally far less bountiful, it has been conserved. In session after session our Territorial legislators have memorialized Congress to abolish fish traps. In session after session of the Congress, our voteless delegate in the House would introduce a bill to abolish fish traps. The people of Alaska, on a referendum 11 years ago, voted by a ratio of over 7 to 1 for the abolition of fish traps, but all in vain.

The result has been the tragic depletion of the fisheries, from a pack of approximately 8½ million cases a quarter of a century ago to less than 3 million cases last year. So grave was the effect of this depletion in Alaska that in 1953 President Eisenhower was obliged to declare Alaska's fishing communities to be disaster areas. Federal funds had to be spent to assist them. This is the first time in my experience that a disaster area was caused, not by so-called acts of God—hurricane, flood, tornado, earthquake, famine—but by acts of men.

Since then the situation has worsened. Alaska now has many depressed areas. Practically every fishing village in Alaska is a depressed area, and we therefore hope for the early passage of the proposed legislation which will help to relieve that situation.

This, Mr. President, is a prime example of how our natural resources can be depleted by selfish interests with their eyes only on immediate profits and entirely forgetful of the fact that our natural resources should be preserved and protected in the interests of and as a heritage for the future generations. It is also an example of how a Federal regulatory agency, whose prime responsibility is conservation, can abdicate that function and permit itself in fact to be regulated by the industry it is supposed to regulate. Despite the mounting evidence of depletion, despite the pleas of Alaskans, the agency arbitrarily accepted the industry's position on fishtraps.

Why, Mr. President, has such a great natural resource as the Alaska salmon been permitted to be depleted? The answer lies in greed and lack of foresight.

The greed was manifest in the hard fight waged by the fishing interests to continue to use fish traps in Alaska—even though the use of such wasteful fishing methods were banned in the very States—Oregon and Washington—from which many of these selfsame fishing companies hailed.

The lack of foresight, Mr. President, was manifest in the reluctance to invest in the future—a reluctance to appropriate sufficient funds to safeguard this great resource. Unfortunately, we are witnessing today a continuance of that same lack of foresight in many other areas where there is great resistance to appropriating funds with which to develop, to preserve, and to protect some of the great natural resources of our country.

In what has happened to the Alaska fishing industry we see a portent of things to come in other areas if we continue to lack the vision needed.

Mr. President, we shall shortly be debating the area redevelopment bill. It is my hope that it will be speedily passed. I am hopeful that it will prove helpful in assisting some of the Alaska fishing areas in their rehabilitation, as well as other depressed areas in the 49 States. But the need for such assistance in these areas should point up the moral. Such assistance would not have been necessary if, during the half century preceding this era, those responsible had taken the necessary steps to prevent the depletion of the salmon resources of Alaska.

The action by the Secretary of the Interior in banning the general use of fishtraps—however late—is welcome. It comes some 10 days after the first State Legislature of Alaska took similar action.

Meanwhile, Alaskans will now begin the long task of rebuilding from the bottom the once great salmon fishery resource. I am confident that now—having control of this resource, cherishing it, living close to it, understanding its importance—they will eventually succeed.

DISCONTINUANCE OF COMMUTER TRAINS

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I joined this week with several other Senators in cosponsoring legislation that would prohibit the discontinuance of commuter trains until there has been a formal judgment by the Interstate Commerce Commission, a judgment based on the public interest and the needs of commuters, as well as the overall welfare of the railroad involved.

This bill would amend the Transportation Act of 1958, which now permits railroads to automatically discontinue passenger trains if they are not formally forbidden to do so by the Interstate Commerce Commission within 5 months after the application for discontinuance.

Since the passage of this act, more than 27 notices have been filed for the discontinuance of more than 100 passenger trains. Five months has proved an inadequate time for the Interstate Commerce Commission to properly investigate and make findings upon this flood of discontinuance requests.

Each of these requests poses a complex problem for the Interstate Commerce Commission, the solution of which must be based upon a delicate balance between the needs of the railroad, the needs of the public, and the overriding transportation needs of the Nation. The result of this insufficient time for proper study is that passenger trains may be discontinued by default, without public hearings and without a careful determination by proper authorities. Thus, the purpose of the Trans-

portation Act of 1958 is not being fulfilled.

I greatly sympathize with the problems of the railroad industry and I intend to do everything I can, commensurate with the public interest, to solve those problems.

The desire of railroads to discontinue unprofitable lines is understandable.

However, a railroad is different from an ordinary private enterprise. It is granted an exclusive and valuable franchise by Government and it, therefore, has a special obligation to meet the needs of the area it serves. Some of these necessary services may prove unprofitable, but railroads must be prepared to meet those public needs which involve loss as well as those which involve profit.

Under the bill I am cosponsoring, one of the criterions which the ICC must consider is the overall condition of the railroad, based on its total profit and loss situation in a given area. This is meant to protect railroads from having to continue passenger trains at a loss they cannot afford.

I recognize that the declining status of our Nation's railroads poses serious problems which deserve the immediate attention of Congress. I am prepared to join in measures to rescue the railroads from their present difficulties. But I am just as anxious that the people receive the necessary services they are entitled to, and I believe that the proposed legislation will result in a fairer consideration of the needs of the public.

NECESSITY FOR NEW TAXES

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, on Monday I read from the Whaley-Eaton News Service letter and failed to give it credit for the information which appears on page 3542 of the RECORD. I apologize for that oversight.

INFLATION

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the Senate Antitrust Subcommittee has been holding hearings for some time to try to discover why we have inflation.

On the one hand, some witnesses say that our inflation has been due to greater demand than supply.

Other witnesses have asserted that the inflation since the war has resulted from decisions by labor leaders and business leaders to raise prices. The testimony is further that these price-rise decisions have occurred in industries where they have so-called administered prices. Administered prices seem to be prices which can be raised or lowered by decisions of business or labor leaders and which last for a certain length of time without being affected by the market.

If this is so, it means that consumers are so anxious to buy the products of these industries and the industries are so strong, that the labor leaders and the business leaders in the industry have a wide discretion as to what price they shall establish for their product.

COLLECTIVE-BARGAINING SESSIONS

Naturally, the price of the product depends a lot on the cost of the labor that goes into the product.

In these big industries, the cost of the labor is agreed upon periodically in collective-bargaining sessions between management leaders and labor leaders.

There is representation of the management side, and of the labor side, at these meetings. The agreed wage increases—which will result in price increases—adversely affect the consuming public. But the consumer is not represented at these wage bargaining sessions.

I should like to raise the question whether there is some way in which the consumer can be represented in collective bargaining sessions.

CONSUMER REPRESENTATION?

Could the Government—without any thought of Government dictatorship—be authorized and directed by the Congress to have a consumer representative of great ability and wisdom present at collective bargaining sessions? His job could be to let the public in on what is going on during collective bargaining, and to express without power to decide what the consumer's interest appears to be.

Perhaps, in this way, the consumers could throw a little light into the collective bargaining sessions.

As things have gone, it appears that collective bargaining sessions have a big part to play in the inflationary spiral. Wages are raised and prices are raised and, though it may be argued which one comes first, that is like the argument of which comes first, the chicken or the egg. But the result is that we have both, the chicken and the egg, and that we also—over the years—have inflation.

Here is something to cause one to think twice—a list of pending bills which if enacted, would cost 190 odd billion dollars. I ask that the list be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ESTIMATED COST OF REVENUE LOSS IF SELECTED BILLS WERE ENACTED

1. S. 722, DOUGLAS and others; Area Redevelopment Act, $400 million.

2. H.R. 2357, RAINS: Housing Act (as reported by committee), $1.6 billion through 1963, $6.1 billion in total cost, including $3.7 billion for public housing over 40 years.

3. S. 2, MURRAY: School Support Act, $15 to $16.2 billion for 5 years.

4.–5. H.R. 22, METCALF: S. 1087, HUMPHREY: Student Aid Act, $966 million for 5 years.

6. H.R. 1031, MULTER: Emergency program of grants for public works, $2.5 billion appropriation authorization.

7. H.R. 1030, MULTER: Community facilities and public works, $2.5 billion public-debt authorization.

8. H.R. 77, PATMAN: Old-age pensions for all over 65, $66 billion for 5 years.

9. S. 791, KENNEDY: Unemployment reinsurance grants, $1 to $2 billion for 5 years.

10. H.R. 102, HOGAN: Pensions for World War I veterans, $9 to $10 billion for 5 years.

11. H.R. 208, MORRISON: Federal employees' health insurance, $1.2 billion for 5 years.

12. H.R. 310, ABERNETHY: Increase individual income-tax exemption to $1,000, $50 billion revenue loss in 5 years.

13. S. 881, MORSE: Social security health insurance, $6.1 billion for 5 years.

14. S. 1, MONRONEY: Airports grants, $565 million for 5 years.

15. H.R. 1301, MCGOVERN: Farm income, $36.5 billion for 5 years.

Total, $193.3 to $196.5 billion.

EXTENSION OF THE UNIVERSAL MILITARY TRAINING AND SERVICE ACT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, has morning business been concluded?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JORDAN in the chair). Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

The Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which is H.R. 2260.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 2260) to extend until July 1, 1963, the induction provisions of the Universal Military Training and Service Act; the provisions of the act of August 3, 1950, suspending personnel strengths of the Armed Forces; and the Dependents Assistance Act of 1950.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I call up my amendment identified as "3–10–59–B" and ask that it be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. It is proposed to strike out section (b) and insert in lieu thereof the following:

(b) The Commission shall be composed of seven members who shall be appointed by the President within sixty days after the effective date of this Act. Seven members of the Commission shall be appointed from civilian life and confirmed by the Senate. The President shall designate one of the members of the Commission appointed as Chairman.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, my statement in support of the amendment will be very brief. I should like to have the attention of the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] for a moment.

It is my understanding from our colloquy last night that the Senator from South Dakota has no particular or strong feeling one way or the other regarding my amendment, or objection to it. He has modified his own original proposal which provided for four civilian and three military personnel. The Senator from South Dakota has modified his proposal so as to include six civilian and one military personnel.

As our debate last night shows, I have deep convictions about not having any persons who are on active military duty in any policymaking position involving the military. The place for them, in my judgment, is at the witness table. They should be called upon for advice, information, and testimony, but they should

not be given a vote in determining questions of policy which involve, in a very real sense, in the ultimate, at least, the legislative processes of Congress. It is one thing to have a civilian commission which can make a study and submit its advice and recommendations to Congress; but I think it is quite a different thing to put a military man on active duty in a policymaking position. That is the reason for my amendment.

I shall certainly understand whatever position the Senator from South Dakota takes on my proposal, because of my high respect for him; but it may be that the Senator from South Dakota will be wiling to accept my amendment. Then we could have one vote on the Commission as a complete civilian commission.

I ask the Senator from South Dakota if his point of view is such that he would find it impossible to accept my amendment.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, generally speaking, I respect the argument which the able Senator from Oregon has made with respect to having policy decisions made independently of the agency which would be expected to carry out any given policy. Of course, the Commission does not have the final determination in the matter. The final determination would rest in the hands of Congress. The Commission would make a report to the President.

But because I respect the argument, I did ask unanimous consent last night, which was given, to modify the amendment so as to provide for Commission personnel of six civilians and one member of the military. On the other hand, so far as I am concerned, I have no objection to making the membership of the Commission exclusively civilian, and if my acceptance of the proposal of the Senator from Oregon would settle the issue, I should be glad to accept it.

I point out, in that connection, that the Commission will have the authority, under the language of the amendment, to get whatever information from the department it desires.

I call attention to paragraph (g) on page 3 of the printed amendment, which reads as follows:

> The Commission is authorized to secure directly from any department—

And, of course, that would include the Department of Defense—

> agency, or independent establishment of the Government information, statistics, data, suggestions, and other matters for the purposes of this section; and each such department, agency, or independent establishment is authorized and directed to furnish any of the foregoing matter directly to the Commission upon request of the Chairman of the Commission.

In view of that language, which is a part of the amendment, I see no necessity for having even one member of the Commission selected from the Department of Defense. It would be satisfactory to me to have the entire Commission a civilian commission, reporting to the President, who in turn would communicate to Congress whatever recommendations the Commission might make. Congress then would have the final decision in its hands.

Therefore, to the extent that my assent is necessary, I am willing to accept the amendment. I recognize that the yeas and nays have been ordered on my amendment, and that it can be modified only by consent. But if the Senators who are present will accept my desire in the matter, I shall be happy to accept the amendment of the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I think all the Senator from South Dakota has to do is to ask unanimous consent that his amendment be modified.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my amendment may be modified by striking paragraph (b) and substituting the paragraph designated (b) in the form of an amendment offered by the Senator from Oregon, and that my amendment as modified then be substituted for paragraph (b) in the original text of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from South Dakota? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. MORSE. I thank the Senator from South Dakota. I think we have greatly expedited action on the matter. I think there will be a much stronger Commission personnel arrangement now, with all of the members being civilians.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], as modified.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, apropos the discussion of a Commission, the Commission having been whittled down from one which would have been half military and half civilian to the point where it is now proposed that it shall be all civilian, it appears to me that one of the ways we have of avoiding issues is the creation of commissions. The President is very good at the appointment of commissions.

I wish some day there would be undertaken an investigation or survey to ascertain what has happened to all the commissions which have been appointed during the past 6 years—how many of them have made reports; how many of them have been appointed, and have died either a natural or an unnatural death; how many of them are hidden behind cobwebs in the various departments of the Government.

It is my understanding—although I may be mistaken, and I should like to ask the chairman of the Armed Services Committee, the distinguished senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] if my understanding is correct—that the pending amendment relates to a matter which the chairman of the committee believes should be a congressional function; and that to that end he has indicated that it is his intention to appoint a subcommittee of the Armed Services Committee, so that in that way a congressional committee or commission, so to speak, will look into this particular subject matter, will make a report, and in that way perhaps will be able to furnish valuable guidance, not only to the Armed Services Committee, but also to the Senate as a whole and to the Congress as a whole. Am I correct as to that?

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, this amendment was proposed originally in the Armed Services Committee, when we were marking up this bill. The amendment was discussed very thoroughly.

In the committee there was considerable objection to the amendment, for some of the reasons the Senator has indicated.

Many commissions have made recommendations in the military field. We have had the so-called Cordiner Committee, headed by a leader of business. It studied at some length the military manpower situation, and rendered a voluminous report.

For several years after 1951, we had the National Security Training Commission, established by the Congress to make recommendations relating to military training and such other recommendations relating to manpower as it considered desirable.

The former distinguished Senator from New York, James Wadsworth, who is recognized as an authority in this field, partly because of his service as chairman of the Military Affairs Committee of the Senate, when he was a member of this body—was chairman of that group. He was succeeded by General Sarnoff, who, as I recall, has been president and chairman of the board of the Radio Corp. of America. General Sarnoff has had a great deal of experience. They gave careful and earnest consideration to the means of providing the necessary military manpower.

In addition, there was the Rockefeller report. This was based on a study financed by the Rockefeller Foundation.

This study resulted in a comprehensive report, which is available to the members of the committee, and, as a matter of fact, has been very helpful to the Congress, I am frank to state.

But, Mr. President, it has seemed to me, and it has appeared to the committee, that the subject matter of the pending amendment is within the responsibility of Congress, and that Congress cannot dodge or eliminate that responsibility by creating an outside Commission. When the bill was under committee consideration, I stated to the committee that it was my purpose at an early date to appoint a subcommittee of the Senate Armed Services Committee to conduct continuing studies into the utilization of military manpower.

After all, it is the constitutional responsibility of the Congress to provide for the strength of the Armed Forces; and although we are glad to obtain advice from every source, we have not been able to assimilate the reports of all the previous Commissions. As a matter of fact, I have not named all of them; there have been others. But I have mentioned the more outstanding ones and the more recent ones that have studied the problems which the proposed group would be created to consider.

I doubt very seriously whether the appointment of another Commission would serve any useful purpose. I believe that, instead, it would be likely to confuse the issue.

We are now considering questions about the necessary military strength of the country and the wisdom of demobilizing some of our present forces. Congress has taken one view of that matter; the executive branch of the Government has taken another.

But now it is proposed that the Congress, which has taken one position on that matter, authorize the executive branch to appoint a Commission with congressional sanction; and it would be a Commission which the executive would name. It is highly unlikely that the executive branch would name a Commission that would support the Congress and would fail to support the executive branch which would name the members of the Commission.

So I do not think anything would be gained by having such a Commission appointed now. In fact, I think the appointment of such a Commission at this time would only add confusion.

So, Mr. President, I hope the amendment will be rejected.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the Senator from Georgia has answered my question. He has stated that it is his intention—not one arrived at lately, but one he has already brought before the members of his committee—to establish a subcommittee on manpower requirements, and so forth, and to have the subcommittee look into this particular matter.

Let me ask this question: If the President wishes to appoint a commission to look into this matter, he can do so at any time, without congressional sanction or request, can he not?

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes. The proof of that is that he has already appointed commissions in this field. I believe they are called committees, when he appoints them; but they are either committees or commissions, composed of groups of men whom the President has selected to conduct studies for the benefit of other branches of the Government. There is nothing on earth to prevent the President from appointing any number of commissions that he may wish to appoint in this area. To be frank, I would not be surprised if he did appoint one to consider such problems, which have been before us for many years.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I thank the Senator from Georgia.

Let me ask the Senator whether he is about to speak on the amendment.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I was about to suggest the absence of a quorum, before the vote on the amendment is taken. Therefore, I now suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JORDAN in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Bennett	Butler
Allott	Bible	Byrd, Va.
Bartlett	Bridges	Byrd, W. Va.
Beall	Bush	Cannon
Capehart	Hill	Murray
Carlson	Holland	Muskie
Carroll	Hruska	Neuberger
Case, N.J.	Humphrey	O'Mahoney
Case, S. Dak.	Jackson	Pastore
Chavez	Javits	Prouty
Church	Johnson, Tex.	Proxmire
Clark	Johnston, S.C.	Randolph
Cooper	Jordan	Robertson
Cotton	Keating	Russell
Dirksen	Kefauver	Saltonstall
Dodd	Kennedy	Schoeppel
Douglas	Kuchel	Scott
Dworshak	Langer	Smathers
Eastland	Lausche	Smith
Ellender	Long	Sparkman
Engle	McCarthy	Stennis
Ervin	McClellan	Symington
Frear	McGee	Talmadge
Fulbright	McNamara	Thurmond
Goldwater	Magnuson	Wiley
Green	Mansfield	Williams, N.J.
Gruening	Monroney	Williams, Del.
Hart	Morse	Yarborough
Hartke	Morton	Young, N. Dak.
Hayden	Moss	Young, Ohio
Hickenlooper	Mundt	

Mr. MANSFIELD. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR] are absent on official business.

I further announce that the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS] is absent because of illness.

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MARTIN] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business of the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences.

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS] is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] as modified. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, the amendment proposes to create a Commission on Military Manpower, to be composed of seven members to be nominated by the President and to be confirmed by the Senate.

The bill before the Senate proposed to extend the draft, or the so-called Universal Military Training and Service Act, for 4 years without substantive amendment. The bill would only change the dates in the present law, for all intents and purposes. In fact, that is all it would do, except for the new section 5, which is not related to the substance of the operation of the act.

The testimony before the committee clearly indicated that there are inequities and discriminations in the operation of the Universal Military Training and Service Act today. The distinguished chairman of the committee [Mr. RUSSELL] in commenting upon the testimony presented by Major General Harrison of the National Guard, said—and I quote again the statement I quoted yesterday—

> So there are a great many inequities in the program. I think it is beyond the power of mortal man to eliminate all the inequities in a program of this magnitude, but it certainly is incumbent on us to do as much as we can to see that this responsibility for the defense of the United States is distributed as widely as possible and is evenly imposed as we can on the young manhood of this Nation.

The Director of the Selective Service System, General Hershey, himself said:

> Millions of our young men have been told they have little, if anything, to contribute to their Nation's defense—because of physical or mental conditions.

He said further:

> We are not doing all we should do in preparation against possible nuclear attack. * * *
>
> Much needs to be done, but many are doing nothing. We cannot afford to waste our manpower.

One of the newspapers which I quoted yesterday said:

> Surely, however, while Congress is attending to the immediate need—

That is, the extension of the act—

> It ought to provide for conscientious, unemotional examination of the possibility of some less wasteful and more equitable method than mere indefinite reliance upon the draft.

Time magazine said:

> The most valid criticism of the draft as now operated is that it is inequitable.

Yet, despite all that testimony and those conclusions, if we should pass the bill as it comes before us, without providing at least for a study by an objective civilian commission, we would be doing nothing to modify the present inequities, discrimination, waste of manpower, and whatever other evils there may be in the operation of the present System.

The amendment which I have offered was discussed in the committee. There was some sentiment for it in the committee. However, it was not brought to a vote in committee. But after considering the testimony which was given and the reports which were made by representatives of youth organizations before the committee, I felt that the Senate ought to have an opportunity to pass upon this question.

The distinguished Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] raised the question about having an additional commission. I remind Senators that we have had commissions which have had fruitful results, including the Hoover Commission, which made recommendations for various reforms in Government; the Clay Commission, which made the primary report upon the basis of which the highway bill was developed, and the Cordiner Commission, which submitted a report, which led to reforms in the pay and other features of the services.

The distinguished Senator from Montana is one of the sponsors of a movement to investigate the water resources of the country.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I should like to point out that the resolution to which the Senator refers calls for the creation of a senatorial commission, whose members would not be appointed or designated by the President of the United States. I believe that we have a responsibility in the water resource field. As the Senator from South Dakota well

knows, the water problems of this country are of great importance; and the time is not too far distant when water will become more important than oil.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I thoroughly agree with the Senator that water is an important resource. But I will not debate with him or anyone else the relative merits of the water resources of the country and the young men of the country. We are taking young men between the ages of 19 and 35, in the most formative period of their lives, and subjecting them to the direction and planning of the state, the Government. They deserve an opportunity to have a civilian commission make its recommendations with respect to the regulations and the directives under which we place them.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield.

Mr. CARROLL. Is it quite clear from the Senator's amendment that the Commission will be a civilian Commission?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. It is. Earlier in the day I agreed to the change proposed by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], which would make the Commission entirely civilian. Last night I proposed to make it a 6-to-1 civilian Commission. Today, upon the request of the Senator from Oregon, I agreed to make it a wholly civilian Commission, whose members would be nominated by the President, and whose nominations would be confirmed by the Senate.

Mr. CARROLL. Is it quite clear from the Senator's amendment that there is a time limitation for the filing of a report by the Commission?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The language of the amendment is as follows:

> (h) The Commission may from time to time report to the President and shall, not later than January 31, 1961, submit to the President for transmittal to the Congress the results of its study and investigation together with such recommendations as it deems advisable. The Commission shall thereafter from time to time make such further reports and recommendations as it deems advisable. The Commission shall cease to exist on July 1, 1963.

The bill pending before the Senate would extend the draft for 4 years. My amendment would insure a report within 2 years.

Mr. CARROLL. Within a 2-year period?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Within a 2-year period.

Mr. CARROLL. Let me say to the distinguished Senator from South Dakota that I am in complete agreement with him. There is no reason why the Military Establishment should not be examined from time to time by a group of civilians, especially in view of the fact that the draft has been in effect for almost 19 years, except for a brief recess of 17 months in 1947–48. There could be no harm in taking a look at the situation. The committees of Congress, which have the primary jurisdiction, would make recommendations. We would still have all the other checks and safeguards. In my opinion no harm could come from the proposed study. At least it is a step in the right direction.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. It is about the minimum which we ought to do if we believe that the civilian viewpoint should have full and free consideration with respect to the use of the manpower of the United States.

It is true that we also had testimony from Mr. Meyerhoff, executive director of the Scientific Manpower Commission, who wanted us to make better use of the scientific and technological manpower in the country. He pointed out that we still are not meeting the need for engineering and scientific talent. Many members of the committee said we ought to do something about it, but we would be doing nothing about it if we were merely to extend the draft law as it is today. The pressure would be off. Anyone with legislative experience knows that once the draft was extended the pressure would be off—the pressure for review, examination, modification, and improvement.

It is true that we had the National Security Training Commission, to which the distinguished chairman has referred. It is true that we had the Cordiner report. Both of those were presputnik. We have not had any military manpower commission studying the problem, either generally or specifically, or from the civilian standpoint, since sputnik was launched.

I believe that every Member of the Senate, if he were to consult the people of his State on this question, would vote for this amendment. But there has been no real opportunity for the people of the country to realize that this measure was coming to a vote so soon. There were 3 days of hearings last week. At that time some witnesses testified that they thought there should be longer hearings, and more notice. We marked up the bill in committee on Monday of this week. It was brought to the floor of the Senate on Tuesday. Had it not been for the debate last night, it would have been voted upon last night.

Let us give the people of the country, through civilians nominated by the President and confirmed by the Senate, an opportunity to express themselves, so that in the years ahead we may make the very best possible use of our most precious resource.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. There are two questions which interest me. I am inclined to support the Senator's amendment, but I feel that those two questions should be determined. I notice in paragraph 3, on page 3, in that portion of the amendment dealing with the functions of the proposed commission, the following:

> Alternatives to the system of induction of civilians for military training and service as a method of maintaining the required strength of the Armed Forces.

Those, like myself, who are deeply interested in a strong posture on the part of the United States to support its policy want to know whether that language implies any irresolution on our part in our determination to ask our young men to do the job which must be done to support our struggle for peace.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I should say certainly not. This amendment would be merely an addendum to the bill. Without it we would be merely extending the draft for 4 years.

Mr. JAVITS. I ask the Senator whether he envisages the possibility that the commission might submit a report which might affect our foreign policy, in terms of lessening the number of men mobilized, or whether we might be asked to make some other fundamental decision which might weaken our powers in the military field, merely because the commission might not agree with what we were doing in terms of foreign policy?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. It would not have a weakening effect. It might result in some better use of manpower. Testimony by Under Secretary of the Army Finucane and other representatives of the Department of Defense was to the effect that if we could find some way to extend the time men remain in the service, we would have a stronger force, rather than a weaker force. Mr. Cordiner, in his report, took somewhat the same view. He stated that 25 percent of our effort is devoted to the training of manpower, and he indicated that there was waste in that field, and that we should not have to use 25 percent of our effort in that activity.

I hope recommendations will be made which will enable us to find ways and means of improving the strength of the military forces and thus make them more effective and more efficient.

Mr. JAVITS. Would the Senator therefore say, as the sponsor of the amendment, as perfected by the Senator from Oregon, that he wishes legislative history established which will guide the commission, as reflected by the two answers which he has just made to me, as to what we had in mind, if the amendment were adopted?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Very definitely. I appreciate the fact that the Senator has asked the questions.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank the Senator.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield.

Mr. COOPER. Last night I heard the interesting speech of the Senator from South Dakota and also the eloquent speech of the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE]. I repeat what I said last evening. First, I believe both Senators have performed a service to the Senate and to the country in insisting that there shall be a full development and discussion of the draft question in the Senate. I intend to vote for the extension of the draft for the period recommended by the Committee on Armed Services. I remember that in 1948, when this question was before the Senate, I voted to support the amendment offered by the Senator from Oregon to limit the draft to 2 years. I believe that the gravity of the situation today has brought about a different condition. For that reason I intend to support the committee in that respect.

I shall vote for the amendment offered by the able Senator from South Dakota, for many reasons. Chiefly I do so for this reason: Whether we say it is so or not, it is a practical fact that we

have a permanent draft. The draft has become almost a permanent institution in our country. Circumstances may dictate that we continue the draft period from year to year. Undoubtedly present circumstances do dictate such a decision. I still maintain my own view, however, that the draft is not an institution of American life and that it is not in harmony with the traditions of American life as a permanent institution.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. For peacetime.

Mr. COOPER. I am glad the amendment offered by the Senator from South Dakota goes to that point, and that there will be an opportunity for a continued investigation and study and determination of the basic question of whether we actually intend to make the draft a permanent institution in our national life.

Secondly, if we are to do so, there should be made a careful and thoughtful study, by able men who have the time to go into such a study, as to the way in which it can be a most effective instrument for the security of our Nation.

I believe there is an inequality of sacrifice by the young men of this country. Some of our young men are called into service, others go into it voluntarily. There are those who do not give any kind of service. It is this kind of question which the investigation will go into and which will be covered by the report. I intend to vote for the amendment. I am happy the Senator from South Dakota and the Senator from Oregon have provoked this discussion and have offered an amendment which gives us an opportunity to go to the roots of these basic questions.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield.

Mr. BUSH. Is there anything in the amendment which the Senator has offered to indicate that this would be a bipartisan or nonpartisan Commission? I notice that in subparagraph (b) the Commission is described, but it does not mention that point.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. No. It has not been customary in the Committee on Armed Services to raise partisan questions.

Mr. BUSH. This is to be a public Commission, as I understand.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. That is correct. I assume that in the tradition of the country in dealing with matters of this kind the Commission would be nonpartisan. I would say nonpartisan, rather than bipartisan. The Senate has the power of confirmation, and the Senate has a strong Democratic majority. The President is a Republican. He would name the members of the Commission, within 60 days of the effective date of the act. He would have to submit the names of the members of the Commission. They would be considered by a Senate which is 2-to-1 Democratic. That fact alone would seem to indicate that the persons named would be selected, I should hope, on the basis of their ability to analyze our manpower resources and make recommendations for the use of those resources.

Mr. BUSH. The Senator would not modify his amendment. Is that correct?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I would not want to do it.

Mr. BUSH. I thank the Senator.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. I have listened to the speech of the Senator from South Dakota. What is his opposition to the proposal made by the distinguished Senator from Georgia, to name a subcommittee to go into the matter? It seems to me that a subcommittee composed of Senators can handle the matter very well. Why should we establish another commission?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The answer to that question is this. Eventually the recommendations would come to a subcommittee for consideration. However I have observed that when Senators are assigned to a committee they tend to develop a certain vested interest in the viewpoint of the department with which the committee deals. The Committee on Agriculture and Forestry—and I cast no aspersions on that committee—naturally tends to assimilate the information of the Department of Agriculture. The Committee on Armed Services naturally inclines to the viewpoint expressed by the Department of Defense.

I prefer a commission to which the people, the rank and file of them, could feel they could go and, in an uninhibited way, express their ideas and recommendations from a civilian point of view. That is why I acceded to the suggestion that it be an entirely civilian commission. In the final analysis the answers are going to come from Congress, and Congress will make the decision. However, I should like to have the people, for whom the Senator from North Dakota has on so many occasions so eloquently spoken and whose petitions and letters he has submitted, be permitted to express themselves, and that these expressions of the public mind, which the Senator from North Dakota so frequently brings to our attention, should come into play in connection with the problems related to the effective nondiscriminatory use of our young men.

Mr. LANGER. The people go to the Senators and other Members of Congress. The people go to the Senators whom they have elected.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. They do, and would in this instance eventually.

Mr. LANGER. I am opposed to establishing commissions and bureaus. It seems to me that we should put an end to it at some time.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. During the time when Congress is in session it is difficult for a subcommittee to devote time to this subject, as is evidenced by the fact that the bill has come to us without the benefit of any exploration into possible changes in the law.

In a review of the bill when it passed the House, one of the local newspapers reported:

> There was some support within the Pentagon before its submission to Congress for changes in the draft law because the manpower pool is steadily mounting, but administration chiefs and congressional leaders decided a simple extension of the law was preferable to opening up the complex law to legislative changes that might prove more troublesome than present defects.

That is the attitude which is reflected. That is why today 10 million young men are registered under the draft, but less than half of them will ever see military services. Does anyone believe that the burden is equitably distributed? Anyone who considers the facts must come to the conclusion that it is not.

Mr. President, I hope the Senate will accept the amendment. I recognize that at this time the legislative machinery is such as to make difficult the adoption of an amendment of this sort. But I believe that if every Senator were to consult the people of his State, he would learn that they would like to have this kind of review of our manpower resources.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, in view of some of the statements made by the Senator from South Dakota, I feel that it is incumbent upon me, representing the Committee on Armed Services, to make a brief reply.

The Senator from South Dakota has complained about the expeditious handling of the bill in the Senate. It is very difficult to please all Members of the Senate in the handling of legislation. Some Senators think the handling of a bill is too fast; others think it is not handled rapidly enough. The fact remains that this bill was introduced early in the year and has been before the committee ever since early February. The further fact is that the Committee on Armed Services afforded every witness who requested to be heard an opportunity to testify.

I do not know what the distinguished Senator from South Dakota expected the committee to do. Did he think the committee ought to have closed the hearings and advertised for people to come forth and present their views?

The Senator from South Dakota has quoted, on at least two occasions, a statement made by me. I stand firmly on that statement today. There are marked inequities and inequalities in the degree of military service rendered by young men in the defense of our country. Most of it exists in the Reserve service. There are more than 30 different ways in which a man can discharge his military obligation to his country. The chief injustices are the result of regulations which are made in the executive branch of the Government.

The principal inequity I have in mind is that those who are inducted, after they have completed their 24 months of service, are divided. About half of them are placed in Active Reserve units, where they must serve for 2 years and attend 48 drills and take 2 weeks of training a year; the other half are placed in a Reserve pool, where they have to take

only 15 days of training over a 3-year period. That is an inequity and an injustice. But Congress did not create it; it was created in the executive branch of the Government.

There is another inequity or injustice in the military which I had in mind. In 1955 the Committee on Armed Services was urged that it was necessary for the Nation to have a greatly enlarged Reserve program. The committee reported a bill. Congress passed it. The bill provided that a young man could submit himself for 6 months of active duty for training, and after he had had the 6 months of training he could serve 7½ years in the Reserve and thereby discharge his obligation. This proved to be a tremendously attractive program to the young men of the country. But as soon as the men started to appear in any considerable number the Department of Defense severely curtailed the program and said they could not operate it to its full potential. That is not the fault of Congress; it is due to the action of the executive branch of the Government.

These inequities will not be cured by our authorizing the executive branch to appoint a commission to deal with them.

When I was a young student in law school, old Dr. Morris—peace to his memory—had a saying that a jury would never convict a man for stealing a steer if the jury had eaten the beef at a barbecue. Inequities in the executive branch will not be corrected by giving the President the power to appoint a commission to deal with them.

There has been no dearth of commissions. We have had the Cordiner Commission. Mr. Cordiner, I believe, was the head of the General Electric Co. He and his associates studied methods of attracting a voluntary career force and the subject of manpower week after week and made extensive recommendations. Congress enacted legislation based on them.

We had the National Security Training Commission, as I said a few minutes ago, first presided over by former Senator Wadsworth, of New York, and more recently by General Sarnoff, of New York, chairman of the board of the Radio Corp. of America. They submitted reports.

There have been two Rockefeller Commissions, one appointed by the President. After the first commission had reported on Defense reorganization, the Rockefeller Foundation financed a private study into defense matters. There have been many other commissions.

This problem will not be solved and Congress will not escape its responsibility by authorizing another commission to be appointed by the President. We know the basic facts in this case. We have all kinds of tables and charts. We know the number of young men who are in this age group and that age group. We know the number who have gone to college and how many have gone to high school. We know how many have availed themselves of each of the 30 methods for discharging their responsibility in the military service of the country.

It would be most unusual for us to create a commission at this particular time. Unfortunately, there have been different opinions between the majority of Congress and the executive branch of the Government on the extent of military strength necessary in this time of world crisis.

Congress has a responsibility. It will not escape it by giving to the executive department the power to appoint a commission to review the matter. Is the President likely to appoint a commission which will support the view of Congress and will be somewhat critical of his position? Or will it not be more likely to sustain the views of the President?

When the Committee on Armed Services was considering the bill, I stated that Congress could not avoid its responsibility. I said I proposed to create or appoint a subcommittee of the Committee on Armed Services to conduct a continuing study of the utilization of the military manpower of the Nation. Congress has a responsibility. We cannot avoid it by appointing commissions. It is about time that we got away from attempting to meet every problem by the appointment of a commission. Some day we may be overtaken by the problems.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. LONG. Did I understand the Senator from Georgia to say that he plans to appoint a subcommittee to study this matter?

Mr. RUSSELL. I so stated in the committee when the committee was considering the bill. It is not a new proposal. It is not in answer to the amendment of the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. LONG. The thought occurs to me that some of the civilian experts who have been asked to study the problem have oftentimes been so busy with their own affairs that they do not have the time which is necessary to do real justice to the work, and that the persons who are hired on the staff sometimes end by being the ones who dominate the entire investigation.

Mr. RUSSELL. The persons appointed are usually those who have achieved success in the field of finance, but they do not have outstanding ability or experience in the military field. They do not have the time to make the proper study. Their names are more in the nature of symbols. Usually we end by getting practically the same recommendations from the commission that we have had from the Department of Defense on the same subject. It is merely a new way of asking for the views of the Department of Defense. It might not do any great harm, but why should we try to avoid our responsibility by appointing an outside commission?

Mr. President, I have been asked to remind the Senate—and I am prepared to do so—that at 12:15 we are expected to go to the Hall of the House of Representatives to attend a joint meeting and to hear the President of one of our neighboring republics, the Republic of El Salvador.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment, as modified, offered by the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE]. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], are absent on official business.

I further announce that the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS] is absent because of illness.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS], and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR] would each vote "nay."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MARTIN] is absent, by leave of the Senate, on official business of the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences.

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS] is necessarily absent.

The result was announced—yeas 24, nays 68, as follows:

YEAS—24

Bartlett	Frear	Morton
Capehart	Gruening	Mundt
Carroll	Hart	Neuberger
Case, S. Dak.	Humphrey	Prouty
Church	Javits	Proxmire
Clark	Keating	Schoeppel
Cooper	McNamara	Wiley
Dworshak	Morse	Young, N. Dak.

NAYS—68

Aiken	Goldwater	Monroney
Allott	Green	Moss
Beall	Hartke	Murray
Bennett	Hayden	Muskie
Bible	Hickenlooper	O'Mahoney
Bridges	Hill	Pastore
Bush	Holland	Randolph
Butler	Hruska	Robertson
Byrd, Va.	Jackson	Russell
Byrd, W. Va.	Johnson, Tex.	Saltonstall
Cannon	Johnston, S.C.	Scott
Carlson	Jordan	Smathers
Case, N.J.	Kefauver	Smith
Chavez	Kennedy	Sparkman
Cotton	Kuchel	Stennis
Dirksen	Langer	Symington
Dodd	Lausche	Talmadge
Douglas	Long	Thurmond
Eastland	Magnuson	Williams, N.J.
Ellender	Mansfield	Williams, Del.
Engle	McCarthy	Yarborough
Ervin	McClellan	Young, Ohio
Fulbright	McGee	

NOT VOTING—6

Anderson	Gore	Kerr
Curtis	Hennings	Martin

So Mr. CASE's amendment, as modified, was rejected.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the vote by which the amendment was rejected be reconsidered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move to lay on the table the motion to reconsider.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. On yesterday, as I recall, the Senate ordered that a recess be declared today at 12:15 p.m., subject to the call of the Chair, because of a joint meeting which will immedi-

ately begin in the other body. Is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Does the Senator from Oregon desire to proceed with his amendment?

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I call up, for consideration immediately after the conclusion of the joint meeting, my amendment identified as 3–10–59–C.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment of the Senator from Oregon will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 1, line 6, it is proposed to strike out "1963" and insert in lieu thereof "1961."

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, while so many Senators are present, I ask for the yeas and nays on my amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, does the Senator from Oregon have any idea how long he desires to discuss his amendment? Can he advise me of the approximate time so I may inform Senators?

Mr. MORSE. Not more than 10 minutes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I desire to announce for the information of all Senators that as soon as the joint meeting is concluded, the Senate will immediately reconvene, and the pending question will be the Morse amendment.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, may we have an understanding, in order to expedite the consideration of the pending legislation, that immediately after the joint meeting I may be recognized to present my argument on the amendment?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that immediately upon the Senate's reconvening the Senator from Oregon be recognized for not to exceed 15 minutes, and that the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] be recognized for not to exceed 15 minutes, and that the Senate then proceed to vote on the Morse amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

JOINT MEETING OF THE TWO HOUSES—ADDRESS BY THE PRESIDENT OF EL SALVADOR—RECESS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask that pursuant to the order entered yesterday the Senate now stand in recess.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. In accordance with the order of yesterday, for the purpose of proceeding to the Hall of the House to hear an address to be delivered before the two Houses by the President of El Salvador, the Chair declares the Senate in recess, subject to the call of the Chair.

Thereupon the Senate stood in recess, subject to the call of the Chair.

At 12 o'clock and 17 minutes p.m., the Senate, preceded by its Secretary (Felton M. Johnston), the Sergeant at Arms (Joseph C. Duke), the Vice President, and the President pro tempore, proceeded to the Hall of the House of Representatives for the purpose of attending the joint meeting of the two Houses to hear the address to be delivered by the Honorable Jose Maria Lemus, President of El Salvador.

(For the address delivered by the President of El Salvador, see the House proceedings of today's CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

RESUMPTION OF LEGISLATIVE SESSION

The Senate returned to its Chamber at 1 o'clock and 30 minutes p.m., and reassembled when called to order by the President pro tempore.

EXTENSION OF THE UNIVERSAL MILITARY TRAINING AND SERVICE ACT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 2260) to extend until July 1, 1963, the induction provisions of the Universal Military Training and Service Act; the provisions of the act of August 3, 1950, suspending personnel strengths of the Armed Forces; and the Dependents Assistance Act of 1950.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I am informed that under a previous agreement the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] will have 15 minutes on his amendment, which is now pending, and that the chairman of the Armed Services Committee will have not to exceed 15 minutes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator is correct.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Is the Senator from Oregon prepared to proceed, or would he like to have me suggest the absence of a quorum?

Mr. MORSE. I am prepared to proceed.

Mr. President, in the 3 days of hearings before the Senate Armed Services Committee, I find testimony in opposition to continuation of the draft from many private witnesses, most of them representing churches and religious groups, educational interests, and organizations of young people.

In support of a 4-year extension, I find testimony from the Defense Department Chiefs and members of the armed services.

But where are the recommendations from the expert study groups that have been used by the President to study preparedness? What has become of the Cordiner report and the Gaither report, for example? The Gaither report has not been made public, but enough of it is known for us to say that it found America's military security in an inadequate and perhaps even precarious state.

The basic finding of the Cordiner group was that—

> The modern military manpower problem reduced to its simplest terms is one of quality rather than quantity. It is not merely a matter of the total number of people on hand but is much more a matter of the competence, skill, and experience of these people. The military services are not able to present, and under present circumstances to keep and challenge and develop the kinds of people needed for the period of time necessary for those people to make an effective contribution to the operation of the force.

It was because of this report that Congress upped the pay schedules of the armed services, though many of us had misgivings at the time that we might be promoting career service in the upper grades but the tiny boost in pay for the lowest grades would do precious little to encourage the men in them to make a career of military service.

The Cordiner report continued:

> The solution is not to draft more men to stand and look helplessly at the machinery. The solution is to give the men already in the Armed Forces the incentives to stay long enough and try hard enough to take on higher responsibilities.

The Cordiner report dealt primarily with compensation as a means of retaining qualified men in the armed services. But it assumed the necessity for a strong career service.

For example, on page 43, we find the following:

> The day has passed when a large portion of the military work force performed relatively unskilled tasks and a major measure of their competence was based upon discipline and physical fitness only. Today, a large portion of the defense team must possess not only the discipline and physical and mental stamina formerly required, but also a trained, experienced, and disciplined skill in the use of complex equipment.
>
> Development of this level of skill requires adequate quality input to training, an intensive program of instruction, and supervised on-the-job experience before the full effectiveness of the individual and equipment in his charge can be realized.

And on page 44:

> Such retention is not being realized today to an acceptable, economic degree. It is least realized in the skills requiring the most lengthy and costly training. Today there is a tremendous outflow of effort to train a stream of transient personnel to a journeyman level of competence without a reasonable realization of skilled service in return. This is the heart of the enlisted retention problem.

Elsewhere in the Cordiner report we find statements that modern war technology makes it almost impossible to train a specialists in 2 years, and we find a summary of Cordiner's reactions from talking to many draftees. I quote him again:

> I found antagonism and bitterness over the draft. They (the men) were checking off the days until they got out. We must devote 25 percent of our military effort to training men who do not stay. The trainers are discouraged. They resemble the poor teacher whose every class flunks.

This is supposed to be a report of manpower experts. Why has it not been taken into account? Does the President believe its findings and recommendations are unwarranted, except those recommendations for higher pay for the top brass which he urged Congress to adopt?

If the Cordiner report is not sound in its findings on the use and value of draftees, why has not the President and the Pentagon answered those findings and disproved them?

Figures put into the Senate committee hearing record by the Defense Department show that reenlistments on the part of all regulars in all the services ran from 43.5 percent to 50.8 percent between 1956 and 1958. Reenlistment by Army Regulars was just about the same on the average, as for the entire Defense Establishment.

But reenlistment by draftees, all of whom are in the Army, ran from 2.2 percent to a high of 4.7 percent.

I am simply at a loss to understand why a 4-year extension of the draft is being advertised as necessary to safeguard American security and to frighten the Russians. In my opinion, it will do neither. I am satisfied that the Russians know that the draft does not strengthen America's security.

What is needed is a congressional restudy of manpower needs. Of course, that job has already been done by executive commissions, but their findings and recommendations either remain locked away or are ignored by the administration that hired them done.

A 2-year extension of the draft while Congress reexamines the military manpower situation is essential for the security of the country. Voting for a 4-year extension of an inadequate system would be to vote for a label.

I want genuine security for my country, and not merely an illusion of security.

Senators know, and the record of the last 12 years amply bears me out, that I have been an advocate of universal military training. With genuine, uniform, and universal basic military training for every American man in early manhood we would have the manpower of basically trained men the Nation would need in time of war.

But I am for a universal military training program which bears a direct relation to the skills, the knowledge, and the competency of each individual. The draft as we now have it bears no such relationship.

We have never had real universal military training. We have never really put it into effect. If we did have it, and in addition had a highly trained career armed force for continuous protection, I think our country would be far more secure than it is today.

Instead, we have compromised with a continuation of selective service, a type of manpower selection that all the experts tell us is inadequate. We have neither the tremendous reservoir that universal military training would provide, nor the career, professional force that is vital over the long run when we are faced with the kind of perpetual and continuing menace of Communist pressure.

I simply do not want to delay for 4 years a reexamination of these inadequate military manpower practices. We should limit the present system to 2 years, and have a congressional study come back at the end of those 2 years with its proposals. If we did that, then I think the Kremlin would know we mean business. What the Russians will learn from a simple 4-year extension will be that the United States is satisfied with its present defense arrangement and does not plan to correct or change the inadequacies that everyone knows are in it, for at least 4 years.

In 1948, in the debate on the draft issue, when it was recommended by the Armed Services Committee of the Senate that the draft be for a 5-year period, I proposed an amendment calling for a limitation to 2 years. As will be shown by the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for that year, an excerpt from which was placed in the RECORD yesterday, my amendment was agreed to by a vote of 47 to 33.

I ask, What has happened since 1948 which would justify a longer extension than 2 years? In 1948 we voted for a 2-year extension. It was increased to 4 years at the time of the Korean war. The record which the Armed Services Committee has brought to our desks leaves no room for doubt in my mind—and I believe in the mind of anyone who will study the record—that a 4-year extension is not justified by the facts on the record. It is not justified by the expert studies on military manpower which have already been made and reports on which have been submitted. There is no doubt in my mind that this extension is being asked for by the Pentagon in order to entrench even deeper some malpractices and inefficiencies in the use of American manpower. What we must say to the Pentagon is: "We will give you 2 years more, and only 2 years more, of this inefficient draft system which you are operating, and at the end of 2 years we will bring forth a bill based upon the facts as to what the Nation needs, and we will adopt a manpower policy based upon the studies which will have been made."

The Senate will make a grievous mistake today if it extends for 4 years a draft system which is honeycombed with great weaknesses and inefficiencies, and is characterized by practices which do not strengthen the security of our country but which, in my judgment, weaken it.

Furthermore, Mr. President, we all know that if we extend the Draft Act for 4 years, the danger will be that Congress will forget about the problem until the 4 years have passed. The people of the United States, the voters whom we represent, are entitled to action by the Senate today. They are entitled to action which carries out the pledge that automatically at the end of 2 years we will take another look at the draft law.

I urge the adoption of my amendment. My amendment will give to the draft system all the service from Congress to which it is entitled. My amendment will permit what I regard as an outdated, inefficient military manpower system to proceed for another 2 years, until we can adopt a perfected one 2 years hence.

Consideration of the extension of this archaic system for another 4 years in my judgment raises serious doubts as to whether we ought to extend it at all. On the basis of the same plea I made in 1948—which I believe is just as applicable today—when the Senate by a vote of 47 to 33 changed a recommendation of the Armed Services Committee for a 5-year period to a 2-year period, I ask that the Senate cut down the committee's proposal of a 4-year extension to a 2-year extension.

I rest my case.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished Senator from South Carolina, a member of the Committee on Armed Services, and a distinguished soldier.

Mr. THURMOND. I thank the senior Senator from Georgia for his kind remarks.

Mr. President, there are a number of reasons why the Universal Military Training and Service Act should be extended for the full 4 years as recommended by the committee.

We find ourselves currently engaged in one of the most crucial stages of our struggle with the forces of communism. The entire free world looks to the United States for a large portion of their protection from the Communist forces. Any show of weakness on our part, such as a failure to extend the draft or even a failure to enact a full 4-year extension, might be interpreted as a slackening in our defense effort and thereby cause irreparable harm to the solidarity of the free world.

It is true that with our present defense structure only a relatively few persons are actually inducted by the draft process. The number of inductees alone, however, is not a true indicator of the total effect of the Universal Military Training and Service Act. Unquestionably, the very existence of the draft is a major stimulus for voluntary enlistments, and it is in this capacity that the Draft Act is so effective in providing our Armed Forces with needed personnel.

We all realize that there is a degree of inconvenience attached to any noncareer military service. Such service is, however, one of the responsibilities of a citizen of a democracy which goes hand in glove with the benefits of democracy. The benefits of a democracy cannot continue to exist unless the responsibilities are also met.

Neither the individual who undergoes military training in his youth nor the country will be harmed from the experience of service. On the contrary, both the individual and the country, aside from the defense issue, will benefit. Military training builds, not only good soldiers, but strong character and bodies, which will be of ultimate advantage to the individual who acquires them and to the country to whose benefit he applies them.

Mr. President, for the reasons I have given I am convinced that H.R. 2260 should be enacted in the form recommended by the committee.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, last evening the distinguished senior Senator from Oregon placed in the RECORD the proceedings in 1948 when the Senate considered reenactment of the draft. I note that fact to indicate that at that time I voted for a 2-year reenactment.

I wish to point out that conditions in the world today are vastly different from those that existed in 1948. At that time we were just beginning the period that has been so aptly described as the cold war. We had about 1.4 million men

in the armed services, and this number was not regarded as adequate. We found it necessary to reinstate the selective service law in an attempt to bring the total up to about 2 million, as I recall. At that time we were still imbued with the hope that we could come to an understanding with the Soviet Government with regard to world conditions. There was still some hope by those who had not had any great experience with the Soviets that the Soviets might on occasion keep their pledged word and carry out their commitments.

Since that time we have found that it is characteristic of them not to discharge their commitments unless it is to their advantage to do so when the time of performance has come.

Therefore, Mr. President, today we must deal with a very dangerous and delicate situation in international relations. This situation revolves around Berlin. The Soviet Union has moved all over the space of the world. It has not been long since the danger point was in the Formosa Straits, on the islands of Quemoy and Matsu. Then they jumped with startling speed to the Middle East. There was trouble in Lebanon. We were compelled to send forces there in order to maintain our commitment. Then the trouble spot was moved from the Middle East to Berlin. Today Berlin is the focal point of conflict between international communism and the free world where there is respect for individual dignity. This conflict is centered in the capital of the old German nation.

There is a great deal more involved in the bill than the mere extension of the draft. It contains authority to extend for 4 years the ceilings on the Armed Forces. If the bill is not enacted it will be necessary on the 1st of July to reduce our military strength by about 500,000. Some 325,000 of that reduction will come in the Department of the Air Force, upon which we pin such vital hopes for our survival as a free people.

There are other provisions in the bill. To take care of the dependents of those who are in the Armed Services, and those provisions also would expire if the act were not extended. So much more, therefore, is involved in the bill than the extension of the draft.

We have had a great debate in the country—and it is manifest on the floor of the Senate every few days—about the size of military forces this Nation should maintain in order to make sure that we will be able to meet any threat anywhere on the globe.

Some of our most distinguished and learned military strategists have advised us that more ground forces are needed to maintain our position in Berlin. That demand has been voiced again and again by Senators in this Chamber. Indeed, the Senate has voted to maintain the manpower at 900,000 in the Army and 200,000 in the Marine Corps for this fiscal year, and will undoubtedly vote to maintain that strength in the coming fiscal year.

Mr. President, in what position would we be if we haggled, quibbled, and squabbled here today about extending the draft for the 4 years requested by the administration? Congress would be saying, in effect, "We must have manpower to defend the country. The administration must acquire greater military strength." While we would be saying that in one voice, in another voice we would be saying, "We will extend the draft for only 2 years." We would be haggling and quibbling about the means to maintain the military strength we say is essential.

I am not a slave to consistency, but, in my opinion, it would be the height of inconsistency—almost puerile—for us to say that the military strength must be increased, while at the same time we placed drastic limitations on the only machinery which we know will provide the manpower necessary to maintain that strength.

I hope the amendment will be defeated. It should be defeated. It should be voted down. Let the word go out from this Chamber that the U.S. Senate means what it says when it asserts that the military strength of the United States must be maintained; and that, distasteful though it may be to extend any form of compulsory military service in this Republic, we realize that the draft is the only means by which our military strength can be maintained; therefore, we are extending the draft for 4 years and are saying to our associates in the free world, and, more than that, are saying to the men who are exercising the vast power of a tyrannical dictatorship in the Kremlin, that the United States of America means what it says.

I hope the amendment will be rejected.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, has all time under the agreement been consumed?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Two more minutes remain.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Who controls that time?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Georgia.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, is the Senator from Georgia willing to yield back the remainder of his time?

Mr. RUSSELL. I am glad to yield back the time, if that is the only time remaining.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time has been yielded back.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas will state it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Do I correctly understand that the vote will be on the Morse amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The vote will be on the Morse amendment to extend the draft for 2 years instead of 4 years. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR] are absent on official business.

I further announce that the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS] is absent because of illness.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR] would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] is paired with the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE].

If present and voting, the Senator from Louisiana would vote "nay" and the Senator from Tennessee would vote "yea."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MARTIN] is absent, by leave of the Senate, on official business of the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences. If present and voting, he would vote "nay."

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS] is necessarily absent.

The result was announced—yeas 24, nays 67, as follows:

YEAS—24

Capehart	Humphrey	Mundt
Carroll	Langer	Murray
Case, S. Dak.	Magnuson	Neuberger
Church	Mansfield	Proxmire
Clark	McCarthy	Schoeppel
Dworshak	McGee	Wiley
Gruening	McNamara	Young, N. Dak.
Hart	Morse	Young, Ohio

NAYS—67

Aiken	Frear	Morton
Allott	Fulbright	Moss
Bartlett	Goldwater	Muskie
Beall	Green	O'Mahoney
Bennett	Hartke	Pastore
Bible	Hayden	Prouty
Bridges	Hickenlooper	Randolph
Bush	Hill	Robertson
Butler	Holland	Russell
Byrd, Va.	Hruska	Saltonstall
Byrd, W. Va.	Jackson	Scott
Cannon	Javits	Smathers
Carlson	Johnson, Tex.	Smith
Case, N.J.	Johnston, S.C.	Sparkman
Chavez	Jordan	Stennis
Cooper	Keating	Symington
Cotton	Kefauver	Talmadge
Dirksen	Kennedy	Thurmond
Dodd	Kuchel	Williams, N.J.
Douglas	Lausche	Williams, Del.
Eastland	Long	Yarborough
Engle	McClellan	
Ervin	Monroney	

NOT VOTING—7

Anderson	Gore	Martin
Curtis	Hennings	
Ellender	Kerr	

So Mr. MORSE's amendment was rejected.

Mr. YARBOROUGH subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my remarks I have prepared with respect to the Draft Act extension be printed in the RECORD prior to the vote on final passage of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Texas? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The remarks prepared by Mr. YARBOROUGH are as follows:

In a few minutes, I, like the great majority of the Members of the Senate, will vote for extension of the draft. It is a vote which I shall cast with some reluctance. But, with the obligation of economic and military leadership of the free world upon us, it appears to me that we have no alternative.

Khrushchev, with his ultimatum to us to abandon Berlin by May 27, has dealt a deadly hand of nuclear Russian roulette to all mankind. In this grave crisis, we could more seriously consider legislation to vastly increase our Armed Forces than we could to allow the draft to end.

Since the obligations and duties of leadership give us no choice but to extend this law compelling a period of military service for our qualified young men, I think we should consider carefully the result of our action.

The draft is a liability which has rested on our young men since 1940, excepting one minor gap, and if extended, will mean that a whole generation of American boys will be following their fathers into the draft lottery system. Who knows what changes this will mean in our national outlook and character, our traditional love of freedom and aversion to the unrestrained power of the military over the person?

Even as we pass this draft extension, I think we should be resolving to pass a new GI bill of rights for veterans of the seemingly endless cold war. The bill, S. 1138, which I have already had the privilige of introducing in cosponsorship with 25 members of the Senate, would not only restore to the boys we are going to draft, and their families, the lost opportunities resulting from their performance of this duty to our country, but also it would be to the very substantial benefit of the Nation in providing millions of more highly educated and trained citizens who would produce millions of additional revenues.

I believe that as we prepare to extend the draft law, we should also be thinking in terms of passing the cold war veterans GI bill, which I hope and expect will be before the Senate for consideration within a few weeks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GRUENING in the chair). The question now is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to a third reading, and was read the third time.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GRUENING in the chair). The Senator will state it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Have the yeas and nays been ordered on the passage of the bill?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The yeas and nays have been ordered.

The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall the bill pass? On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS] is absent because of illness.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS], and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR] would each vote "yea."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MARTIN] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business of the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences, and if present and voting, he would vote "yea."

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS] is necessarily absent and if present and voting, he would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 90, nays 1, as follows:

YEAS—90

Aiken	Fulbright	Morse
Allott	Goldwater	Morton
Bartlett	Green	Moss
Beall	Gruening	Mundt
Bennett	Hart	Murray
Bible	Hartke	Muskie
Bridges	Hayden	Neuberger
Bush	Hickenlooper	O'Mahoney
Butler	Hill	Pastore
Byrd, Va.	Holland	Prouty
Byrd, W. Va.	Hruska	Proxmire
Cannon	Humphrey	Randolph
Capehart	Jackson	Robertson
Carlson	Javits	Russell
Carroll	Johnson, Tex.	Saltonstall
Case, N.J.	Johnston, S.C.	Schoeppel
Case, S. Dak.	Jordan	Scott
Chavez	Keating	Smathers
Church	Kefauver	Smith
Clark	Kennedy	Sparkman
Cooper	Kuchel	Stennis
Cotton	Lausche	Symington
Dirksen	Long	Talmadge
Dodd	McCarthy	Thurmond
Douglas	McClellan	Wiley
Dworshak	McGee	Williams, N.J.
Eastland	McNamara	Williams, Del.
Engle	Magnuson	Yarborough
Ervin	Mansfield	Young, N. Dak.
Frear	Monroney	Young, Ohio

NAYS—1

Langer

NOT VOTING—7

Anderson	Gore	Martin
Curtis	Hennings	
Ellender	Kerr	

So the bill (H.R. 2260) was passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "An act to extend the induction provisions of the Universal Military Training and Service Act, and for other purposes."

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas to lay on the table the motion of the Senator from Washington to reconsider.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

STATEHOOD FOR HAWAII

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 75, S. 50.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (S. 50) to provide for the admission of the State of Hawaii into the Union.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 50) to provide for the admission of the State of Hawaii into the Union, which had been reported from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, with amendments, on page 3, line 10, after the word "amended", to strike out "is" and insert "shall be"; in the same line, after the word "a", to strike out "law" and insert "provision of the Constitution"; in line 11, after the word "State", to insert "as provided in section 7, subsection (b) of this Act"; in line 20, after the word "for", to strike out "ordinary"; in line 23, after the word "amendment", to strike out "or law,"; in line 24, after the word "for", to strike out "ordinary"; on page 4, line 7, after the word "for", to strike out "ordinary"; at the beginning of line 12, to strike out "It is further agreed that neither the State of Hawaii nor any subdivision thereof shall take any action or enact or enforce any law or regulation which imposes a tax, requirement or restriction which unreasonably discriminates directly or indirectly against nonresident persons, firms or corporations, their business, property, or occupational activities or opportunities."; in line 19, after "(a)", to insert "Except as provided in subsection (c) of this section"; in line 21, after the word "shall", to insert "succeed to the title of the Territory of Hawaii and its subdivisions in those lands and other properties in which the Territory and its subdivisions now hold title"; in line 24, after the amendment just above stated, to strike out "have and retain all the lands and other public property title to which is in the Territory of Hawaii or a political subdivision thereof, except as herein provided, and all such lands and other property shall remain and be the absolute property of the State of Hawaii and its political subdivisions, as the case may be, subject to the constitution and laws of said State: *Provided, however,* That as to any such lands or other property heretofore or hereafter set aside by Act of Congress or by Executive order or proclamation of the President or the Governor of Hawaii, pursuant to law, for the use of the United States, whether absolutely or subject to limitations, and remaining so set aside immediately prior to the admission of the State of Hawaii into the Union, the United States shall be and become vested with absolute title thereto, or an interest therein conformable to such limitations, as the case may be."; on page 5, line 15, after "(b)", to insert "Except as provided in subsection (c) and (d) of this section"; in line 16, after the words "United States", to strike out "hereby"; in line 17, after the word "upon", to strike out "the date of"; in line 18, after the word "the", where it appears the first time, to strike out "absolute" and insert "United States' "; in line 20, after the word "Hawaii", to strike out "as described herein,"; at the begininng of line 21, to strike out "in" and insert "held by"; in the same line, after the word "to", to strike out "the" and insert "its"; in line 22, after the word "admission", to strike out "of such State"; in the same line, after the word "the", to strike out "Union," and insert "Union."; in the

same line, after the amendment just above mentioned, to strike out "except as otherwise provided in this Act: *Provided, however,* That as to any such lands or other property heretofore or hereafter set aside by Act of Congress or by Executive order or proclamation of the President or the Governor of Hawaii, pursuant to law, for the use of the United States, whether absolutely or subject to limitations, and remaining so set aside immediately prior to the admission of the State of Hawaii into the Union, the United States shall retain absolute title thereto, or an interest therein conformable to such limitations, as the case may be. As used in this subsection, the term "public lands and other public property" means, and is limited to, the lands and other properties that were ceded to the United States by the Republic of Hawaii under the joint resolution of annexation approved July 7, 1898 (30 Stat. 750), or that have been acquired in exchange for lands or other properties so ceded."; on page 6, line 13, after the word "The", to strike out "lands" and insert "grant"; at the beginning of line 14, to strike out "granted" and insert "made"; in line 17, after "(c)", to strike out "The lands granted to the State of Hawaii pursuant to the preceding subsection, together with the proceeds thereof and the income therefrom," and insert "Any lands and other properties that, on the date Hawaii is admitted into the Union, are set aside pursuant to law for the use of the United States under any (1) Act of Congress, (2) Executive order, (3) proclamation of the President, or (4) proclamation of the Governor of Hawaii shall remain the property of the United States subject only to the limitations, if any, imposed under (1), (2), (3), or (4), as the case may be."; on page 7, after line 2, to insert a new subsection, as follows:

(d) Any public lands or other public property that is conveyed to the State of Hawaii by subsection (b) of this section but that, immediately prior to the admission of said State into the Union, is controlled by the United States pursuant to permit, license, or permission, written or verbal, from the Territory of Hawaii or any department thereof may, at any time during the 5 years following the admission of Hawaii into the Union, be set aside by Act of Congress or by Executive order of the President, made pursuant to law, for the use of the United States, and the lands or property so set aside shall, subject only to valid rights then existing, be the property of the United States.

After line 14, to insert a new subsection, as follows:

(e) Within 5 years from the date Hawaii is admitted into the Union, each Federal agency having control over any land or property that is retained by the United States pursuant to subsections (c) and (d) of this section shall report to the President the facts regarding its continued need for such land or property, and if the President determines that the land or property is no longer needed by the United States it shall be conveyed to the State of Hawaii.

After line 22, to insert:

"(f) The lands granted to the State of Hawaii by subsection (b) of this section and public lands retained by the United States under subsections (c) and (d) and later conveyed to the State under subsection (e), together with the proceeds from the sale or other disposition of any such lands";

On page 8, line 20, after the word "under", to strike out "the preceding subsection" and insert "this Act"; after line 22, to insert a new subsection, as follows:

(g) As used in this Act, the term "lands and other properties" includes public lands and other public property, and the term "public lands and other public property" means, and is limited to, the lands and properties that were ceded to the United States by the Republic of Hawaii under the joint resolution of annexation approved July 7, 1898 (30 Stat. 750), or that have been acquired in exchange for lands or properties so ceded.

On page 9, after line 5, to insert a new subsection, as follows:

(h) All laws of the United States reserving to the United States the free use or enjoyment of property which vests in or is conveyed to the State of Hawaii or its political subdivisions pursuant to subsection (a), (b), or (e) of this section or reserving the right to alter, amend, or repeal laws relating thereto shall cease to be effective upon the admission of the State of Hawaii into the Union.

After line 12, to strike out:

(d) Effective upon the admission of the State of Hawaii into the Union all laws of the United States reserving to the United States the free use or enjoyment of property hereinabove vested in the State of Hawaii or its political subdivisions, or the right to alter, amend, or repeal laws relating thereto, are hereby repealed.

At the beginning of line 19, to strike out "(e)" and insert "(i)"; at the beginning of line 21, to insert "and the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act of 1953 (Public Law 212, Eighty-third Congress, first session, 67 Stat. 462)"; on page 10, line 1, after "Sec. 6.", to strike out "Upon" and insert "As soon as possible after the"; in line 3, after the word "of", to insert "the Territory of"; in line 7, after the word "all", to insert "State"; in line 9, after the word "Hawaii", to insert "and for two Senators and one Representative in Congress. In the first election of Senators from said State the two senatorial offices shall be separately identified and designated, and no person may be a candidate for both offices. No identification or designation of either of the two senatorial offices, however, shall refer to or be taken to refer to the term of that office, nor shall any such identification or designation in any way impair the privilege of the Senate to determine the class to which each of the Senators elected shall be assigned."; in line 18, after the amendment just above stated, to strike out "but the officers so elected shall in any event include two Senators and two Representatives in Congress. Until and unless otherwise required by the constitution or laws of said proposed State, said Representatives shall be elected at large."; in line 25, after the word "election", to strike out "not less than sixty nor more than ninety days after said proclamation, and a general election shall take place within forty days after said primary election," and insert "and a general election"; on page 11, line 4, after the word "be", where it appears the second time, to insert "chosen by the people"; in line 5, after the amendment just above stated, to strike out "and officers for other elective offices provided for in the constitution of the proposed State of Hawaii may be, chosen by the people."; in line 17, after the word "be", to insert "either the primary or"; after line 22, to insert:

"(1) Shall Hawaii immediately be admitted into the Union as a State?

At the beginning of line 25, to strike out "(1)" and insert "(2)"; on page 12, at the beginning of line 6, to strike out "(2)" and insert "(3)"; in line 19, after the word "language" to insert "article XI shall be deemed to include the provisions of section 4 of this Act;"; in line 22, after the word "the", where it appears the second time, to strike out "second" and insert "third"; in line 23, after the word "other", to strike out "language." and insert "language, and section 10 of article XVI shall be deemed amended by inserting the words 'at which officers for all State elective offices provided for by this constitution and two Senators and one Representative in Congress shall be nominated and elected' in lieu of the words 'at which officers for all State elective offices provided for by this constitution shall be nominated and elected; but the officers so to be elected shall in any event include two Senators and two Representatives to the Congress, and unless and until otherwise required by law, said Representatives shall be elected at large'."; on page 13, line 11, after the word "shall", to strike out "thereupon"; on page 14, line 4, after the word "the", to strike out "State" and insert "Territory"; in line 6, after the word "said", to strike out "State" and insert "Territory"; in line 7, after the word "Union", to insert "the persons holding legislative, executive, and judicial office in, under or by authority of the government of said Territory, and"; in line 10, after the word "Congress", to strike out "from said Territory," and insert "thereof,"; in line 17, after the word "in", to strike out "or"; in line 22, after the word "and", to strike out "Representatives" and insert "Representative"; in line 23, after the word "and", to strike out "Representatives" and insert "Representative"; on page 15, line 4, after the word "to", to strike out "two Representatives" and insert "one Representative"; in line 6, after the word "such", to strike out "Representatives" and insert "Representative"; on page 16, line 9, after the word "amended", to strike out "to read as follows: '(a) The district judges, except in Puerto Rico, shall hold office during good behavior. The district judge in Puerto Rico shall hold office for the term of eight years, and until his successor is appointed and qualified.'" and insert "by striking out the words 'Hawaii and'. The second sentence of the same section is amended by striking out the words 'Hawaii and', 'six and', and 'respectively'."; on page 17, line 23, after the word "no", to insert "writ, action,"; in the same line, after the word "indictment,", to strike out "action," and insert "cause"; at the beginning of line 24, to strike out "proceedings" and insert "proceeding"; on page 18, at the beginning of line 8, to

strike out "cases" and insert "writ, action, indictment, cause or proceeding"; in line 13, after the word "no", to strike out "suit" and insert "writ"; in the same line, after the word "action", to insert "indictment"; in line 14, after the word "or", to strike out "prosecution" and insert "proceeding"; on page 20, line 15, after "section 1294", to insert "as amended"; in line 16, after the word "is", to insert "further"; at the beginning of line 17, to strike out "(5)" and insert "(4)"; in the same line, after the word "paragraphs", to strike out "(6)" and insert "(5)"; in line 18, after the word "and', to strike out "(7)" and insert "(6)"; in the same line, after the amendment just above stated, to strike out "as paragraphs (4) and (5) respectively" and insert "accordingly"; in line 21, after the word "Code", to insert "as amended"; in the same line, after the word "is", to insert "further"; on page 21, line 14, after the word "in", to strike out "commission" and insert "office"; on page 22, line 23, after the word "as" to strike out "hereinbefore"; in line 24, after the word "provided", to insert "in section 4 of this Act"; on page 23, line 3, after the words "United States", to insert a colon and "*Provided,* That, except as herein otherwise provided, a Territorial law enacted by the Congress shall be terminated two years after the date of admission of the State of Hawaii into the Union or upon the effective date of any law enacted by the State of Hawaii which amends or repeals it, whichever may occur first"; in line 14, after the word "to", to strike out "the" and insert "its"; in the same line, after the word "admission", to strike out "of the State of Hawaii"; in line 17, after the word "of", to strike out "the" and insert "its"; in line 18, after the word "admission", to strike out "of the State of Hawaii"; on page 25, at the beginning of line 22, to insert "controlled or"; at the beginning of line 23, to strike out "military, naval, Air Force," and insert "Defense"; in line 24, after the word "purposes", to strike out the period, insert a colon and "*Provided, however,* That the United States shall continue to have sole and exclusive jurisdiction over such military installations as have been heretofore or hereafter determined to be critical areas as delineated by the President of the United States and/or the Secretary of Defense."; on page 26, line 14, after "SEC. 17.", to insert "The next to last sentence of"; in line 5, after "(38 Stat. 251)", to insert "as amended by section 19 of the Act of July 7, 1958 (72 Stat. 339, 350),"; in line 7, after the word "amended", to strike out "by striking out the last sentence thereof and inserting in lieu of such sentence the following: 'When the State of Hawaii or any State is hereafter admitted to the Union the Federal Reserve districts shall be readjusted by the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System in such manner as to include such State. Every national bank in any State shall, upon commencing business or within ninety days after admission into the Union of the State in which it is located, become a member bank of the Federal Reserve System by subscribing and paying for stock in the Federal Reserve bank of its district in accordance with the provisions of this Act and shall thereupon be an insured bank under the Federal Deposit Insurance Act, and failure to do so shall subject such bank to the penalty provided by the sixth paragraph of this section.' " and insert "by inserting after the word 'Alaska' the words 'or Hawaii.' "; in line 23, after the word "this", to strike out "or any other"; on page 27, line 3, after the words "United States", to strike out "its Territories"; in line 10, after the word "words", to strike out "and" and insert "an"; in line 15, after the word "words", to strike out "an"; at the beginning of line 21, to strike out "an"; in line 25, after the word "acquired", to strike out "nor" and insert "or"; on page 28, line 2, after the words "United States", to strike out "may have been" and insert "is or was"; in line 4, after "SEC. 20.", to insert "(a)"; at the beginning of line 7, to strike out "SEC. 21." and insert "(b)"; in line 9, after the word "the", where it appears the first time, to strike out "third line of the"; at the beginning of line 11, to strike out "contained in the" and insert "to said"; in the same line, after the word "sentence", to strike out "thereof"; at the beginning of line 12, to strike out "SEC. 22" and insert "(c)"; in the same line, after the word "of", to insert "Section"; in line 13, after the word "Act", to insert "as amended"; in line 14, after "8 U.S.C. 1421(a)", to insert "72 Stat. 351"; in the same line, after the word "is", to insert "further"; in line 15, after the word "words", to strike out " 'District Courts of the United States for the Territories of Hawaii and Alaska' and substituting therefor the words 'District Court of the United States for the Territory of Alaska'." and insert " 'for the Territory of Hawaii, and'."; at the beginning of line 20, to strike out "SEC. 23." and insert "(d)"; after line 23, to insert a new section, as follows:

SEC. 21. Effective upon the admission of the State of Hawaii into the Union, section 3, subsection (b), of the Act of September 7, 1957 (71 Stat. 629), is amended by substituting the words "State of Hawaii" for the words "Territory of Hawaii".

On page 29, at the beginning of line 4, to change the section number from "24" to "22"; in line 6, after the word "thereof", to strike out "to any person"; in line 9, after the word "word", to strike out "to other persons and" and insert "in other"; and, at the beginning of line 11, to change the section number from "25" to "23"; so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, subject to the provisions of this Act, and upon issuance of the proclamation required by section 7 (c) of this Act, the State of Hawaii is hereby declared to be a State of the United States of America, is declared admitted into the Union on an equal footing with the other States in all respects whatever, and the constitution formed pursuant to the provisions of the Act of the Territorial Legislature of Hawaii entitled "An Act to provide for a constitutional convention, the adoption of a State constitution, and the forwarding of the same to the Congress of the United States, and appropriating money therefor", approved May 20, 1949 (Act 334, Session Laws of Hawaii, 1949), and adopted by a vote of the people of Hawaii in the election held on November 7, 1950, is hereby found to be republican in form and in conformity with the Constitution of the United States and the principles of the Declaration of Independence, and is hereby accepted, ratified, and confirmed.

SEC. 2. The State of Hawaii shall consist of all the islands, together with their appurtenant reefs and territorial waters, included in the Territory of Hawaii on the date of enactment of this Act, except the atoll known as Palmyra Island, together with its appurtenant reefs and territorial waters, but said State shall not be deemed to include the Midway Islands, Johnston Island, Sand Island (offshore from Johnston Island), or Kingman Reef, together with their appurtenant reefs and territorial waters.

SEC. 3. The constitution of the State of Hawaii shall always be republican in form and shall not be repugnant to the Constitution of the United States and the principles of the Declaration of Independence.

SEC. 4. As a compact with the United States relating to the management and disposition of the Hawaiian home lands, the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act, 1920, as amended, shall be adopted as a provision of the constitution of said State, as provided in section 7, subsection (b) of this Act, subject to amendment or repeal only with the consent of the United States, and in no other manner: *Provided,* That (1) sections 202, 213, 219, 220, 222, 224, and 225 and other provisions relating to administration, and paragraph (2) of section 204, sections 206 and 212, and other provisions relating to the powers and duties of officers other than those charged with the administration of said Act, may be amended in the constitution, or in the manner required for State legislation, but the Hawaiian home-loan fund, the Hawaiian home-operating fund, and the Hawaiian home-development fund shall not be reduced or impaired by any such amendment whether made in the constitution or in the manner required for State legislation, and the encumbrances authorized to be placed on Hawaiian home lands by officers other than those charged with the administration of said Act, shall not be increased, except with the consent of the United States; (2) that any amendment to increase the benefits to lessees of Hawaiian home lands may be made in the constitution or in the manner required for State legislation, but the qualifications of lessees shall not be changed except with the consent of the United States; and (3) that all proceeds and income from the "available lands", as defined by said Act, shall be used only in carrying out the provisions of said Act.

SEC. 5. (a) Except as provided in subsection (c) of this section, the State of Hawaii and its political subdivisions, as the case may be, shall succeed to the title of the Territory of Hawaii and its subdivisions in those lands and other properties in which the Territory and its subdivisions now hold title.

(b) Except as provided in subsection (c) and (d) of this section, the United States grants to the State of Hawaii, effective upon its admission into the Union, the United States' title to all the public lands and other public property within the boundaries of the State of Hawaii, title to which is held by the United States immediately prior to its admission into the Union. The grant hereby made shall be in lieu of any and all grants provided for new States by provisions of law other than this Act, and such grants shall not extend to the State of Hawaii.

(c) Any lands and other properties that, on the date Hawaii is admitted into the Union, are set aside pursuant to law for the use of the United States under any (1) Act of Congress, (2) Executive order, (3) proclamation of the President, or (4) proclamation of the Governor of Hawaii shall remain the property of the United States subject

only to the limitations, if any, imposed under (1), (2), (3), or (4), as the case may be.

(d) Any public lands or other public property that is conveyed to the State of Hawaii by subsection (b) of this section but that, immediately prior to the admission of said State into the Union, is controlled by the United States pursuant to permit, license, or permission, written or verbal, from the Territory of Hawaii or any department thereof may, at any time during the five years following the admission of Hawaii into the Union, be set aside by Act of Congress or by Executive order of the President, made pursuant to law, for the use of the United States, and the lands or property so set aside shall, subject only to valid rights then existing, be the property of the United States.

(e) Within five years from the date Hawaii is admitted into the Union, each Federal agency having control over any land or property that is retained by the United States pursuant to subsections (c) and (d) of this section shall report to the President the facts regarding its continued need for such land or property, and if the President determines that the land or property is no longer needed by the United States it shall be conveyed to the State of Hawaii.

(f) The lands granted to the State of Hawaii by subsection (b) of this section and public lands retained by the United States under subsections (c) and (d) and later conveyed to the State under subsection (e), together with the proceeds from the sale or other disposition of any such lands and the income therefrom, shall be held by said State as a public trust for the support of the public schools and other public educational institutions, for the betterment of the conditions of native Hawaiians, as defined in the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act, 1920, as amended, for the development of farm and home ownership on as widespread a basis as possible for the making of public improvements, and for the provision of lands for public use. Such lands, proceeds, and income shall be managed and disposed of for one or more of the foregoing purposes in such manner as the constitution and laws of said State may provide, and their use for any other object shall constitute a breach of trust for which suit may be brought by the United States. The schools and other educational institutions supported, in whole or in part, out of such public trust shall forever remain under the exclusive control of said State; and no part of the proceeds or income from the lands granted under this Act shall be used for the support of any sectarian or denominational school, college, or university.

(g) As used in this Act, the term "lands and other properties" includes public lands and other public property, and the term "public lands and other public property" means, and is limited to, the lands and properties that were ceded to the United States by the Republic of Hawaii under the joint resolution of annexation approved July 7, 1898 (30 Stat. 750), or that have been acquired in exchange for lands or properties so ceded.

(h) All laws of the United States reserving to the United States the free use or enjoyment of property which vests in or is conveyed to the State of Hawaii or its political subdivisions pursuant to subsection (a), (b), or (e) of this section or reserving the right to alter, amend, or repeal laws relating thereto shall cease to be effective upon the admission of the State of Hawaii into the Union.

(i) The Submerged Lands Act of 1953 (Public Law 31, Eighty-third Congress, first session; 67 Stat. 29) and the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act of 1953 (Public Law 212, Eighty-third Congress, first session, 67 Stat. 462) shall be applicable to the State of Hawaii, and the said State shall have the same rights as do existing States thereunder.

SEC. 6. As soon as possible after the enactment of this Act, it shall be the duty of the President of the United States to certify such fact to the Governor of the Territory of Hawaii. Thereupon the Governor of the Territory shall, within thirty days after receipt of the official notification of such approval, issue his proclamation for the elections, as hereinafter provided, for officers of all State elective offices provided for by the constitution of the proposed State of Hawaii, and for two Senators and one Representative in Congress. In the first election of Senators from said State the two senatorial offices shall be separately identified and designated, and no person may be a candidate for both offices. No identification or designation of either of the two senatorial offices, however, shall refer to or be taken to refer to the term of that office, nor shall any such identification or designation in any way impair the privilege of the Senate to determine the class to which each of the Senators elected shall be assigned.

SEC. 7. (a) The proclamation of the Governor of Hawaii required by section 6 shall provide for the holding of a primary election and a general election and at such elections the officers required to be elected as provided in section 6 shall be chosen by the people. Such elections shall be held, and the qualifications of voters thereat shall be, as prescribed by the constitution of the proposed State of Hawaii for the election of members of the proposed State legislature. The returns thereof shall be made and certified in such manner as the constitution of the proposed State of Hawaii may prescribe. The Governor of Hawaii shall certify the results of said elections, as so ascertained, to the President of the United States.

(b) At an election designated by proclamation of the Governor of Hawaii, which may be either the primary or the general election held pursuant to subsection (a) of this section, or a Territorial general election, or a special election, there shall be submitted to the electors qualified to vote in said election, for adoption or rejection, the following propositions:

"(1) Shall Hawaii immediately be admitted into the Union as a State?

"(2) The boundaries of the State of Hawaii shall be as prescribed in the Act of Congress approved ----------, and
(Date of approval of this Act)
all claims of this State to any areas of land or sea outside the boundaries so prescribed are hereby irrevocably relinquished to the United States.

"(3) All provisions of the Act of Congress approved ---------- reserving
(Date of approval of this Act)
rights or powers to the United States, as well as those prescribing the terms or conditions of the grants of lands or other property therein made to the State of Hawaii are consented to fully by said State and its people."

In the event the foregoing propositions are adopted at said election by a majority of the legal votes cast on said submission, the proposed constitution of the proposed State of Hawaii, ratified by the people at the election held on November 7, 1950, shall be deemed amended as follows: Section 1 of article XIII of said proposed constitution shall be deemed amended so as to contain the language of section 2 of this Act in lieu of any other language; article XI shall be deemed to include the provisions of section 4 of this Act; and section 8 of article XIV shall be deemed amended so as to contain the language of the third proposition above stated in lieu of any other language, and section 10 of article XVI shall be deemed amended by inserting the words "at which officers for all State elective offices provided for by this constitution and two Senators and one Representative in Congress shall be nominated and elected" in lieu of the words "at which officers for all State elective offices provided for by this constitution shall be nominated and elected; but the officers so to be elected shall in any event include two Senators and two Representatives to the Congress, and unless and until otherwise required by law, said Representatives shall be elected at large".

In the event the foregoing propositions are not adopted at said election by a majority of the legal votes cast on said submission, the provisions of this Act shall cease to be effective.

The Governor of Hawaii is hereby authorized and directed to take such action as may be necessary or appropriate to insure the submission of said propositions to the people. The return of the votes cast on said propositions shall be made by the election officers directly to the secretary of Hawaii, who shall certify the results of the submission to the Governor. The Governor shall certify the results of said submission, as so ascertained, to the President of the United States.

(c) If the President shall find that the propositions set forth in the preceding subsection have been duly adopted by the people of Hawaii, the President, upon certification of the returns of the election of the officers required to be elected as provided in section 6 of this Act, shall thereupon issue his proclamation announcing the results of said election as so ascertained. Upon the issuance of said proclamation by the President, the Territory of Hawaii shall be deemed admitted into the Union as provided in section 1 of this Act.

Until the said Territory is so admitted into the Union, the persons holding legislative, executive, and judicial office in, under, or by authority of the government of said Territory, and all of the officers of said Territory, including the Delegate in Congress thereof, shall continue to discharge the duties of their respective offices. Upon the issuance of said proclamation by the President of the United States and the admission of the State of Hawaii into the Union, the officers elected at said election, and qualified under the provisions of the constitution and laws of said State, shall proceed to exercise all the functions pertaining to their offices in, under, or by authority of the government of said State, and officers not required to be elected at said initial election shall be selected or continued in office as provided by the constitution and laws of said State. The Governor of said State shall certify the election of the Senators and Representative in the manner required by law, and the said Senators and Representative shall be entitled to be admitted to seats in Congress and to all the rights and privileges of Senators and Representatives of other States in the Congress of the United States.

SEC. 8. The State of Hawaii upon its admission into the Union shall be entitled to one Representative until the taking effect of the next reapportionment, and such Representative shall be in addition to the membership of the House of Representatives as now prescribed by law: *Provided*, That such temporary increase in the membership shall not operate to either increase or decrease the permanent membership of the House of Representatives as prescribed in the Act of August 8, 1911 (37 Stat. 13), nor shall such temporary increase affect the basis of apportionment established by the Act of November 15, 1941 (55 Stat. 761; 2 U.S.C., sec. 2a), for the Eighty-third Congress and each Congress thereafter.

SEC. 9. Effective upon the admission of the State of Hawaii into the Union—

(a) the United States District Court for the District of Hawaii established by and existing under title 28 of the United States Code shall thenceforth be a court of the United States with judicial power derived

from article III, section 1, of the Constitution of the United States: *Provided, however,* That the terms of office of the district judges for the district of Hawaii then in office shall terminate upon the effective date of this section and the President, pursuant to sections 133 and 134 of title 28, United States Code, as amended by this Act, shall appoint, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, two district judges for the said district who shall hold office during good behavior;

(b) the last paragraph of section 133 of title 28, United States Code, is repealed; and

(c) subsection (a) of section 134 of title 28, United States Code, is amended by striking out the words "Hawaii and". The second sentence of the same section is amended by striking out the words "Hawaii and", "six and", and "respectively".

SEC. 10. Effective upon the admission of the State of Hawaii into the Union the second paragraph of section 451 of title 28, United States Code, is amended by striking out the words "including the district courts of the United States for the districts of Hawaii and Puerto Rico," and inserting in lieu thereof the words "including the United States District Court for the District of Puerto Rico,".

SEC. 11. Effective upon the admission of the State of Hawaii into the Union—

(a) the last paragraph of section 501 of title 28, United States Code, is repealed;

(b) the first sentence of subsection (a) of section 504 of title 28, United States Code, is amended by striking out at the end thereof the words ", except in the district of Hawaii, where the term shall be six years";

(c) the first sentence of subsection (c) of section 541 of title 28, United States Code, is amended by striking out at the end thereof the words ", except in the district of Hawaii where the term shall be six years"; and

(d) subsection (d) of section 541 of title 28, United States Code, is repealed.

SEC. 12. No writ, action, indictment, cause, or proceeding pending in any court of the Territory of Hawaii or in the United States District Court for the District of Hawaii shall abate by reason of the admission of said State into the Union, but the same shall be transferred to and proceeded with in such appropriate State courts as shall be established under the constitution of said State, or shall continue in the United States District Court for the District of Hawaii, as the nature of the case may require. And no writ, action, indictment, cause, or proceeding shall abate by reason of any change in the courts, but shall be proceeded with in the State or United States courts according to the laws thereof, respectively. And the appropriate State courts shall be the successors of the courts of the Territory as to all cases arising within the limits embraced within the jurisdiction of such courts, respectively, with full power to proceed with the same, and award mesne or final process therein, and all the files, records, indictments, and proceedings relating to any such writ, action, indictment, cause, or proceeding shall be transferred to such appropriate State courts and the same shall be proceeded with therein in due course of law.

All civil causes of action and all criminal offenses which shall have arisen or been committed prior to the admission of said State, but as to which no writ, action, indictment, or proceeding shall be pending at the date of such admission, shall be subject to prosecution in the appropriate State courts or in the United States District Court for the District of Hawaii in like manner, to the same extent, and with like right of appellate review, as if said State had been created and said State courts had been established prior to the accrual of such causes of action or the commission of such offenses. The admission of said State shall effect no change in the substantive or criminal law governing such causes of action and criminal offenses which shall have arisen or been committed; and such of said criminal offenses as shall have been committed against the laws of the Territory shall be tried and punished by the appropriate courts of said State, and such as shall have been committed against the laws of the United States shall be tried and punished in the United States District Court for the District of Hawaii.

SEC. 13. Parties shall have the same rights of appeal from and appellate review of final decisions of the United States District Court for the District of Hawaii or the Supreme Court of the Territory of Hawaii in any case finally decided prior to admission of said State into the Union, whether or not an appeal therefrom shall have been perfected prior to such admission, and the United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit and the Supreme Court of the United States shall have the same jurisdiction therein, as by law provided prior to admission of said State into the Union, and any mandate issued subsequent to the admission of said State shall be to the United States District Court for the District of Hawaii or a court of the State, as may be appropriate. Parties shall have the same rights of appeal from and appellate review of all orders, judgments, and decrees of the United States District Court for the District of Hawaii and of the Supreme Court of the State of Hawaii as successor to the Supreme Court of the Territory of Hawaii, in any case pending at the time of admission of said State into the Union, and the United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit and the Supreme Court of the United States shall have the same jurisdiction therein, as by law provided in any case arising subsequent to the admission of said State into the Union.

SEC. 14. Effective upon the admission of the State of Hawaii into the Union—

(a) title 28, United States Code, section 1252, is amended by striking out "Hawaii and" from the clause relating to courts of record;

(b) title 28, United States Code, section 1293, is amended by striking out the words "First and Ninth Circuits" and by inserting in lieu thereof "First Circuit", and by striking out the words, "supreme courts of Puerto Rico and Hawaii, respectively" and inserting in lieu thereof "supreme court of Puerto Rico";

(c) title 28, United States Code, section 1294, as amended, is further amended by striking out paragraph (4) thereof and by renumbering paragraphs (5) and (6) accordingly;

(d) the first paragraph of section 373 of title 28, United States Code, as amended, is further amended by striking out the words "United States District Courts for the districts of Hawaii or Puerto Rico," and inserting in lieu thereof the words "United States District Court for the District of Puerto Rico,"; and by striking out the words "and any justice of the Supreme Court of the Territory of Hawaii": *Provided,* That the amendments made by this subsection shall not affect the rights of any judge or justice who may have retired before the effective date of this subsection: *And provided further,* That service as a judge of the District Court for the Territory of Hawaii or as a judge of the United States District Court for the District of Hawaii or as a justice of the Supreme Court of the Territory of Hawaii or as a judge of the circuit courts of the Territory of Hawaii shall be included in computing under section 371, 372, or 373 of title 28, United States Code, the aggregate years of judicial service of any person who is in office as a district judge for the District of Hawaii on the date of enactment of this Act;

(e) section 92 of the Act of April 30, 1900 (ch. 339, 31 Stat. 159), as amended, and the Act of May 29, 1928 (ch. 904, 45 Stat. 997), as amended, are repealed;

(f) section 86 of the Act approved April 30, 1900 (ch. 339, 31 Stat. 158), as amended, is repealed;

(g) section 3771 of title 18, United States Code, as heretofore amended, is further amended by striking out from the first paragraph of such section the words "Supreme Courts of Hawaii and Puerto Rico" and inserting in lieu thereof the words "Supreme Court of Puerto Rico";

(h) section 3772 of title 18, United States Code, as heretofore amended, is further amended by striking out from the first paragraph of such section the words "Supreme Courts of Hawaii and Puerto Rico" and inserting in lieu thereof the words "Supreme Court of Puerto Rico";

(i) section 91 of title 28, United States Code, as heretofore amended, is further amended by inserting after "Kure Island" and before "Baker Island" the words "Palmyra Island,"; and

(j) the Act of June 15, 1950 (64 Stat 217; 48 U.S.C., sec. 644a), is amended by inserting after "Kure Island" and before "Baker Island" the words "Palmyra Island,".

SEC. 15. All territorial laws in force in the Territory of Hawaii at the time of its admission into the Union shall continue in force in the State of Hawaii, except as modified or changed by this Act or by the constitution of the State, and shall be subject to repeal or amendment by the Legislature of the State of Hawaii, except as provided in section 4 of this Act with respect to the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act, 1920, as amended; and the laws of the United States shall have the same force and effect within the said State as elsewhere within the United States: *Provided,* That, except as herein otherwise provided, a Territorial law enacted by the Congress shall be terminated two years after the date of admission of the State of Hawaii into the Union or upon the effective date of any law enacted by the State of Hawaii which amends or repeals it, whichever may occur first. As used in this section, the term "Territorial laws" includes (in addition to laws enacted by the Territorial Legislature of Hawaii all laws or parts thereof enacted by the Congress the validity of which is dependent solely upon the authority of the Congress to provide for the government of Hawaii prior to its admission into the Union, and the term "laws of the United States" includes all laws or parts thereof enacted by the Congress that (1) apply to or within Hawaii at the time of its admission into the Union, (2) are not "Territorial laws" as defined in this paragraph, and (3) are not in conflict with any other provision of this Act.

SEC. 16. (a) Notwithstanding the admission of the State of Hawaii into the Union, the United States shall continue to have sole and exclusive jurisdiction over the area which may then or thereafter be included in Hawaii National Park, saving, however, to the State of Hawaii the same rights as are reserved to the Territory of Hawaii by section 1 of the Act of April 19, 1930 (46 Stat. 227), and saving, further, to persons then or thereafter residing within such area the right to vote at all elections held within the political subdivisions where they respectively reside. Upon the admission of said State all references to the Territory of Hawaii in said Act or in other laws relating to Hawaii National Park shall be deemed to refer to the State of Hawaii. Nothing contained in this Act shall be construed to affect the ownership and control by the United States of any lands or other property within Hawaii National Park which may now belong to, or which may hereafter be acquired by, the United States.

(b) Notwithstanding the admission of the State of Hawaii into the Union, authority is reserved in the United States, subject to the proviso hereinafter set forth, for the ex-

ercise by the Congress of the United States of the power of exclusive legislation, as provided by article I, section 8, clause 17, of the Constitution of the United States, in all cases whatsoever over such tracts or parcels of land as, immediately prior to the admission of said State, are controlled or owned by the United States and held for Defense or Coast Guard purposes, whether such lands were acquired by cession and transfer to the United States by the Republic of Hawaii and set aside by Act of Congress or by Executive order or proclamation of the President or the Governor of Hawaii for the use of the United States, or were acquired by the United States by purchase, condemnation, donation, exchange, or otherwise: *Provided*, (i) That the State of Hawaii shall always have the right to serve civil or criminal process within the said tracts or parcels of land in suits or prosecutions for or on account of rights acquired, obligations incurred, or crimes committed within the said State but outside of the said tracts or parcels of land; (ii) that the reservation of authority in the United States for the exercise by the Congress of the United States of the power of exclusive legislation over the lands aforesaid shall not operate to prevent such lands from being a part of the State of Hawaii, or to prevent the said State from exercising over or upon such lands, concurrently with the United States, any jurisdiction whatsoever which it would have in the absence of such reservation of authority and which is consistent with the laws hereafter enacted by the Congress pursuant to such reservation of authority, and (iii) that such power of exclusive legislation shall vest and remain in the United States only so long as the particular tract or parcel of land involved is controlled or owned by the United States and used for Defense or Coast Guard purposes: *Provided, however*, That the United States shall continue to have sole and exclusive jurisdiction over such military installations as have been heretofore or hereafter determined to be critical areas as delineated by the President of the United States and/or the Secretary of Defense.

SEC. 17. The next to last sentence of the first paragraph of section 2 of the Federal Reserve Act (38 Stat. 251) as amended by section 19 of the Act of July 7, 1958, (72 Stat. 339, 350) is amended by inserting after the word "Alaska" the words "or Hawaii."

SEC. 18. (a) Nothing contained in this or any other Act shall be construed as depriving the Federal Maritime Board of the exclusive jurisdiction heretofore conferred on it over common carriers engaged in transportation by water between any port in the State of Hawaii and other ports in the United States, or possessions, or as conferring on the Interstate Commerce Commission jurisdiction over transportation by water between any such ports.

(b) Effective on the admission of the State of Hawaii into the Union—

(1) the first sentence of section 506 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended (46 U.S.C., sec. 1156), is amended by inserting before the words "an island possession or island territory", the words "the State of Hawaii, or";

(2) section 605(a) of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended (46 U.S.C., sec. 1175), is amended by inserting before the words "island possession or island territory", the words "the State of Hawaii, or"; and

(3) the second paragraph of section 714 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended (46 U.S.C., sec. 1204), is amended by inserting before the words "island possession or island territory" the words "the State of Hawaii, or".

SEC. 19. Nothing contained in this Act shall operate to confer United States nationality, nor to terminate nationality heretofore lawfully acquired, or restore nationality heretofore lost under any law of the United States or under any treaty to which the United States is or was a party.

SEC. 20. (a) Section 101(a)(36) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (66 Stat. 170, 8 U.S.C., sec. 1101(a)(36)) is amended by deleting the word "Hawaii,".

(b) Section 212(d)(7) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (66 Stat. 188, 8 U.S.C., 1182(d)(7)) is amended by deleting from the first sentence thereof the word "Hawaii," and by deleting the proviso to said first sentence.

(c) The first sentence of section 310(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, as amended (66 Stat. 239, 8 U.S.C. 1421(a), 72 Stat. 351) is further amended by deleting the words "for the Territory of Hawaii, and".

(d) Nothing contained in this Act shall be held to repeal, amend, or modify the provisions of section 305 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (66 Stat. 237, 8 U.S.C. 1405).

SEC. 21. Effective upon the admission of the State of Hawaii into the Union, section 3, subsection (b), of the Act of September 7, 1957 (71 Stat. 629), is amended by substituting the words "State of Hawaii" for the words "Territory of Hawaii."

SEC. 22. If any provision of this Act, or any section, subsection, sentence, clause, phrase, or individual word, or the application thereof or circumstance is held invalid, the validity of the remainder of the Act and of the application of any such provision, section, subsection, sentence, clause, phrase, or individual word in other circumstances shall not be affected thereby.

SEC. 23. All Acts or parts of Acts in conflict with the provisions of this Act, whether passed by the legislature of said Territory or by Congress, are hereby repealed.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask that the yeas and nays be ordered on passage of the bill, so that all Senators will know such a vote is expected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the majority leader yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield to the distinguished minority leader.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, is my understanding correct that action on the bill to provide statehood for Hawaii will be completed today?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The Senator from Texas can give no such assurance. Some Senators have indicated they may desire to discuss the subject. I do not know how long Senators will talk.

The yeas and nays have been ordered. I suggest that each Senator be on notice that if it is at all possible to complete action today we shall attempt to do so.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Let me rephrase my inquiry. Is it the expectation that action on the bill will be completed today?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. That is a matter entirely within the control of individual Senators. The Senator from Texas is prepared to vote on the bill today, but I do not know that it is the desire of other Members of the Senate to do so. I think we will have to let the other Members decide that question.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, let me further rephrase my inquiry. Is it the hope that action will be concluded on the bill today? [Laughter.]

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I hope that we can conclude action on the bill today, but I can give no such assurance and I do not want to give any such intimation.

NEW ERA OF AGING

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, on many occasions I have emphasized to my colleagues the fact that the Nation has a very definite responsibility toward brightening the future of its senior citizens. This important growing class of individuals in the United States now represents 8.4 percent of the total population and these citizens have spent the greater portion of their lives helping to build this great country. We certainly have a moral responsibility, as well as a practical need, to take constructive steps to meet the special problems of our golden agers.

What do elderly folks need? I have attempted to answer this challenging question on many occasions. I have introduced legislation on old-age problems and, in this past session of the 85th Congress, I actively supported the amendment to increase benefits under the Federal old-age, survivors, and disability insurance system so as to raise the level of retirement benefits from 7 to 10 percent.

I have been happy to correspond extensively with old-age groups; the Senior Citizens of America, Golden Age Clubs, and numerous Federal, State, and local experts in order that these folks can be helped to increasingly realize that they owe a responsibility to themselves—a responsibility to be active, creative, and constructive so as to acquire new interests and build a bright, new chapter in their lives.

I have pointed up the forthcoming White House Conference of the Aging to be held in 1960 and stressed the importance of sound planning, including planning for the various preceding State conferences, in order to focus national interest on problems of older people and to stimulate action in State and communities to meet those needs.

On many occasions I have emphasized that age is not a matter of chronology; it is not a matter of passing a certain arbitrary milestone, but rather it is the composite of one's interest, one's skills, and one's outlook. Our elderly folks need a purpose toward which they can strive; a motivation for a long and healthy life; and, with that purpose, a faith in an all-knowing, all-powerful Creator, a God of love and truth. They also need respect, esteem, and appreciation; coupled with fruitful activity toward helping to earn their own way. Toward this latter end, our American employers need to be reeducated to the value of utilizing the skills and experiences of the middle and later years.

I have been particularly pleased to note the many constructive activities at the grassroots level dedicated to meeting the challenges of our senior citizens. Recently I received a report from the State Medical Society of Wisconsin in which was given an account of a communitywide program on the new era of aging recently held by the Fond du

Lac County Medical Society. This account pointed out that Wisconsin's 370,000 citizens who are 65 years or older represent 9.1 percent of the State's population, which is slightly higher than the National average; and that this indication of an addition to the average life span has also pointed out that there are additional problems of the aged to be met.

In this roundtable discussion were representatives of 38 organizations and groups in the city and county who discussed basic needs of older individuals; disabilities which arise from bone and joint diseases, changes in vision and hearing, high blood pressure, arteriosclerosis, and diabetes; and the role of nutrition and religion in healthy living for older citizens.

In this same issue of the Wisconsin Medical Journal was a short article which tells of a national conference to be held this spring in Chicago under the sponsorship of the Joint Council for the Health Care of the Aged. A director of the council is one of Wisconsin's native sons who has distinguished himself in the field of medicine, Dr. Gunnar Gundersen, of La Crosse, who is also president of the American Medical Association.

I ask unanimous consent that both these articles be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ERA OF AGING

In Wisconsin, some 370,000 people are in a growing class of senior citizens, who are 65 years old or older. They represent 9.1 percent of the State's population, a figure which is a shade higher than the national average of 8.4 percent.

Such statistics are heartening. Yet each addition to the average life span has also brought a multiplication of the problems of the aged. Medical science, well aware that it is primarily responsible for the advance of longevity, has long been in the forefront of several national and State conferences on the growth of the elderly population.

Recently, the Fond du Lac County Medical Society brought the matter down to the local level by initiating a communitywide program on the new era of aging.

Representatives of 38 organizations and groups in the city and county joined physicians in mid-December for a roundtable discussion of the problems involved in the aging process and suggestions which can be carried out to meet the needs of the elderly.

SPARKPLUG

The sparkplug of the event was Dr. A. M. Hutter, chairman of the County Medical Society's Division on Geriatrics.

Ten basic needs for older individuals were cited by Dr. Hutter:

1. A balanced diet.
2. Elimination of waste products.
3. Rest, with adequate rest of the mind and body every 24 hours.
4. Recreation.
5. A sense of humor.
6. Emotional control.
7. Companionship.
8. Maintenance of a sense of pride in one's job.
9. Participation in community affairs.
10. Preservation of an open mind.

Dr. Hutter said that "arbitrary assignments of older persons to inactivity cannot be tolerated in a society which places a premium on individual work and dignity. We cannot isolate the aged. Labor and industry should evaluate their support of arbitrary retirement based on chronological age. All groups must reorient their attitude toward the aging process and opportunities which the new status of age provide."

Dr. D. W. McCormick discussed disabilities arising among the older residents from bone and joint diseases. Dr. Harvey K. Guth discussed the genital urinary diseases and disturbances of calcium metabolism.

RURAL RELATION

Dr. W. C. Wojta described changes in vision and hearing and discussed high blood pressure, arteriosclerosis and diabetes. Dr. James Haberman of Mt. Calvary talked on the problems of rural communities in relation to the aging. He emphasized the need to prevent and arrest the causes of degenerative diseases.

Others discussed the role of nutrition and religion in healthy living for older citizens.

Dr. Hutter stressed the necessity for aging programs that are "health-oriented and not disease impelled." He said that exercise, intellectual activity and mental equanimity is a blueprint for continued good health.

CONFERENCE

Plans are currently under way for a national conference on the health problems of the aged to be held in the spring of 1959 under the sponsorship of the Joint Council for the Health Care of the Aged.

The council, based in Chicago, is supported by the American Medical Association and the national associations of dentistry, hospitals and nursing homes.

This conference will provide the basis for more effective joint planning on the part of those who are the principal surveyors of health care for the aged, according to officials of the council.

Dr. Gunnar Gundersen of La Crosse, president of AMA, is a director of the council. The council's objectives are to identify and analyze the health needs of the aged, appraise available health resources for the aged, develop programs to foster the best possible health care for the aged, foster effective methods of payment for the health care for the aged, and foster health education programs of the aged.

RED BAN SHIFTS SEEN VINDICATING PRESIDENT'S FIRM BERLIN POLICY

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, today, the nations of the world, free and Communist, are watching carefully the rising crisis in Berlin.

Since Khrushchev—without justification—last November 27th, declared that the Soviet Government considered its agreements relating to the occupation of Germany and Berlin null and void, the tensions have been mounting.

At this time, it is difficult, of course, to offer any panacea.

We recall that prior to the end of World War II, agreements were reached by the wartime Allies, including Russia, on common policies and plans for enforcing the surrender terms on Nazi Germany.

Under the agreed plan, the forces of the Allied Powers would each occupy separate zones of Germany. The agreements entered into in good faith by the Allies were to be considered binding upon the agreeing parties, pending a final peace settlement with Germany.

The attempts by the Soviet Union to abrogate its obligations under the agreements, as well as to undermine the rights of the United States to be in Berlin are, in effect, a violation of international law.

We remember, of course, that as early as 1948 the Soviets had begun violating the occupation agreements, particularly by infringing on the rights of free access to Berlin.

One thing, however, should be made abundantly clear: the right of the three Western Powers to free access to Berlin is not a privilege bestowed by the Soviet Union upon the Western Powers; rather, it is an essential part of their right of occupation. The Soviet Union accepted its zone of occupation subject to these rights of access.

Inasmuch as the rights of occupation and of access do not stem from the Soviet Union, the Soviets are without any authority to repeal those rights by denunciation of agreements, or by purported transfer of control over them to third parties. Furthermore the Soviet Union cannot affect the rights by declaring agreements null and void because the rights exist independently of the Soviet Union. Nor can the Soviet Union affect the rights by declaring them subject to the sovereignty it claims to have bestowed upon its puppet regime in East Germany, because, again, the rights remain in being irrespective of any act of the Soviets. Whatever relationship the East German regime may have vis-a-vis the Soviets, it cannot acquire a power in the Soviet Zone which the Soviets are powerless to give. There is no legal or moral doubt of the right of the United States to maintain its occupational functions and its rights of access to Berlin.

These precepts have been, and should continue to be, the foundation of our policy relating to the Berlin situation.

I am aware, of course, that there have been criticisms of our Berlin policy. Some say that it is too hard and fast, too inflexible, and that we need a more creative, imaginative policy. I should be most happy if we could ingeniously find a way to resolve the Berlin situation. However, if by imaginative policy it is meant that we should attempt to find a way to placate the Soviet lust for power and aggrandizement through relinquishing our own obligations, or that we should keep up a facade of living up to our agreements, but bow down before Soviet threats—then I, for one, would oppose this type of modification of our Berlin policy.

Until now, the U.S. proposals for a foreign ministers conference to attempt to lay the groundwork for resolution of the problems of Berlin, and of Germany, appear to be the best road to a solution.

A major question involved in this whole situation is, of course, how long can the Soviet Union continue to flout world opinion, to break agreements, to tear up treaties, to abrogate responsibilities and obligations, whenever and wherever it serves Soviet policy to do so, regardless of the rights of other nations?

Yesterday's Washington Evening Star carried an article by Earl H. Voss entitled "Red Boss' Shifts Seen Vindicating President." In addition, today's New York Times carried a thought-provoking editorial on "The Soviet Program."

I request unanimous consent to have these articles printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Evening Star, Mar. 10, 1959]

RED BOSS' SHIFTS SEEN VINDICATING PRESIDENT

(By Earl H. Voss)

President Eisenhower's stand on Berlin apparently is being vindicated, some administration officials believe, by Soviet Premier Khrushchev's day-to-day modifications of position.

Mr. Khrushchev began last November demanding that West Berlin be made a demilitarized free city.

Yesterday in East Berlin he said he would settle for a militarized, free city.

"We would not mind even if United States, British, French, and Soviet troops or some neutral countries maintained minimum forces in West Berlin," the Soviet Premier said.

Some Western diplomats believe the allied forces in West Berlin could be reduced, and Prime Minister Macmillan of Great Britain may have mentioned this prospect in his talks with Mr. Khrushchev in Moscow last month.

PROPOSALS UNACCEPTABLE

The Soviet leader's inclusion of Soviet troops would bring Red forces into West Berlin for the first time. American officials indicated this would not be acceptable. But the offer is open to a counterproposal for extending the jurisdiction of the Russian-proposed minimum forces to all of Berlin, including the Communist East sector.

Soviet Premier Khrushchev has softened his original November proposal in other ways. It was first presented as an ultimatum.

But Soviet Deputy Premier Mikoyan made it clear in Washington last January his government would be willing to negotiate.

When British Prime Minister Macmillan went to Moscow, Mr. Khrushchev was insisting that only a summit meeting should consider the German question. By the end of the Macmillan visit, the Soviet Union accepted the Western idea of a foreign ministers' conference.

Last November, Mr. Khrushchev had set a 6-month deadline, expiring may 27, for turning over Soviet occupation responsibilities to East Germany. In Leipzig last week the Soviet Premier set the deadline back at least a month or two if negotiations were in progress.

All these modest retreats have come while the West has been affirming its intention of standing firm on its rights in Berlin, but making no move to back its words with deeds.

Congressional agitation for deeds has been mounting in the last few weeks. Democrats increased the pressure yesterday. They demanded postponement of cuts in American military forces projected before the Berlin crisis arose.

OPPOSES MOBILIZATION

President Eisenhower strongly opposed general mobilization at his press conference last week—as proposed by some Democrats—indicating the economic consequences would be disastrous.

Administration officials, while defending the Eisenhower position, add that Mr. Khrushchev has not yet softened his position sufficiently.

State Department Press Officer Lincoln White said yesterday that Soviet Premier Khrushchev has made so many conflicting statements the past few days "it is difficult to differentiate between one and the other."

The trend, however, is found encouraging.

[From the New York Times, Mar. 11, 1950]

THE SOVIET PROGRAM

While Western statesmen confer on the Soviet challenge over Berlin, there is one vital requirement which the whole Western World must meet before an effective and constructive program can be devised to counter that challenge. It is essential for both the statesmen who will formulate the program, and for the public and its representatives who will be called upon to support it, to understand clearly the Soviet program—that is, to recognize the meaning and substance behind Soviet words.

The Soviets agree that a German peace settlement is the key to both European and world peace and on this ground press for a new summit meeting to write a German peace treaty. But they blandly repudiate the essential prior condition for such a treaty—namely, the creation of a reunified Germany by means of free elections, to which Mr. Khrushchev himself agreed at the Geneva summit meeting. Instead, they demand a peace treaty with two German states, which means permanent German partition and permanent European insecurity.

Furthermore, under the Soviet peace treaty draft, this divided Germany would be neutralized and disarmed of modern weapons, which means that, in return for a theoretical release of Communist-ruled East Germany from the so-called Warsaw Pact, West Germany would have to leave the North Atlantic alliance and the alliance itself would have to withdraw from Germany all its troops, nuclear arms and bases. This would mean the end of the alliance as an effective military instrument, the collapse of European unification moves and the early withdrawal of American troops from Europe.

The Soviet program also calls, in the name of noninterference in German internal affairs, for a confederation between the two German states, which really means between West Germany and Soviet Russia as the real ruler of East Germany. In the name of the same noninterference Premier Khrushchev proclaims that he will never permit the liquidation of the East German Communist regime. At the same time he denounces the West German regime as militaristic, reactionary, and bent upon war—a regime which under his peace treaty draft and in the words of his East German Commissar, Walter Ulbricht, must be liquidated in favor of a comprehensive democratization of social and political life in West Germany, meaning its sovietization.

Finally, the Soviet program demands either the withdrawal of all Western troops from West Berlin and its conversion into a defenseless free city or, as a compromise, the admission of Soviet troops to West Berlin, or the stationing there of neutral troops. To the Soviets, Poland and Czechoslovakia, counted as neutrals in the Korean armistice commission, would presumably be neutral in Berlin, too. Either they or the Soviet troops could be counted upon to enforce the limitations on the freedoms of free West Berlin on which the Soviets likewise insist.

MISS CHRISTA WUERTZ, QUEEN OF MISS MINNESOTA PAGEANT

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I am very pleased to bring to the attention of my colleagues a letter which describes a peculiarly warm and pleasant little incident recently in one of the suburbs of Minneapolis, Minn.—Bloomington—in the choice of their candidate for the Miss Minnesota pageant.

The community's choice was a young German girl, Miss Christa Wuertz. I think that the choice of this young lady is rather symbolic of the natural warmth and good will of the American people which is reflected so many times each week in acts of generosity and openheartedness, and which our Government's frequently bombastic pronouncements tend to obscure.

Mr. President, I wish that our friends from around the world could see more of the real America which the little pageant at Bloomington, Minn., more truly reflects than the rather stiff and formalistic pronouncements of the administration. I believe that the letter which Mr. William J. Endersbe, of Bloomington, has written to me describing this incident should be brought to the attention of a wider audience and I therefore ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in my remarks the letter from Mr. Endersbe.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BLOOMINGTON JUNIOR
CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
Bloomington, Minn., March 1, 1959.

Hon. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
U.S. Senator, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: Tonight, out of a field of 21 lovely girls who live in Bloomington, we selected a young lady named Christa Wuertz as queen who will reign as Miss Bloomington for the coming year and will be our representative to the Miss Minnesota pageant this year.

The only thing unusual about this young lady is that she is a German national. She has resided in this country for 3 years and intends to become a U.S. citizen. Her parents after a sojourn in this country have returned to Germany where they presently live in a town near the Swiss border.

This young lady is 21 years of age and resided as a child in Berlin during the last year or two of the war. As you can well imagine she suffered many hardships and actually had to spend some time in a sanitorium following the war to regain her health.

In these times of stress and anxiety, particularly involving Berlin at this time, I only wish there was some way that we could convey to not only the Germans (East and West) but to all Europe and the world that the people of this country embrace all humanity in the spirit of brotherhood. Perhaps our little local pageant does not amount to much in itself but it is symbolic of the general feeling and attitude of the American people, especially as directed to individuals vis-a-vis governments.

Perhaps it is ironic but my own wife (a former British national) suffered the same hardships of bombing and other privations as Christa did although they were, as much as children can be, on opposite sides of the political and military fence.

This young lady is very proud of her title which she won fair and square. We are likewise proud of her and love her. We only wish that such sentiments could be enlarged to the world scene.

Yours sincerely,

WILLIAM J. ENDERSBE,
President.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The young lady to whom I have referred, Miss Christa Wuertz, has resided in this country for only 3 years. She intends to become a U.S. citizen. Her parents, after a sojourn in this country, have returned to Germany, where they live at present in a town near the Swiss border. This young lady lived as a child in Berlin during the last war, and suffered many hardships.

This little incident goes to prove the value of immigration. A charming attractive young lady who is an immigrant becomes one of the queens of the State of Minnesota.

Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota.

INCREASE IN INTEREST RATES

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, in recent weeks there has been a good deal of discussion of the President's proposed budget for fiscal 1960. To me one of the most distressing features of this budget is the huge amount of money to be spent in interest payments on the public debt. Such payments are expected to increase by $500 million in 1960 over 1959 to a new record high of more than $8 billion.

The basic reason for the tremendous increase in interest payments in recent years has been higher interest rates. In the period from 1953 to 1960 the public debt will have risen an estimated 7 percent, but in this same period interest payments on the public debt will have gone up 23 percent.

I repeat that there is no single item in the entire index of the cost of living or the entire index of our economy which has been subjected to a greater increase in that 7-year period than the rate of interest.

Interest payments in 1953 totaled $6,583 million as compared to an estimated $8,096 million in 1960. Measured percentagewise, interest payments accounted for 8.8 percent of Federal expenditures in 1953 as compared to an estimated 10.5 percent in 1960.

In recent months interest rates have risen sharply to the highest levels in a quarter of a century as a result of the Federal Reserve's tight money policy. The Federal Reserve has applied credit restrictions on the grounds of preventing inflation. It is worthy of note, however, that during the Federal Reserve's tight money policy in the period of 1955 to 1957 we experienced one of the sharpest rises in prices in the history of the country.

There is considerable doubt among a growing number of students of monetary policy as to the effectiveness in combating inflation through the conventional means of credit restrictions, as employed by the Federal Reserve. Many contend that modern-day inflation is not due to excessive availability of credit. It is not a case of too many dollars chasing too few goods—the conventional explanation of mounting prices.

If the Federal Reserve's tight money policy is in fact ineffective in halting inflation, this error is costing the people untold billions each year in added interest payments on both the public and private debt, not to mention the loss suffered as a result of heavy unemployment and economic lag.

It is time, Mr. President, for us to take a hard look at the monetary theories of the administration and the Federal Reserve. I am confident that the Joint Economic Committee under the able chairmanship of the distinguished senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], in the study it is undertaking on the subject of inflation and related matters, will throw new light on the role of monetary policy in controlling prices. It is time that we fully explore new means of dealing with this vexing question.

It seems to me that the people who are writing letters to Members of Congress about the rising cost of Government ought to be directing their letters to the President of the United States and asking him why this administration insists on saddling on the back of the American consumer and taxpayer an ever-increasing cost of interest payments on public and private indebtedness, which is exactly what the administration has been doing during the past 7 years.

There appeared in the February 28 issue of Business Week magazine an excellent editorial dealing with the subject of my remarks today. Commenting on the need to consider new ways of dealing with inflation, the editorial states:

> More and more, it is being recognized that we are not confronted with the orthodox type of inflation which can be controlled by orthodox monetary policy. What we need is some new thinking and bold new action to put the Treasury's house in order.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that this editorial titled "Why the Treasury Is in Trouble," be inserted at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXHIBIT A

WHY THE TREASURY IS IN TROUBLE

The grave situation facing the U.S. Treasury was brought to the public's attention last week when President Eisenhower announced that the administration might have to ask Congress to lift the 4¼ percent ceiling now prevailing on the interest rate on new Government marketable bonds. For the Treasury has been experiencing increasing difficulty in its borrowing despite its willingness to pay attractive rates.

The present crisis has been building since last summer, when the Federal Reserve revealed that it was shifting to a restrictive credit policy to combat inflation.

In times of tight money, the very existence of a ceiling on rates becomes a positive handicap to the Treasury, because rates promptly gravitate toward the limit. The ceiling is an arbitrary restriction that hampers the Treasury's financing task.

But the lifting of the ceiling is no panacea, and under present circumstances, is almost superfluous. With the Federal and Treasury voicing their fears of inflation, few investors are interested in long-term bonds. The amount of funds that the Treasury can raise in the long-term market is always limited, and if rates are raised, it runs the risk of drawing funds that would otherwise be used for housing and capital spending.

There is no simple solution to the Treasury's problem. On one hand, it has no choice but to raise the funds to pay for the programs voted by Congress. On the other, it must raise the money under the handicap of the debt limit and the interest-rate ceiling set by Congress. Thus, when the Fed is pursuing a restrictive policy, it cannot go to market on terms or times of its own choosing.

The result is that the Treasury has had to resort to short-term financings. So far, at least, this route has not been inflationary, because corporations, flush with cash, have bought its obligations. But as business activity increases it is probable that companies will cash in their securities; this means the Treasury will have to sell increasing amounts of short-term issues to the banks, which is inflationary.

It is the position of the Fed and the Treasury that higher interest rates are essential to fight the threat of inflation and safeguard the dollar. They are particularly concerned about foreign fears of a deterioration in the dollar and feel that we must demonstrate our resistance to inflation by wholehearted reliance on orthodox credit controls.

Unfortunately, the record of the last few years gives little assurance that this will work. During the 1955–57 boom, the Fed's general controls over credit did restrict the money supply, but they failed to halt the wage and price spiral. At the same time, rates on long-term bonds practically doubled, but this did not result in a stronger market; on the contrary, the long-term bond market hardly exists.

To repeat this process seems likely to destroy the Government market completely and further weaken confidence in the dollar. Equally important, it threatens to curtail our growth at a time when growth is essential.

Instead of relying on methods that have already been used and found wanting, it would be wise to explore what other means are available. The use of specific controls over credit should be considered; and we must decide what amount of money is required to insure growth without inflation.

This does not entail any diminution in the Fed's power. In fact, it would give new responsibility to monetary management. More and more it is being recognized that we are not confronted with the orthodox type of inflation which can be controlled by orthodox monetary policy. What we need is some clear new thinking and bold new action to put the Treasury's house in order.

THE RISING TIDE OF UNEMPLOYMENT

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the same type of monetary control to which I have referred has been totally ineffective in doing anything to check the rising tide of unemployment. In recent months I have viewed with increasing concern the continuing high level of unemployment. In January, the number of unemployed rose to 4.7 million—the highest jobless figure for that month since 1941. Six percent of our work force can find no jobs.

Particularly disturbing is the fact that the increased production of recent months has not, as was expected, alleviated the unemployment situation. Continued heavy unemployment appears to have two major explanations.

First, the total labor force has been rapidly increasing in recent years, whereas our economic growth has been lagging.

Secondly, our modern-day plants and equipment are capable of turning out more and more goods with fewer and fewer workers.

An excellent article by Sylvia Porter on the unemployment problem appeared in the March 10 edition of the Washington Star.

I invite attention, in particular, to Miss Porter's cure for unemployment:

> More growth to absorb the unemployed and new job seekers.
>
> Which means new industries and more production and consumption of such things as autos, houses, appliances, soft goods, public works, services—in short, more of enough things and nonthings to create jobs for all able, willing and seeking work.

Unfortunately, our economy in the past 3 years has remained virtually stagnant. We have failed to maintain the economic growth which is absolutely necessary if we are to avoid increasingly heavy unemployment.

I am shocked every day when I contemplate a recent expression by a Cabinet officer, who said that the No. 1 danger facing the United States was inflation, indicating, apparently, that in the mind of this administration inflation is an even greater danger than the potential conflagration of war. Apparently, according to this spokesman, it is a danger greater than the Communist military and economic threat. I submit that the thinking of an administration which sees the inflation which it has itself created, as a greater danger than economic stagnation and Communist penetration stamps it as an administration which is hopelessly sterile of ideas, and incapable of giving this country the leadership which is needed. The refusal of the administration to face this fact is, in my opinion, one of its most serious shortcomings. The lag in our economy at this critical time in world history cannot be tolerated.

When I hear the President and others say we must be strong and we must stand firm, as in the Berlin crisis, for example, and when I hear spokesmen of the administration speak of our strength, I ask them to compare the relatively limited growth of our economy with that of our opposition in the Soviet Union.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article by Miss Porter be inserted at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CURE FOR UNEMPLOYMENT

(By Sylvia Porter)

It was a private luncheon and the executive in charge of hiring for one of the Nation's giant corporations was speaking freely:

"Sure, we expect better business and our sales are going up. But while we're producing more than at this time in 1958, we're doing it with—thousands less on the payroll. It's really amazing how much we were able to tighten up on costs in 1957–58 and how handsomely our more efficient plants and machinery are paying off now.

"And I'll tell you this. I'd rather have our employees work a longer week and pay overtime than add one more man than necessary to the payroll. We got such brickbats thrown at us when we had to lay off men last year that I'm going to do everything I can to avoid taking on new ones whom I might have to lay off later and invite the brickbats all over again. It's cheaper to pay the extra expense of overtime than to pay the extra expense of a public relations drive to explain a layoff."

I gulped. "Granted that it makes sense on the balance sheet. But what about the unemployed and the new workers seeking jobs in your area? Don't you feel any responsibility to them? Don't you see yourself benefiting if they have jobs and can buy your products and those of others?"

He didn't gulp. "It is not the responsibility of individual corporations to employ more than we need nor to guarantee full employment at all times. It is my responsibility to my corporation to try for maximum production and for a maximum—although reasonable—profit."

There you have it—a key, straightforward, ungimmicked explanation why unemployment is remaining millions above normal.

And don't kid yourself. The unemployment statistics will continue mighty disheartening at least until well into spring.

Translating the unemployment explanation into simple terms.

1. Corporations have greatly improved their efficiency of operations and they're aggressively pursuing ways to turn out more goods with fewer workers.

2. Many feel that while overtime is expensive, it's cheaper in the short run than training workers who might be only temporary and who, if laid off later, would give the corporation a sour reputation the Nation over.

3. New workers are constantly entering the work force, threatening to swell the jobless ranks.

Today's jobless problem is not a superficial thing. It is a byproduct of the new age of automation. It is a result of the huge investment corporations have made in plant improvements and expansion. It is a reflection of the sharp, although short, 1957–58 recession.

The superficial cures lie in extension of jobless benefits, aid for depressed areas, major relocation efforts. But the basic cure lies in only one thing:

More growth to absorb the unemployed and new jobseekers.

Which means new industries and more production and consumption of such things as autos, houses, appliances, soft goods, public works, services—in short, more of enough things and nonthings to create jobs for all able, willing and seeking work.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I should like to say to the distinguished Senator from Minnesota that I read with great interest the speeches made yesterday by the Senators from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH and Mr. BYRD], dealing with the terrific problem of unemployment in West Virginia. I do not believe it is right for the Senate to adjourn from Monday to Thursday and from Thursday to Monday without something being done for the 289,000 unemployed people of West Virginia. The distinguished Senator from Minnesota will remember that when Floyd Olson was Governor of Minnesota and saw the situation in his State during the early 1930's—and all of us saw similar conditions throughout the Middle West—he took care of the situation. Likewise we took care of the people in our sections, although in the Middle West we did not have the situation which was described by the Senators from West Virginia yesterday, with people actually suffering want and hunger and starvation.

I agree that the administration should take prompt and effective steps. I do not care how they do it. There is, as the Senator from Minnesota knows, a large fund which the President can use in any foreign country in which he wishes to use it. I believe it was originally $100 million, and then it was raised to $200 million. We know about that in the Committee on Foreign Relations. Certainly somewhere in the administration there must be a fund which is available to take care of the unemployed people in West Virginia. I wish to say to the distinguished Senator from Minnesota that the example set by Floyd Olson, when he was Governor, is one which the Senate might well emulate.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I am gratified by the remarks of the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] which forcefully brought to the attention of his colleagues in the Senate the serious economic situation which exists today in the State of West Virginia. I would say to the Senator from North Dakota, and to all Members of the Senate on both sides of the aisle, that West Virginians are concerned about these problems. Our people do not desire handouts from the Federal Government. They believe that the Federal Government should give to them the means by which they can help themselves. That is all they want. They feel that, in the provisions of S. 722, there are afforded methods by which they can move forward.

As an indication of this plight in West Virginia, figures for July 1957 to June 1958, taken from the 21st annual report of the Department of Employment Security of West Virginia, reveal that all major manufacturing industries in the State registered losses in employment during this 12-month period, ranging from 2,400 in chemicals to 3,500 in primary metals.

Included among those reporting losses were food, minus 200; products of petroleum and coal, minus 200; textiles, minus 400; fabricated metals, minus 500; apparel, minus 800; lumber, wood products, furniture, and fixtures, minus 900; machinery, minus 1,900; and stone, clay, and glass, minus 3,300. Printing and publishing ended the fiscal year with employment at the same level as in June 1957. All other manufacturing industries reported combined losses of minus 1,800.

Nonmanufacturing industries in the State reduced employment 30,200 during the June 1957 to June 1958 period. In descending order, losses reported were: Mining, minus 16,200; transportation, communications, and public utilities, minus 8,000; trade, minus 4,000; contract construction, minus 3,100; and finance, insurance, and real estate, minus 100. Gains were limited to services, plus 900, and government, plus 400.

These are some of the figures told in their stark reality: The economic story of some of the finest areas of West Virginia in the richest nation on earth in the era of its so-called greatest and most unprecedented prosperity. But in West Virginia they mean poverty, distress, and humiliation.

If we cannot defeat conditions of such character now—while we stand at the pinnacle of our power as the world's strongest industrial nation—when can we overcome it?

If we cannot cure this economic ailment—this degrading recession within our own borders and cut it out of our economic body—then we fail in precisely those fields of endeavor in which we make our loudest boasts.

In the principles of S. 722—the Area Redevelopment Act—we have answers set down clearly and simply—the specific in economic remedy to a specific economic ailment.

There are few measures that will come before the 1st session of the 86th Congress for which I shall feel so strong a sense of personal support as S. 722. This bill is the fruit of the genius and the dedication largely of the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS]. It bears in its cosponsorship the imprint of my most diligent colleague from West Virginia [Mr. BYRD], and that of other distinguished Senators.

For me this measure has profound meaning because it goes deep to the heart of the American philosophy of government. It has deep meaning because it is sound and businesslike. It has none of the elements of that maudlin do-goodism that characterizes certain Government spending.

If I had to define the bill, of which I, too, am a cosponsor, in some of its major aspects I would call it a program in support of private enterprise and community growth and rehabilitation. It is a way to create wealth—not just to spend it. I would say it is a measure to cut down the inflationary process and promote productivity. It is legislation that does not hand out Government largess but, instead acts in most part in the role of a banker. The Government Treasury is the banker—and the Government Treasury in this case not only expects to have its money repaid under its loan provisions, but insists upon repayment with interest. This is sound.

A section of the bill, to be sure, makes provision for outright grants, as distinguished from interest-bearing loans. And it is this that helps us to recognize that, after all, ours is indeed a government and not a purely financial institution. Thus, the element of human welfare enters into the picture.

In addition to the $300 million the bill provides for interest-bearing loans, $75 million is to be used where needed in terms of grants.

The proposed Area Redevelopment Act has a very special impact on me as a Senator from the State of West Virginia, because our State is particularly hard hit—as the statistics cited bear out—and especially in labor surplus cities and areas.

What does this mean?

It means an area in which there is a labor surplus of 6 percent or more of the work force covered by unemployment insurance. Of course my first concern is for those areas in West Virginia where the blow of economic distress is hard, persistent, and unyielding. But the problem is plainly a national one that has struck 80 major labor market areas in some 25 States. All these 80 major labor market areas had 6 percent or more unemployment, according to the reports of the U.S. Department of Labor. The Department discloses also that there are no less than 188 smaller labor market areas throughout 35 States that also suffered from at least 6 percent unemployment—or more.

The proposed Area Redevelopment Act strikes at the root of the depressed conditions in West Virginia and the other 34 States. It establishes the means for achieving a sound economic cure. It does so by a system of advice, carefully meted-out loans, the reimbursement of Government expenditures, and the levying of a reasonable interest rate in accordance with the Government standards that apply in other forms of Government loans.

S. 722 mobilizes the best brains in Government—long and highly trained experts in their respective fields—and uses their skills and their experience to assure the Government and the people of the United States that the loans are wisely made and will yield the returns to the areas—and to the Government Treasury—that are intended by the terms of the measure itself.

This bill, Mr. President, embodying the ideas of some of the best economic minds of our time, bears in its very method of operation the elements of success. It is a modern piece of legislation—one that is designed to meet modern conditions of recession—and is tailored to handle the problem through skillful and long-term planning. It is not merely Government that is doing the job, but State and local authorities as well, in cooperation with private interests and private enterprise. And the aim is not to help a business as such, but to help an entire community—an area—bounce back and stand tall on its own feet, not the Government's.

I have discussed—through the statistics previously cited, and without embellishment—exactly the conditions in West Virginia which make this must legislation.

It is my belief that this area redevelopment program encompasses Government aid, but in terms that draw into the orbit of the project the distressed community itself—its resources, human and physical; its private enterprise, banking, and manufacturing—and it makes all of these a coordinated and cooperative endeavor. The measure would accomplish these results in terms of modern banking and modern industry, with repayment of Government help. It does what needs to be done within the normal operations of our kind of economy.

It is these qualities of fiduciary and economic soundness and carefully drawn provisions that take into account all the realities of the situation that make the Area Redevelopment Act a compelling and appealing one. It is for this reason that S. 22 is a sensible draft of economic legislation, and it is compelling because it answers a chronic problem of unemployment.

And, Mr. President, unless we are—as a Nation and a Government—calloused beyond all human understanding, we will stop gloating over our economic prosperity until we shall have wiped out these areas of economic decay and bankruptcy inside our own borders. S. 722 would provide the mechanism for the achievement of these objectives.

Let us bring forth and pass this Area Redevelopment Act, and place it to work with a minimum of delay. Let us proceed with the busines of reconstruction and rehabilitation. The senior Senator from Illinois, to whom we owe so much for the economic knowledge and wisdom set forth in this bill, has explained its provisions before the Senate.

It is a measure that is not aimed at a passing situation in the changing picture of the American economy. It is directed toward and as an answer to a chronic, ingrown, imbedded, and impacted economic disease that has taken hold in the areas under question—a disease that is dragging the pall of economic death in its path.

Again I thank the Senator from North Dakota for calling to the attention of our colleagues the impact of unemployment in the State of West Virginia, where we find not only distress and poverty, but a real degree of humiliation as well. This should not exist in a democratic country like the Republic in which we are privileged to share our cooperative responsibilities.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator from North Dakota for his comments relating to my remarks on the administration's fiscal policies and the unemployment situation. It gives me an opportunity to associate myself with the very fine sentiments expressed by the Senator from North Dakota relating to the acute and exceedingly difficult problem in West Virginia which, by the way, is a problem being experienced in other States, including Minnesota, Michigan, Pennsylvania, and Kentucky. It is being experienced also by the miners in Butte, Mont.

What I tried to say before is that it seems rather odd to me now to hear spokesmen of the administration say that the No. 1 threat is inflation, at a time when there are literally thousands of people in State after State who do not have jobs. Unemployment compensation payments are being exhausted. In some States there is even surplus foods in the commodity bins——

Mr. RANDOLPH. Nine billion dollars worth.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Which the Government of the United States apparently cannot get to the people because of administrative difficulties.

We have asked for a food-stamp plan, but the Department of Agriculture says it cannot be provided. We have asked for area redevelopment, about which the Senator from West Virginia has commented. The President vetoed the bill. We will pass a similar bill again, and this time over the veto.

There are ways and means of helping; but we cannot help those who are in need if there are spokesmen for the Government who feel that the primary problem is the problem which they themselves, by their fiscal policies, have created, namely, inflation, and they are unwilling to do anything effective against the real human problem, the serious difficult human problem, of unemployment.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, to the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] I may say that I remember, in the late 1920's and the early 1930's, the terrifying period of the great depression, when legislation was proposed to lend tens of millions of dollars to the homeowners of our country, so that they might keep intact the roofs over their families, that there were those who were opposed to such proposals. They declared the

money would not be repaid. They had little faith in the American people.

But I say to the Senator from Montana who has been generous in yielding time, to the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART], who I hope will have the opportunity to speak in a moment, that home loans were repaid.

Senate bill 722 is an area redevelopment bill. It provides for revolving funds to be channeled to the communities and the people within them. I say to the Senator from North Dakota, especially, that the people of West Virginia are of hardy stock. They want only the opportunity to help themselves. If they are given this aid, they will make certain that the money is repaid to the Government of the United States.

The distinguished junior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. BYRD], who was in this Chamber earlier today, found it necessary to attend a session of the Committee on Banking and Currency, which is at present considering the bill for area redevelopment, so that it may be reported to the Senate for early consideration. I trust that Senators who were not privileged to hear his speech on yesterday, will refer to the RECORD for an evaluation of the compelling remarks he set forth on this problem.

I was greatly heartened by the evident feeling with which the Senator from North Dakota spoke on this matter. Even though he is not so vigorous as he once was physically, he spoke today with a ringing determination. He sought to make certain that this type of proposed legislation shall receive the attention of the Senate, and receive it promptly.

Mr. LANGER. I will give every possible assistance, not only to the Senators from West Virginia and the people of their State, but also to the people of the entire country. I am delighted by the vigorous fight which the two Senators from West Virginia are making to bring this matter to the attention of the entire Nation. I wish them godspeed.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, I think an editorial, entitled "What We Need," published in the Detroit Times of March 9, 1959, is quite in order while we are discussing this subject. The Detroit Times is a newspaper which normally is critical of approaches such as this. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHAT WE NEED

Three events which occurred in Government-industry relationship last week deserve review.

On Monday, Senator DOUGLAS, Democrat of Illinois, staged hearings here on his proposed $383 million Area Redevelopment Act, a proposal to pump Federal loans into areas distressed by continued unemployment.

On Tuesday, the board of assessors of the city of Detroit announced the total assessed valuation of the city dropped $71 million under 1958 levels. It was the second successive year of reduction and was caused primarily by loss of industry.

On Wednesday, the Ford Motor Co. and the Michigan Consolidated Gas Co. simultaneously announced separate expansion programs that will mean a total investment in their Detroit area installations of $69 million.

The hearings staged, and we use the word advisedly, by Senator DOUGLAS, revived last year's State election campaign issue of whether high wages and high taxes in Michigan have created an unhealthy climate for industry here.

The bulk of the testimony came from witnesses Senator Hart, Democrat of Michigan, Governor Williams, Mayor Miriani, and Walter P. Reuther. All heartily endorsed the Douglas measure, as DOUGLAS had expected.

But Senator WALLACE BENNETT, a Republican from Utah and DOUGLAS' colleague on the committee, raised a question whether Michigan did not need first to get its house in order before Federal assistance would be of benefit. Some wee small Republican voices from outstate echoed his sentiments.

Reuther replied that unemployment is a national problem, showed that most of the distressed areas are in the East.

Miriani placed the blame on industrial blight—old factories which must be torn down and replaced with new, efficient ones, if Detroit is to regain high employment and maintain sufficient tax revenues.

The announcement of the decreased assessed valuation was like an exclamation mark after the mayor's testimony.

Announcement of the expansion plans of Ford and Michigan Consolidated seemed further to show that Michigan is a good place to do business.

The series of events aptly, and in rapid-fire succession, dramatize how Detroit and Michigan are being swept by crosscurrents of transition. The winds of politics help fan these crosscurrents.

Primary cause for the dispersion of industry in this area has been decentralization and automation in the automotive industry.

This is the basic reason Michigan has not recovered as quickly as some other States from the effects of the recent recession.

There is an element of truth in the charges that high wages and high taxes may discourage new industry from locating here.

There is an element of truth also in the contention that industry had had to disband some of the old Detroit factories because they are obsolete.

But no single source ever seems to tell the whole story. And no one seems to have enough wisdom to get the entire matter into perspective.

From the testimony submitted to the Douglas committee, however, it should be clear that Detroit and many upstate cities could utilize to advantage the provisions of the Douglas bill.

It would provide loans to private industrial firms for building new plants and loans to local units of government for building such facilities as water lines, and roads to service these plants. The money would be repaid to the Federal Government.

As Mayor Miriani pointed out, the bill would help rejuvenate industry here.

It should be made clear that the Douglas bill does not provide outright grants to cities or anyone else either for slum clearance or for building new plants.

The slum clearance grants are included in other legislation labeled urban renewal, also currently under consideration in the Senate.

Money from the Douglas bill could be utilized by the new industries expected to locate here once old factories have been torn down and the land made available by the city.

Detroit badly needs both the urban renewal legislation and the Douglas bill if it is to stave off industrial decay.

FARM SUBSIDIES

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, on February 23, on February 26, and again on March 2, I placed into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD statistics obtained from the Department of Agriculture showing that under our present agricultural laws major benefits of the price-support program are going to the large corporate-type farmer and that our present agricultural program is definitely not in the best interest of, and of very little benefit to, the bona fide American family-type farm.

I placed into the RECORD a long list of names of corporations and individuals who in 1957 had received in excess of $100,000 in price-support loans as support of the production of cotton, rice, wheat, and corn.

Also, on February 26, I pointed out that 10 companies had in 1957 received nearly $3½ million in Government loans in support of the cotton, rice, and wheat which they produced while during the same year this same group of companies received from another Government agency over one-half million dollars as payments for crops they agreed not to produce.

There are those who have tried to claim that the Government does not lose money but in effect makes money on the price-support loans because they are always paid off. Certainly they are paid off, because in granting the loan the Government agrees to take as collateral for full payment of the loan that agricultural crop against which the loan is made. If the market is low the farmer merely lets the Government take the commodity as full payment, and the loan is marked "paid in full."

That is where we have gotten our $9 billion inventory which is now in Government-rented warehouses. On some of these loans the Government, through other agencies, has inaugurated extensive buying programs of the commodities for the intended purpose of exporting these commodities out of the country at sacrifice prices in order to peg the domestic market at a high level. That is what has happened in cotton.

The Government supports the production of cotton in the United States through the Commodity Credit Corporation, and this is done by granting loans to the farmers with the cotton as collateral. In each instance the loan is granted for the full value of the cotton at the support price. Then, under Public Law 480, another Government agency, operated within the Department of Agriculture, buys this cotton and exports it at sacrifice prices.

For instance, in the case of cotton in the past 3 years the Government has under this program purchased 16,100,000 bales and then exported this cotton at a direct loss to the American taxpayers of $835 million; that is an average of $22.30 loss to the American taxpayers for every bale of cotton which has been produced in America during the past 3 years, and still in face of this $835 million loss on cotton alone, some of the Congressmen representing these large corporation farmers have the audacity to

issue statements claiming the Government is making money on this cockeyed operation.

Only yesterday two California New Dealers in the House issued a statement making this ridiculous claim and headlined their remarks with the charge that WILLIAMS is wrong on the cotton loan statements. I quote their remarks as carried by the wire service:

WILLIAMS named four central California corporations as having received price supports amounting to $1,857,677 in 1957–58.

On February 23 as appearing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of that date I did name four California corporations receiving exactly that amount—plus 14 cents—and not even they contradict the accuracy of my figures.

Those loans were as follows:

Westlake Farms, Inc., Stratford, Calif., 5,611 bales cotton	$854,450.67
W. J. Dean, Mendota, Calif., 2,419 bales cotton	370,040.84
Frank and Jim Garona, Bakersfield, Calif., 2,387 bales cotton	350,290.43
Waldo W. Weeth, Coalinga, Calif., 1,898 bales cotton	282,895.20
Total	1,857,677.14

Taking into consideration the taxpayers' average loss of $22.30 per bale on all cotton produced during the last 3 years, it means that the actual loss sustained on the operation of these four California companies alone in 1957 was $274,624.50. The taxpayers' loss on the five California companies listed in my earlier report would on the same basis be $321,967.40 plus the $180,470.58 which two of them received in soil bank payments.

Those are official figures, and they stand unchallenged. The Secretary of Agriculture in a press release has also confirmed the accuracy of this report. Furthermore, the Representatives themselves have accepted the same figures although in an effort to muddy the water they try to pretend they are making a defense by claiming that they are pointing out some errors.

I also call the attention of these Representatives to the fact that one of their particular pets, the Westlake Farms, Inc., Stratford, Calif., not only received price support loans of $854,450.67 on 5,611 bales of cotton produced by them in 1957 but also collected from the U.S. Government $125,942.50 in a direct subsidy check during the same year for agreeing not to grow cotton on another 1,223.9 acres which they owned or controlled. This is one of the "little farmers" these California Representatives are trying to defend and about whom they are shedding their crocodile tears.

As a comparison with what this "little California farmer" gets, I call their attention to the fact that in the year 1957, when the Westlake Farm, Inc., received $854,450.67 in price-support loans on cotton produced, that amount represented more money than was received in crop-support loans by all of the farmers in the States of Pennsylvania and Delaware, combined, on all of the crops which they produced during the same year.

In 1957, Delaware farmers received a total in price-support loans of $69,618.00, while Pennsylvania farmers received a total of $783,353.00.

Furthermore, the $800 million which the American taxpayers have lost in supporting the price of cotton alone during the past 3 years means that the taxpayers in my own State of Delaware, which pays 1 percent of all of the taxes collected in the United States, paid a total of $8 million as their part in supporting these cotton farmers.

The $5 billion loss which the Federal Government is estimated to be taking in the current fiscal year on all of its price-support operations means that the taxpayers in my State will be required to pay into the Federal Treasury $50 million as their proportionate part in sustaining this high-support program. Why should the taxpayers of my State spend $50 million in 1 year to support these large corporation farmers throughout the United States, when the small farmers in my own State—dairy farmers, poultry growers, as well as farmers producing other crops—are all having a desperate time to make a living?

Mr. President, Congress should long ago have repealed the high, rigid price-supports program, and should have adopted a more flexible program, as has been advocated by the Secretary of Agriculture.

I ask unanimous consent to have incorporated in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, an additional list of large California farmers who in 1957 received subsidy checks in excess of $50,000 as payment for crops they agreed not to produce. Five other California companies, who had received in excess of $100,000 in soil-bank payments, were listed in the RECORD on February 26, 1959.

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Name and address	Acres	Commodity	Dollar amount
Jackson & Reinert, Paso Robles, Calif.	3,086.0	Wheat	$97,209.00
Hammonds Ranch, Inc., Firebaugh, Calif.	928.4	Wheat and cotton	95,535.64
Newhall Land & Farming Co., Firebaugh, Calif.	870.5	Cotton and rice	83,903.50
Raymond Thomas, Inc., Five Points, Calif.	395.5	Cotton	66,839.50
The Garin Co., Firebaugh, Calif.	625.4	Wheat and cotton	66,460.92
Peres, Nickel & Pfitzer, Los Banos, Calif.	792.8	Rice and cotton	62,998.80
Broadview Farms, Firebaugh, Calif.	537.0	Cotton	60,681.00
William E. Glotz, Tranquillity, Calif.	480.9	Cotton and rice	55,073.20
Heidrick Bros., Woodland, Calif.	972.5	Wheat and rice	54,528.08
Layton Knaggs, Woodland, Calif.	788.2	Rice	54,388.47
Redfern Ranches, Dos Palos, Calif.	829.0	Rice and wheat	51,480.50
R. J. Roesling Co., San Francisco, Calif.	389.5	Cotton	51,024.50

PEACE THROUGH LAW

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, at the meeting of the Fellows of the American Bar Foundation in Chicago on February 21, 1959, Mr. Henry R. Luce, publisher of Time, Life, and Fortune, gave a most interesting, challenging address, directed to the attainment of peace through law.

I should like to read a few excerpts from Mr. Luce's address, which I believe should be given wider circulation:

Can the West produce a political idea * * * ? That was, and is, the question. Can we answer it by saying "Yes * * * our idea is liberty under law"? That is the political idea of the West. In fact, there is no other. And we need no other. We need only to enter fully into the idea and, with reverent attention, let the idea enter fully into us. "Liberty under law" is the idea which for 2000 years has been elaborated in theory. In a few times and places, notably in America, liberty under law has been significantly realized in practice, thanks to the deeds of Founding Fathers and of other heroes and to the devotion of honest men in all walks of life. * * *

Our unanimous purpose has been to establish a just and durable peace. To that end, we have fought wars. We have spent hundreds of billions of dollars on horrifying weapons. We have given away billions of dollars. We have contracted innumerable military alliances. We have agitated ourselves with debate and doubt. We have propagandized and we have even prayed—but in all this massive material and moral effort we have hardly ever used the word "law"—except in pious parentheses.

* * * * *

President Eisenhower, in his state of the Union message this year, made the advancement of the rule of law the significant new emphasis of his world policy. Secretary Dulles devoted himself exclusively to this subject in the last speech he made before going to the hospital. We pray for his return to full activity and to this decisive theme. Under his guidance, proposals for making more sense out of the U.N. Court will presently go to Congress. Such are the results on the visible stage of high policy.

* * * * *

The way for this crusade has been prepared by many dedicated groups, notably for example by the International Commission of Jurists.

Everywhere in the welter of world politics, there grows the belief that civilization depends on the strength and the power of the law. * * *

May I just stress the importance of the intellectual leadership which is being displayed by various types of law institutes recently established at Cornell, at Harvard, at Duke, at Stanford and at other centers of light and leading.

* * * * *

We are on the march, but we must keep up the momentum. We need more volunteers, stronger leaders—in public life, in intellectual labors, throughout the Nation generally and especially in the legal profession itself. If we lose momentum now, we may never regain it until the world entire is engulfed in such a moral catastrophe that those who survive physically may scarcely deem themselves fortunate.

Mr. President, rather than take up the time of the Senate to read further sections of the address—I ask unanimous consent that the address be printed in the RECORD, following my remarks.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE WAY OF THE LAW

(Address by Henry R. Luce)

Last year at Atlanta it was your good pleasure to have as your speaker Lord Hail-

sham. I think he won't mind if I call him the managing director of the Conservative Party of Great Britain. In words of authentic eloquence, he addressed himself to the question of the future organization of the world. To this question, he said, the East, the Communist East, has an answer "but that answer is a conspiracy against human freedom." Has the West got an answer? In Lord Hailsham's words: "Can the West produce a political idea less offensive than imperialism, less anarchic than the petty nationalism which has brought war and ruin wherever it has been tried—an idea not negative, but positive, an idea dynamic for peace which neither sacrifices justice nor provokes aggression."

Then, turning to the mountains of vision, Lord Hailsham prophesied:

"I see a world where freedom under law is the rule and not the exception for mankind. In that world the sums now spent on arms are devoted to education and research, to the elimination of disease, to the rescue of deserts from the sand * * * and to the enjoyment of the good things of life by the suffering millions of mankind."

Thus prophesied our brilliant friend from Westminster. And I am sure you were impressed by the ardent faith of this practical politician. Would that we had more such politicians here—and everywhere.

Lord Hailsham's eloquence was devoted, in the main, to putting the signature of his conviction to his vision. He did not have much to say about how it is to be achieved. That is the task to which I set myself tonight. If my task is pedestrian, I enter into it nevertheless with enthusiasm. For this reason: The project of bringing about the rule of law on earth, this tremendous project is on the road. Men are at work. Step by step we approach the foothills of those mountains of vision.

"Can the West produce a political idea?" That was, and is, the question. Can we answer it by saying "Yes * * * our idea is liberty under law"? That is the political idea of the West. In fact, there is no other. And we need no other. We need only to enter fully into the idea and, with reverent attention, let the idea enter fully into us. Liberty under law is the idea which for 2,000 years has been elaborated in theory. In a few times and places, notably in America, liberty under law has been significantly realized in practice, thanks to the deeds of Founding Fathers and of other heroes and to the devotion of honest men in all walks of life. Why is it, then, that we have heard so little of it in these past 30 years?

Our unanimous purpose has been to establish a just and durable peace. To that end, we have fought wars. We have spent hundreds of billions of dollars on horrifying weapons. We have given away billions of dollars. We have contracted innumerable military alliances. We have agitated ourselves with debate and doubt. We have propagandized and we have even prayed—but in all this massive material and moral effort we have hardly ever used the word "law"—except in pious parentheses. Why? I ask the question not to answer it for to do so would require a monumental review of modern history. I raise the question just to remind you of the conspicuous absence of the word "law" in all our busyness. Somewhere in the answer would be the moral breakdown of the West, the descent of the West into philosophical confusion. On the one hand, spectacular achievement in science and economics; on the other hand more and more intellectual confusion leading to political impotence—there is the good and the bad of a brilliant era.

Can we say that now at last we of the West have begun to work our passage back out of tragic confusion to reasonable and reasoned hope? I think we can. Can we say that the West is producing an idea? I think we can.

And I should like to sketch, in a few simple human terms as I see it, the story of how it happens that in 1959 the advancement of the rule of law is becoming once again the sign under which the West survives and conquers. The story, as I see it, began in the summer of 1957 at the meeting of the American Bar Association—in London, largely planned by your president, David Maxwell. London. What more symbolic and providential place for the story to begin. There, a few miles from the Runnymede of Magna Carta, there in Westminster, hometown of the mother of Parliaments, there where all about you have grown the oaks from the acorns of the common law—where else could the idea of liberty under law more fittingly have rebirth? There was the place. And the activating force had to be the power of the United States of America. But this time, in the summer of 1957, that power was represented not by atomic warheads, not by dollars; this time the power of America was represented by American lawyers and by American judges who, in turn, represent and are the technicians and the trustees of America's ultimate dedication to liberty under law.

It happened that at that time a man, then little known, became the president of the American Bar Association. Taking up the spirit of your London meeting, Mr. Charles Rhyne returned to this country to make the advancement of the rule of law the chief business of his term. In a year and a half the consequences have been—let us not exaggerate—they have been considerable. President Eisenhower, in his state of the Union message this year, made the advancement of the rule of law the significant new emphasis of his world policy. Secretary Dulles devoted himself exclusively to this subject in the last speech he made before going to the hospital. We pray for his return to full activity and to this decisive theme. Under his guidance, proposals for making more sense out of the U.N. Court will presently go to Congress. Such are the results on the visible stage of high policy. But behind these results one sees the gathering of the clan of the warriors for the law. Volunteers and recruits are to be found at every level, among the best legal thinkers and in the smallest bar association.

The way for this crusade has been prepared by many dedicated groups, notably for example by the International Commission of Jurists. In 1955 their Act of Athens gave perfect utterance to our immortal theme. And only last month their conference of lawyers of 53 nations in New Delhi, India, testified to what may be the most hopeful single fact of our time—namely that leaders in 50 Asian and African countries realize no less than we do—or more—that whereas the peace of the world depends upon the establishment of law between nations, that in turn depends upon the deepening and strengthening of the sense of law within nations. Everywhere in the welter of world politics, there grows the belief that civilization depends on the strength and the power of the law.

To enumerate all that is going on concurrently in this country would take me far into the night. May I just stress the importance of the intellectual leadership which is being displayed by various types of law institutes recently established at Cornell, at Harvard, at Duke, at Stanford and at other centers of light and leading. At Cornell, Professor Schlesinger heads up a 10-year project in comparative law. Seeing him the other day, I was immensely encouraged by his assurance that there are basic principles of law which can command assent in all the countries of the free world—and even beyond.

All this is what I mean by saying that once again the West is getting hold of its one great idea.

We are on the march, but we must keep up the momentum. We need more volunteers, stronger leaders—in public life, in intellectual labors, throughout the Nation generally and especially in the legal profession itself. If we lose momentum now, we may never regain it until the world entire is engulfed in such a moral catastrophe that those who survive physically may scarcely deem themselves fortunate.

Our purpose is nothing less than at last to make the world the lawful habitation of mankind. Tonight, let me speak of this formidable task under three heads. First, there is the philosophical. Second, there is the political—the development of political leadership in this country together with the winning of public consent through understanding. Third, there is the technical or operational—the immense amount of highly expert work that has to be done—mainly of course by lawyers. Under each of these heads I shall attempt to make only one or two points.

First, then, as to philosophy. The question to be answered by philosophy is whether, on the one hand, law is only what anybody wants to make it, only an accidental product of irrational forces. Or whether, on the other hand, law reflects and must seek to reflect a structure of justice established by the Creator of all things for the right relation of man to man and nation to nation. Only if the second answer is correct, only then does it make any sense to speak of general principles, and only if there are some general principles to which all men everywhere may give their consent, only then is there any hope of peace through law.

For many decades, American law schools, American legal thinking and American lawyers have refused to be interested in this basic question. Thus when a few years ago I began to study the possibilities of peace through law, I came across an article in the Columbia Law Review by Prof. Thomas A. Cowan. Its opening sentence read as follows:

"The most striking observation which occurs to one reporting on the philosophy of law in the United States is that the subject matter of the report seems not to exist."

Surely a sorrowful indictment! Was this the final and most ugly American know-nothingism? America at the height of her military and economic power—and intellectually aimless, having neither chart nor compass nor rudder nor star to steer by.

Professor Cowan's report continued:

"To the foreigner, American philosophers, apparently spurning all philosophical traditions, seem to be characterizable under only one all-inclusive 'ism,' namely, anarchism."

Obviously this country cannot contribute to the peaceful ordering of the world if its own mind—and soul—is in a state of anarchy.

There was much to support this darkly pessimistic view—both what is called American anti-intellectualism and the fashion of American intellectuals themselves to distrust and/or disavow all or any general principles whatsoever.

Fortunately for us the tide has turned. It was predictable that we would come out of the hog wallow of know-nothingism or positivism. In the field of law or jurisprudence, the reason for faith was stated by Prof. Harold Berman some years ago. From him I learned that in times of crisis, Anglo-American law can be expected to rise to the challenge of ultimate greatness. He said:

"In times of relative stability it is customary to forget that the attempt to grasp and comprehend the totality, and to see particulars in relation to that totality, is in fact part of the Anglo-American legal tradition. It is that part which is reserved for crisis."

Well, thought I, we sure are in a crisis. So, if Berman is right, we can expect Anglo-American law to rise to the challenge.

And sure enough it has—or is beginning to. In my recent consultation of the authorities, I came across, for example, Prof. Jerome Hall in the Virginia Law Review. He is saying:

"The most striking fact about current developments is the rise of natural law philosophies almost everywhere."

Almost everywhere. There is the shining sun of hope upon our future. Almost everywhere. In America, throughout the West, including Latin America and notably also in Japan.

Now I would like to say just a word—a very amateurish word—about natural law. The classic phrase "natural law" is a stumbling block for many thoughtful people. For others it has most satisfying meanings, reflecting that structure of justice of which I have spoken.

But note that Professor Hall speaks of natural law philosophies—plural. I suggest that there is, indeed, one universal natural law to which human beings are and ought to be conformable. But I further suggest that the one and the same natural law is made equally evident by starting from two different emphases. The one emphasis is justice or order. That was the emphasis of classical Rome and of the Middle Ages. The other emphasis is freedom. That has been the American emphasis. Starting with order, you arrive, under Christian inspiration, at the human necessity of freedom. Starting with freedom, you arrive at the social need for order—or in our tradition what we call liberty under law.

I would hope that in the next few years our thinkers would achieve a powerful synthesis of these two approaches to a knowledge of the natural law.

The object, for ourselves and for the world, is to achieve "that liberty which without order is a delusion and that order which without liberty is a snare."

The American word is "liberty." In American thought and feeling the rights of man are not derivable from physical nature nor from any absurd Rousseau-ian theory of noble savage or social compact. The rights of man are derived from his Creator—

> "Our fathers' God, to Thee
> Author of liberty,
> To Thee, we sing.
> Long may our land be bright
> With freedom's holy light."

But the American word is also liberty under law. In American tradition, we have more naturally spoken of the moral law than of the natural law—not the same things, but closely related. It is typical Emerson to say: "The moral law is at the center of the universe and radiates to its circumference." And so also our greatest men from George Washington and Chief Justice Marshall to President Eisenhower have spoken of the moral law, or the higher law, by the light of which the Constitution is to be interpreted.

Finally, there is one more thing to say about the manmade law that serves the moral or natural law. The law is not to be conceived of as something static. The law is to provide for change—change in the direction of greater justice as the vision of justice is continually being revealed to men in ever-larger terms. A Matthew Arnold defined God as "a power, not ourselves, which makes for righteousness," so we ought to conceive of justice not as something which we have invented. We must conceive of justice as something established prior to us, in the beginning, and also as something which stands out beyond us, in whose work we are privileged to participate.

With this kind of concept of justice and of law, we can find confidence in our own minds. We will overcome the intellectual anarchy which has weakened us. And we can go forth, both humbly and confidently, to speak to other men everywhere, inviting them, praying them to reason together, to discern the general principles which all men may hold in common and thus to proceed to make the world the lawful habitation of mankind.

I have been speaking of "we." But who do we mean by "we"? It is my thesis that the advancement of the rule of law should be the major objective of the American Nation. This leads me, then, from the philosophical to the political. How shall the resources of this Nation be centered on the advancement of the rule of law? Obviously that requires political leadership, which is to say actual politicians, flesh-and-blood politicians, who will make this cause their own.

Ideas have consequences. The role of the politician is to be the executor of an idea. But he cannot execute an idea until the idea has been born, or in this case, reborn and made clear. That is why I have spoken first of the intellectual task. Ideas have consequences—and we also say: Nothing is so powerful as an idea whose time has come. Can we say that the time has indeed come to make the rule of law the dominant force in the world? I think we can for two reasons: First, because the philosophy of law is gaining in health and strength; and second, because it finds acceptance among leaders of many nations. Thus serious thought has prepared the way for the politician. But the politician has a right to ask something else—he has the right to ask that there be a degree of readiness in the voting public to follow his leadership. Here is our difficulty now: how to get any great part of the public to get interested in, to get urgent about the rule of law. This is a tough one.

I speak now not only as a concerned citizen, but as a practicing editor. The doubts that rush to one's mind are sharp—striking deep to the roots of our life as a people. Is it idle fantasy to imagine summoning serious popular interest in so seemingly abstract an ideal as the rule of law? Is it just too much, and too naive, in a democracy—with all its intellectually leveling processes—to expect a stirring of concern (let alone a surge of zeal) for such an ideal by the hypothetical Mr. Average Citizen?

Well, perhaps brashly, I say "no" and "false" to these pessimistic propositions. And I say in retort: "It is not the law or rule of law that is the abstract concept. It is the concept of the average citizen that is the deceptive abstraction."

Let me explain—first about this citizen, then about the law.

It is widely asserted that this American citizen lives in a society that lacks high purpose and spiritual vigor. We all have been hearing—a lot of late—the adjectives of lament or scorn applied to our society. Our society is vacuous. It is anti-intellectual. It is mediocre. It is indulgent and egocentric. It is, in short, a society, fat with affluence, but pitifully thin in spirit and will and wisdom. And so, what could one expect of the average citizen—its typical human product?

I concede some fragments of truth in this grim picture. In many areas of our national life—from the schoolroom to the TV screen—we have a surfeit of the shallow and the banal. But these, in my reckoning, are the frivolities of a characteristically serious and reflective people—serious in purpose, reflective upon their responsibilities to themselves, to other nations, and even to future generations. We love our country. We know as well as love the ideals of liberty that stirred at our birth as a Nation, that have strived even after through our life as a united people. We know that only sustained struggle can carry its ideals into the future—investing that future with promise and meaning. And this is crucial; for the American wants, indeed longs for, nothing so much as to know that his life as an American has meaning and purpose.

If this be true, as I believe, then we can believe one thing more: the American people need the vision of a just cause to summon them to action. Not just any cause, not even just any just cause, but a cause that is right and proper and true for America.

What is the name of this cause—and what is its substance? Peace? Maybe; but peace on what terms, based on what principles, sustained by what purposes? Freedom? Sure—but freedom fortified by what strength, guarded by what rule and authority?

The answer—I submit—is not obscure. The answer is: Peace through law—and freedom under law. For surely without law, there can be neither peace nor freedom. And what is a more meaningful, a more authentic, definition of a just cause than—law?

This, then, is no mere academic abstraction. It can be the heart and nerve of our national purpose. It is practical. And it is pertinent.

Let me suggest some proof of these assertions. I submit a piece or two of evidence—what properly can be called highly material testimony—drawn from the plainest facts of mid-20th century life.

First. As a Nation, we confront no more crucial task than that of relating our spiritual and our material values. Put it differently: our task is to translate our highest values into the lower language of action and policy. This act of translation is performed by law. For law functions on that middle ground between the spiritual and the material. For law is principle applied to fact. And thus it can be the true catalyst of our national purpose throughout the world as well as at home.

Second. The people of the world feel—and feel deeply—that today's sinister balance of power, this peace-by-mutual-terror in which we live, is a dead end. Literally, a dead end. And what question is more urgently asked—from New York to New Delhi, from Akron to Accra—than: Is there no way out?

The rudely realistic answer, of course, is: No there is no way out. The invention of the most horrible weapons of destruction is that fateful aspect of human ingenuity which is irreversible. The secrets unlocked can never be sealed again.

But if there is no way out, there must be something else: A way forward. This must be a way that leads toward mastery and control, in the name of justice and liberty, over the new forces unleashed by science.

This is the way of the law.

And therefore I believe that political leaders—of all ranks, of perhaps all nations—have a rare opportunity. To these leaders, we can rightly and reasonably say: Study our proposition. Scan the promise that lies in these simple words: the rule of law. Place this promise on your political banners. Let the people see that you believe. And they will believe—in it, and in you. They will follow. For you will have given them hope—and reason to hope.

Mr. Arthur Larson, who has recently left the White House to set up the World Rule of Law Center, with President Eisenhower's blessing, at Duke University, says that people come to him saying, "I think what you are going to do is one of the most exciting things I ever heard of—but exactly what is it?"

People seem to understand an atomic warhead better than they do the rule of law. But they would like to understand the rule of law because there, they intuit, they may

find some tidings of comfort and of joy, which they certainly do not find in atomic warheads.

What then is it, this rule of law? It is, as we have noted, a fundamental concept of political philosophy. It is also a multitude of concrete acts and instances—concrete laws and legal arrangements made and to be made, tested and to be tested, sustained and to be sustained.

So we come to the third aspect of the subject which I venture to touch on tonight, namely the fact that there is an immense amount of actual legal work to be done, right now, and mainly, of course, by lawyers. And let me add, emphatically, in most cases for a proper fee. We are not talking about part-time do-goodism; we are talking about doing the world's work, full time, with the highest professional competence.

The work needs to be done for its own sake, for the weaving of the fabric of law. But it is equally important for the sake of public understanding: Every step taken to put some part of international affairs under law is a demonstration to the public of the uses of the law.

Examples of legal work to be done could be drawn from literally every field of human activity—from outer space to internal medicine. I will choose two large examples—one, in the field of world business, the other in international politics.

As to the economic organization of the world, we have long been involved in foreign aid and will continue to be. But for years some of us have been saying that far, far more important than any amount of handouts would be a stern, no-fooling effort to establish adequate rules for international investment and trade. Have our words been lost in the wind? They seemed to be—but now, here too, the power of a right idea makes its way. Our recent eminent visitor from South America, President Frondizi of the Argentine, tells us with enthusiasm that the future of the Argentine's economy is based on respect for law. And now, most importantly of all, there lies on the agenda of international affairs a really fundamental proposal worked out by the No. 1 banker of Germany, Mr. Hermann Abs. Mr. Abs calls his proposal a Magna Carta for trade and investment throughout the world. Every enlightened American corporation should back that Magna Carta—whether or not it is engaged in foreign trade. Corporations need the advice and the prodding of their lawyers to see the profound importance of the Abs proposal. For at stake there is the prosperity of the world—and our prosperity. At stake there is the future of free enterprise—at home no less than abroad. At stake there may even be the peace of the world, since nothing could so vitalize the rule of law as to have it extended to all business transactions everywhere on earth. This would give to millions of people the habit of abiding by the law, of trusting in the law, and of prospering in the trust and confidence which only the law can give. The law seen both as the tremendous first principle, and the law seen also as the moderator of daily life.

In the field of international politics, the example I would take is arbitration agreements. All during the 19th century there was a steady advance in the use of arbitration. In fact, American use of this technique began with the founding of this country. You will remember that in 1794 the Jay Treaty between Great Britain and the United States provided for the arbitration of certain issues arising at the end of the Revolutionary War, including the boundary between Maine and Nova Scotia. The negotiations were successful and the results were accepted. In the 100 years that followed, a total of 177 disputes between nations were resolved by arbitration and the United States was involved in 79 of them. And remember, all this was done without any supranational policeman with a big club.

The high tide of faith in arbitration as a means of having peace with justice was probably marked by the Hague Conference of 1907—about the time Andrew Carnegie set up his Peace Foundation with every expectation that war would be abolished, long before now. But then came the breakdown of the West in 1914—and since then one has heard less and less of arbitration. The reason was, in part, a basic loss of faith that nations and governments would keep their word. Pacta sunt servanda—agreements must be kept. The way to restore faith in good faith is to make more agreements, to make them carefully, and to keep them.

But arbitration agreements are only a part of the fabric of lawfulness throughout the world. The fabric can be even more strongly woven by developing regional courts. Why not, for example, a court with a developing body of law to settle all disputes, without exception, in the Western Hemisphere? A marvelous thing for the New World and a splendid example to the Old.

Meanwhile, there is the World Court of the United Nations—the most unused court in history. As President Eisenhower indicated in his message, we cannot proceed to advance the rule of law until we do our part to make that Court a little more useful than it is. That means that the Connally amendment must be repealed. Since that amendment bears the name of a beloved Texas Senator, I think we should call upon the members of the Texas bar to make it their special job, with all respect to Old Tom, to amend that amendment.

The agenda, of which I have merely suggested a very few examples, is vast. If it is to be mainly your work, how will it relate to mine? As an editor, I have reason to know that the American people's appetite for facts is ravenous. But I also know—and the people know—that facts by themselves, facts in their "innumerable swarmings," are meaningless. Facts about the world, facts about the contemporary United States, facts about our Nation's activities in the world, become significant only as they are attached to a theme, a line of effort, a vision of the truth. As an editor presenting the news of America and the world, I need a clear theme. And so does the reader. So do we all—all the people.

But the theme cannot be contrived. It must be deeper far than propaganda. It must be found actually running through the operations of our society and its government. I think the theme now lies half-hidden, half-visible in the actual American experience. We may agree with those who point out that the American destiny has been largely shaped by the particulars of place and time; that much of our experience as a nation and many details of our way of life are peculiar to us—and will remain so. But the essentials of the American experience can be communicated. First of all, we must understand them more clearly ourselves in order to communicate them to the world.

More than ever, and on the broadest scale, the appropriate theme for America is "Liberty under Law"—and this is our opportunity to work in the world. It is this theme, developed from its highest moral principles down to its most practical aspects, that can define the role that the United States must play in the world. And it can restore to us all an ample sense of the meaning and purpose of life in America, in the world, from day to day—and into the farthest reaches of vision and prophecy.

STATEHOOD FOR HAWAII

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 50) to provide for the admission of the State of Hawaii into the Union.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, as chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, I have the honor of making the opening remarks in this Chamber on Senate bill 50, a bill to admit the populous and prosperous Territory of Hawaii into our Union as a full and equal sovereign State. My remarks on this historic occasion will be brief and general; the details of the bill will be presented by the distinguished and able junior Senator from the State of Washington [Mr. JACKSON], the chairman of the Subcommittee on Territories, which conducted the hearings and reported the measure to this body.

Mr. President, the admission of a new State into our Union of States is always a historic occasion. It is an epoch-making event both for the people of the area admitted to full partnership in the Union and also for the country itself. The growth of our Republic has been accompanied by a corresponding growth in our prosperity and economic strength and in many ways the successive admission of new States has symbolized our rise to power and riches as a nation.

AUTHORITY OF CONGRESS UNDER CONSTITUTION

On March 4, 1791—almost 168 years ago to the day—the United States of America was a little band of 13 States hugging the eastern seaboard of the Atlantic. On that historic date the State of Vermont was "received and admitted into the Union as a new and entire member thereof," in the words of the statute admitting Vermont to the Union. Authority for this action of the First Congress is found in article IV, section 3, of the Constitution, which provides in simple, straightforward language:

> New States may be admitted by the Congress into this Union.

The most recent occasion on which this constitutional authority was exercised was last year, when on June 30, 1958, H.R. 7999, the bill to admit Alaska as a State, was approved by this body by a vote of 64 to 20. What a splendid record of achievement and national strength and vigor has marked that span of 167 years between the admission of Vermont in 1791 and Alaska in 1958.

During those 167 years the authority conferred by the quoted section of the Constitution has been exercised by this body on 31 different occasions by providing for the admission of the 36 States which have become a part of the Union on a "free and equal footing" with the Original Thirteen.

PATTERN FOR ADMISSION OF NEW STATES

The pattern for the admission of new States, generally speaking, was established in the famed Northwest Ordinance by the Continental Congress in 1787. The Northwest Ordinance was the statute for the government of the vast area west of the Allegheny Mountains and north of the Ohio River. From this Territory the five States of Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Wisconsin, and Michigan were created.

Under this pattern, the Territory was first of all incorporated into the Union. That is, the Constitution of the United States was extended to it, and the area thereby legally and politically became a

part of the Union. As soon as a part of the area had sufficient population to support statehood—the original requirement was but 60,000—and the inhabitants gave evidence of their desire for statehood, an enabling act was passed by Congress, which prescribed a procedure for the organization of a State government and certain standards for and conditions of statehood. When these steps had been taken and the requirements met, States were admitted into the Union on a free and equal basis with the Thirteen Original States.

A slight variation in the above pattern has occurred in certain instances when the people of a Territory have gone ahead on their own initiative and held a constitutional convention, drafted a constitution, and submitted it to the people without waiting for the Federal Congress to authorize them to do so. The constitution would then be submitted to the Congress, and if approved, the State would be admitted by the enactment of an Admission Act by Congress. Seven States have entered the Union through this procedure by taking the initiative themselves, namely, Arkansas, California, Florida, Idaho, Maine, Oregon, and Wyoming.

ACTION BY PEOPLE OF HAWAII

I mention this variation of the pattern because Hawaii has followed the precedent of those States and has held its constitutional convention and drafted its own proposed State constitution. The proposed State constitution of Hawaii is before us at this time, it is printed in the committee's report on S. 50, and I wish to call the attention of the Members of the Senate to it. It gives us a preview, so to speak, of the kind of State we would be admitting.

However, regardless of whether the people of a Territory waited for the passage of an enabling act by Congress or acted on their own initiative, the end result, namely, statehood, has been the same for each of the incorporated Territories. Hawaii is the only incorporated Territory which has not yet achieved statehood. The greatness of our Union and the strength of each of the 36 subsequently admitted States today is manifest proof of the success of the policy with respect to incorporated Territories which the Continental Congress established 172 years ago.

In no instance has statehood failed. With the admission of each of the 36 States, the people in the established States have benefited as well as have the people of the new State.

ADMISSION OF HAWAII IN HISTORIC TRADITION

Mr. President, today we begin debate on a bill that is within this historic tradition and pattern under which we have grown great. For Hawaii qualifies under each and every one of the historic concepts that we have evolved in the 37 previous actions this body has taken in admitting new States. Hawaii is the only area that does meet those tests and conditions.

I want to emphasize this point to put at rest the professed fears of those opponents of statehood for Hawaii who assert that by admitting Hawaii we are opening the door to the admission of Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, or Guam. There is no merit to this contention. No area now under the American flag other than Hawaii meets the historic tests of readiness for statehood. No other area conceivably could qualify for statehood under our precedents in the foreseeable future, in my judgment. This idea of "opening the door" is not and cannot be a valid argument, and I hope very much that it will not be made here to this body.

I am certain that many speakers on this bill will discuss those historic precedents and qualifications for statehood. They have been set forth and discussed in each of the five favorable reports the Senate Interior Committee has submitted on the issue of statehood for Hawaii. I wish to direct particular attention to the explanation of these requirements for statehood set forth in the excellent and comprehensive report on S. 50, 86th Congress, filed last week by the distinguished and able junior Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON]. This report, Senate Report No. 80, is one of the most outstanding documents in the long history of statehood for Hawaii in the wealth of information it contains and its clarity of expression.

READINESS FOR STATEHOOD

I shall quote from page 7 of the report for the benefit of the Members of the Senate. Under the heading "Readiness for Statehood," the report states:

> The Constitution of the United States provides that new States may be admitted into the Union by the Congress, but it sets forth no specific requirements. However, a study of American history, with particular attention to the facts and circumstances surrounding the admission of each of the 37 States that have come into the Union since its founding, shows that the requirements have been (1) that the inhabitants of the proposed new State are imbued with and sympathetic toward the principles of democracy as exemplified in the American form of government; (2) that a majority of the electorate desire statehood; and (3) that the proposed new State has sufficient population and resources to support State government and to provide its share of the cost of the Federal Government.

The Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs was unanimous in finding that Hawaii met each and every one of those qualifications beyond any reasonable doubt. In few, if any, instances has the case for the grant of statehood been as well documented and is as clearly shown as in the present instance.

Mr. President, since 1935, the House and Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committees have held 23 hearings on the subject of statehood for Hawaii. The record on the question comprises more than 6,600 printed pages of testimony and exhibits. More than 850 witnesses have been heard in the Territory and in Washington. Seven of the hearings have been held in Hawaii. In addition, at least 12 reports have been made.

ISSUE MOST THOROUGHLY STUDIED

The question of admitting Hawaii to statehood has been longer considered and more thoroughly studied than any other statehood proposal which has ever come before Congress. Thirty-six States have previously been admitted to the Union by the action of Congress; yet in no single case has there been such a thoroughly careful study of the qualifications of the applicant as in the case of Hawaii.

The numerous, exhaustive studies on Hawaii have built up a great body of irrefuted and irrefutable evidence that Hawaii is in every way qualified to stand on a basis of equality with the present States of the United States. Her more than 600,000 people are American in word, thought, and deed. The vast majority of them—more than 85 percent—were born under the American flag, were educated in Hawaii's excellent school system, and are thoroughly imbued with American principles and ideals. They know no loyalty other than that to America—our country and their country.

Hawaii is possessed of great riches of soil and climate. Her more than 300,000 acres of arable land are among the most intensively, and scientifically, cultivated in the world. More than a million tons of sugar, valued in excess of $150 million, are produced annually. Hawaii also produces 85 percent of the total U.S. supply of canned pineapple products. This is 65 percent of the world's production.

IMPORTANT MINERAL DISCOVERY

Hawaii's pleasant climate, scenic beauty, and recreation facilities are also a major asset. The tourist industry has expanded annually—from a $6 million-a-year industry in 1946 to $65 million in 1956.

Within the last several years still another source of wealth for the Territory and for the Nation has become known. I refer to the discovery on the "Big Island" of Hawaii of tremendous deposits of bauxite, the raw material from which aluminum is produced. Hawaii's reserves of bauxite are placed at 60 million tons. This is 10 times the mainland reserve and enough to make our Nation independent of foreign sources of this so vital metal.

In short, Mr. President, there can be no doubt that Hawaii's great resources will enable her to support statehood and to carry her full share of the burdens of the Federal Government. Admission of Hawaii as a State will enrich our Nation materially as well as spiritually, morally, and politically.

Mr. President, in bringing my remarks to a conclusion, I realize I have dwelt much on the past—on our great forward progress as a Nation. As a lawyer, I have profound respect for precedent and tradition, but as a Member of the Senate I realize that Congress is not bound by precedent. I realize the question of admitting, in 1959, the richly endowed and strategically situated American Territory of Hawaii to full equality in our Union of States is within the sound discretion of the 86th Congress.

FAILURE TO ADMIT HAWAII WOULD BE BREAK WITH PAST

However, I believe the past can be used as a useful guide for the present and future. Therefore, I feel justified in calling the attention of the Senate to the historic precedents, and in pointing out that refusal to pass the measure would be breaking the historic pattern—

would be a marked departure from the tradition—under which our Nation has expanded and grown great.

After thorough hearings and careful study, I have found that our 600,000 fellow Americans in Hawaii merit statehood, that they desire it, and that they are ready, willing, and able to support it. I believe that statehood for Hawaii will be in the best interests of the United States as a whole and of the people of Hawaii. I therefore earnestly recommend that the Senate take prompt, affirmative action on this measure, which for 15 years or more has been a major plank in the platforms of both of our political parties.

Admission of Hawaii as a State of the United States is clearly in the best interests of our Nation, and of the free world, as well as fulfillment of the longing of a splendidly patriotic vigorous group of American citizens—600,000 strong—who by every historic test merit full equality with their fellow Americans in the present 49 States.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, no one can fairly accuse the Congress of undue haste in admitting Hawaii to the Union. Indeed, the proposal that Hawaii be admitted to the Union was made so long ago that no man who sat in the Senate at that time is here today.

Our distinguished colleague, the senior Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], will recall that historic Congress. He was then serving in the House of Representatives as the first Representative from the new State of Arizona.

The first Hawaiian statehood bill was introduced so long ago that some of the present Members of this body had not then been born, and some were still being paddled by their teachers in grade school.

The first Hawaiian statehood proposal was made in 1919, in the second administration of President Woodrow Wilson. The bitter debate over America's entry into the League of Nations was then taking place.

In January of that now seemingly remote year of 1919, a director general of European war relief was appointed to distribute $100 million worth of supplies provided for by Congress in a European famine relief bill. The director was an engineer named Herbert Hoover.

In May of the same year, Congress passed a resolution submitting to the States a constitutional amendment providing for women's suffrage. Now the ladies have been voting for so long that many who then voted for the first time as young women are now voting as grandmothers or great-grandmothers.

Indeed, to look back to the day when Hawaiian statehood was first proposed is to look back to a day that seems ancient, in the light of later events, for in October 1919 the Volstead Act became law over the President's veto. That act was designed to enforce prohibition under the 18th amendment to the Constitution.

In October 1919, Frederick Hoenemann, a Missouri farmer, appealed to the courts against the newfangled flying machines; he said that as they flew over his farm, they were scaring his chickens and were making his cows go dry. The judge agreed with the plaintiff, and issued a temporary injunction against the operation of planes above Mr. Hoenemann's farm.

Finally, in the same year, 1919, the population of the United States was approximately 105 million, or some 70 million less than it is today.

Congress may be charged—sometimes justly, and sometimes unjustly—with many things. But certainly no one can say Congress has behaved with mad haste in admitting Hawaii to the Union.

Every possible argument either for or against Hawaiian statehood has been raised and debated. There is no need to review again all the facts and arguments. The issue is not a partisan one. Both political parties have repeatedly pledged support to Hawaiian statehood.

The Territories Subcommittee of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs unanimously recommend enactment of the Hawaiian statehood bill—S. 50. The full Interior Committee, under the distinguished guidance of its chairman, the senior Senator from the State of Montana [Mr. MURRAY], has voted to report the bill, and, for the first time in the long history of the consideration of similar bills, the vote was unanimous. Members on both sides of the aisle have made important contributions to the issue, and it is appropriate that the presentation of the bill today should be a bipartisan effort.

Certainly, one of the most tireless workers on the Territories Subcommittee is its ranking minority member, the distinguished senior Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL]. I want to thank him and all the other members of my subcommittee for their generous help and support.

Mr. President, I should like especially to thank the distinguished majority leader, the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON], for the early scheduling of the bill for debate. I believe we have set a record for prompt action between the reporting of the bill by the full committee and its consideration on the floor of the Senate.

I called the distinguished majority leader, the Senator from Texas, at the time when the bill was reported by the subcommittee; and I advised him that we would be ready in a certain number of days. At that time he told me, "As soon as the bill is ready, we will schedule it for immediate consideration by the Senate."

I should like to add, that the distinguished minority leader [Mr. DIRKSEN], has been most helpful and cooperative in connection with bringing the bill to the floor of the Senate in record time.

Mr. President, let us now refer to the provisions of the Hawaii statehood bill.

We should remember that we are considering an act of admission. No further congressional action will be required.

The last 11 statehood bills passed by Congress since 1889 have uniformly provided for the following: A republican form of State government, definition of boundaries, transfer of court jurisdiction, and a popular referendum on the question of statehood itself. Comparable provisions may be found in Senate bill 50.

Specifically, the bill provides as follows:

Section 1 recognizes the constitution adopted by the people of Hawaii to be republican in form, and in conformity with the Constitution of the United States.

Section 2 sets forth the boundaries of the new State, which will consist of the islands included in the Hawaiian Archipelago.

Section 3 requires that the constitution of the State of Hawaii shall always be republican in form and consistent with the Constitution of the United States.

The next section deals with a problem arising out of the original acquisition by the United States of the Hawaiian Islands. As a condition, our Government promised to retain certain lands for the benefit of the native-born Hawaiians. The Hawaiian Homes Act of 1920 expresses the intent of Congress to adhere to that promise. Section 4 requires that the State of Hawaii adopt the Hawaiian Homes Act of 1920 as a provision of its constitution, and provides that it shall not be changed in its basic provisions except with the consent of the United States.

Section 5 provides that the State of Hawaii shall succeed to the title now held by the Territory. This section further provides that during a 5-year period any public lands which are controlled by the United States may, by act of Congress or Presidential order, be set aside for the permanent use of the United States.

Election procedures for the new State are covered by sections 6, 7, and 8. Upon the President's signature of the statehood bill, the Governor of Hawaii will issue his proclamation for the holding of elections. The proclamation shall provide for the holding of a primary election no less than 60 nor more than 90 days later. A general election is to be held within 40 days of the primary election. At this general election the citizens of Hawaii will elect a Governor, a Lieutenant Governor, and a State legislature; and, in addition thereto, two U.S. Senators and one Representative will be elected.

Sections 9 through 14 are concerned with the judiciary, the maintaining of the Federal court, and the transition from a Territorial to a State court. Technical amendments to the United States Code to indicate the changes necessary upon Hawaii's becoming a State are enumerated in these sections.

It was the considered opinion of the committee that provision for a cutoff date at some fixed point in time relative to Territorial laws of Congress now in effect should be incorporated into the bill. For this reason, section 15 states that all Territorial laws in force at the time of Hawaii's admission into the Union shall continue in force for a period of 2 years, unless the State legislature sees fit to act prior to that time.

Section 16 provides that Hawaii National Park shall continue under the sole and exclusive jurisdiction of the U.S.

Government. The section further provides that the United States will have sole and exclusive jurisdiction over any military installations that are determined by the President or Secretary of Defense to be critical areas.

By means of section 17, the Federal Reserve Act is modified to cover Hawaii.

Section 18 covers maritime matters, and continues in effect the present jurisdiction of the Federal Maritime Board over water transportation to and from the State of Hawaii.

Section 19 provides that the act shall not affect the nationality of any person.

Section 20 makes technical corrections in the Immigration and Nationality Act, to conform it to the new State of Hawaii.

Section 21 applies to the State of Hawaii, section 3(b) of the act of September 7, 1957, which is concerned with the guaranteeing of loans for air feeder lines.

Senate bill 50 differs only in minor respects from the previous Senate bill 50, reported by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs in the 85th Congress. For the benefit of my colleagues, I may observe at this time that the bill the Senate is now considering is practically identical with House bill 4221, which was reported yesterday by the Rules Committee of the House of Representatives.

The Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs has reported, for the consideration of this body, a bill which completely and concisely makes statehood for Hawaii a reality.

Mr. President, what will the admission of Hawaii mean to the United States?

On their islands, the Hawaiians have in their own way created the same miracle that we have brought about on the mainland. It is the miracle that we take for granted, although it unfailingly arouses the wonder and approval of foreign observers of our national life. It is the miracle of unity in diversity; of peoples of varying racial stocks, religions, and points of view who retain their individuality, while at the same time they live in harmony with, and actively cooperate with, their neighbors for the good of the whole community, local, State, and National.

Nor is this all. The Hawaiians are also in the process of doing on their islands what we have done on the mainland. Nearly 200 years ago, when our Nation was being born in the minds of our founders, a farmer of French descent among us—Hector de Crevecoeur—wrote about something new under the sun. He described what he called "that new man—the American." And indeed he was new. He might have been of English, Dutch, Irish, German, or Swedish descent, or of some mixture of these or other strains. But on this soil he became something never seen before, something we describe as "American"—a person easier to sense or to spot anywhere in the world than to describe.

This is also becoming true of Hawaii. There, one finds men of numerous racial strains or admixtures of them: Polynesians, Koreans, Japanese, Chinese, Yankees, Filipinos, Europeans, Micronesians. They are of varying colors of skin, various religions, and various points of view regarding many things. But they are already visibly stamped as something new under the illimitable horizons of the Pacific: they are Hawaiians, and yet they are Americans. They are essentially a new group of people, like their forebears, but, unlike them; they combine, we believe, the best qualities of their ancient and honorable ancestry with the best qualities of the American new world.

In admitting Hawaii to the Union, we shall get more perhaps than we give. It has always been our desire, however skeptically others may have regarded us in the past, to live upon terms of peace, amity, and active cooperation with the great Asian peoples. The achievement of this desire is still a dear objective of all of us; and I think we may come the closer to it as Hawaii becomes a part of the Union, as Asians see that we do mean what we say and do say what we mean.

Recently, in addressing the Senate of the Territory of Hawaii, I said this:

> When Hawaii is admitted, it will come into the Union, not just as the 50th State, but as our "diplomatic State"—our "diplomatic representative"—if you please, next door to over one-half of the world's population. * * * Here the Occident and the Orient have met in a climate of mutual trust, understanding, and respect. By precept and example, you have given us in the Pacific the kind of environment which will have a great meaning throughout the Far East.

I think, then, Mr. President, that we may well rejoice in the prospect that Hawaiian statehood, first proposed 40 years ago, is about to become a reality.

In the interval, those of us on the islands and on the mainland have come to know one another better. More than that, we have become one in the fires of a tremendous conflict when the loyalty, the resolution, and the courage of the Hawaiian people were tried and were not found wanting.

We hope that the people of Hawaii will benefit spiritually and materially from their closer association with us in our union of States. But I have no doubt that mainland Americans will benefit greatly through their closer association with the islander Americans.

Soon, throughout the vast reaches of the Pacific, whose waves wash lands that shelter a large part of the human race, the State of Hawaii will stand as a living embodiment of liberty.

Hawaii will represent in the Pacific what West Berlin stands for in Europe—freedom.

Wherever men endure as slaves, as puppets, as the dispossessed and the disinherited, Hawaii will be a star of hope. It will be the exemplification of one of man's most noble political doctrines: Government by consent of the governed.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the committee amendments be agreed to en bloc, and that, as amended, the bill be considered as original text and open to amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the committee amendments, which have been placed in the RECORD earlier today are agreed to en bloc.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I should like to call up some technical amendments which I have sent to the desk, and ask that they be considered en bloc. These amendments are intended to correct grammatical and typographical errors which have been discovered in Senate bill 50 as reported with the committee amendments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and they will be received.

Mr. JACKSON. The amendments are at the desk.

I ask that the reading of the amendments be dispensed with, and that they be considered en bloc immediately.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendments will be considered, and they are agreed to en bloc.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, do I understand that the amendments were agreed to en bloc?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes.

The amendments which were agreed to en bloc are as follows:

Section 5(a), page 4 at line 24, insert a period after the word "title."

Section 7(c), page 14, line 4, strike out the word "Territory" and substitute in lieu thereof the word "State."

Section 7(c), page 14, line 6, strike out the word "Territory" and substitute in lieu thereof the word "State."

Section 7(c), page 14, line 9, strike out the following words: "all of the officers of said territory including."

Section 18(b)(2), page 27, line 15, insert the word "an" before the word "island."

Section 18(b)(3), page 27, line 21, insert the word "an" before the word "island."

Section 22, page 29, line 6, strike out the word "or" and substitute in lieu thereof the words "in any."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California.

Mr. KUCHEL. A long dramatic struggle in our political history is now about to conclude. The 60-year-old dream of American statehood for Hawaii, from that day in 1898 when she relinquished her independence to become a part of the United States, is finally about to become a reality.

High on the list of accomplishments of this 86th Congress will be, I feel sure, the admission of the populous and prosperous American Territory of Hawaii into this dynamic Nation of ours.

Hawaii is far more than an historic Pacific island paradise with 600,000 people. This beautiful chain of islands, with its vigorous, patriotic people, its unquestionably sound public finances, its thriving economy, its highly scientific, intensive agriculture, has met each and every one of our historic tests of qualification for statehood.

But the issue is even greater than that. In this melancholy world, with the evils—against which we and our friends are arrayed, Hawaii and its people, who are our fellow Americans, represent a symbol of freedom and of democracy in modern day action. And her belated admission to the American Union as an equal member will be one more alluring showcase example that America practices the self-government which she preaches.

AMERICAN PEOPLE OF DIVERSE ANCESTRY

Mr. President, we are a heterogeneous people. The people of every race and from every clime on this globe have come, in part, to this North American Continent to enrich our heritage, to create a great American culture, and, beyond that, to add immeasurably to American strength.

The population of the Territory of Hawaii likewise, Mr. President, is heterogeneous in character, and its admission as an equal in our American Union of States will, without question, bring additional strength to the cause of freedom for which our country and our people stand.

Mr. President, this is no partisan or political question. I salute my friend from the Pacific coast, my colleague on the other side of the aisle, the distinguished junior Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], under whose chairmanship our Subcommittee on Territories once again this year has fashioned an admirable bill by which Hawaii may be admitted into the Union.

COMMITTEE ACTION UNANIMOUS

The action of the Interior Committee in amending this bill and reporting it to the Senate was unanimous. It is to the great credit of my able colleague, the chairman of the full committee, the senior Senator from the State of Montana, my friend during my six years in the Senate, that action in the full committee, under JIM MURRAY'S chairmanship, was so expeditious and harmonious. As a result, once again the Senate has before it a well-considered, effective bill to establish a new State. I wish also to salute my revered chairman [Mr. MURRAY] on the very eloquent and informative, remarks he has made in this body today on the measure for which he has fought the good fight.

Both political parties again and again have promised the people of the country that Hawaii would be admitted into the Union.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of some of these past platform commitments be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, reserving the right to object—and I shall not object—I wish to say that I think the distinguished Senator from California will agree with me that one of the men who fought for Hawaiian statehood for years, and years was the late Delegate Farrington, who passed away some years ago. The fight later was taken up by Mrs. Betty Farrington, one of the most gracious and most lovable women in the entire United States. She has fought hard to bring this day about.

Then, men like Judge Felix in Hawaii, and a score of others, continually bombarded the Senate with letters and resolutions urging statehood for Hawaii.

I particularly desire to refer again to the work done by the late Delegate, Mr. Farrington, because he labored long, long hours, and performed arduous tasks to bring the desire of Hawaii for statehood to the attention of the United States Senate. I know my distinguished friend from California will agree with me.

Mr. KUCHEL. I do, most wholeheartedly, and I thank my able friend the Senator from North Dakota for making this contribution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from California?

There being no objection, the extracts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PARTY PLATFORM PLANKS

To: Senator THOMAS F. KUCHEL.
From: Stewart French, chief counsel, Interior Committee.
Subject: Hawaiian statehood planks in party platforms.

Indicative of the bipartisan nature of the cause of statehood for Hawaii is the fact that for at least the last 15 years major planks in both party platforms have urged Hawaii statehood. Thus, in 1944, the Republican Party platform stated—

"Hawaii, which shares the Nation's obligations equally with the several States, is entitled to the fullest measure of homerule looking toward statehood, and to equality with the several States in the rights of her citizens and in the application of all our national laws."

This platform was of course accepted by the Republican nominee for President, Thomas E. Dewey, of New York.

Again in 1948 the Republican platform had in it a plank favoring Hawaii statehood.

By 1952, all suggestion of Hawaii statehood at some time in the future had given way to the realization that Hawaii was ready and more than ready for statehood. The Republican Party platform stated simply, "We favor immediate statehood for Hawaii."

This sense of urgency was reiterated in the 1956 party platform. The Republican plank stated, "We pledge immediate statehood for Hawaii."

So, too, with the platforms of the Democratic Party. Their platform of 1944 likewise called for "eventual" statehood for Hawaii.

At the 1948 party convention, it was "immediate statehood."

In the 1952 platform, Hawaii was described as a "vital bastion in the Pacific" that had contributed greatly to the welfare and economic development of our country, and again immediate statehood was urged.

The 1956 Democratic platform provided, in its constructive, affirmative part with respect to Hawaii, that the Territory had contributed greatly to our national, economic and cultural life and was vital to our defense. Immediate statehood was called for.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KUCHEL. I yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SCOTT. I thank my distinguished friend from California for yielding to me. I merely wish to say I wholeheartedly and very gladly support S. 50. I am in favor of statehood for Hawaii. I believe I voted seven times for Hawaiian statehood in the other body of Congress.

I served in Hawaii while I was in the Navy during the war. I have been there on many occasions since, and as recently as last December. I have visited all the major islands of Hawaii. I have met the people of Hawaii with their great many different ethnical backgrounds. I have found them to be loyal American citizens. I have enjoyed my association with them.

The Territory has long been ready for statehood. I am glad we have arrived at this happy day in the Senate when we seem to be on the verge of recognizing the merits of the long and ardently held desire on the part of the Territory and people of Hawaii. I look forward to the time when this body will number an even 100 Members. I suppose at that time we shall be known in the press as the "Century Club" and among our Members as "Centurians."

I thank the Senator for yielding.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I thank my able friend from Pennsylvania for what he has said on the question of statehood for Hawaii. The people of the Territory of Hawaii do not have a better friend in the Congress of the United States than the able Senator from Pennsylvania. I can recall that when the Senator graced the chairmanship of the political party to which he and I belong, he spoke out on the subject unequivocally. I congratulate him on the courage with which he stated his convictions at a time when it took substantially more courage than it does to assert that position today.

Mr. SCOTT. That was a period when some of us were pioneers, I will say to my friend, the distinguished Senator from California.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, one of the witnesses before the subcommittee was a good American citizen by the name of Mike M. Masaoka. I wish to read into the RECORD a few sentences from his testimony, as shown on page 69 of the subcommittee hearings.

Prior to World War II, racist myths were current, ascribing to all persons of Japanese ancestry, citizens and aliens alike, an unswerving loyalty to the Emperor of Japan. Immediately after the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor, wild and distorted rumors asserting that the Japanese in Hawaii engaged in sabotage and espionage were circulated.

The fact of the matter is that according to the Federal Bureau of Investigation and the Army and Navy Intelligence not a single case of espionage and sabotage was committed by a resident alien or citizen of Japanese origin before, during, and after the attack on Pearl Harbor. Indeed, the first Japanese enemy captured was by a Japanese-American.

Although purchased at a high cost of lives and personal resources, the magnificent wartime record of the Nisei and Issei in Hawaii and the United States conclusively demonstrated that—

Americanism is a matter of the mind and the heart;

Americanism is not, and never was, a matter of race or ancestry.

More recently, on the battlefields of Korea, the men of Hawaii were again fighting and dying with their fellow Americans from the continental United States. As in World War II, Americans of Japanese ancestry carried their share of the load, for the records reveal that based upon population more than three times as many Japanese-Americans were wounded and killed in Korea than the national average.

In this record of devotion and sacrifice lies the answer to those who question the loyalty of the so-called Japanese population in Hawaii. They have purchased with their blood the right to be accepted as Americans individually and to have statehood extended to the Territory that gave them birth and imbued in them that spirit of liberty and freedom that inspired their wartime gallantry.

If to assimilate American ideals and traditions is to understand the meaning of democracy and to have such faith as to be willing to go out and die for our country in spite of prejudice, discrimination, mistreatment, and persecution such as Japanese-Americans were subject to after the attack on Pearl Harbor, then Americans of Japanese ancestry in Hawaii have been completely assimilated into our way of life.

SUPPORT OF BOTH REPUBLICAN AND DEMOCRATIC ADMINISTRATIONS

Mr. President, to the credit of the present administration, President Eisenhower and his Secretary of the Interior, Fred Seaton, our former colleague in this body, have been in the vanguard of those who have fought for Hawaiian statehood. So that there may be no misunderstanding of the fairness in which I try to make this discussion today, let equal credit be given to President Harry Truman and his able Secretary of the Interior, Oscar Chapman, who with equal vigor again and again urged the Congress of the United States, no matter which party was in control of the Congress, to admit Hawaii into the Union as a State.

Mr. President, I now ask unanimous consent that excerpts from the testimony of Secretary Seaton before the committee be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

There can be no possible question concerning the position of the administration on Hawaii statehood. Since this Congress convened, the President has on several occasions urged the Congress to admit Hawaii into the Union as a State. You are dealing this year not with an enabling act but with an admission act. We of the executive branch wholeheartedly concur in this approach and recommend that the bill before you be dealt with as expeditiously as possible.

* * * * *

The record is clear. For over 100 years people of Hawaii have been dedicated to the goal of complete union with our mainland. The accomplishment of their goal became inevitable with the annexation of Hawaii in 1898 as an "integral part of the United States." To me, there can be no question properly raised as to whether Hawaii should become a State. The question is simply "when shall Hawaii become a State?"

As a personal observation, I believe that the language we all use in referring to the admission of Hawaii "into the Union" is not technically correct. Hawaii is as much a part of this Union today as any State. As an incorporated Territory, and the only one we have left, Hawaiians are subject to all of the obligations imposed upon any citizen in any State by the Federal Government. The problem arises because they are denied some of the most precious prerogatives of freemen, among them equal representation and the right to vote in national elections.

The record is also clear on another aspect of the subject before you. Since the incorporation of Hawaii into the Union, Hawaiians have developed their islands at a rapid pace. Any part of the Hawaiian economy, culture, philosophy, or political institutions that is examined today will be found to be a duplicate of or modeled after the way of life in vogue in the continental United States. Hawaii is the picture window of the Pacific through which the peoples of the East look into our American front room.

This will be particularly important in our future dealings with the peoples of Asia, because a large percentage of the population of Hawaii is of oriental or Polynesian racial extraction. The participation of the people of Hawaii in the full measure of the benefits of American citizenship will bring a fresh, new, informed outlook to our councils. More significantly, the peoples of those eastern lands washed by the waters of the Pacific will look through that front window of ours and take renewed notice that we do, indeed, practice what we preach. There can be no finer way to demonstrate the dynamic nature of our Union and the everlasting validity of the principles upon which our Republic was founded than by the admission of Hawaii as a State in this session of Congress.

While I have mentioned the racial background of some Hawaiians, let me hasten to point out that it would be both unfair and inaccurate to conclude that the objectives of Hawaiian people are in any way "foreign" to those of any other American group. No conclusion could be further from the truth. The overwhelming majority of Hawaiians are native-born Americans—they know no other loyalty and acclaim their American citizenship as proudly as you and I.

* * * * *

One argument against Hawaiian statehood, that of Communist infiltration, seems to demand explanation here today. Historically, even this is not a completely new subject in debate and consideration of statehood, because the question of loyalty to the United States has, indeed, been raised in regard to other States prior to their admission. Debate in Congress as to the extent of French influence in Louisiana and that of the Spanish-speaking people of New Mexico are significant examples. The Communist question, of course, presents a new ramification of the subject of loyalty not presented in the past, and that is whether any substantial segment of Hawaii actually is committed to a doctrine which advocates the violent overthrow of the very Government in which the overwhelming majority of Hawiians seek to permanently become a full partner.

For myself, I believe that this committee and all advocates of Hawaiian statehood will squarely face the Communist issue.

The people of Hawaii have time and time again rejected completely the Communist philosophy and have thwarted every attempt of the Communists to influence their government.

The proposed constitution of the State of Hawaii contains a far-reaching prohibition against any Communist holding public office or public employment of any kind.

A perennial target of alleged Communists in Hawaii has been the law enacted by the 1949 Territorial Legislature following a prolonged dock strike, which empowered the Territorial government to seize Hawaiian docks in the event of a strike. Notwithstanding four general territorialwide elections for the legislature, those laws are still on the books in Hawaii today. In each election the laws were an issue, and in each legislative session attempts have been made to repeal them. This is a prime example of the dogged determination of Hawaiians to stand firm on what they consider to be a matter of principle.

COMMUNISM NO GREATER THREAT IN HAWAII THAN ELSEWHERE

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, a few continue to say, "The problem of communism ought to prevent Congress from now admitting Hawaii into the Union." I deny that. There may well be a problem of communism in the Territory of Hawaii, precisely as there is a problem of communism in the State of California or in the United States as a whole. Indeed, there is a problem of communism today which faces every free nation around the globe.

In that connection I wish to point out that 8 years ago, in 1950, the people of the Territory of Hawaii on their own initiative adopted a constitution which would govern them on their admission as a State. Section 3, article 14, reads as follows:

No person who advocates, or who aids or belongs to any party, organization or association which advocates, the overthrow by force or violence of the government of the State or of the United States shall be qualified to hold any public office or employment.

That is a quotation from the proposed constitution for the new State of Hawaii which the people of Hawaii drafted and adopted for themselves.

Mr. President, the problem of communism, whatever it may be, will not change when statehood status is given to Hawaii; or, if there is to be any change at all, it will be a change to give the people of that great part of our country a better opportunity to cope with the problem at first hand.

EYES OF FORMER COLONIAL PEOPLES ON AMERICA

For an entire generation, an American Territory, whose citizens are thoroughly American in every respect—has been ready for statehood. Its people have long been asking for admission to equality in our Union. The whole world—especially the former colonials of the Pacific—await America's decision.

Hawaii has been at the threshold of statehood for nearly 60 years, patiently and graciously, in the face of a dreary succession of delays and setbacks. Since 1903, the Territory, through its legislature, has petitioned Congress for statehood on 17 different occasions. Since 1920, no fewer than 66 bills have been introduced in successive Congresses, calling for statehood for Hawaii. The House and Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committees have held 22 hearings on Hawaii statehood since 1935. The record on the subject comprises more than 6,600 printed pages of testimony and exhibits. More than 850 witnesses have been heard in Hawaii and in Washington.

Seven of the hearings have been held in Hawaii, in 1935, 1937, 1946, 1947, 1948, 1954, and 1959. The Hawaii statehood question has been considered longer and more thoroughly studied than any other statehood proposal ever to come before Congress.

EARLY HISTORY OF STATEHOOD MOVEMENT

The granting of statehood to Hawaii now, some 61 years after its annexation, is in the national interest. It is a logical step in our growth to political maturity. It amounts to nothing more than the granting of a diploma in self-government to a segment of our people who long since have achieved political and social maturity. It should be accomplished without further delay.

History shows how truly American is Hawaii's case for statehood. Early in 1893, when the Kingdom of Hawaii was overthrown, a provisional government was established. There were charges that the American Minister to Hawaii had had too large a hand in the uprising. This gained credence when the provisional Government sent a mission to the United States with instructions to

arrange for the transfer of the sovereignty of the islands to the United States.

Opposition to annexation came from many quarters, both at home and abroad. Distance was cited as an obstacle. Noncontiguity was advanced as a bar. Race was put forth as an argument. Economic and political assimilation of Hawaii was declared to be an impossibility.

LEGALISTIC OPPOSITION

The strongest arguments against annexation, however, were purely legalistic. Annexation was declared to be repugnant to the Constitution and our form of Government.

In the forefront of the antiannexationists was the great author-jurist Thomas M. Cooley. "Apparently it is expected," wrote Cooley in the Forum for June 1893, "that the islands will be taken in as an outlying colony of the United States, not as a Territory of the sort we now possess and govern, and not, so far as we are notified, with any expectation that they are to be by-and-by accepted as one of the States of the American Union. Government as a colony is what it is said those proposing the annexation would prefer."

The proponents of the argument that annexation was in violation of the Constitution were confronted, however, by a number of historical precedents which defied rebuttal. The purchase and annexation of Spanish Florida—the acquisition of French Louisiana—the annexation of the Republic of Texas—the acquisition of Alaska, then commonly referred to as Russian America.

PRECEDENT OF LOUISIANA PURCHASE

The legal arguments of the antiannexationists were on infirm ground. Actually the matter had been settled many years before by none other than Thomas Jefferson. Jefferson, though frankly admitting that the Constitution contained "no provision for our holding foreign territory and still less for incorporating foreign nations into our Union," nevertheless went ahead and purchased the Louisiana Territory from Napoleon. His record for legal nicety was overcome by consideration of the national interest. When members of his own party had risen in opposition to the Louisiana purchase, Alexander Hamilton and Gouverneur Morris, Jefferson's principal political opponents, had come to his support. Soon after Louisiana was purchased and annexed, its inhabitants, in spite of national origins differing from those of the predominant portion of our population, were welcomed into the Union.

The annexation of the Republic of Texas was largely the handiwork of that great statesman and patriot, John C. Calhoun. Texas had been a part of Mexico and Mexico still asserted claims of dominion. It was inhabited by a population not homogeneous with our own and had been settled by pro-slavery Americans.

The purchase and annexation of Alaska, in 1867, brought in a territory not contiguous to the rest of the Union. At the time of its annexation Alaska was largely inhabited by Eskimos and Indians.

Thus, the Constitution had been interpreted prior to the Hawaiian annexation movement to allow for the expansion of the territorial borders of the United States. Although concepts of the Constitution of the United States ran back through the Magna Carta and English Common Law, it has already been found adequate for the preservation and protection of the human and property rights of such peoples as Frenchmen, Spaniards, Indians, and Mexicans.

OLD WORLD POWERS DISAPPROVE

The antiannexationists, nevertheless, won the argument in 1893. President Harrison ordered the lowering of the American flag from the government building in Honolulu. A constitutional convention was called and, on July 4, 1894, the Republic of Hawaii was proclaimed.

The victory of the antiannexationists in the early 1890's was attributable in no little part to diplomatic pressures from Great Britain, France, and Germany. Old World colonial powers did not relish the idea of the Hawaiian Islands coming into the possession of the United States. The United States, on the other hand, was determined that Hawaii should not fall into other hands.

Thus, toward the close of the 19th century, the people of Hawaii found themselves facing an unhappy situation. As an independent nation, they were too weak to survive long, but their wealth and strategic location made them desirable to several other nations. Yet, they wanted to cast their lot with the United States, their largest customer and the homeland of a substantial part of the island population. The United States seemed reluctant to receive them.

ANNEXATION A NATIONAL ISSUE

Hawaiian annexation became a national issue. One of the leaders of the Hawaiian annexation movement was Senator John T. Morgan of Alabama. He made many speeches and wrote many articles urging annexation of the islands.

One of the most forceful of Senator Morgan's article was published in the Forum for March 1898. It was entitled "The Duty of Annexing Hawaii." It was written in reply to a previous article by Great Britain's Right Honorable James Bryce, M.P., which had obligingly pointed out to Americans the dangers of the annexation of Hawaii by the United States.

The arguments advanced by Senator Morgan for annexation of Hawaii in his reply to Bryce have a ring of familiarity to us today as we consider statehood for Hawaii. The following are some excerpts from Senator Morgan's article:

From the beginning we have uniformly declared that the Hawaiian Islands and people hold to the United States a relation that does not exist between them and any other nation and that we will not permit to exist with any other country.

It is quite safe to assert that, for military and strategic reasons, the authorities are overwhelmingly in support of the annexation of Hawaii and agree as to the serious danger to our country of allowing these islands to become a base of operations for any European or Asiatic power against our western coasts.

Annex Hawaii, and we will rapidly build up at Honolulu, in sight of Pearl Harbor, a commercial mart, like Hong Kong, protected by a fortress, easy of construction, far stronger than Gibraltar, that will stand sentinel over the surrounding ocean for thousands of miles.

Senator Morgan had great vision for Hawaii.

The Republic of Hawaii was annexed at the turn of the century and incorporated into the Union as an organized Territory. Hawaii is now ready for statehood—for a status of equality in our political system. It is generally agreed throughout the United States that this step should be taken. This is established by public opinion polls and newspaper comment which is overwhelmingly in favor of statehood now.

HAWAII BILL PASSED BY HOUSE THREE TIMES

In June 1947 the House of Representatives enacted legislation approving statehood for Hawaii. The vote was 196 to 133.

On March 7, 1950, for the second time in our history, elected representatives of the people of the United States acted to bring statehood to Hawaii. On this date the second bill to enable Hawaii to come into the Union as a State was passed by the House of Representatives. The vote was overwhelming—262 in favor to 110 against.

On March 10, 1953, the House for a third time passed, by a vote of 274 to 138, the bill to enable Hawaii to become a State. The Senate on April 1, 1954, by a vote of 57 to 28, passed the combined Hawaii-Alaska Enabling Act.

In the 84th Congress statehood for Hawaii and Alaska was considered jointly in comprehensive hearings. On May 10, 1955, H.R. 2535 was recommitted by the House to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs by a vote of 218 to 170. On August 23, 1958, in the closing days of the 85th Congress, the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, by a vote of 22 to 4, reported H.R. 49, introduced by Delegate JOHN A. BURNS, to the House, but the bill was not scheduled for floor debate.

Today, with Alaska in the Union as the 49th State, it is Hawaii's rightful turn.

DESIRE OF PEOPLE OF HAWAII

The people of Hawaii have long aspired to statehood. In a 1954 debate in the House of Representatives, Hawaii's Delegate to Congress, the late Hon. Joseph R. Farrington, stated that if a vote were taken today, Hawaii's people would vote 4 or 5 to 1 for statehood now.

S. 50 calls for a plebiscite in Hawaii on statehood so there can be no question but that statehood will be in accord with the wishes of the people of Hawaii.

Today, at the close of the first half of the 20th century we are again confronted with a situation in the Pacific which forebodes little good for our security and national well-being. It is a situation which also threatens the future of our friends and neighbors in the Pacific. It is my conviction that statehood for Hawaii at this juncture of history will serve notice to the world that we are in the Pacific to stay and that we are there in the interests of man's freedom and of

self-government. Statehood for Hawaii will bind us closer together as a nation.

STATEHOOD URGED IN 1898

Over a period of five decades Congress has heard many eloquent appeals for the admission of Hawaii into our Union. None more so, however, in my opinion than that uttered by Representative Charles Lewis Henry, of Indiana. Speaking to the House of Representatives on June 13, 1898, urging, even as I am doing now, support for this longstanding measure, Mr. Henry said:

We want these islands because of their value from a naval and military point of view; we want them on account of the commercial advantages which they will bring to our country; we want them in order that no foreign power may use them as a base of operations against us in time of war; we want them because they are more contiguous to our territory than to that of any other nation; we want them because they are geographically a part of the United States; but Mr. Speaker, we want them more than all on account of the true Americans who have made their homes upon these islands and now seek to present these islands as a free offering to their mother country. Let us pass these resolutions, and bring back again into the family fold the people who have been away from home establishing us a home in these delightful islands.

Let us proceed to pass this proposed legislation and to prepare to welcome the State of Hawaii.

Mr. President, I have the honor in part to represent 14 million people in California. I think over the years the people of California have been most friendly and most intimate with the people in the Territory of Hawaii. Long ago the people of my State looked forward to the day when their friends in Hawaii would be citizens of another State in the American Union. Time and again representatives of the government of California have appeared before the committees of the Congress to urge statehood for the Territory of Hawaii.

ADVOCACY BY HON. EARL WARREN

Perhaps the most distinguished of California's Governors, who is now the distinguished Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States, spoke unequivocally in favor of statehood for both Alaska and Hawaii in 1950, and I ask unanimous consent that the text of his comments as set forth in the hearings by the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs on H.R. 49, 81st Congress, in 1950, be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the testimony was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF HON. EARL WARREN, GOVERNOR OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA BEFORE INTERIOR COMMITTEE IN 81ST CONGRESS

(NOTE.—The testimony of Governor Warren, when he appeared before the committee on April 24, 1950, with reference to Alaska statehood, is inserted herein in its entirety at his request.)

Senator ANDERSON. Now, Governor Warren, if time permits, I would like to give personal testimony to the nice way in which you treat members of the Government when they come to California, and particularly to your courtesy to me when I was out there as Secretary of Agriculture. We are very happy to have you with us this morning and will be glad to hear anything you have to say on this question of statehood for Alaska. If you find it inconvenient to be back here the following week to tell us anything you desire about Hawaii, if you wish at this time to add anything you have to say about Hawaii, the door is open for you to add that additional material this morning, if you desire to do so.

Governor WARREN. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman, and gentlemen of the committee. That is very generous of you, and I appreciate it, because I am under commitment to be in Sacramento tomorrow morning at the opening of business.

I apologize for not having a written statement, but I do not propose to offer any statistics, because I am not here as an expert on the economy of Alaska, I am not here as an expert on the defense of Alaska, nor am I familiar with the details of H.R. 331. I am appearing here as a neighbor, from a neighboring State, a State that is friendly to Alaska and that is hopeful for the opportunities that it may have in the future. I am also appearing as a westerner who happens at the moment to be chairman of a Governors' conference of the 11 Western States, which organization has gone on record several times during the past few years in favor of statehood for Alaska.

We in the West believe that the development of any part of the West is of great benefit to the entire West, and we consider Alaska as an integral part of the West. We have had the association of its Governor in the council of the Governors' Conference Committee 5 or 6 years, and we have come to believe that this is the time for Alaska to be given statehood.

We believe that we have a particular interest in the defense of Alaska, and we believe that if Alaska is given statehood, is given an opportunity to develop its resources and its civilization, that it will be a greater factor in the defense of our Nation than it could otherwise be. We believe, in the last analysis, the defense of Alaska will come from the civilization that we develop there rather than just from the airplanes that we send there, or the fortifications that we develop. We are of the opinion that Alaska will not develop to the fullest extent of its potentialities unless it does achieve statehood.

We believe that no Territory of this country that is owned, more than 98 percent, by the Government and managed by it, by bureaus as far away as Washington is from Alaska, can give the people the opportunity to develop in accordance with American principles and ideals.

We believe that this is a particularly significant time, so far as the development of Alaska is concerned, because it is the outpost of our civilization, it is the outpost of our democracy, and we fervently believe that if people are encouraged to go to Alaska and develop its resources that we can make that portion of our country more secure than could otherwise possibly be done.

We believe that statehood will increase the population of Alaska much faster than it has developed in the past. While we are interested in the welfare of Alaska, we are also interested in our own welfare, and we believe that the development of Alaska will help our economy. We believe that the more people there are there, the more trade they have, the more we will share in it and the better it will be for our people.

We believe that it is only justice for the people of Alaska that they be admitted into the Union of the States. For 83 years Americans have lived in Alaska, and for the last 38 years they have lived under a Territorial government. The people have served in two wars, they have served faithfully and loyally, they have paid the taxes that our Government has imposed upon them, and we believe that they have earned statehood in every sense of the word.

On the question of the population, I want to say that Alaska has more people now than my own State had when it was admitted to the Union 100 years ago.

Senator CORDON. May I also suggest, Mr. Governor, that at the time your State was admitted it also was noncontiguous with another State?

Governor WARREN. Yes, sir. Senator, I was about to say that, and also to point out that I left San Francisco yesterday afternoon at half past four by the fastest mode of transportation that we have, arriving here at 9:30 this morning, and I could have gotten to southern Alaska quicker than I could have gotten to Washington by the same mode of transportation. So we do not feel that the distance out there on the Pacific coast is material to this issue. We are used to distances, and we believe that the great distances in the West represent a great part of its strength.

So we feel that the people of Alaska have earned the right to statehood, and we believe they have earned the right to full development under statehood.

Now, there are always those who view with alarm the distance that the West has been from the Atlantic coast whenever a new State sought admission to the Union, and even some very famous men, men of this Senate, have expressed that alarm in times gone by. I happened to run across a statement of Daniel Webster in the U.S. Senate just a little over 100 years ago, in which statement he said this:

"What can we do with the western coast? A coast of 3,000 miles, rock-bound, cheerless, uninviting, and not a harbor on it. I will never vote 1 cent from the Public Treasury to place the Pacific Ocean 1 inch nearer Boston than it is now." [Laughter.]

Senator ANDERSON. Governor, I will say to you I used that quotation some time ago, and the Library of Congress told me Daniel Webster never said that. I think both of us ought to check it.

Governor WARREN. I quoted it from what I considered was good authority.

Senator ANDERSON. I took it on the best authority that I thought there was in the world. I hope it is true, but I just was not able to find it as yet. You do recognize it is typical of the thinking of a great many people 100 years ago.

Governor WARREN. Yes, and perhaps, some people today, and I say that without intending to give any offense.

I am sure Alaska seems a great deal farther away to many people in our country than any of the European countries, and perhaps some of the Asiatic countries, but really it is not far away. I believe it can be integrated with the other States in the Union, and I am also of the opinion that it will never develop to its full potentialities and possibilities until it does have the same opportunities for self-government that the other people in the United States have.

I believe this is the time for us to integrate our policy on the self-determination of people, and inasmuch as these people have lived there for a period of 83 years under our sovereignty and for 38 years as a Territory and fulfilled every obligation that has been put upon them, it seems to me a matter of common justice that they should be admitted to statehood and should stand in the way of totalitarianism spreading its influence from the Eastern Hemisphere into the Western Hemisphere. I think, if given statehood, the people of Alaska would measure up to that responsibility.

I thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

If I might just say a word now on the question of Hawaii, because I must return to California.

Senator ANDERSON. May I ask you just this question?

Governor WARREN. Yes, Senator.

Senator ANDERSON. Has the Council of Western State Governors to which you referred adopted officially resolutions on the question of statehood for either Alaska or Hawaii?

Governor WARREN. They have adopted officially resolutions favoring both.

Senator ANDERSON. Both?

Governor WARREN. Yes, sir.

Senator ANDERSON. Would you supply for the record copies of these resolutions?

Governor WARREN. Yes sir.

Senator ANDERSON. Thank you.

The resolutions adopted by the Governors' Conference are as follows:

"JULY 13–16, 1947.

"XIV. STATEHOOD FOR HAWAII

"The people of Hawaii have at the ballot box expressed their desire to achieve statehood. Hawaii is one of the two incorporated Territories of the United States for which statehood, following American tradition and precedent, is clearly indicated as their destiny. Hawaii has been under the American flag for 49 years and has, therefore, undergone a period of preparation and tutelage far longer than that of most Territories, before they achieved statehood. The expressed wish of our own fellow citizens of Hawaii is merely for the fulfillment of the moderate, understandable, traditional, and legitimate aspiration to achieve full equality and responsibility in the family of States and for self-government according to the established American pattern.

"Therefore, the Governors' conference hereby expresses its sympathy with the recorded desire for statehood of the people of Hawaii, and endorsed the passage of suitable legislation by the Congress to achieve that end.

"JUNE 13–16, 1948.

"IX. STATEHOOD FOR ALASKA AND HAWAII

"The Governors' Conference hereby reiterates its sympathy with the recorded desire for statehood of the people of Alaska and Hawaii, and endorses the passage of suitable legislation by the Congress to achieve that end.

"JUNE 19–22, 1949.

"X. STATEHOOD FOR ALASKA AND HAWAII

"The Governors' conference urges the Congress promptly to enact enabling legislation to admit Alaska and Hawaii to statehood.

"IV. STATEHOOD FOR ALASKA AND HAWAII

"(Resolution adopted by the western Governors' conference, Salt Lake City, Utah, November 7–8, 1949)

"The last three national Governors' conferences have adopted resolutions urging the admission of Alaska and Hawaii to statehood.

"Since in two successive Congresses, the 80th and the 81st, the committees to which were referred the bills providing statehood for the Territories of Alaska and Hawaii have reported favorably thereon, the conference of western Governors now urges the Congress to act on this legislation at the coming session and speed the admission of the 49th and 50th States."

Governor WARREN. While I am not chairman of the national conference, it also has adopted resolutions recommending statehood for both Alaska and Hawaii.

Senator ANDERSON. If there is no objection, we will hear the Governor at this time on Hawaii also.

Senator BUTLER. While their resolution was on the question of statehood for Hawaii, it was not on H.R. 331

Governor WARREN. That is true.

Senator BUTLER. There is a vast difference between the two, you understand that.

Governor WARREN. Yes.

Senator BUTLER. I am strong for statehood for Alaska and Hawaii, under proper conditions, but I do not think they are getting anything like a fair deal under H.R. 331. Of course, I am open to conviction. Maybe the Governor over there can convert me before we are through taking his statement.

Governor WARREN. No, Senator; our resolutions were directed to statehood for Alaska and Hawaii now, not at some distant date in the future. We are for statehood now. As to the terms and conditions of the admission, we have little knowledge and have nothing to urge at this particular time.

Senator ECTON. Mr. Governor, may I ask you if your conference made any recommendations as to the provisions under which Alaska should be admitted as a State?

Governor WARREN. No; we did not. I can say to you, from a discussion with all of the members of the conference, that it was hoped that it would be under conditions that were most favorable to a State, a new State that would have a very hard job to do, and certainly on terms equal to those that have heretofore been granted to other States as they were admitted to the Union.

Senator ECTON. Thank you.

Senator LEHMAN. Governor, may I ask you this question: I want to emphasize that resolution of the national conference of Governors, of which I was a member for a great many years, is pretty significant, because it is not just one of these hurried resolutions that are acted upon after 5 minutes' consideration. Those resolutions are first submitted and discussed by the executive committee, and then a statement is made to the entire conference, so they did receive very careful consideration.

Governor WARREN. Yes. It so happens, Senator, that I was both on the executive committee and on the resolutions committee, and I know that is true, and that it was considered very seriously by the executive committee and at the conference itself. The resolutions committee gave a great deal of time to the consideration of these resolutions.

Senator LEHMAN. That was my question. Thank you.

Senator ANDERSON. How unanimous was their action? Was it close or overwhelming?

Governor WARREN. It was unanimous, Senator, because we have the rule in the Governors' conference, both in our national conference and in our western conference, that we do not adopt resolutions unless they are unanimous.

Senator ANDERSON. That would be a very good rule to have here.

Governor WARREN. The reason for that is because there is so much diversity of opinion, the country is so complex, and unless we can arrive at a unanimous conclusion we do not think it would serve any great purpose.

Senator ANDERSON. Thank you for your statement.

Now, if you will proceed with the question of Hawaii.

Governor WARREN. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me everything that I have said concerning Alaska could well be said concerning Hawaii, and I can add to that also the fact that California has been particularly close to Hawaii for a great many years, and we feel our economic relations and our social relations with the islands at this time, and for many years in the past, have been just as close as with any of the States of the Union, and much closer than with many of the States of the Union.

We believe that Hawaii, having been a Territory for 52 years and having been an outpost for this country during two wars, and having served faithfully in both of those wars, has earned statehood, if it is possible for any people to earn statehood.

We believe that the islands have the resources and the ability to take care of themselves, and having paid into the United States Treasury, as I am informed, much more than they have ever received from it, they are well able to govern themselves, to finance themselves in every respect.

We believe that a half million people in those islands to be deprived of full citizenship for any greater length of time would be an injustice to them and would be a reflection upon the integration of the principles that we have expressed in the United Nations, and otherwise. In California we feel very earnestly that Hawaii should be admitted to the Union at the earliest possible day.

Senator ANDERSON. Are there any questions of Governor Warren by any members of the committee?

Senator BUTLER. Governor, I just have one question.

Governor WARREN. Yes, sir.

Senator BUTLER. I have the impression that there would be very little opposition, if any, to the admission of Hawaii to statehood as a part of California.

Governor WARREN. Well, Senator Butler, we are pretty aggressive out there in California in a lot of ways, but I never have heard California express the desire to take Hawaii into the territorial limits of California.

Senator BUTLER. Well, they are fine people.

Governor WARREN. I have never heard a public discussion of that in my State, where any Californians have ever advocated that. I feel certain that if it were advocated it would be overwhelmingly repudiated, not because we do not like the people of Hawaii, but because we do not want to force ourselves upon them. We believe it would be unfair to them, we believe they would resent it, and there isn't any reason that we can see why those islands at that distance should become a part of the jurisdiction of any State on the mainland.

Senator BUTLER. The distance you said a while ago was no factor in this matter, and I think so, myself—I agree with you in that—but I do think the economy being built largely around sugar in Hawaii, almost entirely on sugar, and the economy and social relations having been so close over the years, that it would not be a bit different than adding another county down below the southern California line, if that was possible.

Governor WARREN. Senator, a difference for one purpose might be one thing, and for another purpose it might be something entirely different. So far as becoming an integral part of the Union and as one of the States of the Union, it seems to me that the distance between the mainland and Hawaii is insignificant, but when it comes to a question of local government in each of these islands in the Hawaiian group, making them counties of California, it seems to me it would present problems that might be insurmountable.

Senator BUTLER. I do not think it would present any problems that would be insurmountable for the State of California any more than for the United States Government.

Governor WARREN. That is, of course, Senator, local government and on a different footing and representation in a State legislature, which, it seems to me, is on a far more intimate basis and on a far more local basis than representation in the Congress of the United States and in the other agencies of the Government.

Senator ANDERSON. Are there any additional questions? If not, thank you very much, Governor, and if you, or the associations to which you referred, desire to make any supplementary statement, we would be glad to have it.

Mr. KUCHEL. Lastly, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks a copy of a letter dated March 10, 1957, addressed to the distinguished senior Senator from Virginia

[Mr. BYRD] by the Secretary of the Interior, together with the enclosures. This letter contains highly important and significant information with respect to the Territory of Hawaii that bears directly on the issue of statehood.

There being no objection, the letter and enclosures were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, D.C., March 10, 1959.

Hon. HARRY F. BYRD,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR BYRD: We have your letter of February 20 and are pleased to provide you the following information concerning Hawaii.

Hawaii was annexed to the United States on July 7, 1898, by request of the Hawaiian Legislature and pursuant to a joint resolution of the U.S. Congress. Formal transfer took place on August 12, 1898. Upon the enactment by the Congress of its Organic Act on April 30, 1900, Hawaii became an incorporated, organized Territory of the United States. United States citizenship was at the same time conferred upon the citizens of the former Republic.

According to the 1950 Census, Hawaii's civilian population was 476,913. The present civilian population is estimated to be approximately 578,000. The enclosed table lists by racial ancestry Hawaii's population in 1950, and in January 1958. We do not know the number of aliens by race group. Of the present civilian population, however, about 85 percent are American-born or naturalized U.S. citizens.

The economy of Hawaii is well developed and prosperous.

Among civilian industries agriculture is still the major source of income, although manufacturing and tourism are growing rapidly.

Significant economic data are as follows (all figures 1957):

Sugar production: Tonnage, 1,084,646; value, $146 million.

Pineapple: Exports, cases canned, 30,787,208; value, $110,200,000.

Other agriculture: Value, $45,823,000.

Tourism: Number of visitors spending 2 days or more in the islands, 168,829; tourist expenditures, $77,600,000.

Manufacturing: $101,955,824.

Retailing: $666,467,660.

Wholesaling: $277,650,632.

All services: $128,548,264.

Armed Forces expenditures, appropriated funds: Civilian payroll, $97,828,000; military payroll, $141,182,000; goods and services, $68,930,000.

In terms of average incomes and standards of living, Hawaii compares well with stateside averages. According to the U.S. Bureau of the Census, total personal income in Hawaii in 1957 was $1,098 million, a figure greater than that of eight of the present States. Average personal income per capita in Hawaii in 1957 was $1,821, a figure which places Hawaii ahead of 24 of the present States in this respect. From 1956 to 1957, Hawaii showed a gain in total personal income of 7 percent, slightly larger than the 5 percent gain of the continental United States. From 1950 to 1957 Hawaii gained 59 percent in total personal income, again somewhat larger than the 53 percent gain for the continental United States for this period.

The present trend of income and economic development continues to be upward, particularly in such fields as tourism and light manufacturing. For example, the number of visitors staying 2 days or more increased from 46,593 in 1950 to 168,829 in 1957, and private investment in tourist facilities such as resort hotels is growing at a rapid rate. Recent discoveries of tremendous deposits of bauxite offer hopes of adding a new mineral industry to the Territory's economy. Certain branches of agriculture likewise are capable of expansion; however, the land resources of the islands are generally well developed and further increase in agricultural production may well be limited by the limited acreage of land yet available.

Shipments to Hawaii from the continental United States and imports from foreign countries in 1957 amounted to $488 million, of which all except $24 million represented purchases from the mainland. We assume that this figure of $488 million may be taken as representing Hawaii's requirement during a prosperous year for goods to be brought in from outside the islands. To pay for this level of imports and sustain her economy, Hawaii provides the United States with about one-eighth of our sugar needs, 85 percent of our canned pineapple, and miscellaneous other products, and bolsters her income with tourism and with the provision of goods and services to military and Federal civilian personnel stationed there.

Hawaii is also a taxpaying partner of the present States on a large scale. Residents of Hawaii all pay the same taxes to the Federal Treasury as do residents of the present 49 States. In 1957 payments to the Federal Government by Hawaiian residents amounted to $183 million, compared with total Federal expenditures in Hawaii (other than military expenditures) of $77 million.

At present, the Territorial government of Hawaii is solvent and well-financed from adequate local revenue sources. From its local revenues it provides the whole range of services (education, health, highway construction and maintenance, Territorial institutions, etc.) commonly provided by any State for its own people, and on a comparable scale. The grant of statehood would make little difference to the fiscal position of the government of Hawaii or to the Territorial taxpayer of Hawaii, since virtually all the costs of government services at the Territorial-local level are already defrayed from local revenues.

With respect to Federal assistance, Hawaii receives generally the same treatment as do the States on most Federal grant programs, such as public assistance under the Social Security Act, wildlife and fish restoration, aids for agricultural extension work, and the like. In these cases Hawaii's apportionment is generally computed on the same basis as any State's, and Hawaii's matching requirement is generally the same.

The only items of Federal expenditure peculiarly attributable to Hawaii's territorial status are the salaries of the Governor, government secretary, one other person in the Governor's office, and the members of the territorial legislature (for one session per biennium only), and a portion of the salaries of 14 territorial judges. The total of these items amounts to an average of $231,775, per year. This figure represents the additional cost of statehood to Hawaiian taxpayers. It represents about one-quarter of one percent of the territorial budget.

With respect to revenue sources and territorial expenditures, we enclose a copy of the Governor's 1957 annual report, which gives some data on pages 11 through 15. The 1958 report, now being printed, will give somewhat more detail. Although the latter report is not yet available for distribution, we enclose copies of pages 15 through 17 of the page proof, which include all the financial tables.

Sincerely yours,

ROGER ERNST,
Assistant Secretary of the Interior.

Copy to Hon. THOMAS H. KUCHEL, United States Senate, Washington, D.C.

Latest population figures show proportionate increases in the Territory's Caucasian and part-Hawaiian groups. All other groups show relative declines except the Negro which remained the same. All groups showed numerical increases except the Hawaiian. Breakdown by race is as follows:

	1950		1958	
	Percent	Number	Percent	Number
Hawaiian	2.5	11,786	2.0	11,390
Part-Hawaiian	14.8	69,774	16.0	91,120
Caucasian	23.0	108,433	25.0	142,376
Chinese	6.5	30,644	6.0	34,170
Filipino	12.2	57,517	12.0	68,341
Japanese	36.9	173,564	35.0	199,326
Korean	1.4	6,600	1.3	7,404
Negro	.5	2,357	.5	2,848
Puerto Rican	1.9	8,958	1.8	10,251
Other	.3	1,414	.4	2,278
Total	100.0	471,447	100.0	569,504

Source: Department of sociology, University of Hawaii; Department of Health, Bureau of Health Statistics; EIA Market Data Department, January 3, 1958.

Comparative statement of tax collections for the fiscal years ended June 30, 1957 and 1958

Source of revenue	Fiscal year 1956–57	Fiscal year 1957–58	Increase or decrease [1]	Percentage
Bank—Financial corporations	$217,761	$281,610	$63,849	29.32
Compensation and dividends	13,217,451	9,283,208	[1] 3,984,243	[1] 30.14
Declarations of estimated taxes—corporation		143	(3)	
Declarations of estimated taxes—individual		1,701,608	(3)	
Employment security contributions	2,835,967	3,104,358	268,301	9.46
Fuel	11,873,574	12,317,869	444,295	3.74
Fuel retail permits		5,030	(3)	
General excise, consumption and compensating	38,138,517	48,621,304	10,482,787	27.49
Inheritance and estate	426,605	338,604	[1] 88,001	[1] 20.63
Insurance premiums	1,229,012	1,382,782	153,770	12.51
Liquor and permits	2,173,822	2,750,252	576,430	26.52
Net income—corporations	$4,163,393	$4,616,256	$453,863	$10.90
Net income—individual	2,113,435	2,459,712	346,277	16.38
Public utilities	3,003,093	3,382,493	379,400	12.63
Public welfare [2]	891	321	[1] 570	(3)
Real property appeal deposits		87	(3)	
Tobacco and licenses	1,249,024	1,698,496	449,472	35.99
Withholding on wages		6,090,047	(3)	
Total	80,641,545	97,984,180	17,342,635	21.51
Personal property [4]	13	67	54	(3)
Real property [5]	6,604,069	22,505,739	15,901,670	(4)
Grand total	87,245,627	120,489,986	33,244,359	(4)

[1] Decreases.
[2] Repealed July 1, 1943.
[3] Not applicable.
[4] Repealed Jan. 1, 1948.
[5] Data not comparable as fiscal year 1957–58 includes double real property tax, while fiscal year 1956–57 has no current collections due in both instances to delays in setting tax rates in legislative years.

Comparative statement showing allocation of fiscal year tax collections

	Fiscal year 1956–57	Fiscal year 1957–58	Increase or decrease	Percentage
Territorial funds:				
Territorial general	$52,934,218	$68,693,179	$15,758,961	29.77
Territorial highway	6,583,622	6,589,851	6,229	.09
Territorial airport	1,286,373	1,376,451	90,078	7.00
Small boat harbor maintenance	63,873	61,452	[1] 2,421	[1] 3.79
Employment security contributions	2,835,967	3,104,358	268,391	9.46
Subtotal—Territory	63,704,053	79,825,291	16,121,238	25.31
County revenues:				
General excise	$12,997,786	$13,868,774	$870,988	6.70
Property	6,604,082	22,505,806	15,901,724	[2]
Fuel	3,939,706	4,290,115	350,409	8.89
Subtotal—County	23,541,574	40,664,695	17,123,121	[2]
Grand total	87,245,627	120,489,986	33,244,359	[2]

[1] Decreases.
[2] Data not comparable as fiscal year 1957–58 includes double real property tax, while fiscal year 1956–57 has no current collections due in both instances to delays in setting tax rates in legislative years.

Trend in economic conditions as reflected by business volume, wages, dividends, gasoline consumption, etc., on a comparative basis for the 2 fiscal years are summarized from information obtained from current year's tax returns

Taxable base	Fiscal year 1956–57	Fiscal year 1957–58	Increase or decrease [1] [2]	Percentage
Gross business volume	$1,656,980,356	$1,751,964,045	$94,983,689	5.73
Retail sales	623,205,275	651,045,853	27,840,578	4.47
Wholesale sales	271,065,785	279,561,345	8,495,560	3.13
Sugar sales	113,394,923	96,680,488	[1] 16,714,435	[1] 14.74
Canning (pineapple sales, etc.)	96,546,681	99,121,036	2,574,355	2.67
Manufacturing	103,577,508	106,324,191	2,746,683	2.65
Producing	42,404,841	48,971,289	6,566,448	15.49
Contracting	113,373,993	139,094,833	25,720,840	22.69
New business licenses issued	8,265	7,736	[1] 529	[1] 6.40
Licenses canceled	7,472	5,822	[1] 1,650	[1] 22.08
Total number of licenses issued	45,517	44,613	[1] 904	[1] 1.99
Wholesale value of tobacco sales	$8,326,891	$8,769,896	$443,005	5.32
Wholesale value of liquor sales	18,054,716	17,858,027	196,689	1.09
Salaries and wages [2]	600,741,218	412,080,077	188,661,141	31.40
Dividends [2]	42,581,887	34,722,523	7,859,364	18.46
Withholding on wages		230,223,539	[3]	
Gasoline consumption—gallons	116,926,239	117,662,736	736,497	.63
Diesel oil consumption—do	23,575,538	21,477,795	[1] 2,097,743	[1] 8.90
Aviation gasoline consumption—gallons	36,753,517	39,327,176	2,573,659	7.00
Butane consumption—do	161,130	206,795	45,665	28.34
Small boat harbor maintenance—gallons	3,843,160	3,684,210	[1] 158,950	[1] 4.14

[1] Decreases.
[2] Repealed Jan. 1, 1958.
[3] Not applicable.

Comparative real property tax values and other related data covering the entire Territory

Items	As of Jan. 1, 1957	Percent to total	As of Jan. 1, 1958	Percent to total
Assessor's gross valuation:				
Land	$966,657,339	50.00	$1,021,591,382	49.75
Buildings	966,667,881	50.00	1,031,818,707	50.25
Total	1,933,325,220	100.00	2,053,410,089	100.00
Exemptions:				
United States	421,810,647	21.82	453,879,623	22.10
Territory of Hawaii	147,239,155	7.62	166,142,921	8.09
Counties	68,495,407	3.54	75,331,271	3.67
Homes (fee and leaseholds):				
(1957) 50,774	150,398,578	7.79		
(1958) 52,714			156,380,468	7.62
Public utilities	30,322,089	1.57	31,199,893	1.52
Exemptions—Continued				
All others	$80,445,345	4.16	$84,520,451	4.12
Total exemptions	898,911,221	46.50	967,454,627	47.12
Assessor's net taxable values	1,034,413,999	53.50	1,085,955,462	52.88
Valuations on appeal	10,109,014		9,380,720	
Taxpayers net valuation	1,024,304,985		1,076,574,742	
50 percent of valuation on appeal	5,054,508		4,690,360	
Net valuation for tax rate purposes	1,029,359,493	53.24	1,081,265,102	52.66
Amount raised by taxation	15,649,187		16,637,902	
Average rate per $1,000 value	15.20		15.39	

Summary analysis of the finances of the Territory of Hawaii for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1958

	General fund	Special funds	Bond funds	Total
The Territory received from:				
Taxes	$68,692,073.77	$11,271,419.06		$79,963,492.83
Nontaxes	14,065,273.69	28,471,911.28	$27,800,000.00	70,337,184.97
Total receipts	82,757,347.46	39,743,330.34	27,800,000.00	150,300,677.80
Available cash at beginning of year	(3,923,368.93)	30,488,715.32	7,296,311.99	33,861,658.38
Total resources	78,833,978.53	70,232,045.66	35,096,311.99	184,162,336.18
The Territory paid out	77,626,678.20	38,497,314.20	26,964,952.84	143,088,945.24
Available cash at close of year	1,207,300.33	31,734,731.46	8,131,359.15	41,073,390.94
The cost of operating the Territorial Government for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1958, is detailed below by major functions and activities:				
Schools	29,537,176.96	7,460,226.32	437,536.32	37,434,939.60
Highways	17,523.41	9,930,613.26	9,931,911.08	19,880,047.75
Public safety	3,440,082.88	5,231,630.97	128,609.08	8,800,322.93
Hospitals	8,073,087.42	663,577.02	224,842.84	8,961,507.28
Public welfare	9,047,968.93	96,152.44	62,465.53	9,206,586.90
Utilities or other enterprises	88.54	4,057,837.14	3,936,680.22	7,994,605.90
General government	5,686,257.09	188,137.97	134,809.11	6,009,204.17
Health	2,570,531.12	625,517.64	41,397.50	3,237,446.26
Development and conservation of natural resources	2,769,172.08	1,078,951.51	775,482.42	4,623,606.01
Libraries	884,551.44	72,516.61	771.76	957,839.81
Miscellaneous	7,901,320.13	2,925,206.37	5,654,559.54	16,481,086.04
Loans to counties from bond funds			5,635,887.44	5,635,887.44
Purchase of investments	2,000,000.00	2,000,000.00		4,000,000.00
Bond redemptions and interest expense	5,698,918.20			5,698,918.20
Unemployment compensation and benefits payments		4,166,946.95		4,166,946.95
Total	77,626,678.20	38,497,314.20	26,964,952.84	143,088,945.24

EDUCATION—DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION

The increasing school population with its concomitant factors has continued to be one of the most important issues with which the public school system of Hawaii has had to contend. It has been made more acute by the fact that practically the entire increase has been on the island of Oahu, and more especially in rural Oahu. Most of the military installations are in rural Oahu, but many civilian housing projects are also rapidly being constructed in that area.

The geographical location of the increases are shown in the following table representing the five administrative districts of the Department of Public Instruction for Hawaii's territory:

	Honolulu	Rural Oahu	Hawaii	Maui	Kauai
Enrollment Jan. 1, 1957	50,240	38,723	17,491	11,511	6,892
Enrollment Jan. 1, 1958	52,153	42,471	17,341	11,294	6,899
Percentage increase	3.8	9.7	−0.9	−1.9	0.1

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, this concludes my remarks, at least for the time being.

I hope that before this legislative day is concluded the Senate once again will have approved the admission of Hawaii, with its more than 600,000 patriotic, vigorous, resourceful American citizens, to the Union. This year, I hope and believe, the House of Representatives will do likewise. At this precise moment the House bill for statehood for Hawaii is being debated over on the other side of the Hill.

Welcome to Hawaii.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, during my service in the U.S. Senate I have spoken to many people in my own State and throughout the country concerning statehood for Hawaii. As a member of the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, I made a trip to the Hawaiian Islands in 1953 for the purpose of ascertaining the feelings of the Hawaiians on the question of statehood and to gather information on many questions that had troubled me and others to whom I had spoken.

As a result of my study of this situation, I became convinced that to deny to the people of Hawaii the right to be a sovereign State in these United States of America was a grave injustice.

In previous Congresses, as in this Congress, I have sponsored legislation to bring Hawaii into full partnership in our Union of States. I am convinced that we should take this action for many reasons.

Over 100 years ago, the people of Hawaii asked to become a part of the United States. President Franklin Pierce supported negotiations to that end. In 1894, Hawaii became a Republic and 3 years later the new Republic offered to surrender its sovereignty for eventual statehood. The following year the United States annexed Hawaii by joint resolution of Congress under the same procedure by which Texas became part of the Union.

To deny Hawaii the right to become a State now would be to oppose the very purpose for which she gave up her sovereignty.

Since 1898, the people of Hawaii have repeatedly petitioned for the right to become a State. They are subject to Federal laws and pay Federal taxes. They do not want Commonwealth status, which is a step leading toward sovereignty. The people of Hawaii expressly gave up their sovereignty to become a part of the Union.

The right of the people of Hawaii to a State government and to representation in Congress should not be governed by geographical limits, and particularly so in this age of rapid communication. I have no fears for the United States on this account.

I am in favor of Hawaiian statehood, and I do not agree with those who do not trust the democratic processes to operate successfully in Hawaii.

The people of Hawaii have much higher educational standards than the average within the United States. They have a very low rate of illiteracy. Their per capita tax payments to the Federal Government are far greater than the national average.

I believe a serious error would be made to conclude that the problem of maintaining peace and good will between members of the Caucasian and Negro races applies to the situation in Hawaii. There the citizens of Japanese ancestry slightly outnumber the Caucasians. Those of Hawaiian, Philippine, and Chinese ancestry are also present in large numbers. Less than 1 percent of the population of Hawaii are of Negro ancestry.

With regard to the matter of Communist influence, according to my information, the actual number of Communists there is small. The latest figures from the Subversive Activities Commission for the Territory of Hawaii estimate that there are only fifteen hard shelled Communists left in the Isands. Hawaii is to be commended for establishing its own Subversive Activities Commission—something which very few States have done. In every State in the Union, it is probable that there is a handful of Communists. However, this does not mean that the vast majority of people in every State are not loyal Americans.

At this time, I would like to pay special tribute to the present Delegate from Hawaii, JACK BURNS. During World War II, JACK BURNS was responsible for the investigation of subversives and those whose interests were inimical to the United States. Many will recall that he was publicly cited for his work in persuading defection from the Communist Party.

It is gratifying to know that the present Delegate from Hawaii is a man who did much to defeat and destroy the influence of those who were unsympathetic to American ideals.

In the Second World War the Hawaiians proved their loyalty and dedication to the principles on which our country is founded. The degree of patriotism evidenced by Japanese of American ancestry during World War II is revealed by the gallant record of the 442d Regimental Combat Team, which was not excelled by any fighting unit serving under the Stars and Stripes. This unit sustained more casualties and received more decorations than any unit its size fighting for America in the Second World War. Not a single man surrendered to the enemy and only one was captured after he had been totally disabled. On one occasion this unit volunteered to rescue a Texas battalion that had been cut off by the Germans. Although they succeeded in their mission, they suffered more casualties in the operation than there were Texans left to be rescued.

The history of the expansion of our Union through granting statehood to new Territories is very enlightening in connection with the arguments being used to oppose statehood for Hawaii. 1953 was the 150th anniversary of the Louisiana Purchase. In studying my history at the time of this anniversary, I was impressed with the fact that today's opponents of statehood advance substantially the same arguments used by their predecessors in opposing all additions to the Original Thirteen States.

The Louisiana Purchase doubled the size of our new Nation. It was the biggest real estate bargain of all time since the Federal Government paid an average of only 3 cents per acre.

However, Representative Griswold, of Connecticut, on October 25, 1803, in opposing the acquisition of this new Territory, argued as follows:

> It is not consistent with the spirit of a republican government that its territory should be exceedingly large; for as you extend your limits, you increase the difficulties arising from a want of that similarity of customs, habits, and manners so essential for its support.

Senator Plumer of New Hampshire, on this same day, predicted:

> Admit this western world into the Union and you destroy at once the weight and importance of the Eastern States and compel them to establish a separate independent empire.

Senator James White, of Delaware, spoke out against Senate ratification of the Treaty of Acquisition in the following words:

> It may be productive of innumerable evils and especially of one that I fear to ever look upon. Thus our citizens will be removed to the immense distances of two or three thousand miles from the Capital of the Union, where they will scarcely ever feel the rays of the Central Government—their affections will become alienated; they will gradually begin to view us as strangers; they will form other commercial connections and our interests will become distinct. Even supposing that this extent of territory was a desirable acquisition, $15 million was a most enormous sum to give.
>
> We have already territory enough, and when I contemplate the evils that may arise to these States from this intended incorporation of Louisiana into the Union, I would rather see it given to France, to Spain, or to any other nation of the earth upon the mere condition that no citizen of the United States should ever settle within its limits. (The Louisiana Purchase, GPO, 1900, pp. 37–38.)

The passage of time has shown how ridiculous these arguments are that "affections will become alienated" and that "they will gradually begin to view us as strangers." It is hard for us to believe in this day and time that our Congressmen and Senators in the early 19th century could have been so shortsighted.

In 1811, when the area which I have the great honor to represent in this body, asked that interim territorial government be exchanged for statehood, Representative Josiah Quincy, of Massachusetts, felt that it would be better to destroy the Union rather than admit "these westerners." I quote his remarks:

> The bonds of the Union must be dissolved rather than admit these westerners. As it will be the right of all, so will it be the duty of some to prepare definitely for a separation, amicably if they can, violently if they must." (Yankee From Olympus, Bowen: Little, Brown & Co., p. 27.)

Eight years later, when Alabama petitioned for statehood, he became even

more abusive in his opposition to taking in new States:

> You have no authority to throw the rights and property of the people into the hodgepodge with the wildmen of the Missouri, nor with the mixed, though more responsible race of Anglo-Hispano-Gallo-Americans who bask on the sands in the mouth of the Mississippi. Do you suppose the people of the Northern and Atlantic States will, or ought to look with patience and see Representatives and Senators * * * pouring themselves upon this and the other floor, managing the concern of a seaboard 1,500 miles, at least, from their residence? (Ibid., p. 35.)

Every past effort to peacably bring in new States has met with similar disapproval. A few illustrations of this point will show that objections have not been restricted to any specific area. Western, eastern, northern, and southern Territories have had to contend with the same arguments when they strove to claim their full birthright as citizens of this great country.

The admission of California to the Union was filibustered in the Senate. An Ohio Senator predicted:

> With all its extent, California will never sustain one-half the population of Ohio, not one-half. The population of California will be very small indeed. (H. Rept. No. 109, 83d Cong., p. 70.)

Incidentally, it is estimated that California's population is now almost 14 million while Ohio's is slightly more than 9 million.

Oregon also faced opposition in the Senate in January 1843, when it petitioned for statehood. Senator McDuffie said:

> What is the nature of this country? Why, as I understand it, 700 miles this side of the Rocky Mountains is uninhabitable; a region where rain seldom falls; a barren, sandy soil; mountains totally impassable. Have you made anything like an estimate of the cost of a railroad from here to the Columbia (River)? Why, the wealth of the Indies would be insufficient. Of what use will this be for agricultural purposes? Why, I would not, for that purpose, give a pinch of snuff for the whole territory. I thank God for His mercy in placing the Rocky Mountains there.

When Mississippi asked to be admitted, the House Committee Report submitted December 23, 1816, stated:

> Your committee beg leave to remark that they cannot believe a State of such unprecedented magnitude as the one contemplated by the memorialists can be desirable to any section of the United States. Between the Tennessee and the Mississippi settlement there is not, and probably never will be, any commercial interest whatever.

In 1845, Florida's admission was attacked in Congress because a large part of the population consisted of Indians and Negroes, and because of the Spanish ancestry of many of her white citizens. When Arizona sought admission early in this century, Senator Henry E. Burnham of New Hampshire, a member of the Senate Committee on Territories, spoke for 3 days against statehood, criticizing the wide usage of the Spanish language in these States and holding that New Mexico and Arizona did not have sufficient population and natural resources to become prosperous members of the Union.

It is well known that the purchase of Alaska brought ridicule and abuse upon the head of Secretary Seward. The United States paid only $7,200,000 for the territory which has become our newest State and whose two distinguished Senators we were so happy to welcome to this body at the opening of the session. And yet, Representative W. F. Butler, of Massachusetts, on July 7, 1868, spoke out against ratification of the treaty of cession as follows:

> If we are to pay for Russia's friendship I desire to give her the $7,200,000 and let her keep Alaska. I have no doubt that any time within the last 20 years we could have had Alaska for the asking. No man, except one insane enough to buy the earthquakes in St. Thomas and the ice fields in Greenland, could be found to agree to any other terms for its acquisition by the country.

We would do well to pause and be thankful for the wisdom of our leaders who secured Alaska for our great country. If Alaska at present were a part of the U.S.S.R., our situation today in world politics would be far less tenable than it is.

It would be well for those who oppose the admission of Hawaii to recall that, without a single exception in our history, the addition of each new State has done more than merely enlarge our Nation; in each instance our country has been morally enriched and physically strengthened in the process.

Our country has become the great Nation that it is today largely because of statesmen in past Congresses whose sound judgment, foresight, and moral courage prevailed in the face of opposition to new States. Theirs was the vision to perceive that each new State brought into our Union resources and qualities which all of us today recognize to be indispensable ingredients of our national character. No one would care to dispute the fact that the United States would be much the poorer had Alabama, California, Louisiana, Oregon, or Texas been denied statehood. If these early critics of bringing new States into the Union had prevailed, the United States would now be composed of 13 States and a vast territory administered by even more Washington bureaucrats. And let us not forget that in every case each one of the 36 new States of our Union has faced the same kind of vigorous opposition that faces Hawaii today.

It is indeed fortunate that at these critical times in our history, our Congresses were peopled with men like Senator Breckenridge of Kentucky, whose reply to Louisiana's detractors in 1803 is as applicable today as it was 150 years ago:

> Is the goddess of liberty restrained by water courses? Is she governed by geographical limits? Is her dominion on this continent confined to the east side of the Mississippi? So far from believing in the doctrine that a republic ought to be confined within narrow limits, I believe, on the contrary, that the more extensive its dominion, the more safe and more durable it will be. In proportion to the number of hands you entrust the precious blessings of a free government to, in the same proportion do you multiply the chances for their preservation. I entertain, therefore, no fears for the Union on account of its extent.

Americans will always venerate the Jeffersons, the Livingstons, the Monroes. On the other hand, as the historian, Tallant, says:

> As to those who opposed, most of them faded into obscurity.

Is there reason for us to feel that future historians would be kinder to us if we failed to bring Hawaii into our Union?

A recent Gallup poll has shown that our citizens are in favor of Hawaiian statehood by more than 8 to 1. There is certainly no doubt that the vast majority of the citizens of the Hawaiian Islands wish to be full partners in our Union of States. It is my feeling that it would be a grave injustice to delay any longer in granting statehood to these loyal Americans.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, we are fast approaching the hour of decision on whether Hawaii is to become our 50th State.

If our answer is "yes," then we will have welcomed into the Union, as an integral part of our country, the last of our incorporated Territories. Statehood will confer upon the people of the islands, long since citizens of the United States, fundamental rights of self-government equal to our own. They will then elect their Governor, as we do ours; they will then be entitled to two U.S. Senators and a voting Representative in the Congress; and they will participate with us, every fourth year, in the election of the President.

But if our answer should be "no," let no one be deceived into believing that Hawaii will remain indefinitely an American Territory. To be neither in nor out, but to stay a colony, is no more acceptable to our fellow Americans in Hawaii, than it was to our own forefathers. They were subjects of the English King; they bore arms in his defense, and paid the taxes he levied upon them. Again and again, they petitioned him, through his appointed Governors, for redress of their grievances, but he refused to grant them more than limited rights of self-government. So, their call to reason, "No taxation without representation," became, at last, a call to arms.

Yet, despite this national birthright, we are today denying our fellow citizens in Hawaii many of the same prerogatives refused our forefathers by George III. In 1957, the Hawaiians paid over $150 million in Federal taxes, a larger total than several of the existing States, but Hawaii had no representation in Congress to vote either on how much tax should be collected, or upon how the money should be spent. In time of war, Hawaiians shoulder arms with the rest of us, yet they cannot vote for the President who shapes their foreign policy, or for Representatives in Congress who together hold the purse strings over their defense.

To remedy these inequities, the people of Hawaii want statehood. They are tired of standing, hat in hand, at the door of our Union. But what we must understand is this: If we refuse to let them further in, they will, in due course, demand to be let further out.

That we actually face a choice between these alternatives, my recent visit in Hawaii has convinced me. There, I was privileged, as one of five Members of Congress from the Interior Committees of both Houses, to conduct a joint investigation of the statehood question. The House committee was represented by B. F. SISK, Democrat of California; E. Y. BERRY, Republican of South Dakota; LEO W. O'BRIEN, Democrat of New York; while my colleague, the Senator from Colorado, Mr. JOHN CARROLL, and I, represented this committee of the Senate. We talked with hundreds of Hawaiians from all walks of life. We listened to every argument, pro and con. The consensus of this opinion, together with the most current information we could gather about social, economic, and political conditions in Hawaii, left me strongly persuaded the islands are ready for statehood, and we had best admit them now.

There is no doubt but what the vast majority of Hawaiians favor statehood. Even before Pearl Harbor, a plebiscite showed the population endorsing statehood by a margin of 2 to 1. Since then, support for statehood has steadily grown stronger. In 1950, a proposed Hawaii State constitution was approved by the people of the Territory by a vote of more than 3 to 1. Today, I would judge that the Hawaiians want statehood fully as much as did the Alaskans, who, a short 6 months ago, proved their sentiments when five out of six voted to ratify the bill admitting Alaska as the 49th State.

The proponents of Hawaiian statehood believe their case just as deserving as was that of Alaska. Indeed, the islands' economy is far more developed. Sugar and pineapple are produced in abundance by the best paid field workers in the world. The export of Kona coffee is increasing. On the large island of Hawaii itself, the 300,000 acre Parker Ranch, next to the world's largest ranch for Herefords, is a sight for a westerner who believes that the cattle country is limited to the highlands of the mountainous West; while to every island tourists come in burgeoning numbers, beckoned by the gentle tradewinds, in quest of the dazzling beaches and inviting waters. Hawaii, for all its tropical beauty, is bustling and prosperous. No one can charge it with being a "poor relation."

In other ways, too, Hawaii meets all the traditional tests for statehood. Its population of more than 550,000 exceeds that of 5 present States, and closely approaches that of my own State of Idaho. Its islands comprise an area of 6,423 square miles, making it larger than Delaware, Rhode Island, or Connecticut. Those who remonstrate that Hawaii is too remote, fail to reckon with the age we live in. From Boise city, the capital of my State, Honolulu can be as quickly reached by air as Washington, D.C.

Finally, the loyalty of the people of Hawaii has been proven in the hardest of tests. Americans of Japanese ancestry constitute more than a third of the population of Hawaii. Yet, when the Japanese torpedo bomber devastated our Pacific Fleet at Pearl Harbor, and the threat of imminent invasion haunted the islands for months following, not a single act of sabotage was ever traced to a resident Japanese American. Rather, the young Japanese volunteered by the thousands for army service. In the Italian campaign, their casualties were so heavy that their famous outfit was dubbed "the Purple Heart Battalion," winning seven separate Presidential Citations for valor.

It is true that Hawaii is the melting pot of the Pacific. The people are a polyglot mixture of native Hawaiian, Caucasian, Japanese, Filipinos, and Chinese, and the crosses between. But it is also true that Hawaiian life and culture, though it clings naturally to many happy phrases, songs, and customs of its colorful past, is nevertheless essentially American. The cities, the stores, the homes, streets, and schools, all bear the unmistakable stamp of the United States.

We met with public officials and private citizens alike, with teachers and students, with judges and housewives. We talked with businessmen and labor leaders. I had a morning's conference with the presidents of the Big Five, the dominant commercial interests that were once opposed to statehood, but now favor it.

When we left the islands, I came away convinced that the interests of our country urgently require that statehood be no longer denied Hawaii. Already a Commonwealth Party has been activated there. I talked with several of its leaders, who would like to see Hawaii set loose from the United States, absolved of all Federal taxes, and granted full rights of self-government, while the people retained for themselves American citizenship and the continued protection of the American flag. Patterned after the British system, the commonwealth idea is alien to our American tradition of building one Nation, rather than a loose-knit empire.

Today, the Commonwealth Party in Hawaii is small. The people of the islands are not seeking such a free ride. But if statehood is refused Hawaii, the commonwealth idea will grow rapidly. I shall not forget the parting word of one prominent commonwealth proponent. "Senator," he said to me, "right now, the people of these islands want statehood. If you refuse it, they will turn to our solution, and the time will come when you will have to recognize the independent Commonwealth of Hawaii."

To us on the mainland, facing westward toward an Asia awakening from its ancient slumbers, Hawaii is much too vital not to be made an inseparable part of the United States.

Mr. President, we are acting today to fulfill a pledge we made less than a year ago—the pledge to take up a statehood bill for the Territory of Hawaii at an early date in the 86th Congress. I am very pleased that before the Ides of March are quite upon us, we have honored this pledge.

The bill before the Senate, Mr. President, is not pedestrian legislation. It has historic and unique significance. In these days of continuing world crisis, it cuts cross-grain to the negative course that seems to have befallen us. This bill embraces no design to counteract or to contain. Its whole object is to expand and to fulfill in our best tradition as a free nation.

If this bill is enacted, the year of our Lord 1959 will be remembered by our children, and our grandchildren after them, as the year the great American Union was completed. The admission of Hawaii, the last of our incorporated Territories, as our 50th State, will lay in place the finishing stone of the mighty edifice of our Republic, the building of which began 170 years ago.

And in the history of the Western World, Mr. President, the year of our Lord 1959 will be remembered and remarked upon as the year the United States put an end to the last major vestige of its adventure in colonialism. As Hawaii achieves statehood, becoming a full and equal partner in our Union, we signal to the world that the principles of freedom and self-government still burn brightly in our land. If, in the days of our infancy, we could ignite a flame of freedom so bright as to shine like a beacon around the world, then now, in the days of our greatness, we must not do less.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, I believe it should be said that Hawaiian statehood would bolster American democracy in the Pacific, an area where American influence has suffered serious setbacks in recent years. The Communists have traded in propaganda concerning our differences and our conflicts. Not only would Hawaiian statehood bolster our military defenses and serve notice of our intention to remain in the Pacific, it would provide a State where the peoples of the Pacific and of Asia could study American traditions, where they could have visual proof that the east and west can meet, can live, and work together in peace and war, under the flag of freedom.

As the distinguished senior Senator from Nevada has recalled, Senator Newlands of Nevada, worked hard for Hawaiian annexation when he was a Member of this body 61 years ago. Nevada, because of its service in the Civil War, became known as the Battle Born State. What better, modern example can we have today of Hawaii's loyalty than the courage and sacrifice of its citizens during the critical days of World War II?

Today, Hawaii, with its rich tradition in the service of democracy, holds perhaps an even more strategic role in the defense of America. The islands are rendering an invaluable aid to our preparedness, in furnishing strategic tracking stations for our space satellite program. Taking part in our satellite program are such vital Hawaiian installations as the Air Force Tracking Station at South Point on the southerly tip of the big island, the Smithsonian Institution Observatory Station on Maui, the Missile Tracking Station on Oahu and at our Naval Air Station in the islands, in addition to our permanent Naval, Air Force, and Army bases.

Mr. President, Hawaii is now U.S. soil, it will, regardless of what we do here today, remain U.S. soil, and surely must

one day—now, I hope—become a State. I believe this particular time, when expressions of our faith and hope for the future are so desperately needed, would be the most appropriate time for statehood. The Hawaiian people have demonstrated their citizenship and their Americanism. Let us, then, face up to our responsibility.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I am proud to associate myself with legislation that will add the 50th star to the U.S. flag with the admission of Hawaii as a sovereign State.

Last year we fulfilled our obligation to Alaska and we can do no less this year for Hawaii. In fact, Mr. President, the arguments raised for and against the admission of Alaska as a State are equally relevant to the case for Hawaii.

The interest of my native State in Hawaii's destiny goes back many years. One of my illustrious predecessors, the late Senator Francis G. Newlands, introduced a resolution in Congress in 1898 which provided for the annexation to the United States of the Hawaiian Islands. At that time Mr. Newlands was a representative in Congress, and he was largely instrumental in gaining Territorial independence for the Republic of Hawaii.

To bolster the validity of the old saying that there is nothing new under the sun, I should like to point out that the argument of noncontiguity was raised by those who opposed the annexation of Hawaii more than 60 years ago. Senator Newlands' answer to this argument was contained in the following words:

> I shall assume that if the United States can acquire the island of Key West, off the coast of Florida, it can acquire the Hawaiian Islands, off the coast of California.

Another argument against Hawaii's becoming a State has been raised on the grounds of racial characteristics. I believe this argument can be leveled by the simple declaration, Mr. President, that the citizens of Hawaii are Americans. In this connection I shoud again like to quote Senator Newlands, who asserted in 1898—a little more than 60 years ago:

> Hawaii has already, by the peaceful processes of evolution, assimilated itself with us. For years it has been practically American. American ideas, American liberty, American civilization prevail there.

If that situation obtained more than six decades ago, it is all the more pronounced today.

Senator Newlands then prophetically pointed to Hawaii's strategic position as a defensive bastion in the Pacific. He declared:

> With these islands in our possession, no hostile attacking force could reach our Pacific coast from the Asiatic coast.

In 1910, on the floor of the U.S. Senate, Senator Newlands called for larger appropriations for the fortification of Hawaii. Again he demonstrated rare foresight in asserting:

> We are often told that the Pacific Ocean will be the theater sometime of a great naval war, and one of the chief arguments for the increase of our Navy is that in the future we will be menaced on the Pacific; that Japan's growing power there must sometime be met.

The ravage of Pearl Harbor and the terrible war that ensued gave grim testimony to the correctness of Senator Newlands' prophecies.

Another criticism against Hawaiian statehood is that the new State would have too much power because of the composition of its congressional delegation consisting of two Senators and one Representative. This old ghost is perennially paraded, but it evaporates in the face of the wisdom evidenced by our Founding Fathers when they decreed there should be two Senators from each State, regardless of population, as a proper measure of equality.

As the very able assistant majority leader the junior Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] said on the floor this week in a colloquy with the distinguished senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] the designation of two Senators from each State "is the way in which the small States receive a certain degree of protection, and it is the way which equalizes the preponderance based upon population and which the States with large population have in the House."

Opponents of Hawaiian statehood have asserted that Communist influences in the islands are both widespread and threatening. Even if this allegation were documented, which it is not, I believe that Hawaii as a State would be in a far better position to cope with such a problem than Hawaii as a Territory. It is both significant and heartening that our Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, under the able guidance of the distinguished senior Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], gave a unanimous stamp of approval to Hawaiian statehood.

Mr. President, we have a moral obligation that must be fulfilled if Hawaii is to be elevated from its second-class status of a Territory. The affirmative action we take on the pending bill will be heralded throughout the world as proof positive that this great democracy of ours will not tolerate colonialism in any form. In this respect it is important to point out that the islands are America's showcase for thousands of travelers from the Far East. En route to the United States these Asian visitors get their first taste of American democracy when they land in Hawaii.

It follows, Mr. President, that by granting full sovereignty to Hawaii we will be dramatically demonstrating true and undiluted democracy.

In conclusion, I turn again to the remarks made in Congress by my predecessor, Senator Newlands, who declared:

> We wish that this country should live nobly, that it should pursue the high purpose with which it started out, the purpose of establishing within our domain, as far as possible, a homogeneous independent self-respecting people.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BIBLE. I yield.

Mr. CARROLL. I wish to commend the distinguished Senator from Nevada for his able presentation. I had not previously known that a distinguished former Senator from the State of Nevada spoke with wisdom and foresight to urge the admission of Hawaii as a State, as was so ably and clearly outlined by the present distinguished senior Senator from Nevada.

When we examine appendix B and appendix C of the report on the bill, we find, according to appendix B, that since 1935 there have been 22 congressional investigations of the Hawaiian statehood question; and in appendix C, it is noted that there have been 34 separate reports and hearings by Congress. So it can clearly be seen, as the able Senator from Nevada has pointed out, that this is one subject which has been worked upon for 60 years.

As the Senator from Nevada has said, the time has come to take action, in line with the wisdom and foresight of the Senator's distinguished predecessor of more than 60 years ago. Although the proposal was not acted on then, we must not fail, today or tomorrow, to make Hawaii the 50th State.

Mr. BIBLE. I appreciate the statement made by the distinguished junior Senator from Colorado. I share his hope. I think our belief is well founded that ere many more hours we shall have seen complete congressional action, possibly, on both sides of the Capitol.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, again I rise on the floor of the Senate, as I have many times before, to speak in support of Hawaiian statehood.

Mr. President, the Members of the 86th Congress have the distinct opportunity and privilege to be recorded in history as voting for the admission of our 50th State. The people of Hawaii and the people of the Nation are anxiously awaiting our action. We have made them wait far too long.

The history of the Hawaiian statehood movement is a record of the undying efforts—for over 100 years—of the people of Hawaii to become a full and equal part of our Union.

In 1851, the King of Hawaii executed a deed of cession to the United States. Three years later, a treaty of annexation was drafted. In 1893, a similar treaty was presented to the United States, and was accepted by President Harrison, but was not acted upon by the Congress.

For nearly 50 years, Hawaii tried to become an integral part of the United States, and finally met with success in 1898, when the islands were officially annexed.

The ultimate intent of the people of Hawaii has been to exchange their independent sovereignty for statehood. Our predecessors in the 55th Congress spent many days deliberating on the annexation of the islands. The underlying argument stressed by the proponents was Hawaii's strategic importance to this Nation and her natural future membership in our Union of States. Mr. President, as long ago as 1854, the Hawaiian people petitioned their monarch to seek annexation by the United States.

In 1900, the incorporation of Hawaii as an organized Territory further demonstrated the manifest destiny of the islands to become a State.

The case for Hawaiian statehood has been argued longer and more exhaustively than has any other case for statehood in our history. Beginning in 1903,

every Hawaiian territorial legislature has petitioned Congress for admission into the Union. Almost half a century has elapsed since the first Hawaiian statehood bill was introduced in 1919. Such bills have been introduced in almost every intervening Congress. The ramifications of Hawaiian statehood have been investigated by almost every Congress in the past two decades. A total of 21 congressional investigations of this subject have been held since 1935. Thousands and thousands of pages of testimony in hearings and reports have been compiled. The record now is complete and voluminous and very little more can be said for the record.

Hawaii is ready for statehood in every conceivable respect. American principles, traditions, and institutions are thoroughly entrenched in the Territory. The vast majority of the Hawaiian people have known only the American way of life. Hawaiians with diverse racial and cultural backgrounds have assimilated harmoniously, and live as Americans under a republican form of government.

They live under the same laws and tax structure that we live under. Their entire body of law and administrative organization is identical in principle to that in parts of the United States. They are subject to the same Federal taxes that are imposed on the inhabitants of our 49 States. In fact, the Federal taxes that are paid in Hawaii in one year exceed the total of those paid in as many as 14 of our present States.

In 1935—24 years ago—the first congressional committee to visit Hawaii found "the Territory of Hawaii to be a modern unit of the American commonwealth with a political, social and economic structure of the highest type."

In 1937, a joint committee of the House and Senate visited Hawaii, and reported:

> Hawaii has fulfilled every requirement for statehood heretofore exacted of Territories. The Territory has consistently paid into the U.S. Treasury a considerably larger amount than the Federal Government has spent upon the Territory * * * (in 1937) Hawaii paid more than did five States combined.

Over the years, thousands of visitors to the islands have, on their return, reported, either officially or unofficially, that Hawaii's economic development has been so rapid that it is inconceivable to expect her people to be content indefinitely with a subordinate position in comparison to the position of the rest of our Nation.

It happens that a considerable portion of the people of Hawaii are of Asiatic origin. This is fortunate for us, because, as American citizens, they are more adept than some of the rest of us in translating the American ideal into terms which will be understood in Asiatic countries. It is to our utmost interest to let the people in the far Pacific know that the application of the people of Hawaii for statehood has been granted by Congress. The granting of statehood to Hawaii will demonstrate to the people of Asia and to the people of all the rest of the world that we are adhering to one of our most fundamental principles—namely, our dedicated belief in self-government and equal treatment of all citizens, irrespective of race, color, or creed.

Mr. President, at this point I feel compelled to mention to my colleagues and to the people of the United States something of great significance which will follow when Hawaii is admitted to our Union: Unfortunately, too many of the people of the United States and too many of the other people in the Western civilizations fail to realize that the great majority of the people of the world—vast numbers of them—are not of the Caucasian race. Last year, Alaska was admitted as the 49th State of our Union. If we fail to act now to admit Hawaii to our Union, we shall be saying to the rest of the world, to all the non-Caucasians in the world, not that Hawaii is noncontiguous to continental United States, not that other questions are involved, but that we refuse to admit Hawaii because it is composed of peoples whose skins are not white.

Mr. President, it is time that the people of the United States oriented themselves in the world, and oriented themselves to the fact that the great, gasping mass of humanity which seeks to find for itself relief from poverty and oppression and seeks to find opportunities for advancement, is not white. It is yellow, brown, and black. It is only a matter of chance that the 600 million or 700 million people in China, the 90 million people in Japan, the perhaps 250 million people in the Malayan States and in the Indonesian Republic, and the 300 million or 400 million people in India are not members of the white race. It is time that we Americans recognize that our primary task is to sell the American ideal to these peoples.

We do not have to convince them that Americans have the ability to outproduce anyone else in the world, or that Americans have more automobiles, more airplanes, more telephones, more televisions, more radios, and greater wealth than does any other nation in the world. They know that. But the most important job we have in the entire world is to convince them that we Americans believe implicitly in the principles our forefathers laid down in our Constitution and our Declaration of Independence, and that we intend to fight for those principles, not only in our own country, but throughout the world. That is our job. By demonstrating that we are willing to accept into full brotherhood in our Union the people of Hawaii who predominately are of other races, we shall prove to all the people of the world who by chance do not happen to have white skins that we have the same will to face up to the ideals of our Constitution and our Declaration of Independence that our forefathers had. Probably that action will prove it better than anything else we could do at this session, and probably it will have a greater impact on them.

Mr. President, as my friend, the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH], pointed out only a few minutes ago, during World War II and the Korean conflict, the people of Hawaii served and defended this country, alongside soldiers from continental United States. Their performance was as patriotic and loyal as that of other Americans who served with our troops during the war.

Mr. President, at this point in my remarks I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial from the Denver Post of February 24, 1959, setting forth the facts of the service of the people of Hawaii to the Nation, the editorial being entitled "Congress Owes It to the Nation To Make Hawaii Our 50th State."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONGRESS OWES IT TO THE NATION TO MAKE HAWAII OUR 50TH STATE

This week a crucial drive is starting in Congress to bring the Territory of Hawaii into the Union as the 50th State after a wait of more than half a century.

If Congress is responsive to the wishes of a vast majority of the people of the 49 States—as well as the wishes of the people of Hawaii—the statehood bill will be well on its way to enactment before the Easter recess.

We like to think that Congress, in acting upon the bill, will be mindful of the importance of the Hawaiian Islands to the Nation.

The strategic value of this Pacific stronghold of the Army, Navy, and Air Force should not require elaboration.

There are other values, of course.

Hawaii pays more taxes into the U.S. Treasury than do nine of the existing States. Its per capita income is higher than that of 35 States. Its area is greater than that of three existing States.

It is booming economically. A $40 million oil refinery and a semi-integrated steel mill are being added to its diversified industry.

It has a larger population than any other Territory had at the time of statehood with the single exception of Oklahoma.

We hope Congress will be mindful of the fact that in the last two wars, the Korean conflict and World War II, servicemen from Hawaii suffered a greater casualty rate than any of the contingents from any of the States, without a single case of cowardice or defection to the enemy.

We trust Congress will understand that Hawaii has reached a stage of development where statehood is essential to its continuing prosperity.

Hawaii is outgrowing its plantation economy. Its expanding population is creating problems in the fields of planning, education and public services which an absentee Government, located in Washington, cannot solve satisfactorily. A vigorous State government with power to act on all problems must be provided.

Congress must be made to appreciate that a Territorial status cannot meet the needs of Hawaii today.

If statehood should be denied, this country will be guilty of colonial exploitation and Hawaii must, eventually, for it own best interests, demand an independent status.

We are encouraged by the fact that more than a majority of the Members of the Senate are now listed as sponsors of the bill for Hawaiian statehood.

House Speaker SAM RAYBURN has added to the hopes of friends of Hawaii by predicting that the statehood bill will not be sidetracked in committee.

Senator ALLEN J. ELLENDER, Democrat, of Louisiana, has set the pattern for opposition to Hawaiian statehood in this Congress.

He objects because only about one-fourth of the residents of the islands are of Caucasian origin.

He also drags in the old, discredited claim that Hawaii is in danger from Communist-dominated labor leaders.

Hawaii's record during the Korean war and its postwar record of consistently defeating union-sponsored programs in the Territorial legislature should be complete answers to the Communist scare.

U.S. citizens of Japanese ancestry make up about one-third of the Hawaiian population.

Many of these are second and third generation Americans by now.

They are as thoroughly American as the people of Louisiana or any other State. They have attended American schools, learned American history.

What Senator ELLENDER may really fear is that Hawaii, where people of many races live together in harmony, would send two racially tolerant Senators and one racially tolerant Congressman to Washington.

But whether or not Hawaii becomes a State, the days of second-class citizenship for nonwhite Americans are numbered. Defeat of the Hawaiian bill would not change that.

But it would be a grave injustice to the 500,000 fine Americans who live in the islands.

It would brand the United States as an oppressor of minority groups in the eyes of hundreds of millions of Asiatics.

And it could, in time, cost us the possession of the Hawaiian Islands themselves.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, the Communist issue—which involves the question of whether certain alleged Communists or Communist front organizations could in fact control Hawaii or Hawaiian elections—should be faced squarely here on the floor today. There are nearly 200,000 persons in Hawaii who are members of the labor force. Approximately 25,000 are members of the unions alleged to be Communist dominated. Only a few—a very few—of these 25,000 have ever been accused of being Communist sympathizers or Communist Party members.

If this had been proven in the past, the Federal Government, having the authority, facilities, and power to deal with Communist infiltrated unions, would have taken the necessary steps to strip the unions of their collective-bargaining rights.

Such Federal action would free local employers from recognizing these unions in contract negotiations and also permit union members to expel their Communist leaders. No action to this effect has been taken by Federal authorities.

The late Senator Butler, of Nebraska, investigated this problem thoroughly on two separate occasions. In 1947 he opposed Hawaii statehood because he felt positive steps were necessary to mitigate the Communist influence in the islands. In 1952—5 years later—Senator Butler reversed his position. He reported:

I believe the residents of Hawaii have demonstrated by positive action their awareness of the Communist danger and their determination to face it frankly and never let it strengthen its foothold. During these years they have fought it boldly, have restricted its influence, and to some degree have driven it underground. I believe they have shown that they are as well able as the Federal Government to cope with this menace.

Senator Butler's findings are substantiated by reports from the FBI, naval and military intelligence. The FBI in 1953 stated that at no time were there more than 160 Communists in Hawaii. A 1951 FBI report listed only 36 known Communists.

Today it is estimated that between 40 and 60 Communists are left in all the Islands. This is 40 or 60 out of a total population of almost 635,000—at the most, Communists number only 1 out of every 10,000 people in Hawaii.

Other arguments against Hawaii statehood have been based on distance and noncontiguity. The admittance of Alaska discounts both. The speed of modern air travel further lessens the pertinence of such arguments. Hawaii is less than 5,000 miles from Washington, and only 2,500 miles from San Francisco. It is possible to be in Honolulu in less than 18 hours from Washington, and overnight from San Francisco. This is less time than it took to travel from the Capital to California when the latter was admitted into the Union. Jet aircraft will lessen the distance from time even more.

Some opponents of statehood claim that our other territories and possessions will demand statehood if Hawaii is admitted. This is an assumption wholely based on speculation, not proof. I understand that we have had absolutely no indication or requests from any of our insular possessions to be granted statehood. Moreover, it is a congressional tradition that an organized Territory must first serve an apprenticeship as an incorporated Territory with its own organic act before being admitted into the Union. Hawaii is our last incorporated Territory. Our organized Territories can become incorporated only by act of Congress.

I must say at this point, with all frankness and candor, that I do not expect to have my vote interpreted, nor do I wish my vote upon the Hawaiian statehood bill to be interpreted, as being a commitment or a partial commitment in favor of the admission into the Union of States of any other tract of land until such territory has gone through a period of apprenticeship and appears to be qualified for such application.

Deliberations preceding the admittance of Alaska often centered on the new State's lack of population. However, a majority of both Houses justified the grant of statehood on the merits of the case. It is hard for me to understand the use of this same argument against Hawaii when her population of about 635,000 is approximately 2½ times that of Alaska—and more than that of six of our present States: New Hampshire, Delaware, Vermont, Wyoming, Nevada, and Alaska.

Hawaii's apprenticeship as a Territory has more than qualified her for full and equal membership in our Union of States. She has met every conceivable test.

Mr. President, it is our solemn duty, indeed I may say it is one of the greatest acts Congress can take in the interest of our Nation's welfare, to grant to Hawaii statehood at this time.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a collection of editorials from various newspapers in the United States be made a part of my remarks at this point.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ALABAMA

Gadsden (Ala.) Times, February 9: "'All clear for Hawaii now,' seems to be the word in Congress. The way was paved for Hawaiian statehood, of course, by Alaskan statehood on January 3, 1959. In fact, it has been common for States to be admitted by pairs with little or no time gap: New Mexico and Arizona within six weeks in 1912. Idaho and Wyoming 8 days apart in 1890. In 1889 North and South Dakota on the same day, and then Montana and Washington 3 days apart."

Tuscaloosa (Ala.) News, January 30: "It is generally agreed that Hawaii with its 554,000 civilian population has much to recommend it for statehood."

Decatur (Ala.) Daily, January 25: "Will Hawaii become the 50th State? If we knew the timetable in Washington we could answer the question. This we do know, eventually that Territory will become a State. The pattern was made when Alaska was welcomed."

ALASKA

Anchorage Daily Times, January 6: "Admission of Hawaii should complete the Federal family which started with 13 States * * * It is inevitable that Hawaii will some day be the 50th State. The only question left is timing. If it is to be a State eventually, why not now?"

ARIZONA

Yuma (Ariz.) Sun, February 8: "With Alaska we abandoned the notion that only Territories directly attached to the continental United States could be brought within the fold of States. Once we did that, then what difference whether the spread is 1,500 miles or 2,600? By all the fair measures Hawaii is believed ready for statehood."

ARKANSAS

Camden (Ark.) News, February 9: "Alaska is over the hurdle and is one of us. Now it's Hawaii's turn. Hawaii seems to present a more stable picture than in former years. Communist influence in unions appears to have waned and that argument has faded in consequence."

Texarkana Gazette, February 17: "A star for Hawaii? The issue has reached the point where much further delay cannot be explained on reasonable grounds."

CALIFORNIA

San Francisco Chronicle, January 27: "All the arguments against statehood have been persuasively answered. The people of Hawaii have long since demonstrated their adherence to American traditions, ideals, and culture. The allegation of Communist domination in the islands has been proven flimsy, indeed. The population has risen to 635,000, larger than 6 of the existing States."

Los Angeles Examiner, February 5: "It is the position of the Examiner and other Hearst newspapers that Hawaii merits statehood and should receive it at this session of Congress. These are our reasons: In the testimony of Rear Adm. Kenmore M. McManes, Chief of Naval Operations for Administration, the Pentagon has endorsed Hawaiian statehood as militarily desirable. The grant of statehood to Alaska has removed one of the chief arguments in the past. This was the argument of noncontiguity—that is, territories not physically joined with our other States should not be admitted to statehood. The jet age has nullified distances. Both Alaska and Hawaii are frontline bastions of defense. Economically, Hawaii is certainly as well equipped as Alaska to support statehood. Despite fears of Communist influence

in the islands, we have it on the word of such responsible men as Interior Secretary Fred A. Seaton that communism is under as strict surveillance in the islands as it is here. There is a Territorial subversive activities committee that cooperates closely with the FBI. We consider that half-hidden opposition to Hawaiian statehood because of the racial mixture of its people as completely insupportable. In fact, denial of statehood would do us tremendous psychological damage throughout the whole Pacific. As W. R. Hearst, Jr., summed it up Sunday in Editor's Report: "My father advocated statehood for Hawaii. That is still the position of the Hearst newspapers.' "

Los Angeles Mirror-News, February 5: "There is little doubt that admission of Hawaii to full statehood will be voted early in this session of the Congress. There is no reason, in logic, to bar Hawaii. With its population well on the way to a million, Hawaii has more people than several States. It pays its own freight, yielding more U.S. income tax than quite a number of our States in good standing."

Fullerton (Calif.) News-Tribune, February 3: "The usual array of arguments advanced in the past against the admittance of Hawaii appear to have been discarded at last. Favorable action now is predicted this session, and is long overdue."

Riverside (Calif.) Press, February 1: " * * * The words of the special subcommittee (of the House Insular Affairs Committee) report are worth noting: 'There are about 25 identified Communists in Hawaii. We have no exact knowledge as to the number of so-called fellow travelers but investigating agencies (including the FBI and the Territorial subversive activities committee) told us they know of no additional Communists since the previous congressional reports. We were unable to find any evidence in the social fabric of Hawaii that communism had made any substantial progress or that the community as a whole was unable and unwilling to cope with the problem. We were told that the FBI investigations, plus the Federal court convictions (under the Smith Act) had crippled the Communist apparatus and it would remain crippled. Fear no longer holds even the vestige of validity as a reason for keeping Hawaii out."

Vallejo (Calif.) Times-Herald, February 3: "In every sense, Hawaii has demonstrated allegiance to the United States and her principles of government. * * * The Nation should welcome Hawaii into the family of States."

Oakland Tribune, January 27: "Launched with the full support of the administration, the annual battle to bring Hawaii into the Union is under way again, and after nearly 40 years, it appears that the 50th star will be added to the flag. There will be some effort to prevent it once more, but the support that already has been announced for the measure in both Houses of Congress indicates that the opposition will be overcome, as it should."

Fresno Bee, February 11: "With Alaska ensconced in the Union, it will be difficult indeed to justify denial of the same status to Hawaii."

Hollywood Citizen-News, January 27: "Hawaii's efforts to control communism were emphasized by Interior Secretary Fred A. Seaton yesterday in urging the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee to approve a bill to make Hawaii the 50th State."

Turlock (Calif.) Journal, February 5: "The arguments currently being advanced against statehood for Hawaii are few and feeble. Unless some better ones turn up, Congress will have a hard time finding reasons not to make it possible for Hawaii to become the 50th State."

Oakland Tribune, February 5: "The people of Hawaii have been put aside far too long as it is."

San Jose Mercury, February 7: "The Territory has the people, the resources and—above all—the will to become the 50th State. All the legal requirements have been or can be fulfilled readily. All that lacks at the moment is congressional action."

Pasadena Independent, February 7: "The fact that Alaska has become a State is a contributing argument for Hawaiian statehood, but it is only one among many * * *. Statehood is logical, just and necessary."

Bakersfield Californian, January 27: "The islands have become an important part of the Nation's organization, and its economic, social and political life has been closely tied with our own for more than half a century. The events of World War II clearly impressed on the minds of the American people the close connection between the islands and the mainland."

San Jose News, January 23: "If that resounding phrase 'taxation without representation' still can raise anger, then Hawaiians have a right to anger. They are not at all represented. This is idiocy in a modern, democratic western world."

San Bernardino Sun, January 8: "Both Alaskans and Hawaiians have shown unflinching patriotism in times past when the United States has faced major crises. Hawaii also will be most welcome into our family of States."

San Diego Union, January 3: "In the celebration for Alaska, it should not be forgotten Hawaii is equally deserving of statehood. It should be a good thing to approve Hawaii as the 50th State in the flag before major production starts on the 49-star flag."

COLORADO

Fort Morgan Times, February 13: "This Congress should admit Hawaii. Her admission is favored by President Eisenhower, Harry S. Truman, Richard M. Nixon, Earl Warren, Paul M. Butler, Fred L. Seaton, Joseph W. Martin, Gordon Allott, and a long list of statesmen expressing themselves from a bipartisan standpoint."

Pueblo Star-Journal, February 8: "By all the fair measures Hawaii is ready for statehood. The issue has reached the point where much further delay cannot be explained on reasonable grounds."

Pueblo Chieftain, February 12: "Comment on Hawaii statehood at Washington, in connection with the committee hearings there, brings out the significant fact: The series of political defeats the ILWU has suffered in Hawaii in recent years is regarded as an asset to the statehood fight."

CONNECTICUT

Waterbury (Conn.) Republican, January 23: "In many respects, we suspect that the Hawaiians are more American than a great many Americans. Certainly Communist efforts to influence the island government have been pitiful failures, and there can be little doubt that participation by Hawaiian leaders in the affairs of Congress would be of great value because of their long and intimate experience in dealing with oriental peoples."

Bridgeport Post, February 9: "The indications are that in the name of justice toward the people, this Congress will soon pass the necessary legislation, and the United States will once again face the problem—but a much simpler one—of adding another star to the flag."

Norwich Bulletin, February 8: "Now that Alaska has been launched as a full-fleged member of the Union, the reasons for withholding such status from Hawaii are even less compelling than in the past. Congress would do well to approve this measure without further delay."

New Britain Herald, January 17: "The case for Hawaii is a good one: American traditions, affiliations, and interests all abound. Further, there is an outright desire by Hawaiians to be Americans, regardless of the tax increases and other problems it will mean."

DELAWARE

Wilmington (Del.) News, February 7: "In Congress even the opponents of the admission of Hawaii as a State are saying they believe it is inevitable * * *. Nothing succeeds like success—nothing, at least, is a better self-starter in almost any field of endeavor. The success of Alaska beams directly across the Pacific towards Hawaii, which is basking in the glow."

FLORIDA

Tampa Times, January 27: "One of the best reasons for bringing Hawaii into the Union is that it will extend the frontier of the United States well into the Pacific and make us a closer neighbor to Asia. The voice and vote of persons who understand the Asian viewpoint may be a valuable asset in Congress. The granting of full statehood to a Territory with such a large Asian population might also serve to favorably impress other Asian nations and combat anti-American propaganda spread by the Reds."

St. Petersburg Times, January 24: "With a Hawaiian statehood bill in effect already 'passed' in the Senate and with hearings on such a measure promised soon in a House committee, the chances are much better than even that our new flag will have to be redesigned before we have become accustomed to it."

GEORGIA

Atlanta Constitution, January 17: "If the United States wishes to show unmistakably and unequivocally that it stands foursquare behind the principle of equality of all men under God, it can do so by admitting Hawaii to the Union."

Columbus Enquirer, January 28: "These points and others made by (Interior Secretary) Seaton before the House committee should convince the members that Hawaii is ready to enter the Union. It is hoped that the group will lose no time in approving such legislation."

Albany (Ga.) Herald, February 11: "All indications thus point to a 50th star for the American flag in 1959. As in the case of Alaska, the Nation will be far wealthier in terms of human as well as natural resources as a result of congressional action approving Hawaii's unrelenting will for statehood status."

Thomasville (Ga.) Times-Enterprise, February 3: "Statehood for Hawaii is pretty much assured if public reaction is any token. If the Congress is going to approve the plan, it would seem silly to delay now that Alaska's broken the ice."

Rome (Ga.) News-Tribune, February 3: " 'All clear for Hawaii now,' seems to be the word in Congress. The way was paved for Hawaiian statehood, of course, by Alaskan statehood on and as of January 3, 1959."

IDAHO

Idaho Falls (Idaho) Morning Post Register, February 6: "By all the fair measures Hawaii is believed ready for statehood. The issue has reached a point where much further delay cannot be explained on reasonable grounds."

ILLINOIS

Chicago Sun-Times, January 28: "There is no reason whatever why Congress should go slow in granting Hawaii statehood, as demanded by statehood foes. * * * Congress should act to permit Hawaii to join the Union before the current session ends in July or August."

Aurora Beacon-News, January 22: "One of the inescapable tasks confronting the 86th Congress is that of granting statehood to Hawaii, a favor to the islands and to the Nation that has been too long delayed."

Alton Telegraph, January 23: "The United States should welcome Hawaii into state-

hood now; make her part of the country instead of a mere dependent."

Decatur Review, January 28: "In every way, Hawaii is eminently qualified for statehood * * * only statehood will give to the people of Hawaii the full citizenship to which they are undeniably entitled."

Quincy Herald-Whig, January 19: "The people of the Hawaiian Islands have been clamoring for entrance into the Union even longer than Alaska. Congress will find it difficult to withhold statehood from the Pacific islands."

Carbondale South Illinoisian, January 29: "Perhaps the strongest argument for Hawaiian statehood, and one which applied in Alaska last year, is that American citizens in our Territories who pay taxes and serve on battlefronts and fulfill all other duties of citizens deserve a voice in the U.S. Congress where the laws are passed that govern them."

Danville (Ill.) Commercial News, January 30: "Hawaii has earned the star in her crown—and in the American flag. Let us hope she gets it soon."

INDIANA

Madison Courier, January 27: "Hawaii is an enterprising and modern country. It would make a nice addition to the United States."

La Porte Herald-Argus, January 6: "With Alaska officially having become the 49th State, it is appropriate to hope that the new Congress will lose no time in acting to make Hawaii the 50th."

South Bend Tribune, January 25: "Now the number of required States' approvals has been increased by Alaska's admission to the Union, and it is probable that Hawaii also will win statehood in the near future."

Gary Post-Tribune, February 6: "Hawaii's request for statehood is a fine tribute to the American form of government."

Washington (Ind.) Times, February 7: "Industrial development and population growth in Hawaii have gone hand in hand. The island's billion dollar annual gross product should provide enough revenue for intrastate expenses."

Terre Haute Tribune, February 6: "Even that old bugaboo, communism on the islands, has been given the coup de grace by Representative FRANCIS E. WALTER, chairman of the House Committee on Un-American Activities. Noting that the Red menace is weaker than when his group investigated several years ago, WALTER came out for Hawaiian statehood."

Plymouth Pilot-News, February 16: "At long last it seems that Congress will recognize that justice to Hawaii must be done in granting statehood to that Territory."

IOWA

Sioux City Journal, January 30: "Population-wise, the islands are bigger and in many ways better qualified economically and politically for statehood than many of the 49 States were at the times of their admission to statehood."

Marengo (Iowa) Pioneer-Republican, January 15: "Although it required almost a half-century after Arizona was admitted to the Union as a full-fledged State before another Territory finally made the grade into statehood, there seems to be a lot of optimism everywhere before we have the 50th State in the fold."

Delwein (Iowa) Register, January 21: "Five major Pacific commands in Hawaii show the Islands' military importance. Statehood will serve notice to the world that the United States intends to stay in the Pacific."

Fort Madison Democrat, February 7: "Hawaiian statehood should be an immediate order of business in the Senate as in the House."

Burlington (Iowa) Hawkeye-Gazette, February 3: "The odds are that Hawaii will be granted statehood in this session of Congress."

Cedar Rapids Gazette, February 5: "Since Alaska and Hawaii often have been coupled together in earlier bills for admission and, perhaps equally significant, in many party platforms, the point about admission in pairs is well taken."

KANSAS

Wichita Morning Eagle, February 6: "One of the major objections to Hawaiian statehood was erased when Alaska became a State. This was the idea that a territory without borders contiguous with the present United States would be difficult to defend and lacking in common interests with the other States."

Lawrence Journal-World, January 22: "Among the leading Americans who have come out in favor of statehood for Hawaii are President Eisenhower and Chief Justice Earl Warren of the U.S. Supreme Court."

Wellington (Kans.) News, February 3: "Let's send word to our Senators and Congressmen that there is no need or reason to wait longer to add that 50th star to our flag for Hawaii."

Dodge City Globe, January 28: "Secretary of the Interior Fred Seaton, former Kansan, told Congress Monday that 'we need Hawaii as an equal partner as much as Hawaii needs statehood.'"

KENTUCKY

Owensboro (Ky.) Messenger Inquirer, February 9: "Reasons and excuses for deferring the admission of Hawaii to statehood are now impotent if not negligible."

Middlesboro News, February 9: "Alaska is over the hurdle and is one of us. Now it's Hawaii's turn. By all the fair measures Hawaii is believed ready for statehood."

Winchester Sun, February 16: "One opponent of statehood argued that bringing Hawaii into the Union would be 'a geographical absurdity,' but in an age of swift transportation and communication this in itself is an absurdity."

Ashland Independent, January 6: "In point of population the Hawaiian Islands are ahead of Alaska, having substantially more than 500,000 inhabitants. The territory pays more Federal taxes than 10 of the existing States. Hence its application will be hard to refuse."

LOUISIANA

Lafayette Advertiser, February 5: "Hawaii seems to present a more stable picture than in former years. Communist influence in unions appears to have waned, and that argument has faded in consequence. By all the fair measures Hawaii is believed ready for statehood. The issue has reached the point where much further delay cannot be explained on reasonable grounds."

MAINE

Portland (Maine) Express, February 5: "The mood in Congress at this session seems to be 'All clear for Hawaii now.' If the mood lasts, flagmakers will have their work to do all over again."

Bangor (Maine) News, December 18, 1958: "There's no need to review at length the history of Hawaii's long struggle to win statehood status. And we hope members of Maine's delegation to Congress feel the same way and will, to use the slogan of the Hawaii Statehood Commission, 'Help Hawaii become the 50th State in '59.'"

MARYLAND

Baltimore News Post, January 6: "The Hearst newspapers are proud of the part they were privileged to play in the long and vigorous campaign to win statehood for the huge territory which we bought from Russia in 1867 for $7.2 million. The Nation's eyes should now be directed toward Hawaii as a possible 50th State."

Hagerstown Herald, February 6: "With Alaska we abandoned the notion that only territory directly attached to the continental United States could be brought within the fold of States. Once we did that, then what difference whether the spread is 1,500 miles or 2,600?"

Cumberland News, February 6: "It has been pretty common for States to be admitted by pairs with little or no time gap. Idaho and Wyoming 8 days apart in 1890. In 1889 North and South Dakota on the same day, and then Montana and Washington 3 days apart."

MASSACHUSETTS

Boston Globe, January 31: "Hawaii has removed the last plausible objection to admission by writing strong anti-Communist provisions into its proposed State constitution. Both justice and common sense require that she quickly become a State."

Boston Record, February 5: "It is the position of the Daily Record and other Hearst newspapers that Hawaii merits statehood and should receive it at this session of Congress. We consider the half-hidden opposition to Hawaiian statehood because of the racial mixture of its people as completely insupportable. In fact, denial of statehood would do us tremendous psychological damage throughout the whole Pacific."

Boston Traveler, February 7: "Occasionally the United States gets a chance to do itself a real favor and, at the same time, make a big impression on the rest of the world—all without spending a dime. Such an opportunity knocks once again in the bill for Hawaiian statehood, now before Congress."

Boston American, February 6: "It is illogical and unfair to grant statehood to Alaska and deny it to Hawaii."

Springfield, News, February 10: "Hawaii should be admitted to the Union as Alaska's pair. They both belong in the Union, and things won't seem right until we have 50 stars in the flag."

Haverhill Gazette, February 5: "If Hawaii becomes the 50th State this year—and certainly chances now seem favorable—the country will have acquired a pair of States with little time lag in between. There is considerable precedent for such expansion in America."

Springfield Union, January 17: "With Alaska now a full-fledged member of the United States, the logical step is immediate admittance of Hawaii, which has earned statehood along with Alaska."

Christian Science Monitor, January 30: "There are committee processes to be ground out and votes to be taken, but it looks as if mainlanders should be making leis to loop around the necks of incoming Hawaiians."

MICHIGAN

Detroit Free Press, January 6: "We are not through yet, by any means. Before this year is out, we may very well see the 50th star added as Hawaii is admitted."

Detroit Times, February 7: "The House Interior Committee voted 25 to 4 for Hawaiian statehood. The bill to create our 50th State heads next for the Rules Committee, then action by the full House, then the Senate. Though there is some die-hard opposition, the measure should succeed."

Detroit Times, February 4: "The jet age has nullified distances. Both Alaska and Hawaii are front line bastions of defense."

Royal Oak Tribune, January 2: "Maybe pretty soon we will have to change these for 50-star flags, because Hawaii is asking for statehood as well. We hope that this Territory can achieve it soon."

Hillsdale News, January 17: "Deserving Hawaii has been denied statehood much too long."

Muskegon Chronicle, January 20: "Hawaii has waited a long time, much longer than Alaska waited. Within another year our flag is likely to have its 50th star."

Jackson Citizen Patriot, January 29: "Hawaii has some strong arguments on its

side. It has more than double the population of Alaska and is more advanced economically. It is better able to support State government and, like Alaska, is a key bastion in the defense of the United States."

Port Huron Times-Herald, February 9: "It looks as though the chances for Hawaii being admitted to the Union soon are very good."

Albion Recorder, January 30: "Hawaii does, however, by most apparent standards deserve admittance as a State soon."

Saginaw News, February 3: "Both major parties have pledged statehood for several years. Last year they even stood for an 'immediate' grant of statehood. Now it's time that the promise was fulfilled."

Battle Creek Enquirer-News, February 6: "Congress seems to be in a mood to speed action on Hawaii, as it should."

MINNESOTA

Duluth News-Tribune, January 19: "* * * the United States has made itself ridiculous in the eyes of the world by its delay in granting statehood to Alaska for so long and now by its continued delay in making Hawaii a State—after so many pledges."

St. Cloud Times, January 19: "Hawaii has been knocking on the doors of the Union for 55 years. It has more population than Alaska, more industry, more developed wealth. Maybe this is Hawaii's year. We hope so."

Faribault News, January 3: "On this important date for Alaska—official recognition as a State of the Union—we express the hope that Hawaii in the coming months will be admitted as the 50th State."

MISSISSIPPI

Greenville Democrat-Times, February 12: "Our American forefathers rejected being taxed without being represented. The Hawaiians now bear far heavier taxes without representation and send their sons into the armed services via a draft they had no voice in approving. We repeat, the people of Hawaii have too long been denied these rights. This must be Hawaii's year to attain statehood."

Gulfport Biloxi Herald, February 11: "Now it's Hawaii's turn. The issue has reached the point where much further delay cannot be explained on reasonable grounds."

MISSOURI

St. Louis Post Dispatch, February 8: "Everybody who had hoped that Hawaii and Alaska would come into the Union together last year will be delighted with the excellent progress of the Hawaiian cause in a Congress that is barely a month old."

St. Louis Post Dispatch, January 20: "With the 49th State thus working for the 50th-to-be, surely a Hawaiian statehood bill will be an early enactment of the session."

Kansas City (Mo.) Star, January 20: "The great majority of islanders (there are nearly 600,000) consistently have favored statehood. And recent polls show approval by citizens of other States."

Columbia Missourian, January 29: "There is little reason for denying Hawaii admission to the Union at this time."

Hannibal Courier Post, January 29: "It was especially gratifying that Interior Secretary Fred A. Seaton appeared before the House Interior Affairs Committee to make a strong case for Hawaiian statehood. He noted that Hawaii has been preparing for 59 years, which is a good deal longer time than was required."

St. Joseph News-Press, February 4: "The way was paved for Hawaiian statehood when Alaska officially became a State on January 3. An over-the-shoulder look shows that it is quite common for States to be admitted to the Union in pairs."

Columbia Tribune, February 3: "The way seems clear for the early admission of the islands territory."

MONTANA

Butte Post, February 7: "Now that Alaska has been launched as a full-fledged member of the Union, the reasons for withholding such status from Hawaii are even less compelling than in the past. Congress would do well to approve this measure without further delay."

Havre News, February 2: "It is pleasing to note that Republican and Democratic Senators are getting together to see if they can get Hawaii into the Union by the end of this year. Most of the stumbling blocks of the past have been removed and a count of favorable senatorial noses leads us to believe that the great day for Hawaii isn't far off. The more realistic Congress gets about Hawaii the more it realizes that statehood for the Territory has been delayed too long."

Great Falls Leader, February 4: "By all the fair measures Hawaii is believed ready for statehood."

Missoula Sentinel, February 5: "Alaska has broken the ice and changed the flag. Now it is Hawaii's turn."

Billings Gazette, February 4: "Since the measure to admit the Territory of Alaska to statehood was passed at the last session of Congress, it has been taken for granted that the Hawaiian Islands will be voted into the Union during the present session. All reports coming out of Washington on that subject serve to indicate that this prediction will be fulfilled."

NEVADA

Las Vegas Review-Journal, February 5: "A star for Hawaii? * * * This year odds run more strongly for it, though opposition still exists. By all fair measures Hawaii is believed ready for statehood."

NEW HAMPSHIRE

Claremont Eagle, February 5: "All clear for Hawaii now, seems to be the word in Congress. The way was paved for Hawaiian statehood, of course, by Alaskan statehood on and as of January 3, 1959."

Nashua Telegraph, February 7: "Hawaii seems to present a more stable picture than in former years. Communist influence in unions appears to have waned, and that argument has faded in consequence."

NEW JERSEY

Trenton Times, February 3: "There were good and sufficient reasons for the decision of Congress to grant statehood to Alaska. There are equally good reasons for making Hawaii the 50th State."

Passaic Herald-News, January 28: "With such a favorable finding by the subcommittee and the admission of Alaska as a precedent, the Hawaii statehood bill should stand a good chance of passage."

Asbury Park Press, February 12: "Hawaiian statehood will be voted before Easter, Washington prophets says. President Eisenhower has called for prompt action; the Pentagon says that statehood would help the war effort."

Paterson Call, February 6: "Congress would do well to approve this measure without further delay."

NEW MEXICO

Albuquerque, N. Mex., Journal, February 4: "The opposition to admission of Hawaii has been largely by southern Congressmen because it seems another State added to the procivil rights camp, and would enhance the likelihood of more stringent civil rights legislation. But the green light for admission appears to be fixed, especially since the proponents have picked up the votes of the new State of Alaska."

NEW YORK

New York Times, March 5: "Hawaiians of every background have proved their loyalty by fighting and dying for our country on equal terms with Americans from the mainland. Against that background statehood for Hawaii is an obligation the rest of us have long owed our fellow Americans who live in those beautiful islands."

New York Times, February 1: "There is no reason or excuse to put off statehood for Hawaii. The fact that Alaska has become a State is a contributing argument for Hawaiian statehood but it is only one among many."

New York Journal-American, February 3: "It is the position of the New York Journal-American and other Hearst newspapers that Hawaii merits statehood and should receive it at this session of Congress. As W. R. Hearst, Jr.. summed it up Sunday in Editor's Report: 'My father advocated statehood for Hawaii. That is still the position of the Hearst newspapers.' "

New York Times, January 4: "Now we must hope and expect that the 86th Congress will grant statehood to that other Territory which in these days of jet travel lies just across the river that we call the Pacific Ocean, west by south from San Francisco. Hawaii should be next."

New York Journal-American, January 5: "But now our new star in the North is firmly fixed in the flag, and there is room for that Western star that will ascend one day when Hawaii also wins statehood. The Union still grows—and the prophets of doom are confounded."

Mount Vernon Argus, January 6: "So to Alaska, already in, and to Hawaii, knocking at the door, our best wishes for growth throughout 1959 and thereafter along lines which will make their peoples prosperous and happy."

Little Falls, January 22: "Legislation to admit the Territory of Hawaii as the 50th State in the Union has been introduced in Congress, and it is to be hoped that 1959 is the year when this long-sought goal of the islanders will become a reality."

Jamestown Post-Journal, January 28: "The Nation needs Hawaii as an example before the world of American democracy in action. Hawaii should become the 50th star in the flag this year."

Albany Times-Union, January 31: "Hawaii's chances of becoming a State this year continue to look good."

Yonkers Herald-Statesman, February 10: "Now in this promising year of 1959 the newest baby of the grand and glorious galaxy of States was born on January 3. Is Alaska to grow up alone? Or will there be the usual twin? Are you listening, Hawaii?"

Troy Record, January 30: "The admission of Hawaii is only fair and reasonable. The measure deserves speedy support and it is pleasing to observe that Congress seems to also be in the mood to take care of this long-neglected old business."

NORTH CAROLINA

Wilmington, N.C., Star, January 28: "Now that Alaska has attained statehood status, the long-time supporters of Hawaiian statehood are starting the ball rolling for a 50th State. Interior Secretary Fred A. Seaton fired the opening gun for the administration Monday when he declared that after a 59-year 'apprenticeship' Hawaii has earned the right to fair and equal treatment with the other 49 States. Apparently, that apprenticeship is about over. And we agree that 59 years is a long apprenticeship not to have a turning."

Burlington, N.C., Times News, January 27: "Prospects for statehood for Hawaii appear bright before the present 86th Congress completes its work and its Members, in recess, journey home again. Hawaii has a stronger bid now that Alaska finally was victorious in the battle for statehood, after many years, in the 85th Congress last year. The barrier was not the absence of justification for statehood grants, but the restraining power of politics."

Durham, N.C. Herald, January 28: "The Nation's new 49-star flag appears destined to

be outmoded almost as soon as it is run up on the flagpoles for the first time officially next July. Congressional support for Hawaii as the 50th State is already showing a strength approaching that which put over Alaskan statehood last year. With Hawaii, as with Alaska, the movement is bipartisan. It is reflected by leaders both in Congress and the Eisenhower administration. Most important, however, it is reflected in prompt action by Congress * * *."

Greenville, N.C., Reflector, January 29: "There is little if any reason for Congress to continue to deny statehood to this Territory of the United States which has been incorporated since 1898. Clearly Hawaii has earned the right to statehood."

Stanford (N.C.) Herald, January 23: "'Much more than an ordinary newspaper, or a piece of merchandise, is in your hands at this moment. This 1959 progress edition of the Advertiser is an appraisal of the coming year, that looms as bright as that 50th star that seems almost ready to jostle the others in the flag's field of blue.' So begins an editorial in the 62-page Honolulu newspaper issued January 1 for the express purpose of stating Hawaii's case for entrance into the Union of the United States. The paper, a copy of which this week reached our desks, is a brilliant statement of purpose. We read it literally for hours and must confess utter amazement at the power and might and industry which is Hawaii today. * * * Here are some of Hawaii's arguments: Dedicated Americans, Hawaiians look to Congress for full rights of citizenship; jets cut time from San Francisco to 4½ hours; American business capital is pouring into the islands (in Honolulu, as an example, a $50 million shopping center is planned this year); research and diversification in agriculture foretell new vistas of production and sales; and certainly pressure mounts politically on the basis of Alaska's admission. The case for Hawaiian statehood, we submit, is eloquently stated."

OHIO

Cleveland Plain Dealer, February 6: "The overwhelming vote in the House Interior Committee (25 to 4) to admit Hawaii to the Union makes it all but certain that the House of Representatives will speedily approve legislation to make Hawaii the 50th State."

Toledo Blade, February 7: "So if sunny Hawaii becomes the 50th State soon after chilly Alaska's having been made the 49th, Congress will not only be playing fair to the islanders but it will be following a tradition. Let it be another couple soon."

Ashtabula Star-Beacon, February 10: "Alaska is over the hurdle and is one of us. Now it's Hawaii's turn."

Fostoria Review-Times, February 19: "Statehood would confirm the hope that America believes in the full development of local self-government. Our national policies will be judged in no small measure by the decisions we make in respect to the people of Hawaii."

Dayton News, January 27: "Hawaii has struggled for years for the recognition which she now richly deserves."

Mt. Vernon News, January 30: "Congress should not let the Hawaii statehood bill drag along until near the end of the session when it will become lost in the mad rush to enact essential legislation before adjournment."

Cambridge Jeffersonian, January 31: "The loyalty of the Hawaiian was especially pronounced during World War II. Having fulfilled all qualifications, they are perfectly justified in demanding American citizenship."

OKLAHOMA

Enid Eagle, January 27: "For both the mainland United States and the islands themselves, there is little doubt of the mutual value of statehood, both from an economic and a defense basis. It is to be hoped that this time the dream of statehood will be realized * * *."

Alva Review-Courier, February 8: "There seems little doubt now that Congress will be granting statehood to the Territory of Hawaii."

Norman Transcript, February 10: "Now it's Hawaii's turn. The issue has reached the point where much further delay cannot be explained on reasonable grounds."

OREGON

Portland Journal, January 27: "Supporters of Hawaiian statehood stepped aside last year to let the Alaskan bill go through alone. This year the sponsors of Alaskan statehood, including Alaskan and Pacific Northwest delegations, are solidly supporting Hawaii's bid."

Medford Mail-Tribune, December 16, 1958: "It would be singularly appropriate—from Oregon's standpoint—to have the Hawaiian Islands become a State on the 100th anniversary of Oregon's own statehood (during 1959)."

Astoria Astorian-Budget, January 21: "There is no logical argument against Hawaiian statehood. It obviously ought to be granted and Congress has no valid excuse for neglecting it."

La Grande Observer, February 7: "Hawaii is ready for statehood. The issue has reached a point where much further delay cannot be on reasonable grounds."

Eugene Register-Guard, February 10: "Alaska came in officially on January 3, 1959. It would be appropriate this year to add Hawaii as its twin."

Pendleton East Oregonian, February 6: "Today * * * southern Senators are unlikely to filibuster against Hawaiian statehood."

PENNSYLVANIA

Philadelphia Inquirer, February 1: "Surely the time has come when this Territory should follow Alaska into the Union, as our 50th State. Her people deserve it, they very much desire it, and they would be a valuable addition to the United States of America."

Pittsburgh Sun-Telegraph, February 3: "The grant of statehood to Alaska has removed one of the chief arguments in the past."

Pittsburgh Sun-Telegraph, February 6: "It is illogical and unfair to grant statehood to Alaska and deny it to Hawaii."

Reading Times, January 31: "For we hope by the time the 1st session of the 86th Congress completes its chores, Hawaii will be the 50th State."

Ambridge Citizen, February 5: "The arguments currently being advanced against statehood for Hawaii are few and feeble. Congress would do well to approve this measure without further delay."

Oil City Derrick, February 12: "Hawaii should have statehood."

Reading Eagle, February 14: "Quick and overwhelming endorsement of statehood for Hawaii by the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee of the U.S. House of Representatives has reviewed hopes of that Territory's 580,000 inhabitants for admission to the Union after 61 years of subordinate status."

Hazelton Standard-Sentinel, February 13: "We need Hawaii as an equal partner as much as Hawaii needs statehood"—Interior Secretary Fred A. Seaton.

Lancaster News, January 4: "It seems incredible that Hawaii can be kept out."

Doylestown Intelligencer, February 9: "Why not add another star to the flag—pronto?"

Altoona Mirror, February 10: "Let's aid Hawaii. Alaska is over the hurdle. Now it's Hawaii's turn."

Scranton Times, January 29: "* * * it looks now as if the Nation's flagmakers can get busy shortly on the design of another new national emblem bearing a 50th star."

Scranton Tribune, January 26: "As far as the committee (headed by Congressman LEO O'BRIEN, N.Y., Dem.) is concerned, Hawaii has been 'in training' for statehood for 60 years and measures up on all pertinent points * * *."

Homestead Messenger, January 23: "Remind your Congressmen of plea of Hawaiians: It might result in the addition of a 50th State of the Union."

SOUTH CAROLINA

Greenville (S.C.) Piedmont, February 5: "Alaska is over the hurdle and is one of us. Now it's Hawaii's turn. By all the fair measures Hawaii is believed ready for statehood. The issue has reached the point where much further delay cannot be explained on reasonable grounds."

SOUTH DAKOTA

Pierre Capital-Journal, January 3: "Next July we will be flying a flag with 49 stars. That flag ought to have 50 stars by 1960."

Aberdeen American News, February 3: "The United States has made itself ridiculous in the eyes of the world by its delay in granting statehood to Alaska for so long and now by its continued delay in making Hawaii a State—after so many pledges."

Aberdeen American News, February 4: "The way was paved for Hawaiian statehood by Alaskan statehood on and as of Jan. 3, 1959."

TENNESSEE

Nashville Banner, January 27: "Now admit Hawaii. Congress can and should act swiftly, to fulfill a commitment which rests on the merits of the case. The time to do that is now."

Chattanooga Times, February 2: "For years, the prospects have been for Alaska and Hawaii to make it together. Alaska is in; Hawaii should not be far behind."

Oak Ridge Oak Ridger, February 3: "It is wrong to deny any other people rights—as the residents of Hawaii have been denied them for years—just because the votes of their future Congressmen might be in conflict with local sentiments."

TEXAS

Dallas News, January 31: "Statehood for Hawaii has been favored by both major parties by repeated Gallup polls and by three Presidents—Roosevelt, Truman, and Eisenhower. The prosperous sugar, pineapple and tourist industries could easily support a State government."

Beaumont Journal, February 6: "Now that Alaska has been added to the sisterhood of States, there is no sound reason for holding out any longer on Hawaii."

Fort Worth Star-Telegram, February 9: "Like Alaska, the 49th State, Hawaii will be an inviting frontier for development when it becomes a State."

Austin American, February 6: "By all the fair measures, Hawaii believed ready for statehood."

San Antonio Light, February 4: "Despite fears of Communist influence in the islands, we have it on the word of such responsible men as Interior Secretary Fred A. Seaton that communism is under as strict surveillance in the islands as it is here."

Waco Times-Herald, February 2: "This country and both its political parties are obligated by sentiment and repeated promises to give statehood to Hawaii."

San Angelo Standard, February 5: "A recent team of congressional investigators found the islands unmarked by signs of Communist control. Hawaii more than many States, has fought against this menace and brought them under control."

Austin Statesman, January 30: "Statehood is owed Hawaii. Simple justice demands it."

Tyler Telegraph, January 9: "Hawaii is deserving and the Hawaiians have waited for statehood too long already."

UTAH

Salt Lake City Deseret News, January 27: "While the world generally has pointed very critically at Little Rock, Americans could point with pride at the superb example Hawaii gives of many people of a mixed society living together in harmony."

VERMONT

Barre Times, January 27: "This newspaper implores the Vermont delegates in Congress to support immediate statehood for Hawaii. Sixty years of apprenticeship is enough."

VIRGINIA

Lynchburg Advance, February 19: "Admission of the Territory of Hawaii as the 50th United States appears to be just over the blue Pacific's horizon, if not around the corner."

Alexandria Gazette, February 9: "The arguments currently being advanced against statehood for Hawaii are few and feeble. Now that Alaska has been launched as a full-fledged member of the Union, the reasons for withholding such status from Hawaii are even less compelling than in the past."

Norfolk Ledger-Dispatch, February 7: "The drive to grant statehood to Hawaii has begun in Congress with such vigor as to suggest that flagmakers would do well to avoid laying up too great stockpile of the banners with 59 stars."

Newport News Press, January 20: "Alaska is in and Hawaii is not far behind."

WASHINGTON

Seattle Times, January 29: "Now for No. 50. Now that Alaska is off to a good start as the 49th State, we believe the appropriate legislation in both congressional chambers should be brought to an early vote and enacted into law."

Tacoma News-Tribune, January 31: "Congress should regard the will of the people and put Hawaii's star on the flag."

Spokane Spokesman-Review, January 29: "Nothing, except the vagaries of political contention, now can excuse failure to take final and decisive action on these patient petitioners. There is no good reason why the vote of both houses should fail to be 'yes.'"

Walla Walla Union-Bulletin, February 5: "Congressman Russell Mack, of Washington's Third District, has come out unequivocally for the admission of Hawaii as our 50th State."

Longview News, January 23: "Congress has no reason now for not admitting Hawaii. Certainly no territory has been in as good a position to help the United States build friendship and sound business relations in the Pacific."

Everett Herald, January 22: "The whole matter simmers down to the point that it is too bad the Congress did not vote statehood for Hawaii the same year it voted Alaska into the Union."

Olympia Olympian, February 9: "With Alaska we abandoned the notion that only territory directly attached to the continental United States could be brought within the fold of States. Once we did that, then what difference whether the spread is 1,500 or 2,600?"

WEST VIRGINIA

Bluefield Sunset News-Observer, February 16: "President Eisenhower has called for prompt action; the Pentagon says that statehood would help the war effort. Hawaii's chances look good."

Clarksburg Exponent, February 10: "A star for Hawaii? By all the fair measures Hawaii is believed ready for statehood."

Morgantown Dominion News, February 5: "Statehood in pairs. The way was paved for Hawaiian statehood * * * by Alaskan statehood on and as of January 3, 1959."

Mullens Advocate, January 15: "Alaska—and now Hawaii? The Territory pays more Federal taxes than 10 of the existing States * * * its application will be hard to refuse."

Logan Banner, February 5: "Hawaii seems to present a more stable picture than in former years. Communist influence in unions appears to have waned, and that argument has faded in consequence."

WISCONSIN

Milwaukee Sentinel, February 1: (Editor's report by William Randolph Hearst, Jr.)—"My father advocated statehood for Hawaii. That is still the position of the Hearst newspapers."

Racine Journal-Times, January 30: "This session of Congress owes to the people of Hawaii—and, as Secretary Seaton pointed out, to the people of the whole United States—a vote for immediate statehood for a Territory that has waited 59 years for the privilege."

Milwaukee Sentinel, February 6: "Despite fears of Communist influence in the islands, we have it on the word of such responsible men as Interior Secretary Fred A. Seaton that communism is under as strict surveillance in the islands as it is here."

Eau Claire Telegram, February 5: "All clear for Hawaii now, seems to be the word in Congress. Although opposition still exists, the odds are that it will not be strong enough to make an impression."

Oshkosh Northwestern, December 2, 1958: "Now with Alaska in the fold, it seems no more than fair that Hawaii should be granted the same privilege."

WYOMING

Casper Tribune-Herald, February 4: "The old arguments against the island State have been either answered or destroyed by the action on Alaska."

Cheyenne Eagle, February 7: "With the 49th State thus working for the 50th-to-be, a Hawaii statehood bill should be an early enactment of the session."

Sheridan Press, February 11: "Statehood for the islands * * * is about to enter the bill-drafting stage for the umpteenth time. By all the fair measures Hawaii is believed ready for statehood."

Sheridan Press, February 3: "To all current appearances, however, the curtain has been lifted and Hawaii is on the way in."

Cheyenne State Tribune, February 13: "Alaska has broken the ice and changed the flag. * * * Now it's Hawaii's turn * * * further delay cannot be explained on reasonable grounds."

WASHINGTON, D.C.

Washington Star, January 21: "The territorial form of government is the normal step preliminary to statehood, and Hawaii meets all reasonable standards for admittance now as a full-fledged State. There is no good reason for further delay."

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, I rise to associate myself with the eloquent and informative remarks which have been made on the floor today by the many distinguished Senators in support of this historic measure for statehood for Hawaii.

As a Senator from the great State of Utah, I am particularly happy that among the first pieces of major legislation on which I am privileged to vote is statehood for Hawaii. For years I have read and studied what I could on the question of Hawaiian statehood. Then, upon becoming a Member of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, I continued my study of the Hawaii statehood question in the truly voluminous committee records on the subject, and I attended with keen interest the hearings held late last month by the committee on S. 50, of which I am one of the cosponsors.

SIMILARITY TO UTAH'S HISTORY

Hawaii's long, long record of knocking at the doors of Congress for admission as a State struck a most responsive chord in my memory of the efforts on behalf of my own State. For 40 long years the people of the Beehive State sought statehood, and on six separate occasions the Congress denied full equality to them. It was not until 1896 that Utah was finally admitted.

Hawaii, of course, has waited even longer and has petitioned the Congress even more often than did Utah. She became an integral part of the United States in 1900, when the people of Hawaii became American citizens and the Constitution of the United States was extended to her. Beginning in 1903, the Territory, through its popularly elected legislature, has petitioned Congress for statehood on 17 different occasions. Since 1920, no fewer than 66 bills have been introduced in successive Congresses providing for statehood.

STATEHOOD PETITION SIGNED BY 120,000

The legislature's actions have, of course, reflected the desire of the people of Hawaii. In 1954, I recall from my study of the records, the elected delegate from Hawaii and the Governor of Hawaii presented to the Vice President of the United States a statehood roll of honor signed by almost 120,000 citizens of Hawaii exercising their constitutional right of petition to Congress. This gigantic honor roll—it comprises a half-ton of newsprint—was a simply worded petition for immediate statehood for Hawaii. Some 120,000 citizens took the time and the trouble to go to a central place and sign this petition; and often they had to wait in line, sometimes for a long time.

The House and Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committees have been most industrious and thorough in their inquiries into Hawaii's readiness for statehood. The record on the question comprises more than 6,600 printed pages of testimony and exhibits, as I know from my efforts to learn the facts and their signifigance. More than 850 witnesses have been heard in the Territory and in Washington. Seven of the hearings have been held in Hawaii. At least 12 reports have been made, all but one of them, I believe, favorable to statehood.

The question of admitting Hawaii to statehood has been longer considered and more thoroughly studied than has any other statehood proposal that has ever come before Congress. Thirty-six States have previously been admitted to the Union by action of Congress; yet in no single case, not even that of Utah, has there been such a thoroughly careful study of the qualifications of the applicant as in the case of Hawaii.

A more direct link between Utah and Hawaii is the recent dedication at Laie in Hawaii of a $3 million college sponsored by the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints. That church is one of the most vigorous and rapidly grow-

ing churches in the Hawaiian Islands, and the dedication of the new college symbolizes its vigor and growth there.

THE PEOPLE OF HAWAII

However, Mr. President, the aspect of Hawaii that has impressed me the most in my studies on statehood is the people of Hawaii. I heard it stated during our committee hearings that the more than 600,000 American citizens of Hawaii should not be admitted to stand on a basis of equality with other American citizens in the 49 States because some of them had ancestors that were non-Caucasian. More than 85 percent of the people of Hawaii are native-born American citizens, educated in Hawaii's American school system—which is outstanding in all respects—and are thoroughly imbued with the principles of Americanism and democracy. They know no loyalty other than that to America. They proved that loyalty, indelibly, on the bloody battlefields of Europe and Korea, and in their peacetime services to their community and their fellow citizens.

Mr. President, at our committee hearing one of the outstanding witnesses was an American of Japanese ancestry, Mike M. Masaoka. Mike and I attended the University of Utah together, and I know of my own knowledge what a sincere, thorough-going American he is. For the benefit of the Members of the Senate, I should like to quote from Mike's statement before the committee. He said, in part:

First, as to Hawaii's population of preponderantly non-European ancestry, we submit that this is one of the most potent arguments for—and contrary to those who insinuate otherwise, not against—statehood.

The harsh realities of this troubled, tension-filled world are such that the destiny of free men and of free nations, including our own, may well be determined by the two-thirds of the world's population that inhabit the so-called Pacific Basin.

Both the Soviet Union and Red China are cognizant that the balance of power lies in this vast area, and they are systematically attempting to win the minds and the hearts of men with their economic, military, and psychological weapons.

There is an old newspaper saying that one picture is worth a thousand words.

GOOD FAITH DEMONSTRATED

The Communists have much to say, and more to promise, to the restless peoples of the Far East who, stirred by the spirit of nationalism, are yearning to break the bonds of colonialism and to gain acceptance and dignity among the nations of the earth.

Thus far, we have demonstrated our good faith and our belief in the self-determination of peoples. We granted independence to the Philippines as we promised. We helped reconstruct and rehabilitate defeated Japan along democratic principles and then restored her sovereignty. We made the major contribution to the defense and the existence of free Korea. We are responsible that a free China continues to survive. We have bolstered the fighting forces and the economies of southeast Asia with our foreign aid.

While on one hand we have demonstrated our good will toward those of Asian ancestry, on the other we have continued to deny equality of status and have discriminated against an integral part of our Nation, an incorporated territory for more than 60 years, whose voters overwhelmingly time and time again expressed their determination to be full-fledged, participating citizens of the United States.

To the millions of dark-skinned people who are the most numerous of the earth's peoples, regardless of our explanations, the only reason they understand to deny statehood to Hawaii is because there are so many persons of Asian and Polynesian ancestry resident there. This apparent discrimination is emphasized by Alaska's admittance last year into the sisterhood of States, leaving Hawaii as the only remaining incorporated territory in our country.

DEMOCRACY IN ACTION

The grant of statehood to Hawaii, with its many persons of Japanese, Polynesian, Chinese, Korean, Filipino, and other ancestries at this time would—in our opinion—be a positive, constructive step in our efforts to prove that our practices live up to our professions.

To our mind, more than any other single act that might be undertaken by this Congress and Government, statehood for Hawaii would be the picture of democracy in action that will offset the thousands of words poured out by the Communist hatemongers against us.

Hawaii, already a meetingplace for the East and the West, by its very location as the crossroads of the Pacific, could—and should—be our living showcase of democracy.

Indeed, at the present time, thousands of students annually from all of free Asia are invited by our Government to come to Hawaii to study not only our way of life but also our methods of production.

HAWAIIANS FULFILL ALL OBLIGATIONS

One can easily imagine what some of these students must think when they learn that, though Hawaiians pay taxes and fulfill all other obligations of citizenship, they—like so many of their revolutionary fathers on the mainland more than 183 years ago—cannot vote for their own representatives, or executives, or judges. Once Hawaii becomes a State, however, these students would better appreciate the meaning of democracy and would be better able to witness it in action. Then, on their return to their respective homelands, they could better preach the gospel of freedom and equality.

If Hawaii is admitted to statehood, the peoples of Asia particularly would know that persons of their own ancestry are able to participate fully and successfully in the democratic system. Such visible knowledge would give them assurance that this way of life is practical and appropriate for them, too.

Moreover, it will give to the United States and to the free world a new citizenry which, by its very background, culture, and feeling, is best qualified to explain our ideals and our objectives to the peoples of Asia and to interpret for us the hopes and aspirations of most of the world's population. Indeed, considering that we are least informed about these peoples, Hawaiian Americans who trace their ancestries to the new nations of Asia could render our country an invaluable service in establishing mutual understanding and comity.

DISCRIMINATION INCONSISTENT WITH NATIONAL SECURITY

Mr. President, I concur most heartily in Mike Masaoka's testimony. Surely the world of 1959 is not a world in which it is consistent with our national security—to say nothing of the moral and spiritual values at stake—for us to relegate to a secondary status 600,000 American citizens who have met each and every one of our historic tests of readiness for statehood because some of them have non-Caucasian ancestors.

Mr. President, I urge approval of S. 50 as reported by the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee so that we may show all the world that the United States practices what it preaches in the way of democracy and self-determination for its own citizens, as well as supporting such principles elsewhere in the world.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. President, it is quite clear to me that the Senate of the United States will soon grant statehood to the Territory of Hawaii.

At the outset, I think, we ought to commend the men who have through the years made the great fight for statehood for Hawaii. I observe sitting in the Chamber of the United States Senate today, the Delegate in the House of Representatives, from the Territory of Hawaii [Mr. BURNS], whose courage, vision and foresight have contributed in large measure to what I hope will be the passage of the bill by the Senate and what I am informed will be passage of the bill by the other body very soon.

I also wish to commend the able and distinguished Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], the chairman of the subcommittee, and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH], who a short time ago addressed this body in a magnificent speech, outlining the activities in Hawaii of a group of independent Senators not long ago and likewise the recent activities of a very fine House committee, under the able leadership of Representative LEO O'BRIEN, of New York, ably assisted by Representative SISK, of California, and Representative BERRY, of South Dakota.

Mr. President, the able and distinguished Senator from Idaho and I, as members of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, visited the Hawaiian Islands in November to determine whether, in our opinion, that rich Territory was ready for statehood.

After our inquiry and talking to many persons in all walks of life; investigating Hawaii's industry and commerce, its potentialities and its important role in the economy of the Pacific, we concluded there is only one answer.

Hawaii should be granted statehood and at the earliest possible moment.

I feel we can no longer delay in adding this 50th star to our flag and still hold up our head in the free world.

The people of Hawaii want statehood. They are prepared to assume all the obligations of statehood. The admission of Hawaii into the sisterhood of States will be a glorious day for the entire Nation.

We have delayed too long in granting statehood, but further delay would be an imposition we could not tolerate as a nation devoted to the cause of freedom. Statehood will bring equal rights to a group of civilized and mature citizens, who no longer can be relegated to the role of second-class citizens. They have earned and deserve the full rights of citizenship with a voice in their own Government. They pay taxes, they furnish wealth to the United States, and

they deserve all the rights and privileges which statehood will bring.

In World War II, volunteer units from Hawaii showed their patriotism and courage. They fought valiantly as Americans. In fact, the 442d regiment from Hawaii was the most decorated regiment in World War II. Again in Korea they showed they were ready and willing to give their lives for the United States of America.

We cannot do less than grant statehood to the patriotic and sincere citizens of the Hawaiian Islands who have been working to that end for many years.

I would emphasize that granting statehood to Hawaii would give us a tremendous lift in the eyes of the world, especially the Asian nations, who look with scorn upon our professions of freedom so long as we retain Hawaii as a colonial possession.

Any further delay in granting statehood will have serious repercussions in the Far East. I say that to live up to our American ideals, we must grant statehood, and at once.

Hawaii is one of the most delightful places in the world. It has a climate without great extremes. Flowers and plants grow in profusion, there are vast expanses of beaches, towering mountains, waterfalls with running streams. Hawaii is one of the near approaches to paradise on this earth. Millions of dollars have been invested in resort hotels and in making Hawaii a visiting place for people from many lands.

It also is a land of vast plantations, of industry, of shipping and business enterprise. It is not merely a playground, and it does not take too long a visit to realize the wealth and industry which abound in the beautiful galaxy of islands.

Moreover, it has a great resource in the intelligent and progressive citizens who call it home. These people have an earnest desire for statehood for Hawaii. They cannot see why this Nation—supposedly devoted to assuring equality and justice to all—has so long delayed in granting statehood.

Few people realize the extensive area which makes up the group of islands. They do not realize the vast amount of wealth these islands pour into the economic life of our Nation. It is not merely a land of glamour and hula girls.

One visit to the islands will dispel the idea that it is only a "never-never land" dependent upon tourists for its existence. Nothing could be further from the truth, for it is a land of industry, of adequate transportation, of modern agriculture, bustling business, and huge office buildings.

There is no discounting that Hawaii is becoming increasingly important in the trend of world developments and international power. The islands hold the key to the stability of a vast area. We cannot afford to fumble again and still face up to our responsibilities as a world power. There has been too much delay already.

I talked with many persons on my recent trip to the islands. Nearly all earnestly desire statehood. It seems to me there is no legitimate excuse for continuing Hawaiian colonialism. There is no reason for denying the people their full rights as citizens.

I desire again to point out that granting of statehood would help us in the present cold war, and the fact that Hawaii has been denied statehood is having serious repercussions while we seek world leadership. Colonialism can no longer be justified in this age, and the sooner we grant statehood to Hawaii the sooner we shall get away from the stigma of harboring colonialism.

Our relations in the Far East are becoming increasingly important. We are justly criticised because of our treatment of Hawaii. The islands are at the crossroads of the Pacific, and when Hawaii is admitted as the 50th State we will gain a tremendous lift in our relations with the other nations in the Far East.

Last fall a subcommittee from the House also made an investigation of Hawaiian statehood. This group, headed by the able Representative LEO W. O'BRIEN, of New York, went into all phases of the question.

We, all of us—

The report says—

saw and met in Hawaii an intelligent, gentle, loyal people of whom our Nation should be proud.

I also reached this conclusion, and with the finding "calmly, and soberly, we urge the 86th Congress, as soon as possible, place in the flag the 50th star called Hawaii."

While in Hawaii the subcommittee held hearings, heard hundreds of people, and carefully studied every aspect of the statehood problem. It investigated the claim that Hawaii might possibly be dominated by Communists and found it was a claim without foundation. That also was my conclusion.

I can repeat what the Commission for Hawaiian statehood says:

Hawaii is a Pacific outpost of the American way of life, a window on our freedoms. It is a showcase of democracy * * * proof that the people of the East and West can work together for the good of all under the flag of freedom.

Today, statehood for Hawaii is an ethical rather than a political question.

By embracing Hawaii as a State, the United States would advance three bold steps closer to victory in the cold war against communism in the Pacific and Asia.

1. Bolster Hawaii's role as our defense outpost in the Pacific.

2. Make Hawaii a center where the people of the Pacific basin could study and learn our best American traditions.

3. Demonstrate dramatically that the United States both cherishes and practices the democratic ideal that her citizens stand equal before the law regardless of color or creed. The example of a State of Hawaii would shine in the Pacific for half the world's people to see and to compare with the empty promise of equality held out by the Communists.

From my visit I am confident all those statements are true. But if we deny the hopes and ambitions of these loyal and patriotic citizens the whole Nation will suffer. It will be a blow to our hopes of world peace and security.

Commonsense and fairness demand early approval of Hawaiian statehood. When it is granted we can rejoice that we have shown millions in the world we uphold the causes of justice and equality.

Since my recent trip to Hawaii I feel deeply about the importance of Hawaiian statehood. I am firmly convinced that Hawaii should become the 50th in our sisterhood of States and that every day we delay is injurious to our entire Nation. I hope the question can be brought to a vote and this Territory of Hawaii be given statehood at the earliest possible moment.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BARTLETT in the chair). The Senator from New York.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I rise to add my voice to those who strongly favor granting statehood to Hawaii. I am convinced that passage of the measure before us will be in the best interests of the people of our Nation as well as the nearly 600,000 Americans who today reside in the Territory of Hawaii.

Let there be no doubt about it: By every traditional yardstick, Hawaii is ready, willing, and able to assume the duties and responsibilities of statehood. She has passed with flying colors the time-honored tests for entrance into the Union. Hawaii has demonstrated conclusively, over the years, full respect for the ideals of democracy. The people of the Territory have expressed an overwhelming desire to join the Union. And Hawaii has exhibited an economic development adequate to carry the financial burdens incumbent upon a State.

The time for study of this proposition is over. The issue of Hawaiian statehood is more than 100 years old. Scores of bills embodying this ideal have been introduced in Congress and debated at length. Dozens of hearings have been held by committees of Congress.

Bills granting statehood to Hawaii have passed the House four times in recent years. Every time, however, this body has proved to be the stumbling block. This year I am confident we will not stand in the way of simple justice and honest progress. We can, and will, pin the 50th star on the flag of the United States.

Mr. President, those who have visited the islands can testify at first hand to their beauty, qualities, and potential. The people, drawn from many racial backgrounds, combine a love for America and its principles with a rich heritage born of ancestors from many lands.

While this land is gifted with a unique native culture and lush natural beauties and resources, Hawaii is not merely an enchanted "never-never land." It has all the earmarks, all the energy, all the drive, of a fast-moving, fast-developing, modern American community.

When one meets the people of Hawaii, when one sees their way of life, when one experiences the every day happenings of life in the islands, one comes to the realization that the islands are little different from any average American State. The people share the same ideals, suffer from the same problems,

and work for goals in common with the 49 American States.

Yet, after more than 50 years of living as Americans, working as Americans, thinking as Americans, acting as Americans, and dying as Americans, Hawaiian residents today are denied the full privileges of first-class citizensip. These fine people deserve the riches which can come only with statehood and its resultant dignity and prestige.

Mr. President, it is time that statehood—for which Hawaii has worked, dreamed and sacrificed—was granted. I find it hard to understand how anyone who has objectively considered all the factors involved and who has studied at length the evidence on this subject, can continue to oppose Hawaiian statehood.

Mr. President, the issue of the noncontiguity and distance of Hawaii has been raised. I find that argument without substantial basis in fact. In the first place, the easy acceptance of Alaska as the 49th State and the lack of problems of communication and transportation in that case argue strongly against this point of view.

Clearly, transportation to and from Hawaii is much more frequent, easier, and often faster than transportation to and from Alaska. The weather factors which make sea and air connections with Alaska uncertain are not as formidable in the case of Hawaii. Clearly, the argument that Hawaii is too far away to be a State is just plain obsolete in this jet age of speedy, efficient, and dependable transportation and communication.

Opponents of Hawaiian statehood have also raised the question of the effect of the admission of a 50th State on the power of Senators from the more populous States. It has been contended that further additions to the membership of both bodies of Congress will dilute unfairly the power of the more thickly populated sections of this Nation.

There is certainly some truth to these statements. As a Senator from the Nation's most populous State, I would presumably be one most likely to suffer. But such a prospect dismays me little. It appears to me manifest that the simple justice and moral obligations involved, as well as the clear fact that Hawaii is fully qualified for statehood, outweigh any arguments which may be advanced about her admission and its effect on proportional representation.

In addition, it should be noted that Hawaii has a population today greater than any one of the States of Vermont, Delaware, Nevada, Wyoming, and Alaska.

It is my firm conviction the United States has a moral and legal obligation to grant statehood to Hawaii. This obligation has been underscored recently by the addition of Alaska to the Union.

Particularly in this body, we must never overlook our historic national principle that government must be based on the consent of the governed and that our failure to grant statehood to Hawaii would raise the serious question of taxation without representation.

On the other hand, we should not forget the good effect the admission of Hawaii would have on our relations with the peoples of the Far East. The grant of statehood would prove to the world, especially Asia, that we practice what we preach. We need the advice and guidance of Hawaiians more and more as we shape our policies and pursue our dealings with the peoples of the Orient.

From the legal point of view, we must bear in mind that our Nation has a historic practice of admitting incorporated territories to statehood when they have achieved sufficient levels of population and development. There are numerous precedents to substantiate this argument.

Another factor favoring statehood for Hawaii is that such a move would surely stimulate even greater economic growth on the islands. Our experience with other newly admitted States gives strong credence to this argument.

Moreover, there is ample evidence that the Federal Government will save money as the new State takes over many of the governmental functions now borne by the United States. At the same time, the burden of the average taxpayer in Hawaii will undoubtedly be increased with the onset of statehood. It is interesting to note that this factor has apparently not deterred native support for the statehood movement.

There have been repeated and serious charges that there are extensive Communist influences on the islands. I would be less than frank if I did not say that this proposition has caused me a good deal of worry during the years when Congress has considered Hawaiian statehood bills. I would never be party to any action which might in any way give aid and comfort to this ruthless band of atheistic expansionists.

However, Mr. President, I am convinced that the issue of communism in the islands should not be a factor in this debate. On the basis of the evidence I have examined, we need not fear that communism is any greater a menace in Hawaii than in other parts of the United States.

Thus, while I feel we must ever be on the alert against communism, in all its subtle ways, shapes, and fashions, I think this aspect has been largely overrated with respect to Hawaii. While Communists do exist in the Territory, they no more control it than they do the mainland. There is ample evidence the people of the islands abhor this evil challenge as we do, and are meeting it as capably and with as much vigor as are any of the 49 States.

The people of the Territory have repeatedly rejected the Communist philosophy and have turned back every attempt of the Communists to influence their government. They have written into their proposed State constitution a broad prohibition against any Communist holding public office.

In any case, it is plain to me that admission of Hawaii into the Union would strengthen, not weaken, the Federal Government's power to fight whatever vestiges of communism there may be on the islands. As a matter of fact, under the Supreme Court's Nelson decision, which I hope this Congress will correct, the Territory of Hawaii—like our States—can do little in the field of antisubversive activity. Certainly, admission of Hawaii to statehood, no matter what the decision of Congress on Nelson case legislation, will enhance the arsenal of tools available to fight all forms of subversion on the islands.

There is one other issue which has been raised against statehood, which I feel constrained to discuss. That is the specious objection to certain racial characteristics of the population of the Territory. I think it is entirely out of keeping with the American traditions of equality and acceptance that this argument should even be raised. That it should be seriously pressed in some quarters disturbs me deeply.

Let us put the cards on the table. The largest single population group on the islands is Japanese, and there are in addition many people of Filipino, Chinese, and Hawaiian ancestry. The Caucasian segment of the population amounts to about 20 percent of the total.

Opponents have argued that the addition of these racial strains to our Nation would bring adverse effects on our political, social, and economic standards. They have erected one big bogyman, or strawman from this issue, which I feel has no basis in fact or fancy.

To accept the contention that the addition of these new racial strains to the Union would upset any kind of a present "balance" flies in the face of everything I have been taught to believe about this great Nation of ours. It contravenes directly every ideal of our democratic form of government. It presupposes that there is some kind of racial limitation set on being an American. I cannot accept that argument.

American ciitzenship belongs to those who earn it. We are not part of any elite club, with powers to exclude people just because of the color of their skin or the nature of their racial origins.

It is one of the unique qualities of our national fabric that in this country men of all races, all creeds, all national origins have come together here to live in a land dominated by principles of equality and justice, however imperfectly those ideals have been realized in some quarters.

Finally, those who would cast aspersions on Hawaiians because of their largely non-Caucasian nature, are in effect besmirching the memory of those islanders of every background who have proved their loyalty to America by fighting and dying for our country on equal terms with men from the mainland.

Actually, a large majority of residents of the Territory are native-born Americans. The accepted language is English, and all functions and business—government and private—is conducted in English.

Mr. President, the recent admission of Alaska to the Union, in addition to adding impetus to the Hawaiian statehood movement, also increases the arguments for the island. Admission of Hawaii as a State will raise fewer governmental problems because Hawaii has had a greater share of self-government over the years than has Alaska. Since there has been less direct Federal action and supervision in Hawaii than in Alaska,

the process of adaption to statehood should be even simpler for Hawaii.

Mr. President, this Nation has grown great through the infusion into the national bloodstream and addition to the national strength, of new ideas, new energies, new talents, and new outlooks from newcomers to our shores. Historically, such stimuli have come from abroad, but we are presented in the bill before us with an opportunity to infuse new spirit into America by the simple means of admitting Hawaii as a State.

Mr. President, statehood for Hawaii is sound. It is logical. It is just. Let us, today, make possible the addition of that 50th star to the American flag.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, I urge the prompt enactment of S. 50, to grant statehood to Hawaii. I know from personal experience the frustration felt by the people of Hawaii when they do not have the full rights of U.S. citizenship, with all the privileges which go with that high status.

For many years I have worked closely with the Delegates to Congress from Hawaii. Both the former Territory of Alaska and the Territory of Hawaii have faced similar problems in their efforts to attain statehood.

When the Congress of the United States, after long and careful consideration, conferred full statehood to Alaska, a dedication to the ideals of our country surged in the hearts of our people. Spontaneous demonstrations of enthusiasm for our having attained statehood were in evidence everywhere in Alaska.

It is difficult to express the meaning of full citizenship to those who have always had that privilege, but it is the hope of the people of Alaska that our sister State in the Pacific, the State of Hawaii, will now have that privilege and take her place in the Union.

The die was cast for Hawaii, when Alaska was admitted. Hawaii now is the only incorporated Territory of the United States and the only remaining area which has fulfilled the requirements of statehood.

Throughout our history three standards have been required for admission of a Territory to statehood:

First. That the people of the Territory are imbued with and sympathetic toward the principles of democracy as exemplified in the American form of government.

Second. That a majority of the electorate express a desire for statehood.

Third. That the new State has sufficient population and resources to support State government and to provide its share of the cost of the Federal Government.

Hawaii is fully qualified in all these respects. The many congressional investigations which have been held, both in Hawaii and in Washington, provide ample testimony on all facts of life in the islands. I do not intend to go into the statistics which have been gathered together to prove that Hawaii is qualified as a State. The committee report before you gives these.

The people of Hawaii are thoroughly American. The New England missionaries who went to the islands in 1820 established schools and churches, and instilled in the children the American traditions and the ideals of American democracy. These teachings have been carried on through the schools and the homes, and today the population of Hawaii is as American as apple pie. Their records of patriotism are the envy of all of us.

The requirement that a majority of the electorate desire statehood has been satisfied on two separate occasions in the past. The electorate voted 2 to 1 for statehood in 1941. Later, in 1950, the proposed constitution of the new State of Hawaii was submitted to the people and the vote was 3 to 1 in favor. The bill before us calls for a plebiscite on this question by the people of Hawaii before statehood becomes effective, so the people of Hawaii will once more have the opportunity of expressing their sentiments regarding statehood.

As to the next criteria, Hawaii does have sufficient population and resources to take her place in the American economy. She has always paid her proportionate share of the cost of the Federal Government and ably supports her own government. A study of the records reveals that there is no doubt but that Hawaii meets this third standard for statehood.

The Board of Health estimate of July 1, 1958, shows the population of Hawaii to be about 582,000, more than several of the present States. Territorial tax revenues for the last fiscal year amounted to more than $122 million. Federal taxes paid to the U.S. Treasury last year amounted to $166,300,000 which exceeds the amounts paid by 10 of the mainland States. The 1958 per capita income exceeded that of 26 States. Surely this indicates that Hawaii is well able to assume the full responsibilities of statehood, both to the Federal Government and to its own local government.

Only through statehood can the citizens of Hawaii attain the greatest of all assets, that of full suffrage—the right of an individual to express himself at the polls by electing officials who will carry out the wishes of the majority of the electorate. Hawaii, as a Territory, elects its own Territorial legislators, but it has no voice in the Federal Government, as its only representative in Washington is a nonvoting Delegate in the House of Representatives. But never has there been an instance when the people of Hawaii have not met all the obligations of the Federal laws. They pay full Federal taxes, although they have had no part in making tax laws. When their young men were called into the armed services of the country, the response was tremendous, even though the citizens had had no part in the enactment of the Federal laws for this purpose. There has never been any question but that as American citizens they were bound by all the Federal laws. And they would have it no other way. They are proud of their American citizenship but they should be entitled to the full rights of suffrage in order to have a voice in the Federal Government.

Statehood will bring them the right to elect their own Governor and Lieutenant Governor, who will be responsible to the electorate and not to the administration in Washington, as at present. Appointment to the judicial bench will no longer be made from Washington, but will be by officials of the new State who are directly responsible to the people.

Hawaii has her problems, just as Alaska has, and Maine, New York, California, but she can meet these as a State, just as all the other States do. It seems only a matter of simple justice to give her the rights of statehood.

I have dwelt mostly on the benefits which will accrue to the citizens of Hawaii with the granting of statehood, and will leave to others to point out the effects of such action on our world policy. Hawaii is living proof that democracy as advocated by the United States affords a solution to a major problem facing the world.

Mr. President, I should like to make two comments of a personal nature.

I only wish my friend who served Hawaii so ably and so long as Delegate in Congress could be here to witness what surely now will be the planting of the Hawaii statehood banner on the highest summit. I refer, of course, to Joseph Rider Farrington, who died in office and whose death was surely hastened by the intensity and degree of his efforts to bring statehood to the people of his island Territory.

Finally, Mr. President, I wish to repeat here what I said in my testimony before the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, and elsewhere. That is, I believe it is most doubtful if Alaska would now have statehood or if Hawaii would be so close to it if it had not been for the courageous, statesmanlike position taken last year by Delegate JOHN A. BURNS, of Hawaii, a man for whom I entertain personal affection and who has served so effectively his beloved Hawaii. In the spring of 1958 it was plain to all who would see that legislative action could be expected for Alaska one way or another but that the Hawaii bill was not coming up. Delegate BURNS took his stand on the proposition that if Alaska were to be added, Hawaii could expect affirmative action in 1959. And now his judgment is being confirmed. Heavy pressures—very heavy pressures, indeed—were placed upon him from Hawaii to demand that Hawaii and Alaska statehood proposals be joined. This, very positively, would not have succeeded and might have resulted in Alaska's being downed, too. But many in Hawaii did not understand this. The popular course, the political course, would have dictated a yielding to these demands. Fixed by an iron determination, Delegate BURNS stood his ground. When he returned home after Alaska became a State, to explain all of this to his constituents, they agreed with him. So, thanks to JACK BURNS in particular, Hawaii is about to become the 50th and, I believe, the last State of this great Union of States. We cheechakos from Alaska welcome the cheechakos soon-to-be from Hawaii.

I urge my colleagues to vote for the Hawaiian statehood bill.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CHURCH in the chair). Does the Senator from Alaska yield to the Senator from Colorado?

Mr. BARTLETT. I am glad to yield to my friend from Colorado.

Mr. ALLOTT. I wish to compliment the Senator on his remarks; but more than that, I think we all owe him a debt of gratitude for his very wonderful tribute to Joe Farrington. His remarks with respect to Joe Farrington are certainly true. He probably did hasten his own death by the struggle he put up for Hawaiian statehood. It seems to me that it is peculiarly appropriate at this time that we do not forget such men as Joe Farrington, who for many years made the fight which we hope to bring to a culmination today.

Mr. BARTLETT. I agree with the Senator from Colorado. Joe Farrington was a great Hawaiian and a great American.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, I ask that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BARTLETT in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, we are moving toward action on the pending bill in an atmosphere of almost hysterical excitement. We are yielding to propaganda largely promoted for the benefit of those whose ends would be served.

I do not mean to say that all who support statehood for Hawaii have a selfish interest. Many good, patriotic people support Hawaii's admission to the Union. However, there are those who do have a selfish interest, including the Communist world conspiracy; and it is that selfish interest alone which will be served by the grant of statehood to Hawaii, which is not in the national interest of this country.

I understand that my distinguished friend, the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT] made the statement that the Bridges union, the ILWU, must be all right, because if it were Communist-dominated, the U.S. Government would have proceeded against it, or against its leaders.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield.

Mr. ALLOTT. I did not say that Mr. Bridges' union was all right. That is reading into what I said something that is not the way I said it. I said the means were there. I will quote what I said, if the Senator wishes me to do so.

Mr. EASTLAND. That is what I should like to have the Senator do.

Mr. ALLOTT. Speaking of the late Senator Butler's findings I said:

> Senator Butler's findings are substantiated by reports from the FBI, naval, and military intelligence. The FBI in 1953 stated that at no time were there more than 160 Communists in Hawaii. The 1951 FBI report listed only 36 known Communists.
>
> Today it is estimated that between 40 and 60 Communists are left in all the islands. This is 40 to 60 out of a total population of close to 635,000—at the most, Communists number only 1 out of every 10,000 people in Hawaii.

Mr. EASTLAND. What did the Senator say about the union? That is the point.

Mr. ALLOTT. I shall read three paragraphs on that point:

> The Communist issue—which involves the question of whether certain alleged Communists or Communist-front organizations could in fact control Hawaii or Hawaiian elections—should be faced squarely here on the floor today. There are nearly 200,000 persons in Hawaii who are members of the labor force. Approximately 25,000 are members of the union alleged to be Communist-dominated. Only a few—a very few—of these 25,000 have ever been accused of being Communist sympathizers or Communist Party members.
>
> If this had been proven in the past, the Federal Government having the authority, facilities, and power to deal with Communist-infiltrated unions, would have taken the necessary steps to strip the unions of their collective-bargaining rights.
>
> Such Federal action would free local employers from recognizing these unions in contract negotiations and also permit union members to expel their Communist leaders. No action to this effect has been taken by Federal authorities.

Mr. EASTLAND. Such action as could be taken was taken. That is the entire point. Bridges was convicted of perjury on the ground that he had lied when he said he was not a Communist Party member. The leaders of his union were convicted. The Supreme Court of the United States ruled in a case, the name of which I have forgotten, although I believe it was the Yates case. When the Bridges case came up on appeal in the circuit court of appeals on the west coast, the court said, in effect, "We must turn these people loose, because the Supreme Court has made a shambles of the Smith Act."

An attempt was made by the Government of the United States to strip a union of its bargaining rights, because its officials had filed false non-Communist affidavits. That was stopped by the Supreme Court, on the ground that the only person the Government could move against was the signer of the false affidavit, not the union.

Mr. ALLOTT. That was back in the 1940's, was it not?

Mr. EASTLAND. I do not remember the date. It is absolutely immaterial what the date was. The fact is that the U.S. Government has done all it can. The fact is, also, that the economy of Hawaii is Communist controlled.

Mr. ALLOTT. Would the Senator say that any action had been taken by any branch of the Government in the past 10 years?

Mr. EASTLAND. I say I do not remember the date. The date is immaterial. However, action was taken.

Mr. ALLOTT. I believe the date is important.

Mr. EASTLAND. It is a fact that this union is Communist dominated, and that the United States Government has gone as far as it can go. There are some very strange influences in the Supreme Court of the United States. In this instance, as in all others, when it comes to communism, the Court throws the cloak of protection around the Communist conspiracy.

Mr. ALLOTT. Will the Senator yield further?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield.

Mr. ALLOTT. I should like to say that I throw no cloaks around communism, no matter where it may be.

Mr. EASTLAND. I certainly would not want to leave any such implication about the Senator.

Mr. ALLOTT. I know the Senator from Mississippi would not do so. I wish to say further that at one time, within the past 6 years, the Hawaiian Legislature showed by its action that it did deal with a strike there, and dealt with it very forcefully and in a very forthright manner; in fact, in a way we have not employed in this country.

Mr. EASTLAND. And then they took over the Territorial legislature. The speaker of the house showed his subservience to the Communist Harry Bridges by sending his gavel to the Communist Harry Bridges at the convention on the west coast.

Mr. ALLOTT. I may say to the Senator that he is speaking of something of which I have no knowledge.

Mr. EASTLAND. If the Senator knew the conditions in Hawaii, he would be the last man in the Senate to vote to admit Hawaii into the Union. I am glad we are educating the distinguished Senator on the danger of admitting that Territory into the Union.

Mr. ALLOTT. I made one trip to Hawaii for the purpose of informing myself on conditions there. I have numerous personal acquaintances in Hawaii with whom I have discussed this question at great length. They did not come to the same conclusion the distinguished Senator from Mississippi has reached.

Mr. EASTLAND. The Senator speaks about acquaintances in Hawaii. I have been there. I took the Internal Security Subcommittee of the Senate there. As I recall, there were two Democrats and three Republicans on the subcommittee who went to the Hawaiian Islands with me. Any number of people who have led the fight for statehood will tell the Senator off the record: "That is the very last thing we should have, but we must do it for political reasons." The fact remains that a duly constituted subcommittee of the Senate, established by Senate resolution, which has gone into all the ramifications of the subject, has submitted a unanimous report that the Communist conspiracy has entirely too much influence in the Hawaiian Islands. Later I shall read that report. It is bipartisan. It states the facts.

All the pleas for Hawaiian statehood are emotional in nature. Our generosity is appealed to on the ground that Hawaii has earned statehood. Our sense of justice is appealed to on the ground that if Alaska can be a State, Hawaii has a right to be a State. We are cajoled with vistas of blue waters and white sands and waving palms, which, it is subtly suggested, will become more proudly ours if Hawaii attains statehood. We are

cozened with the assertion that the people of Hawaii are all good Americans, just like the rest of us. I certainly believe that the vast majority are good Americans, as we are. However, the economy of the islands, there can be no question, is Communist controlled, by a few Communists at the top who were convicted by the U.S. Government, and turned loose by the Supreme Court. They have control of the economic life of the islands.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield for a question.

Mr. CARROLL. My distinguished colleague from Colorado, if I may refresh his memory—I refer to a year ago or so—had some reservations about communism in the islands. He has had an opportunity to examine into that question, as has been the case with other persons in the past. I have read his very excellent speeches on the subject. Other Members of the Senate have gone into the question. Members of the House have examined into the question. We have gone to the FBI. We have gone to the police department. We have gone to the Republican newspapers. We have gone to Republican businessmen in every walk of life.

I may say to the distinguished Senator——

Mr. EASTLAND. What is the question?

Mr. CARROLL. The question is this: When the Senator makes the assertion that there is a Communist conspiracy in the islands, does he really think that that conspiracy is so dangerous that it could injure the Nation?

Mr. EASTLAND. I do.

Mr. CARROLL. If so, why?

Mr. EASTLAND. Because the Communists have influence in electing high public officials. Let me tell the distinguished Senator from Colorado that a duly constituted subcommittee of the Senate, who are just as patriotic and just as nonpartisan as any other Members of this body, went to Hawaii and held hearings. The subcommittee filed a unanimous report in the light of all the facts which were uncovered.

I will not stand here and say that someone slipped up to me and whispered this to me, as statements to that effect have been made. But I can say that the very persons who are the leaders in the movement for statehood will say privately that it is the last thing that should happen. They will say, "We are not ready for it because of the influence of the ILWU."

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further for a question?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield for a question.

Mr. CARROLL. The Senator refers to the fact that the Communists have elected high public officials. We found on a recent trip to Hawaii, only a few months ago, that the high officials who were elected are Democrats. There was a Democratic sweep in the Hawaiian Islands. I myself, in the town of Hilo, in the Hawaiian Islands, spoke both with Democratic and Republican leaders.

Mr. EASTLAND. I shall discuss that matter in a few moments. There are two factions in the Democratic Party in Hawaii. The minority fraction today is Communist directed. This is not solely a Democratic matter, because the Republicans in the legislature lined up with the Communist-controlled Democrats, and overthrew the Democratic organization, to control the election of the speaker and other officials in the Territorial legislature, as I shall show later.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield for a question.

Mr. CARROLL. It has been said by some persons that there is a minority section of the Democratic Party in our own country, but that does not mean they are Communists.

Mr. EASTLAND. Of course it does not mean that they are Communists; certainly it does not mean that they are Communists; but in Hawaii there is a Communist organization. There have been many fifth amendment cases. We showed, even, that Communist propaganda was being put into the school system. We showed that Communist propaganda from the Soviet Union, Red China, and the satellite countries was flooding the Hawaiian Islands under the auspices of the ILWU. I say that that union is a Communist union and has entirely too much influence in the Democratic Party in Hawaii. I shall show that in detail in a few moments.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for one further question?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield for one question; yes.

Mr. CARROLL. Representative LEO O'BRIEN, who is a distinguished newspaperman from Albany, N.Y., and a Republican; Representative BERRY, of South Dakota; and I visited the FBI only a few weeks ago. We asked the specific question: "How many known Communists are in the Hawaiian Islands?"

Mr. EASTLAND. What does the number mean? I ask the distinguished Senator, What is there in numbers? We have seen, all over the world, a small minority of Communists taking over one country after another. In Hawaii, the leaders are Communists who control the economic life of the islands. That is the point. Whether there be 4, 5, or 50, they have too much power.

Mr. CARROLL. Will the Senator permit me to propound my question? We were informed by the FBI that there were 25 known Communists in the Hawaiian Islands. Now I put the question: Considering the great expanse of area, considering the nature of the population and the nature of the economy, does the Senator from Mississippi think those 25 Communists could form a conspiracy which would injure the Territory of Hawaii if it became a State?

Mr. EASTLAND. I certainly do, because they control the economic life of the island. I notice that the Senator from Colorado made no reference to the influential and powerful positions which Communists have in the island. That is the key to the whole subject. What are their powers? What is their influence? I am very much amazed that the distinguished junior Senator from Colorado did not go into that phase of the question with the FBI.

Mr. President, as I have said, we are moving toward action on this bill in an atmosphere of almost hysteric excitement. We are yielding to propaganda largely promoted for the benefit of those whose ends will be served. I do not mean to say that all who support statehood have a selfish interest; many good patriotic people support Hawaii's admission, but there are those who do have a selfish-interest—including the Communist world conspiracy—and it is the selfish interests alone which will be served by a grant of statehood to Hawaii, not any national interest of this country.

All of the pleas for Hawaiian statehood are emotional in nature. Our generosity is appealed to, on the ground that Hawaii has "earned" statehood. Our sense of justice is appealed to, on the ground that if Alaska can be a State, Hawaii has a right to be a State. We are cajoled with vistas of blue waters and white sands and waving palms which, it is subtly suggested, will become more proudly "ours" if Hawaii attains statehood. We are cozened with the assertion that the people of Hawaii are "all good Americans just like us." We are threatened with the prospect of being declared racists if we oppose Hawaiian statehood for any reason at all. As I say, we are confronted at every turn by emotional arguments. But I have not heard anyone tell how the national interest will be served by making Hawaii a State.

But I can tell you, Mr. President, how the Communist interests will be served if we pass this bill.

Mr. President, we are threatened with the prospect of being declared racist if we oppose the bill for Hawaiian statehood for any reason at all. As I say, we are confronted at every turn by emotional arguments, but I have not heard anyone tell how the national interest will be served by making Hawaii a State. I can tell the Senate how the Communist interest will be served if we pass the bill.

Six years ago, I pointed out that in one respect the proposed Hawaiian constitution was tailormade to expedite Communist control of the islands. That constitution provides that a simple plurality is all that is required to elect a Governor of Hawaii. Under that constitution, the person receiving the largest number of votes will be made Governor. In a two-candidate election, that would be a majority. But suppose there were three, four or more candidates.

With the genius which Harry Bridges and Jack Hall have shown for organizing the workers of Hawaii, and the superb organizing ability of world communism, one can readily visualize what would happen with several candidates running for Governor. Such a situation would be made to order for the manipulation of bloc voters under unscrupulous, ruthless Communist leadership.

Harry Bridges and Jack Hall would hold the balance of power.

I state categorically that they hold the balance of power in the Territory of Hawaii today. Let no one think that a Republican Senator will be elected from Hawaii, either.

The Communists of Hawaii cannot show the full strength of their position until the proposed constitution goes into effect, following the grant of statehood. But if statehood is granted under the proposed constitution, never doubt that they will take full advantage of the opportunities thereby provided them.

Given a Communist Governor, or even a Governor who is a Communist captive, the way would be cleared for Harry Bridges and Jack Hall, by manipulation, by intimidation, and by corruption, to send a Communist controlled or influenced Representative, or two Communist controlled or influenced Senators, to the Congress of the United States.

It is hard to believe that the United States Senate will fall into such a trap as this. The American people will not gain from the granting of statehood to Hawaii. The Territory will gain nothing. World communism will be the sole beneficiary; and what a tremendous victory it will be.

I cannot say that Communist influence put this provision in the Hawaiian constitution. I do not know. But it is there.

Is it significant that in January 1950, it was announced that all units of the ILWU had been notified to establish political committees before February 1, and that these committees were to function in connection with the election of delegates to the Hawaii State constitutional convention to be held in April 1950, and were to remain intact for the fall elections as well? Is it not likewise significant that in the constitutional convention election, 2 of the 63 offices were held by Richard M. Kageyamo, a former member of the Communist Party, and Frank G. Silva, one of the "reluctant 39" who took the fifth amendment before the House Committee on Un-American Activities. They were two Communists who helped draft the proposed Hawaiian constitution.

Another point with respect to the Hawaii State constitution which has been presented to us for ratification merits attention.

This constitution includes what has been referred to as the "loyalty oath" provision, though this provision does not in terms require a loyalty oath. What this provision says is that—

> No person who advocates, or who aids or belongs to any party, organization, or association which advocates the overthrow by force or violence of the Government of the United States shall be qualified to hold any public office or employment.

Inclusion of this provision in the Hawaiian constitution is a recognition by the constitutional drafters of the extreme importance of the Communist problem in Hawaii, and is an effort to meet it. Unfortunately, this provision cannot be taken as a guarantee against either the growth or even the continuance of Communist influence in the islands. It must, rather, be regarded as an abortive effort to deal with the situation.

The reason this is so is that the Supreme Court of the United States has handed down decisions which, when applied to this provision of the Hawaiian Constitution, would appear certain to result in having it declared unconstitutional.

In the Yates case decision, which construes language of the Smith Act which banned the teaching or advocacy of the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence, the Supreme Court of the United States developed the theory of "mere abstract advocacy," and declared such language ineffective against Communist activity not shown to include specific and current "incitement" to action. In more than one case, the Supreme Court of the United States has developed the doctrine of a new first amendment right, which it has called "freedom of association," and has referred to membership in the Communist party as "a mere matter of belief and association."

It is not the fault of the drafters of the Hawaiian constitution that this provision against the holding of office by Communists must be considered ineffective. It is the fault of the Supreme Court of the United States. But the fact remains that the provision is, and will be, ineffective.

Furthermore, this situation raises another point: Should we in the Congress approve a constitution containing a provision which, under existing decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States, is unconstitutional?

I do not wish to be misunderstood on this point. I personally favor prohibiting Communists from holding any office, not only in the government of Hawaii, but also in the Government of the United States or in the government of any State or political subdivision of this Nation. But this is one of the points on which I differ from the majority of the members of the Supreme Court of the United States.

Insofar as this provision of the Hawaiian constitution might be considered the basis for a loyalty oath—for instance, if in implementing this provision it should be decided to require candidates for office to make a disclosure respecting membership in the Communist Party—the Supreme Court of the United States also has spoken adversely. Similar loyalty oath requirements in California, based upon a comparable California constitutional provision—one dealing, however, not with State officers, but with tax exemption—was invalidated by the Supreme Court only a short time ago, on the ground that such requirements violated the due process of law provisions of the Constitution of the United States.

So the efforts of the constitutional draftsmen of Hawaii to meet the Communist problem through a constitutional provision must be considered as thwarted by decisions of the U.S. Supreme Court, and must be considered also as raising a question respecting approval of the Hawaiian constitution with this provision in it, since the provision is at variance with the current doctrines laid down by the U.S. Supreme Court.

COMMUNIST FRATERNIZATION

Mr. President, one of the greatest danger signals of the Communist threat in Hawaii is to be found in the toleration of Communists and the fraternization with Communists by many non-Communists, including officials of the government and leaders of civic and business organizations. In spite of the fact that residents of Hawaii who serve on committees with top Communists, who make it possible for insidious Red propaganda to be smuggled into the public schools, through scholarship contests—which was true in 1954—who give financial and moral aid to the Communist Party and Communist objectives, through paid greeting advertisements in the Communist press, and who help give the Communist Party face and respectability in these and many other ways, are doing more harm to their community and to the Nation than they would if they harbored in their homes, bank robbers or murderers, there are many such.

Today, a major drive of Communist activity on the mainland, as well as elsewhere, is toward respectability and acceptance. In Hawaii, social and political fraternization between highly respected leading citizens of the community, on the one hand, and vicious and sinister enemies of our country, on the other, exists to a degree that is unparalleled anywhere on the mainland, and would be incomprehensible here. As long as treason remains respectable in Hawaii, it is going to be difficult to deal with the Communist menace there.

On the point of communism in Hawaii, I shall have a good deal more to say later. At this time, Mr. President, I wish to discuss a question of precedents.

NEW PRECEDENT

Mr. President, it has been said that by the admission of Alaska we have set a precedent which requires that the Territory of Hawaii be made a State. But this is not a fact. The admission of Alaska is not a good precedent for the admission of Hawaii. Making Alaska a State did involve extension of the boundaries of the United States. It did involve the acceptance as a State of noncontiguous territory, but it did not involve going outside the American Continent. Granting statehood to Hawaii would involve exactly the latter.

It is a plain geographical fact that the 20 volcanic islands in the North Pacific Ocean which make up the Territory of Hawaii are not part of the American Continent. No area not a part of the American Continent has ever been admitted as a State. Our very Constitution recites, in its preamble, that it is ordained and established "for the United States of America." If we admit Hawaii as a State, our country will no longer be the United States of America; instead, it will be the United States of America

and the Pacific Islands. Or perhaps, as Mr. Willis Carto suggested in his testimony before the Territories Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, we should then call our country "the United States of Anywhere," so as to be able to retain the initials "U.S.A."

In view of the fact that the Constitution was established for "the United States of America," how can it be extended beyond America without a constitutional amendment? I do not ask this facetiously. I think it is a serious question. There may have been a time when the preamble to the Constitution was thought to have no force as law, but the general welfare clause, which is part of the preamble, has long since been recognized as a basis for legislation. How can we deny effect to the declaration, in this first paragraph of the instrument itself, that our Constitution was established "for the United States of America"? Admission of Hawaii as a State would not be following the precedent established by the admission of Alaska. On the contrary, a grant of statehood to Hawaii would be setting a new precedent, one which would plague us through countless years. The precedent we would be setting by making Hawaii a State is the precedent that land or islands unconnected with the American Continent and inhabited by people of radically different backgrounds from those of the majority of Americans are eligible to become a State.

This is the necessary result of our action, if we act to admit Hawaii as a State. And when we have set this precedent, where will we stop? Will we deny statehood to Puerto Rico, upon request? To Panama? To Guam? To the Virgin Islands? And if to any or all of these, why not San Marino, or Ghana, or Cyprus? Panama is in a way more "American" than Hawaii. Puerto Rico, and Guam, and the Virgin Islands, are just as "American" as Hawaii is. And if we are to go outside the American Continent for new States, why stop with the Pacific Ocean or any segment of it?

We are told that the people of Hawaii have a "right" to statehood. We are told that Congress must grant statehood to Hawaii because the people of Hawaii want it. Why, Mr. President, if we accept that argument, and if we establish the precedent of going outside the American Continent and accepting as a State a territory whose inhabitants are as radically different in background from the majority of Americans as are the people of Hawaii, then we shall have to grant statehood to Panama or the Virgin Islands or Puerto Rico, or even Ghana, if the people there want it.

This is the road of empire. We must not take it. If we go down this road, we move toward world government, toward the gradual fading and ultimate obliteration of the idea of American nationality; and there will be no turning back.

Every time we add a new State, we add two Members to this body. How many new States must we add outside the American Continent before we have a substantial bloc of Senators whose interests are centered outside America? How many decades will it take before we shall have developed a group of such Senators powerful enough to bring about ratification of a treaty surrendering the sovereignty of the United States to a world government?

I do not ask these questions in a humorous vein. I am serious. This is the direction in which we move when we grant statehood to Hawaii. This is the precedent we set.

Should we move down this road because it is said that the people of Hawaii have "earned" statehood? Mr. President, statehood should never be regarded as a reward. Admission of a new State should always be justified on the basis of the national interest. There is no other basis upon which we may sanction it, in consonance with our duty to act for the best interests of the Nation we serve.

I have said that the granting of Hawaiian statehood will put us on the road to empire. It might be said also that it will put us on the road to colonialism. Once we jump the boundaries of the oceans, and pass beyond this continent, there is no limit to where we may stop. If we accept the Territory of Hawaii as a State this year, what argument shall we have next year against accepting as a State the island of Formosa, if the people of that island should wish it?

Oh, yes, Mr. President; we would have one argument against that: The argument of national interest. But if the argument of national interest is going to be considered valid at some later date, in connection with the application for admission to statehood by Formosa or Ghana or Puerto Rico or Guam, or any other territory outside of America, why is not the argument of national interest a valid one now? And what national interest will be served by granting statehood to Hawaii?

The answer is, Mr. President, there is no national interest which will be served by granting statehood to Hawaii; on the basis of national interest, all of the considerations are against granting statehood to Hawaii.

If any one of my colleagues who plans to vote for Hawaiian statehood thinks I am wrong about this, and believes he can justify the admission of Hawaii as a State on the basis of the prospective benefit to the national interest which will result, I hope he will tell us for the record how he arrived at that conclusion. I wish I could be sure that no Senator would vote for Hawaiian statehood unless he felt he could justify it on the basis of national interest. If that were the case, I know the Hawaiian statehood bill would be defeated in this Chamber by one of the largest majorities ever registered. The vote might be a unanimous "nay."

COMMUNISTS FIRST FAVORED STATEHOOD

It is significant that the first active agitation for Hawaiian statehood came from the Communists. Before 1936, the Communst Party line was to agitate for Hawaiian independence. In 1936, a top strategy decision was made in Moscow that Communist purposes would be best served by Hawaiian statehood; and from that time on the Communist Party line was to favor statehood. It was an implementation of this policy decision and this new Party line that the Communist Party of Hawaii was merged with the mainland party in 1936.

If the Communists had thought at any time since 1936 that it no longer served their purposes to work for Hawaiian statehood, we can be sure that the line would have changed again and that Communist support for statehood would have been withdrawn. There has been no such change.

COMMONWEALTH STATUS AN ALTERNATIVE

Mr. President, the alternatives with respect to Hawaii do not lie between granting statehood and maintaining the status quo. If the present territorial status is to be changed, there is another alternative than statehood, and one which has many factors to recommend it. I refer to commonwealth status. I have discussed the benefits of commonwealth status at considerable length on another occasion, and will not labor the point now.

But let me summarize: Statehood would place additional economic burdens on Hawaii, while solving none of its problems. It would increase the present local tax burden, already too high. It would give the international Communist conspiracy additional opportunities for power and prestige in the islands, and for infiltration of the mainland through or from Hawaii. Furthermore, statehood is a step that, once taken, can never be revoked. On the other hand, commonwealth status would mean a new era of prosperity and economic expansion for Hawaii, giving the islands a future filled with hope and unlimited opportunities. At the same time, opportunities for Communist expansion and infiltration would not be increased, and Congress would remain free to take any emergency steps which might be needed to meet new or increasing dangers from Communist activities in the islands. Between these two choices, therefore, it is clear that in the national interest, as well as for the sake of the islands themselves, the granting of commonwealth status is vastly preferable to statehood.

Every Communist in the islands, and all the puppets of the Communists, are for statehood; they all oppose commonwealth status. They know that growth of Communist power could be checked under commonwealth status, whereas under statehood the lid would be off.

And, if the lid goes off, who will rule Hawaii? The man who rules Hawaii today. And who is he?

Every Senator knows who he is. His name is Harry Bridges. He has been a carrier of the Red baccillus throughout a whole generation. As long ago as 1934, he and his fellow Communist agents threw the people of San Francisco into the convulsions of a general strike. American Communist leaders boasted of the deeds done in that general strike, when they went to Moscow in 1935 to attend the infamous Seventh World Congress of the Communist Internationale. Just last month, Harry Bridges was in Moscow at the time of the 21st congress of the Communist Party, U.S.S.R.

In 1950, a Federal jury found that Bridges had committed perjury when he swore that he had never been a member of the Communist Party. The conviction was reversed by the Supreme Court, only on the ground that the statute of limitations had expired before the charge against Bridges was brought. But there is no disputing the finding of the jury. There is no disputing the fact that he did commit perjury when he denied that he was a member of the Communist Party. Everything in his record confirms this fact. Everything in his record proclaims that he is a mortal enemy of the Government and people of the United States and the whole free world.

We are being asked today to help stabilize Harry Bridges' power in the Hawaiian Islands. We are being asked to vote Hawaii into the Union as the 50th State, so that men under Harry Bridges' domination may come here and sit in these Halls.

The evidence shows that Harry Bridges is not an ordinary trade union leader primarily concerned with the improvement of the wages, hours, and working conditions of American longshoremen, but that he is an integral part of and the prime mover in international Communist strategy in the transportation field. In the event of a possible conflict between the United States and the Soviet Union, this assumes vital importanc to our national security.

In recent months Harry Bridges has been organizing a conference of Communists and left-wing waterfront workers' unions to be held in Tokyo on April 15. Among those participating are the Communist Australian Waterside Workers, the Communist Indonesian Maritime Union, left-wing unions of Japan and Madras (India), and the Communist-dominated ILWU.

On February 13 of this year, in Moscow, Harry Bridges gave a newspaper interview in which he declared that Soviet trade union elections were "more democratic than many American ones."

Said Bridges:

> I have studied the activities of the Russian All-Union Central Council of Trade Unions and 23 trade unions and have come to the conclusion that the organization and system of elections in Soviet unions are democratic. In this respect Soviet trade unions are more democratic than many American ones.

Bridges, who had just completed a week in the Soviet Union as the guest of Soviet trade unions, added that members of the American Federation of Labor-Congress of Industrial Organizations should visit the Soviet Union for "they would learn that everything the worker in America heard about the U.S.S.R. is nothing but lies and slanderous propaganda."

Three days later, Harry Bridges met with union officials in East Germany. Head of the East German group was Rudi Kirchner, secretary of East Germany's trade union organization. After the meeting, Bridges was quoted as having said that his union planned further contacts with the East German unions, including an exchange of workers' delegations.

An illustration of the present-day power of the ILWU in Hawaii is to be found in the formation of a new political coalition in the territorial legislature.

This legislature convened in mid-February, with 36 Democrats and 18 Republicans in its house of representatives. It would have seemed logical to expect the Democrats to organize the house. But the Democrats were split into factions. One of these factions was headed by a young attorney named Vincent Esposito. There are 26 Democrats in this faction. The other Democratic faction, with 10 members, is headed by one Charles E. Kauhane, who is part-Hawaiian. This is the same Kauhane who was speaker of the house 4 years ago, and while acting in that capacity won some notoriety by sending a gavel, with his compliments, to Harry Bridges. The gavel was presented to Bridges at the annual convention of the Communist-led ILWU convention in San Francisco, the presentation being made by one of Hawaii's delegates to that convention, identified Communist Newton Miyagi. Incidentally, this was the same Newton Miyagi who last year was elected to the board of directors of Hawaii's chapter of the American Red Cross, and who was a hostile witness before the Senate Internal Security Subcommitee during its hearings in Hawaii in 1956.

Mr. Charles Kauhane, who leads this 10-man minority faction within the Democratic majority in the Hawaiian Territorial Legislature, is currently considered a spokesman for ILWU leader Jack Hall, who was convicted under the Smith Act of conspiring to teach and advocate the overthrow of our Government by force and violence, but who got off the hook by virtue of the Warren Court's decision that such conspiring is no crime.

Like Kauhane, the other members of Kauhane's 10-man minority bloc in the 1958 Hawaiian House of Representatives are known to be closely tied up with the ILWU.

It would have seemed logical that with a two to one majority over the Republicans, the Democrats would have organized the Hawaiian House of Representatives. But what actually happened was that the 10-man Kauhane bloc of Democrats was joined by the 18 Republicans to defeat the 26 Esposito Democrats in their plans to organize the House.

Some Republicans in Hawaii have defended this action. Others have deplored it. There have been some refusals among Republicans to approve on any basis action which made the Republican members of the Hawaiian House political bedfellows of the Communist leadership of the ILWU.

As an indication of the effect of the coalition, I ask unanimous consent that there may be inserted in the RECORD at this point the text of a news story appear in the Saturday Star-Bulletin, of Honolulu, for February 28, under the caption "Coalition Could Let ILWU Rule Labor Committee," and which describes "Kauhane's followers on the labor committee" as "Representatives Yoshito Takamine, vice-chairman, ILWU agent on the Big Island; Pedro Dela Cruz, ILWU agent on Lanai; Akoni Pule, close associate of Kauhane and counted in the ILWU camp; and Oahu's John C. Lanham whose election hinged partly on ILWU support."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COALITION COULD LET ILWU RULE LABOR COMMITTEE

Organization of the Territory's house, at last accomplished yesterday, put pro-ILWU forces solidly in control of the chamber's labor committee if the Democrat-Republican coalition extends into the field of legislation.

The organization also left three dissident Democrats minus important committee posts—at their own insistence.

The dissident Democrats, led by Oahu's Representative O. Vincent Esposito, found themselves in the minority on 21 of the 26 house committees, and brickbats began to fly before the ink was dry on the settlement agreement.

The Esposito faction held out until the last minute, it was learned, on the make-up of the labor committee through which all labor legislation—including the ILWU-sought repeal of the dock seizure law—will be channeled.

STRONGLY

As the labor committee wound up, it contains four strongly pro-ILWU Democrats—followers of Democratic Representative Charles E. Kauhane—to three Republicans and two Esposito Democrats.

It was the house Republicans who teamed up with the Kauhane Democrats to beat out the Esposito forces for house control through a coalition that put Maui Democratic Representative Elmer F. Cravalho in the speaker's chair.

Kauhane's followers on the labor committee are Representatives Yoshito Takamine, vice chairman, ILWU agent on the big island; Pedro Dela Cruz, ILWU agent on Lanai; Akoni Pule, close associate of Kauhane and counted in the ILWU camp; and Oahu's John C. Lanham, whose election hinged partly on ILWU support.

As an indication that not all Democrat intraparty fighting was ended, Esposito himself turned down the chairmanship of the economic development committee in which faction had been strongly interested.

It was learned that Representative David C. McClung, another Esposito man, turned down the vice chairmanship of the youth and general welfare committee and was replaced at the last minute by Robert W. B. Chang, a colleague in the Esposito camp.

Representative Thomas P. Gill, closely allied with Esposito, reportedly refused several posts offered him.

The committee memberships as originally announced were amended today to correct errors that, according to the Democratic agreement for proportional representation, had put one too many Kauhane men on the important county and judiciary committees.

FAIRLY FIRM

The Republicans have yet to name a member due them on the education committee, but otherwise the assignments seemed to be fairly firm.

A grievance committee representing the two Democratic factions was to meet today to shift assignments of house employees so that one group's colleagues wouldn't be working for another faction, and it was understood there would be no firings.

NO AGREEMENT

Both the Republicans and the Cravalho-Kauhane faction claim they made no coalition agreement on legislation.

But in a prepared statement issued after the committees were announced, Esposito said:

"We disapprove of many of the chairmanships and we disapprove of the formation of several committees.

"One, for example, in which we have expressed strong disapproval is the structure of the land reform committee. * * *"

Esposito said his group had assurances from coalition leaders that the coalition is ended and that Democratic Party bills will never be "iceboxed."

"We hope so. We will be watching and fighting," he said.

HIGHLIGHT

Highlights of committee assignments were:

1. Esposito Democrats were given the chairmanships of 16 of the 26 committees, including the important finance and judiciary committees.

2. Representative Manuel S. Henriques, of Kauai, who last week called the Esposito land-reform program radical, got the chairmanship of the land reform committee.

The makeup of the committee was such that a majority of its members are likely to oppose the heart of the Democratic land reform program now in the house hopper.

ILWU MEN

3. Members of the Cravalho-Kauhane faction who have active ILWU connections received the chairmanships of the agriculture, airports and harbors, and public health committees.

4. Esposito accepted posts on six committees, including land reform.

5. Representative Thomas P. Gill, who was slated to head the land reform committee combined with the judiciary committee under Esposito's organization plan, accepted a seat on the committee.

6. A separate Honolulu city charter committee is composed exclusively of Oahu members.

7. The Esposito group was given the balance of power in two committees, economic development and traffic safety.

The house met briefly yesterday morn'ng before a joint session of the house and senate was addressed by Governor Quinn.

A recess was ordered shortly after noon until 2:30 p.m. but the recess was later extended to 3:30 p.m.

Cravalho then called the house into session and made the committee announcements.

The house was adjourned until 11 a.m. Monday.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a list of the committee assignments of the House of Representatives of the Hawaiian Territorial Legislature, as printed in the Saturday Star Bulletin, of Honolulu, on February 28, 1959.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LIST OF HOUSE COMMITTEE ASSIGNMENT

Because of errors in making appointments, last-minute changes, and one misunderstanding about the number to be assigned to one committee, the committee makeup has been changed slightly since its announcement.

The following list has been changed to show the latest decisions on changes as well as decisions yet to be made.

Names of legislators are grouped according to membership in the two Democratic factions, one led by Representative O. Vincent Esposito and the other by Representatives Elmer F. Cravalho and Charles E. Kauhane, and the Republican minority in the house.

Committee	Esposito	Cravalho-Kauhane	Republicans
Finance	Stanley I. Hara, chairman; Takeshi Kudo; Howard Miyake, James Y. Shigemura, James H. Wakatsuki.	Charles E. Kauhane, vice chairman; Manuel Henriques; David K. Trask.	S. Austin, Robert Teruya, Webley Edwards, Clinton Shiraishi.
County and municipal affairs.	Donald Ching, vice chairman; Akira Sakima; Jack Suwa; Raymond Kobayashi; Sakae Amano.	David K. Trask, chairman; Manuel Henriques; George Okano (either Yoshito Takamine or Akoni Pule).	Joseph Garcia, Barney Tokunaga, Frank Judd, Yoshiichi Yoshida.
Agriculture	Takeshi Kudo, vice chairman; Akira Sakima; James Shigemura; Jack Suwa.	George Okano, chairman; David K. Trask; Charles Kauhane.	Joseph Garcia, Samuel King, Yoshiichi Yoshida.
Judiciary	Hiroshi Kato, chairman; Bernaldo Bicoy; Robert Chang; Thomas Gill; David McClung; O. V. Esposito.	John C. Lanham, vice chairman; Manuel Henriques; Yoshito Takamine.	John Milligan, Clarence Fong, Wadsworth Yee, Ambrose Rosehill.
Land reform	Sakae Amano, Robert Chang, Thomas Gill, O. V. Esposito, David McClung.	Manuel S. Henriques, chairman; David K. Trask, vice chairman; Charles E. Kauhane.	Samuel King, Wadsworth Yee, J. H. Worrall.
Statehood	Tadao Beppu, chairman; James Shigemura, James Wakatsuki, Donald Ching, Raymond Kobayashi, Jack Suwa, O. V. Esposito.	Manuel Henriques, vice chairman; Charles Kauhane, Ray Adams, Akoni Pule, John C. Lanham, Yoshito Takamine.	Stafford Austin, Samuel King, Flora Hayes, Yasutaka Fukushima, Ward Russell.
Economic development	Howard Miyake, chairman; Hiroshi Kato, vice chairman; James Wakatsuki, O. V. Esposito, Thomas Gill, Al Ezell, Sidney Hashimoto.	Ray Adams, Akoni Pule	Stafford Austin, Wadsworth Yee, Clinton Shiraishi.
Printing	Robert Chang	Akoni Pule, chairman; Ray F. Adams, vice chairman; John Lanham.	Yoshiichi Yoshida.
Housing	Sakae Amano, chairman; James Wakatsuki, vice chairman; O. V. Esposito, David McClung, Thomas Gill, Sidney Hashimoto.	Ray Adams, Manuel Henriques, Charles Kauhane.	Clarence Fong, Robert Teruya, Ambrose Rosehill.
Youth and general welfare	Robert Chang, vice chairman; Donald Ching, James Wakatsuki, Akira Sakima.	Walter Harada, chairman; Ray Adams, John Lanham.	Robert Teruya, Dorothy Devereux, Yoshiichi Yoshida.
Tourism	James Wakatsuki, Al Ezell, Raymond Kobayashi, Bernaldo Bicoy, Takeshi Kudo.	John C. Lanham, chairman; Manuel Henriques, vice chairman; David Trask, Charles Kauhane, Yoshito Takamine.	Barney Tokunaga, Webly Edwards, Clinton Shiraishi.
Veterans	Jack Suwa, chairman; Howard Miyake, vice chairman; Takeshi Kudo, Al Ezell.	Pedro Dela Cruz, John Lanham	Wadsworth Yee, Frank Judd, Clinton Shiraishi.
Public health	Sakae Amano, Akira Sakima, Robert Chang, Donald Ching.	Pedro Dela Cruz, chairman; George Okano, vice chairman; John Lanham.	Barney Tokunaga, Flora Hayes, Dorothy Devereux.
Airports and harbors	Tadao Beppu, vice chairman; Jack Suwa, Al Ezell, Bernaldo Bicoy, James Wakatsuki.	Yoshito Takamine, chairman; Manuel Henriques, Ray Adams.	John Milligan, Webley Edwards, Clinton Shiraishi.
Education	Sidney Hashimoto, chairman; James Shigemura, vice chairman; Raymond Kobayashi, Howard Miyake, Robert Chang, O. Vincent Esposito.	Ray Adams, Manuel Henriques, Yoshito Takamine.	John Milligan, Flora Hayes, Dorothy Devereux (another Republican yet to be named).
City charter	Donald Ching, chairman; Akira Sakima, vice chairman; Bernaldo Bicoy, Sakae Amano.	Charles Kauhane, George Okano	Howard Worrall, Frank Judd, Ambrose Rosehill.
Public lands	Raymond Kobayashi, vice chairman; Thomas Gill, Akira Sakima, David McClung.	Charles Kauhane, chairman; Yoshito Takamine.	Joseph Garcia, Samuel King, Flora Hayes.
Public institutions	James Wakatsuki, chairman; Raymond Kobayashi, Howard Miyake, Stanley Hara.	Akoni Pule, vice chairman; David Trask, George Okano.	Stafford Austin, Barney Tokunaga, Dorothy Devereux.
Natural resources	Al Ezell, chairman; Bernaldo Bicoy, vice chairman; Donald Ching, Thomas Gill.	John Lanham, Charles Kauhane	Joseph Garcia, Samuel King, Howard Worrall.
Labor	Raymond Kobayashi, chairman; David McClung.	Yoshito Takamine, vice chairman; Pedro Dela Cruz, John Lanham, Akoni Pule.	John Milligan, Robert Teruya, Ambrose Rosehill.
Accounts	Raymond M. Kobayashi, Howard I. Miyake	Ray F. Adams, chairman; George M. Okano, vice chairman.	Barney Tokunaga.
Government efficiency	Bernaldo Bicoy, chairman; Jack Suwa, vice chairman; Howard Miyake, Al Ezell.	Manuel Henriques, Ray Adams	Clarence Fong, Dorothy Devereux, Howard Worrall.
Civil service	Robert Chang, chairman; Sakae Amano, vice chairman; Donald Ching, Raymond Kobayashi.	David Trask, Manuel Henriques	John Milligan, Ambrose Rosehill, M. Yoshida.
Traffic safety	James Y. Shigemura, chairman; Al Ezell, Jack Suwa, Robert Chang, Bernaldo Bicoy.	Ray Adams, vice chairman	C. Fong, Howard Worrall, Frank Judd.
Utilities	Takeshi Kudo, chairman; Sidney Hashimoto, vice chairman; Al Ezell, Bernaldo Bicoy, James Wakatsuki.	George Okano, Pedro Dela Cruz	Stafford Austin, Wadworth Yee, Frank Judd.
Public improvements	Akira Sakima, chairman; Bernaldo Bicoy, vice chairman; Sakae Amano, Takeshi Kudo.	Pedro Dela Cruz, Akoni Pule	Clarence Fong, Flora Hayes, Webley Edwards.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, there is substantial evidence that the political coup which resulted in the ILWU-Republican coalition in the Territorial house of representatives was initiated by Jack Hall, Communist ILWU leader. The Honolulu Advertiser of February 3 reported that Jack Hall had held a meeting with eight legislators at his home on Sunday, January 25, in what the paper described as "a last-ditch attempt to get major control of the Territorial house." The newspaper said the meeting lasted from 9:30 a.m. to 4:30 p.m. The newspaper said the meeting was attended by Representatives Charles E. Kauhane and George M. Okano of Oahu, Akoni Pula and Yoshito Takamine of

Hawaii, David Trask, Jr., of Maui, Pedro Dela Cruz of Lanai, and two others whose names were not learned.

Among the recent indications of Communist influence in Hawaii was the order of the Supreme Court of Hawaii filed July 28, 1958, appointing a committee to assist the supreme court in the preparation, revision, promulgation, publication, and administration of the general rules of criminal procedure. One of the persons appointed to this committee was Myer C. Symonds, who was a "fifth amendment case," as I recall, when the Internal Security Committee went to Hawaii. The Supreme Court of Hawaii appointed him to help in the preparation, revision, promulgation, publication, and administration of the general rules of criminal procedure.

It is a Communist who has that power.

This was an amazing appointment. Myer C. Symonds is a Honolulu attorney. He was born in Sydney, Australia. He practiced law in San Francisco for about 10 years and went to Hawaii late in 1946. He was a Communist before he left the mainland. He attended the beginners' class of the professional section of the Communist Party from August 17, 1943, to September 3, 1943. He subsequently became membership director of the Lawyers' Club of the Communist Party in San Francisco. He was a member of the professional section of the Communist Party when he joined the U.S. Army in 1944. He was placed on military leave from the Communist Party during his Army service, and after leaving the Army in 1946 he resumed his position of membership director of the Lawyers' Club of the Communist Party. That same year he became a member of the Haymarket branch of the Communist Party.

Myer C. Symonds appeared before the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee in Honolulu in December 1956, and refused to answer questions about his Communist connections, claiming his privilege under the fifth amendment as a basis for such refusal. Yet the Supreme Court of Hawaii in July 1958 named this man as a member of its criminal procedural rules committee. He is an attorney for the Communist Harry Bridges' union, Mr. President, and yet some say that Communist union does not have tremendous influence over the political and economic life of the islands.

Unanimous conclusions of the full Internal Security Subcommittee, as reported to the Senate in 1957, after hearings in Hawaii, included these:

Persons in Hawaii who have been shown to be Communists are acting in concert in an active conspiracy to further Soviet purposes in these islands.

These conspiratorial forces, by their control of the International Longshoremen and Warehousemen's Union—ILWU—and United Public Workers—UPW—are in a position to choke off the flow of all oceanborne commerce upon which the islands depend, and exercise a significant influence on the political life of the islands.

Unions under the domination of unregenerate Communists have a monopoly in handling cargo shipped from all our western ports and through our lifelines on the vast Pacific and on the Hawaiian Islands.

The measure of control exercised by the ILWU, as presently constituted, over the economic life of Hawaii, is a serious threat to the internal security of the United States.

Mr. President, that was a unanimous finding of a 9-man subcommittee, composed of both Democrats and Republicans.

Nothing has happened—nothing—to disturb those conditions.

Any talk about communism having been defeated in Hawaii and the dangers removed is not only wishful thinking but is very dangerous to the security of our country.

It is unfortunate that there are those in Hawaii who want to obtain statehood at all costs. They know that to expose communism in Hawaii would endanger the chances of statehood. Therefore, they would like to conceal evidence of this frightful danger, belittle the Communist menace, sweep it under the rug and hope it will go away. Of course, it will not go away; and the only way to deal with it is to bring it all out in the open. Until this has been done, and until the people of Hawaii have broken the Communist power in the islands, there should be no grant of statehood to Hawaii.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, during September 1958, my wife and I took our first vacation in 10 years. Inasmuch as we had a daughter and a son-in-law in Hawaii, we decided to go to the islands.

We spent about 5 weeks there. I shall never forget the gracious hospitality extended to us by many residents of the islands, including former Governor and Mrs. Oren Long; Mr. and Mrs. Walters Martin; Dr. and Mrs. Gregg M. Sinclair; Mr. and Mrs. Robert Dodge; Miss Elizabeth Keyes, of Honolulu; Mr. and Mrs. Clarence J. Olds, of Kaneohe; and Mr. and Mrs. Norman Olds, of Hilo.

I had an unusual opportunity to visit and talk with many of the residents of the islands. My son-in-law, who is a lieutenant in the Marines, and my daughter were living in a house off the Marine base, at Kaneohe, and among the residents of the islands. Their nearest neighbors were Mr. and Mrs. Clarence Olds. Mr. Olds' grandfather had gone to the islands from New England in 1852. He is one of the finest and kindest men I have ever been permitted to know. As a result of his being a neighbor of my daughter and her husband, I contracted a very warm friendship with him.

He took me about Oahu, and enabled me to see, on intimate terms, many of the residents of the islands.

There is one thing very significant about the islands, and that is the fact that they are the only Territory, originally independent—save and except the Lone Star Republic of Texas—which, of their own volition, and by their own choice, applied for permission to become a part of the United States. I think that is a very significant thing, because it is certainly a rarity in human history for the people of any area voluntarily to request that they be permitted to join another nation.

I was much impressed by the people of the islands and by the process of Americanization, which has reached an obvious fulfillment there. I was particularly impressed on this score by watching the children of the islands, many of whom had the features of orientals, in drugstores and shops. I noticed that the little children of the orientals, the Hawaiians, the Americans, Filipinos, and other residents of the islands went into the drugstores and shops in much the same manner as do little children in America. They purchased ice cream cones, lollipops, and comic sheets.

I was also impressed by the political activity in the islands. During the time I was there the political races were in progress. I have never in my life seen in America a greater interest in public affairs than was manifested by the candidates of the two parties for the various elective offices. They showed a devotion to the concept of government of, by, and for the people.

Another thing which impressed me was the stories I heard about the fidelity of the people of the islands after Pearl Harbor. While a large proportion of the people of the islands are of Japanese origin, they manifested complete loyalty to the United States.

My friend, Clarence J. Olds, has served in the Armed Forces of the Nation in the First World War and in the Second World War, as well as in the Korean conflict. He took me to a very beautiful place known as the Punch Bowl, which overlooks the city of Honolulu and constitutes the Memorial Cemetery of the Pacific. There I saw the graves of hundreds of natives of the islands who had gone out into the Pacific war and into the European areas during the Second World War, and had paid the last full measure of devotion to this country we call America.

One thing which I will treasure among my memories as long as I live was a visit to a Buddhist temple in what is called the Big Island, the Island of Hawaii, which gives the entire chain its name. In that Buddhist temple I saw plaques hanging upon the wall which gave the names of 23 men, natives of the islands, who bore Japanese names, who were members of that little Buddhist congregation in a sparsely settled area, and who had paid the last full measure of devotion to our Nation in the Second World War and in the Korean conflict. As I stood in the Punch Bowl and saw those graves, and as I stood in the Buddhist Temple, where I saw the memorial to 23 members of the congregation who had died for our Nation, I could not help but think of the words of the heroic poet, Rupert Brooks, which applied to them, just as they applied to thousands upon thousands of other American boys who have made the supreme sacrifice for the same country:

These laid the world away; poured out the red
Sweet wine of youth; gave up the years to be
Of Work and joy, and that unhoped serene
That men call age, and those who would have been
Their sons, they gave their immortality.

I am convinced from my own personal observation that the people of the islands are just as devoted to the America we know and love as we are. They have demonstrated that they believe in government of the people, by the people, and for the people. They have demonstrated their complete loyalty to America by their devotion and their sacrifices on the field of battle for our country. They have convinced me that they are entitled to statehood, and for that reason I expect to support the bill.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, although there have been 22 separate investigations and hearings in connection with statehood for Hawaii, beginning in 1935, during most of which time I have been a member of either the House or Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee and the Appropriations subcommittees handling the Interior Department budget, I regret that I did not participate in any of those hearings.

However, I do not intend to sound a discordant note at this time. When the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs a few weeks ago reported favorably a bill for statehood, I voted for statehood. However, during the discussions which preceded that action by the committee, I made some inquiries of the chairman of the subcommittee, the junior Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], concerning the application of the Sugar Act to the new State of Hawaii.

The opinion has been expressed that statehood would not affect in any way the existing provisions of the act as it has applied to Hawaii while a Territory. However, there is a lack of clarity and some uncertainty as to the application of the Sugar Act following the granting of statehood. Two sections of the Sugar Act might be affected by statehood for Hawaii. By section 1112(a)(2)(A) of the 1956 amendment, continental beet and cane sugar may now receive an additional quota each year of 165,000. Hawaii does not now get any of this increase. If Hawaii as a State were included in the continental group and received part of this increase, it would mean less for the States of the mainland.

The other section which might be affected by statehood is section 1107(a) of the Sugar Act, dealing with entry of direct-consumption—refined—sugar from Hawaii and elsewhere.

I should like to ask the chairman of the subcommittee to clarify the legislative history on this particular point. I have no inclination to oppose the continuance of the status which Hawaii has had as a Territory in the application of the Sugar Act. However, I should like to inquire whether it is possible that Hawaii will, as a State, continue to enjoy special privileges which have existed under territorial status when it becomes a State, and whether it will be possible for Hawaii, as a State, not only to retain these benefits but to participate to the same extent as other States in the application of the Sugar Act and possibly acquire additional benefits.

I should like to have a clarification of this point at this time. I should like to inquire of the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee whether he has any clarification on this point, particularly from the Department of Agriculture, which has the responsibility of enforcing this act.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I have before me a memorandum dated March 5, 1959, from the Associate Solicitor for Territories, Wildlife, and Parks of the Department of the Interior, addressed to Legislative Counsel.

The question came up in the subcommittee, and the subcommittee had a definite understanding at the time from a representative of the Secretary of the Interior that the act of statehood would not add or substract from any rights the Territory of Hawaii now has in connection with the Sugar Act.

The memorandum to which I refer states, in part, as follows:

> Assuming the enactment of statehood legislation containing a provision similar to that set forth in section 15 of S. 50, I believe that no change will arise in connection with the Sugar Act.

I should like to read further from the memorandum, and this is very important:

> In this instance, however, it seems to me clear that the Sugar Act provisions relating to Hawaii result from considerations other than its Territorial status. Because of its climate and terrain, it is an area peculiarly suitable for sugar production. Because of its geographical location and its isolation from the continental United States, its sugar problems are susceptible to handling in a fashion which differs from the procedures applicable to sugar producing areas of the continental United States.

It is my understanding from a reading of the memorandum that the passage of S. 50, granting statehood to Hawaii, will maintain the status quo. As counsel has pointed out in the memorandum, the rights of the Territory of Hawaii under the Sugar Act stem not from the fact that it is a Territory, but from the fact that it is an area peculiarly suited for sugarcane. It was on that basis that certain rights accrued to Hawaii. Therefore it is my understanding, I will say to my distinguished friend from Idaho that if there had been any other understanding we would have made changes in the statehood bill. Under the circumstances, we are proceeding on the assumption that the status quo will be maintained.

Mr. DWORSHAK. I understand the explanation to be that as a State Hawaii would continue to receive the benefits which it now enjoys, and, likewise, will not gain any additional benefits by the admission as a State, under the terms of the Sugar Act.

Mr. JACKSON. The Senator is correct.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the entire memorandum be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the memorandum was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
Washington, D.C., March 5, 1959.

To: Legislative Counsel.
From: Associate Solicitor for Territories, Wildlife, and Parks.
Subject: The effect of Hawaiian statehood upon the Sugar Act.

You have requested my views on the question whether the admission of Hawaii into the Union will have any effect upon the provisions of the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended, and particularly whether the quota provisions of that act will be affected. Assuming the enactment of statehood legislation containing a provision similar to that set forth in section 15 of S. 50, I believe that no change would arise in connection with the Sugar Act.

Section 15 of S. 50 provides in pertinent part: "* * * the laws of the United States shall have the same force and effect within the said State as elsewhere within the United States. As used in this section, the term 'territorial laws' includes (in addition to laws enacted by the Territorial Legislature of Hawaii) all laws or parts thereof enacted by the Congress the validity of which is dependent solely upon the authority of the Congress to provide for the government of Hawaii prior to the admission of the State of Hawaii into the Union, and the term 'laws of the United States' includes all laws or parts thereof enacted by the Congress that (1) apply to or within Hawaii at the time of the admission of the State of Hawaii into the Union, (2) are not 'territorial laws' as defined in this paragraph, and (3) are not in conflict with any other provision of this act."

Substantially the same language appears in section 8(d) of the Alaska Statehood Act (72 Stat. 339, 344). As you know, section 8(d) is the subject of a memorandum from me to the Assistant Director of the Technical Review Staff, dated October 24, 1958, which sets forth our views concerning the meaning of section 8(d). That memorandum has been approved by the Department of Justice and has been distributed by the Bureau of the Budget to interested departments and agencies of the Government and, so far as I am aware, has been uniformly adopted by them in construing section 8(d).

The October 24, 1958, memorandum deals, among other things, with statutes which prescribe treatment for Alaska different from the treatment accorded other States of the Union. It concludes that distinctive treatment, so long as it is based upon considerations other than the legal status of Alaska, remains acceptable notwithstanding Alaska's admission. This result is based upon the third sentence of section 8(d), which sentence is the same as the last sentence of section 15 of S. 50 quoted above. The memorandum states, in pertinent part, as follows:

"There remains for consideration * * * those laws * * * which prescribe distinctive treatment for Alaska attributable to some factor other than the Territorial status of Alaska. This, we think, is the type of law to which the third sentence of section 8(d) was directed, in that such laws are laws that '(1) apply to or within Alaska at the time of the admission of the State of Alaska into the Union, (2) are not "Territorial laws" as defined in this paragraph, and (3) are not in conflict with any other provisions of this act.' The distinction may have been made, for example, because of area, population, climate, terrain, or any of a number of other factors. We think it entirely compatible with statehood that those distinctions be preserved until such time as the Congress manifests an intention to the con-

trary. It is our conclusion, therefore, that these provisions of law are laws of the United States which will continue in force and effect after the admission of Alaska to the Union."

In connection with the statement that no necessary incompatibility exists between statehood on the one hand and distinctive treatment on the other, the memorandum further states that this conclusion does not conflict in any way with section 1 of the Alaska Act (and the same statement is contained in section 1 of S. 50), providing for admission "on an equal footing with the other States in all respects whatever." The memorandum points out and cites authority for the proposition that such a provision guarantees a new State equality with respect to its sovereignty and political rights, but it does not operate to restrict Congress in the enactment of legislation within the sphere of its plain power.

We also noted in the memorandum that difficult questions of statutory construction and legislative intent will arise in applying the foregoing to specific statutes prescribing distinctive treatment, and that if substantial doubt exists as to whether distinctive treatment arises as a result of legal status, rather than other factors, a submission of the question to the Department of Justice would be appropriate.

In this instance, however, it seems to me clear that the Sugar Act provisions relating to Hawaii result from considerations other than its Territorial status. Because of its climate and terrain, it is an area peculiarly suitable for sugar production. Because of its geographical location and its isolation from the continental United States, its sugar problems are susceptible to handling in a fashion which differs from the procedures applicable to sugar producing areas of the continental United States. In the Sugar Act, the Congress saw fit to prescribe quotas for the domestic beet sugar area, for the mainland cane sugar area, and for Hawaii. It doubtless could have included Hawaii in either or both of the first two categories and it may in the future see fit to do so. But Congress doubtless recognized that it would be easier to administer a law which recognizes the fact of Hawaii's location outside the continental beet and cane producing areas. I can see no reason why this technique would be less acceptable in the light of Hawaii's admission than it has been during the period of Hawaii's Territorial status.

A. M. EDWARDS,
Associate Solicitor, Territories, Wildlife, and Parks.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. The bill now before the Senate involves an action which has been delayed for about 105 years. In 1854 a treaty for the annexation of Hawaii to the United States was completed between Secretary of State Marcy and King Kamehameha III. However, due to the death of King Kamehameha and certain objections in the United States, unfortunately the treaty was not carried out.

Of course, Hawaii had prior to that time shown its capacity for self-government in the union of all the islands under King Kamehameha I in 1795, under their written laws of 1824, their first written constitution in 1840, and then under their liberal constitution of 1852.

After the 1854 annexation treaty again in 1870, we negotiated a treaty which set up a virtual protectorate in Hawaii, where the people had again shown their capacity for self-government. But this Senate rejected the treaty, and Hawaiian admission and statehood was again delayed. Nevertheless these people of the Territory have been denied admission to their Territory as a State.

In his book on the westward expansion of the American people, the historian, MacCaleb refers to what he describes as "race unconsciousness" the unconscious urge of the race to expansion of their territorial boundaries. He deals with the fact that some peoples have an instinct for expansion while others do not. In our own country some people react slower than the rest of the country in the acquisition of new Territories or new States. We may well wonder that our Nation is longer on the eastern seaboard than it is on the western seaboard. That is due largely to sectionalism among our people. Due to slavery, the southern part of the United States did not want to expand in the Pacific Northwest, whereas the Northern States, opposing slavery, did not want to expand to the Southwest.

The result has been that as we have expanded westward we have developed a rather narrow boundary on the Pacific coast as compared with our land on the Atlantic coast; we contracted instead of expanding our boundaries as we went westward—political considerations pulled our boundaries in, against the instincts of the people.

Ever since American sailors first landed in the islands in the 1700's, and through later settlements by New England missionaries there has been a close bond between us and the Hawaiian Islands.

Despite the relatively small size of the Hawaiian Islands, our act of admitting the islands is nothing more than an act of historic justice. It is the carrying out of an historic commitment, a historic act that should have been done long ago.

The Hawaiian people have shown their capacity for self-government. After having been a united monarchy since 1795, Hawaii became a republic in 1893. It was annexed by the United States, on July 7, 1898, and it became an organized Territory in 1900. The people of Hawaii have had a form of self-government in their islands since 1900, under a type of territorial organization which differs from that in existence in any other American Territory.

Mr. President, as a Senator from Texas, a State which was once an independent nation—and I take issue with the distinguished Senator from North Carolina, because Texas was never a Territory after she won her independence in 1836—and voluntarily came into the Union as a State when she was then an independent nation—I extend the hand of fellowship and brotherhood to another American Territory, which once had won and maintained its own independence as a nation, first as a monarchy, then as a republic, and likewise accepted the protection of the Stars and Stripes, into membership in this great aggregation of commonwealths which make up the United States of America. Texas welcomes Hawaii as the 50th State. Two independent nations voluntarily surrendered their sovereignty to become sister States in the greatest Union of States this world has ever known.

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, as I have listened to these interesting exchanges on the question of Hawaii, two thoughts have come to my mind, which I think need to be expressed at this time of the day.

Meritorious as all the historic tradition is behind the case for Hawaii; meritorious as are our military and moral considerations, which have been eloquently spelled out in the Senate today; there are two aspects of the question which I think might further be emphasized before we say our last words and then pass judgment.

The first is our posture before the rest of the world as opponents of communism. We have made it very clear to the world that we are opposed to Communists and communism. We are also agreed that there may be some Communists on the Islands of Hawaii. However, no one whom I have heard speak today is proposing that we dump the Hawaiians into the Pacific, so to speak; that we dissociate ourselves from them in the future. What the proposition comes down to is: How can we best combat Communists and communism?

We have been criticized by many of our friends in the world for being too negative; for being against, without making clear what it is we stand for. I think that in the case of statehood for Hawaii we have an opportunity to make our posture clear and positive before the rest of the world. We have long since learned that we cannot legislate an idea out of existence. We cannot pass a law to destroy the Communist Party. We fight ideas with better ideas.

One of the real ways we have for combating Communists, it seems to me, is to pull one of their propaganda rugs from under them in Hawaii by admitting Hawaii to statehood. This would exhibit an air of confidence by showing that we are willing to share our system of government; that we are not afraid of its contrasts with communism.

While there are those who believe that a few Communists will infect all the democracies in the world, I think it is important that we appreciate the simple truth that democracy is somewhat infectious too. If we would but use it more positively, we would find a new weapon at our disposal for combating communism.

The second aspect is psychological. I refer to the psychology of the peoples of the Pacific nations. We have heretofore exhibited a stature which was not altogether complimentary to us—a superiority in our air. Some aspects of our past history have suggested such superiority. Often Asians give the superior air of Americans as their reason for turning to alternative ways of life. Therefore, it seems to me that we have a chance in Hawaii to seize the psychological initiative in that area of the world. Where they are now concerned with the contrasts between communism and independence, we would go on record

before the world as proposing a peaceful democratic accession at the suggestion of a people or a territory which is largely Asiatic.

We are, in effect, a hundred years after our own secession movement, indulging in a laudable bit of accession. This, in contrast with the colonialism fears in Asia, would strike a refreshing note, I have no doubt, in that quarter of the world. Likewise, it would suggest our own acceptance of the thesis of equality.

By granting Hawaii statehood in our system of government, we will be saying to the rest of the world that we hold no discriminatory views toward Asiatic peoples.

In addition to the many excellent reasons which already have been developed, I appeal to the Senate to consider statehood for Hawaii in the realm of a positive way of combating communism and of a psychological posture which is constructive and helpful and will inure to our benefit in the struggle which is now going on throughout the world for the minds of men.

I subscribe with deep conviction to the views of those who support statehood for Hawaii.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I rise in opposition to S. 50, which would admit the State of Hawaii into the Union.

Mr. President, I have great respect and admiration for the people of the Territory of Hawaii. Their islands are famous for the hospitality of its citizens, and the lure of island life is so strong that it provides a temptation for many men, young and old alike, to forsake the mad and ambitious pace of competitive living that typifies our North American Continent. I suspect that the tourist information and pictures, which so pleasantly depict life in the Hawaiian Islands, have instilled in many, if not all, of us a fascination and longing for the easy and pleasant life of the beachcomber.

I do not mean to imply, Mr. President, that all of the admirable qualities of the Hawaiian people stem from their traditionally patient and unhurried approach to life, or the recreational possibilities offered by their enviable climate and island geography. Their courage and stamina have been more than proved in war; their industry and efficiency have been demonstrated by the growth and diversification of their peacetime economy. The esthetic of Hawaiian culture is more than adequately balanced by the utilitarian.

Admiration of a people, however, regardless of the degree, is not a sufficient foundation on which to base such an irrevocable and far-reaching political decision as granting to those people statehood in the United States of America. There are many admirable people in the world, and the number of groups which merit our appreciation increases proportionately to our knowledge and understanding of them, and also according to the degree of self-expression accorded to them under their system of government. The English speaking people of the world, generally speaking, enjoy a latitude of political freedom, as we understand the term, which allows self-expression of qualities which, from our earliest training we have learned to admire and appreciate. Other peoples in the world share these qualities, and others that are highly commendable, although, unfortunately, many of them are suppressed to the extent that we are hardly aware of the existence of such qualities.

Looking south from the United States of America, we behold immediately beyond the Rio Grande the Republic of Mexico. Here, too, we observe a people with a more unhurried approach to life than our own, and also a country with the recreational attraction that is common in the more advanced semitropical countries. Here, too, in recent years, is the easy pace of life matched by industry and productivity, as is most graphically illustrated by the competitive position enjoyed by certain Mexican products, among them cotton textiles, which are gaining increased shares of the world market.

This country lies adjacent to our own; in fact, parts of what were originally Mexican territory have long since been incorporated as States of the United States, including our second largest State, Texas, and those States formed from the Gadsden Purchase.

Despite the admirable qualities of the Mexican people, a productive capability which would support and does support State governments, and a parallel, if somewhat slower democratic development, would these factors sufficiently support an application for statehood, even if requested and conditioned on a period of territorial status? Of course not. An affirmative answer would indicate a fallacious and unbalanced concentration on similarities and a neglect of the glaring dissimilarities.

Such a fallacious concentration on similarities has led us too far along the road of no return to Hawaiian statehood. We are so engrossed in the daydream of benevolence and good wishes for these warm-hearted people, that we are in danger of condemnation for what is almost culpable neglect of the basic political factors which should control our decisions. We are not elected to office for the purpose of exercising our emotions; for, at least theoretically, we were sent here to exercise our judgment, individually and collectively, in the best interests of the people of the 49 States in the Union. I propose now, that we consider some of the facts on which our judgment should rest.

The democratic principles of self-government, as practiced in our constitutional Republic, are not the result of merely an enlightened philosophy which our Founding Fathers conceived as an answer to the latent desires for self-determination. The Constitution, itself, while novel in many functional respects, was in reality a formalized implementation of ideas which had been tried, and had been found, from actual experience, to be worthy of implementation. The institutions which comprise our Government were shaped by experiences beyond common recollection; yet the results and lessons which stemmed from those experiences have become ingrained in our political philosophy.

It is appropriate that we review, briefly, at least a few of the developments which have contributed to our rich political heritage, and have, to a surprising extent, without our conscious realization, shaped and formed our basic outlook toward the institutions of government.

Underlying and fundamental to our most basic philosophy is our concern, our respect, for the dignity of the individual. It is so deeply ingrained upon the hearts of the overwhelming majority of the populace of the United States that it approaches the quality of instinct. It is so submerged in our essential character that its origin is often obscured. Origins of such concepts assume tremendous importance in relation to questions, such as those posed by the issue of Hawaiian statehood, which affect the unity of the peoples of the 49 States.

Upon reflection, it is easy for us to realize that our concept of the dignity of the individual could have originated only in Christianity. This concept is only one of the many concepts of the facets of our religious heritage which find expression in our political thoughts and institutions.

Not only is it important to recall the origin of such concepts, in order to put in proper perspective the issue we are considering, but it is equally vital to be aware of the route of transmission of the concepts of Christianity to and through our ancestors, and thereafter and thereby into our very subconscious.

It is imperative that we recollect that Christianity, after its birth on the eastern shores of the Mediterranean Sea, spread almost exclusively with the flow of civilization to the West. Its spread was repulsed, and if anything, reflected away from the East and Orient by the solid wall of the possibly older, already entrenched wall of oriental cults and religions. Christianity flowed ever westward, through Macedonia and Rome, and, on the crest of Roman conquest and civilization, to the shores of western Europe and the islands of Britain. The acceptance and embracement of Christianity by the West was so eager, and its repulsion by the East was so aggressive, that in shortly more than a thousand years after the birth of Christianity in the land of Palestine, the Christian crusaders of the West were engaged in holy war to wrest the land of the origin of Christianity from the oriental non-Christians who had surged in from the East. Thus, the Christian religion, born on the border of East and West, found its acceptance in the West, and became a part of the heritage and culture of the West, as contrasted to the East of the orientals.

Our heritage is not of single origin. Although our sense of values—such as the premium which we place on the dignity of man, as well as many other basic ideals which guide our relationships—is largely derived from the teachings of Christianity, other historical experiences have contributed immeasurably to our political and philosophical heritage.

Many of these other influences had their origin in antiquity; many others

are undoubtedly without historical recordings. Lest we doubt their existence in antiquity, and mistakenly attribute them to the astuteness of ourselves or our immediate forefathers, I would cite an example of the birth of one of our political tenets.

During the days preceding and coinciding with the beginnings of the Roman Empire, there roamed over the lands of northern Europe a nomadic people, who were termed "barbarians" by their more civilized contemporaries of the south. But today we recall these barbarians as the ancestors of the men led by the famous victor at the Battle of Hastings, William the Conqueror.

Those early Germans and Saxons lived in a tribal society ruled by chiefs or councils who were thought to derive power from a higher and nonhuman source. Even at that early state of noncivilized development, the value of fixed rules of conduct, generally applicable to all men, were realized. The chiefs or councils, even at that early point in antiquity, unenlightened by the forces of Christianity or civilization, realized that those empowered to govern had limitations; and, almost without exception, they adhered to the philosophy that they, as rulers, had no power to make laws, but, on the contrary, were limited to applying and enforcing existing rules. To remedy the absence of any lawmaking authority which could enact new rules to meet new and changing conditions, those chiefs and councils resorted to the most questionable practice of not creating, but finding, laws not commonly—nor uncommonly, for that matter—known to have previously existed—a rationalization, to be sure; but this early acceptance by German tribal rulers of a limitation on their absolute power to rule grew and contributed to our present-day philosophy that not only is the power of a ruler limited, but government should be with the consent of the governed.

Advancing in point of time from these ancient contributions, political and philosophical crystallizations of thought, though usually uncodified, contributed to definite and positive conclusions in the minds and consciences of Western peoples. These conclusions have descended as a part of our heritage; and many of them have found codification in our basic documents of guarantee, such as the principles of the Magna Carta which were documented for our posterity in the Constitution. Other concepts, while not codified, and perhaps even elusive of precise definition, have become so engraved in our minds and on our philosophy that they are equally a part of our governmental system.

By seeking to recall the contributions of antiquity to our heritage, Mr. President, I would not leave the impression that our political philosophy is without distinct contributions from post-revolutionary days. Our relatively young Republic—and often our conduct suggests childishness—has been blessed with profitable experience. Some of our experience has been severely painful—for instance, it is hard to imagine an experience more dreadful than the Civil War which ravaged our homeland—but each experience has tempered our thought and judgment; and only from the close association with the consequences and effects of these experiences are we able to meet the inevitable problems that confront us with solutions that are in keeping with our basic beliefs.

Our heritage is so rich and rewarding that even a cursory review of its history and formation would require more words than even a U.S. Senator can muster. Its cumulative impact on both our conscious and subconscious, nebulous as it may appear, is the common denominator of our thought process which enables us, even when in disagreement, to reason together for the common good, while safeguarding the rights of the individual. That condition of our mentality permits an intercourse of ideas bounded by the same walls of moral attitude, and permits harmonious interchange of ideas, just as a common language makes possible a comprehensible exchange of words.

Ours is emphatically not the only heritage on earth, and I might add that it has no monopoly on admirable characteristics. Many other peoples than our own share a major portion of our traditions and principles; and theirs differ from ours only in extent and route of development. With some peoples, such as the English, we share almost all of our basic political philosophy; and our differences appear primarily in the political institutions and procedures which are the expression of our very similar philosophies. The degree to which we share our heritage with other peoples obviously depends on the coincidence of ideas and the degree of their acceptance among and by our several ancestors.

Just as there are those with whom we share, to differing degrees, our heritage, there are also in this world those who are the devisees of a totally different heritage, and with whom we have no identity in either antiquity or modern times. There are many shades and mixtures of heritages in the world, but there are only two extremes. Our society may well be said to be, for the present, at least, the exemplification of the maximum development of the Western civilization, culture, and heritage. At the opposite extreme exists the Eastern heritage, different in every essential—not necessarily inferior, but different as regards the very thought processes within the individuals who comprise the resultant society. As one of the most competent, and certainly the most eloquent, interpreters of the East to the West, Rudyard Kipling felt the bond of love of one for the other; but at the same time he had the insight to express the impassable difference with the immortal words, "East is East, and West is West, and never the twain shall meet."

The chasm of difference between the two, possibly geographical in origin, ceased eons ago to be geographical in nature. The difference is in heritage, the force that shapes the man to form unchangeable, except, if at all, by the infinite passage of time.

At this point, it behooves us to review briefly some of the influences and occurrences which have contributed to the Eastern culture.

Initially, let us recognize the fact that the Eastern, or oriental, heritage antedates that of the West. A heritage begins, not with the discernible history of a generic group of people, but with the birth of lasting ideas which contribute to the development, good or bad, of a people.

History reveals that even at the time of the birth of Christianity, the Eastern society was completely impregnated with the ideas contributed from ancestors' experiences in prehistoric times. For example, one of the contributions of their heritage which was evident even at that early period was their possession of a high respect for their parents—a quality which persists in an even more refined state today, and which, needless to say, is most admirable.

It is not pertinent, however, to consider here whether the attributes of the Eastern heritage meet with our admiration or our disapproval. What is important is the fact that they are vastly different, and—even more important—the fact that the differences are so deeply embedded as to be practically incomprehensible to the product of the Western heritage, and vice versa.

Our best approach to an understanding of the product is through study of the processes that formed it. As I have stated, the traditions and heritage of the East commenced earlier in point of time than did our own, and have, like our own, continued to the present. It would, therefore, be impossible to attempt to approach any degree of exhaustiveness in treating the formation of Eastern heritage. I shall merely mention a few of the periods of oriental history which contributed substantially to the fabrication of things oriental.

As I have mentioned, one of the facts which most sharply illustrates that, from inception, the heritages of East and those of the West were different, is that the origin of the former antedates the origin of the latter. For instance, although the early history of China is shrouded in fable, it is certain that that civilization was much advanced among those oriental people when civilization was only beginning to dawn on the nations of Europe. In fact, the names of numerous Chinese dynasties which belonged to a period two thousand or three thousand years before Christ are still preserved. The fact that a recitation of the names of those dynasties would strike no chord familiar to us, does not detract in the slightest from the contributions of that early civilization to the composite of what is known to us as the Eastern mind. Probably the earliest Chinese individual whose name has a familiar ring to us was Confucius, who was born in 551 B.C., under the rule of Ling-Wang, in the declining days of the Chow dynasty. That one philosopher and teacher made an immeasurable impact on the formation of the Chinese thought process and outlook, and, indeed, on the entire Eastern world, despite the fact that subsequent to his lifetime, an Emperor, or "Whang," ordered the burning

of all books in China, including those containing the teachings of Confucius. In order to establish that book-burning episode in point of time. we may note that the same Emperor commenced construction of the Great Wall of China. It is also worthy of note that at the time of the book burning in China, written languages were rare, and books were almost unknown in the Western World.

There was no interrelation of the Eastern and the Western heritages; in their early development, one did not contribute to the other. For all intents and purposes, each went its own way, uninfluenced by the other. Apparently, the first time when even the vaguest exchange of ideas occurred was following the visit of Marco Polo to China, in the relatively recent period of the 13th century.

The moral attitudes and rules of human relationships of the East are derived, not merely from the teachings of Confucius, but also from mixtures of Taoism and a form of Buddhism and various superstitions which originated in the fables handed down from a form of civilization that antedated history.

The Eastern heritage cannot be characterized by merely observing its descendancy in China, however, any more than Western heritage can be appreciated by a study of, say, the culture of England, to the exclusion of other Western cultures. A look at the heritage of Japan will illustrate the point.

Japan's early heritage unquestionably lies in the same prehistoric Oriental civilization as does that of China. The development of what we might loosely term the "national temperament" of each is similar to the extent of the similarity of the influences of their early common history. The difference is one of degree, rather than substance, and is attributable to the separate and dissimilar influences of more recent times.

In Japan, as in China, the thinking reflects the influence of the precepts of Confucian ethics, as well as those of Buddhism. The ancient respect for parents is reflected in forms of what we consider ancestor worship. Nevertheless, neither China alone nor Japan alone reflects the ultimate in the result of Eastern heritage, any more than France alone or Germany alone could reflect all the facets of the development of the Western heritage.

One factor about Japan is so illustrative of one aspect of the problem I am discussing, that it cannot be ignored. That is the odd historical fact of the relative isolation of Japan from other cultures during what can be called the medieval history of that country. The effects of that isolation are most ably summarized in the words of George Trumbull Ladd, late emeritus professor of metaphysics and moral philosophy at Yale University:

> In a word, there is probably no other one of the foremost and equally populous nations of the world whose mental characteristics, as developed on a basis of race temperament, are more strongly marked.

We should consider that situation in the light of the fact that the Japanese people are not an ethnologically homogeneous race. On the contrary, they are a mixture of two distinctly different racial groups, the Tartars or Mongolians and the Malayans, along with traces of other indigenous elements. This proves beyond doubt that the temperament and philosophy of a people are shaped by their total heritage, rather than by their racial strains.

Now let us turn to the outward manifestations of what we may generally call the resulting oriental philosophy. There are many such manifestations which illustrate the mental approach inspired by their heritage; but the purpose is served just as well by quoting a conclusion of so eminent authority as George Trumbull Ladd, who concluded that the Japanese temperament is characterized, by, among other things, "a disposition to deal with moral and religious truths as though they are matters worthy of only a passing curiosity, rather than concerned with the profounder insights and most important activities of human life." In the other direction, after noting the fundamental difference between the Japanese moral outlook and the Western moral outlook, Mr. Ladd concluded:

> We may safely declare that the Japanese are as truly moral as any other race of civilized human beings.

It is obvious, then, that the fundamental difference between the heritage of the East and that of the West has, in turn, resulted in the existence of equally fundamental differences in the mental approach to the conduct and regulation of society. It is not necessary for us to attempt to form a judgment as to which heritage will ultimately result in the better society, or which mental approach is superior, if, indeed, we were so presumptuous as to imagine that the devices of either heritage could completely comprehend the thought processes of the other group. History has shown that societies with such differences in heritage and resultant outlook can coexist, and that, in fact, each can profit from contemporary experiences of the other.

The fact of the difference is what we must first recognize and acknowledge. Once this basic premise is accepted, we can better understand, perhaps, why Christianity found ready acceptance in the Western World, but was rejected in the East. Of course, the Eastern mentality is quite probably susceptible to the lure of ideologies which persons of Western heritage are inclined to study and then reject.

Having realized that the various heritages have resulted in fundamentally different mental outlooks, and that they can, and do, peacefully coexist, we must turn to the next question which naturally arises in our minds, to wit: Can two diametrically opposed mental approaches be fused with a harmonious result?

The answer is an emphatic "No." Once again, history has provided a clear-cut illustration of this answer; we have only to consider Japan. Subsequent to World War II, the Americans occupied Japan, where they not only voided the power of the Emperor, but also established, at least in form, democratic institutions of Western heritage. Despite the fact that the Japanese were tutored intensely for a period in excess of 10 years in the operation of these institutions, and despite the ability of the Japanese to copy Western accomplishments, in Japan the development of these borrowed democratic institutions has taken on a peculiarly Japanese flavor, and, to many in the Western World, has been both surprising and disappointing. Political parties in Japan have increased alarmingly, and it has become almost impossible to determine from day to day just who belongs to what party. In Japan, this and other similar circumstances have led to a quality of instability that, from the Western point of view, is most disturbing. Many have attributed these developments to what is naively called lack of experience in democracy. Actually, such developments are due to the fact that the Japanese must of necessity operate these Western institutions from a basically oriental mental approach. Undoubtedly, the Japanese, as any other devisee of oriental heritage, is capable of a democratic existence, but only when that existence is the outgrowth of the mental perspective of the Japanese. A fusion of Western form with Japanese mental approach can never be successful. Only by devising institutions that will be singularly expressive of Japanese ideas and ideals can the Japanese obtain a truly workable democracy.

It is not only in the field of government that a fusion of Western and Eastern mental outlooks is impossible; it is also impossible in all other areas of human relationship. For instance, no institution was more stable than the prewar Japanese family. With the advent of the American occupation, Japanese women were tendered emancipation in the Western tradition. Actually, the Japanese family had played an even more vital role in the structure of the Japanese society than the family plays in Western society. However, the Japanese approach to the subject of sex is totally different from that which prevails in the West. This emancipation of Japanese women from sources without the Japanese heritage, therefore, left in the Japanese structure of society a gaping void, the harmful consequences of which will be felt for generations of Japanese to come. It is quite possible, and even probable, that if left to their own approach, the Japanese would have progressed toward an emancipated status for women which would have been orderly and entirely beneficial. But an attempt to bring about a fusion of Western habits with Eastern heritage in an effort to produce harmonious results, was doomed to failure from the outset.

We arrive, then, at the unmistakable conclusion that the mental attitudes resulting from the different heritages of East and West are fundamentally different; and that while the two mental approaches and the resultant diffused societies are capable of coexistence, nevertheless it is impossible to fuse them with harmonious results.

Let us turn now to the Hawaiian Islands; and, from an examination of their outward characteristics, let us determine how the element of heritages

should influence our judgment on the issue of statehood for Hawaii.

The central Pacific archipelago, known as the Hawaiian Islands, is located approximately 2,040 miles across the Pacific Ocean from the North American Continent. There are eight principal islands and many smaller ones, with a total area of approximately 6,400 square miles. As of July 1958, the civilian population of the islands numbered some 578,000, which was augmented by some 35,000 military personnel.

The population density of the Hawaiian Islands is in the neighborhood of 80 persons a square mile. It is significant, also, that 49 percent of the Hawaiian population resides in the city of Honolulu, and 70 percent of the population is concentrated on the island of Oahu, on which Honolulu is located.

From the standpoint of agricultural development, it is worthy of note that Hawaii has approximately 308,580 acres under intensive cultivation. That figure represents the near maximum potential, because of terrain and rainfall factors. In 1950, there were 5,750 farms, encompassing 2,432,069 acres.

The first contact of the Western World with the Hawaiian Islands was at the relatively recent date of 1788, when the English explorer, Captain Cook, visited the islands. Western intercourse, both commercial and cultural, with Hawaii has been prevalent since about 1820. In 1900, Hawaii was incorporated as a Territory of the United States, and has continued in that status to this time. Although Hawaii has a Territorial legislature elected by popular vote, the Governor of the islands is appointed by the President of the United States, and the islands have one nonvoting Delegate to Congress. The franchise, as to elective offices, is extended to U.S. citizens in the islands who can read and write English.

Turning to population composition, according to the Bureau of Census figures for 1950, we find that approximately 23 percent of the population is Caucasian, having declined somewhat, percentagewise, since 1940. The remainder of the population is comprised of Japanese, 36.9 percent; Hawaiian, including part Hawaiian, 17.2 percent; Filipino, 12.2 percent; Chinese, 6.5 percent; and others, 4.2 percent.

Even when the large numbers of military personnel are included—and they have little, if any, bearing on the facts which should influence our judgment on this question—oriental and Hawaiian groups constitute in excess of 70 percent of Hawaii's population.

This large segment of the population has a heritage allied and similar to that of the Japanese and Chinese—in a word, Eastern. It is a rich heritage, more ancient than our own; but, above all, fundamentally different from that of which we are the beneficiaries. It would be foolish to presume that this heritage of the East, which extends back in time for thousands of years, could be replaced by contact with the West for a century, especially when we consider the fact that ties of culture have also been maintained with the East. To make such a fallacious assumption would be an injustice to these people, for they are not so easily brainwashed of their basic mental approach.

A distinction must be recognized at this point between existence of individuals of Eastern heritage under Western institutions of government administered and directed by people of Western heritage, on the one hand, and Western institutions of government administered by individuals of Eastern heritage, on the other hand. The people of Hawaii under Territorial status constitute an example of the former while the people of Japan subsequent to the occupation represent an example of the latter. They are quite different in result. The former can, and often does, have beneficial results to the people concerned; the latter is doomed to have disastrous consequences. Fortunately, the Japanese have sufficient latitude of self-determination to recover by adapting and modifying the Western institutions imposed on them to suit their own mental processes. If the constitutionally bounded status of statehood is imposed on Hawaii, including the responsibility for conformation to the harmony of political and sociological ideas essential to the successful operation of our peculiarly Western, federated Republic, there will be no room for adaptation, and the attempted fusion will work to the disadvantage of both the people of Hawaii and the people of the previous 49 States. And, lest there be any doubt, the interest of the people of the 49 States, our constituents, bears considerably—yes, primarily—on this issue.

The conclusion which I suggest is not in derogation of the principle of local self-government. Self-government is and should be the aim of all peoples, and it is in the interest of all of us who enjoy it to promote it among other peoples.

I am also conscious of the mutual advantages to the United States and to Hawaii which result from close political and economic ties. The beneficial bonds between the United States and the islands must be preserved.

Statehood, however, is not the only vehicle of self-government; neither must a denial of statehood to Hawaii necessarily sever the political and economic bonds of Hawaii and the United States. It is not because of, but rather in spite of, our heritage that we of the Western World are often inclined to limit ourselves to the rut of unimaginative thinking.

The answer to the desire of all of us to assist Hawaii to realize the maximum degree of self-government and determination, while maintaining—even strengthening—the political and economic bonds which now exist between us is the commonwealth status. Through the mechanics of commonwealth status, Hawaii could realize self-government through political institutions conforming to the dominant oriental heritage and outlook. At the same time, the commonwealth act could provide for the defense and support of the islands by the United States, with the assistance of Hawaiians and Hawaiian bases. Commercial ties of mutual benefit could similarly be preserved.

There is serious doubt in my mind as to whether the Hawaiian people would not be seriously handicapped, possibly even precluded, in defending themselves from such as the Communist-dominated Longshoremen's Union by the imposition upon them of Western institutions of government, since their heritage has not equipped them to comprehend the philosophy essential to the effective operation of these institutions. Left to their own resources with respect to the inauguration of democratic institutions to implement self-government, they would surely achieve more harmoniously, and more effectively, the benefits accruing from self-rule.

There is even greater doubt in my mind that the Hawaiian people could contribute to the degree of harmony remaining in the conduct of affairs of our federated Republic through instrumentalities singularly Western. I am impressed with the difficulty of this operation resulting from the slight differences in heritage across our complex Nation, in spite of our very substantial identity of heritage and ideals. I fear that an abandonment of the United States of America in favor of a United States of America and Pacific—precedenting a United States of the World—would actually benefit no one, but toll the deathknell of our federated Republic.

I move, therefore Mr. President, that S. 50 be recommitted to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, with directions to make such investigations as it deems necessary, and to report to the Senate a bill to provide commonwealth status for Hawaii.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Moss in the chair). The Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, ever since World War II I have strongly supported the granting of statehood to Hawaii and the Hawaiian people. We do not speak, in this matter, of annexing to our country an area that is not a part of the United States, because it has been a cherished part of the United States since 1898. We do not, Mr. President, speak of incorporating a large group of people into the citizenship of our Nation who are not already Americans, because they have been Americans—American citizens—since 1898.

Mr. President, the last figures from the Census Bureau show that 85 percent of the civilian residents of Hawaii, of nearly 600,000, are native-born American citizens—native-born citizens of Hawaii. Mr. President, the question, therefore, is not a question of annexation of foreign territory or of the incorporation into our Nation of people who are not Americans, who are not American citizens, just the same as we are, but it is a question of whether or not the progress, the development, the record, the history, the traditions of Hawaii and the Hawaiian people entitle them, under our American system, to become full-fledged citizens of a State with rights, standing, and stature equal to that of any other State of the Union.

Mr. President, it is because I have felt that the people of Hawaii, by their record of loyalty and service to America, and their record as American citizens,

have fulfilled in the highest degree the requirements imposed upon the people of any area of our Nation before statehood, that precious ultimate right, is accorded, and it is because I feel they have merited statehood that I have long supported statehood for Hawaii.

Mr. President, I should like to briefly refer to a few of the things which I think have been established as reasons why we should grant statehood to Hawaii.

First is the strategic importance of Hawaii, not to itself, but to the United States of America. We can all think back to December 7, 1941. We can all remember that the first attack of the enemy was leveled not against the mainland of the United States, but against what was known to be our great bastion of military strength in the Pacific, Hawaii.

Mr. President, what happened that day and what happened in the years which followed demonstrated completely that Hawaii is our great, strong, sturdy bastion for the defense and the security of this Nation in the Pacific area. No one would deny that for a moment. Hawaii was the center of our naval operations in the Pacific, the center of our Army operations in the Pacific, the center of our Air Force operations in the Pacific, and the center of our services of supply for all whom we were supplying in the Pacific. Hawaii is the point of highest strategic importance to our Nation in that important area of the world.

The second point, Mr. President, follows the first point closely. In connection with what happened December 7, 1941, and what happened in the months and years which followed, there has been demonstrated beyond any cavil or question the tremendous loyalty of the Hawaiian people. I shall not elaborate upon that point. My distinguished and eloquent friend, the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN] has already spoken feelingly of the crosses he saw on the Hawaiian hills. Let us simply admit as a matter of course that the Hawaiian people acquitted themselves magnificently as American patriots of the first degree and are entitled to be regarded and always held as such on terms of equality with American patriots anywhere else in any other part of our Nation.

Mr. President, the Hawaiians have supremely demonstrated their loyalty and fidelity to America.

What about the economic capacity of Hawaii? I hope all Senators have read the report of the committee. If Senators have read the report, they know that last year, 1958, Hawaii contributed more to the coffers of the United States than was contributed by each of 10 States, all of which are fine States, and all of which are contributing to the extent of their capacity and the extent of the capacity of their people, as required by Federal law.

Mr. President, last year Hawaii contributed $166 million to the Federal coffers. I think it is worthy of note that there has been no time in recent years when the appropriations made by the American people for the development of Hawaii have equaled the amount paid by Hawaiian citizens into our Federal coffers, exactly as citizens of other States pay from their income and from their personal estates.

Mr. President, I think one more point has been established, which is the capacity of Hawaii for self-government. Hawaii has not only been tested under our Federal laws, but has been tested under local laws in maintaining a responsible and republican form of government. Hawaiian citizens have done so for many years. As a matter of fact, the Hawaiians did so before they were annexed to us, at their own request, in 1898.

Mr. President, from every standpoint I think it is fair to say Hawaiians have shown that they fully merit statehood. Mr. President, I am unwilling longer to withhold from a great group of American citizens a right which is a part of the heritage of any such group of American citizens.

Mr. President, I have one more point and then I shall conclude. I will make this point very quickly. Aside from the Hawaiians' own entitlement to statehood, I want to emphasize the point recently made by my distinguished friend, the junior Senator from Wyoming, to the effect that it is a matter of tremendous importance to us, in all of that great area of the world where more human beings live than live anywhere else in the world, for us to show that we still believe in those principles which used to be regarded as fundamental Americanism—such as no taxation without representation, such as the right of self-government, and such as the catalog of ancient rights declared so long ago in England and transplanted to these soils, here enriched in the history of our people.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield to my distinguished friend from New Mexico.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I should like to make one point in reference to the motion made by my good friend the Senator from South Carolina. I know the Senator would like to have Hawaii put on a commonwealth status, but I am very set against that kind of procedure. I would not like to have the Territory associated with the United States; I should like to have Hawaii made a part of the United States. That is the reason I am in favor of Hawaiian statehood.

Not only that, but Hawaiians have earned statehood, even in making the supreme sacrifice when necessary. Who did better fighting than the native American-Japanese-Hawaiians in Italy or over all of Europe? If those people are good enough to die for the United States, why are they not good enough to be a part of the United States of America, instead of being associated with the United States of America?

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I thank my distinguished friend for his very fine comment.

I close with one point, Mr. President. I think it is extremely important that we remember, no longer will the world be satisfied with people who are static and who are content simply to stay within a well-entrenched position and say, "We are going to live here. We are going to govern ourselves. That is all there is to it. We are not going to extend ourselves even if the strongest kind of case is made by our fellow citizens for extension."

Mr. President, I thought we got away from that idea last year when we gave merited statehood to Alaska, which faces the Soviet Union, only a few miles away across a narrow strip of water. I think for the same reason, but perhaps in an even more important way, we will be serving ourselves and the cause of freedom not by following a path of supercaution or even timidity in this matter but instead by demonstrating that the American democracy is not static but aggressive, not timid but fearless, and is perfectly willing to show that American principles of freedom and American justice mean exactly the same now as they meant in the days of Valley Forge—in the trying days when this Nation became the epitome of freedom throughout the world.

Mr. President, I hope statehood will be granted to Hawaii.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. CARROLL. I wish to commend the distinguished Senator from Florida for one of the most intelligent and penetrating statements made concerning admission of Hawaii to statehood.

Mr. HOLLAND. I am grateful to my distinguished friend.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, is there a motion pending before the Senate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BARTLETT in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND] to recommit the bill to the committee with certain instructions.

The motion was rejected.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I shall detain the Senate only a few moments. I wish to join with my colleagues who have expressed their willingness to vote for statehood for Hawaii this day.

Mr. President, I came to the Senate 7 years ago convinced that Hawaii had long deserved statehood, and I am still of the same conviction.

I am very happy to be associated with the political party which has forced this issue down through the years, and I am glad that finally the Republican Party's efforts have been recognized by a Democrat majority.

I serve on the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and on the Subcommittee on Territories. It has been my pleasure to sit through many days of hearings on this subject, down through the years. There is nothing I could say about Hawaii that has not been said, and there is nothing I could attempt to say with the vigor of those who have already spoken.

I cannot agree with my colleagues who say that the people of Hawaii are different, and therefore Hawaii should not be made a State. That same argument has been used against statehood in the case of many of the States which have been admitted to the Union. I recall

the arguments which were made against Arizona and New Mexico becoming States, because it was said that we were too recently a part of Mexico. While it was true at that time that the great preponderance of our citizens were of Mexican extraction, I say today that that has been a definite asset to the United States, and has continued to be an asset as we have endeavored to mix the peoples of the world.

The people of Hawaii are Americans, and I believe that because they are Americans they are entitled to be closer to the Republic than they are as a Territory.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Montana.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I am very much in favor of the bill. I have not spoken on it, because I am interested in expediting action on it.

I ask the Senator from Arizona, a man with an outstanding war record, if, to the best of his knowledge, at the outbreak of hostilities in 1941, there was any evidence of sabotage in the Hawaiian Islands.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I am glad the Senator asked that question. From all the reading I have done on the subject, which includes documents of the highest order, I have found no evidence of wrongdoing on the part of any of the Hawaiians in connection with Pearl Harbor Day or any events leading up to it.

Mr. MANSFIELD. To be specific, there has been no evidence of sabotage on the part of Americans of Japanese descent, or Japanese citizens who were living in the islands?

Mr. GOLDWATER. The Senator is eminently correct.

I may add, in deference to citizens of Japanese ancestry, that on the mainland we have found no evidence of sabotage among them, either before, during, or after the war. On the contrary, the people of Japanese ancestry who live in Hawaii served the country very admirably in all the branches of the service, all over the globe.

Mr. MANSFIELD. What organization in the war received more decorations and had a higher percentage of casualties than any other group which served in the Armed Forces?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I cannot recall. However, it was an infantry outfit, and it fought in Italy.

Mr. KUCHEL. The 442d Regimental Combat Team.

Mr. GOLDWATER. It was the 442d Regimental Combat Team. I thank my friend from California.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I am glad to hear this point brought out. I recall that when the subject of statehood for Hawaii was last before the Senate for consideration, someone mistakenly raised the question as to the patriotism and loyalty of Hawaiian units.

At that time I looked up the facts, and I found that it was a Hawaiian National Guard unit which received the greatest number of decorations and had the highest percentage of combat casualties of any regiment. It was an outstanding group.

I was in Hawaii in December. I was there for a week. I visited many points in the islands. I was impressed by the character of the people, by their energy, their resourcefulness, and their evident interest in getting ahead and doing things.

I was at the field where the Air National Guard unit is now on the alert. When a button was pressed there, two of their fighter planes were in the air in less than 3½ minutes. They were alert. They had a good organization. I am sure that their patriotism equals that of myself or any other Senator.

While I was there I attended a dinner at which a girl who was said to be of Japanese blood sang the "Star Spangled Banner." At the time, I felt as great a thrill as I have ever felt on any occasion upon hearing the national anthem sung. It was inspiring. When Hawaiian statehood is voted, I should like to see that girl invited to sing the national anthem in Washington. I shall endeavor to ascertain her name.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. It is my understanding that the 442d Regimental Combat Team, which the Senator has mentioned, and which the Senator from South Dakota has extolled, had a slogan to the effect that they "would go for broke." In other words, they would throw everything into their plan of battle, and do everything they could do to accomplish their mission. I hope the Senate will adopt that slogan, and make certain that long overdue statehood is granted to Hawaii.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield to me?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Can the Senator from Arizona indicate how much longer he proposes to occupy the floor?

Mr. GOLDWATER. If I am not interrupted again, I should finish in about 2 minutes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I thank the Senator.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I was very glad to have this little colloquy with my friends relative to the loyalty of Hawaiians, because that is one of the questions that has been raised by other colleagues in the Senate. I feel that if we bring the Hawaiian people into a closer tie with the Republic, we can eliminate any subversion which may be taking place in the islands at the present time.

Let me make one further point. The importance of the Far East has been brought up by a number of my colleagues. It is my opinion that the Far East is the future field of victory or defeat in the world cause for peace. I do not look on Berlin with the horror with which many of my colleagues contemplate it. I look upon our neglect of the Far East with far greater apprehension, because I feel that it is one of the most important flanks of our enemy, Russia.

Mr. President, I hope that the great majority of my colleagues will join me and other Senators in voting tonight for statehood for Hawaii.

During the delivery of Mr. GOLDWATER'S speech,

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my friend from Arizona may yield to me for the purpose of making a motion to reconsider the vote by which the motion to recommit the bill was rejected, because the author of the motion was temporarily detained and did not have an opportunity to vote on the motion. He was not aware that the question was being put. I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Arizona may yield to me with the understanding that he will not lose his right to the floor.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I shall be very happy to do so.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none and it is so ordered.

Is there objection to the reconsideration of the vote by which the motion to recommit the bill with certain instructions was rejected? The Chair hears none; and the vote is reconsidered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, may we have put the question on the motion to recommit the bill?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question recurs on the motion of the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND] to recommit the bill with certain instructions.

The motion to recommit was rejected.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, if the fervor of my support for the bill admitting Hawaii to the Union were to be measured by the length of my remarks, I would try to beat the endurance records made in recent years on the floor of the Senate by the distinguished senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] and the distinguished junior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND]. One could wax eloquent on the subject of Hawaii and the cause of Hawaiian statehood for many hours.

However, rather than expanding and expounding my oft-expressed views, held firmly for a quarter of a century and particularly since, as Director of the Division of Territories and Island Possessions of the Department of the Interior, I visited Hawaii in 1937, I prefer, by speaking only very briefly, to contribute to the worthy effort of passing the Hawaii statehood bill today, if possible, and if not then, by tomorrow at the latest.

To act favorably on this historic and epoch-making measure in so short a time in this Congress will in itself be a great achievement.

It will demonstrate the wide and deep acceptance of the admission of Hawaii as the 50th State by the American people, and the warm welcome which they will shortly extend to the last incorporated Territory as a full-fledged member of the family of States.

It will demonstrate the reflection in the Senate of that sentiment and redound to the credit of its leadership, of its committee and subcommittee chairmen, of the members of the committee that reported the Hawaiian statehood bill unanimously, and of the whole body of the Senate itself.

Mr. President, the people of no State since the original 13 have deserved statehood more than Hawaii. Hawaiians have long since met every objection, have passed all tests—those of population, going economy, ability of self-government, and patriotism.

Beyond that, Hawaii has a unique contribution to make to the Nation in this time of trouble and crisis.

Hawaii's admission will demonstrate to the whole world that whatever else America is, America is, above all, an idea. An idea and an ideal. That idea, that ideal, is the American common denominator.

It was the vision of that idea and ideal that drew men and women across the uncharted wastes of the Atlantic Ocean even before our Union was founded.

It is that idea and ideal which, embodied in those immortal documents, the Declaration of Independence, the Constitution with its Bill of Rights, created America.

It is that idea and ideal, proclaimed by the great men who founded our Nation, which made the Nation.

It is that idea and ideal which served as a beacon to the oppressed of the world.

It is that idea and ideal which rekindled their hopes and led them to leave their countries and join in the great American experiment.

It was that idea and ideal which led them over the Appalachians, across the prairies, to the Rockies, on to the coast, and beyond that to Alaska.

It is, in short, the materializing of that idea and ideal that is America.

The world has shrunk. Modern invention has changed much, but these great changes have merely emphasized that the American idea will either survive or perish. Shall that idea and ideal survive and flourish, or shall tyranny, whose brutality and ruthlessness make the rule of King George III, against which our forefathers revolted, by comparison a benign and benevolent overlordship?

In the effort to extend and strengthen the idea and ideal which are America, no action which the Congress can take will do so much as to admit Hawaii to statehood.

Statehood for Hawaii will extend the idea and ideal which are America into the far Pacific. And Hawaiian statehood will find that idea and ideal already established in those Pacific isles. Statehood will extend that idea and ideal—which is America—to ethnic groups which hitherto have played a relatively small part, quantitatively, in the materializing of it, although they have played that part qualitatively in Hawaii. They will help us to win the confidence of Asia in the idea and ideal which are America.

Those good Americans in idea and ideal, our fellow citizens of Hawaii, have asked for the great right and privilege of joining their fellow Americans in the supreme task of perpetuating and strengthening freedom. They need the equality of citizenship to serve the common cause effectively. We need them to help us.

One could expand this theme indefinitely. It goes to the heart of the Hawaiian statehood issue. But I prefer to state, as my deepest conviction, that America will strengthen itself immeasurably in admitting Hawaii as our 50th State.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, with all deference to everyone concerned, I cannot help entertaining the fear that we are somewhat losing our sense of proportion in passing a measure from which there is no road back, no road of return, and in trying to pass it within a few hours, almost within a few minutes.

I recall that 2 or 3 years ago there was a little lady in my home State who had been in the service. She became paralyzed for life because of a defect in a drug which was administered to her while her husband was in the service and she was a patient in a service hospital. It took me about 3 years, I believe, to have a little bill passed which provided her with the small sum of $5,000, as I recall that is what the amount was finally whittled down to. Yet this evening we are apparently going to pass a measure which is more far-reaching than would be an amendment to the Constitution.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Why does the Senator say that we are going to pass the bill tonight?

Mr. STENNIS. The effort is to pass it tonight. I believe I said apparently it might pass tonight.

That brings to the forefront the thought that, as we all know, those who drafted the Constitution of the United States provided that it would take a two-thirds vote of the membership of each House of Congress to propose an amendment to the Constitution, and that the amendment would have to be approved in solemn assembly either by State legislatures or in convention by three-fourths of the States before it could become a part of the Constitution. Even then it would be subject to change or repeal. Yet merely by majority vote in Congress additional States can be admitted to the Union, and thereafter there can be no change in its status. In view of the provisions of the Constitution, there is certainly a strong admonition that statehood should not be hastily granted and that we should be careful to act on such a question only after the utmost consideration.

I recall that when the matter was debated before the committee, the committee was in a quandary as to how to define the boundaries of Hawaii, just where the boundaries would be, and what would be the situation with reference to the international waters between the islands which would become a State.

Frankly, I have not had an opportunity to check into that matter much further. I understand the situation is as it was when the bill was debated a few years ago. I understand further that nothing has been done to clear up that point. Perhaps nothing can be done. At the very threshold that point poses one of the most serious points involved.

I heard the senior Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], say it would not do for our country to get into a static phase. If he had heard the proof I have been hearing today as a member of the Preparedness Subcommittee, he would be convinced that we are not in a static stage, and that we are not likely to be in one at any time soon, in view of the Berlin crisis and other very grave questions confronting us, which, frankly, with all deference, I believe should be having our attention rather than rushing through a bill to add a new State to the Union.

I believe that we should be making a very serious effort to balance the budget. I do not say that in criticism of anyone. I notice that newspapers and cartoonists refer to the balanced budget. However, the budget is not balanced. The budget for 1960 is not balanced. Even if not so much as $1 were appropriated, at least a billion dollars in new taxes would be required to balance the budget.

I do not hear any great agitation or see any great urge to pass a new tax bill. If we took a fair measure of our needs, perhaps we could pass one, if we were convinced it was needed.

My point is that I think we are getting the cart before the horse. There are so many other things which immediately demand our attention. There are many grave matters confronting us which should take preference over bills of this kind.

The bill for Hawaiian statehood is also a great departure. It is the first one of its kind, in that it abandons the North American Continent as the area for the United States of America. Not only does it abandon the continent; it goes 2,000 miles out into the Pacific Ocean. Regardless of all the merits of the fine people who live in the Hawaiian Islands, we may be setting a precedent by taking into the American Union this farflung archipelago, the nearest island of which is 2,000 miles away.

I hope the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON] will remain in the Chamber, because I wish to ask him a question or two in time.

By admitting Hawaii to statehood, we shall set a precedent for admitting other island possessions into the Union. I am certain that most of the fine qualities and virtues which have been attributed to Hawaii can also be attributed to the people of Guam, the Virgin Islands, and Puerto Rico. We shall set a precedent, if the bill is passed, not only of leaving our territory on the North American Continent, but of going out into a far-flung area in the Pacific Ocean. If that shall be done, Congress cannot close the door to further activities of that kind.

There are other nations which are very wise and very fine. There are other nations on the American Continent. I cannot conceive that Canada would seriously consider taking in as a

part of its government a disconnected, farflung area such as Hawaii. I cannot think of a more serious matter than the bringing into the body of the U.S. Government as a State any area which is in another part of the world. I cannot conceive of England taking such a step as that. I know that France did in the case of Algeria, but the inclusion of Algeria in the French nation has been an act of the most severe kind.

I do not predict that what I have suggested will happen, necessarily, if Hawaii is admitted to the Union. I pray that it will not. But the door will be opened for other such admissions to the Union.

The Hawaiian Archipelago, as I understand, extends 1,600 miles from the principal island of that group to the farthest island. It extends all the way out in the Pacific Ocean beyond Midway Island, although Midway is not included among the islands which are to be admitted in the proposed State of Hawaii.

Merely a quick reference to the map of the globe will show what could happen if we started to admit areas in other directions from the present United States. If a line were stretched out into the Atlantic Ocean a distance similar to that which Hawaii is from the Pacific coast, the line would reach approximately to the Azores. If it were stretched to the north from our northern boundary, it would run far beyond Canada, somewhere beyond Baffin Island. If a similar line were extended to the south, it would take in all the area beyond Mexico and reach into South America almost all the way to Peru, somewhere near Lima.

Those distances graphically illustrate the precedent we shall set by admitting Hawaii to statehood. They raise the questions: Just what are we doing? Where are we going?

I do not see how we can simply turn a deaf ear to Guam, the Virgin Islands, and Puerto Rico.

I heard it stated very emphatically on the floor that we will do nothing about admitting Puerto Rico to statehood. But the admission of Puerto Rico to statehood is proposed in the platforms of the major political parties. It is a solemn pledge, so far as platforms go. But I think, too, that that is a pretty fair comment upon the low status which platforms have reached in recent years, with all deference to those who work hard in preparing them. Theirs is a very difficult assignment, and the utmost effort is spent on it. But we know that statements are written into platforms which could hardly be seriously considered. Nevertheless, once a precedent has been set, I do not see how such a pledge can well be repudiated.

In considering the admission of the Territory of Hawaii we should have in mind not only the distance of the islands from the mainland of the United States, but also the distance of the islands from one another. The distances range from 6 miles to 8, 7½, 22, 26, 15, and 64 miles. Those are the distances between the eight principal islands.

The Hawaiian archipelago itself extends for 1,150 miles beyond the farthest westward of the eight main islands.

Very serious questions have been raised, but have never been answered, as to how far the territorial water extends and the international water starts. Certainly those matters should have been decided more definitely than they are in the bill in its present form.

Much has been said about the Hawaiian people and their very fine patriotism. I am proud to have such a splendid report. I am glad that the Hawaiians have lived up to their opportunities since Hawaii became a Territory. I do not think any U.S. possession was ever more fortunate in becoming a Territory than was Hawaii in that day. I am glad the Hawaiians appreciate their citizenship. With other Americans, I am proud of their very fine war record, which I have heard mentioned, and I commend them for it. But while those fine people were fighting for the United States, there were many fine men and women in the United States who were fighting for the Hawaiians. Hawaiians are not the only ones who lie in unknown, unmarked graves on the battlefields of the world. It happened that the homeland of the Hawaiians was the victim of the sneak attack, the attack which caused President Roosevelt, in an address to Congress calling for a declaration of war, to say that it was "a date which will live in infamy." I have not heard anyone contradict that statement, then or since. So the people of Hawaii had everything to fight for and they fought valiantly.

But all this does not really relate to the merits of the question of statehood. As I have said, there were others who fought, too, and who also had fine war records. I do not discredit the record of the Hawaiians one bit; but there is involved here a serious question because the admission of Hawaii as a State, a State which will be taken to the bosom of our Government, will result in giving it a great measure of control over the affairs of the Nation. It will be given legal representation in the U.S. Senate and House of Representatives, which have the power to change and modify all our laws. Joining Hawaii to the Union of States as it exists today raises serious questions and problems which might plague us in the future.

During this debate, I have not heard much discussion of the military situation. I do not think it can properly be argued that the admission of Hawaii as a State would increase our country's ability to defend Hawaii. Of course, I want the United States to be able to defend Hawaii—even to the death, if need be. I think one of the great problems which will confront us will be that posed by submarine warfare and the use of the submarine as a new weapon along our shorelines. There may be some way to defend our present shorelines against the possibility of such assaults of the most serious kind, including the use of great numbers of nuclear weapons of huge size. But if that threat has any potential at all, it would be absolutely impossible—even if we were to send all our defensive strength there—for us to begin to defend the area that is proposed, by means of the pending measure, to be admitted to the Union as a State.

I do not think it is argued that the admission of Hawaii as a State will strengthen our military position. On the contrary, in my humble opinion, it would greatly complicate and, in a measure, would weaken us.

This brings me to state that for a long time my idea has been that the proper approach to the Government of that great area is to give it a commonwealth status. I think that would be a compliment to the people of Hawaii; I have never seen any justification for the argument, which representatives of the Hawaiian people have made, that such a status would give the people of Hawaii some kind of second-class status or second-class citizenship. I remember that the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] discussed in a very fine way the possibility of providing commonwealth status for this area.

Not many years ago I had the privilege of being one of the representatives of the Senate who served as observers and guests at the British Commonwealth Parliamentary Association, in which every parliamentary body in what was once the British Empire was represented. I remember that the Isle of Man had a representative there; he told us that he was a member of a parliamentary body which had held sessions every year for 1,000 consecutive years. I remember that Bermuda was represented there. Bermuda has had parliamentary sessions for more than 300 years. Many other Crown colonies and Commonwealths were represented at that meeting. Their representatives took great pride in the strength they had developed by their own self-government, and in their continuity of self-government, and in their progress and development. That gave me a very fine feeling toward them and opened my eyes to the possibilities of commonwealth status.

I have never understood the argument of those who say that no change at all should be made in the existing government of Hawaii. Certainly I do not regard Hawaiian citizenship as being of second class. I have never heard anyone suggest such a thing, except when the friends of Hawaii have done so as an argument for statehood. But I do not think that is a sound argument. I think it is not based on fact. I believe it is specious.

Mr. President, I shrink from the idea of creating a State in the middle of the Pacific Ocean, because I believe that area will be the great trouble area of the world. I totally disagree with my friend, the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER]. I do so with sorrow and regret; but I do not see anything but trouble ahead for that great area of the world.

I do not know the extent of our ability to do very much about it. I know there was not much we could do in the case of Indochina. It was the considered judgment of those who wanted us to intervene there that there was little or nothing that we could do there—or, at least, that we could not do enough there.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield to me?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. Does the Senator from Mississippi think the United States would do any less in defense of Hawaii if Hawaii were a State, rather than if Hawaii were to continue to be a Territory?

Mr. STENNIS. I have already said that in any case we would defend Hawaii to the very limit. But I am referring now to trouble areas in the world.

I have not heard anyone present any evidence that conditions in Japan have improved; and I look upon Japan as the foremost power in the Pacific area that could have sufficient strength to stop communism. The Japanese people have great industrial know-how and energy; but I have not seen anyone produce any facts to show that, under present conditions, Japan has much chance to grow into a powerful nation—at least, not at any time soon. Of course, I regret that. Especially is that true in view of the fact that the vast manpower and other strength of China has already gone over to the Communist side.

Mr. President, I do not see a rosy picture so far as the Pacific is concerned. I believe the Pacific will be a trouble area for a long time; and I believe it is the area in which communism is going to make more headway. I believe a great fight will be made there to expand communism farther and farther.

Regardless of what may be the situation today in Hawaii, I believe it will be an open door, and will be subjected to tremendous pressure. I shudder to think what could be the outcome. At such a time, certainly it would be most serious to have membership in the Senate and in the House of Representatives open to persons who, under some circumstances, and through no fault of any person now living in Hawaii, might succumb to that threat. In my humble opinion, by that means we would be further developing a situation which would be bound in years to come to give our country the most serious trouble. I have not heard much evidence to the contrary.

We know that over the years there have been very serious communistic threats there; and I believe they will recur. I shall not attempt to speak further now regarding the situation which exists there today.

I found a letter from the Assistant Attorney General, who certified that his agency has no evidence that the conditions which now exist in Hawaii would control a Senator or a Representative; that was about as far as the letter went. I should say certainly that would be true; but that is no evidence as to what probably could happen in the middle of that vast area in the Pacific.

Mr. President, for the reasons I have stated, I judge the pending measure to be one of the most serious of all those to come before the Senate at this session, and one of the most far reaching the Senate could possibly pass. It is a measure—one of the very few of this type that the Congress could possibly enact—which would constitute only a one-way street from which there would be no return.

Mr. President, I trust that, on sober reflection and the utmost consideration, the Senate will not pass such a measure, but, instead, will consider giving a commonwealth status to this area and to its people.

I yield the floor.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, in view of the backing with which S. 50 comes to the Senate, it would be futile for me to think that anything I may say today will prevent its passage, but before final action is taken I want to go on record once more as believing that granting statehood to Hawaii at this time is unwise.

My reasons for taking this position were outlined at length in three speeches I made in the Senate during the 83d Congress, when the House passed an Hawaii statehood bill and the Senate passed a bill giving statehood to both Hawaii and Alaska, but the House failed to approve the combined bill.

Some of my generalized objections to making either Hawaii or Alaska a State were repeated last year before the Alaska statehood bill was passed.

Reviewing those objections now, even in the light of action which has been taken with regard to Alaska, I still feel that the admission of one of these Territories last year was a mistake, and that to admit the other one this year would merely compound our error.

In the first of the speeches which I made in opposition to Hawaiian statehood on March 12, 1954, I said I believed it would be dangerous and undesirable to expand the borders of the United States beyond the North American Continent. I added that even if this objection were ignored, I still felt Hawaii was not a suitable candidate for statehood under existing conditions, because of circumstances involving the Territory's geography, economics, and population.

In my second speech, on March 30, 1954, I argued that Hawaiian statehood would violate fundamental principles of U.S. foreign policy. My third speech, on April 1, 1954, summarized my objections to statehood for either Alaska or Hawaii, and referred particularly to the precedent we would set that would stimulate future demands for admission of Puerto Rico and other islands in the Atlantic and Caribbean.

I know that in the report made to the Senate on S. 50 an effort has been made to answer the arguments of noncontiguity, of disproportionate representation, of the nature of the population, and of the dangers of Communist domination of the electorate; but what the report offers is more in the nature of denials and pleas of not guilty than factual argument.

The economic condition of Hawaii, which concerned me in 1954, has improved since that time. The population has contiuned to grow, and there is no question about the fine spirit exhibited by Hawaiians who have served in our Armed Forces, and the loyalty to America of its citizens generally.

The geography of the islands has not changed, however, and the influence of communistically inclined labor leaders, while it has been less evident in recent years, has not been eliminated.

But, above all, there remains the objection to including within the United States a territory so remote and separated by such an expanse of ocean over which we have no control. Alaska at least can be approached through our friendly neighbor Canada; but, under international law, we could not protest if the neutral waters surrounding Hawaii were completely ringed with hostile submarines and aircraft, and I can see possibilities of new crises developing involving Hawaii not unlike our present situation in isolated Berlin.

We would defend Hawaii in any case, of course, but I have not been satisfied by the assurances that Hawaii, as a self-governing State, would be as easy to defend as would a Territory similarly situated where Federal powers are more extensive. And, as a firm believer in States' rights, I do not concede that the answer might be to go ahead and continue to assert Federal controls over the new State for defense purposes, because the same principle could then be applied for the destruction of the rights of the older States.

It is not my intention today to review in detail the arguments I have previously made, and to which I have referred. But there are a few statements already in the record which I feel merit repetition.

The argument that we are obligated to give the people of Hawaii statehood as quickly as possible, as a matter of justice to them and in line with our treatment of other Territories, ignores the difference between the way we acquired Hawaii and the way other States came into the Union.

The States formed from the Louisiana Territory resulted from a purchase and the ratification of a treaty. Texas came in after the people of that Republic had voted overwhelmingly for annexation. The people of Hawaii, on the other hand, in the words of one of our colleagues, "crashed their way into our Union as a Territory against every rule of constitutional law and against every precedent then existing."

A treaty with the king of the islands had been proposed as early as 1854, but the ruler died without its being submitted to the Senate. The old treaty was dug out in 1893, and debated in the Senate over a period of years, without favorable action for ratification. Then, in 1897, when the United States was on the verge of entering the Spanish-American War, President McKinley proposed a new treaty of annexation as a defense measure. This was secretly debated over a period of months, but could not win the necessary number of votes.

The naval battle of Manila Bay was fought on May 1, 1898, and 3 days later a resolution to annex Hawaii was offered in the House of Representatives, and steam-rollered through as a war emergency measure, while the treaty proposed in 1897, which had been ratified by the so-called Hawaiian Republic still was pending in the Senate. The House resolution, which required only a majority vote, as compared with a two-thirds

vote for a treaty, was passed by the Senate and Hawaii became a Territory.

In the 1898 debates one Representative said:

> Nobody pretends any purpose to take the Hawaiian Islands into the Union as a State, but the purpose is simply and solely, so far as the contention goes, to acquire them for the purpose of assisting us in our military and commercial operations.

Another speaker in the House said:

> There is not a man on this floor, there is not a man who hears my voice, who will say that he or this Congress contemplates the acquisition of Hawaii for the purpose of making a State of it. * * * On the contrary, this House is full of men who would not vote for this resolution except with the understanding in their own minds that Hawaii is not to be introduced as a State into the Union.

Those were the sentiments of Members of Congress in 1898, when Hawaii became a Territory, and they echoed a well-established theory that the geographical limits of our Nation should be expanded only with great caution.

In 1845, when admission of Texas as a State was being debated, Daniel Webster spoke of "a very dangerous tendency and of doubtful consequence to enlarge the boundaries of our Government," and added:

> There must be some limit to the extent of our territory, if we are to make our institutions permanent. The Government is very likely to be endangered, in my opinion, by a further enlargement of its already vast territorial surface.

Our experience with Texas in itself has not justified Webster's fears, but that does not invalidate the general argument that there are limits beyond which our national territory ought not to be expanded.

When Thomas Jefferson, by the Louisiana Purchase, brought about the expansion of our national border beyond the Mississippi, he wisely foresaw that we could not afford to have a rival nation, especially one under the domination of a possible hostile European power, rise on our western border. The same considerations justified our later expansion through the annexation of Texas and acquisition of the territory along the Pacific Coast, but this argument cannot be applied to inclusion as an integral part of the United States of a group of islands 2,000 miles from our present continental limits, and which themselves stretch over a 1,900 mile area.

Our forefathers who brought this Nation into being through a revolutionary struggle recognized that the American people should be allowed to develop their genius without unnecessary entanglements in the affairs of other continents.

Our first President, George Washington, in his farewell address, pointed out that Europe had a set of primary interests with very remote relation to ours and said:

> Our detached but distant situation invites and enables us to pursue a different course. If we remain one people under an efficient Government, the period is not far off when we may defy material injury from external annoyance.

Improved communications and transportation have shrunk the world since Washington's day, and of necessity we are much more closely involved in the affairs of other parts of the world. It is true, as pointed out in the committee report on S. 50, that it is much easier to reach and communicate with Hawaii today than it was for those in the older States to reach California when that State was admitted to the Union, but all these changes are proportional. When California was remote from Virginia, it was much more remote from Europe and from Asia, and while Hawaii is now much easier to reach from the continental United States, the people of the islands cannot get in their cars and take vacation trips to one of the States or share in our national life in a way comparable to people of the existing States, excepting only Alaska, to whose statehood I interposed the same objections.

Therefore, I say, there still is validity to the idea expressed by Thomas Jefferson in a letter commenting upon the revolt of South American colonies against Spain, in which he said:

> The European nations constitute a separate division of the globe; their localities make them a part of a distinct system; they have a set of interests of their own in which it is our business never to engage ourselves. America has a hemisphere to itself. It must have a separate system of interests; which must not be subordinated to those of Europe.

That theory was the heart of the Monroe Doctrine and, again, while modern conditions have modified the application of that doctrine and we must now concern ourselves more intimately with the affairs of the other hemisphere, I still feel it is a mistake for us to demonstrate to the world an inclination to take in areas outside of this hemisphere as integral parts of the United States.

John Quincy Adams, as Secretary of State in 1823, warned the Russian Minister in Washington that "we should contest the right of Russia to any territorial establishment on this continent, and that we should assume distinctly the principle that the American continents are no longer subject to any new European colonization establishments."

Now, when we are giving protective custody to some areas in other parts of the world where free governments are threatened, it is especially important for us to avoid any appearance of desire to indefinitely expand our own territory. The final step of admitting Hawaii to the Union as a State should, in my judgment, at least be deferred until a less crucial period in international affairs.

The argument I am making was well summarized in an editorial in the Richmont (Va.) News-Leader in May 1953 which said:

> For the United States to abandon fixed and definite borders—unchanged for more than a century—in order to take into the Union an island group 2,500 miles away would be a mistake of the gravest nature. * * * To extend statehood to Hawaii would be to undertake a fateful change in both the physical nature of the Union and in a basic political policy by which the United States has conducted its affairs since the time of Monroe. * * *
>
> Once the step of statehood is taken, it cannot be taken back; and once Hawaii were admitted a precedent would have been established—new rules would have been laid down and old doctrines abandoned—by which the claims of Alaska and Puerto Rico would become far more difficult to resist. At one time Australia talked of petitioning for admission to the Union. And if Australia, why not New Zealand, New Guinea, Indonesia, Formosa? At some future time almost any nation anywhere might logically urge upon the United States the same new rules that are now urged for Hawaii.
>
> These are not remote and speculative contingencies. Hawaii was quite literally scared into seeking annexation to the United States by Spanish pressure in 1898. Since then, international pressures have grown more ominous. Once new standards of degree were established, many an Asiatic nation might offer a consistent plea: If it were sound to take in Hawaii, 2,500 miles away, then why not Guam, some 5,000 miles away? If it is sound public policy to admit Hawaii, with a Japanese population of 37 percent, then why not Japan itself, with a Japanese population of 100 percent?

May I point out, Mr. President, since that editorial was printed, Alaska has become a State, and the fact of Alaska statehood now is presented as a logical reason for granting the same status to Hawaii. This bears out the prediction that breaking the line of contiguity in one place makes it easier to breach it in another. If we go beyond the continental limits of North America to take in Hawaii, we ease the way for further expansion along the line which this editorial suggests.

As I said at the outset of these remarks, I have no hope of blocking favorable action on the pending bill, but I do want to remind the Senate once more of the dangerous principle involved and to express the hope that somewhere in the RECORD there will be recorded statements that we are not throwing open the gates and inviting membership in a United States of the World, but that having given full statehood status to our last two Territories, the United States of America will devote itself to cultivating that form of constitutional liberty which is our precious heritage and which we offer to the rest of the world as an example to be imitated, but not diluted.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I have cosponsored Hawaiian statehood legislation since 1951, and I supported it even before that. This is a good example of the frequency with which good proposed legislation must be reintroduced and fought for in Congress after Congress before it can be enacted.

Last year, when the Senate debated Alaskan statehood, I spoke about the noncontiguous argument used against admission of Alaska. In particular, I compared with modern Alaska the extent to which Oregon and California were separated from their sister States when they were admitted back before the Civil War.

Since the same argument—that it does not border upon the continental United States—is often heard against Hawaii, I wish to repeat some of the facts about the history of the settlement of the West.

I quote from my remarks of June 27, 1958:

> The history of the settlement of America is evidence of the conquest of time and space

by modern transportation and communication that we have achieved.

The fact is that most of the west coast became part of the American Union when the people living there were far more isolated from their fellow citizens than Alaskans are today.

The pattern of orderly, progressive settlement of the United States stopped at the Mississippi River. From its banks westward lay the treeless Great Plains, then the Rocky Mountains, and great deserts. It was the lush valleys of California and Oregon that attracted settlers, and they crossed hundreds of miles of what was then tortuous country to live in California and Oregon, and make them States.

The settlers who crossed the middle of the continent to settle the west coast in the 1840's and 1850's, had to start in April in order to reach the Willamette Valley in Oregon by the next November. Many of their trains were delayed by weather or hostile Indians at the military outposts in Nebraska and Wyoming and they had to wait until the following spring to continue their trip. The hazards and trials they underwent have been vividly recorded by such great writers as A. B. Guthrie, and this epoch of our history lives today in every medium of our entertainment.

There were few attractions for settlers between Missouri and the west coast. The Territory between was nominally under the jurisdiction of the United States, but it was inhabited only by Indians, most of them hostile. Trappers, explorers, a few miners, military stations, and stage stations along the traveled routes were about the only representatives of western civilization. The Great Plains and the Rockies were regarded only as obstacles to be overcome in order to reach the coast. Aside from the trials of nature, the wandering Indian tribes regarded the whites as invaders—and rightly so—who imperiled their way of life, and they were always a threat to travelers, not to mention settlers. Little protection from Indians existed, except near the Army forts.

Yet California became a State in 1850; Oregon became a State in 1859; both were many hundreds of miles from the nearest neighboring States and even the nearest organized Territory of Nebraska. Texas was 650 miles from California; and except for California on its southern border, the nearest State to Oregon in any other direction was Iowa, well over 1,000 miles distant.

California and Oregon were separated from their sister States by vast spaces that were crossed by courageous pioneers, but not either by telegraph or railroad. Except by stagecoach, the quickest way to reach them from the east coast was by sailing around Cape Horn, and the record for the trip was 97 days.

The first telegraph service did not cross the continent until 1861, nor the first train until 1869.

Now, 100 years later, we are linked to Alaska by instantaneous communication from all parts of the United States. Radio, telephone, telegraph, cables, mail schedules, the all-weather road from Great Falls, Mont., to Fairbanks, and air and steamship travel render meaningless the geographic distance so far as statehood is concerned. Today it is 20 hours by air from the east coast to Alaska, and only 5 hours from Seattle to Anchorage. In the 1840's the fastest stage connection between Missouri and California took 24 days, and that was a rarity.

The fact that California and Oregon did not border on their sister States nor on the rest of the American community was no bar to their admission in 1850 and 1859. I think most Oregonians would share my own reaction to the noncontiguous argument, which is simply: "So what?" The 1,000 miles that separated Oregon from Iowa in 1858 were far more difficult to overcome than the 600 miles between the west coast and Alaska are in 1958. Does anyone deny that it is easier to travel through Canada to Alaska now than it was to travel through Indian Territory to California or Oregon or Nevada when they first became States? Intervening land and water have simply not been shown to have any particular bearing on the statehood issue.

We in Oregon and the rest of the Pacific Northwest are tied to Alaska by the ties that really matter. A great many of the Oregon citizens who have written to me in support of Alaskan statehood have mentioned the friends and relatives they have there, and their capability of running their own affairs.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, at this point in my remarks, an editorial entitled "Hawaii and Oregon," from the Milwaukee Review of February 12, 1959.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HAWAII AND OREGON

One hundred years apart the halls of Congress echo to the selfsame arguments over statehood for an aspiring Territory. In 1858 and 1859 it was the Oregon Territory; in 1958 and 1959 it is the Territory of Hawaii.

Oregon was too remote. Oregon was too hard to defend. Oregon was too thinly populated. But most of all, Oregon presented hard-to-handle aspects of the conflict over Negro slavery. The last-named was the real rub, and the other arguments were only the pretexts for delaying full statehood.

Substitute "Hawaii" for "Oregon" and the arguments are the same. Hawaii, some say, is an island, not a part of the main (although in fact it is far closer to the other 49 States than Oregon was 100 years ago). Hawaii may indeed be hard to defend, but restive Oregon of 1859 was a far greater problem because of the deep split of Oregon opinion on slavery as the Civil War approached. No one knew exactly what Oregon's population was in 1858, and much of the debate is given to arguments on both sides over population "guesstimates"; Hawaii, we know almost exactly, has enough to give it two Congressmen—by far the largest population of any State at the time of admission since Texas, 110 years ago.

Underneath the diehard and now about-to-be-defeated hostility to admission of Hawaii as our 50th State is race prejudice. Hawaii, alone among American Territories, has a majority of its population drawn from Asiatic and Polynesian stock, rather than the European, African, and Latin American sources of the other American States. In the world we live in today this is one of the mightiest arguments for immediate statehood for Hawaii as an earnest to the world that all peoples can flourish under the Stars and Stripes.

Only a few years ago a Nebraska Senator blurted out his real opposition when he told his Senate colleagues: "Why the next thing you know we'd have a Senator Yamamoto sitting here."

Some of the more racistic southerners have made it clear, too, that they oppose Hawaiian statehood because no member from Hawaii will ever help maintain southern segregation practices. Both the Nebraskan and the old-school southerners unintentionally add to the reasons why Hawaii should be a State.

As Oregon celebrates this Saturday its 100th birthday, the greatest practical purpose to which we can put our celebration is to extend the helping hand to Hawaii. We have been associated from the earliest days, when Polynesian workmen labored and many died here, since the shipping route took our earliest settlers to the Sandwich Island en route to the mouth of the Columbia. "Owyhee" and "Aloha" among our place names are traces of our common history. The era just ahead will bring vast new association between us in commerce and tourism.

The State of Hawaii will be a tonic to America's body politic. As we revel in our centennial recollections we can do great things for our Nation by assisting the new State of Hawaii—as old as Oregon in American tradition and culture, but 100 years our junior as an equal Commonwealth.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the admission of Hawaii will strengthen the Union. It will add diversity to our population and culture. Yet the people of Hawaii are basically American in their culture and will continue to be so. They are certainly tied closely to the American Continent in the things that count—in their political institutions, their news media, their forms of entertainment, and in their economy.

Let me add that I only wish I could be as confident that the District of Columbia will achieve true home rule during this session of the Congress.

The demands of justice will be served when the people of the District are permitted to elect their own mayor, just as they will be served when two Senators from Hawaii are seated in this Chamber.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, it is not my intention today to go into any lengthy documentation of the case for Hawaii statehood. The record is formidable. It is replete with testimony that demands that the 86th Congress act without fail to make Hawaii our 50th State. For a number of years, as a member of the House committee dealing with Territorial matters and as its chairman for 4 years, I was deeply involved in the question of statehood. I am convinced without question that the Territory of Hawaii has long been ready for statehood and that we will be guilty of grave dereliction if we delay any longer to bring it about.

The smokescreen of spurious arguments advanced by the opponents of Hawaii statehood has been thoroughly pierced, and in its disintegration it has been shown up for what it is—a device to hide the personal motives of the opponents of statehood.

The favorite line of the opposition has been to impugn the loyalty of Hawaii's citizenry, but the evidence shattering their accusations continues to grow in volume and strength. In June 1953, Senator Hugh Butler, onetime foe of statehood because of possible Communist influence, made this statement at a Senate hearing:

I believe the residents of Hawaii during the past 4 years * * * have demonstrated by positive action their awareness of the Communist danger and their determination to face it frankly and never let it strengthen its foothold. During those years they have fought it boldly, have restricted its influence, and to some degree have driven it underground. I believe they have shown that they are as well able as the Federal Government to cope with this measure.

James Michener, in his article in the December 1958 Reader's Digest, came to this conclusion after an extensive study:

Hawaii does suffer from a Communist threat. So do San Francisco and Balti-

more—and all America. Hawaii's problem is no different from that of any other area.

Hawaii is not a captive of the Communists. It is fighting back exactly like any mainland community. Its record is impressive.

It is no longer necessary to answer the argument of "noncontiguity." It was answered firmly and finally when Congress last year made Alaska our 49th State. And there is no need to dwell on the argument of "small population." It has been soundly refuted by the fact that Hawaii's 550,000 population exceeds that of 5 of our present States.

There remains, then, the basic question of whether Hawaii is economically, socially, and politically ready to become a State. These tests have all been met. There is no disputing the cold hard facts and figures that point up the economic prosperity of Hawaii. There is no mistaking the American culture and philosophy that dominates the lives of Hawaii's polyglot mixture. And there is no disputing the political maturity of the men and women in the legislative halls and the executive corridors of the Territory of Hawaii.

Last fall a joint congressional committee visited Hawaii. It went there with open eyes and open mind, self-consciously aware of the need to keep itself free of preconceived ideas and foregone conclusions. Members of the committee walked and rode and flew around the islands, talking to people in every phase of life, and meeting with labor and business groups and with fraternal, political, and community organizations. The committee came back enthusiastic. It came back secure in its conviction that Hawaii must become a State. In its report, the House members of the committee concluded that "admission of Hawaii, with its mixed races and its geographical position, will vastly improve our posture and relationship throughout the vast Pacific area, where we are striving with all our might and means to keep 800 million free and friendly."

Hawaii will, of course, benefit immeasurably from statehood. But let us not underestimate the economic, political, and diplomatic advantages that the United States as a Nation will gain in having as a strong outpost in the Pacific a member of its "family of States." And let us not underestimate the fact that if we fail to bring Hawaii into this family we face the possibility of the Territory becoming a Commonwealth and all that that implies—a nation that belongs to us and yet does not.

In conclusion, I desire to emphasize that the question of Hawaiian statehood is as much an international issue as it is a domestic issue. The nations in the Far East and elsewhere are watching us very closely on this. If we want to maintain their faith and confidence in us as a great democracy, we cannot afford to equivocate on this matter. There is a gap here between our pretensions and our performance. Let us close the gap by waiting no longer to make Hawaii our 50th State.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I regret very much to see the Senate rushing through at this time such an important measure as statehood for Hawaii. I remember this proposal has been before the Senate on other occasions. A few moments ago I was looking at the RECORD of 1954. At that time the proposal for Hawaiian statehood was discussed on the floor of the Senate at length.

As I remember, and according to the RECORD I have before me, I spoke for about 2 hours, opposing statehood for Hawaii at that time. There were many reasons why I then opposed statehood. I feel just as strongly today about everything I said on that occasion in opposition to statehood for Hawaii.

Some time ago the Internal Security Subcommittee saw fit to conduct an investigation concerning communism among the Hawaiians. It will be found, if the report is read, that the committee made a finding that, while the Hawaiian people as a whole were not Communists, a great many leaders in the unions were sympathetic to communism, and some of them, in my opinion, were nothing but Communists themselves. To a large extent, I think the same thing is true today. I do not believe there has been very much of a change since that time.

However, there are other reasons why I believe statehood should not be granted to Hawaii at this time. One of the main reasons, as I have always contended, is that the United States of America should really be the United States of America. When we reach out to a distant Territory—in this instance it is a group of islands—located approximately 2,500 miles from our western shore, and admit it into the Union as a State, I want to warn Senators who vote for such a bill that no nation in the world which has ventured out so far to make a Territory a part of itself has done so without being destroyed because of such action. We can observe what happened to the Roman Empire.

There is another reason for my position. I look at the matter purely from the standpoint of the good people of Hawaii. What do we find? It might become a little burdensome for the people of Hawaii to finance statehood. I think the Alaskans are feeling that way to some extent right now. Some of the people of Alaska are beginning to feel the pinch of statehood. If we could wait a couple of years more I think the people of Hawaii might find out from the people of Alaska what it means to be a State.

Government employees stationed in Alaska are receiving extra pay under the civil service law provisions. That happens, I know, because I am chairman of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. We pay people who go to Alaska and who stay there an extra amount of money because they go outside the United States to work. What are Senators going to do about that when the question comes before the Senate? Are we going to treat one State any different from another State? The same thing will be true with respect to Hawaii. What are we going to do? Are we going to give preferential treatment to people who work in the United States? That is a question which is going to come before the United States Senate very soon. I for one, think all States should be treated alike in regard to matters of that kind.

Yes, I oppose statehood for Hawaii at this time. Of course, the Hawaiians have been told it is a great thing. I have contended Hawaii should become a Commonwealth. The Hawaiians could do as Puerto Rico did, and they would be far better off.

I make the prediction that the majority of the people of Hawaii will be saying that is true in the next 2 or 3 years.

There is not involved the question of making the Hawaiians inferior citizens simply because we do not make Hawaii a State. We have other islands. What are we going to do with respect to the other islands when they ask to become States? What is the limitation?

Mr. President, realizing that what I may say here today, tomorrow or the next day, should this go on, is going to have very little effect upon the votes in the Senate, if any, to conserve time I am going to ask the Senate to grant unanimous consent that I may print some remarks on this subject in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

It is a serious matter, Mr. President, that we have under consideration today, when we are preparing to vote on the question of whether we shall admit a Territory which is located thousands of miles out in the Pacific Ocean. If we admit the Territory of Hawaii to statehood, what can we say to Puerto Rico when she desires to come into the Union? What can we say to Guam when she desires to enter the Union? What could we say to the Philippines if they should desire to enter the Union as a State?

I am warning the Senate that the areas I have mentioned, and many more, will be knocking at our door. I predict that requests for statehood will come from as far away as Italy. Italy will want to be a State of the United States. That is already being talked about in Italy. I am warning the United States again that if we try to spread out we shall begin to deteriorate.

Study the history of other nations which have arisen in the past and note that when they extended their borders unduly, they met their downfall.

What is best for these United States is the question that concerns me. Glossy statements about the example we may set for the rest of the world, and in the Pacific area in particular, have not the slightest appeal either to my reason or sentiment. Such puerility of thought should be addressed to the kindergarten classes. I am here, to use the favorite expression of another of my predecessors, as an ambassador to the U.S. Senate from the sovereign State of South Carolina, to help legislate and formulate a national policy for the good of the United States. The rule for my conduct is what the people of South Carolina and of the United States think of me as I perform my duties in keeping with what light and conscience the Almighty has seen fit to endow me.

What others may think of me—in foreign lands, in the Pacific, in Russia, in the Far East, or in Hawaii, if you please, or elsewhere—influences me very, very little. I am not at all persuaded by an internationalist press nor by any of its wings, left, right, or center. We are here to legislate for what is good and for what is best for these United States as a whole. If not, we ought to go home. That is our sworn constitutional duty, our prime responsibility, and the main purpose for our presence in this body.

My record on the foreign "giveaway" programs is singularly consistent. This proposal, in my judgment, is just another phase of a philosophy of looking out for the welfare of others and utterly neglecting our own.

Mankind has made great and unique progress since July 7, 1898, when these islands were dealt to us under the table as a Territory. But 12 inches still make a foot; 3 feet still make a yard; 24 hours still make a day. The Constitution of the United States, so far as admitting new Territories and new States is concerned, remains unchanged. The precepts and warnings of our great forebears still remain the wisest counsel.

I am thankful that the admission of the Hawaiian Islands as a Territory, on that hot day in July of 1898, was not then, and is not now, considered a party question. Both parties have endorsed the proposition. Neither has been right.

I am one who feels that generally party platforms should be followed; but a platform is something on which to try to get into office, and is not used thereafter, anyway. All of us know how the planks of a platform are adopted at national conventions. I have attended conventions. We are told, "We must adopt this. It will not do any harm, so let us put it in." Of course, that is not said openly, but it is true, nevertheless. Neither convention apparently has studied the proposition with sufficient care to pass impartial judgment on it. Someone sometime ago said that our Republic would have been destroyed long ago if the party in power had adopted all the political planks in its platform. I believe that statement to be true. The admission of these islands as a Territory, in my judgment, constituted a fraud in 1898. If we admit them now as a State, we perpetuate that fraud. Nowhere in the Constitution is there power to expel a State. That is something which must be remembered. The Constitution makes it easy for a Territory to come into the Union, but once a State, it is impossible to get it out. When the Constitution was adopted, our Founding Fathers never had in mind anything such as is now proposed ever happening. If they had, they would have included some protection. But it must be remembered that the Thirteen Original States were closely knitted together.

Now it is proposed to separate the United States. Someone has said that a country divided against itself will fall, or words to that effect. Certainly the United States will become divided if a Territory far out in the Pacific Ocean, 2,100 miles from the mainland is to be admitted as a State. The most we should do is to guarantee it a republican form of government. Sovereignty over these islands now is vested in Congress. If we divest ourselves of it, it will be gone not for a while; it will be gone forever. Our ability to recall a mistake will be forever lost, if this bill passes. If a Senator has in his mind any doubt at all about this proposal he should vote against admission, because he never will have an opportunity in the future to undo his mistake.

I cannot scan the debates on the admission of these islands as a Territory without a feeling that all the precedents theretofore established for the admission of new lands as Territories were violated; even, I conclude, the intendments and spirit of our Constitution were violated. Once having been violated, to admit the islands now as a State would be merely a prolongation and perpetuation of an original wrong. Shall we give our stamp of approval to an improper act?

In conclusion, Mr. President, I call the attention of the Senate to the fact that every great nation which finally has fallen or disintegrated first had passed through a period of annexation and expansion leading to a state of weakness. I hope the United States of America will not have that experience. After all, today the United States of America is the strongest nation in the world, not only financially, but from the standpoint of having one of the best governments. Taking the people of our country as a whole, I think they are the best in the world. Certainly I believe the United States of America is the most Christian nation in the world.

Regardless of the Senate's decision on the pending measure, I believe that so long as the United States leans upon God for guidance and help our Nation will continue to exist. However, if America expands, becomes greedy, and forgets God, she will be destroyed.

Mr. COOPER subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at a point prior to the vote on the Hawaiian statehood bill a statement which I have prepared on this subject.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR COOPER

As one of the many cosponsors of S. 50, I join my colleagues in expressing deep satisfaction that the U.S. Senate has played a noble part today in providing for the early admission of the State of Hawaii to the Union. Hawaii has met every legal test and precedent for statehood. Its people have met the test of loyalty to this Nation's institutions and flag by unparalleled valor in battle, and devotion in times of peace. The heterogeneity of her people will add new sources of ability and creativeness to enrich our Nation. We can congratulate her people and the Nation on the admission of Hawaii as a State.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I shall take only 1 minute. I served for a short time in Hawaii during World War II. I wish to pay my tribute to this great Territory, which I hope very much and expect will very shortly become a State.

Mr. President, taking into statehood this outpost in the Pacific, with its heterogeneous population is one of the most outstanding contributions we can make to the foreign policy of the United States. By doing so we are demonstrating to the world the fact that this is a dynamic and virile nation. We are not static. We have a warm heart and understanding for all people.

I think this will become not only a historic admission to statehood but a historic landmark in the foreign policy of the United States.

Mr. President, I congratulate the people of Hawaii. I know they will perform their obligations and their responsibilities to the people of the United States with the same dignity and capacity—indeed, with the same heroism—which they evidenced in World War II, when I saw them at close range.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Vote! Vote! Vote!

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I shall be very brief. The pros and cons on this issue have been debated thoroughly. There is nothing I can add which will affect the outcome. I merely wish to congratulate the country on the addition of a new State, and to welcome Hawaii as a State on a parity with the other 49.

This is an important day for our people and our country, and I ask that the Senate now proceed to vote.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass? On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I announce that the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] are absent on official business.

I also anounce that the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS] is absent because of illness.

I further anounce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] would each vote "yea."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. MARTIN] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business of the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences.

If present and voting, the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS], and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MARTIN] would each vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 76, nays 15, as follows:

YEAS—76

Allott	Frear	Mansfield
Anderson	Goldwater	Monroney
Bartlett	Green	Morse
Beall	Gruening	Morton
Bennett	Hart	Moss
Bible	Hartke	Mundt
Bridges	Hayden	Murray
Bush	Hickenlooper	Muskie
Byrd, W. Va.	Holland	Neuberger
Cannon	Hruska	Pastore
Capehart	Jackson	Prouty
Carlson	Javits	Proxmire
Carroll	Johnson, Tex.	Randolph
Case, N.J.	Jordan	Saltonstall
Case, S. Dak.	Keating	Schoeppel
Chavez	Kefauver	Scott
Church	Kennedy	Smith
Clark	Kerr	Symington
Cooper	Kuchel	Wiley
Cotton	Langer	Williams, N.J.
Dirksen	Lausche	Williams, Del.
Dodd	Long	Yarborough
Douglas	McCarthy	Young, N. Dak.
Dworshak	McGee	Young, Ohio
Engle	McNamara	
Ervin	Magnuson	

NAYS—15

Butler	Hill	Smathers
Byrd, Va.	Johnston, S.C.	Sparkman
Eastland	McClellan	Stennis
Ellender	Robertson	Talmadge
Fulbright	Russell	Thurmond

NOT VOTING—7

Aiken	Hennings	O'Mahoney
Curtis	Humphrey	
Gore	Martin	

So the bill (S. 50) was passed.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the Hawaiian statehood bill was passed.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas to lay on the table the motion of the Senator from Washington to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, first I wish to pay tribute to the distinguished Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON] for his diligence and effectiveness in connection with this very important piece of legislation. Except for his diligence we would not have passed the bill as it has been passed by the Senate.

I also wish to commend and congratulate my good friend, Delegate BURNS, of Hawaii, whose outstanding statesmanship displayed since coming to Congress as a Delegate has brought about the happy result we have witnessed this evening. I thank the Senate for its prompt action.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I believe the Senator from Texas will agree with me in what I have to say. Of course, my colleague from Washington has done a grand job on this bill. However, I believe that the Senate should pay special tribute tonight to one of the great Members of the Senate, the distinguished senior Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY]. He is the first Senator, I understand, in 46 years who has presided over a committee which has reported bills admitting two States to the Union. I know my friends from Alaska will join me in that tribute.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, since our distinguished friend from Montana has brought in two States, I hope he will not become too generous before the session is over. [Laughter.]

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I thank and congratulate my colleagues on both sides of the aisle for their expeditious and reasoned consideration of statehood for Hawaii. I believe that a thorough study of Senate proceedings will show that we have set a record for major legislation, from hearings 2 short weeks ago to passage tonight.

Mr. President, this record was made possible by the full and complete support of the bill by the distinguished majority leader [Mr. JOHNSON of Texas] in scheduling it promptly for Senate consideration, ably supported and assisted at all times by the distinguished minority leader, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

I believe it is important to repeat from my opening statement today that no one can accuse the Senate of acting in mad haste by passing on Hawaiian statehood after a single day of debate. The reverse is true. The swiftness with which the Senate has acted and with which the House is acting is evidence that all aspects of statehood for Hawaii have been considered thoroughly.

We have done a noble thing. We have kept faith with our fellow Americans in Hawaii. We have demonstrated again the dynamic nature of our American democracy.

Statehood for Hawaii is a significant victory, not only for Hawaii, but for all America and for freedom-loving people everywhere.

I wish to associate myself with the remarks previously made by the distinguished majority leader with reference to the wonderful assistance given by the Delegate from Hawaii [Mr. BURNS]. I, too, wish to congratulate the chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, the distinguished senior Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], who has won great honor as chairman of his committee in seeing two States admitted into the Union in less than 1 year.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I am very proud that the report of the committee in reporting the statehood bill to the Senate was a unanimous report. I congratulate the senior Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] and the junior Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] for their work. The junior Senator from Montana did noble work on the floor of the Senate today in helping to bring about this result.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I believe that for the record it might be well to call attention to the fact that when the debate on the Hawaiian statehood bill started, the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING] was presiding over the Senate, and that when the debate ended and when the vote began the Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT] was presiding. It indicates rather clearly that the new States know how to fulfill their full functions in the Senate. I congratulate both of them for their activities in this matter.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I wish to join in the compliments being paid to everyone except the compliments that are being paid to me.

I especially wish to commend my distinguished senior colleague from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] for the statesmanship he has shown and for the drive and the initiative he has manifested in bringing two statehood bills to the floor of the Senate in less than 1 year.

I also wish to pay a special tribute to the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH], who, as in the case of statehood for Alaska, worked hard and diligently in behalf of statehood for Hawaii. The Senator from Idaho has made a real contribution to the betterment of our country in helping to bring these Territories into the Union.

In addition to the tributes which have been paid to the Democratic members of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, I believe we should not lose sight of members of the committee such as the Senator from Idaho [Mr. DWORSHAK], the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT], and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MARTIN], each of whom made a distinct contribution. The report of the committee was a unanimous report. I am delighted that on this great day for Hawaii the Delegate from Hawaii should be in attendance at this session, because he has done so much to further the cause of statehood for Hawaii.

I hope that the House on tomorrow will follow suit in the action the Senate has taken today, and that soon the bill will receive the President's signature. I hope that before long we will have two Senators from the State of Hawaii, and one Representative in the House.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I wish to associate myself with the tribute paid to the minority leader and to the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH].

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, in addition to the tributes which have been paid to the other Senators, in which I join, I should like to pay tribute also to the majority leader, under whose leadership we have resolved some of the most difficult and trying problems which this Nation has had to face.

During the 10 years I have been in the Senate, it has been my privilege to support statehood for Alaska and statehood for Hawaii in connection with the bills which have been placed before us.

Unfortunately, although those bills were debated for a long time, nothing ever happened. Now we have settled the troublesome issues of Alaskan statehood and Hawaiian statehood, and we have done so with less discussion than in previous years was required merely to talk about one of these bills. It is a great tribute to our majority leader. He has a way of getting people to work and pull together to achieve something with less wasted effort and more results.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I should like to make three comments. The first is that there comes to mind the rather tumultuous discussion we had about changing rule XXII. Here is evidence of how the Senate can work its will if it wishes to do so.

Secondly, I should like to say that our distinguished Vice President was in the chair when the vote was taken both on this action, and when the Alaska statehood issue was resolved in the Senate.

Finally, I wish to congratulate and compliment my colleagues on the minority side. On the entire vote there was only one dissent on the minority side, and I am genuinely proud of it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I should like to say that it would not have been possible to bring about the result which has been brought about except for the complete and thorough cooperation of the distinguished minority leader, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] on this bill, as on all others. I appreciate his help.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I thank the Senator.

BUSINESS REVIEW IN CERTAIN CITIES

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a business review made in cities in America in which a corporation in which I am interested does business. This review will serve to show my colleagues who are downhearted that there are bright spots in the country where people wish to help themselves.

There being no objection, the review was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Business review in Atkins' cities [1]

	Annual rate, latest month		Extent of unemployment, January 1959	Employment compared to year ago, percent	Department store sales compared to year ago, December 1958, percent
	Average worker's income [2]	Income compared to year ago,[2] percent			
Albany, N.Y., area	$4,934	+1.7	Substantial	−4.6	+2
Baltimore, Md	4,878	+6.4	do	−1.0	+10
Boston, Mass	4,352	+6.3	Moderate	−1.6	+9
Charlotte, N.C	3,512	+9.6	do	−.3	[3]
Hartford, Conn	4,782	+7.4	do	−1.3	[3]
Philadelphia, Pa	4,702	+4.4	Substantial	−2.1	+12
Providence, R.I	3,710	+5.0	do	−.8	[3]
Richmond, Va	4,011	+3.2	Moderate	+1.2	+2
Rochester, N.Y	4,871	+3.9	do	−3.6	+12
Washington, D.C	4,968	+8.7	Slight	−.5	+13
Chicago, Ill	5,096	+5.5	Substantial	−4.6	+8
Cincinnati, Ohio	4,801	+6.5	Moderate	[4]−3.5	+3
Cleveland, Ohio	5,330	+3.3	do	[4]−11.6	+5
Dallas, Tex	4,210	+4.1	do	[4]−4.0	+6
Grand Rapids, Mich	4,825	+5.3	Substantial	[4]−3.1	+6
Indianapolis, Ind	[3]	[3]	Moderate	−4.8	+10
Kansas City, Mo	4,876	+5.6	Substantial	−1.9	+13
Knoxville, Tenn	4,297	+4.4	do	−3.3	+9
Memphis, Tenn	3,761	−5.7	do	−2.1	+13
Milwaukee, Wis	5,043	+4.5	Moderate	−4.0	+5
New Orleans, La	4,402	+7.2	do	−3.2	+5
Omaha, Nebr	4,848	+11.0	do	−.7	+11
St. Louis, Mo	4,994	+7.0	Substantial	−3.2	+9
Denver, Colo	4,993	+6.2	Moderate	−.3	+10
Los Angeles, Calif., area	5,176	+6.4	do	+.2	+11
Phoenix, Ariz	5,068	+12.6	do	+6.6	+9
Salt Lake City, Utah	4,646	+3.6	do	+.7	+12
San Diego, Calif	5,409	+12.2	do	+2.4	+8
San Francisco, Calif., area	5,352	+6.8	do	+.5	+4
Spokane, Wash	5,605	+13.5	Substantial	−1.3	+6
Median	4,871	+6.2		−1.6	+9

[1] Frederick Atkins, a buying office, 11 West 42d St., New York City.
[2] Factory earnings.
[3] Not reported by Government agencies.
[4] Factory employment only.

NOTE.—"Slight" unemployment means less than 3 percent of labor force, "moderate" means 3 to 5.9 percent, "substantial" means 6 percent or more.

Source: U.S. News & World Report, Feb. 20, 1959.

FEDERAL ASSISTANCE FOR THE GARRISON MEMORIAL HOSPITAL AT GARRISON, N. DAK.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a resolution adopted by the Junior Chamber of Commerce of Garrison, N. Dak., together with a statement I prepared on the subject.

There being no objection, the resolution and statement were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION OF JUNIOR CHAMBER OF COMMERCE, GARRISON, N. DAK.

Whereas the Garrison Junior Chamber of Commerce is an organization comprised of young men who accept the responsibility of constructive action in the affairs of their community; and

Whereas the Garrison Memorial Hospital is in dire need for added facilities to accommodate for the large number of Indian patients it is taking in, which will in turn enable them to better care for all patients in the hospital; and

Whereas under Public Law 85-151, the Garrison Memorial Hospital is trying to receive aid, through the Federal Indian Agency, to increase their facilities, to better care for the large number of Indian patients they take in; and

Whereas the city of Garrison would be an excellent location for this hospital addition, due to the fact that most of the Indian population comes to the Garrison Hospital to receive medical care and treatment; and

Whereas the city of Garrison has a hospital which was so constructed that it could be added on to quite easily, if the need arose; and

Whereas the Garrison Memorial Hospital has one of the finest groups of medical doctors, surgeons, and technicians for any town our size in the State of North Dakota; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Garrison Junior Chamber of Commerce duly assembled in general membership meeting, this 17th day of February 1959, do hereby support, and go on record as supporting, the Garrison Memorial Hospital in their request for Federal aid for this hospital addition; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution, bearing the signature of the president and secretary, be forwarded to all Members of Congress from the State of North Dakota, the Indian health area officer, the North Dakota State Health Department, and to the delegate and councilmen, National Congress of American Indians.

DARWIN W. JOHNSON,
President.

RICHARD RASCH,
Secretary.

STATEMENT BY SENATOR LANGER

Sister M. Angele, O.S.B., administrator of the Garrison Memorial Hospital, Garrison, N. Dak., on behalf of her hospital, has been in constant touch with me pertaining to obtaining Federal assistance under title VI of the Public Health Service Act as part of the Hill-Burton assistance program.

The hospital serves a large number of Indian patients as well as non-Indian patients in that area. We have received many letters and petitions from North Dakota constituents, urging that everything be done to facilitate the obtaining of funds under Public Law 85-151 which permits funds for construction of additional facilities.

Representative of the letters and resolutions that we have received is one from the Junior Chamber of Commerce at Garrison, N. Dak., which I ask unanimous consent that it be entered at the end of my remarks.

I am happy to report that Dr. James R. Shaw, assistant surgeon general, Chief, Division of Indian Health, as well as other aids in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Public Health Service, have been most cooperative in this matter.

JUVENILE DELINQUENCY

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, as ranking Republican member on the U.S. Senate Subcommittee To Investigate Juvenile Delinquency since its inception, I have had an opportunity to hear the country's outstanding experts on juvenile delinquency. The subcommittee has done a remarkable job in trying to stem the tide of this No. 1 social menace in our country.

We know that juvenile delinquency has been increasing at a rate of approximately 7 to 8 percent each year since the beginning of 1949 which, over a 10-year period, has reached a phenomenal total of approximately 70 percent over the statistics for the year of 1948. This, of course, includes only the known cases of juvenile delinquency and not those that go unapprehended.

This evening I do not intend to go into full discussion of the problem of juvenile delinquency but would like to confine my remarks on a recent article and editorial in the Washington Evening Star, which commented on the testimony of the judges and other experts on juvenile delinquency in the New York City area at a hearing before the U.S. Senate Juvenile Delinquency Subcommittee. The newspaper articles highlighted the fact that these witnesses related to parental delinquency as a primary cause of the juvenile delinquency problem.

The GAPA, a civic organization, wrote a letter to the editor of the Washington Evening Star raising numerous questions that must be resolved in order to correct adult and parental delinquency if the premise is that juvenile delinquency is caused primarily by adult and parental delinquency.

The letter to the editor is as follows:

To the EDITOR:

Your article and editorial referring to the testimony of judges before the U.S. Senate Juvenile Delinquency Subcommittee relating to parental delinquency is timely and goes to the very heart of the juvenile delinquency problem. If the premise is that juvenile delinquency is caused by adult or parental delinquency, then what should be done to correct adult or parental delinquency? Here are some questions that must be resolved.

1. Is each community providing adequately trained family and child guidance clinics to reach families that cannot cope with the many family problems that may lead to delinquencies?

2. Is each community or neighborhood adequately cleaning up the existing conditions which foment into adult delinquency and parental delinquency, resulting in certain amount of juvenile delinquency?

3. Is each school, public or private, providing guidance to the soul as well as guidance to the brain?

4. Is each parent aware of his parental responsibility to his child; and then is he competent to cope with that parental responsibility?

5. Is each church providing adequately trained marriage and parental counseling services for parents and prospective parents?

6. Is each church exerting its fullest effort to encourage church and Sunday school attendance of youth who may have delinquent tendencies? Are parents of these children encouraged to attend church regularly?

7. Is each church providing adequate programing for the youth membership to assure moral guidance?

8. Is each church assuming its obligation in accepting referrals, from the juvenile bureaus of juvenile courts, of youth of its faith or denomination?

9. Is each church providing use of its church buildings and grounds for youth recreation, especially in underprivileged neighborhoods or does each provide expert recreational and guidance leadership to aid their youth?

10. One expert noted that 10 percent of the families are provided with 90 percent of public welfare and social welfare services and that many delinquents come from these families. Will concentration on alleviating the problems of this 10 percent of families curtail juvenile delinquency?

11. What can be done to reach the parents of the well-to-do families who do not know the difference between loving and pampering a child; and further between disciplining and punishing a child, resulting in needless cases of juvenile delinquency among well-to-do families?

The Greek American Progressive Association (GAPA) endorses the Senate Juvenile Delinquency Subcommittee's program of uniting all national service and fraternal organizations into coordinating their efforts in an all inclusive program to wipe away adult and parental delinquency and thereby aid in curtailing and controlling juvenile delinquency. GAPA offers its services locally and nationally in solving our No. 1 social problem.

GREEK AMERICAN PROGRESSIVE ASSOCIATION,
JOHN BROUMAS,
Honorary President.

WASHINGTON, D.C.

Mr. President, of course we cannot blame all acts of juvenile delinquency against the parents, for there are many parents who love their children, give them the best of everything, including parental love and discipline, and yet acts of juvenile delinquency are committed. Recently such a situation occurred in the home of one of the greatest catchers in the history of major league baseball—a fine gentleman and man who has been an outstanding workers in juvenile delinquency programs—namely, Roy Campanella of the Los Angeles Dodgers.

Roy Campanella gave his children good schooling, a good home life, and the fine attributes that he always displayed on and off the baseball field; and as he stated:

I try to teach my own youngsters the right way in life.

In this instance we have to look beyond just the issue of the role of the parents in rearing their children and consider the role of the community, of the church, and of the schools who have very much to do with the character building of every child. That is why I believe that the questions raised in the above letter are so apropos.

Mr. President, I direct the Senators' attention to a statement in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 104, part 6, page 8232, on the subject of "The Role of the Church and Community in Rearing Youth." This article points out what must be done by the churches and its members as a community group in properly rearing their children and thereby combating juvenile delinquency.

Mr. President, it is only when each individual parent who, combined with other individual parents, individually and as a group, become so aroused to the problem of juvenile delinquency that effective action and measures will be taken to control our No. 1 social problem.

An aroused, alert, and coordinated community can do most anything. Corrupt governments and despots have been overthrown; gangsters have been run out of town; gamblers and houses of ill fame have been shut down. Cities have been saved from raging floods and disease-infested areas have been cleared to save the people from plagues.

The combating of juvenile delinquency requires funds, expert personnel, coordinated activity by public and private agencies, by public relations and education. To get funds and expert personnel, it requires concerted effort by the people of a given community to impress upon the city council, the State legislature, or the Congress of the United States, the great need for these funds and the expert personnel.

Therefore, if we want our children to be protected; if we want to assure ourselves that our own children will not be drawn into this spiderweb of delinquency and crime; then the parents, the church members, and the community members must become an aroused and constructive group so that they will gain the support and the funds needed to afford the proper facilities and trained workers through a centrally guided administrative body to wipe from the face of the map this raging disease and menace called juvenile delinquency.

For years I, as well as other Senators, have been urging for such action. Congress can help by passing the several Senate bills directed toward providing Federal funds to match State funds to control juvenile delinquency throughout the country.

A FRESH LOOK AT FOREIGN AID—ADDRESS BY REPRESENTATIVE CHESTER BOWLES, OF CONNECTICUT

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD the Edmund A. Walsh lecture which was delivered last evening by Representative CHESTER BOWLES. This speech is an outstanding contribution to the discussion of foreign assistance and deserves wide attention as Congress begins the consideration of the mutual security program for the coming year. The address sets forth the objectives which our aid program should encompass and provides standards against which we can judge our national effort in foreign aid.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A FRESH LOOK AT FOREIGN AID

(By Hon. CHESTER BOWLES, of Connecticut)

It is an honor and pleasure for me to come to Georgetown as the Edmund Walsh lecturer. Almost everyone who considers our diplomatic corps and its role in administering U.S. foreign policy is reminded of Edmund A. Walsh and the Georgetown School of Foreign Service.

This is not only because the school itself is now the Edmund A. Walsh School of Foreign Service. It is because these two names have been closely connected for 40 years. Both have had special roles in providing competent Foreign Service officers in sufficient numbers to carry out the growing international responsibilities of the United States.

It is, therefore, fitting that we meet here today to discuss our foreign economic programs which have become so closely integrated with the day-to-day work of American Foreign Service officers in our Embassies throughout the world.

Clearly our new generation of American diplomats will face problems that will range far beyond the scope of our Foreign Service tradition. Among the many new capabilities which our foreign representatives must have is a broad understanding of the increasing role that America must play in world development and world economics.

For want of a better term, what we call foreign aid has been a major instrument of U.S. foreign policy since lend-lease helped lay the economic foundations for winning World War II almost 19 years ago.

Then UNRRA moved in to help shoulder the immediate and staggering task of relief which followed the war. Next, the Marshall plan gave a necessary helping hand to European economic reconstruction.

Then the mutual security program was designed to help our allies in Western Europe rearm in the face of renewed threats of Soviet aggression. This program was later expanded to non-European areas and coupled with technical assistance.

Each time we have added a new chapter to the saga of foreign aid, we have had an opportunity to think through our national purposes and to estimate the values and limits of our foreign economic program as an instrument in helping us to realize these purposes.

We have often neglected to utilize these opportunities fully.

We now engage in a wide variety of programs to help other nations build the economic foundations for sound and orderly political growth. But these programs have again reached a crossroad of history. Unless we face up frankly to our mistakes as well as to our achievements, I am afraid that our efforts may begin to lose much of their relevance to the great world problems now facing us.

The reexamination of the scope, motivations, and nature of our economic aid efforts on which I shall embark tonight is necessarily limited and oversimplified.

I offer it with humility in the hope that it may encourage others to do likewise, and thereby promote the responsible public debate and reappraisal which is so long overdue.

For one thing is sure as we in Congress approach the mutual security legislation of 1959: If those of us who believe that this effort is utterly vital to the creation of a peaceful world society fail to speak out constructively, unregenerate opponents of the program will capitalize on its inadequacies to destroy it.

As background for this analysis, I shall first consider briefly the worldwide situation which we now face.

THE NEW CHALLENGE

Since World War II a revolutionary upheaval has been taking place which has directly affected two-thirds of mankind and which may prove to be the decisive overall influence in shaping the next century.

A billion and a half people in Asia, Africa, and Latin America are now striving to create or to reaffirm their national identity.

At the same time an exploding technology in agriculture, public health, engineering, and communications has created expectations of a new and better life in the most remote villages. Yet because both capital and trained people are lacking, the slow increase in production in most areas is barely able to keep up with population growth.

In the meantime the more fortunate nations of Western Europe and America are enjoying a living standard unprecedented in history. Although the American people constitute only 6 percent of mankind, we are producing nearly 40 percent of the world's manufactured goods.

The contrast between the rich prosperous Western nations with some 15 percent of the world's people and the depressed 70 percent of mankind now living in Latin America, Asia, and Africa, is made all the more explosive by racial differences. The first group is largely white and the second group is largely colored.

Advancing toward the center of the world stage is the Soviet Union with an economy that is now expanding nearly three times as fast as ours, with more than double our annual output of technicians and professional men, and allied to a Chinese government which is regimenting 650 million Chinese under a tight-fisted Communist dictatorship.

THE COMMUNIST OBJECTIVE

Thirty-one years ago Lenin proclaimed that "the road to Paris lies through Calcutta and Peking." Five years later Stalin said, "The backs of the British (meaning the West) will be broken not on the river Thames, but on the Yangtze, the Ganges, and the Nile."

For 25 years Stalin's efforts to undermine Europe and isolate America by the expansion of Communist influence in Asia and Africa were ineffective. They failed because the Kremlin lacked an understanding of Asian and African cultures and also the necessary capital resources and technicians for export.

Today these deficiencies have been removed. No one can deny that the Kremlin thoroughly understands what is going on in the underdeveloped world. Nor can anyone deny that it has the able technicians, the capital, and the will to implement the strategy that Lenin laid down more than two generations ago.

In the forefront of the resulting struggle are the two most heavily populated nations on earth—China and India.

Under a tough totalitarian government, the Chinese are being driven at a furious pace to create a new first-class industrial power. Inevitably it will become a nuclear power as well, unless an international control system is established including China.

In the eyes of Asians and Africans the only underdeveloped nation that is remotely capable of meeting the challenge of China is India. Yet India's economic and political handicaps are staggering.

As a democracy, she cannot tax her people past a certain point without revolution.

As a democracy, she must provide some recognizable year-by-year improvements in the living standards of her people.

As a democracy, she must give free reign to an opposition which is often disruptive and irresponsible.

The adequacy of our economic efforts in the coming decade must be judged against the background of these unprecedented revolutionary forces. Our long-term capacity to survive as a free people may largely be measured by our ability to cope with them.

FOUR COUNTS OF FAILURE

I suggest that our present economic efforts are failing on four counts.

First, our stated purposes of foreign aid fail to do justice to our real goals in world affairs. More basically, they fail to take adequately into account the new dimensions of the international political situation and therefore the new dimensions of peace.

Second, instead of focusing our efforts on the political and economic forces which I have described above, our aid program is overbalanced much too far toward the military.

Third, because we have failed to distinguish between the needs and present capabilities of the 60-odd countries receiving our aid, large sums have been misdirected and even wasted.

Fourth, our financial commitment and our administrative performance are both grossly incommensurate with the challenge.

These shortcomings are not sudden or new. I have called attention to them in the past and so have other observers.

They have now become acute. It is no longer possible to gloss over them or to pretend that they are unimportant.

It therefore behooves us to examine each of these points in detail.

I. THE PURPOSES OF FOREIGN AID

The stated purposes of our economic aid programs are negative and narrow. In some cases they imply such an oversimplified view of world realities that they are logically bound to be futile.

That they have not been even more futile is only because the day-to-day actions of the administrators of these programs have often been more adequate than the terms in which they justify those actions before congressional committees. But let us consider our official purposes.

We assert, for instance, that our economic aid programs are primarily designed to block Communist expansion.

In defining our objective so narrowly for domestic political consumption, we have inadvertently appeared to offer a premium to those countries which have the most Communists. We have thus turned communism into a national resource.

To a struggling government, hungry for outside assistance, the local Communist minority has become worth its weight in American dollars.

Nations that have been able to produce sufficiently frightening statistics on their indigenous Communist agitators have often been urged to take more assistance than they could properly use. Other nations, less well endowed with Communist troublemakers, have received little or nothing.

This curious premium on communism is actually written into the preamble of the Mutual Security Act which says that "the peace of the world and the security of the United States are endangered (by) international communism" and that it is "the policy of the United States to continue" the aid program "as long as such danger * * * persists."

Communists are not often blessed with a sense of humor. But some Communist leaders who are, have said to the people of Asia and Africa:

"The Soviet Union offers loans and technicians to speed your development. For this you are grateful.

"But you should be equally grateful to Moscow for the aid the Americans give you. In their own official statement of purpose, they frankly state that if they were not so frightened of us Communists, they would give you nothing."

Buying friends

Another mistaken reason often listed as a purpose of our foreign aid program is that we will bring military allies to our side, or at least win their support for whatever political position we may choose to take in the United Nations.

This argument is also hollow and futile. It is no more possible to buy the long-term loyalty of a nation than it is to buy the enduring loyalty of a friend. To attempt to do so can lead only to frustration and antagonism.

Suppose a wealthy resident of the little New England community in which I live should offer to build a swimming pool for our children, a new library, and an extension of our townhall, provided only that my neighbors and I support his views willy nilly in our town meetings.

What would we do? We would invite him to take his money and go live elsewhere.

Unfortunately, we Americans have often and inadvertently placed ourselves in the position of the richest man in the world community, naively trying to buy friends and supporters for his views.

Is it any wonder that our economic aid program is often suspected, if not rejected by proud, suspicious, newly free peoples?

Well-fed rebels?

Still another mistaken argument in support of foreign aid grows from the false assumption that we can turn Asians, Africans, and Latin Americans into orderly supporters of the status quo simply by filling their hungry stomachs. This is a kind of Marxism upside down.

Yet any experienced authority on economic development will tell us that a landless laborer or a tenant farmer who lacks a sense of belonging and a sense of justice will not be satisfied with marginal economic gains.

Instead of turning him into an unthinking supporter of the political status quo scattered material improvements, granted to him by a suddenly beneficent government within the old political and social framework, will simply create an appetite for the full citizenship to which he now believes he is entitled.

For instance, consider Iraq. Before the revolution last year, no country in the Middle East was making such rapid economic progress. Yet the citizens in the bazaars, villages, and small factories were given only a meager share in the gains.

Consequently their sense of injustice increased. In their lives the much-advertised progress has little meaning. Eventually the political pot boiled over.

Our foreign aid programs are supposed to create mutual security. But when aid is given for negative and mistaken purposes, it fails to generate the public support which it must have here in America. Moreover, it deprives the receiving country of the essential sense of partnership with us, unless that country happens to view the Soviet threat in the same largely military terms that we do.

Before we call willy-nilly for committed nations, let us remember that such a requirement leaves out most of the non-Communist world.

Our earlier experience

Our foreign aid program has not always suffered from such poverty of purposes. There is an important lesson to be learned from a quick backward look at lend lease and the Marshall plan.

We all know that history does not repeat itself, and that the success of these earlier programs does not mean they are infallible models for 1959. But the underlying conception and operating methods of these programs are instructive. Indeed I believe they may hold a key that will open new doors in

our search for a more reliable approach to our economic relations with the underdeveloped nations.

Like the mutual security program, both lend lease and the Marshall plan were initiated because they were held necessary to protect our own national security.

Neither represented an outpouring of pure altruism. But after this has been said, the earlier programs provide several dramatic contrasts to our present mutual security concepts.

First, lend lease was designed to protect the most vital interests of the other participating governments just as much as it protected the vital interests of the United States. It was true international cooperation on the central issue—national survival for all concerned.

Second, lend lease was not simply a holding operation to minimize the Axis conquests. Instead it was an engine that powered the allied drive to defeat the Axis.

Thus lend lease became the tangible, positive symbol of a dedicated and far-sighted U.S. leadership in a common struggle for a more secure and peaceful future.

The vision of the Marshall plan

The Marshall plan had the same essential ingredients, expressed in a different way, that took account of the changed international situation.

In his historic speech at Harvard in June 1947, Secretary of State Marshall spoke of the destruction, the poverty, and the chaos in war-scarred Europe.

He said that Europe's needs for food, machinery, and raw materials were much greater than she could satisfy with her own resources. Without aid principally from America, Europe would face economic, social, and political deterioration of a very grave character.

Secretary Marshall assured the world that U.S. aid policy was not directed against any country, but against hunger, poverty, desperation, and chaos.

"It's purpose," he said, "should be the revival of a working economy in the world so as to permit the emergence of political and social conditions in which free institutions can exist." He offered American aid, but first he called for self-help and cooperation among the European countries.

Secretary Marshall's words could be applied today with equal relevance to other parts of the world.

"It would be neither fitting nor efficacious," he said, "for this Government to undertake to draw up unilaterally a program designed to place Europe on its feet economically. This is the business of the Europeans. The initiative, I think, must come from Europe.

"The role of our country should consist of friendly aid in the drafting of a European program and of later support of such a program so far as it may be practical for us to do so.

There was a wideness in Marshall's vision that far transcended the more narrow although altogether vital American interest in preventing the European Communist parties from gaining power in the wake of economic chaos.

Here was an offer of strong, purposeful, and effective American leadership in cooperation with other countries.

Here was a positive American response to the crisis that jeopardized the economic and political interests of both Europe and America.

Here was an eloquent expression of hope that by cooperative action nations could build a better future for themselves.

Here was a call for a comprehensive plan for European economic reconstruction. Although American aid was to be an integral and essential part, we were counting on Europe itself to push its own resources to the limit.

Our mutual security program today lacks these clear purposes and operating principles. If we are to achieve our crucially important objectives, we must return to them.

Not an easy task

I do not pretend that this will be easy. These principles must be applied in parts of the world where most governments are far less well prepared for effective cooperation than Europe was in 1948. Our ties with many of these governments are less close. But we must take into account the same variables on a new world stage.

We must rethink the nature of the present crisis, the stakes involved, the governments and the people concerned, and above all, the available areas of vital mutual interests.

This is not simply a problem of semantics. Our new purposes must be reflected in our day-to-day actions, in our policies, in our appropriations, and in our administration. Unless the words we speak are reflected accurately in the things we do, we will continue to blunder.

This brings me to the central question: At what point do our vital interests meet those of most of the nations in the non-Communist world?

Again we may borrow Secretary Marshall's words and say that our purpose should be to foster the emergence of political and social conditions in which free institutions can exist.

The area in which our vital interests intersect with those of the non-Communist world is not simply anticommunism or membership in an anti-Soviet bloc. It is rather a common interest in independence and in promoting maximum freedom of choice.

While we in America have tended to become bewitched with a negative, military-oriented, holding operation against communism, most of the rest of the non-Communist world has been concerned with establishing new societies designed to provide a better future.

Yet when we take time out to consider our objectives more closely, we find that we share with most non-Communist countries, underdeveloped as well as developed, the same basic objectives.

We are all trying to maintain true national independence.

We all wish to avoid unwelcome foreign interference.

We all seek to build and maintain the foundations of stable, responsible national governments.

And, of the utmost importance, we all know in our hearts that these national purposes cannot possibly be realized in isolation, we know that cooperation is essential.

All of the less developed countries in Asia, Africa, and Latin America urgently need technical assistance and most of them need investment capital which we and our Western allies are in a position to provide.

We, in turn, need continued access to their raw materials and markets for our own produce and manufactured goods—access to which the Kremlin now seeks to deny us by the end run tactics which Lenin advocated.

But because of the accidents of geography and experience, the non-Communist underdeveloped governments see the world from differing perspectives.

Some feel that their national security is directly endangered by overt aggression from the Sino-Soviet bloc or indirectly by internal subversion spurred on by local Communist parties. Others have their eyes on more immediate economic problems that threaten not only their hopes for a better life, but their actual political survival.

In each case we must seek to develop those points of common concern where our mutual interests intersect and we must root our programs of economic assistance in these mutual objectives.

To do so will require a fresh breadth of vision in a new world of extraordinary complexity. It will, of course, require a genuine sense of concern on our part for the welfare of those beyond our own shores. But one of the most obvious ironies of our time is that unless we interpret our own national interests more generously, we will fail to secure them.

Without a broader perspective, we will almost certainly interpret our vital interests so narrowly that we fail to help others secure their own interests, even when their security is in fact connected with our own security.

If the purposes of our foreign economic programs are to be squarely based on the cooperative securing of our long-range vital interests, we should start by giving our foreign aid statute a less negative name than the Mutual Security Act.

I suggest we call it the Act for International Cooperation. Its stated objectives should be the cooperative development of the conditions of freedom and the maintenance of national independence.

This would place the emphasis where it belongs—on cooperation and partnership. It suggests that America's long-term national purpose is broader than saving our own skins.

II. MILITARY VERSUS ECONOMIC AID

Let me move on now to the second major question facing our foreign aid program.

At present most of our foreign economic aid is military aid. Even our nonmilitary aid largely concentrates on supporting the military programs.

The segment set aside for pure economic aid, moreover, concentrates too narrowly on measurable material development. It fails to recognize that such growth, however valuable, is only a partial answer to the problems now facing the less-developed countries.

Let us briefly examine the breakdown in last year's mutual security legislation. Total foreign-aid appropriations were $3.3 billion. Of this $1.5 billion, or about 50 percent, went straight for military aid.

The second largest sum, $750 million, went for defense support. This is the name we now give to extra aid for countries receiving military aid, extra aid to help their economies support the cost of an enlarged defense establishment.

Such economic aid, in other words, is not officially designed for economic development purposes at all, although it obviously may assist such efforts inadvertently.

Special assistance accounted for $200 million and the contingency fund for another $155 million. While grants under these accounts have been given for economic development, the general categories cover odds and ends of purposes that cannot really be classified in advance as earmarked for either military or economic development aid.

This left mighty little for straight economic development and technical assistance—only $400 million for the Development Loan Fund and $171.5 million for technical cooperation.

Thus we see that less than $600 million, or only 18 percent of more than $3.3 billion, was provided expressly and directly to help raise living standards and foster orderly political growth through technical cooperation and economic development. Even allowing for the economic development aspects of other programs, our mutual security effort, as it is conceived today, still remains largely a military aid program.

It follows that the administration and the Congress apparently still consider the major threats in Asia, Africa, and Latin America to be military threats, and that the principal danger against which we are attempting to

insure ourselves in these areas is the danger of overt Sino-Soviet military aggression.

The hard facts do not support this assumption.

Vietnam, Korea, and Taiwan, to be sure face the clear danger of invasion from Communist China or its satellites. Turkey, Greece, and Yugoslavia remain essential to the NATO defense line. All these nations will continue to need military assistance.

But the primary problems facing most countries of Africa, Southeast Asia, the Middle East, and the Far East are not military problems.

Their problems are mainly concerned with the laying of the foundations for orderly political government. They are problems of national development in the broadest sense of the word.

In my opinion, our emphasis on military spending in such areas represents in large degree a waste of public funds. In some cases it feeds the disruptive internal forces which represent the principal threat to national security.

It compounds local tensions between nations otherwise friendly to ourselves.

It diverts governments faced with pressing problems of internal economic development into a strident military escapism.

I believe that military aid should be separated from development aid.

Furthermore, I believe that Congress and the public should be given a more realistic picture of what our aid program has accomplished and what it has failed to accomplish.

Time is running out

However, the weaknesses of some of our country-by-country programs are not my primary subject tonight.

What concerns me most is our continuing failure to understand, much less to cope with, the revolution of rising expectations which is now sweeping the non-Western World.

Many societies which have been slumbering for centuries are being jolted out of their traditional ways and are energetically seeking to escape from the shackles of the past.

People that have always accepted their poverty and hunger as unavoidable are now convinced that they can have a better life and have it soon.

They have observed that with industrialization come wealth, power, prestige, and security. So they also want to see their countries industrialized—soon.

As we have seen, the crucial question which ought to draw together the less developed countries, Europe, and the United States is whether this economic and national development will take place under totalitarianism or under governments based on the consent of the people.

The inauguration of foreign aid programs by the Sino-Soviet bloc in 1954 is tangible proof that they recognize what is at stake. The question is, do we recognize what is at stake?

Communist extremists persuasively promise the underdeveloped nations a quick ride up the escalator to economic development. Just look, they say, at what is happening in China.

Soviet aid in Asia, Africa, and Latin America is already pushing the $2 billion mark. It may be expected to double and then to triple in the next 5 years.

Unless the non-Communist governments of the less developed countries are able to meet the demands for agricultural and industrial development by the methods of freedom and consensus, they will almost certainly be replaced by governments which are prepared to follow China's example.

Economic progress not enough

I have said that economic development is by no means the complete answer to the problems facing the less developed countries today. If there is to be orderly political growth, economic development must be accompanied by educational, social, and political changes which give people an exciting new sense of participation and of increasing justice.

If these factors are missing, economic development may actually increase the disruptive tensions within the country by opening up expectations that cannot be met. It will almost certainly increase the explosive gap between rich and poor.

The problem of the less developed countries is to build themselves into viable nations. This is a tall order at any time. It is made doubly difficult today because these new lands are caught in the strong conflicting currents of world politics.

What are the essential requirements for a viable nation?

Most important of all, its people must develop a personal stake in the survival of the national government. They must come to believe that the state can help protect and promote their interests, and that they will receive justice at its hands.

Colonial government was primarily organized to serve the interests of a foreign ruler. The people had no stake in its survival.

That was especially so because colonial peoples had little or no sense of participation in the process of government. In their minds the government was they and not we.

When freedom comes, the exciting days of marching, singing crowds and of single-minded opposition to the colonial aggressor quickly fade into history. New governments are faced with the sobering and infinitely greater task of rallying their people in support of constructive programs that will kindle in their countries the desire to grow and endure as free nations.

What is the proper role for the United States in this difficult process?

We must understand the many-sided nature of the problem. Then we must tailor our economic efforts clearly to meet the broad category of problems that are encountered on the way to nationhood.

These needs include raising the level of literacy. An educated people can more easily be persuaded to support a responsible government while doors are opened to enrichment of individual lives.

They include land reform measures so that a higher percentage of the land will be efficiently used for food production and more individual farmers may have the satisfaction of owning their own property.

They include the development of a free, responsible labor movement.

They include programs of community development projects in the rural areas to help increase food products, control disease, build roads and schools, and create small village industries.

They include transmitting insights into modern public administration so that the new governments will be able to operate effectively with due respect for public freedom.

If our efforts are to succeed, we must recognize that Secretary Marshall was wholly right when he said that in working toward these objectives the initiative must come from the people and governments of the countries we are seeking to help.

Although we cannot force these developments, we can stand ready to help intelligently and seriously when our help is requested.

III. DIFFERENT PROGRAMS FOR DIFFERENT COUNTRIES

All too often we tend to think of all the less developed countries as one vast frustrating blur. This obscures the vital differences in importance, needs, and capacity for growth.

It has caused us to set up standards for providing aid and then to attempt to apply them, willy-nilly, to all situations and nations.

Our own specially created democratic process is not necessarily or automatically the best model for an Asian or African country that lacks our historical background. The essence of democracy underscores the need for each people to create its own pattern of social, economic, and political life within the guidelines of its own heritage.

There will be much borrowing of ideas and forms from foreign countries to be sure. But let us have the humility to understand that the guiding institutions of the American way of life are very special ones and that our methods cannot be transported in full to other unique people.

Among the less developed nations themselves, these differences go far beyond physical and social forms. Almost all of the less developed countries stand in need of economic development before they can be viable, modern nations. But it is foolish to expect them to be equally able to absorb United States development help.

Why is it that a dam can be built and operated with great success in one country, while in another country a similar dam is a miserable failure?

Why is it that modern equipment can make a vital contribution to increasing agricultural and small industrial productivity in some countries while similar machinery, sent to other countries, lies rusting on the docks?

In most cases it reflects basic differences between the countries and the governments in question—differences which our program planners and our legislators have lamentably failed to take into account.

The underdeveloped countries fall into many categories. The most favorable opportunities for American assistance exist in those countries which are not only determined to build the economic and social foundations of viable, new, independent nations, but which also have the built-in capacity to implement their plans.

In such countries, which unhappily are altogether too few, we should be prepared to make bold, long-term investments of our capital and our skills.

At the other extreme are those nations which because of lack of farsighted leadership or of administrative ability, or both, are clearly incapable at this stage of meeting the minimum practical requirements of meaningful economic development.

Long-term loans or grants for the general economic development of such countries are foolhardy. Efforts to force the pace beyond their capacity to use the funds effectively will almost certainly fail, and failure will lead to frustration on our part and bitterness on theirs.

Between these extremes there are many variations. Although a particular country may not be ready for a long-term investment commitment, it may nevertheless be making an honest effort. This and the local political situation may combine to warrant a program of modest encouragement with the assurance of more substantial help as the administrative performance improves.

India is clearly the outstanding example of a country in the first category, where maximum aid can be used for maximum benefit. Moreover, India also serves to illustrate the standards by which I believe we should measure the capacity of each country to use our long-term economic development assistance.

Five standards for judgment

1. The most important standard is the standard of self-sacrifice. To become eligible for substantial long-term assistance, a nation should demonstrate as India has demonstrated, that it is making a substantial effort to finance its own national development.

Evidence of this willingness for self-sacrifice includes a reasonably effective program of national taxation, controls over the importation of luxuries and nonessentials,

and a determined and continuing effort to provide the maximum number of peasant families with their own land.

2. A country's political importance also must be taken into account. This may be measured by its population, the size of its territory, and its location. India again is the best illustration.

With her 400 million people, her strategic geographical location and her democratic institutions India is not just another underdeveloped country. It is a continent comparable in size, population, and potential influence to Europe.

Moreover, India alone rivals China in Asia. Although each is rushing forward to develop its resources, each is following a totally different path: India has chosen to follow the path of maximum freedom; China, the path of totalitarianism.

If the Indian democratic experiment fails, most Asians will be convinced that, like it or not, the Communist approach to economic development must be accepted as the only effective way.

3. To qualify for major investment assistance, an underdeveloped nation should have put together a practical, comprehensive plan of objectives and itemized the allocation of resources necessary.

Only in this way can the important tasks be given priority, the development program related to private and public income, and the need for international help judged more accurately.

If there is already a significant private business sector, it should be considered side by side in such a plan with Government-sponsored agricultural, power, and transportation projects in formulating a national development scheme.

India is now in the midst of her second 5 year development plan. It includes both private and Government investment, and private investment is successfully carrying the major share of the load.

4. A qualifying country should have a substantial number of able civil servants. Without good technicians, honest tax collectors, and experienced administrators, large amounts of investment capital cannot be used to economic advantage.

One of the great residual advantages of British rule in India is the excellence of today's Indian civil service. We ought not to treat it as a wasting asset.

5. In order to qualify for long-term investment assistance, a country should have a relatively stable government with popular roots. As the largest democracy on earth, India obviously qualifies to a special degree. We should not, however, stretch this point to bar long-term assistance to all nondemocratic governments.

As I have suggested above, we cannot reasonably expect all underdeveloped nations to develop in a democratic image to the degree that India is now striving to do. The decisive point is the responsiveness of each government to the public interest.

Rightwing dictators whose power is based on feudal landlords are extremely bad risks. By foregoing the support of both the middle-class center and the non-Communist left, they open the door wide for the revolutionary extremists. And when they fall, our prestige and influence may tumble down with them.

On the other hand, Ataturk in Turkey demonstrated that an authoritarian government that is to the left of center can put through effective reforms and thereby hold the support and participation of its people.

Encouragement to others

Measured against these five standards I have listed, India qualifies to a special degree for American economic aid. So do several other nations. On this basis they should be assured of our intensive long-term investment support for their economic development programs.

As other countries approach these criteria, they should receive more aid because more aid can then be put to effective use.

But countries which are clearly unable to meet minimum standards should tactfully be told that they cannot expect investment assistance from us until they have created their own internal basis for development.

This does not mean that we should turn our backs on them.

We can recommend to them the creation of a comprehensive economic development plan.

Directly and through United Nations agencies, we can help provide tax experts, survey engineering teams, and other technicians to help them to create a workable administrative base.

We can urge them to inaugurate land reforms and suggest expert advisers with experience in introducing these critically essential programs previously in other countries.

We can also help them to finance individual projects which are worth while in their own right, that are not dependent on the economy of the country as a whole, and that are clearly in the people's interest.

A new modern hospital in the national capital is a good example of such a project, or an expanded and improved university or agricultural experiment college.

I must, however, stress that no set of criteria can solve all the problems of allocating American economic assistance.

Occasionally some economic aid will be needed for straight political support purposes or to backstop military aid, or as an expedient rental fee for the use of a military base.

But let us separate such aid in our thinking and in our programing from our major effort of constructive development assistance.

Let us recognize it for what it is: an expedient and, we hope, temporary, byproduct of the cold war.

This approach will enable us to avoid much of the waste that comes from trying to promote a broad-scale development program in a country that is not ready for it, and that is unwilling or unable to make a genuine and reasonably effective effort to help itself.

Some will suggest that the standards which I have proposed may be construed and resented by many friendly, unprepared nations as political interference.

Some resistance is inevitable. But I do not believe that it will be of serious proportions. Tactful American negotiators, supported by a firm congressional mandate, could convince most governments that these criteria are essential in their own long-range interest as well as in ours.

Indeed, I believe that many of these governments will actually welcome such standards as a lever with which to persuade reactionary elements within their own countries to cease blocking constructive reforms.

IV. MONEY, METHODS, AND PEOPLE

Let me conclude with some general suggestions on our economic development assistance which I believe are pertinent to the overall effectiveness of this effort.

To whatever extent it is politically practical, we should channel many of our economic programs through international agencies.

International agencies

Most of the underdeveloped countries are deeply concerned about being politically whipsawed between the Communist and Western blocs. Although they are in desperate need of economic assistance, they are not unmindful of the political implications of our relatively new interest in their well-being.

By all odds, the brightest spot so far in the economic development effort has been the World Bank. This institution has achieved a unique position in the underdeveloped continents. Its operations are widely applauded as hardheaded, practical, honest, and nonpolitical.

The unique role of the World Bank has been made possible by a happy combination of circumstances. These include the remarkably able leadership of Eugene Black and his associates, the bank's ability to raise capital funds from the world money markets, and the fact that its administration is not bound to any government or legislature.

The World Bank should be closely consulted on development projects throughout the underdeveloped world. In many cases, as in India, it can effectively coordinate aid programs from different nations and sources.

The specialized agencies of the United Nations have also made a major contribution to economic and social growth in many areas. In some of these agencies, however, there has been a tendency toward bureaucratic overorganization, which will continue to challenge the able administrators who run them.

The United Nations Special Fund headed by Paul Hoffman is a heartening new development. It should be given the money and facilities necessary to enable it to handle its highly important responsibilities.

I hope that it will soon broaden those responsibilities to include not only studies and surveys of specific areas, such as river valleys, but assignments in the field of overall national economic planning.

In addition, I would like to see an increasing proportion of our technical assistance programs handled through the United Nations Expanded Program of Technical Assistance.

Here, as elsewhere, United Nations aid is usually more readily acceptable to the underdeveloped countries. This is particularly so when a strong Communist opposition is in a position to make political capital out of the government's technicians from the United States.

Moreover, United Nations administrators are often in a better position than we Americans are to press recipient governments toward the changes in their tax, trading, or planning policies that are important to the success of their development programs.

A United Nations civil service in the field of technical and development assistance would help to attract and hold able men by providing steady employment and pensions on retirement. Special technical education scholarships in our country and in others might encourage young people to make world development their lifetime careers.

Food for peace

We should also consider the value of an international mechanism for the maximum use of our agricultural abundance.

Imaginative new legislation in the United States has recently made it possible to translate much of our excess agricultural products to constructive use abroad in return for local currencies. The result has been major savings on the part of Yugoslavia, India, and other countries for food that would otherwise have had to be purchased for hard currency.

I hope that we will consider some way of developing a formal world organization to handle such transactions. Perhaps the time has come to take seriously the various proposals which have been made for a world food bank, to serve as a device for the international exchange, sale, or other utilization of our agricultural abundance and that of other countries.

The Development Loan Fund

The World Bank and the U.S. Export-Import Bank (which finances purchases made exclusively in America) provide so-called hard loans to many underdeveloped countries. These loans must be repaid in dollars, pounds sterling, or other easily negotiable currency.

However, such loans cannot possibly meet the minimum capital needs of the developing countries.

Therefore, we must provide an additional source of loan funds which may be repaid with local currencies, such as rupees, which are less easily transferable.

There are two essential requirements for such a program: The amounts available must be substantial and the loan fund must be set up to permit the long-term commitments necessary for long-term development planning.

I have always believed that the ideal solution would be for the more prosperous Western nations to set up such a loan fund on an international basis with a management relationship to the World Bank. This would eliminate the basis for any charge of manipulation by America for political purposes.

However, as a practical matter, I do not believe that we are politically prepared to take this step. Therefore, I propose that we substantially expand our United States Development Loan Fund with assurances for operating capital for at least 5 years.

May I say again this long-term commitment is absolutely essential for effective long-range planning. No private corporation could operate efficiently on an uncertain year-to-year basis. Nor can the harried new governments of the underdeveloped nations.

The Development Loan Fund was formed in 1957. It makes loan capital available for presumably sound economic development projects in the less developed countries which for one reason or another do not qualify for loans from private or other Government sources.

Loans from the Development Loan Fund have an important distinction from conventional loans: they are repayable either in local foreign currency or in dollars and at much lower interest rates than are available elsewhere.

Already the Fund has committed its $700 million of initial funds granted by Congress. Well over $1 billion in acceptable requests are awaiting further funds.

Well administered and adequately capitalized on a long-term basis, the Development Loan Fund can become a key instrument in our international cooperation programs for national development.

The role of private capital

For more than a hundred years Great Britain played a dominant role in promoting world peace and encouraging world development.

During the long Pax Britanica, the British probably invested 10 percent of their gross national product overseas each year, plus a major fraction of their ablest men and women.

If our capital investment abroad today were on a comparable scale, we would now be investing $50 billion annually beyond our borders:

We are living, however, in a world that is economically and politically very different. For instance, the absence of any income or corporation tax in 19th century Britain meant that substantially greater private savings were then available.

Even more important is the fact that most of the areas into which British investments were directed were under tight colonial control which largely eliminated the political risks.

Because of uncertain political conditions, American industry is today reluctant to invest in the very parts of the world where its capital is most needed. Therefore, we must develop new administrative and economic techniques to help increase the flow of private capital and qualified industrial experts to the less developed countries.

This year Congress will be asked to omit income taxes on nonrepatriated foreign earnings of U.S. companies to the extent that they have been excused by the foreign government involved and to the extent reinvested abroad.

At present the U.S. Treasury insists on collecting taxes on profits earned abroad, even when they have been excused by the foreign government in an effort to lure private investment to their countries.

If the proposed change is accepted, it should provide greatly increased incentive for private capital to flow to the less developed countries.

Recently our Government has been able to negotiate agreements with some of the less developed countries guaranteeing that private foreign investment earnings can be transferred home. Other plans also have been devised to increase the security of private capital invested abroad.

Yet, so far, we have merely scratched the surface in our search for ways to bring private American investment capital and American industrial managers to bear on the problems of world development.

Regional development groupings

Another promising device to improve the effectiveness of economic development assistance programs is the formation of regional coordinating organizations.

In addition to encouraging the freer flow of goods and capital within the region, these authorities can help to coordinate the efforts of the World Bank, Export-Import Bank, Development Loan Fund, and the various United Nations agencies.

This should be particularly useful in Central and Latin America, where there is a high level of regional understanding and a long record of cooperation through the Organization of American States. The administration has recently announced its support of a Latin American bank.

The level of cooperation which is possible in the Americas is not possible everywhere. Nevertheless, there is an encouraging trend in the direction of regional cooperation in east, south, and west Asia.

The urgent need for able people

Finally one of the tragedies of recent years has been the flight of competent men from the Government service, and the reluctance of others to take their places. I do not mean to reflect on the capacity of many of those who remain. I am simply saying that many more able and dedicated men are needed.

What has gone wrong?

During the war America's best minds and skills were effectively mobilized to do what was required of us.

The creative, dynamic period of the Marshall plan again brought hundreds of outstanding administrators and technicians to Washington to work long hours under heavy pressure and for limited salaries.

Yet recently, when the President was asked at his press conference to comment on the turnover in ICA (foreign aid) administrators, he replied:

"That's one that after a while everybody gets worn down about * * *. They have a very hostile type of atmosphere in which to do their testifying and to seek their appropriations.

"It is a very worrisome job that they have and I can't blame them much, although I hate to lose Mr. Smith (the most recently departed Administrator), and I don't know who I am going to get to take his place."

What is missing here in Washington is a sense of purpose.

There is nothing wrong with the American people. They are patiently waiting to be told the score.

When our Government explains to them what we must do to seize and maintain the initiative in behalf of freedom, they will respond.

When this occurs, our country will again come alive, and able men will be clamoring to play their part.

COMMUNICATION ACTIVITIES AT THE IX PLENARY ASSEMBLY OF THE INTERNATIONAL RADIO CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 74, Senate Joint Resolution 47.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A joint resolution (S.J. Res. 47) providing that certain communication activities at the Ninth Plenary Assembly of the International Radio Consultative Committee to be held in the United States in 1959 shall not be construed to be prohibited by the Communications Act of 1934 or any other law.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate adjourn until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow. Prior to the taking of action on the motion, I should like to remind the Senate again of the unveiling of the portraits of the five great Senators at 12:30 p.m. tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 7 o'clock and 51 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, March 12, 1959, at 12 o'clock meridian.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate March 11 (legislative day of March 9), 1959:

FEDERAL AVIATION AGENCY

Elwood R. Quesada, of California, to be Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency.

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

Rollin D. Barnard, of Colorado, to be an Assistant Postmaster General.

UNITED NATIONS

Henry J. Heinz II, of Pennsylvania, to be the representative of the United States of America to the 14th session of the Economic Commission for Europe of the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations.

INTERNATIONAL BANK FOR RECONSTRUCTION AND DEVELOPMENT

T. Graydon Upton, of Pennsylvania, to be U.S. Executive Director of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development for a term of 2 years.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Elmer F. Bennett, of Colorado, to be Under Secretary of the Interior.

George W. Abbott, of Nebraska, to be Solicitor for the Department of the Interior.

HAWAII

Edward Elliott Johnston, of Hawaii, to be Secretary of the Territory of Hawaii for a term of 4 years.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, MARCH 11, 1959

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. Charles W. Holland, Jr., pastor, Fountain Memorial Baptist Church, Washington, D.C., offered the following prayer:

Jesus sanctioned the words of the lawyer found in Luke 10: 27: *Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy strength, and with all thy mind; and thy neighbor as thyself.*

Great and gracious God, our Father, may our love for Thee be eternal, plenary, and complete. Strengthen this love from day to day as we study Thy word and realize more completely Thy great sacrifice.

Dear God, may this great body always experience a deep and abiding love for fellow man.

May the love that exists between us and our South and Central American neighbors continue to grow and be magnified.

We make these petitions in the name of our Holy Father, God. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. McGown, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 1096. An act to authorize appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for salaries and expenses, research and development, construction and equipment, and for other purposes.

RECESS

The SPEAKER. The House will stand in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 2 minutes p.m.) the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

JOINT MEETING OF THE TWO HOUSES OF CONGRESS TO HEAR AN ADDRESS BY HIS EXCELLENCY LT. COL. JOSE MARIA LEMUS, PRESIDENT OF THE REPUBLIC OF EL SALVADOR

The SPEAKER of the House of Representatives presided.

At 12 o'clock and 22 minutes p.m. the Doorkeeper announced the Vice President and Members of the U.S. Senate, who entered the Hall of the House of Representatives, the Vice President taking the chair at the right of the Speaker, and the Members of the Senate the seats reserved for them.

The SPEAKER. On the part of the House the Chair appoints as members of the committee to escort His Excellency the President of the Republic of El Salvador, into the Chamber, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK], the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK], the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MORGAN], and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CHIPERFIELD].

The VICE PRESIDENT. On the part of the Senate the Chair appoints as members of the committee of escort the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY].

The Doorkeeper announced the following guests, who entered the Hall of the House of Representatives and took the seats reserved for them:

The Ambassadors, Ministers, and Chargés d'Affaires of foreign governments.

The Chief Justice and Associate Justices of the U.S. Supreme Court.

The members of the President's Cabinet.

At 12 o'clock and 30 minutes p.m. the Doorkeeper announced His Excellency the President of the Republic of El Salvador.

His Excellency the President of the Republic of El Salvador, escorted by the committee of Senators and Representatives, entered the Hall of the House of Representatives and stood at the Clerk's desk. [Applause, the Members rising.]

The SPEAKER. Members of the Congress, I have the great pleasure, and I deem it a high privilege, to be able to introduce to you the President of a neighbor and a friendly country. The United States of North America does not want to be a big brother, nor does it want big brothers or little brothers; it wants to be a good friend of all good people. [Applause.]

I have the honor to present to you the President of the Republic of El Salvador.

ADDRESS OF HIS EXCELLENCY LT. COL. JOSE MARIA LEMUS, PRESIDENT OF THE REPUBLIC OF EL SALVADOR

President LEMUS. Honorable Speaker of the House of Representatives, honorable President of the Senate, honorable Members of the Federal Congress, honorable members of the Cabinet, honorable Justices of the Supreme Court, their excellencies the members of the Diplomatic Corps, ladies and gentlemen, it is a great honor for me to be with you, at the invitation of the Federal Congress of the United States. I deeply appreciate the cordial welcome I have received, and the noble expressions of friendship for El Salvador. In behalf of my country, I, in turn, wish to convey the warmest of greetings to the distinguished representatives of the American people, who are gathered here today in this venerable Hall of Congress.

I also wish to take advantage of this opportunity in order to emphasize the profound admiration of El Salvador for the institutional system of the United States, particularly for the solid structure of its congressional establishment, and its adherence to the ideals of democratic government. [Applause.]

Every day it becomes easier to perceive the boring from within, and the threat from without, that seek to implant a way of life which is foreign to our two American Continents. It would be the height of simple-mindedness to think that in any determined region communism does not exist because it has not shown itself to possess a numerical superiority, or because it does not participate in the deliberations of the democratic system. Its task there is surreptitious and crafty, but efficacious in its capacity to stir up subversion. It is thoroughly acquainted with all techniques, including the coup d'etat, the riot, and sabotage. It even possesses aptitudes for gaining control of the collective conscience of the people.

Acting in accordance with the idea of Lenin, that the mass is an instrument but not a decisive force, and that political power can be captured most easily by the action of audacious and determined minorities, the truth is that it operates with efficient strategy and tactics. Its few men, whether visible or invisible, gain influence over public opinion. They push into the educational structure, and penetrate labor unions and enterprises that disseminate the spoken and written word. They infiltrate into political parties, and scatter themselves everywhere and among all elements of the population, to carry on an effective task of undermining and weakening democracy.

It would be well to recognize that communism has some valuable allies in this work. They are social injustice, disorder and political errors, the impoverishment of nations, and the wretchedness of great groups of human beings whom a weakened economy is not able to protect fully, nor offer them comforting prospects.

In this regard, Dr. Milton S. Eisenhower summed up the existing state of affairs in our countries very recently, when he affirmed:

Poverty and dependence on one sole product of exportation, with the consequent marked fluctuations in their revenues, characterize the economy of the countries of this vast area.

At this point, I am approaching the consideration of a situation which it is very important to clear up. It is frequently said, and this prejudice is found even among some respectable elements of U.S. public opinion, that we Latin Americans, when we allude to our economic and political situation and the problems which grow out of it, always seek to place an artificial emphasis on the facts, with the purpose of making the importance of our countries appear greater in the realm of global strategy. These persons claim that we thus seek to obtain, not the reasonable moral and economic support which a powerful ally would be under obligation to provide, but concessions which approach a condition of privilege, rather than one of justice.

Then it is said almost outright, that we employ tactics of intimidation. But this judgment does not correspond to the truth.

The real fact is that our conduct in this regard is without either fantasy or exaggerated fear. Our actions are those

of people who recognize the value of all honest alliances, and therefore do not hesitate to speak the whole truth to their ally.

What we say, with all frankness, is that the United States must need aid itself and strengthen its own national security, and in a certain sense its economy, by offering respectful aid to its natural Latin American allies in solving their grave problems of an economic and social nature.

It is sometimes thought of us, and this is true even among respectable elements in the United States, that we Latin Americans play the role of a mendicant who comes to the pantry of the rich relative.

On our part, the recriminations against the United States are even more abundant, and at times picturesque. The Americans are accused of being responsible for our poverty, our backwardness, our total confusion when we find ourselves face to face with certain problems. They are even accused of being responsible for the spectacle of tyranny and political disorder, which in reality is typically of our own making.

In the latter regard, which is perhaps one of the most delicate ones, the United States has been led to a situation almost approximating one of conflict, and this fact has an unfavorable repercussion on the good progress of relations.

On the other hand, one must note as a definite tendency, opposed to the fomenting of friendship and the tightening of relations, the action of certain groups which desire to create a gulf between the peoples of the United States and Latin America. Such groups are, perhaps, those who cause the greatest trouble in inter-American relations. They even go so far as to make believe that any unselfish act of cooperation by the United States is a manifestation of imperialism.

Those who look on inter-American relations with this type of mentality see the United States as imperialistic at all moments, and many of the rulers of Latin American countries as embezzlers, and as rapacious and dishonest men. They hold to this point of view despite legitimate proofs of correct administration and strict probity in governmental affairs.

With such an unsettled atmosphere, in the midst of charges of imperialism, rapacity and delivering of one's country to a foreign power, the progress which different and varied forms of cooperation might bring to our peoples is held up. Meanwhile, totalitarian demagoguery takes advantage of the bad conditions and lack of conformity which exist in our countries, and uses them for its campaigns aimed at discrediting democracy and inter-American solidarity.

My greatest hope is that this good will trip which I have made to the United States of America at the invitation of His Excellency, President and Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower, may contribute toward shedding some light on the problems of inter-American relations, and toward consolidating the friendship and mutual liking between this Nation and El Salvador. [Applause.]

I have left for the end the matter of referring to my country, where one may see an example of what, on a greater or lesser scale, is happening or may happen in the underdeveloped countries of our hemisphere, which by reason of the nature of their economy have had to suffer the impact of the decline and lack of stability of the prices of the products and raw materials which they export.

Due to those circumstances, these peoples have seen themselves suddenly paralyzed in their march toward progress and in their economic and social development. They shall have to suffer the consequences of total economic dislocation if an effective cooperation does not give new life to their economies, and the organizations which devote themselves to such activities fail to aid them in putting a halt to the violent impoverishment into which they are falling.

In spite of this, the programs of my government have been carried out, up to the present day, with full precision.

The reduction in the prices of our two chief products, coffee and cotton, and the instability of those prices which grows greater every way, are directly responsible for this situation. In this connection, I should like to quote a paragraph from the report of Dr. Eisenhower, which was presented to the President of the United States:

> At present there is an overproduction of coffee. Production has been increased at a more rapid rate than consumption. Production is growing at the rate of more than 5 percent a year, while consumption is increasing by only 2 or 3 percent. For that reason, the prices of coffee, regarded even now by Latin America as too low, are threatened in the future. In one of these countries, 1 percent in the reduction of the price of coffee causes a loss of $8 million in the revenue from its exports. This is catastrophic for a country which has contracted for loans, and also has a very low national revenue.

The severe situation now in effect, however, has not halted our march toward progress. During the last 2 years, projects clearly benefiting the populace have been carried out.

I wish to emphasize the fact that we also have met our economic obligations. The public debt has been amortized entirely according to schedule, and in a manner which gives us the right to say that we display a high sense of responsibility in maintaining our foreign and domestic credit standing. [Applause.]

But if up to this moment, the decline has not succeeded in producing a major dislocation of our economy, it is not to be doubted that it exerts pressure on the list of projects, which my government has drawn up, following a detailed study of the most urgent needs of the Salvadoran people, so as to satisfy those needs in due form.

Together with the other producing nations, El Salvador has cooperated in the search for adequate solutions to stabilize the prices of coffee, even though temporarily. At the opportune time, I took the liberty of suggesting a four-point plan, which attracted international support, and also consideration by the Organization of American States. Some hope is still held for the adoption of the measures proposed. Under that plan, amplified and complemented by other measures, it would be possible to draft our program of action for the defense of prices of the crop for the 1959–60 season. Perhaps our faith and the continuous efforts of the experts of all the countries interested in the future of coffee may halt the sharp descent for the time being.

The public state of mind is fundamental in this emergency, during which we must save not only our economy but also our morale and our principles, since we could not employ certain measures of action or of force without falling into the category of economic dictatorship, nor curtail our regime of liberty by imposing controls or carrying the State toward an undue interference in private business. Neither do we desire to manipulate our sound currency, which has been stable for many years past, nor have recourse to any of the artificial forms of economic adjustment. [Applause.]

The correct solutions, therefore, are few in number. Barely perceptible on the horizon is a long-term solution: the economic unification of the five counties of Central America. Some steps have been taken in this direction, which may ultimately prove to be of a decisive nature, such as the signing and ratification of a Multilateral Treaty of Free Commerce, and another for the Regulation of Industries of Unification. These documents are aimed at establishing a common market of 10 million persons, and carrying out a plan of effective industrial expansion. This would permit the entire region to amplify its commerce, both domestic and foreign, diversify its production, establish solid industries, and abolish the practice of placing chief reliance on only one crop. [Applause.]

The creation of a regional economic unit which naturally excludes all intransigent nationalism would contribute to the strengthening of the economy of our countries, whose situation is described indirectly but eloquently in the report of Dr. Eisenhower from which I quote:

> If each State of the United States were an independent nation, each one with its own tariff laws and other barriers, the population of this country would presently have a very low standard of living. But we have a vast common market available for ourselves at any moment, which permits each industry to attain a greater efficiency of production and to sell, without restriction, some great quantities of its production to a population of 176 million people. Over a long period of years, our growth has enabled us efficiently to improve the quality of the products and to offer low prices (in terms of a stable dollar), in such a way that the essential articles, and also the luxury items, shall be available for the majority of citizens of the United States.

[Applause.]

If the unity of Central America had not been dissolved during the days that followed the winning of independence, most surely the picture in our own area would be different now. But it has not been until the present times, under the

pressure of urgent economic problems, that our region is seeking to return to the path of its historic destiny; and thus it is that, with the aid of the United Nations Economic Commission for Latin America, and other international organisms, such as the Organization of Central American States, which has its headquarters in San Salvador, a really determined effort is getting under way to achieve economic unification.

Thanks to the spirit of foresight of our legislators, El Salvador is a country with its doors completely open to capital of good will, which desires to locate there in productive projects, whatever their size may be.

The risks which ordinarily drive away the foreign investor, such as expropriation, nationalization or confiscation, do not exist in our system. The tax setup is just, and there are no foreign exchange controls nor restrictions of any kind whatsoever as regards the distribution and exportation of profits. [Applause.]

For the technical resources which facilitate industrialization, we have a plentiful supply of capable labor, and an atmosphere of political stability which guarantees investments. Social benefits have been provided in a spirit of justice, which works for harmony among the different interests involved. The policy of my government is to give reasonable attention to the claims of the working classes, which naturally aspire to enjoyment of better living conditions. It wants them to attain those conditions through means based on order and legality, but without asphyxiating the enterprises which employ them, nor leading to violence for the nation. We have issued frequent calls for the humanization of wealth, for a change, which in great part we have effected, in the mentality of the capitalists as regards their labor relations, in order to guarantee that conflicts may be as infrequent as possible. American enterprises and services already established in El Salvador may well testify to the good conditions prevailing.

The other thing that might hinder an intense current of investments toward our country does not depend on ourselves. There are problems such as that of double taxation and others, which have been dealt with at various international conferences. Outstanding business leaders have expressed their opinion with regard to them, and have suggested the measures desirable.

I sincerely believe that any group that may be interested in exploring new fields of investment will be highly rewarded by its success in El Salvador.

In the foregoing outline, honorable Members of Congress, I have wished to show you a situation which, although it refers specifically to my own country, seems to be a picture common to a great majority of the Latin American Republics.

I should have felt my mission, and the purpose of my trip to the United States, to be without completion, and my presence here to be in vain, had I not sought to refer to these circumstances, animated by a sincere spirit of Pan American solidarity. In them are interwoven values of a human, ethical, political, and strategic nature, to point out the necessity for a new attitude of decided attention toward Latin America, on the part of the United States. [Applause.]

Without a doubt, it is impossible to view with indifference the situation of peoples that are ambitious, enthusiastic and aggressive in their quest for happiness, and that, in spite of the fact they are fighting with all the material and moral resources at their command to overcome their conditions of underdevelopment and low living standards, have been forced in recent years to face the obscure possibility of seeing cut short the programs of development which are vital for them.

The paralyzation of economic progress, naturally, has had undesirable repercussions in both the social and political fields. This fact serves to emphasize, consequently, the need for a more effective cooperation of all the inter-American system which, in accordance with the aspirations shown of late by our countries, should extend outside the juridical and moral spheres, and reach to the economic sphere, in a search for solutions common to a situation of dislocation which exists all over Latin America.

Certainly, within the American democratic form of government, it would be impossible to oblige private capital to take part in financial investments in Latin American countries, above all if the attractions offered by those countries were small and the guarantees of limited scope.

However, it cannot be denied that a careful and undivided reexamination of so complex a situation might smooth away many of the difficulties, taking into consideration the fact that present credit resources are difficult of access, and delayed and limited in their action; and that the countries which find themselves in a critical situation need new systems under which the loans may benefit not only certain areas, but the whole of the economic structure, in order to produce a result which is indispensable for giving new life to that structure. The formulas may come out of the joint study, if there is an earnest desire to consider everything that economic maladjustment, which will continue to accentuate itself in the days to come, may mean for the defense and security of the hemisphere.

I believe that this is not an hour for recriminations, the placing of blame on others, nor refutations, but rather a time when good will may ensure the triumphs of a system whose dislocation might set the world in a very difficult situation.

My trip to the United States constitutes an act of fraternity, aimed at reinforcing our traditional friendship and mutual understanding. [Applause.]

I did not come to promise, nor to negotiate anything in particular for my country. But I shall feel myself deeply flattered, if any one of the ideas expressed in this Hall of Congress, where on so many occasions the destiny of this Nation and of the world have been decided, should at any time come to exert an influence on the course of our relations, and for the necessary strengthening of the inter-American system. [Applause.]

In the presence of the worthy representatives of this Nation, I wish to reiterate my greeting to the people of the United States, my own personal gratitude, and the gratitude of my country, for the honors and distinctions which I have received during my stay on United States soil. Among those honors, this memorable opportunity to be received by the Federal Congress holds an especially esteemed place. [Applause, the Members rising.]

At 1 o'clock and 18 minutes p.m., His Excellency the President of El Salvador, accompanied by the committee of escort, retired from the Chamber.

The Doorkeeper escorted the invited guests from the Chamber in the following order:

The members of the President's Cabinet.

The Chief Justice and the Associate Justices of the Supreme Court.

The Ambassadors, Ministers, and Chargés d'Affaires of foreign governments.

JOINT MEETING DISSOLVED

The SPEAKER. The purposes of the joint meeting having been completed, the Chair declares the joint meeting of the two Houses now dissolved.

Thereupon (at 1 o'clock and 21 minutes p.m.) the joint meeting of the two Houses was dissolved.

The Members of the Senate retired to their Chamber.

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at 2 o'clock p.m.

ELECTION TO COMMITTEES

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 207) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That WILLIAM J. RANDALL, of Missouri, be, and he is hereby, elected a member of the following standing committees of the House of Representatives: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs; Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PRINTING OF PROCEEDINGS HAD DURING RECESS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the proceedings which took place during the joint meeting be printed in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

PRICE CONTROL ORDER NO. 1

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, the President's proclamation of yesterday regulating the importation of crude oil and its principal products into the United States under the national security clauses of the Trade Agreements Act constitutes, in effect, "Price Control Order No. 1."

While the Executive by this action limits the importation of oil, the Texas Railroad Commission, controlling most of the domestic production of oil in America, is limiting production to 11 or 12 days per month. Thus, by combining restrictions on imports along with restrictions on domestic production, the supply as well as the price of oil and petroleum products is a completely controlled commodity in the United States and the consumer takes it on the chin.

The Eisenhower administration has succumbed to another Texas tribute at the expense of the American people.

Combining the clarion call for national security with special protection for the already pampered and overprotected domestic oil industry is ludicrous. If we desire to protect the national security, it would seem more prudent to discover our oil resources and keep them stored in the ground for future emergencies when shipping routes may be closed. In the meanwhile, it would seem wise for us to consume foreign supplies while they remain easily accessible and out of Soviet dominion. As a matter of fact, the continued use of foreign supplies is in the national interest since the shutdown of American imports would probably force the oil export nations into the Soviet markets with their ultimate dominion by the Soviet bloc as the proximate result.

If the administration is carefully studying the impact of imports on domestic industries essential to the national security, why should oil be necessarily first? Are we to overlook the impact of foreign trade on ceramics, textiles, heavy electric generating equipment, plywood, automobiles, or steel? Why should oil be first in line for protection, or is that to be expected?

KING ALFRED DAFFODILS

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, 15,000 King Alfred daffodils grown in Oregon's Fourth Congressional District, which I have the honor to represent, arrived in my office late yesterday. It is my privilege today to distribute them to you and the other Members of the Congress and to the President on behalf of the Umpqua Daffodil Growers.

These golden centennial samplings of the Oregon springtime are only a very small part of the 5 million grown yearly by the Umpqua Daffodil Growers.

Freshly cut and mailed from Oregon Sunday, the daffodils brillantly illustrate part of the beauty of Oregon during this centennial, or any other year. The Golden West abounds in gold—only a part of it beneath the ground.

A flower long known to the poets—Shakespeare, Wordsworth, Tennyson, and Milton, for example—the daffodil with its stately beauty and glorious yellow hue is a splendid ambassador from my State.

As you know, Mr. Speaker, Oregon is celebrating its 100th birthday this year. Oregon's sons and daughters are finding many ways to tell their friends everywhere about our centennial and the beauties of the State.

On behalf of the Umpqua Daffodil Growers, who are members of the West Coast Daffodil Cutflower Growers' Association, I invite you to come to Oregon. You are most welcome.

LEGISLATION TO ALLEVIATE CONDITIONS IN ECONOMICALLY DEPRESSED AREAS

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, we are all aware of the persistent unemployment in various sections of our country that has caused hardship to many families. At the present time the Committee on Banking and Currency is holding hearings on legislation which, among other things, will establish an effective program to help alleviate conditions in certain economically depressed areas. Communities which have been hit by economic misfortune have made efforts to solve their problems locally, but they are in need of outside economic assistance. The resources of our Government should be made available to them to remedy this serious situation. The economic health of our country is in peril unless jobs are available for every ablebodied worker who is willing to work and provide for his family.

Unemployment in itself is unhealthy, but it leads to the wasting away of physical resources, such as churches, schools, homes, hospitals, and so forth, that have taken years to build. Too often it is necessary for families to move from their community to other areas where employment is available, and the community begins to die.

Our Nation can ill afford the loss of production that would add to our national wealth and strength if jobs were provided for all willing workers. The Federal Government, in cooperation with the States, should assist economically depressed areas and take steps to plan and finance their economic redevelopment. Thus, industries, communities, enterprises, and individuals will be in a position to achieve improvements and increase the domestic prosperity by the creation of new employment opportunities. This could be accomplished by assisting them in providing new employment opportunities and by expanding existing facilities and resources without reducing employment in other areas of the United States.

I hope that legislation which holds out the prospect of employment, new jobs, increased production, expanding business and commerce, healthy community life, utilization and development of our Nation's human resources will receive favorable consideration by the Congress.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON LABOR REFORM

Mr. LANDRUM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Fair Labor Standards and the Subcommittee on Labor and Management, sitting as a joint committee on labor reform, be permitted to sit during general debate this afternoon.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

THE ANSWER TO URBAN RENEWAL

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, the mayor of Dallas, R. L. Thornton, has announced a do-it-yourself revitalization program for west Dallas as a private enterprise local government answer to the city's worst slum problem. The area encompasses 599 acres—houses without plumbing or paved streets. Here is the answer to urban renewal—local initiative, pride, responsibility, and local resources, not Federal aid.

The experiences of many other cities have benefited Dallas citizens in their study of urban renewal. It is my hope that this Dallas answer to slum clearance will help others, in turn. In that spirit I call the attention of my colleagues to Monday's RECORD, March 9, 1959, page 3606, in which is presented the basic urban renewal problems facing us all, and as I see it the answer, culminating in the decision of the city of Dallas.

Let me mention several problems facing exponents and opponents of urban renewal with Federal aid. We all approve urban renewal, the rehabilitation of rundown property. It is the question of Federal aid that brings these dangers to the fore.

First. To those who believe in constitutional government in eminent domain—that private property can be taken for public use for just compensation—let me point out that now private property can be taken through eminent domain for private use.

Second. To Supreme Court critics let me point out that this Supreme Court

has redefined eminent domain so that private property can be taken for spiritual and esthetic reasons as a 15-man Redevelopment Board may decree, or for reasons of well-balanced planning.

Third. To those interested in small business, let me point out that the two-thirds shrinkage value Federal expenditure holds the greatest possibility for windfall profit at John Doe taxpayer's expense that big businessmen have ever been extended.

Fourth. To those who favor constitutional appropriation of public moneys let me point out that urban renewal sets up procedures for direct Federal expenditures bypassing Congress.

Fifth. To those who criticize public housing for whatever reasons, let me point out that public housing is, by definition, part and parcel of the relocation problem, so decreed by the urban renewal administration.

These are some of the dangers and problems facing us in the urban renewal problem, just below the surface, like the lurking danger of the iceberg, and there are other dangers.

It is my hope that my colleagues in good conscience, can find time to scan these brief studies of urban renewal I submit for your consideration.

RESOLUTION IN FAVOR OF STANDING FIRM IN BERLIN

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include a resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, it is heartening to find the American people are solidly back of the President in his determination to hold the line in Berlin.

I include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point the following resolution in support of such a policy passed by the Board of Associated Republican Women in Seattle, Wash., on March 5, 1959, and sent to me by the board president, Mrs. Henry B. Morris:

Whereas the Berlin situation is clearly the most dangerous and explosive issue facing the Nation and the world at the present time; therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Associated Republican Women stand firmly behind President Eisenhower in his determination to hold the line against any move that might weaken the Western position and thereby increase the influence of the Soviet Union.

HAWAII STATEHOOD

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up the resolution (H. Res. 205) providing for the consideration of H.R. 4221, a bill to provide for the admission of the State of Hawaii into the Union, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 4221) to provide for the admission of the State of Hawaii into the Union. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed six hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 205 makes in order the consideration of the bill (H.R. 4221) providing for the admission of the State of Hawaii into the Union, as introduced by Congressman O'BRIEN of New York.

The House and Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committees have held 22 hearings on the subject of statehood for Hawaii since 1935. More than 850 witnesses have been heard in the Territory and in Washington. Seven of the hearings were held in Hawaii. In addition, at least 12 reports have been made.

The question of admitting Hawaii to statehood has been longer considered and more thoroughly studied than any other statehood proposal that has ever come before the Congress.

The area of Hawaii, or the Hawaiian Islands, is comprised of a semitropic archipelago in the north Pacific Ocean and is composed of a series of islands stretching over 1,900 statute miles approximately of the size and length and area of Connecticut and Rhode Island combined. There are 8 main islands which are situated within a distance of 350 miles of each other and they are populated by over 600,000 people. This statehood bill refers to these 8 main islands. The history of Hawaii in connection with the United States is most interesting.

In 1820, New England missionaries introduced the Christian religion to Hawaii. From that time forward the ties of trade and friendship between the United States and Hawaii grew progressively stronger. In 1940 the people of Hawaii adopted their first constitution, modeled along the lines of the United States Constitution. A treaty was drafted at the request of President Pierce in 1854, including in its terms the assumption that the constitutional monarchy would become a State after the example of California and Texas. Although this treaty was never ratified because of the death of the Hawaiian King, the idea of statehood propounded by the President of the United States did not die.

A revolution later established a Republic of Hawaii and annexation was again urged, but the treaty then pending in the U.S. Senate was withdrawn by President Cleveland upon his inauguration. On September 9, 1897, the Senate of the Republic of Hawaii ratified the treaty between Hawaii and the United States which had been signed the previous June. The following year Senate Joint Resolution 55 of the 55th Congress was adopted and approved, annexing to the United States the Hawaiian Islands and their dependencies.

Beginning in 1903 the Territory of Hawaii, through its legislature, has petitioned Congress for statehood on at least 17 different occasions. Since 1920 no fewer than 66 bills have been introduced in successive Congresses providing for statehood.

In June 1947, the House of Representatives passed legislation approving statehood for Hawaii by a vote of 196 to 133. This was the first time either House of our Congress had acted on a Hawaiian statehood measure. Although President Truman indicated that he would sign the bill, the Senate committee decided on further investigation.

In March 1950, the Hawaii statehood bill again passed the House by the overwhelming majority of 262 to 110. The Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs reported the measure out in June 1950 but because of pressing matters of international concern the bill did not reach the Senate floor before adjournment.

Before the 82d Congress was 5 months old, the Senate committee had repeated its endorsement of the Hawaii statehood bill, but again the bill was not brought up for debate.

On March 10, 1953, the House of Representatives for the third time passed and sent to the Senate a Hawaii statehood bill, by a vote of 274 to 138.

On April 1, 1954, the Hawaii-Alaska Enabling Act was passed by the Senate by a vote of 57 to 28.

In the 84th Congress statehood for Hawaii and Alaska was considered jointly in comprehensive hearings. On May 10, 1955, Congressman ENGLE's bill, H.R. 2535, was recommitted by the House to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs by a vote of 218 to 170.

On August 23, 1958, in the closing days of the 85th Congress, the committee, by a vote of 22 to 4 reported H.R. 49, introduced by Delegate BURNS, but the bill was not scheduled for floor debate.

An interesting question now comes up in connection with statehood: What does it amount to? What does it mean to a Territory to become a State? It means the following:

A State has two Senators, and in this instance Hawaii will have one Representative in Congress. They will elect their own State government, Governor, and constitutional officers; they will be able to participate in the choice and the election of the President and Vice President of the United States. Automatically they participate in Federal grants to education, health, highways, and other public improvements. They will be governed by officials of their own choosing, rather than by a Federal administrator. They will have latitude in lawmaking by their own legislature without the discretion of the President and the Congress; and they will be free from the overlapping of Federal and local authority. Judicial functions will be carried

out in their own courts by the local authorities rather than by Federal employees, and they will enjoy the enhancement of prestige and pride of becoming and being an active American able to participate in his government.

During the years that I have been in Congress here I have in the past voted in opposition to Alaska. I voted in opposition to Hawaii. I went along with the arguments of noncontiguity, that I did not believe Alaska should be admitted, and I did not believe Hawaii should be admitted. I wondered about the economy of the area; I wondered about the population, as to whether or not it was fair to us in the case of Alaska with only 150,000 people that they should have 2 Members of the Senate, while New York, with 16 million inhabitants, has only 2 Senators; and in the case of Hawaii why they should have 2 Members in the Senate and 2 Representatives in the House with a population of 600,000, whereas Massachusetts with a population of 5 million has but 2 Senators.

And I wondered about the stories I heard of communism and Communist influence in both Alaska and Hawaii.

In the past I voted in opposition to the admission of Hawaii to statehood and last year I opposed Alaska. I can truthfully say that I have become a convert, but I believe that Hawaii is more deserving throughout the years to be admitted to statehood than is Alaska. We have the problem of land. Ninety-eight percent of the land of Alaska was owned by the people of America. In Hawaii the land is owned by the people who live in Hawaii. The economy of Hawaii is excellent.

During World War II it is interesting to note the distinguished record established by the men of Hawaii. The Chief of Staff referred to it as being written in the American Battle History in Europe and Asia. In World War II, for example, the 100th Infantry Battalion and the 442d Combat Team from Hawaii, composed of so-called Japanese-Americans, formed what has been described by Gen. Mark Clark as the most decorated unit in the entire military history of the United States.

When we have people of that caliber in Hawaii, I have no fear of the Communist problem that may exist over there.

Mr. Speaker, this rule provides 6 hours of general debate and it is an open rule.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield 30 minutes of my time to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN].

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Speaker, all of us, I am sure, realize that the gentleman from Massachusetts has made a very thorough study of the problem in regard to Hawaii. He is familiar with the history and is certainly correct when he says that the people of Hawaii have petitioned the Congress of the United States to become a State in the Union since 1903. He was also correct in saying that the Legislature of Hawaii has petitioned the Congress to become a State 17 times since 1903.

But the fact remains that during those years, over 50 years, there must have been some good reason why past Congresses hesitated and did not permit Hawaii to become a State. So I believe I say in good grace that inasmuch as 25 or 30 previous Congresses have not seen fit to permit Hawaii to become a State, I may state my objections and why I do not believe Hawaii should be permitted to become a State.

Many objections have been brought forth during this half century. Let me say at the start that the life blood of Hawaii is shipping. Many witnesses appeared before the Rules Committee in regard to that point, and no one so far has contradicted them. Even though I asked several to contradict these witnesses to rebuke those accusations, I found that without exception every witness said that Harry Bridges and Jack Hall, men I have never known, control the life blood of Hawaii. It was said by several witnesses that Harry Bridges for certain reasons was ordered to be deported from this country at one time. They say that without question they are the rankest labor leaders and not only control the labor unions of Hawaii but also are very influential perhaps in controlling the cultural activities of the Territory of Hawaii.

So, I say, that is one of the objections. And, I am sure that you all realize the importance of shipping as far as Hawaii is concerned. It is different in the States. Furthermore, we have powerful labor leaders in this country who probably are just as leftist as Mr. Hall or Mr. Bridges, but the fact remains that Hawaii's economy is based principally on shipping, which cannot be comparable to shipping as it affects the various States of the Union, because various other means of transportation are to be had. But, in Hawaii it is strictly a shipping proposition.

Another objection that was heard throughout the years against Hawaii being brought into the Union was that many Congresses have felt that inasmuch as the people of Asiatic descent greatly outnumber the people of white blood, that that is also a question that should be taken into consideration. The fact that there are so many more people of Asiatic descent there in those islands undoubtedly had some influence in previous Congresses for not permitting them to come into the Union.

Now, in regard to contiguous territory, I personally am aware in the organizing our 48 States they went across the continent to build a greater America. So, for that reason, these States like Nevada and others were permitted to come into the Union, because they wanted the territory to become States to reach all the way to California, even though the population of these States were extremely small. And we are all aware of the importance of the development of the West and its benefits.

Now, the gentleman from Massachusetts also mentioned the matter of representation. Now, as we know, in the State of New York, for instance, they have 16 million people; California about 14 million people; and Illinois about 10 million people. The 1957 census showed the population of Hawaii to be 613,000. That total of 613,000 people has to be reduced, because there are 57,000 military men in Hawaii. They are nonresidents; they are nontaxpayers of Hawaii. So, you reduce that 1957 figure by 57,000, and that is also true of 25,000 civilian employees over there who do not vote. Many are there temporarily. Many are not residents; many are not taxpayers. They cannot, to any degree, be classified in regard to Hawaii's future economy. So, when you get down to the facts as to the actual population of Hawaii, you have 445,000 men, women, and children in the Territory. And they would receive two Senators and two Representatives. We just admitted Alaska with considerably less population than the people in Hawaii, and for the combination of Alaska and Hawaii, with about 700,000 or 800,000 people, they will have four Senators combined, to more than offset the population of the great State of Pennsylvania, my good friend JOHN SAYLOR's home, or New York with 16 million people. So, I say to this Congress that certainly 25 previous Congresses have taken that into consideration when they turned thumbs down on Hawaii in regard to the population and in regard to the money that comes in to the Treasury of the United States down here.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALLEN. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. Will not the gentleman admit that the sons and daughters of Hawaii were very loyal during World War II and fought with bravery?

Mr. ALLEN. I certainly would. I would say that most of the sons and daughters of Hawaiian people were most loyal.

I would say that what they did 12 or 15 years ago should be taken into consideration. Certainly, they were loyal to the United States, they were brave, and that should be taken into consideration on the question of whether they should come into the Union as a State. But that should not be the final or the sole reason. We should not say merely that anyone who is loyal to us, whether they are in Puerto Rico or the Virgin Islands, should be allowed to become a State. Their loyalty should not be the only condition for statehood.

Mr. PILLION. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALLEN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. PILLION. Would the gentleman say that the soldiers who came from the 48 States were any less loyal than those who came from Hawaii?

Mr. ALLEN. I certainly would not. But I do want to go on record as saying that I certainly agree with my able friend, the majority leader, that the Hawaiian people and the Philippine people were certainly loyal. I personally could not tell you of a single instance of disloyalty. But I do not think that should be the final and the only reason for our decision as to whether a group shall be allowed to come in as a State, because, if that were the only condition then we would probably have other Territories whose people would say, "What did we

ever do that was disloyal to the United States?"

We started with Alaska. Alaska, with Hawaii, would have four Senators in the Senate of the United States. That is a very important matter to the economy of our Nation. Do we want to give Alaska and Hawaii four Senators, when New York, with 20 times more people than both Alaska and Hawaii, has only two Senators? New York probably pays 100 times more in income tax than Alaska and Hawaii combined.

Mr. Speaker, these are some of the things that I feel previous Congresses for over half a century took into consideration when they rejected the various petitions for statehood for Hawaii. I say we should consider those matters among others, and then finally vote our honest convictions.

As far as I am personally concerned, I am going to vote against statehood for Hawaii. I am not going to ask for any rollcall on the rule. I am not fighting the rule in any way, but I felt it incumbent upon myself to state these facts which have caused me much concern.

HOUR OF MEETING TOMORROW

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK].

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock tomorrow.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

HAWAII STATEHOOD

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLMER].

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I really had not intended to make any extended remarks on this subject, and I do not know that I shall, but I do not like the idea of this piece of legislation being rushed through the Congress without some consideration and some debate.

I do not think there is a thing in the world that I could say here today that would influence anyone or change a single vote, because I gather the full political import of this action. Both parties, the Democratic Party and the Republican Party, way back there, in an effort to get delegates, have been advocating the admission of Hawaii as a State. Now payday has come. The way has been paved by the admission of Alaska.

I stood in the well of this House when Alaska statehood was up for consideration and I pointed out then that if Alaska were admitted you would be opening the barn door, and Lord only knew where we would stop. That is exactly what we have done. The biggest argument you can hear today as to why we should go out into the far-flung reaches of the Pacific and bring in to the bosom of the States that island is: "Well, we have given it to Alaska and we promised that we would give it to Hawaii as well."

I never have believed that two wrongs when added together would make a right. I said in the Alaska debate, moreover, that if I had to choose between Alaska and Hawaii I would certainly take Alaska, because it at least has the virtue of being on the American Continent.

I hope you will stop, look, and listen a little bit before you embark upon this new adventure into the faraway reaches of the Pacific, to bring in not alone the Hawaiian Islands, because that will be just a part of it; you are going to be faced with this some day. They say it is discrimination, you are making second-class citizens out of the people of Hawaii if you do not give them admission to statehood. What are you going to do with that other string of islands out there that go to make up Hawaii that are not taken in here as a State? When they come in, or one of them asks to be made a State, are you going to turn them down? Can you, when you have adopted the doctrine of nondiscrimination? Certainly that would be the rankest kind of discrimination.

Again, however, I am not so concerned about that as I am about where you are going from there. Here is the Virgin Islands, here is Puerto Rico, here is Cuba, and here is Samoa and Guam. Where are you going to stop?

Let us go back a little bit. When the Original Thirteen Colonies wanted to throw the yoke of the tyranny of Great Britain off their necks, they got together and formed the United States. Listen to this. You have read it, although I do not know whether or not you have read it recently. Let me refresh your memory. This is the preamble of the Constitution of the United States:

> We the people of the United States, in order to form a more perfect Union, establish justice, insure domestic tranquility, provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity, do ordain and establish this Constitution—

For whom?—

> for the United States of America.

They were not talking about somewhere out in the Pacific or out in the Atlantic or on the other side of the world or into outer space. They were talking about the continent of the United States of America.

If we propose to bring Hawaii into statehood should we not first amend the Constitution?

I opposed the admission of Alaska because I said Alaska could not afford the luxury of statehood. You are going to have bills coming before you that are going to justify that statement because the Federal Government is going to be forced to subsidize the State of Alaska at the expense of your taxpayers and at the expense of my taxpayers. But, I would rather do that with reference to Alaska than to go out to the other side of the world to bring a noncontiguous territory into the sisterhood of States. Mr. Speaker, to me this is a very serious thing. I do not see how you, the representatives of the people, can throw away this heritage that was given to us at such great sacrifice. Oh, I know we hear a lot about liberalism and we hear a lot about progress and we hear a lot about the world becoming smaller and smaller because of scientific advancement in transportation and communications, but I say to you again, and again, and again, that you are departing from the original concept of the Founding Fathers when you embark upon this expedition. I hope as the debate goes on that you will listen and give thought to this question. There are many who are better prepared to present the opposition to this than I am. I am not a member of this committee. I do not have the facts and figures except such as I have picked up as I ran, but I know there are other phases of this that will be developed. There is the question of communism, the question of the economic stranglehold that this man Harry Bridges, that the House of Representatives on two occasions, when during the war he was denying the sinews of warfare to our boys overseas, passed a resolution deporting him. But, that was killed in the other body. I think it is a matter of fact and a matter of common knowledge that this man, Harry Bridges, has a stranglehold on the economy of Hawaii. Now let us be liberal. Let us be progressive. But, let us also be sane and let us be a little sound. Let us think about where we are going and let us think of the precedents you are setting here today because just as sure as the sun will rise tomorrow and the next day, you are going to be faced with one of these other outlying islands coming in here and saying that they do not want to be discriminated against either.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Mississippi has consumed 10 minutes.

Mr. COLMER. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Thank you for your attention.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York, the author of the bill [Mr. O'BRIEN].

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this time to speak very briefly. First, I wish to thank the Committee on Rules for giving us this rule so that we may proceed in an orderly fashion on this historic question. I do not at this time propose to debate the issues because I am most hopeful that we will adopt the rule and then we can discuss the issues fully. But, I will say to those who may have been impressed by what they have heard so far that the members of our committee and other Members who are supporting statehood for Hawaii are prepared to meet head-on some of the questions which have been raised. We will not duck the question of communism in Hawaii. We will not duck the question which has been raised about the admission of Puerto Rico or the Virgin Islands or, perhaps, Formosa or Venus or Mars. We shall meet all those matters at the proper time.

I simply want to say to the gentleman from Illinois who was so concerned about two Senators for the population of Hawaii that I happen to be a Representative from the State of New York which has a population of 16 million. I feel very strongly that when I vote in favor

of statehood for Hawaii the great majority of the 16 million people in New York State will not feel that I am voting to take anything away from them and that they will support the vote I shall cast.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, I know of no further requests for time. I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, on that I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk called the roll and there were—yeas 338, nays 69, not voting 27, as follows:

[Roll No. 9]

YEAS—338

Adair	Corbett	Horan
Addonizio	Cramer	Hosmer
Albert	Cunningham	Hull
Alger	Curtin	Ikard
Andersen Minn.	Curtis, Mass.	Irwin
	Curtis, Mo.	Jarman
Anderson, Mont.	Daddario	Jennings
	Daniels	Jensen
Anfuso	Davis, Tenn.	Johnson, Calif.
Arends	Dawson	Johnson, Colo.
Ashley	Delaney	Johnson, Md.
Aspinall	Dent	Johnson, Wis.
Auchincloss	Derounian	Jonas
Avery	Derwinski	Jones, Mo.
Ayres	Devine	Judd
Bailey	Dingell	Karsten
Baker	Dixon	Karth
Baldwin	Dollinger	Kasem
Baring	Donohue	Kastenmeier
Barr	Dooley	Kearns
Barry	Dorn, N.Y.	Kee
Bass, N.H.	Doyle	Keith
Bass, Tenn.	Duleki	Kelly
Bates	Durham	Keogh
Baumhart	Dwyer	Kilgore
Becker	Edmondson	King, Calif.
Beckworth	Everett	King, Utah
Belcher	Evins	Kirwan
Bennett, Fla.	Fallon	Kluczynski
Bentley	Farbstein	Kowalski
Berry	Fascell	Lafore
Betts	Feighan	Laird
Boggs	Fenton	Lane
Boland	Fino	Langen
Bolling	Flood	Lankford
Bonner	Flynn	Latta
Bow	Fogarty	Lesinski
Bowles	Foley	Levering
Boyle	Forand	Libonati
Brademas	Ford	Lindsay
Bray	Fountain	Lipscomb
Breeding	Friedel	Loser
Brewster	Fulton	McCormack
Brock	Gallagher	McCulloch
Brooks, Tex.	Garmatz	McDonough
Broomfield	Gavin	McDowell
Brown, Mo.	George	McFall
Brown, Ohio	Giaimo	McGinley
Buckley	Glenn	McGovern
Budge	Granahan	McIntire
Burdick	Gray	McSween
Burke, Ky.	Green, Oreg.	Macdonald
Burke, Mass.	Green, Pa.	Machrowicz
Bush	Griffin	Mack, Ill.
Byrne, Pa.	Griffiths	Mack, Wash.
Byrnes, Wis.	Gross	Madden
Cahill	Gubser	Magnuson
Canfield	Hagen	Mahon
Cannon	Halleck	Mailliard
Carnahan	Halpern	Marshall
Carter	Hargis	Matthews
Casey	Harmon	May
Cederberg	Harris	Meader
Chamberlain	Hays	Merrow
Chelf	Healey	Metcalf
Chenoweth	Hébert	Meyer
Chiperfield	Hechler	Michel
Church	Hemphill	Miller, Clement W.
Clark	Henderson	
Coad	Herlong	Miller, George P.
Coffin	Hoeven	
Cohelan	Hogan	Miller, N.Y.
Collier	Holifield	Milliken
Conte	Holland	Mills
Cook	Holt	Minshall
Cooley	Holtzman	Mitchell
Moeller	Randall	Stratton
Monagan	Reece, Tenn.	Stubblefield
Montoya	Rees, Kans.	Sullivan
Moore	Reuss	Teague, Calif.
Moorhead	Rhodes, Ariz.	Teague, Tex.
Morgan	Rhodes, Pa.	Teller
Morris, N. Mex.	Riehlman	Thompson, N.J.
Morris, Okla.	Rivers, Alaska	Thompson, Tex.
Moss	Robison	Thomson, Wyo.
Multer	Rodino	Thornberry
Mumma	Rogers, Colo.	Toll
Murphy	Rogers, Fla.	Tollefson
Natcher	Rogers, Mass.	Trimble
Nelsen	Rooney	Udall
Nix	Roosevelt	Ullman
Norblad	Rostenkowski	Vanik
O'Brien, Ill.	Roush	Van Pelt
O'Brien, N.Y.	Rutherford	Van Zandt
O'Hara, Ill.	Santangelo	Wainwright
O'Hara, Mich.	Saund	Wallhauser
O'Konski	Saylor	Walter
O'Neill	Schenck	Wampler
Oliver	Schwengel	Watts
Ostertag	Scott	Weaver
Passman	Shelley	Weis
Patman	Sheppard	Westland
Pelly	Shipley	Whitener
Perkins	Short	Widnall
Pfost	Siler	Wier
Pirnie	Simpson, Ill.	Wilson
Poage	Sisk	Withrow
Porter	Slack	Wolf
Price	Smith, Calif.	Wright
Prokop	Smith, Iowa	Yates
Pucinski	Spence	Young
Quie	Springer	Younger
Quigley	Staggers	Zablocki
Rabaut	Stead	Zelenko

NAYS—69

Abbitt	Frazier	Norrell
Abernethy	Gary	Pilcher
Alexander	Gathings	Pillion
Alford	Grant	Poff
Allen	Haley	Polk
Andrews	Hardy	Preston
Ashmore	Harrison	Rains
Barden	Hess	Ray
Bennett, Mich.	Hiestand	Riley
Blitch	Hoffman, Ill.	Rivers, S.C.
Bosch	Hoffman, Mich	Roberts
Brown, Ga.	Huddleston	Rogers, Tex.
Broyhill	Johansen	St. George
Burleson	Jones, Ala.	Selden
Colmer	Kilburn	Sikes
Dague	Kilday	Smith, Kans.
Davis, Ga.	Kitchin	Smith, Miss.
Dorn, S.C.	Knox	Taber
Dowdy	Landrum	Thomas
Downing	Lennon	Utt
Fisher	McMillan	Vinson
Flynt	Mason	Wharton
Forrester	Murray	Williams

NOT VOTING—27

Barrett	Frelinghuysen	Scherer
Blatnik	Hall	Simpson, Pa.
Bolton	Jackson	Smith, Va.
Boykin	Martin	Taylor
Brooks, La.	Morrison	Thompson, La.
Celler	Moulder	Tuck
Denton	Osmers	Whitten
Diggs	Philbin	Willis
Elliott	Powell	Winstead

So the resolution was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Martin for, with Mr. Smith of Virginia against.

Mr. Morrison for, with Mr. Tuck against.

Mr. Denton for, with Mr. Willis against.

Mr Celler for, with Mr. Thompson of Louisiana against.

Mr. Simpson of Pennsylvania for, with Mr. Whitten against.

Mr. Frelinghuysen for, with Mr. Winstead against.

Mr. Barrett for, with Mr. Elliott against.

Mr. Blatnik for, with Mr. Boykin against.

Mr. Osmers for, with Mr. Brooks of Louisiana against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Powell with Mrs. Bolton.

Mr. Hall with Mr. Scherer.

Mr. Moulder with Mr. Jackson.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 4221) to provide for the admission of the State of Hawaii into the Union.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 4221, with Mr. KILDAY in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from New York [Mr. O'BRIEN] will be recognized for 3 hours and the gentleman from Washington [Mr. WESTLAND] will be recognized for 3 hours.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. O'BRIEN].

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. I yield to my chairman.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, I would respectfully request that good attention be given to the presentation by the gentleman from New York who is now standing in the well of the House. The gentleman will present the arguments in behalf of and in support of statehood for Hawaii and answer many of the questions which may be voiced later on unless a good hearing is given to him.

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. I thank my chairman. May I at the outset express my very deep appreciation to the gentleman from Colorado, the chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, for permitting me to manage this bill on the floor. It is a kindly gesture on his part and completely in keeping with the kindness for which he is so well known in this House.

Mr. Chairman, we have come to you today with a bill bestowing statehood upon the last incorporated Territory under the American flag—a bill which would bring to full flower the privileges of the 600,000 American citizens who constitute the population of Hawaii. May I say at the outset, Mr. Chairman, that we may as this debate progresses witness a slight distortion of the picture. It is possible for men and women of good will to look upon the same set of facts and by changing a line here or there, like the clever cartoonist, make a caricature out of something that is noble. Let us at the outset realize that we are talking here today about a Territory which is a part of the United States. This is not a part of Asia. This is not a foreign land. This is so much an integral part of our Nation that when we were attacked there we responded immediately, as quickly, as swiftly as if New York, Chicago, or Los Angeles had been attacked. And these people, about whom you may get a certain picture as this debate progresses, are American citizens. Many of those citizens could leave Hawaii and move into your State or my State and run for President of the United States and serve, if elected.

We are not talking about foreigners; we are talking about people who have full privileges of citizenship except for those they seek in this bill. It is not a question of extending the United States of America into Asia; it is a question of bringing the people of Hawaii into full brotherhood, bringing the Territory of Hawaii into the sisterhood of States.

I think it is important that we remember these things as the debate progresses, because there will be a fuzzy idea that we are dealing with something or somebody un-American and alien to us. I believe firmly that enactment of this bill will round out finally the Republic which is the United States. Oh, I know you will be told, as you have been told, that we will be here next year seeking statehood for Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, and other places out in the Pacific. I do not believe that will ever happen. May I point out that in this Congress we have 88 bills pending which would grant statehood to Hawaii, but not a single bill has been offered by a single Member for statehood for any of those other places. They are not incorporated Territories, as is Hawaii, and if we turn down Hawaii we are saying, in effect, that of the two, the only two incorporated Territories, Alaska was welcome, and you, Hawaii, are not.

We all know that less than 1 year ago after a long and memorable debate this House and the other body passed the bill which created the 49th State. During that debate some of you will remember the opposition hammered at three major points: They argued that Alaska was not contiguous to the other 48 States; that its population was too small to warrant statehood, and that its economy could not support statehood. We answered those arguments as best we could, and that debate need not be repeated today. It is sufficient to point out that the 85th Congress did grant statehood to Alaska and that action resulted in a national wave of excitement and approval on the part of the people of our country who are waiting right now for us to admit the Tertory of Hawaii as a State.

I have referred to Alaska only to emphasize that the arguments against Hawaii which revolve around noncontiguity, population, or economic strength, already have been answered by our vote on Alaska. Hawaii's population is three times that of Alaska, and its economic strength as of now is substantially greatest.

I do not propose to engage in any forensic pyrotechnics today; I am not going to talk about second class citizenship or our long failure to keep the promise of the past; each of us is aware of these things and little would be gained by a discussion of them or a reference to the loyalty of the people of Hawaii during times of peril. Instead, Mr. Chairman, I propose to meet head on the principal arguments which will be aired during this debate and to meet with candor some of those which may be only whispered but which can constitute the hidden motive behind the oral arguments. I am very fully aware that before this debate is very far along some Member will rise again to assert the claim, as it has been asserted in the past, that the Communists have a stranglehold upon Hawaii, the Territory, and will dominate Hawaii, the State.

May I say, Mr. Chairman, that when those arguments were advanced here in the past, I was deeply concerned because I had no personal knowledge of what actually was the situation in Hawaii. So in last December three members of our committee, of which I had the honor to serve as chairman, went to Hawaii and looked right down the mouth of the Communist cannon. We talked with everyone in Hawaii who could shed any light upon the situation. We talked with the leaders of this ILWU, about which you will hear today. We also talked with the FBI and the Territorial antisubversive commission, the chamber of commerce, and the school leaders. We even conducted interviews on the front steps of churches.

In our report we did not attempt to tell you that there is no communism in Hawaii. Instead we faced up to the fact. We asserted that there is communism in Hawaii. But we found something rather strange in the Territory. We found a people more alerted to the menace, such as it was, than the people anywhere in the United States. Let me tell you, Mr. Chairman, that these Communists who will be mentioned here on this floor cannot operate in Hawaii without the bells going on and the bright lights shining upon them.

You will hear talk here about some Communists in the ILWU. There are some former Communists in that organization. Personally, I do not know whether they have reformed or not. But I will say that when we are given the impression that Hawaii, the State, will be dominated by Communists, that they will send four Soviet agents to the Congress of the United States, you are being misinformed. The ILWU has a membership of 22,000, roughly. It does have some leaders—and I might say they were assigned to Hawaii from the mainland—for whom I have no respect whatsoever, but I say to you, Mr. Chairman, that the last election demonstrated that those leaders cannot lead their followers into the voting booths and tell them how to vote. Oh, yes; in some instances people endorsed by the ILWU won in the election, but I know of many places where that endorsement was not effective. I know of places where ILWU leaders ran for public office and were snowed under. I know of the fight they put up against a Honolulu city charter and they were beaten 3½ to 1.

May I point out that the Legislature of Hawaii, which the Communists allegedly control, enacted a law over ILWU opposition providing for the seizure of the docks in the event of an emergency. That same legislature has refused to repeal that act.

May I point out to you, as you perhaps see headlined the conviction of certain labor leaders as Communists in Hawaii, that they were convicted by the people of Hawaii, by a Hawaiian jury, and they were turned loose not by Hawaii, not by the people of Hawaii, but by a ruling of the Supreme Court on the mainland.

How many States have antisubversive commissions created, if you please, by this same legislature the Communists are supposed to dominate? Oh, I know what will be said here. I know the picture that will be drawn. But, let me summon my own witnesses on the other side. Let us take what will be said here at its face value, that if Hawaii becomes a State the Communists will control and send four Soviet agents to the Congress. I say, if that is true, any man or woman who favors statehood is very close to treason; certainly guilty of complete stupidity. Who are the people, knowing the facts best, who are on our side? Who should know better than the President of the United States, with all the information available to him? Not satisfied? What about Admiral Felt, the man in charge of our military posture in 100 million square miles of the Pacific Ocean? He favors statehood for Hawaii. The Secretary of the Interior; the head of the Subversive Activities Commission in Hawaii, who will be quoted a little later on, favors statehood. Our own committee, by an overwhelming margin, favored statehood. So does the Department of Justice, which has available all the information that the FBI possesses. And, in this House, who would say that the distinguished chairman of the House Committee on Un-American Activities is soft toward communism? Who would say that the ranking Republican member of that committee in the last Congress, General Kearney, is soft toward communism? They know the situation in Hawaii. They investigated the situation in Hawaii. Our record will show that the Honorable FRANCIS WALTER and the Honorable Bernard Kearney, the gentlemen to whom I refer, testified before our committee for statehood. I say to you that if one-tenth of what will be said here about communism in Hawaii is true, these men should not have the respect of anyone, nor should the members of our committee.

Mr. Chairman, I have talked already longer than I had planned. I would like to close simply by saying this: We are aware, all of us here, that what we do within the next day or two will be a part of our history. If we decide to place a 50th star in our beloved flag, it will glow there long after we have gone our way. It will shine as the star of the Pacific, if you will, as long as our Nation endures. We live at a time which moves more swiftly than any in recorded history. Almost in the same breath we refer to the atomic age, the jet age, and now the space age. Let it not be said that we in this great land live in a frightened age, fearful of the future, chained to the quiet dogmas of the past. Let us not shrink back upon ourselves thinking that we must never have any change. Let us, above all, leave our children and their children a greater land, a broader Union, and a talent not buried, but used.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. I yield.

Mr. ASPINALL. During the debate on the rule, it was stated that this legislation comes before this House at this time too quickly, and that not enough time has been given to consideration of the legislation. Will the gentleman explain just how much time has been given to the subject of statehood for Hawaii?

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. I think that Congress has compiled a stack of records 10 feet high. We explored the subject last year and again this year, until even the opposition ran out of witnesses. I think the question here is so basic and so simple that the records compiled are adequate for any Member of the House.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. I yield.

Mr. ASPINALL. Is it not true that practically the same legislation, with minor changes, has been passed by this body on three different occasions?

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. That is true, by an overwhelming majority. And I suspect sometimes it did not go all the way because of certain political currents of the time.

Mr. PILLION. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. I yield.

Mr. PILLION. Mr. Chairman, this is a rather long, involved question, and I would appreciate the gentleman's answering it at the conclusion of the whole question.

Is it not true that no public hearings were held by this small committee that went to Hawaii recently; that no sworn testimony on the question of Communist influence in Hawaii was taken by that committee; that all three members of the committee who went to Hawaii were in favor of Hawaiian statehood continuously; that no Member who had opposed Hawaiian statehood went to Hawaii as a member of the gentleman's committee; and that at my sugestion the gentleman refused to prepare any hearings in Hawaii, as I requested them to be prepared, by the investigators of the House Committee on Un-American Activities, on the question of communism in Hawaii; that the gentleman was quoted repeatedly prior to going to Hawaii that there was no communism in Hawaii before the committee went there; and that so far as I know the gentleman has never denied that, previous to his going.

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Does the gentleman want me to answer all those questions now or any specific one of them?

Mr. PILLION. I think it could be answered very simply "yes" or "no," but the gentleman may answer them in any way he pleases.

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. I suggest that I will not answer the question "yes" or "no," because the question was not phrased so that such an answer would be complete.

I never said at any time or any place that there was no communism in Hawaii. What I said on the floor of this House and elsewhere, when the gentleman from New York brought up his charges of communism, was that I did not believe the Communists had a stranglehold on Hawaii, and I did not believe that they would send four Soviet agents to the U.S. Congress.

As for our sworn testimony, we went there to investigate the specific subject developed largely by the gentleman from New York, and we believed that we could get more information by talking to more people than if we sat in a room and went around with the same old record spin, that we have in our formal hearings in Washington. But may I say this, that if the gentleman will look at the list of people with whom we did talk he will realize that we would have had to have our eyes and our ears closed not to find out what was going on in Hawaii.

I may say that if I had found there, regardless of my former position, 1 percent of what the gentleman claims, I would be on the floor now opposing the passage of this bill. The gentleman's facts are about 10 percent right and his conclusions more than 99 percent wrong.

The gentleman has never been to Hawaii. He has compiled his case from now-yellowing headlines, he has compiled his case by taking out of context reports by various agencies and groups.

May I say one other thing: There was a Senate committee that went to Hawaii and conducted some rather sensational hearings. It issued a report, upon which the gentleman from New York has leaned so heavily. Yet in the last session of this Congress a highly respected Republican member of that committee, Senator WATKINS, was circulating a petition in the Senate urging statehood then for Hawaii.

So I would say that the gentlemen who heard the sworn hearings came to the same conclusion as the gentleman from New York who did not have hearings with sworn testimony. We believe that we conducted a thorough investigation. We believe that we obtained much more information than if we had had the so-called public hearings under oath. I did not believe nor did my colleagues that we were going to get the true picture by hauling in a half dozen of these former Communists and have them take the fifth amendment a couple of hundred times, because we already knew those people. What we wanted to know was whether the communism that does exist in Hawaii was under control, and we found it was. We found their apparatus was crippled; and we were told that by people responsible for the security of our country.

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 13 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, first of all I should like to pay my respects to the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from New York [Mr. O'BRIEN], who has just preceded me. He has been chairman of this subcommittee for the past 4 years. During that time he has conducted extensive hearings on both Alaskan and Hawaiian statehood. We on the minority side have felt that we have been treated fairly in every respect in the hearings on Hawaiian statehood, that both the proponents and the opponents, such as the other distinguished gentleman from New York who has spoken here this afternoon, have been given ample opportunity under his guidance to present their case.

As a matter of fact, the minority Republican on this Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs once had a bill of his own—I believe it was H.R. 3575, if I am not mistaken—asking for statehood for Hawaii. That came before this House of Representatives and was passed by this body by a vote of somewhere in the neighborhood of 275 to 130.

So again, Mr. Chairman, let me offer my congratulations to the gentleman from New York [Mr. O'BRIEN]. It is rather difficult to follow him in further expounding some of the facts on Hawaiian statehood and why Hawaii should become a State.

Mr. Chairman, probably few, if any, pieces of legislation to come before this House have been so thoroughly considered as Hawaiian statehood. Since 1935 no less than 22 hearings have been held on the subject by the House and Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committees. More than 850 witnesses have been heard. The record consists of over 6,600 printed pages of testimony and exhibits. At least 12 committee reports have been made. Three times, when a bill for Hawaiian statehood came before this body as a separate measure, it was passed by overwhelming margins.

The Territory of Hawaii has served its apprenticeship as a Territory longer than any other Territory now a State. Repeated investigations and hearings have shown beyond any doubt that Hawaii is ready to assume its rightful place as a full member of our Federal Union of States.

The three traditional standards for applicants seeking statehood are:

First. That the inhabitants of the proposed State are imbued with and sympathetic toward the principles of democracy as exemplified in the American form of government.

Second. That a majority of the electorate desires statehood.

Third. That the proposed new State has sufficient population and resources to support State government and to provide its share of the cost of the Federal Government.

That Hawaii more than amply meets these tests has been demonstrated many times. That it meets these tests today is detailed in the report of the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs which accompanies this bill, H.R. 4221.

Mr. Chairman, I support H.R. 4221 and statehood for Hawaii. Indeed, I think there are few who would disagree that Hawaii meets, and has for many years met, the traditional tests for statehood which I have outlined. But certain arguments have been advanced with respect to statehood, outside of these traditional tests. While these arguments, advanced with great sincerity by their proponents, should not deter us, in my judgment, from enacting this legislation, I believe they should be discussed and answered.

The major points of opposition raised are, first, the danger of Communist control; second, noncontiguity; and third,

the ethnic background of the people of Hawaii.

The issue of communism in Hawaii has been extensively investigated since 1948. It has been thoroughly discussed by the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, most recently by a special subcommittee from November 24 to December 8, 1958.

This subcommittee reported that it was "unable to find any evidence in the social fabric of Hawaii that communism had made any substantial progress or that the community as a whole was unable or unwilling to cope with the problem." In a statement before the committee this year, that distinguished fighter against the Communist conspiracy, the chairman of the House Un-American Activities Committee stated that given the kind of machinery that will come to them in the event Hawaii becomes a State, the people of Hawaii under statehood could better manage the security problems created by Communist activities in the islands than under existing conditions.

I would not want to minimize the Communist danger in Hawaii—or in any of the other 49 States. This is a danger against which we must maintain an everlasting vigilance. Let me say that the matter of communism in Hawaii has given me a great deal of concern. For that reason I have given it my particular attention. Let me assure you I would not come before the Members of this House today if there were any reservations in my mind on this situation. To me the very thought of a State of the Union being under the control of the Communists is repugnant to the extreme. But, Mr. Chairman, I am convinced that such has not occurred in the Territory of Hawaii, nor will it occur in the State of Hawaii.

In this connection I think it is highly significant that the constitution of Hawaii, enacted in 1950, is the first in this country to disqualify subversive and disloyal persons from public office, Article 14, section 3, states:

> No person who advocates, or who aids or belongs to any party, organization or association which advocates, the overthrow by force or violence of the Government of this State or of the United States shall be qualified to hold any public office or employment.

I compliment the people of Hawaii for putting the provision in their constitution.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, although the record is well known to the Members of this House, I think it is not amiss to call attention again to the magnificent record compiled by citizens of Hawaii during World War II and the Korean war. There is no more inspiring chapter in our history than that of the 442d Regimental Combat team in World War II. The record in the Korean conflict is equally inspiring. Let me briefly summarize it:

Not one case of cowardice by a Hawaiian soldier in the face of the Communist enemy was recorded in Korea.

Not one case of successful Communist brainwashing of any Hawaiian soldier.

Not one case of desertion by a Hawaiian soldier.

There were 426 Hawaiian boys killed in Korea, a death toll four and one-half times as great as the killed-in-action average for the rest of the United States. There were 1,352 total battle casualties from Hawaii, a rate three times as great as the casualty rate per capita for the rest of the Nation.

Mr. Chairman, I will not labor this point further, other than to say again that the matter of Communist influence in Hawaii should not be a bar to her admission as a State and that indeed the admission of Hawaii would enable her better to deal with the problem.

Turning to the argument of noncontiguity, it is a fallacy to hold that Hawaii should be denied statehood because the islands are not contiguous by land to the continental United States. The admission of Alaska as the 49th State and the facts of modern communication and transportation have shattered forever this contention.

Let me say, Mr. Chairman, that I am well aware of the problem of noncontiguity in my own congressional district. Two of my counties are entirely composed of islands. One county, San Juan, consisting of 172 islands, is accessible only by air or water. In addition, another portion of my district, Point Roberts, can be reached only by air or water or by twice going through Canadian customs. This geographical situation existed at the time of the admission of the State of Washington in 1889, and while I must say that it does add measurably to the problems of a candidate for political office, I am happy to report that these areas are growing and progressive parts of the State of Washington.

Mr. Chairman, the force which the argument of noncontiguity may have had 100, 50, or even 25 years ago, has in this modern age been completely dispelled.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, I think it is necessary to comment only briefly on the argument sometimes advanced based on the ethnic origin and racial situation in Hawaii. Hawaii has been a part of the United States since 1898 and American influence began long before then. Hawaii is thoroughly American in every respect. The devotion of the people of Hawaii to America is, as I mentioned a moment ago, shown for all to see in the battlefields of Europe and Korea. It would be a travesty and a tragedy if the people of Hawaii, so ready for statehood in every regard, were to be denied this distinction merely because of the ancestry of a part of that group. We need Hawaii as a State. We need the citizens of the Territory of Hawaii to be citizens of the State of Hawaii. We need them not only for their counsel and advice which they can give us in our dealings with the peoples of the Orient but we need them for the living symbol they will be to the free world and the uncommitted nations, that America believes in and practices the tenets of the American ideal.

Mr. Chairman, those of us here today are fortunate to be caught up in a great moment of history. Though the problems and perils which beset us give ample cause for anxiety, though we must endure stern tests, we are clearly faced with the opportunity for greatness. Such an opportunity is with us as we consider this legislation. I deem it my good fortune and privilege to stand before the Members of this House today and affirmatively participate in that action which will, I have no doubt, lead to the admission of the State of Hawaii as the 50th State in this Union.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WESTLAND. I yield.

Mr. SAYLOR. I would like to commend the gentleman for his forthright statement in support of this legislation. It was my great privilege to be a member of the committee at the time the gentleman from Washington was appointed a member of the committee.

I have watched with great interest the questions the gentleman asked of witnesses who appeared before our committee prior to coming to the conclusion that he was in favor of Hawaiian statehood. If any Members of this House were in doubt in their own minds and if they would go over the record and read the questions which the gentleman asked of witnesses who appeared before our committee enabling him to make up his mind, they too would come to support this legislation.

Mr. WESTLAND. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ASPINALL].

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, after the long and many years of effort and struggle spent in our quest, it hardly seems possible that the supporters of the legislation now before this committee can sense the thrill of success which is apparently only hours removed from this debate of today.

At this time I desire to especially commend to members of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs—the gentleman from New York [Mr. O'BRIEN], and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR]— who have so ably spearheaded the fight for granting the status of statehood to Hawaii—the last of our incorporated Territories. The gentleman from New York [Mr. O'BRIEN], is the ranking member of the majority side of the committee which I have the honor to chairman. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR], is the ranking member on the minority side of each committee. Each of them has done yeoman service in this program. To them, along with the Delegate from Hawaii [Mr. BURNS], is due more than to any other like Member of the Members of our body the credit of getting this legislation along so quickly in this session. Also they are due great credit in presenting the bill in the fine form and detail in which it is presented to us. Certainly, I do not desire to minimize the good work done in the interests of statehood for Hawaii by other members of the committee particularly, and Members of the House generally. The gentleman from Washington [Mr. WESTLAND], floor manager of the legislation for the minority, has been extremely helpful and constructive with his searching and

meaningful questions which he had propounded during committee consideration.

Without in any way attempting on my part to prejudge the final decision on the legislation which we are now considering, may I say, that, in my opinion, a great majority of this body—truly representing the great majority of the citizens of our Nation—will voice their approval of the bill within the next day or two. Yet, may I say that there are those among us who look with question and fear—and may I add with some suspicion on what the sponsors and supporters of the legislation desire to do. In most instances these questioning and opposing colleagues of ours are most sincere in their opposition. I truly hope that as the advocates of the legislation present their case that the fears and especially the suspicions of our opposing colleagues may be allayed and even removed. Our presentation will be to that end.

Some of my friends have said that the granting of the status of statehood to Hawaii is but the beginning of like attention to be paid to other areas now under our national jurisdiction but not enjoying the status of full membership in our sisterhood of States. I say to those of my colleagues who oppose this legislation for this reason that you have no need for further worry—to be perfectly and brutally frank I say that you really have no logical justification for your opposition founded on such thinking.

Hawaii is the last of the incorporated Territories. With its admission to full statehood in our Union, we shall have filled the galaxy of stars in the field of blue in our national banner. For the foreseeable future there will be no more. It is my opinion that it is most unlikely that there ever will be others. Yet, I know full well that the Members of the 86th Congress cannot speak for the succeeding Congress or Congresses. And, here, may I add my own personal position, which is that I have sufficient faith in those who will be chosen to follow us that they shall do that which is best for the general welfare of our country and its people.

Now, may I explain in some detail just what I mean by stating to you that Hawaii is the last of our incorporated Territories and just what significance must be attached to such statement.

STATEHOOD IS THE NECESSARY CONSEQUENCE OF TERRITORIAL INCORPORATION

The claim that the incorporation of a Territory makes mandatory its graduation to statehood is supported overwhelmingly by historical precedent and the dicta of the Federal judiciary.

Every incorporated Territory—and there have been 31 of them—has become a State except Hawaii. The first of a series of organic acts for incorporated Territories was the Northwest Ordinance of 1787, which outlined a policy of ultimate status not only for the Northwest Territory, but also for all the Territories subsequently to be acquired. A basic provision was that when the population of any district within the Northwest Territory should total 60,000, that district was to be admitted into the Union on an equal footing with the original 13 States. Organic legislation which ensued for the Southwest Territory, the Territory of Michigan, the Territory of Illinois, and so forth, incorporated the Territory to which each of the acts applied and made provision for eventual statehood.

One after the other, all the incorporated Territories on the mainland were admitted to the Union; and only last January 3 Alaska joined the great sisterhood. The constitutional status of Hawaii is identical to that of Alaska, as well as to that of each of the other former incorporated Territories. True, the Organic Act of Hawaii does not refer in explicit terms to statehood; but the fact that the act extended the Constitution in all its parts to our great Pacific Territory and thereby incorporated it into the Union was sufficient to guarantee it eventual statehood.

The courts time and again have made it plain that the act of incorporation constitutes a commitment by the Congress ultimately to admit as a State the Territory incorporated. In *Ex Parte Morgan* (20 F. 298, 305 (1883)), an incorporated territory is considered an inchoate State. In *McAllister* v. *United States* (141 U.S. 174, 188 (1891)), territorial government was said to be temporary and destined to be superseded when the—incorporated—territories became States of the Union. In *Balzac* v. *People of Puerto Rico* (258 U.S. 298 (1922)), the Supreme Court said that incorporation has always been a step, and an important one, leading to statehood.

One of the more baseless of the charges long cherished by antistatehood elements is the allegation that Hawaii's admission would be followed, necessarily, by that of Guam, American Samoa, and all the other unincorporated areas controlled by the United States. The very fact that these Territories are unincorporated precludes their admission. Not until the Congress makes them an integral part of the United States, and thereby accords them incorporated status, can they hope to achieve statehood. Such a development is utterly unlikely, at least for the foreseeable future.

The 30 States having previous Territorial status and their respective periods of such status,[1] plus Hawaii, interpolated as of 1959

State [2]	Date of organic act	Date admitted as State	Years elapsed
New Mexico	1850	1912	62
Hawaii	1900	1959	59
Arizona	1863	1912	46
Alaska [3]	1912 [3]	1959	47
Utah	1850	1896	46
Washington	1853	1889	36
Michigan	1805	1837	32
North Dakota	1861	1889	28

[1] The Thirteen Original States did not, of course, pass through any territorial stage. Vermont, Kentucky, Maine, and West Virginia were formed from already existing States. California and Texas were acquired from foreign governments and consequently escaped the territorial apprenticeship.

[2] States are listed under the names by which they are now known rather than by the name of the Territory from which each was formed.

[3] Alaska was incorporated as of 1868, but its first organic act was not passed until 1884. This first organic act, however, provided only for a "district" rather than a "territorial" form of government. Hence, the organic act of 1912, which created Alaska's first legislature, may more truly be considered the basic act in the establishment of Territorial government.

The 30 States having previous Territorial status and their respective periods of such status, plus Hawaii, interpolated as of 1959—Continued

State	Date of organic act	Date admitted as State	Years elapsed
South Dakota	1861	1889	28
Idaho	1863	1890	27
Montana	1864	1889	25
Florida	1822	1845	23
Wyoming	1868	1890	22
Mississippi	1798	1817	19
Arkansas	1819	1836	17
Oklahoma	1890	1907	17
Indiana	1800	1816	16
Ohio	1787	1803	16
Colorado	1861	1876	15
Nebraska	1854	1867	13
Wisconsin	1836	1848	12
Oregon	1848	1859	11
Missouri	1812	1821	9
Illinois	1809	1818	9
Minnesota	1849	1858	7
Iowa	1838	1846	6
Louisiana	1804	1812	3
Kansas	1854	1861	2
Tennessee	1790	1796	9
Nevada	1861	1864	8
Alabama	1817	1819	8

Source: Statutes at Large.

We have no more areas which have been or are likely to be designated as incorporated Territories. Hawaii is the last. The people of Hawaii—good, loyal, and patriotic citizens of the United States of America—have served well their apprenticeship. They are ready. They are deserving. We are ready to receive them. Let not any fears of ours deny to our own that which our own is entitled to receive—the blessing and responsibilities attendant with full sisterhood in the United States of America.

Mrs. CHURCH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ASPINALL. I am happy to yield to the gentlewoman from Illinois.

Mrs. CHURCH. I should like to preface my remarks by reminding the gentleman that I have always supported statehood for Hawaii. I followed the excellent chairman, the gentleman from New York [Mr. O'BRIEN], in voting last year for the admission of Alaska. However, today a question has arisen on the floor which I know the gentleman can answer readily. Considering the constitutional restriction in existence, would it be possible for Hawaii when a State to annex other territory which is unincorporated but belonging to the United States, without further action being taken by this Congress?

Mr. ASPINALL. It would not.

Mrs. CHURCH. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ASPINALL. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. On page 5 of the bill there is a provision which says that the President may dispose of land within a 5-year period after Hawaii becomes a State. I am referring to paragraph (e) on page 5. Will the gentleman please tell us the meaning of that provision?

Mr. ASPINALL. That provision provides that the areas now held by the United States, for one purpose or another, may be held by the Federal Government for an additional period of not over 5 years for a determination as to

how much of that area is to be needed permanently by the Federal Government, for defense purposes primarily.

Mr. GROSS. And such land could be disposed of at the discretion of the President of the United States?

Mr. ASPINALL. No; the lands automatically go to the new State of Hawaii.

Mr. GROSS. That is not what the provision says.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ASPINALL. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SAYLOR. I should like to call attention of the Members of the House to the fact that the Federal lands in Hawii come in two classes; first, those to which the Federal Government has title in fee. Those are not affected at all by this bill. The other lands affected by this bill are those which the United States Government holds under license. These lands are owned by the Territory of Hawaii. Upon the admission of Hawaii into the sisterhood of States, if there is no provision in the bill, all of the rights of the Federal Government in those lands will cease at once. The military, which occupy a large portion of these lands, have appeared before our committee and asked that for a period of 5 years the President be given the discretion to determine which of those lands are needed and which are not needed.

Those which will be needed will be kept by the United States without any payment to the State of Hawaii of any sort or description, and those that are not needed will automatically then go back to the State of Hawaii.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ASPINALL. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Why should they not come to the Congress for the disposal of this land, rather than leaving it to the discretion of a President? That is the way we dispose of other U.S. property, is it not?

Mr. ASPINALL. These properties are in reality properties of the Territory of Hawaii.

Mr. GROSS. Then why does a President have any discretion in the matter at all?

Mr. ASPINALL. Because we presently hold possession over these particular areas.

Mr. GROSS. So that we do control the land?

Mr. ASPINALL. Just for certain purposes, that is all.

Mr. GROSS. I think that under any circumstance the authority should be vested in Congress to dispose of any federally owned or controlled land.

Mr. ASPINALL. I think that a statement will be made about that when that part of the bill is under consideration.

Mr. GROSS. Is there any special significance to establishing the minimum voting age under the Constitution of the State of Hawaii at 20 years?

Mr. ASPINALL. I think the gentleman understands that we have always left that decision up to the various States. If Hawaii wishes to change the usual age limit for voting, it may do so, just as the great State of Georgia has changed it.

Mr. GROSS. I understand.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ASPINALL. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FULTON. The question comes up as to what we mean by an incorporated Territory when, for example, Guam has a Governor and a Lieutenant Governor appointed by the President, as well as a legislature; likewise the Virgin Islands. Why is there a distinction between the Hawaiian Islands, for example, and those two Territories? What is the distinction between the United Nations trusteeship we hold over the Marshall and Caroline Islands, as they are Territories under the Security Council of the United Nations? What kind of legal situation is there on those Territories in respect to this particular legislation?

Mr. ASPINALL. We have had these three different approaches to the treatment of our areas classified as "Territories." Of course, an incorporated Territory is by its organic act determined to be an incorporated area.

Mr. FULTON. Why has not Guam, when we have an organic law for them, set up its own organization?

Mr. ASPINALL. We have never by congressional act designated Guam as an incorporated Territory. We have said just the reverse, that it is not an incorporated Territory.

Mr. FULTON. Like an unincorporated village.

Mr. ASPINALL. The same is true of the Virgin Islands.

As far as the trust islands are concerned, we hold possession by conquest, of course, but we have control over them at the present time only by mandate from the United Nations.

I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR].

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, an organized incorporated Territory of the United States is a possession to which the Constitution of the United States has been extended by a congressional act. As a result their native-born inhabitants have become citizens of the United States, the area is entitled to statehood, and enjoy representation in Congress. Hawaii is an example.

An organized unincorporated Territory is a possession of the United States to which the Federal Constitution has not been extended by act of Congress. Organic acts have been enacted for Guam and the Virgin Islands, our two possessions falling into this category.

Neither has a Representative in Congress. Neither is eligible for statehood without additional congressional legislation. Guamanians and Virgin Islanders are citizens of the United States.

American Samoa is an unorganized and unincorporated possession of the United States. It has no organic act, no representation in Congress, and, of course, is not eligible for statehood. Its inhabitants are not citizens but are nationals of the United States, but, of course, are eligible for citizenship. They may travel to the mainland without difficulty. This status entitles the American Samoans to the protection of our flag and the enjoyment of undefined fundamental rights, but does not guarantee to them those explicit rights accorded by the Constitution to citizens of the United States.

The Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands is a strategic trusteeship of the United Nations. Its inhabitants are neither citizens nor nationals of the United States, but wards of the United Nations under the supervision of the United States. Since the Trust Territory is not a possession of the United States it obviously could not be admitted to our Union. Its inhabitants have little sense of nationalism and not the least interest in statehood.

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. PILLION].

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Seventy-four Members are present, not a quorum. The Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 10]

Arends	Gubser	Quigley
Ayres	Hall	Randall
Bailey	Hargis	Rogers, Tex.
Barden	Hoffman, Mich.	Scherer
Barrett	Holifield	Smith, Miss.
Barry	Holt	Smith, Va.
Blatnik	Jackson	Spence
Bolton	Kearns	Springer
Bowles	Kelly	Taylor
Breeding	Machrowicz	Thompson, La.
Celler	Martin	Tuck
Dawson	May	Wharton
Diggs	Morrison	Willis
Dixon	Osmers	Withrow
Elliott	Philbin	
Frelinghuysen	Powell	

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. KILDAY, chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill H.R. 4221, and finding itself without a quorum, he had directed the roll to be called, when 379 Members responded to their names, a quorum, and he submitted herewith the names of the absentees to be spread upon the Journal.

The Committee resumed its sitting.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York [Mr. PILLION] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. PILLION. Mr. Chairman, yes; this is an historic event. Today marks another milestone in the decay, in the decline, and in the death of this Nation and of Western Civilization.

May I first point out that this bill is not a simple legislative measure that can later be amended or repealed.

This is neither a regulatory nor an administrative proposal. This is not a law being passed in the ordinary course of legislative businesss.

This measure deals with the basic structure of legislative power—of who shall, in the future, have the power to pass all laws affecting all of the citizens of this Nation.

Mr. Chairman, in my humble opinion, the issue of statehood for the Territory of Hawaii ought to be deliberated from these three broad aspects:

First. The grant of statehood to Hawaii will reduce the political power and the voting rights of every citizen of our population and bestow that power upon another segment of our citizens.

Second. The next phase of this discussion will attempt to refute the arguments advanced in favor of statehood. I will try to demonstrate that the reasoning for statehood is either based upon political errors or is irrelevant or is of emotional origin.

Third. The concluding portion of this statement will deal with communism in Hawaii and its dangerous political consequences.

THE POLITICAL POWER ASPECTS OF STATEHOOD

There is a mistaken popular notion that the people of the Territory of Hawaii are being deprived of their right of self-government. The differences between the powers of the 49 States and the powers of the Territorial Government of Hawaii are insignificant.

Under the Hawaii Organic Act, Hawaii possesses full power to enact laws relating to its property, affairs, and government. Its powers in relation to the conduct of its affairs are substantially as extensive as the powers of the State governments of the 49 States. Hawaii does not lack the power of home rule.

Although Congress has reserved the right to disapprove Territorial legislation, no law passed by the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii has ever been invalidated by Congress.

Although the Governor of Hawaii is appointed by the President, there has never been any substantial complaint that the administration of the Governor's Office has been contrary to the best interests of the people of that Territory.

The campaign of the proponents of statehood is based, not upon their need or desire for power to conduct the affairs of the Territory, but rather, in their desire for power to conduct the affairs of the 49 States. They seek the power associated with the election of two U.S. Senators, two U.S. Representatives, and four electoral votes in the choice of a U.S. President.

The membership of this House knows that all governments, good or bad, are mere organizations of political power. The difference between a totalitarian, an aristocracy, or a representative government is merely a difference in the control of political power.

It is a fundamental principle, that our constitutional representative form of government shall give every citizen an equal voice in the conduct of our Government. The right of a citizen to participate in our Government, almost exclusively, rests with his right to vote. But, the essence of the right to vote lies in the effectiveness of the right to vote.

Statehood would entitle the people of Hawaii to two U.S. Senators. It is our responsibility to decide whether this amounts to an equitable apportionment of legislative power.

The population of Hawaii, according to the consus estimate as of July 1, 1957, was 613,000. Of this population, 59,000 were military personnel. An additional 25,000 people are civilian Federal employees. If we consider these 84,000 Federal civilian and military personnel to each have only one dependent, then the basic population figure should be reduced by 168,000. This would reduce the Hawaiian citizen population to 445,000.

With the grant of statehood, the people of Hawaii will be represented by one U.S. Senator for each of its 223,000 citizens.

The 2 Hawaii Senators representing 445,000 citizens would nullify the will and the representation in the U.S. Senate of New York's 16 million people, California's 14 million people, Illinois' 10 million people, Georgia's 4 million people, and of the voters in each of the other of the 49 States.

The framers of our Constitution founded a compound government, combining the features of both a federal and a national type of government.

The plan to give each State two Senators conforms to a pattern suitable to a Federal Government, with limited powers, where the bulk of the sovereign power is reserved to the States.

The plan to apportion Representatives of this House on the basis of population conforms to the framework of a National Government where all power is concentrated in a Central Government.

The grant of equal representation, that of two U.S. Senators, to each State was adopted for the protection of the sovereign powers of the States from encroachment upon their powers by the Central Government. In furtherance of this purpose, it was provided that the U.S. Senate be chosen, indirectly, by State legislatures.

The framers of our Constitution repeatedly stated that the U.S. Senate would represent the States in their corporate governmental capacities. The election of Senators by the legislatures was an integral part of that historic compromise under which each State became entitled to two U.S. Senators.

The 17th amendment to our Constitution was adopted on April 8, 1913. This amendment fundamentally altered the basis for the allotment of two Senators to each State. This change in the mode of the selection of our Senators to that of popular suffrage totally destroyed the justification, the rationale, for equal representation for each State in the U.S. Senate.

There have been drastic changes in our Republic. The framers of our Constitution envisioned a Central Government of limited powers, with the bulk of the residual sovereign power being reserved to the States.

Now, there is no mathematical formula for the measurement of the division of power between the States and our Central Government. However, we can measure the exercise of political power by the expenditures of our governments.

In the year 1957 our total gross national product amounted to $440 billion. Of this sum, $79 billion, or 18.1 percent, was expended by the Central Government. The State and local governments expended $34 billion, or 7.7 percent. The exercise of Federal power costs our citizens about two and one-half times the exercise of State power.

It is evident that there has been a continuing erosion of power out of the States and a continuing concentration of power in our Central Government. We have become a National Government wherein the States are being relegated to mere provinces. We have evolved from a Federal Republic into a national democracy.

Twenty-five States, with a population of 31 million people, constituting only 18 percent of the Nation's population, control 50 votes and have a majority power in the U.S. Senate.

This imbalance of power is a prime factor in our huge Federal bureaucracy, its wastages, and the consequent huge Federal taxes. Our bankrupt agricultural program with Federal subsidies, creating surplus products and Federal subsidies paid to reduce crops, at the same time, is an example of the satisfactions of local interests resulting from excessive localized political power without a corresponding accountability for the national welfare.

The U.S. Senate is accountable to the pressure of their constituents rather than to the preservation of State powers. Their prime interest must lie in expanding national power to satisfy local political pressures.

The alarming growth of Federal aid is another example of the inequitable distribution of Senate power. These programs are a practical means of socializing the wealth of the States and are encouraged by the political power combinations in the U.S. Senate.

Statehood for Hawaii will reduce the effectiveness and dilute the voting rights of every citizen of the 49 States. In the election of a U.S. Senate, it transfers an excessive amount of Senate representation to the people of Hawaii.

The average representation in the U.S. Senate is 1 Senator for approximately 1,700,000 citizens. Hawaii will have 1 Senator for each 223,000 citizens. The voting rights of the Hawaii citizen will be 7 times as effective as that of the average citizen of the 49 States.

POWER IN THE EXECUTIVE BRANCH

In the event of statehood, Hawaii, after the 1960 reapportionment, will become entitled to 4 electoral votes toward the election of a President of the United States. This can be reduced to 1 electoral vote for each 110,000 of its population. The voters in the 49 States will only have 1 electoral vote for about each 320,000 citizens. In the election of a President, the voting rights of each Hawaii citizen will be as effective as that of 3 average citizens of the 49 States.

Again, the voting rights of the people of the 49 States are reduced in order to transfer excessive voting power to the people of Hawaii.

REPRESENTATION IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

After the 1960 census reapportionment, Hawaii will become entitled to 2

Representatives in this House. Since the membership of this House is fixed at 435, these two Representatives will displace 2 Members who are presently holding seats in this House. This loss of seats will be in addition to the following latest projection by the U.S. Census Bureau of the loss of seats:

Maine	1
Massachusetts	2
New York	3
Pennsylvania	3
Illinois	1
Minnesota	1
Mississippi	1
Iowa	1
Kansas	1
West Virginia	1
North Carolina	1
Georgia	1
Alabama	1
Arkansas	2

STATEHOOD FOR OTHER POSSESSIONS

Statehood for Hawaii will intensify the demands for representation in Congress for the citizens and inhabitants of all other possessions of the United States.

Since Alaska was admitted with a resident population of about 100,000 people, why isn't Guam entitled to statehood with its population of 59,000 citizens.

If the psychological impact upon the oriental countries is a valid reason for admitting Hawaii, then Guam should be admitted because it is farther west and closer to the oriental cultures.

If Puerto Rico seeks admission, shall we admit her to statehood in the interest of reducing the possible enmities of South American countries.

Senator CASE recently introduced a bill to grant three delegates in the House of Representatives to the District of Columbia which is a prelude to statehood. Are these 800,000 citizens less entitled to two U.S. Senators than the 445,000 citizens of Hawaii?

The Virgin Islands has a population of 30,000. Shall we admit the Virgin Islands on the ground that it will improve our relations with the African countries?

Before we further distort the structure of our Government, we ought to be prepared to deal with these prospective troublesome problems on the basis of a principle that is equitable for these people and is also reasonably fair to the people of the 49 States.

EXTRANEOUS ISSUES

Just about any and every conceivable argument has been advanced by the proponents of statehood. The Territory of Hawaii has carried on a high-powered, soft-sell, campaign for the past 12 years. The Hawaii Statehood Commission is the official agency for the promotion of statehood. Since 1947 it has spent more than $1 million for public relations and lobbying. This sum far exceeds the spending by any other lobbying group.

I would like to comment on some of the arguments being advanced by this Commission.

They have raised the slogan of "taxation without representation." Taxation has never been the test of voting rights. The person who pays no taxes is entitled to one vote just as the citizen who pays $1 million of taxes per year. The alien resident who has no voting rights is still duty bound to pay taxes.

The Hawaiian people received, for their taxes, substantially the same benefits as the people of the 49 States.

No one has disparaged the bravery of Hawaiian troops in World War II and in the Korean conflict, except the Hawaii Statehood Commission. They have raised this issue by attributing it to the opponents of statehood. It is inflammatory, emotional language intended to put the opponents on the defensive and furnishes an emotional impact in Hawaii, coupling statehood with a defense of honor.

The loyalty of the Hawaiian soldier cannot and should not be the basis for the equitable apportionment of representation in Congress.

I might remind our fellow citizens in Hawaii that the people of the 48 States did not hesitate to bravely and completely repel the inglorious attack by Japan, not upon the U.S. mainland, but their attack upon Hawaii. The United States discharged its obligations to its fellow citizens in full measure.

The proponents say that denial of statehood would cause an unfavorable psychological impact upon oriental countries. This reasoning is a political mistake. It is an admission of our weakness. This is a domestic problem that should not be decided by foreign agitation.

The Hawaii Statehood Commission advances the argument that Hawaii has met every test of statehood. The Constitution provides no tests for statehood. Congress has not enacted any tests for statehood. The proponents refer to dicta emanating from the Supreme Court. The opinion of the Supreme Court in this matter is just another unwarranted intrusion upon the constitutional powers of Congress.

The height of irrelevancy was attained by a prominent proponent of Hawaiian statehood. He advanced this argument: "The delectation of visitors, the sweetness of Hawaiian music and the rhythm of its dance." The muscular gyrations of the hula dance is certainly far afield from the crux of the statehood problem.

COMMUNISM IN HAWAII

Mr. Chairman, I have said, in and outside Congress, that in granting statehood to Hawaii, we actually invite four Soviet agents to take seats in the U.S. Congress. I repeat this statement.

These men will bear no visible brand marks. They will not be Communist Party members. All that the Communists demand of them, in return for their political support, is to cleverly follow the "Soviet Party line."

The infiltration of communism in Hawaii continues to influence every phase of Hawaii activity to an alarming degree.

The Communist network is centered in two unions, the International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union—ILWU—and the United Public Workers—UPW. From these centers, their influence spreads into both the Republican and Democratic Parties, into the Territorial legislature, into the county and city governments, into the newspapers, the radio, the television, and into every home.

The ILWU has a membership of about 25,000 workers. The UPW has a membership of about 2,700 employees.

Both of these unions were expelled by the CIO in 1950 on the ground that "their policies follow the Communist Party" and that "Communists control these unions."

Gentlemen, the policies of these unions have not changed one iota. I quote from the report of the Territorial Commission on Subversive Activities which was submitted to the Governor this last Monday, March 2, 1959, page 16:

> The propaganda line disseminated by the ILWU has continued to follow and further the Russian international and domestic viewpoint.

These unions continue to be dominated by the same Communist officials as in 1950. The ILWU in Hawaii is known as Local No. 142. The president is that most dangerous and effective international Communist agent, Harry Bridges.

Since last August, Harry Bridges has been actively engaged in promoting an alinement of American labor unions with foreign Communist unions. This, of course, is part of the U.S. Communist Party's and the Soviet Communist Party's present program.

Since August 1958 Harry Bridges has made overtures to: the all-Japan Dock Workers Union, the Waterside Workers of Australia, the Madras Harbor Workers of India, and the Waterside Workers of Indonesia.

These unions are all Communist dominated. He has carefully avoided consultations with any unions who are not Communist controlled.

Since January 1, 1959, Harry Bridges has had conferences with the Communist leadership of unions in London, Paris, Hamburg, Prague, Moscow, Leningrad, and Helsinki.

Bridges has also alined his union with the International Brotherhood of Teamsters, headed by James R. Hoffa.

Jack Hall is regional director of the Hawaii ILWU, local No. 142. He and six other Hawaiian Communists were convicted in 1953 for conspiracy to overthrow our Government by force and violence. These cases were reversed under the authority of the series of shocking Supreme Court pro-Communist decisions.

The UPW's officers are Henry Epstein, Stephen Murin, Max Roffman and Jeanette Nakama Rohrbough, all identified Communists.

Both the ILWU and the UPW have exploited its members and continue to use the dues and the membership to further the Communist Party line.

The UPW has 235 public employees employed by the government of the Territory of Hawaii. The city and county of Honolulu has 567 employees belonging to the UPW, including 37 members of the sheriff's department.

The county of Hawaii has 279 public employees belonging to this Communist-controlled union. The county of Kauai has 293 and the county of Maui 537. These figures come from the checkoff system used by the unions and these governments to extract union dues.

The ILWU and its conspiratorial Communist partner, the UPW, share the same large office building owned by the ILWU. This nonpublic building was recently exempted from public taxation by the Hawaiian Legislature.

These two unions continue to spend upward of $200,000 annually for propaganda and agitation.

They maintain radio broadcasts in the Ilocano and Tagalog, Filipino dialects, every day of the week.

The Japanese broadcasts are continued on three stations every Sunday.

These broadcasts are completely Communist oriented.

The ILWU continues to operate another propaganda apparatus. It has a book-lending library service that disseminates nothing but Communist literature featuring class conflict and other Communist doctrine. It has a Communist movie loan service. These Communist films are stored and checked in and out by the public library of the Territory of Hawaii. This service to the Communist Party is paid for by the Hawaii and United States taxpayers.

To demonstrate the growing and expanding power of the Communist ILWU, I show you two newspaper clippings.

The Honolulu Advertiser of November 26, 1958, reports the union election among the Foodland supermarket meatcutters.

The ILWU vote was 205.

The AFL–CIO vote was 14.

I show you a report of the Honolulu Advertiser of March 1, 1959, last Sunday, reporting on an election among the clerks of the Foodland supermarket:

The ILWU won with 134 votes.

The AFL–CIO union received 42 votes.

The voting in favor of the ILWU is in spite of the fact that its Communist control is known to every citizen of Hawaii.

This certainly does not show any lessening of the influence of the Communist Party in Hawaii.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to describe just one incident to show how the Communist Party infiltrates the cultural activities of a community.

The Honolulu Community Chorus is a civic musical organization. It has planned to produce a festival of folk songs this spring in conjunction with the Honolulu Symphony Orchestra. More than 300 vocalists and musicians are to participate.

The choral chairman, Mr. John M. Kelly, Jr., is insisting that the symphony orchestra present the "Song of the Forests" by the Communist composer, Dmitri Shostakovich. This music and words were written in praise of Dictator Joseph Stalin.

Mr. Kelly also insists upon the rendition of "The Lonesome Trail." This music is by Earl Robinson and Millard Lampbell. Both of these men have Communist affiliations for 20 years.

Mr. George Barati, the director of the Honolulu Symphony as of today still refuses to play these two numbers on the ground that they are of poor musical composition.

The inclusion of Communist music, as American folk songs, can be easily explained. The wife of Mr. Kelly is the former secretary to Jack Hall, the Communist director of the ILWU. The secretary of the choral group is Mrs. Ah Qwon Leong McElrath, the wife of the radio commentator for the ILWU and a Communist agent.

There has been a recent change in the Communist tactics in Hawaii. They are now using the soft, velvet approach to gain respectability and acceptance.

Last year, Mr. Newton Miyagi, secretary of the ILWU, was appointed to the Red Cross board. Mr. Miyagi is a diehard Communist who took the fifth amendment 71 times on questions relating to his Communist affiliations before the U.S. Senate Subcommittee on Internal Security. Mr. Blissard, the U.S. Federal attorney, was so outraged that he resigned as a member of the board.

Strangely, the Federal judge, there, also a member of the board, criticized Mr. Blissard and defended Mr. Miyagi's appointment. The Federal judge was seeking Presidential reappointment.

On November 8, 1956, Gov. Wilder King forced the resignation of his attorney general for attending a testimonial dinner for Communist Jack Hall. Governor King was not reappointed.

Judge Stainback, a former Democratic governor, vigorously opposed to the Communists, was also refused Presidential reappointment.

In the 1956 elections, Mr. William F. Quinn accepted the ILWU endorsement for the Territorial senate on the Republican ticket. He is now the Republican Presidential appointed Governor of Hawaii to replace Governor King. I show you newspaper clipping of Governor Quinn tendering a public office appointment to Jack Hall, the prominent Communist leader, as a member of the Hawaii Traffic Commission.

It is a well-known political fact of life, that you can't receive the recommendation of the Department of the Interior today under a Republican administration or yesterday under a Democratic administration for a Presidential appointment in Hawaii without the blessing of the Communist ILWU.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to conclude my remarks by briefly reviewing the political power that is exercised by the Communist apparatus in Hawaii.

In the 1954 elections, the ILWU gave its endorsement to 71 candidates. A total of 58 of the 71 ILWU-endorsed candidates won. Of these candidates, 22 out of 28 candidates for the Hawaii Legislature won.

In the 1956 elections 21 ILWU-endorsed candidates won out of 30 representatives in the Hawaii House of Representatives.

In this last election of November 1958, there were 69 offices to be filled by election. For these officers, 57 candidates were endorsed by the ILWU. Four of these candidates rejected the ILWU endorsements. Fifty-three candidates accepted these Communist dominated ILWU endorsements.

Thirty-seven of the ILWU-endorsed candidates won their elections.

Thus the ILWU succeeded in electing 37 out of 69 elective positions in the Hawaii Territorial Legislature for a winning percentage of 55 percent out of all public elective offices.

The ILWU succeeded in electing 37 out of 53 candidates whom it endorsed and who accepted this Communist support for a winning percentage of 70 percent.

It must be remembered that four identified Communists sit on the ILWU political endorsement committee that handed out these endorsements. Their long-standing Communist affiliations are well known to every person in Hawaii. These four Communists are: Thomas Yagi, Newton Miyagi, "Castner" Ogawa, and "Slim" Shimizu.

Mr. Newton Miyagi is the same gentleman whose recent appointment to the Red Cross board raised such a furor. During the 1956 U.S. Senate committee hearings on internal subversion, Mr. Miyagi invoked the fifth amendment 71 times and declined to answer when asked if he had been in contact with Russian military intelligence agents.

These are the men whose political endorsements are sought for and accepted in order to attain public office. These are the same Communists who will pass upon and either reject or give political endorsement to the two U.S. Senators and the two U.S. Representatives to be elected in Hawaii and sent to our Congress.

We can best judge the political power of the ILWU by comparing the results of their endorsements with the results of the endorsements of the Republican Party.

Out of the 69 offices in which the ILWU endorsed candidates, 37 won seats; the Republican-endorsed candidates won only 24 seats. In other words, the ILWU endorsement is much more valuable than the Republican Party endorsement.

Mr. Chairman, I reiterate that the power of the Communist Party continues to be so potent that it is a menace to the people of Hawaii and to the people of the 49 States. There is no evidence of the lessening of that power.

In the event of statehood, the Communist Party will, in all probability, exert a continuing tremendous influence on the election of Hawaii's two Senators and two Representatives. The probable election of ILWU-endorsed Representatives to the U.S. Congress will mean that the Communist Party will exert a substantial influence upon these Members of Congress.

The Communist Party will have succeeded in infiltrating the U.S. Congress and establishing a fifth column in this last defense of the free world.

Mr. Chairman, I received this package of Hawaiian newspaper clippings in this morning's mail.

They tell two simple stories.

In the last election, the Republicans elected 18 members in the Hawaii House of Representatives. The Democrats elected 32 members.

The Democratic speaker was O. V. Esposito. The previous Democratic speaker was Charles Kauhane. Mr. Kauhane is one of the members who accepted and was elected with ILWU endorsement and support.

Jack Hall and Charlie Kauhane joined forces and established a coalition with the 18 Republican members. They un-

seated Speaker Esposito and elected their own choice, Mr. Eravalho.

Charlie Kauhane is the same person, who 3 years ago, while speaker of the house, sent a gavel to Harry Bridges, to open an ILWU meeting as a token of esteem for that Communist international agent.

Another portion of this newspaper prints a warm welcome to Hawaii being given to the crew of a Russian ship. This welcome is printed in red ink, and in the Russian language.

Since we are living today under a Khrushchev ultimatum over the Berlin crisis, this warm, fawning welcome to Hawaii for these Russians is a most inappropriate act.

It is further evidence of the spirit of appeasement, tolerance, and encouragement to communism on the part of the citizens of Hawaii.

I make this prophecy, that Hawaii will be the first State whose government will be completely Communist controlled. I further predict that statehood will help to create a rebellious situation similar to that of Cyprus on this most strategic military outpost.

Mr. Chairman, this bill should be defeated for the safety and the survival of this Nation.

Mr. McINTIRE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maine?

There was no objection.

Mr. McINTIRE. Mr. Chairman, I rise to say that H.R. 4221 has my support, just as it had my support when it last appeared before this body for consideration.

I became conscious of the merits of statehood for Hawaii through the dedicated and unremitting efforts of the late Honorable Joseph Rider Farrington. Mr. Farrington came to this legislative hall in the 78th Congress as a Delegate from Hawaii, and, owing to his untimely death on June 19, 1954, departed from our midst in the 83d Congress.

The consideration of this legislation before the House of Representatives today bears testimony to the truth that the good that men do lives on long after they have gone. Indeed, it must be with a great sense of pride that Mr. Farrington's family observes the progress of this principle to which the Delegate from Hawaii gave so much of himself.

The State of Maine can lay claim to many illustrious families, and one of these is the Farrington family. And I feel particularly proud to make known the fact that the roots of this family tree are anchored in Brewer, Maine, a community in the Third Congressional District which I am privileged to represent.

Joseph Farrington was a descendant of this Maine family, and ours was an association that will not quickly be forgotten because it is too easy to remember. I shall always remember him for the fine man he was, and for the enthusiasm he exhibited in his legislative endeavors—statehood for Hawaii was one of these.

It is then with mingled objectivity and sentiment that I lend my strong support to this legislation. That H.R. 4221 has merit, I feel certain—that I can extend this tribute to Joe Farrington brings me a bounty of pleasure and a great sense of satisfaction.

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. ROOSEVELT].

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Chairman, I wish to add my voice to those who are ably endorsing statehood for Hawaii. The Territory of Hawaii has demonstrated beyond a doubt its ability to develop from colonial status, with the concomitant results of economic oligarchy into what we now know as "modern" Hawaii; a Hawaii able to prosper and develop to the fullest its human and natural resources.

The record will show that Hawaii in 1958 was one of the Nation's most progressive and prosperous areas. It will show, for example, that its broadly based economic life brought into our Treasury $166 million in taxes, putting Hawaii ahead of 10 States as taxpayers. Certainly this fact alone would warrant the right of Hawaii to voting participation in the Congress of the United States, voting in our presidential elections, and to its own popularly elected Governor and Lieutenant Governor.

The record will likewise show that Hawaii is an ever-growing area economically, with a fast-growing population to help in its advance toward continued growth. Stagnation is not the mark of Hawaii. Progress is the word to describe this democratic bastion of the Pacific. Business is developing and expanding continuously and the standard of living of workers has continued to improve. For example, in 1957 per capita income rose to $1,821, ranking Hawaii 25th with the States.

The record will also show that the young people of Hawaii are willing and competent to meet the challenges of the 20th century and this is significant because they are living in "America's showwindow" in Asia. In 1958, 7,000 students attended the University of Hawaii, the highest per population in the Nation.

Mr. Chairman, I have merely highlighted certain facts. There are many, many more that could be used to show that Hawaii has conclusively demonstrated that its own development and contributions to the United States serve as more than prima facie evidence of its right to statehood.

I would like to turn to other facets involved in considering statehood for Hawaii. It is wrapped up in this observation: "The Nation Needs Hawaii." It should certainly be recognized that by embracing Hawaii as a State, the United States of America would be taking a significant and historical step in favorably influencing the peoples of the Pacific Basin, and indeed in other areas of the world. To admit Hawaii to statehood would demonstrate in no uncertain terms that we practice as well as preach the democratic ideal that all citizens are equal before the law, regardless of color or creed. This shining example in the Pacific would permit half the world's people to compare for themselves the deeds of our Nation with the empty promises of equality espoused by Communist propagandists.

The Nation needs Hawaii for another reason—admission of this Territory as the 50th State would bolster Hawaii's role as our Pacific bastion of defense. The courageous, valuable and never-to-be-forgotten contribution of the Hawaiians in World War II speaks for itself. I might add I was in the Pacific area during the war and can personally attest to the valor and determination of our fellow citizens from the Hawaiian Islands. Certainly the home of Pearl Harbor should be granted the dignity it deserves—statehood.

And let us never forget the positive impact of our action when we granted independence to the Republic of the Philippines. This the people of Asia understood. I firmly believe statehood for Hawaii, in which we find a real mosaic of racial strains, would offer an even more positive and emphatic impact on Asian thinking. In addition, I believe the Asians would be impressed by our support of the will of the Hawaiians to develop and practice local self-government, the touchstone of democracy.

Mr. Chairman, these are ethical concepts which I think are important to keep in mind.

In granting statehood to the Americans of Hawaii we would be adding the window of our freedom in the Pacific—Hawaii—to the American home now comprised of 49 States, a home in which it properly belongs.

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as she may require to the gentlewoman from New Jersey [Mrs. DWYER].

Mrs. DWYER. Mr. Chairman, some day in the future the Members of the 86th Congress will look back at what we are about to do today and appreciate more completely the historic significance of granting Statehood to the Territory of Hawaii.

I consider it a privilege to join our colleagues in support of this long overdue measure. For nearly 60 years, the people of Hawaii have been waiting for this day. In every respect, I believe they have demonstrated their readiness for Statehood and their ability to carry out the obligations statehood imposes. Hawaii has the population, the economic resources, and the tradition of representative government to assure that, as the 50th State of the Union, she will be a proud and worthy addition.

I have considered as thoroughly as possible the objections which opponents of the bill have raised. I do not believe these objections are at all conclusive. Many of them are based on the rather questionable speculations advanced as to the future political behavior of the population—speculations which do not seem to me to be supported by past experience.

Nor do I share the concern of some that Hawaii lies several thousands of miles in the Pacific—a considerable distance from the shores of continental United States. In this age of fast ships, jet aircraft and miracles of electronic

communication, Hawaii is very much a neighbor to all our States.

As we prepare to accept Hawaii as our newest State, Mr. Speaker, I am reminded of our action last year in granting statehood to Alaska. At that time, many of us called attention to the pledges both our political parties had oftentime made to both Alaska and Hawaii, and we expressed our intentions to continue working for the admission of Hawaii.

Consequently, it seems fitting to me to look ahead at this time to the next great responsibility of this Congress—the enactment of a home rule bill for the District of Columbia. It is hardly necessary today to review the many reasons why this is important: the need to be honest with the citizens of Washington, the need to relieve this national deliberative assembly from the burden of deciding the most insignificant of local affairs, and the need to raise our Nation's Capital to self-governing status.

As a great American newspaper recently observed, home rule for the District of Columbia would free all Americans from the irony of denying self-government to the Capital of the greatest self-governing Nation in the world.

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. DOOLEY].

Mr. DOOLEY. Mr. Chairman, my purpose in rising is to speak in favor of the bill H.R. 4221, which, if enacted, would grant statehood to Hawaii.

I cannot help but believe that if the majority of the Members of this House had visited Hawaii sometime in the past there would be no doubt about the success of the legislation presently under discussion.

Few places on earth are more attractive. Few have the physical advantages Hawaii possesses—the mild climate, abundant natural beauty, and a friendly, heterogeneous population.

I think it was Mark Twain who said of Hawaii, "The most beautiful fleet of islands ever anchored in the sea."

But a Territory does not become a State on the basis of aesthetic criteria. Hawaii merits statehood on more realistic grounds.

No Territory, with the exception of Oklahoma, has ever possessed a population as large as Hawaii's at the time it sought statehood in the Union. Hawaii's population is approximately 600,000.

Thomas Jefferson, in his statement on the qualifications for a Territory seeking statehood, thought that 60,000 was an adequate number. Times have changed, admittedly, but the barriers that once stood in the way of statehood for Hawaii have been eliminated by man's technological and sociological progress.

Distance, for example, was once a principal impediment to the recognition of Hawaii as a State. Yet those 2,200 miles of ocean that separate this beautiful segment of America from the mainland have been spanned in a few hours by jet planes. Telephonic and radio communications place the islands in immediate contact with Washington.

As for sociological progress, Hawaii is made up of people of Polynesian, Japanese, Philippine and oceanic origins. Yet they live together under a system of town government similar to our own. They have free elections, they are subject to our Federal laws, they are citizens of our country, and have been since Hawaii ceded its sovereignty to the United States at the turn of the century.

These people have one thing in common—an abiding faith in the fairness of the United States to grant them the privilege of first-class citizens, and to admit their Territory as a State.

Fifty years ago, with the biased viewpoint of most Americans toward the Asiatic races, such a step would have been impossible.

Today, with the world growing smaller, with man more dependent on his fellow man than ever before, statehood for Hawaii is not only possible but necessary.

Why is it necessary? Because—

Hawaii is our great bastion of democratic strength in the Pacific.

It is the bridge which can unite us with our allies in Asia through ties of understanding and mutual respect.

It has a self-supporting economy.

It is rich in two very much needed agricultural products—cane sugar and pineapples—which produce sales of a quarter-billion dollars annually.

It offers the the only safe harbor for large naval vessels between California and Asia's mainland.

It provides key bases for our Air Force, Navy, Army and Marine Corps in the tremendous area of the Pacific.

The people of Hawaii have proved their right to statehood by every reasonable test of patriotism and good citizenship.

The people of Hawaii are fully qualified to fulfill the responsibilities that statehood would impose upon them and they would do so intelligently, honorably and in the best interests of the Nation.

The Senators and Representative sent by the State of Hawaii to the Congress would not only serve the interests of Hawaii with competence and integrity, but they would also in my humble opinion fulfill their responsibilities to the Nation as a whole with ability and honor.

Statehood would strengthen Hawaii's economic future and contribute to the further political and social progress of these islands.

It is part of America and should not be treated like a poor relative, especially when we recall the sacrifices of its citizens during World War II.

Not a single act of sabotage disturbed the islands. Several thousand Niseis went to their death in Europe to show their affection and loyalty to the country which had given them the opportunities inherent in freedom.

And when the Nisei Regiment which had been shot to bits in Europe was being re-formed and 2,000 more men were asked for, thousands clamored for admission to its ranks so as to do their part for the United States and prove to the world that the Japanese-born citizens of Hawaii were truly appreciative of being citizens of our great country.

Your speaker has talked with many of the Japanese people of Hawaii. They are proud to be Americans—proud of Hawaii—eager for it to be a State. They speak our language, follow our customs, and long for full admission as an integral part of the United States.

The political developments which will follow Hawaii's admission as a State are obvious. But to permit consideration of these developments to stand in the way of favorable action because they might have a certain effect on current legislation is to try to turn back the dynamics of our age and divert the trends of the times.

Hawaii will make a great contribution as a State.

The oft-mentioned communism of the islands—which, by the way, is greatly exaggerated—will eventually pass away in their new found pride in the sisterhood of States.

To let one Communist of importance on the islands stand in the way of statehood is like destroying an orchard because of one blighted tree.

Now is the time to add to our flag the 50th and final star. Now is the time to give fulfillment to the veiled assurances given over half a century that Hawaii would someday become a State.

Now is the time to link that fleet of islands anchored in the sea inseparably to our shores, so that no world event will ever take them from us.

I would like to read an excerpt from an editorial which appeared in the New York Times of March 3:

> Nothing has been more impressive in the recent discussion of this issue than the flimsiness of the arguments of those who oppose statehood. Sometimes these arguments are directly contradictory, as when some critics charge that Hawaii is in the hands of a few large corporations, while others claim it is really ruled by henchmen of Harry Bridges. Sometimes these arguments enter the realm of fantasy, as when they allege that admission of Hawaii as a State would give Communist propaganda grounds for accusing us of colonial imperialism.
>
> But the most unworthy argument against statehood is the one which stresses the non-Caucasian nature of most of Hawaii's population. This is racism with a vengeance and directly contradictory to every ideal of our democracy. American citizenship is not, and should never be, restricted to white men, to people of European origin, or to any other such narrow "elite." It is the glory of our Nation that here men of every color, origin, and religion have come together to live in freedom and equality, though these ideals have not everywhere been realized. Hawaiians of every background have proved their loyalty by fighting and dying for our country on equal terms with Americans from the mainland. Against that background statehood for Hawaii is an obligation the rest of us have long owed our fellow Americans who live in those beautiful islands.

A previous speaker talking about Hawaii pointed out that it was a small area which would be given four votes—two Senators and two Congressmen. I would like to point out that the same can be said of several of our present States: Vermont is one; Nevada, Delaware, Rhode Island, and so on.

Let me give you some figures dealing with the prosperity of the island.

In 1957 Hawaii experienced the most prosperous peacetime year in history; 1958 was expected to exceed this.

The per capita income of Hawaii residents reached $1,821, higher than in 24 States.

Total income was more than in eight States.

Hawaii paid $166 million in Federal taxes, more than any of 10 States.

The economy earned $23 million more than it spent in 1957.

Retail trade climbed from $612 million in 1956 to $660 million in 1975.

Defense expenditures rose from $285 million in 1956 to $308 million in 1957.

There is one other point I would like to make here.

In 1950 the citizens of Hawaii elected 63 delegates to a convention to draft a constitution for the future State of Hawaii.

Of a slate of 14 candidates endorsed by the ILWU leadership, only 3 were elected. They were:

Richard M. Kageyama, who after his election admitted he had been a Communist Party member in 1945. He was forced to resign as a delegate.

Frank G. Silva, an ILWU business agent on the Island of Kauai. After being elected he refused to tell a House Un-American Activities Subcommittee whether he was a Communist. He was expelled by the convention for "contumacious conduct."

Frank C. Luiz, an ILWU business agent on the Island of Hawaii and a member of the county civil service commission. He voted with his colleagues to oust Silva, his fellow business agent.

The Hawaii State Constitution as drafted included a provision that "no person who advocates, or who aids or belongs to any party, organization, or association which advocates the overthrow by force or violence of the Government of the United States shall be qualified to hold any public office or employment." It will be the first State constitution to contain such a provision.

ILWU leaders strongly opposed ratification of the reactionary constitution. They waged a vigorous campaign to defeat it in the November 1950, general elections. Nevertheless, the constitution was ratified by the voters of Hawaii by better than a 3-to-1 margin, with a plurality of more than 55,000 votes.

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. BENNETT].

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I have long and consistently supported statehood for Hawaii and I am glad to have this opportunity to say something here in behalf of this measure.

By virtue of its substantial population of good American citizens, its contribution in taxes to the national welfare, its size, its proximity to our mainland shores, and by virtue of its history of good Americanism, Hawaii has earned the right to statehood. A compelling additional reason for admission to statehood is the national defense requirements of our Nation. I firmly believe that granting statehood will be a positive factor for continued growth and stability in the population there, which undoubtedly would be in the interest of our national defense.

During the early part of World War II I had the privilege of spending the better part of a year in the Hawaiian Islands while training for jungle fighting in the South Pacific and performing other military duties in that area. During this stay I was in close contact with a large number of people who have lived in the Hawaiian Islands for generations and I was deeply impressed with their loyalty to America and the fine American principles by which they lived.

The record of individual heroism for America among the Hawaiians is truly outstanding. Gen. Mark Lance once described a Hawaiian regiment of World War II as "the most decorated unit in the entire military history of the United States." Their superlative record in the Korean war is summarized by the House committee report as follows:

> Not one case of cowardice by a Hawaiian soldier in the face of the Communist enemy.

The statistical record of those Hawaiians giving their lives for our country in the Korean war was unsurpassed by those of any other area.

The role of Hawaii in our defense picture should never be minimized. Statehood can only increase and improve the efficacy of this role. It is obvious that the more stable a local government can be the more successful would be the control and defense of that area in case of a sudden attack. There can be no question that the State and local instrumentalities of law and order would be much more effective than the Territorial administration. Just such reasoning is embodied in a Department of Defense report of 1950, as follows:

> Statehood for Hawaii would undoubtedly give a considerable added measure of strength to the overall defense in the event of an emergency.

> Gen. Douglas MacArthur says: "Hawaii should become our 50th State." This is also the opinion of President Eisenhower, our chief military and civil authority, in 1959.

It is my understanding that this opinion is shared by the leading military authorities who have studied the question.

So, I find myself completely in harmony with the idea that it is in the national interest of our country to allow self-government in this area. They are already American citizens. They have earned the right to self-government within the Federal structure, and I am glad to raise my voice as a Floridian welcoming to the Union a beautiful sister State, Hawaii.

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from Oregon [Mrs. GREEN].

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, it is with the deepest satisfaction that I address the House on this occasion. Today we are beginning for, I hope, the last time, the perennial debate on Hawaiian statehood. For 60 years the good Americans of Hawaii have waited while the Congress has delayed, stalled, considered, and reconsidered their pleas for simple justice. For 60 years they have paid taxes, served in the Nation's Armed Forces, and borne all the duties and responsibilities of American citizenship. For 60 years they have shared with their fellow Americans the hopes, the fears, the aspirations, and the frustrations which have afflicted us all. Yet for 60 years, these people have been singled out as somehow unworthy of the one inestimable privilege which everywhere else has gone hand in hand with those duties—the privilege of the vote. In return for their voteless status, they have enjoyed no special dispensation. They have been taxed without representation, they have been drafted without representation, and almost alone among American communities, they have been bombed without a voice to speak for their problems and without a vote to assert their views on this floor.

Like our newest sister State, Alaska, Hawaii has been ably and eloquently represented by its distinguished Delegate, JOHN BURNS. We who know JOHN BURNS know that any State would be proud to have him serve as one of its Representatives in the Congress. But JOHN BURNS, in spite of his contributions to our deliberations, in spite of his wise counsel, in spite of his devotion to his God and his country, has been a voteless, powerless, spectator of the legislative process. His influence has been felt, but his voice has never been heard in that sacrament of self-government, the rollcall vote.

Now, Mr. Chairman, we are turning once again and, let us hope, for the last time, to an attempt to undo this ancient wrong. We are about to vote, not to confer a favor upon Hawaii, but to undo an injustice wrought on ourselves. This Hall, Mr. Chairman, is a shrine of self-government. It is a place which has been hallowed, not by the transient individuals who have served here, but by the fact that here is embodied the principle of self-government. Here is made manifest the idea of Thomas Jefferson that all just governments derive their power from the consent of the governed. In acting, within the confines of this historic Chamber, to govern peoples whose consent is not asked and whose participation is not encouraged, we have weakened by our example what we uphold with our words. Every time the Congress of the United States acts to pass legislation for the governance of a Territory when such an act could be passed by the legislature of a State, we are cheapening our own dignity and demeaning our high office, no matter how generous may be the terms of such legislation. It does not matter that this Congress has been fair and even openhanded with the American citizens of Hawaii. What does matter is that we have, by these 60 years of delay, denied that American citizens are capable of self-government. If the citizens of Hawaii, as American citizens, are unworthy of the vote, then no citizen of any State is worthy of the vote. It does not matter how that vote will be cast. I do not know, and I could not care less, how the

people of Hawaii will vote in presidential elections, or in congressional elections. There are two alternatives, Mr. Chairman. Either these people are worthy of making their own mistakes or our own constituents are not worthy to select us and, hence, we are ourselves not worthy to govern a great Nation.

Mr. Chairman, Hawaiian statehood is an issue not confined to Hawaii. It sets before us, unmistakably, the question of our own belief in the American system of government. I mean to show forth my faith in that system and to vote for Hawaii's admission to the Union.

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PRICE].

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Chairman, there are many reasons why I favor this legislation providing for the admission of Hawaii as a State in the Union. The primary one is because it is important in the defense structure of this Nation.

HAWAII'S MILITARY IMPORTANCE

Hawaii's place in the military program of our Nation over the years is well known. After the disaster of Pearl Harbor, the islands became the major staging base and fleet service center for the successful prosecution of the Pacific conflict. Later the islands served again as a vital relay station for men and materials used against the Communists in Korea. The islands stand today as a mid-Pacific bastion; headquarters for military defense in the entire central and western Pacific.

Three outstanding military figures of this generation have gone on record in support of Hawaiian statehood. These include President Eisenhower, who endorsed statehood again, during the course of his message to this Congress.

In July of last year Gen. Douglas MacArthur had this to say:

> Hawaii should become our 50th State. No sophistry of political manipulation should delay the conferring of full status of citizenship on this loyal and devoted community.
>
> That a Nation such as ours, founded on the concepts of liberty and freedom, should further hesitate on such a basic question of right and justice is not understandable.

Retired Adm. Chester Nimitz is on record with this statement:

> I have given close study to the islands from a military and naval aspect. I perceive no objection from a military or naval standpoint to the Hawaiian Islands achieving statehood. I have great admiration and appreciation of the complete and wholehearted cooperation they gave me in the war effort.

A Department of Defense report of 1950 said:

> Statehood for Hawaii would undoubtedly give a considerable added measure of strength to the overall defense—in event of an emergency.

Today Hawaii's military importance increases rather than diminishes. Five major Pacific commands direct the Pacific's destiny from Hawaii.

At Pearl Harbor the joint air-sea-land Pacific command exercises control of forces from the west coast to Formosa. This command also embraces our scattered Pacific Fleet units. Within 10 miles of CincPac headquarters at Pearl Harbor are command posts for Pacific Air Force, Pacific Army, Pacific Fleet and Pacific Marine Forces.

The Army has six major posts in Hawaii. At Schofield Barracks a combat-ready Army division trains in reserve. Hickam Air Force Base is headquarters for the Pacific Air Force and nerve center for a Military Air Transport System that reaches from California to Saudi Arabia.

A combat-ready regiment of Marines with jet-fighter air arm is based at Kaneohe, Oahu.

Today as we again are faced with a situation in the Pacific that threatens national security, statehood for Hawaii would serve notice to the world and particularly to the troubled free countries of the Pacific rim that we intend to stay in the Pacific.

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT].

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, I want to commend the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. O'BRIEN], the distinguished gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ASPINALL] and the other members of the Committee on Interior Affairs for bringing this legislation to the floor today for our action. I want also to commend our distinguished colleague and friend, the Delegate from Hawaii [Mr. BURNS], for the untiring effort he has given to the matter of statehood for Hawaii for more than 2 years. This action is a tribute to his work and to his skill. We all congratulate him and our fellow Americans in the "Paradise of the Pacific." We welcome them into the Union. We are happy to see this gem of the West rise to the galaxy of Old Glory as its 50th star.

Mr. Chairman, this action is long overdue. It will strengthen America. I rejoice in this historic event. Aloha Hawaii!

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Alaska [Mr. RIVERS].

Mr. RIVERS of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, aside from the overwhelming majority of the people of Hawaii who have struggled for years to gain admission of Hawaii as a State of our great American Union, I feel that I have a better basis than most people for understanding the underlying human values involved.

As the sole Member of this House from the new State of Alaska, my memory is fresh as to how it feels to be a colonial on the outside looking in as contrasted with the fulfillment of being on the inside looking out.

As a youth raised in Alaska, and an adult who has spent his mature years in Alaska, I have never been eligible, until 3 months ago, to vote in an election for President of the United States, or, until 5 months ago, to vote for Senators and a Representative in the Congress, or even for Governor.

The people of a Territory organized by the Congress under the American flag are satisfied for a period of years to conduct a program of limited self-government, under tutelage, so to speak, as preparation for eventual statehood. After having gained experience and a fair degree of political maturity and economic self-sufficiency, the people of such a Territory find themselves eager to be graduated and awarded the full measure of American political rights and responsibilities. Such full recognition is regarded as the achievement of a great goal. This is true because the people of such Territory are stanch admirers and advocates of the fundamental principle of our American system of government, loyal and devoted and patriotic American citizens. Having been for many years incorporated into the Union, and inalienably a part thereof, they have nowhere to go except statehood, other than to remain in the twilight zone of territoriality. Accordingly a denial of statehood for Hawaii at this point in our history would be a great injustice. To grant statehood to Hawaii, which I am sure this Congress is going to do, will build another monument to the greatness of the United States. Concurrently the United States will benefit by enabling full participation by the people of Hawaii in the conduct of our national affairs, thereby obtaining the benefit of the fine contributions which I know they will make as the 50th State of our great Union.

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. LINDSAY].

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Chairman, I rise to add my voice to those who have spoken so effectively on behalf of statehood for Hawaii.

Mr. Chairman, the qualifications of the Territory of Hawaii for admission to statehood are self-evident. Its people are industrious, wholeheartedly loyal to the United States, and well educated as to the responsibilities which accompany statehood. The islands themselves represent in microcosm what this Nation as a whole has so splendidly and significantly contributed to the history of civilization: the proven ability of peoples of diverse races and backgrounds to work together and live together purposefully, in harmony, and with mutual respect.

Were these not reasons enough—as I believe them to be—we cannot afford to overlook the tremendous importance of Hawaii to our national defense and security as both a bastion and an outpost in the Pacific.

For this reason, Mr. Chairman, as well as for the others I have stated, I happily endorse and urge the passage of H.R. 4221.

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. BERRY].

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Chairman, as has already been indicated, I was a member of the subcommittee that went to Hawaii last November. We went there for the purpose of obtaining facts. We spent 2 weeks there, not in holding hearings, not in bringing witnesses in before us with self-serving statements, as our chairman has indicated, but, rather, going to the people ourselves to get their views. We visited with people from all walks of life. We visited with people from all businesses and professions. We went into the ILWU meeting. We went into the

service clubs. We went into the schools. We went to the university and visited with the president, the professors, and members of the board of regents. We went to the FBI. We went to the chairman of the Territorial Un-American Activities Committee. We went to the IMUA organization. We talked with people on the sugar and pineapple plantations and we talked with management and labor, both. We went to the churches. We talked with the ministers and the priests. I do not know how any group could have more fully and completely obtained a cross section of the thinking and the feeling of the people than we obtained in those 2 weeks of hearings, and it is my purpose, Mr. Chairman, to give to this committee a report.

First, as the gentleman from New York has indicated, I did support statehood in the last session, but I did it with some misgivings as to whether or not communism in the islands was something that should be feared and, as my colleagues will confirm, I was like the proverbial man from Missouri, I had to be shown. I came away from the islands convinced that I could in clear conscience support statehood without any reservation. We found there a situation that is unique in the United States. The island legislature has established a Territorial Un-American Activities Committee with a full-time staff, a committee whose purpose it is to talk with the FBI, to work with the FBI and other organizations in seeking out and providing to the Governor of the islands and to the legislature of the islands such information as they are able to obtain on subversive activities in the islands. This organization works very closely with another group known as the IMUA, which is composed of a group of patriotic, hard-working, conscientious businessmen who also have a staff of employees and whose sole purpose it is to keep the people of the islands informed on any subversive activities. They name names. They do a good job not only of informing the people of the islands what the activity may be but also informing the voters on what candidates are receiving political support of ILWU and support of those who have in the past been named as subversives.

On the other side of the coin, however, there is no evidence to indicate that those who have been named in previous congressional committee reports or who were convicted under the Smith Act have actually changed their spots, except that our committee was told by Jack Hall that he and the other five persons who were so convicted would take an oath that they have not been affiliated with the Communist Internationale for more than 5 years. I should point out, however, that none of the six have gone to the FBI or to the Territorial Un-American Activities Committee and attempted in any way to offer their services or their assistance or their information to these organizations in connection with helping to stamp out communism or the effects of communism either on the islands or on the mainland. I do not condone this action or lack of action. On the other hand, I do believe that the situation is under better control on the islands than it is in most of the areas on the mainland.

We were told that there are about 25 people in the islands who, down through the years, have been identified with the Communist movement; but the significant thing is, there has been no new activity since the trials under the Smith Act several years ago. We were told that these trials had crippled the Communist apparatus and that under the white light of publicity in recent years and a constantly alerted citizenry, it would remain under control either as a Territory or as a State.

We talked the problem of communism with everyone in all walks of life from the president of the university to the chairman of the board of regents, to the men in business throughout the islands, to workers, to the owners of the ranches, the plantations, the tourist attraction operators, and almost without exception we were told that communism is no greater a problem on the islands than it is on the mainland, and that this issue should not be used as a valid argument against statehood.

I had the privilege of asking Admiral Felt, the Supreme Commander of the Pacific, what effect statehood would have in the Pacific. His answer was that it was his considered opinion that to refuse Hawaii statehood, after granting it to Alaska, would be a serious blow to our position in the Far East.

Mr. Chairman, I am not supporting statehood because of our international relations. I am supporting it because 60 years ago we promised statehood to these people when they could prove they were ready for it.

Mr. Chairman, they have today proven they are ready for full citizenship and statehood rights, and I am prepared to cast my vote to give it to them and to bring this great area into the Union of United States.

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. QUIGLEY].

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Chairman, I merely wanted to state for the record that when rollcall No. 9, on the rule for the Hawaiian statehood bill, was taken, I was at the Department of the Interior on official business in connection with the acquisition of lands involved in the Gettysburg battlefield area. Had I been present I would have voted for the rule.

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. LIBONATI].

Mr. LIBONATI. Mr. Chairman, I realize, being a neophyte, that anything I might say here has been thoroughly discussed in an analytical sense relative to the admission of a State to the Union.

After all, Congress acts purely as the machinery of government toward this accomplishment—granting admission upon the manifest approval of all of the people of the United States. It should not be determined in Congress by sectional division based on political or racial bias.

Hawaii has contributed much to the defense of the Union. Hawaii is a strategic place. We are spending millions of dollars upon various geographical sites for the protection of America. How can we now deny people of the Republic, who are stepcitizens or secondary citizens, the right to what they have earned—a voice in Government?

I say to you that we, as servants of the people, can only analyze this question from the standpoint of what is the fundamental belief of each citizen of the United States relative to the entry of Hawaii; and I am sure that the public press and other disseminators of information—the radio and television—have indicated to us that the people of America are asking that you admit Hawaii into the Union; that you facilitate this matter; that you create, in Hawaii, a spiritual and cultural feeling of contribution to the common cause of the United States; that you, in your honest endeavors, set aside any political question or any question based upon the contribution of the economy of Hawaii to this great Government.

On the other hand, the people of America are asking that you admit Hawaii because they are fellow Americans; that they have a common interest; that they have a constitution similar to our own; that they are a proud State, too, except that, as a Territory, we gave them the opportunity to work toward the successful accomplishment, in the future, of becoming a State in the Union.

Some of us seem to feel that it is a personal opinion for determination, or is related to political questions of our State or on consideration of financial factors, each contributing to a background which might negate or approve the acceptance of Hawaii.

This is a national question—whether Hawaii as a State in the Union will contribute to the common cause of the American citizenry in maintaining its democratic institutions and establishing a firm government.

You cannot deny Hawaii the right to participate in our governmental affairs. In order that she might participate, you must recognize her as a State. It is an edict already determined by the American people.

I thank you very much.

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to express my support for the Hawaiian statehood bill. The people of Hawaii have proved themselves to be good citizens and good Americans in time of war and in peacetime. They are entitled to full and equal rights of citizenship including voting representation in Congress, the right to choose their own elected officials at all levels of government, and a full share of Federal grant-in-aid programs.

By every type of measurement, the people of Hawaii have proved that they are worthy of statehood. Hawaii is economically strong, industrious, and prosperous. Per capita income is higher than that of 25 other States. Industry is becoming ever more diversified. Its population is growing rapidly. Its agricultural economy is sound. The people of Hawaii pay more Federal income taxes

than 10 other States. Hawaiians are well educated and alert to the responsibilities of citizenship.

As the test tube of democracy in the Pacific, Hawaiians have proved that peoples of varied racial, cultural, economic, and political backgrounds can live and work together to build a truly American society in the best traditions of our democratic system. Admission of Hawaii as a State will serve as an example to the peoples of the vast Pacific and Far East that we practice democracy as well as preach it in our relations with other countries.

Statehood for Hawaii has been endorsed by both political parties and by virtually every important organization representing the views of farmers, workers, and industry. The people of the United States have time and again registered an overwhelming support for statehood in public opinion polls. The statehood bill has been passed by three previous Congresses.

Mr. Chairman, the people of Hawaii are ready for the responsibility of statehood. They are entitled to statehood. Let us act now to fulfill their destiny by voting overwhelmingly to make Hawaii our 50th State.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Chairman, we are here today to do justice to half a million Americans by granting statehood to Hawaii. The next step, logically and morally, should be restoring home rule to the District of Columbia.

There are those who think we can continue, indefinitely, to deny justice to the nearly 1 million people of Washington. I do not believe this House will accept that argument. In spite of the opponents and the doubters, we have granted statehood to Alaska. We are acting now to grant statehood to Hawaii. We should move on, and soon, to home rule for the District.

Four times in the past 9 years, home rule has been approved by the other body. Each time, it has died for lack of action in this House. The responsibility is ours and we must meet it—and soon.

Under the circumstances, it is ironic that the motto of the District of Columbia is "justitia omnibus"—justice to all. Perhaps this motto was chosen back in the days when the District had its own government. Otherwise it is a cruel joke. What kind of justice is it that prevents 825,000 Americans from running even their own local affairs—takes their taxes but denies them a voice in the spending of their taxes? What right do we have to tell nearly a million people—American citizens like ourselves—that they are second-class citizens who shall have no vote, no voice in their own affairs?

I personally want a chance to vote on the issue. A number of bills have been introduced in this House, with bipartisan backing, to restore home rule to Washington. I trust we will soon have an opportunity to vote on this issue and do justice to all the people of Washington.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, I want to go on record as favoring the admission of Hawaii as a State. The 85th Congress will be remembered as the Congress that admitted Alaska to the Union. It would be fitting for the 86th Congress to be remembered as the Congress which granted statehood to Hawaii.

Hawaii is both economically and politically fully ready to assume the status of a State. The argument of noncontiguity has been raised against statehood for Hawaii. This is an outmoded argument in the present air and space age. Since the admission of Alaska as our 49th State the argument of noncontiguity is overruled.

Hawaii is American, and as such its people are full United States citizens and deserve full representation in the Congress as well as the authority to handle local problems locally as a State, rather than as an incorporated Federal Territory.

It is my sincere desire and hope that the 1st session of the 86th Congress will be the time when Hawaii and her people attain the status of first-class citizenship. We should pass the bill for statehood for Hawaii today.

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. KILDAY, chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 4221) to provide for the admission of the State of Hawaii into the Union, had come to no resolution thereon.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD immediately following the question by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON] an explanation of the difference between an incorporated Territory and an unincorporated Territory, and the status of the island of Guam, the Virgin Islands, and the trust territories.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who desire to do so be permitted to extend their remarks on the pending bill at the conclusion of general debate today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

LIMITATIONS ON USE OF APPENDIX

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I want to make a suggestion on how certain changes might be made to facilitate the use of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. If I am correctly informed, the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD was designed to record the proceedings and debates of Congress, which it does with a remarkable degree of accuracy.

Perhaps I am too critical, and again it may be because I am constantly trying to find ways in which this Congress can save money, but I have some suggestions which I think might serve a good purpose.

During the 10 years I have served in this body I have witnessed an increasing abuse of the privilege Members have of extending their remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD. It is becoming more time consuming all the time and from year to year, to attempt to peruse the great volume of extraneous material that appears in the Appendix, and no wonder some Members have felt the need of an administrative assistant, even if he did nothing else than to note the extensions which are made in the Appendix.

However, I believe the need for this additional employee might be lessened, if the Appendix could be edited and classified, and another section of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD be set aside under a separate title to properly identify material other than remarks of Members and material pertinent to legislation. This in itself might not reduce the cost of printing, but after having some of our extensions consigned to that section of the RECORD, I rather imagine there would be fewer requests for insertions of such inconsequential material that is unrelated to legislation or the actions of Congress. More effective, however, would be the placing of a limitation on the number of times during a session or the amount of space which any one Member might use during a session. At $85 a page, the saving would be no small item in the course of a year. Such limitation would also offer an opportunity to decline requests for insertions of such material.

On Monday of this week unanimous consent for extensions in the Appendix of the RECORD was granted to 1 Member in 10 instances; to 2 Members in 8 instances; to another, 7; to another in 6 instances; to 5 Members in 5 instances; and to 15 other Members in from 2 to 4 instances.

If Congress—and Members of the House of Representatives are not the only ones at fault—persists in wasting the taxpayers money in this fashion, not to mention other ways which have been more widely publicized, how can we expect to convince anyone that we are interested in economy or capable of fiscal responsibility?

NATURAL GAS ACT

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, few in this Congress are not concerned over Supreme Court decisions in recent years which, whatever their legal merits, cer-

tainly did not implement the obvious intent of Congress in enacting the various laws in question.

In no case has Congress' purpose been more clearly thwarted than by court interpretation of the Natural Gas Act of 1938 in the now famous Phillips Petroleum decision.

I have today introduced, again as in the last Congress, in cosponsorship with the very able gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS], a simple measure which attempts no far-reaching overhaul of basic law. As a matter of fact, it simply restates and so clarifies section 1 of the Natural Gas Act, that all who read it may determine that it means just what the Federal Power Commission, the gas producers generally, and most other moderately intelligent though perhaps legalistically unsophisticated minds had always thought it meant prior to the Supreme Court's Phillips decision.

Section 1 of the act reads:

Section 1(b) (15 U.S.C. 717): "The provisions of this chapter * * * shall not apply to any other transportation or sale of natural gas or to the local distribution of natural gas or to the facilities used for such distribution or to the production or gathering of natural gas."

FINANCING OF TVA POWER PROGRAM

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include a statement he made before the Committee on Public Works today relative to H.R. 3460.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I appeared before the House Public Works Committee this forenoon in opposition to H.R. 3460, a bill which among other things would permit the TVA to float its own bonds.

My statement to that committee follows:

I understand that only 2 days of hearings have been scheduled on this bill, H.R. 3460, one to hear the proponents and one to hear the opponents. Frankly, I am surprised that no more time is being taken on a bill that, if enacted, would have such serious and far-reaching adverse effects on the future of this beloved Nation of ours. It would be just a forerunner of other similar assaults on the principles and standards upon which this Nation was founded in keeping with the Constitution.

As a member of the Appropriations Committee of the House of Representatives, I particularly object to the H.R. 3460 bond issue proposal for future financing of the Tennessee Valley Authority power program. This proposal is nothing more than an attempt to bypass the Appropriations Committee and to eliminate the control of the elected Representatives of the American people, in Congress assembled. It is also an attempt to create a hydra-headed entity that would have a primary obligation to the bondholders and a secondary obligation to the American people. Its control would rest in the hands of three men not elected by the people, who in effect have more power to control the destinies and welfare of the region within which the TVA operates than do the Governors of the States involved.

The proposed revenue-bond method of obtaining funds for TVA, bonds without the full faith and credit of the Federal Government back of them, is something new in Federal agency financing. If permitted, it could be the beginning of widespread extension to other agencies of the Federal Government. It is contrary to the provisions and intent of the Constitution of the United States. It is not in keeping with the principles and standards upon which this Nation was founded.

I believe that Congress has the right and the duty to pass annually upon the financing of the Federal Government and its various agencies. This right is inherent in the Constitution that provides that "No money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in consequence of appropriations made by law."

Year after year proposals are made to use the back-door approach to the Federal Treasury or to obtain money for Federal agencies or programs by methods not in keeping with the Constitution of the United States.

Believing as I do that this bond issue proposal and many other features of H.R. 3460 are not in keeping with the Constitution and the basic principles on which this Nation was founded, I am dutybound to oppose it with all the strength at my command. I can do no less.

As I read this bill it would have the following effect:

Practically remove TVA from any congressional control.

Set up a method of financing a Federal agency that is not in accord with the Constitution and the principles on which this Nation was founded.

Provide no real limitation on the area in which TVA power could be utilized.

Repeal present law providing for repayment of $1,200 million of taxpayers' funds appropriated for TVA power facilities and replace this requirement with a substitute that would permit up to 120 years or more for such repayment.

Make no provision for payment into the Treasury of an amount comparable to Federal taxes paid by most non-Federal utilities.

Provide for no repayment of, or interest on, the $500 million of the Federal investment made in TVA power facilities through the use of power revenues we have been told belonged to all the people. (Actually a large part of these revenues were derived from Federal agencies.)

Twenty years ago I stood on the floor of the United States House of Representatives and took my first oath of office as a representative of the Seventh District of the State of Iowa. I have repeated that oath for each of the Congresses since that time, and so long as there is a breath in my body I shall honor that oath. You are familiar with the oath but for the RECORD I repeat it here:

"I, BEN F. JENSEN, do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic; that I will bear true faith and allegiance to the same; that I take this obligation freely, without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion, and that I will well and faithfully discharge the duties of the office on which I am about to enter. So help me God."

In the Constitution of the United States which each of the people's representatives in Congress took an oath to uphold, our forefathers set up a system of checks and balances so that the rights and freedoms on which this great Nation was founded would long endure.

First, was the Congress itself which was to enact the Federal laws in keeping with the provisions of the Constitution.

Second, was the executive department of the Federal Government which was to carry out, in keeping with the provisions of the Constitution, the laws enacted by the Congress.

Third, was the Supreme Court which was to rule on the question as to whether the laws enacted by the Congress were in accord with the Constitution.

In connection with the matter before us relative to the amendment of the Tennessee Valley Authority Act, I think each Member of Congress in passing on these proposals must ask himself: "Is the position I am taking in keeping with my oath to uphold and defend the Constitution of the United States?" It is my belief that the bill under consideration here is not in keeping with the provisions of the Constitution of the United States. I am afraid that we too often give little consideration to this matter of the constitutionality of laws proposed for passage by the Congress, thinking, in too many cases, that after all, "we have the Supreme Court to rule on such matters." Yet in many, if not most instances, it is almost impossible to get the matter brought before the Supreme Court for judicial determination. And there are those who question whether the Supreme Court itself has of late been properly exercising the powers assigned to it. It seems to me under the circumstances, each Member should endeavor to analyze for himself whether he is acting and voting in accordance with his oath of office to uphold the Constitution of these United States of America.

It is my belief that a servile Congress, in 1933, created in the Tennessee Valley Authority a separate "socialistic empire" within these United States that has now grown into a Frankenstein monster that wants to throw off the controls of the body that created it. I for one will not shirk my duty to fight for the preservation of the constitutional obligation to maintain the congressional authority prescribed by that great document and to regain those controls already, relinquished. If the people of the Tennessee Valley and their representatives in Congress, after having been the recipient of nearly $2 billion of the fruit of the labor and sweat of the taxpayers of the Nation, now want to be relieved of further control by the people's representatives in Congress, I would think more of them if they asked permission to secede from the Union. But no, they want to continue to benefit at the expense of the taxpayers of the Nation without assuming their fair share of the cost and without being subject to control by the people's representatives in Congress as are other areas of the Nation.

There were voices in Congress when the TVA Act was originally passed that warned of the dangers of approving this socialistic measure. Representative RICH said on the floor of the House:

"We speak today of Muscle Shoals as being the Norris bill and it was suggested here that it ought to be designated the "Norris bill." If I were to designate the bill, I would call it the Norris folly, and I think probably this would be the best interpretation we could give it, because if we are going to start out today on this gigantic plan of putting the Government in business, I believe it is the opening wedge for the greatest piece of socialistic legislation that has come up before the House of Representatives in the past 2 years that I have been here. It is socialism and Russianism on a gigantic scale."

And Representative Eaton said:

"When the great Russian Soviet experiment was launched I made up my mind and have never changed it since, that when that experiment was developed it would have but one rival in the world. That was the wonderful social experiment known as the United States of America. Either the whole

world would become Russian or the whole world would become American. The two principles are as far apart as the poles, as light and darkness. Of course, they will modify each other tremendously in their application. But before civilization has settled down it must and will determine whether it is to be dominated by the Russian principle or the American principle.

"This bill, and every bill like it, is simply an attempt to graft onto our American system the Russian idea and make the Government everything and the citizen nothing.

"The great ideal of American civilization is that the individual is the end of the civilizing process. Our Government exists to give him a chance to make a man of himself. The Government is the umpire in the game. When it takes the field in hurtful competition with its own citizens, it ceases to be American."

Representative Treadway pointed out that the TVA bill was brought up after a few days' hearings on the general subject matter and was to be voted upon with only 2 days' consideration and said:

"In 2 days, therefore, we are to pass upon a program of such magnitude that it is difficult to visualize. Not only are we setting the Government up permanently in the fertilizer and power business, but we are undertaking a program for the general development of one section of the country at the expense of the Public Treasury that may take 50 years to complete. We are committing the Government to an ultimate expenditure that may run into the hundreds of millions of dollars, and because the Executive has asked for this measure this Democratic-controlled Congress is going to place its rubber stamp of approval upon it without even permitting the dotting of an 'i' or crossing of a 't' and without fully realizing the consequences of its actions."

And as Raymond Moley wrote in the booklet "Valley Authorities" published by the American Enterprise Association:

"This grand design, however nobly conceived, could hardly have been sustained either by a reasonably obedient Congress or by the Supreme Court of that time. Hence, the early requests for appropriations were, in the light of what happened later, relatively modest. And the professed purposes in the bill submitted to Congress were hardly descriptive of the immense authority which eventually took form. To suggest that there be lavished vast treasure on a relatively small section of the Nation at the expense of all would have aroused an opposition of other sections that would have quickly manifested itself in Congress. And such a stupendous piece of paternalism could never have been squeezed through the Constitution, despite the fact that the general welfare clause was already opening the crack which was later to be a veritable breach."

How much farther are we to go? Are we to abdicate our responsibilities to the people who elected us? Are we to abdicate our responsibilities under the Constitution which we swore to uphold? And that is just what we will be doing if we pass this proposed bill to amend the Tennessee Valley Authority Act. It is but another big step down the road to socialism. Norman Thomas, the perennial Socialist candidate for President so aptly described TVA as "the only genuinely socialistic act in the New Deal—a flower in the midst of weeds."

A little of the history of events leading up to the Tennessee Valley Authority Act discloses the underlying objectives of its early proponents.

The Socialist Party platform in 1926 had these planks among others:

"1. Nationalization of our natural resources, beginning with the coal mines and water sites, particularly at Boulder Dam and Muscle Shoals.

"2. A publicly owned giant power system under which the Federal Government shall cooperate with the States and municipalities in the distribution of electrical energy to the people at cost."

All during the 1920's the Public Ownership League (under the active guidance of its secretary, Carl D. Thompson, a prominent Socialist who formerly was head of the Socialist Party Information Bureau) together with the socialistic League for Industrial Democracy (formerly the Intercollegiate Socialist Society) were actively promoting the socialization of all electric power in the country.

The December 1923 issue of the Public Ownership magazine, an official publication of the Public Ownership League, announced the calling of a conference to launch "a movement for nationwide public hydroelectric and superpower for the conservation and utilization of the water powers of the country for the production of electric energy at cost."

And listed the purposes of the conferences, one of which was—

"To draft suitable measures for introduction in Congress, providing for a national superpower system."

It went on to say that—

"U.S. Senator George W. Norris, of Nebraska, has agreed to introduce and is now at work drafting suitable measures providing for the public superpower system."

Such a bill, S. 2790, was introduced by Senator Norris on March 10, 1924, and, according to the league, the bill was to provide for Muscle Shoals to be a part of the proposed superpower system. This broad bill got almost no support in Congress and was allowed to die.

In 1926 Senator Norris introduced S. 2147, to create a Federal Power Corporation in the Tennessee Valley. The emphasis of this bill also was on power development, not on navigation and flood control, and was not enacted into law. In 1937 a somewhat similar bill, Senate Joint Resolution 163, was introduced and also failed of enactment into law.

Having failed to obtain passage of the bills on Muscle Shoals that gave emphasis to power, the next step was the proposal to develop the Tennessee River under the subterfuge that navigation and flood control would be the primary purposes, with power production incidental.

Ostensibly, the Tennessee Valley Authority was to be a navigation, flood-control, and resource-development agency wherein electric power was to be incidental to these primary purposes. This stated purpose was, of course, a subterfuge to the real purpose of its promoters, who even then intended it to be the beginning of a gigantic socialistic superpower empire, the forerunner of similar empires throughout this beloved freedom-loving country of ours.

The officials of the TVA itself during the early years of its existence tried to keep up this subterfuge during their presentations to the U.S. court regarding the TVA activities and program for expansion. Shortly thereafter TVA began a gradual usurpation and claiming of authority to do the very things TVA had told the U.S. courts and the Congress it would not do.

The record is clear that TVA needs more congressional control, not less. The act should be amended to regain the needed control, not to give away what little we now have.

I think it might be well here to place in the RECORD at this point some excerpts of what TVA told the U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals, Sixth Circuit, on January 8, 1937. The excerpts follow:

"The Authority has constructed and recommended for construction only such dams as are necessary for the improvement of navigation and control of destructive floods on the Tennessee and Mississippi River systems. * * * There are numerous sites upon the Tennessee River system which are valuable for the development of power, but dams constructed at such sites would not contribute substantially to the improvement of navigation or the control of destructive floods, although their construction would be more feasible for the development of power than any of the dams constructed, under construction, or recommended for construction by the Authority; but the Authority has not constructed or recommended for construction and has no intention and no authority under the Tennessee Valley Authority Act to construct such dams.

* * * * *

"It is true that by the terms of the Tennessee Valley Authority Act the steam electric generating plant located at Sheffield, Ala., near Wilson Dam, was turned over to the defendant Tennessee Valley Authority. But the defendants allege that the said steam electric generating plant has not been and is not being operated and that there is no plan or intention to operate said plant now or in the future, or to construct or operate any other steam electric generating plants. The said plant is merely held by the defendant Tennessee Valley Authority as an emergency standby plant for national defense purposes in connection with the munitions plants located near Muscle Shoals, Ala.

"The defendant, Tennessee Valley Authority has disposed of and will dispose of only such electric energy as is generated from waterpower inevitably created by the operation of the said dams for navigation and flood control and which is not needed for governmental purposes and which would otherwise be wasted. * * * By the mandate of the said act, the Tennessee Valley Authority is directed to give preference to public agencies in the sale of power and other public property. But defendants deny that they have promoted public ownership for the distribution of electric energy. The defendants deny that they have incited municipalities, or any other customers of the complainants, or any of them, to breach existing contracts with the complainants or to purchase their power requirements from the defendant Tennessee Valley Authority. * * * The defendants allege that in every instance of applications for service received by the Tennessee Valley Authority from the communities within the area, such applications have been made upon the initiative of the communities involved, without solicitation or incitation upon the part of the defendants."

The record shows that TVA has failed to adhere to any of these solemn statements as to its future operations. Do you wonder why I say TVA needs more congressional control, not less?

A few years after the above statements to the high U.S. Court, which TVA never adhered to, we find Mr. Fitts, a high TVA official who had participated in the preparation of the above-mentioned case to the U.S. Court, now telling a Congressional committee that TVA had the authority to construct steam electric generating plants. He told a congressional committee, however, that such authority was limited to the Tennessee River Valley. Excerpts from his statement follow:

"My own view about the limitations now in the statute are * * * that the TVA is authorized to construct dams on the Tennessee River and its tributaries provided that those dams are related to navigation and flood control in a material sense and further, is authorized to construct steam plants to operate in conjunction with those dams within the Tennessee watershed.

Mr. Clason then asked Mr. Fitts:

"Will you refer us to the section that would limit you to the Tennessee Valley watershed?"

Mr. Fitts answered: "Yes, sir. Section 4(j)."

Section 4(j) provides that TVA "shall have power to construct such dams, and reservoirs in the Tennessee River and its tributaries, as in conjunction with Wilson Dam, and Norris, Wheeler, and Pickwick Landing Dams, now under construction, will provide a nine-foot channel in the said river and maintain a water supply for the same, from Knoxville to its mouth, and will best serve to promote navigation on the Tennessee River and its tributaries and control destructive flood waters in the Tennessee and Mississippi River drainage basins; and shall have power to acquire or construct powerhouses, power structures, transmission lines, navigation projects, and incidental works in the Tennessee River and its tributaries, and to unite the various power installations into one or more systems by transmission lines. The directors of the Authority are hereby directed to report to Congress their recommendations not later than April 1, 1936, for the unified development of the Tennessee River system."

Mr. Fitts went on to say:

"Now, it is my conception, and it always has been ever since I have been the one assigned to construe this statute, that the power to construct generating plants is contained in this provision, and that it is limited to the construction of generating plants within the basin of the Tennessee River.

* * * * *

"I think it has the right to construct a steam-generating plant that is an auxiliary to an existing hydroelectric system and it is located within the Tennessee River Valley."

Yet the record shows that TVA soon ignored the limitation their own solicitor said was in the law and constructed the Shawnee and Gallatin steam plants outside the Tennessee River Valley and attempted to get a third plant constructed at Fulton, Ky. Only recently, I was told in a letter from TVA that they now consider that they have the authority to construct steam electric plants inside or outside the Tennessee River Valley.

In view of this record of progressive usurpation by TVA of powers and authority which they formerly disclaimed, do you wonder that I say TVA must have greater congressional control, not less, and that the TVA Act should be amended to reestablish those controls inherent under the Constitution of the United States?

I want to quote what Representative Dondero, a learned and beloved former colleague of ours and former chairman of this committee, said on the floor of the House on February 15, 1949, when he decried the socialistic proposal to appropriate money to TVA to construct steam electric plants. His statement is as follows:

"Mr. Chairman, at the very outset I want to be recorded, as I have been in the past, that I am not opposed to the development of power in the river basins of our country by the Federal Government. With the demand that exists all over the Nation for power I think that is essential and necessary. What I am opposed to and where we divide with minds in this body is the projection of the Federal Government into the sale of power as a private distributor and in competition with investment already made by the citizens of this country and already serving the area where these new projects may come into being.

"In a hearing before the Committee on Public Works last year the year before it was developed that if the Federal Government were compelled to pay the taxes, overhead expenses, interest involved in borrowing money, payment of dividends, the Federal Government could not produce 1 kilowatt of power cheaper than private industry and private investment is now producing it in this country. It is because of that unfair advantage by the Federal Government in projecting itself into the power field in competition with private enterprise that sooner or later if the step we are taking today is extended and expanded private enterprise in the power field will vanish from the American scene. That is socialization of industry. If it is so desirable to socialize electric power, will someone get up on this floor and tell the Nation why it should not be projected into all the other activities of American life—communications, transportation, mines, food, clothing, and others. But after we have done all of that, we will have brought to America an ideology that is foreign to the standards and the basic principles upon which this Nation stands, and the Republic of the United States will disappear.

Congress is now confronted with a proposal that the Tennessee Valley Authority construct and operate a steam electric generating plant. This is unusual, and in fact an unprecedented request. The Federal Government in the past has constructed and operated steam plants, but in every such case the legal background for such authorization has been on the basis of national defense. The classic example, of course, is the still existing steam plant at Muscle Shoals, created under the War Powers Act of 1916 and constructed for the purpose of the manufacture of nitrates for ammunition. Similarly, in 1940, a large steam plant was constructed at Watts Bar, Tenn., as a part of the equipment of the TVA for the purpose of augmenting the generating capacity to meet national defense demands. In addition, the Atomic Energy Commission, at Oak Ridge, has one of the largest steam electric plants in the world, wholly devoted to generating power for the manufacture of atomic bombs.

"With none of these projects has any objection ever been raised as they obviously follow the familiar pattern necessary to national preservation.

"In the case of the pending proposal for the construction of a plant at New Johnsonville, Tenn., the matter of national defense is not used as a justification.

"The lack of such justification indicates that the administration is prepared to establish a new precedent: That the Federal Government shall accept as a normal function the business of producing and selling power commercially, not incidental to any other necessary and constitutional functions of Government. The proposal pending before Congress is unique in other respects.

"Mr. Chairman, I was saying when I was interrupted a few minutes ago that the proposal pending before the Congress is unique in some other respects.

"The proposal pending before Congress is unique in other respects. For example, it is presented as a deficiency appropriation. Until now, deficiencies, have always been appropriated only for the continuance of enterprises and projects already previously authorized and for which funds have already been appropriated. In this case the Congress not only has not authorized and appropriated money for the steam plant, but in fact only a few months ago Congress by rollcall votes—two in the House of Representatives—flatly rejected the proposal to construct this very same project. No one has yet explained satisfactorily how a deficiency appropriation could be made for a project never originated and for which no money was ever appropriated.

"There is a strong doubt that such an appropriation would be legal inasmuch as there is nothing in the organic TVA Act as amended which permits the construction of new steam plants. Even if the act did so provide, it would be patently unconstitutional. The TVA was created for the purpose of harnessing the Tennessee River so that its facilities for navigation would be improved and so that its floods would be controlled. As Senator Norris once said, 'These are the constitutional pegs upon which the Tennessee Valley Authority Act must rest under the commerce clause of the Constitution.'

"There must be some lurking doubts as to the acceptance of this long step in the direction of socialism in the minds of its proponents. Otherwise the problem would have been approached in the normal parliamentary manner and under normal parliamentary procedure. The atmosphere of candor is lacking in the procedure by which this bill arrives before the House.

"On February 3, 1949, the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, acting either in that capacity or as chairman of the Deficiency Subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee, appeared before the Rules Committee and asked for a rule to obtain debate on the bill on February 4. He appeared before the Rules Committee without a bill. The Appropriations Committee itself had not met to discuss the matter. As I understand it, there had not been a formal marking up of the bill by the Deficiency Subcommittee—although this may have happened among the majority members. Thanks to the wise decision of the senior Member of this House, both in age and in consecutive legislative experience—the chairman of the Rules Committee—the proposal was given short shrift.

"In my long service in this House I recall no incident where the chairman of a committee requested a rule of the Rules Committee before his own committee had even held a meeting to consider the measure.

"This is a house of the representatives of the people of the United States. Whether they bear the label "Democrat" or "Republican," every Member of this House is sworn to sustain the Constitution and to put flag and country before partisanship. On that basis every Member in this House has a right to resent parliamentary tactics that would have been scorned by the so-called, rubberstamp Congresses of the early New Deal.

"A century ago Karl Marx published the Communist Manifesto. The past century has been the bloodiest, the cruelest, and in many ways the most catastrophic century in the history of mankind. The forces let loose by this evil dream of Karl Marx are reaping their harvests down to the present day. Only now a cardinal of the Holy Roman Catholic Church awaits his fate at the hands of a Marxian court because he placed God before the Soviet Caesars. For his courage he may hang, or spend his life in a convict's cell, or in the mercy of this Marxian court his term may be shortened. Marxism in Hungary is no different than Marxism in America, except in degree.

"Socialism is a complete word. It needs no qualification. An activity of government is either socialistic or it is not socialistic.

"This continent was peopled by men and women whose whole philosophy is a rejection of socialism and the planned state idea as conceived by Karl Marx. It was pioneered by men and women who believe in God, and in America.

"This small item in the deficiency appropriation calling for the beginning of construction of a steam plant for the TVA is little in itself, but the potentialities as a precedent can involve enormous sums as the curse of socialized power spreads like a creeping paralysis over the economy of our Nation."

Its proponents had no illusions as to the real purpose of the original act and the contemplated extension to all parts of the country. Representative Byrns in the debate on the bill said:

"Our great leader in the White House has had the vision to see what it will mean to the great section of my own State in the development of the great Tennessee River Valley Basin and he has stated that in his opinion, it is simply the forerunner of similar developments which will take place throughout the country. * * * It means also, that if the investment is to be operated by the Government, it will present a yardstick by which the utility commissions of this country will know, in exact figures, just what it costs to produce power and thereby fix the rate to the great consuming public accordingly."

Nor can there be any doubt that the intent to force the existing private utility systems out of business in the area to be served was contemplated by its proponents at the time of the enactment of the bill. Mr. Almon, who said he, Mr. McSwain, and Mr. Hill had introduced identical bills, had this to say on the bill.

"The enactment of this legislation will make provision for the sale of power at a fair price. The bill as amended is fair to the power interests in that no competing lines will be constructed by the Government unless the power company refuses to sell their lines. This legislation will fix a yardstick for the price of power in that locality, and if the power company does not make their rates to conform to same, let them go out of business in that locality."

In contrast to this the TVA officials in the early days told the Congress that they could operate in conjunction with the local private utilities and would not destroy the people's investment in these companies. The record is clear that this was not true.

TVA said in official press releases and in testimony before congressional committees that it was to be a yardstick for electric power, a fair yardstick that would provide for all the cost that a private utility had to pay, i.e., interest, State, local, and Federal taxes equivalent to the rate private utilities would pay, depreciation, and all other operating and maintenance expenses; and would amortize not only the power investment but the nonpower investment as well. Notwithstanding all the false claims to the contrary, TVA has not done these things it claimed it was going to do. In connection with this TVA yardstick business, Mr. Clapp, Chairman of the TVA Board, even had the effrontery to make the following statement before a Senate committee in 1947:

"Senator FERGUSON. At one time, was it not supposed to be used as a yardstick for private industry?

"Mr. CLAPP. Well, there have been claims made that the TVA power system would set up a yardstick. The TVA has not developed or elaborated on that or made that claim."

Do you wonder why I place little confidence in TVA?

Now I would like to talk a little about the area within which TVA now serves, and the additional area within which it could serve under the present act and under the amendment as proposed in H.R. 3460 and similar bills.

The original TVA Act provided that TVA could dispose of its surplus electric power within transmission distance of the place where it was generated. This was, of course, a rather loose limitation on the area within which TVA could operate. There has been an almost continuous expansion of TVA over the years to the present service area of about 80,000 square miles, or double the area of the Tennessee River Valley itself.

In the TVA annual report for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1934, the future TVA power policy was reported on pages 22 through 24. The areas in which TVA initially and ultimately proposed to serve were outlined as follows:

"To provide a workable and economic basis of operations, the Authority plans initially to serve certain definite regions and to develop its program in those areas before going outside.

"The initial areas selected by the Authority may be roughly described as (a) the region immediately proximate to the route of the transmission line soon to be constructed by the Authority between Muscle Shoals and the site of Norris Dam; (b) the region in proximity to Muscle Shoals, including northern Alabama and northeastern Mississippi; and (c) the region in the proximity of Norris Dam (the new source of power to be constructed by the Authority on the Clinch River in northeast Tennessee).

"At a later stage in the development it is contemplated to include, roughly, the drainage area of the Tennessee River in Kentucky, Alabama, Georgia, and North Carolina, and that part of Tennessee which lies east of the west margin of the Tennessee drainage area.

"To make the area a workable one and a fair measure of public ownership, it should include several cities of substantial size (such as Chattanooga and Knoxville) and ultimately, at least one city of more than a quarter million within transmission distance, such as Birmingham, Memphis, Atlanta, or Louisville.

"While it is the Authority's present intention to develop its power program in the above-described territory before considering going outside, the Authority may go outside the area if there are substantial changes in general conditions, facts, or governmental policy, which would necessarily require a change in this policy of regional development, or if the privately owned utilities in the area do not cooperate in the working out of the program.

"Nothing in the procedure here adopted is to be construed in any sense a commitment against extending the Authority's power operations outside the area selected, if the above conditions or the public interest require. Where special considerations exist, justifying the Authority's going outside this initial area, the Authority will receive and consider applications based on such special considerations. Among such special considerations would be unreasonably high rates for service and a failure or absence of public regulation to protect the public interest.

"Every effort will be made by the Authority to avoid the construction of duplicate physical facilities, or wasteful competitive practices. Accordingly, where existing lines of privately owned utilities are required to accomplish the Authority's objectives, as outlined above, a genuine effort will be made to purchase such facilities from the private utilities on an equitable basis.

"Accounting should show detail of costs, and permit a comparison of operations with privately owned plants, to supply a yardstick and an incentive to both private and public managers."

This and later statements of TVA officials before congressional committees on the subject of the area to be served leave little doubt that TVA considers the availability of electric power the only legal limitation on the area it can now serve. With annual power revenues of over a quarter million dollars and the $750 million from bond issues permitted under H.R. 3460 as written, this power availability limitation would be seriously weakened. The potentially possible curtailment of 3 million kilowatts or more of Federal loads on the TVA system could also create considerable pressure to expand to new markets.

I seriously question whether the area limitation now proposed can effectively resist or prevent the pressure for expansion created by the existence of large surplus power capacity derived through major curtailment of existing Federal loads and the construction of new generating capacity.

Under the present knowledge in the art of electric power transmission, power is now being directly transmitted a distance of 280 miles in the United States and 625 miles in Europe. Plans are underway for the construction of a transmission line of some 680 miles in length in Argentina. Studies and experiments now underway may extend the potential transmission distance to in excess of 750 miles. It can be seen that under the present law, insofar as the physical and legal limitations are concerned, the area within which TVA could transmit and dispose of electric power would be that area within something over 600 miles from the TVA generating plants.

In other words, at the present time the TVA for all practical purposes has an unlimited area within which it could physically and legally transmit electric power if it had the facilities to generate such power. And under their present interpretation of the TVA Act they could, without telling Congress in advance, use power revenues to finance and construct a transmission line to distant markets if they saw fit to do so. Congressman JOHN TABER and I recently asked the TVA to furnish us a map showing the area within which the TVA believed it had authority to transmit and dispose of electric power. This request was made several months ago and to date they have failed to comply with the request, saying that with regard to the TVA service area—

"The TVA Board has had no interest in expanding this area to serve all markets within transmission distance and has never had occasion therefore to try to determine the limits of the area which TVA could legally serve."

It will be noted that TVA does not mention anything about the fact that they might some time in the future decide to construct a transmission line to serve one or more distant markets. They only say they have had no interest in serving all potential markets within transmission distance. It is this sort of evasive answers that TVA officials in the past have used to explain away or later justify actions taken in conflict with previous statements as to future programs or intentions. Do you wonder why I say TVA needs more congressional control, not less?

To prevent the continued expansion of this socialistic empire, which is foreign to the concepts of American freedoms and the basic standards and principles upon which this great Nation was founded, I think Congress should, without further delay, expressly limit the area within which TVA electric power could be transmitted and used. That is the kind of bill that should be before this committee today.

It is said that TVA has a gentleman's agreement not to expand their present power market area. If that is so, then there should be no objection to writing a specific legal limitation on the area within which TVA power can be distributed. Both TVA officials and proponents hold up their hands in horror at such a suggestion. This in itself raises the question as to how valid a gentlemen's agreement would be in the future. The past record does not commend the acceptance of such an agreement. The record shows we need more congressional control, not less.

I could go on and on with the record of the TVA failure to operate in accordance with the way TVA officials and its proponents have said it would. It is a sorry record that its officials and proponents have tried to gloss over and to deny over the years, but it is there for anyone to see if he will but read the entire record. It is a record that cries out that TVA needs more congressional control, not less.

We are told that the intent of H.R. 3460 is to provide funds to construct electric generating plants to meet the needs of the existing TVA service area. If this is so, why does not the bill contain a specific restriction on TVA future service to that area only?

Actually, the bill, as written, invites the expansion of the TVA market area by 30 percent more than the present area and contains loopholes for almost unlimited expansion beyond that.

There appears to be a limitation on the area within which TVA can distribute the power to be generated by plants constructed or acquired under the proposed bond issues or from power revenues, but there is no restriction on power generated at existing plants or those which might be constructed with appropriated funds. While there appears to be a restriction on expansion in connection with future contracts for the resale of power by the TVA distributors, nothing is said about the distance the distributors can transmit TVA power received under existing contracts, many of which have 10 to 20 years to run. Nor does the bill provide any restriction on delivery of power by TVA to potential industrial customers over their own lines. In fact, the indicated limitation on the sale or delivery of TVA power, from plants constructed from proceeds of bond issues or revenues, could be circumvented by construction of the necessary transmission by the potential customers.

The only real limitation would be one to specifically define the area within which the TVA power could be utilized.

H.R. 3460, as written, provides that TVA shall charge rates for power that will produce gross revenue to cover certain specified requirements. The existing TVA power contracts run up to periods of 20 years and the rates for TVA power are specified under such contracts. TVA in the past has told Congress that the Constitution of the United States forbids any change in these contracts or the rates specified therein. With Uncle Sam and the taxpayers holding the short end of the stick, one need not guess who will be shortchanged if sufficient revenue is not forthcoming. This also raises an interesting question as to what happens if there is a default on payment of interest or principal on the proposed bonds and the bondholders take over the operations under the bond contracts. Could they force higher rates from the local power users or from Federal defense agencies who now take over 50 percent of the TVA power? These are but a few of the questions raised by the bill under consideration here today.

Now, as any businessman knows, the first requirement for going into business is to have the capital to construct the needed facilities and to provide working capital. If the capital is borrowed, interest must be paid on it and provision made to repay the loan over a certain period of time. In the beginning the TVA Director and later Chairman, David Lilienthal, told the House Appropriations Committee (in answer to a question by Congressman JOHN TABER) that TVA power rates would provide for 3½ percent interest on the power investment. He also said the rates would provide for all operating expense, depreciation, an amount equivalent to the average rate of local, State, and Federal taxes paid by private utilities, and in addition would amortize not only the power investment but the entire project cost in 50 years.

In contract to these early claims, made to obtain approval of appropriations of the taxpayers' money, the record shows that not one cent of interest has been paid into the Treasury on nearly $2 billion of appropriations made to TVA, of which $1.4 billion was charged to power. Nor has there been any interest paid into the Treasury on the $500 million of Federal funds which TVA derived from power revenues (largely from Federal agencies) and utilized to construct new power facilities.

As noted previously, TVA officials told us in the early days that TVA rates would provide for local, State, and Federal taxes equivalent to the average rate paid by the private utilities of the Nation. Only a portion of such local and State taxes have been provided for and not one cent of Federal tax has been paid by TVA. In fact, when a proposal was made to tax TVA as other property is taxed, Senator Norris, the "father of TVA," said in opposition thereto:

"If we go to that extreme, Senators, you can see that the TVA would be out of business in 3 months."

TVA officials and proponents now tell us that TVA belongs to "all the people", therefore there is no need to pay ourselves interest or taxes. And besides, they say that TVA has been earning a net revenue that is equal to such payments. Of course the record shows that none of said net revenue has been returned to the Treasury of "all the people," to cover such items as interest and taxes on the funds appropriated.

In 1947, as chairman of the Government Corporations Subcommittee of the House Appropriations Committee, I insisted that there be included a requirement in the fiscal year 1948 appropriations bill a requirement that TVA make certain minimum annual repayments. (H.R. 3460 now seeks to repeal that requirement.) At that time TVA had paid almost nothing back on the taxpayers' investment and showed no signs of making such repayment without being forced to do so.

A total of $185,059,019 has now been paid into the general fund of the Treasury. This was derived from TVA power revenues. In addition, $65,072,500 of TVA power revenues have been used to retire funded debt. The balance of power revenues was used largely to construct additional power facilities for the benefit of the TVA area itself. Thus we find that the so-called TVA net return has not been returned to "the people's" Treasury to provide for interest and taxes on the TVA power system, but has been utilized for the benefit of the TVA area itself. To have title without benefit means nothing to the people of those areas that have been forced to provide the interest-free funds for TVA and whose tax bill is larger because the TVA area does not contribute its proper share.

It is no wonder, of course, that the private utilities which once operated in the TVA area no longer exist. The farmers of my State could not compete in the marketplace with farmers in another State who were given almost unlimited financing to buy the land and the necessary implements and to provide the capital to operate on, all interest free and tax free.

And I know the people of my State and my district do not like to contribute taxes and pay interest on hundreds of millions of dollars to provide well over a million kilowatts of electric generating capacity, required solely to heat, with electricity, several hundred thousand homes in the TVA area—electricity sold at rates below the cost of production and distribution.

I can only say that TVA needs more congressional control—not less. I must, therefore, oppose this bill that would give TVA almost complete freedom from future congressional control.

If TVA had provided for interest and for taxes at rates equivalent to the average percentage of investment paid by the private electric utilities of the Nation, it would now have a deficit of around $500 million instead of a claimed accumulated net income of $468 million.

The TVA area is enticing industry through subsidized power rates, to move to or locate in the TVA area at the expense of these other areas of the Nation that provided the major part of the funds to create and maintain TVA.

How the representatives of the people outside the TVA area can justify voting for this bill which provides for practically abdicating all control over this socialistic empire is beyond my comprehension.

I want to call attention to the fact that there are numbers of persons in the TVA area itself that do not believe it to be the blessing its officials and proponents would have us believe. In this regard, I want to quote from an editorial in the Tupelo, Miss., Journal on June 12, 1953 (Tupelo was one of the first towns to distribute TVA power):

"The time has come for TVA to back up and admit that the fastest growth in the South actually has taken place outside the TVA area and we who live within its borders are still as a whole just about the poorest people in America.

"This, of course, would be quite true. For with the exception of giant projects like the Oak Ridge atomic energy plant that Uncle Sam has plunked down in Tennessee the TVA area has shown less rapid industrial growth than several other portions of the South.

"And in income, the TVA area is still dollar for dollar further behind the national average than it was in 1933 when the Tennessee Valley Authority was first established."

And there is the statement of Dr. Hoskins, president of the University of Tennessee, condemning the TVA for permanently flooding thousands on thousands of acres of the finest land in Tennessee.

TVA was supposed to provide flood protection for the Tennessee River Valley and it has ended up by permanently flooding 300,000 or 400,000 acres of the finest land in Tennessee. Dr. Hoskins questioned whether TVA was really developing the region by its emphasis on power. I quote some excerpts from his statement:

"The proposed construction of the Douglas Dam on the French Broad River above Knoxville and near the Jefferson and Sevier County lines raises an important, even a critical, question involving the welfare of a large section of Tennessee.

"Should this dam be constructed?

"I address myself to this question as a lifelong resident of east Tennessee, thoroughly in accord with our defense efforts, and as a friend and supporter of Tennessee Valley Authority and its great program. Also, I should note that I have no personal interest at stake and that I am approaching the matter from a disinterested viewpoint.

"Let us observe the immediate factual results that will arise from the construction of this dam. Immediately flooded will be some 31,000 acres of land and an equal amount will be directly affected. Some 3,000 and more persons will be removed from their homes. Several large industries, including five canning plants and three flour mills, will be eliminated.

"These are but the rough outlines of damage that will reflect a serious illness of the community, as an abscess may be but the simple and visible evidence of cancer. May I illustrate how deeply the statistical wounds cut into the vitals of a whole area.

"The 31,000 acres of land to be flooded is not merely land. It is the best land in Jefferson and Cocke Counties that is capable of supporting a culture and a government. Throughout east Tennessee the river bottoms afford almost our sole agricultural resource. Blessed with forests, minerals, and power, we are nonetheless dependent upon the soil—and the soil of the river bottoms—for our standard of living. It is not pleasant to contemplate the permanent impoverishment of a region that must begin to import its vegetables and truck crops—to say nothing of the disruption itself. Yet throughout east Tennessee the following areas have already been flooded or now await the rising water.

	Acres
"Chicamauga	39,400
Fort Loudoun	14,900
Norris	40,200
Cherokee	31,100
Watts Bar	41,600
Hales Bar	5,760
Total	172,960

* * * * *

"The actual soil lost to these dams—as significant as this loss is—is perhaps less tragic than the removal of families from their homes. East Tennessee, even in its lush river bottoms, has no corner on soil. Good soil exists elsewhere and for a price it can be had. When a home is destroyed, however, the loss may be irretrievable.

* * * * *

"What provision can be made for these dispossessed? Is a Government check or ready cash any solution of their problem or of the community problem? What wounds will this money heal? What new community, and where, can be founded upon cash? * * * The flooding of these lands destroys a community, breaks it into bits of flotsam and jetsam humanity—and makes no adequate provision even for them—for families or for individuals. There is more than damage here. There is destruction, irreparable destruction, irretrievable loss for some 3,000 persons.

"And what of those that remain, the main stock from which the stem is broken? Upon them falls the burden of government.

* * * * *

"Altogether, this proposed dam will cut a considerable slice from east Tennessee—from its body politic—from its body social—from its body economic. And altogether, too, let us observe—it is a seizure of commonwealth for special purposes.

"And what is all this for? What are the benefits to accrue that would make this social and economic destruction worthwhile? What is our democracy contemplating in thus altering the face of nature and the course of human affairs?

"There are many advantages of course. Otherwise, the proposal would be an absurdity on the face of it. The French Broad is a contributary to the Tennessee River system. It is a power potential—a defense potential. And it lies within the purposes of the Tennessee Valley Authority to develop this region.

"Here let us pause before a most critical question. Let us be careful of our words. If it is the purpose of the Tennessee Valley Authority to develop this region—what is the meaning of the word 'develop'? If it is democracy we are to defend—what is the meaning of democracy?

"Can we achieve development—can we preserve democracy—by destroying the homes, the commonwealth and community life of our people?

* * * * *

"I appeal to the Tennessee Valley Authority and to the Federal Government for a proper development of the region—for a development that leads to a fuller life for our people—to the welfare and security and defense of our democracy. I submit that democracy has deeper and more enduring purposes than the immediate manufacture of powder and shot. I submit that democracy should defend itself by nurturing its own inner strength. Our country is more than an aggregate of separate parts. It is a living organism and its members are not separable and destructible at will. The hand cannot say to the foot, 'I have no need of you.' The function of east Tennessee is that of a whole democratic community essential to the welfare of the whole. I beg of you to preserve it in this right."

RESTRICTIVE MILK LAWS

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of my colleagues to the editorial on restrictive milk laws which appeared in this morning's Washington Post. This editorial pointed out that the District of Columbia milk regulations, which were drawn up in 1925 and have not been changed since 1950, should be reexamined and modernized. While I agree with the Post editorial that milk sanitation regulations need to be revised frequently to keep pace with technical improvements in the dairy industry, the modernization of the District rules would clear up the situation in just this one area. Countless other cities are using outdated and restrictive sanitary regulations as trade barriers against high-quality milk from other milksheds. My national milk sanitation bill—H.R. 3840—which would make the U.S. Milk Code the quality yardstick for the interstate shipment of milk, would solve the problem not only in Washington, but wherever else this situation exists. Under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to insert the editorial from the Washington Post in the RECORD:

RESTRICTIVE MILK LAWS

The reluctance of the District Commissioners to get into the milk controversy is understandable. But the District milk laws ought to be reexamined. and the Commissioners rather than the Senate or the House District Committee ought to conduct the review. The sanitation regulations drawn up originally in 1925 have not been changed since 1950 when the Commissioners held extensive public hearings on the matter. The new investigation which Chestnut Farms is seeking could lead to a beneficial modernization of the undeniably restrictive milk laws.

Nine years ago the principal change in the regulations affected the prescribed methods of cleaning equipment. Chemical as well as steam cleaning was authorized and now practically all of the sterilization of milk equipment in Maryland and Virginia is done with chemicals.

In 1950 the arguments for steam cleaning and against the chemical method now in use were as impassioned as today's pleas by the Maryland-Virginia Milk Producers Association to leave the present regulations untouched. Now the Association is defending present rules which prescribe the numbers of towels to be used in cleaning a cow and detailed requirements for the construction of milking sheds and barns.

It is interesting to note that the Maryland-Virginia Association, which once maintained that only steam cleaning could assure the Washington area of a quality milk supply, still boasts that the area's milk is the best in the Nation even though the equipment through which the milk moves is now cleaned by the once "unsafe" chemicals. The need for periodic reexamination of regulations like the milk laws is obvious.

LABOR RACKETEERING

Mr. LAFORE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. LAFORE. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Committee on Education and Labor I have seen a number of proposals for corrective labor law reform come before our committee, but most of these measures fail to do the obvious. They fail to attack the problem of labor racketeering at its roots. In other words, they fail to remove the tools that give union officials the power to become tyrants and little dictators. These tools are the vicious secondary boycott and the organizational picket line.

A highly respected authority and close observer of racketeering and corruption in the Teamsters Union also has made these observations. Godfrey P. Schmidt, a court-appointed monitor over the officials of the Teamsters Union, called for the need to stop secondary boycotts and coercive picketing in a letter he wrote last month to Senator KENNEDY, a sponsor of one of the many bills on labor law amendments. In the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 19, at page 2684, Mr. Schmidt's letter to the Senator can be found. This expert on teamster affairs and union abuses remarked:

> From my conversations with rank and file workers, I am persuaded that they are as convinced as I am that no labor reform can be effectuated unless recognition and organizational picketing is banned.

On the subject of the boycott tool, Mr. Schmidt declared:

> Since the irresponsible power of labor leaders needs curbing (it is this power which gives them the opportunity to play dictator), secondary boycotts, which is a source of this power must be limited.

Unfortunately, the Teamsters Union is not the only organization which uses the unfair secondary boycott to involve neutral parties in labor disputes and organizing drives. Records at the National Labor Relations Board show that the Teamsters and the building trades unions are the greatest boycott technicians, but all unions have the power to use the secondary boycott, and most of them have used it at one time or another.

Today, I shall introduce a bill designed to stop all secondary boycotts and to end the blackmail and extortion picketing which masquerades under the names of organizational and recognition picketing.

My bill attempts to keep as much as possible of the Taft-Hartley format, yet clearly shows that no secondary boycotts should be permitted.

My interest in the secondary boycott problem is more than academic. This union power weapon has affected hundreds of citizens of my State and has terrorized scores of workingmen in Philadelphia, Scranton, Pittsburgh, and other cities in Pennsylvania.

At this very moment a secondary boycott in Pittsburgh is slowly strangling a small packing company, merely because the Teamsters want it to die.

This firm, the Fried & Reineman Packing Co., has been in business since 1897, but unless they have relief from a union secondary boycott they will close their doors forever by the end of this month. More than 400 employees will be out of a job—thanks to a Teamster secondary boycott.

The company's story as told by William Chandler, its general manager, reveals that business was poor and the firm sought to-introduce some economies in its delivery service. When they tried to cut costs, their 38 truckdrivers who belong to Teamster Local 249 struck. This was November 3, 1958. The plant has been closed since, and 400 other employees are out of work.

Fried & Reineman then decided to abandon their trucking service and hire a common carrier to handle the job at less cost. The carrier, Kenney Motor Express Co., also employed union drivers who were members of local 249.

The union refused to permit Kenney to take on the new business, threatening Kenney with a strike if it tried to serve the packing company.

Fried & Reineman filed an unfair labor practice charge against the union. Mr. Chandler reports that unless they have relief by March 30, the packing company will go out of business.

Three years ago the Teamsters conducted a terror campaign of violence built upon the secondary boycott. The giant union was seeking to organize 13 Philadelphia auto dealers. When legitimate organizing methods brought no interest in the union by the auto dealers' employees, the Teamsters placed picket lines around several warehouses in which the dealers stored cars for future deliveries.

These warehousemen and their employees had no concern with the teamsters' membership drive against the employees of the auto dealers; yet they became involved.

Violence was the next step. Paint and acid were splashed on new cars and windows were broken in other new vehicles. In all, more than 30 cars were damaged.

The McClellan hearings produced another tragic story of a union secondary boycott in Scranton.

Arnold Schivai, the operator of a Scranton bakery for 35 years, and his employees became teamster boycott victims. This bakery has been in Scranton for three generations, but trouble occurred when the union tried to force itself on the bakery employees.

The union wanted to compel Mr. Schivai to sign a contract requiring that everyone who drove a truck at the bakery must join their local 229. This was an impossible demand because 30 percent of the distributors had their own trucks, paid for the bakery goods and sold them as independent contractors. When Mr. Schivai could not comply, the secondary boycott followed. On April 16, 1957, he described the boycott to the McClellan committee. His testimony is found on pages 1770–72:

> The next morning some of the distributors who buy our product came in the place and they start loading up, and they were confronted with about 12 pickets, plus our own men, who boarded their trucks and told them it was unhealthy to buy their products there from that day on. Some of them made it quite clear that they wouldn't come to the bakery any more. One fellow asked if he could operate one more day. They said OK. They told him that it was unhealthy from that day on to come to our place.

Violence was the next step. Mr. Schivai continued with his story:

> So we kept trying to operate the business; my dad was 63 years old at the time, and myself. When he was eliminated, I had to put my wife on. She drove the car, and tried to take care of some of the accounts. But every place we went, our customers were told that it wasn't very good practice to buy from us, and we kept having trouble right along. I was threatened myself.

There have been many other Pennsylvania secondary boycott victims. The Quaker City Motor Parts Co., of Philadelphia, in 1956 were victims of an organizational picket line by both the machinists and the teamsters.

The Schuylkill Products Co., of Cressona, Pa., manufacturers of concrete pipe and ready mixed cement, have been boycott victims of the teamsters.

In Erie, the Felheim Heating & Roofing Co. was caught between the machinists and the sheet metal workers. Four weeks of construction were lost because of this boycott which occurred back in 1955.

In another Philadelphia organizational picketing and secondary boycott case, the Sandmeyer Steel Co. was the victim. Since April 17, 1958, the teamsters have interfered with deliveries and merchandise pickups. It has been part of another forced-membership drive.

One could find numerous other cases all over the country of unethical and unfair practices by union officials.

In introducing my bill I want to put an end to boycotts and blackmail picketing. It is not possible to publicly endorse legislation to clean up the labor rackets in this country without halting secondary boycotts, because the secondary boycott is the weapon of the labor racketeer. It is economic blackmail against neutral third parties in labor disputes or organizing drives.

The bill also contains provisions to stop coercive picketing—picketing which the labor specialists identify as organizational picketing and recognition picketing. Picketing to organize more workmen or to force an employer to recognize a particular union is economic coercion of the worst type. There is no connection whatsoever with free speech when the objective of the picketing is for organization or recognition. The professional unionists who order such picketing well know it.

The purpose of such picketing is not merely to provide information, but to coerce someone to do something he does not want to do. Generally the economic pressure of such picketing results in an employer recognizing a union his employees do not want, or it results in making employees join a union to protect their jobs. This, of course, infringes and violates the guarantees given employees under section 7 of the act—the right to join or refrain from joining a labor organization.

EXPLANATION OF THE BILL

The bill is designed to close the loopholes that have resulted in the interpretation of the present Taft-Hartley Act making for legal and illegal secondary boycotts. If the union agent is clever, it is not too difficult to impose an unfair secondary boycott yet remain beyond the prohibitions of the law. The boycott, however, is just as harmful and evil whether it be perpetrated by legal or illegal means.

SUBSECTION 4

Subsection (4) of section 8(b)(4) of the present law is simplified in my bill. Much of the original language is kept, but the words which have resulted in legal loopholes have been eliminated or revised. Note that the new subsection (4) of my bill reads:

> (4) to engage in, or to induce or encourage an employee or any other person to engage in, a strike or a refusal in connection with his employment to use, manufacture, process, transport, or otherwise handle or work on any goods, articles or materials, or to perform any services; or to cause or attempt to cause an employee or any other person not to enter or accept employment; or to exert, attempt to exert, or threaten to exert (regardless of the provisions in any collective bargaining or other contract) against an employer or any other person, economic or any other type of coercion, by picketing or by any other means; where an object thereof is: * * *

EMPLOYER PRESSURE

This is a change from the present reading of subsection (4) in that the old language "encourage the employees of any employer" has been changed to "encourage an employee or any other person". This is intended to end the loophole which permits pressure against an employer to make him refuse to do business with another employer. The addition of the word "person" throughout subsection (4) is designed to make it an illegal secondary boycott to induce or encourage an employer, an independent contractor, an architect, a manufacturer's representative, a dealer, a jobber, or a self-employed person to stop doing business with another.

CONCERTED REFUSAL

The present statute uses the term "concerted refusal." In the new bill, "concerted" is dropped. This is to eliminate another loophole which permits a secondary boycott if only one person or a key individual is induced to stop doing business with another employer.

COURSE OF EMPLOYMENT

Another change to close still another loophole is the revision of the present language "refusal in the course of their employment." In certain industries where occasional or per-job employment is the rule, unions have found that they may violate the purpose of the law by

merely refusing to let their members accept work.

Because the refusal is made before the employees actually begin work, it has been held that such a refusal and secondary boycott is not illegal because it was not made "in the course of employment."

By eliminating this language, the present loophole is closed. To be certain that it will not recur, I have added the language, "or to cause or attempt to cause an employee or any other person not to enter or accept employment."

HOT CARGO CONTRACTS

The new subsection (4) would also put an end to hot cargo contracts used so commonly in the transportation industry and in the building or construction industry. The present act makes no direct mention of collective bargaining contracts being used to bypass the intent of Congress to protect the public and neutrals from secondary boycotts. My bill covers this type of contract provision when it makes it unlawful "to exert, attempt to exert, or threaten to exert—regardless of the provisions in any collective bargaining or other contract—against an employer or any other person, economic or any other type of coercion, by picketing or by any other means."

ECONOMIC COERCION

In addition to curing hot cargo secondary boycotts, this same clause attacks attempts by union officials to coerce neutral persons. It is designed to prevent economic or any other type of coercion to force—for example, an architect to discontinue prescribing certain products or services by persons with whom a union may have a quarrel—real or fancied. Unions have tried to compel architects to stop recommending certain products under the threat of labor trouble to the architect's client. This is an extremely vicious type of hidden secondary boycott which a union boss can use to further his monopoly control.

THE SECONDARY CONSUMER BOYCOTT

Another similar insidious variety is secondary consumer boycott. Under the present law a union can apparently picket the customer entrances of a retail store which is carrying a product manufactured by a company with which a union has a primary dispute. Similarly a union can organize a consumer or customer boycott against a distributing firm merely because that company advertises on a radio or television station or in a newspaper with which the union has a primary dispute. Sponsors of radio and TV programs and advertisers in newspapers are threatened with economic pressure and a loss of business by the union unless they discontinue their advertising. These are examples of secondary or consumer boycotts, a potent form of economic pressure, that are intended to be made unlawful by the language of my bill.

SUBSECTION 8 (B) (4) (A)

Section 8(b)(4)(A) of the new bill is simplified to read:

(A) causing or attempting to cause any employer or self-employed person to join any labor or employer organization.

Except for the opening three words (A) is the same as the first clause in (A) of the present Taft-Hartley Act.

I have substituted "causing or attempting to cause" for the present "forcing or requiring." Similar substitutions have been made in subsections (B), (C), (D), and (F). The purpose of this change is to insure the full effectuation of the legislative intent to eliminate secondary boycotts. Once the factor of unlawful coercion has been found, the intent of Congress is not to be frustrated because it might conceivably be said that the objective of the coercion was merely to induce or cause a certain course of action rather than to force or require it.

Note that for purposes of clarification and simplicity, I have restricted subsection (A) to one clause. No change in meaning or interpretation is intended aside from that specifically mentioned.

SUBSECTION 8 (B) (4) (B)

Although (B) of my bill is different from (B) in the present Taft-Hartley Act, it is taken from the second clause of Taft-Hartley's subsection 8(b)(4)(A). It reads:

(B) causing or attempting to cause any employer or other person to cease using, selling, handling, transporting, or otherwise dealing in the products of any other producer, processor, or manufacturer, or to cease doing business with any other person.

The new subsection (B), however, is more compact than the language of the present subsection (A). It also leaves no doubt that it is intended to protect secondary employers such as distributors, dealers, wholesalers, jobbers, and others from secondary boycott pressure.

For example, let us assume that there is a labor dispute between a union and a maker of electrical fixtures. Unable to win its dispute fairly, the union enlists the cooperation of unions engaged in the construction industry. The construction unions advise contractors that they will be courting labor trouble if they continue to use electrical fixtures made by the manufacturer who is having a labor dispute with the electrical union. The construction unions point out to the contractors that they do not have to cease doing business with the jobber or distributor of the electrical fixtures, but merely require the distributor to order fixtures which are not made by the alleged "unfair" manufacturer.

If the distributor handles only one line of fixtures, it means that the contractor is forced to stop doing business with the distributor—both of whom are completely neutral and innocent in the primary labor dispute. Such a distributor faces bankruptcy if the union's coercion is great enough.

Where the distributor handles more than one line of fixtures, it might be contended that the coercion or threat is not designed to force the contractor to cease doing business with the distributor, but that he is merely being asked to provide one brand of a product instead of another.

My bill would make such activity a secondary boycott violation and an unfair labor practice.

SUBSECTION 8 (B) (4) (C)

Subsection (C), except for its first three words, is identical with the present subsection (B) of the Taft-Hartley Act. As I explained earlier the opening words "forcing or requiring" have been changed to "causing or attempting to cause."

The subsection reads:

(C) Causing or attempting to cause any other employer to recognize or bargain with a labor organization as the representative of his employees unless such labor organization has been certified as the representative of such employees under the provision of section 9.

SUBSECTION (D)

Subsection (D) of my bill is designed to prevent recognition picketing. It reads:

(D) Causing or attempting to cause any employer to interfere with his employees' right to join or refrain from joining a labor organization as set forth in section 7.

This language is not found in the present Taft-Hartley law. It is designed to prohibit the use of economic coercion for the purpose of forcing an employer to interfere with the right of his employees to join or refrain from joining a union. These rights, as you know, are the cornerstone of the Wagner Act and the Taft-Hartley Act. Section 7 of the Wagner Act established as public policy the right of an employee to freely select his own bargaining representative. In 1947 the Taft-Hartley Act added to this right—the right to refuse to participate in union activities.

The recognition picketing problem is included in my bill because it is closely allied to the secondary boycott problem.

Studies show that a great many secondary boycotts arise from situations in which a union is trying to organize the employees of a primary employer. Unsuccessful by direct appeal, the union seeks to coerce the employer into recognizing the union by putting economic pressure on the secondary employers who do business with the primary employer.

Although the language in the present act covers situations in which recognition is won through pressure on a secondary employer, my bill would add a necessary element to the protection by stopping economic pressure directed toward the primary employer.

It follows that if a union has the power to compel an employer to recognize it as the bargaining agent, the employees of that employer will be forced to be represented by that union, whether they prefer that particular union or no union.

Neither a company nor a union should have the power to force a bargaining agent upon employees unless the employees want such an agent. Again it follows that an employer should be free from such economic coercion as the secondary boycott to compel him to interfere with the rights of his employees.

SUBSECTION 8(B)(4)(E)

This also is a new section. It is designed to halt organizational picketing—a technique that goes hand-in-hand with recognition picketing covered in subsection (D). It reads:

(E) Forcing or requiring employees to join or refuse to join a labor organization except

as provided in the first proviso to section 8(a)(3).

The purpose of subsection (E) is apparent. It prohibits the use of economic coercion against an employer where an object is to cause employees to join or refuse to join a labor organization. It does not interfere with the right to negotiate a union shop contract.

The present law provides means for unions to organize employees and it provides for elections to determine union representation. Picketing should not be used as a replacement for the already prescribed procedures. In theory there is a hairline difference between recognition and organizational picketing, but the practical effect is the same. The picket line is present in both varieties. Here again, organizational picketing, like recognition picketing, is closely related to the secondary boycott; thus, its inclusion in the bill.

To the employees who do not wish to join a union, organizational picketing is an indirect threat to their loss of employment. If the picketing curtails business, the employer may be forced to go out of business or lay off employees. Call it organizational or recognition picketing, the coercive effect is the same on the workman.

To those who raise the cry "free speech," organizational picketing is more than an attempt to advertise a labor organization. It has become a form of blackmail. I have no intent to infringe on the right of free speech for any organization, but picketing to force membership in a union is far and beyond the scope of free speech.

SUBSECTION 8(B)(4)(F)

The language in this subsection, except for the first three words, is identical to the present language of section 8(b)(4)(D) of the Taft-Hartley Act. As I explained earlier, the change in the first three words is to substitute "causing or attempting to cause" for "forcing or requiring."

The section continues the Taft-Hartley prohibition of secondary boycotts to win jurisdictional disputes between unions. It reads:

(F) Causing or attempting to cause any employer to assign particular work to employees in a particular labor organization or in a particular trade, craft, or class rather than to employees in another labor organization or in another trade, craft, or class, unless such employer is failing to conform to an order or certification of the Board determining the bargaining representative for employees performing such work: *Provided*, That nothing contained in subsection (b) shall be construed to make unlawful a refusal by any person to enter upon the premises of any employer (other than his own employer), if the employees of such employer are engaged in a strike ratified or approved by a representative of such employees whom such employer is required to recognize under this Act.

SECTION 10(L)

Because of the Taft-Hartley changes suggested in my bill, it is necessary to make minor and technical revisions in other sections of the law to bring them in conformity with the changes and the new unfair labor practice sections. Section 10(L), a section providing for NLRB priority status for secondary boycott charges and for injunctions to halt secondary boycotts, is amended in my bill. There is, however, no change from its original meaning. The new section would read:

(b) Section 10(L) of title I of such Act is amended by striking out the first sentence and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "Whenever it is charged that any person has engaged in an unfair labor practice within the meaning of paragraph (4)(A), (B), (C), (D), (E), or (F) of section 8(b), the preliminary investigation of such charge shall be made forthwith and given priority over all other cases except cases of like character in the office where it is filed or to which it is referred."

BOYCOTT DAMAGE SUITS

Section 303 of the present Taft-Hartley Act is the section which provides for damages resulting from the unfair labor practices set out in section 8(b)(4). My bill makes no change in the overall idea of section 303. It merely streamlines it and brings it into conformity with the new changes in section 8(b)(4).

The present section 303(a) is eliminated as repetitious and unnecessary. It is covered by reference to avoid repeating all the unfair labor practices set out in section 303(b) of the present law.

My bill on this section reads:

(c) Section 303 of title III of such Act is amended to read as follows: "Whoever shall be injured in his business or property by reason of any act or acts which are made an unfair labor practice under section 8(b)(4) of the National Labor-Management Relations Act, as amended, may sue therefor in any district court of the United States subject to the limitations and provisions of section 301 of this Act without respect to the amount in controversy, or in any other court having jurisdiction of the parties, and shall recover the damages by him sustained and cost of the suit."

HOME RULE FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. McGOVERN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I am fully in support of this legislation to grant statehood to Hawaii. This historic action is not only in our national interest, but will be applauded around the globe. It will bring economic, political and social benefits to the people of the United States and to the residents of Hawaii.

I only want to add that we should feel just as strongly obligated to grant the lesser right of local self-government to the people of the District of Columbia.

I am sure none of my colleagues is sponsoring legislation to have the Federal Government step in and take over the government of their local communities. We would all be outraged at the thought. Yet that is what we did to the District 75 years ago—and 825,000 Americans here are still waiting for us to give their local government back to them.

I can see no sound basis for such discrimination against the District. Legislation, soundly conceived and broadly supported, is before the House to restore home rule in the District. It amply protects the Federal interest in the city, while turning over local affairs to the people who should run them—the local people.

We are today approving statehood for Hawaii. I trust that, at an early date, we will have a similar opportunity to approve home rule for Washington.

MILK PRODUCERS DESERVE COMPLETE PROGRAM—INCLUDING MILK SANITATION LEGISLATION

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, my colleagues are concerned with the establishment of a nationwide market for milk in which we can establish a national milk income improvement program. Milk producers all over the country deserve and need a total program that will enable them to earn and receive a parity of income for their work, management, property, investment, and risks.

To move toward this kind of program we need, I am convinced that we must enact three major parts:

First. A milk income improvement program for all milk to supplement our Federal fluid milk marketing orders;

Second. Legislation required to facilitate and promote the establishment of a nationwide milk processing, marketing and bargaining enterprise that will give all milk producers the kind of market bargaining power they need to obtain a fair income, as proposed by Gov. Gaylord Nelson and my State; and

Third. The nationwide milk sanitation standards bills that Senators HUMPHREY, PROXMIRE, MCCARTHY, and WILEY and 17 House colleagues and I have introduced.

On Monday, March 9, several of the authors of this bill and I discussed its merits before the House of Representatives.

I have today received a letter taking exception to some of my remarks which will be of interest, I feel, to my colleagues. I shall read the letter I received and my reply which taken together speak for themselves:

MARYLAND AND VIRGINIA MILK PRODUCERS ASSOCIATION, INC.,
Arlington, Va., March 10, 1959.

Hon. LESTER R. JOHNSON,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. JOHNSON: We noted with a great deal of interest the political approach which you made to the Washington milk controversy from your sanctuary, the floor of the House of Representatives of the United

States. Our only way to correct your misleading statements which were made for obvious political purposes is to express them in the press to the people of Washington hoping that the facts will be transmitted to Wisconsin farmers.

You stated that milk could be delivered to Washington from the Ninth Congressional District in Wisconsin, which is along the Minnesota border, for $5.50 per hundredweight. You stated that the freight cost would be $1.80 per hundredweight, leaving a gross return to the plant of $3.70. The handling charge for operating the plant would be a bare minimum of $0.75 per hundredweight. The $0.75 handling charge is less than the national average and less than that allowed plants handling manufactured milk under the price support program. When the $0.75 handling charge and the $1.80 transportation is deducted from $5.50, it leaves but $2.95 for the farmer f.o.b. the milk plant. This does not include any cost for hauling milk from the farm to the milk plant.

In another part of your statement, you suggested that the price of milk could be reduced $0.03 per quart which is $1.38 per hundredweight. When this amount ($1.38) is subtracted from the present price of $6.62, less freight of $1.80 and handling charges of $0.75, Wisconsin producers would net $2.69 f.o.b. milk plants in your area. Mr. JOHNSON, we know of no producers in Wisconsin who are willing to sell grade A milk for $2.95, to say nothing of $2.69.

We are perfectly aware of the producers in Wisconsin asking the Government to support their grade B milk at $3.50 per hundredweight under the price support program. We also note that you have introduced a bill which would establish the support level at $3.25 per hundredweight. This is a lot higher than the price that you say producers would accept to deliver milk to Washington. Are you trying to go both ways at once?

We believe that Wisconsin grade B milk is worth every bit of $3.50. We wish there was some way to get that price for Wisconsin farmers. We don't want to see any dairy farmer short-changed on the value of the food product he produces and sells for market.

We are certain that the dairy farmers in your district will be interested in hearing that you are offering their milk to Washington at lower prices than they can receive for manufacturing milk under the price support program for the sole purpose of cutting the rug out from under another bunch of dairy farmers down here. Probably our biggest problem in the dairy business, Congressman, is securing unity in a broad look at the dairy problem to properly price milk for all producers across the country rather than to have a very narrow district attitude such as you have displayed. The divide and conquer technique may serve local political purposes but it cannot be counted upon to improve incomes for the Nation's dairy farmers.

It puzzles us as to just what your objectives are in making such irresponsible statements as were attributed to you on page 3615 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on Monday, March 9, 1959.

The great bulk of the milk in your district is of manufacturing grade and falls short of meeting the requirements of the National Sanitation Act which you are sponsoring in the Congress at the present time. It seems ridiculous to offer grade A milk for less money than the manufacturing milk in your area and we both know that this manufacturing milk cannot be sold in any fluid milk market in the country, to say nothing of Washington, D.C.

There has been too much advancement in the milk industry for any of us to subscribe to your statements, Mr. JOHNSON, if it is your purpose to pass off grade B milk for grade A milk. We don't feel that we want to go back 30 years and start the long grind of progress all over again for the purpose of bringing grade B milk into the District of Columbia.

In addition to the above facts which are based upon simple arithmetic which anyone can calculate, we are wondering what you would expect the people in Washington to do during those periods of the year, such as last week, when milk either stayed on the farm in Wisconsin or was moved out on a bobsled. Washington consumers expect milk of the same quality every day of the week, winter and summer, and they are getting that service. Neither do Washington consumers want to depend for their milk upon the surplus of the Chicago and Minneapolis markets which have first call on that milk when it is needed at home.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM B. HOOPER,
Secretary-Treasurer.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., March 11, 1959.

Mr. WILLIAM B. HOOPER,
Secretary-Treasurer, Maryland and Virginia Milk Producers Association, Inc., Arlington, Va.

DEAR MR. HOOPER: I have your letter of March 10.

In the interest of keeping the record clear and accurate, I must suggest that you have apparently been badly misinformed concerning milk production, pricing, and handling in Wisconsin and Minnesota.

Your letter raises two points of substance concerning my remarks in the House of Representatives on Monday, March 9.

First, without documentation, you question the dependability of Wisconsin and Minnesota as a source of a continuous supply of milk. With upward of 5 million persons now being served with milk produced in these States, winter and summer, there can be no factual basis for your fear that snows in Wisconsin and Minnesota will stop or seriously delay continuous milk delivery. You may be interested in reviewing the telegram I have just received from the chairman of the Wisconsin Highway Commission concerning the keeping of Wisconsin's highways open. The telegram is attached.

Second, you disagreed with the figures I cited to indicate the price at which grade A Wisconsin milk can be delivered to the District of Columbia. The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD indicates that I made the following statement in this regard:

"Currently, Washington dairies are paying $6.62 per hundredweight for class I or bottling milk. In the past week, I have received letters from two modern dairy plants in Wisconsin's Ninth District. Each of them could deliver top-quality 3.5 percent class I bottling milk to Washington for $5.50 per hundredweight.

"That price includes the cost of transporting the milk from Menomonie and Turtle Lake, Wis., to the District of Columbia. Even taking into account the $1.80 per hundredweight shipping charge, the Wisconsin milk would cost $1.12 a hundredweight less than the bottling milk now being purchased by local distributors. This would represent a saving of at least 2 cents a quart which could and should be passed on to the consumer."

The letters I referred to are a part of the RECORD and are shown on page 3616.

According to the information supplied to me by the manager of the Turtle Lake Cooperative Creamery Association, the farmer cooperatives in my district can pay farmers $3.14 per hundredweight for grade A milk and deliver it to handlers in the District of Columbia for $5.50.

To put this another way, Wisconsin and Minnesota farmers, if not prevented from doing so by artificial barriers, could deliver grade A milk to Washington at 2 cents per quart cheaper than is now being paid for such milk and in doing so would receive $3.14 per hundredweight, 24 cents more than they are now receiving for fully standard grade A milk that has to be made into butter and powder.

If passed on to the Washington, D.C., consumer, this would be a saving of more than 6 percent in their milk bill each month which at the same time would be an 8 percent increase in the gross income of the Wisconsin and Minnesota milk farmer and an increase in net income of probably 15 to 20 percent.

However, your letter draws attention away from the two major points of my remarks of Monday. These were: (1) This Nation should not be divided up into hundreds of little milk markets, each dominated by its own local monopoly, protected by out-of-date and unneeded sanitary codes, each varying in myriad and complex but unnecessary ways from the standards established by the U.S. Public Health Service; and (2) in this era of rapid communication and technological development, it is now possible, and proper, to consider that milk which is pure in one part of the country will be pure in another part.

For this reason I have introduced legislation to make the U.S. Public Health milk sanitation code nationwide in its application so that the standards of purity and quality for grade A milk will be uniformly high in all parts of the Nation.

It is not my purpose to lower the income of any milk producers or to reduce the effectiveness of their cooperative. As you know, I am a strong supporter of legislation to promote and protect the rights of farmers to earn and receive a parity of income. I recognize that for farmers to be able to do so, they must have the right and protection to make use of cooperative bargaining, processing and marketing associations.

However, I do not believe that farmers in any part of the country can be helped by barriers against the products of farmers in other parts of the country or by statements which seem to question the quality, purity or supply-dependability of products produced by other farmers.

I have today requested the Commissioner of Agriculture of the State of Wisconsin to send the prices of home delivered homogenized vitamin D milk in various cities of our State. The figures are: Eau Claire, 22 cents per quart; Wausau, 22 cents per quart; Green Bay, 21 cents per quart; Madison, 24 cents per quart; and Milwaukee, 23 cents per quart. These average well below the 23½ to 24½ cents figure you are quoted as having given to the newspapers here. A copy of the commissioner's telegram is attached.

I must differ with you when you say, "The great bulk of the milk in your district is of manufacturing grade and falls short of meeting the requirement of the National Sanitation Act which you are sponsoring in the Congress at the present time." The U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare bulletin on "Sanitation Compliance Ratings of Interstate Milk Shippers" dated January 1, 1959, lists 104 dairies in Wisconsin on pages 28–32. Fourteen of these dairies are in my district and they are: Baldwin Co-op, Baldwin, Wis.; Barron Co-op Creamery, Barron, Wis.; Boyceville Farmers Co-op Creamery, Boyceville, Wis.; Chippewa County Co-op Dairy, Bloomer, Wis.; Colfax Co-op Creamery, Colfax, Wis.; Ellsworth

Co-op Creamery, Ellsworth, Wis.; Falls Dairy Co., Stanley, Wis.; Land O'Lakes Dairy, Whitehall, Wis.; Sanna Dairies, Inc., Menomonie, Wis.; St. Croix Valley Co-op Dairies, Glenwood City, Wis.; Turtle Lake Co-op., Turtle Lake, Wis.; Wisconsin Co-op Dairies, Inc., Elmwood, Wis.; Wisconsin Co-op Dairies, Inc. (Chicago Shed), Menomonie, Wis.; Wisconsin Co-op Dairies, Inc., Menomonie, Wis. (Wisconsin Shed).

I am at a complete loss to understand why you feel that you need special barriers against Wisconsin and Minnesota milk, in addition to the $1.80 per hundredweight transportation cost. Lacking any other discernible reason for your fearful attitude in this regard, I can only conclude that you are seeking to protect uneconomical operations and high costs of milk in your area.

You may be sure that I would not be seeking to open to Metropolitan Washington markets grade A milk from Minnesota and Wisconsin if I were not fully convinced that the producers in my area could increase their income thereby.

It is in addition my understanding that a farmers' cooperative operating under the Chicago milk order could ship class I Wisconsin milk to Washington under that order in accordance with terms of the Chicago order at $5.50 delivered. I notice that you did not comment in your letter to me on the statement of Mr. FLYNN shown on page 3620 quoting from a letter he had received from the Pure Milk Association of Chicago as follows: "that they can send milk into the District of Columbia at a price of $5.64 a hundred." As you know, such milk would necessarily have to be priced under terms of the Chicago Federal milk order.

I have never had the pleasure of making your acquaintance since I have been in Washington. While I think you are taking a narrow view in your approach to H.R. 3840, we are not going to settle anything by arguing through the newspapers. I will be glad to talk with you to see if there are methods whereby we can work for dairy legislation that will benefit the whole country.

Sincerely yours,

LESTER JOHNSON.

MADISON, WIS., *March 11, 1959.*

Hon. LESTER JOHNSON,
Member of Congress, Washington, D.C.:

The following consumer prices regarding retail milk sales in the five Wisconsin cities requested are being sent in response to your telegram this morning. Home delivered prices for single quarts in Eau Claire, 22 cents; Green Bay, 21 cents; Madison, 24 cents; Milwaukee, 23 cents; Wausau, 22 cents. For half-gallons, Eau Claire, 42 cents; Green Bay, 42 cents; Madison, 42–43 cents; Milwaukee, 42 cents; Wausau, 44 cents. Gallon prices at Madison, home delivered, 79–80 cents; Milwaukee, 76 cents. Store prices for single quarts at Eau Claire, 21 cents; Green Bay, 20½ cents; Madison, 21 cents; Milwaukee, 21 cents; Wausau, 21 cents. For half-gallons, Eau Claire, 41 cents; Green Bay, 39½–42 cents; Madison, 39 cents; Milwaukee, 35–36 cents; Wausau, 41 cents. For gallons, Madison, 75 cents; Milwaukee, 67–69 cents. This is for homogenized vitamin D milk testing 3.5 percent at Eau Claire and Madison, and 3.6 percent at Green Bay, Milwaukee, and Wausau. Over half the milk sold in the State at retail is on a multiple unit basis so that prices on the whole would average somewhere between 19 and 20 cents on a quart equivalent basis.

DON MCDOWELL,
Director, Wisconsin State Department of Agriculture.

MADISON, WIS., *March 11, 1959.*

Hon. LESTER JOHNSON,
Member of Congress,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Wisconsin has as excellent a snow removal program as any State in the Nation. Each of its 71 counties is completely equipped with crews and snow removal facilities of every type. As soon as a snow begins, men and machines move out to keep the roads open. First priority goes to heavily traveled State trunk highways and the policy is to maintain snow-free and ice-free pavements.

Highway 12 is a principal artery in Wisconsin and over the past 7 years it has been snow blocked less than half a dozen times, and none of the closures was for more than 5 hours.

Last week, in the heaviest snow in 36 years, the highway was snow-blocked less than half a day.

Mr. Frank Babbitt, of Chippewa Falls, who operates seven tank trucks of milk to Philadelphia per day, reports he has had but one interruption due to snow in the last 2 years, and none in this recent most severe snowstorm.

HAROLD L. PLUMMER,
Chairman, State Highway Commission of Wisconsin.

BALKANIZATION OF NATIONAL MILK MARKET WILL NOT SERVE PUBLIC INTEREST

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I was shocked and grieved to read in the morning paper that the County Council of Montgomery County, Md., is seriously considering adopting the outdated and unnecessarily restrictive District of Columbia milk sanitation code.

I rise merely to point out that this proposed unwise action by a local governing board is a pertinent illustration of the need for early adoption of the nationwide milk sanitation standards bill which has been introduced by 17 colleagues and myself and by Senators HUMPHREY, PROXMIRE, MCCARTHY and WILEY.

Only by adopting such a nationwide milk sanitation code can we be assured that pure high quality milk will be allowed to move in interstate commerce. If every local jurisdiction is allowed to continue to set up barriers against interstate commerce, the end result can only be a Balkanization of our national market for milk to the economic injury of both milk farmers generally and of the general public.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. SMITH of Virginia (at the request of Mr. ABBITT), for Wednesday, March 11, on account of illness.

Mr. CELLER (at the request of Mr. FARBSTEIN), for the balance of the week, on account of illness in family.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to Mrs. DWYER, for 10 minutes, on Monday, March 16.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. ROOSEVELT and to include an article.

Mr. KILDAY and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. GUBSER and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. MCCORMACK and to include extraneous matter.

(At the request of Mr. O'BRIEN of New York, and to include extraneous matter, the following:)

Mr. BREWSTER.

Mr. BOYKIN and to include a speech by Mr. VINSON.

(At the request of Mr. SMITH of California, and to include extraneous matter, the following:)

Mr. WILSON.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 1096. An act to authorize appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for salaries and expenses, research and development, construction and equipment, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 32 minutes p.m.) under its previous order, the House adjourned until Thursday, March 12, 1959, at 11 o'clock a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

695. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a proposed supplemental appropriation to pay claims for damages, audited claims, and judgments rendered against the United States, as provided by various laws, in the amount of $2,570,198, together with such amounts as may be necessary to pay indefinite interest and costs and to cover increases in rates of exchange as may be necessary to pay claims in foreign currency (H. Doc. No. 95); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

696. A letter from the Secretary of Labor, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to establish standards for hours of work and overtime pay of laborers and mechanics employed on work done under contract for, or with the financial aid of, the United States, for any Territory, or for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

697. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend title XI of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, with respect to insurance of ship mortgages, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

698. A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to repeal the act of May 27, 1912, which authorized and directed the Secretary of the Treasury to sell certain land to the First Baptist Church of Plymouth, Mass."; to the Committee on Public Works.

699. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on review of the management controls of the District of Columbia government; to the Committee on Government Operations.

700. A letter from the Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to improve the compensation policies and practices of the Federal Government with respect to civilian personnel thereof, to establish a temporary Commission on Federal Civilian Employees Compensation Policy, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. SMITH of California: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 4154. A bill to amend section 3238 of title 18, United States Code; with amendment (Rept. No. 199). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. ULLMAN: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 4748. A bill to extend the leasing provisions of the act of June 14, 1926, as amended by the act of June 4, 1954 (68 Stat. 173; 43 U.S.C. 869—869–3), to certain lands in Oregon, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 200). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ALGER:

H.R. 5531. A bill to provide that the provisions of the Natural Gas Act shall not apply to the sale of natural gas, as an incident of its production and gathering, by an independent producer not engaged in the interstate transmission of natural gas; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BARING:

H.R. 5532. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, the Railroad Retirement Tax Act, and the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act, so as to provide increases in benefits, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 5533. A bill to stabilize the domestic market prices of lead and zinc; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BROYHILL:

H.R. 5534. A bill to designate the bridge to be constructed over the Potomac River near 14th Street in the District of Columbia under the act of July 16, 1946, as the George Mason Memorial Bridge, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H.R. 5535. A bill to amend the act of October 24, 1951, to provide that the police for the National Zoological Park shall receive salaries at the same rate as officers and members of the Metropolitan Police force of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. DANIELS:

H.R. 5536. A bill to amend section 12 of the act of September 11, 1957; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 5537. A bill to amend the Postal Field Service Compensation Act of 1955 to change the position of elevator operator from level 2 to level 3 of the postal field service schedule; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. FOLEY:

H.R. 5538. A bill to permit the flying of the flag of the United States for 24 hours of each day on the estate known as Terra Rubra, the birthplace of Francis Scott Key, in Carroll County, Md., and at the grave of Key in Mount Olivet Cemetery in Frederick, Md.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FORAND:

H.R. 5539. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to reduce to 5 percent the manufacturers excise tax on self-contained air-conditioning units; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FULTON:

H.R. 5540. A bill to provide for the admission of the State of Hawaii into the Union; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. GRAY:

H.R. 5541. A bill granting the consent and approval of Congress to the Wabash Valley compact, and for related purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAYS:

H.R. 5542. A bill to regulate the foreign commerce of the United States by amending section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HIESTAND:

H.R. 5543. A bill to amend the Investment Company Act of 1940 to continue the eligibility of certain existing retirement associations to make volume purchases at a reduced sales load; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HOLT:

H.R. 5544. A bill to repeal the excise tax on amounts paid for communication services or facilities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LAFORE:

H.R. 5545. A bill to amend the Labor Management Relations Act, 1947, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. MILLER of New York:

H.R. 5546. A bill to amend the so-called Buy-American Act to provide that the Congress shall have the right to disapprove certain contracts entered into by agencies of the Federal Government for the purpose of acquiring articles, materials, or supplies from abroad; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MILLS:

H.R. 5547. A bill to amend certain provisions of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 relating to possessions of the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 5548. A bill to amend certain provisions of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 relating to possessions of the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MULTER:

H.R. 5549. A bill to amend the Code of Law for the District of Columbia by modifying the provisions relating to the attachment and garnishment of wages, salaries, and commissions of judgment debtors, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. MURPHY:

H.R. 5550. A bill granting the consent and approval of Congress to the Wabash Valley compact, and for related purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'KONSKI:

H.R. 5551. A bill to amend section 1901 of title 38, United States Code, to provide assistance to certain seriously disabled World War I veterans in obtaining an automobile or other conveyance; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. OSTERTAG:

H.R. 5552. A bill to amend the Employment Act of 1946 to make stability of prices an explicit part of the economic policy of the Federal Government; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. RABAUT:

H.R. 5553. A bill granting the consent of Congress to a Great Lakes Basin compact, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts:

H.R. 5554. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to provide that multiple sclerosis developing a 10 percent or more degree of disability within 3 years after separation from active service shall be presumed to be service connected; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. ROGERS of Texas (by request):

H.R. 5555. A bill to recognize the authority of the States relating to the control, appropriation, use, or distribution of water within their boundaries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ROOSEVELT:

H.R. 5556. A bill to repeal the cabaret tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SAUND:

H.R. 5557. A bill to provide for the equalization of allotments on the Agua Caliente (Palm Springs) Reservation in California, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SHEPPARD:

H.R. 5558. A bill for the relief of Mill School District, San Bernardino County, Calif.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STRATTON:

H.R. 5559. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide an amortization deduction for certain facilities in areas of substantial unemployment; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TELLER:

H.R. 5560. A bill to amend section 12 of the act of September 11, 1957; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ULLMAN:

H.R. 5561. A bill to set aside and reserve Memaloose Island, Columbia River, Oreg., for the use of the Dalles Dam project and transfer certain property to the Yakima Tribe of Indians in exchange therefor; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. WESTLAND:

H.R. 5562. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to make it clear that the tax on transportation of persons does not apply to ferry service provided by State-operated ferryboats; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WILLIS:

H.R. 5563. A bill authorizing the modification of the existing project for Bayou Lafourche, La., in the interest of navigation; to the Committee on Public Works.

H.R. 5564. A bill to provide for the improvement of Bayous Petit Anse, Tigre, and Carlin, La.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. AVERY:

H.R. 5565. A bill to amend section 401(b) of the act of July 14, 1952, to permit applications for moving costs resulting from military public works projects to be filed either 1 year from the date of acquisition or 1 year following the date of vacating of the property; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BATES:

H.R. 5566. A bill to provide a program of assistance to correct inequities in the construction of fishing vessels and to enable the fishing industry of the United States to regain a favorable economic status, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. DENT:

H.R. 5567. A bill to amend title III of the act of March 3, 1933, with respect to the acquisition by the United States of articles, materials, and supplies for public use; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. FLOOD:

H.R. 5568. A bill to encourage the establishment of voluntary pension plans by self-employed individuals; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GUBSER:

H.R. 5569. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to authorize the award of certain medals within 2 years after a determination by the Secretary concerned that because of loss or inadvertence the recommendation was not processed; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 5570. A bill to provide that the President shall designate one agency of the Federal Government to conduct all security investigations of civil officers and employees of the United States, and of persons who apply for employment as such officers and employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 5571. A bill to exempt regular and classified substitute employees in post offices of the first, second, and third classes from residence requirements governing appointment and service of postmasters at post offices to which such employees are assigned; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 5572. A bill to permit one-half of the budget surplus for any fiscal year to be applied against the public debt and to provide that one-half of such surplus shall be applied as tax credits against individual income taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 5573. A bill to amend section 110 of the Social Security Amendments of 1956 to permit the inclusion of certain additional income in computing social security benefits under the formula contained in that section; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 5574. A bill to amend section 213 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that amounts paid for the medical and dental care of children who have not attained the age of 6 shall be deductible without regard to the limitations contained in such section; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 5575. A bill to provide for the denial of passports to persons knowingly engaged in activities intended to further the international Communist movement; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H.R. 5576. A bill to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938 in order to authorize free or reduced rate transportation, for retired employees of air carriers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 5577. A bill to establish a permanent Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H.R. 5578. A bill to prohibit the mailing of certain material by a Member of Congress, under his frank, to destinations outside the State or district which he represents; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. KARSTEN:

H.R. 5579. A bill to amend section 162 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that certain expenditures incurred in connection with measures submitted to the electorate shall be allowed as business deductions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KARTH:

H.R. 5580. A bill to continue until the close of June 30, 1960, the suspension of duties on metal scrap, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MACK of Illinois:

H.R. 5581. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to provide pensions for widows and children of veterans of World War II and of the Korean conflict on the same basis as pension is provided for widows and children of veterans of World War I; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. MAHON:

H.R. 5582. A bill to amend section 105(b) of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, relating to price support for oats, rye, barley, and grain sorghums; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mrs. MAY:

H.R. 5583. A bill to enable producers to provide a supply of turkeys adequate to meet the needs of consumers, to maintain orderly marketing conditions, and to promote and expand the consumption of turkeys and turkey products; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. RODINO:

H.R. 5584. A bill to clarify paragraph 4 of section 15 of the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942 (56 Stat. 368); to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BENNETT of Michigan:

H.R. 5585. A bill to provide for a 1-year extension of the Temporary Unemployment Compensation Act of 1958, and to increase the maximum aggregate amount payable under such act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 5586. A bill to regulate the foreign commerce of the United States by establishing quantitative restrictions on the importation of hardwood plywood; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KING of Utah:

H.R. 5587. A bill to recognize the authority of the States relating to the control, appropriation, use, or distribution of water within their boundaries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BOGGS:

H.J. Res. 298. Joint resolution authorizing and requesting the President to set aside and proclaim an appropriate day in each year as Teachers Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GAVIN:

H.J. Res. 299. Joint resolution to provide for the designation of August 27, 1959, as Oil Industry Centennial Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. GRIFFITHS:

H.J. Res. 300. Joint resolution extending an invitation to the International Olympic Committee to hold the 1964 Olympic games in the United States; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. JONES of Missouri:

H.J. Res. 301. Joint resolution providing for printing copies of Cannon's Procedure in the House of Representatives; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. MILLER of New York:

H.J. Res. 302. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.J. Res. 303. Joint resolution prohibiting the Tennessee Valley Authority from awarding certain contracts without the prior approval of the Committees on Public Works of the Senate and the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BREWSTER:

H. Con. Res. 102. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to a program for paying the national debt; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LANE:

H. Res. 208. Resolution relating to Rural Electrification Administration contracts; to the Committee on Agriculture.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. KING of Utah: Memorials of the Legislature of the State of Utah, memorializing the Congress to amend Public Law 85–868 to protect the interests of the State in mineral wealth on lands within the Navajo Indian Reservation of San Juan County, Utah; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MONAGAN: Memorial of the General Assembly of the State of Connecticut, memorializing Congress on the passage of H.R. 2969 or H.R. 3450; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Oregon, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to Senate Joint Resolution 7 of the 50th Legislative Assembly of Oregon, which ratifies the 15th amendment to the Constitution of the United States proposed by Congress on February 26, 1869; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 5588. A bill for the relief of Etelvino MacNamara Migoya; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOLTZMAN:

H.R. 5589. A bill for the relief of Michael J. Collins; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PELLY:

H.R. 5590. A bill for the relief of Maurice L. Hoffman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PIRNIE:

H.R. 5591. A bill for the relief of Bruno Beer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PORTER:

H.R. 5592. A bill for the relief of Nielsen L. Pollard and Elsie M. Pollard, his wife; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REUSS:

H.R. 5593. A bill for the relief of Rosette Sorge Savorgnan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

107. Mr. MONAGAN presented a petition of Unity Council No. 37, Knights of Columbus of Torrington, Conn., declaring themselves unanimously and emphatically opposed to the recognition of the Communist regime of China by the United States of America, and to the admission of Red China to membership in the United Nations, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

H.R. 4001, Townsend Plan Amendments to the Social Security Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES S. GUBSER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 11, 1959

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, I have wholeheartedly joined with Representative BLATNIK, of Minnesota, in sponsoring legislation embodying the Townsend plan. My bill, H.R. 4001, is identical with H.R. 4000, introduced by Representative BLATNIK. It has been my pleasure to sponsor this legislation in past Congresses.

My reason for promoting this legislation is that, in my view, it is conservative legislation. It is conservative, in the first place, because it involves the smallest possible cost of administration while it expends the greatest possible proportion of the revenue it raises for the purposes of paying social security benefits to the American people. This principle of the Townsend plan—holding to a minimum the part of the money the Government spends and uses, while expending the maximum amount on the purposes of the legislation itself—is of the essence of conservatism.

It embodies the philosophy of government expressed by our great President when he said:

> In all those things which deal with the people be liberal, be human. In all those things which deal with the people's money or their economy, or their form of government, be conservative.

In the second place, this legislation will amend title II of the Social Security Act so that the program under that title will be on a solid and reliably pay-as-you-go financial basis. Pay-as-you-go governmental operation lies at the very roots of conservatism. It is absolutely essential to balanced budgets. The Townsend plan amendments to title II will permanently balance the budget to the extent of the part of the budget concerned with the greatest part of our national social security system.

Furthermore, the amendments to title II proposed in this legislation will contribute tremendously to balancing the budgets of our State and local governments. It recognizes that the problem of old-age retirement, disability insurance, and the protection of widows having the care of minor children—the great areas to which title II is addressed—is an out-and-out national problem. My bill is calculated effectively to solve the problem of these needs without the aid of State programs, such as the present program under title II requires to supplement its inadequate benefits. These State programs, under the public-assistance titles of our Social Security Act, dealing with what is properly a national problem, result in ridiculous disparities, discriminations, and injustices. The result of my legislation will be to end this impractical situation, relieving State and local governments of the financial burden of carrying such misplaced and unworkable programs, thereby offsetting greatly improved opportunities to balance their respective budgets.

In respect to these foregoing points, the present system under title II—namely, old-age and survivors and disability insurance—with its collection of generally far more money from the current economy than benefits currently require—and the use by Government for purposes other than social security benefits much of the money collected in the name of that purpose—this present program violates every principle of sound governmental finance and of just apportionment of the taxload.

The Townsend program for social security provides for the perpetual gearing of benefits to changes in the cost of living and in prevailing standards of living. When changes in either standards or costs occur, this program provides for automatic matching of benefits to such changes, up or down, as the case may be. This feature of the program I hold to be preeminently conservative, because it results from careful analysis of the real problem of social security and the evolving of provisions permanently and effectively to meet it—rather than purely expedient makeshifts, patchwork, temporary provisions which are out of date almost before they can be put into effect.

Mr. Speaker, as coauthor of the Townsend bill, I do not contend that it can never be improved upon. However, I am certainly sure that the Committee on Ways and Means, upon full and objective study of it, will find that it affords them the ways and means for giving the American people and our national economy an incomparably more efficient, effective and beneficial system under title II of the Social Security Act than is afforded by the present program. I am equally certain that, after thorough committee studies and hearing and after full and conscientious debate in the House, it will become obvious to all that these amendments to title II will provide not only benefits affording our aged and other proper groups of people benefits reflecting up to date, just standards of living—but, also, an effective, permanent and, in the true sense, a conservative solution of our national social security problem.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include in the RECORD, with this statement, two statistical compilations of great significance. The first shows the rank discriminations, disparities and almost unbelievable violation of anything remotely resembling standards which the present programs of public assistance—supplementing title II—display. The second item sets forth the facts as to the utter failure of our efforts to date to make any progress toward solution of the social security problem under the means afforded by the present system of old-age, survivors, and disability insurance:

Comparative statistics—Old-age and survivors insurance, old-age assistance, for the United States, by States and Territories; and per capita income by States, 1957

Area	1957 per capita income	OAA average monthly benefits, December 1957		OASI average monthly benefits to aged beneficiaries, December 1957					Area	1957 per capita income	OAA average monthly benefits, December 1957		OASI average monthly benefits to aged beneficiaries, December 1957				
		Average benefit	Number per thousand 65 years and over	Primary benefit	Wife and husband	Widow and widower	Parents	Number per thousand 65 years and over			Average benefit	Number per thousand 65 years and over	Primary benefit	Wife and husband	Widow and widower	Parents	Number per thousand 65 years and over
United States	$2,027	$60.68	165	$64.58	$34.37	$51.08	$51.87	550	Hawaii	$1,821	$51.56	54	$61.17	$30.84	$46.08	$53.45	519
									Idaho	1,630	60.55	143	61.51	32.59	46.76	51.35	544
Alaska	-------	63.43	260	63.79	30.07	48.97	70.00	469	Illinois	2,447	67.82	92	68.17	36.86	52.95	55.60	554
Alabama	1,324	38.23	436	55.34	27.28	44.60	47.21	434	Indiana	2,010	56.94	76	65.00	35.08	50.88	54.02	611
Arizona	1,750	55.38	198	64.60	34.17	50.68	49.76	503	Iowa	1,806	67.36	121	62.13	33.65	48.82	52.86	509
Arkansas	1,151	45.72	306	52.84	26.03	42.86	47.99	434	Kansas	1,787	73.04	141	60.67	32.31	47.89	50.21	513
California	2,523	83.16	227	65.07	35.48	51.48	53.60	572	Kentucky	1,372	38.63	216	57.27	28.42	47.16	50.07	494
Colorado	1,996	81.74	340	63.08	33.62	50.25	48.18	483	Louisiana	1,566	63.06	586	57.25	29.34	46.02	47.65	374
Connecticut	2,821	106.20	71	71.78	39.09	54.44	54.79	657	Maine	1,663	55.79	123	60.16	32.72	48.39	50.25	650
Delaware	2,740	49.31	52	65.11	36.69	52.37	52.86	632	Maryland	2,156	51.75	49	63.18	35.27	51.32	48.46	549
District of Columbia	2,514	56.41	46	62.50	35.12	49.96	50.00	433	Massachusetts	2,335	95.83	163	67.86	37.62	52.80	53.73	627
Florida	1,836	54.19	161	66.27	35.40	50.70	49.50	596	Michigan	2,141	66.23	117	71.08	37.84	54.15	57.00	618
Georgia	1,431	43.06	369	55.00	28.40	44.84	46.27	402	Minnesota	1,850	79.10	149	63.17	33.97	51.18	52.92	522

Comparative statistics—Old-age and survivors insurance, old-age assistance, for the United States, by States and Territories; and per capita income by States, 1957—Continued

Area	1957 per capita income	OAA average monthly benefits, December 1957		OASI average monthly benefits to aged beneficiaries, December 1957					Area	1957 per capita income	OAA average monthly benefits, December 1957		OASI average monthly benefits to aged beneficiaries, December 1957				
		Average benefit	Number per thousand 65 years and over	Primary benefit	Wife and husband	Widow and widower	Parents	Number per thousand 65 years and over			Average benefit	Number per thousand 65 years and over	Primary benefit	Wife and husband	Widow and widower	Parents	Number per thousand 65 years and over
Mississippi	$958	$28.43	464	$49.67	$24.06	$42.27	$47.52	408	Puerto Rico	------	$8.09	390	$41.98	$17.96	$39.40	$43.51	320
Missouri	1,940	54.53	272	62.46	33.17	50.28	51.42	519	Rhode Island	$1,990	70.61	91	66.61	36.49	51.76	54.55	696
Montana	1,896	61.99	128	64.62	35.20	50.36	50.00	515	South Carolina	1,180	37.52	247	55.42	27.59	44.72	46.71	407
Nebraska	1,818	62.18	110	61.15	32.77	47.83	49.58	507	South Dakota	1,531	49.18	144	61.16	32.79	47.62	51.61	496
Nevada	2,423	67.72	196	64.89	34.63	51.64	50.00	600	Tennessee	1,383	38.03	210	53.95	26.81	44.84	48.34	457
New Hampshire	1,862	68.57	86	63.12	34.61	49.96	51.56	644	Texas	1,791	47.15	337	58.09	29.88	46.93	43.36	425
New Jersey	2,504	80.43	40	70.64	38.97	54.22	57.47	657	Utah	1,694	65.45	164	65.65	35.04	50.59	52.58	541
New Mexico	1,686	53.83	211	58.38	29.41	46.56	49.63	392	Vermont	1,665	50.64	150	60.76	32.82	48.54	54.17	571
New York	2,578	92.08	61	67.72	37.38	52.80	55.35	618	Virgin Islands	------	18.51	318	46.72	24.32	40.00	------	206
North Carolina	1,317	36.44	180	55.20	27.44	44.77	47.21	467	Virginia	1,660	35.66	62	57.69	29.57	47.32	48.41	514
North Dakota	1,435	76.33	140	61.74	32.79	47.29	48.33	447	Washington	2,128	84.46	219	65.86	35.07	50.47	50.79	599
Ohio	2,255	64.54	112	68.31	37.18	53.17	54.18	574	West Virginia	1,554	34.05	133	62.42	31.32	48.24	50.15	560
Oklahoma	1,619	72.79	407	58.88	30.30	47.01	50.00	405	Wisconsin	1,920	71.09	103	64.89	34.78	54.23	52.76	585
Oregon	1,914	77.77	109	64.74	34.30	50.44	54.15	648	Wyoming	2,038	69.93	155	62.82	32.96	49.50	59.09	506
Pennsylvania	2,112	52.00	48	68.17	37.03	52.20	53.70	606									

Sources: Survey of Current Business, Department of Commerce, August 1958 table 2. Social Security Bulletin, March 1958, tables 12 and 15; July 1958, tables 6 and 8.

Population increase in adult age groups, United States, 1847 through 1957, income position of aged, 1847 through 1957

Increases in numbers of persons:

A. Aged 14 and over:

1947:	
Men	52,459,000
Women	54,953,000
Total	107,412,000
1957:	
Men	57,583,000
Women	62,219,000
Total	119,802,000
Increase (11.5 percent)	12,390,000

B. Aged 14 through 64:

1947:	
Men	47,403,000
Women	49,368,000
Total	96,771,000
1957:	
Men	50,925,000
Women	54,307,000
Total	105,232,000
Increase (8.7 percent)	8,461,000

C. Aged 25 through 64:

1947:	
Men	35,578,000
Women	36,919,000
Total	72,497,000
1957:	
Men	39,264,000
Women	41,558,000
Total	80,822,000
Increase (11.5 percent)	8,325,000

D. Aged 65 and over:

1947:	
Men	5,056,000
Women	5,585,000
Total	10,641,000
1957:	
Men	6,658,000
Women	7,912,000
Total	14,570,000
Increase (36.9 percent)	3,929,000

Share of money income by persons 65 and over:	Percent
1947	*7
1952	*8
1953	7.3
1954	7.7
1955	7.9
1956	7.6
1957	7.4

Sources: Census Bureau, Current Population Reports, Series P-60, No. 5, table 15; No. 30, table 18. *Social Security Bulletin, February 1954, article by Jacob Fisher. Social Security Bulletin, March 1958, table 7 and table 11.

Our elderly population is increasing over three times as rapidly as the rest of our adult population. The income share of the aged group remains static. Since the whole group receives the same total share of income, the economic position of the average member of the group continuously declines.

The part of the income of the aged which is made up of social security benefits increased from 13.9 percent in 1947 to 36.8 percent in 1957. Conversely, the part of their income made up from other resources declined from about 86 percent in 1947 to about 63 percent in 1957.[1] The ability of most Americans to finance their old age through other means than our Federal social security law is shrinking fast and steadily. Our present social security program has failed, not only to better the economic position of our people in old age, but it has even failed to compensate for the constantly shrinking ability of the people otherwise to provide for their old age. These are the facts.

Drastic action on social security legislation must be taken.

[1] Social Security Bulletin, March 1958, tables 7 and 11.

A Valiant Lady

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL B. BREWSTER

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 11, 1959

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I should like to insert a press release which I recently issued. The story of the U.S.S. *Maryland* should be of interest to all those who remember how valiantly she served our country during World War II.

This is a story of a valiant lady of days gone by.

The Department of the Navy recently advised the Armed Services Committee that it intended to scrap 43 warships.

The U.S.S *Maryland* is one of the ships destined for the ironpile. I thought it might be appropriate to review her illustrious career.

This ship is the third to carry the name of *Maryland*. The first was a 380-ton vessel carrying 20 guns and 180 men. Commissioned in 1799, she served in the West Indies during the naval war with France in 1800. The second *Maryland* was an armored cruiser commissioned in 1905. She saw duty in the Atlantic in World War I. The present *Maryland* or "Old Mary," or "Fighting Mary," as she was known to her crew, was commissioned in 1921. She saw heavy action in World War II, and was under attack over a hundred times in the Pacific. The Japanese reported her sunk on three occasions.

On December 7, 1941, the *Maryland* and six of her sister battlewagons were moored along Ford Island at Pearl Harbor. The *Maryland* was severely damaged in the surprise Japanese attack of that morning, but 23 days later she pulled into Puget Sound for repairs. She shortly thereafter rejoined the fleet in the Pacific.

The *Maryland* saw further action at the battle of Midway and in the Solomon Islands. She supported the Marine assaults on Tarawa, Kwajalein, and Saipan. At the last of these engagements, a torpedo ripped a gaping hole in her port bow. After repairs, the *Maryland* again joined the fleet and participated in many engagements. The five old battleships which the Japanese thought they had sunk at Pearl Harbor, the *California*, the *Tennessee*, the *West Virginia*, the *Pennsylvania*, and the *Maryland*, met the Japanese fleet at Leyte Gulf. The thundering guns of these old battleships decimated the enemy's forces.

Shortly thereafter, the "Fighting Mary" was hit by a suicide dive bomber and severely damaged. Ground repairs were quickly made. On April 1, 1945, the *Maryland* was given the job of providing close support for the Marine invasion of Okinawa. I personally well remember the part she there played. I was in the first wave of the invasion, and I will always carry the picture in my mind of the *Maryland's* 16-inch guns shelling the coast as we Marines moved in.

The *Maryland* was again hit by a kamikaze, and again dreadfully damaged. In spite of the heavy casualties, dead and wounded, the *Maryland* continued to support the Okinawan invasion. Having been battle damaged three times in the course of 10 months, she was on her way back to strike again, when the Japanese finally surrendered.

Modern warfare has now rendered this grand lady obsolete. She and her sisters are destined for the scrap heap. I do think, however, that it is only proper to recount her gallant service as she is about to go on her last voyage.

Military Retired Pay

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL J. KILDAY
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 11, 1959

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Speaker, most Members are receiving a large number of letters with reference to the disparity of retired pay of military men retired before and those retired after the military pay bill, effective June 1, 1958—Public Law 85–422.

Because I was chairman of the subcommittee of the Committee on Armed Services which wrote the bill, Members are inquiring of me as to what is involved in this issue. In an effort to be helpful to my colleagues, I have formulated a number of questions and answers which reflect answers to most of the inquiries made of me.

The information given below is intended to be factual. No effort has been made to evaluate the merits of the issue nor to debate the same.

The questions and answers follow:

Question 1: Is there a material difference in the retired pay of members of the military, in the same rank and same length of service who retired before June 1, 1958, and those retiring after June 1, 1958?

Answer: In the higher ranks there is a very material difference in retired pay. The difference diminishes in the lower officer ranks and enlisted grades.

The following table contains full information as to officer ranks and enlisted grades of those retired with average years of service related to retired grade:

Examples of military retired pay under the Career Compensation Act—Nondisability retirements

Grade	Pay grade	Years of service	Paid prior to June 1, 1958	Paid after June 1, 1958		Increase over old rate		
				Retired before June 1, 1958	Retired after June 1, 1958 [1]	Retired before June 1, 1958	Retired after June 1, 1958 [1]	Difference [1]
		(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
Chief of Staff	O–10	30	$807	$1,015	$1,406	$208	$599	$391
General	O–10	30	807	1,015	1,275	208	468	260
Lieutenant general	O–9	30	807	935	1,125	128	318	190
Major general	O–8	30	807	856	1,013	49	206	157
Brigadier general	O–7	30	725	769	881	44	156	112
Colonel	O–6	30	608	645	739	37	131	94
Lieutenant colonel	O–5	27	453	480	523	27	70	43
Major	O–4	26	385	408	410	23	25	2
Captain	O–3	25	322	341	328	19	6	−13
1st lieutenant	O–2	25	258	274	238	16	−20	−36
2d lieutenant	O–1	27	253	268	212	15	−41	−56
Master sergeant	E–7	23	184	195	201	11	17	6
Technical sergeant	E–6	23	166	176	167	10	1	−9
Staff sergeant	E–5	24	155	164	144	9	−11	−20
Sergeant	E–4	25	137	145	119	8	−18	−26
Corporal	E–3	25	102	109	88	7	−14	−21
Private 1st class	E–2	24	80	84	65	4	−15	−19
Private	E–1	23	61	65	60	4	−1	−5

[1] Not applicable to persons on saved pay at time of retirement.

NOTE.—For brevity, tables concerning commissioned officers with over 4 years of active enlisted service and warrant officers have not been included.

Question 2: Under the 1958 pay bill did persons retired before June 1, 1958, receive any increase in the retired pay previously received by them?

Answer: Yes. Those persons retired before the effective date of that pay bill received an increase of 6 percent of the pay previously received. The dollar amount in each grade and rank is given in the above table.

Question 3: Why was 6 percent increase granted rather than some other percentage?

Answer: The Department of Defense had recommended a formula granting a cost-of-living increase of 6 percent for all those active-duty members not receiving a 6 percent increase under the recommendation submitted by it. The subcommittee did not recommend the formula submitted by the Department of Defense. However, the pay scales recommended by the committee, and adopted by the Congress, reflected with but very few exceptions a 6 percent increase. Therefore, the committee recommended an increase of 6 percent for persons previously retired as approaching the increase in the cost of living.

Question 4: What was the annual cost of the increased retired pay of 6 percent?

Answer: Approximately $36 million per year.

Question 5: What increase for persons previously retired was recommended by the Department of Defense?

Answer: The Department of Defense recommended that the retired pay of those retired before the effective date of the bill not be computed on the new rates. Therefore the Department recommended no increase for these officers.

Question 6: What would be the increased cost if those retired before the effective date of the pay bill were permitted to recompute their retired pay on the new pay rates?

Answer: It is estimated the increased cost for the first year would be between $25 million and $26 million, in addition to the $36 million previously granted. This cost would recur annually, but would be reduced by approximately 2 percent per year due to attrition of personnel on the retired rolls.

Question 7: Did the granting of an increase of 6 percent depart from the previous custom as to retired pay?

Answer: Yes. In the past, persons retired prior to the effective date of any pay act have had their retired pay recomputed upon the new rather than the old pay rates.

Question 8: What is the cost of military retired pay, and what has it been in the past?

Answer: The current and past cost of military retired pay is as follows:

Appropriations or expenditures for military retired pay, fiscal year 1950–60

Fiscal year	Million
1950 appropriation	$219
1951 appropriation	322
1952 appropriation	329
1953 appropriation	356
1954 expenditure	386
1955 expenditure	419
1956 expenditure	477
1957 expenditure	509
1958 expenditure	561
1959 budget	640
1960 budget	715

Statement of Hon. Carl Vinson of Georgia on H.R. 3460

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK W. BOYKIN
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 11, 1959

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks, I include a short statement which I made before the Public Works Committee today, and also include a good and a great statement by a good and great statesman—one of the finest men I have ever known on earth, a man with whom I have served over a quarter of a century here in the Congress of the United States, where the men that are standing around me at this moment represent every human being in America and where, Mr. Speaker, they all love and respect the great CARL VINSON. It is a joy and a pleasure to place his statement in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, that will be read all over this land and in many foreign countries.

I consider it a good statement; I consider it a fair statement for private industry. All of us love the TVA and the REA and have voted and worked and pulled for them, but we do have to stand for private enterprise. However, I will say no more about this at the moment, but I do hope that many people everywhere will read the great statement made by this man from Georgia, who

has been in the Congress about as long as any man that has ever lived.

This is the statement by the great Congressman, the chairman of the Armed Services Committee, the Honorable CARL VINSON, of Georgia:

STATEMENT OF CARL VINSON OF GEORGIA, ON H.R. 3460

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate this opportunity to appear before the committee today to offer an amendment to the bill H.R. 3460.

The basic law establishing TVA has no restrictions upon the area in which TVA may operate.

However, TVA has been operating within its present area for many years under a gentlemen's agréement between TVA and surrounding private utility companies.

I understand this gentlemen's agreement as to their respective areas of operation is on an entirely friendly and cooperative basis between TVA and the private utilities.

It is also my information that TVA takes pride in the fact that it is living up to this so-called gentlemen's agreement with private utilities, as to their respective areas of operation, and that TVA-private utility relations are uniformly congenial.

This bill proposes to give TVA its own legal financing and borrowing powers without congressional supervision or control. I propose through the amendment which I am submitting and advocating that if TVA is to be granted this tremendously broad financing power, Congress should now also write into the law the definite and specific area limitations under which TVA is now operating under its present gentlemen's agreement.

In other words, my amendment converts the gentlemen's agreement to law. That's all it does. If Congress is going to grant such exceedingly broad and unrestricted financing powers, to TVA, it should by all means write into the law definite territorial limitations, as to its operative power, to the area TVA now serves.

If, in the future, it is desirable for TVA to extend its area operation beyond its present territorial area, it should come back to Congress and then let Congress pass on the desirability of such an extension.

This is the sensible and sound way to go about this thing.

I understand that TVA itself is not asking for an enlarged or extended area of operation.

I am reliably informed that while TVA of course might like to have enlarged area of operation, they are primarily interested in being given power of self-financing in their own present area of operation.

If Congress is not going to give TVA further financial aid, TVA apparently needs some kind of self-financing powers if it is to meet expanding demands for power in its present operating area.

And that should be the primary aim of this legislation.

Why tack on to it a provision extending TVA territory 25,000 square miles into areas now being well and efficiently served by private utilities on all sides of the presently TVA-served area?

Why encroach so heavily upon areas now well served by present utilities?

Why upset the present gentlemen's agreement areas and the evidently pleasant relations now existing in these areas?

We should limit the area of TVA operation to that now covered by the existing gentlemen's agreement.

That is all I am asking in this amendment.

It is the sensible thing to do, if we are to grant TVA these wide financing powers.

It is fair to all parties.

My amendment does no harm to anybody or to any private or public utility or to any American citizen. It does not affect in any way the present operations of TVA. It closes no door to future congressional legislation which might be desired as to the area or any other feature of TVA.

And it places safeguards around both public and private utilities, which I believe it is our duty to do.

Mr. Chairman, the wording of the pending bill as to additional areas which TVA could serve is very uncertain and ambiguous.

It is estimated that this additional area of TVA operations as provided in the bill as it is now written is at least 25,000 square miles. This is in addition to the 80,000 square miles now served by TVA under its so-called gentlemen's agreement.

This is an increase of over 30 percent into areas now known as private utility served areas; and there are those who are of the strong opinion that the bill as written even covers a far greater area.

Now, Mr. Chairman, throughout the years, from the very inception of Muscle Shoals, I have always supported TVA legislation. But I've always known the area it could cover.

In considering this vitally important legislation, let us use discretion. Let us limit the area of TVA in this bill to its present area of operation if Congress is going to give TVA these huge self-financing powers. I hope this committee will see fit to adopt such an amendment. That is the intent and purpose of my amendment.

Last year in the report which accompanied S. 1868, this committee stated:

"The committee is convinced that this bill provides a workable solution of the problem of supplying the future power needs of the area served by TVA on a basis which will adequately protect the Federal Government, purchasers of TVA power, and investors in TVA bonds."

I appear this morning in support of an amendment to this bill which will permit TVA to supply adequate power needs in its present area, will adequately protect the Federal Government, will adequately protect purchasers of TVA power and investors in TVA bonds; and will also protect the municipalities of Georgia, the taxpayers of Georgia, the stockholders of the Georgia Power Co., the employees of the Georgia Power Co., as well as thousands of individuals who have investments in private utility companies.

Last July when the president of the Georgia Power Co. appeared before the House Committee on Public Works, he advised this committee that the Georgia Power Co. had 5,008 employees operating its properties which served 95 percent of the State of Georgia in an area of 57,000 square miles.

As of June 1958, the Georgia Power Co. directly served electrical energy requirements of 662,385 customers. In addition, approximately 300,000 Georgians receive electric service from 39 rural electric membership corporations and 50 municipal electric distribution systems who in turn receive electric power on a wholesale basis from the Georgia Power Co. The power company also carries on retail operations with 631 municipalities.

Now let me call this to your attention.

In 1957, the Southern Co., with its affiliates, including the Georgia Power Co., paid a total of $55,946,000 in local, State, and Federal taxes.

I am advised that this was considerably larger than the dividends paid to the stockholders. The affiliates of the Southern Co., including the Georgia Power Co., have over $1 billion invested in their facilities.

The Southern Co. have 21,000 preferred stockholders and 124,000 common stockholders in every State of the Union.

The Georgia Power Co. has over 8,910 stockholders, 6,600 of whom are citizens of Georgia.

Therefore, I am appearing this morning in the interests of the State of Georgia, the municipalities of the State of Georgia, the taxpayers of the State of Georgia, as well as thousands of other citizens of this country who have a vital interest in the preservation of free enterprise.

Now, just to give you an example of what the Georgia Power Co. does for the State of Georgia, and the municipalities of Georgia, let me read to you a newspaper clipping from the Union Recorder of Milledgeville, Ga., my hometown, dated Thursday, February 26, 1959:

"POWER COMPANY DELIVERS CHECK TO CITY OVER $10,000

"A check for $10,276.14 was delivered to the city of Milledgeville, February 19, 1959, by H. M. Woodard, district manager of the Georgia Power Co.

"This payment represent 3 percent of the gross receipts in 1958 from the sale of electric power to commercial and residential customers of the company under the municipal partnership plan. The 3 percent tax is paid by the company in place of occupation and franchise taxes and is in addition to the company's property taxes, which totaled $5,270,000 last year.

"More than $2,135,000 is being paid to the communities of Georgia for 1958 under the municipal partnership plan. This is an increase of more than $117,000 over 1957.

"The company's total tax bill for 1958 was $26,600,000. This does not include the sales tax which the company collects from its customers for the State of Georgia nor the sales tax which the company pays on materials used in its operations."

I want to make mighty sure that Milledgeville, my hometown, and 630 other municipalities in Georgia continue to receive these annual payments. That's the main reason I'm here today with a suggested amendment.

Now, the amendment I propose strikes out the last four words on line 13, and all of lines 14 through 25 on page 2, as well as all of lines 1 through 11 on page 3, and substitutes the following in lieu thereof:

AMENDMENT

"Unless otherwise specifically authorized by act of Congress existing and subsequently built, leased, or acquired power facilities of the Corporation shall not be used for the sale or delivery of power for use outside the service area of the Corporation as it existed on July 1, 1957, except, when economically feasible for exchange power arrangements with other utility systems with which the Corporation had such arrangements on said date."

Now let's see what the amendment does:

1. Unless specifically authorized by an act of Congress, present power facilities and those subsequently built, leased, or acquired by TVA shall not be used for the sale or delivery of power for use outside the service area of TVA as it existed on July 1, 1957. This carries out the existing gentlemen's agreement.

2. The exception to this prohibition, however, is that when economically feasible it will be permissible for TVA to provide service for interconnection with other utility systems for exchange power arrangements, if such arrangements were in effect on July 1, 1957. Such a plan is now in operation.

Now, Mr. Chairman, this permits the expansion of TVA facilities within the present service area of TVA.

It is my understanding that the sole purpose of this bill is to allow TVA to finance its future expansions through a bond issue but that that expansion is to be limited to the expansion required to meet the needs of the communities and users of electricity within the present boundaries of TVA.

My amendment permits this; it merely prohibits TVA from going beyond its present service area.

The bill as written provides that power facilities financed with bond proceeds or

power revenues shall not be used for the sale or delivery of power by TVA outside the counties which lie in whole or in part within the Tennessee River drainage basin or the service area in which power generated by the Corporation is being used on July 1, 1957. (Lines 13–21, p. 2.)

Although the proponents of the bill represent the intention of the bill to be to confine TVA to its existing service area, with some minor flexibility, the truth is that the provision: (1) Contains a number of loopholes, ambiguities and exceptions which could be used to expand TVA's existing service area virtually without limit; and (2) in addition, in express terms, permits expansion of TVA's existing service area into an additional area of some 25,000 square miles (or approximately 31 percent of TVA's existing service area) which is not now serviced by TVA.

The loopholes, ambiguities and exceptions, which could be used to permit unlimited expansion, are:

1. The provision does not deal directly with the scope of TVA's operations but is drafted in terms of the use of power facilities financed with the proceeds of bonds or power revenues. But existing facilities or new facilities financed in any other way could be used to expand TVA's service area without any limitations whatever.

2. The provision is phrased in terms of "sale or delivery" (rather than use) of power in the defined areas and, except for the proviso which refers only to a "distributor", does not prohibit the purchase of power within the service area for use outside. There is, for example, nothing in the provision to prevent an industrial customer from taking delivery of power within the defined area and using it outside such area.

3. Power may be sold or delivered to a Federal agency wherever located. It is not clear whether the proviso against resale by a "distributor" would apply to a Federal agency. If not, such an agency as Southeastern Power Administration could qualify as a purchaser for resale, and then, obviously, that would permit it almost unlimited expansion of the area in which TVA power could be used so as to include the entire State of Georgia.

4. The bill authorizes a bond issue of $750 million to be outstanding at any one time to assist TVA in financing its power program. What appears to be words of limitation requiring approval by Congress with regard to the use of these bonds for the expansion of TVA service areas, actually constitute an authorization for expansion over and above the areas now served by TVA. This comes about as a result of the language on lines 17 through 19 which says that it is the intent of this act that the facilities constructed with the proceeds of these bonds or power revenues can't be used without prior approval by Congress, "for the sale or delivery of power by the corporation outside the counties which lie in whole or in part within the Tennessee River drainage basin."

But the geographical studies show that there are about 8,500 square miles within this drainage basin which are not now served by TVA. Thus what appears at first to be a limitation in the bill is actually an open invitation to expansion.

5. The words of limitation with regard to prior approval by Congress apply only to the power facilities built or acquired with the proceeds of the bond issue or power revenues derived from construction resulting from the bond issue. However, there is no limitation with regard to the utilization of revenues derived from existing facilities. Revenue from these facilities therefore could be used for unlimited expansion because there are no words of limitation applicable to these facilities.

6. In other words, the bill contains no limitation whatsoever with regard to new facilities that may be constructed on the basis of revenues produced by existing facilities.

There are some words of limitation with regard to new facilities constructed on the basis of the new bond issue authorized by this bill or on the basis of revenues produced from the new facilities constructed under the bond issue, but even this part of the bill authorizes an expansion of 8,500 square miles in the counties which lie in whole or in part within the Tennessee River drainage basin.

Now, Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that this bill, H.R. 3460, is so cleverly drafted that hereafter TVA is going to keep two sets of books—one set of books will be known as the limited expansion set of books, and the other, the unlimited expansion set of books.

Now, why do I say that?

Well, it is perfectly obvious from the way this bill is drafted, that any facilities built from the $750 million bond issue can't be used for expansion without congressional approval other than the 8,500 square miles of expansion which will result from the language with regard to the counties lying partially or wholly within the Tennessee River drainage area.

Now, any revenues that are derived from any of these new facilities can't be used for expansion other than that I have just mentioned, so they will be kept under the limited expansion set of books.

But if TVA wants to expand without congressional approval, all they have to do is to take the revenues from existing facilities which were not built from the proceeds of the proposed bond issue, and use those revenues for new facilities without any limitation whatsoever and without ever coming back to the Congress to even say, "how do you do."

This is true because there is no limitation in this bill on the utilization of revenues derived from existing facilities.

Now I don't know how TVA plans to operate in the future, but certainly there is nothing in this bill to prevent them from using two sets of books and every time they want to expand into a new area, all they have to do is point to the set of books marked "unlimited expansion" and say, "Congress knew exactly what it was doing. They only restricted us from expanding with the proceeds or revenues derived from the bond issue. They didn't restrict us with regard to the proceeds from existing facilities built before the bond issue was authorized."

It is difficult to understand why the language "the counties which lie in whole or in part within the Tennessee River drainage basin" is used unless the proponents are demanding that the present service areas of TVA be expanded.

Geographical studies and maps show unquestionably that there are some 8,500 square miles in this drainage basin which are not now served by TVA.

Furthermore, the bill refers to the whole of counties which are only partially within TVA's existing service area or the drainage basin. This would permit expansion into some 16,500 square miles which are not now served by TVA. By far, the major part of this 8,500-square mile area and the 16,500-square mile area are now served by investor-owned power companies.

The TVA problem faced by Congress arises from the fact that TVA and its supporters have stated that they would need $1.5 billion in the next 10 years to provide for the expansion of the electric power requirements of its existing service area.

TVA and its supporters profess to have no desire to expand its service area geographically. But its supporters have not been willing to accept an unambiguous direction that the existing service area is not to be extended without further congressional authorization.

Congress may have to face the problem of finding some way to provide for the increased power requirements of the area now served by TVA. But Congress can and should insist that this problem be at least confined to that area and that effective limits be placed on further geographical expansion without express congressional approval. No good reason has been advanced to justify the expansion permitted by the bill or, indeed, to justify any geographical expansion at all.

There should be a direct and unequivocal provision confining TVA's power operations to its existing service area. Further geographical expansion should be permitted only after a showing of the need therefor and express congressional approval.

From the standpoint of the Georgia Power Co., this service area expansion problem is indeed a grave one. If not amended so as to fully protect this company, the adoption of the bill in its present form would have a most immediate and direct adverse effect on the company, which, as of June 1958, directly served the electric energy requirements of 662,385 customers.

I say that the language on page 2 of the bill (lines 13–25) provides the expansion of TVA directly or by its power distributors throughout counties in the Tennessee River drainage basin, and other counties in northwest Georgia now receiving TVA power through the North Georgia Electric Membership Corp., to an extent that was never dreamed of, even during the 1930's.

I interpret this language to not only permit, but also to encourage TVA to service directly some of the municipalities which the Georgia Power Co., now serves in northwest Georgia and, in addition, authorizes North Georgia Electric Membership Corp., a distributor of TVA, to extend its sales of TVA power throughout the whole of all of those counties in northwest Georgia in which it operated as of July 1, 1957. Necessarily, a very uneconomic and destructive duplication of already adequate electrical facilities would eventuate. Such an expansion would involve the largest cities in northwest Georgia.

It is for these reasons that I am proposing this amendment, so that the bill will be confined to what the stated need is, and not permit action to be taken which would adversely affect the municipalities of Georgia, the taxpayers of Georgia, the employees of the Georgia Power Co., and the stockholders of this and other private utility companies.

Mr. Chairman, I offer no apology for appearing here today on behalf of the municipalities of Georgia, as well as the Georgia Power Co. The Georgia Power Co. is a private utility system owned by private citizens. It has 8,910 stockholders, 6,600 of whom are citizens of Georgia.

My amendment very clearly protects my constituents who are stockholders in the Georgia Power Co., and most importantly, the municipalities of my district who do business with this company.

If TVA facilities must be expanded to provide for increased power demands within its present area, then let's confine the bill to only that purpose.

Let's not use a steamroller where a simple sledge hammer will do the job.

STATEMENT OF HON. FRANK W. BOYKIN, OF ALABAMA, ON H.R. 3460

Mr. Chairman, I am appearing before your committee on behalf of myself and the other members of the Alabama House delegation who have the services of the Alabama Power Co. in their respective congressional districts. We are proud of the Alabama Power Co. and feel that it has done much for the betterment of our district and our State. We are also proud that we have the great TVA in our

State. We are for both Alabama Power Co. and TVA and want to help both.

We are all aware of the gentlemen's agreement between TVA and Alabama Power Co., which has been so carefully kept by both parties for so many years. We feel that anything that can be done to continue this peaceful coexistence is all to the good and that it is to the best interest of all concerned that this gentlemen's agreement be preserved by making it the law, as CARL VINSON has suggested.

Order or Disorder in the Space Age?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CLAIR ENGLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 11, 1959

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, the United States has achieved a great international status for its accomplishments in the area of managerial efficiency. We have been represented as the model for democratic decision making and speed of production. But as we move into the space age we find great confusion in both the decision-making process and the production process. We are facing the greatest threat to our survival in our history; yet we are not drawing on our genius for organization and management. The time is now if we are to develop the kinds of procedures which will guarantee our national security and enable us to become the leaders in the space age.

Last week I addressed myself to these problems before the Western Space Age Conference in Los Angeles, and I ask unanimous consent to have my remarks on that occasion printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IMPROVING FEDERAL PROCEDURES IN THE MISSILE AND SPACE CONTEST

(Excerpts from speech by Senator CLAIR ENGLE at Western Space Age Conference, Los Angeles, Calif., March 5, 1959)

I am sure that everyone here is aware that I have only recently become a member of the Senate Armed Services Committee, and of the Senate Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee—and more particularly, the Aviation Subcommittee which deals with civilian aviation. On the other hand, for a number of years I have taken a great interest in the aircraft and missile business. I have spent three tours of active duty with the Air Force in research and development and the missile field.

But obviously I am not an expert on missiles and aircraft design and construction. And I intend, in these remarks, to stay within my specialty—which is legislation and government. I have spent some 16 years in the Congress of the United States, and I am much concerned with the procedures in government affecting production in the aircraft, missile, and space field. I know that these procedures, both legislative and administrative, have a direct effect on the speed and efficiency with which Government programs are put into operation.

THE SUBJECTS

There are two aspects of administrative and legislative management in the production of aircraft and missiles that I particularly want to mention:

First, the contracts, the continuity of the contracts, stretchouts, and termination; and

Second, the complexity of the governmental organization in the aircraft, missile, and space production field.

THE CONTRACTS

We in California have had brought home to us in a particularly acute fashion what it means when a major defense contract is canceled, or stretched out to any appreciable extent. I do not have to remind you of what happened in the summer of 1957 when the Defense Department canceled the Navajo contract. There have been others that have been canceled more recently.

We need to take a hard look at this situation to see to what extent such contract cancellation and stretchouts are a necessary and unavoidable part of our national defense effort.

TECHNOLOGICAL CHANGES

Clearly there are sound technological reasons why some defense cutbacks are made. The extent to which obsolescence makes this necessary is reflected, for example, in the statement of Assistant Secretary of Defense W. J. McNeil before the Joint Economic Committee of the Congress on February 10, in which he listed, on the one hand, the programs which have been or are being phased out or canceled and, on the other hand, work being accelerated.

BUDGETARY PROBLEMS

However, not all defense cutbacks can be accounted for solely on technological grounds. A great deal has in the past depended upon budgetary considerations—and here the record is not so good. Our defense budget, on which our national existence depends, receives less consistent treatment than any other part of the Federal budget.

AN EXAMPLE

As an example, let us review briefly some of the things that happened during 1957 in the way of management of defense funds. In April, the Department of Defense, making new estimates of expenditures through the fiscal year, found that its major programs were moving much faster than they had been aware of, and that expenditures might be as much as $2 billion more than anticipated. To reduce or defer the anticipated overrun of $2 billion, contracting agencies in the Department of Defense were sent telegrams and ordered to curtail or to cease overtime expenditures. Some contractors were asked to withhold voluntarily all or a part of their April, May, and June billings. The result of that was that a budget surplus was created more by deferment of payments than by reduction of obligations. Thus, the Government entered the fiscal year 1958, on July 1, 1957, with a large carryover of bills—and at the same time, new budget appropriations which had in many ways been cut to the bone.

Those contractors who voluntarily or otherwise agreed to deferred payments found themselves with sudden and unanticipated demands upon their working capital, all without additional compensation or profit. The Defense officials found themselves in the awkward position of having to reconcile a large carryover of unpaid bills with orders to hold defense spending to $19 billion in the 6 months from July 1 to December 31, 1957.

AFTER SPUTNIK

After Sputnik No. 1, in October 1957, the Defense Department, faced with a demand for acceleration of defense activity, found itself right up against the debt ceiling, with legally available cash nonexistent. When the new orders really started up after January 1958 contractors had to bid hurriedly and simultaneously on more projects than they could handle. As a result some companies came out overloaded and others had insufficient work.

SPECIFIC REMEDIES

Here are five specific steps I think should be taken:

1. We can insist that the Department of Defense and its branches do a better job in forecasting and budgeting their cash requirements for years ahead. The Department of Defense should provide for an earlier review of the allocation of these needs to particular projects or contracts. This would enable the Congress to make more adequate budget reviews and should facilitate the letting of contracts once appropriations were passed.

2. Carryovers of unpaid bills from one fiscal year to the next can and should be eliminated or minimized. Abnormal peaking of cash requirements in any particular year or period distorts the rate of defense expenditures, gives the Congress and the people of the United States the wrong picture, and accomplishes no more than putting off the day of reckoning.

3. The Congress and the Treasury must make certain that a sound and regular flow of defense contracts is not impeded by the debt ceiling.

4. Recognizing that neither curtailing nor stepping up a firm's production under a defense project can be done without a sizable adjustment of plant, facilities, personnel, and financing, a contractor should have at least 6 months' notice, wherever possible, of requirements to accelerate or decelerate work on a particular contract.

5. If it is found necessary to continue to make limitations on progress payments, as has been common in recent years, the Government should recognize that such limitations involve an increased financial burden borne by the contractor by increasing the compensation allowed him.

GOVERNMENTAL ORGANIZATION

On the second point—the complexity of the governmental organization in the production of aircraft, missiles, and space vehicles—we find that this governmental organization is often responsible for the difficulties that arise. Especially after Sputnik I, the Government agencies in the missile and satellite field have simply flowered, with new committees, new responsibilities, new people, each one of whom is supposed to exercise an important function in this field. I believe that a member of the missile industry looking at these organization charts and this mass of committees will be just as confused as I am—although as a legislator I have had years of familiarity with organizational charts. The one that Trevor Gardner presented in Life magazine over a year ago showed 90 bases that needed touching for complete coordination of space activities. No wonder we are having difficulty keeping up with the Soviets.

MORE CZARS

The successful firings of IRBM's and ICBM's by the Russians led to the appointment of William M. Holaday as Guided Missile Director; the launching of Sputnik I brought in two czars—Roy W. Johnson as Chairman of the Advanced Research Projects Agency (ARPA), and James Killian as the President's special assistant on science and technology; and concern over military domination of space activities resulted in the appointment of Dr. T. Keith Glennan as Administrator of the civilian National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA). Meanwhile, Donald Quarles, Deputy Secretary of the Department of Defense, has responsibilities that tend to put him in direct conflict with all of these people. And we have just scratched the surface of those who are involved in the decision-making process.

AGENCY HODGEPODGE

At the top levels of decision making, we find a proliferation of committees. The NASA law created a Space Council, which is chaired by the President himself. It also set up a Civilian-Military Liaison Committee to coordinate space activities. The Chairman of this Committee is Guided Missile Director Holaday, who has no authority to give orders to any of the members. About all that happens at the regularly scheduled meetings, attended by people from NASA, ARPA, military organizations, and others, is that information is exchanged. NASA itself has 13 coequal committees consisting of 15 or more members each. To complete the jurisdictional complexity and overlap, both NASA and agencies of the Defense Department give assignments to research and development units of the military services. As would appear inevitable, disputes arise on the control of certain projects and the solutions are always compromises which satisfy no one and cause further delays.

VIEW FROM THE PRESIDENCY

If we were to look at it from the vantage point of the President, we would find him advised by so many agencies that he could not possibly know where the decisions should be made. Here is an incomplete listing of the groups he turns to for assistance: The National Science Foundation; the National Science Board; the chief scientific adviser, Dr. J. R. Killian, Jr.; the Federal Council for Science and Technology (proposed); the President's Scientific Advisory Council; the special aviation adviser, General Quesada; the National Security Council; the Federal Aviation Agency; NASA; the Bureau of Standards; and the Department of Defense with all its subdivisions such as ARPA and Guided Missiles and the military services. If Mr. Eisenhower wanted to know about the value of a certain proposal, I doubt if he would be sure where to turn or whether he could get better information from someone other than the adviser he was consulting.

SPECIFIC EXAMPLES

General Medaris: It cannot be doubted that this confusion, overlapping of jurisdictions, and absence of a clear line of command are reflected in aircraft and missile production lags. Gen. John Medaris, Commander of the Army Ballistic Missiles Agency, at a congressional hearing, said: "We have no handicap in the use of our resources once the resources are approved to us and our line of approach is approved." Inherent in the whole process of missile development is the decision-time element, the time required to get decisions as definitive approvals or guidelines on which to proceed.

I asked General Medaris recently how many people—as a minimum—he would have to get in the same room to get a decision that would be firm. He counted off at least five—the Secretary of the Army, the Army Budget Officer, the Secretary of Defense, the Defense Budget Officer, and someone from the Bureau of the Budget. I asked him if he thought he ever could get them all in the same room at the same time, and he said he didn't think so. At the hearing, he cried out rather forlornly: "Some place there has to be one man who can make a decision, who can give a command, and who has the resources to carry it out."

Dr. von Braun: Dr. Wernher von Braun, Director of the Development Operations Division of the Army Ballistic Missiles Agency, went even further in criticizing the constant interference with project development. He could not understand why there had to be so many committees. Medaris went from Huntsville, Ala., to Washington once a week to get decisions while Braun visited the Pentagon twice a month for committee meetings. And if that wasn't enough, from time to time the committees visited the Huntsville project.

Admiral Hayward: Rear Adm. John T. Hayward, Director of Research and Development, Department of the Navy, commented at a House Space Committee hearing: "U.S. supremacy in space science is threatened not by lack of talent, but by lack of skill in bureaucracy."

Admiral Hayward believes that we should have one U.S. space program. With regard to the confusion on organization and lines of command, he commented that it was not a question of standing the heat in the kitchen," but "who it was who was in the kitchen." He said, "In the atom business you never had that—you knew who had the responsibility. You knew how it was done, and the military got what we needed."

Admiral Hayward testified that when he had a program he was anxious to see carried out, he would bring it to Admiral Burke, Chief of Naval Operations, and then he would take it to the Assistant Secretary of the Navy for Research and Development for his approval. He would also go to the Secretary of the Navy, Mr. Gates. Once it has cleared the Navy Department, the program goes to the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Research and Development, Dr. Herbert York—and then Dr. York may or may not present the matter to Roy Johnson, of ARPA, or to William Holaday, the Director of Guided Missiles.

This isn't a complete count. Admiral Hayward said there were at least 10 places where he could be vetoed. He then went on to say that after he gets the program approved in all these places and even after appropriations are made by Congress, he still has to fight back down the line to get approval for the expenditure—and at any time the Bureau of the Budget may step in and impound the funds for the project.

AMMUNITION—KOREA

That these problems are long standing can be shown by the trouble we had getting adequate ammunition to Korea as the war dragged on. It took 18 months from the time the money was made available to get the first ammunition from the manufacturers. When we look at a chart of the operations of the Army Ordnance Corps, we find that an average of 113 days elapses from the original order for ammunition to the award of the contract to produce it—then it has to be produced. According to ordnance lingo, there are 11 action offices and 35 steps to be taken in the process.

NOT EXECUTIVE BRANCH ALONE

The presentation of this whole range of shortcomings in the defense effort does not mean that I am blaming the executive branch for all of the problems, or that the confusion has been confined to this administration. The ammunition hassle in the Korean war is a case in point. At the time, President Truman told me that he spent 80 percent of his time trying to make the Federal Government work—to keep the gears in mesh. The Congress bears much of the responsibility, since it enacts the legislation creating many of the executive agencies involved in the decision-making process. Furthermore, it has its own overlapping jurisdictions, such as the Senate Armed Services Preparedness Investigating Subcommittee covering much the same ground as the Senate Space Committee.

SUMMARY

I have dwelt today on two subjects:

First: The contracts, the continuity of these contracts, stretchouts, and termination.

Second: The complexity of the governmental organization in aircraft, missile, and space production.

I have not suggested all the answers—I don't know them all. But I know we must get the answers.

If we are to be superior to the Soviets, the first requisite is to have the system of government that can maximize our scientific and industrial capabilities.

Two oceans and time will not be protections from now on. The world is shrinking and we must face the new order in the world. We must move fast.

Our form of government, our way of doing business, is relatively new in the perspective of history.

The question is whether we can stand the test against one of the most efficient examples of the old order—a dictatorship with modern refinements—a dictatorship that has the singleness of purpose, the discipline to override the agony and frustration of the masses, and a straight line of command that can direct the resources, human and material, of a whole and powerful nation toward a single objective.

Both the economic and political structures of this country face the greatest challenge in our history in the short years ahead.

I think we can do it. But we must recognize the challenge. And we must be willing—in sacrifice, in diligence, and in the intelligent application of our talent—to meet the challenge. How we organize to do the job can be the difference between winning and losing the cold war.

Gateways to Profits

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. BYRNES

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 11, 1959

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the Wisconsin Division of Industrial and Port Development recently published a most informative booklet, entitled "Wisconsin Ports—Gateway to the Upper Midwest."

I commend this publication to shippers and manufacturers who are looking ahead to the completion of the St. Lawrence Seaway and the connecting channels. As the Governor of our State says in the foreword of the booklet:

Completion of the St. Lawrence Seaway project will make Wisconsin's coasts frontiers once more, as they were in the days of the French voyagers and later, when the pioneer settlers arrived from Europe by ship. This time the frontiers are industrial, created by the opening of Wisconsin's 14 port cities to ocean ships. Men of vision are planning for the industrial developments that the seaway will make possible and profitable in Wisconsin and the entire upper Midwest.

The booklet points out that—

Wisconsin's 14 ports and harbors are important and promising new gateways to the heartland of North America. They lie at the western end of the Great Lakes Waterway system, now being opened to deep-draft world shipping by the St. Lawrence Seaway project. Oceangoing ships, carrying cargo to and from all parts of the world, bring all the advantages of water transportation to Wisconsin ports, 2,000 miles inland from the Atlantic Ocean. These ports serve as convenient transfer points for a vast and rapidly developing region extending a thousand miles to the west. This region includes all

or part of 15 of the United States and 3 Provinces of Canada.

Of the 14 ports described in detail in the booklet, 6 are located in the congressional district I am honored to represent. These ports are Marinette, Green Bay, Sturgeon Bay, Kewaunee, Two Rivers, and Manitowoc.

These six ports connect with railroads which serve the West and with a well engineered and maintained arterial highway system which joins a network of truck routes serving the upper Midwest. Two of the ports have regularly scheduled airline passenger service; the others are less than an hour's drive from such service. All have harbors already deep enough to accommodate moderate size oceangoing ships, together with the necessary harbor installations, including protective breakwaters, navigation aids, movable bridges, bulkheads, and open storage spaces, bunkering facilities and marine repair facilities. Many have dockside warehouses, grain storage elevators, heavy lift cranes, shipyards and drydocks, customs offices, and Coast Guard stations.

Each of these harbors is actively promoting its future development, and Wisconsin, in 1955, created a division of industrial development, and in 1957, added port development to the division's responsibilities. Assistance to shippers and manufacturers interested in the potential of Wisconsin harbors as new gateways to profits is readily available.

Copies of the booklet describing Wisconsin port facilities may be obtained from the State of Wisconsin Division of Industrial and Port Development. More detailed information concerning the harbors in my congressional district can be obtained from the following sources:

Marinette: Manager, Marinette Chamber of Commerce.

Green Bay: Secretary, City of Green Bay Industrial Development Authority, or chairman, committee on industrial development, Green Bay Association of Commerce.

Sturgeon Bay: Sturgeon Bay Development Corp.

Kewaunee: Office of mayor.

Two Rivers: President, Two Rivers Industrial Development Corp.

Manitowoc: Office of mayor, or harbor commission, city of Manitowoc.

Advertising Most Effective Good Will Ambassador

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 11, 1959

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, too often the functions of advertising are misunderstood. This is especially true in the fields of education and politics. Oftentimes sincere and well-meaning politicians and educators make unwarranted and untrue attacks on the advertising profession. It has become a favorite whipping boy for those who want to discredit business and enterprise in America.

As one of the few advertising men in Congress, I was much impressed recently by a speech made by the Secretary of Commerce Lewis L. Strauss, a distinguished citizen who is well-known for his service as an admiral in the U.S. Navy and as Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission. Secretary Strauss' remarks should be read by every student of economics, and by leaders in Government, too. These remarks present a clear picture of the relationships of advertising to the American system of free enterprise. Under unanimous consent, I include his speech as a portion of my remarks:

ADVERTISING MOST EFFECTIVE GOOD WILL AMBASSADOR

(Remarks by Lewis L. Strauss, U.S. Secretary of Commerce, at the annual New York conference of the Associated Business Publications, New York City, February 26, 1959)

Calvin Coolidge once said, "The chief business of America is business." If that statement is still valid, then Mr. Coolidge's description also depicts the significance and the importance to the Nation of publications designed to assist business.

The more than 2,000 business periodicals with a circulation of approximately 40 million and a $540 million advertising revenue in 1958 constitute a tremendous generative force in our free enterprise system.

You are the eyes and ears of business, collecting news of value to resourceful executives. You also are the voice of business—bringing timely information and stimulating ideas to your readers who range from big corporation executives all the way to proprietors of "Pop and Mom" shops. Indeed, your specialized publications have well been described as the research department of small business.

For these reasons, as Secretary of Commerce, I am happy to acclaim your special service in the practical promotion of private industry. I understand that my great predecessor, Secretary of Commerce Herbert Hoover, initiated contacts with business editors and worked in close cooperation with them. I shall try to maintain the same relationship.

EXTREMELY VALUABLE PUBLIC SERVICE

Your publications already are performing an extremely valuable public service for the Commerce Department by creating abroad a better understanding of our American free enterprise system and its products. I refer, of course, to the thousands of copies of business and technical publications which you freely contribute to our numerous international trade fairs—from Addis Ababa to Zagreb.

Thanks to the publishing industry, a fresh, new library, numbering around 1,000 volumes of business and technical publications, factbooks and directories, is shipped with each trade mission. These become quick, authoritative reference sources for Government experts and business executives on our trade teams, enabling them to answer questions about American markets, techniques, convention dates, tariffs and other information of interest to potential buyers and sellers.

One of the most effective American ambassadors for good will is the American advertisement.

European and Asian businessmen, women and other trade fair visitors gaze with excited wonderment at—to them—the unbelievable superabundance displayed in the ads. Tourists are intrigued by the pictures; students and authors gain an insight into the American way of life.

The Soviet pavilions at trade fairs generally have information booths but their supply of reference works and publications is meager in comparison with the U.S. exhibit.

Incidentally, in Poland not only were American periodicals eagerly thumbed through from cover to cover, but also every American city telephone directory was scrutinized line for line by the news-starved people, searching for traces of relatives and friends in the land of the free.

In your comprehensive collection of facts for business, I trust that you will find fresh sources of information in the Department's new series of economic censuses now underway. Included are: the Census of Business, of Manufactures, and of Mineral Industries. The Census of Agriculture, which is taken every 5 years, is scheduled for October and November of this year. Next year, we shall take our great Decennial Census.

And while on the subject of censuses, let me express appreciation to the Associated Business Publications for your active assistance, particularly with respect to the Census of Business. Your cooperation with us has helped to insure the cooperation of the millions of businessmen to whom the reporting forms were mailed. It is important for them to realize that this information is being gathered not to harass them but to help them.

Still another vital function of business publications that is becoming of increasing importance is the spread of genuine economic literacy. None can do this job better than you. The success or failure of growth depends primarily on managerial decisions made in more than 4½ million independent American enterprises. The more adequate and accurate the information, the more likely the wise decision. Yours is that opportunity of leadership—to provide the truth—the whole truth on our economy—thus benefiting sound judgment in economic planning and action.

RISING NATIONAL ECONOMY

I hope to contribute a few facts about the economy, which may be of some use to you in further appraising for your readers the recovery, the current business situation, and the outlook. Some of this data is new.

For the past several months, it has been apparent that the national economy is in the rising phase of a business cycle.

The total value of the Nation's output of goods and services—the gross national product—rose from an annual rate of $430 billion in the second quarter of last year to a $453 billion rate in the final quarter.

The American people's purchasing power is at an all-time high. Personal income in January was at a seasonally adjusted annual rate of $362½ billion, $2½ billion above the previous month.

In retrospect, now that rather firm figures for 1958 are available, it appears that the gross national product for the year as a whole was very little below the 1957 record total. At $438 billion, gross national product in current dollars was virtually the same, and after adjustment for the 1957–58 rise in prices, was only 3 percent lower.

There seems to be a fairly general feeling among many economists and business executives that in dollar terms the 1959 gross national product will exceed 1958 by about the same margin that 1955 was above 1954—more than $30 billion.

How much the gain will be in real terms depends upon our ability to maintain price stability. It should be evident by now to all Americans—and especially to businessmen—that President Eisenhower, and we of his administration, consider this the most important problem that the American economy has to contend with today.

If the richest nation on earth, in the richest year of its history, refuses to live within its income and pay its bills as it goes, when will it ever get out of the red?

We have in prospect an increase in our population from 165 million in 1955—it is now 176 million—to 195 million in 1965. By 1980 the population may not be far below 260 million.

DANGERS OF INFLATION

I think we are well warranted in assuming—if we do not stunt real growth through runaway inflation or other blunters—that living standards, rather than declining, will tend to rise. This means that the demand for consumer goods will be greatly increased. As that dynamic market expands, production must increase to meet its demands and new jobs will be created.

Our long-range view of the national economy and its prospects ought to be a compound of great optimism and common sense caution. The outcome will depend upon how wisely the government and the people handle the temptation of inflation. The forthcoming expansion of the American economy therefore represents a challenge not only to those who formulate public policy but to the free private enterprise system and all engaged in it.

The prospect also offers to the business publication industry immeasurable opportunities of private and public service.

The keys to our continually rising standard of living are mass production and a high rate of technological progress. But in a land of vast distances and millions of inhabitants, production, unaided, never could reach the entire market. The progress of growth will depend in considerable measure on the pace and breadth of distribution. It is in this field that publishing and advertising supply a driving force.

This fundamental truth often is misunderstood and frequently denied by business-baiters. They like to cite Ralph Waldo Emerson who said, "If a man can make a better mousetrap than his neighbor, though he builds his house in the woods, the world will make a beaten path to his door." This, the pundits say, illustrates why advertising is superfluous. That is nonsense, of course, for if the successful trap manufacturer had the intelligence to invent the better mousetrap in the first instance you may be sure that he also had the good sense to see that the path to his door was well indicated by direction signs attesting to the virtue of his product and tied in with display advertising in all the media of the day.

One of my prized possessions is a copy of Weekly Observer and General Advertiser of Culpeper Courthouse, Va., for May 28, 1858. I prize it because it contains the advertisement of my grandfather who came over from Germany 9 years earlier and had saved enough money to set up in the mercantile business. As advertising copy it isn't much but it shows at least that my respect for the institution of advertising is inherited.

Government and business should stand up for the distribution factor of our economy. Last month, at the meeting of our National Distribution Council, an addition was suggested to be made to the objectives and responsibilities of the Department's Office of Distribution. The recommendation reads as follows: "The Department of Commerce should assume responsibility for disseminating an adequate understanding of the vital importance to our economy of the distribution process in all its dynamic activities; and to take appropriate action seeking to defend it against misrepresentation or attack, from whatever source they may arise."

You may be interested to know that on the council's committee of leading executives who drafted that challenge was your own Associated Business Publications president, William K. Beard.

Those recommendations will be carried out.

PROUD TO CHAMPION ADVERTISING

This is how I feel about advertising. To me it is more than a specialty; it is the bloodstream of healthy growing business. Think of a country without advertising. It would be drab—as drab as Russia. I don't mean just the absence of neon signs and lights and display. I mean the monotony of sterile uniformity. Come to think if it, one of the great differences between our system and the Communist system is well exemplified by advertising. For the significance of advertising is that the buyer has a choice.

It is the very ozone of the free air of freedom—the freedom to choose. "Buy my product," one advertiser will urge, "it sells for less." "Buy mine," says another, "it is more durable," or "king size," or "copper riveted," or "aged in the wood," or better than any one of a thousand different ways.

Choice—something the unfortunate dweller under communism never has. Somebody makes the choice for him—even the choice of candidates. There is no place for choice and therefore none for real advertising in a dictatorship.

Freedom of choice is as important as freedom of speech but in this blessed land we take it for granted. We ought to recognize it as the fifth freedom and advertising is the touchstone which proves its existence and its vigor.

Advertising stimulates competition, which in turn, keeps free enterprise vigorous. It points to where needs can be supplied and adds stardust to humdrum living. As the average modern family budget can cover more than sheer necessities, advertising steers discretionary purchasing power.

The size, quality and news coverage of the daily papers, magazines, radio and television are made possible by advertising revenue. Naturally, the detractors of the profit system and the enemies of private enterprise deplore such commercialism. Some would even prefer government subsidy because with it goes the possibility of government thought control.

You, as publishers, and I, as Commerce Secretary, are proud to champion advertising—because its primary function helps our economy to grow and its revenues help a free press to remain free.

Mismanagement of Military Supplies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 11, 1959

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, on January 19, 1959, I received from the Comptroller General of the United States a copy of a report on the U.S. Army Signal Supply Center at Yokohama, Japan. The report indicated beyond doubt the lack of adequate supply management at the base in Yokohama.

Because of my long interest in this subject I wrote to the Comptroller General on January 30, 1959, and asked him, among other things, if it were not possible for the excellent staff of the Comptroller General to make some systems studies going into all facets of supply management with regard to electronic supplies and equipment and other related fields consistent with the intent of the so-called McCormack amendment to the Military Reorganization Act of 1958 which authorizes the Secretary of Defense to "carry out any supply or service activity common to more than one military department by a single agency or such other organizational entities as he deems appropriate."

On March 9, 1959, I received a splendid letter from the Comptroller General wherein he states that during the year ending June 30, 1958, over 200 reports were issued by his agency to the Congress and military departments, the majority of which dealt with various aspects of the supply operations of the military services and involved deficiencies in requirements determination, procurement practices, and supply control management.

The Comptroller General makes this significant statement:

Our previous reviews have disclosed the unreliability of stock records at major supply centers and the consequent lack of sound data on which to base supply decisions; requirement determinations have been improper; inadequate coordination existed for supply matters among the military services; contracting procedures in awarding and administering procurements required improvements; and stocks were being disposed of as surplus when valid requirements existed within the military department.

Mr. Speaker, there is widespread interest in the subject matter involved in this exchange of correspondence with the Comptroller General of the United States which, without objection, I am inserting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
OFFICE OF THE MAJORITY LEADER,
Washington, D.C., January 30, 1959.

Hon. JOSEPH CAMPBELL,
Comptroller General of the United States, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CAMPBELL: I am in receipt of your report (B–133036) relating to examination of the U.S. Army Signal Supply Center, Yokohama, Japan. This and the other reports which you have furnished to me are of great value and, as you know, relate directly to the so-called McCormack amendment (sec. 3.(6)) (Public Law 85–599).

I note from your letter of transmittal and from the report itself that this one Signal Supply Center has failed to properly discharge its supply-control responsibility in regard to determining requirements. As a result of this failure the Government was placed in a position of buying millions of dollars worth of unneeded stocks.

I also note on page 1 of the report itself:

"We did not make an overall appraisal of the activity or its administration. Our work and the related report devote major attention to the identification of deficient areas and the corrective actions taken by the Agency in those areas."

It occurs to me that the findings and conclusions of your excellent report at one supply center indicate a deficiency in the supply system itself in the Signal Corps with respect to requirements determination, procurement, overall inspection and review, and inventory control methods and procedures.

Nor can I help but wonder as to the adequacy of the overall Department of Defense supply demand control system. For example, your report indicates a failure at the one Signal Supply Center in the supply management function involving one item—dry batteries. What is the situation with respect to dry batteries within the Department of Defense? Does anyone relate overall in-

ventory with requirements before procurements are made? Is there concurrent buying and selling?

I am enclosing for your use a copy of the Federal Real and Personal Property Inventory Report issued by the House Government Operations Committee. In analyzing the inventories in the supply systems of the Department of Defense it is noted that communications and signal equipment total hundreds of millions of dollars. It is to be noted also from the distribution of the reported stocks that a large percentage falls into categories that are either designated as being excessive or could reasonably be so considered. Also that each of the major services carries similar categories of stocks which undoubtedly include identical items.

The McCormack amendment to which I referred earlier reads as follows:

"(6) Whenever the Secretary of Defense determines it will be advantageous to the Government in terms of effectiveness, economy, or efficiency, he shall provide for the carrying out of any supply or service activity common to more than one military department by a single agency or such other organizational entities as he deems appropriate. For the purposes of this paragraph, any supply or service activity common to more than one military department shall not be considered a 'major combatant function' within the meaning of paragraph (1) hereof."

Would it be possible for your Agency to extend the scope of its investigation to all facets of supply management of electronic supplies and equipment within the Department of Defense? This would mean a study as to the adequacy of the requirements determination, procurement, inventory control, utilization of all available assets before procurement, distribution of stock and disposal of excess or surplus property.

I should also appreciate recommendations which you may be able to make for improvement of supply management across the board in the Department of Defense as contemplated by the legislation to which I refer.

Sincerely yours,

/s/ JOHN W. MCCORMACK,
Majority Leader.

COMPTROLLER GENERAL
OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, D.C., March 9, 1959.

Hon. JOHN W. MCCORMACK,
Majority Leader,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. MCCORMACK: Reference is made to your letter of January 30, 1959, acknowledging receipt of our report on examination of the U.S. Army Signal Supply Center, Yokohama, Japan. We are particularly appreciative of your comment that this and other reports which we have furnished you are of great value.

A substantial portion of our adult efforts in the Department of Defense is directed toward the delineation of significant areas of deficiencies in the supply and logistics system, and examination and analysis of these deficiencies in terms of shortcomings in management controls including basic policies and procedures, and recommending to management, and to the Congress when appropriate, such action as will, in our opinion, correct or improve the logistical inadequacies. During the year ended June 30, 1958, over 200 reports were issued to the Congress and the military departments, the majority of which dealt with various aspects of the supply operations of the military services and involved deficiencies in requirements determinations, procurement practices, and supply control management. Our reviews have covered signal supply control agencies and depots of the Army, requirements determinations for ground communication-electronic equipment in the Air Force and various supply installations of the Navy. In addition, we have reviewed selected aspects of the supply operations of the military services in Europe, North Africa, and the Far East.

Our previous reviews have disclosed the unreliability of stock records at major supply centers and the consequent lack of sound data on to base supply decisions; requirement determinations have been improper; inadequate coordination existed for supply matters among the military services; contracting procedures in awarding and administering procurements required improvements; and stocks were being disposed of as surplus when valid requirements existed within the military departments.

The results of our previous reviews can now be applied to a study of all facets of supply management of electronic supplies and equipment within the Department of Defense, as you suggested in your letter of January 30, 1959, including a review of the inadequacy of requirements determination, procurement, inventory control, utilization of all available assets before procurement, distribution of stock and disposal of excess or surplus property. The broad nature of such a study, which must encompass evaluation of basic policies and procedures of the Army, Navy, and Air Force, as well as the Office of the Secretary of Defense, will also include a review of the operations of the major electronic supply agencies of the military services in the United States and abroad. As significant matters are disclosed during the course of our review, management and the Congress will be apprised of our findings.

We anticipate that as a result of this defensewide study we will be in a position to make appropriate recommendations for improvement of supply management applicable to all three military services. In this report we will, of course, consider the objectives of the McCormack amendment to which you referred.

As a matter of collateral interest, we have today advised the chairman, Military Operations Subcommittee, House Committee on Government Operations, that as a result of the deficiencies disclosed by our reviews of military supply operations, this area may be of interest to that subcommittee in determining the adequacy of action undertaken by the military departments to correct the matters brought to their attention.

We would be pleased to discuss the proposed study in more detail with you or your staff if you should desire.

Sincerely yours,

JOSEPH CAMPBELL,
Comptroller General of the United States.

In Support of the Civil Rights Act of 1959

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 11, 1959

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert in the RECORD the text of my statement in support of the proposed Civil Rights Act of 1959, which was presented to Subcommittee No. 5 of the House Committee on the Judiciary.

STATEMENT OF HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT, BEFORE SUBCOMMITTEE NO. 5 OF THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY ON MARCH 11, 1959, IN SUPPORT OF THE CIVIL RIGHTS ACT OF 1959, AND RELATED COMMENTS

Mr. Chairman, and members of the subcommittee, I appreciate the opportunity to appear before you to discuss my measure, H.R. 430, the Civil Rights Act of 1959, as well as to offer comment on other major civil rights proposals.

H.R. 430 is a companion measure to that introduced by the chairman of the House Committee on the Judiciary, the Honorable EMANUEL CELLER, and in the other body by Senators DOUGLAS and JAVITS, who were joined by members of both parties. It is gratifying to see bipartisan support of legislation in the civil rights field. Guaranteeing these constitutional rights does not belong exclusively to one party. It is my profound hope that this Congress will assure to the American people that these rights do apply to every citizen regardless of race, creed, color, or national ancestry.

I think that we are all very much aware that the challenge in this fast-moving 20th century is to bring social progress up to scientific, technological, and material progress. This has always been, down through the centuries, the real and overriding challenge to mankind. And the grave internal and external pressures that face this Nation today further emphasize the need for perfecting our democratic institutions through a recognition that social progress—and certainly implementation of civil rights is part and parcel of such progress—is an indigenous ingredient in democratic concepts and institutions.

Therefore, I resolutely affirm that Congress, in recognition of the challenge, must act affirmatively and expeditiously in the field of civil rights legislation.

Any discussion of my proposal would be lacking in depth and fairness if I only allude to its provisions without any reference to other major legislative proposals that have come before this Congress for its consideration and action. A discussion of the relative merit of various measures will, I believe, offer the best approach in determining the most effective civil rights legislation to implement the law of the land—the U.S. Constitution and the interpretation of it by the Supreme Court. I wish to emphasize that while I feel the measure which I am cosponsoring offers the most extensive and meaningful approach to the problem of school integration, as well as the protection of civil rights in general, I also know that no one has a monopoly of ideas on how best to accomplish this implementation nor does any one person have all the answers. Collective thinking is essential for a clear solution.

For the purposes of discussion, I propose to discuss (1) my measure, H.R. 430, which is the same version of the legislation popularly called the Douglas-Javits-Celler bill; (2) the administration proposals, introduced in the other body as seven separate bills, but introduced in the House as one measure, H.R. 4457, and (3) the Johnson proposal. Although Senator JOHNSON's bill has not been offered in the House, I think it will be useful and helpful to include reference to it in any full discussion of pending civil rights legislation. Parenthetically, may I say that for purposes of my presentation, and for clarification, I shall not refer to my given measure, H.R. 430, but rather to the Douglas-Javits-Celler bill.

In recent days, a very useful and careful summary comparison of the main civil rights bills has been prepared and distributed by the executive committee of the Leadership Conference on Civil Rights, comprised of 53 national religious, civic, interracial, labor, welfare, veterans, and fraternal organizations. It should be noted that the organizations involved have more than a fleeting or passing interest in civil rights matters; they all have one common bond: their sincere, studious and enduring interest in and concern about the full implementation of the constitutional guarantees from which should flow first-class citizenship for all. Among

the 53 organizations are the Unitarian Fellowship for Social Justice, the American Civil Liberties Union, the American Jewish Congress, the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, the Improved Benevolent Order of Elks, the International Union of Electrical Workers, the United Automobile Workers, both AFL–CIO affiliates, and the American Council on Human Rights, to mention just a few.

I don't think anyone could properly quarrel with the contention that these groups have had a real and active interest in civil rights matters or that their summary analysis of the proposed bill was done in a perfunctory or superficial manner.

In offering the summary comparison, this group prefaced it by the following statement:

"The summary comparison would appear to justify the following conclusions:

"1. The Douglas-Javits-Celler bill, providing support for the Supreme Court's desegregation decisions and technical and financial assistance to assist the process of school desegregation and including an improved version of the old part III stricken from the 1957 bill, is essential to the accomplishment of school desegregation within a reasonable period and to the maintenance of the equal protection of the laws in other fields; it is certainly the No. 1 civil rights bill. The Javits bill, S. 456 (see also Celler bill, H.R. 3148), which is not included in the summary comparison, also contains an improved version of the old part III of the 1957 bill, but the Javits bill does not contain the remainder of the Douglas-Javits-Celler bill. The old part III contained in both bills authorizes the Attorney General to bring injunction actions against those denying equal protection of the laws to anyone because of their race, color, religion, or national origin, and is the single most essential part of any civil rights legislation.

"2. The administration school bills omit part III completely and contain an inadequate version of the remainder of the Douglas-Javits-Celler bill. Other administration bills, and particularly S. 957 authorizing inspection of voting records, make advances in the area of civil rights which deserve the support of civil rights organizations, to the extent that support for the Douglas-Javits-Celler bill is in no way reduced.

"3. The Johnson bill, by failing to support the school desegregation decisions and by conciliation provisions that may result in civil rights being bargained away rather than enforced, appears to be a step backward. It seeks to relegate the assertion of rights to equal protection by citizens and defiance of the law by States to the status of a neighborhood quarrel to be resolved only by an ill-defined conciliation procedure. Its other provisions would seem to be better dealt with in the administration and other bills."

Mr. Chairman, may I say in reference to S. 957, mentioned in point two of the above quoted statement, that this proposal is also sponsored by the distinguished chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary and is contained in the House bill, H.R. 4457, which has incorporated all seven administration proposals. I heartily concur that legislation covering the objectives set forth should be part of a comprehensive civil rights program.

A COMPARATIVE APPROACH TO CIVIL RIGHTS LEGISLATION

As stated in my earlier remarks, I shall direct my comments to the three proposals already referred to, the details of which are known to the committee members. Therefore, I think the most logical approach to this matter is to offer what I believe highlights the similarities and/or differences in as concrete and brief a fashion as possible, without perverting the intent.

In broad, general terms, I believe the bills can be discussed under the following headings:

1. Support of the Supreme Court decisions.
2. Federal technical and financial assistance to States.
3. Compliance and enforcement of Supreme Court decisions.
4. Suits by Government.
5. Obstruction of justice.
6. Voting records.
7. Civil Rights Commission.
8. Antibombing.
9. Children of military personnel.
10. Equal job opportunity.
11. Conciliation service.

SUPPORT OF SUPREME COURT DECISIONS

I think it is significant to point out that the Douglas-Javits-Celler measure is the only one of the three approaches under discussion that expressly endorses the principle of the Supreme Court's antisegregation decisions in schools, transportation, and recreation. It likewise recognizes the responsibility and authority of Congress to uphold these decisions.

While the administration proposal recognizes that the Constitution as interpreted by the Supreme Court is the supreme law of the land, it does not include the findings of the Douglas-Javits-Celler bill approving the High Court's decisions, nor does it pledge Congress to support those decisions by all due and reasonable means.

The Johnson proposal does not refer to the Supreme Court's decisions. Indirect recognition is given by the feature of his proposal which notes there are constitutional requirements that give rise to disagreements which require conciliation of such disagreements forthcoming from legal decisions. The conciliation approach is, of course, less direct in assuring compliance and enforcement of the law of the land.

Mr. Chairman, I believe that this distinctive feature of the Douglas-Javits-Celler measure may, in some respects, be the most important provision contained in any measure because it is an expression of philosophical endorsement of our national ideals; it is one way that Congress does not leave exclusively to the courts the implementation, as well as the proclamation, of the abiding American belief and conviction that all Americans are equal in the eyes of God which, translated into our constitutional concepts of democratic government, means every human being is entitled to equal protection of the laws.

FEDERAL TECHNICAL AND FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE TO STATES

The Douglas-Javits-Celler proposal authorizes the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to render technical assistance to States and local communities seeking to comply with the High Court's antisegregation decisions.

In addition, the measure which I am supporting makes provision for grants to States and local governmental units for additional school facilities and additional teachers, to mention just two provisions among several. It also provides for grants to local communities, eliminating segregation, when the State threatens to cut off school payments.

To carry out the intent of these sections, the Douglas-Javits-Celler legislation calls for appropriations up to $2½ million a year for a 5-year period for the technical assistance phases of the program; for the program of grants, appropriations up to $40 million a year for a 5-year period.

The administration's program covers the above approaches but is a limited version of the Douglas-Javits-Celler approach both as to extent of the program and the amount of aid to be given. The estimated expenditure has been set at $4½ million for 2 years.

COMPLIANCE AND ENFORCEMENT OF THE SUPREME COURT DECISIONS

The Douglas-Javits-Celler bill sets up the procedure by which the Secretary would be authorized, when other methods fail, to assume responsibility for initiating the development of desegregation plans, with fullest possible local consultation and participation. When the Secretary certifies that all efforts to secure compliance by persuasion and by technical and financial assistance have failed, the Attorney General, as authorized in the bill, would file compliance action.

Neither the administration nor Johnson proposal has provisions in this matter.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to bring to the attention of the committee members that there is another important section of the Douglas-Javits-Celler measure which calls for the injunction procedure which I shall discuss shortly. However, at this point I wish to bring to your attention that the measure has been criticized editorially in the Washington Post, February 2, 1959, as it pertains to the Federal desegregation plans and the injunction procedure if compliance fails. Indeed, the editorial opposes the injunction features as it applies in this matter and as it appears elsewhere in the bill for the purpose of ending denials of equal protection of the laws.

The editorial stated, and I quote only that portion of it concerned with the subject at hand:

"It sweeps on to authorize the HEW to draw up desegregation plans for communities failing to act on their own initiative. Such plans could then be imposed on the reluctant communities through court injunctions. This sort of carpetbaggery would produce more sectional hostility than desegregation. It looks in precisely the opposite direction from Senator JOHNSON'S proposed conciliation agency.

"Nor do we think the time has come to seek enforcement of all civil rights through use of the injunction. Recent events in Virginia indicate that the barriers to desegregation are beginning to crumble. The processes of peaceful adjustment might be gravely upset by undue haste in the application of force from Washington. The wisdom of moving a step at a time in this delicate situation and of converting instead of bludgeoning has been too well demonstrated to be seriously challenged."

The Attorney General of the United States is taking a similar position regarding the injunction provisions, although it should be recalled that the administration program of 1957 included such authority for the Attorney General.

I think this is healthy in our discussion to have such criticism because it offers an opportunity to join the issue and to clarify misconception, confusion, and hasty conclusions. In a letter to the Washington Post, Senator PAUL DOUGLAS has done just that. He logically, factually, and legally challenges, and certainly weakens, the argument of those opposed to the HEW desegregation plan authorization and of those opposed to the injunction features of compliance in connection with such plans and with respect to the injunction features elsewhere in the bill which are aimed at ending the denial of equal protection of the laws in other fields, not just in the field of school integration.

Mr. Chairman, because of the importance of the points made by the distinguished Senator from Illinois, I wish to submit the full text of his letter of February 2, since it covers the issue at hand in a comprehensive and clear manner.

LETTER OF SENATOR PAUL H. DOUGLAS TO THE WASHINGTON POST

FEBRUARY 2, 1959.

EDITOR, LETTERS TO THE EDITOR COLUMN,
Washington Post and Times Herald,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: Reasoned analysis and widespread public discussion are prime essentials in arriving at a workable approach to desegregation and full compliance with the Constitution and decrees of the Supreme Court. Your editorial on "Aid, Not Carpet-

baggery" (Washington Post, Feb. 2, 1959), is a long step in this direction and is a welcome contrast to the more superficial treatment, vituperation, or indifference with which such proposals have been met in the past.

To clarify the issues, however, and to correct some misunderstandings about our proposal, may I be permitted to make a few comments on your analysis.

First, I am proud of the civil rights bill which I introduced last week, and I am glad that it bears my name. But it also bears the names of 16 other Senators as cosponsors, including many of the best known and most thoughtful and reasonable advocates of a sane approach to progress in the field of human relations. A number of these Senators gave important help in the drafting of this measure, and it is therefore truly a joint product. A dozen or more House Members, including Judge CELLER, chairman of the Judiciary Committee, have sponsored the same measure. The credit—or blame—for the proposal is therefore shared by these other Members as well.

We are naturally gratified that the Post recognizes the constructive character of that part of our bill which undergirds the desegregation decisions of the Supreme Court by a statement of supporting congressional policy. Your support is also welcome for our rather comprehensive authorizations of technical assistance and financial aid through the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to the States and localities seeking to work out their desegregation problems.

Your criticisms of the proposed authorization to HEW to draw up and issue desegregation plans as being too hasty and sweeping, however, seem to us to reflect an inadequate understanding of what is proposed.

Title IV of our bill which sets up this administrative action first requires HEW to make every effort to persuade the States and local districts to make a start toward eliminating segregation in public education, utilizing the aids and financial assistance previously referred to. It thus first emphasizes the procedure of conciliation, which you endorse, but specifies that it shall be conciliation with the aim of bringing compliance with the Constitution.

Secondly, in preparing such tentative plans the Secretary is required to seek the advice and assistance of public officials, private organizations, and private citizens in the area and of any * * * advisory council.

In the third place, the proposal specifies that such tentative plans shall take into account the need of the particular area for time to make an orderly adjustment and transition from segregated to desegregated schools.

In the fourth place, if the plan thus formulated meets with the approval of the locality and is adopted by it, a beginning can be made, and the various other forms of assistance can be brought into play.

In the fifth place, however, if the tentative plan is not accepted, the Secretary must set up a public hearing upon the plan, and at this hearing, the local authorities, private organizations and private citizens shall be permitted to participate. Only after all of these steps have been taken is the Secretary authorized to prepare and issue an approved plan for desegregation. The detailed requirements for local participation in our opinion make it clear that your rather captious characterization of "carpetbagger" is wholly unwarranted.

But, finally, it is important to recall that these desegregation plans, if still resisted, cannot come into effect until the Attorney General files an injunction suit and the court, after listening to all of the evidence and hearing arguments, issues its decree in line with the underlying decisions of the Supreme Court requiring all deliberate speed. The trial court's determination is further subject to appeal and review right up to the Supreme Court.

The bill thus seeks to use the assistance and advice of executive and administrative agencies and the experience, recommendations and criticisms of the local community in affirmatively formulating desegregation plans. In similar circumstances of bitter-end resistance under the present law, such plans have to be developed solely by the courts in injunction suits brought by the aggrieved persons in behalf of their children. But the proposed plans under our bill would in no case have any legal effect until they had gone through the judicial processes of court hearings and decision, with full right of review. The procedure is not unlike that now provided to secure compliance with NLRB recommendations.

Surely this accepted, reasonable, and deliberate procedure cannot fairly be characterized as a force plan, as your news reports have described it, or bludgeoning as you editorially refer to it.

In opposing our proposal to authorize the Attorney General to seek injunctions to end denials of equal protection of the laws, you cite with favor the recent events in Virginia. But what has brought about—at long last—the crumbling of the barriers of segregation and the peaceful adjustment which you herald there? Clearly, it is a series of court decisions, in cases initiated by individuals. The patient, thoroughly argued, long drawn out legal proceedings and decrees have been the path to progress in that State.

But what is the ultimate sanction under our bill? The answer is again court actions. These could, however, be initiated by the Attorney General. But in this case they must be preceded either (a) by the lengthy HEW procedure I have outlined above, or (b) by the signed complaint of individuals and a determination by the Attorney General that those individuals are unable to seek the effective legal protections for themselves. The injunctive procedure authorized in our bill is thus basically the same as the procedure under which progress is being made in Virginia, except that under carefully specified conditions the Attorney General may file the suit.

Why is it necessary that the Attorney General be empowered to initiate these procedures which can now be initiated only by individuals? This is necessary because without it the weakest, the poorest, and those most subject to intimidation or coercion are required to fight their case with their own resources against all the legal talent, power, legislation, and economic resources which a State opposed to desegregation can throw into the breach. Because of the antibarratry laws, the anti-NAACP laws, school placement laws, and the multitude of other barriers thrown up to resist the law of the land, and the scales of justice can only be evenly matched if these legal and economic burdens of enforcement are borne in part by the Federal Government, whose duty it is to enforce the law of the land. To require—as is now the case—that this burden be placed solely on the backs of the fathers and mothers of Negro children in areas which are overwhelmingly hostile to them is to apply that concept of justice made famous by Anatole France's remark that the law in its majestic equality forbids the rich as well as the poor to sleep under bridges, to beg in the streets, and to steal bread.

This injunction procedure is not unique or extreme, for, as I have said in the Senate, it is now so commonplace that it is provided in 39 other laws to bring compliance with various Federal statutes, including the voting rights bill of 1957. This procedure is necessarily coupled with all the usual protections of the exercise of the equity powers of the courts and subject to all of the normal appeals in the higher courts. It has been twice approved in school cases by overwhelming votes in the House of Representatives, once in 1956 by a vote of 279 to 126, and again in 1957, by a vote of 286 to 126 in favor of the so-called part III of the civil rights bills of 1956 and 1957.

If the Attorney General sought to move faster than the Supreme Court decisions provide, the Federal judge would deny or modify his request. Thus, there are adequate safeguards through the Federal district courts and judges—almost all of whom in southern areas are southern born—against "undue haste in the application of force from Washington."

The inadequacy of the conciliation proposal by Senator JOHNSON, which you endorse, is that if the dominant forces of the community refuse to restore peaceful relations in accordance with the Constitution, the Federal Government would then lack the authority to initiate court cases to bring compliance. This failure could invite nullification and the ultimate breakdown of the Constitution.

The sponsors of our bill earnestly hope that the affirmative approaches which provide congressional backing for the Court's decrees, technical assistance, financial aid, etc., will be largely effective in getting the movement toward desegregation off deadcenter and demonstrating to the world that we intend to live by our principles of equal justice. But in the background, just as the historic decisions of the court have been the firm rock upon which we have now begun to break away in both the North and the South from our previous discriminatory practices, so do we believe that the ultimate possibility of an appeal to the courts, initiated by the Attorney General, will be helpful in winning acceptance for these constitutional principles all along the line.

Sincerely yours,

PAUL H. DOUGLAS.

SUITS BY GOVERNMENT

The outstanding difference between the Douglas-Javits-Celler bill and the administration program is found in the matter of suits by the Federal Government. The difference is this: The provision contained in the Douglas-Javits-Celler measure represents an improved version of part III of the 1957 bill. The significance of this provision lies in the fact that the objective is for preventive rather than punitive action. It would authorize the Attorney General to seek preventive relief to protect persons being deprived of, or threatened with deprivation of, equal protection of the laws, if the persons whose rights are invaded are unable to seek legal relief because of a lack of finances, economic pressures, or fear of physical harm.

The Attorney General would also be authorized to seek preventive relief to assist public officials in guaranteeing equal protection of the laws by enjoining anyone hindering or attempting to hinder such officials or hindering, attempting or conspiring to hinder the execution of any court order involving the equal protection of the laws.

Again, I bring your attention to the injunction features of the bill as explained and ably supported by Senator DOUGLAS.

The Attorney General would also be authorized to intervene in private civil rights suits, as well as to initiate action.

This singular approach is important in comparing this proposal with the other two under discussion because neither makes such provisions in any manner.

OBSTRUCTION OF JUSTICE

It is literally true that the Douglas-Javits-Celler bill does not have a provision contained in the administration proposal: that is, a provision making it a criminal offense to use force or threats to interfere with court orders in school desegregation cases. However, to accept this literally is also to be misled about the Douglas-Javits-Celler measure. The injunction procedure already discussed would come into play in such a

situation, as well as in other civil rights areas. The proposal which I support thus emphasizes preventive rather than punitive action in the matter covered in the administration bill. Since injunctions can be enforced by contempt proceedings, I feel that such an approach is far more effective than the limited usefulness of criminal action.

VOTING RECORDS

Both the administration and Johnson proposals, while differing in given respects, make provision for inspection of voting records.

I shall support an adequately written proposal and on the basis of the legislation at hand it is my belief that the administration bill offers a better approach in that there would be less delay in obtaining voting records where discrimination in voting has been charged, and it also contains the proviso that such records must be kept for 3 years; the Johnson proposal does not, thus not touching on the problem of the destruction of records. In addition, the latter proposal has a more limited application of the subpena power to obtain such records.

CIVIL RIGHTS COMMISSION

Here again, the administration and Johnson proposals contain a feature not incorporated in the Douglas-Javits-Celler proposal: That is, the continuation of the Civil Rights Commission for 2 years in the administration bill, and until 60 days after January 31, 1961, in the Johnson measure.

I think it is important that the work of the Commission continue, but that it would be a grave error to claim that such a continuation makes additional legislation in the civil rights area unnecessary.

It is important to consider strengthening the Commission by authorizing it to investigate all denials of civil rights because of race, color, religion, or national origin.

ANTIBOMBING

While antibombing provisions are not contained in the Douglas-Javits-Celler bill, I think it should be noted that I and many supporters of this specific proposal have introduced separate legislation. The administration proposal and the Johnson measure both contain provisions in this matter.

Mr. Chairman, I shall not go into a comparison of how these measures differ, but I do wish to comment that I have introduced legislation which includes residential property in its provisions. This provision has not been incorporated in several of the measures that will be considered.

I am hopeful that effective antibombing legislation will be achieved in this Congress.

CHILDREN OF MILITARY PERSONNEL

The administration proposal authorizes the Commissioner of Education to operate schools for children of members of the armed services where local schools are not operating as a result of defiance of the Supreme Court's decisions. It also provides that a school constructed in the future, built in whole or in part with Federal funds, may be taken over by the Federal Government for operation with the latter paying the State rent in line with the State's investment.

The proposal has, in my opinion, certain defects: First, if the goal in administration thinking is only to take care of children of Federal personnel, why limit it to the children of members of the armed services? Why not include other Federal employees? Second the provision with respect to schools constructed under the impacted areas program would be of limited effect, since it would apply only to future construction; thus it would not apply to previously constructed schools. And, finally, the approach offers no provisions relating to desegregating impacted area schools.

I bring to the attention of the committee the fact that the Douglas-Javits-Celler measure has broader application in dealing with closed schools since Federal funds would be offered to local communities where the State has withdrawn school payments; in addition the stronger provisions relating to school desegregation also make the approach more effective.

EQUAL JOB OPPORTUNITY

The administration propose that Congress create a Commission on Equal Job Opportunity Under Government Contracts, similar to the present Committee established by Executive order. The statutory duties and functions granted to the Commission would not differ greatly from those now exercised by the committee, except that it would be able to make its own investigations and conduct hearings.

While I think this approach could be strengthened, for example, by providing such a commission with subpena power, I would hope that creation of such a commission would be another factor in the further diminution of job discrimination by companies holding Government contracts.

My real concern, however, is that this is only a small part of the concept of equal job opportunity for all. I am proud to state that I have introduced legislation that would prohibit discrimination by companies and labor organizations because of race, color, creed, or national origin. While my proposal will not come before this committee, I merely want to apprise the members of my thinking in the matter.

CONCILIATION SERVICE

Reference has already been made to Senator JOHNSON'S proposal to conciliate disagreements by establishing a community relations service. I only wish to pose this question: Will this approach hamper enforcement?

Will conciliation, at the level it is proposed, be a necessary prerequisite of judicial action?

I wish to thank the Chairman and members for their kind attention and to commend the Committee on the Judiciary for its desire to hold full and necessary hearings on civil rights legislation.

May I merely add that I am pleased to have been able to offer my comments and to indicate my support, for the reasons I pointed out, of the Civil Rights Act of 1959.

SENATE

THURSDAY, MARCH 12, 1959

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father, God, amid all the voices of this vast and varied world save us from the supreme tragedy of missing Thy call.

As in age after age men have heard Thy voice, make us vividly conscious that we, too, can hear it when silence falls and we listen with reverent and obedient hearts.

Help us to know that not only in the haunting beauty of the earth, but also in the poignant want and woe of the world's needs, Thy voice to us is calling.

Turning aside for this dedicated moment from the violence and turbulence of human strife, we would hush the words of the wise and the prattle of the foolish. Rising above the deafening prejudices of these embittered days, may we be the hearers and doers of Thy word and of Thy will. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, March 11, 1959, was dispensed with.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the following committees or subcommittees were authorized to meet during the sessions of the Senate today:

The Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly of the Committee on the Judiciary.

The Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

ORDER FOR RECESS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at 12:25 p.m. the Chair may declare a recess, subject to the call of the Chair.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, under the rule, there will be the usual morning hour; and I ask unanimous consent that statements in connection therewith be limited to 3 minutes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

REPORT OF NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF ARTS AND LETTERS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a letter from the Assistant Secretary, the National Institute of Arts and Letters, New York, N.Y., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Institute, for the year 1958, which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS

Petitions were presented and referred as indicated:

By Mr. ANDERSON:

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of New Mexico; to the Committee on Finance:

"SENATE JOINT MEMORIAL 8

"Joint memorial memorializing the President of the United States, the Secretary of Interior, the Speaker of the House and the President of the Senate of the Congress of the United States, and the New Mexico congressional delegation to review and revise the policies which permit the excessive importation of petroleum into the United States

"Whereas the entry into the United States of excessive imports of foreign oil serves to

inhibit the investment of funds for oil exploration in the continental and peninsular United States; and

"Whereas the prompt discovery and orderly development of adequate crude oil reserves is essential to the continued well-being and safety of the United States; and

"Whereas current importation policies have contributed to a stagnation of investment in basic exploration and development by major and independent oil companies of the United States; and

"Whereas proven reserves in the United States have failed to increase during the recent period of heavy importation of crude oils; and

"Whereas this condition is detrimental to the economy and dangerous to the national defense; and

"Whereas New Mexico is a western public lands State which relies heavily upon the normal development of its oil and gas resources for the maintenance of its economy and in which the industry is particularly essential to the financing of its public schools: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Legislature of the State of New Mexico, That responsible officials of the United States and the Congress and the New Mexico delegation to Congress be respectfully urged and encouraged to initiate and continue all measures necessary to limit the importation of crude oil to the end that the domestic industry will be fostered and developed; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this memorial be delivered to the Honorable Dwight D. Eisenhower, President of the United States; the Honorable Fred A. Seaton, Secretary of the Department of the Interior; the Honorable Richard M. Nixon, President of the Senate of the United States Congress; and the Honorable Sam Rayburn, Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this memorial be delivered to the Honorable DENNIS CHAVEZ and the Honorable CLINTON P. ANDERSON, U.S. Senators from New Mexico; and the Honorable JOE M. MONTOYA and the Honorable THOMAS G. MORRIS, Representatives at Large from the State of New Mexico.

"ED V. MEAD,
"President, Senate.
"HAL THORNBERRY,
"Chief Clerk, Senate.
"MACK EASLEY,
"Speaker, House of Representatives.
"ALBERT ROMERO,
"Chief Clerk, House of Representatives.

"Approved by me this 4th day of March 1959.

"JOHN BURROUGHS,
"Governor, State of New Mexico."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of New Mexico; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"HOUSE JOINT MEMORIAL 3

"Joint memorial memorializing the Congress of the United States to decline passage of a bill establishing a national wilderness preservation system and designating certain areas to be maintained as a wilderness

"Whereas a bill is now under consideration by the Congress of the United States, which provides for useless and expensive regulations concerning the maintenance of wilderness areas and is generally burdensome upon the people of New Mexico and of the United States; and

"Whereas there is already an abundant supply of wilderness reservations in the Federal lands; and

"Whereas maintenance of lands as a wilderness area would make scenic wonders of the West inaccessible to many millions of people, and, as well, make such areas prey for insect pests and diseases, and, as well, make fire protection difficult and expensive; and

"Whereas it would encroach upon the water rights of the Western States, and retard their economic development; and

"Whereas the proposed National Wilderness Preservation Council does not seem necessary because it would duplicate and complicate existing services now capably administered; and

"Whereas the proposed legislation is premature until the Recreation Resources Review Commission has made its study of outdoor recreation needs and resources; and

"Whereas the proposed national wilderness preservation system is especially detrimental to New Mexico because of the unusually vast amount of federally controlled land within its boundaries; and

"Whereas this legislature and the responsible officials of the State of New Mexico recognize—

"That the social and economic welfare of New Mexico is best served by the present uses allowed of federally controlled land;

"That New Mexico has an abundance of scenic wonders of which access would be deprived by the proposed legislation;

"That the proposed legislation is burdensome and expensive to administer and will cause great inconvenience and financial hardship to the people of New Mexico;

"That the proposed legislation unduly restricts the use of federally controlled lands, and encroaches upon the water rights of New Mexico: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, that the 24th Legislature of the State of New Mexico, does hereby memorialize the Congress of the United States to take such steps as are necessary to insure that the proposed legislation or similar legislation relating to establishing a national wilderness system and designating certain areas to be maintained as a wilderness does not become law; be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this memorial be sent to the President of the United States, the President of the U.S. Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, and the Members of Congress, and to such other officials as the Governor of the State of New Mexico shall deem advisable.

"ED V. MEAD,
"President, Senate.
"HAL THORNBERRY,
"Chief Clerk, Senate.
"MACK EASLEY,
"Speaker, House of Representatives.
"ALBERT ROMERO,
"Chief Clerk, House of Representatives.

"Approved by me this 3d day of March, 1959.

"JOHN BURROUGHS,
"Governor, State of New Mexico."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of New Mexico; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

"SENATE JOINT MEMORIAL 9

"Joint memorial memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to further the examination and revision of the powers of the Federal Power Commission which are erroneously purported to authorize agency regulation of the wellhead and delivered prices of natural gas

"Whereas the natural gas industry now supplies nearly one-quarter of the Nation's energy requirements; and

"Whereas the ability of the industry to find and develop the reserves necessary to sustain this rate of beneficial and economic use is hampered by arbitrary and discriminatory regulatory practices which attempt to treat the industry as a public utility; and

"Whereas the great variety of conditions of geology, complex problems of gas recovery and processing, and extreme variations in extent and accessibility of markets impose an impossible burden of factfinding, adjudication, and price setting upon an agency which is ill-equipped for and which was never established to cope with such a complex task; and

"Whereas New Mexico ranks third among the States in its reserves of natural gas; and

"Whereas unwise and unwarranted pricing policies inhibit discovery and development of new reserves: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Legislature of the State of New Mexico, That the President of the United States, the Presiding Officers of the Congress, the chairman of the Committee of Interior and Insular Affairs of the Senate, and the chairman of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee of the House of Representatives be respectfully urged and petitioned to further the revision of the natural gas regulatory policies and powers of the Federal Power Commission; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this joint memorial be delivered to the Honorable Dwight D. Eisenhower, President of the United States; the Honorable Richard M. Nixon, President of the Senate; the Honorable Sam Rayburn, Speaker of the House of Representatives; the Honorable Wayne N. Aspinall, chairman of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee of the House of Representatives; the Honorable James E. Murray, chairman of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee of the U.S. Senate; and the New Mexico congressional delegation.

"ED V. MEAD,
"President, Senate.
"HAL THORNBERRY,
"Chief Clerk, Senate.
"MACK EASLEY,
"Speaker, House of Representatives.
"ALBERT ROMERO,
"Chief Clerk, House of Representatives.

"Approved by me this 4th day of March 1959.

"JOHN BURROUGHS,
"Governor, State of New Mexico."

(The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of New Mexico, identical with the foregoing, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.)

A resolution of the House of Representatives of the State of New Mexico; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

"HOUSE MEMORIAL 10

"Memorial memorializing against discrimination in price supports in similar farm commodities by the Secretary of Agriculture of the United States

"Whereas grain sorghums and corn are similar, and have substantially the same feed value; and

"Whereas some areas of the United States are suited to agricultural production of grain sorghums, and other areas of the United States are suited to the agricultural production of corn, any discrimination in the price supports between the two is a discrimination between different areas of the United States; and

"Whereas there is a prejudicial discrimination in the price supports for grain sorghums in that the supports are even below the cost of production; and

"Whereas the area of the United States defined as the high plains, which includes the State of New Mexico, has been unreasonably and unjustly discriminated against by the unrealistic support price of grain sorghum; and

"Whereas the area of the United States defined as the Midwest has been preferred by the relatively high price support for agricultural production of corn; and

"Whereas the State of New Mexico has been especially damaged by this unfair and unjust administrative determination of price supports; and

"Whereas the State of New Mexico should be preferred rather than prejudiced if any

discrimination should exist in view of the fact that the agricultural producers of this State are otherwise greatly handicapped by lack of water, proximity to markets, and lack of cheap agricultural labor available generally throughout the Midwest; and

"Whereas the Congress of the United States never intended that price supports be provided on such an unequitable, unjust and discriminatory basis: now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of New Mexico*, That the New Mexico delegation to the Congress of the United States is memorialized to implore the Secretary of Agriculture to correct administratively the discrimination against the high plains area of the United States with respect to the nominal price supports applied to agricultural production of grain sorghums in relation to preference given the midwestern area in the relatively high price supports applied to agricultural production of corn; be it further

"*Resolved*, That in the event that the Secretary of Agriculture declines to correct such inequities administratively, the New Mexico delegation to the Congress of the United States is memorialized to introduce appropriate legislation to insure against such prejudicial and preferential price supports and exert maximum effort for its passage; be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of this memorial be transmitted to the President of the United States, the President of the U.S. Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, the Secretary of Agriculture, and the members of the New Mexico delegation to the Congress of the United States.

"MACK EASLEY,
"*House of Representatives.*
"ALBERT ROMERO,
"*Chief Clerk, House of Representatives.*"

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware (for himself, Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. ALLOTT, Mr. MANSFIELD, and Mr. DWORSHAK):

S. 1383. A bill to require the use of competitive bidding to the greatest practicable extent in the procurement of property and services by the Armed Forces through the establishment by the Secretary of Defense of specific standards governing the use of negotiated contracts for such procurement, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

(See the remarks of Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. McCLELLAN:

S. 1384. A bill amending the provisions of the National Labor Relations Act and the Labor Management Relations Act, 1947, relating to secondary boycotts;

S. 1385. A bill to prohibit the inclusion of hot cargo provisions in collective bargaining contracts;

S. 1386. A bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act so as to permit the exercise by the States of jurisdiction over labor disputes to which such act applies but over which the National Labor Relations Board does not exercise jurisdiction; and

S. 1387. A bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act so as to prohibit certain types of picketing; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. McCLELLAN when he introduced the above bills, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MURRAY (for himself, Mr. BIBLE, Mr. CANNON, Mr. CHURCH, Mr. McGEE, Mr. MANSFIELD, Mr. MORSE, Mr. MOSS, Mr. NEUBERGER, and Mr. O'MAHONEY):

S. 1388. A bill to provide for the establishment by the Secretary of the Interior of a Pacific Northwest Account, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. MURRAY when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. O'MAHONEY (for himself and Mr. WILEY):

S. 1389. A bill to establish the Patent Office as an independent agency in the executive branch of the Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAGNUSON (by request):

S. 1390. A bill to repeal and amend certain statutes fixing or prohibiting the collection of fees for certain services under the navigation and vessel inspection laws; and

S. 1391. A bill to clarify a provision in the Black Bass Act relating to the interstate transportation of fish, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. MAGNUSON when he introduced the above bills, which appear under separate headings.)

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

S. 1392. A bill for the relief of Isabel M. Menz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEATING:

S. 1393. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code so that the taxes imposed under the Federal old-age and survivors insurance system will not be imposed on account of service performed by individuals who have attained the age of 65; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. KEATING when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. NEUBERGER (for himself, Mr. BENNETT, and Mr. MOSS):

S. 1394. A bill to provide grants to the States to assist them in informing and educating children in schools with respect to the harmful effects of tobacco, alcohol, and other potentially deleterious consumables; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. NEUBERGER when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HUMPHREY (for himself, Mr. McCARTHY, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. YARBOROUGH, Mr. JACKSON, Mr. NEUBERGER, Mr. MORSE, Mr. SYMINGTON, Mr. PROXMIRE, Mr. CURTIS, Mr. MOSS, Mr. BEALL, Mr. FULBRIGHT, and Mr. WILEY):

S. 1395. A bill to enable producers to provide a supply of turkeys adequate to meet the needs of consumers, to maintain orderly marketing conditions, and to promote and expand the consumption of turkeys and turkey products; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(See the remarks of Mr. HUMPHREY when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. DOUGLAS:

S. 1396. A bill for the relief of Ante Tonic (Tunic), his wife, Elizabeth Tunic, and their two minor children, Ante Tunic, Jr., and Joseph Tunic; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DODD:

S. 1397. A bill for the relief of Francisco Adelbert Siapa and his wife, Michelina Siapa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CLARK:

S. 1398. A bill to provide that the Administrator of General Services shall preserve works of art owned by the United States, restore such works of art which have deteriorated or become damaged, provide high standards of architectural design and decoration for Federal public buildings, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

(See the remarks of Mr. CLARK when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

COMPETITIVE BIDDING IN PROCUREMENT OF PROPERTY AND SERVICES BY ARMED FORCES

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill which, if enacted, would unquestionably save millions of dollars annually for the American taxpayers without in any way jeopardizing either our national defense or any domestic program.

This bill merely makes it mandatory that in making its purchases either for national defense or for civilian purposes the Federal Government should exercise the same degree of good business practices that would be followed by any well-managed operation.

The bill provides that in making such purchases the Federal Government shall advertise for bids and award the contracts for the procurement of all types of goods and services on a strictly competitive bid basis. It provides that the contract must automatically be awarded to the lowest responsible bidder with exceptions being made only in those instances wherein the advertisement for public bids would not be feasible from a national security standpoint.

In recent months the Comptroller General has called to the attention of the Congress numerous instances in which millions are being wasted by the Defense Department, as well as by other agencies, because contracts were awarded on a negotiated rather than a competitive bid basis.

In many instances the Federal agencies, even after advertising and receiving competitive bids, do not always award the contracts to the lowest responsible bidder. There can be no justification for such waste of the taxpayers' money. This bill would prohibit such practices.

In January 1959 the Comptroller General submitted to the Congress a glaring example of the waste of the taxpayers' money under the negotiated contract system. I quote from the Comptroller General's report of January 20, 1959:

> In establishing a firm price for the airplanes produced under contract NOas 53-204, Navy contracting officials utilized, without adequate evaluation or verification, cost data which included duplicate costs and costs not applicable to the contract. The contractor has incurred costs of about $6 million less than the amount contemplated in establishing the price, of which $2,596,900 could have been recognized by Navy contracting officials by an adequate review of cost data available at the time the price was established. As a result of our bringing this finding to the attention of agency officials, the contractor offered a price reduction of $3 million but this offer had not been accepted by the Navy as of December 1, 1958. Also, the Navy has informed us that action has been taken to emphasize to its contracting and auditing personnel the need for proper evaluation of cost data.

Our review of the contractor's records disclosed that the recorded and projected airplane costs used by the agency included amounts of about $3,463,500 for engineering and tooling labor and overhead, contractor-furnished equipment, and production materials which were applicable to separately priced portions of this contract or to other contracts. For example, the cost used as a basis for negotiating the price of airplanes under this contract included costs of about $988,600 for material and about $120,200 for engineering, labor, and overhead for modifying the airplanes. However, these costs were also included in the price negotiated separately for this modification under change F to the contract and, in effect, represent duplicate charges for these items.

The Comptroller General's comments quoted were made in connection with negotiations by the Navy with McDonnell Aircraft Corp., St. Louis, Mo. More complete details of the transaction may be found in his report of that date.

This bill makes it mandatory that procurement be on a competitive bid basis in all instances where such bidding practices are feasible. It does give to the Secretary of Defense discretionary authority to negotiate contracts in those instances where to announce for competitive bids and give a description of the article required would not be in the best interests of our security and national defense.

Likewise, it gives the Government the right to negotiate contracts when entering new fields of procurement wherein bona fide competitive bidding would not be feasible, such as in the development of new types of weapons. Any excessive profits resulting from such negotiated bids could be taken care of through the Renegotiation Act and under a recapture clause included in the contracts.

On many previous occasions during the past 10 years I have introduced a similar measure, and attempted to have this requirement included as a restriction on appropriation bills; however, while the measure passed the Senate each time, it was rejected in conference. I strongly urge that the Congress adopt this proposal and give the American taxpayers a break.

I ask unanimous consent that at this point the bill, together with an analysis of the bill, as prepared by Mr. John C. Herberg, legislative counsel, be printed as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the bill and analysis were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 1383

A bill to require the use of competitive bidding to the greatest practicable extent in the procurement of property and services by the Armed Forces through the establishment by the Secretary of Defense of specific standards governing the use of negotiated contracts for such procurement and for other purposes.

That (a) that portion of section 2304(a), chapter 137, title 10, United States Code, which precedes numbered clause (2) thereof is amended to read as follows:

"(a) Purchases of and contracts for property or services covered by this chapter shall be made by formal advertising. However, the head of an agency may negotiate such a purchase or contract if he determines, in conformity with regulations which the Secretary of Defense shall prescribe, that—

"(1) such action is necessary in the public interest during a national emergency declared by the Congress or the President;".

(b) Numbered clause (11) of such subsection is amended by striking out the words "that he determines to be", and inserting in lieu thereof the word "required".

(c) Numbered clause (12) of such subsection is amended by striking out the words "he determines".

(d) Numbered clause (13) of such subsection is amended by striking out the words "equipment that he determines to be".

(e) Numbered clause (14) of such subsection is amended to read as follows:

"(14) the purchase or contract is for technical or special property the production of which will require a substantial initial capital investment or an extended period of preparation for manufacture, and that formal advertising and competitive bidding for the procurement of such property would require duplication of investment or preparation already made, or would unduly delay the procurement of that property;".

(f) Numbered clause (15) of such subsection is amended by striking out the words "he determines that the".

(g) Numbered clause (16) of such subsection is amended by striking out the words "he determines that".

(h) Numbered clause (17) of such subsection is amended to read as follows:

"(17) negotiation of the purchase or contract is expressly authorized by another provision of law.".

SEC. 2. (a) Subsection (b) of section 2304, chapter 137, title 10, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"(b)(1) Regulations promulgated by the Secretary of Defense under subsection (a) of this section shall contain a detailed statement of the standards by which the applicability of each of the exceptions contained in clauses (1)–(17) of such subsection shall be determined. Such regulations shall (A) provide for uniform practices by all Armed Forces in the application of the provisions of such subsection, and (B) make effective provision for the use of competitive bidding in the procurement of property and services to the maximum practicable extent consistent with the policy declared by section 2301 of this chapter. The Secretary of Defense shall transmit promptly to the Committees on Armed Services, Appropriations, and Government Operations of the Senate and of the House of Representatives copies of all regulations promulgated under such subsection and all amendments and revisions of such regulations.

"(2) The data respecting the negotiation of each purchase or contract under clauses (1)–(2) and (7)–(17) of subsection (a) shall be kept by the contracting agency for six years after the date of final payment on the contract.

"(3) Whenever the head of an agency determines that any purchase or contract may be negotiated pursuant to clause (10) or clause (15) of subsection (a), he shall transmit promptly to the Attorney General in writing a full and complete statement of the facts and circumstances upon which such determination was made. Upon receipt of any such statement, the Attorney General shall take such action as he shall consider appropriate to determine whether any violation of law was responsible for or contributed to the inability of the armed force concerned to obtain competition for such purchase or contract. The Attorney General shall transmit to the Congress annually a report containing a full and complete statement of the results of all investigations conducted by him during the preceding year pursuant to this paragraph, and such recommendations for additional legislation as he may deem appropriate to prevent the impairment of procurement activities of the Armed Forces by unlawful restraints and monopolies."

(b) The first sentence of subsection (e) of such subsection is amended to read as follows: "A report shall be made to the Congress, on May 19 and November 19 of each year, of the purchases and contracts made by negotiation under clauses (1), (2), (10), (11), (15), and (16) of subsection (a) during the period since the date of the last report.".

SEC. 3. The amendments made by this Act shall take effect on the first day of the fourth month beginning after the date of enactment of this Act.

MEMORANDUM FOR SENATOR WILLIAMS OF DELAWARE

Pursuant to your request, there is transmitted a draft of a bill to amend section 2304 of title 10 of the United States Code to require more effectively the use of competitive bidding to the greatest practicable extent in the procurement of property and services by the Armed Forces.

The objectives sought to be accomplished by the attached draft are the following:

(1) To require each agency head, in invoking specific exceptions contained in section 2304(a) authorizing the use of negotiated contracts, to make his determinations in conformity with standards which the Secretary of Defense would be required to establish by regulations. This approach to the problem has been suggested by the provisions of section 2387 of title 10, United States Code, as added thereto by paragraph (45) of the first section of the act of September 2, 1958 (Public Law 85–861, 85th Congress).

(2) To require the Secretary of Defense, in promulgating those standards, to (A) provide for uniform practices to be followed by all Armed Forces in the making of contracts by negotiation, and (B) make effective provision for the use of competitive bidding in the procurement of property and services to the maximum practicable extent consistent with the policy declared by section 2301 of title 10, which declares that "a fair proportion of the purchases and contracts made under this chapter" shall be "placed with small business concerns".

(3) To require agency heads, in each instance in which a contract is negotiated under clause (10) or clause (15) of section 2304(a) on the ground that effective competition cannot be procured, to report the facts and circumstances justifying such action to the Attorney General, who would be required (A) to determine whether any violation of law has contributed to such failure to obtain competition, and (B) make an annual report to the Congress concerning the results of such investigations and recommending any proposed legislation he may consider advisable to prevent the impairment of procurement activities of the Armed Forces by unlawful restraints and monopolies.

(4) To require agency heads to keep for 6 years records concerning contracts negotiated under clause (2) of section 2304(a), in addition to records required by present law to be preserved for that period as to contracts negotiated under other specified clauses of that subsection.

(5) To require agency heads, in making semiannual reports to the Congress with respect to certain categories of negotiated contracts, to include in addition thereto similar reports with respect to negotiated contracts made under additional clauses (1), (2), (10), and (15), of subsection 2304(a).

(6) To make clauses (14) and (17) of section 2304(a) somewhat more restricted in scope.

(7) To defer the effective date of the amendments made by the bill to provide a period of not less than 3 months within which the Secretary of Defense may make necessary studies for the purpose of formulating the regulations which he would be required to promulgate.

Respectfully,

(s) John C. Herberg
JOHN C. HERBERG,
Senior Counsel.

JANUARY 16, 1959

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Delaware yield very briefly?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. The New York congressional delegation has been considering legislation of this character. I wonder whether the Senator from Delaware, therefore, would be kind enough to have his bill lie on the desk for a few days so we can study it. The New York delegation has been engaged in drawing up a draft of legislation on the same subject. As a matter of fact, it has a draft. The New York delegation in the House is very considerable in size, consisting of 43 Members. If the Senator will allow the bill to lie on the desk for a few days he may find he has some considerable support.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I am delighted to do so and will certainly welcome the Senator's support.

Mr. President, I ask that the bill lie on the desk for a few days to permit other Senators to cosponsor the bill. Much interest has been expressed in this type of legislation. We all recognize the need, not only from the standpoint of economy, but also from the standpoint of good business practice. We should insist on competitive bidding in all instances in which it is possible. That is certainly a sound business practice which should be adopted, and one of which we all approve.

I am confident that if we enact this bill into law it will save millions of dollars for the taxpayers.

It will prevent possible collusion between contract officers and the sellers.

It will give us more defense for our tax dollars.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SPARKMAN in the chair). May the Chair suggest to the Senator from Delaware that he designate the number of days he wishes to have the bill lie on the desk?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I ask that the bill lie on the desk until the close of business next Wednesday.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator from Delaware yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield to the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. BRIDGES. I wish to associate myself with the distinguished Senator from Delaware on this matter. He has hit a key point, when we are trying to make our defense dollars and our other dollars stretch as far as possible.

I ask unanimous consent that I may be associated as a cosponsor of the bill.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I am glad to have the support of the Senator from New Hampshire.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The name of the Senator from New Hampshire will be added as a cosponsor.

Several Senators addressed the Chair.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, are we still in the morning hour?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair wishes to announce that the time of the Senator from Delaware under the limitation of the morning hour has expired.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may have 1 additional minute, so that I may yield to the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President I should like to associate myself with the remarks of the Senator from Delaware. I think in all the Government's business dealings there is probably nothing more important than that there should be competitive public bidding on any kind of business the Government does, and that negotiated contracts should never be resorted to unless there is no other possible way to let contracts.

I ask that my name be added as a cosponsor of the bill of the Senator from Delaware. I very much appreciate this opportunity.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I welcome the support of the Senator from Colorado.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Did the Senator from Delaware request that the bill lie on the desk so that the names of cosponsors may be added to it?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. That was my request, that the bill may lie on the desk so the names of any cosponsors may be added to the bill at any time before the close of business next Wednesday.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Delaware may be yielded 1 additional minute, so that I may ask him a question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. LONG. I wonder if the Senator from Delaware has considered the growing practice of asking for bids in a great number of alternative ways. It occurs to me that when an agency asks for a bid with several different alternatives, no one can really tell which is the low bid, because one contractor may have made a low bid on one alternative, and another contractor may have made a low bid on another alternative. There may be four or five other possible alternatives, so that it is impossible to tell just who has made the low bid when the bids are entered. I wonder if it would be possible to have an amendment or a provision to cover such possibilities?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. That problem was discussed with the legislative counsel. To the best of our ability we have drafted a bill with language to accomplish that. When the bill goes to the appropriate committee, the matter will be studied further, and as I said before, if it is found that the language needs a slight change to cover that situation, it can be changed. I think the firm principle is what we are trying to establish. The principle we are trying to establish is that the Government to the fullest extent possible and practical must always award contracts on such a basis that they shall go to the lowest responsible bidder.

Mr. LONG. One of the things which occurs to me is that there have been instances as I have noticed, when a person making the low bid might not be a responsible bidder. This person might be simply trying to broker out a contract, if he can get it. If the bid is let in a number of alternatives, it is always possible for the man who is not responsible, who managed to get the bid and who planned to broker it out to make a profit, if he finds he cannot make a profit, to get loose from the contract by going into court and asking to be freed from his bond responsibility by showing that he did not actually have the low bid to begin with. With several alternatives one cannot say that any particular alternate was the low bid and that the service has a right to hold the man to the bid.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. In drafting the bill we recognized all these problems and have tried to get a bill that protects the taxpayers, and we do this by establishing sound business practices in Government. We want a dollar's worth of defense for every dollar spent. The bill, however, applies to all procurement, as well as defense.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I commend the Senator from Delaware for his activity in this particular field. I also invite the attention of the Senate to several things we sell very often. Some things are sold for as much as $100,000, such as the war assets belonging to Germany and Japan. I think things in that field also should be handled on a competitive-bid basis.

I believe the Senator from Delaware and the minority leader, who know about those items, and who know what has sometimes gone on, will agree with me that it would be much better, and the people would look upon the procedure in a much better light, if we would sell those things under competitive bids.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I quite concur in that sentiment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1383) to require the use of competitive bidding to the greatest practicable extent in the procurement of property and services by the Armed Forces through the establishment by the Secretary of Defense of specific standards governing the use of negotiated contracts for such procurement, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. WIL-

LIAMS of Delaware (for himself, Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. ALLOTT, Mr. MANSFIELD, and Mr. DWORSHAK), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. DWORSHAK subsequently said:

Mr. President, I am very happy to join with the distinguished senior Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] in sponsoring the bill which provides that the Federal Government shall advertise for bids and award contracts for the procurement of all types of goods and services on a strictly competitive bid basis. The bill is of vital significance primarily because most of the procurement of the Federal Government is made by the Department of Defense of materiel, missiles, planes, and other items which are so essential for national survival.

When the Senator from Delaware made some remarks earlier, he referred to a report which was submitted recently by the Comptroller General in reference to a negotiated contract between the Department of the Navy and the McDonnell Aircraft Corp., of St. Louis, Mo. I call attention to an article entitled "McDonnell Aircraft Gets $61.8 Million Contract for New F-4-H-1 Planes," published in the Wall Street Journal of March 10, 1959. After hearing the Senator from Delaware urge the favorable consideration of his bill, and after having read the article to which I have just referred, I naturally made inquiry of the Department of the Navy to identify this particular contract with the McDonnell Aircraft Corp., and to ascertain whether it was made on a negotiated basis or upon a competitive basis. I was informed that it is difficult to place such awards or contracts in a specific category because, by the nature of the award of such special defense contracts, it is necessary sometimes to deal with a few companies which have the capabilities for developing the particular planes which are sought.

However, it seems to me, in view of the difficulties encountered by the Navy Department during the past year or two, difficulties which have been called to our attention by the Comptroller General, that the Navy should be extremely cautious in awarding negotiated contracts to firms which have indicated a reluctance to deal with the Government on a proper basis.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DWORSHAK. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The Comptroller General, in his report which was submitted to Congress on January 20, of this year, and in which he commented on the earlier negotiated contract with the McDonnell Aircraft Corp., pointed out that information was available to the negotiating officers at the time they negotiated the contract which could have enabled them, had they wished, to save several million dollars. All such information was available.

After the Comptroller General had pointed this out, the company itself voluntarily offered to refund $3 million, which it recognized as being an overcharge on one particular item. I incorporated a part of this statement in my remarks earlier, but I should like to read a sentence now from the report of the Comptroller General commenting on this particular case:

> We found also that the contractor's claim for termination inventory was overstated, that rent and insurance on Government-owned facilities caused unnecessary cost to the Government, and that the contractor's inventory records were not reliable.

Because numerous instances such as this have been called to our attention, instances of contracts having been negotiated on a rather loose and careless basis, it seems to me that the time is long past due when some business methods should be practiced by the Government. The bill proposes to make it mandatory, in every instance where it would be possible, that contracts be awarded only on a competitive-bid basis, and also awarded to the lowest responsible bidder.

We know there are instances when, in arranging to build a new weapon or a new plane, a certain amount of negotiation has to be done, and that it would not be economical, possibly, to have competitive bids. But the field has been left wide open. Today a large percentage of the Government's business is being awarded on a negotiated basis. Numerous instances of this practice have been called to the attention of the Senate by the Comptroller General and others. I have cited some of them to the Senate during the past several years. Contracts in many instances are being awarded not to the lowest bidders, but to the highest bidders, when lower responsible bids were on the desk at the same time.

I am glad to support the Senator from Idaho, because I think this is one bill which, if enacted, will insure that the American people will receive a dollar in value for every dollar spent.

Mr. DWORSHAK. It is noteworthy that another newspaper dispatch has stated that 85 percent of the more than $25 billion of contracts awarded by the Department of Defense were on a negotiated basis. That indicates the imperative need at this particular time to survey our defense budget, especially when we are faced with the necessity of balancing the budget and getting the most value for our defense dollars.

PROPOSED LEGISLATION RELATING TO LABOR MANAGEMENT RELATIONS

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, on February 19, when I introduced my labor reform bill, S. 1137, I announced that it did not include any Taft-Hartley amendments whatsoever, but that I intended in a series of subsequent bills to provide remedial legislation in certain specific areas that would require amendment to the Taft-Hartley Act. These problem areas are secondary boycotts, hot cargo clauses, recognitional and organizational picketing, and the jurisdictional no man's land in which the National Labor Relations Board will not, and in which State courts and agencies cannot, exercise jurisdiction. The problems in these areas require legislative action, just as do the problems of internal democracy and abuses of trust by union officials.

I am, therefore, introducing today, Mr. President, four separate bills dealing with the subject matters to which I have referred for appropriate reference. I respectfully request that these bills be numbered consecutively.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bills will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bills will be numbered consecutively.

The bills, introduced by Mr. McCLELLAN, were received, read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, as follows:

S. 1384. A bill amending the provisions of the National Labor Relations Act and the Labor Management Relations Act, 1947, relating to secondary boycotts;

S. 1385. A bill to prohibit the inclusion of hot cargo provisions in collective bargaining contracts;

S. 1386. A bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act so as to permit the exercise by the States of jurisdiction over labor disputes to which such act applies but over which the National Labor Relations Board does not exercise jurisdiction; and

S. 1387. A bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act so as to prohibit certain types of picketing.

1. SECONDARY BOYCOTTS

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, existing laws are inadequate to protect innocent parties from secondary boycott abuses. This bill would amend section 8(b)(4) of the Taft-Hartley Act to prohibit certain types of coercion of the employer and, particularly, to prevent coercion by picketing at the premises of a secondary employer in order to prevent customers from doing business with the employer primarily involved in a labor dispute. Such practices are unjust and impose suffering and hardship on innocent parties who are helpless to protect themselves.

This bill, however, provides an exception in the case of so-called farmed-out work, in which, for example, a manufacturer who is not otherwise involved in a labor dispute voluntarily allies himself with a struck manufacturer by performing the work that the latter is prevented from performing because of the labor dispute. In such a case, the second manufacturer may not be regarded as an involuntary, unwilling, and innocent party, since he has elected to thrust himself into the dispute between the union and the first manufacturer.

2. HOT CARGO CLAUSE

Closely related to the secondary boycott bill is one that would make unlawful a contract whereby an employer agrees in advance that he will not require his employees to handle goods or provide other services for the benefit of an employer who is involved in a labor dispute.

The Supreme Court held only last year that a union cannot invoke such a clause as a defense to an unfair labor practice complaint against the union under section 8(b)(4)(A) of the Taft-Hartley Act. However, the Court explicitly left open the question of whether such a clause might have other ramifications in labor-management relations.

Various law-review commentators have since suggested that such a clause

might still be effective to permit an action for damages or specific performance against an employer who orders his employees to perform such services, or that it might protect an employee from being discharged for refusal to carry out such orders. Also to be considered is the possible nonlegal effect of such a clause as a gentlemen's agreement providing moral suasion against an employer.

To remove any such doubts, and to insure that no hot-cargo clause shall be used as justification for, or in aid of, a secondary boycott, this bill outlaws hot-cargo clauses and provides a penalty against entering into them.

3. ORGANIZATIONAL AND RECOGNITIONAL PICKETING

The third bill, Mr. President, would further amend section 8(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act by making it an unfair labor practice for a union to picket or threaten to picket the premises of an employer in order to induce the employees to join the union, or to compel the employer to recognize the union, until a majority of the employees either in a National Labor Relations Board election, or by a petition to the employer, have designated the union as their bargaining representative.

In addition, this bill would provide criminal sanctions against blackmail picketing, which is carried on not for the benefit of the employees but for the personal profit of labor racketeers.

4. "NO-MAN'S LAND" BILL

Mr. President, one of the most perplexing problems in the field of labor-management relations has been the jurisdictional "no man's land" in which the NLRB does not choose to exercise its jurisdiction because the effect of the dispute on interstate commerce is inadequate to warrant the Board's consideration, or in which the NLRB is precluded from asserting jurisdiction because of the failure of the union to comply with disclosure provisions of section 9 of the Taft-Hartley Act. In such cases, under present law, no State court or agency could assert jurisdiction, thereby leaving the parties to such a dispute with no civil remedy whatsoever.

Several proposals have been suggested to remedy this absurd and unhealthy situation. The administration bill would permit the Board to decline to assert jurisdiction in such cases, and would allow a State court or agency to act in any case where jurisdiction has been declined.

The administration bill, however, would leave States powerless to act in cases in which the Board cannot exercise jurisdiction because of union or employer failure to comply with reporting requirements. In addition, under this provision the Board is not compelled to decline jurisdiction until a particular dispute is actually brought before it, which could result in unnecessary uncertainty, delay, and expense to the parties involved.

The Kennedy-Ervin bill would require the Board to act in all cases within its jurisdiction, but empowers the Board to cede jurisdiction to a State agency where the State law is not inconsistent with Federal law. This provision would eliminate the jurisdictional hiatus but would preclude State jurisdiction—regardless of what may be insignificant impact of the dispute on interstate commerce—in any case in which the Board does not choose to exercise its power to cede jurisdiction. In addition, this provision would preclude State jurisdiction—regardless of what may be insignificant impact of the dispute on interstate commerce—in any case in which the Board would remain powerless to cede jurisdiction because State labor relations are within the jurisdiction of State courts rather than a State agency. Further, this provision would preclude State jurisdiction—regardless of what may be insignificant impact of the dispute on interstate commerce—in any case in which the Board is denied power to cede jurisdiction because State law is "inconsistent" with Federal law—whatever that might mean. Inevitably, even in those instances in which the Board does choose to cede jurisdiction, there will surely develop extensive wrangling and undesirable litigation over technical questions of whether and to what extent State labor law is in fact consistent with Federal law.

The bill that I am now introducing on this subject, Mr. President, would compel the NLRB to establish and publish regulations clearly indicating the area of labor disputes that do not have sufficient effect on interstate commerce to warrant the exercise of its jurisdiction. It is immaterial in such a case whether there is a conflict with Federal law, since, by definition, these cases will have only minimal impact, if any, on interstate commerce. In any such case, or in any case in which Board jurisdiction is foreclosed because of failure of unions to comply with reporting requirements, this bill would permit an appropriate State court or agency to assert jurisdiction and settle the dispute.

This bill also provides for clarification by the Board of any ambiguous provision, on petition by interested parties, and provides further that if the Board should fail to render such a determination within 30 days after filing the petition, that it shall be presumed that the Board has declined jurisdiction.

This bill, therefore, would eliminate once and for all the jurisdictional hiatus with a minimum of confusion and litigation, by drawing a clear line between those cases which would substantially affect interstate commerce, and those which should properly be disposed of by the States.

May I take this opportunity, Mr. President, to reiterate my conviction that labor reform legislation must be adopted without unnecessary delay. The evil with which we are dealing is neither weak nor static. It is a malignancy that is rapidly spreading throughout our country and becoming more powerful, more deeply entrenched, and more widespread with each passing day.

There was a time, Mr. President, when employees were subjected to the tyranny of employers who, through economic coercion, deprived them of fair compensation and decent working conditions. However, with the help of honest unionism and a developing sense of responsibility on the part of many employers, the employees have been able to free themselves from that kind of oppression and abuse.

Unhappily, what we are seeing today is the replacement of one tyranny by another. Our labor movement has been infiltrated to a shocking extent by racketeers and gangsters who would use it not for the benefit of the working people, but for their own personal enrichment. Just as the Congress has recognized the former evil in the past, and has acted to help the workingman to protect himself from the tyranny of the employer, so Congress must now act to enable the workingman to protect himself against this new tyranny within the union movement.

The first essential step in affording this protection is provided in the guarantees of minimum standards of basic rights of union members as set forth in title I of my labor reform bill, S. 1137. I have no doubt that if we will only give protection to the workers so that they may govern their unions through democratic procedures, without fear of coercion or intimidation, that they will speedily free themselves from this new tyranny to which I have referred. Honest unions and honest union leaders have nothing to fear from that bill, any more than any honest governing body has to fear from the exercise of democratic rights by those who are governed.

That, as I say, is the first essential step. The four bills that I am introducing today, Mr. President, and which I have previously discussed, are further protection for working people and for American society against abuses perpetrated by dishonest elements in the labor union movement.

With prompt adoption of these proposals, we can reaffirm the dignity of the individual, destroy the new tyranny that would enslave the working people of America, and preserve freedom and integrity in our society.

PACIFIC NORTHWEST ACCOUNT

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to provide for the establishment by the Secretary of the Interior of a Pacific Northwest account, and other purposes.

Cosponsors on the bill with me are nine Members of the Senate from the Pacific Northwest States which contribute to the waters of the Columbia River. They are my distinguished colleagues as follows: Mr. BIBLE, of Nevada; Mr. CANNON, of Nevada; Mr. CHURCH, of Idaho; Mr. MCGEE, of Wyoming; Mr. MANSFIELD, of Montana; Mr. MORSE, of Oregon; Mr. Moss, of Utah; Mr. NEUBERGER, of Oregon; and Mr. O'MAHONEY, of Wyoming.

I shall not go into the details of the bill at this time, but request unanimous consent that the text of the measure be inserted in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

Reclamation interests of the Columbia River Basin States have been working for 2½ years on legislation to establish a Pacific Northwest account. They have

had the services of some of the most capable water lawyers in the West and have worked with many Northwest groups interested in the development of the area. They have consulted with the staffs of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committees of the Senate and the House of Representatives and have had conferences with many officials of the Department of the Interior and the Bureau of Reclamation. Every effort has been made to bring the people of the Columbia River Basin States together on this particular piece of legislation.

This bill makes possible the use of net power revenues from federally constructed, multiple-purpose projects in the Columbia River Basin to assist the farmers in repaying the cost of irrigation projects which are beyond the ability of those farmers to repay within 50 years.

This is not a new philosophy, as the principle has been applied by the Congress in the Missouri River Basin project, the Upper Colorado River Basin project and the Central Valley project of California.

Power has been a paying partner to aid irrigation since 1906 when Congress gave its approval to this method of financing.

Reclamation law gives the farmer 40 years to repay his obligation. All the major projects which can repay this obligation in 40 years have been built. Consequently this legislation will make possible the future reclamation development of feasible irrigation projects in the arid and semiarid areas in the Pacific Northwest.

We feel this development is vital to the economy and economic security of these States and to the Nation.

One feature of the bill is that net power revenues available to a State, under this bill, may be used outside the Columbia River Basin area provided irrigation financial aid is not available from any other basin account.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1388) to provide for the establishment by the Secretary of the Interior of a Pacific Northwest account, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. MURRAY (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That because of the interrelations of various Federal irrigation and hydroelectric projects in the Pacific Northwest, the need for assistance from net power revenues for the development of the irrigation potentials of that area, and the importance of orderly marketing of the commercial power output of said Federal hydroelectric projects, the Secretary of the Interior shall establish a Pacific Northwest account. To said account shall be credited at least once a year all revenues hereafter derived from power operations of each of the projects named or described in section 3 of this Act, and to it shall be charged at least once a year operation and maintenance costs hereafter incurred by the United States in connection with those operations and from the resulting net revenues amounts sufficient to account, as nearly as possible, for the scheduled return (1) of the capital costs of those projects which are allocated to said purpose, (2) of the irrigation capital costs assigned to those projects to be returned from net power revenues, and (3) of interest on the unamortized balances of the commercial power allocations, where and as provided by law. Net revenues derived from power operations as aforesaid shall be applied first to payment of the charges described in items (1), (2), and (3) of the preceding sentence arising in connection with the presently existing or authorized projects named or described in section 3 of this Act and thereafter to payment of charges to the account hereafter incurred pursuant to section 4, subsections (b) and (c), of this Act. The Secretary shall prepare schedules, in which the scheduled return of the presently unamortized balances of the capital allocations hereinbefore referred to shall be set forth, designed to accomplish payout of each project in accordance with the laws governing that project and may from time to time revise said schedules so far as such revision is consistent with those laws.

SEC. 2. As used in this Act—

(a) the term "Pacific Northwest" means the area within the United States comprising the Columbia River drainage basin, the drainage basin of other streams entering the Pacific Ocean between the Canadian boundary and the California-Oregon boundary, and closed basins wholly or partly within Oregon, and

(b) the term "revenues from power operations" includes, in addition to income specifically from power sales from the projects named or described in section 3 of this Act, miscellaneous receipts derived from facilities of such projects the costs of which are charged to or allocated to power, and where only a portion of such facilities are charged to or allocated to power, the term includes an appropriate share of such miscellaneous receipts.

SEC. 3. The provisions of section 1 of this Act shall apply to the Boise, Columbia Basin, Crooked River, Hungry Horse, and Palisades Federal reclamation projects; the Talent division of the Rogue River Basin Federal reclamation project; the Kennewick and Roza divisions of the Yakima Federal reclamation project; unit numbered 7 of the Minidoka project powerplant; the American Falls powerplant of the Minidoka Federal reclamation project; the Bonneville Power Administration transmission system; all presently authorized projects in the Columbia Basin for which the Secretary has power marketing authority under the Act of August 20, 1937 (50 Stat. 731), as amended and supplemented, and under section 5 of the Act of December 22, 1944 (58 Stat. 887, 890), or from which irrigation water is furnished by him under section 8 of the latter Act, including the Albeni Falls, Bonneville, Chief Joseph, Cougar, Detroit-Big Cliff, Hills Creek, Ice Harbor, John Day, Lookout Point-Dexter, McNary, and The Dalles developments which have already been constructed or are now under construction; and such other projects in the Pacific Northwest as may hereafter be designated by Act of Congress.

SEC. 4. (a) The Secretary shall report annually to the President and the Congress on the status of the Pacific Northwest account and particularly on the amounts by which the revenues described in section 1 of this Act exceed the charges therein described and the amounts by which it is anticipated such revenues will exceed such charges. Each such report shall contain a composite payout schedule for all projects then covered by the Pacific Northwest account showing, year by year, estimated future charges to the account, estimated future credits to the account, and estimated unencumbered balances in the account.

(b) Reports to the President and the Congress on the financial feasibility of any project which is hereafter proposed to be authorized for construction in the Pacific Northwest or, in the circumstances stated in section 5 of this Act, elsewhere in the States of Washington, Oregon, Idaho, Montana, Wyoming, Utah, or Nevada and which involves an allocation to irrigation shall include an estimate by the Secretary of what portion, if any, of that allocation is beyond the probable return from project operations within fifty years, exclusive of any permissible development period, and of the probable availability, without increase in then prevailing power rate schedules, of revenues sufficient to cover those costs, as shown by the reports made under subsection (a) of this section, due consideration being given to other commitments of such revenues, including charges against the account incurred or likely to be incurred by reason of variances in the cost at which power can be produced and marketed. No such project the financial feasibility of which depends on assistance from the Pacific Northwest account shall be undertaken except upon authorization by the Congress.

(c) In addition to the costs of the projects covered by section 3 of this Act which are properly chargeable to the Pacific Northwest acount, the Secretary shall schedule for return from revenues to be credited to the account those project construction cost obligations of the water users which will become due and payable fifty years after the beginning of the repayment period, exclusive of any development, water rental, moratorium or deferment periods, on the Deschutes, Owyhee, and Vale Federal reclamation projects; the Payette division of the Boise Federal reclamation project; the Talent division of the Rogue River Basin Federal reclamation project; the Hermiston and West Extension units of the Umatilla Federal reclamation project; and the Kennewick, Kittitas, and Roza divisions of the Yakima Federal reclamation project. Such construction cost obligations on any of such projects, divisions, or units shall be charged to the account only after an amendatory contract, satisfactory in form to the Secretary and to the irrigation district representing the water users of the project contract unit involved, has been entered into restating the construction charge obligation to be repaid by the water users and requiring the water users to waive all claim to any miscellaneous revenue accruing to the project division or unit under the provisions of section 4, subsections I and J, of the Act of December 5, 1924, as amended by the Act of July 1, 1946 (43 Stat. 672, 703, 60 Stat. 348, 366, 43 U.S.C. 501, 526), or of section 5 of the Act of May 16, 1930 (46 Stat. 367, 368, 43 U.S.C. 424d), after the time scheduled under such amendatory contract for completion of repayment of the restated construction charge obligations (exclusive of any extensions by reason of the operation of variable annual installments).

SEC. 5. Nothing contained in this Act shall be deemed to require or to furnish authority for modification of the power marketing arrangements heretofore set up by the Secretary; to relieve any contractor for water or power of any obligation which it has heretofore undertaken except as provided in section 4, subsection (c) of this Act; to amend or repeal any provision of law with respect to the payout of any project; to affect the laws relating to the appropriation of funds for the construction, operation, and maintenance of projects and the deposit of receipts in the Treasury; to require that any portion of amounts properly allocable to irrigation which have been declared to be nonreimbursable and nonreturnable by or pursuant to law shall be accounted for as reimbursable or returnable; to provide for or contemplate utilization of the Pacific Northwest account in connection with any project which, though it is within one or another of the States of Washington, Oregon, Idaho, Montana, Wyoming, Utah, or Nevada, is located

outside the Pacific Northwest except in cases in which irrigation assistance is not available from another similar account or fund and in which assistance from the account to such project is justified in the light of contributions to the net revenues of the Federal Pacific Northwest power system from the State in which it is located (said contributions to be determined by taking into account all significant factors, including particularly both on-site production of energy and water supply for downstream plants); or to authorize the Secrettry to establish rate levels for the sale of power after payout of any project or projects is accomplished in excess of those which he could lawfully establish during payout, due regard being had for changes in the costs of operating and maintaining such project or projects.

REPEAL AND AMENDMENT OF CERTAIN STATUTES RELATING TO COLLECTION OF FEES UNDER VESSEL INSPECTION LAWS

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, at the request of the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to repeal and amend certain statutes fixing or prohibiting the collection of fees for certain services under the navigation and vessel inspection laws. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury requesting the proposed legislation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letter will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1390) to repeal and amend certain statutes fixing or prohibiting the collection of fees for certain services under the navigation and vessel inspection laws, introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

The letter presented by Mr. MAGNUSON is as follows:

MARCH 4, 1959.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: There is transmitted herewith a proposed bill to repeal and amend certain statutes fixing or prohibiting the collection of fees for certain services under the navigation and vessel inspection laws.

The proposed legislation would repeal certain statutes prohibiting the charging or collection of fees for certain services rendered to vessel owners by the Bureau of Customs and the U.S. Coast Guard. It would further repeal fees presently fixed by statute for other services rendered by the Bureau of Customs to vessel interests and thus permit the Secretary of the Treasury, under general authority, to fix fees to be collected upon the rendering of any of these services.

The services for which a fee may or may not now be charged are more specifically set forth in a memorandum accompanying this letter.

It will be appreciated if you will lay the draft bill transmitted herewith before the Senate. A similar proposal has been transmitted to the House of Representatives.

The Department has been advised by the Bureau of the Budget that there is no objection to the submission of this proposed legislation to the Congress and that enactment would be in accord with the program of the President.

Very truly yours,

A. GILMORE FLUES,
Acting Secretary of the Treasury.

MEMORANDUM TO ACCOMPANY A BILL

The proposed legislation would repeal the statutory provisions against the charging and collection of fees by collectors or other officers of customs or by the U.S. Coast Guard for any of the following services:

Measurement of tonnage and certifying same; issuance of a license or granting of a certificate of registry, record, or enrollment; endorsement of change of master; certifying and receiving manifest, including master's oath and permit; granting permit to vessels licensed for the fisheries to touch and trade; payment of entry and clearance fees for vessels engaged in the foreign and coasting trade on the northern, northeastern, and northwestern frontiers; payment of clearance fees for vessels making daily trips between any port in the United States and any port in the Dominion of Canada wholly upon interior waters; granting certificate of payment of tonnage dues; recording bill of sale, mortgage, hypothecation, or conveyance, or the discharge of mortgage or hypothecation; furnishing certificate of title; furnishing a crew list; certificate of protection to seamen; bill of health; shipping or discharging of seamen as provided by title 53, Revised Statutes, sections 563 and 646 of title 46; apprenticing boys to the merchant service; inspecting, examining, and licensing steam vessels including inspection certificate and copies thereof; and licensing of master, engineer, pilot, or mate of a vessel.

In addition it would abolish certain fees which are prescribed by statute for entry and clearance of vessels, post entry, granting permits to proceed, receiving manifest, change of name of vessel, recording bills of sale, mortgages, hypothecations, or other instruments, issuing certificates of ownership and issuing abstracts of title.

The repeal or amendment of these statutes is necessary in order that the Secretary of the Treasury may in his discretion set fees under the provisions of section 501 of the act of August 31, 1951 (5 U.S.C. 140).

It is contemplated that, in those regulations, fees will be established for, but not necessarily limited to, admeasurment of vessels, registry of vessels, issuance of enrollments and licenses, or licenses, renewals of licenses, issuance of special certificates to vessels, authorization for changes of names of vessels, furnishing and recording abstracts of title of vessels, recording of evidence of title to, and encumbrances upon, vessels, and the discharge of the latter, entry and clearance of vessels, furnishing certificates of ownership of vessels, furnishing copies of documents, records, or other papers filed in offices of collectors of customs or in the Bureau of Customs, and certifying such copies.

It is also contemplated that, in addition to any fees which may be established in those regulations, there will also be prescribed therein charges for services performed by customs officers at places other than their official stations, as, for example, admeasuring or readmeasuring vessels at such places, entering or clearing vessels at points which are not ports of entry, furnishing customs supervision over vessels at such points, and the like. It is anticipated that any such charge will reimburse the Government for the compensation of the customs officer concerned while absent from his official station as well as for any expenses incurred by him in connection with any such services rendered by him.

Certain obsolete portions of section 4382 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (U.S.C., 1952 edition, title 46, section 330), section 4383 of the Revised Statutes (U.S.C., 1952 ed., title 46, sec. 333) and the act of June 19, 1886 (U.S.C., 1952 ed., title 46, sec. 331), have been included, in the comparative print although it is probable that they have been repealed by implication or at least superseded. They are the 16th, 18th, 24th, and 25th items of Revised Statute 4382; the reference to naval officer in Revised Statute 4383; and the last sentence of the act of June 19, 1886.

CLARIFICATION OF PROVISION OF BLACK BASS ACT, RELATING TO INTERSTATE TRANSPORTATION OF FISH

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, at the request of the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to clarify a provision in the Black Bass Act relating to the interstate transportation of fish, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent that the letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, requesting the proposed legislation, be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letter will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1391) to clarify a provision in the Black Bass Act relating to the interstate transportation of fish, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

The letter presented by Mr. MAGNUSON is as follows:

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, D.C., March 6, 1959.

HON. RICHARD M. NIXON,
President of the Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Enclosed herewith is a draft of a proposed bill to clarify a provision in the Black Bass Act relating to the interstate transportation of fish, and for other purposes.

We recommend that this proposed bill be referred to the appropriate committee for consideration, and that it be enacted.

Revision of section 9 of the so-called Black Bass Act is desirable, in our opinion, to resolve a question that has arisen concerning the intent of that section. Our revision would result in the addition of language that would make it clear that only the shipment of legally taken fish is contemplated thereunder. While we believe the general intent of the act is clear, in at least one case that has come to our attention, the court has expressed the view that a strict interpretation of the section does not make such a requirement. In the circumstances, we believe that a revision of this section of the act would be desirable.

We have been advised by the Bureau of the Budget that there is no objection to the submission of this proposed legislation to the Congress.

Sincerely yours,

ROSS LEFFLER,
Assistant Secretary of the Interior.

ELIMINATION OF CERTAIN TAXES ON PERSONS OVER 65 YEARS OF AGE

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code so that taxes imposed under the Federal old-age and survivors insurance system will not be imposed on account of service performed by individuals who have attained the age of 65.

This bill is one of several in a program I have undertaken to benefit our rapidly growing group of senior citizens.

Social security was conceived as a self-supporting Government-run plan for old-age insurance. Therefore, it seems to me that if a man has paid social security taxes for many years, with his employer paying in a like amount, when he reaches the proper age he should receive the benefits and not be forced to continue to pay taxes. In other words, if one pays the premiums on an endowment policy, when it matures one should get the endowment without having to continue to pay the premiums.

Under our social security laws, when a man reaches 65 he is eligible for maximum benefits. If he elects to continue to work further, any payments by him do not serve to increase these benefits. As the payments he makes go directly into the general fund of the Treasury, he is actually being taxed for working. This is just plain wrong.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of this bill be printed at this point in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1393) to amend the Internal Revenue Code so that the taxes imposed under the Federal old-age and survivors insurance system will not be imposed on account of service performed by individuals who have attained the age of 65, introduced by Mr. KEATING, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, effective with respect to service performed after the calendar quarter in which this Act is enacted, section 3121(b) of the Internal Revenue Code (relating to the definition of employment) is amended (1) by striking out "or" at the end of paragraph (16), (2) by striking out the period at the end of paragraph (17) and inserting in lieu thereof "; or", and (3) by adding the following new paragraph:

"(18) Service performed by an individual who has attained the age of sixty-five."

MATCHING GRANTS TO STATES FOR EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS ON THE EFFECTS OF TOBACCO AND ALCOHOL

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, for myself and the able Senators from Utah [Mr. Moss and Mr. BENNETT], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill which would aid States in conducting programs to inform and educate schoolchildren regarding the effects of tobacco and alcohol on the human body. Under provisions of this proposal, Federal funds would be available on a matching basis to individual States wishing to take advantage of such grants; the program is entirely permissive.

The legislation which I am introducing today is identical to that which I introduced in the last Congress. I am pleased to announce that Congressman DAVID KING of Utah is introducing similar legislation in the other body today to aid in meeting this need.

I have been disturbed for some time over the flood of glamour advertising of tobacco and alcohol which has deluged our young people. The finest talents of Madison Avenue seem to be working at double time to prepare this cascade of advertising aimed at persuading our young people to use cigarettes and liquor. Our billboards and periodicals are saturated with this advertising. We cannot tune it out of our radio and television.

Our most prominent athletes and glamorous figures of stage and screen are featured in this advertising, which is aimed directly at our Nation's youth. How can school officials enforce no-smoking rules among their student bodies when youngsters are told at every hand that this great baseball hero and that beautiful screen star smoke such and such a brand of cigarette? Young people are highly imitative by nature. Can we not but expect them to follow the patterns which they associate with success?

By contrast, Mr. President, our U.S. Public Health Service has announced these findings:

First. Smokers' death rate from all causes is 32 percent higher than nonsmokers.

Second. For habitual smokers of cigarettes, the death rate is 58 percent higher.

Third. For very heavy smokers—two packs of cigarettes per day—the death rate is nearly twice that for nonsmokers.

Fourth. Regular cigarette smokers have about 10 times as many fatal cases of lung cancer as nonsmokers, and about a 63 percent higher death rate from coronaries.

Fifth. For very heavy cigar or pipe smokers, the death rate is about the same as for smokers of one-half to one pack of cigarettes a day.

Yet what American youngster—indeed, what parent—has heard this warning amid the tumult of advertising praise of tobacco? During the 4-year period when our leading health agency has published information and statistics such as those cited above, the consumption of cigarettes in our country has soared from 355 billion annually to some 409 billion.

Is there not some grim irony in this situation: in which one arm of our Government warns of the dangers of use of tobacco and another arm—our Agriculture Department—pays price supports to the growers of tobacco?

Does this situation follow any pattern of logical or reasonable explanation? How can we, in the sophisticated America of the TV dinner and the automotive forward look, rationalize a situation in which our Nation's youth is beseeched, constantly, to commence a habit which the Public Health Service warns may lead to one of the most dread diseases known to mankind? Is there not a crying need here for dissemination of the story of the effects of the use of these products?

Our youngsters deserve at least the background to resist the daily outpourings in behalf of cigarettes and liquors. We owe this much to the health, tranquillity, and happiness of America's next generation.

With regard to the inclusion of alcohol education in my bill, I would like to note that my own State of Oregon has, for many years, dedicated a portion of the income from its State liquor monopoly system to temperance education. When the State of Oregon took over the liquor retail business in 1933, the original authorizing act provided that some of the revenues realized should go to providing information encouraging temperance.

Mr. President, the bill I introduce speaks for itself. I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed in the RECORD at this point, together with an article on this subject entitled "Pattern for Progress," which I wrote for the January–February 1959 issue of Listen magazine.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill and article will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1394) to provide grants to the States to assist them in informing and educating children in schools with respect to the harmful effects of tobacco, alcohol, and other potentially deleterious consumables, introduced by Mr. NEUBERGER (for himself, Mr. BENNETT, and Mr. Moss), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A bill to provide grants to States to assist them in informing and educating children in schools with respect to the harmful effects of tobacco, alcohol, and other potentially deleterious consumables

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

STATEMENT OF PURPOSE

SECTION 1. The purpose of this Act is to aid the States, through the making of Federal grants on a matching basis, in informing and educating children in the harmful effects of tobacco, alcohol, and other potentially deleterious consumables.

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this Act—

(a) The term "State" means one of the forty-nine States, the District of Columbia, Hawaii, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, Guam, and the Virgin Islands;

(b) The term "State agency" means the State board of education or other agency or officer primarily responsible for the State supervision of elementary and secondary schools, or if there is no such agency or officer any statewide educational agency within the State designated by or under State law, or in the absence thereof by the governor, to be the single State educational agency responsible for developing and submitting a State plan under the provisions of this Act; and

(c) The term "Commissioner" means the Commissioner of Education, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

STATE APPLICATIONS

SEC. 3. The Commissioner shall approve any application for funds for carrying out the purpose of this Act if such application—

(a) designates the State agency for carrying out such purpose;

(b) provides a plan in accordance with the provisions of this Act and in such detail

as the Commissioner may require, for carrying out such purpose; and

(c) provides that such State agency will make such reports and in such form, and containing such information as the Commissioner may from time to time reasonably require.

STATE PLANS

SEC. 4. A State plan for carrying out the purpose of this Act shall set forth, in such detail as the Commissioner may by regulations prescribe—

(a) the number of schoolchildren in the State who it is proposed will be benefited by the provisions of this Act;

(b) the types of potentially deleterious consumables, in addition to tobacco and alcohol, with respect to which it is proposed that such children will be educated and informed;

(c) the amount of time it is proposed will be devoted to informing and educating such children with respect to such potentially deleterious consumables;

(d) an estimate of the cost which will be incurred by the State in providing such information and education; and

(e) a description of the instruction techniques proposed to be employed in imparting such education and information.

APPROVAL OF STATE PLANS

SEC. 5. (a) The Commissioner shall approve any State plan which (1) fulfills the conditions specified in section 4 and (2) is otherwise effectively designed to carry out the purpose of this Act.

(b) Whenever the Commissioner, after reasonable notice and opportunity for hearing to the State agency, finds that—

(1) the State plan submitted by such agency and approved under subsection (a) of this section has been so changed that it no longer complies with the provisions of section 4, or no longer is effectively designed to carry out the purpose of this Act; or

(2) in the administration of such plan there is a failure to comply substantially with any such provision or carry out such purpose;

the Commissioner shall withhold further payments under the provisions of this Act to the State, until he is satisfied that there is no longer any such failure to comply, or, if compliance is impossible, until the State repays or arranges for the repayment of any Federal money which has been diverted or improperly expended.

PAYMENTS TO STATES

SEC. 6. The Commissioner shall pay to each State, out of any money appropriated for the purpose of this Act and in such amounts at such time or times during each year as he shall determine, one-half of the costs incurred by such State under a plan approved under the provisions of this Act.

APPROPRIATIONS

SEC. 7. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such amounts as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act.

The article presented by Mr. NEUBERGER is as follows:

PATTERN FOR PROGRESS

(By Hon. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER, U.S. Senator from the State of Oregon)

The time has come, I believe, for serious Americans to confront a number of obvious facts. One of these is the fact that despite all the wealth lavished upon the American standard of living—and we are the wealthiest country in the world in terms of consumer goods and creature comforts—the male citizens of the United States have a shorter life expectancy than those of no fewer than seven other nations. It is significant that the men of Holland, Great Britain, Norway, Sweden, New Zealand, Israel, and Denmark all live longer than their counterparts in the United States. This is true, I repeat, in spite of the fact that America has a higher per capita income and a greater consumer-purchasing power than any other nation. We have more food, we have more vitamins, we have more shelter, we have more clothing—yet a shorter life expectancy.

What are the reasons for this situation? I am not wise enough to give the final definitive answer, but I would say that among the reasons are these: First, an excessive reliance upon alcohol and tobacco to relieve the tensions of our modern competitive culture; and, second, the lack of emphasis upon physical education and individual athletic activity.

For example, I think it is a commentary on our society that between 1954 and 1958, as disclosed by the U.S. Public Health Service, smokers' death rates from all causes were 32 percent higher than those of nonsmokers. The rate for regular smokers of cigarettes was 58 percent higher than for nonsmokers. For heavy smokers—two packs or more a day—the death rate was twice that of nonsmokers. Yet despite these facts, disclosed by a Federal agency which spends millions of dollars appropriated by Congress for research in this most vital of fields, during this same period the annual consumption of cigarettes among Americans increased from 355 billion to 410 billion.

One of my approaches to this problem is from the angle of education. I have introduced legislation into Congress which would authorize Federal matching funds to any State whose schools would conduct courses telling of the adverse impact on health of the use of alcohol and cigarettes.

When I spoke early this year at Harvard Medical School, one of the greatest doctors in our country asked me, "Have you noticed that the advertising for both alcohol and tobacco is beamed to the young person?" It is evidently felt that any older person who uses such products is already hooked, that the habit is formed, and that he has been secured firmly and perhaps until death as a customer. For this reason the appeal and the glamor of such advertising are directed to the young person.

Since that doctor asked me such a question I have tried to watch the advertisements and the television appeals. I have noticed on television, for example, that cigarette advertising often shows a handsome young man driving up to a house in a fancy convertible. He honks the horn, and a good-looking girl comes out of the house, down the steps two at a time, jumps in the car beside him and puts her arm around him, and they drive off. As they do so, he lights up a cigarette for her, then she lights one for him. In this way the manufacturer makes use of the appeal of sex, the appeal of youth to youth, the appeal of athletic prowess on the part of the boy, and of glamor and beauty on the part of the girl.

In a country with freedom of the press it is extremely difficult to restrict advertising. The Federal Trade Commission has for many years tried it, with greater or less intensity, depending on the policies of the Commission at any particular time. It has not had much success, perhaps with good excuse.

For this reason I think the least we can do is to arm our young people with basic physical facts about these products so that they have a fighting chance to resist such subtle appeals. The young people of this Nation will be the citizens of the future; they will decide the destiny and fate of our country, and perhaps of all mankind.

It is a sad commentary on our civilization that during the first 5 months of 1958, which were unfortunately a time of business recession and general decline, General Motors profits were down 29 percent, Standard Oil profits down 30 percent, the profits of United States Steel down 46 percent, but at the same time the profits of the American Tobacco Co. were up 22 percent. It is significant that, at a time when the greatest industrial firms in our country were experiencing a diminution in their profits, the largest cigarette manufacturing company had a vast increase in profits.

We have 6 agricultural products described legislatively as basic, out of some 172 such major commodities. These six qualify for Federal price supports; in other words, if a person's farm has a historic acreage pattern of one of these six, he qualifies for price-support payments.

To me it has always been ludicrous that one of the six basics of American life is tobacco. The other five, if I'm not mistaken, are wheat, corn, cotton, rice, and peanuts. Thus, tobacco is one of the crops we subsidize.

We rise up in righteous wrath and indignation when we hear that Red China subsidizes the growing of poppies for opium. But I wonder what people in other countries think when they learn that the U.S. Public Health Service, an agency of the Federal Government, reports that the death rate among heavy smokers is nearly twice that for nonsmokers, and yet another agency of our Government, the Department of Agriculture, pays price supports to farmers to encourage the production of tobacco.

You know, Robert Burns, the great and talented Scotsman, once said:

> "O wad some Power the giftie gie us
> To see oursels as ithers see us."

The second factor I mentioned is that we Americans don't get enough exercise. We are in the habit of getting into an automobile to go two blocks, or using an elevator to go up one floor. We have almost stopped using the ordinary method by which human beings were supposed to travel over this earth before the internal combustion engine was ever invented.

I think it wouldn't hurt us at all if occasionally some Americans got a little bit of physical exercise. We are the greatest Nation for spectator sports in the entire history of the world. It is easy, for example, on a Saturday afternoon to get a hundred thousand or a hundred and twenty thousand people to watch 22 men take their exercise.

In all seriousness, I believe that one of the things we should do is to encourage physical activity and athletic prowess not only on the part of the athlete in our society, but on the part of the average person. I am strongly in favor of the President's Commission on Physical Fitness, but I am disturbed by the things that it has revealed about the lack of physical condition not only on the part of those to be inducted into our armed services, but also of the average American who is around middle age. We need a great deal more physical stamina in our country. Too much emphasis is put on the superior athlete and the great athlete, which very few of us can be, rather than on the average individual.

I get concerned, too, when I see too much emphasis on mere prowess rather than on having a good time, recreational and creative time, playing a game.

I recently read in the paper, for example, of a coach in a little baseball league, who gave his 8-, 9-, or 10-year-olds a bawling out because they didn't win their game. A person doesn't need to win every time; he doesn't need to be as fast as Roger Bannister; but just let him go out and get some exercise and have fun. I think it is important for us to inculcate that spirit in the young people of this country.

My appointment by Vice President NIXON to the National Recreational Outdoors Resources Review Commission is particularly gratifying to me, because of my profound conviction that the inspiring cathedral of the outdoors is a great deterrent to immorality and wrong indulgence.

All too few Americans appreciate from personal experience the majesty of the mountains and the sublime grandeur of a rocky seacoast, the cry of the loon at dawn and the honk of the gander at sunset. These are impressions which follow a person through life, but not enough people know them. I believe it was Thoreau who said that all the speeches ever delivered in Congress were as nothing compared with one gentle breath of the south wind. Men and women accustomed to the sky for a roof generally have a profound appreciation of the Creator of such marvels.

I am one of four Senate cosponsors of the Humphrey bill to establish a Youth Conservation Corps, which would be patterned after the CCC camps of the 1930's, by which President Roosevelt took idle youths from the slums and sent them into the national parks and national forests to do trail building and shelter construction. He saved these young men from a life of crime, drug addiction, alcoholism, and jail cells.

Today the crime rate is the highest in American history, and many of the new criminals are teenagers. I think the Youth Conservation Corps is one way to get these boys out of back alleys and into the pine woods, before they have a felony conviction on their records, a conviction which will hound them all their lives.

The sheer physical stamina and endurance required by the vast outdoors are a deterrent to indulgence in both alcohol and tobacco. Remember the famous mountain-climbing book "The White Tower" by James Ramsay Ullman? The great Swiss guide decided he had to get one of his party off the perilous peak when the man began drinking furtively, before he could plunge the entire group to disaster.

My wife, for 12 years a teacher of physical education in our public schools, has always insisted to me that a healthful and zestful appreciation of the outdoors is incompatible with excesses. Mrs. Neuberger's notion of fun is to frolic in her Oregon-made bathing suit in the spray of a waterfall nurtured by snowbanks, so I imagine she would qualify as an authority on the Spartan way of life.

Americans today probably face a sterner challenge than any generation of people in our country has faced since its founding nearly 200 years ago.

I happen to be one who believes not in prohibition, but in education. I believe there are very few people in the United States who, if they know the basic facts of the impact on health, on nervous systems, on personality, of alcohol and tobacco, will willfully go on and indulge to any degree—if indeed at all—in either of these drugs. It is important to show there is no relation whatsoever between such things and personal prestige, achievement, and distinction.

The task is not easy. I doubt if any important task is easy. However, the challenge is great, the opportunity is great, and the goal is commendable, for on its attainment rests the future of our country. In the final analysis what our country does and what it symbolizes to the world will be dependent upon the health, the vitality, and the strength of its people.

I am thoroughly convinced that anything which weakens the health and strength of Americans is a menace not only to America but to the survival of liberty upon this planet.

NATIONAL TURKEY MARKETING ACT

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, at the request of the National Turkey Federation, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to enable producers to provide a supply of turkeys adequate to meet the needs of consumers, to maintain orderly marketing conditions, and to promote and expand the consumption of turkeys and turkey products. I am joined in the sponsorship of this proposal by my colleague the junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MCCARTHY] and by Senators MAGNUSON, YARBOROUGH, JACKSON, NEUBERGER, MORSE, SYMINGTON, PROXMIRE, CURTIS, MOSS, BEALL, FULBRIGHT, and WILEY.

I ask that this bill be held at the desk until the end of the day, Wednesday, March 18, to accept additional sponsors who may be interested.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from Minnesota.

The bill (S. 1395) to enable producers to provide a supply of turkeys adequate to meet the needs of consumers, to maintain orderly marketing conditions, and to promote and expand the consumption of turkeys and turkey products, introduced by Mr. HUMPHREY (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, this measure is called the National Turkey Marketing Act, but in effect it is essentially an enabling act providing the means for turkey producers themselves to develop and vote on a marketing order designed to give more stability to their industry. This act has the sponsorship of the National Turkey Federation, which made this proposal after several years of study and negotiations with the various State turkey federations.

I, together with a number of colleagues, introduced this identical proposal last year. Hearings were held, but at the time it was not possible to get sufficient agreement among committee members to report the bill favorably. Since that time, I believe that a greater understanding of the meaning and the value of this proposal has been achieved both by committee members and by members of various growers associations who were not in full agreement last year. However, there is still some hesitancy among some groups, notably those on the west coast. I understand that a somewhat similar proposal has been introduced earlier this session by the Senator from California [Mr. ENGLE]. It is my hope that hearings can be conducted soon on these measures, and any differences of opinion ironed out at that time.

I have just received a communication from the Minnesota Turkey Growers Association, expressing their continued support of the proposal and enclosing a copy of Resolution 15 which was adopted at their annual convention held February 7 in Minneapolis. I ask unanimous consent that this resolution appear in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY THE MINNESOTA TURKEY GROWERS ASSOCIATION AT ITS ANNUAL CONVENTION, FEBRUARY 7, 1959, MINNEAPOLIS, MINN.

Whereas the National Turkey Federation in convention assembled at Des Moines, Iowa, in January of 1959 endorsed national enabling legislation designed to provide the turkey industry with an avenue of self-help; and

Whereas the Minnesota Turkey Growers Association had considered the impact of such legislation at previous meetings and board of directors' sessions: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the membership of this association go on record as favoring such enabling legislation as may be introduced in Congress through the efforts of the National Turkey Federation so long as such legislation is limited to being a fund-raising vehicle for research and promotion purposes.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, turkey production is a significant agricultural enterprise in Minnesota and many other States of the Union. It makes an important contribution to our economy. Through promotion work carried on by the industry, turkey has become a staple year-round item of the American diet instead of an occasional holiday treat.

But expansion of the industry has brought problems of temporary surpluses, usually seasonal, that reflect the need for some stabilization devices to protect the producers. Turkey production involves many hazards and risks, and effective marketing stabilization could help remove some of the uncertainties. Through this bill, the turkey producers are seeking some way to achieve such marketing stabilization.

Let me emphasize that the bill introduced today is essentially an enabling measure. It does not set up any marketing agreement or order. It would provide a way for producers themselves to finance a stabilization program consisting of surplus removal or diversion, plus research and market development. It provides the means whereby the turkey people could initiate marketing orders which would, after hearing and approval by the Secretary if voted upon favorably by a sufficient majority, put the program into action.

Mr. President, I ask that a copy of the proposed bill be printed at the conclusion of my remarks.

There being no objection, the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 1395

A bill to enable producers to provide a supply of turkeys adequate to meet the needs of consumers, to maintain orderly marketing conditions, and to promote and expand the consumption of turkeys and turkey products

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act shall be known as the "National Turkey Marketing Act."

SEC. 2. Breeder hens for the production of hatching eggs and poults, and market turkeys are produced by persons widely scattered throughout the several States, and hatching eggs and market turkeys and turkey products move in large part through the channels of interstate or foreign commerce.

The number of breeder hens maintained, the supply of hatching eggs, and the number of poults hatched directly affect the supplies of, the markets for, and the prices of, turkeys and turkey products in commerce. Turkeys which do not move to market in commerce directly affect the markets for and the prices of turkeys and turkey products in commerce.

Farmers maintaining flocks of breeder hens for the production of hatching eggs for poults or market turkeys, persons hatching eggs for the production of poults or market turkeys, and growers of market turkeys individually have been unable to determine the number of breeder hens required, or the number of hatching eggs or poults to be produced, to provide a supply of turkeys needed to meet effective demand. As a consequence turkey breeders and turkey hatcherymen and turkey growers are unable to market in an orderly manner or to prevent excessive supplies or shortages occurring in commerce, with the result that prices fluctuate widely, causing severe losses or injury to producers and consumers of turkeys.

DECLARATION OF POLICY

SEC. 3. It is hereby declared to be the policy of the Congress that it is in the public interest to encourage the producers of breeder hens, hatching eggs, poults, and market turkeys, through marketing orders issued pursuant to the provisions of this Act, to establish and contribute to the support of (1) programs to provide, in the interests of producers and consumers, such supply and orderly flow of turkeys in commerce through the marketing season as will avoid unreasonable fluctuations in supplies and prices, and as will tend to provide a reasonable and adequate return to efficient producers, and as will tend to establish, as the prices to farmers, parity prices as defined by section 301 (a)(1) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, and (2) research (including disease control), promotion, and market development programs to expand the consumption of, and to assist, improve, or promote the marketing and distribution in commerce of turkeys and turkey products.

MARKETING ORDERS

SEC. 4. (a) To effectuate the declared policy of this Act, the Secretary shall, subject to the provisions of this section, issue and from time to time amend, orders applicable to persons engaged in the marketing in commerce of breeder hens, hatching eggs, poults or market turkeys, and to buyers of turkeys for slaughter.

NOTICE AND HEARING

(b) Whenever the Secretary, upon the request of producers of breeder hens, hatching eggs, poults, or market turkeys, has reason to believe that the issuance of an order will tend to effectuate the declared policy of this Act, he shall give due notice of and an opportunity for a hearing upon a proposed order. The formulation of the terms of any such order for proposal to the Secretary or the carrying out of any provision of this Act shall not be held to be in violation of any of the antitrust laws of the United States and shall be deemed to be lawful.

FINDING AND ISSUANCE OF ORDERS

(c) After such notice and opportunity for hearing, the Secretary shall issue an order if he finds, and sets forth in such order, upon the evidence introduced at such hearing (in addition to such other findings as may be specifically required by this section) that the issuance of such order and all of the terms and conditions thereof will tend to effectuate the declared policy of this Act.

TERMS

(d) Orders issued pursuant to this section shall contain one or more of the following terms and conditions, and (except as provided in subsection (e)) no other:

(1) Requiring that every person maintaining breeder hens for the production for commerce of hatching eggs, poults, or market turkeys register his name and address, and that each such breeder hen be registered and issued an official band in accordance with the terms of the marketing order.

(2) Providing for the payment by the person registering breeder hens of a market development and stabilization fee for each breeder hen registered and issued an official band in accordance with the terms of the marketing order.

(3) Prohibiting the marketing in commerce of breeder hens, hatching eggs, poults, or market turkeys produced other than by breeder hens registered and issued an official band in accordance with the terms of the marketing order.

(4) Prohibiting the marketing in commerce of breeder hens, hatching eggs, poults, or market turkeys by any person owning, possessing, or controlling any breeder hens which have not been registered and issued an official band in accordance with the terms of the marketing order.

(5) Providing for payments from funds collected pursuant to the marketing order for marketing breeder hens for slaughter in accordance with the terms of the marketing order.

(6) Providing for the payment by the person hatching eggs for the production of poults for commerce or marketing hatching eggs in commerce for the purpose of hatching of a market development and stabilization fee for each hatching egg so hatched or marketed in accordance with the terms of the marketing order.

(7) Providing for the payment by the person marketing poults in commerce or retaining poults for the production of market turkeys for commerce, of a market development and stabilization fee for each poult marketing in commerce or retained for the production of turkeys for market in commerce in accordance with the terms of the marketing order.

(8) Providing for payments from funds collected pursuant to the marketing order for diverting hatching eggs or poults from the channels of commerce.

(9) Providing for the purchase from funds collected pursuant to the marketing order, and the sale or other disposition of breeder hens, hatching eggs, or poults not needed for the production of market turkeys.

(10) Providing for the payment by the person marketing market turkeys in commerce of a market development and stabilization fee for each market turkey marketing in commerce in accordance with the terms of the marketing order.

(11) Providing for the withholding from the proceeds of sale of breeder hens, hatching eggs, poults and market turkeys of any market development and stabilization fees becoming due and owing by reason of the marketing of same, and for the disposition of such fees in accordance with the terms of the marketing order.

(12) Providing for payments to be made from funds collected pursuant to the marketing order to encourage the marketing, sale, export, diversion, or other utilization of market turkeys or turkey products in accordance with the terms of the marketing order.

(13) Providing for the purchase from funds collected pursuant to the marketing order and the sale, donation, export, or other disposition of market turkeys or turkey products to facilitate marketing, promote consumption, or effectuate a better balance between supply and demand of turkeys in accordance with the terms of the marketing order.

(14) Establishing or providing for the establishment of research (including disease control), promotion and market development programs designed to assist, improve, or promote the marketing, distribution, or consumption of turkeys or turkey products, the expense of such projects to be paid from funds collected pursuant to the marketing order.

(15) Any term or condition incidental to, not inconsistent with, and necessary to effectuate any other terms and conditions of such order.

TERMS COMMON TO ALL ORDERS

(e) Any order issued pursuant to this section shall provide a method for the selection of a marketing board to administer such order. Such order shall also provide for adequate representation on the marketing board of each class of producer (as defined in section 8(m) of this Act) subject to the order and for proper regional representation. The members of the board shall be appointed by the Secretary from nominations made by producers. Upon request of the marketing board the Secretary shall appoint from persons engaged in allied industries advisers to advise the board on any matter on which the board may request advice in connection with the performance of its duties. No action taken by any such board affecting any class of producer as defined in section 8(m) of this Act shall be effective unless such action is approved by a majority of the members of the board representing such class of producer. Each marketing order shall state the maximum market development and stabilization fee which may be assessed against any class of producer. The order shall define the powers and duties of the marketing board which shall include the power:

(1) To administer such order in accordance with its terms and provisions;

(2) To establish committees or subcommittees to carry out assigned duties and functions and to designate persons who may or may not be members of the marketing board to serve upon such committees;

(3) To employ or retail the services of necessary personnel;

(4) To enter into contracts or agreements to secure the services of others (including trade organizations serving the turkey industry) in administering the order and in formulating, developing and carrying out programs for the removal or diversion of surplus breeder hens, hatching eggs, poults, and market turkeys from the market, for conducting research (including disease control), promotion and market development projects to expand the consumption of, and markets for, turkeys or turkey products, and for carrying out any other activity provided for in a marketing order;

(5) To recommend to the Secretary rules and regulations to effectuate the terms and provisions of such order;

(6) To receive, investigate, and report to the Secretary complaints of violations of such order;

(7) To recommend to the Secretary amendments to or suspension or termination of, such order; and

(8) To collect market development and stabilization fees and to pay from moneys collected such expenses as may be incurred by such marketing board in the performance of its duties as authorized under this Act, including compensation and expenses to members of the board and advisers.

CONSUMER SAFEGUARD

(f) Whenever the average price of turkeys to growers equals or exceeds the parity price and the Secretary determines that the average price for turkeys for the marketing season will equal or exceed the parity price, the Secretary shall suspend the operation of the provisions of any order authorizing the expenditure of funds for purchasing or diverting market turkeys from normal channels of distribution, and no funds shall be expended to reduce the supply of breeder hens, hatching eggs, or poults available for the production of market turkeys whenever the Secretary determines that the average price of market turkeys to producers during the ensuing marketing season will exceed the parity price.

REQUIREMENT OF REFERENDUM AND PRODUCER APPROVAL

(g) The Secretary shall conduct a referendum among producers for the purpose of as-

certaining whether the issuance of an order is approved or favored by producers, as required under the applicable provisions of this Act. No order issued pursuant to this section shall be effective unless the Secretary determines that the issuance of such order is approved or favored:

(1) By not less than 65 per centum by number of the producers of market turkeys voting in such referendum who, during a representative period determined by the Secretary, have been engaged in the production of market turkeys, and who produced not less than 51 per centum of the market turkeys during said representive period produced by producers voting in such referendum, or by not less than 51 per centum by number of the producers of market turkeys voting in such referendum who, during the representative period determined by the Secretary, have been engaged in the production of market turkeys, and who produced not less than 65 per centum of the market turkeys produced by producers voting in such referendum, and

(2) By not less than 51 per centum by number of the producers voting in such referendum of each commodity specified in such marketing order who, during a representative period determined by the Secretary, have been engaged in the production of such commodity for market, and who produced not less than 65 per centum by volume of such commodity produced by producers voting in such referendum, or by not less than 65 per centum by number of the producers of each commodity specified in such marketing order voting in such referendum who, during a representative period determined by the Secretary, have been engaged in the production of such commodity for market and who produced not less than 51 per centum by volume of such commodity produced by producers voting in such referendum.

AMENDMENT, SUSPENSION AND TERMINATION OF ORDERS

(h)(1) The Secretary shall, whenever he finds that any marketing order issued under this section, or any provision thereof, obstructs or does not tend to effectuate the declared policy of this Act, terminate or suspend the operation of such order or such provision thereof.

(2) Upon the request of the marketing board the Secretary shall conduct a referendum to determine whether producers favor the amendment, suspension, or termination of a marketing order. The Secretary shall suspend or terminate the provisions of a marketing order relating to any commodity specified therein whenever he determines that the suspension or termination of such order is approved or favored by a majority of the producers of market turkeys voting in such referendum or of the producers of such commodity voting in such referendum who, during a representative period determined by the Secretary, have been engaged in the production of such turkeys or of such commodity, as the case may be: *Provided*, That such majority have, during such representative period, produced more than 50 per centum of the volume of such turkeys or of such commodity, as the case may be, produced by the producers voting in such referendum.

(3) The termination or suspension of any order or amendment thereto or provision thereof, shall not be considered an order within the meaning of subsection (j) of this section.

(4) The provisions of this Act applicable to marketing orders shall be applicable to amendments to orders.

ELIGIBILITY TO VOTE IN REFERENDUM

(i) At least fifteen days prior to conducting any referendum under this Act, the Secretary shall issue a public notice fixing a time and a place in each county where producers who, during a representative period determined by the Secretary, have been engaged in the production of market turkeys or of a commodity specified in a proposed marketing order, may register their names, addresses, and such other pertinent information as the Secretary may require. The Secretary may exclude any person who fails to so register or who is otherwise ineligible to vote from participating in the referendum.

PETITION AND REVIEW

(j)(1) Any person subject to any order may file a written petition with the Secretary, stating that any such order or any provision of any such order or any obligation imposed in connection therewith is not in accordance with law and praying for a modification thereof or to be exempted therefrom. He shall thereupon be given an opportunity for a hearing upon such petition, in accordance with regulations made by the Secretary. After such hearing, the Secretary shall make a ruling upon the prayer of such petition which shall be final in accordance with law.

(2) The district courts of the United States in any district in which such person is an inhabitant, or has his principal place of business, are hereby vested with jurisdiction in equity to review such ruling, provided a complaint for that purpose is filed within twenty day from the date of the entry of such ruling. Service of process in such proceedings may be had upon the Secretary by delivering to him a copy of the complaint. If the court determines that such ruling is not in accordance with law, it shall remand such proceedings to the Secretary with directions either (1) to make such ruling as the court shall determine to be in accordance with law, or (2) to take such further proceedings as, in its opinion, the law requires. The pendency of proceedings instituted pursuant to this subsection (j) shall not impede, hinder or delay the United States or the Secretary from obtaining relief pursuant to section 5(b) of this Act.

LIMITATION OF LIABILITY

(k) In exercising powers granted pursuant to this section the members of any marketing board and any agents or employees of any such board shall not be held liable individually in any way whatsoever for errors in judgment, mistakes, or other acts, either of commission or omission, except for their own acts of dishonesty or crime. No such person shall be held responsible for any act or omission of any other such persons.

ENFORCEMENT

SEC. 5. (a) Any fee assessed pursuant to any marketing order issued hereunder shall be due and payable to the marketing board by the person liable therefor under the terms of the order. In the event of failure by any person so assessed to pay any such fee in accordance with the terms of the marketing order, the Secretary, upon request of the marketing board, may cause a suit to be instituted against such person in a court of competent jurisdiction for the collection thereof. Any funds so recovered shall be paid to the marketing board for carrying out the terms of the marketing order.

(b) Any person who willfully violates any provision of any marketing order duly issued by the Secretary hereunder or who fails or refuses to pay any fee duly required of him thereunder shall be liable civilly in an action brought in the name of the United States for an amount not exceeding $1,000 for each separate violation or failure or refusal to pay.

(c) The several district courts of the United States are vested with jurisdiction specifically to enforce, and to prevent and restrain any person from violating any order or regulation made or issued pursuant to this Act.

(d) Upon request of the Secretary it shall be the duty of the several district attorneys of the United States in their respective districts, under the direction of the Attorney General, to institute proceedings to enforce the remedies and to collect the fees and civil penalties provided for in this section.

BOOKS AND RECORDS: DISCLOSURE OF INFORMATION

SEC. 6. (a) All persons subject to a marketing order issued by the Secretary hereunder, shall maintain books and records adequate to reflect their operations subject to the order and shall furnish to the Secretary, as may be called for from time to time by the Secretary, reports covering such operations. For purposes of ascertaining the correctness of any such reports or for the purpose of obtaining the necessary information in the event of failure to furnish the information requested, the Secretary is authorized to examine any such books and records relating to such operations.

(b) Any such information so obtained by the Secretary, his agents, or the marketing board concerned, shall be kept strictly confidential and only such information so furnished or acquired as the Secretary deems relevant shall be disclosed, and then only in a suit or administrative hearing brought at the direction, or upon the request, of the Secretary of Agriculture, or to which he or any officer of the United States is a party, and involving the marketing order with reference to which the information so to be disclosed was furnished or acquired. Nothing in this section shall be deemed to prohibit (1) the issuance of general statements based upon the reports of a number of persons subject to an order, which statements do not identify the information furnished by any person, or (2) the publication by direction of the Secretary of the name of any person violating any order, together with a statement of the particular provisions of the marketing order violated by such person. Any such officer or employee violating the provisions of this section shall upon conviction be subject to a fine of not more than $1,000 or to imprisonment for not more than one year, or to both, and shall be removed from office.

REGULATIONS

SEC. 7. The Secretary shall promulgate such rules and regulations as are necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act.

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 8. For the purposes of this Act—

(a) The term "commerce" means interstate or foreign commerce and that commerce which affects, burdens, or obstructs interstate or foreign commerce in breeder hens, hatching eggs, poults, or market turkeys, or which affects, burdens, or obstructs the supply or prices of such commodities in interstate or foreign commerce.

(b) The term "interstate or foreign commerce" means commerce between any State, Territory, or possession, or the District of Columbia, and any place outside thereof; or between points within the same State or the District of Columbia, but through any place outside thereof; or within the District of Columbia.

(c) The term "marketing" means the offer for sale, sale, or transfer of ownership by any means of breeder hens, hatching eggs, poults, or market turkeys, or the delivery to another person of breeder hens for the production of hatching eggs, hatching eggs for hatching, poults for the production of breeder hens or market turkeys, or market turkeys for slaughter.

(d) The term "Secretary" means the Secretary of Agriculture.

(e) The term "person" means any individual, partnership, corporation, association, or any other business unit.

(f) The term "turkey" means a live turkey of any species over 6 weeks old.

(g) The term "market turkey" means a live turkey over six weeks old produced or marketed for the production of turkey products.

(h) The term "breeder hen" means a live turkey hen kept for the production of eggs for hatching, or a live turkey hen ten months old or older or any classification thereof as defined in the marketing order.

(i) The term "poult" means a young live turkey not over six weeks old.

(j) The term "hatching egg" means any egg produced by a breeder hen.

(k) The term "turkey products" means turkey which has been slaughtered for human food, any edible part of turkey, or any human food product consisting of any edible part of turkey separately or in combination with other ingredients.

(l) The term "marketing season" means a period of not more than twelve consecutive months established pursuant to a marketing order.

(m) The term "producer" means—

(1) in the case of breeder hens and hatching eggs, any person who owns more than ten breeder hens for the production of hatching eggs for the production poults or turkeys;

(2) in the case of poults, any person who produces or acquires more than five hundred hatching eggs for the production of poults for the production of turkeys;

(3) in the case of market turkeys, any person who produces more than two hundred and fifty turkeys for market.

(n) The term "person engaged in allied industries" means any person who is engaged in the manufacture or distribution of feed for poults or turkeys, the slaughtering or processing of turkeys for market, or the distribution of turkey products.

SEPARABILITY

SEC. 9. If any provision of this Act or the application thereof to any person or circumstances is held invalid, the validity of the remainder of the Act and of the application of such provision to other persons and circumstances shall not be affected thereby.

EFFECTIVE DATE

SEC. 10. This Act shall take effect upon enactment.

PRESERVATION OF WORKS OF ART OWNED BY UNITED STATES

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill providing that the Administrator of General Services shall preserve works of art owned by the United States. The bill has four main features.

First. Historic buildings: The Administrator of General Services, who is authorized under present law to order the demolition of any buildings declared surplus to the needs of the Government unless the Secretary of the Interior counteracts that order within 90 days, would be directed to save historic buildings, sites, objects and antiquities owned or controlled by the United States which are or may be threatened with destruction.

National Trust for Historic Preservation figures reveal that between April 23, 1956 and August 23, 1957, proposals to demolish eight historic buildings were referred to the Secretary of the Interior, and only one building, the San Francisco Mint was saved by timely action of the Secretary. Existing laws have not been overhauled for a quarter of a century and are inadequate to safeguard our landmarks of the past.

Second. Works of art: Another purpose of the bill is to direct the General Services Administration to provide a continuing program of preservation, repair, and restoration of works of art owned by the United States and to acquire suitable works of art for the decoration of Federal public buildings.

Third. Architecture: The bill would also direct the Administrator of the General Services Administration to require high standards of architectural design and decoration for Federal public buildings and set up appropriate machinery to accomplish this end after consultation with the Commission of Fine Arts, the Director of the National Collection of Fine Arts and the Director of the National Gallery of Art.

We have come a long way since the days in which the usual Government building was an unattractive pile of cement, but we still have room for considerable improvement. Anyone familiar with the superb work done by the Office of Foreign Buildings of the Department of State in various posts abroad knows what the creative genius of American architects can accomplish if given broader scope. The latter program would be exempted by the terms of the bill.

Fourth. Commission of Fine Arts: The Commission of Fine Arts was created in 1910 primarily to serve as guardian for the L'Enfant plan for the District of Columbia and it has conscientiously carried out that task. Rightly or wrongly, however, the Commission has gained the reputation of restricting the competitions and commissions over which it has advisory responsibilities to a limited coterie of friends. It may be claimed that the style of work thus chosen harmonizes with the esthetic ideal of the period when Mr. L'Enfant—1754–1825—drew his famous plans for Washington.

The United States has made significant contributions to modern architectural design and the decoration of such buildings should be comparably vital and original. If the influence of the Commission of Fine Arts is to be extended throughout the United States, then it is essential that this Commission be enlarged, rotation of membership required, and its members appointed with due regard for nominations submitted by leading national organizations in the fields of art concerned. My bill will accomplish these changes.

Representative HENRY S. REUSS, Democrat of Wisconsin, and FRANK THOMPSON, Democrat of New Jersey, have introduced companion bills in the House of Representatives.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1398) to provide that the Administrator of General Services shall preserve works of art owned by the United States, restore such works of art which have deteriorated or become damaged, provide high standards of architectural design and decoration for Federal public buildings, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. CLARK, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

DEVELOPMENT OF DOMESTIC FLUORSPAR INDUSTRY—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, on March 5, 1959, I introduced the bill (S. 1285) to provide for the preservation and development of the domestic fluorspar industry, and asked that the bill lie on the table through March 11, 1959. Through some oversight the bill was printed that night. I ask unanimous consent that the name of the distinguished Senator from Nevada [Mr. CANNON] be added to the bill as a cosponsor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

REPEAL OF 22D AMENDMENT TO CONSTITUTION—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF JOINT RESOLUTION

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have my name added to the list of sponsors of Senate Joint Resolution 11 which was introduced on January 14 by the senior Senator from Missouri for himself, the junior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE] and the junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART]. This joint resolution proposes an amendment to the Constitution to repeal the 22d amendment. This latter amendment, limiting by law the terms which a President can serve despite any and all circumstances, should never have been adopted. I wish, by cosponsorship, to associate myself with the distinguished sponsors of the proposed amendment which would, in effect, revoke it. As chairman of the Subcommittee on Constitutional Amendments, I shall do all in my power to see that the Senate has a chance to pass upon this joint resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT OF CONSTITUTION RELATING TO FILLING OF TEMPORARY VACANCIES IN HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF JOINT RESOLUTION

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, on January 29, I introduced Senate Joint Resolution 39, a joint resolution to amend the Constitution to authorize the Governors of the 49 States to fill temporary vacancies in the House of Representatives when the total number of such vacancies exceeds half of the authorized membership thereof.

On March 9, the Subcommittee on Constitutional Amendments unanimously approved the joint resolution without amendment and recommended that the Committee on the Judiciary report it favorably to the Senate. At that time, the junior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], a distinguished member of the subcommittee, did me the honor to request that he be joined as a cosponsor of the joint resolution. I now ask unanimous consent that he be joined as a cosponsor of Senate Joint Resolution 39.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

Article entitled "Mikoyan's Success," written by Harrison E. Salisbury, and published in the New York Times of January 11, 1959; and article prepared by him entitled "Mikoyan's Visit Spells Further Soviet Salesmanship on Trade and Berlin, Senator HUMPHREY States," prepared for the North American Newspaper Alliance.

NOTICE OF PUBLIC HEARINGS BY THE SENATE CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS SUBCOMMITTEE ON "EXECUTIVE PRIVILEGE" AND "FREEDOM OF INFORMATION"

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the chairman of the Senate Judiciary Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights [Mr. HENNINGS] has asked me to announce that a public hearing will be conducted by the subcommittee on Friday, March 13, 1959, at 10 a.m. in room 457 of the Old Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C., on "Executive Privilege" and "Freedom of Information," in accordance with the subcommittee's programs for this year, under authorization of Senate Resolution 62, summarized in the accompanying Senate Report No. 31.

The witnesses will be: First, Robert Keller, General Counsel of the General Accounting Office, appearing for the Comptroller General of the United States, and accompanied by, second, Lawrence Powers, Director of the Defense Accounting and Auditing Division, General Accounting Office.

Third. Joseph W. Bishop, Jr., professor of law, Yale Law School, New Haven, Conn.

Incidentally, the subcommittee hopes to be able to hear Prof. Edward S. Corwin at some future date. Professor Corwin has indicated an interest in the studies of the subcommittee but said the other day he would be unable to come to Washington at this time because he has some throat trouble. Professor Corwin, as we all know, is one of the country's leading writers and students of Congress and the Presidency.

NOTICE OF PUBLIC HEARINGS BY SENATE CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENTS SUBCOMMITTEE ON TAXATION BY STATES OF NONRESIDENTS

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, as chairman of the standing Subcommittee on Constitutional Amendments of the Committee on the Judiciary, I wish to announce that the subcommittee has agreed to begin public hearings on taxation by States of nonresidents. The hearings will begin April 15, 1959, at 10 a.m. in a hearing room to be announced later.

The following are the joint resolutions on this subject which will be the subject of the hearing: Senate Joint Resolution 29, introduced on January 23, 1959, by both Senators from New Hampshire; Senate Joint Resolution 67, introduced on March 5, 1959, by the senior Senator from New Jersey; and a joint resolution to be introduced very soon by the junior Senator from Connecticut.

Anyone wishing to testify or file a statement for the record should communicate with the Office of the Senate Constitutional Amendments Subcommittee so that the schedule of witnesses can be prepared; the telephone number is DIstrict 7-8220, and the mailing address is: Senate Constitutional Amendments Subcommittee, U.S. Senate, Washington 25, D.C.

NOTICE OF PUBLIC HEARINGS BY SENATE CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENTS SUBCOMMITTEE ON PRESIDENTIAL DISABILITY

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, one of the few real gaps in our Constitution relates to Presidential disability. It is a gap which has been in the forefront of the public mind for several years.

Last year, the Subcommittee on Constitutional Amendments held extensive hearings on this subject on January 24, and February 11, 14, 18, and 28. The printed hearings contain the statements of a very large number of eminent lawyers and political scientists. On March 12, 1958, Senate Joint Resolution 161, 85th Congress, was favorably reported by the subcommittee. Unfortunately, no action was taken on this resolution by the full Committee on the Judiciary.

This year, I introduced Senate Joint Resolution 40 on this same subject. This joint resolution was discussed by the subcommittee at its meeting on March 9, 1959. At that time, I agreed to amend Senate Joint Resolution 40 in order that it would be identical with the text of Senate Joint Resolution 161, 85th Congress, as reported by the subcommittee last year. I am having a subcommittee print made of Senate Joint Resolution 40, as amended. However, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point the text of the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 40) as amended.

There being no objection, the joint resolution, as amended, was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S.J. RES. 40

Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to cases where the President is unable to discharge the powers and duties of his office

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, (two-thirds of each House concurring therein), That the following article is proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States:

"ARTICLE —

"SECTION 1. In case of the removal of the President from office, or of his death or resignation, the Vice President shall become President for the unexpired portion of the then current term.

"SEC. 2. If the President shall declare in writing that he is unable to discharge the powers and duties of his Office, such powers and duties shall be discharged by the Vice President as Acting President.

"SEC. 3. If the President does not so declare, the Vice President, if satisfied that such inability exists, shall, upon the written approval of a majority of the heads of the executive departments in office, assume the discharge of the powers and duties of the Office as Acting President.

"SEC. 4. Whenever the President makes public announcement in writing that his inability has terminated, he shall resume the discharge of the powers and duties of his Office on the seventh day after making such announcement, or at such earlier time after such announcement as he and the Vice President may determine. But if the Vice President, with the written approval of a majority of the heads of executive departments in office at the time of such announcement, transmits to the Congress his written declaration that in his opinion the President's inability has not terminated, the Congress shall thereupon consider the issue. If the Congress is not then in session, it shall assemble in special session on the call of the Vice President. If the Congress determines by concurrent resolution, adopted with the approval of two-thirds of the Members present in each House, that the inability of the President has not terminated, thereupon, notwithstanding any further announcement by the President, the Vice President shall discharge such powers and duties as Acting President until the occurrence of the earliest of the following events: (1) the Acting President proclaims that the President's inability has ended, (2) the Congress determines by concurrent resolution, adopted with the approval of a majority of the Members present in each House, that the President's inability has ended, or (3) the President's term ends.

"SEC. 5. The Congress may by law provide for the case of the removal, death, resignation or inability, both of the President and Vice President, declaring what officer shall then act as President, and such officer shall act accordingly until the disability be removed, or a President shall be elected. If at any time there is no Vice President, the powers and duties conferred by this article upon the Vice President shall devolve upon the officer eligible to act as President next in line of succession to the Office of President, as provided by law.

"SEC. 6. This article shall be inoperative unless it shall have been ratified as an amendment to the Constitution by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within seven years from the date of its submission."

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement in explanation of the joint resolution.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT—THE INABILITY CLAUSE AND ITS INTERPRETATION

The Constitution of the United States, in article II, section 1, clause 6, contains provisions relating to the continuity of the executive power at times of death, resignation, inability, or removal of a President. This clause reads as follows:

"In case of the removal of the President from office, or of his death, resignation, or inability to discharge the powers and duties of the said office, the same shall devolve on the Vice President, and the Congress may by law provide for the case of removal, death, resignation, or inability, both of the President and Vice President, declaring what officer shall act accordingly, until the disability be removed, or a President shall be elected."

This is the language of the Constitution as it was adopted by the Constitutional Convention upon recommendation of the Committee on Style. When this portion of the Constitution was submitted to that Committee it read as follows:

"In case of his (the President's) removal as aforesaid, death, absence, resignation, or inability to discharge the powers or duties of his office, the Vice President shall exercise those powers and duties until another President be chosen, or until the inability of the President be removed.

"The Legislature may declare by law what officer of the United States shall act as President, in case of the death, resignation, or disability of the President and Vice President; and such officer shall act accordingly, until such disability be removed, or a President shall be elected."

While the Committee on Style was given no authority to change the substance of prior determinations of the Convention, it is clear that this portion of the draft which that Committee ultimately submitted was a considerable alteration of the proposal which the Committee had received. The records of the Constitutional Convention do not contain any explicit interpretation of the provisions as they relate to inability. As a matter of fact, the records of the Convention contain only one apparent reference to the aspects of this clause which deal with the question of disability. It was Mr. John Dickinson, of Delaware, who, on August 27, 1787, asked:

"What is the extent of the term 'disability' and who is to be the judge of it? (Farrand, Records of the Constitutional Convention of 1787, vol. 2, p. 427.)"

The question is not answered so far as the records of the Convention disclose.

It was not until 1841 that this clause of the Constitution was called into question by the occurrence of one of the listed contingencies. In that year President William Henry Harrison died, and Vice President John Tyler faced the determination as to whether, under this provision of the Constitution, he must serve as Acting President or whether he became the President of the United States. Vice President Tyler gave answer by taking the oath as President of the United States. While this evoked some protest at the time, noticeably that of Senator William Allen, of Ohio, the Vice President (Tyler) was later recognized by the Congress as President of the United States by both Houses of Congress (Congressional Globe, 27th Cong., 1st sess., vol. 10, pp. 3–5, May 31 to June 1, 1841).

This precedent of John Tyler has since been confirmed on six occasions when Vice Presidents have succeeded to the Presidency of the United States by virtue of the death of the incumbent President. Vice Presidents Fillmore, Johnson, Arthur, Theodore Roosevelt, Coolidge, and Truman all became President initially in this manner.

The acts of these Vice Presidents, and the acquiescence in, or confirmation of, their acts by Congress have served to establish a precedent that, in one of the contingencies under article II, section 1, clause 6, that of death, the Vice President becomes President of the United States.

The clause which provides for succession in case of death also applies to succession in case of resignation, removal from office, or inability. In all four contingencies, the Constitution states: "the same shall devolve on the Vice President."

Thus it is said that whatever devolves upon the Vice President upon death of the President, likewise devolves upon him by reason of the resignation, inability, or removal from office of the President (Theodore Dwight, Presidential Inability, North American Review, vol. 133, p. 442 (1881)).

The Tyler precedent, therefore, has served to cause doubt on the ability of an incapacitated President to resume the functions of his office upon recovery. Professor Dwight, who later became president of Yale University, found further basis for this argument in the fact that the Constitution, while causing either the office, or the power and duties of the office, to "devolve" upon the Vice President, is silent on the return of the office or its functions to the President upon recovery. Where both the President and Vice President are incapable of serving, the Constitution grants Congress the power to declare what officer shall act as President "until the disability is removed."

These considerations apparently moved persons such as Daniel Webster, who was Secretary of State when Tyler took office as President, to declare that the powers of the office are inseparable from the office itself and that a recovered President could not displace a Vice President who had assumed the prerogatives of the Presidency. This interpretation gains support by implication from the language of article I, section 3, clause 5 of the Constitution which provides that the Senate shall choose a President pro tempore "in the absence of the Vice President, or when he shall exercise the office of President of the United States.

The doubt engendered by precedent was so strong that on two occasions in the history of the United States it has contributed materially to the failure of Vice Presidents to assume the office of President at a time when a President was disabled. The first of these occasions arose in 1881 when President Garfield fell victim of an assassin's bullet. President Garfield lingered for some 80 days during which he performed but one official act, the signing of an extradition paper. There is little doubt but that there were pressing issues before the executive department at that time which required the attention of a Chief Executive. Commissions were to be issued to officers of the United States. The foreign relations of this Nation required attention. There were evidences of mail frauds involving officials of the Federal Government. Yet only such business as could be disposed of by the heads of Government departments, without Presidential supervision, was handled. Vice President Arthur did not act. Respected legal opinion of the day was divided upon the ability of the President to resume the duties of his office should he recover. (See opinions of Lyman Trumbull, Judge Thomas Cooley, Benjamin Butler, and Prof. Theodore Dwight, Presidential Inability, North American Review, vol. 133, pp. 417–446 (1881).)

The division of legal authority on this question apparently extended to the Cabinet, for newspapers of that day, notably the New York Herald, the New York Tribune and the New York Times contain accounts stating that the Cabinet considered the question of the advisability of the Vice President acting during the period of the President's incapacity. Four of the seven Cabinet members were said to be of the opinion that there could be no temporary devolution of Presidential power on the Vice President. This group reportedly included the then Attorney General of the United States, Mr. Wayne MacVeagh. All of Garfield's Cabinet were of the view that it would be desirable for the Vice President to act, but since they could not agree upon the ability of the President to resume his office upon recovery, and because the President's condition prevented them from presenting the issue to him directly, the matter was dropped.

It was not until President Woodrow Wilson suffered a severe stroke in 1919 that the matter became of pressing urgency again. This damage to President Wilson's health came at a time when the struggle concerning the position of the United States in the League of Nations was at its height. During this period of Wilson's physical limitations, the Cabinet did not meet for a period of 8 months. Major matters of foreign policy such as the Shantung Settlement were unresolved. The British Ambassador spent 4 months in Washington without being received by the President. Twenty-eight acts of Congress became law without the President's signature (Lindsay Rogers, Presidential Inability, the Review, May 8, 1920; reprinted in 1958 hearings before Senate Subcommittee on Constitutional Amendments, pp. 232–235). The President's wife and a group of White House associates acted as a screening board on decisions which could be submitted to the President without impairment of his health. (See Edith Bolling Wilson, My Memoirs, pp. 288–290; Hoover, Forty-Two Years in the White House, pp. 105–106; Tumulty, Woodrow Wilson as I Know Him, pp. 437–438.)

As in 1881, the Cabinet considered the advisability of asking the Vice President to act as President. This time, there was considerable opposition to the adoption of such procedure on the part of assistants of the President. It has been reported by a Presidential secretary of that day that he reproached the Secretary of State for suggesting such a possibility (Joseph P. Tumulty, Woodrow Wilson as I Know Him, pp. 443–444). Upon the President's ultimate recovery, the President caused the displacement of the Secretary of State for reasons of disloyalty to the President (Tumulty, Woodrow Wilson as I Know Him, pp. 444–445).

Recent incidents involving the physical health of the President have again served to focus attention on the inability clause. This time, with the President of the United States himself urging action, further interpretations of this clause have been given.

It was the expressed view of former Attorney General Herbert Brownell that article II, section 1, clause 6, of the Constitution vested the power of determining inability in the Vice President (hearings before the Special Subcommittee on Study of Presidential Inability, House Judiciary Committee, April 1, 1957, p. 30). This view is supported by the present Attorney General (1958 hearings before Senate Constitutional Amendments Subcommittee, February 18, 1958, p. 175. For like expression, see pp. 198–199).

No similar provision exists in the Constitution by which to determine the recovery of the President or his ability to resume the office. In the absence of such a provision it must be presumed to be an open question. The Attorney General in his testimony suggested that it was his view that the powers and duties of the Presidency, once having devolved upon the Vice President, could thereafter be resumed by the President upon his determination that the inability had been removed. At the same time, however, the Attorney General admitted that there was considerable divergence among legal opinion concerning this viewpoint (1958 hearings before Senate Constitutional Amendments Subcommittee, pp. 153–154).

THE PROPOSAL AND ITS ANALYSIS

Section 1 of the amendment would confirm the historical practice by which a Vice President has become President upon the death of a President. It would further extend the practice to the contingencies of resignation or removal from office, which, like death, are contingencies of a permanent nature. The Vice President in such situations would continue to serve as President for the unexpired portion of the deceased President's term. Thus the amendment seeks to separate the problem of inability, which may be a temporary contingency, from contingencies of a permanent nature.

Section 2 of the amendment permits the discharge of the powers and duties of the Office of President by the Vice President as Acting President upon a declaration of the President, in writing, that he is unable to discharge the powers and duties of his Office. This section would make abundantly clear that, when the Vice President serves during a period of inability of the President, he serves only temporarily and is required to relinquish the discharge of the powers and duties of the Office whenever the President of the United States has sufficiently recovered to perform the functions of the Presidency.

Section 3 provides for the contingency where the President does not, or is unable to, declare his own inability. In such a situation the amendment would permit the Vice President to consult with the heads of the executive departments of Government and would require the written approval of a majority of them before the Vice President could assume the discharge of the powers and duties of the Presidency as Acting President.

In utilizing the term "executive departments," the amendment adopts language which already appears in article 2 of the Constitution. Such terminology does not include the military Departments of the Army, Navy, and Air Force. It does include the Departments of State, Justice, Defense, Treasury, Post Office, Agriculture, Interior, Commerce, Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare. The language is such that it may include other executive departments which may be created by the Congress at future times.

In determining whether a majority of the heads of executive departments have given their written approval, only those heads of executive departments are to be counted who have been duly appointed by the President prior to the institution of disability proceedings by the Vice President. This is the meaning of the requirement that the heads of executive departments be "in office."

Sections 2 and 3 provide the means by which a President may relinquish, or be required to relinquish, the powers and duties of his office.

Section 4 contains the method and procedure by which a President may reassume his office on recovery. It also provides a check against the premature return of a President who has not fully recovered from his inability.

Section 4 provides that the President may return to office on the seventh day after making a public announcement in writing that his inability has terminated. However, the amendment further provides that if the Vice President agrees that the inability of the President has terminated, the President and the Vice President may determine an earlier day at which the President may resume the discharge of the powers and duties of his Office, but that day must be after the public announcement. They may decide that the President shall reassume his duties immediately. However, if the Vice President is convinced that the inability of the President persists, the amendment then makes it his responsibility to consult with the heads of the executive departments in office at the time of the announcement of the President.

If he secures from a majority of such officers a written statement declaring that the President's inability has not terminated, he is obliged to transmit that determination to the Congress along with his own written declaration that the President's inability has not terminated. It is then up to the Congress to act as the arbiter in this dispute. If the Congress is not then in session, they are obliged to assemble in special session to consider the issue. If the Congress determines by a vote of two-thirds of the Members present in each House that the inability has not terminated, the Vice President must discharge the powers and duties of the Office of the President as Acting President. The expression of the Congress is to be by concurrent resolution, a method which does not require the assent of the President. The Vice President, after such a determination by the Congress would continue to exercise the powers and duties as Acting President until he was satisfied that the President's inability had terminated or until the Congress, by concurrent resolution, adopted with the approval of the majority of the Members present in each House, had expressed its opinion that the President's inability had terminated. If the President's term ended before either of these contingencies occurred, the Acting President, of course, would likewise cease to act as President.

Section 4 does not permit the Congress by inaction to delay the return of the President to the exercise of his prerogatives for more than 6 days. It provides that if the dispute concerning the President's fitness has not been resolved against him before the seventh day, he shall at that time resume the exercise of the functions of the Presidency.

The first sentence of section 5 of the amendment reenacts that part of the present inability clause which provides that Congress may, by law, provide for the case where there is neither a President nor a Vice President, declaring what officer shall then act as President until the disability be removed or a new President elected. The second sentence of section 5 provides that at any time when there is no Vice President the powers and duties conferred by the amendment on the Vice President shall devolve upon the officer next in line of succession to the Office of President, as provided by the succession law enacted by the Congress.

Section 6 is the usual procedural requirement that the amendment proposed shall not be operative unless it shall have been ratified by at least three-fourths of the legislatures of the States within 7 years from the date of its submission.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, this amendment seeks to remove a vexatious constitutional problem from the realm of national concern. It spells out, with a minimum of change, the procedures which are to be utilized whenever a President is unable to discharge the powers and duties of his Office. In so doing, it recognizes the vast importance of the Office involved as well as the tremendous interest which the people of the United States have in the continuity of the executive power of the United States.

It is a proposal which has been fashioned through the cooperation of both the legislative and the executive branches of Government. It does not, and cannot, cover every conceivable contingency which it is possible for the human mind to imagine. It is, however, a substantial improvement over the existing provisions of the Constitution dealing with the same subject.

Mr. President, I shall write the Attorney General and see if he wishes to testify further on this subject. Also, the subcommittee is prepared to hear any additional witnesses on this subject who desire to be heard. Requests or statements for the record should be addressed without delay to Mr. Bernard Fensterwald, Jr., Chief Counsel, Senate Subcommittee on Constitutional Amendments, U.S. Senate, Washington 25, D.C.

TAXATION BY STATES OF SALARIES OF PERSONS NOT RESIDENTS THEREOF—NOTICE OF HEARING ON SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 67

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Constitutional Amendments of the Committee on the Judiciary, I wish to give notice that a hearing will be held at 10 o'clock a.m., on April 15, 1959, on the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 67) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to limit the power of the States and their political subdivisions to tax the salaries and wages of persons who are not domiciliaries or residents thereof.

IMPORTATION OF RUSSIAN-MADE LABORATORY EQUIPMENT FOR USE IN AMERICAN EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTIONS

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, day in and day out it has been almost impossible to pick up a newspaper and not read that the Russians are supposedly beating us at something or other.

With one sad commentary after another being foisted upon the American public, it is appalling to read now that the Soviets are preparing to sell their Russian-made laboratory equipment to our American high schools and colleges.

Just for a starter, the Russians are sending to this country 6,000 pieces of school laboratory equipment to help us educate our youngsters. Items such as microscopes, projectors, and electronic devices, we are told, are being sold, or are scheduled to be sold, to our schools by the Russians at prices as low as one-fifth of the prevailing prices for comparable American-made items.

INVASION OF MARKET ALREADY STARTED

The Soviet Government's invasion of the U.S. markets, so far as these educational training aids are concerned, has already started. The first sample lot of 26 items arrived in this country only a few days ago.

What is more distressing, those who viewed these samples say there is no question as to their quality. One college scientist has been quoted as saying it would be impossible even to hope to buy articles of similar quality, made in the United States, for six times the price. And we are told there are plenty more where these came from.

To make matters worse, these cut-rate prices even take into consideration the high tariff the importer has to pay to bring this equipment into the country. The average duty on scientific educational materials imported into the United States from Iron Curtain countries is more than 40 percent. This is about as high a tariff bracket as one can find on any legal Russian-made item brought into this country.

REASONS WHY UNITED STATES SHOULD BE CONCERNED

There are many reasons why this matter should concern all of us.

First of all, what of the students themselves—the American boys and girls who will use this equipment? What will they think, what will they have to say about it?

Johnny Smith's first question will certainly be simple. Without any thought at all, he is certain to ask, "How come? How come we are using these Russian microscopes?"

And what will his teacher's answer be? Will he or she tell Johnny Smith that the Soviet-made equipment is better than ours? Or will the teacher say it is just cheaper—that our American schools cannot afford anything better? Or will the teacher say that the Soviet-made equipment is better—and cheaper, to boot?

Then what will Johnny Smith think—the Johnny Smith who represents the hope and the future of our country. Will he go home and think about it, and then come up with the conclusion that perhaps the Russians are better than we are? If he does, God help us.

If some persons are grateful enough and eager enough for this help from the Kremlin, the Communists will doubtless do as much for our youth as they already have for the boys and girls of their own country and of Poland and of East Germany and of Hungary and of other countries behind the Iron Curtain and held in the iron fist of the Reds.

It was only a few weeks ago that one of the chief plotters of our destruction visited this country. Under the guise of a sweet, gentle man who gives candy to babies, Mikoyan roamed about our country, with only one real thought in mind: "How can I soften up these Americans? How can I weaken them?"

Unfortunately, some people were taken in by his fraudulent and deceitful actions.

But when Mikoyan went home, he told his comrades how hard up America is. He told the world how much we need help. And now the Russians are trying to show the world how they and their Communist system can come to our aid.

LATEST STEP IS PART OF OVERALL PLAN

This plan of sending Russian-made equipment into our schools is just another step in the overall Communist plan to unbalance, first one, and then another, segment of the U.S. business community. It is another instance of the economic war which the Soviets have declared.

Only 3 weeks ago, the Communist textile mills priced their goods low enough to get the business—cost or profit being no object. The same is true in this case—except that instead of affecting American textile industry, this one affects the American educational system.

Win friends and influence people, regardless of how much it costs, is the Communist plan—a plan that I, for one, will not buy, and a plan which all America cannot afford to buy.

Communism can afford all kinds of losing propositions in attempting to achieve its ultimate goal. So can we, if we, too, want to resort to slave labor. American slave labor could give the whole world something for nothing. But no real American is willing to pay that kind of a price.

If we want to substitute the Communist system of slave labor for the American system of free labor, we might as well substitute the Volga Boat Song for the Star Spangled Banner.

No one ever gets something for nothing. It is unfortunate that some people are always looking for big bargains, and that they cannot see beyond the price tag.

That is exactly what we are faced with now—a big bargain. At cutrate prices, the Soviets are going to give us the tools, they say, with which to educate our high-school children and our college students.

The trouble is that the price might not be a meager savings in dollars and cents; instead, the price may be freedom. We cannot bargain with our freedom. It is the duty of every American to see to it that no one—no American—bargains with freedom as the price.

Right now, today, is the time to face up to this challenge.

If the day ever comes when we have to rely on the Communist system for anything, then that day will go down as the saddest and darkest one in the history of mankind. It will be the day when freedom and peace in the world will falter and fall. It will be the day when the winds of enslavement will slam shut the doors of hope, and faith, and liberty.

To meet this Soviet economic challenge, it is necessary to act as soon as these threats arise. The threat before us today is the Soviet invasion of our school system.

If there is a shortage of such scientific laboratory equipment in our classrooms, what can be done about it?

First of all, we can make the most of the high-quality surplus equipment which is available in warehouses across the country. Our teachers must be kept informed on what is available.

The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare recently said that such equipment is being declared surplus at the rate of about one hundred million dollars' worth, in initial value, each year.

Although this equipment is available to high schools and colleges, both public and private, he said that only about 20 percent of the items actually find their way into the educational institutions of America. Our schools are not necessarily to blame, because they may not know about the possibilities. I hope that hereafter those in charge of such surplus material will keep these institutions informed.

It was also pointed out by the Secretary that in many cases this equipment, after lying in warehouses for many months, was sold to surplus dealers; and the dealers, in turn, sold them to the schools. One cannot blame the surplus dealers for it. That is their business.

Whether the trouble is that the schools are not exercising a little initiative in obtaining these goods, or that the system of obtaining surplus is such that initiative is discouraged, should be looked into. This equipment is not worth anything unless it is used.

Last week, a national business magazine stated that the Russian-made equipment now being brought into this country includes instruments called spectrometers; and a recent report concerning Government surplus activity listed spectrometers as one of the many kinds of items piling up today in our warehouses where surplus goods are stored.

One of those who viewed the first Soviet shipment was quoted as saying that the Russian-made spectrometers were offered at about one-third the price of the cheapest similar item on the U.S. market today. But by just paying warehousing and transportation costs, the same articles could be obtained out of surplus.

These surplus goods, by the way, were actually used by the Defense Department, the Atomic Energy Commission, and other Federal agencies.

The National Defense Education Act of 1958 provides another means of meeting this threat. That act authorizes the sum of $280 million for grants to State educational agencies for just this very thing—laboratory equipment. These grants would be matched on a dollar-for-dollar basis—which, in effect, cuts the cost in half.

This challenge, which faces us today, cannot be treated in the same way that we might treat an economic situation with a friendly nation. The Soviets have declared war on our economy; and this matter of school equipment is just one phase of it. But this phase strikes at the very roots of one of the greatest American enterprises—the educational institution.

Therefore, so far as the National Defense Education Act is concerned, it would be well to consider amending it in such a way that these funds could not be used to buy this Russian-made equipment.

America must act firmly, following this outrageous incident. This problem confronts American educators, American students, and all other Americans.

This matter is vital to every American employer and every American employee. If cut-rate Russian products are allowed to invade the American business community, every one of our Nation's workers will suffer. American labor cannot and must not be revamped so as to compete with the tainted fruits of slave labor.

Now is the time to fight against this thing.

Now is the time to stop letting these Russian schemes go by unnoticed.

Now is the time to tell the Soviets that we have done a fairly good job without them, that we do not need their system, that we do not want their system—either now or ever. We can do things the American way, the free way.

Freedom is the most sacred and cherished of all possessions. In the world today we see too many people who have lost their freedom because of a few who have buried their heads in the sand.

America is a Nation of principles—the principles of freedom, liberty, justice, and equality. I am not willing to sacrifice these principles for anything—much

less for a few dollars or a few microscopes.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD, in connection with my remarks, an article entitled "Russia's Newest Trade Weapon," which was published in the magazine Business Week; and, also, an article entitled "Russ May Supply Us Teaching Aids," which was published in the Wall Street Journal.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From Business Week, Jan. 24, 1959]

RUSSIA'S NEWEST TRADE WEAPON—SAMPLES OF SCHOOL LAB EQUIPMENT ARE EXCITING U.S. MAKERS AND CUSTOMERS—QUALITY IS SO GOOD AND PRICES SO LOW

Following a pattern laid down in aluminum and benzene, the Soviet Government's next invasion of the U.S. market will come in the school laboratory equipment market. That seemed clear this week as the first sample lot of 26 items arrived in the United States. The Soviet offer: delivery of the items, f.o.b. New York, at an average price only one-fifth of prevailing prices for comparable U.S.-made items.

In the opinion of educators who viewed the sample Soviet items, there is no question of the quality of merchandise up for sale. "They are," as one expert put it, "fantastically good."

"It would be impossible," according to one MIT scientist who carefully inspected the numerous spectrometers, microscopes, navigation instruction equipment, rotators, and the like, "to hope to buy anything of similar quality made domestically for six times the price. They're offering a top-grade spectrometer for $53, f.o.b. New York, including tariff. That's about one-third the price of the cheapest spectrometer on the U.S. market today. And the Russian equipment is good enough for a number of industrial uses too."

GROWING MARKET

The first shipment to be sold in the United States by the Ealing Corp., of Cambridge, Mass., will be valued at $45,000. This will bring in 300 to 500 of each of 12 different pieces of equipment.

The total U.S. market for school lab equipment is currently about $6 million a year. But with the new Federal bill for education, some experts think the total sales potential in the United States could run many times higher in the years just ahead.

AMERICAN WORRIES

Reaction of U.S. school lab equipment makers to the latest Russian move is a mixture of anger and frank incredulity. In an industry dominated by two manufacturers—Central Scientific Co. and W. M. Welch Scientific Co., both of Chicago—most companies admit they can't hope to fight back against price cuts of this magnitude.

Disturbed as they are over what would seem to be a stunning blow to their business outlook, however, they're banking on the belief that this is just another step in a larger Soviet plan to unbalance first one and then another section of the U.S. business community.

"Maybe," a manufacturer of microscopes suggests hopefully, "they'll shift their interest to somebody else soon."

In the past, this has been the pattern—a large supply of Soviet merchandise would suddenly appear on the market, then as suddenly dry up.

Official Washington is even more unconcerned about the latest Soviet economic maneuver. The average duty on scientific educational materials imported into the United States from Iron Curtain countries is about 42 percent, they point out. This is about as high a tariff bracket as you can find on any legal Russian-made item brought into the United States. And it should be enough to protect the U.S. manufacturer, officials say.

MASS PRODUCTION

Why this may not be the case—and why the Russians apparently feel they are now in a position to export quality-grade equipment of this type—is a question that interests industry representatives who have seen the sample items.

One logical answer is supplied by Paul D. Grindle, president of the Ealing Corp. Print order numbers on the instruction books accompanying some of the instruments, he says indicate that, compared with ours, the Soviet school lab instrument industry is huge.

Science education was one of the announced goals of U.S.S.R. leaders, and one of the first things the postwar Russian economy was tooled up to supply. As a result, the Soviet-produced equipment is the only equipment of its kind being mass-manufactured anywhere in the world today.

MORE TO COME

The economics of mass-manufacturing any standard item are well known. Having amortized engineering and development costs, the Soviet production machine has undoubtedly reached a point at which it costs hardly more than the price of materials to extend production of scientific lab equipment a few hundred thousand items more.

This puts the U.S.S.R. in a position to sell its runoff in world markets on a cut-rate basis. On the basis of reports coming out of Russia, the same overrun may occur sometime soon in other things from communications equipment to high-speed cameras. Grindle himself brought back a suitcase full of catalogs of electronic equipment.

MAKING CONTACT

How this particular deal came about is a story of startling simplicity. Ealing's President Grindle happened to notice a picture on the cover of the U.S. Physical Society's Physics Today showing a Russian physics teacher at work in his classroom. On the table top in front of the teacher was an array of lab equipment that would be unusual in a typical U.S. physics classroom.

Grindle asked the U.S. Department of Commerce about the legality of importing sample lots of this equipment and found that it was completely within the law. He inquired about the equipment at the Russian Embassy in Washington and was promptly referred to Amtorg—the Soviet trade corporation in New York. Amtorg suggested a note to the proper authorities in Moscow. This was answered by an encouraging letter and a list of 96 laboratory equipment items that the Soviet Union would be willing to sell, with estimated sales prices.

MISSION TO MOSCOW

Grindle then decided to go to Moscow to look over this bonanza for himself. He found a well-organized sales setup, prepared to handle his requests. Proper Ministry of Trade officials were available for discussions. Raznoexport, the Russian agency charged with handling Soviet consumer products, permitted him to examine any of its sales products.

Almost as startling as this organization and planning is the significance of the quality of the Soviet lab equipment. University professors, looking at the equipment, are flabbergasted at its educational implications. The Soviets seem to have planned it for use in classrooms up to the 11th grade level. In the United States it would be adequate in classrooms up to and including the first year of college.

Moreover, all of the instruments were obviously designed by people who understand and care about science education. "The most awful part about what we saw," says one professor, "is how embarrassingly good it is."

RUSS MAY SUPPLY US TEACHING AIDS—EDUCATORS ENTHUSIASTIC OVER POSSIBLE SALE OF APPARATUS

CAMBRIDGE, MASS.—American physics teachers who have long complained of the high cost and poor quality of demonstration apparatus will be offered a possible solution from Russia.

A dealer here, Ealing Corp., has imported equipment at a fraction of the cost of American-made microscopes, projectors, and other physics demonstration apparatus.

The top brass of science education at Harvard, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, and many others, have been briefed, and reaction has been enthusiastic. Formal presentation of the firm's imports is scheduled Tuesday in New York in connection with a meeting of the American Physical Society.

A recent report by the committee on apparatus for educational institutions of the American Association of Physics Teachers stressed the importance of the equipment bottleneck in the Nation's efforts to step up science education.

"There is widespread and increasing dissatisfaction among physics teachers with the high cost, relatively poor quality, lack of imagination, and paucity of new developments in the current offerings of apparatus supply houses in this country," the report said.

It cited a protective tariff averaging 40 percent and ranging up to 85 percent on such imports generally, with duties on Russian-made apparatus 57 percent higher than on German, Swiss, and British imports.

Ealing Corp. president, Paul Grindle, bought the equipment in a whirlwind tour of Russia last fall.

He has held off active marketing, despite Russian promises that the supply is virtually unlimited, so that leading physics teachers could get a preview.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Hampshire yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I think the matter goes a little further than has been so ably set forth by the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire. Several weeks ago on the floor of the Senate I alluded to this subject, although not at quite so much length.

What is involved in this case, Mr. President, in my judgment, is the possibility of using funds made available by the Congress, and derived from taxes extracted from the people, under our national science program, to procure such equipment as is referred to.

As the Senator from New Hampshire has so well pointed out, no teacher is going to make an explanation of the fact that, regardless of whether there be wage differentials, a dictatorship can take this action as a form of propaganda. But it would come into sharp focus when our own public funds from the U.S. Treasury might be made available for the procurement of these items for teaching and laboratory purposes under programs also authorized by the Congress.

I have pondered the matter; and it has occurred to me that somewhere along the line it is going to be necessary to fashion a delimiting amendment to an appropriation bill, so as to forbid completely this sort of thing, because I do not believe our people want their tax moneys used

for the procurement of goods which come into our country at prices our people cannot possibly match, and have their use only add to unemployment in our own Nation.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, in answer, let me say that the dictators of the world have always begun with the youth of the countries with which they have dealt. Hitler started with the youth of Germany; Mussolini started with the youth of Italy; Stalin started with the youth of Russia; and similar developments have occurred in all the Communist satellite countries.

This development is the first attempt in a definite, specific way to drive such a wedge in this country. I believe it should have the attention of the Congress, and should be stopped.

DEATH OF LT. GEN. FLOYD PARKS

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, it was with profound sorrow that I learned of the death of one of the Nation's greatest soldiers, Lt. Gen. Floyd L. Parks, who died day before yesterday at Walter Reed Army Medical Center.

He rose from private to the rank of lieutenant general, and during his career impressed every nation of the world with his ability to lead troops and his ability to get along with his fellowmen.

Even though he was born in the fine State of Kentucky, we in South Carolina are equally proud of his record. He spent much of his youth in South Carolina, and was a graduate of Clemson College. From there he enlisted in the Army and began his illustrious career. His feats were many, among them that of leading some of the first troops into Berlin at the end of World War II. After the war he served as what we may call "mayor" of Berlin, as he presided over meetings of the combined British, French, and Russian commanders of the occupational forces.

He served as Chief of the Public Information Office for the Department of the Army for more than 6 years. He had the respect of all the members of the press and at the same time did a tremendous job of disseminating information for the Department of the Army. It was this versatility which led him to fame.

Certainly his military service, his leadership, and his friendliness will be missed by the Nation as a whole and to citizens. He was truly a fine gentleman and officer, and we, the people, suffered a great loss in his death.

AUTHORIZATION FOR SECRETARY TO RECEIVE MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE AND FOR THE VICE PRESIDENT OR PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE TO SIGN BILLS DURING ADJOURNMENT

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, notwithstanding the adjournment of the Senate today, authority be given to (1) the Secretary to receive messages from the House, and (2) the Vice President or the President pro tempore to sign bills or joint resolutions passed by the two Houses and found truly enrolled.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

THE FEDERAL RESERVE SYSTEM

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of George Harold King, Jr., of Mississippi, to be a member of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System for the unexpired term of 14 years from February 1, 1946.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, it is a privilege to commend Mr. George Harold King, Jr. to the Senate, and to urge confirmation of his nomination to membership on the Board of Governors, Federal Reserve System. Mr. King has an outstanding record of public service in Mississippi, where for several years he has been an active leader in the banking profession and in the economic development of the southeastern area, as well as the entire Nation. He is thoroughly familiar with the problems which come before the Federal Reserve Board. Since 1956 Mr. King has been a Director, the New Orleans Branch, Federal Reserve Bank of Atlanta, and for the past year has served as chairman of the New Orleans Branch Board.

I predict that his record of service as Governor of the Federal Reserve System will be outstanding.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

THE COUNCIL OF ECONOMIC ADVISERS

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Karl Brandt, of California, to be a member of the Council of Economic Advisers.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of all nominations confirmed today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

UNVEILING ON MARCH 12 OF PORTRAITS OF FIVE OUTSTANDING SENATORS — MODIFICATION OF ORDER

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order previously entered be modified and that the time for the ceremonies in the reception room be extended to 12:30, when a recess shall be declared.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Texas? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

RESTRICTION ON IMPORTS ON PETROLEUM AND PETROLEUM PRODUCTS

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I rise today to protest the inclusion of residual fuel oils for home heating systems in the order issued yesterday restricting imports of petroleum and petroleum products.

The Executive Order 3279 of March 10, announced in today's Federal Register, providing for import restrictions on petroleum and petroleum products, has grave implications for Americans whose livelihood depends upon the export of commodities to nations who earn dollars by sending residual oil and related petroleum products to these shores; chief among the nations affected are Canada and Venezuela who are among the best customers for United States products.

Restrictions on the import of residual oils which are used as fuel for home heating systems can seriously raise heating costs to homeowners and tenants, particularly in New York and other northern industrial States—it will be a real test for the sellers of these fuels. Even today, as I speak here, and while Washington is enjoying the first tastes of spring weather, heavy winter storms have struck in New York and elsewhere in the Nation. I hope the sellers will show self-discipline in this matter.

The cost of living index has been maintained at a fairly constant level since last summer. This holding the line against inflation of the dollar has deep meaning not only to the national economy but to the individual wage earner faced with satisfying his economic needs with a limited income. In the interests of holding this line I last week urged that residual fuel oils be excluded from any restrictions imposed on the import of crude oil and related products.

This is also a very serious matter to all Americans who are engaged in the export industries. Let us remember that

10 Americans work in the export industries for every one American working in the import industries.

Last year import quotas were imposed upon lead and zinc, affecting the trade of nations as widely scattered as Canada, Australia, Peru, and Mexico. The oil import quota order has been the second time trade restrictions have affected Canada and Mexico, previously affected by U.S. lead and zinc restrictions. In restricting a foreign nation's exports to the United States we are also tending to limit that nation's ability to import American goods. And—it must also be kept in mind—such a restrictive policy does not strengthen the economies of just those countries whose economies we wish to strengthen as our allies in the economic war which is so important a part of the cold war.

The New York Times of this morning includes an editorial on this question which points out, in referring to the oil import proclamation, that "to many abroad this will look like still another calculated act of economic warfare by the United States against its friends, an act they will interpret as again repudiating our frequent protestations of desire for the freest possible flow of international trade. It is an unhappy precedent which has been set." The editorial is appended hereto:

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OIL IMPORT QUOTAS

President Eisenhower's decision to set up a system of compulsory import quotas covering crude petroleum and its products is an unhappy victory for a group of special interests whose gain will be at the expense of the general welfare and perhaps, ultimately, even at the expense of those who sought this move. If the immediate aims of these interests are served, the new restrictions on imports will tend to raise the cost of oil and its products, and perhaps also of coal, thus further intensifying the inflationary pressure which, in other respects, the Government is seeking to combat. And if, as is hinted in the President's statement, the Government seeks to police the price of oil and its products by changing the levels of permitted imports in response to price changes in this country, the result will be a further major intrusion of Government control in our economic life, with consequent weakening of the free enterprise system.

The national security argument for these controls is not convincing. This is shown most obviously by the inclusion of Canada in the list of countries whose oil exports to us are curbed, though there is no threat of interruption of seaborne transport in the case of Canadian oil. Beyond that, if serious attention need be paid to assuring sufficient petroleum for future emergency needs there is much to be said for keeping as much of our oil as possible in storage under the ground and increasing, not reducing our use of imported oil.

Nor can we look with equanimity upon the probable foreign repercussions of this move. The Canadian Trade Minister has already protested it, and similar resentment is undoubtedly felt also in Venezuela and other sources of imported oil. To many abroad this will look like still another calculated act of economic warfare by the United States against its friends, an act they will interpret as again repudiating our frequent protestations of desire for the freest possible flow of international trade. It is an unhappy precedent which has been set.

THE NEED FOR REALISTIC AND EFFECTIVE LABOR LEGISLATION

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, as the chairman of the Select Committee on Improper Activities in the Labor or Management Field [Mr. MCCLELLAN] has said, increased public demand for effective labor legislation is most encouraging. As a result of the investigations of the McClellan committee over the past 2 years, the American people have been told the sordid story of abuses, racketeering and corruption that have marked the leadership of certain labor union bosses.

As this story has unfolded before the Nation, we have witnessed a gradual awareness by the public turn to heated anger and demands that the Congress of the United States remove the evil shackles of dictatorial abuses which have been forced upon men and women who cannot defend themselves who are members of our trade unions.

The call for constructive, effective action has echoed often in this Chamber. The cry for remedial measures has been heard throughout the land, and once again hope is offered to the oppressed labor union members who rightfully want only to control their own destinies of their own unions.

The challenge comes forth again today from the editorial columns of one of Washington's three daily newspapers. The Washington Daily News today pointedly asks the Congress to make the necessary decisions so as to provide the protection that is needed for union members and their families, for the public and for decent union officials.

If we fail to enact effective corrective measures, the alternative, as the Daily News states, will be continuation by the Congress of conditions which "protect the mobsters, thieves, extortionists and murders exposed by the McClellan committee."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the Daily News editorial printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BILL OF PARTICULARS

Members of the Senate Labor Committee are working on legislation to curb the labor rackets exposed by the McClellan investigation. So far, the action does not point toward a very strong bill.

The reluctance of the Democrats on the committee, under pressure from the union lobby, to write a tight law is frightening, in view of the McClellan disclosures. Surely they can hear what Senator JOHN L. MCCLELLAN, chairman of the investigating committee, has been saying.

Just this week in a New York speech, the Senator spelled out a bill of particulars in support of stronger measures he himself has proposed to correct the abuses revealed by his long inquiry.

"The instability or lack of integrity prevalent today in labor-management relations in this country is appalling," he said.

In the investigation, "we have had to deal constantly with people of low character or no character at all." Of 1,200 witnesses so far summoned, more than 200 ducked behind the fifth amendment for fear of incriminating themselves. The evils which have been exposed, he said, "are outrageously cruel, corrupt, and contemptible."

"No legitimate union, properly administered by honest and decent officials, would be penalized to any extent or degree whatsoever," the Senator said. "If these provisions are enacted into law, however, the power and opportunity of crooked labor bosses and criminal elements to continue the abuse and exploitation of union members and working people in this country will be substantially curbed and reduced."

That's the issue: Whether union members and their families, the public, and decent union officials will be protected; or whether, by not passing such measures, Congress continues to protect the mobsters, thieves, extortionists, and murderers exposed by the McClellan committee.

How can any honest and decent union officials, or Senators of like attributes, not know on which side to stand?

A BILL OF RIGHTS FOR UNION MEMBERS

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I have received considerable mail in support of my bill, S. 1002. Newspapers in my home State of South Dakota, such as the Sioux Falls Argus-Leader and the Brookings Register, have endorsed my proposals.

At this point in the RECORD, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial from the Sioux Falls Argus-Leader which is representative of the opinion I have received in recent weeks since introduction of S. 1002.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A BILL OF RIGHTS FOR UNION MEMBERS

As a member of the McClellan committee investigating various abuses in the field of labor unionism, Senator KARL MUNDT, of South Dakota, has been disturbed by the sordid revelations of perfidy, graft, and corruption on the part of some leaders. He also has been made aware of the fact that the average union member doesn't possess the power under existing regulations to bring about a correction.

In consequence, he has presented a bill which he describes as "a bill of rights for labor union members." Its primary provisions are:

1. A well-defined mechanism for the nomination of candidates through the employment of signed nominating petitions.

2. The establishment of a representative election committee from the rank and file of labor.

3. The election committee's supervision of the entire election procedure including the counting of ballots.

4. A workable procedure for investigating these elections by the Secretary of Labor following a complaint signed by either 2 percent of the union membership or by any members of the election committee.

5. A workable judicial procedure to invalidate the results of irregularly held elections.

6. A mechanism for the authorization of strikes during collective bargaining negotiations.

7. Barring any individual who has been disenfranchised by any criminal conviction from serving as an officer of any union or in

any employee representative status, during the period of disenfranchisement.

8. An annual detailed report of the organization's financial activities, both to the Secretary of Labor and to the individual members of the labor organizations.

9. Any imposition upon union officers and agents that they handle union funds respectfully and honestly in the nature of a fiduciary trust relationship.

The proposed bill provides both the secret ballot and the honest count, so that those who belong to unions will be able to control their destiny, so far as it can be controlled, by the election of officers of their own choosing; the election of responsible and respectable individuals as their union heads, and the determination of major union decisions by democratic procedures.

Careful observers in Washington have said that the Mundt bill provides an answer that should be embodied in legislation and that it does so more thoroughly and more effectively than any other legislation now being considered.

Union members, it appears, should welcome legislation providing them with an opportunity to maintain their rights in the manner outlined in the bill. Certainly the nasty disclosures before the Senate committee in the past 2 years haven't been good for labor and they must have been most disturbing to labor union members. They should be eager—and we are quite certain they are—to do something to prevent such incidents. The Mundt bill provides them with the machinery through which they can reestablish control and assert their own viewpoints without fear of abuse or retaliation.

DEMOCRATIC PROCEDURES FOR THE CONDUCT OF UNION ELECTIONS AND STRIKE AUTHORIZATIONS

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, the Congress must meet the challenge to bring democracy to the dues-paying members of labor unions. We cannot offer a half-a-loaf compromise on this vital issue. To do so would not only be an affront to the public, but would perpetuate the very difficulties which we are trying to correct.

On Monday, March 9, Mr. President, it was my privilege to appear before the Senate Labor and Welfare Committee to testify in behalf of my bill, S. 1002, which provides democratic procedures for the conduct of union elections and strike authorizations.

Mr. President, I sincerely believe S. 1002 does provide the solution which we seek. I ask unanimous consent to include at this point in the RECORD, part of my testimony before the Senate Labor and Welfare Committee.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS OF SENATOR MUNDT BEFORE THE SENATE LABOR AND WELFARE COMMITTEE IN BEHALF OF HIS BILL, S. 1002, PROVIDING DEMOCRATIC PROCEDURES FOR THE CONDUCT OF UNION ELECTIONS AND STRIKE AUTHORIZATIONS

Mr. Chairman, I want to thank you and the members of the Senate Labor Subcommittee for the courtesy you have extended to me in arranging this special hearing on S. 1002, my "Bill of Rights for Union Members." I sincerely believe that S. 1002 contains provisions which are worthy of discussion and consideration by this subcommittee, and I appreciate having this opportunity to discuss certain aspects of S. 1002 with you.

I recognize that this subcommittee has already reported S. 505 to the full Committee on Labor and Public Welfare for executive committee study and consideration. I will, therefore, refrain from any lengthy discourse on comprehensive labor legislation. My presentation today will be limited to two features of the labor bill which I introduced in the Senate on February 6, 1959. Specifically, I refer to the provisions establishing minimum standards for the democratic conduct of union officer elections and strike authorizations.

I want to emphasize at the outset that S. 1002 is in no sense an anti-labor bill. The requirements established in this bill are neither repressive or restrictive. It is a bill for labor spelled with a lower case "l," meaning the rank-and-file members of America's union-labor movement.

S. 1002 stems from a firm conviction on my part that in our American democracy there should always be a place for honest labor unions, and, conversely, in honest labor unions there should always be a place for American democracy.

I am certain that the vast majority in Congress are sincere in their desire to enact labor legislation which will eliminate corruption, racketeerism, violence, and abusive power from the labor-management field. Our differences of opinion are, in the main, over the approach we should employ to arrive at this common goal. Some believe detailed disclosure of union and management finances is the answer; some feel there should be a greater investment of authority in the individual States; some support more stringent controls at the national level; there are even some incorrigible optimists who believe that given time the evil forces will destroy each other and simply fade away. None of these approaches can be entirely discredited; each has some degree of merit. But I am convinced Congress now has an urgent responsibility to enact corrective and realistic reform legislation.

My bill is based on an approach which we dare not disregard if we hope to enact effective labor reform legislation—I refer to the power of the rank-and-file union members to set things right in the house of labor provided they are furnished with the tools required to do the job.

As you gentlemen know, I have served as a member of the Senate Rackets Committee since its creation. In this Congress I serve as vice chairman of the committee chaired by Senator MCCLELLAN. In this capacity I have been accorded an excellent opportunity to discuss union activities with a multitude of rank-and-file members of organized labor as well as with honest and constructive leaders of the labor movement. These discussions have been carried on in the committee room; in my own office; and in other places. The problems which these good folks have brought to my attention have been varied and different—they have ranged from embezzlement of union funds to the deprivation of employment rights. However, in each case the fundamental source of the trouble, the primary causal condition, has been a deterioration of democratic practices in the conduct of union affairs. Compulsory unionism and, in some instances, monopolistic unionism has aggravated this deterioration.

We, the Members of Congress, have told our fellow citizens that we are going to do something in the 86th Congress to rid this Nation of the evils disclosed by the McClellan committee. We have announced to our constituents that the 86th Congress will secure the rights and protect the interests of the individual members of America's labor unions. Our people have listened with solemnity to these exhortations of their elected representatives. They have reacted in a manner consistent with our grand American tradition. The citizenry of this Nation has issued a mandate to Congress, commanding us to enact effective labor reform legislation. I am firmly convinced that we will have failed in this trust which is ours, if in enacting legislation we ignore the marked deterioration of democracy in American unions.

There is, in my opinion, no hope for eliminating the corruption disclosed by the McClellan committee without the earnest efforts of the union rank-and-file members whose dues support the union movement. They are in the best position to assess the scope and nature of the trouble; they have the greatest interest at stake. They have, I am confident, the intense desire to replace corruption and arrogant power with honesty and responsible leadership. S. 1002 is based on this fundamental confidence in the essential honesty of the rank and file and in their ability to right the wrongs, provided they are given the tools guaranteeing them the democratic right and the effective authority to participate in the administration of their own unions.

To thoroughly understand the intent and purpose of my legislative proposal, I think it is first essential to comprehend the conditions which make necessary the enactment by Congress of certain democratic procedures to be followed by labor unions in the conduct of their affairs.

The primary motivating condition which makes necessary such congressional action, is the marked lack of voluntarism in the organizing techniques of American unions today. Substantial numbers of dues-paying rank and file are not in the organized labor movement as a result of their own free will and volition. An even larger number, who desire organization, have been forced into unions to which they do not choose to belong. Free employee choice is being replaced by organization from the top. If there is any member of this committee that doubts the existence of this compulsory condition, I direct his attention to the 40-odd-volume record of the McClellan committee investigations. Case after case has been revealed where individual choice on the part of the workers was totally ignored in union organization.

The 45 employees of Donald Skaff, for example, who were eventually organized by Teamster Local 332 without a representation election. The 300 members of the Barbers Guild in New York City which were swallowed up by the Journeyman Barbers Union, with an assist by the Teamsters. The organization of the A & P grocery clerks by the Amalgamated Meat Cutters. These are only a few examples, but they are typical of the organizational techniques which have been revealed in over 2 years of investigations.

Certainly a portion of the responsibility for this unwholesome atmosphere is directly attributable to the nonfeasance of various employers. Unfortunately, too many have taken the path of least resistance, and have acceded to arrogant demands of certain power-hungry labor bosses. Their surrender has left their employees without a champion.

But, can we condemn too strongly the employer, who, faced with threats of boycotts, violence, strikes, or blackmail picketing, surrenders his employees to a wanton union official without a representation election? For the employer knows all too well the futility attached to opposition under our existing laws.

Federal laws deny him injunctive relief from the coercive and unlawful acts with which he has been threatened. Injunctive

relief in most instances can be ordered only after a decision on the merits—a decision which may be years in forthcoming.

Understandably few employers have the raw courage or the financial status to stand up to such irresponsible power. Few have the courage of Tom Coffey, the small Nebraska trucker, who valiantly defended the rights of free choice of his employees only to see his business destroyed. One could not help but admire this brave man as he grimly testified before the McClellan Committee, advising that he had never lost a case in court nor a representation election before the NLRB, but he had lost his business and his money.

In bringing these facts to your attention, it is not my intention to occasion a lengthy debate on the merits of voluntary unionism versus compulsory unionism. I have cited these facts to set the stage—to show the conditions that now exist.

I see no inclination in this Congress, as I saw none in the 85th Congress, to legislate with respect to coercive organization. This is the trap in which the union rank and file have been placed. Congress, through legislative fiat, is in large measure responsible for building the trap. Since Congress is apparently unwilling to relax the jaws of the trap, are we then not challenged by an incumbency to establish minimum guarantees of democracy within the confines of the trap? I think that we are. I earnestly believe that we must, by Congressional decree, establish within unions a framework of democracy, which will guarantee to every union member the right of unfettered self-expression in the selection of his leaders and in such vital economic matters as strike determinations.

It seems at this point that some of you might reasonably inquire, "Very well Senator MUNDT, we agree that democratic procedures should be established for union elections and strike authorizations, but does not S. 505 establish such guarantees and procedures?"

Let us see just what title III of S. 505 does provide. It requires that local union elections be held every 3 years and international elections be held every 4 years. It requires that a secret ballot be used and it forbids the use of dues money or employer-derived funds for the support of any candidate. The remainder of section 301 is a compound of worthy but totally ineffectual generalities about democracy in union elections. Exclusive of the three aforementioned requirements, I dare say, it would be virtually impossible to violate section 301.

These broadly phrased requirements and prohibitions are, from an evidentiary standpoint, just not susceptible to judicial proof.

Take for example the nominating requirements. S. 505 requires that, "A reasonable opportunity shall be given for the nomination of candidates." What is "a reasonable opportunity?" I can conceive of a number of sets of circumstances which might be determined by a court as "reasonable" due to the difficulty of proof. However, with clearly defined nominating provisions required in the law, these same circumstances could be easily proven to be patently abusive of individual rights.

Let us consider a union of 1,000 members with a quorum provision allowing official business to be conducted in the presence of 8 members—such provisions do exist. Or, even suppose it's a union with a quorum provision calling for 5 or 10 percent or some other minority percentage of the members to be present. The union secretary, representing the incumbent officers, either announces at a union meeting or posts on the union hall bulletin board a notice that nominations will be received at the next union meeting. The incumbent officers then get their cronies together and hold a closed nominating session at the next meeting. Certainly such practice must be recognized as discriminative but I doubt that in a court of law it could be shown to be less than "reasonable" under the general provisions of S. 505. In my opinion this bill, which has been reported by this subcommittee through lack of detail leaves many gapping loopholes for abuse by conniving and corrupt union officials.

S. 505 even fails to adequately advise union members of the date, time, and place of the officer election. At one point in subsection (c) of section 103 it provides for such notification, and then immediately follows this up with a restrictive proviso which eliminates notification if the electon date is specified in the union constitution. The elimination of direct notice to union members as to the date, time, and place of elections denies to them a privilege accorded by law to every corporation stockholder in America. Certainly for the benefit of the union member this subcommittee should require that notification be made mandatory by law, but I believe the procedure prescribed in S. 1002 is far preferable.

S. 505 is eloquently silent as to the standards which should be established to insure that strike authorizations are obtained by union officials in conformity with democratic practices.

This past week I received a letter from a member of the CIO Steelworkers Union at Pleasant Grove, Utah. This gentleman advised me that many of his coworkers, apprehensive over rumors of a forthcoming steel strike, are strongly in favor of Federal laws which will guarantee that strike votes are taken honestly and democratically. Why, he inquires, do our Senators and Congressmen not pass laws making democratic strike votes mandatory?

What should I say in reply to this man? Should I say, "Congress does not care whether such authorization is democratically obtained?" Or should I say, "Because of the perpetuation of a legalistic fantasy that labor unions are voluntary associations, Congress dare not intrude into the internal affairs of these unions?"

How much better if I could advise this union member, "Congress agrees with you that strike votes should be taken in an atmosphere of democracy and Congress intends to enact legislation which will guarantee that the union members determine whether to strike or not to strike."

S. 505 ignores this important feature of union activity, and in so doing fails to adequately secure the individual rights of union members.

You now know my reasons for proposing detailed, clearly defined, easily understood requirements for the democratic conduct of officer elections and strike authorizations. Let me now proceed briefly to describe the provisions and highlights of S. 1002 as they relate to these two important union activities.

S. 1002 sets forth in clearly defined terms the standards which must be established by all unions for the conduct of officer elections. Its provisions are, in my opinion, a vast improvement over the election requirements contained in S. 505 and S. 748, in that the requirements are clearly spelled out, leaving little room for conjecture or interpretation as to their true intent. Both S. 505 and S. 748 have chosen to employ the broad brush legislative approach in respect to election requirements. Such general provisions are immediately vulnerable to manipulation and contrivance by powerful union bosses or by those who are corrupt.

S. 1002 initially provides that union officer elections will be conducted at regular intervals, and that a secret ballot must be employed in all such elections.

S. 1002 provides a nominating procedure, employing a nomination petition, which must be signed by a minimum of 2 percent of the members in good standing as of the date which precedes by 120 days the date of the date of the election. A specific 60-day period is defined for the filing of nominations. The secretary of the labor organization is designated to receive the petitions, and he is required to acknowledge the receipt of such petitions by a signed statement provided to the nominee. This latter requirement protects against a dishonest secretary, who might otherwise be tempted to eliminate prospective candidates through destroying their nominating petitions.

When one investigates existing union governing documents, and finds unions with 1,000 or more members operating with quorum provisions requiring only 7 or 8 members to conduct official business, the need for a uniform nominating procedure becomes immediately apparent.

S. 1002 authorizes the secretary of the union to certify the eligible candidates for office based on the nominating petitions. He is then required to advise the union members by mail of the candidates so certified.

S. 1002 denies the right of candidacy to any individual who, at the time he seeks candidacy, is disenfranchised by the laws of his own State as a result of a criminal conviction. The record of the McClellan committee hearings should leave little question as to the need for inserting this prohibition.

I now come to that feature of my election requirements, which I feel will most effectively guarantee to union members that their elections are fairly and honestly conducted. This section, which appears at page 3 of S. 1002, provides for the creation of a representative membership committee. Members of this committee are designated in writing by the individual certified candidates for office. No individual can serve on this election committee if at the time of service that individual is an officer or employee of either the local or the international union, or if he is a candidate for office in the forthcoming election. This membership committee is granted exclusive authority for the supervision of the entire election, including the counting of the ballots and the certification of the results.

A committee so designated and so established will of necessity be representative of all the interests in contest in the election. The restrictions imposed on its membership limit materially the pressure which might be brought to bear on an election committee by a corrupt incumbent faction. Such an election committee will serve as a formidable guarantee to every union member that any irregularities which might occur in an officer election or delegate election will not occur unnoticed.

The McClellan committee files are replete with examples of dishonest and irregularly conducted unon elections. Any law enacted by Congress which purports to provide safeguards for union elections must, I think, specifically provide for the establishment of a truly representative election committee to supervise such elections and to assure an honest counting and reporting of these votes. Anything less than that would be a horrible hoax and a blatant fraud for both the public and the union membership.

In the event irregularities do occur in a union election, my bill contains an administrative and judicial procedure to be followed in determining the validity of such an election. This procedure is set in motion by the filing of a complaint signed by two percent of the union members with the Secretary of Labor, alleging that the election has been conducted in contravention of the requirements established by S. 1002. I propose

to amend this provision by making it possible for any one member of the membership committee to initiate the complaint procedure.

The Secretary will then initiate an investigation of such allegation. If the Secretary finds probable cause to believe the verity of the allegation and if the Secretary determines that the alleged violation has a substantial effect on the outcome of the election, he shall immediately bring a civil action against the labor organization, directing the conduct of a new election under the supervision of the Secretary of Labor.

S. 1002 vests in the Federal district court the authority to declare an election void and to order a new election to be conducted under the supervision of the Secretary of Labor, if on a preponderence of the evidence substantial irregularities are found to have occurred. An order issued by the court as a result of such proceedings shall be appealable in the same manner as the final judgment in a civil action, but an order directing an election shall not be stayed pending appeal.

Mr. Chairman, this administrative and judicial procedure provides an orderly course to be pursued in determining the validity of any contested union election, with full protection for the rights of all parties in interest under the United States Constitution.

So much for the election requirement, I will now proceed to a brief discussion of the protections included in S. 1002 with reference to strike authorization. In this matter S. 1002 is unique in that it is the only bill before Congress, within my knowledge, which establishes specific democratic procedures for conduct of a strike authorization.

I submit, it is important for all concerned (employees, employers, and the general public) that there is an assurance that every intelligent and honorable step has been taken to avoid a work stoppage and that a strike, when it finally shuts down an enterprise, is a true reflection of the democratic will of its labor force and has been ordered by them only as a last resort.

The need for a dependable secret ballot in the taking of a strike vote should be obvious to the membership of this committee, for you are familiar, I am certain, with current intraunion techniques of whipping up sentiment by means of union boss propaganda, of conducting the balloting in an atmosphere of ballyhoo and union hall mob hysteria in advance of negotiations, of leaving the administration and counting of ballots entirely in the hands of the union crowd. Balloting in such circumstances and under such conditions could well be an out-and-out farce and represent the very opposite of the democratic action the situation rightfully calls for. Indeed, many a strike has been called that has left the very workers involved in a state of utter bewilderment as to the true issues that brought it about. This encourages attempts at strike breaking and picket line violence, as well as offenses against both persons and property.

It seems essential, therefore, that Congress establish a pattern or procedure for the taking of a strike vote by secret ballot in such a manner as to insure that a strike when called is a true reflection of the will of the employees who are to participate in the strike. To this end S. 1002 would establish the following procedure for a democratic strike vote by secret ballot.

(1) No strike ballot will be taken until there have been 20 days of honest negotiation between labor and management followed by an additional 20-day explanatory period, in which the parties to the dispute will explain fully the issues at variance to the employees involved in the dispute.

(2) If a strike ballot is taken, it shall be conducted by a three-man election committee consisting of one member selected by the labor organization, one member selected by the employer and a third member selected by the two aforementioned members. If the employer fails to select a member within 5 days after request to do so has been submitted in writing by the labor organization, then the member will be selected by the NLRB.

If the member selected by the employer and the member selected by the labor organization are unable to agree within 5 days on the third member, said member will be selected by the NLRB.

(3) The three-man election committee will promptly prepare and distribute ballots by first-class mail to all employees in the bargaining unit involved in the labor dispute with appropriate instructions and envelopes to enable the employees to execute and return the ballots, addressed to a designated post office box accessible only to the election committee as a body. The return envelopes will be prepared in such a manner that the signature of the voter will appear on the outer envelope for the purpose of determining his eligibility to vote in the event of dispute, but it will not appear on his actual ballot so that he can vote in secrecy.

(4) The election committee will then process and count the ballots returned in such a manner that the identity of the individual casting a particular ballot will be unknown to the committee or to any other person. At the conclusion of tabulation, the election committee will then certify the results of the election to the parties to the dispute.

(5) If a majority of the employees voting in such election vote to authorize a strike, such strike may be ordered or authorized by the exclusive-bargaining unit involved, but only after expiration of a period of 20 days, during which the employer and the labor organization shall again have made all reasonable efforts to settle the dispute by collective bargaining.

I believe that this procedure will guarantee a fully secret ballot. It also would assure each union member that there would be no personal reprisal taken against him by either the employer or the union, since neither could possibly determine how he voted prior to sealing his ballot in the plain white envelope.

The original 20-day collective bargaining management, untroubled by the ever-present period would provide a relatively peaceful atmosphere for negotiation between labor and threat of a strike. The 20-day explanatory period prior to the strike vote will be of benefit to the employees, the employer, and the general public, but especially to the employees. It will allow a period of sufficient duration in which the employee may thoroughly inform himself on the issues in dispute and once informed he will have ample time to make a thoughtful, judicious, and independent determination as to whether he wishes or not to engage in a strike. The final 20-day period of collective bargaining, after a strike has been authorized by majority vote, provides an additional period for negotiated settlement, but a period in which the labor organization will have an opportunity to introduce into the collective bargaining proceedings their most powerful tool, the threat of an actual strike which has been properly authorized by vote of the union membership.

I firmly believe that this procedure which I have outlined will do much to encourage peaceful labor-management negotiations, and will eliminate a high percentage of the rashly called strikes, which bring such hardships to the employee and to the general public.

We all know that regulatory laws are ineffective without provisions which encourage obedience. A regulatory law without sanctions is like a watchdog without teeth. Therefore, with respect to the strike authorization provisions, S. 1002 includes two sanctions which I feel will effectively enforce obedience to the regulatory features. Disregard of or refusal to comply with its provisions will result in the disobedient union being denied access to the NLRB facilities and in losing its exempt status under section 501(a) of the Internal Revenue Code.

Mr. Chairman, and members of the committee, this Congress has a heavy responsibility to enact effective, objective, constructive labor reform legislation. I sincerely believe S. 1002 provides effective, objective, and constructive methods for eliminating the primary evils in the labor-management field which have been disclosed thus far by our Senate Select Committee To Investigate Improper Activities in the Labor-Management Field.

There are some who insist that this Congress do nothing—that we sit idly by and hope that these evils will cure themselves. There are some who insist upon repressive and punitive legislation which would punish good unions and honest, considerate labor leaders for the sins of those who throw their weight around and through either misuse of personal power or of union funds—or of both—deny to the dues-paying member his full rights and privileges as an American citizen entitled to govern himself and to determine his own destiny. And there are some who insist that we enact only such legislation as the union labor leaders themselves support, and rely upon it to correct the evils which have developed under existing union labor leadership. For myself, Mr. Chairman, I reject all three of these capitulations whether to prejudice, to power, or to the persuasions of expediency.

Without rancor in our hearts and without malice in our motives, this Congress can and should enact legislation which will restore and reenforce the rights and the responsibility of individual dues-paying rank and file union members to put the American trade union movement back on the high road of service to its membership rather than subjecting it to the pitfalls which come through submission to the coercive powers of bossism when they are present in the labor movement. I believe avidly in the good purpose, the good Americanism, and the good conscience of the vast majority of our American working men and women—whether they be in or out of the trade union movement. I believe that if Congress will provide these union rank and file members with a full set of tools by which they can reach their own decisions and then have them effectuated by action we shall see a prompt and wholesale cleanup of trade unionism in those areas where correction needs to come. I doubt that much, if any, subsequent legislation in this area would then be necessary, and the entire, agitated argument as to whether we should legislate on this subject in two packages or meet the challenge with a single package legislative approach would then be moot. If we fail to provide adequate procedures by which the members themselves can correct the prevailing evils, however, we must then seek and secure specific legislative provisions to meet specific problems and this would be the hard, slow, uncertain method of meeting our responsibilities.

At least, I believe, rank and file American union members deserve the chance to demonstrate what they can and will do once they are guaranteed the right and the procedures with which to deal with unscrupulous labor leaders who pervert the purpose of trade unionism by misusing the hard-earned dues money paid by the members or by establishing themselves as thought-control tyrants seeking to determine how dues-paying mem-

bers shall spend their money, plan their futures, conduct their work lives, and, in some instances, even cast their personal votes.

However, if we are to rely on the sound judgment and the good citizenship of rank and file trade union members to correct the unsavory conditions disclosed by the McClellan committee hearings, we must not hand them a spoon when it requires a spade to do the job. What is needed is a full set of man-sized democratic tools—not a tool kit stocked with kiddy tools and make-believe legislative toys.

Ultimate responsibility for the conduct of the union movement must be designated somewhere. Either in the hands of a Government department or agency where it will be slow and awkward in reaching a decision; or in the hands of the labor leaders where so much of it now rests and where some of it has been so badly abused; or in the hands of the dues-paying members fortified with the procedures for decision, and the power to act where I believe this Congress should have the courage, the candor, and the clear good judgment to put it. I urge you to support such legislation, and I feel an answer of this type is found in S. 1002, which I truly believe would become a genuine new bill of rights for American labor.

EMPTY FEARS AND THE COLUMBIA RIVER CORPORATION BILL

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, last December hearings were held in major cities of four Pacific Northwest States on legislation to amend the Bonneville Project Act so as to provide corporation-type management for Federal power operations in the Columbia River Basin. The hearings have aroused widespread comment in the region among persons concerned over shortcomings in the present procedures for planning, financing, and construction of Federal electric power facilities in the Columbia Basin and for wholesale marketing of energy in the region. To be sure, not all of the comments on the proposed self-financing power legislation have been affirmative. But I have been impressed by the strong support for our proposed amendments to the Bonneville Act from many sources.

In its issue of March 5, 1959, the editor of the Hood River News, of Hood River, Oreg., Mr. Robert C. Hall, has presented a thorough analysis of the corporation proposal. He has cut through some of the emotionalism and propaganda used by opponents of the legislation and has concluded that the proposed Bonneville Act amendments offer a plan for power resource advancement with all the same advantages, with so few of the disadvantages the present setup entails. I ask consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD the Hood River News editorial entitled "Why Are They Afraid?"

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHY ARE THEY AFRAID?

Horace Greeley once remarked that an editorial should never run longer than the editor's pencil. This week, we ignore this wise maxim to shed some light on one of the most roundly confused issues of the year—the proposal to form a Columbia River Development Association (CRDA).

We doubt that any issue of such vast significance to the entire Northwest has received such a bickering, snickering fear-ridden reception by all lovers of the status quo in power development—and that includes members of both the private and public power firms. Particularly sad has been the dogged opposition offered by the Northwest's private power interests.

Generally in agreement with these firms on their aims, we must note, with Bill Johnson, distinguished editor of the Lewiston (Idaho) Morning Tribune that the private firms "seem to be reverting to a pattern of propaganda we had hoped they had abandoned. Their furious, intemperate, irrelevant denunciation of this plan reflects a throwback to days better forgotten."

So let's forget the fears of what this bill is not designed to do or undo, the irrelevancies that you can argue all night long on any power measure. Let's talk about the plan, and what it is designed to do, as opposed to what present power development organization can do:

To get power and irrigation and flood control for the growth and development of our region, we must often have dams. These dams, it has been shown, must be built in a comprehensive, orderly manner for the most efficient use of water resources available from the Columbia River watershed.

A Columbia River Development Corp. has been proposed to supervise the construction of those dams, and the transmission and sale of power produced thereby.

Opponents call this plan dangerous, ominous, a Frankenstein corporation that would wrest control of our resources from the region, give it to disinterested, all-powerful czars whose sole concern is socialization of our power industry.

CRDC opponents say the plan is dangerous because it would give to a five-man board of directors the power to transmit and sell the power that comes from Federal dams built in the Northwest.

That's odd because that's exactly what Bonneville Power Administration does right now. And BPA, we might remind you, is run by non-Northwesterners, where CRDC, performing the same simple function that has worked so well through two wars, might be even more responsive to our needs through its regional directorship. Is that dangerous?

But CRDC would not only do that, it would build its own dams, which BPA couldn't do. This gives CRDC a monsterlike authority over who builds what dams where.

First, let's correct that error. The CRDC can't build dams. It can authorize new dam construction by other agencies, private, public, Federal. Now, if that is such a horrible vision, what must these people think of the present way you go about getting a dam authorized?

First you make application to the Federal Power Commission. Its members are seldom Northwesterners, are primarily politicians sensitive to the pressure of the current political year. And don't kid yourselves. FPC can quash a private application, turn it over to public ownership (or vice versa) as swiftly as any monster you ever saw.

Remember the Hells Canyon circus, the Pleasant Valley absurdity, the countless queer reversals of form by the FPC, all to satisfy political expediency, all making a farce of the "orderly development" concept we need so badly here? Again, would you rather have that, or a regional corporation, politically inclined, of course, but at least inclined to this area, since its members must by law be Northwesterners.

Well, opponents grouse, even if that were a fairer organization to approach for dam applications, it has even a more monstrous power. Even the FPC can't finance its own dams. The CRDC would be able to bankrupt us on a power building binge. There is one of the it-might-happen irrelevancies that only confuses the major issue.

Let's go back to the FPC. Assuming we do get our application past them (and too few private and public builders have been able to do so) what happens, under present law? You go to Congress. You wait a year before enough local Senators can get enough other Senators from other areas to trade a few votes and get the thing authorized. Whether or not the project is a valid one means nothing—it's politics pure and simple. The recent vote swapping for the Hells Canyon bill between Oregon's delegation and the civil right faction should engrave this bitter knowledge indelibly on all our minds.

But CRDC, with a Northwest directorship, can take an application, be it from P.P. & L., a Washington PUD, or the Corps of Engineers, and OK it as the best comprehensive plan for a particular dam, then get right to work and start financing the thing immediately. Which is better, CRDC way or the FPC-Congress approach?

And remember, even after Congress authorizes a dam, it can starve the project into worthlessness through its legal power to allot construction money on a yearly basis.

How many times has a dam, just to appease a Northwest Senator, been authorized by the Congress, then slowly bled to nothingness by later Congresses who have no interest or even knowledge of the dam's importance to us?

CRDC is bold, indeed. It is a new approach, yes. But it has this great advantage. It could grant application and then get the thing financed so we can get moving out here on our power needs.

Obviously, CRDC would have political problems. Who doesn't? Obviously, every application it grants will not be universally praised by all the emotional interest attached to the Columbia River. But how many have been so far?

What objection can be made to a corporation, a legal entity, formed by the five States who happen to worry a lot about who bosses their water rights? It takes over a sound, solid, workable system for getting power to the industries and consumers of the region—the Bonneville Power Administration. In addition, it brings to this organization and area the power of the FPC—to authorize new dams, new transmission facilities. Finally, it takes over one of the functions that formerly had to be assumed by an already overloaded Congress—arranging for the financing of those dams that require Federal funds.

It does all this with one neat 5-man directorship, headed by a general manager. All are appointed offices, just as are BPA and FPC officers. If you've got a power problem, you can go to the corporation. If you want to buy power, you go to the corporation. No matter what you want, you go to one regional organization, operating with the best interests of this region in mind.

Now it may be the opponents of this system are happy the way they are. It must be, or they wouldn't raise such a fuss. They must be happy beating their brains out trying to show the FPC how badly we need dams "way out West." It must be with great joy that they pay vast sums to lobby for a vote on another year's construction money for a vital Northwest dam or reclamation project. It must be with great delight that they run between BPA, the FPC, and Congress, hoping to get all to agree on a vital regional power problem. It must be fun. Why else would they fight a plan which offers them all the same advantages, with so few of the disadvantages the present setup entails?

PERIL IN ACCEPTABLE A-RADIATION

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, in the Washington Post and Times Herald of this morning, there was published an article by staff reporter Edward Gamarekian, in which he pointed out that the American people are being led to believe erroneously that foods with less than the maximum permissible concentration of radioactivity are not dangerous. Mr. Gamarekian has invited attention to the fact that the Public Health Service Advisory Committee on Radiation has cast a serious cloud upon the validity of the terms being used to reassure the public about the permissible limits in the human body for stronium 90 and other radioactive products.

Mr. Gamarekian quotes the Chairman of the Advisory Committee, Dr. Russell H. Morgan, a radiology professor at Johns Hopkins University, as saying there is ample evidence there is no safe level and that biological effects begin above zero.

Mr. President, I do not believe the American people are being reassured. The American people share the uneasiness in the world about atomic pollution of the atmosphere, notwithstanding attempts to soothe them.

Mr. President, this exposed nerve will not be deadened by ready reassurance. We must continue our efforts to get an agreement to halt this pollution of the atmosphere, subject to a workable and trustworthy inspection system.

The proposal I recently made for a last resort effort to reach such an agreement at Geneva has been ably recognized by the distinguished Director of the Washington Bureau of the News Week magazine, Ernest K. Lindley, who, in his column entitled "Washington Tides," of the current issue of March 16, 1959, writes about "Atom-free Air?"

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHURCH. I yield to the Senator from Montana.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, with the permission of the distinguished Senator from Idaho, I should like to have the privilege of having printed in the RECORD the article written by Ernest K. Lindley, which has just been referred to by the distinguished Senator from Idaho, relating to the matter of testing.

I should like to read the last paragraph of the column, which is:

> The CHURCH approach takes account of all the chief elements in a complex problem: Worldwide anxiety about pollution of the atmosphere, Russian objections and the need to test their sincerity, our own security. It would also give us the diplomatic offensive, not just in a propaganda way, but through a solid proposal.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent, with the consent of the Senator from Idaho, that the column may be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of the Senator's remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, I am honored to have the distinguished Senator from Montana take the interest he has shown. I thank the Senator very much.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that in addition to the Lindley article, which the distinguished Senator has asked to have printed in the RECORD, there also be printed in the RECORD an article from the Washington Post and Times Herald of this morning, written by Edward Gamarekian, entitled "Peril in Acceptable A-Radiation."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PERIL IN ACCEPTABLE A-RADIATION

(By Edward Gamarekian)

The American people are led to believe, erroneously, that foods with less than the "maximum permissible concentration" of radioactivity are not dangerous.

Estimates in scientific publications show, however, that if the strontium 90 alone reaches the permissible limit in the human body, it may increase the incidence of leukemia by more than 20 percent—2,600 more cases a year on top of the present annual rate of 11,400.

The effect of strontium 90 and other radioactive atomic products on the incidence of other diseases would be added to this toll.

Although the Atomic Energy Commission and the other agencies involved cannot be charged with concealing these figures, they have made virtually no attempt to make them generally known to the public.

CLIMB EFFECT MINIMIZED

Instead, they have used such expressions as "acceptable," "negligible," "protective," and "statistically unobservable" when the levels of radioactivity climbed in milk, wheat, vegetables, and other foods.

They have pointed out that the permissible concentration of strontium 90 in the bones would produce only about twice the amount of natural radiation that comes from cosmic rays, uranium in the soil, and so on.

Humans have got used to this level, they argue, but they neglect to point out that 10 percent, and perhaps more, of the number of new leukemia cases each year are attributed to the background or natural radiation.

The maximum permissible concentrations, or MPC's, are recommendations set by the International and U.S. Committees on Radiation Protection. These committees have just revised their handbook of MPC's for the various end products of atomic reactions.

HANDBOOK QUOTED

Although the new values have not yet been released, they are reported to be close to the present ones. The following statement was quoted from the new handbook during the current hearings before the Congressional Joint Committee on Atomic Energy:

"The permissible dose for an individual is that dose * * * which in the light of present knowledge carries a negligible probability of severe somatic or genetic injuries.

"Furthermore, it is such a dose that any effects that ensue more frequently are limited to those of a minor nature that would not be considered unacceptable by the exposed individual and by competent medical authorities."

The words "negligible" and "unacceptable" depend, of course, on the user.

When AEC Commissioner Willard F. Libby testified before the Joint Committee a few weeks ago on the radioactivity of Minnesota wheat, he referred to the MPC's as "levels which are generally acceptable for a steady diet."

DECLARED WORTHLESS

Even the Public Health Service has indicated everything was all right by stating that the MPC's listed were "for the protection of the general public."

Two days ago, however, the Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Radiation of the PHS lowered the boom, declaring the MPC's worthless, meaningless, and "based on something other than scientific fact."

"Nowhere is there a concerted effort being made to obtain sound scientific data to obtain answers to the problems," he went on. "It is questionable whether we can continue long in this framework." He indicated the Public Health Service would seek to set up an integrated system of measurement and control, taking this function out of the Atomic Energy Commission.

The Advisory Committee Chairman, Russell H. Morgan, is a radiology professor at Johns Hopkins University and the radiologist in chief at the Johns Hopkins Hospital.

Morgan blasted the theories being put forth by some scientists on the existence of a safe threshold below which there are no radiation effects.

"There is ample evidence that there is no safe level," he said, "and that biological effects begin above zero."

EXHIBIT 1

WASHINGTON TIDES: ATOM-FREE AIR?

(By Ernest K. Lindley)

A sensible way to try to break the deadlock with the Soviets over suspension of nuclear tests have been proposed by Senator FRANK CHURCH, of Idaho. He would seek an agreement solely on supsension of tests in the earth's atmosphere. He would postpone efforts to reach agreement on suspension of tests underground, underwater, and in outer space.

The CHURCH proposal would greatly simplify the problem of inspection, thus going far toward meeting Soviet objections to the present U.S.-British plan. At the same time it would halt contamination of the air, the rising peril which has been primarily responsible for the worldwide clamor for a test ban. There is no fallout from tests deep underground nor would there be from tests in outer space.

The inspection and control system on which the nuclear powers are deadlocked at Geneva is supposed to detect explosions beneath the earth's surface as well as in its atmosphere. (Detection in outer space has not yet been tackled.) Agreement on the number and types of fixed inspection stations necessary for this double purpose was reached at the earlier conference of technicians. But, in addition, in the U.S.-British view, the inspectors must be free to move immediately to the spot of any explosion or tremor. This is because of possible difficulties in distinguishing at a distance between an atomic underground blast and an earthquake.

SPY-SCARY

The Russians have put up two barriers to the operation of such a system. First, they insist that inspection teams inside the U.S.S.R. be dominated by Soviet citizens. This would amount to self-inspection, in which nobody outside the Soviet Union would have confidence. Secondly, they insist on a veto in the control commission. This would enable them to prevent inspection on the spot of suspicious tremors. Khrushchev alleges that the U.S.-British purpose is to gather intelligence—that is, to set up a freewheeling spy system—throughout the Soviet Union.

An inspection system solely for shots in the air could be much simpler and less ex-

tensive. The more powerful shots can be detected by existing monitoring systems on each side. The Soviets might insist that nothing more is needed. Senator GORE implied that no special system would be needed when he proposed that we unilaterally suspend aerial tests for 3 years. I am informed, however, that a fully reliable detection system—the only kind worth having—would require a few fixed stations inside each area in which weapons are tested, perhaps as many as 10 in the U.S.S.R. There would be relatively little need for mobile inspection teams.

The CHURCH approach would cut the ground from under the Soviet contention that we are trying to set up a freewheeling intelligence system inside the U.S.S.R. Nevertheless, it would show whether the Soviets are willing to accept any international inspection. If they are, then perhaps later they will accept more, and some progress can be made toward arms control. If they are not, their bad faith will be exposed.

TWO BITES

There are further reasons for deferring negotiations on suspension of underground shots. The Atomic Energy Commission has concluded, from its October tests, that detecting these shots may be much harder than was supposed when the technicians worked out their plan at Geneva last summer. It believes that more tests, in different geological formations, are necessary to furnish the data for a foolproof system. As a result, it unanimously suggested to the State Department in January essentially the same "two-bite" approach that CHURCH has now publicly proposed. Secondly, weapons testing would not be brought to a complete halt. This is important if for no other reason than to prevent the premature and possibly calamitous disbandment of our teams of scientists and technicians working on weapons.

The CHURCH approach takes account of all the chief elements in a complex problem: Worldwide anxiety about pollution of the atmosphere, Russian objections and the need to test their sincerity, our own security. It would also give us the diplomatic offensive, not just in a propaganda way, but through a solid proposal.

HOUSING FOR SERVICEMEN

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, in my State of Montana and in several other States there is an acute shortage of decent housing for servicemen and their families. Recently the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] and I invited attention to the dire need at Glasgow Air Force Base and Malmstrom Air Force Base in Montana. At Glasgow Air Force Base the situation is so critical that new personnel being assigned to the base are advised to leave their families at home.

In cooperation with our colleague, Representative LEROY ANDERSON, who represents the constituency which includes the Glasgow and Malmstrom bases, we are presenting full information on the critical housing shortage to both Senate and House Armed Services Committees.

The March 1959 issue of Air Force magazine carries an editorial entitled "Housing," which describes the housing shortage in Montana, Michigan, North Dakota, and Ohio.

I should like to quote to the Senate two paragraphs from this editorial:

While Glasgow is more isolated than the other bases we visited, the general picture is about the same at all. Available local housing, except for a fortunate few, is either substandard, too expensive, too far away, or a combination of all three.

We as a nation could do much for our safety, and help the State of our conscience as well, if we would accept the responsibility of providing homes for the men who are defending us. Moving the sergeant's living room close to his airplane may keep Russian boots out of our own.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD, immediately following these remarks, the entire editorial from Air Force magazine.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOUSING

There used to be a phrase to describe a man who had decided to make a career of the military service. We said, "He found a home in the Air Force." Or the Army. Or the Navy.

For a single man this might still be valid. But for the serviceman who wishes to exercise his God-given right to marry and raise a family in decent surroundings it's still a long way from being true. Adequate family housing is still the exception, rather than the rule. And there's no excuse for it. The amount of money involved is minute, compared to the vast sums ticketed for weapons, and the serviceman actually pays for it himself.

There are two reasons why the shortage of homes for Air Force families is not only foolish but dangerous. One is based on the military fact of life that the finest weapon systems in the world are but lifeless hunks of metal until they are vitalized by the brains and hands of men—men who are on the spot when needed, not in some shack an hour's drive or more away. The second reason is fiscal—that it makes little sense to invest half a billion dollars or more in a base and its weapons, with careful provision for the housing of aircraft, trucks, and typewriters, yet fail to risk the 2 percent or so additional that it would cost to house the high-priced men who man this costly gear.

Only recently I left Washington—with its buzzing talk of missile gaps, multi-billion-dollar budgets, and space capsules—to get a firsthand look at why the Air Force desperately needs more homes for its families. I returned convinced that family housing, at the type of base I visited at least, is as much a part of the operational requirement, of the great deterrent if you will, as intercontinental ballistic missiles, hydrogen warheads, or supersonic interceptors.

We visited a segment of the so-called northern tier of bases, some still under construction. With a few exceptions, this northern tier was originally programed to serve the Air Defense Command mission, housing SAGE installations and fighter-interceptor units to stop air attacks coming over the short and inviting polar route to the heartland of the United States. Even before some of the bases were completed, new programs threw on them the additional burden of housing bomber and tanker units of the Strategic Air Command, as part of SAC's policy of dispersing its units and thereby multiplying the number of targets the Soviets would have to take out in an initial attack.

This combination of missions—defense and attack—makes this northern chain of high strategic importance indeed. As of this writing, the very survival of this Nation depends on how well they can do their job.

What does family housing have to do with all this? Plenty. Right now it is by far the weakest link in this all-important chain. At these bases and many others it is an integral part of the operational requirement, part of what it takes to get the job done, not just something nice to do for the boys.

On our northern swing we visited Kinross Air Force Base, 20 miles through the evergreen forests from Sault Ste. Marie, in Upper Michigan; Grand Forks and Minot Air Force Bases, near the cities of the same names in North Dakota; Glasgow Air Force Base, Mont., Malmstrom Air Force Base, outside Great Falls, Mont., with a stop at Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Dayton, Ohio, where SAC and ADC missions have been superimposed on the great complex of Headquarters, Air Materiel Command.

At each the problem was basically the same. The Air Defense Command operational requirement calls for its alert personnel to live not more than 5 miles or 10 minutes from their duty station. SAC gives its people a little more time—10 miles or 20 minutes. At none of the bases visited was housing available off the base that met these time-distance criteria for more than a handful of people. And in some cases, not even for the handful.

Take the most dramatic example, Glasgow, scheduled, when completed, to house McDonnell F–101B interceptors for ADC and Boeing B–52 bombers and KC–135 tankers for SAC. By June 1962 it will have a complement of about 3,500 uniformed personnel and 300 civilian employees. Glasgow, Mont., population generously estimated at about 7,000 (last census showed 3,821), is the nearest town of any size, and it is 20 miles away by a narrow, two-lane highway. On the half-hour ride into town we passed three farmhouses.

When the base is fully manned, it is estimated that almost 1,400 officers and airmen in the upper grades (the only ones now eligible by law for on-base housing) will need homes for their families. In addition, Air Force experience factors indicate that almost 600 airmen in the lower grades will want to bring their families to Glasgow.

Where will they live? On base now are 267 family housing units, built by the Army's Corps of Engineers under the military construction program by direct appropriation at an average cost of $20,100 apiece. These are no bargain even at the high construction costs prevalent in the area. A SAC first sergeant told me of a day when the temperature was an even zero, with a 40-knot wind. He turned up the thermostat full blast but couldn't coax the temperature in his living room above 60 degrees.

Some 460 additional units are being built on the base under provisions of the Capehart-Rains Act (more on this later) with another 300 units hoped for but not yet approved. At best this adds up to 1,027 units, leaving a balance of nearly 1,000 families who will be unhoused.

According to the theory of the Department of Defense, which must approve Air Force housing programs, this balance must be ascribed by the local community. At Glasgow this is about like trying to stuff 6 pounds of sand into a 5-pound bag. The civic leaders there are sympathetic and want to be helpful, but there is little they can do.

We chatted with them over coffee and cookies in a downtown cafe—the mayor, the president of the chamber of commerce, the bank president, the newspaper publisher, the superintendent of schools, the chairman of the housing committee. The latter, Mr. O. H. Bundy, explained this situation. Available local capital is just about enough to finance the normal expansion of the town—50 to 60 family housing units per year. There is little or no hope of building privately financed rental housing on a speculative basis. When the base was first

planned, for Air Defense Command units only, the town figured it could muddle through somehow. But when the SAC units were programed in, as Mr. Bundy put it, "we got a bigger package than we bought."

And if, in a burst of wild optimism, one imagined that housing might become available overnight in Glasgow, it is still 20 miles and at least half an hour's driving time away under ideal weather conditions.

The only rational solution is to build housing on the base under title VIII of the National Housing Act, called the Capehart-Rains law from the Senator and Representative who cosponsored it. Briefly, the Capehart-Rains law calls for housing to be built, under private contract with the lowest bidder, with the mortgage insured by the Federal Housing Administration and payment guaranteed by the military services. The contractor must obtain his own financing and the mortgage payments are made from the rental allowances of the officers and airmen involved. The Government is not out of pocket unless the base is later closed, in which case it is holding the bag for an infinitely larger investment in the base facilities.

At the moment there are several reasons why this is only a partial answer. First of all, the Capehart-Rains law expires at the end of the current fiscal year (June 30). It must be extended and probably will be by a friendly Congress. Second, current policies of the Department of Defense place a ceiling for onbase housing of 55 percent of the requirement at an overage base and 75 percent at remote places like Glasgow—the balance to be absorbed by the local community.

What happens when the local community can't absorb this balance—or when there isn't even a local community within the time-distance criteria—is a question which the Defense Department answers with a figurative shrug.

Third, even a hundred percent fulfillment of the authorized requirement through Capehart-Rains housing leaves unanswered the problem of shelter for the families of married airmen of the four lower grades. These, while granted modest housing allowances, are presently not entitled to housing even on bases where it might be available. They must turn to local community resources, and the fact that their rental allowances are not high—in the $60 to $75 range—means that it isn't economically practical to build speculative rental housing for them. In most cases, they must leave their families somewhere else.

At some bases a partial solution is found in a provision of the law which permits the Government to buy Wherry Act housing (built several years ago under different legislation) and renovate and remodel them. Unfortunately, Wherry housing, while it was welcome relief at the time it was built, was constructed under a price ceiling of $11,000 per unit and after 5 years or so of occupancy much of it is marginal. And funds for rehabilitation have been forthcoming in only a few instances.

While Glasgow is more isolated than the other bases we visited, the general picture is about the same at all. Available local housing, except for a fortunate few, is either substandard, too expensive, too far away, or a combination of all three. At Minot I talked with an airman first class with 10 years' service. He has five daughters. The baby shares a bedroom with him and his wife. The other four girls are crammed into another bedroom. At Great Falls the wife of a lieutenant colonel with almost 20 years' service told me they were anxiously waiting for their Capehart-Rains house to be finished.

"We go over and look at it every time we get a minute," she said. "It will be the first chance we've had to live like a colonel's family should be able to."

By July 1962, 1,100 families will need housing at Kinross AFB, Mich., 1,500 at Grand Forks, another 1,500 at Minot, 1,700 at Malmstrom. And so it goes.

Action is urgently required. While we accelerate our missile programs and make grand plans to put man into space, we must remember that even a spaceman has to come down sometime, and when he does he'd like to have a decent home to head for.

What kind of action?

1. Extension of the present Capehart-Rains law, with improvements if possible.

2. Legislation to make permanent the present quarters allowances for airmen in the four lower grades. The present allowances are a temporary measure, enacted to ease the financial burden for men recalled to duty in the Korean war. If the allowances were made permanent, then onbase housing could be programed for these men.

3. Substandard, overpriced housing in adjacent communities must not be counted as an asset when programing housing needs.

4. Where the local community cannot provide adequate rental housing commensurate with quarters allowances, the Department of Defense ceiling for Capehart-Rains housing should be raised from 75 to 90 percent. (One hundred percent is not realistic since one simply cannot program that closely. The number of married men with families assigned to a given base will vary from the averages for the Air Force as a whole.)

5. Consideration of the housing problem on an individual basis, judging each base in terms of mission and location rather than clinging to unrealistic blanket criteria.

Of the above factors, most crucial is a change of heart on the part of a hitherto adamant Department of Defense. This year it cut a proposed 20,000-unit program for the Air Force down to 8,000 units, and thus far it has stubbornly resisted attempts to raise the ceiling at remote installations. One might almost think that the housing money was coming out of the personal funds of Defense officials, rather than out of the pockets of the airmen themselves.

One way to improve the present Capehart-Rains arrangement would be to adjust the cost limits so as to reflect varying construction costs in various parts of the country. The present law says that the average cost per unit in a Capehart-Rains project cannot be above $16,500. This means that in high-cost areas, like the northern tier bases, the $16,500 buys a minimum of house, since a big chunk must go for heating units, insulation, basements, and the general high cost of shipping in materials from long distances. On the other hand, the same amount of money in Florida buys a good deal more.

Another improvement would be to set aside, where possible, a little of the Capehart-Rains money to be spent on the kind of facilities provided by the average community—playgrounds, baseball diamonds, tennis courts, a community building for youth activities.

More than a hundred years ago an Englishman named Sydney Smith wrote:

"A comfortable house is a great source of happiness. It ranks immediately after health and a good conscience."

We as a Nation could do much for our safety, and help the state of our conscience as well, if we would accept the responsibility of providing homes for the men who are defending us. Moving the sergeant's living room close to his airplane may keep Russian boots out of our own.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RECESS—CEREMONIES IN THE RECEPTION ROOM

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. After the ceremonies in the Reception Room the Senate will reassemble. I invite my colleagues to join us in the Senate Reception Room.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Under the order previously entered the Senate will now stand in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Thereupon, at 12:40 p.m., the Senate took a recess subject to the call of the Chair.

The Senators proceeded to the Reception Room of the Senate.

RESUMPTION OF LEGISLATIVE SESSION

On the conclusion of the ceremonies in the Reception Room at 1 o'clock and 43 minutes p.m., the Senate reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. BIBLE in the chair).

PRINTING OF PROCEEDINGS AT UNVEILING OF PORTRAITS OF FIVE OUTSTANDING SENATORS

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD of today the report of the proceedings earlier in the day in the Reception Room of the Senate at the unveiling of the portraits of the five outstanding Senators who were today honored.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Arizona? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. HAYDEN. I also ask unanimous consent that the proceedings be printed as a Senate document, with illustrations, notwithstanding the rule of the Joint Committee on Printing, which I am sure will be abrogated in this instance.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Arizona? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The transcript ordered to be printed in the RECORD and as a Senate document is as follows:

PROCEEDINGS ON THURSDAY, MARCH 12, 1959, 12:40 P.M., IN THE SENATE RECEPTION ROOM OF THE UNITED STATES CAPITOL, WASHINGTON, D.C., ON THE OCCASION OF THE UNVEILING OF THE PORTRAITS OF FIVE OUTSTANDING SENATORS: HENRY CLAY, OF KENTUCKY; DANIEL WEBSTER, OF MASSACHUSETTS; JOHN C. CALHOUN, OF SOUTH CAROLINA; ROBERT M. LA FOLLETTE, SR., OF WISCONSIN; ROBERT A. TAFT, OF OHIO

The PRESIDENT pro tempore (Mr. HAYDEN). Mr. Vice President, my col-

leagues in the Senate, and distinguished guests, if the audience will please rise and come to order, the Reverend Frederick Brown Harris, Chaplain of the Senate, will deliver the invocation.

INVOCATION

The Reverend Frederick Brown Harris, Chaplain of the Senate, delivered the following invocation:

Our Father God, in this shrine of each patriot's devotion we come this day to fulfill the ancient admonition, "Let us now praise famous men, such as did bare rule, men renowned for their power, giving counsel by their understanding—leaders of the people by their wisdom, rich in their ability, honored in their generation, and who were the glory of their times."

In this high hour, as the likeness of national leaders who have stamped their image and superscription on the life of the Republic are unveiled for a perpetual remembrance, in this monumental edifice where their voices were heard, may we here be dedicated to the national tasks they left unfinished.

Through these windows of history to our grateful eyes is unrolled a panorama of this Nation which under Thee has held aloft the torch of a liberty which enlightens the world.

May these pictured lips speak to the endless procession of legislators and visitors within the gates of the Capitol words of inspiration, of caution, of loyalty, of devotion, and of defense to the death for all that is wrapped up in that radiant phrase, "the American dream."

As we emulate those who are here set up as a beacon light of a Nation's faith, save us from the fear and hate which are the tyrant's bitter harvest, and from the scorn of coming generations should we be recreant to our trust.

As we—their successors—face the cause of the Republic in a turbulent day, preserving the goodly heritage they have bequeathed, may these statesmen of other days who here stand guard at the very portals of a Chamber of Governance be inspiring symbols of that cloud of witnesses, out of heroic yesterdays, by which we are surrounded in these latter days of decision and destiny.

We ask it in the name of the Master of all good workmen. Amen.

INTRODUCTORY REMARKS BY SENATOR HAYDEN

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Unfortunately, the hospitalization of Senator THOMAS C. HENNINGS, JR., chairman of the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration, makes it impossible for him to be with us today, and he has asked me to preside in his stead. Senator HENNINGS has forwarded to me a brief statement, which I now read:

I regret exceedingly that ill health prevents my attendance at the proceedings honoring the five outstanding Senators whose portraits are being unveiled in the Senate Reception Room today. It was a high honor for the members of the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration to approve the five paintings which will soon be displayed and to arrange these fitting ceremonies to memorialize these great statesmen who served their States and their Nation with unique distinction in the U.S. Senate. Their portraits enshrined here in our midst will serve as constant reminders of their loyal stewardship and our rich heritage.

It is a great privilege for me to preside at these historic ceremonies. We are gathered to pay homage to five great Americans whose portraits now grace the five medallions on the walls around us.

The names Henry Clay, Daniel Webster, John C. Calhoun, Robert M. La Follette, Sr., and Robert A. Taft, are known and revered throughout our Nation and the free world. By dedicated public service and unstinted patriotism each of these illustrious former Senators has, in his turn, made profound contributions to our democratic way of life. I shall leave more specific tributes to the able speakers who follow on the program.

At this time I should like to identify some of the distinguished guests in our audience and ask that they stand and be welcomed.

First, the three members of the Commission who supervised the accomplishment of the paintings:

David E. Finley, Chairman, Commission of Fine Arts, as Chairman. [Applause.]

John Walker, Director, National Gallery of Art. [Applause.]

The remaining member of the Commission, J. George Stewart, Architect of the Capitol, had planned to be with us, but is now confined to his home by illness.

Next, the artists whose works we are about to view:

Mr. Allyn Cox, who created the likeness of Senator Henry Clay. [Applause.]

Mr. Adrian Lamb, who created the likeness of Senator Daniel Webster. [Applause.]

Mr. Arthur Conrad, who created the likeness of Senator John C. Calhoun. [Applause.]

Mr. Chester La Follette, who created the likeness of Senator Robert M. La Follette, Sr. [Applause.]

Mr. Deane Keller, the remaining artist, who created the likeness of Senator Robert A. Taft, sent his deep regrets that he is unable to join with us today. He is represented, however, by his sister, Miss Caroline Keller. [Applause.]

We are also honored in having with us today:

Miss Henrietta Clay, great-granddaughter of Henry Clay. [Applause.]

Mr. John C. Calhoun, great-grandson of John C. Calhoun. [Applause.]

Mr. Allston D. Calhoun, great-great nephew of John C. Calhoun. [Applause.]

Miss Fola La Follette and Miss Mary La Follette, daughters of Robert M. La Follette, Sr., and sisters of Senator Robert M. La Follette, Jr. [Applause.]

Mr. William Howard Taft III, son of Robert A. Taft. [Applause.]

In addition, we are privileged to have with us Mr. Holmes Alexander, the author of the book entitled "The Famous Five," whose volume was inspired by the Senate action which we today consummate. [Applause.]

ADDRESS BY THE VICE PRESIDENT

Our first speaker is the President of the Senate, Vice President NIXON, who has himself served as a Member of the Senate. He will speak to us on the historical significance of the occasion. I am pleased to present the Vice President of the United States. [Applause.]

The VICE PRESIDENT. Senator HAYDEN, my colleagues in the Senate, our distinguished visitors, and guests, this is one of the proudest days in the history of the Senate, because we honor not only five heroic figures who served in the Senate, but at the same time we honor the hundreds of others throughout the years who have borne the proud title of U.S. Senator.

In speaking of the historic significance of this occasion, I recognize that those who will follow me will refer to the lives of the five men whose portraits are about to be unveiled. It occurred to me that it would be appropriate for me to refer to the Senate itself and the free institutions of which it is one of the most outstanding symbols.

I do not need to tell this audience that 180 years ago there were grave doubts in many parts of the world—and even in our new, young country itself—as to whether the American experiment in free government would work. Those doubts existed not only because of the military weakness of the Nation at that time, the diversity of its population, and all the other manifold problems which necessarily confronted a country embarking upon self-government. They existed also because it was felt in many quarters that the form of government which the people of the United States had adopted as their own gave to men too much freedom, and gave to a body, such as the Senate of the United States, for example, too much influence in the Government—too much control of Executive decisions, particularly in matters of foreign policy.

We often hear that ours is a government of laws rather than of men. Certainly this is true. But, we also know that the most perfect law, the most perfect constitution, the most perfect rules of procedure may not be successful in operation unless there are men who are adequate to the tasks to which they are assigned. This is especially true of the Senate of the United States, because in the Senate great freedom is provided for debate and for criticism of the Government's policies, foreign and domestic. The very fact that throughout the years this freedom has prevailed, but, nevertheless, has been used with such restraint that America in its relations with foreign countries has always presented a united front, is indeed a tribute not only to the system, not merely to these five men, but, also to the men and women of all parties who throughout 180 years have served in the U.S. Senate.

In speaking of the historic significance of this occasion, I might add that the unveiling of the portraits today is the culmination of a movement which may

have begun 89 years ago. In 1870 a Senator from the State of Vermont, Senator Morrill, wrote to the Architect of the Capitol, suggesting that an artist be commissioned to paint some portraits to be placed in the five areas in which these portraits will be hung today. No action was taken. Or should I say that the Senate acted in its usual, very deliberate way? [Laughter.]

However, I think we will all agree that after 89 years the decision which has been made—a decision of which Senator KENNEDY will speak—is one in which we could not find greater agreement. As visitors from all over the world and from our own country come into this Reception Room—particularly the schoolchildren who pass through here by the thousands in the vacation and summer periods—and as the Members of the Senate visit this room, they will see the portraits of these great heroic figures who, in large part, made the history of the Senate and contributed so much to the history of the United States. They will be inspired to render unselfish, dedicated service to their country and to the cause of peace and freedom, for which the Senate and the Government of the United States so proudly stand.

I am honored, as the President of the Senate, to participate in this ceremony and to congratulate the members of the committee and the Members of the Senate who had the foresight and the vision to plan this use of the Reception Room so that throughout the years it will be possible for the people of the United States who come here to be reminded of the history and, moreover, the great destiny of our country. [Applause.]

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. During the 1st session of the 84th Congress the Senate adopted a resolution which reads, in part, as follows:

Whereas the Reception Room in the Capitol outside the Senate Chamber was originally designed to contain medallion likenesses of outstanding Americans; and

Whereas there are at present five unfilled spaces in the Senate Reception Room for such medallions; and

Whereas it is in the public interest to accomplish the original objective of the design of the Senate Reception Room without further delay: Therefore be it

Resolved, That there is hereby established a Special Committee on the Senate Reception Room, consisting of five Members of the Senate to be appointed by the President of the Senate, one of whom shall, at the time of appointment, be designated as chairman of the committee * * *.

It shall be the duty of the committee to select five outstanding persons from among all persons, but not a living person, who have served as Members of the Senate since the formation of the Government of the United States, whose paintings shall be placed in the five unfilled spaces in the Senate reception room.

ADDRESS BY SENATOR KENNEDY

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The first speaker I shall present served as chairman of the special committee provided by the resolution I have just read. He and the other eminent members of the committee deserve our special gratitude for the thoroughness of their study and the wisdom of their choices.

Ladies and gentlemen, Senator JOHN F. KENNEDY, of Massachusetts. [Applause.]

Senator KENNEDY. Senator HAYDEN, Members of the Senate, ladies, and gentlemen, this historic occasion brings to mind the warning given to me during my service as chairman of the committee selecting these Senators by the distinguished historian Samuel Flagg Bemis. He told me that another large portrait of Daniel Webster graced the anteroom of the Secretary of State, as one of the outstanding occupants of that office—but that, after Mr. Bemis' book documented Webster's laxity in certain financial matters, the portrait suddenly and mysteriously disappeared, apparently condemned to a more obscure spot elsewhere in the department. [Laughter.]

I hope that no Senator, now or in the future, will demand that any of these five portraits be removed. But neither should Senators be under any illusion that these are five noncontroversial choices. We are more familiar with the controversies which surrounded Taft and La Follette. But let us also remember that it was said of Henry Clay that "he prefers the specious to the solid, and the plausible to the true. He is a bad man, an imposter, a creater of wicked schemes." Those words were spoken by John C. Calhoun. [Laughter.]

On the other hand, who was it who said that Calhoun was a rigid fanatic, ambitious, selfishly partisan and sectional "turncoat", with "too much genius and too little common sense," who would either die a traitor or a madman? Henry Clay, of course. [Laughter.] When Calhoun boasted in debate that he had been Clay's political master, Clay retorted: "Sir, I would not own him as a slave." Both Clay and Calhoun from time to time fought with Webster; and from the other House, the articulate John Quincy Adams, with old-fashioned New England courtesy, viewed with alarm "the gigantic intellect, the envious temper, the ravenous ambition and the rotten heart of Daniel Webster." [Laughter.]

Nevertheless, recognizing the controversies that surrounded these names, and recognizing that no group of either Senators or historians would necessarily reach the same conclusions, it is a source of satisfaction to the special committee—composed of Senator Richard B. Russell, of Georgia; Senator Styles Bridges of New Hampshire; Senator Mike Mansfield, of Montana; former Senator John Bricker, of Ohio; and myself—that they were unanimous in their choices. In order to emphasize the nonpartisan nature of the committee, I note that none of the five Senators who have been chosen for honoring today were members of the Democratic Party. And we took pride in the fact that Clay, Webster, Calhoun, and La Follette were among the top five receiving the most endorsements from our panel of 150 scholars; that the same four names were also among the top five receiving the most endorsements from those Senators who responded to our inquiry; and that the late Senator Taft, whose name completes the five recommended by our committee, was the first choice of the Senators who responded and among the first 10 recommended by scholars. [Applause.]

It was the committee's hope, and the hope of the authors of the Senate resolution—Senator JOHNSON of Texas and his colleague, former Senator Knowland—that the interest evoked by this project would call attention in these critical times to the high traditions of the Senate, and its significant role in our history, for those traditions are best exemplified, in our opinion by these five men:

Henry Clay, of Kentucky, probably the most gifted parliamentary figure in the history of the Congress, whose tireless devotion to the Union demonstrated that intelligent compromise required both courage and conviction.

Daniel Webster, of Massachusetts, the eloquent and articulate champion of "Liberty and Union, now and forever, one and inseparable."

John C. Calhoun, of South Carolina, the intellectual leader and logician of those defending the rights of a political minority against the dangers of an unchecked majority.

Robert M. La Follette, Sr., of Wisconsin, a ceaseless battler for the underprivileged in an age of special privilege, a courageous independent in an era of conformity, who fought memorably against tremendous odds and stifling inertia for the social and economic reforms which ultimately proved essential to American progress in the 20th century.

And, finally, Robert A. Taft, of Ohio, the conscience of the conservative movement and its most constructive leader, whose high integrity transcended partisanship, and whose analytical mind candidly and courageously put principle above ambition.

These are the five men whom the Senate honors today. This Nation, I know, will honor for all time to come these men and all those who seek to follow in their hard path. [Applause.]

ADDRESS BY SENATOR JOHNSON OF TEXAS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The love of country and the parliamentary skill of our next speaker indeed echo the greatness of the men whose lives we today commemorate. It is especially fitting, therefore, that the Presiding Officer now recognize the distinguished majority leader of the Senate, the Honorable LYNDON B. JOHNSON. [Applause.]

Senator JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Vice President, Mr. President pro tempore, Senator KENNEDY, distinguished guests: I felt very much indebted to this outstanding committee of Members of the Senate, at the time when the selections of the Senators to be honored were made, for their diligence and their judgment in connection with this undertaking.

This project is very close to my heart. At a certain moment, some 3 years ago, my heart was a very especial subject of

interest to me. [Laughter.] For 2 months following the period of July 2, I had few communications; but the President of the United States and the distinguished Vice President indicated some interest and concern in me, and came to see me.

During my stay at the naval hospital, at one time, when I was at a low point, an interesting development occurred. A tailor had measured me for some new suits the day before I had my heart attack. Following the attack, he telephoned to inquire whether I still wanted the two suits I had ordered. [Laughter.] My doctor told me that the first time he was really sure that I was going to live was when I told Lady Bird to tell the tailor that of course I would want them, and that I would need the blue one, whatever happened. [Laughter.]

The next day or so, two great Americans came into my room—Earle Clements, the acting majority leader, and Bill Knowland, of California, the great minority leader. I reviewed with them what had transpired in connection with this room, and expressed the hope that someday the leaders would have their offices near the Senate Chamber, and that we would proceed to carry out the original plans.

They returned to the Capitol that afternoon from the hospital and presented the resolution which has been read in my name. I was designated the chairman—only to find that I was unable to carry out that responsibility. So I suggested as chairman the very able and gifted Senator who has just made such an excellent presentation—Senator JACK KENNEDY.

For all those who have served in the Senate—or who do serve now—this is, I am sure, a very moving and deeply personal moment.

We meet to pay honor to five great men. Five of our best Senators have made the choices. Yet in a real sense we have met here to honor the institution of the Senate which all of us love so much, for what it is, and for what it has always been in our system: the testing place for the character of the living generations of Americans.

The names of those whose portraits hang on these walls—Clay, Calhoun, Webster, La Follette, Taft—are names which history already honors greatly. Our recognition here can add little to the stature and esteem already so securely theirs. Yet by this action we remind ourselves—and perhaps remind the entire Nation—of some of the most important enduring values.

History has not had to seek out these men, to give to them their due. They were honored men in their own times, even though frequently they were criticized.

Their contemporaries, as well as their heirs and successors, recognized and acknowledged in each of them an authentic greatness. I know that each Member of the Senate present today who has had the privilege of serving with Bob Taft as a Senator or under him as a leader will confirm that statement.

This, we realize, is rare. Yet when we consider the place these men hold in history, the rarity of it is explained.

Clay, Calhoun, Webster, La Follette, and Taft are—for Americans—synonyms for character.

The works of these men are—in the main—obscured by the passing of time. By our values of today, not all their works would always meet with our approval or agreement. Nor would their methods always be acclaimed now, just as they were not by contemporaries.

But the greatness that emerges from each of them and towers high is the greatness of character.

In a forum where character is tested—not only the character of the men but of the times and the people they serve—these five Americans met and passed every exacting test.

Significantly, I feel, it can be said that they did so for still another trait each displayed in common: they were all, individually, masters of this institution of freedom, the Senate of the United States.

Among them were men who aspired, at times, for other roles. Most of them, in fact, found less than complete fulfillment of their aims and of their convictions. Yet each of them when entrusted with the responsibilities of duties here in the Senate served, above all, as a good and great U.S. Senator—as one who understood the Senate itself, and who saw to it that the Senate served the demands of the period.

The strength of democracy is the strength of its enduring institutions—and the strength of those institutions is the strength of men, such as these men, who willed the whole of their abilities to the cause to which they were dedicated.

It is for this dedication that these men have won the place they hold in the Nation. It is this special quality which the five able outstanding Members of the Senate who served on the committee which made the selections, have chosen now to honor—in memory to the Senators chosen, and in reminder to ourselves and to those who come after us.

I should like to conclude by expressing a word of gratitude, not merely for the great service these honored men rendered a great institution and a great Nation, but for the service the committee rendered in making their selections, and which have been contributed to a great deal by that outstanding author of the "Famous Five," Holmes Alexander. Long may the memories of the services of these towering giants of the Senate endure. [Applause.]

ADDRESS BY SENATOR DIRKSEN

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It is significant that the men we salute today were first of all patriots, and then partisans. It is in that spirit that I now call upon a Senator who enjoys the respect of all his colleagues, the distinguished minority leader, the Honorable EVERETT M. DIRKSEN of Illinois. [Applause.]

Senator DIRKSEN. Mr. Vice President, Mr. President pro tempore, my colleagues in the Senate, and my fellow Americans: Last week I took occasion on the Senate floor to refer to the 170th anniversary of the meeting of the First Congress. Under the Constitution, it was to meet on the 4th of March 1789, in New York City. Actually, it did not get under way until the 6th of April 1789, for the first day only eight Senators, not a quorum, appeared.

As I recall, another 32 days elapsed before the electoral vote was counted and before John Adams was properly ensconced as Vice President, and before John Langdon, of New Hampshire, was chosen as President pro tempore of the Senate, and this great deliberative body of the Republic under the Constitution got under way.

That was 170 years ago. A long time has elapsed since the first Senate met. In fact, 86 Congresses and 86 Senates have virtually come and gone. It is an amazing record of this free country, probably not to be boasted by any other country on the face of the earth, that in all that time there has been an uninterrupted legislative process in this free land, in peacetime and in wartime.

As the Nation and the population grew and the Original Thirteen States with 26 Senators increased in number, obviously the Senate likewise increased until now there sit in the Chamber nearby 98 Senators from 49 States, and there is an imminent possibility that before too long the number will be increased and there will be 100 Senators from 50 States. Since the First Congress, if my recollection is correct, 1,331 men and women have served in the U.S. Senate.

What an amazing and moving pageant this Republic is. The Senate is a veritable cross section of the country, because within its membership it has numbered admirals and generals, farmers and ranchers, teachers, labor leaders, philosophers, businessmen, industrialists, and those who represented various points of view in the economic and the political and the social structure of the great Republic.

Who was outstanding, among all these 1,300, since the first Congress 170 years ago last week?

In the first Senate were celebrated men—Oliver Ellsworth, who later became Chief Justice of the Supreme Court; Rufus King of New York; Robert Morris of Pennsylvania; Richard Henry Lee and James Monroe of Virginia, the latter later to become President of the United States. In every Senate there have been distinguished Senators, and who among them were outstanding?

That was the criterion for selection. It was not who was most eloquent. It was not who was most resourceful. It was not who was most skillful. It was not who was the best parliamentarian. The question was who was outstanding when measured in terms of influence and impact upon the time in which he lived and moved and had his being.

It was not an easy task to make a selection from that great host which had been marching down the corridors of time as Members of the U.S. Senate.

I tried to find common attributes in those who were selected. Such attributes exist; and three of them appeal to me greatly.

The first attribute is that all of the five were crusaders. One can be a crusader for the right or one can be a crusader for the wrong; but what a great thing it is to be a crusader. The definition of a crusader is one of the most pointed and revealing descriptions in the Book of Revelations that one can ever encounter. If I can reconstruct it, it goes like this:

> I know thy works that thou are neither cold nor hot: I would thou wert cold or hot.
>
> So then because thou art lukewarm, and neither cold nor hot, I will spue thee out of my mouth.

That is a test of the crusader.

As I was coming to the Senate one day last year, we were not driving so fast that I could not spell out the announcement on a church bulletin board, I think on Wisconsin Avenue. As I recall the announcement went like this:

> Ye shall seek me and find me, if ye shall search for me with all your hearts.

That is the measure of a crusader, a wholehearted endeavor. The five men we are honoring were crusaders in their time and generations.

Secondly, I find the common attribute that they were dedicated men, dedicated to cause and to convictions. No matter what the history books may say, when it is undertaken to pick out one facet of their lives it will be found they were dedicated men.

It took dedication on the part of Daniel Webster to support the Clay compromise, because the protests and the excoriation which he had to endure were terrible things to a politician. But he supported that compromise.

It took dedication on the part of John C. Calhoun, passionate as he was in his devotion to the Southland, to resist all efforts at disunion and to undertake to dissuade some of his friends and fellow citizens against the course which they had charted for themselves.

And it took dedication for Henry Clay to embrace compromise, because of his devotion to liberty and to the Union. That required dedication.

We must measure these attributes always against the backdrop of these Senators' own generations. It took dedication on the part of Robert Marion La Follette to lash out against the evils of his time, and, oh, how intrepid he was in doing it.

There was dedication on the part of that man in our own generation, the only one of the five in our generation, Bob Taft, to whom it was my privilege to refer 7 years ago, before a highly clamorous and demonstrative and noisy crowd in Chicago, as "Mr. Integrity and Mr. American." What integrity and dedication it took to stand up against the group cleavages of our own time which menaced and threatened the dignity of the individual and the continuity of the pattern of living.

All these Senators were crusaders. All of them were dedicated spirits. Finally, they had the common attribute of moral courage.

Sometime, if I am ever permitted to do so, I shall go to Hollywood and endeavor to direct a motion picture of the life of Joshua, if somebody does not do it before me, because I have a picture in my mind of a great, eloquent patriot standing out all alone, who hears a stentorian voice above him, as it comes out of the vaulted space of the heavens. He is listening and hears the command which says, "Have not I commanded thee? Be strong and of a good courage."

That is all it took—strength and courage. When we measure the lives of these Senators against all difficulties, against the challenges and causes of the times, we can say they were men strong and of good moral courage.

The attributes I have enumerated are those which in my judgment made these men outstanding and worthy of the feeble tribute which we offer today. They were impressive. They were influential. We hail them as our predecessors, as we move in that same continuous stream of the U.S. Senate. They were great men, dedicated to the cause, and because of the legacy they left and the rich inheritance which is ours this is still a free land and we have a free Senate. [Applause.]

UNVEILING OF THE PORTRAITS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. We have now reached the high point of the program. In behalf of the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration, I hereby direct that the portraits of the five outstanding Senators be unveiled.

The first portrait to be unveiled, at the front of the room, is the likeness of Senator Henry Clay, of Kentucky, who served several terms in the Senate between 1806 and 1852.

(The portrait of Senator Henry Clay was unveiled, amid great applause.)

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Next, to my near left, is the likeness of Senator Daniel Webster, of Massachusetts, who served in the Senate from 1827 to 1850, with the exception of one slight interval.

(The portrait of Senator Daniel Webster was unveiled, amid great applause.)

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Now, to my near right, is the likeness of Senator John C. Calhoun, of South Carolina, who served in the Senate from 1832 to 1850, with the exception of one slight interval.

(The portrait of Senator John C. Calhoun was unveiled, amid great applause.)

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Now, to my far left, is the likeness of Senator Robert M. La Follette, Sr., of Wisconsin, who served in the Senate from 1905 to 1925.

(The portrait of Senator Robert M. La Follette, Sr., was unveiled, amid great applause.)

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Finally, to my far right, is the likeness of Senator Robert A. Taft, of Ohio, who served in the Senate from 1939 to 1953.

(The portrait of Senator Robert A. Taft was unveiled, amid great applause.)

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The ceremonies are now concluded.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 2260) to extend until July 1, 1963, the induction provisions of the Universal Military Training and Service Act; the provisions of the act of August 3, 1950, suspending personnel strengths of the Armed Forces; and the Dependents Assistance Act of 1950.

UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE TAXES

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, the Department of Labor has announced that during the month of February 6.1 percent of our labor force was unemployed. A total of 4,749,000 persons were unable to find work. This illustrates again, if additional illustration is necessary, the urgent need for adequate unemployment insurance.

Our present system is inadequate for either a subsistence standard of living or as a cushion against the debilitating effects of a prolonged recession. Regardless of what the future brings in the way of an easing or a worsening of our economic condition, we are confronted with the established fact of a defective insurance system.

There is no disagreement over this fact. It has often been pointed out by the President in budget messages and economic reports as far back as 1954. Our present unemployment insurance system has been criticized by independent research groups such as the Rockefeller Brothers report of April 1958 and the University of Michigan study of February 1959, by Governors of several States, and by the former Chairman of the President's Council of Economic Advisers, Mr. Arthur Burns, who is now president of the National Bureau of Economic Research. Recently, in a still to be released report, the Federal Advisory Council on Employment Security called for revision of the unemployment insurance law.

No temporary palliative can cure the basic defects in the unemployment insurance system. It can only perpetuate those defects and result in abandonment of the insurance principle. The proposals thus far advanced by the administration ignore the shockingly low benefits which are paid in some States and the many people who cannot take advantage of the unemployment insurance program today.

What is needed is not a kind of patchwork job which ignores the dangerous flaws in the system's basic structure but a thorough modernization program.

This is not a matter which can be deferred, delayed, or postponed. It has been suggested that another temporary extension of the law might relieve the

current crisis. However, this would be of no help whatsoever to more than 2 million workers now unemployed who are not receiving any benefits at all. It would be of little benefit even to those who might gain some additional extension of their compensation. Even with the law temporarily extending benefits, which was enacted last year, exhaustions are averaging approximately 200,000 per month. When that law expires an additional 300,000 to 400,000 jobless workers will suddenly be deprived of their entire income.

It has also been suggested that we wait for the State legislatures to meet and work out a solution. We have been waiting for this for at least 6 years. There is no reason to believe that the individual States are any more likely or any better able to enact a more adequate program without the support of Federal minimum standards than they have in the past.

Unemployment is a nationwide problem. Its effects are felt in every corner of the Nation. The problem can only be solved by the Congress. This is what the draftsmen of the original legislation—the President's Committee on Economic Security—originally intended, and this is in accordance with the theory of the law.

There is a natural tendency among the various States to compete among themselves for industry, and many hold out as inducement low unemployment insurance taxes. The only way to cure this unhealthy competition is by a Federal law establishing minimum standards based upon the needs of economy rather than by competitive advantage which might be gained by low benefit payments.

A permanent standards bill which I have introduced with the junior Senator from Minnesota, the senior Senator from New Jersey, and 32 other Senators, and which Congressmen MACHROWICZ and KARSTEN and 127 other Congressmen have introduced in the other body, modifies the present law in three basic respects.

First, it establishes a uniform weekly benefit equal to 50 percent of the worker's income or two-thirds of the average wage in the State, whichever is lower. Today the average production worker receives $88 per week. But his average benefit when he becomes unemployed is $30 per week. In some States the average benefit is as low as $21 per week—and the most he can get is $26 per week. This is exactly one-half the amount recent studies have shown are necessary to a subsistence standard of living in a metropolitan area. I ask unanimous consent that there be included at this point in the RECORD a table showing benefit payment activities under State programs and the program of unemployment compensation for Federal employees for December 1958.

Secondly, under our bill every worker would be able to draw benefits for a uniform period of 39 weeks, instead of being cut off at the end of 6, 8, or 10 weeks, as he is now in some States. Any period of recession has a double effect. It both increases the number of unemployed and lengthens the duration of the unemployment. The University of Michigan study of the month of October 1958 showed that 42 percent of the unemployed did not find jobs within a 26-week period. Obviously, an insurance program which provides benefits for less than 26 weeks does not take care of the needs of this 42 percent. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be included at this point in the RECORD a table showing the unemployment insurance statutory provisions dealing with minimum and maximum weeks of benefits for total unemployment in September 1958.

Finally, our bill broadens the coverage to include the millions now deprived of its benefits simply because they have less than three coworkers. There is no ground either in logic or in reason for making this distinction between members of our labor force. It is time we corrected this oversight in the law. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be included at this point in my remarks a table showing the size-of-firm restrictions of State unemployment insurance laws and their effect on coverage and exclusion of workers.

As I have said there is little disagreement over the necessity for adopting these minimum standards. The only differences of opinion have been over whether we should establish them as part of our basic law or leave it to each State to adopt. The history of the past few years has conclusively demonstrated the fallacy of waiting for individual State action.

The time is critical and the solution is clear. I hope the Congress will take immediate action.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a table showing benefit payment activities under State programs and the program of unemployment compensation for Federal employees, December 1958; a table showing size-of-firm restrictions of State unemployment insurance laws and their effect on coverage and exclusion of workers; and a table entitled "Unemployment Insurance Statutory Provisions: Minimum and Maximum Weeks of Benefits for Total Unemployment, September 1958."

There being no objection, the tables were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Benefit payment activities under State programs and the program of unemployment compensation for Federal employees, December 1958

Region and State	Weeks compensated					Beneficiaries		Benefits		Final payments [3]
	All types of unemployment	Total unemployment		Partial unemployment [1]		Average weekly number	Percentage change from November 1958	Amount [2]	Percentage change from November 1958	
		Number	Average weekly payments	Number	Percent of all unemployment					
Total, 53 States	7,997,260	7,338,848	$30.41	658,412	8.2	1,738,535	+17.1	$234,683,449	+34.5	213,056
Region I:										
Connecticut	154,760	147,561	35.20	7,199	4.7	33,643	+5.9	5,326,032	+21.6	4,184
Maine	68,947	63,414	21.61	5,533	8.0	14,988	+50.7	1,440,843	+72.5	1,289
Massachusetts	299,213	243,842	31.35	55,371	18.5	65,046	+26.7	8,478,919	+45.7	7,372
New Hampshire	25,973	23,428	23.79	2,545	9.8	5,646	+19.5	587,724	+41.2	559
Rhode Island	59,175	52,725	31.06	6,450	10.9	12,864	+29.8	1,749,083	+64.1	2,024
Vermont	13,938	12,945	24.02	993	7.1	3,030	+16.6	326,259	+47.2	312
Region II:										
New Jersey	468,116	411,680	32.32	56,436	12.1	101,764	+36.5	14,648,560	+56.3	11,439
New York	1,186,629	1,046,713	34.62	139,916	11.8	257,963	+21.2	38,644,401	+30.9	23,371
Puerto Rico	1,185	1,177	25.25	8	.7	258	+6.2	29,832	+23.5	49
Virgin Islands	24	24	19.71	0	0	5	(4)	473	+16.5	0
Region III:										
Delaware	21,560	19,662	32.38	1,898	8.8	4,687	+40.1	674,923	+62.2	663
District of Columbia	26,242	25,655	26.73	587	2.2	5,705	+10.0	695,153	+26.5	843
Maryland	160,963	151,162	30.27	9,801	6.1	34,992	+21.5	4,766,237	+38.8	3,876
North Carolina	150,059	139,942	20.00	10,117	6.7	32,622	+15.2	2,956,764	+29.5	3,310
Pennsylvania	1,009,110	928,834	29.43	80,276	8.0	219,372	+13.7	28,592,364	+29.7	22,668
Virginia	65,220	62,258	23.91	2,962	4.5	14,178	+23.2	1,519,493	+39.2	2,567
West Virginia	110,706	103,298	23.01	7,400	6.7	24,067	+15.4	2,483,990	+30.1	3,575

[1] Includes beneficiaries with part-time jobs and those working at reduced hours. Montana has no provisions for other than total unemployment.

[2] Unadjusted for voided benefit checks and transfers under interstate combined-wage plan. Excludes amount of unemployment compensation for Federal employees' benefits paid to claimants who file jointly to supplement benefits under other programs; nationally this represents less than 0.1 percent of the amount shown.

[3] A final payment is the payment for the last week of compensable unemployment in a benefit year, and indicates the exhaustion of benefit rights by a claimant for that benefit year. Because of the time lapse between the actual week in which the unemployment occurs and the date on which final payment is made, the monthly total includes some claimants who exhausted their rights in the preceding month but received their final payment in the reported month, and excludes some claimants who exhausted their rights in the reported month but will not receive their final payment until the succeeding month. Workers who exhaust their rights may be entitled to additional benefits when the following benefit year begins. The number of exhaustions is not indicative of the number who are still unemployed as some will have obtained employment and others may have withdrawn from the labor force.

[4] Not computed when number or amount is less than 50 in either month.

Benefit payment activities under State programs and the program of unemployment compensation for Federal employees, December 1958—Continued

Region and State	Weeks compensated					Beneficiaries		Benefits		Final payments
	All types of unemployment	Total unemployment		Partial unemployment		Average weekly number	Percentage change from November 1958	Amount	Percentage change from November 1958	
		Number	Average weekly payments	Number	Percent of all unemployment					
Region IV:										
Alabama	113,245	109,103	22.98	4,142	3.7	24,618	+12.5	2,571,021	+29.2	4,646
Florida	70,230	66,392	24.55	3,838	5.5	15,267	−21.3	1,689,768	−7.2	3,531
Georgia	112,683	104,585	23.67	8,098	7.2	24,496	+11.9	2,587,496	+29.2	4,177
Mississippi	43,568	39,911	22.06	3,657	8.4	9,471	+34.8	934,008	+55.6	1,016
South Carolina	49,636	45,697	22.09	3,939	7.9	10,790	+7.3	1,069,047	+23.9	1,739
Tennessee	146,166	134,350	21.79	11,816	8.1	31,775	+14.4	3,092,656	+30.8	4,870
Region V:										
Kentucky	98,752	91,028	27.24	7,724	7.8	21,468	+10.0	2,595,467	+26.6	3,103
Michigan	374,584	361,169	35.21	13,415	3.6	81,431	−24.9	12,960,926	−14.5	18,671
Ohio	396,728	374,601	32.04	22,127	5.6	86,245	+18.9	12,348,623	+37.9	10,653
Region VI:										
Illinois	381,475	348,329	30.15	33,146	8.7	82,929	+8.0	11,163,622	+25.7	11,297
Indiana	141,243	128,537	29.20	12,706	9.0	30,705	+4.0	3,963,739	+20.7	6,661
Minnesota	134,291	128,599	29.27	5,692	4.2	29,194	+56.0	3,862,774	+83.6	3,902
Wisconsin	124,667	112,060	34.50	12,607	10.1	27,102	+16.1	4,226,334	+33.2	[5] 6,173
Region VII:										
Iowa	29,621	27,162	25.39	2,459	8.3	6,439	+44.8	723,998	+73.6	1,061
Kansas	45,900	43,698	29.15	2,202	4.8	9,978	+26.1	1,320,270	+44.3	1,515
Missouri	123,291	102,792	27.57	20,499	16.6	26,802	+6.8	3,086,677	+25.7	2,945
Nebraska	21,329	20,273	27.85	1,056	5.0	4,637	+62.1	578,333	+94.6	662
North Dakota	13,839	12,681	27.63	1,158	8.4	3,008	+388.3	372,672	+505.8	367
South Dakota	6,696	6,216	26.13	480	7.2	1,456	+167.6	169,998	+227.3	251
Region VIII:										
Arkansas	47,348	43,180	20.61	4,168	8.8	10,293	+40.5	945,677	+58.4	1,728
Louisiana	97,707	90,459	30.66	7,248	7.4	21,241	+15.0	2,912,870	+30.8	1,986
Oklahoma	51,875	47,970	25.82	3,905	7.5	11,277	−2.3	1,269,816	+12.1	1,613
Texas	214,842	203,827	24.20	11,015	5.1	46,705	+10.6	5,128,389	+26.8	7,668
Region IX:										
Colorado	32,813	30,699	31.56	2,114	6.4	7,133	+35.7	1,010,591	+55.2	788
Montana	38,734	38,734	27.44	0	0	8,420	+65.9	1,060,515	+94.6	1,102
New Mexico	15,971	15,050	25.72	921	5.8	3,472	+29.0	402,240	+49.3	393
Utah	22,114	20,476	31.53	1,638	7.4	4,807	+44.5	676,477	+70.6	521
Wyoming	8,674	7,821	35.77	853	9.8	1,886	+81.0	304,401	+118.3	225
Region X:										
Arizona	24,618	23,590	29.64	1,028	4.2	5,352	+6.2	722,328	+22.9	656
California	775,743	732,204	33.08	43,539	5.6	168,640	+27.7	25,007,661	+47.1	16,414
Hawaii	14,353	12,481	27.70	1,872	13.0	3,120	+24.4	371,919	+50.2	173
Nevada	21,456	20,079	37.73	1,377	6.4	4,664	+48.2	790,139	+72.6	459
Region XI:										
Alaska	24,781	23,899	36.04	882	3.6	5,387	+63.2	881,843	+89.4	323
Idaho	24,735	23,553	34.45	1,182	4.8	5,377	+88.7	842,502	+125.8	292
Oregon	116,106	108,521	33.55	7,585	6.5	25,240	+56.1	3,820,939	+83.2	1,449
Washington	215,626	204,802	29.71	10,824	5.0	46,875	+31.8	6,296,663	+52.8	1,925

[5] Represents data on a per employer basis and is not strictly comparable.

TABLE 1.—*Size-of-firm restrictions of State unemployment insurance laws and their effect on coverage and exclusion of workers*

State	Statutory minimum number of workers and period for employer coverage [1]	Number of workers, March 1957 (in thousands)		Percent increase in coverage with removal of size-of-firm restriction
		Covered [2]	Excluded [3]	
Total, 51 States		39,089.9	1,898.1	5
Total, 34 States [4]		28,167.5	1,898.1	7
Alabama	4 in 20 weeks	517.6	38.3	7
Alaska	1 at any time	21.9	0	0
Arizona	3 in 20 weeks	190.5	10.4	5
Arkansas	1 in 10 days	241.4	(6)	(6)
California	$100 quarterly	3,521.4	(6)	(6)
Colorado	4 in 20 weeks	291.8	32.4	11
Connecticut	3 in 13 weeks	749.6	27.3	4
Delaware	1 in 20 weeks	122.9	(6)	(6)
District of Columbia	1 at any time	221.2	0	0
Florida	4 in 20 weeks	799.9	82.2	10
Georgia	do	706.7	50.8	7
Hawaii	1 at any time	107.3	0	0
Idaho	$150 quarterly [5]	96.6	(6)	(6)
Illinois	4 in 20 weeks	2,663.0	183.6	7
Indiana	do	1,090.6	74.8	7
Iowa	do	412.4	59.7	14
Kansas	do	344.2	44.9	13
Kentucky	do	435.6	41.3	9
Louisiana	do	555.3	41.9	8
Maine	do	182.8	18.7	10
Maryland	1 at any time	678.1	0	0
Massachusetts	1 in 13 weeks	1,483.7	(6)	(6)
Michigan	4 in 20 weeks	1,904.3	121.1	6
Minnesota	do [6]	630.6	28.3	4
Mississippi	do	236.9	24.2	10
Missouri	4 in 20 weeks	940.9	79.7	8
Montana	1 in 20 weeks	105.8	(6)	(6)
Nebraska	4 in 20 weeks	202.0	30.8	15
Nevada	$225 quarterly [5]	62.7	(6)	(6)
New Hampshire	4 in 20 weeks	137.7	12.0	9
New Jersey	do	1,512.2	111.9	7
New Mexico	$450 quarterly [5]	136.5	(6)	(6)
New York	2 at any time	4,865.4	[7] 150.0	3
North Carolina	4 in 20 weeks	820.4	58.6	7
North Dakota	do	55.9	11.3	20
Ohio	3 at any time	2,519.4	86.9	3
Oklahoma	4 in 20 weeks	363.3	43.3	12
Oregon	2 in 6 weeks [7]	331.0	8.6	3
Pennsylvania	1 at any time	3,108.6	0	0
Rhode Island	do	230.7	0	0
South Carolina	4 in 20 weeks	392.7	29.9	8
South Dakota	do	62.3	14.1	23
Tennessee	do	616.4	49.1	8
Texas	do	1,718.2	169.5	10
Utah	$140 quarterly [5]	158.2	(6)	(6)
Vermont	4 in 20 weeks	69.4	7.5	11
Virginia	do	652.5	51.5	8
Washington	1 at any time	571.8	0	0
West Virginia	4 in 20 weeks	370.0	28.4	8
Wisconsin	do	826.0	75.1	9
Wyoming	$500 yearly [5]	53.6	(6)	(6)

[1] Includes provisions in effect during 1957 and still in effect as of Apr. 30, 1958; alternative requirements for coverage of employers not given.

[2] Data represent covered employment for March 1957 under the State size-of-firm provisions indicated.

[3] Number of workers excluded are estimates based on unpublished Bureau of Old-Age and Survivor's Insurance data for March 1956 except that the number for New York was estimated by the State employment security agency.

[4] Data include only the States with size-of-firm limitations on the number of workers employed; no data are available on the number of workers excluded by limitations on the amount of payroll or the number of weeks of employment required for employer coverage.

[5] Payroll requirement.

[6] Minnesota employers of 1 or more in 20 weeks are covered in 22 communities of 10,000 or more; elsewhere in the State only employers of 4 or more in 20 weeks are covered.

[7] Employer must have 2 workers in 6 weeks in a quarter and also have an annual payroll of $1,800.

CHART 1b.—*Unemployment insurance statutory provisions: Minimum and maximum weeks of benefits for total unemployment, September 1958*

State	Minimum weeks [1]	Maximum weeks
Pennsylvania [2]	30.0	30.0
Louisiana	12.0	28.0
Wisconsin [3]	10.0	26.5
Maine	26.0	26.0
Maryland [3]	26.0	26.0
New Hampshire	26.0	26.0
New York [3]	26.0	26.0
North Carolina	26.0	26.0
Vermont	26.0	26.0
Minnesota [3]	18.0	26.0
California [3]	15.0–26.0	26.0
Alaska [3]	15.0	26.0
Kentucky	15.0	26.0
Utah	15.0	26.0
New Jersey [3]	13.0	26.0
Oregon	12.3–15.5	26.0
Mississippi	12.0	26.0
Washington	12.0	26.0
Wyoming	12.0	26.0
District of Columbia [3]	11.5	26.0
Missouri	11.1–12.5	26.0
Delaware [3]	11.0	26.0
Illinois [3]	10–23.0	26.0
Connecticut [3]	10–12.0	26.0
Arizona	[10] 10.0	26.0
Colorado [3 4]	10.0	26.0
Idaho	10.0	26.0
Nevada [3]	10.0	26.0
Michigan [3]	9.5	26.0
Ohio [3]	9.2–12.0	26.0
Rhode Island [3]	7.9–10.4	26.0
Massachusetts [3]	7.1–17.0	26.0
Oklahoma	6.7	26.0
West Virginia [3]	24.0	24.0
New Mexico	12.0	24.0
Texas [5]	7.2–16.1	24.0
Iowa	6.7	24.0
Montana	22.0	22.0
Tennessee	22.0	22.0
South Carolina	10.0	22.0
Georgia [4]	20.0	20.0
Hawaii	20.0	20.0
North Dakota	20.0	20.0
Alabama [3]	11.7	20.0
Nebraska	8.5–13.5	20.0
Kansas	7.4–13.4	20.0
South Dakota	5.7–13.3	20.0
Indiana [3]	5.6–6.2	20.0
Arkansas [3]	10.0	18.0
Virginia	8.0	18.0
Florida	5.0	16.0

[1] When 2 figures are shown, the lower represents the shortest possible duration; the upper represents duration at the minimum weekly benefit amount where the combination of qualifying wages and the duration fraction yields a longer duration than the minimum. The lower figure only is charted.

[2] Additional weeks of benefits provided by participation in Federal temporary unemployment compensation program.

[3] Additional weeks of benefits provided under State temporary unemployment compensation legislation.

[4] 26 weeks of benefits for claimants with more than $1,000 per year in covered employment in State and no benefit claims for 5 consecutive years (Colorado); 22 weeks of benefits for claimants with wages equal to 4 times lower limit of high-quarter wage bracket (Georgia).

[5] Minimum weeks under 2 alternative qualifying wage requirements.

COMMUNICATION ACTIVITIES AT THE IX PLENARY ASSEMBLY OF THE INTERNATIONAL RADIO CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Chair lay before the Senate the unfinished business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which is Senate Joint Resolution 47.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 47) providing that certain communication activities at the IX Plenary Assembly of the International Radio Consultative Committee to be held in the United States in 1959 shall not be construed to be prohibited by the Communications Act of 1934 or any other law.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, this joint resolution has the approval of the distinguished minority leader and the distinguished majority leader. I ask unanimous consent that a statement taken from the report of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce be incorporated in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the excerpt from the committee report (Rept. No. 81) was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE

The purpose of Senate Joint Resolution 47 is to (a) permit U.S. common carriers to render free communication services to official participants at the Ninth Plenary Assembly of the International Radio Consultative Committee (CCIR); and (b) to permit qualified official participants in the Assembly to operate an amateur radio station licensed by the FCC to be located at the conference, subject to rules and regulations to be issued by the FCC.

GENERAL STATEMENT

The Ninth Plenary Assembly of the International Radio Consultative Committee (CCIR) is a major international conference scheduled to meet in Los Angeles, Calif., from April 1 to April 30, 1959, for the purpose of discussing a whole range of technical problems involving radio. The International Radio Consultative Committee is a permanent organ of the International Telecommunications Union which is composed of representatives of almost all of the nations of the world.

It has been called to the attention of your committee that it is customary for the host government to extend the courtesies of free communication services to the official participants whenever such conferences are held within the structure of the International Telecommunications Union. Under existing law and various rules and regulations promulgated by the Federal Communications Commmission, such services are prohibited.

In 1947, the Congress adopted a resolution similar to Senate Joint Resolution 47, which gave franking privileges to members of the national delegation who attended the Atlantic City Radio and Plenipotentiary Conference held in Atlantic City, N.J., during the period of the conference. This resolution would provide a temporary waiver of the restrictive provisions of existing law and regulations for the period of the International Radio Consultative Committee meeting, April 1 to April 30, 1959.

It should be pointed out that U.S. common carriers would not be required to extend the free privileges to the official participants in the conference, since the resolution is merely permissive. Accordingly, the carriers may grant the free services, if they so desire. Further, the legislation would not involve any expense to the Government of the United States.

The FCC has notified your committee that it has issued an authorization for an amateur station to be located at the site of the CCIR conference and the call letters of this station will be K6USA.

The FCC has also advised us that similar privileges with reference to amateur operations were accorded members of national delegations attending CCIR conferences in Europe. Your committee feels the privileges afforded by this legislation comes under the heading of good public relations, comity between nations, and reciprocity.

CONCLUSION

This resolution would remove the limitations on the granting of free communication services contained in sections 201, 202, 203, 204, 205, and 210 of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, as well as sections 41 and 61 of the Commission's rules and regulations. In addition, the resolution would also waive the limitations now contained in sections 301, 208(b), 310(a)(1), 319(a) as well as section 12.28 of part 12 of the Commission's rules and regulations, but only for the period of the International Radio Consultative Committee Conference. This exemption would be temporary in nature and in accord with custom and practice in such world conferences.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 47) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That nothing in the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, or in any other provision of law shall be construed to prohibit (1) common carriers subject to such Act from rendering free communication services to official participants in the IX Plenary Assembly of the International Radio Consultative Committee (CCIR) to be held in the United States in Los Angeles, California, in 1959, or (2) qualified official participants in such assembly from operating any amateur radio station licensed by the Federal Communications Commission to be operated at such assembly, but any such rendition of services or operation of an amateur radio station shall be subject to such rules and regulations as the Federal Communications Commission may deem necessary.

COMPETITIVE BIDDING IN PROCUREMENT OF PROPERTY AND SERVICES BY ARMED FORCES

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I desire to add my voice to the voices of other Senators who have spoken in commendation of the action of the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] in focusing attention upon the very serious problem of Government procurement in the Defense Department. I have not had an opportunity to read in detail the bill which the Senator from Delaware has introduced. My colleague from New York and I have been working on proposed legislation which I believe is to the same general effect as the bill introduced by the Senator from Delaware.

It is essential that we come to grips immediately with the problem. An altogether disproportionate number of defense contracts, in my judgment, is being awarded on a so-called negotiated basis. We believe that a considerable number should be made on a bid basis. We have an obligation to meet squarely this problem which has been presented to us by the bill introduced by the Senator from Delaware.

TATSEY WRITES AGAIN

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, during the last Congress I inserted into the body of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on several occasions a number of news columns written by one of this country's

most colorful and unique newspaper columnists, John Tatsey, Indian Service policeman on the Blackfeet Indian Reservation. Tatsey writes his column for the Glacier Reporter, of Browning, Mont. He has a sharp wit and a talent for giving a new perspective to local news items.

Since the reconvening of Congress I have received a number of inquiries from people on Capitol Hill asking when I was going to put some more of John Tatsey's stuff in the RECORD. Today, Mr. President, I take great pleasure in asking unanimous consent to have a series of John Tatsey, Heart Butte news columns, reprinted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Glacier Reporter, Nov. 6, 1958]

HEART BUTTE NEWS

(By John Tatsey)

Heart Butte people really were surprised Tuesday morning. Some did not have any ready chopped wood for morning. The snow was really deep mostly in drifts.

The polls opened at 1 o'clock and very few cars showed up—those that were able to get to the highway. They must be the true Democrats.

The Democrats from Pondera County gave a rally Sunday afternoon at the round hall and there was a large crowd. Our big man Leroy Anderson was there and a few county candidates. They each made a little talk. There was one candidate got up to say a few words. First thing, he said where his wife was. There were some Republicans from other counties that were there because they knew the Democrat grub is always good—strong coffee.

The Heart Butte community held a meeting Monday evening to arrange for their Christmas dance. There was not many there so they will have one Saturday evening, November 8, at the Sure Chief home. Everyone welcome.

The school buses were unable to go their routes Tuesday on account of the deep snow drifts so we may have to bum for a snow plow.

There was dance given by teacher staff at Heart Butte last Friday for the children and parents. Everyone enjoyed a good time and cake and coffee served at midnight.

Joe Buger being unlucky, showing up Sunday morning with his right eye shining. It was a birch creek punch.

There was a guy by the name of Frank who lives on Two Medicine; when his wife went after her goods, which she ordered from the Stanley dealer, his wife got him something new—a back scratcher. Now she won't have to do it.

Leo Sure Chief has been at Galen all summer where he was being treated and his wife having a job at the hospital was home for the weekend and has gone back.

Peter Day Rider and Stoles Head Carrier are down around Valier picking rock for farmers. The boys miss old Stoles because he can take a joke.

Sam Horn was in Browning Monday. His wife gave him a scare; she told him to go home alone. Judge Iron Pipe and Jailer James Walters talked for him, so she went home with Sam. Be careful what you do or say Sam.

Aloyous Weasel Head was picked up by Tatsey Sunday night for being drunk and having a minor with him. Judge Iron Pipe soaked him to 50 days with James Walters.

[From the Heart Butte News, Nov. 21, 1958]

HEART BUTTE FOLKS ENJOY SCHOOL CARNIVAL

(John Tatsey, Indian Service policeman, writes Heart Butte community news for the Glacier Reporter, Browning newspaper.)

Last Friday the school had their carnival and was well attended by the children and parents. There were games played, lunches served, and bingo. The money collected is for the benefit of the school children.

The floor show was the outstanding program. It had everyone laughing. There was Hawaiian hula dances and the imitations of Elvis Presley by one of the school boys.

Sunday there was a good crowd at the church and most everyone stayed until evening.

George Wippert had his services as usual. In the evening stick game being the main part.

Polite Pepion was around Heart Butte Monday picking a few cows from the boys.

Mrs. Mazie Chiefallover has her new house moved to Heart Butte so she will be moving in.

There has been a lot of wondering around Heart Butte over the disappearance of Stoles Head Carrier since he went on the relocation job around Valier.

Mervin Brave Rock has gone back to Yakima, Wash. Expects to be gone 2 weeks.

James H. Walter turned over two boys to Tatsey at Heart Butte for education in the line of work. Aloyious Weasel Head and Eugene Head Carrier sure know how to wash dishes. At Heart Butte they are being taught how to chop wood. Wednesday they were digging a basement in an outdoor toilet. Doing fine.

[From the Montana Fourth Estate, Dec. 1958]

TATSEY RIDES AGAIN

(News from Heart Butte as written for the Glacier Reporter by John Tatsey, Blackfoot Tribal Policeman and reporter extraordinary.)

Stoles Head Carrier went to Valier and got some guts or entrails and when he got home he had to cross a bridge. he slip and fell but still had guts.

John Aims Back drank to much Gallo and cross the same bridge that Stoles fell off of. he fell off but hung on to some bushes with half of his body in the creek. some one came along and pulled him out.

Mrs. Stoles Head Carrier got so lonely last week she went to town to forget her loneliness. Jas. Walters had her a few days as a chambermaid.

George Aims Back fell off the wagon last week and land in jail in Browning where he is serving a fifty day sentence.

There was a big surprise to the Heart Butte community last Sunday evening when Stoles Head Carrier and Pete Day Rider showed up. Pete got home and was welcomed home. But when Stoles got home his house was locked and had to go somewhere for the night. Monday morning he went to town and found his wife in a dizzie condition but brought her home. When they got off he had to pack her across a little stream. he sure was good to her.

[From the Glacier Reporter, Dec. 18, 1958]

HEART BUTTE NEWS

(By John Tatsey)

The weather was rather bad last week. Some of the children did not attend school and the buses were unable to travel. Mr. Bill Duncan, the principal, said that the buses would run on regular schedule as soon as the weather gets better and plans are being considered as to have a snowplow stationed here at Heart Butte.

There are now six teachers at the school. The new teacher came last week from Missoula, Mr. Richard Gregory, teaching eighth grade. The first day in his schoolroom he froze out. His stove was not working right.

Joe (Bugger) Marceau finally got to be a grampa. He really blushed when he heard that he had a grandson. Getting old Bugger.

The assembly for Wednesday has been cancelled on account of the roads. Harriett Miller and Mr. K. W. Bergan were to be here.

The Heart Butte People really suffered for firewood during the storm, maybe it will be a lesson.

The snowplow was out on the road Tuesday so that helped a lot some people got to town to get wood and some groceries.

The committee for the Christmas dance had a meeting last Friday and did some singing and spoke on what's to be done at the dance and made some collecting amount $32 and served lunches. There will be meetings till Christmas.

Stoles has been staying home rather close on account of the sudden storms but he has a white man by the name John getting out firewood for him so he is enjoying a good winter.

Chief Joe New Robe has been pestered by wild animals. Early last fall a black bear was meddling around his home at nights so he layed for the bear and found out it was one of James Spotted Bear's pigs. Two weeks ago a mountain lion was around in his backyard.

[From the Glacier Reporter, Dec. 25, 1958]

HEART BUTTE NEWS

(By John Tatsey)

The new classrooms are finished, only some inside work to be done at Heart Butte School.

There is another teacher coming the first of the month so there will be seven teachers for Heart Butte.

Mervin Brave Rock and family have come back home from Yakima, Wash., last week.

Henry Fisher has been at Heart Butte last week doing some plumbing at the police quarters.

Mrs. Maggie Chief All Over has moved in her new home which she had bought from the Hi Line Lumber.

The wind last week did a little damage around the community, some outhouses went over.

George comes at night, had his pickup truck by his house next morning it was laying on its side caused by the high wind.

The children had there Christmas program last Friday. They did put out a good show; good staff of teachers.

The people around Heart Butte have been traveling to different places to spend there money getting ready for Christmas. There will be a lot of happy children.

The reporter for the Glacier Reporter happened to be at the tribal office when the payment was made and saw some happenings.

There were some fat guys that were in the jam at the door when they got inside they had to adjust there pants. The jam and pushing loosened up there belts and there was 16 different size and color buttons on the floor being pulled off by the ones from the back pulling on coats.

Horsebackriding days in town is a thing of the past when cowboys used to ride in buildings, but it happened at the tribal office when a young lady was unable to get in, some big huskky guy picked her up and she rode on his shoulders. That's the way she got in; her name is Mazie.

Stoles Head Carrier has been a pretty good boy for a long time so will be a different story this time.

There were some young men that got there $25 and that money got them in trouble by being drunk so they won't be around for Christmas Day. They will be with Jas. Wal-

ters but may get a Christmas release gift from the judge.

[From the Glacier Reporter, Jan. 8, 1959]

HEART BUTTE NEWS

(By John Tatsey)

The Christmas and New Year went by very quiet. All attended the midnight mass where Father Mallman said the services.

Francis Bull Shoe and family drove to Flandreau, S. Dak., to visit their son who is attending school there. They said they enjoyed a nice trip and no snow after leaving Montana. They returned last Friday night.

There were a few people who went to Starr school for the Christmas dance. There were quite a number of blood Indians, some from other reservations. All enjoyed themselves and had plenty to eat.

Mr. and Mrs. Bernard Red Head really had a good time dancing at Starr school.

The young boys from Canada, where they do a lot of boxing and footracing, tried out at Starr school. When they would get knocked down and get to their feet they would take off and you could not catch them with a quarterhorse.

Heart Butte had their dance after Christmas and had a good dance. Tatsey and his police force went to work on the few that tried to disturb while under the influence of liquor. Only 10 were put to bed.

There were two Still Smoking boys that were jailed, and when they got out of the jail it was still smoking. They set fire to the mattress.

Stoles Head Carrier was trapping during December and he caught one mink, and one Sunday he sold it for enough money to play a couple of stick games.

The next commodity issue will be at Heart Butte on account of some people are unable to get to town, and there will be some elk meat sent out here for the people.

Earl Wetsit was at Heart Butte dance. He dressed in his costume and danced.

Earl Eastwood motored to Great Falls today.

Mr. and Mrs. Theodore Last Star are patients in a Great Falls hospital.

Percy DeWolfe has left Browning to assume duties as representative of Glacier County at Helena.

Mr. and Mrs. Harvey Brown returned last weekend from Spokane where they had spent Christmas with relatives.

Mr. and Mrs. Herbert Burdeaux, of Yakima, and Marjie Rantaria and Leolla George, of Toppenish, Wash., have been here this week visiting Mr. and Mrs. James Burdeaux.

Frank Rhoades, manager of the local Monarch Lumber Co., plans to leave Sunday on a 10-day vacation, during which he will visit Havre, Great Falls, Butte, and other places where he has lived. Stewart Salois, Monarch employee at Cut Bank, will replace him during his absence.

Report is that Bert Fitzgerald, who suffered a serious fracture of his right leg at his ranch home west of town last week, is making favorable recovery. Circumstances of the accident, according to Leslie Snell, who, with his daughter, Maureen, and her girl companion, Nadine Boyd, had gone to the ranch in quest of a place to iceskate, were that Bert, after putting on his skates, lost his balance and fell at an angle as to involve the lower leg close to the ankle. The bone was fractured in two places. Since the injury the Fitzgeralds have been snowbound at their home, severe cold and drifting snow having isolated them at their place since the forepart of this week.

[From the Glacier Reporter, Feb. 26, 1959]

HEART BUTTE NEWS

(By John Tatsey)

Heart Butte was snowbound last Monday till Thursday when the plows showed up. There were 12 cars behind the snowplows. Stoles was in the bunch.

Les Cobell brought some elk meat Sunday and the people had meat during the blockade.

Snackery Juneau and Henry Burd were out to Heart Butte Monday evening during the blizzard.

Word came that John Tail Feathers was going to have one leg or foot taken off at Great Falls Hospital.

The oil truck from Valier was stuck in a deep coulee which was full of snow Monday afternoon.

Ray Doore and John Powers were drifted in south of Blackfoot and they were washing dishes one evening. Ray took a can thinking it was soap and squeezed into his dishwater and found out it was John's shaving cream.

TRADING COWS FOR A BRIDE

A young man became a single guy last fall and last week he took a notion to use the old Indian custom of paying for a wife, he offered two cows but the mother said she would think it over.

Flex Marceau has been staying with the Marceau boys since their mother's funeral.

[From the Heart Butte News, Feb. 27, 1959]

WINTER ISOLATES HEART BUTTE COMMUNITY

(John Tatsey, Indian Service policeman, writes the Heart Butte community news for the Glacier Reporter, Browning newspaper.)

The Heart Butte community was snowed in off and on. Everyone stayed in pretty close to home.

The remains of Mrs. Maggie Marceau were brought to her home Monday and she was buried at the Heart Butte Catholic Cemetery Wednesday.

Wayne Goss was on a wild-goose chase last Saturday when he got stalled on the short-cut road to Browning between Heart Butte and Swims Under School and left his car and Tatsey took him to town.

James H. Walters was out to Heart Butte Sunday to see about the digging of the grave. He brought four prisoners from his quarters. He had Stoles there for a short time. Stoles is good hearted; he served out his time out Monday digging, but donated 2 extra days for good measure.

There was the Wolf Point Herald paper drifted in the Blackfeet Reservation and there were statements in it where the Sioux and Assinboines are fighting over their tribal councilmen and some of our Democrats in D.C. We would not want to see our good friend MIKE MANSFIELD scalped. Better get a short haircut.

Joe Running Crane rode horseback to the store and went to town on the stage and sent his wife to the agency to get some elk meat, and she had to walk. When he came back, he had two saddle horses waiting for him.

The fuel-oil truck came to Heart Butte School Tuesday to refill tanks from Valier, and another truck also came and brought milk, ice cream, and other dairy products.

Police Tatsey drove to Cut Bank and got his car license and visit Jesse Harlan, but no Jesse, so there was no coffee.

[From the Glacier Reporter, Mar. 5, 1959]

HEART BUTTE NEWS

(By John Tatsey)

Last Sunday was a nice and warm. Lots of people in church and church was overcrowded.

Most people went home when the snow started and stopped in evening. Stick game players came and were forced to stay till Monday morning on account of a blizzard.

Richard and James Little Dog and family were here Sunday and were among the stranded.

Mrs. Langly came home from Great Falls last Sunday where she spent a week on account of the bad weather, first try she got as far as Dupuyer and she had to go back. The next time she came as far as Old Agency when she bumped into a snow bank. She went back and finally made it to Browning.

Mose Gilham and his son Robert who came up from Georgia last week and were walking down the main street of Browning when they met a big fat guy. Mose said that Stoles the one you read so much about. Mose said that Stoles never bums for money. When they got the introduction Stoles said give me 50 cents.

Vick Gregory the teacher left for Missoula Tuesday where he will get married and bring her back to Heart Butte.

There was a story told in Heart Butte. When a fellow went up north of Calgary years ago he camped in timber. From there he left by pack horses and hung up his harness on tree. He came back after 20 years and looked around. No wagon but horses still there. He looked up the trees there was his wagon on top of two pine trees 30 feet up. The story teller is still around Glacier County. May bring back memories.

NATIONAL OUTDOOR RECREATION RESOURCES REVIEW COMMISSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 53, S. 82.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 82) to amend the act of June 28, 1958, to provide for a National Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

NEEDED: A BRIGHTER OUTLOOK FOR UNEMPLOYED

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I am deeply concerned that, despite the Nation's substantial recovery from its economic setback, there is still a tremendous amount of unemployment, in fact, far too much.

According to the Labor Department, the number of jobless now exceeds about 4.7 million.

In Wisconsin, too, we are suffering as a result of a lag in reemployment. Currently, there are about 76,000, or 5 percent of the working force still out of jobs.

Now the question arises: What shall be done to deal with this situation?

We recall that, yesterday, the President again reemphasized the responsibility of the States for assuming the major share of the burden—as they have in the past—for unemployment compensation programs.

As a Senator from a State which has been a pioneer in establishment of an unemployment compensation program, I naturally have great respect for the State's ability to act responsibly in this field.

As one who represents, in part, not only my whole State, but also the 76,000 unemployed, however, I am deeply concerned with the fact that there are still so many jobless. We recognize that these workers, their families, and indeed, the surrounding communities are facing serious economic hardships. The situation is particularly distressing after unemployment compensation benefits have been exhausted.

As I understand, the House Ways and Means Committee met in executive session this morning to discuss the possibility of extending the temporary unemployment compensation program.

I am informed, too, that hearings are scheduled to begin on April 7 on possible extension of the temporary unemployment program in mid-1958.

The task, now, is to get the necessary action—not only by the States and, as necessary, by the Federal Government—but also by local communities in, first, helping to meet the needs of the jobless while out of work, and, second, to create employment to brighten their future.

A factor of major concern, too, is that, while there has been substantial economic recovery, the rate of reemployment has not kept pace.

This situation deserves serious consideration by Congress, the Department of Labor, the States, industry, labor, as well as the general public.

AWARD TO REPRESENTATIVE CARL ELLIOTT, OF ALABAMA, BY PARENTS' MAGAZINE

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, the January 1959 issue of Parents' magazine announced an award to three persons for outstanding service to children.

Representative CARL ELLIOTT, who represents the Seventh Congressional District of Alabama, has been named a winner of Parents' magazine's annual medal award "for outstanding service to children." Other winners, announced today, are Dr. Harvey E. White, physics professor who conducts "Continental Classroom," a network educational television program, and Arthur C. Ringland, father of CARE, the postwar foreign relief program.

As chairman of the House Education Subcommitee, Representative Elliott led the fight last August for the passage of the National Defense Education Act, the first major breakthrough in Federal aid to education in 40 years. It authorizes student loans, teaching fellowships, funds for science equipment and foreign language teaching, vocational education, and testing-counseling services.

I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks the brief announcement regarding the award to Representative ELLIOTT.

There being no objection, the extract was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FOR OUTSTANDING SERVICE TO CHILDREN PARENTS' MAGAZINE IS PROUD TO HONOR REPRESENTATIVE CARL ELLIOTT, DEMOCRAT OF ALABAMA

A stanch champion of Federal aid to education, this distinguished legislator from Alabama has worked assiduously over the years to help America's school children. Passage last August of the National Defense Education Act—most important aid-to-education measure enacted by Congress in 40 years—was a singular achievement for Mr. ELLIOTT. As chairman of the House Education Subcommittee, he took the lead in piloting the bill through rough legislative seas. Today and in the future, this 45-year-old lawyer and father of four can be counted on to strive for what he believes—better education for all United States youngsters.

BENEFITS FOR CORPORATIONS BUT NOT FOR SELF-EMPLOYED RESULT IN UNFAIRNESS AND INEQUITY.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, on February 24, 1959, the Committee on Ways and Means reported to the House of Representatives H.R. 10, a bill to permit self-employed persons, such as doctors, lawyers, dentists, accountants, veterinarians, and others, to take a current deduction for a limited amount of investment in certain types of retirement annuity or a specific type of retirement trust.

In explaining the need for the bill, the committee stated:

This bill is intended to achieve greater equality of tax treatment between self-employed individuals and employees. Under present law the employees of a business can achieve this postponement of tax on retirement income savings if the employer pays into a qualified pension, profit-sharing, or stock bonus plan what he might otherwise have paid directly to the employees. These amounts can be placed in a tax-exempt pension trust or they can be paid as premiums on an annuity policy with a life insurance company. In either case the business firm gets immediate deductions for amounts contributed to the plan and the employee is not taxable until he draws down his benefits under the plan. An employee is permitted to defer tax in this manner even though he may have a nonforfeitable right to the employer contribution under the plan.

This tax deferment for an employee's interest in a pension, profit-sharing, or stock bonus plan has two important advantages. In the first place, it permits the employee to have a larger initial investment in retirement savings upon which more investment earnings may accumulate. In addition, most employees will be in lower tax brackets after retirement than they are during their productive years. The tax deferment under a qualified plan permits some income from the years in which an employee is likely to be subject to higher surtax rates to be taxed in the retirement years when he may be subject to much lower rates or even may have unused personal exemptions.

I have previously indicated my support of the principle contained in H.R. 10. I wish to reiterate that endorsement today.

Within the past few days I was surprised and disappointed to note, through the press, that the Republican leadership and President Eisenhower oppose this proposal because they claim it would cost the Treasury $365 million annually in revenue. The administration also expressed concern over possible extension of the program.

If this is the position of the administration with regard to this proposal, then it has a clear duty to eliminate the tax privilege now enjoyed by corporations in setting aside retirement funds for their executives and other employees. Employer contributions to pension plans in 1957 amounted to nearly $4 billion. This means that these business firms realized an estimated $1.9 billion in tax benefits as the result of deductions for such contributions, while corporate employees gained materially from deferred taxation. Yet no such opportunity exists for the self-employed. This is unfair and discriminatory.

The administration is firmly opposed to tax-deferment on retirement funds for doctors, writers, dentists, tutors, and other self-employed individuals. Why does the administration permit corporations to use tax-exempt moneys for retirement benefits for corporation officials? The principle of share-and-share-alike is essential to a democratic society, particularly in the collecting of revenues for the operation of government. This principle is violated when an accountant, lawyer, author, or teacher cannot defer taxes on modest sums set aside for old age, but the president or manager of a motor or tobacco company can enjoy very substantial retirement benefits which his corporation has been able to list as a normal business expense under the revenue laws of the United States.

Mr. President, I urge the administration, if it wishes to persist in its opposition to proposals such as H.R. 10, to follow the course of equity and thus eliminate the unfair advantage now enjoyed by corporations and their executives.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. NEUBERGER. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I compliment the Senator from Oregon upon his remarks relating to H.R. 10, because the argument he has presented is absolutely logical and should be persuasive. If special tax consideration can be given to the large income group at the corporate level, there is no reason in the world why self-employed persons should not receive the same benefits. Like the junior Senator from Oregon, I support the objectives of H.R. 10, and I look forward to the opportunity to vote for it.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I thank the Senator from Minnesota. I am pleased that his great influence and prestige in this body will be used to try to gain this fiscal equity. It seems to me that, if the administration is to say that there shall not be these tax-exempt retirement benefits for self-employed persons, then certainly the same principle should be applied to individuals who are employed by the great industrial corporations. The principle should be share-and-share alike when it comes to tax-free retirement benefits. I thank the able Senator from Minnesota for his support and encouragement.

THE BERLIN TIME BOMB

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, not since Pearl Harbor has our country been in such grave peril as it is in today. Not since I have been in Washington have I spoken in the Senate on so grave a subject. Khrushchev and his Communist coconspirators for world dominion have set a time bomb for the West. It

is up to us either to defuse the bomb or to be destroyed by it. His time bomb is his ultimatum that the West get out of West Berlin by May 27. In open violation of the Yalta and Potsdam Agreement, Khrushchev has ordered the Allies out of West Berlin. The soldiers of the United States, of England, and of France, are ordered to pack up their baggage and surrender Free West Berlin to the Communist dictators. We of the West, the United States, England, and France owe a duty to freedom. We are in Berlin by solemn international agreement. We owe a duty to keep the torch of liberty lit in West Berlin. If we let the Iron Curtain of communism engulf West Berlin, we will have seen a second Munich in our time; a second Munich far more terrible and more disastrous in its results than the first.

What is happening in West Berlin? Since the Iron Curtain of communism lowered over East Germany, more than 3 million people have escaped from East Germany to the freedom of West Germany and to the West generally. One quarter of a million people per year flee Communist domination in East Germany and come to the West; most of them come through West Berlin. About 4,000 a week escape from East Germany to the West. Khrushchev has said that he is interested in the people in Berlin, and that, he says, is why we ought to get out. Yes, Khrushchev is interested in the people in Berlin because he does not want these living witnesses, a quarter of a million of them a year, to come to the West, living witnesses, as they are, of the terror and failure of communism. Four thousand of them a week are coming West to tell us of the terror and hardship and cruelty of life back of that Iron Curtain.

Yes, Khrushchev is interested in the people of West Berlin, because he does not want those living witnesses—a quarter of a million of them a year—pouring out to West Germany, mainly through West Berlin.

At this time, as in all periods of grave crisis, all of us stand firmly with President Eisenhower. If the Soviet leaders think they will find us divided in our fight against communism—divided by political parties or divided by political ideology or divided on any other ground—they have made what will prove to be their greatest mistake, and perhaps their fatal mistake. Personally, I think we ought to follow the diplomatic policy of another great President, Theodore Roosevelt, who said, in another international situation of tenseness, "Speak softly, but carry a big stick." When the President defies the Russians, then cuts our military forces, he speaks loudly but carries a little stick.

It is my earnest hope that, as an emergency measure, we shall immediately move to an advanced position of military readiness, and that we shall build up our military preparedness and efficiency. We cannot negotiate from strength if the President continues to insist on military weakness. All of these administration moves to further reduce our military forces should be, at least temporarily, abandoned. We can cut back the Army, and we can balance the budget; but while doing all that, we might lose our liberty.

On the contrary, as a nation, we should work 24 hours a day to build missiles of diplomacy and to prepare for war, as a power for peace. But, Mr. President, we are not building missiles of diplomacy when we do not build any missiles at all.

As the greatest Nation on the face of the earth, we cannot fail here to hold high the torch of freedom, to light the way for freemen around the world.

We are the only Nation that has the strength to save West Berlin; and the free world is looking and watching to see whether we will have the resolution and the courage to do so. We will not fail to be ready, and to fight, if forced to, for the heritage for which our forefathers fought and gave their last full measure of devotion.

Mr. President, in this hour of peril, it is discouraging to hear the President recommend budget cuts that amounts to saying Let us weaken our military defenses.

Mr. President, one of the finest and most decisive editorials I have read on this subject was published this morning in the Washington Post. The editorial is entitled "Mr. Eisenhower's Defense." I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed at this point in the RECORD, in connection with my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 12, 1959]

MR. EISENHOWER'S DEFENSE

The impassioned statement by President Eisenhower yesterday on defense spending leaves no doubt as to the sincerity and depth of his feeling. Whatever one may think of his arguments, the Chief Executive certainly has been exhibiting vigor in his recent and more regular news conferences. Even if there were a surplus in the Treasury, he said, he would not put more money into the Armed Forces although he might spend more on aid to our allies. He regards the criticisms of his defense policy as something bordering upon hysteria, and he pleads with critics in Congress and elsewhere to calm down.

In the present situation respecting Berlin, obviously, it is imperative to present a united front. The President, as Commander in Chief, has made plain his determination to resist any intimidation by the Soviet Union. Most of the proposals in Congress would not materially improve the American military posture in the near future in any event. It is important that Mr. Khrushchev not be misled by the criticisms into thinking that there is any ambiguity in the country's support of the President over the Berlin issue.

Beyond that consideration, let us put aside the immediate circumstances of the President's ire yesterday and analyze his case from a longer range standpoint. Mr. Eisenhower wants to avoid both provocation and undue excitement. Evidently he views the Soviet threat over Berlin as one of a series of Communist pushes similar to the Chinese threat over Quemoy, and he believes that a firm stand and steady nerves will cause the Soviet leaders to back away. There is much to be said for this view on the basis of past experience.

Similarly, the President believes that defense should be a planned and constant program that does not vacillate up and down with the exigencies of the moment. This is a sound theme often stressed by Gen. George C. Marshall. Mr. Eisenhower also makes a telling point in challenging those who want more defense spending to advocate a tax increase (although the actual need for an increase at this time is not clear, and although some believers in a strengthened defense, including this newspaper, have already faced the tax issue).

Further, the President evidently concludes that there can be no limited war directly between the United States and the Soviet Union. It would be folly, he insists, for this country to become involved in a ground war with the 175 Soviet divisions, although he does not believe that a nuclear war over Berlin would free anything.

If these are the principal arguments of the President apart from concern over a balanced budget—to which he still shows extraordinary devotion even though the balance of his own budget is in many ways phony—what are the arguments on the side of increased defense? In this newpaper's opinion they fall into two categories, protection against actual danger, and improvement in the American negotiating position.

First, there is the possibility of miscalculation by the Soviet Union. Surely it is in the interest of this country, even with its capability for all-out nuclear war, to be able to respond with something less if the situation warrants. It is quite true that in present circumstances the Western Allies could not match the Soviet divisions, and they would be foolish to try. But situations are conceivable in which it might be to the interest of both sides to keep a ground clash limited. The casualties from all-out nuclear war, in the unhappy event that one should develop, surely would surpass any imaginable casualties in limited war, on the ground or otherwise.

Even if a direct clash with the Soviet Union is excluded, there is a strong case for adequate limited war forces to cope with clashes on the periphery. If Mr. Khrushchev were led to believe that this country would have only an all-out response, he might be tempted to nibble—or to induce others to nibble—in the thought that the President would not make the terrifying decision to unleash nuclear war that probably would result in devastation of this country too.

Second, there are the perils of the missile gap itself. If the Soviet leaders were to think that the United States were far behind in the race, that its manned bombers were being outmoded by improved air defenses and that its missiles were cumbersome and in soft fixed bases, they might at some point take the gamble to strike. Whether the gamble would be a frightful mistake, and whether we would be able to reduce the Soviet Union to ashes in retaliation, would not matter very much once the fearful step were taken.

Even more important, in this newspaper's opinion, are the psychological considerations. Few persons seriously think that the Soviet Union is about to rain war on the United States or Western Europe tomorrow morning. But a great many persons, including responsible men of both parties in Congress, are concerned because they see their country slipping into a second-best position.

Secretary McElroy has acknowledged that there will be a missile gap and that it is administration policy to accept that situation. Both he and the President have indicated a low priority for limited war preparedness. Members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff have stated their reservations about the new budget—and, incidentally, it is to be hoped that they will not be disadvantaged because they have stated their honest views in response to questioning from Congress. They may not be right, but Congress is entitled to know their thinking.

The purpose of a defense program, of course, is to avoid war. A deterrent that did not deter an enemy from starting a war would be useless; all the retaliation we might be able to unleash would not compensate for the initial blunder. The fundamental American objective, apart from preventing

attack, is to make possible realistic negotiations toward some reduction of war dangers. Mr. Eisenhower himself has been eloquent in voicing such a wish.

But the experience with the Soviet sputnik and intercontinental missile should have convinced us by now that the Soviet leaders are altogether unlikely to be reasonable if they think they can browbeat the United States and its allies. That is the real problem of the missile gap and the lack of limited war preparedness and such ancillary issues as the reductions in military manpower—not that they make attack imminent, but that they disarm the United States psychologically and render the American negotiating position far more difficult on a host of issues far beyond Berlin. When the administration willingly accepts a second-best position for the United States, it is time to take notice.

The basic question boils down to whether the country is willing to pay an insurance premium, which in this instance would amount at most to an additional $2 billion in fiscal 1960. Congress cannot compel the President to spend more money for defense, but it can seek to persuade the President with an emphatic statement of its belief in the need for an expanded and more flexible missile program along with more attention to limited war requirements. If congressional leaders will combine a reasoned program embodying the conviction of many Members with proposals for additional taxes if necessary to finance such a program, can anyone doubt that the American people will support it?

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BIBLE in the chair). Does the Senator from Texas yield to the Senator from New York?

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. In his presentation, the Senator from Texas made the statement that he regretted to hear the President say that we should weaken our defenses. I have never heard any such statement by the President. There may be a difference of viewpoint between various military officials, and perhaps between the Senator from Texas and myself, over the particular allocations of funds for the defense of our country. But certainly the President of the United States has never made such a statement.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I did not quote the President as saying that we should weaken our defenses. I said the effect of the President's recommendation of reduced military expenditures would have the effect of saying that we would weaken the defenses of the United States, and that we should, instead, build them up at this time.

This is no time to weaken our defenses. Certainly we cannot effectively negotiate with the Russians over West Berlin at the same time that we are weakening our military defenses.

When we fired the very small satellite past the moon, the Army's representatives said, "At last we have gotten back in the same league with the Russians, as regards missiles." There was no statement that we had caught up with them.

The administration seems to take the attitude, as regards missiles, that we shall permanently take second place to the Russians, for the administration continues to talk about how many years it will take us to catch up. I think we should have a "crash" program, regardless of what it may cost, so that we will catch up.

The fine editorial published today in the Washington Post states it might cost $2 billion a year. Suppose it does. In the case of a nation with a gross national product of approximately $450 billion a year, suppose it were to cost $5 billion or $10 billion a year, even that much would be a cheap price to pay for the liberty of our Nation. Even if it cost $50 billion, that would be only one-ninth of our gross national product.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield again?

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. I do not know of one Senator who would not place the safety of the country above budget balancing or any other consideration, nor would the President of the United States. He has recommended expenditures less than the expenditures of the preceding year. The question is how far we are to proceed with this, that, or the other element of our national defense. That is a subject upon which reasonable men may differ. But certainly to charge, even by implication, that the President of the United States is seeking to weaken our natitonal defense is entirely unjustified, in my opinion.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. When it is known that the Russians have 175 ground divisions ready for combat, and equipped with the most modern tanks and other implements of war; and when we have recommendations, from the Executive, to cut back the meager hundreds of thousands of our ground forces, how can it be said that that will not weaken the defenses of the United States?

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield again?

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I yield for a question.

Mr. KEATING. Does the Senator from Texas feel that if we had an additional 25,000 or 30,000 men in the Army or in the Marine Corps, that would have anything to do with the defense of Berlin?

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Certainly. I think that if we weaken one point on the perimeter of our defense—whether it be the Army, the Marine Corps, the Navy, or the Air Force—if only one segment is weakened, the whole will be weakened. In my opinion, our armed forces are now down to the absolute minimum.

We must remember that sudden peril calls for an enlargement of our military forces. In such a case, we must have some men in uniform, and trained, in order to be able to train the new recruits. But in view of the present rapid turnover—with our young men coming into the services for two years, and then leaving—the forces we now have are scarcely large enough for the necessary training groups, the irreplaceable cadre that is required to train the young men who are coming into our armed services.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield again to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MCNAMARA in the chair). Does the Senator from Texas yield again to the Senator from New York?

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. Will the Senator from Texas explain how he would expect to deploy any additional forces of foot soldiers in Berlin—in an area where we do not have control of the perimeter—and how the addition of a certain number of men to our ground troops at this time would have anything to do with the defense of Berlin? I am not talking about the overall effect of additional ground forces. But the statements that additional troops would have anything to do with the defense of Berlin is, in my judgment, entirely beside the point.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Of course, not being a military tactician, I have not attempted to say just how those men would be used in the perimeter of Berlin. Naturally, that is a function of the generals. But the military have testified that they need these forces; and I think the rationale of history shows beyond peradventure of doubt that we need all the troops we now have; in fact, if anything, we need more.

In the case of missiles, we are certainly behind; and certainly we need to expand our missile development and research and other missile work all along the line; and we need additional funds to modernize the weapons of our ground forces and the weapons of all our other forces.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield again to me?

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. As to the number of men we need for our military defense, I am not talking about that subject at all. I am addressing myself to the remarks of the Senator from Texas, which are quite similar to other remarks we hear so often these days—namely, that we are weakening the defense of Berlin by not bringing additional ground forces into the Army and the Marine Corps. In my judgment that has nothing whatever to do with the defense of Berlin and there would be no way to deploy large numbers of additional forces in the Berlin area, nor would the men be prepared to be deployed there, under the existing state of affairs.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, the senior Senator from New York seems to argue that the forces we now have in Berlin and West Germany are considered as separate from the rest of the defenses of the United States. We have men deployed in 73 nations; and all of them are members of the Armed Forces of the United States. In Korea, the situation has reached the point where we have to take into our forces—the two infantry divisions we have there—a large percentage of Koreans, simply because we do not have enough American soldiers there to fill out those two divisions, which are there for the preservation of democracy in South Korea.

Now to pull that down, to weaken in any respect the meager, inadequate forces we have, will certainly weaken the defenses of this country. What are we doing to mobilize planes against the probability that we should have to again

supply West Berlin by airlift, as we did before? We are doing nothing about it. We are talking about standing firm in West Berlin, and yet we are getting recommendations from the executive branch to further reduce our conventional Armed Forces. It is a course of weakness, not of strength.

VOTING RIGHTS FOR RESIDENTS OF DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. HUMPHREY obtained the floor.

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield to the Senator from Maryland, with the understanding that I do not lose the floor.

Mr. BEALL. I thank the Senator from Minnesota for yielding to me.

Mr. President, last night the Senate approved statehood for Hawaii. In the last session of Congress the Senate approved statehood for Alaska. All of which is very fine, and I was very happy to join with the majority in voting for statehood for both Territories. The Senate voted to give Alaska statehood, and to give Hawaii statehood, but here in our Nation's capital we prohibit residents from having the franchise or the right to vote. It does seem to me ironical and unfair, because in the District of Columbia there are as many citizens as there are in Hawaii and Alaska combined. Yet Congress declines to give residents of our Nation's capital full citizenship rights.

Although I am the sponsor of one bill to give the franchise to District of Columbia residents, I am not speaking for my bill or for any other particular bill, but I think the time has long since passed when the citizens of the District of Columbia should obtain the right to vote. I think it is apropos, at a time when the Senate has favorably acted on granting statehood to other Territories, to bring to the attention of the Senate, and particularly the other body of Congress, that the people of the District of Columbia are certainly as much Americans as are any other citizens.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President will the Senator yield?

Mr. BEALL. I do not have the floor. The Senator from Minnesota has the floor.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am happy to yield to the distinguished Senator from Nevada.

Mr. BIBLE. I simply desire to concur in everything the very distinguished Senator from Maryland has said concerning the problem of home rule in the District of Columbia. I know of his perseverance and his deep interest in trying to get home rule for the District of Columbia.

As the Senator from Maryland is well aware, home rule bills of various types have been passed by the Senate. Four such bills were passed by the Senate in recent years. There are presently before the Senate District of Columbia Committee and the Senate Judiciary Committee several home rule and national representation bills of varying types.

I am hopeful that this year, a year in which we shall add a 50th star to the flag by the admission of Hawaii, which will probably be accomplished legislativewise on this very day, at least the home rule movement will receive far more consideration from both sides of Congress than it has in the past. I think the record of the Senator from Maryland in that respect is excellent. I hope the climate this year is such that the approximately 800,000 disfranchised people of the District of Columbia, living in the Nation's great Capital City, will be granted the right to vote and to have a say in their Government.

As the Senator from Maryland so well knows, it is a paradox to have residing here in the heart of the world a group of people who do not have the right of self-government. I certainly hope that condition will be remedied this year.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield to me briefly?

Mr. HUMPHREY. First, may I yield to the Senator from Maryland, and then I shall be glad to yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. BEALL. I thank the Senator from Nevada for his remarks. As chairman of the Senate Committee on the District of Columbia, he has been an ardent supporter of home rule and has cooperated in every way possible. Under his leadership, we are trying to move forward this year.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield now to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CLARK. I thank the Senator from Minnesota for yielding to me.

As a former member of the Committee on the District of Columbia, and as one who still has the interests of the District of Columbia very much at heart, I should like to associate myself with the comments which have just been made by the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BEALL] and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE]. In addition, I should like to observe that yesterday we got rid of practically what remained of American colonialism. America no longer is a colonial power so far as Hawaii and Alaska are concerned, but we still have this one little colony here in the District of Columbia, which we do not permit to enjoy the same right of home rule which the British Empire grants to areas in darkest Africa, but in addition, we put our colony on short rations.

As our friends who are still on the District of Columbia Committee realize, the District of Columbia needs a minimum of $32 million a year of Federal funds in order to maintain a decent budget and to furnish the services which are badly needed in the District of Columbia. Yet last year the joint efforts of the Senator from Maryland, the Senator from Nevada, other members of the District of Columbia Committee, and myself, were unavailing in obtaining more than $20 million from the Federal Government as its just and equitable share.

So I should like again to associate myself with the thoughts of my two colleagues, and to urge that this year we accord at least the same kind of equitable treatment to the District of Columbia as we have just given to Alaska and Hawaii.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota has the floor. Does he yield for a question? Does the Senator from Pennsylvania desire to ask a question?

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, would the Senator from Minnesota like to have the floor back?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes.

Mr. President, this colloquy in reference to home rule for the people of the District of Columbia is one which so deeply interests me that I, too, wish to associate myself with the remarks of the distinguished chairman of the Committee on the District of Columbia [Mr. BIBLE] and with the remarks of the ranking Republican member of that committee [Mr. BEALL], and of course, with the remarks of the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK].

I cannot for the life of me understand why we have been so dilatory in our responsibilies to the cause of self-government as to have denied the residents of the District of Columbia an opportunity to become full-fledged American citizens. It appears to me that if we cannot accomplish it by legislation, there is only one other way to do it, and that is by constitutional amendment.

I think it would be well for the Committee on the District of Columbia to entertain and act upon a resolution in the form of a constitutional amendment which would unqualifiedly give residents of the District of Columbia a full franchise and at the same time give them an opportunity for local self-government on any terms they may want.

I think this is long overdue. I make this recommendation in good spirit and good faith.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. BIBLE. This is a suggestion which has been before the committee at various times. I assure the Senator it is a suggestion which has considerable merit. Failing a straight-up legislative reform in this direction, it may well be that the constitutional approach is the correct answer. That approach will receive the careful attention of our committee. I thank the Senator from Minnesota, because I know of his advocacy and real interest in the problem of home rule and self-government in the District of Columbia.

Mr. HUMPHREY. If it is the desire of those who are responsible for the committee's actions to take an approach on the constitutional amendment basis, I should like to associate myself with that endeavor. I think such a proposal would pass in short order, because the people of the United States of America, which is soon to embrace 50 States, I am sure want to give others what they receive themselves, namely, sovereign powers of self-government in their respective jurisdictions.

Mr. BIBLE. I thank the Senator.

MR. ALSOP'S REJOINDER TO MR. BENSON

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, in the New York Herald Tribune of this morning, March 12, 1959, there was published a letter to the editor entitled "Mr. Alsop's Rejoinder to Mr. Benson." This letter is signed by one of the Nation's most noted and famed columnists, Mr. Joseph Alsop.

The letter to the editor is in response to the letter to the editor of some 2 days ago by the Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Ezra Taft Benson.

Mr. Alsop has seen fit to answer the charges and comments of the Secretary of Agriculture. The Alsop letter indeed presents a devastating argument against the program of the Secretary of Agriculture.

Mr. Alsop, of course, like all the rest of us, has a high personal regard for the Secretary in terms of the private convictions and personal life of the Secretary of Agriculture. Nevertheless, as Mr. Alsop clearly points out:

> When a public official makes a thorough mess, the time comes when the fact of the mess has to be faced, even if the public official is a worthy, religious, and not uncourageous man. That is the best way to sum up the Benson problem.

The letter is so concise and persuasive I believe it would be better to let it stand on its own, rather than to have further elaboration. I therefore ask unanimous consent that the letter be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HART in the chair). Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Minnesota?

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MR. ALSOP'S REJOINDER TO MR. BENSON

TO THE NEW YORK HERALD TRIBUNE:

A reply is fairly insistently demanded by Secretary of Agriculture Benson's letter to the editor of 2 days ago. Three points deserve comment.

First of all, Secretary Benson strangely disclaims all responsibility for everything that has happened at the Agriculture Department during his term of office, saying that "the Benson program has never been allowed to go into effect" by Congress. This is simply not true. Of 53 counted requests that Secretary Benson has made to Congress, only 5, and none of those of first importance, have been rejected. The rest have been granted, in whole or in part. The Republican Congress of 1954 gave the Secretary most of the authority he at first requested to adopt the so-called flexible parity principle. A Democratic Congress approved his soil-bank plan, which turned out to be so faulty and wasteful that it was quietly discarded.

What happened in 1954 is perhaps the best test. The Secretary then requested authority to flex parity from 90 percent down to 70 percent. The Congress voted a compromise, allowing flexing down to 82.5 percent the first year, and 75 percent the second year. Since then, further congressional action has permitted still further flexing, so that parity payments now average just about 70 percent, thus standing at the lowest level the Secretary originally told Congress he wanted. Secretary Benson has not been given carte blanche by Congress, but he has been given a very great deal; and the results have been appalling.

In the second place, any Cabinet officer in Secretary Benson's situation has a clear duty to present a detailed program that he believes will work, if he discovers that the program he is administering is not working. Instead, Benson has let his surpluses fantastically accumulate. He has permitted the over-all cost of the agriculture program to double and triple since President Truman left office. He has tolerated the frustration of the only sensible aim of any agricultural program, the conservation and promotion of independent farming in this country. And except for the disastrous soil bank, he has never offered anything worth arguing about, except further doses of the same medicine that did not work when he first prescribed it in 1954.

Finally, I say these things with some shame, for the quite simple reason that I was a strong and vocal supporter of Secretary Benson during all his first years in office. Like many others, I supported him because I thought he meant to remove the anomalies of the earlier, Democratic farm programs. No doubt this was his intention. I am now ashamed because it took me too long to notice that Benson's good intention was in the class that Dr. Johnson said formed the pavement of Hell. His efforts to remove past anomalies and extravagances have in fact produced even greater present anomalies and extravagances. On this point, the downright horrendous figures of increase of Agriculture Department expenditure under Benson ought to speak for themselves to any reasonable person.

When a public official makes a thorough mess, the time comes when the fact of the mess has to be faced, even if the public official is a worthy, religious, and not uncourageous man. That is the best way to sum up the Benson problem.

JOSEPH ALSOP.

WASHINGTON.

GENEVA NUCLEAR TEST BAN NEGOTIATIONS PROPOSALS TO BREAK PRESENT IMPASSE

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I wish to address myself to the subject of the Geneva nuclear test ban negotiations, citing what I believe to be some possible proposals to break the present impasse.

Mr. President, negotiations for a treaty for the discontinuance of nuclear weapons tests are still going on in Geneva. Representatives of the United States, the United Kingdom, and the Soviet Union are in their fifth month of meetings. Progress in the negotiations has been painfully slow. In the last week or two progress seems to have halted altogether. Many commentators have concluded that the negotiations are doomed, and that the negotiators might just as well pack their bags and return to their countries.

It is true that the Geneva test ban talks are stalled, but they are not completely stalemated. To break them off now would be a serious mistake.

It seemed last summer that the Soviet Union wanted a mutual suspension of nuclear weapons tests. But unfortunately, the Soviet Union is now having an extremely difficult time facing up to the necessary implications of an effective system of control. The Soviet Union keeps insisting that each of the Big Three—the U.S.A., U.K., and U.S.S.R.—must have a veto over such decisions of the control organization as whether an onsite inspection of an unidentified event should take place. The overwhelming majority of Americans are united in the belief that such a veto must not be a part of any agreement on the cessation of nuclear weapons tests.

Mr. President, I digress to point out that we are aware what a veto power can do to an international organization. We have witnessed the abuses of the veto in the Security Council of the United Nations. Those abuses have been perpetrated by the Soviet Union. It is understandable that the negotiators of the United States and the United Kingdom would not want to accede to a request or a demand on the part of the Soviets that there be a further use of a veto in an international control and supervisory organization.

We are willing to yield to others the right to inspect on our territory, and we would not rest secure unless we had the right to satisfy ourselves by adequate investigation, through a trusted international agency that no violations had occurred.

The Soviet Union has taken a position which draws no support from any part of the non-Communist world. It is losing all of the good will it has created by its advocacy of a test ban over a period of years, particularly in the so-called neutral nations. In my judgment it is still too early to determine that the Soviet Union will persist in this completely negative position. The Geneva talks, therefore, I respectfully say, should not be terminated. The United States must continue to probe and to explore every possible and reasonable means for an adequate and effective agreement. If the negotiations are to fail the responsibility for failure must lie with the Soviet Union in its obstinate and intransigent refusal to reconcile differences for a workable program for inspection and control.

In judging the progress of the test ban negotiations it is important to compare them with other negotiations conducted with the Soviet Union or the Soviet bloc. The Korean armistice was reached after 2 years of off-and-on negotiation. The Austrian peace treaty was finally concluded after hundreds of meetings. The Zarubin-Lacy agreement on the exchange of persons between the Soviet Union and the United States was inspired by the summit talks of 1955, but the agreement was not signed until 1958.

This morning it was my privilege to address the War College. During the discussion which followed, I answered a question in reference to the negotiations on the nuclear test ban. I pointed out to the gentleman who asked me a questio as to how long we should continue such negotiations that Americans must be prepared for long-run, long-duration, tedious, and at times very distressing negotiations when we sit down with the Soviet representatives. In a rather facetious, and yet an almost symbolic way, I said, "It might be a good idea to give our negotiators a paid-up social security old-age insurance policy before they sit down for negotiations."

The prospects are that the period of negotiations will be extremely long. Nevertheless, this is a good use of time and talent, because in negotiations at least one has as an objective the solution

of problems, or at any rate their alleviation, rather than the aggravation of problems and their further extension. It seems to me this is a small price to pay in the quest for a just and enduring peace. It is a small price to pay for an attempt to ease international tensions.

So I say that no matter what the issue, whether it be the crisis in Germany or Berlin, or whether it be the test ban question, we must be prepared, first, for long, tedious, arduous negotiations with people who are suspicious, who will examine meticulously every word we say, and who are obviously going to do everything they can to negotiate favorably for the Soviets. We ourselves must be on guard lest in such negotiations we despair and therefore seek to obtain an agreement merely for the sake of an agreement.

What I am trying to say is that the agreement must be carefully worked out, and measured with meticulous detail as to every point, so that we may know the agreement has more assets than liabilities.

I am opposed to seeking agreements merely for the sake of being able to say that we have reached an agreement. This has caused us trouble in the past, and it can cause us trouble in the future. Better that we should negotiate interminably than to sign agreements which lend themselves to violation, or to interests contrary to the national security and the security of our allies.

I believe that this is a worthy admonition to any of our negotiators; and it seems proper that it be stated again and again in the Senate.

A test ban is a more difficult and delicate agreement to achieve than the agreements to which I have previously referred. It lies within the sensitive area of disarmament, which goes to the very heart of the international power balance. It would result in international inspectors stationed in the United States, the Soviet Union, and elsewhere for the purpose of checking on possible violations of the agreement. This has never before occurred in either country, or any other country. We have been seeking disarmament agreements since the immediate postwar era, and negotiations of one sort or another have continued intermittently for 13 years. So I respectfully say that a delay of a few more weeks or months must be viewed with philosophy and patience, in view of this long history. Perhaps it would be better to say "philosophical patience." This is an endurance race, not a sprint.

TEST BAN AGREEMENT—A POLITICAL BREAKTHROUGH

The test ban agreement could represent a significant political breakthrough. We must constantly remind ourselves that the Geneva negotiations represent much more than an effort to conclude an agreement to discontinue nuclear weapons tests. Such an agreement could be signed quickly, but it would not be adequate. If an agreement to stop nuclear weapons tests under a trustworthy system of inspection and control could be realized it would be the most significant political breakthrough in the 13 years of the cold war. I made this point a year ago in a speech on the Senate floor, and I reiterate it today.

A test ban agreement would alert the people of the world to the fact that a small step had finally been taken to penetrate the atmosphere of distrust and tension existing in the world. Our penetration of outer space to date has progressed much faster than our penetration of the cold war atmosphere on earth.

The Soviet Union must be reminded that agreement on a control system to end nuclear weapons tests will give promise that other cold war issues might be removed. But if agreement on a control system cannot be realized, then the hope for accommodation on other issues becomes indefinitely more remote. A test ban agreement would enable any future summit conference, or any future foreign ministers conference, dealing with the question of European security to be held under much more favorable conditions than now is the case.

In other words, if between now and May 27 a test ban agreement with effective controls and inspection could be arrived at that would be satisfactory to our officials as well as those of the United Kingdom and the Soviet Union, then, indeed, the prospect for peace and some kind of equitable adjustments in the instance of Berlin and Germany would appear to be much better.

I can think of nothing that would give the world more hope that there could be a peaceful and just resolution of some of the difficulties which currently exist in the Central European areas than an agreement, including effective controls and inspection, on the issue of nuclear tests. This would be a ray of hope in 1959 that could literally light the world.

Those who want to see some first step arms control agreement should make the point as forcibly as they can, that if a test ban agreement cannot be concluded because the Soviet Union will not accept a workable and effective control and inspection system, then the world, for the present, may be denied any agreement on any issue. There are many who are skeptical that any disarmament agreement can be reached in a period of tension among the major powers. I recognize that the weight of history and of logic tend to be on their side. The Soviet Union, if it persists in its attitude demanding a veto, will furnish proof that even a small step cannot be agreed upon; and if the arms race is to be slowed down and the tension is to be removed it must be removed in other ways. I may add that the prospects for such an agreement would then be remote, indeed.

I do not disagree with the skeptics. I too am skeptical. But I have not yet given up hope. Five months of negotiation is not a very long period in terms of negotiating with the Soviet Union. It is possible that if the Soviets refuse to budge even a little the talks should be recessed for a few weeks or a few months, although even this would be premature at this time.

FUNDAMENTAL REQUIREMENTS OF A TEST BAN AGREEMENT

Neither the Soviet Union nor any other country should have a veto over the operations of the control system. Furthermore, the control system must include the right of on-site inspection of unidentified events which might be suspicious of being nuclear explosions. The control posts and inspection teams must be staffed on an international basis so that all countries will have confidence that the system is being operated on an objective and impartial basis, and that its personnel are motivated toward diligent and accurate fact searching. The control system must also include provision for its technical improvement. Without improvements and adjustments based on increased knowledge and research the countries of the world will not learn of additional possibilities as well as additional difficulties of detection and identification of nuclear weapons tests. Finally, the agreement on the discontinuance of nuclear weapons tests needs to contain procedures by which the agreement and the control system will be extended to other countries and areas in which nuclear tests might possibly take place in the future.

PRAISE FOR UNITED STATES NEGOTIATION AT GENEVA

Mr. President, I wish to say a few words in praise of the United States negotiators and the negotiations at Geneva. I have cited what appear to me to be the fundamental prerequisites of a treaty to stop all nuclear weapons tests. The United States negotiators at Geneva have done a commendable job thus far in attempting to negotiate with a difficult and oftentimes intransigent opponent. Ambassador Wadsworth and his able associates have stood firm on the fundamentals I have mentioned while being conciliatory and flexible on those points which are not so basic. Our negotiators have had a particularly difficult task when one considers the confusion and bickering which have gone on back in Washington during much of the negotiating period. Certain departments of Government have been quite vocal in expressing their doubts regarding the official position of the United States. But our delegation has persisted, and I believe it must continue to persist until the Soviets clearly show that they are not prepared to sign an agreement to end all nuclear weapons tests under an effective system of control.

If the time comes when the last hope of an effective agreement is removed—and I believe that time has not yet come—then the United States must consider what alternatives should be pursued. Two alternatives worthy of very serious consideration have already been submitted by two of my distinguished colleagues on the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. GORE] has suggested that the United States unilaterally decide for a period of 3 years to stop all nuclear tests in the atmosphere, and during this period continue to leave the door open for a cessation of tests under the more difficult conditions of detection, those underground and at high altitudes. The Senator from Oklahoma is to be complimented on his foresight and his imaginative proposal.

The Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH] has offered the proposal that the United States be prepared to negotiate from an alternative position. He proposes an international agreement, as contrasted with unilateral action, which would ban atmospheric tests under a system of control that would necessarily be much less extensive than an agreement which covered underground tests. If the Soviets want a less extensive control system, then a ban on atmospheric tests only may be the most that can be obtained at this time. Again, Mr. President, the Senator from Idaho has made a constructive proposal and suggestion relating to these negotiations.

Both of these suggestions merit very serious consideration. They might well be adopted as official policy if it becomes apparent that the Soviets will not accept effective control and inspection over the cessation of all nuclear tests.

SENATE ROLE CRITICAL IN TEST BAN TALKS

The role of the Senate is a very critical and a very vital role. The suggestions of the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. GORE] and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH] indicate the earnestness with which we in the Senate view the Geneva negotiations. Indeed, other Senators also have made proposals and suggestions, and that is all to the good. Ordinarily members of the Senate could sit back and simply state that the Geneva negotiations are a function of the executive branch, that how they are conducted and whether they succeed or fail are not primarily the business of the Congress. Some might even argue that congressional suggestions during the course of negotiations are out of order—I certainly do not so argue; in fact, I believe they are very much in order—and that the Congress should only be involved in an agreement after it has been concluded and submitted to the Senate for ratification.

Mr. President, the time is long past when the Senate can or should sit idly by and withhold discussion and constructive suggestions on treaties until engrossed copies are formally submitted. Obviously the Senate cannot conduct the negotiations and cannot try to pass approval or disapproval on each minor point that is raised. But a treaty on such a crucial matter as the cessation of nuclear weapons tests should not be considered by the Senate on a rubberstamp basis. On the other hand, we cannot take lightly the very unfortunate consequences of Senate refusal to ratify such a treaty once it has been negotiated by the executive officials and signed by the executive officials. Therefore, the Members of the Senate who are most involved in the question have a duty and a responsibility to discuss before this body and before the public, some of the crucial issues raised in the negotiations. We cannot abdicate our constitutional duty to advise as well as to consent on the making of treaties. That is why Senator GORE and Senator CHURCH have made such a distinct contribution by offering their proposals to the President for consideration.

LETTER OF SENATOR HUMPHREY TO THE PRESIDENT

In the same spirit, from time to time, I have also offered suggestions on aspects of the arms-control problem and particularly on the suspension of nuclear-weapons tests. Last Friday I wrote to the President regarding the Geneva test-ban negotiations. My point in writing was twofold: First, I wished to share with the President some of my observations on the gross distortions of the recent speech of Premier Khrushchev, a major part of which dealt with the test-ban talks. Second, I wanted to suggest two points which would, on the one hand, in my opinion, protect the United States interests and, on the other, show the Soviets that we are at all times prepared to be reasonable, conciliatory, and sincere in trying to reach a workable and trustworthy agreement.

I am sure that my colleagues know that I give a good deal of time and, I trust, sincere and serious thought to these problems relating to disarmament questions; in fact, to the whole broad question of our arms policy and related control measures.

It is in this spirit and with this background that I address myself to this rather difficult subject. I ask unanimous consent that my letter to President Eisenhower of last Friday be inserted at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MARCH 5, 1959.

THE PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: As you know I have been following with intense interest the negotiations in Geneva to draft a treaty for the discontinuance of nuclear weapons tests. Not in 13 long years of effort and hope has the world been so close to an agreement, though small in scope, on the subject of arms control. If these talks fail it may be difficult to convene future talks among the major powers on this subject.

It is apparent that at this point in the Geneva negotiations the Soviet Union is demonstrating a highly inflexible attitude. No indication has yet been given that the Soviets are prepared to accept the most fundamental principle of a control system, namely the right of on-site inspection of unidentified events which could be suspected of being nuclear exposions. If the Soviets have in mind a control system in which no inspection takes place, or if it does, only after prolonged delay, then it is regretful but apparently true that they are determined that no effective control can be a part of any disarmament agreement. If this is the case, then the Soviet Government must bear the responsibility for the failure to realize a first step to ease the pace of the present armaments race.

Premier Khrushchev, in his recent speech before representatives of the Kalinin constituency of Moscow, engaged in a gross distortion of the Western position on the ending of nuclear weapons tests.

For example, Premier Khrushchev misrepresented the Western position when he indicated that since "neither the United States, nor Great Britain would agree that, for example, the Soviet Union should force decisions upon them which touch upon the sovereignty and security of these states * * * then there is only one way out—agreement on decisions * * *." Is it not true that he has already been told by the United States and the United Kingdom representatives that we are prepared to submit to the recommendations of the control commission, and that we are prepared to trust the judgment and integrity of the countries on the control Commission?

Mr. Khrushchev also distorted the facts when he claimed regarding the staffing at control posts that the United States and United Kingdom "want to set up posts on our territory which would be staffed entirely by foreigners who would in effect be undisputed masters in their zone." Then he went on to make the preposterous statement that "it follows that our entire territory would be subjected to complete supervision by foreigners and, in view of the fact, these foreigners would be under the command of American and Britons forming part of the NATO leadership, it means that we would have to hand over our territory to supervision by the aggressive NATO bloc."

Mr. Khrushchev must have been told that the staffing at control posts will not be composed only of U.S. and U.K. personnel. I thought the staffing was to be recruited from many countries, and that the composition with respect to nationalities would be about the same in the United States as it would be in the Soviet Union. I am under the impression that the United States is not suggesting that its territory would be taken over by the Soviet Union. In fact, in the Soviet Union, a country of 200 million people, it is ridiculous to think that the same 600 members of the control organization, even if they were all foreigners, could control that country.

Mr. Khrushchev must also know that Soviet representatives would accompany every inspection party and that even the transportation would probably be provided by the Soviet Union.

According to press reports, Mr. Khrushchev now indicates his speech was not to be taken too seriously, that it was for electioneering purposes. Nevertheless, his extreme statements do not fill us with the hope that the Soviet Union sincerely is prepared to end nuclear weapons tests under an effective control system.

But, Mr. President, having said these things about the Soviet position, I do have some inquiries about the position of the United States. I am aware that in view of the unreasonable Soviet position the talks at Geneva are at a very critical stage. However, I do think that the world situation is too grave and too filled with danger to have us give up too easily at this time.

The people of all nations urgently want an agreement which may have the effect of slowing down the armaments race. If an agreement to stop nuclear weapons tests under effective inspection and control could be concluded, I believe it would also enable any summit conference that may eventually be held to be conducted in an atmosphere much less fraught with tension than now is the case.

I wonder whether we have explored all the possibilities which preserve the principle of effective control on the one hand and on the other which show clearly to the suspicious Soviets that espionage and indiscriminate inspection are definitely not the purposes of adequate control.

Both as a Senator and as chairman of the Subcommittee on Disarmament, I feel that every possibility must be explored. We must be sure that no idea worthy of consideration has been passed over. Senator CHURCH has made an interesting suggestion if the Soviets adamantly refuse to accept a control system for the cessation of all nuclear weapons tests.

I also have two proposals to put forth. The first concerns the matter of on-site inspection. I would like to inquire whether the United States has adequately explored

the idea of placing a ceiling on the number of inspections that could take place in a given country or area within a specified period of time.

When one tries to visualize just how the inspection and control system would work in practice the conclusion seems obvious that only a limited number of on-site inspections could take place. An event which the control posts are unable to identify could lead to an inspection and this fundamental right would in itself act as a deterrent to a potential violator. If all tests were banned, obviously not every unidentified event could be inspected. All such events occurring in areas in which earthquakes do not usually occur would probably be inspected and this, I believe, the Soviet chairman of the conference of experts, Mr. Federov, admitted would have to take place. But inspections of unidentified events in earthquake areas would need to be on a spot-check basis. If a limit were placed on the number of inspections per year, for example, it would be necessary that the control organ never exhaust all of its inspections before the end of the period.

Would not a limit on the number of inspections on the territory of each of the nuclear powers and in the areas in which tests might take place preserve the interests of the United States and at the same time clearly indicate to the Soviet Union that we would not, as Mr. Khrushchev maintains, be inspecting all mines, quarries, woods, ravines, and all the rest.

The other proposal concerns voting procedure in the control Commission. The present Western proposal, I believe, is for a 7 nation control Commission composed of the United States, United Kingdom, U.S.S.R., and 4 other countries. Would not our interest be preserved if the composition of the control Commission consisted of the United States, United Kingdom, U.S.S.R., one other country in the Soviet-Sino bloc, and three neutral countries? If decisions were made by a simple majority, each side would need to pick up two of the three neutrals to order an inspection.

I am offering these suggestions for your consideration. If proposed and if subsequently rejected by the Soviet Union, it would be, unfortunately, further indication to the world that the Soviet Union has no intention of ever letting any inspection take place.

There are undoubtedly other measures that could also be explored which might, assuming a seriousness of purpose on the part of the Soviet Union, bridge the gap between the positions of the two sides and still protect the vital interests of the United States.

I am fully cognizant that no one measure will insure the success of the nuclear test ban talks. It is obvious that other issues still divide the conference, such as the means by which the control system would be extended to other nations which might be capable of exploding nuclear devices or nations which might permit their territory to be used for nuclear testing.

Thank you for your consideration of my letter.

Respectfully,

HUBERT H. HUMPHREY.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the letter speaks for itself. However, I wish to amplify slightly two suggestions I made, and I shall quote from the letter by way of reference.

PROPOSAL FOR COMPOSITION OF SEVEN-NATION CONTROL COMMISSION

One of my suggestions deals with the composition of the control organization which would be responsible for monitoring the test-ban agreement. The three nuclear powers have agreed that the control organization should be operated by a seven-nation Commission with the three nuclear powers serving as permanent members. The United States and the United Kingdom originally proposed that the other four members be chosen by all the nations which signed the test-ban treaty. Recently the United States has suggested that the control Commission be composed of three Western nations, two Soviet bloc nations, and two neutrals. The Soviet Union has demanded that the three permanent members have a veto on all decisions of this Commission. In other words, any one of the three permanent members would have a veto. The Soviets argue that the Soviet Union would be a permanent minority. The Soviets claim that the United States would always have a majority of the members of the Commission and thus the Commission could force its will on the Soviet Union. We can examine that complaint.

Members of Congress are familiar with the problems of majority and minority rights. No veto as such exists either in the conduct of the business of the Senate or the House, but those who have found themselves occasionally or consistently out of step with majority opinion sometimes devise ways of assuring that their views will not be trampled on by what they consider to be the wishes of a possibly overzealous majority. This problem engaged the attention of the men who met in Philadelphia at our Constitutional Convention in 1787, and it is one which inspired some of the most thought-provoking wisdom of the distinguished statesman, John C. Calhoun.

I do not mean to draw too precise an analogy here between the conduct of the business of the Senate and negotiations with the Soviet Union. But in negotiating with a country that has been and probably will continue to be in a minority position with respect to numbers but will also continue to wield great political, military, and economic power in the world, we have to make a choice. The choice is perhaps a choice between no progress toward a test-ban agreement and some progress based on the concept of a different composition of the control Commission.

I add that the second concept would in no way, in my opinion, jeopardize our national security.

My suggestion to the President was that the control Commission might be composed of the three nuclear powers—U.S., U.K., and U.S.S.R.—one other member of the Sino-Soviet bloc and three neutrals. This would put the Soviet Union on a par with the United States and Great Britain in terms of numbers, but it would mean that the balance of power in the voting of the Commission would rest with the three neutrals. In order to achieve a simple majority to make decisions, either side would need to have two of the three neutral votes. Since the Commission is supposed to be run on an impartial and technical basis with no extraneous political issues included, the role of the neutral nations in this case would be proper.

Again, I must underscore that when I say "neutrals," I mean real neutrals; not those who profess a kind of neutrality, only to find convenient arrangements with the Soviet Union. I am talking about the kind of neutrals symbolized by Sweden and Switzerland, for example. There are others, but I cite those two countries on the European scene, for illustration.

If my suggestion were accepted it would remove the argument and case of the Soviet Union to attempt to justify a veto. The Soviet Union could no longer contend that it needed protection from a so-called built-in majority of the Western nations. The majority would in fact be determined by the neutrals.

Here, again, I underscore the importance of the word "neutrals;" that this is not, for example, a control Commission with neutrals, in which the neutrality is not really explicit or implicit. But we have also seen a country, such as India, which can act as a neutral sincerely and conscientiously.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I should prefer not to yield at this point.

Mr. KEATING. I should like to ask the Senator a question at this point.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I should not like to yield at the moment; I shall yield shortly.

PROPOSAL FOR CEILING ON NUMBER OF ON-SITE INSPECTIONS

I now come to my second suggestion. This covers the point of on-site inspection of events which have been registered at the control posts and which might be suspected of being nuclear explosions. Analysis of the data registered at the control posts, particularly if the control posts contain the most improved and efficient equipment possible, should usually identify the causation of the many signals that will be recorded. The most important and frequent source of vibrations will be earthquakes occurring beneath the surface of the earth. In most cases, it will be a relatively simple matter to identify these positively as earthquakes. There will be other occasions when the control posts will not be able positively to identify the source and here it is essential to have the right to send a mobile inspection team to the area from which the signal arises, in order to conduct an inspection on the spot which will enable it to determine whether the vibrations were caused by a nuclear explosion.

The Soviet Union claims that the United States and Great Britain will try to use the right of inspection to roam indiscriminately throughout the Soviet Union to learn its well-hidden secrets.

Here we see the suspicious nature of the Soviet Union coming to the forefront. I know, and every Member of this body knows, that this is not the purpose of inspection. It definitely could not be the purpose of inspection if the control organization is operated on an impartial basis. We know also here that we are willing to yield privileges to others as great as those we demand for ourselves.

As a practical matter there would be a limit on the number of inspections that would take place during any given

period and in a given area. The United States has already suggested that there should be some limitation on the number of inspections which could take place. This suggestion has been made in Geneva. My suggestion is that if we agreed on a ceiling for the number of inspections this would show that espionage definitely is not our purpose, as we know it not to be, but it would preserve the right of spot-checking suspicious events in a specific number of cases. It would still make it possible to uncover speedily a course of conduct in violation of the treaty.

In my letter to the President I pointed out that the control Commission would probably always want to send an inspection team to investigate suspicious and unidentified events in areas in which earthquakes normally do not occur. In areas where earthquake activity is high, inspection would be on a spot-check basis.

The Soviet Union must accept the principle that some inspections will be necessary and that such inspections must be conducted in an unimpeded manner—no delays and no redtape. But there would not and need not be an unlimited number of inspections.

REQUEST FOR RELEASE OF BERKNER REPORT

Before concluding my remarks, I have two additional points to make. Both concern the question of the adequacy of the control system that was devised last summer at the conference of experts with scientists from Western and Soviet bloc nations.

Mr. President, at this point I yield to the distinguished Senator from New York.

Mr. KEATING. I commend the Senator from Minnesota for discussing this very serious matter on the floor of the Senate. I entirely agree with his viewpoint that our function is not only to consent, but also to advise. I feel that the Senator is performing a constructive task in bringing our attention to this problem.

I am a little troubled by the first suggestion which the Senator made, concerning the composition of this group. He suggested that the United States, the United Kingdom, the U.S.S.R., and one of the so-called Sino-Soviet bloc, together with three neutrals, comprise the group. Did the Senator have in mind that the U.S.S.R. would select the other member of the Sino-Soviet bloc, and that we would agree to take whoever might be selected?

Mr. HUMPHREY. That would be in accord with the principle of equality between two Western nations and two Communist-controlled nations.

Mr. KEATING. I understand the principle which the Senator from Minnesota is seeking to enunciate; but would not that be likely to result in Communist China being the fourth member of the group?

Mr. HUMPHREY. It could be.

Mr. KEATING. Would not that in turn involve at least an implicit recognition of Communist China, which would be contrary to existing policy and, indeed, contrary to resolutions passed by Congress?

Mr. HUMPHREY. No, I think not, because the same situation would prevail as in the instance of North Korea, and, as the Senator is aware, we have negotiated with the North Koreans and with the Chinese Communists with respect to North Korea.

Mr. KEATING. But would not the suggestion involve a more formalized body than any the United States has yet recognized? In other words, would it not be a step toward the recognition of Communist China?

Mr. HUMPHREY. It would be a step toward recognizing Communist China as a reality, but it would not be a step toward political recognition of Communist China on a diplomatic basis.

As a matter of fact, I am not at all certain that the Soviet Union would select Communist China; in fact, she might very well not want Communist China. The Soviet Union might very well want to do what she has done in recent talks, namely, choose Poland or Czechoslovakia. In the surprise attack conference, it may be recalled, there were representatives from other Eastern European countries, but none at all from Communist China.

It seems to me that we might more likely expect that it would be an Eastern European country which the Soviet would want to have in the group. It might be a little easier for the Soviet Union to exercise, if I may say so, its control over a nation less powerful.

Mr. KEATING. I share the views of the Senator. My guess at the moment is that the U.S.S.R. might select some country other than Communist China.

However, in an effort to bring about the result they are constantly seeking to achieve, namely, complete recognition of Communist China—I think it would be dangerous for us to stick our heads into a noose, unless we are going to change our policy; and, personally, I do not favor doing that—which is what we would be doing if we agreed to a setup which foreclosed us from objecting at a later time to the inclusion of a member of the Sino-Soviet bloc which the Russians might seek to include.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The truth is that today the Soviets are insisting that there be some equality in terms of the numbers on the control Commission. Strictly from the point of arithmetical logic, they do have a point.

My feeling is that if there is ever to be an effective ban on nuclear weapons, Communist China will have to be included.

I have taken up this matter with the Secretary of State. In fact, the State Department itself has responded to the suggestions of the importance of including what we call mainland China in an effective type of control system.

Presently we have been able to devise inspection systems which operate fairly well, as regards surveillance over the explosion of nuclear weapons on the mainland of China. But I believe it would be less than responsible, and surely less than accurate, to say that we can really have an effective control over the possible violation of a ban on nuclear tests if Communist China is permanently excluded from such an agreement. Furthermore, today our Government recognizes that; and it is the official position of our Government, as of this hour, that the treaty we hope will be ageed to will be open for the inclusion of other nations, including Communist China.

Mr. KEATING. That may be. But I would question—and I am quite sure the Senator from Minnesota did not mean to imply—that the present policy of our Government is to accept Communist China on a formal commission.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am not at all sure about that. I would say that today our policy, insofar as the State Department is concerned, and also the President's policy, is that the nuclear test ban should cover as many areas as possible. That leaves the matter "open end," so to speak; and it has been made such intentionally, quite frankly.

I would wish, in the interest of national security, to see Communist China covered by some form of inspection. I do not agree with some persons that we should recognize her at this particular time. But if we can negotiate with the Chinese Communist Ambassador in Warsaw, as we have been doing day after day, and also negotiate with the Chinese Communists in North Korea, I believe we should consider the possibility of including the Chinese Communists in a nuclear weapons test ban, lest they test the weapons themselves and later have no hesitancy in using them in some areas of the world.

Mr. KEATING. But my point with the Senator is that to suggest——

Mr. HUMPHREY. I did not suggest it.

Mr. KEATING. I realize that, and I should not have stated the matter in quite that way. What I mean is that a suggestion that the Chinese Communists become a member of the Commission under this arrangement would seem to me to be a matter to which we would wish to give much long thinking before we would agree to it.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Perhaps so.

Mr. KEATING. Of course, the letter being sent to the President will receive consideration at policy levels with which I am not familiar in any way.

Mr. HUMPHREY. In the letter I sent to the President, I merely stated—and let me say that I hope I did so in a most respectful and cooperative manner—that I believe consideration should be given to making some adjustments in the Commission, in the interest of our own national security.

It follows, as the Senator from New York has properly pointed out, that my proposal would include the right to include on the Commission a second Communist nation—in other words, the Soviet Union and one other Communist nation—along with the United Kingdom, the United States of America, and three countries that are truly neutral.

It is possible that one of those countries could be Communist China. I do not say it should; but I am of the opinion that, sooner or later, the Chinese Communists are going to pose us a very serious problem in the field of nuclear

weapons; and the sooner they are included within some kind of control devices, the better off we shall be. So I suggest that we do so early, rather than late. But, again, this is a matter for the negotiators, the State Department, and the President. My suggestions are not offered as dicta; but, rather, they are offered as friendly, helpful suggestions.

Mr. KEATING. I realize that; and I think the ventilation of this entire question is all to the good.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator from New York for his very helpful and constructive questions and comments.

Mr. President, a few moments ago I stated that I have two additional points to make, and that both concern the question of the adequacy of the control system which was devised last summer at the conference of experts with scientists from Western and Soviet bloc nations. All Members of the Senate are aware that new data from the Hardtack II series—a recent atomic test series indicated that in important respects the control system, if no improvements were made in it, would have a more difficult task than the conference of experts had anticipated. This point has been discussed previously in the Senate and in congressional committees.

We need not wait to see the end of the negotiations, to render improvements in the detection system. At the request of the executive branch of the Government, a committee headed by Lloyd Berkner, head of the Space Science Board of the National Academy of Sciences, has prepared a report on how the science of the detection and identification of underground nuclear tests may be advanced and further improved and refined. That report has been completed. I suggest that it should be made public. This document should not be privileged. The Congress ought to share in the findings of such an important group in working on such a crucial problem. I respectfully request the President not to construe the role of advisers in such a way that reports such as the Berkner study are kept guarded within the confines of the executive branch. I cannot find any reason why such a report should be classified. We need to see the conclusions and recommendations of this distinguished group.

RESEARCH AND PEACEFUL TESTS SHOULD BE CONDUCTED NOW ON A MUTUAL BASIS

My other point on the technical side of this question is that we could, and should, be conducting research this very minute, so as to test the worth of the suggestions made by the Berkner committee and the conclusions arrived at last summer by the conference of experts. In other words, research on peaceful tests should continue, and they should be conducted on a mutual basis. The Soviet Union, the United Kingdom, and the United States have already agreed in principle to the need for further nuclear tests for peaceful purposes, which would include the perfection of the control system.

My distinguished colleagues, the chairman of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, the senior Senator from New Mexico (Mr. ANDERSON), and the junior Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. PASTORE), suggested some time ago that additional tests be held to check the reliability of the control system. Their suggestion should now be acted on in view of the following:

First. The Berkner report consists of theoretical possibilities which need to be tested.

Second. Such tests could be held with the three nuclear powers participating. After so many months of negotiation, both last summer at the technical conference and later at the political conference, the Western and Soviet scientists have now become rather well acquainted. If they planned and jointly carried on a few tests for research purposes, even the few remaining doubts about the effectiveness of the system might be removed.

Mr. President, I am offering these proposals for the consideration of the President, his Department of State, and negotiators in Geneva.

I am also making my letter public at this time so that Members of the Senate may ponder its worth, if any.

It is possible that we who are trying to find ways to reach a safe and effective agreement are engaged in an exercise of futility because in the end the Soviet Union will not accept a control system that is effective and workable. But we do not yet know what will be the final and irrevocable decision of the Soviet Government. The negotiations, I repeat, have not definitely failed. I respectfully suggest that we should persevere and be patient.

In any event, we are not wasting our time. We could never forgive ourselves if we failed to exhaust every possibility in our search for peace. The world looks to the United States for leadership in efforts to remove the threat of destructive war, and we shall be judged by the vigor, the imagination, and the fairmindedness of our work in Geneva, and, I am sure, in other places, in the years to come.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. GORE. I wish to congratulate the able Senator from Minnesota on his address. He has spoken eloquently and well, particularly with reference to the desire and the need for disarmament.

Does not the Senator think that a clearer line of distinction should be drawn between disarmament, on the one hand, and a stoppage of radioactive contamination of the atmosphere, on the other?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I certainly do, and I believe that the Senator from Tennessee has made his case very, very effectively and convincingly.

I should also like to make this differentiation between the negotiations currently under way in Geneva on the test ban and negotiations on disarmament. Actually, these are not disarmament negotiations in themselves. They lend themselves toward a reduction of armaments. They could lend themselves toward an effective system for future disarmament agreements. They could have a tendency, if the negotiations were successful, to slow down the what I call proliferation or the extension and expansion, of atomic weapons into other countries. But I think it would really be stretching the point a bit to call the current negotiations disarmament negotiations. I say they adjust the atmosphere for the possibilities of disarmament.

Mr. GORE. Insofar as the stoppage of underground tests is concerned, that, it seems to me, is essentially disarmament, just as would be the stoppage of further development of missiles and rockets. The contamination of the atmosphere does not come from underground explosions, if they are contained. So I think there is more of disarmament in the negotiations than the able Senator has just indicated, although the Russians refused to consider disarmament. As the Senator knows, whenever disarmament is suggested at Geneva, the Russians react by blaming us for the fallout hazard.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I make this one correction. The issue at Geneva over disarmament came in a proposal we made that such an agreement should be tied in with further disarmament proposals which would be made in the future.

I agree with the Senator from Tennessee that when weapons technology is slowed down, it has a tendency to slow down the arms race, but a country could still arm itself heavily with weapons it already had. In other words, the style and the type of the weapons which so far have been approved could be expanded and extended. So there is not really involved disarmament in the sense of reducing the number of weapons which are available.

Mr. GORE. But any substantial agreement for international control of atomic tests of whatever character would, I believe, be a major step which might lead to the taking of other steps.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Absolutely. The Senator is undoubtedly correct. That is the importance of such an agreement.

With reference to the proposal of the Senator from Tennessee concerning the banning of atmospheric tests, I do not know whether he had more inside knowledge than did some of us. That is possible because of the important role of the Senator from Tennessee on the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy; or it may have been due to the Senator's prophetic vision. But since the proposal of the Senator from Tennessee—and this statement includes the proposal of the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH], who is present in the Chamber—a tremendous amount of new information has been made available about the danger of contamination by radioactive materials. The difference in emphasis on this subject in February and March 1959, as compared with February and March 1958, is the difference between day and night. All at once statements by scientists from all over America—even scientists, such as Mr. Libby, who a year ago, were less than open about the dangers of strontium 90 and radioactive fallout—are filling the newspapers every day. The information as to the potential

dangers of the pollution of the atmosphere comes not from emotionally unbalanced, but from responsible, actually working scientists.

Therefore, the two suggestions which have been made—the proposal of the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] on a unilateral basis, and the proposal of the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH] on an international basis—emphasize the concern of the Congress about this matter. Both suggestions have been made in a spirit of constructive proposals in order that there might come out of the conference at Geneva something worthwhile—not merely an agreement for the sake of having an agreement, but something worthwhile for humanity.

I am hopeful, and so are the two Senators to whom I have referred, that we can get a much broader agreement; but if we cannot get a broader agreement—and it is our aim and purpose to get a broader agreement—then I hope and pray our negotiators, under the inspiration which has been provided from the Senate, will proceed forthwith to take up the possibility of international control of atmospheric explosions. If the Russians will not agree to such control, then, I say to the Senator from Tennessee, his courageous proposal is one I would readily embrace, because it would indicate that we are taking the political and moral lead—and I underscore "moral lead"—in trying to protect not only our national security, but the welfare of mankind for generations to come.

I have been concerned about what I have been reading from reports of our scientists, and some reports from eminent scientists of Great Britain, that everywhere there is serious concern over radioactive fallout.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes; I yield to the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, I wish to say at the outset that the distinguished Senator from Minnesota has made a signal contribution in the excellent address he has made this afternoon. I never think of this problem without being reminded of a cartoon which was published several years ago depicting two falling atomic bombs. Under these falling bombs stood the United States and the Soviet Union. One bomb was falling a little faster than the other. Both the United States and the Soviet Union were pointing up to the falling bombs, and one was saying to the other, "Look, we are ahead."

Mr. President, the only way humanity can move ahead is by having some success at the conference table at Geneva, because assuredly the American people and the Russian people are breathing the same air, and assuredly the air is being poisoned day by day by the rising levels of radioactivity.

I suggest, therefore, Mr. President, if there is a place where it is at all possible for the United States and the Soviet Union to find a common ground upon which to negotiate, certainly it ought to be with respect to the subject currently in the process of negotiation at Geneva. I feel very strongly, as does the distinguished Senator from Minnesota, that we must not lose this fateful opportunity to take some forward step in this field. Even if it should develop that we cannot achieve all we want at Geneva, let us at least demonstrate a capacity for flexibility. Let us alter our course if we must, but let us do our utmost to achieve something useful, valuable, and meaningful from the conference, in order that the contamination of the atmosphere may come to an end.

Again I wish to say to the able Senator from Minnesota he has made a contribution of great importance this afternoon. I hope his statement will be seriously studied by the State Department and given the attention it warrants. I commend the Senator from Minnesota for his continuing interest and effort in this field.

If everyone in this land were as much concerned about this problem as he is, I think we would be making better progress. If everyone understood this problem as well as he, the concern would be so grave that the Press Gallery would be filled today, to report a subject of this great moment, and such a demand would rise over all the land that our negotiators at Geneva would bend every effort to negotiate a settlement to bring about an end to the poisoning of the air.

It was not my intention to make a speech. I apologize for having done so.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator has made a good one.

Mr. CHURCH. My purpose in rising was to commend the Senator upon the excellence of his address, and to assure him that in this effort he has my wholehearted cooperation.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I am deeply grateful to the Senator from Idaho not only for his very generous remarks—his overly generous personal comments—but I am also grateful for the interest and the leadership of the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], and many other Senators now present on the floor with respect to this very important issue, in the attempt to find some workable, some reasonable, some effective and some safeguarded type of agreement which will lend itself toward the easing of international tensions on the one hand, and, as has been stated so brilliantly and movingly today by other Senators, which will spare humanity from the inevitable poisoning which will come to the air from a continuation of this kind of activity.

It is a great and moving experience, Mr. President, to realize that the Senate of the United States—not simply one Senator who is on a self-styled crusade of his own, but many Senators—will take the lead to encourage the Government and to encourage our negotiators to move ahead.

I will say to the Senator from Idaho that when he spoke about flexibility being required at this time he touched upon the real secret of success. It is not a flexibility which would set aside our security at all, but is a flexibility to permit forward movement, to permit an advance, and to permit constructive progress. Whatever may be the results at Geneva, at least the Senator from Idaho, the Senator from Tennessee and other Senators who have expressed themselves can honestly feel in their hearts that they have tried.

I think this is very important. I say to my colleagues, in the months to come we will see more and more to justify every word said on the floor today, because the truth is coming to the forefront. Even our President noted yesterday, in his very serious press conference, the dangers of radioactive fallout in the Northern Hemisphere. I remind Senators this fallout occurs in the northern regions. Atomic tests have a way of spewing down fallout rapidly in the northern regions, where we live, while the so-called lag period of holding radioactive particles in the atmosphere far above the earth for years and years and years, during which time the particles lose some of their lethal effect, takes place not in this area but near the Equator. We are in the area which receives the full impact. Is it any wonder that we read of strontium 90 in milk, of strontium 90 in wheat, of strontium 90 in vegetables and in other products we consume?

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CLARK. I wish to join my colleagues in commending the Senator from Minnesota not only for the splendid address which he has just concluded but also for the many contributions which he has made as the chairman of the Subcommittee on Disarmament.

It occurs to me that in this, the 86th Congress, the Senate is truly fulfilling that constitutional responsibility with respect to foreign affairs which all too long it has allowed to lie unused.

I should like to point out that while the lead has been taken primarily by the members of the Committee on Foreign Relations—and we have an ex traordinarily able Committee on For eign Relations—there have been other Senators who have made contributions on the great debate on foreign policy, among them the senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] whom I observe in the Chamber, who made a very constructive suggestion for a multilateral organization to coordinate the separate foreign aid programs of the Western nations.

I hope our friends on the Foreign Relations Committee will continue their efforts to bring about more vision, more imagination, fresher thinking in our foreign policy, as opposed to the relative sterility and relative inflexibility of the present administration.

I make this suggestion in all humility: Would it not perhaps be worthwhile for the members of the Foreign Relations Committee to formulate an overall policy for the Senate, and to bring before those of us who are not members of that committee a greater degree of information,

in order that there may be closer unity in the Senate with respect to our observations on foreign policy? I think it is a fine thing for the senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the junior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], the junior Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH], the senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the junior Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], the junior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], and others to come forth with their very constructive suggestions with respect to certain aspects of foreign policy. However, if such suggestions could be tied together by the leaders in the Foreign Relations Committee, and if they could bring to the Senate resolutions and recommendations, I feel that the influence of this great body would be even more effectively felt at the other end of Pennsylvania Avenue.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I think the Senator's suggestion is very meritorious. The Senator will be interested to know that considerable effort is being made in the Foreign Relations Committee to bring about the kind of consensus to which he refers. I have sent to the chairman of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations a draft copy of a resolution, in order to obtain his very well-reasoned and sound advice. I hope to submit that resolution, which deals with the entire area of the nuclear test ban, and points out the concern of the Congress along the lines which have been discussed here today. We have discussed today the general theme of that particular resolution, but I should like to have the Senate go on record with an expression of the views of the elected representatives of the American people of the sovereign States.

My proposed resolution will be given preliminary consideration in a more or less private manner by the chairman and the ranking Republican member of the committee. Then I should like to submit it in the regular order, have it considered by the committee, and reported back to the Senate. I believe this can be done. However, I do not wish to offer anything that would jeopardize our present negotiations.

Tomorrow, or the next day the Senate meets, I shall present a compilation of the reports which we have been able to obtain thus far on radioactive fallout and atmospheric pollution. I have discussed this subject with a member of the staff of our subcommittee. This compilation would more or less buttress and underscore the arguments of the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH], and other Senators. It will be made a part of the RECORD, for all to see. I believe it will represent a rather extensive and comprehensive research job.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. GORE. Almost the first speech it was my privilege to make as a Member of this body was addressed to the subject of policy in relation to massive retaliation.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I remember the Senator's speech.

Mr. GORE. I questioned its wisdom, as well as its adequacy and efficacy.

The Senator may recall that I expressed apprehension that to follow such a policy would be, so to speak, placing all our eggs in one basket. We might be preparing to fight the kind of war which we might, God grant, never have to fight. I went so far as to express the hope that no nuclear bomb might ever again in my lifetime be dropped upon a city.

Despite my views to the contrary, we have proceeded upon the policy of massive retaliation.

As I listened to the testimony in secret session in the Foreign Relations Committee day before yesterday, and again, as I watched President Eisenhower last evening on television, and heard him say to us and to the world that there would be no ground warfare, and that he did not rule out the possibility of nuclear warfare, it occurred to me that the Berlin crisis might be the supreme and ultimate test of the wisdom and effectiveness of the policy of massive retaliation.

I hope and pray that my apprehensions with respect to that policy are proved illfounded. I hope it succeeds in preserving peace and the position of the free world. If it does succeed, then the Russians will back down and the position of the United States and the Western Powers will be preserved in Central Europe and throughout the world.

If it does not succeed, then either there must be some accommodation of the Russian position by us—I hope not appeasement—or, God forbid, nuclear war. I say "God forbid" because, according to scientists whom I have heard testify, there is enough radioactivity in the nuclear stockpiles of the three nuclear powers to make large portions of the earth uninhabitable.

I am not here saying that I question the wisdom of the President's statement yesterday. I question the wisdom of the policy that has brought us to the point where we must depend upon massive retaliation with nuclear weapons alone.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I wish to associate myself quickly, briefly, and positively with the remarks of the junior Senator from Tennessee. He has stated exactly the doubts, fears, and concerns which bother many of us.

Without trying to pass judgment on the President's remarks—and I think he could have said very little else in terms of our real power—it might have been better, from my point of view, not to have said what was said about the ground forces.

The truth is that the policy which has been pursued made the comment almost inevitable. The Senator from Tennessee has stated the question today in a moving and persuasive manner.

Often we hear it said that we should restrain ourselves in foreign policy debates. I believe in responsible debate. I believe in restrained and responsible discussion. However, I believe that responsible debate means discussion. We need to hear more from members of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, such as the distinguished Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] and other members. We need to know what the facts are. The only place where members of the Armed Services Committee and members of the Committee on Foreign Relations meet is in this Chamber. Outside this Chamber we are living in our own little jurisdictions. One of the troubles with our foreign policy today is that it is departmentalized to such a great extent that there is no adequate synthesis and coordination either in the legislative or the executive branches. Yet the Soviets have a totality of policy within a totalitarian regime, and they move on all fronts at once. Everything is related to everything else. The one place where we, as Members of the Senate, have an opportunity to achieve synthesis and coordination of information and policy is in this Chamber, where we debate, not as committee members, but as Members of the Senate, each of us representing his own constituents, his own State, and his own points of view.

A Member of the Senate need not be a member of the Committee on Foreign Relations to have sound foreign policy views. There are many Members of the Senate, not members of the Committee on Foreign Relations, whose views on foreign policy are extremely well grounded. I do not believe that a Member need be a member of the Committee on Armed Services to have views on the strength of the Nation in terms of our Armed Forces. We ought to be enlightened enough to receive the views of well-informed Senators. Some of the best speeches I have ever heard on foreign policy were made by Members who were not members of the Committee on Foreign Relations. That does not mean that members of a committee are less informed. It means that some persons have an unusually good talent and have an unusual store of information on these subjects.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, I wish to congratulate the Senator from Minnesota once again on his remarks, and also those of the distinguished Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], particularly as they relate to the role of debate. It seems to me that there has not been enough debate on the floor of the Senate in recent years about the general direction in which this country is moving. Perhaps this is because there is so little disagreement among us as to what that direction should be. Perhaps it is because, in the guise of a bipartisan foreign policy, we have come to think that it is somehow unseemly to question the general direction of our course in the world at large.

But, Mr. President, whatever the reason may be, it is a very unhealthy symptom. How long has it been since there has been a general debate on American foreign policy on this floor? How long? I submit it has been nearly 20 years. What is the difference between the parties today as to the direction of our course? The main argument between the Democratic Party and the Republican Party seems to pivot on the number of missiles we ought to build this year or next year. But, Mr. President, though I feel very strongly, as do so many of

my colleagues on this side of the aisle, that we cannot afford to allow a gap to develop between our military strength on the one hand, and that of the Soviet Union on the other, and although I join with my colleagues in the indictment which has been made against the administration, particularly as relates to the missile lag, still there should be another question, and a greater question, which each of us should be asking ourselves, and which ought to be the focal point of debate on the floor: Suppose we do achieve this terrible parity in missiles? Suppose we close the gap in a year or 2 years, where are we headed? Four or five years from now will we have 100 or 200 intercontinental ballistic missiles set in place, each pointed at a metropolitan area, or industrial center, or military bastion in the Soviet Union? At the same time, will the Soviets not have 200 or more intercontinental ballistic missiles set in place, pointed toward the heartlands of America?

That is indeed the prospect. Whereas a few years ago, when we were thinking of an attack by Russia in terms of intercontinental bombers, with 8 hours or 10 hours of warning time, today we are thinking in terms of intercontinental ballistic missiles, with the warning time reduced to 15 minutes. Our technicians and Soviet technicians in 4 or 5 years will be sitting before their radar screens. Is there one among us who does not believe that these men are fallible? Is there one among us who does not believe that the day will come when one of these technicians, sitting before his radar screen, is going to make a mistake? Is it not a mathematical certainty that a mistake will be made, given sufficient time?

When the mistake is made, there will be 15 minutes for decision. If the mistake takes the form of assuming that an attack has been launched against the United States, then within 15 minutes a hundred or more intercontinental missiles will presumably be launched, and within the hour 40 to 50 million people may die. Then an awful retaliation occurs.

Oh, Mr. President, this is not a nightmare. This is not an idle fancy. This is what we are facing, like a ship with its tiller locked and moving in the current toward the maelstrom. That is the specter we are facing. But we do not talk about it.

I have listened for a long, long time to eminent spokesmen in the field of diplomacy, in my party and in the Republican Party, as they recite that the purpose of our whole course of action in the world is to build positions of strength from which to negotiate. However, I have not heard one of them specify what we ought to negotiate for.

That is the unspoken thing. When the time comes, just as we are faced today with the impending crisis at Berlin, when negotiation confronts us as a necessity, will there be a real debate on the floor of the Senate as to what form the negotiation should take? We must begin to think about the areas within which we should be prepared to negotiate. We must think and talk about how to free the tiller to move our ship of state out of the current which is leading us into the maelstrom.

Geneva is the starting point. It is the place where it is possible that the first step may be taken. Any progress in this difficult field will be made in little steps, not by grandiloquent designs.

That is why it is so important that our negotiators be prepared to do their utmost, and prepared to take whatever alternative course may be necessary in the public interest, keeping the national security of this country in mind, to make that first step possible at Geneva.

Once more I wish to commend the distinguished Senator from Minnesota. If we bring the same resolve to the conference table which he has demonstrated on the floor today, I am sure we will make that first step.

Such might well prove to be the crucial occurrence of this century, for if we once begin to move out of this dreadful current, there is hope. if we remain in it, there is no hope. The atomic war one day will come, because for the first time in the history of man such a catastrophe becomes possible through accident. Surely the law of mathematical averages makes that accident nearly inevitable, given the necessary time.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I might add that as weapons become more broadly accessible, as more nations are brought into the atomic field, and as more nations develop their missiles and warheads, we will not know from which direction the attack comes. The question then will be: Against whom do we retaliate? What an unforgivable error it will be if we retaliate against the wrong country.

I thank the Senator from Idaho. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

PASSAGE BY HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF HAWAIIAN STATEHOOD BILL

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I rise to make an announcement which I know will be of interest to all Senators. The House of Representatives has just passed the Hawaiian statehood bill by a vote of 323 to 89.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, let me join the Senator from New York in complimenting the House of Representatives on its prompt and expeditious action. I should like to be privileged, along with the Senator from New York, to extend to Hawaii the warm greetings and felicitations of all of us in the Congress who are in favor of statehood for Hawaii. Nothing could make my heart any happier today than this announcement, because surely the people of Hawaii are the finest kind of Americans, and they have long deserved the opportunity to be members of the great and wonderful system which we call the Federal Union.

So I am delighted, Mr. President; this is wonderful news. I am confident that the President will sign the bill as soon as it reaches the White House.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I should like to join in the congratulations and hearty good wishes to the new State of Hawaii.

Mr. HUMPHREY. As a result, our country is all the stronger.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the bill (S. 50) to provide for the admission of the State of Hawaii into the Union.

DOCTOR L. M. DONALSON CHOSEN 1960 PRESIDENT OF LINCOLN COUNTY, TENN., MEDICAL ASSOCIATION

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I wish to call attention to a fine and well-deserved honor which has been accorded Dr. L. M. Donalson, of Fayetteville, Tenn. Dr. Donalson came to Fayetteville in 1932 with a 98-cent medical bag and a diploma from Meharry Medical College in Nashville. In those hard depression days he began his long service of ministering to the medical needs of his fellow Negroes.

Dr. Donalson has been chosen by his fellow colleagues—all of them white—as the 1960 president of the Lincoln County Medical Association. His response was typical of the modest and self-effacing service he has rendered his community. He said:

> I'm just a country doctor, trying to make a living.

I think Dr. Donalson's unselfish record and the honor he has been accorded is a wonderful testimony to him and to men of both races in a time when anger and emotion seem frequently to confuse issues.

I commend Dr. Donalson for his great human achievements, and his colleagues for their recognition of them.

Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee.

DEATH OF FORMER SENATOR GUFFEY

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, many of our present colleagues served in the Senate with Joseph Guffey, and knew him far better than I did.

A few days ago the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] had occasion to recall many of the happy incidents of Senator Guffey's career in this body. I am sure that all the Members who served with him join me in expressing to his family and to his many friends our sincere sympathy at his passing.

THE UNEMPLOYMENT SITUATION

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, during the past 2 days, my distinguished senior colleague from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH] and I have been making to this body a series of addresses on the gravity of the economic distress which grips our Nation's areas of chronic unemployment. We have based

these addresses on the severe conditions in our own State of West Virginia, which were studied last week in 3 days of depressed-areas hearings, which I conducted as a member of the Subcommittee on Production and Stabilization. In our addresses we have dealt with numerous programs, now before the Senate, which we feel might be undertaken to bring both temporary and lasting relief to the stricken regions.

Today, however, I should like to direct my remarks almost entirely to one piece of proposed legislation, which calls for a new program. I believe this measure relates to the most important domestic matter that will come before this 1st session of the 86th Congress.

I am speaking, of course, of the area redevelopment measures—and, more specifically, of Senate bill 722, introduced by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], and cosponsored by 38 other Senators.

It is my devout belief that today our Nation's need is so great that only a measure as forceful and far-reaching as this one is capable of achieving the desired purpose—namely, that of stimulating the growth of new industry in depressed areas and of bringing a healthy supply of new employment to the suffering communities where hunger and privation now haunt many families.

In support of my belief, I could quote statistics at great length. I could draw upon the record of our public hearings in West Virginia, and could cite figures to show that 13.6 percent of the State's labor force—or 1 out of 8 persons—is unemployed. I could state that this represents 90,000 jobless men and women—of whom 53,000 now are receiving unemployment benefit payments, with the rest getting nothing at all. I could point out that each month 278,000 of West Virginia's people are standing in line to receive small rations of Government surplus foods, and that more than 20,000 others are eligible for these foods, but have not been able to receive them. I could recount testimony to show that hundreds of small businesses have failed, because retail sales have slumped as much as 35 percent in some areas. I could point out that, in the past 8 years, the number of coal-industry jobs available to miners in West Virginia has fallen from 120,888 to 44,237.

All these statistics I could recite to show that lingering, chronic employment has laid a heavy hand on the economic well-being of my State, and that thousands of desperate men and women are prayerfully waiting for something—anything—that would make new jobs available to them, so that they might again support their families.

But in dealing entirely with statistics and figures, sometimes the urgent human meaning of the problem can be missed. For that reason, I should like to read a brief passage from the record of the testimony taken at one of the hearings I conducted last week in West Virginia. The hearing was held at Beckley, a medium-sized city in the south-central portion of the State; and the witness was the Honorable Howard B. Chambers, sheriff of nearby Mingo County.

Sheriff Chambers, a down-to-earth man who knows his people and their conditions, pointed out that 41 percent of the population of his county is—due to destitute circumstances—eligible to receive surplus commodities. That is 41 percent—nearly half of the persons in a county of 47,409 population—who are so desperate that they must depend entirely upon meager amounts of Government commodities for their sustenance.

Then the sheriff continued—and I quote further from the record:

> The conditions in Mingo County are that they mechanized so much in the mines that they are laying off people, and then these people draw out their unemployment compensation and they are down on starvation. They go and apply for DPA—

That is to say, the department of public assistance benefits. Then the sheriff said:

> They in turn send them to a doctor, and if they are well enough to work, they cannot get any assistance at all. I have run on people and talked to people that actually broke down and cried. One woman, whom I met yesterday, was on starvation. Her husband is healthy, but he cannot find work. He has been in other States, and they tell us that other States have the same conditions, and that they want to take care of their own people. The men are out hitchhiking, hoboing on the freight trains, walking the roads with their shoe soles worn out, and they cannot get any assistance at all.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, I hesitate to interrupt the continuity of the compelling presentation which my colleague from West Virginia is making. I would ask, however, for time to submit a unanimous-consent request in connection with the particular point being made.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I am glad to yield.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, the Charleston Daily Mail, through its lead editorial of March 9, has indicated what Senator BYRD has so well stated—namely, that this problem—acute as it is in the State of West Virginia—is not confined to the hills and valleys, the mining region where heavy pockets of unemployment exist in West Virginia. As the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], who now has risen to his feet, well knows, conditions are not good, within the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

The editorial is entitled "The State's Problems, Acute as They Are, Are Not Typical of West Virginia Alone."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD that editorial, which sets forth the need for an awareness of this problem.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Charleston Daily Mail, Mar. 9, 1959]

THE STATE'S PROBLEMS, ACUTE AS THEY ARE, ARE NOT TYPICAL OF WEST VIRGINIA ALONE

The problems of automation, technological unemployment, surplus commodities and so forth are not peculiar to West Virginia. In fact and while they dominate the economic horizon of West Virginia its problem is not even the most acute or widespread.

Representative JOHN SLACK of the State's Sixth District has obtained from the U.S. Department of Agriculture a summary which shows clearly that this complex byproduct of what is otherwise a substantial economic recovery has national proportions. In 24 of the 49 States there are 210 counties where 15 percent or more of the population is receiving surplus commodities as "needy persons."

West Virginia does not have the largest number of these counties. Kentucky, Oklahoma and Arkansas are all more poorly situated, and Pennsylvania and Tennessee are close. Neither does West Virginia have the largest percentage of its population in this state of dependency. The ratio is higher in Tennessee, Kentucky, Louisiana and Oklahoma. Indeed, the average for the 210 counties is 21.8 percent. West Virginia has some counties where the ratio is higher than this, but the figure for the State is only 15 percent.

Representative SLACK insists that this puts a different light upon the problem, and we think he is correct. For it is one thing to say, as many do, that West Virginia is simply going through an adjustment, but it is quite another when this adjustment embraces wide areas of Pennsylvania, Michigan and New York as well.

Whether or not the surplus commodities list is a precise measure of the Nation's economic status, the fact remains that 5,220,000 of the Nation's population are now drawing surplus commodities.

This is not just a revolution in the coal business, which is the shape it takes in West Virginia. It is a sign of trouble for the whole of the American economy, and it deserves far more attention than Congress and the administration have been giving it.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, again I am constrained to speak with vigor about the necessity—which is recognized by the capable junior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. BYRD]—to alert the membership of this body to the problems of unemployment, not only in West Virginia, but in the Nation as well.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator from West Virginia yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HART in the chair). Does the Senator from West Virginia yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. I have been very much interested in listening not only to the splendid address being made by the junior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. BYRD], but also to the most interesting comments made just now by his colleague, the senior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH], with respect to the area redevelopment bill.

I have the privilege of serving on the Banking and Currency Committee's Subcommittee on Production and Stabilization, which heard the testimony with respect to Senate bill 722; and I also had the privilege of participating in the deliberations of the full committee which resulted yesterday in the reporting of the bill.

I can testify—and I am happy to do so—with respect to the very vigorous and helpful part the junior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. BYRD] took in all those deliberations. I believe he is particularly to be commended for having gone into the field and for having

heard, throughout West Virginia, testimony with respect to the plight of his State's unemployed and the help this bill could give them.

I recall to the minds of both my good friends from West Virginia the fine testimony which was given by their colleague in the other body, Representative KEN HECHLER, who brought a tape recording before the Senate subcommitte, and gave it the benefit, by ear, of the interviews he had conducted with unfortunate unemployed citizens of West Virginia, their wives, and their families, in order to dramatize—if that were needed—the plight of those unfortunate American citizens.

I can say, in response to the suggestion of my friend the senior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH] that we in Pennsylvania are in almost equally difficult circumstances. As we read the latest figures, there are 508,000 Pennsylvanians walking the streets, looking for work which they cannot find. We find, in Fayette County, in southwest Pennsylvania, not far from the West Virginia border, 25 percent of our labor force is unemployed.

The situation is little, if any, better in the anthracite, hard coal, regions of ncrtheast Pennsylvania; in the railroad towns, such as Altoona and Tyrone, in Blair County; along the line of the Pennsylvania Railroad; and in other areas served by the Reading, the Lehigh, the Erie, and the Lackawanna railroads.

We have in the great steel town of Johnstown, in Cambria County, a pitiable situation of unemployment, which is being, only temporarily and to a slight extent, alleviated by the temporary increase in steel employment, which I fear will fall off again the end of June.

Mr. President, we in Pennsylvania, with one out of every nine of our labor force unemployed, with 11 percent, across the State, of our labor force unemployed, certainly welcome the splendid help that the two Senators from West Virginia are giving us to push this much needed bill through the Senate.

I had the privilege of serving in the 85th Congress. I know the fine efforts which were made by so many fine Members of the Senate in getting a bill, in many respects identical with the bill which was ordered reported to the Senate yesterday, out of the committee and to the Senate.

I know our majority leader is committed to having this bill acted upon at the earliest possible moment. We have splendid bipartisan support from the other side of the aisle, in that the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BEALL] and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] are cosponsors of S. 722. I am very hopeful the Senate will pass the bill before the Easter recess. I hope when it reaches the other body of Congress it will remain substantially intact, and that when the President has it on his desk he will reconsider the ill-advised action he took last year, and will think a little more of human misery and compassion, and have a little less sterile thinking of a budget balanced at $77 billion with which he seems to be so obsessed at the present time. But in the unhappy event the President shall adhere to the same action he took last year, I hope the Congress of the United States will stand up in all its majesty and pass the bill over his veto, for the bill is needed to give the unemployed people of the depressed areas of Pennsylvania, West Virginia, and a score of other States the assistance which they are entitled to ask from the Federal Government.

I thank the Senator for his courtesy in yielding to me.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I thank the Senator from Pennsylvania for his very excellent contribution. I have had the opportunity, since coming to this body, to observe the diligence, the interest, the loyalty, and the faithfulness which he applies to this kind of legislation.

In serving on the committee with him, I have been truly inspired by his knowledge of the situation and by the talent which he has exerted in an effort to bring some kind of proposed legislation out of the committee that might deal effectively with this situation. I am very pleased that yesterday the committee took the action it took.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I yield to the senior Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, at 12:08 p.m. today, over the United Press-International News ticker, these words were placed before the people of America who will read this dispatch:

> Unemployment increased by 25,000 to a total of 4,749,000 last month. The Government said the change was so small that it was insignificant. Employment also rose 16,000 to 62,706,000 in February. A joint report by the Labor and Commerce Departments said the stability marked the usual pause between heavy winter cutbacks in jobs and the normal spring pickup in the economy.

Now, Mr. President, we find in the story the words, "The Government said the change was so small that it was insignificant." I reiterate the word "insignificant."

Mr. President, the loss of one job is not insignificant. The loss of a hundred jobs is not insignificant. Certainly the loss of 25,000 jobs within a month is not insignificant. One job is worth while.

I am afraid that this is the attitude within the thinking of too many persons who hold responsible leadership in the administration at the present time. I do not want to wave the flag. I do not want to overdramatize this situation. But the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. BYRD] is discussing unemployment, continued unemployment, with workers in the State of West Virginia losing their jobs month-by-month. And when we find a statement that the change of 25,-0000 less men and women at work is insignificant, it comes with ill grace to the men and women of West Virginia who are in immediate need of assistance.

If my colleagues will indulge me this further comment, I hope I am not too vigorous in my denunciation of the departments of the Federal Government which, through their spokesmen, would indicate that the loss of jobs, regardless of how few they may be, is insignificant. Such an attitude ill becomes a nation in which human resources must ever have the utmost consideration.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I thank my senior colleague. I share in the fears that he has so ably expressed.

Mr. President, I quoted from the testimony that was given to the Subcommittee on Production and Stabilization of the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency by the sheriff of Mingo County; and I am sure that his statement, as I have quoted it, sounds familiar. It sounds as though it might be a description of conditions in the depression years of the early thirties. Although the causes of unemployment in Mingo County today are not the same as those of the 1930's, the reason today being primarily mechanization of the mines and losses in coal sales, it makes little difference to those helpless people who are victims of unemployment.

I wish to continue, Mr. President, with the words of Sheriff Chambers:

> One fellow I have known for 30 years, an honest man. He has had a big family. And he had worked in this mine for 30 years. He came into my office. He had been over to apply for public assistance. They told him that he was able to work, that they could not allow it to him. Most of his kids have left home. He and his wife are starving to death. They do not have anything in the house.
>
> This fellow tells me that they have cut him out from the mines just recently, that they have put a new piece of machinery in there. He was a machinist, working on a loading machine or something similar inside the mines. He worked on different types of machinery. They want young men in there now. They said that he could not qualify to run this piece of machinery. "Well," he says, "give me a chance." They said, "You can't run it." He says, "Give me a chance." "We can't use you. You can't run this type of machinery." "I have run other machinery," he says. Well, they will not give him a chance. They cut the man off. He is 53 years old.
>
> Nowadays around the mines and the mining communities, these companies do not want an old man who has devoted his lifetime. Their fathers before them have devoted their lifetimes to the coal mining industry.
>
> In my county I would say that half the population there do not know anything else but mining. They were brought up that way. Some of them have never gone to school. But they know machinery. They are good, honest people, and they know how to work.
>
> I think this program that you, Senator BYRD, and you, Senator RANDOLPH, are on, will help tremendously there in that section.

Mr. President, do these words not bring home the painful truth of what is happening today?

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. RANDOLPH in the chair). Does the Senator from West Virginia yield to the Senator from Wisconsin?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. If the Senator will withhold for just a moment, I shall be happy to yield to him.

This is what is happening and what has been happening for years in our Nation's regions of chronic unemployment. Do these words not emphasize

the terrible need of the people—and even more so, the desire of the people—for a bold Government program that will make new employment available to them?

I shall read just a few more sentences from the transcript of Sheriff Chambers' testimony. At another point, I asked him if he had found any evidence of husbands and wives intentionally separating so that the wives and children would be eligible for State welfare benefits, and he replied:

> I have had men come in my office and ask me to swear out a warrant or have the wife do it in order to get them (the wife and children) on DPA. On one occasion the guy did go in there. His wife swore out a warrant for nonsupport. You show it to the department of public assistance, and of course, they sign her up.

At another point, the sheriff said:

> Crime is on the increase in my county. And they are not stealing money. They are stealing food in my county.

And later, he said:

> I know in my county, moonshine is on the increase. * * * No other means of making a living. The people have turned to moonshining. It is tremendous in my county.

And then he said:

> I ran on a situation yesterday. It is in another coal-mining community where the companies have told those people to vacate the houses by April 1, and that is going to affect approximately 125 men in Red Jacket Hollow alone. They are asking them to vacate because there is no rent coming in. The mine operations of the whole hollow are closed down. The company intends to tear the houses down. But these people have nowhere to go, nothing to go in if they could go somewhere. If they canot pay rent there, they sure cannot pay it anywhere else.

At this point, I asked the sheriff if he believed that the dislocated workers could solve their problem by migrating to other areas, and he replied:

> No, sir; I do not think that is the answer. * * * You have got to do something in your own State where the people born and raised in this State do not know anything else but mining. And this bill—I looked at it—(he was referring here to S. 722) would bring something in here and educate these people to other types of work, which is going to be the only salvation I can see.

Mr. President, these words I have quoted are not scholarly rhetoric, but they tell very eloquently the human story of the desperate needs and prayerful hopes of those men, women, and children who are trapped today in America's pockets of lingering joblessness.

These people are crying out to us today. They are fervently asking, not for a free Government handout, but for a chance to go back to work, and once more earn their way as productive American citizens. This plea is evident, not just in the testimony of Sheriff Chambers, but throughout the thousands of words of testimony which have been gathered in West Virginia and in other depressed areas.

Mr. President, I now am happy to yield to my delightful friend from Wisconsin for his comments.

Mr. PROXMIRE. First I wish to commend the junior Senator from West Virginia for an eloquent and extremely timely speech on a bill which, I agree with the Senator, is enormously important. I think it is one of the most important bills for consideration at this session of Congress.

I believe the point the Senator from West Virginia is making, which is most compelling, and the point which he made so well in quoting the testimony of Sheriff Chambers, is that this is a different kind of unemployment from the kind with which we are dealing under the unemployment compensation program, or perhaps under the monetary policies or fiscal policies or by other kinds of governmental action. This is not a seasonal unemployment, which is going to be taken care of in the coming months as summer activities and outdoor activities step up. This is not a cyclical kind of unemployment, which will be taken care of as the business cycle sweeps ahead.

As the Senator from West Virginia pointed out so well, this unemployment really cannot be solved by having people migrate from the only place they know, from their home community where they have roots. This is a chronic unemployment situation, and the only way it can be solved is by bringing in new industry and, as I understand the situation, by assisting the people who want to work and who have demonstrated their character and ability in the past but who simply need training and education, which can be provided quite simply and quite inexpensively in many, many cases.

I think the bill which the Senator from West Virginia is supporting so eloquently is enormously important not only to West Virginia and Pennsylvania but also to my State. The State of Wisconsin at the present time is fortunate, in that the rate of unemployment is below the national average. However, we have some areas in the northern part of our State which have been depressed areas in the past, and which in the future, would be benefited by passage of this kind of bill.

I think it is necessary that all citizens and all Senators, regardless of the State from which they come and regardless of the relative prosperity, should recognize the kind of problem the Senator from West Virginia is describing so well, chronic unemployment, caused by a very serious, long term, permanent depression in a significant industry, which can really only be solved on a national basis and can only be solved if we have the heart and the sympathy and the human understanding I think is embodied in the bill.

I commend the Senator from West Virginia for an excellent speech and I am happy to give him all the support I can.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I thank the Senator from Wisconsin. He is exactly correct in saying that it is not seasonal unemployment that has blighted my State.

West Virginia is the greatest bituminous coal-producing State in the country. In 1923, 704,000 coal miners were employed in this country. Now there are fewer than 200,000 miners working. West Virginia has based its economy on this one industry, we might say. Even though it is a great agricultural State, yet its economy has been geared to the coal industry. Mechanization in that industry has come to stay.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I yield.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I think the point the Senator from West Virginia makes is an excellent point. As he says, the economy of the State is geared, and has been geared, to mining. While there are agricultural and service industries, the agriculture of the area and the service industry of the area depend for their prosperity upon mining. So when tens of thousands of miners are laid off in West Virginia, the effect on small business, the effect on agriculture, and the effect on virtually all industry, is serious and most damaging.

I think the point the Senator from West Virginia makes in this respect is most important and most compelling. This is not merely a problem of doing something about the coal industry. It is a problem of getting new industry in the State, in order that the service industry and other industries which have found employment by meeting the needs of coal miners may again furnish employment.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Exactly. There was a time when 100 percent of all the coal produced was produced by hand loaders. Today more than 90 percent of the coal produced is produced by machinery. It is very high-cost machinery.

One continuous loading machine costs perhaps $125,000. One of the great power shovels which can scoop up 90 tons at a bite costs perhaps $2½ million. With such great expenditures for plant and equipment, I am confident that the mines in West Virginia and elsewhere will never again see great numbers of hand loaders and great numbers of miners employed—men who once earned their bread and butter working in the bowels of the earth to bring out the black diamonds.

If we cannot expect the mining industry to employ those workers, it will be necessary, as the Senator from Wisconsin has so ably pointed out, to make possible the diversification of the economy and the location of new industries.

Those people are in debt. They are unable to migrate elsewhere. They have no money with which to purchase bus tickets. They do not have the money for board and lodging in some distant city. They are tied to the spot, as it were; and it is imperative that we take action quickly to make it possible for them again to take their place in society.

I see in Senate bill 722 the instrument whereby this can be done.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, will my colleague yield?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I yield to my colleague.

Mr. RANDOLPH. The persuasive argument which the junior Senator from West Virginia has been making this afternoon, and the emphasis he has placed upon the needs of the miners for other employment because of mechanization within the mines and the automation which has taken place, which has changed the character of production,

lead me to make this observation: I wonder if it would not be appropriate at this point to indicate to Senators who are in the Chamber, and to those who will later read what the Senator is saying, the provision within Senate bill 722 with respect to the retraining of workers. I believe this feature of the proposal is most important.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. In answer to the question of the senior Senator from West Virginia, Senate bill 722 provides that the Secretary of Labor shall determine the vocational training or retraining needs of the unemployed individuals residing in the areas designated by the administrator of the new agency as industrial redevelopment areas, or rural redevelopment areas.

After the needs have been determined, the Secretary of Labor, when he finds that additional facilities or services are needed in such an area, will then advise the Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and the Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare will provide assistance, including financial assistance when necessary, to the appropriate State vocational education agency in order to furnish additional training and services.

If the Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare should find that the State agency is unable to provide such services and facilities, then the Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare may, after consultation with the State agency, provide for the facilities and services by agreement or contract with public or private educational institutions.

I feel that this is one of the most important features of the bill. As the Governor of West Virginia, who happens to be a member of the opposite political party, so well stated when he appeared before our subcommittee in West Virginia, this is one of the most important provisions of the bill. He indicated his strong support of it, and of the provision for subsistence payments; and one after another of his departmental heads who followed him supported his testimony as they indicated vigorously that they believed this provision of the bill to be very necessary if we are to help those people prepare themselves to take their place in the new industries which may be encouraged to locate in the State.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, will my colleague further yield?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I yield.

Mr. RANDOLPH. The junior Senator from West Virginia has mentioned the comment by the Governor of West Virginia in reference not only to the feature providing for retraining of workers, but also the need for a positive approach in the matter of subsistence payments. I believe that at this juncture in the Senator's remarks it might be well for him to indicate the action within the Committee on Banking and Currency with reference to subsistence payments—an action which I believe was taken yesterday, when the bill was reported with an amendment.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Yesterday the committee took action to extend from 13 weeks to 16 weeks the period during which subsistence payments may be made. The original provision in the bill was for 13 weeks.

In regard to the question of retraining of dislocated workers, I should like to quote at this time a statement which was made by a Mr. Hunter Bennett, a very capable attorney in western West Virginia when he appeared before our subcommittee during the hearings at Morgantown.

He said:

I am very doubtful that any new industry is going to come to Lewis County unless some arrangements can be made to train the workers to work in the industry so that the industry does not have a large training bill to pay itself.

Then I said:

Mr. Bennett, you are a native of Lewis County?

Mr. Bennett replied:

That is correct; yes.

Then the following colloquy occurred:

Senator BYRD. You are an attorney in Lewis County?

Mr. BENNETT. Yes.

Senator BYRD. You have indicated this evening that industries have failed to locate in your county because of the fact that they are not able, or at least they are not willing, to expend the moneys required to retain the available labor in your county for the types of jobs that would have to be done were those industries to locate there?

Mr. BENNETT. In my opinion, that is correct.

Mr. President, I should also like to bring to the attention of the Senate today an excerpt from a report which was filed by Dr. Laird, of Montgomery, recently, because I think it is pertinent. In his report, the doctor said:

On December 8 a man was brought to the hospital in a state of absolute collapse. He was hardly more than a skeleton covered with skin. The emaciation was absolutely shocking. The diagnosis was starvation. He was almost completely dehydrated. After 24 hours' hospitalization, he was still weak and almost helpless, even though intravenous feedings were being administered. A few days after admission he died. The cause of death was recorded as starvation.

This case is a reminder to us that in these days of acute deprivation we owe a duty to unfortunate individuals like this. They are victims of the depressed business cycle, and challenge all our interest and concern.

The number of patients who are being classified as guests is steadily increasing. The situation of many of these people is desperately pitiful. Life has kicked a lot of them around considerably. It is important for us to make their last days as comfortable as possible. Their appreciation moves us deeply. I believe I have seen not a single one who does not appreciate kindness.

Between 23,000 and 25,000 people in Fayette County are receiving surplus commodities. This is a fairly good index of the seriousness of the situation.

Mr. President, it is clear that the need exists—the need for Federal assistance, and the need for legislation which will permit the Federal Government to move in the direction that S. 722 would provide. The proposed legislation would stimulate and provide initiative. It would stimulate and provide enterprise. It would make it possible for these people in the depressed areas to lift themselves up by their own bootstraps. However, first of all they will have to have the bootstraps.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, would my colleague, perhaps, explain the feature of the repayment of the loans which would be made? There is a need for capital. That is a lack of ability to secure loans. I believe that provision for long-term loans at a reasonable rate of interest is very important, because the Senator has indicated to the Members of the Senate that this is a measure which is businesslike. I believe that the feature of the loan provision would be important.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. My colleague from West Virginia makes a very salient point. This is not legislation which would provide a dole. The people of West Virginia are not looking for a dole. There is only one thing the people of West Virginia are asking for, and that is an opportunity to exert their energies so that they may obtain something for their families.

The proposed legislation would set up three $100 million revolving loan funds. Two of the revolving loan funds would be for the purpose of extending loans on a long term low interest basis to those areas which would qualify under the criteria for loans. They would be repaid. The loans would be made for industrial projects, for buildings, for machinery, for facilities.

The third revolving fund of $100 million would be for the purpose of extending long term low interest rate loans to industrial redevelopment areas and rural redevelopment areas for the construction of public facilities, sewage disposal systems, industrial parks, the provision of industrial water, access roads, and so on—facilities which are absolutely necessary if an area is to equip itself in such a way as to induce new industry to locate therein.

I believe that at this point, in answer to the question of my distinguished colleague from West Virginia, I should quote the statement which was made to the subcommittee by Dr. Leo Fishman, professor of economics and finance at West Virginia University, Morgantown, W. Va. Dr. Fishman said:

As I suggested earlier in the day, West Virginia banks are exceedingly small, largely because the cities in West Virginia are small; and, secondly, because we have a unit banking system which virtually guarantees that the banks in the State will remain quite small. Moreover, there is a provision affecting banks in West Virginia, as in the country as a whole, which stipulates that no bank shall lend more than 10 percent of its capital and surplus to any single borrower. Since the capital and surplus of the West Virginia banks in general is small, the amount of funds they are empowered to lend is therefore necessarily small, too. The requirement of the large volume of capital to support the construction of new facilities or the rehabilitation of existing facilities will, in most communities in West Virginia, require an application to some outside financial sources, which is not readily available at the present time.

Mr. President, this statement and other important testimony which was gathered during the course of the hearings make it amply evident that we must

have some kind of legislation which will make possible long-term low-interest rate loans to those communities which are very desirous of helping themselves.

It is my considered belief that one measure now before Congress—the area redevelopment bill of Senator DOUGLAS—is imperative. I feel that S. 722 is capable of taking positive, long-range steps to save America's unemployed families from increasing hunger and suffering. And I respectfully urge each of my colleagues in this House of Congress to join with me in working for its prompt passage.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, would the Senator care to comment on the veto of the President during the 85th Congress of the legislation and to express, as I know the Senator will, the affirmative action which he trusts will take place on the measure which we hope the Senate will consider in the near future?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I can only say that I regret greatly that the President of the United States vetoed a somewhat similar measure which was passed by both Houses of Congress last year.

He pocket vetoed the measure, and by so doing delayed for many precious months the effectation which we hope will come with the passage of the bill.

I express my sincere hope that the President of the United States will not veto this measure when it is placed before him. I believe that he is more aware of the suffering and the unemployment which exists in West Virginia and other areas of the Nation, perhaps, than he was when a similar bill was placed before him last year. I do not believe the President wishes to exhibit a callous attitude toward proposed legislation of this kind. I believe in him to that extent. I hope and am confident—I do not presume to speak for him, of course—that he will sign the bill this year.

If the President fails to sign the bill, then I shall join with other Senators in placing the matter before the people and in marshaling our forces toward overriding the veto, because this kind of legislation is needed. It is needed now. The people of America are crying out for it.

If the United States is to remain strong internationally, it will have to remain strong economically. If we are to remain strong economically, our people must have the opportunity to work, to earn a living, to pay their debts, to buy their homes, and to pay the taxes with which this Nation can be girded with the armaments of defense.

TESTIMONIAL DINNER HONORING FORMER REPRESENTATIVE BROOKS HAYS

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD certain proceedings relating to the testimonial dinner honoring former Representative Brooks Hays: An address delivered by the distinguished junior Senator from Oklahoma, Hon. A. S. MIKE MONRONEY; an address delivered by Dr. Billy Graham; the contents of a scroll presented to the Honorable Brooks Hays; and some excerpts from the remarks of the Honorable Brooks Hays himself.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY SENATOR A. S. MIKE MONRONEY, OF OKLAHOMA

Tonight we are paying tribute to a modern-day hero, who in temporary political defeat has won a lasting spiritual victory—and a place in the hearts of millions of Americans.

We are here because we know Brooks Hays for what he is—a man who will not leave the path which conscience sets. His loyalty to those ultimate virtues of love and courage has set a high mark in our political life. A prefabricated sticker may mutilate a ballot, but not this record.

It has been my privilege to serve with him since he was sworn in as a Member of the Congress in 1943. We sat side by side on the House Banking and Currency Committee. That he had the courage required to be a great Congressman was apparent from the start.

My earliest memories of his service—and his courage—were in the days of OPA when the great economic pressures of special interest groups plagued our committee's efforts to hold the line against disastrous inflation. The strife—and at times the intolerant, unreasoning, inflamed passions of economic avarice—were a small-scale replica of the struggle we now witness over civil rights.

It was here that I first learned to respect the careful and tolerant aproach to legislative problems that Brooks always took. No testimony or demand was so brash or so unreasonable that he would not carefully hear it out. He was ever courteous, attentive, and fair. And having weighed any testimony—he would then follow the dictates of his mind and his heart to reach what he thought was a just and equitable decision.

Often, as now, the decisions he had to make were unpopular with those who sought short-range goals and failed to consider the Nation's ultimate security and integrity.

Upon his promotion to the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House—he approached our world problems with the same fairminded judgment and with the same farsighted interest in his Nation's welfare. This innate fairness and his love of all his fellow men later made him one of our Nation's most effective representatives in the United Nations.

It was this same concern for our long-range future as a Nation, and this same sense of tolerance that led him to take a leading part in attempting to bridge the chasm that was beginning to split his home State asunder. He might have joined the unreasoning clamor and rushed in political panic to join the crowds in the street.

But this would have been contrary to the great faith by which he lives. Like the other moderates of our history who have made a path through the turbulence of issues of passion, Brooks sought to give leadership to dispel bitterness and hatred and to substitute reason and tolerance until a middle ground could be found.

The paste-in election and temporary defeat at the hands of those he sought to help is not an unusual occurrence. The musty pages of our history books are filled with names of moderates who were once thought destroyed by intemperates in moments of panic. Few can now recall the names of those who sought to destroy—but the names of Daniel Webster, of Lincoln, of Andrew Johnson, and of Woodrow Wilson have been remembered by a grateful America. It was their faith in their people and their search for peaceful and tranquil relations among all Americans that placed them in their secure niche of history.

It is interesting to note—and I am sure no one appreciates this fact more than Brooks—that intemperance and intolerance are not confined to sectional lines.

Brooks Hays has lost nothing. It is his Nation and colleagues in the Congress who are the losers—for he has brought into our lives the example of a courageous Christian leader.

TEXT OF ADDRESS BY DR. BILLY GRAHAM

I heard of three Kiwanians at their national convention who were discussing the merits of their respective professions. The first, a physician, said, "I think the medical profession is the greatest, for after all, Luke was a physician, and the Bible has a great deal to say about our profession." The second, an engineer, said, "Away back in the book of Genesis we are told that order was brought out of chaos. Now that took engineering, so I contend that the work of the engineer is the greatest." The politician interrupted and said, "Wait a minute. Who do you think created that chaos?"

Now Brooks Hays is not among the politicians that create chaos. He has exemplified, for 16 years, what many of us have often urged: That we need Christian leaders in politics.

It always amuses me to hear discussions on the old problem of religion and politics, and to think what such discussions would have meant to men like Jeremiah, Amos, Isaiah, and Ezekiel. For in fact, half their time was spent in trying to bring home to the men of their day the fact that God was directly concerned in the way society was organized, in the way wealth was distributed, in the way men behaved to one another. In short—in politics.

Brooks Hays has been one of those rare jewels that has helped lift the word "politics" out of the mud, slime, and mire, to help it have a new meaning in modern America.

Brooks Hays is more than a great political leader. He is every inch a Christian statesman who has been given the highest honor that his religious denomination can bestow upon him. As the president of the Southern Baptist Convention, he heads one of the largest religious bodies in the world. Make no mistake about it, he has the overwhelming support of the people of his denomination.

There are, unfortunately, few men who are qualified to serve equally well in both fields. Brooks Hays is one of these men, and in the sovereign plan of God, circumstances have released him to a larger and even more important work. While our political life is in desperate need of leadership, our religious life is equally in need of leadership.

During the months to come, Mr. Hays will be called upon to travel throughout the world, speaking on behalf of millions of Baptists and will, in my humble opinion, have even greater influence that he had on the floor of the Congress.

We hear a lot about political demagogs. How cheap and easy it is to let such words slip off our thoughtless tongues. But I think it speaks well for the qualities of our governmental leadership, when one of our largest denominations chooses a man from our Congress to be their spiritual leader. The Southern Baptist Convention, of which I am a member, has paid Congressman Hays this tribute. Such a tribute is more eloquent than any word that I or others may speak tonight.

To those of us who call him a personal friend, Brooks Hays is a rare combination of a man. He combines the humor of a Mark Twain, the commonsense of a Benjamin Franklin, and the integrity of Lincoln.

He can smile his way through difficulty, think his way through trouble, and pray his way through hardships.

The entire Nation was stunned a few weeks ago when it learned that a writein candidate had apparently defeated our friend. The people of Arkansas were even more stunned. Brooks Hays not only gave them the representation of 16 years of seniority, but of tremendous national influence. Little Rock realizes it has made a tragic mistake, and will, in my opinion, rectify this mistake in short order. Brooks Hays is familiar with Arkansas mud and perhaps a good deal of it was thrown his way during the recent election. But that doesn't dismay our friend. He has no doubt told the story of a man who was driving his jeep through a mud-hole down in Arkansas and noticed a hat lying in the middle of the road. He stopped his jeep, got out and picked up the hat only to find a man under it. "My good fellow," said the man, "give me your hand and let me help you out." "Nope, I'll make it all right," said the bogged-down fellow. "This old mule I'm on will take me through."

Congressman Hays' good humor, common sense, and integrity will take him through.

He has served his country well, from the Fifth Arkansas District which has been in catastrophic ferment during the past 3 years. He has not yielded to either extreme. His common sense has kept him in the middle of the road when most men were traveling the ruts on either side. Congressman Hays doesn't just think of light as being to the left or the right. He has a vertical vision, also, which sees men above or below the standard that God has for us. There is a difference between an arbitrator and a mediator. An arbitrator is neutral and objective, not sympathetic to either side. On the other hand, a mediator is sympathetic to both, understanding both, partial to both, belonging to both. Brooks Hays is a true mediator. He belongs to the people of Arkansas and to the people of the Nation. This is why Jesus Christ has been called in Scripture a mediator. He is God and He is man. He is part of both. Thus, He can effectually reconcile God and man. Brooks Hays' service, his philosophy and his life, remind us of the importance of sterling character in the business of building a better world.

The other day Dr. Ralph Oberman, director of the Atoms for Peace program of our Government, showed me around our atomic plant at Oak Ridge, Tenn. He said something I would like to share with you tonight. He said "The atom has the power to build a better world or destroy the one we have, and the atom doesn't care which purpose it serves, for it has no conscience." And then he said something I shall never forget as long as I live. He said "It's the man that makes the difference."

So our problem is not the atom, but the quality of man behind the atom. Our problem is not Government, but the kind of men we have behind the Government. Our problem is not education, but the kind of men we have running education. Our problem is not the church, but the kind and quality of men we have in the church. Brooks Hays represents the kind of man we need in Government, society, education, and the church.

Sometimes, to be God's man in an hour of crisis, results in controversy and temporary setbacks. We can retire from the battle as some men do and be content with cultivating our own inner life. There is what Milton calls a fugitive and cloistered virtue that slinks out of the race where that immortal garland is to be run for, not without destiny. He might have been content, especially after his blindness, to retire within himself and write his great poems. But he flung himself into the battle and helped to build an England where men were free to think and to speak.

I am convinced that this temporary defeat has already been turned into a triumphant victory for Brooks Hays because of his exceptionally outstanding ability, Christian character, and qualifications. I feel he is destined to play an important role in the future as we face the many problems that trouble the South and harass the entire world. In these days of baffling world problems and domestic problems that seem, at times, unsurmountable, let us pray that God may give us a double portion of Brooks Hays' good humor, common sense, and spiritual integrity, and that the spiritual ideal of one Nation under God, with liberty and justice toward all, may not just be something we say, but something we live, across the length and breadth of our Nation.

PRESENTATION OF SCROLL

The National Committee To Honor Brooks Hays presents to you, Brooks Hays, this scroll to honor you:

We salute you first as a human being, a very human being, whose gift of laughter has spread its clean, homely wit far and wide among all who know you.

We salute you as an educator, an expositor of truth, a clarifier of the complex, an inspiration to youth.

We salute you as a lawyer, who sees clearly what the rule of law can mean to a people, an apostle of constitutionalism sensitive to its new meanings in a changing age.

We salute you as a statesman. Your many terms in Congress have combined the wisdom of conciliation, and a gallant greatness in devotion to principle. A party man on appropriate occasions, at heart you have been greater than party.

We salute you as a man of courage, never more than in this day, a day which some may count a day of defeat, but which to us is a day of victory.

We salute you as a man of faith. We count this the greatest of all, because we know that it is to you of all things most precious. The love of others for you, as your love for them, knows no boundaries of creed in the consciousness of the common fatherhood of God.

EXCERPTS FROM REMARKS OF BROOKS HAYS, DECEMBER 18, 1958

On this occasion I believe I will be forgiven for speaking intimately of the most significant experience of my political life, my defeat on November 4. One of our great Americans, Walter Hines Page, said "the world is infinitely cruel but the world is also infinitely kind." It has certainly been kind to us, particularly since that election. My misfortune tapped the sources of sympathy in 48 States, for that is exactly the number we have heard from.

It has led some of my friends to the discouraging conclusion that the cause of moderation is hopeless, but I do not agree, since so much of my mail is from the South and virtually all of it is favorable. Moreover, while I am stuck with the label and will not renounce it, I am starting no new cult under that name. Moderation is not invariably a virtue. Truth is often highly partisan. And anyway, there are more precise ways of describing what we are about.

For assuming the risk of displeasing certain political powers, I have drawn occasional compliments for courage. I am reminded by them of the Cabinet member in the Norwegian Government who was commended for courage in opposing Hitler's regime. His reply was: "It wasn't courage. We just decided that a certain course of action was necessary and when the logic of the situation called for such action, the steps in that course just came in natural sequence." So I would prefer to speak in terms of the values we are defending. I presume from what is being said that my defeat might add something to that defense; if so, I would be happy. While I honor the office of Representative, I am convinced that under the circumstances the loss of my seat in Congress is not too big a price to pay.

Is there a standard to which the just and prudent may repair? There is. First, it seems to me, is an appreciation of what the rule of law means in sustaining our liberties and our property. The point does not need laboring, but the times do call for reminders that the Constitution provides a method for change and that until changed, unpopular as well as popular laws must be respected. Odium does not attach to lawful protests against statutes or decisions. Defiance is another matter.

The Federal system presents difficulties, but it is the American way and it can be made to work. The greater and stronger power in the hands of the National Government must be responsibly and patiently exercised, and the corollary is that grievances of groups or regions must be so phrased that love of country is not obscured. The patriot and the dissenter may inhabit the same heart. In spite of strains upon it, I believe we are on our way to recovering the strong sense of national community which has maintained us through wars and depressions. It is indispensable.

Secondly, we must have a firm commitment to the democratic tradition as expressed in our procedures and institutions. Our public school system must be preserved. Without it, the freedom that flowers from an educated citizenry would perish. James Madison put it succinctly: "Without popular education, popular government will be a farce or a tragedy, perhaps both." We know that there can be no government of and for the people without government by the people. Citizens of a racial minority who meet the qualifications prescribed for electors should not be denied a vote because of race. This, too, is basic.

There are procedural standards to be rigidly defended in attaining government by consent of the governed. I have cheerfully accepted several defeats because I acknowledge the principle of majority rule. That rule will be frustrated, however, unless the people are given an opportunity to secure and deliberate upon the facts and the issues. That is the reason we have filing dates that give candidates time to defend themselves and legal restrictions regarding the use of money and libelous material in campaigns. And throughout the structure of popular government there must be such respect for the minority that public policy is built on wisdom and justice in representative functions, not on the sophistry that the majority's judgment is always wise and best for the people. Congressional rules devised long ago have protected minority rights of every kind. I might add that if we moderates are a minority we are still conforming to our region's cherished tradition in asking that majorities not be indifferent to this principle. In the 1958 campaigning I was not trying to ride a popular idea. I was trying to popularize an idea that had become so much a part of me I could not rid myself of it if I had tried.

The third imperative is disciplined freedom. This embraces the right to maintain private schools at private expense, not as a substitute for public education but as a privilege in American life that not only adds to our cultural enrichment but helps to preserve the independence of viewpoint that makes freedom possible. This principle grants to both the proponents and opponents of proposed changes the right to organize, and their rights are not forfeited by methods and manners that are not admirable so long as they are not illegal.

Finally, there must be a due concern for the preservation of our common faith—the faith which sustains our position of world leadership. If there were not other and

higher motivations we would still be inspired to bind up the Nation's wounds by the knowledge that a ruthless force is loose in the world and that our failure at this point would be exploited. The door that religion alone can open leads to a sure passageway of peace and justice.

We are really not disunited; we are merely enjoying our freedoms. One of the enigmas of modern life is that ill will looks so deceptively strong while the conquering power of compassion appears so frail. Any sectional cleavages should merely spur us on to greater exertions in building bridges of understanding and dispelling fears of antagonism. We cannot exalt a common faith without acknowledging our common humanity and resolving to attack common enemies—disease, ignorance, intolerance, juvenile delinquency, and poverty.

There are lessons in American history to support the course of moderation, notably the careers of two beloved Americans, Abraham Lincoln, and Robert E. Lee. The North understands better, perhaps, in the present perspective the adulation which the South has evidenced for General Lee, and happily we have come to the place where one can point to the sentiment which Lincoln entertained for the South without a question as to its relevancy. You may have heard of the incident recorded of General Lee during the time that he served as president of Washington College at Lexington. It is said that he was sitting on the front porch of the president's home with a neighbor one afternoon when an old man stopped at the gate. He was shabbily dressed, and when the general walked down to the gate to hand him something and returned to his chair, the visitor looked curious, so the great man merely said, "One of the boys needing a little help." "What outfit did he fight with?" the neighbor asked. "I wouldn't know," replied the general, "you see, he was on the other side."

I cannot help thinking that Abraham Lincoln intended to include southern sorrows when he spoke of the mystic cords of memory stretching from every patriot grave and battlefield to every living heart and hearthstone. He said to a friend, George Floyd, in the Quincy Hotel lobby, "I have not suffered from the South, I have suffered with the South." But the moderates of that period were not strong enough to hold the middle ground occupied by these two men who, though enemies in war, must have respected each other and were congenial in the philosophy of mediation.

I know from what I have seen and heard since November 4 that healing hands are being laid upon the bruises of ill will and human conflict and that the task of educating both sides and all sides to the alternative solutions of the problem can be accomplished. My hope is strong now that compassion will be matched by imagination in the arts of government so that our lives that are so interlocked and interrelated may be blessed and may be made secure in God's love.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I move that the Senate adjourn until 12 o'clock noon on Monday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 53 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until Monday, March 16, 1959, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate March 12, 1959:

Subject to qualifications provided by law, the following for permanent appointment to the grades indicated in the Coast and Geodetic Survey:

To be captains

Edward B. Brown	Edmund L. Jones
John C. Ellerbe	Kenneth S. Ulm
James C. Tison, Jr.	

To be commanders

Francis X. Popper	Marvin T. Paulson
Howard S. Cole	V. Ralph Sobieralski
Raymond M. Stone	Lorne G. Taylor
Lorin F. Woodcock	

To be lieutenant commanders

Arthur R. Benton, Jr.	Roger F. Lanier
Eugene A. Taylor	John B. Watkins, Jr.
William D. Barbee	Jack E. Guth
Herbert R. Lippold, Jr.	Robert E. Williams

To be lieutenant

Lavon L. Posey

To be lieutenants (junior grade)

John J. McCoy	Sidney C. Miller
Vello Kiisk	Duane L. Georgeson
Loyd D. Thurman	Gerald D. Bradford
Philip L. Rotondo	Wesley P. James
Roy W. Entz	Mart Kask
Robert W. Franklin	Ronald M. Buffington
Ben Frank Worsham III	Morris J. Rothenberg
Bobby S. Woodruff	Bobby W. Jester

To be ensigns

Richard F. Dudley	Robert L. Sandquist
Thomas B. Fox	Raymond L. Speer
Renworth R. Floyd	Larry L. Wilkerson
William L. Hart	

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate March 12, 1959:

THE FEDERAL RESERVE SYSTEM

George Harold King, Jr., of Mississippi, to be a member of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System for the unexpired term of 14 years from February 1, 1946.

THE COUNCIL OF ECONOMIC ADVISERS

Karl Brandt, of California, to be a member of the Council of Economic Advisers.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, MARCH 12, 1959

The House met at 11 o'clock a.m.

Rev. Alan J. Davis, North Royalton Methodist Church, North Royalton, Ohio, offered the following prayer:

Eternal God, Father of us all, to whom with confidence we turn for guidance and for strength, we thank Thee now for the countless blessings Thou hast bestowed upon us. Grant, O God, that we be not wasteful of them.

May we waste not the precious days Thou hast given us. Help us to do this day what needs most to be done.

May we in our deliberations waste not words. Enable us to use the gift of speech with truth and compassion.

May we in our work waste not the moneys entrusted to our care. Guide us with wisdom and justice in their allocation.

And may we waste not the opportunities for leadership and service with which Thou hast honored us. May we have the moral courage to ever defend and work for that which is most pleasing to Thee.

Dear God, hear us as we pray, and be with us in our assemblies, for the sake of our Lord Jesus Christ. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. McGown, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 2260. An act to extend until July 1, 1963, the induction provision of the Universal Military Training and Service Act; the provisions of the act of August 3, 1950, suspending personnel strengths of the Armed Forces; and the Dependents Assistance Act of 1950.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 50. An act to provide for the admission of the State of Hawaii into the Union.

EXTENDING UNIVERSAL MILITARY TRAINING ACT

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill H.R. 2260, an act to extend until July 1, 1963, the induction provisions of the Universal Military Training and Service Act; the provisions of the act of August 3, 1950, suspending personnel strengths of the Armed Forces; and the Dependents Assistance Act of 1950, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 2, after line 10, insert:

"SEC. 5. Section 203 of the Career Compensation Act of 1949, as amended, is amended by striking out 'July 1, 1959' wherever such date appears therein and inserting 'July 1, 1963' in lieu thereof."

Amend the title so as to read: "An act to extend the induction provisions of the Universal Military Training and Service Act, and for other purposes."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I shall not object, I wish the chairman would just explain what this amendment does.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, the Senate amended the bill by adding to it a legislative proposal by the Department of Defense that continues eligibility for special pay for physicians, dentists, and veterinarians entering on active duty after July 1, 1959.

In an attempt to procure more physicians and dentists, and to make military medical compensation more competitive with civilian incomes by persons with similar experience, there has been in effect for several years a system of special pay for physicians, dentists, and veterinarians. The amount of this special pay is graduated in accordance with length of service. Medical and dental

officers with less than 2 years of active duty are eligible for special pay of $100 a month. Those with more than 2, but less than 6 years of service, are eligible for $150. Those with more than 6, but less than 10 years of such service are eligible for $200 a month. Those with more than 10 years may receive $250 a month. Veterinarians are eligible for $100 a month in special pay, regardless of length of service.

Physicians, dentists, and veterinarians already on active duty, or entering on active duty before July 1, 1959, would continue to receive this special pay, even if this amendment were not adopted. The amendment permits officers in these categories who enter on active duty between July 1, 1959, and July 1, 1963, to be eligible for these special payments in the same manner and amount that officers already on active duty are now receiving.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I heartily am in accord with that, and I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it may be in order in connection with the Hawaiian statehood bill to consider the Senate bill in lieu of the bill H.R. 4221 and under the same terms and conditions of the special rule adopted yesterday in relation to the Hawaiian statehood bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

Mr. PILLION. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER. Objection is heard.

JOINT MEETING ON WEDNESDAY, MARCH 18, 1959, TO RECEIVE THE PRESIDENT OF IRELAND

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it may be in order at any time on Wednesday, March 18, 1959, for the Speaker to declare a recess for the purpose of receiving in joint meeting the President of Ireland.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO SIT DURING GENERAL DEBATE

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Science and Astronautics may be permitted to sit during general debate on the bill H.R. 4221.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

TRADE BARRIERS AGAINST FREE FLOW OF MILK

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. If it does not exceed 300 words. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, news that the Maryland-Virginia Milk Producers Association is asking the Governor of Maryland to further erect trade barriers in his State against the free flow of milk from throughout the Nation is fresh evidence of the need of a National Sanitation Standards Act for milk.

For a long time, an effective blockade has been in force in the District of Columbia under the guise of arbitrary sanitation inspections. This action by the association shows that it wants to use every means at hand to further prevent distribution of milk which can qualify under any reasonable health inspection.

Many times in the past, Mr. Speaker, I have urged passage of the National Sanitation Standards Act—but this action by the association only reinforces the argument.

Passage of this act would put the distribution of milk on a fair basis—and would insure that the only barrier to entry of outside milk would be on an economic basis.

Considering present Washington, D.C., milk prices, it is evident that Minnesota milk can favorably compete on this basis. The class 1 price for milk delivered to plants in the Twin Cities of Minnesota is $3.73 per hundred pounds in March. Any increased handling costs in preparing the milk for transportation to the District of Columbia would not be greater than 10 cents per hundred pounds. This fact was established conclusively by researchers at the University of Minnesota. Transportation costs to the District of Columbia would be $1.80 per hundred pounds. This means that Minnesota milk can be delivered to Washington, D.C., from a Twin City Milk Producers Association plant for $5.63 per hundred or 99 cents less than the present Washington price, a saving of better than 2 cents a quart to the consumer.

The need for a National Sanitation Standards Act was never more evident now that the Virginia-Maryland Milk Producers Association has decided on this step.

HAWAII STATEHOOD

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 4221) to provide for the admission of the State of Hawaii into the Union.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 4221) with Mr. KILDAY in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state that when the Committee rose on yesterday the gentleman from New York [Mr. O'BRIEN] had 1 hour and 44 minutes remaining, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. WESTLAND] 1 hour and 47 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. O'BRIEN].

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. HALEY].

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Chairman, I am sorry I find myself somewhat in disagreement not only with my own committee chairman but with others on the committee reporting this bill. May I say in passing that we have a very fine chairman, and I would like to commend the gentleman from New York [Mr. O'BRIEN] for the splendid job he is doing.

Mr. Chairman, I am realistic enough to realize that certain facts of life are very evident here and that this bill is going to pass.

I have opposed Hawaii statehood bills ever since I have been in Congress for a number of reasons, and I might state that at this time sitting in this Congress today are 165 Members who at one time or another have opposed statehood for Hawaii. The vote on yesterday indicated that not that many are opposed to statehood today. I merely say to those gentlemen either that they were wrong a few years ago or they are wrong now.

I take this time, Mr. Chairman, to direct a question or two to the gentleman from Colorado in order to satisfy the mind of the gentleman from Florida who has many misgivings about this bill. I direct the following question to the gentleman from Colorado: One of the things that is very disturbing to me in this proposed bill for statehood for Hawaii is the fact that the bill itself continues what I think has been a very inefficient organization or committee in the Hawaiian Islands, namely the Hawaiian Home Commission. If the gentleman would enlighten me on that particular thing I would appreciate it. It is my understanding that the present bill under consideration will extend the life of the Hawaiian Home Commission for a period at least of 99 years, is that correct?

Mr. ASPINALL. I will try to answer the gentleman's question as logically and as directly as I possibly can. I know the gentleman's feeling about this particular question and I have some sympathy with his position. On the other hand, I do not consider that it is a problem which we should resolve in deciding on the question of statehood.

Let me state that I cannot find myself in agreement with his statement in reference to the longevity of the Hawaiian Home Commission which my colleague has just mentioned. It might be 99 years, it might be longer than 99 years. But it is provided in the act which created the Hawaiian Home Commission

that loans granted shall be for a term of 99 years.

The purpose back of this originally was, of course, to give to the Hawaiian people of 50 percent or more Hawaiian blood the right to ownership and use of some of the land that was taken away from them when the treaty was originally made. It was taken away from them even though they had no ownership individually in the lands. The land was held by the Crown and the Crown having held the land at the time of Hawaii's inclusion into the United States it then became Territorial land. When it came into the Union it was then the responsibility of the Federal Government and the Territorial government to administer the area.

What was attempted with the creation of the commission was to provide for individual ownership of homes rather than the commercial approach which we have provided for the Indian tribes of the United States.

Mr. HALEY. Of course, the gentleman is well aware of the fact that the census of native Hawaiians in 1940 showed there were only 14,375 or 3.4 percent native Hawaiians.

Let me ask the gentleman this question: Are we here going to create another situation similar to the situation we have created in regard to the American Indian, and what is going to be the responsibility of the people of America and this Congress to those people?

Mr. ASPINALL. It is my opinion that we are not creating a similar condition to that which has brought about our Indian tribal communal ownership. It is my opinion also that as the years come and go, whether for 10, 50, or 100 years, this number which is slowly dwindling will become so negligible that this land will no longer be used for the purposes for which it is now administered by the Hawaiian Home Commission. When that time comes, then it will be up to the government of the State of Hawaii, providing the bill passes, with the consent of the Congress of the United States, to make such disposition of this land as is in the best interest of the people of Hawaii.

Mr. HALEY. Of course, the gentleman is well aware of the fact that under the original organic act or the original act, approximately 400,000 acres of land was set aside to be used for the establishment of the people of Hawaii on their native land. Now, will it be the responsibility of the State of Hawaii to continue to hold that land, make it available for the settlement of the people of Hawaii?

Mr. ASPINALL. If I understand the gentleman correctly, it will be the authority and the obligation of the State of Hawaii to hold this land for the people of Hawaii.

Mr. HALEY. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. ASPINALL. May I make one more statement, if my colleague will yield?

Mr. HALEY. I yield.

Mr. ASPINALL. In a measure I agree with his statement about the discharge of their duties by the members of the Hawaiian Home Commission. On the other hand, the law provides for a leasehold interest. It has been impossible for the Hawaiian people who are entitled to benefits under the provisions of the act to borrow money from any public agency, and that is one reason why the project has not worked any better than it has. It is expected that when the new State comes into existence they will make available funds which the Hawaiian people can obtain on long-term loans so that they can take advantage of the provisions of the Hawaiian Home Commission statute.

Mr. HALEY. Will the gentleman be kind enough to answer one additional question?

Mr. ASPINALL. I will do my best.

Mr. HALEY. I am somewhat disturbed about the tremendous powers that we are turning over to the executive department in Hawaii. As the gentleman is well aware, there are only two elected executive officers, namely, the Governor and the Lieutenant Governor. Of course, the Governor can then appoint members to carry out the various functions of government in similar positions that, I might say, obtain in his own State as cabinet officers and, as I have in my State of Florida. We have cabinet officers to carry out those responsibilities. In this particular instance you are going to allow the Governor of Hawaii to nominate these men who will hold their responsible positions and positions of great power, with the concurrence, of course, of the senate, which in this particular case would be approximately 14 men. Now, does not the gentleman think, first, that that is a tremendous amount of power and, second, will it be possible under the present bill, if the people of Hawaii later find it desirable, to change their constitution to provide for constitutional officers to carry out these functions?

Mr. ASPINALL. Let me advise my colleagues of this committee to this effect: My colleague, the gentleman from Florida, has taken his chairman into his confidence and has asked him these questions before coming on the floor. And, I am most appreciative of that approach. First, I also share somewhat his views on this new departure from ordinary control of executive and administrative departments of government. On the other hand, as I answered our colleague, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS], relative to his question about 18-year-olds voting, I suggest that this is an obligation and a responsibility of the State. Now, may I say, as I also advised my colleague from Florida, that I opposed in Colorado the question of the cabinet form of government, and we only have it partially at the present time. I am not so sure that it is so good. But, I think it is a State responsibility and a decision for the citizens of a State. As this bill is drawn, if the new State of Hawaii through its legislative processes desires to change then to a form of government which is perhaps more adaptable to our wishes, then it has the power under this bill to do so.

Mr. HALEY. I thank the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALEY. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SAYLOR. I want to commend the gentleman from Florida for his forthright raising of these questions. As a member of the House Interior Committee, he has always been opposed to statehood for both Alaska and Hawaii. But in his approach he has always been objective; and while we may disagree on the outcome, the approach of the gentleman from Florida [Mr. HALEY] is one that everyone must respect and admire. I commend him for raising these questions with regard to the bill which is before us at the present time.

Mr. HALEY. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. KILDAY, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 4221) to provide for the admission of the State of Hawaii into the Union, had come to no resolution thereon.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I renew my unanimous-consent request, heretofore made, that it may be in order for the House to consider the bill S. 50, in lieu of the bill H.R. 4221, under the terms and provisions of House Resolution 205 adopted yesterday by the House in relation to the Hawaiian statehood bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

Mr. PILLION. Mr. Speaker, I do not renew my previous objection.

There was no objection.

TREASURY-POST OFFICE APPROPRIATION BILL, FISCAL YEAR 1960

Mr. GARY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Appropriations have until midnight Wednesday, March 18, to file its report on the Treasury-Post Office appropriation bill for the fiscal year 1960, and that it may be taken up on the floor of the House on Thursday, March 19.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object—and I shall not object—I understand that this matter has been cleared with the membership of the Committee on Appropriations on our side of the aisle.

Mr. GARY. It has been cleared with everybody with whom I know it should be cleared; the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. CANFIELD], and also the leadership on this side of the aisle.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I reserve all points of order on the bill, and withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

HAWAII STATEHOOD

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (S. 50) to provide for the admission of the State of Hawaii into the Union, in lieu of the bill H.R. 4221.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill S. 50, with Mr. KILDAY in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. ANDERSEN].

Mr. ANDERSEN of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, it is gratifying to note that support for Hawaiian statehood here today is coming from both sides of the aisle. That is as it should be. The question of admitting a new State to the Union should not be a political one. Nevertheless, I should not want it to go unnoticed that the first Hawaiian statehood bill introduced in this body was authored in 1919, during the 65th Congress, by the then Republican Delegate from the Territory, Prince Jonah Kuhio Kalanianaole, who served with distinction in the House for over 20 years.

As most of us know, this body has approved Hawaiian statehood bills on three previous occasions. The first time was by the Republican 80th Congress by a vote of 196 to 133. The next time was by the Democratic 81st Congress by a vote of 262 to 110. The last time was by the Republican 83d Congress by a vote of 274 to 138. If the Members on our side of the aisle had had our way, and the bill had been brought up for consideration last summer after Alaska was admitted, I am sure Hawaii would have been admitted to the Union at that time.

Mr. Chairman, those who have opposed Hawaiian statehood in the past now have exhausted all their arguments. After countless hearings and debates, all their arguments have been tried and found wanting. Last year we disposed of the point of noncontiguity by admitting Alaska to the Union. The matter of Hawaii's distance from the mainland has been debated and found to be pointless with the advent of the jet age. The loyalty of the people of Hawaii has been questioned time and time again but has been completely disposed of by reams of evidence testifying to the fact that the people of Hawaii are no less loyal to the United States than are those anywhere here on the mainland.

The argument can no longer be advanced that the economy of Hawaii cannot support statehood. Hawaii has a sound financial base. Her dynamic development continues to attract industry. Sugar and pineapples, the foundation of Hawaii's economy, annually are produced in increasing quantities and values.

In 1957 Hawaii's 28 independent sugar plantations produced 1,085,000 tons of raw sugar on their 220,000 acres with a crop value of $148 million.

Hawaii's 9 pineapple canneries processed 30,787,000 cases of fruit and juice grown on 77,000 acres of 13 plantations. The total value of the crop was $117 million.

A notable expansion and diversification of industry is taking place. The most dramatic of recent developments was the selection of a site several miles from Honolulu for a $40 million refinery by the Standard Oil Co. of California. Construction was begun in October 1958 for this first oil refinery in Hawaii.

The islands' first steel mill, for production of reinforcing bars for the flourishing construction business, will be completed and in operation early this year.

For the fiscal year ended June 30, 1958, the Territory paid a record high of $166,306,000 in Federal taxes, more than any of 10 States, including Alaska.

Hawaii has paid more than $2.300 million in Federal taxes since becoming a Territory.

Per capita personal income in Hawaii in 1957 was $1,821, putting Hawaii in 25th place nationally, or ahead of 24 States.

Tourism is Hawaii's third basic industry, and is challenging sugar and pineapples in dollar value. Every year sees new highs in the number of visitors, which reached a record figure of 168,000 in 1957. In dollar volume this has meant a jump from $6 million in 1946 to $77 million in 1957, or an increase of 1,183 percent.

A projection by the Hawaii Visitors Bureau indicates Hawaii will be host to 280,000 tourists by 1965.

Mr. Chairman, by every yardstick Hawaii has long since passed the test of qualifying for statehood. And let there be no question that the people of Hawaii want statehood.

In the National Archives here in Washington, not far from the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution, there is a dramatic testimonial to the statehood hopes of the citizens of Hawaii.

It is the statehood honor roll, a historic petition to Congress from Hawaii's citizens, asking for immediate statehood. It was delivered to Vice President NIXON as President of the Senate, on February 26, 1954, after 116,000 signatures had been affixed in Hawaii in a few days.

The giant roll of newsprint containing the signatures is 6 feet wide, about a mile long, and is the second largest petition received in the history of the United States Congress.

Perhaps better than more formal resolutions and bills, it transmits the emotion-filled desire of Hawaii's citizens to be granted the statehood status they have so demonstrably earned.

For over half a century, the residents of the Territory have lived as Americans, worked as Americans, fought as Americans.

Only statehood can raise Hawaii's people to the dignity of Americans, first class, with the accompanying rights and privileges.

That is why Hawaii's people want statehood—now.

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. MACK].

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Chairman, Hawaii has been preparing for statehood for the past 50 years and the results are available for all to study. In late years more than a dozen congressional committees have investigated this proposition.

Many Members of Congress have studied the Hawaii situation at close range, and from over 100 days of congressional hearings we have nearly 5,000 pages of testimony on the subject. They have established many reasons why Hawaii should be admitted to statehood.

The reasons why Hawaii should be admitted into the Union as its 50th State, to me, are clear, convincing, and compelling.

The Congress, during many statehood debates, has established a list of traditional qualifications which a Territory should or ought to have to be considered eligible for statehood.

Among these qualifications are, first, the Territory should possess adequate area; second, it should have sufficient population; third, its economic situation should be such as to permit its people to assume and to carry their proportionate share of the Federal Government's financial responsibilities; fourth, the people of the Territory must have manifest a sincere desire for statehood; and, fifth, finally and most important, the people of the Territory must believe in the American republican form of government and be qualified by education and experience for self-government according to American traditions.

All of these five qualifications, I am convinced, the people of Hawaii now abundantly possess.

In area, the Territory of Hawaii covers more than 6,600 square miles of land. Hawaii, therefore, is larger in area than Connecticut, Rhode Island, or Delaware. Since these three now are States, an argument cannot effectively be made that Hawaii is too small in area for statehood.

In population, Hawaii now has more than half a million inhabitants. This is more people than any Territory, except Oklahoma, in all the history of the country possessed when it was admitted to statehood. Furthermore, Hawaii's present population is larger than that now possessed by six of our States. Surely, Hawaii cannot be denied statehood on the ground she has too few people.

Is the economy of Hawaii such as to permit her to assume her full share of support of the Nation's financial responsibilities? As to that qualification we also must answer in the affirmative. During recent years the people of Hawaii have paid more than $90 million a year in Federal income taxes. There are many present States which do not pay that much. To deny statehood to a people who pay so much toward the support of the Federal Government is to practice what our forefathers denounced, "taxation without representation."

Then, there is the question of whether the half million people of Hawaii want statehood. They have said they do again, again, and again. In 1940, in a plebiscite held on the issue of statehood, the people of the Territory voted 2 to 1 for statehood. The Hawaiian Territorial Legislature, composed of duly elected representatives of the Hawaiian people, have petitioned the Congress in the past half century almost a score of times for statehood. These representatives or similarly minded ones, have been elected and reelected time after time indicating they were, in petitioning statehood, expressing the will of the people.

And lastly, are the people of Hawaii qualified by training and experience for statehood? Few can doubt that they are. Their educational system is of the best. Their rate of literacy is high. For more than 50 years they have lived under and been faithful to an American system of representative form of government.

When Hawaii was admitted to the status of a Territory, the United States made her people an implied promise that, someday, when qualified, Hawaii would be admitted to statehood. The conventions of both political parties in their platforms declared that they favored statehood. We, of both parties, should keep those promises.

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HORAN].

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, in voting to admit Hawaii to statehood, as I am confident we shall do, we are admitting to equal partnership a State which is exceptionally well qualified to share the rights and responsibilities of our Nation with the older States. In fact, I believe that Hawaii's case for statehood is stronger than that of almost any of the other 36 States which have previously been admitted to the Union, since the Original Thirteen.

First, Hawaii has served an apprenticeship as an organized, incorporated Territory for 59 years, since passage of the Organic Act in 1900. Most of the present States served similar appenticeships of only 5, 10, or 20 years.

Hawaii's population today is well over 600,000, more than the population of any of the 36 States previously admitted since the founding of the Union, with the single exception of Oklahoma. Hawaii's population, in fact, is already larger than that of six of the present States, and is still growing.

Hawaii's economy is strong and progressive. Some people speak of statehood as if it were a question whether a new State could help in bearing the financial burdens of the Nation, but discussion along those lines is completely out of order when we are speaking of Hawaii, because the people of Hawaii already pay all the same Federal taxes at exactly the same rates as the rest of us on the continent do. Of course Hawaii is able to help share in those burdens; she is already doing that as a Territory. The Federal tax revenues from Hawaii are already very substantial—$166 million in 1958—greater than the Federal tax receipts collected from 10 of the present States.

In fact, statehood will make little difference to Hawaii financially, or to the rest of us either. Hawaii has never asked for nor received special favors in a financial way. The only expenses in Hawaii now paid by the Federal Government which the State will have to assume are the salaries of the Governor, his administrative assistant, the government secretary, and the members of the legislature, and part of the salaries of the territorial judiciary. Hawaii also of course receives most of the general Federal grants-in-aid, but on the same basis as the States, without special consideration or favoritism. The special Federal costs that I mentioned—the salaries of the Governor, legislators, and judges—amount to less than one-quarter of a million dollars per year on the average. These additional costs the taxpayers of Hawaii will have to pay, but they can do so easily since the current budgetary surplus of the Territory is many times that figure.

The achievement of statehood is not a matter of economic or financial gain for Hawaii. To them, it is a matter of equal political rights, of being accepted as of equal status with the rest of us. Although they have not suffered under territorial status, they want the right to govern themselves, to select their own Governor and other executive officials, to determine fully their own policies, and to participate with the rest of us in the formation of national policies. They have shown that they are well fitted to exercise those rights, and they have earned the right to exercise them.

Mr. Chairman, I am proud of the opportunity which has been given me to participate in this great event, to cast my vote for this historic action. I am gratified that my vote will be one of those which finally brings to completion a historic process which has already been too long delayed. I welcome Hawaii as a sister State with my own. I welcome her people—of various races and creeds—to equality of rights with myself because the diversity of her racial backgrounds adds variety to our citizenship. I do not think we need apologize for the large percentage of persons of Polynesian and Oriental background who make up Hawaii's population. There is also a large percentage of persons whose ancestry and race go back to the continental United States, and they have succeeded in extending American ideals and culture into the Pacific, and in indoctrinating the orientals and others with our ideals and our outlook.

I look forward to celebrating the final admission of Hawaii as our 50th State before the end of this year. The admission of Hawaii will make our Union complete, and will announce to the world that we practice what we preach.

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. CANFIELD].

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Chairman, on this day I shall cast my fourth vote for Hawaiian statehood. I supported the statehood bills passed by our body in 1947, 1950, and 1953.

It now appears that the hope expressed by President Eisenhower in his state of the Union message last January will be realized. The President then said:

> May I voice the hope that before my term of office is ended I shall have the opportunity and the great satisfaction of seeing the 50th star in our national flag.

As long as 1,000 years ago, Polynesians from the South Pacific were attracted to the volcanic mountain tops known as the Hawaiian Islands. Over the years traders, adventurers, missionaries, and settlers from the east and west made their homes in Hawaii in the melting-pot tradition so dear to Americans. Nearly 120 years ago the kingdom adopted its first constitution, one modeled along American lines. Since 1900 the Hawaiian Islands have been a strategic territory. Can we ever forget Pearl Harbor? Or the valor of Hawaii's Japanese-Americans on battlefields? The saga of self-sacrifice which the Nisei wrote in Europe and Korea has been matched, perhaps, but not exceeded.

It is abundantly evident that Hawaii has met all the traditional requirements for admission to statehood. Her people have demonstrated an abiding faith in the principles of democracy, and her electorate has made clear its earnest desire for statehood. Hawaiian people and resources alike are recognized to be more than capable of supporting a State government.

I acknowledge that Hawaii would enjoy disproportionate representation in the U.S. Senate. But there is precedent here. The Connecticut compromise, whereby representation in the Senate was to be equal for all States while House representation was to be based on population, was a practical solution to a very real problem. Hawaii's lone voice in the House would be all but muted when competing with, say, the 43 distinguished Representatives from the sovereign State of New York.

I am not among those who are horrified by the prospective transfer of a portion of each State's rightful voting power in the Senate to the State of Hawaii. Perhaps I should be if the people of these United States took more seriously their own voting obligations. Two-fifths of the eligible citizens in this country never bother to vote. And this figure, representing the national ratio, is very high compared to the percentages in some of our States. In one State, in the presidential election of 1956, only 22.1 percent of the potential voters condescended to show up at the polls. I doubt rather seriously that the people of this State would be concerned over any transfer of voting power.

And it is fairly obvious that mere size has never guaranteed greatness. The long roll of distinguished Senators in our history contains, I suggest, as many names from the smaller States as from the larger.

Hawaii is too small? It has more land area than Rhode Island, Delaware, or Connecticut, and more people than Vermont, Wyoming, Delaware, or Neveda. It would make as much sense to say that these States should be abolished.

A frequently mentioned fear is that Hawaii the State would become a Communist outpost. Only last month the

House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee concluded that—

> Statehood will provide a suitable and effective political structure through which the people of Hawaii can and will hasten the destruction of the last vestiges of Communist influence.

Mr. Chairman, by making Alaska our 49th State and now following through with Hawaii our 50th State, bringing to their people the full privileges of citizenship, we are engaging in an act which can only have wholesome repercussions throughout the world, especially in those lands where real freedom is still only a hope far from reality.

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Chairman, it is not my intention to try to convince anybody to vote for or against this particular bill, because in all fairness, in all honesty, I cannot say that I know exactly how to vote on this particular bill. It is a unique situation indeed. For the first time in our history we are now faced with the possibility, and undoubtedly it will pass, of adding some islands and making them a State of the United States of America.

I wish I had a crystal ball so I could look into it and see what would happen a year, 5 years, or 10 years from now if Hawaii is made a State, or what would happen if it is not made a State. I voted against statehood for Alaska. As of now, I do not know whether I was correct in voting against Alaska. Only time will tell, but certainly as time goes on, if we have to subsidize Alaska and give them special benefits that the other States in the United States do not have, then my vote was right. If they go ahead and take their place as the 49th State equal with the other 48 States, then my vote was wrong.

When we talk about H.R. 3, H.R. 10, and such measures as that, I have little difficulty, because I am for those measures; but in this one I find myself in a little bit of confusion. One of the reasons happens to be that I, too, went to Honolulu this year along with the committee, not as a member of the committee but strictly for pleasure. I talked to a lot of people over there and did not find any tremendous desire among the people to become a State. Some thought they should, some thought they should not, some thought they should wait. But I did not find any overwhelming opinion among all the people that they should become the 50th State.

A number of years ago I was a special agent of the FBI and, along with other agents, was selected to conduct a special investigation to determine whether or not Harry Bridges was a member of the Communist Party. Many of us spent several months in determining that fact, and found out that he actually had been a member of the Communist Party. Another agent and myself were the ones who obtained the statement from the individual who took Harry Bridges into the Communist Party and gave him his card and attended meetings with him. Subsequent thereto, hearings were held, as you know, and Bridges was ordered deported. But later changes were made. I well realize as a matter of history, should he go back to his associations with Hall and follow the same principles we know he had some years ago, we may be faced with some problems. I hope he does not do that if we make Hawaii a State.

I rather anticipate this bill will be passed and Hawaii will be made a State. The 86th Congress will probably be long remembered for this action rather than any other action that is taken in this session. So I say that in casting our vote, I hope that I for one will vote so that the people of Hawaii will best be helped and the people of the United States will best be helped in this historic vote here today.

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ROGERS].

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I am not laboring under any delusions. I realize this is nothing more than a delaying action, and I want you to know I am not doing it for the purpose of delaying these proceedings. Of course, we could have objected to the substitution of the Senate bill for the House bill. But, we are doing this for the purpose of making a record on an issue which I think will be called to the attention of the Members of the Congress and to the attention of the people of the United States within the confines of the 48 States—mind you, I did not say 49 States, for a number of years not today. Now, as you know, last year we took in Alaska. I opposed that as did some other members of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. When we convened this time, as we had anticipated, Hawaii was waiting on the line. No hearings were held before the subcommittee. We went right into the full committee and started hearings in order to speed the matter up. Actually, it was because the ice had been broken in a new political era or area—whichever you want to call it—and we moved forward to bring Hawaii in. What will be up next February or next January or the following January no one knows. But, I think in all fairness to the Members of the Congress who are moving forward in that direction, they ought to recognize the fact that we should anticipate that other territories will be coming in in the next few years. Where we are going to stop, I do not know. It must be somewhere.

But, Mr. Chairman, I want to talk to you about just a few of the things that I think are important as we move into this new so-called political area. First, I want to say this. There have been attempts all during the hearings and in the previous discussions and debate on statehood bills to bring personalities into it. I have been in Congress since 1951 and we have had the Hawaiian bill and the Alaskan bill up so many times that I cannot remember the exact number. Much has been said in an effort to bring personalities and inject personalities and hatred into this thing, and I want to make the record clear on that right now that so far as I am concerned and the others with whom I have been associated in opposition to this bill, that we have had no ill feeling toward anyone in Alaska or Hawaii. As a matter of fact, if you will permit me to say it now, I think the Alaskan people probably can claim the right to a pioneer status that is probably unequaled in the history of the world. They are fine people and certainly none of us have anything against them, and I think the Hawaiian people and all the people who make up the citizenry of the Hawaiian Islands so far as I know have been wonderful people. They have never mistreated me and I have looked upon them as fine human beings as I do upon all other people, and I do not think we ought to get this debate off on anything like personalities or hatred or any such thing.

Mrs. BLITCH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. I yield.

Mrs. BLITCH. Would the gentleman be inclined to agree with the gentlewoman from Georgia that the real danger in this legislation is that really we are not sowing the seeds, but rather we are laying the foundation for a philosophy that is entirely foreign to the original concept of these United States—a philosophy that really embodies that concept of one worldism that was promulgated not in recent years, but as we have been told and has been pointed out to us, was advocated by certain individuals as long ago as fifty or sixty or one hundred years. Does that not express the gentleman's objections to this bill?

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. May I say to the gentlewoman, I think if the concept that is being followed in bringing in these Territories and these far-flung lands is carried out to its logical conclusion, I do not see how anyone can successfully argue against a man who accuses us of indulging in one worldism. I think that is exactly right.

Mrs. BLITCH. I thank the gentleman. I wish to state, since he has given me the opportunity to do so, that that is my greatest objection to the granting of statehood to Hawaii.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. I thank the gentlewoman from Georgia.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SAYLOR. I would like to say at this point that it has been my pleasure to serve with the gentleman from Texas on the Interior Committee for as long as he has been in Congress. While he has been an avid opponent of statehood for Hawaii no one who has been a member of that committee or a Member of Congress during that time could ever accuse the gentleman of not being forthright in his position, and there has never been any hatred or enmity motivating him. The only reason he opposes it is because of his philosophy of government. Much as I disagree with him, I can do nothing but respect and admire the gentleman for maintaining his position.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. I thank the gentleman. I appreciate having served with him. There are so many nice things I can say about him, that my limited time will not permit me to begin. I will tell him personally later on.

I want to speak for a moment on this question of contiguity. Many people, who criticize the opposition which is based on the question of contiguity, will admit they do not know what the word really means when applied to these circumstances; but the matter of contiguity without any question is seriously involved in this thing; it is the serious objection that I think ought to be weighed very carefully by everyone who is interested in doing what is best for this Government. I do not challenge anyone in his sincere belief as to what philosophy of government should be pursued, but I do think that you ought to use history and precedent to reach a conclusion, and know what certain actions might create.

A small committee went to Hawaii last year to report further on this matter. They went into the question of contiguity. As a matter of fact so did the entire committee, and the committee report deals with the question of contiguity, but they base the entire concept of contiguity on the question of travel, how fast and how far, how long it would take to get from New York or Washington to Honolulu. That, however, is not the point at all.

The point is simply this, that we have devoted ourselves, since the Thirteen Original States, to the preservation of the Union, a Union of the States that make up the United States. What did we do? We moved out and took in Alaska, and prior to that there had not been any State attached to the United States, the Union that made up the United States, that was not attached by land over which we had exclusive jurisdiction. When we admitted Alaska into this Union of States we broke that precedent. We not only took in a Territory which was separated from the rest of the States by the high seas over which we have at most joint jurisdiction, or, one might say, sufferance to travel, but also we did this, we placed between us and that Territory in the words of the subcommittee that reported on this, in the case of Alaska, miles and miles of foreign territory, foreign territory, mind you, over which we have no jurisdiction whatever unless we get it by the will of the people of that sovereignty, by treaty, or by Executive agreement. But the fact of the matter is that if Canada, which is a friendly nation and we expect will always continue to be, but if the time should come when this Communist menace of which so much has been said—and I think a great deal of attention should be paid to it—and they should decide to attack the Hawaiian Islands economically and they said, "We will strike your ports," and men like Harry Bridges, Jack Hall—names do not mean anything—issue the edict, "We will strike your ports and we will strike your ports in Alaska, too, we are going to attack you economically."

Well, we say: We will go through Alaska, we have a corridor, we can get there, we do not have to resort to an airlift.

So Canada says, Wait a minute, before you do that let us find out what is going to happen.

This same group of people that has this international union will say to Canada: If you permit the United States to use Canadian soil as a corridor to get to Alaska we will strike your ports, too.

What would be the reaction of Canada under those circumstances? It is something we do not know. I know that Canada would take a long and hard look at permitting this country to use their soil as a corridor in order to break a strike brought about by this international union if those facts were present. I can anticipate just such a situation arising, and it is not something that you have to reach up in the air to get.

This so-called internaticnal union, whether it be that union or some other union dominated by anyone, by one single edict can completely isolate Hawaii because Hawaii is wholly dependent on the sealanes, her economy rests upon what traffic she can maintain via the sea.

Not only that, but each one of those islands is separated by the high seas, the high seas over which we do not have exclusive jurisdiction, we do not claim exclusive jurisdiction, waters over which every other foreign nation in the world has the same identical right to travel as do we.

As I said a minute ago, those people who talk about transportation and travel and nearness by virtue of the fact we have jet planes have missed the entire point. The question is resolved to the issue of preservation of the Union. When you have 1 solid made up of 48 or 49 integral parts, or 50 integral parts represented by a flag that has 50 stars, and somebody comes along, because one of those parts is isolated, and takes one of those parts away from you, which is conceivable from experience in our own history, your solid dissolves. You either have the whole or you have not preserved the Union. I think that is the risk that the people of this country ought to think about when we move into this new political area. That is going to bring problem after problem up for consideration, not only of conflict as we have had between the State laws but it is going to bring about conflict in the application of our maritime laws, the interstate commerce laws and other matters we have never been confronted with before, in addition to conflict of State laws.

The committee asks, because they are separated from this country, does that mean they will never become a State? I have never said that and I do not say it now, but every time you pick up a daily newspaper or periodical you see headlines that this country, our philosophy and our way of government, is now facing the greatest challenge it has ever faced in our history. The question is: "Can we safely embark at this time on uncharted political seas, heretofore untraveled by any country?"

If we admit Hawaii, why should not others be allowed to come in? Yes; they have said in answer to that argument, and I refer to the proponents of this legislation, that is not true at all because you have to meet certain requirements before you are eligible for statehood, and under the situation as it exists Hawaii is the last incorporated Territory, therefore it is a long way before we will have to recognize any other Territory or any other place that might want to make application for statehood.

Now, we asked the question in the hearings as to what the requirements might be for statehood, and here is what we were told. The three standards which are said to be traditional are these: First, that the inhabitants of the new State are imbued with and sympathetic toward the principles of democracy as exemplified in the American form of government. That was the Secretary of the Interior testifying; second, that a majority of the electorate desires statehood; and, third, that the proposed new State has sufficient population and resources to support State government and to provide its share of the cost of the Federal Government.

Now, I asked the Secretary of the Interior at that time if actually the first two measures were not the ones that ought to be applied and the ones that would be applied, unless we were willing to apply a means test and to say to the people, in the language of the proponents, mind you, that if you do not have so much money, then you cannot come in. Now, that is what their arguments amounted to on that. Take Cuba, for instance, which we have been reading about so much lately, suppose they had a plebiscite and voted 4 to 1 to join this country and they adopted a constitution and said that they were firm believers in a democratic form of government and imbued with the ideals of democracy, they could even go so far as to say "We can trade with you and show you we are rich enough to be citizens." Now, what are you going to say to that? How can you say to them that "No, we are not going to take you in." Well, they will say, "You took in the Hawaiian Islands; they were a Territory. Why did you take them in?" "Because we did not want anybody to think we were for colonialism. That is why we took them in, but we do not want you."

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. ASPINALL. Before I ask the question, I wish to state that the gentleman now in the well is one of the most valuable and able members on the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. This bill today is better because of the contribution which he has made in opposing certain sections which we have changed in order to meet some of his objections. We do disagree on fundamentals of the bill. The only question that I have to ask at this time of my colleague is this: It will be true as long as the United States of America remains an independent nation that we can, if both parties are willing, add to our jurisdiction new areas, just in the same way as we added the great State of Texas, coming from an independent status, and the great Territory of California from a conquered area, is that not right? That is what the gentleman from Colorado now speaking stated yesterday in his statement to the committee.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. I think that is exactly right. The gentleman from Colorado, as you all know, is one of the greatest chairmen that the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs ever had, and one of the most valuable Members of Congress, a man whose integrity has never been questioned. As he pointed out, we disagree basically on the philosophy that is represented by this piece of legislation. Now, back to the contiguity situation for just a minute. Some person says "What difference does it make whether they are attached, in the final analysis?" It makes this difference. Under international law sovereignties are separated by land masses and inland waters. That is the main difference when you get right down to the analysis. Now, if that is changed and we could go on and get exclusive jurisdiction in the Pacific Ocean to the Hawaiian Islands, maybe this problem could be answered. But we better take another look at this thing, and we ought to wait until that time before doing anything.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ROGERS] has again expired.

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. I thank the gentleman for his kindness.

Mr. Chairman, it was argued for a long time that unless statehood were granted to Hawaii we would have a situation whereby we would be making second-class citizens out of all the people of Hawaii. Nobody answered that, and it went along that way for a long time and finally someone expressed the thought that if they were second-class citizens out there, maybe the District of Columbia has some second-class citizens. That created a question, and as this thing moved along, they began to drop that—I do not want to say propaganda, but I will say that advertising—they dropped that because they saw that it did not really mean anything. They were not second-class citizens at all. They are just as fine people as there are anywhere, and because of the philosophy of government that we follow, they have many rights that we do not have in this country because they are a Territory, and I suppose we could say vice versa; but these rights are all pretty well balanced. The funny thing about it is that this same group of people at that same time were claiming that they were entitled to statehood because they had been promised statehood by somebody—I do not know who it was. Someone said that it was a gentleman from the other body who had gotten over to Hawaii and promised them statehood. What the circumstances were that brought out that promise I do not know. We were never able to find out.

But let us assume that he did that and let us assume that somebody else did it, and so on, from time to time. And let us assume, as the platforms of both parties reflect, statehood was promised to Hawaii. What they forgot was this, that if such a promise was made, it was made to all of the islands that constituted the Hawaiian Archipelago when it was annexed to the United States.

What have the people of Hawaii done in this situation? According to their own standards they have created some second-class citizens, because they have taken the eight islands that they think might be economically sound to operate as a State, but they cut off the other islands in the Hawaiian Archipelago, I suppose because they thought it was not economically feasible, let us say, for those islands to be included in the operations of a State.

After all is said and done, that just does not make sense, to approach a problem in that manner. And some day, as was pointed out by the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE], when he appeared before the Committee on Interior, we are going to be called upon to create a State of the Pacific, or a State of something out there, to take in a bunch of loose ends in these islands, if we continue the philosophy that we are pursuing at the present time with respect to taking in these other Territories. Whether or not that will be sound government, I do not know. But, as I said before, I think that what we ought to do is to weigh this situation fairly and squarely from the point of view of the type of government we have and what we are moving into so that in the future we can avoid these embarrassing situations that are bound to arise.

I have just been informed that I have only 1 minute of my time remaining, which is not sufficient time to treat communism properly. But in that minute, if you will bear with me, and I wish you would, I will try to do so.

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 additional minute to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. That will give me just about time, as was said on the floor one time by the distinguished father of one of our colleagues, to wish you all a Merry Christmas and a Happy New Year.

I refer you, and I hope you will read it, to the report that was filed by the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. O'BRIEN], the gentleman from California [Mr. SISK], and the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. BERRY], very distinguished members of our committee, who went over to Hawaii. I think it will be very revealing. That is the report of a committee that went over there, and it actually admits the control that the ILWU has over the economics of the Hawaiian Islands. It is not a matter of debate, it is a matter of complete admission on the part of those people who want Hawaiian statehood worse than any group I have ever seen.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. I am happy to yield to my distinguished colleague from Mississippi.

Mr. COLMER. I hope the distinguished chairman, the affable gentleman in charge of this bill, will yield some additional time to the gentleman from Texas. After all, there is very little opposition. Very few opponents have spoken against this bill. Before we finally bury the United States of America as such, I think we ought to have some fitting eulogies on it. I hope the gentleman will yield the gentleman from Texas a little time.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has again expired.

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. I thank the gentleman from New York.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. I am happy to yield to my distinguished colleague from Oklahoma.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I have been listening with great interest to the gentleman's remarks, and particularly would appreciate his directing my attention to the place in the report where it states that the economy of Hawaii is controlled by the ILWU.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. It is on page 4 of the report, that is, the small report. The gentleman has the wrong report. This is the supplemental report.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Which report is it, now?

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. It is on page 4. This is the supplemental report, Committee Print No. 39. I will be happy to read it to the gentleman. It is very short. It states:

> The economic control of the islands by the ILWU, some leaders of which have been identified in the past as home-grown or mainland-imported Communists, goes without saying.

That is the language of the report, it is not my language. I was reading that.

This was all brought out in connection with what the ILWU could do or could not do in an effort to get this Communist situation out of this picture, because it was a terrible indictment, and it is something that all of us are worried about, and something that we rightfully should be worried about.

I want here and now to say that it is not my purpose to accuse any Hawaiian or anyone else of being a Communist. I do not know whether or not they are Communists. But I think before we move into a situation such as we are moving into right now, that, in my opinion, is going to completely do away with whatever rights the sovereign States have left, and they have been whittled down to where they are not many, we should realize that this trend is going to create a situation where it is not going to be long until you are going to have a completely concentrated Government in Washington or Denver or Chicago or wherever the national capitol might be, and this Communist menace in that sort of situation would be much worse than if we maintain the status quo.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Just to get the record absolutely straight about this report, the gentleman has referred to this as a committee report. I think the document to which the gentleman is referring is a report of a special subcommittee consisting of three men on the committee.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Yes.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I know that as a member of the committee I have never subscribed my name to a report which

states that the ILWU controls the Hawaiian Islands.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. I do not know, but I have the greatest respect for these three fine men that went over there and found this. I was reading their words.

Mr. EDMONDSON. The gentleman does agree, however, that that is not a committee report but rather a special subcommittee's language that he is referring to; is that not correct?

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Well, I think that would make it more binding because the special subcommittee consisting of three such fine gentlemen could go into this thing and they could dig much deeper into it than the whole committee could because of the time element involved, and they were right there on the ground.

Mr. PILLION. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. I am happy to yield.

Mr. PILLION. Talking about reports, perhaps, I might call the attention of the Members of the House to this report issued on February 28, 1959, about two weeks ago, by the Hawaiian Commission on Subversive Activities. Here is what that report says on page 11:

> Since 1945 day-to-day ILWU operations in Hawaii have been directed by a regional director and several other paid officials, all selected by the ILWU international organization, not by ILWU members in Hawaii. During that period two-thirds of these officials have been identified as having been Communist Party members.

Now, I might also turn to page 23 of that report and here is what that report said. This is just about two weeks ago, about the UPW that has all been referred to the Legislature of Hawaii. It said:

> The United Public Workers in Hawaii is controlled by the Communist Party through the instrument of Henry Epstein, Stephen Murin, Max Roffman, Jeanette Nakama Rohrbough and other paid employees of the union.
>
> The Communist Party has exploited the UPW and its membership primarily for Communist purposes.
>
> The elected officials of the union and the rank and file cannot or will not recognize that their union is Communist dominated.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has again expired.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, that 5 minutes went awful fast. Could I ask for just a minute or two more?

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. If the gentleman from Washington would yield some time, it would be appreciated. We have very little time left.

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Chairman, I yield an additional 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas. Will the gentleman yield to me for just a moment?

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. WESTLAND. We are hearing a great deal of talk about the ILWU and the UP—what is it?

Mr. PILLION. The UPW.

Mr. WESTLAND. Yes, the UPW or something like that. We are not talking here about statehood for the ILWU or the UPW because if we are, I am going to change my vote.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. There. That is the point, and I am glad the gentleman from Washington brought that out because that is one of the fears about this situation when you are voting statehood out there, if these unions have control of this situation from an economic standpoint, then you are voting the powers of statehood into the hands of these people that run the unions. That is the thing we have to look into thoroughly before we move into this new political area.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. I yield.

Mr. UDALL. All of us on the committee respect not only the sense of humor of the gentleman from Texas but his sense of fair play as well. Is it not likely that the type of officials who will be sent here to Washington and the type of State officials who will be elected will be the same type of people who have been elected in Hawaii in the past? In all likelihood is that not what will happen?

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. That depends on how much pressure can be brought to bear. I can anticipate the situation where those who want to take over economic control and control of State powers would be more than happy to go along with the crowd or lie behind the log so to speak, until those powers may possibly be grabbed and then walk in and grab them. If that is what Jack Hall and Harry Bridges have in mind, which is entirely possible, I think we ought to look into it thoroughly.

Mr. UDALL. The gentleman has served, as I have served, with a Democratic delegate as well as a Republican delegate from the territory and certainly they will elect the same type who are here now.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. They are wonderful and that is one reason I am opposing this bill—because I think we will lose our good delegate from Hawaii to the other body.

Mr. PILLION. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. I yield.

Mr. PILLION. It is not true that the gentlemen who have been sent here to represent Hawaii were sent here with the backing primarily of the ILWU and that when the ILWU withdrew—and that "the" was the Communist dominated ILWU—withdrew its support of Joe Farington, his plurality just went down to nothing and when they transferred their endorsement to his opponent, then the votes and the plurality went on up and that in the past two or three elections, the ILWU had a considerable and a deciding influence on who came to the House of Representatives as a delegate from Hawaii, and will in the future have a deciding influence on who will come to this House as Members of this House and as Members of the United States Senate?

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. I think this, I will say to the gentleman from New York, I think it is a matter that only the future can determine, because I think that if those fellows do have in their minds doing what I said a moment ago of trying to take over the State government through the election of the Governor and Lieutenant Governor—and they can do it that way—that is what I pointed out was the danger of a cabinet-type of government. It is a step moving in the wrong direction if you are going to perpetuate democracy, to take away the right of the people to vote for their local officers.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I see on page 47 of the report, article 14 of the constitution and the provision relating to the oath omitted, and there is not recognized, a Supreme Being or Deity in the oath that is prescribed for their officials under the constitution of Hawaii. Can the gentleman tell me why?

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. No, sir, I cannot. I was interested in the bill. If we can defeat the bill, we won't have to worry about the constitution of Hawaii.

Mr. GROSS. I am not a preacher either, but the gentleman well knows that we take an oath of office that recognizes the Supreme Being.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Summing up briefly in the last minute at my disposal, one could talk on this bill for several days, but I am not going to be allowed to do that, and I can only close as fast as I can, but this whole thing goes to the proposition of our walking into an entirely new situation, actually on hearsay evidence. The committee that went out to Hawaii came back with statements like this: "We were told certain things." When asked: "Who told you?" we did not get an answer, we never have found out. That is all the information we could get. I do not know whether that ought to be classified or not, but as a lawyer I know that you cannot convict anybody on testimony like that. If we are going to have to rely on hearsay testimony at least we should know who did the talking.

Again, if we are going to go on hearsay testimony I think we ought to give the same weight to hearsay testimony on the other side. I have been told only recently that some of the Reds—in the unions controlling the economy of Hawaii have been to Russia and Moscow attending extensive conferences—and I will be glad to identify the man who told me if requested.

In conclusion, may I say that I am sorry the pleas of myself and others will fall on deaf ears. I sincerely hope that, if this Congress does pass this legislation, we will not be confronted with the tragedies anticipated. But the facts indicate otherwise, and I must oppose statehood for Hawaii.

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. HOSMER].

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Chairman, my colleague the gentleman from California

[Mr. SMITH] a moment ago well expressed the difficulty with which conscientious legislators face the question of the entrance of a new State into our Union.

During the past 6 years we often have had considerable difficulty in considering Alaskan and Hawaiian statehood because we were not given the opportunity to decide upon them individually in accordance with their respective merits, but had to accept them as a package or not at all. If you opposed one you had to oppose both. That was the difficult situation which many others as well as myself faced.

Today I want to record the fact that I now, and have always, supported statehood for Hawaii. I am sure that the majority of this body is like minded. We do have the various doubts expressed, for example, with respect to the contiguity question, the one-world argument and the argument on matters concerning the ILWU and the UPW, as well as the matter of Communist difficulties. But I think those latter difficulties can be at least as well, and possibly better, handled under statehood than under territorial status.

I feel that on careful analysis the arguments with respect to contiguity, one-worldism, and so forth, have failed to challenge the wisdom of making Hawaii a State. For that reason I say, as I did when I previously cast my vote against Alaska, that the real decision we make on admitting a new State is that concerned with whether or not there are sufficient people and whether or not there is a sufficiently broad economy for the Territory involved to support State government and to bear its share of the cost of the U.S. Government. I did not feel this condition existed in connection with Alaska and so stated. When that bill was passed I expressed the hope that I was wrong in my opinion. I feel this condition does exist with respect to Hawaii and that it is fully qualified for statehood. I will so cast my vote today.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOSMER. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. JACKSON. I want to associate myself with the statement made by the gentleman from California. I had some question in my mind with reference to the Alaska matter. That question does not exist with respect to statehood for Hawaii, which I support.

Mr. HOSMER. That statement is particularly significant coming from a colleague who, as an outstanding member of the Committee on Un-American Activities, has been consistently zealous in his insistence that there be not the slightest weakening of our defense against the insidious subversive activities of the international Communist conspiracy.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOSMER. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. JENSEN. I appreciate the statement the gentleman has made relative to un-American activities which we have heard about as existing in Hawaii. I have been rather undecided as to just how I should vote on this bill, but I have come to the conclusion that we will be in a better position to control any un-American activities that might exist in Hawaii if we make that Territory a State. So I shall cast my vote in favor of statehood for Hawaii.

Mr. HOSMER. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. O'HARA].

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I am voting for statehood for Hawaii as I have done since March 1950. Sure, this is setting a pattern for the United States of the world, but I am young enough in spirit to be thrilled by the vision.

This is a day in history. Today by an overwhelming vote this body will place its stamp of approval on legislation bringing an island in the Pacific, far from continental United States, into the sisterhood of American States. I have voted for statehood for Alaska and for Hawaii in every Congress of which I have been a Member.

The Honolulu Star Bulletin of March 17, 1950, March 20, 1950, and March 21, 1950, carried in three installments my remarks in this Chamber in support of the Hawaiian statehood bill in the 81st Congress. Because what I said at that time is as true as it was at the time of those remarks almost a decade ago I am repeating to my colleagues in the 86th Congress a portion of my remarks in the 81st Congress and which the Honolulu Star Bulletin graciously stated "was a fine exposition of the historic action being taken and dealt with statehood in its broadest aspects."

What I then said was that in the admission of Hawaii, far out in the Pacific, we were setting the pattern for what, without intention on our part, might prove in the working out of the destiny of this changing world in the development of the United States of America into the United States of the world. In travel time we are closer today to the most remote lands of the world than the original States of the Union were to Illinois.

Today as I shall vote for statehood for Hawaii I shall be thinking especially of the young men of Japanese blood who went from Hawaii to the battlelines on the western front with the 100th Infantry Battalion and proved by their heroism the intense love for the United States of Hawaiians, including those whose family roots had been in Japan. The 100th Infantry Battalion covered itself with glory, and I am very happy that one of its survivors, Harry Ono, is the husband of Mary Ono, of my congressional staff, and the first Japanese-American congressional secretary in the history of this body.

MAKING OF A NEW PATTERN

Mr. Chairman, I am quoting from my remarks in this Chamber on March 6, 1950:

In the statehood bill for Alaska which we have passed and the statehood bill for Hawaii which I anticipate we will pass, a new pattern is being laid for that association of sovereign States formed at the beginning of the Republic to attain through union highest measure of welfare for the citizen and of security for the Nation.

For the first time we are accepting into the family of sister States those Territories that are outside of continental United States and not contiguous thereto. Where this will end, to what extent conceivably the pattern may be carried in the realization of the dream of our generation of a permanent peace through a world union of States, only the future can tell.

I think it is proper here to place emphasis on the fact that the step we are taking has not been decided upon hastily. It is altogether too important a step to be left for decision alone to the Members of this body. However able and conscientious they may be, nevertheless in common with all humankind their judgment cannot be infallible. What we are doing is merely making effective the decision arrived at by the American people. That is the way democracy functions with us. The question of statehood for an island in the Pacific and for a mainland not contiguous to continental United States, with a long stretch of islands running into the Orient, has been discussed for a long time in every city, hamlet, and crossroads in the country.

My colleagues and I must accept it as the judgment of the American people as a whole—or that substantial majority which under our democratic system controls—that this step should be taken and in a New World, bound much closer by radio transmission of the thoughts of men and aerial transportation of persons and products, the pattern of the Old World of the horse and buggy should be modernized even in the matter of selecting Territories to be taken into the Union as States. I say we must accept this as the judgment of the American people because when the delegates met at the national conventions of the two major political parties, with scarcely a dissenting note, they pledged the support of their respective parties to Alaska-Hawaii statehood. We Democrats and Republicans may differ in our interpretation of how far the majority vote in a closely contested election is to be constructed as a mandate. There can be no question, however, about the validity of the mandate when it emanates from the voters of the two major parties.

BINDING THE WORLD IN PEACE

I respectfully suggest to my colleagues, with no desire to pose as a prophet, that the new pattern we are setting up may prove a more vital factor than we imagine in bringing the world closer together in peace and the common pursuit of human happiness. Many in this Chamber, in their ardent desire to advance the cause of understanding and of permanent peace, have sponsored the World Federation resolution. It at least is worthy of note that what we are now doing, although certainly it is not in the minds of any of us here, may furnish in the future the basis for a United States of America expanded, on the petition of other peoples, into a United States of the World.

I am not advancing this thought with the idea that having moved in the direction of taking in territory far from continental United States we actually may, as the world grows closer and closer together, add to our sisterhood of States territories still farther removed. For one thing there is the difference in languages and in customs, which even if distances were annihilated would still present a formidable barrier. But there is no escaping the import of the departure we are approaching. Considered in connection with the development of the backward areas of the world under point 4 of President Truman's plan—an undertaking the success of which hangs on the removal of trade barriers—it at least should furnish the subject

for intriguing speculation and lively discussion in the way the American people have of thinking and talking things over even when such things are still in the realm of the improbable and the unexpected.

That we are making history today I think there can be no doubt. The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of these days of the Alaska-Hawaii statehood debates very likely will be consulted by historical researchers long after the last of those participating in these debates has had his hour in the traditional memorial services in this Chamber. For that reason I am putting in the record, with especial emphasis, that the pattern for the future admission of States, when no longer required to be of contiguous territory or a part of continental United States, came to us from the sound judgment of the American people arrived at after long discussion and deliberation and so wholly on a bipartisan level that both major political parties incorporated in their respective platforms expression of that judgment arrived at by the American people.

On the occasion of the *Maine* memorial anniversary, I called attention to the fact, sometimes overlooked, that the explosion in Havana Harbor on February 15, 1898, started the United States of America on the road to world leadership. I ventured the suggestion that future historians would term the period of the Spanish-American War, World War I, and World War II—the half century or so from the destruction of the *Maine* to the bomb of Hiroshima—as the 50-year war that ushered in the golden era of American world influence.

Now that Hawaii is on the threshold of statehood and a new pattern is being adopted in conformance with the unquestioned mandate of the American people, I think my colleagues will be interested in the remarks of Senator Teller in the U.S. Senate on February 16, 1898, the day following the sinking of the *Maine*. I am quoting from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of that day:

REMARKS IN CONGRESS IN 1898

"Mr. TELLER. Mr. President, there has been some interest manifested throughout the world over the question whether or not this Government was about to take the Hawaiian Islands and make them part of the United States * * *. The people of all the world have been looking to see what we are about to do. I picked up the other day a copy of the London Globe of last June * * *. The article was commenting on our desire to annex the Hawaiian Islands, if they should become ours: * * * it was very apparent that the Globe was not friendly to that movement on our part. This is what the Globe said, and it is so truthful that I think it may be worthwhile to read it:

" 'The American Navy is absolutely unfit to protect the islands (Hawaiian) which lie at the mercy of any Spanish ships appearing at Honolulu while Japan's sea power is so immeasurably superior to that of the United States that a Japanese naval demonstration would place President McKinley in a difficult and perilous position * * *.

" 'Viewing the great strategic value of the group to England, it is a matter of regret that the islands were not added to the British Empire long ago. Lord Salisbury should stiffen his back and tell McKinley plainly that Great Britain claims the right to be consulted before the matter of annexation is decided.'

"Mr. President, Japan is a small power. Small, I mean, when compared to the United States, small in resources compared with the United States, though it is strong in its navy when you consider the results it might accomplish as a nation. Yet, when there was a note of protest from Japan against the annexation of Hawaii, it was urged by a great many people in this country as a bar to annexation that we were not free to exercise our own judgment because it would not do to get into a quarrel with Japan."

JOINED IN WORLD OF BROTHERHOOD

Mr. Chairman, I am voting for statehood for Hawaii as I voted for statehood for Alaska. With every new State that joins up with us, to share under free government, the benefits and the responsibilities of joint effort in advancing human welfare, greater strength is given us to carry on. My faith is in my country and the purity of its purpose to ask nothing for its own people that it does not seek to make possible for all men to attain in a world of brotherhood. My faith is in the people of the United States and when after discussion and deliberation they have reached a judgment, by that judgment I will abide.

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Montana [Mr. ANDERSON].

Mr. ANDERSON of Montana. Mr. Chariman, I am particularly happy because Montanans have played an important role in this drama of Hawaiian statehood over the years. Montana's distinguished senior Senator, JAMES E. MURRAY, as chairman of the Senate Interior Committee, has worked hard and effectively for Hawaiian statehood for many years. Last night Senator MURRAY enjoyed the unique distinction of being the only legislator ever to have piloted two statehood bills to a successful conclusion. This distinction will probably never be attained by any other legislator, excepting only our own distinguished subcommittee chairman, the gentleman from New York [Mr. O'BRIEN]

Montana's junior Senator, MIKE MANSFIELD, as assistant leader of the Senate, has given freely of his talents and abilities in pushing Senate action to such a prompt and happy conclusion.

The senior Congressman from Montana [Mr. METCALF], for years a member of the House Interior Committee, has lent his brilliant legal talents and his energy and drive to the accomplishment of statehood for Hawaii. As a member of the Interior Committee, I myself have followed carefully the progress of Hawaii toward statehood, and I feel that this is the time to bring this long march to its glorious conclusion.

It may come as a surprise to some of the members of this committee that there is a fifth Montanan even more directly concerned with the current and successful campaign to make Hawaii a State. That fifth Montanan is our beloved colleague, Delegate JACK BURNS. JACK BURNS was born in my district, in Havre, Mont. Delegate BURNS is certainly entitled to major credit for the strategy which has finally broken the deadlock of many years, and leads to the admission of Alaska and Hawaii as the 49th and 50th States of the Union in this year of our Lord nineteen hundred and fifty-nine.

Those who attacked and vilified Delegate BURNS for supporting Alaskan statehood ahead of Hawaiian statehood now stand confounded, convicted themselves of a shortsightedness which, had it prevailed, might well have simply perpetuated the stalemate which dogged both States for so many years.

The resounding note by which we pass this bill will be an exoneration of Delegate BURNS' strategy, and at the same time will demonstrate the love and affection and respect in which we hold our beloved colleague.

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. KOWALSKI] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. KOWALSKI. Mr. Chairman, from 4½ years of experience in Japan and Korea, I feel I know something of the great importance which the people of the Orient attach to the admission of Hawaii to full membership in the United States. No single act by the Congress could give our Nation more prestige among the teeming millions in Asia than the granting of statehood to Hawaii.

The leadership of the new free nations in Asia from Korea around the Pacific Basin even to Ceylon have their eyes on Hawaii and this Congress. They are watching our handling of the Hawaiian statehood issue, not because they have an economic stake in the outcome, but because they have a great emotional involvement in the granting of statehood to our outer bastion in the Pacific.

This emotional involvement is based on questions now unanswered in their minds:

First. Are the non-Caucasian, chiefly oriental peoples of Hawaii, acceptable to this Congress for full and complete citizenship in the United States of America?

Second. Are the Members of this Congress open to the acceptance of men whose forefathers came to our shores from Asia as their colleagues in the great American legislative process?

Third. Are the United States ready to symbolize the noble concept of the equality of men by the admission of Hawaii to statehood, thus giving reality to a term that will otherwise be an empty abstraction where Asians are concerned?

Who are these Asian leaders, what manner of men are they? Our experiences of them, widely reported, confirm that these leaders possess certain common characteristics.

First. They are men of intelligence, well informed on the affairs of the world and keenly aware of the nature and intensity of the relations between the free world and those nations in the Communist orbit.

Second. They are intensely nationalistic and hold a dim view of relationships between peoples that so much as border on colonialism.

Third. They are culture-bound to each other in the vast panoply of the Asian complex.

Fourth. They are akin to and sympathetic to that large segment of the Hawaiian public of oriental ancestry.

To them, the granting of statehood to Hawaii will be a convincing evidence of our acceptance of free men of their own antecedents.

The case for Hawaiian statehood on merit is conclusive. The significance of Hawaiian statehood as it will symbolize freedom and equality to free Asian leadership is even more conclusive.

If we want to demonstrate to Asian leaders in the free world that we mean what we say when we seek their friendship and support in the struggle to keep people free, there can be no more convincing act than to grant statehood to Hawaii now.

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may be permitted to extend their remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from California [Mr. BALDWIN].

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 4221, which would provide statehood for Hawaii.

I supported statehood for Alaska last year, and feel that the citizens of Hawaii are equally entitled to statehood. Many of the present residents of the Hawaiian Islands formerly resided in the United States, and particularly in the Pacific Coast States. These residents have had experience in carrying out their responsibilities as voters in their former State governments, and also as voters for President and for Representatives in the House of Representatives and for U.S. Senators.

It is evident to me that the citizens of Hawaii are fully qualified to assume the responsibilities of statehood. In fact, I feel it would be a serious discrimination against them if they were not granted statehood at this time. The citizens of Hawaii are governed by Federal laws. Their taxes are established by the U.S. Congress. Certainly they are entitled to participate in these decisions through electing their chosen representatives to serve in the House of Representatives and in the Senate. Likewise, they should be entitled to participate in the selection of their President. I urge approval of this measure.

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. JOHANSEN].

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Chairman, for all practical purposes we are going through motions today. All of us know that there is no question as to the outcome of this issue. For all practical purposes the question of statehood for Hawaii was decided last year when Alaska was made the 49th State.

I voted against statehood for Alaska. I shall vote against statehood for Hawaii.

Among a number of reasons, I shall do so as a matter of consistency. I do not believe that it is a course of wisdom to bestow statehood on a noncontiguous Territory, particularly one 2,000 miles beyond the continental United States.

While our fellow citizens in Hawaii have a testament to their loyalty heroically written in World War II and the Korean war, I am not satisfied that adequate progress has been achieved in Hawaii in coping with the very real fact and threat of Communist infiltration and of domination by Communist leadership in organized labor in that Territory.

I am frank to say that my vote against statehood is cast with some reluctance. I recognize that if it was a mistake to grant Hawaii the status of an incorporated Territory—historically always a prelude to statehood—rather than Commonwealth status, that mistake was made 59 years ago. I suppose that there are some sort of practical statutes of limitations so far as trying to remake history or undo past mistakes are concerned.

My greatest concern in opposing statehood is the possibility that we might undercut the efforts of our fellow citizens in Hawaii in combating communism. I am deeply impressed by the arguments on this score advanced by the distinguished chairman of the House Committee on Un-American Activities [Mr. WALTER], a committee on which I am privileged to serve. I am likewise impressed by the statement in the same vein offered by the distinguished former ranking minority member of that committee, former Congressman Kearney, of New York.

But I note that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER], with characteristic frankness and modesty, seemed to acknowledge in his testimony before the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs that it is a matter of hope and faith rather than demonstrable proof that statehood will improve conditions in Hawaii so far as the Communist problem is concerned.

I earnestly hope and pray that this will prove to be the case. I hope that statehood for Hawaii can never become a device of the evil forces of communism for the injury of the United States, the State of Hawaii, or its loyal citizens. I pledge that, as long as I am privileged to be a Member of Congress, I will work in every way within my power to support our fellow citizens in Hawaii, as elsewhere in these United States, in their fight against internal subversion and betrayal by the enemies of our country.

So much then for the issue of Hawaiian statehood and the reasons for my stand on this issue.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I wish to address myself briefly to a bitter irony and an intolerable paradox which confronts the people and the Congress of the United States at the very moment we take the historic step with respect to statehood for Hawaii.

The simple and shocking truth is that statehood today means less than it has ever meant in the history of our Republic.

In my judgment, the simple and shocking truth is that a great deal more of statehood was conferred upon the first State admitted to the Union, after the Original Thirteen, than we are conferring in this year 1959 upon the new State of Hawaii.

In my judgment, we would be much more realistic, and we would be addressing ourselves to a far more timely issue, if we were concerned with the problem of restoring statehood to the 49 so-called States of the Union—soon to become 50. I am sure that my colleagues do not need to have my meaning spelled out in great detail.

By action and inaction on a dozen fronts, the status and role of the sovereign States in our Federal system of government is being obscured, weakened, and destroyed.

Not so long ago, a U.S. district judge—he does not happen to sit in my own State of Michigan—acknowledged to me that the practical meaning and import of the 10th amendment and of the reserve powers of the States is, at best, obscure and, at worst, no longer capable of definition.

We have among supposedly responsible leaders of our Nation, including Members of Congress, open advocacy of the federalization and centralization of the tax-levying and revenue-dispensing functions of government, necessarily at the expense and sacrifice of State prerogatives and responsibilities in this field.

We have numerous excursions of the Federal Government, both by legislative and judicial act, into areas of responsibility and authority historically and constitutionally belonging to the States.

We have the judicial decree of the doctrine of Federal pre-emption, a situation which the Congress has thus far failed to set right.

And here is the supreme irony: The very statehood which we are now bestowing upon Hawaii, the very statehood which the citizens of that Territory so deeply covet, as matters now stand, involves impairment of the powers and efforts of Hawaii to cope with its own direst problems as a State.

For example: It is extremely doubtful whether, under existing decisions of the U.S. Supreme Court, the provision against office holding or employment in the State government by a person "who advocates, or who aids or belongs to any party, organization, or association which advocates the overthrow by force or violence of the Government of this State or of the United States" will have any validity or effect.

Under existing decisions of the U.S. Supreme Court, it is questionable whether Hawaiian efforts to investigate and expose Communist activity will have—or even now has—any legal validity.

I earnestly suggest that it would be much more in order and much more timely for the Congress of the United States to be devoting its time and efforts to the repair of the status of statehood rather than to the bestowal of a statehood, which in the words of one eminent authority, has become or threatens to become a hollow shell.

Certainly once this business of statehood for Hawaii is disposed of, I earnestly hope that the Congress will direct its attention to this far broader and more fundamental problem.

And since I am discussing the impaired status and standing of statehood, I must direct my attention for a moment to testimony given by the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE], when he appeared before the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs during the hearings on statehood for Hawaii.

What I have to say about this testimony of the gentleman from Texas is said with all respect and, I think, with some understanding of the provocation under which he spoke.

I have long believed that we could not continue indefinitely the negating and nullifying of the 10th amendment and the reserved powers of the States without ultimately precipitating the sentiments voiced by the gentleman from Texas.

In his testimony on January 28 of this year, the gentleman from Texas, obviously referring to the fact that the Confederacy lost the war fought between the States on the issue of secession, said this:

> We always believed, and still believe, if anyone wants out, let them get out and go on their own.
>
> I would gladly say to anybody, in or out of the continental United States, "Go your own way, if you do not like the Union you are in."

Needless to say, these are words that distress and alarm me. I am sure that there is no serious proposal to revive the issue of secession. I do not believe these words were intended to suggest, in connection with the granting of statehood to Hawaii, that there is a future right to demit membership in the Federal Union.

Yet it is profoundly disturbing to have these words spoken in any circumstance and doubly so to have them spoken in conjunction with the consideration of the creation of a new State. It strikes me as being as incongruous as the insertion in the marriage service of a declaration of the right of divorce.

As Members of Congress and as American citizens, we have every right in advance of the decision to differ on the question of statehood for any new Territory, but once that decision is made, there must be a full understanding that the new State becomes a permanent member of an indissoluble Union.

To me the real import of the words spoken by the gentleman from Texas is that here is one more solemn and somber warning that we must address ourselves to repairing the status of the States and restoring them to their rightful place in our scheme of government.

One final word: I have no wish to prejudge the caliber or the political philosophy of those who will take their place in this House and in the other body as the duly elected representatives of the State of Hawaii.

I would be less than frank, however, if I did not admit to a fear that the prevailing political ideology of a majority of the citizens of Hawaii may be such as to add new membership in the Congress schooled in a philosophy, or responsive to the pressures of organizations and philosophies, which would weaken, if not destroy, the meaningfulness of the very statehood we are about to bestow.

I am frank to say that this is the most compelling reason for my vote against statehood. I earnestly hope and pray that I shall be proven completely wrong.

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. DAVIS].

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I should like to compliment the distinguished gentleman who has just left the well on the splendid presentation he has made. I refer to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. JOHANSEN]. I should like to associate myself with his remarks on this subject, and also associate myself with the remarks of the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. ROGERS], who spoke just a short time ago.

I think on a subject as grave as this under discussion today the people of the United States should have an opportunity to vote on whether or not the new State should be admitted. In the last Congress I introduced an amendment to our Constitution to provide that any State hereafter to be admitted must be voted upon by the States already in the Union. I think this method now in vogue, now legal under our Constitution, of having a new State voted in by a mere majority vote of the membership of the two Houses of Congress, does not approach it with the seriousness the question really deserves.

During the debate here this morning in discussing the very serious question of communism involved in this legislation, the question was raised as to the activities of this notorious Harry Bridges within recent months. I have investigated that to a considerable extent myself.

The information I have obtained is that this Harry Bridges who, on at least two occasions that I know of, has been the losing party in litigation in lower courts on such matters as deportation and perjury, but who has always been successful in having his convictions and the decisions in the lower courts set aside when he comes up here to the Supreme Court. This man, with an assistant named William Glaser, left this country on January 21 and went to Rome, where he was met by Italian Communists. He was taken to the CGIL, which is the general confederation of Italian labor, the Communist labor federation which has stirred riots against the United States in Italy. It constitutes a part of the underground of the Italian Communist Party. He engaged there in considerable negotiation with the Communists of that country. He appeared later in Prague, Czechoslovakia, which is the munitions capital of the Iron Curtain countries, on February 7.

There in Prague, he said he would come back to the United States to explain the views of the Iron Curtain countries and he said further that we get nonsensical propaganda from our press and radio about the Soviet Union and the Iron Curtain countries in the United States.

I understand he was a guest of the Union of Workers of Transport and Tele-Communications, which I am also advised is a Communist union. I am further advised he arrived in Moscow on February 8 of this year and that in an interview there, he declared and I quote what is said to be his language:

> That unions in the U.S.S.R. are more democratic than many of the unions in the United States.

He said also that the system of elections in the U.S.S.R. is more democratic than many American ones.

He further is quoted as saying he wants United States workers to visit Russia because everything United States workers have heard about the U.S.S.R. is nothing but slanderous propaganda.

I am advised also that he arrived back in this country on February 24 and that he is to appear under subpena before the House Committee on Un-American Activities on March 24 of this year.

The question of the population in Hawaii, I think, is a very serious one. The population is predominantly Asiatic. That is something which I do not know how many of us here in America realize.

Mr. Chairman, in the revision of my remarks, because I will not take the time to do it here, I will insert the figures as to the number of Japanese, Caucasians, Filipinos, and mixed bloods and Chinese, and Hawaiian who were in the Hawaiian Islands on the basis of the 1950 census.

The official 1950 census figures show that Asiatics and nonwhites account for more than 70 percent of the islands' population. Less than 25 percent of the people are white and fewer than 5 percent are Hawaiian, that is, descendants of the original natives or Polynesian stock. Here is the breakdown from the 1950 census:

Japanese	184,611
White Americans	114,793
Filipino	61,071
Mixed bloods	66,806
Chinese	32,376
Miscellaneous nonwhites (Negro, Puerto Ricans, etc.)	20,852
Hawaiian	19,285

(Mixed bloods and Hawaiians are estimated on the basis of the 1940 census, as the 1950 census combines Hawaiian and part-Hawaiian into one category.)

With a population so radically different from the rest of the United States, this Territory cannot possibly qualify as one of the United States. Its background is radically different from ours. Its history is very different from our own and that of our forefathers. The 65 percent nonwhite influx has been almost exclusively a labor force imported from other Asian countries to work the pineapple and sugar plantations of the few white immigrants. In any case, it is quite clear that the historical and ethnic backgrounds of Hawaii and the United States and even between the various Hawaiian peoples are radically different from each other. The language and the dialects are also different. There are really no shared experiences that extend substantially into the past among its people. Hawaii is essentially rootless. Its closest link with the mainland was during World War II when it served as a base for operations of our Armed Forces. Now that is no reflection on the nonwhite population, but the cross currents of racial feeling do create political and administrative whirlpools too dangerous to yet be allowed the authoritative voice in the American Government that goes with full statehood. Furthermore, I have in my files a breakdown of the nationalities of candidates who were elected in Hawaii in the general election in November 1954. This breakdown and report was compiled by an election inspector in Honolulu who stated that a check through the ballots disclosed that the Japanese in that country do engage in block voting.

This breakdown of the election results in the 1954 general election shows that of the 15 members of the Hawaiian Senate, 7 are of Japanese ancestry; and of the 30 members in the Hawaiian House of Representatives, 15 are of Japanese ancestry. I would say that the results of the election clearly confirm the statement of the election inspector that the Japanese do engage in block voting. The Japanese people certainly constitute the largest nationality group in Hawaii. It is contrary to our traditions in this country, and I think that in any country where democratic principles are adhered to it is contrary to such principles to engage in block voting.

The point of noncontiguity has been referred to many times in this debate. It comes into both the area of national defense and that of economic self-sufficiency.

World history shows that the growth of the most dangerous enemy of the free world today—Soviet Russia and its satellites—has been based on expansion only on her perimeter for the last 700 years. Soviet Russia has never included territory that could not be reached by direct land route. Her lines of communication for war or peace have been interior lines of communication and supply. The great powers of the past which depended upon oversea communication between areas of empire have steadily receded through the centuries. Spain's dual hemisphere power crumbled. The flight from colonialism has taken its toll from Great Britain, France, Italy, the Netherlands—most of that toll being in direct chronological parallel with the growth of Soviet and Communist power.

There is great doubt in the minds of many of us in Congress that the present war-threatened age is the time to abandon our historical position of contiguous territory in favor of a similar geographical alinement to that which has proved disastrous to all nations which have tried it in the past.

There is also the question of territorial waters. The distances between the eight major islands included in the statehood bill range anywhere from 15 miles to 121 miles. Each of these little islands is separated from the other by international waters, under our 3-mile offshore limit. This means that to get from one part of the State to another, one would have to cross the high seas and could run into foreign shipping. This also means that the enemy could sail in and out of the area of one of our States without our being able to do anything about it. It would be difficult to think of a more untenable or dangerous position to be in.

The point of producing unbalanced representation in the Congress certainly applies to Hawaii.

Four States of our Union—Delaware, Nevada, Vermont, and Wyoming—have smaller populations than Hawaii. This fact is sometimes used by proponents of statehood as an argument for granting statehood to Hawaii as a matter of course. The cases are different, however. Delaware was one of the Original Colonies signing the Declaration of Independence, with ratification of the Constitution in 1787. Vermont has been a State since 1791, Nevada since 1864, and Wyoming since 1890. None is affected by the threat of Communist infiltration, non-Caucasian majorities of population, or noncontiguity to the degree of the present candidate for statehood. Certainly their acceptance in the Union for periods ranging from 69 years, in the case of Wyoming, to 172 years in the case of Delaware, overrides any question of present population in determining their right to their representation in Congress.

All of the Colonies and Territories admitted to statehood have been located on the North American Continent. Each Territory before admission adjoined either a State or a Territory and when admitted became a part of the unbroken contiguity area which makes up our country.

To avoid the evils of a multitudinous, unwieldy House of Representatives, the membership was fixed at 435 in the year 1911. It has remained at that figure since. The 1929 Apportionment Act made the reapportionment of House seats for each State automatic, with a permanent limitation of 435 seats.

Statehood will entitle not only the 49th State of Alaska but Hawaii also, if it is admitted, to either 2 or 3 seats, depending on which number is finally decided upon. These seats will displace those presently held by some Representatives in this House. The average increase of our population, according to the U.S. census estimate, is 13 percent between 1950 and 1957. The loss of membership in the House of Representatives will necessarily be borne by those States that have failed to keep pace with the 13 percent average increase in population.

A listing of these candidates for loss of representation discloses a list of some of the most distinguished and history-laden States in our Union. At least these States would be affected: West Virginia, Mississippi, and Arkansas.

In any case, the vote of the individual American would be diluted by the admission of Hawaii. If we vote to admit Hawaii, we would be voting in effect to reduce our representation.

Now, Hawaii is not a part of America—either North or South. If Hawaii were to be admitted as a State, the term "United States of America" would be a misnomer. It would become the United States of America and the Pacific. We could no longer write, talk, or say "the good old U.S.A." We would have to refer to it as the "good U.S.A.P.," from that time on.

In the Hawaiian Statehood Commission booklet, there are such phrases as "its rightful place as a State of the Union," its "inherent right to statehood," the "demand for statehood," and many others.

I do not concede that any State which was ever admitted had any "inherent right" to such admission. They were admitted because they wanted to come in and because our Government was willing to let them in. There was no question of "inherent right" involved. There is no such right involved in this instance. There is no such thing as a right to statehood; there is only the privilege of statehood.

Last, but by no means least, of the objections to Hawaiian statehood is the fact that not all the islands in the Hawaiian chain or Archipelago have been included in the statehood bill, H.R. 4221. This is a glaring inconsistency.

It palpably demonstrates the fact that what are generally known as the Hawaiian Islands are so far flung and disconnected that they could not possibly make up a proper State as we have understood the term. H.R. 4221 specifically excludes from the chain of nine major islands the island of Palmyra. Yet, the Territory of Hawaii includes Palmyra as one of its nine major islands. Why is Palmyra "together with its appurtenant reefs and territorial waters" left out?

Because, the office of the Hawaiian Delegate informs us, it is too far away from the nearest major island, Kauai, which is about 950 miles away.

Also, I am informed, because it is owned by only one family.

To take each point at a time, if distance is to be a criterion for disqualification, would not the entire Hawaiian chain, which is some 2,500 miles from the nearest point on the U.S. mainland, be unqualified for inclusion in the family of States? This is clearly an a fortiori case.

If Palmyra—which is 950 miles from the rest of Hawaii—is too far to be included as part of the new State, then the Hawaiian Islands as a whole—which are 2,500 miles from the U.S. coast—are too far to become a part of our country.

Besides the remote distance, there is also the matter of small population. Included in the group of eight major islands proposed for statehood are two islands, Kahoolawe and Niihau, which between them, have a population reaching the grand total of 75. The thriving metropolis of Kahoolawe—or whichever way it is pronounced—has no known population at all. According to the Delegate's office "only goats" live there. The size of the island, or atoll, or whatever one would call this thing that protrudes out of the water, is exactly 45 square miles.

The island of Niihau, which is included, is 72 square miles small and has a population of from 50 to 75—people, that is, not goats this time. All these people are members of the household of one, Mr. Robinson, a planter and sole owner of the island.

If the second reason for excluding Palmyra from statehood was the fact that it is owned by one family, the same argument could be raised for excluding Niihau also, for it, too, belongs to only one family.

The height of inconsistency and the double standard has been reached in this matter.

I fear that, really, the main argument for statehood of the proponents is a sentimental one and one which should have no place in serious consideration. They probably feel that because Alaska

was granted statehood last year, it would be only fair to extend the same privilege to our other great Territory. If that argument were accepted, just think of the possibilities.

What about Puerto Rico, for example? And the Virgin and Samoan Islands? The Panama Canal Zone? Wake, Midway, and Guam? Johnston and Sand Islands? Canton and Enderbury Islands? The Carolines, Marianas, and Marshall Islands? What of Okinawa? And how about little Kingman Reef?

The possibilities of such a fallacious argument stagger the imagination.

As to Alaska, many Members opposed its admission to statehood last year and before then. Some of the grounds for opposition to Alaska were similar to those against Hawaii, although the case against statehood for Hawaii, I believe, is much stronger.

We were not successful in regard to Alaska. But not for that reason will we give up the effort to prevent yet another mistake from being made. Two wrongs do not make a right, as the old adage so wisely said. They only constitute two wrongs. Let us not compound our first error with another error such a short time later. Let us rather try to make amends for the error by rejecting the proposal to admit Hawaii into the Union.

To those who keep arguing that it is important to look over our shoulder at what foreigners might think about our internal actions, I say that by not incorporating Hawaii into the Union of States we would be showing the world that we are not an imperialistic nation. In effect, we would be saying that people abroad need have no fear about being engulfed by mighty Uncle Sam. We respect even the Territorial status of our good friends the Hawaiians.

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as she may desire to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS].

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I want to congratulate first of all the majority and minority members of the committee for presenting the case of statehood for Hawaii so ably. I am delighted to vote again for statehood, for Hawaii, as I always have. I am very sure when Hawaii becomes a State she will be loyal to the United States, her foster mother. She has always been extremely loyal to us, and her sons have fought in great numbers to preserve their freedom and ours. Many gave their lives for us and many have gotten terribly sick and wounded for us. I wish for Hawaii and her people great happiness and great success always. She will be a great addition to our United States.

I remind the House that New England missionaries played a very important part in the development of Hawaii. Hawaii is one of the garden spots of the world, and I have many friends there.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER].

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Chairman, the sole question, as I see it, with respect to the charges made about communism in Hawaii is how to best deal with the situation.

It so happens that the Committee on Un-American Activities, of which I am for the moment chairman, conducted rather extensive inquiries into this question several years ago. The hearings took upward of 2 weeks, following nearly 3 months of intensive investigation by a competent staff of investigators.

There is no question but that Communist unions have a very strong hold on the economy of Hawaii. There is no question but that the Bridges union, under the control of Jack Hall, exercises influence far beyond the usual and normal influence and legitimate activities of labor leaders. In politics their pressures have been felt. And, in that connection let me say to you that it has not only been the Democrats that this group has endorsed. We have in our files complete and irrefutable evidence of the exercise of influence on behalf of members of the other party. But, my friends, again here are we going to wash our hands of this situation? Are we going to say to the good people in Hawaii, of which there are no better people anywhere on the mainland, "We are not going to permit you to become a part of this great family of States because in your midst are those who are members of organizations that are dedicated to the overthrow of the Government of the United States?"

Now, in answering that question let me call your attention to something very, very significant and very serious. Not too long ago the base of our naval activities in the Pacific was moved from Japan to Hawaii. Now, that means that this is our extreme western bastion of defense. Are we going to permit a left-wing, Communist-dominated labor union to cripple the activities of our fleet, or are we going to take a chance that the people in Hawaii, awakening to their new responsibilities as citizens, will attempt to do something about this intolerable situation? I say to you that this situation is not going to improve so long as Hawaii does not have a chance to demonstrate that it is proud of the fact that it is a voting member of this beloved Republic of ours. Given that chance, I am certain that the hold that Mr. Hall and his associates have on the Hawaiian economy will be broken for all time to come. During the course of the time I spent in Hawaii—and unlike many people, in a few weeks' time I did not learn all about the economy of Hawaii, but I did learn much—I associated with people in all walks of life. I met the leaders in every strata of society, and I am thoroughly convinced that the patriotism of these people, as demonstrated by the 442d Combat Battalion, is not exceeded anywhere in these United States. And, I ask you, as a security move, to enact this legislation to the end that these people will throw off the yoke of those who are so strong and so powerful.

In that connection I would like to call your attention to the fact that just recently the employers in Hawaii were forced to sit down and bargain across the table with a man who was under sentence of 5 years in the penitentiary because of his advocacy and his connection with the movement that advocates the overthrow of the Government of the United States. It is inconceivable to me that those people, who were forced into that position, will not take the kind of strong, positive and drastic action necessary to place in positions of authority those people who do not subscribe to this foreign ideology. It is indeed unfortunate that the Supreme Court saw fit to so interpret the Smith Act as to permit these people, who had been properly convicted, to escape going to the penitentiary. But it seems to me that if this bill is adopted, and I am sure it will be, we will find a completely different attitude on the part of the people in Hawaii and a complete change in the entire structure of the labor movement in Hawaii.

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALTER. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Mr. Chairman, first I should like to commend the distinguished gentleman, the Chairman of the House Committee on Un-American Activities, for a very factual statement. I think he came to about the same conclusions that our small committee, which went there last fall, arrived at. Our report has been criticized by some, but in our report we faced up, as the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania has faced up, to the fact that there is communism in Hawaii is something that is to be deplored; and it is too extensive. But we also looked, as did the gentleman, at the other side of the coin, and we saw what the people there wanted to do and were trying to do about it.

May I ask the gentleman if it is not true that the people who were convicted as Communists, as advocates of the violent overthrow of our Government, were tried and convicted by the people of Hawaii, and their going free was the result of an action over which they had no control?

Mr. WALTER. Oh, yes; there is no question about that. The jury was selected in Hawaii, an all-Hawaiian jury, which found those people guilty; that is correct.

Mr. PILLION. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALTER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. PILLION. Is it not true that the frightening increase of communism and its influences throughout the world, in Africa, in Hawaii, in Asia, is not dependent upon the form of government in any of these areas; that, no matter what the form of government may be, communism continues its advances in South America, in Cuba, in all these places; and the mere fact that statehood would give Hawaii two Representatives and two Senators and an elected Governor would not in any particular way be a cause for the lessening of Communist influences in Hawaii?

Mr. WALTER. I shall try to answer the gentleman's numerous questions by

saying that it is true that the form of government makes no difference. But if given the feeling of belonging, if given the feeling of being a part of this great sisterhood of States, I am sure they will do more than is being done now. Now nothing is being done.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER] has expired.

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD].

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, during this historic debate there is only one regret I have had, and that is that the Honorable Joseph Farrington, my dear friend, who was Delegate to this Congress from the Territory of Hawaii for many years, is not here today to see the culmination of that for which he worked so long and intelligently and valiantly, as did his wife, Betty, following him as Delegate, and as has the present Delegate from Hawaii, Mr. BURNS. Actually, Joe Farrington burnt himself out and hastened his own death by the dedicated zeal with which he worked for this cause. He did it not only as something desired by his constituents but as of the greatest importance in that crucial part of the world from the standpoint of the total well-being of the United States.

Mr. Chairman, as my speech today I should like to read, if I may, an extemporaneous statement I made before the House Committee on Public Lands when the first statehood for Hawaii bill, and I was one of those privileged to introduce it, came up for hearing on March 10, 1947. I do not know anything that is substantially different now from the situation existing then, except that the urgency it is, is even more acute now than it was then; and the need is more visible to more people.

The original statement begins on page 85 of the published committee hearings on statehood for Hawaii, 1947.

No one can be blind to the fact that there is a life death struggle going on in the world today between the only two basic forms of government there have ever been. One form is essentially dictatorship, government from the top down. And nobody can deny that that form of government once more is making tremendous strides in the world, encroaching steadily on the other form which is basically democratic and can perhaps best be described by the word "federation"; federation of classes or of blocs or of races or of people or States. Either the democracy principle will extend and grow and expand; or the dictatorship principle will grow and extend and expand. At this particular juncture in the world's history—this was 1947—when we witness this struggle all about us, I can think of few things more important than for the United States to demonstrate by action which way it really believes in.

This bill affords us an opportunity to recognize in Hawaii one of the most distinguished achievements of American democracy as contrasted with the other type of government. Nowhere else in the world, including our own 48 States on the mainland, has there been a more successful demonstration than in the Hawaiian Islands of the ability of people of different races and national origins and tongues and cultural and social and intellectual background to work together in mutual respect and teamwork for the good of all, as the true way to promote the good of each.

It is no longer just an experiment for us to argue about. It is an accomplished fact.

Granting statehood to the people of Hawaii at this time will be more than just fulfillment of their aspirations as citizens of the United States. It will focus attention throughout the whole vast Pacific Basin on the capacity of our form of government to inspire the loyalty and the cooperation of people of many racial and national origins. I am sure that such an example will have an immeasurable value in strengthening our relations with every people of the Pacific Ocean area.

Hawaii's heritage has been very fortunate for the development of an enlightened democracy. Its aboriginal race, the Hawaiians, whose character and culture have left a marked influence on the modern community, were a friendly, tolerant, intelligent, and gracious people.

The early missionaries from New England, and if I may pause to interject a personal note, having been a medical missionary myself for 10 years in China, I have always been interested in the fact that the first doctor to the Sandwich Islands, as they were called then, was a distant relative of mine, Dr. Garrett Parmalee Judd, who went out in 1828, as I recall, under the mission board which I was privileged to serve later. He was the first to serve the people of these islands as a physician.

There were four other families, the Cooks, the Castles, the Bishops, and one other family—you see their names on the stores, the banks, the streets and parks all over Hawaii today. The five families went out from New England in a sailing vessel around Cape Horn, a 6 or 7 months' journey to the Sandwich Islands. The families now have descendants all through the islands.

The early missionaries from New England brought with them a strong faith in public education, in the worth of the individual human being, and in the strictest political democracy.

The plantation owners, also, who carried on a strong missionary tradition, were on the whole zealous in the promotion of public health and education without discrimination among the workers of many racial backgrounds who came to the islands. Consequently, Hawaii's standards of rural health and rural education are an example to the whole country.

The high moral and physical standards which have resulted from these influences are the foundation of Hawaii's success as a democratic American community.

It is fortunate that this is the case, because, from a mainland point of view, we must place a stronger national reliance upon the people of Hawaii. Their position is one of key importance in the Pacific world. They are on the life lines of trade and cultural intercourse between all peoples of the area, and the diversity of their own racial background gives them an intense and broad interest in Pacific affairs. Can anyone doubt that representatives in Congress from this thoroughly American mid-Pacific State will broaden our horizons, enrich our congressional debates, and contribute in many ways to the national welfare?

No Americans are more alert to our problems of national defense than those who live on our frontiers, especially those in Hawaii who, in 1941, suffered the severest enemy attack ever inflicted on American territory and were compelled for many months to toil unceasingly and unwaveringly in their own and the Nation's defense.

I am sure, therefore, that one of the advantages which we as a united Nation will derive from having the State of Hawaii fully represented in Washington will be an increasing alertness to all problems of national security in that part of the world and an added ability to meet those problems effectively. A loyal island people, firmly united with the rest of the American people, will have a high strategic value for the entire Nation.

Above all, I am convinced that our national policies will be judged in no small measure by the decisions we make with respect to the people of Hawaii, and other island peoples of the Pacific. We should continue to demonstrate the reality of our belief that every people should have a government of its own choosing. It will be a great advantage to the United States to have one of our great States in the mid-Pacific as a conspicuous example of our American way of life.

In summary, I believe statehood should be granted to the people of Hawaii, first, for security reasons.

There is bound to be uncertainty and instability in the Pacific for years. Forces are at work there which have destroyed the old patterns and nobody can predict with certainty what the new pattern is to be.

It seems to me incontrovertible that our situation would be far better, and that Hawaii would be a much firmer bastion of American security as a full State than it would as a Territory of restless, unhappy half-citizens.

Under their present status, they have to make the same contribution to the national welfare as other citizens but without the same rewards, the same standing as citizens on the mainland.

The question of physical separation from the mainland seems to me inconsequential because, of course, Hawaii today is so very much nearer the rest of the Nation than our Western States were when they were admitted to statehood.

The second reason is commercial considerations. The undeveloped areas of the world are largely in Asia. I am willing to hazard the prediction that eventually historians will agree that World War II all along was a war more than anything else to determine who is going to control the development of Asia and the other undeveloped areas of the world.

There are three areas of great undeveloped natural resources: Africa, South America, and Asia, but only one has also vast human resources. Africa and South America do not have comparable populations.

Asia has half the population of the world. Hitler understood its importance. Certainly the Russians have demonstrated for 25 years that they understand its importance. The British, the Dutch, the French understand it. The Japanese understood it. That is why they fought so long and hard to get control of the manpower and the resources and the potential markets in China.

Only we Americans, with Asia right in our front door, so to speak, seem seldom to sense the importance to our future of who is to control or what ideas are to dominate in the development of Asia. So, for security reasons and for commercial reasons, we need every possible advantage in the gigantic struggle ahead. Making Hawaii a State would give us a very great advantage.

The third basic reason is the moral consideration. How can we, with any decency or hope of success, talk about people having the right to governments of their own choosing, for example in Eastern Europe, unless we show by our deeds that we believe in it in the Pacific as well.

And the fourth reason I would call ideological considerations, which to my mind are really synonymous with our ultimate security.

Actually our own survival is at stake. Democracy is under attack today. The belief that free man is capable of self-government for sustained periods is under systematic organized assault in the world as it has not been since the American and the French Revolutions succeeded. And democracy is losing ground. We can see it on every hand.

The people of Asia, up until the middle 1920's or a little later, were definitely moving in the direction of greater freedom and self-government and the democratic pattern. Now they are uncertain. Some are wondering whether they might not have been better off to adopt the racial pattern, which is what Japan tried to force on them—Asia for the Asiatics. Some believe there is no hope for decent treatment from white men; that when white men get in a jam, they will promise everything to get help until they get out of their difficulty—but then they forget their promises.

Some are wondering whether they should not adopt totalitarianism of the Communist pattern. That is the one making the greatest advance both in Europe and in Asia and, in my judgment, we cannot successfully combat totalitarianism of the Communist pattern just by calling it names and fighting it defensively.

We have to overcome evil with good. We have to have a better policy, and then we have to do a better job of selling it to the people of the world.

In most parts of the world today the trend is from the status of citizen to the status of subject. We have to reverse that trend and widen the areas where the direction is from subject to citizen.

Hawaii is almost the only place I find right now where we have a chance to give new life to our fundamental faith and beliefs.

I repeat, either democracy will spread or totalitarianism will spread and I hope very much that the Congress will act favorably upon these bills to give this concrete object lesson, this vivid demonstration before the world of the vitality of our democratic faith, the strength of our federation principle of government, by extending to these people who have proved themselves worthy in every reasonable sense the right to become full citizens on the same basis as all the rest of us.

We ought to do this because it is right; but if we do not consider that factor, we ought to do it out of a decent concern for our own well-being in the future.

I do not know of anything to add to the above which I said in 1947. I can see nothing important to lose by granting statehood. I can see a great deal to gain. I am happy that after 12 years of effort the objective is about to be achieved. It will prove to be a good and a wise act.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair at this time will call attention to the time remaining. The gentleman from New York [Mr. O'BRIEN] has 39 minutes remaining, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. WESTLAND] an hour and 2 minutes.

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Chairman, I have only one remaining request for time.

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Would the gentleman prefer that I yield now?

Mr. WESTLAND. I would prefer that.

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield 17 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. PASSMAN].

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, it is my earnest hope that the Members of this House will vote favorably, by large majority, on the momentous question of admitting Hawaii as the 50th member of our Union of States. As a Member of this body from the Deep South—the Fifth District of the great State of Louisiana—I feel that I should avail myself of this opportunity to express my unqualified personal support of statehood for Hawaii and also, I am fully confident, the approval of the people whom it is my honor and privilege to represent in the Congress.

I say to you, that contrary to impressions which are held by some people, both in and out of public life, the majority of the people of the Southland—along with the majority of the citizenship of our entire Nation—are unquestionably for statehood for Hawaii. These same people, notwithstanding the erroneous public assertions that were made otherwise, also were supporters of statehood for Alaska. Our people of the South, where good American citizenship and patriotism are ingrained as a way of life, have warmly welcomed Alaska into our Union of States; and there is no doubt whatsoever in my mind that the welcome to Hawaii will be equally as sincere and complete.

The people of our Southland are vitally interested, and justly so, Mr. Chairman, in the preservation of the constitutional rights of the States of our Union. The thoughtful citizen, not only of the South but of every section of our Nation, realizes full well that the citizens of the new State of Hawaii would also be keenly conscious of the tremendous importance of safeguarding the rights of the States, a status for which they have worked so long and hard.

Mr. Chairman, we hear the same arguments in opposition to admission of Hawaii to the Union as were used against Alaska. The same type of objections were also raised against admitting many of our other great States. But none of these arguments has proved valid, for in every instance of the admission of a new State to the Union, our country has been strengthened immeasurably.

I wish to note that our fellow Americans of the Territory of Hawaii have given their children more years of schooling, have a lower crime rate in every category, pay a higher per capita tax to our Federal Treasury, and have sacrificed proportionately more of their sons and husbands in the last three American wars, than has, for example, the population of my own great State of Louisiana, or many other of the States within the Union.

Furthermore, Mr. Chairman, I believe it is worth while to mention that under its constitution, overwhelmingly ratified in 1950, the people of Hawaii have taken this move as a strong protection against communism:

> No person who advocates, or who aids or belongs to any party, organization or association which advocate, the overthrow by force or violence of the government of this State, or of the United States, shall be qualified to hold any public office or employment. (Sec. 3, article 14, constitution of the State of Hawaii.)

May I add, Mr. Chairman, that no other American State constitution contains such a protective provision against communism.

Let us recall also that thus far our Nation has fought only one shooting war against Communists—the war in Korea. When that conflict suddenly erupted our Hawaiian troops were geographically closer to Korea and were among the first to see action. All told, more than 12,000 of Hawaii's young men—many of them dock and field workers—enlisted, or were drafted, to fight for the country that denied them representation in the Government that conscripted them.

In the Korean conflict, not one case of cowardice, or of desertion to the enemy, was recorded on the part of a Hawaiian; instead, 426 of them were killed in action, a death toll which was four times as high as the killed-in-action average for the United States as a whole. Almost one thousand other Hawaiians were severely wounded, or captured; yet not one of them was successfully brainwashed by the enemy.

And surely we have not forgotten the valiant record of Hawaii's men at arms in World War II. No fighting men from anywhere ever conducted themselves more valiantly.

Fair play demands, Mr. Chairman, that we admit Hawaii to our Union of States. Enlightened self-interest also demands it.

Is it not unrealistic for Uncle Sam to use one of his hands to lavishly pass out billions of dollars in gifts and guns to other nations of the world in an effort to obtain their loyalties, while he uses the other hand to reject a half million of his own loyal citizens who ask nothing but to be bound more closely to him that they may share, in common with other Americans, all of the privileges and duties and perils of full citizenship?

As it is, even if Hawaii is to be awarded full statehood this year—and I firmly believe that such is to be—historians of the future doubtless will shake their heads in puzzlement over a United States that has wantonly delayed the grant until now. A United States which has permitted 14 golden post-World War II years to slip by without such action, which—had it occurred in 1946 or earlier—would surely have helped retard the spread of communism in the Orient.

But despite the delay, it is heartening to realize that today we are finally awakening to our responsibilities to act with justice toward our fellow Americans in Hawaii, and to strengthen our Union through the practice of intelligent self-interest, as we did last year in the case of Alaska. I hope and trust that we will act positively, with no further delay, to bring the Territory of Hawaii, with its vast wealth of human and natural resources, into full union with our other 49 States.

It is apropos to quote here a statement made by Abraham Lincoln, who said some hundred years ago:

> Those who would deny freedom to others do not deserve it for themselves; and, under a just God, they will not retain it.

With all my heart, I believe those words to be true. And believing them to be true, I am convinced that statehood for Hawaii resolves itself, in essence, to this question: Will this Nation, by its action on this issue, turn from or continue to pursue the path which has led it to greatness, and has caused it to be the bright beacon of hope for freedom-loving peoples throughout the world?

Mr. Chairman, if statehood should be denied the deserving Territory of Hawaii through our failure now to close the small remaining gap, then every individual responsible for such a disgraceful occurrence would richly deserve censure of history. For, if this statehood bill should be defeated, we would have failed not only the disfranchised Americans of Hawaii, but we also would have failed to respond to the unmistakable and expressed wishes of a substantial majority of the people we represent.

Never should we forget that the American people are fair-minded; and time and again they have demonstrated that they are wise, wiser by far than is sometimes recognized. I firmly believe that the three out of four Americans who favor statehood for Hawaii do so because they know that the colonial status of the Territory is repugnant to both the letter and the spirit of our form of government; and they know, too, that if "taxation without representation" and "Government without the consent of the governed" were tyrannies 183 years ago, they are equally so today.

The American people also realize, of course, that the free peoples of the world and the evil forces of international communism are locked in a battle to the death for the minds of men; and their sound judgment tells them that we are denying ourselves an important victory in that struggle when we fail to give our Hawaiian citizens their full birthright as American free men.

Mr. Chairman, I have touched upon but a few of the significant points of the case for Hawaiian statehood. May I add here, however, a very brief summary:

Hawaii was an independent nation, with a king and a queen, until by agreement it became an incorporated Territory of the United States, with a complete understanding that statehood would be granted when the people had become prepared for it.

The Hawaiian is just as much an American as any citizen of any State. The citizen of Hawaii is subject to all the laws of our land, but is without a vote in the Congress.

In per capita income tax payments to the U.S. Treasury, Hawaii ranks about 16th among all the States, paying more income tax on a per capita basis than 32 States of the Nation.

Records show clearly that Hawaii is freer from communism than any State in the Union. The Hawaiian people's patriotism and their love for the American way of life are such that Communists find it very difficult to thrive there.

Hawaii has an educational system as fine as any in the world, outranking any of the States of the Union. Illiteracy is practically an unknown phenomenon in the islands.

In the history of the whole world, the Japanese-Hawaiian military unit emerged from World War II as the bravest military unit ever to do battle, receiving more medals for valor than any other military unit ever known.

During all the wars in which we have been involved since Hawaii became an incorporated Territory of the United States, Hawaii has always been the first to meet its war bond quota, before any of the States of the Union have done so.

Militarily, on a per capita basis, the Armed Forces enlistments from Hawaii have surpassed those of any State in the Union.

Mr. Chairman, I know the Hawaiian people; I have associated with them. They are fine Americans, for whom full citizenship as members of the Union of States is long overdue.

Just as, throughout the course of our national history, the addition of each new State has made us a better and stronger Nation, so, too, will Hawaii, upon admission to statehood, add its measure of greatness to the whole.

Now, Mr. Chairman, before I conclude, I wish to pay tribute to a great American, a dear personal friend, a fellow Louisianian, a successful businessman, an outstanding citizen, Mr. George H. Lehleitner, of New Orleans. More than any other single individual, either in the Government or out of it, George Lehleitner has been at the forefront in advancing the cause of statehood for both Alaska and Hawaii, and in finally bringing to reality what once was a hope, at times, it seemed, a hope far from fulfillment. But George Lehleitner, New Orleans businessman, outstanding American, became imbued with the ideal of gaining statehood for Hawaii and Alaska while in service as a naval officer, the captain of his ship, during World War II. The fire that was kindled within him then, through his association with the fighting men and the people as a whole of Hawaii and Alaska, has never since flickered. He has given of his very self—his time, his talents, his efforts, his financial means—to carry on the statehood fight, to bring about correction of the injustices resulting from keeping our fellow citizens of Hawaii and Alaska in Territorial status, without the full privileges of citizenship, although bearing all the responsibilities. Last year George Lehleitner saw justice done in the matter of statehood for Alaska; this year, I have no doubt, he will see justice done for Hawaii. He has fought the good fight, and now the victory. America is much the stronger, the better, because of him. For his great and good works, we of the Congress—Americans everywhere, and especially Alaskans and Hawaiians—owe to George Lehleitner a lasting debt of gratitude.

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. TOLLEFSON].

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Chairman, on three occasions since it has been my privilege to serve in this House, I have voted in favor of statehood for Hawaii. Again I shall vote for the bill now pending before us, which would grant such statehood.

On each of the earlier occasions I sincerely believed that Hawaii deserved and was entitled to membership in our sistership of States. After hearing the arguments in favor of the pending measure I am more convinced than ever that statehood should be granted. The members of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs have presented an ironclad case in support of their proposal. Their arguments are irrefutable. I trust that the measure will be overwhelmingly approved.

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as she may desire, to the gentlewoman from Washington [Mrs. MAY].

Mrs. MAY. Mr. Chairman, unlike my colleague who spoke just before me, this will be my first opportunity to exercise the privilege of voting for Hawaiian statehood. I am going to be very proud so to do.

I am pleased to be able to add my remarks to those already made on this historic session of the House of Representatives because I believe our Nation needs Hawaii as a State of the Union.

Hawaii is a community of Americans who have proved that East and West can live and work together, in peace and war, under the flag of freedom. I am

sure that statehood will be an example before the world of American democracy in action. Hawaii has now passed every test.

The Nation wants Hawaii because public opinion is overwhelmingly in favor of admitting Hawaii into the Union. Numerous congressional hearings have exhaustively investigated Hawaii's fitness for statehood. This body has passed Hawaiian statehood bills many times. The platforms of both political parties have called for an immediate statehood.

I believe Hawaii's 500,000 people have fulfilled the obligation of citizens for more than one-half a century without enjoying all the privileges. They have paid taxes as residents of the States do and have served on battlefronts equally, but have had no voice in either tax or draft legislation and as we are all so aware, taxation without representation violates a basic American precept. Statehood is the expressed will of Hawaii's people, as it is the expressed will of the people of the United States of America. Statehood will be beneficial to us all and I am pleased to go on record as heartily favoring the admission of Hawaii as the 50th State of the United States of America.

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HENDERSON].

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Chairman, I know that many of my colleagues have expressed misgivings with regard to this bill. Many more have been silently weighing the issues. At one moment they feel that the matter should be delayed another term or two. Further consideration suggests that action should be taken now. I must admit that I have had misgivings, and that some of them are yet unresolved.

I opposed the Alaska bill last year, and consistency might suggest that I follow the same course on this bill. But sometimes events occur which destroy some of the virtues of consistency. With Alaska, the step has been taken, statehood has become a reality. The action cannot be undone. There is a 49th State, and because of that precedent there is additional argument for a 50th. I shall support the bill, and I believe that there is ample reason for those in this Chamber, this Congress, to support the statehood issue.

Correspondence I have had with constituents leads one to believe that statehood for Alaska has popular approval.

Many arguments are advanced in opposition. The insular nature of the area, its distance from the mainland, the racial composition of the residents, the important position of the ILWU, and Communist influence have all been discussed and proper weight given to their importance.

I am glad to hear assurance from some of our colleagues, Mr. WALTER, Mr. JACKSON, among others, who have made a special study of subversion that statehood may strengthen the hand of loyal Americans by placing upon them full-scale American responsibilities of citizenship. I share that feeling, Mr. Chairman. I feel that statehood will give Hawaii the same completeness of American style of government which has enabled all the States to overthrow undesirable situations arising within them, and to withstand continuous to their existence.

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SIMPSON].

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, once again Hawaiian statehood is before the House and once again I rise in its support.

Although we have heard many arguments on both sides of this question, I feel certain that no issue coming before the Congress in recent years has captured the imagination of the American people as has the admission of two new States to our Union. In admitting Alaska last year, the Congress brought to fruition the hopes and dreams of the people of that far northern Territory and stirred in the hearts of many other Americans new dreams of another frontier for our adventurous people.

Mr. Speaker, in acting to admit Hawaii as our 50th State, we can right another wrong and bring to full citizenship some 575,000 people who have met all the obligations of citizenship for more than half a century without its privileges. The admission of Hawaii as a State would provide a dramatic example to the world, and particularly to our friends in the Far East, of American democracy in action. It would bolster Hawaii's defense role in the Far East and serve notice on the rest of the world that the United States intends to stay in the Pacific.

Hawaii has passed every test for statehood. Congressional committees, Government departments, military leaders, and many, many other groups have taken a close look at the islands and come up with one conclusion: Hawaii is ready for statehood and America is ready for Hawaii.

Since 1941, national surveys have shown that American public opinion is overwhelmingly in favor of admitting Hawaii into the Union. Some 30 national organizations have gone on record in favor of Hawaiian statehood.

The platforms of both political parties urge immediate statehood. Twenty separate congressional hearings have exhaustively investigated Hawaii's fitness for statehood. The House of Representatives has passed statehood bills three times, dating back to 1947.

The American press is nearly unanimous in its support of Hawaiian statehood. Let me cite a few examples from the newspapers in my State which could be multiplied over and over in every State in the Union.

First, Philadelphia Inquirer, February 1:

> Surely the time has come when this Territory should follow Alaska into the Union, as our 50th State. Her people deserve it, they very much desire it, and they would be a valuable addition to the United States of America.

Second, Pittsburgh Sun-Telegraph, February 6:

> It is illogical and unfair to grant statehood to Alaska and deny it to Hawaii.

Third, Reading Times, January 31:

> For we hope by the time the first session of the 86th Congress completes its chores, Hawaii will be the 50th State.

Fourth, Hazelton Standard-Sentinel, February 13:

> We need Hawaii as an equal partner as much as Hawaii needs statehood. (Interior Secretary Fred A. Seaton.)

Fifth, Lancaster News, January 4:

> It seems incredible that Hawaii can be kept out.

Sixth, Altoona Mirror, February 10:

> Let's aid Hawaii. Alaska is over the hurdle. Now it's Hawaii's turn.

Mr. Speaker, these are just a few examples of editorials that have come to my attention in recent weeks. But they demonstrate the overwhelming desire of the American people to bring into the Union this enchanted Pacific paradise whose beauty has overwhelmed its citizens and visitors for generations.

I would like to quote Mark Twain who once visited the islands and 20 years later remembered them in these words:

> No alien land in all the world has any deep, strong charm for me but that one; no other land could so longingly and beseechingly haunt me sleeping and waking, through half a lifetime, as that one. * * * Other things leave me, but it abides. * * * For me its balmy airs are always blowing, its summer seas flashing in the sun; the pulsing of its surfbeat is in my ears. * * * In my nostrils still lives the breath of flowers that perished 20 years ago.

Mr. Speaker, Hawaii is literally America's "Main Street" in the Pacific. It is a community of Americans who have proved that East and West can live and work and play together, in peace and war, under a flag of freedom which I sincerely hope will very shortly contain 50 stars instead of 49.

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR] to close debate on this side.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, today is a momentous day in American history, because before the sun sets today a condition will exist under the American flag that has not existed since July 1, 1776. On the 1st day of July 1776 in Philadelphia representatives of Thirteen Crown Colonies met in the Continental Congress. On that day the Jefferson resolution was called up. There was a great deal of debate. John Hancock presided until the last Delegate had spoken. He then turned over the chair to a Delegate from Virginia, Mr. Randolph; went over to the group that came from his own Colony and sat with them. Then the clerk of the committee called the roll for the first time of those Thirteen Colonies. It rather ominously began with the New England Colonies: Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Connecticut, New Hampshire, followed by New York, Delaware, Pennsylvania, and others. Is it not strange that today when the roll is called of the 49 States of the Union it begins with Alabama, Alaska, Arizona, Arkansas, California, and Colorado, names unheard of and undreamed of on July 1, 1776? Yet every

one of the 36 States that have been admitted to the sisterhood of States from that time has met opposition. But I dare say—and I challenge the members of this committee to have one Member of Congress from any one of those 36 States rise in the well of the House and say that when the Congress in its wisdom admitted his State to the sisterhood of States it made a mistake.

It is very interesting to note that even before the Constitution of the United States was adopted by the Thirteen Original Colonies they had granted an organic act to the Territory of Ohio. Two years later they granted an organic act to Tennessee, and State after State from that time down until last year was admitted into the sisterhood of States; and this country has become bigger, and better, and greater because of it.

When we vote in this House later this afternoon to admit the Territory of Hawaii into the sisterhood of States to make it the 50th State of the Union, for the first time in the history of our country, we will not have under the American flag an incorporated Territory.

Yes, Mr. Chairman, this is a momentous occasion. The people who voted against other States have lived to see the error of their ways. I appreciate, and I know that the other members of this committee appreciate the opposition, and the loyal opposition, of those who have spoken against Hawaiian statehood. But I call upon those who have up until now opposed statehood to see the error of their ways, to rise and support the action of the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, so that this Congress can present to the world a unanimous front, so that when the word goes out this evening over the wires throughout the known world that the United States has added a 50th star to its flag, it will be known that it was done with the unanimous support of all of the Members of the House of Representatives.

Yes; let us not be like a Member of the other body who saw me last night and said, "Do you know, if I had it to do over again, I would have voted for Hawaiian statehood." Today you will have your last opportunity. No other Member of Congress in the foreseeable future will ever have the opportunity that is being presented to you today.

I urge you to support this committee and to make the vote not three to one but overwhelming in favor of Hawaiian statehood.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAYLOR. I am happy to yield to my chairman.

Mr. ASPINALL. May I, at this time, commend the gentleman for his fine presentation. May I state that throughout the 10 years that I have worked with the gentleman from Pennsylvania his actions have been prompted as he has studied and made judgment on legislation not only by his mind, but also by his heart, and in his statement today, it is the heart of the Congressman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR] making this presentation.

Mr. SAYLOR. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAYLOR. I am happy to yield to my colleague from Arizona.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I want to compliment the gentleman for his fine statement and also I wish to compliment the gentleman for the many years that he has spent working for statehood for Alaska and Hawaii. When I first came to the Congress in 1952, the gentleman from Pennsylvania was chairman of the Subcommittee on Territories and Insular Possessions. He worked very hard in that Congress for statehood, and in every subsequent Congress. He has worked very hard in this Congress. I wish, at this time, to give the gentleman my personal word of congratulations not only to the gentleman from Pennsylvania but to the gentleman from New York and all the other members of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs for what I anticipate will be not only a great day for them but for the people in Hawaii as well.

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. MEYER].

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MEYER. I yield.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, I thing it is perfectly fitting that we should now hear from the gentleman from Vermont who has just taken the floor to follow the presentation of the gentleman from Pennsylvania. It is certainly in order that the gentleman who represents in this House the first State to become a State by admission after the Thirteen Original States had united together under the Constitution of the United States should now state his position.

Mr. MEYER. Mr. Chairman, our Nation had its beginnings in the union of thirteen colonies who ultimately in 1787 drafted and subsequently ratified the Constitution of the United States of America.

In 1791 Vermont became the 14th State and was the first State to be admitted to the Union by a special act of Congress. Prior to its admittance, on January 10, 1791, Vermont had approved the United States Constitution and in presenting to the Congress its case for statehood the commissioners of Vermont said:

> They have seen with great satisfaction a new and more perfect union of the people of America, and the unanimity with which they have recently approved the national Constitution manifests their attachment to it, and the zeal with which they desire to participate in its benefits.

And in conclusion they added:

> The memorialists on behalf of their constituents most respectfully petition that the Congress will consent to the admission of the State of Vermont, by that name and style, as a new and entire member of the United States.

The petition was granted by act of Congress on February 18, 1791, and on March 4 of that year Vermont was legally admitted as the 14th State of these United States.

One hundred and sixty-eight years have passed since that memorable occasion and our Nation has increased in area, and in stature, and now comprises 49 States. There remains one Territory which desires statehood and which has demonstrated that it is prepared to assume equal partnership in our cherished Union.

I am happy to say that the people of my State have indicated to me that they favor the admission of Hawaii as the 50th State. I am able to enthusiastically express the wishes of those constituents who with rare exception wish to welcome a new star into our galaxy.

It is most appropriate that the Representative of the Green Mountain State—the first petitioners for statehood—should be supporting this proposal. Vermont again looks westward. We want Hawaii to join as full partners in our common destiny.

As I have listened to the arguments against the admission of Hawaii as a State, I recall that probably most of these arguments and many others were used in earlier opposition to the entrance of almost every other State that came in after the Thirteen Original Colonies. I propose that in the final analysis, granting the legitimacy of the opposition, it does not make much difference in the end. This country has grown and become great because we were willing to admit other States. If we had not seen fit to do so, probably the original Union would no longer endure; and, therefore, I hope that on this historic occasion we will present an overwhelming vote in favor of the admission of Hawaii.

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ULLMAN].

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Chairman, I want to take this time to pay tribute to the distinguished chairman of the full committee and the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee for the fine way in which they have brought this bill before the House. I would also like to commend the other members of the committee, many of whom worked on this legislation for years before I came to this body. And I would like to pay particular tribute to the gentleman who led the opposition in the committee, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ROGERS] because although he was basically and deeply opposed to this legislation he nevertheless contributed greatly to the perfecting of the bill. He helped write the language that makes this bill one of the finest statehood bills that has ever come before this body.

My good friend the Delegate from Hawaii deserves great commendation for the statesmanlike way in which he handled this matter which has meant so much to him personally and so much to his Territory. When he came here he set a goal, and he worked consistently toward that goal. He did not let temporary changes in the political situation deter him; steadfastly he worked toward his objective. Today marks a tremendous personal victory for the Delegate from Hawaii.

We in Oregon celebrate our hundredth birthday of statehood this year, and I

am particularly happy that Hawaii is going to join the Union 100 years following the State of Oregon.

Mr. Chairman, as a sponsor of one of the proposals authorizing Hawaiian statehood, I am pleased that this legislation is now before the House for consideration.

Extensive hearings have been held by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs concerning the wisdom of permitting Hawaii to join the Union. I actively participated in those hearings, and I am convinced that now is the time to authorize statehood and thus provide long-overdue equitable treatment for the more than half a million loyal Americans inhabiting the Hawaiian Islands.

Hawaii has long been promised statehood, both by implication and by official action of the Government of the United States. Fifty-nine years ago Hawaii voluntarily surrendered its independence at the urgent invitation of this country. This action between two governments took place in order that Hawaii might be, as officially stated, "incorporated into the United States as an integral part thereof."

It is particularly significant that more than a hundred years ago, in 1854, President Franklin Pierce authorized negotiations to annex Hawaii to the United States. This proposed treaty of 1854 stated that the "Hawaiian Islands shall be incorporated into the American Union as a State, enjoying the same degree of sovereignty as other States, and admitted as such as soon as it can be done in consistency with the principles and requirements of the Federal Constitution to all the rights, privileges, and immunity of a State as aforesaid on a perfect equality with other States of the Union." Though the negotiations were not consummated, their discussion in official circles caused the people of Hawaii to believe statehood was their destiny.

President Andrew Johnson, in his annual message to the 40th Congress on December 19, 1868, in speaking of a reciprocity treaty with Hawaii, said "it would be a guarantee of the good will and forebearance of all nations until the people of the islands shall of themselves, at no distant day, voluntarily apply for admission into the Union." Twenty-two years later Hawaii was incorporated into the Union. Since then Hawaii has applied by petitioning Congress for statehood on at least 20 different occasions.

President Harry S. Truman as long ago as January 21, 1946, recommended statehood for Hawaii in his annual message on the state of the Union. He again recommended to Congress that Hawaii be granted statehood when the 81st Congress reconvened.

When the elected leaders of democratic America throughout a hundred-year period officially recommend that Hawaii should be granted State government, it is time the recommendation be fulfilled. In statements of its Members and by action of its committees, Congress itself has caused the people of Hawaii to believe that State government would soon be achieved.

The action taken by Congress is much more than an implied promise; it is the continuation of a policy firmly established by Congress on 29 other occasions when States have been brought from territoriality to statehood. It has been recognized historically that when Congress actively recognizes a Territory as a "part of the United States" and incorporates it into the Union as such, that in itself is a prerequisite to any step in the direction of statehood.

As long ago as 1900, Congress rejected an amendment to the proposed Organic Act for Hawaii which would have provided that Hawaii should not at any time in the future be admitted to statehood. It was during the 56th Congress, 1st session, that Congressman Ebenezer J. Hill, Republican, of Connecticut, during debate on the proposed Organic Act for Hawaii, moved to add an amendment as follows:

> Nothing in this act shall be construed, taken, or held to imply a pledge or promise that the Territory of Hawaii will at any future time be admitted as a State or attached to any State.

When questioned by a colleague, Congressman Joseph G. Cannon, of Illinois, as to whether or not there was anything in the bill providing a government for Hawaii which committed Congress to admit Hawaii to statehood, Congressman Hill replied:

> I think there is. * * * The American people look upon the authorization and full organization of a Territory as the first step toward statehood. It has always been so construed; it always will be so construed.

The amendment was rejected. But Congressman Hill was correct when he stated:

> The American people look upon the authorization and full organization of a Territory as the first step toward statehood.

On February 20, 1900, Senator Morgan, of Alabama, during debate on Hawaii's Organic Act in the Senate, said that when he was in Hawaii, as a member of the McKinley Commission to draft a form of government for Hawaii, he had made a study of Hawaii's experience in government. Following his two visits to Hawaii, he said:

> I became satisfied that those people had built up a government that was at least equal in all respects to any government in the American Union.

He then told the U.S. Senate his first proposition to the members of the Commission meeting in Honolulu was that—

> We should recommend that the people of the Hawaiian Islands should hold a convention, adopt a constitution, and apply for admission into the American Union.

The last survivor of that group, the late Justice Frear, wrote not long ago to Hawaii's late Delegate to Congress, Joseph R. Farrington, that the five-man Commission "did recognize and realize at the time that they were recommending for Hawaii a status which was regarded as leading to statehood."

During the past 20 years Congress has, on a number of occasions, sent its committees to Hawaii to investigate the readiness of Hawaii to attain statehood. Several of these congressional committees have also held statehood hearings in our National Capital. Every year since the end of the war, a congressional committee has recommended immediate statehood for Hawaii. No wonder the half-million people of Hawaii feel that statehood has been promised to them.

From every historical precedent in our dealings with former territories which are now States, the people of Hawaii have had every reason to believe that they would one day attain State government. Statehood for Hawaii has been promised by implication ever since our Nation began to function.

The Continental Congress provided in the ordinance of 1787 for the admission of States. In those days when a territory had 5,000 free male inhabitants, it was granted legislative powers and allowed to have a delegate to Congress; when it had 60,000 inhabitants it was eligible for statehood. Hawaii, today, has over half a million inhabitants—more than any of the other 29 territories had when they attained statehood, excepting only Oklahoma. Yet Hawaii, which has served an apprenticeship of half a century, in contrast to the average of 20 years for all other former Territories now States, still lives on in hopes of having the promises of statehood fulfilled.

The promises of statehood have not only been held out to Hawaii by action of our Government, and by statements of our Presidents, but by the two major political parties of the United States. Both the Democratic and Republican Parties endorse statehood for Hawaii. Those promises to the people of Hawaii must be kept. We must give increasing evidence to the millions of people the world over that democracy works.

The U.S. Congress has a direct obligation to the citizens of Hawaii to grant them statehood. Hawaii was annexed by act of Congress 59 years ago as a part of the territory of the United States. Congress, in 1900, by enactment of an organic act—in reality a pattern of a State constitution—completed the incorporation of Hawaii as an integral part of the Union. Based on historical precedent, Hawaii has been promised statehood.

Our Supreme Court recognizes the tentative character of Territorial status. The Court in one case before it concluded that—

> The organization of governments for the Territories was but temporary, and would be superseded when the Territories become States of the Union.

Thus, three branches of government under our Constitution have by their actions implied or promised State government to Hawaii. Congress has already enacted legislation to admit as States 30 former Territories, including Alaska. A number of our executives, President Eisenhower among them, have endorsed State government for Hawaii. Supreme Court decisions have pointed out that Territorial government was necessarily limited to a period of pupilage.

Let us not delay any longer in granting statehood to our fellow American citizens in Hawaii. Let us keep our promises to the people of the Territory of Hawaii that with maturity will come responsibility. In our modern world Hawaii needs voting representation in Congress. "No

taxation without representation" and "No government without the consent of the governed," are axioms as much alive and as important to the people of Hawaii as they were to our forefathers who first conceived them. They can only be made meaningful by the adoption of the legislation now before the House.

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON].

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, as one who supports the cabinet system at the Federal level and who supported the cabinet system for his own State, I welcome the cabinet system experiment reported in the constitution of the State of Hawaii.

As one who supports division of the budget into separate capital and expenditure sections, I welcome the fact that the State of Hawaii has seen fit to so divide its budget, as is indicated in the constitution reported to us today.

As one who has long supported in his own State an automatic constitutional reapportionment of the legislature on a reasonable population basis, I welcome the inclusion in the Hawaiian constitution of that feature as reported to us today.

As a first-term Member, I deem it a high privilege to have been sworn into this body on the same day as the gentleman from Alaska [Mr. RIVERS], the first Representative from that State, and I deem it an even higher honor to have the rare privilege and good fortune to be a Member of the Congress which admits the 50th State to the Union.

May I say parenthetically that I have yet to receive the first piece of mail asking me not to vote in favor of statehood for Hawaii. I can recall no occasion in my own State when this question has come up but what the vote, whether in my party or among my friends, was unanimous for the admission of the State of Hawaii into the Union.

As a Member from a mountain State, may I say I am pleased to see the Congress welcome into statehood a most unusual mountain State. We shall be glad to welcome Hawaii into the group of mountain States.

Speaking as a member of the Colorado delegation, I want to pay special tribute to the dean of our delegation, Mr. ASPINALL, the very able chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, for this very fine work in bringing this measure to the floor at this time. As a Member of this body, and I am sure on behalf of all the Members, I congratulate the entire membership of that committee on both sides, not only for the work they have done on the bill and the report, but also for the able presentation we have had today.

As an American citizen I welcome Hawaii into full membership in the family of States.

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER].

Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of statehood for Hawaii. I was one of the members of the Larcade committee, a subcommittee of the then Committee of Insular Affairs that in 1946 visited the islands and made one of the most intensive studies on behalf of statehood that has ever been made. I am convinced, as I was then, that Hawaii is more than ready for statehood. She is as capable of governing herself as any of the States in the Union, and this privilege should be accorded her.

At that time we had the privilege of nailing to the mast a number of rumors in reference to subversion, and disloyalty that had been spread during the war. There was no positive evidence to support them.

There is only a small fraction of the people in our States who can be accused of disloyalty or whose political ideals are not the political ideals of the overwhelming number of Americans. If there are any who can claim any State is without such groups, let them stand up. Hawaii's proportion of such dissidents is no greater than the average.

Surely the people of Hawaii are no different from the people in the other 49 States. They are good American citizens who when called upon have done their bit to sustain this country and who are as proud of that citizenship as you are or I.

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from New York [Mr. RIEHLMAN].

Mr. RIEHLMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this legislation and I want to commend the committee for the fine work they have done in bringing this bill before the House for action today.

It is indeed a pleasure to be able to speak in behalf of Hawaiian statehood. Hawaii has been a Territory of these United States for many years. We have watched her grow and develop a healthy economy. We have watched her sons defend our constitutional liberties on the battlefield. We have watched her blossom into statehood status. Hawaii has come of age, she is fully able to bear her part of the burdens of statehood and I say it is time we extend to her the benefits of statehood.

It was my privilege to vote for Alaska in the last Congress. I deemed it a high honor to vote for the 49th State and I likewise deem it an honor and a privilege on this historic occasion to cast my vote welcoming Hawaii as the 50th State.

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from New York [Mr. PIRNIE].

Mr. PIRNIE. Mr. Chairman, Hawaii has the population, economy, and proper respect for constitutional government to support statehood. As a Territory, its people have demonstrated a firm adherence to our common American ideals and practices. On the battlefields of Europe, the Pacific, and Korea, the loyalty of the people of Hawaii, as Americans, has been indelibly written into the pages of world history. I am proud to support the bill to admit Hawaii into the Union as our 50th State.

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WIDNALL].

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Chairman, I heartily support this bill and hope it will have a speedy passage. It not only makes possible the addition of a new State to the Union that richly merits such recognition, but awarding statehood should prove most advantageous to the future of the United States. Hawaii has for 40 years awaited statehood status since the first bill was introduced in the House. Its population of almost one-half a million has for years shown its ability to support a sound economy and it has had outstanding development through progressive leadership. During World War II many of our citizens believed that, because of the very varied national background of the people of Hawaii that the islands would prove an Achilles heel in our defense. To the contrary and to the everlasting credit of its residents their full loyalty was proven continually and aided immeasurably in our ultimate victory.

I believe that admission of Hawaii will prove of great significance in our history. It carries even greater import than the admission of Alaska last year. Finally, after many years of debate, sober thought, and judgment, the representatives of the 48 States and now Alaska, have put aside their prejudices and narrow views of the past. This year the debates on both the Senate and House floors were on a high level and did not display the appeals to passion and bias exhibited on some past occasions.

Not only does statehood fulfill the promises made in the Republican and Democrat platforms, but it demonstrates to the world that the people of our country respect the dignity of man and sincerely mean our belief in freedom and liberty and opportunity for all our citizens. Hawaiian statehood carries with it a spiking of Communist propaganda claims and I hope that it also indicates that the temper of both Houses is such that the long disfranchised residents of the District of Columbia will be granted self-government. It is a tragedy that the residents of Washington have been voteless for so many years.

We have spent billions on defense for missiles and H-bombs and billions to bolster the economy and yet unwillingness to grant the vote to District of Columbia citizens again provides Communist propaganda.

The vote that will be taken today will mark the beginning of a new era for the United States. As the Representative from the Seventh District of New Jersey, I consider myself most fortunate in being able to vote for Hawaii as our 50th State.

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. UDALL].

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Chairman, we are nearing the close of the debate, and I think we all know that this legislation will pass by an overwhelming vote. I think the reason is that we are going to legislate our hopes here and not our fears. Some would have us vote "no" because we fear Harry Bridges, because we fear a little band of Communists, because we fear that these people in this great island—with their wonderful blend of racial strains—cannot govern them-

selves as other people do. I say that that is no way to legislate. We are going to pass this bill today because we will legislate our hopes. There appears—and I know all of you have seen it so many times that you probably have committed it to memory—in this great Chamber a statement by Daniel Webster high on the wall above the rostrum occupied by the Speaker. It is the only tablet or writing on the walls of this great room. I think that the challenge of Webster's great utterance was placed there as a challenge to us and to all others who will serve here. Let me read it:

> Let us develop the resources of our land, call forth its powers, build up its institutions.

This is what we are doing today. We are strengthening our country. We are building up its institutions, I say to you. Further, Daniel Webster said in this statement that if we do these things, quoting again:

> We also in our day and generation may perform something worthy to be remembered.

I say that if the 86th Congress does nothing else, when the history books are written, it will be recorded that we were the Congress that enlarged the concept of our Nation and admitted the Territory of Hawaii. So, let us vote yes today because we believe in democracy; vote yes because we believe in strengthening the institutions of our country. This is the reason this legislation will pass, and let us brush aside all the doubts, all the insignificant arguments, and vote for democracy and a strengthened United States.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. UDALL. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Chairman, I do not know whether the gentleman has ever made the acquaintance, during the many years of discussion on statehood for Alaska and Hawaii, of a citizen of my State, George Lehleitner. Mr. Lehleitner is well known in Alaska, as in Hawaii. I would not want this debate to end without paying tribute to him, because, using his own resources and with complete devotion to the causes of the peoples of these two great areas; I think more than any single individual he has contributed immensely to the historic occasions of statehood for Alaska and Hawaii. I might say also that I personally am proud that a man from my State of Louisiana has made this contribution, because the Louisiana Territory, purchased in 1803, was the first significant development of the United States of America after the Thirteen Original States.

Mr. UDALL. This is a most appropriate comment, and we on the committee know of his magnificent contribution.

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. CAHILL].

Mr. CAHILL. Mr. Chairman, on this historic occasion, I rise to support the legislation which will make Hawaii our 50th State.

Our history is convincing proof that our country has grown not only in size but in strength, vision, and unity with the admission of each succeeding State. As California, Louisiana, Texas, Alaska, and the remaining States admitted to the Union, opened new vistas to our people, increased our strength and unity and demonstrated the practical application of the words of the Constitution and the Declaration of Independence to the world, so will Hawaii.

My only reservation, occasioned by certain Communist influences, now apparently prevalent, has been resolved by the belief that a grateful people in a surge of patriotism kindled by their admission to the Union will exert the necessary effort to remove this one blemish from an otherwise untarnished record of patriotism, industry, and accomplishment.

I urge my colleagues to vote for the admission of Hawaii as our 50th State and, in the belief that this bill will pass by an overwhelming majority, welcome the people of Hawaii to the Union.

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLMER].

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Chairman, in connection with the remarks of my distinguished colleague and friend, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BOGGS], I wanted to say that I subscribe to the tribute that he paid to Mr. George Lehleitner, who maintains a home in my congressional district.

I have consistently, as the Members of this House know, opposed this legislation, and I am still opposed to it, and I am going to vote against it. But in this man to whom tribute was paid here we find one who unselfishly has been a great crusader for this cause. He has done everything he could to try to change my position, but whatever he has done has been unselfish, and I think he is entitled to the tribute that my friend has paid him. I respect his views even as I have reason to believe he respects mine. He is a gentleman in every respect and believes in fighting for what he subscribes to.

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WRIGHT].

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, statehood for Hawaii is the redemption of a promise which we made more than 60 years ago.

By granting it, the United States is proving today that we keep our word.

We shall be proving also that we still are motivated by the same principles which gave us birth as a nation when we said that "taxation without representation is tyranny."

For 60 years the proud people of Hawaii have uncomplainingly paid all Federal taxes paid by other Americans, and for 60 years their sons have willingly volunteered and have been conscripted to offer their lives in defense of our country. Yet they have had no voice in the governing of the country.

Today, happily, that fundamental wrong is being righted.

The citizens of Hawaii have fully demonstrated a readiness for full partnership in our American family of States.

The record clearly shows, to their great credit, that they have given their average youngster more years of schooling, have a far lower crime ratio in every category, pay a higher per capita tax to our Federal Treasury, and have sacrificed proportionately a greater number of their sons and husbands to defend freedom in the last three American wars than has the population of the United States as a whole.

For Hawaiians, this has been much more than merely a fight for political equality. It has been an intensely spiritual struggle by a people to demonstrate to their fellow Americans on the mainland, and especially to their own children, and the possession of an oriental or a Polynesian name and face is not of itself a badge of inferiority.

More important than any of this perhaps, we and they are today demonstrating to the world that the system of government we have perfected here in the United States works, not only for Caucasians, but for all of the world's peoples.

What an impact this lesson could have on all of Asia.

So far as Hawaiians themselves are concerned, they have long since proven their own deep and abiding patriotism to the United States.

During World War II, Hawaii's native son battalions endured the heaviest battlefield casualties of any American field unit and justly won the distinction of being the most highly decorated organization in the entire 170 year history of the U.S. armed services.

Many of my very good friends in Texas who served in the 36th Division during World War II owe their lives to the selfless, heroic, and sacrificial patriotic devotion of the men of the 442d Infantry Regimental Combat Team, Hawaiians all, who broke through the enemy lines in Italy during the bitter days of World War II when other units had failed and, at great cost to themselves, provided a rescue for that substantial part of the 36th Division which had found itself trapped and surrounded. No Texan, and no American, should ever forget that act of marvelous heroism.

In the Korean war, our only armed clash as a nation with communism, Hawaiian units were employed heavily in those heartbreaking early days when they, and a pitifully small number of other Americans, gallantly kept us from being pushed off the Korean Peninsula. As a consequence, Hawaii's Korean war deaths were more than four times higher than the U.S. average.

More than 22,000 Hawaiians wore the American uniform in that conflict with communism. Many were killed, and others taken prisoner. Yet the record reveals not a single case of defection or

desertion to the enemy. The Communists, with their most fiendish techniques, could never succeed in brainwashing a single one of them.

On every occasion when we have brought in another State as a member of this great American union, the action has precipitated bitter controversy. Always there have been dire predictions. But always those predictions have been proven to have been wrong. Most of the self-same arguments being employed today against Hawaii were employed against the admission of Louisiana, Florida, and Texas.

On the face of the great seal of Hawaii, there is this inscription: "Ua mau ke ea o ka aina i ka pono." Translated, it reads: "The life of a land and its people is preserved by righteousness."

It seems to me that all they ask of us today is righteousness—to be given a voice along with the rest of us in the governing of our common country which levies taxes against them and which takes the lives of their sons to defend our Nation.

To give them anything less would be unworthy of our own history and unworthy of our aspirations as a nation. For, as Abraham Lincoln stated:

> Those who would deny freedom to others, do not deserve it themselves. And, under a just God, they will not long retain it.

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield one minute to the gentleman from California [Mr. SAUND].

Mr. SAUND. Mr. Chairman, when the vote was taken in the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs on this bill, I was absent. I had accepted an invitation to speak before a group of State Department employees. I was unavoidably delayed. As I have stated to the chairman of the committee, if I had been present I would have voted for granting statehood to Hawaii, with an unqualified and emphatic "Yes."

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4½ minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. EDMONDSON].

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, I consider it the greatest honor I have known in my service in the House to have the privilege of being one of the closing speakers for the committee on this matter of Hawaiian statehood. I had intended to discuss from this well in the closing minutes the issue of communism, but I believe that has been so adequately handled by the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Un-American Activities and by the evidence put before us here today that no further comment is necessary.

To me the most convincing answer to any charge that suggests disloyalty or subversion among the people of Hawaii is their battlefield record in Korea. You cannot look at that record and see what it tells of heroism and loyalty of the Hawaiian soldiers without concluding that here is a people deserving of our trust and confidence. Remember, there has been only one battlefield of the world where American arms thus far have met the challenge of Communist arms, and that was the battlefield of Korea. On that battlefield, with 4½ times as many casualties per unit of population as the average for other States in this Nation, the people of Hawaii have demonstrated and proved their loyalty and their right to full participation in this Republic.

Three months ago, Mr. Chairman, I walked in the shadows of the walls of the Kremlin with a distinguished young American who is giving his life to the fight against communism. I asked him in the shadow of those walls in Moscow, "What could we in Congress do to contribute most effectively to this worldwide fight against the Communist conspiracy?" I would like to tell you here today that his answer was direct and unequivocal on the question of Hawaii. It was not. He did not say, "Vote statehood for Hawaii." But he did say something that leads to that conclusion. He said, "Give us from the Congress positive and affirmative acts to show the world what democracy means and what it stands for."

That is what we do here today, Mr. Chairman. We give to the world positive and affirmative acts by our votes and by admission of Hawaii to demonstrate to the world that the American dream is not limited to one continent, that the American dream is not limited to people of one particular racial strain or one particular national origin. We say to the world we believe in this American dream and we believe in it for all people who qualify for participation in this Union of States.

We say also to the world that America honors her commitments, that when we enter into a commitment with an incorporated Territory we keep that commitment and we extend to that Territory when it is ready for statehood the mantle of statehood and all that goes with it.

We also say to the world that we are not afraid of communism or the Communist philosophy among the people who know what the American dream stands for. Regardless of our people's racial origin, regardless of their place of birth, we have no fear that they will abandon American principles and American ideals for this Communist philosophy, in the Hawaiian Islands or any place else where statehood is entrusted to a people.

So I say to you today, we have the opportunity here with a positive and affirmative act to spread the glory of the American dream 2,000 miles to the west, and to say to a great people, we admit you to full partnership in this Union. And we are not afraid of the 2,000 miles, either. We know that you can go from Washington to Honolulu in less than 1 day. When this Nation was conceived it took 4 days to travel from Washington to Philadelphia. Today we travel the thousands of miles from here to Hawaii and we do it in less than a day.

We say to the world, "We are citizens of a new age and a new world. We are writing into law, with the new State of Hawaii, a new foundation for our Government and its future that recognizes this new age."

STATEMENT OF CONGRESSMAN B. F. SISK, 12TH DISTRICT, CALIFORNIA

Mr. SISK. Mr. Chairman, as a member of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and of the subcommittee having jurisdiction over statehood, I am happy today to rise in support of full citizenship for the people who will become our 50th State. As a member of the Territories Subcommittee, I have supported statehood for Hawaii for the past 4 years. That support has been based upon my firm conviction that the residents of the islands were entitled to the full rights and privileges of citizenship. That feeling, however, had been rather an impersonal one based upon my philosophy and hearsay, rather than upon actual knowledge. Last fall, as a member of the special committee heretofore mentioned in this debate, it was my privilege to visit the islands and today my support is based upon a deep personal conviction of the absolute necessity to grant statehood to this area. It was my opportunity to meet and talk to hundreds of people in all walks of life and this led me to the deep conviction that here was a group of people of mature capabilities well able to carry out their duties and responsibilities as a sister State. Because of my contacts with labor unions, business organizations, educational people, religious and social leaders, I am deeply convinced of their awareness of and their ability to cope with the Communist issue in their area.

Allegations of Communist domination in Hawaii are again being injected into the statehood issue as a reason for delaying admission of this Territory into the Union.

I should like to make two points clear with respect to the revival of this line of attack.

The people of Hawaii and their many friends and mainland supporters know this tactic and they are most anxious that it be recognized. Its sole aim is the defeat of pending legislation for Hawaiian statehood.

The people of Hawaii, by vote of their Territorial legislature in 1949, requested the House Un-American Activities Committee to come to Hawaii and make an on-the-spot investigation.

The confidence of the people of Hawaii that they would be vindicated was justified by the reports of the committees which followed.

A subcommittee of the House Committee on Un-American Activities subsequently, during April 1950, conducted an investigation of Communist activities in the islands. Upon its conclusion, neither the Democratic chairman, Representative FRANCIS E. WALTER, nor the ranking Republican member found any cause whatever for withholding statehood from the Territory. As recently as the opening weeks of this 86th session of the Congress Representative WALTER voluntarily appeared before the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs to reaffirm his belief that Hawaii should be granted statehood.

We have never assumed that there were no Communists in Hawaii. To do so would be as dangerous as it would be naive. Hawaii is too important to have been overlooked by the enemies of our way of life. However, the problem of communism in Hawaii is a national problem, just as it is in New York, and in

California, and everywhere else in the Nation.

We must not fall into the error of attempting to isolate a whole community of American citizens, and to keep them in isolation, just because there are some Communists among them.

A large number of labor unions are represented by locals in Hawaii. In only one of them, the largest, has there been a question of Communist influence. This is the International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union, headed in San Francisco by Harry Bridges. It has been expelled from the CIO as part of the national organization's campaign against communism. More recently, it was accused of being Communist-dominated by one of its former leaders, Jack Kawano, in testimony before the subcommittee of the House Un-American Activities Committee.

As part of a nationwide roundup of alleged Communist leaders, the Federal Bureau of Investigation in September 1951 arrested seven persons in Hawaii on charges of violating the Smith Act. All seven were indicted by a Federal grand jury composed of Hawaii citizens.

On June 19, 1953, a jury of Hawaii citizens returned a unanimous verdict of guilty against all seven defendants. The fact that the verdict was nullified by the U.S. Supreme Court, does not destroy the importance of this example of Hawaii's ability to handle whatever Communist problem there may be.

It was during the 1949 waterfront strike that the Territory demonstrated most conclusively that it was able to control the effects of a vital labor-management dispute.

During the 1949 dock strike the Territorial legislature was convened in special session. A law was enacted authorizing the Territory to take over the docks and carry on stevedoring operations until the strike was settled. This law remains in effect and Hawaii's legislators have rebuffed efforts by the ILWU to have it repealed.

As a consequence of this strike the Hawaii Residents' Association was formed to carry on an educational program to combat communism. This association has continued its program for almost 10 years, supported by voluntary contributions from Hawaii's people.

In a further demonstration of Hawaii's determination and ability to deal with communism, the legislature established a Territorial commission on subversive activities. This commission serves as an investigating body and issues periodic reports on whatever evidence of lingering communism may be uncovered.

Thus have the people of Hawaii demonstrated their determination to handle their own Communist problem. In this way they have offered further evidence of their loyalty, political maturity and ability to fulfill the added responsibilities of statehood.

HOME RULE FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Chairman, statehood for Hawaii will be recognition, at last, of an old American principle. Those who govern themselves are governed best.

The great progress Hawaii has made, the prosperity of the islands and the achievements of their community have qualified them for equal status with the States of the Union.

If there are any who doubt the benefits of self-government, I would like to refer them, for contrast, to the Commissioners' recent report to Congress on the state of the Nation's Capitol, the District of Columbia. Its pages make somber reading. Washington, after 85 years of Federal control of local government, is in a serious plight. The cold statistics of the Commissioners' report give a sorry picture of what can happen to a great city without self-government.

And the Commissioners themselves, and some of the Members of Congress most experienced in District affairs, are the first to declare that Washington needs its own local self-government.

My point, Mr. Chairman, is that it is time to examine the state of the District and ask ourselves whether, in good conscience, we can continue to deny the people of Washington the power and opportunity to deal with problems they are now helpless to attack. Look at the facts.

They show that much of the District is being blighted by slums. Higher income families are moving out and are being replaced by low income families unable to bear the tax burden required to run a modern city. Property values are declining and welfare costs are rising.

Decay has set in in the downtown business areas. Retail sales in the District decline while business is booming in nearby Maryland and Virginia.

District government finances are in trouble and the forecast in years ahead is even darker.

This picture, I submit, is in sharp contrast to the glowing economic health of Hawaii. It cannot be blamed on the voteless citizens of the District. We, not they, have presided over the decay of Washington.

It is true that many cities in this country are struggling with similar problems. But the people of other cities can fight their problems with their powers of self-government, local initiative and local enterprise. The people of Washington are denied even the chance to try to solve their problems.

If 85 years of nonrepresentative government have brought the Nation's Capital to this crisis, I say it is time for a change. Certainly, the people of the District could do no worse. I think they could do a lot better because I have faith in local self-government.

Hawaii has shown what local self-government can accomplish. When the time comes later this session—I hope not much later—let us bestow at least a measure of self-rule and self-respect on the nearly million people of the District by granting home rule.

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Chairman, I want to add my voice to those urging immediate passage of this bill to enable Hawaii to become a State. This measure is long overdue. The repeated promises, the repeated efforts that have been made, some by this House, to grant statehood can be crowned today by this effort.

I know of no one in this body with whom I have talked who thinks of this addition to our flag as a symbol of empire. We have no imperial intentions as we welcome Hawaii to the Union. We have no colonial designs. Instead Hawaii comes in as have 49 before her—agreeing to federate because in union there is strength. Her sovereignty as a State remains as does the sovereignty of all States. Her cooperation as a member of the Union lends strength to her and to this Federal Government.

The facts regarding Hawaii are available to all who have read the excellent report of the committee chaired by the distinguished gentleman from Colorado. I noted, in particular, the fact that Hawaii has a greater population today than any other State—but the original 13 and Oklahoma—had when admitted to the Union. It is larger in area than my own State of Connecticut. While it is true that its territory is not contiguous with the country, neither was California. Neither is Alaska.

The mail I have had from my district is overwhelmingly in favor of admission. Connecticut has historic ties with the Hawaiian Islands. Its people were among the first missionaries to settle there. The ancestor of a former Senator from Connecticut played an important part in its history. More recently, many of Connecticut soldiers who served in the Pacific in World War II had occasion to become familiar with the islands.

I would like to pause briefly to pay tribute to the Hawaiian participation in that war. As one who served in Italy, I am familiar with the record and achievements of the 442d Regimental Combat Team, the famous Go-for-Broke outfit. Their courage, their tenacity, their drive has gone down in the history of the Fifth Army. In the Pacific theater, I am particularly aware of the work done at the Amphibious Landing Training Center on the island of Oahu, where techniques of Pacific assaults were taught to members of divisions staging for combat. I know, of course, of the great bastion at Pearl Harbor and the Army installation at Schofield Barracks that marked this outpost of American defense.

Since 1903, Hawaii has petitioned no less than 17 times for statehood. We have repeatedly promised her the full rights and privileges of statehood. Let us make that pledge good.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Chairman, I would like to comment briefly on the legislation before us, to provide statehood for Hawaii.

I have listened carefully and intently to the debate on this bill, both yesterday and today. The testimony and evidence presented leaves little doubt but that the majority of the people of Hawaii desire statehood. They wish to be joined more closely with our Nation. They want to be an integral part of our Nation. They desire to be admitted to the Union as the 50th State.

I have no doubt that the people of Hawaii would prove loyal citizens of such a new State, and loyal citizens of the United States of America. Their

past history and past endeavors make that point clear. Further, their energies and talents, and the resources of their Territory, would prove a definite asset to our great Nation.

In spite of these facts which argue strongly for the enactment of the legislation before us, I feel that I should voice certain reservations which have not been dispelled in this debate. These reservations do not cast any reflections upon the people of Hawaii—on their loyalty, their sincerity, or their strong desire to become entirely included in our Nation.

My reservations are based on a simple geographical fact: The fact that the Territory of Hawaii is, and will always remain, separated from our continent by thousands of miles of the Pacific Ocean. The Territory is not contiguous to our country. It has a separate geographical identity. This geographic location of the Hawaiian Islands has certain definite implications as far as the defense and security of the proposed 50th State are concerned.

It is very true that we have already assumed certain responsibility for the security and defense of Hawaii—a responsibility which will continue even if Hawaii should not be granted statehood. The fact remains, however, that—in the admission of Hawaii to statehood—our responsibility in this field will increase, and the discharge of that responsibility may entail problems which we have not encountered to date.

This is the only point that I wanted to stress. I believe that we must face this fact squarely as we vote to admit Hawaii to the Union. To avoid this issue, or to minimize its implications, would be very shortsighted.

Fully conscious of the new responsibilities it will entail, I shall vote for statehood for Hawaii because I believe that the reasons for the enactment of the bill before us outweigh the reasons which argue for another course of action. I sincerely hope that Hawaii, and our entire Nation, will in the long run benefit from this decision.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Chairman, there are over 800,000 people living almost in the shadow of our Capitol, the world's greatest symbol of liberty and freedom—who have no voice in shaping the destiny of even their own affairs through self-government. In many States, because of disproportionate representation in State legislatures, many citizens of those States are referred to as second class citizens. In the District of Columbia these 800,000 people are not even citizens. So far as the law and the present situation continues, we the people of this great Government, we who proudly refer to our Government as a government of the people, by the people, and for the people, treat these people of the District as children. We Representatives in Congress who are elected to represent our districts are forced to sit as members of a city council or as members of a school board to look after the affairs of people who can and will take care of their own affairs and do it much better than we can, and if we gave them the right of representation here as we should they would give as good an account of themselves in this body as the new Representatives that this new State will send to this body.

Last year we granted the right to vote and representation in this Congress to the people of Alaska who have more territory and less people than any other State in the Union. In fact the election before they voted for the approval of statehood indicated that there were less than 30,000 people who were sufficiently interested in government to vote. We gave these people the right to have two votes in the U.S. Senate and one vote in the U.S. House of Representatives. Three votes in the greatest legislative body in the world.

My question, Mr. Chairman, is this: Is it not more important to give the people in the District a voice in their own government at least than it is to give people in far-off Alaska and in faraway Hawaii the right to be represented here?

These people can truly state that they are worse than second class citizens. They have every right to complain and join the refrain of another day which said, "Taxation without representation is tyranny."

Both Hawaii and the District of Columbia, I sincerely believe, present us with a basic moral issue. It is this—do we have a right and can we justify denying fellow Americans the rights of citizenship—the right to achieve equality? Is it right to ask their sons and daughters to face the enemy and fight with bullets and not give them the right to fight with ballots? It is my feeling that this Congress will and should meet this moral issue so far as Hawaiian statehood is concerned and in doing so I think we accept an equal moral obligation to grant our fellow Americans who live in the District of Columbia the right to at least govern their own local affairs.

Let us now give immediate attention the rights of people of the District of Columbia—who have been voteless much too long—the people of our country will approve and the freedom-loving people of the world will applaud.

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Chairman, I want to go on record for statehood for Hawaii. Throughout our history three basic requirements have been demanded by tradition and precedent before a State can be admitted into this Union of ours: First, that the inhabitants of the proposed new State be imbued with, and sympathetic toward, the principles of democracy as exemplified in the American form of government; second, that a majority of the electorate desire statehood; third, that the proposed new State have sufficient population and resources to support a State government and to provide its share of the cost of the Federal Government.

With regard to the first requirement, there can be no question that the people of the Hawaiian Islands are thoroughly American. Their wartime record of patriotism leaves no doubt of their loyalty to the mainland, and I am sure my colleagues will agree that this loyalty is most certainly an integral part of our concept of Americanism. Hawaiians, regardless of ancestry, look to the West for guidance and emulation. Whether it be business, education, sports, politics, or mores, the pattern is always unmistakably American. Hawaii is in every way a mirror of the mainland. It is the showcase of American democracy.

Now, Mr. Chairman, concerning the second requirement that a majority of the electorate desire statehood. The record of Hawaii is quite clear in this respect. In a 1940 plebiscite, her people voted 2 to 1 for statehood. A decade later they approved the proposed State constitution by more than a 3 to 1 majority. More recently, the ratio of approval has jumped from the 3 to 1 ratio in 1946 to an 8 to 1 ratio in August of 1958. The people of the islands desire to participate in the full responsibilities of American citizenship.

Mr. Chairman, the third requirement for statehood—the ability to pay for statehood—poses no problem for Hawaii. The gross Territorial product of Hawaii for 1957 was about 1¼ billion, a figure twice as large as that of any other State at the time of its admission. In 1956 the per capita income exceeded that of 26 States, while the per capita tax burden was higher than that of 33 States.

The Territory is comparatively thickly settled with a population of about 582,000. In fact, Hawaii today has a greater population than that enjoyed at the time of admittance to the Union by any of the States, with the single exception of the State whose Fifth District I represent, Oklahoma.

Mr. Chairman, America was founded, and has grown into the great Nation she now is, on the principles of dealing fairly with all her people and granting equal rights to all those able to fulfill their responsibilities and share in carrying the common burdens. Hawaii has long since served her apprenticeship in the American way of life and the American way of government. She has accepted voluntarily and wholeheartedly our ideas, concepts and methods. Statehood for Hawaii and the obligations State sovereignty will impose on her people will bring the true spirit of liberty to the islands. Hawaii, the window through which all Asia views American democracy, will assume this last challenge with dignity and fortitude.

Mr. LIBONATI. Mr. Chairman, it is a foregone conclusion that H.R. 4221, presently substituted by S. 50, passed by the Senate on March 11, will pass the House by a comfortable margin estimated by good authority as 340 to 66.

The success of the measure was largely a result of the sagacious handling of the legislation by Delegate JOHN BURNS in the 85th Congress. His courage was matched only by his good judgment in acceding to the delay of the Hawaii bill in order to insure the adoption of the Alaska bill.

Under the forceful leadership of the gentleman from New York [Mr. LEO O'BRIEN], the opposition crumbled into total insignificance.

The prophecy that I made on July 31, 1958, relative to the recognition of Hawaii is now, as far as the House is concerned, a reality.

I am proud to insert in the RECORD the prediction that I made at that time together with the merited praise ac-

corded to Delegate BURNS, of Hawaii. I congratulate him on his foresight and leadership:

Mr. LIBONATI. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege to attest to the sincere efforts of Delegate JOHN BURNS, representing Hawaii, in his laborious and persistent campaign to successfully carry the banner of his constituency into the circle of States.

In spite of the vicious opposition waged against Hawaii's admission, he has always maintained the patient and polite attitude of a gentleman. He earned the confidence and trust of all his colleagues and has demonstrated forensic abilities on the floor and in his committee work that commands the respect and admiration of the Congress and officials of Govefnment.

Personally I am proud to number him among my intimate friends. He has so impressed me—a new Member—with his appeals for the admittance of Hawaii that I sponsored a bill for its admittance.

It is unfortunate that because of a combined effort on the part of several geographical divisions within the congressional membership that the presentment of both Alaska and Hawaii at the same session would, as in the past, sealed their doom.

So that it was the consensus of the opinion of the supporters of both States to delay the Hawaii bill and press for the Alaska bill—after many filibusters and other delaying tactics including some 15 quorum calls and lengthy debate about 3 days—it was purely a setup political stampede.

The treatment of the Alaska bill in the Senate followed the same pattern. And the threat was made that the Hawaii bill's filibustering would make the Alaska job look like a Sunday-school meeting.

Delegate BURNS succumbed to our advice. He could not jeopardize the Hawaii bill—the solid membership of both bodies, northern Democratic stalwarts and pro-Republican State men from the high timber and urban sections of the North, so decided. And they knew what they were talking about.

It has come to our attention that certain political promising wild guessers are blaming Delegate BURNS for the delaying to next session the statehood campaign for Hawaii.

No one was more anxious than Delegate BURNS to go ahead. We decided it for him—and we do the voting.

It will take a full campaign for 3 or 4 months to put over the Hawaii bill, so that means lack of time made the decision necessary. We stand behind Hawaii with an honest and sincere desire to establish her statehood. And we stand behind Delegate BURNS, the finest representative and most popular public servant in the Congress. His return insures the realization of the dreams of every Hawaiian.

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Chairman, I was privileged last year to cast my vote in favor of statehood for Alaska. I do not wish to repeat here the many valid reasons given by my colleagues in support of statehood now for Hawaii. To my mind those arguments are as compelling today in favor of Hawaii as they were in the last Congress in favor of Alaska.

It is also my belief that an overwhelming majority of the people of my congressional district desire that this Congress extend the long overdue advantages of statehood to the loyal people of Hawaii and that, in view of that fact, I should not consider this question from the standpoint of political or partisan objections, as I fear some of us are tempted to do.

I am particularly impressed with one extremely important result of the action we may be taking here today. Statehood for Hawaii, Mr. Chairman, in my mind will dramatically demonstrate that the people of the United States both cherish and practice the democratic ideal that our citizens do stand equal before the law regardless of color or creed.

The example of a State of Hawaii will shine in the Pacific for half the world's people to see and compare with the empty promise of equality held out by communism. Let us act now to set such an example.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Chairman, on this historic occasion in voting statehood for Hawaii our Government is keeping a promise made long ago. Hawaii has waited long and patiently. In some ways this long wait has not been in vain. The State constitution that has been adopted is a model one that might not have been so admirable had Hawaii gained admission earlier. The economy of Hawaii is better able to support a State government, and the voters of our new sister State have a maturity that will enable them to bear their new burdens with poise and their new obligations with dignity.

In the more than 100 years that have elapsed since Hawaiian statehood was first considered; and in the 22 hearings that have been held on that subject, no one man nor any single group of men can be given complete credit for the successful vote that is going to come about at the conclusion of this debate. However, special recognition should be given to a few who have participated in the culmination of Hawaii's long drive for statehood. I join in honoring the gentleman from New York [Mr. O'BRIEN], the chairman of the subcommittee, and the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ASPINALL], the chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR], the ranking majority member of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and himself a former chairman of the territorial subcommittee, are the trio whose teamwork has brought this bill to the floor today. On the Senate side, my own senior Senator, Senator MURRAY, of Montana, presided over many of the Interior Committee hearings and committee sessions to bring out the bill in that body.

I join my colleagues in paying tribute to the untiring efforts of Mr. George H. Lehleitner, of New Orleans, who has made statehood for Alaska and Hawaii a personal crusade.

But if any one man is to be singled out for his statesmanship, his tact, his patience and perseverance in the cause whose triumph we are today witnessing, it is Delegate JOHN A. BURNS. Insofar as I know, only the gentleman from Oregon, Mr. ULLMAN, and I, of all the Members of Congress, were born in Montana. However, the delegate from Hawaii also has that great distinction. He was born at Fort Assiniboine in northern Montana. If he desires to represent his new State in the other body he will be the only Member of that body who was born in Montana. If he returns to our side, AL and I will welcome him as the third Montana-born Member of the House of Representatives.

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Chairman, first, with extreme pleasure I compliment all the members of our Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, both those who oppose this bill, H.R. 4221, and those who favor it—on both sides of the committee aisle. It is a splendid presentation of the case—both pro and con—that they present us for our important and historymaking decision to be recorded yet this afternoon on a rollcall vote.

As you may readily surmise, I will vote for statehood for Hawaii. I have done so each of the other occasions it has been before us during my dozen years in this great legislative body. I voted during the 85th Congress for statehood for Alaska. I shall vote for the House bill before us now, or if the Senate bill for Hawaii statehood, which passed the U.S. Senate on yesterday afternoon, is substituted for our House bill, I shall vote for that.

Having listened throughout yesterday's several hours of debate, and then again from this morning at 11 a.m. adding this information to that which I obtained at Hawaii when I was there a few years ago officially for one of my House committees, I cannot but conclude that the fair and sound, reasonable action should be to again act affirmatively for its admission into the sisterhood of United States.

I will not now take the time of this committee of the House in general debate to reenumerate the substantial arguments in favor of the admission of Hawaii under this bill, and which arguments I at this time adopt as and for my own; nor, could I do less than compliment those who have debated against the bill for their manifestly well-prepared presentation of their antiphilosophy toward the bill. As this debate comes to a close I observe it as one of the most dignified and best presentations of factual information and summary I have listened to in my more than a dozen years upon this floor.

Furthermore, I know full well that our minds are pretty firmly already made up as to how each of us shall vote in an hour or so from now.

As to the Communist problem existing in Hawaii, which is stated as one of the very major objections to admitting Hawaii into statehood, I call your specific attention to the clear-cut, analytical, factual statement made on this very floor within the hour by the distinguished chairman of the House Committee on Un-American Activities, Mr. WALTER, who although he sat in committee hearings in Hawaii on the subject of communism and became pretty intimately familiar with the problem there existing, took this floor and emphatically urged the passage of this bill. Having been a member of the House Un-American Activities Committee myself for several years now, some of which years he has been the committee chairman, I have never known Mr. WALTER to advocate any congressional move which would mean either the strengthening of, or success

for, the Communist philosophy or program. Furthermore, we must not overlook the fact that any of these citizens of Hawaii can come to the United States of America as American citizens. They are American citizens where they are. They are not aliens in the sense which you and I ordinarily think of a person as being an alien.

Beginning at the time I was a teenager in my high school years I was more proud than otherwise of my Nation because it was designated as "the melting pot of nations." I doubt if I can be successfully contradicted when I now make the observation that probably 90 percent of the Members of this House can trace their ancestry back to parents, grandparents or great grandparents born in foreign countries. Hence the fact of there being many thousands of American citizens of foreign ancestry or lineage in what will be the new State of Hawaii does not destroy my sense of decision that it is in the best interests of our beloved Nation's security, defense and expansion that Hawaii be admitted to full statehood. I shall vote accordingly.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Chairman, I would like to add some remarks about the memorable occasion of today in which I had the pleasure of participating.

It is an honor to vote for statehood for Hawaii and to participate in this historical moment of the passage of this bill.

This is a living demonstration of democracy in action. It is proof of the vitality of the United States. It is a complete refutation of the Communist lies that we wish to perpetuate colonialism.

It is the fulfillment of the hope that we have long held out to the loyal people of Hawaii. It is the fruition of their dream. It is a complete demonstration of the honor and integrity of the United States.

Pearl Harbor will long be remembered as the point where the infamy of the totalitarians challenged the honor and courage of the United States. History records how we responded to that challenge.

Today, we say to the people of Pearl Harbor and to all Hawaiians that we not only remember Pearl Harbor but that we remember the people of Hawaii and their loyalty to the United States.

This vote today demonstrates that the United States offers more than the hope of freedom to the world. It is proof that the United States of America is synonymous with the word freedom.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Chairman, I am as happy to cast a vote in support of statehood for Hawaii as I was to cast a similar vote for Alaska last year.

On every count, the people of the Hawaiian Islands have proven their case for statehood.

The admission of these new States is a symbol to the rest of the world that America is still a young Nation and a growing Nation, a United States in which membership comes by the voluntary action and with the consent of both the new States and the old.

As a State, Hawaii will undoubtedly have to meet many problems of adjustment. The concentration of land ownership and the tight reigns on its control will quite likely become the concern of every American, particularly as Hawaii is drawn more closely to the Union. It will become increasingly difficult for one family to continue to own an island to itself and completely dictate the use of its land or the custom and habits of its people.

During my years in military service, I recall the restrictions which governed any military operations in and about the Island of Niihau, which was owned by one family and continues to be the property of one family today. This type of island proprietorship and matriarchal determination of what is good or bad for the occupants of an island must pass. Undoubtedly the longstanding grip of a few families on the fine and beautiful lands of Hawaii will in a like manner pass after more and more people migrate to the islands and among the islands in search of opportunity for work or pleasant living.

I know that Hawaii will take its proper place among the States and that adjustment to statehood will be quickly made.

The people of Hawaii owe a deep debt of gratitude to Delegate JOHN A. BURNS who worked with great and untiring devotion for the cause of Hawaiian statehood. It is my hope that the people of Hawaii will recognize these efforts as a newly admitted State.

Mr. DANIELS. Mr. Chairman, I am indeed very happy to be a Member of the 86th Congress which will vote upon Senate bill 50 for admission of the State of Hawaii into the Union. It is a great pleasure for me to join with my colleagues in the House in support of this bill. The economy of Hawaii is excellent and the loyalty and patriotism of its people during World War II and the Korean War was excellent, and, in my opinion, is still excellent today.

The people of Hawaii have petitioned the Congress of the United States no less than 17 times since 1903 to become a State of the Union. Hawaii has served its apprenticeship as a Territory longer than any other Territory now a State. These people are not foreigners, they are not Communists; they are people who seek to be brought into the full brotherhood of the Union of our 49 States. These people are imbued with the spirit and principles of our democracy as exemplified in our form of government. The people of this Territory deserve statehood. They are possessed with sufficient resources to support State government, as well as its share of the cost of the Federal Government.

Hawaii has demonstrated in many ways and many times its loyalty to our principles of government. It is my privilege to join with my colleagues of this House to vote for the admission of the State of Hawaii as the 50th State of the Union.

Mr. GIAIMO. Mr. Chairman, today is a historic day in the history of our beloved country.

Today by our vote on Hawaii we have shown once again to the world, as we have done throughout the history of our Nation, that ours is indeed a living, dynamic, and freedom-loving country dedicated to the principles enunciated in our Bill of Rights.

Today we have done our part to assure statehood for Hawaii. We have said to the world that the United States truly measures up to the oft-stated expression that it is man's greatest experiment in self-government. Our laws have long provided for admission to statehood of incorporated Territories when they should have attained the standards required for admission.

Today we are seeing these laws live and with such a magnificent vitality.

We are welcoming to the sisterhood of States an incorporated American Territory, 2,200 miles out in the Pacific Ocean, southwest of California, whose population is 85 percent native-born American and of diverse racial and national backgrounds, which are 23 percent Caucasian, 37 percent Japanese, 17 percent Hawaiian, and the remainder Filipino, Chinese, Korean, Puerto Rican, and others.

In effect we have proclaimed to all the world that America is for all Americans regardless of color, creed, or racial origin. We are welcoming a group of loyal Americans to the sisterhood of States realizing full well that the racial and national backgrounds of a majority differ from those of most continental Americans.

Surely this proves the spirit and words of the Constitution of these United States that America is not for some people, dependent on their race or color, or nationalistic background or religious belief, but rather that it is for all Americans. This has always been the heritage of America. This has always been the mission of America.

Today it has been proven once again to those who may need the proof.

I shall always remember with the greatest of pride for my country what has been accomplished in these last 2 days for Hawaiian statehood.

Truly, this has been a day in which history has been made and with humility and gratitude I am happy to have participated in it.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, on this historic occasion I am happy and privileged, on behalf of the people whom I represent in the Fourth Congressional District of Florida, to add my support to the legislation which is pending before this Committee granting statehood to Hawaii.

The record is abundantly clear that Hawaii, its people and its government have met every fair criteria and condition for joining us in this great union of sovereign States.

Over the many years that the issue of Hawaiian statehood has been considered, the people of Hawaii have waited patiently, and yet as Americans, have acted vigorously so that as this outstanding event in history takes place, the people of Hawaii can note with pride the progress which they have made.

As a star in the Pacific, the new State of Hawaii expresses a fulfillment of a hope—not only to Hawaiians, but to all people in the world who love and cherish freedom and respect of the individual found under our form of government.

Let us hope that the favorable and affirmative action which we take here today in the creation of the State of Hawaii will long be a shining light to the mass of humanity in this world still struggling mightily to achieve some small measure of a life free from fear, economic want, and political tyranny.

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the distinguished Delegate from Hawaii [Mr. BURNS].

Mr. BURNS of Hawaii. Mr. Chairman, I should like to thank each and every member of the Interior Committee, as well as each and every member of the Rules Committee, for his careful and thorough consideration of this present bill, for the time each has given, for the great interest and concern each has displayed. Personally, and on behalf of the people of Hawaii, I want also to express our deep and immense gratitude to those many Congressmen and Senators of both parties and those millions of American people who have worked for and supported Hawaii's efforts to be admitted as a sovereign State in the American Union. We convey, too, our respect to those Congressmen and Senators of both parties, and those citizens of the United States, who, while they have not supported Hawaiian statehood, have taken their stand out of conviction and out of concern for the same welfare of the same United States where we, in Hawaii, believe in and uphold with like conviction and like concern, and which we are convinced Hawaiian statehood will immeasurably advance.

I am proud and humbly thankful to stand here today on the floor of the U.S. House of Representatives as the representative of the people of Hawaii—of whom I am one—and to whom, as an American and as a human being, I owe so much. They are a great people and this is a great Nation. My only sorrow, and I assure you it is a deep one, is that so many of Hawaii's people and so many citizens of the 49 States and their Congressmen share, is that it is still necessary for someone to stand here before you and argue that Hawaii should be admitted as a State in the American Union.

Mr. Chairman, many people have remarked that the single greatest achievement for which the 85th Congress will go down in history was its passage of Alaska statehood. It is my deepest hope, the hope of the nearly 600,000 Hawaiian Americans, the hope of the vast majority of the American people everywhere, that the 86th Congress will go down in history as the Congress which authorized statehood for Hawaii.

Mr. Chairman, I share with many others the intense conviction that there is no more important piece of legislation before this Congress than Hawaii statehood. For passage of Hawaii statehood will usher in a great new era in the Pacific and in the East—in other words, in that area of the world whose astounding recent emergence has already placed in its hands the key to future world peace. Hawaii statehood will assure for America its full opportunity for leadership in the development of this major part of the world as a ground for thriving, free peoples, whose culture will be a strong, fruitful union of East and West. The outlines of this transformation are fast being drawn, and the State of Hawaii would provide a model agency and focal point through which the United States could play its part in shaping the direction of this transformation. Statehood for Hawaii would be our most decisive step to date in assuming this leadership and in opening up in this area a positive, invaluable avenue of approach.

There is no point in trying to elaborate here on Hawaii's many virtues and qualifications, on the many wonderful contributions it can make to our country as a State in the American Union.

What I do wish to point out is that Hawaii has waited long; that committee documents alone are so voluminous it would very likely take several months of sustained work for anyone to read them straight through; that Hawaii—unselfishly—precluded any good chance of its own passage in the last session of Congress to allow Alaska the full, free consideration it certainly deserved; and that Hawaii is willing and able to employ its talents, as a State equally with other States, in helping solve the vast and difficult problems which confront our American democracy in these times above all.

Mr. Chairman, on behalf of Hawaii's people, whom I am most privileged to represent, and who have always believed, and will always believe, that the Congress of the United States will never deviate from its historic effort to foster and secure liberty and self-determination for all its people, I express our earnest hope that this House, today, will enable Hawaii's people to assume their full, unfettered stature as Americans, as mature, responsible bearers of the American heritage in which they so deeply believe and whose ideals they have so wonderfully fulfilled.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired. The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, subject to the provisions of this Act, and upon issuance of the proclamation required by section 7(c) of this Act, the State of Hawaii is hereby declared to be a State of the United States of America, is declared admitted into the Union on an equal footing with the other States in all respects whatever, and the constitution formed pursuant to the provisions of the Act of the Territorial Legislature of Hawaii entitled "An Act to provide for a constitutional convention, the adoption of a State constitution, and the forwarding of the same to the Congress of the United States, and appropriating money therefor", approved May 20, 1949 (Act 334, Session Laws of Hawaii, 1949), and adopted by a vote of the people of Hawaii in the election held on November 7, 1950, is hereby found to be republican in form and in conformity with the Constitution of the United States and the principles of the Declaration of Independence, and is hereby accepted, ratified, and confirmed.

SEC. 2. The State of Hawaii shall consist of all the islands, together with their appurtenant reefs and territorial waters, included in the Territory of Hawaii on the date of enactment of this Act, except the atoll known as Palmyra Island, together with its appurtenant reefs and territorial waters, but said State shall not be deemed to include the Midway Islands, Johnston Island, Sand Island (offshore from Johnston Island), or Kingman Reef, together with their appurtenant reefs and territorial waters.

SEC. 3. The constitution of the State of Hawaii shall always be republican in form and shall not be repugnant to the Constitution of the United States and the principles of the Declaration of Independence.

SEC. 4. As a compact with the United States relating to the management and disposition of the Hawaiian homelands, the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act, 1920, as amended, shall be adopted as a provision of the Constitution of said State, as provided in section 7, subsection (b) of this Act, subject to amendment or repeal only with the consent of the United States, and in no other manner: *Provided,* That (1) sections 202, 213, 219, 220, 222, 224, and 225 and other provisions relating to administration, and paragraph (2) of section 204, sections 206 and 212, and other provisions relating to the powers and duties of officers other than those charged with the administration of said Act, may be amended in the constitution, or in the manner required for State legislation, but the Hawaiian home-loan fund, the Hawaiian home-operating fund, and the Hawaiian home-development fund shall not be reduced or impaired by any such amendment, whether made in the constitution or in the manner required for State legislation, and the encumbrances authorized to be placed on Hawaiian homelands by officers other than those charged with the administration of said Act, shall not be increased, except with the consent of the United States; (2) that any amendment to increase the benefits to lessees of Hawaiian homelands may be made in the constitution, or in the manner required for State legislation, but the qualifications of lessees shall not be changed except with the consent of the United States; and (3) that all proceeds and income from the "available lands", as defined by said Act, shall be used only in carrying out the provisions of said Act.

SEC. 5. (a) Except as provided in subsection (c) of this section, the State of Hawaii and its political subdivisions, as the case may be, shall succeed to the title of the Territory of Hawaii and its subdivisions in those lands and other properties in which the Territory and its subdivisions now hold title.

(b) Except as provided in subsection (c) and (d) of this section, the United States grants to the State of Hawaii, effective upon its admission into the Union, the United States' title to all the public lands and other public property within the boundaries of the State of Hawaii, title to which is held by the United States immediately prior to its admission into the Union. The grant hereby made shall be in lieu of any and all grants provided for new States by provisions of law other than this Act, and such grants shall not extend to the State of Hawaii.

(c) Any lands and other properties that, on the date Hawaii is admitted into the Union, are set aside pursuant to law for the use of the United States under any (1) Act of Congress, (2) Executive order, (3) proclamation of the President, or (4) proclamation of the Governor of Hawaii shall remain the property of the United States subject only to the limitations, if any, imposed under (1), (2), (3), or (4), as the case may be.

(d) Any public lands or other public property that is conveyed to the State of Hawaii by subsection (b) of this section but that, immediately prior to the admission of said State into the Union, is controlled by the United States pursuant to permit, license, or permission, written or verbal, from the Territory of Hawaii or any department thereof may, at any time during the five years following the admission of Hawaii into the Union, be set aside by Act of Congress or by

Executive order of the President, made pursuant to law, for the use of the United States, and the lands or property so set aside shall, subject only to valid rights then existing, be the property of the United States.

(e) Within five years from the date Hawaii is admitted into the Union, each Federal agency having control over any land or property that is retained by the United States pursuant to subsections (c) and (d) of this section shall report to the President the facts regarding its continued need for such land or property, and if the President determines that the land or property is no longer needed by the United States it shall be conveyed to the State of Hawaii.

(f) The lands granted to the State of Hawaii by subsection (b) of this section and public lands retained by the United States under subsections (c) and (d) and later conveyed to the State under subsection (e), together with the proceeds from the sale or other disposition of any such lands and the income therefrom, shall be held by said State as a public trust for the support of the public schools and other public educational institutions, for the betterment of the conditions of native Hawaiians, as defined in the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act, 1920, as amended, for the development of farm and home ownership on as widespread a basis as possible for the making of public improvements, and for the provision of lands for public use. Such lands, proceeds, and income shall be managed and disposed of for one or more of the foregoing purposes in such manner as the constitution and laws of said State may provide, and their use for any other object shall constitute a breach of trust for which suit may be brought by the United States. The schools and other educational institutions supported, in whole or in part, out of such public trust shall forever remain under the exclusive control of said State; and no part of the proceeds or income from the lands granted under this Act shall be used for the support of any sectarian or denominational school, college, or university.

(g) As used in this Act, the term "lands and other properties" includes public lands and other public property, and the term "public lands and other public property" means, and is limited to, the lands and properties that were ceded to the United States by the Republic of Hawaii under the joint resolution of annexation approved July 7, 1898 (30 Stat. 750), or that have been acquired in exchange for lands or properties so ceded.

(h) All laws of the United States reserving to the United States the free use or enjoyment of property which vests in or is conveyed to the State of Hawaii or its political subdivisions pursuant to subsection (a), (b), or (e) of this section or reserving the right to alter, amend, or repeal laws relating thereto shall cease to be effective upon the admission of the State of Hawaii into the Union.

(i) The Submerged Lands Act of 1953 (Public Law 31, Eighty-third Congress, first session; 67 Stat. 29) and the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act of 1953 (Public Law 212, Eighty-third Congress, first session 67 Stat. 462) shall be applicable to the State of Hawaii, and the said State shall have the same rights as do existing States thereunder.

SEC. 6. As soon as possible after the enactment of this Act, it shall be the duty of the President of the United States to certify such fact to the Governor of the Territory of Hawaii. Thereupon the Governor of the Territory shall, within thirty days after receipt of the official notification of such approval, issue his proclamation for the elections, as hereinafter provided, for officers of all State elective offices provided for by the constitution of the proposed State of Hawaii, and for two Senators and one Representative in Congress. In the first election of Senators from said State the two senatorial offices shall be separately identified and designated, and no person may be a candidate for both offices. No identification or designation of either of the two senatorial offices, however, shall refer to or be taken to refer to the term of that office, nor shall any such identification or designation in any way impair the privilege of the Senate to determine the class to which each of the Senators elected shall be assigned.

SEC. 7. (a) The proclamation of the Governor of Hawaii required by section 6 shall provide for the holding of a primary election and a general election and at such elections the officers required to be elected as provided in section 6 shall be chosen by the people. Such elections shall be held, and the qualifications of voters thereat shall be, as prescribed by the constitution of the proposed State of Hawaii for the election of members of the proposed State legislature. The returns thereof shall be made and certified in such manner as the constitution of the proposed State of Hawaii may prescribe. The Governor of Hawaii shall certify the results of said elections, as so ascertained, to the President of the United States.

(b) At an election designated by proclamation of the Governor of Hawaii, which may be either the primary or the general election held pursuant to subsection (a) of this section, or a Territorial general election, or a special election, there shall be submitted to the electors qualified to vote in said election, for adoption or rejection, the following propositions:

"(1) Shall Hawaii immediately be admitted into the Union as a State?

"(2) The boundaries of the State of Hawaii shall be as prescribed in the Act of Congress approved ----------, (Date of approval of this Act)

and all claims of this State to any areas of land or sea outside the boundaries so prescribed are hereby irrevocably relinquished to the United States.

"(3) All provisions of the Act of Congress approved ---------- reserving rights or powers to the United States, as well as those prescribing the terms or conditions of the grants of lands or other property therein made to the State of Hawaii are consented to fully by said State and its people." (Date of approval of this Act)

In the event the foregoing propositions are adopted at said election by a majority of the legal votes cast on said submission, the proposed constitution of the proposed State of Hawaii, ratified by the people at the election held on November 7, 1950, shall be deemed amended as follows: Section 1 of article XIII of said proposed constitution shall be deemed amended so as to contain the language of section 2 of this Act in lieu of any other language; article XI shall be deemed to include the provisions of section 4 of this Act; and section 8 of article XIV shall be deemed amended so as to contain the language of the third proposition above stated in lieu of any other language, and section 10 of article XVI shall be deemed amended by inserting the words "at which officers for all state elective offices provided for by this constitution and two Senators and one Representative in Congress shall be nominated and elected" in lieu of the words "at which officers for all state elective offices provided for by this constitution shall be nominated and elected; but the officers so to be elected shall in any event include two Senators and two Representatives to the Congress, and unless and until otherwise required by law, said Representatives shall be elected at large".

In the event the foregoing propositions are not adopted at said election by a majority of the legal votes cast on said submission, the provisions of this Act shall cease to be effective.

The Governor of Hawaii is hereby authorized and directed to take such action as may be necessary or appropriate to insure the submission of said propositions to the people. The return of the votes cast on said propositions shall be made by the election officers directly to the Secretary of Hawaii, who shall certify the results of the submission to the Governor. The Governor shall certify the results of said submission, as so ascertained, to the President of the United States.

(c) If the President shall find that the propositions set forth in the preceding subsection have been duly adopted by the people of Hawaii, the President, upon certification of the returns of the election of the officers required to be elected as provided in section 6 of this Act, shall thereupon issue his proclamation announcing the results of said election as so ascertained. Upon the issuance of said proclamation by the President, the State of Hawaii shall be deemed admitted into the Union as provided in section 1 of this Act.

Until the said State is so admitted into the Union, the persons holding legislative, executive, and judicial office in, under, or by authority of the government of said Territory, and the Delegate in Congress thereof, shall continue to discharge the duties of their respective offices. Upon the issuance of said proclamation by the President of the United States and the admission of the State of Hawaii into the Union, the officers elected at said election, and qualified under the provisions of the constitution and laws of said State, shall proceed to exercise all the functions pertaining to their offices in, under, or by authority of the government of said State, and officers not required to be elected at said initial election shall be selected or continued in office as provided by the constitution and laws of said State. The Governor of said State shall certify the election of the Senators and Representative in the manner required by law, and the said Senators and Representative shall be entitled to be admitted to seats in Congress and to all the rights and privileges of Senators and Representatives of other States in the Congress of the United States.

SEC. 8. The State of Hawaii upon its admission into the Union shall be entitled to one Representative until the taking effect of the next reapportionment, and such Representative shall be in addition to the membership of the House of Representatives as now prescribed by law: *Provided*, That such temporary increase in the membership shall not operate to either increase or decrease the permanent membership of the House of Representatives as prescribed in the Act of August 8, 1911 (37 Stat. 13), nor shall temporary increase affect the basis of apportionment established by the Act of November 15, 1941 (55 Stat. 761; 2 U.S.C., sec. 2a), for the Eighty-third Congress and each Congress thereafter.

SEC. 9. Effective upon the admission of the State of Hawaii into the Union—

(a) the United States District Court for the District of Hawaii established by and existing under title 28 of the United States Code shall thenceforth be a court of the United States with judicial power derived from article III, section 1, of the Constitution of the United States: *Provided, however*, That the terms of office of the district judges for the district of Hawaii then in office shall terminate upon the effective date of this section and the President, pursuant to sections 133 and 134 of title 28, United States Code, as amended by this Act, shall appoint, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, two district judges for the said district who shall hold office during good behavior;

(b) the last paragraph of section 133 of title 28, United States Code, is repealed; and

(c) subsection (a) of section 134 of title 28, United States Code, is amended by striking out the words "Hawaii and". The second sentence of the same section is amended by striking out the words "Hawaii and", "six and", and "respectively".

SEC. 10. Effective upon the admission of the State of Hawaii into the Union the second paragraph of section 451 of title 28, United States Code, is amended by striking out the words "including the district courts of the United States for the districts of Hawaii and Puerto Rico," and inserting in lieu thereof the words "including the United States District Court for the District of Puerto Rico,".

SEC. 11. Effective upon the admission of the State of Hawaii into the Union—

(a) the last paragraph of section 501 of title 28, United States Code, is repealed;

(b) the first sentence of subsection (a) of section 504 of title 28, United States Code, is amended by striking out at the end thereof the words ", except in the district of Hawaii, where the term shall be six years";

(c) the first sentence of subsection (c) of section 541 of title 28, United States Code, is amended by striking out at the end thereof the words ", except in the district of Hawaii where the term shall be six years"; and

(d) subsection (d) of section 541 of title 28, United States Code, is repealed.

SEC. 12. No writ, action, indictment, cause, or proceeding pending in any court of the Territory of Hawaii or in the United States District Court for the District of Hawaii shall abate by reason of the admission of said State into the Union, but the same shall be transferred to and proceeded with in such appropriate State courts as shall be established under the constitution of said State, or shall continue in the United States District Court for the District of Hawaii, as the nature of the case may require. And no writ, action, indictment, cause or proceeding shall abate by reason of any change in the courts, but shall be proceeded with in the State or United States courts according to the laws thereof, respectively. And the appropriate State courts shall be the successors of the courts of the Territory as to all cases arising within the limits embraced within the jurisdiction of such courts, respectively, with full power to proceed with the same, and award mesne or final process therein, and all the files, records, indictments, and proceedings relating to any such writ, action, indictment, cause or proceeding shall be transferred to such appropriate State courts and the same shall be proceeded with therein in due course of law.

All civil causes of action and all criminal offenses which shall have arisen or been committed prior to the admission of said State, but as to which no writ, action, indictment or proceeding shall be pending at the date of such admission, shall be subject to prosecution in the appropriate State courts or in the United States District Court for the District of Hawaii in like manner, to the same extent, and with like right of appellate review, as if said State had been created and said State courts had been established prior to the accrual of such causes of action or the commission of such offenses. The admission of said State shall effect no change in the substantive or criminal law governing such causes of action and criminal offenses which shall have arisen or been committed; and such of said criminal offenses as shall have been committed against the laws of the Territory shall be tried and punished by the appropriate courts of said State, and such as shall have been committed against the laws of the United States shall be tried and punished in the United States District Court for the District of Hawaii.

SEC. 13. Parties shall have the same rights of appeal from and appellate review of final decisions of the United States District Court for the District of Hawaii or the Supreme Court of the Territory of Hawaii in any case finally decided prior to admission of said State into the Union, whether or not an appeal therefrom shall have been perfected prior to such admission, and the United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit and the Supreme Court of the United States shall have the same jurisdiction therein, as by law provided prior to admission of said State into the Union, and any mandate issued subsequent to the admission of said State shall be to the United States District Court for the District of Hawaii or a court of the State, as may be appropriate. Parties shall have the same rights of appeal from and appellate review of all orders, judgments, and decrees of the United States District Court for the District of Hawaii and of the Supreme Court of the State of Hawaii as successor to the Supreme Court of the Territory of Hawaii, in any case pending at the time of admission of said State into the Union, and the United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit and the Supreme Court of the United States shall have the same jurisdiction therein, as by law provided in any case arising subsequent to the admission of said State into the Union.

SEC. 14. Effective upon the admission of the State of Hawaii into the Union—

(a) title 28, United States Code, section 1252, is amended by striking out "Hawaii and" from the clause relating to courts of record;

(b) title 28, United States Code, section 1293, is amended by striking out the words "First and Ninth Circuits" and by inserting in lieu thereof "First Circuit", and by striking out the words, "supreme courts of Puerto Rico and Hawaii, respectively" and inserting in lieu thereof "supreme court of Puerto Rico";

(c) title 28, United States Code, section 1294, as amended, is further amended by striking out paragraph (4) thereof and by renumbering paragraphs (5) and (6) accordingly;

(d) the first paragraph of section 373 of title 28, United States Code, as amended, is further amended by striking out the words "United States District Courts for the districts of Hawaii or Puerto Rico," and inserting in lieu thereof the words "United States District Court for the District of Puerto Rico,"; and by striking out the words "and any justice of the Supreme Court of the Territory of Hawaii": *Provided*, That the amendments made by this subsection shall not affect the rights of any judge or justice who may have retired before the effective date of this subsection: *And provided further*, That service as a judge of the District Court for the Territory of Hawaii or as a judge of the United States District Court for the District of Hawaii or as a justice of the Supreme Court of the Territory of Hawaii or as a judge of the circuit courts of the Territory of Hawaii shall be included in computing under section 371, 372, or 373 of title 28, United States Code, the aggregate years of judicial service of any person who is in office as a district judge for the District of Hawaii on the date of enactment of this Act;

(e) section 92 of the Act of April 30, 1900 (ch. 339, 31 Stat. 159), as amended, and the Act of May 29, 1928 (ch. 904, 45 Stat. 997), as amended, are repealed;

(f) section 86 of the Act approved April 30, 1900 (ch. 339, 31 Stat. 158), as amended, is repealed;

(g) section 3771 of title 18, United States Code, as heretofore amended, is further amended by striking out from the first paragraph of such section the words "Supreme Courts of Hawaii and Puerto Rico" and inserting in lieu thereof the words "Supreme Court of Puerto Rico";

(h) section 3772 of title 18, United States Code, as heretofore amended, is further amended by striking out from the first paragraph of such section the words "Supreme Courts of Hawaii and Puerto Rico" and inserting in lieu thereof the words "Supreme Court of Puerto Rico";

(i) section 91 of title 28, United States Code, as heretofore amended, is further amended by inserting after "Kure Island" and before "Baker Island" the words "Palmyra Island,"; and

(j) the Act of June 15, 1950 (64 Stat. 217; 48 U.S.C., sec. 644a), is amended by inserting after "Kure Island" and before "Baker Island" the words "Palmyra Island,".

SEC. 15. All Territorial laws in force in the Territory of Hawaii at the time of its admission into the Union shall continue in force in the State of Hawaii, except as modified or changed by this Act or by the constitution of the State, and shall be subject to repeal or amendment by the Legislature of the State of Hawaii, except as provided in section 4 of this Act with respect to the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act, 1920, as amended; and the laws of the United States shall have the same force and effect within the said State as elsewhere within the United States: *Provided*, That, except as herein otherwise provided, a Territorial law enacted by the Congress shall be terminated two years after the date of admission of the State of Hawaii into the Union or upon the effective date of any law enacted by the State of Hawaii which amends or repeals it, whichever may occur first. As used in this section, the term "Territorial laws" includes (in addition to laws enacted by the Territorial Legislature of Hawaii) all laws or parts thereof enacted by the Congress the validity of which is dependent solely upon the authority of the Congress to provide for the government of Hawaii prior to its admission into the Union, and the term "laws of the United States" includes all laws or parts thereof enacted by the Congress that (1) apply to or within Hawaii at the time of its admission into the Union, (2) are not "Territorial laws" as defined in this paragraph, and (3) are not in conflict with any other provision of this Act.

SEC. 16. (a) Notwithstanding the admission of the State of Hawaii into the Union, the United States shall continue to have sole and exclusive jurisdiction over the area which may then or thereafter be included in Hawaii National Park, saving, however, to the State of Hawaii the same rights as are reserved to the Territory of Hawaii by section 1 of the Act of April 19, 1930 (46 Stat. 227), and saving, further, to persons then or thereafter residing within such area the right to vote at all elections held within the political subdivisions where they respectively reside. Upon the admission of said State all references to the Territory of Hawaii in said Act or in other laws relating to Hawaii National Park shall be deemed to refer to the State of Hawaii. Nothing contained in this Act shall be construed to affect the ownership and control by the United States of any lands or other property within Hawaii National Park which may now belong to, or which may hereafter be acquired by, the United States.

(b) Notwithstanding the admission of the State of Hawaii into the Union, authority is reserved in the United States, subject to the proviso hereinafter set forth, for the exercise by the Congress of the United States of the power of exclusive legislation, as provided by article I, section 8, clause 17, of the Constitution of the United States, in all cases whatsoever over such tracts or parcels of land as, immediately prior to the admission of said State, are controlled or owned by the United States and held for Defense or Coast Guard purposes, whether such lands

were acquired by cession and transfer to the United States by the Republic of Hawaii and set aside by Act of Congress or by Executive order or proclamation of the President or the Governor of Hawaii for the use of the United States, or were acquired by the United States by purchase, condemnation, donation, exchange, or otherwise: *Provided,* (i) That the State of Hawaii shall always have the right to serve civil or criminal process within the said tracts or parcels of land in suits or prosecutions for or on account of rights acquired, obligations incurred, or crimes committed within the said State but outside of the said tracts or parcels of land; (ii) that the reservation of authority in the United States for the exercise by the Congress of the United States of the power of exclusive legislation over the lands aforesaid shall not operate to prevent such lands from being a part of the State of Hawaii, or to prevent the said State from exercising over or upon such lands, concurrently with the United States, any jurisdiction whatsoever which it would have in the absence of such reservation of authority and which is consistent with the laws hereafter enacted by the Congress pursuant to such reservation of authority; and (iii) that such power of exclusive legislation shall vest and remain in the United States only so long as the particular tract or parcel of land involved is controlled or owned by the United States and used for Defense or Coast Guard purposes: *Provided, however,* That the United States shall continue to have sole and exclusive jurisdiction over such military installations as have been heretofore or hereafter determined to be critical areas as delineated by the President of the United States and/or the Secretary of Defense.

SEC. 17. The next to last sentence of the first paragraph of section 2 of the Federal Reserve Act (38 Stat. 251) as amended by section 19 of the Act of July 7, 1958, (72 Stat. 339, 350) is amended by inserting after the word "Alaska" the words "or Hawaii."

SEC. 18. (a) Nothing contained in this Act shall be construed as depriving the Federal Maritime Board of the exclusive jurisdiction heretofore conferred on it over common carriers engaged in transportation by water between any port in the State of Hawaii and other ports in the United States, or possessions, or is conferring on the Interstate Commerce Commission jurisdiction over transportation by water between any such ports.

(b) Effective on the admission of the State of Hawaii into the Union—

(1) the first sentence of section 506 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended (46 U.S.C., sec. 1156), is amended by inserting before the words "an island possession or island territory", the words "the State of Hawaii, or";

(2) section 605(a) of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended (46 U.S.C., sec. 1175), is amended by inserting before the words "an island possession or island territory", the words "the State of Hawaii, or"; and

(3) the second paragraph of section 714 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended (46 U.S.C., sec. 1204), is amended by inserting before the words "an island possession or island territory" the words "the State of Hawaii, or".

SEC. 19. Nothing contained in this Act shall operate to confer United States nationality, nor to terminate nationality heretofore lawfully acquired, or restore nationality heretofore lost under any law of the United States or under any treaty to which the United States is or was a party.

SEC. 20. (a) Section 101(a)(36) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (66 Stat. 170, 8 U.S.C., sec. 1101(a)(36)) is amended by deleting the word "Hawaii,".

(b) Section 212(d)(7) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (66 Stat. 188, 8 U.S.C. 1182(d)(7)) is amended by deleting from the first sentence thereof the word "Hawaii," and by deleting the proviso to said first sentence.

(c) The first sentence of section 310(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, as amended (66 Stat. 239, 8 U.S.C. 1421(a), 72 Stat. 351), is further amended by deleting the words "for the Territory of Hawaii, and".

(d) Nothing contained in this Act shall be held to repeal, amend, or modify the provisions of section 305 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (66 Stat. 237, 8 U.S.C. 1405).

SEC. 21. Effective upon the admission of the State of Hawaii into the Union, section 3, subsection (b), of the Act of September 7, 1957 (71 Stat. 629), is amended by substituting the words "State of Hawaii" for the words "Territory of Hawaii".

SEC. 22. If any provision of this Act, or any section, subsection, sentence, clause, phrase, or individual word, or the application thereof in any circumstance is held invalid, the validity of the remainder of the Act and of the application of any such provision, section, subsection, sentence, clause, phrase, or individual word in other circumstances shall not be affected thereby.

SEC. 23. All Acts or parts of Acts in conflict with the provisions of this Act, whether passed by the legislature of said Territory or by Congress, are hereby repealed.

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York (during the reading of the bill). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered as read and open for amendment at any point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. POAGE: On page 2, section 2, line 17, strike out the period at the end of the sentence and insert a comma and add: "but all of such areas, lands, and territorial waters together with all other areas, lands, and territorial waters lying or being in the Pacific Ocean and not now constituting any part of the States of California, Oregon, Washington, or Alaska, and which are now or may hereafter come under the jurisdiction of the United States of America may be included, in whole or in part, in the State of Hawaii at any time or times, when a majority of the qualified voters of any congressionally authorized area therein shall vote to become a part of such State of Hawaii.

"(b) The Congress shall have the right to offer a referendum in all or any part or parts of such area and on such terms and conditions and to such voters as it may from time to time decide, but such areas, lands and territorial waters shall never be constituted into another State without the expressed consent of the State of Hawaii and of the United States of America."

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment, but I will reserve the right to argue it in order to permit my friend, the gentleman from Texas, to make his statement.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Colorado reserves the point of order. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE].

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, we have heard a very persuasive argument that the United States should not hold in bondage and should not own as chattel any human beings or as property the territory where other people live. I think that enunciates a rather sound principle. It proclaims on the part of the United States the abandonment of colonialism.

To the extent that this legislation abandons the policy of colonialism, it has worldwide appeal. This bill, however, does not carry that persuasive suggestion to its logical conclusion. It limits to a portion of what was once the Territory of Hawaii, what was once the Kingdom of Hawaii, the area of the new State. It leaves hanging as a part of no State, some portions of that Territory that was once ruled by the royal line of Hawaii. It leaves without any statehood status other islands and territories in the Pacific Ocean over which the American flag flies and over which we claim jurisdiction.

This amendment, if adopted, will provide not for the immediate incorporation of areas that may not presently fit into the organization of the new State, but it does provide an opportunity for the ultimate inclusion of every acre of American territory in the Pacific Ocean to be organized into the State of Hawaii. I see nothing so startling or unfair about that proposition. It seems to me that if you accept, as I will accept, the philosophy that every bit of this area should be organized into the boundaries of a State that we ought to here and now make provision for it. We are told by the proponents of this bill that they too feel that these remote areas should ultimately become a part of the new State, but they suggest that we should not act now.

What is the alternative? Mr. Chairman, there is but one alternative, and that is that we will again meet this issue, and that the time will come when this Congress will again be called upon to organize another state or other states in the Pacific Ocean.

I think it has been well pointed out here today that the Hawaiian Islands have the population, have the resources, have the ability to maintain viable State government. No one has contended, and I do not think anyone will contend, that the small islands to the west and to the south of Hawaii can by themselves be so organized as to have that economic stability needed for statehood. Yet when you exclude them today, you exclude them from any possible future consideration, and your only alternative somewhere down the line is to meet the question of admitting those small islands or part of them as another State in our Union. That is, you must ultimately so admit them or you must forever leave them as the property of a colonial United States.

Frankly, I do not want to have to admit another state. I am prepared to vote to bring Hawaii in as a state of the Union with all of the islands of the Pacific under the American flag along with it, but I want to finish the job. I do not want to leave the door open.

I am not here offering this amendment to destroy this bill; on the contrary, I

want here and now to perfect the bill. I am not here trying to prevent Hawaiian statehood. I am trying to prevent a continuation of colonialism. I will accept the policy of anticolonialism for the United States. I wish that it were so easy for some of our friends to accept it. Their problems are often more difficult than ours in this field. I condemn no one. I just want to take advantage of the opportunity which we have today.

Nor do I think that is is quite fair to say that we are going to bring Hawaii into the Union today and that when we need two more votes in the U.S. Senate then we will bring in Samoa or Guam. And if you think that is not going to happen I ask you in all fairness how are you going to bring statehood status to these people on the other islands of the Pacific I ask those who would like to put it off with a smile, how are you going to provide this statehood status for all of the nationals of U.S. territory unless you are prepared to give statehood to those small groups of islands? So, inevitably, Mr. Chairman, we have got to face the question, and now is the time to face it.

There is no purpose in trying to pass just any bill here this afternoon. A bill has already been passed at the other end of the Capitol. We surely have time to consider what actually should be done, and it will take but a few minutes to adopt an amendment. We have got time to do the thing that ought to be done this afternoon and to solve this whole problem at one time. It ought not to be put off. We ought to give to every man who owes allegiance to the American flag the right to be a citizen of a State, of a district or a Commonwealth associated with the United States of America.

I hope you will adopt this amendment and make it possible to include within the boundaries of Hawaii all of the American islands in the Pacific, and thereby to take away from this Congress the power to create another state in the Pacific Ocean. I hope the members of the Committee will be willing to accept this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose does the gentleman from Colorado rise?

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of my point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, my point of order is this: Rule 16, clause 7 provides that—

> No motion or proposition on a subject different from that under consideration shall be admitted under color of amendment.

This is our familiar rule of germaneness.

The bill with which we are dealing, S. 50, deals with the immediate admission of a new State into the Union, subject only to a proclamation by the President that certain essential conditions precedent have been fulfilled. Subsection (a) of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas deals with a different subject. It deals with the enlargement of that State at some indefinite time in the future under totally different circumstances. Moreover, it deals with that subject only in a hypothetical way. It presupposes that some other area will ask to be admitted as part of the State of Hawaii. These proposals are not germane to the subject of the bill before us or to the subject of the section of the bill which it is proposed to amend. And they are of doubtful constitutionality. I read from article IV, section 3 of the Constitution:

> SEC. 3. New States may be admitted by the Congress into this Union; but no new State shall be formed or erected within the jurisdiction of any other State; nor any State be formed by the junction of two or more States, or parts of States, without the consent of the legislatures of the States concerned as well as of the Congress.

Subsection (b), in addition, anticipates that these island areas may, at some future time, seek to become a separate State. It provides that they may become such if they so vote, and if the State of Hawaii consents, and if the Congress agrees. This situation is entirely foreign to the purposes of S. 50. The amendment is not germane and is contrary to the ruling of Mr. Speaker Orr recorded in 5 Hinds 5529 and Mr. Speaker Carlisle recorded in 5 Hinds 5837.

I shall read the decision by Speaker Carlisle on a bill for the admission of one Territory. The amendment provided also for the admission of several other Territories. It was held not to be germane:

> On January 17, 1889, the House was considering a bill of the Senate providing for the admission of the Territory of Dakota into the Union. The consideration of the bill was governed by a special order, which specified that the bill of the House (H.R. 8466) might be offered as a substitute. Instead of this bill, however, there was offered by Mr. William M. Springer, of Illinois, a substitute different in form and containing, with a provision relating to Dakota other provisions providing for the admission of Montana, Washington, and New Mexico.
>
> Mr. Julius C. Burrows, of Michigan, made the point of order that the proposed amendment was not germane.
>
> After debate the Speaker held:
>
> "When the gentleman from Michigan made the point of order, the Chair supposed that the gentleman from Illinois had offered as a substitute the bill H.R. 8466, which is the bill mentioned in the order made by the House. Of course, if the gentleman has not offered that bill, the question which the Chair proposed to submit to the House has not yet arisen. The Chair supposes that a mere technical difference between the two bills would not be material—for instance, a correction of a mere clerical error, or something of that sort. But it seems that the proposed substitute now offered by the gentleman from Illinois contains provisions of a substantial character and not contained in the original House bill. The Chair thinks, therefore, that the order does not apply to it, and believes that in accordance with the practice of the House and its rules, even since the House overruled its own decision in the case of California, that this substitute is not in order under the rules. The Chair holds therefore, that the substitute sent to the desk by the gentleman from Illinois does not come within the terms of the order made by the House, and hence is not in order under the rules and practice of the House."

Mr. Chairman, it has been well said by a distinguished presiding officer of this House that "The fundamental purpose of the amendment must be germane to the fundamental purpose of the bill" (8 Cannon 2911) before the amendment can be considered. This is the test and this is the rule by which the proposed amendment fails.

For these and other reasons—reasons such as the usual rule forbidding enlargement of the scope of a bill by an amendment—see, for instance, 8 Cannon 2913, 2914, 2915, 2918—I object to the amendment that has been offered.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. KILDAY). May the Chair inquire if the occasion the gentleman referred to, and the decision, was one involving a bill providing for the admission of one State and the substitute provided for the admission of an additional State or additional States?

Mr. ASPINALL. That is correct. It also provided for the determination of the question of statehood over areas which were not in the original bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair thanks the gentleman. The Chair will now hear from the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE].

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, basically the amendment which has been offered is one that changes the boundaries of the proposed State of Hawaii. The boundaries of the State of Hawaii are defined in the legislation before us. Certainly it is one of the subject matters presently before this House.

What are the boundaries of the area that we are bringing into the Union? Surely these boundaries are subject to change by amendment. Now, I take it certain of the boundaries may be established on time and certain of the boundaries may be established at a different time so long as it is done by or under the direction of this Congress. That has been done in the amendment. It was done in the case of numerous of the Western States when we did not have actual accurate maps of all of the areas at the time they were admitted. I am under the impression it was done at the time of the admission of the State of Maine. It was done at the time of the admission of the State of Texas. It has been done repeatedly. And, it can be done with the admission of the State of Hawaii.

We are therefore, by this amendment, fixing a different set of boundaries from those that were outlined in the original bill. We are providing that some of those boundaries shall be in effect today; that others of them shall be in effect at future dates upon the happening of future events. I therefore submit that the amendment is in order.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. KILDAY). The Chair is prepared to rule.

The gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE] has offered an amendment which has been read at the Clerk's desk. The gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ASPINALL] has made a point of order against the amendment that it is not germane to the bill.

In ruling on the first portion of the amendment, the Chair will point out that it seeks to add additional language to the last sentence of section 2 of the bill. Section 2 of the bill and the sentence to which it is proposed to add language deals with the boundaries of the new State of Hawaii to be admitted

under this bill, and the language of the proposed amendment likewise deals with the boundaries of the State to be admitted. As to paragraph B of the proposed amendment, the Chair would point out that this language would grant to the new State of Hawaii a right over land not included within the boundaries proposed in this bill but land outside of the boundaries, so that it would be granting to the new State of Hawaii a right over those lands which she does not now possess and would be one of the conditions on which she is admitted.

The Chair is constrained to hold that the amendment is germane to the bill and overrules the point of order.

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. STRATTON. Before the gentleman speaks in opposition to the amendment, I would like to say, as a colleague of the gentleman from New York, that as we move forward this afternoon toward this historic occasion whereby we give positive evidence to the Communist world that America is indeed still growing, I would like to pay particular tribute to my colleague and friend, the gentleman from New York [Mr. O'BRIEN] for the tremendous job which he has done in steering this bill through the various stages of the legislative process in this House. We in New York State are proud of the gentleman from New York for the job that he is doing in Congress, not only in connection with this bill but also for what he did last year in connection with the incorporation of Alaska into the Union. And we in New York are proud of the constructive and nonpartisan leadership which he has demonstrated in this House. I might say that if the gentleman from New York never does anything else in his legislative career—and I know that he will in fact do many more great things here—what he has done in connection with the Hawaii and Alaska statehood legislation will carve for him a real and lasting niche not only in the history of this body but of the Nation.

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, the Chair has disposed of the germaneness of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas. I would like to discuss its merits. May I say quite frankly that while the gentleman indicated he might or even would vote for the statehood bill if the amendment were included therein, as far as I am concerned, the price is entirely too high.

The gentleman testified eloquently and with great ability before our committee. He proposed this very plan that is now before the Committee. It was not offered in committee by a single member of the committee nor was it discussed by the committee itself. It is my honest belief that if you want to kill the statehood bill, here is the test because, in effect, the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas would bestow upon the Legislature of the new State of Hawaii the biggest legislative broom in history. They could reach out into the Pacific and make part of their State Guam. They could take the Trust Territories. They could have the strangest combinations possible. They would run into a situation where they might assert their right to a Trust Territory at the very moment that it was ceasing to be a Trust Territory. This would be too great a burden for any State to assume, let alone a new State. I hope that the Committee will reject the amendment.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. POAGE. I believe the gentleman misunderstood the amendment. It does not give Hawaii the right to reach out and bring anything in. It simply says that before you could admit those areas into any other State, the Legislature of Hawaii would have to join in the agreement. It does not bring anything in to Hawaii.

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. It certainly would give, in a fashion, the new State of Hawaii absolute control over the ultimate destiny, no matter what it might be, of these assorted islands, big and small. We would get into the most confusing international situation that I can imagine if we adopted this amendment.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Gladly.

Mr. POAGE. The amendment specifically provides that only the Congress of the United States can submit the referendum to the people of the other islands, and then only that they can become a part of Hawaii. It does not require any action on the part of the Hawaiian Legislature, but if the Congress should decide it wanted to create them into another State, it would have to have the consent of the Hawaiian Legislature, and only in that event. The purpose of that is to prevent the creation of another State, to say that they may be admitted to Hawaii, but not as another State at some future time.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. I yield.

Mr. ASPINALL. I am certain the gentleman did not wish to mislead the Committee. We did have this matter before the committee. It was proposed by the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. MORRIS]. It was voted upon, and with the exception of two or three votes, it was refused by the committee.

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. I thank the gentleman. He has refreshed my recollection. I think that makes it even more important to reject this amendment, because it was considered by the committee in Congress with the most intimate knowledge of this area, which has specific jurisdiction of these various areas in a legislative way. They considered the amendment, took into consideration the persuasive ability of the gentleman from Texas, and then voted it down.

I say that we would alter the whole face of this bill if we adopted this amendment.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, the argument just made by the gentleman from New York [Mr. O'BRIEN] in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE] boiled down, is that it would give Hawaii when admitted altogether too much authority and make it too big in area. Have we learned anything from tradition or history? If we have it is that nations are formed, grow, become so large, expand to such an extent that finally they fade out of the world picture.

In even our domestic affairs we have found it necessary to curb bigness as represented in monopolies.

The last few years this country of ours has been attempting to extend its influence throughout the world to tell the people in all the rest of the world and all the other nations what they should do. Yes, and on occasion what they should think. That is quite a job. It does seem to some that perhaps we should, before we tell other people what to do, set our own house in order—insure freedom in all parts of the world, establish it here.

If freedom of the individual be one of our goals, one of the purposes of our Government, it might be well to consider what has happened here. How the citizen is denied freedom, where freedom of the individual—the exercise of which harmed no one—has, by the U.S. Supreme Court, been denied the individual.

In the Apex Hosiery case, decided by the U.S. Supreme Court on May 27, 1940 (310 U.S. 469), the U.S. Supreme Court, in a suit for damages held that damages were not recoverable by the company from a labor union seeking to unionize the company's employees by violence and destruction of property, because the Sherman Antitrust Act did not apply to unions—that unions were exempt from Federal prosecution under that act.

Chief Justice Hughes, writing a dissenting opinion, concurred in by Mr. Justice McReynolds and Mr. Justice Roberts, among other things said:

> When the union demanded a closed shop agreement and, on its refusal, declared the strike, only 8 of the company's 2,500 employees were members of the union. The company's plant was seized and held for several weeks. Its machinery and equipment were "wantonly demolished or damaged to the extent of many thousands of dollars."
>
> There was not merely a stoppage of production, but there was also a deliberate prevention of the shipment of finished goods to customers outside the State.

In the final paragraph of the dissenting opinion, there is this statement:

> Once it is decided, as this Court does decide, that the Sherman Act does not except labor unions from its purview, once it is decided, as this Court does decide, that the conduct here shown is not within the immunity conferred by the Clayton Act, the Court, as it seems to me, has no option but to apply the Sherman Act in accordance with its express provisions.

In a case decided the next year—that of *U.S.* v. *Hutcheson* (312 U.S. 219), the Court held that strikes in restraint of trade, the purpose of which was to en-

force a secondary boycott, were not a conspiracy in violation of the Sherman law.

Here, again, Justice Roberts dissenting, and with his opinion Chief Justice Hughes concurred, pointed out that the Court was in error in holding that "because Congress forbade the issuing of injunctions to restrain certain conduct it intended to repeal the provisions of the Sherman Act authorizing actions at law and criminal prosecutions for the commission of torts and crimes defined by the antitrust laws" and added that the decision was radical legislation by the Court "where Congress has refused to do so."

In the case of *Bradley* v. *Local Union No. 3* (325 U.S. 797), decided in 1945, the Court, after holding that the Electrical Workers Union, through agreements with employers, had established a monopoly in the sale and servicing of electrical equipment in New York City, referring to the said union, said:

It intended to and did restrain trade and monopolize the supply of electrical equipment in the New York City area to the exclusion of equipment manufactured in and shipped in from other States, and did also control its price and discriminate between its would-be customers.

The Court stated the question this way:

Our problem in this case is therefore a very narrow one—do labor unions violate the Sherman Act when, in order to further their own interests as wage earners, they aid and abet businessmen to do the precise things which that act prohibits?

Among other things, the Court said:

Seldom, if ever, has it been claimed before, that by permitting labor unions to carry on their own activities, Congress intended completely to abdicate its constitutional power to regulate interstate commerce and to empower interested business groups to shift our society from a competitive to a monopolistic economy.

Then, by way of excuse, the Court said:

This, it is argued, brings about a wholly undesirable result—one which leaves labor unions free to engage in conduct which restrains trade. But the desirability of such an exemption of labor unions is a question for the determination of Congress.

Here, again, Justice Roberts dissented, as did Mr. Justice Murphy. Among other things, Justice Roberts wrote—page 814:

Unless I misread the opinion, the union is at liberty to impose every term and condition as shown by the record in this case and to enforce those conditions and procure an agreement from each employer to such conditions by calling strikes, by lockout, and boycott, provided only such employer agrees for himself alone and not in concert with any other.

* * * The course of decision in this Court has now created a situation in which by concerted action, unions may set up a wall around a municipality of millions of inhabitants against importation of any goods if the union is careful to make separate contracts with each employer, and if the union and employers are able to convince the Court that, while all employers have such agreements, each acted independently in making them—this notwithstanding the avowed purpose to exclude goods not made in that city by the members of the union; notwithstanding the fact that the purpose and inevitable result is the stifling of competition in interstate trade and the creation of a monopoly.

By its decision, the Supreme Court of the United States had decided that—page 819:

This Court, as a result of its past decisions, is in the predicament that whatever it decides must entail disastrous results.

These three decisions show how the freedom of the citizen has been destroyed by the Court. How a monopoly for certain union members has been established.

Today in New York State you cannot install and get electric equipment serviced so that you can use it unless it is manufactured by employees who belong to one union or serviced by members of a specified union. Why insist on freedom for people of other nations while denying it to our own citizens? That is the situation here in America today. Carry freedom to the people here, but don't linger on the way to dole out a little to the woman or man who, here at home, would like to work without paying tribute to a union boss.

One more example, and I will make it very, very brief. This is one you have heard so much about recently, about the farmer in the Fourth Congressional District of Michigan, Stanley Yankus, who grew and used wheat on land which he owns. What for? So that some producers of cotton, corn, rice, tobacco, peanuts, and wheat might get more for what they had to sell. Taking from one group and giving to another. He did not sell a kernel of the wheat he grew. He fed it all to his chickens.

In addition he purchased wheat on the open market. He reduced the surplus. Yet he was fined something like $5,000.

I know the fate of this bill. But let me tell you what one veteran thinks about freedom here at home. This letter is dated March 3, 1959:

DEAR SIR: Enclosed please find my endorsed World War II disability compensation check. This is to help pay the fine of Stanley Yankus for the crime of being an American. Each month as these checks come in I shall forward them to you for the above purpose, as the present state of justice and government for the people is far more disabled than I.

L. M. KNOWLES.

ROYAL OAK, MICH.

Here is a photostat of the check, for $19 and some cents, from the disabled veteran:

No. 2,786,012

CLEVELAND, OHIO,
February 28, 1959.

Treasurer of the United States: Pay $19 to the order of Loren M. Knowles, 1109 East Fifth Street, Royal Oak, Mich.

——— ———,
Regional Disbursing Officer.

(For Stanley Yankus fund.)

When Russia aside from our own country, is the only country trying to take over the rest of the world, when France, Great Britain, Belgium, and other countries have been relinquishing the authority they had over outlying territory, colonies, why should we follow down the road of bigness and ruin ourselves, fade out as did the nations of other days? Why expand until we fall apart? I cannot go along with a policy which I believe will destroy us as a Nation.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, the 86th Congress in the passage of this bill will go down in history as an historic Congress, just the same as the 85th Congress by its passage of the Alaskan statehood bill will always be recorded in history as an historic Congress. So we are going to culminate a very historic event today in the life of our country.

In connection with that, I want to compliment the chairman and all the members on the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, not only those who favor the bill but those who oppose it, because those who opposed it did so constructively from their angle, and they did not engage in any dilatory tactics.

I particularly want to compliment the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. O'BRIEN] because he, with another distinguished gentleman in the other body, that fine Senator from Montana, "JIM" MURRAY, will go down in history as two men who are the coauthors of two bills admitting States into the Union, Alaska and Hawaii.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. O'BRIEN] and "JIM" MURRAY, and no finer man did God ever make than JIM MURRAY, and that includes the gentleman from New York [Mr. O'BRIEN], will occupy a position in the history of our country, in my opinion, that no other Member of Congress will ever occupy in the future and that no Member has ever occupied in the past. They are the coauthors of bills that became law bringing two separate States into the Union of our country.

I also want to compliment the leadership in the other body for the outstanding manner in which the leadership has acted in bringing about the early passage of this bill in the Senate in a period of about 4 or 5 hours, and also in a period of 2 days bringing about the passage of three important bills—one, the authorization bill in relation to the outer space agency, known as NASA, the extension of the draft, and also the passage of this historic measure. That is the kind of leadership the country needs. The country needs firm leadership, good leadership, progressive-looking leadership, a leadership that recognizes responsibility and rises to the occasion. The kind of leadership that is weak and uncertain is properly subject to criticism, but a leadership that is fair and honest, decent and tolerant, firm and effective, and which produces results is the kind of leadership that should be complimented. I particularly refer to that great leader and great American, the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON].

Mr. Chairman, I rise to compliment the House on the passage of this historic measure and also to pay my respects to the chairman and all the members of this great committee as well as to compliment the other body and the leadership of the other body in the outstanding work that they have done.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I have only one question to ask. There has been extended debate here concerning communism, but there is this one question I would like to ask of the distinguished chairman who has had control of this bill. The gentleman filed a report over his name in which he admitted that the union that has leaders in it who are members of the Communist Party had control of the economy of Hawaii, and I heard the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania who has done such great work against the Communist menace in this country, say that same thing was true and that he also found that. Then they undertook to take the position that the granting of statehood to Hawaii would provide the means by which you could combat that Communist menace. I think the record ought to be clear here during this debate as to where the responsibility lies at the present time for the failure to effectively combat communism in the Hawaiian Islands up to this date. I sincerely hope that the chairman of the committee or someone can answer that question for us.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. I yield.

Mr. EDMONDSON. The gentleman is aware of the fact that the report to which he makes reference calls attention to the passage of a dock seizure bill by the Legislature of Hawaii in 1949 which was stoutly resisted by the ILWU and the Communist element and which they have been trying to repeal ever since its passage, but without success.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. That is not the question I asked. The fact of the matter is it was stated there has been no effective combating of the Communist situation in Hawaii up to date. I think we ought to know who is responsible for the failure up to date. Is it this Congress who is responsible or who is responsible for not having done something up to this date? I yield to the chairman because I think he is the one who ought to be permitted to answer that question in view of the report that he filed.

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Mr. Chairman, the report by the committee which visited Hawaii did not say that nothing was being done to combat communism in Hawaii. In fact, the very strength of our report was based upon what they were doing, and what they are doing in Hawaii. We were told by the highest authorities and the people responsible for security that the Communist apparatus there had become ineffective. We know of our own knowledge that the punishment meted out to the Communists there was punishment meted out by the people of Hawaii and by a Hawaiian jury, and these people escaped jail by a decision outside of the islands.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I do not yield further, because the gentleman is not answering my question. If that is true the ILWU still has control of the economy of Hawaii.

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. May I say to the gentleman, if he has asked me that question, that as far as the security of the United States is concerned that control to whatever extent it may be is just as serious to us whether Hawaii is a Territory or a State; but we believe that with statehood they can combat it even better than they are now doing.

Mr. PILLION. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. PILLION. Does the gentleman from Texas know that within the past month Mr. Hall, the Communist director of the ILWU, joined with Mr. Charles Kuomi, a member of the House of Representatives in Hawaii, and other radical ILWU members of the lower house of that legislature, and the whole membership of the Republican Party, to depose and get rid of the Democratic speaker, Mr. Esposito? And that the speaker who replaced that gentleman is now a creature of Mr. Hall and Mr. Kuomi? He was a leader of the Communist Party and the gentleman they put in as speaker sent a gavel to Mr. Bridges to open up the ILWU convention in San Francisco, and they now control the lower body of the House of Representatives in the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. I thank the gentleman from New York.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. KILDAY, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (S. 50) to provide for the admission of the State of Hawaii into the Union, pursuant to House Resolution 205, he reported the bill back to the House.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill was read a third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. PILLION. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. PILLION. I am.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman qualifies. The Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. PILLION moves that the bill S. 50 be recommitted to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion to recommit.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, on that I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were refused.

The motion to recommit was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken and there were—yeas 323, nays 89, not voting 22, as follows:

[Roll No. 11]

YEAS—323

Adair	Dwyer	Machrowicz
Addonizio	Edmondson	Mack, Ill.
Albert	Everett	Mack, Wash.
Andersen, Minn.	Evins	Madden
	Fallon	Magnuson
Anderson, Mont.	Farbstein	Mailliard
	Fascell	Marshall
Anfuso	Feighan	May
Arends	Fenton	Meader
Ashley	Fino	Merrow
Aspinall	Flood	Metcalf
Auchincloss	Flynn	Meyer
Avery	Fogarty	Michel
Ayres	Foley	Miller, Clement W.
Bailey	Forand	
Baker	Fountain	Miller, George P.
Baldwin	Friedel	
Baring	Fulton	Miller, N.Y.
Barr	Gallagher	Milliken
Barrett	Garmatz	Minshall
Barry	Gavin	Mitchell
Bass, N.H.	George	Moeller
Bass, Tenn.	Giaimo	Monagan
Bates	Glenn	Montoya
Baumhart	Granahan	Moorhead
Becker	Gray	Morgan
Beckworth	Green, Oreg.	Morris, N. Mex.
Belcher	Griffin	Morris, Okla.
Bennett, Fla.	Griffiths	Moss
Bentley	Gross	Moulder
Berry	Gubser	Multer
Betts	Hagen	Murphy
Blatnik	Halleck	Natcher
Boggs	Halpern	Nelsen
Boland	Harmon	Norblad
Bolling	Hays	O'Brien, Ill.
Bosch	Healey	O'Brien, N.Y.
Bow	Hébert	O'Hara, Ill.
Bowles	Hechler	O'Hara, Mich.
Boykin	Hemphill	O'Konski
Boyle	Henderson	O'Neill
Brademas	Herlong	Oliver
Bray	Hiestand	Osmers
Breeding	Hoeven	Ostertag
Brewster	Hogan	Passman
Brock	Holifield	Pelly
Broomfield	Holland	Perkins
Brown, Mo.	Holt	Pfost
Brown, Ohio	Holtzman	Philbin
Buckley	Horan	Pirnie
Budge	Hosmer	Poage
Burdick	Irwin	Porter
Burke, Ky.	Jackson	Powell
Burke, Mass.	Jarman	Price
Bush	Jennings	Prokop
Byrne, Pa.	Jensen	Pucinski
Byrnes, Wis.	Johnson, Calif.	Quie
Cahill	Johnson, Colo.	Quigley
Canfield	Johnson, Md.	Rabaut
Carnaham	Johnson, Wis.	Randall
Carter	Jones, Mo.	Reece, Tenn.
Cederberg	Judd	Rees, Kans.
Chamberlain	Karsten	Reuss
Chelf	Karth	Rhodes, Ariz.
Chenoweth	Kasem	Rhodes, Pa.
Chiperfield	Kastenmeier	Riehlman
Church	Kearns	Rivers, Alaska
Clark	Kee	Rivers, S.C.
Coad	Keith	Robison
Coffin	Keogh	Rodino
Cohelan	King, Calif.	Rogers, Colo.
Collier	King, Utah	Rogers, Fla.
Conte	Kirwan	Rogers, Mass.
Cook	Kluczynski	Rooney
Corbett	Kowalski	Roosevelt
Cramer	Lafore	Rostenkowski
Cunningham	Lane	Roush
Curtin	Langen	St. George
Curtis, Mass.	Lankford	Santangelo
Daddario	Latta	Saund
Daniels	Lesinski	Saylor
Davis, Tenn.	Levering	Schenck
Dawson	Libonati	Schwengel
Delaney	Lindsay	Scott
Dent	Lipscomb	Shelley
Derounian	Loser	Sheppard
Derwinski	McCormack	Shipley
Devine	McCulloch	Simpson, Ill.
Diggs	McDonough	Simpson, Pa.
Dingell	McDowell	Sisk
Dollinger	McFall	Slack
Dooley	McGinley	Smith, Calif.
Donohue	McGovern	Smith, Iowa
Dorn, N.Y.	McIntire	Spence
Doyle	McMillan	Springer
Dulski	McSween	Staggers
Durham	Macdonald	Steed

Stratton	Ullman	Westland
Stubblefield	Utt	Whitener
Sullivan	Vanik	Widnall
Teague, Calif.	Van Pelt	Wier
Teague, Tex.	Van Zandt	Wilson
Teller	Wainwright	Withrow
Thompson, N.J.	Wallhauser	Wolf
Thompson, Tex.	Walter	Wright
Thomson, Wyo.	Wampler	Yates
Toll	Watts	Younger
Tollefson	Weaver	Zablocki
Udall	Weis	Zelenko

NAYS—89

Abbitt	Gary	Patman
Abernethy	Gathings	Pilcher
Alexander	Grant	Pillion
Alford	Haley	Poff
Alger	Hardy	Polk
Allen	Harris	Preston
Andrews	Harrison	Rains
Ashmore	Hess	Ray
Barden	Hoffman, Ill.	Riley
Bennett, Mich.	Hoffman, Mich.	Roberts
Blitch	Huddleston	Rogers, Tex.
Bonner	Hull	Rutherford
Brooks, La.	Ikard	Scherer
Brooks, Tex.	Johansen	Selden
Brown, Ga.	Jonas	Short
Broyhill	Jones, Ala.	Sikes
Burleson	Kilburn	Siler
Casey	Kilday	Smith, Kans.
Colmer	Kilgore	Smith, Miss.
Cooley	Kitchin	Taber
Dague	Knox	Thomas
Davis, Ga.	Lennon	Thornberry
Dorn, S.C.	Mahon	Trimble
Dowdy	Mason	Vinson
Downing	Matthews	Wharton
Elliott	Mills	Whitten
Fisher	Moore	Williams
Flynt	Mumma	Winstead
Forrester	Murray	Young
Frazier	Norrell	

NOT VOTING—22

Bolton	Green, Pa.	Nix
Cannon	Hall	Smith, Va.
Celler	Hargis	Taylor
Curtis, Mo.	Kelly	Thompson, La.
Denton	Laird	Tuck
Dixon	Landrum	Willis
Ford	Martin	
Frelinghuysen	Morrison	

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Martin for, with Mr. Smith of Virginia against.

Mr. Celler for, with Mr. Thompson of Louisiana against.

Mr. Green of Pennsylvania for, with Mr. Willis against.

Mr. Morrison for, with Mr. Landrum against.

Mr. Ford for, with Mr. Tuck against.

Until further notice:

Mrs. Kelly with Mr. Curtis of Missouri.

Mr. Denton with Mrs. Bolton.

Mr. Nix with Mr. Frelinghuysen.

Mr. Hall with Mr. Dixon.

Mr. Hargis with Mr. Laird.

Mr. Cannon with Mr. Taylor.

Mr. DONOHUE changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The bill, H.R. 4221, was laid on the table.

PERSONAL ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I was in the well and I ask that my name be recorded as voting in the affirmative.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman cannot be recorded after the announcement of the vote unless he voted during the rollcall.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the RECORD be revised. I was standing here in the well.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman cannot be recorded by unanimous consent, if he did not vote. If the gentleman voted and wants to correct the RECORD and say that he is not recorded, he may do that but he cannot be recorded as voting if he did not vote.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I should have been recorded.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to extend their remarks in the RECORD on the bill, S. 50.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Appropriations may have until midnight tomorrow night to file a report on the District of Columbia appropriation bill for the fiscal year 1960.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, I reserve all points of order on the bill.

PUERTO RICO, NEXT STATE IN THE UNION?

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 10 minutes and to revise and extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, now that favorable action has been taken by the Congress to admit Hawaii into the Union as the 50th State, I submit the proposal that at the earliest possible occasion Congress should give consideration to the granting of statehood to another U.S. Territory which unquestionably deserves this recognition and meets all the criteria required for statehood. I refer, of course, to Puerto Rico.

Contrary to the prevailing opinion in the United States, a great majority of the people of Puerto Rico believe that the island merits statehood and they advance persuasive arguments in support of their views.

But first I wish to cite some facts about Puerto Rico. Our relationship with the island began in 1898 when Puerto Rico was formally ceded to the United States under the Treaty of Paris of that year. In 1900, Congress passed the first organic act reestablishing civil rule in the island and granting to its people the right to protection by the United States, including free trade, tariff protection and financial assistance. In 1917, Congress passed the second organic act granting U.S. citizenship to the people of Puerto Rico. As a result of the latter act, many Puerto Ricans have come to our shores and have become our neighbors.

Puerto Rico is now an autonomous Commonwealth voluntarily associated with the United States. On June 4, 1951, the Congress of the United States approved Public Law 600 to grant self-government to the people of Puerto Rico. On July 25, 1952, the new Puerto Rican regime was officially proclaimed and a constitution was drawn up setting up the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico.

Mr. Speaker, a paramount reason for the admission of Puerto Rico into the Union is the fact that a number of our legislators in the past, as well as both major political parties, have at various times urged eventual statehood for Puerto Rico. It will interest my colleagues to know that as long ago as March 9, 1900, Senator Lindsay, of Kentucky, declared as follows:

> Puerto Rico is essentially an American country. It lies almost within sight of our southern shores; and while its term of Territorial probation may necessarily be an extended one, there is no reason, in its geographical situation, in its industries, in its products, or in the character of its inhabitants that precludes it at some future time from being admitted into the Union as an American State.

These words sound almost prophetic today in the light of events.

A second argument in favor of statehood is that the platforms of both the Democratic and Republican Parties have in the past on various occasions called for eventual statehood for Puerto Rico. I prefer to believe that these political testimonials were not merely empty gestures but constituted a reflection of the sentiment of the American people.

Third, is the argument based on Puerto Rico's geographic position as it fits into the picture of strategic defense. I should like to ask my colleagues to look at the map of the Western Hemisphere. One of the most striking things as you look at the map is the location of Puerto Rico right in the center as the gateway from the Atlantic to the Caribbean Sea, and directly athwart of the approaches to the Panama Canal. The more you look at that location of Puerto Rico, the more you will become impressed with its strategic location and its major importance to the defense of our country, the Panama Canal, and the whole Western Hemisphere.

Finally, I submit the argument that the admission of Puerto Rico is amply justified by other important considerations, such as its economic growth and development, the adequacy of population, its financial stability, and similar requirements which the island meets most satisfactorily. In population, for example, Puerto Rico is far larger than that of any U.S. Territory at the time of its admission into the Union. According to the census of 1950, Puerto Rico's population at that time was 2,210,703, a figure almost 4½ times as that for Hawaii and more than 17 times as large as that of Alaska.

Puerto Rico's population is equal to or greater than 24 of our States: Maine,

Vermont, New Hampshire, Rhode Island, Connecticut, North Dakota, South Dakota, Kansas, Nebraska, Delaware, West Virginia, South Carolina, Mississippi, Arkansas, Oklahoma, Montana, Idaho, Wyoming, Colorado, New Mexico, Arizona, Utah, Nevada, and Oregon.

The composition of its population should also be of interest to us. The 1950 census lists 1,762,411 whites, 446,948 Negroes, and 1,344 of other races. Puerto Rico's population is further classified as follows: Urban, 894,813; rural, 1,315,890. Thus, it is primarily a rural-agricultural community raising coffee, sugarcane, and other products which are not competitive with those raised on the U.S. mainland.

In the financial and economic spheres, Puerto Rico's progress in recent years has been phenomenal. Some 300 new industries have been established in the island in the past decade. The total annual production of Puerto Rico is over a billion dollars, which is a highly respectable figure for a community chiefly agrarian and small industry, and aslo compares favorably with the production of many of our States.

As for its trade with the United States and other countries, I cite these figures for the year 1955, as taken from the Statistical Abstract of the United States:

Puerto Rican imports from the United States, $548 million.

Puerto Rican imports from other countries, $53,671,000.

Puerto Rican exports to the United States, $368,688,000.

Puerto Rican exports to other countries, $12,982,000.

Total imports, $601,681,000.

Total exports, $381,671,000.

By way of comparison, let me cite the figures for Alaska and Hawaii for the same year 1955 and from the same source:

Alaska's total imports, $2,217,563.

Alaska's total exports, $6,457,995.

Hawaii's total imports, $19,998,829.

Hawaii's total exports, $9,106,983.

And one other fact that I wish to point out. The area of Puerto Rico is 3,435 square miles, compared with 6,423 square miles for Hawaii. Puerto Rico is a little larger than half the size of Connecticut, or greater than the combined area of Delaware and Rhode Island.

I should like to mention briefly the patriotism and the loyalty shown by Puerto Ricans during World War II and the Korean war. They distinguished themselves with great valor and bravery in battle and earned wide admiration and appreciation of the American people and the whole free world.

Mr. Chairman, there is no doubt in my mind that Puerto Rico has ably demonstrated its eligibility and has met all the requirements for statehood. The people of Puerto Rico make good American citizens and are a valuable asset to our country in every phase of its activities. They are part and parcel of the fabric of America. Like millions of other Americans, our citizens of Puerto Rican descent are vitally interested in maintaining a higher standard of living, in education, in adequate housing, in proper standards of health, and, above all, they are interested in maintaining the United States and the Western Hemisphere as an area of freedom and a bulwark of democracy. They stand shoulder to shoulder with us in the current world struggle against communism.

In conclusion, I wish to state that while Puerto Ricans have received excellent treatment on the part of the American people, there have been rumblings in some quarters that they were still regarded as second-class citizens because of their Territorial status. Granting statehood to Puerto Rico would remove any doubt as to their status and would enable them to receive equal treatment and the enjoyment of all rights and privileges as all other Americans.

Now that Alaska and Hawaii have been admitted into the Union, I submit the proposal to the Congress to also consider Puerto Rico's admission. It is logical, it is desirable, it will enhance our position throughout all of Latin America.

DIVERSION OF WATER FROM LAKE MICHIGAN

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MADDEN].

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I call up a privileged resolution (H. Res. 202) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 1) to require a study to be conducted of the effect of increasing the diversion of water from Lake Michigan into the Illinois Waterway for navigation, and for other purposes. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed two hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Public Works, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN] and yield myself such time as I may need.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois is recognized.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 202 makes in order the consideration of H.R. 1, requiring a study to be conducted of the effect of increasing the diversion of water from Lake Michigan into the Illinois Waterway for navigation, and for other purposes:

H.R. 1 would provide for a 3-year study by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare and the Secretary of the Army of the effects of a diversion of Lake Michigan waters at Chicago in an amount of 1,000 cubic feet per second for a period of 1 year. The diversion would start 1½ years after funds were first made available for the study and would be completed a year later. The first year and a half and the last half year of the 3-year period would be used for field and office studies, evaluation of the findings and preparation of the report.

This bill is a modified version of legislation approved by the House in the last four Congresses. The principal modification in H.R. 1 is that it calls for a diversion of only 1 year, whereas the bills previously reported called for a diversion of 3 years.

The purpose of H.R. 1 would be to permit a test period of diversion to be evaluated in a study of its possible effects on the sewage treatment problem at Chicago. The bill is supported by the city of Chicago and others who are seeking a solution to the pressing pollution problem which exists in Chicago. All members of the Illinois delegation, both Republican and Democratic with the exception of one, are in favor of this bill.

After completing the study, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare and the Secretary of the Army would correlate their findings and report to Congress on or before June 1, 1962. The report would contain their recommendations with respect to continuing the authority to divert water from Lake Michigan into the Illinois Waterway. Congressman THOMAS O'BREIN, the dean of the Chicago delegation, is deserving special commendation for the outstanding support he has given this legislation in this and previous sessions of the Congress.

The Public Works Committee has held extensive hearings on this subject during the past few years, and I urge the adoption of House Resolution 202 at this time.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FULTON. What position does the administration take on this, the Department of the Interior?

Mr. MADDEN. I do not know what position they are taking on it in this session, but the President vetoed it I think session before last.

Mr. FULTON. Because of the 1-year limitation are they against this particular bill?

Mr. MADDEN. I will yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES] to answer the gentleman.

Mr. YATES. The 1-year limitation is a reduction from the previous bill which sought to obtain a 3-year diversion. The reduction was made at the suggestion of the administration last year.

Mr. FULTON. So, actually, the administration, then, has no opposition to the 1-year diversion, having vetoed a 3-year provision.

Mr. YATES. The administration has expressed itself through the Department of State and through the Bureau of the Budget as being in opposition to the bill.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may use.

Mr. Speaker, the rule now before us makes in order H.R. 1, a bill to require a study to be conducted of the effect of increasing the diversion of water from Lake Michigan into the Illinois Water-

way for navigation, and for other purposes.

The author of the bill is my close friend, Hon. THOMAS J. O'BRIEN, of Chicago, one who has worked long and faithfully on this most meritorious bill.

Long hearings have been held before the Committee on Public Works, and it was favorably reported by that Committee. The Rules Committee, after holding hearings, has favorably reported it for House action.

While I am not in agreement, Canada and six Great Lakes States oppose it. Illinois is not one of the opposing States.

Canada and the opposing Great Lakes States contend that the additional diversion would do serious damage to navigation and power projects by lowering Great Lakes level. Supporters of the bill maintain that any damage would be extremely small.

This bill authorizes a diversion of an additional 1,000 cubic feet a second from Lake Michigan for a trial period of 1 year. Chicago now diverts an average of 1,500 cubic feet per second into the waterway for navigation and sanitary purposes, and uses about 1,600 cubic feet per second for domestic purposes. This also is discharged into the waterway.

I sincerely believe that after listening to debate, the great majority of the membership of the House will agree that this is a most meritorious bill, and will meet with your approval.

Mr. Speaker, it has been mentioned here that the President of the United States will veto this bill. It is true he has vetoed a bill along these lines, but not this identical bill.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SPRINGER].

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I have supported similar legislation to this in 3 previous years. I supported the legislation because I thought it was good legislation and would not do the harm it was claimed it would do by other States bordering on the Great Lakes, but, on the other hand, would do a great deal of good for the city of Chicago. I believe it is legislation in the general public interest.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DERWINSKI].

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the residents of my district and the entire State of Illinois, and I can truthfully say in a theoretical sense, on behalf of all the citizens of the country, I wish to join my colleagues from Illinois in urging that the members of the House support H.R. 1 giving needed lake diversion for the Chicago metropolitan area in the State of Illinois an opportunity to be properly tested.

It is unfortunate that a measure so obviously in the public interest should be subject to gross misinterpretation by misguided opponents throughout the country. All that we are asking for in this measure is to authorize the Chicago Metropolitan Sanitary District to take an additional 1,000 cubic feet of water a second from Lake Michigan for a 1-year experimental period. This increased diversion would be a tremendous help to the disposal of sewage in the Chicago area and for navigation on the all-important Illinois inland waterway system.

I urge you to disregard the objections that have been raised to this measure including the obvious confusion that our State Department has in their knowledge of this issue. All the reliable research indicates that this 1-year experimental period will have no practical effect whatsoever on the water level of the Great Lakes.

I am positive, ladies and gentlemen of the House, that you will support the united stand of the Illinois representatives and vote for this practical, worthwhile, and necessary measure.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FEIGHAN].

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to adoption of this rule and the passage of H.R. 1. The minority report in opposition to H.R. 1 sets forth 14 cogent reasons in opposition to H.R. 1. The supplemental views of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SCHERER] present a clear analysis of the bill and the reasons why it should be rejected. The water level of Lake Erie is about 4 feet lower than it was 6 years ago. In 1952 the elevation of Lake Erie was 574.4 above sea level. Today it is 570.2. This low water level means that Cleveland must have additional dredging to accommodate the large ships that will soon be sailing on the Great Lakes. If the water level is lowered more, other very expensive rehabilitation programs will be necessary. Reduction of the water level of Lake Erie would greatly lessen cargo capacities of freighters. Reduction of the water level would very adversely affect the city of Cleveland because as a result of the diversion, the potential capacity of Cleveland's four water intake plants would be reduced about 2½ to 3½ million gallons a day. This in face of the fact that a serious problem already exists at two of the filtration plants where maximum extraction of water is required each summer. Ralph S. Locher, Cleveland law director, has stated that passage of this bill would endanger the city of Cleveland's domestic water supply.

I feel strongly that the fact that the city of Chicago, under the United States Supreme Court decision, may apply for and obtain relief if it can present and sustain persuasive arguments on its behalf, is sufficient guarantee to it that its rights are protected. I feel that it has a legal remedy and that any redress to which it is entitled will be given it if it is able to persuade the United States Supreme Court of the justice of its claims.

It is my opinion that the arguments presented in opposition to H.R. 1 are overwhelming. The city of Chicago is not in a position whereby it does not have any redress. There is the opportunity open to it to present its case to the U.S. Supreme Court in accordance with the procedure outlined in its decision.

I urge the defeat of this rule.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BENTLEY].

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the passage of H.R. 1, a bill to require a study to be conducted of the effect of increasing the diversion of water from Lake Michigan into the Illinois Waterway for navigation, and for other purposes. I intend to confine my remarks this afternoon to a study of the probable effects this legislation, if passed and enacted into law, would have upon our relations with the Canadian Government. For that purpose, I include in my remarks at this point the text of a memorandum prepared for me by the Department of State and containing a review of the Canadian position on the proposed Chicago diversion.

MEMORANDUM

There has been a continuous diversion of waters from Lake Michigan at Chicago into the Mississippi watershed since January 17, 1900, when the Chicago drainage canal was opened. Five thousand cubic feet of water per second (an amount greater than that presently authorized) was diverted for purposes of navigation and sewage dilution by permit from the Secretary of War.

During the years 1922–26, various Great Lakes States filed suits in the U.S. Supreme Court to enjoin the diversion or to restrict diversion to an amount to be determined by the Court. The defendants were then diverting 8,500 cubic feet per second under a permit issued by the Secretary of War in 1925. The Supreme Court held in 1929 that the Secretary of War's authority was limited to permitting diversion for navigation in the Illinois Waterway and that it did not extend to diversion for sanitation purposes. In order to avoid health hazards, the Court decided that the reduction in diversion to an amount necessary only for navigation should be gradual to enable Chicago to construct sewage-treatment plants. Consequently, a decree was entered on April 21, 1930, authorizing Illinois and the Chicago Sanitary District to divert, in addition to whatever water was needed for domestic uses, no more than 1,500 cubic feet per second from Lake Michigan after December 31, 1938. That Supreme Court decree is still in effect.

In the 83d, 84th, and 85th Congresses legislation was introduced authorizing the Chicago Sanitary District to divert an additional 1,000 cubic feet per second for a period of 3 years, during which time studies were to be made of the effect of such increased diversion upon the level of Lake Michigan and upon navigation on the Great Lakes and the Illinois Waterway. The diversion bills passed the 83d and 84th Congresses, but were vetoed by the President. A similar bill in the 85th Congress failed to pass the Senate. In the present 86th Congress H.R. 1 and similar bills have been introduced providing for a 1-year additional diversion as part of a 3-year study.

The Government of Canada has made known to our Government at various times its views on the diversion legislation before the 83d, 84th, 85th, and 86th Congresses.

Two notes from the Canadian Embassy to the Secretary of State dated February 1 and March 10, 1954, objected to the bill before the 83d Congress. In the latter note, the

Canadian Government referred to article II of the Boundary Waters Treaty and stated:

"The terms of the last paragraph of that article clearly affirm the understanding that neither party to the treaty surrenders 'any right which it may have to object to any interference with or diversion of waters on the other side of the boundary the effect of which would be productive of material injury to the navigation interests on its own side of the boundary.' If the proposed increase in the diversion at Chicago were to take place, the Government of Canada would, in the circumstances described above, consider that there would be material injury to the navigation interests on its side of the boundary."

The Canadian note of March 10, 1954, concludes as follows:

"The Canadian Government wishes to draw attention once more to the fact that the Chicago diversion is one aspect of a matter now before the International Joint Commission and it is suggested that it would be in the best interests of Canada and the United States to allow the Commission to complete its study of this and related matters before any change in arrangements affecting the levels of the Great Lakes is authorized."

A third note, dated August 24, 1954, was sent by the Canadian Embassy to the Department of State. Attention was again drawn to the contents of its previous notes and the following statement was made:

"As mentioned in my previous two notes, the Canadian Government considers that the adoption of this measure would have an adverse effect on navigation in the Great Lakes and the St. Lawrence River. After careful consideration the Government of Canada has reached the conclusion that an increase in the diversion at Chicago by 1,000 cubic feet per second as provided in this legislation would in fact result in injury to navigation in boundary waters, particularly during cycles of low levels on the Great Lakes.

"It is the view of my Government, therefore, that the implementation of this proposed legislation would constitute a diversion of waters on the United States side of the boundary, the effect of which will be productive of material injury to the navigation interests on the Canadian side of the boundary. In these circumstances and in accordance with the right which is expressly reserved in article II of the Boundary Waters Treaty of 1909, I am instructed by my Government to make formal objection to the proposed increase in the diversion of the waters of Lake Michigan and to request that the United States Government take whatever measures may be appropriate to insure that this proposal is not implemented."

In his further note of February 13, 1956, the Canadian Ambassador stated in the concluding paragraph that—

"I am accordingly instructed to make clear that, in the view of the Canadian Government, the enactment of the proposed legislation would be prejudicial to the navigation and power interests of both countries."

An aide memoire of January 6, 1958, from the Canadian Embassy referred to "useful conversations between United States and Canadian officials" on July 9, 1957, on various aspects of the proposed diversion from the Great Lakes system.

"In considering the economics of alternative methods of improved waste disposal, it is assumed that full consideration will be given to the economic harm which may be done to navigation and hydroelectric generation in both countries by extended use of dilution methods.

"It is not possible to give a firm undertaking to provide flows of a particular volume through the existing Long Lac and Ogoki diversions to the Great Lakes Basin during the 3-year period envisaged by proposed United States legislation. However, if it were possible to offset part of the effects of the Chicago diversion by inflows from the Albany Basin in Canada, it would be equitable that an equivalent amount of water should remain available for use in hydroelectric power generation by the Ontario interests at St. Marys Falls, Niagara Falls and in the international section of the St. Lawrence River until the effects of the proposed temporary diversion will have ceased to be felt in the Great Lakes system.

"All rights under the provisions of the Boundary Waters Treaty of 1909 are specifically reserved."

In an aide memoire dated February 20, 1959, responding to a request from the United States Government dated February 9, 1959, the Canadian Government set forth its views on H.R. 1 and similar diversion bills being considered by the 86th Congress. A copy of this aide memoire and the United States request therefor are enclosed herewith for your information.

I also wish to include in my own remarks, Mr. Speaker, the text of the State Department's press release No. 136 dated February 24, 1959. This release contains the text of an exchange of aide memoires between the United States Government and the Canadian Government on increased diversion of water from Lake Michigan at Chicago.

The State Department today released the text of an exchange of aide memoires between the United States Government and the Canadian Government on increased diversion of water from Lake Michigan at Chicago.

The text of the U.S. aide memoire, sent to the Canadian Government on February 9, 1959, is as follows:

"The Canadian Government has, on various occasions in the past, furnished the Department of State with the Canadian views on proposed U.S. legislation aimed at increasing the diversion from Lake Michigan into the Illinois Waterway. The most recent comments of this nature were contained in an aide memoire received on January 6, 1958, from the Canadian Embassy in Washington.

"Once again this year, as in recent years, a considerable volume of legislation, looking to increased diversion from Lake Michigan at Chicago, has been introduced in the 86th Congress. Some of this legislation is similar to former legislation with regard to which Canadian views have previously been expressed. A number of other pending bills, however, such as H.R. 1, a copy of which is enclosed, call for a 1-year additional diversion period to be made as part of a 3-year study of the effect on Lake Michigan and on the Illinois Waterway of such an increased diversion.

"Congressional hearings on this legislation are scheduled to begin in the near future. During the course of these hearings, it is anticipated that the Department of State will be asked to submit a statement as to the present Canadian views. It is hoped, therefore, that the Canadian Government will be able to transmit to the Embassy at an early date, its views with respect to that proposed legislation which authorizes an additional 1,000 cubic feet of water per second to be diverted from Lake Micihgan into the Illinois Waterway for a period of 1 year as part of a 3-year study."

On February 20, the Canadian Government responded to the United States memorandum with the following aide memoire:

"On a number of occasions in the past, the Canadian Government has expressed its objections to proposals envisaging increased diversions of water from Lake Michigan at Chicago. Once again, and at the invitation of the Government of the United States through the United States Embassy's aide memoire of February 9, 1959, the Government of Canada is anxious to make known its views on legislative proposals now before Congress such as bill H.R. 1, which are intended to authorize an increased diversion of water from the Great Lakes Basin into the Illinois Waterway.

"While recognizing that the use of Lake Michigan water is a matter within the jurisdiction of the United States of America, it is the considered opinion of the Canadian Government that any authorization for an additional diversion would be incompatible with the arrangements for the St. Lawrence Seaway and power development, and with the Niagara Treaty of 1950, and would be prejudicial to navigation and power development which these mutual arrangements were designed to improve and facilitate.

"The point has been made repeatedly by Canada that every withdrawal of water from the basin means less depth available for shipping in harbors and in channels. Additional withdrawals would have adverse effects on the hydro-electric generation potential on both sides of the border at Niagara Falls and in the international section of the St. Lawrence River, as well as in the Province of Quebec, and would inflict hardship on communities and industries on both sides of the border.

"The Government of Canada therefore protests against the implementation of proposals contained in H.R. 1."

There is no question in my mind, Mr. Speaker, that this additional diversion authorized by H.R. 1 would set dangerous precedents in our relationships with Canada. I refer to the recent testimony of Robert Moses, chairman of the New York State Power Authority, on February 17 who said that if Chicago were allowed to take water from a system jointly shared with Canada, then Canada would have a basis for demanding that it be allowed to divert additional water from Niagara, the St. Lawrence, and the Columbia River Basin.

On March 3, the attorney general of the State of Michigan, Paul L. Adams, testified before the House Public Works Committee and referred to a State Department study entitled "Legal Aspects of the Use of Systems of International Waters," printed as Senate Document No. 118. He referred to certain principles contained in this study governing systems of international waters and which are clearly applicable in this case.

The House should be informed that, under the Boundary Water Treaty of 1909, the International Joint Commission was created to study the contentions of Canada and of our country over the use of waters which are international in character between us and Canada such as the Columbia-Kootenay River system.

In his earlier testimony before the committee on February 17, Attorney General Adams referred to a conversation with Mr. Harry C. Donohue, secretary to the American section of the International Joint Commission. To use Mr. Adams' own words:

He (Mr. Donohue) informed us that there has been no settlement between us and Canada of the proposed Columbia River diversion; that Gen. A. G. L. McNaughton, chairman of the Canadian section, still insists on Canada's right to divert the Columbia River; that Canada still reserves its right under the treaty of 1909 with respect to the Chicago diversion and still continues to use

the Chicago diversion as a precedent against us in justification of its demands to divert the Columbia River.

At this point, Mr. Speaker, I think it would be useful to include in my remarks the text of a letter written by Attorney General Adams and Assistant Attorney General Olds of Michigan to Col. John Raymond, Deputy Legal Advisor to the State Department, under date of December 3, 1958, discussing the international ramifications of the Chicago diversion controversy.

STATE OF MICHIGAN,
Lansing, December 3, 1958.

Col. JOHN RAYMOND,
Deputy Legal Adviser,
State Department,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR COLONEL RAYMOND: It was a real pleasure to have had the privilege of discussing with you and your associates in the State Department the international ramifications of the Chicago diversion controversy. It occurs to me that since this matter is of such vital importance both to the States involved and to the Federal Government we should keep each other informed of any developments that would affect in some degree our separate or mutual interests.

Although the other complainant States did not have personal representatives at this conference, may I assure you that the views expressed by Mr. Boyd, assistant attorney general of Ohio. Mr. Torina, solicitor general of Michigan, and myself reflect the views of those who have been representing the States of Minnesota, Wisconsin, Pennsylvania, and New York with whom we have been conferring during the past year.

May I summarize what I consider to be the viewpoints of the complaining States as we discussed them at this conference:

1. The Great Lakes Basin constitutes the largest fresh water basin in the world; it is an international body of water since it forms a boundary between the United States and Canada, and whatever occurs in or to these waters may cause injury to either Nation.

2. Both the United States and Canada have a common, mutual interest in the navigation that occurs on these waters, and of course this interest is now greater than before on account of the near completion of the St. Lawrence Seaway.

3. The Great Lakes Basin is the source of enormous hydroelectric power, particularly beginning at Niagara and extending southward in Lake Ontario and the St. Lawrence River. The production of this power has been agreed upon by our two countries and, of course, every drop of water that is lost to this basin by diversion or by any other artificial extraction directly affects adversely the generating potential of the powerplan's now in construction as well as those contemplated.

4. Both countries have a common interest in maintaining the integrity of the water naturally belonging to this basin because lake levels affect the navigational depth of ports and harbors, the use of our shores for recreational purposes, and the management and maintenance of the wildlife populations that abound in these waters.

5. Although Lake Michigan does not actually border Canada, nevertheless Lake Michigan and Lake Huron constitute one lake both geologically and hydraulically. Any lowering of water in Lake Michigan directly affects the levels of Lake Huron, Lake Erie, Lake Ontario, and the St. Lawrence River. This fact does not seem to be understood by many people, even some who are high in the Government of the United States. I recall very vividly many efforts made by Senator KERR during the hearings before the Senate Public Works Committee this summer in which he repeatedly insisted that Lake Michigan did not border Canada and, therefore, he could not understand what business it was of Canada's to protest the diversion at Chicago.

6. Although the memorandum received from the State Department by the Senate Committee on Public Works indicated that Canada would not protest the temporary 1-year diversion of 1,000 cubic feet per second contemplated during the hearings on H.R. 2 in the 85th Congress, nevertheless we are under the impression (as indicated in your letter to me of April 22, 1958) that Canada has protested the Chicago diversion pursuant to paragraph 2 of article 2 of the Boundary Water Treaty of 1909.

There are certainly real grounds for fearing that should the Chicago diversion continue to increase in amount, as it surely will if Illinois and the sanitary district succeed in their efforts, Canada will use the diversion by Chicago as a precedent against us before the International Court of Justice in case we get into a disagreement with Canada over its intentions to divert the waters of the Columbia River. The intricacies of this international problem are explained in Senate Document 118 containing a study made by Mr. Griffin of your Department on "The Legal Aspects of the Use of Systems of International Waters With Reference to Columbia-Kootenai River System."

Consequently, it behooves all of us, State officials as well as officials of the Federal Government, to take positions which are not vulnerable in the event serious efforts are made to bring about diversion of rivers or bodies of water that rise in Canada and flow into the United States.

7. As we explained to you in great detail at the conference, there exists no overriding necessity on the part of the Sanitary Dictrict of Chicago to continue its present diversion of water for domestic uses, let alone to increase it. Every single municipality on the Great Lakes except Chicago returns to the Great Lakes the water which it has extracted, used and purified through sewage treatment plants. We see no reason why Chicago should not be made to do likewise; in fact, the only excuse that it may offer for its neglect and refusal to return the water to Lake Michigan is that it would cost money to do so. To us this is no valid reason, let alone a legal defense. Chicago and its metropolitan area is a rich, growing, expanding community. I am told that its per capita cost for collection and treatment of sewage is well below that which is carried by much smaller communities. It has such a large tax and revenue-collecting base that it could well afford to construct and operate the works that are necessary to return to Lake Michigan the effluent which is discharged by its plant after adequate treatment.

8. However, there is an even greater danger confronting us and this danger looms ever larger than the present and prospective diversion at Chicago. When we visualize a growing demand for enormous quantities of water for domestic and industrial uses as our population increases and industry demands greater water supplies for its processes, the danger becomes even more menacing.

You will recall that we showed you a map of the Great Lakes Basin prepared by the Lake Survey Division of the United States Corps of Engineers. In many places the divide is not too far distant from the shores of Lake Michigan, Lake Superior, Lake Erie, and Lake Ontario. There are many places at which new and additional diversions could be initiated both by Canada and by our States. In fact right now we are wrestling with an attempted diversion by the Elmhurst—Villa Park—Lombard Water Commission to supply the water needs of communities in DuPage County situated in Illinois on the Misisssippi side of the divide.

There have already been some inquiries and talk circulating around that industries located on the Ohio River side of the divide wish to extract water from Lake Erie into the Ohio River. You will recall that we observed many places where such diversions could be made. We must remember that this huge fresh water basin, the largest of its kind in the world, is viewed with longing eyes by water-thirsty communities located in other places that would like to tap and drain its water resources.

Therefore, it is our fear that unless both our courts and our legislative bodies, including Congress, adhere to a firm principle by which it is considered an act of trespass or illegality for any person, State or entity to extract water from the Great Lakes Basin and thereafter allow it to be diverted to another basin, the day will come when the Great Lakes Basin will be nothing but a "grab-bag" for all comers. The result will be utter chaos and the consequences will be sad to contemplate.

Perhaps this was the first opportunity that you have had to become acquainted with the views of the other Great Lakes States in regard to the transcendent issues which are involved herein. We believe that they should be settled upon the basis that paramount interests of the whole Nation are at stake. The increase in overseas navigation which will result from the existence of the St. Lawrence Seaway is a benefit that will inure to future generations for centuries to come. However, unless we jealously guard the waters that rightfully belong in this basin from depredation, all the expense and effort that have gone into construction of this eighth wonder of the world will be dissipated and set at naught.

We feel very strongly that our Supreme Court has not had the benefit of a clear exposition of the vast international and national interests here involved. We appreciate that this is the function of the Solicitor General of the United States, but we realize that he depends on your Department for information, advice and guidance on these phases of this case. May we hope that you will present this problem in the setting which we have tried to express in this letter so that he will understand, and the court will understand, that we are not here dealing with a microcosmic problem, but with one which unless resolved correctly now will later bring untold injury and anguish to the generations which follow us.

Very truly yours,

PAUL L. ADAMS,
Attorney General.
By NICHOLAS V. OLDS,
Assistant Attorney General.

Now, Mr. Speaker, with further reference to the possible effect of the passage of H.R. 1 on upper Columbia River diversions, I refer to a letter written by the State Department on July 29, 1958, to Senator NEUBERGER, of Oregon, which reads in part as follows:

The proposed legislation authorizing an increased diversion from Lake Michigan at Chicago has been opposed by Canada on the ground that it may cause injury to Canadian navigation and hydroelectric power interests. Canada's reasons for opposing the Chicago diversion bill are thus very similar to those of the United States with respect to the Columbia River diversion, and it would seem that H.R. 2, if enacted, could constitute a precedent to be used by the Canadian interests in support of their proposals on the Columbia.

This letter was referred to in Senator NEUBERGER's individual concurrent views contained in Senate Report No. 2482 of last year and concerned with H.R. 2, a somewhat similar piece of legislation to that which we are considering today. In those views Senator NEUBERGER stated

"It seems clear that, had this been the last word on this subject, it would have been our duty in the situation described above to oppose H.R. 2 in defense of the tremendous interest which the Pacific Northwest has in an equitable solution of the Columbia River problem, in the face of a continued objection by Canada to the Chicago diversion we could, in the interests of our region of the country, reach no other decision." I submit to my colleagues from the Pacific Northwest that the opposition of the Canadian Government to H.R. 1 has been clearly established and that I am certain they will see their proper course of action.

Mr. Speaker, at this time I should like to give a background sketch of the international legal situation on the question of this diversion issue that I believe will be helpful in considering this entire matter.

There has been a continuous diversion of waters from the Great Lakes Basin at Chicago into the Mississippi watershed since January 17, 1900, when the Chicago Drainage Canal was opened and 5,000 cubic feet of water per second—an amount greater than presently authorized—was diverted by permit by the Secretary of War—Olia and Sprecher, "Legal Aspects of Lake Diversion," Northwestern University Law Review, page 656 (1957). The amount of the diversion had been increased at the time that the treaty between the United States and Great Britain relating to boundary waters and questions arising between the United States and Canada were signed on January 11, 1909 (36 Stat. 2448; T.S. 548). The treaty went into effect on May 13, 1910, and is still operative.

Canadian opposition to the Chicago diversion existed prior to the signing of the 1909 treaty. The "Second Interim Report of the Canadian Section of the International Waterway Commission," dated April 25, 1906, contained the following reference to this diversion:

> At Chicago, the Americans have built a drainage canal which, when in full operation, will use about 10,000 cubic feet of water per second * * * which will have the effect of lowering Lake Michigan by over 6 inches, and Lake Erie by 4½ inches.
>
> * * * * *
>
> It is exceedingly important in the interests of navigation, both to ourselves and to the people of the United States, that the diversion by way of the Chicago drainage canal should be limited. It is equally essential in the interest of both countries that no diversion or interference should be allowed in streams crossing the boundary which would interfere with the interests of navigation in either country.

The terms of the Boundary Waters Treaty of 1909 do not appear to affect the legal rights of United States or Canadian interests in regard to the Chicago diversion. The preliminary article of the treaty defines "boundary waters" as "the waters from main shore to main shore of the lakes, along which the international boundary between the United States and the Dominion of Canada passes, including all bays, arms, and inlets thereof, but not including tributary waters, which in their natural channels would flow into such lakes." Lake Michigan is not a "boundary water" because it is entirely within the United States, and the part of the lake which is closest to Canada is about 40 miles from the international boundary. Secretary of State Elihu Root, who negotiated the treaty on behalf of the United States explained in his testimony regarding the treaty before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee that "the definition of boundary waters was carefully drawn in order to exclude Lake Michigan"—Naujoks' "The Chicago Water Diversion Controversy," 30 Marquette Law Review 228, 251 (1947).

Jurisdiction and control over diversions from bodies of water, such as Lake Michigan, which do not fall within the definition of "boundary waters" are reserved to the State where such water is located by article II of the treaty which reads in part:

> Each of the high contracting parties reserves to itself or to the several State governments on the one side and the Dominion or Provincial Governments on the other as the case may be, subject to any treaty provisions now existing with respect thereto, the exclusive jurisdiction and control over the use and diversion, whether temporary or permanent, of all waters on its own side of the line which in their natural channels would flow across the boundary or into boundary waters.

Injured parties are given certain rights and remedies in respect of diversions in the other country by the succeeding clause of the treaty subject to the proviso that such rights and remedies do not apply to cases already existing. That proviso thus eliminates rights of injured parties in regard to the Chicago diversion which was already an existing case.

Canadian Federal and Provincial interests which may be injured by diversions are not covered by the rights and remedies clause just cited or the proviso thereto. A memorandum by Mr. Chandler Anderson, who drafted the treaty, states as follows:

> The right of action for damages provided for in article II applies to private or individual interests in distinction from public or governmental interests. Any question on the point is set at rest by the use of the words "injured parties." Whenever the word party is used in a treaty, referring the high contracting parties, a capital P is used, so the absence of the capital and the use of the word in the plural indicates that it can refer only to individuals. (Files of the Department of State.)

The only other provision of the treaty which must be considered in connection with the Chicago diversion is the final paragraph of article II, which states:

> It is understood, however, that neither of the high contracting parties intends by the foregoing provision to surrender any right, which it may have, to object to any interference with or diversions of waters on the other side of the boundary the effect of which would be productive of material injury to the navigation interests on its own side of the boundary.

Secretary Root in his testimony, cited above, made the following statements after citing the terms of the last paragraph of article II:

> There should clearly be a right, there would be a right to object to, for instance, drying up one of the lakes. Either country, for instance, would be justified in going to war to prevent the other country from drying up Lake Erie, and that right to object to the destruction of the navigation in these international waters is preserved. I did not want to press Canada to give up any such rights, and I did not want to give up any such rights ourselves.

And later on in his testimony, when the Secretary was explaining why Canada was allowed to take a greater amount of water at Niagara than the United States under article V of the treaty, he stated:

> In the third place they consented to leave out of this treaty any reference to the drainage canal, and we are now taking 10,000 cubic feet per second for the drainage canal which really comes out of this lake system.

The opinion of Attorney General Judson Harmon, rendered on December 12, 1895, to the Secretary of State relates to the taking of water from the Rio Grande for irrigation in relation to article VII of the treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo between Mexico and the United States of February 2, 1848. He concluded that the United States as the upstream country in that case had an unlimited right to divert the waters in question and that injured Mexican interests were without right or remedy. The Department of State believes that a reiteration of the Harmon doctrine by any branch of the U.S. Government would not be in the best interests of this country or in line with the progressive development of international law during the last 60 years.

When the United States negotiated a treaty with Mexico relating to the utilization of waters of the Colorado and Tijuana Rivers and of the Rio Grande with Mexico, which was signed at Washington on February 3, 1944—TS 994—the United States no longer asserted that the upstream country had an unlimited right to divert waters within its boundary. At the time the Secretary of State made the following statement before the Senate:

> It must be realized that each country owes to the other some obligation with respect to the water of these international streams, and until this obligation is recognized and defined, there must inevitably be unrest and uncertainty in the communities served by them—a condition which becomes more serious with the increasing burden of an expanding population dependent upon the waters of these streams.

In addition the Assistant Secretary of State declared:

> The logical conclusion of the legal argument of the opponents of the treaty appears to be that an upstream nation by unilateral act in its own territory can impinge upon the rights of a downstream nation; this is hardly the kind of legal doctrine that can be seriously urged in these times. (Hearing before the Committee on Foreign Relations, U.S. Senate, 79th Congress, 1st sess., part 1, p. 19 (Secretary of State); part 5, p. 1762 (Assistant Secretary of State).

The Supreme Court, in dealing with the problem of interstate diversions, has developed the principle of "Equitable Apportionment" in a notable series of cases—*Kansas* v. *Colorado*, 185 U.S. 125 (1902), 206 U.S. 46 (1906); *Hinderlider* v. *La Plata Company*, 304 U.S. 92 (1937). In the development of this principle, the Court has indicated that it was acting, at least partially, in the field of interna-

tional law. Thus, in the second opinion in *Kansas* v. *Colorado*, the Court states, at page 97:

Nor is our jurisdiction ousted, even if, because Kansas and Colorado are States sovereign and independent in local matters, the relations between them depend in any respect upon principles of international law. International law is no alien in this tribunal.

Principles similar to that of "Equitable Apportionment" have won increasing acceptance in international law. The Italian Court of Cassation, for example, stated in 1939:

International law recognizes the right on the part of every riparian State to enjoy, as a participant of a kind of partnership created by the river, all the advantages deriving from it for the purpose of securing the welfare and the economic and civil progress of the Nation. * * * However, although a State, in the exercise of its right of sovereignty, may subject public rivers to whatever regime it deems best, it cannot disregard the international duty, derived from that principle, not to impede or to destroy, as a result of this regime, the opportunity of the other States to avail themselves of the flow of water for their own national needs. In order to settle this conflict between the exercise of the right of sovereignty and the fulfillment of the duty imposed by the comitas sentius, regulations have been laid down by international conventions. ("Annual Digest and Reports of Public International Law Cases" (1938–1940, 120 at 121).)

The United States has taken the position that there is no basis under either the Boundary Waters Treaty of 1909 or customary international law for any contention that Canada has a legal right unilaterally to divert within its own territory certain waters of the Columbia River Basin, without regard to any material injury which may be sustained by downstream interests in the United States.

Canada, in its most recent aide memoire—February 20, 1959—has protested against the proposed legislation—H.R. 1—authorizing an increased diversion from Lake Michigan on the ground that such diversion would adversely affect navigation and hydro-electric interests in the Great Lakes Basin. If this increased diversion should take place despite Canada's protest and if, in fact, it should cause material injury to Canadian interests, Canada might well take the position that the United States by ignoring the Canadian protest gave Canada justification for taking a similar course of action with regard to a diversion in the upper Columbia River Basin.

Two notes from the Canadian Embassy to the Secretary of State dated February 1 and March 10, 1954, objected to the bill before the 83d Congress. In the latter note, the Canadian Government referred to article II of the Boundary Waters Treaty and stated:

The terms of the last paragraph of that article clearly affirm the understanding that neither party to the treaty surrenders "any right which it may have to object to any interference with or diversion of waters on the other side of the boundary the effect of which would be productive of material injury to the navigation interests on its own side of the boundary." If the proposed increase in the diversion at Chicago were to take place, the Government of Canada would, in the circumstances described above, consider that there would be material injury to the navigation interests on its side of the boundary.

The Canadian note of March 10, 1954, concludes as follows:

The Canadian Government wishes to draw attention once more to the fact that the Chicago diversion is one aspect of a matter now before the International Joint Commission and it is suggested that it would be in the best interests of Canada and the United States to allow the Commission to complete its study of this and related matters before any change in arrangements affecting the levels of the Great Lakes is authorized.

A third note, dated August 24, 1954, was sent by the Canadian Embassy to the Department of State. Attention was again drawn to the contents of its previous notes and the following statement was made:

As mentioned in my previous two notes, the Canadian Government considers that the adoption of this measure would have an adverse effect on navigation in the Great Lakes and the St. Lawrence River. After careful consideration the Government of Canada has reached the conclusion that an increase in the diversion at Chicago by 1,000 cubic feet per second as provided in this legislation would in fact result in injury to navigation in boundary waters, particularly during cycles of low levels on the Great Lakes.

It is the view of my Government, therefore, that the implementation of this proposed legislation would constitute a diversion of waters on the United States side of the boundary, the effect of which will be productive of material injury to the navigation interests on the Canadian side of the boundary. In these circumstances and in accordance with the right which is expressly reserved in article II of the Boundary Waters Treaty of 1909, I am instructed by my Government to make formal objection to the proposed increase in the diversion of the waters of Lake Michigan and to request that the U.S. Government take whatever measure may be appropriate to insure that this proposal is not implemented.

In his further note of February 13, 1956, the Canadian Ambassador stated in the concluding paragraph that:

I am accordingly instructed to make clear that, in the view of the Canadian Government, the enactment of the proposed legislation would be prejudicial to the navigation and power interests of both countries.

An aide memoire of January 6, 1958, from the Canadian Embassy referred to "useful conversations between United States and Canadian officials" on July 9, 1957, on various aspects of the proposed diversion from the Great Lakes system:

In considering the economics of alternative methods of improved waste disposal, it is assumed that full consideration will be given to the economic harm which may be done to navigation and hydroelectric generation in both countries by extended use of dilution methods.

It is not possible to give a firm undertaking to provide flows of a particular volume through the existing Long Lac and Ogoki diversions to the Great Lakes Basin during the 3-year period envisaged by proposed U.S. legislation. However, if it were possible to offset part of the effects of the Chicago diversion by inflows from the Albany Basin in Canada, it would be equitable that an equivalent amount of water should remain available for use in hydroelectric power generation by the Ontario interests at St. Marys Falls, Niagara Falls and in the International Section of the St. Lawrence River until the effects of the proposed temporary diversion will have ceased to be felt in the Great Lakes system.

All rights under the provisions of the Boundary Waters Treaty of 1909 are specifically reserved.

I should also like to include at this point the text of the statement of Mr. Woodbury W. Willoughby, director, Office of British Commonwealth and Northern European Affairs, before the House Committee on Public Works on H.R. 1.

STATEMENT OF WOODBURY W. WILLOUGHBY, DIRECTOR, OFFICE OF BRITISH COMMONWEALTH AND NORTHERN EUROPEAN AFFAIRS, BEFORE THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS ON H.R. 1

H.R. 1 authorizes the withdrawal of water from the Great Lakes Basin at Chicago and thus must be considered in relation to the rights of Canada as a co-riparian in the waters of that basin. The Department, in the interest of maintaining harmonious relations with that country, has traditionally sought its views on proposals of this type.

This committee has previously been furnished with the texts of the recent communications exchanged with the Canadian Government regarding its views on H.R. 1, and will have noted the protest registered by that Government against implementation of the proposals contained in the bill. I should be glad to submit a copy at this time for insertion in the record.

The most recent Canadian aide memoire, dated February 20, 1959, expresses the opinion that any authorization for an additional diversion from Lake Michigan at Chicago would be incompatible with the arrangements for the St. Lawrence Seaway and power development, and with the Niagara Treaty of 1950, and would be prejudicial to navigation and power development which these mutual arrangements were designed to improve and facilitate.

Neither the Niagara Treaty nor the International Joint Commission orders relating to the development of power by the United States and Canada in the International Rapids section of the St. Lawrence River, place any specific limitation upon diversions of the type authorized by H.R. 1. Nevertheless, the Department is not in a position to question the Canadian position that an additional withdrawal of water from the Great Lakes Basin such as that under consideration would affect adversely Canadian navigation and power interests in the Great Lakes, their connecting channels, and the St. Lawrence River.

I understand that estimates have been furnished to the Congress by the U.S. Army Corp of Engineers as to the extent of the damage that would be suffered by downstream hydroelectric interests on both sides of the boundary in the event that the present proposal is enacted. It is noted that H.R. 1 provides no means by which injured parties may be compensated.

In view of the foregoing, the Department believes that enactment of H.R. 1 would adversely affect our relations with a friendly foreign government. Therefore, it is unable to support this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I have read the committee report on H.R. 1. It is contained therein that the Columbia River problem should have no weight in reaching a decision on the Chicago diversion. I think that the words of Mr. Donohue as quoted in the February 17 testimony of Attorney General Adams is evidence that the Canadian Government does feel that Lake Michigan diversion would definitely provide it with a precedent for Columbia River diversion.

I note that the committee report also states "since Lake Michigan is not an international water and is not covered by the Boundary Waters Treaty of 1909, there is no legal obstacle to diversion by the United States of water from Lake Michigan." But the Canadian Government, Mr. Speaker, has not asserted that the Chicago diversion constitutes a breach of the treaty but has rather stated that the increased diversions would be productive of injury to Canadian navigation interests. The right on the part of the Canadians to make such an objection is contained in paragraph 2 of article II of the Boundary Waters Treaty.

I believe I have presented sufficient evidence here this afternoon, Mr. Speaker, to show that the Canadian Government is opposed and has been opposed for some time, to enactment of legislation such as H.R. 1. I think the presumption can safely be drawn that the enactment of H.R. 1 would be damaging to our present friendly relations with the Government of Canada.

Mr. Speaker, until quite recently, good relations with our neighbors to the north were taken as a matter of course. But lately there have been disturbing signs that even the closest and friendliest of neighbors should not be taken for granted. In this connection, I refer Members to the two reports of the Hays-Coffin study mission to Canada last year. There is an important paragraph contained in the conclusion to the second report (p. 43):

> It may well be that we have reached a stage where the cooperation possible between the two North American neighbors can be much greater than is usually found, even among allies and traditional friends. Such cooperation must develop within the context of world relationships and responsibilities. Internal differences will continue to exist. But the realization that full strength for the free world depends largely on the ability of the Western Hemisphere to provide a firm economic and military base on which to build emphasizes the need for the closest kind of coordination, especially between the United States and Canada.

Mr. Speaker, I submit that enactment of H.R. 1 would damage our good relations with Canada and would go far toward endangering United States-Canadian cooperation in many fields too numerous to mention here but many of which relate directly to the national defense and security of this country. I, therefore, believe that H.R. 1 should not be enacted at this time.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES].

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, I think it is well that we meet the Canadian protest at the beginning of the debate.

The gentleman from Michigan has told you that the Dominion of Canada has protested against the passage of H.R. 1, and that is so, and it is unfortunate. But that protest, Mr. Speaker, is one of the great mysteries of this controversy. We have always sought Canada's cooperation, and last year we received its approval. Only a few months ago, last August to be exact, I received a letter from the Department of State which declared that the Government of Canada had no objection whatsoever to the diversion of an additional 1,000 cubic feet of water per second at Chicago. That was the attitude of the Government of Canada to the proposal which is now before the House, exactly the same proposal. At the time the Government of Canada took that position, as revealed by the State Department, the situation was exactly the same, the conditions were exactly the same, and yet, Canada changed its mind. Why? Why did the State Department suddenly write the Government of Canada to submit its viewpoint on this bill? It knew Canada's views. The State Department must have wanted the protest. I say that the State Department is really the culprit in the picture. I believe that pressure was applied on the State Department by a ranking member of the Committee on Foreign Relations of another body, and the State Department wilted under that pressure. There was no need for the State Department to invite the opinion of Canada on this bill. It was exactly the same bill that was before the Government of Canada at the time it expressed itself as having no objection.

The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. O'BRIEN] had spent almost an entire year hounding the State Department in an effort to find out what the attitude of the Government of Canada was. Then last January, in an aide memoire which the State Department furnished to the chairman of a subcommittee on public works of the other body, the Government of Canada indicated that it had no objection to the bill then pending which provided for a 3-year diversion.

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a correction?

Mr. YATES. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. BENTLEY. I think that if the gentleman will review the correspondence he will find the Canadian Government did not at that time, last August, interpose an objection to a temporary 1-year diversion.

Mr. YATES. That is correct—nor can the Canadian aide memoire of last January be said to be an objection. The Government of Canada reviewed the bill, H.R. 2, and did not specifically object to it in contrast to specific objections it had made to earlier diversion bills. Then in August in a letter that was addressed to me personally, the Assistant Secretary of State declared that the Government of Canada had assured the State Department that it had no objection to the diversion.

Why then this sudden change of attitude by the Government of Canada? I think it is because politics raised its head at that time. As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, in the Chicago Daily News for March 4, it is indicated that the ranking member of the Foreign Relations Committee of another body set about to persuade Canada to change its view.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker.

Mr. YATES. Does the gentleman want me to yield to him?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I want to make a point of order, as much for information as anything else. The gentleman is talking about a change of attitude in the Canadian Government on this proposition, and then he very clearly intimates, if he does not charge directly, that the change is due to the representations made by the chairman of a committee of the other body.

Mr. YATES. Not by a chairman of a committee, but by a ranking member.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. All right, by a ranking member of the committee. But what I would like to point out is, I would like to know whether it is a proper argument. I do not care what the gentleman says, but I make the point of order on that question.

Mr. YATES. I referred to an article in the Chicago Daily News, Mr. Speaker, which indicated that the ranking member of the Foreign Relations Committee of another body had indicated that he had undertaken to get a change of views. I think it perfectly proper to refer to it.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I am not questioning the accuracy of it as to what the other fellow did or did not do. I am just wondering and raising the point as to whether it is proper for a Member here to suggest, as has been suggested, that the chairman of the other body influenced the Canadian Government to change its position.

Mr. YATES. Well, Mr. Speaker, may I respectfully suggest that if Members will read the Chicago Daily News of Wednesday, March 4, in the article pertaining to this bill, that the Members can then make up their own minds as to whether any special influence was used.

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that it is out of order to make such reference to a Member of the other body.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, I am referring to a member of another body.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, I decline to yield further at this time.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois will proceed in order.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, there was no reason for soliciting Canada's viewpoint. It had expressed itself clearly to the proposal incorporated in this bill.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES] has expired.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 additional minutes to the gentleman.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, the treaty of 1909 to which the gentleman from Michigan referred dealt with boundary waters including waters of the Great Lakes and specifically excluded Lake Michigan from its consideration as being inland waters—waters entirely within the United States; and it is interesting to note that the treaty allocated water from Niagara River between the United States and Canada and granted 36,000 cubic feet per second to the Canadian side and 18,500 cubic feet per second to the American side. The Secretary of State, Elihu Root, who was interrogated about it at that time said the reason for the disparity was that Chicago was with-

drawing 10,000 cubic feet per second of water. This was the reason for allotting Canada more water, he said. So it is expressly recognized by Canada by this treaty of 1909 that Chicago has the right to withdraw 10,000 cubic feet of water per second. Chicago today is withdrawing only a fraction of that amount, 1,500 cubic feet per second to be exact.

The treaty of 1950 to which the gentleman from Michigan referred in no way affected or changed the treaty of 1909.

Let me suggest this additional point to you. In the controversy before the Supreme Court in which the amount of water which Chicago would withdraw was reduced from 10,000 cubic feet to 1,500 cubic feet per second, Canada did not appear before the Court to make its position known. Two years ago when there was a critical shortage in the Illinois Waterway, the Supreme Court upon petition of the State of Illinois granted the Sanitary District authority to withdraw 8,500 cubic feet of water per second, Canada did not appear at that time either and Canada did not protest.

The amount of water the Supreme Court permitted Illinois to withdraw was decidedly greater than the amount sought in this bill. Canada did not protest the decision of the Supreme Court. It did not appear before the Supreme Court; it made no representation of protest to the Department of State. It cited no damage that had occurred. And yet, now, when faced with a situation which would permit diversion of a much smaller quantity it files a protest.

Of course the protest of Canada is something that should be considered. We from Illinois do not want to disrupt or strain our relationship with our great neighbor to the north. But I must say it comes with poor grace for our neighborhood to file its objection in view of the fact that it indicated only 6 months ago under exactly similar conditions that it had no objection to the relief that is sought in this bill.

The charge will be made, too, Mr. Speaker, that the diversion at Chicago could very well serve as a precedent in the dispute between Canada and the United States over the division of the waters of the Columbia River. This is not a valid point. I have an opinion by the legal counsel of the State Department to the effect that if there is no material damage to Canada from the diversion of water at Chicago, the diversion cannot serve as a precedent in the dispute over the division of the waters of the Columbia.

So, Mr. Speaker, I think it is well that we meet this Canadian objection at the inception of this debate. We regret very much the Canadian protest. I personally think that it was inspired. I believe that the State Department opened up the whole controversy by inviting the Government of Canada to make a protest at a time when the State Department knew that under exactly the same circumstances the Government of Canada had indicated it had no objection to this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I hope the rule is granted and I hope the bill passes.

I now yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PUCINSKI].

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Michigan rests his entire opposition to this bill on the basis of preserving friendly relations with Canada. I wonder if the gentleman from Illinois would clarify this point: Is it not a fact that Canada had not offered any opinion about or opposition to this legislation as late as August, and came into the picture only after such an opinion was solicited by our own State Department?

Mr. YATES. This year, after H.R. 1 was filed. The gentleman is entirely correct.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has again expired.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. COLLIER].

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, as an ardent supporter of the lake diversion bill since its inception, I contend that failure to pass this much needed legislation in the 86th Congress would certainly be a sin of omission.

The controversy over this bill during the last three sessions of Congress has consumed countless hours of debate and literally thousands of pages of testimony—much of a highly technical nature and all punctuated with conjecture.

Not even the most avowed opponents of this legislation can question the need for something to be done to increase the flow of water into the Illinois Waterway to clear the streams and decrease stagnation in the interest of the general health and welfare of our people.

The fact that on three different occasions, the most recent in 1944, diversion of water from the Great Lakes became a must to meet the emergency conditions which developed as a result of an entirely inadequate flow into the Illinois and Mississippi Rivers.

Since the need has been established by the most qualified sanitary engineers plus the very history of our waterways, let us then honestly appraise the objections of those who would oppose even granting a 3-year test in this very important project.

You will hear that this diversion will lower the lake level.

The truth of the matter is that the level of the Great Lakes might be lowered by one-eighth of an inch maximum during this 1-year test period—but let me remind you that the seasonal variation by the normal processes of Nature is 18 to 22 inches per year and has frequently gone considerably above that figure in all of the five Great Lakes.

You will be told that the diversion will cause the loss of hydroelectric power.

Regardless of how many figures in kilowatt hours are presented, the fact remains that the loss of electrical energy will amount to a small fraction of 1 percent of the total energy production at the plants affected in the Great Lakes region.

The question, of course, of Canada's objection has been raised.

I submit, however, that the original treaty of 1909 is still in full force and effect under the International Joint Commission which has jurisdiction over certain diversions of water from the Great Lakes.

But, and I believe this is a very important point, Lake Michigan is not a boundary water as provided in the terms of that treaty.

It is, as you know, the only one of the five Great Lakes which lies entirely within the United States and neither borders nor extends into Canada as do the other four Great Lakes.

But even if we are to assume that Lake Michigan is by a vague interpretation of this treaty under this jurisdiction, I wish to point out that in 1909 when this treaty was entered into, the city of Chicago was authorized to withdraw 10,000 cubic feet per second from Lake Michigan for the Illinois Waterway.

This permission was subsequently reduced to the point where today the people of the vast Chicago area are permitted approximately 1,500 cubic feet per second for drinking water and domestic pumpage. I do not believe it is necessary to comment on the tremendous population growth in the country and northern Illinois in recent years and the corresponding need for this diversion of water from Lake Michigan.

Yet all we ask in this legislation is 1,000 additional cubic feet on a test basis under the supervision of the Army Corps of Engineers.

We will then abide by the decision based upon the actual results of this test rather than conjecture and unfounded theory.

In closing, I submit that in both the 83d and 84th sessions of Congress, after long and intensive study of this bill by Members of both the House and the Senate more than 350 Representatives from the 48 States voted for this authorization and apparently felt in their wisdom, that it was necessary and proper after having all the facts and—in each session there were but hardly more than 100 Members who voted against the project.

I contend that this legislation is a must in the interest of the general health and welfare of millions of our people. I contend that in dealing with this issue, ladies and gentlemen, we must place human values before commercial and political interests.

I certainly would be remiss if I did not in conclusion pay much deserved compliment to Congressman THOMAS J. O'BRIEN for the long hours of work and the diligent and untiring efforts he has extended in the cause of this vitally important legislation.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SCHERER].

Mr. SCHERER. Mr. Speaker——

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCHERER. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. BECKER. I preface my remarks by saying that I served for 5 years on the Public Works Committee which has dealt with this subject. I would like to ask the gentleman why this bill comes to us authorizing a study but not authorizing the expenditure of any money to make the study? I understand from the report that this study is going to cost $550,000. It would seem to me that the bill should contain an authorization for the expenditure of the money necessary to conduct the study the bill authorizes. What can the gentleman tell me about that?

Mr. SCHERER. I understand that if this legislation is passed the Appropriations Committee will have to provide the necessary funds to conduct the study.

Mr. BECKER. And in the report is a statement that it will cost approximately $500,000, is that correct?

Mr. SCHERER. That is correct.

Mr. CURTIS of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCHERER. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. CURTIS of Massachusetts. I would like to ask the gentleman about the title of this bill. Is it an adequate description of what the bill really does?

Mr. SCHERER. I do not feel that the title covers the substance of the bill and I shall discuss that in my remarks.

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCHERER. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. JOHANSEN. Do I understand that the hearings on this bill have not yet been printed?

Mr. SCHERER. The report was made available this morning, not the hearings.

Mr. JOHANSEN. The hearings?

Mr. SCHERER. The hearings, I understand, have not been printed. The report was made available this morning.

Mr. JOHANSEN. May I observe, the real mystery is why we should grant a rule before we have the hearings printed on such a complex subject as this is?

Mr. SCHERER. Mr. Speaker, since the objection of Canada was discussed by the two previous speakers, I would like to treat with that subject first.

We can dispute the legal or moral right of Canada to raise an objection to this legislation, we can point out that Canada may or may not be harmed by this bill or that Canada is acting in bad faith or that our State Department may have solicited Canada's opinion with reference to this legislation. However, the fact remains, Mr. Speaker, that Canada has objected to the passage of H.R. 1 and if we ignore that objection at this time, Canada, then, will have money in the bank on which to draw when she begins diversion of the headwaters of the Columbia River before those waters leave Canada. If we do that we are going to not only put the United States but every State in the Pacific Northwest over the proverbial barrel because we will not have a leg to stand on to oppose diversion which Canada presently is contemplating in the headwaters of the Columbia River.

Mr. Speaker, if the end result of H.R. 1 was only the additional diversion of 1,000 cubic feet of water per second for 1 year from Lake Michigan by the Sanitary District of Chicago, and there was some substantial evidence that such diversion would help solve Chicago's sewer pollution problems, I would not oppose this legislation.

Now I realize that some of the proponents of this legislation contend that this is all they are asking. If they said that it was all they were asking at the moment, I might agree with them.

The last sentence of the bill itself indicates what the proponents really want and expect to get. This sentence reads:

> The report on such results shall contain recommendations with respect to continuing the authority to divert water from Lake Michigan into the Illinois Waterway in the amount authorized by the first section of this act or increasing or decreasing such amount.

Once this additional diversion of 1,000 cubic feet per second is granted, everyone in this House knows that there is no more chance of having it stopped than there is of repealing a tax once it is enacted. The purpose of this bill is to get the foot in the door—to get the matter away from the Supreme Court, to get Congress to take jurisdiction, to let the politicians do the necessary logrolling so that from year to year the diversion can be increased and increased permanently.

Ever since 1930 the Supreme Court of the United States by continuing decree has had jurisdiction over the diversion of waters from Lake Michigan to Chicago. There have been numerous applications under this decree filed by Chicago and the lake States for orders to increase or decrease the diversion. After exhaustive hearings the Court has acted. In some instances it has granted the relief prayed for in the applications by either increasing or decreasing the authorized diversions. In some instances it has refused to act.

It is my opinion that, whenever Chicago offers satisfactory evidence that she is entitled to additional diversions, the Court under the 1930 decree will act as it has in the past. The trouble is that Chicago is not able to make a case on its merits for additional diversions before the Court and, therefore, wants Congress to act arbitrarily in the matter and grant her the relief she seeks.

The fact is, however, that Chicago has not made a case before the Committee on Public Works to justify the Congress in acting. Her hope is to gain her objective for political considerations, rather than on the merits of her case.

There is no question but that there is a legal right to divert waters from the Great Lakes for navigation purposes. The Supreme Court, the Army Engineers, and all competent authorities agree that the 1,500 cubic feet per second diversion which Chicago is now permitted to make under the 1930 decree of the Supreme Court is sufficient to take care of the navigation needs on the Illinois Waterway. Whenever it is shown that additional waters are needed on a temporary or permanent basis for navigation needs, the Court, as it has in the past, will grant such additional diversion. To contend that the additional diversion requested in H.R. 1 or the study proposed therein is for navigation purposes is pure unadulterated nonsense and legal subterfuge.

The real purpose of this legislation is, as I have said, to get congressional authority for a diversion which will be increased from year to year in order to assist Chicago with its sanitary problems. No one will deny that Chicago does have a sanitary problem. She has had one for more than 30 years. True it is that Chicago has one or two of the most modern treatment plants in the world, but she does not have enough of them, of sufficient capacity, properly located, to handle the waste from the ever-increasing population and industrial development in the Chicago area. If Chicago were willing to spend the money and do the job that should be done in the Chicago area to handle the sewage problem, there would be no need for additional diversions.

It would take an additional diversion of almost 10,000 cubic feet per second to dilute the sometimes raw and partially treated sewage that is today dumped into the Illinois Waterway. The testimony is conclusive that the diversion of an additional 1,000 cubic feet could in no way help Chicago's situation; it could not even assist in making the test or survey that is proposed in this bill. It certainly cannot cure Chicago's problem.

Obviously the Chicago Sanitary District needs a survey—a survey to determine exactly what Chicago must do to handle her ever-increasing sewage problems, a survey to determine how many more sewage treatment plants are required and in what locations. The problem in the Chicago area is going to grow worse. The projected population increase and industrial expansion in the next 10 years is going to be such that without adequate preparation and changes by the sanitary district to handle the increased sewage load, we might be required to run all of Lake Michigan through the Illinois Waterway and eventually into the Gulf of Mexico.

While I realize it would be extremely costly if Chicago properly treated all of its sewage and then returned the effluent to Lake Michigan as does every other large city on the lakes, she could then divert as much water as is needed without any damage to or complaints from the other lake cities and States and without violating the basic law governing water usage and diversion.

Chicago over the years has received preferred treatment. In addition to the 1,500 cubic feet per second which she is allowed to divert for navigation purposes under the 1930 Supreme Court decree, she is taking approximately 1,800 cubic feet per second for domestic pumpage,

which should be returned to Lake Michigan as is done by all other cities of the lake basin. Instead, as we know, the ever-increasing domestic pumpage is lost forever to the Great Lakes. This diversion of domestic pumpage has permanently lowered the lake levels approximately 2 inches. The damage and loss caused by this lowering over the years in hydroelectric power, in shipping losses, and in the cost of dredging harbors and connecting channels, is incalculable.

We must also remember that Chicago by changing the course of three streams which originally flowed into Lake Michigan has also deprived the lakes of the normal flow of these streams to which the lakes are entitled.

But I suppose cities are like some people. When they have a special privilege, advantage, or concession, they are never satisfied. They become greedy and want more and more, even if it results in inconvenience and damage to their neighbors.

Chicago today is diverting from Lake Michigan approximately 3,300 cubic feet per second. The additional 1,000 cubic feet asked for in this bill makes a total diversion of 4,300 cubic feet per second.

Now when you talk about water in cubic feet per second, 4,300 cubic feet per second does not sound like too much water to the average Joe since he is used to measuring water by gallons. But do you know that a diversion of 4,300 cubic feet per second is a diversion at Chicago of 2,786,400,000 gallons every day. This is almost twice the flow of the Delaware River.

When you take this amount of water out day in and day out, year in and year out, one can readily comprehend the annual loss in hydroelectric power at Niagara and the St. Lawrence, the tonnage loss to shipping, and the additional cost for the dredging of hundreds of harbors and connecting waterways. It would take a Univac machine to calculate the totals for just 10 years.

Under these circumstances should we give Chicago the amount of water provided in this bill, namely, an additional 648 million gallons per day?

If we create this precedent, how many buckets of water are we going to allocate to Detroit, Toledo, Cleveland, Buffalo, Milwaukee, and hundreds of other smaller lake cities when they come to the Congress with all their water and sewage problems?

There are a number of cities in Ohio which are willing to take care of their own sewage problems but need a little additional water for domestic purposes. Maybe they can come to the Congress with a bill next year which would permit the building of canals or pipelines to divert just a few billion gallons from Lake Erie. Furthermore, a little Lockport plant down on the Ohio River in my district would give us some cheap hydroelectric power. In the succeeding years we can take care of cities in Indiana, Pennsylvania, New York, and our Canadian friends.

Seriously, Canada has entered its objection to this legislation with the State Department.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield the remaining time on this side, 4 minutes, to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 12]

Bailey	Hall	Nix
Barden	Hargis	O'Brien, N.Y.
Bolton	Hébert	Powell
Boykin	Jackson	Short
Cahill	Judd	Smith, Miss.
Celler	Kelly	Smith, Va.
Curtis, Mo.	Lafore	Spence
Denton	Laird	Taylor
Dixon	Landrum	Thompson, La.
Ford	McGinley	Toll
Frelinghuysen	Martin	Tuck
Green, Pa.	Morrison	Willis

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 392 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

DIVERSION OF WATER FROM LAKE MICHIGAN

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN], who has 2 minutes remaining.

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. BENTLEY. I would like to point out that I am afraid some of my friends from Illinois left the impression that the protests of the Canadian Government on this diversion issue have been rather recent. I would like to ask them to read my remarks tomorrow morning whereby they will see that the Canadian Government has been protesting Lake Michigan diversion as far back as the turn of the last century.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to announce that the Secretary of Agriculture today announced that current dollars-and-cents support prices for manufacturing milk and butterfat will be continued through the 1959–60 marketing year which begins on April 1.

The support prices are being continued at $3.06 per hundredweight for manufacturing milk and 56.6 cents per pound for butterfat.

In carrying out the program to support prices of milk and butterfat sold by farmers, USDA as in the past will offer to purchase butter, cheddar cheese, and nonfat dry milk in carlot quantities.

The announcement is as follows:

By law, the Secretary of Agriculture must before the beginning of the marketing year (presently April 1) set a level of price supports that will "assure an adequate supply."

During 1958, milk production was reduced by some 700 million pounds. Milk cow numbers as of January 1, 1959 were down 2.8 percent from a year earlier. The number of milk cows on farms is expected to decline still further in 1959 but not at as rapid a rate as in 1958.

With a rise in our population and a significant increase in cheese consumption and little per capita change in the use of other products, total commercial use of milk products increased in 1958 over 1957. As a result and since milk output declined, CCC outlays for price support purchases of dairy products are down substantially. (For details see press release USDA 645–59, dated Mar. 6, 1959.)

We have moved into consumption the reduced acquisitions. Our uncommitted supplies are as follows in comparison with last year:

Uncommitted supplies

[In million of pounds]

	Butter	Cheese	Nonfat dry milk
Feb. 28, 1959	28.5	6.5	49.3
Feb. 28, 1958	55.9	143.3	35.4

Nineteen hundred and fifty-nine production is not expected to be significantly different from 1957 or 1958 levels. Increased consumer incomes are in prospect, and commercial use of milk products per person is expected to be at least as large as in 1958. With the rise in population, supply, and the commercial use of milk products—measured on a fat basis—is expected to be more nearly in balance than in several years. (However, we still expect some surplus of nonfat dry milk solids.)

In arriving at a decision, I have consulted with producer groups, farm leaders interested in dairying, and the CCC Advisory Board.

Based on analyses by our dairy technicians, it would appear that retention of the present support levels is desirable to provide the level of production with the margin of safety to "assure an adequate supply." Therefore, I am maintaining the 1959 marketing year support levels for butterfat and manufacturing milk at the same dollar and cents levels as for 1958.

The dairy industry provides one of the most important sources of cash income for our farmers—about 14 percent of cash receipts from marketing in 1958. I believe its future is bright. Each morning there are 8,000 new customers for its products.

For good nutrition we need to consume more dairy products. We will do everything feasible to cooperate with this great industry to promote and merchandise its products. We will, of course, continue to assist the dairy industry in every sound way to expand its markets, reduce costs, and help it build on a firmer foundation.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. The gentleman from Illinois may extend his remarks immediately following those by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BENTLEY] and I ask unanimous consent to strike out what I previously said and yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. JOHANSEN) there were—ayes 163, noes 62.

So the resolution was agreed to.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 1) to require a study to be conducted of the effect of increasing the diversion of water from Lake Michigan into the Illinois Waterway for navigation, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H.R. 1 with Mr. SISK in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may require and to revise and extend my remarks.

Mr. Chairman, the hour is late. Most of us are quite familiar with the subject matter of H.R. 1. So may I limit myself to a brief summary of what the bill will do and then let the proponents and the opponents discuss in more detail the points in controversy?

Most of the Members, with the exception of the new Members of the House, have heard this bill discussed or debated, pro and con, for a period of perhaps 8 to 10 years, in the 82d, 83d, 84th, and 85th Congresses. The present bill has been modified somewhat to try to meet, to as great an extent as possible, the objections raised during those years of debate.

Very briefly, H.R. 1 would provide for a 3-year study to be conducted by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare and the Secretary of the Army, of the effect of the diversion of Lake Michigan waters at Chicago in the amount of 1,000 cubic feet per second for a period of 1 year.

I want to emphasize the fact that the diversion will be for 1 year whereas previous bills had called for a diversion of this amount of water over a 3-year period. In addition to this 1 year of diversion, the remainder of the time, up to a period of 3 years, would be used for field, office, and engineering studies and for the preparation of a report.

Mr. Chairman, there are those of us who may have some reservations about a permanent diversion and the speaker has some doubts concerning perhaps the effects of a permanent diversion. But the study is desperately needed by the city of Chicago to solve what is probably the most pressing sewage disposal problem of any city, certainly of any major city, of the United States. And although the city of Chicago through its sanitary district has constructed one of the most elaborate and efficient treatment plants in the world, one which has been referred to as one of the seven engineering wonders of the country by the American Society of Civil Engineers, the tremendous growth of the metropolitan area and the rapid industrial growth, combined with the peculiar geographical location of the city, at the very foot of Lake Michigan, make it necessary, in fact imperative, to find some means of combating this serious problem.

One of the first steps in the solution is the proposed study of diversion, and I feel there can be little, if any, valid objection to this experimental research. With one possible exception all of the objections concern the effect of permanent diversion at Chicago.

I wish to emphasize, Mr. Chairman, that this is not a permanent diversion, that the argument that this will be a foot in the door is not valid because the moment the time expires as to the life of this bill the act automatically becomes as dead as a doornail, and all of the required work would have to be put into motion to initiate a new bill for any further diversion. So in my judgment and the judgment of the majority of the committee which voted out this bill by a vote of 19 to 11, this argument is not valid.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLATNIK. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. I wonder if the gentleman from Minnesota then would explain the last paragraph of H.R. 1, which states:

> The report on such results shall contain recommendations with respect to continuing the authority to divert water from Lake Michigan into the Illinois Waterway in the amount authorized by the first section of this act.

To me it is very obvious that that section, being in the bill, does imply that it is a foot-in-the-door policy.

Mr. BLATNIK. That question implies only what one may want it to imply. I think the language is clear. I was interested in what diversion, if any, may be required. The study may recommend no diversion. So what do you imply? You imply what you want to read into the bill. It is only a recommendation which will come back before the House Committee on Public Works for consideration.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. If I may pursue that one step further, why cannot the study be based on the present diversion of water? Why do they need additional water to make their study?

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLATNIK. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. YATES. I have here a letter from Mr. G. E. McClelland, who is the chief of the water-supply and water-pollution control program of the Chicago Department of Health and Welfare, under the heading "Broad Knowledge That May Be Derived From a Study of the General Type Authorized in H.R. 1." I shall put this whole letter in my remarks, but I want to read one paragraph of that in reply to the question of the gentleman from Michigan. He says this:

> Many American communities are now faced with the problem of maintaining water quality for all legitimate purposes in the face of having a variable streamflow providing only a limited amount of dilution water at critical times. The critical problem in protecting water quality is that of discharging treated waste effluent into a watercourse having limited dilution capacity. This problem becomes especially acute when the community is providing the highest degree of waste treatment now feasible. The study will add much needed knowledge of dilution requirements under conditions existing at Chicago that could be applied elsewhere.

So that this study will probably be of value not only to Chicago but to every major metropolitan community in the United States.

Mr. BLATNIK. Yes; that is correct.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLATNIK. May I, for the sake of orderly progress, conclude this? Then we will hear the speakers in the regular order. The gentleman from Ohio has been most considerate on this matter, and I appreciate it.

That has been made perfectly clear. The committee has thoroughly investigated all possible objections to a test diversion. Most of them have been repeated and repeated and repeated until we know them by heart. We feel that the seriousness of the problem here does justify this temporary diversion for a period of 1 year. Then we will have the results of the specialized agencies, the Corps of Engineers and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, who can tell us precisely and exactly what the effect of this and any other diversion may be on navigation, or what else may be required for proper sanitation and pollution control in the sanitation district in Chicago, or whatever the effect may be on the loss of hydroelectric power.

I do strongly urge the adoption of this bill. It merely provides for an experimental test and survey.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLATNIK. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DINGELL. I do not read anywhere in this bill where there is anything other than a study on navigation. Is the gentleman telling us now we are going to have a study in addition to navigation of pollution and other things in the Illinois Waterway? Is that what the gentleman is telling us?

Mr. BLATNIK. That is right.

Mr. DINGELL. Is there any such language in this bill, H.R. 1?

Mr. BLATNIK. Yes. I think the words are broad but they do cover the intent.

Mr. DINGELL. May I ask the gentleman this question. He was telling us at this time that a part of this bill or rather a part of the study that will be made pursuant to this bill will be a study of pollution in the Illinois Waterways; is that correct?

Mr. BLATNIK. Yes.

Mr. DINGELL. Then, I assume the gentleman would have no objection nor would any other sponsors or proponents of this particular measure have any objection to having concrete language in the form of an amendment to H.R. 1, which would specifically set forth that it shall include a study of pollution in this particular waterway; is that correct?

Mr. BLATNIK. I have no objection, but I doubt if it is necessary. There is now a study going on and underway which the proponents from the city of Chicago and in particular the author will explain. The study is now underway which is costing over 150,000-and-some-odd dollars studying this sewage disposal problem aspect.

Mr. DINGELL. Then, I shall remind the gentleman and others who favor the enactment of this particular measure of this particular colloquy at the appropriate time when I offer an amendment.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLATNIK. I yield.

Mr. VANIK. With respect to this report and study that the gentleman referred to, as I read the bill on page 3, it provides for a study to be made of the effect on Lake Michigan and on the Illinois Waterway. We, in the lower lakes, Lake Erie in particular, are concerned about the effect of this on the connecting channels and the Great Lakes and on our Lake Erie, as I suppose it would affect the other lower lakes. What would be the feeling of the gentleman if this were amended to provide for reporting on the navigational effects with respect to the connecting channels of the lower lakes?

Mr. BLATNIK. Let us understand, of course, there will be some effects on other neighboring lakes, and they, too, are included in this report.

Mr. VANIK. Should not they be included in the language of the bill so that we who have this concern about the effect on navigation could have some assurance that our interests are going to be covered in this investigation and report?

Mr. BLATNIK. It is our understanding that that aspect of the problem would be included and it is not necessary to make more detailed or specific restrictions on the scope of the study.

Mr. VANIK. This specifically says on Lake Michigan and on the Illinois Waterways. Would the gentleman have any objection to including instead of Lake Michigan, "the Great Lakes and connecting channels thereof"?

Mr. BLATNIK. I would have no objection, but I would like to hear more from the author of the bill.

Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the dean of the Illinois delegation and our beloved friend and distinguished and eminent colleague from Chicago, Mr. O'BRIEN, the author of the bill, H.R. 1.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota has consumed 11 minutes.

Mr. O'BRIEN of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, this is the fourth time I have appeared in the well of this House in support of the Chicago lake diversion bill. It is not often that I take the floor and I hope that you will forgive me for taking these few moments to again make some brief remarks in support of my bill.

I hope—and expect—that it will be the last time I will have to urge passage of this bill. I hope that it receives congressional approval and that the President will sign it.

Essentially, H.R. 1 is like the bill that passed the 85th Congress. There is a significant difference, however, in that the earlier bill provided for withdrawal of 1,000 cubic feet of water per second for 3 years to supplement the city of Chicago's presently authorized withdrawal of 1,500 cubic feet per second. This bill reduces the period of the diversion to 1 year. The remaining 2 years of the experimental period will be taken up with studies and measurements prior to and following the actual diversion.

To most of the Members of the House, this is not a major bill but I can assure you that to those of us who come from the city of Chicago and the State of Illinois—it is a major bill. It is a bill of extreme importance.

Chicago is one of the great industrial communities of the world. As an industrial city it has the burden of disposing of a tremendous amount of waste products, and as a matter of fact, its human and industrial waste is the greatest in the United States—greater even than New York City itself. And Chicago is growing and will continue to grow, thereby multiplying its waste disposal problems enormously.

To meet this problem the Metropolitan Sanitary District of Greater Chicago has built a sewage disposal system which is perhaps the finest of its kind in the world. It has the finest and most modern equipment in the world, purchased at a cost of hundreds of millions of dollars, all paid for by the citizens who live in Cook County. The engineering processes of the system permit a 90-percent purification which is the highest degree obtainable. It is for the treatment of the 10 percent balance that we need a small amount of additional water from Lake Michigan.

Let me emphasize that this is not a permanent diversion. You will hear statements today from opponents of the bill who will talk to you about the camel's nose and this being the first step toward permanent diversion. Such statements are totally unwarranted. This is a bill for a one-year diversion to be carried out under the supervision of the Corps of Army Engineers. The tests are to be conducted by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. I repeat—it is not permanent.

We are quite sure the small amount of additional water will not be injurious to any of the communities on the Great Lakes. We have an unsanitary condition in the Illinois Waterway that we want to try to relieve. All we ask is your approval to permit us to make this test. The passage of H.R. 1 will give us that opportunity. Thank you.

Mrs. CHURCH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'BRIEN of Illinois. I yield.

Mrs. CHURCH. Mr. Chairman, I would like to take this opportunity of expressing my pride and that of the entire Illinois delegation for the remarkably fine and enduring and courageous fight the gentleman from Illinois, Mr. O'BRIEN, has given us under his leadership.

One of the things I am proud of in my service in the Congress is to be able to serve under his leadership. I am glad to say that I nominated him to head this fight knowing full well he was the only one who could put through such a bill, and I am sure he is going to be successful.

Mr. O'BRIEN of Illinois. I thank my colleague.

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Chairman, when we cut through the fog of confusing and often conflicting statements made in support of the measure now before us—H.R. 1—it becomes clear that the net result of this bill would be to benefit Chicago at the expense of other Great Lakes cities and States.

Not only would this increased diversion result in adverse effects on Great Lakes shipping and power development, but it is clear that to pass this bill would seriously jeopardize our good relations with Canada.

To support this statement I would like to quote briefly from a memorandum of the Canadian Government dated February 20, 1959:

> While recognizing that the use of Lake Michigan water is a matter within the jurisdiction of the United States of America, it is the considered opinion of the Canadian Government that any authorization for an additional diversion would be incompatible with the arrangements for the St. Lawrence Seaway and power development, and with the Niagara Treaty of 1950, and would be prejudicial to navigation and power development which these mutual arrangements were designed to improve and facilitate. * * * The Government of Canada therefore protests against the implementation of proposals contained in H.R. 1.

Mr. Chairman, we are spending many millions of dollars to improve the Great Lakes both in connection with the St. Lawrence Seaway and the related deepening of Great Lakes ports.

Much of this effort will be wasted if at the same time we undertake this increased diversion.

As a final point I would like to submit that at present jurisdiction for Lake Michigan lies in the Supreme Court. If the Congress, by enacting H.R. 1, assumes this jurisdiction, we can look forward to constant and continued harassment on the multitude of problems connected with this great body of water. Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. AUCHINCLOSS] is recognized.

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. MACK] who will yield time on this side.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman man from Washington [Mr. MACK] is recognized.

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Washington will proceed.

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Chairman, this bill came out of the House Public Works Committee by a vote of 19 to 11. We are here as a result of that vote debating the academic question of whether a thousand cubic feet of water should be diverted from Lake Michigan at Chicago as proposed by this bill.

I call this an academic question because everyone who has studied the history of this legislation must realize that this bill if passed by the Congress will be vetoed by the President.

I say it will be vetoed because the President on two previous occasions, in 1954 and 1956, vetoed similar bills passed by the Congress.

I say the President will veto this bill because the State Department is emphatically and unequivocally opposed to it. The State Department says this bill if passed will imperil our friendly relations with Canada.

The Bureau of the Budget is emphatically and unequivocally opposed to this bill. Because of the opposition of these two departments and judging by his previous vetoes we may be certain that this legislation if passed faces an inevitable veto. The question before us today therefore is purely academic. It will not become law.

This bill proposes to take from Lake Michigan 1,000 cubic feet of water per second. That may seem like a small amount, but 1,000 cubic feet a second is 60,000 cubic feet a minute or 3,600,000 cubic feet an hour. The water to be diverted would be the equivalent of a river 100 feet wide, 10 feet deep, flowing into the Illinois ship canal at a rate of about 15 miles a day.

That quantity of water, the engineers inform us, will lower the water in Lake Michigan by 1 inch if continued for a 15-year period.

It is argued that this legislation is temporary legislation. It is called only a 1-year diversion. This is foot in the door and camel's nose under the tent tactics. There is no reason whatsoever for any survey unless a permanent diversion is its purpose.

The only benefits claimed for this proposed diversion is that it will clean-up the pollution in the Illinois canal. Navigation in the canal will not be improved by this legislation. The only thing the extra water will do is to lessen pollution.

We have almost all of the information now on this problem. We know that the pollution in the Illinois Waterway is tremendous. It is unhealthy. It is unsanitary. It should be removed. Chicago can remove this pollution by the same methods employed by nearly every large city in the country. These other cities reduced pollution by building large enough in size and numerous enough in number sewage disposal plants to remove the solids in sewage before they reach a river. But Chicago, looking after the financial interests of Chicago, does not want to build these plants which would cost her millions of dollars. Chicago proposes to correct her pollutions by diverting water, a plan which will cost her nothing.

Canada is very much disturbed by this bill. Canada has protested very emphatically against it. State Department witnesses in testifying before our committee, in answer to questions by me, stated that passage and approval of this bill will give Canada an excuse and a precedent for diverting water from the Columbia River in Canada to the Frazier River in Canada. A few years ago Canada did propose to divert from the Upper Columbia River one-third of all the water that comes down that stream into the United States. If that water is diverted, why it would wreck havoc and cause millions of dollars of damage annually to power production on the American side of the Columbia River Valley where our Government has numerous power dams dependent for generating capacity on this water that has its origin in Canada.

If Canada diverts water from the upper Columbia that will lower the level of water in the lower Columbia River, with the result that navigation will be imperiled and tremendous damage done shipping which uses this river. We in the Pacific Northwest are very much concerned about Canada obtaining an excuse or a precedent for diverting Columbia River water.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Washington has expired.

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 3 additional minutes.

Mr. Chairman, shipping interests using the Great Lakes testified before our committee that if the level of water in the Great Lakes and their connecting channels is reduced by 1 inch, every large Great Lakes vessel will be compelled to carry 100 tons less of freight. There are hundreds of ships plying up and down the Great Lakes with cargoes. Shipping interests testified that the loss to shipping would total $2 million a year, of which sum the Canadian shipping companies would lose about $600,000.

The New York Power Authority testified that if the level of the lakes is lowered by 1 inch the Canadian power dams and the American power dams on the St. Lawrence and Niagara Rivers will lose $600,000 a year in power generation capacity; one-third of this loss would be suffered by Canada. So Canadian interests stand to lose about $800,000 a year of revenue which they now are obtaining when the water takes its natural course; that is, flows through the Great Lakes, through the St. Lawrence, to the sea, instead of being diverted at Chicago to go down the Illinois Waterway to the Mississippi River.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MACK of Washington. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. YATES. Will the gentleman tell the House what legal basis, if any, Canada has to object to this bill?

Mr. MACK of Washington. Canada has a right legally, of course, to object. Anybody has a right to object to anything. Any government has a right to protest to our State Department. The Canadians admit the United States has the legal right to divert the water if our Congress chooses to do so. The United States admits that Canada has the legal right, if she chooses, to divert water from the upper Columbia River in Canada.

Mr. YATES. In connection with the treaty of 1909, did not Canada by that treaty agree that Chicago could withdraw 2,000 cubic feet per second?

Mr. MACK of Washington. I am not familiar with that.

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MACK of Washington. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. BENTLEY. As I pointed out in my statement, Canada has the right to object under article II of the 1909 treaty to any action taken by the United States which in Canada's opinion would adversely affect her navigation.

Mr. MACK of Washington. I know the gentleman has made a very thorough study of the international problem in relation to water decisions. He is an able and most fully informed member of the House Foreign Affairs Committee.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MACK of Washington. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. I would like to ask the question why is Chicago so interested in circumventing the Supreme Court ruling? After all, was it not our understanding that Chicago went before the Supreme Court and got permission to divert something like 8,500 additional gallons per second a year ago, when there was an abundance of water? I cannot see why the Chicago delegation is so interested in circumventing the Supreme Court ruling.

Mr. SCHERER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MACK of Washington. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. SCHERER. The gentleman from Washington gave us some idea of the magnitude of the water that would be diverted at the rate of 1,000 cubic feet per second. Is it not a fact, that Chicago, for domestic pumpage today, diverts in addition to the 1,500 that is allowed for navigation another 1,800 cubic feet per second for domestic pumpage?

Mr. MACK of Washington. For domestic pumpage and for industrial use in the city of Chicago.

Mr. SCHERER. Is that water ever returned to the lake?

Mr. MACK of Washington. I am positive it is all returned to the Illinois Waterway. It goes eventually into the Mississippi. None of it goes back into Lake Michigan.

Mr. SCHERER. But not to the lakes?

Mr. MACK of Washington. That is correct.

Mr. SCHERER. Does any other city on the Great Lakes divert water for pumpage that is not returned to the lakes?

Mr. MACK of Washington. I do not believe so.

Mr. SCHERER. Now, if this additional 1,000 cubic feet per second is granted, that will make a total diversion at Chicago from the Great Lakes of 4,300 cubic feet per second, will it not?

Mr. MACK of Washington. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and twenty Members are present, a quorum.

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. WITHROW].

Mr. WITHROW. Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to the pending piece of legislation which would permit the diversion of 1,000 additional cubic feet of water from Lake Michigan at Chicago. I feel that this is entirely a local problem and I sincerely believe that if this bill is passed by the Congress and signed by the President, it will mean extensive and expensive litigation. Many eminent lawyers are of the opinion that Congress has not the authority or the jurisdiction to regulate the diversion of water from any of the Great Lakes. The attorney general of the State of Wisconsin particularly is very firm in his belief that the Supreme Court is the forum in which it should be decided. To me that seems very reasonable indeed, because when you divert water from Lake Michigan at Chicago, no matter how much that diversion may be, you lower the lake level on every one of the Great Lakes with the exception of Lake Superior. Certainly the people who live in the cities on the lakes will be affected adversely by a lowering of the lake level in their respective lakes. So to me it seems reasonable that this is a question for the Supreme Court to decide.

The Supreme Court as of April 21, 1930, did reduce the number of cubic feet that could be diverted at Chicago by 1,000 cubic feet per second.

In regard to the veto of the President on legislation similar to this, as stated by our good friend, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. O'BRIEN], President Eisenhower as of September 3, 1954, vetoed the bill H.R. 3300, a similar bill, which provided for 1,000 cubic feet per second additional water to be diverted from Lake Michigan at Chicago. His reasons were as follows, and I quote from a copy of the veto message of September 3, 1954:

I am unable to approve the bill because, first, existing diversions are adequate for navigation on the Illinois Waterway and Mississippi River; second, the methods of control of lake levels and protection of property on the Great Lakes should be considered before arbitrarily proceeding with the proposed increased diversion; third, the diversions are authorized without reference to the negotiations with Canada; and fourth, the legitimate interests of other States affected by the diversion may be adversely affected.

Further in that message he goes on in detail to enlarge upon his objections to H.R. 3300, which is a measure similar to this one. In the bill before us today, not one single objection of the President has been met. I cannot for the life of me see how the President in good conscience can possibly sign this piece of legislation even though it were approved by both Houses of the Congress.

I am including herewith President Eisenhower's veto message of September 3, 1954.

LOWRY AIR FORCE BASE, DENVER—MEMORANDUM OF DISAPPROVAL

I have withheld my approval of H.R. 3300, "To authorize the State of Illinois and the Sanitary District of Chicago, under the direction of the Secretary of the Army, to help control the lake level of Lake Michigan by diverting water from Lake Michigan into the Illinois Waterway."

The bill would authorize the State of Illinois and the Sanitary District of Chicago, under the supervision and direction of the Secretary of the Army, to withdraw from Lake Michigan, in addition to all domestic pumpage, a total annual average of 2,500 cubic feet of water per second into the Illinois Waterway for a period of 3 years. This diversion would be 1,000 cubic feet per second more than is presently permitted under a decree of the Supreme Court of the United States dated April 21, 1930. The bill also would direct the Secretary of the Army to study the effect in the improvement in conditions in the Illinois Waterway by reason of the increased diversion, and to report to the Congress as to the results of the study on or before January 31, 1957, with his recommendations as to continuance of the increased diversion authorized.

The bill specifies that the diversion would be authorized in order to regulate and promote commerce, to protect, improve, and promote navigation in the Illinois Waterway and Mississippi Valley, to help control the lake level, to afford protection to property and shores along the Great Lakes, and to provide for a navigable Illinois Waterway. No mention is made of possible improvement of sanitary conditions or increase in hydroelectric power generation on the waterway.

I am unable to approve the bill because (1) existing diversions are adequate for navigation on the Illinois Waterway and Mississippi River, (2) all methods of control of lake levels and protection of property on the Great Lakes should be considered before arbitrarily proceeding with the proposed increased diversion, (3) the diversions are authorized without reference to negotiations with Canada, and (4) the legitimate interests of other States affected by the diversion may be adversely affected. I wish to comment briefly on each of these points.

I understand that waterborne traffic on the Illinois Waterway has grown in the last 20 years from 200,000 tons to 16 million tons annually. The Corps of Engineers advises, however, that the existing diversions of water are adequate for navigation purposes in the Illinois Waterway and the Mississippi River. Surveys are now underway by the International Joint Commission and the Corps of Engineers to determine the best methods of obtaining improved control of the levels of the Great Lakes and of preventing the recurrence of damage along their shores. Reasonable opportunity to complete these surveys should be afforded before legislative action is undertaken.

The diversion of waters into and out of the Great Lakes has historically been the subject of negotiations with Canada. To proceed unilaterally in the manner proposed in H.R. 3300 is not wise policy. It would be the kind of action to which we would object if taken by one of our neighbors. The Canadian Government protested the proposed authorization when it was under consideration by the Congress, and has continued its objection to this bill in a note to the Department of State dated August 24, 1954. It seems to me that the additional diversion is not of such national importance as to justify action without regard to the views of Canada.

Finally, as is clear from the report of the Senate committee, a major purpose of the proposal to divert additional water from Lake Michigan into the Illinois Waterway is to determine whether the increased flow will improve existing adverse sanitation conditions. The waters of Lake Michigan are interstate in character. It would seem to me that a diversion for the purposes of one State alone should be authorized only after general agreement has been reached among all the affected States. Officials of several States adjoining the Great Lakes, other than Illinois, have protested approval of the bill as being contrary to their interests and not in accord with the diversion authorized under the 1930 decree of the Supreme Court. Under all of these circumstances, I have felt that the bill should not be approved.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *September 3, 1954*

You may speak about an inch not meaning much in the lowering of the lake level. It may not mean much when the lake level is up, but there is a cycle involved; there are times when the water is up and likewise there are certain times when the water is down. The testimony before the committee was to the effect that there would be a lowering of 1 inch in the lake level if 1,000 cubic feet per second were diverted at Chicago. What does that mean? Responsible people testified that a lowering of 1 inch in the lake level at a low-level time would adversely affect lake shipping to the extent of 1 million tons annually. Do you know that during World War I and World War II and during the Korean conflict, fortunately, we had high levels on the lakes.

Certainly we were very fortunate that the levels were high during these critical times.

This question of lowering lake levels by permitting diversion is fundamental. It not only can have an adverse effect upon our economy but it can also greatly impair our national defense effort. Even during the comparatively high lake level period we are now in, there are numerous ships plying the Great Lakes that are restricted in the amount of tonnage they can carry. When the St. Lawrence Seaway is completed, more vessels will have access to the Great Lakes and to Great Lakes ports, which will increase the tonnage adversely affected at the present time. I hope that H.R. 1 is defeated.

I want to quote from the testimony of Adm. Lyndon Spencer, president of the Lake Carriers' Association, in testifying before the committee on H.R. 1, the bill before us today:

The Congress has no moral or legal right, acting in the interest of Illinois, to experiment with property or assets belonging to the people of all the States and Provinces bordering the Great Lakes.

Additional diversion will result in irreparable loss and injury to the Great Lakes vessel industry, port facilities, and shoreside industries dependent upon lake-borne commerce.

Canadian rights to the waters of the lakes must be given full consideration, and this can be done only through an international body providing joint representation to both Canada and the United States.

Admiral Spencer informed the committee that the loss to shipping on the Great Lakes would amount to about $2 million annually; two-thirds of the damages would have to be borne by U.S. carriers and one-third by Canadian carriers. He explained his computation by saying that for each inch a ship is immersed the tonnage runs to a little over 100 tons; this loss per inch is multiplied by the number of trips a ship makes, which results in a total economic loss of 1 million tons annually on the basis of an additional diversion of 1,000 cubic feet per second.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WITHROW. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. I should like to ask the gentleman whether he could advise the House whether the President is going to veto H.R. 1 in this session of Congress?

Mr. WITHROW. I do not see how he can sign it in good conscience. Canada has protested, and it is a matter for the courts; it is not a matter for the Congress.

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WITHROW. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. COLLIER. Is the gentleman forgetting the St. Lawrence Seaway, which will more than compensate for any loss of shipping?

Mr. WITHROW. I have not forgotten about that, but I cannot see the sense in whittling out through the earth the St. Lawrence Waterway when you are going to permit the lakes to be lowered by diversion of water. You are working entirely at cross purposes.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Chairman, I want to reiterate my strong and continued opposition to the proposed legislation which would increase the rate of water diversion from Lake Michigan through the Chicago Sanitary Canal.

The district which I represent in the House of Representatives—the Fourth District of Wisconsin—lies on the very shores of Lake Michigan. The Milwaukee Harbor, our municipal port, and other public, industrial, and recreational facilities, located in my district, are closely affected by fluctuations in the level of Lake Michigan. It is for this reason that I am particularly concerned about this legislation, and its potential effect on the interests and the well-being of our people.

It is only fair to expect the interests of Milwaukee, and of all other Great Lakes communities, to be considered in determining the disposition of H.R. 1. If that will be the case, H.R. 1 will be soundly defeated by this House. I have no doubt about this, because the weight of evidence against the passage of this legislation is very considerable.

My objection to H.R. 1, based on past experience and the results of careful studies, can be summarized very briefly.

My first point is this:

Increased water diversion through the Chicago Sanitary Canal will permanently lower the level of Lake Michigan, and of other Great Lakes, to the detriment, first, of the navigation and shipping activities in our ports and harbors; secondly, of the use of our shores for recreational purposes; thirdly, of the hydroelectric power production in the Great Lakes Basin; and, fourthly, of the management and maintenance of the wildlife populations that abound these waters.

We know this from experience, as well as on the basis of recent studies, to wit, the study completed not long ago by the Corps of Engineers.

As to past experience, back in 1930, after almost 40 years of litigation between Chicago and the other States of the Great Lakes area, the Supreme Court of the United States pointed out that the Chicago water diversion up to that time had caused a permanent lowering of 6 inches in the level of the Great Lakes; that it had greatly damaged lake commerce by decreasing the cargo capacity of lake vessels; that it had damaged beaches, fisheries, and recreational areas; and that it had caused a permanent lowering of the water table in the Great Lakes region with great damage resulting to docks, harbor facilities, and building foundations.

It was for these reasons that the Supreme Court ruled that the rate of diversion then in effect through the Chicago Sanitary Canal should be reduced gradually from 10,000 cubic feet per second to 1,500 cubic feet per second. The decision of the Court proved to be very wise.

Now I realize that H.R. 1 proposes only what is referred to as a "temporary and experimental" increase in the rate of diversion. The fact remains, however, that even such a limited increase will lower the level of the Great Lakes. Further, this temporary and experimental increase can well become the "foot-in-the-door" which will lead to larger, and permanent, increases. For this reason, I must oppose it.

My second point is this:

Placing aside for a moment the fact that the communities on the shores of the Great Lakes, with the exception of Chicago, oppose this legislation in the sincere and substantiated belief that it will cause all of us harm, no bona fide case has been presented by Chicago to show the necessity for overcoming these objections and enacting H.R. 1.

This legislation is not required for reasons of public health. There is no evidence—at least none has been presented—to show that the health of the people of Chicago will be jeopardized if the rate of diversion is not increased.

Further, the proposed increased rate of diversion is not necessary for navigation of barges in the waterway which connects with the Chicago Sanitary Canal. The Army Corps of Engineers arrived at this conclusion on the basis of their study—and no one in Chicago has successfully challenged their opinion.

Finally, the proposed increase is not absolutely necessary to help Chicago solve its sewage problem. Every single municipality on the Great Lakes, except Chicago, returns to the Great Lakes the water which it has extracted, used, and purified through sewage treatment plants. I see no reason why Chicago should not do likewise. As a matter of fact, the only excuse that can be offered for Chicago's refusal to return the water to Lake Michigan is that it would cost money to do so. This is no valid reason, let alone a legal defense. The Chicago metropolitan area is a thriving community, and it can well afford to construct and operate the works that are necessary to return to Lake Michigan the effluent which is discharged by its plant after adequate treatment.

My third and final point is this:

Both the United States and Canada have a common interest in maintaining the integrity of the water in the Great Lakes Basin. We have a treaty with Canada on this subject. Further, Canada has objected to the proposed unilateral increase in the diversion through the Chicago Sanitary Canal. Now I believe—all other things being equal—that this fact alone should argue strongly against any unilateral action on our part, action which could damage our good relations with Canada, and work to the detriment of our national interests in the future.

That is all that I have to say. I believe that the reasons which I have summarized argue strongly against the enactment of H.R. 1. I hope that this bill will be defeated, and I shall vote against it.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Seventy-three Members are present, not a quorum.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. HARRIS) having assumed the chair, Mr. SISK, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 1) to require a study to be conducted of the effect of increasing the diversion of water from Lake Michigan into the Illinois Waterway for navigation, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

AREA REDEVELOPMENT LEGISLATION

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, communities where people live and work were never intended to be unchanging clusters of factories and stores and homes and public buildings. They are not confined by walls and moats. Even buildings and factories grow old and die, and industries come and go.

Through its slum clearance and urban renewal programs, the Federal Government has recognized its responsibility in assisting the communities to tear down and rebuild the deteriorated areas that are no longer fit for human habitation or for retail enterprise. It owes a similar responsibility toward the ancient, rundown, and abandoned industrial areas of these communities, in order to revitalize their economies.

The decline of local industrial economies, followed by chronic unemployment, is a postwar problem that cannot cure itself. Some of the affected communities, based upon an older industry that is steadily contracting, or has moved away, have been bogged down in the surplus labor category, for the past 7 years. Meanwhile, the empty and obsolete factory buildings are a drag upon the life of the whole community.

Our experience with this problem has proved that local groups and local initiative, despite valiant and partially successful efforts, cannot complete the heroic task of redevelopment without help from outside. Show me just one community, suffering from prolonged labor surplus, that has managed to lick this problem entirely by itself.

The danger of industrial blight is one that, sooner or later, can affect the economic health of any community, and that is the reason why we must have national legislation, providing adequate remedies, to help the distressed areas of tomorrow as well as those of today.

The old textile, coal mining, and railroad centers, are the current victims. But other communities are in the first stages of infection, and are refusing to admit the symptoms.

When I first introduced an industrial redevelopment bill in 1953, the suggestion was slow to win support. Within a few years, as the problem continued to plague many communities, public opinion gave more and more support to the need for legislation along these lines.

A pledge to aid chronically distressed areas was written into both the Democratic and the Republican Party platforms. In 1958, the House and the Senate passed an area redevelopment bill that was vetoed by the President. In the congressional election of last fall, the results in those areas of chronic unemployment, reflected public repudiation of the President's delaying action. I say "delaying" because the need for area redevelopment legislation is plain for all to see. The only question is: How soon and to what extent?

I believe that the composition and the viewpoint of the present Congress will insure passage of this legislation, even if it has to override another veto but with plenty of votes to spare.

For this program to be more than a half-hearted gesture, it must provide financial assistance for industrial and commercial facilities from revolving funds of $100 million for urban redevelopment areas and a like fund for rural redevelopment areas; grants up to $75 million for community public facilities; at least $5 million for technical assistance; and provision for suitable retraining for the unemployed.

To assist our expanding economy, we must be original in our thinking and flexible in our planning. Area redevelopment legislation meets these modern requirements. As it limits eligibility to those communities that have had substantial unemployment over a period of time sufficient to prove that the distress is not due to seasonal or other temporary factors, it will apply only to those areas that are clearly in need of help. When its mission has been accomplished, and the area has been restored to economic health, there will be no further need of Federal participation. Bear in mind also that the major emphasis is on loans, which, as they are repaid, will restore the capital to asist other affected communities in the future.

This is the type of pioneering that proves the capacity and the wisdom of our Federal union in coping successfully with any problem that may arise.

I am convinced that by the enactment of legislation to promote area redevelopment, we shall be able to help depressed communities so that they shall share as equals in our national progress.

IS FRANCO EITHER FRIEND OR ALLY?

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, is Franco a friend? I believe that it is clear he is not. This can be demonstrated beyond any doubt, despite the statements and actions of our Ambassador to Spain, Mr. John Davis Lodge.

Is Franco an ally? He is, but not a very good or dependable one. He has allowed us to build and occupy valuable military bases in Spain.

Should this House again vote to urge Spain's admission to the NATO alliance?

This has been proposed by House Concurrent Resolution 29 by the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER].

It is my hope that the Foreign Affairs Committee will fully consider this proposal, and take into account, among other things, the following ten facts, each of which will be separately explained:

First. Franco was morally and actually on the Axis side in World War II.

Second. The U.S. Ambassador to Spain, John Davis Lodge, contrary to Dr. Milton Eisenhower's recent recommendation which the President endorsed, publicly advocates an abrazo—embrace—for Spain from the United States.

IMPORTANCE OF U.S. AID HIDDEN

Third. Even though our aid to Franco Spain now amounts to almost $2 billion, Franco's policy has been to hide the extent and importance of this aid. He claims that current Spanish inflation is caused by the construction of American bases.

Fourth. U.S. economic aid has not helped solve the country's economic problems but has merely permitted the Government to avoid facing them.

Fifth. Spaniards persist in smuggling large sums out of the country, hedging against both inflation and the fall of Franco.

Sixth. The Spanish Government has been selling at a big profit cotton purchased from the U.S. under the surplus agricultural disposal programs.

Seventh. We have no binding assurances that we will be able to use our military installations on Spanish soil in case of war.

Eighth. The people of Spain do not like us because they believe us responsible in large part for their bad economic situation and because we appear to be closely identified with Franco.

Ninth. The U.S. message of freedom and democracy is not reaching the Spanish people.

Tenth. Communist support grows under Franco.

The explanation of these points follows:

FRANCO DOESN'T LIKE US

First. Franco was morally and actually on the side of the Axis in World War II.

Franco does not like us, or Britain or France. He never has. He plotted and fought against us in World War II.

On March 4, 1946, 13 years ago, our Department of State publicly announced that France, the United Kingdom and the United States had agreed that—

> So long as General Franco continues in control of Spain, the Spanish people cannot anticipate full and cordial association with those nations of the world which have, by common effort, brought defeat to German Nazism and Italian Fascism, which aided the present Spanish regime in its rise to power and after which the regime was patterned.
>
> There is no intention of interfering in the internal affairs of Spain. The Spanish people themselves must in the long run work out their own destiny. In spite of the present regime's repressive measures against orderly efforts of the Spanish people to organize and give expression to their political aspirations, the three governments are hopeful that the Spanish people will not again be subjected to the horrors and bitterness of civil strife.
>
> On the contrary, it is hoped that leading patriotic and liberal-minded Spaniards may soon find means to bring about a peaceful withdrawal of Franco, the abolition of the Falange, and the establishment of an interim or caretaker government under which the Spanish people may have an opportunity freely to determine the type of government they wish to have and to choose their leaders. Political amnesty, return of exiled Spaniards, freedom of assembly and political association and provision for free public elections are essential. An interim government which would be and would remain dedicated to these ends should receive the recognition and support of all freedom-loving peoples.
>
> Such recognition would include full diplomatic relations and the taking of such practical measures to assist in the solution of Spain's economic problems as may be practicable in the circumstances prevailing. Such measures are not now possible. The question of the maintenance or termination of the Governments of France, the United Kingdom, and the United States of diplomatic relations with the present Spanish regime is a matter to be decided in the light of events and after taking into account the efforts of the Spanish people to achieve their own freedom.

How far afield we have strayed from these noble words.

As item A following these remarks I am appending the entire State Department pamphlet of which the above statement is the introduction.

The pamphlet is entitled "The Spanish Government and the Axis, Official German Documents" and was published by the Department of State in March 1946. Newspapermen have had trouble finding copies. We ought to be reminded of Franco's role in World War II. The communications among Franco, Hitler, and Mussolini make interesting reading—the significance of which, in the case of Franco, is more than historical.

AN ABRAZO? FOR WHAT?

Second. The U.S. Ambassador to Spain, John Davis Lodge, contrary to Dr. Milton Eisenhower's recent recommendations which the President endorsed, publicly advocates an abrazo—embrace—for Spain from the United States.

The United States has become closely associated with the Franco regime in the eyes of many Spaniards. This is inevitable when a series of U.S. bases is being operated in Spain and the Spanish Government receives military and economic aid from the United States, even if the Spanish people are not generally aware of the extent of this aid.

The United States has gone further, however, and has made a special point of emphasizing its friendship with Spain. One recent example of this is contained in a speech delivered by U.S. Ambassador John Davis Lodge before the Spanish Institute at New York. Mr. Lodge said:

> Our relations with that great nation (Spain), to which America owes so much of its heritage, have progressed so steadily that today I would not hesitate to call them exemplary. As in relations between people, relations between nations must go through various stages, from the somewhat cool first handshake to the informal and heartfelt abrazo. I believe that we have reached with Spain the stage of the abrazo (the embrace). In the two-way street of friendship and association, this stage can only be reached through mutual respect and sincerity. (U.S. Department of State Bulletin, December 15, 1958, p. 963.)

This assertion by Ambassador Lodge contrasts strangely with the recommendations made by Milton Eisenhower a few weeks later when he reported to the President on our Latin American relations. Milton Eisenhower said:

> I believe the suggestion of Vice President NIXON is sound and would be applauded by Latin America itself—that we have an abrazo for democratic leaders, and a formal handshake for dictators. Trivial as this may sound, I recommend that it be our official policy in relations with Latin American leaders and nations. (Dr. Milton S. Eisenhower, report to the President, "United States-Latin American Relations, December 27, 1958"; Department of State publication 6764, 1959, p. 15.)

It is difficult to see why the United States should embrace the dictator of Spain but not the dictators of Latin America. It would seem more consistent to adopt the policy of a handshake toward dictators everywhere.

Third. Even though our aid to Franco Spain now amounts to almost $2 billion, Franco's policy has been to hide the extent and importance of this aid. Instead, he claims that current Spanish inflation is caused by the construction of American bases.

AID TO SPAIN—HOW MUCH?

Spain has been one of the leading recipients of U.S. assistance since 1953, but the exact sum of this aid is the subject of controversy.

The officially announced totals for aid actually transferred to Spain are:

	(*Millions of dollars, or equivalent*)
Grants (nonmilitary from fiscal year 1946 through 1958)	$343.02
Mutual security aid	257.48
Agricultural commodities through private agencies	65.33
Military equipment loans	20.234
Aid to Spanish dependencies	.066
Loans and other credits utilized (fiscal year 1941 through 1958)	142.58
Export-Import Bank (directly and through agent banks)	50.49
Mutual security program	81.92
Mutual security under Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act	10.18
(In addition there was $162.56 millions in unutilized loans and credits available on June 30, 1958. Most of this sum resulted from the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act)	
Military aid	239.0
The Department of Defense announced on Oct. 7, 1958, that $239 million in military aid had already been provided to Spain.	
Total officially announced in these categories	724.6

Unofficial estimates of U.S. aid provided to Spain considerably exceed the official figures.

The New York Times reported on January 3, 1959, that Spain had received $350 million in arms aid and $894 million in varying types of economic aid, including $351 million in commodities and $100 million in foodstuffs distributed through American Roman Catholic charities. This would make a total of $1,244 million.

The Times does not specify exactly what it considers as foreign aid. This figure may include the sale of U.S. surplus agricultural commodities to Spain in return for Spanish pesetas rather than dollars. Commodities have been sold in this way for about a $380 million equivalent in pesetas. Some of these peseta funds are included in the official totals above, however, when they are later loaned or granted to Spain. About $115 million equivalent in Spanish pesetas have been granted or loaned to Spain from these funds.

Nor does the Times specify whether its reported figures represent aid actually transmitted to Spain, or merely authorization and commitments. These, of course, run substantially ahead of actual transfers. The official U.S. figures cited above represent only the aid which has been transmitted. And they do not include the value of agricultural commodities sold to Spain for pesetas unless this money was later loaned or granted to Spain.

If the sale of agricultural surplus commodities to Spain is added to the categories of aid listed in the official figures above, it would add about $206 million making the total aid value $930.6 million rather than $724.6 million. The figure of $206 million represents the present value in dollars of the Spanish pesetas in U.S. accounts that have been derived from the sale of surplus agricultural products and which have not been loaned and granted to Spain.

Some unofficial accounts of U.S. aid to Spain also include the cost of constructing the U.S. base system in Spain, usually estimated at about $400 million. Some feel this is at least indirect foreign aid since the base agreement (1953) provides that the bases and all permanent construction located there will revert to Spain when the agreement is terminated. The agreement runs for 10 years, with two planned renewals of 5 years each.

The full $400 million cannot be considered aid, however, since most of the local construction and materials costs were paid for out of the Spanish counterpart funds and did not involve a new outlay of U.S. dollars. Counterpart funds are foreign owned, but jointly controlled funds generated by the sale within a foreign country of U.S. grant aid. It has been estimated that perhaps $75 million of the $400 million total base construction funds came from the Spanish peseta counterpart funds.

The London Economist also provided an estimate of U.S. aid to Spain in its issue for January 17, 1959. The Economist reports that economic aid has passed the $1 billion mark. It also includes $350 million for base construction and $400 million in military aid for modernizing the Spansh armed forces. Together, these forms of aid total $1,750 million. The Economist, like the Times, does not itemize what it considers to be economic aid so that it is difficult to compare these unofficial estimates with the official ones in any kind of responsible way.

If the Economist's aid totals are used it is possible to estimate that Spain has received an average of approximately $300 million in U.S. aid each year since 1954. A rough idea of the significance of this aid to the Spanish economy can be had by comparing the Spanish foreign trade deficit with the value of aid received.

FINANCING THE DEFICIT

In 1957 the total Spanish trade deficit was at a record high of $387 million and preliminary estimates place the 1958 figure at approximately the same level. If the Economist's aid total is used it may be said with some oversimplification that the United States has been financing most of the Spanish foreign trade deficit during the last 2 years.

Despite the magnitude of U.S. aid and its importance to Spain, the Spanish Government has generally seen fit not to give publicity to the actual dimensions of this aid. The policy of the Spanish Government as it has been reported by foreign correspondents in U.S. newspapers is to say there has been too little U.S. aid without, however, citing any figures, and then to claim that the current Spanish inflation results from construction of the American bases.

Recently this situation has been corrected somewhat by the widespread publicity in Spain given to statements

by U.S. Ambassador John Davis Lodge citing total aid figures and refuting the charge that the American bases have caused Spanish inflation. In January 1959, for instance, the weekly Spanish news magazine, SP, carried a five-page interview with Ambassador Lodge which dealt at length with the bases and the aid program.

Finally, it should be noted that the Spanish Government has appealed for increased U.S. aid. The New York Times reported on January 3, 1959, that Gen. Antonio Barroso, Spanish War Minister, recently had visited Washington and requested help in modernizing five Spanish divisions at an estimated cost of $400 million.

In general, U.S. aid to Spain is regarded as a quid pro quo for the American bases. The development of ICBM's by the Soviet Union has increased the vulnerability of the Spanish bases to Soviet attack and Spain is requesting more aid, partially in recognition of this new situation.

Press reports also indicate that some Spaniards have come to look upon U.S. economic aid as a kind of Spanish Marshall plan that should be designed to develop the national economy. When considered from this perspective, the American aid is felt by the Spanish Government to be insufficient.

At the same time there is little indication that the United States has conceived of the Spanish aid program as one aimed at the economic development of the nation. The United States has assumed that its economic aid to Spain has been designed to support the military aid program and as compensation for base rights.

There is little to suggest that the U.S. economic aid to Spain is intended for the purposes of thoroughgoing economic development. Some accounts do suggest, however, that the United States originally hoped to stimulate economic development and a liberalizing political trend through the aid program. If this ever was a major purpose it surely has failed.

QUESTIONS ARE RELEVANT

Because the Spanish aid program is mainly on a quid pro quo basis does not mean it is completely irrelevant to ask questions concerning the use of these funds. First, it may be questioned whether expensive military aid should be provided when it is unrelated to building the necessary defenses of the recipient country against external aggression. This appears to have been the case in Spain.

A report prepared for the Senate Special Committee To Study the Foreign Aid Program by the Institute of War and Peace Studies of Columbia University included the following reference to the military aid program in Spain:

> Spain furnishes the best illustration of a country which seems to have been granted aid on a straight quid pro quo basis. The United States wanted rights to build and maintain air and naval bases at given locations in the country, and the Spanish Government wanted hundreds of millions of dollars worth of certain specified types of military hardware. It was probably not a coincidence that Spanish sights were set at a level which reflected provisions written into mutual security legislation making available at least $225 million for Spain before the negotiations were concluded. The bargain was struck at about that level, making the Spanish case the outstanding example of a substantial grant of military aid in which the immediate American security interest was not to increase the aided country's own military power. This is not to say that modernized, effective Spanish armed forces might not prove useful in certain future contingencies, but rather that, for a variety of reasons, including Spain's exclusion from NATO, her forces were not likely to have a role in Western European defense which justified about $225 million worth of military aid at that time. (U.S. Congress, Senate, Special Committee To Study the Foreign Aid Program; Foreign aid program, compilation of studies and surveys; S. Doc. No. 52; 85th Cong., 1st sess., 1957; pp. 949–950.)

HAVE ECONOMIC REFORMS BEEN MADE?

Fourth. U.S. economic aid has not helped solve the country's economic problems but has merely permitted the government to avoid facing them.

There is good evidence to suggest that the Spanish Government despite its interest in a Spanish Marshall plan has failed to make the necessary economic reforms that make economic development a real possibility.

As a result, the U.S. economic aid has not helped solve the country's economic problems but has merely permitted the Government to avoid facing them. The Franco government has pushed industrial expansion by the importation of foreign machinery so fast that the nation's gold reserves have dwindled to $57 million, which is the untouchable minimum required to cover the national currency. Industrialization has been pushed forward at the expense of agricultural needs. The Government has further increased the country's economic problems by failing to disturb vested economic interests, by resisting foreign capital investment, and by excessively controlling private economic activity. See the Economist, January 17, 1959, page 229.

INFLATION IN SPAIN

The nation is in the midst of a spiraling inflation that has made the cost of living soar 40 percent in the last 2 years, thus wiping out the benefits of large wage increases decreed in the fall of 1956 and pricing Spanish goods out of foreign markets, thus reducing her exports.

Spain looks to the United States for help in extricating it from the increasing economic difficulties. But unless Spain is willing to undertake economic reforms it is doubtful whether further economic aid will help resolve the economic difficulties. It may perhaps be true that even though economic aid is provided for political and military reasons it still must be used in an economically rational manner or the result will be to increase the total problems facing the receiving country.

Fifth. Spaniards persist in smuggling large sums out of the country, hedging against both inflation and the fall of Franco.

Another reported problem which may illustrate the Government's failure to marshal national resources for its own economic development is the recent financial scandal involving the flight of hundreds of millions of dollars worth of Spanish pesetas to Switzerland. These are smuggled out of the country and deposited in private Swiss bank accounts by individual Spanish citizens. This has been happening for some years, but in December 1958 it was announced that some $100–$400 million worth of pesetas had been smuggled out in the preceding 2 months alone. These sums are highly important in the present perilous Spanish economic situation. Yet it is widely rumored but not confirmed that many of the highest government officials have been participating in this flight of the peseta. The Spanish Government has ordered an investigation, but little has been made public. The New York Times, December 17, 1958, in commenting on the scandal said:

> Spanish citizens hedging against mounting inflation here, others desirous of secreting foreign currency abroad for travel or purchasing puposes, and still others fearful of disturbances in Spain when Generalissimo Franco passes from the scene, have been exporting pesetas for years and selling them at a discount for whatever dollars, sterling or Swiss francs they could get.

When economic aid is provided as a noneconomic quid pro quo in Spain, the United States is often deprived of the leverage for achieving necessary local reforms which a program of this magnitude would normally be expected to provide. Spain feels that the United States needs the base system as much as Spain needs American aid. This country therefore does not seem to be in a position to curtail the aid program without inflicting an equal or greater injury upon itself, possibly by making American use of the bases somewhat more ambiguous than it is now.

See item B appended after these remarks.

A PROFIT AT U.S. EXPENSE

Sixth. The Spanish Government has been selling at a big profit cotton purchased from the United States under the surplus agricultural disposal programs.

Examples of the United States failure to exact Spanish economic reforms have been made public. Most recently, this country has been unable to have Spain change its pricing policies on the cotton which it buys from the United States under the surplus agricultural disposal programs in return for Spanish pesetas and then sells to the Spanish people. The Government sells this cotton to Spanish spinning mills at a significantly higher price than it pays the United States for the cotton—U.S. Congress, House Committee on Appropriations, Department of Agriculture appropriations for 1960, hearings, part 1, 86th Cong., 1st sess., 1959, page 207.

SPECIFICS ARE LACKING

Seventh. We have no binding assurances that we will be able to use our military installations on Spanish soil in case of war.

Under the terms of the defense agreement signed between Spain and the United States on September 26, 1953—TIAS 2850—the United States was permitted to construct, maintain, and use

military installations on Spanish soil in cooperation with Spanish armed forces. In theory the bases are to be used jointly by the two countries.

They remain under the Spanish flag and command, and at the termination of the agreement revert to full Spanish control. The agreement states that, "the time and manner of wartime utilization of said areas—bases—and facilities will be as mutually agreed upon."

The base agreement, therefore, does not specifically provide for United States use of the bases in wartime. It is reported that a verbal agreement exists to the effect that the United States will be able to use the bases, but this has not been put in writing. The absence of written permission has been questioned by many observers.

In 1955, Secretary of the Air Force Talbott was asked by a Washington reporter whether the agreement with Spain did not provide only for the peacetime use of the bases. He replied, "Well, who's going to stop us? There are certain agreements on the use of the bases, but when the balloon goes up we are going to use them." It seems clear that in the last analysis the wartime use of the bases depends on the consent of the Franco government or whatever one succeeds it. It is perhaps open to question whether this is a satisfactory guarantee for the United States to plan the use of the Spanish bases in a future emergency.

It was noted earlier that $350 to $400 million is the generally accepted unofficial figure for the cost of constructing the bases. This is higher than was expected at the beginning of work. In 1954 it was reported that the total construction program in Spain was to cost $216 million—U.S. Congress, Senate, Appropriations Committee, special report on Spain and French Morocco, by Hon. DENNIS CHAVEZ; 83d Congress, 2d session, 1954, page 2:

> The following is the list of airbases, all belonging to the 16th Air Force stationed in Spain: Torrejón de Ardoz, near Madrid; Sanjurjo, near Zaragoza; San Pablo, near Sevilla; Morón de la Frontera, southeast of Sevilla; and Rota, on the northern entrance to the Bay of Cadiz.
>
> The list of the naval bases is as follows: El Ferrol, in Galicia, which has always been the largest naval port of the Iberian Peninsula and one of the largest natural ports of Europe (it has, in addition, the distinction of being General Franco's birthplace); Rota, which is not only an airbase, but also the largest American naval establishment in Spain, from where the nearly 800-kilometer pipeline supplying all American bases, with the exception of El Ferrol, leads to Zaragoza via Sevilla, Ciudad Real, and Loeches. Beyond its special significance as a combined air and naval base, Rota is important as a subsidiary of Gibraltar, the latter's runways being too short for certain types of planes, and its waters not deep enough to accommodate warships of the *Forrestal* type.
>
> The whole system of American bases is completed by a number of air warning stations which are a part of the American early warning network spread across Western Europe.
>
> Contrary to an opinion widespread among the population of Spain, the size of the American mission is small. It totals 20,000 persons, including the families, about 7,000 men being ready for combat.

Eighth. The people of Spain do not like us because they believe us responsible in large part for their bad economic situation and because we appear to be closely identified with Franco.

Reports from Spain hold that there is a general local hostility toward the U.S. bases on the part of the Spanish people despite the scrupulous American efforts to avoid this hostility. The American mission, including families of servicemen, total about 20,000 persons, most of whom are stationed on the premises of the bases themselves. When off base the American forces do not appear in uniform and are careful to avoid discussing political topics. Violations of discipline are severely punished. In general, their lives are isolated since they have their own stores, clubs, and restaurants. Despite all this, the Spaniards have a general distrust, prejudice, and antipathy toward foreign troops stationed in their country.

Hostility toward the American forces in Spain and the bases is increased by the Spanish Government's public accusations that they are a major cause of the current Spanish inflation. Referring to these charges, Ambassador Lodge said last year:

> It is true that through the construction of military bases some additional pesetas have been placed in circulation. But about two-thirds of the base construction costs are paid for in dollars made available by the United States in the form of equipment, supplies, and services. The peseta costs, which are met not from the Spanish budget but from the counterpart funds generated by American aid, have been more than matched by imports to absorb the additional purchasing power created. (Quoted in Christian Science Monitor, June 21, 1958.)

Finally, it should be noted that hostility toward the American bases and Armed Forces also flows from the fact that many Spaniards who are out of sympathy with the Franco government look upon the bases and American aid as one of the Government's major supports. Antipathy toward the Franco dictatorship thus becomes antipathy toward the United States in some cases. C. L. Sulzberger, a New York Times correspondent, wrote recently from Madrid:

> Intellectuals and university students see Washington as a principal prop for the Caudillo (Franco). They begin to identify us with his stultified regime. Unreasonably, some conclude that we prefer to keep Spain underdeveloped and dictatorially controlled. (New York Times, Feb. 9, 1959.)

LET'S USE OUR "VOICE"

Ninth. The U.S. message of freedom and democracy is not reaching the Spanish people.

The United States has little opportunity to present American policy to the Spanish people and as noted earlier, the Spanish Government has been reticent about informing its people of the actual dimensions of U.S. aid. The U.S Information Agency offices in Spain have publicized our aid program, but this is a very modest activity, which is not widely seen by the people.

The United States has not even been able to use the Voice of America to reach the Spanish people. We do not beam any program directly to Spain. Instead we provide programs on tapes to the Spanish Government which it uses at its own discretion. These tapes are weekly cultural programs and a series of 2- to 3-minute excerpts from speeches by the President or other prominent Americans. The Spanish Government has not signified its willingness to accept any other American programs.

Taped broadcasts instead of live programs are used by the Voice throughout Western Europe, so that Spain is not an exception here. In each case the local government determined what it will use and attributes the material to the Voice according to its own wishes. It should be noted, however, that in general the other Western European countries are willing to use a much greater variety of Voice taped programs than is Spain.

Voice of America programs are beamed directly to Yugoslavia and that Government does not jam the programs. A case might be made for treating Spain like Yugoslavia in regard to Voice of America broadcasts. Both are on the fringes of Western Europe. Both are dictatorships. In both instances it seems important for the United States to have increased means of presenting its own story to the local people.

COMMUNIST SUPPORT INCREASING

Tenth. Communist support grows under Franco.

According to official United States estimates the Communist Party in Spain has only 5,000 members, though some responsible commentators cite reports that its supporters may number in the hundreds of thousands. The strength of the Spanish Communist Party and its operations are cloaked in considerable secrecy and there is disagreement as to its relations with the Franco government.

There is a widespread feeling among those writing about Spain today that although the Communist Party has been insignificant up to now, it may become a potent force in the near future by picking up strength from the rising Spanish opposition to the Franco government. The Communist Party's current program aims at a united front of all anti-Franco parties and groups directed at reasserting Spain's historic policy of neutrality.

On the other hand one report concludes that the Spanish Communist line has now changed to collaboration with the Franco government in a joint opposition to the non-Communist anti-Franco groups. According to this report, the Government is presumed to have ceased its attacks on the Communist Party and in return the Communists have ceased making anti-Government broadcasts into Spain from Eastern Europe—reported in Iberica, December 15, 1958, page 4. It has not been possible to check completely on the accuracy of this report. It has been ascertained, however, that the Communist radio broadcasts have not been silenced, but continue as in the past to support the local party line. In return, the Spanish Government radio blasts back at the Iron Curtain countries in Czech, Russian, Polish, Chinese, and so forth.

Many commentators on the Spanish scene seem to feel that the tactics of the Franco government, in stifling all

opposition at the same time the country is going through a severe economic crisis, may tend to weld the anti-Franco forces together. This could benefit the Communist united front position. Some commentators even claim that disillusion with the present state of Spanish affairs has spread to the Falange Party itself. C. L. Sulzberger, writing in the New York Times, from his present post in Spain says:

> Some Falangists recognizing the failure of their own system, are attracted by the new Communist line: "Let us forget the past and achieve national unity." Students sent by the party to agricultural Andalusia, draw glowing pictures of the Soviet collective system. Poor peasants can be heard to mutter: "When the Russians come we shall welcome them." (Feb. 11, 1959.)

THE PICTURE IS MUDDY

The picture of communism in Spain today is so confusing that it is impossible to draw many dependable conclusions until much greater information is available. It does seem clear, however, that support for the Communist position is growing in Franco's Spain today. Opposition to the Franco regime is rising and the Government has recently repressed several opposition groups.

It is also clear that the U.S. foreign aid program has not been the instrument to undercut whatever communism there was in Spain. Foreign aid has contributed to the growing industrialization of the country. But Spain might be suggested as almost a classic example of an instance in which economic development has heightened internal problems because the local government has not been willing to adopt strict and responsible policies that would make development a success.

Is Franco our friend?

He was not during World War II. He thought our victory would mean his downfall.

Why does Ambassador Lodge believe that Franco's Spain merits our embrace? A Spain that has been saved from economic collapse by U.S. funds. A Spain that gives us no firm assurance we can use our bases in time of war. A Spain with a leader who blames the United States for economic woes when he knows that our help has been essential.

It is clear that Franco is not our friend. It is also clear that we do not want him as a friend, any more than we wanted his friends Mussolini, deceased; Hitler, deceased; Trujillo, tottering; Perón, deposed; Pérez Jiménez, deposed; or Batista, deposed.

But we do need those bases so we have to deal with him, at least until our ICBM's are sufficiently operational. Very well, let us deal with him at arm's length and, as absolutely necessary, a formal handshake. We are paying value to him.

PUT IT IN WRITING

Let us insist on a written agreement as to the use of our bases in case of war. Let us stipulate, as a condition to further aid, that the facts about this aid be known to the Spanish people—and through more channels than our Franco-philic Ambassador.

PUT IT ON THE AIR

Let us also beam radio broadcasts into Spain to tell the Spanish people about our freedom and democracy. We do not do this now, but eight Soviet stations regularly give the Communist side to the Spanish people.

Franco's hold on Spain is weakening. Who will succeed him is by no means clear in Spain or elsewhere. None knows the date of Franco's death. All we know for certain is his final resting place in solitary grandeur in the Valley of the Fallen. Anyone who wants to look at the facts, some of which are stated above and more of which are appended, can predict that his successor will be anti-United States unless our policies and our Ambassador are quickly and forthrightly changed.

We need Franco as an ally but we do not have to compromise our deepest traditions to curry his favor, any more than we have to treat Trujillo as though we respected him and his despotic government.

LET US LEAD AS WE SHOULD

Vice President NIXON phrased it, Milton Eisenhower recommended it, and President Eisenhower endorsed it—an embrace for democratic leaders and a formal handshake for dictators. Now is the time to start carrying out this inevitable, commonsense policy in this hemisphere and throughout the world.

The United States can successfully lead the freedom-loving people of the world to better days, and away from godless mechanistic communism, only by holding fast to the Christian principles of individual freedoms on which our Nation was founded as it was born in a revolution against a tyrant.

ITEM A

THE SPANISH GOVERNMENT AND THE AXIS

I. STATEMENT BY THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE [1]

The Governments of France, the United Kingdom, and the United States of America have exchanged views with regard to the present Spanish Government and their relations with that regime. It is agreed that so long as General Franco continues in control of Spain, the Spanish people cannot anticipate full and cordial association with those nations of the world which have, by common effort, brought defeat to German nazism and Italian fascism, which aided the present Spanish regime in its rise to power and after which the regime was patterned.

There is no intention of interfering in the internal affairs of Spain. The Spanish people themselves must in the long run work out their own destiny. In spite of the present regime's repressive measures against orderly efforts of the Spanish people to organize and give expression to their political aspirations, the three Governments are hopeful that the Spanish people will not again be subjected to the horrors and bitterness of civil strife.

On the contrary, it is hoped that leading patriotic and liberal-minded Spaniards may soon find means to bring about a peaceful withdrawal of Franco, the abolition of the Falange, and the establishment of an interim or caretaker government under which the Spanish people may have an opportunity freely to determine the type of government they wish to have and to choose their leaders. Political amnesty, return of exiled Spaniards, freedom of assembly and political association and provision for free public elections are essential. An interim government which would be and would remain dedicated to these ends should receive the recognition and support of all freedom-loving peoples.

Such recognition would include full diplomatic relations and the taking of such practical measures to assist in the solution of Spain's economic problems as may be practicable in the circumstances prevailing. Such measures are not now possible. The question of the maintenance or termination by the Governments of France, the United Kingdom, and the United States of diplomatic relations with the present Spanish regime is a matter to be decided in the light of events and after taking into account the efforts of the Spanish people to achieve their own freedom.

[1] This statement was released to the press by the Department of State on March 4, 1946.

II. DOCUMENTS [2]

No. 1, memorandum by the German Ambassador in Madrid

BERLIN, *August 8, 1940.*

OPERATION GIBRALTAR

Conditions for Spain's entry into the war:

According to a memorandum presented in June of this year by the Spanish Embassy, the Spanish Government declares itself ready, under certain conditions, to give up its position as a "nonbelligerent" state and to enter the war on the side of Germany and Italy. The Spanish Foreign Minister, and also the Minister of the Interior, have up until the last few days repeatedly pointed out this Spanish offer to me, so that it may be assumed that Spain even today will keep its promise made in June.

As conditions for entry into the war, the Spanish Government cites the following:

1. Fulfillment of a set of national territorial demands, Gibraltar, French Morocco, that part of Algeria colonized and predominantly inhabited by Spaniards (Oran), and further the enlargement of Rio de Oro and of the colonies in the Gulf of Guinea;

2. Making available military and other assistance required for carrying on the war.

The memorandum of Admiral Canaris enclosed here [3] gives detailed information regarding the extent of military assistance apparently necessary.

Besides this military assistance, however, economic support of Spain will also be necessary. To this belong, above all else, the delivery of gasoline and, at the beginning of next year, delivery of grain for bread. According to a recent utterance of the Spanish Minister of Foreign Affairs (of the 3d of this month) Spain, due to its shortage of gasoline, can wage war without our help 1½ months at the most. As concerns the grain for bread, the Minister believes that Spain has sufficient supplies until about March of next year. I consider this latter supposition as too optimistic, unless a strict rationing is carried out.

Besides this necessary assistance however, Spain, beginning with entry into the war, will with respect to a number of other commodities as well be exclusively left to the resources of German and Italian aid.

Advantages of the operation:

1. The effect of the declaration of war on England by a new country will be very strong in England and on the entire world; England's prestige and her prospects for victory will receive a new severe blow, while—upon success of the operation—our prestige will be greatly increased.

2. England will no longer be able to carry on trade with Spain, thus will receive from there no more ores and above all no more pyrite.

[2] This series of 15 documents (translations) was released to the press by the Department of State on March 4, 1946.

[3] Not printed.

3. Nullification of English property rights in ore and copper mines, et cetera.

4. A victorious execution of the operation will mean the control of the straits.

Dangers of the operation for Spain:

1. It would be possible that England, after becoming aware of Spain's war preparations, would beat Spain to the draw and begin war operations.

2. For this purpose she could attempt to extend the territory of Gibraltar in order thereby to make the attack upon Gibraltar more difficult. England could further occupy the Canary Islands, Tangier, and the Spanish colonies, operations which without doubt will result at least in part after the outbreak of war. Spain even considers the Balearic Islands as being threatened.

3. A break between Spain and England can have consequences for Portugal. The English could occupy Lisbon and Lagos or other places in Portugal so that Spain would have a land front. In case of an occupation of Portuguese harbors Salazar is said to have naturally held out to the Spaniards the prospect of military countermeasures, and to have declared himself agreed to a Spanish entry for rendering assistance against England.

4. Outbreak of the war between Spain and England can bring events to a head in north Africa, especially Morocco, where the situation is very tense. Spain distrusts Resident General Nogues who is said to be ogling with the English. Therefore a cooperative English-French-Moroccan operation against the Spanish zone and Tangier would be possible.

5. Because of debilitation resulting from the civil war, Spain is economically unfit to carry through to the end a war lasting more than a few months, if she does not receive economic aid from German and Italian quarters. Aside from gasoline, this, as mentioned above, is true of grain for bread as well.

6. As a result of an intensification of the grave economic situation and eventual starvation and as a result of political and military setbacks (loss of islands, of the colonies) domestic riots could result. This danger I do not consider as very grave at first, since the army is intact. Should the war be of longer duration, however, the situation could become serious.

Difficulties and dangers for us:

1. For transporting the necessary war material to Spain, only the railroad line Bordeaux-Hendaye-(border)-Irun-San Sebastián-Burgos, and so forth, and the road running parallel are available. Within the border area occupied by our troops there is only one other passageway over the Pyrenees, namely, at St. Jean Pied de Porc. According to information from General of the Infantry von Both in Biarritz, only passenger cars and light trucks can travel on this passroad because of its narrow curves. The transporting of all war material must therefore go along the coast where, for long stretches, between Bayonne and San Sebastian, the railroad and the road can be observed and fired upon from the sea. A further difficulty exists in the fact that the Spanish railroad has a different gage from the French so that reloadings are necessary and such equipment as railway guns cannot be transported on. Heavy artillery and other [artillery] are therefore confined exclusively to the roads.

2. The claims upon Germany to deliver weapons and supply special troops should meet with no objections. On the other hand, should the war be of longer duration, the economic assistance requested of us could represent a great burden (especially with respect to nutrition).

If the operation is undertaken, it is in any case necessary:

1. To have the preparations go forward in as camouflaged a manner as possible, to make available in Spain supplies of gasoline and war material (ammunition, bombs) which can be unobtrusively transported by railroad and truck, and, not until the last moment, to bring the heavy guns collected in the south of France across the border by fast transit and into the prepared emplacements, while the air arm is absolutely not to make its appearance until the operation begins in earnest.

2. The moment for initiating the preparations and the operation itself must be adjusted to the expected development of things in England itself, in order to avoid a too early entry of Spain into the war, that is to say, a period of war unendurable for Spain, and thus under certain circumstances the beginning of a source of danger for us.

STOHRER.

No. 2, letter from General Franco to Mussolini

CHIEF OF STATE AND GENERALISSIMO
OF THE SPANISH ARMY,
Madrid, August 15, 1940.

To His Excellency Senor BENITO MUSSOLINI,
Head of the Italian Government, Italy.

DEAR DUCE: Since the beginning of the present conflict, it has been our intention to make the greatest efforts in our preparations, in order to enter the foreign war at a favorable opportunity in proportion to the means at our disposal, since the lack of the most vital provisions and the interruption of communications with Italy and Germany hindered every operation at the moment.

The rapid and devastating victories in Flanders altered the situation; the defeat of France liberated our frontiers, lessening the grave tension which we along with our Moroccans have been bearing since our civil war.

From this moment, our horizon became brighter, our operation became possible and could become very effective, once the difficulties of provisioning have been removed.

In this manner, upon the entry of your nation into the war, we had to take a clearer stand, one of alertness, changing to one of nonbelligerency, which, in the field of foreign affairs, could not fail to have great repercussions. This awakened jealousy and opposition, and unleashed an Anglo-American offensive against our provisioning, aggravated in these days by the new measures taken by the United States against our exports, and by the English blockade measures, causing grave tension in our relations with those countries.

The consequences, which the conquest of France is to have for the reorganization of the north African territories have made it advisable for me, now that the time has come, to charge my Ambassador in Rome with transmitting to Your Excellency the Spanish aspirations and claims traditionally maintained throughout our history in the foreign policy of Spain, today more alive than ever in our consciousness; to territories, whose present administration is a consequence of that Franco-English policy of domination and exploitation, of which Italy also bears so many scars. To the legitimate Spanish aspirations are added in this case the requirements for security necessitating the elimination of a weak and thinly protected frontier, and the assuring of our communications with the Canary Island group.

In this manner, Spain in addition to the contribution which she made to the establishment of the new order, through our years of hard struggle, offers another in preparing herself to take her place in the struggle against the common enemies.

In this sense, we have requested from Germany the necessities for action, while we push forward the preparations and make every effort to better the provisioning situation as far as possible.

For all these reasons, you will understand the urgency in writing you, to ask your solidarity in these aspirations for the achievement of our security and greatness, while I at the same time assure you of our unconditional support for your expansion and your future.

With my greatest admiration for the brave Italian comrades who are fighting so gloriously, I send you my most cordial regards.

F. FRANCO.

No. 3, letter from Mussolini to General Franco

THE CHIEF OF GOVERNMENT
AND DUCE OF FASCISM,
Rome, August 25, 1940.

To the Head of the Spanish Government,
Generalissimo DON FRANCISCO FRANCO-BAHAMONDE, Madrid.

DEAR FRANCO: I thank you for the letter which you have sent me, and in which you sketch the position of Spain in the present stage of the war.

I should like to make it clear to you at once, that your letter has not surprised me.

Ever since the outbreak of the war I have been constantly of the opinion that your Spain, the Spain of the Falange revolution, could not remain neutral until the end of the war, but at the right moment would change to nonbelligerency and finally to intervention.

Should that not happen, Spain would alienate herself from European history, especially the history of the future, which the two victorious Axis Powers will determine.

Furthermore, she would have no moral justification for the solution of her African questions, and, let me say to you, a victorious revolution must set itself extreme goals of an international type, such goals, therefore, as can, at a given moment, require the complete attention and the total effort of a people.

It is clear to me that Spain, after 3 years of civil war, needed a long period of recuperation, but events will not permit it, and your domestic economic condition will not get worse when you change from nonbelligerency to intervention.

I should like to say to you, dear Franco, that I, with these my practical considerations, do not wish to hasten you in the least in the decision that you have to make, for I am sure that in your decisions you will proceed on the basis of the protection of the vital interests of your people and am just as certain that you will not let this opportunity go by of giving Spain her African Lebensraum.

There is no doubt that after France, Great Britain will be defeated; the British regime exists only on one single element: the lie.

I certainly do not need to tell you that you, in your aspirations, can count on the full solidarity of Fascist Italy.

I beg you, dear Franco, to accept my most cordial and comradely greetings.

MUSSOLINI.

No. 4, notes of a conversation between the Führer and the Spanish Minister of the Interior Serrano Suñer in the presence of the Reichs Foreign Minister in Berlin on September 17, 1940

As a preliminary Serrano Suñer delivered a short and voluntary message of Generalissimo Franco, in which the latter expressed to the Führer his gratitude, sympathy, and high esteem, and emphasized to him his loyalty of yesterday, of today, and for always. Franco had commissioned him to bring about a direct contact with the German Government in this decisive time. Since he had already informed the Reichs Foreign Minister of the Spanish wishes, he did not at the moment want to come back to that again, but only wished to emphasize that the Spanish attitude toward Germany had not changed in the least. It was not a question of a revision of the Spanish foreign policy, but only of a clarification of the conditions under which Spain was ready to fight the war together with Germany. Whenever Spain's

supply of foodstuffs and war material was secure she could immediately enter the war. With reference to the war material, Suner declared that the details of the Spanish wishes had been conveyed to Admiral Canaris and Suñer made precise the wish for placing artillery at their disposal specifying that the Spaniards considered 10 38-centimeter guns necessary for Gibraltar.

The Führer replied that the German people had not forgotten the stand which Spain had taken in the World War and that this feeling of appreciation had been the most profound cause for the German conduct during the civil war. Now Germany was in the decisive struggle against England. Continentally this struggle was already decided. A British landing on the Continent was to be characterized as an absolute chimera. The only military possibility still existing was an attempt by England to alienate the French colonies in north Africa from the Pétain government and use them as a new position for the continuation of the war. Aside from that, England had no more opportunities whatever for penetration into the European Continent, from Norway to Spain and Portugal.

In this connection, Suñer pointed to the Spanish fear concerning an English landing on the Cantabrian coast and in this regard mentioned that communistic elements in the population of the Asturias would render the situation very complicated in the event of such a landing attempt. The Führer replied that he could set Suñer's mind at rest in this respect on the basis of landing experiences with landings in Norway where indeed the entire population had been on the side of the English, and the latter, in spite of that, could achieve no success. In Norway it had also been shown that coast artillery was not suitable for repelling an attack, but instead that air defense brought the most favorable results. If a group of Stukas and a group of heavy pursuit planes were made available for the conquest of Gibraltar, then within 8 days no enemy ship would any longer dare to venture into these Spanish areas within a radius of 350 kilometers for the heavy bombs of 1,800 kilograms which these machines carried could perhaps not completely destroy a ship but with a direct hit would render it so incapable of battle that a repair of several months would be necessary. The English, however, would not want to run such a risk. In Norway, however, we had forced the English to retreat only through the use of Stukas.

When Serrano Suñer for his part pointed again to the great strength of the fortress of Gibraltar, the Führer replied that an attack with heavy artillery against an establishment of that type would not be as effective as would be an operation with the special weapons used in overwhelming the Maginot Line. Heavy aerial bombs had an effect many times as great as the heaviest artillery and even the works of the Maginot line could not stand up under it, since armored structures which, according to World War experience, could withstand the heaviest artillery, had been annihilated by 1,000-, 1,400- and 1,800-kilogram aerial bombs inside of 10 minutes. Even when there was no direct hit, the concussion effect of a 1,000-kilogram bomb was, in itself, tremendous. Therefore, the decisive factor for the conquest, and later defense, of Gibraltar, is the guaranteeing of absolute air supremacy.

To be sure, we had set up heavy artillery on the channel coast; it was, however, intended only for very bad weather when penetration by air attacks upon the enemy positions was completely out of the question. Aside from that the installation of 38-centimeter guns lasts several months. Already in the middle of July we had installed the batteries erected in the vicinity of Calais.

The superiority of the Stukas as compared to the heavy artillery is shown by the following figures: A great long-barreled gun could fire 200 rounds without repair, while a Stuka squadron of 36 machines in use thrice daily could drop 120 bombs of 1,000 kilograms each, every 1 of which contained the appropriate amount of high-powered explosives, while a 38-centimeter shell contained only 70 to 75 kilograms of explosives.

It (was a sure thing that one could not long resist the attack of a)[4] dive-bombing group of Junkers 88's and that, at the approach of this feared opponent, the English fleet would immediately get away from Gibraltar and from the entire vicinity.

The Führer declared further that it would not be possible to provide 38-centimeter guns for Gibraltar. Even the transporting would involve extraordinary difficulties, and the installation would require 3 to 4 months. Germany could, however, make special artillery available for the Gibraltar undertaking. Moreover, it was clear that Germany would do everything in her power to help Spain. For once Spain entered the war, Germany would have every interest in her success, since indeed a Spanish victory would be a German one at the same time.

In the Gibraltar undertaking, it would be primarily a matter of taking the fortress itself with extraordinary speed and protecting the straits.

Serrano Suñer thanked the Führer and pointed out that in the previous discussions which had taken place on this subject between German military experts, among others General von Richthofen, and Admiral Canaris, and General Franco, the German intentions had not clearly come to light, indeed, quite on the contrary a certain confusion had arisen. Because of the Führer's statements, the military possibilities had appeared in an entirely new light. He was asking the Führer whether he was ready to put down in writing the views just expressed so that he could convey them to General Franco on his return.

The Führer promised this and emphasized that the question of the capture of Gibraltar had already been studied exactingly by the Germans. For example, a commission of German frontline officers who had had a leading part in the conquest of important French and Belgian fortifications, like Fort Eben Emaël and the Maginot line, had gone to Spain in order to examine the question on the spot. On the basis of the impressions of this commission as well as of the particulars about the condition of Gibraltar which Germany had possessed from former times or obtained recently through Admiral Canaris they had come to the conclusion that Gibraltar could be conquered by a modern attack with relatively modest means. It was a matter of methods which Germany had already used so successfully in the west. Gibraltar was definitely less capable of resistance than the fortifications in the west. (Casemated)[5] guns could be silenced more easily than perchance the guns of the Maginot line which were installed in armored cupolas, and the exposed artillery of Gibraltar could be overwhelmed even more easily. The military cooperation of Germany in the Spanish war would consist of:

1. Immediately expelling enemy ships from the straits, and

2. Making available a small troop of specialists with special weapons by whom Gibraltar could be quickly overwhelmed without great sacrifice of blood. This would be a matter of a small selected special troop of assault engineers equipped with special armor-destroying guns—the so-called "Scharten" or "Pillbox-crackers." As soon as Gibraltar was taken, the problem of the Mediterranean would therewith be settled and no serious danger from French Morocco either could any longer threaten.

In the further course of the conversation, Serrano Suñer, in the same fashion as in his conference with the Reichs Foreign Minister again criticized a few Spanish diplomats. In Berlin, Spain had unfortunately been represented by an Ambassador too old and too liberal-minded, but the Falange had not been able to build up the necessary young forces fast enough to fill the posts important in foreign policy with the right people. The Führer replied that he had great appreciation of this difficulty, for Germany, also, in certain instances in 1934, still had representatives abroad with the spirit of 1932. Suñer seized upon this remark and said that Germany in fact had not always been well represented in Salamanca also. Sometimes it was a matter of Germans who, to be sure, spoke Spanish because they had formerly lived in South America, but who had had no idea of the actual Spanish problems and of the Spanish spiritual sphere.

In the further course of the conversation, Serrano Suñer came to speak about Morocco, and justified the Spanish claims for it in a manner similar to that in the conversation with the Reichs Foreign Minister. He characterized Morocco as Spain's Lebensraum and as her natural expansion objective. For reasons of domestic strengthening of the regime and of external security, Spain was raising the known territorial demands.

The Führer agreed with him in the last point with the remark that many a domestic difficulty which Spain at the moment perhaps still had to face could quickly and easily be overcome by successes with foreign policy. This was an old historical experience. Moreover, it was a matter of two questions:

1. Of the problem of the war, which essentially was a military question, and

2. Of the future configuration of the relationships in Europe and Africa.

Here Germany, on the one hand, had economic interests—she wanted to buy raw materials and sell finished manufactured goods—and, on the other hand, there was the problem of security for her African future in central Africa. For under (certain) conditions, a great danger could threaten her possessions there and even the whole new order as well. It was not out of the question that England and France would try to entice America to the Azores and in these efforts find support in certain imperialistic tendencies of America now already coming to the fore. England could in this way gain a foothold in the islands stretching out in front of Africa—whereby, in time, a very unpleasant situation would arise. For the Continent would be dependent upon that power which kept the outlying islands occupied, especially if it concerned a power with naval superiority. Now the control of the seas could be exercised neither by Italy, nor by Germany, nor by Spain. Therefore, it was necessary to set up defensive strong points on the islands in good time.[6]

To this, Serrano Suñer remarked that Germany had won the war and could claim the leadership in the new order. The defense of the European-African area, however, must take place within the framework of a military alliance of the three powers and of a wise policy. The Führer, continuing, explained the German interests. It was a matter of:

First, to render the northern area free from the blockade;

Second, to create security toward the east for danger always threatened from the east, and Germany was filling a very useful role as the eastern bulwark for Europe; and

Third, to assure Germany a great colonial area, which was not, however, a matter of

[4] Probable translation; text indistinct in microfilm.

[5] Probable translation; text indistinct in microfilm.

[6] Most of one paragraph illegible on microfilm.

area for settlement, of which she possessed enough on the European Continent, but instead purely a matter of raw-material colonies.[7]

After a 1-hour duration the interview was concluded.

SCHMIDT,
Minister.

SEPTEMBER 19, 1940.

No. 5, letter from Generalissimo Franco to Hitler

CHIEF OF STATE, GENERALISSIMO OF THE NATIONAL MILITARY FORCES,
September 22, 1940.

MY DEAR FÜHRER: I received your letter in which you stated to me your views and those of your General Staff in connection with the problems with respect to Spain which are arising from the war, views which with the exception of small details match my thoughts and plans and those of my General Staffs.

I must thank you for the cordial reception which you and your people prepared for my envoy, Minister Serrano Suñer, who reported to me about your conversation and about your esteemed ideas, which satisfy our wishes, and with which we believe ourselves to be in complete agreement, as you will see from the content of this letter. In spite of complete agreement with your words "to recognize the Spanish claims to Morocco with the one limitation of assuring Germany through favorable commercial agreements a share in the raw material of this area," there is to be sure one point where they are inconsistent, namely in the wishes of Herr von Ribbentrop, expressed in the form of a proposal during the conversations between our Ministers, for the establishment of an enclave for German military bases by occupying both the two harbors of the southern zone. These are, according to our opinion, unnecessary in peacetime, and superfluous in wartime, because in this case, you can count upon not only these harbors but on all of them that Spain possesses, since our friendship is to be sealed firmly for the future as well. The advantages that these bases could offer would neither counterbalance the difficulties which this type of enclave always produces nor the harm which they cause to the areas involved whose outlet to the sea they constitute.

I thank you very much for your idea, put before Minister Suñer, of providing me with an opportunity for us to meet near the Spanish border, for, apart from my eager wish to greet you personally, we could have a more thorough and more direct exchange of ideas than our present communications make possible. I should therefore like to state to you my opinion about the individual points of your letter.

1. In regard to your trains of thought set forth in point one concerning the political and economic effects of the present struggle, I can only say to you that I have agreed from the first day on with your opinion expressed there. Only our isolation and the lack of resources most indispensable for our rational existence made our operation impossible.

I am in agreement with you that driving the English out of the Mediterranean Sea will improve the condition of our transports, although it is self-evident that not all questions of the provisioning of Spain will be solved thereby since there are many products and raw materials which Spain lacks, and which are not to be found in the Mediterranean Basin.

2. I am likewise of the opinion that the first act in our attack must consist in the occupation of Gibraltar. In this sense our military policy in the straits since 1936 has been directed by anticipating the English intentions of expanding and protecting their bases.

I agree with your opinion that is is possible to aim at the success of this operation within a few days by the use of modern equipment and tried troops. In this sense, the equipment which you offer me will be of great effect.

For our part, we have been preparing the operation in secret for a long time, since the area in which it is to take place has no suitable network of communications. With respect to the special conditions of the rock, points of resistance can withstand even the strongest action from the air, so that they will have to be destroyed by good and accurate artillery. The extraordinary importance of the project would, in my opinion, justify a strong concentration of resources.

3. The fall of Gibraltar would actually protect the western Mediterranean, and rule out any danger, except the dangers which might arise in passing should De Gaulle succeed with his plan for rebellion in Algiers and Tunis.

A concentration of our troops in Morocco will prevent this danger.

In this respect, it would be suitable for your control commission to increase the precautionary measures to the utmost.

4. I completely share your opinion about the effectiveness of dive bombers for the defense of the coasts, as well as about the actual impossibility of establishing fixed artillery emplacements with heavy material on the vulnerable points on the coast. Evidently a mistake has crept into the transmittal of my wish, for my wish concerned not stationary guns of large caliber, but movable material of about 20 centimeters. I consider this necessary for the future as well and indeed in moderate quantities because of the conditions of the terrain which is mountainous and irregular. The possibility of constructing airports is therefore extraordinarily limited. In most cases, these will lie far removed from the coast and from the objects to be defended. Furthermore, one must reckon with the limitations which necessarily result from the storms and rains frequently occurring there.

In any case, the strong air forces offered by you are indispensable.

5. At the present moment, there is actually little probability of the English undertaking a landing attempt on the peninsula. Even if this should be the case, our own resources and those which you offer me would quickly ruin this plan.

6. The possibility of a surprise attack on the Canary Islands by the English in order to create a naval base for themselves to protect oversea connections has always been a worry of mine. Within the scope of our possibilities we are about to lay aside there supplies of food, ammunition, and sufficient artillery material which we are getting from other less-threatened regions; we effected a partial mobilization several months ago, and also have sent arms for the entire archipelago. We have transferred a group of pursuit pilots there who would no longer have been able to get there once the war had begun. I am of your opinion and consider the presence of dive bombers and destroyer planes in Las Palmas extremely useful, for which bomb material and spare parts must be sent in advance.

7. Obviously freedom of movement in the western Mediterranean is dependent upon Italian successes in Alexandria and Suez, by which the destruction of the English Fleet in these waters will be made possible. At such a moment, a great part of our provisioning problem would be solved.

8. I consider the offer contained in your point 8 for our undertaking as extremely useful and absolutely necessary. For the economic aid which you offer me with such foresight and in the highest measure possible for Germany is just as important as the military equipment. For our part, I offer you reciprocal aid of the same type and to the greatest extent possible considering our potentialities.

In the meantime I consider it my duty to point out to you that in my opinion the conversations hitherto conducted by our specialists have taken the course of negotiations more of a purely commercial orientation. By having treated the settlement of old matters, by wanting to solve the economic problems and the postwar exchanges of commodities, they have deviated from the main subject, which affects both parties equally and which will find its complete solution in the statements of your letter, with which I completely agree.

I would like to thank you, dear Führer, once again for the offer of solidarity. I reply with the assurance of my unchangeable and sincere adherence to you personally, to the German people, and to the cause for which you fight. I hope, in defense of this cause, to be able to renew the old bonds of comradeship between our armies.

In the expectation of being able to express this to you personally, I assure you of my most sincere feelings of friendship and I greet you,

Your,

F. FRANCO.

No. 6, notes covering the interview between the Führer and Count Ciano in the presence of the Reichs Foreign Minister and the State Secretary Meissner in Berlin on September 28, 1940

At the beginning the Führer directed to Count Ciano the question whether the possibility existed for a meeting with the Duce at the Brenner. He considered it right to bring about an exchange of opinion with the Duce concerning the general situation but especially also concerning the Spanish question, before far-reaching decisions were to be made. Also he wanted to speak with him about the strategic situation. As concerned Spain, Germany, on the basis of the experiences gained during the civil war, was clear about the fact that one could not make progress with the Spanish without quite concrete and detailed agreements. It was critical for Germany and Italy successfully to end the war in great security and in as short a time as possible.

The Spanish proposals to Germany, somewhat crassly expressed, go as far as the following:

1. Germany is to deliver for the coming year 400,000–700,000 tons of grain;
2. Germany is to deliver all the fuel;
3. Germany is to deliver the lacking equipment for the army;
4. Germany is to put up artillery, airplanes, as well as special weapons and special troops for the conquest of Gibraltar;
5. Germany is to hand over all of Morocco and besides that, Oran, and is to help her get a border revision in the west of Rio de Oro;
6. Spain is to promise to Germany, in return, her friendship.

One must think it over thoroughly if one intends to enter into such obligations and if one is to bar other possibilities from oneself. Aside from that, he (the Fuhrer) was afraid that the agreements concerning Morocco would somehow leak through and become known in France. In this case the French would possibly even come to an agreement with the English, if they knew that Morocco would be lost to them in any case after the conclusion of the war. At all events, it would be more favorable for Germany if the French remained in Morocco and defended it against the English. If the Spanish were to occupy the territory, they probably would only call for German and Italian help in the event of an English attack, and moreover they would let the tempo of their civil war prevail in their military measures. It was therefore necessary to talk over very calmly

[7] Two subsequent paragraphs are illegible in the material available and have, therefore, been omitted here.

for a few hours with the Duce the whole question in the light of its usefulness and its military significance, especially since the deliveries demanded of Germany would represent a great sacrifice, which after all could not be made only in return for the good graces of the Spanish. Thus far, at any rate, the Spanish had not yet held out the prospect of an equivalent. One must ponder the problem very cooly and examine it in the light of its possible effects. The case would be entirely clear if Spain would assume distinct obligations. Considering the uncertainty of the Spanish attitude, Germany and Italy in this interview between the Fuhrer and the Duce would have to take a similar stand on the Spanish problem. The agreements with Spain would only contain obligations for her partners and in practice would have to be made good militarily by Germany and Italy. The consequences could be very unpleasant. It would not be impossible that, the commitments concerning Morocco and Oran becoming known, North Africa even might fall into the hands of the English. That would make a conquest of this territory necessary. This military undertaking would have to be carried out over the very dubious bridge, Spain, during which the possibility would definitely exist that Spain then would withdraw again into her neutrality. At all events, England would then have in Africa a great number of airbases, which to be sure would not be decisive for the war, but which could really turn out to be very unpleasant, since air penetration from Germany and Italy would be difficult on account of the great distance.

The Fuhrer then mentioned in this connection the invitation which Franco had extended to him to meet with him on the Spanish-French border. He did not yet know whether he ought to accept this invitation. It would all depend on the conversation with the Duce. In any case he was not convinced that Spain had "the same intensity of will for giving as for taking". Moreover it was customary for allies to support one another reciprocally; in the case of Spain, however, the reciprocity would have to be missed.

When Spain was engaged in the Civil War, Germany had supported Franco in a very extensive measure considering her [Germany's] condition at the time. This support moreover had not been without risk. It was not limited only to the delivery of materiel, but volunteers were also made available and many Germans and Italians had fallen in Spain. He did not intend to compute this blood sacrifice in terms of economic values, but instead considered it an outright gift to Spain.

Economically Germany had given out many hundreds of millions for Spain. He (the Fuhrer) had taken the stand that the payment of this debt should be left alone during the war, however that it would have to be taken up again after the victory of Franco. Whenever the Germans demand the payment of the 400 million debt incurred during the Spanish Civil War, this is often interpreted by the Spanish as a tactless confusing of economic and idealistic considerations, and as a German, one feels toward the Spanish almost like a Jew, who wants to make business out of the holiest possessions of mankind. Therefore in all agreements with the Spanish one must to begin with clearly stipulate the terms, and if Germany is to furnish grain, the question of compensation must be settled now already.

Italy and Germany had done very much for Spain in the year 1936. Italy just had its Abyssinia undertaking behind her, while Germany was in the midst of her rearming. Without the help of both the countries there would today be no Franco.

From all these considerations a joint discussion with the Duce was necessary before making further decisions which could be very far-reaching. In no case should any step which would be undertaken with regard to Spain lead to a deterioration of the strategic position in the Mediterranean Sea.

Count Ciano replied that the Duce certainly would gladly seize the opportunity for a discussion with the Fuhrer. He had already frequently spoken to him (Ciano) about it. Would the Fuhrer like to make a suggestion concerning the date.

Moreover the Duce had the same fears as those the Fuhrer had just mentioned concerning the difficulties involved in an entry of Spain into the war. Italy also had not forgotten the experiences of the Spanish Civil War. At that time Franco had declared that if he received 12 transport planes or bombers, he would have the war won in a few days. These 12 airplanes became more than one thousand airplanes, 6 thousand dead, and 14 billion lire. With all due sympathy for Spain, this had upon reflection proven in fact to be right, and now again the Duce feared that many sacrifices would be demanded of Italy and Germany without return. Aside from this, it was to be feared that following the pattern of the Spanish Civil War, Spain's demands as now reported would be increased more and more in the further course of events. Therefore caution was in order and a discussion very appropriate.

It was then decided to hold the discussion between the Fuhrer and the Duce at the Brenner in connection with the visit of Serrano Suner in Rome on Friday, October 4, 1940.

SCHMIDT, *Minister.*

BERLIN, *September 29, 1940.*

No. 7, letter from Serrano Suñer to Von Ribbentrop

EL PRESIDENTE DE LA JUNTA
POLITICA DE FALANGE ESPANOLA
TRADICIONALISTA Y DE LAS JONS,
Madrid, October 10, 1940.

To His Excellency J. VON RIBBENTROP,
Minister of Foreign Affairs of the German Reich.

MY DEAR MR. MINISTER: Upon my return from Berlin and Rome I had several conversations with the Caudillo for the purpose of continuing the examination of the questions and viewpoints which were considered during our meeting in the capital of the Reich. We have at hand the proposals of an economic character which were formulated by the German Government and expect shortly to make a concrete counterproposal with the object of arriving at an agreement on those matters, as well as on those dealing with the details and circumstances of the 10-year military alliance with Germany and Italy. We believe that all of these should be negotiated with the utmost secrecy in order not to jeopardize the several shiploads of Argentine and Canadian wheat which we are endeavoring—with great difficulty—to acquire. All of this for the good of the common cause. This will be done in such a way that while the rank and file of our diplomatic service continue keeping the balance in order to obtain the greatest possible quantities of wheat and gasoline, our negotiations will be carried on through our personal contacts and through secret correspondence between the Führer and the Caudillo.

We have in the Canary Islands four batteries, an important group of pursuit planes and machinegun nests, all of which dispose of the possibility of an English or American landing. One of the bravest generals of our army departed yesterday to take command of the Grand Canary.

We have just finished sending to Morocco two additional divisions under good command. The Caudillo has requested me to inform you of his impression that De Gaulle is preparing an uprising in Oran.

While reiterating the expression of my personal friendship toward you, please be good enough to renew my respects to the Führer, with best wishes for the collaboration of our two peoples for the common good.

RAMÓN SERRANO SUÑER.

No. 8, notes on the conversation between the Führer and the Caudillo in the Führer's parlor car at the railroad station at Hendaye on October 23, 1940

At the beginning the Caudillo expressed his satisfaction about the fact that he was at the moment able to make the personal acquaintance of the Führer and to render to him Spain's thanks for everything that Germany has done for his country up to the present. Spain has always been allied with the German people spiritually without any reservation and in complete loyalty. In the same sense, Spain has in every moment felt herself at one with the Axis. In the civil war the soldiers of the three countries had fought together and a profound unity has arisen among them. Likewise, Spain would, in the future, attach herself closely to Germany for historically there were between Spain and Germany only forces of unity, and none of separation.

In the present war as well, Spain would gladly fight at Germany's side. The difficulties which were to be overcome therein were well known to the Fuhrer. A war would necessitate preparations in the economic, military, and political spheres. Within her modest possibilities, Spain had begun these preparations; was, of course, coming up against difficulties therewith which were being made for her by elements in America and Europe, hostile to the Axis. Therefore, Spain must mark time and often look kindly toward things with which she was thoroughly not in accord.

Franco then came to speak of Spain's growing provisioning difficulties and in this connection mentioned that the United States and Argentina apparently were precisely following orders from London, for there had been cases in which the channel through the British Embassy immediately removed difficulties in both the above-mentioned countries. The difficulties already existing would be more intensified by the bad harvests. In spite of this, Spain with a view toward her spiritual alliance with the Axis powers, has assumed the same attitude towards the war as Italy had in the past autumn.

The Führer replied that he was glad to see the Caudillo personally for the first time in his life after he had so often been with him in spirit during the Spanish Civil War. He knew precisely how difficult the struggle in Spain had been, since he himself since 1918–19 had had to go through similar grave conflicts, until he had helped the National Socialist movement to victory. Spain's enemies had been his enemies, too. The struggle which was raging in Europe today would be decisive for the fate of the Continent and the world for a long time to come. Militarily, this struggle in itself was decided. Germany had established a front against the British Islands from the North Cape to the Spanish border and would no longer allow the English a landing on the Continent. The military actions were now taking place right in English motherland. In spite of that, England had certain hopes: Russia and America. With Russia, Germany had treaties. Aside from this, however, he (the Führer) immediately after conclusion of the French campaign had undertaken a reorganization of the German Army so that, beginning with March of the coming year, the latter would present itself in the following strength: of a total of 230 divisions, 186 were attacking divisions. The rest consisted of defense and occupation troops. Of the 186 attacking divisions, 20 were armored divisions equipped with German material,

while 4 additional armored brigades possessed captured material in part. In addition to this there were 12 motorized divisions. With this army strength Germany was grown ready for any eventuality. He (the Führer) believed that England was wrong too in placing her hope on Russia. If the latter country were aroused at all from its inactivity, it would, at the most, be active on the German side. It was therefore a matter of misspeculation on the part of England.

With respect to America, there was no need to be afraid of an active attack during the winter. There would therefore be no change in the present military situation. Until America's military power would be fully armed, at least 18 months to two years would pass.

There would arise, nevertheless, a considerable danger if America and England entrenched themselves on the islands stretching out off Africa in the Atlantic Ocean. The danger was all the greater because it was not certain whether the French troops stationed in the colonies would under all circumstances remain loyal to Pétain. The greatest threat existing at the moment was that a part of the Colonial Empire would, with abundant material and military resources, desert France and go over to De Gaulle, England, or the United States. Moreover, the war of Germany against England was continuing. The difficulty was that the operations had to be carried on across an ocean which Germany at sea did not control. She had only air supremacy. Of course the weather over the Channel for exercising it had, up to then, been extremely unfavorable. Since the middle of August there had not even been five fair days, and the major attack against England had as yet not been able to begin since an attack against the British naval forces, on the part of Germany, could only be carried out from the air, whereby, under good atmospheric conditions, the British fleet had always been forced to yield, according to previous experiences.

According to meteorological forecasts which prophesied with certainty a period of fair weather for seven to eight days, a great air attack had been started on a fixed day. Of course it had to be broken off again after lasting half a day because of a sudden change in the weather.

Germany had, up to this point, carried off very great victories. But for this very reason, he (the Führer) wanted to guard against suffering a failure by some thoughtless move In this connection, the Führer mentioned as an example of his tactics, the events of the great offensive in France. Originally he had had the plan of striking the great blow as early as October of the previous year, but had constantly been hindered from doing this by the weather. He had suffered because of not being able to act but he had been really determined not to begin the offensive in bad weather, but on the contrary had preferred to wait until the weather conditions became better. When the meteorologists had then reported to him that on May 10 the normal period of clear weather for the summer would begin, he had, on May 8, issued the order for attack. The result of this attack was known, and in the battle against England he would act precisely as in the French offensive. He would begin the great attack only when the weather conditions permitted absolute success. In the meantime, England, and especially London, was being bombarded day and night. On London alone, 3,500,000 kilograms of bombs had been dropped. Many harbor installations, factories, and armament works were thus being shattered; England's approaches were being mined; and an increasing U-boat activity was contributing to the further isolation of the islands. At the moment, the number of U-boats being finished every month was 10. In spring, it would rise to 17; in July to 25; and after that up to 34 per month. He hoped the concentrated activity of the air arm, minelayers and destroyers, U-boats, and speedboats would do so much damage and harm to England that in the end attrition would set in. In spite of this, he was lying in wait in order to carry out the great blow during fair weather, even if this could not happen until spring. It is self-evident that the time during which such vast masses of troops were lying inactive would continue to be exploited.

Naturally Germany had an interest in ending the war in a short time if possible, since every additional month cost money and sacrifice. In the attempt to bring about the end of the war as soon as possible and to render the entry of the United States into the war more difficult, Germany had concluded the Tripartite Pact. This pact was compelling the United States to keep its Navy in the Pacific Ocean and to prepare herself for a Japanese attack from that direction. In Europe as well, Germany was attempting to expand her base. He could confidentially report that several other nations had announced their intention of joining the Tripartite Pact.

To guarantee her petroleum supply, Germany has sent pursuit squadrons and Panzer troops to Rumania upon the request of the Rumanian Government and in agreement with it.

The great problem that was to be solved at the moment consisted in hindering the De Gaulle movement in French Africa from further expanding itself, and (hindering) the establishment, in this way, of bases for England and America on the African coast. A danger in this direction was actually present. The Petain government was in the deplorable condition of having to liquidate a war for which it was not responsible, for the consequences of which, however, its opponents blamed it. It was now a matter of preventing De Gaulle from receiving an increase in power from this difficult position of the French Government, something which moreover would lead France to complete collapse. Finally, the attempt had to be made to bring France herself to a definite stand against England. This indeed was a difficult undertaking because there were still two tendencies in France: A Fascist one represented by Petain and Laval, and an opposition one which wanted to carry on a doubledealing game with England. Moreover, it was particularly difficult to stir the French to a clear stand because they did not know how the peace would look. On the other hand, nothing could be said about the peace as long as the war was not completely ended, for one of Germany's opponents certainly had to pay for the war. Were England soon overpowered, Germany would then be ready without further ado to grant France easier peace terms. Should the war, however, continue on and should the English, as a result, offer Germany a compromise, she (Germany) would certainly not continue to fight only to spare France. Moreover, Germany needed France as a base as long as she was fighting against England. Yesterday he had, in all frankness, informed Vice President Laval of this interpretation and he would, on the morrow, speak with Petain in precisely the same manner.

The purpose of this conference in Hendaye was the following: If they would be successful in effecting quite a large front against England, then the struggle would be substantially easier for all the participants and could be ended sooner. In setting up this front, the Spanish desires and the French hopes were obstacles in the path. Were England no longer participating in the war and if there were no De Gaulle, one would not have to think of relinquishing the demands on France. France could then be brought to submit and, in case she did not wish to cooperate, she could be occupied by the military within 12 days without any difficulty. More difficult would be the solution of the administrative problems and the economic problems. To occupy North Africa would of course be difficult and would not be possible without a strong military effort. The French knew that they had to sacrifice something in the peace treaty. They counted on losing the German colonies and Alsace-Lorraine; they knew that border rectifications would be undertaken and that Nice, Corsica, and Tunis would be lost to them. In the latter case, they would of course be very downcast over the loss and would prefer to make an arrangement which would, in another fashion, assure access to the raw materials there. Such an arrangement would be a fraud, however, for whoever no longer had the country, to him, at the proper moment, would no longer be given the raw materials. There was the danger that, if it were concretely asserted to the French that they would have to get out of certain African areas, the African possessions would perhaps desert France even with the concurrence of the government of Vichy. In order to meet this danger, he had worked up a general formula which he had developed yesterday to M. Laval. In doing this he did not allow himself to make any concrete statement of the territorial changes to take place after the war.

(The record of this conversation is incomplete.)

No. 9, German Foreign Office memorandum

BERLIN, *October 31, 1940.*

(Reporter: Councillor of Legation Kramarz)

NOTE.—The Naval Warfare Command informs that the necessity exists in connection with naval operations in the Bay of Biscay for being able to supply German destroyers with fuel in out-of-the-way bays of the Spanish coast. For this purpose, German tankers would be sent there, from which replenishing would take place by night in order thus to guarantee the secrecy. The Naval Warfare Command has in this connection pointed to the fact that the Spanish Government has already shown similar obligingness in the supplying of German U-boats.

The Naval Warfare Command requests opinion and corresponding instruction of the Spanish Government.

Herewith submitted to Ambassador Ritter.

KRAMARZ.

No. 10, telegram from the German Ambassador in Madrid to the Foreign Office in Berlin

MADRID, *December 5, 1940.*

In reply to proposal made by Embassy as instructed, Foreign Minister has now informed that Spanish Government has agreed to the placing in readiness of German tankers in out-of-the-way bays of the Spanish coast for the supplying of German destroyers with fuel. Foreign Minister vigorously requested observing greatest caution in carrying out measure.

STOHRER.

No. 11, telegram from the German Ambassador in Madrid to the Foreign Office in Berlin

MADRID, *December 12, 1940.*

(Strictly secret)

In reply to telegraphic directive No. 2246 of December 11.

The protocol of General Vigón covering the conference of Admiral Canaris with the Generalissimo (Dec. 7, 1940) reads in translation:

"Admiral was received 19:30 o'clock in presence of General Vigón. Admiral presents Chief of State Führer's greeting and conveys Germany's wish to undertake attack upon Gibraltar within a short time in con-

nection with which German troops are to march into Spain on January 10. Reports that the Führer considers this moment the most favorable since the troops now available for operation are directly thereafter to be used for other undertakings and therefore could not be reserved for indefinite time. Admiral reports that as soon as march of troops began, economic cooperation of Germany would at once begin.

"To this Generalissimo explains to Admiral that it was impossible for Spain for reasons duly presented to enter into the war on the suggested date.

"1. English fleet still possesses such freedom of operation that the success being expected in Gibraltar—which he considers certain and quick—would very soon be dimmed by loss of the possessions of Guinea and later on one of the Canary Islands. Further, pretexts would be given England and the United States for occupying the Azores, Madeira, and the Cape Verde Islands.

"2. Although tied up with difficulties because of restriction of foreign trade, military preparation of Spain has progressed. They are endeavoring to improve as much as possible defense of the islands and of coast, and are strengthening artillery of the straits. Everything is however incomplete and unfinished; this is however not the actual reason which is preventing Spain from accepting the proposed date.

"3. Spain's provisioning is absolutely inadequate both with respect to the present scanty supplies, as well as with respect to their distribution. There are at the moment two problems:

"(a) the deficiency in foodstuffs, especially grain, which latter [deficiency] is estimated at 1 million tons.

"(b) the inadequacy of transports due to lack of railway materials and because of the compulsory restriction in the use of motor trucks. If one adds to it the discontinuance of the sea transports as results of the war, the situation of many provinces would become unbearable.

"4. Generalissimo and Government are endeavoring to remove these difficulties. They effected grain purchases in South America and Canada; they are pushing the purchase of railway cars and are expediting provision of locomotives; they are effecting purchases of gas generators for motor trucks for the eventuality of a complete lack of gasoline. But incipient exhaustion of all supplies and restriction of foreign trade are preventing quick improvement.

"5. For these reasons Spain cannot enter into the war within a short time. She could also not wage a long war without imposing unbearable sacrifices upon the Spanish people. Aside from that, a long war would with certainty bring with it loss of a part of the Canary Islands, which could only be supplied for 6 months.

"6. In presenting all the difficulties which are preventing Spain from accepting the proposed date, Generalissimo wishes to stress that he is not only thinking of Spain's advantages but is also considering those of Germany, for, in his opinion, in a war of rather lengthy duration Spain's weakened condition would certainly represent disadvantage and burden for Germany.

"Admiral asked Generalissimo whether, under these conditions, which are preventing fixing the 10th of January as the date, it would be possible now already to set a different later date. Generalissimo replies that since removal of difficulties depends not only upon the will of Spain, he too could name no definite date, which might have to undergo change because of the circumstances. In any case, his attention and his effort would be directed toward hastening and completing Spain's preparations. The preparation was being continued with vigor, something which the admiral himself would have the opportunity of confirming upon his next visit to the area of the straits. Generalissimo also shows admiral photographs of the mortar 240, which is to make up for the lack of heavy artillery and air arms, and with which tests are at the moment being made.

"Generalissimo considers is advisable that a German economist visit Spain in order to examine the then-existing condition and to pass on to his government a firsthand impression. He agrees with the admiral that preparatory studies and labors begun be continued jointly and in the same discreet form hitherto carried out.

"He then charges the admiral with conveying to the fuhrer his most cordial greetings and with reporting the conference [to him] at the same time expressing again his esteem to the admiral and his delight at seeing him again in Spain.

"JUAN VIGÓN,
"Divisional General."

End of the protocol.

STOHRER.

No. 12, letter from Hitler to Franco, February 6, 1941

FEBRUARY 6, 1941.

DEAR CAUDILLO: If I write this letter it is done in order to determine once again with extreme clarity the individual phases of the development of a situation which is not only important for Germany and Italy but could have been of decisive importance to Spain.

When we had our meeting, it was my aim to convince you, Caudillo, of the necessity of common action of those States whose interests in the final analysis are certainly tied up indissolubly with each other. For centuries, Spain has been persecuted by the same enemies against whom today Germany and Italy are forced to fight. In addition to the earlier imperial strivings inimical to our three nations there now arose, moreover, antitheses conditioned by world outlook: The Jewish-international democracy, which reigns in these States, will not excuse any of us for having followed a course which seeks to secure the future of our peoples in accordance with fundamental principles determined by the people and not those imposed by capital. As concerns the German determination to follow this fight through to the final consequence, I need waste no word. The Duce thinks no differently. On the basis of this analysis, the Japanese people as well will not in the long run get by, unless it be by a submission sacrificing the future of the Japanese people. I am now convinced that Spain faces the same fate. Caudillo, if your struggle against the elements of destruction in Spain was successful, it was only because of the democratic opponents forced to be cautious by attitude of Germany and Italy. You will be forgiven, Caudillo, but never for this victory. Just as little does England think of letting you remain for a long period in North Africa opposite Gibraltar—as soon as she is once again in a position of power. The Spanish seizure of the Tangier zone would in such a case—and this is my deepest conviction, Caudillo—only be a passing intermezzo. England, and probably America too, will do everything to render this entry into the Mediterranean in the future even more secure under their dominion than up to now. It is my most heartfelt conviction that the battle which Germany and Italy are now fighting out is thus determining the future destiny of Spain as well. Only in the case of our victory will the present regime continue to exist. Should Germany and Italy lose this war, however, then any future for a really national and independent Spain would be impossible.

I have thus been striving to convince you, Caudillo, of the necessity in the interests of your own country and the future of the Spanish people, of uniting yourself with those countries who formerly sent soldiers to support you, and who today of necessity, are also battling not only for their own existence, but indirectly for the national future of Spain as well.

Now at our meeting we agreed that Spain declare its readiness to sign the Three-Power Pact and to enter the war. In setting the date, periods in the far future were never considered or even mentioned, but instead the conversation always was concerned with a very short time-limit within which you, Caudillo, still believed that you could carry out various economic measures favorable for your country.

I personally have been skeptical from the beginning about the hope of receiving very soon more real economic benefits for Spain.

1. England indeed has no thought at all of really helping Spain. England is only endeavoring to postpone the Spanish entry into the war, to put it off in order in this way continually to increase her distress and thus to be able finally to overthrow the Spanish Government of that time.

2. But even if England were about to think otherwise, in an impulse toward some kind of sentimentality never present in British history up to now, she could not really help Spain under any conditions. She is absolutely not in the condition even in transportation alone to aid another country in a time in which she herself has already been forced to the most rigorous retrenchments in her standard of living. And the need for transport space will as the months go by not decrease but instead will get more and more serious.

In spite of the fact that I, therefore—as stated—have been thoroughly skeptical about this from the beginning, I nonetheless brought to bear every bit of appreciation for your efforts in at least trying, even before entering the war, to get shipments of foodstuffs into Spain from countries overseas as well.

Germany, however, has for her part, declared herself ready to deliver to Spain, immediately after undertaking entrance into the war, food, that is—grain—to as great an extent as possible. Furthermore, Germany has declared herself prepared to replace the 100,000 tons of grain which was waiting in Portugal destined for Switzerland in order that it might benefit Spain immediately. This of course remains contingent upon the final decision for Spain's entry into the war. For about one thing, Caudillo, there must be clarity: We are fighting a battle of life and death and cannot at this time make any gifts. If it should later be asserted that Spain could not enter the war because she received no supplies, that would not be true. For immediately after settling the entry into the war, a fixed date of which there has as yet been no outward indication at all, Spain would receive the first supplies, that is, 100,000 tons of grain. I doubt whether 100,000 tons of grain could really have reached Spain from abroad within the same period of time, even if such an inclination had existed. Thus, I also doubt that this is going to happen. The assertion, however, that—if our grain had been delivered immediately—the Spanish people could thus by propaganda have been prepared for entry into the war is self-contradictory for another reason.

Your, yourself, Caudillo, have indeed personally indicated to me the importance of not yet consummating publicly the entrance in the Three-Power Pact, because you feared that this would have hurt your other efforts, for example in obtaining more grain, indeed would perhaps have wrecked them. How much less possible would it then have been to carry on open propaganda for entering the war? No, I am taking the liberty once more to confirm that:

1. During our conversation, it was never considered that Spain's entry into the war

would perchance not take place until autumn or the coming winter, and that—

2. Germany was ready to furnish supplies to the Spanish Government at the moment when the final date for entering the war was determined.

When I had the request made to you, Caudillo, with the impression of urgency to bring relief to the Italian ally and to set this date in the middle or the end of January, that is, to permit the German march against Gibraltar to begin on or after January 10, in order to start attacking at the end of January, then for the first time our negotiators were unequivocally informed that such an early date could absolutely not be considered and this was again motivated by economic factors. However, when I thereupon let it be known again that Germany was indeed ready to begin at once with deliveries of grain, Admiral Canaris received the conclusive information that this delivery of grain would not be decisive at all, for via railway, it certainly could accomplish no practical effect. It was now further declared that since we had already made available batteries for the Canary Islands and moreover intended also to provide dive bombers for additional security—even that was not decisive, since the Canary Islands from the point of view of food could no longer be held after 6 months.

That is absolutely not a matter of economic factors but rather of others is apparent from the last statement in which it is stated that for climatic reasons to march in this season could not succeed, but on the contrary should only be considered at the earliest in the autumn or winter.

Under these conditions, of course, I do not understand why one should first want to declare an event impossible on economic grounds, which is now said to be impossible simply for climatic reasons. Now I do not believe that the German Army would be disturbed during its march in January by a climate which in itself is nothing out of the ordinary for us. In any case, we solved our problems in the Norwegian campaign under varied conditions and with severe climatic hindrances in the form of snow and ice, not to mention the fact that, from the participation of German soldiers and officers in your campaign, Caudillo, the climatic conditions of Spain are nothing unfamiliar to us. I regret most profoundly, Caudillo, this your opinion and your stand since:

1. I feel it my duty to bring relief to my Italian friend and ally and thus be of help to him—indeed be of help at the moment when he experienced an unfortunate mishap. The attack on Gibraltar and the closing of the straits would have changed the Mediterranean situation in one stroke.

2. I am of the conviction that in war, time is one of the most important factors. Months which one lets slip by are often never regained again.

3. Finally however it is clear that, on January 10 if we had been able to cross the Spanish border with the first formations, Gibraltar would today be in our hands. That means: 2 months have been lost, which otherwise would have helped to decide world history.

4. I am further of the conviction that Spain's economic condition would have improved and not become worse because of what would in any case have come to Spain through us and that on the other hand the deliveries which since then actually came to Spain from abroad during this time can only amount to a fraction compared to that which would in any case have been delivered at once by us.

But quite aside from this, Caudillo, I should like now to mention the following:

The entrance of Spain into this struggle has certainly not been conceived of as exclusively to the benefit of the interests of Germany and Italy. Spain herself has advanced very great territorial claims for the fulfillment of which the Duce and I had declared ourselves ready in every degree which could at all be reconciled with an acceptable new arrangement of the African colonial possessions for Europe and its countries. And I may point out in this regard that in this struggle up to now first Germany and then Italy, have suffered the most prodigious blood sacrifice, and that both, in spite of this, themselves made very modest claims.

In any case, however, the moment of military operations above all can only be proposed by the one who therewith assumes the main burden of the struggle and who must therefore calculate it into the total program of a military analysis which is after all of worldwide extent. That I myself have no other goal in mind than the common success is certainly understandable. Indeed in this case, Caudillo, my urging in and of itself only proves the strength of my consciousness of responsibility toward my ally as well. For wheresoever in the course of this war difficulties should arise, it will be my unbending will to help out with them; and my decision to make good in the final settlement whatever during one or another stage of this war can perhaps at first have miscarried. This affects Spain as well. Spain will never get other friends than those given [her] in the Germany and Italy of today, unless it becomes a different Spain. This different Spain however would only be the Spain of decline and of final collapse. Even for this reason alone, Caudillo, I believe that we three men, the Duce, you, and I, are bound to one another by the most rigorous compulsion of history that is possible, and that thus we in this historical analysis ought to obey as the supreme commandment the realization that in such difficult times, not so much an apparently wise caution as the bold heart, rather, can save nations.

Moreover, Caudillo, this war is decided regardless of what ephemeral successes the British believe they can achieve anywhere on the periphery. For independently thereof, the fact remains that the British power in Europe is broken and that the mightiest military machine in the world stands ready for every additional task which may be put to it to solve. And how good and reliable this instrument is, the future will prove.

Accept my cordial and comradely greetings.

Your

ADOLPH HITLER.

No. 13. letter from General Franco to Hitler

EL PARDO, *February 26, 1941.*

DEAR FUEHRER: Your letter of the 6th makes me wish to send you my reply promptly, since I consider it necessary to make certain clarifications and confirmation of my loyalty.

I consider as you yourself do that the destiny of history has united you with myself and with the Duce in an indissoluble way. I have never needed to be convinced of this and as I have told you more than once, our civil war since its very inception and during its entire course is more than proof. I also share your opinion that the fact that Spain is situated on both shores of the strait forces her to the utmost enmity toward England, who aspires to maintain control of it.

We stand today where we have always stood, in a resolute manner and with the firmest conviction. You must have no doubt about my absolute loyalty to this political concept and to the realization of the union of our national destinies with those of Germany and Italy. With the same loyalty, I have made clear to you since the beginning of these negotiations the conditions of our economic situation, the only reasons why it has not been possible up to now to determine the date of Spain's participation.

Having in mind our own postwar difficulties, you will recall that I have never fixed too short a period for our entry into the war. Permit me, Führer, to say that the time elapsed until this moment has not been completely lost, since we have been obtaining not certainly great enough quantities of grain to permit us to build stocks, but certainly for some of the bread necessary for daily sustenance of the people who otherwise would have perished of starvation in considerable numbers.

Furthermore, it must be acknowledged that in this question of the supply of foodstuffs, Germany has not fulfilled her offers of effective support until very recently. We are now beginning to move in the realm of concrete facts and within this field there is nothing I desire more than to hasten the negotiations as much as possible. With this end in view several days ago I sent to you information on our needs as to foodstuffs and in general economic and military fields. These data are open to new examination, clarification, verification, and discussion in order to reach quickly the solution which interests us both equally. However, you will understand that at a time when the Spanish people is suffering the greatest starvation and enduring all sorts of privations and sacrifices, it is not certainly propitious for me to ask further sacrifices of them if my appeal is not preceded by an alleviation of this situation, which at the same time may permit us to carry out beforehand an intelligent propaganda on the constant friendship and effective support of the German people, which will reawaken in the Spaniard the sentiments of sincere friendship and admiration which he has always had for your nation.

My remarks about our climate were simply an answer to your suggestions, and were not in any way a pretext to postpone indefinitely that which at the right moment it will be our duty to do.

During the recent Bordighera conference I gave proof to the world of the nature of my resolute attitude; this conference also served as a call to the Spanish people marking the direction in which lie their national obligations and the preservation of their existence as a free nation.

One observation I must repeat to your Excellency; the closing of the Strait of Gibraltar is not only a prerequisite for the immediate amelioration of the situation of Italy but also perhaps for the end of the war. However, in order that the closing of Gibraltar may have a decisive value it is also necessary that the Suez Canal be closed at the same time. If this last circumstance should not take place, we who are making the actual contribution of our military effort have the duty sincerely to say that the situation of Spain in the event of an inordinately prolonged war would then become extremely difficult.

You speak of our demands and you compare them with yours and those of Italy. I do not believe that one could describe the Spanish demands as excessive, still less, when one considers the tremendous sacrifice of the Spanish people in a battle which was a worthy forerunner of the present one. Concerning this point the necessary preciseness does not exist in our agreement as well. The protocol of Hendaye—permit me to express it—is in this respect extremely vague and Your Excellency remembers the conditions (today so changed) of this vagueness and lack of preciseness. The facts in their logical development have today left far behind the circumstances which in the month of October had to be taken into consideration with respect to the prevailing situation, and the protocol then existing must at the present be considered outmoded.

These are my answers, dear Führer, to your observations. I want to dispel with them all shadow of doubt and declare that I stand

ready at your side, entirely and decidedly at your disposal, united in a common historical destiny, desertion from which would mean my suicide and that of the cause which I have led and represent in Spain. I need no confirmation of my faith in the triumph of your cause and I repeat that I shall always be a loyal follower of it.

Believe me your sincere friend, with my cordial greetings,

F. FRANCO.

To: His Excellency ADOLPH HITLER,
Führer of the German People.

No. 14, secret protocol between the German and Spanish Governments

MADRID, *February 10, 1943.*

At the time in which the intention of the German Government to deliver to the Spanish Army in the shortest time possible arms, war equipment, and war material of modern quality and in sufficient quantity is to be realized, the Spanish Government, at the request of the Reich Government, declares that it is determined to resist every entry by Anglo-American forces upon the Iberian Peninsula or upon Spanish territory outside of the peninsula, that means, therefore, in the Mediterranean Sea, in the Atlantic and in Africa as well as in the Spanish protectorate of Morocco, and to ward off such an entry with all the means at its disposal.

Both parties obligate themselves to keep this declaration, prepared in the German language and in the Spanish language absolutely secret.

For the German Government:

VON MOLTKE.

For the Spanish Government:

GOMEZ JORDANA.

No. 15, notes on conversation between General Franco and Ambassador Dieckhoff

BERLIN, *December 15, 1943.*

The conference with the Spanish Chief of State, which took place on Friday, December 3, at the Pardo Palace, in the presence of the Foreign Minister, Count Jordana, and lasted somewhat over an hour, took the following course:

I explained to the chief of state that I had now been in Madrid more than 7 months and had attempted to secure for myself a picture of the Spanish foreign policy. I had the feeling, and the Reich Government was under the same impression, that the foreign policy of Spain was recently beginning to change. We observed in a number of spheres little of a positive attitude of the Spanish Government with respect to Germany and we had especially the feeling that this change in the Spanish attitude was to be traced to English and American pressure. I could only point with the greatest emphasis—and I was speaking on the order of my Government which was taking a very serious interest in these matters—to the fact that it would be a very dangerous policy for Spain to make concession after concession to the English and Americans; Spain would thereby find herself on the downgrade, and she would become more and more dependent upon the Anglo-Saxon powers. Only a completely firm and stable policy which made no concession was proper and guaranteed that the English and Americans would permanently refrain from further pressures; it would be a fatal error if the Spanish Government believed that it could change its course with allegedly slight concessions; the Anglo-Saxons would seize not only the little finger but the hand and the whole arm and would draw Spain deeper and deeper into a relationshiup of dependency. I certainly could not believe that this was the intention of the Spanish Government for the chief of state must certainly be clear about the fact that the policies of the English and of the Americans—as they always had been—were interested only in a weak Spain, in contrast to the German policy, which was always intent upon a strong national Spain. I then mentioned in detail those points to which we especially objected (concession by the Spanish Government in the question of passage of French fugitives through Spain to North Africa, compliant conduct of the Spanish Government in the question of Italian merchant ships in Spanish harbors, unjustified internment of various German U-boat crews, withdrawal of the Blue Division, action against German ships in Vigo and in the Canary Islands, and so forth). I told the Caudillo that I considered it my duty to lay before him in all sincerity all these facts of the case summed up, as I had already often done with Count Jordana, and that I was requesting him (Caudillo) to tell me how he stood on these matters.

The chief of state listened to me seriously and calmly and then stated the following: He would like to emphasize at once that there was no question of the Spanish foreign policy changing. He knew quite certainly that the German policy was pursuing the objective of strengthening Spain, while the English and American policies traditionally aimed at weakening Spain. Further, he knew for certain and was clearly conscious of the fact that only the victory of Germany would make possible the continued existence of the regime of Franco; a victory of the Anglo-Saxons, in spite of all the pacifying declarations which would be made to him from time to time in this respect by the English and American side, would mean his own annihilation. He therefore was hoping with all his heart for the victory of Germany and he had only one wish that this victory would come as soon as possible. In the meantime, however, he was in a difficult position. His country was only now recovering slowly from the effects of the civil war, and it could only recover if it imported gasoline and cotton from abroad, products which he could receive only from the Americans and only with English navicerts. The Anglo-Saxons were ready to deliver these things to him and were delivering to a certain extent, they were demanding in return, however, that Spain assume not too outspoken a pro-Axis attitude and that matters which were indisputably unneutral should be discontinued. This was the reason why the Spanish Government recently had permitted a few modifications. The Caudillo took up these points in detail. He said on the subject of the Blue Division that recently it had actually become more difficult to mobilize Spanish volunteers for this unit and that for this reason alone they had to start on a conversion of the division into a weaker legion. The Anglo-Saxons had presented no ultimatum with regard to the withdrawal of the Blue Division, but he had to expect that they sooner or later would present an ultimatum for the withdrawal, whereby the Spanish Government would then find itself in a very difficult position; for this reason he had preferred to anticipate such an ultimatum and to request of the Reich Government the withdrawal of the division. He emphasized, however, that the attitude of the Spanish Government against bolshevism and communism would thereby be altered in no way; and that at home as well as abroad this struggle was continuing, just as against Jewry and Freemasonry. As concerns the question of the passage of French refugees through Spain to north Africa, this was a problem which has for a long time been causing the Spanish Government annoyance and inconveniences. It was a matter of several thousand people, almost all of them bad, undesirable elements, who had in some way succeeded in getting into Spain across the border of the Pyrenees, and who could not be turned over to the German authorities since this would provoke a frightful outcry on the part of the Anglo-Saxons, and who therefore must either be retained in Spain or thrust out over the other borders. The retention of these people meant not only a great financial burden but also a certain internal political danger since it was a matter predominantly of communistic riffraff. He had therefore granted his permission for a large part of these people to be transported to North Africa. To my objection that this was really a matter of a clear favoring of the enemy, who was sticking these men into uniform and then having them fight against Germany, the Caudillo answered by saying that this was not to be feared, since it was a matter of people so inferior and so undesirous of fighting, who had actually fled from France only to avoid work, and that their entry into the De Gaulle army would mean no strengthening of the enemy fighting power worth mentioning at all. Moreover, he had directed that the transports cease from now on. As concerned the Italian ships in Spanish harbors, the Caudillo emphasized that the warships were interned and would remain interned; the crews of the warships would be transported into Spanish camps. As concerned the merchant ships, the legal question was very unclear. In two cases they had not been able to avoid letting the ships put to sea upon the request of Ambassador Badoglio. The other cases were still being investigated, and it was probable that most, if not all, of the ships would be retained in Spain. In this connection it was very important that the Mussolini government order a representative to Spain as soon as possible, to take up these matters, even though previously the points of view of the Mussolini government had already been represented by the Italian shipping interests themselves and by the German Embassy. As concerned the question of the recognition of the Mussolini government, the Caudillo emphasized—just as previously in the conference of October 5—the Spanish Government was ready to receive an unofficial representative. On the question of the U-boat crews, the Caudillo was of the opinion that on this point the English had been extraordinarily sharp in insisting that these crews be interned. The situation according to international law—contrary to the German assertions—had not been cleared up totally without objection, and the Spanish Government had therefore considered it wiser to proclaim for the time being the internment. He could assure me, however, that the crews would be set free gradually, as had already happened in previous cases; and moreover the most important officer, Lieutenant Commander Brandi, the wearer of the Oak Leaves, had, with the consent of the Spanish Government, immediately been let out of Spain. With respect to the attitude of the Spanish press, the chief of state said that it was indeed being kept somewhat more objective and somewhat more neutral to avoid protest from English and American sides, but that it, however, was still quite predominantly appreciative of Germany and sympathetic to Germany, and that it doubtlessly was very much better than any other neutral press, such as the Turkish, Swedish, Swiss, Portuguese, or Argentine. Even with respect to this, only a somewhat more cautious press line had resulted in order to avoid conflicts, the Spanish Government was not, however, thinking of allowing the Anglo-Saxons an inroad into the press, just as little as she was thinking of permitting them an inroad into Spanish foreign policy.

In summarizing, the Caudillo said that he believed that this cautious policy of Spain was not only in the interest of Spain but also in the interest of Germany. If because of a newspaper article or for any other of the reasons mentioned above, a serious conflict with the Anglo-Saxon powers should result, this would in his opinion not at the present moment be desirable for Germany as well;

a neutral Spain which was furnishing Germany with wolfram and other products was, in his opinion, more valuable for Germany at the present than a Spain which would be drawn into the war. Of course, Spain would not go beyond the comparatively trivial concessions mentioned above. Demands as had been made upon the Portuguese by the English side would not be accepted by the Spanish. In a case of this kind Spain would fight. Of course, Spain was not only economically very dependent, but was also militarily rather weak. She had, indeed a good army with brave soldiers and good officers, but she did not have sufficient weapons at her disposal; especially lacking were heavy weapons and airplanes. Had Spain a stronger armament, the Anglo-Saxons would proceed less presumptuously; also Spain would then be able to strengthen Portugal, with whom she was on very friendly terms, against English pressure even more than this had hitherto been possible. The Caudillo therefore urgently requested that if possible we should send more weapons than we had already sent and more than we had had in mind. The chief of state concluded the conversation in a very cordial fashion, by emphasizing again his hope for the German victory and his friendship for Germany and very warmly requested me to greet the Fuehrer most cordially on his behalf.

Of interest was the fact that the chief of state, in connection with the mention of the Portuguese situation, remarked that Salazar, in his conference with Jordana, shortly before the conclusion of the Azores agreement, had stressed the fact that he was finding himself in a very difficult position and was having to give in; not only were the English exerting very strong pressures, but his own, Salazar's, position was being weakened by the fact that General Carmona as well as half of the army was taking a different stand than he himself.

DIECKHOFF.

ITEM B

[From New York Times, Mar. 10, 1959]

MADRID FINES 369 FOR FUNDS ABROAD—PENALTIES TOTAL $5 MILLION FOR THOSE WITH UNAPPROVED DEPOSITS IN SWITZERLAND

(By Benjamin Welles)

MADRID, March 9.—The Spanish Government has cracked down on 369 Spanish citizens found guilty of having maintained unauthorized deposits in Swiss banks.

Fines of nearly 117 million pesetas (about $2,786,000) were announced here today, plus confiscation of foreign money and other assets totaling $1,198,715 in U.S. currency, £8,000 ($22,400) in sterling, and 5,506,213 Swiss francs.

The total revenue that will accrue to the Spanish Treasury following 10 weeks of investigations is estimated at more than $5 million. Those who have been fined may appeal, but only after having deposited the full amounts of the fines and confiscations with the Government.

None of the 369 persons publicly cited are prominent in government, military, or clerical circles. Many, however, are well known socially or are outstanding in business and professional life here or in Barcelona, Bilbao, San Sebastian and other cities.

SWISS BANK'S AGENT HELD

The Government's action stems from the arrest here in December of George Laurenz Rivara, an agent of the Société de la Banque Suisse, whom the Spanish fiscal authorities had been watching.

Rivara's arrest led to the seizure of a list of persons, both Spanish and foreign, with bank deposits in Switzerland—none under specific names, but under numbers.

It is not an offense in Spanish law to have foreign currency or valuables deposited abroad. However, it is an offense when Spanish citizens do not register such holdings with the fiscal authorities here.

The arrest of Rivara became an overnight sensation and a prime topic of conversation throughout Spain. However, because of the tight censorship imposed by Gabriel Arias Salgado, Minister of Information, rumors spread abroad that amounts between $280 million and $1 billion were involved.

The Spanish Government, for reasons still unexplained, has never issued a complete statement detailing what amounts were involved in the case, though cabinet ministers privately complained against the campaign of defamation that they insist the world's press is waging against their country.

TOTAL PUT AT $6 MILLION

Today, a government source of the highest rank said that the overall total was around 300 million pesetas—that is, about $6 million.

The largest fine has been the peseta equivalent of $520,000 assessed against Carlos Sobrino Alvarez, a Madrid coal merchant, who was ordered also to remit $516,057 in foreign-banked dollars. The next highest penalty was $170,000 in pesetas, imposed on Ricardo Gorina Oliver of Barcelona, plus $160,000 in confiscated dollars.

Others who received heavy fines included Ansemlo Bangel Lopez Martin of Madrid, $100,000; Antonio Sabates Vila of Madrid, $70,000, and Constantino Villar Soria of Madrid, $60,000. Most of the fines ranged between $1,000 and $10,000.

The 369 Spaniards who were found guilty were included in a list of 872 names carried today in the government's official bulletin. Publication of the list had been urged for weeks by Falangist groups and newspapers as a political blow at capitalist enemies of the regime.

FOREIGN RESIDENTS NAMED

Apart from the 369 persons fined, the names were divided into five categories. In the first category were 149 foreign residents in Spain, including 3 U.S. citizens who have bank deposits in Switzerland but have violated no laws and against whom the Spanish Government has made no charges.

The three U.S. citizens are George F. Train, a highly respected businessman here and former chief of the U.S. economic aid mission to Spain; Miss Edith Breedon Bulson, for many years a U.S. Embassy employee, and Mrs. Emily Nunn Weldon. There was some surprise that the Spanish Government had listed foreign nationals, whose right to deposit their money abroad is not questioned under Spanish law.

The four other categories of names included Spanish citizens who are absent or whose cases are still being investigated or who were found to have complied with the legal formalities and thus have been exonerated.

ITEM C

[From the New York Times, Mar. 6, 1959]

SPANISH MISUSE OF VOICE IS SEEN—STUDENT LEADER HOLDS U.S. BROADCASTS INTEGRATED WITH PROPAGANDA

A Spanish student leader said yesterday that broadcasts of the Voice of America in Madrid had been integrated with daily Spanish radio propaganda.

The United States has thus been identified with government policy in the mind of the Spanish public, Juan Manuel Kindelan, 26-year-old leader of an anti-Franco student union, said in an interview at the office of Iberica, a publishing concern, at 112 East 19th Street.

He declared that the effect was damaging to the United States irrespective of the broadcasts' content.

Señor Kindelan said that for 6 months before he left Spain, in May 1958 he heard Voice of America 3-minute broadcasts on the regularly scheduled Spanish Government afternoon program of domestic and foreign news. The British Broadcasting Corp. and the Paris radio did not participate, he added.

The United States Information Service at 250 West 57th Street explained yesterday that tapes were sent to Spanish broadcasting stations for use at their discretion. It was not known here or in Washington precisely how or when the material went on the air, a spokesman said.

Señor Kindelan, a Socialist, is a nephew of Gen. Alfredo Kindelan, chief of General Franco's air forces during the civil war. Señor Kindelan is returning from Lima, Peru, where he attended an international student meeting. He lives in Paris.

ITEM D

[From the Progressive, March 1959]

FRANCO'S STRAPERLO GAME

(By Lawrence Fernsworth)

(Lawrence Fernsworth, now a Washington correspondent, has represented the New York Times and the London Times in Spain and other countries of Europe. His articles have appeared in Foreign Affairs, Current History, the Fortnightly (London), and the Economist, among others. His books include "Nothing but Danger," "Dictators and Democrats," and "Spain's Struggle for Freedom.")

The time has come for a full-scale congressional investigation of the regime headed by Generalissimo Francisco Franco, Spain's chief of state, in its dealings with the United States under the so-called bases agreements. These military air bases will have cost us $2 billion or more by the end of the current fiscal year. What has been their value to the United States? How worthwhile are they likely to be in the future? How usefully has American money been spent and to what extent has it served the valid interests of the two countries? What is the impact on world opinion, and particularly on Latin American opinion, of the aid and comfort extended to Western Europe's most odious dictatorship by American military and foreign policy? What is the impact on the feelings and the opinions of Spaniards? Have we earned their good will? Will the bases agreements be fruitful of future good relations between the two countries and their peoples? Is it likely we will ever be allowed to use those bases should the calamity of war overtake us?

Let us look at a few of the facts in an effort to answer these questions.

On New Year's Eve, 1953, Franco broadcast to the world a speech in which he envisaged himself and General Eisenhower, as the American Chief of State, exercising "a rectifying responsibility over the destinies of the universe." The fact that Spain and the United States were both governed by generals provided a greater hope for peace than if civilians were the heads of those governments, he boasted.

Every New Year's Eve since, Franco has addressed the world via the radio, but the fervor of that first speech, so far as a prospective Franco-Eisenhower axis is concerned, has been lacking. It is true that President Eisenhower and Secretary of State John Foster Dulles last year forgot their warning that it is "too late to mock men's hopes with mere words and promises and gestures," and indulged in encomiums of Franco and his regime in a broadcast to the American people. Dulles spoke of the Franco dictatorship as one of the ties that hold the free world together. But on the last night of 1958, Franco's enthusiasm for the rectifying influence of himself and the American President—and for the $2 billion lift his regime is getting from the United States—had so subsided that his 8,000-word speech contained no mention of either Eisenhower or this American bounty—not one word of recognition or thanks.

Since World War II the United States has acquired such broad interests in the Mediterranean area that it has become, in effect, one of the family of Mediterranean countries. Since the Napoleonic Wars, the keystone of that family has been Spain. But Franco's dream of becoming the protector of Mediterranean nations has petered out everywhere. His buttering of Egypt's Nasser, which went to the extreme of lauding his seizure of the Suez Canal, has not brought results. The Arabs have rejected him scornfully. In desperation he has been making friendly gestures toward Russia, whose totalitarian system he praised in one of his speeches, while at the same time proclaiming himself Europe's only sure bulwark against communism—a statement which our well-intentioned but all too naive national legislators seem to believe.

Franco and what he stands for will run out the life span set down for him in history's book—as has happened in such countries as Venezuela, Colombia, and Argentina, and most recently in Cuba. Spain, thereafter, will regain an authoritative voice in Mediterranean councils. Where then will we stand with its people? Will their feelings of disillusionment about us, and their distrust of us, which already runs deep among Spaniards, find issue in some kind of cold war, or will we travel together as friends? This is a primary and paramount question, overshadowing even the transitory question of the "straperlo" game which many Spaniards and other acute observers are convinced Franco is playing with us.

Spaniards have a knack of summing up their bruised feelings about things they detest in an odious nickname, a shibboleth by which they effectively turn thumbs down on what they reject. "Straperlo," the name of a crooked gambling game, was adopted in the thirties and signifies swindle. Now, ironically, Spaniards have dubbed with the word "Eisenhowers" the armed tanks we have been sending to Franco, which they say are being used to render them powerless in their efforts to throw off the dictatorship. The "Eisenhowers" signify partnership with tyranny.

It is not too late to reverse such Spanish thinking by showing them when we say, as President Eisenhower has said, "we shall never acquiesce in the enslavement of any people in order to purchase fancied gains for ourselves," that these words will be implemented by deeds. If we do not, it will hurt us forever.

Franco's big selling point in his "straperlo" game with the United States is that he saved Spain from communism. This is believed by Americans despite the facts spread on the record of history, and despite the testimony of a long line of competent correspondents who had nothing in common with communism that of all European countries the Spanish Republic, up to the time of the war against it jointly by Hitler, Mussolini, and Franco, was least influenced by communism; that it was forced to turn to Russia for arms only when it could not buy them elsewhere.

Here is what a capable former Associated Press reporter, Charles Foltz, wrote about Franco and communism in his revealing and still valid book, "The Masquerade in Spain":

"One day wandering through the halls of the vice-secretariat of press and propaganda of the Falange, seeking a censor, I discovered a room full of anti-Franco pamphlets. They were fresh from the Falange printing presses. The signature was that of the Junta Suprema Nacional [supposed Communist underground]. Not long afterward I received this pamphlet by ordinary mail * * * printed with the same type face and on the same paper as that used in Arriba, the organ of the Falange." The Falange is the official party, headed by Franco. "The Family" [the clique around Franco], the author continued, "knows that Spanish communism is so weak that it must be nursed along to survive."

When the United States continues to pour billions into Spain under the assurance that its dictator saved, and continues to save, Europe from communism, we should examine the validity of that assurance.

"Franco—How Good an Ally?" was the title of an article by New York Times correspondent Samuel Pope Brewer that appeared in the Yale Review before the bases agreements were signed. Because of the truths that he told in this and in other articles, he, like many another honest correspondent, was kicked out of Spain. The question, "How good an ally is Franco?" is as valid a question as ever and needs to be considered on the basis of facts.

In his last year-end speech Franco announced his "neutrality." What does that mean, especially in the light of his flirtations with Russia and with Nasser? He has led us to believe that he was anything but neutral, indeed was our sworn and undying ally in all that concerned the discomfiture of communism. Does this proclamation of "neutrality," along with other warnings directed toward the United States by him personally, by his official spokesmen, or by his personally controlled and inspired press, mean that he is disposed to pull the military rug out from under us when convenient?

Franco began his "straperlo" game the moment we started making our blueprint for bases in Spain. This is revealed in a report made by U.S. Comptroller General Joseph Campbell last year. He reported that there was "no military need for one of the U.S. bases being built in Spain," and "there is no operational need for the facilities planned at San Pablo. * * * Had the Air Force not insisted on the construction of this base it could have saved $5 million." The Air Materiel Command found that base unnecessary for its mission, but, said Campbell, "The project was continued because its rejection would have adverse effects on Spanish-American relations."

Campbell reported further that "the selection of another base site, at Torrejon, 15 miles from Madrid [which by officially published figures has now cost us $69.2 million], was made largely on the initiative of the Spanish authorities who wanted a base near the national capital, and as a showpiece for at least one fighter jet squadron."

Franco is now demanding that this same Torrejon base, which he originally insisted the United States build, be turned over to him as a commercial airport on the plea that it is too near Madrid to be used as a military base. The United States would then be free to build another big base for another $70 million or so, somewhat farther away. This demand was secretly made to several Members of Congress who talked with Franco last fall.

The breakdown of funds so far handed to Spain (according to published dispatches from Madrid, but kept officially secret here) is: modern arms, $350 million; various types of economic aid, $894 million; cost of bases to date; $400 million. A New York Times dispatch tells us that War Minister Antonio Barroso, on his recent visit to Washington, asked for another $400 million to equip five Spanish divisions with modern arms. These figures total more than $2 billion. When the bases agreements were made, the American public was told they would cost a few hundred million at most. When I wrote in Foreign Affairs that the total would run to a billion, the forecast was challenged in some quarters.

The current financial scandal is another example of the Franco government's fraudulent operations, this time involving millions of United States' dollars which have been siphoned out of Spain. Officially the exportation of foreign capital is put at $280 million. Other reports say it is at least $400 million. Some estimates run as high as a billion. At the same time Spain's treasury reserves are down to, at best, $70 million. The trade balance deficit is $215 million.

Although the men around Franco—"The Family"—are making a grandstand show of indignation over the exportation of funds (largely to Swiss banks, but also for the purchase of stock and bonds, and investment in various properties in the United States and elsewhere) the fact is that "The Family" itself has been the exporter. An uncensored dispatch from Madrid reports: "The investments of Dona Carmen Polo de Franco, wife of the Caudillo, in Swiss, American, and Canadian banks, is the subject of jokes and rumors in all the cafes of Spain." Spaniards call her the richest person in Spain.

There is nothing new about this export of capital. It has been going full blast for 2 or 3 years on the pattern set by Latin American dictators, like Cuba's Batista.

Franco well knows that only more and more U.S. dollars can save his regime from collapse. A searching inquiry into the Franco clique's holdings in the United States, in bank deposits, stocks, bonds, and other investments, would be revealing.

Highly pertinent in determining the value of the U.S. military and quasi-political alliance with Franco is the question of the regime's stability. How long is it likely to last? This writer, who witnessed the fall of the monarchy in 1931, sees a strikingly similar situation now. The monarchy and its military dictatorship fell because of rising public sentiment against them and because they were coming apart at the seams—just as is happening now. They fell without violence, like a house of cards in a breeze. It could not stand before the fresh wind heralding—as Spaniards then fondly believed—a new order of freedom.

In Spain, sentiment and political action on the part of university students has had a profound effect on the country's political fortunes—a situation unknown in this country. A survey of 400 students in 1955 revealed they were preponderantly against everything for which Franco stood. Vicente Girbau Leon, a former official of the Spanish Foreign Office who escaped from Spain after being tried for not liking the things Franco stood for, reveals some of the results of this survey in the January issue of the U.S. publication Iberica:

Seventy-four percent of the students accused the government of incompetence, 85 percent of immorality; 90 percent accused the army of ignorance and incompetence, 48 percent of immorality; 67 percent found their professors unqualified; 52 percent accused the church hierarchy of immorality and of dedication to ostentatious and worldly affairs; 67 percent felt the church lacked concern for the workers; 70 percent found the church's social doctrine did not inspire confidence; 70 percent opposed their country's social-economic structure; only 20 percent accepted the Falange's totalitarian philosophy.

These are a few of the highlights of the things we should know about Franco and his dictatorship. Only a few—for the entire list is long. If we must continue our relations with him, it should be on the basis of complete and duly assessed information. Up to now the evidence used to justify our dealings with Spain cannot be found in the record. It is a situation which the croupiers of Franco's "straperlo" game find most profitable, but which is neither helpful to the United States now, nor good for our relations with Spain and her people in the future.

ITEM E

[From the New Leader, Mar. 9, 1959]

TENSION IN SPAIN

(By Bogdan Raditsa)

(Bogdan Raditsa recently spend 4 months in Spain, where he was engaged in research on the philosopher, Miguel de Unamuno.

Raditsa is a professor of European history at Fairleigh Dickinson University.)

The Spanish people are marking the 20th anniversary of Generalissimo Francesco Franco's rule by scarcely disguised contempt for the Caudillo and his regime. The widespread arrests of liberals and socialists all over Spain are not only the symptoms of Franco's unpopularity but one of the clearest signs of his weakness.

This sickness of a decaying regime buttressed by obsolete and weary propaganda is probably the most depressing feeling one has after living in Spain for several months. Yet in no country of Europe is there such a tremendous drive for change and such a strong desire to cross the Pyrenees, the mountain barrier that still seems to hold Spain back from the rest of Europe.

Two generations of Spaniards, one over 40 years of age, the other under, are locked in silent conflict over the question of political and other fundamental changes. Those who still remember the civil war and its horrors have been either resolute or tepid supporters of Franco. They are strongly opposed to any change. To them change means an unpredictable future and the specter of another civil war. But to those who have grown and developed intellectually under Franco's shadow, change means the way to put an end to apathy and backwardness.

That Spain is the most backward country in the Atlantic community is clear to everyone who has lived there recently. At least 50 years behind Italy, young Spain, aware of the progress taking place in all neighboring countries, yearns for advances in all directions: economic, political, social, and cultural. It now wants to be part of Europe, and the archaic, traditionalist, autarchic, and authoritarian Franco regime stands against its powerful desire to "Europeanize."

The most tragic paradox of the new Spanish drama is the opposition of one man, backed by a corrupt police state, to a whole nation's desire for a new way of life. And the more the Caudillo persists in his rejection of change, the more resolved the people become to do all they can to bring about a change.

What, then, is the real possibility of a change in Spain? How could Franco eventually be overthrown? Will Franco finally step down and open the door to a peaceful succession? What are the forces that keep Franco in power and what are those opposing him? What do the Spanish people seek from other nations of the West?

The forces behind Franco are still those that helped the Generalissimo establish himself in power 20 years ago.

The army, the strongest of those forces, has been rebuilt and has achieved such economic and political strength that it is still Franco's major support. Most of the old generals and officer elite from the civil war are dead, leaving Franco without any serious rival. The new generals and colonels are Franco's creatures and see in his perpetuation in power their own security. The regime has given them a remarkable economic situation that makes them eager to postpone any change. In the lower ranks of the army, however, a new feeling of opposition is growing, and it could eventually turn against the dictator.

A similar climate prevails in the old church hierarchy. The old bishops and clergy fear that a change could expose the church to wide-scale persecution. Many bishops are former military vicars, owing their position to Franco. This section of the church still fights against the dead Immanuel Kant and Miguel de Unamuno as much as against the living Jacques Maritain or Luigi Sturzo. They are often in conflict with Rome, and some of the late Pope's encyclicals have been expurgated before publication in Spain. Their feeling of social responsibility toward the people, primarily the peasantry, is limited to a paternalism reminiscent of the Middle Ages. They support the big landed proprietors in the south and still teach the peasantry that to suffer is God's will. Their influence upon the young clergy is weak and diminishing. To them, Spain is still the old fortified castle that must fear God and remain aloof from the liberal and Protestant West.

Together with these two traditional forces, a new class has arisen in Spain as the result of the economic transformation which has inevitably occurred despite the regime's inertia. This new class is not, as one might expect, the old Fascist Falange which has died both as an ideology and a political movement. It is a class of aggressive nouveaux riches whom the regime has made wealthy through corruption and through financial speculation and the use of foreign aid, powerful in obtaining and delivering export and import licenses, thus becoming the strongest vested interest in the State.

Although not exactly a part of the new class—the term has been used in Spain, too, following the publication of Milovan Djilas' "The New Class"—the Opus Dei comes next as a powerful group in the State. It is a Roman Catholic laymen's association that claims to be socially minded and politically enlightened.

The Opus Dei has been publicized often abroad as a Christian Democratic movement. Nothing could be more incorrect. It is a Catholic "Masonry," as it is called even by the Catholics, and is a clearly antidemocratic movement which tries to control the education and, to a certain extent, the finances of the country. It offers Franco an impressive screen behind which he can cover his own passion for power. Though the Opus Dei, as an association of Catholic laymen, denies it possesses any power in Franco's regime and often emphasizes its nonpolitical character, it is strongly attacked by the young revolutionary Catholics and by the Jesuits, who see the role played by Opus Dei in the state as a misfortune for the church.

The Opus Dei has filled the Spanish ideological and political vacuum which was aggravated by the fall of international facism. The Falange remains strong in the government-controlled trade unions, the Sindicatos, whose aim is to keep the workers silent and acquiescent in a regime which has slightly improved their standard of living and provided a certain degree of social security. The decline of the Falange has had another and more complex result: The sons of the old Falangists are today the best recruits for the Communists, if not the most active elements in the Communist underground, which the regime leaves free to act.

The enemy of the regime is not communism, but socialism and liberalism. Franco fights the liberals and the Socialists with greater passion and conviction than the Communists. The latest arrests are not the only example of Franco's eagerness to fight the liberals and the Socialists while permitting the Communists to continue their activities. The Communists, on the other hand, seem satisfied to see Franco eliminate their opponents, for the sole Communist aim today is to promote action "against the foreigner," so as to get the Americans and their bases out of Spain. In that movement, they have the backing of the Falange and, what is even more dangerous, the younger officers, supported by a public opinion which is convinced that Franco's prolonged stay in power is due to American aid.

Though it is understandable that the Americans did not go to Spain to free it from Franco, as they did not go to Yugoslavia to free the Yugoslavs from Marshal Tito, it is nevertheless true that the indifference with which the West looks upon Spain is responsible for Franco's stability. The economic aid that has moved Spain out of stagnation has helped the new class of merchants, middlemen, and managers more than the broad masses of the people. It has made the rich richer and kept the poor poor. This, too, explains the unrest and gives the Communists a useful source of propaganda against the West.

The opinion which the anti-Franco intelligentsia has of the West and its policy in Spain can be summed up as follows: "Spain is an underdeveloped country. The West treats Spain as all the underdeveloped countries. It seems to think that it is easier to work out a policy through a monolithic dictatorship than through a constitutional democratic government. Therefore, all the talk about the West being attached to the principle of democracy leaves us baffled. The Spanish people have now only one alternative: to fight Franco and the West and free themselves from the foreigners whose attitude toward Franco is subservient and opportunist." These opinions are repeated again and again, not only by the liberals and the Socialists, but by the Christian Democrats and nationalists.

They all believe the time has come when they must break with the older generations which, according to them, have betrayed Spain's right to live as a modern democratic society. The Christian Democrats talk with enthusiasm of a revolutionary Christianity that would sweep away medieval feudalism and give Spain greater political and social freedom.

The young Christian Democrats with revolutionary tendencies and the Socialists have much in common. When I was in Spain I was very surprised to be introduced to a Socialist by a young Catholic clergyman and by young left-wing Christian Democrats. In Barcelona I met some anarchists and syndicalists in the home of a priest and they spoke freely and without fear. They were all united against the older generation and against Franco, of course—and against the Communists too.

That is not the case with the youngest group, the young students, who are sympathetic to the Communists. For the Communists are the only ones, I was told, who can organize successful underground action against the regime. Franco's regime has done nothing to help the youth understand the real meaning of Communist action. The books that in the West have opened people's eyes about communism are not obtainable in Spain. Franco fights liberalism and Christian and social democracy. Whenever the Soviet Union achieves a technological victory over the West, Franco is the first one to praise it as the achievement of a strong and totalitarian state and to accuse democracy of decadence.

What are the prospects for the future in Spain? The question of Franco's succession is still an open one. Spain is a monarchy without a king. Two pretenders to the Spanish throne, Don Juan Bourbon, and his son, Don Carlos, one living in comfortable exile in Portugal and the other studying in Spain, are waiting for the succession. The Spanish monarchy, according to the Caudillo, is traditional, Catholic, social and representative, and it could be established as soon as Franco says so. But Franco, a healthy and vigorous man at 66, who seems to desire power for power's sake, doesn't appear ready to move out. Though offered assurances that he would be safe when out of power, he knows that his life in Spain would be endangered.

Yet the longer Franco stays in power, the more remote appears the possibility of a normal and peaceful transition to monarchy. What would happen if Franco should die? When asked this question by one of the most distinguished of Spain's high clergymen, Franco declared serenely that power lies in trustworthy hands, the hands of the

Council of the Realm, which would insure the normal succession under a monarchy.

As this answer did not satisfy the high clergyman, it does not satisfy the younger generation in Spain, who seem convinced that Franco's continued stay in power cannot contribute to the peaceful transformation of the state into a constitutional monarchy. Many predict a new civil war, a new conflict between the old and young, and a new period of anarchy and internecine social strife. Furthermore, an internal separatist movement cannot be excluded. The national feelings of Catalonia and of the Basques are running high again. Franco, with his policy of enforced assimilation, has merely helped strengthen these internal regional passions.

The West can no longer ignore the new developments in Spain. The revolutionary movements sweeping the Middle East have had a direct impact upon Spain. Against change stands not only an old decrepit regime but also the indifference of the West. The only possibility of preventing Spain from moving torward a new civil war in which the Communists might benefit is change in the direction of democracy.

The recent arrests of some of the most distinguished Spanish liberals and Socialists is a new warning not for the Caudillo, but for the West to help Spain to win her freedom.

ITEM F

[From the London Economist, Dec. 13, 1958]

OPERATION TREADING ON EGGS

With 866 housing units for married Air Force officers and enlisted men nearing completion on the outskirts of Madrid, a new white village welcoming Air Force families near Seville, and a housing shortage looming near Cadiz, the American "guests of the Spanish Government" are settling in.

The process entails a degree of diplomacy that is seldom demanded of the individual citizen, even on a visit. Some 17,000 Americans, people more inclined to bounce than to tiptoe, have been shoe-horned into a country traditionally sensitive and suspicious of foreigners. Here they expect to stay, as a corps if not as individuals, for 10 years or more, barring accidents too dire to be contemplated by anyone other than a billeting officer facing a delegation of indignant housewives.

The figure of 17,000 is a symbol rather than a statistic. Given with reserve, it does not include the expansion in force now going on near Cadiz, nor does it include either the large Embassy staff or the swarm of unofficial visitors—businessmen, friends, relatives and so on—who crowd the best Madrid hotels. The American population in Spain is understandably fluid.

The problems it creates for Spain, and itself, are no trifle, but still the worrying that is done about it looks out of proportion. This may be partly because the American Government has been trying so hard to prove that a force of 6-foot fliers, equipped with wives, electric refrigerators, blond children and baby-blue automobiles could be inserted into Spain without disturbing the Spanish economy or upsetting the conservative Spanish sense of how life is lived. The technique chosen to work this miracle is separate living, buying and schooling.

For some time the Air Force has had a hotel on lease in Madrid where incoming service families were lodged on arrival; next the families had to find living quarters in the town, and this increased the city's acute housing problem. Now that the new American suburb near the Torrejon base, called Royal Oak, is nearly finished, families are assigned living quarters there, built to American standards.

Food and clothing are to be had at a commissary and a post exchanged where Air Force wives can buy the tinned goods, packaged groceries and frozen foods that they buy back home. Bread is baked to Air Force specifications, although not always with success; Spanish bakers find it hard to understand why they should substitute foam for their own firm loaf.

The theory is that all this procedure operates without putting pressure on the Spanish economy, that it takes nothing out of it, and avoids the inflationary effect of competitive buying in local markets on the part of housewives equipped with fatter purses than most Spanish women have. It is also supposed to keep the American wife healthy and happy by providing her with approved and familiar goods. It may also please American suppliers and soothe Congressmen.

But behind this somewhat ostrich-like procedure lie other and deeper problems less easily handled. The whole business of building American airbases and housing airmen in another land, is difficult, as the British well know, but for reasons of history on both sides of the Atlantic the Spanish affair has been handled with kid gloves piled on velvet.

So tricky did it seem at first, that all airmen sent to Spain were hand-picked as Catholic, married, and Spanish-speaking. To cushion Spanish sensibilities still further, they could not wear uniforms off the base. Now that the forces are larger, the bases are finished, and the first idea of a huge supply center near Seville has given way to the concept of a small body of Strategic Air Command fliers changing frequently in line with the demands of Operation Reflex (described in the Economist on July 26) most of these precautions have lapsed. Airmen must still wear civilian dress, (and their wives may not wear slacks in public) but some of them are bachelors, and some are even Protestants.

The Americans have provided nearly a billion dollars for use in Spain, and the horn of plenty is still open-ended. What it has bought them, apart from such tangible things as miles of concrete airstrip, and hundreds of buildings on base and in housing units—buildings that will revert to Spain when and if the forces are withdrawn—is, first, an official permission to practice military activities which (as both sides miss no occasion to declare) are as important to Spain as to the United States.

Second, it has bought them an almost embarrassing popularity among the people of Spain, a popularity which is recognized as fragile and certainly reversible, should there be any falling out between the two governments.

New as it all is to the Americans, some of them have heard that it is only 4 years since Spanish mobs crying "Gibraltar for Spain" marched on the British Embassy in Madrid with the clear intention of burning it down. Balked by the police, they smashed every window that gave on the street. If someone were to put it into these same heads to cry, "Torrejon for Spain!" the vast expanse of glass in the American Embassy building would be equally vulnerable.

What the Spaniards have got out of the billion that has been spent is less stressed, and this concession to delicacy may be a mistake.

The Spanish Government maintains firmly that American spending has done almost nothing for them, that far too little has been given, and that much more is needed. The American officials maintain with equal stoutness but less repetition, that they have done a great deal—cushioned bad crop years with food imports, helped railway rehabilitation and roadbuilding; at the same time they insist that their spending, like their presence, has had no harmful effect on the Spanish economy and is in no way responsible for the current inflation.

In private conversation, the benefits to Spain tend to be played down and the problems emphasized. This may be the effect of a short and exacting experience, but the Americans talk like men still uneasy in Spain, who need to reassure themselves, as well as the visitor that everything is going well. The one word that must not be used under any circumstances is "occupation." These forces are "guests of the Spanish Government" and there during good behavior only. The sole hope of staving off a request to go, is by walking as softly as to cause no alarm.

But exemplary behavior—and that is what one sees—can only go so far. What of accidents, such as the highway tragedy involving an American car going at high speed? What of an angry scandal, a public quarrel such as the one that flared up between a Seville bootblack and a young American, and was on its way to the riot stage when a respected Spaniard intervened?

What of an explosion in the pipeline? What of a change in ambassadors if the (U.S.) Republicans lose in 1960? What of General Franco's not eternally postponed end?

These are some of the nightmares that haunt responsible officials. Any one of them might break all the eggs on which the Americans walk so warily. Yet the obvious concern makes one wonder whether the obligations inherent in the guest status have not been overplayed until they too constitute a danger point.

If this operation of bases and pipeline is as truly important to Spain as to the United States, is not the same thing true of the responsibilities of adjustment to each other's ways?

Is there no manner in which the Americans, in this second phase, can convince the Spanish Government that the risks have to be borne jointly? If not, when the honeymoon is over and the base operations become routine, they may find the long-feared incident upon them—and not by chance.

MANUFACTURE AND SALE OF FERTILIZER BY THE TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, among the business enterprises which the Hoover Commission pointed out the Federal Government operates in competition with taxpaying private industry is the manufacture and sale of fertilizer by the Tennessee Valley Authority.

Originally justified in part by the fact that the Tennessee Valley area was deficient in supply of fertilizers, the Commission pointed out that by 1954, in competition with private business TVA was manufacturing $19,800,000 worth of fertilizer which it sold in 35 States.

I have today introduced, for the third time, a very simple and modest bill aimed only at finding out what this fertilizer costs and what it ought to sell for.

This bill would not do away, necessarily, with TVA's fertilizer operation. It would simply direct the Comptroller General to look into this operation and lay all the cards out on the table, and it would require this Government operation, if it is to compete with private enterprise, to charge at least a price for

its product which will cover its real cost to the taxpayers.

Can anyone seriously object to determining the real cost of something being manufactured for sale by a Government agency?

COUNTERVAILING DUTY ON WOOL TOPS

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, the distinguished and famous gentleman from Virginia, Senator HARRY F. BYRD, chairman of the Committee on Finance, U.S. Senate, has informed me that he has inserted in the record of his committee's hearings my protest on the proposed removal of the countervailing duty on wool tops from Uruguay by the Treasury Department.

At my request, the very distinguished gentleman has also inserted protests from various labor-management groups in my district and State.

The proposed removal of this countervailing duty on wool tops is just another distressing instance of the destructive operation of current reciprocal trade policies which are having such a disastrous impact upon many American industries.

The disease of reciprocal "treatyitis" which has infected the American economy is seriously undermining the production of American industries and the employment of American workers and taxpayers.

This disease is spreading from one industry to another and is now affecting a wide range of American manufacture and production. Its worst effects are to be observed in the textile industry, but are by no means confined to that industry, since it is now embracing many other industries.

Since the executive department has not generally approved recommendations of the Tariff Commission designed to enforce the peril-point and escape-clause provisions of the trade treaty law, I urge that Congress give immediate attention to the revision of basic reciprocal trade treaty laws, and put real teeth into these laws that will promptly and automatically stop foreign imports injurious to American industry, responsible for causing serious unemployment in this country.

It would be well, in my opinion, to question in such proposed legislation, the very basis of trade treaty laws, and to adopt workable provisions in the form of a quota system, or some similar techniques, for adequately protecting American workers and businesses from ruthlessly cutthroat competition that is threatening to overwhelm our entire productive system.

I have stated time and time again, and now reiterate, that I favor and support mutually beneficial trade and commerce with all free nations. In fact, I am anxious that this Government should encourage and stimulate that kind of commerce and trade in ways that would redound to the mutual benefit of nations of the free world. Drastic and prompt action must be taken, however, to effectively stop the kind of competition from abroad which is crumbling the foundations of the American competitive economy.

In the process of taking this corrective action, Congress should and must gather and evaluate the recent reports that under the offshore procurement program and notwithstanding the Buy American Act, the Navy has purchased large quantities of steel from Japan and TVA has contracted to buy $13 million worth of turbo-generators from England.

What the Navy Department is doing with Japanese steel, I do not know, but am endeavoring to find out.

How a tax-supported, public subsidized agency like TVA, competing against private enterprise business, could so flagrantly purchase electricity-producing equipment overseas that could be procured in this country under conditions more favorable respecting long-term costs for repair, replacement and security safeguards in the event of war and emergency, is completely incomprehensible to me. These agencies should be called upon to explain these apparently unjustified purchases.

These are questions which this Congress must explore and correct. What must the American worker employed in these industries, who painfully pays heavy taxes to this Government, think of this situation? What must American businessmen who are taxed and taxed and taxed almost beyond the point of tolerance and fiscal stability think about these deliberate decisions to patronize foreign business and turn valuable procurement contracts away from their doors.

What kind of policy is it, anyhow, that turns its back on American workers and American industries in favor of foreign workers and foreign industries?

Congress has the duty of coming up with the answers to these questions, if we are to adequately fulfill our constitutional responsibilities which require us to protect, defend and safeguard the interests of the United States and develop its human material and natural resources for the general welfare of the country.

TEXTILES AND ECONOMIC FALLACY

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks I include a very illuminating excerpt from a recent editorial of the Saturday Evening Post entitled "America's Textile Industry Threatened by a Maze of Bewildering Restrictions."

This article outlines the extremely difficult problems of the textile industry in trying to cope with the impact of the reciprocal trade treaties. When we consider the $18 billion invested in textiles in this country and the millions of individuals employed directly and indirectly in the industry, the damage inflicted upon this industry by foreign competition arising from the operation of the trade treaties is pathetic and almost unbelievable. It is rapidly liquidating large segments of this once great industry.

The program is inflicting unconscionable damage, detriment, and injustice to a vital American industry, and the worst of it is that the contagion of this paralyzing trade treaty disease, with which the American economy has been inoculated, is spreading to many other important industries.

If some effective way is not found in the Congress before long to control the effects of the operations of the trade treaties, the American economy as a whole will suffer additional staggering, shocking injury which could be disastrous to many industries.

I again urge that Congress give its early attention to these crucial problems. The people are in favor of sound foreign trade; we all want good relations with our neighbors and other nations. But we should insist upon truly reciprocal treatment. Foreign trade should not be a one-way street. It should be mutually and severally beneficial. The present situation which accords great trade benefits to foreign nations and inflicts serious detriment upon our own Nation is an economic fallacy of the first magnitude. It cannot be permitted to keep its deadly stranglehold on American business and the livelihood of American workers and their families.

The editorial follows:

AMERICA'S TEXTILE INDUSTRY THREATENED BY A MAZE OF BEWILDERING RESTRICTIONS

Most Americans respond favorably to the general purpose behind the administration's effort to expand international trade. However, when you get down to cases and understand how the reciprocal-trade program works in specific instances, approval is considerably short of unanimous. The plight of the textile-manufacturing industry, which involves an investment of $8 billion and provides employment for more than a million individuals, plus another million workers and $4 billion investment in the apparel industry, is a case in point. The threat to the cotton-textile industry is a weird combination of obstacles before which any American industry might quail.

First, the textile manufacturer who uses cotton yarn must buy his raw cotton at the price fixed under the agricultural-support program. In the meantime the Government, stuck with cotton which it has accumulated at the support price, sells it in the world market, where the price is about 20 percent under the American "kept" price. Thus the manufacturer in Japan, Italy, or Indonesia is able to buy his major raw material for 20 percent less than his American competitor has to pay.

Why, it may be asked, doesn't the American manufacturer go into the world market for his cotton? The cotton farmers' lobby and its political henchmen have taken care of this possible loophole by placing an import quota on raw cotton. Although most raw-cotton imports are prohibited by the quota, the present duty on cloth, dresses, shirts and underpants made from our exported cotton does not close the gap between the world price and the higher American legislated price.

Another major threat to the textile industry is the difference between American high wages, to a large extent compulsory under various laws and regulations, and the low wages prevailing in competing areas, especially Japan and Hong Kong. The classical free-trade position—advanced by supporters of the General Agreement on Tariff and Trade—is that consumers are entitled to the benefits of low costs in other countries and that, if the American producer cannot meet the competition, he ought to go into some other trade. But, argue the American producers, even if it were desirable to junk the American standard of living in order to boost standards of living elsewhere, it couldn't be done without the repeal of minimum-wage and maximum-hours laws and other protections which the American worker now enjoys.

Furthermore, the U.S. textile man points out, our International Cooperation Administration and other distributors of foreign aid have made the lot of our foreign competitors even easier by helping to equip them with brand new plants and the latest machinery to go with them. Modernization of the American industry, while impressive, has been hampered by inadequate depreciation allowances.

As of now, imports of all textiles are but a small fraction of the total textile production in this country. Furthermore, the American industry exports more textiles than it imports. However, the manufacturer of one category of textiles, ginghams or velveteens for example, heavily hit by low-cost imports, does not benefit because the manufacturer of another variety, like industrial webbing, is unscathed. The ratio of textile imports to exports is far less in favor of exports than it once was, for the obvious reason that our foreign customers are being taken from us by competitors blessed with the advantages already mentioned.

Obviously we cannot build a nonscalable tariff wall around the textile industry. However, it does not seem unreasonable to suggest a compensating import duty on goods made from the cotton which we supply to foreign processors at a 20-percent discount. After all, American flour mills are protected against imports of flour made from wheat sold abroad for less than the support price. A little less enthusiasm for setting up still more textile industries abroad with American money would also contribute.

There would still remain the wide difference between American and Asiatic wages in the affected industries. Probably there is no cure for this except an enforcible quota which should be liberal enough to give the Japanese and foreign industry generally a reasonable share of the market, but drastic enough to prevent disaster to the domestic industry.

THE APPROPRIATION PROCESS AND TAX REVISION

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I was pleased to note that the very able chairman of our great House Ways and Means Committee, the distinguished gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MILLS], and his esteemed colleagues have brought a bill to the floor of the House for taxing life insurance companies.

This important question has been pending in Congress for many years during which the Federal Treasury has lost huge revenues which normally should have flowed into the coffers of the Government. It is satisfying to note that under this bill the income will now be received by our Federal Treasury.

The insurance companies themselves have recognized the need and the justice of such legislation and have been agreeable to an equitable formula setting forth what the industry should pay.

We all know the difficulties presented by such legislation by the very nature of the insurance business, and I think we are all substantially in agreement that the insurance companies should pay their fair share of taxes just as other corporations and individuals. They should be dealt with fairly and equitably by the Government.

I think that Mr. MILLS and the committee should be complimented for their endeavors to work out a measure that will accomplish this result without imposing unfair tax burdens on any segment of our great insurance business.

The problem of reaching a suitable formula to tax life insurance companies and mutual insurance companies, undoubtedly presented a very challenging task for the committee, and I hope that their earnest labors have resulted in a bill which will be agreeably received by the companies concerned and will result in the very substantial revenue which is anticipated from this legislation. At least, we may agree that this is one step in the right direction.

In my opinion, the committee and the House have other important steps which they should take at a very early date to tackle and thoroughly revise the complex, inequitable, outmoded tax system under which the Government is now operating.

The balloon budgets of recent years, annually swelling and inflating in an alarming way, require adequate revenue, if we are not to revert to budget deficits. They must be painstakingly considered, item by item, and all fat eliminated.

In the past 6 years, Congress has cut over $20 billion from the Executive budget, but there is clear indication that the annual budget is still heavily larded with fat. This cannot be tolerated.

Does Congress have adequate efficient machinery for evaluating, going over and cutting these huge annual budgets? Are our committees properly and adequately staffed to examine with scrupulous care the thousands of items that go into these budgets?

Are we equipped to make intelligent cuts that will effect permissible economy and yet not interfere with national security and essential services of the Government.

Do we have the informed know-how and adequate administrative facilities here for following up the expenditures we authorize and appropriate for, on governing and checking waste, extravagance, seeing how funds we appropriate are used, protecting the interests of our taxpayers?

Is there need for more and better cooperation between the executive and legislative branches and the effective coordination of budget-making policies and the actual appropriation of funds to carry them out?

Is there sufficient coordinated effort made to hold down expenditures to the minimum point consistent with national safety and the proper socially conscious conduct of Government.

Do we need here a supplementary joint appropriation body, similar to the one that exists in the tax field, staffed with experts, lawyers, economists, inspectors, and investigators, to go over budget requests with a fine tooth comb, assist the Appropriations Committee in determining minimum necessary expenditures, and follow up the entire appropriating and spending process through departmental levels to make sure that waste and extravagance are minimized and that appropriated funds are efficiently used?

I mention this subject at this time because, as I have indicated, the size of the annual budget bears necessary relation to the size of the national tax levy.

Now for a moment, I would like to deal briefly with the related question of tax revision. From time to time, Congress has made herculean efforts to change and modernize the tax structure, both in its substantive and procedural aspects. Various efforts have been made and legislation presented. One measure I recall was so voluminous that the bill consisted literally of a large book, which, of course, very few Members of this House could possibly read in its entirety since it embodied countless technical changes, let alone fully comprehend its provisions.

The withholding principle, enacted back in the war years, marked a radical tax departure, and, in addition, war taxes, nuisance taxes, and a wide assortment of taxes on about everything from baby oil to transportation, many of them still unfortunately with us, were adopted by Congress.

High rates ranging from 20 percent in the lower to 91 percent in the upper brackets were established. High corporate rates were also enacted. Excise and other Federal taxes imposed a virtually impenetrable labyrinth of regulations written into a tax system so all-embracing, haphazard and uncoordinated that inequities and injustices flourished; fair, clear-cut tax obligations were minimized.

What is worse, exemptions and special administrative rulings applying frequently in a discriminating way, multiply and fasten a tight grip on about every class of the taxpaying public.

Of great concern to all of us are these constantly growing, continually spreading tax burdens weighing down workers, business, farmers, veterans, social security beneficiaries, retired pensioners, and others under the press of laws and regulations freezing inequities, favoritisms, and gross discriminations, lowering standards of living for a huge majority of Americans, working hardships on poor people, swallowing up seed capital in the maws of Government bureaucracy, disrupting and impeding the productive functions of our free enterprise system.

It would be impossible to estimate the hardship, inconvenience, and damage that is being caused by oppressive taxation, nor can we even approximately determine the profound, deteriorative effect of high-bracket taxation on our

economic system—that fabulous mechanism which at once affords work, free play for talent, energy, and ambition, high standards of living, and investment opportunities for our people.

How long can a free enterprise system, constituted as ours, stand up under the oppressive tax burdens that are inexorably weighing it down so heavily as to give genuine concern that its very underpinnings are being undermined, and may, in the not too distant future, collapse?

All of these questions point to the urgency of tax reform of a sweeping nature as soon as Congress can get to it.

Unprecedented demands are being made upon the Federal Government by the States and local communities. The Federal Government has undertaken large, financial support in a great many activities heretofore deemed to be solely within the province of the several States.

How far can we go down this road and retain State sovereignty, or indeed preserve constitutional balance and the vitality of our economic system is a question Congress and the American people will have to determine.

I think that thoughtful Americans are gravely concerned about these trends toward centralism in the guise of national welfare, and I personally believe that before we proceed further along our present economic course that we should stop and take heed of the clear warning signs indicating that we cannot hope to socialize American institutions and at the same time retain the immeasurable benefits and blessings that have come to us and our great country as a consequence of the operations of our free enterprise system. At the moment it seems to me that we cannot further delay vigorous action in these two fields of budgetary reform and drastic tax revision. Nor should we further delay a broad evaluation of alarming trends in Government leading us farther and farther away from our free institutions and State and local autonomy.

I will not here elaborate upon the basic, guiding principles, so well known to Members of the House, which we should follow in this process of regulating our fiscal affairs and tax structure.

We are committed to the fundamental principle of ability to pay. By the same token, we should be very careful and see that this principle is so applied that it will not go beyond the true, reasonable ability to pay, and thus cause hardship, indebtedness, and penalty to our people and our business groups. The vital thing is to move with all practicable speed to harness necessary national expenditure to our true revenue potential under efficient appropriation procedures consistent with maximum economy and under a realistic, modernized Federal tax system, fair and equitable to all and stimulative to our free enterprise institutions.

I hope very earnestly, Mr. Speaker, that the House may soon be prompted to the full implementation of these fundamental principles and wholeheartedly pledge myself, by voice, vote, and vigorous effort to every cooperation.

PRICE SUPPORT LEVEL ON MILK

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, the news that the Secretary of Agriculture has agreed to maintain the present price support level on milk at $3.06 per hundred is certainly heartening. Many of us have been concerned that the Secretary would lower this support level by 10 cents—to $2.96 per hundred.

A price support drop such as this would have resulted in a difference of approximately $1,327,000 of income for the First District of Minnesota, and would have worked a hardship on the dairy farmers across the Nation.

It was for this reason that I have urged the Secretary not to reduce support prices on dairy products.

The need to continue this level is clear. From a national standpoint, it has been estimated that approximately 1,500,000 farm families of the United States derive all, or a major part of their income, from dairy cows. Dairying produces 19 percent of the gross national income from agriculture—larger than any other segment of our farm economy.

Dairying exerts an important influence on Minnesota's farm income as well. It has been estimated that approximately 9,739,000,000 pounds of milk were produced in Minnesota during 1958.

As a dairy farmer myself, I represent a district composed of 12 counties in southeastern Minnesota which depend on dairying for a substantial part of the farm income. An estimated 1,327,000,000 pounds of milk were sold by farmers of the First District.

The supply and demand situation has so improved in the dairy industry that surplus stocks of butter and cheese have been drastically reduced. Production of milk was reduced this last year rather than increased which occurred in the previous years.

This, coupled with the fact that our population continues to grow, giving us new consumers for milk, gives hope for further improvement in the entire dairy industry and the support price no longer needs to be down at the lowest possible level.

WABASH VALLEY COMPACT

Mr. BOYLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. WAMPLER] may extend his remarks at this point and to include a copy of a bill introduced by him.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. WAMPLER. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing legislation today which would grant the consent of Congress to the States of Indiana and Illinois to enter into a Wabash Valley Compact.

As stated in article I of the measure, Mr. Speaker, the States of Indiana and Illinois have found that the Wabash Valley has suffered from a lack of comprehensive planning for the optimal use of its human and natural resources and that under-utilization and inadequate benefits from its potential wealth are likely to continue until there is proper organization to encourage and facilitate coordinated development of the Wabash Valley as a region and to relate its agricultural, industrial, commercial, recreational, transportation, development, and other problems to the opportunities in the valley.

To this end it is the purpose of the party States to recognize and provide for such development and coordination and to establish an agency of the party States with powers sufficient and appropriate to further regional planning for the valley.

If for no other purpose than to establish the necessary organizational machinery to devise a master flood control plan for the protection of the people, and their agricultural and property interests, the proposed compact would be of inestimable value.

By way of illustration, Mr. Speaker, there appeared in the Sunday, March 8, 1959, edition of the Terre Haute (Ind.) Tribune an article titled "Reservoirs Needed on Upper Wabash," which statistically documents, in terms of human lives, agricultural acreage and property lost, a portion of the tragic waste and devastation suffered in the Wabash Valley as a result of perpetual flooding.

The story states that—

> The 1913 flood, the worst in the State's (Indiana) history, resulted in damages amounting to $11 million, the 1943 flood damage was $10,660,000 and the loss of six lives, and the 1950 flood resulted in four deaths and damage of $1,662,000.
>
> The 1958 agricultural flood loss of acreage along the Wabash tributaries, including the White River, amounted to 262,500 acres and 224,700 acres in 1957. Total losses in crop value in this area was $10,190,000 in 1958 and $8,874,000 in the previous year.
>
> The lower Wabash in which this area is located lost 174,000 acres of crops valued at $8,340,000 in 1958 and 142,000 acres valued at $6,300,000 in 1957.
>
> The upper Wabash area lost 83,068 acres of crops valued at $3,683,790 last year and 78,267 acres valued at $2,350,948 the year before.
>
> Indiana highway losses due to floods in 1958 cost the counties and the State $602,770 in road repairs and $912,754 in bridge repairs. The 1957 State flood loss figures were $502,187 for roads and $113,417 to replace washed out or damaged bridges.
>
> In Vigo County alone, the financial bill for repair of flood damaged roads in 1958 was $34,605 and $30,000 the year before, with $98,463 being spent on bridge repairs last year and none in 1957.

Mr. Speaker, the losses sustained during the recent 1959 floodings are still being totaled.

I hope my colleagues will appreciate to the fullest extent the absolute necessity for the approval of this measure, which is identical to bills which have been introduced by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SHIPLEY], and Senator HARTKE, of Indiana.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I insert the text of my Wabash

Valley Compact bill at the conclusion of my remarks:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the consent of Congress is hereby given to the States of Illinois and Indiana to enter into the Wabash Valley Compact in the form as follows:

"THE WABASH VALLEY COMPACT

"Article I. Findings and purpose

"The party states find that the Wabash Valley has suffered from a lack of comprehensive planning for the optimal use of its human and natural resources and that under-utilization and inadequate benefits from its potential wealth are likely to continue until there is proper organization to encourage and facilitate coordinated development of the Wabash Valley as a region and to relate its agricultural, industrial, commercial, recreational, transportation, development and other problems to the opportunities in the Valley. To this end it is the purpose of the party states to recognize and provide for such development and coordination and to establish an agency of the party states with powers sufficient and appropriate to further regional planning for the Valley.

"Article II. The Valley

"As used in this compact, the term 'Wabash Valley' shall mean the Wabash River, its tributaries and all land drained by said river and tributaries, to whatever extent they lie within the party states.

"Article III. The Wabash Valley Interstate Commission

"(a) There is hereby created an agency of the party states to be known as the Wabash Valley Interstate Commission (hereinafter called the Commission). The Commission shall be composed of seven Commissioners from each party state designated or appointed in accordance with the law of the state which they represent and serving and subject to removal in accordance with such law. The federal government may be represented without vote if provision is made by federal law for such representation.

"(b) The Commissioners of the party states shall each be entitled to one vote in the Commission. No action of the Commission shall be binding unless taken at a meeting in which a majority of the members from each party state are present and unless a majority of those from each state concur, provided that any action not binding for such a reason may be ratified within thirty days by the concurrence of a majority of each state. In the absence of any Commissioner, his vote may be cast by another representative or Commissioner of his state provided that said Commissioner or other representative casting said vote shall have a written proxy in proper form as may be required by the Commission.

"(c) The Commission may sue and be sued, and shall have a seal.

"(d) The Commission shall elect annually, from among its members, a chairman, a vice chairman, and a treasurer. The Commission shall appoint an executive director who shall also act as secretary, and who, together with the treasurer, shall be bonded in such amounts as the Commission may require.

"(e) The Commission shall appoint and remove or discharge such personnel as may be necessary for the performance of the Commission's functions irrespective of the civil service, personnel, or other merit system laws of any of the party states.

"(f) The Commission may establish and maintain, independently or in conjunction with any one or more of the party states, a suitable retirement system for its employees. Employees of the Commission shall be eligible for social security coverage in respect of old-age and survivors insurance provided that the Commission takes such steps as may be necessary pursuant to federal law to participate in such program of insurance as a governmental agency or unit. The Commission may establish and maintain or participate in such additional programs of employee benefits as may be appropriate to afford employees of the Commission terms and conditions of employment similar to those enjoyed by employees of the party states generally.

"(g) The Commission may borrow, accept, or contract for the services of personnel from any state or the United States or any subdivision or agency thereof, from any interstate agency, or from any institution, person, firm, or corporation.

"(h) The Commission may accept for any of its purposes and functions under this compact any and all donations, and grants of money, equipment, supplies, materials, and services, conditional or otherwise, from any state of the United States or any subdivision or agency thereof, or interstate agency, or from any institution, person, firm, or corporation, and may receive, utilize, and dispose of the same.

"(i) The Commission may establish and maintain such facilities as may be necessary for the transacting of its business. The Commission may acquire, hold, and convey real and personal property and any interest therein.

"(j) The Commission may adopt, amend, and rescind bylaws, rules, and regulations for the conduct of its business.

"(k) The Commission annually shall make to the Governor of each party state, a report covering the activities of the Commission for the preceding year, and embodying such recommendations as may have been adopted by the Commission which report shall be transmitted to the legislature of said state. The Commission may issue such additional reports as it may deem desirable.

"Article IV. Finances

"(a) The Commission shall submit to the executive head or designated officer or officers of each party state a budget of its estimated expenditures for such period as may be required by the laws of that jurisdiction for presentation to the legislature thereof.

"(b) Each of the Commission's budgets of estimated expenditures shall contain specific recommendations of the amount or amounts to be appropriated by each of the party states. Subject to appropriation by the respective legislatures the Commission shall be provided with such funds by each of the party states as are necessary to provide the means of establishing and maintaining facilities, a staff of personnel, and such activities as may be necessary to fulfill the powers and duties imposed upon and entrusted to the Commission.

"(c) The Commission may meet any of its obligations in whole or in part with funds available to it under Article III(h) of this compact, provided that the Commission takes specific action setting aside such funds prior to the incurring of any obligation to be met in whole or in part in this manner. Except where the Commission makes use of funds available to it under Article III(h) hereof, the Commission shall not incur any obligations prior to the allotment of funds by the party jurisdictions adequate to meet the same.

"(d) The expenses and any other costs for each member of the Commission shall be met by the Commission in accordance with such standards and procedures as it may establish under its bylaws.

"(e) The Commission shall keep accurate accounts of all receipts and disbursements. The receipts and disbursements of the Commission shall be subject to the audit and accounting procedures established under its bylaws. However, all receipts and disbursements of funds handled by the Commission shall be audited yearly by a qualified public accountant and the report of the audit shall be included in and become a part of the annual report of the Commission.

"(f) The accounts of the Commission shall be open at any reasonable time for inspection.

"Article V. Advice and cooperation

"(a) The Commission shall establish a technical advisory committee which shall be composed of representatives of such departments or agencies of the governments of the party states as have significant interest in the subject matter of the Commission's work: *Provided,* That if pursuant to the laws of a party state a representative of any such department or agency serves as a member of the Comission said department or agency need not be represented on the technical advisory committee. The Commission shall provide under its bylaws for procedures for the reference of questions to such committee.

"(b) The Commission may establish other advisory and technical committees composed of private citizens, expert and lay personnel, representatives of industry, labor, commerce, agriculture, civic associations, and officials of local, state and federal government, and may cooperate with and use the services of any such committee and the organizations which they represent in furthering any of its activities under this compact. The Commission shall encourage citizen organization and activity for the promotion of the objectives of this compact.

"Article VI. Functions

"The Commission shall have power to:

"A. Promote the balanced development of the Wabash Valley by

"(1) Correlating and reporting on data significant to such development.

"(2) Recommending the coordination of studies by the agencies of the party states to provide such data.

"(3) Publishing and disseminating materials and studies which will encourage the economic development of the Valley.

"(4) Recommending standards as guides for local and state zoning and other action which will promote balanced development by encouraging the establishment of industrial parks to facilitate industrial development, the reservation of stream bank and lake shore areas for recreation and public access to water, the preservation of marshes and other suitable areas as wild life preserves, the afforestation and sustained yield forest management of submarginal lands, the protection of scenic values and amenities and other appropriate measures.

"(5) Preparing in cooperation with appropriate governmental agencies a master plan for the identification and programming of public works.

"(6) Cooperating with all appropriate governmental agencies in the encouragement of tourist traffic and facilities in the Valley.

"B. Recommend integrated plans and programs for the conservation, development and proper utilization of the water, land and related natural resources of the Wabash Valley, including but not limited to:

"(1) Encouraging the classification of Valley lands in terms of appropriate uses.

"(2) Cooperating in the development of appropriate plans for flood protection, including but not limited to the construction of protective works and reservoirs.

"(3) Developing public awareness of the need for flood plain zoning and in cooperation with the appropriate agencies of the party states and their political subdivisions evolving standards for the implementation and application of such zoning in the Valley.

"(4) Reviewing the need for and appropriate sources of suitable water supplies for domestic, municipal, agricultural, power, industrial, recreation and transportation purposes.

"(5) Encouraging a pattern of land use and resource management which will increase the natural wealth of the Valley and promote the welfare of its inhabitants.

"(6) In cooperation with appropriate agencies, analyzing the recreational needs and potential of the Valley and developing a program for the use and maximization of recreational resources.

"C. Secure the necessary research and developmental activities by:

"(1) Correlating such research and developmental activities as are placed within its purview by this compact. The Commission may engage in original investigation and research on its own account or secure the undertaking thereof by a qualified public or private agency.

"(2) Making contracts for studies, investigations and research in any of the fields of its interest.

"(3) Publishing and disseminating reports.

"D. Make recommendations for appropriate action to:

"(1) The legislatures and executive heads of the party states and the federal government

"(2) The agencies of the party states and the federal government.

"E. Undertake such additional functions as may hereafter be delegated to or imposed upon it from time to time by the action of the legislature of a party state concurred in by the legislature of the other.

"Article VII. Enactment and withdrawal

"This compact shall become effective when entered into and enacted into law by the states of Illinois and Indiana. The compact shall continue in force and remain binding upon each party state until renounced by legislative action of either party state.

"Article VIII. Construction and severability

"The provisions of this compact shall be severable and if any phrase, clause, sentence or provision of this compact is declared to be unconstitutional or the applicability thereof to any state, agency, person, or circumstance is held invalid, the constitutionality of the remainder of this compact and the applicability thereof to any other state, agency, person or circumstance shall not be affected thereby. It is the legislative intent that the provisions of this compact be reasonably and liberally construed."

SEC. 2. A Federal representative to the Wabash Valley Interstate Commission shall be appointed by the President, and he shall report to the President either directly or through such agency or official as the President may specify. Such representative shall have no vote on the commission. His compensation shall be in such amount, not in excess of $100 per diem, as the President shall specify, but the total amount of compensation payable in any one calendar year shall not exceed $10,000: *Provided*, That if the Federal representative be an employee of the United States he shall serve without additional compensation: *Provided further*, That a retired military officer or a retired Federal civilian officer or employee may be appointed as such representative, without prejudice to his retired status, and he shall receive compensation as authorized herein in addition to his retired pay or annuity but the sum of his retired pay or annuity and such additional compensation as may be paid hereunder shall not exceed $12,000 in any one calendar year. The Federal representative shall be entitled to travel expenses, he shall also be provided with office space, stenographic service, and other necessary administrative services. The compensation of the Federal representative shall be paid from available appropriations for the White House Office or from funds available to the President in connection with special projects. Travel expenses, office space, stenographic, and administrative services shall be paid from any available appropriations selected by the head of such agency or agencies as may be designated by the President to provide such expenses.

SEC. 3. The Wabash Valley Interstate Commission constituted by the compact shall make an annual report to Congress not later than sixty days after the beginning of each regular session thereof.

SEC. 4. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this Act is expressly reserved.

FARM HEARINGS FOR NEW MEMBERS OF CONGRESS

Mr. BOYLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to announce to the House, and particularly to the new Members of the House, that the Committee on Agriculture has set aside next Wednesday and Thursday, March 18 and 19, for the purpose of hearing Members of Congress who desire to appear before the committee and present their views concerning farm problems and programs. We want all Members of the House and especially the new Members to know that we shall be delighted to hear them or to receive statements from them.

The agricultural dilemma that faces the Nation was an important issue in many elections last fall and numerous new Members of the House and Senate were elected on the basis of platforms which included important new proposals for farm legislation.

The Committee on Agriculture is interested in all proposals and anxious to have the new Members of Congress, reflecting as they do the thinking of the people in their districts, make available to the committee such ideas as they may have with reference to agricultural legislation.

The hearings will be held by the full Committee on Agriculture and will start at 10 a.m., in the Agriculture Committee Room, 1310 New House Office Building. The hearings will be open to the public. Members who desire to appear are requested to notify the clerk of the Committee on Agriculture and indicate which of the 2 days, the 18th or the 19th will be most convenient to them.

If the Member desires to submit a written statement, either as part of or in addition to his oral presentation, the committee will be glad to receive it and it will appear in the printed hearing. If a written statement is to be presented, it is suggested that the Member make approximately 50 copies available to the committee at the time he appears, for the use of committee members and for distribution to the press.

TUNISIA

Mr. BOYLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL] may extend his remarks at this point in the body of the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, I wish to salute today His Excellency, Habib Bourguiba, President of Tunisia, and His Excellency, Mongi Slim, the Ambassador to the United States, on their country's third anniversary of independence from France on March 20.

Although Tunisia is a young nation and is small and far from wealthy, the country is important for the place she occupies in the heart of the Mediterranean. Fate has given Tunisia a privileged position in the center of the sea which has nurtured civilization. From her favorable position looking both toward Europe and the East, Tunisia has traditionally welcomed men and ideas from either direction. President Bourguiba emphasized a few years ago that Tunisia's responsibilities in the modern world are dictated by her location:

> Never to close her door on men of good will bringing spiritual or material help to offer peaceful cooperation to her neighbors; to be the conciliator between the Arab and Western World.

Let it not be forgotten that Tunisia can also be a barrier standing between them. President Bourguiba advises:

> In a world which has great and obvious need for mutual understanding Tunisia stands out as a land of reconciliation and fraternity between men, religions, and nations.

Although Tunisia has a population of only four million inhabitants and the country itself is no larger than the State of New York, its people have no feeling of timidity when mingling with large Western nations for theirs is an ancient nation whose cohesion and personality have been established for many centuries past. To which ancient cultural heritage has been forged the modern civilization of Arab culture enriched by drawing elements from Islam and the West.

Agricultural production still provides the main part of resources, which as elsewhere is subject to fluctuations and subjects the country to severe repercussion on standards of living and on foreign trade. Therefore, the country is eager to engage in other development to offset the uncertainty and disequilibrium of an agrarian economy and make the necessary economic progress in the modern world. President Bourguiba has announced his country's policy of "total freedom for capital and benefit transfers" for foreign investments in Tunisia. Moreover, he added, mineral resources abound and supply raw materials for industry and agriculture throughout the world. Though he readily admits that natural resources of energy are limited, he informs that labor is abundant and economic development is based on confidence and liberalism. Tunisia realizes she cannot raise the new industries and therefore the President has appealed to foreign investments announcing new and sub-

stantial guarantees providing investors security.

The President has announced that Tunisia desires free, dignified, and loyal cooperation; that Tunisia is modest but proud and will not stoop to begging.

If we of the United States would but study, give thought and react to the wise admonition of President Bourguiba on this Tunisian birthday anniversary which is stated below our position as an ally and friend of all the Afro-Asian countries might be strengthened:

It is incumbent upon the United States, as the responsible leader of the West, to review its policy and to chart a bold new course.

Alliances are only as strong as its members. If certain members bring to the alliance weakness and imperialistic tendencies, the vitality of all the alliance as a whole is undermined. The alliance courts failure, also, if it props up, by artificial means, regimes which command neither the confidence nor the loyalty of their people. We find examples of this today in the Middle East.

There is today among the Arab people an elite which, in the main, is not attracted by the blandishments of Russia or communism. If this elite nevertheless compacts with the Soviet Union, it is with the simple purpose of countering the support which the United States and Great Britain have tendered certain unpopular, corrupt, and tyrannical monarchies and certain vestiges of colonialism.

I am compelled to reiterate the warnings which I have sounded during the last 2 years in my weekly speeches to the Tunisian nation: The United States runs the risk, as the leader of the free world, of losing the battle with Russia by persisting in backing and in indulging those who violate the principles of human liberty and dignity, and the respect for nations.

American policy has been subject to ambiguities. While Soviet intervention in Hungary is strongly criticized, France is supplied with airplanes and bombs for use in Algeria. In the Middle East as elsewhere, the West continues to prop up regimes already in the shadow of extinction, thus bringing upon the Western Alliance the deepening hostility of all the forces of change.

The United States must put an end to such ambivalence and no longer support either France in her actions in Algeria, or regimes similar to the one which existed in Iraq, for the mere sake of agreements and pacts. These allies, instead of strengthening the Western Alliance, are in fact robbing the group of its vitality and creating dangerous vacuums along the peripheries of the free world.

A choice must be made. The United States would do better if, instead of entering into fruitless and propagandistic summit meetings, it would have serious heart-to-heart talks with thoes among its own allies who still harbor imperialistic ambitions at a time of the awakening of all nations to liberty and freedom. America has it in its power to chart a bold new course for the West. America is mighty and her allies could not do without her: The life, security, and prosperity of these allies are bound inextricably to the power of the United States. Only by adopting the new approach, and by obliging its allies to follow suit, can the United States shore up the swaying structure of the free world and command the respect and loyalty of freedom-loving people everywhere.

American policy toward Tunisia is a case in point. Democracy in Tunisia has deep roots and is popular with its people. But the United States, understandably perhaps, continues to be deferential to French opinion. It is needless to invoke here the martyrdom of the Algerian people. The bloodshed in Algeria continues partly because the United States, while sincerely wishing an end to this strife, has failed to use firm and imperative language with its French ally—to oppose the errors and wanderings of passion.

U.S. policy has met failure in the Middle East—the failure which may clear way for greater Russian influence in that area. Yet, there are always lessons in defeat. Out of the setbacks and the disappointments in the Middle East may emerge the guidelines for a new policy, a new and broad course of action.

Such a fresh policy must be carefully conceived and firmly carried out. It must be designed to erase some of the errors of the past and to destroy, by positive action, the misconceptions which have beguiled millions of oppressed people in their craving for liberty. So long as the status of these people remains unchanged, communism will continue to beckon to them as the only salvation from the feudal tyranny of their own regimes and from the domination of imperialistic forces from without.

The alternatives are grim for all concerned, and especially for us. Should the United States lose heart in the defense of the Middle East and Africa and withdraw altogether from its overseas bases which have been the targets of so many irresponsible attacks—should it abandon all its allies including France and Great Britain—not a day would pass before Russian armies would sweep over Western Europe.

The free world owes its existence to the protection of the powerful United States. I state this blunt fact as the chief of state of a nation who is responsible for the security of his people. While we may not hesitate to criticize the United States whenever necessary, we cannot deny the fundamental facts of our survival. To deny them is to yearn secretly for the advent of communism and for the destruction of liberty and dignity everywhere.

ESTABLISHMENT OF TEMPORARY COMMISSION TO STUDY VETERANS' PROGRAM OF THE UNITED STATES IN THE PHILIPPINES

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced the following joint resolution:

JOINT RESOLUTION TO ESTABLISH A TEMPORARY COMMISSION TO STUDY THE VETERANS' PROGRAM OF THE UNITED STATES IN THE PHILIPPINES

Whereas many citizens of the Republic of the Philippines served valiantly as nationals and members of the Armed Forces of the United States during World War II;

Whereas notwithstanding the sacrifices of these people in the combat with the common enemy were as great as those of other members of the Armed Forces of the United States, certain benefits are denied these veterans which are now provided other veterans who performed comparable service;

Whereas the problems encountered by Filipino veterans in the matter of benefits under laws administered by the Veterans' Administration and other agencies of the United States have been one of the causes for the demand in the Philippines for a reexamination of the existing relations and agreement between the United States and the Republic of the Philippines; and

Whereas the immediate solution of these problems is necessary to maintain the harmonious relations which have heretofore existed between these two nations: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That there is hereby established a Commission on Filipino Veterans' Benefits (hereafter referred to as the "Commission"), to be composed of five members appointed by the President.

SEC. 2. (a) Any vacancy in the membership of the Commission shall not affect its powers, but shall be filled in the same manner in which the original appointment was made.

(b) The Commission shall elect a Chairman from among its members.

(c) Three members of the Commission shall constitute a quorum.

SEC. 3. (a) It shall be the duty of the Commission to conduct a thorough and comprehensive investigation and study of the entire veterans' program of the United States in the Republic of the Philippines with a view to determining a just and equitable solution of all problems relating to or growing out of such programs.

(b) Within six months after the date of enactment of this joint resolution, the Commission shall submit to the President and to the Congress a full report of its findings, together with such recommendations as it deems appropriate.

(c) Sixty days after the submission of its report under subsection (b), the Commission shall cease to exist.

SEC. 4. (a) Each member of the Commission shall receive $50 per diem when engaged in the performance of duties vested in the Commission plus reimbursement for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by him in the performance of such duties.

(b) The Commission may appoint and fix the compensation of such personnel as it deems advisable, subject to the civil-service laws and the Classification Act of 1949.

SEC. 5. (a) The Commission may, in carrying out this Act, hold such hearings and take such testimony, and sit and act at such times and places (within the United States and the Republic of the Philippines), as it deems advisable.

(b) The Commission may secure directly from any department, agency, or independent establishment of the Government information, statistics, data, suggestions, and other matter for the purposes of this joint resolution. Each department, agency, or independent establishment shall furnish any of the foregoing matter directly to the Commission upon request of the Chairman.

SEC. 6. There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this joint resolution.

TIGHT MONEY AGAIN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the previous order of the House the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, this is tight money again. Very tight money.

Raising the discount rate as the Federal Reserve did last week has no meaning in and of itself. This is a point that is frequently misunderstood.

The discount rate is kind of a signal or a barometer. It is a signal of what the Federal Reserve has already done and what it is doing. And, more than that, it is a pretty definite sign that the Federal Reserve expects to continue for some time doing what it has already done. It has tightened money to the extent that within a very few days or weeks we will hear the effects from the

grassroots. The effects have already taken place in the money market and in practically all loan rates.

Since the first of the year, up until March 4—the last report date—the Federal Reserve has reduced its contribution to member-bank reserves by $2 billion. This is a reduction of two billion high-powered dollars. In other words, it reduces the lending power of the private banks by $14 billion.

This reduction in credit was accomplished principally by reductions in the Open Market Committee's portfolio of Government securities. The Open Market Committee has unloaded more than $1 billion worth of Government securities on the open market since the first of the year. We can assume that all or substantially all of this reduction was in Treasury bills. Under its "bills only" policy, the Open Market Committee uses these bills almost exclusively to expand and contract bank credit.

Now can we say just how tight money is?

The Federal Reserve authorities themselves look at what are called net free reserves in the member banks. This is what they consider the best barometer of the degree of credit ease or restraint they are maintaining.

Net free reserves are arrived at this way: You take the total excess reserves in the banking system and subtract the amount of the loans outstanding from the Federal Reserve's banks.

Excess reserves are those on which the member banks can normally make loans or buy securities. In a gross way they measure the banking system's lending power.

Furthermore, in a quite limited sense the borrowings of member banks from the Federal Reserve banks are also bank reserves, because the member banks can make loans or purchase securities on these, too.

The fact is that these borrowed reserves are borrowed for quite brief periods. The Federal Reserve banks lend them not just because member banks want to borrow and are willing to pay the discount rate, but because the member bank is in an emergency situation. The Federal Reserve banks keep member banks having these borrowed reserves under constant pressure to pay them back. This is by regulation and long practice.

So the Federal Reserve authorities look upon loans from the Federal Reserve banks as an offset or as a subtraction from the member banks' excess reserves. When the borrowings from the Federal Reserve bank exceeds the excess reserves in the banking system, this means the banks do not have enough reserves to pay back the reserves they have borrowed, and yet they are under constant pressure to pay them back.

A position of negative or minus free reserves means very stringent credit. Free reserves were minus last Wednesday, the last report date, by $177 million, and this was approximately the same position the Federal Reserve System had the banking system in at about this time in 1957, when the Federal Reserve was then openly admitting and advertising that it was following a very tight-money policy.

MONEY LOOSENED WHEN NOT NEEDED, TIGHTENED WHEN NEEDED

Early last year, at the depth of the recession, the Federal Reserve gave reserves to the private banks. It gave them all told $3.5 billion in reserves. It gave them $1.5 billion through reductions in required reserves and $2 billion through Open Market Committee operations. The banks could create money on these reserves at the rate of $7 of new money for each dollar of reserves. In other words, on this $3.5 billion of reserves the banking system could have created up to $24.5 billion of new money with which to make loans or buy securities. The money was not needed then, because in the recession the demand for business credit was falling. More than that, at the lower interest rates then prevailing in the bond market many of the big corporations were paying off the bank loans they already had outstanding and were going to the bond market for money on a long-term basis.

So what happened was that the private banks used the money-creating power given them last year to buy $10.4 billion worth of Government securities. This was a free gift from the Federal Government of $10.4 billion to the private banks.

In the first part of the present year, however, business recovery has been under way and more bank credit is needed to allow this recovery to take place. So the Federal Reserve System has contracted credit. By reducing its credit to the member banks by $2 billion this year, it has taken back $14 billion of the $24.5 billion of money-creating power it gave the banks earlier last year.

As I have said, the level of the discount rate is an indication, a kind of gage, of how tight the Federal Reserve is making money. So the increase to 3 percent last week brings us back to a rate which the Federal Reserve maintained in the first 7 months of 1957. As you know, that was a very tight-money period. It certainly helped to bring on the recession which began in August of 1957. And many economists think it was solely responsible for the recession.

Now, how have the money market operators and the bond market operators interpreted the 3-percent discount rate?

On Monday, the Treasury held its regular Monday auction of 91-day Treasury bills. The yield on these bills jumped to 3.062 percent, which was the highest since December of 1957. It jumped from a rate of 2.816 percent on the previous Monday, and from a rate of 2.589 percent on the Monday before that. It is principally with these bills that the Federal Open Market Committee regulates the amount of credit available in the banking system, though, of course, when the rates on very short-term securities go up, the rates on long-term securities go up, too.

ALL INTEREST RATES WILL COST CONSUMERS BILLIONS

You may have noted that the Wall Street Journal reported on Monday that 4-percent yields on U.S. Government bonds are now freely available. The Treasury's new 4-percent bonds maturing in 1980 dropped by a full point last Friday following the Federal Reserve's announcement, and dropped another quarter of a point on Monday. In other words, this bond dropped in the open market by $1.25 on the 100 between Friday morning and Monday night.

On Monday, dealers in bankers' acceptances raised their rates by one-fourth of 1 percent and dealers in open market commercial paper raised their rates by one-eighth of a point. The papers for this morning report that the New York banks expect shortly to raise their prime rates. This is the rate which is charged on large bank loans to business firms with preferred credit ratings. The rate is now 4 percent, and we can probably expect it to be raised to 4¼ percent within a few days.

This new tight-money program means that the Treasury will have to pay higher interest rates, and it is confronted with refunding at least $28 billion of the debt this year, not counting Treasury bills and savings bonds. Also this does not count the new financing that will be necessary because of the large Federal deficit this year.

This new increase in interest rates will cost in the neighborhood of a billion dollars a year just in interest charges on the Federal debt. And it will cost consumers many times that amount in increased carrying charges on personal debts and in higher prices, whether or not they buy on credit.

This new tight-money policy means that a heavy damper and huge wet blanket is being put on the business recovery.

The new report on unemployment became available last night. Unemployment did not drop in February as had been widely predicted. Unemployment almost always does drop in February because of seasonal factors. But last month unemployment actually increased by 25,000 people. People who have been unemployed for more than 15 weeks now number more than a million and a half.

Speaking in the most conservative terms I can think of, putting on a new credit squeeze at this time is a shocking thing to do. It is utterly indefensible.

FEDERAL RESERVE SYSTEM FIGHTING "PSYCHOLOGY"

In fact, it is difficult to find any rational excuse for a new credit squeeze at this time. The only halfway plausible excuse that I have seen is one advanced by Miss Sylvia Porter in her column today. It is her thesis that the Federal Reserve System is fighting psychology. And this may be true. By the processes of elimination, the System certainly is not fighting inflation. There is no inflation to be fought and no signs of any. But it is true, as Miss Porter points out, there is considerable "psychology of inflation" in the country. But if this is what the Federal Reserve System is fighting, then it is fighting a psychology which the Federal Reserve people themselves have helped to create. Chairman Martin himself has recently been making public statements of the same kind which President Eisenhower and other administration spokesmen have been making so

freely and which would have us believe that a real and monstrous inflation is upon us, big as life, or is certainly just around the corner. All of this propaganda has frightened a lot of people.

So, if it is true that this new tight-money, high-interest squeeze is merely to fight a psychology, then I say it is too bad that practically the whole Nation has to suffer—everybody except the bankers and big-money lenders—in order to fight an imaginary bogeyman which the administration and the Federal Reserve authorities have themselves created.

Miss Porter's column, or such portions of it as appeared in the Washington Evening Star today, March 12, is as follows:

PSYCHOLOGY OF INFLATION

(By Sylvia Porter)

The Federal Reserve Board has tightened credit again.

It did this by increasing the interest rate it charges the Nation's banks for loans from the System. Thereby it gave the signal to its member banks to charge more for loans they in turn make to you as a businessman or as an individual consumer and it set the stage for another round of borrowing rate increases up and down the line.

Why?

This a strong anti-inflation step. Why this move at a time when unemployment is uncomfortably close to 5 million and a Governor of the Federal Reserve Board openly admits the high level of joblessness is a social, political, and economic problem today?

The first key point is that the Federal Reserve System is not fighting actual, serious inflation. There isn't any actual, serious inflation now.

More specifically, the prices we pay at retail for food, most major products, have been holding steady in a comparatively narrow range and there have been few big upswings in other price areas. There's lots of excess capacity in many lines of industry and most corporations could turn out more goods if the demands were present. There are no signs that consumers are taking off on a buying splurge, no signs that business will boost its spending on new plants and equipment for some time. The auto industry is hardly booming, housing isn't in a runaway advance.

And then there is unemployment, dismayingly high in some key areas. And even in regions which are prospering, there is proper worry about the general economic impact—as well as simple human meaning—of millions of jobless at this stage of a business advance, and of no prospect for a big drop in the totals until the economy is considerably boomier.

No. Regardless of what you may think the White House is saying about inflation or how you interpret the repeated warnings of leading Washington policymakers, actual inflation is not our problem today.

What, then, is the explanation for the tightening of the credit screws at this date?

The answer is that the Federal Reserve System is trying to fight a psychology of inflation—a spreading conviction among increasing numbers of businessmen and wage earners that prices and wages soon are going into another leapfrog upswing and the dollar is doomed to lose buying power rapidly and steadily.

It is this psychology which has been behind much of the indiscriminate buying in the stock market in recent months. In a sense, this buying has represented a flight from the dollar, and it is unreasonable, it is dangerous, it is destructive. It is this psychology which has caused investors to be indifferent to new Government securities. It is this psychology which analysts fear may lead to unsound increases in wages, prices, wild buying.

Reserve Board Chairman Martin has stated flatly that the "inflammable tinder" of inflation is "all around us" and the speculative psychology so clearly evident could spark an inflation blowoff at any time. He has said that only proper public and private actions could avert this blowoff.

Thus the tightening of the credit screws. It is a signal that the Reserve System intends to fight aggressively the psychology of inflation, that it is determined to get in position to combat inflationary forces themselves whenever they emerge. It is a warning to all to act with caution.

THE LATE LT. GEN. FLOYD L. PARKS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. CANFIELD], is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, Lt. Gen. Floyd L. Parks, who died at Walter Reed Army Hospital early Tuesday morning, was one of the most unforgettable men I have ever met.

While I have long known of the general's outstanding record both in time of war and peace, I never came to know him closely until I was a fellow patient at Walter Reed last September and October. While I was convalescing from surgery, I would join him for breakfast, luncheon, and dinner, and I developed tremendous admiration and affection for him because of his obvious love for his fellow men. Hour after hour, he would relate most interesting stories of extraordinary experiences and always he was wont to speak well of others.

When the general's old alma mater, Clemson, played Maryland on the gridiron last fall, he insisted that I have a front seat with him for the television set in his room.

He was so proud of his family, and I was privileged to meet Mrs. Parks during my stay at Walter Reed. He talked much of his daughter and three sons, one a graduate of West Point and one now a Cadet at the Academy, and the other a lieutenant at Ft. Belvoir.

Last night, when I was a guest of the National Rifle Association at a buffet supper at the association's new headquarters on 16th Street, a guide took me into the general's office, and on his desk was a striking picture of his family. On the walls were framed pictures of his fellow American military commanders, one of them from General Eisenhower, who, in an autographed picture, had paid compliment to "my devoted friend of 38 years."

Phil Casey, staff reporter of the Washington Post and Times Herald, yesterday wrote a story of the passing of this great American, and it reads as follows:

GENERAL PARKS IS DEAD AT 63

(By Phil Casey)

Lt. Gen. Floyd L. Parks, who achieved with ease the unlikely feat of being an Army news boss and popular at the same time, died early yesterday at Walter Reed Army Medical Center.

General Parks will be buried with full honors Thursday, after funeral services at 3 p.m. at Fort Myer Chapel.

The 63-year-old soldier rose from private to general during his 38-year military career with distinguished service in World War II.

Affable and humorous, he became something of a press corps darling during his tenure as Chief of Army Information, most of the time from 1946 to 1953.

SHUNNED CENSORSHIP

The newsmen respected his ability, fairness, and straightforward desire to let the people know. He'd had no news experience, but he had the right impulses, or, at least, the impulses newsmen like. He knew news is news, even if it's bad.

Newsmen who dealt with him in that difficult post, during the years when Chief of Staff Dwight D. Eisenhower was being rumored as a presidential possibility, not only on one but both tickets, found him unfailingly courteous, able, and helpful as he could be.

Recognized as one of the Army's top strategists and field soldiers, holder of a Distinguished Service Medal with oak leaf cluster, and numerous other decorations, he also could tell a good story.

One of them was on him and about Mr. Eisenhower. The two had been old friends, beginning when Ike was a colonel and he was a captain.

"I hadn't seen him for 23 years," General Parks recalled one day, "and I ran into him in England in 1944. He said, 'Hello, Floyd. What happened to your hair?' "

AIRBORNE COMMANDER

A veteran of Army service during World War I, the general took the first airborne troops into Germany in World War II, and after the war was a sort of Mayor of Berlin, with the title, "Chief Kommandator," presiding over meetings of the combined British, French, and Russian commanders of the occupational forces.

"We'd start off like a sandlot baseball team," he said once. "Each speaking his own language. It was a lucky thing for me the British speak English."

Later, he'd have the day's problems written in the three languages. When he pointed to one of the written problems and its suggested answer, what he got was "Da," "Oui," and "Quite right, old man."

The only trophy he picked up in Germany was a wastebasket of Hitler's that he found in the bombed chancellery. It used to sit next to his study desk at Fort Meade, while he was commander of the Second Army from 1953 to 1956.

He was an avid golfer, and a good one, better than his celebrated golfing companion, President Eisenhower. In 1957, he was Middle Atlantic senior champion, and he served as president of the Middle Atlantic Golf Association. He founded a junior golf tournament at Fort Meade.

NATIVE OF KENTUCKY

Born in Louisville, he passed much of his youth in South Carolina, and was graduated from Clemson College there. He enlisted as a private in World War I and later won a commission.

He won his Distinguished Service Medal with the oak leaf cluster for his work as Chief of Staff, Army Ground Forces, early in World War II, and for his service in Europe. There, he was Chief of Staff of the First Allied Airborne Army, taking part in the massive air assault in Holland and the Rhine River crossing. He took command of the First U.S. Airborne Army in May 1945, and led the first American troops into Berlin.

General Parks made all administrative arrangements for the Potsdam Conference in

July 1945, and received an official commendation from President Truman.

In later years, he had been critical of Defense Department supervision over public information on the Military Establishment. His philosophy was that as few impediments as possible be placed in the way of the public's right to know.

DIRECTED NRA

After retiring from service in 1956, he was named executive director of the National Rifle Association, and reaction to him there was just what it had been in the Army and among the press corps here.

A woman who worked with him in the association echoed the warm words of veteran political and golfing writers: "He was one of the nicest people I've ever known."

He is survived by his wife, Harriet M. Parks; a daughter, Edwyna Ann Strain, of Poughkeepsie, N.Y.; three sons, Floyd L. Parks, Jr., a student at the University of Maryland; Cadet Basil M. Parks, now at the U.S. Military Academy; and Army Lt. William R. Parks, of Ft. Belvoir, Va.; and a granddaughter.

Washington's three daily newspapers yesterday carried these editorial tributes:

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 11, 1959]

FLOYD L. PARKS

Lt. Gen. Floyd L. Parks was a fine soldier with an exceptional understanding of the importance of public information. This graduate engineer who served with armored and paratroop forces had a splendid wartime record as Chief of Staff at headquarters of the Army ground forces in Washington, as Chief of Staff of the 1st Allied Airborne Army in Europe, and later as commander of the 1st American Airborne Army and commanding general of the United States sector in Berlin. He led the first American troops into Berlin, helped restore public services in that devastated city, and made administrative arrangements for the Potsdam Conference. Afterward he served two tours as Army chief of information, as deputy Army commander in the Pacific and as commanding general of the 2d Army at Fort Meade before his retirement 3 years ago.

But these cold statistics do not tell the full story about a warm and able man. Floyd Parks had an innate sense of the situation, and his judgment, whether in command or in his information activities, was almost invariably keen. He was a valuable counselor who made his impact felt at top levels. He was an expert golfer and rifleman who also loved a good story. His flair for putting the Army's best foot forward was recognized in the fact that he was twice brought back to the Pentagon as chief of information. His credo, as described in the Army Information Digest, was a simple one which bears much emulation:

"Many people mistakenly think that the primary public information mission is to suppress unsavory stories or at least counter them with favorable releases. In reality it is not possible to suppress news, whether good or bad, and it is poor policy to try. * * * Therefore if the story is bad, I admit it; if it is good, I try to see that the good points are known—and speedily."

In addition to the many military comrades who will miss Floyd Parks are a host of grateful newsmen who respected him as a good friend and ally.

[From the Washington Evening Star, Mar. 11, 1959]

GENERAL PARKS

Lt. Gen. Floyd L. Parks, dead at 63, had a distinguished career in the Army—in peace, in war, and in the difficult period which has beset the world since 1946. Both his competence as a soldier and his skills in the field of interallied administration were reflected in the many honors paid him by our own and other governments. But to newsmen in Washington, and indeed to many from other cities at home and abroad, General Parks occupied a special place of respect and affection. He did two tours of duty as the Army's chief information officer at the Pentagon and they were years of pleasant and productive harmony between that service and the press. On that level, General Parks was serving his country again in the finest tradition of a good soldier—an officer and a gentleman.

[From the Washington Daily News, Mar. 11, 1959]

FLOYD PARKS

Lt. Gen. Floyd Parks, who died here yesterday, was quite a soldier and an extraordinary Army public relations man—though he always insisted he knew nothing about public relations.

What he did know, or sense, was that the art of public relations is basically a strategy of dealing honestly and fully with the press and other outlets of public information.

Serving two terms in this job, covering 6½ years as Army information chief, General Parks constantly endeavored to get across the story of what the Army was doing. Always he had in mind that his audience was the millions of American parents and others whose sons and relatives made up the Army.

When former Defense Secretary Charles Wilson's office interposed authority over General Parks' department, the old paratrooper characteristically spoke up. He told a Congress committee that such interference was keeping him from informing the public of Army men's activities. He was no messenger boy or bookkeeper, he made clear.

As a soldier, General Parks was recognized as a top strategist and field leader. In 1945 he led the first American troops into Berlin as commander of the 1st U.S. Airborne Army. He was not a West Pointer, having come up from enlistment in World War I.

His versatility included many things—from a degree as master of science in mechanical engineering from Yale, to a hole-in-one golf shot while his old friend, President Eisenhower, looked on enviously.

Mr. Speaker, my heart goes out to Mrs. Parks and all the members of the general's wonderful family in their great loss and sorrow.

PASSENGER TRAIN AND FERRY SERVICE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from New Jersey [Mrs. DWYER] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. DWYER. Mr. Speaker, my colleague, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WALLHAUSER] and I have introduced companion bills today which would amend the Interstate Commerce Act so as to require more adequate consideration of the public interest before passenger trains and ferries are permitted to be discontinued.

The situation which has prompted the introduction of this legislation is a matter of considerable urgency in the New Jersey-New York-Connecticut metropolitan area, as well as other areas of the country in which commuter rail service is important.

I would respectfully call the attention of the distinguished chairman and members of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to this matter and urge them to schedule prompt consideration of the legislation.

Since enactment last year of the Transportation Act of 1958, a number of important commuter railroads have hurried to take advantage of a provision in that act making it considerably easier to discontinue passenger train and ferry service. This provision permits discontinuance of service 5 months following notification by the railroad unless the Interstate Commerce Commission orders the service to be continued within the 5-month time limit.

There is now pending before the Commission a total of 27 notices of intention to discontinue about 100 passenger trains. Many of these trains currently provide commuter service of critical importance to metropolitan New Jersey and New York. Discontinuance of the service, without thorough consideration of the public need and the potential impact on the economy of the area, could be disastrous.

Our legislation—which is identical to a bill presently pending in the other body—would assure full consideration of the public interest by the Commission in train discontinuance cases by requiring public hearings in the event of objections to proposed discontinuances, by eliminating the 5-month time limit, and by providing that the ICC make a positive finding that the public convenience and necessity permits of such discontinuance before authority to curtail the service is granted.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD by including the full text of a statement issued by my colleague from New Jersey and me, and I invite the attention and the support of all our colleagues.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

(The statement referred to follows:)

We share the concern that has motivated our colleagues in the Senate to propose a way of assuring full and effective consideration of all the facts before the Interstate Commerce Commission authorizes railroads to discontinue train and ferry passenger service.

The speed with which some railroads in the metropolitan New Jersey-New York-Connecticut area, and in other parts of the country, have moved to use the Transportation Act of 1958 as authority to discontinue important commuter service is disturbing.

Many thousands of New Jersey residents depend on these rail facilities to travel to and from work. Major disruption of this service would seriously and adversely affect the economy of northeastern New Jersey, including the districts we represent.

We recognize that the commuter problem—in our own area as in other areas—is a complex one. It is not going to be solved completely by this single proposal or by any single agency. It is a problem that has accompanied the growth of metropolitan areas and has become more difficult over the past several years, as urbanization itself has intensified.

We have both proposed—and we desire to repeat that proposal here—that any long-range solution to this difficult situation requires the cooperation of the many levels of government involved, Federal, State, and local, and of the many private institutions affected, including rail and motor carriers, as well as the people themselves. We believe

that the Subcommittee on Intergovernmental Relations of the House Committee on Government Relations is an appropriate group to make at least a preliminary study of the possibilities of such cooperation, and we urge again that the subcommittee accept this responsibility.

In the meantime, however, there is need for immediate action.

Under present law, as provided in the Transportation Act of 1958, railroads may petition the Commission to discontinue passenger trains and ferries and 5 months after notification of such an intention—if the Commission has not ordered the service to be continued—the proposed discontinuance may go into effect automatically. No public hearings are required. No procedures requiring adequate consideration of possible objections, or of the need to maintain the particular service involved, are provided for at present.

Consequently, this particular provision has operated, in effect, as an invitation to railroads to abandon a great deal of their passenger facilities—considerably more than they might should they be required to sustain an affirmative case before the ICC that abandonment or discontinuance is in the public interest.

Twenty-seven notices of intention to discontinue about 100 passenger trains are currently pending before the Commission. In addition, some railroads are proposing further abandonments of service. It is, therefore, abundantly clear that the ICC is unable, administratively, to give the full procedural attention to these discontinuance cases necessary to assure protection of the public interest—within the 5 months limitation presently in force.

The bill we propose would add a new paragraph 19 to section 1 of the Interstate Commerce Act revising the procedures under which the Commission would consider railroad requests to discontinue the operation of passenger trains and ferry service.

Railroads would be given an option to apply for authority to discontinue service either to the ICC or the appropriate State agency where States have legislated on the matter. The Commission would be obliged to hold a hearing before acting on discontinuance applications, and all interested parties would be permitted to be heard. Thereafter, ICC procedures would be similar to those ordinarily followed in cases involving proposed abandonment of an entire railroad line. No time limit would be imposed within which the Commission would be required to make a decision. And the Commission would be empowered to set certain conditions in discontinuance cases which it found were required in the public interest.

We believe that such a procedure represents a fair compromise between the method in effect prior to passage of the Transportation Act of 1958 and the method instituted by that act. The interests of both the rail carriers and the commuting public—as well as the public at large—would be properly recognized, and any decisions regarding discontinuance of railroad passenger service would be made only after all relevant factors had received full consideration.

As we have indicated, we do not consider this proposal the last word on the subject, or the conclusive means for solving the present commuter crisis. But we believe that maintenance of adequate railroad commuter service is of critical importance right now, and no time should be lost in beginning hearings on this admittedly stop-gap proposal in both houses of the Congress.

PASSENGER TRAIN AND FERRY SERVICE

Mr. WALLHAUSER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. WALLHAUSER. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill proposing amendment of the Interstate Commerce Act to provide for thorough consideration and review by the Interstate Commerce Commission of applications for discontinuances of railroad passenger trains and ferries.

I consider this a highly important bill. It is a companion bill to one introduced here today by my distinguished colleague from New Jersey, Representative FLORENCE P. DWYER. It also is similar to a bill introduced in the other body by a bipartisan group of Members.

It is my sincere hope that many Members of this body will join with us in this action, through introduction of bills of their own, so that the weight and prestige of their numbers will impress upon the appropriate committee the immediate importance of this matter.

This bill is in the public interest, particularly for the many great metropolitan areas of our Nation. I believe its adoption is essential if we are to keep faith with those hundreds of thousands of people throughout the Nation who must depend upon railroad commutation service to carry them back and forth to work.

My bill would change a section of the Interstate Commerce Act amended last year. Since enactment of last year's amendment, railroads in many areas of the Nation have virtually leaped into action to seek the discontinuance of trains under the relatively soft terms of that amendment.

Presently there are 27 notices of intention to discontinue some 100 passenger trains pending before the Interstate Commerce Commission. It appears obvious that these are only the start of an avalanche of similar applications. Some railroads even have stated unequivocally that they will seek to completely wipe out commuter services on their roads.

Under terms of present laws, it is conceivable that this could happen rapidly. I cannot believe that this was foreseen in adoption of the 1958 amendment. If it does happen, it will have a catastrophic impact on many of the great metropolitan areas of our Nation.

The 1958 amendment has imposed an unreasonable time limit on the Interstate Commerce Commission in its consideration of discontinuance applications. It is obvious the Commission cannot now give full and needed consideration to all applications before it, and those that they may reasonably expect in the near future, under the time limit. My bill would correct this condition.

My bill also would make it compulsory for the Commission to hold public hearings on the discontinuance applications presented to it. The changes that I propose would in no way diminish the rights the railroads now enjoy under law. However, they would give greater rights to the public when the railroad services that are so essential to them are threatened with extinction.

I am keenly aware of the financial troubles of the railroads. But I am also keenly aware that we cannot permit rapid and wholesale discontinuances and abandonments of railroad services without giving full and deliberate consideration to the rights and needs of the general public.

I do not hold for a moment that my proposed amendment is a cure-all for the plight in which the railroad commuter finds himself because of circumstances beyond his direct control. At best what is proposed here is a mild antidote, but a sorely needed antidote.

It will prevent hasty action. It will serve to help prevent action wherein the rights of the railroads could be allowed to take precedence over the rights of the people.

It will provide added opportunity for the railroads and proper Government agencies to carry out their joint responsibility of finding a solution to the commuter service problem before it is too late.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. MCGINLEY, from 4 p.m. March 12 to 1 p.m. March 18, on account of official business in his district.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia (at the request of Mr. GARY), for the remainder of the week, on account of illness.

Mr. ROOSEVELT, for Friday, March 13, on account of official business in his district.

Mrs. KELLY of New York (at the request of Mr. KEOGH), for Thursday, March 12, 1959, and Friday, March 13, 1959, on account of death in family.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. CANFIELD, for 10 minutes, today.

Mrs. DWYER, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. ALGER, for 60 minutes, on Tuesday next.

Mr. CONTE, for 5 minutes, on Monday next, March 16, 1959.

Mr. BECKER (at the request of Mr. SMITH of California), for 1 hour, on tomorrow.

Mr. KING of Utah, for 45 minutes, on Monday, March 16.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mrs. GRANAHAN.

Mr. BUDGE.

Mr. POAGE.

Mr. SLACK.

Mr. PHILBIN and to include extraneous matter.

(At the request of Mr. SMITH of California, and to include extraneous matter, the following:)

Mr. WAINWRIGHT.

Mr. DORN of New York in two instances.

Mr. FLYNN and to include extraneous matter.

(At the request of Mr. BOYLE, the following Members were given permission to revise and extend their remarks in the RECORD:)

Mr. MULTER in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. FOGARTY and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. JENNINGS.

Mr. MCGINLEY in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BOYLE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 8 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, March 13, 1959, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

701. A letter from the Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, relative to the appropriation to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare for "Indian health activities, Public Health Service," for the fiscal year 1959, has been apportioned on a basis indicating a need for a supplemental estimate of appropriation for pay increases granted by Public Law 85-462 for employees paid under this appropriation, pursuant to section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U.S.C. 665); to the Committee on Appropriations.

702. A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting the report of the Archivist of the United States on records proposed for disposal under the law; to the Committee on House Administration.

703. A letter from the Secretary of Labor, transmitting a report prepared by the Administrator of the Wage and Hour Division, which sets forth information concerning the operation and effect of the act and statistical data provided by the Bureau of Labor Statistics, pursuant to section 4(d) of the Fair Labor Standards Act; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

704. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on examination of the Department of the Air Force contract AF 33(600)-31100 with Avco Manufacturing Corp., Crosley Division, Cincinnati, Ohio; to the Committee on Government Operations.

705. A letter from the Governor, Canal Zone Government, transmitting a report of disposal of foreign excess property by the Panama Canal Company and Canal Zone Government for the year ended December 31, 1958, pursuant to the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 (63 Stat. 398); to the Committee on Government Operations.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANDERSON of Montana:

H.R. 5594. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to continue the exclusion, from the basis of certain excise taxes, of discounts and rebates for cooperative local advertising; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DEROUNIAN:

H.R. 5595. A bill for the relief of certain hospitals which received loans pursuant to the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mrs. DWYER:

H.R. 5596. A bill to amend the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, so as to strengthen and improve the national transportation system, insure the protection of the public interest, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 5597. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that an individual's entitlement to child's insurance benefits shall continue, after he attains age 18, for so long as he is regularly attending school; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KOWALSKI:

H.R. 5598. A bill to authorize the President to issue posthumously in the name of George Washington a commission as General of the Army, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. LIBONATI:

H.R. 5599. A bill to amend section 106 of title 38, United States Code, to provide veterans' benefits for female contract surgeons who served with the Armed Forces during World War I; to the Committee on Veteran's Affairs.

By Mr. MCGOVERN:

H.R. 5600. A bill to increase and extend the special milk program for children; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 5601. A bill to provide that for the purpose of disapproval by the President each provision of an appropriation bill shall be considered a separate bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5602. A bill to amend the Federal Trade Commission Act, as amended, so as to equalize rights in the distribution of merchandise identified by a trademark, brand, or trade name; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MACK of Illinois:

H.R. 5603. A bill granting the consent and approval of Congress to the Wabash Valley compact, and for related purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MEYER:

H.R. 5604. A bill to increase the authorized maximum expenditure for the fiscal years 1959, 1960, and 1961 under the special milk program; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. NORBLAD:

H.R. 5605. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to make it clear that the tax on transportation of persons does not apply to ferry service provided by State-operated ferryboats; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PROKOP:

H.R. 5606. A bill to amend subchapter III of chapter 15 of title 38, United States Code, to provide pension for widows and children of World War I veterans at the same rates as apply in the case of widows and children of Spanish-American War veterans; to increase the income limitations applicable thereto; and to eliminate annuities in the compensation of such time; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. RHODES of Arizona:

H.R. 5607. A bill to provide for the preservation and development of the domestic fluorspar industry; to the committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. WALLHAUSER:

H.R. 5608. A bill to amend the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, so as to strengthen and improve the national transportation system, insure the protection of the public interest, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WAMPLER:

H.R. 5609. A bill granting the consent and approval of Congress to the Wabash Valley compact, and for related purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HARRIS:

H.R. 5610. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, the Railroad Retirement Tax Act, and the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act, so as to provide increases in benefits, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ALGER:

H.R. 5611. A bill to provide for a survey of the production of fertilizer by the Tennessee Valley Authority, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. ANFUSO:

H.R. 5612. A bill to create a Science and Technology Agency, and to transfer to it certain existing agencies and functions of the Federal Government; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

By Mr. BROWN of Missouri:

H.R. 5613. A bill to increase and extend the special milk program for children; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. COAD:

H.R. 5614. A bill to enable producers to provide a supply of turkeys adequate to meet the needs of consumers, to maintain orderly marketing conditions, and to promote and expand the consumption of turkeys and turkey products; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 5615. A bill to amend section 105(b) of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, relating to price support for oats, rye, barley, and grain sorghums; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. COLLIER:

H.R. 5616. A bill to establish reciprocal import quotas upon the importation of confectionery and chocolate into the United States from foreign countries which impose quotas upon imports of confectionery and chocolate from the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H.R. 5617. A bill to repeal the cabaret tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DIXON:

H.R. 5618. A bill to recognize the authority of the States relating to the control, appropriation, use, or distribution of water within their boundaries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. FARBSTEIN:

H.R. 5619. A bill to prohibit discrimination in employment because of race, religion,

color, national origin, or ancestry; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. FULTON:

H.R. 5620. A bill to provide for the establishment of a Federal Advisory Council on the Arts to assist in the growth and development of the fine arts in the United States; to the Committeee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 5621. A bill to provide for the appointment of an assistant to the Secretary of State to assure joint policy and planning and equitable budgeting of exchange-of-persons programs and administrative cooperation between staffs engaged in carrying out such programs; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mrs. GRANAHAN:

H.R. 5622. A bill to amend the act of June 10, 1955, as amended, so as to establish the hours of work for rural carriers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. GUBSER:

H.R. 5623. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that disability determinations (for purposes of disability insurance benefits and the disability "freeze") shall hereafter be made by or under the direction of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare rather than by State agencies; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 5624. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that the Secretary of the Treasury shall be bound by decisions of certain Federal courts; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado:

H.R. 5625. A bill to permit a woman who is the widow of two totally disabled veterans of World War I to receive benefits as the widow of either of such veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. KING of Utah:

H.R. 5626. A bill to provide grants to the States to assist them in informing and educating children in their schools about the harmful effects of tobacco, alcohol, and other potentially deleterious consumables; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. LESINSKI:

H.R. 5627. A bill to amend section 402 of the Federal Employees Uniform Allowance Act, approved September 1, 1954 (title IV, Public Law 763, 83d Cong.), as amended; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 5628. A bill to amend section 402 of the Federal Employees Uniform Allowance Act, approved September 1, 1954 (title IV, Public Law 763, 83d Cong.), as amended; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 5629. A bill relating to increases in compensation granted to wage board employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 5630. A bill to amend section 9(a) of the Civil Service Retirement Act, relating to computation of annuities; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. METCALF:

H.R. 5631. A bill providing for payments as incentives for the production of manganese; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MONAGAN:

H.R. 5632. A bill to extend by 6 months the period for which additional benefits may be paid under the Temporary Unemployment Compensation Act of 1958; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MULTER:

H.R. 5633. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Income and Franchise Tax Act of 1947 with respect to the deduction of medical expenses; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. STAGGERS:

H.R. 5634. A bill to establish a program of economic relief for distressed areas through a system of loans and grants-in-aid; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 5635. A bill to authorize a 5-year program of grants and scholarships for collegiate education in the field of nursing, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WAINWRIGHT:

H.R. 5636. A bill to amend the War Claims Act of 1948, as amended, and the Trading With the Enemy Act, as amended, and to provide for the payment of certain American war damage claims; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WILSON:

H.R. 5637. A bill to amend section 217 of the Social Security Act to provide that certain military or naval service not now creditable toward benefits under title II of such act may be counted toward such benefits if such service is not used in determining entitlement to, or the amount of, military retired pay; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 5638. A bill to provide that in determining the amount of retired pay, retirement pay, or retainer payable to any enlisted man, all service shall be counted which would have been counted for the same purposes if he were a commissioned officer; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 5639. A bill to amend section 410 of title 38, United States Code, to provide that all retired members of the uniformed services who served not less than 25 years on active duty, or who were retired for disability in excess of 50 percent, and who die after 1956 shall be considered to have died service-connected deaths; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. MILLS:

H.R. 5640. A bill to extend the time during which certain individuals may continue to receive temporary unemployment compensation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 5641. A bill to extend the time during which certain individuals may continue to receive temporary unemployment compensation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HULL:

H.J. Res. 304. Joint resolution to establish a commission for the celebration of the 100th anniversary of the birth of Gen. John J. Pershing; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McGOVERN:

H.J. Res. 305. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TOLLEFSON:

H.J. Res. 306. Joint resolution designating the daffodil as the national flower of the United States; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts:

H.J. Res. 307. Joint resolution to establish a temporary commission to study the veterans' program of the United States in the Philippines; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. SIKES:

H. Con. Res. 103. Concurrent resolution to commemorate the quadricentennial anniversary of Florida and to recognize the quadricentennial anniversary commission of that State; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado: Joint memorial of the Senate and the House of Representatives of the State of Colorado memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact legislation to bring the State of Colorado under the provisions of section 218 (d)(6)(C) of the Federal Social Security Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts: Memorial of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts memorializing the Congress to establish a Federal domiciliary hospital in New England; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Alaska, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to requesting immediate enactment of Senate bill No. 1, pertaining to Federal grants to needed aviation facilities; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADAIR:

H.R. 5642. A bill for the relief of Anastacio de Vaga; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ADDONIZIO:

H.R 5643. A bill for the relief of Epamiononda Eddie Marsal; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BARR:

H.R. 5644. A bill for the relief of Mr. Albert Keil; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOSCH:

H.R. 5645. A bill for the relief of Christopher J. Mulligan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DEROUNIAN:

H.R. 5646. A bill for the relief of Jolanda Ferretti; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FARBSTEIN:

H.R. 5647. A bill for the relief of Wong Gee Sing; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5648. A bill for the relief of Chan Choy Kam; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. OSMERS:

H.R. 5649. A bill for the relief of Marie Haiadjian; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POWELL:

H.R. 5650. A bill for the relief of Antonio Valenti; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5651. A bill for the relief of Antonio Testoni; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RIEHLMAN:

H.R. 5652. A bill for the relief of Marko Klapan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SANTANGELO:

H.R. 5653. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the U.S. Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Henry G. Mathusek; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of Mississippi:

H.R. 5654. A bill for the relief of Leo Shoenholz, Tobias Kaplan, the Kroger Co., and Cleveland State Bank, all of Cleveland, Miss.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Repeal of the Hiss Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 12, 1959

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, today I presented my statement in support of H.R. 578 which I introduced to repeal the so-called Hiss Act before the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee.

My statement was as follows:

STATEMENT OF REPRESENTATIVE ABRAHAM J. MULTER, DEMOCRAT, OF NEW YORK, BEFORE THE HOUSE POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE COMMITTEE, THURSDAY, MARCH 12, 1959, IN SUPPORT OF H.R. 578

Mr. Chairman, allow me to express my appreciation for this opportunity to explain the purpose of my bill, H.R. 578 and to urge its careful consideration by this committee.

The purpose of the bill is quite simple to explain. It is to repeal in its entirety Public Law 769 of the 83d Congress—the so-called Alger Hiss Act. This act, as you know, prohibits the payment of annuities or retired pay to retired civilian officers and employees of the Federal Government and to retired military officers and enlisted men who are or who ever have been convicted of certain criminal offenses or who commit certain acts in the future.

It is my firm belief that not only is repeal the simplest way to handle what promises to develop into a very complicated problem, but that it will prove to be the most effective and the cheapest way of doing it. I say this because, first, the law is grossly unfair to the great majority of persons to whom it applies and should, therefore, be either abolished or amended so as not to apply to them. Second, as regards the other individuals to whom it applies, the law is subject to attack on a number of constitutional grounds, and if allowed to stand it will be the subject of endless litigation with the probable result that its provisions will gradually be chipped away by the courts.

First, I would like to discuss the broader policy aspects of the law.

This law was passed during what might be termed the witchcraft era on Capitol Hill. When I say this I do not mean to imply that I do not think that we have never had a national security problem in this country or that we might not have one in store for us. However, looking back to the year 1954, I think that our increased concern with this problem made us lose sight of its true dimensions. In such a setting, the Hiss Act passed the House of Representatives, unchallenged and undebated. And this despite the warnings of Civil Service Commission officials that the legislation's language was so general and vague that numerous inequities and hardships would result from it.

From the reports I have seen and heard, a good number of these hardship cases have already presented themselves. To date some 200 civil service retirees have been denied annuities approximately some $300 million in benefit rights. I do not claim familiarity with all of these cases.

I have heard of some, however, which demonstrate the extreme injustices which can result from the provisions of the act. For example, a study undertaken by the Federal Bar Association in 1956 disclosed that 51 out of the 64 cases that had arisen at that time involved offenses that had been committed prior to the law's enactment. Thirteen of these 51 cases—more than 25 percent—concerned employees who had been hired or rehired by the Government after they had been convicted and punished for the offense for which their annuities were later denied.

The Government, in other words, employed these persons with full knowledge of their past convictions. They were allowed to work for years, making contributions to the civil service retirement fund with the expectation of retirement benefits for themselves and their families when they reached the eligible age. Out of a clear sky, this law appeared on the statute books and their plans and dreams for a secure old age vanished into thin air. This, I submit, is not in keeping with the American concept of justice and fair play.

The Hiss Act, like charity, it might be said, covers a multitude of sins. About one-third of the crimes for which a person can lose his retirement rights are misdemeanors. Thus, a very valuable property can be lost for a minor offense. It has been reported that one employee lost an annuity valued at over $49,000 for a conviction in which the court saw fit not to impose any fine or imprisonment. Another case involved a person who in his youth stole a ham from the Army. This law, is seems to me, fails to comply with the basic principle of criminal law of trying to make the punishment fit the crime.

There are other proposals before this committee to amend Public Law 769 so as to eliminate many of the problems I have referred to. The administration, I understand, has finally realized the problems that have arisen because of this law, which it advocated in 1954. It now offers proposals to amend it to apply only to convictions for disloyalty reasons.

As I stated earlier, however, I believe that the problem would be best solved by repealing the statute entirely, as my bill, H.R. 578, would do.

I shall not undertake at this time to present a brief on the unconstitutionality of the law. That is a study which this committee is better equipped to undertake than I am. I am here only to point out that the subject deserves serious consideration.

Indeed one section of the act has already been declared unconstitutional by the U.S. Court of Claims. In the case of *Steinberg* v. *United States*, decided last July, the Court of Claims struck down the provision of the law denying retirement benefits to persons who refuse to testify on the ground of self-incrimination before a congressional committee, a Federal court, or a Federal grand jury. This provision, the Court declared, circumvents the fifth amendment guarantee against compulsory self-incrimination and indiscriminately links the innocent with the guilty.

To be sure, in the Steinberg case the Court was dealing with what is probably the most vulnerable section of Public Law 769, which does not even require a conviction but makes the simple exercise of a constitutional right grounds for withholding retirement benefits. It does point up, however, that the entire law was passed and adopted without careful scrutiny. Otherwise such an obviously invalid provision would not have been included in it. It also, I am afraid, portends the fate of other provisions of the act.

Those persons who were convicted of crimes before Public Law 769 was passed, but who will lose benefits if its provisions are carried out will attack it as ex post facto. The man whose name was made a part of its legislative history may well challenge it on the grounds that it is a classic bill of attainder.

Others may maintain that they are being deprived of vested property rights without due process of law. They will point to the concurring decision of Judge Whitaker in the Steinberg case and the recent decision of Judge Tamm, of the District Court of the District of Columbia, in the Nester case which involved social security benefits. If there ever was a piece of legislation which was destined for rough sledding in the courts, this is it.

The judiciary, of late, has often been charged with usurping some of our legislative functions. But what about the other side of the coin? Isn't it about time we admitted to ourselves that perhaps in passing Public Law 769 we were trying to exercise some judicial functions.

I think that Public Law 769 was a mistake—well intended, it may be true—but still a mistake. I sincerely hope this committee will take early action on my bill, H.R. 578, which would strike this provision from the statute books.

Whose Farm Program?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DONALD F. McGINLEY
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 12, 1959

Mr. McGINLEY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues a chronology of some statements made by the Secretary of Agriculture during the past 5 months. I will leave it to my colleagues to determine what the administration's position is on the farm program now in effect.

Washington Post, February 25, 1959—Joseph Alsop column:

Secretary Benson is ripe for the operating table because his farm program has finally got absolutely out of hand.

Letter to the editor of the Washington Post, March 11, 1959, by Secretary of Agriculture Ezra Taft Benson:

The farm program now in effect is not that of this Secretary of Agriculture. The Benson program has never been allowed to go into effect.

Omaha World Herald, October 9, 1958—interview with Secretary Benson at Nebraska City, Nebr., when the Secretary visited Nebraska on a campaign junket:

Mr. Benson said that his farm program has been in effect only since the fall of 1955 and that there had been a steady improvement in conditions since then.

Associated Press story of Secretary of Agriculture Benson's address to a luncheon of the National Affairs Forum sponsored by the Pittsburgh Chamber of Commerce which appeared in the Lincoln Journal October 8, 1958:

Secretary of Agriculture Benson says the American farmer "never had it so good."

H.R. 105 Endorsed by International Rescue and First Aid Association, Inc.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. PAT JENNINGS
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 12, 1959

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, on the opening day of the 86th Congress I introduced H.R. 105 in the House. This bill is similar to a measure that I sponsored in the last Congress—H.R. 242—and would make volunteer fire departments and rescue squads eligible for donable surplus Federal property.

In the second session of the last Congress we approved a bill pertaining only to volunteer fire departments. However, this bill was not passed in the Senate prior to adjournment.

It is my sincere belief that both volunteer fire departments and rescue squads should be eligible for the surplus property that might be donated for their use. Each of these organizations performs a very vital public service

A few days ago the board of directors and executive committee of the International Rescue and First Aid Association—IRFAA—met in nearby Alexandria, Va. The members of this group went on record as endorsing and urging passage of my bill, H.R. 105.

During the IRFAA's convention last November, the membership reaffirmed the association's position as set forth in a resolution adopted at the 1956 convention. I include this 1956 resolution in these remarks for the benefit of my colleagues who have sponsored legislation similar to H.R. 105.

The resolution follows:

Whereas in recent years our great Nation has suffered enormously from the destructive forces of nature by virtue of hurricanes, floods, and tornadoes, which caused great tolls in loss of life and injury to thousands of our citizens as well as being most destructive to commercial establishments and residential structures; and

Whereas these catastrophies must be met by the immediate organization of disaster squads, equipped with articles from Federal surplus stockpiles, which would greatly enhance rescue, first aid and transportations so vital at said disaster areas; and

Whereas disaster squads should be organized, equipped and trained within the organizational planning of Armed Forces Reserve training centers, stations, and armories, Civil Defense, Civil Air Patrol, and organized civilian rescue-first aid squads; and

Whereas the release of said surplus Federal equipment would also enhance routine localized functions on a year-round basis and thereby greatly reduce death and injury tolls from the presently high rates; and

Whereas human misery could be relieved and alleviation of unwarranted delays could be achieved by trained and well-equipped squads which would provide the best in rescue, first aid, and transportation; and

Whereas within the past 2 years the eastern seaboard and the New England States have suffered high tolls in loss of life and billions in property losses, causing peril to our national security and public safety: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That this resolution be unanimously passed in concurrence and proper Federal authorities be notified.

This resolution outlines succinctly the need for this legislation; its statements are also applicable to the volunteer fire departments of the Nation.

Because of the important role IRFAA plays in community service in the Nation, I outline herewith the organization's purposes and objectives:

THIS IS THE IRFAA

The International Rescue and First Aid Association is an association of organized volunteer, paid, and industrial rescue squads, ambulance and first-aid crews, fire departments, and other comparable units equipped with all types of rescue and first aid apparatus and devices which can be carried in mobile units, either by vehicular, water, or air transport; county, State, and other associations; and individuals, both men and women, active or interested in the rescue and first aid movement.

The IRFAA membership thus is composed of individuals, organized units, and associations, and associate members in the United States, Canada, and other countries. This association was organized in 1948 at the first annual convention in Atlantic City, N.J. The IRFAA is incorporated under the code of the Commonwealth of Virginia as a voluntary nonprofit organization.

OBJECTIVES OF THE IRFAA

First. To promote the ideas of organized rescue and first aid work throughout the world;

Second. To promote and assist in the establishment and training of rescue and first aid organizations;

Third. To cooperate to the fullest possible extent with other organizations whose objectives are accident prevention, safety education, rescue and first aid work;

Fourth. To cooperate in, foster, and conduct research designed to advance the science and art of rescue and first aid work, and to encourage the desirable standardization of practice and equipment;

Fifth. To establish a system of mutual assistance both within the association and with other organizations to be used in the event of large-scale disaster;

Sixth. To develop and maintain a code of high ethical standards among rescue and first aid personnel;

Seventh. To promote the general good and welfare of the members of the association;

Eighth. To aid in bringing about and maintaining world harmony by developing a spirit of kinship among the people who are devoted to the cause of saving life and aiding the sick and injured;

Ninth. To bring together in a common association all organizations and individuals interested in the aforementioned objective.

ACTIVITIES

All activities of this association are designed and carried out to accomplish and forward the aforementioned activities. All elected and appointed officers are volunteers in their work in and for the association except the executive director who is employed to conduct the operations of the executive office and to serve as editor of the association's official magazine, the International Rescuer.

This association encourages plans of cooperative action and mutual assistance among its members; and on local, county, State, provincial, and other levels but it does not itself become operational in any emergency or disaster situation whether it be of a local, State, National, or international character. It does not order, dispatch, or request any member unit to go to the scene of any emergency or disaster of any type. Any unit, individual, or organization does not lose any autonomy or freedom of action through membership in this association.

Mr. Speaker, when surplus Federal property is available for donation purposes, it should be placed in the hands of those organizations performing a public service. The volunteer rescue squads and volunteer fire departments of America certainly meet this test.

The chairman of the Donable Property Subcommittee had advised me that when departmental reports are received on the pending bills that consideration will be given to hearings.

It is my hope that we can complete action on H.R. 105 in this session of Congress and make these organizations eligible to receive donable property.

Centennial Celebration of the Heffley & Browne Secretarial School

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS E. DORN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 12, 1959

Mr. DORN of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I should like to pay honor to Heffley & Browne Secretarial School of Brooklyn, N.Y., on the occasion of its centennial celebration. Brooklyn is proud and fortunate to have had the hundred-year influence on its youth of this school. It is vitally important that capable, modern and scientifically designed instruction in present day office procedures be given to our young men and women. Heffley & Browne have kept abreast of the times. The student body, alumni, and faculty are to be congratulated.

This is the year which marks the centennial of the Heffley & Browne Secretarial School, founded in 1859, and the oldest school of its kind in the East. It has graduated over 100,000 students, many of whom now serve in positions of responsibility and distinction in the Nation.

We in Brooklyn are glad to call attention to Heffley & Browne's record of achievement as a pioneer in commercial education, in training personnel to fill important positions in the business world, and as Brooklyn's only accredited, registered secretarial school.

The success of the school is due in large measure to the demonstrated ability of the many young men and

women who have emerged from our classrooms into the business world. We take pride in their accomplishments and feel deeply appreciative of the renown and distinction which these graduates, now in government, industry and the professions constantly, through their ability and outstanding service, are bringing to this institution.

Congratulations to St. Catherine's High School Basketball Team of Racine, Wis., Champions of Wisconsin State Catholic Conference

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GERALD T. FLYNN
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 12, 1959

Mr. FLYNN. Mr. Speaker, it is with a deep sense of satisfaction that I rise to inform this august body of the fact that my high school alma mater, St. Catherine's, of Racine, Wis., has again in 1959 as in 1958 won the State basketball championship in the Catholic Conference of Wisconsin. This team, under the skilled leadership of Coach John McGuire and the tutelage of a most personable athletic director, to wit: the Reverend Cletus V. Uhen, has amassed the outstanding record of 26 wins and 3 losses for the 1958 to 1959 season and 51 won and 5 lost in the last 2 years. I might state that St. Catherine's High School in Racine, Wis., is one of the finest secondary scholastic institutions in the State, that a large building project recently completed has tripled its student capacity but that, with these enlarged facilities, the recognition of its valuable effect on the community and the good work of its Dominican Sisters who comprise its teaching staff and the hard work of its president, Rev. S. B. Whitkowiak, is such that its expanded facilities are already overcrowded to a point where the school is teaching on a two-platoon basis. The school is outstanding for its part in the development of a Christian attitude and a good moral character among the students in addition to its scholastic training.

High on the agenda of the school activities, however, is its athletic program. It has repeatedly won the State championship in both football and basketball. It is also active in track and other sports.

The basketball team has been invited by Georgetown University to participate in the first national Catholic basketball conference to be held here in Washington, D.C., on Friday, Saturday, and Sunday of this week, to wit: March 13, 14, and 15, 1959. The members of the St. Catherine team are: Jim May, Jim Poulsen, Joe Gammell, Jim Olley, Tom Schilke, Chuck Wood, Bob Letsch, Don Tempesta, Rocke Calvelli, and Todd Pettit.

I predict that this fine group of midleave Washington on Sunday next with the national Catholic basketball crown tucked securely in their suitcase and I issue to all of you who enjoy watching basketball, played by artists in their field, to join me at Georgetown University Gymnasium in watching the Catholic invitational basketball tournament during this coming weekend.

TVA Generator Award

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 12, 1959

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, when the award was announced, I strongly protested to the President and Mr. Herbert D. Vogel, head of TVA, to withdraw the recent order for a 500,000-kilowatt turbogenerator for the Tennessee Valley Authority awarded to a British concern. The contract price was some $13 million.

There are concerns in my district and State which employ our fellow citizens and taxpayers with highest capability of performing this large Government contract.

It is neither just nor wise to displace American labor and penalize American business by giving out contracts to foreign competitors which result in depriving American industries of business and taking bread out of the mouths of American working people.

Most of us are willing to help our allies of the free world as much as we reasonably can. In the past 18 years, we have spent well over $100 billion for this purpose overseas.

In addition, we have allowed a flood of competitive goods to come into the United States to undermine standards of employment and industrial vitality.

This law is threatening to infect our whole economic structure. Industry after industry is being hit.

The practice of purchasing overseas government procurement items that can be purchased in this country, cannot be justified. Whether it technically complies with the Buy American Act or not, it is to say the least, ill-advised, unsound economic policy.

In any event I believe that this turbine-generator bid should be rejected and the order canceled and readvertised so that American industry can qualify to get the work.

The Buy American Act formerly was interpreted to prohibit purchases overseas when the price range was within 25 percent. In my opinion, 25 percent is not enough in most cases to reflect the wide wage differentials between foreign and domestic labor let alone other cost factors.

Moreover, the Government has by administrative ruling, reduced the former 25 percent differential requirements to about 6 percent, and that literally opens the floodgates that could well permit foreign bidders to have a picnic at the expense of American producers and workers in the American market.

I also question heavy overseas purchases by the Armed Forces.

The offshore procurement policy, so-called, is another example in the assortment of huge financial subsidies we are heaping upon foreign nations at the expense of our own economic machine.

There are instances where it is feasible to purchase certain goods in foreign aid and military aid programs, but there are also instances where it is an extremely unsound, costly practice. The most recent instance of this practice was the purchase by the U.S. Navy of 7,000 tons of steel from Japan.

Mr. Speaker, I am preparing legislation to amend the Buy American Act, calling for the study and adoption of sound methods to bar large overseas purchases harmful to American industry where monopolistic or excessive costs are not in question.

Obviously Congress must protect the Government as well as the consumer against monopolistic or unfair trade practices.

The shortsightedness of the purchase is shown by the fact that servicing and repairing of this TVA foreign-made equipment estimated over a period of years will unquestionably raise the original purchase price very considerably above the bid price. If this additional cost were taken into account, it would prohibit the purchase under any fair interpretation of the Buy American Act, because it would bring the price within a prohibitory range.

The situation is the more indefensible because of the status of TVA, a taxpayer-supported public utility, grossly competitive with private enterprise utilities, having the temerity as a recipient of huge Government largesse, to award a contract to a foreign company and leave American workers in the lurch.

There is also a very serious security aspect to the award. What will the situation of TVA be in the event of war or emergency should this electricity-producing equipment break down and require parts replaced or technical aid from overseas?

I am astonished that any responsible Government agency would be willing to put its seal of approval on a deal so unfair to American industry and its employees.

H.R. 5633—To Amend the District of Columbia Code With Reference to Income Taxes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 12, 1959

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced H.R. 5633 to amend the District of Columbia Code with reference to income taxes.

I am hopeful that by the enactment of this bill we will give to residents of the

District of Columbia the same privileges as granted to all citizens in connection with the filing of their income tax returns with the United States. It is intended to equalize those exemptions and benefits.

At the same time it should put residents of the District of Columbia at least on an equal basis with residents in Maryland and Virginia in that connection.

The benefits will inure principally to our aged citizens 65 years of age and older and those who are called upon to pay large medical, dental, and hospital expenses.

Secretary Benson Dissents

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAMER H. BUDGE
OF IDAHO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 12, 1959

Mr. BUDGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am pleased to include an interesting letter written by the Secretary of Agriculture, Ezra Taft Benson, in reply to one of Joseph Alsop's columns. The letter which was printed in the March 11, 1959, issue of the Washington Post and Times Herald newspaper follows:

SECRETARY BENSON DISSENTS

My attention has been called to the February 25 column, "Operating on Ezra," by Joseph Alsop.

Mr. Alsop's article is based on the premise that the farm program operating today is my program. The farm program now in effect is not that of this Secretary of Agriculture. The Benson program has never been allowed to go into effect.

Today's program is a holdover from a Democrat administration, modified grudgingly to the limited degree to which Congress has been willing to grant our requests for changes. If it were my program we would not be asking Congress to make the far-reaching changes contained in the President's recent farm message to the Congress.

It is true that the Government will have $9 billion invested in price-support commodities (as of July 1, 1959) and that it will cost over $1 billion a year for storage, interest, and transportation on these stocks. However, these stocks consist mainly of wheat, corn, and cotton accumulated under programs we inherited and have tried to change with but little success.

The President has pointed out these facts. The Secretary of Agriculture has called attention to these facts. These facts are a visible demonstration of the bankruptcy of the old program. We have recommended changes to the Congress.

Mr. Alsop says a proposed production payment plan will cost "half the cost of subsidies requested by Benson." Our figures based on studies by career economists show the Talmadge-Brannan payment program will cost annually about $5.4 billion, for payments for the basic commodities alone. In addition we would still have the present tremendous stocks and attendant costs, the special surplus disposal programs and the soil bank, etc.

Mr. Alsop cites a $2 billion figure for the Brannan proposals. This is the first time that I've seen this figure. It is fallacious.

Congress refused to adopt this program when submitted by my predecessor, Secretary Brannan. It would have these undesirable effects:

1. Require drastic controls of production to keep costs within reason.
2. Will limit opportunity of new farmers to enter into the production of these crops.
3. Unless extended to livestock (which would boost the cost to even higher levels) could create extremely serious problems for livestock producers.
4. Will lead to international repercussions because U.S. surpluses would be dumped on world markets.
5. Would make farmers even more dependent than now on Government appropriations for farm income (quite obviously this payment approach would be a step away from our efforts to balance the budget).

We want a farm program which will give farmers a satisfactory level and stability of income consistent with a balanced and expanding consumption of agricultural commodities here and abroad and the most rational use of resources. Our alternative suggestions to achieve this goal already have been submitted to Congress. The type of farm program we will have in the future will depend upon the action Congress takes.

Unless Congress makes changes in the present unworkable and unrealistic farm program, we are bound to have costs in the future of the size Mr. Alsop cites regardless of who is Secretary of Agriculture.

EZRA TAFT BENSON,
Secretary of Agriculture.

WASHINGTON.

Distribution of Obscene Literature Through the Mails

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KATHRYN E. GRANAHAN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 12, 1959

Mrs. GRANAHAN. Mr. Speaker, it is indeed a sad commentary on our sense of values when we cannot distinguish between objects of art which are a matter of national pride and the use of such objects as lures to the theater box office.

There is a great deal of difference between the student of anatomy at a great university who is engaged in its study for the sake of humanity and the student of anatomy in the front row of a burlesque theater. It is high time that something is done to zero-in our thinking on this important moral issue.

The American public—American fathers and mothers—have a right to resent the use of themselves and their families as a captive audience to be bombarded through the avenues of the U.S. postal service by material to which they object plainly calculated to undo years of training they have devoted to their children.

Mr. Speaker, as the House has directed our committee to look into the use of the mails to send obscene literature, I wish to announce that the Postal Operations Subcommittee, of which I am chairman, intends to take immediate action to thoroughly explore the situation as it now exists. We are watching with interest the present efforts of the Postmaster General to protect the rights of patrons of the postal service. We hope that his arm is strong enough to properly enforce what we believe to be the wishes of the public. If not, we intend to develop and recommend legislation which will give him the necessary tools.

It is unfortunate that the American theater should line itself up in this situation with those who seek to corrupt the morals of our country by sending obscene material through the U.S. mails. Obviously, the attempt to send through the mails the advertisement of the now notorious stamp portraying a nude painting was not intended to raise the dignity of the stamp or the painting. It was intended solely for the profit of the owners of the film.

The Mikoyan Salesmanship

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, March 12, 1959

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD two articles dealing with Deputy Premier Mikoyan's visit to the United States.

The first article by Harrison E. Salisbury was published in the New York Times of January 11, 1959, and is entitled "Mikoyan's Success."

The second article is one which I prepared for the North American Newspaper Alliance.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, Jan. 11, 1959]

MIKOYAN'S SUCCESS—SOVIET VISITOR MAKES DEEPENING IMPACT DESPITE WASHINGTON'S HANDS-OFF ATTITUDE

(By Harrison E. Salisbury)

SAN FRANCISCO, January 10.—Anastas I. Mikoyan brought his Soviet good will mission to the Pacific coast today. There were signs in each city that the First Deputy Premier has visited of a deepening impact resulting from his blunt words, crackling wit, and unfailing good humor. For a man who has spent most of the last 35 years high in the ranks of the Kremlin leadership, Mr. Mikoyan has displayed outstanding gifts of public relations. He has campaigned in Cleveland, Detroit, Chicago, and now San Francisco with the skill of a veteran of the American political hustings.

In fact, his whirlwind trip has acquired much of the flavor—but few of the amenities—of a national presidential campaign tour. However, Mr. Mikoyan is not running for American political office—not yet, at least.

He is running for peace at every point, in every city, before every kind of audience—before workingmen in the River Rouge powerplant of the Detroit Edison Co., before the bankers of Cleveland, the furniture salesmen of the Chicago Merchandise Mart, the lawyers of the Middle West. To every American he can reach with his message, Mr. Mikoyan is saying: Let's argue, let's dispute, let's compete, but let's not fight.

SEES NO GOLDEN AGE

He is not holding out hope of a golden age in which the capitalist lion and the Communist wolf shall lie down together. But he is saying with every modulation of his quick-witted Armenian temperament that this is one world and that Russians and Americans must live in it together, at least as peacefully as, for instance, General Motors and Ford inhabit the environs of Detroit.

Mr. Mikoyan's speech has not been completely uninhibited. But he has been saying the kind of things that Americans are not used to hearing from Kremlin spokesmen. He is talking in pithy terms of men whose names so long have been headline words in the United States—Lavrenti P. Beria, former police chief; Vyacheslav M. Molotov, former Foreign Minister; Nikolai A. Bulganin, former Premier.

He is talking about these men not in the cliches of Pravda but in salty language of his own. And the American audiences, made up of influential business, industrial, and banking leaders, are reacting positively. Their warmth surprises Mr. Mikoyan and sometimes, it seems, even his listeners as well.

U.S. HANDS-OFF ATTITUDE

No Soviet statesman has ever attempted anything like Mr. Mikoyan's campaign before. In fact, few foreign leaders of any country have taken to the road in the United States in the manner in which he has done. Few would care to tackle the odds against which Mr. Mikoyan has been working thus far with startling success.

The way in which Mr. Mikoyan's campaign has developed has brought into critical focus State Department policy with respect to the Soviet visit. The State Department has maintained an official hands-off attitude, taking the line that Mr. Mikoyan is here on a private visit that must not be dignified by official arrangements.

It has accepted minimum security responsibility for Mr. Mikoyan's movements, but nothing more. It has done nothing to facilitate his visits to United States cities. It has provided no official host of liaison for his party. It has refused to offer advice to local officials as to how Mr. Mikoyan should be treated, whom he should see or what he should be shown.

Under the circumstances, the White House statement expressing hope that Mr. Mikoyan would be afforded every opportunity to see American life at its best has a somewhat dubious ring to correspondents who have observed the Mikoyan visit.

The fact is that Mr. Mikoyan is seeing a good deal of the United States and is making a decided impact on many leading Americans. But he is doing this in spite of the State Department.

The impression given to Mr. Mikoyan is that there is a deep split between official Washington, on the one hand, with its narrow definition of protocol and deep-freeze approach, and the attitude of powerful business interests of the country. In contrast to the Government, big business has acted with traditional warmth.

It would appear that the State Department once again was caught off balance by Soviet initiative. It seems probable that Washington, despite repeated advice from Llewellyn E. Thompson, Jr., Ambassador to Moscow, underestimated the force and vigor of Mr. Mikoyan's personality and the energy that he would dedicate to the cause of convincing Americans that it is time to end cold war.

The seeming discourtesy of the State Department, the constant harassment by Hungarian pickets and the erratic arrangements of the local police, who in Chicago spent more time fighting newsmen than holding back demonstrators, have produced a barrage of negative publicity for the United States in Europe.

Mr. Mikoyan's trip is being covered in minute detail by a corps of foreign correspondents. Many of their dispatches have been couched in acid terms as far as official America is concerned. And Mr. Mikoyan is getting the highest marks for ability to maintain equilibrium under trying circumstances.

Mr. Mikoyan's talks have not been a mere collection of platitudes about good relations. He has been advancing a consistent line for United States-Soviet relations. This is simply: Let us stop arguing about the past and concentrate on negotiating our way out of present difficulties.

Mr. Mikoyan insists that the Soviet position on Berlin will not be changed. But at the same time he has given repeated and clear hints that, like all Soviet positions, this is in fact negotiable.

With regard to United States-Soviet relations in the United Nations, he has said:

Let us stop making the United Nations a propaganda forum. There is no useful purpose served in rolling up majority votes against the Soviet Union. This settles nothing.

Instead let us negotiate. Let us seek to reach agreements. If we cannot get an agreement, let the question lie over for 6 months or a year while the diplomats work at it. Perhaps after a year they will come up with a solution. Meanwhile, do not bring the issue up for a vote, which may go against the Soviet Union but certainly will not solve the issue.

MIKOYAN'S VISIT SPELLS FURTHER SOVIET SALESMANSHIP ON TRADE AND BERLIN, SENATOR HUMPHREY STATES

Anastas Mikoyan's tour of the United States added up to—

1. A new chapter of Soviet supersalesmanship to win the American "market" of public opinion.

2. A signal of additional Soviet overtures to come so as to break the diplomatic impasse over Berlin.

In appraising the coast-to-coast Mikoyan tour, too many people jump to one or the other conflicting conclusions to the effect that the overall result was a success or a failure, that it changed nothing, or changed a great deal.

Actually, Soviet diplomacy is relentless and is based on the most intricate long-range planning. It rarely consists of "one-shot" trys. Successful or not, each step fits into an unending pattern of probe and thrust. That means, constantly feeling for weak spots and then exploiting every point which may yield to pressure.

Throughout his travel, the shrewd First Deputy Premier evaded, in effect, all the embarrassing $64,000 questions, such as the martyrdom of enslaved Hungary and what if anything he would concede as being wrong today in Russia. Instead, he seized the offensive and boldly sought to appeal over the heads of U.S. officials. His aim was a psychological breakthrough, especially on the trade, Berlin, and other key fronts.

How successful his effort was, only the future can really confirm or deny. But these facts seem evident:

(a) Mikoyan's deft public relations, his "soft sell" salesmanship did pay off in favorable reaction in some quarters. The fact which is obvious, now even to the Soviets, is that their traditional "hard sell"—bluster and threats—wins few, if any, friends or converts here. But some Americans do react to Soviet "soft sell."

(b) The Soviets may now be expected to offer a new alternative formula looking toward disengagement in central Europe. Mikoyan's comments at the luncheon of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations indicated that the road to any agreement on troop rollback from the Elbe is still a hard one, but that it is nonetheless a possibility which the Soviets are seriously offering.

(c) Mikoyan did bring home at least part of the bacon for the 21st Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, which opens next Tuesday. Khrushchev, in dispatching Mikoyan here was, I believe, determined to be able to report thereby to the assembled comrades that Khrushchev and company are making some progress toward settlement of the serious Berlin crisis. I am convinced Mr. Khrushchev is extremely concerned as the May 27 "ultimatum—which was not an ultimatum" approaches for Allied forces to get out of Berlin. The Soviet Premier knows that the Allies remain united in rejecting the ultimatum, and he has somehow to get off the hook of his own making.

(d) Mikoyan did, I believe, considerably jolt American opinion in high circles. He forced the State Department to think through whether our old, tired formula of weak counterpunching to the flurry of Soviet cold war proposals will suffice. The vigorous, imaginative Soviet diplomacy such as Mikoyan represented can hardly be contested effectively except through far greater vim, imaginativeness, and initiative on our own part. But these are qualities which have often been conspicuous by their absence in recent U.S. diplomacy.

(e) Mikoyan has impelled American opinion and the American Government to answer the question of, "What, indeed, is our policy toward expansion of U.S.-U.S.S.R. trade?" To date, our attitude toward such enlarged trade has been neither "fish nor fowl."

We had better make up our minds whether (a) we, in effect, regard all such trade as needlessly strengthening world communism, or (b) whether we feel there should be such expanded trade aside, of course, from materials usable in military weapons.

We cannot underestimate how zealous the Soviets are to trade in heavy items, especially those like petrochemical equipment and pipelines, which are crucial to the success of their ambitious 1958–65 7-year plan.

This was an impression which I gained in my December 1 talks in Moscow with Khrushchev, Mikoyan, and with Trade Expert Kuzmin, whom Khrushchev had specifically suggested I see. Khrushchev went all out for trade. "We desire mutually beneficial trade, not gifts," he told me. "We trade with 70 countries. Our firm is a good one."

The Premier, however, did not hesitate to add that if we refused to sell various needed items Russia would produce them, anyway. "By refusing to sell items to us you do not prevent us from producing them; you simply cause a delay which we overcome because we are forced to rely on our own resources," he told me.

In any event, a priceless opportunity was, in my judgment, lost when Mikoyan visited the U.S. Commerce Department. There, we could have offered him before the eyes of the world a long list of consumer items which the Soviet people do desperately want (in contrast to the heavy industry goods) which alone interest the Kremlin.

It was Berlin, however, which was on Mikoyan's mind most of all.

Russia had confidently expected that her 6-month ultimatum would precipitate fissures and pressures inside Allied ranks, but Big Four unity has held firm. Instead, there is evidence to believe that the threat of a May 27 deadline has, like previous Soviet saber rattling, actually caused alarm within the Soviet hierarchy itself. Among all governing people, the crafty leaders of the presidium are, perhaps, least of all willing to permit Khrushchev and company to risk an all-out war over Berlin or on any other local issue, however important.

Inevitably, the Soviet Premier has been getting more and more impatient for a Berlin settlement. "What are your counter-

proposals on Berlin?" Khrushchev had asked me, just as Mikoyan kept probing for some new formula and U.S. concession.

All in all, the Soviets feel that if the Mikoyan visit did set the stage for a U.S.-U.S.S.R. agreement on Berlin, it might establish a basis for further globe-changing decisions. These might bilaterally alter the map of spheres of influence. The implication here is: Let's you (the U.S.) and us (the U.S.S.R.) talk; just ourselves; no one else. This is a theme which I had heard repeatedly, in effect, from the Soviet Premier. But we are not buying it. The United States has no intention of violating genuine partnership with its allies by unilateral decisions without their consent.

For resolving world policy problems, Premier Khrushchev apparently divides people and nations into two categories: those with supreme power, or access to it, and those who lack such supreme power or access. He is interested basically in deals only with the powerful. He has no time for anyone else. "We're competing only against you, the United States," he told me. This was in the context of his pointing out a contrast between the Soviet Union and Red China. Here, he was referring to the latter's assertion that in 15 years, Peiping would surpass the steel production of the United Kingdom. To surpass Britain might be considered a feat for the Chinese Reds, but to the Soviets, there is only one big league team worth competing against, and that is the United States.

The "world series," so to speak, is the contest for the entire globe. It is a contest which the Kremlin would like to win peacefully through what I described to Khrushchev as its Operation Nibble. Khrushchev chuckled at the characterization, but did not refute it.

Peace was his refrain, just as it was Mikoyan's.

MIR—peace—is constantly on Khrushchev's and Mikoyan's lips, just as it was on the lips of Russians in all walks of life whom I encountered during my week in Russia.

Khrushchev knows what world war III would mean, for during our discussion, he indicated in turning to a large polar map, a virtual East-West inventory of possible U.S. and Soviet thermonuclear targets.

But talk of the possibility of war is never too far from the lips of the Soviet hierarchy. It is determined to impress us with the fact that it is not panic stricken by the thought of conflict. Khrushchev, for example, told me, bluntly it will be war "if you attack the forces of the German Democratic Republic. We will not permit the liquidation of a Socialist state."

I do not doubt that Khrushchev feels that his whole house of cards in Eastern Europe might indeed collapse if the very survival of the misnamed East German "State" were endangered. And that is one reason why he is determined to get the "Berlin bone" out of his "throat." For Free Berlin, apparently, does represent a critical threat to the puppet regime of Walter Ulbricht. The astonishing 10-year total of 3,500,000 refugees who had previously fled from East Germany through the Free Berlin escape hatch is supplemented each month by an additional 20,000 refugees. How long, many observers have wondered, can a state like East Germany continue to hemorrhage in this fashion, losing its lifeblood—its people, particularly its top specialists like doctors and engineers?

Naturally, Khrushchev in his talk with me did not acknowledge that this embarrassing dilemma is the crucial reason for the Soviet's wanting so-called internationalization of West Berlin. Instead, Khrushchev pointed his fire at Allied occupation troops there, pretending that their presence constitutes a danger of aggression.

This camouflage of real reasons is characteristic of Soviet doubletalk and feint. Disguise, together with attempted outwitting—these are Soviet stock in trade.

It was not without significance that Khruschev recalled another memory from experiences at the key city of Kharkov during World War II. He mentioned how, anticipating the German onslaught toward that vital objective, the Red army had laboriously built up extensive lines of defense. But a tour de force in Nazi strategy completely outflanked the defenses.

Khrushchev has not forgotten that and a lot of other tricky lessons.

"We will outflank your NATO—it is obsolete," he told me. "We will surpass you economically." And I believe that he is determined to do exactly that, particularly in the area of the world which has far too little concerned us—the emerging areas of Asia, Africa, and the Middle East.

Yet NATO is not obsolete if it can be transformed from a straight military alliance to a fountainhead of free world economic, political and social strength. Therein is a key to U.S. success in competitive coexistence.

Administration's Failure To Promote Industrial Uses of Farm Products

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD F. McGINLEY

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 12, 1959

Mr. McGINLEY. Mr. Speaker, city dwellers often ask midwesterners why we disagree so firmly with the administration's policies on the farm program. And sometimes we wonder if, indeed, we are unfair.

But then other facts come to light which confirms our basic position that the administration should be working to improve the plight of agriculture which is one of the basic industries of the Nation.

A story told to me privately by J. Leroy Welsh and later told to a House Agriculture Subcommittee recently which was studying industrial uses of agriculture products further reaffirms our suspicion of the administration.

Welsh, of Omaha, is well known for his efforts as Chairman of President Eisenhower's Bipartisan Commission To Study Utilization of Farm Products for Industrial Purposes.

He said that he and other members of the Commission visited the Federal research laboratory in Peoria, Ill., that has been working for years in this field of agricultural products.

VISIT LABORATORY

While there, Welsh and others were told that 100 million bushels of corn could be utilized annually in the manufacture of paper if one problem could be solved.

By adding 5 percent starch to woodpulp in paper manufacturing, a better quality paper could be produced. It would be economically feasible since the cost of the starch would be competitive in price to that proportion of woodpulp it replaced.

This use of starch has been tried, but it developed that something in the starch caused it to become brittle and caused brown spots to appear on the paper after a time.

This was the problem.

Welsh asked the Peoria people if that could be solved. After some discussion, the Peoria people agreed that by intensifying their effort on the project it could certainly be done within 2 years—maybe 2 months. Two million dollars would be the most it would require to do the job.

ACTION PLANNED

Welsh went to the Secretary of Agriculture and other members of his staff and related the story. It was agreed that it was a wonderful plan. The $2 million could come from the money Congress made available to the Secretary for just such projects.

A man was named in that meeting as the person who would have the responsibility of working out the starch research project.

Welsh in visiting with the Secretary 7½ months later found that nothing had been done.

When Welsh testified this past week to the Agriculture Subcommittee, he reported that it was now a year and a half from that meeting in which the project was set to go. As far as he knows nothing has yet been done.

The Secretary of Agriculture has a fund now of $300 million which comes from import duties earmarked by the Congress for use in financing a program for industrial use of agriculture projects. The Congress has authorized an additional $500 million for the same purpose.

And yet the Secretary insists that the new agency that is being considered in legislation pending before the Congress should be under the Department of Agriculture.

WHAT MOTIVE?

It is difficult to determine the administration's motives. It also raises the question if the administration provides the incentive needed to carry out this program which would be a boon to agriculture and reduce the ever-increasing burden on the taxpayer.

It has all the authority and all the money needed to have initiated a program within the framework of the Department of Agriculture.

However, I submit that the Department officials indicate that they do not realize that our present need is to push wholeheartedly for programs in utilization research, instead of continued attention to means of increasing production.

Hon. John V. Lindsay on the Passport Question

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STUYVESANT WAINWRIGHT

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 12, 1959

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, the Republican Party from time to time produces a young, adventurous crusader

who can be likened to the bright star of the future. The new Representative from New York's 17th District, JOHN V. LINDSAY, falls squarely into this category. Typical of his courageous, forthright and intelligent appraisal is a recent address he delivered in New York on the passport question. While not in complete sympathy with Mr. LINDSAY I feel that his approach deserves public hearing and should be set forth in the RECORD.

The address follows:

One of the most important subjects of legislative concern to the 85th Congress, and I suspect it will be to the 86th, is passport legislation. It is important because it involves the question of a citizen's right to travel—not only the question of whether there is such a right, but its metes and bounds. These questions have been cast into special prominence by the Kent, Briehl, and Dayton cases, decided by the Supreme Court of the United States in June of 1958. The Court did not decide these cases on constitutional grounds. It held only that Congress had not given the Secretary of State authority to withhold passports from citizens because of their beliefs or associations. This put it up to Congress. What kind of legislation do we want, if any? What kind of balance should we strike between competing interests?

When the Supreme Court said that the Congress had not given the Secretary of State authority to do what he was trying to do in these cases, it said a mouthful. The word "authority" is a big word. And when one is talking about the sovereign and its powers, the word "authority" means different things under different circumstances. What does it mean here?

We start with a pretty broad hint from the Supreme Court. The Court said this: "We deal here with a constitutional right of the citizen, a right which we assume the Congress will be faithful to respect." And this: "The right to travel is part of the liberty of which a citizen cannot be deprived without the due process of law of the fifth amendment." Now this may give us the dimensions of the ball park but it doesn't tell us much about the ground rules of the game.

In July 1958, the President and Secretary of State sent to the Congress proposed passport legislation with accompanying messages. The legislation was introduced and received considerable bipartisan backing, but not enough to get it through. It has been reintroduced in the 86th Congress, although to date there has been no comment from either the White House or the State Department. The proposal spells out the authority that the Secretary of State would have in respect of the issuance of passports. The chief difficulty I have with it lies in two short provisions.

One gives the Secretary authority to withhold passports from citizens where it is "determined upon substantial grounds that their activities or presence abroad or their possession of a passport would * * * (ii) seriously impair the conduct of the foreign relations of the United States, or (iii) be inimical to the security of the United States." The other would permit the Passport Hearing Board of the Department of State, in determining an application for a passport, to consider nonrecord (undisclosed) information. The Board would be required to furnish a résumé of the confidential information to the applicant and certify that it is a fair résumé. The findings, conclusions and recommendations of the Board would be transmitted to the Secretary of State, who would make a final determination. The Secretary, if he should deem it in the interest of the national security or the conduct of foreign affairs, also would be empowered to consider nonrecord information, whether or not contained in the résumé. Presumably, under the general rules and regulations of the Department of State, the Secretary is not obliged personally to consider the case but may delegate the authority, including that of resorting to confidential information, to a subordinate officer. There is provision for appeal to the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia, but the court is not given access to undisclosed information and must accept the résumé provided by the Board. There is no definition of the circumstances under which confidential information may be used, such as on certification by a senior officer of the State Department that its disclosure would expose so-called double or buried agent of tested and known reliability, that the case cannot be decided without the use of such information, and that the decision as to the need for both its use and its secrecy has been made by a top officer of the Department of State. And, as I have stated, the court would not have access to the information. The power thus reserved to the Department is sweeping and final; its exercise is not subject to scrutiny by applicant or judicial tribunal. On what ground, then, does the Department of State predicate its request for such authority?

In an important address last November before the Veterans of Foreign Wars, a State Department spokesman made a strong plea for this proposed legislation. He cited examples where the Department of State had been required, as a result of the Supreme Court decisions, to issue passports to known members of the Communist Party. One of two were admitted members with long histories of attendance at various international Communist meetings and functions. Undoubtedly true, and certainly distressing to us all. But let's take a look at the proposed cure. The spokesman stated that personal communication by travel is the most effective way for any person or group to do business, whether it be the United States Government, United States Steel Co., two individuals trying to make a contract for the sale of paper clips, or members of the international Communist Party. What is needed, therefore, it was argued, is authority in the State Department first, to refuse to issue passports on the broad ground that their issuance would impair the conduct of foreign relations or be inimical to national security, and, second, to act as sole judge, in many cases, of what impairs or what is inimical, because neither the applicant nor a court would be allowed to know what the evidence is. The rationale for this approach is stated as follows: "By so doing we can very seriously hinder the effective operation of the Communist Party both here and abroad by making it difficult for the supporters of that party to depart from the United States." In other words, put a crimp into communication.

Like every American who bears allegiance to this country, I loathe and detest communism. It is not only dangerous, but as a philosophy it is repugnant to a freeman's sense of ordinary decency and fairness. Its trained agents and obedient servants in this country are detestable, mainly because they lie to you and to me in their daily lives. They use us and our institutions while their total allegiance is to a foreign power. They are mere pawns, and their objective is to use us in the same fashion. Undoubtedly, this raises a question of security. Here, then, is a competing interest which may call for some careful, limited restrictions on personal freedoms in certain cases in the interest of safeguarding the whole. But, to quote Justice Frankfurter, "let's not throw out the baby with the bath." The way to fight the disease is not to kill the patient with the cure, but to strengthen the body with the same nourishment that made it strong in the first place—by holding high the torch of liberty and rekindling its fires. Important as the need for vigilance is, let us not be so overcome by fear and mistrust that we lose precious ground gained in the ancient struggle for freedom. It is our duty to etch out legislative standards which, while giving due regard to the dangers of the international Communist conspiracy, preserve and safeguard to each individual his most precious liberties.

What is the right to travel? In my book it is one of the most fundamental liberties that we have. The Supreme Court tells us that it is "part of the 'liberty' protected by the due process clause of the fifth amendment." The Solicitor General of the United States conceded as much in his argument before the Court in Kent and Dayton. But I would suggest also that it is conjoint with, and a part of, the first amendment—freedom of speech and assembly. Of all the freedoms that we have, the one I should most hate to lose is freedom of speech. Speech is communication, and communication this modern day is impossible without locomotion. Speech is meaningless unless thought of in the context of the physical and social aspects of human existence. The social aspect suggests that speech is not effectively exercised when a man talks to himself; speech implies communication. The physical aspect renders communication impossible under some circumstances—or possible only through certain means. The social aspect may in turn attach connotations to the physically possible means, rendering all but one appropriate. The Supreme Court has repeatedly recognized the interaction of these aspects in its interpretation of free speech and has held that denial of the appropriate means of communication may abridge free speech.

The abridgement of free speech is precisely what is sought to be accomplished by this legislation. Let's recognize it for what it is, and then see how far we should or can go. In other words, let's find the balance.

Now let me make it absolutely clear that we are not here talking about anyone who is under indictment for the commission of any crime, or is under restraining order of any kind by any court, or has been stripped of any right or liberty by due process of law. There may well be risks inherent in allowing a member of the Communist Party, or one identified as such by our intelligence units, free exit from our shores to travel abroad. But it is necessary to point out that this is true when Communists travel from Chicago to New York, or from New York to the Bahamas, or from Dallas to Mexico, or from San Francisco to Buenos Aires, or to any other South American country, none of which places requires a passport for exit or entry. It should be pointed out also that under the McCarran-Walter Act we are required to deport alien members of the Communist Party and we go to elaborate efforts to secure their removal after they have been traveling freely in this country for years. Well and good enough. Yet under our passport procedures, until the Supreme Court decided otherwise, we have insisted that it is essential to the national security to keep citizen members of the party confined to our shores. The point is that there could possibly be something wrong with our reasoning; and when we are dealing with limitations on constitutional rights it is important that our reasoning be compelling and logical.

The elimination of passports between this country and Canada, and Central and South America, and all of the contiguous islands is a good thing and is consistent with the several statements that the President has made about the need for facilitating travel. In the last Congress, for example, following an administration request in support of greater ease and freedom of travel, the requirement of fingerprinting was eliminated from the McCarran-Walter Immigration Act for all

transients and temporary visitors. Under modern means of travel and communication, and the expectation of greater miracles to come, the world has shrunk and distances mean nothing. It means little more to fly from New York to Paris or Vienna than it does to fly to San Francisco. Therefore, until passports are abolished under reciprocal arrangements with all countries—a development much to be hoped for—passports remain important.

What, then, is the nature of the passport? Passports have only been fashionable with our Government since World War I. Prior to that time we got along without them mainly becaues they were not a requirement of travel abroad. After World War I the citizen's request for a passport was generally regarded as nothing more than a request for a service from his Government to facilitate his travel in other lands—something which governments have an obligation to do for all citizens.

The right to a passport has always been assumed to be subject to the general war power. Few would argue that in the case of armed hostilities there are not extraordinary powers lodged in the sovereign to place limitations on all of our constitutional liberties, limitations which in the absence of the war power would be unconstitutional. The history of limitations over the right of exit goes back in the common law to the writ ne exeat regno under which the English kings could prohibit a man's departure or recall him if he had gone abroad. It was identified with war and service in the King's armies. In more modern times it became a credential to facilitate travel. But since 1941, the crucial function of the passport in this country has been control over exit. The earlier purpose of the passport—to facilitate travel—is not only subordinate but has in fact become an appendix which we have appropriately gotten rid of in some areas in order to facilitate travel.

Let's go back to the first amendment. Although constitutional sources do not reveal that the first amendment was framed specifically to preserve a right to travel, they do not reveal the contrary. They strongly suggest, at least, that early Americans recognized a freedom to move beyond national frontiers. However uncertain its basis may have been, however unclear its limitations, the English recognized that freedom long before they crossed the Atlantic. The people of the Colonies, moreover, evidently took the freedom for granted: witness the constant movement between Colonies and to the West. That may explain why the freedom was not more clearly recognized in writing. The Declaration of Independence goes no further than to list as a grievance the restrictions which George III placed upon emigration. The Articles of Confederation merely guaranteed free movement between different Colonies, though the Colonies, not yet joined in a more perfect Union, were more like foreign countries to each other than the United States are today. Perhaps the most direct documentary evidence is to be found in the Pennsylvania constitution of 1790 which declared "that emigration from the State shall not be prohibited."

These sources, taken together, and viewed in the light of the ninth amendment, warrant the assumption that omission of the words "right to travel" was not intended to eliminate the right. Nor is the omission inconsistent with a specific intention to include the right in free speech. The Constitution was designed to guide the United States for an indefinite period of time. It would have been impossible to enumerate the variety of ways in which free speech might be abridged—and the framers recognized this in the generality of the first amendment's language.

It is equally fundamental that the liberty guaranteed by the Constitution is not absolute. "Civil liberties," says the Supreme Court, "imply the existence of an organized society maintaining public order without which liberty itself would be lost in the excesses of unrestrained abuses." Freedom to travel, like other liberties, is subject to reasonable regulation and control in the interests of the public welfare. I am not sure that it is possible to draw up absolutely fixed rules which will in advance strike a proper balance which will meet the exigencies of every case, protect the public interest, and yet stay within constitutional limitations. Circumstances and the times vary and due process of law has never been a term of fixed and variable content. But the following general rules I would deem to be guideposts which should guide the Congress in its consideration of this subject:

First. The right to travel—to communicate—is a constitutionally protected right which may not be abrogated by the State except under the general war power, which normally may be invoked only in time of extreme emergency, usually involving armed conflict between nations. The right is a concomitant of, and conjoint with, the first amendment of the Constitution. A denial of a passport, therefore, may result in violations of both the fifth and first amendments.

Second. Neither the right of the citizen to have issued, nor the right of the Secretary of State to deny issuance of, a passport is an absolute right.

Third. A general standard under which the Secretary of State is authorized to deny the issuance of a passport whenever he finds that its issuance would seriously impair the conduct of foreign relations or be inimical to the national security of the United States probably is too indefinite a standard when applied to a right as firmly grounded among our basic liberties as is freedom of speech and assembly. In the past we have too often seen examples of executive arbitrariness under the umbrella of "the national security" and "the conduct of foreign relations."

Fourth. A refusal to issue a passport may not rest upon confidential, undisclosed information, under a blanket, unlimited authority to use the same. Such a refusal would, in all probability, be a denial of due process of law under the fifth amendment. The authority to use confidential information in the administrative process, under imprecise standards, coupled with the power to delegate the authority to subordinates, can result in a breeding ground of arbitrariness in the course of which innocent people may suffer. I have spoken here of blanket, unlimited authority. There may be room for an exception to cover the hard-core Communist case, under which the Secretary of State or the Under Secretary, personally, will certify that disclosure will expose a double or buried agent of tested and known reliability, that such exposure will be prejudicial to the national interests, and that the case may not be decided without resort to such evidence. But even then, full access to the evidence in question should be given to the court, under seal, for examination by the court in camera.

I have not in this discussion tried to spell out an entire code to govern the issuance of passports, or to draft legislation. My purpose here has been only to state my views on some of the fundamentals, and I would hope that consideration of this matter in the Congress would be guided by those fundamentals. Neither have I touched upon the whole subject of area restrictions, except indirectly. Here, I would recommend the report of the special committee to study passport procedures of the Association of the Bar of the City of New York, an excellent report, prepared by a distinguished committee of lawyers. Its conclusion on the subject of area restraints is as follows:

"Travel abroad by all U.S. citizens may be prohibited in areas where the Secretary of State determines that such prohibitions should be imposed in the national interest, but only in situations of exceptional gravity. The imposition of area restrictions should be accompanied by a statement by the Secretary of State setting forth the reasons therefor. Exceptions to general area prohibitions, permitting travel by particular individuals or groups, may be made by the Secretary of State in his discretion."

In closing, I should like to make a reference to a document of great importance, which is too seldom invoked. It is the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, which this year celebrates its 10th anniversary. Article 13 of the declaration reads as follows:

"ART. 13. (1) Everyone has the right to freedom of movement and residence within the borders of each state. (2) Everyone has the right to leave any country, including his own, and to return to his country."

The United States along with the other member nations, has pledged itself to achieve, in cooperation with the United Nations, the promotion of universal respect and observance of the human rights and fundamental freedoms set forth in the declaration. Let us in the United States be faithful to our pledge.

Speech and Hearing Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 12, 1959

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak for the 15 million Americans handicapped with hearing and speech defects who cannot speak for themselves or hear your answer to their pleas for help.

It is no wonder that over 3 million of these are children, since more children are handicapped from hearing and speech defects than from any other single cause. Many of these children have neither heard their mother's voice nor learned about God. Yet they have received scant attention from the public because their plight is not dramatic. Since they neither speak nor hear they are considered dumb and stupid. Other physical ailments, being self-evident, have attracted sympathy and received considerable help from individuals and agencies, yet those children who live in a silent noncommunicative world have had little thought or opportunity given to them.

Ten thousand children are forced to leave grammar schools each year because of hearing or speech defects. The rehabilitation potential of those pupils makes this waste a national tragedy.

The problem is far-reaching. The economic loss alone is staggering. Servicemen, particularly those flying the jets, veterans, labor in the noisy industries, and certain research workers, are debilitated from hearing losses. With the present lack of facilities, many of the above persons receive no help. Consequently, many are forced to retire or change jobs. It is conceivable that these losses could affect our defense effort. To

say the least, millions of dollars are required to train new personnel.

The effects of hearing and speech defects are also widely felt in medicine and dentistry. No program for the treatment of cerebral palsy, polio, mental health, cleft palate, hairlip, and some other diseases can function adequately without a companion hearing and speech program.

There is necessarily great interest in the aged at this time, 10 percent of whom have an incapacitating hearing loss. Cancer takes a toll of 2,000 or more voices each year, necessitating the removal of the vocal box. These laryngectomized patients can talk again, provided you give them the means.

I am advised that there are only 4,000 professionally trained audiologists and speech pathologists in this country, many of whom are without adequate training. It is conservatively estimated that 20,000 additional postgraduate students need education training in this field. Until this figure is approached, hearing and speech centers will be unable to expand and few new centers will be established. Until expansion is possible, research for the numerous problems discussed above, will continue to lag, the teaching programs for this needed graduate personnel will remain under par and the growing rehabilitation problem cannot be met.

With the purpose of alleviating this situation I have introduced a bill which would make grants to institutions of higher learning for the instruction of graduate students in the field of hearing and speech. The bill provides that the program is placed under the direction of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. The Secretary will be assisted in determining policies and programs by an advisory committee serving without compensation and appointed by the Secretary with the approval of the President of the United States. This committee is to consist of outstanding individuals from specific groups, competent to render advice.

Institutions would be required to meet certain standards as outlined in the bill in order to participate in the program. Funds granted to institutions, meeting requirements as may be determined by the Secretary and the advisory committee, shall use funds in a hearing and speech program as defined in this bill solely for: first, salaries for members of the faculties teaching graduate students; second, payment of stipends to college graduates who are awarded fellowships; third, the acquisition of equipment as needed for teaching purposes; and, fourth, the administration of such a program. The bill also would make it possible for persons in allied fields, such as many branches of medicine, physics, psychology, and so forth, to receive training.

With the broad concept of this bill the great needs of approximately 10 percent of our population, those people handicapped with hearing and speech defects, would be served.

Mr. Speaker, I plead for urgent passage of this measure. In addition to the great humanitarian need, immediacy is important to the Nation. The lack of trained personnel is largely responsible for: first, the discontinuation of over a thousand pupils from public schools monthly; second, incurable deafness in a number of children living noncommunicable lives who should have received treatment before the age of three, if they were to be enabled to communicate with other people; third, the failure to rehabilitate 80 percent of the remedial cases of children who daily are becoming less able to absorb training because of age; fourth, the lack of one or more comprehensive speech and hearing centers in many States; fifth, labor, veterans, members of the aged, research men and women, industry, the Government, and society as a whole, are daily paying heavy penalties through the lack of an effective program of assistance.

The precepts of this bill are humanely just and economically sound. Prevention of deafness and restoration of millions of individuals to usefulness is cheaper than any form of charitable maintenance. A normal life, including the ability to pay taxes, is their right and their wish.

Chronic Unemployment Needs Action

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN M. SLACK, JR.
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 12, 1959

Mr. SLACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I wish to insert and call the attention of my colleagues to testimony which I submitted yesterday before the House Banking and Currency Committee which is presently considering measures designed to benefit depressed areas and encourage area redevelopment.

The statement follows:

The general topic under consideration before this committee is second to none in national importance, and the actions to be taken as a result of these hearings will have far-reaching consequences. The economic redevelopment of those areas which have lost step in the forward march of our national progress is no longer a matter of interest to a few Members of Congress or to a relatively small percentage of our citizens.

It is demonstrably a national challenge, arising out of national and even international trends, and of increasing interest to more persons every year. The manner in which it is approached, and the extent to which it is recognized for what it actually is, will go far toward encouraging or discouraging national unity of thought and purpose in our struggle to maintain economic leadership among the peoples of the world.

Our people today pay high taxes, and with their money we support and maintain foreign aid programs of many kinds, reciprocal trade agreements, international barter arrangements, world-wide activities through the United Nations, foreign development programs and overseas information services. All of these activities are perhaps worthy of support, and are possibly a necessary part of our role in the world situation of today, but they are a mockery and a sham if we do not first and foremost adequately protect our own people here at home. For no matter how generous our intentions abroad, no nation overseas has a prior claim on us above and beyond that of our own people for food and shelter and the right to an opportunity to earn a decent livelihood.

At first glance it seems strange indeed that we must consider legislation of this kind at all. As a Nation we are generally prosperous today. At the end of 1958 our gross national product had reached an annual rate of $453 billion, an all-time high and an increase of $13 billion over the previous year. Personal income hit a new high also, reaching a rate of $362.3 billion annually in January, an increase of $13.5 billion over the preceding year. Construction and new housing are increasing, and the indications are that, with the exception of a few industries and a few areas, most of the ground lost during the 1958 recession has been regained.

Total unemployment has declined slightly, to 4,724,000, and constitutes 6 percent of the labor force, as against 7.6 percent a year ago.

In the face of these figures, however, we must acknowledge that there are areas which do not respond to the upturn of the business cycle, but remain dormant or continue to decline as our economy progresses. These areas are the victims of a special situation, and their recent history marks them as forerunners of serious trouble in the future. Their circumstances underscore the need to begin action to solve their special problems now, that we may learn today on a pilot basis the procedures which will be effective wherever the situation may develop tomorrow.

On the basis of facts established there is little disposition to dispute the causes of chronic unemployment in particular areas. It is directly traceable to technological advancement by industry. We in the Congress support and actively encourage the increase of technical skill and productivity in business and industry. Much has been said recently about the threats from our enemies overseas, and fear has been expressed that they will surpass us in technical skills. All of us know that we as a Nation cannot afford to be second best in the international race for top industrial skill.

But some by-products of this progress are, as in this case, problems in terms of displaced human beings. The advance of the machine adds muscle power to our national strength, but at the same time forces some of our people into permanent idleness. They become casualties of the battle for international survival, with none of the protection afforded the casualties of any other type of conflict or disaster.

We are actively encouraging programs designed to increase and accelerate the education of scientists and engineers. Their efforts will be reflected throughout our economic life in the years to come, and the pace of technological advance must inevitably quicken as their knowledge is brought to bear on existing methods and processes.

Already, however, the rate of technical progress has created a pool of chronically unemployed. It has happened gradually but steadily over a period of years, and in the face of growing national prosperity. The trend is established, and knows no state or industry boundaries. I call your attention to some findings of a special study of postwar job loss published recently in U.S. News & World Report:

"Since the close of World War II, the output per worker has increased 19 percent in the steel industry. As a result, the steel industry in 1957 employed only 536,000 workers. If output per man had been the same as in 1947–49, steel companies would have needed 637,000 workers to produce the same tonnage.

"In automobiles the loss during the past 10 years because of higher output per man is

estimated at 132,000 jobs. An additional 48,000 jobs were lost because of the importation of foreign cars.

"In the oil refining industry there is an estimated loss of 71,800 jobs during the past 10 years.

"In coal mining there has been an estimated 46 percent increase in efficiency due to mechanization. In 1958 there were 195,000 employees in bituminous mining, but for the same output, as produced in 1948, there would have been required 95,000 more workers than are needed today."

You have heard from many other sources the details of the effect of mechanization on the coal industry which, on an industry-wide basis, has been first and hardest hit. I do not intend to review those details. I offer for your serious consideration, however, the knowledge that only a few weeks ago in my own State of West Virginia a mechanized mine was opened which will produce 50 tons of coal per day per man, as compared with the average of 10 tons per day by conventional pick and shovel operation.

This is technological advance run rampant. Yet, mine owners must mechanize to survive. They must be competitive nationally and internationally or they will lose markets to other fuels. What has been happening to coal will evenually happen throughout industry as we develop increasingly efficient machines and processes. It has been happening in other industries already—in textiles, leather products, and railroading, to name a few.

Recently a spokesman for the Michigan Unemployment Compensation Commission stated that, although the production of passenger cars is 12 percent ahead of a year ago, automotive employment is down 30,000 from that date, and stated further that the city of Detroit has developed a hard core of about 200,000 unemployed who just aren't going back to work in the plants.

The Wall Street Journal cites countless examples of increased productivity per man-hour, in everything from television to paper products and from floor wax to camera parts. The industrial drive for greater man-hour productivity is unceasing, and is a recognized part of the enterpriser's plan for success.

The trend is not confined to this country; it is not based on national characteristics but rather on the forces which drive an industrial economy. Recently the A. V. Roe Corp. of Canada laid off 15,000 men on 5 hours notice, and suspended the production of the Avro Arrow, Canada's finest supersonic interceptor plane. There was nothing wrong with the product or the workers, but the Arrow had been superseded by a new missile which is cheaper and more efficient.

If this can happen in supersonic aircraft, what industry or industrial region can feel certain about its status a year hence?

The foregoing statements add up to just one conclusion: The coal industry is far from alone in this situation. It has been first to feel the effects of technological advance, and its employees have seen the by-products of that advance left unattended, with the result that temporary idleness has hardened into chronic unemployment with no hope for a return to work in the future. The condition of the unemployed miner today point dramatically to the need for pioneering in the field of economic redevelopment.

For the temporarily unemployed there are programs of assistance, but for the displaced and dispossessed worker there is nothing. He is consigned to a permanent dole, and it is the permanence of his condition that I wish to emphasize most strongly.

Several weeks ago, in an attempt to pinpoint the areas in which chronic long-term unemployment has hardened into a way of life, I requested from the Department of Agriculture a tabulation of counties in which 15 percent or more of the population received surplus agricultural commodities as needy persons. Persons in this classification are necessarily unemployed, and have been unemployed for a sufficient time to exhaust unemployment compensation benefits, have generally been certified for direct relief, have little or no income, and few other food sources.

The resulting tabulation which I received emphasizes the national scope of the problem. It reported that there were 210 counties, 7 percent of the counties in the United States, in which 15 percent or more of the population received surplus commodities under the classification of needy persons. These counties are distributed through 24 States, and are in the districts served by 75 Members of the House of Representatives.

In one county 51 percent of the population received these commodities, while in numerous others between 40 percent and 49 percent are in similar condition. The average for the 210 counties was 21.8 percent of the population.

I call these figures to your particular attention because of two conclusions resulting from a study of three of these counties in my own Sixth West Virginia District:

1. Reviewing the monthly percentages during the past 2 years, we found that the number of persons receiving commodities seldom rises or falls more than 1 percent in any month. In short, the trend has been growing slowly for a long time, and cannot be reversed overnight.

2. Employment experts in my district estimate that 72 percent of those persons now receiving commodities are unemployed employables.

As proof of the relentless growth and permanent nature of the trend, I offer you these statistics from the Department of Agriculture:

Needy persons in family units receiving commodities

Fiscal year:	
1956	3,170,000
1957	3,485,000
1958	4,665,000
First half of 1959	5,230,000

Surplus foods are distributed to needy persons in 45 States, although the percentage of recipients is notably small in some. The percentages are excessively high in some other States, however, and it is noticeable that those are the very States which have been hardest hit by chronic unemployment due to technological progress. The top 10 States, according to number of recipients, are as follows:

Total needy persons receiving surplus commodities

State:	
Pennsylvania	829,550
Michigan	538,385
New York	348,871
Mississippi	331,441
West Virginia	278,223
Kentucky	254,377
Oklahoma	246,960
Arkansas	219,354
Tennessee	154,551
Louisiana	137,713

Statistics of this kind are helpful, but they must not cause us to lose sight of the human element they represent. The bald statement that a needy person receives surplus agricultural commodities means that he receives currently just five items—butter, dry milk, rice, flour, and cornmeal. The commodities distributed are controlled by previous legislation enacted by the Congress, and the Department of Agriculture has no responsibility to conduct a welfare program, or authority to purchase foods to help States or communities operate welfare programs for the needy.

In the areas of chronic unemployment thousands of families exist on these commodities alone, and in my own district I have talked with families who have not had fresh milk, eggs, meat, or citrus juices for periods ranging up to 2 years. These Americans actually exist on a diet less than half as nutritive as that provided for the occupants of displaced persons camps in Europe after World War II. From a nutrition standpoint they are slightly below the level of common laborers in the Soviet Union, as reported by Senator ALLEN ELLENDER last year after a visit to Russia, when he stated that the largest proportion of Soviet citizens in the common laboring class subsisted on a diet of black bread, cabbage, potatoes, beets, and tea.

To give you an idea of the situation that is developing, the Bureau of Nutrition of the West Virginia State Health Department reviewed the diet of persons existing on surplus commodities and announced that the average family of four would receive, for 1 month, 20 pounds of flour, 10 pounds of corn meal, 9 pounds of powdered milk, 2 pounds of rice, and 4 pounds of butter. This would give them only 26 percent of the calories they need each month, 36 percent of the proteins, and 46 percent of the calcium considered necessary for good health. In other words, a protracted diet of this kind will create a group of persons who will soon not be able to work, and will rear children condemned to be a permanent charge on the community.

This condition is destroying home and family life. Children quit school and migrate without being prepared to work, fathers desert their families so the families will become eligible for relief, crime is on the increase, but these desperate people steal food, not money, according to local enforcement officials.

Only one conclusion is supportable in the face of the evidence—our mode of industrial advance is cannibalizing our own people. Technical progress, without attention to its by-products and effects on human beings is building a massive complex of industrial skill based on a pile of human bones and operating to the tune of wailing, hungry children.

We are already working around the edges of the problem. This year we will again appropriate funds for more surplus foods for needy families, and for school-lunch programs. We will, no doubt, extend the supplemental unemployment relief measure set up by the last Congress. In these and other ways we will spend millions of dollars to deal temporarily with the undesirable aspects of the problem without undertaking a general assault on the core of the problem itself.

This piecemeal approach cannot be effective. The problem is too great and its origins are too complex. It can only be overcome by a bold program of action in several areas simultaneously:

1. Liberalization of the surplus commodities program as a temporary measure to maintain life and health among those who have been displaced by the growth of machine efficiency.

2. An economic redevelopment measure to place the Federal Government in support of efforts to correct the situation, and to lend the power and prestige of the Federal Government to such efforts as a recognized Federal policy.

3. Public works activity in these areas where economically justifiable, on a priority basis, particularly where such public works will improve the attractiveness of such areas to industry.

I am not speaking here in behalf of any particular measure already introduced. Indeed, it may well be that this committee will, after hearing the testimony, conclude that a

new and inclusive measure should originate with the committee itself.

Further, I am not proposing a massive spending program. But when we use that word "spending" it is only fair to remember a few facts: We are currently spending at the rate of $6½ billion per month, or $40 per month for every man, woman, and child in the United States. Would it be unreasonable to embark on a program to recoup the fortunes of the dispossessed at the rate of $10 per month for each of the 4 million unemployed employables? This would add up to $480 million a year.

I do not propose this figure as a basis of consideration, but only as a spending yardstick, if the program is to be considered as a spending measure. Certainly some money must be spent, but it will be self-liquidating through the return of these people to full status as citizens, able to bear their share of the tax burden. I have talked with dozens of them, and they want work, not handouts. Money itself is not the answer.

The answer would appear to lie in recognition of the trend as a growing national economic peril, of which the situation in these districts is but a forerunner; in placing the strength of the Federal Government behind a definite program of evaluation and correction; in activities which will increase job opportunity by creating conditions which will be attractive to industry and lead to long-term economic stability in these areas; in short, an investment in the future of a growing segment of our people.

The Congress has faced similar specific problems before and has acted to control them. When nuclear energy was born, the Atomic Energy Commission was devised to deal with its development and use. When space flight began to seem possible, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration was created. This problem deserves similar treatment on a long-range basis, or we will be caught unprepared in the years to come.

The alternatives are brutal and unthinkable. Condemn a growing number of Americans to a starvation diet, without hope for the future, or tell them to uproot themselves and be scattered across the continent, seeking work as best they can, destroying home ties and family loyalties. This would indeed mark a low point in the development of the American heritage, and constitute a damage to national morale far more serious than could be created by an enemy with a bomb.

I am confident that this committee will grasp the implications of the problem, and will demonstrate the resourcefulness in meeting it for which the Congress is world-famous, in war and in peace. And I believe that when the record of this Congress is written, and the pages are studied in future years, it will be unanimously agreed that your efforts to deal with this problem will stand as a high point of accomplishment for this congressional session.

USDA Barter Regulations Depress Our Commodity Markets

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. R. POAGE
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 12, 1959

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, the awkward regulations which surround the Public Law 480 barter program have had the unfortunate effect of cutting world prices on U.S. agricultural commodities, seriously disturbing trade operations and preventing the movement of our farm products into some of our normal export areas.

As a result of the so-called modified barter regulations, instituted last fall by the Department of Agriculture, this program lacks the flexibility which would enable it to supplement our cash sales and to meet competition from the Soviet bloc. In fact the Department has publicly admitted that it is more difficult to move commodities under their present regulations than it was under the old ones, which the Congress had sought to liberalize under the new law.

Two years ago, over $350 million in surpluses were moving into export annually through barter, at discounts or commissions to exporters averaging only one-half to 1 percent, and with no disruption of world prices or normal trade operations. Now, as a result of the new regulations, we are moving commodities at a rate of less than a hundred million dollars a year, at discounts ranging from 7 to 12 percent, or even higher. And these discounts are beginning to have a serious effect on normal commercial sales and world prices.

I want to emphasize that the present high discounts on exported commodities are not taken out of the price paid to the CCC. They are made possible only because the private traders are able to capitalize on temporarily depressed minerals markets. In some cases, they are buying material at distressed prices. Were it not for the fact that stockpile materials can be purchased at 10 percent or so below world prices, it would be difficult, if not impossible, to negotiate barter deals under the present regulations. We are doing business now only because we can take advantage of the misfortunes of others.

Of course the American farmer, and the foreign producers too, are hurt by the big discounts, because they have the effect of cutting both the prices and the quantities of agricultural commodities that are sold abroad. Foreign buyers, in a desire to buy their stocks at a reduced price, may hold off buying in hopes of getting a discount.

In place of a good barter program which supplements and stimulates our cash sales, such as we had before these restrictions were instituted, we now have an operation which invites unfortunately large discounts on the small amount of goods that are being bartered.

There is absolutely no doubt in my mind that the procedures required under the so-called modified barter regulations are responsible for the present high discounts. These regulations make it so difficult to dispose of our farm surpluses overseas that those with materials to barter are having to pay these unreasonable commissions in order to barter at all. All the responsible contractors I talked with have affirmed this, and I believe that the experts in the Department of Agriculture would also affirm it.

I would like to explain, as I understand it, how the barter regulations are creating this situation. Although the matter is somewhat technical, briefly it amounts to this: in order to deliver goods into the big "A" and "B" markets—the countries which would be the best outlets for our surplus—a contractor must specify ahead of time the commodities and the country into which he intends to sell and from which he must secure the materials covered by the barter contract. By the time he gets approval from the Department of Agriculture, which takes up to 3 months, the contractor may find that the market he counted on no longer exists. In this situation, if he were permitted to dispose of the commodities into any of the free world countries, he could move the surplus into some other market; but under the present regulations he has to sell the commodities within the specified country. Under these circumstances there is a great risk that he may be forced to reduce his price or even to take a heavy loss. Thus the reason for the high discounts.

These regulations are creating the unfortunate situation they are supposed to prevent. They depress our cash commodity markets. They cripple our barter program. They are a real hindrance to our efforts to distribute our tremendous agricultural surplus.

We urge the Department of Agriculture to modify or abolish these regulations which now frustrate the barter program.

Address of Hon. Arthur S. Flemming

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS E. DORN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 12, 1959

Mr. DORN of New York. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, February 22, 1959, the Stanley H. Miner Memorial Pavilion of the Methodist Hospital, of Brooklyn, N.Y., was dedicated. We were very fortunate in having as our principal speaker the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, the Honorable Arthur S. Flemming. I believe his remarks on the occasion of that dedication are worthy of the attention of my colleagues, and I incorporate them herewith:

Mr. Diefendorf, those who are associated with the ministry of this great hospital, and the friends of this hospital, I can assure you that I appreciate more than I can express adequately in words, the opportunity of participating in this manner in this dedication. I am sure that it is difficult for you to understand just how much those words from Dr. Marshall mean to me. After one listens to such words, he should be very sure of the fact, to use a Government expression, that he has a system of checks and balances operating in his own life. Through the years I discovered that the best guarantee for that is to have some children in your household. About 10 years ago, I was about to be inaugurated president of Ohio Wesleyan. Mrs. Flemming and I were walking down the main street of Delaware, Ohio, with my then 8-year-old daughter. We had just visited the grave of Bishop and Mrs. Baxter. Bishop Baxter was one of the early presidents of Ohio Wesleyan. During the course of conver-

sation, Mrs. Flemming said to Susie, "You know daddy is about to become the ninth president of Ohio Wesleyan." Without a moment's hesitation, came the response, "Yes; and there'll be a 10th." Somehow, she was right, because there is a 10th right now, having just recently assumed the duties and responsibilities of that office.

One of the fine things about the position I now occupy is that as the incumbent of this position you are given the privilege from time to time of sharing in the victories that take place in the fields of health, education, and welfare. Surely, the dedication of these marvelous facilities is a victory, a victory over the temptation that so easily besets all of us. They want to turn aside from the opportunities to participate in the ministry of healing and to "pass by on the other side of the road."

I also want to express my gratitude to those who planned this program for making it possible for Arthur Flemming to participate in the program. This is a very special hospital as far as I am concerned. It is a hospital that was founded and has been supported by the members of the denomination with which I have always been and always will be proud to be associated. It is a hospital that for almost 20 years had the benefit of the leadership of a good minister of Jesus Christ who gave me, as he has already indicated in his introductory remarks, the right hand of fellowship as I joined Trinity Methodist Church in Kingston, N.Y., and whose life of dedicated service has always been and always will be an inspiration to me.

It is a hospital that now has as its chaplain a man who gave me and thousands of other Ohio Wesleyan students an insight into the Gospel of Jesus Christ that we will never forget as he occupied the pulpit of the Williams Street Methodist Church in Delaware, Ohio, the home of Ohio Wesleyan University. It is a hospital that had as one of its trusted leaders and outstanding benefactors a truly great man whose friendship it was my privilege to enjoy over a period of the last 6 years. Ellis Phillips has left an indelible mark on my life just as I know he has on the lives of countless other persons. I am not surprised that he and Mrs. Phillips decided to give this chapel. Certainly it is a source of inspiration to those of us who have the privilege of being here this afternoon and will continue to be a source of inspiration and comfort to countless thousands of persons down through the years. The reason I am not surprised is that it was their idea that religion and education should be linked together in the beautiful building that they gave to Ohio Wesleyan University. It is providing the setting for what will be some of the most meaningful services of worship that take place on the Ohio Wesleyan campus.

Finally, this is a hospital that my father remembered in his last will and testament. I know that he remembered because of his conviction that the money that he had earned would be used in such a manner as to strengthen the hospital's ministry of healing. I am likewise sure that his bequest was his way of expressing his gratitude for a friendship that meant as much (if not more) to him as any other friendship that he enjoyed throughout his life, the friendship of Chester C. Marshall. These are the reasons that prompt me to say "Thank you" for inviting Arthur Flemming to participate in this program.

The tenth chapter of Acts provides us with an account of the visit of Peter to the town of Cornelius the centurion. Within that chapter, nine verses are set aside for the purpose of presenting to us what in effect is a Reader's Digest life of Christ as told to Cornelius by Peter. In that brief account Peter felt that it was very necessary to include this statement, "Now he went about doing good and healing all that were oppressed by the devil, for God was with him."

Have you ever thought how strange it is that an expression that Peter lifted up in order to describe one aspect of the Master's ministry is used so often in our day to express contempt for some of our fellow human beings? When men and women turn the spotlight on human needs and insist on action to meet those needs so often their efforts are dismissed by their expression, "Oh, well, they're just a group of do-gooders." It is these "do-gooders" that I would like to think about with you for just a few minutes on this very important occasion.

I'm sure that if we can engage in a conversation about this expression someone would say something like this, "I really don't intend to express my contempt for such persons. I'm simply trying to point out that they're not practical. They seem to think that money grows on trees. They just don't seem to realize that all of these needs can't be met." Frankly, I think that you and I are simply trying to appease our own consciences. We are trying to rationalize our own insistence on indulging in the luxuries of life in the midst of human need. We are trying to justify our failure to use the time, energy and resources that have been entrusted to us in order that we may go about doing good.

Today, as a result of the experiences that I have had since assuming the duties of my present office 6 months ago, I'm more thankful than ever before in my life for the "do-gooders". I'm glad that they are focusing our attention on cancer, heart disease and many other diseases that are causing suffering and heartache, and are insisting on the fact that there must be a way out.

A few weeks ago, I spent the better part of the day at the clinical center of the National Institutes of Health out in Bethesda, Md. One section of this clinical center is set aside for the research activities that center around children with leukemia. The doctors and nurses talked with me about the research activities that are under way. They told me that because of certain developments, it has been possible for them to extend the lives of the children who come to that center, not by years, but by a few weeks or by a few months. They told me about their hopes that while the lives of these children are being extended in this way, a breakthrough might take place that would make it possible for those children and many others to look forward to normal lives. That breakthrough hasn't taken place. I am convinced that as a result of the dedication that is taking place all over this Nation, on the part of men and women who are determined to stage such a breakthrough that it will ultimately take place. One cannot become acquainted with activities of this kind with the dedicated spirit that accompanies these activities on the part of doctors and nurses and research workers without being thankful for the "do-gooders" who insist on staying with this problem until there is a breakthrough.

I am glad and increasingly so that there are do-gooders in our midst who insist on focusing our attention on the opportunities that we have missed and are missing in the field of education. We haven't provided the opportunities we should provide for retarded children, for exceptional children, and for those who fall in between. As a society we haven't provided the educational opportunities we should provide for our children and young people without regard to race, color or creed.

Not long ago I was talking with a former distinguished resident of Brooklyn, Branch Rickey, about this particular problem and I wish that you could have heard him underline his convictions in this particular area. All we have to do is to look around us in order to realize that we are paying the penalty for sins of omission in the field of education.

I am likewise thankful for the do-gooders who are constantly reminding us of what we can do in our communities through the use of both public and private funds to help those who are ill, those who are handicapped, those who are in need of food and clothing, those who are imprisoned, and those who can profit from competent counseling. Yes; I'm thankful for the more than 6,000 do-gooders who have made this great building possible. As I think of the relationship that all this has to some community, some place in this Nation; and as I think of the tremendous opportunities for service that exist in these communities, I feel that there are times when we should hang our heads in shame when we do not follow the lead of the do-gooders at least to the extent, for example, of meeting our goal in a united fund or community chest drive.

Also, I am glad the do-gooders are pointing out what can be done to replace despair with hope by providing those who are handicapped with the medical care and with the training that enables them to once again become productive members of our community. When one begins to realize and appreciate what can be done in this area, he cannot help but wonder why we are so timid about investing our resources both public and private in vocational rehabilitation programs.

Sometimes we shrug off the do-gooders by saying something like this, "They think that government is the only institution in society that can deal adequately with these pressing human needs. Because they think this way, they constitute a real threat to our way of life." I believe that this is an unfair characterization of the persons we are talking about. Most of those who persist in focusing our attention on these pressing human needs put it this way: let's determine what we need in order to meet these needs; then, let's determine what constitutes a fair share for both public and private groups; then, let's do everything we can to persuade public and private groups to accept their fair share. In other words, the do-gooders primary concern is that we face up to the human needs that confront each one of us and resolve to do something about meeting those human needs. This kind of person I'm talking about isn't going to take very much time arguing about the method.

"Now he went about doing good and healing all that were oppressed by the devil, for God was with him." Let's all of us become better acquainted with the "do-gooders" who in our day seek to follow in the footsteps of the Master. They will prick our consciences, they will challenge us not to pass on the other side of the road in order to avoid the needs of our fellow human being. Let's not only become better acquainted, with the "do-gooders" of our day, but let's strive to be "do-gooders" ourselves. In our striving, however, let's realize that no matter how fine our resolutions may be, we will not succeed in doing good unless God is with us. During this Lenten season may we develop a far better understanding than we have ever had of the strength that God, revealed to us through His Son, Jesus Christ, can bring into our lives so that it will be possible for us to "go about doing good."

This hospital has had a great history because thousands of persons have looked upon it as a medium through which they could serve the needs of their fellow human beings; and they have never been disappointed. The resources that have been entrusted to this hospital have been used

wisely and well. I am convinced that the greatest days for this hospital and for other comparable institutions throughout our Nation lie ahead of us. Never before, I am convinced, have men and women been as willing to give of their time, energy, and resources to serve others. More and more men and women want to join that great company of "do-gooders." This is why, personally, as I look to the future, I do so not with a feeling of pessimism, but with a feeling of optimism. I am convinced that as more and more join the great company of "do-gooders" that we are setting into motion those spiritual forces throughout this world that will ultimately provide us with the kind of spiritual breakthrough that will lead us into the pathway of peace.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FRIDAY, MARCH 13, 1959

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. Charles W. Holland, Jr., pastor, Fountain Memorial Baptist Church, Washington, D.C., offered the following prayer:

The Psalmist has said, Psalms 34: 3: *O magnify the Lord with me, and let us exalt His name together.*

Merciful and omniscient God, we do thank Thee for Thy great and tender mercy.

We know that even when a sparrow falls to the ground Thou art mindful of it.

We thank Thee, therefore, Heavenly Father, for the routine necessities of life, food, shelter, clothing, and all that enters into our daily existence. May we never accept these gifts nonchalantly; but remember that they come through Thee.

We thank Thee for wisdom and solicit Thy continued guidance for this great law-forming body of men and women.

These thanks we give, and requests we make, through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Ratchford, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. McGown, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed a joint resolution of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S.J. Res. 47. Joint resolution providing that certain communication activities at the IX Plenary Assembly of the International Radio Consultative Committee to be held in the United States in 1959 shall not be construed to be prohibited by the Communications Act of 1934 or any other law.

EXPENSES OF CONDUCTING STUDIES AND INVESTIGATIONS INCURRED BY COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I submit a privileged resolution, House Resolution 156, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That, effective January 3, 1959, the expenses of conducting the studies and investigations authorized by H. Res. 93, Eighty-sixth Congress, incurred by the Committee on Agriculture, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, not to exceed $50,000, including expenditures for the employment of accountants, experts, investigators, attorneys, and clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House, on vouchers authorized by such committee, signed by the chairman of such committee, and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

SEC. 2. The official committee reporters may be used at all hearings, if not otherwise officially engaged.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

BASIC COMPENSATION OF EXPERT TRANSCRIBERS

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I submit a privileged resolution, House Resolution 197, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the basic compensation of the eight expert transcribers, office of the official committee reporters, and the seven expert transcribers, office of the official reporters of debates, shall be at the basic per annum rate of $3,450 each, effective March 1, 1959.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I submit a privileged resolution (H. Res. 198), and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That, effective January 3, 1959, in carrying out its duties during the 86th Congress, the Committee on Banking and Currency is authorized to incur such expenses (not in excess of $5,000) as it deems advisable. Such expenses shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by such committee, signed by the chairman thereof, and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRIEDEL. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. When did all this start?

Mr. FRIEDEL. The $5,000 for the Committee on Banking and Currency?

Mr. GROSS. Yes.

Mr. FRIEDEL. In the 85th Congress they received $5,000 also.

Mr. GROSS. Were these bills on the whip notice to come up today?

Mr. FRIEDEL. Yes; it was cleared with the leadership.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, not on the whip notice, because they are preferential matters. They are not included in the whip notice because they have a preferential status.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I submit a privileged resolution (H. Res. 206) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the expenses of conducting the studies and investigations authorized by House Resolution 182, Eighty-sixth Congress, incurred by the Committee on Ways and Means, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, not to exceed $300,000, including expenditures for the employment of experts and clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, effective January 3, 1959, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by such committee or subcommittee, signed by the chairman of the committee, and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CODE OF ETHICS FOR GOVERNMENT SERVICE

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I submit a privileged resolution (H. Con. Res. 15) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That there shall be printed as a House document the "Code of Ethics for Government Service" as adopted by the Congress in H. Con. Res. 175, Eighty-fifth Congress. Such code shall be run in two colors and gold from letterpress plates reproducing engrossed artwork, hand lettered and appropriate for framing and office wall display. Stock for prints shall be one hundred and sixty pound white, size twelve and one-quarter inches by sixteen and one-quarter inches flat. Prints shall be inserted in white envelopes inside mailing brown envelopes of twenty-eight pound brown kraft, flaps sealed or tucked in with one corrugated board protector. In addition to the usual number, there shall be printed a sufficient number of extra copies to provide twenty-five copies for use and distribution by each Senator and each Representative. For the purposes of this resolution, the Delegate from Hawaii and the Resident Commissioner from

Puerto Rico shall be considered as Representatives.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I asked for this time because I am going to have to oppose this resolution, and I do so with some reluctance. I have talked to the author of the resolution. The Congress did adopt this code of ethics at the last session. The reason I feel disposed to oppose the resolution is that this is just one instance of many in which the Congress has authorized the printing of many things which have little value. Many of these projects like this start as a very small item. I think this one calls for maybe $2,900, which, of course, is a very small amount. It does set another precedent. We print so many things around here and order a limited distribution to Members that are never used and are sold as waste paper. Now, this code of ethics had been circulated among many departments of Government and among many employees by those departments of Government. This proposal here today calls for a very attractive piece of printing. It is a rather expensive piece of printing. As I say, it is with some reluctance that I oppose this resolution, but I am going to have to do it, and from time to time I expect to oppose other proposals like this. Somewhere along the line we are going to have to accept some responsibility and to give more attention to the use to which this printing is made. We are spending several million dollars here in the Congress for reports and other pieces of printing that to me is entirely a waste of the taxpayers' money.

As another example we have, for instance, a calendar. I think the distribution is something like 10 to 25 calendars to each Member of Congress. Actually, to many of us it is more of a nuisance than a help, because they do not come in sufficient quantity to do a great deal of good. We could save I do not know how much money; I do not know what they cost. But this item before us I think we could dispense with, and for that reason I am going to vote against the resolution.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS. For a question.

Mr. GROSS. Was a sample of this proposed printing sent around to the various offices?

Mr. HAYS. I believe so, yes.

Mr. GROSS. Then it is a rather expensive piece of printing, is it not?

Mr. HAYS. I believe the gentleman said that it was going to cost $2,976.

Mr. GROSS. I know; for how many copies?

Mr. HAYS. The regular printing plus 25 copies for each Member.

Mr. GROSS. So it is an expensive piece of printing. What we need around here is not to print copies of a Code of Ethics, but to do something about the so-called ethics that we practice, in view of some of the things that have happened recently. I want to join the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. JONES] in opposing this sort of thing.

Mr. HAYS. Now that the gentleman has joined with him, I might say that in my opinion this is a document which might do some good. The gentleman has raised the point that there is some need for some ethics. Maybe this document will promote some. I hope so. I might say to him that the Committee on Printing has 3 resolutions here this morning and has turned down 6 others. So it has been rather selective about what is to be printed.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HOUSE REPORT NO. 41, COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I submit a privileged resolution, House Resolution 187, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That there be printed for the use of the Committee on Un-American Activities eleven thousand five hundred additional copies of House Report Numbered 41, current session, entitled "Communist Legal Subversion."

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I should like to make a brief statement on this resolution. This resolution was the object of some comment by a columnist some time back in February. I think his column appeared somewhere around the 20th of February. In that column he said that no copies of this document could be obtained because the Committee on Printing was dragging its feet, and he intimated, if not alleged, that we were trying to keep any documents about communism from being printed.

This column appeared, as I have said, around the 20th of February. Actually the resolution for the printing of this document was only introduced by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER] on March 2. It was heard by the subcommittee of which I have the honor to be chairman on the 5th of March, and reported out of the full committee the day before yesterday, and is up for consideration here today. I consider that rather expeditious handling.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I am very much surprised that anybody should make the sort of attack on the gentleman from Ohio that he has just described because, actually, he has been most cooperative. It is because of his interest in the work of the Committee on Un-American Activities that we have been able to supply the tremendous demand for these pamphlets. I wish to take this opportunity to thank the gentleman publicly for his cooperation.

Mr. HAYS. I thank the gentleman for his statement.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GOVERNMENT PROGRAMS IN INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up House Resolution 175 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That there be printed with certain minor editorial, grammatical, and typographical changes, two thousand five hundred additional copies for the use of the Committee on Government Operations of House Report Numbered 2712, Eighty-fifth Congress, entitled "Government Programs in International Education."

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MUTUAL SECURITY PROGRAM—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 97)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

A year ago in concluding my message to the Congress on the mutual security program I described it as of transcendent importance to the security of the United States. I said that our expenditures for mutual security are fully as important to our national defense as expenditures for our own forces. I stated my conviction that for the safety of our families, the future of our children, and our continued existence as a nation, we cannot afford to slacken our support of the mutual security program.

The events of the intervening year have vividly demonstrated the truth of these statements. In this one year there have been crises of serious proportions in the Middle East, in the Far East, and in Europe. In each of these the strength built by our mutual security program has been of immeasurable value.

At the time of the difficulty in Lebanon the uneasy balance of the Middle East would have been far more seriously endangered if it had not been for the stability of other Middle Eastern countries which our mutual security program had helped build. Without our mutual security aid, Jordan, under severe pressures, would have faced collapse, with the danger of flaring conflict over her territory.

In the Far East, the firm stand of the Republic of China against the Communist attack on Quemoy would not have been possible without the arms and training furnished by our mutual security program and by the high morale promoted by the economic progress we have

helped forward on Taiwan. This successful local defense blunted an aggression which otherwise could have precipitated a major conflict.

In Europe today the Soviet Union has made demands regarding the future of Berlin which, if unmodified, could have perilous consequences. The resoluteness with which we and our allies will meet this issue has come about in large measure because our past programs of economic and military assistance to our NATO allies have aided them in strengthening the economies and the military power needed to stand firm in the face of threats.

While our mutual security program has demonstrated a high value in these tense moments, its military and economic assistance to other areas has undoubtedly had an equal value in maintaining order and progress so that crises have not arisen.

REALITIES OF 1959 AND AHEAD

I believe that these events of the past year and the stern, indeed harsh, realities of the world of today and the years ahead demonstrate the importance of the mutual security program to the security of the United States. I think four such realities stand out.

First, the United States and the entire free world are confronted by the military might of the Soviet Union, Communist China, and their satellites. These nations of the Communist bloc now maintain well-equipped standing armies totaling more than 6,500,000 men formed in some 400 divisions. They are deployed along the borders of our allies and friends from the northern shores of Europe to the Mediterranean Sea, around through the Middle East and Far East to Korea. These forces are backed by an air fleet of 25,000 planes in operational units, and many more not in such units. They, in turn, are supported by nuclear weapons and missiles. On the seas around this land mass is a large navy with several hundred submarines.

Second, the world is in a great epoch of seething change. Within little more than a decade a worldwide political revolution has swept whole nations—21 of them—with three-quarters of a billion people, a fourth of the world's population, from colonial status to independence—and others are pressing just behind. The industrial revolution, with its sharp rise in living standards, was accompanied by much turmoil in the Western World. A similar movement is now beginning to sweep Africa, Asia, and South America. A newer and even more striking revolution in medicine, nutrition, and sanitation is increasing the energies and lengthening the lives of people in the most remote areas. As a result of lowered infant mortality, longer lives, and the accelerating conquest of famine, there is underway a population explosion so incredibly great that in little more than another generation the population of the world is expected to double. Asia alone is expected to have one billion more people than the entire world has today. Throughout vast areas there is a surging social upheaval in which, overnight, the responsibilities of self-government are being undertaken by hundreds of millions, women are assuming new places in public life, old family patterns are being destroyed and new ones uneasily established. In the early years of independence, the people of the new nations are fired with a zealous nationalism which, unless channeled toward productive purposes, could lead to harmful developments. Transcending all this there is the accompanying universal determination to achieve a better life.

Third, there is loose in the world a fanatic conspiracy, international communism, whose leaders have in two score years seized control of all or parts of 17 countries, with nearly 1 billion people, over a third of the total population of the earth. The center of this conspiracy, Soviet Russia, has by the grimmest determination and harshest of means raised itself to be the second military and economic power in the world today. Its leaders never lose the opportunity to declare their determination to become the first with all possible speed.

The other great Communist power, Red China, is now in the early stages of its social and economic revolution. Its leaders are showing the same ruthless drive for power and to this end are striving for ever increasing economic output. They seem not to care that the results—which thus far have been considerable in materialistic terms—are built upon the crushed spirits and the broken bodies of their people.

The fact that the Soviet Union has just come through a great revolutionary process to a position of enormous power and that the world's most populous nation, China, is in the course of tremendous change at the very time when so large a part of the free world is in the flux of revolutionary movements, provides communism with what it sees as its golden opportunity. By the same token freedom is faced with difficulties of unprecedented scope and severity—and opportunity as well.

Communism exploits the opportunity to intensify world unrest by every possible means. At the same time communism masquerades as the pattern of progress, as the path to economic equality, as the way to freedom from what it calls "Western imperialism," as the wave of the future.

For the free world there is the challenge to convince a billion people in the less developed areas that there is a way of life by which they can have bread and the ballot, a better livelihood and the right to choose the means of their livelihood, social change and social justice—in short, progress and liberty. The dignity of man is at stake.

Communism is determined to win this contest—freedom must be just as dedicated or the struggle could finally go against us. Though no shot would have been fired, freedom and democracy would have lost.

This battle is now joined. The next decade will forecast its outcome.

The fourth reality is that the military position and economic prosperity of the United States are interdependent with those of the rest of the free world.

As I shall outline more fully below, our military strategy is part of a common defense effort involving many nations. The defense of the free world is strengthened and progress toward a more stable peace is advanced by the fact that powerful free world forces are established on territory adjoining the areas of Communist power. The deterrent power of our air and naval forces and our intermediate range missiles is materially increased by the availability of bases in friendly countries abroad.

Moreover, the military strength of our country and the needs of our industry cannot be supplied from our own resources. Such basic necessities as iron ore, bauxite for aluminum, manganese, natural rubber, tin, and many other materials acutely important to our military and industrial strength are either not produced in our own country or are not produced in sufficient quantities to meet our needs. This is an additional reason why we must help to remain free the nations which supply these resources.

The challenge that confronts us is broad and deep—and will remain so for some time. Yet our gravest danger is not in these external facts but within ourselves—the possibility that in complacent satisfaction with our present wealth and preoccupation with increasing our own military power we may fail to recognize the realities around us and to deal with them with the vigor and tenacity their gravity requires.

We have the national capacity and the national program to surmount these dangers and many more. We have the strength of our free institutions, the productivity of our free economy, the power of our military forces, a foreign policy dedicated to freedom and respect for the rights of others, and the collective strength of our worldwide system of alliances.

The effectiveness of all these in meeting the challenge confronting us is multiplied by our mutual security program—a powerful and indispensable tool in dealing with the realities of the second half of the 20th century.

I should like to outline how the principal elements of this program will serve the vital interests of our country in fiscal year 1960.

THE MUTUAL SECURITY PROGRAM FOR FISCAL YEAR 1960

The mutual security program which I propose for fiscal year 1960 is in the same pattern and has the same component parts as the program which the Congress enacted at the last session. To carry forward this program I ask $3,929,995,000.

I ask these funds to attain the two basic objectives of the mutual security program: military security and economic and political stability and progress.

THE MILITARY SHIELD

In view of the maintenance by the Communists of armed force far beyond necessary levels and the repeated evidence of willingness to use a portion of that force where the Communist leaders believe it would be a successful means to a Communist end, it is rudimentary good sense for the peoples of the free

nations to create and maintain deterrent military strength. We do this not through choice but necessity. It is not in our nature to wish to spend our substance on weapons. We would like to see these outlays shifted to the economic benefit of our own Nation and our friends abroad striving for economic progress.

Because the need for military strength continues, we seek to build this strength where it can most effectively be developed, deploy it where it can most effectively be used and share the burden of its cost on as fair a basis as possible. To this end, we and over 40 other nations have joined together in a series of security pacts. Some of our allies and close friends have joined in other supporting agreements. We have also made certain individual undertakings such as the Middle East resolution.

Each of the free nations joined in this worldwide system of collective security contributes to the common defense in two ways: through the creation and maintenance of its individual forces; through the support of the collective effort.

For our own military forces, which form a major element in the total security pattern, I have asked the Congress to make available $40.85 billion, to which must be added approximately $2.8 billion for atomic programs, largely for defense purposes. For our contribution of military materiel and training assistance to the collective security effort, I now ask the Congress to make available $1.6 billion. This amount is far below that needed for our share of the cost of improving, or even providing essential maintenance for the forces of our allies. It is a minimum figure necessary to prevent serious deterioration of our collective defense system.

These two requests, one for our own defense forces, the other for our share in supporting the collective system, are but two elements in a single defense effort. Each is essential in the plans of the Joint Chiefs of Staff for our national security. Each is recommended to you by the same Joint Chiefs, the same Secretary of Defense, and the same Commander in Chief.

Dollar for dollar, our expenditures for the mutual security program, after we have once achieved a reasonable military posture for ourselves, will buy more security than far greater additional expenditures for our own forces.

Two fundamental purposes of our collective defense effort are to prevent general war and to deter Communist local aggression.

We know the enormous and growing Communist potential to launch a war of nuclear destruction and their willingness to use this power as a threat to the free world. We know also that even local aggressions, unless checked, could absorb nation after nation into the Communist orbit—or could flame into world war.

The protection of the free world against the threat or the reality of Soviet nuclear aggression or local attack rests on the common defense effort established under our collective security agreements. The protective power of our Strategic Air Command and our naval air units is assured even greater strength not only by the availability of bases abroad but also by the early warning facilities, the defensive installations, and the logistic support installations maintained on the soil of these and other allies and friends for our common protection.

The strategy of general defense is made stronger and of local defense is made possible by the powerful defensive forces which our allies in Europe, in the Middle East, and the Far East have raised and maintain on the soil of their homelands, on the borders of the Communist world.

These military forces, these essential bases, and facilities constitute invaluable contributions of our partners to our common defense. On our part we contribute through our military assistance program certain basic military equipment and advanced weapons they need to make their own military effort fully effective but which they cannot produce or afford to purchase.

As we move into the age of missile weapons, this plan of collective security will grow in importance. Already intermediate range ballistic missiles are being deployed abroad. Our friends on whose territory these weapons are located must have the continued assurance of our help to their own forces and defense in order that they may continue to have the confidence and high morale essential to vigorous participation in the common defense effort.

The funds I now ask for military assistance are to supply to these partners in defense essential conventional weapons and ammunition for their forces and the highly complex electronic equipment, missiles, and other advanced weapons needed to make their role in the common defense effective.

As already pointed out these funds are asked on a minimal basis. Continuation of a sufficient flow of materials and of sufficient training for the year can be attained only by some additional cannibalizing of the pipeline, already reduced to a point where flexibility is difficult.

To summarize, through the mutual security program our friends among the free world nations make available to us for the use of our forces some 250 bases in the most strategic locations, many of them of vital importance. They support ground forces totaling more than 5 million men stationed at points where danger of local aggression is most acute, based on their own soil and prepared to defend their own homes. They man air forces of about 30,000 aircraft of which nearly 14,000 are jets, 23 times the jet strength of 1950 when the program started. They also have naval forces totaling 2,500 combat vessels with some 1,700 in active fleets or their supporting activities.

Over the years of our combined effort, these allies and friends have spent on these forces some $141 billion, more than 6 times the $22 billion we have contributed in military assistance. During calendar year 1958 they contributed $19 billion of their own funds to the support of these forces. On our part we have created and maintain powerful mobile forces which can be concentrated in support of allied forces in the most distant parts of the world. We know it would be impossible for us to raise and maintain forces of equal strength and with the immeasurable value of strategic location. Without the strength of our allies our Nation would be turned into an armed camp and our people subjected to a heavy draft and an annual cost of many billions of dollars above our present military budget.

Because the military assistance program is a vital part of our total defense, and to be certain that it serves its intended purpose fully and effectively, I have appointed a bipartisan committee of prominent Americans of the highest competence to examine this program and its operation thoroughly. I have asked them to make a report of their findings on the program, including its proper balance with economic assistance. Since its formation in late November of last year, the Committee has been vigorously pursuing its study, including personal visits to all major areas where military assistance is being rendered. The committee has already indicated to me that it will recommend an increase in the level of commitments for vital elements of the military assistance program, primarily for the provision of weapons to the NATO area. I expect to receive its written interim report shortly. I will, of course, give this report my most careful attention and will then make such further recommendations as are appropriate.

MAINTAINING ECONOMIC STABILITY

While our own and our allies' military efforts provide a shield for freedom, the economic phases of our mutual security program provide the means for strengthening the stability and cohesion of free nations, limiting opportunities for Communist subversion and penetration, supporting economic growth and free political institutions in the newly independent countries stimulating trade, and assuring our own Nation and our allies of continuing access to essential resources.

Two of these programs, defense support and special assistance, are specifically directed toward helping maintain order, stability, and, in certain countries, economic progress, where these are of material importance to the welfare of the United States itself.

Defense support: For most of our allies and friends the cost of the share which they bear of the common defense effort constitutes a heavy burden on their economies. Our NATO allies in Western Europe bear this entire economic burden themselves, receiving from us only advanced weapons and other essential items of military equipment and certain training. But for others the burden of defense vastly exceeds their limited resources. They, therefore, are forced to turn to us for economic help in maintaining political and economic stability.

We supply this assistance through our defense support program to 12 nations in which we are helping to arm large military forces. Eleven of these nations—Greece, Turkey, Iran, Pakistan,

Thailand, Laos, Cambodia, Vietnam, the Philippines, the Republics of China and Korea—lie along or are narrowly separated from the very boundaries of the Sino-Soviet bloc, subjected daily to the pressures of its enormous power. Several of them are also the sites of major U.S. military installations. The twelfth, Spain, is the strategically located site of other bases used by the United States. Together, these 12 nations are supporting 3 million armed forces—nearly one-half of the total forces of the free world.

Despite their proximity to Communist forces, most of these nations have pledged themselves to the worldwide collective defense plan. Greece and Turkey are among our NATO allies. Pakistan, Thailand, and the Philippines are among our SEATO allies and Cambodia, Laos, and Vietnam are protected through SEATO. Turkey, Iran, and Pakistan are active members of the Baghdad Pact which forms a connecting link of free world defenses between NATO and SEATO. Korea, the Republic of China, and the Philippines are joined with us in special mutual defense agreements.

For defense support, to make possible the needed contributions of these 12 nations to the common defense, I ask $835 million. I ask the Congress to recognize these economic needs of our partners and to provide the full amount I request.

Over two-thirds of this sum will be used for Turkey, Vietnam, Taiwan, and Korea. These courageous and strategically located nations—three of them the free areas of divided nations—are directly faced by heavy concentrations of Communist military power. Together they contribute nearly 2 million armed forces in the very front lines of the free world's defenses. These nations depend for survival on our defense support program. The remaining third of the funds will be for the eight other nations which rely on this help to enable them to make their valuable contributions to the common defense without serious harm to their economies.

These nations are contributing heavily to the defense effort in keeping with their abilities. Reducing the defense support we provide them will compel a reduction in the forces we wish them to maintain in our common defense or place a heavy additional burden on the already low standards of living of their people.

Special assistance: There are a number of other nations and areas of the world whose need is so great and whose freedom and stability are so important to us that special assistance to them is essential. In North Africa, for example, the newly independent Arab nation, Tunisia, is struggling to improve the economic and social conditions of its people while under strong external pressures. Its neighbors, Morocco and Libya, are also striving to build economic progress upon their newly acquired political independence. Another new nation, the Sudan, is an important link between the Arab world and rapidly growing central Africa and is intently working to maintain its independent course of progress in the face of strong Communist and other outside pressures. These nations are all new outposts of freedom in whose success we are deeply interested.

During the last year, as I have mentioned, Jordan has been subjected to severe pressures. Should Jordan be overwhelmed, the peace and stability of the Middle East would be endangered. But with its very limited internal resources, Jordan desperately needs continued substantial outside help.

West Berlin is a solitary outpost of freedom back of the Iron Curtain. In addition to the firm support which we and our NATO allies have assured West Berlin in the face of current Soviet threats, it is important that we show our support of its people by continuing our economic assistance to the beleaguered city.

Programs for health: I have on several occasions during the recent past sought to focus public attention on the great opportunity open to the United States in the field of health. The United States will continue to support and promote the accelerating international fight against disease in the coming fiscal year. The great campaign to eradicate the world's foremost scourge, malaria, is moving into its peak period of activity and need for special assistance funds. Of more than a billion people formerly exposed to the disease, half have now been protected and the movement is gaining strength and momentum as a true international effort. The substantial progress of this campaign as well as modern medical potential generally have opened new vistas of the conquest of mass disease through pooling of efforts.

I ask the Congress to make available funds to continue the program for development of medical research programs begun last year by the World Health Organization with the help of a grant from the United States. I also propose that the United States explore whether practical and feasible means can be found whereby progress can be made toward equipping those nations whose needs are greatest to provide in a reasonable time pure drinking water for their people as a method of attack on widespread waterborne diseases.

Added to the health programs now being carried on by our bilateral programs and through our voluntary contributions to the United Nations, these new programs will raise the health activities proposed for fiscal year 1960 under the mutual security program to a total value of some $84 million, exclusive of loans by the Development Loan Fund in this field. The total effort of the United States in the field of international health, including among other activities those conducted by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, will approximate $100 million.

For the nations I have mentioned and several others, for West Berlin, for such programs as those for health, for support to certain of our American sponsored schools abroad and for our contribution to the United Nations Emergency Force I ask $272 million in special assistance funds. I believe that the close examination which I expect the Congress to give each of these special needs will show that this request is conservative.

AIDING ECONOMIC PROGRESS

The request for funds for defense support and special assistance which I have outlined thus far are directed primarily at maintaining political and economical stability. But in our dynamic world of multiple revolutions this is far from enough.

In many nations of Asia and Africa per capita incomes average less than $100 a year. Life expectancies are half those of the more advanced nations. Literacy averages 25 percent. Affected by the revolutionary drives which are sweeping their regions, the peoples of the areas will tolerate these conditions no longer—and they should not. They are intently determined to progress—and they deserve to do so. If they cannot move forward, there will be retrogression and chaos, the injurious effects of which will reach our own shores. These newly independent peoples look to their present generally moderate governments for leadership to progress. If they do not find it, they will seek other leadership, possibly extremists whose advent to power would not only endanger the liberties of their own people but could adversely affect others, including ourselves.

Above all, these people must have hope that they can achieve their economic goals in freedom, with free institutions and through a working partnership with other citizens of the free world.

The leaders of the Soviet Union and Communist China are intently aware of the great revolutionary surges in these less developed areas, many of which are on the borders of the Communist bloc. Seeing in these new trends a historic opportunity, they have reversed their attitude of hostility to all nations not under their direct control. Five years ago they entered on a great diplomatic and economic campaign of wooing the new nations of Asia and Africa, even attempting to push their drive into Latin America. I reported on this campaign of trade and aid in my message to the Congress last year. It has increased in intensity in the intervening time. Communist bloc military and economic credits to 17 selected nations exceeded a billion dollars in 1958 alone, bringing the present total to $2.4 billion. The number of technicians supplied to 17 countries of Asia and Africa rose from 1,600 in 1957 to 2,800 in 1958.

Our own programs of technical cooperation and capital assistance are not mere responses to Communist initiatives. The reverse is true. This year will mark the 10th anniversary of our point 4 program. Capital assistance for development has been flowing to nations needing our help for many years. Even if the Communist bloc should revert tomorrow to its previous icy treatment of all free peoples, we would continue the warmth of our interest in and help to their determined efforts to progress.

Nevertheless, it is imperative that we understand the real menace of the Communist economic offensive. The great contest in half the globe, the struggle of a third of the world's people, is to prove that man can raise his standard of living and still remain free—master of his individual destiny and free to choose those who lead his government. The

Communist economic offensive presents the grave danger that a free nation might develop a dependence on the Communist bloc from which it could not extricate itself. This must not happen. We and other nations of the free world must provide assurance that no nation will be compelled to choose between bread and freedom.

The United States is determined to do its part in providing this assurance. For this purpose, in addition to channels of private investment and existing financing institutions, we have created two carefully designed instruments of national policy: the technical cooperation program and the Development Loan Fund.

Technical cooperation: To carry on our technical cooperation program some 6,000 skilled American men and women are now working in 49 countries and 9 dependent territories which have asked our help. They are advising high officials on problems of administering new governments. They are helping farmers raise their incomes by teaching them better methods of cultivation, irrigation, and fertilization and by introducing more productive seeds, poultry, and livestock. They are planning with local scientists for uses of atomic power and isotopes. They are attacking disfiguring and debilitating diseases and helping to increase the health and vigor of untold millions. They are helping to organize the educational systems which will bring literacy and the knowledge which is the power for progress.

In order to transfer our modern technical knowledge even more effectively, we will bring next year over 10,000 of the rising leaders of the less developed areas to study in the United States or in specially developed training programs in other countries.

To provide for the work of our technicians abroad and for these training programs I ask $179.5 million for fiscal year 1960. The increase in this sum over the current year is to expand programs recently begun in the newly independent and emerging countries of Africa, to intensify activity in Asian nations and to augment substantially cooperative programs with countries of Latin America.

I also ask $30 million to be available for our contribution to the companion technical cooperation and special projects programs of the United Nations, initiated by our own Government. I anticipate that increasing contributions by other members in the year 1960 will call for this increased contribution on our part.

As in recent years, I believe we should continue our annual contribution of $1.5 million to the technical cooperation program of the Organization of American States.

The Development Loan Fund: Administrative and technical skills, though essential to economic growth, cannot of themselves make possible the rate of progress demanded of their governments by the peoples of the newly independent nations. For this progress they must have capital—capital for the roads, telecommunications, harbors, irrigation, and electric power which are the substructure of economic progress and for the steel mills, fertilizer plants, and other industries which are fundamental to general economic growth.

Just as in the early decades of our own national development we depended upon the more highly developed nations of that period—England, France, and others—for capital essential to our growth, so do the new nations of this era depend on us and others whose economies are well established.

Two years ago the Congress, the executive branch, and several distinguished private organizations reexamined the needs of the newly independent nations for outside development capital and of the then existing sources. The independent but unanimous conclusion of these studies was that existing sources were and for the foreseeable future would be inadequate to meet even the most pressing needs. They recommended that there be established a new institution to provide long-term credits on flexible terms.

In the light of these findings, I recommended to the Congress and it established the Development Loan Fund, an agency of the U.S. Government especially designed to advance loans on a business-like basis for sound projects which cannot find financing from private or established governmental sources.

The Development Loan Fund in its little more than a year of active operation has established the sound and useful position that was foreseen for it. In this short time it has taken under consideration $2.8 billion in screened requests for loans. It has later determined that some $600 million were unacceptable or more appropriate for private or other public financing. Of its total capital of $700 million thus far made available by the Congress, it had by mid-February 1959, committed $684 million for loans to projects in 35 countries. For all practical purposes it is now out of funds for further loan commitments and has before it applications totaling over $1.5 billion with more being received almost daily.

In order that the Fund may continue to meet the most urgent needs of the nations depending on us, I have asked the Congress for a supplemental appropriation of $225 million to be available in the fiscal year 1959. This appropriation is under authorizations previously made but not used.

When I made my original recommendation to the Congress in 1957 for the establishment of the Development Loan Fund I urged that it be provided with capital for 3 years of operation and stated that based on observation of its progress within that period I would ask for longer term capitalization commencing in fiscal year 1961. The Congress chose to authorize capital initially for 2 years of operation. I now ask that the Congress authorize and appropriate $700 million to become available in fiscal year 1960, the third year of the fund. This sum will allow the Fund a level of activity no higher than it established in its first year of operation.

Consideration should continue to be given to capitalization procedures that will allow better long-range planning.

Private investment: These governmental programs of technical cooperation and capital financing of course only augment the investment in progress which comes from private sources. But they are indispensable and probably will be for a number of years because private investment, though very significant in the Western Hemisphere, does not and cannot in the near future be expected to supply more than a fraction of the capital needed by the new nations of Asia and Africa.

In order to encourage increased private investment in these areas, our Government has already undertaken a system of guarantees against loss from nonconvertibility of foreign currency receipts and from expropriation, confiscation, and war. To further stimulate such investment, I now request that legislation be enacted to allow similar guarantees against risks of revolution, insurrection, and related civil strife. I propose also that the Congress double the availability of such guarantees.

CONTINGENCY FUND AND OTHER PROGRAMS

The experience of this year has shown, as in the past, that there will arise each year contingencies for which funds will be urgently needed—but which cannot be foreseen at all or with sufficient clarity to program in advance. For the current year I asked $200 million for such eventualities. Heavy demands, arising from the crises in the Middle East and from needs elsewhere, have already been made on the $155 million appropriated—with several months of the fiscal year remaining. I still believe that $200 million is the smallest sum which safety and prudence recommend and I ask that this sum be provided for fiscal year 1960.

I recommend that we continue our support of the United Nations Children's Fund, our help in the resettlement of refugees from communism, our program of atoms-for-peace, and certain other small programs we are now engaged in. The International Cooperation Administration will need an increase in its administrative funds, particularly to help obtain more persons of high qualifications for service abroad and to strengthen our representation at key posts in Africa and Latin America. For all these purposes I ask $112 million.

SOME FISCAL CONSIDERATIONS

The total sum I request for the mutual security program for fiscal year 1960, $3,929,995,000 is slightly less than I asked last year. Each category and item in it has been weighed in terms of the contribution it will make to the achievement of the important objectives the program is designed to serve. The total amount is well under 1 percent of the gross national product our country will enjoy in the coming year. It is approximately 5 percent of our national budget. The greater part will go for military equipment to our allies and for economic support directly related to defense. The remainder, for aid to the economic growth we are most anxious to promote amounts to less than 2 percent of our national budget, under one-third of 1 percent of our national production. At the end of the present fiscal year the military assistance pipeline will be at the

lowest level in its history and will be further reduced by next year's expenditure which will substantially exceed the new appropriation I am now asking. The economic assistance pipeline will, as in recent years, be barely enough to keep the program flowing without serious interruption.

The true measure of this national security program is what we have gotten and will get for our expenditures and what the cost would be without it. Over the years we have received returns many times the value of our investment.

Our first great work, the Marshall plan, cost less than projected, ended on time, and revived Western Europe from the destruction of the war to a group of thriving nations, now among our best customers and strongest allies, many of whom are now joining with us in assistance to the newly independent nations.

Our military and economic aid has been indispensable to the survival and gradual progress of nation after nation around the perimeter of Asia from Greece to Korea and others in Africa and our own hemisphere. When I hear this program described as a giveaway or aid to foreigners at the expense of domestic programs, I wonder what sort of America we would have today—whether any funds would be available for any domestic programs—whether all of our substance would not today be devoted to building a fortress America—if we had not had such a program: if the key nations of Europe had been allowed to succumb to communism after the war, if the insurrectionists had been allowed to take over Greece, if Turkey had been left to stand alone before Soviet threats, if Iran had been allowed to collapse, if Vietnam, Laos, and Cambodia were now in Communist hands, if the Huks had taken control in the Philippines, if the Republic of Korea were now occupied by Communist China.

That none of these tragedies occurred, that all of these nations are still among the free, that we are not a beleaguered people is due in substantial measure to the mutual security program.

CONCLUSION

The realities of this era indicate all too clearly that the course of our country will be deeply affected by forces at work outside our borders. These forces if left to exploitation by extremists will inevitably lead to changes destructive to us. Yet with wisdom and tenacity it lies within our power to frustrate or to shape these forces so that the peoples directly concerned and our own Nation may be benefited.

We cannot safely confine Government programs to our own domestic progress and our own military power. We could be the wealthiest and the most mighty Nation and still lose the battle of the world if we do not help our world neighbors protect their freedom and advance their social and economic progress. It is not the goal of the American people that the United States should be the richest Nation in the graveyard of history.

In the world as it is today—and as it will be for the foreseeable future—our mutual security program is and will be both essential to our survival and important to our prosperity. It not only rests upon our deepest self-interest but springs from the idealism of the American people which is the true foundation of their greatness. If we are wise we will consider it not as a cost but as an investment—an investment in our present safety, in our future strength and growth, and in the growth of freedom throughout the world.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *March 13, 1959*.

COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Ways and Means may have until midnight tonight to file a report, including any supplemental views, on the bill H.R. 5640.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

ON THE QUESTION OF SUBSIDIES

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, we hear a lot about subsidies these days, and most of the criticism appears to be directed at the so-called subsidies to farmers. Some of those who have been most vocal in their criticism appear to have little conception of what a subsidy is, and have confused loans which are repaid with interest as being subsidies.

I have just read, Mr. Speaker, where the Federal Maritime Board has announced that the American Export Lines will get a construction subsidy of 48.3 percent of the cost of four new cargo vessels. According to the announcement, the subsidy is based on comparative costs in Japanese shipyards for vessels of similar size and speed.

To be specific, this one company will receive a subsidy in excess of $20 million for four ships which will be constructed by a California shipbuilding corporation, the low bidder on four ships costing $10,894,997 each, whereas the Board determined that vessels of the type planned for American Export Lines would cost approximately $5,555,000 each if built in Japan.

At the same time that one department of this administration is approving a subsidy of more than $20 million for just one company of an important and widespread industry, another branch of the Government, with the approval of the Secretary of Agriculture has approved the manipulation of the parity index in such a way as to take from one segment of American agriculture, namely the cotton producers of this Nation, some $60 million.

Without criticizing the Federal Maritime Board for looking after the interests of those it has the responsibility of representing, I would like to ask who in this administration is looking after the best interests of the farmer? Certainly, it is not the Secretary of Agriculture.

DAIRY PRICE SUPPORTS

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, everyone in the Nation's dairyland will be pleased at the announcement of the Secretary of Agriculture yesterday that current dollar support prices for manufacturing milk and butterfat will be continued through the marketing year which begins on April 1.

It is particularly pleasing to note that this action was based upon a decided improvement in the dairy picture during the current marketing year. Milk production is down. Total use of milk products has increased, and Government purchases have been substantially less.

The support prices announced by the Secretary represent an increase in the support rate to 77 percent, based on the March parity price, from the current 75 percent level.

This action by the Secretary gives the lie to those who have so loudly been proclaiming that his only interest is in driving farm prices lower. The Secretary's goal is to develop markets for farmers by moving farm products into consumption rather than Government warehouses, and his action yesterday is thoroughly consistent with that objective.

DIVERSION OF WATER FROM LAKE MICHIGAN

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 1) to require a study to be conducted of the effect of increasing the diversion of water from Lake Michigan into the Illinois Waterway for navigation, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H.R. 1, with Mr. SISK in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee rose on yesterday the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. BLATNICK] had 44 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Washington [Mr. MACK] had 44 minutes remaining.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. BLATNIK].

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. COOK].

Mr. COOK. Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to the passage of H.R. 1, princi-

pally because of its effect on navigation. Coming from a district which borders Lake Erie and contains some of the largest industrial ports on the Great Lakes, any proposal which would result in a decrease in the shipping so vitally necessary to our economy must be vigorously fought.

I am sympathetic with the needs of the Chicago area for the proper disposal and treatment of sewage wastes but it is not fair for one city to use the natural resources of the Great Lakes to solve a problem when no other city does so.

H.R. 1 would provide for a diversion of 1,000 cubic feet per second at Chicago in addition to the present diversion of 1,500 cubic feet per second plus domestic pumpage. This amount may not sound very large to the layman but measured in terms of gallons it would amount to 236 billion gallons per year. The present diversion alone is about 3,300 cubic feet per second made up of the 1,500 cubic feet per second permitted under a court decree and the estimated average annual domestic pumpage which amounts to about 1,800 cubic feet per second. Adding the additional 1,000 cubic feet per second which would be legalized by H.R. 1 would make the total diversion 4,300 cubic feet per second, or more than 1,000 billion gallons a year. There is no question in my mind but that 1,000 billion gallons a year taken from Lake Michigan would cause an appreciable lowering in the lake levels.

Although the bill provides for temporary diversion of 1 year only, there is no question in the minds of those who oppose it that this would be a "foot in the door." In fact, even the last sentence in the bill states that—

> The report * * * shall contain recommendations with respect to continuing the authority to divert water from Lake Michigan into the Illinois Waterway.

In fact, there would be no point in making a study with an actual diversion unless it were to form the basis of a permanent diversion, which might even be of greater amount.

If we are to have an additional diversion of 1,000 cubic feet per second, with a subsequent lowering of lake levels, experts have stated that the carrying capacity of the United States and Canadian Great Lakes fleet would be reduced by more than 1 million tons a year with a direct economic loss to the vessel industry of better than $2 million per year. This is not hard to understand when we are told by shipping experts that 1 inch of difference in lake levels represents 100 tons of cargo per vessel. I have no breakdown as to what this loss would be for the three major harbors in my district, Ashtabula, Fairport Harbor, and Conneaut, but I am sure it could represent a substantial blow to the economy. The situation becomes particularly paradoxical when it is considered in the light of the tremendous sums of money which are being spent to provide for the St. Lawrence Seaway and to deepen the connecting channel of the Great Lakes. The U.S. portion alone of the cost of the St. Lawrence Seaway is $140 million and the cost of dredging the connecting channels is about the same, making a total of almost $300 million without even considering the proposed deepening of the various harbors of the Great Lakes to accommodate the deeper draft traffic. The total investment for navigation might easily run into the neighborhood of a half a billion dollars. Should this huge investment be jeopardized by permitting the diversion of water for the use of one city?

I have not mentioned the losses in hydroelectric power production which the experts have testified will occur on the St. Lawrence River and at Niagara to both the Canadian and U.S. plants, since they do not directly affect my district, but they certainly should be taken into account in reaching a decision on H.R. 1.

As a final argument, I understand the Canadian Government has recently expressed its opposition to this diversion. It would be most unwise, in my opinion, for the United States to permit unilaterally such a diversion without first negotiating with the Canadian Government and arriving at some equitable arrangement for payment of damages to Canada.

For the foregoing reasons, I am obliged to oppose the passage of H.R. 1.

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. VAN ZANDT].

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, my opposition to H.R. 1 is based on the following letter dated February 9, 1959, from Attorney General Anne X. Alpern, of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, which I should like to read at this time:

COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA,
DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE,
Harrisburg, February 9, 1959.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I wish to call to your attention the very serious adverse effects upon Pennsylvania of H.R. 1, introduced into the House by Mr. O'BRIEN of Illinois and referred to the Committee on Public Works. This bill would permit the Metropolitan Sanitary District of Chicago to divert out of the Great Lakes 2,500 cubic feet per second of water for a period of 12 months.

At the present time, the Metropolitan Sanitary District diverts 3,500 cubic feet per second from the Great Lakes Basin pursuant to a decree of the U.S. Supreme Court, in addition to diverting an unknown quantity of water for domestic pumpage. The right to divert domestic pumpage is now being tested before the U.S. Supreme Court by the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and the other Great Lakes States.

The additional diversion which would be authorized by this bill would lower the level of Lake Erie 1½ to 2 inches. While this may appear to be but a slight matter, it would affect adversely all riparian landowners and seriously interfere with the operations of the Port of Erie. Much effort and money have been expended to maintain a deep channel at this port. The lowering of the lake level vitiates this work.

Moreover, the lowering of the lake level would result in a loss of 1 to 1½ million tons of shipping each year for each inch by which the lake level is lowered. The Great Lakes barges, which carry so much of the commerce of this region, are loaded to the nearest inch. Consequently, the maintenance of lake levels is of utmost importance to the shipping industry and the commerce of the Great Lakes area. This commerce is a significant factor in Pennsylvania's economy.

The lowering of the lake level also affects the power potential at Niagara. Since a large section of Pennsylvania will be among the preferred users when the hydroelectric power is developed, this potential loss of cheap power also affects Pennsylvania adversely.

The diversion of water, one of our most precious natural resources, out of its watershed area in order to benefit some other area, constitutes a new and dangerous principle of law.

Very sincerely yours,

ANNE X. ALPERN,
Attorney General.

Mr. Chairman, as Attorney General Alpern states, if H.R. 1 is enacted the level of Lake Erie would be lowered from ½ to 2 inches and the loss to harbors, utilities, shipping, and so forth, would run into millions and millions of dollars. Since these losses represent a significant factor in Pennsylvania's economy, as a member of the Pennsylvania delegation in Congress I am unable to support H.R. 1.

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Chairmain, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from New York [Mr. OSTERTAG].

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to H.R. 1, and ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks. This bill would authorize the diversion of additional waters from the Great Lakes, St. Lawrence system. I have voted against this bill when it was previously before the House, and it is my intention to vote against it again. As a Representative from the great State of New York, I feel it is incumbent upon me to vigorously oppose any legislation which would deprive the people of the State of New York of their full and established rights in the natural resources of the Great Lakes, of Lakes Erie and Ontario and the Niagara and St. Lawrence Rivers. I cannot favor legislation that is designed to help the Metropolitan Sanitary District of Greater Chicago with its problem of sewage at the expense of the people of New York State or of the other Great Lakes States.

The Corps of Engineers has conducted a thorough study of this matter and has reported its findings. The corps' study shows clearly that increased diversion would have a very definite and harmful effect on navigation and power.

I would like to point out, Mr. Chairman, that the Government of the United States and the Government of the Dominion of Canada have both expended, and are expending, large sums of public funds in the development of the St. Lawrence Seaway. I believe that this development will be considerably injured if existing lake levels are impaired.

Further, diversion of water from the Great Lakes to other areas would not only materially injure the interests of 50 million people who today reside in the Great Lakes area and who are today the beneficiaries of this great natural resource, but would also reduce the amount of water available to the New York State Power Authority, which has recently put into operation its project on the St. Lawrence River and commenced construction of its project on the Niagara River to use all of the waters at Niagara Falls made available to the United States for power development under the 1950 treaty with Canada.

As Governor Rockefeller pointed out in his statement presented to the Public Works Committee, the New York State Power Authority is financing the abovementioned projects by borrowings without State or Federal credit. Its bonds are backed by the revenue it receives from the sale, at no profit, of electric power. These projects were financed on the basis that the power authority was entitled to use the flow of the Niagara and St. Lawrence Rivers undiminished, except as provided in the 1930 decree of the Supreme Court. Any reduction in the amount of water available for power will reduce the revenue to the power authority which necessarily will increase the cost of electricity to consumers. Thus, the monetary benefits which H.R. 1 will give to the Sanitary District of Greater Chicago will be paid in part by the people of the State of New York and this cost will exceed the entire benefit received by the Sanitary District of Chicago.

The Supreme Court has jurisdiction over water diversion. It can grant permanent or temporary relief to Chicago when the need is shown, and has done so. The Court, as recently as 1956, granted Chicago temporary increases in diversion. Obviously, only lack of merit keeps Chicago from going to the Court for the diversion authorized in this bill.

Mr. Chairman, in the interests of the people of New York State and the people of the Great Lakes States, I urge the defeat of H.R. 1. It is an unconstitutional deprivation of the rights of the people of those States. If there is a need for further sewage treatment by the city of Chicago, it is the responsibility of that great municipality.

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. BALDWIN], a member of the committee.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. Chairman, although because of the position taken by the Canadian Government, I feel it is necessary for me to oppose this bill. I want to be among those who recognize the very fine and diligent efforts that have been carried on by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. O'BRIEN], the author of this bill. I would like also to recognize the diligent and able efforts by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. KLUCZYNSKI] in our committee in pressing for enactment of this bill. As was pointed out yesterday, the Canadian Government has taken a position in opposition to this measure. There was some discussion yesterday as to whether the position of the Canadian Government was taken in good faith and whether it was stimulated by the Department of State. However, it seems to me, we have to accept the objection of the Canadian Government on its merits. It is a sovereign government and we have to consider that if it registered its objections in a proper message to our Government, these objections must be considered as being in good faith. There was some question raised yesterday as to whether under the treaty of 1909, the Canadian Government has the right, that is the legal right, to register objection to any diversion of water from Lake Michigan. Perhaps, the best way to determine the position of the Canadian Government on this point is to quote from its own message. I would like to quote one paragraph which appears on page 15 of the committee report. This is the second paragraph in the message submitted by the Canadian Government on February 20, 1959, to our State Department. This is what they say:

> While recognizing that the use of Lake Michigan water is a matter within the jurisdiction of the United States of America, it is the considered opinion of the Canadian Government that any authorization for an additional diversion would be incompatible with the arrangements for the St. Lawrence Seaway and power development, and with the Niagara Treaty of 1950, and would be prejudicial to navigation and power development which these mutual arrangements were designed to improve and facilitate.

These are the basis upon which the Canadian Government has founded its case in recording its objection to this bill. We are now, Mr. Chairman, at a period of time in our history when our relationship with other governments is very important to us. Last year we had some vivid demonstrations in South America of what happens when we neglect to some extent proper relationships with our sister countries in this hemisphere. These sister countries when they have found that they are neglected, have reacted adversely to us. That was demonstrated by numerous riots and other demonstrations last year during the trip of the Vice President of the United States to South America. Now we have had some of the same kind of things happen with Canada in the last year. We have had Canada pointing out that we have not given very careful consideration to their needs by some of our steps relative to tariffs. This bill is another case where Canada in good faith is reporting to us their views on an issue on which they feel that they are properly concerned. So the question is: Are we going to ignore these views or are we going to give proper consideration to a friendly nation immediately to the north of us whose good will in the years to come is very, very important to us.

I realize the interest of the city of Chicago in this bill, and they are rightly interested in it; they have a real problem; there is no question about it. I do not think we should minimize it.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BALDWIN. In just a moment, as soon as I complete my statement.

I do not think we should minimize that problem. At the same time we are at a critical stage of world problems, and the friendship of neighboring nations on this continent is extremely important to us. For these reasons it seems to me that the position of the Canadian Government, as far as my own personal vote is concerned, must prevail. I therefore feel I must vote against this bill.

I now yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. I wonder if the gentleman would inform me whether our State Department regards the Dominion of Canada as part of the American hemisphere or as part of Europe; does the gentleman know?

Mr. BALDWIN. I am not a member of the State Department. I have never asked them that question.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. I think the gentleman would find out and it might interest him to learn that our State Department regards Canada as part of Europe, even to such an extent that in our Committee on Foreign Affairs the Inter-American Subcommittee does not have jurisdiction of Canada; Canada is under the jurisdiction of the European Subcommittee. With that knowledge perhaps the gentleman will begin to understand a little better the shifting position of Canada as regards what Chicago desperately needs at this time. The spirit of hemispheric solidarity, which would prevail if divorced from European influences, certainly would not permit Canada to be put in the position of blowing hot and cold on something so vital to the health and welfare of the people of Illinois and which if not done might result in a frightful plague of disease.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER].

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Chairman, a moment ago my distinguished friend, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. VAN ZANDT], referred to a letter from the attorney general of Pennsylvania in which it was stated that the enactment of this legislation would result in a significant lowering of the level in Lake Erie. I asked for this time for the purpose of ascertaining whether or not the statements made by the attorney general of Pennsylvania are well founded.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALTER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. YATES. As I remember the statement that was made by the attorney general of Pennsylvania it was to the effect that the proposed study would result in lowering the level of Lake Erie by at least 2 inches.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. One to two inches.

Mr. YATES. This statement is an example of the misinformation which is being spread by opponents of the bill. It seeks to convey the impression that a permanent diversion is sought in this bill. That is not true.

The Corps of Army Engineers is an objective body and certainly has no ax to grind in connection with this bill. I now read from the report of the Corps in Washington dated May 1, 1958, entitled "The Effect on the Great Lakes and the St. Lawrence River of an Increased Diversion of 1,000 Cubic Feet Per Second by the City of Chicago for 1 Year," and from that report, paragraph 2, which is headed "Effects on Lake Outflows and Levels," I read the following: "Lakes Michigan-Huron, one-fourth of an inch," would be the resulting maximum lowering of the level.

"Lake Erie, three-sixteenths of an inch"—less than one-quarter of an inch.

"Lake Ontario, three-sixteenths of an inch."

There is no effect at all on Lake Superior.

You will remember the debate in the House both yesterday and today on what effect this will have on navigation be-

cause of the lowering of the levels. The Corps of Army Engineers in the same report states that the effects on navigation would be as follows:

> The effect on navigation of lowering the levels of Lakes Michigan, Huron, and Erie would be small. The levels of Lakes Michigan and Huron would be lowered between 0.01 and 0.02 foot during two and a fraction navigation seasons; those of Lake Erie would be lowered by the same amount during one and a fraction navigation seasons.
>
> These small temporary lowerings of lake levels, although they would tend to adversely affect navigation except during very high lake stages are not considered to have any measurable effect on Great Lakes navigation.

Mr. WALTER. I thank the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania has consumed 3 minutes.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. FLYNN].

Mr. FLYNN. Mr. Chairman, it is with mixed emotions that I arise on behalf of the cities of Racine and Kenosha in the State of Wisconsin and on behalf of the State of Wisconsin as a whole to discuss with you the question of the request of the city of Chicago to divert 1,000 cubic feet of water per second from Lake Michigan into their sanitary canal.

My emotions are mixed because I know from firsthand experience, from observation and not from hearsay the disastrous effects upon Wisconsin that the present water diversion is having and I know the calamity that will befall my home State if Chicago is permitted to divert further water from the Great Lakes. On the other hand, there are in this body from the city of Chicago, Representatives appearing in favor of the diversion for whom I have the highest respect and admiration. Chicago being as close to my hometown as it is, I have a tendency to lovingly look upon it as my foster home. I have enjoyed many good times there. I have many friends and relatives living in that city. So it is with deep concern that I rise to protest to my friends and to point out to them that their proposal would cause lasting and irreparable harm running into untold multimillions of dollars to my home district and to the people living in the other congressional districts of Wisconsin and the Great Lakes States.

Instead of talking of the anticipated future damage as so many of my colleagues have done or about the Canadian objection which has been so emphatically stated in the record, or about whose pressure is affecting whom, let me discuss with you the untold and serious damage that already exists from present diversion. Damage which will be multiplied many times if further diversion were to be permitted. In this regard I might state that the city of Chicago already diverts 1,500 cubic feet of water per second for industrial use and 1,800 cubic feet of water per second for human consumption. This, with the consent and permission of the Supreme Court of our land. The Court through referees has studied the problem and realized that further water cannot be diverted without causing serious and irreparable harm to Chicago's neighbors. Chicago is now in effect appealing to this Congress from an adverse decision of the Supreme Court. This is an old trick that many astute lawyers have often tried. Today we even see reckless people who would abolish the Supreme Court in order that they might accomplish their end on matters where the Court does not agree with them. Fortunately the vast majority of Americans have full faith and confidence in the integrity, the ability, and the sincerity of the Highest Court in our land and they are willing to give full credence to its decisions and they are not willing to permit its authority to be weakened by those who would avoid its mandates.

The existing water diversion of 3,300 cubic feet per second in my home district, the First of Wisconsin, and in particular in the cities of Kenosha and Racine, has caused great damage. In Racine the deep river inlet of the harbor which should be used by deep-draft oceangoing vessels operating through the St. Lawrence Seaway has been lowered a total of 21 feet. Twice already existing pilings and piers have had to be driven further down for the reason that as originally installed with the drop in the water level, the pilings were exposed and as a result were deteriorating and the piers were so far above the water level that they could not be used. At the present rate, it will not be long until we again have to drive our pilings and piers along our river harbors and inlets further into the ground. The result is that nothing but the shallowest of boats could possibly navigate our harbor and we will not be able to accommodate deep-draft oceangoing vessels. This will be a tremendous loss in the years ahead for the reason that our greatest leaders have envisioned the St. Lawrence Seaway as a source of commerce, wealth, and new prosperity for the American heartland.

The entire concept of the waterway is based upon a deep-draft navigable channel to the sea. The channel, however, cannot be used unless we have harbors to load and unload our ships and 1 inch in the middle of the lake means many feet in the river inlets and harbors and means ruination of the harbor for shipping.

This is just one of the many losses it has caused. The rivers of my area, where, as a boy, I went swimming in 8 to 10 feet of water, have been caused to dry up in the summertime to a point where in many places you can walk across the creeks and river bottoms without getting your shoes wet. This is not an idle statement. It is a fact that exists largely because of existing diversion of water by Chicago.

In Kenosha where the city harbor authority built ramps along the river inlet to the harbor for the use of pleasure craft, we see today an awesome sight, and I can produce pictures to back this up, of boat ramps set high on the banks resting many feet above the water level of the harbor; absolutely no use to the boatowner. While this exists the water level continues to get ever lower. Imagine what will happen when another thousand cubic feet per second is removed from the Great Lakes by the city of Chicago.

Even these damages to my home district, which I presume are multiplied many times over in the other lake cities, are insignificant when compared to the damage that is caused by the inability to use these inland rivers for either commerce, shipping, or pleasure and because of the fact that the lowering of the water level in the rivers, in the harbors, and in the Great Lakes results in a general lowering of the water table for the entire area. Water cannot rise above its source, and after the water level goes down, so goes down the water table and I need not explain to those farmers among you the effect of an ever-lowering water table on agriculture.

Time does not permit me to protract into the future the many severe economic losses upon my district that the further diversion of water will make but may I close by admonishing you that the ramifications of Chicago's request are varied, are many and are serious, that it is a matter already in the hands of the Supreme Court of our Nation. A Court which has already granted Chicago all that she is entitled to and all that can be granted without irreparable harm being caused surrounding cities and foreign nations. Does this body want, under circumstances such as these, to reverse the decision of the Supreme Court, and in addition to the lawmaking power with which this Congress is vested to take over the law interpreting powers which is vested in the courts of our land.

In closing may I say that we of Wisconsin value deeply our friendship and our social and economic intercourse with Chicago and its citizens, but we find ourselves much in the position of the farmer who living peacefully side by side with his neighbor for 40 years and who regarded the neighbor's children as his foster children, finally after many years found himself in court with his neighbor fighting over a lot-line dispute over where the fence belonged on the back 40 acres. We find this dispute with Chicago most distasteful and we ask you in the interests of both Chicago and the Great Lakes' States and Canada, to give this matter your serious, your deep, your honest consideration, and do unto us as you would that we, under similar or like circumstances, would do unto you.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLYNN. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. YATES. Does the gentleman attribute this drop entirely to the diversion at Chicago?

Mr. FLYNN. Not entirely, but the great bulk of it is due to diversion at Chicago.

Mr. SCHERER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLYNN. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. SCHERER. The gentleman just stated that there is a diversion of 1,800 cubic feet per second for domestic pumpage at Chicago.

Mr. FLYNN. That is my understanding.

Mr. SCHERER. That is right. There is a 1,500 cubic feet per second diversion for navigation purposes.

Mr. FLYNN. That is correct.

Mr. SCHERER. If this additional 1,000 cubic feet per second is granted, that will make a total diversion for the city of Chicago of 4,300 cubic feet per second.

Mr. FLYNN. That is right.

Mr. SCHERER. Does the gentleman know how much that is in gallons per day? That is 286 million gallons per day, which is twice the flow of the Delaware River.

Mr. FLYNN. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from Illinois [Mrs. CHURCH].

Mrs. CHURCH. Mr. Chairman, this is the fourth time that I have risen in this House to express the need not only of the city of Chicago but of what we call the Chicago urban area, and even farther, for this 1,000 cubic feet per second additional, which would result in an almost infinitesimal lowering of the lake level, as attested by the Army Engineers.

I am not first of all going to review the history of the legislation or of our efforts; I am not going into the technical points that are involved, though I think that we have them on our side; but I am going to speak first about one feature that has bothered me yesterday and so far today. I could understand that Ohio, a large part perhaps of Indiana, and New York State might be able to claim that the sanitation involved is a matter of so-called local interest to Chicago and its immediate environs.

But, as one whose district runs from the northern limits of the city of Chicago up to Wisconsin, it is incredible to me that any Congressman who has a district bordering on Lake Michigan, either in Michigan or Wisconsin, should fail to see the difficulties, the dangers, the dire effect that would come to his district, also, if pestilence hits Chicago because necessary and sufficient water is not allowed. Such danger, at the present moment, is not imminent, I hasten to say. I, too, have a district, I remind you, north of Chicago. There were one or two people in the northern part who once felt, perhaps, that this legislation was not needed; but they were soon converted when they realized that the population along the southern and southwestern end of Lake Michigan is contiguous and that the effects of anything that happened in Chicago would spread up right through my district to Wisconsin and even to Michigan, where so many Illinois people already own summer homes. I would like to say to the gentleman from Wisconsin that pestilence does not stop at the State line. If it should hit Waukegan, Zion, and Winthrop Harbor, it would soon be up in Kenosha and Racine. In addition, I have had close personal experience with varying lake levels of Lake Michigan. It has not been lake diversion which has caused the present lower level of Lake Michigan. I have been up in Wisconsin within the last 8 years when the lake level was so high that you could not find a mooring post for small boats in the harbors, that was not under water. I definitely feel, gentlemen, that we should keep this contest on a basis of fact and not on a basis of claiming that 1,000 cubic feet per second more could bring terrific damage to an area. Man cannot control nature, when it comes to lake levels; and what controls the level of Lake Michigan is very definitely the progress and the proceeds of natural action. No lake diversion at any spot on the Great Lakes could be held accountable for what has been fortunately a decrease from that recent time of high level during which we had to rescue people, with their goods and chattels, because Lake Michigan was exceeding its normal boundaries.

As I have said, this is the fourth time that I have joined with my colleagues from the Chicago area of the State of Illinois in pressing on this floor for enactment of legislation authorizing the testing of the effect of increased diversion of water from Lake Michigan into the Ilinois Waterway. In the 82d Congress—and in each succeeding Congress—I have introduced a companion bill to that introduced by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. O'BRIEN], the dean of the Illinois delegation; and I have once more this year introduced such companion bill to H.R. 1.

We who know full well the need of the State of Illinois for the proposed action are grateful to this House for its previous votes of approval on this legislation.

The need for this increased diversion has grown over these years during which we have sought enactment of the necessary legislation; and now, more than ever, we need prompt congressional action and prompt Presidential approval of H.R. 1.

As I have done in the past, I would emphasize particularly the need for increased water diversion in order to protect the health and life of the growing population in the Chicago area and along the Illinois Waterway.

The authorized diversion from Lake Michigan into the Illinois Waterway is still limited by law to only 1,500 cubic feet of water per second—despite the fact that there has been a population increase of well over 1 million people in the area since 1933, when the existing limit was originally set. At the time that the 1,500-cubic-feet limitation was set in 1933, it was stated in the report as follows:

> It does not appear possible to arrive at a conclusive determination whether this flow will afford suitable sanitary conditions on the waterway after the sewage purification plants at Chicago have been completed and placed in operation.

Since 1950, the Sanitary District of Chicago has been providing the complete treatment for substantially all of its sewage. However, the Sanitary District now testifies that there is serious pollution in the upper 50 to 60 miles of the Illinois Waterway and that there can be no marked improvement until more fresh water is available.

Competent authorities feel that the enactment of this legislation before us in this 86th Congress would be of great benefit to the people of Chicago and the State of Illinois in permitting an adequate study to be made of the effect of such increased diversion on both sanitation and navigation.

Furthermore, although it has been alleged by adversaries of the program that lake levels will be so materially reduced through such increased diversion as to effect and reduce hydroelectric power, the report sent by Major General Itschner, Chief of Engineers, U.S. Army, to the Secretary of the Army under date of January 29, 1957, stated that a temporary increased diversion of water from Lake Michigan into the Illinois Waterway would have very little if any effect as regards navigation and power production in the Great Lakes area. This opinion was similarly expressed in an earlier report, dated June 14, 1955, of the International Ontario Board of Engineers of the International Joint Commission.

I would point out, moreover, that this particular bill under discussion—H.R. 1—provides at this time only for a 1-year-trial period of actual increased diversion of 1,000 cubic feet per second in water diversion from Lake Michigan, in place of the 3-year period of increased diversion proposed in previous legislation.

I once again join with my colleagues from the Chicago area in hoping and expecting that H.R. 1 will not only receive congressional approval—but Presidential approval as well. I am, of course, hoping that as a first vital step, this House once again will give its prompt approval to this legislation which—I repeat—is vitally needed to help solve the sanitation problems of a rapidly expanding metropolitan area.

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. DOOLEY], a member of the committee.

Mr. DOOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I regret very much to be at issue with the distinguished chairman of my subcommittee, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. BLATNIK], and with the distinguished gentlewoman from Illinois [Mrs. CHURCH], but I rise in opposition to H.R. 1 because of the effect this experiment would have on the Niagara power project and because I believe it represents an imposition on the riparian rights of lake shore communities in this country and in Canada.

As Robert Moses, New York State's most distinguished hydroelectric power authority, said in a statement made through one of his assistants who testified for him before the Public Works Committee, "The diversion is unnecessary." He did not add, but he implied, that since the navigational requirements of the Illinois Waterway were met by the present cubic-feet-per-second flow, the additional flow now sought is actually to take care of sewage in the canal, the treatment of which should be properly provided for by the Sanitary District of Chicago.

Mr. Moses' other arguments are equally convincing. He claims that an additional flow of 1,000 cubic feet per second would deprive the power authority of legal and esential rights and put an unfair burden on the consumers of Niagara and St. Lawrence power.

It would set a precedent for actions which would adversely affect the power authority's interests as well as those of a large area of the Nation.

Also, it is debatable whether Congress has the authority to grant, as this bill would have it do, to the Metropolitan Sanitary District of Greater Chicago—at the expense of other interests in the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence system, including the interests of the power authority, its bondholders and its customers—this special privilege.

It would nullify the decisions of the International Joint Commission which have been approved by the Governments of the United States and Canada.

The power authority as a licensee of the Federal Power Commission for the construction of the St. Lawrence and Niagara power projects is entitled to use all the United States share of the St. Lawrence and Niagara Rivers water available for power. This means that the power authority has the right to use one-half of the available water of the St. Lawrence and one-half of the available water of the Niagara, less 5,000 cubic feet per second. On the basis of its licensed right to use such waters the power authority has constructed the St. Lawrence power project at a cost of $350 million, according to Mr. Moses, and has borrowed from private investors and is in the process of constructing the Niagara project at a cost of more than $700 million. Both projects are being financed without State or Federal credit. The power authority, a nonprofit public corporation, is entirely dependent upon the revenue from the sale of power to pay off its bonds. Any reduction in the amount of water available reduces the power which can be generated and sold and such loss of revenue must be borne by the power users.

In accepting its licenses, in financing these projects and in fixing the rates for the sale of power to cover the costs, the Power Authority relied on the decree of the Supreme Court of April 21, 1930, limiting the amount of water that can be diverted from the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence system at Chicago to 1,500 cubic feet per second in addition to domestic pumpage. That decision in *Wisconsin* v. *Illinois*, 281 U.S. 696, decreed that it was the power authority's licensed right to use the United States' share of the water available for power and the legal right of the State of New York as a downstream riparian State to benefit by the natural flow of the Niagara and St. Lawrence Rivers.

The full effect of the additional diversion at Chicago, which this bill would authorize would not be experienced in the Niagara and St. Lawrence Rivers for at least 4½ to 5 years. Under this bill there would be no increase in diversion for 18 months after it becomes law and it takes about 3 to 3½ years for a temporary diversion to reach its maximum effect after which the effect gradually diminishes over a period of 15 years. By the time such a diversion would reach its maximum effect both of the power authority's projects will be in full operation.

Moreover, under this bill the diversion is not required to be uniform. The only limitations are that the total annual average diversion shall not exceed 2,500 cubic feet per second as stated on page 2 of the bill, and no water shall be allowed to be diverted during times of flood.

This means that great quantities of water can be diverted during the dry season just so long as the total annual average does not exceed 2,500 cubic feet per second and that the maximum effect of such diversion will be felt in the Niagara and St. Lawrence Rivers 3 years later in the dry season when water is most needed for power development.

If, as made plain in the "Aide Memoire," dated January 6, 1958, setting forth Canadian views with respect to this additional diversion, the effect of the diversion is to be offset by diversions into the Great Lakes Basin from the Canadian Long Lac-Ogoki works, but such additional water diverted into the Great Lakes system is to be available only to Canadian interests, the power authority will suffer the full loss of the additional water diverted at Chicago.

The power authority has based its marketing arrangements on the historic flow of the Niagara and St. Lawrence Rivers, and on the sale of virtually all of the kilowatts produced in any one month. If the power authority is deprived of the historic flow of these rivers by a 1-year additional diversion at Chicago of 1,000 cubic feet per second and Canadian power interests do not share the loss, it will suffer a total revenue loss of $1,038,000.

Added diversion at Chicago will not benefit navigation in the Illinois Waterway. It will adversely affect navigation on the Great Lakes. It will benefit the Sanitary District. And it will adversely affect the power authority and its customers to a far greater extent than the benefit to the district. There is, therefore, a serious question whether Congress has the constitutional power to authorize such additional diversion. Proponents of the legislation are well aware of the history of the litigation which preceded and followed the decree of the U.S. Supreme Court on April 21, 1930, in *Wisconsin* v. *Illinois* (281 U.S. 696), which I mentioned previously, and Congress is conscious of the doubt which that litigation casts on the power to enact legislation having such consequences as I have indicated.

If not unconstitutional, it certainly is unfair to deprive navigation and downstream power interests of their rights solely for the monetary benefit of the Sanitary District of Chicago.

On July 2, 1956, the International Joint Commission issued an order setting forth a broad plan for the regulation of flows from Lake Ontario which had been approved by the Governments of Canada and United States. On July 14, 1958, it approved a method of regulation recommended by the International St. Lawrence River Board of Control. The criteria stated in the plan of regulation which had to be met by the method of regulation requires that the levels of Lake Ontario be controlled during navigation season. This criteria was based on the historic flows from the other Great Lakes. If the supplies of water are to be depleted by additional diversions at Chicago these determinations of the International Joint Commission will be nullified. This would give rise to "questions of matters of difference" between the United States and Canada "involving the rights, obligations, or interests of either in relation to the other or to the inhabitants of the other," because it would affect Canadian navigation and power interests downstream from Lake Ontario. Therefore, the question of the effect of an added diversion at Chicago is one which should be referred to the International Joint Commission pursuant to the provisions of article IX of the Boundary Waters Treaty of 1909.

In the light of all the circumstances and particularly in view of the effect additional diversion would have on New York's power project, I vigorously oppose this increase and hope it will meet the same legislative fate as it did on previous occasions. To enact this bill into law will be to impose on the riparian rights of down lake residents, and also to deprive an important power project of waterpower and revenue.

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DENT].

Mr. DENT. Mr. Chairman, I would not inject myself into this debate except that I served for many years in Pennsylvania as chairman of the Great Lakes Compact Committee and, therefore, have had some experience with this problem before.

If this were a permanent diversion we were making today I would necessarily have to oppose it, but I think the gentlewoman from Illinois put her finger on the main argument that should be discussed here, and that is the direct need of the city of Chicago at this moment. I doubt very much, and I say this from knowledge of the past, if Chicago will be able to meet the need it will have 1 year from now without some additional diversion; but at this moment it is imperative to the health of the city.

Mr. SCHERER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question on that point?

Mr. DENT. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. SCHERER. That very question of a possible pestilence facing the Chicago area from pollution was put to the counsel for the committee of the Sanitary District of Chicago. He said that in his opinion if such a situation was faced by the Chicago area, the Supreme Court would grant relief upon application by the city of Chicago.

Mr. DENT. The Supreme Court, if I am not mistaken in past history, did grant relief and granted it in a figure 50 percent greater than the request now made by H.R. 1 in this Congress.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DENT. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. YATES. The gentleman is exactly correct. The fact the Supreme Court granted such relief does not mean

the Congress cannot also consider the question.

Mr. DENT. That poses a question. I have heard it said we have no right as Members of Congress to give this right of diversion to the State of Illinois. That, of course, poses the question as to whether the Supreme Court or the Congress, or both have the right, or neither one has the right. I believe that the Congress has the right.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DENT] has expired.

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. Mr. Chairman, although we are pressed very much for time, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DENT] is making such a splendid statement that I must yield him 2 more minutes.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DENT. I yield.

Mr. YATES. Inasmuch as it has been consistently contended by opponents of this bill that the Supreme Court alone has jurisdiction and that the Congress does not, may I read to the gentleman from the decision of the Supreme Court of the United States in the case of *Wisconsin* v. *Illinois*, 281 U.S. 179, in which Justice Holmes said the following:

> All action of the parties and the Court in this case will be subject, of course, to any order that the Congress may make in pursuance of its constitutional powers and any modification that necessity may show should be made by this Court.

So that Congress does have the authority to consider this matter and to act.

Mr. SCHERER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DENT. I yield.

Mr. SCHERER. The case that the gentleman cited says that with reference to navigation, Congress does have the power.

Mr. DENT. Well, the question of the relative importance of navigation over sanitation is one that you will have to discuss with someone who is wiser in such matters than I am. Personally, I think that the sanitation angle is of greater importance to the membership of this Congress at this moment than any future profit or nonprofit from the St. Lawrence Seaway or any other navigation project. This is a matter of extreme importance to the whole citizenry of the State of Illinois let alone the city of Chicago or the Great Lakes Compact Commission. It has done a magnificent job meeting the demands on its sanitary canal up to this moment. But the question of economics and time cannot be set aside by any Supreme Court decision or any action of this Congress. We have to give the relief now on the basis of need and the need is as has been testified to over the years in our compact agreements and I, for one, believe this Congress would be derelict if it did not give the city of Chicago this right, a modest request in face of the problem.

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BYRNES].

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I do not believe in giving preferential treatment to one community to the detriment of the rest of the country.

I am therefore opposed to H.R. 1, the Chicago water diversion bill.

It has been clearly established that this bill would cause serious financial damage. It would injure American and Canadian shipping by about $2 million annually and decrease power output at the Niagara and St. Lawrence hydroelectric plants by over $1 million annually.

Furthermore, the lowering of the water level in the Great Lakes by H.R. 1 would partly negate the costly dredging in connection with the St. Lawrence Seaway and would also multiply damages resulting from the present low water cycle of the lakes.

Besides being harmful to other interests on the Great Lakes, this bill is unnecessary.

Although the only stated purpose of the bill is to study the effect of increased diversion upon navigation, the Corps of Engineers has already testified that increased diversion would not improve navigation upon the Illinois Waterway but would adversely affect navigation upon the Great Lakes. The Supreme Court and recognized authorities have agreed.

Moreover, the Corps of Engineers is now making another study of the effects of Chicago diversion and to my knowledge has never expressed any desire for additional diversion to aid in this study.

Another reason why congressional action is unnecessary is that this issue is now and has always been within the jurisdiction of the Supreme Court and is in fact the subject of litigation at the present time.

If the Supreme Court is overruled and congressional approval is given to one community to drain water from the Great Lakes, then on what grounds can we deny other communities in the basin the same right?

In fact, if this bill is enacted, how are we to answer those who are proposing uses for Great Lakes water outside the basin itself?

And what about those who want to use Great Lakes water for regulatory purposes on the Mississippi? Or those who want it for overcoming salinity in the New Orleans water supply?

It should also be remembered that the passage of this bill would provide a basis for Canada to divert water from the Columbia River into the Fraser River as has been proposed. It has been pointed out that such a diversion would reduce the flow of the Columbia into the United States by 25 percent with consequent serious effects upon the many power projects and shipping and fishing interests on the American end of the river.

We are not against the use of Great Lakes water for any legitimate purpose. That water is being used by many cities and industries right now. However, the important thing is that every user returns the effluent to the Great Lakes with the exception of Chicago which discharges it down the Mississippi and into the Gulf of Mexico.

The real or imagined problems of one community on the Great Lakes should not be permitted to take precedence over the welfare of all of the people dependent on the preservation of the present character of the Great Lakes Basin.

We in the Great Lakes States protest this attempt to deprive us of one of our most precious assets—the waters of the Great Lakes—without our consent and against our will and without giving consideration to all the problems such an action would create.

Of course, it is obvious why Chicago would rather go to the Halls of Congress than argue the merits of her case in the nonpolitical atmosphere of the Supreme Court.

The real reason behind the perennial demand for additional diversion is simply that Chicago wants more water to flush out her sanitary canal. It is a lot cheaper for Chicago to use the free water from the Great Lakes than to construct adequate sewage treatment facilities as every other city must do.

If Chicago is really interested in seeking a solution to her sewage problems, a survey can be conducted without H.R. 1. Additional drainage of water from Lake Michigan is not needed to show what is wrong with Chicago's sewage treatment facilities.

For years Chicago has been demanding Lake Michigan water on nearly every pretext imaginable. She has argued she needs water for recreation, for community use, for agriculture, for restoration of fisheries, for public health, for atomic power, for navigation, and for war production purposes.

This year's demand is for a $545,000 experiment with the Federal Government footing the bill. It supposedly is of a temporary nature, but it doesn't take much insight to know Chicago intends the bill to be an opening wedge. There would be no point in conducting a test unless something permanent were in mind. It is pertinent to give some consideration to the size of the camel which is trying to put his nose into the tent. As damaging as would be 1 year of increased diversion, continued acceptance would be disastrous.

The most important thing about this bill, in my opinion, is that it would open a Pandora's box of dangerous precedents.

I would like to call the attention of the House to a resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin. It is as follows:

JOINT RESOLUTION MEMORIALIZING CONGRESS REGARDING THE DIVERSION OF WATER FROM THE GREAT LAKES

Whereas the city of Chicago and its suburbs attempted, prior to 1900, to dispose of their sewage by digging the Chicago sanitary canal across the Continental Divide and diverting water from Lake Michigan to discharge the sewage into the Mississippi watershed; and

Whereas the U.S. Supreme Court restrained this diversion in 1930 and required the area to develop other means of sewage disposal, but since then a veritable parade of other reasons for directing water from the Great Lakes have been proposed, including the desire to reduce the salty content of the lower

Mississippi by diverting water from Lake Michigan; and

Whereas the program of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Basin is rapidly shaping up into a plan which will enhance the economic life of that area; and

Whereas the persistent efforts of the advocates of diversion to make inroads into the Great Lakes water supply are disrupting and in fact nullifying any long-range plan for the development of the waterways of the Great Lakes; and

Whereas the U.S. Supreme Court has provided an equitable plan for the allocation of the waters of the Great Lakes which is subject to modification whenever the advocates of diversion can provide the necessary data to cause the Court to modify its order of 1930 and 1956: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the assembly (the senate concurring), That Congress be and it hereby is petitioned to refrain from disrupting the longstanding order of the Supreme Court because:

1. The authorization of increased diversion of waters from the Great Lakes must of necessity affect the development of lake ports and lake shipping adversely;

2. The issue which involves engineering decisions and international considerations should be made by means of the judicial process; and

3. The valuable resources contained in the waters of the Great Lakes ought not to be disposed of without the consent of the States abutting thereon; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States; to the Committee on Public Works, U.S. Senate, and to the appropriate committee of the House of Representatives; to Senators and Representatives from the State of Wisconsin; to the attorneys general of the Great Lakes States opposing water diversion; to the Great Lakes Harbors Association; to the Great Lakes Compact Commission; and to the Lake Carriers Association.

———, *President of the Senate.*
LAWRENCE R. LARSEN, *Chief Clerk of the Senate.*
GEORGE MOLINARO, *Speaker of the Assembly.*
NORMAN C. ANDERSON, *Chief Clerk of the Assembly.*

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as she may desire to the gentlewoman from Washington [Mrs. MAY].

Mrs. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the fact that this controversy has existed for a number of years and has been thoroughly aired in committee and I would like to thank the Honorable RUSSELL MACK for his excellent consideration and treatment of this vital subject.

I am opposing passage of H.R. 1 because State Department witnesses in testimony before the House Public Works Committee have stated that passage and approval of this bill would give Canada an excuse and a precedent for diverting water from the Columbia River in Canada to the Fraser River in that country.

The Bureau of Reclamation, Bonneville Power, and the U.S. Corps of Engineers had invested $1,900 million in facilities along the Columbia River below the Canadian border which would be adversely affected by any diversion from the Columbia in Canada. Such action would cause damage amounting to millions of dollars annually, including power production in the Columbia River Valley of the United States. Any such action would cause untold hardships from which the people of this vast section of the United States could never recover.

If Canada should divert the Columbia River water, thus lowering the level of the river in the lower stretches, navigation would be imperiled and shipping would be seriously crippled.

I believe the people of the United States are concerned over any precedent action such as the Chicago plan, which would give Canada an excuse to divert Columbia River water.

Certainly this is no time to upset our relationship with the people of Canada. The people of the United States and Canada and their chosen representatives must approach the mutual questions involved in the development of the Columbia River Basin in the same spirit, realizing that their problems are mutual and call for wise solutions. Only in this way, can people on both sides of this international boundary be assured of maximum benefits from this great river.

Canada and the United States are dependent upon each other, both militarily and economically. Our people have an estimated $14 billion invested in Canada and its future. Frankly, the United States has unnecessarily irritated our Canadian friends.

The critical time is here for complete and permanent agreement to the end that we may share in friendship the wonderful benefits of these river resources in terms of navigation, hydroelectric power, atomic energy, irrigation and reclamation, fisheries, flood control, and recreation.

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROBISON].

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Chairman, in the few minutes allotted to me I will be unable to give as much time as I would like to a further discussion of the many and compelling reasons why this legislation—H.R. 1—should be defeated or, at the least, returned to committee. I can only summarize those reasons.

As a Representative from the State of New York, I join with my colleague on the committee, the gentleman from New York [Mr. DOOLEY], in asking you to consider the probability that the implementation of this legislation, in its implied, long-range and intended, if not so stated, effect, will place in jeopardy the benefits which will arise not only to the people of the State of New York but to all the American people as a result of the imminent completion of the St. Lawrence Seaway.

The seaway will become a reality in a matter of months. Millions of dollars have been spent in construction of this great project, and millions of dollars have been, are being, and will be spent to deepen the connecting lake channels and the lake ports themselves. As an example, this year's Federal budget includes more than $2 million for further deepening work in Buffalo's harbor. Any lowering of lake levels will add to these costs or nullify such expenditures to the amount of many millions of dollars, as well as inflict an even greater loss upon the navigation interests using these waters.

As for hydroelectric power, the New York Power Authority has completed the so-called St. Lawrence power project at a cost of $350 million, and is now constructing the Niagara project at an estimated cost of $700 million. Both projects are being financed without State or Federal credit. The private investors who have loaned their savings to the authority have done so relying on the good faith of this Government, through the Federal Power Commission, in giving the authority the license right to use all of the historically available U.S. share of the waters of the St. Lawrence and Niagara Rivers. It would, therefore, be manifestly unfair, if not unconstitutional, for this Congress to impair, by this legislative method, the property rights of the authority and of its investors, acquired by virtue of such license.

This body has, I believe, the duty to consider the constitutionality of its acts. To my mind, there is serious doubt that the power given this Congress to regulate commerce between the States gives it the power to destroy such commerce, as might well be done here, as well as a strong possibility that the proposed diversion constitutes a taking of the property of the downstream owners and proprietors in the Great Lakes chain. Should we act in the face of such doubt, when this very matter is now pending before the Supreme Court, the proper body to consider the legal rights impaired and liabilities incurred by the proposed additional diversion?

I recognize that the objections I have been summarizing up to this point are of particular concern to the people of my State, and of the other Lake States. Perhaps we are inclined to overstate them because of our proper provincial concern. But even if so, there is a still more compelling and urgent reason for the defeat or delay of H.R. 1.

I am referring, of course, to the aide memoire handed by the Canadian Government to our State Department under date of February 20, 1959. Some mention was made here yesterday of political influence having been brought to bear, somehow, to induce Canada to file her note of protest, and that the protest represents a change in the heretofore Canadian attitude toward this diversion problem.

It does not seem to me, Mr. Chairman, that we, here, have the right to even speculate about why Canada has protested, or why she has changed her mind, if indeed she has. All we can and should consider is that Canada now says that any authorization for an additional diversion from Lake Michigan at Chicago would, in her opinion, be incompatible with the arrangements for St. Lawrence Seaway and power development, and with the Niagara Treaty of 1950, and would be prejudicial to navigation and power development which these mutual arrangements were designed to improve and facilitate.

This official protest is fact not fancy. We should not, we cannot ignore it without running the risk of seriously and adversely affecting our relations with our great and good neighbor to the north. Is 1959, Mr. Chairman, the time for us to risk losing even a small measure of the historic Canadian-American friendship? It seems to me that, like human next-door neighbors, friction usually develops between nations, as next-door neighbors, over small incidents, unintentional slights, and inconsiderate behavior. All of us have noted, I presume, with some concern the recent instances when there have been brief periods of strain between our Government and Canada. Let us not add to this situation.

It was also argued yesterday that Canada has no real, no valid basis for her objections. Perhaps that is so, but she has the right to protest, and to have the merits of that protest duly considered, not here in this legislative body, but in a proper tribunal of an international judicial nature, or by the International Joint Commission established by the Boundary Treaty of 1909.

Let us also remember, Mr. Chairman, that irrespective of our treatment of our neighbor, the manner in which we will act here will be watched by the entire world community to see if we are ready to depart from the traditional manner in which we have, heretofore, scrupulously honored our international obligations and good manners to the letter.

I submit there is no reason, no justification for us to be urged to pass this bill today in the face of this international question. Our committee only concluded its hearings on H.R. 1 a few days ago, the committee report was only available yesterday morning, the minutes of the hearings are not yet available for even the members of the committee to study, to say nothing of my colleagues who are not members of the committee and have had little or no opportunity to be advised of or consider the serious implications hidden in this seemingly simple and innocent-appearing legislation. I hope and trust H.R. 1 will be defeated or returned to our committee for further consideration.

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from New York [Mr. DULSKI].

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Chairman, the fresh water bodies of the Great Lakes are one of nature's generous gifts to America, and in no way can be considered as municipal in scope, to be exploited, polluted, or plundered, without due regard for the rights of everyone concerned. To cover up for the years of past neglect and poor planning and operation of its sanitary district, Chicago is now attempting to foist its problem onto the backs of all of its neighbors bordering the Great Lakes without as much as a "by your leave" in regard to the damages it may cause.

Mr. Chairman, over 3 years ago Buffalo was instrumental in creating a port authority. The city of Buffalo turned over $28 million worth of assets, extended loans to the authority, and so forth, having faith that we would become a seaport on the St. Lawrence Seaway. The Army Corps of Engineers received appropriations of some millions of dollars for deepening the harbor.

Buffalo, one of the great milling centers in the world, is also known for its huge steel mills and, as a great railroad center, knows that with the St. Lawrence Seaway becoming a reality, it must make some sacrifice. Some of the grain vessels are now being diverted from our port but again there will be other areas of shipping which will be attracted to the Buffalo port.

Our neighbor across the way, Canada, has stated its views as follows:

> While recognizing that the use of Lake Michigan water is a matter within the jurisdiction of the United States of America, it is the considered opinion of the Canadian Government that any authorization for an additional diversion would be incompatible with the arrangements for the St. Lawrence Seaway and power development, and with the Niagara Treaty of 1950, and would be prejudicial to navigation and power development which these mutual arrangements were designed to improve and facilitate.
>
> The point has been made repeatedly by Canada that every withdrawal of water from the basin means less depth available for shipping in harbors and in channels. Additional withdrawals would have adverse effect on the hydroelectric generation potential on both sides of the border at Niagara Falls and in the international section of the St. Lawrence River, as well as in the Province of Quebec, and would inflict hardship on communities and industries on both sides of the border.

All of the other agencies drawing water from the Great Lakes Basin are thankful for the blessings of this great body of water and have the courtesy of returning the volume of water, after use, back into the same basin of water from which it was drawn—but not Chicago. It wants to take the water from Lake Michigan, use it, and then let it flow into the Illinois Waterway rather than pump it back, after treatment, to Lake Michigan, for this is an economic matter costing money, which is objectionable from the viewpoint of those who benefit from this water diversion, if they are able to pass the bill and its resulting problems along to their neighbors in the way of lower water depths with ensuing navigational problems, receding shorelines, damaged recreational areas, and a reduced water flow over Niagara Falls—all damages which are either irreparable, or of a nature that would take years to overcome.

The people of Chicago who are responsible for sanitary matters in that area have long cast an envious eye upon the great body of fresh water bordering it for a great many years now to the point where, I think, it has destroyed their incentive and initiative to solve their problems by paying their own bills and rendering their neighbors harmless from their depredations.

I say to the Members of this great body in Congress that how well we care for the resources afforded us by the Great Lakes will depend the future happiness and prosperity of the people in the communities bordering these Great Lakes.

I reiterate my firm conviction that as a matter of public policy, any water diverted from a basin should be returned, after use, to the same basin from which it was drawn, to maintain present standards and balances, and to protect and preserve the well-established rights and equities of all parties concerned with the waters of the Great Lakes.

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MURPHY].

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Chairman, as a supporter of H.R. 1, the lake diversion bill, I should like to make the following statement regarding the diversion of water from Lake Michigan by the Metropolitan Sanitary District of Chicago.

It is quite apparent that this question involves several issues which are definitely not pertinent to the purpose of the survey. The question has been before the Congress during several sessions, and as I view the purposes as set out in H.R. 1 and the numerous arguments pro and con as to the effect of the diversion of an additional 1,000 cubic feet of water per second from the Great Lakes, which is primarily requested for the improvement of sanitation conditions and the elimination of pollution from the Illinois Waterway, the engineers have stated, and it is the consensus, that the diversion of water for over a period of 3 years might have a tendency to lower the level of Lake Michigan to the extent of five-eighths of an inch. This, I understand, is definitely theoretical and based on a preliminary survey.

H.R. 1 suggests and recommends a definite survey for a period of 1 year. The first 6 months of this survey will not require the diversion of any additional water from Lake Michigan; also, in the 6 months' period immediately following there will be no increase in the authorized diversion.

I should like to call attention to the great increase in the population in the metropolitan area of the city of Chicago, which, naturally, causes additional sewage passing through the treatment plants in order to remove pollution. This cannot be done without additional water.

The numerous objectors to this survey have only the fear as to what might happen if the diversion actually occurred and should prove to affect the level of the Great Lakes. This, however, is not contemplated and I see no reason, as a matter of public safety and public health, that the immense population living along the Illinois Waterway should not be given the benefit of this survey and the benefits to be derived therefrom.

Representing the Third Congressional District of Illinois in the city of Chicago, and having been affiliated for a number of years in an official capacity with the city of Chicago, I know of where I speak and know how my district has increased in population with the building of many new residential and commercial areas in order to keep abreast of the changing times.

I firmly hope that this survey will be permitted and prove that the additional diversion of water will in no way affect our neighbors from adjacent States.

I further believe that this is predominantly one of the most essential surveys, from the point of public health, that is presently before the Congress and it should not be considered, as some of the

opponents of the bill infer, a matter of personal convenience to the electric power generating stations on the waterway.

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VANIK].

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Chairman, there has been a great dispute about the effect of diversion on lake levels, and you have heard many conflicting figures cited. I think it is extremely regrettable that the record of the testimony and the hearings are not available to the Committee and will not be available for 10 days. It seems to me that we should save the expense of printing these proceedings since they will serve no useful purpose to this Congress.

Mr. Chairman, I want to express my vigorous opposition to this proposal to legalize the taking of more water from Lake Michigan and the Great Lakes Basin for the purported sanitary needs of Chicago, the navigational needs of the Cal-Sag Canal, and the power facilities at Lockport. By this action Congress is asked to deny and contradict the basic riparian rights of all the States and communities which abut the Great Lakes drainage system and artificially create new rights in these waters all along the Mississippi Basin to the Gulf of Mexico.

Mr. Chairman, the issue involved in this debate transcends the local conflict between the Chicago area and the many communities of the lower lakes which are competing for use of the Great Lakes waters. It also transcends the traditional competition between the seaboard ports and the ports of the Great Lakes. The question is, Should one section of the country, for its own purposes, be permitted to withdraw water from the Great Lakes, which are the property of this Nation, Canada, and the citizens of the several States?

The issues involved transcend personal respect and devotion for the sponsors of this legislation—for whom I have the highest regard. The issue is simply this: Shall the Congress of the United States be used to raid the riparian or waterside rights of all the co-tenants of the Great Lakes Basin?

There have been conflicts in Congress before over water. On this subject no individual Member can feel indifferent to the issues involved. The harmful and wrongful precedents established by this legislation will, at some time or another, or in some way, affect every single Member of this House.

On this issue almost all Ohioans in Congress are joined in opposition. Our attorney general has protested the further withdrawal of Great Lakes water at Chicago. The Governor of the State of Ohio—the widely known and respected Michael V. DiSalle, today renewed his plea in opposition to diversion in the following message:

> The persistent efforts of those who would divert water from the Great Lakes are disrupting and nullifying any long-range plan for the development of the waterways of the Great Lakes.
>
> Ohio is greatly interested in the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Seaway which is rapidly advancing and expanding the economic life of this area. Ohio will use every resource possible to prevent further diversion of water from the Great Lakes. The State of Ohio is against H.R. 1.

At this point, I want to take opportunity to commend the splendid efforts of my distinguished colleague, the Honorable GORDON SCHERER, of Ohio, for his splendid efforts and leadership in opposition to this proposal.

Mr. Chairman, to the people who constitute the wealth of this land, the freshwater supplies are America's prime asset and must be guarded.

Increasing water needs and falling water table of the several States are rapidly approaching a national crisis. Ohio, Indiana, Pennsylvania, New York, and even Illinois are threatened with reduced water tables, along with an increase in their populations. As a matter of fact, more and more communities as far away as 100 miles from the Great Lakes are looking to the day when they can tap the Great Lakes for a water supply for life, for industry, and for their very sustenance. We can anticipate a tremendous development of urban growth along the New York Thruway and the Pennsylvania, Indiana, and Ohio Turnpikes. Someday three will be one continuous band of cities along these highways. These new communities are going to need water, and the only source for that water is the Great Lakes Basin.

Secondly, the commerce of the Great Lakes cannot be placed in jeopardy by the self-interest of one city. In Cleveland the huge ore-carrying vessels drag their bottoms in the mud of a shallow river in order to reach their unloading berth. We cannot afford any loss of water in this part of the Great Lakes. We have tremendous investments in shipping facilities, and we would be exposed to the adverse effect of a lowered level if this legislation were to become law. It would have a disastrous effect along the entire Great Lakes Seaway, as has been previously indicated.

Chicago's need for water is not for life but for waste. To permit that city to flush its industrial wastes into the lower Illinois and Mississippi downstate areas is a wrongful act, and those people in the lower areas who believe they will enjoy a bonanza of water for commerce will soon discover they have received an increased gallonage of pollution and refuse too dense to sail boats in.

Along with other Great Lakes cities, my city has spent millions of dollars for expanded port facilities. The prospect of lowered lake levels through this contemplated action is disheartening indeed to every Great Lakes city preparing for seaway commerce.

This private bill—and that is what it is—seeks to divide America, attracting seaboard support in the hope that lower lake levels will hurt seaway commerce, luring the South with more water for Mississippi Basin commerce, luring private power support on the promise of more water for private power at Lockport and less for public power in New York. It dissolves the traditional unity and common purpose of the Great Lakes cities in the Great Lakes region.

I hope this legislation is defeated.

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from New York [Mr. LINDSAY].

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Chairman, I wish to commend the gentlemen from New York [Mr. ROBISON and Mr. DOOLEY] for the excellence of their remarks and to associate myself with those remarks.

The State of New York has a great deal at stake in this legislation and can be seriously prejudiced by its enactment. However, to me the compelling and overwhelming argument is the one that was made, particularly by the gentleman from California, Mr. BALDWIN, to the effect that where there is a pending protest from a neighboring nation now is not the time to act hastily or precipitously in this fashion.

I would, therefore, vote against the legislation on those grounds alone, quite apart from the position of my own State of New York.

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SCHERER].

Mr. SCHERER. Mr. Chairman, earlier in the debate today on this issue there was some discussion of the testimony of the assistant attorney general from the State of Pennsylvania. It was indicated that this young lady was in error in her testimony.

As has been stated, these hearings are not available, but I have a rather distinct recollection of her testimony before the committee. As I recall, she did not say that the granting of this 1,000 cubic feet per second diversion for 1 year would lower the lake level from 1 to 2 inches, or more. Everybody knows it would not do that. What she did point out in her testimony is that Chicago today has a 3,300 feet per cubic second permanent diversion. That water is never returned to the lakes, and that permanent diversion, to which will be added, if this legislation is passed, an additional 1,000 cubic feet, will cause a lowering of the lakes of more than 2 inches. And, the testimony of the assistant attorney general of Pennsylvania in that respect has been supported by other testimony. Today, with Chicago's diversion of approximately 3,300 cubic feet per second, it has already permanently lowered the lake level approximately 2¼ inches.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, does not the testimony show that the diversion by Canada from the Albany region has increased the level by 5 inches, so that the diversion by Chicago of its amount has not affected the Lake Michigan level?

Mr. SCHERER. Will the gentleman from Illinois deny the fact that the permanent diversion that Chicago has now, which no other city or State on the Great Lakes has, namely, 3,300 cubic feet per second, which amounts to more than 2 billion gallons of water a day, has permanently lowered the level of the lake by more than 2 inches?

Mr. YATES. I will say that the testimony shows that Chicago's diversion has been offset by the diversion by the Canadians into Lake Superior. The levels of the lakes are higher as a result

of the Canadians' diversion and the withdrawal of the water by Chicago has not equaled it.

Mr. SCHERER. There is no doubt but that your last statement is right, but Canada can stop that diversion any time she wants to.

Mr. YATES. Can you imagine Canada stopping its diversion?

Mr. SCHERER. Oh, yes.

Mr. YATES. On the contrary, Canada would like more water to feed her powerplants at Niagara and the St. Lawrence.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. GRAY].

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 1. As a member of the Committee on Public Works, I have listened to this argument concerning lake diversion for the past 4 years. I honestly believe that the opposition to this legislation is more traditional than real. The legislation is badly needed by the city of Chicago. It does not affect my district in downstate Illinois therefore I can speak as an impartial observer. Chicago is now diverting water from Lake Michigan without damage to the Great Lakes States or shipping and I cannot possibly see how any damage would result from an additional 1,000-cubic feet-per-second diversion. I also fail to see why my friends from the West fear Canada will be angry and want to divert water from the Columbia River when they already have a precedent set by present diversion if they want to use that as an excuse. I cannot stretch the imagination to believe that lake ports or shipping will be hurt by lowering lake levels one-fourth of an inch by the additional diversion. This is the figure the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers gave us as the amount of affected level. All the bill does anyway, is to study the effects of additional diversion, therefore I cannot see why anyone would want to stop Chicago from getting this valuable information and submitting it back to our committee and the Congress. I urge immediate passage of this legislation.

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. LIBONATI].

Mr. LIBONATI. Mr. Chairman, the diversion bill incorporates the plea of a hard-pressed community to petition the Congress for help to meet its needs for studying the present precarious problems; for the treatment of sewage and waste, so necessary for the health of millions of people within the environs of Chicago and Cook County.

It is purely a crisis brought about by the increase of services so necessary in a growing community.

The U.S. Supreme Court in a previous ruling set up a 1,500 cubic feet per second diversion. The present act sets up a thousand cubic feet per second for a complete study to be conducted by the Army engineers, such diversion limited to a period of 1 year.

The study will determine navigation and water pollution problems and a systematic analysis of water conservation and the study of the continued lowering of water tables during the past 15 years.

The factors involved may be the answer to flood control and distribution of excess waters.

One thing is certain, no community can afford in its conscience to deny the needs of persons of another community in this great land.

The fresh water facilities and natural water areas belong to all of the people—and just because some communities have no such interest or problems does not dictate to good conscience of the citizenry to disregard and deny people of another community the cooperation to make possible the solution of a problem that threatens the lives and well-being of its people's very lives.

The health of a community is everyone's concern. To obstinately refuse to cooperate to bring about its protection is un-American.

If the Congress refuses to help the people of Chicago—then perhaps the U.S. Supreme Court will, by its own edict, carry out the purposes for which its previous decision was written. Then we may suppose that the same objectors will wail out the old wolf cry that the Supreme Court is legislating again.

The rights of the people of Illinois to take sufficient water to meet their moderate needs is as right as the law of survival—so be it—and with the help of God-fearing Congressmen and Senators who love all Americans equally, this study must be made, the crisis is now, the long-range effects of any experiment is for tomorrow. No great harm can result from this program. At most a lowering of five-eighths of an inch in the Great Lakes Basin can result.

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BOYLE].

Mr. BOYLE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 1 introduced in the House, in this session of the 86th Congress, by the dean of the Illinois delegation, Congressman O'BRIEN.

The House Public Works Committee has held extensive hearings in the 82d Congress—H.R. 6100—Sheehan bill, 83d Congress—H.R. 3300—Jonas bill, 84th Congress—H.R. 3210—O'Brien bill, and the 85th Congress—O'Brien bill—H.R. 2—on legislation similar to H.R. 1 and said committee has heretofore approved all of the aforesaid bills.

The bill in its present form—H.R. 1—specifically limits the increased diversion to 1 year. The provisions of the instant bill follow the principles approved at the Senate hearing of its Subcommittee on Public Works of the 2d session of the 85th Congress on H.R. 2. They were then approved by the Bureau of the Budget, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, the Army Engineers and the State Department. Canada earlier stated it had no objection to a proposed 1 year temporary increase in diversion of 1,000 cubic feet per second.

H.R. 1 specifically divides the 3-year proposed study period into the following four phases or periods:

First phase: A 6-month period of study to develop study plans, and so forth—no increased diversion.

Second phase: A 12-month period of the stream survey in the field to establish existing conditions—no increased diversion.

Third phase: A 12-month study under conditions of the increased diversion—annual average increase of 1,000 cubic feet per second diversion for 1 year.

Fourth phase: Six months required to prepare the final report to the Congress—no increased diversion.

This bill—H.R. 1—authorizes the State of Illinois and the Metropolitan Sanitary District of Greater Chicago, under the supervision and direction of the Secretary of the Army, to temporarily withdraw from Lake Michigan at Chicago, for a period of 1 year, an additional amount of water of 1,000 cubic feet per second—over the presently authorized diversion of 1,500 cubic feet per second—to enable the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, in cooperation with the Secretary of the Army—acting through the Chief of Engineers—to study, over a 3-year period as above detailed, the effect thereof in the improvement in navigation conditions and other improvements along the Illinois Waterway resulting from such increased diversion and to report to the Congress the results of such studies and their recommendations before June 1, 1962.

The Illinois Waterway—a Federal navigable waterway—was opened for navigation March 1, 1933, and Colonel Sultan, Army district engineer, Chicago district, in his report on the matter, House Document No. 184, 73d Congress, 2d session, September 1933, stated that the 1,500 cubic feet per second of water diverted from Lake Michigan at Chicago—authorized in the U.S. Supreme Court decree of April 21, 1930, as "necessary for the purpose of maintaining navigation in the Chicago River as a part of the port of Chicago" and subsequently authorized for navigation of the Illinois Waterway by the River and Harbor Act of 1930—plus the Chicago treated sewage, was sufficient for the direct, or flotation needs of the Illinois Waterway, but that there was some doubt whether this would provide decent conditions for workers on or about the waterway.

Colonel Sultan recommended, in his report, that after the treatment plants of the sanitary district were completed and in service, navigation conditions should be observed for about 2 years. He said:

> Then, and then only, can it be determined with reasonable certainty whether any additional diversion is necessary in order to provide decent and healthful living conditions for boat crews and river terminal operators.

This test has never been made. It is the test contemplated in the similar legislation passed by the 83d Congress in 1954—H.R. 3300—and in the 84th Congress in 1956—H.R. 3210. Both measures were vetoed by the President. It was also the test provided in H.R. 2 of the 85th Congress—the O'Brien bill—which passed the House but failed to pass in the Senate in the closing days of the 85th Congress. It is the test now specifically provided in H.R. 1 with the actual

diversion limited to 1,000 cubic feet per second for 1 year.

The entire problem of testing would become a duty of the Army and the Public Health Service, who would have the responsibility, under H.R. 1, of reporting and making their recommendations thereon to Congress.

I have no fear but the sanitary district engineers and those of the Illinois Division of Waterways will cooperate in every way possible in conducting the tests.

FACTUAL AND LEGAL ASPECTS OF DIVERSION

I have no desire at this late hour to impose upon this House a lengthy dissertation on the question of lake diversion. Both the proponents and the opponents have heretofore repeatedly presented their views on this subject and a repetition here would be of no avail.

There is one outstanding engineer of recognized national standing in the field of hydraulics and Great Lakes levels, whose professional views are uniformly respected. He is Horace P. Ramey, chief engineer of the Metropolitan Sanitary District of Greater Chicago. A half century of Mr. Ramey's professional engineering activities have been devoted in this particular field.

Chief Engineer Ramey is therefore amply qualified to speak with unquestioned authority of this subject of diversion. At previous hearings of this House committee his noteworthy paper on "Great Lakes Levels and Their Changes" was submitted. For this study he was awarded the Octave Chanute Medal by the Western Society of Engineers.

On June 20, 1957, Chief Engineer Ramey delivered another scholarly presentation on "Diversion of Water" before the Illinois section of the American Society of Civil Engineers.

Opponents to the various diversion bills heretofore considered have repeatedly stressed that questions as to an increase in diversion or otherwise should be presented to the Supreme Court of the United States and not to the Congress.

Contrary to this view the supporters of H.R. 1, and its predecessors, have always insisted that Congress has plenary power over navigation and navigable waters.

In support of this legal phase, I submit that a brief on this subject filed as amicus curiae in the Supreme Court of the United States by the Chicago Association of Commerce and Industry documents that we have that right. The legislative history of the River and Harbor Act of 1930 further demonstrates that we have the legal right to legislate in this area.

OPPOSITION OF THE LAKE STATES

It is recognized that the consistent opposition of the Lake States to an increase of water from Lake Michigan at Chicago, of any nature or for any purpose, whether temporary or permanent, has not diminished.

In December 1957 the State of New York filed a motion in the Supreme Court of the United States, in the so-called Lake Level cases, asking for a modification of the decree of that Court of April 21, 1930. They sought, among other matters, to require the Metropolitan Sanitary District of Greater Chicago to return to Lake Michigan the water taken therefrom as domestic pumpage.

This was followed by an application of similar effect filed by the States of Wisconsin, Minnesota, Ohio, Pennsylvania, and Michigan, in which the State of New York also joined.

Both actions attempted to require the Chicago area to dump its sewage-treated effluent into Lake Michigan, the same source from which its drinking water is drawn, thereby threatening the pollution of the water supply, instead of emptying such effluent into the canals of the sanitary district and thence into the Illinois Waterway. The latter procedure has been followed since 1900 and is as authorized by the Supreme Court's decree of April 21, 1930, and by the River and Harbor Act of July 3, 1930, for navigation purposes for the Illinois Waterway.

The action instituted in the Supreme Court in December 1957 was also an apparent attempt to frustrate the proposed action by the 85th Congress with regard to the enactment of H.R. 2, as at the time of the above attempt by the Lake States to invoke action by the Supreme Court of the United States, H.R. 2 had been passed by the House of Representatives in the 1st session of the 85th Congress, May 22, 1957, and was then pending before the Senate subcommittee.

The application of the Lake States and the motion of New York were in effect a rehash of their traditional arguments presented previously at the congressional hearings on diversion. They were replete with legal errors, factual misstatements, and unsupported preposterous allegations which have unfortunately ofttimes heretofore characterized their opposition.

Among other matters considered in that action before the Supreme Court, initiated by the Lake States, were the constitutional provisions and the legal authorities—including the decisions in the various Lake Level cases—which we assumed demonstrated the exclusive right of the Congress to act in matters affecting navigable waters, such as those here involved pertaining to a Federal waterway.

The consideration of this problem by the Supreme Court was again made necessary because the Lake States in their application to the Supreme Court sought a presumptuous declaration that legislation such as that proposed by H.R. 2 would be in effect a nullity. This was an attempt to secure an unheard of type of relief, requesting a statement or determination from the Supreme Court that an anticipated action of Congress within its proper sphere would be unconstitutional.

The State of Illinois and the Metropolitan Sanitary District of Greater Chicago filed a joint brief in opposition to the action of the Lake States and the Solicitor General, at the request of the Supreme Court, filed an amicus curiae brief.

After a consideration of the briefs of all the parties, this flagrant attempt of the Lake States, seeking to enlist the aid of the Supreme Court, to interfere with the exercise of congressional jurisdiction or to delay Congress in the proper exercise of its constitutional functions was appropriately disposed of by a summary denial of the relief—with the right to renew their application if substantial facts were later presented—sought by New York and the other Lake States in the order of March 3, 1958, entered by the Supreme Court. This dismissal order, in our judgment, demonstrated the refusal by the Supreme Court to act in such a way as to interfere with the exclusive control by Congress over Federal waterways.

Subsequent to the Supreme Court order of March 3, 1958, however, the Lake States again attempted to frustrate the action of Congress by anticipating the introduction of H.R. 1, now pending before the House Committee on Public Works. They filed, on November 3, 1958, a so-called amended application. This document is essentially a rehash of the earlier documents summarily dismissed, on March 3, 1958, by the Supreme Court of the United States. All of the allegations made in this new amended application and their supporting brief have been answered by the joint brief of the State of Illinois and the Metropolitan Sanitary District of Greater Chicago. Despite the many conflicting speeches and the heat engendered over the years between the advocates and those opposing this legislation, a calm analysis of the actual questions involved should demonstrate to unbiased observers that the issue is, in effect, fundamentally simple. And its solution by the same token, is likewise simple.

The residents of Illinois have demonstrated their good faith and their basic reasonableness, in the compromises which have been suggested from time to time and are now incorporated in H.R. 1. This bill would enable a scientific study to be made. It would be made by trained, impartial men.

The repeated myth as to puffed up anticipated losses to navigation and by the power interests, if any diversion from Lake Michigan is authorized by the Congress, can by no stretch of imagination be applicable to the temporary 1-year increased diversion of 1,000 cubic feet per second authorized by H.R. 1.

On August 1, 1958, Major General Itschner, Chief of Engineers, transmitted to Senator DOUGLAS—pages 373–375, Senate subcommittee hearings on H.R. 2, July 28, 29, and August 7, 1958—the report of the division engineer of the north central division at Chicago, evaluating the effects on lake levels and power of an increase of 1,000 cubic feet per second at Chicago for a period of 1 year. A summary of this study estimated that the maximum resulting lowerings of Lakes Michigan and Huron to be one-fourth of an inch and that it was not practical to evaluate the effects because of the small amount of the lowering. As to estimated losses of dependable hydroelectrical capacity at the Niagara and St. Lawrence plants, the study found that they were of such temporary nature and small magnitude that replacement of the loss or substitution of the gain in capacity would not be justified.

One point, the author of the bill, the gentleman from Illinois, Congressman O'BRIEN, wishes to make abundantly clear and repeats is that the State of Illinois and the Metropolitan Sanitary District of Greater Chicago do not seek the additional temporary diversion provided in H.R. 1 as a substitute for the proper treatment of sewage of Chicago's metropolitan area.

The sanitary district collects and treats to a very high degree, in three modern major sewage-treatment plants and several new smaller plants, more than a billion gallons of sewage daily. No other metropolitan area in the world has equal facilities or performs a comparable efficient operation. The American Society of Civil Engineers in 1955 selected our sewage-treatment system as one of the "seven wonders of American engineering." I respectfully urge that H.R. 1 be passed by this House today.

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL].

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, it is with a great deal of personal sorrow that I find myself on the opposite side of any issue with the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. KLUCZYNSKI] and with the distinguished dean of the Illinois delegation [Mr. O'BRIEN]. We have heard it said that this is a piddling amount of water. It is not. The people of Chicago want to divert from our Great Lakes—and they are ours as much as theirs—what would be the equivalent of a river 10 feet deep, 20 feet wide, and all the way across the United States, in just 15 days. That is just how much water they want to take from the people of the Great Lakes Basin area. They are now taking 3,300 feet per second of water. In addition to that, they propose to add an additional 1,000 cubic feet. For comparison, the whole State of Illinois contributes exactly 500 cubic feet per second of water to the Great Lakes.

So you can see they are doing far better than any of their neighbors on the Great Lakes Basin, and are taking a resource belonging to all of us to their own sloth in handling their sewage problem.

There is presently pending a proceeding before the Supreme Court of the United States, an open decree subject to Court review on application of any party. If there were any merit in what the Chicago Sanitary District seeks to do, I am sure the Supreme Court would be more than glad to honor their wishes and accord them relief, and would have done so a long time ago if there were any merit to their case. They would take this course instead of coming before the Congress every 2 years to have legislative relief. In due course of time, however, this will be matter vetoed.

I assume that my colleagues from Chicago will recognize the name Frank W. Chesrow. He is president of the Chicago Sanitary District. He was quoted on January 29 of this year as saying:

More diversion of lake water is not needed—

I want to emphasize that word "not"—

is not needed for sanitation purposes but solely for navigation purposes on the Illinois Waterway.

This is witnessed by what the Corps of Engineers in the person of General Itschner, Chief of that corps, had to say; and on many occasions he or another person speaking on behalf of the corps has said that there is no necessity for any additional water for navigational purposes. Indeed, they have pointed out that the amount of domestic pumpage plus the present diversion is more than adequate even when the Chicago ship canal or the Illinois Waterway is "double tracked" to handle upbound and downbound traffic in separate canals.

The real situation here is this: The Illinois Waterway is the largest chamber pot in the world, and it is probably the worst smelling.

Mr. Chairman, let me tell you what goes on here. The sanitary district does not properly treat its sewage. They have a two-State system of collection. When it rains Chicago floods their storm runoff together with their sanitary sewerage in one system and dumps the whole volume of sewage, flowing directly into the Illinois Waterway, with little or no treatment. This is why the sad situation in the waterway.

In addition to this, there is no attempt by Chicago or by any of its agencies to meter any of its industry and its industry is not watched at all. As a result, very large amounts of industrial waste go directly into this waterway without any scrutiny or examination by any person whatsoever.

Mr. Ramey, speaking on behalf of the sanitary district, said that its efficiency dropped to 87 percent or less in 1955–56. And he went on to state that—

About 10 tons per day of solids went into the canal in 1955 and more than 18 tons per day in 1956.

This is in addition to 80 tons which go into the waterway in a form which Chicago says is impossible to strain out under existing processes.

This last contention I deny. Milwaukee and other cities treat their waste, municipal and industrial waste to 95-percent purity. Indeed, one may safely drink the sewage effluent of Milwaukee. I challenge any Chicagoan to drink the sewage effluent of that city.

Let me tell you what was said by a Mr. William Dundas, of the Chicago Sanitation District, in an article appearing in the Engineering News Record, a national publication:

The 900-square-mile metropolitan area feeds about 1,200 million gallons of sewage a day into the sanitary district plants for treatment. From 800 to 900 million gallons per day flows to the southwest works, carrying from 600 to 650 tons of solids. Another 100 tons of solids are pumped daily to the southwest plant from the North Side works.

This adds up to 700 to 750 tons of solids to be disposed of daily at the southwest works. Present facilities, however, according to William A. Dundas, general superintendent, can handle adequately only 450 to 500 tons per day. This leaves 200 to 250 tons for disposal by other means.

(Sludge is the consolidated sewage solids settled out of sewage in either the primary or secondary settling tanks.)

Mr. Dundas' other means is simply dumping into the sanitary and ship canal all 200 to 250 tons a day of sewage solids to be flushed downstream on the unfortunate neighbors to the south.

Now let us characterize the state of this miracle of sanitary engineering system by the state of the sanitary and ship canal near the southwest sewage plant. I quote from the remarks of Mr. Milton Adams, nationally known sanitary engineer, member of the President's Pollution Control Board and head of the Michigan Water Resources Commission, who said:

Some of you may wish to learn from Mr. Dundas what he means by those last three words "by other means" and what effect this has on the sanitary quality of waters of the so-called sanitary and ship canal serving the southwest works. Unless sludge handling capacity is balanced to receive solids accumulations from daily sewage flow, either raw or partly treated sewage, or the sludge itself must be bypassed.

May I now submit a personal observation of downtown river conditions indicating inadequacy of the district's collection system or its maintenance. At noon on last Friday, the 13th, I was crossing the river into the Loop on the north sidewalk over the West Jackson Street Bridge. Looking over the rail to the north, I spied three floating objects along the west bank—some seven or eight near the east bank in a pool of suds and broken feces and other flotsam common to raw sewage. It so happens that most sewage and pump station screen rooms collect these objects. The point is these objects are invariably a telltale of the presence of sewage. But here they were in the river bobbing along on a dry day winking at me and catching an occasional ray of sunlight as it came through the clouds.

Now I ask you how these could be in the Chicago River where sewage is all faithfully collected and treated by the district. Another incident, shall we say of a faulty sewage collection system or regulator? Additional diversion from the lake cannot remedy this problem—study or no study.

Finally, as a member of the Federal Water Pollution Control Advisory Board I was called on to discuss the Chicago diversion controversy at their May 1957 meeting in Washington. There was already talk of the Public Health Service being called upon by the Corps of Engineers to make a study in the event H.R. 2 of the 85th Congress was enacted. I told the members our Michigan convictions, the Illinois position as I understood it, and that of the other States.

Following the meeting, I suggested to the Surgeon General's Chief of Water Supply and Water Pollution Control, "Mac, maybe you better have your Chicago boys have a looksee at this Chicago area problem if you can. You may have to make an estimate of a survey for higher authority one of these days and you ought to know what you are getting into."

Now it so happens a single river trip was made early last fall on these waterways and water samples collected and analyzed. This single exploratory trip was all the Division had resources to finance. No written or published report of findings is available. A summary sheet I have been able to examine showed "zero" oxygen and septic condition in the Chicago River north of the Loop. Water coming in from Lake Michigan with its 100 percent saturation of dissolved oxygen dropped almost immediately to zero after reaching the Chicago River. The oxygen continued to drop progressively as the trip

progressed downstream. Little was found below and none in the Calumet Sag Channel samples.

Should this finding be representative of formal survey results, it can mean but one thing to this engineer. The collection and interception of sewage before it reaches the waterway is so far from adequate that septic conditions are created even in the upper waterways despite the amount of sewage intercepted and treated at the district plant.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL] has expired.

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. NORBLAD].

Mr. NORBLAD. Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to this legislation.

I am vigorously opposed to H.R. 1 which would permit an additional diversion of 1,000 cubic feet of water per second for a period of 1 year into the Illinois Waterway. There is no question but that this additional diversion would set a very dangerous precedent in our relationships with Canada. The Canadian Government contends that such additional diversion would produce material injury to the navigation interests on the Canadian side of the boundary. If we were to enact this legislation permitting additional diversion of Lake Michigan water into the Illinois Waterway our Government would be placed in a most untenable position to resist Canadian efforts to divert additional water from the Niagara River, the St. Lawrence River and the Columbia River Basin. Canada still insists on its right to divert the Columbia River. Canada still reserves its right under the treaty of 1909 with respect to the proposed Chicago diversion contemplated by H.R. 1. Canada, in its most recent aide memoire, has protested against the proposed Chicago diversion on the ground that such diversion would adversely affect navigation and hydroelectric interests in the Great Lakes Basin. Surely, if this proposed diversion were permitted in spite of Canada's protests, and Canadian navigational and hydroelectric interests suffered, Canada might very well take the position that our ignoring their protests would give Canada sufficient justification for diverting water from the upper Columbia River Basin. Those of us from the Pacific Northwest know full well the dangerous effects additional diversion of water from the Columbia River would have on irrigation and hydroelectric projects in our area. These projects are extremely important to the economy of the Pacific Northwest and to my State of Oregon. If their full potential were to be impaired by additional diversion of water from the Columbia River by Canadian interests, it would be a serious blow to the economic welfare of our people in Oregon whose livelihood depends on employment in industries that necessarily must secure their water from the Columbia River.

If this legislation is enacted, Canada might very well use it as an excuse to divert water from the upper Columbia River in Canada to the Fraser River in Canada. If such a diversion is made not only would irrigation and hydroelectric projects on the American side of the Columbia River be adversely affected, but also the level of the lower Columbia River would be lowered which would imperil shipping which uses this river. While I am sympathetic with the sanitation problem confronting the people of Chicago it seems to me that it would be sheer folly to divert water from Lake Michigan to solve their problem thus setting a precedent whereby Canada could divert water from the Niagara, the St. Lawrence, and the Columbia Rivers which would result in tremendous financial losses and jobs to those people employed in industries which utilize the water and waterpower from these rivers. The pollution in the Chicago River can be removed by sewage disposal plants such as are used by nearly every large city in the country. Why should the proposed diversion method be used when it very likely will disrupt our good relations with Canada, set a very dangerous precedent with respect to diversion from other rivers in which both our people and the Canadians have an interest.

I shall vote against this unwise and unsound legislation which if enacted could ultimately have such disastrous effects on the economy of the Pacific Northwest.

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BROOMFIELD], a member of the committee.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Chairman, it seems as if the matter of draining additional water from the Great Lakes through the Illinois Waterway has become a subject of congressional concern as regular as the first robin of spring.

Quite frankly, I consider this newest plan contained in the provisions of H.R. 1 for the mockingbirds.

We are being asked to toss aside the interests of States bordering the Great Lakes for the selfish gain of one of these States. We are being asked to ignore the protests of a neighboring nation which has been our friend and valiant ally in two world conflicts.

We are asked to set aside the fruits of some 30 years of work in Congress and the Canadian Parliament, of thousands of men who labored through cold, bitter winter weather to construct the St. Lawrence Seaway in order to complete it on schedule this year.

We are asked to narrow our connecting channels and make our lake beds shallower, to pose possible added dangers to navigation and the largest volume of ship traffic in the world.

We are asked to overthrow a decision of our Nation's Supreme Court; to bypass one of its rulings.

All this is sought for the possible gain of one American city and for the possible disadvantage of dozens of others.

Now, this situation would be bad enough if it stopped right there. But very few of the majority members of the House Committee on Public Works appear to have taken into consideration the later repercussions of this bill and its implications. If we can divert water from the Great Lakes, why can't Canada? And if we can divert water from the Great Lakes, why can't Canada divert water from rivers and streams which have their headwaters in her territory and flow into our Northwestern States and our newest State of Alaska?

If it is right for us to tell Canada that she has no business in voicing an opinion on a matter of such great concern to her people, then has not Canada the right to tell us to go soak our collective heads on her own plans for water diversion?

If fair play and international courtesy are not to be considered by the proponents of this bill, then possibly they will yield more readily to self-interest and realize the Pandora's box of mishaps they are opening on our Nation's waterways.

The proponents of this bill are going to say that this is only a proposal for a 1-year test. If their words are slightly muffled and distorted, I imagine it is because they are having difficulty in speaking with their tongues in their cheeks. There is no doubt in my mind that if this bill is passed, we will be asked next year to extend the provisions of H.R. 1 for an additonal 2-year period, so that the full effects of this diversion can be studied.

We are told by the Army Engineers that it will take some 15 years for the Great Lakes to build up to previous levels once diversion is completed. Now, what if this diversion is more serious than our engineers first figured? After all, this is a test, or so the proponents claim. If such is the case, then the results are merely a matter of conjecture at this point. If the results are known, as the proponents of H.R. 1 claim, then there is no need for a test.

But our Army Engineer estimates, for every 1 year of such testing, it will take 5 years to completely undo any ill effects of such tests. That is too great a risk to take with one of the most important waterway systems in the world.

If the Chicago Sanitary District can have its way in this matter of Great Lakes water diversion, then why can't any other city—American or Canadian—have the same privilege?

If the United States can take unilateral action on this issue, then why cannot Canada exercise the same right?

Let us not put one obstacle in the path of the St. Lawrence Seaway and the great benefits our Nation will derive from its completion. Let us not mark the anniversary of the completion of this great engineering project by action which may limit its effectiveness. Let us defeat H.R. 1 and live up to our obligation to the people of the Midwest, the rest of our Nation and our good neighbor, Canada.

Mr. Chairman, as a part of my remarks I include the following article from the Detroit News of February 9, 1959:

NEW ROUND IN CHICAGO WATER STEAL—THE STORY BEHIND SEVEN-STATE BATTLE AGAINST DIVERSION

(By Stoddard White)

Without its water—surrounding seas, inland jewels, lifegiving underground reservoirs—what would the Water Wonderland be?

Alarm over new plans to steal more of one of Michigan's most precious and famed resources has caused State officials to marshal their allies around the Great Lakes in a new battle before the U.S. Supreme Court.

So important is the problem of water supply to the whole Nation that J. Lee Rankin, Solicitor General of the United States, has called a conference for the early part of March.

He will invite Illinois to tell its future plans in the historic Chicago water diversion from Lake Michigan, and the other seven Lake States to state their opposition to what has happened and what might happen.

Led by Wisconsin, the other States have been fighting for almost 40 years to check Chicago's system of turning Lake Michigan water westward without returning any of it.

Chicago uses lake water for its sewage system, sending the result westward toward the Mississippi—and to maintain navigation for barges and tugs on the Illinois Waterway.

MARCH SHOWDOWN

For almost the first time, Illinois' opponents have been placed on the defensive. In March they must reply to a suit by that State, acting for a small water authority centered at Lombard, one of Chicago's western suburbs.

That water authority proposes to draw water—though only a tiny fraction of that taken at Chicago—from the big lake and, after using it 25 miles inland, send it down the Mississippi side of a watershed.

Michigan and the other States contend that, after purification in a sewage disposal system, the water should be returned to the Great Lakes.

Their protest cast a cloud over the Lombard bond issue. Now Illinois, on behalf of the Lombard authority, is suing for a Supreme Court order to make Michigan and the others stop these tactics.

Nicholas V. Olds, assistant Michigan attorney general in charge of the water case, calls the Lombard plan "only the precursor of a flood of such demands."

"Lombard wants to grow at our expense," he says. "Its area is running out of well water for homes, commerce, and industry. So it is in the position of being in danger of overdrawing your bank account and going to another bank for money."

WORLD'S GREATEST

Olds and Attorney General Paul L. Adams head a fight to protect every drop of water in the Great Lakes Basin—the largest freshwater basin in the world.

If they do not protect it, they say, the lake States will lose invaluable quantities of water, and Federal and local governments will lose the millions of dollars they have spent to maintain navigation channels, beaches, recreation areas, and water supplies.

Other water-thirsty communities, behind the divide and watching their own wells dry up, view the lakes with longing eyes. They would like to pump lake water over the divide—whence it never would be returned.

By virtue of its position in the center of the basin, Michigan is the only State which can abstract water from the lakes and automatically return most of it to them. Any other community, except a small one on the very lakeshore, would send it down the outside of the divide, never to return.

Other States are not being dogs in the manger, however. A proposal by Youngstown and other communities in southeastern Ohio to take Lake Erie water for their own use was slapped down by their own State government.

NO EXCEPTIONS

Every important municipality—American or Canadian—on the lakes, except Chicago, returns to the lakes the water which it has extracted, used, and purified through treatment plants.

"We see no reason why Chicago should not be made to do likewise," Adams and Olds told the State Department, which must consider the damage to Canadian areas.

"Chicago's only excuse is that it would cost money to do so. But, by using Lake Michigan water, its per capita cost for sewage treatment is well below that of much smaller communities.

"It has such a large revenue-collecting base that it could well afford to construct and operate the works necessary."

What are the objections to Chicago's water diversion? The State lawyers say these are the principal damages:

1. To navigation and commercial interests:

Taking more than 1,800 cubic feet a second for domestic use has lowered Lakes Michigan and Huron 2 inches and Lakes Erie and Ontario an inch each. Harbors and channels are affected correspondingly.

THE BIG INCH

An inch of water permits a large lakes freighter to load nearly 100 tons of cargo. It increases the annual tonnage of the whole lakes fleet by 1,500,000 gross tons. Lost water levels cost the fleet $4 million in annual revenue and increase transportation costs on the cheapest transportation system in the world.

The Federal Government dredges 100 of the 400 lakes harbors. Diversification nullifies costly Federal improvements, as well as costly improvements by local governments and individuals—many millions of dollars.

Value and utility of the huge bulk freighters is impaired; accordingly, the welfare and prosperity of the population of the complaining States are injured.

Additionally, yachtsmen, fishermen, and other small boat owners operate their boats only with difficulty during low-water periods.

2. To riparian (waterside) property:

Hundreds of miles of shoreline in lakes States has been substantially damaged. Large investments have been hurt in commercial and private summer properties. Extensive damage has been caused to fishing and hunting grounds, spawning beds, and open marshes.

3. To the rights of the States themselves:

These States suffer damage to parks, camps, and fish hatcheries on the lakeshore. They suffer as consumers of lake-borne coal for public buildings and State institutions.

4. Specifically, to New York State and its citizens for power losses in the Niagara and St. Lawrence Rivers:

New York citizens lose a potential revenue of $1,027,841 a year because the water goes west instead of east and over Niagara Falls or down the St. Lawrence to hydroelectric powerplants. This figure is doubled if Canada's equal share is considered.

THE ISSUE

Illinois' opponents among the Lakes States ask the Supreme Court to halt the discharge of treated sewage into the Chicago Sanitary and Ship Canal and to require that it be returned, purified, to the Great Lakes Basin

They suggest that the Court appoint a "special master"—a powerful investigator for itself—to take testimony and report on Chicago's compliance with an order to return its water to the lake.

(Former Chief Justice Charles Evans Hughes was such a "special master" in 1929. The High Court affirmed his findings of great loss to the other States. In 1930 it ordered the diversion held down to 1,500 cubic feet a second, in addition to domestic pumpage, that water ordinarily needed for home, commercial and industrial use. This order still stands.)

Solicitor General Rankin, at his March hearing, will attempt to inquire how Chicago is coming with its sewage treatment program.

Chicago's opponents contend that the efficiency of the treatment plants has dropped in 6 years from about 95 percent to about 85 percent.

Missouri and other States into whose waters Chicago's treated sewage is discharged, complain that treatment is inadequate. A leading engineering publication says that, of 700 to 750 tons of solids to dispose of daily, Chicago's plants can handle only 450 to 500 tons.

CITIES OBJECT

This means, according to the engineers, that 200 to 250 tons of solids a day must be disposed of by other means. Many of these are flushed down the Chicago and Illinois Rivers.

Smaller communities along these rivers between Chicago and the Mississippi object to the sewage. Their alternative is a greater flow from Lake Michigan, which often floods their towns. The third proposition is that of the opposing States—that Chicago be made to spend the money to purify its sewage and return it to Lake Michigan.

International complications enter the picture. Ontario, at least, had asked its Federal Government to protest to the United States against Chicago diversion.

"There certainly is real ground," Michigan's lawyers told the State Department, "for fearing that Canada will use (Chicago diversion) against us in case we get into a disagreement with Canada over its intentions to divert the waters of the Columbia River."

(The Columbia passes through both Canada and the United States. The right of Canada to use some of the water before it gets to this country and empties into the Pacific Ocean is a subject of current controversy and study.)

The opposing States also worry about the growth of Chicago and its water problems. It already has the world's largest sewage treatment system.

HUGE GROWTH SEEN

In 1930—when the present Court order was issued—the sanitary district of Chicago covered 450 square miles. By 1957 this had grown to 920 square miles—and it had become known as the metropolitan sanitary district.

Chicago has bragged that it will grow to supply filtered water to 3 million people not now receiving it. This figure does not even consider industrial demand.

Chicago serves not only itself, but 85 adjoining suburbs. Estimates are that within our time its population will exceed 15 million people. In 17 years, the opponents say, the ordinary diversion of water for domestic pumpage will double and lower the lake another 2 inches.

Michigan and the other contestants worry lest they are not moving fast enough.

Sovereign States are exempt from what lawyers call the doctrine of laches—the doctrine that it is the complainant's fault if he fails to protest against a wrongdoing.

Olds says this is something like publishing the banns in a church—in effect, speak now or forever hold your peace.

MUST ACT NOW

But courts, from time to time, have refused relief to municipal or other sovereign entities which failed to assert their rights.

"We insist that we might wake up 20 years hence and find the Supreme Court convinced that we did not protest enough and therefore are not entitled to relief," Olds says.

Another ancient doctrine is that of riparian (shoreside owner) rights. That doctrine says that only the riparian owner has the right to take water—and that the right even then belongs only to the land user and the benefit must go to the land itself.

To answer this argument, Chicago argues that the whole State of Illinois is the riparian owner of Chicago's waterfront.

Michigan's lawyers say, however, a basic doctrine of riparian rights is that the user must return a reasonable amount of what he has taken from the stream or lake.

The first bill in the 1959 Congress called for an extra 1,000 cubic feet a second at

Chicago for other improvements, including navigation and sanitation.

TWO VIEWS

Chicago argues that 1,800 cubic feet for domestic pumpage is needed to sustain navigation on the sanitary-ship canal. This is one of America's most important inland waterways, connecting Chicago with the Mississippi and the Gulf of Mexico.

But Gen. Emerson R. Itschner, Chief of the Army's Corps of Engineers, says that the present 1,500 cubic feet is ample.

The canal is what is known as slack water, and water is needed only to open and close the locks to permit the passage of boats.

It is worse than slack water, Michigan authorities declare. They call it a cesspool, and say that its use as a dumping area for sewage only postpones the day when Chicago will be compelled to adopt Michigan's solution—treating the water and returning it to Lake Michigan.

"The canal has become a fetid mess," Adams and Olds say. "As long as the sanitary district insists on using it as a cesspool for untreated industrial wastes and inadequately treated sewage, there will be clamor for more diverted water from Lake Michigan."

MILLIONS SPENT

General Itschner says that even if duplicate locks were built in the future to handle increased traffic on the busy waterway, 1,750 cubic feet of water a second would be ample.

"The Federal Government spends millions of dollars annually in maintaining adequate depths in connecting channels and shallow areas of the Great Lakes and the St. Lawrence Seaway," the Michigan attorneys told Rankin. "Our ports and cities spend large sums for the same purpose.

"It is illogical to spend money on one hand so that proper depths can be maintained and then allow a diversion which militates against the maintenance of such depths—particularly when the diversion can be stopped by requiring (Illinois) to return its treated effluent to the lake."

SKIP COURTS, CARRIERS ASK

American and Canadian steamship companies propose that the Chicago water diversion controversy be taken out of the courts—even the U.S. Supreme Court—and adjudicated by an international body.

Their proposal came at a recent joint convention of Lake Carriers' Association and its Canadian counterpart, the Dominion Marine Association.

The two groups propose that the matter be studied by the International Joint Commission. This body was created in 1909 by the United States and Canada and has almost extraterritorial powers over such boundary disputes as this.

HOW CHICAGO TURNED TIDE

Chicago diverts water from Lake Michigan by what once was considered an engineering miracle.

Until 1900 the Chicago River flowed east into the lake. Then its course was reversed to bring in fresh water, after a series of severe typhoid outbreaks resulted from sewage polluting the drinking water intakes in the lake.

The State of Missouri sought an injunction to prevent opening of the Chicago Sanitary Canal. It feared that Chicago's wastes would imperil the St. Louis water supply.

But the sanitary district reasoned that, once started, the flow would be hard to stop—even by a court order. So it quietly ordered a dam knocked out on January 2, 1900, before the order could be issued, and turned the waters of the Chicago River westward.

LITTLE DROPS ADD UP

Though vetoed by President Eisenhower, a bill passed by Congress last year would have permitted Chicago to increase by 1,000 cubic feet a second the Lake Michigan water it uses.

The new figure of 2,500 so aroused N. G. (Ance) Damoose, city manager of Traverse City, Mich., that he wrote a conversion of "this innocent little figure" into quantities that "people can visualize." Other engineers confirm his figuring:

Diversion of 2,500 cubic feet of water a second is diversion of more than a million gallons a minute—1.6 billion gallons a day.

This would permit Chicago to waste as much water in 6 hours as all Detroit used in a day.

The amount Chicago could have diverted in 1 day would have filled, to a depth of 10 feet, a trench 20 feet wide stretching from Traverse City nearly to Kalamazoo.

At the rate of 2,500 cubic feet a second, Traverse City could be covered with a foot of water in 1 day. In a month, downtown Traverse City would be inundated "to the height of the new street lights."

In 3 minutes Chicago would take enough water from Lake Michigan to supply Traverse City for a whole day.

Three hours of 2,500-foot diversion at Chicago would take enough water to supply Detroit and Michigan's nine other largest cities for a whole day.

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. O'HARA].

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, this bill calls for a 1-year diversion and a study of its effects. A study is not necessary and its result is a foregone conclusion. It is not necessary for navigation. The Illinois Waterway is a slackwater system. All that is needed to determine navigation needs is a pencil and paper. This has already been done by the Corps of Engineers. It is not necessary to determine the effect upon lake levels. Again pencil and paper have sufficed. As for pollution, the principal difficulty results from a lack of dissolved oxygen in the water below Chicago. If you take an additional thousand cubic feet per second of fresh lake water and dump it into the sanitary canal, it is going to abate the pollution. The laws of biochemistry have not been repealed. The report will state that the diversion was helpful in combating pollution in the sanitary canal. This is what we dread in the State of Michigan. When we authorize this study, by implication we say that if it is successful further diversion will be authorized. The State of Michigan does not recognize the existence of a right in the Chicago Sanitary District to continue to divert this water over any period of time.

The facts regarding millions of dollars of loss to other Lake States from a permanent diversion are well known.

The loss of power to the New York Power Authority from a 1-year temporary diversion has been variously estimated at from $608,000 to $1,381,000. Add to this a cost of $545,000 for conducting the study, and the total cost of a 1-year temporary diversion is somewhere between $1,153,000 and $1,583,000, without including any loss of shipping or lakeshore property values that might result.

The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare has found that the same results with regard to pollution abatement could be achieved by construction and operation of additional facilities at Chicago. They estimate that such facilities could be installed for from $750,000 to $1,500,000 without diverting a single additional drop of Great Lakes water. The cost of doing this is about the same as the cost of a temporary increase in diversion. The question is, Who shall bear the cost, the Federal Treasury and the people of the Great Lakes States or the people of Chicago? If this Congress insists on helping Chicago, it should be honest about it and pass a private bill for the relief of the Chicago Sanitary District, build these alternative facilities, and leave the lake levels alone.

The Sanitary District of Chicago does have serious problems with regard to pollution of the Chicago Sanitary Canal. The State of Michigan and other States bordering the Great Lakes recognize this and have in the past consented to temporary increases in the diversion of Great Lakes water. But, we do not consent to the diversion proposed in this bill.

Shipping on the Great Lakes and connecting waterways is hindered by any lowering of levels of the lakes and connecting waterways however slight.

The resulting decrease in the flow of the Niagara and St. Lawrence Rivers would, as has been indicated, deprive the New York Power Authority of generative capacity.

The effects on lakeshore properties and watertable levels are difficult to estimate but would, nevertheless, be detrimental.

Chicago is the only Great Lakes city taking water from the Great Lakes Basin and permanently diverting it to another watershed. Every other city on the Great Lakes, including Milwaukee, Detroit, Cleveland, Erie, and Buffalo, returns the water it uses to the lakes after proper treatment. Chicago does not do so because its treatment facilities are not adequate to permit it to return the water it uses to the lakes without contaminating its own water supply.

The answer to this problem is proper treatment not increased diversion. The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, in its report of April 1957, recommends four possible methods by which Chicago could obtain water quality in the sanitary canal that would compare favorably to that resulting from the increased diversion requested here. These alternatives involve improvement of Chicago's sanitary collection and treatment facilities and involve expenditures for improvements by the city of Chicago. These are the methods used by all other Great Lakes communities and all involve expense to the citizens of these communities for installation and operation. We ask only that Chicago recognize its obligation to take these steps, as we have, rather than attempting to solve its difficulties by diverting water to the detriment of other Great Lakes communities.

In brief, we feel that a 1-year diversion would be detrimental to Michigan's interests and we further feel that Chicago's problems can be better met by adopting one or more of the alternative methods proposed by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. We object to the implications of authorizing

a temporary increase in diversion for test purposes. We are convinced that once additional diversion is begun it will not be stopped. The last sentence of H.R. 1 says:

> The report * * * shall contain recommendations with respect to continuing the authority to divert water from Lake Michigan into the Illinois Waterway.

The passage of this measure authorizing a study makes no sense whatsoever unless Congress is prepared to take action based upon the results of the tests.

We oppose with all our might any recognition by this body that the Chicago Sanitary District can be authorized by Congress to disregard its obligation to adequately treat its waste by shifting its burden to other Great Lakes States. We ask you not to be deceived as to the ultimate objective of this bill which is to pave the way for a permanent and continuous withdrawal of water from the Great Lakes never to be returned.

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. GRIFFIN].

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Chairman, we have been hearing much about the urgent necessity for passage of this bill because of the serious sanitation problems of Chicago and the dire consequences that would follow if we reject the bill. Many who are not familiar with the history of this legislation might think that this pressing problem is something new.

I should like to focus attention on an application made by the city of Chicago back in 1913 to the then Secretary of War, Henry L. Stimson, for approval of a proposal to divert Lake Michigan water. The reasoning used then, in 1913, by Secretary Stimson is still appropriate and even more compelling today. This is what he said:

> In a word, every drop of water taken out at Chicago necessarily tends to nullify costly improvements made under direct authority of Congress throughout the Great Lakes, and a withdrawal of the amount now applied for would nullify such expenditures to amount of many millions of dollars, as well as inflict an even greater loss upon the navigation interests using such waters.
>
> On the other hand, the demand for the diversion of this water at Chicago is based solely upon the needs of that city for sanitation. * * *
>
> The evidence indicates that at bottom the issue comes down to the question of costs. Other adequate systems of sewage disposal are possible and are in use throughout the world. * * *
>
> It is manifest that so long as the city is permitted to increase the amount of water which it may take from the lakes, there will be a very strong temptation placed upon it to postpone a more scientific and possibly more expensive method of disposing of its sewage.

Mr. Chairman, I should like to focus attention upon some of the underlying legal aspects of the bill.

It will be noted that this bill has been carefully drafted to make it appear that the proposed study is somehow related to navigation; no reference whatever is made in the bill to the principal and only purpose of the proposed study; namely, sanitation.

The reason for the careful draftsmanship is readily apparent if one studies the Supreme Court opinions in *Wisconsin* v. *Illinois et al.* (278 U.S. 367 (1928) and 281 U.S. 179 (1930)), which are the decisions under which Chicago is now permitted to divert water in the amount of 1,500 cubic feet per second.

In the 1928 case, the Supreme Court said:

> Insofar as the prior diversion was not for the purpose of maintaining navigation it was without legal basis because made for an inadmissible purpose. The sanitary district authorities relying on the argument with reference to the health of its people have much too long delayed the needed substitution of suitable sewage plants as a means of avoiding diversion in the future. Therefore, they cannot now complain if an immediate heavy burden is placed upon the district because of their attitude and course.

In the 1930 case, the Supreme Court said, at page 184:

> This Court held that diversion for sanitation is illegal and inadmissable.

And at page 185:

> Diversion to remove a nuisance created by the sewage of Chicago is not in aid of navigation.

With respect to the diversion then being made by the Chicago Sanitary District into the Chicago Drainage Canal, the Court had this to say, at page 196:

> The defendant State (of Illinois) and its creature, the sanitary district, were reducing the level of the Great Lakes, were inflicting great losses upon the complainants and were violating their rights, by diverting from Lake Michigan 8,500 or more cubic feet per second into the Chicago Drainage Canal for the purpose of diluting and carrying away the sewage of Chicago. The diversion of the water for that purpose was held illegal, but a restoration of the just rights of the complainants was made gradual rather than immediate in order to avoid so far as might be the possible pestilence and ruin with which the defendants have done much to confront themselves * * *. The defendants have submitted their plans for the disposal of the sewage of Chicago in such a way as to diminish so far as possible the diversion of the water from the lake * * *. They are material only as bearing on the amount of diminution to be required from time to time, and the times to be fixed for each stop, and therefore we shall not repeat the examination. It already has been decided that the defendants are doing a wrong to the complainants and that they must stop it. They must find out a way at their peril * * * it (the State of Illinois) can base no defenses upon difficulties that it has itself created. If its constitution stands in the way of prompt action it must amend it or yield to an authority that is paramount to the State.

In view of the Supreme Court's explicit holding that water diversion for sanitation purposes is illegal, and that water diversion can only be validly authorized for purposes of navigation, it is interesting to review the committee report and the available documents with respect to the relation of the proposed study to navigation.

It is particularly disturbing to those of us who oppose this bill that it should have been brought to the floor before printed copies of the committee hearings held by the Rivers and Harbors Subcommittee of the House Committee on Public Works are available. I have carefully reviewed the printed hearings held before that subcommittee during the last Congress and I should like to focus the attention of the Members upon the testimony of Brig. Gen. J. L. Person, who spoke for the Corps of Engineers, and said this:

> Recent studies of the present and prospective water requirements for navigation on the Illinois Waterway show that the present authorized diversion of 1,500 cubic feet per second plus domestic pumpage from Lake Michigan is adequate to meet navigation requirements. An increase of 1,000 cubic feet per second in the diversion would result in an average increase in velocity of about one-tenth of a mile per hour. This would tend to have a slight effect on navigaton in the Illinois Waterway, since about 85 percent of the commerce on the waterway is upbound, so there would be a slightly adverse effect.

Following that statement, at page 22 of the printed hearings there appears the following colloquy:

> Mr. BLATNIK. Thank you, General. Now that the Corps of Engineers report has been completed, are there, in your opinion, any further studies or investigations necessary before conclusions can be reached on the effects on this proposed diversion?
>
> General PERSON. Only insofar as the effect of the proposed diversion on the sanitary conditions of the waterway are concerned. As far as navigation and power effects are concerned, and effects on shore property, we feel that our report is complete.

In the committee report on this bill, at page 7, appears the following:

> The Department of the Army stated that the question as to whether the proposed legislation is necessary or desirable is one upon which the Department is not in a position to comment since the possible improvements in sanitary conditions arising from the diversion is a matter not within its jurisdiction, and that with respect to navigation, the Department has already submitted a report, printed as Senate Document No. 28 of the 85th Congress.

Mr. Chairman, each Member of Congress takes an oath of office to protect and uphold the Constitution of the United States just as do the members of the Supreme Court. Surely there is a heavy obligation resting upon each of us to consider seriously the constitutionality of bills presented to Congress. In recent years, we have heard a lot of criticism from Members of this body who contend that the Supreme Court has disregarded constitutional principles. I wonder how many of those critics will vote for this bill.

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Chairman, we are coming to the close of this very, very important legislation; we are about to vote on it very shortly, and I am happy that we are coming to a close, because I have had to roll up my cuffs; we are pumping so much water I cannot keep them dry.

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. COLLIER. I thank my colleague. I simply want to make this observation in connection with the statement he has

just made. We have heard here about the tremendous volume of water that is going to be diverted. The fact of the matter is that we are actually taking one quarter of an inch; that is the maximum by which the lake level might be lowered. It might be well to consider in this connection that the average annual seasonal variation of lake levels on the 5 Great Lakes is from 18 to 22 inches a year. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. I thank the gentleman from Illinois.

Let us now review a little of the history of this bill, especially for the benefit of the new Members. We first introduced this bill in the 82d Congress, back in 1951.

We had a tough time getting it out of the Committee on Public Works because we did not explain it properly. It got hung up in the Rules Committee toward the close of the session.

In the 83d Congress H.R. 3300 was passed by the House and Senate, but, for some unknown reason, it was vetoed by the President. The same thing happened in the 84th Congress when our great leader from Illinois [Mr. O'BRIEN] introduced a bill. In the 85th Congress we passed this legislation in the House of Representatives, as you will all remember, but it was hung up in the Senate because the junior Senator from Wisconsin filibustered it to death, the fellow who is against rule 22 in the Senate, and he is against filibustering.

So, in the 86th Congress, H.R. 1 introduced by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. O'BRIEN], was reported by the Committee on Public Works by a vote of 19 to 11.

Now, they are trying to scare you, especially the new Members. The oldtimers are used to this. They are telling you new Members that Canada is going to take a lot of water from the Columbia River. They are telling you that the President is going to veto this bill. I do not know where they got that information. The Lake Carriers Association is going to be put out of business, they say, and the power companies will have to hang up.

Mr. Chairman, you know what a great man the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. O'BRIEN] is. He would not want to harm anybody, and neither would I.

This bill, H.R. 1, Mr. Chairman, was prepared at the request of an Assistant Director of the Bureau of the Budget, who is now in the White House as one of the Presidential aids. This is the language that he suggested to the two Senators from Illinois, DOUGLAS and DIRKSEN, Democrat and Republican, and all the Members of the House from Illinois, Democrats and Republicans alike. We were all present.

This gentleman said if we would put this language in the bill for the 1-year study instead of the 3 we would have no opposition from the Bureau of the Budget the State Department, or from Canada. Mr. Chairman, we, the Members of the House and Senate from Illinois, have lived up to that agreement.

Now, it was claimed that we would steamroller this bill through the Committee on Public Works. So let us see what we did there. We had extensive hearings. We had a long list of witnesses, three or four sheets of them. We had the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. O'BRIEN] explain the purpose of the bill; we had the Honorable Mayor of Chicago before us. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. O'BRIEN] spoke for all members of the Illinois delegation. Of course we had Senator PROXMIRE, of Wisconsin, who brought some water over. We asked him to drink some of the water he got from the drainage plant in Milwaukee, but he said he was not that thirsty.

We also heard from the attorney general of Michigan who said he did not have time enough to testify before our committee; so he came in with a prepared statement of 48 pages. Two weeks later he came in for a second hearing. A gentleman by the name of Milton T. Adams, executive secretary of the Water Resources Committee of the State of Michigan, a man who knew what this is all about, testified before our committee. He also came in the second time. That shows we did not steamroller the hearings. The committee had patience enough to listen to his testimony the second time. He showed pictures to the committee that he took while flying over Chicago. He took pictures of the canal and of the Chicago River.

And I looked at those pictures and I began thinking, Do I live in the city of Chicago, with all that debris and everything in that canal? So, I took a couple of pictures with me. I could not wait until the next morning so that I could take a ride out to Chicago and take a look at it. I also carried a little camera with me, but I did not see any debris or anything around the canal. I had to get some fieldglasses, and so away out yonder, I saw a couple of empty packs of cigarettes and some paper cups. This is the pollution that this gentleman spoke about.

This is very, very vital to the people of the State of Illinois and of Cook County. You have been very fair with us in the past by voting this legislation out of this august body, and I am going to plead with you to vote for H.R. 1 again. To you, the new Members, for the sake of TOM O'BRIEN and the Illinois delegation and all the people of the State of Illinois, I ask you to support H.R. 1.

Mr. Chairman, this bill authorizes an increase in diversion of water from Lake Michigan into the Illinois Waterway, in the amount of 1,000 cubic feet per second, in addition to the present amount of 1,500 cubic feet per second annual average now authorized by permit of the Secretary of the Army pursuant to the 1930 decree of the Supreme Court of the United States.

Under the provisions of the bill the Secretary of the Army shall at all times have direct control and supervision of the amounts of water directly diverted from Lake Michigan. In the event of any floods in the Illinois, Des Plaines, Chicago, or Calumet Rivers, the Secretary of the Army is authorized and shall not allow any water to be directly diverted from Lake Michigan to flow into the Illinois Waterway during such times.

This legislation has been before the House Committee on Public Works for a number of years and after serious and careful deliberations it has again been favorably reported by the committee.

H.R. 1 differs from previous bills authorizing the diversion of water from Lake Michigan at Chicago in that the reported bill would provide for a diversion of 1,000 cubic feet per second for only 1 year, whereas earlier bills provided for a 3-year period. H.R. 1 would also require specific studies made by the Departments of Health, Education, and Welfare and the Army to be coordinated and submitted to Congress. The bill establishes a timetable for the studies preceding and following the diversion. As a result of the decreased time of diversion provided in H.R. 1, the effect on lowering of the lake level would be less than in bills previously considered and consequently any losses or damages, either tangible or intangible, which might be claimed to result would be correspondingly less.

The suggestion was made by the Public Health Service and others for a joint study of the treatment of the sewage of Chicago, and also of the condition of the Illinois Waterway, to be financed equally by the Metropolitan Sanitary District of Greater Chicago and the Public Health Service.

The Metropolitan Sanitary District of Greater Chicago on January 1, 1958, entered into a contract with the outstanding sanitary engineering consulting firm of Greeley & Hanson, at a price of $125,000, to make an 18-month study of the present system, and to make recommendations for any necessary improvements and extensions. This study is near completion and will produce the information required in the suggestion.

I firmly believe that this legislation is in the best interests not only of the Cook County area, but of the entire Midwest.

The Illinois Waterway is steadily increasing in importance. It connects the two most important waterway systems in the Nation, namely the Great Lakes and the Mississippi River. An additional diversion of 1,000 cubic feet per second of water from Lake Michigan, in addition to the presently authorized 1,500 cubic feet per second, would provide a clean stream and improve navigation. It would result in a marked improvement in the Chicago sewage system.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PUCINSKI].

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I rise to speak in support of H.R. 1, sponsored by one of the most highly respected Members of this Congress, the Honorable THOMAS J. O'BRIEN, dean of the Illinois delegation.

We all heard Mr. O'BRIEN'S impassioned plea for enactment of this legislation, which would permit the city of Chicago to divert an additional 1,000 cubic feet per second of water from Lake Michigan to improve navigation and bring other benefits to the Illinois Waterway.

This bill has been submitted by the senior member of the Illinois delegation

because it will not only serve the equivalent of 8½ million people of the Chicago area, but alsc because its beneficial effects will be felt along the entire route that this water flows, down to the mouth of the Gulf of Mexico in New Orleans.

Let us analyze the arguments voiced by opponents of this bill. I conclude that they submit two basic arguments:

First. That our neighbor to the north, Canada, opposes this legislation.

Second. That sponsors of this legislation are trying to get Congress to do something which the Supreme Court of the United States had refused to do.

I should like to address my remarks, first, to the statement that Canada objects to this legislation.

The basic water distribution agreement between the United States and Canada—water that flows through Niagara Falls—goes back to the boundary treaty negotiated by Secretary of State Elihu Root in 1908. This treaty provided that the United States and Canada shall each be allotted 36,000 cubic feet of water per second. Since the city of Chicago was already allocated 10,000 cubic feet per second, Root agreed that the rest of the United States would get only an additional 26,000 cubic feet per second.

This is important: Secretary of State Root was willing to give Canada an extra 10,000 cubic feet per second because Chicago already was allocated 10,000 cubic feet per second, but he stubbornly insisted that Lake Michigan be excluded from the treaty of 1908 because it is not a boundary body of water; it touches no part of Canadian territory.

But there are even more compelling reasons why Canada should not object to the legislation. In 1950, with the advent of power development along the entire waterway separating the United States and Canada, a new treaty was executed between the United States and Canada. Under this treaty, our Nation and the Canadian Government agreed to increase the total flow through Niagara Falls to 64,000 cubic feet per second for each Nation, with the proviso that if one nation did not use the allotment, the other nation could.

Gentlemen, the fact of the matter is that right now, today, the United States is drawing only 16,000 cubic feet per second of its authorized allotment of 64,000 cubic feet per second at Niagara Falls. Quite logically, you might ask "Why?" The answer is very simple. The American powerplant at Bucharris went out of operation due to a landslide, and we are unable to use the amount of water that we would normally use under the 1950 treaty.

Actually, then, Canada is using a great deal more water right now than the authors of the 1950 treaty ever intended for her to use.

We witnessed yesterday opponents of this legislation expressing great fears over the fact that if we approve this legislation, we might in some mysterious manner shatter hemispheric solidarity with our friendly neighbor to the north, Canada. I think we can all agree we want to enjoy Canada's continued traditional friendship. But the men who fear lest we in the United States do anything to ruffle the feelings of our friends in Canada should be reminded that the American people in the last 14 years have carried the major brunt of protecting the free world from international communism. We, as citizens of the United States, have poured $80 billion into various plans to help preserve the free world through foreign aid and military assistance, not to speak of the countless billions of dollars for our own national defense, which benefits the whole free world.

If it is true that Canada really objects to this legislation, then I submit that the Foreign Office of Canada is nowhere nearly as concerned about retaining hemispheric solidarity with the United States as opponents of this legislation have shown toward Canada.

I ask you in all humility if the time has not come when we should ask the Foreign Office of Canada if it is showing the same consideration toward the problems facing the great Midwest as the opponents of this bill are showing for Canada.

Opponents of this bill would have you believe that adoption of this bill would deteriorate the relationship between the United States and Canada. I doubt this particularly when we consider the more serious problems confronting the free world today: namely, May 27 in Berlin, and the entire spectrum of the cold war.

Now let us go to the second aspect: The opponents of this bill claim that the proponents of this bill are trying to do something in Congress which rightfully belongs to the Supreme Court of the United States. The fact of the matter is that this entire question of lake diversion for Chicago fell under Supreme Court jurisdiction only because prior to June of 1930, there was no legislation dealing with control of lake diversion. The original Supreme Court decree limiting Chicago to 1,500 cubic feet per second was entered on April of 1930—2 months before the Federal act was passed. We submit that since the 1930 Rivers and Harbors Act was passed by Congress taking jurisdiction over lake diversion, this entire matter now rests with the Congress of the United States, and those who try to confuse this issue know that sooner or later, under the 1930 act, the Congress will have to decide whether Chicago should get more water to protect the health of the entire Midwest. As a matter of fact the Supreme Court said in its 1930 decree that Congress may act on this matter.

I am urging passage of this legislation for many reasons but perhaps to me personally, the most compelling reason is that a part of the North Branch of the Chicago River flows through one of the most beautiful sections of my district. This river has created serious problems for thousands of my constituents. Added lake diversion would be of tremendous help to those people.

To those who oppose this legislation because they fear that added diversion provided in this legislation would reduce lake levels in their respective ports, let me remind them again and again that Army engineers have testified the net effect on lake levels would be a drop of one-quarter of an inch in a 15-year period. We ask for this added diversion for only 1 year and the Army engineers have testified that under this 1-year provision the drop in lake levels would be infinitesimal or practically nonexistent.

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of the time on this side to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CRAMER], a member of the committee.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, it is not my intention to take all of that time, but there are some facts with regard to this bill that should be brought to the attention of the House, some of which have not been brought previously to the attention of the House and some of which are in the form of summarization.

Let me say first that this bill is of greater interest than merely to the adjoining States in the Chicago, Ill., area. As a matter of fact, the gentleman from Washington has very vigorously opposed this legislation in that the people of Washington are concerned about it as setting a precedent with regard to the diversion of water in their own State. I understand that even the Governor of that State has taken a position with regard to the diversion of water which is an indication that not only the adjoining States but other States in this Nation are equally interested from the standpoint of conservation and the question of water pollution.

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAMER. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. MACK of Washington. I wanted to make a correction in your statement. The gentleman said that the Governor of our State came out against diversion of this water. The Governor has not. He has taken a rather wishy-washy position on it. In fact, I think our Governor has been asleep at the switch when it comes to recognizing the threat to the State of Washington and the Pacific Northwest power production and navigation on the Columbia River that is inherent in this legislation. I wrote to the Governor in the middle of February and requested that he be present or send his representative to testify against this proposed legislation. I expressed my fears, but the Governor did not respond to my letter until a day or so ago, or 17 days after I wrote him and not until after the hearings were completed.

In his letter to me, he said he regarded this bill as solely an Illinois problem. He said he was not going to take any part in debating it.

On the other hand, the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. NORBLAD] who represents the Oregon side of all the navigable part of the lower Columbia and I, who represent the Washington side of the lower part of the Columbia River, are both opposed to this proposed legislation.

Mr. Herbert West, who represents all the shipping interests on the Columbia River, the interests of Oregon, Washington, and Idaho, has written me strongly protesting against this legislation.

The users of the power on the Columbia River, the public utility companies, have written to me protesting against this legislation. Many of the granges of my district have written to me protesting this legislation. They feel that if this water is diverted from Lake Michigan at Chicago, the result may well be that Canada will use this as a precedent or as an excuse for diverting water from the Columbia River, which would cause millions of dollars of damage to their power generation of the dams on the Columbia River. If Canada diverts Columbia River water the stream levels of the Columbia River which serve such ports as Astoria and Portland, Oreg., and Longview and Vancouver in Washington State will suffer navigation losses.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, I think the gentleman has expressed more eloquently than I could the fact that there is a particular problem in his State, and their apprehension and the reasons therefor, concerning this legislation as exists in States other than those immediately in the Illinois area.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAMER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. PELLY. I would like to say that the city of Seattle's powerplant is located on the Skagit River where we have an arrangement with the Canadians in the matter of the backing up water into Canada. Seattle has a great interest in assuring that we work harmoniously with Canada in any disposition of water. The State of Washington's economy is tied in with any way that the United States handles the negotiations with our good neighbor, Canada. Therefore, I oppose this bil.

Mr. CRAMER. I appreciate the gentleman's further confirmation of the remarks I just made about the concern of other States with regard to this.

Let me bring out a few points some of which have not been brought out in the past debate.

The first is this: We do not have the hearings. They are not printed and not available, so we must rely on our memory as to what was testified before our Committee on Public Works.

The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare testified in effect that there is nothing in this bill with regard to the study except the question of drawdown.

There is nothing in this bill with regard to the question of pollution in the lake; there is nothing with regard to the question that the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare should legitimately be interested in, and that those of us who are interested in conservation, those of us who are interested in water pollution, those of us who have consistently supported water pollution legislation in this Congress, should be concerned with. There is nothing that would permit the Health, Education, and Welfare Department to go into that in this legislation. Equally important to draw down is the question of pollution, if not now, then sometime in the future if water diversion were approved as a permanent matter.

There is nothing in the bill about that. The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare refuses to take a position in support of this legislation because on further questioning they stated that if the study were properly made and did include the water pollution question, which it should include, it would cost an additional half a million dollars, bringing the total cost of this legislation to over a million dollars.

What is this expenditure for? This expenditure is for the benefit, and no one is kidding anyone else, of the Sanitary District of Chicago. We can understand that they have this problem. But they have a forum and a relief other than asking the taxpayers of this country to pay for it, a half a million dollars, a million dollars if it were properly done. That forum is the Supreme Court, the Federal court system for permission and local contributions through bond issues for costs. Yet they want the U.S. Congress now to inject itself into the question even though the courts presently have jurisdiction over it. What they really want—let us get down to the fact—is that they want the Federal Government to pay the bill. They want the taxpayers to pay the half million dollars.

As far as I am concerned, this is a dangerous precedent. I know of no similar, analogous authorizing legislation that has recently come out of the Committee on Public Works, certainly not since I have been a member of it in the last 5 years, which has required the expenditure of Federal money.

I call your attention further to the fact that there is no limitation in this authorization with regard to how much Federal money shall be used. There is no limitation whatsoever. It is just another deviation from the usual procedure of our Committee on Public Works, but in this particular legislation they have in effect asked for the expenditure of Federal money for the purpose of studying the effect of the local sanitary project, only the drawdown question. I think it is a deviation which we cannot afford and should not permit at this time. We simply should not set this as a precedent for future action of our Committee on Public Works.

The question has been raised, Will the President veto this bill? I think he will. I think logically he has no alternative but to veto it. If you look at the minority report on pages 12 and 13 you will see his reasons for vetoing it last time. You will find there is not one single change in this legislation that affects these major questions that he raised as a basis for his veto, and there are four of them. There is not one single change made in the bill with the exception of the time involved. They have changed it from a 3-year to a 1-year study. It has been changed to a 1-year study, but I can see no reason why the President would not veto it if it were a 1-year study, because the question of diversion, and the question of the general agreement of the States in the adjoining area, and the question of the Supreme Court retaining jurisdiction, and the question of the Canadian objection, are just as strong as before. So it appears to me this is as useless an action as it was in the first place.

Canada has objected. That has been strongly stated in the consideration of this bill.

There are many members on the Committee on Foreign Affairs who are asked to consider this bill now, which I do not have the privilege of serving on. It seems to me that committee would be equally concerned with us, with the President, with the State Department. The State Department has objected to this legislation. It appears to me that they would be equally concerned over the fact that the State Department objects to the legislation because there has been no agreement reached between the United States and Canada concerning it and the Foreign Affairs Committee has not had a chance to consider the bill. Therefore, I say to you the reasons for opposition to this bill are just as strong today as they were at the time the President vetoed it and we should not pass this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. BLATNIK].

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KASTENMEIER].

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Chairman, I speak here today in a final appeal to my distinguished colleagues to vote against H.R. 1, a proposal to divert an additional 3,600,000 cubic feet of water each hour from Lake Michigan for a full year. This diversion of water creates some serious problems which I think all of us should consider fully before casting our votes.

I do not want to engage in a lengthy discussion of each argument, but let me summarize for you briefly the far-reaching effects of this legislation.

First. If the Chicago Sanitary District is permitted to divert additional water from Lake Michigan, it may well undo the years of efforts to promote the development of the St. Lawrence Seaway. Millions of dollars have been spent to complete the St. Lawrence Seaway project, and additional millions of dollars are being expended to deepen channels and harbors so that ocean-bound ships can use our Great Lakes ports. The water level may be lowered by this increased diversion the few inches necessary to prevent ocean-going ships from fully utilizing the Great Lakes ports.

Second. It is my considered opinion that established beyond all reasonable doubt has been the principle that no State or Nation can act unilaterally on a matter affecting an international water in a manner which will adversely affect some other State or Nation. The distinguished authority on international law, Lauterpacht, now a judge of the International Court of Justice, has stated that "the duty of the State not to interfere with the flow of a river to the detriment of other riparian States" is "one of those general principles of law recognized by civilized States which the Permanent Court is bound to apply to virtue of article 38 of its statute"—1 Oppenheim, "International Law," pages 346–347, 8th edition, Lauterpacht, 1955.

For those of you who wish additional evidence, I refer you to two publications: "Document on the Use and Control of Waters of Interstate and International Streams," a compilation of compacts, treaties and adjudications affecting the use of interstate and international waters, published in 1956 by the U.S. Department of Interior, and the "Principles of Law Governing the Uses of International Rivers and Lakes," the proceedings of the 10th conference of the Inter-American Bar Association held in 1957 in Buenos Aires, Argentina.

Third. If the Congress is to act unilaterally to divert greater amounts of water from the Great Lakes in the face of protests from the Government of Canada, we may well encounter a situation in the Pacific Northwest States which should be of paramount concern to my colleagues from that section of the country. The Canadian Government could take steps to unilaterally divert water from the Columbia River at points before it enters the United States.

Claims have been made by some proponents of increased diversion that Canada is not involved in this diversion, because Lake Michigan is not attached in any way to Canada. Let us not delude ourselves into this type of foolhardy thinking. For all water purposes the Great Lakes are one body, and any effect of Lake Michigan diversion is felt all the way to tidewater below Montreal.

Fourth. In addition, if Chicago is to be permitted to increase its diversion of Lake Michigan water by congressional action, then the precedent to allow other Great Lakes communities to divert water for other purposes will have been established. Consider for a moment the devastating results if this were to happen.

Fifth. The matter of diversion of Lake Michigan water is currently the subject of litigation before the Supreme Court of the United States, and congressional action at this time would have the effect of preempting the highest Court of our land.

In December 1958 the State of Wisconsin, and the State of Minnesota, and the State of Ohio, and the State of Pennsylvania, and the State of Michigan, and the State of New York—parties to the original action in the case of Wisconsin et al against Illinois and the Chicago Sanitary District, filed application with the U.S. Supreme Court to reopen the decree of April 21, 1930. By that decree the Supreme Court retained jurisdiction over the subject matter of H.R. 1. Wisconsin's present application is for the purpose of requesting the Court to appoint a special master to take evidence to determine whether Chicago should be compelled to follow the practice of all other Great Lakes cities and return its unused domestic pumpage, after it had passed through its waterworks and purification system, to the Great Lakes Basin. The State of Illinois and the Sanitary District have filed their brief in opposition to our application.

Sixth. To have the U.S. Public Health Service make this so-called year-long study of the effect of diversion is totally unjustified and an extravagant waste of Federal funds at a time when we are all concerned with Federal spending.

The Corps of Engineers has testified that it is fully satisfied that additional diversion will not improve navigation on the Illinois Waterway and that it will have an adverse effect on navigation on the Great Lakes. There has never been shown any evidence that a study would contribute any useful information to a better understanding of navigation consequences. Yet, the stated purpose of this bill is to seek information on the effect of increasing the diversion of water from Lake Michigan into the Illinois Waterway for navigation. The only remaining purpose that this study could serve is what additional diversion does for sanitation.

The U.S. Public Health Service, the Illinois Board of Health, the Chicago Board of Health and every other competent public health body have concluded that increased diversion is not necessary for improved sanitation or public health.

On the other hand, the most competent public health survey ever made of Chicago's sanitation problems, the U.S. Public Health Service's Chicago and Cook County health survey, called for a series of other recommendations to improve Chicago's sanitation. It specifically considered additional diversion, but failed to recommend it. I concede that this study was made 12 years ago, but no contrary findings have been reported since this study was concluded.

Furthermore, I believe this bill is unnecessary because the U.S. Supreme Court has established jurisdiction over diversion by Chicago for many years, and everything provided in this bill could be granted by the Supreme Court. The Court has been willing to grant Chicago temporary increases in diversion in the past, having done so as recently as 1956. Undoubtedly, increased diversion would be approved again if the situation merited it.

Obviously, only lack of merit keeps the Chicago Sanitary District from going back to the Supreme Court to seek the diversion authorized in this bill.

I do not question the fact that Chicago has an overwhelming sanitation problem. However, I feel it is wrong for this great Midwestern city to use water which belongs to all of us to flush away its sewage-disposal problems.

The effect of Chicago's using Great Lakes water to solve its own problem is much too far reaching. Let us take a sober second look before it is too late.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. MEYER].

Mr. MEYER. Mr. Chairman, although I recognize the needs and desires of the city of Chicago for more water, I must protest the possible passage of this bill.

The diversion of additional water from Lake Michigan will, according to reliable estimates and studies, adversely affect the most efficient production of St. Lawrence power. It may also create problems with Canada.

These results would not be in the interest of the people of Vermont.

Mr. KNOX. Mr. Chairman, I rise today as it is imperative that the membership of the House be informed so its action will not jeopardize the national interests in favor of a piece of local legislation.

This measure, H.R. 1, asks for an additional 1,000 cubic feet per second diversion of Lake Michigan water into the drainage system of the Metropolitan Sanitary District of Chicago in order to test the effect of this fresh-water supply and the oxygenation caused thereby on the drainage canal.

As the Representative of the 11th Congressional District of Michigan, which is surrounded by three of the Great Lakes; namely, Michigan, Huron, and Superior, and a shoreline of 1,000 miles, I am compelled to rise and voice my objection. However, I rise also to protect the interests of the country as a whole, as well as my district in particular.

Everyone here today knows the result when the plug is pulled in the bathtub. The advocates of this bill allege that when this is done the water will not run out—we all know better. So let us begin by agreeing that the diversion of an additional 1,000 cubic feet per second of water from Lake Michigan is going to cause this large body of water to recede.

I would like at this time to suggest to you just some of the many reasons why this is such a dangerous piece of legislation.

We have here before us a threat of the St. Lawrence Seaway project. The estimated construction cost of this country's share alone is around $125 million not to mention the millions of dollars that have been spent by Canada and the many, many port cities of the Great Lakes. The law of navigation demands that the water depth in the connecting channels and the harbors be 27 feet. If we allow this diversion it is quite possible that such a level could not be maintained in many of the harbors and the connecting channels. Doesn't it seem illogical to spend millions of dollars to create and maintain proper depths while at the same time allowing a diversion which would lower these depths?

Consider the effect that the lowering of the lake levels would have on Great Lakes' shipping, thus causing adverse economic repercussions on the whole economy of this Nation. If this area of transportation is hampered the result will be increased unemployment due to the reduced quantity of raw materials being delivered to the factories.

Should no consideration be given to the views of our neighbor Canada? I do not mean to suggest that the decisions of this Congress should be dictated by another country, but in view of the circumstances I believe that the Congress should not ignore the legitimate interests of our good friends to the north. The Canadian Government, while recognizing that the use of Lake Michigan water is the jurisdiction of the United States, is of the opinion that this additional diversion would be incompatible with the arrangements of the St. Lawrence Seaway and with the Niagara Treaty of 1950. Consider how we are going to react if Canada in turn allows added diversions in the Great Lakes and of the bodies of water in the great Northwest.

Before allowing any further diversions let us first permit the lake levels to return to a depth which will enable this Government to meet its present contractual obligations. The Federal Government had been unable to perform its part of a contract with an industry in my home town because of the extremely low level of Lake Superior. This problem makes it necessary for the industry to request the Federal Government to renegotiate the contract in order to relieve the burden of the cost involved for water usage. This is going to have a direct effect upon the Treasury of the United States.

I also find great difficulty in understanding why Chicago should be privileged to take water from Lake Michigan and not return it, while other cities using the waters of the lakes are so required.

I have mentioned only a few of the great dangers of this legislation. I fail to recognize how any Member of this Congress, who has the best interests of the country in mind can vote affirmatively on this measure.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Chairman, there are a number of strong reasons why H.R. 1 should not be enacted. Among these are:

Jurisdiction over water diversion from Lake Michigan resides in the Supreme Court. If Congress takes over jurisdiction, as it would by enacting H.R. 1, the Congress will constantly be bedeviled with this problem, which the Court is eminently capable of handling.

H.R. 1 would benefit Chicago, at the expense of other Great Lakes cities and States.

Additional diversion would result in adverse effects on Great Lakes shipping and on power development.

Perhaps most important of all, our good relations with our fine northern neighbor, Canada, are at stake in this legislation.

Mr. Chairman, under date of February 20, 1959, the Canadian Government informed our Government again that it objects to increased diversion of water from Lake Michigan at Chicago.

I quote briefly from the latest Canadian Government memorandum on this subject:

> The point has been made repeatedly by Canada that every withdrawal of water from the (Great Lakes) Basin means less depth available for shipping in harbors and in channels. Additional withdrawals would have adverse effects on the hydroelectric generation potential on both sides of the border at Niagara Falls and in the international section of the St. Lawrence River, as well as in the Province of Quebec, and would inflict hardship on communities and industries on both sides of the border. The Government of Canada therefore protests against the implementation of proposals contained in H.R. 1.

Mr. Chairman, because of the Canadian position, and for other reasons, the Bureau of the Budget has recommended against enactment of H.R. 1, foreshadowing another veto of this legislation if it is passed. The Bureau of the Budget has further suggested two other courses of action that should be taken before any additional water diversion is authorized from Lake Michigan. Surely these suggestions should be thoroughly examined before H.R. 1 or any similar legislation is enacted.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Chairman, the bill under discussion, H.R. 1, would allow Chicago to withdraw an estimated 1 million gallons of clean water from Lake Michigan each minute and dump it, laden with sewage, into the Illinois Waterway and the Mississippi River.

The measure is innocuously labeled. The diversion of water sought is not termed such, but, instead, is called a study. The language used in defining the ostensible purpose of the measure is this:

> To require a study to be conducted of the effect of increasing the diversion of water from Lake Michigan into the Illinois Waterway for navigation and other purposes.

Such phraseology, Mr. Chairman, cannot, however, conceal the true intent of the bill nor can it minimize the many dangers involved in its passage. This is but a poorly veiled attempt by one community to make others shoulder and finance its sanitary burdens.

This so-called study is not that, but actually is an authorization for the State of Illinois and the Metropolitan Sanitary District of Greater Chicago to withdraw vast additional amounts of water from Lake Michigan. As is most often the case in such measures, H.R. 1 contains every indication that the diversion would not end with the completion of the so-called study, even if that came to its promised conclusion.

There is nothing really new about H.R. 1 except its ostensible purpose. This Congress has been called upon to consider a long string of similar measures since the turn of the century and twice even approved the legislation called for. Fortunately, President Eisenhower vetoed the bills on both occasions.

The House Committee on Public Works, on February 6, 1959, sent out a notice announcing hearings on H.R. 1, and correctly pointed out that the committee had "held extensive hearings in the 82d, 83d, 84th, and 85th Congresses on similar legislation."

The notice also said that because of the attention given such legislation in the past, "only new engineering and economic data would be considered pertinent" to the measure sponsored by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. O'BRIEN] this year.

I point this out, Mr. Chairman, only in order that all Members of this body may understand clearly that this bill is not new, despite the claims made by its sponsors that it is "a considerably modified version" of the measure heretofore vetoed by the President.

Mr. Chairman, 7 of the 11 counties I represent, border on Lake Michigan. Any measure which would lower further the water level of this body of water is of vital interest to the residents of those counties, as it is to the residents of other counties bordering the Great Lakes and the St. Lawrence Seaway.

Were the city of Chicago to drain from the Great Lakes no more than the 1,000 cubic feet per second, asked for in H.R. 1, perhaps the consequences might not be so serious. However, it should be kept in mind that a 1930 decree of the U.S. Supreme Court now authorizes the diversion of 1,500 cubic feet of water per second from the lake and, accordingly, the bill before us would actually make possible a diversion of 2,500 cubic feet per second, in addition to all domestic pumpage.

Disregarding domestic pumpage, the diversion would amount, as I have said, to more than 1 million gallons of water a minute.

Domestic pumpage, incidentally, amounts at present to nearly 2,000 cubic feet per second. Accordingly, the total diversion authorized, if H.R. 1 were to pass, would be approximately 4,500 cubic feet per second.

In addition to this enormous drainage, the State of Illinois also diverts the flow of three rivers from the Great Lakes into its waterway.

I strongly object to such a high rate of drainage because of the damage to freight traffic on the Great Lakes, which represents the very lifeblood of many American and Canadian communities. With the opening soon of the St. Lawrence Seaway, obviously this consideration is about to become even more important.

Lower lake levels mean lower harbor and canal depths. Extra and expensive dredging would be required. The beauty and recreational value of lakeshore property would be impaired to the injury of the important tourist industry. Every inch in lake level counts, particularly in this cycle when the level of the Great Lakes is already very low.

There can be no question but that the diversion of an additional 1,000 cubic feet of water each second from Lake Michigan would have an adverse effect upon shipping and to some extent would nullify the benefits of deepening the connecting channels as authorized by Congress.

With these facts in mind, Mr. Chairman, I think it is important for the Congress and the people to understand just why such a proposal has been placed before us.

Is it, as the title of the bill indicates, to facilitate navigation on the Illinois River and the Mississippi River?

Anyone familiar with the subject knows that there is no navigational problem on either of these waterways which could be solved by such an additional diversion. Witnesses from the Army Corps of Engineers have testified that water retaining works above Alton, Ill., designed for this specific purpose, will more than meet the navigational needs outlined in H.R. 1.

Obviously, then, the true motivation behind H.R. 1 rests in the phrase, ostensibly outlining its aims, which says, "and for other purposes."

Very simply put the other purposes amount to a desire by the Chicago Sanitary District and its supporters to spare themselves the cost of installing needed additional sewage disposal facilities.

The ever increasing population of the Chicago metropolitan area has run far ahead of its sewage disposal development.

In 1952, for instance, the percentage of solids removed from the area's sewage

was 91.1. By 1957, this had dropped to 80.6 percent.

There are two approaches to the problem. One is the installation of additional sewage disposal facilities. The other is to empty more clean water into the sewage system in order to flush the solids away.

Unlike other communities on the Great Lakes and elsewhere on our navigable waterways, the city of Chicago displays no inclination to install the needed additional sewage treatment facilities.

Chicago apparently is determined, if possible, to solve its waste disposal problem by taking more water from Lake Michigan with a callous disregard for the effect this action would have upon other States and upon our international relations.

The Presidential vetoes of similar measures in 1954 and in 1956 apparently have made no impact upon the sponsors of this legislation. Obviously, they are determined to press on with their public-be-damned effort in order, if possible, to escape their own civic responsibilities. The reasons for opposing this effort were well outlined by President Eisenhower in his last veto message on a similar bill. He said:

1. Existing diversions are adequate for navigation on the Illinois Waterways and Mississippi River.

2. All methods of control of lake levels and the protection of property on the Great Lakes should be considered before arbitrarily proceeding with increased diversion.

3. The diversions should not be authorized without reference to negotiations with Canada.

4. The legitimate interests of other States affected by diversion would be adversely affected.

In previous years, sponsors of diversion have stated openly that sanitation was behind their efforts, and pointed out that the city's population and industry are increasing. The Chicago Sanitary District presently has a sewer capacity of some 53,000 cubic feet per second. Very clearly, such a requirement cannot be met with an additional diversion of only 1,000 cubic feet per second.

If the solution of Chicago's future sewage problems are allowed to depend upon lake water diversion, rather than upon the construction of additional treatment facilities, there is no conceivable limit to the amount of water that eventually will be needed.

Obviously, such a path to the solution of Chicago's sewage problems can lead only in the direction of disastrous economic results for other Great Lakes States.

Passage of this measure would encourage similar demands by other communities on the Great Lakes which now dispose of sewage in a more civic-minded manner.

Even communities far removed from the Great Lakes might be expected to clamor for authority to divert lake water by other means, such as by pipeline.

I believe it is obvious that passage of H.R. 1 would set a dangerous and absurd precedent.

Surface levels of both Lake Michigan and its tributaries today are dangerously low and are dropping continuously. A decrease in the water level of the lakes by even so much as 1 inch has a drastic effect on shipping. Authorities have estimated that the lowering of the lake water levels by 1 inch can mean the loss of 1.5 million tons of shipping.

On the Great Lakes, more than half the ship load changes posted are within 1 inch.

I should add, Mr. Chairman, that opposition to the additional diversion of water by Chicago is not a partisan political matter. In this attempt to divert more water from the Great Lakes there lies a very real and serious danger to the Nation as a whole, and to our international relations.

In view of these considerations, I respectfully urge my colleagues to vote against this bill. Thank you.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES].

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, let me say at once that the gentleman from Florida is exactly wrong in almost everything he says. But before I answer him, let me yield to the distinguished gentlewoman from Illinois [Mrs. CHURCH].

Mrs. CHURCH. Mr. Chairman, I would like to say I was amazed that the gentleman from Florida, who is not a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, attempted to express the opinion of that committee on this subject. The House Foreign Affairs Committee has taken no action whatsoever on this matter—and I personally, as a member of that committee, strongly support this bill.

Mr. YATES. I thank the gentlewoman.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Florida—all the opponents of this bill, for that matter—have presented their arguments upon the basis that this bill seeks to authorize the Metropolitan Sanitary District of Greater Chicago to withdraw permanently from Lake Michigan an additional 1,000 cubic feet of water per second, which of course is totally untrue. This bill has been called a diversion bill, but actually it would be more appropriate to designate it as a study, for that is what it really is. This bill proposes to authorize a 3-year study by the Corps of Army Engineers and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare covering a number of important subjects. The additional 1,000 cubic feet of water per second would be used as an instrumentality in the studies, an additional factor to be considered under controlled conditions. And although the people of Chicago and of Illinois are the primary beneficiaries of the project, its important information would be of tremendous value to urban communities throughout the Nation. In concept it is a national project, not a local one, even though the study will be conducted within the confines of the area of the Metropolitan Sanitary District of Greater Chicago.

The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare has made clear that the study is a meritorious one as is shown by its letter dated March 9, 1959, which I received from Mr. Gordon E. McCallum, Chief of the Department's Water Supply and Water Pollution Control program, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION, AND WELFARE,
PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE,
BUREAU OF STATE SERVICES,
Washington, D.C., March 9, 1959.

Hon. SIDNEY R. YATES,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. YATES: In accordance with your telephone request, we are transmitting the attached report on types of information and its use by others which may be derived from the survey of the general types proposed for the Illinois Waterway.

Sincerely yours,

GORDON E. MCCALLUM,
Chief, Water Supply and Water Pollution Control Program.

BROAD KNOWLEDGE THAT MAY BE DERIVED FROM A STUDY OF THE GENERAL TYPE AUTHORIZED IN H.R. 1 [1]

(Prepared by Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Public Health Service)

A study of pollution control in the Illinois Waterway covering (1) an analysis of the present and projected future water quality of the Illinois Waterway under varying conditions of stream flow and waste treatment and disposal; (2) an evaluation of municipal and industrial waste treatment and disposal practices including storm water overflows within the Metropolitan Sanitary District of Greater Chicago; (3) an evaluation of water quality needs of the entire Illinois River Basin; and (4) alternate means of solving sanitary problems, including additional treatment measures, will probably have broad application throughout the Nation in the following respects:

1. Many American communities are now faced with the problem of maintaining water quality for all legitimate purposes in the face of having a variable stream flow providing only a limited amount of dilution water at critical times. The critical problem in protecting water quality is that of discharging treated waste effluent into a watercourse having limited dilution capacity. This problem becomes especially acute when the community is providing the highest degree of waste treatment now feasible. The study will add much needed knowledge of dilution requirements under conditions existing at Chicago that could be applied elsewhere.

2. Out of the study may well come new or changed concepts dealing with:

(a) Diffusion of wastes in receiving waters.

(b) Bacterial death rates under varying conditions in streams.

(c) Fertilizing effects of sewage and industrial wastes upon troublesome aquatic growths.

(d) Reappraisal of factors affecting rates at which oxygen is used by sewage and industrial wastes in streams, and rates at which oxygen is supplied by natural and artificial means.

(e) Adverse effects of specific wastes, individually and in combination, upon the natural purification processes in streams.

(f) Effects of decomposing sludge deposits upon the overlying water quality.

(g) Field testing of automatic sampling and recording devices now being developed.

3. The study will reveal research needs designed to find practical ways of approaching higher degrees of purification of sewage and industrial wastes where necessary.

---

[1] Such new information, on the basis of past experiences, will be of value to and utilized widely by State and interstate water pollution control agencies, Federal agencies, river basin authorities, communities, industries, and universities.

4. The survey will afford a unique opportunity to correlate accurate measurement of pollution sources with accurate measurement of pollutional effects under varying conditions. Such complete sets of data become classics and when published are in great demand. The comprehensive study of the Ohio River, conducted in the late thirties by the Corps of Engineers and the Public Health Service, is an example of one such classic that has been of great value.

It is clear, Mr. Chairman, that this experiment will be very valuable. But its opponents say that its harmful consequences overshadow any benefits that might be derived from the study. And they cite as examples the damage which would accrue to the lake shipping interests and the power companies. They point out too, the disruptive effect which this bill might have upon friendly relations with Canada as an additional reason for its disapproval.

The chamber of horrors they have conjured up presumably representing the possible terrible consequences of this bill are actually projections based on a permanent withdrawal of water from Lake Michigan. It does not relate to the subject matter of this bill at all. Starting from the illogical premise that this bill must be a forerunner to a permanent diversion, they assume that it does provide for a permanent diversion. Thus beginning from that unreal and illogical premise, they reach their illogical conclusions and the horrible consequences they have stated.

As I listen to them hurl their lightning and thunder against Chicago like Jove of mythological fame, I thought of one of the favorite stories of Abraham Lincoln. Lincoln used to tell the story about the meek husband who was badly henpecked. One day he ran out of the house to escape the beating which his wife was giving to him, and he encountered a friend on the street who said: "Look here, John, I have always stood up for you but I refuse to do it any longer. Any man who quietly takes a beating from his wife deserves to be horsewhipped." John smiled and patted his friend on the back. "Do not be offended," he said. "Why, it hurt me hardly at all, and you have no idea what a powerful lot of good it did for my wife."

For decades, literally, Mr. Chairman, because it diverts water from Lake Michigan, Chicago has been the favorite whipping boy of the surrounding States. They object to Chicago's method of waste disposal. Instead of messing up the Great Lakes like her sister cities of Milwaukee and Cleveland, which dump their sewage after treatment, back into the lake, Chicago flushes its waste, after treatment, into the Chicago River and thence along the drainage canal into the Illinois Waterway. We do not pollute or contaminate the lake. But we do have a problem with adequate disposal of the sewage in the Illinois Waterway.

Their protests would have had some meaning and basis in fact if the sanitary district of Chicago withdrew 10,000 cubic feet of water per second permanently, as it did prior to 1931. At that time the surrounding States obtained a Supreme Court decree which over a period of 7 years required the city to curtail the amount it withdrew from Lake Michigan from 10,000 cubic feet per second to 1,500 cubic feet per second in addition to domestic pumpage—that is, the amount of water needed for drinking and industrial purposes. And that is the amount of water we have been withdrawing since 1938—even though there has been an enormous growth in our industrial and commercial development, and in our population.

But the objections of the sister States have not diminished since that time. Even though the protests are no longer based on fact, for we are not withdrawing 10,000 cubic feet per second, they are made nevertheless. Historical antagonisms are continued like a blood feud in the mountain States, even though the reason for the feud has long disappeared.

The testimony which the opponents of this bill rely on are the statements made by shipping and power interests. You can believe their statements, if you wish, but you must remember that the testimony comes from people who have an interest at stake.

Or you can believe the report of the Army Engineers which has no ax to grind. The Army Engineers made a study of the effect of a 1-year diversion at Chicago of an additional 1,000 cubic feet of water per second and concluded that such a diversion would have no effect at all on Lake Superior. The maximum reduction on the water level on Lakes Michigan and Huron would be one-fourth of an inch. The maximum effect on the water level of Lakes Erie and Ontario would be to reduce them by three-sixteenths of an inch.

Now how much damage do you think there would be to lake shipping interests if as a result of this diversion, the lake levels of four of the Great Lakes were to be lowered one-fourth of an inch or less, particularly when you keep in mind that the lake levels vary between 5 and 7 feet during each year?

And yet you will hear opponents of this bill complain about the tremendous damage that would occur if it were approved, to the St. Lawrence Seaway, to various harbors and shipping installations in the Great Lakes.

As for losses in power revenue, it is estimated that the American and Canadian power interests—both of these, mind you, would lose a maximum of $36,000 a year during the period when this diversion might have an effect—$36,000 a year to power companies which are taking in $100 million a year in total revenues—$36,000 a year as compared with $100 million a year. How true is the statement of the committee on page 3 of the report:

The value of helping to solve one of the most pressing problems of a great metropolitan area far outweighs whatever slight temporary loss, if any, might be sustained by adjacent areas.

That is the point—the value of the study will be great, the damage, little, if any.

The problem of waste disposal and water pollution is one that affects every community in this country, some to a greater degree than others. The large, long-established metropolitan communities have a tremendous stake in studies of this kind, and regardless of what Milwaukee and Cleveland and the other States may tell you, they, too, as well as communities like Philadelphia, Pittsburgh, New York City, Los Angeles—all the big cities can benefit from the study that is proposed in H.R. 1. That is made clear in the HEW letter to which I referred earlier.

The single most important remaining objection relates to the protest filed by the Government of Canada against this bill. This deserves our most serious consideration because we respect and esteem the friendship of our great neighbor to the north. There are many things that one can say about Canada's attitude toward the diversion at Chicago, but its protest to the proposed study is completely incomprehensible in view of the fact that only a few months ago the Department of State wrote me a letter which declared that the Government of Canada had no objection to this study and to the additional diversion of 1,000 cubic feet of water per second at Chicago.

Nothing has changed since that time. All the conditions are the same but for some unknown reason Canada has changed its position.

I suggest that Canada had not thoroughly analyzed this bill at the time it filed its protest. As a matter of fact, a significant amendment adopted by the committee was not in the bill at the time that the Canadian memorandum was received. That amendment appears at line 10 on page 3 of the bill and requires that funds first be made available for this study before it should commence at all. This amendment, in effect, makes this bill an authorization bill subject to the same conditions and contingencies that any public works authorization bill has. Even though the study may be authorized by passage of this legislation, it could not be undertaken unless and until it is given life by the allocation of funds.

Secondly, Canada cannot be serious in contending that its shipping and power interests would be injured by this study. As I have already declared, the proposed study would have a most insignificant effect upon lake levels and thereby upon shipping interests. The damage would be so small that the Corps of Army Engineers stated it could not even measure it.

As far as power is concerned, the total estimated power loss over the 15-year period during which time the proposed diversion is supposed to have some effect, would be $618,000 or $36,000 per year. How badly would Canadian power interests be hurt when it is remembered that the $36,000 per year should be compared with total power revenues accruing to Canadian and American interests of $100 million a year, which is the anticipated earnings of the combined plants? One can only repeat the statement made on page 3 of the majority report that "the value of helping to solve one of the most pressing problems of a great metropolitan area far outweighs whatever slight temporary loss, if any, might be sustained by adjacent areas. I suggest that the Government of Canada might very well reconsider its memorandum of protest and readopt the position expressed

last August that it had no objection to the bill.

For certainly the equities are all on the side of the people of Chicago and Illinois. By the Treaty of 1909 Canada was given a division of the waters of the Niagara River based upon the diversion at Chicago of 10,000 cubic feet per second. The decision of the Supreme Court of the United States in limiting such withdrawal to 1,500 cubic feet per second has since 1938 given Canada the benefit of an additional 8,500 cubic feet of water per second.

Mr. Chairman, I shall attach to my remarks the article entitled "Diversion of Water," by H. P. Ramey, which was delivered before the Illinois section of the American Society of Civil Engineers on June 20, 1957. Mr. Ramey's attitude toward Canada is a strong one but is very revealing.

Incidentally, it should be pointed out that Mr. Ramey's article was predicated upon an earlier bill filed by Congressman O'BRIEN, H.R. 2, which sought a 3-year diversion of 1,000 cubic feet per second at Chicago:

DIVERSION OF WATER

(By H. P. Ramey, chief engineer, the Metropolitan Sanitary District of Greater Chicago, for meeting, Illinois section, American Society of Civil Engineers, June 20, 1957)

The following are axiomatic truths presented as premises to our subject of discussion. Water is a natural resource, essential to all life. Its necessity to human welfare makes it desirable to use it where it will do the most good for the greatest number of people. Such better use may require its diversion from one water course to another. Diversion of water where most needed is not only sound engineering, but good economics.

PRINCIPLE OF DIVERSION

Diversion of water was practiced as early as the earliest civilization, of any consequence. As far back as 2100 B.C., the ancient Babylonians were diverting water from the Euphrates River, using it for irrigation and transportation and discharging it into the Tigris. Even earlier, the Egyptians diverted flood waters of the Nile into a storage reservoir, for later use during periods of low water, a practice similar in principle to that of diversion. This same principle is now being performed in the United States, on the Colorado, the Tennessee, the Missouri, and the Upper Mississippi Rivers.

The principle of water diversion is, of course, universal. Instances can be cited of diversions in the United States, Canada, Great Britain, Brazil, Egypt, India, Korea, Norway, Switzerland, and in Russia.

EXAMPLES OF DIVERSION

In the Hetch Hetchy project for the water supply of San Francisco, the headwaters of the Tuolumne River, a tributary of the San Joaquin River, are impounded 4,700 feet above sea level, 170 miles from San Francisco, from which place they pass through powerplants and through pipelines under the San Joaquin River and under the upper end of San Francisco Bay to the city of San Francisco. This water, diverted from the San Joaquin River Basin, ultimately reaches San Francisco Bay, as sewage.

Much of the water supply of Los Angeles and San Diego, Calif., is diverted from the Colorado River and reaches the Pacific Ocean directly from those cities, instead of its natural route through the Mexican waters of the Gulf of California.

In the Big Thompson project, in eastern Colorado, some of the headwaters of the Colorado River are impounded high up on the western slope of the Rocky Mountain, pumped up, across the Continental Divide, and allowed to flow down the eastern slope of the Rocky Mountains, through powerplants, and is then used for irrigation in semi-arid portions of Colorado and northwestern Kansas. This is a transcontinental diversion.

In the Sierra do Cubata power project, near São Paulo, Brazil, a diversion is made similar to the Big Thompson project. Headwaters of the Grand and Tiete Rivers (which naturally flow west into the Parana River, then southwest into the Paraguay River, then south into the Rio de la Plata, then east into the Atlantic Ocean, near Buenos Aires) are diverted east across the Sierra do Mar, a low mountain chain, and dropped through powerplants, through a head of 2,380 feet, in a comparatively short distance to the Atlantic. This water is diverted from undeveloped country and furnishes power to the most populous section of Brazil.

Water is diverted by Canada into Lake Superior, from the Ogoki and Kenogami Rivers, tributaries of the Albany River, which flows into Hudson Bay, and after transit through the Great Lakes, is used by the Canadians for power in the Niagara Falls and St. Lawrence River areas.

Water is diverted from the Connecticut River watershed and carried east, to augment the water supply of Boston.

New York City augments its water supply by the diversion of water from the Delaware River, which is the natural boundary between the States of New Jersey and Pennsylvania; and a river considered as belonging to those States.

Dozens of other cases of diversion of water could be cited. The instances mentioned have been cited merely to show that diversion is not unusual; and that where water has been diverted, it has been used for the most good for the most people. That is sound engineering.

THE CHICAGO DIVERSION

The diversion of water from Lake Michigan started a controversy which has lasted for 50 years and is still not settled.

This diversion, since 1900, has been made under permits granted by the Secretary of War to the Sanitary District of Chicago, which authorized diversion, as follows:

Permit May 8, 1899, to open canal, to 5,000 cubic feet per second flows.

Permit December 5, 1901, 4,167 cubic feet per second average flow.

Permit March 3, 1925, 8,500 cubic feet per second plus domestic pumpage.

Permit December 31, 1929, 8,500 cubic feet per second, including domestic pumpage.

Permit June 26, 1930:

On and after July 1, 1930, 6,500 cubic feet per second, plus domestic pumpage.

On and after December 31, 1935, 5,000 cubic feet per second, plus domestic pumpage.

On and after December 31, 1935, 1,500 cubic feet per second annual average, in addition to domestic pumpage.

No time limit was placed on this last permit, but it is revocable at the will of the Secretary of War; and is subject to such action as may be taken by Congress.

The presently authorized diversion of 1,500 cubic feet per second, annual average, is not sufficient to properly dilute the effluent from the treatment plants of the sanitary district (even after complete sewage treatment) and a condition of nuisance prevails, during the warmer months of the year, in the upper 50 miles of the Illinois waterway. For the past 5 years the sanitary district has been seeking an additional diversion of 1,000 cubic feet per second, average, for a period long enough to enable a study of conditions in the waterway, by Army Engineers and the U.S. Public Health Service, to determine what the ultimate solution should be.

BACKGROUND OF CHICAGO DIVERSION

Water has been diverted from the Lake Michigan watershed for the past 109 years. This diversion began in 1848, when water was pumped from the Chicago River, at Bridgeport (Ashland Avenue) to serve the navigation needs of the Illinois and Michigan Canal, built by the State of Illinois, under an act of Congress, 1827, and financed originally by the sale of 284,000 acres of the public land, granted to the State by the Federal Government for that purpose.

This diversion averaged about 250 cubic feet per second, from 1848 to 1870, and, being greater than the dry weather flow of the Chicago River, caused an inflow from Lake Michigan. The Chicago sewer system, built 1856–58, drained principally into the Chicago River; and the pumpage for the I. & M. Canal carried this sewage, diluted, into the I. & M. Canal. The I. & M. Canal was deepened, 1866–71, at the expense of the city of Chicago, to provide a gravity flow of 1,000 cubic feet per second from Lake Michigan and thus became, in part, a sanitary canal. This flow was obtained for 1 year; then the canal was silted up from a local flood in 1872; and the lake level dropped. By 1879 the maximum flow was estimated at 283 cubic feet per second.

The city of Chicago then built a new pumping station, at Bridgeport, capacity 1,000 cubic feet per second, by 1884, and caused the operation of the I. & M. Canal for the dilution of sewage, from 1885 until 1907. The average pumpage, over these years was 560 cubic feet per second, the maximum being 950 cubic feet per second in 1898.

CHICAGO DRAINAGE CANAL

The Chicago Drainage Canal was opened January 1900 and the following year 3,515 cubic feet per second of water was diverted from Lake Michigan through it. This was increased to 3,840 cubic feet per second in 1905, to 6,030 cubic feet per second in 1910, to 6,800 cubic feet per second in 1915, to 7,170 cubic feet per second in 1920, and to 8,190 cubic feet per second in 1924. It was less than 7,000 cubic feet per second in 1925, 1926, and 1927, but was 8,400 cubic feet per second in 1928, the maximum for any year. Subsequently this diversion was reduced, by Supreme Court decree, to 6,500 cubic feet per second for the years 1931 to 1935; to 5,000 cubic feet per second for the next 3 years; and to an ultimate of 1,500 cubic feet per second, annual average, from 1939 to date.

All these figures, for diversion, are in addition to domestic (or city) pumpage, which increased from 530 cubic feet per second in 1901, to 800 cubic feet per second in 1910, and 1,200 cubic feet per second in 1921. It was 1,700 cubic feet per second in 1930 and ranged between 1,600 cubic feet per second and 1,700 cubic feet per second for the next 36 years. In 1956 it was 1,697 cubic feet per second.

This domestic pumpage is mentioned separately because the right of any city to pump water for its necessary and domestic uses, and then dispose of such water, or sewage, wherever it desires, has never been questioned. Chicago is the only city on the Great Lakes, which is in the fortunate position of not having to drink its own sewage, or pass it on for others to drink. This aim, to which Chicago has adhered, since 1900, to keep sewage out of the lake, to keep its lake front clean, for water supply, for safe bathing, boating, and other recreations, has been the cause of much recrimination in other lake cities, not so fortunate.

LAKE LEVELS

A withdrawal of 10,000 cubic feet per second from Lake Michigan at Chicago would have a computed lowering effect, after 5 to 8 years, of about 6 inches on Lakes Michigan and Huron, and about 5 inches on Lakes Erie and Ontario. Such lowering can be figured only theoretically, because of the annual fluctuation of about 1 foot between the winter and summer levels of all the Great

Lakes, and the long-time fluctuations, from natural causes, of more than 5 feet on an annual average basis; more than 6.5 feet on monthly averages; and 2 to 3 feet more on daily averages; and 2 to 3 feet more than this on an hourly average.

The Chicago diversion, in continuous effect from 1900 to 1928, probably had, by the end of 1928, when the diversion was 8,400 cubic feet per second and domestic pumpage 1,565 cubic feet per second, total withdrawal 9,965 cubic feet per second lowered lake levels almost as much as 6 inches. By that time, outlet changes in the Detroit and St. Clair Rivers had lowered Lake Michigan and Huron more than 7 inches. Retention of water in Lake Superior, to increase its level, for navigation, had by 1925, lowered the levels of all the other Great Lakes, by 3 inches. These figures and specific instances are cited to show that the matter of lake levels has not, over the years, been considered sacred, by Government authorities.

The presently authorized diversion of 1,500 cubic feet per second of water, for the last 17 years, in effect since 1939, is estimated to have lowered the levels of Lakes Michigan and Huron about 1 inch. The domestic water pumpage at Chicago, about 1,700 cubic feet per second in recent years, has lowered such levels about 1⅛ inches. Hence the present total lowering effect is estimated at 2⅛ inches. The proposed additional diversion of 1,000 cubic feet per second for 3 years is estimated would lower levels of Lakes Michigan and Huron five-eighths of an inch, if continued indefinitely. The total estimated lowering effect of the three quantities since 1939 would therefore amount to 2¾ inches on Lakes Michigan and Huron, and slightly less on Lakes Erie and Ontario.

Introduction of water into Lake Superior from the Hudson Bay watershed, by Canadian interests, in amounts averaging more than 5,000 cubic feet per second, since July 1943, has raised levels of all the Great Lakes at least 3 inches. This has more than offset the lowering due to the diversion of water at Chicago and will more than offset the prospective diversion of 1,000 cubic feet per second more, sought in recent years.

In respect to these diversions from and into the Great Lakes system, the lake surfaces are fluctuating through their normal ranges, at levels slightly higher than their natural levels. Navigation interests receive the benefit of slightly greater depths thus created.

The foregoing statements are for information on the physical facts involved in this matter of the diversion of water from Lake Michigan.

HOW THE LAKE LEVEL CONTROVERSY BEGAN

The Sanitary District of Chicago was created by an 1889 act of the Illinois State Legislature; to divert the sewage of the Chicago region from Lake Michigan, the source of municipal water supply, and to dispose of this sewage by dilution with sufficient Lake Michigan water to prevent nuisance downstream. This legislative act specified the flow capacity of the drainage canal, 10,000 cubic feet per second, sufficient to carry away the greatest flood which could originate in the Chicago area. It also specified the dilution ratio, namely 3⅓ cubic feet per second of lake water for the sewage of 1,000 persons. This figures 3 million people (the 1920 population of the Sanitary District for 10,000 cubic feet per second of water, as the capacity of the canal for the disposal of sewage, by dilution. Industrial wastes were not considered.

Before construction of the drainage canal was started, the sanitary district informed the Chief of Engineers of its plans; and he informed the Secretary of War, who reported the matter to Congress, 1892. The canal was built 1892–1900 and its construction was viewed by the Chief of Engineers and the Secretary of War in 1898. The sanitary district requested and received permits from the Secretary of War, to improve the south branch of the Chicago River, to make it a proper supply channel for the drainage channel, then under construction. The sanitary district, April 1899, requested permission to open the drainage canal, for a flow of 5,000 cubic feet per second of lake water, and May 8, 1899, the Secretary of War granted a permit "to open the channel constructed, and cause the waters of Chicago River to flow into the same."

This was subject to a condition "that it is distinctly understood that it is the intention of the Secretary of War to submit the questions connected with the work of the Sanitary District of Chicago to Congress for consideration and final action, and that this permit shall be subject to such action as may be taken by Congress."

The drainage canal was opened January 17, 1900. This permit was amended, slightly, three times within the next 2 years, the final permit, December 5, 1901, limiting the flow to an average of 4,167 cubic feet per second.

All these permits mentioned the submission of the matter to Congress, for final determination, but this was not done by either the Secretary of War, or by the sanitary district. Hindsight shows this omission was detrimental to Chicago because Congress at that time would undoubtedly have authorized a diversion of 10,000 cubic feet per second, or the amount for which the channel had been built; and there would have been no lake level controversy.

The sanitary district trustees believed that since the drainage canal, constructed for navigation as well as for flood runoff and sanitation, would fit into the plans of the Government for a waterway between Lake Michigan and the Mississippi River, the use of such canal would never be questioned. Government engineers had been studying a waterway of greater capacity than the I. & M. Canal, since 1857. Nine separate reports on this matter had been made to Congress on surveys authorized by Congress, between 1857 and 1905. Lake Michigan was always assumed as the only logical source of water to supply this waterway, in all these reports and recommendations. The quantities of water, or diversion recommended, varied in amounts from 1,000 cubic feet per second to 10,000 cubic feet per second.

In 1907, the Secretary of War, Taft, questioned the authority of the Secretary of War, to regulate the diversion; and a friendly suit between the Government and the sanitary district was started, 1908, in the Federal district court, to determine jurisdiction. This suit was not pressed seriously.

By 1912 the sanitary district had improved the south branch of the Chicago River to a point where it had capacity to flow 10,000 cubic feet per second without currents obstructive to navigation; and applied to the Secretary of War for an increase in the diversion from 4,167 cubic feet per second to 10,000 cubic feet per second.

After a public hearing, in which opposition was expressed by the Lake States, Canada, shipping interests, etc., Secretary of War Stimson denied this request in a lengthy opinion, January 8, 1913. In this opinion Secretary Stimson stated that diversion of water from the Great Lakes was a matter for Congress to determine.

The sanitary district, however, did not seek action by Congress, but decided to have its rights decided in the Federal district court. This decision, which may now be considered a bad mistake, was caused by certain trustees of the sanitary district, who insisted that the disposal of Chicago's sewage by dilution, as specified in the Sanitary District Act of 1889, was the only method authorized.

Engineers of the sanitary district had been experimenting with sewage treatment, since 1909; and had recommended, 1911, that all sewage in excess of that from 3 million people, or equivalent, be given treatment. This was the original sewage treatment program of the district, to utilize the drainage canal to its capacity, and to provide treatment for all sewage in excess of that amount.

FEDERAL SUIT

Suit was filed October 1913, by the Government in the Federal district court to restrain the sanitary district from diverting more than the 4,167 cubic feet per second of water specified in the permit of 1901. The sanitary district contended that the Secretary of War had no right to limit the diversion and that as a State agency it had a right to use water to protect the health of its people, under the State's police power. The Supreme Court decided, however, January 1925, that the power of Government, in the regulation of interstate commerce, was supreme over any power of the State; and that the injunction should go into effect within 60 days.

Within this 60 days, the sanitary district obtained a permit, March 3, 1925, from the Secretary of War, for a diversion of 8,500 cubic feet per second of water, in addition to domestic pumpage, for 5 years, or until December 31, 1929.

LAKE STATES CASE

Then the Wisconsin suit, or Lake States case, was tried, in the U.S. Supreme Court, by Charles Evans Hughes, as special master. In this case, the State of Wisconsin sought to restrain the diversion of any water from Lake Michigan. Special Master Hughes, reported to the Court, November 1927, on both facts and the law. Some of the facts he found were:

The diversion of approximately 10,000 cubic feet per second of water had lowered the levels of Lakes Michigan and Huron 6 inches, and of Erie and Ontario about 5 inches.

The diversion had caused substantial damage to the navigation and commercial interests of the Lake States.

The diversion had provided 4 feet of the low water depth of 7 feet in the lower Illinois River Waterway project, from Utica to Grafton.

The diversion had provided about 1 foot of the low water depth of the Mississippi River, at St. Louis.

On the matter of law, Special Master Hughes concluded that Congress had the power to regulate the diversion; that Congress had conferred authority on the Secretary of War to regulate it, within reasonable limits; and that the permit of March 3, 1925 was valid. Special Master Hughes recommended that the bill of the Lake States, for injunction, be dismissed, without prejudice.

The Supreme Court, Taft opinion, January 1929, reversed Special Master Hughes in his construction of the law and in his recommendation for dismissal. This Taft opinion stated that "Insofar as the diversion was not for the purposes of maintaining navigation in the Chicago River, it was without any legal basis, because made for an inadmissible purpose."

The case was re-referred, for further hearing, to Special Master Hughes to determine (1) what works were needed to replace diversion of water for the disposal of sewage; (2) what time would be required to build sewage disposal works; (3) what reductions in diversion could be made, from time to time, pending completion of the sewage treatment works; and (4) what diversion of water from Lake Michigan would be "necessary for the purpose of maintaining navigation in the Chicago River, as a part of the port of Chicago after these sewage disposal plants are in full operation."

SUPREME COURT DECREE, 1930

Trial of the Lake States case resulted in the entry of the decree of the Supreme Court,

April 21, 1930, under which the diversion was geared to the time for the completion of various phases of the construction program, the dates for the reductions of diversion being (1) reduced to 6,500 cubic feet per second, annual average, July 1, 1930; (2) to 5,000 cubic feet per second, December 31, 1935; and (3) to 1,500 cubic feet per second, December 31, 1938. The Sanitary District was thus required to build works for the complete treatment of all its sewage during that period. The Drainage Canal could no longer be counted on for the disposal of the sewage of 3 million people. It still remains available for flood runoff, for the passage of the treated sewage; and for navigation.

SEWAGE TREATMENT BY SANITARY DISTRICT

Since 1950, the Sanitary District has given complete treatment to all of its sewage, except of course, the storm flow during major rains.

The highest degree of sewage treatment, on an annual average basis, which can be expected from the Sanitary District plants, or from any plant is 90 percent. The population of the Sanitary District (1955) was 4,500,000, and industrial wastes were equivalent to the sewage of 3,800,000 people, total 8,300,000. With 90 percent removal of biochemical oxygen demand, there still remains 10 percent of the BOD. Ten percent of 8,300,000 is 830,000. The remaining BOD, therefore, is equivalent to that from the sewage of 830,000, or from a city as large as Washington, D.C. The presently authorized diversion of 1,500 cubic feet per second, annual average, provides a dilution ratio of 1,500 cubic feet per second for the equivalent of the sewage of 830,000 people, or 1.8 cubic feet per second of water for the sewage of 1,000 people. This is only about half of the dilution ratio specified in the Sanitary District Act; and is not enough to prevent nuisance conditions in the stream.

Another approach is in the matter of solids. In 1955 the solids, in the sewage reaching the treatment plants of the Sanitary District, averaged 867 tons per day. With 90 percent removal of sewage solids, there still remains, in the treated sewage, about 87 tons per day of solids, which contain about 5 tons per day of nitrogen. An additional 40 tons per day of nitrogen is carried to the canal in the treated sewage effluent. This nitrogen promotes underwater growth which in time cause nuisance, and probably actual, obstructions.

Under present conditions, with diversion at Chicago limited to 1,500 cubic feet per second, a foul condition is created in the upper 50 miles of the Illinois Waterway, from Chicago to Dresden Island. The worst section is between Lockport and the Brandon Road pool in South Joliet. Here the dissolved oxygen (DO) in the water frequently drops to less than 1 part per million, in the summer months, with a biochemical oxygen demand (BOD) of 6 to 7 parts per million. Considerable sludge digestion takes place in the Brandon Road pool, and some in the Dresden Island pool. Below that point the stream is in fairly good shape.

WATERWAYS

Despite the fact that Government engineers had been making studies for an adequate waterway connection between Lake Michigan and the lower Illinois Rivers, since 1880 and earlier, the only physical change in this situation for 50 years, or up to 1930, had been the construction of the Drainage Canal, by 1900, and its extension to Joliet, by 1908. The Government had authorized a 9-foot navigation project in the lower Illinois River, 1927, requiring a diversion of about 5,000 cubic feet per second of water from Lake Michigan to maintain this depth.

The State of Illinois was constructing the Illinois Waterway, five locks and dams, for 9-foot draft, between Lockport and the Illinois River, under the State Act of 1919. So, when the Lake States case was tried, on re-reference, 1929, there was no authorized physical connection between the Federal navigation project in the Chicago River including the Drainage Canal, and the Federal project in the lower Illinois River. For the slim, but perhaps proper, legal reason that there was no authorized connection between these two Federal navigation projects, no testimony was permitted in this case as to the needs of the Illinois River, or the needs of the waterway as a whole. Testimony was limited to the needs of the Chicago River, "as part of the Port of Chicago."

Funds of the State of Illinois, for the construction of the waterway, became exhausted and, July 3, 1930, less than two and one-half months after the Supreme Court decree of April 21, 1930, limiting the diversion to 1,500 cubic feet per second, Congress passed an act, taking over the Illinois Waterway and appropriating funds for its completion. This act provided that the 1,500 cubic feet per second of water from Lake Michigan, authorized by the Supreme Court, should be used for the navigation of this waterway; and provided further that after the Illinois Waterway was completed the Secretary of War should cause a study of the amount of water required to meet the needs of a commercially useful waterway and report to the Congress on or before January 31, 1938.

The Illinois Waterway was completed March 1, 1933 and officially opened June 22, 1933. Colonel Sultan, U.S. District Engineer, at Chicago, made a report to Congress on the matter September 26, 1933, in which he concluded that the diversion of 1,500 cubic feet per second, annual average, from the Lake Michigan watershed, in addition to domestic pumpage, was sufficient to meet the direct (flotation) needs of the waterway; but that the indirect needs, in the matter of securing satisfactory sanitary conditions for those aboard vessels or employed at terminals could not be determined until after the waterway had been fully completed, the sewage treatment plants of the Sanitary District placed in full service, and the diversion limited to 1,500 cubic feet per second for a sufficient period of time (suggested as not more than 2 years) to observe the conditions as they might then exist.

Colonel Sultan stated: "Then, and then only, can it be determined whether any additional diversion is necessary in order to provide decent and healthful living conditions for boatcrews and river terminal operators."

This study has never been made.

NAVIGATION—ILLINOIS WATERWAY

Traffic on the Illinois Waterway has increased from 5,501,000 tons in 1939, to 12,895,000 tons in 1949, to 20,077,000 tons in 1953, and to about 22 million tons per year, or more, as of today.

Representatives of the Army Engineers testified at congressional hearings in 1952, 1954, 1955, and again in 1956, recommending an increase of 1,000 cubic feet per second in diversion for 3 years for study purposes to enable by tests to determine whether any increase in flow through the Illinois Waterway is necessary or desirable in the interest of navigation.

All agree that it would benefit the welfare of the users of this waterway, both on boats and on shore, to have at all times a clean stream.

CANADA'S INTEREST

Canada's interest in the matter of diversion is purely selfish and noncooperative. The record shows this clearly. A full discussion of Canada's interest in this diversion is in order because objection by Canada to bills for increased diversion of 1,000 cubic feet per second, passed by Congress 1954 and 1956, was cited by the President as one of the reasons for his veto of both bills. It appears to be the principal reason for objection to passage of the pending O'Brien bill, H.R. 2, 85th Congress, 1st session.

On June 3, 1902, Congress passed the act under which the International Waterways Commission was created to study and report on the matter of waterflow at Niagara Falls. Three engineers from the United States and three from Canada formed this Commission.

After due study, this Commission reported, each section to its own Government, April 1906, and then, the joint commission to both Governments, May 1906, that a treaty or legislation be had authorizing diversion of water from Niagara River, above the falls, in the amounts of 36,000 cubic feet per second on the Canadian side, and 28,500 cubic feet per second on the U.S. side, this latter figure to include 10,000 cubic feet per second for the Chicago drainage canal.

Congress, on June 29, 1906, passed the Niagara Falls Act, providing in section 1, as follows:

"That the diversion of water from Niagara River or its tributaries, in the State of New York, is hereby prohibited, except with the consent of the Secretary of War as hereinafter authorized in section 2 of this act: *Provided,* That this prohibition shall not be interpreted as forbidding the diversion of the waters of the Great Lakes or of Niagara River for sanitary or domestic purposes, or for navigation, the amount of which may be fixed from time to time by the Congress of the United States or by the Secretary of War of the United States under its direction."

Section 2 of this 1906 act authorized the Secretary of War to grant permits for power purposes, within certain limitations. By section 4, the President was requested to open negotiations with Great Britain for the purpose of effectually providing by suitable treaty, for such regulation and control of the waters of Niagara River and its tributaries as should preserve the scenic grandeur of Niagara Falls and of the rapids. In view of the last-mentioned provision, an amendment of the bill, proposed by Senator Hopkins of Illinois, had been adopted in the Senate, as follows:

"Provided, however, That nothing contained herein shall be construed to hold or concede that the waters of Lake Michigan shall be or are subject of international agreement."

The House of Representatives refused to concur in this amendment, as it might embarrass the President in conducting negotiations. The conference committee therefore receded from the amendment. Senator Lodge, on reporting to the Senate the action of the conference committee and replying to Senator Hopkins, said:

"Mr. President, I had supposed that the Senator from Illinois [Mr. Hopkins] realizes that the report of this bill in its present condition would not in any way endanger the rights of Chicago to have water from the lake. Certainly I should have adhered to the amendment if I had thought that the drainage canal of Chicago would have been in any way endangered by the Commission. The House did not accept this amendment.

"The first section of the bill protects the rights of Chicago. No treaty would be made by our commissioners which would impair or infringe those rights.

"Every right is safeguarded. The confereees were as anxious as the Senator from Illinois could possibly be to protect the drainage canal at Chicago, but they did not feel warranted in allowing the whole legislation for such an important object to fail."

On January 4, 1908, the International Waterways Commission made a special report upon the Chicago Drainage Canal. This gave a full description of the canal. It concluded with the following recommendation:

"A careful consideration of all the circumstances leads us to the conclusion that the diversion of 10,000 cubic feet per second through the Chicago River will, with proper treatment of the sewage from areas now sparsely occupied, provide for all the population which will ever be tributary to that river, and that the amount named will therefore suffice for the sanitary purposes of the city for all time. Incidentally, it will provide for the largest navigable waterway from Lake Michigan to the Mississippi River which has been considered by Congress.

"We, therefore, recommend that the Government of the United States prohibit the diversion of more than 10,000 cubic feet per second for the Chicago Drainage Canal."

The Boundary Waters Treaty was signed, 1909, and ratified May 1910.

The statement of the Secretary of State (Elihu Root) before Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate when this treaty was under consideration shows that it was not intended to cover Lake Michigan as a boundary water or to affect the diversion through the drainage canal at Chicago. Among other things, Secretary Root said to the committee:

"The treaty starts with defining the boundary waters as the waters from main shore to main shore of the lakes and rivers and connecting waterways, or the portions thereof along which the international boundary between the United States and the Dominion of Canada passes, including all bays, arms, and inlets thereof, but not including tributary waters which in their natural channels would flow into such lakes, rivers, and waterways or waters flowing from such lakes, rivers, and waterways.

"I have very carefully guarded the terms of this treaty in order not to include Lake Michigan and in order not to involve Senator Cullom's constituents in the drainage canal in the treaty in any way. * * *

"The great bulk of the water goes on the Canadian side, and the Waterways Commission that was appointed some time ago to deal with the question of the lake levels reports, I think, that 36,000 feet can be taken out of the Canadian side and 18,500 on the American side, without injury to the Falls. I thought it wise to follow the report of the Commission and I put in 1,500 feet in addition to get round numbers, so our limit is higher than we want but their limit could not be cut down below what it is because there are three companies on the Canadian side who have the right and works there. * * * Then, there is this further fact why we could not object to this 36,000 provision on the Canadian side. We are now taking 10,000 cubic feet a second out of Lake Michigan at Chicago, and I refused to permit them to say anything in the treaty about it. * * *

"The definition of boundary waters was carefully drawn in order to exclude Lake Michigan. * * *

"* * * In the third place" (referring to the reasons for allowing the United States to divert but 20,000 cubic feet per second, while Canada was allowed 36,000 cubic feet per second) "they consented to leave out of this treaty any reference to the drainage canal, and we are now taking 10,000 cubic feet per second for the drainage canal which really comes out of this lake system."

Despite this record, Canada objected to increasing the diversion from 4,167 cubic feet per second to 10,000 cubic feet per second, at the hearings before Secretary of War Stimson. Objections were expressed by Canada, or Canadian interests, on every possible occasion thereafter. It is not improbable that the great wave of publicity against the Chicago diversion, beginning about 1923, was financed largely by Canadian funds.

Issuance of the diversion permit of March 3, 1925, was the cause of diplomatic correspondence, initiated by Canada.

The first proposed St. Lawrence Seaway Treaty, signed 1932, by its article VIII, would have fixed the diversion from Lake Michigan, at Chicago, at 1,500 cubic feet per second, for all time, or subject to an international tribunal. This treaty failed of ratification in 1934, largely because this provision would have removed this question from the jurisdiction of Congress and the Supreme Court.

This proposed 1932 treaty would have given Canada the exclusive right to use, for power purposes, any water it might divert into the Great Lakes system. Later, as the result of a series of notes exchanged between Canada and the State Department of the United States about 1938–41, Canada was given permission to divert about 5,000 cubic feet per second of water from the Albany River watershed into Lake Superior.

The Niagara Falls Treaty of 1950, ratified by two-thirds of a very small group of Senators present, divided the water at Niagara Falls equally, for power purposes, but exempted the inflow from the Hudson Bay watershed, from this division.

Canada enjoyed the use of 16,000 cubic feet per second more water for power than the United States, for 40 years, from 1910 until 1950, when the Niagara Falls Treaty was passed and the water divided equally. This 1950 treaty did not legally change the status of water diversion at Chicago in any respect.

The 1950 treaty of Niagara amended the 1909 treaty in some respects, particularly in providing for equal division of waters available for power purposes, but expressly excluded the amount of water used and necessary for domestic and sanitary purposes and for the service of canals for the purposes of navigation.

Cordell Hull, Secretary of State, construed the 1909 treaty as having reserved 10,000 cubic feet per second of water for Chicago. In a letter, 1938, to the Canadian Minister, he stated that the Supreme Court decree, 1930, limiting the Chicago diversion to 1,500 cubic feet per second, had made 8,500 cubic feet per second of water available at Niagara Falls, which were not considered available in 1909.

RECENT ATTEMPTS AT LEGISLATION

The sanitary district has sought additional diversion of water from Lake Michigan to provide a clean stream and decent conditions for navigation in the upper reaches of the Illinois Waterway, in particular, from Chicago to the Brandon Road pool just below Joliet. If proper conditions can be maintained in this critical reach, the conditions further downstream will assuredly be good, since the quality of the water improves as it flows on, beyond Brandon Road.

The sanitary district, as such, has no particular obligation in this respect, as these channels in question have, since 1930, been taken over by the Federal Government and operated as a part of the Federal Waterway, from Lake Michigan to the Gulf of Mexico. The sanitary district has, since 1950, provided complete treatment for all of its sewage; and has thus done all that can be expected of any municipal organization. It has complied with all the requirements of the Supreme Court decree of April 21, 1930, in the Lake States case. Its major sewage treatment plant, the West-Southwest plant, was named, October 1955, by the American Society of Civil Engineers as one of the seven modern engineering wonders of the United States.

The legislation in question has been:

The Sheehan bill, 1952, approved by the House Public Works Committee, was killed by an early adjournment of Congress.

The Jonas bill, passed by Congress, 1954, but vetoed by President Eisenhower, who gave four reasons for this action:

1. Existing diversions were adequate for navigation on the Illinois Waterway and Mississippi River.

2. All methods of control of lake levels and protection of property on the Great Lakes should be considered before arbitrarily proceeding with the proposed increased diversion.

3. The diversions are authorized without reference to negotiations with Canada.

4. The legitimate interests of other States affected by the diversion may be adversely affected.

The O'Brien bill, passed by Congress, 1956 (H.R. 3210, 84th Cong.), but vetoed by President Eisenhower, who gave reasons 2, 3, and 4, above for this veto.

Pending is another O'Brien bill (H.R. 2, 85th Cong.), which has passed the House and is now before the Senate.

The O'Brien bill provides for a temporary increase of 1,000 cubic feet per second in the diversion, from 1,500 cubic feet per second to 2,500 cubic feet per second, for a 3-year period; and a study in that time by U.S. Army Engineers and the U.S. Public Health Service, of its effect on the Illinois Waterway and on the Great Lakes. Whether or not the increase in diversion would be permanent would depend upon future action by Congress, after a report on the results of this proposed study.

ARGUMENTS FOR AND AGAINST DIVERSION

More water is needed:

1. For sanitation, in the Chicago to Joliet area.

2. For industrial use in the same area.

3. To improve the quality of water, for navigation in the Illinois Waterway, particularly in the 50 miles of the stream from Chicago to Dresden Island.

4. To restore fish life to the entire waterway and thus assure clean conditions throughout the Illinois River.

5. To provide navigation depth in the Mississippi River, from Alton to St. Louis, in crises, when prolonged droughts have caused the water resources of the Missouri and upper Mississippi Rivers to be exhausted.

Objections to this added water at Chicago are based on claims that it would:

1. Infringe on certain legal rights of the Lake States.

2. Lower lake levels, about five eighths of 1 inch, and amount so small that it can not be measured, but can only be computed theoretically.

3. Cause loss to shipping on the Great Lakes.

4. Reduce the waterpower potential at Niagara Falls and in the St. Lawrence River. It is power potential, and not actual power, because the present plants lack the installed capacity to use the water now available, and will not have such capacity for years to come.

As to loss to shipping, and the reduction in waterpower potential, the International Lake Ontario Board in its report, 1955, concluded that:

The reduction of five-eighth of 1 inch in lake levels would have no significant effect on navigation.

The computed reductions in power are of such small magnitude that provision for any replacement capacity would not be justified.

In the report, January 1957, by General Berrigan, Division Engineer, the following comments are made:

As to power:

"For a 3-year increase in diversion, the temporary character of the effects on dependable capacities is such as not to warrant evaluation."

As to lake levels:

"However, it is not believed practicable to evaluate such effects because of the small

extent of the lowering and also because of the temporary nature of the lowering there would be no means of estimating the lake stages which would prevail at the time lowering of lake levels is effective."

The Chief of Engineers' comments on the report of General Berrigan, made at the direction of the administration, are as follows:

In regard to navigation:

"That the lowering of Lakes Michigan and Huron could be offset by construction of a deeply submerged sill in the St. Clair River, cost $1,530,000; for Lake Erie, by proper operation of control gates in the Niagara River, now under construction; and that there would be no significant change in Lake Ontario and St. Lawrence levels."

In regard to power:

"That the changes in theoretical dependable capacity are so small with respect to the total capacities of the power systems that assignment of value to the changes is not warranted, from a practical operational standpoint."

A good example of the selfish type of opposition to this legislation, and to the tests which might clear up some of the points which have been in dispute, over the years, can be cited:

As to the loss to shipping on the Great Lakes, counsel for the Lake Carriers in a sentence carefully worded, to be purposely misleading, stated (1956): "If all the vessels owned by the Lake Carriers had their draft reduced three-fourths inch, the annual loss in carrying capacity would be 1½ million tons of cargo.

The answer is that a slight lowering of the water surface would affect only the few larger boats, capacity 10,000 tons and over and these only on downbound trips, when they carry the heaviest cargo, iron ore. On the upbound trips, even fully loaded with coal, they could not possibly be affected. Perhaps 75 percent of the boats on the Great Lakes have drafts that do not require even present full project depths.

It is significant that the Army Engineers, interested in navigation and even now working on the Calumet-Sag Channel widening project to increase the capacity of the Illinois Waterway, have supported each of the four bills for increased diversion, from 1952 to 1957; while the State Department has opposed them. The State Department apparently pays more attention to an objection by Canada, whether it be a valid objection or not, than to the needs of the Middle West.

In 1956, the Supreme Court of the United States finally recognized, for the first time since its decree in 1930, that navigation can require increased diversion. Unprecedented drought conditions existing in the area of the Mississippi and Illinois Rivers threatened the water supplies of many communities upon the waterways and seriously impaired navigation. At one time, for example, 200 barges were tied up on the Mississippi River at the Alton Dam. Therefore, the Governor of Illinois on October 16, 1956, petitioned the Secretary of Defense for an increase of diversion, but the petition was rejected by the Secretary of the Army. Thereupon the State of Illinois petitioned the Supreme Court on November 13, 1956, to increase diversion to 10,000 cubic feet per second for a period of 100 days. On December 17, 1956, the Supreme Court entered the following order:

"In view of the emergency in navigation caused by low water in the Mississippi River, paragraph 3 of the decree in these causes issued on April 21, 1930, is temporarily modified to permit the diversion to and including the 31st day of January 1957, from the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence system into the Illinois Waterway and the Mississippi River of such amount of water not exceeding an average of 8,500 cubic feet a second, in addition to domestic pumpage, as the Corps of Engineers, U.S. Army, shall determine will be useful in alleviating the emergency with respect to navigation on the Illinois Waterway, at such times and in such amounts as the Corps of Engineers shall direct."

It is a matter for Congress, and Congress has acted, but has been overruled twice, by pocket vetoes, after Congress had adjourned.

The point is next made that the proposed additional diversion at Chicago may well serve as a precedent in the controversy between the United States and Canada over the waters of the Columbia River. There is fear expressed that a unilateral diversion at Chicago without Canada's consent—even though legally appropriate—may serve as an incentive for Canada to take unilateral action in diverting the waters of the Columbia River away from the United States. On this point let me cite the letter of the Counsel of the Department of State, dated July 31, 1958, on that point, to the effect that if there were no material damage resulting from the proposed additional diversion at Chicago, there would be no precedent established for consideration in the discussions of the diversion of the waters of the Columbia River. The studies of the Corps of Engineers indicate that the proposed diversion cannot possibly result in material damage either to the power or the shipping interests. It is extremely unlikely, therefore, that passage of this bill and any diversion made under it could serve as a precedent for the Columbia River water discussions. I shall attach that letter to my remarks.

The contention in opposition to the bill is being made, too, that increased expenditures by the sanitary district could improve its engineering facilities and its treatment processes to the point where the additional diversion would not be necessary. Even the most ardent opponents of this bill admit that the sanitary district is one of the most modern treatment plants in the world. In fact, some of its operations have been described by the American Society of Sanitary Engineers as one of the engineering marvels of the world. The work of improvement of its facilities is a constant one and in the next 2 or 3 years alone, the sanitary district will spend $46.9 million in maintenance and improvements to its plant. If this is not an indication of good faith, I do not know what is.

And so, Mr. Chairman, we who represent this great metropolis of the Middle West ask your help in allowing Chicago to fulfill its destiny. We would not jeopardize the St. Lawrence Seaway because we know that this waterway will eventually make Chicago the No. 1 port of the world. New commerce and new industry are moving into our city every day. New people are establishing homes and making contributions toward building our community and our country. This problem of sanitation and waste disposal is a straitjacket to our growth. That is why this bill is of such vital importance—of importance not only to us, but to every great city in the country.

The benefits which flow from this test and this study will accrue to all the people of our Nation. This bill should be approved.

JULY 31, 1958.

The Honorable SIDNEY R. YATES,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. YATES: In accordance with your telephone request of yesterday, I am submitting herewith a supplementary statement regarding certain of the conclusions set forth in my letter of July 29, 1958, to Senator RICHARD L. NEUBERGER. With the consent of the Senator I am sending you herewith a copy of that letter.

The Department has not attempted to make any determination with regard to the conflicting claims as to whether the proposed diversion at Chicago would in fact cause material injury to Canadian navigation or hydroelectric power interests. As far back as 1954 the Canadian Government, in objecting to a bill similar in its terms to H.R. 2, asserted: "If the proposed increase in the diversion at Chicago were to take place, the Government of Canada would, in the circumstances described above, consider that there would be material injury to the navigation interests on its side of the boundary." In 1956 they stated their view that "the enactment of the proposed legislation would be prejudicial to the navigation and power interests of both countries." In 1958 they referred to "the economic harm which may be done to navigation and hydroelectric generation in both countries by extended use of dilution methods." Extracts from the communications from the Canadian Government in which these expressions of view appear were set forth somewhat more fully in my letter of July 29, 1958, to Senator NEUBERGER.

It was in the light of this position of the Canadian Government that I stated, in that letter: "Canada's reasons for opposing the Chicago diversion bill are thus very similar to those of the United States with respect to the Columbia River diversion, and it would seem that H.R. 2, if enacted, could constitute a precedent to be used by the Canadian interests in support of their proposals on the Columbia."

If in fact the proposed diversion at Chicago did not result in material injury to navigation or power interests on the Canadian side of the boundary, this basis of objection by Canada would not exist, and in those circumstances there would, of course, be no precedent that might be cited in connection with the Columbia River situation.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN M. RAYMOND,
Acting Legal Adviser.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

All time has expired.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, in order to provide the basis for the study, authorized by section 2 of this Act, of the effect of increased diversion of water from Lake Michigan, in addition to the one thousand five hundred cubic feet of water per second presently provided by the 1930 decree of the Supreme Court of the United States (281 U.S. 181–202) and subsequently authorized by the Rivers and Harbors Act of 1930 (46 Stat. 918, 929), upon the Illinois Waterway and the degree of improvement in such waterway caused thereby, and the effect of such increased diversion upon commerce among the several States and navigation on the Great Lakes and the Illinois Waterway, authority is hereby granted to the State of Illinois and the Metropolitan Sanitary District of Greater Chicago, under the supervision and direction of the Secretary of the Army, to withdraw water from Lake Michigan for the one-year period specified in paragraph (3) of subsection (b) of section 2 of

this Act, in addition to all domestic pumpage, at a rate providing a total annual average of not more than two thousand five hundred cubic feet of water per second, to flow into the Illinois Waterway during such one-year period, subject to the following limitations:

(1) The Secretary of the Army shall at all times have direct control and supervision of the amounts of water directly diverted from Lake Michigan.

(2) The Secretary of the Army shall not allow any water to be directly diverted from Lake Michigan to flow into the Illinois Waterway during times of flood in the Illinois, Des Plaines, Chicago, or Calumet Rivers.

SEC. 2. (a) During the three-year period beginning on the date of enactment of this Act the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, in cooperation with the Secretary of the Army (acting through the Chief of Engineers), shall cause a study to be made of the effect on Lake Michigan and on the Illinois Waterway of the increased annual diversion of one thousand cubic feet of water per second for the one-year period authorized by this Act, and the improvement in navigation conditions and other improvements along the Illinois Waterway which may result from such increased diversion.

(b) The study authorized to be made by subsection (a) of this section shall be divided into the following phases:

(1) The first period of six months shall begin on the date of enactment of this Act and shall be used to develop plans for the tests and range of studies of the Illinois Waterway, with no increase in the authorized diversion from Lake Michigan during such period.

(2) The twelve-month period immediately following the period specified in paragraph (1) shall be devoted to a stream survey of the Illinois Waterway under existing conditions, with no increase in the authorized diversion from Lake Michigan during such period.

(3) The twelve-month period immediately following the period specified in paragraph (2) shall be used to study the conditions in the Illinois Waterway with a total annual average diversion of two thousand five hundred cubic feet of water per second (comprising the authorized diversion of one thousand five hundred cubic feet of water per second and the additional one thousand cubic feet of water per second authorized by the first section of this Act) in addition to all domestic pumpage.

(4) The six-month period immediately following the period specified in paragraph (3) shall be used to prepare the final report required by subsection (c) of this section.

(c) Upon completion of the study authorized by subsection (a) of this section, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, and the Secretary of the Army shall correlate the results of such study. Thereafter the Secretary of the Army shall report such results to Congress on or before June 1, 1962. The report on such results shall contain recommendations with respect to continuing the authority to divert water from Lake Michigan into the Illinois Waterway in the amount authorized by the first section of this Act, or increasing or decreasing such amount.

Mr. BLATNIK (during the reading of the bill). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the bill be dispensed with, that it be printed in the RECORD and that it be open for amendment at any point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there any objection to the request of the gentleman?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the first committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment on page 3, line 11, strike out "of enactment of this Act" and insert in lieu "funds are first made available for the study".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment on page 4, lines 10 and 11, strike out the period after the word "study" and substitute a comma and strike out "Thereafter the Secretary of the Army" and substitute the word "and".

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, some of us find ourselves in a difficult situation. The Illinois Members, and especially our colleague from Illinois [Mrs. CHURCH], and the Chicago Tribune, a great American paper, if there ever was one, and no doubt other Chicago publications, want this legislation. It is tough on some of us who oppose it, who would like to please them, to vote as we must, but the bill is no solution to the sanitation problem of the city of Chicago. I recall very distinctly standing on the State Street Bridge in Chicago and watching the river flow into Lake Michigan, carrying its sewage into Chicago's source of drinking water. That was 60 years ago. The gentleman from Chicago [Mr. O'HARA] remembers it very, very well. Chicago has not successfully solved the problem, which is an excess of sewage in their water supply. That is the real issue here.

Chicago wants to draw additional water out of Lake Michigan to lessen its burden of disposing of its sewage. So doing may or may not lower the water level of our harbors around the lakes, the harbors of Ohio, Wisconsin, Indiana, Michigan; it may or may not; but one thing is certain: Chicago intends to use that water to dump this sewage through the canal and down the river. True, Michigan is not without sin; we have dumped some of our sewage into the lake; but in my home town we bonded our city and taxed our people to build a sewage-disposal plant, and that is what Chicago will be forced to do before it ever gets its sanitation situation solved.

And answer this question of pollution and public health: Where do you get your drinking water? You take it out of the lake.

That question will confront us. We are already getting letters on it. These foreign ships come in and dump their sewage into the lake. As rivers flowing into Lake Michigan continue to dump sewage into Lake Michigan your water supply will continue to grow less drinkable. You get your drinking water from the lake. We do not want it polluted, nor should we lessen its volume. There is another problem you must meet. All you have to do to realize its magnitude is to fly over Chicago and look at those cesspools or sludge ponds all around that great canal. Sometime Chicago will be forced to either quit growing or take care of its own sewage, both raw and industrial, for throughout the country the water supply is becoming inadequate.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I listened to my colleague from Michigan reduce this discussion to an argument about Chicago sewage. As far as I can see there is considerably more involved in the issue before the House today.

Others have made an argument about Canada. I happen to be chairman of the Subcommittee on Foreign Trade Policy of the Ways and Means Committee. My subcommittee visited Canada about a year ago and we met with everyone from Prime Minister Diefenbaker on down. We listened to the Canadian problems very sympathetically. As a matter of fact, I have taken this well on numerous occasions to present the Canadian point of view on many of these issues. I might say in passing that not once in our discussion was any mention made of this bill now being debated. This bill was before the Congress then, it was before the Congress prior to that time.

What does this bill seek to do? This bill does not seek to set up a permanent system of diversion. It simply says that under the direction of the Army Engineers—who are the best qualified in our country—there shall be diverted from Lake Michigan into the Chicago Canal 1,000 cubic feet of water additional per second for 1 year, and that a study of such diversion shall be made extending over a 3-year period. I cannot conceivably believe that the Government of our greatest friend and finest neighbor, Canada, could possibly object to a responsible agency of our Government making this type of study.

Second, when I was in Canada I had the privilege of going to Toronto and going out and looking at the model of the St. Lawrence Seaway. In this project there is diversion of many types: diversion from lake to lake; from lakes into the St. Lawrence River; from lakes into various channels of the St. Lawrence system, and that whole thing has been worked out between the United States and Canada. I cannot believe that there is not enough common sense existing between the United States and its Canadian neighbor to work out this problem.

Finally, let me say that there is more than Chicago involved, although I think that is quite a commanding consideration. I yield to no one in my profound affection for the gentleman from Illinois, TOM O'BRIEN, but I would be for this bill whether I held that affection for the gentleman from Illinois, TOM O'BRIEN, or not.

I would be for this bill because there is much national interest involved in it. We have built in our country, with great pride and great credit, a magnificent system of inland waterway navigation and transportation. This is part of it. Back in 1956, if I remember correctly, the oil barges moving up the inland waterway system from Houston, Tex., from the oil wells of Texas and Louisiana and the great Southwest, could not get past the

Alton locks, just above St. Louis, to the areas to the north, Chicago, and the other great centers, including the cities that have expressed some concern about this study being made. These areas were threatened with a shortage of fuel oil in a cold winter because of the fact these locks were not navigable.

So this study is important not only from the point of view of whether or not the city of Chicago has or has not used proper diligence in solving its sewage-disposal problem. This is important in the whole complex of the inland waterway system of the United States.

It would seem to me that the people who reside in the Great Lakes region would recognize the importance of connecting the St. Lawrence Seaway system with the vast inland waterway system stretching from Pittsburgh on the east to beyond Kansas City on the west and down the Mississippi River to New Orleans and points throughout the world.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Louisiana has expired.

(By unanimous consent (at the request of Mr. BOGGS) he was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. SCHERER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOGGS. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. SCHERER. Would the gentleman explain to the House how the 1,000 cubic feet per second per year would help navigation in view of the Army Engineers' report that 1,500 cubic feet per second is adequate?

Mr. BOGGS. The question of a thousand feet would not have any perceptible effect on navigation. I do not think anyone who advocates this bill says it does. All I am saying is that this bill states: Let the qualified agency of the Government make a study and report back to Congress.

When you vote against that, you say, "We will not let them make that study." So I am pleading that in the interest of navigation, including navigation on the Ohio River, which is a great river—and there is more navigation on the Ohio River today than there was before the coming of the railroads—this study should be authorized.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOGGS. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DINGELL. I would like to remark for the gentleman's benefit that this problem of oil barges being tied up at the Alton Locks was handled under Supreme Court procedure. Additional water was permitted under the decree to the city of Chicago, the sanitary district. The additional water that was needed was furnished to let these barges go up and down that river.

Mr. BOGGS. I am very happy that the gentleman made that point, because the amount of water made available at that time was considerably above the 1,000 cubic feet asked for in this study, and it had no effect whatsoever on the level of Lake Michigan.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOGGS. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. YATES. The amount made available was 8,500 cubic feet per second, and the amount which is suggested under this bill is only 1,000 cubic feet per second.

Mr. BOGGS. Yes. In conclusion, I would hope we would not deny the Army Engineers the information which we are all entitled to, not as a sectional thing but as a national proposition for the benefit of all of us.

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, my distinguished friend from Louisiana says that he cannot imagine the Canadian Government protesting to this legislation. Well, all he has to do is to read the report of the committee that is here on file. He will find that the Canadian Government already has protested to the State Department the enactment of this legislation. The position of Canada is perfectly clear. Canada does not want this legislation enacted, and for very good reasons.

Shipping interests on the Great Lakes testified before our committee that if Lake Michigan is reduced in level by one inch as this bill will reduce it the cost to the shipping interests on the Great Lakes will be $2 million. Of that $2 million loss to the shipping interests $600,000 will be lost by the shipping interests of Canada. Furthermore, we have evidence from the New York Power Commission and others that if this bill is enacted, the Canadians will lose several hundred thousand dollars annually of income due to the loss of power generation at its St. Lawrence Canadian plants.

Now, my distinguished friend from Louisiana says this bill provides for only a temporary diversion. No one here, I hope, is so naive as to believe that Chicago seeks to obtain diversion only for 12 months. The purpose of the survey sought to obtain a go ahead on full scale permanent diversion. There is no sense of spending $545,000 of the Federal taxpayers' money for a survey if the purpose is not to go ahead with a permanent diversion of the waters of Lake Michigan to the Illinois ship canal.

Now, there is only one issue here. The city of Chicago has a tremendous and dangerous pollution problem. Chicago can solve that problem itself, as the gentleman from Michigan well said, by merely building more or building larger sewage disposal plants. The reason that the pollution exists in the Illinois waterway is that Chicago is dumping solids from untreated sewage into the canal. A sewage disposal plant or plants built by Chicago at its own expense could correct this pollution problem. But, the people of Chicago, naturally, would rather have the Federal Government, the taxpayers of the Nation, pay for the eradication of this pollution than for Chicago to pay for it. You cannot blame them for that. They now introduce this legislation in the hope that Chicago can obtain additional water, flush out the waterway, and thereby correct the pollution, with the taxpayers of the United States paying the bill rather than the taxpayers of the city of Chicago.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MACK of Washington. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. YATES. Does not the gentleman overlook the testimony of the Corps of Army Engineers? Did not the Corps of Army Engineers testify that the maximum lowering of the Great Lakes that would occur under the bill under consideration would be one-quarter of an inch?

Mr. MACK of Washington. I say that this bill is an attempt to get permanent diversion of 1,000 cubic feet of water per second. General Parsons testified before the committee. I said to the general, "What is the U.S. Army Engineers' official position as to the amount of lowering of the water level, if it continues over a period of 15 years?" And he said, "It will lower the level of Lake Michigan, not by a quarter of an inch, but by one inch."

Mr. YATES. You asked the general what would happen if it was permanent. That is not in this bill. This seeks diversion for 1 year, and we will have to come back to the Congress again.

Mr. MACK of Washington. It is my position that the purpose of the bill is eventually to get permanent diversion, since temporary diversion will be of no value.

I append to my statement, first, Canada's protest to the proposed diversion; second, the statement of the U.S. State Department in opposition to this legislation; and third, the statement of the Budget Bureau in opposition to this legislation.

The Canadian Government expressed its official position in its communication dated February 20, 1959, to our Department of State, which is as follows:

On a number of occasions in the past, the Canadian Government has expressed its objections to proposals envisaging increased diversions of water from Lake Michigan at Chicago. Once again, and at the invitation of the Government of the United States through the U.S. Embassy's aide memoire of February 9, 1959, the Government of Canada is anxious to make known its views on legislative proposals now before Congress, such as bill H.R. 1, which are intended to authorize an increased diversion of water from the Great Lakes Basin into the Illinois Waterway.

While recognizing that the use of Lake Michigan water is a matter within the jurisdiction of the United States of America, it is the considered opinion of the Canadian Government that any authorization for an additional diverison would be incompatible with the arrangements for the St. Lawrence Seaway and power development, and with the Niagara Treaty of 1950, and would be prejudicial to navigation and power development which these mutual arrangements were designed to improve and facilitate.

The point has been made repeatedly by Canada that every withdrawal of water from the basin means less depth available for shipping in harbors and in channels. Additional withdrawals would have adverse effects on the hydroelectric generation potential on both sides of the border at Niagara Falls and in the international section of the St. Lawrence River, as well as in the Province of Quebec, and would inflict hardship on communities and industries on both sides of the border.

The Government of Canada therefore protests against the implementation of proposals contained in H.R. 1.

The opposition of the Department of State to enactment of H.R. 1 was made known to the committee through the testimony of Woodbury W. Willoughby, Director, Office of British Commonwealth and Northern European Affairs, and includes reference to the Canadian Government's views. The statement to the committee was as follows:

H.R. 1 authorizes the withdrawal of water from the Great Lakes Basin at Chicago and thus must be considered in relation to the rights of Canada as a coriparian in the waters of that basin. The Department, in the interest of maintaining harmonious relations with that country, has traditionally sought its views on proposals of this type.

This committee has previously been furnished with the texts of the recent communications exchanged with the Canadian Government regarding its views on H.R. 1, and will have noted the protest registered by that Government against implementation of the proposals contained in the bill. I should be glad to submit a copy at this time for insertion in the record.

The most recent Canadian aide memoire, dated February 20, 1959, expresses the opinion that any authorization for an additional diversion from Lake Michigan at Chicago would be incompatible with the arrangements for the St. Lawrence Seaway and power development, and with the Niagara Treaty of 1950, and would be prejudicial to navigation and power development which these mutual arrangements were designed to improve and facilitate.

Neither the Niagara Treaty nor the International Joint Commission orders relating to the development of power by the United States and Canada in the International Rapids section of the St. Lawrence River place any specific limitation upon diversions of the type authorized by H.R. 1. Nevertheless, the Department is not in a position to question the Canadian position that an additional withdrawal of water from the Great Lakes Basin such as that under consideration would affect adversely Canadian navigation and power interests in the Great Lakes, their connecting channels, and the St. Lawrence River.

I understand that estimates have been furnished to the Congress by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers as to the extent of the damage that would be suffered by downstream hydroelectric interests on both sides of the boundary in the event that the present proposal is enacted. It is noted that H.R. 1 provides no means by which injured parties may be compensated.

In view of the foregoing, the Department believes that enactment of H.R. 1 would adversely affect our relations with a friendly foreign government. Therefore, it is unable to support this legislation.

The Bureau of the Budget, on March 3, 1959, the day before the committee voted to favorably report H.R. 1, advised the committee of its opposition to the bill. The views of the Bureau of the Budget are as follows:

On February 18, 1959, we advised your committee by letter of the views of the Bureau of the Budget on H.R. 1, a bill to require a study to be conducted of the effect of increasing the diversion of water from Lake Michigan into the Illinois Waterway for navigation, and for other purposes. However, because it was necessary to submit that report before there was an opportunity to consult with other affected agencies, we indicated that we would advise you further of our views on H.R. 1 at a later date.

We noted in our letter particularly the fact that the Department of State had asked for the current views of the Government of Canada on this legislation. Since that time the Canadian Government has advised the Department of State that it protests the implementation of the proposals contained in H.R. 1.

In the face of this latest protest from Canada and in view of the pending application by certain Great Lakes States before the Supreme Court for a review of the decree of April 21, 1930, the Bureau of the Budget must recommend against the enactment of H.R. 1, even if amended as suggested in our letter of February 18, 1959.

However, we believe that two possible avenues of further exploration may prove fruitful. The first, and the one which we believe is clearly preferable, is to investigate the feasibility of a full technical study of the sewage treatment problems of the Metropolitan Sanitary District of Greater Chicago to be undertaken and financed jointly by the U.S. Public Health Service and the sanitary district without any actual increase in the present diversion of water from Lake Michigan. We visualize that such a study would attempt to measure very carefully existing sanitary conditions in the Illinois Waterway and extrapolate future conditions based on anticipated population growth. The study would also explore alternative means of correcting the problem, including a possible increased diversion of water into the Illinois Waterway, the effect of which should not be difficult to calculate, and attempt to evaluate the alternatives in terms of costs and effectiveness. If such a study is considered feasible by the Public Health Service and the sanitary district, we would strongly recommend that your committee consider legislation to authorize it.

However, if a study of the problem without an actual test diversion for an extended period is not feasible, we believe that before your committee acts on H.R. 1, the possibility of compensation by the sanitary district for damages to Canadian and United States interests, particularly hydroelectric power developments, should be explored. The Department of State could be asked to discuss with Canada what it would consider an equitable compensation and the Department of the Army could be asked to pursue the same question with hydroelectric power interests in the United States.

It is hoped that this presentation of our further views will be helpful to your committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Washington has expired.

The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BLATNIK: On page 2, line 22, strike out the words "the date of enactment of this Act" and insert "funds are first made available for the study."

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Chairman, this is merely a technical amendment to have this earlier section conform to the following section which we have already amended where we struck out the words "on the date of enactment" and inserted in lieu thereof "as of the date funds are first made available."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Chairman, I offer a clarifying amendment on the same subject, to make the entire bill conform.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BLATNIK: On page 4, lines 11 and 12, add a period after the word "Congress" and strike out the words "on or before June 1, 1962."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WITHROW. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WITHROW: On page 3, lines 22 and 23, strike out the words "annual average" and on page 3, line 23, after the words "diversion of" insert the words "not to exceed at any time."

Mr. WITHROW. Mr. Chairman, under the present wording of the bill before us there is no determining how much water may be diverted over a year from Lake Michigan. I realize that it is an annual average. However, if, for instance, we have a lot of moisture in the northwest for a period of 3 months and very little water has to be drawn off the lake, then in order to bring the average up, if that is what they desire to do, no one can determine how much water will be drawn off Lake Michigan during the remaining 9 months of the year. But we know that a great deal more than 2,500 cubic feet per second will be drawn off. And it will be drawn off at a time when we need the water the most in Lake Michigan and the other Great Lakes.

I believe regardless whether one is for this piece of legislation or not, that each and every Member must feel that if this experiment is to be carried on, they should not be permitted to draw off more than 1,000 cubic feet per second. That is why I have offered this amendment. The amendment restricts them to that amount of water, and I believe the amendment should be supported by this body.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. I believe the amendment is rigid and restrictive. This is a technical matter. The amendment would arbitrarily restrict the engineering operations of the Corps of Engineers. There may be occasions when they may need a flow at a higher rate than 2,500 cubic feet per second, but the average shall not exceed 2,500 cubic feet per second.

So I rise in opposition to the amendment. It would arbitrarily restrict and hamper a technical study.

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment. This bill carries a provision that in times of flood downstream below the city of Chicago, they may prohibit the diversion of any water. That means that the water will be taken away from Lake Michigan, as the gentleman has said, at a time when the lakes are at its lowest level.

The amendment, in my opinion, is a good amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. WITHROW].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, this is a far-reaching and controversial piece of legislation. Similar legislation has been vetoed twice by the President. Yet there are no hearings available so that the Members of the House may know the evidence upon which they are going to have to make a decision. We have already found in the debate thus far controversies over what was actually testified before the Committee on Public Works. And yet we do not have the hearings here upon which any such disagreements as to the testimony could be resolved.

I had to resort to getting a copy of a prepared statement of the president of the Lake Carriers Association, Mr. Lyndon Spencer, who testified before the House Committee on Public Works on February 17, 1959, because I was interested in the cost of this program and in the question of less efficient navigation. On page 4 of his statement I find the following:

> Under existing conditions the continued diversion of an additional 1,000 cubic feet per second with its subsequent lowering of lake levels will reduce the carrying capacity of the United States and Canada Great Lakes fleets by more than 1 million tons annually with a direct economic loss to the vessel industry of better than $2 million per year.

I have not heard actual figures on current lake levels discussed in detail in this debate. I have before me the report of the U.S. Army Engineers district in Detroit, Michigan, for the levels of the Great Lakes for December of 1958. Let me say that report, which I will insert in the RECORD in its entirety pursuant to permission obtained in the House earlier this afternoon, shows that this is the poorest time for water to be diverted from the Great Lakes because the Great Lakes are at their lowest level in recent years.

The only port Michigan has on Lake Erie is in my congressional district, the port of Monroe. Just last year the Committee on Appropriations appropriated $1 million to restore that port to its project depth. What sense does it make for us to be spending money on the connecting channels and the harbors in the St. Lawrence Seaway system, after spending over $100 million on the St. Lawrence Seaway itself, on the one hand, adding the cost of transportation on the second hand, and then diverting water and making these public works and the shipping they support less efficient and less economical?

Likewise, we are subsidizing shipbuilding, yet making shipping less economical and efficient at the same time. How inconsistent can we be, and how can we decide this question without any evidence before us on such a far-reaching matter?

Lake Erie is now below its average level by over 1 foot. It was 570.79 feet above sea level in December 1958. That was only 1.32 feet above the lowest December level in all history, which was in 1934. It is 2.75 feet below the December high in past history, which was in December 1885. It is 3.39 below the high level in March 1952. If Chicago is going to have a diversion for 1 year for a study, why should it not ask for the diversion and study when the lake levels are high rather than when they are low?

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MEADER. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. YATES. May I suggest to the gentleman that in this bill the actual diversion will not take place until two conditions are first met; first, when funds are made available for the study; and, second, after such funds are made available the diversion will not begin for 18 months. In all probability the actual diversion will not take place for at least 2 or 3 years from this time, assuming the bill is passed soon and the funds made available shortly thereafter.

Mr. MEADER. The lake levels are still on the decline. Can the gentleman tell me whether he would be willing to wait until the lake levels go up before this diversion occurs?

Mr. YATES. I do not know what the lake levels will be at the time the actual diversion is made. Perhaps they will be higher than they are at the present time.

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Chairman, the Corps of Engineers' Bulletin, from which I quoted, is as follows:

MONTHLY BULLETIN OF LAKE LEVELS FOR DECEMBER 1958, U.S. ARMY ENGINEER DISTRICT, LAKE SURVEY, CORPS OF ENGINEERS

The following table presents the monthly average levels of the Great Lakes during December 1958, determined by the U.S. Lake Survey from daily readings of staff gages. These provisional elevations are generally within 0.05 foot from the more precise monthly averages to be derived from the continuous records of the automatic gages. The table also lists for comparison prior monthly average December levels during the period of record since 1898 on Lake St. Clair and since 1860 on the other lakes.

Lake	December 1958 level	December 1957 level	Average December level, entire record	Extreme low and high December levels during entire record prior to 1958				Difference, December 1958 level from L.W.D.[1]
				Low	Year	High	Year	
Superior	602.07	601.91	602.21	600.70	1925	603.17	1876	+0.47
Michigan-Huron	577.94	578.98	580.24	577.53	1933	582.70	1861	−.56
St. Clair	573.88	574.70	574.64	572.87	1925	576.65	1951	+.38
Erie	570.79	571.78	571.85	569.47	1934	573.54	1885	+.25
Ontario	244.20	244.74	245.40	242.71	1934	247.58	1861	+.20

[1] L.W.D. is the plane to which Lake Survey chart and Federal navigation improvement depths are referred.

NOTE.—Elevations are in feet above mean tide at New York, 1935 datum.

The table below shows recorded changes between successive months in the monthly average levels of the Great Lakes which will provide the basis for comparison of the current behavior with that of the past and also shows the Lake Survey estimate of the probable January level:

Lake	Change in level from November to December		Change in level from December to January			Probable January level
	In 1958	Average during entire record	Average during entire record	Maximums during entire record		
				Fall	Rise	
Superior	−0.21	−0.25	−0.26	−0.52	−0.01	601.8
Michigan-Huron	−.19	−.19	−.12	−.39	+.27	577.7
St. Clair	+.14	−.01	−.43	−1.85	+.57	573.4
Erie	−.27	−.08	−.03	−.67	+.83	570.7
Ontario	−.17	−.08	+.02	−.58	+.63	243.9

NOTE.—Lakes Superior and Michigan-Huron continued their seasonal decline at about average rate from November to December. Lakes Erie and Ontario declined at greater than average rate.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. VANIK: Page 2, line 3, after "Lakes" insert the following: "and their connecting waterways."

Page 2, line 25, strike out "Lake Michigan" and insert in lieu thereof the following: "the Great Lakes and their connecting waterways."

Page 3, line 12, after "Waterway," insert the following: "and the Great Lakes and their connecting waterways."

Page 3, line 17, after "Waterway" insert a comma and the following: "and the Great Lakes and their connecting waterways."

Page 3, line 22, after "Waterway" insert a comma and the following: "and the Great Lakes and their connecting waterways."

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendments be considered en bloc.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Chio?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendments.

The amendments were agreed to.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DINGELL: On page 3, line 6, after the period insert the following: "Such study shall include, but not be limited to, an analysis of municipal and industrial waste disposal treatment practices and storm overflows within the metropolitan district of Chicago in order to determine whether everything possible is being done to reduce to a minimum the strength and volume of waste discharged into the Illinois Waterway."

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, the chairman of the subcommittee [Mr. BLATNIK] will recall a colloquy which we had on the floor yesterday about this, wherein I stated to Mr. BLATNIK—and which is reported in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—as follows:

Mr. DINGELL. May I ask the gentleman this question? He was telling us at this time that a part of this bill or rather a part of the study that will be made pursuant to this bill will be a study of pollution in the Illinois waterways; is that correct?

Mr. BLATNIK. Yes.

Mr. DINGELL. Then, I assume the gentleman would have no objection nor would any other sponsors or proponents of this particular measure have any objection to having concrete language in the form of an amendment to H.R. 1, which would specifically set forth that it shall include a study of pollution in this particular waterway; is that correct?

Mr. BLATNIK. I have no objection.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DINGELL. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. YATES. May I suggest to the gentleman that the Metropolitan Sanitary District of Greater Chicago has just retained perhaps the outstanding sanitary engineering firm in the world for the purpose of conducting the exact study that is the subject of the gentleman's amendment at a cost to the district of $125,000. Therefore, it would be repetitive and redundant for the study to be made a part of this bill.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, I decline to yield further.

Mr. Chairman, I want to tell the gentleman I think the worth of the study that is going to be made by the Chicago Sanitary District will have as much merit as have some of the other things that have been said by the Chicago Sanitary District. They have played all sides of the field on this particular issue.

The record of the Chicago Sanitary District in the treatment of its pollution and its waste is so bad that I do not think that a study made by them can be objective. We already have heard the Corps of Engineers, in the person of General Itschner, and other representatives tell us time after time that there is no need for a study of navigation on this particular waterway, and yet the bill is full of provisions for study of navigation. If the one needs further study so does the other.

Existing diversion is more than adequate to sustain any foreseeable navigation on the waterway even if the waterway was going to be double tracked so that they would have an upbound lane and a downbound channel.

What we are asking is a fair and impartial study of the matter. If you are going to have a study of navigation, which the Corps of Engineers has already said is not necessary because the existing water flow is more than sufficient. Let us at least have the benefit of everything that the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and the Corps of Engineers can find on this subject.

So I think we are entitled to have at least a fair and objective study by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and the Corps of Engineers of the treatment practices and the waste disposal methods of the Chicago Sanitary District. If the people from Chicago come to us and say, "We must have this to treat or dilute our sewage." We say, "Let us have the study be complete." And "Let us have it be objective. Let us have it go into treatment methods and the question of whether or not Chicago's treatment methods are adequate. We want adequate study of this matter which will give us a good understanding and a fair interpretation and sufficient factual data on which we can act." I assume, the gentlemen from Chicago will be here wanting us to legislate sometime in the future on this, to give Chicago right to more Great Lakes water.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DINGELL. I yield.

Mr. GRIFFIN. I would just like to call to the attention of the membership the fact that several references have been made to the Canadian position in the last Congress and reference was made to the aide memoire which was supposed to indicate that the Canadian Government was not in opposition at that time to the water diversion proposal.

Mr. GRIFFIN. I am going to quote certain provisions from the memorandum:

The Canadian Government understands that, if such legislation is enacted, these sanitation studies will not be limited to evaluation of the effects of dilution, but will also include consideration of all possible measures for dealing with waste-disposal facilities at Chicago. Such measures would include: (a) complete separation of storm sewers from the domestic sewerage system, or expansion of the existing treatment facilities to serve a total combined flow; (b) treatment of organic wastes in industrial plants before discharging these effluents into the sewerage systems; (c) chlorination of effluent before discharge into the Illinois Waterway; and (d) artificial aeration of the waterway.

Mr. DINGELL. I thank the gentleman very much.

With regard to my statement I am going to ask the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BLATNIK]: Is what I am asking here fair and proper? Or is it improper?

I yield to the gentleman to answer me.

Mr. BLATNIK. I am only speaking for myself, but I say for myself that what the gentleman requests in my opinion is a fair and sound request. It does extend the survey to a much larger scope. This matter was brought up before the committee and it was explained by the proponents of the bill that a private survey is now under way.

Mr. DINGELL. There is no reason why this private study could not be used to help with the other study proposed by the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan.

The question was taken, and on a division (demanded by Mr. DINGELL) there were—ayes 51, noes 125.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MICHEL: Page 2, immediately following line 20, insert the following:

"(3) With respect to the regulation of flows along the Illinois River, particularly at Pekin, Ill., the diversion authorized by this act in accordance with this section will be regulated with the objective of maintaining a uniform flow at Pekin of 8,000 cubic feet per second when such uniformity of flow is feasible, as determined by the Chief of Engineers and the Secretary of the Army, and when maintenance of this uniformity will not conflict with or interfere with the preceding provisions of this section."

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Chairman, this amendment which I offer today is the same one which I offered the last time this legislation was being considered in the 85th Congress. It was unanimously accepted by the committee and incorporated in the final bill approved by the House.

All I am simply attempting to do here is to write into the law specifically what the committee expressed in its House Report No. 369, 85th Congress, 1st session, page 8, which reads as follows:

The committee anticipates that the diversion authorized by H.R. 2 in accordance with section 1 will be regulated with the objective of maintaining a uniform flow at Pekin of 8,000 cubic feet per second when such uniformity of flow is feasible, as determined by the Chief of Engineers and the Secretary of the Army, and when maintenance of this uniformity will not conflict with or interfere with the provisions of section 1.

You see here the language is practically verbatim of that embodied in my amendment.

In order that the House may again act favorably on this amendment, I should like to quickly review the reasons why this amendment should be reapproved. Inasmuch as the Illinois River runs diagonally through my congressional district for a little better than a hundred miles, we have a definite interest in any proposed increase in diversion. Except for the last few years, downstate Members of Congress from Illinois have generally been opposed to any increase.

I have taken the position that an increase of 1,000 cubic feet per second would serve a number of good purposes, provided that the controlling of the daily rate of diversion is regulated to a degree by the Corps of Engineers downstream at Pekin, Ill.

As a matter of fact, I have introduced legislation which differs from H.R. 1 in only one respect, and that is the text of the amendment which I offer here today. Two years ago, when I presented my views to the House Public Works Committee and last year before the Senate Public Works Committee, I sought to regulate the diversion as a means of giving those of us downstate a more uniform flow in the river throughout the year.

There seems to be little question that the main cause of the death of thousands of fish in the river 2 years ago was the rapid lowering of the water level. Any quick change of the water level for any reason, aside from an outright emergency, is inexcusable.

Such changes are not only destructive to fish and wildlife, but are highly inconsiderate of the people whose land lies adjacent to the river. Sudden shifts of the water level cause the destruction of those recreational pursuits which we have come to enjoy downstream.

I have been told that the increased diversion would increase the oxygen content of the river and would be of major benefit to fish and wildlife. Better control of low-water flow assists materially in the spawning activities of wildlife. It is also my belief that a better quality of water would tend to develop a better grade and type of fish. Higher low-water stages would provide better duck-hunting facilities. Reduction of diversion during the fall months in past years has tended to dry up many small pools of water that could have been used for duck-hunting purposes.

I point out these advantages to the sportsmen and conservationists as the objections to increased diversion in Illinois in years past have come principally from these quarters.

There are other benefits to be derived downstream with a properly controlled increase in diversion.

First, ground-water levels all over the State are declining, and in the Illinois River Valley, the underground water level definitely fluctuates with the river level. Any raising of the low-water level, therefore, has a corresponding beneficial effect on the level of the underground water supply.

As a matter of fact, the situation is so critical that three major industrial interests in Peoria, the Peoria Water Works, Bemis Bag Co., and the water resources and flood control committee of the Peoria Association of Commerce, have already constructed four river water infiltration pits into which some 7 million to 8 million gallons of river water is put into our underground water supply. Plans are under way to construct a water purification plant. Other Illinois cities, including Jacksonville, Winchester, and Galesburg, have already found it necessary to do likewise in the future.

Second. During the low-flow period of the Illinois River, there is a possibility of an inadequate supply of sufficient water to provide proper cooling for major industrial and powerplants. Continued industrial development will require more and bigger powerplants with a corresponding increase in demand for more cooling water during low stages in the river. Increased flow of cooler Lake Michigan water would increase the efficiency of industrial and powerplant cooling systems.

Third. Higher low water levels would eliminate the costly operation of reducing river barge payloads due to low river water levels. With the rapid increase of river shipping this is becoming more and more important.

A comparison of figures for tonnage carried on the Illinois Waterway indicates a growing traffic on the river. At Peoria, for instance, total tonnage for 1956 was over 18 million tons, an increase of 2 million tons over the previous year. The Corps of Engineers has just informed me that the tonnage at Peoria for 1958 was over 24 million tons. With the opening of the St. Lawrence Seaway early this summer, this figure should be increased greatly.

Fourth. In past years, icebreaking during the winter months has been a costly operation, both from the standpoint of icebreakers and tow charges. This led to an order by the U.S. Supreme Court to grant a temporary increase in diversion to cope with recent serious ice jams occurring on the Illinois River.

In conclusion, it seems to me that for as many years as this matter has been kicked around, we ought to take the logical and sensible approach and approve the bill under consideration, along with my amendment.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MICHEL. I yield.

Mr. BLATNIK. I ask the gentleman whether this is not similar or identical to an amendment submitted when the bill was under consideration 2 years ago.

Mr. MICHEL. The proposal 2 years ago was in this exact identical language, and the committee unanimously accepted it.

Mr. BLATNIK. That is our recollection.

Mr. Chairman, we have no objection to this amendment.

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Chairman, there is no objection on this side.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, it had not been my intention to participate in this debate, my colleagues from Illinois having so well presented the issue, but when the gentleman from Florida sought to speak for the Committee on Foreign Affairs, I felt that I should say something.

I am in thorough agreement with the gentlewoman from Illinois [Mrs. CHURCH]. She and I serve on that committee. We know something of its problems. With all due respect for the distinguished gentleman from Florida I join with Mrs. CHURCH in suggesting that perhaps we are in better position to speak for the committee on which we serve.

We know, and I think we both regret, that because of the setup of the State Department the Dominion of Canada is not regarded as belonging to the American hemisphere but belonging instead to Europe. So the determinations are made not on what is good for America but on what is good for Europe.

Certainly all on the Committee on Foreign Affairs look forward to the day when between the United States and the Dominion of Canada there will be a working together in complete accord and understanding and for a common hemispheric purpose. We believe that if Europe will take care of its own affairs and not meddle in the affairs of the American hemisphere by exerting pressures on the Canadian Government that objective will be reached.

The trouble is that in the concept of the State Department the Dominion of Canada is not regarded as belonging to the American hemisphere but as belonging to Europe. This concept, however unrealistic, is reflected necessarily in the setup of our own subcommittees on the Committee on Foreign Affairs. The Dominion of Canada, despite the fact that it is our hemispheric neighbor to the north and we have so much in common that it is separated from the interest of Europe, is not under the jurisdiction of our subcommittee on Inter-American affairs. Instead the Dominion of Canada is under the jurisdiction of the subcommittee on Europe.

If the Dominion of Canada were left to itself, freed entirely from European influences, it is inconceivable that it would take a position in opposition to the test proposed in H.R. 1 on which the health of the people of Chicago and the people of Illinois so vitally depends. The gentlewoman from Illinois has eloquently and convincingly brought home to us the grave risk of a frightful plague of disease unless something is done and done quickly along the lines proposed in H.R. 1. If the Dominion of Canada were faced with such a threat does anyone doubt that there would be any hesitancy to cooperate on the part of the people of Illinois? I am very sure that the people of Canada have the same neighborly feeling toward the people of Chicago and of Illinois, and if left to themselves would go all out in friendly cooperation. Indeed, only a few months ago the State Department informed the author of H.R. 1, the Honorable THOMAS J. O'BRIEN, beloved dean of the Illinois delegation, and Congressman YATES, that Canada had no objection to H.R. 1. That, Mr. Chairman, was at a time when Canada was making her own determinations and on the basis of what was best for her and best for the American hemisphere of which she is a part.

I with Mrs. CHURCH and other members of the Committee on Foreign Affairs deeply regret that any decisions that affect the American hemisphere should be influenced by matters that concern Europe and have no relation to this hemisphere. Unfortunately, determinations too often are made not on what is good for America but on what is good for Europe.

Let me call the attention of my colleagues to the situation that obtained shortly after the Suez incident and the United Kingdom was badly in need of money. Our State Department was consulted, and there followed a loan commitment to the United Kingdom of $500 million, a loan from the Export-Import Bank, which never before had made a loan for political purposes. The function of the Export-Import Bank is to make loans to backward countries for the development of their economies.

About this time the United Kingdom wished to postpone its payments on its war debt to the United States. My colleagues who were in the Congress at that time will remember the very spirited debate. The measure carried on a very close vote and largely because the then Secretary of the Treasury, a distinguished son of Ohio, put his full weight behind it and also the weight of the State Department and of the administration.

I need not remind my colleagues that Ohio has always led the fight against legislation along the lines of H.R. 1. The reason is that the lake carriers have a stranglehold on the press and the politics of that State. No one wants to hurt the lake carriers. Certainly in Chicago we have no such desire, and Mayor Daley of Chicago has publicly stated that if the test proposed in H.R. 1 should prove in any reasonable measure to work to the harm of the lake carriers he would be the first to ask that the test be called off.

I would not suggest that there was a connection between the loan commitment by the Export-Import Bank of $500 million to the United Kingdom for a political purpose, and the extension of the payments on the debt of the United Kingdom to the United States, with anything that has happened in connection with the consideration of a proposal for Lake Michigan water diversion to prevent a frightful plague of disease from striking the city of Chicago and the State of Illinois. But it is a fair presumption, human nature being what it is, that in return for being bailed out the United Kingdom might have had open ears to the suggestion that a little whispering to Canada would be a gracious reciprocal gesture.

Mr. Chairman, I am convinced that this time when the Lake Michigan water diversion bill has passed this body and the other body and has reached the White House, the President of the United States will agree with the majority in both branches of the Congress that what is in the common hemispheric interest of both the United States and the Dominion of Canada should not be lost through European meddling.

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I was interested in hearing the remarks of my two good colleagues, members of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the gentleman who has just spoken and the gentlewoman from Illinois who earlier spoke. I think I have as much right as any other Member to speak for the committee. I believe that many of us on the committee are concerned about the possible effect the enactment of this legislation will have on our relations with Canada.

There seems to have been some misapprehension on the part of a good many people that the Dominion of Canada in protesting the enactment of H.R. 1 has no legal basis and is merely protesting for the record.

I call the attention of the Committee to the treaty of 1909, the International Boundary Treaty. The final paragraph of article II of that treaty states:

> It is understood, however, that neither of the high contracting parties intends by the foregoing provision to surrender any right which it may have to object to any interference with or diversions of waters on the other side of the boundary the effect of which would be productive of material injury to the navigation interests on its own side of the boundary.

A lot of people appear to regard it as somewhat sinister that last month, or perhaps in January, the Department of State requested the views of the Canadian Government with respect to H.R. 1. I do not think there is anything particularly sinister about the fact that the Canadian Government, having previously expressed opposition to diversion from Lake Michigan, would again be consulted as to its views.

I want to call my colleagues' attention to the fact that opposition on the part of the Canadian Government is not recent, and if they will turn to page 4044 of the RECORD of March 12 they will find an objection by the Canadian Government going back to April 25, 1906.

So, I say that the position of the Canadian Government is quite historic in this respect, and it was perfectly proper and natural for the State Department to solicit their views and present them to the Committee on Public Works. I am not going to get into an argument about the technical questions regarding lake levels; I leave that to the committee. But, I do say that the Canadian Government has made its position clear and unmistakable that it reserves its right under the International Boundary Treaty to take whatever action is proper if diversion legislation is enacted. Furthermore, I say that the passage of this legislation endangers our relations with the Dominion of Canada—which is still in the Western Hemisphere, no matter what the State Department may say—it will endanger our relations with the Dominion of Canada whose cooperation and mutual assistance we need so desperately in the defense of our own best interests and our own vital security.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENTLEY. I yielded to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. CRAMER. Since my name has been mentioned, does the gentleman not believe that the members of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, being jealous of their own jurisdiction, should be concerned about the fact that we are here today considering a bill that involves the Committee on Foreign Affairs; a bill that the Foreign Affairs Committee has never had an opportunity to consider and which is opposed by the State Department. I am delighted to see that the members of the Committee on Foreign Affairs are asserting thmselves in the course of this debate.

Mr. BENTLEY. I will say to the gentleman, as one member of that committee, that I am very much concerned with our relationships with Canada, and the effect the passage of this legislation will have on them.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENTLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Chairman, question has been raised concerning the extent of the objection actually raised by Canada. It has even been suggested that the official objection registered with our State Department reflects the views of diplomats in England rather than our Canadian neighbors.

To indicate that such is not the case, I offer for consideration of the House a recent editorial which appeared in the Grand Rapids (Mich.) Press:

ONTARIO OBJECTS, TOO

> For the last several weeks supporters of Chicago's petition to be permitted to divert additional water from Lake Michigan have been saying that Canada no longer has any objection to this scheme. But the Province of Ontario has some very strong objections, and intends to voice them at any hearing conducted on the matter.
>
> Ontario's municipal affairs minister, William K. Warrender, has attacked the proposed water grab on two fronts. He has declared, first, that diverting water from Lake Michigan into the Illinois Waterway would be "bound to have an adverse effect on harbor installations in a great many ports in Ontario." Further, he has stressed that Chicago is asking permission to divert more water to relieve its sewage disposal problem, but that Ontario, at the request of the President of the United States "some years ago" is spending millions of dollars to halt pollution of international waterways.
>
> The Province has a right to be incensed. Why should Chicago be permitted to use part of Ontario's water to avoid having to spend large sums for sewage disposal when Ontario is being compelled to spend millions for the same purpose to help keep Canadian-American waterways clean? Why should Chicago escape having to do what all the other cities on Lake Michigan are doing to prevent pollution and protect lake levels?

It should be kept in mind that our international policies are judged by others in the world not entirely by what the executive branch does or says but also by what this Congress does and says.

If we expect other nations of the world to conduct themselves within the norm of accepted principles of international law, surely it behooves all of us, both officially and unofficially, to adhere to the same principles which we call upon others to respect.

On February 12, 1958, the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of the other body sent a letter to our Secretary of State requesting that the committee be provided with a memorandum on the international law applicable to the proposed diversion by Canada from the Kootenay River into the Columbia and from the Columbia into the Fraser. The committee asked the State Department, in its study, to analyze the law under any applicable treaties and also under general international law.

In August 1958 the State Department transmitted to the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs the study entitled "Legal Aspects of the Use of Systems of International Waters," which has been printed as Senate Document No. 118. This is an exhaustive study of the principles of international law which are applicable to the use of international water systems.

Now what were the principles of international law set forth in this study which we call upon other nations to respect in dealing with the use of systems of international waters?

The principles are outlined on pages 89–91 of the document, as follows:

> It is believed that any examination, such as the foregoing, of the sources of international law demonstrates that there are principles of international law governing systems of international waters in the sense that if issues with regard thereto were to be posed

before an international tribunal it would pronounce judgment in accordance with such principles.

Bearing in mind that as used in this study system of international waters refers to an inland watercourse of lake, with its tributaries and distributaries any part of which lies within the jurisdiction of two or more States, and riparian and co-riparian refer to States having jurisdiction over parts of the same system of international waters—it is believed that an international tribunal would deduce the applicable principles of international law to be along the following lines:

1. A riparian has the sovereign right to make maximum use of the part of a system of international waters within its jurisdiction, consistent with the corresponding right of each co-riparian.

2. (a) Riparians are entitled to share in the use and benefits of a system of international waters on a just and reasonable basis.

(b) In determining what is just and reasonable account is to be taken of rights arising out of (1) agreements; (2) judgments and awards; and (3) established lawful and beneficial uses; and of other considerations such as (4) the development of the system that has already taken place and the possible future development, in the light of what is a reasonable use of the water by each riparian; (5) the extent of the dependence of each riparian upon the waters in question; and (6) comparison of the economic and social gains accruing, from the various possible uses of the waters in question, to each riparian and to the entire area dependent upon the waters in question.

3. (a) A riparian which proposes to make, or allow, a change in the existing regime of a system of international waters which could interfere with the realization by a co-riparian of its right to share on a just and reasonable basis in the use and benefits of the system, is under a duty to give the co-riparian an opportunity to object.

(b) If the co-riparian, in good faith, objects and demonstrates its willingness to reach a prompt and just solution by the pacific means envisaged in article 33(1) of the Charter of the United Nations, a riparian is under a duty to refrain from making, or allowing, such change, pending agreement or other solution.

These are not new principles of international law. They apply equally to us as well as to Canada. They apply to the diversion of water at Chicago just as they apply to the proposed diversion by Canada of waters of the Columbia and other rivers, which might cause us injury.

I should like to emphasize the principle stated that whenever a co-riparian nation objects or files a protest against a proposed change in the existing regime of international waters, the nation desiring to make the change should refrain from putting it into effect until opportunity has been afforded to negotiate and satisfactorily compose the difference, and if such negotiations fail to achieve a mutually satisfactory solution, then the matter should be referred to arbitration or the International Court of Justice.

Here we are, with full knowledge that the Canadian Government has lodged a vigorous protest with our State Department against the diversion at Chicago proposed in this bill. If we expect Canada to abide by these principles of international law, how can any Member of this Congress vote for the present bill?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GROSS: On page 4, after line 16, add the following new paragraph:

"(d) No Federal funds shall be made available for the studies contemplated in this act."

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, this is a nice, simple amendment that anyone can understand. It is contemplated that half a million dollars will be provided by all the taxpayers of the country to provide for the study proposed in this act. I have no objection to the city of Chicago studying this proposition from now until doomsday. Just help yourselves and spend all the money you want to spend, but get off the backs of the taxpayers of Iowa and the rest of the country.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS].

The question was taken, and on a division (demanded by Mr. GROSS) there were—ayes 67, noes 134.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DINGELL: On page 4, strike out line 10, and all that follows down through and including line 16 and insert in lieu thereof the following: "correlate the results of such study. Thereafter the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare and the Secretary of the Army shall submit their proposed report to the Governor of each of the following States: Minnesota, Wisconsin, Illinois, Indiana, Michigan, Ohio, Pennsylvania, and New York, and to the Secretary of State who is requested to transmit such proposed report to the appropriate officials of the Government of Canada. After the expiration of 45 days from the date the proposed report is submitted to the Governors and the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, and the Secretary of the Army shall make their final report to Congress which shall contain (1) all comments and recommendations with respect to the proposed report made by any Governor and by any official to whom such proposed report was submitted, and (2) shall contain recommendations with respect to continuing the authority to divert water from Lake Michigan into the Illinois Waterway in the amount authorized by the first section of this Act or increasing or decreasing such amount, and such other recommendations as may be necessary. Such final report shall be made to the Congress on or before June 1, 1962."

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, having been run over by the Illinois steam roller one time already this afternoon and having watched numerous and sundry others of my colleagues suffer the same experience, I must confess that I offer this amendment with some apprehension.

Briefly, for the benefit of proponent and opponent alike, the only thing this amendment seeks to do is to have the text of the report when complete submitted to the Governors of the other Great Lakes States and through the Secretary of State to the officials of the Government of Canada 45 days before submittal to Congress. It makes no other change in the bill. You will note that it imposes no delays, no time extension over and above what is already provided in the legislation before us. It only requires that the report be submitted to the Governors of the various Great Lakes States and the Government of the Dominion of Canada through the Department of State. This is the appropriate and proper method of seeing to it that our neighbor to the north, Canada, is notified of the text of this particular study report. Beyond this it does nothing else.

It does not compel the Corps of Engineers to pay any heed to the wishes of the Governors of the various States or to pay any heed to the views and wishes of the Dominion of Canada. Indeed, it compels no more attention to the wishes of these States, their citizens and their officials, and the views of the Dominion of Canada than we see paid by the House of Representatives today. That is very little.

So, Mr. Chairman, what we seek and what we hope here today is that some notice be given those concerned.

We know this legislation is going to be passed, but I will make a prediction, that it will be vetoed in the ordinary course of events by the President of the United States for the same reason that he vetoed the other bills on this subject. After all, citizens of our Great Lakes States outnumber the citizens of Illinois. These Great Lakes States are contributing a great deal more water to the Great Lakes than the State of Illinois which only gives 500 cubic feet per second to the Great Lakes.

We ask that you at least give our officials, the Governors of our States, and the Government of the Dominion of Canada, an opportunity to look at the report before it is filed with Congress. That is the only thing we ask. We hope we are entitled to some fairness, to some small consideration in this matter, and that you will listen to our pleas for a fair and objective study, as you have not so far. We hope the House will at least give us the courtesy of having our Governors know a little bit in advance what is proposed on the basis of the study which will be made. That is all we ask today of the Congress of the United States. Give us a little bit of basic fairness, give us a little bit of notice. I hope you will do so.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL].

The amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. SISK, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 1) to require a study to be conducted of the effect of increasing the diversion of water from Lake Michigan into the Illinois Waterway for navigation, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 202, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

Mr. WITHROW. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. WITHROW. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. WITHROW moves to recommit the bill H.R. 1 to the House Committee on Public Works.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The motion to recommit was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. MACK of Washington. On that, Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 238, nays 142, answered "present" 2, not voting 52, as follows:

[Roll No. 13]

YEAS—238

Abbitt	Davis, Tenn.	Jensen
Abernethy	Dawson	Johnson, Calif.
Addonizio	Delaney	Johnson, Md.
Albert	Dent	Jones, Ala.
Alexander	Denton	Jones, Mo.
Alford	Derwinski	Karsten
Allen	Dollinger	Kasem
Anderson, Mont.	Donohue	Kee
	Dorn, S.C.	Keogh
Andrews	Dowdy	Kilday
Arends	Downing	Kilgore
Ashmore	Doyle	King, Calif.
Aspinall	Durham	King, Utah
Bailey	Edmondson	Kirwan
Baring	Elliott	Kitchin
Barr	Everett	Kluczynski
Barrett	Fallon	Kowalski
Bass, Tenn.	Farbstein	Landrum
Beckworth	Fascell	Lankford
Bennett, Fla.	Fenton	Lennon
Blatnik	Flood	Libonati
Blitch	Flynt	McCormack
Boggs	Fogarty	McDowell
Boland	Foley	McMillan
Bolling	Forand	McSween
Bonner	Forrester	Mack, Ill.
Boykin	Fountain	Madden
Boyle	Frazier	Mahon
Brademas	Friedel	Mailliard
Breeding	Gallagher	Marshall
Brewster	Garmatz	Mason
Brock	Gary	Matthews
Brooks, La.	Gathings	Merrow
Brooks, Tex.	Giaimo	Metcalf
Brown, Ga.	Granahan	Michel
Brown, Mo.	Grant	Miller, Clement W.
Broyhill	Gray	
Buckley	Green, Oreg.	Miller, George P.
Burdick	Hagen	
Burke, Ky.	Haley	Mills
Burke, Mass.	Hardy	Mitchell
Burleson	Hargis	Montoya
Byrne, Pa.	Harmon	Morgan
Canfield	Harris	Morris, N. Mex.
Cannon	Harrison	Morris, Okla.
Casey	Healey	Moss
Chenoweth	Hechler	Moulder
Chiperfield	Hemphill	Multer
Church	Hoffman, Ill.	Murphy
Clark	Hogan	Murray
Coad	Holifield	Natcher
Cohelan	Holtzman	Norrell
Collier	Huddleston	O'Brien, Ill.
Colmer	Hull	O'Brien, N.Y.
Cooley	Ikard	O'Hara, Ill.
Daddario	Irwin	O'Neill
Daniels	Jarman	Oliver
Davis, Ga.	Jennings	Passman
Patman	Roush	Thornberry
Perkins	Rutherford	Toll
Pfost	Santangelo	Trimble
Philbin	Saund	Tuck
Pilcher	Selden	Udall
Poage	Shipley	Ullman
Powell	Sikes	Vinson
Preston	Sisk	Walter
Price	Slack	Wampler
Prokop	Smith, Iowa	Watts
Pucinski	Smith, Miss.	Whitener
Rains	Smith, Va.	Whitten
Reece, Tenn.	Spence	Wier
Rhodes, Pa.	Springer	Williams
Rivers, Alaska	Staggers	Willis
Rivers, S.C.	Steed	Winstead
Rodino	Stratton	Wolf
Rogers, Colo.	Stubblefield	Wright
Rogers, Fla.	Sullivan	Yates
Rogers, Mass.	Teague, Tex.	Young
Rogers, Tex.	Thomas	Zelenko
Rooney	Thompson, La.	
Rostenkowski	Thompson, N.J.	

NAYS—142

Adair	Gavin	Moorhead
Alger	George	Mumma
Ashley	Griffin	Nelsen
Auchincloss	Griffiths	Norblad
Avery	Gross	O'Hara, Mich.
Ayres	Gubser	O'Konski
Baldwin	Halleck	Osmers
Barry	Halpern	Ostertag
Bass, N.H.	Hays	Pelly
Bates	Hess	Pillion
Baumhart	Hiestand	Pirnie
Becker	Hoeven	Poff
Belcher	Hoffman, Mich.	Porter
Bennett, Mich.	Holland	Quigley
Bentley	Holt	Rabaut
Berry	Horan	Ray
Betts	Hosmer	Rees, Kans.
Bosch	Jackson	Reuss
Bow	Johansen	Robison
Broomfield	Johnson, Colo.	Saylor
Brown, Ohio	Johnson, Wis.	Schenck
Budge	Jonas	Scherer
Bush	Karth	Schwengel
Byrnes, Wis.	Kastenmeier	Short
Carnahan	Kearns	Siler
Cederberg	Keith	Simpson, Ill.
Chamberlain	Kilburn	Simpson, Pa.
Conte	Knox	Smith, Calif.
Cook	Langen	Smith, Kans.
Corbett	Latta	Taber
Cramer	Lesinski	Teague, Calif.
Cunningham	Levering	Thomson, Wyo.
Curtin	Lindsay	Tollefson
Curtis, Mass.	Lipscomb	Utt
Dague	McCulloch	Vanik
Derounian	McDonough	Van Pelt
Devine	McFall	Van Zandt
Diggs	McIntire	Wallhauser
Dingell	Machrowicz	Weis
Dooley	Mack, Wash.	Westland
Dorn, N.Y.	May	Wharton
Dulski	Meader	Widnall
Dwyer	Meyer	Wilson
Feighan	Miller, N.Y.	Withrow
Fino	Milliken	Younger
Flynn	Minshall	Zablocki
Ford	Moeller	
Fulton	Moore	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—2

Baker Rhodes, Ariz.

NOT VOTING—52

Andersen, Minn.	Green, Pa.	Nix
	Hall	Polk
Anfuso	Hébert	Quie
Barden	Henderson	Randall
Bolton	Herlong	Riehlman
Bowles	Judd	Riley
Bray	Kelly	Roberts
Cahill	Lafore	Roosevelt
Carter	Laird	St. George
Celler	Lane	Scott
Chelf	Loser	Shelley
Coffin	McGinley	Sheppard
Curtis, Mo.	McGovern	Taylor
Dixon	Macdonald	Teller
Evins	Magnuson	Thompson, Tex
Fisher	Martin	Wainwright
Frelinghuysen	Monagan	Weaver
Glenn	Morrison	

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Baker for, with Mr. Laird against.

Mr. Curtis of Missouri for, with Mr. Bray against.

Mr. Martin for, with Mr. Weaver against.

Mr. Celler for, with Mr. Frelinghuysen against.

Mrs. Kelly for, with Mr. Henderson against.

Mr. Chelf for, with Mrs. St. George against.

Mr. Monagan for, with Mr. Dixon against.

Mr. Green of Pennsylvania for, with Mr. Judd against.

Mr. Hébert for, with Mr. Coffin against.

Mr. Riley for, with Mr. Scott against.

Mr. Rhodes of Arizona for, with Mr. Wainwright against.

Mr. Roberts for, with Mr. Glenn against.

Mr. McGinley for, with Mrs. Bolton against.

Mr. Lane for, with Mr. Lafore against.

Mr. Thompson of Texas for, with Mr. Riehlman against.

Mr. Sheppard for, with Mr. Taylor against.

Mr. Morrison for, with Mr. Polk against.

Mr. Roosevelt for, with Mr. Quie against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Herlong with Mr. Andersen of Minnesota.

Mr. Evins with Mr. Cahill.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Speaker, I have a live pair with the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LAIRD]. If he were present, he would have voted "nay." I voted "yea." Therefore, I withdraw my vote of "yea" and vote "present."

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I have a live pair with the gentleman from New York [Mr. WAINWRIGHT]. If he were present, he would have voted "nay." I voted "yea." Therefore, I withdraw my vote of "yea" and vote "present."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

PROGRAM FOR THE BALANCE OF THIS WEEK AND FOR NEXT WEEK

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this time for the purpose of inquiring concerning the program for the balance of the day and the program for next week.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, for the balance of today we have the bill relating to the coloring of oranges. That is about to come up. Then there are two bills out of the Committee on Armed Services.

There are three rules to be adopted, if they do not take too long.

I know of no opposition to the bills, I am hopeful they will be disposed of them today. Those in charge of the bills, if they find there is opposition, I am sure will proceed expeditiously.

Mr. HALLECK. If there are rollcalls, however, they would be had this evening?

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes. I know of no rollcall that will be asked, but one can never tell.

If either of the bills from the Committee on Armed Services is not disposed of, they will go over until next Tuesday. I am hopeful they will be disposed to today. Assuming the three bills to which I have referred are disposed of today, I come now to next week's program.

On Monday we have the Consent Calendar.

Then there are three suspensions:

H.R. 5640, the extension of the temporary unemployment compensation law.

H.R. 10, the self-employed individual retirement act of 1959.

H.R. 519, revision of laws relating to depositary libraries.

Then the District of Columbia appropriation bill for 1960 will be brought up.

If the District of Columbia bill is not completed on Monday it will go over until Tuesday. As I say, if any of the bills programed for today are not completed today they will come up Tuesday.

By agreement of the leadership on both sides, any rollcalls on Monday and Tuesday will go over until Wednesday, on account of Tuesday's being, of course, one of the greatest days in the history of the world, St. Patrick's Day.

The Committee on Rules meets on Tuesday. If a rule is reported out on Tuesday on the bill H.R. 5132, or the Airport bill, which is H.R. 1011, either one of those bills might be brought up. I prefer not to state now which one will be brought up or brought up first. Of course, if both can get through the same day, that would be fine. I would want to bring up both of them, but if rules are reported out on both, as to which one would be brought up first I should like to have a little flexibility. The probability is that the Armed Forces retention of officers bill would be the one, but I would not want to commit myself on that now.

On Thursday the Treasury-Post Office appropriations bill for 1960 will be considered.

The Easter recess will begin at the close of business on March 26 and will run until Tuesday, April 7.

I make the usual reservation that conference reports may be brought up at any time and that any further program will be announced later.

Mr. HALLECK. If I may in my time, I should like to make an observation with respect to the suspensions that are scheduled for Monday. The first one has to do with the extension of temporary unemployment compensation. The majority leader and the Speaker very kindly spoke to me about it, and I agreed that it should be called up. We all realize that action must be had on that measure before March 31, which puts it in the nature of an emergency.

The suspension having to do with the revision of laws relating to depository libraries is rather a matter of routine and is not of any great consequence.

I would want the record to show that with respect to H.R. 10 I did not agree, so far as I was concerned, to the suspension on Monday next. As a matter of fact, I did what I could to avoid its being called under suspension. Of course I recognize that this is a matter completely within the prerogative of the Speaker, as to recognizing any Member to move to suspend the rules and pass a bill. Certainly anything I could say I would not want to be interpreted as any criticism of the Speaker in that regard.

However, no rule has been asked for on the bill. If it comes on under suspension, the minority does not have any right even to make a motion to recommit. Under the circumstances, I thought it might have been better to call the bill under a rule, which rule certainly I would have joined in trying to obtain. However, the promise has been made to put it on under suspension on Monday. So, having made that statement, that is the most I can do.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Is Monday a holiday or something? Why should we not have a rollcall vote on Monday?

Mr. McCORMACK. I think the gentleman from Iowa is one of the fairest-minded men that I have met.

Mr. GROSS. Well, now——

Mr. McCORMACK. Wait a minute, now. I am expressing my views, and the gentleman has no control over my thoughts. If they are nice and favorable to my friend, they are my thoughts just the same.

Since Tuesday is St. Patrick's Day, I am sure my friend would not want to have Members who have commitments for that day to go away over the weekend and come back here on Monday and then go back on Tuesday to carry out the comitments which they might have. That is, as I said, a very important day and I am sure that is an observation which will appeal to the fairmindedness of our colleague, the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I join with the gentleman from Massachusetts in his statement that it is really a great day, but I will not say it is the greatest day.

If I may add one thing further in connection with what I said about the bill, H.R. 10, I would not want my remarks to be construed by anyone here as anything but an expression of opinion as to procedure—certainly not on my side, because I know a great many Members on both sides of the aisle are very much in favor of the enactment of H.R. 10. What I had to say had to do only with the matter of keeping the record straight with respect to the procedure involved.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL MONDAY NEXT

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

ORANGE COLORING

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up the resolution (H. Res. 200) to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to permit the temporary listing and certification of citrus red No. 2 for coloring mature oranges under tolerances found safe by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, so as to permit continuance of established coloring practice in the orange industry pending congressional consideration of general legislation for the listing and certification of food color additives under safe tolerances, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, for the consideration of the bill (S. 79) to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to permit the temporary listing and certification of Citrus Red No. 2 for coloring mature oranges under tolerances found safe by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, so as to permit continuance of established coloring practice in the orange industry pending congressional consideration of general legislation for the listing and certification of food color additives under safe tolerances. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed one hour to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 200 makes in order the consideration of S. 79, which amends the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to permit the temporary listing and certification of citrus red No. 2 for coloring mature oranges.

The practice of using artificial color to color the skins of fully mature, sound oranges has prevailed in Florida and Texas for many years. Such coloring is necessary because fully mature fruit from those areas in many instances may be greenish and nonuniform in color.

Formerly the coloring material employed was coal tar color FDC red No. 32. In 1955 the Food and Drug Administration developed evidence that this coloring material was not harmless since, under some circumstances and in some quantities, it is capable of causing harm when fed to laboratory animals under properly conducted tests. Because of these findings the Administration caused this color to be removed from the list of colors certifiable for use in foods, which prohibited its use in coloring oranges.

In the 84th Congress legislation was passed, Public Law 672, which provided for the temporary continuation of certification and use of the color previously known as FDC red No. 32 solely for the purpose of coloring skins of oranges, it having been determined that this would involve no known danger to public health. This legislation expressly provided an expiration date of February 28, 1959, or sooner if a harmless substitute were developed. The studies undertaken during that period led to the development of the color known as citrus red No. 2, and we have been assured that the toxicity level of citrus red No. 2 is significantly lower than that of FDC red No. 32, and that in the quantities necessary to color the skin of oranges it is without hazard to man.

It is specifically provided that the provisions of this bill will become inoperative on August 31, 1961, or before that time if general legislation affecting coloring materials for food is enacted by the Congress. The reason for the time limit is that this is emergency legislation which will meet the immediate needs of the citrus industry without permanently engrafting on the basic Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act a new principle of tolerances for coal tar colors which is not applicable to foods generally. The expiration date has been so fixed as to allow the Congress ample time to consider the application of this principle to all foods. It is the intention of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, to which this bill was referred for consideration, to study amendments to the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act dealing with color additives generally since the need for such legislation has been amply demonstrated to this committee.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN].

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, this resolution was unanimously reported by the Committee on Rules. It makes in order the consideration of the bill, S. 79. I support both the rule and the bill. I have no requests for time and yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING CONSTRUCTION OF MODERN NAVAL VESSELS

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up the resolution (H. Res. 203) providing for the consideration of H.R. 3293, a bill to authorize the construction of modern naval vessels, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 3293) to authorize the construction of modern naval vessels. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed one hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Armed Services, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN]; and pending that, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, this rule was reported unanimously and the bill that will be considered under the rule was also unanimously reported. I know of no opposition to the rule.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, the minority members of the Committee on Rules supported this rule. I know of no opposition to either the rule or to the legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF SPECIAL ENLISTMENT PROGRAM

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 204 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 3368) to extend the special enlistment programs provided by section 262 of the Armed Forces Reserve Act of 1952, as amended. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed two hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Armed Services, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN] and yield myself such time as I may consume.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York is recognized.

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 204 makes in order the consideration of H.R. 3368, to extend the special enlistment programs provided by section 262 of the Armed Forces Reserve Act of 1952, as amended. This resolution provides for an open rule and 2 hours of general debate.

The purpose of this bill is to extend until August 1, 1963, the special Reserve component enlistment program provided by section 262, Armed Forces Reserve Act of 1952, as added by section 2(1), Reserve Forces Act of 1955. It is this authority upon which the Department of Defense has established its 6 months' trainee program for individuals between the ages of 17 to 18½. Under present law the authority for this program will expire on August 1, 1959. The Department of Defense has indicated that extension of this authority is considered essential to the maintenance of the strengths and mobilization readiness of the Reserve components.

This amendment to the Armed Forces Reserve Act of 1952 was part of the Reserve Forces Act of 1955, which act had as its primary purpose the development of an efficient and well-trained Ready Reserve Force. Therefore, the authority provided in section 262 of the Armed Forces Reserve Act was not an independently conceived program but an integral part of the effort made by Congress in 1955 to overhaul the Reserve structure with a view toward providing the machinery by which our Reserve Forces could be so organized and trained that in the event of war they would be mobilized quickly and be capable of efficiently augmenting the Active Forces in defending our country.

Since the implementation of section 262 in 1955 nearly 100,000 physically fit and qualified young men have taken advantage of the opportunity offered by this program to satisfy their military obligation to this country.

Extension of this authority will parallel extension of the Universal Military Training and Service Act and assures a continued flow of well-trained young men into the Ready Reserve components of our Armed Forces.

I urge the adoption of this resolution.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, the minority members of the Rules Committee supported this rule. I know of no opposition on this side to either the rule or the bill.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

USE OF CITRUS RED NO. 2 FOR COLORING ORANGES

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (S. 79) to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to permit the temporary listing and certification of citrus red No. 2 for coloring mature oranges under tolerances found safe by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, so as to permit continuance of established coloring practice in the orange industry pending congressional consideration of general legislation for the listing and certification of food color additives under safe tolerances, and ask unanimous consent that it may be considered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) the second proviso of section 402(c) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act is amended by striking out "March 1, 1959," and inserting in lieu thereof "May 1, 1959,".

(b) The third proviso of section 402(c) of such Act is amended to read as follows: "*And provided further,* That, without regard to the requirements of sections 406(b) and 701(e), the Secretary shall promptly establish, and may from time to time amend, regulations (1) prescribing the conditions (including quantitative tolerance limitations) under which the coal-tar color known as Citrus Red No. 2 (more particularly to be defined in such regulations) may be safely used in coloring the skins of oranges which are not intended or used for processing (or, if so used, are oranges designated in the trade as 'packinghouse elimination'), and which meet minimum maturity standards established by or under the laws of the States in which the oranges are grown, (2) providing for separately listing such color solely for such use on such oranges, and (3) providing for the certification of batches of such color, with or without harmless diluents, for each restricted use; and such oranges, if colored prior to September 1, 1961, and to the enactment by the Congress (subsequent to the date of enactment of this proviso) of general legislation for the listing and certification of food color additives under safe tolerances, in conformity with this proviso and such regulations, with Citrus Red No. 2 from a batch certified in accordance with such regulations, shall not be deemed to be adulterated within the meaning of this paragraph."

Mr. HARRIS (interrupting the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered as read and printed in the RECORD at this point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of the bill which was passed unanimously by the Senate and reported favorably and unanimously without amendment by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce is to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to permit the artificial coloring of the skins of oranges with a color known as citrus red No. 2.

Mr. HALEY, our esteemed colleague from Florida, introduced a bill identical with S. 79. Mr. HALEY testified before our committee on this legislation and he made his presentation with the clarity and persuasiveness which is so characteristic of the gentleman.

The practice of using artificial color to color the skins of fully mature, sound oranges has prevailed in Florida and Texas for many years. Such coloring is necessary because fully mature fruit from these areas, in many instances, may be greenish and nonuniform in color.

Formerly, the coloring material employed was FDC red No. 32. In 1955, the Food and Drug Administration developed evidence that red No. 32 was not harmless, and because of these findings the Food and Drug Administration caused the color to be removed from the list of colors certifiable for the use in foods. This removal had the effect of prohibiting its use for the coloring of oranges.

In the 85th Congress legislation was passed—Public Law 672—which provided for the temporary continuation of certification of red No. 32 solely for the purpose of coloring skins of oranges. The Food and Drug Administration found that this practice would involve no known damage to the public health.

The legislation expressly provided for an expiration date of February 28, 1959, or sooner, if a harmless substitute was developed. Citrus red No. 2, which was the substitute developed, has a toxicity level significantly lower than FDC red No. 32.

The bill, S. 79, provides authorization for the listing and certification, under safe tolerances, of citrus red No. 2 solely for the use in coloring mature oranges. The bill provides that each batch of such color employed in the coloring of oranges shall be certified by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Since it will require a period of approximately 60 days for the color citrus red No. 2 to be manufactured, certified, and available to orange packers, the bill further provides that the effective date for the termination of Public Law 672—which authorizes the use of FDC red No. 32—shall be April 30, 1959, instead of February 28, 1959.

Testimony was received by the committee from the Food and Drug Administration that the use of these colors will in nowise be detrimental to the public health.

The legislation is temporary legislation and will become inoperative on August 31, 1961, or before that time if general legislation affecting coloring materials for food is enacted by the Congress. The Food and Drug Administration expects to submit a general bill to the Congress in the near future. It is then the intention of the committee to give consideration to these general amendments to the Federal Food, Drug and Cosmetic Act since the need for such legislation is apparent to the committee.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD as part of my remarks a letter from John L. Harvey, deputy commissioner, dated February 26, 1959, and one from Mr. Harvey dated March 3, 1959, together with a summary of toxicity studies on citrus red No. 2.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

(The matter referred to follows:)

FEBRUARY 26, 1959.

Hon. JAMES J. DELANEY,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. DELANEY: In accordance with your request by telephone I may say the Department has indicated no objection to the passage of S. 79 as passed by the Senate and I so testified before the full Senate committee and the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce in the House.

This bill would continue a provision making available a coal tar color for application to the skin of oranges but would require a limitation or tolerance for the color to be imposed and restrict the color to this use only. Each orange would be marked "Color Added" as has been heretofore required where oranges are artifically colored. Also, in accordance with the restrictions of long standing, color is applied only to fully mature oranges which fail to color naturally.

This temporary legislation is in effect a substitution of the color citrus red No. 2 for FDC red No. 32 with the added safeguard of a tolerance limitation. The citrus red No. 2 represents significant advantage over red 32, both because it is inherently much less toxic by level of feeding and because it requires only about one-fifth as much of the citrus red No. 2 to effectively color oranges. The bill is not inconsistent with the provisions of the Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act generally, and as you have noted it is actually designed to be merged in a general color bill which we hope will be passed in the Congress this session.

The expiration date of existing legislation on the red 32 color is February 28—hence the urgent desire on the part of proponents to pass this bill on a consent calendar. If there is further information we can supply, please call me.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN L. HARVEY,
Deputy Commissioner.

MARCH 3, 1959.

Hon. JAMES J. DELANEY,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. DELANEY: Further reference is made to S. 79, as amended and passed by the Senate and as favorably reported by the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. We are satisfied that the provisions of the bill are such as to fully safeguard the public health. The requirements for certification of each batch of the color and the application of a tolerance are practicable and workable provisions.

The Department will shortly submit a bill generally applicable to the use of colors in foods, drugs, and cosmetics, which will embody the same principles of insuring safety contained in S. 79. These principles have been adopted after very thorough study in an effort to devise the most satisfactory means of dealing with the use of colors so as to insure that they are safe under the conditions of use and to always provide a wide margin of safety.

Considering the present emergency situation which prohibits the coloring of oranges after February 28, 1959, and the expectation that general legislation on colors will provide for the coloring of oranges, we believe that S. 79 should be passed.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN L. HARVEY,
Deputy Commissioner.

SUMMARY OF TOXICITY STUDIES ON CITRUS RED NO. 2; 2 (1-[2, 5-DIMETHOXYPHENYLAZO]-2-NAPHTHOL

I. Chronic toxicity studies on rats, using pharmacologically accepted procedures, showed that the feeding of 500 parts per million of the dye in the diet for 2 years produced no effect. One thousand parts per million produced only suggestive (questionable) effect. Higher levels produced effect.

II. Chronic toxicity studies on dogs, using pharmacologically accepted procedures, showed that the feeding of about 2,000 parts per million of the dye in the diet for 76 weeks produced no effect. About 8,000 parts per million in the diet for 2 years produced effect.

III. Subcutaneous injection studies and metabolism studies gave no basis for ques-

tioning the safety of lifetime ingestion of small amounts of citrus red No. 2.

IV. There was no indication in any of the experiments that the dye causes cancer.

V. Conclusions:

The dye did not produce any adverse effect when fed to dogs at 2,000 parts per million for 76 weeks, or when fed to rats at 500 parts per million for their lifetime. There was no indication that the dye is carcinogenic.

The level proposed for use of the dye on oranges—1 to 1.5 parts per million—would give the following safety factors: (a) 300- to 500-fold based on rat experiments; (b) 1,300- to 2,000-fold based on dog experiments.

(A 100-fold safety factor would be regarded by competent pharmacologists as adequate where results such as those obtained here are obtained.)

This shows that citrus red No. 2 can be used on oranges at a level of 1 to 1.5 parts per million without hazard to man. Juice or peel from treated oranges, or the whole oranges, would be safe.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRIS. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Speaker, I have no objection to this bill and I do not know of anyone from California who does, but I would like to point out for the benefit of my friends here in the House that my colleagues from Arizona and California would like to make the point that we in California and Arizona do not find it necessary to use coloring on the oranges grown in those States.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRIS. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, unfortunately the gentleman from California has expressed in different words my own thoughts. My question was going to be: Would those oranges from Florida and Texas have that natural result that the good sunshine in California gives them and therefore makes California oranges attractive to the American people?

Mr. HARRIS. I would not want to undertake to make a comparison of oranges from Florida or Texas that are colored with the oranges from the gentleman's State.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I may say all of my colleagues from California are sympathetic with the plight of the orange growers in Texas and Florida, and we have no desire to stand in the way of helping them in any manner we can.

Mr. HARRIS. The point that the gentleman has so well made was made to our committee by another colleague of ours from California.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRIS. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I want to add my voice to those who have already spoken and say that we do not begrudge this gift to the gentlemen from Florida and Texas. We know full well that the outside of the fruit might look the same as ours, but inside will not compare with ours in any way and there is nothing they can do about it, so we are for this bill.

Mr. HARRIS. May I make this other point seriously, Mr. Speaker, for the information of the House. It is necessary that this temporary legislation be passed because they are now in the harvesting season in Florida. Already some of these plants are being closed down, and within a very few days some 6,000 people will be out of jobs and the American people will be deprived of the kind of oranges they have been accustomed to receiving.

Mr. WIER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRIS. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. WIER. Your very report would leave the impression, at least with me, that this stopgap legislation is not yet safe. We are preparing a safe one, it is said. Anyway, I want to say that I am opposed to it. I am opposed to the artificial coloring of foodstuffs that the American people eat.

Mr. HARRIS. The gentleman has a right to express his views. I did not mean to leave the impression that this was in any way unsafe.

Mr. WIER. The gentleman said this is stopgap legislation and until they perfect the formula it might be unsafe.

Mr. HARRIS. No; not this formula. I referred to the overall, broad subject.

Mr. WIER. Are we going to have this on all fruit?

Mr. HARRIS. This only affects oranges.

Mr. WIER. Well, I am still against it.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Arkansas has expired.

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot in good conscience support S. 79.

Although tests show that citrus red No. 2 is much less toxic than FDC red 32, which it is designed to replace, it is, nevertheless, toxic. If it were not toxic, the citrus industry would not feel impelled to ask for this legislation.

As you know, the Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act bars the use of any coal tar dye in food unless it is harmless. Unfortunately, the burden of proof is on the Government and the Food and Drug Administration does not have the facilities to test all of the coal tar dyes now in use. In fact, it has been stated that it would take them 20 years to complete the job, and, meanwhile, the public continues to consume them in food.

However, a number of the dyes that FDA has been able to test have been found toxic, and these have been delisted. Only last month, final action was taken to delist four of them—FDC yellow 1, 2, 3, and 4. Just this week I have learned that tests have revealed that yellow 3 and 4, AB and OB, contain an element which is known to induce cancer in humans. I understand that these dyes have been used in margarine and certain baked goods. Previous to last month's action, FDA had delisted other dyes—among them FDC red 32.

The pasasge of S. 79 would be only a first step to weaken our protection against harmful coal tar dyes. I say that the public needs more protection—not less.

Coal tar dyes are in a special category, and scientists have been suspicious of them for many years. That is why the Congress enacted special provisions relative to them in the Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act.

When a new coal tar dye is proposed for use, I believe it is time to stop, look, and listen. That is why I stopped, looked, and listened when citrus red No. 2 came along.

Is this dye harmless at the level of use suggested? Well, I have been able to discover that it belongs to a chemical family, two members of which have been found to induce cancer when implanted in the bladders of mice. The first of these compounds induced cancer in 25 percent of the mice tested—the second, in 37.5 percent of the mice. These tests were reported in the British Journal of Cancer, June 1958, volume 12, No. 2, in a paper by D. B. Clayson, J. W. Jull, and G. M. Bonser. I understand that citrus red No. 2 is related, chemically, to the 2 compounds reviewed in this paper.

I do not claim that citrus red No. 2 can cause cancer. A summary of the toxicity studies on the color, which was submitted to me by FDA, states that there was no indication in any of the experiments that the dye causes cancer. However, the tests were feeding tests. Cautious cancer researchers do not accept feeding tests alone as conclusive.

In any event, this bill means taking a calculated risk with the public health. In the case of coal tar dyes, I hold that we are not justified in taking a calculated risk.

Coal tar dyes serve no useful purpose. They do not add any nutritive value to oranges. They do not make oranges any more delicious. Their only use is to add to eye appeal.

If the citrus industry would spend as much money educating consumers to accept undyed oranges as it spends in dyeing them, the public would not be subjected to any risk and, in the long run, the industry would save money and trouble.

Mr. Speaker, I see no good reason for passing this bill, and I see many reasons for defeating it.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DELANEY. I yield.

Mr. HARRIS. The gentleman did have a letter from the Food and Drug Administration on the subject, did he not?

Mr. DELANEY. Yes; I did.

Mr. HARRIS. That letter did advise the gentleman that this was a safe coloring?

Mr. DELANEY. May I say that I had to write to the Food and Drug Administration and consult with them on three different occasions. Finally, we got a letter that said that the tests showed 100 degrees of safety. They found it was safe, in their opinion; that is, the opinion of the Food and Drug Administration. While they did not sponsor the bill, they did not object to it.

LONG-RANGE SIGNIFICANCE OF THIS LEGISLATION

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

I have had, and still have, many reservations about the desirability of this legislation. I wish it were not necessary for us to consider it. I will be sorry to see it become law. Yet I have to acknowledge that every question I have raised to responsible authorities about the possible dangers inherent in the bill has been answered straightforwardly and persuasively.

On the basis of existing scientific knowledge it appears clear that there would be no danger to the consumer in eating oranges colored by citrus red No. 2, even to children sucking an orange through a hole in the skin.

On the other hand, I do not want to let this bill go through the House without raising some points about the long-range significance of this bill's enactment, with the hope that some better method can be devised by our food industry for promoting sales of its varied products than continuously using more and more camouflage to fool the consumer, particularly if the camouflage consists of chemical materials definitely known to be harmful under certain circumstances.

SEARCH FOR "HARMLESS" COLOR WAS FRUITLESS

Mr. Speaker, this is not the first bill brought before us under so-called emergency circumstances to legislate the citrus industry of Florida and Texas out of a difficult situation involving the coloring of their oranges. Several years ago, when it first became known that the coal tar color then being used on oranges—and which will still be used for a little while under this bill—when it became known that this coal tar color designated food, drug, and cosmetic red 32 was not in fact harmless, Congress passed temporary legislation to permit the industry to continue using the color until February 28, 1959.

Congress agreed to that in the expectation that—in the assurance that—a harmless substitute color could be developed in the interval.

The interval has expired, but no suitable and practical harmless color has been discovered to take the place of the old food, drug, and cosmetic red 32 in coloring oranges. The effort was certainly made. But it is clear that coal tar derivatives are no longer providing a reservoir of new artificial colors which can qualify under the Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act as being harmless.

CITRUS RED NO. 2 NOT HARMLESS, BUT IS LESS TOXIC

Instead, Mr. Speaker, the chemical industry has developed a synthetic color known as citrus red No. 2 as a substitute for the old food, drug, and cosmetic red 32 in coloring oranges. Citrus red No. 2 is not harmless under the terms of the Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act. But it is said to be substantially less toxic than the old FDC red 32. The Food and Drug Administration is convinced that in the manner in which this color would be used for coloring oranges, and in the quantities which FDA would permit to be used in coloring oranges under the authority of this legislation, citrus red No. 2 would be perfectly safe from the consumer standpoint.

Of course, Mr. Speaker, I can hardly claim to know more, or anywhere near as much, about this as the FDA, so I am certainly not going to challenge their scientific determination as to the relative safety of using this material on oranges, subject to close supervision and control.

But it is worth noting that what we are authorizing is not the use of a harmless material, but of one which is less harmful, less toxic, than the chemical which has long been used for this purpose.

S. 79 TEMPORARY PENDING PASSAGE OF OVERALL COLOR LEGISLATION

As I said, Mr. Speaker, I would much prefer not to see legislation of this kind enacted. I would prefer to see some way found to eliminate the alleged economic necessity for the artificial coloring of foodstuffs with chemicals about whose safety there is even remote doubt and suspicion.

The food additives bill which we enacted last year after many years of effort was a big step toward the solution of a very serious problem involving the use in foodstuffs of hundreds of other chemicals of doubtful safety but the food additives bill did not apply to this specialized field of coal tar derivatives because the coal tar derivatives have been treated for years under our laws with deep suspicion.

This bill is the first step in a process to change that basic attitude toward the coal tar colors. It is a temporary piece of stopgap legislation intended to remain in effect only until Congress enacts overall legislation in the field of artificial coloring of foods, or for no more than 2 years at the outside.

The necessity for such overall legislation, or at least the pressure for it, arises out of the fact that the Food and Drug Administration is being caught in a squeeze between food industry demands, on the one hand, for more and more certified colors to use in or on foods, and the scientific truth, on the other hand, that fewer colors, old or new, are able to pass the test of harmlessness required under the Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act of 1938.

CONSUMER BLAMED FOR INCREASE IN USE OF ARTIFICIAL COLORS

Presumably it is the public which demands this coloring material in food. If that is so I would say that the food industry makes little effort to talk the consumer out of this so-called fetish for fancy camouflage of the foods we buy. Rather, I would say the food industry deliberately promotes, provokes, and fools the consuming public into buying more and more foods unnecessarily colored with artificial and potentially dangerous chemical substances. I use the word "unnecessary" about this coloring from the standpoint of nutritional value. The coloring is put in only to make the product more attractive.

For instance, we have official word from the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare that synthetic colors, including some of now very doubtful safety are now being used in or on such a wide variety of commodities as butter, margarine, sausage casings, cakes, cookies, pies, bread, processed cheese, spreads, canned and frozen vegetables, confectionery, ice cream, gelatin desserts, puddings, and many, many other items.

The significant thing about this increasing use of coloring matter on or in food is that the old colors long in use and always thought to be completely safe are now being found to be less than completely safe, definitely harmful under certain circumstances, and thus no longer subject to certification and approval under the Food and Drug Act.

So once we enact this law to permit oranges to be colored by a material which is not harmless under that act, we are going to be faced with the necessity of allowing other doubtful colors to be used under similar safeguards.

SAFE TOLERANCES DON'T ALWAYS STAY SAFE

But who is to say that we have enough scientific knowledge to guarantee that the safe tolerances which are now to be set will still be found to be safe as our testing techniques improve? That is not an academic question. We know now that the old Food, Drug, and Cosmetic red No. 32 used for so many years on oranges is more toxic than we thought. It can no longer be used in or on food—it has been redesignated as external red 32 for use only on drugs or cosmetics used externally, although for the next few months it will still be used on oranges, under this bill.

I am reminded, Mr. Speaker, of the announcement made a day or two ago by a committee of experts reporting to the Public Health Service on so-called safe limits of radiation. Just a few years ago, safe tolerances were set for atomic workers at 100 units a year. Later study has proved this was completely unrealistic—the so-called safe limit for atomic workers is now only 5 units a year.

The committee of experts now wonders if this is much too high. The safe level for the general public is set at one-half unit per year. And this may prove to be too high a constant.

The same is true with these coal tar colors. We know they are dangerous—potential killers. We know that in using them in food we are taking a chance. We are assured the level permitted under this bill for use on oranges will be a safe one, but how do we know further research may prove there is no such thing as a safe level of citrus red No. 2?

IS THIS BILL AN ECONOMIC NECESSITY?

Mr. Speaker, I for one am not at all convinced that passage of this legislation now before us is an economic necessity for the survival of the Florida and Texas citrus industries. If that is the case, then the firms involved in that industry—the industry as a whole—have only themselves to blame. They tell us people will not buy their oranges in competition with the naturally colored oranges of California unless the Florida and Texas oranges can be tinted to what is regarded as a natural orange color.

Everyone knows that Florida and Texas oranges are juicier. Why cannot the industry spend some of the money

it devotes to coloring oranges in order to explain to the public that the uncolored, natural orange is not only just as good in taste and flavor and everything else but contains on its skin no doubtful chemicals?

It seems to me the consumer would prefer the natural orange to an orange treated with even minute quantities of a chemical which can, in sufficient quantities, cause serious harm. Yet as far as I know the citrus growers of Florida and Texas have made no effort at all to popularize the uncolored oranges. Instead, they take the adamant position that they must color oranges with coal tar derivatives because the public insists on it.

What the public does not know may, in this instance, be hurting it.

QUESTIONS RAISED ON CITRUS RED NO. 2

I asked the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare for a full report on some questions which had occurred to me about this legislation and I have received an excellent and, I will admit, reassuring reply from the Food and Drug Administration. I am placing that exchange of correspondence in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks. But I call attention now to these unpleasant facts, which I do not think appear in the hearings of the committee or in the report on this bill. I quote Mr. John L. Harvey, Deputy Commissioner of the Food and Drug Administration, in reply to my question asking at what point these coloring materials become toxic:

The acute effect in toxic doses of red 32—

Mr. Harvey wrote—

is vomiting and diarrhea. Among the chronic effects are growth retardation and anemia. In the rats studied there was liver damage at autopsy. In the case of citrus red No. 2 excessive dosages produce damage to the circulatory system and cause blood seepage with swelling or edema. There was also harm to the liver in the test animals. The safe level for the citrus red No. 2 in the test animals is 500 parts per million and the amount that would be needed in coloring oranges is from 1 to 1½ parts per million. The toxic level of citrus red No. 2 begins at about 1,000 parts per million. Signs become more marked as the quantity fed is increased significantly above this. In the studies on red 32 which led to its delisting, some effects were noted at levels of 100 parts per million in the test animals. The amount of red 32 used in the coloring of oranges was found to be 3 to 5 parts per million.

In other words, Mr. Speaker, the amounts to be used in coloring oranges are infinitesimal compared to the quantities necessary to cause harm. That is the only basis under which we could possibly permit the use of any of these coal-tar derivatives to be used on the skins of oranges which children like to put in their mouth. But I hate to see even such a tiny amount of a poisonous or harmful substance used in or on food, when it is not necessary.

CONSUMER WANTS FACTS

What is the answer, then, to the problem? The citrus industry affected says it absolutely must have the ability to disguise the natural color of its product. Otherwise, it says, people would not buy it.

On behalf of the housewives of our country, I deny any such broad statement as that. Our housewives are not morons—they must be pretty intelligent individuals to buy and shop and budget and maintain a home and keep a family today under present cruelly high prices. They are as a group intensively interested in everything about their homes—and anxious to know more about nutrition and diet and comparative values. Anyone who thinks differently just has not been in the stores watching women shop. I would not say men are less careful shoppers, but I might point out that the supermarkets love to see the husbands come in to do the shopping—and for the benefit of the husbands, incidentally, the stores have a wide variety of impulse-buying luxury items displayed just at eye height on the shelves where the men find it almost impossible to resist buying.

I do not say this in any battle of the sexes over which group constitutes the best shoppers. But I do want to emphasize that women read up on the food values, watch the prices, and look for nutritional items. They are intelligent shoppers.

WHY NOT EDUCATE CONSUMERS?

Certainly our great food industry—the biggest users of advertising in the whole world—could market uncolored oranges very successfully if they would take the time and effort to help educate the public to the advantages of uncolored oranges.

When the citrus growers were before the Supreme Court last year on this question of coloring oranges with coal tar colors no longer considered harmless, I understand Justice Douglas asked why they did not spend some effort to try to market the uncolored oranges so that it would no longer be economically necessary to tint the oranges. He was told the industry had made such an attempt but it did not work. His comment was a good one. He said something to this effect: that the industry was much more willing to spend time and money to litigate, rather than to educate on this issue. The industry lost the litigation, and now it is in here with a plea for us to legislate it out of a difficult situation. Still, as I see it, there is virtually no inclination on the part of the growers to educate the public—the housewife.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE SHOULD HELP

I wonder, Mr. Speaker, why our Department of Agriculture, which spends many millions both in research and in educational work to promote purchase by consumers of good foods in ample supply, cannot devote some of its time and effort to promoting the purchase of uncolored oranges. I for one would support whatever appropriation was necessary to enable the Department to explain to housewives that the coloring material in Florda and Texas oranges is unnecessary and, in fact, may someday turn out to have been more harmful than we thought.

It is worth the effort, I think, to guide the consumer to buy the natural foods in preference to those which contain unnecessary colors or other ingredients which add absolutely nothing to their nutritional value or taste or anything else—but which just make them appear to be perhaps more attractive in the store. If the ingredients used are potentially dangerous, even if not harmful in the amount used, I still think we are better off not using these additives.

Once the consumers learn of the dangers involved, I am sure this problem will solve itself. In the meantime, we should tread slowly in the use of potentially dangerous ingredients.

FACTS ON POSSIBLE DANGERS TO CONSUMERS

Mr. Speaker, I mentioned my exchange of correspondence with the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare on this bill, and some of the facts which were brought out in that exchange.

Of great significance to this discussion, too, is the report made by the same Department nearly a year ago on legislation which was introduced in the 85th Congress to set up the kind of safe-tolerance color standards for all foodstuffs which this bill would permit in the case of oranges. As I said, this bill is the temporary expedient until long-range color legislation can be passed. I think many of the things in the Department's report of last year on the long-range color legislation are important to our discussion here today, and so I am including that report also as part of my remarks.

I submit, therefore, in the following order, as part of my remarks, my letter to Secretary Flemming, the reply from the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare containing the memorandum from Mr. Harvey, of the Food and Drug Administration, and then, third, the report of June 27, 1958, from Assistant Secretary Elliott L. Richardson on the whole question of color legislation. I have quoted in my talk today from portions of that report.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., February 12, 1959.

Dr. ARTHUR S. FLEMMING,
Secretary, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I have just read the Senate debate of Monday on S. 79, the emergency bill to let the Florida and Texas citrus industry use the coal-tar color formerly known as Food, Drug, and Cosmetic red 32 for another 2 months, until May 1, and then to use thereafter the newly developed citrus red 2 until September 1961 for coloring oranges, despite the fact that neither color is harmless under the Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act.

The fact that the Senate action, both in committee and on the floor, was unanimous, and the further fact that you indicated your Department's approval of the bill as amended along lines you suggested, indicate it will probably be coming before us in the House very shortly, accompanied by a demand for speedy action. I would therefore appreciate your comments on some thoughts which occur to me about this measure.

I read your report on the bill with mixed feelings. The changes you suggested in the legislation were certainly improvements, but I wonder if the emergency is really so serious to the industry as your report seems to indicate. Several stores, I notice, have anticipated the deadline of February 28 for the use of the old red 32 on oranges by putting up signs saying they will handle only uncolored oranges until a safe color is developed. Has anyone made any study to

show whether consumers actually refuse to buy uncolored oranges if they are aware of the facts about the coloring material used? Is the industry or the Department of Agriculture making any effort to promote the sale of uncolored oranges in view of the toxicity of any coloring which would be used to camouflage the true color?

While I know that you did not write the Senate committees' report on the bill, undoubtedly the facts therein were based to a large extent on your report and the testimony of your experts. Therefore, I wonder if you could explain the contradiction between the statement in your report, on the one hand, that the Florida and Texas citrus growers face an emergency because of consumer resistance to uncolored oranges, making artificial coloring an economic necessity, and the statement in the committee report on the other hand that the coloring of oranges will not raise their price "inasmuch as the competition between colored and uncolored oranges would have the effect of precluding passing on the cost of coloring to the consumer"?

More important than these questions involving the degree of economic necessity behind this legislation are several others which keep occurring to me: if the old red 32 and the new red 2 are not toxic in the manner in which they are used in coloring oranges, why would the coloring matter not be permitted on oranges which are intended for processing? What percentages of these colors would be toxic, and what percentages are now in use or to be permitted under this legislation? What are the reactions to toxic quantities of either color? Will a child sucking an orange through a hole in the skin—and nearly every child loves to do that—be in danger of ingesting any harmful quantity of this coloring matter?

I would very much appreciate the considered judgment of your experts on these questions. If there is absolutely no danger whatsoever to anyone as a result of the use of these coal-tar colors on oranges, that is one thing; but if there is even a remote but possible danger of harm, then I don't think we should rush into bad legislation under the spur of an imagined economic crisis.

With best wishes, I am,

Sincerely yours,

LEONOR K. (Mrs. JOHN B.) SULLIVAN,
Member of Congress, Third District of Missouri.

THE SECRETARY OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION, AND WELFARE,
Washington, February 23, 1959.

Hon. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MRS. SULLIVAN: Replying to your letter of February 12 regarding the newly developed color citrus red No. 2, enclosed herewith is a memorandum which was furnished me by the Food and Drug Administration.

I hope that this covers the questions which you have; and if we can be of further service, please let us know.

Sincerely yours,

ARTHUR S. FLEMMING,
Secretary.

FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION,
February 21, 1959.

Hon. ARTHUR S. FLEMMING,
Secretary, Department of Health,
Education, and Welfare.

JOHN L. HARVEY,
Deputy Commissioner,
Food and Drug Administration.

USE OF CITRUS RED 2 FOR COLORING ORANGES

Very complete toxicity studies were conducted by a manufacturer of citrus red 2 and reported to us for study some months ago. These studies show that while the color can produce harm when fed to test animals in sufficient dosage, the feeding level at which harm is produced is so much greater than the level of use required for coloring oranges that the dye can be employed commercially without any hazard to the consumer. Thus, we are assured that the coloring with citrus red 2, which we would sanction if the proposed legislation were enacted, would not even harm the child who sucks an orange through a hole in the skin.

It has been our policy in administering the pesticide chemicals amendment and will be our policy in administering the food additives amendment to the Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act not to allow more chemical in food than is reasonably required to accomplish the intended purpose, even though a higher concentration would appear to be safe, based on animal toxicity studies. We believe the same policy should apply with respect to the color for use on oranges. Oranges intended for processing do not need to be colored.

The statement in the Senate committee report that the coloring of oranges will not raise their price, "inasmuch as competition between colored and uncolored oranges would have the effect of precluding passing on the cost of coloring to the consumer," was not based on our testimony. However, we understand that it is based on the fact that California oranges and at least some of the oranges grown in other parts of the country do not acquire a greenish tint after ripening and are not artificially colored. The oranges that may acquire a green tint after ripening and are artificially colored would have to meet the competition from the uncolored oranges.

We do not know of studies conducted to show whether consumers refuse to buy uncolored oranges if they have a choice of uncolored and colored variety. We have been assured, however, by people who are well acquainted with conditions in the citrus-growing regions that consumers do not care to have oranges with green streaks or a slightly green cast at one end if they are able to buy fruit which is uniformly orange in color.

The acute effect in toxic doses of red 32 is vomiting and diarrhea. Among the chronic effects are growth retardation and anemia. In the rats studied there was liver damage at autopsy. In the case of citrus red No. 2, excessive dosages produce damage to the circulatory system and cause blood seepage with swelling or edema. There was also harm to the liver in the test animals. The safe level for the citrus red No. 2 in the test animals is 500 parts per million, and the amount that would be needed in coloring oranges is from 1 to 1½ parts per million. The toxic level of citrus red No. 2 begins at about 1,000 parts per million. Signs become more marked as the quantity fed is increased significantly above this. In the studies on red 32 which lead to its delisting, some effects were noted at levels of 100 parts per million in the test animals. The amount of red 32 used in the coloring of oranges was found to be 3 to 5 parts per million.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
Education, and Welfare.
Washington, D.C., June 27, 1958.

Hon. OREN HARRIS,
Chairman, Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This letter is in response to your request for a report on H.R. 8945, a bill to protect the public health by amending the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to prohibit the use in food, drugs, and cosmetics of color additives which have not been determined suitable and harmless for such use.

The bill would, through substantial changes in the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, broaden and make flexible the Secretary's authority relating to the regulation and certification of colors for safe use in or on foods, drugs, and cosmetics.

I. COMPANION OF EXISTING LAW AND THE BILL

1. Scope of coverage: The provisions of existing law relating to the listing and certification of colors are limited to so-called coal-tar colors. The term "coal-tar color," however, has been interpreted to apply, generally, not only to dyes which are coal-tar derivatives, but also to synthetic dyes so related in their chemical structure to a coal-tar constituent as to be capable of derivation therefrom even when not actually so derived. The present bill would embrace all color additives, whether or not synthesized and whether or not capable of derivation from a coal-tar constituent.

2. Restrictions as to use of toxic colors—exemptions from certification requirement: The present law, more fully explained below, simply requires the Secretary to promulgate regulations providing for "the listing" of coal-tar colors harmless and suitable for use in food, or in drugs or cosmetics, and providing for the certification of batches of such colors, with or without harmless diluents (secs. 406(b), 504, 604). A food, drug, or cosmetic (other than a hair dye) is deemed to be adulterated if it bears or contains a coal-tar color other than one from such a certified batch (secs. 402(c), 501(4), 601(e)).

The bill (1) would require separate listing of color additives which are suitable for use in food, drugs, and cosmetics, and which are harmless under the conditions of use specified in such listing; (2) would expressly authorize the Secretary to establish maximum tolerance for the use of any listed color additive in or on different foods, drugs, or cosmetics; and (3) would require not only that the regulations provide for the certification of listed color additives, with or without diluents [but also] for the exemption from certification of color additives the certification of which is not necessary to protect the public health. The above-mentioned provisions of the present act relating to adulteration would be changed to correspond with these changes.

As we interpret the bill, the Secretary would, among other things, not only be authorized to establish tolerances for toxic color additives and to limit the manner of their use—e.g., to external use—in or on different foods (or drugs or cosmetics), but could permit the use of a color for one food, drug, or cosmetic and exclude it altogether from others. Thus, on the basis of the data before him, the Secretary might decide to list a color additive as harmless for use on the skin of mature oranges—subject to a tolerance if he thinks it necessary—and bar it for any other use.

The bill would not affect the temporary proviso to section 402(c), enacted by Public Law 672, 84th Congress, with respect to the coloring of oranges. It also would leave intact the present provisions of the act which establish the procedures (including hearing and judicial review) for the issuance, amendment, or repeal of regulations on colors, and would, as at present, provide for fees to maintain the listing and certification service (secs. 701(e)–(g); 706).

Under present law, as we read it, we do not have the kind of latitude afforded by this bill. We can, in our view, list a color as harmless for use in food, in drugs, or in cosmetics only where there is no possibility of adverse physiological effect on the consumer from its use, regardless of the concentration or manner, or the number of commodities, or (except as noted below) the kinds of commodities, in which the food, drug, or cosmetic manufacturer might choose to employ the color. Thus, if laboratory tests show a color to have any toxic effect

when ingested, we cannot list it as harmless for any use in which there is a possibility that some amount of the color, however minute, might be ingested by the consumer or come into contact with mucous membrane, though we can and do list such a color for a use (particularly in drugs or cosmetics intended only for external application to the body) which involves no possibility of its ingestion and where the color, regardless of amount or concentration used, is harmless for such noninternal use.

Our interpretation, recently challenged in the courts, is now in litigation. In one case, our action in "delisting" three coal-tar colors was sustained by the Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit on the basis of a record which demonstrated the toxicity of these colors. The court—without deciding whether we had basic authority to fix safe tolerances for toxic coal-tar colors—held that we could not be required to do so because (a) on the record, there was no showing of what (if any) level of use of the delisted colors would be harmless, (b) the Secretary should in no event be required by a court to permit the use of toxic colors "without the clearest and most uncompromising evidence that usage at certain levels was absolutely safe" in the light of the consumer's total diet, and (c) the court could see no possibility of limiting the consumer's actual intake of such colors (if permitted) to the consumption level estimated in setting a tolerance (*Certified Color Industry Committee* v. *Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare,* 256 F. 2d 866 (1956)).

In another case, however—which involved the same "delisting" action and hearing record, though the petitioners were concerned only with the use of one of the delisted dyes in coloring oranges—the Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit decided that we had authority, in the listing and certification of colors, to differentiate between one food and another and one food use and another, and that in the case of food we were required to determine and establish safe tolerances for a particular food use—in this case, coloring of the skins of oranges—where the marketability of the food would otherwise be seriously prejudiced and an important segment of the industry depended upon the marketing of the colored commodity. The holding as to our tolerance authority and duty was bottomed on the view that in such a case the addition of color was "required in the production" of the food within the meaning of section 406(a) of the act, which provides that a poisonous or deleterious food additive shall be deemed to be unsafe unless "required in the production" of the food or unavoidable by good manufacturing practice and that, if it is so required or unavoidable, the Secretary shall establish safe tolerances therefor (*Florida Citrus Exchange* v. *Folsom,* 246 F. 2d 850 (1957)). This case is now pending for review in the Supreme Court.

3. Effective date and grandfather clause: The bill would become effective 6 months after the date of enactment. However, any color additive in use immediately prior to the date of enactment "in accordance with a sanction or approval previously granted" would be deemed to have been listed as suitable for use at the levels of use prevailing when the bill was enacted unless and until such presumed listing is "modified" by the Secretary.

II. COMMENT

We believe that, while the bill should be modified in certain substantive and technical respects, the concepts of the permanent provisions of the bill (as distinguished from the grandfather clause) are basically sound in view of (a) the inflexibility of the present law; (b) the resulting threat to the continued availability of color additives suitable for use in (or on) foods, drugs, and cosmetics in which they have long been used; (c) the fact that scientific procedures are available for determining whether such color additives may be safely used and, if so, in which commodities and under what conditions (including tolerance limitations); and (d) the anomaly of the present law in establishing different ground rules as between so-called coal-tar colors and other additives. It seems desirable to set forth the reasons for these conclusions.

1. The problem: The use of synthetic or other substances in food, drugs, and cosmetics for the purpose of imparting an attractive or distinguishing color to the commodity or, in the case of certain cosmetics, for the purpose of enhancing the appearance of the human body through added color, has long been established and is growing. It is widely accepted, and in many cases consciously demanded, by the consuming public. In the case of food, for example, synthetic color subject to listing and certification under the act is used in (or on) a wide range of commodities, including butter, margarine, oranges, sausage casings, cakes, cookies, pies, bread, processed cheese, spreads, canned and frozen vegetables, confectionery, ice cream, gelatin desserts, puddings, soft drinks, condiments, soups, pickles, prepared dishes, etc. Many housewives also purchase certified color directly and use it in their kitchen in making cakes, icings, desserts, and milk drinks, canning fruit, etc. And before the special tax on colored margarine was repealed, housewives often purchased the color separately and went to the trouble of mixing it with uncolored margarine. The Food and Drug Administration, in the fiscal year 1957, certified 1,581,000 pounds of primary colors listed as suitable and harmless for use in food, a quantity sufficient to color over 1 billion pounds of food. Color has come to be an economic necessity in the marketing of a variety of foods and other commodities covered by the act.

This development has, for more than half a century—i.e., since the enactment of the Pure Food and Drugs Act of 1906—taken place in the shelter of a national policy of allowing the use of synthetic colors, subject only to safeguards considered necessary to protect the public health and prevent deception of consumers. The provisions of the present act (enacted in 1938), prohibiting the use of so-called coal-tar colors other than harmless certified colors, were designed to give legislative sanction to, and to extend to drugs and cosmetics, a longstanding administrative practice in certifying "harmless" colors for food. While the congressional committees recognized that most so-called coal-tar colors were toxic—which was the reason for singling them out for special control—it was thought—and this is the central premise of these provisions—that an adequate supply of harmless ones, i.e., those demonstrated to be without adverse physiological action, had been developed under this administrative practice and, presumably, would continue to be developed as needed; hence, the stringency of the law as we read it (S. Rept. No. 361, 74th Cong. See also H. Rept. No. 2139, 75th Cong.). However, present-day scientific methods are providing this premise to have been largely illusory.

Within the past few years, new scientific testing methods have shown that some of the coal-tar colors which were permitted in food because earlier testing showed that they were harmless, are capable of causing harm when ingested. Three of these, as above mentioned, have therefore been removed from the list of permitted food colors and have been transferred to the list restricted to use in externally applied drugs and cosmetics, and proceedings have been commenced to remove four more, including a yellow color commonly used in margarine. These tests, conducted with a view to determining whether the colors are themselves harmless, were not aimed at determining, and hence were not adequate to show, whether we could establish for such colors safe levels of use in or on particular foods, drugs, or cosmetics, and, if so, whether their actual use exceeded those levels. As these modern tests are applied to other colors, it is not unlikely that more and more of them will be found to be toxic and thus will have to be removed from the list.

The process could eventually pose a serious threat to established coloring practices in the food, drug, and cosmetic fields. The threat is already present in the case of food colors. There were only 19 primary coal-tar colors listed for food use when the delisting process began. These have now been reduced to 16 (subject to the use on oranges permitted under court order and under temporary legislation) and would be reduced to 12 if the present proceedings on 4 other colors should end in delisting. While acceptable substitute mixtures of still listed primary colors have been developed for most (not all) food uses in which the three delisted colors were employed, substitution will obviously become more and more difficult as additional primary colors are taken off the list. Nor has it been found technically feasible, in most of these cases, to develop satisfactory non-coal-tar color substitutes.

In this situation, a legislative reexamination of the entire subject of color additives for use in the food, drug, and cosmetic supply of the country is indicated, and we should, in our view, be given new and clear statutory directives as to national policy in this field and as to our duty in carrying out that policy.

The process of judicial interpretation, even if it were finally to establish that we can or must fix tolerances for toxic colors, is not likely to lend itself in this instance to the establishment of the kind of rational scheme—with appropriate controls and with criteria for allocating the aggregate tolerance for a color among different commodities where necessary—which, we believe, would be necessary if coal-tar colors or other color additives were to be admitted to the food, drug, and cosmetic supply under tolerances established by this Department. In this connection, it should also be noted that the decision of the Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit in the orange color case is based on a provision of the act relating to food additives (sec. 406(a)) which has no counterpart in the drug and cosmetic provisions of the act. Moreover, legislation can also relieve, through suitable transitional provisions, the special consumer protection problem caused by the fact at the present rate of testing in the Food and Drug Administration's laboratories it would take many years to complete the task of reexamining the toxicity of all coal-tar colors now on the list. (See the discussion, below, of the grandfather clause of the bill.)

2. Basic approach of bill: The question, then, as we see it, is not so much whether the law should be changed, but, rather, what changes should be made so as, on the one hand, to avoid upsetting needlessly the established coloring practices and, on the other hand, to protect fully the public health and the consumer's interest in honesty and fair dealing.

(a) Scope of coverage: We do not believe that the present distinction between coal tar colors, so-called, and other color additives, whether synthetic or extracted from natural sources, is sound. The assumption that a color additive is necessarily safe when extracted from a plant, or when synthesized with a chemical structure which will not bring it under the term "coal-tar color," whereas a so-called coal tar color is safe only when subjected to special restrictions, is not scientifically tenable. We, therefore, believe that the same ground rules should apply to non-coal-tar color additives for food,

drugs, and cosmetics as are applied to coal-tar colors. In this respect the bill is therefore soundly conceived. (Pending enactment of color-additive legislation, food additives which are non-coal-tar colors should, of course, continue to be included in the proposed food additive legislation. See H.R. 6747.)

(b) Tolerances and other specifications of conditions of use of colors: There are few substances which are wholly inert and without any physiological effect, beneficial or harmful, when ingested by man or animal even in normal quantity. To the toxicologist, moreover, harmlessness in the abstract is an unrealistic concept, for it is one of the cardinal principles of toxicology that every substance has a toxic dose, though that dose may in actual practice never be reached. This, of course, does not mean that public health protection requires a tolerance limitation for every substance added to food. And it may well be true that certain color additives have such properties, or are suitable and intended for use in such limited circumstances, that it would be entirely safe to list them for use without quantitative restraint, at least for given uses, without establishment of a tolerance. In such cases we should be authorized to admit such colors for use without being required to establish a tolerance, though we would wish to be able to prescribe other conditions of use.

We are satisfied, however, that many color additives, though useful and presumably capable of safe use at given levels, are sufficiently toxic to give no assurance of safety in actual use in the absence of a governing tolerances limitation, since in the case of such colors individual food processors might otherwise, out of ignorance or carelessness, exceed the safe limit. This is true of all the colors we have delisted, or have so far proposed to delist, for food use. And the more toxic the color, the more this is true. As already indicated, we are likewise satisfied that, unless such colors are admitted under safe tolerances, the adequacy of the supply for continuation of established coloring practices will be in jeopardy. In this setting, a committee of recognized scientists, appointed by the National Academy of Sciences to review the coal tar color research program of the Food and Drug Administration, said in 1956: "This committee feels compelled to indicate that certification of a compound as 'harmless and suitable for use' in food, drug, and cosmetics, as required under present law, is unrealistic, unless the level of use is specified." It is not unreasonable to suppose that if Congress, when enacting the present act, had been aware that it was acting on a false premise in assuming that the color sections of the act were sufficient to assure an adequate supply of safe color, it would have permitted the establishment of tolerances under proper safeguards.

We are, therefore, in accord with the proposal that we be permitted to admit colors for use under appropriate tolerance and other prescribed conditions of use in specified foods, drugs, and cosmetics. In this connection, it will be recalled that, in our proposal on protesting of food additives (H.R. 6747), we conceded the desirability of permitting per se toxic additives in the food supply under safe tolerances if they have functional value, instead of limiting such additives to situations where they are required in production or are unavoidable by good manufacturing practice. In using the term "functional value," we did not intend to exclude nondeceptive additives designed for eye appeal, any more than additives intended for gustatory appeal.

(c) Certification of colors—Exemptions: While providing for certification of batches of color, as in the case of existing law, the bill would permit us to grant exemptions where certification is not necessary to protect the public health. The present requirement of certification for coal-tar colors is intended to assure food processors and housewives that the color is free from toxic impurities and otherwise complies with regulations defining the color's identity. We believe that power to exempt colors from the certification requirement is desirable, especially if the coverage of the law is broadened to include all types of color additives.

III. PRINCIPAL RECOMMENDATIONS FOR IMPROVEMENT OF BILL

While, as above shown, we agree in principle with the concepts embodied in the permanent provisions of the bill, we believe that the bill is in need of material revision in a number of respects.

1. Grandfather clause: (a) Listed colors: This provision of the bill (sec. 11(b)), while not altogether clear, would apparently have the effect of exempting from the bill preexisting uses and levels of use of coal-tar colors which are on the approved list at the time of enactment of the bill, until the Department has been able to do the necessary scientific work to establish tolerances and properly list them. The Food and Drug Administration estimates that completion of its present retesting work on all listed coal-tar colors at the current rate of testing in its laboratories would take about 25 years, even though these tests are not conducted with a view to the establishment of tolerances. Evaluation of the listed food colors alone, on which considerable work has already been done and which are relatively few in number, is expected to take at least 7 to 8 years at the current rate. Tests adequate for determining the precise toxicity of all these colors with a view to the establishment of tolerances would, of course, take as long or longer.

We, therefore, believe that in its present form this provision is not compatible with adequate protection of the public health. Industry, we believe, should at least share the task of retesting, thereby greatly accelerating its completion. We would therefore recommend that the bill be modified so as to require all the colors now on the permitted list to be reexamined and, unless existing data establish their toxicity in a reliable way, retested within a reasonable period of time by industry to establish satisfactory proof of the precise toxic potential of each color, so that the levels at which the colors may safely be used in food, drugs, or cosmetics can be set. Our food additives bill (H.R. 6747) could furnish a guide for what is a reasonable period.

Moreover, in view of the many uses for which listed colors are now employed, the probable toxicity of many of them, and the long time required for adequate retesting by the Food and Drug Administration at its present rate, enactment of the grandfather clause in its present form would, for many years to come, so devitalize the health protective aspects of the permanent provisions of the bill as to cast serious doubt on the acceptability of the bill as a whole, even if the bill were otherwise modified in accordance with our recommendations. Our suggestion for modification of the grandfather clause should, therefore, be considered as integrally and inseparably related to our position on the bill as a whole.

(b) Other color additives already in use: With respect to color additives which are not coal-tar colors, and which were in commercial use prior to January 1, 1958, we likewise suggest that a reasonable period be allowed for compliance with the bill. Such period, we believe, should follow the one contained in the grandfather clause of H.R. 6747, less any part of the period already elapsed under H.R. 6747 in the event of its prior enactment.

2. Related substances: The bill should be clarified by granting the Department specific authority in listing and setting a tolerance for a color to consider the additive effect of chemically or pharmacologically related substances in the diet.

3. Antideception provision: Added color, especially in the case of food, often lends itself to deception. The bill should expressly forbid the listing of a color for a use which will promote deception of the consumer or violate any provision of the basic act. In the case of new uses, the burden should be on the applicant for listing to satisfy the Secretary that it will not promote deception.

4. Barring violative colors from commerce—Verification of distribution: In order to facilitate enforcement, we believe that the bill should be amended so as to make contraband any color additive which is marketed in interstate commerce for use in food or drugs, or for use in or as a cosmetic, if such color additive is not listed or certified (when required) for such use, or if, in the case of a listed color additive, such additive or its packaging or labeling is not in conformity with requirements of the applicable regulation. It seems desirable to authorize the Secretary expressly to establish such packaging and labeling requirements instead of leaving this to implication. Also, we believe that the requirement, now contained in regulations, that color manufacturers maintain and afford access to records of disposal of listed colors should be expressly provided for by the bill.

5. Allocation of aggregate tolerance to one or more commodities: The bill, as we interpret it, authorizes the Secretary to decide which foods, drugs, or cosmetics may bear a color and in what amounts. A situation may arise whereby the entire safe tolerance of a particular color is used in one type of food. This would exclude its use on all other types of food until the former use has been delisted. Conceivably this could cause considerable difficulty. In the case of drugs and cosmetics, the bill lays down no criteria to guide the Secretary on how to allocate the supply of a color as between one commodity and others for which it is suitable and desired. Even in the case of food, the bill is not clear. It states that the Secretary may provide for different tolerances for the same color additive in or on different foods, "depending upon the relative importance of each color additive to the several foods in which it is used and the relative significance of those several foods in the human diet." We hope that the hearings will elucidate the intent of this phrase and, perhaps, develop specifications which will be less difficult to apply. Moreover, we hope that, at least in general, the allocation of a limited tolerance as between two or more color uses originating after enactment of the bill, or as between a use antedating the bill and a subsequently proposed use, can be based on a first-come, first-served basis.

6. Other improvements: In order to expedite this report, we are not commenting at this time upon a number of other revisions, of a subordinate or purely technical character, which we believe to be desirable. Such comment will be submitted at a later stage if desired.

IV. COST

Enactment of the bill would require a material expansion of enforcement and educational activity on colors to afford consumer protection equivalent to that available today. While the cost of the listing and certification service would be defrayed out of fees (sec. 10 of the bill) as at present, the cost of enforcement and education activities would necessarily have to come from appropriations out of general revenues. This additional cost is estimated, for the first year, to be about $825,000.

Under the present certification system, the food and drug inspector need only determine that the colors being used in a food plant are certified, in order to assure himself that the law is being complied with. If

known poisonous colors are used with tolerance limitations, he will have to determine not only whether the color is certified, but also the level at which it is employed, a determination which will have to be checked by periodic laboratory examination of samples of foods, drugs, and cosmetics. According to our best estimates, a minimum control at the Federal level under the tolerance-setting procedure would require approximately 75 additional employees (50 inspectors and 25 analysts).

V. CONCLUSION

To summarize: While we cannot support the bill, and especially the grandfather clause, in its present form, we favor the basic principles of the bill and would favor its enactment if modified along the above-suggested lines. We should be glad to submit such technical and other assistance to that end as the committee may desire.

The Bureau of the Budget, while perceiving no objection to the submission of this report, advises that, in the event of enactment of the bill, the level of appropriations to be requested in the President's budget would be determined in the light of broad budgetary and program considerations then prevailing.

Sincerely yours,

ELLIOTT L. RICHARDSON,
Assistant Secretary.

Mr. KING of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Speaker, I raise my voice at this time in unalterable and violent objection to the passage of this bill. I feel that it is one more example of the authorization of corruptive additives to our food, which has become the fad, today, but which I believe is dangerous in the extreme. I believe that if the members of the American public who will be buying these oranges were informed of the fact that these oranges have been artificially colored with coal tar products they would unite en masse here to object to the passage of this bill.

I realize, Mr. Speaker, that this bill calls only for the coating of the outer peel of the orange, and I suppose it will be argued that these materials do not reach the inner orange, and that they are not consumed. That, however, is not true. There are many people today who feel, and I think with reason, and I believe supported by scientific evidence, that the peel of the orange is also a source of great nourishment, and particularly of vitamins. I know of several nutrition textbooks myself which advocate the use of orange peels, grated and simmered over a fire, the liquor or the juice to be poured off and consumed as an aid in the cure of many diseases.

There are many people who consume the orange peels in that manner. Children, of course, suck on oranges. Millions of people make or consume marmalade made with orange peels. So coal tar products are taken into the system. Notwithstanding the fact that it has been reported that there is no evidence that this particular coal tar formula is damaging to the system, the fact still remains that no one on this earth can state absolutely and authoritatively that coal tar products will not cause damage to the human system. We are traveling here in the realm of the unknown. This is a dangerous thing. Now, at a day when we are witnessing 35,000 deaths every year from lung cancer alone, and alarming death rates from cancer in other parts of the body, it would seem to me the better part of wisdom that we eliminate all artificial and synthetic additives until more evidence is available. For that reason, I earnestly urge the Members of this House to reject this bill.

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KING of Utah. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. HALEY. The gentleman said just a moment ago that if people knew these oranges were colored they would not buy them. Every orange is plainly stamped "color added."

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KING of Utah. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. WOLF. I should like to associate myself with the gentleman's remarks and thank him, and congratulate him on his statement.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word, in order that the RECORD may be perfectly clear that the Food and Drug Administration has thoroughly tested this formula and that it is thoroughly safe.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRIS. I yield.

Mr. PUCINSKI. I understood earlier from the remarks of the Pure Food and Drug Administration that they had approved an earlier dye only to reverse itself a couple of years later; is that correct?

Mr. HARRIS. No; that is not my understanding that they had approved it. They had investigated it over a period of time and while they did not hold that that particular formula was unsafe, they held that it was harmless when used to color the outside of oranges. They held that the new color is safer and, therefore, recommend it.

Mr. PUCINSKI. But is there any assurance then that they may not reverse themselves on this again?

Mr. HARRIS. They are coming up with general legislation on color additives which they say in this letter they are going to recommend to the Congress.

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield in order to clarify one point?

Mr. HARRIS. I yield.

Mr. DELANEY. Under the 1938 Food and Drug Act, no minimum tolerance was created for coal tar dyes. There was an absolute prohibition and zero tolerance is in order. However, the Food and Drug Administration did establish a tolerance which was appealed to the United States Supreme Court and the decision came down last December sustaining the contention that no minimum tolerance would be permitted.

Mr. HARRIS. I appreciate the gentleman's statement clarifying that point.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRIS. I yield.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity to express my opposition to this legislation to permit the temporary certification of citrus red No. 2 for coloring oranges. The purpose of this legislation is to make the fruit more attractive and salable by the use of artificial coloring.

Although the proposed coloring is alleged to be less harmful than a previously authorized coloring, it obviously does not meet the requirements of the Food and Drug Act. This legislation very cleverly shifts to the Congress of the United States any responsibility for error in judgment. It also has the effect of relieving the industry from any legal responsibilities if the coloring substance should subsequently prove to be harmful. The acceptance of this legislation will delay the development of coloring substances which can meet the requirements of the Food and Drug Act.

I believe the American people are capable of learning the use of uncolored oranges—particularly if they are made available at an attractive price. The industry can pass on to the consumer the savings in color and the high cost of color application. The vitamin-starved population should have an opportunity to purchase uncolored, lower-priced fruit.

An orange by any other color would be just as sweet—just as nourishing, and just as marketable.

At the present time and under existing official and unofficial controls, the citrus industry is doing very well. The price of citrus concentrates has continued at high levels invoked by artificial controls in marketing and processing. This artificial manipulation of concentrate pricing is every bit as wrong and as harmful as artificial coloring.

I hope this legislation is defeated.

Mr. WIER. Mr. Speaker, I will refrain, of course, from pursuing a policy of asking for a rollcall. I know that many have left and I do not want to leave anybody minus their right. I do hope at least, since I am going to oppose this bill, I want the RECORD to show my opposition to it and I do hope that a sufficient number here at least will answer and vote "Yes" or "No."

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I am in favor of this legislation which has been sponsored by my colleague, Hon. JAMES HALEY, of Florida.

F.D. & C. red No. 32, which is being continued under this bill for a period of 60 days until a new color can be certified, has been in use since before the passage of the Food and Drug Act in 1938. After complete hearings it was certified as harmless and suitable for use in foods in 1939 and more than 300 million boxes of color-added fruit have been shipped from Florida and large numbers from Texas without any complaint or claim of harm. A high percentage of the oranges shipped from both of these States is colored with this color. In one or more years in Texas 100 percent of fruit was so colored.

The new color leaves less residue and has a high level of use and is estimated to have 50 times the safety factor of the other color. This bill is intended to be only temporary legislation pending the adoption of the general color legislation

and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare approved substantially the same feature in the general legislation in its approval of the Curtis bill. The Department favors this bill. As a matter of fact, this bill was carefully worked out by the Department and the industry so as not to disrupt the industry and at the same time protect the public safety.

No one claims that the present color is harmful as used in the coloring of oranges. The claim is that at high levels it would be harmful in other foods.

On February 28, 1955, the Commissioner of Food and Drugs wrote letters to Senator HOLLAND, Senator SMATHERS, and Representative HALEY in which he stated:

> There is, however, no evidence that, in the amounts used, and in the manner of use, in the coloring of citrus fruit, the product so colored is not safe for human consumption.

These letters were under the seal of the Department. I enclose for your information a copy of the letter to Congressman HALEY.

The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare in his report on H.R. 7732, 84th Congress, 1st session, stated that "the evidence so far available does not establish a likelihood of injury to man," and so forth.

Dr. Larrick, the Commissioner of the Food and Drug Administration, testified to substantially the same thing. No one actually claims that it is harmful as used in the coloring of oranges. The circuit court of appeals and even the Supreme Court of the United States so pointed out. The Supreme Court in the case of Flemming against Florida Citrus Exchange, and others, handed down on December 15, 1958, pointed out that the record does not show that it is harmful as used in the coloring of oranges and "it is conceded by the Secretary that there is no evidence that the level of ingestion of red No. 32 involved in human consumption of color-added oranges is harmful."

Nearly a quarter of a million dollars has been spent in developing a new color as contemplated by the special act of 1956 and this bill would allow the Secretary to certify such color with proper tolerances.

The color is on the outside and is an oil soluble color which does not even penetrate the white or rag of the orange. The tests show that with red No. 32 a person would have to drink 5,000 gallons of juice per day or eat at least 250 oranges, peeling and all, per day to show harm. Of course, the ordinary food products at such levels would be harmful. I have furnished Congressman HALEY with a detailed analysis made by Dr. Gerwe if this should be needed.

WHY THE NEED FOR COLOR?

The orange is one of the very few fruits which has blossoms, small fruit and fully mature fruit on the tree at the same time. In the fall until the cool days come a fully ripe and mature fruit may be green on the outside; when cool weather comes the late variety of orange may have a rich color on the outside and not be fully mature inside. Later in the spring when the chlorophyll—green color—rises in the tree it goes into the leaves and new fruit and likewise goes into the mature and ripe fruit "regreening it," causing it to be green on the outside although it is fully mature and by reason of this it is impossible to sell unless it is colored.

The Department of Agriculture, even when the Food and Drug Administration was within its department, recognized and encouraged the coloring and the Congress has recognized that it is an economic necessity and the Court of Appeals of the Fifth Circuit likewise recognized it. For your convenience I attach excerpts of certain departmental publications.

The necessity is borne out by the fact that for the seasons of 1945–46 through 1956–57, 68.2 percent of all oranges shipped out of the State of Florida used this color and the color-added range varied from season to season and ran from a low of 60 percent to a high of 76.3 percent and in Texas in some years 100 percent.

THE USE OF THIS COLOR DOES NOT RESULT IN DECEIT

Under the laws of Florida fruit cannot be colored for the purpose of concealing defects. This is also true of the Federal statutes. The fruit to be colored must have a higher standard than is required for fruit generally. No immature fruit can be colored. The amount of color added is limited. The law prohibits the use of color beyond the natural varietal color of the fruit.

The words "color added" are stamped upon each and every orange so colored.

Right now is the beginning of the regreening season and Valencia oranges, the late variety, which were a beautiful color a few days ago are beginning to regreen. The passage of this legislation is urgent. Failure to pass it will result in reducing employment and creating a chaotic market condition. The passage will allow the Congress to consider permanent legislation and allow the use of the color, which has been in use for more than 30 years and which is harmless as used, for 60 more days during the transition period and then allow the use of a new color with 50 times the "no effect" level of the old color for the period set forth herein.

Not all Florida oranges are colored. Those colored are so marked.

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, S. 79 would permit the listing and certification of a new color, citrus red No. 2, for the coloring of mature oranges under tolerances found safe by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. Thus, the bill would permit the continuation of an established coloring practice which began in the mid-thirties with the use of citrus red No. 32.

On November 10, 1955, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare ordered citrus red No. 32 removed from the certified list, based on tests in 1951 to 1953 which cast doubt on the harmlessness of the color. The tests indicated that when red No. 32 was fed to test animals in substantial amounts, there was evidence of toxicity. The Secretary, therefore, held he had no authority, under present law, to list and certify red No. 32 because it was not found to be completely harmless. The Department construed the term "harmless" to mean without toxicity, and took the position that so long as there was any evidence of toxicity, regardless of the minute amount of the color used, the Secretary had no authority to certify that color for use. The Secretary's order was upheld by the U.S. Supreme Court on December 15, 1958.

The delisting of red No. 32 created an emergency for the citrus industry in Florida and Texas. Consequently, in 1956, the 84th Congress enacted Public Law 672 to permit the industry to continue for a maximum of 3 years—until March 1, 1959—the use of red No. 32 for coloring oranges. The enactment of this law, Public Law 672, was considered appropriate and necessary since the coloring of oranges was determined to be an economic necessity, and since there was no likelihood of injury to man from the use of red No. 32 on the exterior of oranges at the levels of use involved, Further, there was no evidence that injury to consumers had resulted from the consumption of oranges colored with red No. 32. I might add that citrus red No. 32 has been used for more than 20 years. More than 300 million boxes of color-added fruit have been shipped from Florida and a large amount from Texas without any complaint or claim of harm.

At the time of enactment of Public Law 672, it was understood the industry would conduct necessary scientific study toward the development of a harmless substitute for red No. 32. Pursuant to that understanding, the industry has developed citrus red No. 2 at a cost of approximately $200,000. The level of toxicity of the new color is one-fifth that of red No. 32, by the most conservative reports. In addition, the new color has greater tinctorial power than red No. 32. As a matter of fact, only one-fifth as much red No. 2 is required to color oranges as is necessary with red No. 32. Thus, it is easily seen that the new color has at least 25 times the safety factor of the other color. Even so, under present law, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare is not authorized to list and certify red No. 2. Hence, the need for this legislation.

With respect to the new color, I am pleased to point out that in his report on this bill, the Secretary reported that, if authorized, the Department would be able to establish a safe tolerance for the use of citrus red No. 2. The Food and Drug Administration has reported that the provisions of this bill are such as to fully safeguard the public health, and that the requirements for certification of each batch of the color and the application of a tolerance are practicable and workable provisions.

Mr. Speaker, it should be pointed out that Florida and Texas color a large percentage of the fresh oranges shipped. For the seasons of 1945 to 1946 through 1956 to 1957, 68.2 percent of all oranges shipped out of the State of Florida used red No. 32. The color-added oranges varied from season to season, running

from a low of 60 percent to a high of 76.3 percent. I understand that coloring of Texas oranges has run as high as 100 percent of the fresh oranges shipped in a season. The fact that such a high percentage of the fresh oranges shipped are colored indicates that for some reason, people do not buy oranges whose color is green, but rather select the orange with the orange color. It is because of this that the coloring of oranges is an economic necessity.

It is a well-known fact that the economy of Florida is largely dependent on its sunshine, its warm climate, its tropical beauty, and its citrus industry. It is because of its wonderful climate that the Florida oranges must be colored artificially in order to have the eye appeal necessary to maintain a high volume of sales. This is due to the fact that in the fall of the year, or until cooler weather, the fully ripe and mature orange may be green on the outside. Cool weather, on the other hand, may cause the late varieties of orange to have a rich orange color on the outside even though it is not fully mature on the inside. Later in the spring, or with warmer weather, green color rises in the tree and into the leaves and oranges, thereby regreening the mature and ripe fruit.

I want to point out that under the laws of Florida, the fruit to be colored must have a higher standard than is required of other fruit. Coloring may not be used for the purpose of concealing defects. No immature fruit may be colored under Florida law. Further, under the Federal Food and Drug Act and the regulations promulgated by the Food and Drug Administration, the amount of color that may be used is limited and the words "color added" is required to be stamped on each and every orange so colored. Therefore, there is absolutely no danger of injury to the public.

Mr. Speaker, Public Law 672, 84th Congress, expired February 28, 1959, and at the present time the citrus industry is not permitted to use any coloring on oranges. We are now at the beginning of the regreening season and the late varieties of oranges, which had a beautiful orange color a few days ago, are beginning to regreen. Therefore, this legislation is urgent. Failure to enact this bill will result in reduced employment in Florida and will create a chaotic market condition. I respectfully request approval of this bill.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, here is an ideal situation for application of Dr. Flemming's famous formula. You will recall that Dr. Flemming, Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, has said that if the States would and could do the job of building schools they would and could build 75,000 classrooms. Of course, the States would have to change their constitutions and revise their basic tax structure, but under Dr. Flemming's formula that is an unimportant matter.

Not only could we have brilliant orange oranges growing in both California and Florida, but we could have red oranges, blue oranges and, for next Tuesday, we could have ripe green oranges. To accomplish this might require a change in the molecular structure of the orange tree and cooperation of the orange itself, but under the Flemming formula those are minor obstacles.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I strongly urge the Members of the House of Representatives to vote favorably on S. 79, which would permit the temporary listing and certification of citrus red No. 2 for coloring mature oranges under tolerances found safe by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

In 1956 Congress passed a bill to permit the industry to continue for a maximum of 3 years the use of red No. 32 for coloring oranges to allow time for necessary scientific study in the development of a harmless color. The industry then developed red No. 2, a much less toxic dye.

This legislation is needed because the Supreme Court has held that the Secretary has no right to certify for a limited purpose or to grant tolerances. There was no claim anywhere in the record by the Food and Drug Administration or anyone else that the old color was harmful as used in the coloring of oranges, but the Supreme Court case hinged on the use of the word "harmless," and they held that it could not be certified if harmful at high levels and in other uses in food.

This legislation will allow the use of a new color with a very much higher safety factor than FDC red No. 32, although as stated before it was not claimed that this was harmful as used in the coloring of oranges.

The coloring of oranges is not done to deceive as the colored oranges are marked "color added" and only mature oranges meeting a higher degree of maturity than other oranges can be colored.

The need for coloring was brought out in the hearings, because the early orange does not color until the cold nights come and may be fully mature and yet be green on the outside. The later orange may be immature when it has a rich orange color and then as the chlorophyll comes into the leaves in the spring it regreens and the green gets in the orange, so a green-looking orange may be of greater maturity than a rich, ripe-looking one.

In answer to my distinguished colleague from California [Mr. TEAGUE], who commented on coloring of California oranges, I wish to suggest that we in Florida do not have the California smog through which to filter our sunshine, and the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. RHODES], with regard to the oranges from his State, I suggest that while he has the hot sunshine to color the oranges it also has the effect of drying them out to some extent. I also might remind my distinguished colleagues that it is not the hot sunshine that colors the oranges, but rather it is the cooler weather that adds the color. Florida offers the perfect climate for growing juicy, sweet oranges.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. FULTON) there were—ayes 61, noes 21.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present, and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 213, nays 94, not voting 127, as follows:

[Roll No. 14]

YEAS—213

Abernethy	Gathings	O'Brien, Ill.
Adair	Gavin	O'Hara, Ill.
Albert	George	O'Neill
Alexander	Granahan	Oliver
Alford	Grant	Passman
Alger	Gray	Patman
Anderson, Mont.	Hagen	Perkins
	Haley	Pfost
Andrews	Hardy	Pillion
Ashmore	Hargis	Pirnie
Aspinall	Harris	Poage
Avery	Harrison	Porter
Baldwin	Hays	Preston
Baring	Healey	Prokop
Barr	Hechler	Quie
Bass, Tenn.	Hess	Rains
Bates	Holifield	Reece, Tenn.
Baumhart	Holland	Rees, Kans.
Beckworth	Huddleston	Reuss
Belcher	Ikard	Rhodes, Ariz.
Bennett, Fla.	Jarman	Rivers, Alaska
Bennett, Mich.	Jennings	Rivers, S.C.
Bentley	Johnson, Calif.	Rogers, Colo.
Berry	Johnson, Colo.	Rogers, Fla.
Betts	Johnson, Wis.	Rogers, Tex.
Blitch	Jonas	Rooney
Boggs	Jones, Ala.	Roush
Bolling	Jones, Mo.	Rutherford
Bonner	Kee	Saund
Bow	Keith	Saylor
Brewster	Kilburn	Schenck
Brock	Kilday	Selden
Brooks, La.	Kilgore	Short
Brooks, Tex.	King, Calif.	Sikes
Brown, Ga.	Kitchin	Sisk
Brown, Ohio	Kluczynski	Slack
Budge	Landrum	Smith, Iowa
Burke, Ky.	Lankford	Smith, Kans.
Burke, Mass.	Latta	Smith, Miss.
Bush	Lennon	Spence
Byrne, Pa.	McCormack	Steed
Carnahan	McCulloch	Stratton
Chenoweth	McFall	Stubblefield
Clark	McIntire	Teague, Calif.
Colmer	McMillan	Teague, Tex.
Cooley	McSween	Thompson, La.
Cramer	Machrowicz	Thomson, Wyo.
Curtin	Mack, Ill.	Thornberry
Curtis, Mass.	Mahon	Toll
Dague	Matthews	Trimble
Davis, Ga.	May	Tuck
Dent	Meader	Udall
Derwinski	Metcalf	Ullman
Devine	Michel	Utt
Dollinger	Miller, Clement W.	Van Zandt
Dorn, S.C.		Vinson
Dowdy	Milliken	Wallhauser
Downing	Mills	Wampler
Doyle	Minshall	Watts
Durham	Mitchell	Weis
Dwyer	Moeller	Whitten
Edmondson	Montoya	Widnall
Elliott	Moore	Williams
Everett	Moorhead	Willis
Fascell	Morris, N. Mex.	Wilson
Fenton	Morris, Okla.	Winstead
Flood	Mumma	Withrow
Flynt	Murphy	Wright
Forrester	Murray	Yates
Frazier	Natcher	Young
Gallagher	Nelsen	Younger
Gary	Norrell	

NAYS—94

Addonizio	Cannon	Dooley
Ashley	Cederberg	Dulski
Barry	Chamberlain	Feighan
Becker	Church	Flynn
Blatnik	Cohelan	Foley
Boland	Conte	Forand
Bosch	Cook	Ford
Boyle	Corbett	Fulton
Brademas	Cunningham	Giaimo
Breeding	Daddario	Green, Oreg.
Broomfield	Delaney	Griffin
Burdick	Denton	Griffiths

Gross	McDonough	Robison
Halpern	Mack, Wash.	Rodino
Hiestand	Madden	Rogers, Mass.
Hoffman, Ill.	Mailliard	Scherer
Holt	Marshall	Schwengel
Hosmer	Miller, George P.	Siler
Irwin	Miller, N.Y.	Simpson, Ill.
Jensen	Norblad	Smith, Calif.
Johansen	O'Hara, Mich.	Springer
Karsten	O'Konski	Sullivan
Karth	Ostertag	Thompson, N.J.
Kastenmeier	Pelly	Tollefson
Kearns	Poff	Vanik
King, Utah	Powell	Van Pelt
Knox	Price	Walter
Langen	Pucinski	Westland
Levering	Rabaut	Wier
Libonati	Ray	Wolf
Lindsay	Rhodes, Pa.	Zablocki
Lipscomb		

NOT VOTING—127

Abbitt	Fallon	Martin
Allen	Farbstein	Mason
Andersen, Minn.	Fino	Merrow
Anfuso	Fisher	Meyer
Arends	Fogarty	Monagan
Auchincloss	Fountain	Morgan
Ayres	Frelinghuysen	Morrison
Bailey	Friedel	Moss
Baker	Garmatz	Moulder
Barden	Glenn	Multer
Barrett	Green, Pa.	Nix
Bass, N.H.	Gubser	O'Brien, N.Y.
Bolton	Hall	Osmers
Bowles	Halleck	Philbin
Boykin	Harmon	Pilcher
Bray	Hébert	Polk
Brown, Mo.	Hemphill	Quigley
Broyhill	Henderson	Randall
Buckley	Herlong	Riehlman
Burleson	Hoeven	Riley
Byrnes, Wis.	Hoffman, Mich.	Roberts
Cahill	Hogan	Roosevelt
Canfield	Holtzman	Rostenkowski
Carter	Horan	St. George
Casey	Hull	Santangelo
Celler	Jackson	Scott
Chelf	Johnson, Md.	Shelley
Chiperfield	Judd	Sheppard
Coad	Kasem	Shipley
Coffin	Kelly	Simpson, Pa.
Collier	Keogh	Smith, Va.
Curtis, Mo.	Kirwan	Staggers
Daniels	Kowalski	Taber
Davis, Tenn.	Lafore	Taylor
Dawson	Laird	Teller
Derounian	Lane	Thomas
Diggs	Lesinski	Thompson, Tex.
Dingell	Loser	Wainwright
Dixon	McDowell	Weaver
Donohue	McGinley	Wharton
Dorn, N.Y.	McGovern	Whitener
Evins	Macdonald	Zelenko
	Magnuson	

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Smith of Virginia with Mr. Martin.
Mr. Monagan with Mr. Arends.
Mr. Hébert with Mr. Auchincloss.
Mr. Morrison with Mr. Allen.
Mr. Pilcher with Mr. Simpson of Pennsylvania.
Mr. Lane with Mr. Taber.
Mr. Burleson with Mr. Merrow.
Mr. Chelf with Mr. Baker.
Mr. Evins with Mr. Halleck.
Mr. Fallon with Mr. Curtis of Missouri.
Mr. Garmatz with Mr. Dixon.
Mr. Friedel with Mr. Fino.
Mr. Nix with Mr. Ayres.
Mr. Green of Pennsylvania with Mrs. Bolton.
Mr. Teller with Mr. Broyhill.
Mr. Quigley with Mr. Canfield.
Mr. Thompson of Texas with Mrs. St. George.
Mr. Staggers with Mr. Bass of New Hampshire.
Mr. Scott with Mr. Osmers.
Mr. Riley with Mr. Mason.
Mr. Roberts with Mr. Laird.
Mr. Hull with Mr. Judd.
Mr. Kirwan with Mr. Glenn.
Mr. Sheppard with Mr. Frelinghuysen.
Mr. Loser with Mr. Derounian.
Mr. McGinley with Mr. Dorn of New York.
Mrs. Kelly with Mr. Gubser.
Mr. Zelenko with Mr. Andersen of Minnesota.
Mr. Donohue with Mr. Bray.
Mr. Philbin with Mr. Byrnes of Wisconsin.
Mr. Fogarty with Mr. Weaver.
Mr. Fountain with Mr. Taylor.
Mr. Herlong with Mr. Riehlman.
Mr. Hemphill with Mr. Chiperfield.
Mr. Roosevelt with Mr. Wainwright.
Mr. Shelley with Mr. Wharton.
Mr. Boykin with Mr. Cahill.
Mr. Santangelo with Mr. Collier.
Mr. Keogh with Mr. Lafore.
Mr. Anfuso with Mr. Horan.
Mr. Allen with Mr. Jackson.
Mr. Buckley with Mr. Hoffman of Michigan.
Mr. Multer with Mr. Henderson.
Mr. Holtzman with Mr. Hoeven.

Mr. REUSS changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

Mr. RODINO, Mr. BARRY, and Mr. KEARNS changed their votes from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have permission to extend their own remarks in the RECORD on the bill just passed immediately prior to the vote.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

EXTENDING SPECIAL ENLISTMENT PROGRAMS

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (H.R. 3368) to extend the special enlistment programs provided by section 262 of the Armed Forces Reserve Act of 1952, as amended, and ask unanimous consent that it be considered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS]?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 262 of the Armed Forces Reserve Act of 1952, as amended (50 U.S.C. 1013), is further amended by deleting the date "August 1, 1959" in the first sentence of section 262(a) and inserting in lieu thereof the date "August 1, 1963".

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Speaker, the bill before the House today extends the special enlistment programs provided by section 262 of the Armed Forces Reserve Act of 1952, as amended, for a period of 4 years, until August 1, 1963. It is this authority upon which the Department of Defense has established its 6 months' training program for individuals between the ages of 17 to 18½. Under present law, the authority for this program, among other things, will expire on August 1, 1959. The Department of Defense has indicated that extension of this authority is considered essential to the maintenance of the strengths and mobilization readiness of the Reserve components.

As you will recall, the Congress during the past month has voted an extension of the induction provisions of the Universal Military Training and Service Act until July 1, 1963. The provisions of this proposal would similarly extend those provisions of the Armed Forces Reserve Act which permit the deferment and exemption from draft liability of individuals who agree to perform 6 months of active duty for training with the Armed Forces and thereafter continue to perform satisfactorily in the Reserve Forces.

Now let me refresh your memory on the history of the Armed Forces Reserve Act, as amended.

In 1955 the Congress, in response to a Presidential request, amended the Armed Forces Reserve Act of 1952 to provide the President with the authority to establish Reserve component enlistment programs for young men between the ages of 17 and 18½ and for persons who have critical skills and are engaged in civilian occupations in any critical defense-supporting activity or in any research activity affecting national defense.

This amendment to the Armed Forces Reserve Act of 1952 was part of the Reserve Forces Act of 1955 (69 Stat. 598) which had, as its primary purpose, the development of an efficient and well-trained Ready Reserve force. The authority provided in section 262 of the Armed Forces Reserve Act was not an independently conceived program but an integral part of the effort made by Congress in 1955 to overhaul the Reserve structure to provide the machinery by which our Reserve Forces could be well organized and efficiently trained. In the event of war they could be mobilized quickly and would be capable of effectively augmenting the Active Forces in defense of our country.

Under the authority contained in section 262, the Armed Forces, under such quotas as may be determined by the President—not to exceed 250,000 annually—are authorized until August 1, 1959, to establish special enlistment programs in units of the Ready Reserve for persons who, first, are mentally and physically qualified for service; second, have not been ordered to report for induction; and third, are under 18½ years of age.

This section further prescribes that the enlistment period for this special program must be for 8 years including an initial period of not less than 3 months or more than 6 months of active duty for training, with satisfactory service in the Reserve thereafter. In the case of individuals in attendance at high schools, the requirement of the 3- to 6-month period of active duty for training is deferred until the individual completes high school or reaches 20 years of age. Except for war or national emergency, individuals enlisted under this program and who serve satisfactorily are exempt from induction under the Universal Military Training and Service Act.

Included in section 262 is authority to establish an enlistment program for individuals possessing critical skills who are engaged in civilian occupations in any critical defense-supporting industry or in any research activity affecting national defense. In the case of such individuals the law provides that the program will also require an 8-year enlistment period with an initial period of active duty for training of not less than 3 nor more than 6 months. However, the law prescribes that such individuals may be enlisted without regard to age and even though ordered to report for induction.

On the basis of the statutory authority contained in section 262 of the Armed Forces Reserve Act of 1952, as amended, the President, by Executive order in the summer of 1955, authorized the acceptance of enlistments under this program in units of the Ready Reserve. Subsequently, by Executive order in early January of 1956, the President established the authority for the administration of the special enlistment program designed for individuals possessing critical skills. Both programs, authorized by the statute, were put into operation soon after Congress had acted to permit this development.

The Honorable Hugh M. Milton II, Under Secretary of the Army, in testimony before the Armed Services Committee on February 17, 1959, on the extension of section 262 of the Armed Forces Reserve Act, made the following comment which reflects the importance of the enlistment and training programs authorized by this law:

> When we requested legislative authority for the direct enlistment and training of qualified young men for service in the Reserve components nearly 4 years ago we emphasized the then unsatisfactory state of our Reserve Forces. You were told that too large a percentage of reservists had not undergone basic training; that in the Ready Reserve of the Army Reserve only 1 out of 10 trained enlisted men was actively participating in unit training and that the Reserve could not be built to a minimum state of combat readiness in an acceptable period of time. We sought the opportunity to show what we could do to correct these deficiencies and promised you that we were determined to do a good, sensible job. The section 262 enlistment programs providing for the direct Reserve component enlistment of young men in the 17–18½-year age group and critically skilled specialists employed in national defense activities represents your response, interest and determination to develop a strong Reserve.
>
> We have had the law and the special enlistment programs for nearly 4 years now and there is no doubt in my mind that the Reserve components of the Army have attained the highest degree of mobilization readiness, deployment availability, and combat potential in history.
>
> Continuation of the section 262 programs will assure the Reserve Forces a steady supply of men basically trained and qualified to participate as members of a Reserve unit. The 6 months' training period provides the sound basis for their integration into the unit team and the future development of their ability and skill through more advanced training and application.

I am sure that you are aware of the favorable reaction given the 6 months' enlistment and training programs by parents, educators, civic and religious leaders, and the young men of our country.

As you are also no doubt aware, the Reserve Forces Act of 1955 required the National Security Training Commission to report annually to the Congress with respect to the welfare of certain members of the Ready Reserve undergoing 6 months' active duty for training. In June 1957 the commission reported to Congress that—

> The services are doing an excellent job in looking after the welfare of trainees. The manner in which they have conducted the 6 months' Reserve training program has been a credit to themselves and to the Nation. * * * Now that the Reserve program is well under way, the commission feels that its mission has been accomplished. * * * The commission believes that the Defense Department and the various Armed Forces can adequately look after the welfare of the trainees without the aid of a civilian body. Therefore, the commission recommended, and President Eisenhower agreed, that it should terminate its activities on June 30, 1957.

The military services are unanimous in their endorsement of this enlistment and training program and each utilize or will utilize its provisions to the degree most compatible to the requirements of their Reserve component.

In view of the foregoing it is easy to understand why the Department of Defense looks upon section 262 of the Armed Forces Reserve Act of 1952 as the cornerstone upon which its 6-month training program is based.

Mr. Speaker, I am convinced that the Congress in its enactment of the Armed Forces Reserve Act of 1952 provided our Armed Forces with an instrument of inestimable value in terms of national security and preparedness. Our Reserve Forces in their utilization of this statute have attained a posture with regard to mobilization readiness and combat potential unparalleled in history.

The Committee on Armed Services strongly recommends enactment of the proposed legislation which will extend until August 1, 1963, the authority upon which the Armed Forces presently base their 6 months' training programs. Extension of this authority will parallel extension of the Universal Military Training and Service Act and will assure a continued flow of well-trained young men into the Ready Reserve components of our Armed Forces.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Speaker, there is little more that I can add to the detailed explanation that has just been presented by my colleague, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS].

He has given you a thorough explanation of the need for this legislation and has fully justified the 4-year extension of the special enlistment programs provided by section 262 of the Armed Forces Reserve Act of 1952, as amended.

There are, however, a few aspects of this measure that I consider worthy of mention in some little detail.

We have heard of the benefits of this legislation insofar as our country and its security is concerned. There is another important aspect of this matter which should be mentioned. I refer to the relative security this legislation offers the young men of our Nation in terms of their future. I would like to quote from section 262 of the Armed Forces Reserve Act of 1952 wherein it is stated:

> Performance of such initial period of active duty for training by any person enlisted under this section while satisfactorily pursuing a course of instruction in a high school shall be deferred until such person ceases to pursue such course satisfactorily, graduates from such course, or attains the age of 20 years, whichever first occurs.

Thus, through the enactment of this provision of law young men have been provided with an opportunity to volunteer their services in such a manner as to permit minimum interference with educational plans while satisfying the requirements of a military service obligation. This, to my way of thinking, is extremely important when we consider the urgent need for brainpower in so many of our national and international activities. This legislation positively reflects the interest of Congress in the educational well-being of our country as well as its national security. While contributing to the storehouse of national assets in terms of better educated young people properly prepared to take their places in the world of tomorrow, we strengthen the military security of the Nation.

The Honorable Hugh M. Milton II, Under Secretary of the Army, in testimony before the Armed Services Committee on February 17, 1959, on the extension of section 262 of the Armed Forces Reserve Act, made reference to this aspect of the matter when he stated:

> I think this is a wonderful provision of law.

He continued by saying:

> If you will recall, 4 years ago, one of the problems which we were worried with was trying to adjust our Reserve component training so that youngsters who wanted to go to college, who wanted to get into some sort of arts and training, would not have their programs interrupted. And I am very much in favor of this 17–18½ provision, because it just works splendidly with these youngsters.

Later in his testimony before the committee, Secretary Milton made reference to the effect that these young men had on the Reserve components of our Armed Forces when he stated that:

> Qualitatively the influx of these basically trained young men has contributed significantly to the present high status of readiness, training, stability, and efficiency of the Reserve components. It is considered noteworthy that for the first time in the history of the Army's Organized Reserves, selected units have begun basic unit training. This will serve to reduce the post training mobilization training requirements of these units by up to 17 weeks. Noteworthy too is the high mental caliber of the young men attracted to the program. During fiscal year 1958 more than 17 percent of those enlisted were in the highest mental grouping. This compares most favorably with the 9.6 percent of Regular Army enlistees in this category and the 7.8 percent of those inducted.

Mr. Speaker, the young men of this Nation recognize and understand their

military service obligation and the necessity for maintaining our military strengths. They have recognized the opportunities provided by this legislation to discharge such responsibilities in a voluntary manner as evidenced by the overwhelming success experienced by the military services in its administration. It is widely known that enlistment and training programs provided by this legislation are congressionally sponsored and that they provide statutory draft deferment and eventual exemption.

I think it is important at this point to tell you that not one single voice was raised in opposition to extension of section 262 of the Armed Forces Reserve Act of 1952, as amended, during the course of the Armed Services Committee hearings on February 17, 1959. On the contrary its extension was highly recommended by the National Guard Association, the Reserve Officers Association, the American Legion, the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, the Jewish War Veterans of the United States, as well as representatives of the military services.

When Congress enacted the Armed Forces Reserve Act of 1952, as amended, it initiated a new era in the history of the Reserve components of our Armed Forces and for that reason the Congress should continue to identify itself with this program through its endorsement of the bill now before the House.

In addition and finally I am convinced that extension of these special enlistment and training programs as provided for in H.R. 3368 is essential to the maintenance of the strength and mobilization readiness of the Reserve components of our Armed Forces.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING CONSTRUCTION OF NAVAL VESSELS

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (H.R. 3293) to authorize the construction of modern naval vessels and ask unanimous consent that it be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DURHAM]?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the President is authorized to undertake the construction of not to exceed twenty thousand tons of amphibious warfare vessels and landing craft and not to exceed four thousand tons of patrol vessels.

SEC. 2. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary for the construction of the foregoing vessels.

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Speaker, this bill is identical in all respects to a number of bills which the Congress has passed over the last several years.

This year's bill would authorize the construction of five ships as follows: One amphibious transport, dock; one amphibious assault ship; two escort vessels; and one submarine chaser.

The ships are described in detail on pages 3 and 4 of the report. The dimensions, tonnage, and function are all clearly set out in that portion of the report.

Briefly stated, the amphibious assault ship and the amphibious transport form the nucleus of the assault landing force. They were developed by the Navy and Marine Corps especially for use in assault by vertical envelopment. Both of them carry helicopters and one of them, the amphibious transport, carries landing craft underneath the flight deck.

The two escort vessels are actually a type of destroyer escort. They will be highly mobile, very fast, and will be equipped with the most modern antisubmarine weapons.

The submarine chaser is a hydrofoil. Previously, a prototype of this vessel was authorized and has proved highly successful. As you know, a hydrofoil provides that the body of the ship be placed on what I will call skis. As the ship increases in speed, its body is lifted out of the water and the only contact with the water from that point on is that made by the skis.

The ship is very fast and can operate even in rough water up to a distance of 200 miles from shore. It, too, will be equipped with submarine detection devices and will be a most effective antisubmarine weapon.

This bill represents only a small fraction of the total shipbuilding program of the Navy for fiscal year 1960. All of the remainder of the ships will be built from tonnages currently available to the Navy from previous laws. This bill, however, is necessary because these five ships are in categories for which there is no available tonnage.

The Armed Services Committee had a very detailed hearing on this measure and reported the bill unanimously.

I know of no objection to the bill.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DURHAM. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. Does the gentleman intend to propose an amendment to provide that this $110 million shall come out of the foreign giveaway counterpart funds?

Mr. DURHAM. No; I do not expect to offer such an amendment.

Mr. GROSS. Would the gentleman be opposed to an amendment of that kind if offered to the bill?

Mr. DURHAM. I think I would have to oppose an amendment such as that.

Mr. NORBLAD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

Mr. NORBLAD. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DURHAM], who is the chairman of the subcommittee which handled this bill, has given a clear and concise description of what this bill will do.

There is little that I can add to his fine explanation of the bill itself, but I do think it would be a matter of interest to the Members of the House—and to the public at large—to have some knowledge of the current status of our nuclear-propelled ships.

Five nuclear-powered submarines have been completed: U.S.S. *Nautilus*, U.S.S. *Seawolf*, U.S.S. *Skate*, U.S.S. *Swordfish*, and U.S.S. *Sargo*. There are 19 other nuclear-powered submarines now under construction, including 6 fleet ballistic missile submarines, 1 nuclear-powered guided missile submarine, and 1 nuclear-powered radar picket submarine. Nine other nuclear-powered submarines have not been awarded.

At present, there are three nuclear-powered surface ships under construction: The *Long Beach*, the *Enterprise*, and the destroyer leader guided missile–25—unnamed. The *Long Beach* is scheduled for delivery in October 1960, the *Enterprise* in September 1961, and the destroyer leader guided missile in October 1961. Physical construction is under way on both the *Long Beach* and *Enterprise*. With regard to the destroyer leader guided missile–25, orders have been placed for long leadtime items including key reactor components and steel; development of working plans is on schedule and prekeel fabrication began in February of this year. This ship, which is part of the fiscal 1959 program, was awarded in September of 1958. The *Long Beach*, with delivery scheduled for October 1960, will be the Navy's first nuclear-powered surface ship to become operational.

In addition, I would like to point out that at present three fleet ballistic missile submarines—SSBN—for which funds were provided in a supplemental fiscal 1958 appropriation, are under construction, the *George Washington* and the *Patrick Henry* at the Electric Boat Division of General Dynamics Corp., and the *Theodore Roosevelt* at the Mare Island Naval Shipyard.

Two other SSBN submarines, the *Robert E. Lee* and the *Abraham Lincoln*, both of which are part of the Navy's fiscal 1959 program, are also under construction, the former at the Newport News Shipbuilding and Drydock Co., the latter at the Portsmouth Naval Shipyard.

Of the four remaining SSBN submarines in the 1959 program, funds for which were added by Congress, only one, the SSBN–608, has been awarded. Electric Boat has received a contract to prepare working plans for this lead ship of a new class of SSBN submarines and to construct the prototype ship itself. Procurement of long leadtime components for all four ships has been in progress for some time.

Mr. Speaker, I trust that this brief explanation has given a reasonable picture of our progress in the field of nuclear propulsion and I urge that the House give favorable consideration to H.R. 3293 as an important forward step in our total defense picture.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REPEAL OF EXCISE TAXES ON TELEPHONE AND TELEGRAPH SERVICES

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD, to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I have again the honor to lay before this House a memorial enacted by the 50th Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon. This memorial prays the repeal of the Federal excise taxes on telephone and telegraph services.

In the text of the memorial are set forth several good and ample reasons why these taxes, relics of the wartime period, should be removed from the statute books. But chief among these reasons, from the point of view of the State which I have the honor and privilege to represent in the Congress, and from the point of view of her sister States of the West and, in particular, the two newest members of the Union, is that set forth in the seventh paragraph of that memorial, to wit:

> The continued imposition of this tax is discriminatory upon businesses in the western United States who market their products competitively in the East, with communication service to such eastern markets essential to such competition.

I might add to this the discriminatory effect which the excise taxes on these services has upon the people, as well as the business firms, of our Western States. These taxes, Mr. Speaker, are unfair in their incidence, bereft of the wartime justification for their enactment, and long overdue for repeal.

SENATE JOINT MEMORIAL 2

To the Honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America, in Congress assembled:

We, your memorialists, the 50th Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon, in legislative session assembled, most respectfully represent as follows:

Whereas the Federal Government levies an excise tax on telephone and telegraph services; and

Whereas such tax was levied during World War II as a wartime emergency tax to help defray war costs and to discourage unnecessary use of such services; and

Whereas the wartime emergency has expired and there is no longer a justification for imposing such tax for the purpose for which it was initially levied; and

Whereas the tax on telephone and telegraph bills imposes an undue hardship upon millions of individuals and businesses in this country, and is discriminatory; and

Whereas telephone and telegraph services are essential to the orderly transmission of information required in transaction of business and personal affairs and should not be taxed in the same manner as luxury items such as furs, jewelry, and other nonessentials; and

Whereas the continued imposition of this tax is discriminatory upon businesses in the Western United States who market their products competitively in the East, with communication service to such eastern markets essential to such competition; and

Whereas the maintenance of an adequate communication system is essential to the economic prosperity and welfare of the people of this country: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate of the State of Oregon (the House of Representatives jointly concurring therein), That the Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon respectfully memorializes the Congress of the United States to repeal the excise tax levied upon telephone and telegraph services; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this memorial be sent to the President and Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives and to all Members of the Oregon congressional delegation.

DIRE ECONOMIC AND FOREIGN POLICY CONSEQUENCES WILL RESULT FROM PRECEDENT-SETTING MANDATORY QUOTAS ON OIL IMPORTS

Mr. IRWIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. IRWIN. Mr. Speaker, President Eisenhower's precedent-setting imposition of mandatory quotas on oil imports can have only dire and damaging effects upon the Nation's economy and upon our relations with foreign powers.

It is my opinion—one, I believe, shared by many others in this Nation—that the President's action will increase the cost of oil and its products, thereby contributing to the inflationary pressures which the administration has been accusing the Democrats in Congress of fostering.

And in imposing compulsory quotas on oil imports, Mr. Eisenhower has established a precedent in recognizing the protectionist interests of one group at the expense of all others and particularly of the public welfare.

I question, Mr. Speaker, the President's contention that oil imports are on such a scale as to threaten to impair our national security.

Import restrictions, such as those imposed by the administration, should not be established unless deemed a necessity to our national security by appropriate, unbiased, and knowledgeable nongovernmental advisory groups.

It is my belief, Mr. Speaker, that this hemisphere can only be adequately defended if petroleum can flow freely between countries.

I contend that our experiences in World War II and during the Suez crisis should have taught us that healthy Canadian, Latin, and South American crude oil production is vitally important to this Nation.

The administration to the contrary, we are still quite dependent upon our neighbors for fuels to supplement our own resources in peacetime and provide for full mobilization in wartime.

It seems obvious to me, Mr. Speaker, that the administration's action constitutes a surrender to certain special interests motivated by desire for greater profits rather than any national, economic or industrial security measure.

I am wholeheartedly in agreement with an editorial in the New York Times of March 12 which declares that the imposition of compulsory quotas on oil imports will result in a further major intrusion of Government control in our economic life, with consequent weakening of the free-enterprise system.

Certainly, we appear to have committed a calculated act of economic warfare by, in the words of the Times editorial, "again repudiating our frequent protestations of desire for the freest possible flow of international trade."

I would like, Mr. Speaker, to introduce into the RECORD, the following highly informative editorial from the New York Times on this precedent-setting action by Mr. Eisenhower:

OIL IMPORT QUOTAS

President Eisenhower's decision to set up a system of compulsory import quotas covering crude petroleum and its products is an unhappy victory for a group of special interests whose gain will be at the expense of the general welfare and perhaps, ultimately, even at the expense of those who sought this move. If the immediate aims of these interests are served, the new restrictions on imports will tend to raise the cost of oil and its products, and perhaps also of coal, thus further intensifying the inflationary pressure which, in other respects, the Government is seeking to combat. And if, as is hinted in the President's statement, the Government seeks to police the price of oil and its products by changing the levels of permitted imports in response to price changes in this country, the result will be a further major intrusion of Government control in our economic life, with consequent weakening of the free-enterprise system.

The national security argument for these controls is not convincing. This is shown most obviously by the inclusion of Canada in the list of countries whose oil exports to us are curbed, though there is no threat of interruption of seaborne transport in the case of Canadian oil. Beyond that, if serious attention need be paid to assuring sufficient petroleum for future emergency needs there is much to be said for keeping as much of our oil as possible in storage under the ground and increasing, not reducing our use of imported oil.

Nor can we look with equanimity upon the probable foreign repercussions of this move. The Canadian Trade Minister has already protested it, and similar resentment is undoubtedly felt also in Venezuela and other sources of imported oil. To many abroad this will look like still another calculated act of economic warfare by the United States against its friends, an act they will interpret as again repudiating our frequent protestations of desire for the freest possible flow of international trade. It is an unhappy precedent which has been set.

DISCONTINUANCE OF EXCISE TAX ON TELEPHONE SERVICE

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, I am calling to the attention of the House a petition from the Public Utilities Commission of Connecticut relative to the excise tax on telephone service. I request unanimous consent that the text of the petition be placed in the body of the RECORD with my remarks.

I have had a good deal of correspondence from people in my district opposing the continuance of this tax. The telephone is certainly an essential part of our communications, and it is hard to recognize why a tax on its use should continue so long after the war has ended.

Knowing the many difficult problems that face the Ways and Means Committee, I would expect that this has been brought to their attention. But I would stress that Connecticut and Hartford County feels that the purpose of the tax has long since been outmoded and that there is a substantial claim for reconsideration. In reviewing the tax laws, the Ways and Means Committee should recommend the end of this particular excise.

The petition follows:

PETITION AND RESOLUTION OF THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF CONNECTICUT PERTAINING TO FEDERAL EXCISE TAXES ON TELEPHONE SERVICE

It appearing, that Federal excise taxes on telephone service were levied initially or greatly increased during World War II to assist in defraying the expenses of conducting the war, and to discourage the unnecessary civilian use of telephone service; and

It appearing further, that the Congress has recognized that wartime excise taxes should be eliminated and many such eliminations have been made; and

It appearing further, that telephone service is not in the class of luxuries but is an essential public utility service; and

It appearing further, that at this time, almost 14 years after the end of World War II hostilities, the excise tax on telephone service is still in effect and is continuing to discourage public use of this essential service—the only household utility service which is the subject of Federal excise taxes:

Now, therefore, we, the undersigned, comprising the Public Utilities Commission of the State of Connecticut, petition and memorialize Connecticut Representatives and Senators in Congress that the Federal excise taxes on telephone services are not consistent with the maintenance of a reasonably priced and nondiscriminatory public telephone service and, therefore that such Federal excise taxes should be repealed.

We hereby direct the secretary of this commission to forward a copy of this petition and resolution to each Connecticut Representative and Senator in Congress.

EUGENE S. LOUGHLIN,
HENRY B. STRONG,
BASIL P. FITZPATRICK,
Public Utilities Commission.

Dated at Hartford, Conn., this 11th day of February 1959.

AREAS OF SUBSTANTIAL LABOR SURPLUS

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, it is with regret that once again I am compelled to point out that joblessness in this country is on the increase and that at this moment upward of 5 million Americans are out of work.

This is not only a distressing situation but a stern challenge to our Government. This Nation, confronted as it is with a grave military threat, particularly in Berlin, and an intensified Soviet economic war, cannot afford to treat this problem casually.

Action is demanded to deal with unployment—action on a broad front—action that will mobilize the economic resources of the Nation. We need a program, and need it quickly, that will put to work the potential of millions of hours of productive effort that are now being wasted. We need job-creating policies and programs to bring these idle workers into the battle against inflation, and to strengthen America's hand in the deteriorating cold war.

It becomes my unpleasant duty to inscribe on the record the latest unemployment compilation of distress areas, which constitute a record-breaking peak of joblessness in recent years.

This bad news confirms the necessity of legislation like the Douglas-Flood bill to provide for the redevelopment of chronically distressed communities. Earlier this week I testified before the House Banking and Currency Committee on my area redevelopment bill, H.R. 3466, which is designed to meet the problems of these jobless-plagued regions, and I strongly urge that this badly-needed legislation be brought to early enactment by the Congress so that its constructive, beneficial provisions can begin to minister to the national economy and welfare at the earliest possible date.

The growth and widespread nature of chronic unemployment throughout the United States is grimly borne out by the following tables, ably assembled and prepared by the Area Employment Expansion Committee, 99 University Place, New York City, under the direction of Mr. Sol Barkin, executive secretary.

I would like to point out, Mr. Speaker, the fact that of the 149 major labor market areas, 72 will become eligible for assistance by January 1960, under my bill, H.R. 3466 and S. 722, but only 19 areas will become eligible for assistance by that date under the administration's bill H.R. 4264 and S. 1064.

The aforementioned compilation and tables follow:

AREA REDEVELOPMENT FACT SHEET NO. 34—COMPARATIVE IMPACT OF H.R. 3466 AND H.R. 4264 (THE ADMINISTRATION BILL) ON MAJOR LABOR MARKET AREAS IN THE UNITED STATES

Twenty-eight major labor market areas are currently eligible for assistance (grants and loans) under H.R. 3466. Of these only 12 are currently eligible for assistance under H.R. 4264.

Of the remaining 44 major labor markets with substantial labor surpluses in January 1959, all but one would be eligible under H.R. 3466 for assistance (grants and loans) in 1959, if substantial unemployment continues.

Under H.R. 4264, only 7, in addition to the 12 enumerated above as immediately eligible, would become eligible in 1960. The remaining 53 would, at best, become eligible in 1961 or much later.

Similar information is being developed for smaller and very small labor markets by individual States since the Bureau of Employment Security has not made available data for them.

I. Major labor markets currently eligible for assistance under both H.R. 3466 and H.R. 4264:

Indiana: Evansville, Terre Haute.
Massachusetts: Lawrence, Lowell, New Bedford.
New Jersey: Atlantic City.
Pennsylvania: Altoona, Johnstown, Scranton, Wilkes-Barre-Hazleton.
Rhode Island: Providence.
West Virginia: Charleston.

II. Additional major labor markets currently eligible for assistance under H.R. 3466:

Massachusetts: Fall River.
Michigan: Detroit, Flint, Grand Rapids, Lansing, Muskegon.
New York: Utica-Rome.
North Carolina: Asheville, Durham.
Oregon: Portland.
Pennsylvania: Erie.
Tennessee: Chattanooga, Knoxville.
Washington: Spokane, Tacoma.
West Virginia: Huntington-Ashland.

III. Dates of eligibility of major labor markets with substantial labor surplus on January 1959 for assistance under H.R. 3466 if substantial labor surpluses continue:

MARCH 1959

Connecticut: Bridgeport.
Pennsylvania: Pittsburgh.

APRIL 1959

Connecticut: New Britain, Waterbury.[1]
Ohio: Lorain-Elyria.
West Virginia: Wheeling-Steubenville.[1]

MAY 1959

Kentucky: Louisville.
Michigan: Battle Creek.

JUNE 1959

New Jersey: Newark-Jersey City, Paterson-Clifton-Passaic, Perth Amboy-New Brunswick, Trenton.
New York: Buffalo.

JULY 1959

Alabama: Birmingham.
Connecticut: New Haven.
Illinois: Joliet.
Indiana: Fort Wayne, South Bend.
Maine: Portland.
Maryland: Baltimore.
Massachusetts: Brockton, Springfield-Holyoke, Worcester.
Minnesota: Duluth-Superior.
Missouri: St. Louis.
New York: Albany-Schenectady-Troy, New York, Syracuse.
Ohio: Canton, Toledo, Youngstown.
Pennsylvania: Allentown, Bethlehem-Easton, Philadelphia, Reading, York.
Tennessee: Memphis.
Texas: Beaumont-Port Arthur, Corpus Christi.
Wisconsin: Racine.[1]

SEPTEMBER 1959

Alabama: Mobile.
Illinois: Chicago.
Michigan: Saginaw.
Missouri: Kansas City.
Virginia: Roanoke.

JANUARY 1960

New York: Binghamton.

IV. Dates of eligibility of major labor markets with substantial labor surplus on January 1959 for assistance under H.R. 4264 if substantial labor surpluses continue:

A. Seven major labor markets will become eligible for assistance under H.R. 4264 in 1960 if substantial labor surpluses continue in 1959:

Indiana: South Bend.
Massachusetts: Fall River.

[1] All but these three will become eligible after 18 months of substantial surplus. These three labor markets are likely to be eligible after 15 months, since their rate is 9 percent or more.

Michigan: Detroit, Flint, Muskegon.
North Carolina: Asheville.
Tennessee: Knoxville.

B. The dates for the other labor markets becoming eligible are 1961 or later so that estimates are not at all feasible.

TABLE I.—*Annual averages of unemployment as a percent of labor force, major areas of substantial labor surplus, 1955–58*

Labor market areas	1955	1956	1957	1958
Alabama:				
Birmingham	4.5	3.7	3.9	7.2
Mobile	5.2	4.0	3.9	6.7
Connecticut:				
Bridgeport	3.2	2.2	3.9	10.8
New Britain	3.1	2.4	3.9	11.3
New Haven	2.3	1.5	2.5	6.9
Waterbury	4.7	3.1	5.3	11.1
Illinois:				
Chicago	4.1	2.6	3.1	7.5
Joliet	3.6	1.9	2.7	8.4
Indiana:				
Evansville	7.3	8.9	6.8	10.2
Fort Wayne	4.1	2.8	4.4	9.1
South Bend	6.8	6.8	5.2	13.0
Terre Haute	12.8	11.3	7.7	8.5
Kentucky: Louisville	4.2	4.7	5.6	8.5
Maine: Portland	5.3	4.4	4.8	7.8
Maryland: Baltimore	4.1	2.9	3.0	7.1
Massachusetts:				
Brockton	4.1	4.4	5.5	8.4
Fall River	6.1	6.3	10.6	12.2
Lawrence	16.4	10.2	8.9	10.3
Lowell	8.8	6.7	7.0	11.0
New Bedford	8.6	6.1	6.6	11.2
Springfield-Holyoke	4.2	3.4	4.8	8.3
Worcester	4.3	2.8	4.2	8.8
Michigan:				
Battle Creek	4.2	3.8	4.5	8.4
Detroit	4.3	7.7	7.3	16.1
Flint	2.2	6.5	9.7	14.0
Grand Rapids	2.5	4.2	7.4	12.0
Lansing	2.7	5.1	5.2	9.6
Muskegon	4.3	6.2	8.7	13.1
Saginaw	1.9	5.2	3.5	8.5
Minnesota: Duluth-Superior	7.2	5.2	5.0	11.1
Missouri:				
Kansas City	6.2	6.2	4.8	6.6
St. Louis	5.2	4.1	4.4	7.7
New Jersey:				
Atlantic City	10.1	9.3	9.4	11.5
Newark	5.3	4.7	5.1	8.3
Paterson	6.3	5.0	5.5	9.0
Perth Amboy	5.1	4.0	4.3	8.4
Trenton	5.3	5.6	5.6	8.8
New York:				
Albany-Schenectady-Troy	5.6	3.6	3.9	7.0
Binghamton	4.7	3.3	2.8	6.1
Buffalo	4.4	4.0	4.5	11.4
New York	5.7	5.1	5.2	7.3
Syracuse	4.5	3.3	3.8	7.8
Utica-Rome	7.8	5.5	5.4	10.4
North Carolina:				
Asheville	7.6	6.8	6.9	8.2
Durham	6.4	5.7	6.7	8.1
Ohio:				
Canton	3.3	2.2	4.0	9.6
Lorain-Elyria	3.1	2.8	3.7	13.9
Toledo	5.3	5.1	4.3	8.2
Youngstown	3.5	2.6	3.5	10.9
Oregon: Portland	5.6	4.3	5.6	7.7
Pennsylvania:				
Allentown-Bethlehem-Easton	3.9	3.0	3.7	7.9
Altoona	11.9	9.2	10.4	16.5
Erie	7.5	5.0	6.2	13.3
Johnstown	10.6	8.0	6.6	15.4
Philadelphia	5.3	4.9	5.2	7.8
Pittsburgh	6.1	4.5	4.5	11.0
Reading	5.6	4.6	4.9	8.4
Scranton	13.9	11.9	11.2	16.4
Wilkes-Barre-Hazleton	13.9	13.0	11.4	16.8
York	5.2	4.6	5.8	7.6
Puerto Rico:				
Mayaguez	16.8	11.8	12.4	13.4
Ponce	14.5	13.3	11.8	12.2
San Juan	8.8	6.7	7.2	9.8
Rhode Island: Providence	8.7	8.0	9.8	13.1
Tennessee:				
Chattanooga	5.7	5.6	6.0	7.8
Knoxville	6.8	6.9	7.0	9.7
Memphis	5.6	4.5	5.2	7.2
Texas:				
Beaumont-Port Arthur	6.0	4.6	4.6	9.4
Corpus Christi	5.8	5.1	4.9	7.1
Virginia: Roanoke	4.7	3.1	2.8	7.6
Washington:				
Spokane	5.4	4.7	6.0	8.6
Tacoma	5.2	4.5	5.2	7.8
West Virginia:				
Charleston	11.5	8.7	8.2	11.6
Huntington-Ashland	7.0	5.8	5.9	14.0
Wheeling-Steubenville	4.5	4.4	5.2	12.0
Wisconsin: Racine	3.8	4.7	5.5	7.5

Source: Bureau of Employment Security.

SAFEGUARD OUR NATIONAL SECURITY

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ALGER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, with every day's papers recounting the grave concern of congressional leaders over the adequacy of the President's defense proposals, one's confidence grows that these same men will spare no effort in seeing to it that we are fully prepared in every way to fight if need be, and to win.

Surely, men who regard as niggardly the administration's $41 billion military budget, and who call for even greater taxpayers' sacrifice in the interest of preparedness, surely such men will leave no stone unturned, no deal overlooked, in insuring that American boys will not have to fight for their lives with their hands tied behind their backs. Consequently, I am perfectly confident that Congress will act promptly on bills already introduced by Senator BUTLER, by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SCHERER], and today by myself, aimed simply at enabling us to protect ourselves and the forces in the field from crippling expionage.

The gentleman from Ohio did the Congress and the Nation a service when, on January 29 on this floor, he outlined in graphic detail our dangerous and potentially tragic impotency to deal with espionage. To any who may not have heard his remarks or seen them in the RECORD, on pages 1446–1448, I strongly urge that you read Mr. SCHERER's statement thoughtfully and soberly.

Equipped with ample and clear testimony, that the very communications tielines and the leased lines out of the Pentagon itself are exposed at this very moment to the surveillance of a Communist controlled unit, equipped with the knowledge that restricted messages from the Pentagon have already been intercepted by persons under discipline of this Communist controlled organization and there is presently nothing the Army can do about it, forewarned that the Pentagon knows of some 2,000 identified potential saboteurs employed in plants vital to our Nation's defense, but is powerless to remove them, surely Congress will act to meet the challenge.

In the face of the Pentagon's plea that "unless this legislation is enacted, we are not in a position to assure the Congress and the American people that all reasonable measures are undertaken to safeguard our national security," can a Congress, if seriously concerned over our defense preparedness, fail to act?

RETIREMENT FOR SELF-EMPLOYED

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. STEED] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. STEED. Mr. Speaker, on January 27 I introduced H.R. 3507, a bill to permit the self-employed person to defer income tax each year on a portion of his own income set aside to provide for his retirement. This could be done on up to 10 percent of total income or $2,500, whichever is the lesser amount.

This bill is identical to H.R. 9 and 10, which were introduced by my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from New York, Congressman KEOGH, and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SIMPSON]. It is a bipartisan measure, with bipartisan support, which passed the House in the closing days of the 85th Congress.

High taxes and inflated living costs have made it difficult for self-employed people to set aside money for their own retirement. On the other hand, tax deferments are already applicable in the case of corporate employees covered by private pension plans. This constitutes an inequity in treatment which badly needs correction. More and more qualified young men are going on a corporate payroll, rather than striking out for themselves. The factor of retirement planning often plays a significant role in their decision.

H.R. 10 would do much to correct this disparity. It has been favorably reported by the Committee on Ways and Means, and it is my understanding that it will come before the House for consideration on Monday. I believe this measure is a long-delayed step of tax justice.

The Keogh bill would affect a wide variety of self-employed people, totaling about 7,500,000 in number. This figure would include an estimated 13,000 persons in my own Fourth Congressional District of Oklahoma alone.

By far the majority of these are small retailers, farmers, and other independent proprietors. These are people who have the personal initiative to go out on their own, and who help promote the productivity that provides the basic strength of the American economy. Typical of those who have written me concerning this legislation are druggists, realtors, furniture-store owners, plumbers, savings and loan men, and certified public accountants.

I feel that my colleagues may be interested in a few of these expressions, especially because they indicate the wide range of persons who would be affected by the passage of the bill. For this reason, I now ask permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD to include a few of the communications I have received on this measure:

STILLWATER, OKLA.,
February 25, 1959.

Hon. TOM STEED,
Congress of the United States,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. STEED: I am definitely in favor of the immediate passage of H.R. 10. In my opinion this is long overdue. Generally men in my profession have long seen the need for tax equality as being enjoyed by a few. My thoughts on this has been if one were

allowed to invest perhaps up to this amount in a deferred annuity contract or even an insured annuity contract. The actual cost of the insurance being taxable but the saving portion exempt. Insurance companies, no doubt, could furnish you a breakdown on this as to savings or retirements income, that is, the portion charged to insurance.

If in my limited way I can be of any service to you in this respect, please advise.

Sincerely yours,

PAUL M. KERR, *Realtor.*

SHAWNEE, OKLA.,
March 2, 1959.

The Honorable TOM STEED,
Congress of the United States,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. STEED: Thank you for your letter of February 24 relating to H.R. 10. I am somewhat familiar with this bill and I also was aware of the fact that you were one of the sponsors. I appreciate your interest and support in this bill, and feel as though it is a change which is long overdue.

In addition to offering you my support, I am also advising clients of my office about this bill and urging them to write you also. These clients are, for the most part, businessmen within the Shawnee area.

Yours very truly,

DREW FINLEY, Jr.
FINLEY & COOK,
Certified Public Accountants.

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF
PLUMBING CONTRACTORS,
Washington, D.C., March 12, 1959.

Hon. TOM STEED,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. STEED: The average plumbing contractor in the United States employs between 8 and 11 persons.

The plumbing contractor operates a family business. In most cases he does some plumbing work himself, and frequently his wife and family handle the books and the office end of things.

There are about 80,000 plumbing contractors in the country. More equitable tax treatment for these self-employed men would reflect a great return to the Nation's economy. An inequity in the tax laws now works against the small self-employed businessman. For example, a man who works for someone else may be provided with certain fringe benefits at no cost to himself. These include in many cases sickness, accident, health, and welfare pensions, and similar benefits. The cost of providing these is deductible by the employee on his tax returns but need not be included in the employee's declaration of income.

A self-employed individual is not treated equally in this respect. He must pay the cost of such protection for himself and his family out of earnings remaining after income taxes have been paid. In many cases, the small businessman operates on a narrow and often fluctuating margin and is simply unable after payment of all expenses and income taxes on net earnings to provide the necessary retirement funds.

The National Asssociation of Plumbing Contractors feels there is great merit in the Keogh-Simpson proposal in H.R. 10 allowing a limited tax deduction for funds to provide for retirement. We appreciate support of this legislation on behalf of the nearly 10,000 members of our association, most of whom are self-employed small businessmen.

Sincerely yours,

LEONARD F. KILEY,
Chairman, Public Relations Committee.

NATIONAL FEDERATION OF
INDEPENDENT BUSINESS,
Washington, D.C., March 12, 1959.

Hon. TOM STEED,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN STEED: I know that you will be interested as to a recent poll of our nationwide membership of independent business and professional men, all voting members (not groups) that we recently presented to them for the fifth time, arguments for and against on the Keogh-Simpson bill. The argument we presented to our members is as follows:

ARGUMENTS FOR

Fair play for business and professional people, that's what this bill seeks. These people generate much of our prosperity and provide essential services. They should have the same chance to provide for retirement as have corporation officials and employees—which this bill would grant them. By exempting from tax the first 10 percent of income pay into these plans, it would help them finance programs for retirement. Congress went almost 75 percent of the way toward making this into law in 1958 * * * in all fairness, it should go all the way this year. This is nothing but simple justice.

ARGUMENTS AGAINST

There are a lot of injustices in our tax laws. Perhaps these bills would correct one of them. But in doing so, they would create others. Treasury officials have testified that the bills would throw a harpoon into budget balance work and promote further depreciation of the dollar. Others have argued that the bills would confer special privileges on higher, middle, and upper income groups at a time when all need a tax reduction. Congressional authorities say we should start with a general reduction in all tax rates, and eliminate all special exceptions. Let's start with a general tax cut.

Congressman STEED, this poll was recently completed and the vote was 76 percent for the proposition, 20 percent against, and 4 percent no vote.

We believe this information should prove of considerable interest to your colleagues.

Sincerely yours,

GEORGE J. BURGER,
Vice President.

SHAWNEE, OKLA.

Hon. TOM STEED,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR TOM: I appreciate very much your letter of February 16, regarding H.R. 10, of which you are a joint sponsor.

This is the first time that I have given any serious thought to the bill and was quite interested in reading the comments in your letter as well as the leaflet enclosed, which more fully explained the purpose of the proposed legislation. It does seem to me that this would provide a solution for an inequity which now exists, and that those who are self-employed should not be penalized for attempting to provide for their retirement years.

I have no suggestions to offer but wanted you to know that my reaction to this bill is favorable.

Your very truly,

JOHN A. MERRILL,
Vice President, First Federal Savings & Loan Association of Shawnee.

WETUMKA, OKLA., *February 28, 1959.*

TOM STEED,
Member of Congress,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR TOM: I am very interested in private pensions for self-employed persons. H.R. 10 is legislation that is fair and just, and I hope that it is approved and passed on soon.

I understand the legislation, so won't comment further.

Your friend,

W. M. LOVE.

ADA, OKLA., *February 28, 1959.*

DEAR MR. STEED: Thank you for your letter concerning H.R. 10.

I am in favor of this bill. It seems to me that too much emphasis is being placed upon employees benefits with little or no relief for the employer.

Thank you.

HOMER H. HENSLER, Jr.

CHANDLER, OKLA., *February 28, 1959.*

Congressman TOM STEED,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR TOM: I am happy that you called your House bills (H.R. 10 and H.R. 9) to my attention, for I'm very much in favor of this voluntary pension plan, I happened to read about this plan in the newspaper some 2 or 3 weeks ago and thought about writing you at the time.

Again I want to thank you for being so thoughtful as to ask what or how I feel about the bill.

Sincerely,

FRIEND BURNHAM.

SHAWNEE, OKLA., *February 27, 1959.*

Hon. TOM STEED,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR TOM: We are vitally interested in bills H.R. 10 and H.R. 9. It is something the self-employed person has needed a long while, we think.

Surely do appreciate your efforts on behalf of the bill.

Sincerely,

COY and LETA WINSETT.

BARTLESVILLE, OKLA., *February 27, 1959.*

Hon. TOM STEED,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Our observation in the preparation of income tax returns for all classes of taxpayers has proved to us that the executive of a corporation approaches the retirement time in his life in a much more secure position than the average business or professional man.

The corporation employee has had the advantage of joining a company retirement plan and retires with payments from the plan with an income sufficient to care for him in his declining days. The self-employed has been unable for various reasons to provide for his declining days.

For these reasons we are highly in favor of the Keogh-Simpson bill (H. R. 10) and hope you will use your best efforts to assure its passage.

We could give many more reasons why we feel that this is commendable legislation but trust that this is sufficient to secure your support.

Yours very truly,

SEIDLE, WILSON, JONES, & SEIDLE,
GENE E. WILSON, *Partner.*

GEOPOLITICS AND NATIONAL POWER

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD, and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, during the past several years I have devoted much time and study to interoceanic canal policies and other matters related to our national power. In examining such questions, the evidence is cumulative of the imperative necessity for deriving our policies to present a reasoned line of thought in relation to actual conditions with a view to improving them.

Thus, it was most gratifying to read in the March–April 1959 issue of the Military Engineer, the journal of the Society of Military Engineers, published bimonthly in the Nation's Capital, a thoughtful article on "Geopolitics and National Power," by Capt. William T. Greenhalgh, U.S. Navy. Also in this issue is the following brief biographical sketch of the author:

Capt. W. T. Greenhalgh has served for the past 3 years as Assistant Chief of Naval Material and Director, Supply Programs Division in the Office of Naval Material. His interest in foreign affairs began as a student at the Industrial College of the Armed Forces where he served as an instructor in "Military and Economic Potential of World Areas." Following this, he served as chief of foreign production on the Munitions Board, and participated in the establishment of NATO requirements for the first military aid program. In 1951 he was ordered to the staff of SHAPE, where he served as logistics officer under Generals Eisenhower and Gruenther. Captain Greenhalgh received his education at the University of Pennsylvania. In the field of foreign affairs, he studied under former Ambassador to the U.S.S.R. George Kennan, and Father Edmund Walsh, of Georgetown University.

To give Captain Greenhalgh's article wider circulation as well as to record it in the permanent annals of the Congress, under leave accorded to extend my remarks, I quote the indicated article:

GEOPOLITICS AND NATIONAL POWER

(By William T. Greenhalgh, captain, U.S. Navy)

In these days of international confusion which call for swift and drastic national actions, it is important to be fully aware of the basic philosophies upon which American foreign policy is based and to manifest an interest in how these policies are affected by current events. If they are not understood, it is possible to arrive at erroneous interpretations of the events or actions.

Many of the factors and recommendations included here have been expressed before, but the passage of time sometimes puts old problems in new settings; and it may be the essence of great wisdom to make time the creative ally of diplomacy. Even though history is moving with long and rapid strides, previously proposed courses of action cannot be discarded without careful consideration, for they may involve new and dynamic courses which are vitally necessary. The world today is begging for words of guidance to cheer its toilsome march across the chasm of these perilous years.

Geopolitics, as a science, affects philosophies and policies both foreign and domestic. It is far broader than the two aspects expressed in its title—geography and politics. It also involves national and racial attributes, national traditions, social mores and customs, environment of the people, and to a very large extent, military philosophies such as those expressed by Clausewitz and Mahan and to some extent by national leaders and statesmen.

Geopolitics can be for the thinker a kind of extension in space and time of his experience, a deepening and a widening of his private world. Even though it may seldom move one emotionally, it can give the inquisitive and imaginative mind a magnificent ranging ground.

The present overall strategic policies of the United States and the U.S.S.R. have their basis in the geopolitical theories set forth some 50 or 60 years ago. While time and the accelerated progress in technology have challenged the validity of these theories, it is essential to understand them and the effect that they have had in the last half century. Today it may be vital to examine even visionary philosophies in an effort to find either a catalyst or a dynamic counterphilosophy to communism.

For example, the tallest buildings are nothing more than an extension of the earth's surface—manmade caves constructed from materials taken out of the earth and transformed and fashioned into shapes suitable to current desires. Such structures would never be built without knowing the strengths, the tensions, and the wearing qualities of the materials used or all facts concerning the foundation. The same is true in the building of geopolitical philosophies and the formulation of foreign policies. While others may be charged with the responsibilities of creating such philosophies and policies, it is, nevertheless, vital for everyone affected by them to be fully aware of the basic concepts underlying their adoption.

BASIC EARLY PHILOSOPHIES

Seapower: In 1890 Adm. A. T. Mahan developed his theory of insular dominance. He pointed out[1] that nations may rise or fall but no nation may stand still. He believed that expansion was essential to national greatness. His theory was that to expand, a nation must be wealthy; to be wealthy, it must have a large and prosperous foreign trade; to have a large and prosperous trade, it must have a large navy. Insularity, according to Mahan, was an invaluable asset in the struggle to control the sea. No state with insecure land frontiers could compete for maritime primacy with a comparably strong state that was completely insular; hence, the state which controlled the oceans and narrow seas could be the leader in world politics through its grip on the seaborne movement of commerce and military forces.

Mahan believed that a physically secure base, such as an insular base, would be free of the economic burden of having to defend insecure land frontiers. This is exemplified by Great Britain and the NATO forces in Europe.

Fifty years ago Mahan predicted that America's possession of an economically strong and secure insular base of continental proportion might well be the means of her succeeding Great Britain as the dominant maritime power of the globe.

Landpower: The theory that landpower was more essential than the development of maritime supremacy was first advanced by Sir Halford K. Mackinder, when he challenged the maritime supremacy theories of Admiral Mahan in 1904.[2]

Mackinder's concepts were formulated around the greatest land mass—Europe, Asia, and Africa—which he aptly named the world island. He considered the world island to be composed of two very different regions, with the rest of the world lying in a third region. Of the two regions comprising the world island, the first included the interior of the Eurasian land mass, dependent upon overland communications and relatively inaccessible to the influence or domination of seafaring peoples. This he named the heartland of Eurasia. The second region was exterior, comprising those outer areas of the world island which are generally accessible to the sea and dependent upon sea communications for a large element of their economic strength. The maritime outer region he named the coastland or inner crescent of the world island.

Mackinder warned that if some central European power were to unite the advantages of the heartland with the advantages which would accrue through access to the sea, there might arise a combination of land and sea power that could easily dominate the world. He feared that possible leadership for just such a superpower could be found in the Germanic peoples of central Europe.

It was not until 1919, however, that the strategic concept of Mackinder's theories was made known to the world. In that year he published his "Democratic Ideals and Reality," a book addressed to the Allied statesmen then sitting at the peace table following World War I. In it he pointed out the ever present threat to the peace of Europe through German-Russian rapprochement or through German domination of Russia. He cautioned his readers that: who rules Europe commands the heartland; who rules the heartland commands the world island; and who rules the world island commands the world. He feared that Germany would get control of Russia and in time accomplish the conquest of the world.

APPLICATIONS OF THE HEARTLAND THEORY

The world ignored Mackinder's warning but one man studied it carefully. Gen. Karl Haushofer, a German soldier and scholar, combined the theories of earlier geopolitical scholars with the thoughts expressed by Mackinder. He saw in these theories a logical plan for German conquest.

The story is told that Rudolf Hess, a disciple of Haushofer's took him to see Hitler in the Landsberg jail. From this and subsequent visits came chapter XIV of "Mein Kampf"—Mackinder's heartland theory twisted to Germany's ends. And to this theory Hitler added action.

Haushofer's aim was to bring about a tripartite alliance between Japan, Russia, and Germany. But, as is well known, this was not to be. Nazism and communism included an identical objective—world revolution and eventual domination. They jointly expressed the two most dynamic principles in the European balance of power and were historically and politically destined for eventual collision. Both secretly understood the nature of the breathing spell afforded them by the Russo-German nonaggression pact of 1939. They knew it to be merely a breathing spell to prepare for the inevitable struggle between the two titans, between the two philosophies of political and economic life most concerned with the domination of the heartland. It must be recognized that the U.S.S.R. was thrown not so much into the camp of the Allies as back into her original domestic defense position respecting Nazi Germany. She was fighting with the Allies against a common enemy, but neither guaranteeing nor underwriting the common objectives of the United Nations. This fact was not understood, or else it was ignored, by many of America's leading statesmen.

On the other hand, Japan was convinced that an alliance with Germany and Russia would assist in securing Asia for the Asiatics with Japan calling the plays. Fortunately for the world, Tojo and Hitler failed to heed fully Haushofer's warnings. With Russia lost to the alliance, he counseled Japan to strike first against the British Pacific Empire and the other European

[1] In his book, "The Influence of Seapower Upon History."

[2] In a paper presented before the Royal Geographic Society that year.

colonies in the Pacific. His advice to Hitler was to direct the Nazi conquest primarily toward the Middle East with the idea of meeting the invasion forces of Japan somewhere in India. Thus both the heartland and the interior of the Chinese mainland would be cut off and isolated.

Instead of turning south, however, Japan started her drive on the continent of Asia. At the other end of the Berlin-Tokyo axis the clash with Russia became inevitable.

With the defeat of Germany and Japan, the heartland extended its tentacles in all directions. While seizing Eastern Europe and buffer areas in Asia, the Kremlin also attempted to gain control of areas in north Africa and the Middle East (Tripolitania and the Kars-Erzurum area of Turkey). Failing in the latter attempts, the U.S.S.R. has consistently tried to foster the creation of a Kurdistan Republic—to be carved out of Turkey, Iraq, and Iran—which would seal off all entrances to Soviet territory through the Middle East. All of these moves follow the heartland theory and its ultimate aim of controlling the world island.

CONTAINMENT AND THE RIMLAND THEORY

But how do the geopolitical ideas tie in with American attempts to halt this growing Red tide? Shortly after Mackinder advanced his heartland theory, the late Prof. N. J. Spykman, of Yale, pointed out what he believed to be fallacies in the Mackinder theory. Among others, he felt that the inner crescent, composed of the Mediterranean Basin, the European Peninsula, and the Asiatic coastlands, with its seapower and its own natural barriers, was of greater strength and power than the heartland. He paraphrased Mackinder by saying that who controls the Rimland, or inner crescent, rules Eurasia; who rules Eurasia controls the destinies of the world. Apparently the United States and other allied nations, either by choice or necessity, favor the rimland theory. This, of course, accounts for the accent on Western Europe and the determination to hold Japan, Formosa, and southeast Asia, and foster the American position in the Middle East. This, in essence, is the containment policy.

Containment means, first of all, the prevention of the extension of Communist control into the rimland—a policy which was inaugurated officially back in 1947 with American aid to Greece and Turkey. The philosophical basis for the pursuit of such a policy has often been cited as set forth in an article entitled, "The Sources of Soviet Conduct," by George F. Kennan, career Foreign Service officer.

Kennan's thesis rests on the premise that there are two basic facts: First, that the Russians live in a vast, defenseless plain, where they have always been surrounded by hostile forces; and, second, that their society and culture have ever been weak, disorganized, and primitive, according to Western standards. As a result, Kennan contends, the Russians have traditionally suffered from a sense of insecurity and their rulers from feelings of inferiority. They have always been consumed by fear—fear of foreign penetration; fear of what would happen if the Russian people learned the truth about the world outside, or if foreigners learned the awful truth about the world inside; fear of direct contact between the Western World and their own. Thus, Russia's rulers have learned to seek security only in waging a patient but deadly struggle for the total destruction of rival power—never in compacts and compromises with it.

The advent of Marxism in Russia, Kennan holds, and its doctrine of the irrepressible conflict between Marxism and capitalism, is just a convenient vehicle, serving to enhance the concept of Old Mother Russia encircled on all sides by hostile forces. It has served merely to provide Russia's rulers with a plausible apology and justification for the exercise of autocratic power, and with an intense faith in the ultimate triumph of Russia's cause, without the urgency of adhering to any fixed timetable to insure ultimate success.

To Kennan the most effective policy for the West is a long-range containment effort, pursued as steadily, patiently, and resourcefully as the policy pursued by the Russians. This involves the diligent application of Western power at a series of constantly shifting geographical and political points, corresponding to the shifts and maneuvers of Soviet policy. The West must confront the Communists with unalterable counterforce at every such point. The United States must demonstrate to the world that she is capable of dealing successfully with her own internal problems, that she is a country that knows what she wants, and that she possesses a spiritual vitality capable of holding her own among the major ideological currents of the time.

In summary, Kennan believed that such a program of continuous pressure applied from the outside, if vigorously pursued for a period of 10 to 15 years, would so frustrate and disillusion Russia's leaders as to result in either a genuine mellowing of Soviet power or its complete collapse.

Considerable encouragement has been found by Mr. Kennan in the trend of events in Eastern Europe during the last year such as Zhukov's dismissal, and the outbreaks in Hungary and Poland. Soviet communism today remains what it proclaimed itself to be 40 years ago—a threat to the non-Communist world. But the nature of the threat has changed. There was a real possibility that the bitterness and frustration generated by World War I (and to some extent World War II) would turn men's minds to communism and touch off revolutions in other countries besides Russia. In those days Russia was militarily helpless to the point of impotence; propaganda and examples were the weapons of the Communist government.

Now, except possibly in some of the more backward areas of Asia, Communist Party propaganda has lost much of its power of appeal. Soviet living conditions are not calculated to induce workers or anyone else to embrace its theories in the hopes of reproducing these conditions in other countries.

But, rapid Soviet mastery of deadly weapons and a willingness to brandish these weapons for purposes of blackmail pose new and worse threats.

Today the sea and air power of the Western allies depend upon the fringing rimlands of Eurasia and the bordering islands and continents, such as Africa, for forward bases. This insular concept of strategy was entirely valid in the days before the airplane and the atomic bomb and it still has some validity today. But island bases, fringing continental land masses such as Great Britain, Japan, and Formosa, are less secure in the age of airpower and hydrogen weapons than in the decades when surface ships were supreme.

Around the Eurasian periphery—on the continental rimland and the fringing islands—the United States and its allies have the advantage of hundreds of air and naval bases, which virtually encircle the Communist heartland. The Communists, on the other hand, would have no such bases in the Western Hemisphere; attacks on the United States would have to cross great distances of sea and air. This condition has made the development of the intercontinental ballistic missile (ICBM) a Soviet necessity, while shorter range missiles and bombers are still suitable for the West.

THE WAY TO PEACE AND FREEDOM

The American defense problem in the age of nuclear plenty is twofold. She must maintain her strategic power, enough of it so that any prospective enemy must believe that he cannot survive a war against it. Such strength will serve as a deterrent to prevent general war. Equally, America must be prepared to exert her force successfully in limited conflicts. The two requirements are parallel. Neither has priority; both are necessary. America faces destruction if she becomes incapable of an annihilating stroke, but she can just as surely be destroyed piece-by-piece if she cannot manage the so-called little threats. It might take longer to destroy her that way, but probably not much. She cannot sit idle while her foundations are chiseled away. And, of course, it is also true that little threats can bring on general war if they are not adequately dealt with at the start.

Advances in transportation and communication have made a smaller world, into which the tremendous destructiveness of nuclear weapons must be crowded. Someone has suggested that the United States and the U.S.S.R. are like two deadly enemies locked in a small room, each armed with a hand grenade. For this problem, the analogy may be refined by assuming that Russia also has a knife. If America does not provide herself with a weapon to parry Russia's knife, she can be cut to ribbons, with no defense that is not also suicide. If America should also have a knife she is then in a position to put up a suitable defense, and possibly find a way out of the room.

The Soviet cold war tactics will succeed only if America and her allies fail to move together. It is imperative to recognize that the Soviet Union and her satellites are employing a combination of military, political, and economic techniques all over the world to achieve Communist ends. The West requires no less an integration of its own strategy, and must realize that wise use of economic and political power is just as necessary as increased military power.

In the postwar years the non-Communist countries, even though they differed among themselves in opinions, desires, and needs, have been pushed together by the pressure of a common opponent and a common danger.

There may have been a time, long before written history was set forth when primitive people, huddled over their fires with the cold and darkness pressing in on them, realized with some suddenness that they must be brothers if they were to withstand the perils of the wilderness. Something like that has happened today. The fire America and her allies cherish and strive to keep alive is the bright flame of civilization and freedom. The cold and darkness are the possibilities of Communist despotism menacing the human spirit. Much that was good came from the conquest of the old and simpler danger. Perhaps the new danger also carries some reward, for when freedom is menaced it is valued the more; when civilization is attacked it is realized how bleak the world would be if the attack were to succeed. Americans must not merely oppose the Communist terrorism but hold up to the world a glowing and warmhearted alternative. Let America offer her friends her confidence and cooperation as equal to equal.

America has lived for some time in a kind of winter of the modern world chilled by the cold war. There have been short periods when there seemed to be a coming of spring—a possible end to the cold war, but each time her hopes have been in vain. It might be said of Americans in particular that no people in all history ever wanted more to be let alone. If the thought of American military forces being stationed in Europe, in Asia, or anywhere else overseas is accepted, it is because it is believed that this action, so many miles away, may make it a little more certain that the Americans at home may go more peaceably about their business.

America wants peace and knows that mankind cannot survive without it. Perhaps the peoples of the Communist countries would understand the principles of peace and freedom and meet the West halfway if they could be reached. For this reason America cannot afford to reject completely Communist avowals of goodwill just because she is not convinced of their sincerity. Issues such as unification of Germany and Western mutual influence in the Middle East, where Communist and Western national interests clash, must be made susceptible to negotiation. Naturally, it must be a genuine negotiation in which both sides are no longer looking for the ultimate destruction of an enemy but for the accommodation of a rival in the sincere belief that the survival of both is of more advantage to each than the destruction of either. It would indeed be difficult to make peace with Russian communism; however, peace is not made with the doctrine of communism, but with the national interests of Russia. Unfortunately, it is believed that this is the only way in which the nuclear fires may be escaped, the true creative energies of free society released, and freedom served.

The contest between the Communist and the free world must, therefore, be fought out on the diplomatic battlefields, where the battle will be won or lost by the possession or the lack of certain basic elements which decide international contests on any field. These elements include the imponderable but indispensable support of the moral forces of the world, which must recognize the justice of the Western cause, and which in the long run have toppled even the strongest tyrannies. Equally important are both military and economic strength to permit America to negotiate from a position of strength with a world power which has only contempt for weakness. In both these categories the United States must still aid the free world where necessary, and any reduction in either respect, due to either a false sense of security or a false economy, can spell disaster.

This is the way of diplomacy and power; it can spare America neither trial nor tension, but in the interminable struggle will demand realism and risktaking. It is the only way left to the free people between the distant alternative of full agreement and the near alternative of continued conflict.

TECHNOLOGY, DIPLOMACY, AND POWER

Every great achievement of modern technology may be used to bring to humanity hope and promise if mankind will work together for the common good, or may lead to despair and disaster if used for the purposes of aggression, death, and destruction. So it is with the space satellite. The rocket motors which sent it into the upper atmosphere may be harnessed for a great cooperative scientific assault on the barriers of distance in space, or they may be used to propel destruction upon defenseless millions. The fantastic speed of modern scientific and technical advance permits no procrastination in deciding on the course to take.

Wise, forward-looking diplomacy, supported with effective power, offers free men a rational hope for survival. It will tax them not only in resolution but also in resources. To prevail with diplomacy and power against the Communist world, America must undo its lies with truth and must challenge its threats of aggression with superior power. No more formidable task has ever confronted the American people. No more fearful judgment has ever awaited them should they fail.

OPENING THE BANKERS' EYES TO CREDIT UNIONS

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, last week the American Bankers Association held its 56th Annual Savings and Mortgage Conference in New York.

The American Banker has reported that the bankers attending this conference "got an eye-opening report on one of their liveliest competitors, the credit unions." The eye-opening report in question was delivered by Dr. Rudolf Modley who told the bankers that credit unions now have assets amounting to $4.3 billion and they have share holdings amounting to nearly $4 billion.

These figures bring up some important comparisons, and they raise some important questions for the future of the commercial banking system of the country.

PAID-IN CAPITAL ABOUT EQUAL

First, consider this: The share holdings, of credit unions or what we would call "paid-in capital" in commercial banking, is now about the same as the paid-in capital of all member banks of the Federal Reserve System. On June 23 of last year the paid-in capital of all these banks amounted to only $4.5 billion, or roughly one-half billion dollars more than the paid-in capital of the credit unions.

On that date the paid-in capital, plus notes and debentures of all insured commercial banks in the country, came to only $5.3 billion. In the case of all insured commercial banks, I do not have a separation of the figures as between capital stock on the one hand and the notes and debentures on the other. But that is unimportant.

The contrasts in the ways which the credit unions and the commercial banks use their paid-in capital make the interesting points.

SEVENTY-SEVEN BILLION DOLLARS OF GOVERNMENT OBLIGATIONS ON CREATED MONEY

As has beeen noted, the total assets of the credit unions are only $4.3 billion—only slightly more than their paid-in capital. Unlike the commercial banks, the credit unions do not create money. Credit unions have a certain amount of money invested, by their members, and they can lend and invest no more than the members have put in. They can make loans to their members. They can invest in certain amounts of U.S. Government securities and in insured building and loan and savings and loans institutions.

The commercial banks, on the other hand, create money. As of June 23, 1958, the insured commercial banks, on their $5.3 billion of paid-in capital, had acquired and were holding $63.5 billion of interest-bearing obligations of the U.S. Government. These holdings of U.S. Government obligations alone amounted to about 12 times the amount of their paid-in capital.

In addition, these banks held at least $13.7 billion of tax-exempt obligations of the States and subdivisions. This was the amount of such obligations which they held at the end of 1957, and such holdings have long been on the increase. It is probable that by midyear 1958 their holdings of these obligations were substantially larger.

All of the assets of the insured commercial banks on June 23 came to $225.9 billion. These assets included, in addition to the securities I have mentioned, $95 billion in loans outstanding to business, consumers, security dealers, and so on, and included about $43 billion in cash.

On the liability side of the account, insured commercial banks had, of course, some earnings on their paid-in capital which had not been distributed to the stockholders. In other words, there are earnings from previous years on the created money which by one method of comparison should be counted as invested capital. These banks had on June 23, $3.7 billion of undivided profits; $8.4 billion of surplus, and about $0.5 billion in reserves which, when added to capital, makes a total capital account of $17.9 billion. If we compare their total capital account to their holdings of U.S. Government obligations, we find that their holdings of these obligations amount to 3½ times their total capital account.

PRIVILEGES TO BANKS INTENDED FOR SERVICES TO LOCAL COMMUNITIES

I have some serious reservations about allowing the commercial banks to create money—which is done on a delegation of the power of the U.S. Government—to acquire U.S. Government securities and tax-exempt securities of the State and local governments. If it is wise to allow the commercial banks to do this, should the law be amended to permit the credit unions to operate on a fractional-reserve system and create money to buy and hold these kinds of securities?

The original idea which justified all the privileges extended commercial banking—the privilege of chartering, with limited monopoly protection, the privilege of creating money on the credit of the United States, and so on—was that the commercial banks would use these in service to the local communities. It seems to me the commercial bankers are getting too far away from their proper function—serving the credit needs of their local communities when they become simply holders of securities of the United States and tax-exempt securities of the State and local communities.

THE CORNEY DRAINAGE SYSTEM

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, the State of Louisiana is proud of its fishing and hunting areas, made possible by a plentiful supply of surface waters. Many of these are parallel streams which flow from southern Arkansas into Louisiana, thence to the Ouachita River. One such system of streams and bayous is called the Corney drainage system, consisting

of Corney Lake, Corney Creek and other tributaries.

Once the Corney Drainage System was an abundant source of fish and small game, an established recreation area, supporting commercial fishing, trapping, and providing water for livestock.

In southern Arkansas, however, oil was discovered. Large fields of oil wells sprang up along the borders of streams which formed the Corney system. Although the operation of these wells brought in valuable oils, also supplied in even greater quantity was an utterly valueless byproduct a brine of high salt and acid content.

Getting rid of the large volumes of brine was most cheaply accomplished by discharging them to the surrounding land from which they made their way into the waters of the Corney drainage system. Later, holding pits of earthern walls were hastily constructed by bulldozer operation. These were far from waterproof and the brines continued to seep into the nearby surface streams. Residents of the sportsmen's paradise in Louisiana soon found that the blessings of oil enjoyed by Arkansas signified a curse to themselves.

Pollution of these waters became so severe and complaints mounted so high, that the Public Health Service, under its enforcement powers, was called in to conduct a hearing, to look into the matter. Witness after witness took the stand to testify about the ways in which the pollution from Arkansas was damaging the stream, their uses of it, and their properties. They told of large-scale fish kills, corroded metal boat parts, disintegrated fishing lines, and the disappearance of the formerly abundant fish and wildlife. Farmers who depended upon the stream as a source of water for livestock were compelled to sell their cattle and, in one case, abandon land which, once flooded by the acid-laden waters, could no longer produce crops.

One farmer, relating his experiences, indicated the nature and effects of the water in the following colloquy:

Question. When you noticed the bad effects of this water, did you taste it?

Answer. Man, it stunk so bad you couldn't afford to taste it. Too much slime in it, and stuff like that * * * I had a nice peach orchard, selling peaches every year, and I had this land all plowed up and broke up there, and this overflow backed in on it there, and in 6 weeks' time every tree was dead.

Another farmer, in matter-of-fact language that masked what must have been a personal economic catastrophe, described how the polluted water affected him.

Question. Will you explain what you were doing on those 90 acres of land and what occurred to you?

Answer. Well, we used it mostly as a dairy farm. We had a lot of other land rented that we also used, and in 1952 pollution hit us; we felt a little results of it. In 1953 it almost got us; and in 1954 it completely got us.

Question. When you say it completely got you, what happened?

Answer. We quit.

Question. How many head of cattle did you have?

Answer. We had a total of about a hundred and thirty or forty head.

Question. What did you do with them?

Answer. We lost 96 head of them, they died.

Question. What happened to the timber along the creek where the creek overflowed?

Answer. It began to die, and also, the land it backed out on, approximately 60 or 70 acres, it ruined it totally as a pasture and as farm land.

A trapper told of how his business of trapping along Corney Creek was damaged:

Everything has been killed in the creek, and the furbearing animals has done quit traveling it. They don't feed there any more; there's nothing there for them; not even a frog.

And another citizen of the area who spent several thousand dollars building a private camp along the waters of the creek was forced to give up the use of it because of the pollution:

Of course the loss to me has been the loss of the use of my camp which has been rendered entirely useless, but the principal loss to me is the loss in my family recreation with my two boys whom I used to be able to take out of school at three o'clock in the afternoon and take them up there for a nice fishing trip.

As a consequence of this testimony, the Public Health Service compelled the oil-well operators to install equipment for pumping brines back into the wells themselves in order to avoid further contamination of the streams. Despite these installations, because the soil in the area has been so thoroughly impregnated with brines which still wash into the stream each time it rains, it will be years before the waters of the Corney drainage system are restored to their former quality.

NATIONAL MILK SANITATION BILL

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, March 9, a number of my colleagues from Wisconsin, Minnesota, and Iowa and I called to the attention of the House the national milk sanitation bill we are sponsoring. My bill is H.R. 3840. On the afternoon of that day, Al Stedman, an outstanding editorial and feature writer, farm editor, and recognized authority on Federal milk sanitation standards and milk orders, wrote an editorial in the St. Paul (Minn.) Pioneer Press, entitled "Uncle Sam's Milk." This is one of the leading newspapers in the Midwest. In this editorial, he calls attention to what is going on under our eyes in the way of a new Federal milk order in the Washington area. This order is so far-reaching that—and I quote Mr. Stedman's editorial—"it applies itself to sales of milk to all Government agencies, whether Federal, State, or local. This includes all defense agencies and military posts, docks, wharves, piers, and ships in the Nation's key defense area. And it applies specifically to fresh or frozen concentrated milk that can be and often has been sold to Government defense agencies at economical costs to them." Mr. Stedman also states: "Finally, an order omission opens the way for Washington area milk prices and Government milk costs to rise as high as the artificial restriction of supply helps push them. The order regulates supplies but not prices."

Mr. Speaker, I include with my remarks the article by Mr. Stedman along with the proposed Federal milk order. I think it would be well if the proper committee would look into this new Federal milk order, as it will affect our Armed Forces in the Washington, D. C., area.

Mr. Stedman's article follows:

In formidable and bipartisan strength, Midwest House Members in Washington this afternoon will raise for later decision a key issue. This is the question of abolishing Federal, State, and municipal barriers against freedom of interstate commerce in milk of established wholesomeness and quality. Their abolition would be achieved by enactment of the Lester Johnson bill.

Special target will be the new Federal milk order now being proposed for the Washington area by the U.S. Department of Agriculture. This amazing 15,000-word Government edict would regulate milk supplies for the District of Columbia and nine surrounding counties in Virginia and Maryland. The order is in itself a summation of types of milk barriers being used to wall out milk that can compete with local dairy monopolies.

The order starts by complaining against "increasing competition" from such outside milk. It proceeds to impose the usual Federal restrictions plus some more. Then it gives special Federal sanction to milk regulations of surrounding municipalities. Thus it authorizes them to bar any outside milk they choose by simple refusals to inspect, as Washington already does.

From that point, the proposed order applies itself to sales of milk to all Government agencies whether Federal, State, or local. This includes all defense agencies and military posts, docks, wharves, piers, and ships in the Nation's key defense area. And it applies specifically to fresh or frozen concentrated milk that can be and often has been sold to Government defense agencies at economical costs to them.

Finally, an order omission opens the way for Washington area milk prices and Government milk costs to rise as high as the artificial restriction of supply helps push them. The order regulates supplies but not prices. Its stipulated prices are merely minimums. Right now actual Washington area milk prices are much above the order's show-window figures.

Of course, the 2,000 or so dairy farmers supplying that market have a natural advantage due to location and hauling costs that cannot be taken from them. But why deliberately erect artificial barriers on top of the natural one? Our Government claims to be founded on principles of freedom of competition and enterprise. These principles can be applied in ways that treat Government suppliers fairly. Or, in the face of severe budget problems, they can be flouted to discriminate between citizens and inflate Government costs.

Midwest dairying asks that these principles be reaffirmed by enactment of the Johnson bill. Our farmers, cooperatives, and milk handlers are Americans, too. They pay taxes to the Government. Their sons help man its defenses. They ask Congress by enacting the Johnson bill to get rid of such harmful and costly discriminations as the proposed Washington order exemplifies.

[From the Department of Agriculture, Agricultural Marketing Service, 7 CFR pt. 902, Docket No. AO-293]

HANDLING OF MILK IN WASHINGTON, D.C., MARKETING AREA—NOTICE OF REVISED RECOMMENDED DECISION AND OPPORTUNITY TO FILE WRITTEN EXCEPTIONS THERETO WITH RESPECT TO PROPOSED MARKETING AGREEMENT AND ORDER

Pursuant to the provisions of the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, as amended (7 U.S.C. 601 et seq.), and the applicable rules of practice and procedure, governing the formulation of marketing agreements and marketing orders (7 CFR pt. 900), notice is hereby given of the filing with the hearing clerk of this revised recommended decision of the Deputy Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture, with respect to a proposed marketing agreement and order regulating the handling of milk in the Washington, D.C., marketing area. Interested parties may file written exceptions to this recommended decision with the hearing clerk, room 112, Administration Building, U.S. Department of Agriculture, Washington 25, D.C., not later than the close of business the 10th day after publication of this decision in the Federal Register. The exceptions should be filed in quadruplicate.

Preliminary statement: A public hearing on a proposed marketing agreement and order was called by the Agricultural Marketing Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture, following receipt of a petition filed by the Maryland and Virginia Milk Producers Association. The hearing was held in Washington, D.C., on April 8–19, 1957, pursuant to a notice duly published in the Federal Register on February 27, 1957 (22 F.R. 1116). The period until June 14, 1957, was allowed interested parties for the filing of briefs on the record.

Upon the basis of the evidence introduced at the hearing and the record thereof, the Deputy Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, on May 26, 1958 (23 F.R. 3719), filed with the hearing clerk, U.S. Department of Agriculture, his recommended decision on all issues except the issue of class I price. It was stated in the decision that the hearing would be reopened to receive further evidence on this issue. The period until July 2, 1958 was provided for the filing of written exceptions to the recommended decision.

The reopened hearing was held on September 22–25, 1958, pursuant to a notice duly published in the Federal Register (23 F.R. 6909). The notice set forth a revised class I price proposal made by the proponent cooperative association and stated that interested parties might submit additional evidence on all issues included in the original hearing notice. The period until November 3, 1958, was allowed interested parties for the filing of briefs on the record.

In arriving at the conclusions and recommendations set forth in this revised decision consideration has been given to the record evidence of the reopened hearing and to the exceptions filed to the initial recommended decision.

The material issues of record related to:

1. Whether the handling of milk in the market is in the current of interstate commerce or directly burdens, obstructs or affects interstate commerce in milk or its products;

2. Whether marketing conditions justify the issuance of a marketing agreement or order; and

3. If an order is issued what its provisions should be with respect to:

(a) Scope of regulation;

(b) The classification of milk;

(c) The level and method of determining class prices;

(d) The method to be used in distributing proceeds among producers; and

(e) Administrative provisions.

Findings and conclusions: Upon the evidence adduced at the hearing and the record thereof, it is hereby found and concluded that:

Character of commerce: The handling of milk in the Washington, D.C., marketing area is in the current of interstate commerce and directly burdens, obstructs, or affects the handling of milk and its products.

The Washington fluid milk market is an interstate market encompassing not only the District of Columbia but the immediately adjacent counties of both Maryland and Virginia. Within this market there is a substantial and continuing interstate commerce, both in the procurement of milk and in the sale of fluid milk and its products.

The District of Columbia which is but a part of the area comprising the whole market, is entirely urbanized and must rely completely on movements of milk in interstate commerce for its supply. Milk for the market is regularly supplied by dairy farmers in the four-State area of Maryland, Pennsylvania, Virginia, and West Virginia. Statistics presented by the Maryland and Virginia Milk Producers Association, whose members produce approximately 90 percent of the total market supply, indicate that for the month of March 1956, 49 percent of their milk originated from farms located in the State of Virginia, 46 percent from farms in the State of Maryland, 2 percent from farms in the State of Pennsylvania and 2 percent from farms in the State of West Virginia. In addition, at least two substantial handlers in the market procure their milk supply from other sources. One of these dealers procures his supply through the Capitol Milk Producers Association from farms located in the States of Virginia and Maryland. The other dealer, whose bottling and distributing plant is located outside the District of Columbia in the State of Maryland, procures his supply primarily from two cooperative associations, one of whose plants is located in the State of Pennsylvania and the other in the State of Virginia. Milk from the Virginia plant is supplied by dairy farmers located in Virginia and in West Virginia. The milk from the Pennsylvania plant is supplied by dairy farmers in Pennsylvania, Maryland, and in West Virginia.

Distributors whose plants are located in the District of Columbia have regular and substantial route sales, both wholesale and retail, extending into the adjacent counties of both Virginia and Maryland. One such distributor also makes regular sales into the State of Delaware as well as on the Eastern Shore of Maryland and Virginia. Distributors whose plants are located in nearby Maryland and distributors whose plants are located in nearby Virginia regularly compete with distributors whose plants are located in the District of Columbia for contract sales to Federal and/or State installations in the District of Columbia and in Maryland and Virginia. One substantial handler processes and packages frozen concentrated milk at his Washington, D.C., plant which milk is later transported to naval installations in the State of Florida. In addition, the Maryland and Virginia Milk Producers Association makes substantial spot sales of bulk milk to outlets in the States of New Jersey, North Carolina, and Florida.

Milk produced for the local fluid market, but which may be in excess of current fluid needs, is processed into manufactured milk products in nearby manufacturing plants which products are sold on the national market in competition with similar products from all parts of the country. In addition manufactured dairy products such as cottage cheese, sour cream, and ice cream are distributed in the local market from sources outside of the District of Columbia or the States of Maryland and Virginia.

From the foregoing it is evident that the vast majority of the milk in the Washington market does move in the current of interstate commerce and directly burdens, obstructs or affects interstate commerce of milk and its products.

Need for an order: Marketing conditions in the Washington, D.C., marketing area justifying the issuance of a marketing agreement and order.

For a period of about 14 years from February 1940 to August 1954, marketing conditions in the Washington market were, in general, orderly and stabilized. During the period from February 1940 until April 1947 the market was regulated under Federal Order 45. That order was terminated effective April 1, 1947, at the request of the Maryland and Virginia Milk Producers Association, a cooperative association representing the majority of the producers supplying the market. Throughout the period in which the order was in effect the market was generally in short supply and supplemental outside milk was regularly imported to meet the fluid needs of the market. After the termination of the order the market continued to be in short supply until early in 1951. Throughout the period in which the market was in short supply the blended prices returned to all producers on the market were very near the class I price.

Subsequent to the termination of the Federal order the Maryland and Virginia Milk Producers Association continued to market the milk of its producer-members on a classified use basis and to return a blended price to its members. The Capitol Milk Producers Association, which markets the milk of its producer-members through one substantial handler in the market, on the other hand, has sold the milk of its members on a flat price basis which price has approximated the blended price which the Maryland and Virginia Milk Producers Association has returned to its members. The handler who purchases this milk has maintained a very high Class I utilization, currently about 95 percent. The utilization of the Maryland and Virginia Milk Producers Association, while varying, has in some months of 1956 been as low as 65 percent in class I.

A substantial handler who prior to October 1, 1954, purchased his milk from the Maryland and Virginia association on a classified use basis now purchases his milk from two cooperatives, one in Virginia and one in Pennsylvania, on a negotiated flat price basis. The handler's current utilization approximates 95 percent of class I. The loss of this class I outlet has increased the volume of milk from members of the Maryland and Virginia Milk Producers Association utilized in manufacturing uses, thus lowering the blended prices returned to the members of this association, and indirectly, the returns to members of the Capitol Milk Producers Association whose milk is purchased on a price related to the Maryland and Virginia blended price. At the same time the advantage which the handler buying milk through the Capitol Milk Producers Association has maintained over other handlers in the market in the cost of class I milk has been further enhanced. The record evidence does not reveal the prices paid by the one handler to the two cooperatives who supply his needs. However, it does show that the prices paid to the two cooperatives are not necessarily the same and do vary from month to month.

The trend of increasing milk supplies in the Washington market is typical of the

dairy industry generally throughout the country. With the increase in milk supplies locally and in adjacent markets, Washington handlers who purchase their milk on a classified use basis have encountered increasing competition in their regular route distribution as well as on contract sales to Federal Government installations. Government contract purchases in the Washington area represent a substantial part of the total class I sales in the market. In recent years Washington area handlers have encountered increased competition from outside dealers using milk surplus to their normal market with the result that bid prices to supply class I milk to Government installations currently reflect values only slightly in excess of milk disposed of in manufacturing use.

In an effort to preserve their established class I outlets the Maryland and Virginia Milk Producers Association has priced milk to its buyers at prices calculated to meet the competition from the flat price buyers in their regular trade and the outside dealers on contract business for Government installations. One substantial handler testified that his company paid as many as six different class I prices for the same quality milk. This must be presumed to be typical of all other handlers in the market since the association witnesses pointed out that all of the regular buyers purchasing milk for any particular outlet were charged the same prices. Notwithstanding the efforts of the local producers to hold their class I outlets, local handlers have not been entirely successful in holding the contract business.

The Maryland and Virginia Milk Producers Association currently supplies nearly 90 percent of all the class I milk for the market and an even greater proportion of the reserve supply. In earlier years arrangements with one of the larger handlers in the market who maintains a receiving and manufacturing plant at Frederick, Md., provided a basis whereby the cooperative association could direct milk to the several handlers in the quantities and at the time needed. Milk not needed for fluid uses was held at the Frederick plant for manufacturing uses. In order to better service the market and to return the highest possible prices to its producer-members the association in 1955 acquired its own manufacturing plant. This acquisition has provided substantially greater flexibility in marketing on the part of the association. Notwithstanding, the loss of class I outlets, and the extensive price cutting which has prevailed over an extended period, have resulted in increasing market instability, which if continued, may lead to a complete breakdown of the marketing system. This situation constitutes a continuing and serious threat to a dependable supply of pure and wholesome milk for the Washington area.

It is concluded that the issuance of a marketing agreement and order for the Washington market will contribute substantially to the stabilization of the fluid milk market and will tend to effectuate the declared policy of the act. The adoption of a classified price plan based on audited utilization of handlers will provide a uniform system of pricing of milk to all handlers and will assure a fair division of returns to all producers. The public hearing procedure required by the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act will provide opportunity for representation of producers, handlers, and to the public to present information on marketing conditions and participate in the determination of prices for milk in the area.

The marketing area: The Washington, D.C., marketing area should include all of the territory in the District of Columbia; the city of Alexandria and the counties of Arlington, Fairfax, Prince William, all in the State of Virginia, and the counties of Prince Georges (exclusive of the corporate limits of the town of Laurel), Montgomery, Charles, and St. Marys; the southern portion of Calvert County, and the southern portion of Frederick (including the city of Frederick), all in the State of Maryland, together with all piers, docks, and wharves connected therewith and including all territory within such boundaries which is occupied by Government (municipal, State, or Federal) installations, institutions, or other establishments.

The maximum area of regulation as set forth in the several proposals contained in the hearing notice included, in addition to the area herein proposed, the counties of Accomack and Northampton in Virginia and the counties of Talbot, Dorchester, Wicomico, Worcester, Somerset, the remaining portion of Calvert County and portions of the counties of Washington, Howard, and Anne Arundel, and the town of Laurel in Prince Georges County, all in the State of Maryland.

The population of the area as herein proposed, according to the 1950 census, is in excess of 1,500,000 persons, of which approximately 800,000 are in the District of Columbia. Unofficial population estimates introduced in the record of the hearing indicate an overall population growth in this area from 1950 through 1956 of more than 33 percent, the greater part of which has taken place in the nearby Maryland and Virginia counties. The principal populated areas outside of the District of Columbia include: Alexandria, Arlington, Falls Church, Fairfax and Manassas, Va.; Bethesda, Chevy Chase, Rockville, Silver Spring, Hyattsville, Riverdale, Mount Rainier, College Park, La Plata, Leonardtown, Prince Frederick, and Frederick, Md. The major Federal installations in the area include Andrews Air Base, Bolling Field, Bethesda Naval Hospital, Cameron Station, Fort Belvoir, Fort Myer, Fort McNair, Mount Alto Veterans' Hospital, National Institutes of Health, Naval Air Station, Naval Gun Factory, Naval Receiving Station, Patuxent Air Station, Quantico Marine Base, St. Elizabeths, and Walter Reed Hospital.

Milk for the marketing area as herein proposed is produced under the applicable health regulations of the District of Columbia, or the States of Maryland and Virginia and in some instances local jurisdictions. Milk produced under District of Columbia inspection is sold throughout the area since it is acceptable under all of the applicable ordinances. Milk produced under State or local health inspections, while generally of similar quality, cannot be distributed in the District of Columbia and it is not clear from the record to what extent the respective State or local health authorities accept reciprocal inspection. Distributors from the District of Columbia compete with one another throughout most of the area herein proposed. The greater part of their business is done in the highly urbanized area comprised of the District of Columbia, Montgomery and Prince Georges Counties in Maryland, and the city of Alexandria and the counties of Arlington and Fairfax in Virginia. Throughout this area District of Columbia handlers are the primary handlers. However, they meet substantial local competition in both Virginia and Maryland.

District of Columbia handlers also do the preponderance of the overall fluid milk business in Charles and St. Marys Counties, Md., and are substantial handlers in the southern portion of Calvert County and the Frederick County, Md., area and in Prince William County, Va. These areas, though substantially more rural in character than the other parts of the proposed area, represent substantial sales areas in which District of Columbia handlers operate.

The Frederick County area herein proposed for inclusion was specifically requested by local handlers who are the primary distributors there but who would be brought under full regulation by virtue of the sales which they make into Montgomery County. A local Frederick handler appeared at the reopened hearing to support the inclusion of additional territory in Frederick County, contending that he had substantial business beyond the proposed limits of the marketing area and would be disadvantaged in the sale of milk outside the marketing area in competition with unregulated milk.

The area in question was not noticed in either the original or the reopening notice of hearing and no point in this regard was raised in exceptions filed to the recommended decision. Inclusion of territory not previously noticed in accordance with the applicable rules of practice and procedure cannot be considered on the basis of this record. However, if after an order is promulgated it appears desirable to consider inclusion of additional territory in Frederick County in the marketing area this may be accomplished through an amendment hearing.

It was concluded in the initial recommended decision that all of Calvert County, Md., should be included in the marketing area. On the basis of exceptions filed to the recommended decision and evidence adduced at the reopened hearing, it is now concluded that Baltimore handlers do the preponderance of business in the northern portion of this county and accordingly, that only the area of Calvert County which lies south of Maryland State Highways 507 and 263 appropriately should be included in the marketing area.

Prince William County has experienced a very considerable suburban development in recent years, particularly in the Manassas area. With the exception of the southernmost tip, the county is served exclusively by District of Columbia handlers and by local Virginia handlers who would be regulated by virtue of their business in other parts of the proposed area.

Proponents for inclusion of the Quantico Marine Base contend that under present circumstances the contract milk distributed through the base commissary is a serious disruptive factor over a wide area of Prince William County. The Quantico Marine Base has been a substantial outlet for handlers who will be brought under regulation by the order. While such handlers have not exclusively held this contract they have been the primary suppliers. In order to remove this source of disruption to orderly marketing within the regulated area Quantico Marine Base must be included.

The record indicates that the boundaries of the Quantico Marine Base extend beyond Prince William County into Stafford County. However, that portion of the base in Stafford County is exclusively used as a maneuver and firing range. The inclusion in the marketing area of that portion of the base within Prince William County will encompass all of the administrative barracks, quarters, and sales area of the base and will tend to implement the intent of regulation.

A dealer who operates a plant at Fredericksburg, Va., proposed that the portion of the Fredericksburg area of the Virginia State Milk Central Commission which lies in Prince William County, with the exception of the Quantico Marine Base, be excluded from the marketing area. This particular dealer was the principal proponent for the inclusion of the Quantico Marine Base in the area. It would be impractical to exclude this area if the Quantico Marine Base is included. The extent of business done by this dealer in the immediately surrounding area is such that with little adjustment in his business he may become fully regulated or remain outside the scope of regulation as he deems best. In any event, the provisions of the order are so drafted that he has substantial latitude of choice in the matter of impact

of regulation upon his operations. In the interest of orderly marketing, it is necessary that the entire area of Prince William County be included in the marketing area.

It is intended that the sales of fluid milk from piers, docks, and wharves and to crafts moored thereat be included in the marketing area. It is also intended that the area include all the territory occupied by Government reservations, institutions, or other such establishments whether municipal, State, or Federal if they fall within the limits of the area as defined. The record indicates that in general the quality requirements for milk for such installations are patterned after the U.S. Public Health Standards and are similar to those for milk sold in other parts of the marketing area. These, by location and past performance represent logical areas of distribution for Washington, Virginia, and Maryland dealers who are in substantial competition with one another in the marketing area. Unless they are included, regulated handlers will be placed at a serious competitive disadvantage in competing with unregulated dealers for such sales. The inclusion of these areas will tend to assure uniform and equal costs as between handlers.

The marketing area as herein defined comprises a contiguous, generally heavily populated territory served by the same handlers. Such area is in reality a single milk market, all part of which are regulated by health ordinances generally similar in scope and enforcement, which constitutes a practical unit for the proposed regulation.

The town of Laurel, in Prince Georges County, Md., historically has been served almost exclusively by Baltimore distributors. While Washington area handlers who would be brought under regulation by this order, have some sales there, such sales are a minor portion of their total sales and the inclusion of the town might bring under regulation Baltimore distributors who do the major portion of their business beyond the limits of distribution of Washington handlers.

Although the extreme southern portion of Anne Arundel County and a portion of Howard County were proposed for inclusion in the marketing area, the record provides no basis for determining the extent of business done in this area by Washington dealers and it is not possible to ascertain whether in fact Washington, Baltimore, or local dealers are the primary distributors. It is apparent that distribution here by Washington handlers is not extensive and inclusion of these areas under regulation is unnecessary at this time.

While one substantial Washington handler distributes milk through an independent vendor in the Eastern Shore counties of Dorchester, Somerset, Talbot, Wicomico, Worcester, Accomack, and Northampton, this area is basically rural in character and its inclusion in the area would bring under regulation a number of distributors doing a large portion of their business in other parts of Maryland and the State of Delaware where Washington area handlers have little or no distribution. This distribution by the Washington handler constitutes a minor portion of his overall fluid business. It is neither administratively feasible nor necessary to include within the marketing area all of the territories in which Washington handlers do any business. Ideally, the established marketing area boundaries should encompass that area in which handlers who would be regulated do the preponderance of their business and should leave a minimum of competition with unregulated handlers outside the area. The inclusion of any part of the eastern shore area would not tend to implement this position, but would place local handlers serving the area in a disadvantageous position relative to their competition in their normal area of distribution outside of the marketing area.

Although a portion of Washington County, Md., was proposed for inclusion in the marketing area the record fails to substantiate the fact that any handler who would be regulated is presently serving this area and its inclusion at this time is unnecessary.

Milk to be priced: The plants which distribute milk in the Washington, D.C., marketing area disposed of the major portion of their milk receipts for fluid consumption. Milk intended for fluid consumption in the Washington area is required to be produced in compliance with inspection requirements of the duly constituted health authorities having jurisdiction in the area. The minimum class prices of the order should apply to such milk which is regularly received from dairy farmers at plants primarily engaged in the fluid milk business and which pasteurize and bottle milk for fluid distribution on retail or wholesale routes (including routes of vendors) or through plant stores in the marketing area or which is received at plants which are regular and substantial suppliers of milk to such pasteurizing, bottling or distributing plants. This milk may be identified by providing appropriate definitions of the terms: "Approved plant," "pool plant," "handler," "dairy farmer," "dairy farmer for other markets," "producer," "producer-handler," "producer milk," and "other source milk."

These definitions are designed to identify the supplies of milk on which the market regularly and normally depends. However, under the terms of the order herein proposed milk may be disposed of for fluid consumption in the marketing area by and from plants not meeting such criteria. It is necessary, therefore, to establish definitive standards of performance which may be used in determining which plants and what milk constitute the regular sources of supply and therefore become fully subject to regulation. Such standards are set forth in the order and apply uniformly to all plants wherever located. Any plant, regardless of location, may bring itself under regulation by performing in the manner required. Any plant may relieve itself from regulation by no longer operating in a way that brings it within the scope of the order. Under the circumstances, the decision as to whether a plant will be regulated or unregulated is determined by the decision of the plant operator.

The class I price under a Federal order is fixed at a level which exceeds the value of milk for manufacturing uses. This value or differential over milk used for manufactured dairy products is essential as an incentive to producers to supply the market with an adequate supply of pure and wholesome milk for fluid consumption. The extra cost incurred by producers who supply milk which meets the requirements for class I milk must be borne by that portion of the milk which is marketed as class I milk. Milk in excess of class I uses, although an essential part of the fluid milk business, cannot be expected to return producers more than a manufacturing value. The only outlet for reserve milk not needed for fluid uses is in the form of manufactured milk products and such products must be marketed on a national market in competition with similar products which can be, and are, made throughout the country from ungraded milk.

In establishing an appropriate class I price it is intended that the level shall be such as will attract only that volume of milk which is needed to meet the fluid needs of the local market plus the necessary reserve to assure an adequate supply throughout the year.

Because of the distances that eastern fluid markets are from areas of alternative supply in the Midwest, the price for milk for fluid uses in eastern markets is higher in relation to manufacturing milk values than is the case in the Midwest. Under such circumstances there might be an incentive for dealers in unregulated adjacent markets to seek a class I outlet in the Washington market for temporary or seasonal surpluses in excess of their local market needs. Because of the substantial number of Government installations in the area which procure their milk supplies on a competitive bid basis for relatively short periods there is a considerable opportunity, unless appropriate safeguards are provided, for such unregulated dealers to market milk excess to their local needs at prices below the value of milk for fluid uses. They may do this by bidding off available contracts at such Government installations. This situation, would be a serious disruptive factor to orderly marketing in the Washington marketing area. It is essential, therefore, that the order be constructed in a manner which will safeguard the market from serving as a surplus disposal area for surrounding markets.

As indicated elsewhere in this decision, marketwide pooling of producer returns is considered essential to the stable and orderly functioning of the market. One of the primary problems in setting up a marketwide pool is to establish appropriate standards which accommodate the sharing of class I sales among those dairy farms who constitute the regular source of supply for the marketing area. Performance standards, therefore, should be such that any milk plant which has as its major function the supplying of milk for fluid use in the marketing area would participate in the marketwide equalization pool. On the other hand, such standards should be sufficiently flexible to permit intermittent shipment of milk from supply plants not regularly identified with the local market and direct distribution from plants which have only a minor part of their overall fluid business in the area without subjecting such plants to full regulation.

Full regulation of such plants is unnecessary to accomplish the purposes of the order and might result in placing such plants at a competitive disadvantage in supplying the unregulated but primary markets with which they are normally associated.

Any plant which disposes of milk in the marketing area as Class I milk or which supplies milk to a plant which disposes of class I milk in the area is intended to be an "approved plant." An approved plant other than that of a producer-handler, from which class I milk equal to not less than 50 percent of its receipts of milk from dairy farmers is disposed of in the form of class I milk during the month on routes (including routes operated by vendors) or through plant stores to wholesale or retail outlets and which disposes of not less than 10 percent of such receipts on such routes in the marketing area should be a fully regulated pool plant. The pool plant definition should also include an approved plant which has no direct distribution in the marketing area but which disposes of 50 percent of its receipts from dairy farmers during any month(s) of October through February or 40 percent of such receipts during any month(s) of March through September to another plant(s) which disposes of class I milk equal to 50 percent or more of its receipts from dairy farmers and receipts from other approved plants and which disposes of at least 10 percent of such receipts as class I milk on routes in the marketing area.

Any plant distributing fluid milk in the marketing area and which disposes of less than 50 percent of its total receipts from dairy farmers as class I milk cannot be considered as primarily in the fluid milk business and any distributing plant which does

less than 10 percent of its total fluid business in the marketing area cannot be considered as substantially associated with the local market.

In like manner, any supply plant which during the shortest production months does not ship at least 50 percent of its total receipts from dairy farmers to fully regulated distributing plants cannot be considered as primarily associated with the market. Any such plant which is a pool plant in each of the months of October through February should be a qualified pool plant in each of the months of March through September regardless of the quantity then shipped unless the operator thereof elects to withdraw the plant from regulation. This provision will accommodate the pooling of all milk primarily associated with the market under changing supply-demand relationships which occur from season to season.

A plant which was a nonpool plant during any of the months of October through February should not be permitted pool plant status in any of the immediately following months of March through September in which it is operated by the same handler, an affiliate of the handler or any person who controls or is controlled by the handler. It would be inappropriate to permit a handler pooling status during the flush months of production if his milk were used to supply outside class I markets during the short production months when such milk would be most needed by the local market. This provision, however, will permit a handler, who during certain short production months ships the required percentages, to pool his plant(s) in those months in which the standards are met. If the milk is utilized for other markets during part of the short season, it will not permit the pooling of such supplies during the months of flush production.

It is recognized that the demand for milk from supply plants may vary seasonally and will be greatest during the season of low production. During the months of flush production supplies of milk received at plants located in or near the marketing area may be sufficient to supply the class I outlets, in which case it would be more economical to leave the most distant milk in the country for manufacturing and utilize the nearby milk for class I use. Performance standards under the order should not force milk to be transported to distributing plants during the flush months merely for the purpose of maintaining eligibility for pooling.

To avoid uneconomic movements of milk provision should be made whereby a plant may maintain pool status throughout the year if it supplies a substantial portion of its producer milk to the market during the normal low production months. The order, however, should not force such a supply plant to pool during the flush if it does not meet the current supply requirements and the operator thereof elects to withdraw his plant from the pool. The order provisions are drafted to require qualification of a supply plant on the basis of the current month's performance except that a plant which has previously qualified in each of the months of October through February may retain pool status during the March through September period unless application is made to the market administrator to be a nonpool plant during those months.

Provision should be made whereby pool plant status is accorded any manufacturing plant operated by a cooperative association if the production of at least 70 percent of its members is regularly received at other pool plants. The Maryland and Virginia Milk Producers Association, whose members supply nearly 90 percent of the milk for the market, operates a manufacturing plant to provide for orderly disposition of the excess or reserve milk in the market. This association, acting as the marketing agent for all of its producer members, daily moves milk (by assigning producers) directly from the farm or through receiving stations to its buyers in the amounts required for class I and related uses. Milk not so needed in the market and for which no class I outlet is available is moved to the association plant for processing. The volume of receipts at this plant varies from day to day and month to month depending on the needs of the several handlers and the variation in production. Although the operation of this plant is very beneficial to the orderly marketing of milk for this market, the nature of the operation carried on would not result in pool status under the standards for distributing or supply plants.

The qualification for pool plant status is a means of establishing identity of plants with the fluid market. In this regard, however, it must be recognized that the arrangement of the Maryland and Virginia Milk Producers Association is unique and does not lend itself to performance requirements of the usual nature. The milk of its producer members which is received at its manufacturing plant is a part of the regular supply for the local fluid market and is available to the several handlers in the market whenever needed. While the manufacturing plant does not carry District of Columbia health approval, this in no way affects its status as a surplus disposal plant or its functions of carrying the reserve supply of milk for the market.

The performance standards herein provided for a manufacturing plant operated by a cooperative association describe a particular basis of operation in this market and will accommodate the pooling of milk regularly associated with this market.

It was proposed at the hearing that provision be made whereby a system of distributing and supply plants could qualify as a unit if the overall system met the distributing plant pooling requirements. It was concluded in the recommended decision that the system pooling requested was not needed and that the pooling requirements, as recommended, were reasonable and necessary to define those plants which were sufficiently associated with the fluid market to be included in the pooling arrangement. The proponent for a system pooling arrangement excepted to this conclusion stating that it was essential that the company's two manufacturing plants be accorded pooling status and that the provisions as recommended were inappropriate in that they would not accomplish this end. Exceptor further stated that if the pooling provisions were not revised some other procedure must necessarily be devised to permit their manufacturing operations access to pool milk.

It is not clear why exceptors hold that the pool should furnish a milk supply for their manufacturing operations. It is apparent that the market now operates almost exclusively under bulk tank handling and that the plants in question now have little function as supply plants. While they at one time may have been intimately associated with the market as receiving plants and/or as balancing plants, much in the same way as the cooperative association's plant now operates, they no longer are essential to the market as a whole in this role.

The order is intended to assure an adequate, but not excessive, supply of quality milk to meet the fluid needs of the market only. The pooling requirements herein recommended are minimum standards and under the existing market structure it is expected that virtually all distributing plants will have a substantially higher class I utilization than the 50 percent requirement established. To permit system pooling of supply plants and distributing plants as requested would tend to implement the inclusion in the pool of plants with little or no direct association with the market and primarily engaged in manufacturing operations.

Plants primarily engaged in manufacturing operations and not meeting the pool plant qualifications herein recommended should not be granted pool status, nor should the order be so drafted that handlers are encouraged to develop a milk supply solely for manufacturing uses. It is recognized that processing facilities must be available to the market to permit orderly disposition of the necessary market reserve and seasonal surplus resulting from day-to-day and month-to-month variations in supply and demand. To the extent that such surpluses exist, handlers with nonpool manufacturing operations need not be encumbered in their ability to process such surpluses through their own facilities. This can be accomplished through appropriate diversion provisions which will permit direct delivery from the farm to such nonpool plants without loss of pool status for the milk involved. However, to promote the integrity of regulation such diversion should be accommodated only to the extent necessary to assure orderly handling of the necessary market surplus. The diversion provisions hereinafter set forth will accomplish this end.

It was concluded in the recommended decision that when milk moves to market in tank trucks owned or operated by, or under contract of a cooperative association the cooperative should be held as the responsible handler. A number of exceptions were filed to this conclusion. Exceptors state that milk now moves to market via independent haulers and that holding the cooperative as the responsible handler would adversely affect present handler-producer relationships and quality programs which are currently being carried on. Certain proprietary handler exceptors also contend that if the cooperative were made the responsible handler the order must necessarily make clear that such cooperative would absorb any shrinkage between the farm and plant of first receipt. Cooperative exceptors on the other hand state that they would be placed in a disadvantageous position if required to absorb such shrinkage.

The record is not clear as to precisely what extent the cooperative actually controls the independent hauler. In view of the fact that proprietary handlers have expressed a desire to be held as the responsible handlers and the proponent cooperative is reluctant to accept the shrinkage resulting from farm to plant movements it is concluded that the operator of the pool plant at which producer milk is first received should be held the responsible handler. However, in the case of milk which is first received at the plant of a cooperative association and which is subsequently disposed of to a proprietary handler the order should require that such handler pay the cooperative association not less than the minimum order prices applicable at the location of the transferee plant. The act clearly establishes the intent that no cooperative association may sell milk to any handler at less than the prescribed order class prices.

Some milk distributed in the marketing area may be from plants which are fully subject to the classification and pricing provisions of other Federal milk marketing orders. To extend the application of this order to cover such plants which dispose of the major portion of their receipts in another area would result in unnecessary application of regulation. Accordingly, the order proposed herein provides that a distributing plant which would otherwise be subject to the classification and pricing provisions of another order and which disposes of a greater volume of class I milk in such other area than in the Washington area shall not be regulated by this order. Also, any supply plant which disposes of a greater volume of milk under another order and which would be subject to the classification and

pricing provisions of the other order would be exempted from regulation under this order. This condition would not be applicable during the months of March through September, however, if such plant had been a supply plant under this order in each of the preceding months of October through February. While some milk may be distributed in the marketing area from plants regulated under another order and will not be subject to regulation under this order, such plants should be required to report their receipts and utilization to the market administrator so their exact status under the order can be determined.

A "handler" should be defined as (1) any person in his capacity as the operator of one or more approved plants or any other plant which is a pool plant, and (2) any cooperative association with respect to the milk of any producer which it causes to be diverted to a nonpool plant for the account of such association.

Inclusion in the handler definition of the operator of any approved plant which does not qualify as a pool plant, including a producer-handler, is necessary in order that the market administrator may require reports as he deems necessary to determine the continuing status of such individual. In the case of an approved plant which is a distributing plant but does not acquire pool status because of insufficient direct sales in the marketing area, such reports are necessary to determine the amount payable by the operator of such plant on the milk distributed in the marketing area.

The handler definition should be sufficiently broad so as to include a cooperative association with respect to producer milk diverted by it from a pool plant to a nonpool plant for the account of such association. This arrangement will permit the cooperative association to divert milk for class I use which might otherwise be used or disposed of by the proprietary handler in class II and thus will promote efficient utilization of producer milk in the highest available use class. The handler definition should also include a cooperative association with respect to its operations of a manufacturing plant which meets the requirements of a pool plant hereinbefore described.

The term "dairy farmer" means any person who produces milk which is delivered in bulk to a plant. The term "dairy farmer for other markets" as herein proposed is intended to designate those dairy farmers whose milk production is primarily associated with other markets and which should not be accorded pooling status along with regular producers for the market.

Under usual circumstances the Washington market is adequately supplied with milk. Any needed supplemental supplies would most likely be required during the short production months. This is also the period when milk would be in greatest demand in other surrounding fluid markets which represent alternative outlets for milk produced by local dairy farmers. Under the marketwide type of pooling herein provided any dairy farmer or group of farmers with an alternative outlet during the short season might find it advantageous to leave the Washington market during those months when milk is in greatest demand and seek to return during the flush production months when the outside market was no longer available. While it is not intended that Federal regulation should preserve a market for any particular qualified producers to the exclusion of other qualified dairy farmers, the regulation should not provide a means whereby through manipulation certain dairy farmers may preserve their class I outlets for themselves and dispose of their surplus in the pool. Under the terms of the order as hereafter set forth a dairy farmer delivering milk to a pool plant during the flush production months of March through September, who during the preceding short production months of October through February delivered his milk to a nonpool plant operated by the same handler, or an affiliate thereof, would be considered a dairy farmer for other markets during the flush months of March through September.

The "dairy farmer for other markets" definition should also include those dairy farmers whose milk is received at the manufacturing plant of a cooperative association, which plant is a pool plant, for the account of another cooperative association which has no membership among producers delivering to other pool plants. The manufacturing plant of the Maryland and Virginia Milk Producers Association, herein proposed to be a pool plant, from time to time processes milk purchased from a cooperative association in the neighboring Baltimore market which milk is in excess of the fluid needs of the Baltimore market. Such milk is not available for fluid distribution in the local market. It is handled in the manufacturing plant of the local cooperative as a service to the Baltimore cooperative and hence cannot be construed to be a part of the normal milk supply for the Washington market. A continuation of this relationship will in no way adversely affect the application of regulation and will facilitate orderly marketing of milk both in the Washington and Baltimore area.

The term "producer" should be defined to mean any person other than a producer-handler or a dairy farmer for other markets, who produces milk which is approved by the appropriate health authority having jurisdiction in the marketing area for consumption as fluid milk in the area and which milk is received at a pool plant.

The definition should be sufficiently broad to include a dairy farmer whose milk is ordinarily so received but is diverted by a handler to a nonpool plant for his account on not more than 8 days (4 days in the case of every-other-day delivery) during any month of October through February and at any time during the months of March through September. In order that milk which is so diverted continues to be included in the regular pool computations, it should be treated as if received at the pool plant from which it was diverted.

As previously indicated, it is intended that the order shall assure an adequate, but not excessive, supply of milk for the fluid market. The order provisions should not be so drawn as to encourage an excess volume of milk to associate with the pool. During the months of October through February it is not necessary to accommodate diversions to nonpool plants except insofar as may be necessary to assure orderly handling of the weekend surpluses which accrue because plant bottling operations may be suspended during weekends.

The months of March through September are the months of greatest production during which unlimited diversion privileges are desirable in order to expedite the orderly disposition of the necessary surplus.

Milk disposed of to Government installations under contract sales is required to meet specified standards patterned after the U.S. Public Health standards which are similar to those in effect in other parts of the area. It is intended that dairy farmers whose milk is received at a plant used to fill contracts for Government installations in the marketing area shall be considered as qualified producers in such month(s) when their milk is so disposed of if the plant at which their milk is first received is a fully regulated pool plant during such month(s).

In the case of milk regularly received at a manufacturing plant operated by a cooperative association which is pooled on the basis of its function as a reserve plant, further identification standards are needed to properly define those dairy farmers whose milk is approved for fluid consumption in the marketing area. Without such identification milk may be received and included in the pool which does not meet the sanitation requirements for fluid consumption in the marketing area.

Under usual circumstances dairy farmers producing milk for fluid distribution in the marketing area hold individual farm inspection permits issued by the appropriate health authority having jurisdiction in the marketing area. However, under certain circumstances, milk may be received at distributing or supply plants serving the area from dairy farmers which do not hold such permits. It must be presumed in such cases that the milk is acceptable to the appropriate health authority having jurisdiction and therefore any dairy farmer whose milk is so received should be considered to be a producer.

The manufacturing plant of the local cooperative association as hereinbefore explained, does not have health approval to move milk to other pool plants for fluid consumption. Hence, it is possible that some of the milk received at this plant is not qualified for fluid distribution in the market. It would be impractical to require the market administrator to make individual determination as to whether each dairy farmer's milk so received is of acceptable quality for fluid use. It is therefore appropriate in the case of dairy farmers who deliver their milk to a manufacturing plant owned by a cooperative association, which is pooled on the basis of its function as a reserve plant for the market, to require that such farmers in order to acquire producers status hold valid farm permits issued by the appropriate health authority having jurisdiction in the marketing area.

The definition of producer as herein provided will identify those persons who deliver milk to pool plants which is acceptable to the appropriate health authorities for fluid consumption in the marketing area. It also identifies those persons to whom the minimum prices are to be paid and who share in the marketwide pool under the terms of the proposed order.

The term "producer milk" is intended to include all skim milk and butterfat contained in milk produced by producers and received at pool plants directly from such producers. As previously stated certain diversions are permitted and such diverted milk is considered as a receipt at the plant from which it is diverted.

A "producer-handler" is defined as any person who operates a dairy farm and an approved plant from which class I milk is disposed of in the marketing area and who received no other source milk or milk from other dairy farmers. Since a producer-handler receives only milk of his own production or pool milk from other handlers it is unnecessary to subject such an operation to the pooling and payment provisions of the order. However, as previously indicated it is necessary that the plant operator in his status as a handler be required to make reports to the market administrator in order that his continuing status as a producer-handler can be ascertained and to facilitate accounting with respect to transfers from other handlers.

The classification provisions of the proposed order should provide that any milk in the form of class I products transferred by a pool handler to a producer-handler will be class I milk. Any supplemental supplies of milk which may be obtained from other handlers, by virtue of the type of operation involved, may be presumed to be needed by the producer-handler for fluid use and should be classified in the supplying handler's pool plant as class I milk. A producer-handler may receive pool milk from other handlers and still maintain his status as a producer-handler.

Any milk which a handler receives from a producer-handler should be "other source milk" and would, therefore, be allocated to the lowest class utilization at the pool plant after the allocation of shrinkage on producer milk. Milk disposed of to another handler by a producer-handler must be presumed to be surplus to the operation of the producer-handler and since other producers do not share in the class I utilization of the producer-handler it would be unfair to ask such producers to share their class I utilization with the excess milk of a producer-handler. This method of allocating producer-handler milk will preserve producers' priority on the class I sales in the market.

Exceptors to the above conclusion suggested that some further limitation should be placed on producer-handlers, by restricting their ability to use milk other than own farm production, by limiting the number of farms which such individuals might operate or by limiting their volume of distribution. The record indicates that there are few producer-handlers operating in the market and there is no showing that they have been a disturbing factor in the market. Accordingly, it is concluded that further limitations of the proposed nature are not necessary at this time.

The term "other source milk" should be defined as all skim milk and butterfat utilized by a handler in his operation except milk and milk products in the form of class I milk received from pool plants, inventory in the form of class I milk and current receipts of producer milk. The term should include all skim milk and butterfat in products other than class I products from any source, including those produced at the handler's plant during the same or an earlier month, which are reprocessed or converted to other products during the month. Other source milk is intended to represent all skim milk and butterfat from sources not subject to the classification and pricing provisions of the attached order. If other source milk is disposed of in class I products, partial pricing and regulation is provided under compensatory payment provisions. Defining other source milk in this manner will insure uniformity of treatment to all handlers under the allocation and pricing provisions of the order.

Classification of milk: All milk and milk products received by pool handlers should be classified on the basis of skim milk and butterfat according to the form in which, or the purpose for which, such skim milk and butterfat was used or disposed of as either class I milk of class II milk.

Under an order, only producer milk is priced. Milk is received, however, at pool plants directly from producers, from other handlers and from other sources. Milk from all of these sources is intermingled in the handlers plant(s). It is necessary, therefore, to classify all receipts of milk to properly establish classification of producer milk.

The conditions in this market make it appropriate to provide for a two class classification scheme. Class I milk should include those products which are required by the local health authorities in the various segments of the marketing area to be made from milk from approved sources. Class II milk should include those products which compete on a national market with similar products. Such products are not required by the local health authorities to come from approved sources under their jurisdiction. Products which are permitted by the local health authorities to be sold in the area from milk from unapproved sources include ice cream, cottage cheese, sour cream, eggnog, evaporated milk, aerated whips, and milk in hermetically sealed containers. Although local health authorities require local handlers to use approved milk in their fluid milk plants in the manufacture of such manufactured products they permit similar and competing products to be sold in the marketing area from unapproved sources. Under such circumstances it would not be feasible economically to classify and price such products in class I. To do so would place local handlers at a competitive disadvantage in the disposition of such products and would virtually deny a market for the reserve milk supplies of the market. Moreover, the classification and pricing of such products in class I would extend regulation beyond the limits necessary for orderly and stable marketing.

The extra cost of getting quality milk produced and delivered to the market in the condition and quantities required makes it necessary to provide a price for milk used in class I products somewhat above manufacturing milk prices. This higher price should be at such level that it will yield a blend price to producers that will encourage production of sufficient quantities of milk to meet the market needs for these class I products and the necessary market reserve.

Milk not needed seasonally or at other times for class I use must be disposed of for use in manufactured products. These products must be sold in competition with products made from unapproved milk. Milk so used should be classified as class II and priced in accordance with its value in such outlets.

Under the proposed classification scheme, class I milk would comprise all skim milk (including that used to produce concentrated milk and reconstituted or fortified skim milk) and butterfat: (1) Disposed of (other than in hermetically sealed container) in fluid form or as frozen concentrated milk for human consumption as milk, flavored milk, skim milk, flavored skim milk, cultured skim milk, buttermilk, cream, (except sour cream) including any mixture of cream and milk or skim milk containing less butterfat than the regular standard for cream; and (2) not specifically accounted for as class II milk.

Class I products such as skim milk drinks and buttermilk to which extra solids have been added, or concentrated whole milk disposed of for fluid use, should be included under the class I definition. The quality requirements for the milk used to produce such milk solids or concentrated milk are the same as for the milk used to produce the skim milk to which such solids are added and other products included in class I. The classification scheme herein established provides for a full accounting of all skim milk and butterfat and in the event products classified as class II are later disposed of in a different form any reclassification should apply to the respective volumes of skim milk and butterfat originally used to produce such products.

All skim milk and butterfat used to produce products other than those classified in class I should be class II milk. This classification would include all of those products which are generally considered as manufactured milk products not required by the health authorities to be made from approved milk.

Handlers have inventories of milk and milk products at the beginning and end of each month which enter into the accounting for the receipts and utilization. The accounting procedure will be facilitated by providing that end-of-the-month inventories of all class I products be classified as class II milk, regardless of whether such products are held in bulk or in packaged form. Inventories of such products on hand will then be subtracted under the proposed allocation procedure from any available class II disposition in the following month. The higher use values of any class I product in inventory assigned to current producer receipts during the month and which may be allocated to class I milk in the following month should be reflected in returns to producers. The mechanics of the attached order provide for the reclassification of inventories on that basis.

Inventories of class I products on hand at a pool plant at the beginning of any month during which such plant first becomes a pool plant should likewise be allocated to any other available class II utilization at the plant during the month. This will preserve the priority of assignment of current producer receipts to current class I use.

Under usual circumstances in the operation of a fluid-milk plant, small unavoidable losses of both skim milk and butterfat are experienced. Such losses are normally referred to in the trade as "shrinkage." Since it is intended that a handler be required to make a full accounting for all plant receipts on a classified use basis, it is necessary that provision be made for the classification of such plant shrinkage.

The operations carried on by local handlers are such that plant-shrinkage experience in this market is somewhat lower than the average market. The record clearly establishes that an allowable shrinkage on producer milk of not more than 1½ percent will cover normal plant operations. Accordingly, it is concluded that shrinkage of producer milk not in excess of 1½ percent of total producer receipts should be classified as class II and any shrinkage in excess of that quantity should be classified as class I.

In the determination of shrinkage of producer milk, total shrinkage should first be prorated between receipts of producer milk and receipts of other source milk. None of the shrinkage should be assigned to milk received from other pool plants since shrinkage on such milk is allowed to the transferring handler. All shrinkage of other source milk should be classified as class II. The classification procedure herein recommended gives adequate protection in the classification of shrinkage on producer milk and it is unnecessary to limit the classification of shrinkage on other source milk in class II.

Skim milk and butterfat are not used in most products in the same proportions as contained in the milk received from producers, and therefore should be classified separately according to their separate uses. The skim milk and butterfat content of milk products, received and disposed of by a handler, can be determined through certain recognized testing procedures. Some of these products such as ice cream and condensed products, present a more difficult problem of accounting in that some of the water contained in the milk has been removed. It is proposed, in the case of such products, that the respective volumes of skim milk and butterfat be ascertained by the use of adequate plant records made available to the market administrator or by use of standard conversion factors of skim milk and butterfat used to produce such products. The accounting procedure to be used in the case of any concentrated products such as condensed milk and nonfat solids should be based on the pounds of milk or skim milk required to produce such products.

Each handler must be held responsible for a full accounting of all of his receipts of skim milk or butterfat in any form. The handler who first receives milk from producers should be responsible for establishing the classification thereof, and for making payment to producers. This principle is followed consistently in federally regulated markets and is necessary to assure effective administration of the order.

Except for that shrinkage which may be classified in class II under conditions previously described in this decision, all skim milk and butterfat which is received and for which the handler cannot establish utilization should be classified as class I milk. This provision is necessary to remove any advantage to handlers who fail to keep complete and accurate records and to assure

that producers receive full value of their milk on the basis of its use.

Because of spoilage or as a result of the handler's inability to salvage route returns butterfat and skim milk in the form of class I products may be disposed of from time to time, for livestock feeding. It is provided that such a disposition shall be classified as class II if verifiable evidence of such disposition is available to the market administrator.

From time to time handlers may find it necessary to dump skim milk. Under such circumstances, the market administrator must be provided opportunity to witness the actual dumping, if he deems it necessary, and to otherwise have verifiable evidence to substantiate such reported disposition. Such class II utilization may be allowed only when the handler during normal business hours has given the market administrator at least 3 hours advance notice of intention to dump and information regarding the quantity of skim milk involved.

No allowance is made for butterfat dumped even though the skim milk dumped, and for which a class II classification is provided, is a component of a fluid milk product from which the butterfat has not been removed. Under normal circumstances, the butterfat component of any fluid milk product is salvagable and it is not desirable to permit dumping of butterfat under other than a class I classification.

Producer proponents at the hearing proposed a three-class classification scheme similar to the plan which they now employ in marketing their milk with handlers in the market. As previously indicated, under the order as herein proposed, skim milk and butterfat are classified separately in accordance with their actual dispositions and are priced in the class in which they are utilized. Under such circumstances it is unnecessary to provide for more than two classes of utilization. All of those products which are designated as class I are required by the local health authorities to be made from approved milk. Those products designated as class II are not subject to this requirement and local produced milk so disposed of must compete on a national market with similar products made from unregulated milk. To establish a separate classification and a higher pricing for milk disposed of in any of these products could seriously restrict such outlets as a disposition for the necessary reserve of the local market.

One handler proposed that milk which was disposed of as frozen concentrated milk to military installations for use outside the continental United States be classified in a class I–A and be priced below the price of milk disposed of in other class I products. Official notice is taken that the quality specifications established by the Defense Department for such milk are the same as those for fresh fluid milk. Under such circumstances it would be improper to classify and price milk so utilized as other than class I.

As previously indicated classification of skim milk and butterfat used for the production of class II products should be considered to have been established when the product is made. Classification of skim milk and butterfat used to produce class I products should be established when such products are actually disposed of. Classification of such class I products disposed of by transfer to another plant, under certain circumstances, should be determined on the basis of their utilization in the transferee plant.

Skim milk and butterfat in the form of any class I product transferred to the pool plant of another handler, should be classified as class I unless both handlers indicate in their reports to the market administrator that such classification should be class II. However, sufficient class II utilization must be available in the transferee plant to cover any claimed class II classification after the prior allocation of shrinkage, other source milk, and inventory of class I products. Skim milk and butterfat disposed of in bulk in the form of any class I product to an approved plant other than a pool plant or the plant of a producer-handler should be classified as class I milk up to the extent of such plant's disposition of skim milk and butterfat, respectively, as class I milk in the marketing area. Any remaining amount of such transfer or diversion should be assigned to the highest remaining utilization in the transferee plant after the prior assignment of receipts at such plant from dairy farmers who the market administrator determines constitute its regular source of approved supply for the outside area. This procedure will complement the application of the compensatory payment provision and will provide the nonpool handler with class I sales in the marketing area with the opportunity to choose whether he shall offset such class I sales with pool purchases or make compensatory payments to the pool. In either event the pool handlers have assurance that nonpool handlers will not have a price advantage on milk disposed of in the marketing area. It is not intended that pool milk should displace a nonpool handler's regular receipts from dairy farmers which meet the quality requirements of the health authority having jurisdiction in the area in which his outside sales are made. However, because of the known high quality of pool milk, transfers of pool milk to a nonpool distributing plant should take priority assignment in the highest available use class ahead of other receipts of milk at such plant except regular receipts from dairy farmers meeting local health approval.

Skim milk and butterfat disposed of in bulk in the form of milk, skim milk, or cream to a nonpool plant other than an approved plant either by transfer or diversion should be class I unless specified conditions are met. If the transferee plant is located not more than 300 miles distance from the zero milestone in Washington, D.C., by shortest highway distance the transferring handler should be permitted to claim classification as other than class I. In such instance the transferee handler must maintain adequate books and records of utilization of all skim milk and butterfat in his plant which are made available to the market administrator, if requested, for verification purposes and must have utilized at least an equivalent amount of skim milk and butterfat, respectively, in the reported use. Provision for verification by the market administrator is reasonable and necessary to assure that producer milk will be paid for in accordance with its utilization. The record shows that there are ample manufacturing facilities within a 300-mile distance of Washington to handle any prospective surplus of the market. Unless some limitation is provided on the distance beyond which shipments of milk, skim milk, and cream are permitted in class II classification, it would be necessary for the market administrator to follow any such shipments of milk, skim milk, and cream to their destination to determine utilization and classification. Such procedure would of necessity increase the costs of administering the order. Under usual circumstance in this market, milk, skim milk, and cream which is moved in excess of 300 miles distance from the zero milestone in Washington, D.C., is for fluid uses. It is appropriate therefore both for administrative convenience and for the conservation of market administrative funds to provide automatic classification in class I for milk, skim milk, and cream which is moved more than 300 miles distance from the zero milestone in Washington, D.C.

The class prices established by the order apply only to producer milk. Accordingly, since a plant may receive skim milk or butterfat from sources other than producer milk a procedure must be established whereby it may be determined what quantities of milk in each plant should be assigned to producer milk. The milk from producers who are regular suppliers of milk for the Washington market should be given priority of the assignment of class I utilization at pool plants. When milk is received from other sources it should be assigned to class II milk first. Unless this procedure is followed there can be no assurance that such other source milk would not be used to displace producer milk in class I when it is advantageous to the purchasing handler. If the order permitted handlers to obtain other source milk for class I uses whenever it was advantageous to do so while producer milk in the plant was utilized in class II the order would not be effective in carrying out the purposes of the act and the market would be deprived of a dependable supply of milk.

In the assignment of other source milk, any such milk received from sources not regulated by an order issued pursuant to the act should be first assigned to class II milk. The plant(s) supplying such milk may not have purchased it from dairy farmers on a classified use basis and it is not feasible to determine this or other conditions of sale. Following the assignment of such unregulated other source milk, other source receipts in the form of class I products received from plants regulated by other orders issued under the act should be assigned to the lowest remaining available use classification. Under this procedure a handler has assurance that if his producer receipts are inadequate to meet his class I needs and he purchases regulated milk from another Federal order market such milk will be assigned to class I. Since it is not intended that there be any compensatory payment on other source milk which is fully regulated under another order and which is disposed of for class I use in this market, this sequence of assignment will tend to minimize the application of the compensatory payment provision.

One proprietary handler proposed that following the assignment of unregulated other source milk an amount equal to 10 percent of the receipts from regular producers be allocated to class II prior to the allocation of other source milk from a regulated plant under another Federal order. Proponent contended that such procedure would protect the handler in months when his overall receipts from producers equaled or exceeded his fluid needs but were inadequate during certain days of the month.

The record evidence shows no need for such allocation during recent years. In fact, since 1951 there has been no milk purchased by Washington handlers from outside sources to supplement local producer deliveries for utilization in fluid products. Production by local producers has been running in excess of class I requirements during all months of the year. Further, the Maryland and Virginia Milk Producers Association has readily moved milk from surplus plants to its buying handlers for fluid uses. During recent years the Maryland and Virginia Association had supplied an adequate amount of local producer milk to meet all their fluid needs during every month of the year. With adequate supplies of milk available from local producers and with marketwide movements of such milk to the local handlers when needed, it would be inappropriate to permit such other source milk to displace producer milk in class I in this market.

If after making the various assignments of skim milk and butterfat pursuant to the allocation provisions of the order, the total of all class I and class II milk assigned to producer milk exceeds the amount of producer milk reported to have been received by the handler for whose pool plants the computation is being made, such overage should be assigned first to the available class II utilization and any remainder to class I.

Such overage should be paid for by the handler at the applicable class prices. In the allocation procedure recognition is taken of all receipts of other source milk reported by the handler. When utilization records indicate a disposition greater than receipts it must be presumed that the handler underreported his receipts of producer milk.

The accounting procedure as herein proposed would establish a calendar month as the accounting period. One handler proposed at the hearing that some flexibility be provided in the accounting period so that a handler might in as many as 3 months during any one year choose to break a calendar month into two accounting periods. It was contended that such a provision would provide reasonable assurance to a handler that in any month in which the relationship between his supply of producer milk and his class I utilization fluctuated to the point that during a part of such month he had a more than adequate supply, and during the remainder of such month an inadequate supply, his producer milk would not displace his necessary purchases of other source milk in class I. The Washington market is presently adequately supplied with milk from local producers and carries a sufficient reserve supply to meet all handlers' needs in all months of the year. This reserve supply, which when not needed for fluid uses, is processed at the manufacturing plant of the principal cooperative association in the market is available to all handlers in the market and may be readily shifted from plant to plant as needed. Under such circumstances no need was shown for this proposed provision in this market.

The level and method of determining class prices: In order to restore and maintain orderly marketing conditions in the Washington, D.C., marketing area, it is essential that minimum prices for class I and class II milk be established at such levels as will maintain an adequate but not excessive supply of quality milk for the fluid market and assure the orderly disposition of the necessary market surplus.

The production area for the Washington market is largely coextensive with that for the Baltimore market and in certain areas overlaps the production areas for the Philadelphia and New York markets as well as a number of local markets. It is essential in order to restore and maintain orderly marketing of milk in the area that producer returns maintain a close alinement with competitive prices paid to dairy farmers supplying these neighboring markets.

Class I price: A basic class I price of $5.10 per hundredweight for the months of March through June and $5.55 per hundredweight for the months of July through February should be established for the Washington market to be effective for the first 18 months in which the order is in operation. An adjustment mechanism should be provided which will move such price either upward or downward, as the case may be, to reflect the average movement in the class I price levels in the Philadelphia, New York, and Chicago markets.

Proponents at the original hearing proposed that a basic class I price level of $5.86 be established and that movements in the U.S. Wholesale Commodity Price Index, as published by the Bureau of Labor Statistics, U.S. Department of Labor, be used as a temporary mechanism for adjusting the basic price to meet current economic conditions. They pointed out that a committee of nationally recognized economists and specialists were then engaged in a detailed study of the local market with the purposes of developing a specific proposal for a pricing mechanism to reflect the peculiarities of the local market and of recommending an appropriate level for the class I price.

It was concluded in the initial recommended decision that the record did not support a price level of $5.86 and that the use of the U.S. Wholesale Price Index did not provide an adequate basis for maintaining the local price in alinement with milk values in the national market. It was further concluded that the hearing should be reopened on the issue of class I price after the committee had completed its investigations and a specific proposal had been received setting forth its recommendation for a class I pricing formula.

Members of the committee appeared at the reopened hearing and presented their recommendations and the reasons therefor. They proposed a basic annual price level of $5.55 with a price of $5.10 to be applicable during the months of April, May, and June and a price of $5.70 to be applicable in other months of the year. They further proposed that changes (from levels prevailing in the same months of 1957) in the Federal order class I prices for the Chicago, Philadelphia, and New York markets be used as a basis for automatic adjustment of the Washington class I price to assure continuing alinement of the local price with those of other markets and with changing conditions of supply and demand both regionally and nationally. And finally, they proposed that such pricing mechanism be made effective for a period of from 12 to 18 months and that after a year's operation of the order the provisions thereof be reviewed, and if necessary modified in light of experience under the order.

The committee, in recommending an annual class I price level of $5.55, concluded that such price, in conjunction with the class II price set forth in the original recommended decision, would return to dairy farmers a blended price approximating that which they had actually received in 1957. While they recognized that there had been a steadily increasing supply of milk over an extended period of time and that current supplies were somewhat in excess of the fluid needs of the market, they took the position that such excess was not unreasonably large and that there were positive indications of a leveling off of supplies. They therefore concluded that the blended prices actually returned to producers in the previous year could be considered as an appropriate level of prices for the first 12 to 18 months under an order.

While the committee was inclined to view the general leveling off of supply which occurred in late 1957 and through the spring of 1958 as an indication that prices were not sufficiently high to attract greater volumes of milk, such factors as the pool quality of feed resulting from the 1957 summer drought and the wet, cold spring of 1958 undoubtedly had an influence on production during this period. It is apparent that there is, and has been, a somewhat larger than necessary milk supply and that there are no physical barriers to further increased production. Moreover, even though proponents suggested that bulk tank handling will tend to deter such increase, the record indicates that only about half of the bulk tank milk is presently delivered daily and that farm tanks generally are not being used to capacity.

In any event, the class I price in the local market cannot be established at a level which would exceed the cost of securing dependable alternative supplies. The Chicago milkshed represents an appropriate area for determining such alternative cost, because of its existing dependable reserve supply and its past experience as a supply of milk to fluid markets throughout the country.

The 55–70 mile zone class I price under the Chicago Federal order during 1957 averaged $4.03 and in 1958 will approximate $3.92, both exclusive of supply-demand adjustments which reduced the price approximately 18 and 19 cents, respectively, in such years. Since the supply-demand adjuster in the Chicago order is intended to reflect the supply-demand situation in the local market it need not be a consideration in establishing the basic price level in a market as far distant as the Washington market.

Milk would not likely move to outside markets from near-in Chicago plants and it is appropriate therefore that price comparisons be related to the order prices in that market's surplus supply area. The committee suggested Shawano, Wis., as an appropriate point from which milk might move to the Washington market. Shawano is in the 12th zone under the Chicago order and a 22-cent location adjustment is applicable at that point. According to Rand McNally Road Atlas, Shawano is 914 highway miles from Washington, D.C. The schedule of transport rates for fluid milk issued by Dairyland Transport Company, a nationally recognized transport company doing considerable business in hauling between the Midwest and eastern markets, which was presented in evidence at the hearing, indicates a charge of $1.52 per hundredweight for moving milk 920 miles. The Chicago average 12th-zone price for 1958 adjusted for transportation to Washington, D.C., would suggest $5.22 as the appropriate level of class I price for Washington.

Proponents, however, contend that any price based on comparative costs from Chicago should recognize the markup which the seller of spot milk customarily includes in his selling price. They suggest that such charges may vary from 0 to 75 cents depending upon the market involved, the season and alternative outlets for milk.

In establishing an appropriate price level for the Washington market, the available alternative supply sources must be considered as a potential regular supply source in which case the charges, of the nature suggested, would not be applicable. Under the Federal order program it is a generally accepted principle that producers should bear the cost of moving milk from the farm to the central market. This is accomplished by pricing milk at the location of the plant of first receipt and by providing appropriate location differentials to reflect transportation costs to the market. When milk is received directly at the city the handler bears the costs associated with physical receipt of the milk.

In some instances handlers operate country receiving plants where milk is received, assembled and cooled for shipment to the city. In such cases, the country plant performs many of the necessary functions otherwise performed at the city plant. Whether milk is received at country plants, or directly at the city is largely the choice of the individual handler whose decision is undoubtedly related to his physical plant setup and can be presumed to result in the most economical overall cost to him. Hence, it is not appropriate that producers be asked to bear the cost of operating country receiving plants.

Nevertheless, it seems apparent, in the case of milk movements from the Chicago area to Washington, that the selling handler in recognition of his alternative outlets and use of such milk would pass on to the purchaser the cost of services performed in receiving, assembling and cooling. Under normal circumstances such costs should approximate the costs Washington handlers incur in direct receipt at city plants. Hence, costs of loading milk at the Chicago plant, and unloading at the Washington plant which costs are directly related to and for this purpose may be considered a part of the transportation cost, are additional necessary costs which may appropriately be considered in determining the cost of alternative supplies.

Official notice is taken of the decision of the Assistant Secretary on proposed amendments to the Philadelphia order issued on November 25, 1957 (22 F.R. 9600) in which it was found that the fixed costs associated with loading a tanker approximated 10 cents per

hundredweight and that the cost of receiving tanker milk at the city approximated 5.5 cents per hundredweight. It seems likely that such cost would not vary substantially between markets. Hence, it is appropriate for this analysis that a figure of 15.5 cents be added to transportation costs between Chicago and Washington to secure an appropriate alternative cost figure for establishing a Washington market price.

The addition of 15.5 cents to the Shawano, Wis., Chicago order price plus transportation would provide a price level of $5.375 per hundredweight which for administrative convenience is rounded to $5.40. This is concluded to provide an appropriate annual price level for the Washington market for the initial 18 months.

Milk prices in fluid milk markets throughout the country normally vary seasonally, being highest in the short production months and lowest in the months of flush production. Notwithstanding the fact that producers in the Washington market have not sold milk to dealers at seasonally varying prices (for reasons later explained) it is desirable that some seasonality be provided to insure that the cost of alternative supplies during the flush production months will not be sufficiently below the Washington price to encourage handlers to drop local milk during this period in favor of cheaper supply sources. The months of normal flush production in the several markets vary somewhat due primarily to variations in weather and pasture conditions. The months of March through July, however, are generally considered to constitute the period of flush production. Washington is a notable exception in that July is the month of lowest production. Under these circumstances, it is concluded that an appropriate intermarket pricing relationship can be maintained throughout the year if a price of $5.10 and $5.55 respectively is provided for the periods of March through June and July through February.

Notwithstanding the fact that the pricing herein recommended is limited to a period of 18 months, it is essential that some mechanism be provided to assure that the price during such period will reflect the current supply-demand situation in the market and maintain an appropriate relationship with prices in surrounding markets. Lack of marketwide information at this time deters the formulation of a supply-demand adjuster based on local market conditions. The committee recommended an adjustment mechanism based on the average movements in the Philadelphia, New York, and Chicago Federal order class I prices. They pointed out that the Washington market production area overlaps that of Philadelphia and to a degree that of New York and hence bulk milk supplies regulated by these orders are, in many instances, within easy trucking distance of Washington. They concluded, therefore, that notwithstanding the need for general price alinement with Chicago, for reasons previously stated, it is essential that a close alinement also be maintained between class I prices in the Washington, Philadelphia, and New York markets.

Since the adjustment mechanisms of the New York and Philadelphia orders are based on broad economic indications and the Chicago order uses a mechanism that relates the class I price to values of manufacturing milk, the relating of Washington price movements to the average price movements in these three markets will have the effect of bringing each of these to bear on the Washington price.

It is concluded that this mechanism will produce appropriate changes in the Washington class I price which reflect changes on the national market for milk and cost factors affecting the supply and demand for milk and will maintain a reasonable alinement of price between markets during the interim period of operation of the order. Since the interim class I price herein recommended is based on 1958 data it is appropriate that the three-market average movements be related to the same month in 1958 rather than 1957 as recommended by the committee.

The Washington market has not been accustomed to frequent price changes. Frequent price changes of a few cents would serve no useful purpose in this market. The committee recommended that the interim class I price be effective without adjustment within a range of plus or minus 15 cents from the three-market average for each month when compared to the corresponding month of the base year (1958) and that movements in the three-market average in excess of 15 cents but not exceeding 35 cents in total provide an adjustment of 20 cents in the Washington price. Subsequent adjustment to the Washington price would be made in 20-cent multiples following each 20-cent change in the three-market average price. The committee recommendations in this regard are concluded to represent an appropriate procedure for maintaining the desired intermarket price alinement.

Proponents for a larger marketing area than that herein recommended requested that, if their marketing area proposal was not acceptable, a separate classification and pricing mechanism be provided for fluid milk products sold outside the marketing area which would assure a price competitive with that of unregulated handlers in such area. It is concluded that such a provision would not be appropriate.

The essentials of the classified pricing plan as herein proposed and generally applicable to all Federal orders issued by the Secretary are to establish one level of price for milk which is sold as fluid milk or fluid milk products for fluid consumption and another lower price or prices for the necessary surplus of the market which is disposed of in lower-valued manufactured products. It is intended that the class I price herein proposed will bring forth a sufficient supply to meet the demands of milk for the marketing area, but not necessarily to fulfill the requirements of outside markets. Producer milk sold for fluid uses outside the marketing area has the same characteristics of bulk and perishability, is produced under identical conditions and cost and is subject to the same transportation costs in moving from the farm to the handlers' pool plant, as is milk disposed of in the marketing area. Different health and sanitation requirements in markets outside the marketing area might result in different costs of producing milk for those markets only, but would have no effect on the production costs of producer milk sold to Washington handlers.

Neither is it intended, moreover, that adjacent outside markets be used as dumping grounds for milk in excess of a regulated market's needs. The fixing of a lower price for milk sold in other markets could have a depressing effect on the price paid farmers by competing unregulated distributors in such markets. Such action would also tend to lower blended returns to producers in the Washington market with the result that the level of price for milk to be sold within the regulated market might have to be raised to provide incentive for the production of a sufficient supply to fulfill the market needs.

Class II price: Some milk in excess of class I requirements is necessary in order to maintain an adequate supply of fluid milk for the market on an annual basis. This excess milk must be disposed of in manufactured products which under the proposed classification system would be class II. The class II price should be maintained at the highest level consistent with facilitating the movement of class II milk to manufacturing outlets when it is not needed in the market for class I purposes. Such price should not be established at a level so low as to encourage handlers to procure milk supplies solely for the purpose of converting them into class II products.

The available manufacturing facilities associated with the market are sufficient to handle any prospective market surplus. The Maryland and Virginia Milk Producers Association, which handles the bulk of the market surplus, proposed that milk disposed of for other than class I purposes be priced on the basis of butterfat values as reflected in the Philadelphia market cream price quotations and skim values as reflected in the Chicago market dry milk price quotations. Substantially the same formula which proponents proposed, and which was generally supported by handlers in the market, has been used in the market as a basis for pricing milk surplus to fluid needs over an extended period of years dating back to and including the time during which order No. 45 was in effect.

The formula as herein proposed would base the butterfat value on the Philadelphia market weekly quotations per 40-quart can of 40 percent sweet cream approved for Pennsylvania and New Jersey for each week ending within the month as reported by the U.S. Department of Agriculture, and would provide a make allowance of $2 per can of cream. In order that butterfat values may not be unduly depressed by local market conditions in the Philadelphia area as reflected in such cream price it is provided that the butterfat value shall not be less than the average grade A (92-score) butter price at New York as reported by the U.S. Department of Agriculture for the month less 17 cents. This arrangement will provide assurance to local producers that the class II price will continuously reflect competitive eastern butterfat values.

The skim milk value under the formula as herein proposed would be based on the average of the Chicago daily market quotations for roller and spray nonfat dry milk as reported by the Department of Agriculture for the period from the 26th day of the preceding month through the 25th day of the month for which the class II price is being determined and reflects a make allowance of approximately 5½ cents per pound of powder.

It is concluded that values determined from the proposed formula will provide a proper basis of pricing class II milk in the Washington market. The formula as herein proposed would have yielded an average class II price of $3.23 for the year 1957. While such price is 17 cents higher than the New York class III price, it is only 2 cents over the Philadelphia class II price and appropriately reflects the value of milk going into manufactured products in this market. This level of class II pricing should provide for the orderly disposition of milk in excess of fluid needs and at the same time will return to producers a competitive use value for such milk. A higher price for class II milk than that herein proposed might result in a loss of outlets for local producer milk for manufacturing uses and hence, would not be in the interest of orderly marketing.

The classification system hereinbefore set forth provides for a full accounting of all skim milk and butterfat. While milk is priced to handlers at a basic test it is intended that the butterfat values be as precisely related to open market cream or butter values as is practical. Hence, the price to handlers for differential butterfat is rounded to the nearest one-tenth cent. For reasons later explained the butterfat differential to producers is rounded to the nearest full cent. Since a different butterfat differential is charged to handlers than is paid to producers it is necessary that the payments for differential butterfat be cleared through the producer-settlement fund.

The health regulations applicable in the marketing area permit the standardization of milk for consumer use. Open market cream can be sold in a substantial part of the marketing area. Excess cream must be disposed of in the open market or utilized in manufactured products. Producer milk delivered to Washington handlers is intended primarily for fluid milk requirements of the market and the butterfat differential should be designed to encourage the production of milk with a butterfat content about the same, or at least as high, as the butterfat content of fluid milk products sold by handlers. To set the butterfat differential above competitive values would encourage handlers to utilize alternative sources of butterfat. Setting the producer butterfat differential at a higher level than competitive prices would encourage producers to produce milk with a higher butterfat content than needed for fluid uses.

The basic test at which milk has been sold to handlers and uniform prices paid to producers historically has been 3.5 percent in this market. Both producers and handlers proposed that the 3.5 percent basic test be maintained. Producers and handlers generally supported a proposal that the butterfat differential be determined on the basis of open market cream values.

It is concluded that the class I butterfat differential value should directly reflect the open market value of sweet cream for fluid uses as determined from current price quotations on the Philadelphia cream market. Such value may be derived by dividing by 334.8 the average of all weekly quotations for 40-quart cans of 40 percent sweet cream approved for Pennsylvania and New Jersey in the Philadelphia market as reported each week ending within the month by the U.S. Department of Agriculture.

Should the class II butterfat differential exceed the value determined through this calculation, however, the class II butterfat differential should be used as the class I butterfat differential value.

The class II butterfat differential should be directly related to the butterfat values in the class II pricing formula. Such values reflect the competitive value of butterfat for manufacturing uses and will implement the orderly disposition of butterfat in excess of fluid needs.

Location differentials: Location differentials should be established for milk received at plants located a substantial distance from the marketing area. Such differentials recognize the principle that milk similarly used and located should be similarly priced. Milk which originates nearest the market should command a higher price than milk more distantly located in order to reflect the difference in cost of transporting it to the marketing area. No advantage can be accorded any particular group of producers if the location differentials established realistically reflect only differences in transportation cost.

Since virtually all of the milk produced for the Washington market moves from the farm in tank trucks, it would be inappropriate to establish differentials within the radius from which milk would normally move directly from farms to bottling and distributing plants in the area. Accordingly, it is concluded that no differential should be established on class I milk received at plants located within a 75-mile radius of the zero milestone in Washington, D. C. In the case of plants located more than 75 miles from the zero milestone in Washington, D. C., it is concluded that a differential on class I milk of 12 cents per hundredweight plus 1.5 cents for each additional 10 miles distance, or fraction thereof which such plants are located from Washington by the shortest hard-surfaced highway distance as determined by the market administrator should be appropriate. Such location differentials provide adequate allowances for transporting milk in bulk tankers between plants in the Washington area.

Milk may be received at a fluid milk bottling plant directly from producers as well as from one or more receiving plants. Under such circumstances it is necessary to designate an assignment sequence which will protect producers from unnecessary transportation costs involving transfers for other than class I uses. It is provided, therefore, that for purposes of computing allowable class I location differentials for each handler, the class I disposition from a fluid milk pateurizing or bottling plant shall first be assigned to direct producer receipts at such plant and any remaining class I use shall be assigned to receipts from other pool plants in order of their nearness to Washington.

The value of milk used in manufactured dairy products is affected, little, if any, by the location of the plant receiving and processing such milk in contrast to the situation with respect to class I milk. The milk received at country plants need not be transported to the city for utilization in class II. Accordingly, a location differential should apply only to milk received at country plants and utilized in class I or disposed of to plants which dispose of milk on routes in the marketing area.

The pricing provisions herein proposed utilize a number of reported prices and indexes from various specified sources. From time to time it is possible that such individual price(s) or index may not be reported or published. Under such circumstances it is necessary to provide that the market administrator shall use a price or index determined by the Secretary to be equivalent to or comparable with the unreported or unpublished factor or price.

Payments on other source milk: As pointed out previously, the minimum class prices established under the order apply only on producer milk received at plants subject to full regulation under the order. However, milk may be disposed of for class I utilization by and from plants not subject to full regulation of the order. Such unregulated plants may sell milk in bulk form to pool plants that in turn use it in supplying their class I outlets, or they may sell class I milk directly on routes as defined herein, including sale to Government installations.

The role of the compulsory classification system and the minimum prices as set forth in a Federal milk order is to insure that the price competition from reserve and excess milk will not break the market price for class I milk, thereby destroying the incentive necessary to encourage adequate production. Because the classified program of the order is applicable only to fully regulated plants, it is necessary, in order to provide continued stability of the market, to remove any advantage unregulated plants may attain with respect to sales in the regulated market. Such plants have a real financial incentive to find a means to sell excess milk at prices somewhat less than current class I levels so long as the price is higher than its value when used in manufactured dairy products. If unregulated plant operators were allowed to disposed of their surplus milk for class I purposes in the regulated marketing area without some compensating or neutralizing provision of the order, it is clear that the disposition of such milk, because of its price advantage relative to fully regulated milk, would displace the fully regulated milk in class I uses in the marketing area. The plan of Congress as contemplated under the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, as amended, of returning minimum prices to the producers for the regulated marketing area, would be defeated.

In the absence of any competitive or regulatory force which compels all handlers to pay producers for milk used in fluid outlets at a rate commensurate with its value for such use, the position of any handler who pays the class I price is insecure, if not untenable, whenever cheaper milk is available to the market. A classified pricing program under regulation cannot hope to be successful in the long run in insuring returns to producers at rates contemplated by the act if it is possible for some handlers to purchase outside milk for class I use at less than the class I price. Any handler who finds himself in a situation where his competitors pay less for fluid milk than he pays will be compelled to resort to the same methods, if possible. A price advantage in using unregulated milk is a compelling force in promoting its greater use and as a result it is probable that regular sources of regulated milk will eventually be abandoned by handlers, thus creating insecurity for themselves, producers, and consumers alike.

It is concluded, therefore, that the inclusion of compensation payment provisions in the order is necessary to insure against the displacement of producer milk for the purpose of cost advantage. This is essential to preserve the integrity of the classified pricing program of the order. Since minimum class prices may not be set under the order for handlers who do not participate in the marketwide equalization, the only alternative is to levy a charge against unpriced milk, for the removal of any advantage that there may be in using unregulated milk in class I instead of regular producer milk.

While there are few handlers who now have regular direct distribution in the marketing area and who would maintain unregulated status under the terms of the order as herein proposed; nevertheless, there are a very large number of substantial handlers in the immediately adjacent markets, many of whom could readily extend their distribution routes into the marketing area and by preserving their unregulated status could operate with a substantial price advantage over regulated handlers unless provision is made to assure that all competing handlers pay the minimum class prices. The interrelationship of the supply areas of these adjacent markets with the Washington market emphasizes the need for application of the compensatory payment provision on such distribution. As was earlier pointed out the utilization in the Washington market was as low as 65 percent class I in some months. Hence, unless provision is made to protect the integrity of regulation there exists a substantial opportunity for unregulated handlers to exploit the local fluid market to the detriment of both regular producers and regulated handlers.

The compensatory payments applicable to other source milk disposed of in the marketing area from approved plants which are not pool plants should be the same as those applicable to other source milk distributed from pool plants. It would not be possible to stabilize this market under the classified pricing program in the market if nonpool plants were allowed to distribute unpriced milk in the marketing area without compensatory payments. Handlers distributing such unpriced milk in the marketing area have the same opportunity to buy milk at the opportunity cost level as do the operators of the pool plants who purchase other source milk. In addition, however, the operator of a nonpool plant in all probability has surplus milk in his own plant which he would willingly dispose of on any basis that would yield a higher return than the surplus value. It would be particularly easy to dispose of such milk for class I use in the marketing area by bidding for large contracts such as hospitals, defense establishments, or other types of institutions. With surplus outlets as the alternative, and no compensatory payments to make, the nonpool handlers would have considerable incentive or margin to underbid the seller of priced milk for such

sales. Providing for some method of compensating for, or neutralizing the effect of, the advantage created for unregulated milk, therefore, is an essential and necessary provision of this order.

It is concluded that the compensatory payment on other source milk utilized in class I should be the difference between the class II price and the class I price under the Washington order. The class II price established by the order is a fair and economic measure of the value of milk in surplus uses in the Washington area and hence, represents the actual value of other source milk.

By choosing a rate of compensatory payment which reflects the cost of the cheapest other source milk which may be expected to be available to regulated handlers, any advantage to one handler relative to others, in obtaining such cheap milk and substituting it for producer milk in class I, is removed insofar as administratively possible and no handler is given the clear opportunity to gain an unfair advantage which would otherwise exist. Although the unfair advantage of obtaining other source milk is removed by the particular rate of payment herein provided, nevertheless, if other source milk is to be purchased, the incentive for purchasing the cheapest of such milk remains, because the lower the price which a handler pays for other source milk, the lower will be his total cost of purchasing such milk.

All funds collected from compensatory payments should be added to the producer-settlement fund. The handler regulated by the order should be obligated to make compensatory payments to the producer-settlement fund. There will be no difference in actual price paid for milk whether the payment is made by the regulated handler or by the operator of the unregulated plant from which the other source milk was obtained. Because the regulated handler makes the actual distribution of the milk in the marketing area and because he reports its utilization to the market administrator he is, from the administrative viewpoint, the logical one to make the payment.

For the reasons set forth in this decision, class I milk under the order is priced at the plant where the milk is first received from producers, hence, the compensatory payment on other source milk should be computed at the same stage of the marketing process to be directly comparable. No allowances are made in the order for cost and profits of handlers in moving producer milk to subsequent stages of marketing; neither should they be made for other source milk.

(d) Distribution of proceeds to producers: The order should provide for the distribution of returns to producers through a marketwide type of equalization pool. Under this type of pooling all producers receive a uniform price which varies only to reflect differences in butterfat content and location of plants of receipt.

As has been previously indicated the principal cooperative association in the market carries the bulk of the necessary surplus of the market which is processed through its manufacturing plant. It is imperative, therefore, that a procedure for pooling be established which will provide for an equitable sharing by all producers of the lower returns realized from the handling of this necessary reserve supply of milk.

A marketwide pool will facilitate the activities of the cooperative in moving milk supplies among handlers to meet their individual needs and will encourage processing of the necessary surplus of the market at the plants which can make the most efficient use of such milk.

This method of paying producers will require a producer-settlement fund for making adjustments in payments, as among handlers, to the end that the total sums paid by each handler shall equal the value of milk received by him at the prices fixed in the proposed marketing agreement and order.

Under this pooling arrangement handlers who are required to pay more for their milk on the basis of their utilization than they are required to pay to producers or cooperative associations will pay the difference to the producer-settlement fund; all handlers who are required to pay more to producers or cooperative associations than they are required to pay for their milk on the basis of utilizations will receive the difference from the producer-settlement fund. The market administrator in making payment to any handler from the producer-settlement fund should offset such payments by the amount of payments due from such handler. This is sound business practice. Without this provision the market administrator might be required to make payments to a handler who may have obtained money from the producer-settlement fund by filing incorrect reports or who owes money to the producer-settlement fund but who is financially unable to make full payment of all of his debts.

If at any time, the balance in the producer-settlement fund is insufficient to cover payments due to all handlers from the producer-settlement fund, payments to such handlers should be reduced uniformly per hundredweight of milk. The handlers may then reduce payment to producers by an equivalent amount per hundredweight. Amounts remaining due such handlers from the producer-settlement fund should be paid as soon as the balance in the fund is sufficient, and handlers should then complete payments to producers. In order to reduce the likelihood of this occurring, milk received by any handler who has not made the required payments into the producer-settlement fund for the preceding month should not be considered in the computation of the uniform price in current month.

The order should provide that in the case of a cooperative association which is authorized to collect payments otherwise due its producer members, and which requests such payments in writing, the handler shall make payment to the cooperative of the amount otherwise due its producer members. Under the provisions of the order as hereinafter proposed a cooperative association by definition has "full authority in the sale of milk of its members" and is engaged in "making collective sales of or marketing milk or its products for its members." As the duly authorized agent of its producer members there can be no question of its authority to receive the payments otherwise due such producers. This privilege is specifically provided for in the act and the practice is being followed by all of the cooperatives operating in the market.

In order that the cooperative may have the proper records on which to pay the individual producer members, the handler should, on or before the 8th day after the close of the month, be required to furnish the cooperative association with a statement showing the name, address, and code number, if any, of each producer for whom payment is to be made to the cooperative association, the volume and average butterfat content of milk delivered by each such producer, and the amount of and reason for any deduction which the handler is withholding from the amount payable to each producer. This information is necessary in order that the cooperative association can make proper distribution of moneys to its producer members for whom it makes collections.

In making payments to producers for milk received at plants located at least 75 miles distance from Washington the price should be reduced 12 cents plus 1.5 cents for each additional 10 miles distance or fraction thereof which such plant is located from Washington. Such a location differential will reflect cost of hauling milk to market by an efficient means and should tend to distribute returns to producers fairly.

Provision should also be made for the handler, if authorized in writing by the producer, to make proper deductions for goods or services furnished to or for payments made on behalf of the producer.

Proponents of the order proposed that the order provide for a "take-out and payback" plan to encourage a level production program. They pointed out that their association had operated such a plan for several years with satisfactory results to their membership.

Another cooperative in the market has successfully operated a base rating plan which has provided a seasonality of production which meet the fluid needs of its buyers.

The two plans, each intended to promote an even production over the year, have operated independently of each other without apparent adverse effects upon the market as a whole. A seasonality of pricing is provided in the class I pricing formula hereinbefore set forth. If further seasonality is desirable, there is good reason to allow the seasonal returns plans of the several cooperative associations to be continued outside the structure of the order.

The order should provide that each handler pay each producer, for milk received from such producer, and for which payment is not made to a cooperative association, on or before the 15th day after the end of each month. This is the date on which producers have been accustomed to receiving payment and provides a reasonable time for reporting, computation and announcement of the blended price and the drawing of individual checks. All reporting, announcement, and payment dates herein provided are synchronized to permit payment on this date.

When payment is to be made to a cooperative association, such payment should be made on or before the 13th day after the end of each month. This will permit the cooperative association to prepare and mail individual checks to its producer members by the 15th, the same date on which nonmember producers receive payment.

In the event a handler has received milk from producers which has an average butterfat content of more or less than 3.5 percent, the returns to such producers should be adjusted by a differential which reflects the weighted average values of the butterfat and skim milk in producer milk utilized in the respective classes. This follows the same principle as the payment of a uniform price to all producers. Since each producer shares equally in the total value of the handlers' class I and class II utilization at the basic test of 3.5 percent butterfat, it is equally appropriate that each should receive the average utilization value of the butterfat and skim milk components for milk testing above or below 3.5 percent. The producer butterfat differential should be rounded to the nearest full cent. Such adjustment will tend to minimize audit adjustment and will recognize that producers have long been paid on a fixed differential basis and are not accustomed to constantly changing values.

Administrative provisions: The marketing agreement and order should provide for other general administrative provisions which are common to all orders and which are necessary for proper and efficient administration of the order.

In addition to the definitions discussed earlier in this decision which define the scope of regulation, definition of certain other terms is necessary for brevity and to assure that each usage of such terms denotes the same meaning. These include the terms "act," "Secretary," "Department of Agriculture," "person," and "cooperative association."

Provision should be made for the appointment by the Secretary of a market administrator, and the order should define his

powers and duties, prescribe the information to be reported by handlers each month, set forth the rules to be followed by the market administrator in making computations required by the order, and provide for the liquidation of the order in the event of its suspension or termination.

The powers of the market administrator as set forth in the order are specifically provided in section 8c(7)(C) of the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, as amended, and the proposed language is essentially that of the statute.

The duties of the market administrator as set forth are essentially those which are found in all Federal milk marketing orders and are necessary to define specifically the responsibilities of the market administrator. Handlers should be required to maintain adequate records of their operations and to make the reports necessary to establish classification of producer milk and payments due for such milk. Time limits must be prescribed for filing such reports and for making payments to producers. It should be provided that the market administrator report to each cooperative association, which so requests, the amount and class utilization of milk received by each handler from producers who are members of such cooperative association. For the purpose of this report, the utilization of members' milk in each handler's plant will be prorated to each class in the proportion that total receipts of producer milk were used in each class by such handler.

Handlers should maintain and make available to the market administrator all records and accounts of their operations and such facilities as are necessary to determine the accuracy of the information reported to the market administrator as he may deem necessary or any other information upon which the classification of producer milk or payments to producers depends. The market administrator must likewise be permitted to check the accuracy of weights and tests of milk and milk products received and handled to verify all payments required under the order.

It is necessary that handlers maintain records to prove the utilization of the milk received from producers and that proper payments were made therefor. Since the books of all handlers associated with the market cannot be audited immediately after the milk has been delivered to a plant, it is necessary that such records be kept for a reasonable period of time.

The order should provide for specific limitations of the time that handlers should be required to retain their books and records and of the period of time in which obligations under the orders should terminate. Provision made in this regard is identical in principle with the general amendment made to all milk orders in operation on July 30, 1947, following the Secretary's decision of January 26, 1949 (14 F.R. 444). That decision covering the retention of records and limitations of claims is equally applicable in this situation and is adopted as a part of this decision.

Each handler should be required to pay the market administrator as his pro rata share of the cost of administering the order not more than 4 cents per hundredweight or such lesser amounts as the Secretary may, from time to time prescribe on (a) producer milk (including such handler's own production), (b) other source milk in pool plants which is allocated to class I milk, and (c) class I milk disposed of in the marketing area (except to a pool plant) from a nonpool plant.

The market administrator must have sufficient funds to enable him to administer properly the terms of the order. The act provides that such cost of administration shall be financed through an assessment on handlers. One of the duties of the market administrator is to verify the receipts and disposition of milk from all sources. Equity in sharing the cost of administration of the order among handlers will be achieved, therefore, by applying the administrative assessment to all producers' milk (including handler's own production) and other source milk allocated to class I milk.

Plants not subject to the classification and pricing provisions of the order may distribute limited quantities of class I milk in the marketing area. These plants must be checked to verify their status under the order. Assessment of administrative expense on such milk sold in the marketing area will help defray the cost of such checking.

In view of the anticipated volumes of milk and the cost of administering orders in markets of comparable circumstances, it is concluded that an initial rate of 4 cents per hundredweight is necessary to meet the expenses of administration. Provision should be made to enable the Secretary to reduce the rate of assessment below the 4 cents per hundredweight maximum without necessitating an amendment to the order. This should be done at any time experience in the market reveals that a lesser rate will produce sufficient revenue to administer the order properly.

A provision should be included in the order for furnishing market services to producers, such as verifying the tests and weights of producer milk and furnishing market information. These should be provided by the market administrator and the cost should be borne by the producers receiving the service. If a cooperative association is performing such services for any member producers and is approved for such activities by the Secretary, the market administrator may accept this in lieu of his own service.

There is need for a marketing service program in connection with the administration of the order in this area. Orderly marketing will be promoted by assuring individual producers that payments received for their milk are in accordance with the pricing provisions of the order and reflect accurate weights and tests of such milk. To accomplish this fully, it is necessary that the butterfat test and weights of individual producer deliveries of milk as reported by the handler be verified for accuracy.

An additional phase of the marketing service program is to furnish producers with correct market information. Efficiency in the production, utilization and marketing of milk will be promoted by the dissemination of current information on a market-wide basis to all producers.

To enable the market administrator to furnish these marketing services, provision should be made for a maximum deduction of 5 cents per hundredweight with respect to receipts of milk from producers for whom he renders marketing services. If later experience indicates that marketing services can be performed at a lesser rate, provision is necessary for the Secretary to adjust the rate downward without the necessity of a hearing.

Rulings on proposed findings and conclusions: Briefs and proposed findings and conclusions were filed on behalf of several interested parties in the market. These briefs, proposed findings and conclusions, and the evidence in the record were considered in making the findings and conclusions set forth above. To the extent that the suggested findings and conclusions set forth in the briefs are inconsistent with the findings and conclusions herein, the requests to make such findings or to reach such conclusions are denied for the reasons previously stated in this decision.

General findings: (a) The proposed marketing agreement and order and all of the terms and conditions thereof, will tend to effectuate the declared policy of the act;

(b) The parity prices of milk as determined pursuant to section 2 of the act are not reasonable in view of the price of feeds, available supplies of feeds, and other economic conditions which affect market supply and demand for milk in the marketing area, and the minimum prices specified in the proposed marketing agreement and the order are such prices as will reflect the aforesaid factors, insure a sufficient quantity of pure and wholesome milk, and be in the public interest; and

(c) The proposed marketing agreement and order will regulate the handling of milk in the same manner as, and will be applicable to persons in the respective classes of industrial and commercial activity specified in, a marketing agreement upon which a hearing has been held.

Revised recommended marketing agreement and order: The following order regulating the handling of milk in the Washington, D.C., marketing area is recommended as the detailed and appropriate means by which the foregoing conclusions may be carried out. The recommended marketing agreement is not included in this decision because the regulatory provisions thereof would be the same as those contained in the proposed order.

DEFINITIONS

Section 902.1. Act:

"Act" means Public Act No. 10, 73d Congress, as amendment and as reenacted and amended by the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, as amended (7 U.S.C. 601 et seq.).

Section 902.2. Secretary:

"Secretary" means the Secretary of Agriculture or any officer or employee of the United States authorized to exercise the powers and to perform the duties of the Secretary of Agriculture.

Section 902.3. Department of Agriculture:

"Department of Agriculture" means the U.S. Department of Agriculture or any other Federal agency as may be authorized by act of Congress, or by Executive order, to perform the price reporting functions specified in this part.

Section 902.4. Person:

"Person" means any individual, partnership, corporation, association, or other business unit.

Section 902.5. Cooperative association:

"Cooperative association" means any cooperative marketing association of producers which the Secretary determines, after application by the association:

(a) To be qualified under the provisions of the act of Congress of February 18, 1922, as amended, known as the "Capper-Volstead Act"; and

(b) To have full authority in the sale of milk of its members and to be engaged in making collective sales of or marketing milk or its products for its members.

Section 902.6. Washington, D.C., marketing area:

"Washington, D.C., marketing area" hereinafter called "the marketing area" means all of the territory situated within the District of Columbia; the counties of Arlington, Fairfax, and Prince William, and the city of Alexandria, all in the State of Virginia; the counties of Prince Georges (excluding the corporate limits of the town of Laurel), Montgomery, Charles, and St. Marys; that portion of Calvert County lying south of a line beginning at the western terminus of Maryland State Highway 507, continuing easterly along said highway to its intersection with Maryland State Highway 2, continuing northerly along said Highway 2, to its intersection with Maryland State Highway 263 and then easterly along said Highway 263 to its terminus at the Chesapeake Bay, and that part of Frederick lying south of a line be-

ginning at the intersection of the Washington-Frederick County line with Alternate U.S. Route 40, following Alternate U.S. Route 40 easterly to the western boundary of the corporate limits of the city of Frederick, thence along the western, northern, and eastern boundary of the city to its eastern junction with Alternate U.S. Route 40 and then southeasterly along Alternate U.S. Route 40 to the Frederick-Carroll County line, all in the State of Maryland; together with all piers, docks, and wharves connected therewith and including all territory within such boundaries which is occupied by Government (municipal, State, or Federal) installations, institutions, or other establishments.

Section 902.7. Plant:

"Plant" means the land, buildings, surroundings, facilities, and equipment, whether owned and operated by one or more persons, constituting a single operating unit or establishment for the receiving and processing or packaging of milk or milk products.

Section 902.8. Approved plant:

"Approved plant" means:

(a) Any plant which is approved by the applicable health authority having jurisdiction in the marketing area for the handling of milk for disposition as class I milk and from which class I milk is disposed of on routes to retail or wholesale outlets in the marketing area; and

(b) Any plant which is approved by the applicable health authority having jurisdiction in the marketing area to supply milk to a plant specified in paragraph (a) of this section and from which milk is moved during the month to such plant.

Section 902.9. Pool plant:

"Pool plant" means:

(a) An approved plant other than the plant of a producer-handler: (1) During any month within which a volume of milk equal to not less than 10 percent of its receipts of milk from dairy farmers, approved by the applicable health authority for fluid disposition in the marketing area, is disposed of as class I milk on routes in the marketing area: *Provided,* That the total quantity of class I milk disposed of from such plant, both inside and outside the marketing area, is equal to not less than 50 percent of such plant's total receipts from such dairy farmers; or (2) during any month of October through February in which at least 50 percent, and during any month of March through September in which at least 40 percent, of its receipts of milk from dairy farmers, approved by the applicable health authority for fluid disposition in the marketing area, is shipped in the form of milk, skim milk, or cream to a plant which disposes of not less than 10 percent of its receipts of approved milk from dairy farmers and from other approved plants as class I milk on routes in the marketing area and not less than 50 percent of such receipts are disposed of as class I milk, both inside and outside the marketing area: *Provided,* That any such plant which was a pool plant in each of the preceding months of October through February shall be a pool plant for the months of March through September, unless the handler gives written notice to the market administrator on or before the first day of such month that the plant is a nonpool plant: *And provided further,* That any such plant which was a nonpool plant during any of the months of October through February shall not be a pool plant in any of the immediately following months of March through September in which it was owned by the same handler or affiliate of the handler or by any person who controls, or is controlled by, the handler.

(b) Any manufacturing plant which is operated by a cooperative association 70 percent or more of whose membership are qualified producers whose milk is regularly received during the month at other pool plants.

Section 902.10. Handler:

"Handler" means:

(a) Any person in his capacity as the operator of an approved plant (whether or not such approved plant is a pool plant) or any plant qualified as a pool plant pursuant to section 902.9(b); and

(b) Any cooperative association with respect to the milk of any producer which it causes to be diverted in accordance with the proviso of section 902.15 from a pool plant to a nonpool plant for the account of such cooperative association.

Section 902.11. Pool handler:

"Pool handler" means any person in his capacity as the operator of a pool plant or a cooperative association qualified as a handler pursuant to section 902.10(b).

Section 902.12. Producer-handler:

"Producer-handler" means any person who operates a dairy farm and an approved plant from which class I milk is disposed of on route(s) in the marketing area and who during the month received no milk from any source other than his own farm production and from pool plants.

Section 902.13. Dairy farmer:

"Dairy farmer" means any person who produces milk which is delivered in bulk to a plant.

Section 902.14. Dairy farmer for other markets:

"Dairy farmer for other markets" means:

(a) Any dairy farmer whose milk is received by a handler at a pool plant during the months of March through September from a farm from which the handler, an affiliate of the handler, or any person who controls or is controlled by the handler, received milk other than as producer milk during any of the preceding months or October through February; and

(b) Any dairy farmer whose milk is received at a pool plant qualified pursuant to section 902.9(b) for the account of a cooperative association which has no membership among producers delivering milk to other pool plants.

Section 902.15. Producer:

"Producer" means any dairy farmer, except a producer-handler or dairy farmer for other markets, who produces milk which is approved by the applicable health authority having jurisdiction in the marketing area for fluid disposition within the marketing area and which is received at a pool plant or is diverted to a nonpool plant during any month(s) of March through September or on not more than 8 days (4 days in the case of every-other-day delivery) during any month(s) of October through February: *Provided,* That the milk so diverted shall be deemed to have been received by the diverting handler at a pool plant at the location from which it was diverted: *And provided further,* That the criterion for determination of qualification under this definition for a dairy farmer delivering milk to a pool plant qualified under section 902.9(b) shall be the holding of a valid farm inspection permit issued by the applicable health authority having jurisdiction in the marketing area. This definition shall not include any dairy farmer whose milk is diverted during the month or more than the number of days specified in this section.

Section 902.16. Producer milk:

"Producer milk" means any skim milk or butterfat contained in milk received directly at a pool plant from producers, or diverted in accordance with the proviso of section 902.15.

Section 902.17. Other source milk:

"Other source milk" means all receipts of skim milk and butterfat other than that contained in (a) producer milk, (b) receipts from pool plants, or (c) class II products disposed of in the form in which received without further processing by the handler.

Section 902.18. Route:

"Route" means any delivery (including any delivery by a vendor or disposition at a plant store or from vending machines) of any class I product to a wholesale or retail stop, including a Federal, State, or municipal institution or installation, but excluding any delivery to a plant.

MARKET ADMINISTRATOR

Section 902.20. Designation:

The agency for the administration of this part shall be a "market administrator" selected by the Secretary. He shall be entitled to such compensation as may be determined by, and shall be subject to removal at the discretion of, the Secretary.

Section 902.21. Powers:

The market administrator shall have the following powers with respect to this part:

(a) To administer its terms and provisions;

(b) To make rules and regulations to effectuate its terms and provisions;

(c) To receive, investigate, and report to the Secretary complaints of violations; and

(d) To recommend amendments to the Secretary.

Section 902.22. Duties:

The market administrator shall perform all duties necessary to administer the terms and provisions of this part, including, but not limited to the following:

(a) Within 45 days following the date on which he enters upon his duties, or such lesser period as may be prescribed by the Secretary, execute and deliver to the Secretary a bond, effective as of the date on which he enters upon his duties and conditioned upon the faithful performance of such duties, in an amount and with surety thereon satisfactory to the Secretary;

(b) Employ and fix the compensation of such persons as may be necessary to enable him to administer its terms and provisions;

(c) Obtain a bond in a reasonable amount, and with reasonable surety thereon, covering each employee who handles funds entrusted to the market administrator:

(d) Pay out of the funds received pursuant to section 902.88:

(1) The cost of his bond and the bonds of his employees,

(2) His own compensation, and

(3) All other expenses except those incurred under section 902.87, necessarily incurred by him in the maintenance and functioning of his office and in the performance of his duties;

(e) Keep such books and records as will clearly reflect the transactions provided for in this part, and, upon request by the Secretary, surrender the same to such other person as the Secretary may designate;

(f) Publicly announce at his discretion, unless otherwise directed by the Secretary, by posting in a conspicuous place in his office and by such other means as he deems appropriate, the name of any person who, within 5 days after the date upon which he is required to perform such acts, has not made reports pursuant to section 902.30 or payments pursuant to sections 902.80 to 902.88.

(g) Submit his books and records to examination by the Secretary, and furnish such information and reports as the Secretary may request.

(h) Verify all reports and payments of each handler, by audit if necessary, of such handler's records and of the records of any other handler or person upon whose utilization the classification of skim milk and butterfat for such handler depends;

(i) Prepare and make available for the benefit of producers, consumers, and handlers, such general statistics and information concerning the operation of this part as do not reveal confidential information;

(j) On or before the date specified, publicly announce by posting in a conspicuous

place in his office and by such other means as he deems appropriate, the following:

(1) The 5th day of each month, the class I price computed pursuant to section 902.50(a) for the current month, and the class II price computed pursuant to section 902.50(b) and the handler butterfat differentials computed pursuant to section 902.51, both for the preceding month; and

(2) The 10th day of each month, the uniform price computed pursuant to section 902.71 and the producer butterfat differential computed pursuant to section 902.81 both for the preceding month; and

(k) On or before the 10th day after the end of each month, report to each cooperative association which so requests, the class utilization of milk purchased from such association or delivered to the pool plant(s) of each handler by producers who are members of such cooperative association. For the purpose of this report, the milk so purchased or received shall be allocated to each class in the same ratio as all producer milk received by such handler during such month.

REPORTS, RECORDS, AND FACILITIES

Section 902.30. Reports of receipts and utilization:

(a) On or before the 8th day after the end of each month each pool handler shall report to the market administrator in the detail and on forms prescribed by the market administrator as follows:

(1) The quantities of skim milk and butterfat contained in (i) receipts of producer milk (including such handler's own production), (ii) receipts from other pool plants in the form of products designated as class I milk pursuant to section 902.41(a)(1), and (iii) receipts of other source milk.

(2) Inventories of products designated as class I milk pursuant to section 902.41(a)(1) on hand at the beginning and end of the month; and

(3) The utilization of all skim milk and butterfat required to be reported pursuant to this paragraph.

(b) Each nonpool handler shall make reports to the market administrator at such time and in such manner as the market administrator may prescribe.

Section 902.31. Other reports:

(a) Each pool handler shall report to the market administrator in the detail and on forms prescribed by the market administrator as follows:

(1) On or before the 20th day after the end of the month, for each of his pool plants, his producer payroll for such month, which shall show for each producer; (i) his name and address, (ii) the total pounds of milk received from such producer, (iii) the average butterfat content of such milk, and (iv) the net amount of the handler's payment, together with the price paid and the amount and nature of any deduction;

(2) On or before the first day other source milk is received in the form of milk, fluid skim milk or cream at his pool plant(s) his intention to receive such product, and on or before the last day such product is received, his intention to discontinue receipt of such product; and

(3) Such other information with respect to receipts and utilization of butterfat and skim milk as the market administrator shall prescribe.

(b) Promptly after a producer moves from one farm to another, or starts or resumes deliveries to any of a handler's pool plants, the handler shall file with the market administrator a report stating the producer's name and post office address, the health department permit number, the date on which the change took place, and the farm and plant location involved.

(c) Each pool handler who receives milk during the month from producers for which payment is to be made to a cooperative association pursuant to section 902.80(b) shall on or before the 10th day after the end of each month report to such cooperative association concerning each producer-member of such cooperative association from whom he received milk during the month as follows:

(1) The name, address, and code number, if any;

(2) The total deliveries and the number of days on which delivery was made;

(3) The average butterfat test of the milk delivered; and

(4) The nature and amount of any deductions to be made in payments due such producer.

(d) Each handler dumping skim milk pursuant to section 902.41(b)(3) shall give the market administrator during normal duty hours, not less than 3 hours' advance notice of intention to make such disposition and of the quantities of skim milk involved.

Section 902.32. Records and facilities:

Each handler shall maintain and make available to the market administrator during the usual hours of business such accounts and records of his operations together with such facilities as are necessary for the market administrator to verify or establish the correct data for each month, with respect to:

(a) The receipt and utilization of all skim milk and butterfat handled in any form;

(b) The weights and tests for butterfat and other content of all milk and milk products handled;

(c) The pounds of skim milk and butterfat contained in or represented by all items in inventory at the beginning and end of each month required to be reported pursuant to section 902.30(a)(2); and

(d) Payments to producers and cooperative associations, including any deductions and the disbursement of money so deducted.

Section 902.33. Retention of records:

All books and records required under this part to be made available to the market administrator shall be retained by the handler for a period of 3 years to begin at the end of the month to which such books and records pertain: *Provided,* That if, within such 3-year period, the market administrator notifies the handler in writing that the retention of such books and records, or of specified books and records, is necessary in connection with a proceeding under section 8c(15)(A) of the act or a court action specified in such notice, the handler shall retain such books and records, or specified books and records, until further notification from the market administrator. In either case, the market administrator shall give further written notification to the handler promptly upon the termination of the litigation or when the records are no longer necessary in connection therewith.

CLASSIFICATION OF MILK

Section 902.40. Skim milk and butterfat to be classified:

All skim milk and butterfat received within the month at pool plants and which is required to be reported pursuant to section 902.30 shall be classified by the market administrator.

Section 902.41. Classes of utilization:

Subject to the conditions set forth in sections 902.42 to 902.46 the classes of utilization shall be as follows:

(a) Class I milk: Class I milk shall be all skim milk (including that used to produce concentrated milk and reconstituted or fortified skim milk) and butterfat: (1) Disposed of (other than in hermetically sealed containers) in fluid form or as frozen concentrated milk for human consumption as milk, flavored milk, skim milk, flavored skim milk, cultured skim milk, buttermilk, cream (except sour cream) including any mixture of cream and milk or skim milk containing less butterfat than the regular standard for cream; and (2) not specifically accounted for as class II milk.

(b) Class II milk: Class II milk shall be all skim milk and butterfat (1) used to produce any product other than those designated as class I milk pursuant to paragraph (a)(1) of this section; (2) disposed of for livestock feed; (3) contained in skim milk dumped if the conditions of section 902.31(d) are met by the handler; (4) contained in inventory of products designated in paragraph (a)(1) of this section on hand at the end of the month; (5) in actual plant shrinkage not to exceed 1½ percent of skim milk and butterfat, respectively, in producer milk; and (6) in shrinkage of other source milk.

Section 902.42. Shrinkage:

The market administrator shall allocate shrinkage at the pool plant(s) of each handler as follows:

(a) Compute the total shrinkage of skim milk and butterfat respectively; and

(b) Allocate the resulting amounts pro rata to skim milk and butterfat, respectively, in producer milk and other source milk.

Section 902.43. Responsibility of handlers and the reclassification of milk:

(a) All skim milk and butterfat shall be class I milk unless the handler who first receives such skim milk and butterfat proves to the market administrator that such skim milk or butterfat should be classified otherwise.

(b) Any skim milk or butterfat shall be reclassified if verification by the market administrator discloses that the original classification was incorrect.

Section 902.44. Transfers:

Skim milk or butterfat disposed of during the month from a pool plant shall be classified:

(a) As class I milk if transferred in the form of any products designated as class I milk pursuant to section 902.41(a)(1) to a pool plant of another handler unless utilization as class II milk is claimed by both handlers in their reports submitted for the month to the market administrator pursuant to section 902.30(a): *Provided,* That the skim milk or butterfat so assigned to class II milk shall be limited to the amount thereof remaining in class II milk in the plant of the transferee handler after the assignment of other source milk pursuant to section 902.46 and any additional amounts of such skim milk or butterfat shall be assigned to class I milk: *And provided further,* That if either or both handlers have received other source milk, the skim milk or butterfat so transferred shall be classified at both plants so as to allocate the greatest possible class I utilization to the producer milk at both plants.

(b) As class I milk if transferred in the form of any product designated as class I milk pursuant to section 902.41(a)(1) to a producer-handler.

(c) As class I milk if transferred or diverted in the form of any product designated as class I milk pursuant to section 902.41(a)(1) to an approved plant, other than a pool plant or the plant of a producer-handler, to the extent of such plants' disposition of skim milk and butterfat, respectively, as class I milk in the marketing area: *Provided,* That any remaining amount of such transfer or diversion shall be assigned to the highest remaining utilization in the transferee plant after the prior assignment of receipts at such plant from dairy farmers who the market administrator determines constitute its regular source of supply.

(d) As class I milk if transferred or diverted in bulk in the form of milk, skim milk, or cream, to a nonpool plant, other than an approved plant, located less than 300 miles from the zero milestone in Washington, D.C., unless (1) the handler claims class II utilization in his report submitted pursuant to section 902.30(a), (2) the operator of the transferee plant maintains books and records showing the utilization of all skim milk and butterfat at such plant which are made available if requested by the market administrator for the purpose of verification, and (3) not less than an equivalent amount of skim milk and butterfat was ac-

tually utilized in such plant during the month in the use indicated in such report: *Provided,* That if upon inspection of the records of such plant it is found that an equivalent amount of skim milk and butterfat was not actually used in such indicated use the remaining pounds shall be classified as class I milk.

(e) As class I milk if transferred or diverted in bulk in the form of milk, skim milk, or cream, to a nonpool plant other than an approved plant located 300 miles or more from the zero milestone in Washington, D.C.

Section 902.45. Computation of skim milk and butterfat in each class:

For each month, the market administrator shall correct for mathematical and for other obvious errors the reports of receipts and utilization submitted pursuant to section 902.30(a) for the pool plant(s) of each handler and shall compute the pounds of skim milk and butterfat in class I milk and class II milk for such handlers.

Section 902.46. Allocation of skim milk and butterfat classified:

After making the computations pursuant to section 902.45 the market administrator shall determine the classification of producer milk received at the pool plant(s) of each handler as follows:

(a) Skim milk shall be allocated in the following manner:

(1) Subtract from the total pounds of skim milk in class II milk the pounds of skim milk in producer milk classified pursuant to section 902.41(b)(5);

(2) Subtract from the remaining pounds of skim milk in each class, in series beginning with class II milk, the pounds of skim milk in other source milk received during the month in a form other than products specified in section 902.41(a)(1);

(3) Subtract from the remaining pounds of skim milk in each class, in series beginning with class II milk, the pounds of skim milk in other source milk received in the form of products specified in section 902.41(a)(1) from plants which are not fully subject to the pricing provisions of another order issued pursuant to the act;

(4) Subtract from the pounds of skim milk remaining in each class in series beginning with class II milk the pounds of skim milk in other source milk received in the form of products specified in section 902.41(a)(1) from a plant(s) which is fully subject to the pricing provisions of another order issued pursuant to the act;

(5) Subtract from the pounds of skim milk remaining in each class in series beginning with class II milk, the pounds of skim milk contained in inventory of products specified in section 902.41(a)(1) on hand at the beginning of the month;

(6) Subtract from the remaining pounds of skim milk in each class the pounds of skim milk received from the pool plants of other handlers in the form of products specified in section 902.41(a)(1) according to the classification thereof as determined pursuant to section 902.44(a).

(7) Add to the remaining pounds of skim milk in class II the pounds of skim milk subtracted pursuant to subparagraph (1) of this paragraph; and

(8) If the remaining pounds of skim milk in both classes exceed the pounds of skim milk contained in producer milk, subtract such excess from the remaining pounds of skim milk in each class in series beginning with class II milk. Any amounts so subtracted shall be known as "overage."

(b) Butterfat shall be allocated in accordance with the same procedure outlined for skim milk in paragraph (a) of this section; and

(c) Add the pounds of skim milk and the pounds of butterfat allocated to the producer milk in each class computed pursuant to paragraphs (a) and (b) of this section, and determine the weighted average butterfat content of each class.

MINIMUM PRICES

Section 902.50. Class prices:

Subject to the provisions of sections 902.51 and 902.52 each handler shall pay, at the time and in the manner set forth in section 902.80 for each hundredweight of milk containing 3.5 percent butterfat received at his pool plant(s) during the month from producers or a cooperative association not less than the following prices per hundredweight for the respective quantities of milk in each class computed pursuant to section 902.46.

(a) Class I price: During the first 18 months after the effective date of this part the price for class I milk shall be $5.55 for the months of July through February and $5.10 for the months of March through June: *Provided,* That such price in any month shall be adjusted to reflect the deviation of the average of the Federal order class I prices for the Philadelphia, New York, and Chicago markets for such month from such average price in the corresponding month of 1958, as follows:

Washington price adjustment

3-market deviation from corresponding month of 1958 (cents), plus or minus:	
0–15	0
15.1–35	20
35.1–55	40
55.1–75	60
75.1–95	80

(b) Class II price: The price for class II milk shall be the sum of the values of butterfat and skim milk computed as follows:

(1) Butterfat: Add all weekly quotations per 40-quart can of 40 percent sweet cream approved for Pennsylvania and New Jersey in the Philadelphia market as reported each week ending within the month by the U.S. Department of Agriculture, divide by the number of quotations, subtract $2, divide by 33.48, multiply by 3.5: *Provided,* That such butterfat value shall not be less than 3.5 times 120 percent of the average grade A (92-score) butter price at New York as reported by the U.S. Department of Agriculture for the month for which payment is to be made less 17 cents.

(2) Skim milk: The average of carlot prices per pound for nonfat dry milk, spray and roller process, respectively, for human consumption, f.o.b. manufacturing plants in the Chicago area, as reported for the period from the 26th day of the preceding month through the 25th day of the current month by the Department of Agriculture shall determine the skim values, as follows:

Average price per pound of nonfat solid-spray and roller process:	*Skim value*
$0.065 or below	$0.075
$0.066 to $0.075	.15
$0.076 to $0.085	.225
$0.096 to $0.105	.30
$0.106 to $0.115	.375
$0.116 to $0.125	.45
$0.126 to $0.135	.525
$0.136 to $0.145	.60
$0.146 to $0.155	.675
$0.156 to $0.165	.75
$0.166 to $0.175	.825
$0.176 to $0.185	.90
$0.186 to $0.195	.975

Section 902.51. Butterfat differentials to handlers:

For milk containing more or less than 3.5 percent butterfat, the class prices pursuant to section 902.50 shall be increased or decreased, respectively, for each one-tenth of 1 percent butterfat by the appropriate rate, rounded in each case to the nearest one-tenth cent, determined as follows:

(a) Class I milk: Add all weekly quotations per 40-quart can of 40 percent sweet cream approved for Pennsylvania and New Jersey in the Philadelphia market as reported each week ending within the month by the U.S. Department of Agriculture, divide by the number of quotations and divide the resulting value by 334.8: *Provided,* That if the result is less than the class II differential determined pursuant to paragraph (b) of this section, such class II differential shall also be applicable to class I milk; and

(b) Class II milk: Divide by 35 the butterfat value determined pursuant to section 902.50(b)(1).

Section 902.52. Location differentials to handlers:

For that milk which is received from producers at a pool plant located 75 miles or more from the milestone in Washington, D.C., by the shortest hard-surfaced highway distance as determined by the market administrator, and which is assigned to class I milk, the class I price as specified in section 902.50(a) shall be reduced at the rate set forth in the following schedule:

Distance (miles):	*Rate per hundredweight (cents)*
75	12.0
For each additional 10 miles or fraction thereof	1.5

Provided, That for the purpose of calculating such location differential, products designated as class I milk which are transferred between pool plants shall first be assigned to any remainder of class II milk in the transferee plant after making the calculations prescribed in section 902.46 (a)(1) to (5), and the comparable steps in section 92.46(b) for such plant, such assignment to the transferring plant to be made in sequence according to the location differential applicable at each plant, beginning with the plant having the largest differential.

Section 902.53. Use of equivalent prices or indexes.

If for any reason a price quotation or index required by this part for computing class prices or for other purposes is not available in the manner described, the market administrator shall use a price or index determined by the Secretary to be equivalent to the price or index which is required.

APPLICATION OF PROVISIONS

Section 902.60. Producer-handler:

Sections 902.40 to 902.46, 902.50 to 902.52, 902.62, 902.70 to 902.71 and 902.80 to 902.89 shall not apply to a producer-handler.

Section 902.61. Plants subject to other Federal orders:

A plant specified in paragraph (a) or (b) of this section shall be considered as a nonpool plant except that the operator of such plant shall, with respect to the total receipts and utilization or disposition of skim milk and butterfat at the plant, make reports to the market administrator at such time and in such manner as the market administrator may require (in lieu of the reports required pursuant to section 902.30) and allow verification of such reports by the market administrator.

(a) Any plant qualified pursuant to section 902.9(a)(1) which would be subject to the classification and pricing provisions of another order issued pursuant to the act unless the Secretary determines that a greater volume of class I milk is disposed of from such plant on routes in the Washington marketing area than in a marketing area regulated pursuant to such other order.

(b) Any plant qualified pursuant to section 902.9 (a)(2) or (b) which would be subject to the classification and pricing provisions of another order issued pursuant to the act unless such plant has qualified as a pool plant pursuant to the first proviso of section 902.9(a)(2) for each month during the preceding October through February.

Section 902.62. Payments on other source milk:

Within 11 days after the end of each month handlers shall make payments to producers through the producer-settlement fund as follows:

(a) Each pool handler who received other source milk which is allocated to class I pursuant to section 902.46 (a)(2) and (b) shall make payment on the quantity so allocated at the difference between the class I price and the class II price applicable at the location of his pool plant qualified pursuant to section 902.9(a).

(b) Each pool handler who received other source milk which is allocated to class I pursuant to section 902.46 (a)(3) and (b) shall make payment on the quantity so allocated at the difference between the class I price and the class II price applicable at the zone location of the nearest nonpool plant(s) from which an equivalent amount of such other source milk was received; and

(c) Each handler operating an approved plant, other than a pool plant, which is not subject to the classification and pricing provisions of another order issued pursuant to the act and from which class I products are disposed of on routes in the marketing area during the month shall make payment on the total hundredweight of skim milk and butterfat so disposed of which is in excess of his receipts of skim milk and butterfat, respectively, from pool plants at the difference between the class I price and the class II price applicable for the zone location of such plant.

DETERMINATION OF UNIFORM PRICE

Section 902.70. Computation of the value of producer milk for each handler:

For each delivery period, the market administrator shall compute the value of milk for each pool handler as follows:

(a) Multiply the pounds of producer milk in each class computed pursuant to section 902.46 by the applicable class price and total the resulting amounts;

(b) Add the amount of any payments due from such handler pursuant to section 902.62 (a) or (b);

(c) Add the amounts computed by multiplying the pounds of "overage" deducted from each class pursuant to section 902.46 (a)(8) and (b) by the applicable class price;

(d) Add the amount computed by multiplying the difference between the appropriate class II price for the preceding month and the appropriate class I price for the current month by the hundredweight of producer milk classified in class II during the preceding month less allowable shrinkage allocated pursuant to section 902.46(a)(1) in such month, or the hundredweight of milk subtracted from class I pursuant to section 902.46 (a)(5) and (b) for the current month, whichever is less;

(e) Add the amount computed by multiplying the difference between the appropriate class II price for the preceding month and the appropriate class I price for the current month by the hundredweight of milk allocated to class I pursuant to section 902.46 (a)(5) and (b) for the current month which is in excess of (1) the hundredweight of milk for which an adjustment was made pursuant to subparagraph (d) of this paragraph and (2) the hundredweight of milk assigned to class II pursuant to section 902.46 (a)(4) and (b) for the previous month and which was classified and priced as class I under the other Federal order; and

(f) Add or subtract, as the case may be, an amount necessary to correct errors discovered by the market administrator in the verification of reports of such handler of his receipts and utilization of skim milk and butterfat for previous months.

Section 902.71. Computation of the uniform price:

For each month the market administrator shall compute the uniform price per hundredweight of producer milk of 3.5 percent butterfat content, f.o.b. market as follows:

(a) Combine into one total the net obligations computed pursuant to section 902.70 for all handlers who made reports prescribed in section 902.30(a) for the month and who were not in default of payments pursuant to section 902.84 for the preceding month.

(b) Subtract, if the weighted average butterfat content of producer milk included under paragraph (a) of this section is greater than 3.5 percent, or add, if such average butterfat content is less than 3.5 percent, an amount computed as follows: Multiply the amount by which the average butterfat content of such milk varies from 3.5 percent by the producer butterfat differential computed pursuant to section 902.81 and multiply the resulting figure by the total hundredweight of such milk;

(c) Add an amount equal to the sum of deductions to be made from producer payments for location differentials pursuant to section 902.82;

(d) Add an amount equal to not less than one-half of the unobligated balance on hand in the producer-settlement fund;

(e) Divide the resulting amount by the total hundredweight of producer milk included under paragraph (a) of this section; and

(f) Subtract not less than 4 nor more than 5 cents from the amount computed pursuant to paragraph (e) of this section.

PAYMENTS

Section 902.80. Time and method of payment:

(a) Except as provided in paragraph (b) of this section, each pool handler on or before the 15th day after the end of each month shall make payment to each producer from whom milk is received during the month for the quantity of milk so received at not less than the uniform price per hundredweight computed pursuant to section 902.71 adjusted by the butterfat differential computed pursuant to section 902.81 and by the location differential computed pursuant to section 902.82 less proper deductions authorized in writing by the producer: *Provided,* That if by such date such handler has not received full payment from the market administrator pursuant to section 902.85 for such month, he may reduce pro rata his payments to producers by not more than the amount of such underpayment. Payment to producers shall be completed thereafter not later than the date for making payments pursuant to this paragraph next following after receipt of the balance due from the market administrator;

(b) In the case of a cooperative association which the market administrator determines is authorized by its producer-members to collect payment for their milk and which has so requested any handler in writing, such handler shall on or before the second day prior to the date on which payments are due individual producers, pay the cooperative association for milk received during the month from the producer-members of such association as determined by the market administrator, an amount equal to not less than the total due such producer-members as determined pursuant to paragraph (a) of this section; and

(c) In the case of milk received by a handler from a cooperative association in its capacity as a handler such handler shall on or before the second day prior to the date on which payments are due individual producers, pay to such cooperative association for milk so received during the month, an amount not less than the value of such milk computed at the applicable class prices for the location of the plant of the buying handler.

Section 902.81. Producer butterfat differential:

In making payments pursuant to section 902.80 (a) or (b) the uniform price shall be adjusted for each one-tenth of 1 percent of butterfat content in the milk of each producer above or below 3.5 percent, as the case may be, by a butterfat differential equal to the average of the butterfat differentials determined pursuant to section 902.51 (a) and (b) weighted by the pounds of butterfat in producer milk in each class and rounded to the nearest full cent.

Section 902.82. Location differential to producers:

In making payments to producers or to a cooperative association pursuant to section 902.80 (a) or (b) a handler shall deduct with respect to all milk received at his pool plant(s) located 75 miles by shortest highway distance from the zero milestone in the District of Columbia, as determined by the market administrator, 12 cents per hundredweight plus 1.5 cents for each 10-mile additional distance, or fraction thereof, which such plant is located from such milestone.

Section 902.83. Producer-settlement funds:

The market administrator shall establish and maintain a separate fund known as the "producer-settlement fund" into which he shall deposit all payments made by handlers pursuant to sections 902.62(c), 902.84, and 902.86 and out of which he shall make all payments pursuant to sections 902.85 and 902.86: *Provided,* That the market administrator shall offset any such payment due to any handler against payment due from such handler.

Section 902.84. Payments to the producer-settlement fund:

On or before the 11th day after the end of each month, each handler, including a cooperative association which is a handler, shall pay to the market administrator for payment to producers through the producer-settlement fund the amount by which the net pool obligation of such handler is greater than the sum required to be paid producers by such handler pursuant to section 902.80 (a) and (b).

Section 902.85. Payments out of the producer-settlement fund:

On or before the 12th day after the end of the month, the market administrator shall pay to each handler for payment to producers the amount by which the sum required to be paid producers by such handler pursuant to section 902.80 (a) and (b) is greater than the net pool obligations of such handler: *Provided,* That if the balance in the producer-settlement fund is insufficient to make all payments pursuant to this section, the market administrator shall reduce uniformly such payments and shall complete such payments as soon as the necessary funds are available.

Section 902.86. Adjustment of accounts:

Whenever verification by the market administrator of reports or payments of any handler discloses errors resulting in money due (a) the market administrator from such handler, (b) such handler from the market administrator, or (c) any producer or cooperative association from such handler, the marketing administrator shall promptly notify such handler of any amount so due and payment thereof shall be made on or before the next date for making payments set forth in the provisions under which such error occurred.

Section 902.87. Marketing services:

(a) Except as set forth in paragraph (b) of this section, each handler, in making payments directly to producers for milk (other than milk of his own production) pursuant to section 902.80(a) shall deduct 5 cents per hundredweight or such lesser amount as the Secretary may prescribe and shall pay such deductions to the market administrator on or before the 18th day after the end of the month. Such money shall be expended by the market administrator to provide market information and to verify the weights, samples, and tests of milk of producers who are not receiving such service from a cooperative association; and

(b) In the case of producers for whom the Secretary determines a cooperative association is actually performing the services set forth in paragraph (a) of this section, each handler shall make, in lieu of the deduction specified in paragraph (a) of this section, such deductions from the payments to be made directly to such producers pursuant to section 902.80(a) as are authorized by such producers on or before the 18th day after the end of each month and pay such deductions to the cooperative rendering such services.

Section 902.88. Expense of administration:

As his pro rata share of the expense of administration of this part, each handler, including any cooperative association which is a handler, shall pay to the market administrator on or before the 18th day after the end of the month, 4 cents per hundredweight or such lesser amount as the Secretary may prescribe, for each hundredweight of skim milk and butterfat contained in (a) producer milk (including such handler's own farm production), (b) other source milk allocated to class I milk pursuant to section 902.46(a)(2), (3), and (b), or (c) class I milk for which a payment is due pursuant to section 902.62(c).

Section 902.89. Termination of obligations:

The provisions of this section shall apply to any obligation under this part for the payment of money.

(a) The obligation of any handler to pay money required to be paid under the terms of this part shall, except as provided in paragraphs (b) and (c) of this section, terminate 2 years after the last day of the month during which the market administrator receives the handler's utilization report on the milk involved in such obligation, unless within such 2-year period the market administrator notifies the handler that such money is due and payable. Service of such notice shall be complete upon mailing to the handler's last known address, and it shall contain but need not be limited to, the following information:

(1) The amount of the obligation;

(2) The month(s) during which the milk, with respect to which the obligation exists, was received or handled; and

(3) If the obligation is payable to one or more producers or to an association of producers, the name of such producer(s) or association of producers, or if the obligation is payable to the market administrator, the account for which it is to be paid;

(b) If a handler fails or refuses, with respect to any obligation under this part, to make available to the market administrator or his representatives all books and records required by this part to be made available, the market administrator may, within the 2-year period provided for in paragraph (a) of this section, notify the handler in writing of such failure or refusal. If the market administrator so notifies a handler, the said 2-year period with respect to such obligation shall not begin until the first day of the month following the month during which all such books and records pertaining to such obligations are made available to the market administrator or his representatives;

(c) Notwithstanding the provisions of paragraphs (a) and (b) of this section, a handler's obligation under this part to pay money shall not be terminated with respect to any transaction involving fraud or willful concealment of a fact, material to the obligation, on the part of the handler against whom the obligation is sought to be imposed; and

(d) Any obligation on the part of the market administrator to pay a handler any money which such handler claims to be due him under the terms of this part shall terminate 2 years after the end of the month during which the milk involved in the claim was received if an underpayment is claimed, or 2 years after the end of the month during which the payment (including deduction or setoff by the market administrator) was made by the handler if a refund on such payment is claimed, unless such handler, within the applicable period of time files, pursuant to section 8c(15)(A) of the act, a petition claiming such money.

EFFECTIVE TIME, SUSPENSION, OR TERMINATION

Sec. 902.90. Effective time:

The provisions of this part, or any amendment to this part, shall become effective at such time as the Secretary may declare and shall continue in force until suspended or terminated, pursuant to § 902.91.

Sec. 902.91. Suspension or termination:

The Secretary may suspend or terminate this part or any provision of this part, whenever he finds that this part or any provisions of this part, obstructs, or does not tend to effectuate the declared policy of the act. This part shall terminate, in any event, whenever the provisions of the act authorizig it cease to be in effect.

Sec. 902.92. Continuing obligations:

If under the suspension or termination of any or all provisions of this part, there are any obligations thereunder, the final accrual or ascertainment of which requires further acts by any person (including the market administrator), such further acts shall be performed notwithstanding such suspension or termination.

Section 902.93. Liquidation.

Upon the suspension or termination of the provisions of this part, except this section, the market administrator, or such liquidating agent as the Secretary may designate, shall, if so directed by the Secretary, liquidate the business of the market administrator's office, dispose of all property in his possession or control, including accounts receivable, and execute and deliver all assignment or other instruments necessary or appropriate to effectuate any such disposition. If the liquidating agent is so designated, all assets, books, and records of the market administrator shall be transferred promptly to such liquidating agent. If, upon such liquidation, the funds on hand exceed the amounts required to pay outstanding obligations of the office of the market administrator and to pay necessary expenses of liquidation and distribution, such excess shall be distributed to contributing handlers and producers in an equitable manner.

MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

Section 902.100. Agents:

The Secretary may by designation in writing, name any officer or employee of the United States to act as his agent or representative in connection with any of the provisions of this part.

Section 902.101. Separability of provisions:

If any provision of this part, or its application to any person or circumstances is held invalid, the application of such provision and of the remaining provisions of this part, to other persons or circumstances shall not be affected thereby.

Issued at Washington, D.C., the 30th day of January 1959.

[SEAL] ORIS V. WELLS,
Administrator.

[F.R. Doc. 59-957; Filed, Feb. 3, 1959; 8:51 a.m.]

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, for the week, on account of death of his father.

To Mr. ROBERTS (at the request of Mr. RAINS), for today, on account of illness in the family.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin, for 15 minutes today, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. STRATTON, for 30 minutes, on March 18.

Mr. VANIK, for 15 minutes, on March 17.

Mr. FLOOD, for 20 minutes today, and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. BECKER (at the request of Mr. SMITH of California), to vacate the special order he had for today and Monday and that he be permitted to address the House for 1 hour on Wednesday, March 18.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts, for 5 minutes, on Monday.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mrs. BOLTON (at the request of Mr. ARENDS) in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. REUSS.

Mr. YATES, his remarks in Committee of the Whole today on H.R. 1, and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. VAN ZANDT and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. MEADER, his remarks in Committee of the Whole today on H.R. 1 and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. MICHEL, his remarks in Committee of the Whole today; and in two instances and to include editorials.

Mr. HALPERN and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin, his remarks in Committee of the Whole today and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. METCALF in three instances.

Mr. KEOGH and to include the proceedings of the annual banquet of the National Conference of Christians and Jews, held in Brooklyn, notwithstanding it will exceed two pages of the RECORD and is estimated by the Public Printer to cost $189.

Mr. MCDONOUGH in three instances, in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. BROOMFIELD (at the request of Mr. SMITH of California) was given permission to revise and extend the remarks he made in the Committee of the Whole on H.R. 1.

Mr. WESTLAND (at the request of Mr. SMITH of California).

(At the request of Mr. BURDICK, and to include extraneous matter, the following:)

Mr. DANIELS.

Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER.

Mr. DINGELL.

Mr. MULTER.

Mr. BREWSTER.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

A joint resolution of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S.J. Res. 47. Joint resolution providing that certain communication activities at the IX Plenary Assembly of the International

Radio Consultative Committee to be held in the United States in 1959 shall not be construed to be prohibited by the Communications Act of 1934 or any other law; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 2260. An act to extend the induction provisions of the Universal Military Training and Service Act, and for other purposes.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 50. An act to provide for the admission of the State of Hawaii into the Union.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 2260. An act to extend the induction provision of the Universal Training and Service Act, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 1 minute p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, March 16, 1959, at 12 o'clock noon.

REPORT OF COMMITTEES ON USE OF COUNTERPART FUNDS

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the provisions of the Mutual Security Act of 1958, chapter IV, section 401(a), there is submitted herewith the report of use of foreign currencies by the House Committee on Agriculture:

MARCH 8, 1959.

Counterpart Funds

REPORT OF SUBCOMMITTEE ON TOBACCO

(Foreign currency and U.S. dollar equivalents expended between Sept. 28 and Oct. 13, 1958)

Country	Name of currency	Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollars
France	Francs	1,368,934	$2,702.00
Germany	Deutsche mark.	2,240	2,110.00
Switzerland	Francs	2,000	500.00
Belgium	do	41,844	825.00
United Kingdom	Pounds	1,211.12	3,391.14
Denmark	Kroners	2,600	376.00
Italy	Lire	648,000	1,036.80
Spain	Pesetas	18,400	334.50
Greece	Drachma	11,880	600.00
Portugal	Escudos	20,171	700.00
Total			14,335.44

HAROLD D. COOLEY,
Chairman, Committee on Agriculture.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

706. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a report for the month of February relating to the cooperative program of the United States with Mexico for the control and the eradication of foot-and-mouth disease, pursuant to Public Law 8, 80th Congress; to the Committee on Agriculture.

707. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Navy (Material), relative to a proposal by the Department of the Navy to transfer a 64-foot work boat, hull No. C–104362 and engine No. C–14611 to the Chelsea Yatch Club, Chelsea, Mass., pursuant to title 10, United States Code, section 7308; to the Committee on Armed Services.

708. A letter from the Chairman, National Labor Relations Board, transmitting the 23d Annual Report of the National Labor Relations Board for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1958, pursuant to the Labor Management Relations Act of 1947; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

709. A letter from the Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend the Government Corporation Control Act, as amended"; to the Committee on Government Operations.

710. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, by eliminating the requirement of an oath or affirmation on certain documents filed with the Federal Communications Commission"; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

711. A letter from the Chief Commissioner, Indian Claims Commission, transmitting a report that proceedings have been concluded with respect to the following claim: *The Kiowa, Comanche and Apache Tribes of Indians, Petitioners,* v. *The United States of America, Defendant.* (Docket No. 32), pursuant to the Indian Claims Commission act of August 13, 1946 (60 Stat. 1055; 25 U.S.C. 70t); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

712. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a report covering all tort claims paid by this Department in the fiscal year 1958, pursuant to the Federal Tort Claims Act (28 U.S.C. 2673); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

713. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Power Commission, transmitting a copy of each of the following: "Statistics of Natural Gas Companies, 1957", "Steam-Electric Plant Construction Cost and Annual Production Expenses, 1957", "Statistics of Electric Utilities, 1957", "Privately Owned, Statistics of Electric Utilities, 1957", "Publicly Owned, and Typical Residential Electric Bills, 1958"; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

714. A letter from the Chairman of the Board, Tennessee Valley Authority, transmitting a report entitled "A Program for Reducing the National Flood Damage Potential", pursuant to section 22 of the TVA Act and Executive Order No. 6161 (June 8, 1933); to the Committee on Public Works.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. FRIEDEL: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 156. Resolution to provide funds for the expense of the studies and investigations authorized by House Resolution 93; without amendment (Rept. No. 201). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. FRIEDEL: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 197. Resolution fixing the basic compensation of the eight expert transcribers, office of the official committee reporters, and the seven expert transcribers, office of the official reporters of debates, House of Representatives; without amendment (Rept. No. 202). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. FRIEDEL: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 198. Resolution to provide funds for necessary expenses of the Committee on Banking and Currency; without amendment (Rept. No. 203). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. FRIEDEL: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 206. Resolution providing for expenses of studies and investigations authorized by House Resolution 182; without amendment (Rept. No. 204). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. HAYS: Committee on House Administration: House Concurrent Resolution 15. Concurrent resolution providing for the printing of the "Code of Ethics for Government Service" as a House document; without amendment (Rept. No. 205). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. HAYS: Committee on House Administration: House Resolution 187. Resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of House Report No. 41, current session; without amendment (Rept. No. 206). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. HAYS: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 175. Resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies with minor editorial, grammatical, and typographical changes of House Report No. 2712, 85th Congress, entitled "Government Programs in International Education"; without amendment (Rept. No. 207). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi: Committee on House Administration. House Joint Resolution 115. Joint resolution to reserve a site in the District of Columbia for the erection of a memorial to Franklin Delano Roosevelt, to provide for a competition for the design of such memorial, and to provide additional funds for holding the competition; with amendment (Rept. No. 208). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HARRIS: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. House Joint Resolution 257. Joint resolution providing that certain communication activities at the IX Plenary Assembly of the International Radio Consultative Committee to be held in the United States in 1959 shall not be construed to be prohibited by the Communications Act of 1934 or any other law; without amendment (Rept. 209). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. COOLEY: Committee on Agriculture. H.R. 306. A bill to amend the Federal Crop Insurance Act; with amendment (Rept. No. 210). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. RABAUT: Committee on Appropriations. H.R. 5676. A bill making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of said District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1960, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 211). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MILLS: Committee on Ways and Means. H.R. 5640. A bill to extend the time during which certain individuals may continue to receive temporary unemployment compensation; without amendment (Rept. No. 212). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ALGER:

H.R. 5655. A bill to authorize the Federal Government to guard strategic defense facilities against individuals believed to be disposed to commit acts of sabotage, espionage, or other subversion; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ASHMORE:

H.R. 5656. A bill to repeal the excise tax on amounts paid for communication services or facilities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BAKER:

H.R. 5657. A bill to repeal the excise tax on amounts paid for communication services or facilities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BENNETT of Florida:

H.R. 5658. A bill to amend the Employment Act of 1946 to make the maintenance of a reasonable stable price level an explicit aim of Federal economic policy; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. BONNER:

H.R. 5659. A bill to amend title 14, United States Code, entitled "Coast Guard," to authorize the Coast Guard to sell supplies and furnish services not available from local sources to vessels and other watercraft to meet the necessities of such vessels and watercraft; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. CHIPERFIELD:

H.R. 5660. A bill granting the consent and approval of Congress to the Wabash Valley compact, and for related purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DELANEY:

H.R. 5661. A bill to protect the public health by amending the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act so as to provide for the safety of chemicals in cosmetics; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DENT:

H.R. 5662. A bill to amend section 1077 of title 10, United States Code, to provide dental care for dependents of any member of a uniformed service residing with the member at or near his duty station; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. FARBSTEIN:

H.R. 5663. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that a fully insured individual may qualify for the disability freeze and for disability insurance benefits with 20 quarters of coverage, regardless of when such quarters occurred; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H.R. 5664. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to exempt from income tax the first $2,400 received each year as civil service salary or compensation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HIESTAND:

H.R. 5665. A bill to establish a Firefighting Air Corps in the Forest Service; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts (by request):

H.R. 5666. A bill to provide chiropractic treatment when requested for veterans eligible for outpatient medical care; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. PORTER:

H.R. 5667. A bill to amend the Social Security Act and the Internal Revenue Code so as to provide insurance against the costs of hospital, nursing home, and surgical service for persons eligible for old-age and survivors insurance benefits, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 5668. A bill to promote mining and development research for beryl, chromite, and columbium-tantalum from domestic mines; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SMITH of Iowa:

H.R. 5669. A bill to amend section 105(b) of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, relating to price support for oats, rye, barley, and grain sorghums; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SPRINGER:

H.R. 5670. A bill granting the consent and approval of Congress to the Wabash Valley compact, and for related purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TELLER:

H.R. 5671. A bill to provide financial assistance for the support of public schools by appropriating funds to the States to be used for constructing school facilities and for teachers' salaries; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. TOLL:

H.R. 5672. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act so as to remove the limitation upon the amount of outside income which an individual may earn while receiving benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. UTT:

H.R. 5673. A bill to protect the right of the blind to self-expression through organizations of the blind; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. VINSON:

H.R. 5674. A bill to authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. YOUNGER:

H.R. 5675. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to provide that "equal time" provisions shall not apply to news programs; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. RABAUT:

H.R. 5676. A bill making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of said District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1960, and for other purposes.

By Mr. BOYLE:

H.R. 5677. A bill to provide for the District of Columbia an appointed Governor and secretary, and an elected legislative assembly and nonvoting Delegate to the House of Representatives, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 5678. A bill to grant a pension of $100 per month to all honorably discharged veterans of World War I who are over 62 years of age; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. DENT:

H.R. 5679. A bill to amend title III of the act of March 3, 1933, with respect to the acquisition by the United States of articles, materials, and supplies for public use; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. FLOOD:

H.R. 5680. A bill to establish a temporary Presidential commission to study and report on the problems relating to blindness and the needs of blind persons, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HAGEN:

H.R. 5681. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct the San Luis unit of the Central Valley project, California, to enter into an agreement with the State of California with respect to the construction and operation of such unit, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HOSMER:

H.R. 5682. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct the San Luis unit of the Central Valley project, California, to enter into an agreement with the State of California with respect to the construction and operation of such unit, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado:

H.R. 5683. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to increase grants for construction of sewage treatment works, to establish the Office of Water Pollution Control; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. JOHNSON of California:

H.R. 5684. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct the San Luis unit of the Central Valley project, California, to enter into an agreement with the State of California with respect to the construction and operation of such unit, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MOULDER:

H.R. 5685. A bill to provide for the preservation of historical and archeological data (including relics and specimens) which might otherwise be lost as the result of the contruction of a dam; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SILER:

H.R. 5686. A bill providing for the establishment, equipment, and maintenance of a nuclear energy-coal experiment station in the coal regions of eastern Kentucky; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SISK:

H.R. 5687. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct the San Luis unit of the Central Valley project, California, to enter into an agreement with the State of California with respect to the construction and operation of such unit, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SMITH of Iowa:

H.R. 5688. A bill to modify Reorganization Plan No. II of 1939 and Reorganization Plan No. 2 of 1953; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. SPENCE:

H.R. 5689. A bill to repeal obsolete provisions of law relating to the mints and assay offices; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. WESTLAND:

H.R. 5690. A bill to amend the United States Housing Act of 1937 to reduce from 65 to 62 the age at which a single woman can qualify for admission to a low-rent housing project and the age at which a woman can qualify her family for admission to a project designed specifically for elderly families; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 5691. A bill to authorize adjustments in accounts of outstanding old series currency, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. DOWDY:

H.J. Res. 308. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing for the election of President and Vice President; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCHERER:

H.J. Res. 309. Joint resolution designating November 19, the anniversary of Lincoln's Gettyburg Address, as Dedication Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEARNS:

H. Res. 309. Resolution creating a select committee to conduct an investigation and study of the feasibility of relating the office allowances of Members to the workload of their offices; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Montana, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to take such action as may be required to place the Absaroke-Yankee Jim

project under construction at the earliest possible time; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of North Dakota, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to oppose any change or proposed change in the law which would effect an increase in the interest rate on loans to rural electrical cooperative associations or corporations; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Oregon, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to repeal the excise tax levied upon telephone and telegraph services; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BARR:

H.R. 5692. A bill for the relief of Kuo Ning Yau; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BERRY:

H.R. 5693. A bill to provide for the issuance of a patent-in-fee-simple to Bartley M. Mills covering certain real property now held in trust for the Rosebud Sioux Tribe; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. CURTIS of Massachusetts:

H.R. 5694. A bill providing for the application for letters patent on behalf of the estate of the late Dr. Saul Hertz concerning a medical process for the use of radioactive iodine; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOOLEY:

H.R. 5695. A bill for the relief of Fleischmann Distilling Corp. and others; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FARBSTEIN:

H.R. 5696. A bill for the relief of Eulalia Fernandez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FOGARTY:

H.R. 5697. A bill for the relief of Francis Conlon; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOSMER (by request):

H.R. 5698. A bill for the relief of Heh Ik Chang (Harry Glover); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LIPSCOMB:

H.R. 5699. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Anastasia Miljkovic and her minor son, Serbolub Miljkovic; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MARSHALL:

H.R. 5700. A bill for the relief of Parker E. Dragoo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

108. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the chairman, Conference of Americans of Central-Eastern-European Descent, New York, N.Y., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to proposing a policy of full inclusion of naturalized citizens in claim settlements in accordance with the concepts of Public Law 857, 81st Congress; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

109. Also petition of Eugene G. Evans, Jr., M.D., Hendersonville, N.C., relative to a redress of grievance relating to Executive Order No. 10730, dated September 24, 1957; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Statement in Opposition to H.R. 1, Lake Michigan Diversion Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 13, 1959

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include herewith a statement I presented to the Committee on Public Works on February 17 in opposition to H.R. 1, the Lake Michigan water diversion bill.

STATEMENT BY HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON, BEFORE COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, IN OPPOSITION TO H.R. 1 AND OTHER BILLS TO REQUIRE A STUDY TO BE CONDUCTED OF THE EFFECT OF INCREASING THE DIVERSION OF WATER FROM LAKE MICHIGAN, ON FEBRUARY 17, 1959

Mr. Chairman, members of the committee, thank you for giving me an opportunity to present a statement in opposition to H.R. 1, a bill to require a study to be conducted of the effect of increasing the diversion of water from Lake Michigan into the Illinois Waterway.

As you know, this subject has been debated in practically every session of Congress since 1937. The Great Lakes Harbors Association, the port cities of the Great Lakes, the Lake Carriers' Association, and the governments of the States bordering the Great Lakes have always been united in opposition to the demands of Chicago for permission to divert additional water from Lake Michigan.

While we realize that the measure presently under consideration (H.R. 1) is deemed to be a study bill, we feel that its enactment will be a detriment to the best interest of all areas in the Great Lakes other than Chicago. In Ohio our industries have a great need for additional water for industrial use, however we oppose diversion of water where there is no means provided for returning water to the lakes.

The diversion of water from Lake Michigan will lower the natural level of that lake and the other Great Lakes, their connecting and tributary waters and the St. Lawrence River, thereby reducing the carrying capacity of ships and leading to higher transportation costs. At this time we in the Midwest are anticipating the opening of the St. Lawrence Seaway to large oceangoing vessels. When the Federal Government is spending large sums to deepen the Great Lakes connecting channels and improve the harbors on the Great Lakes to accommodate these deep-draft vessels, it would be most inconsistent to permit this measure to pass which will eventually result in lowering the lake levels.

It is my hope that the committee will table H.R. 1 and all other bills which would permit additional diversion of water into the Illinois Waterway.

Dr. Flemming's Formula

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEE METCALF
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 13, 1959

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, Dr. Flemming, has recently applied his talent to the development of a formula which he states would solve the classroom shortage.

Under the Flemming formula, the Federal aid will be supplied to the States which will enable the building of an additional 75,000 classrooms over the next 5 years. In order for this formula to work, however, it will be necessary for the States and local districts to repeal debt limitations, for many States to amend their constitutions, and for others to completely revamp the system of State aid which they and the local districts have worked out over the years. To Dr. Flemming, these are only minor obstacles.

Dr. Flemming has expressed great concern over the problem of supplying an adequate number of competent teachers for the public schools but, as yet, his administration has not seen fit to take any action in this field. He has not made sufficient application of his own ingenious formula.

He should consider applying the Flemming formula to other education problems—teaching the English language, for instance. Under the Flemming formula, all he would have to do is change the basic rules of grammar.

Then a noun does not have to agree with a verb. And there would not be nothing wrong with a double negative. It would be all right to mispel words and use a preposition to end a sentence with.

This application of the Flemming formula might help solve the classroom and teacher shortage. Children would not have to spend so much time learning English. Fewer English teachers and fewer classrooms would be needed. Of course, this is an absurd application of Dr. Flemming's formula but no more absurd than his contention that the classroom shortage can be overcome by changing State constitutions and taxing concepts.

March 15, 1959: Anniversary of Hungarian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY S. REUSS
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 13, 1959

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, on March 15, 1848, the Hungarian people under the leadership of the famed Louis Kossuth, won freedom from Hapsburg rule. The freedom movement led to the aboli-

tion of serfdom and to enlarged public representation in political affairs. A charter of freedom also proclaimed the right to create a national government. This victory over tyranny, although short-lived, will never be forgotten by the people of Hungary.

It was the spirit of 1848, for example, that guided the October 1956 revolution against the rule of Communist Russia. Certainly no people have struggled more valiantly for freedom than the people of Hungary. I am sure that these people shall always rank freedom and independence as the highest goals that man may seek.

I salute the people of Hungary on the anniversary of their independence from the Hapsburgs 111 years ago. I am proud that many Hungarians have come to this country where they have enriched our own democracy with their high concept of freedom. I am proud of their traditions, proud of their remarkable past, and look forward with them to the day when this great heritage may come to its full fruition in Hungary.

Hungarian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 13, 1959

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, the bloody events of October-November days of 1956 in Hungary were the result of an outward manifestation on the part of tough and tenacious Hungarians held down by the most powerful totalitarian dictatorship. There in their homeland they were being oppressed by their taskmasters. Hating and detesting these alien overlords, and yearning for freedom, the people staged a sudden uprising, thereby hoping to expel Russian Communists and the Red army detachments, and thus regain their freedom. Unfortunately, the helpless and brave Hungarians were alone in this unequal struggle against the massive and monolithic might of the Soviet Union. The valiant efforts of the brave Hungarians ended in a tragic blood-bath. But such events are not new or rare in Hungary's long history. Such an epochmaking event took place a little over 100 years ago which began on the 15th of March 1848.

In that year, when revolutionary waves were sweeping all over Europe, all oppressed peoples under autocratic regimes were stirred and became restive. Hungarian people showed their resentment against the Austrian government. Their great spokesman, Louis Kossuth, presented their grievances to the government early in March. But, before the government had given serious considerations to these grievances, demonstrations were held in various parts of the country, demanding freedom. Fortunately the government was not in position to suppress the people and ignore their demands. Finally on March 15, on the "Ides of March," their demands were granted; the people regained their freedom. Since then, for more than 110 years, March 15 has been celebrated as one of the chief national holidays of Hungary. The events of that day proved that however ruthless and heartless autocracies may seem, and often are, they are bound to lose out in the end against the will and tenacity of a sturdy and stout-hearted people. Perhaps the best way to revive the spirit of those days is to celebrate the anniversary of that great event, even when today Hungary is suffering under Communist tyranny. I therefore take pleasure in associating myself with Hungarian Freedom Day, and with those Americans of Hungarian descent who mark this day.

Reuniting of Families

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DOMINICK V. DANIELS
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 13, 1959

Mr. DANIELS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include my statement issued in connection with a bill I introduced on March 11, 1959, to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to facilitate the reuniting of families:

TO FACILITATE REUNITING OF FAMILIES

On March 11, 1959, I introduced a bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to grant nonquota status to certain immigrants who are brothers, sisters, sons, or daughters of American citizens. These close of kin are classified under the fourth preference quota section of the act, and it is unjust and inhumane to prevent them from being reunited with their families. One of the cardinal principles of our immigration laws should be to facilitate the reuniting of families.

Fourth preference visas can be issued only when deficiencies occur in the first, second, and third preferences, which are allotted 100 percent of the quota. It is unjust to permit American citizens to file petitions for their brothers, sisters, sons, or daughters, granting them approval and then let them pile up in a huge backlog at the American consulates abroad without the hope of any visas being issued.

There are approximately 100,000 petitions on file and many of these were filed as far back as 10 years ago. The petitioners have been waiting hopelessly for many years to be reunited with their parents, brothers, or sisters. In Italy, for example, there isn't a single available quota for the fourth preference group nor is it contemplated that there will be one for many, many years to come. This is true of Poland, Hungary, Spain, Greece, Portugal, and many other countries. The consulate in Iraq is now processing applications filed in 1946 and applications from Turkey are presently being processed which were first filed in 1945. It is estimated that there is a backlog of some 100,000 people who daily crowd the offices of our consulates abroad and unless this conversion is made from quota to nonquota, the number will grow and the pressure will increase.

This backlog is due primarily to our national origin quota system which gives such pitifully small quotas to the countries of southern Europe and Asia and gives to Great Britain 65,360 of our total annual quota of 152,000. Yet Britain uses only 10 percent of this alloted quota and the rest is wasted.

To rectify this inequity of opportunity, I therefore introduced a bill which, following the precedent established by the act of September 11, 1957, will provide for the conversion of the fourth preference category registered up to July 1, 1959 to nonquota immigrant status. It is my considered opinion that this is the just and humane thing to do in the interest of the United States.

Good Hearing Is as Essential as Good Sight for Automobile Driving

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 13, 1959

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, no one can drive an automobile in any State or Territory of the United States who suffers from any serious type of vision impairment. Thanks to the American Safety Council all motor vehicle bureaus in every State and Territory have made it mandatory that all applicants for operators' licenses submit to rigorous sight tests. Where it is found that the applicant suffers from any type of visual difficulties of a nature which might impair his own or the safety of others, he is obliged to wear corrective lenses and his need of such lenses while operating a motor vehicle is clearly imprinted upon the face of each such license.

However, up to now nothing has been done about taking into account the important fact that there are some 15 million or more Americans who suffer from hearing defects of a minor or major nature. There is no hearing test required of anyone seeking an operator's license nor is any cognizance given to applicants suffering from such deficiencies. This, in spite of the fact that deficient hearing, equally as much as poor eyesight, can endanger lives and property.

Of some 15 million Americans suffering from impaired hearing, only about 1 million use hearing aids as a corrective measure. This is due mainly to two things: First, many hard-of-hearing persons of all ages are totally unaware of such defects, and second, many who do know of it refuse to wear hearing aids because the majority of such instruments are cumbersome and conspicuous.

The reluctance of the hard-of-hearing to wear a hearing aid which draws attention to their affliction is understandable. But it does not alter the fact that a hard-of-hearing person driving an automobile can endanger lives and property.

Three men in the United States are currently doing something about this situation. They have petitioned the National Safety Council to help. They are also appealing to the legislators of every State in the Union to enact laws requiring motor vehicle bureaus to take legal

steps to prevent persons with poor hearing from operating a motor vehicle unless they use an adequate hearing aid.

These men are Paul B. H. Smith, who has devoted his life to audiology and is president of one of the Nation's foremost hearing aid manufacturing companies; Dr. James A. DePew, Jr., chief audiologist of the world famous New York Eye and Ear Infirmary; and William R. Hutchins, electronics engineer, presently a key figure in the U.S. guided missiles program.

These three men are requesting that all motor vehicle bureaus require a hearing test of every applicant for a driver's license just as they now require a vision test.

Dr. DePew and Mr. Hutchins are inventors of a drastically sensitive audiometer which can accurately measure the extent of human hearing in fractions of a second.

To date, thousands of students in schools of every level throughout the Nation who had previously been labeled by their teachers as backward, indifferent, or below normal intellectually, have been subjected to audiometer tests. In a great number of cases, it was discovered that these boys and girls were neither poor scholars nor indifferent ones, but victims of some hearing impairment. Steps were at once undertaken to provide them with corrective materiel and when this was accomplished their classroom interests became enlivened and their marks shot up, equally as good as their fellow students.

Because so many sufferers from deafness are unaware of their affliction, Dr. DePew, Paul B. H. Smith, and Mr. Hutchins are waging this campaign to make it mandatory that a hearing test be required for all applicants for drivers' licenses.

Inspired by this campaign, hundreds of leading industrial firms are arranging for their own workers in plants, offices, and factories to take audiometer tests as a measure of safety as well as to increase worker efficiency where it is discovered that employees suffer from hearing deficiencies.

In some cities across the Nation, steps are being taken to offer free audiometer tests under civic sponsorship via mobile audiology laboratories.

In the case of those who need a hearing aid, but do not want to use one because of vanity or sensitivity, hearing aids are being made available which are no longer visual to others. These can be adriotly concealed as they no longer require wires or a volume control box because they are manufactured on transistor principles.

The people of the United States are indebted to Dr. James A. DePew, Jr., Engineer William R. Hutchins, and Paul B. H. Smith for their long and now successful fight to bring a normal way of life to persons suffering from hearing deficiencies; to safeguard life and property by campaigning for legislation which will require a hearing test for applicants for drivers' licenses; and for directing the paths of thousands of children who are hard-of-hearing into progressive, useful, and productive channels.

DAV Services in Maryland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. DANIEL B. BREWSTER

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 13, 1959

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I should like to insert the following speech which I made at the DAV installation of officers last night in Greenbelt, Md.

I believe that it speaks for itself.

An exceptional record of vital rehabilitation services freely extended to thousands of Maryland citizens has recently come to my attention. These splendid humanitarian services are not sufficiently appreciated by those who have benefited thereby, directly and indirectly.

Among the several congressionally chartered veteran organizations, which have State departments and local chapters in Maryland, is the Disabled American Veterans. The DAV is the only such organization composed exclusively of those Americans who have been either wounded, gassed, injured, or disabled by reason of active service in the Armed Forces of the United States, or of some country allied with it, during time of war. Formed in 1920, under the leadership of Judge Robert S. Marx, DAV legislative activities have benefited every compensated disabled veteran. Its present National Commander is another judge, David B. Williams, of Concord, Mass. Its National Adjutant is John E. Feighner, of Cincinnati, Ohio. Its National League Director is Elmer M. Freudenberger, its National Director of Claims is Cicero F. Hogan, and its National Director of Employment Relations is John W. Burris—all located at its national service headquarters, 1701 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

Inasmuch as less than 10 percent of our country's war veterans are receiving monthly disability-compensation payments for service-connected disabilities—some 2 million—the DAV can never aspire to become the largest of the several veteran organizations. Nevertheless, since shortly after it formation in 1920, the DAV national headquarters, located in Cincinnati, Ohio, has maintained the largest staff of any veteran organization, of full-time trained national service officers, 138 of them, who are located in the 63 regional and 3 district offices of the U.S. Veterans' Administration, and in its central office in Washington, D.C. They have ready access to the official claim records of those claimants who have given them their powers of attorney. All of them being war-handicapped veterans, themselves, these service officers are sympathetic and alert as to the problems of other less well informed claimants.

Located in the Veterans' Administration regional office at St. Paul and Fayette Streets, Baltimore, Md., is the DAV National Service Officer, Mr. Frank Dubinskas, a fine friend of mine. Because of the financial inability of the DAV to pay salaries in competition with commercial enterprise and the Federal Government, Mr. Dubinskas is now doing the work that should ordinarily be done by two national service officers and he is doing a fine job.

The present Department Commander of the DAV in Maryland is another friend of mine, Mr. John Stubbs, and the Adjutant is Jake Finn. The DAV Department of Maryland has nationally appointed representatives to the Veterans Administration Voluntary Services Advisory Committees at each of the Veterans' Administration hospitals servicing Maryland veterans. These DAV representatives and the hospitals are as follows: Mr. John E. Kellam at the 291-bed Tuberculosis Hospital at Baltimore, Mr. Earl Vellaca at the 377-bed General Medical and Surgical Hospital at Fort Howard, Mr. Charles Kennedy at the 1,800-bed Neuropsychiatric Hospital at Perry Point, and Mr. Earl Rosensteel at the 1,340-bed VA Center at Martinsburg, W. Va.

During the last fiscal year, the VA paid out $67,498,000 for its veteran program in Maryland, including $20,506,324 disability benefits to its 27,041 service-disabled veterans. These Federal expenditures in Maryland furnish substantial purchasing power in all communities.

Only about 7 percent—1,756—are members of the 27 DAV chapters, ranging up to 510 members in the Baltimore Chapter No. 1.

This 7 percent record is strange, in view of the very outstanding record of personalized service activities and accomplishments of the DAV national service officers in behalf of Maryland's veterans and dependents during the last 10 fiscal years, as revealed by the folowing statistics:

Claimants contacted (estimate)	45,438
Claims folders reviewed	37,865
Appearances before rating boards	3,670
Compensation increases obtained	3,332
Service connections obtained	661
Nonservice pensions	456
Death benefits obtained	66

Total monetary benefits obtained were $1,082,193.72.

The above figures do not include the accomplishments of other national service officers on duty in the central office of the Veterans' Administration, handling appeals and reviews, or in its three district offices, handling death and insurance cases. Over the last 10 years, they reported 83,611 claims handled in such district offices, resulting in monetary benefits of $20,850,335.32 and in the central office, they handled 58,282 reviews and appeals, resulting in monetary benefits of $5,337,389.05. Proportionate additional benefits were thereby obtained for Maryland's veterans, their dependents and their survivors.

These figures fail properly to paint the picture of the extent and value of the individualized advice, counsel, and assistance extended to all of the claimants who have contacted these DAV service officers in person, by telephone, and by letter.

Pertinent advice was furnished to all disabled veterans—only about 10 percent of whom were DAV members—their dependents, and others, in response to their varied claims for service connection, disability compensation, medical treatment, hospitalization, prosthetic appliances, vocational training, insurance, death compensation or pension, VA guarantee loans for homes, farms, and businesses, etc. Helpful advice was also given as to counseling and placement into suitable useful employment (to utilize their remaining abilities), civil service examinations, appointments, retentions, retirement benefits, and multifarious other problems.

Every claim presents different problems. Too few Americans fully realize that governmental benefits are not automatically awarded to disabled veterans—not given on a silver platter. Frequently, because of lack of official records, death, or disappearance of former buddies and associates, lapse of memory with the passage of time, lack of information and experience, proof of the legal service-connection of a disability becomes extremely difficult—too many times impossible. A claims and rating board can obviously not grant favorable action merely based on the opinions, impressions, or conclusions of persons who submit notarized affidavits. Specific, detailed, pertinent facts are essential.

The VA, which acts as judge and jury, cannot properly prosecute claims against itself. As the defendent, in effect, the U.S. Veterans' Administration must award the benefits provided under the laws administered by it, only under certain conditions.

A DAV national service officer can and does advise a claimant precisely why his claim may previously have been denied and then specifies what additional evidence is essential. The claimant must necessarily bear the burden of obtaining such fact-giving evidence. The experienced national service officer will, of course, advise him as to its possible improvement, before presenting same to the adjudication agency, in the light of all of the circumstances and facts, and of the pertinent laws, precedents, regulations and schedule of disability ratings. No DAV national service officer, I feel certain, ever uses his skill, except in behalf of worthy claimants, with justifiable claims.

The VA has denied more claims than it has allowed—because most claims are not properly prepared. It is very significant, as pointed out by the DAV Acting National Director of Claims, Chester A. Cash, that a much higher percentage of those claims, which have been prepared and presented with the aid of a DAV national service officer, are eventually favorably acted upon than is the case as to those claimants who have not given their powers of attorney to any such special advocate.

Another fact not generally known is that, under the overall review of claims inaugurated by the VA some 4 years ago, the disability compensation payments of about 37,200 veterans have been discontinued, and reduced as to about 27,300 others, at an aggregate loss to them of more than $28 million per year. About 1 percent (.013) of such discontinuances and reductions have probably occurred as to disabled veterans in Maryland, with a consequent loss of about $364,000 per year.

Most of these unfortunate claimants were not represented by the DAV or by any other veteran organization. Judging by the past, such unfavorable adjudications will occur as to an additional equal number or more during the next 3 years, before such review is completed. I urge every disabled veteran in Maryland to give his power of attorney to the national service officer of the DAV, or of some other veteran organization, or of the American Red Cross, just as a protective measure.

The average claimant who receives helpful advice probably does not realize the background of training and experience of a competent expert national service officer.

Measured by the DAV's overall costs of about $12,197,600 during a 10-year period, one would find that it has expended about $3.50 for each claim folder reviewed, or about $8.80 for each rating board appearance, or, again, about $22.70 for each favorable award obtained, or about $123 for each service connection obtained, or about $54 for each compensation increase obtained, and has obtained about $14.10 of direct monetary benefits for claimants for each dollar expended by the DAV for its national service officer setup. Moreover, such benefits will generally continue for many years.

Evidently, most claimants are not aware of the fact that the DAV receives no Government subsidy whatsoever. The DAV is enabled to maintain its nationwide staff of expert national service officers primarily because of income from membership dues collected by its local chapters and from the net income on its Idento-Tag (miniature automobile license tags) project, owned by the DAV and operated by its employees, most of whom are disabled veterans, their wives, or their widows, or other handicapped Americans—a rehabilitation project is thus furnishing them with useful employment. Incidentally, without checking as to whether they had previously sent in a donation, more than 1 million owners of sets of lost keys have received them back from the DAV's Idento-Tag Department, 13,555 of whom during the last 8 years, were Maryland residents.

Every eligible veteran, by becoming a DAV member, and by explaining these factors to fellow citizens, can help the DAV to procure such much needed public support as will enable it to maintain its invaluable nationwide service setup on a more adequate basis. So much more could be accomplished for distressed disabled veterans, if the DAV could be enabled financially, to maintain an expert service officer in every one of the 173 VA hospitals.

During the last 10 years, the DAV has also relied on appropriations from its separately incorporated trustee, the DAV Service Foundation, aggregating $3,300,000 exclusively for salaries to its national service officers. Its reserves having been thus nearly exhausted, the DAV Service Foundation is therefore very much in need of the general support of all serviced claimants, DAV members and other social-minded Americans—by direct donations, by designations in insurance policies, by bequests in wills, by assignments of stocks and bonds and by establishing special types of trust funds.

A special type of memorial trust fund originated about 3 years ago with concerned disabled veteran members of the DAV chapter in Butte, Mont., which established the first Perpetual Rehabilitation Fund of $1,000 with the DAV Service Foundation. Recently it added another $100 thereto. Since then, every DAV unit in that State has established such a special memorial trust fund, ranging from $100 to $1,100, equivalent to about $4 per DAV member.

Each claimant who has received any such rehabilitation service can help to make it possible for the DAV to continue such excellent rehabilitation services in Maryland by sending in donations to the DAV Service Foundation, 631 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. Every such serviced claimant who is eligible can and should also become a DAV member, preferably a life member, for which the total fee is $100 ($50 to those born before January 1, 1902 or World War I veterans), payable in installments within two full fiscal year periods.

Every American can help to make our Government more representative by being a supporting member of at least one organization which reflects his interests and viewpoints—labor unions, trade associations and various religious, fraternal, and civic associations. All of America's veterans ought to be members of one or more of the patriotic, service-giving veteran organizations. All of America's disabled defenders, who are receiving disability compensation, have greatly benefited by their own official voice—the DAV.

I am proud to be a life member of the DAV.

Statehood for Hawaii

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 13, 1959

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday and Thursday when H.R. 4221, the Hawaii statehood bill, was before the House, I was unable to be present because of illness. Having been a supporter of such legislation for many years, I regret missing the two votes very much. Had I been able to be present, I would have voted "yea" on the rule for consideration and "yea" on passage of the bill.

I extend my congratulations to the people of Hawaii, and shall hope to visit our 50th State sometime in the not-too-distant future.

Construction of the 291-Mile Keystone Shortway in Pennsylvania Would Relieve the Unemployment Situation in 13 Labor Surplus Areas in 29 Counties of the State

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 13, 1959

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, with area development legislation occupying a prominent position on the legislative agenda of the 86th Congress, the significance of the 291-mile Keystone Shortway in relationship to Pennsylvania's acute unemployment problem is explained in the following letter I wrote on March 12, 1959, to the Honorable Lewis L. Strauss, Secretary of the U.S. Department of Commerce.

In a few words, the letter reveals that if the U.S. Department of Commerce and the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania agree to construct immediately the Keystone Shortway which cuts directly across Pennsylvania from Stroudsburg to Sharon, the unemployment in 13 labor surplus areas of the 29 counties traversed by the shortway will be alleviated. In my district alone, the construction will cost $1 million per mile, and it will provide employment for 1,200 persons for a 3-year period. In addition, the construction of this 70.2-mile stretch will provide additional employment in industries which manufacture and transport the material.

Mr. Speaker, here is a wonderful opportunity for the Department of Commerce and the Commonwealth to spend funds already allocated for highway construction in Pennsylvania on a project that will alleviate a lot of Pennsylvania's chronic unemployment.

The letter to Secretary Strauss follows:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., March 12, 1959.

Hon. LEWIS L. STRAUSS,
Secretary, U.S. Department of Commerce, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SECRETARY STRAUSS: As you know, of the nearly 5 million unemployed in the United States, 508,000 of them are located in the State of Pennsylvania representing 10 percent of its labor force. Most of this unemployment in Pennsylvania has existed for years and is of great concern to the State and Federal Government. The result is that the problem has been attacked on the State and National level and at the present time this vexing unemployment problem in Pennsylvania is involved in the area redevelopment legislation now being considered by Congress.

The purpose of writing you on the subject of unemployment in Pennsylvania is due to the fact that included in the Department of Commerce is the Office of Area Development as well as the Bureau of Public Roads, with both agencies having a relationship to the proposed construction of the 291-mile Keystone Shortway in Pennsylvania. This shortway with dual lanes cuts directly across Pennsylvania.

According to the Pennsylvania Department of Labor and Industry, the Keystone Shortway traverses 13 labor market areas whose unemployment ranges from 8.6 percent to 16.6 percent. In these areas, there is a total of 115,800 unemployed workers, many of whom would find ready employment on construction of the shortway.

According to the Bureau of Public Roads, from a cost standpoint the national average shows 1 mile costing $1 million. Therefore, the immediate construction of the 291-mile Keystone Shortway in Pennsylvania would provide employment to most of the 115,800 unemployed persons in the 13 labor market areas previously mentioned. In addition, Pennsylvania's coal mines, cement plants, steel mills, and other industries including transportation will indirectly provide employment to many of Pennsylvania's 508,000 unemployed.

In my own congressional district in Pennsylvania comprising the counties of Blair, Centre and Clearfield, 70.2 miles of the shortway would be constructed. To give you some idea of the effect such construction would have on unemployment, it will require 3 years to build the shortway and meanwhile provide employment for 1,200 persons for each of the three 9-month years. In a few words, this employment and accelerated employment in related industries could have a tremendous and favorable impact on the unemployment in my congressional district. If this is the case in my congressional district, think of the benefits to be enjoyed by areas with pockets of unemployment throughout Pennsylvania.

According to the Bureau of Public Roads, the Federal Government has allocated to the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania for highway construction $117,103,237 for fiscal year 1959 and $101,440,250 for fiscal year 1960, making a total of $218,543,487. In general, this amount represents the Federal Government's contribution of 90 cents of every dollar spent by the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania on its Interstate System of Highways. While this fund will not entirely cover the entire Federal aid necessary in paying the overall cost of the Keystone Shortway, it represents roughly 75 percent of the amount needed.

From the information furnished, you will readily see that the Federal Government's financing of the Keystone Shortway in Pennsylvania could alleviate a lot of chronic unemployment in 13 labor market areas. Therefore, it is my thinking that the U.S. Department of Commerce should prevail upon the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania to construct the Keystone Shortway immediately as part of a Federal-State effort to alleviate chronic unemployment in the 13 areas of Pennsylvania affected.

Over a period of years, former Governor Leader of Pennsylvania advocated area redevelopment legislation and now his successor and present Governor, David Lawrence, is doing the same thing. While it is true that the construction of the Keystone Shortway is not the complete answer to the unemployment problem, it will have a favorable effect on wiping out unemployment in 13 labor markets in Pennsylvania. Therefore, a Federal-State program that would bring about immediate construction of the shortway should merit Governor Lawrence's undivided support.

In conclusion, may I point out that in the northern part of my congressional district and elsewhere throughout Pennsylvania the lack of adequate highway transportation is a handicap to the industries that we now have in that area and if we are to rehabilitate and diversify the economy of the area through an area redevelopment program, modern highways like the proposed Keystone Shortway are the answer to our problem. This is a compelling reason why the Keystone Shortway should be constructed before Congress approves an area redevelopment program because adequate transportation is vital to the development of any area.

Thanking you for the consideration of my proposal and with best wishes, I am,

Sincerely yours,

JAMES E. VAN ZANDT.

Dr. Flemming's Famous Formula

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEE METCALF
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 13, 1959

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce reported H.R. 1011 the other day to provide for amendments to the Federal Airport Act. This bill would authorize Federal aid for airports in the amount of $297 million over the next 4 years.

The hearings and the report on this legislation make out a good case for the bill, but I failed to find where the talents of the Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare have been utilized. Had he been consulted, perhaps we could save almost $300 million.

Secretary Flemming is the author of a formula for the construction of 75,000 of the 140,000 classrooms the children of the Nation need by a Federal program resting upon changes in the State constitutions of many of the States, changes in statutes and debt limits in other States and changes in the whole tax systems of many of the States and local districts. He anticipates this will be done in time to get some of the boys and girls in school next September even though the elections for the changes won't take place, if at all, until November 1960, and even though many of the State legislatures have completed their legislative sessions not to meet again for 2 years. But these minor obstacles of time and space do not bother Dr. Flemming.

An application of the Flemming formula to our airport problems would take care of the stacking up over airports by simply changing the aeronautical definition of a stall from "the loss of necessary airspeed to maintain altitude and control" to "a place for parking airplanes in midair." This would keep the planes waiting to land from having to circle the field and thus endangering other traffic. Long runways could be eliminated by passing legislation requiring planes to land and take off vertically and much valuable land that is now being used for runways could be used for storage or administration buildings or parking space for automobiles. All that the plane manufacturers have to do is equip their planes with antigravity stabilizers and vertical landing gear and all of our problems will be solved. Or better yet just repeal the law of gravity.

Lt. Gen. S. T. Williams, U.S. Army

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE P. MILLER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 13, 1959

Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, the Secretary of Defense, the Honorable Neil McElroy, in his recent defense posture statements prepared for this Congress, paid a splendid tribute to the noteworthy progress being made by the armed forces of the Republic of Vietnam. The Secretary, while visiting Vietnam, learned that this nation is determined to remain a free Republic despite what faint hearts consider its precarious location on the edge of the Communist sphere of influence in southeast Asia and despite its exposure to Red military might which could come at any time by direct land routes and over short air and sea distances.

Certainly, the reassuring words of the Secretary were good to hear. I submit that he genuinely meant that Vietnam's armed forces were, to some degree, relatively exceptional. In the brief 4 years since the 1955 armistice terminating the French Indochina war and starting from less than nothing—indeed, from the ashes and ruins of the holocaust itself—the army, navy, and air force of Vietnam have come a long, long way toward fulfillment. To the point, in fact, where Mr. McElroy took special note of their capabilities.

Mr. Speaker, behind this mighty effort and achievement there must have been good counsel and leadership of the highest order of modern military times. For a fact, there was. This land could be saved by sound assistance and advice to its newly created armed forces. The emergency arose and we had the man for the job. On November 15, 1955, a great American and truly outstanding general officer was named Chief of the U.S. Military Assistance Advisory Group for Vietnam. That man was Lt. Gen. Samuel T. Williams, U.S. Army, in whom we can surely take abundant pride.

General Williams went out to far-off Vietnam in 1955 and brought to that war-torn nation his invaluable combat experience, his sagacity for planning, his indomitable spirit and vigor. Side-by-side with the Vietnamese, he organized, he trained, he built, and he stayed with the job and thus has struck a real blow for freedom.

Mr. Speaker, I know whereof I speak about Vietnam perhaps better than most. I had personally seen the situation in Vietnam in 1955. Then in October 1958, it was my great privilege to visit that country again to participate in ceremonies commemorating Vietnam's

third anniversary of the proclamation of the constitution of that country. The military took a prideful part in these ceremonies.

I could scarcely believe that so much could have been done so quickly.

But it was there for all to see, a magnificent modern military achievement, a testimonial to the tireless and unpublicized efforts of General Williams.

Mr. Speaker, I would like the House and our colleagues in the Senate to know of General Williams' unselfish and remarkable service in Vietnam. In a larger sense, I would like also for the Congress to note the long and honorable service of this fine officer and gentleman. In these days, we seldom see personal records of such devoted service to one's country. As times goes on, we shall see less and less. While we can, let us note this great soldier's record, a saga of over 40 years with the colors. It was a lifetime spent, and still being spent, all in America's name and in Freedom's name.

This is General Williams' outstanding service:

General Williams was born and raised in Denton, Tex. He attended the first officers' training camp at Leon Springs, Tex., in 1917 and was commissioned a second lieutenant of infantry with assignment to Company I, 359th Infantry 90th—Texas-Oklahoma—Division. He served with the 359th Infantry in the Toul sector and in the St. Mihiel and Meuse-Argonne battles and in the Army of Occupation.

Between 1920 and 1942 General Williams served in various infantry regiments as a company commander and regimental staff officer and graduated from the Infantry School, the Command and General Staff College, and the Army War College.

During World War II, General Williams held assignments as Assistant Chief of Staff, G–4, 95th Infantry Division; regimental commander of the 378th Infantry Regiment, 95th Division; G–3 XXII Corps, C/S XXII Corps; and assistant division commander of the 90th Infantry Division, participating in the Normany landing and five campaigns in Europe. From 1946 until 1950, General Williams commanded the First Military District in Germany, the 26th Infantry Regimental Combat Team, and was Acting C/S and Assistant Division Commander of the First Infantry Division.

Returning to the United States in 1950, General Williams served as Assistant G–3, Office, Chief Army Field Forces, until 1952. He then commanded the 25th—Tropic Lightning—Division in Korea during the last year of that war. During this period he also served as deputy corps commander of the II Republic of Korea Corps of the Republic of Korea Army during the last great Chinese offensive. After the armistice, he was sent to northern Japan to command the XVI Corps and was charged with the defensive plans of that part of Japan north of Tokyo.

In April 1954 General Williams returned to Korea to command the IX U.S. Corps and the V Republic of Korea Corps. During this period he also served as Deputy Army commander of the Eighth U.S. Army in addition to his duties as a corps commander. Returning to the United States, he assumed his duties as deputy Army commander of the Fourth Army, Fort Sam Houston, Tex., in January 1955. He assumed command of the Fourth Army on June 17, 1955, and retained that command until named Chief, Military Assistance Advisory Group, Vietnam, on November 15, 1955.

General Williams' decorations include the Distinguished Service Cross, Distinguished Service Medal, the Silver Star with oak leaf cluster, the Soldier's Medal, Bronze Star, Purple Heart with oak leaf cluster, French Legion of Honor, French Croix de Guerre with palm, the Korean Taeguk with silver star, and Ulchi Medal with gold star for his services to the Korean Army during the Kumsong Bulge battle in July 1953, and other high decorations of our allies.

Balance Budget for Bright Economy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACK WESTLAND
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 13, 1959

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I would like to enclose part of the transcript of a television program filed February 27, 1959, for presentation over KOMO–TV, Seattle, Wash., and KVOS–TV, Bellingham, Wash.

The program is an interview between myself and Dr. Raymond J. Saulnier, chairman of the President's Council of Economic Advisers. I believe Dr. Saulnier's remarks are of interest not only to the citizens of my own Second Congressional District of Washington, but also to all citizens of this land.

The transcript follows:

TRANSCRIPT OF INTERVIEW BETWEEN REPRESENTATIVE JACK WESTLAND AND DR. RAYMOND J. SAULNIER

Mr. WESTLAND. Practically everybody is interested in the future economy of the country and just what it holds for us in the way of economic development. I have been getting a lot of letters from people in my district and from people outside my district, talking about this budget we have, whether or not it should be balanced, and about our economy in general.

I believe that this subject is important and people all over the country are interested in it. In order to bring some discussion of this matter to you, I have as my guest today, Dr. Raymond J. Saulnier, better known among his friends as Steve. Steve is chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers to the President. Maybe, he'll be able to answer some of the questions that I'll ask here. Steve, it's good to have you on this program with me.

Mr. SAULNIER. Well, I'm delighted to be here. It's a flattering invitation.

Mr. WESTLAND. Tell me, just what is the Council of Economic Advisers, and what is its relationship to the President?

Mr. SAULNIER. The Council is a body set up by law—set up in the Employment Act of 1946. That means the Council has been in operation now for 12 years. Our job is to follow developments in the economy, to keep the President informed, and to work with the administration generally, appraising the impact of legislation and administrative actions on the economy and on jobs and income.

* * * * *

Mr. WESTLAND. The President has recently made a statement, Steve, that this last recession—the 1958 recession—was the sharpest and the shortest one we've ever had in history. Just how sharp was it and how long do you feel it lasted?

Mr. SAULNIER. Well, I think I'd want to correct that just a bit. We've had some sharper ones but we've had very few shorter ones. This is not to say that it wasn't a sharp recession, because it did fall off very quickly, beginning about the middle of 1957 and continuing through for about 9 months. We hit a boom, so to speak, in April. Now that's a very short recession by most of our historical experience.

* * * * *

Mr. WESTLAND. Well, do you feel that it is over now?

Mr. SAULNIER. I don't think that there is any question about that, in the sense that we are on a recovery path. The fact of the matter is we, certainly, in terms of production, have recovered by now the ground that was lost. In terms of employment we have recovered a bit less than the full amount of the ground that was lost.

Mr. WESTLAND. Well, that was one thing I want to discuss just a little bit later, Steve. But, now, this was one recession where we came out of it without any of these tremendous Federal programs. Remember, we had many recommendations or suggestions for sort of another WPA program, a tremendous building program which we avoided. We did do some things, but how do you account for this recovery without those other types of Government intervention?

Mr. SAULNIER. Well, I think fundamentally the most important feature of the recession and recovery was the fact that sales at retail stores through the country stayed up very well throughout the recession. There was a remarkably small drop in sales and that meant confidence was maintained and recovery came fairly quickly. Now, this is not to say that there weren't some industries that were badly hit—the automobile, for example.

Mr. WESTLAND. Yes, you're right. The lumber industry, for example, in the Pacific Northwest was hit quite badly, Steve, because the fact is, I think, that we only built about 900,000 homes in 1957.

Mr. SAULNIER. In 1957, but, I'm glad to say that's pretty much as, let us say, we expected. The building industry was one of the first to pick up and the pickup has been, as you know, very substantial. I certainly hope that we can continue a high level of building through the rest of this year and 1960.

Mr. WESTLAND. Well, actually, we've gotten off into home building and that's a real important thing in the Pacific Northwest, of course, to the lumber industry as a whole. I think we built pretty close to 1,200,000 homes, wasn't it, in 1958?

Mr. SAULNIER. That's correct, and we now are operating at a level a little bit better than 1,300,000.

Mr. WESTLAND. A million three hundred thousand?

Mr. SAULNIER. At the present time. And we are hopeful that that can be continued. I can assure you one of the things we have tried to do in Government has been to maintain a high rate of homebuilding and there

is hardly anything that has a more beneficial effect throughout the economy generally.

Mr. WESTLAND. That's right. The ramifications of it are tremendous. It gets not only into our lumber, of course, but also into all of the utilities and so many other things.

Mr. SAULNIER. That is correct. Then there is another aspect of it. And that is, we like to see homes being built.

Mr. WESTLAND. Yes, we like that, too. Steve, I think it was a week or so ago a professor at one of the universities, was talking about inflation. I believe he said that 3 percent inflation was creeping inflation, but that 5 percent inflation was galloping inflation. Now it is pretty hard for me to distinguish between these two. I'm basically opposed to any kind of inflation. But do you feel that we must have inflation if we're going to have this so-called full employment?

Mr. SAULNIER. No, I don't think so at all. I not only do not think that we need to have it in order to have full employment, but what is even more important, if we get into an inflationary period, we're just not going to have full employment. I feel very strongly about this. We can't sustain economic growth over a long period of higher levels if we are indulging in an inflationary spree.

Mr. WESTLAND. Why?

Mr. SAULNIER. Well, there isn't any such thing, really, you know as a moderate or creeping inflation. It starts at a low rate and that in itself will tend to pick up, feed on itself. This encourages all kinds of developments in the economy that at some point come to a crisis. Then you have disaster. What we want to do is to avoid that and have steady sustainable growth.

Mr. WESTLAND. What can we do here, say my job as Congressman, and others in the same area that you're in, to try to prevent inflation, Steve?

Mr. SAULNIER. There are a lot of things we can do, and as a government, many things. Now there's a program, that we think will promote steady growth and high employment and will avoid inflation, put forward by the President. It is spelled out in some detail in the Economic Report of the President which he sends to Congress every year, and sent in January. The cornerstone of that, I can tell you, for the Government, in my judgment, is a balanced budget.

Mr. WESTLAND. Just how important is a balanced budget?

Mr. SAULNIER. Well, I think it's vitally important, not only just for technical, economic reasons, the sort of reasons as economist can spell out for you in some detail. There's a psychological factor as well, and I think that at this time a balanced budget would do more for the psychology of Americans and for people around the world than any other single thing that government can do.

Mr. WESTLAND. Well, it's good to hear you say that, Steve, because that certainly repeats the feeling I've had for a long time. We're getting some brickbats thrown at us, such as you can't meet the enemy with a balanced budget. But it does seem to me that unless a country, as well as an individual, lives within its income it can go broke just as it happened in France or in Germany in the extreme. It could happen, I suppose, here.

Mr. SAULNIER. Of course, it could happen and we don't want that to happen. It is perfectly possible, as the President has shown, to have an adequate defensive budget within the framework of an overall balance, and that is the kind of budget which we have presented.

Mr. WESTLAND. Steve, the cost-of-living index has been remaining pretty stable for about the last 8 or 9 months. This is real important, Steve, to people who are retired or are trying to live on social security or their own pension plans. Is this balanced budget going to affect that or is it going to help keep it on a level keel?

Mr. SAULNIER. I think it will. I know it will. Of course, we're pretty grateful that it has been stable now for 8 or 9 months. I honestly believe that the outlook for some time ahead is for stable prices in general. On the other hand, we can upset this. One of the ways to upset it, in my judgment, is to engage in a level Federal spending that is not needed in terms of the needs of our country and is not matched by necessary revenues.

Mr. WESTLAND. Steve, in 30 seconds can you tell me what you see for the future economic wealth of this country?

Mr. SAULNIER. Well, I think the future is very good. Quite sincerely, I think the outlook for the rest of this year is good. We've had a good recovery so far and it is my own feeling that 1960 is even better.

Mr. WESTLAND. Thank you, Steve, that's good news and thanks very much for having been on this program with me.

Hungarian Freedom Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 13, 1959

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, March 15 will mark the anniversary of Hungarian Freedom Day.

More than 100 years ago Europe experienced one of its recurrent revolutions. That revolution, begun in 1848, marked the rise and spread of national feelings, national dreams and aspirations. As the movement swept from Paris to other capitals, suppressed and subjugated nationalities were encouraged. They saw the chance of realizing their dreams, and all were stirred by the new wave of freedom and liberty. A number of old guard reactionary despots and governments were shaken. Among these was the arch enemy of freedom in Europe, the dominant Chancellor Metternich, of Austria, who had set the pattern of autocratic government throughout Europe for almost half a century. In 1848 his supremacy came to an end.

On March 15 of that year a group of liberty-loving and patriotic Hungarians, in their irrepressible zeal for freedom and independence, staged a bloodless demonstration, presented their grievances to the government, and demanded reforms and freedom. The government, apparently aware of the spreading discontents and dangers, acquiesced in these demands, and allowed the Hungarians certain freedoms. That March 15, the day on which demonstrations were staged, is marked in Hungarian history as a national holiday. Annually it is being celebrated as their Freedom Day.

Today they once more find themselves under tyranny and unable to celebrate this holiday. I am glad to join Hungarians in the free world in the celebration of Hungarian Freedom Day, in the hope that liberty may soon be restored to their homeland.

Thirtieth Anniversary Testimonial Banquet of the National Conference of Christians and Jews

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 13, 1959

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following proceedings of the 30th anniversary testimonial banquet of the National Conference of Christians and Jews, in honor of the Honorable Maximilian Moss, Surrogate of Kings County, held at the Hotel St. George in Brooklyn on October 16, 1958. Mr. Andrew S. Roscoe, president of the Equitable Savings & Loan Association of Brooklyn, was the toastmaster.

Mr. ROSCOE. Distinguished officers, guests, and friends, this is the 30th annual award dinner of the Brooklyn region, National Conference of Christians and Jews.

Each of these 30 years has been significant in bringing men of faith together in common purpose, peace and freedom. But, this is very special, a very extraordinary gathering of men and women of good will, for it honors a very great person, a true leader, one who embodies all the ideals of brotherhood, one whose entire life represents just this—the promotion of good will and understanding among all the people—the Honorable Maximilian Moss, Surrogate, Kings County.

As you can see in this crowded ballroom, this is the largest assembly we have ever held. The success of our dinner is due to the selfless, infinite labors of our chairmen:

Mr. Chester A. Allen, treasurer; and Alexander Aldrich, Vincent Caristo, and Arthur Levitt, regional cochairmen. And there are others whose help has been strong and eager: The members of our executive dinner committee, and, as well, the workers of our general committee, who worked with unsparing time and labor.

There are many, many credits, many thanks to offer to many of you tonight. But let me mention just a few quite casually:

Mr. Joe Weinstein, who contributed great moral and substantial support and presented us with a gracious reception and gave us these beautiful flower arrangements.

Mr. Harry Aschkinasi, the spark plug of the professional staff.

Mr. Joseph L. Edwards, director, Brooklyn region, National Conference of Christians and Jews, and finally, each of our many sponsors, who really made this historical event possible by their good will and solid effort.

Cochairman of the Brooklyn division of the National Conference of Christians and Jews, and cabinet officer of the police commissioner in charge of youth welfare, deputy commissioner of the New York Police Department, the Honorable Alexander Aldrich.

Brooklyn philanthropist and banker, recipient of the 1957 Brotherhood Award, president of the Brooklyn Chamber of Commerce, the treasurer of this 30th anniversary testimonial dinner, Mr. Chester A. Allen.

Distinguished statesman, organizer of the Italian Board of Guardians; military leader and veteran; knighted by Pope Pius XII because of humanitarian service to all, especially children of unhappy homes, Hon. VICTOR L. ANFUSO.

A truly admirable public servant, a beaver in the municipal government, budget

director of the city of New York, Hon. Abraham Beame.

A philanthropic leader, honorary president of the Jewish Hospital of Brooklyn; and associate justice of the appellate division of the supreme court, the Honorable George J. Beldock.

A philanthropist and distinguished jurist who has provided strong, unfailing support for Brooklyn's effort in vigorous social progress, Hon. A. David Benjamin.

A philanthropist, and a dedicated public servant, justice of domestic relations court, Hon. Maurice Bernhardt.

A devoted leader of human understanding, vigorous leader in every effort to increase human tolerance among all classes and creeds, vice president of the National Conference, Dr. Sterling Brown.

Chaplain of the Italian Board of Guardians, whose service to troubled youth is of inestimable value, and rector of Our Lady of Grace Church, the Very Reverend Monsignor Salvator B. Cafiero.

Distinguished philanthropist and builder, cochairman of the Brooklyn division of the National Conference of Christians and Jews, Mr. Vincent Caristo.

The first citizen of Brooklyn, and my dear friend, the borough president of Brooklyn, Hon. John Cashmore.

A distinguished lawyer and a philanthropist, vice president of the Flatbush Boys' Club, Hon. Daniel G. Connolly.

Executive director of the Brooklyn division of the Protestant Council, Dr. David M. Corey.

Vigorous, youthful, energetic community leader and responsible, devoted, public servant, builder of highest standards of civil and human justice, senior judge of the supreme court of New York, Hon. Anthony DiGiovanna.

Able, consistent worker for local progress and national security. Sturdy representative of human rights and honest government, and member of our Brooklyn team of representatives, Hon. FRANCIS E. DORN.

Participant in every worthy cause in our community, a worker of genuine sincerity and energy, and the hardest worker for this dinner, Mr. Joseph J. Dreyer.

Executive director of the National Conference of Christians and Jews, Brooklyn division, and the sparkplug of this dinner and of the conference all year around, Mr. Joseph V. Edwards.

The municipal court of the city of New York is the primary frontier of justice in our great frontier town, the welcoming harbor of our Nation.

We are privileged to have the president justice of this court, Hon. Harry Eppig.

A communal leader in manifold fields, chairman of the Brooklyn chapter of American National Red Cross, vice president and general manager of the New York Telephone Co., Mr. Walter A. Giles.

One who portrays the best of American womanhood and dedicated to the service of all worthy community endeavors, Miss Elizabeth A. Goodman.

An educator of international distinction; recipient of many deserved honors and awards, including the French Legion of Honor. A distinguished companion of our superintendent of schools, Dr. Jacob Greenberg.

Recipient of the 1957 Brotherhood Award, trustee of two great colleges, philanthropist, industrialist, and banker, Mr. John W. Hooper.

The "Horatio Alger" of Brooklyn, good friend of the conference, and member of the public service commission, Hon. Aaron L. Jacoby.

A former member of the American diplomatic corps, educator, philanthropist, and industrialist, president of the Navy Yard Boys' Club, Mr. Douglas James.

A distinguished leader in social welfare and public service, president of the Brooklyn Borough Gas Co., Mr. Walter M. Jeffords, Jr.

Back in darker days of the Nation's history our homeowners had a friend in the Halls of Congress, presently a guiding member of the House Ways and Means Committee, a distinguished Member of Congress, Hon. EUGENE J. KEOGH.

A distinguished, untiring leader in the field of social welfare and community effort, Mrs. Bertha Kirsch.

Distinguished young banker, chairman of the board of governors of the Brooklyn Academy of Music, unfailing leader in Brooklyn cultural education, Mr. Everett Livesey.

Philanthropist, industrialist, and former recipient of the brotherhood award of our conference, Mr. Lester Martin.

A generous, great-hearted citizen, public official, lawyer, and banker, immediate past cochairman of the Brooklyn division of the National Conference of Christians and Jews Hon. John P. McGrath.

Great champion of freedom of enterprise and the dual banking system, Superintendent of Banks Hon. George A. Mooney.

Distinguished Congressman, thorough student of economics and political science. Recognized leader of our national parliament and member of a grand and worthy team representing the Borough of Brooklyn, Hon. ABRAHAM J. MULTER.

Distinguished war veteran, aristocrat of merchants, and one who brings philanthropy and integrity to our community, Maj. Benjamin H. Namm.

A friend of our guest of honor from a distant land, human and compassionate American, esteemed by those who know him, former mayor of the city of New York and former U.S. Ambasador to Mexico, Hon. William O'Dwyer.

Ever kindly, sympathetic and understanding friend of humanity, a distinguished community leader, judge of the eastern district of the State of New York, Hon. Leo F. Rayfiel.

Our good and able friend, director of the National Conference of Christians and Jews, Dr. Allyn Robinson.

Dedicated community leader well in the vanguard in every movement for community improvement, leader of the city council, Hon. Joseph T. Sharkey.

A soldier, a lawyer, a corporate executive, and a philanthropist, president of May's Department Store's, and our host of this evening's reception, Maj. Max L. Shulman.

A distinguished leader in business, social welfare, and community effort, president of Abraham and Straus, Mr. Sidney L. Solomon.

Active in all worthy efforts and dedicated to community welfare, judge of the court of claims, Hon. Sidney Squire.

The businessman of our city administration, champion of human rights, and president of the city council, Hon. Abe Stark.

Poet laureate and spiritual leader of our guest of honor and rabbi of Temple Ahavath Sholom, Rabbi Alexander Steinbach.

A big heart whose warmth embraces everything worthwhile in human relations, outstanding industrialist and businessman, chairman of the board of May's Department Store, Mr. Joe Weinstein.

A devoted, consistent community servant, justice of the municipal court of the city of New York, and designated as an acting justice of the city court, Hon. Oliver D. Williams.

One who has dedicated himself to our community's welfare; a distinguished philanthropist and an outstanding businessman, president of Martin's Department Store, Mr. Harry Zeitz.

In introducing our speakers tonight, allow me, please, to limit my introduction to extraordinary phases of these distinguished careers, only referring to the peaks of their communal service, for it is community service and community conscience that bring them here with us tonight.

Distinguished statesman, our good friend, Col. Arthur Levitt, comptroller of the State of New York, is more than a great public official. He represents civic and communal life on its highest level here in our community of Brooklyn. He is our cochairman of the National Conference of Christians and Jews, Brooklyn region; cochairman for civil defense of Brooklyn; former vice chairman of the Brooklyn chapter of the American Red Cross; president and trustee of the Union Temple of Brooklyn, counsel and director of the Pride of Judea Children's Home, and past commander of the Sydney Rosenberg Post, American Legion, and former president of the Board of Education of the city of New York.

Fellow guests, it is a great honor to present to you a citizen of our community whose breadth of vision and intelligence is as great as his community service and sense of duty, The Honorable Arthur Levitt.

Mr. LEVITT. The sum total of activities of the National Conference of Christians and Jews is devoted to building brotherhood. There are a number of ways that this is being done in the Borough of Brooklyn.

Brooklyn high school students have attended the annual High School Youth Conference at Camp Lake Bryn Mawr in Pennsylvania and these students form a nucleus of a group actively working in the Brooklyn region.

Much is being done in educating Brooklyn teachers who are in direct touch with the adults of the future. Teams of teachers have attended workshops at colleges and universities throughout the Nation. Many more are taking courses in human relations, and a group of five has journeyed to Puerto Rico to better equip themselves to work with the Puerto Rican children in the Brooklyn school population.

A unique program is the National Conference of Christians and Jews training in human relations for the Police Department. High-ranking officers are attending these courses on their own time with the approval of the Commissioner of Police, Stephen P. Kennedy. Last year a similar program was conducted for members of the Bureau of Internal Revenue in Brooklyn.

Apart from these specific programs, the National Conference of Christians and Jews has rendered services to all types of schools, community, and religious organizations that wish to promote the idea of brotherhood.

The National Conference of Christians and Jews exists to create harmony and understanding among the many different groups that make up America. As much as any place in this country, Brooklyn has representatives of every race, religion, and national group in the world. Fortunately, we've been able to live together in harmony and understanding, but it is only because of organizations like the National Conference of Christians and Jews, which have taught us to appreciate the fundamental necessity of the brotherhood of man under the fatherhood of God.

Mr. ROSCOE. Distinguished jurist, justice of the supreme court of the State of New York—in introducing this good friend of ours, let me tell you some of his less known achievements because his major accomplishments in his distinguished career are part of the history of Brooklyn and the history of the State of New York.

Judge Keogh began his professional career as a teacher in Public School 183 in Brooklyn, N.Y. Apparently, Judge Keogh has dedicated himself to public service ever since those early days in 1924 when the young boys and girls of Brooklyn first knew him. For he has served the citizenry of youth of our community well and consistently ever

since as borough commissioner of the Boy Scouts of America, trustee of the Brooklyn Juvenile Guidance Center, Brooklyn Cancer Committee, New York Heart Campaign. He is now president of the Brooklyn Council of Boy Scouts of America and vice president of the Friends of the Brooklyn Public Library.

As teacher, community friend, author, distinguished jurist and scholar and, above all, able leader of the best in Brooklyn, we proudly introduce the Honorable J. Vincent Keogh.

Judge KEOGH. Mr. Toastmaster, reverend clergy, our guest of honor and his lovely family, Borough President John Cashmore, Dr. Jones, my colleagues on the bench, our friend, Ambassador O'Dwyer, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen, friends of the Conference and of Surrogate Moss:

When one as our guest of honor has been acclaimed in so many tangible ways with medals, plaques, loving cups, desk sets, and citations, it is appropriate to recall Keats' classical expression from Endymion, "A thing of beauty is a joy forever." The great artists were not only those of the dim past—there are some who are contemporary, and one of them is Leslie Huvos whom I should like to have join me. Mr. Huvos was kind enough to execute for the Conference of Christians and Jews the presentation I am about to make. His great artistry now joins the company of the Winged Victory of Samothrace, Venus de Milo, Michaelangelo's David and Moses and the other great works of art, even to those now exhibited in the Museum of Modern Art. Mr. Huvos, who did not always live in the United States, was considered the outstanding sculptor of middle Europe. His works are in the Paris Opera House and throughout Europe. Most of the statues in the public squares of Budapest are his creations. He created the St. Christoper monumental statue in the Salon des Artistes Francais in Paris and was complimented therefor by President Theodore Roosevelt at the unveiling. The statue was blessed by the Pope.

Among other works of art of this sculptor are the busts of Admiral Horthy in the royal castle in Hungary, Hector Berlioz in the opera houses of Budapest and Paris, Toscanini, Frantz Liszt, and Chopin. Surrogate Moss, an artist of such talent was chosen so that on this occasion we could tangibly present to you a creation that will live forever and is less expendable than even a car, that forever will reflect the talents, attributes and congenital humanity of one who stands out in our community as representing all that which is noble in American democracy. A lawyer, veteran of World War I, then for many years associated with an outstanding law firm in Brooklyn, president of the New York City Board of Education, our guest of honor has contributed to the interests not of any one particular group, but of our entire borough and city, not only president of the Jewish Community Council, but interested in the work of the Salvation Army and yes, even the defunct Dodgers' Knothole Club, not only a member of the executive committee of the Federation of Jewish Philanthropies, but active in our Boy Scout and Red Cross movements, not only past vice president of the Brooklyn Zionist region, but a member of the advisory council of the Sister Kenney Foundation, and on the Columbus Day Citizens Committee, and also Brooklyn Week for the Blind, elected a justice of the supreme court in 1951 and later as surrogate of Kings County in 1955, maintaining the dignity, high standards and sincere understanding of that long line of surrogates, Ketcham, Wingate, McGarey, and Rubenstein. We who work with and know our guest of honor take pride this evening in reminding him of his many unselfish community activities, all consonant with the philosophies and ideals of the Conference of Christians and Jews. Surrogate Moss, it is my heartfelt pleasure on behalf of all those assembled, to make this presentation.

Judge Moss. Revered members of the clergy, Mr. Chairman, Borough President Cashmore, President Jones, my brethren on the bench, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen, and my family, particularly Richard and Nikki, the eldest two of my seven grandchildren.

Although Judge Benjamin could have expressed it better than I, yet I would not be happy without paying my personal respects to that genuine lovable human being, our dynamic chairman, Andy Roscoe. Only those who worked closely with him know of the hard labor performed by him even until 3 in the morning; and always with patience and much charm.

But no man can stay out, day after day, until the early hours of the morning without an understanding wife, and therefore we owe much to Ethel, Andy's better half, and incidentally to my own dear wife, Grace. Both have our genuine gratitude.

Now, when a president of a bank gives his time to a community project, it cannot be done without the consent of its board of directors, and therefore we tender our thanks to the board of the Equitable Savings and Loan Association.

You will see that this is a chain reaction, for when the directors of a bank give leave to their president to engage in a communal endeavor, it is because this is agreeable to the superintendent of banks.

In this audience, we are privileged to have Mr. George Mooney, superintendent of banks of the State of New York, and, Mr. Mooney, I know I bespeak the voice of Brooklyn when I say that we appreciate deeply the policy which you pursue of encouraging presidents and officials of banks to become part of all worthwhile community endeavors. Your presence and their presence tonight attest to that.

My appreciation also goes to the dedicated sponsors, chairmen, and members of the various committees, and to Mr. Edwards and Mr. Aschkinasi of the professional staff; and, of course, to my own spiritual leader, Rabbi Steinbach for his kind words. But transcending all, we recognize that you in this ballroom are the dedicated persons who really made this dinner.

And I cannot restrain myself from singling out the man who first brought me into public life; one whose picture has always occupied the most conspicuous place in my chambers, one whom I have never deviated in my opinion, admiration and love, in storm as well as fair weather—our former Mayor Bill O'Dwyer.

To Mr. Leslie Huvos: I feel very humble to have merited the attention of such an outstanding sculptor. A thousand thanks for having recorded so faithfully my wrinkles and facial muscles; and my deep appreciation to the gentlemen who donated the bust to the conference without a penny's expense to the organization.

And finally my gratitude to my very dear friend, Judge Keogh for his laudatory, but undeserved remarks.

I would not be human if I were not profoundly touched by all of this; and I pledge to you that the events of this evening will seal within me that inspiration which guides men to devote their lives to their community.

The presence of so many people demonstrates clearly an essential aspect of the American way of life; that American culture is no abstract isolated concept but rather a living and growing force which has fed upon the established cultures and religions of all the faiths.

There is in this audience, Prof. Abraham Katsch of New York University, who said in a lecture that on close analysis, our practical democratic creed turns out to be merely an affirmation of the common basis of all the many faiths; that democracy is a masterful symphony, the mellowness and richness of which depend upon an amalgam of the traditions and cultures of all its peoples, brought into an harmonious accord.

The freedom of the human mind is a gift of God to man. But the distortion of the human mind is the act of man, which Dr. Jones has just described as "wicked and destructive," and which we hope can be changed by education. That is why so many of us of all faiths are behind the work of the National Conference of Christians and Jews.

History has a habit of repeating itself, for today we are witnessing a resurgence of hate. The ministers of God recognize it.

As an example, in a recent sermon at solemn Mass in St. Patrick's Cathedral, Father Francis X. Duffy declared, "God cannot be adequately loved by any person who harbors hate." He said that it "is a disease of the spirit." He called it, "Murder from the heart which can express itself in the sharp tongue, the heavy fist, and open war."

The instigators of the hate campaigns care little for the aftereffects of their poison, which by careful studies of the past, have proved beyond doubt that the person who, for example, today is antisemitic, tomorrow becomes anti-Negro, anti-Catholic or anti-Protestant, and vice versa; anti-everything outside his own particular group.

This is not mere surmise but stark past history. And to show you the truth of this assertion, I need only bring to your mind a few examples:

In 1826, an Anti-Masonic National Party was started in America. One history book said: "Anti-Masons were as thick as hornets in the rural Yankee Belt from Maine to Ohio."

The Anti-Masonic Party was the first American party (I hate to call it "American") to hold a presidential nominating convention, which it did in September of 1831 in Baltimore.

The party carried Vermont.

The party ran ahead of President Jackson in Massachusetts.

But, as I said before, prejudice and hatreds once engendered have habits of changing quickly from one scapegoat to another.

And so, a few years later in 1844, an anti-Catholic party was formed, called the "Native Americans." (Notice how all these anti forces always use the cherished name "American.")

As a result of the formation of this anti-Catholic party, many persons were killed and ancient Catholic churches here and elsewhere were burned.

This was the predecessor group to the Know-Nothings, which elected Governors in Kentucky, Maryland, Delaware, and four New England States. They also elected a mayor in New York City and even President Fillmore later became one of their party.

Today the world has made tremendous progress. Dr. Jones has touched on our rocket exploration as but one example. Man's brain has thus brought great scientific triumphs. But it seems that as man's mind becomes sharper in material things, the world becomes more hazardous. And because of that we must encourage every organization and group, whose purpose is to direct man's brain to the more important victories of spiritual triumphs. If the history of civilization proves anything, it proves that the flesh is endowed with something which lifts it above the material, and that something is the divine spirit in man.

Man's future and his progress throughout the ages have always been the history of his spirit. It is no different today, and happily there is a growing realization of this infinite power in both our young and old.

Oh, if the peddlers of hate could only learn in their lifetime, that regardless of

the extent of their hates and prejudices, in the republic of the grace, all men, at last, are equal. The tragedy of the world today is that this eternal truth is unfortunately learned by too many, only in death. If only the world would hearken back to the Book of Genesis, for then they would realize that all the people of the earth sprang from the same ancestry; that there is a unity of the human race; that God is the common Father, the creator of all; that it is His divine law which declares all men to be brothers.

Cooperative League of the U.S.A.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SEYMOUR HALPERN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 13, 1959

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday I was privileged, with Representative BYRON JOHNSON, of Colorado, to address a workshop session at the second national conference on cooperative housing being held this week at the Hotel Statler, here in Washington, under the auspices of the Cooperative League of the U.S.A. I would like to call the attention of the House to this splendid gathering which is searching out ways and means to improve, promote, and further the development of cooperative housing in America.

This excellent form of middle-income housing offers a practicable means of meeting a goodly share of America's housing needs.

The cooperative movement is a constant training ground in democracy, and cooperative housing projects in particular are instrumental in promoting the values most cherished in our traditions.

The housing cooperatives, however, are running into some difficulties in a period of rising costs. Two problems are of particular significance. The first is the maintenance of reasonable monthly carrying charges within the means of the middle-income owner occupants of existing cooperatives. The second is the encouragement of new cooperative housing construction with adequate sized units for today's middle-income families and for which the monthly carrying charges are bearable.

Those financed under section 213 of the National Housing Act will receive some relief under the provisions of S. 57 as reported from the Banking and Currency Committee. In my remarks at the Cooperative League workshop session I pointed out that I was not at all sure that the proposed measures would be adequate to do the job, and I offered several suggestions to strengthen and expand the legislation to meet the needs of the present and potential owners of cooperative housing.

Because of the importance of this vital housing program and the timeliness of the conference, I would like to present to this House the talk I gave at the league's session on Tuesday which in substance discusses the cooperative housing provisions of S. 57:

Ladies and gentlemen, it is my sincere pleasure to be with you today and to participate in this workshop on legislative proposals on cooperative housing pending before Congress. This is a field of great interest to me and I am pleased that I have secured membership on the House Banking and Currency Committee where I can, I hope, effectively carry the objectives of your league.

In my short capacity as a Member of Congress and of the committee I have worked since the start of the current session for legislation of assistance and benefit to the cooperative housing movement. In this regard I have received sound advice, counsel and background from my friends in the coordinating council of 213 cooperative, many of whose members are in my district; from its first president and counsel, Si Gallett whose aid has been invaluable; from Paul Golz, executive secretary of the council, with whom I have been in constant touch; from Gerry Meyers, president of the council who has contributed so much; and, I might add, the helpful background offered by Bernie Walpin; and from many groups and other individuals who are interested in cooperative housing. Now I feel I'm part of the co-op family and can earn the good counsel of the parent group, the Cooperative League of the U.S.A.

Cooperative housing is one of the finest ways to provide worthwhile and adequate homes for people in the middle income group. It offers the opportunity to secure attractive, durable homes at reasonable carrying charges. It provides an excellent solution to urban housing problems.

But, as your discussions have brought out, there seem to be two significant problems confronting cooperative housing in this period of rising costs. The first is the maintenance of reasonable monthly carrying charges within the means of the middle-income owner-occupants of existing cooperatives. The second is the encouragement of new cooperative housing construction with adequate sized units for today's middle-income families and for which the monthly carrying charges are bearable.

The pending legislation before Congress does include some provisions of benefit to new owners and of supposed benefit to existing owners. We all welcome these provisions which Congressman JOHNSON has described so well for us. But they do not, in my opinion, go far enough, particularly in helping existing owners to maintain reasonable monthly carrying charges.

I would like to discuss with you some other possibilities and perhaps amendments to a few of the provisions in the proposed legislation which, if enacted, would, together with most of the pending legislation, make up a portfolio of instant and real benefit to cooperative owners, present and potential.

At this point I would like permission to have included in the record at the conclusion of my statement a copy of the views on section 213 cooperative housing which Congressman FINO and I presented as supplemental views in the report on the omnibus housing bill from the House Banking and Currency Committee. I do not wish to take up too much of your time, and if the views could be included with these, it would save time all around.

Briefly, the report covers the various amendments I had offered in committee to fill what I feel to be obvious gaps in the omnibus housing bill.

First, for the benefit of owners of existing management-type cooperatives with commercial or community facilities, there is the proposal that such mortgages be open-ended to permit the inclusion of new commercial or community facilities. Cooperatives could utilize this provision to up-date their facilities and acquire the same facilities for their needs such as could be secured by new cooperatives after the passage of the pending legislation. Mortgages could be opened up in an amount which together with the original obligation would not exceed any principal obligation limits in effect after the passage of the Housing Act of 1959. The advantages which would flow to owners of existing management-type co-ops from this privilege are self-evident. They range all the way from the acquisition of needed new facilities to retardation of obsolescence.

Second, for new cooperatives, proposals would: (a) Authorize new sales-type and investor-sponsored co-ops to include both commercial and community facilities in their mortgages. This would provide income to both types to aid in keeping the monthly carrying charges at a reasonable level, and would provide a stimulus to construction because of the assurance that many of the needs of the owners could be provided for; (b) extend the amortization period of mortgages of new co-ops from 40 to 50 years. This is predicated on the supposition that present interest rates will not be changed. Although by stretching out the amortization period the eventual total cost to the owners will be greater, such an extension would help to reduce monthly carrying charges; and (c) increase the FNMA per unit limit on special assistance purchases to $20,000. This would be more in accord with provisions in the pending legislation which increase the per-room limits for FHA insured mortgages, and would help to meet the needs of today's middle-income families for adequate sized homes, particularly in high cost areas.

These were the amendments I offered to the so-called Rains housing bill when it came before the full House Banking and Currency Committee. They are contained in the supplemental report to which I referred and in separate legislation I sponsored. At the committee meeting I was given full assurance that they would be fully reviewed by the Housing Subcommittee and that ample opportunity will be given the proponents to present their case.

Since the publication of the report further consultation with counselors in the cooperative housing movement—and here again I want to point to the enlightened information provided by Si Gallett—has convinced me of the need to broaden the scope of the open-ending proposition. It should include authority for capital improvements and replacements. Costs such as $14,000 for the rewiring of air-conditioning systems, as was presented to one co-op, or costs for the resurfacing of sidewalks, among others, should be included in the open-ending suggestion. Legislation to cover this is now being prepared and will be introduced within a matter of days.

But, particularly I want to discuss two proposed changes in the pending legislation which, if adopted, would be of great benefit to owners of existing cooperatives.

One of these is discussed in the supplemental views referred to. It relates to extending the proposed one-quarter of 1 percent insurance premium minimum to existing cooperatives. I am happy to see the provision in the pending House bill which grants this benefit to new co-ops, but it should and can be extended to existing co-ops. If it were, occupants would be accorded a well-merited reduction in monthly carrying charges and they would obtain some relief in a period of rising costs.

It is my understanding that a surplus of between $7 and $10 million exists in the insurance fund. There is no reason why, if the proposed lower rate can be applied to new co-ops which will be built at higher costs, existing co-ops which have been paying at the one-half of 1 percent rate on lower mortgages cannot acquire the same privilege.

When this question comes up, the proponents have run into the argument that in

order for individual mortgages to benefit, the consent of the mortgagee banks would have to be obtained. This, it is argued, is because a stated insurance premium rate forms a part of the mortgage contract with the banks. A reluctance to open all the mortgages to renegotiation has prevented acceptance of the legislation. That is what others have been told; that is what I was faced with as I offered the proposal. My legislative aid, Bob Tienken, also has been faced with this reasoning and has been trying to effectuate an answer.

Here again, working together with your able brains in this field—I should mention Si Gallett again—sound basis has been found to refute this contention. We are convinced that this matter of contract renegotiation is a misunderstanding and that, in fact, the co-op mortgages, in the main, only refer to the mortgagors paying each month, one-twelfth of the annual premium. As a result, it is possible to enact legislation which does not refer to obtaining the consent of mortgagees, but which need only state that the rate of one-quarter of 1 percent will be applicable to existing cooperatives after the date of passage of the Housing Act of 1959. The rate is a matter of interest to the mortgagors and the FHA, and legislative change in the rate is all that should be required. It would not be made retroactive but only apply to premium payments by existing co-ops as of the passage of the 1959 act.

The second issue affecting carrying charges for owners of existing co-ops relates to the application to existing mortgages of the pending provisions for the establishment of mutual insurance funds. Under the pending legislation the excellent mortgage amortization experience of co-ops would be pooled, and return insurance premiums paid back to owners over a period of time. The proposed bill provides, however, that the consent of the mortgagees must be obtained if existing mortgages are to participate in the new funds. This might delay or prevent existing co-ops from sharing in the benefits of the mutual funds. On the reasoning which I have presented as to the relationship of the mortgagors and mortgagees concerning inclusion of references to the insurance fund in the mortgage contracts, I do not believe that consent of the mortgagees is necessary in this regard either. Again, the question of insurance would seem to be of interest to the mortgagors and the FHA, and thus, since contract renegotiation is not necessary, the requirement for consent of the mortgagees can be stricken from the pending legislation.

New legislation is being prepared (a) to provide for broadening the open-ending possibility; (b) for extending the one-quarter of 1 percent to existing co-ops, on which I am working closely with Congressmen HOLTZMAN and FINO, two of the pioneers in this field; and (c) for deleting any reference to the consent of mortgagees when existing co-ops join the mutual insurance funds. And I will continue to press the committee to consider the other legislation that I outlined earlier and which, I was assured, would be given full review.

If such additions can be made to the pending omnibus housing legislation I believe that the greatest benefit will accrue to both existing and future co-ops.

I thank you for this opportunity to discuss certain features of the pending legislation. It has been a real pleasure to me to be present with you. I want to again thank all my friends in the cooperative housing movement who have given me wise advice and counsel and who are helping me in my efforts, Paul Golz, Si Gallett, Gerry Meyers, Bernie Walpin. My appreciation and profound thanks to you, Wallace Campbell, for giving me this privilege to be with you.

I want you and all those who are interested in cooperative housing to know that my door in the House Office Building is always open to you, and that my aid, Bob Tienken, my staff, and myself are always ready to work with you in this good fight.

I assure you that it is a real pleasure to be with you, and I hope that the word "cooperative" will also be descriptive of my own endeavors in this extremely important field.

Dr. Flemming's Famous Formula

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEE METCALF
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 13, 1959

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, Dr. Flemming, Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, has brought to Congress a proposal which he says will help meet the current shortage of more than 140,000 classrooms. However, to build the 75,000 classrooms which Dr. Flemming says will be built under his formula, State constitutional and statutory debt limitations will have to be changed, basic tax concepts will have to be revised, and the States will have to match the Federal funds with money they do not have.

On this St. Patrick's Day, Dr. Flemming's famous formula can be modified slightly. Those fabled little rascals, the leprechauns, can be put to work. The Secretary could change the necessity for matching funds by the States to matching by the leprechauns. All each State would have to do would be to convince a leprechaun to come forward with his pot of gold. The Federal Government would match every pot with an equivalent one from the Federal Treasury. Those who disbelieve in the existence of the leprechauns may not have too much faith in the ability of this proposal to build classrooms but as many scoili—schools—could be built for the cailini—girls—and buachallai—boys—under this method as would be under Dr. Flemming's original formula.

SENATE

MONDAY, MARCH 16, 1959

Rev. Kenneth G. Phifer, minister, Old Presbyterian Meeting House, Alexandria, Va., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, we pause in prayer amid the bustle and din of this workday. Refresh our hearts and renew our spirits. May the quiet grace of Thine eternal calm pervade us now. May we feel something of the still depths of Thine everlasting peace. All about us there is discord. All around are clamor and shrillness. We are buffeted by pressures from without, and we are strung tight by tensions within. At times it is difficult for us to fulfill our responsibilities and meet our obligations. Drop now Thy still dews of quietness upon our hearts, that we may be strengthened anew to meet this day's tasks.

Unto Thee would we commit ourselves now. Unto Thee would we commit the work of this day. May Thy blessing rest upon us, upon the Nation we desire to serve, upon all Thy children everywhere.

Unto Thee be all glory and honor, in Jesus Christ, our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, March 12, 1959, was dispensed with.

MESSAGE FROM HOUSE RECEIVED DURING ADJOURNMENT

Under authority of the order of the Senate of March 12, 1959, the Secretary of the Senate received the following message from the House of Representatives on March 13, 1959:

That the House had passed, without amendment, the bill (S. 79) to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to permit the temporary listing and certification of citrus red No. 2 for coloring mature oranges under tolerances found safe by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, so as to permit continuance of established coloring practice in the orange industry pending congressional consideration of general legislation for the listing and certification of food color additives under safe tolerances.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED DURING ADJOURNMENT

Under authority of the order of the Senate of March 12, 1959, the Vice President, on March 13, 1959, signed the following enrolled bills, which had been previously signed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives:

S. 50. An act to provide for the admission of the State of Hawaii into the Union; and

H.R. 2260. An act to extend the induction provisions of the Universal Military Training and Service Act, and for other purposes.

ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on March 13, 1959, he presented to the President of the United States the enrolled bill (S. 50) to provide for the admission of the State of Hawaii into the Union.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MUTUAL SECURITY PROGRAM—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

(For President's message, see CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for March 13, 1959, pp. 4097–4102.)

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry

nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 1. An act to require a study to be conducted of the effect of increasing the diversion of water from Lake Michigan into the Illinois Waterway for navigation, and for other purposes;

H.R. 3293. An act to authorize the construction of modern naval vessels; and

H.R. 3368. An act to extend the special enlistment programs provided by section 262 of the Armed Forces Reserve Act of 1952, as amended.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to a concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 15) providing for the printing of the "Code of Ethics for Government Service" as a House document, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (S. 79) to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to permit the temporary listing and certification of citrus red No. 2 for coloring mature oranges under tolerances found safe by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, so as to permit continuance of established coloring practice in the orange industry pending congressional consideration of general legislation for the listing and certification of food color additives under safe tolerances, and it was signed by the Vice President.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED OR ORDERED TO LIE ON THE TABLE

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles and ordered to lie on the table or referred as indicated:

H.R. 1. An act to require a study to be conducted of the effect of increasing the diversion of water from Lake Michigan into the Illinois Waterway for navigation, and for other purposes; ordered to lie on the table.

H.R. 3293. An act to authorize the construction of modern naval vessels; and

H.R. 3368. An act to extend the special enlistment program provided by section 262 of the Armed Forces Reserve Act of 1952, as amended; to the Committee on Armed Services.

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION REFERRED

The concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 15) providing for the printing of the Code of Ethics for Government Service as a House document, was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That there shall be printed as a House document the "Code of Ethics for Government Service" as adopted by the Congress in H. Con. Res. 175, Eighty-fifth Congress. Such code shall be run in two colors and gold from letterpress plates reproducing engrossed artwork, hand lettered and appropriate for framing and office wall display. Stock for prints shall be one hundred and sixty pound white, size twelve and one-quarter inches by sixteen and one-quarter inches flat. Prints shall be inserted in white envelopes inside mailing brown envelopes of twenty-eight pound brown kraft, flaps sealed or tucked in with one corrugated board protector. In addition to the usual number, there shall be printed a sufficient number of extra copies to provide twenty-five copies for use and distribution by each Senator and each Representative. For the purposes of this resolution, the Delegate from Hawaii and the Resident Commissioner from Puerto Rico shall be considered as Representatives.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, under the rule, there will be the usual morning hour for the transaction of routine business. I ask unanimous consent that statements in that connection be limited to 3 minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

TRIBUTES TO SENATOR MANSFIELD ON HIS BIRTHDAY ANNIVERSARY

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, today is a very happy day for me. It is a little unusual to call the attention of the Senate to an individual's birthday.

I say to my friend, MIKE, do not leave the Chamber; I want you to hear this.

Mr. President, today is the birthday of the distinguished junior Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD]. I know that every Member of the Senate joins me in wishing him many happy returns of the day.

There is a reason for very sincerely feeling this way. Those of us who were privileged to serve with MIKE MANSFIELD in the House of Representatives, and who have served with him in the Senate, know there is no greater patriot in this country than MIKE MANSFIELD. He is a good man. He is a kind man. He is a fair man. He can be as aggressive as a tiger, and as mild and meek as a mother.

He is a tower of strength to the Senate leadership. Yesterday I saw him on television. I wish the Secretary of State could have heard what MIKE MANSFIELD said about him, because I know it would have improved his physical well-being. I wish the Commander in Chief, who is dealing with all the complex questions of a troubled world, could have heard MIKE MANSFIELD, because of the superb manner in which he answered the questions, which, answered in another way, could have been provocative and creative of differences that would divide the Nation.

MIKE MANSFIELD never loses his head or his heart, and he has the heels to carry into effect the program that constitutes the greatest good for the greatest number.

MIKE MANSFIELD did not have the benefits of a formal education. He came from very humble surroundings. He ran away from home, and became a marine—a fact he never lets us forget—when the Marines are concerned with any matter that is under consideration on this floor.

He went down into the bowels of the earth and worked in the mines and he worked as a day laborer. He reflects his early contacts in his judgments on public questions.

He loves the people—spelled "p-e-e-p-u-l"; and he always votes for them. He wears no man's collar. He is a rugged, independent, individual thinker.

Mr. President, if I had more than 3 minutes at my disposal, I should like to say some other things about MIKE MANSFIELD. But I am going to sum up all of it by saying that, although Mrs. Johnson and I have never had a boy, if we had a boy and if he grew to manhood, we would like to have him become the kind of man MIKE MANSFIELD is.

Mr. DIRKSEN: Mr. President, I suppose one of the greatest theological minds and one of the most eloquent persons was the noted preacher, Henry Drummond, of Scotland. Not only was he a magnificent preacher; he was also an eminent scientist. He left us a great legacy in the form of a sermon on the 13th chapter of 1st Corinthians. The title is "The Greatest Thing in the World." It has probably been reprinted more than any other sermon; and someone had the vision to have it printed in small book form, so one can carry it with him. It is by all odds one of the most stimulating things I have ever read. Of course everyone knows the great line the remarkable sales manager, the Disciple Paul, left us—"And now abideth faith, hope, charity, these three; but the greatest of these is charity."

When the translators get busy, one never knows whether they will catch the spirit of the words of the Scriptures. Drummond said they made a mistake, that the word Paul used, properly translated, was not "charity," at all, but should have been translated "love," and that love is the greatest thing in the world.

Mr. President, I have watched MIKE MANSFIELD, and he is the most disarming man in the world. That was emphasized to me, because when I campaigned against him, I lost all heart for what I was doing. The reason I lost all heart for it was that I knew MIKE so well.

Many of us served together in the House of Representatives, and now we meet here in the Senate, as graduates of the school of "Mr. Speaker" RAYBURN. MIKE MANSFIELD is one; the majority leader, Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, is another; the Vice President is another. So, from the great confraternity of spirit engendered when we were colleagues in the House, we got to know each other very well.

I have never heard MIKE MANSFIELD say a mean, unkindly, trivial, or vindictive thing about anyone, in season or out, regardless of whether a political campaign, with all its intensity, was in progress.

I come to one conclusion, and it is not difficult to state: It is that MIKE MANSFIELD's heart is filled with love for his fellow human beings. There is no other way

to express our opinion of him. So I testify to him. And humble as he is, I suppose he would be the first to abjure it.

But, MIKE, in a purely personal sense we reciprocate your love, and we love you. I know of no better thing I can say to you.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I like the custom that has been inaugurated. I think it is wise on a friend's birthday, before he passes on, to say nice things about him.

The other day, as I was coming to the Chamber, MIKE MANSFIELD passed. A bystander said, "Well, there goes quite a guy." Another said, "Yes; but look at his wonderful wife."

I can agree with everything that has been said about MIKE MANSFIELD, but I can also agree that his fine wife, who has been his companion through the years, and has stood shoulder to shoulder with him, has been his urge and his inspiration. She, too, must be the object of a word of praise in the Senate on MIKE's birthday.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I wish to associate myself with the remarks of the distinguished majority leader, the distinguished minority leader, and the distinguished senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], in the tributes they have paid to the junior Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], the assistant majority leader, or whip of the Democratic majority in the Senate.

During the years I have known him, I have not only come to have deep affection for him, but to respect him greatly for his courage, his integrity, his forthrightness, and also his ability to work with others, which is a very essential quality in any man.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I shall not take up the time of the Senate in flowery testimony to the worth and fine attributes of the junior Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD]. He knows what I think of him without having the tribute printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I should like to say, however, it is a good thing for the country that MIKE MANSFIELD was born.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, when the Democratic leader of the Senate spoke a few moments ago and paid tribute to our colleague, MIKE MANSFIELD, I felt that he expressed the sentiments of all of us so accurately that it was not necessary for an ordinary, garden-variety Member of the Senate to add to the statement. However, since certain members of the Republican Party have joined in the praise, I feel I should not let the occasion go unnoted, and that I, in behalf of the ordinary, garden-variety Democrat in the Senate, should add my bit to the words of praise given by our leader.

I am sure all of us join in the well-deserved words the majority leader has so eloquently spoken expressive of our own affection and respect for MIKE MANSFIELD.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, I am very happy to join with my colleagues in words of congratulation and praise to our distinguished assistant majority leader, MIKE MANSFIELD. I wish to concur in the four-letter word tributes which the majority leader so correctly paid him—good, kind, and fair. In simple English, I think they describe the feeling all of us have about MIKE MANSFIELD.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, as time passes, we make alluring and lasting friendships with many of our colleagues, and it is highly appropriate to join in tributes paid to them on their birthdays. In the 6 years I have been privileged to serve in the Senate I have been enriched by my friendship with MIKE MANSFIELD, of Montana. So, with those who have just spoken, I say to our very able colleague, the junior Senator from Montana, "Happy birthday, and many, many happy returns of the day."

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I wish to join in all the good things said about the distinguished junior Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD]. He deserves all of them and more.

I particularly wish to applaud the suggestion of the senior Senator from Wisconsin, that it is a good custom to pay tributes upon the occasion of birthdays of Members of the Senate. But I point out that the poor junior Senator from Tennessee is in the plight of having his birthday fall on December 26.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, there is nothing poor about the junior Senator from Tennessee except perhaps that his birthday does come so close to Christmas that in his past years he may have encountered some difficulties.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I wish to asociate myself with the other Members of the Senate who have extended congratulations to the assistant majority leader, MIKE MANSFIELD, on his birthday anniversary. Probably it is only natural for those of us who live in the Midwest to get closer together than is the case with those who live in other sections of the country. However, it has been particularly pleasing for me on several occasions to work with the distinguished Senator from Montana. I am particularly pleased that I shall have the opportunity of becoming even closer associated with him as I begin my service on the Committee on Foreign Relations. I have admired him especially when he has spoken on the floor of the Senate on questions dealing with foreign relations problems. Therefore I, too, wish to extend to him my congratulations and best wishes on his birthday anniversary.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I am happy to join our distinguished majority leader and my colleagues in noting the birthday anniversary of the great junior Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD]. I have known Senator MANSFIELD for a few years. While I was a Member of the House of Representatives and serving as a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee of that body and before I had met the able Senator from Montana, I took him as a model of what a legislator should be. I believe I have been, and surely without his knowledge, greatly influenced by his character, his work, and his personality.

With many others, I am grateful for MIKE MANSFIELD. He has enriched our generation and in a time of contention and bitterness, he has demonstrated that one can fight hard for great causes in which he believes without giving any intellectual quarter while always with patience, kindness, and understanding of others.

I am very thankful for the benefit of this splendid example and I hope he is given many more years of life in which to continue his great work in the interest of peace and justice.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I wish to join in the congratulations being offered to the distinguished junior Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] upon his birthday anniversary. Those of us who come from the Pacific Northwest are very proud of the scholarly, dignified, and effective way in which MIKE MANSFIELD performs his duties in the Senate, not only as a Senator from the Pacific Northwest, but also as the majority whip of the Senate. I know I speak for many persons in my State of Oregon when I express the best of good wishes to MIKE MANSFIELD, who is one of the outstanding Senators of this era.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I find myself in a very embarrassing position. Naturally, I appreciate everything my colleagues on both sides of the aisle have said today. I do not know what to say in return, except "Thank you," and to express the regret that I was not born 4 hours later, because then I would have been born on St. Patrick's Day.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Routine morning business is now in order.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

REPORT ON REAPPORTIONMENT OF AN APPROPRIATION

A letter from the Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, reporting, pursuant to law, that the appropriation to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare for "Indian health activities, Public Health Service," for the fiscal year 1959, had been apportioned on a basis indicating a need for a supplemental estimate of appropriation for pay increases granted by Public Law 85-462; to the Committee on Appropriations.

REPORT ON REVIEW OF MANAGEMENT CONTROLS OF DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA GOVERNMENT

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on review of management controls of the District of Columbia Government, July 1958 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

NEWLY ISSUED PUBLICATIONS OF FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION

A letter from the chairman, Federal Power Commission, Washington, D.C., transmitting, for the information of the Senate, a copy of each of its newly issued publications, as follows:

"Statistics of Natural Gas Companies, 1957";

"Steam-Electric Plant Construction Cost and Annual Production Expenses, 1957";

"Statistics of Electric Utilities, 1957, Privately Owned";

"Statistics of Electric Utilities, 1957, Publicly Owned"; and

"Typical Residential Electric Bills, 1958" (with accompanying documents); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REPORT OF DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

A letter from the Secretary of Labor, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the Department of Labor, for the fiscal year 1958 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

PROPOSED FEDERAL CIVILIAN EMPLOYEES COMPENSATION POLICY ACT OF 1959

A letter from the Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to improve the compensation policies and practices of the Federal Government with respect to civilian personnel thereof, to establish a temporary Commission on Federal Civilian Employees Compensation Policy, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the Archivist of the United States on records proposed for disposal under the law (with accompanying papers); to a Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments.

The VICE PRESIDENT appointed Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina and Mr. CARLSON members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Michigan; to the Committee on Finance:

"SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 11

"Concurrent resolution urging the Congress of the United States to repeal the Federal excise tax on motor vehicles

"Whereas this Nation is emerging from a business recession; and

"Whereas business analysts have counted upon strong public acceptance of 1959 automobiles as a major force in our economy, not only because of the thousands of persons employed directly in the manufacture of automobiles and parts therefor, but also because the automobile industry is a large user of steel, glass, rubber products, transportation and other goods and services; and

"Whereas it is important at this time that all measures possible be taken to stimulate and revitalize the American economy; and

"Whereas it is believed that the immediate repeal of the excise tax on motor vehicles would supply an important impetus to the sale of motor vehicles and to business activity and employment in automobile factories and related industries throughout Michigan and the rest of the United States; and

"Whereas the loss of revenue from the repeal of the excise tax on motor vehicles would be largely, if not wholly, offset through an increase in business activity and the resulting increase in income tax collections: Now therefore be it

"Resolved by the senate (the house of representatives concurring), That the Legislature of the State of Michigan, on behalf of the people of Michigan, respectfully urges the Congress of the United States to repeal the excise tax on motor vehicles; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States, the Secretary of Labor, the President of the Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and the members of the Michigan delegation in the Congress.

"Adopted by the senate, February 19, 1959.

"Adopted by the house March 2, 1959.

"NORMAN E. PHILLE,
"Clerk of the House of Representatives.
"FRED I. CHASE,
"Secretary of the Senate."

A resolution of the Senate of the State of Maryland; to the Committee on Armed Services:

"SENATE RESOLUTION 5

"Senate resolution urging that the U.S. Naval Gun Factory continue operation as engineering center for the Bureau of Ordnance and that the same be modernized and expanded and its name be changed to reflect its current responsibilities.

"Whereas the trend in development, engineering, and manufacture of naval ordnance has resulted in a concentrated effort directed to advanced weapons and weapons systems; and

"Whereas the U.S. Naval Gun Factory is an essential and indispensable part of the naval ordnance defense establishment; and

"Whereas there is no other naval ordnance field establishment or private defense contractor capable of displaying the diversification in engineering, scientific, and industrial skills; and

"Whereas there is no other naval ordnance field establishment or private defense contractor capable of displaying the diversification in physical plant and industrial equipments; and

"Whereas there is no comparable naval ordnance field establishment or private defense contractor having the broad technical competence and diversified experience and the conception, engineering development, design, prototype manufacturing evaluation and product engineering of weapons and weapons systems equivalent to the Naval Gun Factory; and

"Whereas the Naval Gun Factory is the only naval ordnance establishment having the comprehensive technical competence and industrial ability in the field of structural fabrications, an area of vital importance in the development and manufacture of advanced weapons and weapons systems; and

"Whereas the Naval Gun Factory has a complete complement of technical skills in the basic fields of the physical sciences and engineering (physics, chemistry, metallurgy, materials, electrical, electronics, mechanical, structure) and superior technical abilities in optics, fire control, hydraulics, engineering management and contract administration supplemented by designers, draftsmen, technicians, engineering aids, technical writers and editors; and

"Whereas the Naval Gun Factory has a complete complement of industrial skills in metals processing, fabricating, metals finishing, electroplating, heat treating, molding, casting, forging, electronics, plastics; and

"Whereas the Naval Gun Factory has provided consulting services to nationally recognized corporations in the field of design, materials, and fabrication techniques taking the form of analyses, critiques, and advice in order to support programs in which these contractors are involved, thus facilitating the Navy Department's progress in varied projects; and

"Whereas it is believed that overall operational costs in the Naval Gun Factory are not in excess of those found in comparable industry operating under similar fiscal procedures; and

"Whereas the Naval Gun Factory has displayed outstanding proficiency in contributing to the progress of development of new scientific, engineering, industrial, and related techniques necessary for flexibility in conforming to the ever-changing weapons and weapons systems concept; and

"Whereas the citizens of Prince Georges County, and in fact, the people of the entire State of Maryland, are vitally affected in the premises aforementioned: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate of Maryland, That a change of name be effected for the Naval Gun Factory that more realistically reflects the establishment's current responsibility such as 'Naval Ordnance Development Center' or 'Naval Weapons Engineering Center,' and be it further

"Resolved, That the Navy Department provide the Naval Gun Factory with a definite mission based on vital engineering functions in lieu of the outmoded weapons and product concepts in order to continue the Naval Gun Factory as an essential link in the chain of national defense; and be it further

"Resolved, That the Naval Gun Factory continue to operate as an engineering center for the Bureau of Ordnance to maintain surveillance and provide adequate contract administration and field engineering service to contractors engaged in the fabrication of defense weapons and weapons systems, in order to prevent the Navy Department from relinquishing control over defense projects; and be it further

"Resolved, That the Navy Department Bureau of Ordnance provide adequate support for the Naval Gun Factory relating to continued modernization of physical plant, installation of necessary equipment, more favorable consideration of Naval Gun Factory proposals for the developmental and prototype manufacture of ordnance weapons and weapons systems, in order to insure Navy Department efficiency, and reduce costs in completion of defense projects; and be it further

"Resolved, That the Navy Department, Bureau of Ordnance, take cognizance of the potential capabilities and capacities of the Naval Gun Factory as an essential establishment for the defense of the Nation and thereby provide an adequate engineering and manufacturing workload in order to utilize the experience and versatility existing in this naval ordnance field establishment; and be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of the senate be instructed to send copies of this resolution to the President of the United States; Vice President of the United States; Secretary of Defense; Rear Adm. Paul D. Stroup, Chief of Navy Bureau of Ordnance; Vice Adm. Edward W. Clexton, Bureau of Ordnance, O.N.M.; Rear Adm. T. A. Ahroon, Chief of Planning, Bureau of Ordnance; Capt. Charles E. Briner, Superintendent of the U.S. Navy Gun Factory; and all of the members of the congressional Armed Services Committee.

"Read and adopted by the senate, January 22, 1959.

"J. WATERS PARRISH,
"Secretary of the Senate.
"EUGENE DELLA,
"President of the Senate."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Oregon; ordered to lie on the table:

"HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION

"Whereas the Vice President of the United States, RICHARD M. NIXON, has taken time from his many and varied duties to visit the

State of Oregon on the occasion of the celebration of the 100th birthday of our State's admission to the Union; and

"Whereas despite inclement weather Vice President NIXON traveled to and participated in local celebrations of our centennial in Astoria, Portland, and Salem, without fear for his own personal safety and certainly at some personal inconvenience, thus contributing greatly to the success of such local celebrations; and

"Whereas the presence of such a high official of the Federal Government as Vice President NIXON added dignity and importance to our celebration and provided the impetus for a successful centennial year: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Oregon (the Senate concurring therein), That this legislative body express its appreciation for the efforts of the Vice President of the United States, RICHARD M. NIXON, and for the contribution he has made to Oregon's centennial celebration; and be it further

"Resolved, That an authenticated copy of this resolution be transmitted to the Vice President NIXON as an expression of our esteem.

"Adopted by senate, February 25, 1959.

"WALTER J. PEARSON,
"President of Senate.

"Adopted by house, February 19, 1959.

"RUTH E. RENFROE,
"Chief Clerk.

"ROBERT B. DUNCAN,
"Speaker of House."

A resolution of the House of Representatives of the State of Missouri; to the Committee on Public Works:

"HOUSE RESOLUTION 51

"Memorializing Congress to initiate plans for the development of the Meramec River Basin.

"Whereas plans for the development of the Meramec River Basin were submitted to Congress some time ago; and

"Whereas these plans are urgently needed (1) to control almost yearly floods; (2) to increase suitable location for industries; (3) to reduce loss of crops, livestock, and dwellings; (4) to eliminate health hazards; and (5) to provide a recreational area within 30 miles of St. Louis: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Missouri, That the Congress of the United States be memorialized to initiate the plans for the development of the Meramec River Basin; and be it further

"Resolved, That Missouri Congressmen be urged to impel the activation of these plans; and be it further

"Resolved, That a duly attested copy of this memorial be immediately transmitted to the Secretary of the Senate of the United States, to the Clerk of the House of Representatives of the United States, and to each Member of the Congress from the State of Missouri."

The petition of Geo. Washington Williams, of Baltimore Md., relating to the implementation of so-called segregation cases; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

CHICAGO WATER DIVERSION—JOINT RESOLUTION OF WISCONSIN LEGISLATURE

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I have just received from Norman C. Anderson, chief clerk of the Assembly of Wisconsin, a joint resolution, concurred in by the Wisconsin Senate, memorializing Congress regarding the diversion of water from the Great Lakes.

This joint resolution opposes diversion of water from the Great Lakes.

This joint resolution is particularly timely in view of the passage by the House of Representatives of the United States on Friday, March 13, 1959, of H.R. 1, a bill which would authorize additional diversion at Chicago.

The joint resolution is signed by Philleo Nash, president of the senate; George Molinaro, speaker of the assembly; Lawrence R. Larsen, chief clerk of the senate; Norman C. Anderson, chief clerk of the assembly.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the joint resolution of the Wisconsin Legislature opposing the Chicago water diversion be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the joint resolution was ordered to lie on the table, and, under the rule, ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE OF WISCONSIN

JOINT RESOLUTION 11A

Joint resolution memorializing Congress regarding the diversion of water from the Great Lakes

Whereas the city of Chicago and its suburbs attempted, prior to 1900, to dispose of their sewage by digging the Chicago Sanitary Canal across the Continental Divide and diverting water from Lake Michigan to discharge the sewage into the Mississippi watershed; and

Whereas the U.S. Supreme Court restrained this diversion in 1930 and required the area to develop other means of sewage disposal, but since then a veritable parade of other reasons for directing water from the Great Lakes have been proposed including the desire to reduce the salty content of the lower Mississippi by diverting water from Lake Michigan; and

Whereas the program of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Basin is rapidly shaping up into a plan which will enhance the economic life of that area; and

Whereas the persistent efforts of the advocates of diversion to make inroads into the Great Lakes water supply are disrupting and in fact nullifying any long-range plan for the development of the waterways of the Great Lakes; and

Whereas the U.S. Supreme Court has provided an equitable plan for the allocation of the waters of the Great Lakes which is subject to modification whenever the advocates of diversion can provide the necessary data to cause the court to modify its order of 1930 and 1956: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the assembly (the senate concurring), That Congress be and it hereby is petitioned to refrain from disrupting the long standing order of the Supreme Court because:

1. The authorization of increased diversion of waters from the Great Lakes must of necessity affect the development of lake ports and lake shipping adversely;

2. The issue which involves engineering decisions and international considerations should be made by means of the judicial process; and

3. The valuable resources contained in the waters of the Great Lakes ought not to be disposed of without the consent of the States abutting thereon; and, be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States; to the Committee on Public Works, U.S. Senate, and to the appropriate committee of the House of Representatives; to Senators and Representatives from the State of Wisconsin; to the attorneys general of the Great Lakes States opposing water diversion; to the Great Lakes Harbors Association; to the Great Lakes Compact Commission; and to the Lake Carriers Association.

PHILLEO NASH,
President of the Senate.
LAWRENCE R. LARSEN,
Chief Clerk of the Senate.
GEORGE MOLINARO,
Speaker of the Assembly.
NORMAN C. ANDERSON,
Chief Clerk of the Assembly.

RESOLUTIONS OF SENATE AND HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF STATE OF UTAH

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, I present, for appropriate reference, House Resolution 5, and Senate Resolution 5, both of which were adopted on the closing day of the 1959 Utah State Legislature, and were approved by Gov. George D. Clyde. I send these resolutions to the desk, and ask that they be printed in the RECORD.

The resolutions memoralize the Congress to pass my bill, S. 1032, which would amend Public Law 387, 83d Congress, to remove the 640 acre limitation now placed on the Secretary of the Interior on the transfer, in one calendar year, of Federal lands to the States for park purposes, and to provide for the conveyance without consideration.

At the present time the Bureau of Land Management has no program for the preservation of historic sites, or unique or scenic areas, on the millions of acres of land it is administering. Some of our most magnificent recreation and scenic wonders are being damaged or destroyed. We must do something about them now—or in a few years they will be beyond salvage.

My bill has wide support. These memorials reflect the unanimous desires of the members of the Utah Legislature and the Governor of the State that the measure be enacted.

There being no objection, the resolutions were referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and, under the rule, ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATE RESOLUTION 5

Resolution objecting to limitation of public lands

Whereas under the Recreation Act of June 14, 1926, as now amended and in effect, the Secretary of the Interior is limited to not more than 640 acres of the public lands of the United States which may be conveyed to any one grantee in any one calenar year; and

Whereas this limitation is a severe handicap to the State of Utah and to the Utah State Park and Recreation Commission in the development of its planned State park system, and in the acquisition, preservation and protection of areas which should be incorporated into and protected by said State park system: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate of the 33d Legislature of the State of Utah, That the President of the United States and the Congress of the United States be memorialized to amend the Recreation Act of June 14, 1926, as amended, to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to convey to a State, without

acreage or other limitation, any public lands within such State for State park and recreation purposes; and be it further

Resolved, That certified copies of this resolution be transmitted by the secretary of state to the President of the United States, to the Presiding Officer of the U.S. Senate, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to the Senators and Representatives from the State of Utah.

HOUSE RESOLUTION 5

Resolution memorializing Congress and the President to remove the limitation on the number of acres of public lands which the State may acquire

Whereas under the Recreation Act of June 14, 1926, as now amended and in effect, the Secretary of the Interior is limited to not more than 640 acres of the public lands of the United States which may be conveyed to any one grantee in any one calendar year; and

Whereas this limitation is a severe handicap to the State of Utah and to the Utah State Park and Recreation Commission in the development of its planned State park system, and in the acquisition, preservation, and protection of areas which should be incorporated into and protected by said State park system: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Utah, That the President of the United States and the Congress of the United States be memorialized to amend the Recreation Act of June 14, 1926, as amended, to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to convey to a State, without acreage or other limitation, any public lands within such State for State park and recreation purposes; and be it further

Resolved, That certified copies of this resolution be transmitted by the secretary of state to the President of the United States, to the Presiding Officer of the U.S. Senate, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to the Senators and Representatives from the State of Utah.

By Mr. LANGER (for himself and Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota):

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of North Dakota; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

"HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 'O'

"Concurrent resolution urging Congress to retain the present 2-percent interest rate applying to loans made to rural electrical cooperative associations or corporations

"Whereas a number of proposals were presented to the 85th Congress proposing an increase in interest rates on loans to rural electrification associations; and

"Whereas the Congress, by enacting the Pace Act in 1944 and thereby fixing such interest rates at 2 percent, made a covenant with the rural electrical cooperatives to proceed with area coverage at reasonable retail rates; and

"Whereas the proposed increased interest rates would have a detrimental effect on rural electrical cooperative associations or corporations operating in sparsely settled areas; and

"Whereas we believe the continuance of the 2 percent interest rate is necessary to enable the rural electrical cooperative associations and corporations to complete the task of providing full, efficient, and reasonably priced electrical service on an area coverage basis: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of North Dakota (the Senate concurring therein), That we urge the Congress of the United States to vigorously oppose any change or proposed change in the law which would effect an increase in the interest rate on loans to rural electrical cooperative associations or corporations; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded by the chief clerk of the house of representatives to the President of the U.S. Senate, and Speaker of the U.S. House of Representatives, and to each Member of the North Dakota congressional delegation.

"HJALMAR C. NYGAARD,
"Speaker of the House.
"GERALD L. STAIR,
"Chief Clerk of the House.
"C. P. DAHL,
"President of the Senate.
"VIC GILBREATH,
"Secretary of the Senate."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of North Dakota; to the Committee on Appropriations:

"HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 'E-1'

"Concurrent resolution memorializing Congress to make an adequate appropriation for school-lunch programs

"Whereas the abundance of farm produce produced by the farmers of our Nation should be used for the benefit of the citizens of our Nation; and

"Whereas our children should be kept healthy in order to maintain a strong and healthy Nation: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of North Dakota, the Senate concurring therein, That the Congress of the United States be urged to appropriate a sufficient amount so as to adequately support the school-lunch programs carried on in the public schools of this Nation; and be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of state transmit copies of this resolution to U.S. Senator WILLIAM LANGER, U.S. Senator MILTON R. YOUNG, Representative QUENTIN N. BURDICK, and Representative DON L. SHORT.

"HJALMAR NYGAARD,
"Speaker of the House.
"GERALD L. STAIR,
"Chief Clerk of the House.
"C. P. DAHL,
"President of the Senate.
"VIC GILBREATH,
"Secretary of the Senate."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of North Dakota; to the Committee on Finance:

"HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 'P-1'

"Concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to increase the exemption on Federal income tax

"Whereas present provisions of the Federal income tax are causing hardships to many citizens of the Nation; and

"Whereas an increase in income tax exemptions would increase spending power of consumers, who in turn would increase their purchases, thereby reducing food surpluses; and

"Whereas an increase in income tax exemptions would increase the amount of sales of all other commodities, which in turn would increase labor hours and thereby strengthen our Nation's economy: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of North Dakota, the Senate concurring therein, That the Congress of the United States is hereby urged and requested to pass legislation increasing Federal income tax exemptions as follows:

"1. Increase exemptions of married persons to a total of $2,000 per year.

"2. Increase exemptions of an unmarried person to $1,000 per year.

"3. Increase exemptions for each dependent to $800 per year; and be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of state is hereby directed to mail copies of this resolution to each member of the North Dakota congressional delegation.

"HJALMAR C. NYGAARD,
"Speaker of the House.
"GERALD L. STAIR,
"Chief Clerk of the House.
"C. P. DAHL,
"President of the Senate.
"VIC GILBREATH,
"Secretary of the Senate."

Three concurrent resolutions of the Legislature of the State of North Dakota; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION I

"Concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress to establish as a national park a suitable area of land lying at the confluence of the Yellowstone and Missouri Rivers in northwestern North Dakota and northeastern Montana to include the sites of Fort Buford, Fort Union, and Mondak, and to preserve and develop this area of national historical significance as a historical memorial

"Whereas the area at the confluence of the Yellowstone and Missouri Rivers in northwesteren North Dakota and northeastern Montana played a large and significant part in the opening of the Pacific Northwest; and

"Whereas the area at the confluence of the Yellowstone and Missouri Rivers was known to the Governments of Spain, France, and England before the 19th century; and

"Whereas the area at the confluence of said rivers was a highlight in the exploration trip of Lewis and Clark and was by them designated as the place of rendezvous in the year 1806; and

"Whereas a trading post was established at the confluence of the Yellowstone and Missouri Rivers in the year 1822 by the Rocky Mountain Fur Co., with the support of William Ashley, later a United States Senator, Andrew Henry, Mike Fink, Jim Bridger, and other early explorers; which trading post in the year 1828–29, after acquisition by the American Fur Co., was developed by Kenneth McKenzie into the greatest fur trading post on the North American Continent and played a preeminent part in the opening of the Pacific Northwest for more than two decades; and

"Whereas Fort Union became a port of call for many world-famous personages, such as George Catlin in the year 1832, who arrived on the first steamer to reach the Yellowstone River; Prince Maximilian of Wied and party in the year 1833; John James Audubon in the summer of 1843; and the eminent frontier missionary Father Pierre Jean DeSmet in the year 1840; in addition to being a point of meeting for many years for bands of Indians from the Chippewa, Blackfeet, Crow, Sioux, Cree, Blood, Piegan, Assiniboine, Hidatsa, Mandan, Arikara, Cheyenne, Flathead, and Snake Nations; and

"Whereas Fort Buford was similarly established at the confluence of the two rivers in the year 1866; and

"Whereas said fort played a large and significant part in the regulation of the fur trade with the Indians and in the subsequent Indian campaigns, culminating in the Battle of the Little Big Horn in 1876; and

"Whereas such Indian prisoners as Chief Joseph and members of his Nez Perce Tribe and Chief Gall passed through Fort Buford; and

"Whereas it was at Fort Buford in the year 1881 that Sitting Bull surrendered, together with the remnants of his followers; and

"Whereas this area situated at the confluence of the Yellowstone and Missouri Rivers is an area of great historical significance to the people of the United States; and

"Whereas its historical significance has been lost largely by reason of its nondevelopment: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate of the 36th Legislative Assembly of the State of North Dakota, the House of Representatives concurring therein, That we do respectfully and earnestly request the Congress of the United States to authorize and establish sufficient of the area situated at the confluence of the Yellowstone and Missouri Rivers as a national park and that the sites of Fort Union, Fort Buford, and the early frontier town of Mondak and other historical sites be renovated, preserved, and maintained for the enjoyment and benefit of the people of the United States; and be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of state of the State of North Dakota be authorized and he is hereby directed to forward certified copies of this memorial to the President of the United States, the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States, to the Senators and Representatives representing this State, to the Governor of the State of Montana, and to the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Montana.

"C. P. DAHL,
"President of the Senate.
"VIC GILBREATH,
"Secretary of the Senate.
"HJALMAR C. NYGAARD,
"Speaker of the House.
"GERALD L. STAIR,
"Chief Clerk of the House."

(The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of North Dakota, identical with the foregoing, which was referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.)

"SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 'JJ'

"Concurrent resolution authorizing and directing the State historical society to accept the old Fort Totten site from the Federal Government if it is offered to the State

"Whereas, the site of old Fort Totten is one of the State's oldest historic sites, having been established in 1867; and

"Whereas old Fort Totten is presently being used as an Indian school but will be abandoned in the near future when a new Indian school is completed; and

"Whereas the United States Bureau of Indian Affairs has expressed a willingness to transfer the site and buildings at old Fort Totten to the State: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate of the State of North Dakota, the House of Representatives concurring therein, That the State historical society is hereby authorized and directed to accept the site and buildings at old Fort Totten if such property is offered to the State by the United States Bureau of Indian Affairs and to maintain and preserve the site of historic old Fort Totten as a tourist and recreational center; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded by the secretary of the senate to the State historical society, the Secretary of the Interior, the North Dakota congressional delegation, the superintendent of the Turtle Mountain Indian Reservation, and the President of the Pioneer Daughters of the State of North Dakota.

"C. P. DAHL,
"President of the Senate.
"VIC GILBREATH,
"Secretary of the Senate.
"HJALMAR C. NYGAARD,
"Speaker of the House.
"GERALD L. STAIR,
"Chief Clerk of the House."

"SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 'BB'

"Concurrent Resolution to the Congress urging the passage of a "point four program" to raise the standards of well-being of Indian citizens

"Whereas the Indian citizens of this State who reside on and adjacent to Federal Indian reservations do not enjoy a standard of living in any way approaching that found among the non-Indian citizens of this State, and in fact often suffer extreme hardships through inadequate diet, housing, and at times even hunger; and

"Whereas a continuation of the Federal reservation system with its ever-increasing population will result in even further hardships because of an almost total absence of employment opportunities on the reservation; and

"Whereas the social advancement of our Indian citizens is and will continue to be largely barred unless economic improvements are forthcoming; and

"Whereas legislation will be presented to the Congress to provide assistance similar to the "point four program" to the Indian citizens of this and other States through the provision of technical and financial assistance to aid in the development of natural resources on Indian lands; to develop the full capabilities of industrial and agricultural production; in improvements in housing, nutrition, clothing, sanitation and health; and the resettlement of individuals and families in other areas: Now therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate of the State of North Dakota, the House of Representatives concurring therein, That the Congress is respectfully urged to give favorable consideration to the passage of a "point four program" to aid the Indian citizens of this and other States to reach the level of well-being enjoyed by the great majority of the citizens of our country and to provide for the implementation of this program at the earliest possible date; and be it further,

"Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded by the secretary of state to the Secretary of the Interior, the Commissioner of Indian Affairs, and to each member of the North Dakota congressional delegation.

"C. P. DAHL,
"President of the Senate.
"VIC GILBREATH,
"Secretary of the Senate.
"HJALMAR C. NYGAARD,
"Speaker of the House.
"GERALD L. STARR,
"Chief Clerk of the House."

Two concurrent resolutions of the Legislature of the State of North Dakota; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

"HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION J–1

"Concurrent resolution memorializing Congress to establish and maintain the U.S. Maritime Service as a uniformed service

"Whereas the U.S. Maritime Service performs a highly valuable service to the United States in time of peace and is an integral part of our national defense in time of war; and

"Whereas a measure will be placed before Congress during its current session to recognize the status of the U.S. Maritime Service by making it one of the uniformed services of this country: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of North Dakota, the Senate concurring therein, That Congress is respectfully urged to pass suitable legislation to establish and maintain the U.S. Maritime Service as one of the fully recognized uniformed services of this country, and that copies of this resolution be forwarded by the secretary of state to the Secretary of Commerce, and to each Member of the North Dakota congressional delegation.

"HJALMAR C. NYGAARD,
"Speakers of the House.
"GERALD L. STAIR,
"Chief Clerk of the House.
"C. P. DAHL,
"President of the Senate.
"VIC GILBREATH,
"Secretary of the Senate."

"SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION Q

"Concurrent resolution requesting the Federal Communications Commission to premit television booster stations in North Dakota

"Whereas many of the people of the State of North Dakota are on the fringe or outside of the effective range of a television station; and

"Whereas because of the sparse population and the large area of this State it is not economically feasible to construct additional television stations in this State; and

"Whereas the cost to individual television viewers, on the fringe or outside the range of a television station, for the purchase of equipment to improve their television reception would be prohibitive in the event television booster stations are not permitted in this State: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate of the State of North Dakota, the House of Representatives concurring therein, That the 36th Legislative Assembly of the State of North Dakota requests the Federal Communications Commission to allow television booster stations in North Dakota under such rules and regulations as the commission may prescribe, and that the people of this State will be highly appreciative of any consideration that the Federal Communications Commission may give to the continued operation of booster stations; and be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of state forward copies of this resolution to the Members of the Federal Communications Commission and to the Members of the North Dakota congressional delegation.

"C. P. DAHL,
"President of the Senate.
"VIC GILBREATH,
"Secretary of the Senate.
"HJALMAR C. NYGAARD,
"Speaker of the House.
"GERALD L. STAIR,
"Chief Clerk of the House."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of North Dakota; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

"HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 'W'

"Concurrent resolution lauding the sound development of organized labor in North Dakota, and memorializing Congress to vigorously legislate to stamp out racketeering in the labor and management fields, and to protect the democratic rights of member control within labor unions

"Whereas the growth of organized labor in North Dakota has taken place on a sound and democratic basis; and

"Whereas the leadership of organized labor in North Dakota has conducted the affairs of their organizations in a commendable manner; and

"Whereas the cause of organized labor has suffered because of racketeering and nondemocratic procedures followed by some labor leaders and some management in areas outside of this State: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of North Dakota, the Senate concurring therein, That the cause of organized labor and of all citizens of North Dakota can best be served by a Federal statute which would:

"1. Prevent racketeering in the fields of organized labor, and management-labor relations.

"2. Assure the positive control of any and all labor organizations to the individual members through guaranteed democratic processes.

"3. Make management liable for any action to suppress democratic processes in labor organizations, or to encourage or abet in labor racketeering; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies hereof be mailed by the secretary of state to the President of the

Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to the members of the North Dakota Congressional Delegation.

"HJALMAR C. NYGAARD,
"Speaker of the House.
"GERALD L. STAIR,
"Chief Clerk of the House.
"C. P. DAHL,
"President of the Senate.
"VIC GILBREATH,
"Secretary of the Senate."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of North Dakota; to the Committee on Public Works:

"HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION V–1

"Concurrent resolution requesting the Corps of U.S. Army Engineers to study and investigate the most feasible means of protecting from erosion the banks of the Missouri River in the reaches thereof between the Oahe Reservoir and Garrison Dam

"Whereas a recent study was made by the North Dakota State Water Conservation Commission relative to the bank erosion occurring in the reach of the Missouri River between the Oahe and Garrison Reservoirs; and

"Whereas it was determined that 440 acres of valuable agricultural land was annually being destroyed through erosion; and

"Whereas the bottom land in this section of the river is the only sizable area lying adjacent to the Missouri River in North Dakota that has not been inundated by a federally constructed reservoir; and

"Whereas through the construction of the Garrison Reservoir the water now flowing in this reach of the river has silt carrying capacity only and no longer deposits silt to rebuild stream banks; and

"Whereas the lands adjacent to this entire part of the river will be subjected to total erosion unless remedies are undertaken to protect the banks from such erosion; and

"Whereas bank protection can be accomplished through the use of a series of low head dams, or through the use of the jetties and riprap; Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of North Dakota, the Senate concurring therein, That the U.S. Corps of Army Engineers be requested to investigate the most feasible means of protecting the banks of such reach of the Missouri River through the fund proposed in the President's budget for use in connection with a study of a low head dam in the vicinity of Bismarck; and, be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of state mail a copy of this resolution to each of our Senators and Representatives in Congress, to the Chief of Engineers, U.S. Corps of Army Engineers, Washington, D.C.; Maj. Gen. Keith Barney, Missouri River Division Office, Omaha, Nebr.; Col. L. W. Pine, District Engineer, Riverdale, N. Dak.; and to the President of the United States.

"HJALMAR C. NYGAARD,
"Speaker of the House.
"GERALD L. STAIR,
"Chief Clerk of the House.
"C. P. DAHL,
"President of the Senate.
"VIC GILBREATH,
"Secretary of the Senate."

INTERFAITH MEDITATION ROOM IN KANSAS STATE CAPITOL BUILDING—CONCURRENT RESOLUTION OF KANSAS LEGISLATURE

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, there has been introduced in the Kansas Legislature Senate Concurrent Resolution 22, which was cosponsored by every member of the Kansas State Senate and was unanimously approved by that body.

This resolution authorizes and directs the State executive council to designate and provide an interfaith meditation room in our Kansas State Capitol Building.

Several years ago the Congress of the United States authorized the construction of a Prayer Room just off of the rotunda in our Nation's Capitol.

The location of the room is convenient for Members of Congress to drop in for prayer and meditation. The furnishings and decorations in the room are in keeping with an atmosphere that is conducive to worship.

The Kansas Legislature is to be commended for following the suggestion of the Congress in the construction of a Prayer Room in the State's capitol.

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution was ordered to lie on the table; and, under the rule, was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION No. 22

Concurrent resolution authorizing and directing the State executive council to designate and provide an interfaith meditation room in the State capitol building

Whereas members of religious groups of different faiths have long felt that there should be a place for prayer and meditation in the State capitol building; and

Whereas the Capitol Prayer Room in Washington, D.C., and the meditation room in the United Nations Building in New York City, N.Y., are being increasingly used; and

Whereas space is available on the fifth floor of the statehouse which appears to be well suited for such a purpose; and

Whereas the executive council has the charge, care and management of the Statehouse: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate of the State of Kansas (the House of Representatives concurring therein), That we hereby authorize and direct the State executive council to designate room 503 in the statehouse, or some other room deemed more suitable and available by the executive council, as an interfaith meditation room. The said executive council is further directed to redecorate and refurnish any room so designated and to provide for the care of such room and to pay the cost thereof out of any available appropriations. Any contract for redecorating or refurnishing a room shall be made in accordance with plans prepared by the State architect and the executive council. The designated room shall not be furnished in such manner as to remind anyone of any particular religion, and shall be open and available to all races and creeds; be it further;

Resolved, That the secretary of state be directed to send an enrolled copy of this resolution to each member of the State executive council and to the State architect.

REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

The following reports of a committee were submitted:

By Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary without amendment:

S. 947. A bill for the relief of the estate of Verentes Bent, deceased (Rept. No. 102).

By Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment:

S. 458. A bill for the relief of Maria Bogatkin Manea (Rept. No. 103); and

S. 758. A bill for the relief of Viktors Neimanis (Rept. No. 104).

By Mr. WILEY, from the Committee on the Judiciary, with amendments:

S. 1207. A bill for the relief of Rosette Sorge Saborgnan (Rept. No. 108).

By Mr. O'MAHONEY, from the Committee on the Judiciary, with amendments:

S. 355. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code so as to prohibit the misuse by collecting agencies of names, emblems, and insignia to indicate Federal agency (Rept. No. 107).

By Mr. LANGER, from the Committee on the Judiciary, without amendment:

S. 331. A bill for the relief of Peter E. Dietrich (Rept. No. 105).

By Mr. LANGER, from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment:

S. 1075. A bill to provide for the reimbursement of Meadow School District No. 29, Upham, N. Dak., for loss of revenue resulting from the acquisition of certain lands within such school district by the Department of the Interior (Rept. No. 106).

REPORT ENTITLED "AN INVESTIGATION OF REFUGEES AND ESCAPEES" (S. REPT. NO. 101)

Mr. LANGER, from the Committee on the Judiciary, pursuant to Senate resolution 239, 85th Congress, 2d session, as extended, submitted a report entitled "An Investigation of Refugees and Escapees," which was ordered to be printed.

EXECUTIVE REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

As in executive session,

The following favorable report of a nomination was submitted:

By Mr. BIBLE, from the Committee on the District of Columbia:

Francis F. Healy, to be a member of the District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. AIKEN (for himself and Mr. PROUTY):

S. 1399. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain land comprising a part of Ethan Allen Air Force Base to the State of Vermont, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 1400. A bill to provide for the erection of a Federal building in Montpelier, Vt.; to the Committee on Public Works.

(See the remarks of Mr. AIKEN when he introduced the first above-mentioned bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. KUCHEL (for himself and Mr. ENGLE):

S. 1401. A bill to authorize an extension of the time for final proof under the desert land laws under certain conditions; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. KUCHEL when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. CLARK:

S. 1402. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to acquire certain additional property to be included within the Independence National Historical Park; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 1403. A bill to amend title IV of the Social Security Act so as to permit children

who are in need because of the unemployment of their parents to be eligible for assistance under the State plans for aid to dependent children established pursuant to such title; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. CLARK when he introduced the last above-mentioned bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. ELLENDER (for himself and Mr. LONG) (by request):

S. 1404. A bill to permit certain real property heretofore conveyed to the Board of Supervisors of Louisiana State University and Agricultural and Mechanical College to be used for general educational purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina:

S. 1405. A bill for the relief of Panayiotis Michel Mavroyiannis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HARTKE:

S. 1406. A bill to amend chapter 15 of title 38, United States Code, to grant a pension of $100 per month to all honorably discharged veterans of World War I; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 1407. A bill for the relief of Mrs. John M. Cica; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BARTLETT:

S. 1408. A bill for the relief of Ronald R. Dagon and Richard J. Hensel;

S. 1409. A bill for the relief of Donald B. Thurston and other employees of the Fish and Wildlife Service; and

S. 1410. A bill for the relief of Jay R. Melville and Peter E. K. Shepherd; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

My Mr. BARTLETT (for himself and Mr. GRUENING):

S. 1411. A bill to amend the act of August 1, 1956 (70 Stat. 898); and

S. 1412. A bill to amend the act of July 7, 1958, providing for the admission of the State of Alaska into the Union, relating to selection by the State of Alaska of certain lands made subject to lease, permit, license, or contract; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. TALMADGE:

S. 1413. A bill for the relief of Dr. Herbert H. Schafer and Dr. Irma Niemeyer Schafer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota:

S. 1414. A bill to provide for wheat marketing quotas without acreage allotments; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. CARLSON:

S. 1415. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide the same treatment for prepaid dues income received by a nonprofit motor club as is provided for prepaid subscription income; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. MOSS:

S. 1416. A bill to recognize the authority of the States relating to the control, appropriation, use, or distribution of water within their boundaries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. Moss when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MUNDT:

S. 1417. A bill to establish in the executive branch of the Government a temporary Commission on Federal Contributions to State and Local Governments; to the Committee on Government Operations.

(See the remarks of Mr. MUNDT when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. ELLENDER (by request):

S. 1418. A bill to amend section 377 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, to provide for the extension of the automatic preservation of acreage history provision, with certain modifications; and

S. 1419. A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, to eliminate the 30-acre limitation on the amount of wheat exempt from wheat marketing quotas where all the wheat produced on the farm is used on the farm for feed, food, and seed; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. NEUBERGER:

S. 1420. A bill to promote the conservation of migratory fish and game by requiring certain approval by the Secretary of the Interior of licenses issued under the Federal Power Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. NEUBERGER when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. COTTON:

S. 1421. A bill for the relief of Dolly Daulette Roshan Pestonji; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CASE of South Dakota:

S. 1422. A bill to provide for the establishment of a Soil and Water Conservation Laboratory at the Federal land-grant college at Brookings, S. Dak.; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. SCOTT:

S. 1423. A bill to extend by 6 months the period for which additional benefits may be paid under the Temporary Unemployment Compensation Act of 1958; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. SCOTT when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MAGNUSON (for himself and Mr. ENGLE):

S. 1424. A bill to extend the provisions of title XI of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, relating to mortgage insurance, to certain terminal facilities; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MAGNUSON (for himself, Mr. CARROLL, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. CHURCH, Mr. COOPER, Mr. JACKSON, Mr. HART, Mr. KEFAUVER, Mr. LANGER, Mr. MCGEE, Mr. MCCARTHY, Mr. MCNAMARA, Mr. MORSE, Mr. MOSS, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. NEUBERGER, Mr. PROXMIRE, Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota, and Mr. HENNINGS):

S. 1425. A bill to amend the Interstate Commerce Act so as to provide for the protection of railroad employees by regulating the use of track motorcars, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 1426. A bill for the relief of Capt. Emily M. Rudnick; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1427. A bill to provide chiropractic treatment when requested for veterans eligible for outpatient medical care; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

S. 1428. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act so as to provide for payment of annuities to widowers of female employees, and to surviving children, without regard to dependency; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. KENNEDY:

S. 1429. A bill for the relief of Magdaleno V. del Rosario; and

S. 1430. A bill for the relief of Agostino Aresco; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CLARK:

S. 1431. A bill to provide for the establishment of a Commission on Metropolitan Problems; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. THURMOND:

S. 1432. A bill to prevent the service or consumption of alcoholic beverages aboard commercial passenger aircraft and military aircraft; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. JACKSON:

S. 1433. A bill for the relief of John Axel Arvidson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAGNUSON (by request):

S. 1434. A bill to amend title XI of the Merchant Marine Act, as amended, with respect to insurance of ship mortgages, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. MAGNUSON when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

S. 1435. A bill to legalize maritime and building trades hiring halls; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. BENNETT:

S. 1436. A bill to amend section 1 of the act of June 14, 1926, as amended by the act of June 4, 1954 (68 Stat. 173; 43 U.S.C., sec. 869); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. BENNETT when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. RANDOLPH (for himself and Mr. BYRD of West Virginia):

S. 1437. A bill for the establishment of a temporary National Advisory Committee for the Blind; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. KUCHEL (for himself Mr. DIRKSEN, Mr. LAUSCHE, Mr. WILEY, Mr. SCHOEPPEL, Mr. GRUENING, Mr. RANDOLPH, and Mr. CARLSON):

S.J. Res. 78. Joint resolution authorizing the President of the United States of America to proclaim September 17 of each year General Von Steuben Memorial Day for the observance and commemoration of the birth of Gen. Friedrich Wilhelm von Steuben; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MANSFIELD:

S.J. Res. 79. Joint resolution providing for a study of the possibility and desirability of establishing a University of the Americas; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

(See the remarks of Mr. MANSFIELD when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate hearing.)

RESOLUTION

Mr. MORSE submitted a resolution (S. Res. 92) favoring an advisory opinion by the International Court of Justice concerning the rights of the United States to maintain Armed Forces in, and to have unrestricted access to, and from Berlin, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

(See the remarks of Mr. MORSE when he submitted the above resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

CONVEYANCE OF CERTAIN LAND TO STATE OF VERMONT

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, and the junior Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to provide for the conveyance of certain land comprising a part of Ethan Allen Air Force Base to the State of Vermont, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent that the bill, together with a statement prepared by me be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GRUENING in the chair). The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill and statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1399) to provide for the conveyance of certain land comprising a part of Ethan Allen Air Force Base to the State of Vermont, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. AIKEN (for himself and Mr. PROUTY), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Armed Services, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Air Force is authorized and directed to convey to the State of Vermont all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to certain land comprising a part of the Ethan Allen Air Force Base, together with improvements thereon, and appurtenances thereto belonging; such property being more particularly described as follows:

Beginning at the northeasterly corner of land described as parcel No. 2 in the Department of the Air Force license to the State of Vermont for National Guard purposes, dated May 12, 1953, said point of beginning, indicated by iron stake, being located easterly of Feigle Street at or near the existing fire hydrant line; thence running north forty-nine (49) degrees forty-five (45) minutes west a distance of two thousand three hundred nineteen point zero (2,319.0) feet; thence turning an exterior angle of two hundred seventy (270) degrees to run a line north forty-five (45) degrees twenty (20) minutes east, a distance of three hundred forty-nine point four (349.4) feet; thence turning an exterior angle of two hundred seventy-one (271) degrees to run a line south one hundred thirty-two (132) degrees five (5) minutes east a distance of one thousand eight hundred thirty-eight point zero (1,838.0) feet; thence turning an exterior angle of two hundred fourteen (214) degrees to run a line south five (5) degrees twelve (12) minutes east a distance of five hundred sixty-four point zero (564.0) feet; thence turning an exterior angle of two hundred seventy-four (274) degrees to run a line south eighty-two (82) degrees and three (3) minutes west a distance of one hundred seventy-nine point sixty-seven (179.67) feet to the place of beginning. Meaning hereby to enclose an area consisting of twenty point four three seven (20.437) acres of land be the same, more or less.

SEC. 2. The property authorized to be conveyed by the first section of this Act shall be used for the training of the National Guard of Vermont and for other military purposes, and the conveyance authorized herein shall be made without monetary consideration therefor, the right of reentry and use by the United States in the event of need therefor during a national emergency declared by the President or the Congress; and the condition and limitation that if the property shall fail or cease to be used for the training of the National Guard of Vermont or for other military purposes, the title to the property so conveyed shall revert to and revest in the United States,. and all improvements made thereon during its occupancy by the State of Vermont shall vest in the United States without payment of compensation therefor.

SEC. 3. The costs of any surveys necessary as an incident of the conveyance authorized herein shall be borne by the State of Vermont.

The statement presented by Mr. AIKEN is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR AIKEN

This bill would provide for the conveyance of approximately 20 acres of Federal land, now comprising a part of the Ethan Allen Air Force Base, located at Winooski, Vt., to the State of Vermont for use by the State for National Guard purposes.

Three years ago a similar measure was passed by the Congress to provide land for an access road to Camp Johnson, Vermont National Guard, through the Ethan Allen Air Force Base. This land changed title and the access road was built to the mutual satisfaction of the Air Force and National Guard.

Recently, however, Maj. Gen. Francis W. Billado, the Adjutant General of the State of Vermont, was advised by the Vermont Highway Department that it will be necessary to construct an access road to the new interstate highway across a portion of the access road to Camp Johnson.

I am assured that this new highway construction project is essential, and further that the Vermont National Guard needs an additional strip of land bordering on the Camp Johnson access road. The land which this bill would convey to the State of Vermont is presently being used by the National Guard for the winter storage of some 500 military vehicles. In addition, I am told that there are three frame buildings on the land—two being used for storage and the third for an organizational maintenance shop servicing the vehicles of all the military units in the area. These buildings are presently being maintained by the National Guard.

I am further advised that these 20 acres are in excess to the requirements of the Air Force at Ethan Allen Air Force Base.

The costs of any surveys incident to the conveyance of this land would be borne by the State of Vermont, the land would only be used for the training of the National Guard of Vermont and for other military purposes, and the United States would reserve the right to reentry and use in the event of a national emergency. No monetary consideration would be involved in this conveyance.

Finally, I would like to say that the working relationship between our Air Force and National Guard units has been a thoroughly cooperative and efficient one. I am convinced, from the information brought to my attention, that this is a conveyance which the Congress could authorize with the full assurance that it would be in the national interest.

EQUITABLE RELIEF FOR CALIFORNIA ENTRYMEN

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and my colleague, the junior Senator from California [Mr. ENGLE], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill "to authorize an extension of the time for final proof under the desert land laws under certain conditions."

This bill pertains exclusively to a limited situation of only local application in the southwestern portion of my State; namely, the Palo Verde Mesa in Imperial County, Calif. The purpose of the bill is to afford temporary relief and protection to a group of about 125 or so small desert land entrymen who are now subject to unjustified deprivation of their homestead entries.

Under the public land laws, these entrymen have proceeded over the past 15 years to qualify for final patent. In the face of extreme difficulties they have been making the required improvements to suit the land for cultivation under irrigation with water from the Colorado River, for which they have one of the highest priority rights under State law and under the Federal Boulder Canyon Act. About the time that they had progressed to the point that they were ready to begin construction of the irrigation system that must be completed before the lands can be actually cultivated, the State of Arizona instituted in the Supreme Court of the United States a suit against the State of California relative to the whole system of water rights of the two States. One unforeseeable result of this litigation has been to raise questions about the water supply for this group of entrymen that had never previously been in question. This in turn has caused great difficulty to them in securing the necessary financing for the construction of those irrigation works.

I have given this quick summary of the background, in order to make clear that the delays in completing the necessary improvements for irrigation farming on these desert land entries is the result of the action of parties other than the desert land entrymen; and because they are the actions of sovereign States, they are wholly beyond the control of the entrymen.

To complete my brief account, I point out that the delay in completion of the required improvements results in expiration of the statuatory period within which the improvements must be made. As a consequence, under the existing law, a substantial number of these entrymen who have been working on their project for about 15 years are about to lose all of their entry rights, and their tracks are about to revert to public domain status.

The purpose of bill is solely to suspend such adverse action and the loss of the entrymen's rights until completion of the Supreme Court suit. At that time, I am confident that they will be able to complete the necessary irrigation facilities and qualify for patent under the existing law. I wish to make clear that my bill will make no change whatsoever in the existing public land laws, other than to afford a temporary extension of time during the pendency of the Supreme Court litigation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1401) to authorize an extension of the time for final proof under the desert land laws under certain conditions, introduced by Mr. KUCHEL (for himself and Mr. ENGLE), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

AMENDMENT OF TITLE IV OF SOCIAL SECURITY ACT, RELATING TO CERTAIN DEPENDENT CHILDREN

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I send to the desk for appropriate reference a bill to amend title IV of the Social Security Act so as to permit children who are in need because of the unemployment of their parents to be eligible for assistance under State plans for aid to dependent children established pursuant to such title.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1403) to amend title IV of the Social Security Act so as to permit children who are in need because of the unemployment of their parents to be eligible for assistance under the State plans for aid to dependent children established pursuant to such title, introduced by Mr. CLARK, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, the bill is another measure intended as a part of a unified legislative program to help alleviate the effects of the very serious unemployment situation which continues to affect the Nation.

Mr. President, an article published in the New York Times of this morning, entitled "People Behind Statistics: A Study of Unemployed," graphically brings this fact before us. As a part of that article is a dispatch from Pittsburgh entitled "Pennsylvania Puzzle," written by Stanley Levey.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that excerpts from the major article written by A. H. Raskin, and the article on Pennsylvania, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpts and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PEOPLE BEHIND STATISTICS: A STUDY OF UNEMPLOYED—VICTIMS IN FIVE STATES PUZZLED BY PLIGHT—FAMILY DEBTS INCREASE AMID GAINS IN OUTPUT AT MECHANIZED PLANTS

(By A. H. Raskin)

Unemployment is a figure in a Government report, as dreary and lifeless as the Federal debt or the death rate.

Unemployment is people—the individual hardship and heartache of 4,749,000 Americans, willing and able to work but unable to find suitable jobs.

Unemployment is the husky, fresh-faced college graduate, with 3 years of Air Force duty behind him, being told he is too old for a job with a future—at age 26.

Unemployment is the breezy, blustery executive, accustomed to an income of $50,000 a year, trying to pay his bills on a State job insurance check of $40 a week—an amount he once spent on taxis and cigars.

Unemployment is the head shipping clerk, stranded when his textile plant moved from New York to North Carolina, subsisting on odd jobs of heavy cleaning and reading an inspirational pamphlet. Its title, "Get Rich in Spite of Yourself."

Unemployment is the rhinestone setter, with all her State and Federal benefits drawn, watching a give-away show on television and murmuring "It makes me feel bad to see people getting all these nice things."

Unemployment is the electrical worker, fearful that automation has permanently wiped out his chances for reemployment, wondering whether he can volunteer for a space flight to the moon.

To put faces on figures, correspondents of the New York Times have spent the last week talking to idle workers and their families in States where unemployment has remained high despite the general pickup in business.

Their story makes a gray backdrop for reports of higher production, higher sales, higher profits, higher wages and other indexes of returning prosperity. It is a story told without bitterness—almost apologetically—even by those who have gone through the last anguishing turn of the wringer and been forced to turn to public relief.

Puzzlement is more apparent than anger in the attitude of men and women who have tramped the streets, month after weary month, with nothing to show for their efforts but holes in their shoes and a growing pile of debts.

In Detroit, capital of the automobile industry, one worker in seven is jobless and cutbacks in the output of some 1959 models threaten to add thousands to the idle lists in the next few weeks. Pittsburgh, crossroads of steel and coal production, is worried that large-scale unemployment will become a chronic drag on its economic well-being.

In the mine regions of West Virginia the specter of permanent pools of idle workers is even more tragically present. Mechanization has cut the need for manpower so drastically that 68,000 men now dig more coal than 125,000 did 10 years ago. The displaced, returning from futile job-seeking expeditions to Cleveland, Columbus, or Detroit, are less disposed to be philosophical about their plight than most of the country's uncomplaining unemployed.

Surplus food—"mollygrub" is what they call it in the Kanawha Valley coal fields—has become a mainstay in the diets of tens of thousands of families, not only in West Virginia but also in every other State. In December, 5,230,000 persons benefited from the Federal dole of butter, flour, cornmeal, and other surplus commodities. The food lines were almost twice as long as they had been a year earlier.

Yet, by the standards of mass misery that prevailed in the great depression of the thirties privation is a minor problem. What bears most raspingly on today's jobless is the sense of uselessness that comes with being unwanted and unneeded in the world's richest and most productive nation.

The corrosive effect has been acute among youngsters—high school and college graduates, ex-G.I.'s, and others in the 20- to 35-age group—locked in their first real bout with hard times and deprived of the community of suffering that helped preserve the fabric of self-respect in the depression years when everyone was in trouble.

YOUNG MAN'S RECESSION

In many ways this was a young man's recession, especially in factory industries operating under rigid seniority systems. The most recently hired were the first to feel the layoff ax. Now science, moving with the same breathtaking speed in the improvement of industrial technology as it is in the conquest of the atom and of outer space, is making the day of recall to work more remote.

The harnessing of electronic brains to mechanical muscles has made it possible to produce more goods with fewer workers. Men with 10, 12, and even 15 years of seniority remain on the surplus list while their companies climb past the production peaks they set in preautomation days.

To make the outlook gloomier, other employers hesitate to hire them for fear that their desire to safeguard their pension equities and priority status in their old jobs will cause them to quit when and if the recall whistle sounds.

For men and women of more advanced age among the unemployed, the calendar is an enemy. The piling up in New York and other States of statutory prohibitions against discrimination based on age has brought no abatement in the conviction of those past 35—and even a good many under that age—that their biggest handicap is the years in which they acquired their maturity and skill.

There is little tendency to clutch for the comforts of the welfare state. Confronted with the necessity for going on relief, most workers will grab a job at half or less than the standard they used to enjoy. And there are plenty of employers ready to capitalize on this preference for staying independent of a government handout.

RELIEF LOAD UP 3 PERCENT

In small machine shops, dry goods warehouses, and other small businesses, the calls are for work at only a few cents above the legal minimum of $1 an hour. Only in the large standardized industries and those under stringent union policing is there no move to pull down pay scales or trim fringe benefits. There the movement is still up—in both prices and wages.

In this city, where 50,000 workers have drawn all the Federal and State unemployment insurance they could get in the last 14 months, fewer than 100 a month have turned to the department of welfare for relief after their insurance ran out. The total public assistance case load here has gone up less than 3 percent in the last year, and not all of this slight rise is attributable to unemployment.

In contrast to the economic trough of the thirties, when one-fifth of the city's population was on home or work relief, the ratio now is 1 in 23. And many of the family heads now on the rolls are unemployable even by the relaxed tests that would apply in the rosiest flush of full employment.

In Detroit and other centers of productivity unemployment, the relief rolls have risen more rapidly. But everywhere the idle, without insurance or other sources of support, echo the remark of the Detroit mother of five who told a reporter:

"Accepting money from welfare, I feel we're down to the last notch. I don't want the children to grow up with the idea of welfare aid. My parents back in Arkansas raised me never to lean on welfare."

Here are some reports on what unemployment has meant to workers and their families.

PENNSYLVANIA PUZZLE

(By Stanley Levey)

PITTSBURGH, March 13.—Up and down the river valleys of western Pennsylvania smoke is shooting once again from steel mill stacks. After 2 years of recession and unemployment, it is a signal read in various ways by various persons.

"Look at that smoke," says the owner of a shoe store in Homestead. "Isn't it beautiful?"

"Went back to the mill last week," says a laborer in Ambridge. "First day's work in 14 months. I never thought I'd be so glad to see the lousy place. But after looking at all that television, I really was."

"The recession is over," says a steel company official.

"I don't know," says a forgeman in New Castle. "I hear the recession's over and I know a lotta guys have gone back, so I guess maybe it is. But not me, they don't call me back, and sometimes, mister, I don't think they ever will."

ELEVEN PERCENT IDLE IN JANUARY

Halfway across the State in Harrisburg, the capital, in the new sleek building of the department of labor and industry, analysts have compiled statistics and drawn graphs and curves. This is the story they tell:

At the end of January, 508,000 Pennsylvanians (or about 11 percent of the work force) were idle. The figure for the country was 6 percent. At the bottom of the recession last June, 520,000 persons were jobless in the State. This was 10.9 percent of the work force. The comparable national figure then was slightly more than 7.5 percent.

What worries the analysts (and workers, union leaders, merchants, and businessmen) is that increased production has not been accompanied by a corresponding increase in employment. Does this tendency mean, they

wonder, that new pools of chronic unemployment are in the making—in the steel areas, for example?

"Is Pittsburgh in danger of becoming another Scranton?" asked an economist in the bureau of employment security.

Thirty years ago Pennsylvania's heavily populated hard coal regions about Scranton and Wilkes-Barre employed 150,000 miners. By 1937 the total was 32,000. Today it is probably even lower. Scranton has tried desperately and effectively to attract new industry, but the area's economic base has been almost completely destroyed. Ten thousand new jobs have been provided but the rate of unemployment is about the same.

"Scranton has been running like hell to stand still," said the economist.

The basic cause of high production with fewer workers is automation—the use of machinery to run machines. During the recession many mills have introduced new equipment, discontinued using inefficient plants, and eliminated jobs.

Bruce Alexander, district staff member of the United Steelworkers of America in McKeesport, predicted that many workers would never regain their jobs.

"This fellow comes in to see me," Mr. Alexander recalled last week, "He's got his kids with him—three of the cutest kids you ever saw. And he says, 'I'm down to nothing. I got no family to help me. I'm on public assistance and I don't think I'm ever going to get my job back. What's going to become of me?' "

Mr. Alexander lifted his palms in a gesture of helplessness. "What could I tell him?" he asked. "I didn't have any answers. It's rough. Oh, we don't let him hurt. We help him, we get him food and like that. But we can't mislead him and tell him we can get his job back for him."

Actually while the recession has resulted in distress, it has not produced disaster. A reporter looking for signs of political protest or starvation in Pennsylvania would come away with an empty notebook. Tom Leslie, a 42-year-old hammer operator from Beaver Falls with 20 years in the industry, illustrates the reasons why this is so.

In the good days he made as much as $200 a week and averaged $6,000 a year. He saved some money, but not much. He bought a home and has $4,000 still to pay on it. He installed storm windows last year but owes a substantial balance. He still drinks a bottle of beer when he feels like it but not so often as formerly. His wife and three children eat regularly.

WIFE'S WORK IS KEY

"How do you manage it?" he is asked.

"My wife works as a bookkeeper," he says a little sheepishly.

This answer is heard in various forms throughout the steel area:

"My wife does day work."

"My wife got a job as a nurse's aid."

"My son brings home a little money."

"My wife and I moved in with my mother."

"My folks help us out."

Tom Leslie has got by for several other reasons. He has worked occasionally with a friend who owns a truck. He has picked up odd carpentry and repair jobs. He has drawn $35 a week in State unemployment compensation. Under the State-Federal program he is entitled to 45 weeks of payments.

Finally under the supplementary unemployment benefits program negotiated 3 years ago with the steel industry by the union, he has been receiving benefits that started at about $20 a week. They will run for a year. He has only one major complaint.

"Too damn much housework," he said.

Tom Leslie is joined by others who think the benefits may have saved the day. These include merchants in steel towns who were lukewarm about the welfare program when it was broached back in 1956.

A member of the Beaver County Public Assistance Commission reported that in 2 year only 10 steelworkers had applied for relief.

"Without SUB," he said, "there would have been relief lines all over the country."

In the union's district 15 area, Bruce Alexander and Paul Hilbert, the district director, organized a community services program to help steel workers in distress. Banks were asked to grant moratoriums on mortgage payment, and 150 agreed. Members were told how to obtain public assistance and surplus food. Medical and hospital service were obtained for men whose benefits had lapsed because of prolonged idleness.

But the picture has its shadowy corners, too. George Combs, a burner in the Clairton plant of United States Steel, has been out of work for 13 months. He says he has not had "8 hours work since I was laid off." His benefits will run out in a few weeks. He owes a $400 furniture bill. The store is waiting. He has not been able to pay his $42-a-month rent for an apartment in a county housing project. The project is waiting.

He receives a relief check for $4 every 2 weeks. He sought surplus food and was told he was ineligible. Now he finds other men with his seniority called back to work. He is getting uneasy about providing for his wife and three children.

TAKE JOB ANY PLACE

"I'll take a job any place," he said. "After more than a year this place don't look so good to me."

In that judgment, George Combs is not typical. Despite unemployment, steel workers are reluctant to strike out to new frontiers. Their homes, their families, their roots keep them clustered about the mills. In Beaver Valley, Wilbert Berarducci, 22 years old and unemployed since July 23, 1957, drove West a few weeks ago with his wife in his 1946 automobile.

Almost as soon as he arrived in California, he received a telegram from his mother, summoning him back home. He had been called back to the mill, she said. Without funds and unable to rely on the old automobile for another trip across the continent, he hitchhiked home in 5 days, only to find there had been a mixup and no job awaited him.

"Why did you come back?" he was asked. "Why didn't you stay out in California and look for a job?"

"Why," he said without hesitation, "this is my home and I'm a steel worker."

WEST VIRGINIA GRIM

(By Homer Bigart)

CHARLESTON, W. Va., March 10.—Thousands of unemployed coal miners have used up their "rockin' chair money" and are living on "mollygrub" in the coal fields of West Virginia.

"Rockin' chair money" is the miners' term for unemployment compensation. "Mollygrub" is the monthly dole of Federal surplus foods.

With about 15 percent of its work force idle, West Virginia is the blackest spot among the Nation's areas of economic distress.

The statistics are grim enough: 45,000 workers have exhausted their unemployment benefits.

ONE IN EVERY FOURTEEN IDLE, U.S. JOB SURVEY REVEALS

One worker in every fourteen was jobless last month. The regular joint report of the Federal Labor and Commerce Departments showed 4,749,000 unemployed and 62,722,000 employed. The total of idle was 424,000 below the figure for the recession month of February 1958, but 1,628,000 above that for the prerecession month of February 1957.

In the last 14 months of slump and recovery, more than 3 million workers have exhausted all the unemployment insurance to which they were entitled under regular State programs. Nine hundred thousand of these long-term unemployed went on to use up all the extended protection available to them under the temporary Federal program, which went into effect 9 months ago. No official estimate has been made of how many of these workers are still jobless.

The Federal program is scheduled to expire March 31, but Congress is expected to authorize a 3-month tapering-off period. This would prevent an abrupt cutoff in payments to the 300,000 who will still be on the emergency benefit rolls at the end of this month. In addition to this group, 2,375,000 workers are registered for regular State insurance checks.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, there are other badly needed pieces of legislation which I hope will be enacted by the 86th Congress to help deal with the serious national unemployment situation, which affects my State perhaps more than any other State but which also deeply affects many other States. Among those measures which I have cosponsored are S. 791, introduced by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], to provide permanent minimum standards for unemployment compensation; S. 1323, introduced by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. MCNAMARA], to provide 16 weeks of benefits for unemployed persons whose unemployment compensation benefits have expired or who were not eligible for such benefits; S. 489, introduced by the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER], to facilitate the distribution of surplus food products to needy families in the United States; and, most important of all, the area redevelopment bill, S. 722, introduced by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] and many cosponsors, which has been ordered reported by the Banking and Currency Committee and which will come to the Senate for consideration, I hope, before the end of this week.

Mr. President, all of these measures make up a comprehensive and coherent program to help us deal with the critical unemployment situation.

AUTHORITY OF STATES TO CONTROL WATER WITHIN THEIR BOUNDARIES

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, during the 84th and 85th Congresses, efforts were made to enact legislation designed to end the controversy between the States and certain agencies of the Federal Government with respect to the protection of established water rights in the Western States.

Hearings were held, but nothing beyond that was accomplished toward ending this controversy. Several of the Federal agencies that deal with western public lands agreed on a bill of their own which was presented to the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs in May of 1958. That bill, with several amendments, was introduced as Senate bill 851, on February 2 of this year, under the sponsorship of Senator O'MAHONEY, of Wyoming. I was 1 of 15 cosponsors of S. 851.

At the time of introduction it was understood that S. 851 did not go as far as many advocates of western water rights

wanted to go, and that its language failed to give complete protection from Federal preemption. It was necessary, however, that a legislative proposal be presented to Congress that moved in the right direction. And S. 851, though limited, accomplishes that objective.

Many individuals and organizations over the entire Nation are interested in legislation to do the complete job of protecting State and individual water rights from Federal preemption. It is my belief that these interests should be heard and that the entire water rights problem should have full consideration by the Congress.

Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to provide for recognition of the authority of all States relative to the control, appropriation, use, or distribution of water and ask that it be held at the desk until the end of the day, Friday, March 20, to accept additional sponsors.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from Utah.

The bill (S. 1416) to recognize the authority of the States relating to the control, appropriation, use, or distribution of water within their boundaries, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. Moss, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

TEMPORARY COMMISSION ON FEDERAL CONTRIBUTIONS TO STATE AND LOCAL GOVERNMENTS

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, during the past quarter century, the continuing expansion and growth of the Federal Government has created some very real problems insofar as State and local governments are concerned. As the Federal Government increasingly has come to own and control pieces of property formerly considered to be owned by individuals, some very genuine tax problems have crept into the picture. In connection with this problem, Congress has had bills before it for many years. Two or three years ago, at one time, a bill was before the Senate which the senior Senator from South Dakota was instrumental in stopping because he opposed its passage in that form at a time so late in the session. The bill was finally withdrawn. New proposed legislation has now been introduced in this field this year. It raises a large family of problems: What kind of Federal property is to be compelled to make payments in lieu of taxes, and to whom? What areas of Federal ownership or operation are to be taxed, as it were, to make payments for community or State activities? If the Federal Government enters into this field, what shall be its limitations? Here, indeed, are a possibility and a potentiality for vast, multi-billion-dollar expenditures, newly assumed by the Federal Government, to assist local governments in support of local projects and local functions. Payments in lieu of taxes could open up a vast Pandora's box of limitless new Federal costs.

If the Federal Government is to enter upon this uncharted sea, what will be the date of beginning? What Solomon is to decide at what date it shall be determined that the Federal Government shall make payments to a local community in lieu of taxes and that a neighboring local community, removed a few short miles from the first one, is to receive no payment from the Federal Government in lieu of taxes for similar installations or operations. In other words who is to be taxed additionally to make payments in lieu of taxes to whom?

The entire problem is very complex. At the same time, I recognize that it is a very compelling recommendation. Senators and Representatives who feel that their communities, localities, or States will benefit from it are eager for the passage of such legislation. Other Members of Congress, who feel that their communities will be shut out because of the definition of the particular type of property to be considered, or because of the charmed calendar date which may be chosen, look with a jaundiced eye upon proposed legislation which would impose upon their constitutents heavy new expenditures for the benefit of other communities.

This is a most complicated and complex problem. It comes before us very often. Its solution is most difficult. It should be of great concern to every Senator and Congressman and to every State and local government. Therefore, I am today introducing a bill, for appropriate reference, for the purpose of establishing in the executive branch of the Government a Temporary Commission on Federal Contributions to State and local governments. The purpose of the bill is to make a prompt but thorough study of the whole difficult problem and to make recommendations to Congress which will be complete, comprehensive, and completely equitable as among the various types of Federal activities in our many and varied communities.

Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed at this point in my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1417) to establish in the executive branch of the Government a temporary Commission on Federal Contributions to State and Local Governments, introduced by Mr. MUNDT, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Government Operations, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Federal Contributions to State and Local Governments Act."

DECLARATION OF PURPOSE

SEC. 2. (a) Although the United States is under no constitutional obligation to pay taxes, or to make financial contributions in lieu of taxes, to any State or to any political subdivision or instrumentality thereof with respect to any property of the Federal Government, the Congress has recognized that the exemption of Federal property from taxation by State and local governments has worked hardship upon such governments in a number of instances, and heretofore has enacted a number of legislative measures providing relief in varying forms for such governments.

(b) It is the purpose of this Act to provide for a comprehensive study of the nature and effect of such previous enactments, and for an investigation to determine the nature and effect of any further legislation which may be required for the relief of State and local governments from such hardship.

(c) It is hereby declared to be the policy of the Congress that no such additional relief shall be made to any State or local government with respect to any Federal property devoted to any Federal activity the establishment or retention of which within the territorial jurisdiction of such State or local government at any time has been solicited by such State or local government.

COMMISSION ESTABLISHED

SEC. 3. (a) There is hereby established within the executive branch of the Government a Commission on Federal Contributions to State and Local Governments (referred to hereinafter as the "Commission").

(b) The Commission shall be composed of—

(1) the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, who shall serve as chairman thereof;

(2) one representative of each of the following departments and agencies of the U.S. Government, each of whom shall be designated by the head of the department or agency represented by him from officers or employees of such department or agency: the Department of Defense; the Department of Justice; the Department of the Interior; the Department of Agriculture; the Office of Defense Mobilization; the General Services Administration; and the Veterans' Administration; and

(3) one representative of each other department or agency of the U.S. Government named by the President, each of whom shall be designated by the head of such department or agency from officers or employees of such department or agency.

(3) The Commission shall select a vice chairman from among its members. A majority of the members of the Commission shall constitute a quorum. Any vacancy in the Commission shall not affect its powers, but shall be filled in the same manner in which the original appointment was made.

(d) Members of the Commission shall serve without compensation in addition to that received for their services as officers or employees of departments and agencies of the Government, but shall be reimbursed for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of the duties of the Commission.

STAFF OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 4 (a) The Commission may appoint and fix the compensation of such personnel as it deems advisable, without regard to the provisions of the civil-service laws and the Classification Act of 1949, as amended.

(b) The Commission may procure, without regard to the civil-service laws and the classification laws, temporary and intermittent services to the same extent as is authorized for the departments by section 15 of the act of August 2, 1946 (60 Stat. 810; 5 U.S.C. 55a), but at rates not to exceed $50 per diem for individuals.

DUTIES OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 5. (a) The Commission shall conduct a comprehensive study of the nature and effect of all previous enactments of the Congress providing for—

(1) the payment to any State or local government of any tax or special assessment with

respect to any Federal real or personal property;

(2) the making of any payment to any such government in lieu of the payment of any tax or special assessment with respect to any such property; or

(3) the rendition of assistance to any State or local government through the making of grants-in-aid, the sharing of revenues derived from properties of the United States, or through the furnishing of services or facilities by the United States.

(b) The Commission shall conduct a comprehensive study and investigation of the extent to which State and local governments derive benefits directly or indirectly through payments made to them (1) by persons residing or employed upon Federal property, and (2) for or in connection with any property, trade, business, occupation, or transaction situated or occurring upon Federal property.

(c) The Commission shall conduct a comprehensive investigation to determine the extent, if any, to which there is need for legislation by the Congress to provide additional financial assistance for State and local governments to relieve hardship incident to the tax-exempt status of Federal property. Such investigation shall include inquiry to determine—

(1) the classes of Federal property, if any, with respect to which any such additional assistance should be granted;

(2) the nature and extent of any such additional assistance;

(3) the conditions, if any, under which such additional assistance should be granted;

(4) the annual cost to the United States of providing such financial assistance with respect to each such class of Federal property and with respect to all such classes of Federal property; and

(5) ways and means whereby State and local governments may be accorded effective right to apply property taxes in effect within their several jurisdictions to industrial plant equipment, materials, supplies, and inventories owned by private parties and used by them for commercial purposes within plant facilities owned or controlled by departments and agencies of the U.S. Government.

(d) On or before March 1, 1960, the Commission shall submit to the President, for transmittal to the Congress, a comprehensive report containing—

(1) the text of all provisions of law referred to in subsection (a), together with an analysis of the purpose and effect of each such provision;

(2) the findings of the Commission as to the facts disclosed by its studies and investigations made under subsections (b) and (c) of this section;

(3) its recommendations, consistent with the policy prescribed by section 2(c), as to any additional legislation the need for which has been disclosed by its investigation under subsection (c) of this section; and

(4) a detailed analysis of the relationship between any recommendations so made and the provisions of existing law set forth in compliance with paragraph (1) of this subsection.

(e) Upon the transmittal of such report to the Congress, the Commission shall cease to exist.

POWERS OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 6. (a) To carry out the provisions of this act, the Commission, or any duly authorized member or employee thereof, may hold such hearings, sit and act at such times and places, administer such oaths, and require, by subpena or otherwise, the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memoranda, papers, and documents as the Commission, or such member or employee, may deem advisable. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the Chairman of the Commission or any duly designated member or employee, and may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member. The provisions of sections 102 to 104, inclusive, of the Revised Statutes (2 U.S.C. 192–194) shall apply in the case of any failure of any witness to comply with any subpena or to testify when summoned under authority of this section.

(b) The Commission is authorized to secure directly from any executive department, bureau, agency, board, commission, office, independent establishment, or instrumentality of the United States information, suggestions, estimates, and statistics for the purpose of this act. Each such department, bureau, agency, board, commission, office, establishment, or instrumentality is authorized and directed to furnish such information, suggestions, estimates, and statistics directly to the Commission, upon request made by the chairman or vice chairman.

EXPENSES OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 7. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act.

TETHERING THE FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION WHEN DAMS IMPAIR FISH AND WILDLIFE

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I introduce a bill which is designed to restrain the Federal Power Commission from issuing licenses for hydroelectric power development in areas where dams will impair fish and wildlife values. Such legislative action is necessary, in my opinion, to assure survival of the greatest fish runs in our Nation—the fabulous Chinook salmon migrations of the Columbia River Basin.

Without this legislation, there is little doubt in my mind that the Federal Power Commission will be free to license a dam or series of dams on the Snake and Salmon Rivers which would blockade forever the vast spawning areas that lie at the source of the Salmon River, the Snake's turbulent wilderness tributary.

This conclusion is the result of two developments. The first is the declaration of the Federal Power Commission staff, in a report issued last year, that either Government or private agencies could feasibly construct a high dam at the Nez Perce site on the Snake River. Construction of this project below the confluence of the Salmon with the Snake would doom fish passage beyond that point, especially in view of the present state of technical knowledge for passing fish back and forth over high dams.

Second, a combine of four privately owned power companies operating in Pacific Northwest States has filed with the Federal Power Commission an application to develop the middle reach of the Snake River. This proposal includes dams at the Mountain Sheep site, on the Snake, and eventual construction of another high dam at the Lower Canyon site on the Salmon. The high Mountain Sheep-Lower Canyon dams would be no less damaging to the fishery resources of the Columbia Basin than the Nez Perce project. The fact that this proposal is pending before the Federal Power Commission adds urgency to congressional action on the bill I am now introducing. I ask consent to have printed at this point in my remarks the bill to promote conservation of migratory fish and game by requiring approval of Federal Power Commission licenses by the Secretary of the Interior, with limitation through provisions for congressional review on any veto action he might take.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1420) to promote the conservation of migratory fish and game by requiring certain approval by the Secretary of the Interior of licenses issued under the Federal Power Act, introduced by Mr. NEUBERGER, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the first sentence of subsection (e) of section 4 of the Federal Power Act is amended by inserting before the period at the end thereof a colon and the following: *"And provided further,* That no license shall be issued until the plans for the project have been approved by the Secretary of the Interior, after consultation with the Fish and Wildlife Service of the Department of the Interior, as not being detrimental to the conservation of migratory fish and game. If the Secretary of the Interior should deny such approval, he shall prepare a statement citing his reasons for denial and such statement shall be transmitted to the Congress. The delivery to both Houses shall be on the same day and shall be made to each House while it is in session. Following such denial the Commission may grant such license only if during the sixty-day period following the transmittal of such statement to the Congress there is passed by the Congress a concurrent resolution stating in substance that the Congress does not support the Secretary of the Interior's denial. The procedure in the Congress with respect to any such resolution shall be as provided in title II of the Reorganization Act of 1949.".

CHECKREIN OF FPC IS NECESSARY

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, the purpose of this bill is to make it impossible for the Federal Power Commission to license projects without at least requiring that the fish-passage facilities at the dam be studied and approved by the one Federal agency most qualified to appraise the worth of such facilities—namely, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. The bill is intended to put a tether on the Federal Power Commission, which has been running rampant in the Pacific Northwest, licensing dams on mountain rivers, without any real regard for the valuable fish pilgrimages in those rivers.

The bill will give the Fish and Wildlife Service some tangible authority in these situations, by requiring that the Secretary of the Interior sanction the fish ladders, fishways, fish staircases, skimmer devices, and other apparatus designed to make it possible for adult salmon to pass the dam en route to spawn, and for fingerling salmon to traverse the dam safely downstream, on their tempestuous and perilous journey to the sea.

Mr. President, after I introduced a similar bill (S. 3185) at the last session of Congress, objections were raised that

too much veto power was being given to the Secretary of the Interior in the issuance of waterpower project licenses. It must be remembered that the Secretary of the Army has absolute authority, under the existing statutes, to reject licenses for projects which might impair the navigability of interstate streams. I think that fish and wildlife deserve equal consideration with ships and barges in the management of our water resources. Despite this belief on my part, the bill I have introduced today somewhat tempers the authority of the Secretary of the Interior in passing judgment on project licenses. The bill provides that Congress, by concurrent resolution, can overrule the Secretary, after which the Federal Power Commission may grant the license in question. Thus, the Secretary's veto authority is not complete nor irreversible. I trust that this modified approach will find support among true conservationists.

SECRETARY ALREADY RECOMMENDS, BUT FPC IGNORES

Other objections voiced against Senate bill 3185, of the 85th Congress urged amendment of the bill to require that the Federal Power Commission merely give consideration to recommendations from the Secretary of the Interior on fish and wildlife problems involved in a project. This proposal would mean nothing more than reaffirmation of the status quo. The Commission presently does give consideration to the Secretary's recommendation. But this has not stopped the earlier granting of licenses on the Deschutes River, of Oregon, nor the Cowlitz River, in Washington, for dams impairing the migration of fish. I have been advised by Mr. Jerome K. Kuykendall, Chairman of the Federal Power Commission, that the following paragraph presently appears in all Commission letters to the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting copies of applications for licenses, and requesting his comments thereon:

> It is requested that you give the Commission your views as to the measure which should be taken to protect wildlife resources in connection with the project in accordance with the provisions of the act of August 14, 1946 (60 Stat. 1080). Your advice concerning fishways is also requested pursuant to the provisions of section 18 of the Federal Power Act, 16 U.S.C. 811.

It is clear, therefore, that the Commission does obtain the views of the Secretary of the Interior on fishery matters. But I emphasize again that the receipt of this information from the experts of the Department of the Interior has not prevented the staff of the Commission from recommending dams, such as the high Nez Perce project, as feasible for construction. Obviously, more forceful control over the Federal Power Commission's decision-making power is needed, in order to preserve fish and wildlife values. The bill I have introduced will provide this control.

I was particularly grateful last year when the able chairman of the Senate Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, the senior Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], reported Senate bill 3185 to the Senate for action. The Senator from Washington knows more about salmon fisheries than does any other Member of this body. He represents a State in which thousands of people earn their livelihood as commercial fishermen and packers. He himself has many times taken the lead in seeking to safeguard our salmon fisheries at sea from the depredations of unrestrained trolling and netting by boats flying the flags of Japan or the Soviet Union. On numerous occasions he has demonstrated his knowledge and deep concern in this vital field, and this is another such occasion today.

JUDGMENT ON FISHERY VALUES

Exercise of judgment on fishery values, outside the Federal Power Commission, was necessary after the Commission on January 20, 1958, ruled that a high dam at the Nez Perce site would be feasible for construction, either by the Government or by private interests. The Commission's decision contended that fishery experts have made great strides in enabling migratory fish to survive high dams like the proposed 700-foot Nez Perce project. Yet, Mr. President, conclusive evidence from testimony of fishery experts and biologists fails to substantiate this contention of the Commission. For instance, the regional director of the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries for the Pacific region, Mr. Samuel J. Hutchinson, stated on January 21, 1958:

> The state of our knowledge of fish passage over high dams is much too meager at this time to risk the survival of these runs at high dams incorporating plans for untried fish passage facilities.

This view is affirmed by the eminent fish biologist and naturalist, Dr. Ira Noel Gabrielson, Director of the National Wildlife Management Institute and formerly Chief of the Fish and Wildlife Service. He wrote to me on November 6, 1957:

> Regardless of statements that have appeared from time to time, there simply is not enough know-how to get anadromous fish over such high dams. They would be a barrier to the adult fish on the upstream migration and to the young fish on their move to the sea.

In view of this wide difference in the status of passing fish over high dams, I introduced Senate bill 3185 on January 29, 1958, to provide that no license shall be issued by the Commission until the plans for the project had been approved by the Secretary of the Interior, after consultation with the Fish and Wildlife Service, as not being detrimental to the conservation of migratory fish and game.

During hearings conducted on Senate bill 3185 by the distinguished chairman of the Senate Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee [Mr. MAGNUSON], Mr. Ted Stevens, of the office of the Secretary of Interior, pointed out that "There are few water-resource projects proposed for construction under Federal license which do not have some detrimental effects on fish and wildlife values." The Department proposed modification of the language of the bill I had introduced, so as to require approval by the Secretary of Interior of plans for dams and other structures before the issuance of licenses.

The modified language proposed by the Secretary's office was acceptable to me, and I so advised the chairman of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee. The report of the committee emphasizes that this amendment to the Federal Power Act "cannot be considered as the establishment of a new precedent." The bill amends the section which also provides that no license for a water power project shall be issued until the plans of the dam or other structures affecting navigation have been approved by the Chief of Engineers and the Secretary of the Army.

ARMY ALREADY HAS SIMILAR VETO POWER

The requirement for approval of dam plans by the Corps of Engineers was put into the Federal Water Power Act to assure unimpeded navigation for river traffic. Surely, Mr. President, the vast migratory fish runs which contribute to our Nation's food supply and provide important outdoor recreation are also deserving of unimpeded progress during spawning cycles. Otherwise, there is grave danger that major fish runs of the Columbia will not survive.

Fishery experts should be given parallel participation with the Army engineers in Federal Power Commission verdicts which concern dam projects. Enactment of my bill will assure that major fisheries of the Nation receive protection equal to that afforded the requirements of navigation. In my opinion, this will greatly enhance sound management of our Nation's water resources for their full multiple-purpose benefits.

As an independent arm of Congress, the Federal Power Commission has great discretionary authority in weighing the various resource values affected by waterpower projects. But nothing in the Federal Power Act prohibits the Commission or its staff from making mistakes of judgment. The checkrein provisions of this new legislation will greatly reduce the opportunities or possibilities of erroneous judgments by the Commission.

Mr. President, I am gratified by the support which this bill has received from leading conservation and sportsmen's organizations throughout the Nation. Much valuable counsel and advice about the bill has come to me personally from these sources. Enactment of the bill has in the past been recommended by the Izaak Walton League of America, the National Audubon Society, the National Fisheries Institute, the National Parks Association, the National Wildlife Federation, the North American Wildlife Federation, the Sport Fishing Institute, the Columbia River Fishermen's Protective Union, the Pacific Marine Fisheries Commission, the Columbia River Salmon and Tuna Packers Association, and a great many other groups and organizations.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD in connection with my remarks an article describing the importance of the Columbia River salmon fishery, from the Oregon Journal of February 8, 1959; and an article entitled "Conservation: Prospects for 1959." I wrote the latter article for the New York Times issue of Sunday,

January 4, 1959. The article lists preservation of migratory fisheries as a major conservation goal for 1959 and the years ahead.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Oregon Journal, Feb. 8, 1959]

SALMON PACKED IN 1829—CANNERY SET UP IN 1866

(By Tom Humphrey)

Oregon's commercial fish-processing industry, with a pack valued at approximately $35 million a year, started in a very small way 130 years ago—more or less accidentally.

Capt. John Dominis came into the Columbia River on the brig *Owyhee* out of Boston in 1829 to trade with the Indians. Impressed by the great salmon runs, he filled 58 empty rum hogsheads with salmon, pickled in brine, and sold it in Boston for 10 cents a pound.

That was the beginning of the commercial salmon industry in the Oregon country. By 1860 the salting and barreling of Columbia River salmon had grown to 15,000 hogsheads annually.

Before that it was estimated that the Indians were taking around 18 million pounds of salmon along the Columbia and its tributaries.

The first salmon cannery was established in 1866 at Eagle Cliff, Wash., by William Hume, who built the first salmon cannery in the world on the Sacramento River in California, canning 4,000 cases the first year.

By 1883 there were 39 salmon canneries on the Columbia, but their combined production was no greater than the 7 major canneries in operation today, headed by the Columbia River Packers Association of Astoria which packs under the famous Bumble Bee brand and accounts for approximately half of the State's fish canning volume.

Other major fish processors are Portland Fish Co. of Portland; Chinook Packing Co., Chinook, Wash.; Keystone Packing Co., Ilwaco, Wash.; Barbey Packing Co. and Union Fishermen's Cooperative Packing Co. of Astoria, and Point Adams Packing Co. at Hammond, Oreg.

In addition there are a number of custom canners, freezers, and packers. In this group are the New England Fishing Co. of Oregon, Sebastian-Stewart Fish Co., Astoria Seafood Co., and San Juan Fishing & Packing Co. of Hammond.

Altogether they do between $30 million and $40 million worth of busines annually.

Columbia River Packers Association, Inc., biggest operator in the Pacific Northwest, was organized in 1899 by a group of independent fish packers and was first known as "the combine."

Some of the combined plants were closed, and one of them, the Hanthorne cannery in Astoria, was converted into a cold storage plant, now the largest privately owned cold storage plant on the Pacific coast. Salmon canneries were operated at Rooster Rock, Oreg.; Eagle Cliff, Wash.; and at the Kinney and Elmore plants in Astoria.

Canning operations today are centered at the great Elmore cannery on the Astoria waterfront, one of the largest and most modern plants on the coast. CRPA also operates two canneries in Alaska and one at Bellingham, Wash., plus a tuna cannery at Honolulu.

CRPA's total pack in 1958 was approximately 1,500,000 cases, grossing approximately $21 million. Of this total, 400,000 cases were salmon, more than 1 million cases were tuna and the balance mixed varieties.

The company has an annual payroll of $2,900,000, averaging $2 million in Oregon. Its work force, now employed about 11 months of the year, ranges from a minimum of 700 to a peak of 1,300. Fishermen operating out of Oregon ports are paid at least $2 million for their catch.

Between 16,000 and 19,000 tons of frozen tuna are imported from Japan and processed in Oregon plants.

In the long range, the salmon deal has fallen off in recent years and the tuna deal has leaped forward, starting in 1939 when the first albacore runs were discovered off the Oregon coast. The volume increased until 1944 when 33 million pounds of tuna were landed at Astoria, but by 1950 it dropped to virtually nothing. Some tuna have been caught in the past 3 years, but Oregon packers have become more and more dependent on frozen tuna imports and some tonnage from as far south as San Francisco.

Columbia River salmon runs have declined since 1943, with minor variations, thanks to the dam building program, shorter commercial fishing seasons and the heavy take of salmon by sports fishermen. Annual take of Chinook, silver, and steelhead in Oregon and Washington waters is running more than 1 million fish and is still heading upward.

CRPA and other Columbia River processors are not too discouraged over the future of the commercial salmon industry. They are trying to hold the line in the spawning grounds of the middle Snake, especially the Salmon and Imnaha Rivers, and hoping that the dam problem can be solved, particularly the downstream movement, before salmon runs are further depleted.

Meanwhile the commercial fishing industry of Oregon (once in third place) still ranks about 10th among principal industries of the State.

[From the New York Times, Jan. 4, 1959]

CONSERVATION: PROSPECTS FOR 1959—A ROSTER OF THE ISSUES WHICH FACE CONGRESS IN THE NEW YEAR

(By Hon. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER, of Oregon)

(Mr. NEUBERGER, the junior U.S. Senator from Oregon, serves on the two major Senate committees dealing with conservation questions, Interior and Public Works. He recently was appointed by the Vice President as one of the Senate members of the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission.)

Conservation issues will loom larger than ever in the public mind when Congress and the 49 State legislatures go into their sessions some time during the month of January. The lawmaking arenas are vital to the destiny of America's recreational and scenic values.

All of our conservation achievements are heavily reliant on the public opinion mobilized by the great conservation organizations. These include the Izaak Walton League of America, the National Wildlife Federation, Wildlife Management Institute, the Garden Clubs, the Audubon Society, the Sierra Club, the Wilderness Society, the Roadside Councils, the Boy Scouts and Girl Scouts, Campfire Girls, the Federated Women's Clubs and many others.

MAJOR CHALLENGES

Without their vigilance, we would have few national parks or national forests; much of our wildlife and fisheries might have been destroyed and our scenery despoiled.

What will be the principal causes undertaken by these useful organizations during 1959, at both the national and local levels? I would enumerate the major challenges in the conservation field as follows:

1. Extensive inquiries must look into the impact of lethal chemical sprays on fish, birds, and game. The use of pesticides has become widespread. These substances protect orchards and crops by destroying insect marauders. Unfortunately, they also kill our wild friends of air, stream, and forest. Whole valleys have lost their robins because of poisoning by pesticides. Congress authorized the sum of $260,000 for research in this realm last year, but many times this amount is needed to do the job right.

2. Hearings were held throughout the Western States this past autumn on the national wilderness preservation bill. Recreation groups mainly supported the proposal, while opposition came from such user segments of industry as lumber, mining, grazing, and power. The bill concerned seeks to give legal status to wilderness and primitive areas which must be kept free of human exploitation. In these areas there can be no permanent structures or roads and airfields. While the legislation requires some modification—such as the exemption from its scope of Indian lands—it does seem that Congress should not allow our relatively few outdoor museums of the past to be reduced in size or abolished by purely administrative fiat.

3. The Fish and Wildlife Service must be given some collateral jurisdiction over Federal Power Commission licenses permitting dams on rivers inhabited by valuable migratory fish runs. On numerous occasions the FPC has disregarded the advice of biologists—for example, on the Cowlitz River of Washington State and the Deschutes River of Oregon. Priceless fisheries have been imperiled as a result. Now the FPC has indicated its willingness to approve the 730-foot Nez Perce project, which would blockade off from their mountain spawning grounds over 60 percent of the prodigious Chinook salmon of the Columbia River watershed. The Army engineers have had for 37 years the right to veto FPC dams which endangered navigation. Surely the Fish and Wildlife Service is entitled to put the same protective umbrella over our dwindling fishery resources.

4. Congress must provide additional appropriations for the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission, which was established last summer to inventory the recreational opportunities for our expanding population. Only $50,000 was made available to get the Commission started. It will report in September of 1961, thus providing ample time for a study long and urgently needed. President Eisenhower has made an excellent choice as chairman of Laurance S. Rockefeller, who has been such a moving spirit in the national parks among the Grand Tetons and in the Virgin Islands. Two new Senate Members of the Commission must be appointed by Vice President NIXON before the review of outdoor resources can actively commence.

5. Federal standards for billboard control along the 42,000-mile Interstate Highway System must be accepted by the legislatures of all our States. Congress has done this with the carrot rather than the stick, for any State accepting such Federal standards will receive 90½ percent of the funds for interstate roads from the U.S. Treasury instead of a straight 90 percent. When Senator THOMAS H. KUCHEL, of California, and I sponsored this provision, we felt that protection of roadside scenery was essential to the ultimate success of the biggest highway-building program in American history.

6. A new national park should be created along the historic Chesapeake and Ohio towpath, where it threads through the valley of the Potomac River. Legislation for this purpose passed the Senate in the last Congress, but bogged down in House committee. The only C. & O. Canal bisects one of the loveliest woodland realms remaining in the Eastern States. Opposition has come principally from groups which prefer reservoirs for water storage to retention of the area's sylvan grandeur.

7. Federal matching funds must be increased from $50 million to $100 million, as authorized in the Blatnik bill, to encourage States and local communities to eliminate filth from our rivers. In the United States today there are more than 20,000 sources of pollution, tainting our water supplies with

offal and chemical wastes. The Nation needs at least 6,000 more municipal sewage plants or improvements and 3,500 more plants to eliminate industrial wasts. Eventually our most serious shortage may be that of pure water. The National Government should have the authority to penalize States or cities which pollute rivers or lakes flowing across State boundaries.

8. Appropriations must be kept on schedule to assure Federal purchase of the great Klamath waterfowl marsh in southeastern Oregon, and also to safeguard the 4 billion board feet of magnificent Ponderosa pine timber in the Indian forest of that upland area. Legislation authorizing such a goal was enacted by the 85th Congress—mainly through the active assistance of conservation spokesmen in the press and leaders of organizations like the Izaak Walton League.

9. Funds will be required from Congress to continue Mission 66 in the national parks and Operation Outdoors is the national forests. These are programs to expand the recreational opportunities in the greatest such amphitheaters belonging to the American people. The funds are required for roads, trails, campgrounds and similar facilities. Not since the era of the Civilian Conservation Corps, during the 1930's, has there been a genuine program of rehabilitation in the national parks and national forests.

10. Conservationists must continue to oppose the Bruces Eddy and Penny Cliffs Dams of the Clearwater River in Idaho, which would endanger the steelhead trout migrations of that region and also would threaten the winter forage grounds of the largest elk herd surviving in the United States. This challenge to lovers of wildlife was made triply difficult when the last session of Congress appropriated $1,200,000 for planning the Bruces Eddy project, even though the dam has never been formally authorized by law.

IN DEFENSE OF NATURE

Some of my recommendations may seem somewhat slanted in favor of wilderness as against commercial exploitation. While I realize that man must have bread for sustenance, still he cannot live by bread alone. Somewhere in this vast land of ours, we ought to retain a few valleys or uplands just as they were when Lewis and Clark carried our flag across a virgin and untrammeled region. Exploitation is not everything. After all, Central Park might be worth countless millions to the New York City coffers if it were subdivided for apartment houses and skyscrapers. Yet what New Yorker, in his right mind, would think of sacrificing this island of trees and grass for a few more piles of masonry?

The roster which I have presented here of goals confronting conservationists during 1959 is by no means final or complete. There are other tasks of equal magnitude—such as adding wetlands to some of our cramped wildlife refuges, or furnishing national-park status through the Allott bill to the Dinosaur National Monument, where the epic struggle over Echo Park Dam was waged several years ago. But if only a portion of the objectives listed in this article is achieved, America's conservationists will be justified in citing 1959 as a busy and highly successful 12-month period.

EXTENSION OF TIME FOR PAYMENTS OF BENEFITS UNDER TEMPORARY UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION ACT OF 1958

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, during January 1959, the average weekly number of persons receiving unemployment benefits were as follows: Under the regular State program, 257,000 weekly; under the temporary unemployment compensation program, 59,700 weekly.

Continued unemployment in many areas throughout the country, and particularly in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, presents the problems as to whether the temporary unemployment compensation program shall be permitted to expire on March 31, 1959, or extended for a further period of time.

On Friday of last week, the House Ways and Means Committee reported a bill which would provide a running-out period for the existing program.

It would deny any new applications for benefits beyond March 31, but those who were eligible, and receiving benefits as of the cutoff date, could continue to receive benefits through June 30, 1959.

The Department of Labor estimates that this runout period for benefits would provide payments for some 405,000 individuals, and involve additional costs of $78 million.

Appropriations in the amount of $665,700,000 were made to cover benefit payments and administration under the program, in fiscal 1959. As of March 30, 1959, the total expenses under the program will be about $447 million, leaving an unexpended balance of about $218 million. There will be no need for additional appropriations to continue this program, as proposed by the House bill.

Mr. President, according to the latest figures I have been able to obtain, there are 508,000 unemployed persons in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. This figure is admittedly seasonally high, but unemployment in Pennsylvania has averaged for some time around 470,000—or 10 percent of the national unemployment figure.

Mr. President, I do not mean to imply that I believe the chronic unemployment in certain areas in Pennsylvania can be solved by temporary unemployment compensation. We have other legislative proposals about to be brought before the Senate, which it is hoped will attack persistent unemployment and underemployment due to a variety of economic ills.

Nor do I favor the continuation of heavy Federal contributions to unemployment compensation, or the dislocation of the present Federal-State relationship in the administration of the employment security program.

My immediate concern is the family breadwinner in Pennsylvania, and in other States, participating under the temporary unemployment compensation program, whose benefits will be cut off, or nonexistent as of March 31, 1959—or, who will, at best, receive about 6 weeks more of payments.

We do not know whether new employment will start to curve upward within the next 6 weeks, or 6 months. We do not know whether such an upturn will take place in time to prevent hardship and suffering to those who need assistance beyond the running-out period of the present program.

Therefore, Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill that proposes to increase the existing temporary unemployment compensation program for a period of 6 months, to October 1, 1959.

I do not close my mind to the fact that a longer period of time may be needed should the tide of unemployment not be checked in the months immediately ahead.

The cost of extending the present program for 6 months is estimated at a total of $210 million.

This means that for the quarter, April through June 1959, the estimated cost will be $105 million, which will be chargeable to the 1959 fiscal appropriation.

The remaining $105 million will have to come under the 1960 budget. By this I do not mean it will have to push through the President's budget ceiling, but it can be met by reducing other Government programs, which do not have the same urgency or demand.

Mr. President, I realize that we do not know what the final outcome will be on the House temporary unemployment compensation extension bill, or what the Senate Finance Committee will decide to recommend. It is my intention to ask the Senate committee to consider my bill as an amendment to the House measure, should it reach the Senate substantially as reported.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD that part of an article entitled "Survey of the Unemployed: People Behind the Statistics in Five Major Job Areas" published in the New York Times of today, which is titled "Pennsylvania Puzzle," and also that part which is captioned "One in Every 14 Idle, U.S. Job Survey Reveals."

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PENNSYLVANIA PUZZLE

(By Stanley Levey)

PITTSBURGH, March 13.—Up and down the river valleys of western Pennsylvania smoke is shooting once again from steelmill stacks. After 2 years of recession and unemployment, it is a signal read in various ways by various persons.

"Look at that smoke," says the owner of a shoe store in Homestead. "Isn't it beautiful?"

"Went back to the mill last week," says a laborer in Ambridge. "First day's work in 14 months. I never thought I'd be so glad to see the lousy place. But after looking at all that television, I really was."

"The recession is over," says a steel company official.

"I don't know," says a forge man in New Castle. "I hear the recession's over and I know a lotta guys have gone back, so I guess maybe it is. But not me, they don't call me back, and sometimes, mister, I don't think they ever will."

ELEVEN PERCENT IDLE IN JANUARY

Halfway across the State in Harrisburg, the capital, in the new sleek building of the department of labor and industry, analysts have compiled statistics and drawn graphs and curves. This is the story they tell:

At the end of January, 508,000 Pennsylvanians (or about 11 percent of the work force) were idle. The figure for the country was 6 percent. At the bottom of the recession last June, 520,000 persons were jobless in the State. This was 10.9 percent of the work force. The comparable national figure then was slightly more than 7.5 percent.

What worries the analysts (and workers, union leaders, merchants, and businessmen) is that increased production has not been accompanied by a corresponding increase in employment. Does this tendency mean, they

wonder, that new pools of chronic unemployment are in the making—in the steel areas, for example?

"Is Pittsburgh in danger of becoming another Scranton?" asked an economist in the bureau of employment security.

Thirty years ago Pennsylvania's heavily populated hard-coal regions about Scranton and Wilkes-Barre employed 150,000 miners. By 1937 the total was 32,000. Today it is probably even lower. Scranton has tried desperately and effectively to attract new industry, but the area's economic base has been almost completely destroyed. Ten thousand new jobs have been provided, but the rate of unemployment is about the same.

"Scranton has been running like hell to stand still," said the economist.

The basic cause of high production with fewer workers is automation—the use of machinery to run machines. During the recession many mills have introduced new equipment, discontinued using inefficient plants and eliminated jobs.

Bruce Alexander, district staff member of the United Steelworkers of America in McKeesport, predicted that many workers would never regain their jobs.

"This fellow comes in to see me," Mr. Alexander recalled last week. "He's got his kids with him—three of the cutest kids you ever saw. And he says, 'I'm down to nothing. I got no family to help me. I'm on public assistance and I don't think I'm ever going to get my job back. What's going to become of me?' "

Mr. Alexander lifted his palms in a gesture of helplessness. "What could I tell him?" he asked. "I didn't have any answers. It's rough. Oh, we don't let him hurt. We help him, we get him food and like that. But we can't mislead him and tell him we can get his job back for him."

Actually while the recession has resulted in distress, it has not produced disaster. A reporter looking for signs of political protest or starvation in Pennsylvania would come away with an empty notebook. Tom Leslie, a 42-year-old hammer operator from Beaver Falls with 20 years in the industry, illustrates the reasons why this is so.

In the good days he made as much as $200 a week and averaged $6,000 a year. He saved some money, but not much. He bought a home and has $4,000 still to pay on it. He installed storm windows last year but owes a substantial balance. He still drinks a bottle of beer when he feels like it but not so often as formerly. His wife and three children eat regularly.

WIFE'S WORK IS KEY

"How do you manage it?" he is asked.

"My wife works as a bookkeeper," he says a little sheepishly.

This answer is heard in various forms throughout the steel area:

"My wife does day work."

"My wife got a job as a nurse's aid."

"My son brings home a little money."

"My wife and I moved in with my mother."

"My folks help us out."

Tom Leslie has "got by" for several other reasons. He has worked occasionally with a friend who owns a truck. He has picked up odd carpentry and repair jobs. He has drawn $35 a week in State unemployment compensation. Under the State-Federal program he is entitled to 45 weeks of payments.

Finally under the supplementary unemployment benefits program negotiated 3 years ago with the steel industry by the union, he has been receiving benefits that started at about $20 a week. They will run for a year. He has only one major complaint.

"Too damn much housework," he said.

Tom Leslie is joined by others who think the benefits may have saved the day. These include merchants in steel towns who were lukewarm about the welfare program when it was broached back in 1956.

A member of the Beaver County Public Assistance Commission reported that in 2 years only 10 steelworkers had applied for relief.

"Without supplemental unemployment benefits," he said, "there would have been relief lines all over the country."

In the union's district 15 area, Bruce Alexander and Paul Hilbert, the district director, organized a community services program to help steelworkers in distress. Banks were asked to grant moratoriums on mortgage payment, and 150 agreed. Members were told how to obtain public assistance and surplus food. Medical and hospital service were obtained for men whose benefits had lapsed because of prolonged idleness.

But the picture has its shadowy corners, too. George Combs, a burner in the Clairton plant of United States Steel, has been out of work for 13 months. He says he has not had "8 hours work since I was laid off." His benefits will run out in a few weeks. He owes a $400 furniture bill. The store is waiting. He has not been able to pay his $42-a-month rent for an apartment in a county housing project. The project is waiting.

He receives a relief check for $4 every 2 weeks. He sought surplus food and was told he was ineligible. Now he finds other men with his seniority called back to work. He is getting uneasy about providing for his wife and three children.

TAKE JOB ANY PLACE

"I'll take a job any place," he said. "After more than a year this place don't look so good to me."

In that judgment, George Combs is not typical. Despite unemployment, steelworkers are reluctant to strike out to new frontiers. Their homes, their families, their roots keep them clustered about the mills. In Beaver Valley, Wilbert Berarducci, 22 years old and unemployed since July 23, 1957, drove west a few weeks ago with his wife in his 1946 automobile.

Almost as soon as he arrived in California, he received a telegram from his mother, summoning him back home. He had been called back to the mill, she said. Without funds and unable to rely on the old automobile for another trip across the continent, he hitchhiked home in 5 days only to find there had been a mixup and no job awaited him.

"Why did you come back?" he was asked. "Why didn't you stay out in California and look for a job?"

"Why," he said without hesitation, "this is my home and I'm a steelworker."

ONE IN EVERY FOURTEEN IDLE, U.S. JOB SURVEY REVEALS

One worker in every fourteen was jobless last month. The regular joint report of the Federal Labor and Commerce Departments showed 4,749,000 unemployed and 62,702,000 employed. The total of idle was 424,000 below the figure for the recession month of February 1958, but 1,628,000 above that for the prerecession month of February 1957.

In the last 14 months of slump and recovery, more than 3 million workers have exhausted all the unemployment insurance to which they were entitled under regular State programs. Nine hundred thousand of these long-term unemployed went on to use up all the extended protection available to them under the temporary Federal program, which went into effect 9 months ago. No official estimate has been made of how many of these workers are still jobless.

The Federal program is scheduled to expire March 31, but Congress is expected to authorize a 3-month tapering-off period. This would prevent an abrupt cutoff in payments to the 300,000 who will still be on the emergency benefit rolls at the end of this month. In addition to this group, 2,375,000 workers are registered for regular State insurance checks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1423) to extend by 6 months the period for which additional benefits to be paid under the Temporary Unemployment Compensation Act of 1958, introduced by Mr. SCOTT, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

AMENDMENT OF TITLE XI OF MERCHANT MARINE ACT, RELATING TO SHIP MORTGAGES

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, at the request of the Secretary of Commerce, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend title XI of the Merchant Marine Act, as amended, with respect to insurance of ship mortgages, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent that a letter from the Secretary of Commerce requesting the proposed legislation be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letter will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1434) to amend title XI of the Merchant Marine Act, as amended, with respect to insurance of ship mortgages, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

The letter presented by Mr. MAGNUSON is as follows:

THE SECRETARY OF COMMERCE,
Washington, D.C., March 11, 1959.

HON. RICHARD M. NIXON,
The President of the Senate, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: There are submitted herewith four copies of a draft bill, together with a statement of purpose and provisions, to amend title XI of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, with respect to insurance of ship mortgages.

The draft bill would authorize a delay in placing a mortgage on a newly constructed vessel, if the loan secured by the mortgage is to be used to make the downpayment on other vessels to be constructed, without depriving the owner of the privilege of obtaining Government insurance of the mortgage. Under existing law a vessel mortgage is not insurable unless it is placed on the vessel before the vessel is delivered by the shipbuilder. Under the draft bill, if the loan is to be used for the foregoing purpose and the mortgagor obtains a commitment before the keel of the vessel to be mortgaged is laid, the mortgage would be insurable if placed on the vessel at any time during the vessel's economic life. All restrictions under existing law would be applicable in addition to new restrictions which would keep the substance of the insurance transaction the same as it is under existing law, except that the Government would not be under risk for so long a time.

The draft bill would make it possible for an operator who plans to replace a fleet of vessels to pay in full for the first vessel and to mortgage the vessel subsequently (and obtain Government insurance of the mortgage) to obtain the downpayment on other vessels, rather than mortgaging each new vessel as it is delivered by the shipbuilder as he must under existing law if his mortgages are to be insurable.

The draft bill would thus enable the operator to arrange his financing in a more flexible way, would save him interest, and would reduce the period of time during which the Government would be under risk with respect to the vessel mortgage.

We have been advised by the Bureau of the Budget that there would be no objection to the submission of this report to the Congress.

Sincerely yours,

LEWIS L. STRAUSS,
Secretary of Commerce.

STATEMENT OF PURPOSE AND PROVISIONS OF DRAFT BILL TO AMEND TITLE XI OF THE MERCHANT MARINE ACT, 1936, AS AMENDED, WITH RESPECT TO INSURANCE OF SHIP MORTGAGES, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

The purpose of the draft bill is to amend the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, by inserting in title XI (Federal ship mortgage insurance) of that act a new section 1107, which would permit the prospective owner of a vessel that is to be constructed to delay placing a mortgage on the vessel until some time after the vessel has been delivered by the shipbuilder, without losing his privilege of having the mortgage insured by the Secretary of Commerce.

The purpose of the new section is to permit the prospective owner to save interest, and to reduce the period of time during which the Secretary of Commerce is under risk with respect to the mortgage.

The new section would be available both to subsidized and to unsubsidized operators.

An operator who plans to replace his existing fleet by new construction that will be built at staggered intervals over a period of years may have sufficient money on hand to pay in full for the first ship. Under existing law, however, if he does this, he will not later be able to mortgage the vessel and obtain Government insurance of the mortgage in order to obtain the downpayment on future vessels.

If, for example, an operator who has (1) a fleet of four ships, (2) plans to replace one each at 3-year intervals at a cost of $10 million each, and (3) a fund of $10 million to finance such replacement, spends the entire fund to pay for the first ship, he cannot under existing law, later obtain an insurable mortgage on the vessel to finance the downpayment on the other three vessels, because under existing law a vessel mortgage is not insurable unless it is placed on the vessel before the vessel is delivered by the shipbuilder. Under existing law, therefore, to finance his replacement program, the operator cannot use his fund to pay in full for the first ship, but must use his fund to make the minimum downpayment on each ship ($2½ million if he receives construction-differential subsidy) and must mortgage each ship as it is delivered so that the mortgage will be eligible for Government insurance.

The existing law thus unduly restricts the operator in arranging his financing, makes the financing more expensive to the operator than is necessary, and keeps the United States under risk on the mortgages for a longer period than is necessary.

The draft bill would remedy this situation by authorizing the Secretary of Commerce to make a commitment to the vessel operator before the keel on the first vessel is laid, to insure any eligible mortgages such operator, as mortgagor, may place on the vessel at any time to obtain the downpayment on other vessels. The foregoing authorization is subject to conditions which will keep the substance of the mortgage insurance transaction the same as it is under existing law, except that the placing on the vessel of the mortgage that is to be insured would be delayed until such time as the operator needs the money to make the downpayment on other vessels.

Under provisions of the existing law, the Secretary of Commerce is authorized to insure a mortgage on a vessel if he finds that the vessel or the project with respect to which the vessel is to be operated is in his opinion economically sound and if the mortgage (1) secures a loan made to finance construction of the vessel; (2) involves a principal obligation not exceeding 87½ percent of the actual cost of the vessel, if the vessel complies with the requirements of section 509 of the act, or 75 percent of the actual cost of the vessel if the vessel does not comply with these requirements; (3) has a mortgagee who is responsible and able to service the mortgage, and a mortgagor who possesses the ability, experience, financial resources, and other qualifications necessary to the adequate operation and maintenance of the mortgaged property; (4) secures bonds, notes, or other obligations having maturity dates satisfactory to the Secretary of Commerce but not exceeding 20 years; (5) contains amortization provisions satisfactory to the Secretary of Commerce requiring periodic payments by the mortgagor; (6) secures bonds, notes, or other obligations bearing interest at a rate not exceeding 5 percent per annum, or, if the Secretary of Commerce finds the lending market demands it, not exceeding 6 percent per annum; (7) provides in a manner satisfactory to the Secretary of Commerce for the application of the mortgagor's periodic payments (except interest payments) to amortization of the principal of the mortgage; (8) contains such terms and provisions with respect to construction, maintenance, and operation of the vessel and with respect to repairs, alterations, payment of taxes, insurance, delinquency charges, revisions, foreclosure proceedings, anticipation of maturity, additional and secondary liens and other matters pertinent to the security as the Secretary of Commerce may prescribe; and (9) provides that the mortgagor shall pay mortgagee the amount of each mortgage insurance premium at least 60 days before payment of such charge to the Secretary of Commerce is due.

Under the draft bill, all of the foregoing requirements would have to be met at the time the mortgage is to be insured except (1), (2), and (4), and in addition the following requirements would have to be met: (1) The vessel is not subject to a mortgage that has not been insured by the Secretary of Commerce; (2) the principal obligation of the mortgage to be insured shall not exceed an amount which when added to the unpaid balance of the principal obligations of prior mortgages will exceed 87½ percent or 75 percent, as the case may be, of the actual cost of the vessel depreciated at the rate of 5 percent per annum from the date the vessel was delivered by the shipbuilder to the date the mortgage is executed; (3) the mortgage has maturity dates which do not exceed a period of 20 years from the date the vessel was delivered by the shipbuilder; (4) the purpose of the loan secured by the mortgage is to finance the construction of other vessels or both to refinance a mortgage on the vessel which is insured by the Secretary of Commerce and to finance the construction of other vessels; (5) the loan agreement for the making of the loan secured by the mortgage, or the mortgage provides that the loan, except such portion as it has been agreed will be used to refinance a mortgage on the vessel which has been insured by the Secretary of Commerce, will be disbursed by the mortgagee to a shipbuilder in payment, on behalf of the mortgagor, of part of the contract price for the construction of a vessel contracted for by the mortgagor which has not yet been delivered; and (6) the vessel is in as good condition as it would have been in, if it had been mortgaged immediately upon delivery of the vessel by the shipbuilder and such mortgage had been insured by the Secretary of Commerce, and the mortgagor had complied with all of the requirements of the Secretary of Commerce with respect to a vessel on which he has insured the mortgage.

Under the draft bill, therefore, the risk to the United States under the insured mortgage is the same as it is under existing law, except that under the draft bill the United States would not be under risk for as long as it is under existing law.

Under existing law if an operator has (1) a fleet of four vessels, (2) plans to replace one each at 3-year intervals at a cost of $10 million each, and (3) a fund of $10 million to finance such replacement, he must mortgage each vessel as it is delivered by the shipbuilder if he wishes to obtain Government mortgage insurance. Each vessel, therefore, would be subject to an insured mortgage for a period of 20 years.

Under the draft bill, the operator could pay for the first vessel in full, obtain a mortgage commitment from the Secretary of Commerce, and mortgage the vessel later on to obtain all or part of the down payment on the other three vessels. If he mortgages the vessel in the amount of $2½ million at the end of 3 years to obtain the downpayment on the second vessel, and again at the end of 6 years in the amount of $2½ million to obtain the downpayment on the third vessel, then at the end of 9 years he will be able to mortgage the vessel only in the amount of $250,000, because 75 percent of the depreciated actual cost of the vessel at the end of 9 years would be $4,125,000, and the unpaid principal balance of prior mortgages would be $3,875,000.

The foregoing example is not the only way in which the draft bill could be used. Under the draft bill, an operator who pays for his first vessel in full and, before the keel is laid, obtains a commitment from the Secretary of Commerce to insure mortgages on the vessel, could, at any time during the 20-year life of the vessel, obtain Government mortgage insurance on eligible mortgages on the vessel in the aggregate amount of 75 percent or 87½ percent, as the case may be, of the depreciated actual cost of the vessel for the purpose of financing the construction of other vessels.

NEED FOR BETTER STATE PARK SYSTEMS IN PUBLIC LAND STATES

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill which would materially assist our public land States in their efforts to conserve and develop long-neglected State park and recreation areas. The bill would amend section 1 of the act of June 14, 1926, as amended by the act of June 4, 1954 (68 Stat. 173), to permit the conveyance of public lands to a State for public park purposes without any limitation as to acreage. At the present time a State or other political subdivision may acquire only 640 acres yearly.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1436) to amend section 1 of the act of June 14, 1926, as amended by the act of June 4, 1954 (68 Stat. 173; 43 U.S.C., sec. 869), introduced by Mr. BENNETT was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Mr. BENNETT. To a State such as Utah, which is more than 70 percent federally owned, the present law has proved completely inadequate because most of our potential park and recreation areas are on Federal lands and many are of large size. It should be noted that my

bill would for the most part merely restore the situation as it existed under the 1926 act prior to its amendment in 1954. The 1926 act contained no limitation as to the acreage which could be conveyed to any one applicant for public recreational purposes. When the scope of the act was expanded in 1954 to permit disposal of public lands for all public purposes and to allow nonprofit organizations to acquire the lands as well as local governments, the 640-acre limitation was imposed. However, this new limitation on State and local government acquisitions has proved to be unduly restrictive on laudable State efforts to conserve and develop our great park and recreation potential.

Under the 1954 act, the authority of the Secretary of the Interior is discretionary, and he would permit conveyances for State park and recreation purposes only where the State could produce a satisfactory plan for use and development of the land. The existing repayment provisions would remain unchanged. It should be emphasized that the traditional multiple-use doctrine will continue to prevail on the lands acquired by the States.

HALT VANDALISM

My proposed amendment of the law would do much to halt growing vandalism, negligence and dissipation of priceless and irreplaceable national resources. In Utah, our great petrified forests have been hauled away by the truckload. Indian writings, dwellings and other artifacts left by a now vanished people are being seriously damaged by an uninformed, thoughtless few. One of the most tragic losses was the destruction near Blanding, Utah, of the striking Goblet of Venus which had been the marvel of viewers for decades as it stood precariously on its delicate pedestal. Evidently vandals threw a rope over it, tied the rope to car and wantonly pulled it over, a total loss to future generations. Great damage has occurred in other such unprotected areas as Goblin Valley and Dead Horse Point.

Unfortunately, the Bureau of Land Management has neither the men nor the money to protect the 24 million acres of public lands under its jurisdiction in Utah or the vast acreage in other public land States. The fine BLM Director, Edward Woozley, and his public lands aid, Harold Hochmuth, have been unfailingly cooperative and helpful, but they are the first to admit that they cannot police the vast area under their jurisdiction.

UTAH PARK AND RECREATION COMMISSION

Two years ago, the Utah State Legislature approved Governor Clyde's recommendation that a park and recreation commission be created. Since that time, the five appointed commissioners, their director, and staff have done an excellent job to get this important program under way. I have been privileged to work with them for over a year, particularly with Chairman Harold P. Fabian and Director C. J. Olsen. The State legislature has just approved $1 million for the new commission to continue its activities and to buy Federal and other lands for park and recreation purposes.

While Federal holdings in Utah include two national parks, eight national monuments, and seven national forests, many of the State's finest scenic, geologic, archeologic, and historic sites are on BLM lands. The Bureau of Land Management has no recreation funds or programs. The National Park Service is struggling to secure adequate funds just to complete the Mission 66 program for our existing national parks and monuments to bring these areas up to a minimum stage of development. The State of Utah has clearly demonstrated that it is prepared to carry out and maintain a program to protect and develop park and recreation areas in the State, but it is handicapped by the 640-acre limitation. The acreage for a State park varies greatly in size. Frequently such parks cannot be properly developed if a State cannot acquire all the necessary acreage at one time or have some assurance that it can obtain the acreage in the future.

In its magnificent report for 1959, the Utah Park and Recreation Commission listed 118 different locations for future park or recreational areas. Of the total potential, the Federal Government owns 1.7 million acres, the State 339,000 acres, private owners control 169,000 acres and local communities own 1,400 acres. Similar situations exist in other public land States. I ask unanimous consent to insert letters from State parks officials in eight Western States expressing support or great interest in the objectives of my bill.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WYOMING STATE PARK COMMISSION,
Shoshoni, Wyo., June 23, 1958.

Mr. C. J. OLSEN,
Director, Utah State Park and Recreation Commission, Salt Lake City, Utah.

DEAR MR. OLSEN: Your letter of June 10, 1958, in reference to possible amendments to Public Law 387, whereby acquisition of lands for State park and recreation areas might be made without its present limitations, does interest me.

I don't have a copy of the law available just now, but I am familiar with its general content. The vast acreages of land controlled by the Federal Government in many of our Western States makes it patent that greater cooperation be exercised between State and Federal agencies in any type of development on such lands.

In answer to your questions, I feel that we, as a State, are interested in the amendments to the law you have suggested. It is difficult to anticipate just when we may want an area for recreational development under this law, but I am sure that should the time come and the area exceed 640 acres, we would hate to be bound by that limitation.

Legislation which will open the way for additional Federal cooperation in the development of recreational areas within the State would certainly be of interest.

I hope this will reach you before your planned trip. The letter was somewhat late in its arrival, since it was forwarded on to me.

Your progress in the matter will be of interest to us.

Sincerely,

HAROLD S. ODDE,
Director.

ARIZONA STATE PARKS BOARD,
Phoenix, June 23, 1958.

Mr. C. J. OLSEN,
Director, Utah State Park and Recreation Commission, Salt Lake City, Utah.

DEAR MR. OLSEN: I would be personally interested in having the law amended to make it possible for States to acquire, without acreage limitations and cost, potential sites now administered by the Bureau of Land Management. However, since the Arizona State Parks Board is a policymaking board, my interest and feeling in this matter cannot be considered official. The Arizona State Parks Board does not meet again until August 12 and 13, 1958. At that time I will get this matter on the agenda for board consideration.

I will also research the Clark-McNary Act and the McNary-McSweeney Act, and place this matter also on the agenda for the August meeting.

I am sure that the Arizona State Parks Board will give sympathetic consideration to any recommendations which might further the cause of the State park and recreation movement.

Ernie Allen, who has been visiting with us during the past week and a half, will be in the State again from July 16 until July 25. At that time we will attempt to meet with you when we will be in the vicinity of the Utah-Arizona boundary. I will let you know as far in advance as possible when we will be in the area.

I am sorry that I was unable to answer your letters sooner. Travel and other reasons caused the delay. I will be interested in hearing from you on the outcome of your Washington meeting.

Sincerely yours,

DENNIS MCCARTHY,
State Parks Director.

STATE PARK COMMISSION,
Carson City, Nev., June 17, 1958.

Mr. C. J. OLSEN,
Director, State Park and Recreation Commission of Utah, Salt Lake City, Utah

DEAR MR. OLSEN: In reply to your letter of June 10, 1958, Col. Thomas W. Miller, chairman of the Nevada State Park Commission, is absent from the State; however, he will be advised of your inquiry upon his return.

Regarding your question No. 1; the Nevada State Park Commission is definitely interested in having Public Law 387 amended to make it possible for State parks to acquire acreage without limitation and cost. The present limitation of 640 acres which may be conveyed to any one grantee in any one calendar year seems to be an arbitrary figure inasmuch as at present we have application in to the Bureau of Land Management in the amount of approximately 5,000 acres, more or less. We have had to take advantage of the lease provisions of Public Law 387 in order to have set aside outstanding scenic, historic, and recreational areas which are in danger of being lost or destroyed, and as you can see, it will take many years under the limitation of 640 acres per year to eventually receive conveyance of title from the United States.

In reply to your question No. 2, Chairman Miller is thoroughly familiar with the problems of needed Federal legislation related to State parks, and will no doubt forward to you a prompt reply regarding this matter upon his return to the State.

Very truly yours,

HOWARD W. SQUIRES,
Director.

STATE OF COLORADO,
STATE PARK AND RECREATION BOARD,
Denver, Colo., June 16, 1958.

Mr. C. J. OLSEN,
Director, State Park and Recreation Commission, Salt Lake City, Utah

DEAR CHET: Your nice letter of June 10 is acknowledged and very much appreciated.

Naturally, we are very much interested in the limitations which Public Law 387 makes upon any acquisitions for State park purposes, with which our board might be confronted. We will probably have numerous occasions whereby the lands now under the control of the Bureau of Land Management might well be incorporated into potential State parks or State recreation areas, and, certainly, we are very sympathetic with your views on the need for some changes in the law.

I am certain that our board would be very much in favor of cosponsoring any Federal legislation, which would provide for more leniency in the amount of acreage which the State might acquire in any given calendar year. Certainly, our States, which have few State parks, or, in our case, none at all, will have need to acquire much more than the 640 acres in a calendar year. Our board has plans to establish at least two areas each year, and to develop one. I hope that none of them will have to be less than 1,000 acres in extent, and would like to see even greater acreages.

Please advise me when and where we can be of service, if action is taken to amend the present law, and I shall advise our Members of Congress accordingly.

Assuring you of my cooperation and support, I am

Sincerely yours,

HAROLD W. LATHROP,
Director.

STATE OF MONTANA,
HIGHWAY COMMISSION,
Helena, June 16, 1958.

Mr. C. J. OLSEN,
Director, State Park and Recreation Commission, Salt Lake City, Utah.

DEAR MR. OLSEN: This will be with reference to your letter concerning acquiring title to potential State park sites from the Bureau of Land Management.

We are very much interested in this problem and answer your questions as follows: (1) We are interested in having the law amended to make it possible for States to acquire, without acreage limitations and cost, potential sites now administered by the Bureau of Land Management; (2) we are interested in assisting to sponsor Federal legislation which would, if enacted, make it possible for State parks to cooperate in a manner similar to the Clark-McNary Act and the McNary-McSweeney Act.

Montana has the same problem as Utah and other Western States in acquiring such acreages of public domain that have outstanding scenic and recreational value, and we are very anxious to acquire them. Under existing law, however, we are definitely handicapped.

Since you have been authorized to go back to Washington, D.C., to help prepare the necessary legislation, may we suggest that you check on Senate bill 1318 introduced by Senators MURRAY and MANSFIELD of Montana and House Bill 3121. These bills are now before the Senate Committee on Government Operations and the House Committee on Government Operations. It may be that this pending legislation incorporates what we are looking for with regard to public domain land.

We very much appreciate your interest in this problem and please be assured of our support.

Very truly yours,

ASHLEY C. ROBERTS,
Director, State Parks Division.

NEW MEXICO
STATE PARK COMMISSION,
Santa Fe, June 12, 1958.

Mr. C. J. OLSEN,
Director, State Parks and Recreation Commission, Salt Lake City, Utah.

DEAR MR. OLSEN: We are definitely interested in the proposals in your letter of June 9, 1958. Recently we received a memorandum from James F. Evans, Director of Parks of the State of New York, calling our attention to Senate bill 1318 and House of Representative bill 3121. These are to be presented as amendments to bills now before Congress. These would authorize the Federal Government to turn over surplus land to the State for recreational use without monetary consideration.

You no doubt received from the Department of Interior, Bureau of Land Management, a copy of information release, dated April 16, 1958. This simply reiterates policies expressed in the past which have not been carried out at State levels. The acquisition of land for States is still a cumbersome limited procedure. We have a case of ours which is almost too ridiculous to relate. In a park created about 1934 there were included eleven 40-acre tracts of BLM land. This was during the CCC days and apparently the transfer of the Federal land to the State of New Mexico was never completed. It was fenced in and always considered as part of the park. We have been trying for over 2 years now to obtain title to this land. A first appraisal was figured at a higher price than land sells for in the immediate area. We asked for a second appraisal. The second appraisal was almost twice as high as the first one. I agree with you that the 640-acre limitation is not consistent with State park developments or the conservation of land for future public recreational use.

It is our thought that these lands which have little or no value, in comparison with their recreational use, should be transferred to the State without cost and without limitation as to the number of acres to be acquired in one year. We further agree that there should be Federal aid for the basic improvements of certain areas within the tracks obtained for the development of public recreational use.

We also feel that there should be legislation introduced that would permit States to acquire from the Corps of Engineers any or all land around a reservoir project except that which is actually needed for the administration area of the Corps of Engineers. We very definitely feel that there should be a closer relationship between National Park Services and the various States in protecting and acquiring areas to be used in the future. You have no doubt noted that already there are indications that the National Park Service Mission 66 will not meet the future requirements of their areas. One of the most practical ways of meeting annual increases of people going to recreational areas, is Federal aid to the State for developing new areas, which the States will further improve and administer, after using a reasonable amount of Federal funds for basic improvement.

I think it is very desirable for Western States, particularly the four States that join at a common corner, to combine their efforts in a realistic program for future development of areas that are necessary to accomodate the tourist travelers.

I could go on indefinitely on this subject but I assure you we are interested in any bills that will approach the particular solution that we have.

Yours truly,

DON LA NOUE,
Administrative Assistant.

STATE OF OREGON,
STATE HIGHWAY DEPARTMENT,
Salem, June 13, 1958.

Mr. C. J. OLSEN,
Director, State Park and Recreation Commission, Salt Lake City, Utah.

DEAR MR. OLSEN: I have your letter of June 10, relative to your request in the changing of the Federal requirements to limit State acquisition to 640 acres of Federal land during any 1 calendar year.

For your information, I am attaching a copy of a resolution prepared by the Columbia Basin Interagency Subcommittee on Recreation on this subject, together with some other subjects which may be of interest to you. We are definitely opposed to the 640-acre limitation and will go along a considerable way on this matter. I might tell you that I discussed this matter with the Oregon delegation in Congress last January and it seemed they were all very much in favor of it. There is some opposition in the Bureau of Land Management; however, they did advise me that there was some possibility of getting that changed. I hope that you are successful in getting some action on this.

Very truly yours,

C. H. ARMSTRONG,
State Parks Superintendent.

DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC LANDS,
Boise, Idaho, June 23, 1958.

Mr. C. J. OLSEN,
Director of State Parks,
Salt Lake City, Utah.

DEAR CHET: Your letter addressed to Jack Emmert has been referred to me to reply to that part pertaining to the sponsoring of Federal legislation which would provide for cooperation with the States in developing State parks and recreation areas.

I believe that Idaho would be willing to participate in sponsoring legislation of this kind, particularly since there is but one Federal monument wholly within the State of Idaho. This is a matter for the land board to resolve and I shall bring the question before the board at the next regular meeting, which will be the early part of July. The board may be willing to cooperate, even though there are not sufficient funds to send a man to Washington. Perhaps we could join you in our efforts and you be the representative of the State.

I am very much in favor of the Federal law's being amended to permit the States to acquire potential recreation sites without limitation. By the time we could acquire those desired, it is more than likely that other interests would have absorbed the areas and our State would be without those sites that would be a valuable asset to our park program.

Thank you for writing Mr. Emmert in this matter and I hope that he will be able to have a visit with you in the near future, which should be of benefit to both States.

With personal regards,

Sincerely,

ARTHUR WILSON,
State Land Commissioner.

MANY STATES HAVE A SIMILAR NEED

Mr. BENNETT. I also ask unanimous consent to include a resolution adopted by the national conference on State parks at its annual meeting held at Itasca State Park, Minn., in 1957, which urges revocation of the 640-acre limit, together with 2 tables showing the amount of Federal lands in each State and the amount under jurisdiction of the Bureau of Land Management.

The Utah State Senate and House passed resolutions in the waning moments of the recently concluded session of the legislature, recommending removal of the 640-acre limitation, and I ask unanimous consent that they also be included in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the resolutions were ordered to be printed in the RECORD.

RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY THE NATIONAL CONFERENCE ON STATE PARKS AT ITS ANNUAL MEETING HELD AT ITASCA STATE PARK, MINN., ON SEPTEMBER 18–21, 1957

Whereas the act of June 4, 1954 (68 Stat. 178 43 U.S.C. 1952 ed., supp. III, sec. 869), amends the Recreation Act of June 14, 1926 (44 Stat. 741), to limit conveyances of land by the Bureau of Land Management to State and local agencies for public park and recreation purposes to 640 acres in any 1 year; and

Whereas this limitation prevents many of the State park agencies for acquiring needed park lands; and

Whereas the need for additional State park lands is increasing so rapidly that the States are unable to keep pace with their needs: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Recreation Act should be further amended to revoke the 640-acre limitation so far as it is applicable to State park agencies, it is further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution shall be forwarded to the chairman of the Senate and House Interior and Insular Affairs Committees, to the Secretary of the Interior, to the Director, Bureau of Land Management, and to the Director, Bureau of the Budget.

HOUSE RESOLUTION 5

Resolution memorializing Congress and the President to remove the limitation on the number of acres of public lands which the State may acquire

Be it resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Utah—

Whereas under the Recreation Act of June 14, 1926, as now amended and in effect, the Secretary of the Interior is limited to not more than 640 acres of the public lands of the United States which may be conveyed to any one grantee in any one calendar year; and

Whereas this limitation is a severe handicap to the State of Utah and to the Utah State Park and Recreation Commission in the development of its planned State park system, and in the acquisition, preservation, and protection of areas which should be incorporated into and protected by said State park system: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Utah, That the President of the United States and the Congress of the United States be memorialized to amend the Recreation Act of June 14, 1926, as amended, to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to convey to a State, without acreage or other limitation, any public lands within such State for State park and recreation purposes; be it further

Resolved, That certified copies of this resolution be transmitted by the Secretary of State to the President of the United States, to the Presiding Officer of the U.S. Senate, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to the Senators and Representatives from the State of Utah.

SENATE RESOLUTION 5

Resolution objecting to limitation of public lands

Be it resolved by the Senate of the 33d Legislature of the State of Utah—

Whereas under the Recreation Act of June 14, 1926, as now amended and in effect, the Secretary of the Interior is limited to not more than 640 acres of the public lands of the United States which may be conveyed to any one grantee in any one calendar year; and

Whereas this limitation is a severe handicap to the State of Utah and to the Utah State Park and Recreation Commission in the development of its planned State park system, and in the acquisition, preservation, and protection of areas which should be incorporated into and protected by said State park system: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate of the 33d Legislature of the State of Utah, That the President of the United States and the Congress of the United States be memorialized to amend the Recreation Act of June 14, 1926, as amended, to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to convey to a State, without acreage or other limitation, any public lands within such State for State park and recreation purposes; be it further

Resolved, That certified copies of this resolution be transmitted by the Secretary of State to the President of the United States, to the Presiding Officer of the U.S. Senate, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to the Senators and Representatives from the State of Utah.

OTHER PURPOSES OF THE BILL

Mr. BENNETT. Inadvertently the 1954 act establishing acreage limitations has led to unequal treatment for the various States and other governmental entities. The 1954 act refers to the disposition of public lands to a "State, Territory, county, municipality, or other State, Territorial, or Federal instrumentality or political subdivision." The word "instrumentality" has been construed by the Department in its usual sense, and, therefore, a State agency must have the authority to hold lands in its own name if it is to qualify as an instrumentality within the meaning of the 1954 act.

If a State agency cannot qualify as an instrumentality, any land which it accepts under the 1954 act must be charged against the sum of 640 acres which the State is permitted to accept within the year. This means that a State the agencies of which cannot qualify as instrumentalities can take only 640 acres annually, while a State the agencies of which are able to qualify as instrumentalities can acquire 640 acres annually for each of those qualifying agencies in addition to 640 acres annually for itself as a State. Thus, instead of the acreage which each State may receive being determined by the 1954 act, the amount that a State may receive depends, in reality, to a very large extent upon the State law.

The bill is intended to make the act uniform in its practical application by applying the limitation against each of the programs of a State rather than by applying the limitation to a State and to each of its instrumentalities. For example, under the proposed bill the highway, forestry, police, and other departments and agencies of a State, whether or not they qualify as instrumentalities, would be permitted to secure up to 640 acres each. A similar case of unequal treatment may sometimes arise because projects which in some States are undertaken at the county or other subordinate level may in certain States be undertaken at the State level. The proposed amendment would help to rectify this matter.

The proposed amendment also permits the various State park agencies to receive title directly to the lands acquired under the 1926 act where it is permitted by State law. This is done to do away with the necessity in some States of requiring the State legislature to formally transfer the lands in question from the State to the State park board.

This is not a hastily conceived bill, but is the product of many months of study and negotiation, and merits the approval of Congress. Because many States will be benefited by my proposed bill, I ask unanimous consent that the bill lie on the desk until March 23, 1959, in the event that other Senators may wish to join in sponsoring the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the bill will lie on the desk as requested.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks a table showing Bureau of Land Management lands and percentage of total State acreage; also a table showing lands owned by the Federal Government as of June 30, 1957, and the percentage of the State area.

There being no objection, the tables were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

State	Bureau of Land Management lands (acres)	Percent of total State acreage
Alabama	16,000	
Arizona	13,093,000	18.0
Arkansas	8,000	
California	16,867,000	16.8
Colorado	8,245,000	12.4
Florida	4,000	
Idaho	11,915,000	22.5
Kansas	1,000	
Louisiana	4,000	
Michigan	5,000	
Minnesota	101,000	
Mississippi	11,000	
Montana	6,714,000	7.2
Nebraska	13,000	
Nevada	47,948,000	68.2
New Mexico	14,536,000	18.7
North Dakota	81,000	
Oklahoma	4[illegible]000	
Oregon	15,492,000	25.1
South Dakota	278,000	
Utah	24,404,000	46.3
Washington	471,000	
Wisconsin	2,000	
Wyoming	17,176,000	27.5
Alaska	298,925,000	81.8
Total United States	486,353,000	20.9

State	Lands owned by Federal Government June 30, 1957 (acres)	Percent of State area
Alabama	1,075,000	3.3
Arizona	32,415,000	44.6
Arkansas	2,979,000	8.8
California	46,195,000	46.1
Colorado	24,016,000	36.1
Connecticut	5,000	.2
Delaware	32,000	2.5
District of Columbia	11,000	28.7
Florida	3,353,000	9.7
Georgia	1,998,000	5.3
Idaho	34,487,000	65.1
Illinois	412,000	1.2
Indiana	335,000	1.4
Iowa	122,000	.3
Kansas	341,000	.6
Kentucky	973,000	3.8
Louisiana	1,603,000	3.7
Maine	125,000	.6
Maryland	223,000	3.5
Massachusetts	58,000	1.2
Michigan	3,238,000	8.9
Minnesota	3,264,000	6.4
Mississippi	1,510,000	5.0
Missouri	1,671,000	3.8
Montana	28,019,000	30.0
Nebraska	695,000	1.4
Nevada	61,644,000	87.7
New Hampshire	695,000	12.0
New Jersey	97,000	2.0
New Mexico	27,493,000	36.4
New York	259,000	.8
North Carolina	1,879,000	6.0
North Dakota	1,927,000	4.3
Ohio	204,000	.8
Oklahoma	993,000	2.2
Oregon	31,610,000	51.3

State	Lands owned by Federal Government June 30 1957 (acres)	Percent of State area
Pennsylvania	549,000	1.9
Rhode Island	8,000	1.2
South Carolina	1,084,000	5.6
South Dakota	3,200,000	6.5
Tennessee	1,570,000	5.9
Texas	2,630,000	1.6
Utah	36,484,000	69.2
Vermont	248,000	4.2
Virginia	2,122,000	8.3
Washington	12,669,000	29.6
West Virginia	934,000	6.1
Wisconsin	1,782,000	5.1
Wyoming	29,853,000	47.8
Alaska	362,673,000	99.2
Total, United States	771,226,000	34.0

A UNIVERSITY OF AMERICAS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, on the first day of this session one of our most distinguished colleagues in the House of Representatives, Representative HALE BOGGS, of Louisiana, introduced a joint resolution providing for a study of the possibility and desirability of establishing a University of the Americas.

This is a proposal in which I have been interested for quite some time, and I was very much pleased to learn that Representative BOGGS has taken the initiative in this area. He is known, and justly so, as a great friend of our Latin American neighbors.

The establishment of such a University of the Americas, if it is feasible, would indeed be a major step in cementing relations between our country and our neighbors to the south. It could do much to foster the cultural, scientific and other relations which are so vital in maintaining harmonious and fruitful relationships among the nations of the Western Hemisphere.

Mr. President, the joint resolution I have sent to the desk is identical with House Joint Resolution 1. I ask that there be printed, at the conclusion of my remarks, the joint resolution, together with a preliminary report on the matter which was prepared by the Department of State at the request of the Committee on Foreign Relations during the 84th Congress.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the joint resolution and preliminary report will be printed in the RECORD.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 79) providing for a study of the possibility and desirability of establishing a University of the Americas, introduced by Mr. MANSFIELD, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the nations of the Western Hemisphere have developed a solid foundation for the maintenance of peaceful relations through the inter-American system and the Organization of American States; and

Whereas the increasing degree of cultural, economic, and commercial relations between the United States and its sister Republics of Latin America warrants that consideration be given to the availability of educational facilities which will contribute to a further appreciation of the mutual problems arising from these relations; and

Whereas an effective means of serving this desirable goal would be provided by the facilities of an inter-American university accessible to the students and professors of all nations of the Western Hemisphere and by a curriculum specially drawn to impart deeper understanding of those legal, social, commercial, and political problems common to the nations of the Western Hemisphere; and

Whereas the existence of a university of this character would afford superior opportunities for students and professors from all parts of the Americas to develop closer personal relationships to expand the interchange of ideas, skills, and culture, and to further, through the opportunities thus provided, increased understanding among the peoples concerned: Now therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) there is hereby established a commission to be known as the Commission on the University of the Americas (hereinafter referred to as the "Commission").

(b) The Commission shall be composed of eight members as follows:

(1) Two appointed by the President of the Senate from the Members of the Senate (not more than one from any political party);

(2) Two appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives from the Members of the House of Representatives (not more than one from any political party);

(3) Four appointed by the President of the United States from the presidents of such universities as will provide representation from the principal geographical areas of the United States.

(c) Any vacancy in the Commission shall not affect its powers, but shall be filled in the same manner in which the original appointment was made.

(d) Service of an individual as a member of the Commission or employment of an individual by the Commission as an attorney or expert in any business or professional field, on a part-time or full-time basis, with or without compensation, shall not be considered as service or employment bringing such individual within the provisions of section 281, 283, 284, 434, or 1914 of title 18 of the United States Code, or section 190 of the Revised Statutes (5 U.S.C. 99).

(e) The Commission shall elect a Chairman and a Vice Chairman from among its members.

(f) Five members of the Commission shall constitute a quorum.

SEC. 2. (a) The Commission shall make a full and complete investigation and study, including consultations with officials of the Organization of American States, for the purpose of determining the possibility and desirability of establishing a University of the Americas, to be a center of higher education for the people of all nations of the Western Hemisphere.

(b) In making such study the Commission shall consider all possible factors bearing upon the desirability of establishing a university of the type contemplated by this joint resolution, and the prospects for its acceptance and successful operation. The Commission shall recommend a possible site for such university, and in the selection of such site the Commission shall give consideration to geographical accessibility, climate, and the availability of existing facilities.

SEC. 3. (a) The Commission or, on the authorization of the Commission, any subcommittee or member thereof, may for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this joint resolution, hold such hearings and sit and act at such times and places as the Commission or such subcommittee or member may deem advisable.

(b) The Commission may secure directly from any executive department or agency of the Federal Government information, suggestions, estimates, and statistics for the purposes of this joint resolution; and each such department or agency may furnish such information, suggestions, estimates, and statistics directly to the Commission, upon request made by the Chairman or Vice Chairman.

SEC. 4. (a) Members of the Congress who are members of the Commission shall serve without compensation in addition to that received for their services as Members of Congress; but they shall be reimbursed for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of the duties vested in the Commission.

(b) The members of the Commission from private life shall each receive $50 per diem when engaged in the actual performance of duties vested in the Commission, plus reimbursement for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of such duties.

SEC. 5. (a) The Commission shall have power to appoint and fix the compensation of such personnel as it deems advisable, without regard to the provisions of the civil service laws and the Classification Act of 1949, as amended.

(b) The Commission may procure, without regard to the civil service laws and the Classification Act of 1949, temporary and intermittent services to the same extent as is authorized for the departments by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (60 Stat. 810), but at rates not to exceed $50 per diem for individuals.

SEC. 6. The expenses of the Commission as authorized in this joint resolution shall not exceed $50,000, and shall be paid from funds appropriated under the authorization contained in section 401 of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended.

SEC. 7. The Commission shall report its findings and recommendations to the President and the Congress not later than January 31, 1957, and shall cease to exist thirty days after the submission of such report.

The preliminary report presented by Mr. MANSFIELD is as follows:

PRELIMINARY STUDY OF MEANS OF STRENGTHENING THE EDUCATIONAL TIES OF THE AMERICAS WITH SPECIAL REFERENCE TO THE POSSIBILITY OF ESTABLISHING A UNIVERSITY OF THE AMERICAS

I. INTRODUCTION

Senate Joint Resolution 174, 84th Congress, 2d session, providing for a study of the possibility and desirability of establishing a University of the Americas, which was sponsored jointly by Senators MANSFIELD and Knowland, was introduced by Senator MANSFIELD in the Senate on May 16, 1956. The resolution provided for the establishment of a commission which would explore the possibility and desirability of establishing a great university in the Western Hemisphere as a center of higher education for the people of all the American Republics. (Identical resolutions were introduced in the House as follows: H.J. Res. 635 by Mr. BOGGS on June 5, 1956, H.J. Res. 641 by Mr. MORRISON on June 6, 1956, and H.J. Res. 699 by Mr. FASCELL on July 25, 1956.)

In response to a request for the views of the Department of State on this proposed legislation, the following preliminary statement on means of strengthening the educational bonds among the Americas, with special reference to the possible establishment of a University of the Americas, has been prepared.

In both Europe and America the idea of an international university, either worldwide or regional in character, began to receive attention as a promising means of furthering understanding among nations early in the 20th century. Following the First World War many proposals for the creation of an international university were brought before the League of Nations. The

Commission of Intellectual Cooperation or the League, after thorough study of the proposals, concluded that obstacles, which at that time seemed insurmountable, stood in the way of the realization of the ideal of an international university. The Commission recommended, instead, a more modest project for a federation of the institutions which, in the different countries, were devoting themselves to the teaching of those matters which were indispensable for a knowledge of the contemporary world and international relations. An international university established in Brussels in 1920, which only reached its first stage of development, had to close its doors in 1923 because of lack of financial support.

In Europe a number of important institutes were established to deal with international problems. Among these was the Hague Academy of International Law, which was established as a truly international institution and which since its opening in 1924, has ranked among the foremost institutes for international studies. Created through the efforts of the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, the academy has had continued financial support from U.S. foundations.

In the meantime interest in an inter-American university was increasing in the Western Hemisphere. Both Puerto Rico and Panama had been proposed as appropriate centers for the establishment of such an institution. Panama especially had, since 1912, been trying to develop support for a Pan-American University within its borders. At both the third and eighth Pan-American Congresses recommendations were made supporting the establishment of a Pan-American University in Panama.

Finally an inter-American university was established in Panama in October, 1943. A convention on the Inter-American University was signed by representatives of the 21 American republics meeting in Panama September 27 to October 4, 1943, for the First Conference of Ministers and Directors of Education of the American Republics. The United States signed with certain reservations.

The convention, which was subject to ratification by the several governments, provided that the Panamanian Government would donate to the new institution, the lands, equipment and financial endowment formerly belonging to the National University of Panama. The Governments of the Republics were to contribute to the expenses of maintenance of the university and to the expenses of construction and equipment on a proportional basis. Scholarships would be made available to students of each American country in proportion to the contributions made to the maintenance of the university.

According to its statute the university was to have autonomy in all its internal activities. Its administrative board was to be composed of heads of the diplomatic missions of the American Republics accredited to Panama, or those whom the respective Governments might designate, and the Minister of Education of the Republic of Panama. A comprehensive program of regular instruction on the undergraduate and graduate levels was to be offered in the new university, with special emphasis on courses and facilities for research on the cultural problems which affect the Western Hemisphere.

While waiting for the ratification by the American States of the Convention for the Inter-American University, the new institution began to operate on a transitory statute. When, however, the only State to ratify the convention was Venezuela, the Republic of Panama decided, in 1946, to return the Inter-American University to its former status as a national university, while awaiting ratification of the convention. Since that time there has been no sufficient coordinated effort on the part of the American States to reactivate the Inter-American University in Panama.

In recent years the U.N. agencies and the OAS have been concerned with the development, on a small scale, of international educational centers which give training in specialized fields at the college level. For example, UNESCO, in the establishment of the Latin American Regional Center (CREFAL) at Patzcuaro, Mexico, in 1950, has undertaken a regional educational project which, in organization, is truly international. The work of the center is carried on at the college level. The staff, administrative and professional, is drawn not only from different countries of the region, but also from a few countries in other parts of the world. The student body is composed of teams of students sent by those American States which wish to participate in the work of the center. The OAS cooperates with UNESCO in financing the work of the center.

II. DISCUSSION OF PROBLEMS INVOLVED IN THE CREATION OF AN INTERNATIONAL UNIVERSITY

One of the most controversial questions in the whole field of international intellectual cooperation has been and continues to be the question of the creation of an international university, either worldwide or regional in character. While the universities of many nations are becoming increasingly aware of their international role in the modern world and are taking on more of an international character, in part through their participation in official and private programs of international educational exchange involving the exchange of professors, research specialists and students, there is in existence no truly international university which, with an international staff and an international student body, directs primary attention toward the development of better understanding of the common economic, social and political problems of all nations or of a group of nations.

The idea of a great international university, challenging as it is, has proved to be difficult of realization. Perhaps the time has not been ripe for it. The several attempts made during the 20th century to establish such an institution of higher learning on a worldwide or regional scale did not meet with lasting success.

At the present time, however, when there is so much emphasis on international organization, and when programs of international cultural relations have come to play such an important role in the conduct of foreign affairs, a review of the idea of an international university and its possible realization is timely.

An analysis of recent efforts to establish an international university brings to the fore a number of problems, some of which would seem to be of special importance to those considering the proposal for the creation of a university of the Americas as presented in resolution 174.

The creation of a great inter-American university, like that of any great national university, would be a slow, very complex, and expensive process. If an inter-American university is to have a chance of success it will have to come into being as the result of a very real need recognized by the American States. Otherwise they will not give it the moral and financial support needed for its creation and continuing existence. One of the main reasons why the Inter-American University in Panama, with its well-developed plan for international organization, never actually existed as an international institution was the lack of support from most of the American Republics.

One of the greatest obstacles to the development of an international institution of higher learning has been and continues to be the predominating opinion in university circles that the usefulness of an international university would be very limited and would not justify the enormous effort and expense that its creation would necessitate. Without the strong support fo the universities of the several American countries as well as of universities in other parts of the world, and without continuing opportunities for close collaboration with them in educational, scientific, and cultural interchange, the new international university would find it impossible to develop as a great institution.

The question of financial support for an international university raises very serious problems. The establishment of a new institution of this kind, adequately equipped with buildings, libraries, laboratories, and so on, and adequately staffed, would require enormous financial resources. If it seems preferable to make one of the national universities the international university of the future, the reorganization, with all that it involves, would also call for large funds although the expense would not be as great as for a new institution. There is also the question as to whether all the governments would be able to or inclined to contribute financially to an international university located in another country to the detriment, perhaps, of their own national institutions of higher learning. While private funds, including foundation funds, might be sought, it would be difficult if not impossible to find the large sums needed to finance the establishment of even a small university from these sources.

There are a number of problems involved in the administration and staffing of an international organization or institution of which such international bodies as the United Nations and its specialized agencies and the Organization of American States are well aware. The development of an effective administrative and professional staff, composed of nationals of different countries with very different cultures, is a complicated process involving many kinds of adjustments while developing an esprit de corps in a new international institution. This process of living together and working together on problems of common concern is an extremely important element in the development of international understanding, which is one of the major aims of the international university, but it calls for much understanding of peoples and their cultures and of methods of bringing them together in a common cause.

Only an international staff of the highest quality would draw a high level student body. One of the questions in creating a new inter-American university would be whether or not outstanding professors in the American Republics could or would leave their posts to participate in a new university venture where they would not have some of the perquisites that they now have—tenure, provisions for retirement, and so on. In time the new university might be able to regulate such matters, but in the beginning the finding of an expert staff might be difficult, especially if, as seems probable, the national universities of the area would not want to release their best professors.

Another problem of serious import would be that of the equivalence of degrees and the validity of diplomas. One concept of an international university is that of a kind of superinstitution of higher learning awarding diplomas valid in all counties and substituting itself, so to speak, for the national universities. Such a concept would not only be dangerous to the latter, but would be unrealizable at this time. Moreover, the question of reciprocity of degrees and diplomas continues to present one of the most difficult problems in the whole field of international educational relations in spite of continuing efforts to solve it. It might not be too difficult to establish for the degrees of the inter-American university a purely academic,

scientific or honorary validity, but it is certain that all the Republics would not accept these degrees for the exercise of the professions.

Finally, some of the most basic problems in organizing an inter-American university would be those connected with the development of a curriculum for an international institution such as that suggested in Senate Joint Resolution 174 "a curriculum specially drawn to impart deeper understanding of those legal, social, commercial and political problems common to the nations of the Western Hemisphere." While recognizing the important contribution that study along these lines in an international institution might make to better inter-American relations, the question must be raised as to how to balance the national needs of the several States, which are sending their youth to be educated in the inter-American center, with the international character and aims of the university. How, in this internationally oriented institution, can an education be given which would enable the students both to understand and to exercise their responsibilities as citizens and to prepare them for their future careers in business or the professions in their home countries? Although the inter-American university might be especially qualified to prepare students for careers in the international field, there are not too many opportunities available for careers in the foreign service and other government services, teaching and certain kinds of business enterprises which involve international trade and commerce, for which training in international relations would be of great importance.

III. CONCLUSIONS

Undoubtedly, as the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations states in its report on Senate Joint Resolution 174 (Report No. 2671, 84th Congress, 2d session, July 20, 1956), "the increasing degree of cultural and commercial relations between the United States and its neighbors to the South warrants the development of educational facilities which would contribute to the greater appreciation of mutual problems confronted by our peoples." The suggestion that one way to serve this goal would be the creation of a University of the Americas, is one that is well worth consideration. However, while many of the ideas behind the proposal for the creation of such a university are sound, a project of such magnitude and complexity would be extremely difficult of realization, at least in any immediate future. The prospects for the acceptance of the proposal by the American States, all of whom would have to contribute largely of their educational funds for the support of a great inter-American university, would be doubtful. While the final decision on this matter should not be made before the attitudes of the American States toward it have been surveyed, experience to date with the financing of such regional projects would seem to indicate that many States, even though they were deeply interested in participating in such a project, would find it difficult and even impossible to provide their share of financial support.

Again experience would indicate that the successful operation of a truly international or regional university, in which nationals of the several participating countries would have to learn to live together and work together along new lines of endeavor, would be extremely difficult, especially if the operation was on a large scale.

Since the idea of a great inter-American university has never been fully realized, there is relatively little experience on which to base plans for the development of a new inter-American institution on the university level. Even if a decision were made to create a university, during the early stages the institution should be kept extremely small and should work only within certain very limited areas.

In view of the fact that Senate Joint Resolution 174 only calls for the establishment of a commission to make a full and complete investigation and study, including consultations with officials of the OAS, for the purpose of determining the possibility and desirability of establishing a University of the Americas, to be a center of higher education for the people of all nations of the Western Hemisphere, any further suggestions on the university projects might be premature.

REVIEW BY INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION OF RAILROAD PASSENGER TRAIN AND FERRY DISCONTINUANCES—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Under authority of the order of the Senate of March 9, 1959, the name of Mr. KUCHEL was added as an additional cosponsor of the bill (S. 1331) to amend the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, so as to strengthen and improve the national transportation system, insure the protection of the public interest, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. CASE of New Jersey (for himself and other Senators) on March 9, 1959.

PRINTING OF REVIEW OF REPORT ON MISSISSIPPI RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES, HARBOR IMPROVEMENTS AT NATCHEZ, MISS. (S. DOC. NO. 16)

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, on behalf of the chairman of the Committee on Public Works, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], I present a letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a report, dated September 16, 1958, from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a review report on Mississippi River and tributaries with respect to harbor improvements at Natchez, Miss., requested by a resolution of the Committee on Public Works, U.S. Senate. The reports of the district engineer and the Mississippi River Commission are favorable for the improvement, with an economic ratio of about 4 to 1, but the report of the Chief of Engineers is unfavorable. Because of the public interest involved, I ask unanimous consent that the report be printed as a Senate document, with illustrations, and referred to the Committee on Public Works.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, March 16, 1959, he presented to the President of the United States the enrolled bill (S. 79) to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to permit the temporary listing and certification of citrus red No. 2 for coloring mature oranges under tolerances found safe by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, so as to permit continuance of established coloring practice in the orange industry pending congressional consideration of general legislation for the listing and certification of food color additives under safe tolerances.

MEDICAL EXAMINATIONS FOR CIVILIAN PILOTS

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD, at the end of my remarks, an article entitled "Closer Medical Check on Civilian Pilots Set." This article appeared in Washington's Sunday Star of March 15.

The article reports an important development and a step in the right direction in efforts to provide more adequate tests for civilian pilots, particularly airline pilots.

I drew attention to this important and difficult problem in remarks made on the floor of the Senate on February 16 and 26, this year. It is not my purpose to restate the problem now.

But I do wish to point out that the regulations governing medical requirements for all civilian pilots are being completely rewritten, as the newspaper article reports. I am hopeful that this revision—the first since the rules were set up in 1926—will help to make air travel more safe.

The revision, by the new Federal Aviation Administration, I understand, will include a provision for special tests for older pilots. It is interesting to note, in this connection, that civilian aviation does just the opposite of what the Armed Forces do with their older pilots.

The article points to this and other facts, which I believe the Members of the Senate will find to be both interesting and important in the urgent matter of greater air safety.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from New Hampshire?

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CLOSER MEDICAL CHECK ON CIVILIAN PILOTS SET—CRACKDOWN IS EXPECTED THIS SUMMER AS OPENER IN FULL OVERHAUL OF CODE

(By Andrew W. Bingham)

The official rules and regulations governing medical requirements for all nonmilitary pilots are being completely rewritten for the first time since they were established in 1926.

The entire job will take about 5 years. But the first elements of the sweeping revision should be in effect sometime this summer, according to Dr. John E. Smith, Acting Civil Air Surgeon.

They will make it tougher for many would-be flyers to get their licenses.

Standards for commercial airline pilots were termed inadequate by three leading authorities in a story in the Star last month. The authorities, urging immediate action, called the situation urgent.

The important revisions for all nonmilitary pilots include:

1. Automatic denial of a license to anyone who is a diabetic taking insulin; has a coronary heart condition, or has a history of a serious mental illness.

2. Special tests for older pilots.

3. Having physical examinations conducted only by doctors designated by the Federal Aviation Agency.

QUESADA'S OK NEEDED

The net result of the changes should be a sound medical program, according to Dr.

Smith. He adds that in certain areas—particularly with the automatic denials—individual rights will be denied arbitrarily in the interests of aviation and public safety. To become effective, the new regulations must be approved by Federal Aviation Administrator Elwood R. Quesada.

Putting across this program with the aviation industry could be one of the severest tests facing the new Federal Aviation Agency, according to at least one veteran authority in the field.

"The current medical program is so full of holes that it has needed a complete redoing for a long, long time," said Dr. W. R. Stovall, head of the Medical Division of the Civil Aeronautics Administration (now the FAA) for 17 years before his retirement a year ago.

CRASH RECALLED

But he added: "Most of the industry will be afraid that many people will get caught up in the new requirements. Many people will hold back and hope the system won't work."

Doctors in the FAA are convinced that the present system is not working.

No plane crash has ever been attributed to the physical failure of the pilot, they admit, but there is much circumstantial evidence that this factor plays a more important part than is generally admitted.

They often cite cases in air transport and private flying to prove their point.

In one commercial airline accident involving several fatalities, for instance, investigation showed that the copilot did not have a valid medical certificate. The pilot did have an unlimited first-class certificate; but it was discovered after the accident that the Navy had previously found him unqualified for duty involving actual control of an airplane because of a serious heart condition.

BOTH KILLED IN ACCIDENT

Both the pilot and copilot were killed in the accident. The Flight Safety Foundation, which cited this case in an official, Government-paid survey of the medical aspects of civil aviation, pointed out these facts were not used to "imply that a medical condition was related to the accident; it does point up, however, the possibility that there could be medical implications in some accidents where no other cause can be found."

Dr. Smith cites another case of a crop duster who, after completing his early morning work, told companions he was hungry and would fly to the local airport for a meal. He crashed and was killed shortly after takeoff.

Investigation showed the man was a diabetic who required insulin. "All the evidence is that this man needed insulin and was having a reaction," Dr. Smith explained, "although the official cause for such crashes as this is usually something like 'flying too low.'"

CASE OF PSYCHOTIC CITED

Another example of the shortcomings of the present system is the pilot who, a few years ago, dangerously buzzed Des Moines, Iowa, for several hours. Examination revealed he was a psychotic who had been denied a driver's license in the State.

FAA officials also point out that while the safety record for commercial airlines is very good, the record for others is nothing to be proud of. According to their official statistics, a total of 10,938,000 hours were flown in general aviation, excluding the transports, in 1957. There were 4,217 accidents, of which 429 involved fatalities. Exactly 800 persons were killed.

Currently, private pilots who have less rigid physical requirements to meet than the commercial pilots, are examined by doctors of their own choosing. This means that of the 230,000 physical examinations checked by the FAA each year, 150,000 are from doctors not designated by the Agency. All pilots except private pilots must go to a designated examiner.

SAFETY REPORT QUOTED

The nondesignated doctors, it is often pointed out, have received no special instructions on how to conduct the exams; they seldom have any knowledge of aviation medicine, and they often have no special feeling of responsibility toward the FAA.

The Flight Safety Foundation pointed out in its report:

"There are known cases where the (medical) certificates have been issued by mail; where examinations are conducted without the applicant being required to remove his coat; where numerous consecutive reports have been turned in with identical blood pressures and identical figures for specific gravity from urinalysis."

There is also, both for the designated and nondesignated examiners, a perpetual question of interpretation of the requirements, which are often stated in the broadest terms. The safety foundation noted, for instance, that "an applicant may be denied certification because an examiner may not feel he is psychologically suited, yet the basis shown on the report may be borderline blood pressure."

REGIONAL TEST CENTERS

The new FAA program, besides requiring all pilots to go to designated examiners, will include more dynamic training for these examiners and an inspection system to check their work and their equipment.

"What we're after is more quality control," said Dr. Smith.

Still another part of the program will be to establish three regional testing centers where pilots who do not pass the initial examination may go for more intensive testing. "It's the only fair thing to do," Dr. Smith said. These tests—unlike the initial ones—would be conducted at Government expense.

The special requirements for older pilots will include more detailed physiological examination and additional eye tests. The standards have not yet been worked out, according to Dr. Smith, and there will be difficulty in doing so.

SENIORITY SYSTEM CITED

"The eye requirements for older men now are completely inadequate," he said, "But at present we don't know any rational basis for making changes."

The problem is an urgent one, he said, because of the airline pilots' seniority system. "Civil aviation does just the reverse of what the Armed Forces do with their older pilots," he said.

The Navy, for instance, automatically downgrades any pilot who reaches 50 years of age. The most senior, and often the oldest, airline pilots on the other hand, get first crack at the newest, fastest equipment.

According to Captain Henry H. Meadows, U.S.N., physical qualifications officer for Navy aviation, pilots start slipping after 40. A usual decline in vision is the primary reason for the automatic downgrading at 50 years, he said, although generally higher blood pressure and slower reflexes also play a part.

Any Navy pilot over 50 who wants to continue flying on an unrestricted basis, he said, must undergo special tests. It is a system such as this which the FAA intends to establish.

MAY SMOOTH RELATIONS

The new medical program should help smooth relations between the FAA and the Civil Aeronautics Board, which until the establishment of the FAA last year made the regulations and which still hears and decides appeals from applicants denied certification by the FAA.

In the past, the CAB has decided many of these appeals against the FAA—and the old CAA. It has, as the Flight Safety Foundation report noted, given certification to "airmen with vision in only one eye, with almost complete hearing loss, with variable loss of limbs (including a quadriplegic), with below-standard depth perception and color vision, and with many other physical or medical deficiencies."

Such cases have occurred in all classes of pilots, although they are most prevalent among student and private pilots.

The FAA feels particularly strongly about 32 recent appeals, 26 of which have been decided so far—and all against the FAA. "With such a situation, there's almost no point in having a medical program," Dr. Smith said.

TROUBLE OFTEN COMPOUNDED

Part of the trouble is caused by the provision in the current physical requirements which permits issuance of limited medical certificates to pilots who have deficiencies but are able to compensate for them.

Also, in these same requirements, under the headings of "General Physical Condition" and "Nervous System," the wording is that the applicant shall not have defects or diseases which "would be likely" to interfere with his safe performance in the air.

In many cases, FAA personnel feel they cannot prove an applicant would be unsafe until he actually has a crash; and then it's too late.

The trouble is often compounded by the inability of the FAA to be represented at the hearings by a medical specialist and by the sketchy data on which it often must base its objections.

A high CAB official, for instance, last week told of one pending appeals case involving a diabetic who requires insulin. The applicant's chief witness at the hearing was a top doctor from the Mayo Clinic who had personally observed the man for a week and who insisted he would not be a danger in the air.

RIGHTS OF INDIVIDUAL

The FAA was represented by one of its regional attorneys, who could state the Agency's general position, but who could not give testimony on the actual condition of the applicant.

"Which way do you think the hearing examiner is going to decide the case?" the official asked.

"All we have been asking," said another CAB official, "is that the agency translate into reasonable terms the significance of the applicant's condition." He added that the Board "has always regarded very seriously the rights of the individual; this is a very fundamental factor."

STORY OF DEAD MAN TOLD

The Board is interested in knowing for instance, why a private pilot should be denied certification for flying by himself when no one questions his capability to drive a car, he said.

Many experts feel, however, that the CAB has gone too far in protecting the rights of the individual.

"I have seen a number of cases in the last 2 years where I would never have granted the applicant his certificate, and the CAB did," said Dr. William J. Kennard, a member of the American Medical Association special committee on aviation medical problems and a retired Air Force brigadier general who was head of the aviation medical division of the Air Force Surgeon General's office.

"There's a story of the CAB granting a man his certificate after a year's delay and finding that he had died," Dr. Kennard said. "Some of the cases I've seen were about that bad."

Dr. Smith and other FAA personnel hope that the new, more specific regulations, combined with an expanded and improved medical examination system, will end the controversy.

"The role of the CAB in the appeals cases then will be to determine whether or not

the applicant meets the medical requirements, rather than whether or not he will be a danger in the air," Dr. Smith said. Under the new regulations, he said, the whole air safety program will have a sound medical foundation.

HORSE AND BUGGY DAYS

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, the March issue of the Freeman magazine contains an article by Mr. Ralph Bradford entitled "Horse and Buggy Days." Mr. Bradford effectively counters remarks that are frequently and sarcastically made about "horse and buggy days" being out of date. This article contains a number of facts which long ago should have been set forth. For example, in referring to those persons who object to going back to the "horse and buggy days," Mr. Bradford asks this question:

Do you happen to believe that a nation, like an individual, should pay its debts honestly and honorably and not defraud its creditors by forcing them to accept payment in depreciated money? Then surely you are a hangover from the horse and buggy period.

I think that many of our young people, as well as their elders, might well refresh their memories as to the principles which were established in past years.

I ask unanimous consent that the article from the Freeman be inserted in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HORSE AND BUGGY DAYS

(By Ralph Bradford)

One way to damn a person who speaks up for solvency in these spendiferous years is to ask him scathingly, "What do you want us to do—go back to the horse and buggy days?"

This not only conjures up the image of an outmoded means of transportation, but denotes also that the person addressed has a primitive and unprogressive outlook. To say of a man that he possesses a horse and buggy mind is to bury him very deep indeed in blackest obloquy.

A President of the United States gave great currency to the phrase in the middle thirties. The Supreme Court had invalidated one of his pet interventionist measures by declaring it unconstitutional. To the joy and satisfaction of his worshipful followers, he put the Court in its place by asserting that its decision would take the country back to the horse and buggy days.

Since then the phrase has served many a progressive spender when he felt the need of administering oral chastisement to some benighted devotee of a balanced budget and a sound currency.

Do you happen to believe that a nation, like an individual, should pay its debts honestly and honorably and not defraud its creditors by forcing them to accept payment in depreciated money? Then surely you are a hangover from the horse and buggy period.

Do you think it is unfair to your grandchildren to pile up mountainous debt and leave it for them to pay as best they can? Ah then, quite clearly you belong to the horse and buggy type of mentality.

Are you concerned lest continued governmental spending, year after year, of more than it takes in will lead to insolvency and ruin? Why then—what's the matter, man, do you want us to go back to the horse and buggy days?

It is a verbal dagger that has caused many a stout heart to quail and grow faint—and I often wonder why. Actually, the horse and buggy days constituted one of the most enlightened and progressive periods in human history.

THE BUGGY CAME LATER

The horse, of course, served mankind from very early times. We see him in prehistoric picture tablets, bearing burdens and drawing loads. Sometimes he is depicted drawing sledges; at others he is hitched to carts or wagons. Here and there we find him galloping fiercely ahead of Assyrian or Roman chariots of war. Later he furnished the power for cumbersome but on the whole rather stately coaches.

But the light, delicate, strong, and easily handled vehicle with the unfortunate name of "buggy"—this was a latecomer in the large family of horse-drawn contraptions and did not reach very general use until around 1800. Its age was roughly the 19th century.

In itself it was a distinct advancement over many of its predecessors. In England it was generally a two-wheeled conveyance drawn by one horse hitched between side members known as shafts. It developed also in India, where it usually had a hood, or top.

The American buggy could be drawn either by a single horse between shafts, or by a team hitched to an equalizer called a double-tree, and harnessed on either side of a guiding pole, usually called the "tongue." There were several varieties of buggy in this country, with or without tops. When there was a top, it could be let down in fair weather and put up in foul. Side curtains could be snapped on when it rained, and a storm curtain was also supplied, with an isinglass window and protected slots for the reins, or "lines" as most people called them. This curtain came from the top down over the dashboard in front, thus enabling driver and passenger to proceed snugly through the rain.

A feature of most buggies was the so-called fifth wheel. This was a horizontal metal ring, made up of two parts that rotated on each other around the king-bolt or center pin of the swinging front axle. This fifth wheel, far from being the useless appendage that its name came later to imply, was a valuable addition to travel comfort in that it prevented careening, and also enabled the buggy to be turned around in a very short compass.

So much for the buggy as a means of transportation—a light, springed, cushioned, sometimes rubber-tired, generally, comfortable, and often gaily painted little conveyance. It was a "modern" vehicle in which people went happily and not at all uncomfortably about the business of getting from one place to another—or of going nowhere in particular. People often "took a spin" for pleasure in their buggies, just as they later did in their automobiles.

A PERIOD OF REMARKABLE PROGRESS

But what of the horse and buggy days? What of that dark and dismal era to which you are quickly consigned if you are so brash as to ask, regarding any piece of public work, "What does it cost?" What, in short, of that period in history which is the present-day symbol of backwardness and stagnation?

The horse and buggy days? Well, to start out with, they were the days of Watt and Evans and Bull and M'Naughton—days in which the imaginations of men dreamed up ways to harness the expansive power of steam to make it push a piston and finally turn a wheel. They were the days of George and Robert Stephenson, of Peter Cooper and their successors, who believed that the steam engine could be made to drive a thing they called a locomotive—and who made it work. They were the days of Symington and Bell and Fitch and Fulton, who set steam to turning the paddles of watercraft; and of Ericsson, who did away with the paddles in favor of a submerged screw.

The horse and buggy days? They saw Corliss perfect the reciprocating engine; they saw De Laval invent the steam turbine. And when it seemed that steam had about reached the zenith of its development, they saw the age of electricity begin and develop. It was the age of Volta, Farraday, Kelvin, Maxwell, Ampere, Ohm—bold thinkers and patient experimenters who advanced the theories and surmises of Galvani, Franklin, and the other pioneers to the point of practical use and application.

And then, right in the middle of the horse-and-buggy period—it was 1837—the name of a portrait painter named Morse flashed upon the electric horizon, and the telegraph was born. A few years later the Brett Brothers, followed by Crampton, pioneered the ocean cable by laying the first wires under the English Channel. And in 1858, while the horse and buggy were still a going concern, the New World and the Old were joined by Field's transatlantic cable.

In 1879, driven to his work no doubt by horse-and-buggy transport, Thomas Edison invented the incandescent bulb, and the era of electric illumination broke splendidly upon the world. And just ahead of that, young Alexander Bell spoke his summoning words to Watson over the first telephone.

While the horse-drawn cabs and carts of Paris went cloppety-clop over the paving stones, a young couple named Curie toiled in their dreary workshop to startle the world with the magic of radium; and while there were as yet only a few automobiles in the whole world, a young Italian named Marconi had dispatched the first wireless message. In the same period the human voice, acoustically recorded on wax and zinc, was reproduced mechanically, and the now-commonplace but then-miraculous moving picture was created.

While all this was going on, sail gave place to steam on the high seas, and men went from continent to continent amid all the comforts and thrills of great luxury liners—but they went to the dock in a conveyance of the horse and buggy days. The crude engines of Stephenson and Cooper evolved into mighty moguls with compound drive, and the American Continent was spanned and crisscrossed with a railroad system of fabulous speed, comfort, and dependability—even while the passengers drove to the depots in horse-drawn cabs and buggies.

That was because men of inventive skills and entrepreneurial talents thought first of mass transport rather than of individual conveyance. When mass transport had been well served by the development of ship and train, those skills and talents were directed to the needs and desires of the individual and the family; the internal combustion engine was soon brought to practical perfection, and the automobile followed.

But while the automobile was still an infant and the horse and buggy age was still in lusty stride, another bit of magic was wrought by men of genius and persistence. The Wright brothers flew above the sands of Kitty Hawk. The air age, too, began in the horse-and-buggy days.

MEDICAL DEVELOPMENT

These paragraphs have traced only the more dramatic and obvious achievements. Medical science also advanced in the same period with seven-league strides. It was the century of Laennec, who invented the stethoscope, of Serturner, who isolated morphine from the opium gum, of Long and Morton, who developed ether. In this dark age Auenbrugger and Corvisart discovered percussive diagnosis; Bright solved the meaning of urinary albumen, Blundell devised blood transfusion, and Semmelweiss discovered the cause and prevention of the deadly puerperal fever. Virchow laid the foundation for cellular pathology, Pasteur

demonstrated the germ theory of disease, Lister began the use of antiseptics, McDowell introduced abdominal surgery, and Roentgen invented, or rather discovered, the X-ray.

Malaria and yellow fever were conquered. Typhoid, once a dread scourge, was practically eliminated. Tuberculosis, the great killer, lost much of its terror. Smallpox was reduced to manageable proportions. Surgery was vastly improved and extended. And perhaps most significant of all, the importance of mind in the cure and prevention of disease was recognized.

SOCIAL AND POLITICAL GROWTH

It was a century of the greatest invention and material progress and general prosperity that the world had ever known or dreamed of, and it was all done in the horse-and-buggy days.

It was a time, too, of social and political progress. Here in the Western World a new Nation had just been founded, based on fresh new principles of self-government. The theory of the divine right of kings had run its course. The ancient ideas of monarchial and other highly centralized authorities were gradually abandoned in favor of representative government. The liberty and importance of the individual were stressed, and statesmen were careful to build up safeguards for man's freedom of conscience and of choice.

At the core of the new attitude was a wholesome fear of government. Comprehending fully that government was necessary for their protection, men who understood its nature, who knew its fatal tendency to grow and spread and feed upon the substance of its own people, men who in their own lifetimes had experienced its tyrannies over mind and body, such men held with Jefferson that the best governed were the least governed; and in forming a wholly new Nation they set up checks and balances among the several arms of their government, all designed to preserve the greatest degree of freedom to people as individuals.

As the 19th century moved further into the horse-and-buggy age, society developed still further its social conscience and consciousness. At a prodigious cost of life and treasure, human slavery was abolished. Child labor was first outmoded by industrial progress, and then outlawed. Within the States, education was broadened and extended. Beneficent laws were enacted to protect the honest and unwary from exploitation at the hands of the unscrupulous. And quite apart from the compulsions of law, enlightened policies evolved in business and industry respecting the relations of management with labor and with the general public.

REVOLUTION IN AGRICULTURE

It was also a time of growth and development in many fields other than those we have mentioned. Agriculture was being studied, and men were going in for what they called scientific farming, with the laudable object of increasing production. They never dreamed that a time would come when they would be paid by their Government not to produce.

Chemistry was then the top magician, as electronics was later to be. Invention was the obsession of many; and out of the great seethe of questing minds, the world was enriched. The moldboard and landside plows, the mowing machine, the semiautomatic hay rake, the multiple-furrow drill that placed seed and fertilizer in the ground at the same time, the mechanical broadcasting machine for sowing grasses and small grains, the checkrow planter for corn and cotton, the reaper, the binder, the steam-powered combine—all these came along in those benighted horse-and-buggy days.

So did the trolley car, at first horse drawn, later pulled by cables, and at last electrically driven. So did the elevator or lift, which made multiple-story buildings possible. The sleeping car, the automatic coupling, the air brake and the refrigerator car—four primary essentials to railroad progress—all were invented in the horse-and-buggy days.

It was an amazing time of development—roughly a century of man-wrought miracles. More strides were made toward speed, production, comfort, health, ease, and general diffusion of material benefits than had taken place in all the previous ages of human experience lumped together.

A TIME OF SOLVENCY

And along with other virtues, it was generally a time of solvency. Following the Revolutionary War the Colonies were heavily in debt. Not yet a united country, not yet truly a self-governing Nation, but rather an alliance of separate and often antagonistic provinces, the war-created Continental Congress of the nation-about-to-be had attempted the impossible by creating a kind of fiat paper money. It was called continental currency to distinguish it from the money issued by the several Colonies on their own authority, and its individual notes were referred to as "continentals." This money soon became so worthless that the phrase "not worth a continental" was invented to describe anything that was completely without value. There was a terrific inflation—which is another way of saying that the Congress had spent on the war far more than it could realize from taxes, and had issued bales of excess and unsupported paper money. The cost of living went sky high—which simply meant that, with no confidence in the plentiful continentals, people preferred things to money and bid up their prices accordingly. But then came the new constitutional Republic, buttressed by the improved monetary policies of Hamilton; and in a short time the young country again had a currency that meant something.

It would, of course, be naive to assert that absolute monetary and financial stability characterized the century of the horse and buggy. These lines are not written to overglamorize that period, nor to gloss over its shortcomings. There was pronounced inflation during the Civil War period; and there were other cycles of financial and industrial boom and subsequent panic.

Certainly it is not contended that voters and their agents in Congress during the 19th century understood thoroughly the fundamentals of monetary and credit policy. Then as now, the exploiters and victims of boom and bust blamed one another, and little suspected that Government tampering with money had helped cause bad conditions—which further tampering was expected to cure.

Nevertheless, the people of the horse-and-buggy century did generally hold a conservatively healthy respect for solvency. Of course, they knew about debt and its proper uses. They did not at all hesitate to borrow when it was good business to do so. They could have understood, and did understand, an occasional deficit year on the part of their government, when some unusual circumstance controlled.

But to operate on a permanent deficit basis, to keep piling debt on top of debt endlessly, cheapening their money and threatening their standards of living in the process—this is a procedure that would have been revolting to their reason and offensive to their practical good sense. Is this another reason to be slightly nostalgic about the horse-and-buggy days?

Now it is about time for somebody to rise up and say, "What do you want to do—go back to those horse-and-buggy days?" And that, needless to say, is nonsense. I couldn't go back if I would, and I wouldn't if I could. Those days had many discomforts and some hardships—though I must say they were not then so regarded. But nobody in his senses wants to go backward. The way of life and of progress is forward, to new comforts, inventions, achievements, adventures.

UNCHANGING TRUTHS

But there are certain things that do not change, whatever the age. Living in the space age does not alter the fact that honesty is the best policy. The miracle of atomic fission does not negate that two and two make four. A thermonuclear bomb may destroy a city and raise a cloud 100 miles high, but it does not destroy the truth that neither a man nor a nation can forever spend more than it takes in and escape bankruptcy. Supersonic speed can never take us away from the truth that human freedom and welfare are conditioned by limitations upon governmental power.

Such truths, which seem so easily forgotten or ignored today, were not merely in existence but were recognized and generally understood and acted upon during the horse-and-buggy days.

Some time ago I saw a drawing that depicted the parlor of an American home around 1900. The windows were heavily draped. The walls were hung with family portraits. An upright piano stood in the corner. A wood stove furnished heat. Even a "God Bless Our Home" motto was hanging above the door. The picture was supposed to be funny to a present-day viewer. But it failed to amuse me.

I was conscious that the scene typified an era. Maybe we shall have other eras as good, but we have not for many years enjoyed a period of time so filled with peace and comfort and lack of fretful worry, so rich with real security, and withall so full of freedom, as that one was.

Maybe the man of the picture had a small income by today's standards; but he had a comfortable home, and he lived well and saved money. And when he had saved that money, he was not haunted by the fear of ruinous inflation or the awareness that his savings were losing their value steadily and inexorably.

Maybe he ran a small business. If so, it was his business, not a kind of adjunct to the State. Nobody at Washington shed crocodile tears over his plight as a small businessman; and by the same token nobody at Washington or elsewhere told him how to run that business. If he wanted to expand it, he did so within the limits of his resources and credit, without securing the consent or approval of any bureau or commission, whether of the State or Federal Government.

Or possibly he was a farmer. If so, he was free to plant as many acres as he liked to whatever crops he pleased and sell his produce at the price it would bring in a relatively free market. If he could devise some way to raise more or better wheat or hogs or beef or wool or cotton, he was free to do so without being subject to fine and prosecution.

He had his problems, that turn-of-the-century householder, whatever his occupation. He probably knew some hardships. But actually he enjoyed a far greater sense of security than he would today.

SECURITY SOUGHT AND LOST

Security. What an irony the word contains. What are we secure from today, with the threat of thermonuclear devastation hanging over our lives? Are we secure in our position as a nation? If so, then why are we afraid? Are we secure economically? Then why the almost frenzied analysis and counteranalysis of the recent business slowup? And what of our so-called social security? What does it mean to the average beneficiary, when the dollars that he and his employer have paid in have already been spent for other governmental operations, while the promised benefits have shrunk to less than half their value, and are still shrinking?

Go back to the horse-and-buggy days? Certainly not. The way of life is forward, even though it may lead to disaster before it leads to fulfillment. But we might very well and with great profit go back to some of the moral values and some of the economic horse sense of that much maligned period.

At least we can stop referring to it with sneering condescension as though it were a kind of modern dark age. It was in fact a great and glowing century, excelling all others before it, and all of them combined, in the richness and variety of its unfoldment.

POLIO IS GAINING

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD an editorial appearing in the March 11, 1959, issue of the Washington Daily News. This editorial gives a timely warning that the danger of polio is still with us and warns us that we must continue the fight by urging all to use the Salk vaccine.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

POLIO IS GAINING

Remember only a few years ago when people in this country, especially parents with small children, were almost frantic with fear of infantile paralysis, or polio?

In 1954, this disease killed or maimed 18,308 persons.

The next year Dr. Jonas Salk was able to announce an answer—the now celebrated Salk vaccine. The clamor for this vaccine bordered on hysteria. The Government put up money. Doctors' offices were stormed for shots. Vaccine manufacturers worked overtime.

In 1957, the polio casualty list was down to 2,499. People thought of polio as being virtually extinct—as well-conquered as smallpox or typhoid. But something happened. The desperation of 1954 and earlier years disappeared.

The vaccine, 85 to 90 percent effective, was available in abundant quantities. But the alarm subsided. The vaccine isn't being used.

So we cite these statistics: Last year polio cases were up 24 percent; in the first 8 weeks of this year, they are up 55 percent.

If your children (or you, if you are in the susceptible years) have not had the Salk shots and you think this editorial is intended to scare you, that's right. This disease is a killer. It is making a comeback. What more do you need to know?

OUTRAGE IN OIL

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a very appropriate article appearing in the March 16, 1959, issue of Barron's entitled "Outrage in Oil."

This article raises another very important question. If our oil is in such a surplus that we need import quotas as well as production quotas here in our own producing areas to prevent oversupply, then why continue the 27½-percent depletion allowance to encourage even greater discovery and supply?

The time is long overdue when we should cut this special tax privilege and give both the consumer and the taxpayer a break.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OUTRAGE IN OIL—IMPORT QUOTAS WILL HARM PRODUCER AND CONSUMER ALIKE

In the voluminous annals of American industry, the 27th of August 1859, enjoys a special place. On that redletter day Edwin L. Drake, ex-railroad conductor and entrepreneur extraordinary, made the first commercial discovery of oil, not on some vast Texas plain, as might be expected, but near the quiet little farming town of Titusville, in western Pennsylvania. The epoch-making event already has been celebrated, in story if not yet in song, by publication of an entertaining book aptly titled "The Great Oildorado." In coming months, if all goes according to plan, the centennial also will be marked by the proclamation of Titusville Week, the issuance of a commemorative stamp and, tentatively at any rate, the sealing of a time capsule in a replica of the original well.

Such gestures are a fitting tribute to a remarkable fuel, which, since its discovery, has played a vital part in the mighty U.S. economic and military machine. Unfortunately, however, owing to the untimely intrusion of the Federal Government, the occasion has lost some of its luster. For in a year dedicated to the power and glory of domestic petroleum, Washington perversely has chosen to underscore its growing competitive weakness. Last Tuesday the White House imposed mandatory quotas on imports of crude oil and refined products. According to a proclamation of the President, the move was made to safeguard the national security. More jaundiced observers tend to view it as a political gift to U.S. oil and coal producers, thoughtfully wrapped in the flag. While the causes may be murky, however, the probable effects are all too plain. Import quotas will damage American prestige abroad. They will hurt the consumer at home. In the end, they are likely to lead to outright Federal control of an industry which once was famous for its flaming independence.

This mess of protectionist pottage has been threatening to boil over for a long time. It started to simmer 5 years ago, when Congress, at the behest of domestic producers of coal and oil, passed a special amendment to the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act. Specifically, the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization (then known as ODM) was given authority to decide whether imports of any commodity constituted a danger to the country. With this club in the closet, to change the metaphor, the agency soon persuaded the importers (who include not only the major integrated companies, but also a growing number of smaller operators) to embrace a system of voluntary import restraints. Though fairly effective, the velvet glove policy failed to satisfy the protectionists. Under their relentless pressure, the White House last week finally was persuaded to bare its iron fist. Complete details of the mandatory scheme are not available; the harsh outlines, however, may be discerned. To begin with, it covers not merely crude, but also, for the first time, residual fuel oil and other products. Effective immediately, moreover, all imports will be reduced, by as much as 20 percent in some cases. In a new and disturbing departure, finally, the Government plans to act as a kind of watchdog over petroleum prices.

To justify its outrageous program, the administration, as noted, has taken refuge in the plea of national security. Specifically, it cites the decision of OCDM that oil imports, at recent levels, constitute a threat to domestic producers, whose wellbeing, in turn, is viewed as a strategic imperative. Despite its impressive authorship, this finding is clearly suspect. Imports, to begin with, have not throttled the domestic industry; at worst they have tended to slow its growth. From the military standpoint, moreover, Canadian oil, the flow of which also has been curtailed, is surely neither more vulnerable nor less valuable than its U.S. counterpart. Finally, the OCDM seems absurdly out-of-date in its whole approach. Like the proverbial generals, the defense officials are preparing for the next war with the tactics of the last. Yet, if one is to credit the testimony of the Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces (given the very day after he issued his proclamation), the United States never again will fight a major war with anything but atomic weapons. In such a holocaust, oil in the ground is a dubious asset.

The advantages of the mandatory program thus are illusory; the drawbacks, contrariwise, are very real. For consumers, the bill already has begun to mount: Scarcely had the new curbs been announced when one Midwest refiner, the forerunner of others throughout the country, raised the price of gasoline. As to the industry, some producers, notably those misleadingly known as independents, may enjoy a temporary windfall. Their gains, however, in part at least, will come out of the pockets of other oil concerns, notably large refiners such as Tidewater (which estimates its losses at roughly $25,000 per day). What is worse, they will be at the expense of the very system of free enterprise under which the venturesome oil business, perhaps more than most, has grown and prospered. Among other things, the new decree will mean Federal licensing and inspection; freeezing of competitive status; and, if history be any guide, trafficking in quotas and bootlegging of crude. Sooner or later, it could lead to price controls, all the way from wellhead to pump. Two years ago a high-ranking bureaucrat warned that "if mandatory curbs were initiated, there would be no assurance that they would not eventually blanket the industry." Unlike most forecasts out of Washington, his grim prophesy shows signs of coming true.

While the outlook, then, is none too bright, all is not yet lost. According to reports in the trade, several leading companies are planning to challenge the new controls on constitutional grounds. Perhaps in the courts they will succeeed in defending the rights which Congress and the White House have overridden. One can only wish them success in their quest. Meanwhile, as the industry prepares to observe its centennial, it will do well to ponder a homely truth. Since 1859 the oil business has thrived on individual risk and reward, not on Government largesse. Willingness to venture remains its best hope for the next hundred years.

FISCAL CONDITION OF ALASKA

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, when statehood for Alaska was debated in the 85th Congress, the question as to Alaska's ability to support a State was often raised, and we have heard echoes of this doubt expressed subsequently.

I have never had any doubt that Alaska would be able to support statehood, although it is clear that, in justice and fair play, Alaska is entitled to consideration for the inequities, discriminations, and injustices that were visited upon the 49th State during the 92 years of territorial rule. During that period, we were for 40 years denied inclusion in the Federal aid highway legislation. We were for years denied the appropriations the University of Alaska was entitled to as a land-grant college. Specific discriminatory provisions were written into the Merchant Marine Act of

1920 which brought about a steamship monopoly, and consequently the highest freight rates in the world—which are, in large part, the direct cause of Alaska's high cost of living. Many other such discriminations have greatly handicapped Alaska. I have named only a few; nevertheless, it gives me great pleasure to report that the first State legislature, while increasing its budget for the first year by $6 million, has balanced the budget, and is asking for no additional taxes to meet these increased appropriations.

I ask unanimous consent that a special dispatch to the New York Times from Juneau, Alaska's capital, reporting on this situation, be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ALASKA BUDGET UP BY 6 MILLION; NO TAX RISE ASKED TO BALANCE IT

JUNEAU, ALASKA, March 14.—Acting Gov. Hugh J. Wade offered the Alaska Legislature yesterday a balanced budget of $26,500,000 for the 12-month period beginning July 1. The budget does not call for any new tax measures.

The State will have a surplus of $3,049,000 on June 30, carried over from Territorial days.

The $26,500,000 budget is about $6 million more than Alaska spent under Territorial status last year.

The bulk of the increases is sought in three fields—education, health and welfare, and the fish and game department.

Alaska's existing State income tax is expected to produce the largest single source of income, $8,102,000. This is more than a million dollars greater than last year's receipts. Leased rentals for oil and gas lands and the State's share of receipts from the seal-fur sales of Pribolofs Island account for much of the additional expected revenue.

Despite the increase, the budget generally reflected the "hold the line" on spending outlined by Gov. William A. Egan shortly after he was elected last last year. More than $6 million was slashed from individual departmental requests. Governor Egan is now in Seattle, recuperating from surgery.

Mr. Wade cut State construction to a minimum, recommending the spending of only $800,000 of the $2 million worth of projects by the education department.

In his budget message, Mr. Wade said Alaska had entered statehood in a "sound financial condition," but he warned against optimism.

The Acting Governnor said Alaskans should not deceive themselves that the oil and gas lease revenue would continue indefinitely. "Sustained production is needed to make this a continuing major item of future income," he said. The rentals produced $3 million last year, but have risen as oil companies have launched large-scale explorations in the State.

The budget was the first presented to an Alaskan Legislature by an Alaska Governor. Under Territorial status the budget was compiled by the State finance department.

THE SOLICITOR GENERAL SUPPORTS THE SUPREME COURT

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article from the New York Times of Saturday, March 14, 1959, entitled "Rankin Assails Critics of Court."

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GRUENING in the chair). Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Pennsylvania?

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RANKIN ASSAILS CRITICS OF COURT—INSIDIOUS ATTACKS IMPERIL BENCH, SOLICITOR GENERAL TELLS PITTSBURGH BAR

(Special to the New York Times)

WASHINGTON, March 13.—Solicitor General J. Lee Rankin urged the country's lawyers today to support the Supreme Court.

"We cannot permit the Court's independence to be undermined by direct or indirect assaults," he said.

"Nor can we stand by and let the Court suffer for its declaration of some of the finest values in American life; for its recognition that the declared standards must be lived by; for the reaffirmation of the integrity of the individual; and that the State is required to treat its citizens with equality."

Mr. Rankin spoke to a Pittsburgh regional meeting of the American Bar Association.

Just last month, at its midwinter meeting, the association passed a series of resolutions critical of Supreme Court decisions to communism.

Mr. Rankin's speech was released by his office here.

Mr. Rankin offered stronger praise for the Supreme Court than has recently come from any other high administration official.

"If we did not have a Supreme Court today we would have to create one," he said, "or our basic freedoms would rapidly disappear.

"These are heroic times and man is engaged in a period of not only historic thoughts but orbital enterprises * * * With such rapid developments, involving great aggregations of capital, associations of labor and huge government, the individual never needed more the protection of his freedoms by an independent court."

Mr. Rankin suggested that continuous attacks on the Supreme Court may threaten its independence. He described the assault on the Court as "an insidious and indirect effort to affect its judgment."

"The layman cannot fully realize how much the Court means to the preservation of his freedoms and his fundamental rights," he said.

CRITICS RALLYING POINT

"But we who labor in the law know that our responsibility for the defense of the Court is therefore incomparably greater * * * we should be proud to support and defend each additional step toward the day that man shall be judged in accordance with his intrinsic worth as a member of the family of God."

Mr. Rankin traced past attacks on the Supreme Court. He said the Court today was "the target of a rare combination of dissident groups who have found common ground in their displeasure with decisions in their fields of special interest," and he asserted that "segregation is the particular rallying point."

Mr. Rankin defended the school segregation decision of 1954 as the only proper course for the Supreme Court to take. He said to have upheld the constitutionality of racially segregated schools would have broken with the line of recent decisions in racial cases, and he added:

"The consicence of a great people could not be denied so easily. It is also difficult to imagine how we could have justified such a judgment to the peoples of the world after repeated claims that under our law citizens have equal rights."

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I should like to associate myself particularly with the comments of the Solicitor General of the United States to the effect that the continuous attacks upon the Supreme Court may threaten its independence. The Solicitor General describes the assaults on the Court as "an insidious and indirect effort to affect its judgment."

As Mr. Rankin says, "The layman cannot fully realize how much the Court means to the preservation of his freedoms and his fundamental rights."

I am sure many Members of this body have the same views about the Supreme Court as those expressed by the distinguished Solicitor General of the United States.

WILEY URGES NATIONAL VIGILANCE IN BERLIN CRISIS

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, we recognize that today the world faces a serious threat to its peace and security—the Berlin crisis. A major question in the minds of leaders and citizens, at home and abroad, is: How can we find a solution to the crisis without war?

The challenge, as we fully appreciate, is complex. The situation is particularly difficult, since we must deal with the Communists, who have no principles, ethics, standards of conduct, or morality. Over the years, we have experienced that the sole criterion by which they justify action is whether or not it will forward the objectives of the Communist world conspiracy.

To meet the Soviet challenge in Berlin, will require:

First. Ever greater unity among our allies;

Second. Readiness of our Armed Forces including NATO, to protect us in the awful event that the Kremlin should attack us;

Third. Exhaustive efforts to find a reasonable, peaceful solution to the crisis;

Fourth. Mobilization, as much as possible, between now and May 27, of world opinion—perhaps through the United Nations—to "pressure" the Kremlin into a peaceful, or at least a nonwar solution to the crisis, which has been fostered by its own unjustified, immoral, and unlawful acts in Berlin.

Here in our own country, there are definite steps we must take, including:

Keeping our citizens alert to the dangers confronting us;

Encouraging a unified, bipartisan support of foreign policy;

Adoption of a strong defense program; and

Approval of an adequate mutual security program—to assure our allies that we stand with them shoulder-to-shoulder in defense of our world interests.

In our efforts to recognize and fulfill our bona fide obligations to the people of Berlin and the free world, we need to make it clear to the Communists that we will not be blackmailed or threatened into acquiescing in the Soviet's unwarranted demand for territorial expansion or unjustified violation of their international obligations.

Even though the situation is grave, however, I desire to emphasize that this is no time for hysteria. Nor is it a time to rush into a series of crash military programs, which—because of required long planning periods—would make

them useless in the present crisis and perhaps upset long-range planning to meet similar threats in the future.

Instead, we must stand firmly vigilant and ready to act shoulder-to-shoulder with our allies.

However, recognizing the extent to which the Kremlin appears willing to push the world toward war in the current crisis, we had better be forewarned for the future and make our plans, particularly for defense and mutual security, accordingly.

The March 14 edition of the New York Times carried a thought-provoking article on the contribution which mutual defense makes to strengthening the overall defense of the free world, as well as the need for an adequate defense program. I request unanimous consent to have the editorial, with a recently released statement by myself on the need for a strong mutual security program, printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the editorial and statement were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, Mar. 14, 1959]

BERLIN AND MUTUAL DEFENSE

With special reference to the threatening crisis over Berlin, President Eisenhower has opened the annual battle to maintain the collective military defense and defensive strength of the free world.

He had already called for $41 billion for our own Military Establishment, which is all he thinks he can use in this field. But our security, and world peace, do not rest on our own Military Establishment alone. They rest on the alliances and mutual security arrangements we maintain with 42 nations, which add their strength to ours, and on the invulnerability of all free nations to Communist political or economic penetration. With these goals in mind, the President calls for $3,930 million more for what is misleadingly labeled "foreign aid" but is really an integral part of the defense structure of the United States.

The collective Western determination to deter and, if necessary to resist, Soviet aggression, whether in Berlin or elsewhere, is being reaffirmed in continuous consultations, as illustrated by the complete unity of views established between Prime Minister Macmillan and Chancellor Adenauer. This unity will be further cemented when Mr. Macmillan visits President Eisenhower next week. But the congressional battle over mutual security funds promises to be as bitter as ever, and at the moment the psychological impact of that congressional battle could be as important as the funds appropriated.

In his strongly worded message President Eisenhower yesterday gravely warned against any reckless cuts of the mutual security program lest the Communist conspiracy, which maintains 6,500,000 armed men, convert us into "the richest nation in the graveyard of history." Congress itself has become aware of this menace. But, whatever may be said about some controversial aspects of the President's defense budget, too many Congressmen seek safety in a hasty expansion of our own Military Establishment. They are more than willing to provide greater funds for that purpose, but less willing to provide ample funds for mutual security. The principal trouble here appears to be false reasoning.

As the President points out, dollar-for-dollar mutual defense funds add more to our security than would a greater amount spent at home. Mutual security funds have helped to maintain 5 million armed men, 30,000 aircraft, and 250 strategic air, naval, and army bases among our allies and friends to supplement our own strength. Without that added strength it would be difficult to stand fast in Berlin; without it the United States would have to convert itself into a beleaguered Fortress America, sacrificing everything to mere survival. This is true to only slightly lesser degree of our economic aid, designed to meet the Soviet economic offensive.

Let us hope that Congress will weigh these arguments thoughtfully and do nothing to undermine the morale of our allies and friends at this critical moment by a niggling opposition based upon false premises.

STATEMENT BY SENATOR WILEY—STRONG MUTUAL SECURITY PROGRAM URGED

The security of the free world, now and in the future, will depend, to a substantial degree, upon the extent to which we are willing—militarily and economically—to support the efforts of our allies in withstanding the aggression of communism.

As the Communist nations gain in power, the need for strong alliances among free nations is increasing—not diminishing.

We recognize that, today, the free world-Communist conflict, rather than lessening, is becoming more complex and many fronted—covering a wide variety of military, economic, scientific, cultural, psychological, ideological, and other ranges.

If the free world fails to meet these challenges, it may well mean enslavement for more than the nearly 1 billion people—or about one-third of the world's population—now dominated by communism.

So, let us not kid ourselves. The battle is not over. Rather, an ever-greater challenge to our security is ahead of us—perhaps for many years.

Again and again, representatives of the Government, the military, and free enterprise have carefully studied the program and found that, dollar for dollar, the mutual security expenditures buy more security than expenditures, for example, for our own forces.

To the degree that it is possible to provide military support that will prevent the shouldering of weapons by American boys, I say "Let us prove it."

Economically, let us shore up the free world's economic front; however, insofar as feasible, I believe that this aid should be in the form of loans—rather than grants.

Over the years, the principle of mutual security has proved workable. Let us not destroy it at a time when the free world is still in serious danger.

Naturally, the Congress will want to carefully examine the $3.9 billion program offered by the President and perhaps make its own recommendations and changes.

Even though this program, traditionally, is not politically popular, however, I would hope that Members of Congress would be as courageous in supporting mutual security—essential to our defense—as in supporting "pork barrel" legislation—perhaps involving less political hazards.

THE BERLIN CRISIS

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I have a series of items to submit for the RECORD as quickly as possible. They are all related items, but I shall not need to exercise all of my rights under the 3-minute rule with respect to each one.

I am today introducing a resolution with reference to seeking an advisory opinion of the World Court on the Berlin crisis. I am also offering for insertion in the RECORD certain sections of the United Nations Charter. It is my desire to make a very brief comment on these items for inclusion in today's proceedings of the Senate before the President's speech tonight.

The resolution reads as follows:

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate that the United States should seek to have the appropriate organ of the United Nations request an advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice, pursuant to article 96 of the Charter of the United Nations, which would confirm the continuing validity of the rights of the United States as an occupying power to maintain its Armed Forces in Berlin and to have free and unrestricted access to and from Berlin in connection with its occupation thereof.

I ask that the resolution be appropriately referred.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The resolution (S. Res. 92) was received and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks the statute of the International Court of Justice.

There being no objection, the statute was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATUTE OF THE INTERNATIONAL COURT OF JUSTICE

Article 1

The International Court of Justice established by the Charter of the United Nations as the principal judicial organ of the United Nations shall be constituted and shall function in accordance with the provisions of the present statute.

CHAPTER I—ORGANIZATION OF THE COURT

Article 2

The Court shall be composed of a body of independent judges, elected regardless of their nationality from among persons of high moral character, who possess the qualifications required in their respective countries for appointment to the highest judicial offices, or are juris-consults of recognized competence in international law.

Article 3

1. The Court shall consist of fifteen members, no two of whom may be nationals of the same state.

2. A person who for the purposes of membership in the Court could be regarded as a national of more than one state shall be deemed to be a national of the one in which he ordinarily exercises civil and political rights.

Article 4

1. The members of the Court shall be elected by the General Assembly and by the Security Council from a list of persons nominated by the national groups in the Permanent Court of Arbitration, in accordance with the following provisions.

2. In the case of members of the United Nations not represented in the Permanent Court of Arbitration, candidates shall be nominated by national groups appointed for this purpose by their governments under the same conditions as those prescribed for members of the Permanent Court of Arbitration by article 44 of the Convention of The Hague of 1907 for the pacific settlement of international disputes.

3. The conditions under which a state which is a party to the present statute but is not a member of the United Nations may participate in electing the members of the Court shall, in the absence of a special agreement, be laid down by the General Assembly upon recommendation of the Security Council.

Article 5

1. At least 3 months before the date of the election, the Secretary General of the United Nations shall address a written request to the members of the Permanent Court of Arbitration belonging to the states which are parties to the present statute, and to the members of the national groups appointed under article 4, paragraph 2, inviting them to undertake, within a given time, by national groups, the nomination of persons in a position to accept the duties of a member of the Court.

2. No group may nominate more than four persons, not more than two of whom shall be of their own nationality. In no case may the number of candidates nominated by a group be more than double the number of seats to be filled.

Article 6

Before making these nominations, each national group is recommended to consult its highest court of justice, its legal faculties and schools of law, and its national academies and national sections of international academies devoted to the study of law.

Article 7

1. The Secretary General shall prepare a list in alphabetical order of all the persons thus nominated. Save as provided in article 12, paragraph 2, these shall be the only persons eligible.

2. The Secretary General shall submit this list to the General Assembly and to the Security Council.

Article 8

The General Assembly and the Security Council shall proceed independently of one another to elect the members of the Court.

Article 9

At every election, the electors shall bear in mind not only that the persons to be elected should individually possess the qualifications required, but also that in the body as a whole the representation of the main forms of civilization and of the principal legal systems of the world should be assured.

Article 10

1. Those candidates who obtain an absolute majority of votes in the General Assembly and in the Security Council shall be considered as elected.

2. Any vote of the Security Council, whether for the election of judges or for the appointment of members of the conference envisaged in article 12, shall be taken without any distinction between permanent and nonpermanent members of the Security Council.

3. In the event of more than one national of the same state obtaining an absolute majority of the votes both of the General Assembly and of the Security Council, the eldest of these only shall be considered as elected.

Article 11

If, after the first meeting held for the purpose of the election, one or more seats remain to be filled, a second and, if necessary, a third meeting shall take place.

Article 12

1. If, after the third meeting, one or more seats still remain unfilled, a joint conference consisting of 6 members, 3 appointed by the General Assembly and 3 by the Security Council, may be formed at any time at the request of either the General Assembly or the Security Council, for the purpose of choosing by the vote of an absolute majority one name for each seat still vacant, to submit to the General Assembly and the Security Council for their respective acceptance.

2. If the joint conference is unanimously agreed upon any person who fulfills the required conditions, he may be included in its list, even though he was not included in the list of nominations referred to in article 7.

3. If the joint conference is satisfied that it will not be successful in procuring an election, those members of the Court who have already been elected shall, within a period to be fixed by the Security Council, proceed to fill the vacant seats by selection from among those candidates who have obtained votes either in the General Assembly or in the Security Council.

4. In the event of an equality of votes among the judges, the eldest judge shall have a casting vote.

Article 13

1. The members of the Court shall be elected for 9 years and may be reelected; provided, however, that of the judges elected at the first election, the terms of five judges shall expire at the end of 3 years and the terms of five more judges shall expire at the end of 6 years.

2. The judges whose terms are to expire at the end of the above-mentioned initial periods of 3 and 6 years shall be chosen by lot to be drawn by the Secretary General immediately after the first election has been completed.

3. The members of the Court shall continue to discharge their duties until their places have been filled. Though replaced, they shall finish any cases which they may have begun.

4. In the case of the resignation of a member of the Court, the resignation shall be addressed to the President of the Court for transmission to the Secretary General. This last notification makes the place vacant.

Article 14

Vacancies shall be filled by the same method as that laid down for the first election, subject to the following provision: the Secretary General shall, within 1 month of the occurrence of the vacancy, proceed to issue the invitations provided for in article 5 and date of the election shall be fixed by the Security Council.

Article 15

A member of the Court elected to replace a member whose term of office has not expired shall hold office for the reminder of his predecessor's term.

Article 16

1. No member of the Court may exercise any political or administrative function, or engage in any other occupation of a professional nature.

2. Any doubt on this point shall be settled by the decision of the Court.

Article 17

1. No member of the Court may act as agent, counsel, or advocate in any case.

2. No member may participate in the decision of any case in which he has previously taken part as agent, counsel, or advocate for one of the parties, or as a member of a national or international court, or of a commission of inquiry, or in any other capacity.

3. Any doubt on this point shall be settled by the decision of the Court.

Article 18

1. No member of the Court can be dismissed unless, in the unanimous opinion of the other members, he has ceased to fulfill the required conditions.

2. Formal notification thereof shall be made to the Secretary General by the registrar.

3. This notification makes the place vacant.

Article 19

The members of the Court, when engaged on the business of the Court, shall enjoy diplomatic privileges and immunities.

Article 20

Every member of the Court shall, before taking up his duties, make a solemn declaration in open court that he will exercise his powers impartially and conscientiously.

Article 21

1. The Court shall elect its President and Vice President for 3 years; they may be reelected.

2. The Court shall appoint its Registrar and may provide for the appointment of such other officers as may be necessary.

Article 22

1. The seat of the Court shall be established at The Hague. This, however, shall not prevent the Court from sitting and exercising its functions elsewhere whenever the Court considers it desirable.

2. The President and the Registrar shall reside at the seat of the Court.

Article 23

1. The Court shall remain permanently in session, except during the judicial vacations, the dates and duration of which shall be fixed by the Court.

2. Members of the Court are entitled to periodic leave, the dates and duration of which shall be fixed by the Court, having in mind the distance between The Hague and the home of each judge.

3. Members of the Court shall be bound, unless they are on leave or prevented from attending by illness or other serious reasons duly explained to the President, to hold themselves permanently at the disposal of the Court.

Article 24

1. If, for some special reason, a member of the Court considers that he should not take part in the decision of a particular case, he shall so inform the President.

2. If the President considers that for some special reason one of the members of the Court should not sit in a particular case, he shall give him notice accordingly.

3. If in any such case the member of the Court and the President disagree, the matter shall be settled by the decision of the Court.

Article 25

1. The full Court shall sit except when it is expressly provided otherwise in the present statute.

2. Subject to the condition that the number of judges available to constitute the Court is not thereby reduced below 11, the rules of the Court may provide for allowing one or more judges, according to circumstances and in rotation, to be dispensed from sitting.

3. A quorum of nine judges shall suffice to constitute the Court.

Article 26

1. The Court may from time to time form one or more chambers, composed of three or more judges as the Court may determine, for dealing with particular categories of cases; for example, labor cases and cases relating to transit and communications.

2. The Court may at any time form a chamber for dealing with a particular case. The number of judges to constitute such a chamber shall be determined by the Court with the approval of the parties.

3. Cases shall be heard and determined by the chambers provided for in this article if the parties so request.

Article 27

A judgment given by any of the chambers provided for in articles 26 and 29 shall be considered as rendered by the Court.

Article 28

The chambers provided for in articles 26 and 29 may, with the consent of the parties, sit and exercise their functions elsewhere than at The Hague.

Article 29

With a view to the speedy dispatch of business, the Court shall form annually a chamber composed of five judges which, at the

request of the parties, may hear and determine cases by summary procedure. In addition, two judges shall be selected for the purpose of replacing judges who find it impossible to sit.

Article 30

1. The Court shall frame rules for carrying out its functions. In particular, it shall lay down rules of procedure.

2. The rules of the Court may provide for assessors to sit with the Court or with any of its chambers, without the right to vote.

Article 31

1. Judges of the nationality of each of the parties shall retain their right to sit in the case before the Court.

2. If the Court includes upon the bench a judge of the nationality of one of the parties, any other party may choose a person to sit as judge. Such person shall be chosen preferably from among those persons who have been nominated as candidates as provided in articles 4 and 5.

3. If the Court includes upon the bench no judge of the nationality of the parties, each of these parties may proceed to choose a judge as provided in paragraph 2 of this article.

4. The provisions of this article shall apply to the case of articles 26 and 29. In such cases, the President shall request one or, if necessary, two of the members of the Court forming the chamber to give place to the members of the Court of the nationality of the parties concerned, and, failing such, or if they are unable to be present, to the judges specially chosen by the parties.

5. Should there be several parties in the same interest, they shall, for the purpose of the preceding provisions, be reckoned as one party only. Any doubt upon this point shall be settled by the decision of the Court.

6. Judges chosen as laid down in paragraphs 2, 3, and 4 of this article shall fulfill the conditions required by articles 2, 17 (paragraph 2), 20, and 24 of the present statute. They shall take part in the decision on terms of complete equality with their colleagues.

Article 32

1. Each member of the Court shall receive an annual salary.

2. The President shall receive a special annual allowance.

3. The Vice President shall receive a special allowance for every day on which he acts as President.

4. The judges chosen under article 31, other than members of the Court, shall receive compensation for each day on which they exercise their functions.

5. These salaries, allowances, and compensation shall be fixed by the General Assembly. They may not be decreased during the term of office.

6. The salary of the Registrar shall be fixed by the General Assembly on the proposal of the Court.

7. Regulations made by the General Assembly shall fix the conditions under which retirement pensions may be given to members of the Court and to the Registrar, and the conditions under which members of the Court and the Registrar shall have their traveling expenses refunded.

8. The above salaries, allowances, and compensation shall be free of all taxation.

Article 33

The expenses of the Court shall be borne by the United Nations in such a manner as shall be decided by the General Assembly.

CHAPTER II—COMPETENCE OF THE COURT

Article 34

1. Only states may be parties in cases before the Court.

2. The Court, subject to and in conformity with its rules, may request of public international organizations information relevant to cases before it, and shall receive such information presented by such organizations on their own initiative.

3. Whenever the construction of the constituent instrument of a public international organization or of an international convention adopted thereunder is in question in a case before the Court, the Registrar shall so notify the public international organization concerned and shall communicate to it copies of all the written proceedings.

Article 35

1. The Court shall be open to the states parties to the present statute.

2. The conditions under which the Court shall be open to other states shall, subject to the special provisions contained in treaties in force, be laid down by the Security Council, but in no case shall such conditions place the parties in a position of inequality before the Court.

3. When a state which is not a member of the United Nations is a party to a case, the Court shall fix the amount which that party is to contribute toward the expenses of the Court. This provision shall not apply if such state is bearing a share of the expenses of the Court.

Article 36

1. The jurisdiction of the Court comprises all cases which the parties refer to it and all matters specially provided for in the charter of the United Nations or in treaties and conventions in force.

2. The states parties to the present statute may at any time declare that they recognize as compulsory ipso facto and without special agreement, in relation to any other state accepting the same obligation, the jurisdiction of the Court in all legal disputes concerning:

(a) the interpretation of a treaty;

(b) any question of international law;

(c) the existence of any fact which, if established, would constitute a breach of an international obligation;

(d) the nature or extent of the reparation to be made for the breach of an international obligation.

3. The declarations referred to above may be made unconditionally or on condition of reciprocity on the part of several or certain states, or for a certain time.

4. Such declarations shall be deposited with the Secretary General of the United Nations, who shall transmit copies thereof to the parties to the statute and to the Registrar of the Court.

5. Declarations made under article 36 of the Statute of the Permanent Court of International Justice and which are still in force shall be deemed, as between the parties to the present statute, to be acceptances of the compulsory jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice for the period which they still have to run and in accordance with their terms.

6. In the event of a dispute as to whether the Court has jurisdiction, the matter shall be settled by the decision of the Court.

Article 37

Whenever a treaty or convention in force provides for reference of a matter to a tribunal to have been instituted by the League of Nations, or to the Permanent Court of International Justice, the matter shall, as between the parties to the present statute, be referred to the International Court of Justice.

Article 38

1. The Court, whose function is to decide in accordance with international law such disputes as are submitted to it, shall apply:

(a) International conventions, whether general or particular, establishing rules expressly recognized by the contesting states;

(b) International custom, as evidence of a general practice accepted as law;

(c) The general principles of law recognized by civilized nations;

(d) Subject to the provisions of article 59, judicial decisions and the teachings of the most highly qualified publicists of the various nations, as subsidiary means for the determination of rules of law.

2. This provision shall not prejudice the power of the Court to decide a case ex aequo et bono, if the parties agree thereto.

CHAPTER III—PROCEDURE

Article 39

1. The official languages of the Court shall be French and English. If the parties agree that the case shall be conducted in French, the judgment shall be delivered in French. If the parties agree that the case shall be conducted in English, the judgment shall be delivered in English.

2. In the absence of an agreement as to which language shall be employed, each party may, in the pleadings, use the language which it prefers; the decision of the Court shall be given in French and English. In this case the Court shall at the same time determine which of the two texts shall be considered as authoritative.

3. The Court shall, at the request of any party, authorize a language other than French or English to be used by that party.

Article 40

1. Cases are brought before the Court, as the case may be, either by the notification of the special agreement or by a written application addressed to the Registrar. In either case the subject of the dispute and the parties shall be indicated.

2. The Registrar shall forthwith communicate the application to all concerned.

3. He shall also notify the Members of the United Nations through the Secretary General, and also any other states entitled to appear before the Court.

Article 41

1. The Court shall have the power to indicate, if it considers that circumstances so require, any provisional measures which ought to be taken to preserve the respective rights of either party.

2. Pending the final decision, notice of the measures suggested shall forthwith be given to the parties and to the Security Council.

Article 42

1. The parties shall be represented by agents.

2. They may have the assistance of counsel or advocates before the Court.

3. The agents, counsel, and advocates of parties before the Court shall enjoy the privileges and immunities necessary to the independent exercise of their duties.

Article 43

1. The procedure shall consist of two parts: written and oral.

2. The written proceedings shall consist of the communication to the Court and to the parties of memorials, counter-memorials and, if necessary, replies; also all papers and documents in support.

3. These communications shall be made through the Registrar, in the order and within the time fixed by the Court.

4. A certified copy of every document produced by one party shall be communicated to the other party.

5. The oral proceedings shall consist of the hearing by the Court of witnesses, experts, agents, counsel, and advocates.

Article 44

1. For the service of all notices upon persons other than the agents, counsel, and advocates, the Court shall apply direct to the government of the state upon whose territory the notice has to be served.

2. The same provision shall apply whenever step are to be taken to procure evidence on the spot.

Article 45

The hearing shall be under the control of the President or, if he is unable to preside, of the Vice President; if neither is able to preside, the senior judge present shall preside.

Article 46

The hearing in Court shall be public, unless the Court shall decide otherwise, or unless the parties demand that the public be not admitted.

Article 47

1. Minutes shall be made at each hearing and signed by the Registrar and the President.

2. These minutes alone shall be authentic.

Article 48

The Court shall make orders for the conduct of the case, shall decide the form and time in which each party must conclude its arguments, and make all arrangements connected with the taking of evidence.

Article 49

The Court may, even before the hearing begins, call upon the agents to produce any document or to supply any explanations. Formal note shall be taken of any refusal.

Article 50

The Court may, at any time, entrust any individual, body, bureau, commission, or other organization that it may select, with the task of carrying out an inquiry or giving an expert opinion.

Article 51

During the hearing any relevant questions are to be put to the witnesses and experts under the conditions laid down by the Court in the rules of procedure referred to in article 30.

Article 52

After the Court has received the proofs and evidence within the time specified for the purpose, it may refuse to accept any further oral or written evidence that one party may desire to present unless the other side consents.

Article 53

1. Whenever one of the parties does not appear before the Court, or fails to defend its case, the other party may call upon the Court to decide in favor of its claim.

2. The Court must, before doing so, satisfy itself, not only that it has jurisdiction in accordance with articles 36 and 37, but also that the claim is well founded in fact and law.

Article 54

1. When subject to the control of the Court, the agents, counsel, and advocates have completed their presentation of the case, the President shall declare the hearing closed.

2. The Court shall withdraw to consider the judgment.

3. The deliberations of the Court shall take place in private and remain secret.

Article 55

1. All questions shall be decided by a majority of the judges present.

2. In the event of an equality of votes, the President or the judge who acts in his place shall have a casting vote.

Article 56

1. The judgment shall state the reasons on which it is based.

2. It shall contain the names of the judges who have taken part in the decision.

Article 57

If the judgment does not represent in whole or in part the unanimous opinion of the judges, any judge shall be entitled to deliver a separate opinion.

Article 58

The judgment shall be signed by the President and by the Registrar. It shall be read in open court, due notice having been given to the agents.

Article 59

The decision of the Court has no binding force except between the parties and in respect of that particular case.

Article 60

The judgment is final and without appeal. In the event of dispute as to the meaning or scope of the judgment, the Court shall construe it upon the request of any party.

Article 61

1. An application for revision of a judgment may be made only when it is based upon the discovery of some fact of such a nature as to be a decisive factor, which fact was, when the judgment was given, unknown to the Court and also to the party claiming revision, always provided that such ignorance was not due to negligence.

2. The proceedings for revision shall be opened by a judgment of the Court expressly recording the existence of the new fact, recognizing that it has such a character as to lay the case open to revision, and declaring the application admissible on this ground.

3. The Court may require previous compliance with the terms of the judgment before it admits proceedings in revision.

4. The application for revision must be made at latest within 6 months of the discovery of the new fact.

5. No application for revision may be made after the lapse of 10 years from the date of the judgment.

Article 62

1. Should a state consider that it has an interest of a legal nature which may be affected by the decision in the case, it may submit a request to the Court to be permitted to intervene.

2. It shall be for the Court to decide upon this request.

Article 63

1. Whenever the construction of a convention to which states other than those concerned in the case are parties is in question, the Registrar shall notify all such states forthwith.

2. Every state so notified has the right to intervene in the proceedings; but if it uses this right, the construction given by the judgment will be equally binding upon it.

Article 64

Unless otherwise decided by the Court, each party shall bear its own costs.

CHAPTER IV—ADVISORY OPINIONS

Article 65

1. The Court may give an advisory opinion on any legal question at the request of whatever body may be authorized by or in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations to make such a request.

2. Questions upon which the advisory opinion of the Court is asked shall be laid before the Court by means of a written request containing an exact statement of the question upon which an opinion is required, and accompanied by all documents likely to throw light upon the question.

Article 66

1. The Registrar shall forthwith give notice of the request for an advisory opinion to all states entitled to appear before the Court.

2. The Registrar shall also, by means of a special and direct communication, notify any state entitled to appear before the Court or international organization considered by the Court, or, should it not be sitting, by the President, as likely to be able to furnish information on the question, that the Court will be prepared to receive, within a time limit to be fixed by the President, written statements, or to hear, at a public sitting to be held for the purpose, oral statements relating to the question.

3. Should any such state entitled to appear before the Court have failed to receive the special communication referred to in paragraph 2 of this article, such state may express a desire to submit a written statement or to be heard; and the Court will decide.

4. States and organizations having presented written or oral statements or both shall be permitted to comment on the statements made by other states or organizations in the form, to the extent, and within the time limits which the Court, or should it not be sitting, the President, shall decide in each particular case. Accordingly, the Registrar shall in due time communicate any such written statements to states and organizations having submitted similar statements.

Article 67

The Court shall deliver its advisory opinions in open court, notice having been given to the Secretary General and to the representatives of members of the United Nations, of other states and of international organizations immediately concerned.

Article 68

In the exercise of its advisory functions the Court shall further be guided by the provisions of the present statute which apply in contentious cases to the extent to which it recognizes them to be applicable.

CHAPTER V—AMENDMENT

Article 69

Amendments to the present statute shall be effected by the same procedure as is provided by the Charter of the United Nations for amendments to that Charter, subject however to any provisions which the General Assembly upon recommendation of the Security Council may adopt concerning the participation of states which are parties to the present statute but are not members of the United Nations.

Article 70

The Court shall have power to propose such amendments to the present statutes as it may deem necessary, through written communications to the Secretary General, for consideration in conformity with the provisions of article 69.

Mr. MORSE. In particular, I invite attention to chapter IV, article 65, under the heading "Advisory Opinions":

1. The Court may give an advisory opinion on any legal question at the request of whatever body may be authorized by or in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations to make such a request.

2. Questions upon which the advisory opinion of the Court is asked shall be laid before the Court by means of a written request containing an exact statement of the question upon which an opinion is required, and accompanied by all documents likely to throw light upon the question.

Next, I invite attention to the fact that the United Nations Charter provides, in article 96, that the General Assembly and Security Council of the United Nations may call for an advisory opinion. I ask unanimous consent that article 96 of the charter be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ARTICLE 96

1. The General Assembly or the Security Council may request the International Court of Justice to give an advisory opinion on any legal question.

2. Other organs of the United Nations and specialized agencies, which may at any time be so authorized by the General Assembly, may also request advisory opinions of the

Court on legal questions arising within the scope of their activities.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that article VI of the United Nations Charter, entitled "Pacific Settlement of Disputes," be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CHAPTER VI—PACIFIC SETTLEMENT OF DISPUTES

ARTICLE 33

1. The parties to any dispute, the continuance of which is likely to endanger the maintenance of international peace and security, shall, first of all, seek a solution by negotiation, inquiry, mediation, conciliation, arbitration, judicial settlement, resort to regional agencies or arrangements, or other peaceful means of their own choice.

Mr. MORSE. I read the first section of article 33:

The parties to any dispute, the continuance of which is likely to endanger the maintenance of international peace and security, shall, first of all, seek a solution by negotiation, inquiry, mediation, conciliation, arbitration, judicial settlement, resort to regional agencies or arrangements, or other peaceful means of their own choice.

The second section reads as follows:

2. The Security Council shall, when it deems necessary, call upon the parties to settle their dispute by such means.

It is my view that article 33 is in no way a prohibition against any nation seeking, as a preparation for negotiations, an advisory opinion of the Court through the appropriate United Nations agency. I happen to believe that the situation in Berlin is so critical, because many nations other than Russia, the United States, West Germany, France, and Great Britain have such a great interest in the Berlin crisis—the interest of peace—that we ought to be proceeding with the judicial processes of the United Nations now.

We would strengthen our position on the Berlin crisis if we would stop threatening Russia and the rest of the world with a nuclear war and call upon the United Nations to take jurisdiction now over the Berlin crisis. I do not believe that the proposed negotiations on the Berlin crisis outside the United Nations augurs very well for peace. We ought to buttress our position for negotiations with an advisory opinion of the World Court. Article 33 provides, as the State Department stated when I raised the question, that the parties should seek a solution by negotiation. However, it is not mandatory that we try to negotiate with Russia before we go to the United Nations.

Negotiations have been in progress. We have not had "showcase" negotiations, but negotiations have been going on. So far as we can see, there is no strong indication any negotiations outside of the United Nations may prove to be successful. I think United Nations negotiations might be if the other nations of the world, aside from the party litigants in the Berlin crisis, would do what I think is their duty under the United Nations Charter at the present time. They are not doing it.

The time has come for nations other than the party litigants to the Berlin crisis to proceed to make clear to Russia, the United States, France, Great Britain, and West Germany that there is no moral justification for a nuclear war.

Every time I listen to a member of the State Department or someone from the Pentagon say, "If such and such happens, it means all-out nuclear war." I am shocked and aghast. Neither my Nation nor Russia can justify a nuclear war over Berlin.

We have the duty as a peace-loving nation to proceed under the judicial processes of the United Nations Charter now. I say to the other countries of the world, "What are you doing in this crisis? Why are you not raising your voices to make clear, in accordance with the resolution adopted on November 3, 1950, that it is within the power of the other nations of the United Nations to call a special assembly of the General Assembly of the United Nations?" That assembly should be called forthwith.

If Russia, the United States, France, and Great Britain cannot settle their differences quickly through negotiations by way of the Security Council—and that is where they ought to be negotiating now, in my judgment—the General Assembly of the United Nations should proceed to take jurisdiction over this serious threat to the peace of the world. Under the powers which the other nations have under the resolution of November 3, 1950, they should call upon the United Nations through its judicial processes to take over. I think that is the way to strengthen the hand of the United States, and make clear to Russia that we are ready to proceed with Russia, within the framework of the United Nations, to a settlement of what appears to be the greatest threat to peace and the greatest danger leading to a possible inhumane nuclear war that has confronted our generation.

We should repudiate those American leaders who are talking about a horrible nuclear war over Berlin. The world should rebuke Russia for its sinister scheme to use Berlin as a threat to peace in order to gain its designs on Germany and Western Europe.

Neither Russia nor the Western Powers should be allowed by the rest of the world to inflict upon all mankind for the next several thousand years the horrible damages to all human and animal life in large parts of the world which the radiation from a nuclear war would cause. I plead with the leaders of the world to conform to the moral law on this issue before it is too late.

RELATION BETWEEN ADMINISTERED PRICES AND INFLATION

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, in this morning's Washington Post Mr. Bernard Nossiter makes a revealing analysis of the growing unanimity of economic opinion that administered prices are causing inflation. I am also happy to read in Mr. Nossiter's article that the distinguished economist, Gardiner Means, is becoming increasingly recognized as the man who is primarily responsible for this new economic realism. It is Gardiner Means' careful and thorough analysis of the nature of our inflation that is puncturing the mythological nonsense and providing Congress and the administration with a genuine opportunity to do something about this enormously important problem of inflation which is just beginning to be understood.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this article by Bernard Nossiter be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald, Mar. 16, 1959]

ECONOMISTS SWITCH TO FINGER POINTING IN FIXING BLAME FOR SLOW RECOVERY

(By Bernard Nossiter)

The jawbone, or open-mouth attack on slump-breeding price increases took a new and decisive turn last week.

The administration and the Federal Reserve Board abandoned their traditional, generalized appeals to business and union chiefs for restraint. Instead, key economists for the Federal Reserve System and the President got down to cases and named names, or at least industries.

Raymond J. Saulnier, chairman of President Eisenhower's Council of Economic Advisers, was the first to signal the new approach. A letter of his was made public which blamed price increases in autos and heavy industry for holding down output between 1953 and 1957.

Ralph Young, the Fed's research director, went a step further. He said last year's steel and auto price increases didn't make economic sense because demand was falling. Their effect, Young said, is to cut demand to which output and jobs are tailored.

Woodlief Thomas, the Fed's economic adviser, next took up the cudgels. He made the crucial point that administered prices and wages not only create inflation, but more importantly slow up economic growth and breed unemployment.

Presumably, none of the three would have spoken out without the approval of President Eisenhower and Fed Chairman William McChesney Martin.

The switch from the general to the particular, a form of finger pointing that is considered lese-majeste in the corporate world, reflects the seriousness with which the Government views the present state of economic affairs.

The recovery has been modest almost to the vanishing point for the last 3 months, a leveling off that is coming much earlier than usual after a slump. Unemployment is high and shows few signs of receding to tolerable levels. The Treasury is having aggravating problems refinancing the maturing portions of the debt because investors, counting on rising prices, want stocks. Finally, the Fed feels a sense of frustration. Its money-tightening measures apparently can't break the administered prices of corporate giants this side of a depression.

The surprising degree of bipartisan unanimity about the causes of recent inflation and slump is pointed up by the support John Kenneth Galbraith gives to the auto-steel administered price role. Galbraith is the Democratic Advisory Council's chief economist.

Implicit in all this discussion is a tribute to Gardiner Means. This remarkable economist has been pointing for a generation to

the decisive economic power of corporate giants. In autos, steel, oil, and other concentrated industries, Means has been observing, prices and wages are administered—set and held by conscious decision and raised despite drops in demand.

To be sure, economists who do not speak for a vested interest have not yet reached a point of total agreement on all questions. Young, for example, believes that excess demand was more important than price-administering power in the 1953–57 inflation. There is wide disagreement over whether unions or management are more responsible for the price increases and slump that followed. However, this debate, many economists believe is sterile and the key question is what to do about it all.

The administration is clearly trying to influence the forthcoming steel wage negotiations. In the past, the industry has used them to grant substantial gains, jack up prices, and according to the experts, multiplied our economic woes.

Senator ESTES KEFAUVER, Democrat of Tennessee, chairman of the Antitrust Subcommittee, has spent 2 years, virtually unnoticed except by the business press, documenting the power of United States Steel and General Motors. Last week, he warned the United Steelworkers and the industry that this was their last chance to respond to the pointed pleas for the restraint. Many economists are convinced that no matter how pointed, appeals won't work and before long, new institutional devices for controlling the key price-wage decisions will have to be invented. Just as important, many in Congress agree with these economists.

AN AROUSED RESERVE BOARD

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, Saturday's New York Times carries an editorial entitled "An Aroused Reserve Board." This editorial marks an extremely significant breakthrough for those who have agreed that inflation in recent years has been caused largely by the power of a few huge corporations to administer their prices upward without regard to demand, supply, or consumers.

Here is the good, gray New York Times, a paper that has earned as solid a reputation for constructive economic conservatism as any in the Nation, calling administered prices, and I quote, "inflationary policies that are socially and economically unsupportable."

But, Mr. President, the most significant aspect of this editorial is that the New York Times is praising, as indeed it should, the remarks of the Federal Reserve Board's Director of Research, Mr. Ralph A. Young, who represented the Federal Reserve Board itself in protest against the excesses of administered prices. The Times points out that the Board's role has traditionally been one of dignified detachment from controversies such as this. The inflationary impact of administered prices, however, has become so extremely serious that the Board decided that it must speak out in protest.

Mr. President, when you have two institutions like the New York Times and the Federal Reserve Board speaking vigorously against the inflationary policies of top management in this country, it seems to me that the American people should take notice and recognize that the cost of their living has been shoved up by men who are exercising a power that has become excessive.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial from the New York Times entitled "An Aroused Reserve Board," was ordered to be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

[From the New York Times, Mar. 14, 1959]

AN AROUSED RESERVE BOARD

Hearings were resumed during the past week before the Senate Antitrust Subcommittee, which has been considering the situation in those heavy industries that are most prominently identified with the issue of administered prices. The renewed hearings brought the unusual spectacle of a high-ranking representative of the Federal Reserve Board joining actively, and even vigorously, in the criticism that has been leveled at the steel and automotive industries for raising prices in time of business recession.

The Federal Reserve Board representative was Ralph A. Young, its Director of Research and Statistics. There is no question among students of monetary and price problems that to the extent that rising prices in recent years have had their origins in the wage-price push it has presented the monetary authorities with an extremely serious dilemma. The Board can always refuse to validate such price rises by clamping down on the volume and availability of credit. But general credit controls are too blunt an instrument for dealing with this type of price rise. If applied with sufficient vigor they can slow down the whole economy and produce widespread disemployment, thus creating the impression that the Federal Reserve Board was neglecting its responsibilities under the Employment Act of 1946.

While the wage price situation has undoubtedly had a moderating influence on the Board's policies since recovery got under way last year, the Board has chosen up to now to let the public do its own speculating on that subject. Its decision to take an active part in the controversy is, it seems to us, a healthy one. It has proceeded as long as any agency could reasonably be expected to proceed on the assumption that the problem would disappear. And this, we think, is all to the good. The Board's role traditionally has been one of dignified detachment from controversies such as this one. And there is much to be said for that attitude up to a point. But that point has certainly been reached when it finds itself forced into the position of taking the rap for inflationary policies that are socially and economically unsupportable, but with which it isn't equipped to deal. To continue to ignore such a situation could be to invite political action directed against the monetary authorities themselves, a development that would merely serve to strengthen the forces of inflation.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, in yesterday's New York Times Mr. Edwin L. Dale, Jr., reported how widespread the conviction has become among responsible and informed Federal officials that administered prices are indeed a prime cause of creeping inflation. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this article also be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. AIDS UNEASY ON PRICE POLICIES—ADMINISTERED LEVELS SEEN AS LEADING TO POSSIBLE GOVERNMENT CONTROLS

(By Edwin L. Dale Jr.)

WASHINGTON, March 14.—Price and wage developments during last year's recession have brought a quiet revolution in the thinking of key Government economic officials.

In brief, these officials have come to accept the concept of administered prices. They accept recent evidence that important sectors of the private economy can hold or even increase prices when demand is weak.

If the revolution in thought goes far enough—and if future events warrant—the result could be some form of Government price control.

The reason for controls would be that the concentrated industries that administer their prices appear largely immune from the classic Government instruments for controlling inflation. These are mainly balanced budgets and tight money, which are aimed at curbing demand.

ROSE AGAINST TREND

Last year, demand was sluggish because of the recession, and yet prices in the administered sector rose anyway. Steel and automobiles are the most commonly cited examples.

The major retreat has been in the Federal Reserve Board, long the stronghold of classic economic thinking. In the last week two leading officials of the Board have gone on record publicly with expressions of their concern at the consequences of private economic power in steel and autos.

The same view was expressed, also publicly, by Raymond J. Saulnier, Chairman of the President's Council of Economic Advisers. It is known that even Robert B. Anderson, the Secretary of the Treasury, is persuaded that the inflation outlook will depend at least as much upon wage and price decisions by powerful economic groups as upon balancing the budget.

HAD MINIMIZED THREAT

In the Federal Reserve, officials long minimized the fear that monopolistic power among concentrated industries was a serious threat to the price level. The conviction was that when things got tough and orders fell off, prices would be cut in these sectors of the economy just like any other.

Last year this did not happen. Prices in several of such areas actually rose. The result was that the Federal Reserve has begun taking this problem far more seriously than in the past.

None of this means that officials now favor price or wage controls or any form of direct Government intervention—even intervention limited to the big business-big labor part of the economy. But the sharp change in thinking about the problem is the sort that would necessarily precede a decision that controls are necessary.

A great deal will depend on this year's steel wage negotiations and subsequent pricing decisions. If the steel settlement, with or without a strike, is not followed by a price increase, the wave of concern will subside to a considerable degree.

AUTO DECISION AWAITED

This would be particularly the case if such an event was followed by a decision in Detroit next fall not to raise the prices of the 1960 automobile models.

In the background is the possibility of a Democratic President after 1960. A number of leading Democrats were convinced of the administered price problem in advance of the more conservative officials in the Eisenhower administration.

Thus a Democratic President might be even less reluctant than President Eisenhower to choose the road of controls.

Much of the groundwork for the increasing awareness and acceptance of the administered price problem has been laid by hearings of the Senate Antitrust Subcommittee, headed by Senator ESTES KEFAUVER, Democrat, of Tennessee. The hearings have gone on for nearly 2 years and produced nine volumes of testimony.

LAST CHANCE IS SEEN

Even Senator KEFAUVER is not yet persuaded that direct controls are necessary. But he warned last week that the steel and auto industries are now having their last chance.

There remain a number of economists and others who do not believe the administered price problem is a major one, threatening the future stability of prices. But some of these men, while not worrying about the economic power of big business to raise prices, do find dangers in the upward push on costs exerted by big labor.

Others argue that the effect on consumers of recent developments in the steel and other concentrated industries is much overrated.

One witness before the Kefauver subcommittee, Simon N. Whitney, sought to show last week that the 33 percent increase in steel prices since 1953 could have been the cause, at most, of only six-tenths of 1 percent increase in the Consumer Price Index, the usual measure of inflation.

The cost of living, he noted, is dominated by food, services, and such soft goods as apparel.

But these reservations have not changed the growing concern about the problem in the Government. There is a strong belief in the Federal Reserve, for example, that the persistent failure of unemployment to decline with the recovery from the recession, particularly unemployment in the durable goods industries, is attributable in great part to price and wage decisions in those industries in recent years.

In brief, the idea is that these industries, to a significant degree, have "priced themselves out of their market." By the same token, so have their workers.

Again, this view is sometimes challenged. But it was stated in explicit terms last week by Woodlief Thomas, economic adviser to the Federal Reserve Board, in a lengthy letter to the Washington Post and Times Herald. In part, this is what Mr. Thomas said:

"One of the considerations in fixing prices, of course, should be what price can be sustained and whether markets might be lost for a longer period by asking the highest possible price for any short period of time. Criticism arises with respect to administered prices when they are not adjusted properly in response to supply and demand forces.

They are harmful if prices are raised so as to choke off demand and lead to reductions in output or if prices are held up in the face of declining demand when lower prices might sooner or later stimulate some demand."

HYDROELECTRIC POWER, THE KEY TO MONTANA'S FUTURE

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the past 100 years are unsurpassed in history for the great multiplication of mankind's abilities to produce for his needs. This multiplication of abilities is due in large part to the increasing use of power sources additional to human and animal power. First it was steam. Then came electric power. In fact, throughout the world there is a close identity between the per capita use of electricity and living standards.

Electric power is now an essential of a modern diversified economy. An abundance of assured power is indispensable for the continued growth of the economy of each of the 49 States. Assured power supplies are a prerequisite to the establishment of a firm industrial base in the Western States. Insufficient supplies of electric power now restrict western areas, rich in raw materials, to what are, essentially, exploited economies whose potentials for serving the peoples of these areas and the entire Nation are scarcely tapped.

My home State of Montana is an example. It is, in an economic sense, a nation within a nation, with a great future. Its growth is dependent on the equitable and proper exploitation of its abundance of resources. That, in turn, depends on an adequate supply of hydroelectric power. Industry and commerce follow the transmission lines; they come after, not before, the power that they need.

Montana, today, does not have adequate electric power. The inadequacy is reflected in the small number of manufacturing and processing industries. And, today, it is also reflected in Montana's high rate of unemployment.

What we lack in Montana is not power potential but power development. Montana is richly endowed with hydroelectric resources. Great rivers rise in my State. Out of the mountains, the waters of the Columbia and Missouri River systems plunge down steep grades through deep canyons and gorges along which are many sites suitable for reservoirs.

Regrettably, these great hydroelectric resources are largely undeveloped. Less than 15 percent of Montana's 6,500,000-kilowatt potential has been harnessed. According to the Federal Power Commission, there are, in the State, some 70 potential power projects with an aggregate capacity of over 5 million kilowatts.

In Montana there are several sites which cry out for Federal development at an early date: Libby Dam, Yellowtail Dam, and the proposed Knowles Dam are examples. We already have Hungry Horse Dam and the Fort Peck Dam. If we add to them the others I have cited, we will assure an adequate supply of power for present consumers, and preference customers, and we will provide the incentive for new industries to move into one of the most seriously underdeveloped areas of the Nation.

Just one-fourth of this 5 million kilowatts of hydroelectric potential, which I have just mentioned, would double Montana's entire supply of electricity from all sources. If this additional power can be put in service, it would convert communities now stagnant with unemployment into prosperous centers. One-fourth of the undeveloped hydroelectric potential of Montana's rivers would bring diversified industries to our towns. It would bring diversified markets to our farms and ranches. It would do much to restore, on a sound and continuing base, a measure of prosperity for Montana and it would, at the same time, add to the strength and security of the Nation.

We have seen this happen in one portion of my State. In 1952, the generators at Hungry Horse Dam went into service. By the terms of the congressional authorization, Montana has preference in the the use of Hungry Horse power. This great energy supply has brought industry and commerce to the western part of the State. Following the flow of power, came the Anaconda Aluminum plant, the Victor Chemical Co., the Diamond Match Works, and expanded lumber activity. Around these clustered new shops, new homes, new services, and new trading centers. In addition, the new power made possible the extension of rural electrification to the farming and ranching areas of western Montana.

Mr. President, there are two significant observations to be drawn from the Hungry Horse experience. First of all, we had to develop the potential power resource—that is, we had to build the dam and install the generators. The second is that the power had to be reserved by a preference to the State of Montana where it was produced; that is what brought industry to the area. This was done by the authority and guidance of Congress. By way of clarification, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at the conclusion of my remarks, the February 19, 1959, letter of the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, reciting the manner in which this preference works out.

The Hungry Horse story is a happy one. Unfortunately, we also have an unhappy story, involving another large multipurpose project, Fort Peck Dam in eastern Montana. This great project was authorized in 1938 and was intended to supply power for meeting Montana's needs. The records of the Senate show that this was the original intent, but unfortunately, the congressional authorization was not explicit in fixing the preference. As a result, today, with 175,000 kilowatts capacity being installed at Fort Peck, Montana will receive less than 24,000 kilowatts of the power which will be drawn from its reservoirs. This is the allotment decided upon by the administration, not by Congress. It seems to me persuasive evidence that allocations should be fixed by Congress rather than left to the discretion of the Department of the Interior. It is a consideration which will be uppermost in my mind in considering any future legislation which authorizes additional development of Montana water resources. Montana must have a first and definite claim on all waters rising within the State.

There is one final point I would like to make. In seeking to assure to the people of Montana a fair share of the benefits of the State's resources, I do not intend to ignore the needs of neighboring States. We are all citizens of one Nation. The people of Montana have no desire to be less generous in their attitudes toward others, than others are toward them.

By building Hungry Horse to its maximum effectiveness, benefits have accrued, not only to Montana, but also to downstream neighboring States. This approach, I believe, ought to be the key to future public power projects. By full development of each site, it will be possible to share the benefits widely and generously. As we move forward with water resource programs, I believe we must, to the fullest extent possible, seek the benefit of whole regions of the Nation. No State will suffer if the needs of all are met. No State in the long run will gain, if the needs of any are ignored.

Mr. President, in conclusion I want to say that any multipurpose project in

the State of Montana must have the following prerequisites:

First. Montana must be given primary preference on the order of the Hungry Horse project.

Second. Any proposed project must be feasible and economically sound.

Third. Any proposed project must have the approval of the majority of the people directly affected by its construction.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a letter addressed to me by Fred G. Aandahl, Assistant Secretary of the Interior, dated February 19, 1959, which indicates beyond any peradventure of doubt that, so far as the preference for Montana of power from the Hungry Horse project is concerned, there can be no question.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, D.C., February 19, 1959.

Hon. MIKE MANSFIELD,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MANSFIELD: In your January 30, 1959, letter pertaining to Hungry Horse power for the State of Montana, you ask if the legislative history regarding this project did not firmly establish a power preference for the State of Montana and if the Department of the Interior translated this preference by engineering and administrative computation to be the at-site capability of Hungry Horse under coordinated operation. Your statement appears to be substantially accurate. The legislative history and the Hungry Horse Act of June 5, 1944, did firmly establish a power preference for the State of Montana.

Numerous studies were made as to the amount of power that should be included in such a preference. It was obvious that the at-site isolated generation of about 90,000 kilowatts would be too small and not in keeping with the legislative history or the economy of operations. Also, it would be uneconomical to bring large amounts of power from downstream plants for sale in Montana. The at-site capability of Hungry Horse under coordinated operation is approximately equal to the transmission capability that was economically feasible. This is the transmission system that was constructed to tie in the Hungry Horse project with the balance of the Federal Columbia River power system.

Sincerely yours,

FRED G. AANDAHL,
Assistant Secretary of the Interior.

NATIONAL OUTDOOR RECREATION RESOURCES REVIEW COMMISSION

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Order of Business No. 53, Senate bill 82. It is a noncontroversial measure. The House has passed a similar bill and it is desired to substitute the House bill for the Senate bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Texas?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 82) to amend the act of June 28, 1958, to provide for a National Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission, and for other purposes.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed a bill (H.R. 1776) to amend the act of June 28, 1958, entitled "An act to provide for a National Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission, and for other purposes," in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The bill was read the first time by title and the second time at length, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That subsection (a) of section 4 of the Act of June 28, 1958, entitled "An Act to provide for a National Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission, and for other purposes" is amended to read as follows:

"The Commission is authorized, without regard to the civil service laws and regulations, and without regard to the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, to appoint and fix the compensation of an executive secretary and such additional personnel as may be necessary to enable it to carry out its functions, except that any Federal employees subject to the civil service laws and regulations who may be assigned to the Commission shall retain civil service status without interruption or loss of status or privilege."

NATIONAL OUTDOOR RECREATION RESOURCES REVIEW COMMISSION

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, a message just received states that the House has passed a bill similar to the one which the Senate has just taken up for consideration. I ask unanimous consent that the House bill be substituted for the Senate bill and be now considered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill (H.R. 1776) was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, Senate bill 82 is indefinitely postponed.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate reconsider the vote by which H.R. 1776 was passed.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I congratulate the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] for having obtained such expeditious action on the bill. It is characteristic of his actions throughout the years, as I have observed them.

Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I desire to make an announcement about the program of the Senate for the remainder of the week.

Following the conclusion of the business of the Senate today, it is planned to have the Senate go over until Wednesday. Tomorrow is St. Patrick's Day.

It is planned to have a call of the calendar on Wednesday. At the conclusion of the calendar call, it is planned to have the Senate go over until Thursday.

It is possible that Thursday the television education bill will be called up, to be followed by the depressed areas bill. The minority of the Committee on Banking and Currency has until Wednesday to file its views on that bill. We want to be certain that the hearings and the report, including the minority views, are available before we proceed to the consideration of that bill.

I have consulted with some of my colleagues concerning the bill. There will be some discussion of it. Friday is not a good day on which to have votes. Since there will be some amendments offered to the bill, there will be some votes. It is expected that there will be considerable controversy about the bill, and if it is agreeable to the minority leader, I should say to Senators that we will attempt to have no yea-and-nay votes for the remainder of this week. Beginning on Monday, voting on the amendments can begin.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I should like to ask the distinguished majority leader about one measure which is at the desk, Senate bill 308, relating to the diversion of water from Lake Michigan. Of course, I am agreeable to having that bill passed today, if that were possible; but I am afraid that that would involve some difficulty.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. It is not possible to have the bill passed today. The Senator from Illinois, however, as usual, has a very excellent memory. I am thankful for it, and I rely on it greatly. I simply forgot to mention that bill. It is planned to have the Senate debate it, discuss it, and vote upon its referral, I trust, on Wednesday. I should like to have all Senators on notice that H.R. 1, the Lake Michigan water diversion bill, is at the desk. I ask that it remain there so that Senators may know that precipitate action is not being taken on it. On Wednesday, perhaps, the reference of the bill will be debated and possibly voted on.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Obviously, the majority leader cannot foresee how long the debate may take on the area redevelopment bill. But assuming expeditious action on that bill, is it his belief that probably the Senate could go over from Thursday until the following Monday, assuming the area redevelopment bill is disposed of on Thursday?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I should think there would be enough discussion on the bill to occupy the Senate on Thursday and Friday. If not, I should be willing to follow the procedure suggested by the distinguished minority leader. I will be guided by his wishes. We can determine the question on Thursday. If many speeches are to be made, they can be made on Friday. If not, and if the minority leader agrees, we may ask that the Senate go over from Thursday until Monday. But there will be no votes on the area redevelopment bill this week.

It is possible that there will be a vote on the TV education bill, if some Senator seeks to have it, on Thursday. We may have a vote on the reference of the Lake Michigan water diversion bill on Wednesday. But the controversial area redevelopment bill will not be taken up until Thursday, and there will be no votes on that bill until the early part of next week. But every Senator should take notice of the possibility or likelihood that voting will begin on next Monday on the area redevelopment bill.

SENATOR GRUENING'S ESSAY "ALASKA: THE 49TH STATE"

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, now, that we of the Senate happily have added a 50th State, I desire to herald an event associated with our new 49th State, Alaska. The 1959 edition of the annual "Yearbook of the Encyclopaedia Britannica" features a superlative full-length article about Alaska. The eminent and skilled author of the article is also our colleague, the able junior Senator from Alaska [Mr GRUENING].

In my opinion, Mr. President, this article, entitled "Alaska: The 49th State," is the finest modern compendium of facts ever assembled in comparatively short space about our vast new sister State in the Far Northwest. The editors of the "Britannica" deserve credit for their editorial ingenuity and originality in publishing Senator Gruening's thoughtful and informative article. It is valuable and outstanding.

This is merely one more achievement in this respect by ERNEST GRUENING. His book "The State of Alaska" was the almanac and the source and fountainhead of many of the best arguments for statehood. His article in the 1959 "Yearbook of the Britannica" tells, succinctly and dramatically, of the long struggle for full membership in the Union, and how it finally succeeded.

"Alaska is still a frontier," writes ERNEST GRUENING, as he concludes his splendid and vivid essay. Yes, Mr. President, Alaska is still a frontier. But the wise leadership of ERNEST GRUENING and his popular and tireless senatorial partner, E. L. (BOB) BARTLETT, the senior Senator from Alaska, will help to bring about the industrial and economic development which that frontier needs in order to grow and prosper.

I congratulate Senator GRUENING upon a fine article; and I congratulate the voters of the State of Alaska, State No. 49, for sending to us and to the Nation two such outstanding characters as Alaska's first U.S. Senators, E. L. (BOB) BARTLETT and ERNEST GRUENING.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. YOUNG of Ohio in the chair). Does the Senator from Oregon yield to the Senator from Alaska?

Mr. NEUBERGER. I am happy to yield.

Mr. GRUENING. Needless to say, Mr. President, I am extremely grateful for the very generous remarks of my old and good friend, the junior Senator from Oregon. He has made many notable contributions to the progress of Alaska, and Alaskans will eternally be grateful to him on several very important counts. I should not take the time of the Senate to list his various contributions, because if I were to do so I would have to violate the 3-minute rule; it would take very much longer than that to give an adequate account of the splendid services and great aid the Senator from Oregon has rendered the 49th State. His assists to Alaska date far back to before World War II when Alaska was a Territory much less developed than today and was aspiring to the position it now has by virtue of the action of the 85th Congress—a long-sought goal which the junior Senator from Oregon helped greatly to achieve.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I thank the Senator from Alaska.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield to me?

Mr. NEUBERGER. I yield.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I wish to have the privilege of being associated with the Senator from Alaska in the splendid things he has said about the junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER], and I also desire to be associated with the Senator from Oregon in the splendid things he has had to say about the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING] and the State of Alaska.

I wish to inform my colleagues how proud we who live in Texas are that Alaska is a member of the Union. Texans are not jealous one whit of Alaska. Instead, both of the Texas Senators, who supported the bill for Alaskan statehood, believe that Alaska will be one of the brightest stars in the Union.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, if the Senator from Oregon will yield further to me, let me say that we Alaskans are very appreciative of the great help the State of Texas has rendered us.

There was a feeling—it was wholly mistaken—that some representatives of Texas in the Congress opposed the admission of Alaska to the Union because of a not expressed but somewhat subconscious feeling that Texas might thereby lose its status as the largest State. But we Alaskans are always happy to point out that if it had not been for the two great Texans at the two ends of the Capitol—the Speaker of the House of Representatives, SAM RAYBURN, and the majority leader of the Senate, LYNDON JOHNSON—Alaska would not today be a State. We are happy to record that history for the benefit of all future generations.

ARCHBISHOP JAMES AND ARCHBISHOP EZEKIEL, OF THE GREEK ORTHODOX CHURCH

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, recently the American people generally, and the Greek Orthodox faithful in United States specifically, were happy to learn that for the first time in Greek Orthodox history, two American-trained Greek Orthodox bishops, namely, Metropolitan James and Bishop Ezekiel, were elevated to be Archbishop of the Western Hemisphere and Archbishop of Australia, New Zealand, Philippines, Japan and Korea, respectively.

The Ecumenical Patriarch, his Holiness Athengaros, announced the election of Archbishop James as head of the Greek Orthodox Archdiocese of North and South America. The new archbishop had previously served as Vicar of Patriarch at the World Council of Churches in Switzerland, and Dean of the Cathedral in Boston, Massachusetts.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a biographical sketch of Archbishop James.

There being no objection, the biographical sketch was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

METROPOLITAN JAMES OF MELITA ELECTED ARCHBISHOP OF THE GREEK ORTHODOX CHURCH OF NORTH AND SOUTH AMERICA

Metropolitan James of Melita (Malta), who was elected the new permanent archbishop of the Greek Orthodox Church of North and South America by the Holy Synod of the Ecumenical Patriarchate in Istanbul on February 14, 1959, was born Demetrios A. Coucouzis in 1911 on the Turkish island of Imbros. He graduated with high honors from the Theological School of Halki of the Ecumenical Patriarchate in Istanbul in 1934, and was ordained a deacon in 1939. In that year he came to the United States and served as archdeacon of the Greek archdiocese and as professor of the archdiocese theological school, then located in Pomfret, Conn.

He was ordained a priest in Boston on June 14, 1940, and served in this capacity at Hartford, Conn., in 1940–41. He was a preacher at the Holy Trinity Cathedral in New York from 1941–42, and later in 1942 served for a brief period in St. Louis, Mo.

In 1942, he was appointed dean of the Cathedral of the Annunciation in Boston and served in that capacity until 1954. For a brief period in 1954, prior to his election as a bishop, he served as director of the Holy Cross Orthodox Theological School in Brookline, Mass.

On December 17, 1954, he was elected bishop of Melita (Malta) and was assigned to the archdiocese of central and western Europe. In March 1955, he was appointed permanent representative of the Ecumenical Patriarchate at the World Council of Churches headquarters in Geneva. On April 4, 1956, he was elected a metropolitan.

While in Boston, Metropolitan James studied at the Harvard Divinity School and earned the degree of master of sacred theology (S.T.M.). As the representative of the Ecumenical Patriarchate in the World Council of Churches, Metropolitan James traveled extensively throughout the world and attended many ecclesiastical meetings and councils. During this time, he also visited the United States on several occasions and delivered lectures at Harvard, Boston University, and at other institutions and at several religious conferences. He is the author of many religious books and pamphlets.

Metropolitan James is an American citizen, the first to hold the position of archbishop of the Greek Orthodox Church of North and South America. He has close ties with Protestant and Episcopal groups in the United States, especially within the World Council of Churches and the National Council of Churches. The new archbishop is expected to assume his duties at the Greek Archdiocese of North and South America in New York City in April 1959. As the permanent archbishop, he succeeds Archbishop Michael, who died on July 13, 1958.

The Greek archdiocese, which is under the jurisdiction of the ancient Ecumenical

Patriarchate of Constantinople now headed by Patriarch Athenagoras I, has 1,500,000 communicants and 375 churches in the United States. It is the headquarters of the Greek Orthodox Church, which is the largest of the many Eastern Orthodox bodies in America. The combined total of Eastern Greek Orthodox in United States is 6½ million.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, the Ecumenical Patriarch's announcement of the elevation of Bishop Ezekiel was accepted with mixed emotions, since all in this country will very much miss him, although they realize the importance of his new post in the Pacific, where the Orthodox Church is beginning to grow as it did here in the United States 40 years ago.

Mr. President, I know Bishop Ezekiel well; and I know what wonderful work he has done as bishop of Chicago, with an area from Canada to the Gulf of Mexico; as former bishop of New England; and as former head of the theological seminary in Boston. I know of his inspiring leadership in the proper recognition of his faith, and his cooperation with other faiths in bringing true understanding between the four great faiths in this country—Protestant, Catholic, Greek Orthodox, and Jewish. I wish Archbishop Ezekiel well. I ask unanimous consent that an article in the column of James Mezilson, in the Greek Press of Chicago, dated March 6, be inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ELEVATION

A fortnight ago the omogenia of this country was heartened by the news of the selection of Metropolitan James to be the new head of the archdiocese of North and South America. Then in a subsequent announcement from the Phanar, headquarters of the Ecumenical Patriarchate, Patriarch Athengaros I revealed the election by the holy synod of the elevation of our own beloved Bishop Ezekiel to the rank of Metropolitan to head the archdiocese of Australia and of New Zealand. This news brought a mixed reaction, happy that Bishop Ezekiel had been selected to receive this honor, and sad that he would be leaving his Chicago post after 5 years of progressive and constructive leadership.

Archbishop-elect Ezekiel's reaction to the news brought forth the response: "I am deeply honored and I feel very happy upon the occasion of my election." He added further that "from the bottom of my heart I give glory to God and I express humble thanks to Him, who has guided my steps up to now and led me in the service of our Church and entrusted me with the care of the souls of His flock."

The new primate of the land "down under" expressed the important lesson learned from his 22 years of service here—that in America there is democracy in action, and furthermore, there is certain proof of what Christian spirit and Christian love can accomplish. He pointed out that "If this Christian and democratic spirit existing among the many minorities comprising this great land of America could be spread to all the nations and to all the peoples of the world, then the ideal of peace and of one world, which many consider a utopia can indeed become a reality."

Chicago will bid farewell to its beloved leader and one-time dean of the Holy Cross Theological Seminary at a dinner at the Hotel Sherman on Wednesday evening, March 11. The event will be under the auspices of the official Greek Orthodox Church family in this area. This includes the members of the mixed council of the archdiocese, the clergy, the presidents of the church boards, the Philoptohos societies, GOYA, and the Greek Archdiocese Welfare Foundation. The communities' various fraternal, social, civic, and cultural groups will join the official sponsors in honoring Bishop Ezekiel. This is the first time that Chicago has been so afforded to honor its bishop. Metropolitan Ezekiel's predecessors, Bishops Callistos and Gerasimos, died in office.

Prior to his departure from Chicago, his grace headed for the New England area, where he served for many years, and was honored on March 5 at a farewell testimonial dinner at the school he once headed, Holy Cross, in Brookline. He returns to Chicago on Saturday, March 14, to officiate at vespers in the Cathedral of the Annunciation, and marking his last official duty before his departure, but he will serve as celebrant of the liturgy at St. Constantine Church on Sunday morning, March 15.

All of Chicago will miss him, but we are happy for what he left behind in his works and his love for all.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I conclude with the note that the just solution of the Cyprus issue by our three friendly allies—England, Greece, and Turkey—and its acceptance by Archbishop Makarios, on behalf of the people of Cyprus, gives Cyprus an independence status, and again brings strength and cooperation to our Greek-Turkish alliance which guards the eastern Mediterranean Sea and gateway to the East.

THE POSITION OF THE UNITED STATES IN THE BERLIN CRISIS

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, as Mr. Khrushchev maneuvers the Berlin situation on a giddy course toward the conference table, the doubts and fears of our people are probably growing almost in proportion to his capricious and thoroughly unpredictable statements.

Clearly, the executive branch must have a free hand in finding an acceptable solution to the Berlin question. Yet, it is also clear that all Americans should have a keen appreciation of our Government's position and of just what is meant when we say we are standing firm. They want, I should think, and surely deserve, to see in a clearer and deeper perspective the inherent character of our policy. And this applies to our friends abroad, as well as to the American people.

Among many responsible Europeans, there is a suspicion that we are weakening, that we are being lured into a conference in which all important concessions will be made by our side. They observe that, even as we profess firmness, we are trimming our conventional forces. A prominent French editor has been quoted as saying:

They—

Meaning some French officials—

think you are about to commit treason in a war that has already started.

So it becomes urgent that not only the Russians, but the entire world, understand our intentions—intentions which I believe are shared by Republicans and Democrats alike. If we fail to make our intentions clear, we shall have disheartened our friends and people everywhere who value freedom; and we shall, of course, have done our adversary a great service.

My purpose in making this brief statement, therefore, is not only to reassure our friends, but also to make clear to the leaders of the Soviet Union, and thereby avoid miscalculations on their part, that, despite the free debate characteristic of a democracy, the American people, regardless of party, stand united on the following propositions:

First. The United States will make no separate, or unilateral, deals with the Soviet Union.

Second. The United States will not be driven or enticed from Berlin or from West Germany. We intend to stay until such time as we, in concert with the Governments of West Germany, France, and Britain, decide to withdraw. Such withdrawal will come only as a result of some agreement with the Russians on issues larger than Berlin which we and our allies believe is in our interest. To leave Berlin prematurely, or before Russia's goad, would induce consequences of a psychological nature in both the German sectors, ranging from cynical mistrust of our reliability to despair itself. The fabric of the Western Alliance would undoubtedly begin to unravel. And the neutral societies, anxiously watching this struggle of two great systems, would probably commence an unflattering evaluation of our chances.

Third. The United States cannot in honor accept, even tacitly, any proposition designed to formalize the subjugation of the once free satellite peoples. Our society owes much of its character to the 18th century philosophers who gave meaning and depth to the term "freedom." We could no more accept the permanent subjugation of freedom in the satellites than we could consent to any compromise of freedom in Berlin or West Germany.

This is not to say that we intend to use force against the Soviets to bring about the liberation of these presently subjugated peoples. False hopes of physical intervention by us should not be encouraged.

It does mean that we deny that the Russians have any legal or moral right to dominate these subject peoples. We reject the validity of their position based solely upon superior physical power.

It does mean, we believe, that in time the public opinion of the world will cause the Russian people to relinquish their control of the once free peoples of Poland, East Germany, Hungary, Czechoslovakia, Latvia, Estonia, Lithuania, Rumania, and Bulgaria.

We may even hope that as conditions of life improve in the U.S.S.R., the harsh and brutal attitude of the Russians toward their fellow men may be humanized.

These basic intentions having been stated, it is necessary to add that I see no peculiar virtue in the status quo. We must not, therefore, be unreceptive to fresh, soundly reasoned ideas. We welcome all responsible suggestions aimed

at dissipating this glow of crisis hanging over Central Europe and the sense of futility that goes with it.

There are negotiable points. Agreements by us and the Russians on some of them might serve the interests of both nations. In Germany, we find both sides, each bristling with nuclear weapons, eyeing one another balefully across an unrealistic boundary. It seems to me, for example that if both were to move back an equal distance—however slight the distance—the possibility of war, especially accidental war, would be reduced.

Much of the difficulty of making progress toward relieving tensions in Central Europe derives from the growing use of such terms as "easement," "relocation of forces," and, especially, "disengagement." If, as seems to be the case, there is a fundamental ambiguity clinging to words like "disengagement"—and even "negotiation"—it should be cleared up. These terms must not be equated with appeasement and retreat, as too often they are.

It should be clearly understood by friend and foe alike that under no circumstances will the United States disengage, or relocate its forces, except in return for a bone fide quid pro quo—in short, an agreement that would benefit the Western Allies at least as much as it would benefit the Soviet Union.

We ought not to accept the facile axiom that the Russians have no intention of ever coming to reasonable terms on any matter directly affecting their own interests. To endorse such dogma would be to accept an annealing of the present situation, surely insupportable over the stretch of time. To the corollary admonition—that any deal with Russia would have to be policed—we agree. Neither the United States nor any of its allies is prepared to trade an easement of the situation for any agreement that could not be effectively monitored.

Finally, as the time for negotiation draws nearer, it is essential to remind ourselves not to expect too much in the way of results. A willingness on our part to negotiate, even to relocate military forces under the right circumstances, is all to the good. However, to expect any substantial easement in the near future would be the height of wishful thinking. Indeed, it may be a matter of years rather than months before the Russians will extend a quid equal in value to our quo. As before, our duty is to strengthen our defenses and our resolve. Also, we must not be discouraged. Instead, we should chip away relentlessly at the encrusted Communist mixture of dogma, braggadocio, and fear that contributes so much to keeping world peace in a recurring state of serious jeopardy.

ORDER TO DISPENSE WITH CALL OF THE CALENDAR TODAY

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the call of the calendar, scheduled for today under the rule, be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CALL OF THE CALENDAR ON WEDNESDAY—LEGISLATIVE REVIEW COMMITTEE

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I announce, for the information of the Senate, that there will be a call of the calendar, for the consideration of bills to which there is no objection, on Wednesday, at the conclusion of morning business. I have previously worked out that arrangement with the distinguished minority leader, and have previously announced it, but I want all Members of the Senate to have ample time to be prepared.

In connection therewith, the majority has a legislative review committee, and the Senator from California [Mr. ENGLE], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT], and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART], are the members of that committee. It is their responsibility to take the 20,000 bills which are introduced each year and analyze and evaluate them, and to analyze carefully bills which are reported; and if they can be passed without controversy and without objection, as many can be, then they are passed.

If any Member of the Senate wants measures passed over or wants objection made to bills on the consent calendar, if he will communicate with the three Senators I have named, they, or any one of them, will act for that particular Member of the Senate.

Furthermore, in the case of bills that involve controversy and have more substance, and which may require some debate and amendments, the Senators mentioned will attempt to work out amendments that are satisfactory and that will result in their passage. If they fail in that attempt, they will make their recommendations to the policy committee. We ask them, through their staffs, to make the recommendations, and I think we will ask them to sit with us in scheduling legislation before this body.

I need not inform the minority, but I wish to repeat to the minority leader and his legislative review committee, or whatever is comparable to it—I am informed it is called the calendar committee of the minority—that we welcome their suggestions at any time and will always try to comply with them, if possible, because this is a matter which requires as much unity as is obtainable.

Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

JOINT MEETING OF THE TWO HOUSES ON WEDNESDAY NEXT TO HEAR ADDRESS BY HON. SEAN T. O'KELLY, PRESIDENT OF IRELAND

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I announce, for the information of the Senate, that on Wednesday next the Senate will proceed to the House of Representatives for a joint meeting at 12:30 o'clock. The two Houses will hear an address to be delivered by Mr. Sean T. O'Kelly, President of Ireland.

I hope that all good Irishmen will return from their St. Patrick's Day celebrations and be here to welcome this very able President.

THE NEED FOR PROPER PRIOR PLANNING REGARDING WEST BERLIN

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, there is a little alliterative saying in the Army which I believe has an important meaning to this Nation today.

In preparing to become officers or noncommissioned officers, candidates are reminded that "Proper prior planning prevents poor performance."

The date of May 27 is circled on the world's calendar. That is the date when Russia's Mr. Krushchev, in a cold-blooded game of worldwide Russian roulette, has demanded that the West get out of West Berlin. The Communist dictator has said the deadline may be extended to June or July—if things are going to suit him. However, Wednesday, May 27 could still become the day which will mark the beginning of world war III.

Another old quotation is applicable. Shakespeare said:

> All the world's a stage.

And one of the principal players in the gripping drama currently being presented is the United States of America. The other nations, our friends as well as our enemies, make up the audience. The audience is closely watching the happenings on the stage because, unlike what happens in most plays, the events affect all of them.

What must the audience think of a nation which, in the face of the situation currently facing it, talks of cuts in its armed forces and seems resigned to becoming a second-rate power in the missile race?

The cold war may not suddenly turn hot on May 27, but the failure of the United States to show that, although it wants peace, it is willing to defend the rights and principles for which it stands, could well so weaken our position in the eyes of the audience, the world, as to cause us to lose our current position of leadership of the free nations.

In remarks before this distinguished body on March 12 I discussed this problem. I should like to repeat three short statements from that discussion:

First. It is known that the Russians have 175 ground divisions ready for combat and equipped with the most modern tanks and other implements of war. We have very small forces with which to meet them.

Second. At this time, as in all periods of grave crisis, all of us stand firmly with President Eisenhower. If the Soviet leaders think they will find us divided in our fight against communism—divided by political parties or divided by political ideology or divided on any other ground—they have made what will prove to be their greatest mistake, and perhaps their fatal mistake.

Third. We are the only nation which has the strength to save West Berlin, and the free world is looking and watch-

ing to see whether we will have the resolution and courage to do so.

In preference to the horrors of war, negotiation is advisable at any time. However, we can only negotiate with the Communists from a position of military strength. We must have prior planning to prevent not just poor performance but to prevent a tragedy. The time for the planning is now.

Negotiation does not mean retreat. Any retreat in the case of West Berlin would be fatal.

Mr. President, a thoughtful examination of our position was included in an editorial published in the Columbus, (Ga.) Enquirer. I request unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point the editorial from the Enquirer for Saturday, March 14, 1959, under the heading "President's Attitude Toward Size of Ground Forces Disconcerting."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PRESIDENT'S ATTITUDE TOWARD SIZE OF GROUND FORCES DISCONCERTING

In continuing his stand against the position of those who are fighting a cutback in ground forces, President Eisenhower made a surprising statement at his news conference Wednesday. The Chief Executive, not in the habit of making statements containing little or no substance, declared to reporters that if Congress persists in providing more manpower for the Army and Marines, he supposes he will have to put them "someplace where it's nice, to keep them out of the way, because I don't know what else to do with them."

This does not sound like President Eisenhower.

The statement not only is surprising, but it is a bit shocking.

Mr. Eisenhower pleaded with the country to stand ready, to avoid hysteria and going a little bit off half-cocked. He said that because of the actions and attitudes of communism, "we are living and we are going to live in a tense period."

The President said it would be ruinous to be "pushed off" time and again by something suddenly described as a crisis, from a defense plan he said represents the nearest approach to a consensus of those people who are best informed on the subject.

In connection with the opinions of those best informed on the subject of military preparedness, it is interesting to note that Senator LYNDON B. JOHNSON made this statement right after a Senate preparedness subcommittee had questioned Gen. Maxwell D. Taylor, Army Chief of Staff.

"One conclusion is inescapable. That is that the size and composition of the Army does not reflect the judgment of the men who must lead the Army in the event the Army must be used."

This does not seem to bear out President Eisenhower's contention that the policy he has put into effect is the nearest approach to a consensus of those who are best informed on the subject.

On the contrary, it appears that those whose duty it is to lead the ground forces are not in agreement with plans to cut their size.

The Eisenhower program contemplates cutting the Army from 900,000 to 870,000 men and the Marine Corps from 200,000 to 175,000 by midyear. An Associated Press dispatch from Washington said Wednesday that General Taylor told reporters he twice has recommended 925,000 men for the Army and that he nodded assent that he still wants that many. This, said the AP dispatch, was something like an hour after Mr. Eisenhower told newsmen:

"I don't think that an Army of 870,000 is a small Army. And I don't see why we should get so hysterical or excited about it."

The President asked what would be done with more ground forces in Europe—start a war? The man who commanded Allied forces in the invasion of Europe in World War II stated that to win and enforce your will "you have got to go to other means." He apparently was alluding to nuclear weapons.

A reporter told the President at his Wednesday news conference that some of his critics are saying that $90 million is being spent for jet transports for the White House and Pentagon, whereas 60 million more would bring 55,000 men into the Army and Marine Corps. The President replied he believed it would take 250 millions to provide for an extra 55,000 men a year. He added:

"I have never asked for a jet plane and I am not sure that I will ever be riding in one."

The Chief Executive said he authorized the military to acquire two or three jet transports because he knows of no other way they can decide whether the jets are an efficient and effective means for supporting our forces.

The strong opposition to a cut in the ground forces developed anew on Capitol Hill when the Berlin crisis developed.

Senator STUART SYMINGTON said Wednesday that General Taylor had shown "very clearly that he completely disagrees with the administration position" on the Army's size.

The Berlin situation points up the need for the President to give serious consideration to the view of those military leaders who view with alarm the plans to cut materially the size of the ground forces.

It is disconcerting when the President says he would not know what to do with additional manpower if voted by Congress. Indeed, it is distressing.

There seems to be little doubt that the military leaders of the country are disturbed by the plans to chop off 30,000 members of the Army and 25,000 from the Marines.

To whom does the President refer when indicates that those who are best informed on the subject favor the reduction?

It is hoped that Congress will act with bipartisan vigor in such a way as to convince the administration that the United States must maintain an adequate ground force. To fail to do so would invite tragedy.

DEATH OF HENRY PATRICK KILEY

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I have received word today of the loss of a public servant whose devotion to his country and his friends went far beyond the call of duty. I am speaking with respect and sadness of Henry Patrick Kiley, who died this morning at Georgetown Hospital, where he had apparently been on the road to recovery after a serious operation.

Mr. Kiley's record of conscientious, effective service is one which has been equalled by few. It began when he entered the U.S. Army on September 19, 1918, and continued through the Superior Provost's Court, the State Department, the Department of Justice, the Senate Committee To Investigate Campaign Expenditures, and the Senate Crime Committee, where his fine work deserves special mention.

In the past few years Pat Kiley, as he was known to most of us, had not been in good health. Yet he still carried on as a part-time employee on my staff, working for the public. Pat Kiley was a warm and friendly man, with a very big heart. All who knew him will be saddened by his passing—especially my staff and I, who will remember him with special affection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business?

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I have further business during the morning hour.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from New York.

LEO O'BRIEN: A GREAT CHAMPION OF ALASKAN AND HAWAIIAN STATEHOOD

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, it is with a great deal of pleasure that I rise to pay a somewhat unique tribute to a true friend of mine, Representative LEO W. O'BRIEN, of New York. Although LEO is of a different political persuasion from myself, his quick wit, his active mind, his powers of warm understanding, and his readiness to cooperate above and beyond the call of partisanship, have endeared him to all Members of Congress, regardless of political affiliation.

LEO O'BRIEN's name has been preserved for immortality by events of the past 2 years. Through his skillful and successful quarterbacking of the Alaskan and Hawaiian statehood bills, LEO O'BRIEN's name has been indelibly written on the history books of our Nation. And rightly so, for more than any other single man, he deserves the credit for these two great achievements.

Undaunted by repeated rebuffs and slow action by Congress, LEO has plugged away on these two projects with his usual determination and stick-to-itiveness. Much of the success of his efforts can be traced to the intensive, painstaking manner in which he convinced himself—and any doubters—about the soundness of statehood for these two Territories. LEO's careful research into every aspect of statehood for Alaska and Hawaii convinced him—and enabled him to convince a majority of both bodies—that the cause was right and just.

I am pleased to salute him as the godfather—if not father—of Alaska and Hawaii statehood. Particularly since his most recent spectacular success came on the eve of St. Patrick's Day, it is reassuring to note that his name will be written boldly, and perhaps in green, on the pages of our Nation's history. I congratulate LEO O'BRIEN for this job well done. It will be a pleasure to continue our pleasant association, working together for those things we feel are good for New York and the Nation.

Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York.

HUNGARIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, March 15 marked the anniversary of Hungarian

Freedom Day or Hungarian Independence Day. In ceremonies all across our land, the memory of the great Louis Kossuth and other leaders of the noble Hungarian people was evoked and audiences were exhorted to rededicate themselves to the cause of Hungarian freedom.

It was in 1848 that the Hungarians, along with other liberty-loving peoples of Europe, won freedom from despotic rule. The incomparable Kossuth led his people in a bloodless uprising which resulted in the abolition of serfdom, the proclamation of a charter of freedom, and other manifestations of a victory over tyranny. That day, March 15, will never be forgotten by the people of Hungary and their friends throughout the world.

It is important for those of us who are fortunate enough to live in the free world to continue the observance of Hungarian Independence Day. For by these ceremonies, and the resultant publicity which seeps through the Iron Curtain, we can assure those brave people still under the yoke of Kremlin imperialism that they are not forgotten. Because the Hungarian people in their native land cannot celebrate this day, it is doubly important that we mark it and mark it well.

We know that the spirit of liberty is not dead in Hungary. The spirit of 1848 was clearly manifested in the October 1956 revolution which shook the Kremlin to its foundations. It has been demonstrated in numerous acts of sabotage and other activities of silent resistance to the Red overlords.

We in the United States, who have benefited so much from the Hungarians who have come to our land and contributed so much to our progress and strength, must on this occasion reaffirm our belief in the freedom of Hungary. We must hope and pray for the day of liberation.

I salute Hungarians on both sides of the Iron Curtain on this anniversary occasion, and express the hope that the day will not be long delayed when this fine country will once more regain its rightful place in the family of free nations.

Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York.

FORTY-SEVENTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE FOUNDING OF THE GIRL SCOUTS OF AMERICA

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, the week of March 8 to 14 marked the 47th anniversary of girl scouting in America. I want to take this opportunity to extend my hearty congratulations to this fine organization and its members, and to express the hope that it will continue to grow and prosper.

Throughout its history in our Nation, the Girl Scout movement has consistently contributed to better citizenship and to making this a better place in which to live. Through programs such as aid-to-voters, the proficiency badges stressing good citizenship and contributions to good government, and other worthy projects, the Girl Scouts of America are doing much to insure that the women of tomorrow will be fully informed, wholly alert, and valuable members of the American community.

Through its international programs, the Girl Scouts are contributing much to the building of strong bonds of friendship with our world neighbors. Their personalized, people-to-people contacts help break down barriers of misinformation and distrust, and help immeasurably to enhance prospects for a lasting peace based on mutual understanding and trust.

It is encouraging to note, in these days when we hear so much about juvenile delinquency, that the programs of the Girl Scouts are contributing so successfully to the sound development of our youth. It is worthy of note, also, that the Girl Scouts seek not to displace, but rather to supplement, the basic foundations for the development of happy and useful citizens—namely, the home, church, and school.

In its 47 years of existence, the Girl Scouts of America have become a nationwide symbol and movement for better citizenship among girls and women. By melding constructively and effectively in its programs the virtues and teachings of love, worship, work, and play, the Girl Scouts are contributing magnificently to the building of a stronger America.

I salute this great, high-minded organization on its birthday and wish all concerned Godspeed and every success in the years ahead.

THE PROBLEM OF AGRICULTURAL SURPLUSES

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks a letter which I have received from Mr. Noel Cover, who conducts some of the most extensive agricultural operations in the State of Nebraska. The letter deals with the problem of agricultural surpluses.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COZAD, NEBR., *March 5, 1959.*

Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
U.S. Senator, North Dakota,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: I am Noel Cover, Dawson County, Cozad, Nebr. I have been one of the big meat producers of the country. Have bred, raised, grown, fed, and marketed large numbers of cattle, hogs, and sheep—running into millions of head. Never bought on order nor sold on commission.

In these operations would feed a million bushels of corn and thousands of tons of alfalfa hay each year. Buying 80 percent more than I produced.

In the thirties bought hundreds of thousands bushels of good, sound corn for 8 to 15 cents bushel. Also thousands of tons of alfalfa hay at $2 to $5 a ton, and other feeds on same price level.

While I buy many times more corn than I produce, I would rather pay $1.60 bushel for corn to feed than any price less than $1.60. In doing so, I am not being a philanthropist.

Dawson County stands in the first 100 agriculture counties in the United States. Has more irrigation in Dawson County than any county in the State.

Farm sales are many, many times greater this winter and spring than at anytime in the past. Farm tenants are throwing in the sponge.

I have some choice irrigated farms that I have been unable to rent—not even a prospect since September. There has always been more renters than farms.

I am a Republican. Have never complied with the farm program. Even though the farm program was set by the Democrats, it was the greatest thing—not only for the agriculture—but for all the people until President Eisenhower and Secretary Benson took over.

Secretary Benson started at once to destroy the farm program. His answer to the agriculture problem was farmers cooperative.

Shipping millions of bushels of corn and wheat on the open market. He puts forth every effort to injure, damage, and destroy the farm program.

Having enough wheat in the bins now to carry us a year, and 300 million bushels over, without a crop this year, is a wonderful position to be in, especially at this time.

Even though the farm population is down to 15 million we are dependent upon agriculture for our very existence and the most important segment in our economy, where new wealth comes from.

If there was 90 to 100 percent parity on cotton, wheat and corn, set to run until Congress could make any changes, giving the Secretary of Agriculture limited power and directions in disposing of the surplus. This would be an answer.

If the agriculture program was put to where it was when President Eisenhower and Secretary Benson took over, even if, it cost 15 billion a year, every dollar would go into channels of commerce and taxes. It would not cause inflation—it would be prosperity.

I am from the grassroots, with agriculture experience second to none, successful to a degree. If there is any possibility I can do agriculture any good in appearing before committees or hearings, I will be glad to do so at my own expense. I want no job nor publicity.

Secretary Benson and his agriculture program and the 5 million unemployed is what put the Democrats in the saddle.

Thanking you, I am,

Yours truly,

NOEL COVER.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. YOUNG of Ohio in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

THE SUPREME COURT

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, there is a widespread debate in the Nation today regarding the role of the Supreme Court. Unfortunately, this controversy has led to extreme pronouncements by both the Court's unqualified defenders and its irrepressible detractors. The extremists in one camp have proposed measures which would endanger the very institution of the Supreme Court. The extremists in the opposite camp

have bitterly attacked even proposals to study the decision of the Court. I am convinced that neither of these factions reflects the sentiments or best interests of the American people.

There is a tendency under our constitutional system of checks and balances for controversies to develop between the respective branches of the Government. Such controversies are an inevitable and, I believe, an intended result of the division of governmental responsibility decreed by the fundamental law. The clashes often produce a compromise between those who want too much and those who would give too little, which provides the people with just enough. I hope this will be the outcome of the present controversy between Congress and the Supreme Court.

The Supreme Court, like the other branches of Government, has served us well in its 179 years of existence. Its justices have established an outstanding record for integrity and impartiality. The Court should not be any more immune from criticism than other branches of the Government. But its imperfections should be brought to light and remedied by intelligent and constructive scrutiny of its decisions, not by vindictive and intemperate attacks on the Court itself.

It is of vital importance that we avoid precipitous action which will plague us ever after. We must act with wisdom and not in anger. We must be judicious in our approach so that we may, with clear conscience, criticize whatever injudiciousness we uncover in the approach of others. Exercise of legislative self-restraint in this area will earn us respect and remove all doubts as to our good intentions.

I was delighted to note the strong reaffirmation of faith in the institution of the Supreme Court contained in the preamble to the recent resolutions adopted by the American Bar Association. This report has been so widely misrepresented that I believe it would be well to quote its very first "whereas" clause in full. It reads:

> The Supreme Court of the United States and an independent judiciary created by the Constitution have been and are the ultimate guardians of the Bill of Rights and the protectors of our freedom, and as such it is the duty of the members of the bar to defend the institutions of the judiciary from unfair and unjust attacks.

This reverent attitude toward our judicial institutions should be shared by all Americans, particularly lawyers, no matter what their opinion may be of any particular decisions. The first canon of professional ethics enjoins upon each of us who are privileged to be members of the legal profession, the sacred duty "to maintain toward the courts a respectful attitude not for the sake of the temporary incumbent of the judicial office, but for the maintenance of its supreme importance." This canon also contains the practical observation that: "Judges not being wholly free to defend themselves, are peculiarly entitled to receive the support of the bar against unjust criticism and clamor." This is advice which every citizen should take to heart.

Congress has a responsibility to prevent the undermining of our judicial system and to protect and preserve the rule of law. This is a sacred mission. The difference between a society governed by principles of justice and a society governed by arbitrary fiats is the difference between democracy and tyranny. I want to make it clear that I will always defend with all my vigor the institution of the Supreme Court as one of the pillars of our constitutional structure.

The Court's role has not always been readily accepted. In many periods of controversy between the Court and both the legislative and executive branches of the Government, attempts have been made to undermine and destroy the structure and power of the Court itself.

Many of the earlier Jeffersonian Democrats, for example, because they were fearful of the direction of the Court, attempted to repudiate the whole idea of judicial review of acts of Congress. Their view was that Congress had the exclusive right to interpret the Constitution.

President Andrew Jackson, expressed like sentiments when he said:

> The Congress, the Executive, and the Court must each for itself be guided by its own opinion of the Constitution * * * The opinion of the judges has no more authority over Congress than the judges, and on that point the President is independent of both.

The most far-reaching and potentially dangerous attack upon the status of the Supreme Court came in the 1930's after the Supreme Court overturned a number of administration statutes. It was proposed at that time to increase the number of judges on the Court in an obvious attempt to pack it with jurists sympathetic to the threatened legislation. If this plan had succeeded, it might have permanently impaired the respect for the judicial process of our Nation.

More subtle but equally pernicious proposals were made at the same time to compel the Court to comply with the Chief Executive's will. One proposal was to adopt an amendment under which Congress could overrule any Supreme Court decision by simply reenacting the law. Another proposal would have deprived the Supreme Court of its appellate jurisdiction in cases involving Federal constitutional questions. And there was even a proposal to require the vote of seven members of the Court rather than a majority in order to hold a statute unconstitutional.

By what logic could reiteration constitutionalize an unconstitutional law? By what reasoning could it have been urged that the conflicts in lower court decisions should be permanently perpetuated by the absence of appellate review? By what system of political mathematics could it have been calculated that any two members of the Court should be allowed to frustrate the constitutional determinations of a court majority? Perhaps this foolishness was apparent then, too, for we know that after a bitter controversy, all of these proposals were rejected. Yet we have recently seen evidence of their reappearance.

We may disagree most strongly with the opinions of the Court, and I, for one, find fault with a good number of recent vintage, but disagreement with individual decisions does not excuse extreme attacks on the members of the Court nor upon the institution itself. The critics who would have us impeach members of the present Court, or submit them to reconfirmation every 4 years, and who have advanced other such schemes, reveal a lack of understanding for the basic concept of the Court and the part it must play in the American system.

In my view there are three major circumstances under which Congress is warranted in revising decisions rendered by the Court. The most obvious is when the Court departs from its role as interpreter of the law and presumes to pass upon the wisdom of the statutes. Next, when it has mistaken the intention of Congress in construing the meaning of the law. And, finally, when it has sought to adopt laws of its own when Congress has been silent.

In these situations, it is the duty of Congress, as the elected body duly constituted to enact the Nation's laws, to state its intentions forcefully and unmistakably. Such action is not an attack on the Court, but an effort to fulfill the congressional responsibility under the Constitution. Only shortsighted and naive judicial purists, who fail to comprehend our system of checks and balances, could reasonably object to allowing Congress to have its say on such matters. In my opinion it is as subversive of Congress' functions under the Constitution to doubt its right to examine such decisions as it would be subversive of the Court's functions to propose its submission to either legislative or executive domination.

Indeed, nothing is better calculated to encourage unjustifiably drastic measures against the Supreme Court, than the antics of the extremists on the other side who engaged in an overzealous, emotional defense of the merits of every judicial pronouncement. These judicial absolutists condemn every legislative effort to consider the decisions of the Court. Such people, because they believe that the present Court faithfully serves their libertarian interests, attempt to undermine and belittle even the most moderate congressional exercise of its own lawmaking authority in this field. In their zeal for a particular decisional doctrine, they would destroy the fundamental constitutional doctrine of checks and balances on which our governmental structure is built. We must always respect and defend the institution of the Court, but it would be fatal to our system of Government to confer upon the Court immunity from legislative scrutiny.

To maintain that the Court is infallible, is to deny history. After all, it was a decision by the Supreme Court in the Dred Scott case which held that Congress could not constitutionally prohibit the extension of slavery in the Louisiana Territory north of Missouri. The immediate result of this decision was to make a slave out of a human being intended by Congress and God to be a

free man. It took a Civil War and a constitutional amendment to completely undo the consequences of this action of the Supreme Court.

It was Supreme Court decision in the Pollock case which invalidated the first Federal income-tax law and required the 16th amendment. I know that no one particularly enjoys paying taxes, but think of where this country would be today if Congress had not reviewed, and the people had not revised, this decision by the Supreme Court.

It was the Supreme Court which declared the first Federal workmen's compensation act for employees of interstate carriers unconstitutional.

It was the Supreme Court which declared that it was unconstitutional to prohibit an employer from discriminating against union members.

It was the Supreme Court which at one time held unconstitutional early Federal civil rights laws.

It was the Supreme Court which at one time said that Congress exceeded its power in attempting to legislate against child labor.

It was the Supreme Court that declared that Congress could not establish a minimum wage law for women in the Nation's Capital.

I could, as could any other Senator, multiply these examples. Those which have been cited, however, are sufficient to demonstrate the desirablity—indeed, the necessity—for surveillance of the rulings of this third branch of Government. Study of the operations and decisions of the Court can contribute as much to the public welfare as in other cases study by the Court of the operations and actions of the other branches of Government has contributed to the public welfare.

Unfortunately, some legislative critics of the Supreme Court approach their task with a degree of hostility which makes constructive action impossible. I am particularly concerned about the unrestrained attacks upon the Court in some quarters because of its decision in the school segregation cases. In my opinion the Court's desegregation decision was eminently sound, both in law and in morals. The ruling was forecast by a number of cases ordering the admission of Negroes to State institutions of higher learning. As early as 1938, the Court, speaking through Chief Justice Hughes, in *Gaines* v. *Canada* (305 U.S. 337) held that a Negro living in Missouri was entitled to study law at the University of Missouri, a State school, there being no other law school maintained by the State which he could attend. The significant fact about this decision was its teaching that the requirement of equal protection of the laws was not satisfied by Missouri's offer to pay tuition at a school of comparable standing in a nearby State. Later, in 1950, in *Sweatt* v. *Painter* (339 U.S. 621), the Supreme Court said it was proper to examine intangible as well as tangible factors in determining whether separate law schools maintained for Negro residents were equal to schools open to white residents only. This clearly presaged the Supreme Court's reliance, in the 1954 school desegregation cases, on the psychological and sociological impact on children of enforced educational separation based on their race.

An eminent legal scholar, Dean Pound, once remarked that while the law must be stable, it cannot stand still. It strikes me that the school desegregation decision is a good illustration of the kind of growth in the law which has always been necessary to prevent stagnation. In my opinion, this decision was a logical and inevitable step after the Gaines and Sweatt opinions, unless we were to erect a constitutional principle upon the difference between elementary and advanced education. Moreover, it was a decision which added strength and character to our claim of being a Nation of free and equal people.

My strong support of this decision, however, does not blind me to the reasonableness of criticisms directed against decisions of the Court in other fields, particularly in cases involving subversion and law enforcement. While I was a Member of the House of Representatives, I introduced a number of bills to deal with these cases on an individual and selective basis, and I have already introduced or cosponsored similar measures in the Senate. I regard it as my duty as a legislator, and particularly because of being honored by membership on the Committee on the Judiciary, to keep myself as fully informed as possible about the fate of legislative enactments in the courts. When I feel that the intention of Congress in passing a law has been misconstrued, I will work hard for a congressional reiteration of its views in unambiguous and unmistakable terms. But I will never do this in a way which challenges either the motives or the power of the High Court, and I will firmly oppose any indiscriminate legislation sponsored by others which would curtail the Court's jurisdiction and methods of operation.

One of the most significant shortcomings of the 85th Congress was its failure to enact bills designed to remove unreasonable impediments to effective action against subversives and the criminal underworld revealed by several Court decisions. In the Nelson case the Supreme Court held that the States could not act against Communists seeking the overthrow of the Republic because that was a field which the Federal Government had preempted; then, in the Yates case, the Court held that the Federal Government's own antisubversive laws did not apply to organizing a cell or a unit of the Communist Party because only participation in organizing the original Communist Party ran afoul of the law, and finally in the Kent and Briehl cases the Court held that the Federal Government could not prevent even known Communists and other subversives from leaving and returning to the country at will. The result of these decisions was virtually to immunize the Communist Party from either State or Federal prosecution and at the same time to permit its traitorous members to improve their techniques and spread their poison in foreign lands all over the globe. These decisions of the Court, which in large part were based on alleged constructions of congressional intent, made a mockery of our national effort to keep this country secure against Communist treachery.

Under the legislation proposed to meet this situation, the States would be authorized to prosecute all traitors; the Federal Government would be authorized to prosecute anyone for teaching and advocating the violent overthrow of our Government if he tried to form a cell of the international Communist movement for this purpose; and the Secretary of State would be authorized to deny passports to Communist Party members and their agents.

Congress should also act to unshackle law enforcement efforts against the domestic garden variety type of criminal by correcting a number of Supreme Court decisions which have disclosed entirely unwarranted obstacles to anti-crime measures.

In the Mallory case, for example, the Supreme Court imposed a system of timetable justice on police officers which has made it impossible properly to investigate crime. In the Benanti case the Supreme Court completely destroyed the effectiveness of State wiretapping laws and transformed the ordinary telephone into a privileged instrument for criminality. In the Sullivan case the Supreme Court gave entirely undeserved financial assistance to professional gamblers by ruling that they could deduct the expenses incurred in carrying out their illegal operations in figuring their income taxes.

The bills dealing with these rulings would restore the constitutional test of voluntariness and reject the Supreme Court test of timeliness in determining the admissibility of confessions; would authorize any wiretapping by local law enforcement officers sanctioned by State law, as in New York, while at the same time tightening up on illegal wire tapping by "private eyes," and others, who misuse that medium; and would enable the Federal Government to deal with criminal conspiracies operating across State lines; and would close the tax loophole for gamblers.

As I have indicated, it is not the intent of any of the bills to which I have referred to undermine the Court as an institution or to interfere with its jurisdiction or procedures. The attempt by some judicial activists to cast these bills in anti-Supreme Court mold is therefore inexcusable. The only objective of these bills, and their only consequence, would be to carry out the legislative responsibilities vested in the Congress by the Constitution. Members of Congress certainly may disagree as to the merits of these proposals, but I earnestly hope that their consideration will not become mired in another battle over whether this is a good or a bad Court.

Many eminent authorities with no axes to grind have strongly suggested that the Supreme Court overstepped itself in the cases to which these bills relate. Professor Corwin, a leading expert on the Constitution, has pointed to the problem of keeping the Court out of legislative and executive territory. In his characteristically blunt way, he has publicly

stated that on one recent decision day the Court "went on a virtual binge and thrust its nose into matters beyond its competence, with the result that, in my judgment at least, it should have aforesaid nose well tweaked." He described as "irresponsible" the Court's decisions in the field of subversion, pointing out that the total result of its actions was "to leave the country exposed to unjustifiable propaganda urging the right of revolution." Professor Corwin concluded that "the country needs protection against the aggressive tendency of the Court."

For myself, I am so much interested in having the Court's nose "tweaked" as I am in having Congress deal on a selective and sound basis with the substance of any misconceived judicial encroachments on the legislative power. I stand with the great sage, Judge Learned Hand, in his criticism of judges who attempt to serve as communal mentors or who attempt to suppress measures of which they do not approve. I know that anyone truly interested in preserving our democratic form of government will share Judge Hand's repugnance at being "ruled by a bevy of platonic guardians."

There must be added to the voice of Judge Hand and Professor Corwin what is perhaps the most impressive of all warnings against the tendency of these Supreme Court decisions to overrule congressional and executive policies. I refer to the action of the conference of chief judges in adopting a resolution and report highly critical of the Supreme Court for its alleged lack of judicial self-restraint and its invasion of the field of legislation. This resolution expressly calls upon the Court to recognize and give effect "to the difference between that which, on the one hand, the Constitution may prescribe or permit, and that which, on the other, a majority of the Supreme Court, as from time to time constituted, may deem desirable or undesirable." Knowing the traditional reluctance of judges to criticize the High Court, the approval of this resolution by the judges of 36 of the 44 jurisdictions represented attests to the serious proportions of the situation.

The remedy for this situation is squarely in the hands of Congress. Congress can act decisively by approving curative legislation without in any way infringing upon the vital function of the Supreme Court to interpret the law. The bills I have discussed are not attempts to wreak vengeance on the Court or retaliation against any member of it. They do not deal with matters of personality or abstract philosophy. They simply are attempts to enact commonsense laws to restore public protection against subversion and lawlessness.

I suggest that we approach our task with a profound respect for the place of the Supreme Court in our system of Government. Only a balanced and moderate approach will halt the trend toward Federal judicial legislation without undermining the status of our great institutions. Let us earnestly strive for that proper working together of all of the components of our Federal system, which offers the best hope for meeting the needs of the people.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KEATING. I am happy to yield.

Mr. SCOTT. I wish to compliment the distinguished Senator from New York on having presented a comprehensive wrapper of the problem which so confused the 85th Congress. I sometimes feel that in the last Congress we lost sight of exactly what needed to be done.

I ask the distinguished Senator from New York if he does not agree that it is, in fact, a very sloppy practice to attempt, in a spirit which seems, at least to me, to be somewhat petulant, the meat-ax approach of slashing away at the constitutional powers of the Court and our traditional checks and balances in an attempt to cure misapprehensions of the Court, which, in fact, we, I think, agree did call for specific relief. Does not the Senator agree that that is the case?

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I entirely agree with the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania. I appreciate his remarks. I believe the only proper way to approach all these problems, where the Court has misconstrued what we believe to be the intent of Congress, or has entered into what we believe to be legislative areas, rather than interpretive areas, is to take up each case separately.

One other difficulty in enacting legislation which is too broad is that it may do things Congress never intended. I remember, as does my colleague, the bill we debated last year at some length in the House of Representatives. To the surprise of many Members, during the debate it developed that the bill would have struck a fatal blow at the railroads. Of course, the railroads had never been thought of in the framing of that proposed legislation, nor was any such result intended. This illustrates the importance of confining our legislation in this field to the specific situations we are seeking to correct.

Mr. SCOTT. As I recall—and I am sure the distinguished Senator from New York also recalls it—there was likewise a great deal of concern that the overall approach might well have wreaked havoc with the status of our labor-management statutes.

Mr. KEATING. That is very true.

Mr. SCOTT. Again I should like to say that the distinguished Senator from New York certainly is as well qualified as any other Member of this body to present and discuss this subject, in view of his long service and his many years of work as the ranking member of the Judiciary Committee of the House of Representatives, in which I had the privilege of serving with him in the 84th Congress. I compliment him on what he has said today.

To conclude these comments by me, I should like to point out, if I may, that I recall that Chief Justice Hughes referred to freedom of speech as freedom for the thoughts we hate, rather than for the thoughts we love. I think the analogy applies in this instance. Some of the opinions of the Court may well have been obnoxious to us as lawyers and as legislators; and, so far as I am concerned, I specifically include in that category, the Court's decisions in the Nelson, Mallory, and Jenkins cases. I do not believe that, from my standpoint, the Supreme Court ever went so far off base as it did in its decision in the Nelson case.

However, be that as it may, we have an obligation to maintain the Court in all its authority and all its constitutional power; and we do not solve specific problems by acting in a petulant spirit or by seeking to sweep away the substructure of the judicial branch of our Government.

Again I thank the distinguished Senator from New York.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I appreciate the remarks of the Senator from Pennsylvania. His entire legislative record attests to his respect for the institution of the Court and his respect for the fundamental structure of our Government. I felt sure that the approach I have suggested here would strike a responsive chord with the Senator from Pennsylvania, whose fine work I have so long admired and respected.

Mr. MORTON. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield to me?

Mr. KEATING. I yield.

Mr. MORTON. I, too, wish to commend the Senator from New York for putting this problem in such good perspective. I believe it is high time that was done. Today it has been ably and succinctly done by the distinguished Senator from New York.

The Senator from New York will recall that, last year, during the 85th Congress, House bill 3, as I recall its number, was passed by the House, and was sent to the Senate; and in the Senate it was offered as an amendment to some other pending legislation, and at that time it was defeated by a majority of only one vote. A great deal of support was generated for that measure. That support was sincere, but I believe it was misdirected. Those of us who voted against that meat-ax approach, or omnibus approach, were rather harshly taken to task by some of our constituents, since that measure failed by a majority of only one vote. Some persons said that a change of only one vote would have changed the result.

Therefore, I wish to commend the Senator from New York for so ably putting this matter into proper perspective.

I believe all of us who voted against House bill 3 last year had misgivings, in various degrees, as to some of the actions of the Court. But even though we felt strongly on that subject, we felt that we took the proper approach.

As I recall, the Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING], at that time the ranking member of the House Committee on the Judiciary, spoke very ably against that measure on the floor of the House of Representatives.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, the Senator from Kentucky is correct. The chairman and the ranking Republican member of the House Judiciary Committee and the ranking member on the Democratic side all fought against the bill. Nevertheless, the bill went sailing

through—in large measure, I believe, because of a misapprehension. It was argued that the bill, if enacted, would take care of the Court's decision in the Nelson case. Nearly every Member of the House of Representatives wanted something done to take care of the decision in the Nelson case. Later, a bill to do specifically that was passed by the House. But the difficulty was that the bill contained other language, which went far beyond the Nelson case decision, and dealt with areas which I believe were not envisioned by many of those who supported that measure.

This is an intricate field. I am in no way critical of those who voted for H.R. 3, because I am sure they were actuated by the highest motives. But I feel strongly that they failed to understand fully the impact of that proposed legislation in many areas which never entered their minds.

Mr. MORTON. I believe the consequences of all these decisions tend to be oversimplified, especially in the case of those of us who are not lawyers. These matters really must be thought through; and there is great danger that we may restrict the Court as an institution.

So I appreciate very much the succinct manner in which the Senator from New York has pointed out this problem and the suggested remedies.

An incident which occurred in either 1954 or 1955 points out some of the difficulties involved. After the two decisions the Senator from New York has mentioned—namely, the decision in the Kent case and the decision in the Beiehl case—the State Department was "up against it" as to what should be the policy in regard to denying passports. Of course, all of us believe in freedom of travel; but I think there have to be certain practical limitations.

I remember that at that time there was pending the case of Jane Foster Zlatovski, an American girl who had married a Russian who had become a naturalized citizen. She was living in Paris, and came to this country to visit her mother, who was ill. While she was in the United States, the State Department picked up her passport, and refused to return it to her, thus making it impossible for her to return to Paris. At that time I happened to be Chairman of the Appeals Board. She went through the appeal procedures. I was told by the FBI under no circumstances to let her have a passport; that she was a member of a ring which was engaged in international espionage; that the FBI had about concluded the preparation of the case, and they could not afford to let her know that. So I was given the job of finding other grounds for denying her a passport.

The only ground I could find was that at the age of 19 or 20, she had picketed the White House—a mistake which a certain number of young people have made. On that ground, I denied her a passport. She got another lawyer, and took the matter to court; and the case was pending at the time of the decisions to which the Senator from New York has referred. I went to the Department of Justice, and I said, "We are getting tired of losing these cases. Either you will have to give me more evidence or permit me to use more evidence, or we are not going to fight this case."

It was decided it would have been worse to disclose our hand than to let her go to Paris. She went to Paris. Soon after that she was indicted for espionage in, I believe, the New York court. In any event, of course, she is in Paris. She is not to return. Perhaps it was better to let her go than to have tipped our hand.

I cite this instance to show that the question is not so simple as some think it is. It is not all black or white. Freedom to travel is a guaranteed, inherent freedom, yes; but we are going to have to face up to this problem, in addition, to the other matters which the Senator from New York has mentioned. I think Congress should face up to it. Certainly there should be a better answer than to let a known spy leave the country with no punishment whatsoever.

Again I wish to commend the Senator from New York for his very able statement.

Mr. KEATING. I thank the Senator from Kentucky. I think he has, in this particular instance, pointed up the necessity for legislation in this field. We must be careful, in framing such legislation, to protect the right of loyal Americans to travel, but I think we need to legislate, and do it carefully, in this area as in others.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. YOUNG of Ohio in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further proceedings under the quorum call may be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

METROPOLITAN PROBLEMS

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CLARK. A short time ago I sent to the desk, for appropriate reference, a bill to provide for the establishment of a Commission on Metropolitan Problems.

Sixty percent of all Americans live in metropolitan areas. That means more than 100 million individuals.

If Census Bureau forecasts are correct, the population of this country, now 175 million, will double within the lifetime of most people now living. There is every reason to believe that the percentage of those living in metropolitan areas will increase. Indeed, it is likely that by the year 2,000 more than 300 million Americans will be living in such areas.

Already our cities and suburbs are expanding into the countryside at a rapid rate. Already they are merging with one another. Already one vast metropolitan area stretches along the Atlantic seaboard, embracing parts of 11 States and the District of Columbia.

Mr. President, 2 years ago the New York Times published an excellent series of articles analyzing the problems created by the explosive growth of metropolitan areas. In that series it listed 24 standard metropolitan areas which in reality constitute a single metropolis reaching from Massachusetts to Virginia and including 27 million people.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that this list of eastern seaboard metropolitan areas, with their 1950 populations, printed in the New York Times of January 27, 1957, may appear in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Lowell-Lawrence-Haverhill, Mass.	340,906
Boston	2,558,581
Fall River-New Bedford, Mass.	278,247
Providence, R.I.	775,985
Worcester, Mass.	332,261
Springfield-Holyoke, Mass.	407,255
Hartford, Conn.	358,081
Waterbury, Conn.	154,656
New Britain-Bristol, Conn.	146,983
New Haven, Conn.	264,622
Bridgeport, Conn.	258,137
Stamford-Norwalk, Conn.	196,023
New York-northeast New Jersey	12,911,994
Trenton, N.J.	229,781
Atlantic City, N.J.	132,399
Allentown-Bethlehem-Easton, Pa.	437,824
Philadelphia, Pa.	3,671,048
Reading, Pa.	255,740
Lancaster, Pa.	234,717
Harrisburg, Pa.	292,241
York, Pa.	202,737
Wilmington, Del.	268,387
Baltimore, Md.	1,337,373
Washington, D.C.	1,464,089
Total	27,510,067

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, the New York Times article explains that an urban region is defined as an expanse in which two or more standard metropolitan areas overlap or adjoin. A standard metropolitan area consists of a county containing at least one city of 50,000 or more population, or several adjoining counties containing such cities.

As defined by the Census Bureau, it includes also "contiguous counties if, according to certain criteria, they are essentially metropolitan in character and socially and economically integrated with the central city."

An exception was made for New England, where the Census Bureau defines a metropolitan area in terms of towns and cities instead of counties.

Under these terms, the great eastern seaboard region is technically two urban regions, with the Boston-centered cluster of metropolitan areas, from Haverhill to Worcester, a separate urban region. But for all practical purposes, the eastern seaboard's 600-mile strip is regarded as a single region.

The article lists 17 other urban regions, with a total population in 1950 exceeding 32 million. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the list of these regions and their populations be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The 17 other urban regions, in order of size, are:

Chicago, Kenosha, Racine, Milwaukee	6,551,234
Cleveland, Lorain-Elyria, Akron, Canton, Youngstown, Wheeling-Steubenville, Pittsburgh, Johnstown, Altoona	5,833,593
Los Angeles, San Diego, San Bernardino-Riverside	5,376,407
Detroit, Flint, Saginaw, Bay City	3,529,136
San Francisco-Oakland, Sacramento, Stockton, San Jose	3,009,204
Cincinnati, Hamilton-Middletown, Dayton, Springfield	1,620,599
Seattle, Tacoma	1,008,868
Dallas, Fort Worth	976,052
Houston, Galveston	919,767
Kansas City, St. Joseph	911,183
Wilkes-Barre-Hazleton, Scranton	649,637
Syracuse, Utica-Rome	625,981
Norfolk-Portsmouth, Hampton-Newport News-Warwick	589,427
Greensboro-High Point, Winston-Salem	337,192
Lansing, Jackson	280,866
Raleigh, Durham	238,089
Springfield, Decatur	230,337
Total	32,686,572

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, the populations of all these urban regions total 60,196,639, according to the 1950 census. The urban regions include 77 of the Nation's 174 standard metropolitan areas.

Since 1950 there has been an extraordinary—indeed, an almost explosive—additional growth in the suburban regions which are a part of these urban and metropolitan areas, and, consequently, during the years since the 1950 census the populations of those urban regions have grown by an additional 10 million.

Already this explosive growth has created social, economic, and political problems which are getting out of hand. As President Eisenhower said in 1957 at Williamsburg, Va., "the needs of our cities are glaringly evident. Unless action is prompt and effective, urban problems will soon almost defy solution."

Those, Mr. President, are words of truth; indeed, if anything, they are conservative. I should like to stress the need for prompt and effective action, as advocated by the President of the United States, before these problems do get so definitely out of hand that their successful solution may become impossible.

Let us consider the major metropolitan problems.

Perhaps the most serious is transportation. The question is, How can people be moved cheaply and quickly into, out of, and around our metropolitan areas? Millions of people must travel daily from their homes to their places of employment and back, and must move around their home areas for dozens of other proper purposes. While mass transit and suburban rail traffic wither on the vine, we are committed to a vast federally sponsored urban highway program, with costs running in at least one instance as high as $17 million a mile. Think of that, Mr. President, $17 million to build 1 mile of a highway on the Federal system through a congested urban area. Meanwhile, automobile and truck traffic congestion clogs our existing urban roads and threatens the slow economic strangulation of our cities.

Mr. President, those of us who live in the Greater Washington metropolitan area and who motor back and forth to work in the Capitol during rush hours are keenly aware of what traffic strangulation can do to our personal convenience and to the business of the Government. We are keenly aware of the fact that Washington has no subway system and that its trolley system is quite inadequate to meet the needs of the community. We are also aware of the fact that the bus system, while a fine one, nevertheless, does not fully meet the needs of the people of this great area in their effort to go about their daily business, and to attend to those social and recreational activities which are a part of daily living.

We are all aware of the wide range of plans for inner loops and outer loops, and the need to provide even more space for the automobiles while the automobiles get bigger and seem sometimes to carry fewer and fewer passengers.

We know the railroads in this area carry very little of the daily suburban traffic load, and bring few people in and out of downtown Washington. We have here, under our noses, in our own Nation's Capital, a good example of the problems of traffic control and transportation and we can observe how inadequate transportation is slowly strangling the life of a great city.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK. I am happy to yield to my friend from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. I think the excellent account of the traffic problems of the District of Columbia stated by the Senator from Pennsylvania should include at least one item which I believe the Senator, by oversight, failed to mention.

We cannot get through the Congress the necessary appropriations for the building of a number of bridges across the Potomac River, which bridges are necessary to handle the traffic bottleneck situations. I say this for the purpose of illustration and emphasis.

I suspect if an analysis were made of the loss sustained by the Government of the United States as a result of the delays caused employees in getting to and from work, it would probably be found that we are wasting every year an amount of money sufficient to pay for half the cost of building one of those bridges.

Probably from four to six bridges are needed; yet we get into a big debate in the Senate each year when it is proposed to build only one.

Mr. CLARK. The Senator from Oregon is eminently correct. Of course, he is a distinguished member of the Committee on the District of Columbia of the Senate, and has been for some years, so he has had an opportunity to learn intimately of these problems. What the Senator has to say about the bridges is very well exemplified by the difficulties during the 85th Congress which, the Senator may recall, when we could not agree whether to build a bridge or a tunnel. Long and far into the night the controversy raged. Meanwhile, the people who lived on the other side of the Potomac River and who had to travel to Washington, D.C., to perform their daily work were hard pressed to get across the river. In fact, I would not have been surprised—and I am sure the Senator would agree—to find in the hot weather that some of the people might have started to swim across, on a day or two, simply because they could not get to Washington, D.C., any other way.

Mr. MORSE. The only thing which stopped them was the pollution of the river.

Mr. CLARK. That is another problem. How much chlorine will it be possible to put into the waters of the Potomac River and still have water which is drinkable? That is something I believe we shall have to find out in the reasonably near future.

The Senator will recall that he and I, on at least one occasion during the 85th Congress, made a field trip to study the need for reservoirs for the water supply of the city of Washington, D.C. We were very much concerned as to whether certain land had been reserved, adequate for the long-range reservoir needs of this rapidly growing area. Though, as the Senator knows, the Federal interest is very often neglected in the appropriations the Congress makes for the District, the Federal interest is at least clear in Washington, D.C. If we do not do our job the spotlight is on us.

The Federal interest, as I pointed out in connection with the urban highway program, and as I shall shortly point out with respect to some other metropolitan problems, is equally keen in all the other metropolitan areas; yet, as I expect to develop at greater length—and I believe the Senator will agree with me—often the right hand does not know what the left hand is doing. We have cleared a number of slums for the urban segments of the Interstate Highway System, which has been paid for $9 from Federal funds and $1 from local and State funds, and in doing so have displaced many people without making arrangements to put them anywhere, and there simply is not an adequate amount of safe and decent housing for them.

Mr. President, I turn next to the major metropolitan problem of shelter. Thirteen million housing units which are unsafe or unsanitary are occupied by American families, most of them in metropolitan areas. Slums and blight spread faster than ambitious plans are able to remove them. Commercial and industrial slums are almost as serious as those in residential districts.

Only recently we approved what, in my judgment, is a very good housing bill. It includes massive Federal assistance for our metropolitan areas. So this is clearly another area where the Federal Government is already deeply involved.

I turn now to the subject of water. Water shortages are no longer only a Western problem. "The day the taps run dry" is approaching for the industrial Northeast as well as for the Great Plains and Western States. Stream pollution is not yet under control. Here again, Federal water development and conservation programs are under way on a large scale.

These problems are of intense interest to our metropolitan areas. At the present time the Army Corps of Engineers is completing an intensive 3-year study of the all-purpose use of the waters of the Delaware River, which rises in New York State, forms for many miles the boundary between New Jersey and Pennsylvania, and finally flows into Delaware Bay, with the State of Delaware abutting on its western bank.

All four of these States have a keen interest in the use of Delaware River water. The huge metropolitan area which stretches from Trenton to south of Wilmington, on both sides of the Delaware River, has a particularly keen interest in the proper use of Delaware River water, not only for domestic water supply for our cities and their populations, but also because of the enormous use which is made of water for industrial purposes.

A large part of the Delaware River is a tidal basin. Salt water and tides are involved all the way from the Delaware Bay up to Trenton. This is a matter of grave concern to the industrial and residential users of water alike. So here again we find the Federal Government prepared to build large dams through the Corps of Engineers and small dams through the Department of Agriculture. There is a large Federal interest in the dredging of the channel of the Delaware River to a depth sufficient to enable heavy oceangoing shipping to go up from Delaware Bay all the way to Philadelphia, and, indeed, eventually all the way to Trenton and to the great United States Steel Corp. plant at Morrisville, Pa., across the river from Trenton. We find a great Federal interest in water resources development, which is essential to the continued prosperity of that large metropolitan area.

If we shift to the western part of my State, we find the same interest in the all-purpose development of the Allegheny, Monongahela, and Ohio Rivers, where there is a never-ending threat of flood damage. The Federal Government is already preparing to start construction of the great Kinzua Dam on the Allegheny River, for purposes of flood control and water supply in Pittsburgh and in the many other urban communities on the Allegheny River.

These are but two examples of the great interest of our metropolitan areas in water resource development in general and in making certain that Federal participation in water resources development is coordinated with State and local efforts in the same field.

Another metropolitan problem, which may seem minor to some, is that of air pollution. But in my own State, at Donora, and in Los Angeles in California, people have died from the poisonous effects of smog and air pollution.

We already have a Federal program for research into the causes of air pollution and methods of eliminating it. The distinguished senior Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL] is pressing a bill, which I have cosponsored, to obtain further Federal participation in the air-pollution field. Here again, the problem of coordinating local, State, and Federal efforts remains unsolved.

Turning to another field, massive problems of health and welfare are straining State and local facilities and finances to the breaking point. Already the Federal Government has spent billions of dollars to assist local efforts in both these fields.

In the field of health I make mention only of the Hill-Burton Hospital Act, under which the Federal participation is substantial, and in which even greater Federal participation is being sought.

In the field of welfare we are all aware of the several categories of public assistance under which the Federal Government picks up the larger part of the tab. Most of these Federal public assistance funds are being expended in metropolitan areas.

I had occasion to introduce in the Senate earlier today a bill which would make Federal payments for assistance available to children who are unable to maintain a normal, healthful diet because the breadwinner in the family is unemployed.

I turn next to the field of education. Our educational system needs drastic expansion. One of the major strains to which it is subjected comes from exploding suburbs and the declining population in core cities which are the heart of metropolitan areas.

As new housing developments are built in what formerly were rural areas, the need arises for schools. If the area has no industry within its boundaries, the taxes necessary to provide the schools are indeed a heavy burden on residential property. On the other hand, if a large industry happens to be located in the area, residential property may bear a relatively low burden for the support of schools. In the meantime, in the core area many people of substance have fled to the suburbs. The vacuum which they leave behind has been filled by minority groups and lower income groups who are not able to afford the levy on their property which is necessary for a continued support of a first-class school system.

Last year the Federal Government embarked on a program of Federal aid to education. All of us are aware of the limitations in the National Defense Education Act. It is my hope that the Federal Government will move further in the field of education at this session of Congress.

In the field of education, also, it seems important that a study of the impact of local, State, and Federal participation be made so that we may have a better understanding of the way in which metropolitan areas should be able to treat this important problem, and the extent to which the contributions toward its cost should be shared by the varying levels of Government.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK. I am happy to yield to my good friend from Texas.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I should like to commend the able senior Senator from Pennsylvania for the bill he has introduced, and for the fine statement he is making. Inasmuch as he is commenting now on education, I should like to ask him if the proposed study would include a study of the inadequate college facilities which will be available 5 years from now, for example, when it is believed the potential college population may be double the present college population, as the children of veterans of World War II reach college age and the need for greater participation by our people in higher education becomes evident.

Mr. CLARK. I thank the able Senator from Texas for his penetrating question. He serves with distinction as a member of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and has been one of the leaders of that committee in studying our educational problems, and in advocating Federal legislation to help solve those problems.

I do indeed feel that one of the areas for investigation by the commission, which I hope will be established as a result of the proposed legislation, would be the field of higher education, with particular regard to the need for establishing in our metropolitan areas the kind of higher educational institutions which students could attend while living at home and in which they could get just as good an educational opportunity as if they were to go many miles away from home and have the extra expense of board and lodging superimposed on their educational expenses.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I thank the Senator for his comment. I believe that is a very important element in the growing problem connected with an adequate number of persons attending institutions of higher learning in our country, so as to raise the level of those sufficiently trained to enable us to keep ahead of any other country in the world.

Mr. CLARK. In the housing bill, which was passed by the Senate a month ago, a relatively modest amount was authorized for loans for academic facilities at colleges and universities. I hope that a further study will reveal the extent to which the expense of the needed expansion in university facilities may be distributed among private agencies and individuals, whose charitable impulse impels them to make contributions, and the extent of possible further support by local and State governments, in order to determine what, if anything further, the Federal Government should do in this field.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I should like to ask the Senator from Pennsylvania if, in the study he is proposing in the forward-looking bill concerning the problems of urban renewal in the metropolitan areas of the United States, provision is made for a study of the problem of older universities, such as New York University and Columbia University, which see the slums creeping up on them? That is

happening in many of the larger cities of America, even in the vicinity of Harvard itself.

Mr. CLARK. The Senator from Texas is quite correct in that regard. I believe this is a matter which the housing bill we passed earlier this year does encompass. The Committee on Banking and Currency received much testimony on this subject earlier this year. A number of educational institutions, in addition to those which the Senator from Texas has mentioned, were referred to. It was stated that urban blight is creeping into the university areas, making it difficult to acquire land for needed scientific laboratories, libraries, and academic facilities. The University of Chicago was particularly mentioned. It may well be that there are similar situations in the Senator's own State of Texas.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I commend the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania again for his leadership in the effort to establish a commisison to study the major problem of the changing nature of our population.

Mr. CLARK. I thank the Senator from Texas for his most helpful assistance in this regard.

Mr. President, in the same series of articles in the New York Times, to which I had occasion to refer earlier, there was printed a table showing examples of growth in school costs in the suburbs of several metropolitan centers. The table shows the increases from 1945 to 1955 in population, school enrollment, and school tax rates, and the percentage of increase in typical suburban areas throughout the Nation. I ask unanimous consent that the table be printed in the RECORD, at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Examples of growth in school costs

	Population		Enrollment		School tax rates (per $100)		Percent increase
	1945	1955	1945	1955	1945	1955–56	
New York suburbs:							
Carle Place, Long Island	1,220	10,400	174	2,600	$1.10	$4.16	278.2
Great Neck, Long Island	25,000	48,000	3,429	9,313	1.14	4.04	255.4
Rockville Center, Long Island	16,000	22,000	2,600	4,000	1.09	3.88	256.0
Levittown, Long Island	721	55,572	40	14,943	.73	4.24	480.8
White Plains	42,000	53,000	6,240	7,939	1.45	1.96	35.2
Tenafly, N.J.	8,000	13,000	1,789	2,820	1.86	4.56	145.2
Westport, Conn.	8,670	16,776	1,500	3,731	1.80	2.50	38.9
Boston suburbs:							
Newton	77,257	86,535	11,194	14,679	.91	1.73	90.1
Dedham	16,659	21,450	2,626	3,540	1.31	2.02	54.2
Cleveland suburbs:							
Parma Heights	[1] 1,330	22,000	3,153	10,078	.93	1.79	92.5
Garfield Heights	[1] 16,989	41,000	2,017	4,007	1.67	2.09	25.1
Michigan suburban: School districts:							
Lakeview	13,053	38,500	767	2,208	.91	1.90	108.8
Inkster	9,474	30,600	1,308	3,925	1.10	1.80	63.6
Maryland-Virginia:							
Arlington County, Va.	[1] 57,040	163,000	10,825	21,318	1.20	2.01	67.5
Prince Georges County, Md.	[1] 89,490	289,000	21,915	49,397	1.55	2.15	38.7
Denver suburbs:							
Jefferson County	35,079	90,000	6,378	16,869	2.05	3.47	69.3
Aurora	4,200	30,000	750	6,133	2.59	2.19	[2]—15.4
Los Angeles suburbs:							
Beverly Hills	[1] 26,823	31,132	2,963	4,100	1.20	1.35	12.5
Pasadena	[1] 81,864	117,564	21,465	29,157	2.04	2.70	32.4

[1] 1940 figures; 1945 not available.
[2] Decrease indicated is not actual tax reduction. All assessments were raised 100 percent 4 years ago. Thus, present tax of $2.19 is actually $4.38 in terms of 1945 tax base, a 68-percent increase.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK. I am happy to yield.

Mr. HART. I think one safe prediction, in the always dangerous business of predicting, is that no area will be more compelling in its demands for sound answers in the years immediately ahead than the area to which the senior Senator from Pennsylvania is now addressing himself. I am sure I voice the sentiments of all Senators in commending him for the leadership he seeks to give us.

I was struck by the table to which he referred. Traditionally, we think the urban population problem, with all its tragic consequences, affects the older sectors of our Nation. I hope the readers of the RECORD will be impressed by the fact that America is a mature Nation, east and west, north and south, and that this is a universal problem.

I am struck, too, by the modesty of the senior Senator from Pennsylvania. I spent the first 22 years of my life just outside Philadelphia. I spent the past weekend in Philadelphia. I make this point for two reasons: First, to pay a very deserved tribute to the leadership of the senior Senator from Pennsylvania because of his drive to renew the city of Philadelphia itself during the period when he was the distinguished mayor of that city. I saw evidences of it on all sides on Saturday afternoon, when I was riding along Schuylkill River Drive. I think his is a voice which can be relied upon to respond to one of the very first objections we may expect to hear about the proposal; namely, that it is an undue intrusion upon the responsibility and jurisdiction of local governmental units.

Here we have a proposal advanced by a man who served with very great distinction as the mayor of—is it still the third largest city in the Nation?

Mr. CLARK. I regret to say it is now the fourth largest city. But, after all, quality is more important than quantity, as the Senator from Michigan knows. I suspect it may even be that the great metropolis in the State which the distinguished junior Senator from Michigan so ably represents, in part, may catch up to us in the not too distant future. I would not want to say then that quality was more important than quantity, because I think we are both deep in quality.

Mr. HART. Without making any qualitative analysis, I know we will not overtake Philadelphia in population if highway construction requires $17 million a mile, because the principal crop of Michigan uses the highways.

Last Friday, I received a letter from the supervisor of the county of Wayne, which contains the city of Detroit. He himself has been the principal leader in Michigan in the effort to coordinate several areas of local government most directly affected by the concentration of urban population. I should like to read one paragraph from the letter I received from Ed Connor, councilman of the city of Detroit, who is chairman of the intercounty committee, which comprises seven counties, six of which are in Michigan. The paragraph reads:

> Incidentally, I was very much impressed with Senator CLARK's speech before the National Municipal Association, and I think the idea of the joint conference on urban problems is an extremely good one. Anything else I can do to help, let me know.

Here, again, is a spokesman who realizes that Federal interest in the urban problem is not an indication of distress or an effort to overreach any local unit of government, but rather a recognition or an acknowledgment on the part of communities that the various units of government, Federal, State, and local, have a common responsibility which can be met only by a common undertaking. The problem is simply too big for us in Michigan. I think I am pleading guilty to nothing which anybody else will be able to deny.

Mr. CLARK. I thank the Senator from Michigan for his very kind words. I regret that he did not choose to stay in Philadelphia for the rest of his career. If he had, perhaps he would be in my shoes instead of in those of the distinguished former Senator from Michigan whom he replaced in the last election. So perhaps it is my good fortune that he did not stay in Pennsylvania. But there is no new Member of the Senate who is more keenly aware of the problem of the metropolitan areas than the distinguished junior Senator from Michigan, and I want him to know how very deeply I appreciate his support in this matter.

The Senator had occasion to refer to a talk which I had the good fortune to make in Boston, in December, before the American Municipal Association on some problems which confront our cities, particularly in connection with their relations with the Federal Government.

I point out that a study such as the one I am proposing is advocated by the American Municipal Association, which includes among its members representatives of practically all the large and small urban communities of the United States.

Mr. President, another growing metropolitan problem is that of open land for

State and regional parks and recreational areas. Land is being gobbled up for residential and commercial development on the outskirts of all metropolitan areas. Unfortunately, adequate prior planning has not been done, and the cost of the land is now so high that it is difficult for the States and local governmental units to acquire it for the needed recreational facilities of their communities. As the metropolis expands, the cost of land increases, so it is more and more difficult to provide the means for escape which the urban populations need for relaxation and relief from the tensions of urban life.

In metropolitan areas the Federal Government is also involved in the problem of crime and juvenile delinquency. A high crime rate and increasing juvenile delinquency are unhappy characteristics of many metropolitan areas. A substantial part of the effort of the Federal Bureau of Investigation is already devoted to assisting local and State police forces to deal with these problems.

I can recall, when I was the mayor of Philadelphia, the enormous assistance which the FBI gave our local police force in successful raids which rounded up the principal vendors of narcotics in Philadelphia. That was, to some extent, an interstate matter, because criminal gangsters in control of the narcotics trade were bringing narcotics from New York by smuggling them on boats which were landing at Philadelphia. I know that our local police force would not have been able to cope with the problem if it had not been for the high degree of cooperation it received from the FBI.

The distinguished senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] has for several years been actively identified with investigation of the causes of juvenile delinquency. There is already on the statute books legislation which provides for Federal assistance in research in the fields of crime and juvenile delinquency. This problem is getting worse, instead of better. The commission I am proposing would be most useful in making a study in depth of Federal-local relations and responsibilities in regard to juvenile delinquency.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator from Pennsylvania yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HARTKE in the chair). Does the Senator from Pennsylvania yield to the Senator from Texas?

Mr. CLARK. I am very happy to yield to the distinguished majority leader, whose advice I have sought in connection with this proposed legislation, and whose support is very welcome.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I wish to commend the Senator from Pennsylvania for the great interest he has exhibited in this extremely important field. As he is aware, I have, from the public rostrum, on occasion, in speaking to various groups of officials, urged that the Congress take a step similar to the one suggested by the very able Senator from Pennsylvania. His leadership in this field and his dedication to this cause have been an inspiration to me. I am hopeful that the efforts he has expended in attempting to set up a just, fair, and effective vehicle for finding the solution to this most troublesome problem will be effective.

I congratulate the Senator from Pennsylvania. I commend him on the efforts he has made. I assure him of my support. Anything that one Senator can do to bring about early action on the bill the Senator from Pennsylvania has submitted will be done by the senior Senator from Texas.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I wish to thank the distinguished majority leader for his kind remarks and for his most welcome support. I know he has long had a keen interest in this field. While I was considering drafting this bill last fall, I had an opportunity to read a speech the Senator from Texas had made in his home State, in which he pointed out the desirability of doing just what this bill calls for. I derived that encouragement from his remarks then, and I repeat that I am most grateful to him for his assistance now.

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Pennsylvania yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HART in the chair). Does the Senator from Pennsylvania yield to the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. CLARK. I am happy to yield to my good friend, the junior Senator from Indiana, who, himself, was a distinguished mayor before he came to this body, and who has, I think, as wide and and as deep a command of metropolitan area problems as does any other Member of the Senate.

Mr. HARTKE. I thank the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. President, I wish to say to the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania that I have long looked upon him as my ideal of the man who represents what I believe is necessary if the cities of the Nation are to be restored to their full stature.

I am fearful, as he is, that we have not paid enough attention, soon enough, to this problem.

I know that his inspirational leadership of the city of Philadelphia and the great interest he was able to inspire in organizations such as the American Municipal Association League for Municipal Development will result, for a large number of our people, in a rebirth of the type of living they should have.

I hope the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania will continue with his zeal and with this type of thinking. Not only does he have my support; but I certainly shall be more than happy to do all within my power, and to devote as much time as I possibly can, to assist in any activity of any kind in this most important field, in which he is providing such outstanding leadership.

Mr. CLARK. I thank the Senator from Indiana. I assure him that if the bill is to become law, we certainly shall depend upon his efforts and his deep thinking in this area.

Mr. President, transcending all of these specific problem areas, in which the Federal Government is already committed, is the need for metropolitan-area planning to assure sound and orderly growth and development of the many public services which citizens of metropolitan areas require from government.

In short, the Federal Government is already massively involved in metropolitan problems. But State and city officials constantly complain that the impact of various Federal programs on local planning is haphazard and uncoordinated.

Mr. President, probably there is no one in the general field of State and local government who is more learned regarding this entire area than is Luther Gulick. He recently declared that—

> The Federal Government must do a better job of interrelating its activities so that they are rationally coordinated at the grass roots, which in this case is "on the sidewalks.
>
> God help us if the Federal Government goes on building highways with one hand, dredging harbors with another, regulating commerce with another, erecting hospitals and schools with another, supporting urban renewal with another, locating factories with tax writeoffs and defense contracts with another, developing civil defense with another, and dabbling negatively in water resources and water pollution with another.
>
> Viewed from the metropolitan areas, Uncle Sam begins to look like the Buddhist idol Kuan Yin, with a thousand arms. But in our case the arms do not seem to connect with the same backbone or with a single brain.

Mr. President, complicating and handicapping every effort of the States and cities to cope with metropolitan problems are the twin obstacles of archaic government organization and inadequate public finance.

Many studies—of which the report of the Kestnbaum Commission on Intergovernmental Relations is the most recent, and perhaps the most important—have detailed the weaknesses of State and local governments in grappling with even their present range of metropolitan-area problems. Obsolete State constitutional provisions, underrepresentation of urban areas in State legislatures, outmoded administrative structures, regressive and relatively unproductive forms of taxation available to States and cities—all of these are pointed out in the report of the Kestnbaum Commission; but the States are either unable or unwilling to undertake the necessary basic reforms; and the hands of the cities and suburban areas are tied, through lack of both financial resources and governmental powers.

In some areas, perceptible progress has been made, as in Atlanta, Ga., and Dade County, Fla.; but there has been no systematic study on a nationwide basis of how to deal with metropolitan area governmental problems within our American structure which distributes power between local, State, and Federal governmental units.

There are many who resist the expansion of Federal activity which has already taken place. Yet I suggest the clock will not be turned back on these matters. The problems cry for solution. A sound solution will require a cooperative effort of government at all levels—local, State, and Federal.

I suggest to my colleagues that the time has come to think through the Federal role in dealing with metropolitan-

area problems. It may be that ways and means can be found to give State and local governments the financial powers they need in order to deal with these critical areas of public service. It may be that a fourth layer of government is needed in some places for their solution. If either of these suggestions is feasible, then perhaps the Federal Government could withdraw from many of the activities in which it is now engaged. But if a careful study should show that Federal activities must be expanded if these problems are to be solved, then let them be expanded on a national and coordinated basis.

The bill I have introduced would create a commission to examine this entire problem and to report to the Congress and the President by February 1, 1961. This Commission, like the two Hoover Commissions and the Kestnbaum Commission, would include Members of both branches of Congress and individuals appointed by the President. Its members would represent Federal, State and local government.

The Commission would consist of 18 members: 6 from each House of Congress—4 from the majority party and 2 from the minority; and 6 Presidential appointees, of whom 2 would be officials of the executive branch; 2 would be Governors—1 from each party; and 2 would be mayors—1 from each party. The chairman and vice chairman would be elected by the Commission from among its congressional members. In preparing the bill, I have worked closely with the distinguished majority leader, who put forward a proposal for such a commission last November.

It is my hope that the Commission proposed in the bill will help us chart our course in dealing, for the foreseeable future, with social, economic, and governmental problems unlike any ever before experienced on earth—problems which, in truth, affect the survival of Western civilization, for today our civilization is largely centered in our metropolitan areas.

Mr. President, if we do not plan intelligently to meet these problems right now, they may well overwhelm us tomorrow.

ADJOURNMENT TO WEDNESDAY

Mr. MORTON. Mr. President, I move that the Senate adjourn until noon on Wednesday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 3 o'clock and 12 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until Wednesday, March 18, 1959, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate March 16, 1959:

IN THE U.S. COAST GUARD

The following-named persons to be chief warrant officers, W–2, in the U.S. Coast Guard:

Frederick W. Rix	Joseph E. Franken
Joseph C. Chighizola	George M. P. Young
Loyd R. Smith	James W. Johns
Arthur E. Vincent	Isadore L. Souza
Howell M. Joynes, Jr.	Carl L. Smith
Lester H. Green	Bernhart A. Wicks
Frank N. Campagna	John T. Renfroe
Earl W. C. Harris	John H. Bettis, Jr.
William R. Hendricks, Jr.	Albert V. Carver
Leonard E. Tarvers	Mack E. McGuffin
Samuel N. Low	Hubert F. Midgett
Max Trepeta	Hull O. L. Tanner
Sherwood N. Patrick	John E. Simpson
Albert N. Dill	Oscar A. Erickson
Kenneth N. Black	Claude A. Broadus
James L. Cropper	Robert L. Walters
Newton P. Caddell, Jr.	Edward T. Lowe
Wayne R. Glenny	Ernest N. Yaroch
Lee D. Wooden	Duane A. Force
Louis L. Bayers	Ernest G. Crispi
John H. Bunting	Stephen T. Watson
John H. Westbury	John W. Schiffbauer
John G. Schwelm	Lawrence A. Taylor
Harold R. Dycus	Russell R. Hickman
Eugene B. Cox	Arnold S. Knudsen
Charles W. Wicks	Joseph C. Gimbl
Joseph J. Zagiba	Wilton A. Hockenberry
	Dallas W. Palmer

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, MARCH 16, 1959

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. Paul J. Harrell, pastor, Memorial Baptist Church, of Arlington, Va., offered the following prayer:

O God, Thou art my God, I seek Thee, my soul thirsts for Thee. I have looked upon Thee in the sanctuary, beholding Thy power and glory. Because Thy steadfast love is better than life, my lips will praise Thee. I will lift up my hands and call on Thy name (Psalm 63: 1–4).

Almighty and eternal God, we call upon Thee even now, in a spirit of praise and humility and thanksgiving and with a keen and conscious sense of need.

We have, on yesterday, looked upon Thee in the sanctuary, beholding Thy power and glory. We knew Thee to be near and to be real. Let that be no passing salute only, but rather let Thy presence continue with us in all the business of this day.

Especially, our God, we pray Thee to be present here with the Members and officers of this body as they take up the duties of the day. Give them a due sense of responsibility. Enable them to see their responsibility to those who elected them, but enlarge that responsibility to include a Nation and even a world and remind them that our final responsibility is to Thee, the Supreme Ruler and Ultimate Judge of all.

And Thou, O Christ, who hast commanded us to work while it is yet day, enable the Members of this body to make the best use of their time, despite all the difficulties of these days, that all vital matters may be cared for with due consideration and saved from becoming the victims of rush and exhaustion.

Save us, our Father, from vagueness in our faith, commitments, and loyalties and enable us firmly to grasp what we know to be the will of God.

Enlighten our minds, O God, stimulate our spirits and keep Thy love in our hearts.

Through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Friday, March 13, 1959, was read and approved.

FRANCE DESERVES BETTER

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, it is difficult to understand the opposition of the Joint Congressional Committee on Atomic Energy to the proposal that the United States make available to France an atomic powerplant for a French atomic submarine. Our Secretary of State Dulles pledged just such aid to our stanch NATO ally. That pledge should be kept.

We are building a plant for another NATO ally, Great Britain. France has taken umbrage, and properly so. We should not treat her differently than Great Britain. That is hardly the way to create a united front against Russia, especially during the Berlin crisis. It is a most shortsighted policy.

France will get the atomic submarine. She has the ingenuity and expertise to build her own. Only valuable time and funds will be unnecessarily lost. French scientists like the Curies and the Joliot-Curies gave the world basic discoveries that made nuclear energy possible.

General De Gaulle is affronted and in all likelihood will hold his Mediterranean naval forces under this own control and will refuse Western Combined Command. This is regrettable, but understandable.

What else can we expect?

We get a rebuff in return for humiliation.

If the shoe were on the other foot and France treated us that way, we would bridle too.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON IRRIGATION AND RECLAMATION

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Irrigation and Reclamation of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs may be permitted to sit during general debate this afternoon.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

MR. BENSON'S MESS

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, whenever I criticize the Secretary of Agriculture, it is understandable that I might be charged with prejudice. Whatever I might say in opposition to the views of the Secretary might be interpreted as being biased or based upon politics. Now while I have not hesitated to call attention to what I think are

mistakes of Secretary Benson, and expect to continue to do so, I would not deny that I do have some prejudices—justified, I believe.

That is why, Mr. Speaker, it was so refreshing to read in the "Letters to the Editor" in last Saturday's Washington Post, a reply by Joseph Alsop, which was identified with an appropriate heading "Mr. Benson's Mess." Now, I do not know Mr. Alsop, personally, but through his writings I think he is known to a rather large portion of the newspaper-reading public, both as an accurate reporter and as a competent news analyst. I regret that the letter he wrote as an answer to Secretary Benson's did not appear in his syndicated column rather than in the "Letters to the Editor" column in the local newspaper.

Mr. Alsop has made several statements of fact that should be read by all Americans, particularly those who have been misled into believing that the Secretary of Agriculture is performing a valuable service to the people of this Nation.

Mr. Alsop states in his letter that, "I myself was a strong supporter of Secretary Benson when he took office." Now, apparently, Mr. Alsop is willing to accept his part of the responsibility for the Benson myth which has done irreparable damage to American agriculture, for he also states in his letter, "I am only ashamed that it took me so long to notice that Benson's long suit was pious talk rather than positive performance."

I think we should accept Mr. Alsop's frank confession, and extend him an invitation to join with those of us who are trying to give the truth to the American public.

Mr. Alsop has made a great start when he writes that the agricultural mess that he—Benson—found was much less bad than the agricultural mess he has made. The fact cannot be denied, so it had better be faced.

COMMISSION FOR A BETTER PAY SYSTEM IN THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill to create a temporary commission to develop a better pay system for the entire Federal Government.

My bill establishes an action commission. The Commission is directed to review, in depth, the entire range of salaries in the executive, legislative, and judicial branches of the Government and submit firm recommendations for a coordinated, Government-wide salary policy.

I would like to point out that the present uncoordinated, polyglot variety of Federal pay practices is inefficient and wasteful from the standpoint of the taxpayers as well as unfair to many Federal employees.

Our committee studies in cooperation with the administration have disclosed that the $13 billion annual Federal civilian payroll is paid out under 77 widely varied statutory or administrative plans; that no attempt has been made for 40 years to modernize the overall pay structure, although employment has increased from 390,000 to 2,300,000; that no proper relationship exists between pay rates in the three branches of the Government—or, in fact, within any one branch; that there is no reliable means to compare Government salary rates with those in private industry as a guide to proper Federal pay rates; and that existing pay practices are unjust to many employees as well as inefficient and uneconomical for the Government. For example, supervisors in many cases are paid less than personnel they supervise.

Nearly 1 million professional, management, administrative, and clerical employees are classified and paid under this act. The new bill provides the basis for classifying and paying these and all other Federal employees in proper relationship.

I want to stress the need for prompt and decisive action on my bill to control rising payroll costs, maintain maximum efficiency in our vital defense effort, and enable the Government to recruit and retain the best qualified employees to carry out all essential Government programs.

PERSONAL ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, it is my intention in a special order tomorrow to discuss the urban renewal problem with or without Federal funds. I have some rather strong views on this subject, having been a student of it for some time. I take this time merely to announce to my colleagues, to those who are interested in urban renewal, that I shall make this speech and invite them to participate in the discussion following my remarks, if they wish.

THE AMERICAN'S CREED AND WILLIAM TYLER PAGE

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. BOLTON], I ask unanimous consent that she may revise and extend her remarks with respect to "The American's Creed and William Tyler Page," a new book by Myrtle Cheney Murdock.

Because each of us in the House has received a gift copy of this volume, the gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. BOLTON] also asks unanimous consent that all Members who desire to do so may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on this subject.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking and Currency may sit during general debate this week.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, although I have not had an opportunity to consult the minority leader on this matter, at the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary may sit during general debate this week.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

THE LATE RIGHT REVEREND (MSGR.) RICHARD J. HABERLIN

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, on March 10, 1959, the Right Reverend (Msgr.) Richard J. Haberlin died. Monsignor Haberlin was a close and valued friend of mine whom I admired intensely. For years he was one of the outstanding priests of the archdiocese of Boston. He was not only a great priest, but a great American.

Monsignor Haberlin was loved by all persons: Catholic, Protestant, and Jew. Without regard to their race, color, or creed, he was the friend of the poor, the sick, the underprivileged. The life of Monsignor Haberlin as a priest, from the time he was ordained in Rome, where he prepared for his ordination at the North American College, until his death, was one of outstanding spiritual leadership, of great understanding, and of love of God, and of love of neighbor. His life was an active one, during which he held many positions of church responsibility.

Monsignor Haberlin was ordained to the holy priesthood in 1911. He was appointed by the Holy Father as a domestic prelate in 1922. He later had the additional honor conferred upon him of being named a protonotary apostolic, as well as knight commander of the Order of the Holy Sepulcher.

During his priestly career, which was one of great activity, Monsignor Haberlin was vice chancellor of the archdiocese of Boston; secretary to the late William Cardinal O'Connell; and chancellor and vicar general of the archdiocese of Boston; and pastor of St. Peter's Church in Dorchester for 32 years. In addition to his priestly duties, Monsignor Haberlin gave untiringly of his time to the success of civic and patriotic and charitable activities.

A courageous fighter for justice, Monsignor Haberlin vigorously fought bigotry and injustice in any form wherever their ugly heads appeared.

The sick, the afflicted, the poor have lost a real friend in Monsignor Haberlin. Mrs. McCormack and I have lost a close and valued friend.

CONSENT CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. This is Consent Calendar Day. The Clerk will call the first bill on the Consent Calendar.

MOUNT VERNON MEMORIAL HIGHWAY

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2228) to provide for the acquisition of additional land along the Mount Vernon Memorial Highway in exchange for certain dredging privileges, and for other purposes.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

PEACETIME LIMITATION ON NUMBER OF LIEUTENANT GENERALS IN THE MARINE CORPS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 3323) to establish a peacetime limitation on the number of lieutenant generals in the Marine Corps.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 5232(b) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking out the word "two" and inserting in place thereof the word "five."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SUBSISTENCE ALLOWANCE FOR FEDERAL JUDGES

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2909) relating to the maintenance and travel expenses of judges.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the first paragraph of section 456 of title 28, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"Each Justice or judge of the United States and each retired Justice or judge recalled or designated and assigned to active duty, while attending court or transacting official business at a place other than his official station, shall be paid by the Director of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts all necessary traveling expenses, and also a per diem allowance in lieu of actual expenses of subsistence (as defined in the Travel Expense Act of 1949, as amended, 63 Stat. 166; 5 U.S.C. 835) at the rate of $12 per day or, in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Director of the Administrative Office of the United State Courts with the approval of the Judicial Conference of the United States, reimbursement for his actual expenses of subsistence not in excess of $25 per day."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDMENT OF TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, ELIMINATING CERTAIN REPORTS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 3290) to amend title 10, United States Code, to eliminate the requirement that each chaplain make an annual report to the Secretary of the Navy.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That subsection (d) of section 6031 of title 10, United States Code, is hereby repealed.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CHANGING DESIGNATION OF CERTAIN MEDALS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 3291) to amend title 10, United States Code, with respect to certain medals.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That chapter 857 of title 10, United States Code, is amended as follows:

(1) Section 8742 is amended—

(a) by amending the catchline to read as follows:

"§ 8742. Air Force cross: award"; and

(b) by striking out the words "a distinguished-service cross" and inserting the words "an Air Force cross" in place thereof.

(2) Section 8744 is amended—

(a) by amending the catchline to read as follows:

"§ 8744. Medal of honor; Air Force cross; distinguished-service medal: limitations on award"; and

(b) by striking out the words "distinguished-service cross," wherever they appear therein and inserting the words "Air Force cross," in place thereof.

(3) Section 8745 is amended—

(a) by amending the catchline to read as follows:

"§ 8745. Medal of honor; Air Force cross; distinguished-service medal: delegation of power to award"; and

(b) by striking out the words "distintinguished-service cross," and inserting the words "Air Force cross," in place thereof.

(4) Section 8747 is amended—

(a) by amending the catchline to read as follows:

"§ 8747. Medal of honor; Air Force cross; distinguished-service cross; distinguished-service medal; silver star: replacement"; and

(b) by inserting the words "Air Force cross," after the words "medal of honor,".

(5) The catchline of section 8748 is amended to read as follows:

"§ 8748. Medal of honor; Air Force cross; distinguished-service cross; distinguished-service medal; silver star: availability of appropriations".

(6) Section 8750 is amended—

(a) by amending the catchline to read as follows:

"§ 8750. Airman's Medal: award; limitations"; and

(b) by striking out the words "Soldier's Medal" wherever they appear therein and inserting the words "Airman's Medal" in place thereof.

(7) The analysis is amended by striking out the following items:

"8742. Distinguished-service cross: award.
"8744. Medal of honor; distinguished-service cross; distinguished-service medal: limitations on award.
"8745. Medal of honor; distinguished-service cross; distinguished-service medal: delegation of power to award.
"8747. Medal of honor; distinguished-service cross; distinguished-service medal; silver star: replacement.
"8748. Medal of honor; distinguished-service cross; distinguished-service medal; silver star: availability of appropropriations.
"8750. Soldier's Medal: award; limitations."

and inserting the following items in place thereof:

"8742. Air Force cross: award.
"8744. Medal of honor; Air Force cross; distinguished-service medal: limitations on award.
"8745. Medal of honor; Air Force cross; distinguished-service medal: delegation of power to award.
"8747. Medal of honor; Air Force cross; distinguished-service cross; distinguished-service medal; silver star: replacement.
"8748. Medal of honor; Air Force cross; distinguished-service cross; distinguished-service medal; silver star: availability of appropriations.
"8750. Airman's Medal: award; limitations."

SEC. 2. For the purposes of sections 8744 (a) and 8750(b) of title 10, United States Code, a person who was awarded a distinguished-service cross or Soldier's Medal before the date of enactment of this Act shall be treated as if he had not been awarded an Air Force cross or Airman's Medal, as the case may be.

SEC. 3. References that other laws, regulations, and orders make, with respect to the Air Force, to the distinguished-service cross and the Soldier's Medal shall be considered to be made to the Air Force cross and the Airman's Medal, respectively.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FURNISHING SUPPLIES AND SERVICES TO FOREIGN VESSELS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 3292) to amend title 10, United States Code, to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to furnish supplies and services to foreign vessels and aircraft, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. GROSS. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask someone why we have required cash

payments in the past for the services we have provided foreign ships?

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield.

Mr. KILDAY. This bill was not reported out of my subcommittee. The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DURHAM] would be informed about it, but I do not see him at the moment. He will probably be here in a minute.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield.

Mr. PRICE. I am familiar with this bill. I was present at the time the hearings were held on it. This is a bookkeeping matter which expedites services to these vessels.

Mr. GROSS. The point is why have we required cash in advance in the past? We now are going to perform these services not only for naval vessels but foreign airplanes will be serviced.

Mr. PRICE. The requirement of cash to be paid in advance has caused many inconveniences and held up repairs on ships and has delayed the performance of many important missions.

Mr. GROSS. These are foreign ships that we are talking about; are they not?

Mr. PRICE. Yes. This is a matter of reciprocity.

Mr. GROSS. Why in the past have we required cash to be paid in advance?

Mr. PRICE. Because there was no provision in the law before which permitted us to operate on this reciprocal basis. This is for our convenience more than anyone else.

Mr. GROSS. Let me put the question in another way. Has there been any question that we would not be reimbursed for services performed on naval vessels of foreign countries?

Mr. PRICE. There has been no question as to reimbursement at all.

Mr. GROSS. The provision for servicing and supplying foreign airplanes as well as naval vessels could run into quite an item of cost?

Mr. PRICE. Yes. There is the same problem there. This matter of reimbursement permits these matters to be handled expeditiously so as to prevent any delays in operation, and further, this is being sought by us and not by anyone else.

Mr. GROSS. I merely want to point out to the gentleman that my interest is on the question as to whether we are going to get paid for our services on these foreign naval vessels and airplanes.

Mr. PRICE. We definitely are going to get paid.

Mr. GROSS. With that assurance, Mr. Speaker, I have no objection to the bill. I just wanted to be sure that this is not going to be an addition to and more of the great foreign giveaway business.

Mr. PRICE. No; it is not.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 7227 of title 10, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"§ 7227. Foreign naval vessels and aircraft: supplies and services

"(a) The Secretary of the Navy, under such regulations as he prescribes, may authorize any United States naval vessel or activity to furnish any of the following supplies or services, when in the best interests of the United States, on a reimbursable basis without an advance of funds if similar supplies and services are furnished on a like basis to naval vessels and military aircraft of the United States by the friendly foreign country concerned:

"(1) routine port services in territorial waters of the United States or in waters under United States control, including pilotage, tugs, garbage removal, linehandling, and utilities, to naval vessels of friendly foreign countries;

"(2) routine airport services, including landing and takeoff assistance, use of runways, parking and servicing to military aircraft of friendly foreign countries;

"(3) miscellaneous supplies, including fuel, provisions, spare parts, and general stores, but not including ammunition, to naval vessels and military aircraft of friendly foreign countries; and

"(4) overhauls, repairs, and alterations together with necessary equipment and its installation required in connection therewith, to naval vessels and military aircraft of friendly foreign countries.

"(b) Routine port and airport services may be furnished under this section at no cost to the foreign country concerned where such services are provided by United States naval personnel and equipment without direct cost to the Navy.

"(c) Payments for supplies and services furnished under this section may be credited to current appropriations so as to be available for the same purpose as the appropriation initially charged."

SEC. 2. The analysis of chapter 631 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking out the following item:

"7227. Foreign naval vessels: supplies and services."

and inserting the following item in place thereof:

"7227. Foreign naval vessels and aircraft: supplies and services."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

OREGON AND CALIFORNIA RAILROAD GRANT LANDS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 3495) to direct the Secretary of the Interior to administer certain acquired lands as revested Oregon and California railroad grant lands.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Interior shall hereafter administer the east half, section 24, township 21 south, range 8 west, Willamette Meridian, in the State of Oregon, as revested Oregon and California railroad grant lands under the Act of August 28, 1937 (50 Stat. 874), as amended (43 U.S.C. 1181a–1181j), and all other laws which are or may become applicable to such lands.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REVISING BOUNDARIES OF KINGS MOUNTAIN NATIONAL MILITARY PARK, S.C.

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 3496) to revise the boundaries of the Kings Mountain National Military Park, S.C., and to authorize the procurement and exchange of lands, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I do so only for the purpose of commending and thanking the gentlewoman from Idaho [Mrs. FROST] for handling this matter expeditiously.

In behalf of the people of the Fifth Congressional District of South Carolina, I want to thank the gracious and hard working chairman of this subcommittee for her early application and hearings on the legislation "To revise the boundaries of the Kings Mountain National Park, S.C., and to authorize the procurement and exchange of lands, and for other purposes." If I might be personal, I might say that the bill was in good hands, as we recognize the able chairman of the subcommittee to be one of the most diligent, conscientious, and most hard working Members of Congress. I served with her on another committee, and her work has always been outstanding.

I would like to thank the Department of the Interior, and especially Mr. Harrison, who testified, for their handling of this matter. The bill is a good bill, and will improve the area facilities of the park considerably. The part which is to be cut off proposed difficulties in management and supervision, and will not be advantageous in present or future plans.

The parts which will be brought into the park, the 140 acres, will be a protection to the present park area and its immediate environment.

The Battle of Kings Mountain was fought on October 5 or 6, 1780, and the revolutionary troops defeated Patrick Ferguson, an able soldier, and an equal or larger force of British antagonist. That battleground is a hallowed shrine today, and marks the turning point of the Revolutionary War in the South.

This wonderful park is in my district and I am proud of it.

I urge the passage of this legislation and welcome the further productivity of our very fine Park Service.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That in order to consolidate the Federal ownership of lands in, and to facilitate protection and preservation of, Kings Mountain National Military Park, South Carolina, the boundaries are hereby revised as follows:

(1) Federally owned lands lying west of the easterly right-of-way line of State Route

P–11–123, containing approximately two hundred acres, are excluded from the park;

(2) Privately owned lands lying east of the easterly right-of-way line of State Route P–11–123, containing approximately eighty acres, are included in the park; and

(3) Lands of the Mary Morris estate lying south of the southerly right-of-way line of the historic Yorkville-Shelbyville Road, and forming the triangle bounded by the new State Route P–11–86, the historic Yorkville-Shelbyville Road and the present park boundary (Old Houser tract), aggregating approximately sixty acres, are included in the park.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Interior is authorized to acquire lands and interests in lands within the revised boundary by purchase, donation, with donated funds, or by exchange, utilizing for such exchanges federally owned lands of approximately equal value excluded from the park pursuant to this Act. Federally owned lands so excluded which the Secretary of the Interior determines are not needed for such exchanges shall be disposed of in accordance with the provisions of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended.

SEC. 3. Lands and interests therein acquired pursuant to this Act shall thereupon become a part of the Kings Mountain National Military Park and be subject to all the laws and regulations applicable thereto.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDING ACT OF JUNE 28, 1958, PROVIDING FOR A NATIONAL OUTDOOR RECREATION RESOURCES REVIEW COMMISSION

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1776) to amend the act of June 28, 1958, entitled "An act to provide for a National Outdoor Resources Review Commission, and for other purposes."

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Reprsentatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the fourth section of subsection (a) of section 2 of the Act of June 28, 1958, entitled "An Act to provide for a National Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission, and for other purposes" is amended to read as follows:

"The Commission is authorized, without regard to the civil service laws and regulations, and without regard to the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, to appoint and fix the compensation of an executive secretary and such additional personnel as may be necessary to enable it to carry out its functions, except that any Federal employees subject to the civil service laws and regulations who may be assigned to the Commission shall retain civil service status without interruption or loss of status or privilege."

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 3, strike out the words, "That the fourth section of subsection (a) of section 2" and insert in lieu thereof the words "That subsection (a) of section 4."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDING ACT OF JUNE 21, 1950, RELATING TO APPOINTMENT OF BOARDS OF MEDICAL OFFICERS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 3320) to amend the act of June 21, 1950, relating to the appointment of boards of medical officers.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 2 of the Act of June 21, 1950 (ch. 342, 64 Stat. 249), is amended by striking out the last proviso and inserting the following in lieu thereof: "*And provided further,* That competent medical authority shall consist of a board appointed from available medical officers or physicians under his jurisdiction by the head of whichever of the following departments or agencies is providing medical treatment for the member, or by a person designated by the head of that department or agency:

"(1) Department of the Army
"(2) Department of the Navy
"(3) Department of the Air Force
"(4) Department of Health, Education, and Welfare
"(5) Veterans' Administration

If the hospitalization or medical care of the member is not provided by the United States, the board shall be appointed by the secretary of the department having jurisdiction of the member. Each board shall consist of at least three qualified medical officers or physicians one of whom must be specially qualified in the treatment of mental disorders."

SEC. 2. Section 3 of the Act of June 21, 1950 (ch. 342, 64 Stat. 249), is amended by inserting the words "and the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs" after the words "department concerned."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDING TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 3322) to amend title 10, United States Code, and certain other laws to authorize the payment of transportation and travel allowance to escorts of dependents of members of the uniformed services under certain conditions, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, this bill will in no way be used to pay people who have been used in the past to wet-nurse dogs and cats on military transports; will it?

Mr. KILDAY. No; I can assure the gentleman it will not apply to cases of that kind. It will reimburse a few men who under orders have escorted families with men missing in airplane accidents or in other actions, to their homes. But that is only to the extent of about 1,600 of the cases previously accumulated.

Mr. GROSS. Does the gentleman know whether we are still paying people to take care of dogs, cats, and other pets?

Mr. KILDAY. I have no knowledge that we are, and I am quite sure we are no longer doing that if we did.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That chapter 53 of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by adding the following new section after section 1035:

"§ 1036. Escorts for dependents of members: transportation and travel allowances

"Under regulations to be prescribed by the Secretary concerned, round trip transportation and travel allowances may be paid to any person for travel performed or to be performed under competent orders as an escort for dependents of a member of the Armed Forces, if the travel is performed not later than one year after the member—

"(1) dies;
"(2) is missing; or
"(3) is otherwise unable to accompany his dependents;

and it has been determined that travel by the dependents is necessary and that they are incapable of traveling alone because of age, mental or physical incapacity, or other extraordinary circumstances."; and

(2) by adding the following new item at the end of the analysis:

"1036. Escorts for dependents of members; transportation and travel allowances."

SEC. 2. Section 3(a) of the Act of August 10, 1956, chapter 1041, as amended (33 U.S.C. 857a(a)), is amended—

(1) by redesignating clauses (1), (2), (3), (4), (5), (6), and (7) as clauses "(2)", "(3)", "(4)", "(5)", "(6)", "(7)", and "(8)", respectively; and

(2) by inserting the following new clause at the beginning:

"(1) Section 1036, Escorts for dependents of members: transportation and travel allowances."

SEC. 3. Section 221(a) of the Public Health Service Act, as amended (42 U.S.C. 213a(a)), is amended—

(1) by redesignating clauses (1), (2), (3), (4), (5), (6), and (7) as clauses "(2)", "(3)", "(4)", "(5)", "(6)", "(7)", and "(8)", respectively; and

(2) by inserting the following new clause at the beginning:

"(1) Section 1036. Escorts for dependents of members: transportation and travel allowances."

SEC. 4. Travel and transportation allowances paid before the effective date of this Act to persons ordered by competent authority to escort dependents of members of the uniformed services are hereby validated, if they would have been authorized under section 1 of this Act.

SEC. 5. Any person who was ordered by competent authority after January 1, 1950, and before the effective date of this Act to escort dependents of members of the uniformed services and who has not been paid travel and transportation allowances, or who has repaid the United States the amount so paid to him, is entitled to be paid the amount otherwise authorized by section 1 of this Act, if application for such payment is made not later than one year after the effective date of this Act.

SEC. 6. The Comptroller General of the United States, or his designee, shall relieve disbursing officers, including special disbursing agents, from accountability or responsibility for any payments described in section 4 of this Act, and shall allow credits in the settlement of the acounts of those disbursing officers or agents for payments which are found to be free from fraud or collusion.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 4, line 11, insert:

SEC. 7. No regulations under section 1 of this act relating to the military departments shall be prescribed by the Secretary of a military department unless such regulations are first approved under procedures prescribed by the Secretary of Defense. Regulations of the Secretaries of the Treasury, Commerce, and Health, Education, and Welfare under section 1, 2, or 3 of this act shall, to the extent practicable, agree with regulations so approved.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDING TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, BY REPEALING SECTION 7475

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 4068) to amend title 10, United States Code, by repealing section 7475, which restricts the increasing of forces at naval activities prior to national elections.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That title 10, United States Code, is amended as follows:

(1) Section 7475 is repealed.

(2) The analysis of chapter 643 is amended by striking out the following item:

"7475. Force at naval activities not to be increased before elections."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NORTH ATLANTIC TREATY PARLIAMENTARY CONFERENCE

The Clerk called the resolution (H. Con. Res. 34), favoring the meeting of the North Atlantic Treaty Parliamentary Conference for 1959 in Washington, D.C.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this resolution be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

CENTENNIAL OF ESTABLISHMENT OF LAND-GRANT COLLEGES AND STATE UNIVERSITIES AND THE ESTABLISHMENT OF THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 4012) to provide for the centennial celebration of the establishment of the land-grant colleges and State universities and the establishment of the Department of Agriculture, and for related purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. FORRESTER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to inquire what subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary this bill was referred to. Subcommittee No. 4, of which I am chairman, ordinarily has jurisdiction of matters of this kind. I would like to know what subcommittee did have the legislation and just why.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORRESTER. I yield.

Mr. LANE. I doubt if I can answer the gentleman from Georgia as to the reason the chairman [Mr. CELLER] has referred this bill to Committee No. 2. What his reasons were I am not aware of. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORRESTER. I yield.

Mr. CELLER. The gentleman from New York is rather embarrassed. This is one of those slips. I would say that ordinarily the bill would be referred to the subcommittee headed by the distinguished gentleman from Georgia [Mr. FORRESTER]. I am at a loss to explain why it went to the so-called Subcommittee No. 2 headed by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. LANE]. I hope the gentleman from Georgia will not object, because it is a very meritorious bill concerning the celebration of the 100th anniversary of the setting up of the Department of Agriculture and land-grant colleges and State universities.

Mr. FORRESTER. I would like to ask the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. LANE] is that all that this bill does, that stated by the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER]?

Mr. LANE. It does a little more than that. This sets up a commission and gives the various departments the right to participate in this commission. It is estimated that the amount will be in the nature of about $200,000. Much of this money can be taken from the various departments, such as the Agricultural Department and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, the defense agencies all will participate in this establishment of this commission.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I am not opposed to centennial celebrations, but why should there be the expenditure of $200,000 for a proposition of this kind? Why create another commission to spend more money? We are already surfeited with commissions. Can this not be carried on without the establishment of a commission and without the expenditure of $200,000 from the Treasury?

Mr. LANE. May I say to the gentleman that this bill comes about as the result of an Executive communication. As you know, it provides for the centennial celebration of the establishment of land-grant colleges, State universities and the Department of Agriculture. In the year 1962 would mark this anniversary both for the establishment of the Department of Agriculture and the land-grant colleges.

This bill was introduced, as I say, through Executive communication. The Department of Agriculture, as the gentleman from Iowa knows, was established way back in 1862, and under the first Morrill Act approved in that year there was provided the beginning of aid to the land-grant colleges through the setting aside of public lands for their support.

This commission would initiate and prepare plans with the Department and the land-grant colleges. For example, the Department of Agriculture has a working relationship with the State departments of agriculture. The Department is not concerned with the colleges. On the other hand, the land-grant colleges and universities have much in common with the Department of Defense and with the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

As I understand, Mr. Speaker, although this may cost that amount of money, if the Department can see fit to obtain part of this cost from various agencies in the Department they may be able to carry out the program without going in excess of the money appropriated.

Mr. GROSS. I wonder if when the national debt reaches $300 billion a commission will be created to celebrate that event at a cost of $200,000 or $300,000.

Mr. LANE. I hope not, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, although the indication is that the estimated cost will be $200,000 for this centennial program, there is nothing in the bill which limits the proposed expenditure to that amount. In fact, as I read the bill, it says there is an authorized appropriation of such sums as may be necessary. That is a wide open authorization. I personally feel that if this is the estimate we ought to write that limitation into the legislation.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORD. I yield.

Mr. CELLER. Would not the Appropriations Committee have the last say on that?

Mr. FORD. Yes; but I think it is healthy and wholesome in the authorizing legislation to have a limitation right at the very outset.

Mr. CELLER. Does the gentleman believe you should have a limitation now before we know exactly what the needs may be? This, to my mind, is a rather important centennial; it affects a great many Members of the House who come from agricultural districts, and their constituents naturally are interested.

I simply offered the bill at the suggestion of the Secretary of Agriculture. I think it is a wholesome bill and worth while. I cannot conceive of its costing much more than $200,000. It may cost more. I have not the slightest knowledge as to what the ultimate cost will be.

Mr. FORD. What I am saying, Mr. Chairman, is that they estimate it will cost $200,000. If that is their estimate I think it would be wholesome and helpful

to have that written into the legislation as a limitation so that the total is fixed and unequivocal from the outset.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORD. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. Page 9, section 12, of the bill provides that member institutions receiving benefits under the second Morrill Act, and so on and so forth, are authorized to utilize such funds and prepare such plans; in other words, more than the $200,000 can be spent. As it stands we do not know what this is going to cost.

Mr. CELLER. I would not have any objection if the gentleman cares to offer an appropriate amendment.

Mr. FORD. May I make one other comment I think would be appropriate? Would there be any objection to imposing on the individual States some responsibility for the expenses of these ceremonies and celebrations?

Mr. CELLER. I would not know how to answer that. I would want to take advice and counsel from the real authors of the bill who are the representatives of the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. LANE. May I say to the gentleman from Michigan that according to information from the Secretary of Agriculture they felt this amount would not exceed $200,000. We put that in our report, that the Department of Agriculture has estimated that about $200,000 will be needed to carry out the observance part of this bill. As far as your committee is concerned, we felt there should be a limitation and that amount would be perfectly all right, as we have the evidence before us it would not take any more than that. Perhaps a good part of this sum could be taken from the various departments that are working in connection with this commission and it may not call for any additional funds.

Mr. FORD. May I suggest that the committee prepare such an amendment which could be submitted the next time the Consent Calendar is called before the House?

Mr. LANE. Yes, that is all right.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

AUTHORIZING SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY TO SETTLE CERTAIN CLAIMS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2741) to amend section 2734 of title 10, United States Code, so as to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to settle claims arising in foreign countries incident to noncombat activities of the Coast Guard.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill:

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That title 10 of the United States Code is amended as follows:

(1) Section 2734 is amended as follows:

(A) The catchline is amended to read as follows:

"§ 2734. Property loss; personal injury or death: incident to noncombat activities of the armed forces; foreign countries."

(B) Subsection (a) is amended as follows:

(i) by striking out the words "of a military department" and inserting in place thereof the word "concerned"; and

(ii) by striking out the words "the department concerned" and inserting in place thereof the words "the military department concerned or the Coast Guard; as the case may be."

(C) Subsections (c) and (d) are amended by striking out the words "of the military department."

(D) Subsection (f) is amended as follows:

(i) by striking out the words " a military department" and inserting in place thereof the words "the department concerned"; and

(ii) by striking out the word "military."

(E) Subsection (g) is amended to read as follows:

"(g) Payment of claims against the Coast Guard arising while it is operating as a service in the Department of the Treasury shall be made out of the appropriation for the operating expenses of the Coast Guard."

(2) The analysis of chapter 163 is amended by striking out the following item:

"2734. Property loss; personal injury or death: incident to noncombat activities of the Department of Army, Navy, or Air Force; foreign countries."

and inserting the following item in place thereof:

"2734. Property loss; personal injury or death: incident to noncombat activities of the armed forces; foreign countries."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

VALIDATING PAYMENTS OF CERTAIN QUARTERS ALLOWANCES MADE IN GOOD FAITH

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2975) to validate payments of certain quarters allowances made in good faith, and pursuant to agreements by authorized officials, to employees of the Department of the Navy, but which were subsequently determined to be inconsistent with applicable regulations.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, from a study of this proposed legislation I can see merit to those people who are individually involved. I wonder, however, if we may not be setting a precedent unless we make it clear that the disbursing officer is not having any waiver of his responsibility. Could somebody from the committee discuss that aspect of the question with me?

Mr. LANE. May I reply to the gentleman from Michigan by stating that in the bill, H.R. 2975, beginning with line 6, it is stated:

Any employee or former employee of the Department of the Navy who has made repayment to the United States of any amount so paid him as quarters allowance is entitled to have refunded to him the amount so repaid.

In other words, your committee, Mr. Speaker, is only interested in those employees of the Department of the Navy and not in the disbursing officers.

Mr. FORD. There is by this proposal no waiver of the fundamental responsibility of the disbursing officer for any erroneous action on his part?

Mr. LANE. None whatsoever.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That all payments of quarters allowances made after January 1, 1949, and before August 16, 1953, to civilian employees of the Department of the Navy on duty in London, England, are hereby validated. Any employee or former employee of the Department of the Navy who has made repayment to the United States of any amount so paid him as a quarters allowance is entitled to have refunded to him the amount so repaid. Any appropriation that was available for the payment of salaries of civilian employees of the Department of the Navy at any time during the years 1949 through 1953 is available for the payment of the refunds authorized by this act.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read a third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RELIEVING CERTAIN MEMBERS AND FORMER MEMBERS OF THE NAVAL SERVICE OF CERTAIN LIABILITY

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 4615) to relieve certain members and former members of the naval service of liability to reimburse the United States for the value of transportation requests erroneously furnished them by the United States, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object I make the same inquiry of the gentleman from Massachusetts in this case as I did before. Is there by this legislation any waiver of the disbursing officers' responsibility for erroneous payments?

Mr. LANE. As far as the committee is concerned, there is no intention to waive anything as far as the disbursing officer is concerned. We seek to relieve the claimants in this particular bill, of which there are seven or eight of them, due to the fact there was an error made by somebody outside of the naval service.

The committee feels that on the state of these facts it is clearly unfair to penalize the individual Navy men. The mistake was made in the application of

travel regulations to a group of sailors traveling under official orders. It was the conclusion of the committee that these sailors were entitled to relief.

Mr. FORD. I believe the comment made by the gentleman from Massachusetts is appropriate. The individual sailors were not responsible, but somebody in the disbursing office or in the travel office made an error. And, they are not relieved of that responsibility by this legislation.

I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the issuance of transportation requests (including the cost of transporting excess baggage) and payments made for mileage or per diem, or both, to members of the naval service for travel performed by them by commercial carriers after June 30, 1955, and before July 1, 1958, under orders that transferred them between duty stations (including vessels) outside the United States and authorized them leave en route in the United States are validated. Any member or former member of the naval service who has wholly or partly reimbursed the United States for the value of transportation requests so issued to him or for payments so made to him is entitled to have refunded the amount he has so reimbursed the United States.

SEC. 2. Current appropriations available to the Department of the Navy for the pay and allowances of members of the naval service are available for refunds under this Act.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDING THE COLUMBIA BASIN PROJECT ACT

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1306) to amend section 2(b) of the Columbia Basin Project Act, as amended.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 2, subsection (b), of the Columbia Basin Project Act (57 Stat. 14, 15, 16 U.S.C. 835a), as amended, is hereby further amended by designating subdivision (v) as subdivision (vi), and by adding thereto a new subdivision (v) reading as follows:

"(c) Water may be delivered from, through, or by means of the project works to or for conformed farm units comprising a total irrigable area of not more than six hundred forty acres held by the State of Washington for use by the State College of Washington for agricultural research purposes, notwithstanding the maximum irrigable area limitations on the delivery of water to farm units provided in subdivision (iii) of this subsection or the fact that one or more of those units may be deemed to be excess lands under the provisions of subdivision (iv) of this subsection."

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That notwithstanding any provisions of sections 2(b)(iii), 2(b)(iv), and 4(b) of the Columbia Basin Project Act, as amended (16 U.S.C., ch. 12D), conformed farm units, or portions of farm units, comprising not more than six hundred and forty acres of irrigable land on the Columbia Basin project may be sold by the Secretary of the Interior and others to the State of Washington for use by the State College of Washington for agricultural research purposes, and water may be delivered from, through, or by means of the project works to or for conformed farm units comprising no more than that acreage, as nonexcess lands, whether so acquired or already held by the State, as long as they are used for those purposes. Except as otherwise provided in this Act, any lands sold to the State under this Act shall be governed by the provisions of the Columbia Basin Project Act, as amended, and regulations of the Secretary issued pursuant thereto.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to provide for the sale of Columbia Basin project lands to the State of Washington, and for other purposes."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WATER RESOURCES—SALT FORK AND PRAIRIE DOG TOWN FORK, TEX.

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 4405) to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Interior to conduct studies and render a report on the feasibility of developing the water resources of the Salt Fork of the Red River in the State of Texas.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, could we have a further explanation from the author of this bill? What is the Federal responsibility here, who will be the prime beneficiaries, is this a new start, and so forth?

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Let me say this. This bill is for the purpose of authorizing the Bureau of Reclamation to make a survey of two streams in the Panhandle of Texas which are the only streams that supply a source of water in that area. There are some surveys already prepared, but the Bureau of Reclamation will make their surveys in connection with some of the surveys that have been made in order to develop or answer the question of feasibility in this particular area with relation to a possible reclamation project at that point.

Mr. FORD. Will the ultimate beneficiaries be solely those people living within the area; is this an expansion of the idea of the Bureau of Reclamation's fundamental responsibility?

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. No. The beneficiaries will be the same as they are in most every other reclamation project. The fact of the matter is this, that a reclamation project built in this particular area would be almost wholly reimbursable to the Federal Government insofar as the cost of the project is concerned. These are the only two sources of water or the only two streams from which water can be had in that area. Unless these streams are developed, the territory there will remain in a semiarid state.

Mr. FORD. I notice in the report it says "the potential requirements of water by municipalities, industries, and irrigation projects." It seems to put the emphasis on municipalities and industries rather than irrigation for agricultural purposes.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Of course, that is right. This bill, though, may I say to the gentleman, does this. It is a question of priority insofar as the survey is concerned. They already have the authority to do the very thing that is named in this bill. It is simply a question of priority that should have been gone into, I think, several years ago.

Mr. FORD. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. MORRIS of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. If the gentleman will withhold that for a minute, I will be happy to answer any questions concerning it. I have discussed it with the gentleman.

Mr. MORRIS of Oklahoma. Well, I do not want to prejudice my right by making such a request. Mr. Speaker, I have discussed it with the gentleman and, of course, I am not opposed to the purposes of his bill other than this, that the whole stream ought to be investigated instead of stopping at the State boundaries. I would hope that the gentleman and I might agree on an amendment, but I must insist at this time to have the opportunity to further study the matter.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORRIS of Oklahoma. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. I will say this to the gentleman, as I told him before, this bill has nothing in the world to do with Oklahoma. The fact of the matter is this, that the surveys anticipated in this bill are presently being conducted in Oklahoma, and an amendment to it would serve no purpose in the world. As a matter of fact, the money has already been allocated and the work being done in Oklahoma on this type of project, and I sincerely hope that the gentleman will not hold it up.

Mr. MORRIS of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I certainly have no disposition to hold it up indefinitely, but I just learned about this recently, as the gentleman knows, and I do feel we can sit down and work the matter out. I certainly see no objection to an investigation going on in his great State, but I do not want to stand by and permit a situation to arise where there might not be the same proper investigation in my own State where the streams flow. I, therefore, must insist upon my request. I should be glad to sit down with the gentleman, and I think we can work out something that will be satisfactory.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MORRIS]?

There was no objection.

INDEPENDENCE NATIONAL HISTORICAL PARK

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2154) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to acquire certain additional property to be included within the Independence National Historical Park.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to acquire by donation or with donated funds, or to acquire by purchase, the land and buildings immediately adjacent to, but not including, the St. George's Methodist Church property, which land and buildings are identified generally as 318, 320, and 322 New Street, for inclusion in the Independence National Historical Park: *Provided,* That the Secretary shall first enter into an agreement with the proprietor or proprietors of the St. George's Methodist Church property, such agreement to contain the usual and customary provisions for the protection and physical maintenance of said church property, without expense to the United States, in keeping with, but not as a part of, the nearby Independence National Historical Park and providing for its continued use, without limitation or control, for customary church purposes.

SEC. 2. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums, not exceeding $25,000, as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of section 1 of this Act.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REVISION OF BOUNDARIES OF EDISON LABORATORY NATIONAL MONUMENT

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 318) to authorize a revision of the boundaries of the Edison Laboratory National Monument, N.J., and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to rocure for addition to the Edison Laboratory National Monument, such additional lands and interests in lands lying directly across Main Street and northwest of the monument, not to exceed two and one-half acres, as in the discretion of the Secretary are necessary for the proper administration and interpretation thereof.

SEC. 2. Lands and interests in lands acquired pursuant to this Act shall become a part of the Edison Laboratory National Monument upon the issuance of an appropriate order or orders, by the Secretary of the Interior, setting forth the revised boundaries of the monument, such order or orders to be effective upon publication thereof in the Federal Register. Lands and interests therein so added to the monument shall thereafter be subject to all the laws and regulations applicable thereto.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 3, strike out the word "rocure" and insert in lieu thereof "procure."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LEASE OF BUILDINGS FOR NASA

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 4913) to amend the National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958 to authorize the National Aeronautics and Space Administration to lease buildings in the District of Columbia for its use.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I should like to have some information concerning these various locations which would be consolidated, and whether the rentals now exceed the total called for here.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. If the gentleman will yield to me, I should be glad to explain the situation. This bill provides that the General Services Administration may make leases to take care of the needs of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. The NASA is presently housed in a number of locations all over Washington. For instance, it is housed on Jackson Place in a building that is going to be torn down within the year, so I am informed. It is housed at 9th and C Street in Washington. It is housed in 1512 I Street in Washington. A portion of it is housed in 1520 I Street in Washington. We have divisions of it housed at 7th and D Street in Washington in a temporary structure belonging to the Government, which the Government is taking away from them.

This bill would permit the General Services Administration to make arrangements for a lease not exceeding 120,000 to 130,000 square feet for the personnel of that organization. It would provide to bring them together so that they may operate efficiently. Right now they are moving from one part of the city of Washington to another, and they cannot get any efficiency when they are separated in so many places, even more than I have already mentioned to the gentleman.

The purpose is to give the General Services Administration the authority to lease in Washington sufficient space to take care of their local employees. They estimate that the lease will cost something like $6 per square foot. That is what they have been paying for leased space in Washington, so I am informed. The idea of the whole thing is to take care of the present needs of the Space Administration.

Mr. PELLY. I should like to know whether the amount that is being paid in the various locations that are being rented now would exceed $800,000 a year, which this authorization would permit.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. No, this is not an authorization of $800,000. You figure it out at the rate of $300 per square foot, and with 120,000 or 130,000 square feet, that is the ultimate it will reach. But actually there is no authorization for that particular amount at all.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PELLY. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FULTON. In the absence of the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MARTIN] I have been the senior Republican on the committee. We have checked into this thoroughly. We find that this is immediately necessary. Do not under estimate the importance of our space program in relation to Washington, I should like to warn the House.

Secondly, this is not additional money and is merely a correction bill. Under the act of March 3, 1877, any leasing or buying of a building in Washington, or rather, the District of Columbia, must be by appropriation of the Congress. When the act was passed last year, 1958, for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration that was not called to our attention. This puts it in proper form where it is solely under the General Services Administration, not the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, giving the General Services Administration, just as it usually has, the power to lease when the necessity is shown. Likewise, it will go before the Committee on Appropriations to justify the amount.

May I answer the gentleman's question individually on this. Of course, part of this space is Government buildings now, and we are going to have to give it up, in one place within a year, and in another because it is a temporary building and they want them to get out. So I should say it is not more than 10 percent. But there is all the authorization to lease. The peculiar thing about it is that if we did not come in here and ask for this authorization under this bill, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration can lease or buy any place in the United States outside the District of Columbia. It already has that authority. So obviously the thing to do is pass this bill and make them go to the Committee on Appropriations, who will force them to justify it. It corrects the legislation and does not add any other money.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. May I say also to the gentleman that the act we passed last year creating the National Aeronautics and Space Administration authorized that Administration to make leases, but we figured perhaps it was better policy to let the General Services Administration make all the leases. This simply corrects the law to authorize the General Services Administration to make the leases for the Administration. That is the change we make.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PELLY. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Does this mean the leasing of two or more floors of the Arlington Towers Apartments?

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. It was justified before our committee that they had no place in mind. We asked them, and they said it was up to the General Services Administration to find the cheapest available space.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman knows this new organization started out to take

over two or more floors of the Arlington Towers Apartments, does he not?

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. No; I do not. I never had any information on that whatsoever; not one bit.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. PELLY. I yield.

Mr. FULTON. The problem is this. It should be under the control of the General Services Administration because that is the regular practice. It had not previously been because under the act we passed last year, 1958, authorizing the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, they were given extra powers. This takes it away from them and puts it completely under the General Services Administration. It is really just what the gentleman wants and what I want, too, as the Republican on the committee.

Mr. GROSS. I do not necessarily agree that the General Services Administration should be the last word because I understand it recently leased five floors in the new Cafritz Building at a rental of $6,500,000 for 10 years for another agency. The owner of the building said that he had $10 million invested in it. Now he has the other five floors of the building to lease. He should do very well on that.

Further, let me say to the gentleman that in the Arlington Towers apartment building is located the Foreign Service Training School, which I assume is a General Services Administration deal. I am told that even with the erection of the new $50- to $60-million State Department Building no provision is being made to put the Foreign Service Training School in the new structure, so they apparently will go on indefinitely and forever leasing from the Arlington Towers apartments some 75,000 square feet of space.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. I have no information on that. I want to say that this simply provides 300 square feet per individual or per employee. It is a reasonable space to allow. The General Services Administration no doubt is going to leave this space at the very lowest cost, and if they do not do that some of these buildings are going to be torn down and others will be vacated by the Government.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PELLY. I yield.

Mr. FULTON. You see, it should be pointed out that the National Space Agency has the authority to do this under the law passed in 1958, and this is simply limiting legislation that puts it under the General Services Administration and under the act of 1887 of March 3 forced them to go before the Committee on Appropriations to justify the appropriation. What more does the gentleman from Iowa want? Of course, go before the Committee on Appropriations and object to it, if you do not like it, but let us put this through because I may say to the gentleman we are in a race for life with Russia and when we tell you we are falling behind in space in some ways, let us get it most efficiently as we can and protect the security of this country. When I tell you there is not one extra dollar being authorized by this bill, but it is being tightened up by putting it under the General Services Administration, let me tell you it conforms to our regular Government practice, and I believe the General Services Administration generally has been doing a good job. If the gentleman from Iowa wants to object, go on over to the Committee on Appropriations and object to the total amount because we are not changing the amount in this legislation.

Mr. PELLY. I would like to say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania that the idea of consolidating the operation certainly appeals to me so far as doing an effective job.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

WAGE EARNERS' PLANS—OF THE BANKRUPTCY ACT

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2237) to amend chapter 13—Wage Earners' Plans—of the Bankruptcy Act.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That paragraph (8) of section 606 of the Bankruptcy Act (11 U.S.C., 1006(8)) is amended to read as follows:

"(8) 'wage earner' shall mean an individual whose principal income is derived from wages, salary or commissions."

SEC. 2. That paragraph (3) of section 659 of such Act (11 U.S.C., 1059(3)) is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(3) an additional fee for the referees' salary fund, to be graduated and charged in the manner outlined in paragraph (2) of subdivision c of section 40 of this Act, and to be computed upon the amount of the payments actually made by or for a debtor under the plan; and commissions to the trustee of not more than 5 per centum to be computed upon and payable out of the payments actually made by or for a debtor under the plan;".

SEC. 3. The provisions of this Act shall apply to all cases in which the petition initiating the proceedings under the Bankruptcy Act is filed subsequent to the date of the enactment of this Act.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDING SECTION 3238 OF TITLE 18, UNITED STATES CODE

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 4154) to amend section 3238 of title 18, United States Code.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 3238 of title 18, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"§ 3238. Offenses not committed in any district.

"The trial of all offenses begun or committed upon the high seas, or elsewhere out of the jurisdiction of any particular State or district, shall be in the district in which the offender, or any one of two or more joint offenders, is arrested or is first brought; but if such offender or offenders are not so arrested or brought into any district, an indictment or information may be filed in the district of the last-known residence of the offender or of any one of two or more joint offenders, or in the District of Columbia."

With the following committee amendment:

On page 2, line 3, after the word "or", insert the following: "if no such residence is known the indictment or information may be filed".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENDING LEASING PROVISIONS OF ACT OF JUNE 14, 1926

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 4748) to extend the leasing provisions of the act of June 14, 1926, as amended by the act of June 4, 1954 (68 Stat.; 43 U.S.C. 869—869–3), to certain lands in Oregon, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Act of April 13, 1928 (45 Stat. 429; 43 U.S.C. 869a), is hereby repealed.

SEC. 2. The second sentence of subsection (c) of section 1 of the Act of June 14, 1926 (44 Stat. 741), as amended by the Act of June 4, 1954 (68 Stat. 173; 43 U.S.C. 869–869–3), is hereby amended to read as follows: "Nothing in this Act shall be construed to apply to lands in any national forest, national park, or national monument, or national wildlife refuge, or to any Indian lands or lands set aside or held for the use or benefit of Indians, including lands over which jurisdiction has been transferred to the Department of the Interior by Executive order for the use of Indians, or, except insofar as this Act applies to leases of land to States and counties and to State and Federal instrumentalities and political subdivisions and to municipal corporations, to the revested Oregon and California Railroad grant lands and the reconveyed Coos Bay Wagon Road grant lands in the State of Oregon."

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, following line 11, add a new section to read as follows:

"SEC. 3. A new section is hereby added to the Act of June 14, 1926, as amended, supra, to read as follows:

" 'SEC. 6. All moneys received from or on account of any revested Oregon and California Railroad grant lands or reconveyed Coos Bay Wagon Road grant lands under this Act shall be deposited respectively in the Oregon and California land-grant fund and the Coos Bay Wagon Road grant fund, and shall be applied in the manner prescribed respectively by title II of the Act of August 28, 1937 (50 Stat. 875), as amended (43 U.S.C. 1181f), and by the Act of May 24, 1939 (53 Stat. 753).' "

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NORTH ATLANTIC TREATY PARLIAMENTARY CONFERENCE FOR 1959

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HAYS] rise?

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to return to Calendar No. 20 for the consideration of the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 34) favoring meeting of the North Atlantic Treaty Parliamentary Conference for 1959 in Washington, D.C.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I shall not object, I should like to ask the gentleman this question. Where is it proposed to hold this meeting?

Mr. HAYS. It is proposed to hold this conference in the committee room of the Committee on Ways and Means in the New House Office Building.

Mr. GROSS. May I ask the gentleman another question? Is it proposed to use the dining facilities of the House or the cafeteria in the New House Office Building to entertain these people?

Mr. HAYS. Presumably, any Member of Congress can take anyone there as his guest. But, if the gentleman inquires as to whether the United States is going to pick up the check, or not, the answer is, unqualifiedly, "No." Each person will have to pay his own way.

Mr. GROSS. I asked that question because when the Interparliamentary Union met in Washington, this House Chamber and the dining room downstairs was used. And my understanding is we finally woke up to the fact that some of the foreign delegates were going down to the dining room, eating and walking out and we were left holding the bag. I hope that does not happen in this case.

Mr. HAYS. I can assure the gentleman, it has already been made clear that all of the delegates will be paying their own way including any hotel bills and meals, unless they are invited by some individual to be their guest.

Mr. GROSS. We were also assured that that was the case when the Interparliamentary Union met here, but we found it did not work out that way. I do not want us to wake up this time to find out that the taxpayers are providing a free eating place for these foreign delegates.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the concurrent resolution?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the concurrent resolution, as follows:

Whereas United States delegates have attended each of the four North Atlantic Treaty Parliamentary Conferences which have been held in Paris; and

Whereas the Fourth North Atlantic Treaty Parliamentary Conference, by resolution, expressed a wish to hold the next conference in Washington, District of Columbia: Therefore be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the Chairmen of the United States delegation to the North Atlantic Treaty Parliamentary Conference be requested to invite the North Atlantic Treaty Parliamentary Conference to hold its annual meeting for the year 1959 in Washington, District of Columbia.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently no quorum is present.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 15]

Barden	Fountain	Moulder
Barrett	Frazier	Multer
Bennett, Mich.	Frelinghuysen	Nix
Bonner	Gallagher	Osmers
Bowles	Granahan	Philbin
Bray	Grant	Polk
Buckley	Griffiths	Porter
Burke, Mass.	Gubser	Powell
Carter	Hall	Prokop
Chelf	Hardy	Randall
Collier	Healey	Rivers, Alaska
Corbett	Hechler	Rivers, S.C.
Cramer	Henderson	Rostenkowski
Davis, Tenn.	Hoffman, Ill.	Scott
Dawson	Holland	Shelley
Diggs	Kasem	Staggers
Dixon	Lesinski	Taylor
Dorn, N.Y.	McCulloch	Teller
Dulski	McDowell	Toll
Durham	McGinley	Tuck
Fallon	Macdonald	Walter
Farbstein	Madden	Weaver
Feighan	Martin	Zelenko
Fino	Meader	
Forand	Moorhead	

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 353 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

TEMPORARY UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 5640) to extend the time during which certain individuals may continue to receive temporary unemployment compensation.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That paragraph (1) of section 101(a) of the Temporary Unemployment Compensation Act of 1958 (42 U.S.C. 1400) is amended—

(1) by striking out "April 1, 1959" and inserting in lieu thereof "July 1, 1959"; and

(2) by adding at the end of such paragraph the following: "Payment of temporary unemployment compensation under this Act to any individual shall be made only if such individual's first claim under this Act was filed before April 1, 1959."

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a second be considered as ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, on April 1 next, the temporary program enacted by the Congress last year for the payment of additional unemployment compensation expires. When Congress enacted the program it did so with the thought in mind that it would be a temporary program and that all payments under the program would cease on April 1.

The bill before the House provides for a continuation of payments to those who have established claims prior to April 1, not to continue longer than July 1, next. In other words, we have made it possible for people who were eligible, who are now eligible for temporary unemployment compensation, to draw that compensation in accordance with the provisions of the statute, but that no payment may be made beyond July 1, next. The bill is very simple in that respect. It does not do all that many would have had us do, I am certain.

There was a suggestion made that the program should be extended for at least a year or until April 1, 1960. However, Mr. Speaker, when the committee gave consideration to this matter on last Thursday it became quite evident in the committee that if we were to enact a program we must do it by April 1, or in fact, by March 26, if the Congress takes the contemplated Easter recess, and that to do more than we are proposing at this time in the bill would not lead to the enactment of an extension at all. So the committee finally decided, I think by almost a unanimous vote if not a unanimous vote, that we would propose to the House this extension of payments to those people who have established their claim under this program by April 1, so that payments could be made in accordance with the provisions of the program, but that all payments would have to stop by July 1, next.

The Congress in the last session appropriated some $665 million for the program. It is estimated that the cost of the program through March 30 will be approximately $447 million, leaving approximately $218 million appropriated that will not be spent under the existing program.

This extension will apply to approximately 405,000 people and it is estimated that it will cost, out of this $218 million remaining unexpended, some $78 million. When the matter was being considered in the committee, the Department of Labor thought that a number less than 405,000 would be involved and that the total cost of the program would be around $49 million, but upon further consideration the Department of Labor reached the conclusion that this extension would involve an additional $78 million, virtually all of which would be spent within this fiscal year. None of the amounts, except for some slight number of claims that might be in dispute, would carry over into the next fiscal year.

As I say, it does not go as far as some on the committee wanted it to go, but it became quite evident to me that we could not go further than we have gone here and expect to enact a program of any extension whatsoever in this field.

We think that this is the humane thing to do, at least, so that we can prevent an abrupt termination of payments. Some people will have established their eligibility under the program and perhaps have drawn only one week of these extended benefits. Maybe they are entitled in, say, the State of Pennsylvania to some 14 weeks additional. Under this bill those additional payments could be made, but no new cases will be added to the rolls, no new cases will be set up after April 1 for the benefits that are envisioned in this bill.

I trust that the bill will merit approval of the House and that it will be passed by the House.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include with my remarks a statement that was prepared, at the request of the chairman of the committee, by the Department of Labor setting forth certain pertinent information concerning this program, and also including a number of tables.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

The matter referred to follows:

TEMPORARY UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION PROGRAM

1. GENERAL

The Temporary Unemployment Compensation Act of 1958, which became effective June 19, provides that unemployment benefits may be extended to individuals who, since June 30, 1957, have exhausted their benefit rights under State unemployment insurance laws and the unemployment compensation programs for Federal workers, ex-servicemen, and for veterans (UCFE, UCX, and UCV). Temporary benefits are payable to claimants under the laws of States which have entered into agreements with the Secretary of Labor to participate in the program. The States have the option of participating fully, partially, or not at all, in the temporary Federal program. The TUC law expires on March 31, 1959; that is, temporary benefits are not payable for any weeks of unemployment beginning after that date.

2. PARTICIPATING STATES

On February 24, 1959, there were 36 States in which Federal temporary unemployment compensation programs were in effect. Seventeen States had adopted the Federal plan for UI, UCFE, UCX, and UCV exhaustees and another 14 States had adopted the Federal plan for UCFE, UCX, and UCV exhaustees, but had not provided for their State UI exhaustees. Five other States had elected to pay temporary benefits to State UI, UCFE, and UCX exhaustees within the framework of their own laws and adopted the Federal plan only for UCV exhaustees.

The following table indicates States participating in the TUC program and States which have extended benefits under their own law:

State	UI-TUC		UCX-UCFE-TUC		UCV-TUC	
	Exhaustion date	Date benefits payable	Exhaustion date	Date benefits payable	Exhaustion date	Date benefits payable
Alabama	June 30, 1957	July 6, 1958	June 30, 1957	July 6, 1958	June 30, 1957	July 6, 1958
Alaska	do	Oct. 5, 1958	do	Aug. 3, 1958	do	Aug. 3, 1958
Arizona			do	July 1, 1958	do	July 1, 1958
Arkansas	June 30, 1957	July 6, 1958	do	July 6, 1958	do	July 6, 1958
California	do	do	do	do	do	Do.
Colorado	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	do	July 13, 1958
Connecticut	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	do	July 6, 1958
Delaware	June 30, 1957	July 1, 1958	June 30, 1957	July 1, 1958	do	July 1, 1958
District of Columbia	do	June 19, 1958	do	June 19, 1958	do	June 19, 1958
Florida			do	July 15, 1958	do	July 15, 1958
Hawaii			do	Aug. 3, 1958	do	Aug. 3, 1958
Idaho			July 7, 1957	July 6, 1958	July 7, 1957	July 6, 1958
Illinois	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	Nov. 30, 1957	July 1, 1958
Indiana	June 30, 1957	June 23, 1958	June 30, 1957	June 23, 1958	June 30, 1957	June 23, 1958
Kentucky			Mar. 31, 1958	Sept. 14, 1958	Mar. 31, 1958	Sept. 14, 1958
Maryland	June 30, 1957	June 19, 1958	June 30, 1957	June 19, 1958	June 30, 1957	June 19, 1958
Massachusetts	do	July 6, 1958	do	July 6, 1958	do	July 6, 1958
Michigan	do	June 22, 1958	do	June 22, 1958	do	June 22, 1958
Minnesota	do	July 1, 1958	do	July 1, 1958	do	July 1, 1958
Nebraska			do	Aug. 17, 1958	do	Aug. 17, 1958
Nevada	Dec. 28, 1957	July 13, 1958	Dec. 28, 1957	July 13, 1958	Dec. 28, 1957	July 13, 1958
New Jersey	Oct. 1, 1957	June 29, 1958	Oct. 1, 1957	June 29, 1958	Oct. 1, 1957	June 29, 1958
New Mexico			June 30, 1957	July 6, 1958	June 30, 1957	July 6, 1958
New York	June 30, 1957	June 23, 1958	do	June 23, 1958	do	June 23, 1958
North Dakota			do	Oct. 26, 1958	do	Oct. 26, 1958
Ohio	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	do	July 13, 1958
Oregon			June 30, 1957	July 13, 1958	do	Do.
Pennsylvania	June 30, 1957	June 19, 1958	do	June 19, 1958	do	June 19, 1958
Puerto Rico			do	do	do	do.
Rhode Island	June 30, 1957	June 22, 1958	do	June 22, 1958	do	June 22, 1958
South Carolina			do	Aug. 4, 1958	do	Aug. 4, 1958
Texas			do	Aug. 20, 1958	do	Aug. 20, 1958
Virgin Islands			do	June 19, 1958	do	June 19, 1958
Washington			July 6, 1957	July 13, 1958	July 6, 1957	July 13, 1958
West Virginia	June 30, 1957	June 27, 1958	June 30, 1957	June 27, 1958	June 30, 1957	June 27, 1958
Wisconsin	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	do	June 21, 1958

[1] The following States have extended benefits under their own law. Such extension applies equally to UCFE (but not to UCV). Interstate UI and UCFE claims should be taken in usual manner against such States. Form ES-960 not required except for participation in TUC program as shown in columns above.

	UI Exhaustion date		UCFE Dates benefits payable	
Colorado [a]	June 30, 1957	July 13, 1958	June 30, 1957	July 13, 1958
Connecticut	(b)	Apr. 16, 1958	(b)	Apr. 16, 1958
Illinois	Nov. 30, 1957	July 1, 1958	Nov. 30, 1957	July 1, 1958
Ohio	June 30, 1957	July 13, 1958	June 30, 1957	July 13, 1958
Wisconsin	do	June 21, 1958	do	June 21, 1958

[a] Colorado law extends benefits by 25 percent rather than 50 percent of regular benefits.
[b] See "Interstate Claims Taking Handbook, Connecticut, Revision of Apr. 16, 1958," for explanation of Connecticut extended benefits.

3. LAG IN THE RECOVERY IN EMPLOYMENT AND UNEMPLOYMENT

As usually occurs when the economy is coming out of a recession, the recovery in employment and the reduction in unemployment is lagging behind the expansion in industrial production and other indicators of economic well being.

Production generally increases before employment rises, partly because employers first lengthen hours of work and partly because output per worker usually rises in this stage of the business cycle. The increased output reflects the technological improvements and more efficient utilization of employees which are emphasized during a period of recovery under highly competitive market conditions. Because of these factors manufacturing output in January 1959 was within 1.2 percent of prerecession production in the third quarter of 1957, while manufacturing employment was still 6.5 percent below the average for that quarter (both figures seasonally adjusted).

Unemployment levels tend to stay high even after employment begins to rise, partly because of technological unemployment in some areas and industries, but largely because the labor force continues to expand even during a recession. As a result, more job opportunities are needed every year to keep unemployment from increasing. Reflecting these factors, total unemployment, and insured unemployment in January 1959 were, on a seasonally adjusted basis, about 40 percent higher than during the third quarter of 1957, even though total employment, seasonally adjusted, had about returned to the levels of that quarter.

4. INSURED UNEMPLOYMENT AND EXHAUSTIONS WILL CONTINUE HIGH

It is estimated that State insured unemployment will remain at high levels through

fiscal year 1960, in spite of continued economic recovery. As will be seen from the following table,[1] average monthly insured unemployment during fiscal year 1960 is estimated at 2,100,000, as compared with an average of 2,250,000 in fiscal year 1959 and 1,284,000 in fiscal year 1957. The lag in reemployment will be principally due to increased productivity per worker and a faster growth in the labor force than in the growth of demand for labor.

As a result of these expected high levels of insured unemployment, exhaustions of benefits are also expected to continue at high levels, averaging about 190,000 a month from April through September 1959. There will be no considerable drop in exhaustions until after October 1959, when 195,000 exhaustions are estimated. Thereafter, it is expected that they will taper off more than insured unemployment, dropping to 130,000 in June 1960 (see following table).

State-insured unemployment level and State UI and UCFE exhaustions—actual, July 1956–January 1959; estimated, February 1959–June 1960

Month in fiscal year	State-insured unemployment (in millions), fiscal year—				State UI and UCFE exhaustions (in thousands), fiscal year—			
	1957	1958	1959	1960	1957	1958	1959	1960
July	1.196	1.269	2.483	2.1	86.6	98.9	285.4	210
August	1.046	1.134	2.175	1.9	88.1	91.6	255.0	190
September	.977	1.151	1.875	1.8	73.5	82.9	237.4	195
October	.868	1.218	1.698	1.7	73.8	94.5	224.3	195
November	1.004	1.492	1.758	1.8	70.4	84.4	177.7	155
December	1.277	2.087	2.088	2.1	73.3	110.6	213.1	165
January	1.727	2.846	2.491	2.6	106.7	147.1	212.4	170
February	1.719	3.133	2.8	2.5	95.2	145.5	195	150
March	1.580	3.244	2.7	2.4	112.5	191.4	200	155
April	1.465	3.274	2.5	2.2	115.1	231.2	195	150
May	1.338	2.957	2.3	2.1	106.5	236.8	175	140
June	1.239	2.643	2.1	1.9	92.5	254.0	170	130
Fiscal year total	1.284	2.193	2.25	2.1	1,094.1	1,768.7	2,540	2,005

5. UNEMPLOYMENT IN 17 PARTICIPATING STATES

Insured unemployment in the 17 fully participating States during the week of February 14, 1959, averaged 6.7 percent. Insured unemployment averaged 5.1 percent in the nonparticipating States. (The Department classified areas with 6 percent or more unemployment as areas of substantial unemployment.) Practically all of these States are industrial and share in the lag in reemployment.

For the week ended February 14, 1959, all but 1 (Delaware) of the 17 States had less insured unemployment than in the corresponding week of 1958. On the other hand, all but the District of Columbia (1.9 percent) and Indiana (4.9 percent) had an insured unemployment rate in excess of 5 percent. (See following table.)

Exhaustions were also higher in January 1959 than in January 1958 in all but 2 of the 17 States; namely, Indiana and Rhode Island. For all of the 17 States, the exhaustions totaled 113,186 in January 1959 as compared with 73,713 in January 1958. From past experience, practically all of these exhaustions will become TUC beneficiaries.

Comparison of State and UCFE insured unemployment and exhaustions with same period in 1958

	Insured unemployment, week ended Feb. 14, 1959			Exhaustions		
	Number	Rate, percent	Change from year ago	January 1959	January 1958	Change from year ago
Alabama	32,607	5.6	−13,703	4,354	3,382	+972
Arkansas	24,005	9.1	−4,301	1,759	1,535	+224
California	230,846	6.1	−84,997	14,740	8,895	+6,845
Delaware	8,427	6.5	+2,289	742	488	+254
District of Columbia	8,359	1.9	−1,764	738	713	+25
Indiana	54,854	4.9	−32,717	6,183	7,213	−1,030
Maryland	46,239	6.2	+1,593	3,795	1,707	+2,088
Massachusetts	89,846	5.8	−20,980	7,352	5,589	+1,763
Michigan	127,873	6.7	−95,130	12,198	9,102	+3,096
Minnesota	47,081	6.8	−8,004	2,953	2,063	+890
Nevada	5,959	8.2	−1,462	464	367	+97
New Jersey	112,716	7.2	−30,096	11,068	9,546	+1,522
New York	337,604	6.5	−23,835	22,206	10,228	+11,978
Pennsylvania	279,702	8.7	−29,902	18,973	9,156	+9,817
Rhode Island	18,064	7.2	−8,253	2,055	2,412	−357
West Virginia	35,838	9.3	−7,546	3,606	1,317	+2,289
Total	1,460,020	6.7	−358,808	113,186	73,712	+40,473

6. FUNDS REMAINING AT END OF PRESENT TUC PROGRAM

Through January 1959, almost $350 million had been expended in benefits under the TUC program. It is estimated that $74 million will be paid out in benefits in February and March, making an estimated $434 million that will be expended for benefits during the operation of the program. This will leave a balance of approximately $206 million of the $640 million appropriated for benefits.

It is estimated that $13 million will be spent on State administration of the program through April 1959, assuming that the program ends at that time. This will leave a balance of $12.1 million of the $25.1 million appropriated for State administration. If the program is extended, the balance will be somewhat larger, since there will be some costs of closing out the program in April that would be available for the continued payment of benefits.

It is estimated that the Federal administrative costs, if the program is not extended, will amount to $330,800, leaving a balance of $269,200 of the $600,000 appropriated for Federal administration.

	Salaries and expenses	Grants for administration	Benefit payments
Appropriated	$600,000	$25,100,000	$640,000,000
Estimated costs to Apr. 30, 1959	330,800	13,000,000	434,000,000
Estimated balance remaining Apr. 30, 1959	269,200	12,100,000	206,000,000

7. ESTIMATES OF COST OF EXTENSION OF TUC

If the TUC program is extended for 6 months through September 30, 1959, the cost of extension would be $210 million. If provisions were made for a runoff of benefits to those in compensable status at the end of the program, an additional $45 million would be required.

If the TUC program were extended for 15 months through June 30, 1960, under present rules, the cost of extension would be $480 million.

The bases for these estimates are contained in parts A and B which follow:

Part A

Table 1 showing the number of new beneficiaries, average weekly number of beneficiaries, and weeks compensated, by months, July 1958–June 1960.

Table 2 showing the estimated average weekly number of beneficiaries and estimated benefit costs, by calendar quarters, April 1959–June 1960.

Part B

Basic assumptions used in estimating coverage, number of beneficiaries in compensable status, new beneficiaries, average weekly number of beneficiaries, duration of benefits, weeks compensated, average weekly benefit amount, and benefit costs contained in part A.

PART A

PRESENT TUC PROGRAM

TABLE 1.—*New beneficiaries, average weekly number of beneficiaries, weeks compensated for TUC program; actual, July 1958–January 1959; estimated, February 1959–June 1960* [*all figures in thousands*]

Year and month	New beneficiaries	Average weekly number of beneficiaries	Number of weeks compensated
1958—July [1]	479	276	1,290
August	278	512	2,100
September	201	527	2,319
October	124	383	1,759
November	115	337	1,318
December	131	319	1,468
1959—January	122	310	1,365
February	112	305	1,127
March	116	290	1,161
July 1958–March 1959	1,678	357	13,937
EXTENSION OF TUC PROGRAM			
1959—April	110	271	1,191
May	106	260	1,091
June	111	247	1,088
July	125	249	1,144
August	120	258	1,082
September	115	266	1,169
October	108	263	1,156
November	104	249	1,046
December	100	231	1,064
1960—January	98	224	940
February	96	222	934
March	94	216	924
April	92	207	868
May	84	199	877
June	80	190	838
April 1959–June 1960 [2]	1,808	236	15,482

[1] No estimates of total unemployment are presently available. The estimates for insured unemployment contain an allowance for recovery.

[1] Includes data for last part of June in 11 States.

[2] Includes 265,000 beneficiaries in compensable status as of Mar. 31, 1959, who must be included in the total count of beneficiaries.

TABLE 2

Calendar quarter	Average weekly number of beneficiaries	Benefit costs
	Thousands	*Millions*
April–June 1959	268	$105
July–September 1959	266	105
October–December 1959	246	101
January–March 1960	220	89
April–June 1960	198	80
15 months	236	480

If the present TUC program were extended to run off an estimated 265,000 beneficiaries in compensable status as of March 31, 1959, these beneficiaries would receive an average of 6 weeks of benefits at an average of $31 per week for a total of about $49 million.

An estimated 264,000 beneficiaries would be in compensable status as of September 30, 1959, and would receive an average of 5.5 weeks of benefits at an average of $31 per week for a total of about $45 million in run-off benefits for unemployment after this date.

A total of about 950,000 beneficiaries, including those in compensable status as of March 31, 1959, would receive an average of 7.1 weeks of benefits at an average of $31 per week for a total of about $210 million if the TUC program were extended 6 months through September 1959.

A total of about 1,800,000 beneficiaries would receive an average 8.6 weeks of benefits at an average of $31 per week for a total of $480 million, if the TUC program were extended 15 months through June 1960.

Extension of TUC program—Part B

The estimates contained in part A were made under the assumptions specified below:

1. Present coverage of States in TUC program: 17 States with full State and Federal UI participation; 14 States with UCFE and UCV participation only; and 5 States with UCV participation only.

2. Assumed State insured unemployment levels and estimated State and UCFE exhaustions for all States are given in table under section 4. To include UCV exhaustions, increase figures in this table by 3 percent (UCV experience).

3. Sixty percent of all State UI, UCFE, UCX, and UCV exhaustions in the 51 States are covered under the TUC program in the 17 fully participating States, 14 UCFE, UCX, and UCV participating States and the 5 UCV-only participating States (current experience).

4. While 80 percent of covered State and Federal UI exhaustees file first claims immediately (current experience) the remaining 20 percent file first claims within a few weeks. Thus 100 percent of covered exhaustees are assumed to file soon after exhausting regular State and Federal UI programs.

5. Ninety-six percent of first claims become beneficiaries (estimated figure adjusted from State UI experience as TUC experience is too unstable).

6. Probability of remaining unemployed for another week is 96 percent.

7. Average potential duration of 11 weeks of benefits per beneficiary based on one-half average potential duration in State and Federal UI programs. (State UI, UCFE experience of 23.4 weeks in October–December 1958.)

8. Average weekly benefit amount of $31 (current TUC experience is slightly below, but is expected to increase).

9. These assumptions are based on an extension of the present law without substantive amendment. Any change in the rules for determining eligibility for TUC benefits would necessitate revision of the estimates.

8. UI COVERED WORKERS IN STATES PARTICIPATING IN THE TUC AND TED PROGRAMS

The following table indicates that 52.5 percent of the covered workers under the UI program in the United States are in the 17 States that have accepted the TUC program and that an additional 17.5 percent are in the 5 States that have extended their own laws to provide for temporary benefits (TED).

	Average number of covered workers	Percent of total
Alabama	584,566	1.4
Alaska	46,946	.1
Arkansas	265,163	.6
California	3,840,121	9.1
Delaware	129,522	.3
District of Columbia	450,448	1.1
Indiana	1,135,850	2.7
Maryland	753,807	1.8
Massachusetts	1,568,489	3.7
Michigan	1,953,722	4.6
Minnesota	691,488	1.6
Nevada	73,380	.2
New Jersey	1,583,644	3.7
New York	5,231,560	12.4
Pennsylvania	3,268,082	7.7
Rhode Island	254,411	.6
West Virginia	389,088	.9
Total (TUC)	22,220,287	52.5
Colorado	341,213	.8
Connecticut	785,320	1.9
Illinois	2,791,570	6.6
Ohio	2,634,962	6.2
Wisconsin	865,616	2.0
Total (TED)	7,418,681	17.5
Total (TUC and TED)	29,638,968	70.0
U.S. totals	42,286,386	100.0

9. EXHAUSTIONS OF BENEFITS UNDER THE UI AND UCFE PROGRAMS

The following table shows the number of UI–UCFE exhaustions that occurred in the period July 1, 1957, to July 31, 1958, and each month thereafter through January 1959. Data is shown for the total United States and for the fully participating TUC States. These States show 53.2 percent of U.S. total UI–UCFE exhaustions during the 13-month period (July 1958 through July 1959) and an average of 57.8 percent in the 6-month period (August 1958 through January 1959).

The national total of exhaustions of regular benefits averaged approximately 100,000 per month during calendar year 1957. A sharp rise was experienced during the period January to July 1958, reaching a peak of 284,550 exhaustions in July. There has been some decline since then but the monthly figure still exceeded 200,000 in December 1958 and January 1959. No significant change is anticipated until April when the monthly rate of exhaustions under the UI–UCFE programs is expected to decline gradually to a level of approximately 170,000 in June 1959:

Exhaustions of UI-UCFE benefits

States	July 1, 1957–July 31, 1958	1958					1959, January	Total, July 1, 1957–Jan. 31, 1959
		August	September	October	November	December		
U.S. total	2,115,896	255,032	237,448	224,335	177,666	213,056	212,332	3,435,765
TUC States:								
Alabama	50,169	5,448	4,597	4,420	3,572	4,646	4,354	77,206
Alaska	4,965	201	190	286	325	323	335	6,625
Arkansas	22,982	2,377	1,900	1,687	1,269	1,728	1,759	33,702
California	121,830	13,266	12,339	15,072	13,415	16,414	14,740	207,076
Delaware	7,309	772	727	701	502	663	742	11,416
District of Columbia	9,645	946	986	975	746	843	738	14,879
Indiana	103,245	12,704	8,262	6,737	5,371	6,661	6,183	149,163
Maryland	27,987	3,009	2,916	4,030	2,900	3,876	3,795	48,513
Massachusetts	79,940	8,628	7,990	8,297	6,083	7,372	7,352	125,662
Michigan	176,822	29,738	27,739	16,726	15,108	18,671	12,198	297,002
Minnesota	28,896	3,258	2,627	2,347	2,394	3,902	2,953	46,377
Nevada	4,781	432	347	341	308	459	464	7,132
New Jersey	125,051	11,708	11,528	11,562	8,392	11,439	11,068	190,748
New York	157,506	25,557	25,071	23,879	19,940	23,371	22,206	297,530
Pennsylvania	144,956	25,421	24,558	22,478	20,967	22,668	18,973	280,021
Rhode Island	30,072	2,290	2,098	1,955	1,594	2,029	2,055	42,093
West Virginia	23,742	4,593	4,146	5,011	3,557	3,575	3,606	48,230
Total	1,119,898	150,348	138,021	126,504	106,443	128,640	113,521	1,883,375
Percent, U.S. total	53.2	59.0	58.1	56.4	59.9	60.4	53.5	54.8

10. NEW BENEFICIARIES UNDER THE TEMPORARY UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION PROGRAM

From the beginning of the TUC program on June 19, 1958, to January 31, 1959, a total of 1,296,141 different individuals have received benefits under the temporary unemployment compensation program. The following table shows the number of new beneficiaries by month for the 17 States fully participating in the TUC program.

Also included in the table are monthly figures for new beneficiaries in the 8 to 14 (varying by month) States which are participating in the TUC program with regard to all Federal (UCV, UCFE, and UCX) programs.

A total of 20,213 different individuals received benefits in these States for the period June 1958 to January 1959. In addition approximately 8,450 persons who exhausted UCV claims received TUC benefits in the 5 States which participate in the TUC program only with respect to UCV exhaustions. These five States have their own temporary benefit (TED) programs which cover UI and UCFE–UCX exhaustees.

It is estimated that 116,000 new beneficiaries will receive their first TUC payment in February and 121,000 additional persons will receive a first payment in March. Thus, by the time the TUC program terminates on March 31, 1959, approximately 1,533,000 different persons will have received at least one weekly payment under the TUC program.

New TUC beneficiaries June 1958 to January 1959

States	1958						1959, January	Total
	June-July	August	September	October	November	December		
Alabama	13,603	9,021	5,826	4,954	3,959	4,554	4,632	46,549
Alaska				302	500	655	514	1,971
Arkansas	3,309	3,806	2,591	1,792	1,356	1,829	1,676	16,359
California	31,824	26,846	18,750	13,068	16,785	17,058	17,116	141,447
Delaware	1,217	960	653	700	538	599	566	5,233
District of Columbia	2,058	1,463	883	950	716	572	707	7,349
Indiana	40,235	18,600	9,771	6,707	3,987	4,506	6,866	90,672
Maryland	10,724	4,484	3,332	3,691	3,093	3,419	4,116	32,859
Massachusetts	17,281	11,729	9,426	9,167	6,544	7,503	7,321	68,971
Michigan	85,468	42,802	32,020	21,219	15,976	12,471	10,359	220,315
Minnesota	8,097	4,310	3,304	2,905	2,290	3,786	3,591	28,283
Nevada	589	597	356	323	242	384	355	2,846
New Jersey	44,475	16,977	13,730	14,119	9,646	12,009	11,773	122,729
New York	73,671	34,425	29,173	27,463	21,086	26,055	25,512	237,385
Pennsylvania	42,301	27,223	28,535	24,133	20,512	24,112	19,086	185,902
Rhode Island	10,264	3,073	2,415	1,991	1,554	1,774	1,774	22,845
West Virginia	7,912	6,585	4,469	5,066	4,044	3,968	3,719	35,763
Total	393,028	212,901	165,234	138,550	112,828	125,254	119,689	1,267,478
8 to 14 States paying on UCV and UCFE exhaustions only	2,528	5,186	3,492	2,607	1,675	2,072	2,653	20,213
5 States paying UCV exhaustions only (approximate figure)								8,450
Grand total	395,556	218,087	168,726	141,157	114,503	127,326	122,342	1,296,141

11. EXHAUSTIONS OF BENEFITS UNDER THE TUC PROGRAM

The following table shows the number of individuals who have exhausted their benefits under the TUC program from July 1958 through January 1959. The number of such individuals was 612,752 and this figure is expected to reach approximately 800,000 by the end of the program on April 1, 1959. It is estimated that there will be approximately 250,000 individuals whose benefits will cease because of the termination of the TUC program. Thus there will have been a total of approximately 1,050,000 individuals whose TUC benefits ceased because of exhaustion of benefits or termination of the program.

As indicated in section 6 of this report, the total number of beneficiaries under the TUC program through March 1959 is estimated to be 1,533,000.

Thus two out of every three TUC beneficiaries were or will be still unemployed when their benefits under the program are exhausted.

Exhaustions of benefits under the TUC program

	July	August	September	October	November	December	January	Total		July	August	September	October	November	December	January	Total
Alabama	35	643	9,709	5,511	3,640	4,113	3,880	27,531	Nevada		14	176	338	203	205	202	1,138
Alaska				1	15	39	322	377	New Jersey		3,299	12,411	22,470	8,945	11,105	9,305	67,535
Arkansas		446	2,853	1,650	1,206	1,543	1,436	9,134	New York			25,325	24,029	15,440	16,662	14,810	96,266
California		202	3,292	14,654	10,946	9,098	10,786	47,799	Pennsylvania			363	24,084	13,418	18,188	13,227	69,280
Delaware		304	452	599	417	471	417	2,660	Rhode Island	441	2,649	3,367	2,089	1,400	1,610	1,600	13,156
District of Columbia		371	720	858	586	705	621	3,861	West Virginia		5	2,194	4,955	2,692	3,262	3,671	16,779
Indiana	2,791	9,970	17,800	9,573	6,280	5,734	6,613	58,761	8 to 14 States paying on UCV and UCF exhaustees only		25	135	1,911	2,761	1,515	1,944	8,291
Massachusetts		4,341	7,331	14,794	5,309	5,725	5,596	43,096									
Maryland			3,618	3,569	2,073	2,234	2,833	14,327									
Michigan	704	14,791	32,455	27,363	18,406	13,297	13,715	120,731									
Minnesota			2,369	3,351	1,933	2,338	2,039	12,030	Total	3,971	37,060	124,570	161,799	95,670	97,844	93,007	612,752

12. CHARACTERISTICS OF TUC CLAIMANTS

There is very little information currently available on the characteristics of claimants under temporary programs. Because of our urging, all but 2 of the 22 States which have complete temporary programs are going to conduct studies, but most of these will not be completed until after the program has ended. Only 10 States have submitted any material so far and some of this is fragmentary.

While it is difficult to draw conclusions from the spotty information available it is probable that there is little real difference between the claimants under TUC and those under the regular programs that cannot be attributed to the industry from whence the claimants came. In other words, differences between TUC claimants and regular claimants as far as sex, occupations, and geographic locations are concerned can be accounted for by the characteristics of the industry, and when it held its layoffs. (Industries which laid off early in the recession are more highly represented in the TUC programs because claimants had been unemployed long enough to exhaust their regular benefits.)

In addition to differences which can be attributed to the industry, it appears that TUC claimants, particularly men, tend to be older than do claimants under the regular programs.

The most significant data so far comes from New York and Illinois. In New York a higher proportion of TUC claimants than of regular claimants come from the metals, machinery, and transportation equipment industries; a higher proportion are in upstate New York; and a somewhat higher proportion are males.

In Illinois there seemed to be no significant differences between the temporary and regular beneficiaries although proportionately there were somewhat more temporary beneficiaries from the primary metals and electrical machinery industries, and a somewhat higher proportion of women.

The data from the other States indicate that the characteristics of the temporary claimants vary widely from State to State, probably depending upon the industrial composition of the State, the types of workers employed, the extent to which specific industries were affected by the recession, and the timing and duration.

At least two States, Delaware and Rhode Island, believe their data indicate that many temporary claimants are not firmly attached to the labor market—that there is a heavy proportion of older workers drawing pensions.

13. STATUS OF TUC BENEFIT FUNDS AND TUC BENEFIT PAYMENTS BY STATE

Benefit payments from the beginning of the TUC program through January 1959 have totaled $359,693,196. Estimated benefits to be paid in February and March equal $74 million, making a total of approximately $434 million which will have been expended for TUC benefits during the 10 months prior to termination of the program on March 31, 1959.

Table A which follows shows the monthly rate of TUC benefit expenditures including estimates for February and March 1959. This table indicates that approximately $206 million of the $640 million appropriation for benefits will remain unexpended at the end of the program.

The following table B provides the distribution of TUC benefit expenditures by

States and by months from June-July 1953 to January 1959. The table shows that five States, New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, California, and Michigan, paid out 75 percent of all TUC funds.

The average duration of benefits under the TUC program has been 9 weeks and the average weekly benefit amount, $31.

TABLE A.—*Status of TUC benefit funds*

Congressional appropriation for TUC benefits	$640,000,000
Payments:	
June	57,935
July	41,362,585
August	65,194,528
September	71,124,540
October	$54,627,087
November	39,829,607
December	45,497,034
January	41,173,587
Total	358,866,903
February	[1] 38,000,000
March	[1] 37,000,000
Total	433,866,903
Balance available from congressional appropriation	206,133,097

[1] Estimates based on trends of initial and continued claims filed through Feb. 21, 1959.

Benefit payments by States under the TUC program

State	June and July	August	September	October	November	December	1959, January	Total
Alabama	$659,373	$1,792,679	$1,790,329	$1,142,895	$794,850	$944,680	$851,497	$7,976,303
Alaska				31,473	100,423	203,092	211,494	546,482
Arkansas	135,995	501,442	503,663	331,588	224,089	313,347	268,408	2,278,532
California	2,591,918	6,239,369	7,498,523	5,366,677	5,668,681	5,373,894	5,731,913	38,470,975
Delaware	101,410	223,570	202,099	186,046	149,818	170,572	155,781	1,189,296
District of Columbia	183,568	292,478	299,193	265,141	202,543	214,334	189,631	1,646,888
Indiana	3,841,733	4,826,731	3,534,919	2,171,715	1,491,164	1,517,203	1,461,246	18,844,711
Maryland	1,211,487	1,564,239	1,683,612	1,280,704	1,053,886	1,261,341	1,278,937	9,334,206
Massachusetts	2,053,919	4,151,334	3,854,091	3,210,698	2,015,037	2,208,641	2,045,228	19,574,948
Michigan	9,554,499	15,161,406	16,890,593	9,554,776	7,146,391	5,719,178	4,837,063	68,863,906
Minnesota	622,517	1,113,597	1,192,975	966,405	750,066	1,019,622	954,546	6,619,738
Nevada	28,687	132,810	133,582	116,484	88,208	109,223	104,100	713,094
New Jersey	4,498,045	6,529,879	6,963,349	5,410,394	3,525,796	4,381,500	3,691,710	35,000,673
New York	8,267,190	11,571,506	14,229,750	11,161,897	8,159,515	9,495,529	9,607,004	72,492,391
Pennsylvania	4,579,433	7,472,100	9,773,862	9,919,065	7,785,055	9,220,104	7,757,746	56,462,365
Rhode Island	995,897	894,344	747,785	543,393	417,649	486,825	486,825	4,572,718
West Virginia	462,789	1,228,373	1,444,415	1,246,417	991,844	1,190,014	1,048,740	7,612,592
Total	39,788,460	63,695,857	53,869,630	52,905,768	40,565,015	43,829,099	40,681,869	352,199,818
8 to 14 States paying on UCV and UCFE exhaustions only	335,839	659,428	925,243	879,353	587,520	668,165	707,338	4,762,886
5 States paying on UCV exhaustions only								1,904,199
Grand total								358,866,903

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I join the distinguished chairman of my committee to urge the membership of the House to pass the bill H.R. 5640, which would provide for the phasing out of a program we passed last year commonly referred to as the Temporary Unemployment Compensation Act.

What we did a year ago, I am sure you will recall, was pass a law which took into recognition the facts that, first, persons were drawing unemployment compensation; second, their entitlements to payments were nearing an end; and third, they had not regained employed status. This legislation at the Federal level reflected the fact that the State legislatures were not then in session. Inasmuch as unemployment compensation has been viewed to date as an area in which the State determines the amount of benefits and the periods for which the benefits are available, it was somewhat unusual for the Congress to take even temporary action in this field.

But, I repeat, because the respective State legislatures were not in session, we did take action and we did pass a temporary unemployment compensation program. We provided a substantial amount of money, over $665 million, to take care of this temporary program.

We did not apply any means test whatever. We did it within the framework of the existing State administered programs and in the way that unemployment compensation must be administered; namely, on the basis of giving a man unemployment insurance for which he pays while he works through a tax. Of course, it is a tax paid in fact by his employer. It is money which otherwise might be used to pay him an increased wage. It might otherwise be used to pay dividends. It might otherwise be used for business expansion. It might otherwise be used to afford lower prices to the consumer. But at all events, it is a charge against the product of that man's work and it is used to buy unemployment compensation.

A year ago we provided for 1 year a temporary supplementation of the availability of that program provided the States determined they wanted to accept it on a loan basis and would repay the Federal advances by the imposition of an increased tax, if necessary, upon the employers of their State. That is the law today. It is that law which is scheduled to terminate on April 1.

What your committee has done, and why it is before you at the moment, is to prepare a bill and to recommend its passage to provide an extension beyond April 1 so that unemployed persons eligible for benefits in the phasing-out period may continue to draw benefits under this temporary unemployment compensation program. We are here providing that until those persons' rights under the temporary unemployment compensation law, as it is today, have expired, this law will continue provided that those payments are received by July 1, 1959.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. I yield to my distinguished committee colleague.

Mr. MASON. As the gentleman knows, I opposed any extension of this temporary unemployment compensation. I did agree finally to this tapering off, or feathering off, as it is called, so that it would not end abruptly. But I insisted that no new beneficiaries should be placed on the rolls after April 1.

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. I thank the gentleman. I know that he has in mind the fact that the legislatures of practically all the States are in session at this moment. They may pass legislation, if they so desire, which would further continue or increase the benefits under the unemployment compensation programs in effect in the respective States.

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. I yield.

Mr. ADAIR. Do I understand the gentleman to say that no new appropriations will be required by this legislation?

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. No new appropriations will be required. As a matter of fact, as the committee chairman pointed out, the total cost of the bill we passed last year including that which will be authorized in this legislation is approximately $125 million less than we anticipated the cost would be last year.

I support this legislation and urge my colleagues in the House to join in voting for its passage today.

Experience under the temporary unemployment compensation program has found that 17 States have fully participated in the program. These 17 States have 52.5 percent of the workers covered under the unemployment insurance programs. In addition, five States have extended benefits entitlement under temporary programs within the framework of their existing State laws.

Mr. Speaker, we find from our study of the economic indicators that measure the health of our economy that the Nation is well on the way to recovery from the downward adjustment of last year. We find that compared with a year ago we have 700,000 more people working and 400,000 fewer people unemployed. We find the index of industrial production at 143 compared to 133 in 1958 and such other economic indicators as car loadings and personal income rising. I cite these evidences of economic resurgence not in disregard of unemployment levels that in my judgment continue to be too high. Instead, I have referred to them as indications of the economic growth that is ahead.

If this TUC program extension is to be effective, it will be necessary that the legislation be enacted by April 1 of this year. Accordingly, it is my hope that we can pass this legislation at this time so as to permit consideration of the measure in the other body. To those who would like to do more in the areas of Federal legislation on the subject of the unemployment compensation program, I would call attention to the fact

that the Committee on Ways and Means is scheduled to begin hearings on this subject on April 7.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. KARSTEN].

Mr. KARSTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous material.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. KARSTEN. Mr. Speaker, in the opening statements, the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MILLS] and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SIMPSON] have very well and completely explained the intent and scope of the legislation before the House at this time.

It is intended to phase out the temporary unemployment compensation program and is limited to those individuals who are eligible to apply and file vailid claims before April 1, 1959. We have received two estimates as to the number of unemployed involved. The first estimate was 265,000. Later the Labor Department revised those figures to about 405,000. The bill, however, is silent with reference to the remainder of the unemployed, which is estimated at something in excess of 4½ million.

Under this legislation the temporary compensation program will enter the phasing-out stage on April 1, and it will terminate completely on June 30, after which no additional payments may be made. The figures compiled by the Department of Labor disclose that the average benefit period under this phasing-out process will amount to about 6 weeks. In some cases the benefit period would be perhaps as little as 1 week.

Many have asked me why the Committee on Ways and Means selected June 30 as the date to end this program. Some have asked me whether on that date it is expected unemployment will show a substantial decrease. This unfortunately is not the case, and I am afraid I must report that the date June 30 is simply an arbitrary date.

I have tried to answer the inquiries I have received by quoting official estimates of the Bureau of Labor Statistics. The estimates which have been projected through October 1959 show that unemployment will continue at abnormally high rates and that exhaustion of benefits under the various State programs will also continue at high levels. The Department of Labor predicts that in the fiscal year 1960 monthly insured unemployment will be approximately 2.1 million as compared with 2.25 million in 1959. As a result of the expected high levels of insured unemployment, the Department of Labor predicts that exhaustions of benefits from April through September 1959 will average 190,000 a month.

In October we will still be at the very high level of 195,000 exhaustions, and only after that does the Department expect employment conditions will significantly improve.

I should like to include as a part of my remarks the official estimates and predictions of the Department of Labor at this point:

State-insured unemployment level and State UI and UCFE exhaustions—actual, July 1956–January 1959; estimated, February 1959–June 1960

Month in fiscal year	State-insured unemployment (in millions), fiscal year—				State UI and UCFE exhaustions (in thousands), fiscal year—			
	1957	1958	1959	1960	1957	1958	1959	1960
July	1.196	1.269	2.483	2.1	86.6	98.9	285.4	210
August	1.046	1.134	2.175	1.9	88.1	91.6	255.0	190
September	.977	1.151	1.875	1.8	73.5	82.9	237.4	195
October	.868	1.218	1.698	1.7	73.8	94.5	224.3	195
November	1.004	1.492	1.758	1.8	70.4	84.4	177.7	155
December	1.277	2.087	2.088	2.1	73.3	110.6	213.1	165
January	1.727	2.846	2.491	2.6	106.7	147.1	212.4	170
February	1.719	3.133	2.8	2.5	95.2	145.5	195	150
March	1.580	3.244	2.7	2.4	112.5	191.4	200	155
April	1.465	3.274	2.5	2.2	115.1	231.2	195	150
May	1.338	2.957	2.3	2.1	106.5	236.8	175	140
June	1.239	2.643	2.1	1.9	92.5	254.0	170	130
Fiscal year total	1.284	2.193	2.25	2.1	1,094.1	1,768.7	2,540	2,005

Neither the Congress nor the unemployed can take much comfort in these statistics. Instead of a return to normal levels of employment this summer we can expect to see continued serious unemployment over the next several months. In my opinion, if sound reasons exist to extend this program to June 30, the same reasons could and should be applied to extend the program until at least October after which the Department of Labor anticipates employment conditions will improve.

Mr. Speaker, I do not oppose this bill because it contains a little good. I do not support it enthusiastically because it falls far short of any effective relief for the thousands of persons the Department of Labor predicts will exhaust their unemployment benefits under State laws over the next several months. I urge the House to adopt this legislation, and it is my hope that it can be improved in the other body.

Before long the Congress must face up to the real problem of bringing our basic unemployment insurance system up to date. If last year we had enacted the proposed Federal Standards bill, we would not now be faced with the need for another emergency action. If we fail to enact such a bill at this session of Congress we will be faced, in the future, with similar demands for emergency action whenever unemployment reaches disturbing levels. My colleague, Representative MACHROWICZ, of Michigan, and I—with the announced support of more than 130 Members—have introduced bills for a reasonable set of Federal standards which would provide benefit rates of realistic levels and for 39 weeks—such benefits to be available to all covered workers regardless of the level of unemployment or the decision of any given State to participate in a temporary program. The misery of an unemployed worker's family does not depend upon the number of unemployed nor on the State in which he resides.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MACHROWICZ].

Mr. MACHROWICZ. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this time merely to make clear, as has already been done by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. KARSTEN] and the gentleman from Illinois that this is by no means an extension of the present unemployment compensation program but a mere tapering off.

Mr. Speaker, we are considering today merely a continuation of temporary unemployment compensation benefits for an estimated 265,000 unemployed workers for an average of about 6 weeks after April 1.

Under the procedural rule which allows no amendment to be made in this measure on the floor of the House today and recognizing that without its passage these 265,000 unemployed workers would be cut off on the April 1 termination date of the current TUC law, I hope the bill is passed by an overwhelming vote.

But, Mr. Speaker, today we have almost 2 million men and women who are out of work and who have exhausted all their unemployment benefits or were never eligible for any benefits. This bill does nothing for them.

In fact it provides no improved benefits or extended weeks of coverage for 4½ million of the currently unemployed. And it will not help a single one of the estimated 10 to 12 million men and women who will become unemployed through no fault of their own after April 1 and during the next 12 months at various times and for substantial periods.

Mr. Speaker, during the 12 months beginning April 1, 1959, the Labor Department expects an additional 2,125,000 of the unemployed to completely exhaust their unemployment benefits. This figure does not include those most unfortunate among the unemployed who are not covered by unemployment insurance and receive no benefits at all. Of the approximately 2 million unemployed who are not now receiving benefits slightly more than half are from uncovered jobs.

Mr. Speaker, on January 29 of this year when I joined with the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. KARSTEN] and about 130 other colleagues to introduce H.R. 3457, the Federal standards for unemployment compensation bill, I said:

> It may well be, Mr. Speaker, that we shall have to provide for some extension of the temporary unemployment compensation bill which is now due to expire April 1, 1959.
>
> * * * But such extension, if made, must not be allowed to become a substitute for action on this substantial and permanent improvement in the entire Federal-State unemployment compensation system.

With all the good will and hard work of which the 86th Congress and the American people are capable in the next 2 years, large-scale unemployment is all too likely to continue to be a major problem.

And I called attention to the role of advancing technology, including automation and of corporation pricing policies in relation to our continuing mass unemployment.

Mr. Speaker, I am sorry to report that last Thursday before the Ways and Means Committee, the Labor Department witness confirmed my fears about stubborn hard core unemployment. It is still with us. Recovery in employment and in the reduction of unemployment are lagging far behind the expansion of production.

For example, the Department reports that manufacturing output in January of this year "was within 1.2 percent of prerecession production in the third quarter of 1957, which manufacturing employment was still 6.5 percent below the average for that quarter."

And we learned this revealing fact regarding our 1959 economic situation: In January 1959 unemployment in the whole economy was 40 percent higher than in the prerecession last quarter of 1957 although employment was about the same if all figures were seasonally adjusted.

The economic effect of the increasing efficiency of our industrial plant, including automation, is heightened by the fact that the labor force continues to expand even during the recession.

We are therefore not only continually able to produce more goods with fewer workers but we have continually more men and women for whom jobs must be provided or unemployment will increase. Our economy is not expanding fast enough to supply these jobs.

For this reason the work-force side of our economy will present no picture of emerging health in the year ahead. While the production picture is improving gradually, the unemployment picture improves at an excruciatingly slow rate.

Mr. Speaker, we cannot ignore these basic facts about our unemployment problem. It would be irresponsible and economically stupid of us to be guided by the mirage of production performance and stock prices in our decisions here on this floor concerning the economic health of this Nation.

The Labor Department figures show, that even allowing for the recovery which the administration expects, about 190,000 people a month will run out of benefits and still be without jobs right on through this recovery year.

Mr. Speaker, I said here in January and I say again today, we cannot do the whole job of putting idle men and machines and capital back to work through improvements in our unemployment compensation system. We need a whole kit of measures to do that—measures on which I hope the 86th Congress will act courageously in the critical months ahead. But we can do a part of this job by increasing benefit levels, extending the weeks of coverage, covering additional people, and providing for reinsurance to realistically help cushion the blows of the kind of recession we are now undergoing. Had the Federal standards bill been enacted in the last Congress we could now look forward, beginning July of this year, to its substantial material aid to millions of unemployed and to its significant assistance to recovery by way of circulation of fast moving dollars in the communities where sales most need stimulation.

We have this measure before us which goes just a little way to help. I hope it passes. If it comes back to conference from the Senate I hope our conferees and the Members from the other body in conference will reform it to meet the awesome need of the currently unemployed and of those who will become unemployed prior to the effective date of proposed Federal standards legislation.

And, Mr. Speaker, I hope that the Congress subsequently this year, with the inescapable lesson of the inadequacy of temporary measures and the huge hard fact of continuing mass unemployment, will act to substantially strengthen that massive bulwark of personal dignity and economic stability which is our great Federal-State unemployment compensation system.

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I yield the remainder of the time on this side to our majority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK].

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, it is very important that we notice, and pay attention to and evaluate certain unusual phenomena which have taken place during the present recession. If you analyze objectively the present recession you will find one significant factor is that as business gets better large unemployment still remains. You will also find that the unemployment problem in this recession has been worse than in any other post-war recession.

You will also find, adjusted for seasonal factors, that unemployment last August reached a peak of 7.5 percent of the labor force. During the recession period in 1949–50 it was slightly under 7 percent and in the period of 1953–1954 it barely touched 6 percent. More alarming, unemployment has remained at a high level despite rising business activity.

I refer to the August figure of 7.5 percent of unemployment. This dropped in November 1958 to 5.7 percent. In December it went up to 6 percent and in January of this year it went up to 6.2 percent.

In January, 4,700,000 persons were out of work, 200,000 more than in January of 1958, with our gross national product higher in January of this year than it was in January last year. With our labor force growing all the time to get unemployment in 1959 down to a 5 percent basis, which some are talking now as a percentage of unemployment, we will have to live with but which is a sad admission of defeat, I repeat, with our labor force growing all the time to get unemployment in 1959 down to 5 percent we will have to add another 2,200,000 jobs this year. Furthermore, the period of unemployment is now longer than in past recessions. The layoffs were broader than in the 20-, 30-, and in the early 40-year groups, due mainly to seniority rights; but whenever older workers have lost jobs they find it harder to get one back.

Also, as unemployment increased, the price level did not decrease, but in fact, increased.

These are all factors that are going to live with us. In a number of our States there is a persistent unemployment, for example, in Michigan because of automobiles; in Pennsylvania mainly because of steel, coal, and the railroads; in New York, New Jersey, Connecticut, Illinois, Indiana, Ohio, Maryland, and Alabama because of a variety of hard goods industries; in Massachusetts, Maine, and Rhode Island, chiefly because of the textile industry; in West Virginia, Kentucky, Montana, Colorado, and Minnesota, because of the mining situation.

Mr. Speaker, this bill does some good. Like those who have preceded me, I hope the bill will pass. I am aware of certain factors and intangibles that existed, and I am sorry they existed in the minds of some who should have been advocating the extension of 1 year. While I would like to see an extension for 1 year, nevertheless this bill is going to do some good for anywhere from 265,000 unemployed workers to 405,000, whichever might develop between now and June 30.

However, Mr. Speaker, I took the floor to call attention of the Members of Congress that we have a persistent unemployment situation existing in our country that we cannot ignore and that must be given early consideration.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members desiring to do so may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD on this bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, in voting for this extension I do so with great reservation. I can only favor this bill because to fail to do so would doom any extension of the Temporary Unemployment Compensation Act due to expire March 31. And those now eligible for 39 weeks' benefits would abruptly find their qualification entitles them to only 26 weeks of benefits after March 31.

This bill is wholly inadequate to meet the problems of depressed labor areas. Today, unemployment is even greater than it was when the original legislation was enacted. The emergent need to assist a person who wants but cannot find a job has not diminished. Unemployment has increased. Distressed labor areas have grown.

Employment opportunity has not kept abreast of the increase in the business cycle since the end of the 1958 recession.

We cannot ignore mounting unemployment. I support this measure with the great hope that we shall immediately set out to overhaul the permanent program of unemployment compensation benefits through the addition of mini-

mum Federal standards which the States must follow.

Let us also set out immediately to face the reality that there is large scale unemployment in America. Let us not approach this problem merely from a standpoint of statistics. Let us approach the solution of the unemployment problem in terms of people—people and families who want jobs and security and not merely the right to collect unemployment compensation.

We must take a realistic approach in the search for a vigorous program that will provide our country with full employment and full production.

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, I most earnestly hope that the House will suspend the rules and unanimously vote in favor of H.R. 5640, to provide a continuation of unemployment benefit payments.

However, I would like to state my opinion that this measure is unfortunately and seriously deficient in meeting the requirements of the current situation, and it extends too little assistance to the families of the more than 4½ million Americans who are unemployed.

Mr. Speaker, legislation more important in scope may be later presented to this House, but I doubt very much that we will deal with any legislation this session that will be more vitally important in nature than this measure we are now considering.

This unemployment problem goes right to the heart of the morale of the American people, and it provides an unhappy comparison of what the Congress is asked to do in helping our foreign allies and what we are requested to do to assist millions of Americans who are in desperate need. I submit that none of our diplomatic overtures, military aid supports, or foreign assistance programs can be successfully carried on without the backing of an American people possessed of a high morale.

I further submit that such a high morale cannot be asked or expected of our people unless the actions of this Congress convince them that this body is primarily concerned with the sufferings and the needs of our our United States citizens. We have no right to request our people to persevere in their heavy taxation burdens in support of our foreign objectives if we remain indifferent to the unemployment hardships affecting more than 4½ million persons here at home.

Beyond granting a very limited measure of help to a comparatively restricted few, the only other thing this current bill does is to emphasize the imperative necessity for basic revision of the whole unemployment compensation program. There are many adequate bills for this good purpose pending, and I hope the committee and the Congress will deal patriotically and effectively with them before further distress and hardship is imposed upon many more millions of American taxpayers who want to work but can find no employment through no fault of their own.

Meanwhile, on the eve of the birthday of the great St. Patrick, and in the spirit of his renowned concern for the needy and the distressed, I urge you to adopt this bill, as a temporary measure, without further delay.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I rise in favor of H.R. 5640, a bill to extend the time during which certain individuals may continue to receive temporary unemployment compensation.

This legislation would extend the time from April 1, 1959 to July 1, 1959, during which unemployed persons who have established a claim to temporary unemployment compensation before April 1 may receive such payments.

MANY DRAWING TEMPORARY BENEFITS IN MASSACHUSETTS

Mr. Speaker, in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, which has been hard hit by the current recession, there were 13,496 unemployed persons drawing unemployment benefits on February 28 last under the Temporary Unemployment Compensation Act of 1958. A week later, on March 7, 1,647 new claims were initiated under provisions of the act. If this bill is not passed by the Congress, I am sure that more than 15,000 unemployed persons in Massachusetts alone, and many more thousands in other industrial States, will be cut off on April 1, from receiving badly needed income for their families in the form of extended unemployment benefits payments.

I urge my colleagues to consider these unfortunate victims of the recession and vote with me in favor of this legislation.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, although I support H.R. 5640 to extend temporary unemployment compensation benefits to July 1, 1959, I regret the inadequate nature of this legislation.

It makes no provisions for those of the unemployed who will exhaust their rights under State laws after April 1, 1959, or the millions of unemployable workers who are currently unemployed.

The time is long overdue for Congress to take some positive steps to make provisions for the unemployed and recognize its obligations under the Full Employment Act of 1946.

The SPEAKER. The question is on suspending the rules and passing the bill.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SELF-EMPLOYED INDIVIDUALS' RETIREMENT ACT OF 1959

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 10) to encourage the establishment of voluntary pension plans by self-employed individuals.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Self-Employed Individuals' Retirement Act of 1959".

SEC. 2. DEDUCTIONS OF AMOUNTS PAID AS RETIREMENT DEPOSITS.

(a) ADJUSTED GROSS INCOME.—Section 62 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to definition of adjusted gross income) is amended by inserting after paragraph (6) the following new paragraph:

"(7) DEDUCTION OF AMOUNTS PAID AS RETIREMENT DEPOSITS.—The deduction allowed by section 217."

(b) ALLOWANCE OF DEDUCTION.—Part VII of subchapter B of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to additional itemized deductions for individuals) is amended by renumbering section 217 as section 218 and by inserting after section 216 the following new section:

"SEC. 217. AMOUNTS PAID AS RETIREMENT DEPOSITS.

"(a) GENERAL RULE.—In the case of a self-employed individual, there shall be allowed as a deduction amounts paid by him within the taxable year as retirement deposits. Any amount paid by an individual as a retirement deposit on or before the 15th day of the fourth month following the close of the taxable year may, at his election (made under regulations prescribed by the Secretary or his delegate), be treated as having been paid on the last day of such taxable year. No deduction shall be allowed under this section for any taxable year of the taxpayer begininng after he attains age 70.

"(b) LIMITATIONS.—

"(1) ANNUAL LIMIT.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), the amount allowable under subsection (a) to any self-employed individual for any taxable year shall not exceed whichever of the following is the lesser:

"(A) $2,500, or

"(B) 10 percent of his net earnings from self-employment (as defined in subsection (d)).

"(2) ANNUAL LIMIT FOR INDIVIDUALS ATTAINING AGE 50 BEFORE 1959.—In the case of any individual who attained age 50 before January 1, 1959, the annual limit for the taxable year provided by paragraph (1) shall be increased by one-tenth for each full year of his age in excess of 50, determined as of January 1, 1959.

"(3) LIFETIME LIMIT.—The aggregate amount allowed as deductions to an individual under subsection (a) for all taxable years during his lifetime shall not exceed an amount equal to 20 times the maximum annual deduction allowable if the annual limit provided in paragraph (1) (A) (computed without the application of paragraph (2)) were the only annual limit.

"(4) LIFETIME LIMIT FOR PARTICIPANTS IN CERTAIN EMPLOYEE PLANS.—In the case of an individual who—

"(A) for any prior taxable year has received any amount under an employee plan (as defined in subsection (c)(2)(B)), or

"(B) at the close of the immediately preceding taxable year, has nonforfeitable rights in any such plan,

if any portion of such amount or rights is attributable to an employer contribution, the lifetime limit provided in paragraph (3) shall be computed by using (in lieu of 20) a lesser number, equal to 20 reduced by the number of years of such individual's service to which his rights under such plan are attributable.

"(c) SELF-EMPLOYED INDIVIDUAL DEFINED.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of this section, the term 'self-employed individual' means, with respect to any taxable year, any individual who is subject to tax for the taxable year under section 1401 (imposing a tax on self-employment income), or who would be subject to such tax for the taxable year but for—

"(A) paragraph (4) (relating to ministers of a church and members of a religious order) or paragraph (5) relating to physicians, etc.) of section 1402(c), or

"(B) section 1402(b)(1) (relating to reduction of net earnings for wages paid).

"(2) INDIVIDUALS COVERED BY CERTAIN EMPLOYEE PLANS.—

"(A) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding paragraph (1), the term 'self-employed individual', with respect to any taxable year, does not include an individual—

"(i) who during such taxable year receives an amount any portion of which is attributable to an employer contribution under an employee plan, or

"(ii) in respect to whom during such taxable year an employer contribution is made (or treated under section 404(a)(6) as having been made) under an employee plan, whether or not such individual's rights under the plan are nonforfeitable.

"(B) EMPLOYEE PLAN DEFINED.—For purposes of subparagraph (A) of this paragraph and subsection (b)(4), the term 'employee plan' means —

"(i) a pension, profit-sharing, or stock bonus plan described in section 401(a) which is exempt from tax under section 501(a), or an annuity plan meeting the requirements of section 401(a)(3), (4), (5), and (6), or

"(ii) a pension plan established for its employees by the United States or any agency thereof, by a State or Territory or the District of Columbia or any political subdivision or instrumentality thereof, or by any organization described in section 501(c)(3) (relating to religious, charitable, etc., organizations) which is exempt from tax under section 501(a).

For purposes of this subparagraph, references to provisions of this chapter shall be treated as including references to the corresponding provisions of the Internal Revenue Code of 1939.

"(d) NET EARNINGS FROM SELF-EMPLOYMENT DEFINED.—For purposes of this section, the term 'net earnings from self-employment' means the net earnings from self-employment as defined in section 1402(a), but determined—

"(1) without regard to paragraphs (4) and (5) of section 1402(c), and

"(2) without regard to items which are not included in gross income for purposes of this chapter, and the deductions properly allocable to or chargeable against such items.

"(e) RETIREMENT DEPOSIT DEFINED.—For purposes of this section, the term 'retirement deposit' means a payment in money to—

"(1) a restricted retirement fund (as defined in section 405(a)), or

"(2) a domestic life insurance company (as defined in section 801) as premiums under a restricted retirement policy issued on the life of the taxpayer.

In the case of premiums described in paragraph (2), only that portion of such premiums which (under regulations prescribed by the Secretary or his delegate) is properly allocable to the cost of restricted retirement benefits shall be allowable as a deduction under this section.

"(f) RESTRICTED RETIREMENT POLICY DEFINED.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of this section, the term 'restricted retirement policy' means a contract (other than a term insurance contract) which is an annuity, endowment, or life insurance contract, or combination thereof—

"(A) issued by a domestic life insurance company (as defined in section 801) on the life of the taxpayer,

"(B) which provides for the payment of restricted retirement benefits, and

"(C) which meets the requirements of paragraph (3).

"(2) RESTRICTED RETIREMENT BENEFITS.—For purposes of paragraph (1)(B), a policy shall be treated as providing restricted retirement benefits only if it provides that the entire value of the policy is payable in one or more of the following methods:

"(A) to the insured not later than at age 70½,

"(B) to the insured as a life annuity (which may provide for a minimum term certain not extending beyond his life expectancy), beginning not later than at age 70½,

"(C) to the insured and his spouse as a joint life annuity or as a joint and survivor annuity (which may provide for a minimum term certain not extending beyond the insured's life expectancy), beginning not later than the time the insured attains age 70½, or

"(D) to the insured (or, in the event of his death, to his beneficiary) as an annuity certain beginning not later than the time the insured attains age 70½ and not extending beyond his life expectancy.

No annuity shall be treated as satisfying the requirements of subparagraph (B), (C), or (D) if it provides for payments which (after annuity payments begin) may increase for any reason other than dividends or increases in investment income allocable to the policy.

"(3) RESTRICTED RETIREMENT POLICIES MUST BE NONASSIGNABLE, ETC.—

"(A) IN GENERAL.—To meet the requirements of this paragraph, a policy—

"(i) shall be nonassignable, and no person other than the insured shall have any of the incidents of ownership, and

"(ii) shall not provide for life insurance protection after age 70½.

"(B) SPECIAL RULES.—For purposes of subparagraph (A)(i), there shall not be taken into account—

"(i) the right to make any designation described in paragraph (2),

"(ii) the right to designate one or more beneficiaries to receive the proceeds payable in the event of death of the insured before he attains age 70½, and

"(iii) any designation made pursuant to a right described in clause (i) or (ii).

"(g) IDENTIFICATION OF POLICIES AND FUNDS.—

"(1) POLICIES.—No deduction shall be allowed under this section with respect to any amount paid as a premium on a restricted retirement policy for any period before such policy has been identified as such, in such manner and form as the Secretary or his delegate shall by regulations prescribe.

"(2) FUNDS.—No deduction shall be allowed under this section with respect to any amount paid to a restricted retirement fund by any individual before such fund has been identified as such, and before such individual has been identified as a participant in such fund, in such manner and form as the Secretary or his delegate shall by regulations prescribe.

"(h) FACE-AMOUNT CERTIFICATES.—For purposes of this title, any reference to a restricted retirement policy as defined in subsection (f) of this section shall be treated as including a face-amount certificate, as defined in section 2(a)(15) of the Investment Company Act of 1940 (15 U.S.C., sec. 80a-2), issued after December 31, 1954, but only if such certificate provides restricted retirement benefits within the meaning of subsection (f)(2) and meets the requirements of subsection (f)(3). With respect to any face amount certificate described in the preceding sentence, references to an insurance company or the insurer in this section and sections 78, 6047, and 7207 shall be treated as including a reference to the company issuing such certificate.

"(i) CROSS REFERENCES.—

"(1) For taxation of amounts received from a restricted retirement fund or policy, see section 78.

"(2) For provisions relating to information requirements with respect to restricted retirement funds and policies, see section 6047."

(c) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for such part VII is amended by striking out the last item and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"SEC. 217. Amounts paid as retirement deposits.

"SEC. 218. Cross references."

SEC. 3. AMOUNTS RECEIVED FROM RESTRICTED RETIREMENT FUNDS OR POLICIES.

(a) GENERAL RULE.—Part II of subchapter B of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to items specifically included in gross income) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"SEC. 78. AMOUNTS RECEIVED FROM RESTRICTED RETIREMENT FUNDS OR POLICIES.

"(a) RESTRICTED RETIREMENT FUNDS.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as otherwise provided in this section, amounts of money and the fair market value of property received from a restricted retirement fund shall be included in the recipient's gross income for the taxable year in which received.

"(2) SPECIAL RULES.—In the case of a restricted retirement fund—

"(A) RETURN OF EXCESS CONTRIBUTIONS.—There shall be excluded from gross income any amount received which has become an excess contribution by reason of the disallowance of a deduction taken with respect to amounts paid to the fund, but only if such excess contribution (and the income attributable thereto) is returned as provided in section 405(c)(2)(D). The exclusion provided by this subparagraph shall not apply to income attributable to any such excess contribution.

"(B) CONTRIBUTIONS KNOWN TO BE EXCESSIVE.—If at any time an individual knowingly makes contribution to one or more restricted retirement funds in excess of the amount which he reasonably believes will be allowable as a deduction for such contributions for the taxable year, his entire interest in all restricted retirement funds shall be treated for purposes of paragraph (1) as amounts received during such taxable year.

"(C) DISTRIBUTION OF ANNUITIES.—Notwithstanding any other provision of this subtitle, no amount shall be includible in gross income by reason of the receipt of an annuity contract from such fund, if such contract and the distribution thereof meets the requirements of section 405.

"(3) PROHIBITED TRANSACTIONS, ETC.—If the trustee of a restricted retirement fund knowingly engages in a prohibited transaction (within the meaning of section 405(d)(3)), the member (or members) in respect of whom such transaction occurred shall be treated as having received, in his taxable year in which such transaction occurred, his entire interest in the fund. The period for assessing a deficiency for any taxable year, to the extent attributable to the interest described in the preceding sentence, shall not expire before one year after the date on which the Secretary or his delegate is notified, in such manner as he shall by regulations prescribe, of such prohibited transaction.

"(4) BASIS.—The adjusted basis of any person in a restricted retirement fund shall be zero.

"(b) POLICIES.—

"(1) GENERAL RULE.—Any amount received under a restricted retirement policy shall be taxable under section 72 (relating to annuities) with the modifications set forth in paragraph (2).

"(2) APPLICATION OF SECTION 72.—In applying section 72 for purposes of paragraph (1)—

"(A) Section 72(e)(3) shall not apply.

"(B) Notwithstanding section 72(e)(1)(B), any amount received before the annuity starting date shall be included in the recipient's gross income for the taxable year in which received to the extent that—

"(i) such amount, plus all amounts received by all persons under such policies and includible in gross income under this subparagraph, does not exceed

"(ii) the aggregate amount allowed under section 217 with respect to the policy for the taxable year and all prior taxable years.

"(C) In computing—

"(i) the aggregate amount of premiums or other consideration paid for the policy for purposes of section 72(c)(1)(A) (relating to investment in contract), and

"(ii) the aggregate premiums or other consideration paid for purposes of section 72(e)(1)(B) (relating to certain amounts not received as an annuity),

there shall not be taken into account any amount allowed as a deduction under section 217, nor (as determined under regulations prescribed by the Secretary or his delegate) any portion of the premiums or other consideration which is properly allocable to other than the cost of restricted retirement benefits (within the meaning of section 217(f)(2)). Proper adjustment to basis, or premiums or other consideration paid, shall be made for advances which are treated as income under paragraph (3)(B), and shall have been repaid.

"(3) SPECIAL RULES.—In the case of a restricted retirement policy—

"(A) PROCEEDS OF LIFE CONTRACTS PAYABLE BY REASON OF DEATH.—Paragraph (1) shall not apply to the extent that amounts received under a life insurance contract by reason of the death of the insured exceed the cash surrender value of such contract immediately before the death of the insured, and to such extent such amounts shall be treated as provided in section 101.

"(B) BORROWING, PURCHASE OF INSURANCE.—

"(i) If during any taxable year of the insured any part of the value of the policy is borrowed by the insured from the insurer, the amount so borrowed shall be treated for purposes of paragraph (1) as having been received by the insured under the policy during such taxable year. This clause shall not apply to a borrowing in an amount not in excess of the current annual premium, if applied to the payment of such premium and if repaid in full within 12 months after the due date of such premium.

"(ii) If, under any option or under any other arrangement with the insurance company, any amount of the value of a restricted retirement policy is applied to the purchase of other than restricted retirement benefits (within the meaning of section 217(f)(2)), the entire cash surrender value of such policy at such time shall be treated for purposes of paragraph (1) as an amount received under such policy, except to the extent that such value is within 60 days after such time irrevocably converted into a contract which provides only such restricted retirement benefits.

"(iii) This subparagraph shall not apply in the case of any borrowing or any purchase, to the extent that the aggregate amount which has been so borrowed or applied does not exceed the cash surrender value at the time the policy (or a predecessor policy) became a restricted retirement policy.

"(C) ASSIGNMENT OF CONTRACT.—If during any taxable year the insured assigns (or agrees to assign) any portion of the value of the policy in violation of section 217(f)(3), the entire cash surrender value of such policy at such time shall be treated for purposes of paragraph (1) as an amount received under such policy.

"(D) TAXATION OF CASH SURRENDER VALUE ON DEATH BEFORE AGE 70½.—If the insured dies before he attains age 70½, the entire cash surrender value of a restricted retirement policy shall be treated for purposes of paragraph (1) as an amount received under the policy, except to the extent that such value is applied to provide an immediate annuity for his surviving spouse which will be payable for her life (or for a term certain not extending beyond her life expectancy).

"(c) COMPUTATION OF TAX.—

"(1) AMOUNTS TO WHICH SUBSECTION APPLIES.—This subsection shall apply only to amounts (other than dividends) referred to in subsection (a) or (b) which are received by any person while the self-employed individual is living and has not attained age 64½ and includible in such person's gross income.

"(2) INCOME TO BE SPREAD FOR PURPOSES OF COMPUTATION.—

"(A) IN GENERAL.—If the aggregate of the amounts to which this subsection applies received by any person in his taxable year equals or exceeds $2,500, the increase in his tax for the taxable year in which such amounts are received shall not be less than 110 percent of the aggregate increase in taxes, for the taxable year and the 4 immediately preceding taxable years, which would have resulted if such amount had been included in such person's gross income ratably over such taxable years.

"(B) PERIOD WHERE DEDUCTIONS HAVE BEEN TAKEN FOR LESS THAN 4 YEARS.—If the self-employed individual has been allowed deductions under section 217 for a number of prior taxable years less than 4, subparagraph (A) shall be applied by taking into account a number of taxable years immediately preceding the taxable years in which the amount was so received equal to such lesser number.

"(3) AMOUNTS AGGREGATING LESS THAN $2,500.—If paragraph (2) does not apply to a person for the taxable year, the increase in tax of such person for the taxable year attributable to the inclusion in gross income of amounts to which this subsection applies shall be 110 percent of such increase (computed without regard to this paragraph).

"(d) LUMP SUM DISTRIBUTIONS OF ENTIRE INTEREST.—

"(1) APPLICATION OF SUBSECTION.—This subsection shall apply—

"(A) in the case of a self-employed individual, if—

"(i) after attaining age 64½ he receives within 1 taxable year his entire interest under all his restricted retirement funds and policies,

"(ii) he has been allowed deductions under section 217 for 5 or more prior taxable years (whether or not consecutive), and

"(iii) no person has theretofore received any amount under any of his restricted retirement funds or policies (other than dividends on such policies); and

"(B) in the case of the estate or other beneficiary of a decreased self-employed individual, if there is received by such beneficiary within one taxable year such beneficiary's entire interest under all restricted retirement funds and policies of the deceased.

"(2) LIMITATION ON TAX.—In any case to which this subsection applies, the tax attributable to the amounts so received for the taxable year in which so received shall not be greater than 5 times the increase in tax resulting from the inclusion in gross income of the recipient of 20 percent of the amount so received which is includible in gross income.

"(e) DETERMINATION OF TAXABLE INCOME.—Notwithstanding section 63 (relating to definition of taxable income), for purposes only of computing the tax under this chapter attributable to amounts includible in gross income by reason of this section, the taxable income of the recipient for the taxable year of receipt (and for any other taxable year involved in the computation under subsection (c)) shall be treated as being not less than the amount by which—

"(1) the aggregate of such amounts so includible in gross income, exceeds

"(2) the amount of the deductions allowed for such taxable year under section 151 (relating to deductions for personal exemptions).

In any case in which the preceding sentence results in an increase in taxable income for any taxable year, the resulting increase in the taxes imposed by section 1 or 3 for such taxable year shall not be reduced by any credit under part IV of subchapter A (other than section 31 thereof) which, but for this sentence, would be allowable.

"(f) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this section—

"(1) SELF-EMPLOYED INDIVIDUAL.—The term 'self-employed individual' means an individual who has been allowed a deduction under section 217 for any taxable year.

"(2) DIVIDEND.—The term 'dividend' means any amount received, by a policyholder of a restricted retirement policy in his capacity as a policyholder, which is in the nature of a dividend or similar distribution.

"(3) RESTRICTED RETIREMENT FUND.—The term 'restricted retirement fund' means any fund (including a predecessor fund) with respect to which the self-employed individual has been allowed a deduction under section 217 for any taxable year.

"(4) RESTRICTED RETIREMENT POLICY.—The term 'restricted retirement policy' means any policy (including a predecessor policy) with respect to which the self-employed individual has been allowed a deduction under section 217 for any taxable year."

(b) TECHNICAL AMENDMENTS.—

(1) Section 72(m) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to cross references) is amended to read as follows:

"(m) CROSS REFERENCES.—

"(1) For special rules relating to amounts received under restricted retirement policies, see section 78.

"(2) For limitations on adjustments to basis of annuity contracts sold, see section 1021."

(2) Section 316(b)(1) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to definition of dividends) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: "The definition in subsection (a) shall not apply to the term 'dividend' as used in section 78 (relating to amounts received under restricted retirement funds and policies) or in section 217 (relating to deduction for retirement deposits)."

(c) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for part II of subchapter B of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new item:

"Sec. 78. Amounts received from restricted retirement funds or policies."

SEC. 4. RESTRICTED RETIREMENT FUNDS.

(a) DEFINITION.—Part I of subchapter D of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to pension, profit-sharing, stock bonus plans(etc.) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"SEC. 405. RESTRICTED RETIREMENT FUNDS.

"(a) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of this chapter and section 6047, the term 'restricted retirement fund' means a trust established under a retirement plan for one or more self-employed individuals.

"(b) RETIREMENT PLAN.—For purposes of subsection (a), the term 'retirement plan' means a trust instrument for the exclusive benefit of the participating individual or individuals who are members of the plan, for the purpose of investing and reinvesting, and of distributing to the respective members of the plan, or to their estates or other beneficiaries, the corpus and income of the trust.

"(c) REQUIREMENTS FOR RETIREMENT PLAN.—A plan described in subsection (b) shall be

treated as a retirement plan only if the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (3) of this subsection are met:

"(1) TRUSTEE MUST BE BANK.—The trustee is a bank (as defined in section 581).

"(2) TERMS OF TRUST.—Under the trust instrument—

"(A) INTEREST NONASSIGNABLE.—A member may not assign (or agree to assign) any portion of his interest in the fund, but he may—

"(i) designate one or more beneficiaries in the event of his death, or

"(ii) direct the trustee to transfer his entire interest to another restricted retirement fund designated by such member.

"(B) TERMINATION OF TRUST, ETC.—

"(i) Before the member attains age 70, his entire interest in the trust will be distributed or applied to the purchase of an annuity described in subparagraph (B), (C), or (D) of section 217(f)(2) which does not provide life insurance protection, and which is immediately distributed to the member, or he will have elected to have his entire interest in the trust distributed before he attains age 80 (with not less than 10 percent of the value of such interest, determined at age 70, being distributed in each taxable year beginning with the taxable year in which he attains age 70).

"(ii) If the member dies before he attains age 70, his entire interest in the trust will, within 5 years after the date of his death, be distributed, or applied to the purchase of an immediate annuity for his surviving spouse which will be payable for her life (or for a term certain not extending beyond her life expectancy) and which will be immediately distributed to such spouse.

"(C) INTERESTS TO BE PROPORTIONATE.—If the trust has more than one member, the interest of each member shall be proportionate to the money he has paid in (or his interest which has been transferred thereto in accordance with subparagraph (A)(ii)), and to the income and other adjustments properly attributable thereto.

"(D) RETURN OF EXCESS CONTRIBUTIONS.—The trustee is required to distribute promptly to the member, any amount paid in by him for any taxable year in excess of the amount deductible by such member for such year under section 217, together with all income attributable to such excess.

"(3) PERMISSIBLE INVESTMENTS.—Under the trust instrument, the trustee may not invest or reinvest the corpus or income of the trust other than in—

"(A)(i) stock or securities listed on a securities exchange which is registered with the Securities and Exchange Commission as a national securities exchange (not including stock and securities in a corporation if, immediately after the acquisition thereof, the aggregate ownership of voting stock in such corporation by the trust and by its members (including ownership attributed to such members under section 318) is more than 10 percent of such voting stock), (ii) bonds or other evidences of indebtedness issued by the United States, any State or Territory, or the District of Columbia, or any political subdivision or instrumentality of any of the foregoing, and (iii) stock in a regulated investment company meeting the requirements of section 851; and

"(B) the purchase, for the account in the plan of a member thereof, of an annuity on the life of such member (or a face-amount certificate which meets the requirements of section 217(h)) which provides only restricted retirement benefits (within the meaning of section 217(f)(2)).

"(d) REQUIREMENTS FOR EXEMPTION FROM TAX.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—A restricted retirement fund which has engaged in a prohibited transaction shall not be exempt from taxation under section 501(a).

"(2) TAXABLE YEARS AFFECTED.—Paragraph (1) shall apply only for taxable years after the taxable year during which the fund is notified by the Secretary or his delegate that it has engaged in a prohibited transaction; except that if the trustee knowingly engaged in a prohibited transaction, paragraph (1) shall apply with respect to the accounts in the fund of the member or members in respect of whom such transaction occurred for the taxable year in which such transaction occurred and all taxable years thereafter.

"(3) PROHIBITED TRANSACTION DEFINED.—For purposes of this subsection, the term 'prohibited transaction' means any transaction in which the trustee—

"(A) lends any part of the corpus or income of the fund to;

"(B) pays any compensation for personal services rendered to the fund to;

"(C) makes any part of its services available on a preferential basis to; or

"(D) acquires for the fund any stock securities, or evidences of indebtedness from, or sells any stock, securities, or evidences of indebtedness of the fund to,

any person described in section 503(c) (for this purpose treating each member of the plan as the grantor of the trust). The term also includes any transaction pursuant to which the fund ceases to meet any requirement of subsection (c) of this section, and any failure to comply with any provision of the trust instrument required by such subsection.

"(4) CROSS REFERENCES.—

"(A) For tax consequences to members involved in a prohibited transaction, see section 78(a)(3).

"(B) For tax-free transfer of interests to other restricted retirement funds of members not involved in the prohibited transaction, see subsection (c)(2)(A)(ii).

"(e) OTHER TRUST RULES INAPPLICABLE.—The provisions of part I of subchapter J (section 641 and following, relating to estates, trusts, and beneficiaries) shall not apply with respect to restricted retirement funds, so long as they are exempt from tax under section 501(a)."

(b) EXEMPTION FROM TAXATION.—Section 501(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to exemption from tax of certain organizations) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: "A restricted retirement fund (as defined in section 405) shall be exempt from tax under this subtitle except to the extent such exemption is denied under section 405(d)."

(c) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for part I of subchapter D of chapter 1 of such Code is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new item:

"Sec. 405. Restricted Retirement Funds."

SEC. 5. TECHNICAL AMENDMENTS.

(a) RETIREMENT INCOME CREDIT.—Section 37(c) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to definition of retirement income) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: "Such term does not include any amount received from a restricted retirement fund (as defined in section 405) or under a restricted retirement policy (as defined in section 217(f))."

(b) TREATMENT OF AMOUNTS RECEIVED BY SPOUSE OF OTHER BENEFICIARY UNDER A RESTRICTED RETIREMENT FUND OR RESTRICTED RETIREMENT POLICY.—Section 691 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to recipients of income in respect of decedents) is amended by relettering subsection (e) as subsection (f), and by inserting after subsection (d) the following new subsection:

"(e) AMOUNTS RECEIVED BY BENEFICIARY OF A PARTICIPANT IN RESTRICTED RETIREMENT FUND, ETC.—For purposes of this section, amounts received after the death of the member of a restricted retirement fund (as defined in section 405), or after the death of the insured under a restricted retirement policy (as defined in section 217(f), from such fund or under such policy shall, to the extent included in gross income under section 78, be considered as amounts included in gross income under subsection (a)."

(c) INFORMATION REQUIREMENTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subpart B of part III of subchapter A of chapter 61 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to information concerning transactions with other persons) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"Sec. 6047. Information Relating to Restricted Retirement Funds and Policies.

"(a) BANKS AND INSURANCE COMPANIES.—Every bank which is a trustee of a restricted retirement fund (as defined in section 405), and every insurance company which is the issuer of a policy which is a restricted retirement policy (as defined in section 217(f)), shall file such returns (in such form and at such times), keep such records, make such identification of policies and funds (and accounts within such funds), and supply such information, as the Secretary or his delegate shall by forms or regulations prescribe.

"(b) SELF-EMPLOYED INDIVIDUALS.—Every individual who—

"(1) is a member of a restricted retirement fund (as defined in section 405), or

"(2) is the insured under a restricted retirement policy (as defined in section 217(f)),

shall furnish the bank or insurance company such information, at such times and in such form and manner, as the Secretary or his delegate shall by forms or regulations prescribe.

"(c) CROSS REFERENCE.—

"For criminal penalty for furnishing fraudulent information, see section 7207."

(2) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for such subpart B is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"Sec. 6047. Information Relating to Restricted Retirement Funds and Policies."

(3) PENALTY.—Section 7207 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to fraudulent returns, statements, or other documents) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: "Any person required pursuant to section 6047 (b) to furnish any information to any bank or insurance company who willfully furnishes any information known by him to be fraudulent or to be false as to any material matter shall be fined not more than $1,000, or imprisoned not more than 1 year, or both."

SEC. 6. TAXABLE YEARS TO WHICH APPLICABLE.

The amendments made by this Act shall apply only with respect to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1958.

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, a second will be considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include in the statement I am about to make extraneous matter. Further, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who may desire to do so may extend their remarks in the body of the RECORD today preceding the vote on the bill and that all other Members who desire to extend their remarks may do so within the next 5 legislative days.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 8 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, on July 29 last year we moved to suspend the rules and pass a bill which was identical to the pending bill today. The pending bill is H.R. 10, Mr. Speaker, but it might very well be any one of the following bills introduced by distinguished Members of this body on both sides of the aisle. Those bills are:

H.R. 9, by Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 18, by Mr. ANFUSO, of New York.

H.R. 98, by Mr. FOGARTY, of Rhode Island.

H.R. 506, by Mr. FASCELL, of Florida.

H.R. 567, by Mr. MILLER of California.

H.R. 1265, by Mr. JUDD, of Minnesota.

H.R. 1286, by Mr. MCDONOUGH, of California.

H.R. 2327, by Mr. DOOLEY, of New York.

H.R. 2401, by Mr. HERLONG, of Florida.

H.R. 2555, by Mr. PORTER, of Oregon.

H.R. 2562, by Mr. REUSS, of Wisconsin.

H.R. 2889, by Mr. LIBONATI, of Illinois.

H.R. 3038, by Mr. MATTHEWS, of Florida.

H.R. 3389, by Mr. WAINWRIGHT, of New York.

H.R. 3481, by Mr. LOSER, of Tennessee.

H.R. 3507, by Mr. STEED, of Oklahoma.

H.R. 3616, by Mr. COFFIN, of Maine.

H.R. 3660, by Mr. LIPSCOMB, of California.

H.R. 3846, by Mr. BROOMFIELD, of Michigan.

H.R. 3879, by Mr. ZELENKO, of New York.

H.R. 3894, by Mr. CRAMER, of Florida.

H.R. 4211, by Mr. KARTH, of Minnesota.

H.R. 4419, by Mr. WITHROW, of Wisconsin.

H.R. 4999, by Mr. FULTON, of Pennsylvania.

It might be one of several other similar bills such as:

H.R. 327, by Mr. BOSCH, of New York.

H.R. 4463, by Mr. RAY, of New York.

H.R. 5017, by Mr. ROOSEVELT, of California.

The same or similar principles have been incorporated in bills introduced by approximately 14 Members of the other body.

Mr. Speaker, coming, as it does, relatively shortly after July 29, and this being the 16th of March, I trust that I will be permitted to remind the Members of a story that is supposed to have taken place in Dublin, Ireland. Mr. De Valera was standing on a soapbox on a corner in Dublin one night making a speech, and His Majesty's troops summarily took him into custody. He was just as quickly tried, convicted, and sentenced to 1 year in prison. On the expiration of the year he left the prison, went directly to that corner on the street in Dublin, stood on the precise same soapbox, and started his remarks as follows:

As I was saying before we were interrupted.

I say today, as we were interrupted by the sine die adjournment of the 2d session of the 85th Congress and the later expiration of that Congress, that this bill is most meritorious. It comes to you with the active support of a long, distinguished list of national, professional, and businessmen's associations, as follows:

American Angus Association.

American Association of Medical Clinics.

American Association of Small Business.

American Bar Association.

American Brahman Breeders Association.

American College of Radiology.

American Dental Association.

American Farm Bureau Federation.

American Federation of Labor.

American Hereford Association.

American Hotel Association.

American Institute of Architects.

American Institute of Certified Public Accountants.

American Institute of Chemists.

American Medical Association.

American National Cattlemen's Association.

American Ophthalmological Society.

American Optometric Association.

American Patent Law Association.

American Podiatry Association.

American Society of Industrial Designers.

American Society of Internal Medicine.

American Veterinary Medical Association.

American Women's Society of CPA's.

American Association of Consulting Chemists and Chemical Engineers, Inc.

Association of Consulting Management Engineers, Inc.

Association of Stock Exchange Firms.

Authors League of America.

Bureau of Salesmen's National Association.

Conference of Actuaries in Public Practice.

Consulting Engineers Council.

Engineers Joint Council.

Investment Bankers Association of America.

Maritime Law Association of the United States.

Mobilehome Dealers Association.

National Association of Chiropodists.

National Association of Plumbing Contractors.

National Association of Real Estate Boards.

National Association of Retail Druggists.

National Association of Retail Meat and Food Dealers, Inc.

National Association of Tax Accountants.

National Association of Women's & Children's Apparel Salesmen, Inc.

National Association of Women Lawyers.

National Automobile Dealers Association.

National Council of Salesmen's Organizations, Inc.

National Federation of Independent Business.

National Food Brokers Association.

National Funeral Directors Association.

National Liquor Stores Association, Inc.

National Live Stock Tax Committee.

National Medical Veterans Society.

National Shorthand Reports Association.

National Society of Professional Engineers.

National Society of Public Accountants.

National Sugar Brokers Association.

National Wholesale Furniture Salesmen's Association.

Panel on Management Responsibility for Employee Compensation.

Public Relations Society of America, Inc.

The Tax Institute.

United States Chamber of Commerce.

It comes to you with the support of such nonprofessional groups as the American Farm Bureau Federation, the U.S. Chamber of Commerce and, in hearings held before our committee, it received, in principle, the support of the spokesman of the American Federation of Labor Congress of Industrial Organizations.

Mr. Speaker, on July 29 I took occasion to indulge in lengthy amenities. Those amenities are as appropriate today as they were then for, Mr. Speaker, if it were not for your splendid leadership, for your realizing that this body should have the right to vote up or down on a principle about which they have heard for years, we would not be here today. And I commend our majority leader for his cooperation and support. I must pay my respects to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means and all the other members thereof. This bill comes to you today with the overwhelming support of the membership of that committee.

I regret the absence today from our body of our late distinguished Member, Mr. Reed, of New York, and Mr. Jenkins, of Ohio, both of whom contributed immeasurably in the promotion of this legislation and both of whom would, I am sure, support our position today both as to form and content. I must, and I do pleasurably, include the distinguished ranking minority member of our Committee on Ways and Means, Mr. SIMPSON, of Pennsylvania, who has cosponsored the pending bill and has been a source of great help. The chief counsel of the committee, Leo H. Irwin, and assistant chief counsel, John M. Martin, Jr., and Gerard M. Brannon, of the professional staff; Thomas A. Martin, minority counsel; Colin Stam, chief of staff of the joint committee, and his associates, all have given graciously of their time and have been of great assistance. Edward O. Craft and Ward M. Hussey of the legislative counsel's office have, too, been most cooperative.

You and I who have been here for any length of time have become accustomed to the indulgence by others in cliche-like terms that are bandied about and

used as substitutes for logical and clear thinking. We have heard it said by those who are either uninformed or irresponsible that this is opening a loophole. Well, let me tell you, many years ago this Congress enacted what became later section 165 of the 1939 code, which section was reenacted virtually in its entirety and, with subsequent amendments, as section 401 of the 1954 code. And in 1942 we enacted an amendment that gave rise to the tremendous growth of qualified private pension plans, approved by the Treasury Department, to the point that in June of 1958 there were approximately 45,000 such plans in existence covering upward of 18 million of employees of the country, and in which there are now held funds in excess of $35 billion and into which, in 1957, there was contributed, for the most part by the corporate employers of this country. $3.7 billion, tax deducted to those employers and tax free to their employees. During that same year (1957), the members of such private pension plans were, on their own part, contributing only $600 million.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, today $6 of every $7 contributed to the existing qualified private pension plans are being paid for by the taxpayer of the United States of America, 52 cents on every dollar, of which the 7,100,000 of our intrepid, courageous, self-employed, those who have made their mark in their professions and their businesses, are contributing their proportionate share.

Who are these 7,100,000? They are those who engage in the private practice of their chosen professions. They are those who, by law cannot or, by choice do not, operate as corporations. They are denied the right under law of doing anything to provide for their superannuation or retirement.

We come here to you with a restricted voluntary plan that, as all measures before this body should be, has been exposed to the severe and grueling test of time. It has proven that it could withstand that test of time. The interest in and the support of this measure has grown session after session.

Mr. Speaker, closing a loophole? Why, this is a long-delayed and very meritorious extension of this privilege to those decent, honest Americans who for the most part constitute the great middle class, the existence and the continuance of which will mark this great country of ours as different from most in the free world and all behind the Iron Curtain. Closing a loophole? Away with you who seek to mislead.

The pending measure is just, meritorious, anti-inflationary and a savings incentive. It removes an obvious and an admitted inequity and should receive the overwhelming support of this House.

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I am happy to join my distinguished colleague on the Committee on Ways and Means, the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEOGH], in urging passage of legislation having the very substantial support of the membership of our committee.

This proposal has been before the Congress in the past. It was approved by the House of Representatives last year. Its purpose and provisions are well known. There is no element of surprise in bringing the bill before us under a suspension of the rules.

I am happy to be one of the cosponsors of this bill which was so ably described by the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEOGH]. I call to the attention of my colleagues on this side of the aisle that our beloved and recently departed friend, the Honorable Daniel A. Reed, was a sponsor of this legislation in a previous Congress, as was our good friend, the Honorable Thomas A. Jenkins, of Ohio.

I am ordinarily opposed to the hasty consideration of legislation under the suspension procedure. However, my usual objection to the suspension procedure is on this occasion substantially lessened by the fact that the substantive provisions of H.R. 10 are well-known to the membership of the House by virtue of the numerous hearings and other publicity that had been devoted to the legislation as well as by the fact that the bill before us today is identical to the bill that the House of Representatives passed last year. Thus, there is not inherent in today's procedure any element of inadequate consideration that often attends the debate of important legislation under suspension.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend one of my colleagues whom I anticipate will speak in opposition to the suspension of the rules today. I refer to my able and esteemed colleague on the committee, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BYRNES]. I believe it should be made clear in fairness to him that his opposition is not based on indifference to the problems of the self-employed in providing for their retirement security. There is no man who has been more conscientious and diligent in his efforts to assure fiscal integrity in our Federal Government and to provide fairness and equity in our Federal tax structure than has Mr. BYRNES. I sincerely regret that he and I find ourselves on opposite sides on this issue. I believe it fair to say that we are both equally aware of the need for and are interested in fiscal responsibility and tax fairness.

Many in this body have learned over the years that we may, with similar motivations, follow different courses to attain our goals. Our objectives in the present situation, in my judgment, are to attain a greater degree of fairness and equity in our tax laws and, at the same time, to assure an increased measure of fiscal integrity in the long run.

Thus am I satisfied with the justification for H.R. 10 and that is why I speak in support of this bill.

On the last point, that of fiscal integrity, I insist that the tax burden upon all the people, particularly on the independent, the self-employed worker, is intolerable. The farmer would benefit under this proposal, as would the butcher, the carpenter, the small druggist, the barber, the grocery-store proprietor, the accountant, the doctor, the lawyer, and many others. Men who work for themselves would have a chance to care for their families by not paying a portion of their taxes this year, but paying some years in the future. All we do in this bill is defer the moment of impact of an income tax.

I do not think that tax rates, which in many areas should be lowered right now, will be reduced in the immediate future. Indeed, Congress instead of facing this problem head-on and reducing our rates has chosen by one means or another to compensate for the high rates by providing some other means of relief.

That is why we have the carryback and carry-forward provisions for the handling of losses in our income tax laws. That is why we have exemptions and deductions. That is why we have the depletion provisions. It is why we have employee qualified pension plans about which the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEOGH] has spoken so earnestly in which $4 billion today are going tax free, and from which, if this money were taxed, the Treasury would collect $1,800 million.

On the point of employee pension plans the Congress very wisely a number of years ago recognized that the workers of our country did deserve a tax incentive in providing for their old age and permitted the establishment of qualified retirement plans. Likewise as a means of getting around the high level of taxes that we have today, we have profit sharing plans and stock bonus plans. Today 18 million people are covered by these deferred compensation plans. I do not know on this very day how many more plans, by the action of the Treasury Department, will before evening be approved and exempted from the payment of income taxes on a portion of their earnings. Every day the Treasury is considering new applications from those who seek to have a retirement program under tax-free status. The employees today, to the extent of employer contributions equalling $4 billion are receiving this protection.

Under the bill before us today all we are trying to do is to provide similar tax treatment for the self-employed man who is by law precluded from participating in a qualified pension plan. We are trying to permit him to establish a retirement fund by excusing him temporarily from the payment of income taxes on a portion of his income limited by statute which he can use for certain retirement purposes specified by law. And then, and never forget this, when he does receive the benefits, he does pay income tax upon those benefits. That is what we are attempting to do here. It is done for the great bloc of free, self-employed persons in our country.

Today a lawyer can give up his private practice and obtain a job with some big corporation and thus get every advantage that he will be able to get under this law. Today a doctor can give up his private practice and give up calling upon the sick people of the country. He can go to work for a big corporation and get every benefit that we would give him under this law. I want him to get that benefit and yet remain as a self-employed private practitioner. I want to build up the idea of self-employment in this country of ours and play down the absolute necessity of making corporations bigger.

One of the principal objections raised against this legislation is the revenue loss that may result from its enactment. There have been numerous estimates as to the full-year cost to the Treasury of this legislation. These estimates are at significant variance and range from less than $100 million to the Treasury estimate of $365 million. I do not know which of these extremes is correct. I would point out that any estimate in connection with this legislation is highly speculative in that it must be based on so many contingencies. We do have the actual experience and the facts derived from that experience with similar legislation in other countries. In England, Canada, and New Zealand actual experience demonstrated a considerably smaller revenue loss than had been originally anticipated. I believe that we will similarly find that realized revenue losses in the initial years of this program will fall considerably short of the official Treasury Department estimate.

It is perhaps partially correct to say that from the standpoint of budgetary considerations solely the favorable consideration of H.R. 10 cannot be justified today. However, I submit to my colleagues in the House that the cost of enduring the existing tax inequity that would be corrected by the enactment of H.R. 10 falls on a limited number of Americans. I also submit that if budgetary considerations weigh against achieving greater tax equity, then we should undertake to raise the necessary tax revenues in other ways that do not discriminate and that are not inequitable—or better yet, we might reduce our Federal spending by at least an amount commensurate with the revenue loss.

Mr. Speaker, there is not only an inequity or tax discrimination contained in present law but we find from statistical evidence that in each passing year in which H.R. 10 remains unpassed the disparity in tax treatment increases in magnitude. We hear it said that the revenue loss precludes our giving tax justice to the self-employed, but as I have already pointed out every year thousands of new qualified pension plans are approved by the Treasury without consideration being given to the revenue loss entailed. For example I have said in 1957 employer contributions to qualified pension plans amounted to $4 billion. The total reserves in these plans equalled $34.8 billion and these plans covered upwards of 17 million employees. Also, in 1957 employee contributions equalled $680 million. I have indicated that the discrimination against the self-employed increases each year that existing tax treatment continues. The estimated revenue loss to the Federal Treasury in 1945 from the operation of qualified pension plans equalled $400 million. By 1950 this revenue loss had nearly doubled to $788 million and in the year 1957 the estimated revenue loss had more than doubled over 1950 to $1.8 billion.

Mr. Speaker, I cite these statistics not in criticism of the existence of tax incentives for the establishment of these employee pension plans but instead to cite the growing magnitude of the discrimination against the self-employed. I believe it is desirable social policy that we should encourage any sound plan that improves the economic security of our employed citizens but I am convinced that there is equal merit in encouraging provision for the economic security of our self-employed. Why is it that we are concerned with revenue loss only when the tax saving would benefit the self-employed? Where is the equity in the Treasury Department continuing to approve tax-deferred employee pension plans involving millions of dollars in revenue loss on the one hand and on the other hand having the Treasury Department say that the self-employed cannot provide for their economic security with tax-deferred dollars because the revenue loss is too great?

Mr. Speaker, we are told that deficit financing is inflationary, and I subscribe to that view. However, I do not believe that H.R. 10 will contribute to any inflationary pressure. On the contrary, I am convinced that the favorable consideration of H.R. 10 will tend to reduce inflationary pressures. H.R. 10 will encourage private savings and will increase the availability of funds for capital investment. Such capital accumulations should encourage business expansion and increase productivity for the greater economic good of all concerned.

The point is made that because H.R. 10 is limited in its application to only the self-employed that it contains a discrimination against those employed individuals who do not participate in a qualified employee pension plan under existing law. I would acknowledge that it is desirable that we make the privilege of providing for retirement security on a tax-deferred basis as broad as possible so that we would include not only the self-employed but would include those employed individuals who do not now participate in a qualified pension plan. It is my contention that by recognizing the existence of a discrimination in existing law, the legislation before us today is a step in the right direction of correcting the existing inequity. It can also be argued that by making it possible for a self-employed individual to provide for his own retirement security, we will thereby be encouraging him to take similar steps in behalf of his employees. It should also be noted that our Federal tax laws are not a problem to the low income individual in providing for his retirement security. One must also bear in mind the fact that State laws often preclude some of the professions that are covered under the provisions of H.R. 10 from engaging in those professions in a corporate form. One of the very genuine evils that would be corrected by the enactment of this legislation is that we would be removing one compelling motivating force that drives our citizens from the private practice of the professions to which I refer. Contrary to the contention of some, H.R. 10 does not create new inequities but instead serves to diminish existing inequities.

It is maintained that the enactment of H.R. 10 will bring demands for similar tax deferment with respect to employee contributions in the areas of railroad retirement, social security, civil service retirement, and other employee contributory systems. The allegation is that we are opening a Pandora's box. In this connection I have received a very well considered communication from the distinguished dean of the Law School at Yale University, the Honorable Eugene V. Rostow. Dean Rostow in effect says that this is an argument that the Treasury has consistently resorted to. He also very properly describes the argument as an abdication of responsibility. He properly points out that Congressmen are elected to make discriminating judgments for the people. I will, Mr. Speaker, include Dean Rostow's letter in my remarks:

YALE UNIVERSITY LAW SCHOOL,
OFFICE OF THE DEAN,
New Haven, Conn., March 12, 1959.

Hon. RICHARD SIMPSON,
Member of Congress,
New House Office Building,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN SIMPSON: I am writing you in behalf of the principle of H.R. 10, the Keogh-Simpson bill. I firmly believe that the retirement opportunities for practicing lawyers and those of corporate employees should be equalized, and I view your bill as a step in the right direction.

In my annual report to the president and fellows of Yale University for 1955–56, I referred to the problem in these terms:

"The independence of the bar, and some of its most significant traditions, are threatened by a variety of factors. There are increasing indications that a changing structure of values and incentives in our culture may actually be weakening the recruitment into law of a fair proportion of the ablest and finest of our young people. We have seen no evidence of such a trend at the law school. But there are signs throughout the country which justify thoughtful concern about the appeal to young people both of law and of other learned and demanding professions. The national flow of law school applications has dropped relatively, like the flow of applications for medical schools and for several other branches of graduate study. And, in increasing number, lawyers are being drawn out of the independent bar by the appeal of incomparably higher financial rewards in business, banking, and other lines of endeavor. It is time for the law schools and the bar to consider prudent steps in the interest of protecting the vitality and the professional freedom of the bar, and the future of the profession. I do not suggest a narrow, defensive program for bolstering vested interests. But energetic efforts are in order to make the profession more effective, and therefore more attractive, in carrying out the wide range of social duties for which it is ultimately responsible. There is no need to stress the continuing social need for independent lawyers as solicitors and as barristers—as detached, professional advisers to private and public interests, and as trial counsel in every forum where rights are settled."

The evidence which continues to come to me as dean of a national law school strongly confirms what I wrote 3 years ago. As I see it, the higher rewards of corporate employment, and especially the availability of pension plans, are imposing an increasing pressure on the legal profession. Some good lawyers have always left the practice for business and banking, and that tradition has been a constructive element in our economic life. But I wonder whether the trend is now becoming too strong. There are signs, it seems to me, that the disparity

between the rewards of law and those of corporate employment may be weakening the independent bar. I don't have to stress to you, I know, how absolutely vital the independent bar is to the preservation and development of all the values of our constitutional system. Where would we be if men like Henry Stimson, G. C. Burlingham, John Lord O'Brian, and George Roberts had not been free agents, willing to speak out responsibly from time to time, when popular passions threatened the fabric of the legal order? And why should I have the advantage of Yale's 10 percent contribution to my retirement, tax free, while lawyers in practice do not?

I am not impressed when I hear sensible proposals for tax reform resisted on the ground that to make one reform would open Pandora's box, or be the "entering wedge," etc. I know you are up against that argument from the Treasury. All Treasuries always fall back on it. It is an abdication of responsibility. The true answer is Justice Holmes'. When confronted with the proposition that "the power to tax is the power to destroy," he said, "not so long as this Court sits." Congress can discriminate. Indeed, why else de we elect Congressmen, if not to make discriminating judgments for us? There should be better arguments than that for not doing what clearly ought to be done.

With every good wish.

Yours sincerely,

EUGENE V. ROSTOW.

Mr. Speaker, on the subject of Pandora's box, I would also point out what is known by us all that the benefits derived under both the railroad retirement program and the social security program are not subject to tax whereas withdrawals from a retirement program that a self-employed individual will make under H.R. 10 will be subject to tax. We should also bear in mind that the employer contributions in connection with these other qualified retirement programs are not subject to tax until the benefits are drawn by the recipient at which time there are numerous provisions in the tax law to further mitigate the final tax liability. I refer to such provisions as the allowance of an additional $600 exemption for an individual over age 65, the annuity rule under section 72 of the code, and the retirement income credit contained in section 37 of the code.

Mr. Speaker, in the brief time that has been available to me I have endeavored to place in factual context the issue that is before us today. The issue is not a controversy involving parliamentary procedure; the issue is not whether or not the U.S. Treasury can afford tax justice to a substantial segment of our citizens; the issue is not a question of a Pandora's box. The issue is not a question of budget-busting or fiscal irresponsibility because that question will not be decided by the one vote that will be cast today on the question before us. The issue is solely related to the question of whether or not we will approve legislation, H.R. 10, on its merits so as to take a major step forward in achieving equity in the application of our tax laws. It is on that issue, Mr. Speaker, that I urge my colleagues in the House to vote affirmatively for the passage of this meritorious legislation.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEOGH].

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time at the moment, and I am reserving my time pending developments.

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BYRNES].

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I assume that this is the development.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I yield.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I want to call the attention of the House to the views of the gentleman from Wisconsin, as they have been expressed heretofore, and to state I join in his opposition to suspending the rules. A balanced budget means more to the group that we are talking about and to the entire Nation than does the removal of this inequity. There are many desirable and, in fact, many needed programs which must be postponed until we get our fiscal house in order. This is one of those programs which I regrettably state have to be postponed. I feel very strongly that this is a good program, but under the circumstances, we cannot pass it at this time.

I thank the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I thank the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS].

Mr. Speaker, there is a political adage we are all familiar with: Vote for all expenditures and against all taxes.

There is no one of us who takes pleasure in opposing spending programs which we feel are desired by some of our people. At the same time there is no one of us who takes pleasures in voting to maintain the high taxes which are a burden on all of our people.

Nothing would please us more, I am sure, if each day we could vote on some legislation that would give tax relief to some group of our people. I would love it and you would too.

If we are reasonable and responsible Representatives, however, we recognize that if we are going to vote to spend money, we must also vote to raise the money we spend. We cannot have our cake and eat it too.

In the consideration of this bill, I make only one plea—let us be reasonable and responsible.

To me, the bringing of this bill before us at this time and under this procedure is neither reasonable nor responsible.

I am not going to discuss the merits of this bill except to say that I agree that there is today an inequity in our tax laws with respect to the treatment of income set aside for retirement purposes. But contrary to the contention of the proponents, this bill does not achieve greater equality of tax treatment between the self-employed individuals and employees. What it does is to provide favored treatment for certain self-employed individuals in the high-income tax brackets as against all other taxpayers. I will extend my remarks to include a statement showing the difference between the treatment of the self-employed under this bill and the treatment accorded qualified pension plans under the 1954 revenue code.

But even if you believe in the underlying principle of the legislation, I suggest to you that the enactment of this bill at this time and under a gag procedure is neither reasonable nor responsible.

This is a tax-reduction bill. Make no mistake about that. It is a tax reduction for a very limited group. Now, I would just love to be able to vote for a tax reduction for this group. I would like to do it for other groups. This is not the only inequity in our tax laws. Practically every Member of this Congress has introduced one or more bills to provide tax changes which he or she feels will eliminate some inequity. Are you going to single this out as the only or the most glaring inequity in our tax code?

Let me ask you this: With a deficit this current year estimated at around $13 billion, with a budget submitted by the President for 1960 which is only precariously in balance, is it reasonable or responsible for this Congress to consider tax-reduction legislation on a take-it-or-leave-it basis, with only 40 minutes to discuss the merits or demerits of the proposal? I think it is preposterous that the majority leadership should take this matter so lightly.

Certain spokesmen on the majority—the Democrat side of the aisle—are complaining that the President's budget of expenditures is too low, that it should be increased. A Democrat committee has reported out a housing bill that goes beyond the President's spending recommendations by billions, a Democrat committee has recommended an increase in expenditures for airports of almost $100 million above the budget. We hear them complain that planned expenditures for defense, in the face of Berlin and the Soviet threat, are woefully inadequate.

Yet they bring to this House a bill to reduce the Government's revenue by over $350 million a year. In fact, this bill could be called a $3 billion tax reduction bill because it certainly sets the stage for further tax revision in this area which will result in revenue losses of over $3 billion a year.

Are you going to vote for this bill and tell the railroad employees that you are unwilling to permit them to deduct their compulsory payments to the Railroad Retirement System?

Are you going to vote for this and tell the civil service employees and teachers that they shouldn't be able to deduct the contributions they make to a retirement system?

Of course not.

If your object is to treat all of our people equitably, you are going to have to

follow this bill up with similar tax reduction bills for these people and others.

We have had a lot of talk by Members recently about the need for balancing our income and expenditures—of balancing the budget.

We have heard speeches complaining about the $8 billion carrying charge on our national debt of over $280 billion and the necessity for a program looking to the orderly reduction of that debt.

Let me ask a few questions:

Are you going to vote for this tax reduction of $350 million and still stand for a balanced budget?

Are you going to vote for this tax reduction and still maintain we must do something about reducing the national debt?

If you are going to be reasonable and responsible, you cannot do both. When you vote on this bill you will be making your choice.

In only hope that your choice will be in the interest of our Nation in this critical time and in the interest of all of our people.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include a letter from the Secretary of the Treasury and a statement of the principal features of H.R. 9 and H.R. 10 and qualified pension plans under the 1954 Revenue Code.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

(The matter referred to follows:)

THE SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY
Washington, March 13, 1959.

Hon. JOHN W. BYRNES,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. BYRNES: This is in reply to your telephone request for Treasury's current position on H.R. 9 and H.R. 10, bills to encourage the establishment of voluntary pension plans for self-employed individuals. I am glad to reaffirm the Treasury opposition, for the reasons cited below, as expressed in a report and appearance before the Committee on Ways and Means by Mr. David A. Lindsay, Assistant to the Secretary for Tax Legislation.

These bills would permit employers or self-employed persons to establish their own private pension plans without requiring them to make any provision for the retirement of their employees. This is difficult to justify, especially since about two-thirds of all employees are not covered by any pension plans.

There is no effective means provided under the two bills to prevent or discourage the use of the specified savings before the age of retirement. Consequently, persons with fluctuating incomes would be able to use the plan for averaging their incomes, providing an advantage not available to other taxpayers.

H.R. 9 and H.R. 10 would involve very substantial revenue losses which would seriously affect our budgetary situation. We have estimated this loss at $365 million on a full year's basis, assuming eligible persons invested only part of the allowable amounts. About 80 percent of the total tax relief would go to the self-employed with incomes over $10,000. We do not believe that selective tax relief of this magnitude should be permitted at a time when general tax relief is not possible.

Adoption of H.R. 9 and H.R. 10 would be a precedent for an extension of the privilege of deducting contributions to retirement plans to all employees. If all taxpayers were allowed deductions for retirement savings in accordance with the terms of the bills, it is estimated that the revenue loss would be $3 billion a year.

For the reasons stated, it is hoped that H.R. 9 and H.R. 10 will not be adopted.

With warm regards.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT B. ANDERSON,
Secretary of the Treasury.

Principal features of H.R. 9 and H.R. 10 (86th Cong., 1st sess.) and qualified pension plans under the 1954 Revenue Code

Feature	H.R. 9 and H.R. 10	Qualified pension plans
1. Coverage	Limited to self-employed individuals	Limited to employees.
2. Antidiscrimination requirements	None	Must not discriminate as to coverage or benefits in favor of officers, executives or highly paid employees.[1]
3. Maximum contributions	10 percent of self-employment income up to $2,500 a year and $50,000 over the individual's lifetime.	Employers' contributions generally limited to 5 percent of compensation of covered employees; however, with certain limitations, higher amounts are allowed if needed to finance stated benefits and to fund benefits for past service.[2] Employees may also make contributions on their own behalf.
4. Tax treatment of contributions:		
Contributions made by the covered individual.	Deductible in arriving at adjusted gross income	Not deductible.
Employers' contributions		Not included for tax purposes in income of covered employees.
5. Rights of covered individuals to contributions under the plan.	Participants keep fully vested rights to contributions	Employees typically do not get vested rights to employers' contributions until they have reached a specified age or have worked a specified number of years (or both) and frequently forfeit rights if they leave the firm.
6. Investment media	Restricted retirement policies purchased from life insurance companies and face amount certificates. Trusteed plans can invest in listed stocks or securities, Federal, State and local bonds, stock in regulated investment companies or restricted retirement policies. (However, see prohibited transactions, item 9 below.)	Annuities purchased from life insurance companies under either a trusteed or nontrusteed plan. Pension trusts have very wide latitude in investing funds. For example, they may place their funds in all types of securities and real estate. (However, see prohibited transactions, item 9 below.)
7. Benefits	Annuities, lump-sum payments or other payments from the retirement trust. Participants can arrange to have benefits begin at any age, but not later than 70. Trusts must complete distributions to the participant by the time he reaches 80.	Pensions payable at retirement which usually is at age 65 but may be earlier. Benefits may be payable before the retirement age in the event of disability. Lump-sum payments may be made if the participant leaves the firm or dies.
8. Tax treatment of benefits received from plan:		
Withdrawals after age 65	Annuities and periodic payments taxed in full as ordinary income. Tax on lump-sum withdrawals generally limited to 5 times the tax resulting from including ⅕ of the sum in income in the year of withdrawal.	Pensions taxed as ordinary income, but exclusions are allowed under the life expectancy method of taxing annuities, for the tax-free return of the employees' own contributions. Capital-gains treatment is granted to lump sums paid because the employee becomes separated from the firm or dies. Also, up to $5,000 of payments to the beneficiary of a deceased employee may be exempt from tax.[3]
Withdrawals before age of 65	Withdrawals of less than $2,500 taxed at 110 percent of the liability otherwise applicable had funds been withdrawn after age 65. Withdrawals of $2,500 or more generally taxed at 110 percent of the liability resulting from spreading them in equal parts over the taxable year and up to four immediately preceding years.	Same as benefits received after age 65 except that a sick-pay exclusion up to a rate of $100 a week applies to disability payments received before retirement age.
Exemptions, tax deductions and tax credits.	Exemptions are applied against income resulting from withdrawals; however, the amount of income includible because of withdrawals cannot be reduced by personal deductions and the tax credit for retirement income does not apply.	Personal exemptions, personal deductions, and the tax credit for retirement income may be applied against pensions and other benefits received from pension plans.
9. Prohibited transactions	Plans may not engage in certain specified transactions with the participant, certain members of his family or a corporation controlled by him. Such prohibited transactions include lending them money, paying them compensation for personal services, making services available on a preferential basis or purchasing or selling securities from or to them.	Pension plans may not engage in certain specified transactions with the grantor of the trust (the employer), certain of his relatives or a corporation controlled by him. Such prohibited transactions include lending them money without adequate security and a reasonable rate of interest, paying unreasonable compensation for personal services, making services available on a preferential basis, purchasing securities for more than they are worth, selling securities for less than they are worth, and engaging in a transaction which diverts its funds to them.

[1] Coverage requirements are met if (1) 70 percent of employees are eligible for coverage and 80 percent of those eligible are actually covered exclusive of temporary, part-time and seasonal employees, or (2) coverage of the plan is approved by the Internal Revenue Service as not discriminatory.

[2] A study of a sample covering 5,800 pension plans for 1951 indicated that in about ¼ of these plans, employers' contributions averaged 10 percent or more of nondeferred compensation.

[3] This $5,000 exemption of death benefits paid to the beneficiary of an employee under a pension plan applies (1) to all lump-sum payments, and (2) to payments other than lump sums, where the deceased employee did not have a vested right to such payments at the time of his death.

Mar. 12, 1959.

Mr. RAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. RAY. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 10 gives substantial tax reduction to self-employed individuals who establish and make payments into pension trust funds or who purchase retirement annuities.

The cost to the Government of providing this subsidy for the self-employed, some 6 million in number and mostly professional people such as lawyers, doctors, engineers, and so forth, would be between $320 and $365 million for the first year and $365 million per year thereafter. Under present circumstances it is, I believe, vital that Government receipts at least equal Government expenditures. The Government simply cannot afford to lose the revenues which would be lost to it if H.R. 10 were enacted. The bill is opposed by the administration.

This is important legislation. Its merits and demerits should have adequate debate and there should be opportunity for amendments. Adequate debate being impossible and amendments being precluded by the procedure under which this bill comes before the House, I must vote against the motion to suspend the rules.

One respect in which the bill should be amended concerns the formula for measuring the tax reduction the bill would make available to individuals. The maximum deduction from otherwise taxable income is $2,500 per year. That maximum applies to self-employed individuals whose net earnings from self-employment are $25,000 or more for that year. Take the case of two individuals having net earnings from self-employment of $25,000 per year, and therefore entitled to pay $2,500 into pension trust funds. Each would have a $2,500 reduction from otherwise taxable income. If one of the individuals had no other source of income, his effective tax rate would be approximately 39 percent. The other whose taxable net income might include $25,000 received from other sources would have an effective tax rate of approximately 53 percent. Having an outside income, the second individual would have a tax subsidy one-third higher than the man with no outside income.

In past years I have introduced bills to provide smaller individual tax reductions for self-employed and also for those employed in businesses which do not have pension plans. This latter group numbers about 35 million. If H.R. 10 were amended to include all of that group, the total loss to the Government would be $3 billion.

The conclusions I express reflect some change of opinion on my part. That change is compelled by the current financial condition of the Treasury and to some extent by estimates not heretofore available to me as to the workings of the formulas set forth in H.R. 10.

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MASON].

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I have been for the principle of this bill ever since it was introduced many years ago. I believe in the principle of the bill and in the provisions of the bill.

When the social security program was adopted in 1934 it was then adopted as a floor of security under the aged people, and upon that floor they were supposed to be able to build more security of their own.

The farmers of the land are self-employed; most of them are under social security. Social security provides that floor and this provides a method upon which they can build upon that floor, and that is one of the principal reasons for this bill.

Now, fiscal integrity. Fiscal integrity. I have heard about that so much on this floor for the last 20 years that I am sick of hearing it. I claim that I have a greater respect for fiscal integrity on the part of the Government than many of the Members of this House who have been yelling for fiscal integrity yet voting for billions of dollars for foreign aid that I have refused to vote for.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MASON. No, I will not yield. I have not very much time; the gentleman had his time.

Now, what am I referring to? I am referring to the sixty-odd billions of dollars of foreign aid that this House has voted since the last World War. I am speaking of an administration that pretends to be concerned about fiscal integrity and balancing the budget, yet sends up here a recommendation to continue this foreign aid spending to the tune this year of about $4 billions.

Now, Mr. Speaker, if we want to be consistent on fiscal integrity we can vote 3 or 4 hundred million dollars in this bill for our respectable American citizens who are on their own, and cut the foreign appropriation of $4 billion for citizens in foreign lands by 10 percent, and you will have the budget balanced, according to the administration. Why balance the budget by favoring billions for foreign aid and deny one-tenth of that amount to our own people who are self-employed?

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. MEYER].

Mr. MEYER. Mr. Speaker, I have to speak against this bill because I believe it is more or less out of order so far as tax legislation is concerned. I feel that we should first consider an increase in the exemptions from $600 to $800 per dependent before we pass legislation such as this. I believe that there are many inequities and that there are many reasons why the professional people and self-employed deserve better consideration than they have received; however, I fear that later, after we have passed this bill, it will be used as an argument against raising the exemption from $600 to $800. Therefore I am against the pending bill.

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from California [Mr. UTT].

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H. R. 10.

Mr. Speaker, in discussing the plan for voluntary pensions for self-employed individuals, I believe that a brief review of the pre-legislative history as well as the legislative history of what is today called the Keogh-Simpson bill will interest you. For more than a quarter of a century there has existed some form of preferential tax treatment to employed individuals whose employer, corporate or otherwise, set up a qualified pension plan for its employees. The employer contributions to these funds, together with the annual income earned on these funds were not subject to income tax liability upon the employer. The tax liability would arise when the benefits thereunder would be received by the beneficiary or his survivors.

These limited pension programs provided several advantages:

First. While the money was credited to the account of the employee, he did not have to pay an income tax on it until he actually received its enjoyment. This was highly proper because the funds as a rule did not vest in the employee until after a certain number of years. So why should he pay tax on something he might never enjoy?

Second. The earnings from his retirement fund were tax exempt until they were distributed.

Third. The pension benefits to be enjoyed by the employee would be distributed to him at a time in life when he would be without earned income and have a double deduction, after the age of 65, and therefore be in a lower income tax bracket than he would have been at the time the fund was created for him.

These limited pension funds became very popular, and today there are 40,000 private pension funds providing savings and retirement for more than 15 million employees. The present total assets in these funds, most of which are invested in common stock, amount to more than $30 billion, and are growing at a rate which would indicate some $70 billion within the next decade.

With this background in mind, it is not surprising that the self-employed individual, be he a doctor, lawyer, merchant, farmer, or in any other profession of self-employment, would seek out a manner in which he could defer a portion of his earnings through some kind of a restricted pension plan and thus obtain a tax equality equal to an employee.

As early as 1945, a group of New York lawyers met and inaugurated discussions on ways and means of providing such a restricted retirement program, not only for themselves, and other self-employed individuals, but also for the 30 or 40 million employees who were not covered by any such voluntary employer-employee pension benefit plan. It was first hoped that this could be done through section 165 of the Internal Revenue Code, under which such other employee plans have been permitted. But it was found that such a program could not qualify under the Treasury Department's ruling, for several reasons. Two years later, Harry Silverson published an article in the American Mercury entitled "A New Tax Proposal" which in essence provided

limited preferential tax treatment for any taxpaper for the purpose of creating a retirement pension plan. The investment of these deductions was to be in nonassignable Government bonds bearing 1-percent interest, redeemable at any time, on or before 10 years after the death of the taxpayer, and the tax liability would attach against him or his heirs at the time of redemption. The Silverson plan was considered, along with other plans, by the tax section of the American Bar Association in 1948. The Treasury Department violently opposed these plans as a scheme for tax averaging, resulting in not less than a billion dollars a year loss of revenue, and they were abandoned.

Following this, in 1950, the American Bar Association appointed a committee on the general problem of retirement benefits. In this work the New York State Bar Association played an important part. These studies resulted in the drafting of legislation for presentation before Congress.

The first draft was prepared under the supervision of Mr. Leslie M. Rapp, a member of the New York and District of Columbia bars. The original bill was then introduced in the 82d Congress by Representative EUGENE KEOGH, of New York, and Representative Daniel Reed, also of New York, both of whom were members of the House Ways and Means Committee. Mr. Reed was a Republican, and Mr. KEOGH is a Democrat, thus giving the legislation bipartisan sponsorship. While the proposed legislation embodied many of the Silverson and other proposals, it appeared to be a true restricted retirement program rather than an income averaging device.

This was in 1951, and while it was prepared and presented by the legal fraternity, it immediately attracted nationwide support from most professional groups, including the American Medical Association and the American Dental Association.

The following year, extensive public hearings were held by the House Ways and Means Committee. The Treasury Department vigorously opposed the measure, mainly on the grounds of loss of revenue at a time when the budget was facing a deficit. The insurance companies also opposed the legislation on the grounds that such deducted investment funds could not be used for the purchase of life insurance annuities and other such contracts. The original Keogh-Reed bill provided much more liberal deductions and accumulations than are provided in the current legislation. No action was taken by the House Ways and Means Committee during that session, and the bill died with the adjournment of Congress. The following year, Mr. Reed became chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, and the legislation was again introduced by Representative Tom Jenkins and Representative EUGENE KEOGH, thus retaining the bipartisan basis. That was my first year as a member of the Ways and Means Committee, and no action was taken, as work was going on for the general revision of the Internal Revenue Code, which was completed in 1954. In the meantime, several modified retirement bills were introduced by a number of members of the New York delegation, among them Representative JOHN RAY of Staten Island. There was an effort made to incorporate the Ray bill in the omnibus tax revision bill, but this move failed, and all legislation again died with the adjournment of Congress in 1954.

The legislation was again introduced at the opening of the session in 1955. The Jenkins-Keogh bill was again introduced with technical changes to permit its integration—I hate the word—into the revised revenue code. By this time the Treasury Department, headed by Secretary George Humphrey, recognized the tax inequity which existed between employed and self-employed persons, but continued to oppose the legislation on budgetary grounds, making it appear that any legislation, regardless of how equitable it might be, which reduced Federal revenues rather than increased them, would be opposed by Treasury, a principle with which I have never been able to agree. The life insurance companies were still demanding, and reasonably so, that any such restricted pension fund should include the right to purchase insurance contracts. While it was the hope and the original intention of the sponsors of this legislation to not only include the self-employed but also those employed persons not then or now enjoying employer-employee pension plans, it became apparent that favorable action would only be obtained by limiting the legislation to self-employed individuals. Amendments were therefore offered by Mr. KEOGH to confine the bill to self-employed persons, to permit insurance policies to be used as a funding medium, in a limited fashion, and to broaden the allowable investment portfolio for custodian accounts. Amendments were also offered and adopted reducing the annual and lifetime exclusions and the legislation was included in the omnibus tax bill upon which the Ways and Means Committee was then working.

An abortive attempt was made to amend the Jenkins-Keogh bill into other pending legislation, which sometimes is a good parliamentary move, and sometimes a bad one, in that you can load a bill down to a point where it falls of its own weight. This situation appeared to be in the making, and the proponents of the legislation decided henceforth to move it forward on its own merits. It was again introduced in 1957 as the Jenkins-Keogh bill with all of the previous amendments adopted by the House Ways and Means Committee. The new bill had several points of refinement, and after further amendments reducing the annual and lifetime excludable amounts, the bill was passed by the committee and by the House late in 1958. It went to the Senate so late in the session that it was not considered by the Senate Finance Committee, and died again with the close of the session.

This legislation has more lives than a cat, and was again introduced this year in exactly the same form in which it had previously passed the House. However, the sponsorship shifted from Mr. Jenkins, who did not run for reelection, to the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Representative RICHARD SIMPSON; but on the Democratic side, the bill still retains the sponsorship of Mr. KEOGH. So today, we have before us the Keogh-Simpson bill. This, then, is the legislative and prelegislative history of the bill to provide limited retirement pensions for self-employed individuals, of whom there are more than 10 million in the United States.

The bill provides that the amounts paid by an individual as a retirement deposit shall be included in the section of the Income Tax Code allowing itemized deductions for individuals, and may be made any time within 3 months and 15 days after the close of the taxable year, and shall be considered as having been made on the last day of such taxable year. No deduction shall be allowed for any taxable year after the taxpayer attains the age of 70.

There are limitations upon the annual allowable deductions as well as on lifetime deductions. The annual limit for an individual is $2,500 or 10 percent of his net earnings from self-employment, whichever amount is the lesser, and the lifetime aggregate amount allowed as deductions to an individual during his lifetime shall not exceed $50,000 which is 20 times the maximum annual deduction. However, if an individual has reached the age of 50 before January 1959, his annual allowable deduction is increased by one-tenth for each full year of his age in excess of 50. In other words, if as of today you have attained the age of 60, your annual deductions would be $5,000 or 20 percent of your net earnings, whichever is the lesser, but the lifetime limit remains at $50,000. In cases where a self-employed individual has previously been covered under a restricted employee pension plan, but is now self-employed, his aggregate lifetime exclusions are to be reduced by the number of years he was so covered, multiplied by $2,500. In other words, if a self-employed individual had been covered for a period of 10 years under a restricted employee benefit plan, his aggregate lifetime deductible amount would be reduced by 10 years times $2,500, or $25,000, so that his remaining lifetime deduction would be $25,000 instead of $50,000, provided, of course, he had acquired a vested interest in the previous retirement plan.

The bill further provides that any self-employed individual who is receiving benefits from an employee retirement plan, or to whom contributions are being made by the employer for his account, and such contributions are vested, cannot participate in this plan during such taxable year.

A self-employed individual is defined, with respect to any taxable year, as any individual who is subject to self-employment social security tax, or would be subject to such tax if he were not excluded, such as ministers, physicians, dentists, and so forth.

An employee restricted pension plan which excludes a self-employed individual from participating in the provisions of this legislation, is defined as a pension, profit sharing, or stock bonus plan, which is exempt under section 501(a) or

an annuity plan which meets the requirements of section 401(a) 3, 4, 5, and 6, or a pension plan established for the employees of the U.S. Government or any agency thereof, by a Territory, or the District of Columbia, or any political subdivision or any instrumentality thereof. Thus, you see, I, as an employee of the Federal Government which has set up a restricted pension program for me, cannot participate in the provisions of this legislation, even though I am otherwise self-employed under the provisions of the Social Security Act relating to tax on self-employed individuals.

Retirement deposit, as defined in the bill, means the payment of money into a restricted retirement fund or into a domestic life insurance company as premiums on a restricted retirement policy issued on the life of the taxpayer. In the latter case, only those funds are deductible which are allocable to the cost of the restricted retirement benefits.

The legislation defines a restricted retirement policy as an annuity, endowment, or a life insurance contract, or a combination thereof which meets certain specifications, among which are that it must be paid to the insured not later than at age 70½ or to the insured as a life annuity, payable within his life expectancy, beginning not later than at age 70½, or to the insured and his spouse as a joint life and survivor annuity. Here there are several technical restrictions which I am sure will require the services of the legal profession, and the legal profession will require the services of the doctors, when they get a severe headache over the confusion which is certain to arise when the regulations are issued by the Internal Revenue Service.

These retirement policies must be nonassignable, and there shall be no incident of ownership by anyone except the insured, and cannot provide life insurance after the age of 70½.

I must warn you that you will not be permitted any of the deductions above referred to with respect to premiums paid on a restricted retirement policy before that policy has been identified as such in the manner and form prescribed by the Secretary of the Treasury or his delegate. Likewise, no deductions can be allowed with respect to any amount paid into a restricted retirement fund by any individual before such fund has been identified as such, nor before such individual has been identified as a participant in such fund in the manner and form prescribed by the Secretary of the Treasury or his delegate.

Now I will direct your attention to the tax treatment of benefits received under these plans. In general the amounts of money and the fair market value of property received from a restricted retirement fund shall be included in the recipient's gross income for the taxable year in which it is received, except that if these benefits are received in a lump sum, the tax liability shall be computed over a 5-year average. The bill provides special rules in the case of the return of excess contributions and in cases of contributions made which were known to be excessive. There are certain prohibited transactions imposed upon the trustee of a restricted retirement fund. The general rule applying to annuities will be applicable to annuity payments accruing under this retirement program. There are several exceptions to this, too detailed to mention.

Proceeds from a life insurance policy under this program in case of death receive special treatment, in that the amount of the cash-surrender value of the policy on the day preceding the death of the individual shall be taxable as income to the recipient, and amounts in excess of that will be taxed as any other insurance.

If the insured borrows against the cash surrender value of his policy during his lifetime, that amount will be considered as taxable in the year it was borrowed, with the exception that he may borrow not in excess of the current annual premium if he applies the money so borrowed to the payment of the annual premium, and liquidates the loan within 12 months. The taxpayer also has options which permit him to receive the full cash surrender value at any time, provided that within 60 days thereafter such money is irrevocably converted into a contract providing restricted retirement benefits. The taxpayer cannot make an assignment of his policy without being subject to a tax on the entire cash surrender value.

There are several technical sections involving the tax treatment of the benefits and they should be carefully studied before any affirmative action is taken.

In cases where a trust fund is established the trustee must be a bank, and a trust instrument issued in accordance with the provisions of H.R. 10 as well as any subsequent rules and regulations issued by the Secretary. Here again, the trustor's interest cannot be assigned, but he may designate one or more beneficiaries in the event of his death, or he can direct the trustee to transfer his entire interest to another restricted retirement fund. The trust must terminate and be distributed, or the funds applied to the purchase of an annuity before the trustor reaches the age of 70, or he must elect to have his entire interest in the trust distributed before he reaches the age of 80 with not less than 10 percent of the value of such interest determined at the age of 70 being distributed each taxable year thereafter. If the trustor dies before he reaches the age of 70, his interest in the trust must be distributed within 5 years of the date of his death, or applied to the purchase of an immediate annuity for his surviving spouse, payable for her life or for a term certain which cannot go beyond her life expectancy. One or more individuals may associate themselves in the same trust, and their interest must be apportioned on the basis of their contributions. The trustee has a large range of permissible investments, including any stock or securities listed on an exchange which is registered with the Securities and Exchange Commission, subject, of course, to the prohibited transactions which are defined in the bill. These trusts receive special treatment and are subject to the general rules relating to estates, trusts, and beneficiaries.

The bill provides that the income from such a restricted retirement fund shall be exempt from income taxes. Banks and insurance companies are required to file informational returns.

This, then, is a thumbnail analysis of the pending legislation, the provisions of which, of course, are subject to revision by the Senate Finance Committee and the Senate as a whole. H.R. 10 is not a substitute for social security, but rather a retirement program supplemental to it; and I urge the immediate passage of H.R. 10.

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Washington [Mr. PELLY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I support H.R. 10, the so-called Keogh-Simpson bill, which is to give to voluntary pension plans of self-employed persons the same tax deferment that is granted under present law to the retirement savings of employees under qualified plans. This equalizing legislation is sought by doctors and lawyers and professional persons such as accountants, all of whom are considered to have high earnings. By postponing the tax on payments to retirement savings plans it might be in the nature of relief to those in high income brackets, but also it will help plumbers and independent workers, the butcher, the baker, the candlestickmaker, and persons with modest earnings.

Last year I voted to suspend the rules and pass the same measure, but it was late in July and never became law.

Now, the Secretary of the Treasury opposes the bill because of the need of the Government for revenue. I do not want to unbalance the budget, and sympathize with the Secretary, but to me a reduction or economy in Government spending is the answer to that. So, as for me, I will vote for H.R. 10 and if it becomes law I will support efforts to reduce nonessential Federal expenditures to make up the difference. My support of this bill is not a vote for an unbalanced budget. I am firmly for holding the line on spending. I want to make that point clear.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I rise to review how this problem came about and to discuss some of its implications. During the war years there was, as you will recall, a wage freeze. Many corporations and many workers sought for means by which wage increases could be granted without breaking the wage freeze orders. It was at this time that fringe benefits including pension funds became popular. The War Labor Board and the Treasury joined to rule that payments on behalf of employees would not be viewed as income, and tax treatment was modified accordingly. The effect of this was, of course, to open the door to tax-free contributions made by employers on behalf of their employees. Concessions having been made, it was inevitable that the Congress should be asked to provide some similar form of tax treatment for self-employed persons who do not have the

options made available to employed persons by that war-time ruling.

The bill facing us today represents an answer to the request for relief by the self-employed. There is a relative inequity which justifies some revision of tax treatment. I regret, Mr. Speaker, that the relief being offered takes the form that it does. This bill, for good and sufficient reason of tax accounting, carefully limits the kinds of investments which shall be accorded such favored tax treatment. In the process it influences, and I think adversely, the freedom of such persons to manage their estates as may seem to them best. I find nothing in this bill that would give tax relief, for example, to a young doctor if he were to decide that the best investment he could make of his income would be in the form of the building of a medical clinic. There is nothing in this bill to encourage a small businessman to invest up to 10 percent of his income in the building up of his business.

It seems to me that if we are to give tax favors for investment of a portion of one's income, then we ought to permit the investor to use his own best judgment as to the form the investment should take. More than that, we ought to give at least equal tax treatment to an investment in a form which enhances his own productivity and capacity to earn income. This should be at least as important as tax encouragement to retirement plans.

It may seem strange to some that members of the business community are urging upon the Congress the passage of a tax law that will limit their freedom to manage their own business affairs rather than expand that freedom. I would suggest that their purposes might have been better served by a fundamental tax reform. For example, the Federal law might deal with the whole range of taxpayers by providing that 10 percent, or some other reasonable percentage of their income, shall be treated as tax exempt if it is invested, with the added proviso that upon realization of income from such sale or other disposition of assets, such receipts shall be treated as taxable income. This would give the taxpayer complete freedom to manage his income as seems best to him. It would avoid favoring one type of investment over another. Moreover, if the Congress were to remove this inequity, we ought to charge any employer contribution on behalf of the employee against the first portion of that tax exempt allowance. For example, if the employer contributes an amount equal to 6 percent of the employee's wage to a retirement account, that 6 percent should first be credited and, then any other investment by the employee permitted to use up the remainder of the 10 percent. This more fundamental reform might be a more equitable solution for the inequity that now exists.

Or to pursue completely this line of attack, it has been suggested, for example, by a recent article in Fortune magazine, that the high marginal rates are a fundamental inequity in the income tax because of their uneven application to various types of income. It has been suggested that the $365 million of tax relief which we are approving with the passage of H.R. 10 could instead be used to reduce the top rate to 65 percent. This would perhaps be a less satisfactory solution to the small businessman but it might be a wiser course from the standpoint of an equitable income tax structure.

I shall vote for H.R. 10 reluctantly because I think an inequity exists and has existed for many years that is partially remedied by H.R. 10. But I find in H.R. 10 a further invasion of the taxpayer's freedom to manage his own income and estate. This invasion may be justified in order to simplify tax accounting over a man's lifetime. It is not justified by any considerations of the resulting economic consequences either to the taxpayer or to the community. I think both will suffer from that invasion.

I sincerely hope that the business community will join the Congress in a thorough re-examination of our tax structure, looking toward a far more fundamental tax reform that will protect the integrity of our tax system, protect the integrity of the budget, and expand the freedom of individuals and businessmen to manage their own affairs as seems to them best without the tax angle becoming the decisive factor in business decisions.

Mr. KARTH. Mr. Speaker, once again the House considers a worthy bill to help millions of self-employed persons—the small businessmen, doctors, dentists, lawyers, and other professionals—provide for themselves a sound, convenient, and orderly plan for retirement income.

Late last session this bill was approved by the House but unfortunately it died at adjournment before it could be considered in the other house and included with the other small business legislation which the 85th Congress passed because of able and vigorous Democratic leadership. This series of measures, incidentally, if properly financed and sympathetically administered, could well initiate the renaissance of American small business.

H.R. 10 when adopted will round out the basic structure in this system to help men and women who are gifted with ideas and energy but short of other resources to invigorate and put meaning and substance in the idea of free enterprise.

Our economy is in dire trouble because the giant corporations since World War II have through consolidation, purchase, or a variety of other dubious methods crushed out of existence much of their competition. Our country is now paying the terrible price for the monopolization of our economy with inflation, underproduction, and unemployment. Negative weapons of antimonopoly legislation have failed—the promising, positive program of encouraging small business is an inspired effort to keep the American economy democratic and dynamic. I am proud of the leading part that the Democratic Party, both nationally and in my State of Minnesota, has had in reinvigorating small business. Some considerable tribute has to be paid too to those fearless members of the minority party who have voted with the Democrats despite the formidable disapproval of the Republican administration.

This administration has fought tooth and nail against any really effective program for small business and when it has been forced to accept, reluctantly, Democratic sponsored measures it has practiced cold, deliberate sabotage against small business as our distinguished and venerable colleague WRIGHT PATMAN has revealed.

The administration's big guns are now being trained on H.R. 10 to destroy any chance for the millions of self-employed persons to get only a fraction of the tax consideration received by high-salaried corporation executives, those exalted employees with their bonuses in stock, stock options, company contributed pensions, and other fancy emoluments—not including that ultimate in tax evasion devices, expense-account living.

The Republican congressional leaders and the administration through Secretary of Treasury Anderson have now declared war on H.R. 10 and in effect say to small businessmen, the doctors, dentists, lawyers, and other professional people of this Nation that as far as retirement income is concerned, "you can drop dead."

Republicans in the administration wrap the flag of patriotism around them saying that to enact H.R. 10 would throw the President's budget into deficit and would be doing Karl Marx's work of destroying capitalism. Yet where is patriotism when Secretary of Defense Neil McElroy plans, with the President's best wishes, to desert his crucial post as the countdown in Berlin nears, a possible blast-off for civilization itself, just so that Mr. McElroy can, as the press reports, save the pension and other interests given him by his soap factory?

Should our civilization survive the summer I hope than an H.R. 10 enacted into law will spur the millions of America's self-employed persons to do better democracy's work of invigorating free enterprise by helping themselves provide for their golden years.

I urge the passage of H.R. 10.

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, it is indeed a pleasure for me to rise in support of H.R. 10. The distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. KEOGH], has spent many years in behalf of this very much needed legislation for our business and professional people, and I hope the bill will become a law soon. He came close to making it last year, but the Senate did not act following the passage of the bill by the House.

This year, as last year, I have had a number of my own constituents write to me about this legislation and I feel they deserve the benefits to be derived from such legislation.

This bill gives hope, help, relief, and encouragement to the small, independent businessman and professional man. Many of my friends in business have complained that big outfits have deductible pension plans, but the small businessman had no allowance for deduction. This gives the small businessman that deduction.

The self-employed businessman, having a small organization, has his hands full. He is burdened with taxes of every kind, and spends many long hours doing paperwork for the Government. He has all the responsibility of leadership in his business, as well as the burden of terrific competition. This legislation seeks to give him a chance at a pension plan.

The professional man, such as the doctor, accountant, engineer, consultant, lawyer, and clergyman will also benefit. Each professional man, as each businessman, contributes daily to the life of his community. Unless he is employed by some company, he cannot have a self-propelled deductible pension plan of his own. This legislation gives him the same opportunity as the professional man on the payroll of another. It gives him a measure of tax relief.

Aside from the tax relief and encouragement, we must recognize that this will encourage saving, and will generate capital for new investment. Our form of government, our standard of living, our way of life—are each and all dependent on constant investment and reinvestment of capital to provide expansion, new plants, promote new ideas, and provide lending capital to promote new jobs. In one chain of plants in my district, the employees are allowed to buy stock. What opportunity.

The provisions of the bill make the participation voluntary. No one is forced into it. No Government funds are involved. No new administration is created, and no new or old bureacracy encouraged. We are just saying to the man who runs his own business: "You deserve the same consideration of those who work for someone else, and Congress is going to try to give it to you."

The average businessman today actually works 7 to 9 days a month for Uncle Sam. I say this because all of us are aware of the heavy taxes we have. I had hopes for and urged tax relief this year, but the leaders of the parties vetoed the idea. This measure is in the right direction and I hope and pray that next year we can enact a real tax relief bill across the board.

I believe the American people would be in favor of this bill which helps the small businessman and professional man. I hope the legislation will pass.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I am privileged once again to join in support of legislation which, if enacted, will prove of inestimable value to an increasingly large segment of Americans. H.R. 10, by permitting self-employed individuals to take a deduction for a limited amount of investment in certain types of retirement programs, will help straighten out the inequalities under the present tax setup where the employee is receiving this type of tax treatment, but the self-employed person is not.

While company officials and employees receive benefits from retirement plans which are not counted as income until the money is actually drawn out, the small businessman, farmer and professional man now has to save at a great disadvantage since income put into savings for retirement is taxable at a higher rate during peak income years, rather than later in life when income is normally reduced.

It is true that such a measure as this would result in some revenue loss. However, to oppose such a measure, desirable apart from its impact on receipt of revenue by the Treasury, is to preclude reform in our tax structure when reform is indicated. I submit that the relatively small loss in revenue which will result from passage of this bill, will be more than balanced if we dedicate ourselves to the task of cutting down unnecessary Federal spending.

It is for the millions of small businessmen, farmers, and professional people that the Congress must act favorably on this bill. These people have every right to enjoy the fruits of their labor during their reclining years on an equal footing with the man who now qualifies for retirement benefits as an employee.

This measure will reiterate our belief in the free enterprise system by removing the present disadvantage the independent businessman finds himself in regarding savings for retirement.

It will recognize that the inherent qualities of success—thrift, initiative, and consideration for the future—will receive their just reward.

I sincerely hope that the House will adopt this measure and thereby go on record in support of equal treatment for the farmers, small businessman, and professional people who have contributed so much to the economic and social growth of the America we know today.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I am extremely pleased that the House leadership has scheduled H.R. 10 for debate and vote today. I have long been an enthusiastic supporter of this proposal and cosponsored it during the last Congress and again this year.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. KEOGH] has made an excellent presentation of this proposal in his usual eloquent and precise manner. His bill will provide self-employed individuals with the opportunity to deduct from their annual taxable income, an amount—not to exceed 10 percent—paid by him into a restricted retirement policy or trust fund as a contribution toward his retirement income. These contributions, plus all accumulated earnings, will become taxable when drawn upon after age 65.

I hope that the other body will accord this worthwhile and reasonable legislation its early and favorable consideration.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Speaker, except for the retroactive feature in this legislation, I wholeheartedly subscribe to the principles and purposes which it embodies. Since I am a lawyer by profession and intend to return someday to the practice of law, it is not difficult for me to find merit in the bill.

However, Mr. Speaker, this is not the time in the session to enact tax cutting legislation. The pressures which have been brought to bear by well-intentioned business and professional people for passage of this bill, should first be directed toward the requirement that Congress maintain a balanced budget.

I would pledge my enthusiastic support for the passage of this bill at the end of the session providing that this Congress, at that time, has not appropriated more money than is called for in the President's balanced budget.

Mr. Speaker, if it should be that lawyers and doctors cannot understand the necessity for fiscal responsibility, then I fear there may be little hope left for the country.

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Speaker, it is with mixed emotions that I rise in opposition to H.R. 10.

First, I regret that I find myself on the other side of this or any other issue of my good friend and distinguished colleague, the gentleman from New York, the sponsor of this bill.

My reaction upon finding myself on the other side of the issue from the cosponsor on the other side of the aisle, my distinguished colleague from Pennsylvania, is, I must confess, somewhat different. We have been on opposite sides on so many issues that I suspect we are both slightly embarrassed on those rare occasions when we find ourselves in full accord. I can assure the gentleman that neither of us is in danger of being embarrassed at this time.

To say this is not to say that I do not see considerable merit in H.R. 10. I recognize that it has real merit—not the least of which is that it would put money in my pocket. And this would be a deposit that could be made not just once or twice but for every year of my life.

The only trouble is that for me to have this money it must come from someone else. H.R. 10 is a perfect case of robbing Peter to pay Paul. In this instance, it would be a case of taking care of JIM at the expense of Uncle Sam.

Now I recognize that the most persuasive argument in favor of this measure is that it is an attempt to restore fairness and equity to our tax structure because as we all know for many years other Jims, along with Joes, Dicks and Harrys have been taken care of quite well at Uncle Sam's expense. Under the circumstances, it is indeed understandable if the professional and self-employed in this country long for the advantages which our tax laws give to the key personnel in the American business community. I know from personal experience the feeling of envy with which members of the legal profession have looked upon the manner that big businesses and businesses not so big, have in recent years lavished pension and retirement benefits on their executive personnel. We would be less than human if we reacted otherwise.

However, Mr. Speaker, I suggest that what the country needs at this time is not an organized effort on the part of the members of the bar, or the doctors, or the businessmen, or the farmers, to see that they too get theirs. What we need, Mr. Speaker, is a revision in our basic tax structure which would give us at one and the same time the fairness in our tax structure and fiscal integrity which my colleague from Pennsylvania referred to.

I want fairness in our tax laws and I believe that our country needs fiscal integrity. Unfortunately, H.R. 10 guarantees neither. In fact, it all but makes it a certainty that we will not have both.

As the gentleman from Wisconsin has correctly pointed out, H.R. 10 succeeds in being fair to the professional and the self-employed of this country vis-a-vis the employees of many private industries, but it succeeds in doing this only by making the situation more unfair as far as other deserving groups are concerned—the civil servants and the railroad workers to cite just two examples.

Mr. Speaker, within the past week the President of the United States has challenged those of us who have been critical of his "we can't afford" approach to come forward with proposals which will provide the additional taxes which will be necessary to give this country the defense posture it must have—our children the schools they need; the families of America the decent homes they are entitled to have; the Nation the economic growth so essential if the American worker is to have a job; and the American businessman to enjoy anything which resembles prosperity. Under the Constitution, I am not at all certain that, regardless of how annoyed he may become at his critics, the responsibility to propose a tax program still rests with the executive branch of our Government. Even if it does not, I confess that I am not enough of a tax expert to be the one in the Congress who would attempt to pick up that challenge. However, Mr. Speaker, I do recognize that, much as we might like it to be otherwise, we cannot have everything. And sometimes the choices we must make are not always easy.

The choice before us today is one of those hard ones to make. But it seems to me if I must choose between voting for a bill which will do well by me in my declining years and vote for a bill which will do well by my children during their formative years, the choice becomes a lot easier. In my judgment, I have no choice but to see to it that my children and all the children of this country get the best education possible.

If I must choose between being nice—no, Mr. Speaker—not nice, being fair to myself and to millions of other Americans similarly situated and making certain that America remains the place wherein these millions can continue to practice their profession, pursue their own business efforts, plow their own fields, then I find it an easy choice to make. Rather than run the risk of being unfair to this country, I would sooner be unfair to myself.

For all of these reasons and for many more which I will not now take the time to detail, I feel I am constrained to vote against this bill.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise to support H.R. 10. This bill will help to encourage initiative, push, and determination—the will to succeed by dint of one's own efforts.

Our economy requires big business and a large number of corporate employees to keep it going on an even kilter. In order to help keep it that way, we need a large group of self-employed. This would include professional men, lawyers, doctors, dentists, architects, artists, artisans of various kinds and businessmen who work for themselves.

If we still want to preserve this type of individual, as I am sure we do, the Government, which has done so much to tear down the spirit of self-reliance with quasi-socialistic programs in the past quarter century, must make amends for its past errors. It should do this by seeing to it that men and women with a spirit of individual enterprise should have the opportunity to succeed at their chosen endeavors. The Government, which has largely created the difficulty, should see to it that the large numbers of self-employed are not so handicapped by taxes that they choose the status of an employee, thus holding themselves back as well as others.

By its heavily graded income taxes—the so-called progressive tax—the Government is actually doing the opposite of what it should be doing. It is discouraging self-employment and individual free enterprise when it should be lending it every aid. There is no system at present of averaging for hard times—the bad years—which are altogether too common for the self-employed—or to make any practical provision by which the self-employed can save money for catastrophic periods and the winter of old age.

Tax laws now in effect do not provide for the self-employed in similar fashion to the statutory aid to pension plans for the employed. The bill under discussion today, H.R. 10, would correct that inequitable situation, if enacted into law. It would give the self-employed an opportunity to save their own money for their own retirement. No subsidy or use of Treasury money is involved. The people involved would be the ones saving for themselves. They would be getting no handout. While the immediate beneficiaries would be the self-employed, in a larger sense America would be as much the beneficiary. Self-reliance would be rekindled in America. The individual entrepreneur could get a new birth of freedom by this bill.

These high taxes and high living costs make it hard indeed for the self-employed man or woman to create an old-age retirement fund out of current income. This point must be crystal clear to us by now. H.R. 10 would give them the opportunity that is their due to save a small part of their money, under the provisions of the bill, which are fair and sound, and on which they will pay their own taxes when they retire.

I am happy to support H.R. 10 and hope that it shall pass.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion that the rules be suspended and the bill be passed.

The question was taken; and (two thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

REVISION OF LAWS RELATING TO DEPOSITORY LIBRARIES

Mr. HAYS: Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 519) to revise the laws relating to depository libraries.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act shall be known as the "Depository Library Act of 1959."

The term "Government publication" as used in this Act and the amendments made by it means informational matter which is published as an individual document at Government expense, or as required by law.

Government publications, except those determined by their issuing components to be required for official use only or those required for strictly administrative or operational purposes which have no public interest or educational value and publications classified for reasons of national security, shall be made available to depository libraries through the facilities of the Superintendent of Documents for public information. Each component of the Government shall furnish the Superintendent of Documents a list of publications, except those required for official use only or those required for strictly administrative or operational purposes which have no public interest or educational value and publications classified for reasons of national security, which it issued during the previous month that were obtained from sources other than the Government Printing Office.

SEC. 2. That section 501 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (March 1, 1907, ch. 2284, sec. 4, 34 Stat. 1014; 44 U.S.C. 82), is hereby amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 501. The Government publications, which may be selected from lists prepared by the Superintendent of Documents and when requested from him, shall be distributed to depository libraries specifically designated by law and to such libraries as may have been designated by each of the Senators from the several States, respectively, and as have been or shall be designated by the Representatives in Congress from each congressional district and at large, and by the Delegate from each Territory, or the Resident Commissioner from each Commonwealth: *Provided,* That additional libraries within areas served by Representatives, Delegates, or Resident Commissioners may be designated by them to receive Government publications to the extent that a total of not more than two such libraries, other than those specifically designated by law, which are qualified to fulfill minimum requirements as provided by law for depository libraries, may be designated within each area; however, before any additional library within a congressional district, Territory, or Commonwealth shall be designated as a depository for Government publications, the head of that library shall furnish his Representative, Delegate, or Resident Commissioner with justification of the necessity for the additional designation. This justification, which shall also include a certification as to the need for the additional depository library designation, shall be signed by the head of every existing depository library within the congressional district, Territory, or Commonwealth or by the head of the library authority of the State, Territory, or Commonwealth within which the additional depository library is to be located. The justification for additional depository library designations shall be transmitted to the Superintendent of Documents by the Representative, Delegate, or Resident Commissioner."

SEC. 3. That section 502 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (January 12, 1895, ch. 23, secs. 53 and 61, 28 Stat. 608 and 610; 44 U.S.C. 83), is hereby amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 502. The Superintendent of Documents shall currently issue a classified list of Government publications in suitable form, containing annotations of contents and listed by item identification numbers in such manner as to facilitate the selection of only those publications which may be needed by designated depository libraries. The selected publications shall be distributed to depository libraries in accordance with regulations issued by the Superintendent of

Documents, so long as they fulfill the conditions provided by law."

SEC. 4. That section 5 of the Act of June 23, 1913 (38 Stat. 75, ch. 3; 44 U.S.C. 84), is hereby amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 5. The designation of a library to replace any one of not more than two depository libraries, other than those specifically designated by law, within a congressional district, Territory, or Commonwealth may be made only when the library to be replaced shall cease to exist, when the library voluntarily relinquishes its depository status, or when the Superintendent of Documents determines that it no longer fulfills the conditions provided by law for depository libraries."

SEC. 5. That section 4 of the Act of March 1, 1907, as amended (34 Stat. 1014, ch. 2284, and 52 Stat. 1206, ch. 708; 44 U.S.C. 85), is hereby amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 4. Upon request of the Superintendent of Documents, the components of the Government which order the printing of publications shall either increase or decrease the number of copies of publications furnished for distribution to designated depository libraries and State and Territorial libraries so that the number of copies delivered to the Superintendent of Documents shall be equal to the number of libraries on the list: *Provided,* That the number thus delivered shall at no time exceed the number authorized under existing statute: *Provided further,* That such copies of publications which are furnished the Superintendent of Documents for distribution to designated depository libraries shall include the journals of the Senate and House of Representatives; all publications, not confidential in character, printed upon the requisition of any congressional committee; all Senate and House public bills and resolutions; and all reports on private bills, concurrent or simple resolutions; but shall not include so-called cooperative publications which must necessarily be sold in order to be self-sustaining.

"The Superintendent of Documents shall currently inform the components of the Government which order the printing of publications as to the number of copies of their publications required for distribution to depository libraries. The cost of printing and binding those publications which are distributed to depository libraries, when obtained elsewhere than from the Government Printing Office, shall be borne by components of the Government responsible for their issuance; those requisitioned from the Government Printing Office shall be charged to appropriations provided the Superintendent of Documents for that purpose.

"All land-grant colleges shall be constituted as depositories to receive Government publications subject to the provisions and limitations of the depository laws."

SEC. 6. That section 70 of the Act of January 12, 1895 (28 Stat. 612, ch. 23; 44 U.S.C. 86), is hereby amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 70. Each library which may hereafter be designated by Representatives, Delegates, or Resident Commissioners as a depository of Government publications shall be able to provide custody and service for depository materials and be located in an area where it can best serve the public need, and shall be located within an area not already adequately served by existing depository libraries. The Superintendent of Documents shall receive reports from designated depository libraries at least every two years concerning the condition of each and shall make firsthand investigation of conditions for which need is indicated; the results of such investigations shall be included in his annual report. Whenever he shall ascertain that the number of books in any such library is below ten thousand, other than Government publications, or it has ceased to be maintained so as to be accessible to the public, or that the Government publications which have been furnished the library have not been properly maintained, he shall delete the library from the list of depository libraries if the library fails to correct the unsatisfactory conditions within six months. The Representative, Delegate, or Resident Commissioner in whose area the library is located shall be notified and shall then be authorized to designate another library within the area served by him, which shall meet the conditions herein required, but which shall not be in excess of the number of depository libraries authorized by law within each district, Territory, or Commonwealth."

SEC. 7. That section 98 of the Act of January 12, 1895 (28 Stat. 624, ch. 23; 44 U.S.C. 87), is hereby amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 98. The libraries of the executive departments, of the United States Military Academy, and United States Naval Academy are constituted designated depositories of Government publications. A depository library within each independent agency may be designated upon certification of need by the head of the independent agency to the Superintendent of Documents. Additional depository libraries within executive departments and independent agencies may be designated to receive Government publications to the extent that the number so designated shall not exceed the number of major bureaus or divisions of such departments and independent agencies. These designations shall be made only after certification by the head of each executive department or independent agency to the Superintendent of Documents as to the justifiable need for additional depository libraries. Depository libraries within executive departments and independent agencies are authorized to dispose of unwanted Government publications after first offering them to the Library of Congress and the National Archives."

SEC. 8. That section 74 of the act of January 12, 1895, as amended (28 Stat. 620, ch. 23; and sec. 11, 49 Stat. 1552, ch. 630; 44 U.S.C. 92), is hereby amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 74. All Government publications of a permanent nature which are furnished by authority of law to officers (except Members of Congress) of the United States Government, for their official use, shall be stamped 'Property of the United States Government', and shall be preserved by such officers and by them delivered to their successors in office as a part of the property appertaining to the office. Government publications which are furnished to depository libraries shall be made available for the free use of the general public, and may be disposed of by depository libraries after retention for a minimum period of five years, and in accordance with the provisions of section 9 of this Act, if the depository library is served by a regional depository library. When the depository libraries are not served by a regional depository library, or if they are regional depository libraries themselves, the Government publications, except superseded publications or those issued later in bound form which may be discarded as authorized by the Superintendent of Documents, shall be retained permanently in either printed form or in microfacsimile form."

SEC. 9. Not to exceed two depository libraries in each State, Territory, and Commonwealth, may be designated as herein provided to be regional depositories, and as such shall receive from the Superintendent of Documents copies of all new and revised Government publications authorized for distribution to depository libraries; and in addition shall be entitled to receive a microfacsimile copy of these Government publications which the Superintendent of Documents determines to be suitable for such form of reproduction and which can be furnished by him within the limits of available appropriations. Designation of regional depository libraries may be made by a Senator, Delegate, or the Resident Commissioner within the areas served by them, after approval by the head of the library authority of the State, Territory, or Commonwealth, who shall first ascertain from the head of the library to be so designated that the library will, in addition to fulfilling the requirements for depository libraries, retain at least one copy of all Government publications, either in printed or microfacsimile form (except those authorized to be discarded by the Superintendent of Documents); and within the region served will provide interlibrary loan, reference service, and assistance for depository libraries in the disposal of unwanted Government publications as herein provided. The agreement to function as a regional depository library shall be transmitted to the Superintendent of Documents by the Senator, Delegate, or Resident Commissioner when designation is made.

The libraries designated as regional depositories shall be authorized to permit depository libraries, within the areas served by them, to dispose of Government publications which they have retained for at least five years after first offering them to other depository libraries within their area, then to other libraries, and then if not wanted to discard.

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. SCHENCK. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a second be considered as ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 519 is identical with H.R. 13140, a bill that passed the House unanimously last July. It would revise the laws relating to Federal depository libraries. The bill passed the House last year without a dissenting vote, but got over to the other body too late to be considered by the Committee on Rules and Administration. I sent a letter to the members of that committee and received replies from all of them that they were very much interested in the proposal, and they hoped the bill could be before them early in this session so that they could have ample time for its consideration.

Briefly, what this bill does is to revise the laws relating to depository libraries; which laws, I might add, have not been revised since they were passed at a time when the population of this country was 70 million people.

It allows some additional libraries to be designated for more effective distribution of Federal publications. More importantly, in my opinion, Mr. Speaker, it allows designated libraries, upon certification, after 5 years, to dispose of Federal documents which, under the present law, they must keep in perpetuity. It is estimated that if all of the libraries that could become eligible under this law were designated, there would be an additional cost to the Government of approximately $150,000 a year. However, a poll that we have taken indicates that there will only be about one-fourth

of those designated actually, which would reduce the cost, the maximum cost, to about $40,000 a year. In my opinion, by sending out, as this law provides, a more selective list so that the libraries can be more discriminating about what they select, there should be indicated savings to the Government. I might say that we polled 1,000 librarians by questionnaire in the preceding Congress as to their ideas about this law.

We held hearings in Washington and in four widely scattered points in the United States, and we believe this bill now embodies the recommendations of the people most vitally concerned with the matter, namely, the librarians, the Public Printer, and all others who have associated interests. Now, it is a rather complex bill, and I will be glad, to the best of my ability, and I am sure my colleague, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SCHENCK], the ranking minority member of the Committee on House Administration, will be glad to the best of his ability, to explain any points in question for the membership.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. I have checked into the situation in the district that I represent, and I have been told that we now have three such depositories in the Fifth Congressional District of Georgia. If that is correct, and I have been told by a qualified agency here that it is correct, would this bill have the effect of cutting them down to two?

Mr. HAYS. No. This bill will not cut down any present depositories. As a matter of fact, your case is unique, but it is not the only one in the United States. This situation came about by redistrictings where intrastate boundaries have been redrawn through the years and mergers of districts have developed. We have a district in Ohio that actually has four depositories, and none of those will be affected by this legislation.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. I might say, to the converse, I represent a district that has not got one. I have tried to get one to qualify who would be eligible under the law. I have not been able to do so. I made efforts only within the past week or 10 days, exploring the situation again. So, as the gentleman from Georgia says, he has three in his district and the gentleman from Ohio says he knows of one Ohio district that has four because of the changed congressional lines, I am unfortunately in the position where I have not got any, although I am entitled to one under the law. But, no one seems to be interested among those who could qualify or there is no institution within my district that can qualify in accordance with the basic law.

Mr. HAYS. I thank the gentleman. There are other districts in exactly the same situation in which he finds himself. I might say that this matter first came to my attention from a university which has an enrollment of 9,000 students, but it is not a designated Federal depository. Forty miles away from this institution is another college which was designated 50 years ago and has an enrollment of only 600 students. This will not take away from the college with 600 students its designation, but it likely permits the university with 9,000 students to secure a depository status and thus avail itself of these Government publications.

I might say that none of these are in my district. There is no library in my district that I know of that now desires to be designated. I have no personal interest in it whatever. It came before my subcommittee as one of those matters which needed attention, and we spent some time trying to write the best piece of legislation that could be drafted on this broad subject.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS. I yield to the majority leader.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I want to compliment the gentleman because I know that he and the members of his subcommittee conducted hearings in various parts of the country. In fact they conducted very extensive hearings in the city of Boston.

Mr. HAYS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. HAYS. I yield.

Mr. MONAGAN. Am I correct in assuming that these depositories concern only, or primarily, the documents that are published by the Government itself?

Mr. HAYS. Only documents published by the Government. That is all this bill concerns.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

EXPLANATION OF PURPOSES AND OBJECTIVES OF H.R. 519

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks on the bill (H.R. 519), to revise the laws relating to Federal depository libraries, I have developed a list of important features contained in the proposal, and desire to set forth this series of simple statements explanatory of the various topics. While the House report accompanying the bill is lucid and clear in its analysis, I believe that a short condensed answer is very often of greater assistance to one who seeks information, and for that reason I have chosen a set of subjects and explanations which have been most frequently asked during our study of this important measure.

BETTER AND MORE SELECTIVE DISTRIBUTION OF GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS

The bill permits more effective distribution of Government publications to depository libraries, based on need together with more selectivity by libraries for publications they chose to receive.

STATUS QUO FOR PRESENT DEPOSITORIES—EXCEPTIONS

Presently designated depositories would retain their status, if desired, unless, found not to comply with requirements.

ADDED DEPOSITORIES

An additional depository could be designated by Representatives, Delegates, and Commissioners within their areas when the need for it is shown to exist, as outlined in the bill.

SELECTING PUBLICATIONS

An improved listing from which publications would be selected by depositories is provided in bill.

REPLACING EXISTING DEPOSITORIES

Replacement for depositories is provided in cases where they either cease to exist or fail to meet requirements for retaining designation.

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS OBTAINED FROM OTHER THAN GPO

Publications obtained by departments and agencies elsewhere than at the GPO would be distributed to depositories, when requested, thus fulfilling a need that has long been felt by these libraries.

EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS

Libraries of independent agencies as well as those of executive departments could, when needed, be designated depositories.

DISPOSAL OF OUTMODED PUBLICATIONS

Depository libraries could dispose of Government publications after 5 years if no longer needed.

REGIONAL DEPOSITORIES

In most States, one regional depository would probably be adequate. Only in a few States would two be considered necessary. Regional depositories would receive and retain copies of all Government publications; would provide interlibrary loan, reference service, and assistance to depositories in disposal of unwanted publications.

MICROFACSIMILE COPIES OF PUBLICATIONS

The Superintendent of Documents would be authorized to supply microfacsimile copies of Government publications to regional depositories after determining which of several existing forms is preferable. In microfacsimile form, as many as 400 pages can be put on a card the size of a single page. With an adequate reading device, it is as easy to read and as accessible as a book and takes a minimum of storge space. This form of reproduction is much desired by libraries which would be required to retain all Government publications.

Mr. SCHENCK. Mr. Speaker, our committee spent considerable time holding hearings on this proposed legislation both in 1957 and again in 1958. This legislation has been requested by the American Library Association for nearly 20 years. It is very meritorious. I know of no objection to it. I have no requests for time on this side.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCHENCK. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I notice that the budgetary amounts are not very great. Is this included in the budget, if the gentleman knows?

Mr. SCHENCK. My understanding is that it is included in the budget. It is also my understanding that it is very likely to result in substantial savings.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. SCHENCK. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on suspending the rules and passing the bill H.R. 519.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ECONOMY AS A SOURCE OF INCOME—TIME TO ACT

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, for many years the investigative committees of Congress, the two Hoover Commissions and many other objective groups have shown conclusively the great overlapping, duplication and waste in the military supply and service systems. Within the last year, the Comptroller General of the United States has issued some 200 reports from worldwide investigations which confirm the enormity of the mismanagement in the military supply and service systems.

I might add, Mr. Speaker, that the Department of Defense Reorganization Act of 1958 and prior statutes give the President and the Secretary of Defense adequate authority to develop an effective, efficient and economical supply and service setup for the Department of Defense.

There can be no better time to use this authority than right now. I hope that history will not record that a fatal amount of defense money was spent for fat instead of muscle.

One of the large supply management problems involves the disposal of surplus property.

Richard Fryklund had an excellent article on this subject in the Washington Star on March 15, 1959, which article I include as a part of my remarks:

PENTAGON PLANS $60 BILLION SURPLUS SALE—HUGE CLEANOUT HINGES ON ALTERING DISPOSAL CEILING

(By Richard Fryklund)

The Pentagon hopes to get rid of almost $60 billion worth of surplus defense equipment and supplies in a mammoth bargain sale and a giveaway-throwaway program.

Before the gigantic housecleaning can get under way, however, Congress must lift a $49-million-a-year spending ceiling on the disposal of surplus equipment. Assistant Defense Secretary E. Perkins McGuire will ask for that Wednesday in testimony before the House Appropriations Committee.

If Congress gives the go-ahead, work will begin this summer on emptying the Government's warehouses of surplus items which when new cost almost half again as much as is budgeted to operate the entire Defense Establishment for a year.

The 4-year return to the taxpayers should be about $10 billion. That includes savings through use of the surplus items by other Government agencies, reduced purchasing under procedures designed to hold down future accumulations of surplus, returns on sales of some of the items and savings in warehousing and other costs.

HOPE TO QUIET CRITICS

The Pentagon hopes its plan will quiet at least some of the congressional critics of the buildup of this huge surplus stock.

But Congressmen have served notice on Defense officials that not all of their surplus problems were over. First, disposal of the surplus would not cure what these congressional critics say is the cause of the surplus—nonunified purchasing and handling of supplies. Also, there are good indications that Congress will not vote to remove the spending ceiling on the Pentagon's disposal operations, although it may relax it.

How does the Defense Department happen to have this mountain of unwanted equipment and supplies?

The answer depends on where you ask the question. In the Pentagon they say a large surplus is the price of a large, modern Military Establishment. If the Nation wants its Armed Forces to have billions of dollars' worth of the latest equipment, and if the equipment is not destroyed in a war, then a certain percentage of it will become obsolete each year.

STORAGE COSTS HIGH

In the past this old equipment has not been disposed of quickly enough. It has piled up in the form of aged tanks, planes, ships, shoes, bulldozers, rifles, and spare parts which bulges warehouses all over the country and costs more than $100 million a year just for storage and handling.

The admitted errors of the past, the Pentagon says, will be corrected over the next 4 years if Congress approves the giant disposal program.

Many Congressmen say the Pentagon is telling only part of the story. Men like Senator DOUGLAS, Democrat, of Illinois, and Representative MCCORMACK, House majority leader, say one reason for the mountains of surplus is that too much was bought in the first place.

These Congressmen are trying again this year to get the Defense Department to expand its unified purchasing program—the only way, they say, that wasteful and duplicated purchasing can be avoided.

But whether or not the backlog could have been avoided, the Pentagon has a colossal task ahead of it.

MUCH WILL BE JUNKED

Some $26.7 billion worth of surplus is now ready for processing. It accumulates at the rate of about $9 billion a year. So during the 4-year disposal program another $36 billion worth of material will pile up.

If the program is successful, about $10 billion worth of the total will be used by other Government departments, foreign allies, schools, hospitals and so forth. Almost $48 billion worth will be sold or junked. Only $5 billion worth will be left over.

These are the official valuations put on the material by the Pentagon and Congress. Government accounting procedure requires every item to be listed at its original cost to the Government, no matter how worn it is or what it would be worth on the open market. For instance, a staff automobile bought 5 years ago for $2,000 is still valued at that price, even though after years of hard use it could bring only $200 or $300 on the used-car market.

AIRCRAFT BARGAINS

Recently the Air Force sold a batch of obsolete aircraft, carried on the books at $241 million, for $6 million. Some obsolete tanks valued at $4.3 million were sold by the Army for $30,000. And some old ships valued at $106 million went for $2.4 million.

Except for ammunition, 70 percent of the surplus material is used, even though depreciation does not show up in the bookkeeping.

Most of the surplus is hardware—fighting machinery, spare parts, communications equipment, and the like. About 10 percent is consumable—items like uniforms, medical supplies, food.

The Defense Department has been nibbling at its surplus mountain ever since World War II, but without impressive results. The fact is the military services don't like to admit anything is surplus. The attitude is, "Let's keep it. Who knows, maybe someday it will come in handy."

But now all three services have new programs to determine what is really necessary now or as wartime reserve and to get rid of the rest.

NINETEEN HUNDRED AND SIXTY PROGRAM SCHEDULED

The Defense Department unloaded $1.7 billion worth of surplus in fiscal year 1956, $4.1 billion in 1957, $6 billion in 1958, and expects to increase that to $8 billion in the current fiscal year. The new program would get under way in fiscal 1960—starting this July.

Disposals would rise to $10 billion in 1960 and then to about $12 billion a year until the bulk has been removed. After that, disposals would about equal the annual expected input of surplus material—some $9 billion worth a year.

Total savings to the taxpayer in the 4-year program are hard to estimate. Assistant Secretary McGuire can only point out that receipts from sales should total about $1.3 billion and that storage costs should be reduced by $216 million.

In addition, there will be a savings through utilization of part of the surplus by other departments of the Government, which would otherwise buy the material on the open market.

It would not seem out of line, however, to estimate that the savings could total up to $10 billion in 4 years.

At the same time, disposal operations would cost $416 million. Half of that would be spent to demilitarize equipment—change it from something useful solely to the Armed Forces to something useful by civilians.

Right now Congress says the Pentagon cannot spend over $49 million a year on surplus disposal and that money must come out of receipts from sales.

Mr. McGuire plans to ask Congress to authorize whatever spending is necessary to carry out the program. But Representative MAHON, Democrat, of Texas, chairman of the House Military Appropriations Subcommittee, says he won't go along.

"We want them to have some flexibility," he said, "so they may be able to justify an increase. We have raised the ceiling from time to time in the past. But I don't think the ceiling should be removed."

The Assistant Secretary believes he could launch the program effectively for $104 million, but the ceiling ultimately would have to go to $112 million a year.

Even if Mr. McGuire gets his money, Congressmen are expected to hammer at the waste and duplication in military purchasing and supply policies.

NEW SYSTEM IN VOGUE

Integrated, single-manager purchasing systems now exist for several types of items—food, clothing, medical supplies, and petroleum. But when the Defense Secretary tries

to extend the single-manager system to other items, the services object strenuously. Even though all three use, for instance, the same types of communications equipment, they believe they can be properly supplied only if they do it themselves.

This adds to the surplus, Congressmen say. Also, the purchasing, storage, and distribution systems are so uncoordinated, they say, excessive waste is found everywhere spot checks are made.

The Comptroller General found the Air Force did not know it had surplus R–2800–103 aircraft engines available for conversion to R–2800–54 engines. It set out to buy new "54" engines until it was told about the "103's." It used the 103's and saved $435,000, the Comptroller General reported recently.

Again, the Navy failed to report a million dollars' worth of unneeded helicopter parts even though the Army was buying just such parts. This was stopped after a Comptroller General report, and $720,000 was saved.

The Pentagon does not deny these horrible examples. But it says it is making heroic efforts to avoid them.

LEASE BUILDINGS FOR NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H.R. 4913) to amend the National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958 to authorize the National Aeronautics and Space Administration to lease buildings in the District of Columbia for its use.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I shall not object, do I understand that the committee will scrutinize any leases that are entered into by the General Services Administration before they become effective?

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. The gentleman may be assured of that fact. I saw the article to which the gentleman referred. I was surprised by it, and he may be assured that the committee will carefully watch this matter.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER. For the information of the gentleman, there has been written into this bill the same safeguards that the Committee on Armed Services exercises over leases of real estate.

Mr. GROSS. I would say to the gentleman that I should hope there would be more safeguards than are written into some of the contracts entered into by the military services. If the gentleman was here this morning, he heard me refer to the leasing of space by the military over here in the Arlington Towers apartment building. I think that is one of the reasons why the lease that was suggested for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, which they attempted to enter into with Arlington Towers, was not consummated. It was because of the fact that some of us are delving into that contract which was entered into by the military, and perhaps the people who are operating that apartment house are beginning to understand that they may be in difficulty over the contracts entered into with the military.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. I understand the gentleman's solicitude; I have read the article. We shall carefully watch this matter.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman and, Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 203(b)(3) of the National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958 is amended by inserting after "or any interest therein" the following "(including buildings or parts of buildings in the District of Columbia acquired for the use of the Administration under leases for periods not exceeding ten years)".

With the following committee amendment:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following: "That the National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958, section 203(b)(3), be amended by inserting the following after the semicolon following the phrase 'continental United States': 'to acquire by lease or otherwise, through the Administrator of General Services, buildings or parts of buildings in the District of Columbia for the use of the Administration for a period not to exceed ten years without regard to the Act of March 3, 1877 (40 U.S.C. 34)'."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce may have permission to sit during general debate this week.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATION BILL, 1960

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 5676) making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of said District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1960, and for other purposes; and pending that motion, I ask unanimous consent that general debate on the bill be limited to not to exceed 2½ hours, ½ to be controlled by the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. RHODES] and the other half by myself.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H.R. 5676, with Mr. PRICE in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, this is the annual appropriation bill for the financial operation of the District of Columbia Government. As the committee report indicates, we are asking you to approve a bill recommending appropriations of $237,186,112. This is a reduction of $9,511,888 in the budget estimates but an increase of $33,152,652 above funds appropriated to date in fiscal 1959.

There are two significant points, in my opinion, relating to this bill.

One is the fact that the bill recommends appropriations from the general fund of the District totaling $1.6 million more than presently anticipated revenues. It can be argued that there is no need for the committee to recommend an unbalanced budget. All we have to do is recommend an increase in the Federal payment and we could eliminate the deficit.

But despite some objections to the contrary, the committee has already approved a 25 percent increase in this Federal appropriation. In my opinion, this is a significant factor in the fiscal relationship between the District and the Federal Government. I might add parenthetically here that I have seen very little mention of this increase of $5 million.

Rather than being pleased with this increase, the press and other individuals comment about the reduction of $7 million from the authorization. The point that everybody seems to overlook is that, to date, the District Government has never received more than $20 million as a Federal payment from the U.S. Treasury and this bill increases the prior maximum by $5 million.

We have had presented to us the argument that the $32 million Federal payment is authorized by law; therefore, the committee has no choice but to recommend the full authorized Federal payment. However, the committee believes that this authorization is no different from any other of the very numerous authorization acts passed by Congress. In the normal course of legislative procedure, each program requiring the expenditure of funds from the Federal Treasury is reviewed and the funds necessary to carry out the proposed program are approved—usually in an amount less than that originally authorized.

This year the District budget proposed the expenditure of $246.7 million. Of this total budget $201,372,000 was proposed to be financed from the general fund. To finance this portion the District anticipated $151.3 million in various

taxes, $19.5 million as a loan from the Federal Treasury and $32 million as a Federal payment. Last year this same portion of the budget was financed by $146.75 million in District revenues, and a $20 million Federal payment. In other words, to finance this greatly increased budget in 1960, the District has increased its tax revenues by about $4.6 million and asked the Federal Government to increase its share of the expenses by $12 million in cash authority to borrow $19.5 million at a comparatively low rate of interest from the Federal Treasury.

The committee does not feel that the District has shown enough initiative and responsibility to finance such an increased budget. The District seems to want to rely solely on Uncle Sam for the solution to its financial problems. Therefore, the committee has approved a budget in excess of anticipated revenues. While this is not a direct mandate from the Congress to increase taxes to finance the approved budget—and incidentally a property tax increase of only about 7 cents or 3 percent is all that is necessary to eliminate the "deficit"—the Commissioners have the option of reviewing the necessity for the 598 new positions, and some of the new, improved, or expanded services approved by the committee. They can pick and choose, or if each new position or each new improved service is of critical importance to the District, then and only then are the Commissioners obligated to increase taxes.

The second point is a connection with the motor vehicle parking fund which will have a surplus of $2.6 million on this coming June 30. In addition, the Commissioners recently increased the rate on parking meters from 5 to 10 cents. I have some reservations on the wisdom of that decision. Rather than trying to attract the shoppers to the downtown area, the Commissioners seem bent on driving still more shoppers to the shopping centers in the suburban areas. But enough on that point. The committee has recommended that the Commissioners proposed legislation which would abolish the parking fund as such; thereby providing additional revenue to the general fund. If the Commissioners follow the committee's suggestion on this point, instead of a deficit of $1.6 million in the general fund, there will be a surplus of $1 million.

Out of all these words one point is obvious, I hope, and that is the committee's concern about the responsibility of the District to finance the improved municipal services it seems to want rather than relying solely on the Federal Government. I note in this connection that the U.S. Census Bureau recently issued the results of a study of the total State and local taxes per $100 of personal income of citizens of the 48 States and the District of Columbia. In this study the District ranks 46th. The only States in which the citizens have a lesser tax burden are Ohio, Missouri, and Delaware.

There are several other items in the bill which I believe I should mention for your information.

Under the public school appropriation we have made several reductions in the various activities of the school system and we have reallocated this reduction of $266,000 to a new program to provide lunches to the children attending elementary schools who—for one reason or another—are in need of such assistance.

The subcommittee has been concerned about this problem for over a year and in our report last year we directed the District government to submit a program to feed these children—estimated to be about 7,300 students by the school officials. The Commissioners proposed a pilot program of feeding about 1,000 students in 11 elementary schools at a cost of $133,000. In effect, we have doubled the size of the program recommended by the Commissioners.

In the Department of Public Health, we have included an unbudgeted $50,000 to finance a roving medical team that will administer prenatal care to prospective mothers. We did so because we received testimony both from the departmental witnesses and some of the witnesses we heard during our all-day session of public hearings relative to the very high infant mortality rate in the District. The rate here is the highest of 16 comparable sized cities in the United States. The addition of another medical team should help in reducing this tragically high rate.

Last year, as a result of our investigation of the Health Department and, in particular, District of Columbia General Hospital, we approved a rather substantial increase in the hospital's budget, amounting to $1.6 million. Again, in this budget, we have recommended another substantial increase of about $1 million. Since the increase in 2 years will be over $2.6 million, the committee has put the Department on notice that future increases will have to be fully justified on the basis of either increased workload or increased costs.

In the Department of Public Welfare, the budget requested 215 new jobs and we have recommended 133. The total reduction of $306,000 was reallocated by us to the public assistance activity as the number of recipients of public assistance grants is increasing very rapidly. A table on page 918 of the hearings indicates this trend. In January 1957 the number of cases was 8,482. In January of 1959, the number is 10,798, an increase of 2,316 in just 2 years.

The surprising thing—and this is contrary to most opinions on this subject of public assistance—is that most of the mothers—about 34 percent—receiving aid under this program were born in the District.

Another statistic is, again contrary to public opinion, that the average length of time that an individual receives such public assistance is only about 2¼ years.

After a careful analysis of the public building construction budget, the committee reduced the estimate by $5.3 million. There are two projects that make up most of the reduction. One was a request for construction funds in the amount of $2.7 million for a new junior high school. The other request was for $1.7 million for a new warehouse.

We also had a request this year for $800,000 to buy a little over an acre of land—near the new State Department building. The agency proposed to build over a period of years an undeground parking garage costing about $5 million, primarily for the convenience of Federal employees in the area. The testimony confirmed that this was an economically unsound project and the committee denied the request.

In summary, I would say that this is a good bill. It does not provide everything the Commissioners requested but no agency in the bill will lose a single employee as a result of the committee's action. Therefore, I urge your support of it.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RABAUT. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I notice the report states that this bill is $33 million more than recommended last year. What is the principal item that brings about the increase?

Mr. RABAUT. The cost of last year's Pay Act had a good deal to do with it. We also have some new facilities that must be manned.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RABAUT. I shall be pleased to yield.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. I wonder if the gentleman can tell me whether there was any testimony before his committee concerning a request for additional pay for athletic coaches?

Mr. RABAUT. We did not have a specific request for that purpose although we did receive some testimony on the subject.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. There is not before the committee at the present time a request respecting higher salaries for them than for other teachers?

Mr. RABAUT. There is nothing recommended to our committee for that purpose.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. I am very glad to hear that. It seems to me in this day and age of space flight and sputniks that certainly teachers of science, teachers of mathematics, teachers of languages, should receive at least as high a salary as those people who are in the athletic department.

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RABAUT. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. FOLEY. If I understand correctly the gentleman stated that the District stands 46th in the total amount of taxation derived from the individual citizen.

Mr. RABAUT. According to this study the rate in the District of Columbia is $14 and some cents less than the average for the country.

Mr. FOLEY. And the city stands 46th in a total of 49 States?

Mr. RABAUT. Yes; it is fourth from the bottom in taxes that are paid on $100 of personal income.

Mr. FOLEY. Am I correct in understanding that Congress decides what the tax rate shall be?

Mr. RABAUT. The real estate tax rate is determined by the Commissioners, by those who make a study of the fiscal affairs of the District. That is

why this committee suggested that they have a program to equalize the tax rates to have some sort of balance. Some properties in the District of Columbia had not been reappraised for about 30 years.

Mr. FOLEY. Just a couple of questions concerning this additional $7 million in the Federal contribution raising it to $32 million. Was the committee satisfied that the Commissioners have presented justification for their request for the additional $7 million?

Mr. RABAUT. May I say that the Commissioners represent the city and the citizens are very willing to live here and they live well. This is a fine city. But the question in the committee's mind is: Who is going to pay for it?

Mr. FOLEY. It is the recommendation of the committee that the citizens of the District pay that extra amount?

Mr. RABAUT. Yes.

Mr. FOLEY. Finally, in the gentleman's opinion, what would assist the District in solving these problems and concentrating on the $7 million of services needed to complete the $246 million budget that the District has proposed? Would home rule help?

Mr. RABAUT. If they had home rule, I think they should be treated the same as any other State in the Union. We have Federal installations in many States and in some States to a greater extent than in the District of Columbia. We do not give a Federal payment to those States. If the District wants to be a State maybe they would be face to face with that argument for the first time.

Mr. FOLEY. Would the District be better equipped under the home rule system to meet these services?

Mr. RABAUT. That problem belongs to them.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RABAUT. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Did I understand the gentleman to say that there has been no reappraisal of some property in the District of Columbia for tax purposes in 30 years?

Mr. RABAUT. Up to 3 years ago there were some pieces of property that had not been looked at in that length of time. They did go up and down in value but there was no attention paid to reassessing the property. When we initiated this program to equalize real property tax burden, we wanted everybody to be treated alike. They came up with an improved revenue also, insofar as their own treasury is concerned, of about $4 million a year. This increased revenue will be realized in the fiscal year beginning this coming July 1. However, the committee was somewhat surprised to discover that the new positions requested in the budget totaled exactly $4,105,829.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman. I certainly do not question the gentleman, but it is an almost unbelievable situation that there had not been a reappraisal of property in the District for 30 years.

Mr. RABAUT. It certainly was a surprise to the committee, too.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RABAUT. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I want to commend the gentleman for the effort he has made in trying to deal with this most difficult problem. After the work he has done and the committee has done, we find they are favored in the District by a great deal, comparing their figures against other States of the Union. They pay a lot less than our State, for instance.

Mr. RABAUT. They are fourth from the bottom.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RABAUT. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I want to commend the gentleman for what looks like a saving, but what is in effect actually spending more money.

I want to know if it is the gentleman's opinion that the Commissioners are never going to take on this job until they are faced with the necessity of having to find this money and not get it from the Congress. Are they not going to do the job until they are forced to do it?

Mr. RABAUT. If the gentleman will read the editorials in yesterday's and today's papers, he will find that they have a lot of people defending them.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Of course, those people live here in the District of Columbia and are the benefactors of all the advantages they have had. I have been talking about this tax situation in the District of Columbia for the last 10 years. I wasted 6 years of my time on the District of Columbia Committee, and I finally gave up in disgust and figured I made my contribution, let somebody else take it over. I was fighting a losing battle because of the fact these people in the District of Columbia are not paying their fair share of the cost of government. I am getting so tired of it that I do not intend to vote for any appropriation for the District of Columbia until we get a tax rate that is fair.

I would like to ask another question. I notice in the operating expenses in the executive department, for operation of the Executive Office of the District of Columbia, the committee recommends an appropriaton of $576,000. Then the report points out this is a reduction or $84,000, but an increase of $176,500 above the 1959 appropriation. If my figures are correct, that is an increase of more than 40 percent in that one office. I notice the positions that are allowed include seven new positions.

I do not know what the seven positions are. Some of them are very minor positions, it would seem, and yet we are going to spend $176,000 more, and that is 40 percent more for that one department. Now, I do not know how we can justify that big an increase. I want to commend the chairman; you have been trying to do a good job, and if you could get some more people to support you, I think you could get it handled properly. I appreciate what the gentleman has done, but some in our Congress and some people on the committee are not taking this thing seriously, and they are not making these people in the District of Columbia pay their fair share. That is all I want them to do. How can you justify a 40-percent increase in that one office?

Mr. RABAUT. I would have to have the figures before me to answer that question properly and I shall be happy to do so later.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. WEAVER] may extend his remarks immediately following my own remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, I wish to begin my presentation by paying a very profound and sincere tribute to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT]. This is the first session that I have been on the Committee on Appropriations and on the District of Columbia Subcommittee. The guidance of the gentleman from Michigan, his knowledge of the District of Columbia, and his knowledge of the fiscal affairs of the District, in my opinion, are invaluable as far as the Congress of the United State is concerned and also as far as the District is concerned.

Mr. Chairman, I deplore the fact that many people in the District do not appreciate the hard work and, I think, the fine results obtained by the District of Columbia Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations and particularly by the gentleman from Michigan. In my opinion, the work of this committee has done much to keep the District in line as far as its expenditures are concerned, and at the same time to condition the thinking of the people of the District and the Commissioners for the future growth which this city must and will attain. It is a rapidly growing community, a rapidly changing community, it is a community in which there is great need for expansion of public facilities; it is a community which is unique in this country, if not in the world, insofar as it is a city and yet it is not a city, insofar as it is a political entity and yet it is not a political entity, and insofar as its board of governors, so to speak, is the Congress which also controls the whole country in which this particular entity is situated. We of the Congress are the board of governors, the city council, if you will, of the District of Columbia. Our particular committee has the responsibility of approving the money which the District government must spend. This money, or most of it, is raised by the District of Columbia itself by laws of taxation which are passed by the Congress.

Some of the money is paid by the Federal Government. In the past, and I suppose it will be true in the future also, one of the greatest guessing games at this time of any year is what the Federal payment to the District of Columbia should or will be. This year, since we had passed in the last session of Congress a pay increase bill which has cost the District of Columbia government

some $15 million, it became obvious that the Federal payment should be increased.

As a new member of the committee I tried, and the rest of the members tried also, and I think we have been somewhat successful, to rationalize and in some way perhaps to systematize the Federal payment to the District of Columbia. I feel that this payment should somewhat reflect the amount of money which the Federal Government would pay on the property which it owns in the District of Columbia just as if it were an ordinary taxpayer. This amount of money, applying the same rates which the District of Columbia Commissioners submitted to the Congress as the rates which it intended to charge the real property taxpayers of the District, would have amounted to some $22.5 million. In order to be very fair we also took not only the assessed valuation estimate of the Federal property but also the assessed valuation estimate of the embassies of foreign governments located in the District of Columbia. Then in utter fairness we thought, since the District of Columbia at the behest of this committee, reevaluated its assessed property valuations—which will amount to a 9 percent increase in the real property tax of the District—we increased our own estimated tax by 9 percent, and we came up with a figure which is just over $25 million.

The Federal payment to the District of Columbia General Fund for this fiscal year is the sum of $25 million as far as the House of Representatives Appropriations Subcommittee of the District of Columbia is concerned, and we hope as far as the House itself is concerned.

I do not know of anybody who is a member of the subcommittee or a member of the full committee who does not have every desire in the world to be utterly fair with the District of Columbia. I do not know of any Member of Congress who does not want to be utterly fair. I understand that there has been criticism of the way the Congress has run this city in the past, and I do not say that much of it is not justified. However, I want to make it crystal clear that in my opinion this city is not neglected by the Congress as so many people feel it is. In my opinion this city has many advantages because of the fact that it is a Federal city, because of the fact that it has the Congress of the United States and the President acting as its governing body.

To be a little more specific about this bill and some of the problems facing the District of Columbia let me talk for just a moment concerning the situation of general assistance and relief. The figures which we have on page 918 of the hearings indicate that public assistance cases increased from a monthly total in January of 1957 of 8,482 to a monthly total in January of 1959 of 10,798. That is an increase of some 2,400 cases from 1957 to 1959, or just 2 years. The percentage is some 25 percent. The amount of money is, in January of 1957, $639,550 and January of 1959, $1,008,839, or an increase of some $370,000 per month for public assistance cases, in 2 years.

I asked during the hearings why this was so. Of course, there are various reasons as to why the caseload would increase that much. First we ruled out the possibility that there was a seasonal increase; there was not. And then I asked this question of Mr. Shea, the Director of the Department of Public Welfare:

> How does the level of general assistance in the District of Columbia compare to that in Maryland and Virginia?
>
> Mr. SHEA. The District of Columbia average grant on general public assistance in December of 1958 was $72.60, and the average grant for the State of Maryland was $57.41, and for the State of Virginia it was $37.01.

In other words, Mr. Chairman, the average public assistance grant for the District of Columbia was almost double that of the State of Virginia and it was about one-quarter greater than that of the State of Maryland.

Next I asked Mr. Shea:

> So we are a high island surrounded by a desert as far as the public assistance people are concerned?

The answer was:

> Yes, sir.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. BAILEY. That difference is probably due to the fact that there has been no distribution of surplus foods in the District of Columbia; so part of that load in Virginia and Maryland has been shifted over to surplus food supplies to the Department of Public Assistance.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. It is my understanding, I will say to the gentleman, that there has been such a program for some time.

Mr. BAILEY. But just in the last 60 days?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I will yield to the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. RABAUT. The program was started in 1957 and we have in this bill $161,000 for that purpose.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. The gentleman from Michigan has talked about the tax rate more ably than I would be able to do, but I just want to reiterate that this budget we present as the budget for the fiscal year 1960 for the District of Columbia is $1,600,000 more than the anticipated revenue. However, the anticipated revenue is based on a tax rate of $2.30 per hundred of assessed valuation. This is an estimate until July 1. The District Commissioners may change that estimate and may either raise it or lower it. In order to balance this budget it would be necessary for the District Commissioners to have a tax rate of $2.37 per $100, or 7 cents per $100 higher than they had estimated previously. This is an increase of less than 5 percent.

I may say also, Mr. Chairman, that even considering the fact that the District of Columbia now assesses on the basis of about 50 percent of market value, and in my congressional district we assess on the basis of 33⅓ percent, a little arithmetical interpolation shows that there is not one single school district in Maricopa County, Ariz., which does not have a combined tax rate of at least double the tax rate of the District of Columbia. I do not say that in pride; I say it merely in explanation of the fact that I find it impossible to believe too much of what I read in some of the papers and hear as to the burden of taxation which many people in the District of Columbia feel they are bearing. I believe they must pay their full share. I think they must look to their own resources in the future, and I hope they will, because this is a great city and the District of Columbia residents can help to make it greater, but it is not to be done at the expense of the taxpayers of the rest of the country.

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I yield.

Mr. FOLEY. Sir, I note the gentleman from Arizona states that he is a new member of the subcommittee on appropriations for the District of Columbia. I am also a new member of the legislative committee on the District of Columbia. I am particularly interested in the gentleman's views as a new Member. I know the gentleman has given very careful and thoughtful attention to this, as to the possible ultimate solution of this annually recurring problem of the District of Columbia financing these services for the citizens of the District of Columbia. My question is this: Inasmuch as the gentleman recommends that the District of Columbia citizens look to their own resources for the support and financing in major part of these services, I wonder if in your mind home rule for the District of Columbia would contribute to the lessening of the pressure on this Congress for Federal payments and to the education of the people of the District of Columbia to the shouldering of these particular services for which they are now coming to the Congress for assistance.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Of course, the gentleman from Maryland, I am sure, is aware of the fact that the Committee on Appropriations does not have jurisdiction of that particular matter. The legislative committee, of which the gentleman is a member, does have jurisdiction of that. Personally, as far as home rule is concerned and as it concerns the fiscal position of the city of Washington, I would venture to say that if the city of Washington had home rule, it would be treated the same as any other State in the United States is treated insofar as Federal payments are concerned. In other words, if we are speaking only of the fiscal situation, it would be my thought that probably the city of Washington would lose whatever Federal payment that it now receives except insofar as those payments are for services rendered. I might add, in addition to the $25 million which this bill recommends the Congress appropriate to the general fund, we also appropriate funds to the water fund in the amount of $1,532,000 and to the sanitary sewerage works fund in the amount of $686,000. This money is paid for services rendered. These latter two payments would continue no matter whether the District of Columbia had home rule or did not have home rule. But, I doubt very much whether the Congress would be inclined to pay an-

nually to the District of Columbia $22 million, $25 million, or $30 million, or whatever figure it might be any more than it would be inclined to pay the city of New York, for instance, payments in lieu of property taxes for the Federal installations in that city.

Mr. FOLEY. One last question, sir, and I thank the gentleman very much. This inquiry by the subcommittee that the gentleman is a member of is confined basically to determining the extent of the Federal payment; is it not? Or does it go into the total of the proposed $246.7 million budget?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. We went into the total budget very carefully.

Mr. FOLEY. But the extent of the Federal responsibility is limited solely to $25 million plus Federal payment; is that correct, sir?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. No, sir; it is not correct. We appropriate money which is collected by the tax laws which the Congress passed applying to citizens of the District of Columbia. This money is collected and then appropriated by the Congress of the United States—every bit of it.

Mr. FOLEY. That is the total budget of $240 million and some odd?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. That is correct.

Mr. FOLEY. May I ask the gentleman this question? Of course, the gentleman does not have to answer it. Inasmuch as the appropriation is the heart and soul, the body and bone and marrow of the government for the District of Columbia, and inasmuch as it provides the wherewithal for those services, would home rule or would the self-governing function, if it rested with the people of the District of Columbia, in your judgment, as a new member of the Appropriations Subcommittee, facilitate the satisfying of these pressures on the Federal Government and relieve them so far as the pressure is concerned?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Well, I think I answered the gentleman's question a little while ago. I do not claim to have any crystal ball that allows me to look that far into the future. I think I know a little bit about human nature, but not enough to psychoanalyze 850,000 people to the extent the gentleman seems to desire that I do.

Mr. FOLEY. No, I am not asking the gentleman to do any psychoanalyzing. I am asking for your opinion as an expert on the Appropriations Subcommittee.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I must disavow the title of expert because I have not tried to put myself out as an expert on the subject of home rule. The gentleman lives in this area and I might ask him how he feels about it.

Mr. FOLEY. Well, of course, you can probably gather how I feel about it. I am very strong for home rule. I feel that if the people of the District of Columbia have to look to their own resources for the future, they should have the legislative means of accomplishing that purpose.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Of course, I do not want to be misunderstood. I do not think the Federal payment of $25 million was exactly kicking the District of Columbia out the front door or even out the back door. My only point was that in the future it will be, I think, necessary for the District of Columbia government to make sure that it provides the means of financing at least its share of any improvements that it requests. This budget which came up from the District Commissioners, in my opinion, was unrealistic because it would be completely unbalanced unless the Federal Government put in $32 million as a Federal payment.

Mr. FOLEY. What is the share of the District of Columbia? You said they should finance their share.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Their share of the $237 million?

Mr. FOLEY. Is it not 88 percent?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I have not figured the percentage of $237 million. The Federal Government pays $27,218,000. If the gentleman wants to get out his pencil and figure the percentage, he may do so.

Mr. FOLEY. The gentleman made the statement that the District should finance its share. I was wondering what you meant, in your own terms.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I do not have any particular percentage in mind. I have our Federal Government's share, and that is the position we would be put in as a property owner, the same as any other taxpayer. As to the services rendered by the District, this is a figure that the District Commissioners figure out themselves.

Mr. SANTANGELO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I yield.

Mr. SANTANGELO. Is it not a fact that in addition to the $25 million Federal payment, a grant of one-half million dollars for public assistance is given to the District?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. The gentleman is absolutely correct, and there are other Federal payments made which are concealed—not concealed knowingly, but they are concealed in this budget.

Mr. SANTANGELO. And in addition to that, the Federal Government loans money to the District, some of it being interest free?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. That is correct.

Mr. SANTANGELO. And on the other loans, the rate is a very low rate?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. That is also correct.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I yield.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. I directed a question a few moments ago to the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee in regard to the amount paid to athletic coaches. Have extra payments to athletic coaches been contemplated?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I think it is definitely possible that this could be done. However, it would require authorizing legislation. If they needed some money for this purpose, it would also be necessary to ask for a supplemental appropriation. The gentlewoman is correct, that there was no request of this committee for such pay adjustments as the gentlewoman has suggested. I may say, as one member of the committee, if such adjustments were made without the knowledge and consent of this committee, I would be very unhappy.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. I am very pleased to hear the gentleman state that.

One other question in regard to the school lunch program: Is my understanding correct that at the present time there are no hot lunches for any of the youngsters in the elementary schools in the District of Columbia?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. That is correct. We have appropriated $266,000 to start a bag lunch program for some 2,000 children who are hungry and who cannot afford to bring lunches to school.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. But there are hot lunches that are provided for students in the high schools?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. In the high schools and also in the junior high schools.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Can the gentleman tell me how it was decided that it was more important to provide hot lunches for the students in the high schools than in the elementary schools?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I am sure that decision was made long before either the gentlewoman or I became Members of this body. I do not know the answer. Perhaps the chairman of the subcommittee can answer the lady.

Mr. RABAUT. The facilities to prepare a hot lunch are not in the elementary schools for one reason.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Does it cost more to provide facilities in the grade schools than in the high schools?

Mr. RABAUT. No; but when the schools were constructed they did not have those facilities, as it was felt that the children could walk to their homes at the noon hour for their lunch.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. It is my understanding—perhaps I am wrong—if the gentleman will yield for just one more question, that the elementary schools in the District have rather large enrollment; I am told as high as 1,500 or 2,000. Do not these pupils come from greater distances than the high school children?

Mr. RABAUT. I do not think so, unless it is for some special reason. The schools are placed in these areas predicated upon the population. In some places the population has grown, and then new schools are put adjacent thereto, not immediately adjacent, but some place quite close.

We are very much interested in the school lunch program; we want to give it this impetus in the elementary schools, and in order to get it started we have approved a bag lunch and milk program.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I might also say to the gentlewoman from Oregon that the committee was so interested in the program that it increased it to over 2,000 children; the committee felt the program was so important that we doubled the amount of money and at least doubled the number of children who will receive these bag lunches in the next fiscal year.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. I am very pleased to hear that, but it is still woefully inadequate. Can the gentleman

tell me the number of hungry children in the District schools?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Seven thousand.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Seven thousand?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. That is correct.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. So one hungry child out of seven hungry children will receive a school lunch under this program?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I would say to the gentlewoman, one out of three and a half.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. I am glad the committee has recognized that this problem exists here, but I must say that it is indeed shocking that here in the Capital of the United States, one of the wealthiest cities in the Nation, we find hungry children in our schools when we have such a surplus of food going to waste in the storage bins and warehouses of the country.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I might say to the gentlewoman from Oregon after talking to the members of the committee, I can assure her and other Members of the House that as rapidly as possible progress will be made in this field.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Your committee put in quite a long time of pretty hard work on this. You learned, did you not, that the people of the District of Columbia are highly favored in the way of steady jobs and no missing of pay checks?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. But I would remind the gentleman that notwithstanding that there is considerable poverty here in the District of Columbia.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. The people here have steady jobs, steady payrolls, and a comparatively steady employment. Why can they not feed their own children?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Of course there are people in the District of Columbia as there are in all wealthy cities who are not well off, many of them through no fault of their own, and the gentleman from Michigan also knows that I pointed out in answer to a question a while ago that of the money we are appropriating all but $25 million is supplied by the people of the District of Columbia.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Of course, no child should be permitted to go hungry; we are all agreed on that, but what puzzles me is why with almost continuous pay checks rolling out and steady employment, what is wrong in the District, what makes it necessary for these people to let their kids go hungry? Other people find a way to feed their children. What is wrong that there is such a desperate situation in the District of Columbia?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Maybe the gentleman from Michigan would like to answer that for himself; I cannot answer it for him.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. If I had any idea what the correct answer was, certainly I would not be asking about it. I understand they have here a guaranteed annual wage, too.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman from Michigan must remember that we are feeding people in underdeveloped areas all over the world. They must be taken care of first.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Are you advocating that we transport these children to these underdeveloped areas and feed them there?

Mr. GROSS. I am advocating that we use some of our surplus food to feed our own.

Mr. Chairman, I want to take this opportunity of commending the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT], and I am sure the gentleman from Arizona joins with me, for stopping this fantastic parking project that was being advocated for the District of Columbia. I want to commend both of you as well as the other members of the subcommittee.

Mr. IRWIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. IRWIN. Could the gentleman tell me if this budget that he is presenting here represents a cut in the administration proposals on this matter?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. The budget which we propose here today is below the estimates, that is correct.

Mr. IRWIN. To what extent?

Mr. SANTANGELO. $9,500,000 below.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. It is $9,500,000 below.

Mr. IRWIN. The committee is cutting the administration request by $9 million; is that correct?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. That is correct.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. REES. First, I want to tell the gentleman that we appreciate his analysis of this legislation. We know it is a difficult situation with which we are faced in regard to this tax business. But it is one we have been faced with over the years. This is repetitous perhaps but in view of the fact that we are favored here in the District of Columbia and rank probably as the 46th State in the amount of taxes we pay per $100 of personal income, does it not seem to the gentleman that somehow in some way we ought to say to the people who pay taxes here: All we want you to do is to pay your fair share. Can we not do that in this Congress? Are we helpless or what is the matter?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I will say to the gentleman from Kansas that is exactly the thing this committee is trying to do in submitting the type of budget we have submitted today.

Mr. REES of Kansas. We do not want the people of Washington, the property owners and taxpayers, to pay more than their share but we are trying to raise money to take care of the Government.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I agree with the gentleman.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Getting back to the hungry children, there are fairly large areas of so-called slums here in the District. Those children go to school too, and they need lunches, is that not true?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. If the gentlewoman characterizes some sections of Washington as slums, I would have to accept the word.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I do not like the word "slums," let us say underdeveloped.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Underdeveloped would be a very good word to use, or maldeveloped.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Or substandard.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Yes.

Mr. WEAVER. Mr. Chairman, this is the first time I am speaking on an appropriations bill as a member of the House Committee on Appropriations. It is a new experience for me and, frankly, a very interesting one.

I think that it is well that we in the Congress take a long, very careful look at the District of Columbia. It is unfortunate that in past years more care was not taken by the Congress as a whole to insure a more orderly development of this city's government. It has been a stepchild to a degree, and too often Members have treated it as an unwanted stepchild. Unlike Alaska, Hawaii, and Puerto Rico, the District has never had a voice on the floor of the House itself. As a member of the subcommittee on the District of Columbia appropriations bill, however, I soon learned that the District has a very loud voice of its own. Unfortunately, this voice tends to be discordant at times, and sometimes seems to sound a great deal louder than it actually should be.

For reasons known to themselves, the people of the District—and by that I mean the people of the District's government—appear to feel that they are in a category that differs vastly from every other agency of government. When the Congress cuts the budget of, say, the Department of Commerce, the Secretary and his people accept the cuts and go about the business of running their agency on the reduced funds. Not so the District of Columbia. They apparently think that they have some special place in the sun, and the noise created after a congressional cut is quite considerable. This does not endear these gentlemen either to the Congress as a whole or to your Committee on Appropriations. I have noticed through the years that the committee is thoroughly and constantly castigated by the public press of Washington, and the chairman of the subcommittee has frequently been harshly criticized because he takes the attitude that the taxpayers of his State, or any other State, have some right to say how their money is being spent. Twenty-five million dollars of the District of Columbia budget, or over 10 percent of the total, is supplied by the taxpayers from

Maine to Hawaii, and I think personally they have every right to ask us to guard their tax dollars. The District, however, seems to think it has a peculiar right to this money and that the general public of the rest of the Nation owes them something special and should not ask questions about it.

Mr. Chairman, the subcommittee increased the Federal share of the District of Columbia budget by $5 million this year. This is a 25-percent jump, which represents a pretty handsome increase. This, however, does not satisfy the District nor its government. They want more.

The reason we arrived at the $25 million figure is really quite simple. It represents the amount of money the Federal Government would be paying in property taxes if the Government were a private citizen and subject to these taxes.

For the information of those who complain that the Government ought to pay its fair share of the costs borne by the city for serving the Government, let me say this: We do.

Some examples come to mind. The Government pays its water bills to the District government and its sewage bills are paid. If the Government asks for special protection or special police help, as, for instance, we at the Capitol did after that unfortunate episode involving the Puerto Rican nationalists, then we recompense the District of Columbia government in full for the additional policemen assigned. We also pay our share of the costs of any investigatory work the Metropolitan Police Force performs on Capitol Hill.

These are but a few examples. I think, in general, the Federal Government is bearing its full and honest share of the cost of running the District government. The people of Washington itself must pay the rest.

When the budget was submitted to the Appropriations Committee, it was quite a bit bigger than the bill now before us. The committee chose to cut a number of items from the budget, some of them because they were obviously nothing but frills, some of them because they were wasteful. Specifically, we cut $800,000 from the budget request to buy land for a gigantic new parking garage for the Department of State employees. I voted for that cut because I do not like the idea of the Federal Government financing such a project and then turning it over to a private operator who could then charge the customers $20 monthly each to use the garage. That is $22,000 a month. Actually, this would not even pay the interest on the money spent, and amortize the garage facilities. We asked the District Commissioners why they felt the Government should undertake this project and were told that private garage operators just were not interested in investing their money, but if Uncle Sam was willing to make the investment for them, they most certainly were willing to reap the profits. It just did not make sense.

There are a number of areas in this budget where we made no cuts at all. These include the public schools which asked for $46,685,000 and was approved at that figure which is more than $6 million more than last year. The Library budget is up over last year, and was left uncut by the committee, along with several other departments. We made no really serious cuts in funds for either the police or fire departments. Personally, I have nothing but praise for these two agencies.

We did cut the frills. We did attempt to cut the waste. I think we did a remarkably good job in that.

Generally speaking, there are two ways of financing an increased budget such as the one the District Commissioners presented to us this year.

One method is to increase the burden on the American taxpayer generally by increasing the amount of money given by the Federal Government. This the committee refused to do and I think it did right in thus protecting the taxpayers' pocketbook.

The second way of accomplishing such an increase is through higher taxes. I would like to say this: As long as I have been in public life I have never voted to increase taxes for anyone. I have voted constantly to cut expenses rather than to force the public to dig deeper into its pocket. I am not going to start now, to force people who have no vote to pay higher taxes to support luxuries and waste. Therefore, it was my suggestion to the committee that we trim down the budget, rather than force the Commissioners to increase the property tax. I realize fully that the District's homeowners and businessmen have a tax advantage over many other localities in the country. Be this as it may, I do not think this is any time for the Congress to approve the kind of spending programs which would increase this tax burden they must carry.

For these reasons, Mr. Chairman, I think the bill submitted by the Committee on Appropriations is a good bill. I think it is based on sound principles. I most strongly urge the support of every Member of this House for that bill.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. NATCHER].

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Chairman, the Subcommittee on the District of Columbia of the Committee on Appropriations once again brings to the floor of the House for your approval the annual District of Columbia appropriations bill for the fiscal year 1960.

It has been a pleasure serving with our chairman, the able and distinguished gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT], and the other members of this committee. We were ably assisted by Francis Merrill, our staff assistant.

For years now we have been confronted with demands for home rule in the District of Columbia. As pointed out by one of the Washington papers, Congress and the President should work toward development of this city as the Capital of the United States and forget the play-acting diversion of some futile form of home rule which would delay rather than hasten that desirable and readily attainable development. A request for voting rights for the people in the District for President and Vice President and for representation in Congress by a nonvoting delegate might be the answer to the home rule plea. This change of that section of our Constitution which provides in part, "To exercise exclusive legislation in all cases whatsoever over such District—not exceeding 10 miles square—as may, by cession of particular States and the acceptance of Congress, become the seat of the Government of the United States, and to exercise like authority over all places purchased by the consent of the legislature of the State in which the same shall be for the erection of forts," and so forth, should be carefully considered by able lawyers because there is considerable doubt in my mind that any change would be constitutional unless approved by the States as provided for under article V, which provides for amendments to the Constitution. To say the least, the problems confronting the people in our Capital City are considerably more important than the home rule play-acting diversion which confronts the Congress each and every session. As pointed out further by one of the Washington papers, home rule is an unrealistic approach, and the government and development of the great Capital of a great country are responsibilities that Congress should discharge. I for one am willing to assume my part of that task.

The city of Washington is today one of the great cities in the world and as our Capital City it should be a model city in every respect. Every member of this House should take pride in the advancement and accomplishments of our Capital City.

The District of Columbia has changed considerably since April 15, 1791 when the cornerstone for the District of Columbia was laid on Jones' Point. Today the total population is about 825,000. There are 39,040 acres in the District of Columbia. The Federal Government owns 11,297 acres in the District excluding the streets, alleys and parkways. This represents 28.9 percent of the total acreage. To compensate for the land owned and controlled by the Government a Federal payment is made each year to the District. Such a payment has been made since the District was established. From 1924 to 1959 the payment has ranged from $4,539,295 to $20 million. The budget for the District during this period has increased from $23,923,754 to the amount recommended in the bill of $237,186,112.

You would naturally assume that the budget requests for fiscal year 1960, which establishes an alltime high would be carefully considered by the Bureau of the Budget. This is not the case. The exact amount requested was simply passed along to Congress with no changes, reductions, or suggestions. This fact was established during the hearings. In this year of budget balancing we have this type of budget for the District. With all of its serious problems brought about by the shifting of its population from section to section of the District and out of the District to Maryland and Virginia, we have pressure groups demanding that the Commissioners and Congress build more buildings and spend additional millions for services. Unsettled conditions

in this city should cause those interested in its future development to face the facts and attempt to formulate plans calling for reasonable expenditure of funds during this period of uncertainty. Instead of constructing some of the buildings requested for the District we should take a look around and try to decide just how many of the present buildings will be vacant and no longer needed as the direct result of the population changes within and outside the District.

The present tax structure of the District is low enough. A real estate tax of $2.30 per hundred, personal property tax of $2 per hundred, and a total tax burden of $68.58 per person per thousand of personal income is low when the national average is $83.42. We have reached the point when we must realize that the people who have carried the tax burdens of the District are rapidly leaving, and the demands continue for more projects and services costing millions of dollars.

The Commissioners of the District are in my opinion able men who are conscientiously attempting to meet the demands of all segments of the population in the District. They, too, should look around and join the Congress in recommending necessary expenditures for the most urgent needs. Instead of record budgets, more time should be given to solving present day problems and those which are bound to come up in the future.

The city with no water problem is the exception rather than the rule. The same applies to sewage disposal and water pollution. All are present today in the District of Columbia. They are more important than some of the requests made in this budget.

Our Police Department is one of the best in the country. We need the best. Our committee has joined hands with the Police Department during the past 4 years and recommended necessary funds for the full number recruited under the authorization allowed by Congress. Certainly we want to stop the murders, rapes, and yokings which take place all too often in the District. The people of this country should be able to visit their Capital City and have no fear of walking the streets during the day or at night. We recommend the sum of $21,750,000 for our Police Department, and if more is required in the future to prevent major crime, then we should appropriate the necessary amount.

In addition to our Police Department, our committee has, during the past 4 years, recommended additional appropriations which have produced results in our schools, hospitals, streets, welfare system, Fire Department, water, sewage disposal, pollution, and the many other governmental functions here in the District.

The practice established by our juvenile judge of waiving jurisdiction in cases involving 16- and 17-year-old juveniles who have committed felonies, with the boys having previous records in court, is to be commended. This action speeds up the processes of our juvenile court, and, at least places our Police Department in a position of knowing that juveniles with records, who are committing crimes almost daily, will be properly punished. In order to assist our Police Department, and our law-enforcement agencies generally, it is imperative that we now have another juvenile court judge to assist Judge Ketcham.

In this bill we recommend $266,000 to feed the hungry children of this District. So far, no money has been appropriated for this particular purpose. This is one of the serious problems of the District.

Our committee took a good look at the real-estate assessment in the District in 1955 and recommended the reassessment program which will be completed on June 30 of this year. The cost was $802,472 and the additional revenue will total $4 million annually. Many inequities were corrected, and the real-estate base was increased some $180 million. This has been one of the more serious problems facing the District.

The Department of Agriculture with its 80,000 plus employees serving 49 States only requested some 536 new employees for 1960, and most of these will be required under the new Poultry Act passed during the last session of Congress. Certainly the District with all of its many serious problems should not try to solve them by adding 939 new employees. This is the number requested for 1960. There are 23,689 persons presently employed by the District. Assistants to the assistants will not solve the problems of our Capital City.

Our school system is faced with problems which are related directly to the shifting of population in the District. Unless more careful attention is given to this problem, we will find a number of new buildings only partially used in certain sections and a shortage of buildings in other sections.

New business life in the downtown area is all important. Congress must join with the District government and save the downtown section. These people are the big taxpayers of the District—producing more and demanding less than all of the other sections combined. Cities are not outmoded and destined to die. They are here to stay and will continue to play a major part in our industrial, commercial, economic, and social way of life. A proper, balanced growth and expansion of our cities is one of the great domestic problems with which we are confronted today.

Abatement of pollution in the Potomac River and expansion of the water system are two of our major problems. Storm water sewers and expansion of the sewage treatment plant are now necessary. If it becomes necessary, the District must take a new look at the demands and dependence of other jurisdictions within the metropolitan area on our water system. Before too many years pass we may be forced to cut off the metropolitan area. We have no authority to extend the present 10 miles square, therefore, a weaning may be in the offing.

The District is financed out of five separate funds, a general fund, highway fund, motor vehicle parking fund, water fund, and a sanitary sewage fund.

The bill before us today calls for a Federal payment of $25 million. This bill provides for a Federal payment to the water fund of $1,532,000 and $686,000 to the sanitary sewage works fund.

In addition to receiving testimony from the officials of the District, we had before us representatives of civic organizations, parent-teacher associations and other organizations interested in the welfare of the Capital City. We carefully considered every request for fiscal year 1960.

Mr. Chairman, our committee recommends this bill to the Members of the House.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NATCHER. I yield to the gentlewoman from Oregon.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. I thank the gentleman for yielding to me. I share his high opinion of the distinguished gentleman from Michigan. I know of his sincere interest, and I think the very fact that the chairman of the subcommittee has paid attention to the hot-lunch program, and has called it to the attention of all of us in the House shows that he has performed a real service. It is my hope that the committee will be able to proceed in the next few years and not only feed 2,000 of the hungry children, but all of the children who are hungry in the District so that they may have the same kind of a lunch program that the children in the elementary schools in other States receive.

Mr. NATCHER. I thank the gentlewoman.

In addition, Mr. Chairman, to the $266,000 in this bill to take care of the hungry children in the District of Columbia, the chairman of this subcommittee, ever since he has served as chairman of the subcommittee, has seen to it that all the children of the District, not only the hungry children, but all the children have received the necessary protection. Mr. Chairman, it has been a pleasure serving on this committee with our new members. We have Mr. SANTANGELO here, of the great State of New York; Mr. RHODES, of the great State of Arizona; and Mr. WEAVER, of the great State of Nebraska. It has been a pleasure serving with our new members and also, as I pointed out in the beginning, it is a pleasure serving with our chairman, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT].

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NATCHER. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. MATTHEWS. I want to join with my colleagues in congratulating the distinguished chairman of this subcommittee [Mr. RABAUT] and our colleague from Kentucky [Mr. NATCHER] and the other members of this committee who have worked so hard on this appropriation bill.

As the gentleman knows, I am a member of the Committee on the District of Columbia. I am proud of the fact that this afternoon we have several very capable members of our committee here on the floor.

Would the gentleman agree with me that one of the biggest problems of the District is the fact that, according to the Commissioners themselves, the people that make the money to pay the taxes are more and more leaving the District?

Mr. NATCHER. The gentleman is entirely correct.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Would the gentleman agree with me that one of the problems that we are going to have o look into in the District is why that happens, and to see if something can be done to stop that rapid rate of transit from the city? It is my understanding that other cities in America have that same problem, of course, but would the gentleman agree with me that the problem is a little bit more intense in the District?

Mr. NATCHER. I agree with the gentleman. I think it is one of the more serious problems confronting the Congress of the United States.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SANTANGELO].

Mr. SANTANGELO. Mr. Chairman, at the outset I want to commend my chairman, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT], for the wonderful job he did as chairman of this committee and for the courtesy he shows to the witnesses and to the Commissioners when they appeared before the committee. It has been a great pleasure also to serve with the distinguished and able gentleman from Arizona [Mr. RHODES], the distinguished gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. NATCHER], and the distinguished gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. WEAVER].

This is my first year on the House Appropriation Subcommittee on the District of Columbia. I know that there are many people in this House who have served on the District of Columbia Legislative Committee and the Appropriation Subcommittee on the District of Columbia and they are more expert in this field than I. I believe that the expenditures provided for in this bill are amply justified by the evidence we had before the committee.

Much criticism is heard that the Federal Government does not contribute sufficient Federal funds to the District of Columbia and is abusing the residents of this area. In deciding what the Federal Government was to give the District, our objective was to equalize the burden of the District between the residents of the District and the Federal Government. In my opinion, the residents of the District have the right to receive fair treatment, to expect financial contributions from the Federal Government commensurate with the value of the land which the Federal Government occupies and the services it receives from the District of Columbia. In considering what is fair, we must not overlook the fact that the Capital is a mecca and millions of people flock here, not only during the cherry blossom time but throughout the year. By reason of these visitors and by reason of the thousands of governmental employees availing themselves of the hotel facilities and purchasing from the tradesmen, these industries are assured of continuous business and revenue.

In my opinion the residents of the District do not have the right to expect the Federal Government to solve all their problems. Federal money alone cannot solve their problems. They have a duty to call upon their property owners and the residents to contribute their fair share for the support of the District government.

Real estate has in the past been underassessed and the tax rate has been comparatively low. Our decision to approve $25 million Federal contribution was based upon what we believed was fair in the light of our objectives.

The committee recommends an appropriation of $237,186,112 for the operation of the District of Columbia government. The committee recommends an appropriation of $33,152,652 above the fiscal year 1959 appropriations, but a reduction of $9,511,888 in the budget estimates. I would like to point out to this House that the Bureau of the Budget does not pass upon or review the District of Columbia budget, but that we, the committee, pass upon it without any recommendations from the Bureau of the Budget. I believe that the Bureau of the Budget in the future should review the District budget and make recommendations. The $25-million Federal contribution we recommended is 25 percent more than the District of Columbia received in the fiscal year 1959. The amount we recommended for general fund expenditures was $1,600,000 more than anticipated revenues. We have directed attention of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to section 47–501 of the District of Columbia Code which states in essence that the District must levy sufficient taxes in addition to the Federal contribution to produce sufficient funds to defray the expenses of the District during the year. We have suggested to the Commissioners that they raise this additional $1,600,000 or if they do not wish to raise the tax rate, they should review the need for approximately 598 new positions which they have requested and which we recommended. They can do this by raising the real estate tax rate slightly or if they do not increase the tax rate for real estate for fiscal year 1960 they should cut out some of the jobs which they have requested.

One of the complaints which has been heard is that the Federal Government property is tax exempt and that the District therefore is denied the right to collect taxes on Federal property and on foreign embassies and on other miscellaneous real estate. We have computed the value of the exempt Federal and embassy property and have found the value to be $23,071,953. Adding the average increase of 9 percent in real property taxes which will result from the reassessment program which was initiated, the total value of the exempt property in the District of Columbia would be $25,148,428. Consequently we feel that the Federal contribution on the basis of the value of the exempt property is realistic and fair.

We have also heard complaints that the tax rate in the District is higher than the rate in the adjoining areas. Our examination has disclosed that the tax burden of the citizens of the District compares favorably with that of the surrounding metropolitan areas generally, and that, further, the city of Alexandria, Va., Fairfax County, Va., Montgomery County, Md., and Prince Georges County, Md., are proposing to increase the tax rate on their real estate ranging from 30 cents per hundred to $1.67 per hundred of assessed valuation. In order to raise the additional $1,600,000 of revenues, all that the Commissioners must do is to raise the tax rate approximately 7 cents per hundred. We do not believe that it is an excessive burden to them. The specific amount of proposed increases by the adjoining areas may be found on page 3 of the committee's report.

We have recommended increases in appropriations of fiscal year 1959 for almost all departments. We have provided for services to this community, increased the appropriation for the police and fire department in order to protect the citizens, expanded the school lunch program for the needy children in the elementary schools, increased the number of teachers to reduce the pupil-teacher ratio, increased the expenditures to staff two new libraries and provide a roving medical team to reduce the high mortality birth rate in this community.

Here I would like to interpolate and say that the Secretary of Agriculture has recommended a decrease in appropriations for the school lunch program throughout the United States while this committee has initiated a school lunch program for the needy children in the elementary schools of the District. This is a pilot proposition and when it is seen what is going to develop here I feel, as do many Members of the House, that the school lunch program will be one of the most worthy programs we have in this country and it should be expanded. It is inexcusable that the needy children in this community do not have a school lunch program. I shall favor school lunches in the future.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SANTANGELO. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. RABAUT. Relative to the suburban tax bill, this morning's Washington Post and Times Herald has a headline on page B–3: "Proposed Suburban Tax Bill Raised to $260 Million." I thought that should be in the RECORD.

Mr. SANTANGELO. We have increased the number of teachers somewhat to reduce the pupil-teacher ratio and we have increased the expenditures to staff two new libraries and provide a roving medical team to reduce the high mortality birth rate in this community. We have one of the highest mortality rates in the United States in this District of Columbia.

There is one final point that I would like to make. It is believed in some quarters that in the District of Columbia crime is rampant and uncontrolled.

That is contrary to the facts. There is crime, it is true, but the number of crimes in the District has steadily been reduced, and the District enjoys a police force is second to none. The number of crimes in the District has fallen from a high of 22,848 in 1948 to 16,354 in 1957. The authorized strength of the Police Department has been met and the members of the committee agree that the police force is one of the finest in the United States. Inquiry has disclosed that the percentage of the solution of crimes since the famous Mallory decision has not decreased but has increased, and the chief of police in explaining why the number of solutions of crimes has increased says that adversity brings out the best in them, and perhaps we shall reconsider the Mallory decision in the light of the statistics which have been submitted to this committee. If you seek additional information, the hearings will disclose the extent to which crime has dropped in the District of Columbia. In my opinion, gentlemen, the chairman of this committee and the committee have done a good job. This bill is fair and should be approved.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SANTANGELO. I yield to the gentlewoman from Oregon.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. As I understand, the D.C. General Hospital and the Glenn Dale Hospital are both District hospitals but Freedmen's is not; it is under the administration of HEW. There is a bill before your Committee on Education and Labor for a new Freedman's Hospital, and yet when the subcommittee went out there the other day we visited the tubercular annex building, and there are two floors that are not used at all. I am told there are 90 beds, but they are not used in any way. Could the gentleman advise me why there should be a request for a new hospital while two floors of a fairly modern building are not being used?

Mr. SANTANGELO. Some of these contract hospitals do not have full occupancy. We have facilities in some of the District hospitals which provide adequately for the types of illness which are being treated in Freedmen's Hospital. We recommended, because of the high cost to these hospitals, an additional $1.20 per patient in the hospitals so that they can meet the rising cost of hospital care. I believe and I think the committee will agree that the reason is that it is being taken care of by the District hospitals.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. When we were out at the hospital we were advised by the doctors that the reason those two floors were not being used was that there were no funds appropriated; that the District would not reimburse them for tubercular patients, and yet it is also said that there are people suffering from tuberculosis walking around in the District who should be hospitalized. Does the gentleman know about that?

Mr. SANTANGELO. It does not appear to me to be the fact. We have them taken care of in the District hospitals, and if there is disinclination to go to Freedmen's Hospital, it is because they can receive adequate care in the District hospitals. There are not sufficient cases to fill both hospitals, and where there is a choice, they would send them to a District hospital where the cost is less. The recommendation is that they go to the District hospital. As to the accuracy of the doctors' statement, I could not guarantee.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Does not the gentleman think that somehow we could make use of the two floors and the 90 beds that are unused at the present time?

Mr. SANTANGELO. If they use them and have patients the District reimburses them to the extent of $21.20 per patient.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, we have no further requests for time.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, we have no further requests for time.

The CHAIRMAN. There being no further requests for time, the Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

FEDERAL PAYMENT TO DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That there are appropriated for the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1960, out of (1) the general fund of the District of Columbia (unless otherwise herein specifically provided), hereinafter known as the general fund, such fund being composed of the revenues of the District of Columbia other than those applied by law to special funds, and $25,000,000, which is hereby appropriated for the purpose out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated (to be advanced July 1, 1959), (2) the highway fund (when designated as payable therefrom), established by law (D.C. Code, title 47, ch. 19), (3) the water fund (when designated as payable therefrom), established by law (D.C. Code, title 43, ch. 15), and $1,532,000, which is hereby appropriated for the purpose out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated (to be advanced July 1, 1959), (4) the sanitary sewage works fund (when designated as payable therefrom), established by law (Public Law 364, 83d Congress), and $686,000, which is hereby appropriated for the purpose out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated (to be advanced July 1, 1959), and (5) the motor vehicle parking fund (when designated as payable therefrom), established by law (D.C. Code, title 40, ch. 8), sums as shown herein; and there is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, $33,800,000, which, together with balances of previous appropriations for this purpose, shall remain available until expended, for loans authorized by the Act of May 18, 1954 (68 Stat. 101), and the Act of June 6, 1958 (72 Stat. 183), to be advanced upon request of the Commissioners to the following funds: general fund, $19,500,000, highway fund, $13,100,000, and, water fund, $1,200,000.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered as read and open for points of order and amendments at any point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any points of order?

If not, are there any amendments?

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that the bill be passed.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. PRICE, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 5676) making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of said District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1960, and for other purposes, had directed him to report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that the bill do pass.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

THE LATE GEN. JOHN SALLING, OF SLANT, VA.

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, it is a sad duty that I have today. I have just learned of the death of Virginia's last veteran of the Confederate Army, Gen. John Salling of Slant, Va. He was one of two surviving veterans of the Civil War, both having served in the Confederate Army.

General Salling was 112 years of age. He would have been 113 on May 15, 1959. He had been in good health until entering the hospital last week with a respiratory ailment, which later turned into pneumonia.

General Salling has been a stalwart representative of a great era in the Nation's history. He has been a symbol of the bond that unites our Nation today. Americans everywhere will miss him.

During my tenure in Congress it has been a privilege for me to participate in the observance of General Salling's birthday celebrations. Last year I joined Virginia Senator A. WILLIS ROBERTSON in the observance of the general's 112th birthday at his mountain home in Scott County, Va. Representatives of the Civil War Centennial Commission presented General Salling with

an honorary membership in the Commission; each of the military services sent a representative to honor this soldier of the Confederacy; an aide from the White House carried greetings from the President.

Mr. Speaker, two actions of the Congress serve to illustrate the affection in which General Salling was held. The 84th Congress approved the striking of a special medal for the surviving veterans of the Civil War. General Salling's medal was presented to him by an Assistant Secretary of the Army at appropriate ceremonies at his home.

Last year we approved the payment of a pension to General Salling and the other surviving veteran of the Confederate States Army. I know from personal contact with the general that this pension has meant much to him and his family.

The people of Scott County and Virginia are saddened today over the news of General Salling's death.

I am sure that all of my colleagues wish to join me in extending our sincere sympathy to General Salling's family.

Mr. Speaker, I include with these remarks a copy of the newspaper account of General Salling's death.

The story follows:

JOHN SALLING, VETERAN OF CIVIL WAR, IS DEAD

KINGSPORT, TENN., March 16.—John Salling, one of two Civil War Veterans in the Nation, died today.

The 112-year old Confederate soldier was brought to a clinic here Thursday from his home in Slant, Va., suffering from pneumonia.

The only other survivor of the Civil War, Walter Williams of Houston, Tex., has been ill for several months. Mr. Williams was 116 years old on November 14.

Mr. Salling joined the Army when he was 16 years old. He would have been 113 next May 15.

At his bedside when the end came were Mrs. H. A. McKamey, a daughter; Hobert Hawkins, a grandson, and Miss Linda Hawkins, great-granddaughter, all of Bristol, Va.

Mr. Salling's condition had weakened steadily since he was admitted to the hospital and he had been receiving a constant supply of oxygen.

Mr. Salling liked to see people and talk with them and was mentally alert, although hard of hearing.

About a year ago, a group of WAC's at Fort Myer, Va., presented him with a summer-weight Confederate uniform, which he wore on special occasions.

He once said "I never saw a girl I didn't like." He also liked an occasional toddy and chewing tobacco.

In recent years, his birthday was an occasion, and well-wishers would come from miles around to see him. He received a special gold medal given to surviving Civil War veterans. It was presented by Assistant Secretary of Army Hugh Milton.

Although his hearing was not as good as it once was, Mr. Salling still had a full head of black hair which he attributed to always wearing a hat and never using soap and water on his head. His wit remained sharp and he laughed often.

LIVED WITH DAUGHTER

The general—the title was purely honorary—was born about a mile and a half from the little mountain home where he lived his last years with his daughter, Mrs. McKamey. He moved in with Mrs. McKamey and her husband after he became too old to tend his farm.

Each May 15, on his birthday, Mr. Salling could be counted on to be on his front porch, resplendent in his Confederate uniform, hat on his head and a cigar in his mouth, receiving best wishes from dignitaries and just plain friends.

Birthday cards always came from the President, the Governor, and Members of Congress.

The Civil War was not glamorous for Mr. Salling. He did not wear the gold sash or cavalry hat which distinguished some of the boys in gray. His duties as a member of D Company, 25th Virginia Regiment consisted of digging saltpeter for Confederate gunpower.

After the war he returned to Scott County in mountainous southwest Virginia and married Mary Flanary. They had seven children. His wife died in 1940.

TRIED HAND AT FARMING

Mr. Salling tried his hand at farming and logging and occasionally borrowed a neighbor's 100-gallon still.

"I've made a slight of brandy," he once recalled. He added that "good likker never did hurt no man, if he knew how to drink it."

Mr. Salling flew to Mobile, Ala., in 1953 for the annual Confederate Veterans. Some years earlier he went to Gettysburg, Pa., for the 75th anniversary of that famous Civil War battle. He reported later that he "and a couple of Yankees set together and listened to President Roosevelt speak."

Confined to a wheelchair for the later part of his life, General Salling was always proud of his peaceful nature.

"I've never had a fight, I've never been locked up in jail, I've been a great hand to visit the sick, I've given more than I've got and I always tried to treat everybody right," he would say.

UNEMPLOYMENT IS DECIDED BY THE FOURTH BRANCH OF GOVERNMENT

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, the Federal Reserve System has taken on the job of trying to regulate the economy of the country, and for better or worse it is succeeding to an important extent.

Its main target is total economic activity, which means also, of course, total employment. But it also tries to dampen or stimulate particular kinds of activity. And this does not stop just with regulating stock market credit—where it has a specific duty to exercise selective control.

For example, the big credit squeeze which was begun in late 1955 and applied with increasing pressure, until it ended in the recession of late 1957, was aimed at checking investment in new plants and production equipment.

Chairman Martin and others have testified to this at the time and since. The Fed felt that productive capacity was expanding too fast—outrunning consumer-demand—and if not checked, would ultimately result in a worse recession later. Thus the reasons for the Fed's policy are not always a question of inflation. They hinge on questions of what the Fed thinks is good for the country and, of course, good for the bankers.

For better or for worse, the country is being regulated by a fourth branch of the Government.

In its economic policymaking the Fed has declared itself independent from the three branches of Government created by the Constitution. And it has the final say. It is in a position to overrule any decision the Congress and the President might make as to what level of business and employment the country should have.

How can it do this? What are its powers and its methods?

REGULATES THE QUANTITY OF PRODUCTION BY REGULATING THE QUANTITY OF MONEY

Its power lies in its power to issue money and to regulate the value of money. This is a power which the Constitution reserves to Congress, but Congress has delegated it to the Federal Reserve System.

As to the Fed's methods, these are several.

It can and does determine the supply of money and credit. Also it can and does determine interest rates.

To an important extent the Fed can and does, at times, change interest rates independently of the supply and demand for money. It can do this because the markets for money and securities are not perfectly competitive markets. Prices of money and securities are to an important extent administered prices. These prices are largely made by negotiation; and the Fed itself is one of the most powerful negotiators. It is the biggest single factor both in the money market and in the market for Government securities. And, of course, prices for Government securities affect the prices of other securities, bank lending rates, and so on.

The Fed's main weapon, however, is the money supply. In other words, the Fed is attempting to control economic activity by changing the quantity of money in the private banking system. And by changing the quantity of money in the banking system, it can and does change in indirect ways the amount and price of credit available from nonbank sources—that is, from the insurance companies, and so on, and, even to some extent, the amount available from the industrial corporations. The Fed is fully conscious of these indirect effects, and its policy decisions are frequently aimed at these indirect effects.

The Fed has 3 methods of changing the quantity of money.

CHANGES THE QUANTITY OF MONEY BY OPEN MARKET OPERATIONS

Its most important method is through its open market operations. Its Open Market Committee is trading in Government securities in New York almost constantly. And these trades are made for the purpose of expanding or shrinking the quantity of money in the banking system. When the Open Market Committee purchases Government securities,

it gives the member banks added reserves in the amount of its purchases. And the commercial banking system can then expand credit—that is, expand the quantity of money—up to about $7 for each $1 of additional reserves. In other words, $1 of additional reserves makes it possible for the private banks to expand their loans and investments up to about $7—assuming, of course, that there is a demand for this additional credit and a willingness on the part of the bankers to extend it.

The Open Market Committee has, on the average, a portfolio of about $25 billion of Government securities. It acquired these by creating money—on the credit of the Government—then going into the market and purchasing interest-bearing securities of the Government with this money. In other words, the Federal Reserve acquires Government securities by going over to the Bureau of Engraving and Printing and getting currency and then using this currency to buy the Government's securities. Actually, it does not always go so far as to have the currency printed. Sometimes it simply gives the banks credit on the books for additional reserves. But this credit on the books is backed with the credit of the United States, just as the currency is backed with the credit of the United States and if anyone having this credit desires the actual cash the money in the form of Federal Reserve notes—currency—is delivered to him.

When the Open Market Committee sells Government securities in the open market, it takes reserves away from the commercial banks. And taking reserves away reduces the banks' ability to lend and make investments by the same 7 to 1 ratio.

CHANGES THE QUANTITY OF MONEY BY CHANGING MEMBER BANKS' REQUIRED RESERVES

The Fed's second most important method of changing the quantity of money in the banking system is that of changing the banks' ratio of required reserves. At the beginning of last year, the ratio was such that the banks could make about $6 in loans and investments for each $1 of their reserves. But in the early part of last year, the Board of Governors made several reductions in reserve requirements, so the result is that today the banks can expand at the rate of about $7 for each $1 of reserves.

In recent years the Fed has fallen into some peculiar practices in the use of this method of regulating the money supply. Since 1951 there have been many times when the Fed contracted the money supply, but it has never raised reserve requirements for this purpose, nor for any purpose. It has adjusted reserve requirements in only in one direction, and that is downward. It has made seven reductions in reserve requirements since 1951, but never made an increase in these requirements. This is because the bankers are in favor of the lowest possible reserve requirements, and they have had a campaign on for several years now to get reserve requirements down eventually to the point where they can expand 10 to 1 on each dollar of reserves. The Fed has been going along with the bankers on this, slipping reserve requirements down every now and again, but never raising them when it wants to tighten money.

So, to summarize to this point—the Fed has two methods of giving reserves to the private banks or taking reserves away from these banks. The first is by buying or selling securities in the open market. The second is by changing the ratio of reserves which the member banks are required to keep against their deposits.

When the Fed gives the banks more reserves through its open market operations, it creates the money. And, unless it raises the member banks required reserves by an equal amount, these banks can then create still other new money on the new money—high-powered dollars—which the Fed has created.

When the Fed gives the member banks more reserves by changing its regulations as to the reserves these banks are required to keep against deposits, then the private banks create the new money.

RESERVE BANKS LEND RESERVES TO MEMBER BANKS WITH ODD EFFECTS

In addition to these two methods of giving or taking away bank reserves, the Federal Reserve banks also engage in an activity which affects the quantity of money, although to a relatively minor extent. These banks, in effect, "lend" the member banks reserves under certain circumstances and for brief periods. In other words, the Reserve banks made loans to the member banks through the discount window, charging them the discount rate.

Federal Reserve bank loans involve, however, some practices which are not generally appreciated. This lending of reserves is under rather rigid regulations. It is for the purpose of helping out individual banks only when they are in an emergency situation, not for expanding reserves generally. Furthermore, these loans of reserves are for very brief periods; and any borrowing bank is kept under constant pressure to adjust its affairs—liquidate securities if necessary—and pay back these borrowed reserves. In short, when the Fed thinks it appropriate to let the banking system have more reserves, it does this either through open market operations or by reducing required reserves, not by letting individual member banks borrow from the Federal Reserve banks. Such borrowing is frowned upon at all times.

The member banks are in such a different position with respect to their borrowed reserves that the Federal Reserve authorities look upon these reserves as having a different effect on monetary ease, or stringency, from other, "free" reserves. In fact, when these authorities are considering the question of how much additional credit the banking system could extend, they do not consider simply the amount of the banks' excess reserves, which is the amount of reserves the banks have in excess of the amount they are currently required to keep. On the contrary, they consider free reserves to be the best single measure of credit availability. And free reserves are defined to be excess reserves minus borrowed reserves.

It sometimes happens—when money is made extremely tight—that excess reserves in the member banks actually amount to less than their borrowed reserves. The whole banking system then has minus free reserves. In other words, it has more borrowed reserves than it can pay back; and yet it is under constant pressure to pay back. At such times the banking system not only has almost no money to lend but it is usually having to sell some of its Government securities or call some of its loans.

The banking system is in a minus free reserve position today. Such is the degree of the present credit squeeze.

QUANTITY OF MONEY INCREASED WHEN NOT NEEDED, DECREASED WHEN NEEDED

Early last year the Fed had a program of fighting the recession. For this purpose it gave the banks large amounts of reserves. Early in the year it gave the banks $1.5 billion in reserves through reductions in reserve requirements; and before the year was out it gave them another $2 billion of reserves through open-market operations. This total of $3.5 billion of reserves gave the banks new lending power of up to $24.5 billion. This was said to be for the purpose of enabling the banks to make more loans to business.

The banks did not use their new money-creating power for this purpose. Demand for business loans was shrinking, not increasing. And the total amount of bank loans to business went down slightly between the first of the year and the end of the year.

The private banks did, however, use the reserves they were given to create new money to the extent of $10.4 billion; and they used this money to acquire that amount of additional U.S. Government securities.

But this year, with recovery underway and an actual need for more reserves to increase business loans, the Fed has been reducing reserves. It has reduced reserves, principally through its open market operations, by $2 billion since the first of this year. In other words, it has subtracted $14 billion of lending power from the private banks.

On March 11, it had the member banks in a borrowed-reserve position amounting to $228 million. This compares with positive, or "free" reserves of $546 million only last July.

TIGHT MONEY NOW CAUSING UNEMPLOYMENT

We are back now in a period of tight credit just at a time when there seems to be some moderate demand for additional credit and some tendency for business to make a full recovery.

Interest rates have been raised throughout the financial system. The rate on 91-day Treasury bills, which is the security the Open Market Committee trades in, has been raised from less than 1 percent last summer to a level now above 3 percent. Along with this, prices of long-term Government securities have dropped and interest yields have shot up. As a result, interest rates on corporate bonds have gone sky high. This puts a damper on business spending for expansion, and it eliminates jobs that would otherwise be available.

Also as a result, interest rates on State and local bonds have been pushed up with the result that many States and communities are having to cancel or postpone their plans for building roads, schools and all kinds of public facilities. This eliminates jobs which would otherwise be available to help put the unemployed back to work.

Now how good is this regulation of economic activity by the fourth branch of the Government? How effective is increasing or decreasing the quantity of money, and running interest rates up and down, in regulating the volume of economic activity?

The answer seems to be that this kind of regulation is effective, in a way, in keeping business activity and employment down. It is effective—with many horrible distortions and unwanted side effects—in choking down economic activity.

On the other hand, the magic is lost, if any magic there be, when it comes to trying to stimulate demand. In other words, the Fed can pull on the purse strings to choke off a business boom, but it cannot push on the purse strings to stimulate a recovery when the necessary consumer demand and business confidence are not present.

What caused the business recovery of the latter part of last year? Was it the Fed's action in giving the private banks $10 billion of Government securities? No, of course not.

In case our memories have grown dim as to what stimulated demand last year, a reminder is provided under the heading "The Merchant's Views" by Herbert Koshetz in the New York Times February 22, 1959. This article discusses a recent analysis by Dr. Julius Hirsch, who is now on the graduate faculty of the New School for Social Research. I will quote from Mr. Koshetz' article in part as follows:

> The Nation was fortunate that a series of events last year sparked the recovery. * * * The administration sat tight, according to Dr. Hirsch, in the face of many pleas to take action for stepping up business. The economy, however, did get the benefit of (1) an increase of wages to Federal employees on July 1 retroactive to January 1, 1958, (2) bumper crops of agricultural products, and (3) the late but sudden raising of the Federal debt limit, which permitted larger expenditures for defense.

The question in many of our minds now is, What more is needed to bring about a full recovery and put the 5 million unemployed back to work? Certainly recovery is still far from complete, and the signs are not pointing upward. The widely predicted improvement in employment in February did not come about. Unemployment should have dropped in February, but there were actually more unemployed people in February. And credit was already being squeezed in February.

What can Congress do to bring an end to this recession?

The answer is that our first job is to persuade the Federal Reserve authorities to relax their money squeeze and let the recovery take place to the extent that present demand forces are sufficient to bring about recovery. There is nothing we can do to be really effective without first gaining the Federal Reserve's willingness to have the unemployed back at work.

Our first task is to persuade the Federal Reserve to come back into the Federal Government and direct its policies toward carrying out the wishes of the people.

VETERANS COMMISSION FOR THE PHILIPPINES

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes and to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, the other day I introduced House Joint Resolution 307, a joint resolution to establish a temporary commission to study the veterans' program of the United States in the Philippines.

It is time, Mr. Speaker, that we settle this question of Filipino veterans' rights once and for all and I believe that the only way is to create a commission that will restudy the matter carefully, give the Filipino veterans as full and as impartial a hearing as they are entitled to, analyze every single evidence submitted, and then make their report and recommendation. Whatever such commission may decide will be final and the action taken on their recommendation will close this vexing question that will always be a problem to the U.S. Congress and our Government unless we act on the resolution I have proposed.

I have been made to understand that in the Philippines many of the Filipino veterans feel that their claims have not been given the consideration that is their due. If any such feeling exists, it will always be a source of misunderstanding and it can only be effaced if a commission is created that will give them a hearing. I know the commission will be faced with a tremendous task but the work, no matter how difficult, should and must be undertaken, the sooner the better. It is important for America's prestige in Asia, and it is essential to maintain our special relationship with a people that proved their loyaty to us in a critical moment in our Nation's history.

Mr. Speaker, we recall the speeches delivered on this floor by our esteemed former colleague, the then Resident Commissioner of the Philippines, now the Philippine Ambassador to the United States, General Carlos P. Romulo. It was he who extolled the valor and heroism of the Filipino soldiers who fought in Bataan and Corregidor. It was he who described to us the resistance movement in the Philippines, how the guerrillas fought the enemy without any letup and how they saved many American lives with their courage and their determination. General Romulo pleaded on this floor time and again for the recognition of the services rendered by all these Filipino veterans who risked their lives and fought unhesitatingly for our flag. The record is replete with his statements, not only on the floor but in the various committees, underscoring the loyalty to democracy and freedom of these valiant and heroic men who without thought of themselves suffered torture in the hands of the enemy and the rigors of hunger, as well as sickness and the loss of their dear ones while fighting for us in the field. General Romulo, former aide to General MacArthur, a veteran himself, is a worthy and effective spokesman of his fellow veterans.

Our distinguished colleague from Texas [Mr. TEAGUE], who is a war hero himself, and is the able chairman of the Veterans' Affairs Committee, has been indefatigable in his disinterested advocacy of the recognition of the service rendered by the Filipino veterans during the Second World War. There is no reason why his bill No. 261 which is to amend title 38, United States Code, with respect to payment of Philippine pensioners, should not be passed this session of Congress. It is an act of simple justice for the Filipino veteran, who is the only soldier who risked his life for the American flag who is receiving only one-half of the benefits—he is paid in pesos instead of in dollars—what the others are receiving in full.

The veterans commission that I propose will take up other inequalities and other claims that the Filipino veterans feel should be taken up. It is only fair that they should be given a hearing, and they must be made to understand that once this commission has rendered its report and recommendation and action taken on the report, that it is final and the matter a closed one.

World leadership, Mr. Speaker, came to our people without our expecting or wanting it. We want nothing for ourselves; we have no aggressive designs against any nation. But world leadership came to us in a crucial moment in the history of mankind. Human freedom and the dignity of man are in danger. Ours is the duty to defend and uphold both. We can only do so if we appear before the world as exemplars of both. Our strength therefore must be on the moral principles on which we as a Nation stand. If we observe morality in our conduct with other nations as the Father of our Country enjoined us to do in his farewell address, we will have the respect of the world that is the rock, that is the foundation stone of true and abiding national greatness.

I insert in the RECORD at this point two resolutions passed by the two leading veterans' organizations in the Philippines, the Veterans Federation of the Philippines and the Veterans Organization of the Philippines, advocating the creation of a veterans commission and presented to General Romulo during his last visit to Manila:

> RESOLUTION OF VETERANS FEDERATION OF THE PHILIPPINES PETITIONING PRESIDENT CARLOS P. GARCIA, THROUGH AMBASSADOR CARLOS P. ROMULO, TO INITIATE THE CREATION OF A JOINT PHILIPPINE AMERICAN COMMISSION OR COMMITTEE TO STUDY THE ENTIRE U.S. VETERANS PROGRAM AS IT AFFECTS FILIPINO WAR VETERANS
>
> Whereas a special relationship exists between the people of the United States and the Republic of the Philippines by virtue of

their close association for over half a century;

Whereas the Filipino soldiers fought valiantly side by side with the American soldiers against a common enemy during the last World War, displaying a high sense of devotion to duty and loyalty to the cause of democracy, and upholding the highest traditions of the service especially in the trying battles of Bataan and Corregidor;

Whereas the Filipino soldiers during the said war underwent the same risks and suffered the same hardships and deprivation as did the other members of the Armed Forces of the United States and should therefore be entitled to equal protection of U.S. laws and to the same rights and benefits as are enjoyed by other U.S. veterans;

Whereas the problems encountered by Filipino veterans in matter of benefits under laws administered by the U.S. Veterans' Administration and other U.S. agencies have been one of the causes for the widespread clamor in the Philippines for a reexamination of the existing relations and agreements between the United States and the Philippines;

Whereas the American Legion feels that there exists no valid reason for depriving the Filipino veterans of the benefits which the Government of the United States is under legal and normal obligation to extend them;

Whereas the American Legion, in its national convention held in Chicago, Ill., September last year, approved Resolution No. 384 seeking proper representations with the U.S. Government for the creation of a commission that will undertake an immediate survey and restudy of the entire U.S. veterans program in the Philippines and recommend measures that will solve the problems above mentioned and remedy other situations that may be noted during such survey and restudy of veterans affairs;

Whereas the Filipino people and their Government have an abiding faith and confidence in the magnanimity, altruism, and sense of justice and fairness of the American people and their Government;

Whereas the Veterans Federation of the Philippines places its fullest support and endorsement behind the American Legion's Resolution No. 384 for the immediate creation of a Joint Philippine American Commission or a committee to study the entire U.S. veterans program; by unanimous approval: Therefore

Resolved, as the Veterans Federation of the Philippines hereby resolves, to request his Excellency, President Carlos P. Garcia, through Ambassador Carlos P. Romulo to do his utmost, in behalf of the veterans in particular and of his country in general, to seek for the immediate creation of a Joint Philippine American Commission or a committee to study the entire U.S. veterans program.

Adopted in the city of Manila this 12th day of February 1959.

JOSE RAZON,
President.

Attested:

Conrado B. Rigor, Colonel, GSC (FA), Secretary-General; Alfonso Arellano, National Commander, USAFIP-NL; Dionisio S. Ojeda, National Commander, Peftok; Fausto Alberto, National Commander, ECLGA; Vincente J. Benedicto, National Commander, Markings Fil-Am; Antonio F. Garcia, National Commander, Magsaysay Veterans Legion; Basilia M. Baja, Gold Star Mothers Association; Benjamin G. Molina, National Commander, REFIL; Antonio Varias, National Commander, DBC; Tereso D. Pia, National Commander, Hunters ROTC; Silvino Matias, National Commander, UDVAP; Francisco L. Gonzalez, National President, FDVA; Sofia L. Prudenciado, President, Philippine Association of War Widows, Parents, and Orphans.

RESOLUTION OF VETERANS' ORGANIZATIONS OF THE PHILIPPINES URGING THE CREATION OF A JOINT PHILIPPINE-AMERICAN COMMITTEE OR PANEL TO RESTUDY THE ENTIRE U.S. VETERANS PROGRAM IN THE PHILIPPINES

Whereas the Government of the Republic of the Philippines has presented to the Government of the United States an omnibus claim covering among others certain claims of Philippine veterans;

Whereas the veterans' claims covered by the omnibus claim, consist mostly of arrears-in-pay and allowances of former members of the Philippine Commonwealth Army which constitute only a small portion of the benefits sought by the Philippine veterans from the Government of the United States, particularly during World War II;

Whereas by virtue of a rider in the Rescission Act approved on February 18, 1946, Philippine veterans have been denied numerous benefits which are extended to other U.S. veterans such as pension for non-service-connected disability or death, compensation in dollars instead of in pesos, education and training, vocational rehabilitation, and other benefits under the GI bill of rights passed by the U.S. Congress;

Whereas there has been a widespread dissatisfaction among Philippine veterans over the manner they have been deprived of rights and benefits to which they were already legally entitled prior to the approval of the rider to the Rescission Act;

Whereas various other problems have been encountered by Philippine veterans in claims for benefits under the laws of the United States, arising particularly from loss or destruction of service and medical records, discriminatory regulations and policies, and arbitrary rulings of agencies administering those benefits;

Whereas veterans' claims may not be thoroughly covered and favorably considered by the Government of the United States if combined with other government claims cited in the Philippine omnibus claim not germane to purely veterans' matters;

Whereas it is believed that the best and most expedient way to bring the veterans' claims and problems to the attention of the Government of the United States is through a joint Philippine-American committee or panel created by executive and/or legislative authority which shall undertake a survey and restudy of the entire U.S. veterans' program in the Philippines and recommend measures to equitably settle and resolve such claims and problems once and for all instead of by piecemeal measures: Now, therefore, we the undersigned, representatives of various veterans' organizations in the Philippines

Resolve to strongly recommend, as we hereby strongly recommend, to his Excellency the President of the Republic of the Philippines, that in the consideration of the Philippine omnibus claim, all matters pertaining to veterans' benefits be treated separately from the other government claims, and that the President officially propose to the U.S. Government the creation of a joint Philippine-American committee or panel to undertake an immediate survey and restudy of the entire U.S. veterans' program in the Philippines and recommend measures to equitably resolve once and for all the Philippine veterans' problems to the satisfaction of all concerned.

Done in the city of Manila, Philippines, this 13th day of February 1959.

Gen. Macario Peralta, Jr., Commander, Panay Guerrilla Forces; Col. Vicente Umali, Commander, PQOG Guerrilla Forces; Attorney Rafael Estrada, Member, Defenders of Bataan and Corregidor; Col. Alejo Santos, Commander, BMA; Col. Eleuterio Adevoso, Commander, Hunters-ROTC, Guerrilla Forces; Col. Augustin Marking, Commander, Marking's Fil-American Guerilla Forces and Veterans' Organization of the Philippines; Mrs. Luz Belen Sese, National President, Philippine Veterans' Legion Auxiliary; Maj. Francisco Offemaria, National Commander, Philippine Veterans' Legion.

The American Legion in its September 1-4, 1958, convention in Chicago passed a resolution advocating the creation of a commission to restudy the entire veterans program in the Philippines. The resolution follows:

RESOLUTION 384

Resolution to create a Government Commission to restudy entire veterans program in the Philippines

Whereas a special relationship exists between the people of the United States and the Republic of the Philippines by virtue of their close association for over a half a century;

Whereas the organized military forces of the Government of the Commonwealth of the Philippines were inducted into the service of the Armed Forces of the United States (USAFFE) pursuant to the military order of the President of the United States dated July 26, 1941, and were in such service up to June 30, 1946;

Whereas at the time of such induction, the Philippines was a Territory of the United States and the citizens thereof where American nationals;

Whereas the Filipino soldiers fought valiantly side by side with the American soldiers against a common enemy during the last World War, displaying a high sense of devotion to duty and loyalty to the cause of democracy, and upholding the highest traditions of the service especially in the trying battles of Bataan and Corregidor;

Whereas the Filipino soldiers during the said war underwent the same risks and suffered the same hardships and deprivation as did the other members of the Armed Forces of the United States and should therefore be entitled to equal protection of U.S. laws and to the same rights and benefits as are enjoyed by other U.S. veterans;

Whereas existing laws passed by the U.S. Congress, particularly a rider in the First Supplemental Surplus Appropriation Rescission Act of 1946 (Public Law 301, 79th Congress) and the rules and regulations implementing the same have deprived the Filipino soldiers of various benefits to which they should be entitled;

Whereas the existing laws and regulations have created certain classes of veterans and different types of benefits for each class, resulting in misunderstanding, hardships and discontent not only among veterans but also the Filipino people as a whole;

Whereas veterans of other components of the Armed Forces of the United States who are residing in the Philippines have likewise been deprived of certain benefits by reason of their residence outside of the continental limits of the United States or its territories or possessions, such as domiciliary and hospital care and medical treatment;

Whereas the problems encountered by Filipino veterans in the matter of benefits under laws administered by the U.S. Veterans' Administration and other U.S. agencies have been one of the causes for the widespread clamor in the Philippines for a reexamination of the existing relations and agreements between the United States and the Philippines;

Whereas the American Legion feels that there exists no valid reason for depriving the Filipino veterans and other U.S. veterans residing in the Philippines of the benefits which the Government of the United States is under legal and moral obligation to extend to them;

Whereas the Filipino people and their Government have an abiding faith and confidence in the magnanimity, altruism, and sense of justice and fairness of the American people and their Government;

Whereas the immediate solution of these problems is necessary to maintain the harmonious relations which have heretofore existed between the two nations: Now, therefore, the

American Legion, in national convention assembled at Chicago, Ill., from September 1 to 4, 1958, resolves as it hereby does resolve, That the American Legion make proper representations with the legislative or executive branch of the U.S. Government for the appointment or creation of a commission that will undertake an immediate survey and restudy of the entire U.S. veterans program in the Philippines and recommend measures that will solve the problems above mentioned and remedy other situations that may be noted during such survey and restudy of veterans affairs.

U.S. CHAMBER PICKS CANHAM AS PRESIDENT

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, this headline in last Saturday's papers stated a fact. But that fact opens the door to prospects that will please every American.

Erwin D. Canham, editor of the Christian Science Monitor, is one of the world's best newspapermen. His election as president of the United States Chamber of Commerce is like the coming of spring, bringing new life to the organization that speaks for free enterprise.

The Chamber is to be congratulated for breaking with precedent, and for taking this long step forward. For Erwin D. Canham's career has been just that: digging out all the facts; analyzing and interpreting them in the light of modern realities; growing with his times.

There are many papers that, by the numbers, enjoy a far larger circulation than the Christian Science Monitor, but there are few that measure up to the prestige it has earned for objective reporting and illuminating editorial comment.

The Monitor has always maintained high standards in the field of journalism, but its reputation has become outstanding under the direction of Erwin D. Canham. His talent and his opinions have won increasing recognition. He is former president of the American Society of Newspaper Editors, and has served as an alternate delegate to the United Nations General Assembly. At the age of 55 he brings to his responsible position a wealth of experience, and a capacity for reasoning through problems that inspires respect and confidence. His reaction, upon being informed of the honor that has come to him, is characteristic of Mr. Canham.

I am deeply convinced the United States is involved in the greatest competitive struggle in history—

He said—

One of the tools with which it can work is the progress of American enterprise in cleaning its own house in the last half-century.

The 1900 concept of capitalism is a thing very foreign to the capitalism of today. Business has accepted a deep responsibility and accountability to its customers, its civic neighbors, its workers and its stockholders.

He said that business groups and labor organizations can provide powerful impetus to progress, but only to the degree that they remain voluntary. You have made a good and forthright beginning, Erwin Canham. Those of us who have followed your constructive career, know that you have the intelligence, the sincerity, and the courage to lead the United States Chamber of Commerce to a new high in accomplishment and in public esteem. You have a challenging opportunity, and we know you are equal to it.

With your comprehensive knowledge of national issues and international problems, of economics and human nature, you are equipped to lead the business community of the Nation as no other man before you.

We predict that you will guide the United States Chamber to the most illustrious chapter of its history, to the greater pride of Massachusetts in her distinguished son, and to the benefit of the whole free world.

HELP THE VISUALLY HANDICAPPED CITIZENS OF AMERICA

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Speaker, at the present time, the House Committee on Education and Labor is considering various types of legislative proposals to help the visually handicapped citizens of America. I appeared before the committee last week on behalf of my bill H.R. 1855. The purpose of this proposed legislation is to create a temporary Advisory Committee for the Blind to suggest programs or changes that will improve services to our blind citizens. I have received hundreds of letters of support for this legislation, and many organizations who are working with the blind throughout America have sent me letters of approval. I do not want to burden the RECORD by asking permission to include these many pages of approval of this proposed legislation. I am, however, including the statement that I made before the House Committee on Education and Labor, and I hope my colleagues have an opportunity to read this statement, which follows:

STATEMENT OF CONGRESSMAN D. R. (BILLY) MATTHEWS, EIGHTH DISTRICT, FLORIDA, BEFORE THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON SPECIAL EDUCATION, U.S. HOUSE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR, ON BEHALF OF H.R. 1855, FOR THE ESTABLISHMENT OF A TEMPORARY NATIONAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE FOR THE BLIND, MARCH 9, 1959

As a young man I became associated with the Lions Clubs of Florida and had the high honor of serving in 1941 as the district governor of the Lions—35 clubs in the northern district in Florida. This great civic association appealed to me partly because of its interest in our blinded citizens. You may recall that Helen Keller appeared before Lion International at one of their great conventions many years ago and asked this civic association to help in every way possible with our blind citizens. As a result, chiefly, I think, of her appeal, throughout the years the Lions' organization has devoted much of its philanthropic effort toward working with the blind and for the blind.

As a district governor of Florida Lions many years ago, I was asked by the Governor of Florida, the Honorable SPESSARD L. HOLLAND, who is now a U.S. Senator, to serve as a member of the newly created Florida State agency known as the Florida Council for the Blind. I accepted this high honor with deep satisfaction and later became the chairman of this State agency. As a former chairman of the Florida Council for the Blind, I take great pride in recollecting that the first executive director of our agency was a young man nearly totally blind by the name of Henry Johnson. He died at a tragically young age, and was succeeded by the Honorable Robert Barnett, who is now, as you know, executive director of the American Foundation for the Blind. The third executive director of the Florida agency, and the gentleman who is now serving, is the Honorable Harry Simmons.

I have given you this personal background in order that you may know that I am no Johnny-come-lately in my earnest desire to be of help to the visually handicapped of America.

Soon after I came to Congress I began to study the Federal statutes that are on the books concerning help for the blind and I found a veritable maze of laws administered by many varied Federal agencies, bureaus, and departments. I found further that the Honorable Caleb Boggs back in 1951 saw this same problem and had introduced a bill to establish a temporary National Advisory Committee for the Blind. I felt that passage of this legislation was of the utmost importance and could probably be the greatest contribution I could make in this field as a Member of Congress. So, in the 84th Congress I introduced H.R. 6500, a bill for the establishment of a temporary National Advisory Committee for the Blind, and in the 85th Congress I introduced H.R. 1955, which was the identical bill. Now in the 86th Congress the same bill is H.R. 1855.

A National Advisory Committee for the Blind would be instrumental in promoting greater coordination and mutual cooperation among Federal agencies. The committee would provide needed guidance in the development of uniform objectives and procedures, improved methods, and increasingly effective programs of services for the blind.

It could be of major significance, for example, in planning and organizing studies and research projects to be carried on jointly by Federal agencies such as the National Institute of Neurological Diseases and Blindness, the Veterans' Administration, the Office of Vocational Rehabilitation, and the Office of Education, in conjunction with such national private organizations as the American Foundation for the Blind, the Braille Institute of America, and the National Federation for the Blind.

Perhaps the present need for establishing coordinated services and uniform standards for blind programs is mostly clearly illustrated by the fact that there are numerous definitions of blindness in laws and regulations of the Federal and State Governments. For instance, under the old-age survivors and disability insurance program there is a specified definition of blindness for purposes

of the disability freeze, which allows an individual to disregard, for benefit purposes, the period of time he is under a disability.

In defining disability for a cash payment under the same program, however, blindness is neither specified nor defined, and therefore is not necessarily a disability. Moreover, under the aid to the blind public assistance program there is no definition of blindness in the Federal law. Thus, presumably, it remains for the States to determine what constitutes blindness. State definitions of the term, as a result, include varying degrees of limited sight. The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare maintains that the Secretary has the power to disapprove a State plan incorporating a definition of blindness which does not comply with the Department's own recommended definition of blindness.

That is in no way of criticism; that is just a statement of fact.

The National Advisory Committee for the Blind could also conduct a thorough study, evaluating existing programs with the purpose of obtaining maximum benefits for the blind. The committee would determine how much Federal money is now being expended on behalf of the blind and in what areas these expenditures are concentrated. The committee could then make recommendations as to the proper allotment of Federal money so as to adjust for inadequate budgets in some programs which have resulted in breakdowns of essential services for the blind.

The role of the Federal Government in this area would be thoroughly explored. The committee would study the public assistance aid to the blind programs to determine whether income restrictions should be liberalized to encourage employment, whether the Federal maximum should be raised, and whether the Federal Government should make a greater percentage contribution to State payments. These are broad questions of policy which will call for the establishment of a basic philosophy in respect to our assistance to the blind.

Other Federal programs in which services to the blind are only one phase of their activities should be studied to determine the extent to which these programs actually serve the blind and whether this phase is receiving proper emphasis.

Moreover, recommendations should be made as to the question of duplication of services between Federal, State, local, and private agencies so that the blind people in the country will get the maximum benefit, regardless of where they live, of the taxes and contributions of the American people.

The establishment of a National Advisory Committee for the Blind, and its subsequent activities, would focus national attention on the potentialities and the achievements of the blind in adjusting satisfactorily to society, thus contributing to the development of positive and realistic national attitudes toward our blind population.

An evaluation of the extent to which the results of modern research are disseminated and made available to all blind people in the country could be explored by the committee.

The committee could also direct its attention to certain aspects of the problems of the blind which have not received sufficient emphasis in the past, such as special treatment and training for the large numbers of people who are handicapped by limited, deteriorating eyesight, but who are not under medical care at the present time.

It should be noted that on June 17, 1957, the administration sent a proposed bill for the blind to Congress which was substantially the same as the National Advisory Committee for the Blind envisioned in my bill H.R. 1855. That was the bill introduced by the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. WAINWRIGHT].

In submitting the proposal, Secretary Marion B. Folsom said the proposed study should provide needed guidance in the development of improved methods and increasingly effective programs of services for the blind. He added it should stimulate greater interest and action among our medical, education, industrial, and social science research talent in the prevention of and reduction of the handicapping effects of blindness.

I should like to give you a brief analysis of H.R. 1855. Section 1 of the bill states "There is hereby established a National Advisory Committee for the Blind (in this act referred to as the 'committee'). The committee shall investigate and study the entire field of existing Federal, State, and local activities related to the granting of services to the blind, including the history and development of such activity. The committee shall report to the President and to the Congress, within 24 months after passage of this act, the results of such investigation and study, together with recommendations (1) for accomplishing greater coordination of and more effective results from such activities, (2) for the attainment of maximum benefits for the blind, and (3) with respect to such other matters as the committee may deem appropriate." Section 2 deals with the membership of the committee and states that "The committee shall be composed of nine members, who shall be conversant with work for the blind, to be appointed by the President as follows: (1) One individual from the executive branch of the Federal Government; (2) one individual from the Senate of the United States; (3) one individual from the House of Representatives of the United States; (4) one individual from among officers and employees of the State governments; (5) one individual from a national association of professional workers with the blind; (6) one individual from a national organization of the blind; (7) one individual from a national research organization for the blind; (8) one individual from the field of education of the blind; and (9) one individual from the public at large."

The bill sets forth the organization of the committee which provides that "The committee shall elect a chairman from among its members" and that "five members of the committee shall constitute a quorum." Section 5 of the bill provides for compensation of members of the committee and states a maximum amount of $25 per day when members of the committee are engaged in the performance of their duties, plus reimbursement for travel, subsistence, and any other necessary expenses incurred. Section 6 of the bill states that "the committee shall have the power to appoint and fix the compensation of such personnel as it deems advisable, without regard to the civil-service laws and the Classification Act of 1949, as amended." Section 7 points out the powers of the committee. "The committee, or any authorized member thereof, may, for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this act, hold such hearings and sit and act at such times and places, and take such testimony, as the committee or such member may deem advisable. Any member of the committee may administer oaths or affirmations to witnesses appearing before the committee or before any authorized member thereof.

"The committee, or any authorized member thereof, is authorized to secure directly from any executive department, bureau, agency, board, commission, office, independent establishment, or instrumentality, information, suggestions, estimates, and statistics for the purpose of this act; and each such department, bureau, agency, board, commission, office, establishment, or instrumentality is authorized and directed to furnish such information, suggestions, estimates, and statistics directly to the committee, or any authorized member thereof, upon request made by the chairman of the committee or any authorized member thereof.

"The committee, or any authorized member thereof, shall have power to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of witnesses and the production of books, papers, and documents; to administer oaths; to take testimony; to have printing and binding done; and to make such expenditures as it deems advisable within the amount appropriated under authority of this act."

Section 8 authorizes to be appropriated the sum of $250,000 to carry out the provisions of this act, and section 9 states that "the committee shall cease to exist within 30 days after the committee submits its report pursuant to section 1."

Now, I am not wedded to the particular wording of this bill, neither am I committed to try to obtain the passage of this bill exactly as it is presently written. There are some honest differences of opinion about one or two points in the bill. For example, the number of members of the committee or the total amount authorized in the bill for the expenses of the committee. I am firm in the conviction that the advisory committee should be independent of Government agencies, of any set forms and rules of procedure that would interfere with what we might call a free and unbiased study of all of the problems dealing with the blind in America.

The oldest Federal statute, as I recall, concerning the blind dates back to 1879. From that time on we have had a veritable hodgepodge of laws interposed here and there throughout a large number of Government agencies. Surely there should be interest in the establishment of a temporary National Advisory Committee for the Blind to make recommendations to make possible more coordinated services and uniform standards for our blind programs. Many Congressmen have expressed their interest in this legislation, and at least 20 of my colleagues in the House have introduced this same measure. Without any solicitation from me, hundreds of letters have come to my desk supporting this legislation.

I sincerely hope your committee will report favorably on this bill with any appropriate amendments that in the judgment of the committee may improve the legislation.

FORTY YEARS OF SERVICE FOR GOD AND COUNTRY

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, during this month of March, our citizens in every community throughout the country are joining their Legionnaire neighbors in celebrating the 40th anniversary of the birth of the American Legion, the world's largest veteran organization.

It is right and necessary that America should recognize and salute the nearly three million Legionnaire veterans of World War I, World War II, and the Korean conflict for the contribution they have made to the welfare and security of our Nation and all of our people during the past 40 years.

It is appropriate that the American Legion's history and record of service to God and country should be reviewed and

reemphasized during this birthday month.

The American Legion was born at the historic caucus in Paris, France, March 15 to 17, 1919. Attending this meeting in the Cirque de Paris were 1,000 delegates from the first American Expeditionary Force. They agreed to form an organization of American veterans of World War I. They named the new society the American Legion, established a committee of 100 to push plans for enrollment overseas and at home, and left completion of the new organization to a second caucus, held in St. Louis, Mo., May 8 to 10, 1919.

The St. Louis caucus adopted a constitution and by-laws and selected Minneapolis, Minn., for the American Legion's first national convention, November 10 to 12, 1919.

It is interesting to note what historian Richard Seelye Jones wrote of the founding Paris caucus:

> The American Expeditionary Force dissolved. It left its dead in France. It left its record for history. It bequeathed the perpetuation of its memories, comradeships and service ideals to the American Legion.

Forty years of dramatic service to God and country now lie behind the American Legion. It is now starting on the fifth decade of its wonderful life. Today its ranks are mostly filled by a younger generation of American veterans eager and anxious to write the greatest chapters in the history of the American Legion.

The march of time has changed the entire world. We are living today in a fantastic period that we call the space age. Mankind is hard at work cutting its earthbound shackles to reach literally for the stars.

The American Legion too has changed. But it has changed only in dimensions, not in character and integrity. It is today a three-war organization. It has 17,000 community posts. It has outposts in every land outside of the Iron and Bamboo Curtains. It can well be said today that the sun never sets on the domain of the American Legion. It has an Auxiliary today with 14,000 community units. It has grown far beyond the fondest dreams of its founders—grown in stature, in membership, in prosperity, in prestige, in influence and best of all in public esteem.

Today the men and women in the uniform of the American Legion still are charter members of war, chairmen of democracy and treasurers of peace. They are still filled with an aggressive Americanism, sparking with the victory volts of the ideals of freedom. They are still teaching by word and by example that love of country is America's best bodyguard. They are still warning that danger lurks where patriotism shirks and that when liberty is lost it passes to no one and is never regained. They are still implanting in American youth the fiery concept that sacrifice is the salt of patriotism and that willingness to sacrifice is the watermark of the patriot.

Today the American Legion still offers all eligible veterans the world's greatest fellowship value. Today the typical American Legion post home is still a kind of heartbeat house for community activity.

Today it is still a source of fierce pride to the American Legion that it is regarded by the Communist Party of the United States as its public enemy No. 1. Today the American Legion still is in the foreground in militantly opposing Communist and other subversive activities, in ripping off the masks of Communist front organizations and in teaching and preaching that it is not enough to be merely anti-Communist. In the American Legion you have first to be pro-American.

The American Legion has had an immeasurable impact on the American scene during the first 40 years of its life. This impact was registered through its major basic programs which brought new concepts of service to the entire Nation and changed the thinking of all Americans.

Through its rehabilitation program for veterans of World War I, the American Legion actually pioneered in bringing about enlightened modern methods of taking care of the disabled and physically handicapped and of retraining them to become self-sustaining and useful members of society. Today such care and rehabilitation are available to all American citizens through public programs, services and resources unheard of before World War I.

The American Legion has become the greatest name in rehabilitation. The Veterans' Administration is today its greatest living memorial.

Through its far-sighted fathering of the GI bill of rights for World War II veterans and its subsequent Korean GI bill, the American Legion has contributed to the raising of the educational level of the entire nation. This same legislation also gave a tremendous boost to home ownership in the United States.

GI bill-educated or trained veterans today boast of a 15 percent greater earning power than nonveterans of the same age brackets, a complete reversal of the situation 13 years ago.

The American Legion is largely responsible for bringing about modern concepts of child welfare and for streamlining laws, court procedures and public services having to do with the care and protection of all American children. Horse and buggy period adoption and probation laws have been brought up to date. Uniform state laws on desertion have been enacted. Juvenile court procedures have been revamped. These changes came about mostly through American Legion leadership.

Since 1925 the American Legion has expended more than $148,000,000 in emergency financial aid to children in need. Most of this money has gone for food, clothing, shelter, and medical treatments.

Today The American Legion still pioneers in the field of child welfare. It is financing through grants from its National Child Welfare Foundation research studies and surveys aimed at improved training and services for mentally retarded children, at helping partially seeing youngsters and at training police officers for careers in working with juveniles who have become delinquent.

Its Americanism program is one of the brightest jewels in the crown of the American Legion. Through its constant accent on its positive programs of youth-training it has built soundly over 40 years for future good citizenship. Some 2 million youngsters annually are enrolled in its activities such as Boys States, Boys Nation, the high school oratorical contest, the School Medal Awards, the 4,300 Boy Scout troops sponsored by our posts, and in other local, department, or national projects.

More than 400,000 selected high school students participate annually in the American Legion's nationwide oratorical contest. The objective of this program is to stimulate original study and research by these students of the United States Constitution and Bill of Rights. They have to prepare their own orations on some phases of these documentary bulwarks of American freedom. Think of how many constitutional lawyers this program must have produced—men and women dedicated to upholding the Constitution and defending it against emasculatory amendments.

If any organization has helped effectively to hold down patriotic illiteracy in these United States, that organization is the American Legion. Legionnaires have always been praise agents of America—to enhance popular appreciation of all American blessings.

Taking note that the path away from the altar leads to the pagan shadows of the Red Star in Moscow and concerned over an increasing number of American families in which religious vacuums have developed, the American Legion in 1950 launched its nationwide, nondenominational "back to God" movement. In this program American Legion chaplains at all levels have come into their own as true spiritual leaders. This activity has three simple objectives—daily family devotions, regular church or synagogue attendance, and religious training of American youth. Through this program thousands of dedicated Legionnaires are working to strengthen the churches and synagogues of their home towns. They are putting the accent on divine guidance in daily living. It is fitting to note that the birth of the American Legion in Paris in 1919 was ushered in by a prayer by an Army chaplain.

In its militant opposition to communism, the American Legion has always had the courage to speak up for America. The House Committee on Un-American Activities whose exposés and reports to the American people have aroused them to a realization of the Communist infiltrations in this country, came into being in 1938 in response to a resolution adopted by the 1937 national convention of the American Legion in New York City. At every session of Congress over the last 20 years the American Legion led the legislative fight to assure adequate funds for the work of this committee.

In fighting communism the American Legion relies chiefly on education and on

exposure. It is to the credit of the American Legion that its chief traducers today are those whose first allegiance is not to America.

In the stirring days that lie ahead, there will be still greater calls on the services of the American Legion and its loyal courage and realism. The American Legion is entering its fifth decade geared with fresh strength and greater community bulwarks for its bases of operations. Today more than 60 percent of all American Legion posts own their homes which have an aggregate valuation of more than $300 million. From these fortresses of freedom radiate patriotic influences that are serving to bring about a dynamic conviction of Americanism to cope with the tidal waves of communism.

The American Legion continues to give the best of itself to its communities, States, and Nation. Its gifts are precious for they are tied with heartstrings. The 17,000 American Legion posts are the lengthened shadows of 2,700,000 patriots working for God and country.

YES AND NO TO EVENING STAR EDITORIAL

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include extraneous matter at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, this past Friday, March 13, the Washington Evening Star ran an editorial on the subject of milk standards for the District of Columbia. I would like to comment on portions of this editorial, and I ask unanimous consent to include the editorial at this point in the RECORD:

HIGH MILK STANDARDS

All parties concerned with the current milk controversy are agreed that the standards of purity for milk sold in Washington should be high. Views differ widely, however, as to just how high they ought to be. For our part, we believe they should be high enough to protect the public health—but not so needlessly high as to adversely affect the cost to the consumer.

The Commissioners are to be commended, therefore, in sponsoring an intensive and comprehensive study by the District Health Department of present laws and regulations fixing milk standards for Washington. Such a study offers the best approach to a solution of the question raised by certain local dairies as to whether the standards here are too high.

It is a fact that the standards set by the District under a 1925 law are higher than those prevailing in most other parts of the Nation. They are higher than the standards approved by the U.S. Public Health Service and adopted by health authorities in 35 of the States and in more than 1,500 municipalities. The Chestnut Farms (Sealtest) and Thompson dairies contend that the Federal requirements are as adequate for Washington as they have proved to be for other jurisdictions. The Washington-Virginia Milk Producers Association, a cooperative organization of dairy farmers, is waging a vigorous fight against any lowering of the District standards. The co-op seeks to prevent Chestnut Farms from importing milk from areas outside the Virginia-Maryland milkshed. This milkshed is under constant inspection by the District Health Department.

Involved in the dispute, of course, are economic factors of special concern to the farmers and the distributors of milk. Lowering the standards would permit importation of cheaper milk and presumably permit reduction of milk prices to the consumer. The co-op has declared that there is no assurance, however, that importers of cheaper milk would pass the savings on to the consumer. There is the possibility, on the other hand, that widening of competition with respect to milk supplies might result in lower milk prices for everybody.

The paramount consideration, in any event, must be the health of the community. The consumer must be assured of an adequate supply of milk that is safe by every reasonable standard. If such milk can be supplied under the model code approved by the U.S. Public Health Service and at a cost lower than that possible under the stricter standards now in force here, we can see no good reason for banning the Federal standards in the Nation's Capital.

I beg to differ with the first two paragraphs of that editorial. A review of the District of Columbia's milk standards—and a revision of those which are outdated, arbitrary, and unduly restrictive—would, of course, help the local situation. But this same appalling situation exists in countless other Eastern and Southern cities. What we really need is a national quality yardstick for milk shipped in interstate commerce. My milk sanitation bill, H.R. 3840, would make the proven U.S. Milk Ordinance and Code that quality yardstick.

The need for national legislation in this field is underlined by the fact that 17 of my colleagues have introduced companion bills to my H.R. 3840 in the House. A similar bill has been introduced in the Senate by Senator HUMPHREY, of Minnesota. Cosponsors are Senator MCCARTHY, of Minnesota, and Wisconsin's Senators WILEY and PROXMIRE.

I am sure I speak for the 17 Congressmen and the Senators I have just mentioned when I say we feel that health rules which are used to maintain a local milk monopoly do not serve the public interest. Sanitary standards for milk should protect the consumer. They should not be used to make the consumer pay more for milk or to penalize the large body of producers of high-quality milk.

I cannot agree with another portion of this editorial, which reads:

It is a fact that the standards set by the District under a 1925 law are higher than those prevailing in most other parts of the Nation. They are higher than the standards approved by the U.S. Public Health Service and adopted by health authorities in 35 of the States and in more than 1,500 municipalities.

In a talk on the floor of the House on March 9, I pointed out some of the things which make the U.S. Milk Code a reliable standard for milk. I would like to review a portion of that speech. In it, I said:

The U.S. Milk Code, regarded as a model for the industry, was the result of the work of top technical experts in both the health and dairy fields. It was not a product of the U.S. Public Health Service alone, since the code was developed with the aid of an advisory board of experts in the fields of dairy technology, veterinary medicine, agriculture, and public health—in addition to State and local agencies who use the code, industry and interested Federal agencies, including the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which has approved the present edition.

Mr. Speaker, the code is revised frequently to keep pace with the rapid improvements in milk processing, handling, and shipment. Since the first code was published in 1924, it has been completely revised 12 times.

Currently, the U.S. Milk Code is being used as the basis for milk sanitation regulations in 35 States and has been voluntarily adopted by some 1,900 cities and counties. It is used as the quality standard for milk purchased for our Armed Forces.

At Walter Reed Hospital here in Washington, D.C., the milk served to patients must meet the specifications of the U.S. code rather than the District of Columbia's sanitary regulations. Many of this country's distinguished citizens have been treated at that hospital, and I have never heard of any of them suffering ill effects from the milk they drank there.

In the same speech, I pointed out that two dairy plants in my district had offered to deliver class I, grade A milk to Washington, D.C., for $1.12 per hundredweight less than dairy plants here have to pay for milk they are now buying. I also showed that the two Wisconsin plants I have just mentioned are rated higher by the U.S. Public Health Service than the two major dairies supplying metropolitan Washington.

On March 11, in answer to charges made by the general manager of the local milk monopoly that I was trying to pass grade B Wisconsin milk off as grade A milk, I gave the names of 12 other dairy plants in my district that are equipped to sell class I, grade A milk. The majority of these also rate higher than the District plants. They are: Barron Co-op Creamery, Barron, Wis.; Boyceville Farmers Co-op Creamery, Boyceville, Wis.; Baldwin Co-op, Baldwin, Wis.; Chippewa County Co-op Dairy, Bloomer, Wis.; Colfax Co-op Creamery, Colfax, Wis.; Ellsworth Co-op Creamery, Ellsworth, Wis.; Falls Dairy Co., Stanley, Wis.; Land O'Lakes Dairy, Whitehall, Wis.; Sanna Dairies, Inc., Menomonie, Wis.; St. Croix Valley Co-op Dairies, Glenwood City, Wis.; Wisconsin Co-op Dairies, Inc., Elmwood, Wis.

No, the District of Columbia milk regulations do not secure higher quality milk than does the U.S. Milk Code. They only insure higher cost milk.

Mr. Speaker, the only reason I mention this local milk problem is that 17 of my colleagues and I are trying to pass legislation which would correct not only the situation here but wherever a similar situation exists. And I know from experience when hearings on similar legislation were held last year before the Health and Science Subcommittee of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee that the members of each local group who have been using health laws to maintain their own little milk monopoly will be telling the subcommittee the same story we are hearing here in

Washington, D.C., namely, that they do not want a national quality standard for milk because then their own inspectors will not be able to check the farms and dairies from which the milk comes. These local monopolists claim they cannot trust the Wisconsin, Minnesota, Iowa, and other midwestern inspectors—men who under the terms of our bill will have been trained by the U.S. Public Health Service to give uniform inspections.

What these milk monopolists are saying in effect is that it is OK to have Federal inspection of meat and poultry—but not of milk. As a result, Mrs. Housewife is paying a higher price for her milk because dairymen are not allowed to supply her full needs for fluid milk.

Can anyone believe that the U.S. Public Health Service will not see to it that Mrs. Housewife gets milk of the highest quality and purity? This is the same U.S. Public Health Service which now administers our Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act and has such a high reputation for insuring that the American people have pure food.

I can but say a hearty amen to the last paragraph of the Evening Star's editorial, which reads:

> The paramount consideration * * * must be the health of the community. The consumer must be assured of an adequate supply of milk that is safe by every reasonable standard. If such milk can be supplied under the model code approved by the U.S. Public Health Service and at a cost lower than that possible under the stricter standards now in force here, we can see no good reason for banning the Federal standards in the Nation's Capital.

Pure milk of the highest quality can be obtained under the U.S. Milk Code, and there is no reason why those standards should be banned anywhere.

Mr. Speaker, it is now possible for any dairy plant in the United States to be rated under the U.S. Milk Code. These ratings are printed in a report titled "Sanitation Compliance Ratings of Interstate Milk Shippers." I am going to ask that the January 1959 report be placed in the RECORD at the end of my remarks so that any Member of Congress who wishes may check to see how the dairy plants in his area compare with the ratings of the District of Columbia dairies. I think many Congressmen will find their local dairies rate higher than the District of Columbia ones.

I hope that this documented proof will end the brainwashing we have been receiving for the past few weeks by way of ads on radio, television, and in the local newspapers from the local milk monopoly. These ads claim that the District of Columbia milk regulations give the Washington area better milk than is produced in any other area of the country. I say this is not true—and the sanitation ratings of interstate milk producers prove my point. Under unanimous consent, I include at this point the "Sanitation Compliance Ratings of Interstate Milk Shippers":

Sanitation compliance ratings of interstate milk shippers, Jan. 1, 1959

Name and address of shipping station or plant	Type of product	Type of rating		Percent compliance rating				Enforcement rating	Rating agency	Date of rating
		Area	Individual	Raw milk	Receiving station	Pasteurizing plant	Pasteurized milk			
ARKANSAS										
Acee Co., Fort Smith, Ark.	Pasteurized milk and milk products.		X	95.5	------	98.0	97.0	98.3	SHD	May 23, 1958.
Beckman Dairy, Fort Smith, Ark.	do		X	94.0	------	97.0	96.0	98.3	SHD	Do.
Dean Milk Co., Conway, Ark.	do		X	94.7	------	99.0	97.5	97.5	SHD	Sept. 10, 1958.
Tastemark Dairy Co., Paragould, Ark.	do		X	92.9	------	97.8	96.0	93.0	SHD	Nov. 21, 1957.
CALIFORNIA										
Arden Farms Co., Barstow, Calif.	do		X	94.3	------	91.0	93.0	90.0	SDA [1]	Oct. 7, 1958.
Borden Co, California Division, Gustine, Calif.	Raw milk, cream, and skim		X	91.8	------	95.4	------	91.0	SDA [1]	Oct. 25, 1957.
Carnation Co., Oakland, Calif.	Raw milk, pasteurized milk, and milk production.		X	89.8	------	95.6	93.8	92.0	SDA [1]	July 23, 1958.
Dairymen's Cooperative Dairy Association, Tulare, Calif.	Raw milk, cream, and skim		X	94.6	96.0	------	------	91.0	SDA [1]	Sept. 12, 1957.
King's County Dairy Association, Lemoore, Calif.	do		X	90.8	95.0	------	------	92.0	SDA [1]	Sept. 20, 1958.
Lucerne Milk Co., Los Angeles, Calif.	Raw milk, pasteurized milk, and milk production.		X	90.2	------	96.0	94.0	94.0	SDA [1]	Apr. 9, 1957.
Petaluma Cooperative Creamery, Petaluma, Calif.	do		X	88.0	------	95.0	92.7	89.0	SDA [1]	Oct. 10, 1958.
Safeway, milk dept., Oakland, Calif.	do		X	88.0	------	95.0	92.6	92.0	SDA [1]	July 15, 1958.
Superior milk Producers Association, Artesia, Calif.	Raw milk		X	88.2	96.0	------	------	94.0	SDA [1]	Apr. 9, 1957.
COLORADO										
Beatrice Food Co., Denver, Colo.	Pasteurized milk and milk products.	X (production)	X (plant)	91.7	------	94.7	93.7	85.3	SHD	August 1957.
Beatrice Foods Co., Greeley, Colo.	do	X (production)	X (plant)	90.0	------	100.0	96.6	91.5	SHD	October 1957.
Beatrice Foods Co., Pueblo, Colo.	do	X (production)	X (plant)	92.0	------	93.0	92.6	91.2	SHD	February 1958.
Carlson-Frink Co., Denver, Colo.	do	X (production)	X (plant)	91.7	------	93.4	92.8	85.3	SHD	August 1957.
Frank Creamery, Fort Collins, Colo.	Raw milk, cream, and skim	X (production)	X (receiving station)	92.5	99.0	------	------	85.3	SHD	Do.
Garden Farm Dairy (National Dairies), Denver, Colo.	Pasteurized milk and milk products.	X (production)	X (plant)	91.7	------	95.0	93.9	85.3	SHD	Do.
IXL Creamery, Colorado Springs, Colo.	do	X (production)	X (plant)	89.2	------	97.0	94.4	93.3	SHD	December 1957.
Lucerne Milk Co., Denver, Colo.	do	X (production)	X (plant)	91.7	------	95.3	94.0	85.3	SHD	August 1957.
DELAWARE										
Foremost Dairies, Inc., Clayton, Del.	Raw milk		X	91.6	93.0	------	------	92.0	SHD	Oct. 16, 1958.
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA										
Chestnut Farms Division, National Dairy, Washington, D.C.	Raw milk, cream, pasteurized milk, and milk products.	X (production)	X (plant)	91.0	100.0	97.0	95.0	94.0	USPHS	Mar. 6, 1958.
Embassy Dairy, Washington, D.C.	Pasteurized milk and milk products.	X (production)	X (plant)	91.0	------	98.0	96.0	94.0	USPHS	Do.
High's Dairy Products Corp., Washington, D.C.	do	X (production)	X (plant)	91.0	------	96.0	94.0	94.0	USPHS	Do.
Lucerne Milk Co., Washington, D.C.	do	X (production)	X (plant)	91.0	------	95.0	94.0	94.0	USPHS	Do.
Thompson's Dairy, Inc., Washington, D.C.	do	X (production)	X (plant)	91.0	------	97.0	95.0	94.0	USPHS	Do.

See footnotes at end of table.

Sanitation compliance ratings of interstate milk shippers, Jan. 1, 1959—Continued

Name and address of shipping station or plant	Type of product	Type of rating		Percent compliance rating				Enforcement rating	Rating agency	Date of rating
		Area	Individual	Raw milk	Receiving station	Pasteurizing plant	Pasteurized milk			
FLORIDA										
Bordens Dairy, Pensacola, Fla.	Pasteurized milk and milk products.		X	92.0	93.0	98.0	96.0	88.0	SHD	June 1958.
Foremost Dairies, Inc., Tallahassee, Fla.	do		X	92.7	------	94.0	93.6	92.0	SHD	May 16, 1958.
Maddox Dairies, Lakeland, Fla.	Raw milk, pasteurized milk, and milk products.	X (production)	X (plant)	91.3	------	95.0	93.7	96.5	SHD	April 1958.
Southern Dairies, Inc. (Sealtest), Marianna, Fla.	Pasteurized milk and milk products.		X	93.0	------	91.9	92.3	91.0	SHD	July 16, 1958.
Velda Dairies, Winter Haven, Fla.	Raw milk, pasteurized milk, and milk products.	X (production)	X (plant)	94.2	------	90.0	91.4	96.5	SHD	April 1958.
GEORGIA										
Foremost Dairies, Inc., Atlanta, Ga.	Raw milk, cream, and skim, pasteurized milk, and milk products.	X		89.0	------	95.2	93.0	95.6	SHD	Aug. 23, 1957.
Pet Dairy Products Co., Washington, Ga.	do	X		90.2	------	96.0	94.0	90.8	SHD	Mar. 1, 1957.
Southern Dairies, Inc. (Sealtest), Atlanta, Ga.	do	X		89.0	------	95.2	93.0	95.6	SHD	Aug. 23, 1957.
IDAHO										
Arden Farms Co., Moscow, Idaho	Pasteurized milk and milk products.	X		92.6	------	93.0	92.9	93.0	SHD	Apr. 26, 1957.
Cream Top Dairy, Idaho Falls, Idaho.	do	X		92.3	------	95.0	94.4	95.0	SHD	Nov. 12, 1957.
Golden Grain Dairy Products, Lewiston, Idaho.	do		X	93.0	------	99.9	97.6	94.0	SHD	Apr. 22, 1957.
Guernsey Gold Dairy, Payette, Idaho.	do		X	88.5	------	95.0	92.8	93.5	SHD	Apr. 24, 1958.
Home Dairies, Boise, Idaho	do	X (production)	X (plant)	86.8	------	98.9	93.9	90.0	SHD	Jan. 11, 1957.
Home Dairies, Nampa, Idaho	do		X	92.4	------	98.0	96.0	94.5	SHD	May 20, 1958.
Idaho Creameries, Boise, Idaho	do	X (production)	X (plant)	86.6	------	98.9	93.2	90.0	SHD	Jan. 11, 1957.
Jerome Cooperative Creamery, Jerome, Idaho.	do		X	93.8	------	90.0	91.3	92.0	SHD	June 10, 1958.
Sandpoint Dairy Products, Sandpoint, Idaho.	do	X		89.8	------	89.0	89.3	96.0	SHD	June 21, 1957.
Stowell's Dairy, Rigby, Idaho	do		X	95.6	------	98.0	97.2	94.0	SHD	Mar. 20, 1958.
Upper Snake River Valley Dairymen's Association, Idaho Falls, Idaho.	do	X		92.3	------	98.0	96.0	95.0	SHD	Nov. 15, 1957.
Van's Creamery, Coeur d'Alene, Idaho.	do	X		88.3	------	90.0	89.4	94.5	SHD	June 17, 1957.
Vita-Rich Dairy, Caldwell, Idaho	do		X	93.2	------	99.0	97.0	95.0	SHD	Apr. 3, 1958.
Young's Dairy, Twin Falls, Idaho	do	X		91.8	------	98.8	96.4	98.0	SHD	Mar. 20, 1957.
ILLINOIS										
Batavia Dairy Co., St. Charles, Ill.	Raw milk	X (production)	X (receiving station).	93.7	99.0	------	------	96.0	SHD	June 13, 1957.
Beatrice Foods Co., Bloomington, Ill.	Pasteurized milk and milk products.	X (production)	X (plant)	93.4	------	97.0	95.8	97.3	SHD	Apr. 10, 1957.
Beatrice Foods Co., Champaign, Ill.	Raw milk, pasteurized milk and milk products.	X (production)	X (plant)	93.0	------	96.0	95.0	92.0	SHD	Mar. 5, 1958.
Beatrice Foods Co., Danville, Ill.	Pasteurized milk and milk products.	X (production)	X (plant)	90.0	------	96.0	94.0	92.0	SHD	Mar. 19, 1958.
Beatrice Foods Co. (Meadow Gold), Galesburg, Ill.	do		X	90.8	------	90.0	90.2	93.0	SHD	Nov. 6, 1957.
Beatrice Foods Co., Matoon, Ill.	do		X	93.5	------	97.0	95.2	92.0	SHD	Apr. 2, 1958.
Beatrice Foods Co. (Midvale), Moline, Ill.	Pasteurized sour cream, pasteurized milk and milk products.		X	95.9	------	100.0	98.6	94.0	SHD	Aug. 23, 1957.
Beatrice Foods Co., Waukegan, Ill.	Raw milk, pasteurized milk and milk products.	X (production)	X (plant)	90.1	------	94.0	92.7	90.0	SHD	Feb. 26, 1957.
Borden Co., 3014 North Tripp Ave., Chicago, Ill.	Pasteurized milk and milk products.	X (production)	X (plant)	93.7	------	99.0	97.2	96.0	SHD	June 13, 1957.
Borden Co., Hebron, Ill.	Raw milk	X (production)	X (receiving station).	93.7	100.0	------	------	96.0	SHD	Do.
Borden Co., Pekin, Ill.	Pasteurized milk and milk products.	X (production)	X (plant)	91.8	------	91.0	91.3	98.0	SHD	Apr. 17, 1958.
Borden Co., Rock Island, Ill.	do	X (production)	X (plant)	91.2	------	95.9	94.3	92.0	SHD	July 16, 1958.
Borden Co., Woodstock, Ill.	Raw milk	X (production)	X (receiving station).	93.7	100.0	------	------	96.0	SHD	June 13, 1957.
Borden Food Products Co., Dixon, Ill.	do	X (production)	X (receiving station).	93.7	100.0	------	------	96.0	SHD	Do.
Bowman Dairy, 4124 North Kostner, Chicago, Ill.	Pasteurized milk and milk products.	X (production)	X (plant)	93.7	----	100.0	97.9	96.0	SHD	Do.
Bowman Dairy, 4149 State St., Chicago, Ill.	do	X (production)	X (plant)	93.7	------	100.0	97.9	96.0	SHD	Do.
Bowman Dairy, Harvard, Ill.	Raw milk	X (production)	X (receiving station).	93.7	100.0	------	------	96.0	SHD	Do.
Bowman Dairy, Herbert (P.O. Kingston), Ill.	do	X (production)	X (receiving station).	93.7	100.0	------	------	96.0	SHD	Do.
Bowman Dairy, River Forest, Ill.	Pasteurized milk and milk products.	X (production)	X (plant)	93.7	------	100.0	97.9	96.0	SHD	Do.
Brook Hill Farms, Chicago, Ill.	Pasteurized milk and milk products (dairy specialties).	X (production)	X (plant)	93.7	------	100.0	97.9	96.0	SHD	Do.
Burlington Milk Products Co., Burlington, Ill.	Raw milk	X (production)	X (receiving station).	93.7	98.0	------	------	96.0	SHD	Do.
Chapel Hill Creamery, Inc., McHenry, Ill.	do	X (production)	X (receiving station).	93.7	98.0	------	------	96.0	SHD	Do.
Chester City Dairy, Chester City, Ill.	Pasteurized milk and milk products.		X	93.8	------	96.0	95.2	92.0	SHD	Nov. 1, 1957.
Country's Delight, certified grocer, Chicago, Ill.	do	X (production)	X (plant)	93.7	------	99.0	97.2	96.0	SHD	June 13, 1957.
Country's Delight, certified grocer, Hampshire, Ill.	Raw milk, cream, and skim	X (production)	X (receiving station).	93.7	99.0	------	------	96.0	SHD	Do.
Dairy Brand-Harrisburg Dairy Products Co., Harrisburg, Ill.	Pasteurized milk and milk products.		X	92.5	------	93.6	93.2	90.0	SHD	Dec. 18, 1957.
Danville, Producers Dairy, Danville, Ill.	do	X (production)	X (plant)	90.0	------	98.0	98.0	92.0	SHD	Mar. 19, 1958.

Sanitation compliance ratings of interstate milk shippers, Jan. 1, 1959—Continued

Name and address of shipping station or plant	Type of product	Type of rating		Percent compliance rating				Enforcement rating	Rating agency	Date of rating
		Area	Individual	Raw milk	Receiving station	Pasteurizing plant	Pasteurized milk			
ILLINOIS—continued										
Dean Milk Co., Belvidere, Ill.	Raw milk	X (production)	X (receiving station).	93.7	98.0	------	------	96.0	SHD	June 13, 1957.
Dean Milk Co., Chemung (P. O., Harvard) Ill.	Pasteurized milk and milk products.	------	X	94.4	------	100.0	98.0	96.0	SHD	June 18, 1958.
Dean Milk Co., Huntley, Ill.	do	X (production)	X (plant)	93.7	------	98.0	96.6	96.0	SHD	June 13, 1957.
Dean Milk Co., Rockford, Ill.	Raw milk cream, and skim	X (production)	X (receiving station).	93.7	100.0	------	------	96.0	SHD	Do.
Downing's Dairy, Inc., Rock Island, Ill.	Pasteurized milk and milk products.	X (production)	X (plant)	91.2	------	94.0	93.0	92.0	SHD	July 16, 1958.
Edwardsville Creamery Co., Edwardsville, Ill.	do	------	X	91.5	------	92.8	92.0	90.0	SHD	Feb. 11, 1958.
Elgin Milk Products Co., Chicago Ill.	do	X (production)	X (plant)	93.7	------	98.0	96.6	96.0	SHD	June 13, 1957.
Fairmont Foods Co., Rock Island, Ill.	do	X (production)	X (plant)	91.2	------	90.0	90.6	92.0	SHD	July 16, 1958.
Hanson Dairy San Jose, Ill.	Raw milk, cream, and skim; pasteurized milk and milk products.	------	X	91.0	------	91.6	91.3	90.0	SHD	Apr. 24, 1958.
Hawthorn Mellody Farms Dairy, 4215 West Chicago Ave., Chicago, Ill.	Pasteurized milk and milk products.	X (production)	X (plant)	93.7	------	99.0	97.2	96.0	SHD	May 6, 1957.
Hawthorn Mellody Farms Dairy, 4224 West Chicago Ave., Chicago, Ill.	do	X (production)	X (plant)	93.7	------	99.0	97.2	96.0	SHD	Do.
Hunding Dairy, Chicago, Ill.	do	X (production)	X (plant)	93.7	------	94	93.9	96.0	SHD	June 13, 1957.
Hunding Dairy, Peotone, Ill.	Raw milk	X (production)	X (receiving station).	93.7	95.0	------	------	96.0	SHD	Do.
Instant Whip—Chicago, Inc., Chicago, Ill.	Pasteurized cream	X (production)	X (plant)	93.7	------	94	93.9	96.0	SHD	Do.
Kraft Foods Co., Manlius, Ill.	Raw milk	------	X	90.0	100.0	------	------	92.0	SHD	July 10, 1958.
Kraft Foods Co., Milledgeville, Ill.	do	X (production)	X (receiving station).	93.7	100.0	------	------	96.0	SHD	June 13, 1957.
Kraml Dairy, Chicago, Ill.	Pasteurized milk and milk products.	X (production)	X (plant)	93.7	------	100	97.9	96.0	SHD	Do.
Ludwig Milk Co., 200 North Spring St., Elgin, Ill.	do	X (production)	X (plant)	93.7	------	98	96.6	96.0	SHD	Do.
Ludwig Milk Co., 56 Water St., Elgin, Ill.	do	X (production)	X (plant)	93.7	------	98	96.6	96.0	SHD	Do.
Ludwig Milk Co., Polo, Ill.	Raw milk, cream, and skim	X (production)	X (receiving station).	93.7	95.0	------	------	96.0	SHD	Do.
Meadowmoor Dairies (Gaymont Laboratories) Chicago, Ill.	Pasteurized milk and milk products and yoghurt.	X (production)	X (plant)	93.7	------	98.0	96.6	96.0	SHD	Do.
Midwest Dairy Products Co., Centralia, Ill.	Pasteurized milk and milk products.	------	X	95.5	------	99.0	97.2	95.0	SHD	Sept. 17, 1957.
Muller Pinehurst Dairy, Rockford, Ill.	do	------	X	90.3	------	100.0	96.7	90.0	SHD	Apr. 10, 1957.
National Cheese Co., Chicago, Ill.	Pasteurized sour cream	X (production)	X (plant)	93.7	------	98.0	96.6	96.0	SHD	June 13, 1957.
New Era Dairy, Carbondale, Ill.	Pasteurized milk and milk products.	------	X	91.0	94.0	94.0	92.5	92.0	SHD	June 25, 1957.
Oatman Brothers, Inc., Sandwich, Ill.	Raw milk, cream, skim, and condensed skim.	X (production)	X (receiving station).	93.7	99.0	------	------	96.0	SHD	June 13, 1957.
Peoria Producers Dairy, Globe St., Peoria, Ill.	Raw milk	X (production)	X (plant)	91.8	------	98.0	96.6	98.0	SHD	Apr. 17, 1958.
Peoria Producers Dairy, University Ave., Peoria, Ill.	Pasteurized milk and milk products.	X (production)	X (plant)	91.8	------	99.0	96.6	98.0	SHD	Do.
Prairie Farms Creamery, Carbondale, Ill.	Raw milk	------	X	91.0	94.0	------	------	94.0	SHD	June 25, 1957.
Prairie Farms Creamery Co., Carlyle, Ill.	do	X (production)	X (receiving station).	92.0	100.0	------	------	98.5	SHD Missouri	Oct. 16, 1957.
Prairie Farms of Southern Illinois, Olney, Ill.	Pasteurized milk and milk products.	------	X	93.7	------	95.8	95.0	84.3	SHD	Oct. 10, 1958.
Pure Milk Association, Bloomington, Ill.	Raw milk	X (production)	X (receiving station).	93.4	92.0	------	------	97.0	SHD	Apr. 10, 1957.
Pure Milk Association, Chicago, Ill.	Pasteurized milk and milk products.	X (production)	X (plant)	93.7	------	99.0	97.2	96.0	SHD	June 13, 1957.
Pure Milk Association, Hinckley, Ill.	Raw milk	X (production)	X (receiving station).	93.7	100.0	------	------	96.0	SHD	Do.
Pure Milk Association, Kankakee, Ill.	Raw milk	X (production)	X (receiving station).	93.7	100.0	------	------	96.0	SHD	June 13, 1957.
Pure Milk Association, Lisle, Ill.	Raw milk, cream, and skim; pasteurized milk and milk products.	X (production)	X (plant and receiving station).	93.7	100.0	100.0	97.9	96.0	SHD	Do.
Pure Milk Association, Pearl City, Ill.	Raw milk	X (production)	X (receiving station).	93.7	97.0	------	------	96.0	SHD	Do.
Pure Milk Association, Richmond, Ill.	do	X (production)	X (receiving station).	93.7	100.0	------	------	96.0	SHD	Do.
Quality Milk Association, Mount Carroll, Ill.	do	------	X	91.3	93.0	------	------	92.0	SHD	July 8, 1958.
Sealtest Dairy, Peoria, Ill.	Pasteurized milk and milk products.	X (production)	X (plant)	91.8	------	100.0	97.2	98.0	SHD	Apr. 17, 1958.
Super Whip Sales Co., Chicago, Ill.	Pasteurized cream	X (production)	X (plant)	93.7	------	95.0	94.6	96.0	SHD	June 13, 1957.
Tinley Park Dairy Co., Tinley Park, Ill.	Pasteurized milk and milk products.	------	X	91.9	------	97.0	94.5	94.0	SHD	Dec. 4, 1957.
United Milk & Ice Cream Co., Chicago Heights, Ill.	do	------	X	92.8	------	90.0	90.9	94.0	SHD	Dec. 5, 1957.
United Milk Products Co., Garden Prairie, Ill.	Raw milk, cream and skim	X (production)	X (receiving station).	93.7	100.0	------	------	96.0	SHD	June 13, 1957.
Waterloo Milk Co., Inc., Waterloo, Ill.	Raw milk, pasteurized milk, and milk products.	------	X	91.0	------	90.0	90.5	90.0	SHD	July 30, 1957.
Willow-Dale Dairy, Antioch, Ill.	Pasteurized milk and milk products.	X (production)	X (plant)	93.7	------	98.0	96.6	96.0	SHD	June 13, 1957.
INDIANA										
Aimone Bros., Clinton, Ind.	do	X (production)	X (plant)	81.5	------	94.2	89.9	66.0	SHD	May 1, 1957.
Allen Dairy, Fort Wayne, Ind.	do	X (production)	X (plant)	90.0	------	95.5	93.6	91.0	SHD	July 15, 1958.

Sanitation compliance ratings of interstate milk shippers, Jan. 1, 1959—Continued

Name and address of shipping station or plant	Type of product	Type of rating		Percent compliance rating				Enforcement rating	Rating agency	Date of rating
		Area	Individual	Raw milk	Receiving station	Pasteurizing plant	Pasteurized milk			
INDIANA—continued										
American Dairy Co., Inc., Evansville, Ind.	Pasteurized milk and milk products.	X (production)	X (plant)	93.0	------	91.0	91.6	96.0	SHD	June 5, 1958.
Beatrice Foods Co. (Jersey Creamery Co.) New Castle, Ind.	Raw milk, pasteurized milk, and milk products.	X (production)	X (plant)	93.0	------	95.0	94.5	94.0	SHD	Apr. 24, 1958.
Borden Co., Hammond, Ind.	Pasteurized milk and milk products.	X (production)	X (plant	91.5	------	97.4	95.4	92.0	SHD	Apr. 24, 1957.
Borden Co. (Indianapolis Milk Division), Indianapolis, Ind.	do	X (production)	X (plant)	89.3	------	95.0	93.0	96.0	SHD	Apr. 3, 1958.
Butler Dairy Co., R.R. No. 4, Madison, Ind.	do		X	92.7	------	95.0	94.2	92.0	SHD	July 23, 1958.
Central Dairy, Fort Wayne, Ind.	Raw milk and skim; pasteurized milk and milk products.	X (production)	X (plant and station).	90.0	85.0	83.6	85.7	91.0	SHD	July 15, 1958.
Cloverleaf Dairy Co., Inc., Gary, Ind.	Pasteurized milk and milk products.	X (production)	X (plant)	91.5	------	97.2	95.3	92.0	SHD	Apr. 24, 1957.
Covalt Dairy Co., Inc., Muncie, Ind.	Raw milk, pasteurized milk, and milk products.	X (production)	X (plant)	90.0	------	94.7	93.0	93.0	SHD	May 29, 1958.
Dean Milk Co., Rochester, Ind.	Pasteurized milk and milk products.		X	93.3	------	97.0	95.8	98.0	SHD	Sept. 17, 1958.
Dixie Dairy Co., Gary, Ind.	do	X (production)	X (plant)	91.5	------	94.6	93.6	92.0	SHD	Apr. 24, 1957.
Eskay Dairy, Fort Wayne, Ind.	do	X (production)	X (plant)	90.0	------	99.8	91.2	91.0	SHD	June 18, 1958.
Gerber's Central Dairy, Bluffton, Ind.	do	X (production)	X (plant)	92.0	------	90.4	90.9	94.5	SHD	Jan. 17, 1957.
Goshen Milk Condensing Co., Goshen, Ind.	Raw milk, cream, and skim		X	91.0	99.0	------	------	97.0	SHD	Jan. 10, 1957.
Holland Custard & Ice Cream Co., Holland, Ind.	Raw milk, pasteurized milk, and milk products.	X (production)	X (plant)	90.0	------	94.0	92.0	96.0	SHD	Feb. 13, 1958.
Home Dairy Products, Inc., Rural Route No. 2, Berne, Ind.	do	X (production)	X (plant)	91.0	------	92.0	92.0	97.0	SHD	Oct. 17, 1958.
Hunding Dairy, Wellsboro, Ind.	Raw milk	X (production)	X (receiving station).	93.7	96.0	------	------	96.0	SHD	June 13, 1957.
Indiana Dairy Marketing Association, Muncie, Ind.	Raw milk, pasteurized milk, and milk products.	X (production)	X (plant)	90.0	------	95.0	93.3	93.0	SHD	May 29, 1958.
Kroger Co. Dairy, Indianapolis, Ind.	Pasteurized milk and milk products.	X (production)	X (plant)	89.3	------	96.7	94.2	96.0	SHD	Apr. 3, 1958.
Lookwell Farm Dairy, Inc., Elkhart, Ind.	do	X (production)	X (plant)	86.6	------	97.0	93.5	90.0	SHD	Dec. 5, 1957.
Mutual Milk Co., Indianapolis, Ind.	do	X (production)	X (plant)	89.3	------	97.9	95.0	96.0	SHD	Apr. 3, 1958.
National Milk Co., Inc., South Bend, Ind.	do	X (production)	X (plant)	91.4	------	92.8	92.3	91.0	SHD	Nov. 27, 1957.
New Paris Creamery Co., New Paris, Ind.	Raw milk, cream, pasteurized milk and milk products.		X	90.6	100.0	100.0	96.9	90.0	SHD	Dec. 5, 1957.
Pleasant View Dairy Corp., Highland, Ind.	Pasteurized milk and milk products.		X	90.0	------	95.0	93.3	91.5	SHD	Mar. 25, 1957.
Polk Sanitary Milk Co., Indianapolis, Ind.	do	X (production)	X (plant)	89.3	------	97.7	94.9	96.0	SHD	Apr. 3, 1958.
Prairie View Dairy Co., East Chicago, Ind.	do	X (production)	X (plant)	91.5	------	94.4	93.4	92.0	SHD	Apr. 24, 1957.
Pure Sealed Dairy, Fort Wayne, Ind.	do	X (production)	X (plant)	90.0	------	94.0	92.7	91.0	SHD	June 19, 1958.
Purity Maid Products Co., New Albany, Ind.	do		X	91.0	------	91.0	91.0	93.0	SHD	Oct. 16, 1957.
Red "73" Creamery, Inc., Madison, Ind.	Raw milk		X	90.0	93.0	------	------	91.0	SHD	Oct. 3, 1957.
Red "73" Creamery, Inc., Union City, Ind.	Raw milk, pasteurized milk and milk products.		X	95.3	------	91.6	92.8	92.0	SHD	July 3, 1957.
Reddi-Wip Manufacturing, Inc., of Indiana, Fort Wayne, Ind.	Pasteurized cream	X (production)	X (plant)	90.0	------	85.0	86.6	91.0	SHD	June 27, 1958.
Reliable Dairy Co., Inc., Plant No. 1, South Bend, Ind.	Pasteurized milk and milk products.	X (production)	X (plant)	91.4	------	94.8	93.7	91.0	SHD	Nov. 27, 1957.
Reliable Dairy Co., Inc., Plant No. 2, South Bend, Ind.	do	X (production)	X (plant)	91.4	------	94.8	93.7	91.0	SHD	Do.
Spriggs Dairy Products, Inc., Bloomington, Ind.	Raw milk and cream; pasteurized milk and milk products.	X (production)	X (plant and station.)	92.6	95.0	89.8	90.7	97.0	SHD	Jan. 10, 1958.
Tip Top Creamery Co., Vincennes, Ind.	Pasteurized milk and milk products.	X (production)	X (plant)	92.3	------	90.9	91.4	92.0	SHD	Oct. 3, 1957.
Vigo Cooperative Milk Producers Association, Terre Haute, Ind.	Raw milk	X		86.8	(4)	------	------	87.0	SHD	Aug. 14, 1958.
Wayne Cooperative Milk Producers, Inc., (Hoosier Division), Bluffton, Ind.	do	X (production)	X (plant)	91.0	91.0	91.0	91.0	97.0	SHD	Oct. 17, 1958.
Wayne Cooperative Milk Producers, Fort Wayne, Ind.	Raw milk, cream, and skim		X	90.0	93.0	------	------	91.0	SHD	Aug. 5, 1958.
Wayne Dairy Products, Inc., Richmond, Ind.	Pasteurized milk and milk products.		X	93.9	------	95.3	94.8	95.0	SHD	Apr. 24, 1957.
IOWA										
Anderson Erickson Dairy Co., Des Moines, Iowa.	do		X	92.9	------	99.5	97.3	95.5	SHD	July 3, 1958.
Beatrice Foods Co., Council Bluffs, Iowa.	do	X (production)	X (plant)	92.0	------	94.0	93.0	94.0	SHD	Jan. 22, 1958.
Beatrice Foods Co., Dubuque, Iowa.	do		X	92.9	------	95.0	94.3	93.0	SHD	June 19, 1958.
Beatrice Foods Co., Ottumwa, Iowa.	do		X	94.0	------	100.0	98.0	85.5	SHD	May 23, 1958.
Brookside Dairy Co., Dubuque, Iowa.	do		X	90.8	------	92.0	91.6	93.0	SHD	June 19, 1958.
Burlington Cooperative Milk Producers Association, Burlington, Iowa.	Raw milk		X	89.4	96.0	------	------	92.0	SHD	Apr. 17, 1958.
Carnation Milk Co., Mason City, Iowa.	Pasteurized milk and milk products.		X	97.0	(4)	100.0	99.0	96.0	SHD	Mar. 21, 1958.
Carnation Co., Waterloo, Iowa.	do		X	95.2	(4)	100.0	98.4	90.6	SHD	Jan. 9, 1958.

Sanitation compliance ratings of interstate milk shippers, Jan. 1, 1959—Continued

Name and address of shipping station or plant	Type of product	Type of rating		Percent compliance rating				Enforcement rating	Rating agency	Date of rating
		Area	Individual	Raw milk	Receiving station	Pasteurizing plant	Pasteurized milk			
IOWA—continued										
Des Moines Cooperative Association, Des Moines, Iowa.	Raw milk	X (production)	X (receiving station).	91.9	97.0	------	------	95.5	SHD	July 3, 1958.
Dubuque Cooperative Dairy, Dubuque, Iowa.	do		X	91.8	98.0	------	------	93.0	SHD	June 19, 1958.
Eastern Iowa Cooperative Dairy Products, Cedar Rapids, Iowa.	do	X (production)	X (receiving station).	93.9	100.0	------	------	92.4	SHD	Nov. 7, 1957.
Eastern Iowa Cooperative Dairy, Marion, Iowa.	do	X (production)	X (receiving station).	92.5	100.0	------	------	92.8	SHD	Oct. 8, 1958.
Estherville Cooperative Creamery Association, Estherville, Iowa.	Pasteurized milk and milk products.		X	92.2	------	97.0	95.4	93.0	SHD	Aug. 6, 1958.
Fairmont Foods Co., Sioux City, Iowa.	do	X (production)	X (plant)	90.0	------	98.0	95.3	85.0	SHD	June 10, 1958.
Farmers Cooperative Creamery Association, Cresco, Iowa.	Raw milk		X	90.8	90.0	------	------	93.6	SHD	Dec. 4, 1957.
Farmers Mutual Cooperative Creamery, Sioux Center, Iowa.	Pasteurized milk and milk products.		X	96.3	------	97.0	96.8	95.5	SHD	July 24, 1958.
Fort Dodge Creamery Co., Fort Dodge, Iowa.	do		X	96.6	------	96.6	96.6	94.0	SHD	Aug. 28, 1958.
Freemeier Dairy Co., Fort Madison, Iowa.	do		X	87.5	------	91.0	90.0	92.0	SHD	Sept. 11, 1958.
Hi Acre Dairy Co., Dubuque, Iowa.	do		X	91.8	------	91.0	91.2	93.0	SHD	June 18, 1958.
Hilldale Dairy Co., Dubuque, Iowa.	do		X	91.8	------	95.0	93.9	93.0	SHD	June 19, 1958.
Illinois-Iowa Dairy Co., Davenport, Iowa.	do	X (production)	X (plant)	91.5	------	96.0	94.5	96.0	SHD	July 24, 1958.
Iowana Farms Milk Co., Bettendorf, Iowa.	do	X (production)	X (plant)	91.5	------	98.0	95.8	96.0	SHD	Do.
Jones Dairy Co., Corydon, Iowa	do		X	94.0	------	97.0	96.0	93.8	SHD	Mar. 17, 1958.
Kinnard Dairy Co., Estherville, Iowa.	do		X	93.0	------	94.0	93.7	93.0	SHD	Aug. 6, 1958.
Linn County Farmers Mutual Creamery Association, Coggon, Iowa.	Raw milk		X	92.0	92.0	------	------	92.4	SHD	Oct. 24, 1957.
Maquoketa Valley Cooperative, Arlington, Iowa.	do		X	91.4	94.0	------	------	94.0	SHD	Oct. 1, 1958.
Marshall County Milk Producers Association, Marshalltown, Iowa.	do	X (production)	X (receiving station).	90.0	98.0	------	------	91.5	SHD	Dec. 3, 1957.
Medd-O-Lane Dairy Products, Bettendorf, Iowa.	Pasteurized milk and milk products.	X (production)	X (plant)	91.5	------	100.0	97.0	96.0	SHD	July 24, 1958.
Oakland Dairy Co., Dubuque, Iowa.	do		X	93.3	------	95.0	94.4	93.0	SHD	June 19, 1958.
O'Brien County Cooperative Association, Sanborn, Iowa.	Raw milk		X	93.7	90.0	------	------	93.3	SHD	Apr. 9, 1958.
Osceola Cooperative Creamery Association, Sibley, Iowa.	do		X	93.7	99.0	------	------	93.3	SHD	Do.
Peter's Dairy Co., Keokuk, Iowa	Pasteurized milk and milk products.		X	90.2	------	90.5	90.4	91.0	SHD	Aug. 12, 1958.
Pilley & Sons Dairy, Frank, Sioux City, Iowa.	do	X (production)	X (plant)	90.0	------	97.0	94.7	85.0	SHD	June 12, 1958.
Roberts Dairy Co., Sioux City, Iowa.	do	X (production)	X (plant)	90.0	------	99.5	96.3	85.0	SHD	June 10, 1958.
Roe Dairy Co., Sioux City, Iowa	do	X (production)	X (plant)	90.0	------	95.0	93.3	85.0	SHD	June 12, 1958.
Sanitary Farms Dairy Co., Cedar Rapids, Iowa.	do	X (production)	X (plant)	92.5	------	99.0	96.8	92.8	SHD	Oct. 8, 1958.
Sanitary Farm Dairies, Clinton, Iowa.	Raw milk, pasteurized milk, and milk products.		X	94.2	------	99.4	97.7	92.5	SHD	Aug. 7 1958.
Sunshin Dairy Co., Burlington, Iowa.	Pasteurized milk and milk products.		X	91.8	------	91.0	91.2	92.0	SHD	Apr. 17, 1958.
Tri-States Co-op Dairy Products, Keokuk, Iowa.	do		X	92.0	------	94.0	93.3	91.0	SHD	Aug. 14, 1958.
Walnut Farms Dairy Co., Waterloo, Iowa.	do		X	96.2	------	96.0	96.0	90.6	SHD	Jan. 9, 1958.
Wells Dairy Co., Le Mars, Iowa	do		X	94.9	------	98.0	96.9	94.2	SHD	Feb. 4, 1958.
Whitehouse Dairy Co., Keokuk, Iowa.	do		X	91.2	------	94.3	93.3	91.0	SHD	Aug. 11, 1958.
Youngs Dairy Co., Sioux City, Iowa.	do	X (production)	X (plant)	90.0	------	99.0	96.0	85.0	SHD	June 12, 1958.
KANSAS										
Allvine Dairy Co., Kansas City, Kans.	do		X	92.8	------	99.0	96.9	98.9	SHD	Aug. 13, 1958.
Arkansas City Cooperative Milk Association, Arkansas City, Kans.	Raw milk, cream, and skim; pasteurized milk and milk products.		X	92.4	------	94.7	93.9	96.8	SHD	Nov. 13, 1957.
Banner Dairy, Fort Scott, Kans	do		X	90.8	------	98.4	95.8	93.0	SHD	Jan. 17, 1958.
Beatrice Foods Co., Parsons, Kans.	do		X	90.8	------	100.0	96.9	97.7	SHD	Apr. 11, 1957.
Beatrice Foods Co., Inc., Topeka, Kans.	do		X	92.9	------	99.9	97.5	99.4	SHD	May 23, 1958.
Beatrice Foods Co., Wichita, Kans	do		X	94.2	------	96.8	95.4	99.0	SHD	May 13, 1958.
Burkett Dairy, Goodland, Kans	do		X	92.9	------	97.7	96.0	95.8	SHD	Apr. 24, 1958.
Central Kansas Cooperative Creamery Association, Hillsboro, Kans.	do		X	93.4	------	99.6	97.5	98.9	SHD	Feb. 11, 1958.
Fairmont Foods Co., Concordia, Kans.	do		X	93.4	------	96.0	95.0	95.2	SHD	Mar. 1, 1957.
Fairmont Foods Co., Dodge City, Kans.	Pasteurized milk and milk products.		X	92.4	------	97.9	96.0	97.0	SHD	Apr. 11, 1958.
Gardiner Dairy, Garden City, Kans.	Raw milk, cream and skim; pasteurized milk and milk products.		X	89.0	------	94.9	93.0	97.0	SHD	Jan. 17, 1958.
Kings Dairy, Liberal, Kans	do		X	89.6	------	91.9	91.0	97.6	SHD	May 29, 1958.
Meyer Dairy, Basehor, Kans	do		X	94.5	------	99.0	97.5	99.3	SHD	July 30, 1958.
Meyer Sanitary Milk Co., Kansas City, Kans.	Pasteurized milk and milk products.		X	96.7	------	99.0	98.2	99.2	SHD	Aug. 13, 1958.

Sanitation compliance ratings of interstate milk shippers, Jan. 1, 1959—Continued

Name and address of shipping station or plant	Type of product	Type of rating		Percent compliance rating				Enforcement rating	Rating agency	Date of rating
		Area	Individual	Raw milk	Receiving station	Pasteurizing plant	Pasteurized milk			
KANSAS—continued										
Milk Producers Marketing Co., Kansas City, Kans.	Raw milk, cream, and skim; pasteurized milk and milk products.		X	92.9	------	97.9	96.3	98.9	SHD	Aug. 13, 1958.
Nemaha Cooperative Creamery Association, Sabetha, Kans.	do		X	95.4	------	99.0	97.8	99.4	SHD	Mar. 12, 1958.
Neosho Valley Cooperative Creamery Association, Erie, Kans.	do		X	91.5	------	98.9	96.4	99.2	SHD	May 28, 1958.
Page Milk Co., Coffeyville, Kans.	do		X	92.6	------	98.0	96.3	98.5	SHD	Feb. 21, 1958.
Puritan Dairy, Pittsburg, Kans.	do		X	95.7	------	99.0	97.9	99.5	SHD	Apr. 9, 1958.
Southwest Milk Producers Association, Dodge City, Kans.	Raw milk		X	92.4	100.0	------	------	97.0	SHD	Apr. 11, 1958.
Steffens Dairy Foods Co., Wichita, Kans.	Raw milk, cream and skim; pasteurized milk and milk products.		X	93.0	------	99.9	97.6	98.9	SHD	Apr. 28, 1958.
Sunflower Cooperative Creamery Association, Everest, Kans.	do		X	92.2	100.0	99.0	96.7	99.0	SHD	Dec. 6, 1957.
Weside Dairy, Junction City, Kans.	do		X	89.4	------	98.0	95.0	99.0	SHD	Mar. 19, 1958.
Wichita Milk Producers Association, Wichita, Kans.	Raw milk		X	93.0	(4)	------	------	98.6	SHD	Apr. 28, 1958.
KENTUCKY										
Atkins Dairy, George, Hopkinsville, Ky.	Pasteurized milk and milk products.	X (production)	X (plant)	85.2	------	98.0	93.7	95.0	SHD	Sept. 26, 1957.
Border's Pure Milk Co., Bowling Green, Ky.	do	X (production)	X (plant)	93.6	------	99.0	97.2	97.8	SHD	July 22, 1957.
Brown Ice Cream & Milk Co., Bowling Green, Ky.	do	do do	do do	93.6	------	95.0	94.5	97.8	SHD	Do.
Cloverleaf Dairy, Maysville, Ky.	do		X	89.3	------	92.0	91.0	86.7	SHD	July 1957.
Cumberland Dairies, Inc., Monticello, Ky.	do		X	95.9	------	99.0	98.0	97.5	SHD	June 1958.
Dairy Brand, Mayfield, Ky.	Raw milk, pasteurized milk, and milk products.	X (production)	X (plant)	91.4	------	94.0	93.0	93.5	SHD	July 22, 1957.
Dean Milk Co., Louisville, Ky.	Pasteurized milk and milk products.	X (production)	X (plant)	91.0	------	92.0	91.7	96.7	SHD	March 1958.
Falls City Cooperative Producers Association, Louisville, Ky.	Raw milk	X (production)	X (receiving station).	91.0	100.0	------	------	96.7	SHD	March 1958.
Ideal Pure Milk Co., Inc., Owensboro, Ky.	Raw milk, pasteurized milk, and milk products.	X (production)	X (plant and station).	93.4	100.0	97.0	95.8	95.7	SHD	May 9, 1958.
Midwest Dairy Products Paducah, Ky.	do	X (production)	X (plant)	93.0	------	98.0	96.3	99.0	SHD	July 1957.
Model Farms Dairy, Louisville, Ky.	Pasteurized milk and milk products.	X		91.0	------	95.0	93.6	96.7	SHD	March 1958.
Ohio Valley Milk Producers Association, Russellville, Ky.	Raw milk		X	93.0	100.0	------	------	95.7	SHD	May 8, 1958.
Oscar Ewing, Inc., Louisville, Ky.	Pasteurized milk and milk products.	X (production)	X (plant)	91.0	------	95.8	94.2	96.7	SHD	March 1958.
Princeton Creamery (Division Beatrice Food), Princeton, Ky.	do		X	93.0	------	94.5	94.0	96.5	SHD	February 1957.
Pure Milk Co., Fulton, Ky.	Raw milk, pasteurized milk, and milk products.		X	93.5	------	95.0	94.5	93.7	SHD	August 1957.
Ryan Milk Co., Murray, Ky.	Pasteurized milk and milk products.		X	93.4	------	93.8	93.6	98.0	SHD	Feb. 5, 1958.
Sealtest Central Division, Louisville, Ky.	do	X (production)	X (plant)	91.0	------	96.0	94.3	96.7	SHD	March 1958.
Sealtest (Hiland Dairies), National Dairies Corp., Newport, Ky.	do	X (production)	X (plant)	86.5	------	98.0	94.0	98.0	SHD	Oct. 18, 1957.
Southern Belle Dairy Co., Somerset, Ky.	do		X	93.9	------	97.2	96.4	97.6	SHD	January 1957.
U.C. Milk Co., Madisonville, Ky.	do		X	93.4	------	98.6	96.9	92.0	SHD	Do.
Von Allmen Bros., Inc., Louisville, Ky.	do	X (production)	X (plant)	91.0	------	88.0	89.0	96.7	SHD	March 1958.
Walnut Grove Diary, Inc., Louisville, Ky.	do	X (production)	X (plant)	90.0	------	96.5	94.3	96.7	SHD	Do.
MARYLAND										
Chestnut Farms Diary Plant No. 1, Frederick, Md.	Raw milk, cream and skim	X (production)	X (receiving station).	91.0	100.0	------	------	94.0	USPHS	Mar. 6, 1958.
Martin's Dairy, Olney, Md.	Pasteurized milk and milk products.	X (production)	X (plant)	91.0	------	92.0	92.0	94.0	USPHS	Do.
Mount Ararat Farms, Port Deposit, Md.	Raw milk, cream and skim, pasteurized milk and milk products.		X	93.3	------	96.0	95.0	73.0	SHD	June 19, 1958.
Superior Dairy, Hagerstown, Md.	Raw milk, pasteurized milk and milk products.		X	81.0	------	95.0	90.3	54.0	SHD	Oct. 12, 1957.
MICHIGAN										
Brookvale Dairy, Ironwood, Mich.	Pasteurized milk and milk products.	X (production)	X (plant)	92.9	------	93.8	93.5	98.0	SDA	Jul. 11, 1957.
Carney Milk Products Co., Carney, Mich.	Raw milk		X	91.2	100.0	------	------	96.0	SDA [1]	Nov. 7, 1958.
Consolidated Dairies of Michigan, Inc., Bessemer, Mich.	Pasteurized milk and milk products.	X (production)	X (plant)	94.9	------	92.8	93.4	96.5	SDA	Sept. 2, 1957.
Golden Producers Dairy, Sault Ste. Marie, Mich.	do		X	90.3	------	94.9	93.4	91.0	SDA	May 15, 1958.
Ideal Dairy Co., Menominee, Mich.	do	X (production)	X (plant)	90.6	------	93.0	93.3	96.0	SDA	Oct. 11, 1957.
Michigan Producers Dairy Co., Adrian, Mich.	do		X	92.9	------	100.0	97.6	90.5	SDA [1]	Feb. 6, 1958.
M & M Producers Dairy, Menominee, Mich.	do	X (production)	X (plant)	91.0	------	98.0	95.6	96.0	SDA	Oct. 11, 1957.
National Dairy Products Corp., Lansing, Mich.	do		X	94.0	------	100.0	98.0	88.5	SDA [1]	Sept. 18, 1958.
Ontonagon Valley Cooperative, Bruce Crossing, Mich.	do	X (production)	X (plant)	89.4	------	99.4	92.7	96.5	SDA	Nov. 26, 1957.

See footnotes at end of table.

Sanitation compliance ratings of interstate milk shippers, Jan. 1, 1959—Continued

Name and address of shipping station or plant	Type of product	Type of rating		Percent compliance rating				Enforcement rating	Rating agency	Date of rating
		Area	Individual	Raw milk	Receiving station	Pasteurizing plant	Pasteurized milk			
MICHIGAN—continued										
Pine Mountain Dairy, Iron Mountain, Mich.	Pasteurized milk and milk products.		X	91.9	------	96.2	94.7	94.3	SDA [1]	July 18, 1958.
Reading Home Dairy, Reading, Mich.	do		X	87.4	------	93.9	91.7	84.5	SDA [1]	Sept. 12, 1958.
Saatoff United Dairies, Inc., Niles, Mich.	do		X	91.0	------	98.0	95.6	89.0	SDA [1]	July 16, 1958.
Twin Ports Cooperative Dairy, Ironwood, Mich.	do	X (production)	X (plant)	91.9	------	100.0	97.3	98.0	SHD	June 6, 1957.
Vacationland Dairy Cooperative, Crystal Falls, Mich.	Raw milk, pasteurized milk and milk products.	X (production)	X (plant)	96.3	------	97.9	97.0	93.0	SDA	Feb. 26 1958.
MINNESOTA										
Albert Lea Cooperative Creamery Association, Albert Lea, Minn.	Raw milk, cream, and skim; pasteurized milk and milk products.		X	97.0	100	99.0	98.3	95.0	SHD	Oct. 21, 1957
Bemidji Cooperative Creamery, Bemidji, Minn.	Raw milk		X	93.0	97	------	------	90.0	SHD	Jan. 22, 1957.
Benson Dairy, Worthington, Minn.	Pasteurized milk and milk products.		X	87.0	(4)	92.0	90.3	90.0	SHD	Nov. 7, 1957.
B. & W. Dairy, Breckenridge, Minn.	do		X	93.0	------	96.0	95.0	94.0	SDA [1]	July 24, 1958.
Fergus Dairy, Fergus Falls, Minn.	Raw milk, cream, and skim; pasteurized milk and milk products.		X	93.0	96	96.0	95.0	94.0	SDA [1]	Do.
First District Association, Litchfield, Minn.	Raw milk		X	90.0	100	------	------	93.0	SHD	July 24, 1957.
Foremost Dairies, Inc., Duluth, Minn.	Pasteurized milk and milk products.		X	90.5	(4)	92.5	91.8	92.0	SHD	Nov. 26, 1957.
Golden Dairy Co., Austin, Minn.	do	X (production)	X (plant)	94.0	(4)	100.0	98.0	93.0	SHD	Aug. 22, 1957.
Hi Park Guernsey Farm, Red Wing, Minn.	do		X	92.0	------	95.0	94.0	(3)	SHD	Jan. 29, 1957.
Land O'Lakes Creameries, Inc., St. Michael, Minn.	Raw milk, pasteurized milk and milk products.		X	94.0	98.0	98.0	96.6	93.0	SHD	Apr. 10, 1957.
Maple Island, Inc., Stillwater, Minn.	Raw milk, cream, and skim; pasteurized milk and milk products.		X	96.0	95.0	95.0	95.3	96.0	SDA [1]	Feb. 28, 1958.
Marigold Dairies, Inc., Austin, Minn.	Pasteurized milk and milk products.	X (production)	X (plant)	94.0	(4)	100.0	98.0	93.0	SHD	Aug. 22, 1957.
Minnesota Milk Co., St. Paul, Minn.	do		X	95.0	------	98.0	97.0	90.0	SDA [1]	Nov. 18, 1958.
Northland Milk & Ice Cream Co., Minneapolis, Minn.	do		X	91.0	(4)	96.0	94.3	93.0	SDA	Apr. 12, 1957.
Oak Grove Dairy, Norwood, Minn.	do		X	95.0	------	99.0	97.6	95.0	SHD	Aug. 2, 1957.
Red Oak Grove Cooperative Creamery Association, Austin, Minn.	do	X (production)	X (plant)	94.0	(4)	93.0	93.3	93.0	SHD	Aug. 22, 1957.
Sanitary Farm Dairies, St. Paul, Minn.	do		X	92.0	(4)	96.0	94.6	93.0	SHD	May 8, 1957.
Schroeder Milk Co., St. Paul, Minn.	do		X	92.0	(4)	97.0	95.3	90.0	SHD	Do.
Superior Dairies, Inc., Minneapolis, Minn.	do		X	91.0	(4)	96.0	94.3	93.0	SHD	June 5, 1957.
Twin City Milk Producers Association, Farmington, Minn.	Raw milk, cream, and skim		X	91.0	97.0	------	------	93.0	SHD	Apr. 12, 1957.
Twin City Milk Producers Association, Minneapolis, Minn.	do		X	91.0	96.0	------	------	93.0	SHD	Do.
Twin Ports Cooperative Dairy Association, Duluth, Minn.	Pasteurized milk and milk products.		X	89.0	95.0	95.0	93.0	91.0	SDA [1]	May 15, 1958.
Zaiser's Dairy, Montevideo, Minn.	do		X	89.0	------	96.0	93.6	94.0	SDA	Apr. 3, 1957.
MISSISSIPPI										
A & H Dairy, Cooperative Creamery Association Receiving Station, Starkville, Miss.	Raw milk		X	93.4	94.0	------	------	98.5	SHD	Mar. 13, 1957.
Borden Co., Biloxi, Miss.	Raw milk, pasteurized milk, and milk products.		X	95.4	------	97.9	97.0	95.5	SHD	Mar. 26, 1958.
Borden Co., Jackson, Miss.	Raw milk, cream and skim; pasteurized milk and milk products.		X	96.9	------	100.0	98.9	97.5	SHD	May 29, 1957.
Borden Co. Receiving Station, Tylertown, Miss.	Raw milk		X	93.0	93.0	------	------	99.0	SHD	May 7, 1957.
Brookhaven Creamery (Division of Sealtest-Southern Dairies), Brookhaven, Miss.	Raw milk, cream and skim		X	92.6	92.0	------	------	99.0	SHD	Sept. 18, 1958.
Bush Dairy, Laurel, Miss.	Raw milk, pasteurized milk, and milk products.		X	94.0	------	100.0	98.0	99.2	SHD	May 20, 1958.
Copiah Dairies Receiving Station, Hazlehurst, Miss.	Raw milk		X	92.2	94.0	------	------	98.0	SHD	Aug. 1, 1958.
East Central Dairies Receiving Station No. 1, Newton, Miss.	do	X (production)	X (receiving station).	90.6	98.0	------	------	97.0	SHD	Apr. 23, 1958.
East Central Dairies Receiving Station No. 2, Newton, Miss.	do	X (production)	X (receiving station).	90.6	93.0	------	------	97.0	SHD	Do.
Hattiesburg Creamery, Hattiesburg, Miss.	Raw milk, pasteurized milk, and milk products.		X	95.4	------	91.7	92.9	96.0	SHD	May 16, 1958.
Home Milk Products Co., Inc., Biloxi, Miss.	do		X	88.3	------	92.3	91.0	95.5	SHD	Mar. 26, 1958.
Louisiana-Mississippi Milk Producing Association (pasteurization plant), Poplarville, Miss.	Raw milk, cream, pasteurized milk, and milk products.		X	91.5	------	96.0	94.5	97.5	SHD	Oct. 30, 1957.
Louisiana-Mississippi Milk Producing Association (receiving station), Poplarville, Miss.	Raw milk and cream		X	91.5	100.0	------	------	97.5	SHD	Do.
Magnolia Creamery Receiving Station, Magnolia, Miss.	Raw milk		X	94.0	96.0	------	------	99.0	SHD	May 10, 1957.

See footnotes at end of table.

Sanitation compliance ratings of interstate milk shippers, Jan. 1, 1959—Continued

Name and address of shipping station or plant	Type of product	Type of rating		Percent compliance rating				Enforcement rating	Rating agency	Date of rating
		Area	Individual	Raw milk	Receiving station	Pasteurizing plant	Pasteurized milk			
MISSISSIPPI—continued										
Newman-Cobb Dairy, Gulfport, Miss.	Raw milk, pasteurized milk, and milk products.		X	91.9	------	97.8	95.8	95.5	SHD	Mar. 26, 1958.
Noxubee Milk Producers Association, Macon, Miss.	Raw milk		X	89.9	99.0	------	------	97.5	SHD	Mar. 14, 1957.
Perry Creamery Co. Receiving Station, Starkville, Miss.	do		X	92.4	96.0	------	------	98.5	SHD	Mar. 12, 1957.
Pet Dairy Products Co., Jackson, Miss.	Raw milk, cream and skim; pasteurized milk and milk products.		X	94.3	------	100.0	98.0	97.5	SHD	Mar. 10, 1958.
Pure Creamery Co., Laurel, Miss.	Raw milk, pasteurized milk, and milk products.		X	95.4	------	98.0	97.0	99.2	SHD	May 16, 1958.
Southern Guernsey Dairies, Inc., Hernando, Miss.	Pasteurized milk and milk products.		X	92.6	------	98.6	96.6	99.0	SHD	Jan. 7, 1957.
South Texas Producers Association Receiving Station, Magnolia, Miss.	Raw milk		X	89.0	100.0	------	------	99.0	SHD	May 10, 1957.
Vance Dairy, Hattiesburg, Miss.	Raw milk, pasteurized milk, and milk products.		X	94.5	------	91.0	92.0	96.0	SHD	May 16, 1958.
MISSOURI										
Adams Dairy, Blue Springs, Mo.	Raw milk, cream, and skim; pasteurized, milk and milk products.	X (production)	X (plant)	90.0	------	99.0	96.0	92.0	SHD	June 11, 1958.
Adams Dairy Co., Inc., St. Louis, Mo.	do	X (production)	X (plant)	92.0	------	99.0	96.6	98.5	SHD	Oct. 2, 1957.
Aimes Diary, Kansas City, Mo.	do	X (production)	X (plant)	90.0	------	100.0	96.6	92.0	SHD	June 11, 1958.
Aro Dairy Co., St. Louis, Mo.	do	X (production)	X (plant)	92.0	------	98.0	96.0	98.5	SHD	Oct. 2, 1957.
Bailey Farm Dairy Co., St. Louis, Mo.	Raw milk; pasteurized milk and milk products.	X (production)	X (plant)	92.0	------	98.0	96.0	98.5	SHD	Oct. 2, 1957.
Beatrice Foods Co., St. Joseph, Mo.	Raw milk, cream and skim; pasteurized milk and milk products.		X	91.0	------	96.0	94.3	94.5	SHD	Apr. 14, 1958.
Beaty (Hy-Klass) Milk Co., St. Joseph, Mo.	do		X	88.0	------	100.0	96.0	94.5	SHD	Do.
Chapman Dairy, Kansas City, Mo.	Pasteurized milk and milk products.		X	91.6	94.0	98.0	95.8	92.0	SHD	June 11, 1958.
Cloverleaf Dairy, Springfield, Mo.	Raw milk, cream and skim; pasteurized milk and milk products.		X	93.0	------	98.0	96.3	95.0	SHD	May 13, 1958.
Community Dairy, Joplin, Mo.	do		X	92.0	------	100.0	97.3	95.0	SHD	Feb. 4, 1958.
Country Club No. 1, Kansas City, Mo.	do		X	85.7	------	100.0	95.0	92.0	SHD	June 11, 1958.
Country Club No. 2, Kansas City, Mo.	do		X	90.0	------	100.0	96.6	92.0	SHD	Do.
Golden Rod Dairy Co., St. Louis, Mo.	Raw cream, pasteurized cream	X (production)	X (plant)	92.0	------	100.0	97.0	98.5	SHD	Oct. 2, 1957.
Greene County Milk Producers Association, Springfield, Mo.	Raw milk, cream and skim		X	93.0	100.0	------	------	95.0	SHD	May 13, 1958.
Hiland Dairy, Springfield, Mo.	Raw milk, cream and skim; pasteurized milk and milk products.		X	91.0	------	100.0	97.0	95.0	SHD	Do.
Major Dairy Co., Ozark, Mo.	Raw milk		X	90.0	100.0	------	------	98.5	SHD	Nov. 19, 1957.
Ozark Dairy Co., St. Louis, Mo.	Raw milk, cream and skim; pasteurized milk and milk products.	X (production)	X (plant)	92.0	------	96.0	94.6	98.5	SHD	Oct. 2, 1957.
Patton's Dairy Co., Springfield, Mo.	Pasteurized milk and milk products.		X	93.0	------	100.0	97.6	95.0	SHD	May 13, 1958.
Pevely Dairy Co., St. Louis, Mo.	Raw milk, cream and skim; pasteurized milk and milk products.	X (production)	X (plant)	92.0	------	100.0	97.0	98.5	SHD	Oct. 2, 1957.
Producers Creamery Co., Cabool, Mo.	Raw milk, cream and skim		X	92.0	100.0	------	------	98.5	SHD	Nov. 19, 1957.
Producers Creamery Co., Lebanon, Mo.	do		X	88.0	98.0	------	------	98.5	SHD	Nov. 12, 1957.
Producers Creamery Co., Springfield, Mo.	do		X	93.0	100.0	------	------	95.0	SHD	May 13, 1958.
Pure Milk Producers Association, Butler, Mo.	do		X	91.6	94.0	------	------	92.0	SHD	June 11, 1958.
Quality Dairy Co., St. Louis, Mo.	Raw milk, cream, and skim, pasteurized milk and milk products.	X (production)	X (plant)	92.0	------	99.0	96.6	98.5	SHD	Oct. 2, 1957.
Raskas Dairy, St. Louis, Mo.	do	X (production)	X (plant)	92.0	------	96.0	94.6	98.5	SHD	Do.
Reiss Dairy, Sikeston, Mo.	Pasteurized milk and milk products.		X	94.0	------	99.0	97.3	92.0	SHD	Feb. 11, 1958.
Sanitary Milk Producers, Lebanon, Mo.	Raw milk		X	88.0	98.0	------	------	98.5	SHD	Nov. 12, 1957.
Sanitary Milk Producers, Mountain Grove, Mo.	do		X	93.0	98.0	------	------	98.5	SHD	Nov. 19, 1957.
Standard Milk Co., Aurora, Mo.	Raw milk, cream, and skim	X (production)	X (receiving station).	92.0	98.0	------	------	98.5	SHD	Oct. 16, 1957.
St. Louis Dairy Co., St. Louis, Mo.	Raw milk, cream and skim, pasteurized milk and milk products.	X (production)	X (plant)	92.0	------	98.0	96.0	98.5	SHD	Oct. 2, 1957.
St. Louis Dairy, Versailles, Mo.	Raw milk	X (production)	X (receiving station).	92.0	99.0	------	------	98.5	SHD	Oct. 16, 1957.
Sunny Hill Dairy, Cape Girardeau, Mo.	Raw milk, pasteurized milk and milk products.		X	89.6	------	96.0	93.9	87.5	SHD	Sept. 23, 1958.
Tucker Dairy Co., Inc., Rolla, Mo.	do		X	83.2	------	98.0	93.0	87.5	SHD	Nov. 13, 1958.
Twentieth Century Foods, Ava, Mo.	Raw milk		X	93.0	100.0	------	------	98.5	SHD	Nov. 19, 1957.
Valley Farms Dairy, St. Louis, Mo.	Pasteurized milk and milk products.	X (production)	X (plant)	92.0	------	92.0	92.3	98.5	SHD	Oct. 2, 1957.
Weisenborn Dairy, St. Joseph, Mo.	Raw milk, cream, and skim, pasteurized milk and milk products.		X	92.0	------	99.0	96.6	94.5	SHD	Apr. 14, 1958.
Western Dairy, St. Joseph, Mo.	do		X	91.0	------	98.0	94.5	94.5	SHD	Do.

See footnotes at end of table.

Sanitation compliance ratings of interstate milk shippers, Jan. 1, 1959—Continued

Name and address of shipping station or plant	Type of product	Type of rating		Percent compliance rating				Enforcement rating	Rating agency	Date of rating
		Area	Individual	Raw milk	Receiving station	Pasteurizing plant	Pasteurized milk			
MONTANA										
Billings Dairy, Billings, Mont	Pasteurized milk and milk products.	X (production)	X (plant)	85.4	------	95.0	91.8	85.0	LSB [1]	May 10, 1957.
Gallatin Cooperative Creamery, Bozeman, Mont.	----do	X (production)	X (plant)	86.0	------	93.0	90.0	90.0	LSB [1]	May 14, 1957.
Kessler Dairy, Inc., Bozeman, Mont.	----do	X (production)	X (plant)	86.0	------	91.0	89.3	90.	LSB [1]	Do.
Nye's Dairy, Billings, Mont	----do	X (production)	X (plant)	85.4	------	91.0	89.0	85.0	LSB [1]	May 10, 1957.
Thompson's Dairy, Billings, Mont	----do	X (production)	X (plant)	85.4	------	89.8	88.3	85.0	LSB [1]	Do.
NEBRASKA										
Alamito Dairy, Omaha, Nebr	----do	X (production)	X (plant)	92.0	------	99.0	97.0	94.0	SHD	Jan. 22, 1958.
Nebraska Dairy Products Co., Holdrege, Nebr.	----do		X	84.0	------	95.0	91.0	92.0	SHD	Jan. 8, 1957.
Roberts Dairy Co., Omaha, Nebr	----do	X (production)	X (plant)	92.0	------	92.0	92.0	94.0	SHD	Jan. 22, 1958.
Safeway Stores, Inc., milk department, Omaha, Nebr.	----do	X (production)	X (plant)	92.0	------	95.0	94.0	94.0	SHD	Do.
NEVADA										
Anderson Dairy, Las Vegas, Nev	----do		X	95.0	------	92.3	93.0	96.0	SHD	Aug. 4, 1958.
Clark's Dairy, Las Vegas, Nev	Raw milk and cream	X (production)	X (receiving station).	91.5	92.0	------	------	91.0	SHD	May 1957.
NORTH CAROLINA										
Biltmore Dairy, Asheville, N.C	Raw milk, cream and skim; pasteurized milk and milk products.	X (production)	X (plant)	90.0	------	94.0	92.7	94.0	SHD	Feb. 28, 1958.
Biltmore Dairy Farms, Charlotte, N.C.	----do	X (production)	X (plant)	93.0	------	97.0	95.6	94.0	SHD	Mar. 7, 1958.
Borden Co., High Point, N.C	----do	X (production)	X (plant)	92.0	------	96.0	94.7	94.0	SHD	June 18, 1958.
Carolina Dairy, Shelby, N.C	----do	X (production)	X (plant)	92.3	------	98.0	96.0	91.5	SHD	Oct. 11, 1958.
Coble Dairy Cooperative, Inc., Lexington, N.C.	----do	X (production)	X (plant and station).	91.5	97.0	92.9	92.4	94.5	SHD	Feb. 7, 1958.
Cumberland Dairy Products, Fayetteville, N.C.	----do	X (production)	X (plant)	90.4	------	95.9	94.0	93.0	SHD	Mar. 28, 1958.
Durham Dairy Products, Durham, N.C.	----do	X (production)	X (plant)	92.7	------	95.0	94.2	96.0	SHD	Apr. 22, 1958.
Farmers Co-Op, Charlotte, N.C	----do	X (production)	X (plant)	93.0	------	91.0	91.6	94.0	SHD	Mar. 7, 1958.
Farmers Cooperative Dairy, Winston-Salem, N.C.	----do	X (production)	X (plant)	90.6	------	93.0	92.2	90.0	SHD	Feb. 22, 1957.
Foremost Dairies, Charlotte, N.C	----do	X (production	X(plant)	93.0	------	94.0	93.6	94.0	SHD	Mar. 7, 1958.
Gardner's Dairy, Rocky Mount, N.C.	----do	X (production)	X (plant)	93.5	------	94.0	93.8	92.0	SHD	Feb. 27, 1958.
Guilford Dairy, Greensboro, N.C	----do	X (production)	X (plant)	92.0	------	96.0	94.7	94.0	SHD	June 18, 1958.
Hunter's Dairy, Charlotte, N.C	----do	X (production)	X (plant)	93.0	------	96.0	95.0	94.0	SHD	Mar. 7, 1958.
Kalmia Dairy Cooperative, Inc. Hendersonville, N.C.	----do	X (production)	X (plant)	94.6	------	94.8	94.7	93.7	SHD	Oct. 20, 1958.
Lindale Daires, Roanoke Rapids, N.C.	----do	X (production)	X (plant)	91.5	------	95.0	93.8	91.0	SHD	Sept. 13, 1957.
Long Meadow Farms, Durham, N.C.	----do	X (production)	X (plant)	92.7	------	98.0	96.2	96.0	SHD	Apr. 22, 1958.
Maola Milk & Ice Cream Co., New Bern, N.C.	----do	X (production)	X (plant)	92.9	------	98.0	96.3	97.5	SHD	Aug. 30, 1957.
Pet Dairy Products, Greensboro, N.C.	----do	X (production)	X (plant)	92.0	------	91.0	91.3	94.0	SHD	June 18, 1958.
Pet Dairy Products Co., Waynesville, N.C.	----do	X (production)	X (plant)	93.9	------	92.8	93.2	90.8	SHD	Mar. 14, 1958.
Pine State Creamery Co., Raleigh, N.C.	----do	X (production)	X (plant and receiving station).	93.7	100.0	96.9	95.8	91.0	SHD	Jan. 27, 1958.
Rowan Creamery, Salisbury, N.C.	Raw milk, cream and skim; pasteurized milk and milk products.		X	93.4	------	97.7	96.2	90.0	SHD	June 28, 1957.
Southern Dairies:										
Asheville, N.C	----do	X (production)	X (plant)	90.0	------	97.3	94.8	94.0	SHD	Feb. 28, 1958.
Charlotte, N.C	----do	X (production)	X (plant)	93.0	------	97.0	95.6	94.0	SHD	Mar. 7, 1958.
Winston-Salem, N.C	Raw milk and cream; pasteurized milk and milk products.	X (production)	X (plant)	90.6	------	95.8	94.0	90.0	SHD	Feb. 22, 1957.
Sunrise Dairy Gastonia, N.C	----do	X (production)	X (plant)	91.5	------	96.0	94.5	92.0	SHD	July 19, 1957.
Superior Dairies, Statesville, N.C	----do	X (production)	X (plant)	91.8	------	96.0	94.6	87.0	SHD	July 1, 1958.
Wayne Dairy Cooperative Goldsboro, N.C.	----do	X (production)	X (plant)	91.6	------	95.7	94.3	94.0	SHD	Jan. 27, 1958.
White's Ice Cream & Milk Co. (division of Southern Dairies), Wilmington, N.C.	Pasteurized milk and milk products.	X (production)	X (plant)	92.8	------	95.0	94.3	90.0	SHD	Apr. 21, 1958.
Yadkin Valley Dairy Co-op, Wilkesboro, N.C.	Raw milk, cream and skim; pasteurized milk and milk products.		X	92.6	96.8	95.2	94.3	94.5	SHD	May 8, 1958.
NORTH DAKOTA										
Barnes County Co-op Creamery Co., Valley City, N. Dak.	Raw milk; pasteurized milk and milk products.		X	95.0	------	94.0	94.3	97.0	SHD	July 7, 1958.
Bridgeman Creamery (division of Land O'Lakes), Grand Forks, N. Dak.	Pasteurized milk		X	91.0	------	91.0	91.0	94.0	SHD	Aug. 8, 1957.
Bridgeman Creameries (division of Land O'Lakes), Minot, N. Dak.	Pasteurized milk and milk products.		X	89.0	------	93.0	91.6	77.0	SHD	Jan. 9, 1957.
Cass Clay Creamery, Inc., Fargo, N. Dak.	Raw milk; pasteurized milk and milk products.		X	90.0	------	99.0	96.0	91.5	SHD	Mar. 14, 1957.
Equity Union Cooperative Creamery, Inc., Jamestown, N. Dak.	Raw milk and cream; pasteurized milk and milk products.		X	93.0	------	91.0	91.6	97.0	SHD	May 20, 1959.
Foremost Dairies, Inc., Jamestown, N. Dak.	----do		X	93.0	------	92.0	92.0	97.0	SHD	May 21, 1958.
Lindale Creamery Co., Wahpeton, N. Dak.	Pasteurized milk and milk products		X	95.0	------	98.0	97.0	96.0	SHD	July 31, 1958.
Minnesota Dairy Co., Grand Forks, N. Dak.	----do		X	93.0	------	97.0	95.0	95.0	SHD	Dec. 2, 1958.
Yegen Dairy Co., Inc., Bismarck, N. Dak.	----do		X	94.0	------	95.0	94.6	95.0	SHD	May 16, 1958.

See footnotes at end of table.

Sanitation compliance ratings of interstate milk shippers, Jan. 1, 1959—Continued

Name and address of shipping station or plant	Type of product	Type of rating		Percent compliance rating				Enforcement rating	Rating agency	Date of rating
		Area	Individual	Raw milk	Receiving station	Pasteurizing plant	Pasteurized milk			
OHIO										
Babcock Dairy Co., Toledo, Ohio	Pasteurized milk and milk products.		X	91.0	------	95.0	93.6	92.0	SHD	June 16, 1958.
Beatrice Food Co. (Meadowgold), Lima, Ohio.	do	X (production)	X (plant)	88.0	------	95.0	93.0	93.0	SHD	September 1957.
Bel-Park Dairy, Belpre, Ohio	do		X	92.0	------	95.0	94.0	84.0	SHD	July 1958.
Borden Co., Portsmouth, Ohio	do	X (production)	X (plant)	91.8	------	97.0	95.2	91.0	SHD	June 18, 1958.
Broughton's Farm Dairy, Inc., Marietta, Ohio.	Raw milk, cream and skim; pasteurized milk and milk products.		X	91.0	------	91.0	91.0	84.0	SHD	July 1958.
Cedar Hills Farms, Cincinnati, Ohio.	Pasteurized milk and milk products.	X (production)	X (plant and station).	96.2	96.0	90.0	92.0	95.0	SHD	Jan. 24, 1958.
Collender Dairy, Edgerton, Ohio	do	X (production)	X (plant)	88.0	------	90.0	89.0	95.0	SHD	June 27, 1958.
Coshocton Dairy Cooperative Co., R.F.D No. 3, Newcomerstown, Ohio.	Raw milk		X	88.0	100.0	------	------	92.0	SHD	July 18, 1958.
Crystal Dairy Co., Marietta, Ohio	Raw milk, cream and skim; pasteurized milk and milk products.		X	92.0	------	94.0	93.0	84.0	SHD	July 1958.
Defiance Milk Products Co., Defiance, Ohio.	Raw milk and cream; pasteurized milk and milk products.	X (production)	X (plant)	85.4	------	92.0	88.9	85.0	SHD	Mar. 25, 1958.
French Bauer Co., Cincinnati, Ohio.	Pasteurized milk and milk products.	X (production)	X (plant and station).	96.2	96.0	96.0	96.0	95.0	SHD	Jan. 24, 1958.
French Bauer, Hamilton, Ohio	do	X (production)	X (plant)	92.0	------	99.5	97.0	94.0	SHD	March 1957.
Ideal Milk Co., Portsmouth, Ohio	do	X (production)	X (plant)	91.8	------	93.0	92.6	91.0	SHD	June 18, 1958.
Kroger Co., Cincinnati, Ohio	do	X (production)	X (plant)	96.2	96.0	98.0	97.3	95.0	SHD	Jan. 24, 1958.
Lawson Dairy, Wheelersburg, Ohio	do	X (production)	X (plant)	91.8	------	93.0	92.6	91.0	SHD	June 18, 1958.
Linton Dairy, Inc., Wilmington, Ohio.	do		X	85.5	------	90.9	89.0	80.5	SHD	June 3, 1958.
Lundy's Dairy, Edgerton, Ohio	do	X (production)	X (plant)	88.0	------	93.0	91.0	95.0	SHD	June 27, 1958.
Miami Valley Milk Producers Association, Greenville, Ohio.	do		X	88.6	------	92.9	91.4	91.5	SHD	June 11, 1958.
Orrville Milk Condensing Co., Orrville, Ohio.	Raw milk; pasteurized milk and milk products.		X	90.4	98.0	96.0	94.0	95.0	SHD	Jan. 21, 1958.
Pet Milk Co., Fremont, Ohio	Raw milk and cream		X	92.3	95.0	------	------	94.0	SHD	Aug. 13, 1957.
Pickaway Dairy Cooperative Association, Inc., Circleville, Ohio.	Raw milk		X	83.5	96.0	------	------	90.0	SHD	Dec. 11, 1957.
Sealtest Central Division, Cincinnati, Ohio.	Pasteurized milk and milk products.	X (production)	X (plant and station).	96.2	96.0	95.0	95.3	95.0	SHD	Jan. 24, 1958.
Sealtest Central Division-Frechtling, Hamilton, Ohio.	do		X	89.4	------	92.9	91.7	94.0	SHD	February 1957.
Select Dairy, Portsmouth, Ohio	do	X (production)	X (plant)	91.8	------	83.0	85.9	91.0	SHD	June 18, 1958.
Swenger Dairy, Hillsboro, Ohio	do		X	87.0	------	82.0	83.7	89.5	SHD	Apr. 29, 1958.
United Dairy Co., Waterford, Ohio	Raw milk, cream and skim; pasteurized milk and milk products.		X	84.0	------	86.0	85.0	84.0	SHD	July 1958.
United Dairy Farmers, Cincinnati, Ohio.	Pasteurized milk and milk products.		X	95.7	------	95.0	95.4	97.0	SHD	May 19, 1958.
Wayne Cooperative Milk Producers, Inc. (Dairymen's Division), Ceveland, Ohio.	Raw milk, cream and skim; pasteurized milk and milk products.		X	92.3	95.0	90.4	91.0	96.0	SHD	Apr. 11, 1958.
OKLAHOMA										
Beatrice Foods Co., Tulsa, Okla	Raw milk, pasteurized milk, and milk products.		X	93.9	------	98.0	96.6	93.0	SHD	May 23, 1958.
Carnation Co., Tulsa, Okla	do		X	91.5	------	97.0	95.2	93.0	SHD	Do.
Gilt Edge Dairy, Norman, Okla	Raw milk; pasteurized milk		X	95.9	------	98.0	96.6	83.2	SHD	Jan. 28, 1957.
Gold Spot Dairy, Enid, Okla	Pasteurized milk and milk products.		X	95.7	------	98.9	97.9	90.0	SHD	April 18, 1957.
Johnson Dairy, Norman, Okla	Raw milk; pasteurized milk		X	93.6	------	97.0	95.9	83.2	SHD	Jan. 28, 1957.
Kelley Creamery, Elk City, Okla	Pasteurized milk and milk products.		X	93.8	------	95.0	94.6	93.5	SHD	Apr. 9, 1957.
Mendonca Dairy, McCloud, Okla	Raw milk, pasteurized milk, and milk products.		X	93.4	------	99.4	97.4	84.5	SHD	Jan. 3, 1957.
Pure Milk Association, Eastern Oklahoma, Tulsa, Okla.	Raw milk		X	95.2	96.0	------	------	93.0	SHD	May 23, 1958.
Steffens Dairy, Shawnee, Okla	Raw milk, pasteurized milk, and milk products.		X	90.0	------	97.0	94.6	84.5	SHD	Jan. 3, 1957.
OREGON										
Clover Lawn Dairy, Nyasa, Oreg	do		X	89.5	------	92.6	91.6	91.0	SDA [1]	July 31, 1957.
Lucerne Milk Co., Portland, Oreg.	Raw milk and cream, pasteurized milk, and milk products.	X (production)	X (plant)	86.0	------	96.0	92.7	89.5	SDA [1]	Sept. 20, 1957.
PENNSYLVANIA										
Arthur's Dairy, Waynesboro, Pa.	Raw milk, pasteurized milk, and milk products.		X	88.8	------	89.8	89.5	85.8	SDA [1]	Nov. 7, 1958.
Foremost Dairies, Inc., Benton, Pa.	Raw milk		X	90.7	100.0	------	------	83.0	SDA [1]	Apr. 2, 1958.
Foremost Dairies, Inc., Boiling Springs, Pa.	do		X	88.9	100.0	------	------	90.9	SDA [1]	Dec. 6, 1957.
Foremost Dairies, Inc., Dushore, Pa.	Raw milk cream, and skim		X	90.0	95.0	------	------	93.0	SDA [1]	June 5, 1958.
Foremost Dairies, Inc., LeRaysville, Pa.	Raw milk		X	86.0	95.0	------	------	92.3	SDA [1]	July 30, 1958.
Foremost Dairies, Inc., York Springs, Pa.	do		X	93.0	96.0	------	------	89.8	SDA [1]	Nov. 21, 1957.
Hovey-Stanter Co., Cleona, Pa	do		X	90.0	96.0	------	------	86.4	SDA [1]	Mar. 9, 1957.
Hovey-Stanter & Co., Inc., Greencastle, Pa.	do		X	90.0	97.0	------	------	86.9	SDA [1]	Apr. 11, 1958.
Lancaster Milk Co., Carlisle, Pa	do		X	94.0	100.0	------	------	89.9	SDA [1]	Nov. 14, 1957.
Lancaster Milk Co., Lancaster, Pa	do		X	90.4	97.0	------	------	89.0	SDA [1]	June 27 1957.
Lancaster Milk Co., Littlestown, Pa.	do		X	91.9	96.0	------	------	89.0	SDA [1]	Aug. 8, 1957.
Penn Dairies, Inc., York, Pa	Raw milk, pasteurized milk, and milk products.		X	91.5	------	88.6	89.6	88.0	SDA [1]	Aug. 29, 1957.
Penn Dairies, Inc., Lancaster, Pa.	do		X	91.6	------	89.5	90.2	88.0	SDA [1]	July 18, 1957.
Quality and Service, Red Lion, Pa.	Raw milk		X	90.0	91.0	------	------	88.0	SDA [1]	Oct. 30, 1957.
Queen City Cooperative Dairy, Meyersdale, Pa.	do		X	91.2	99.0	------	------	91.3	SDA [1]	Apr. 4, 1958.

See footnotes at end of table.

Sanitation compliance ratings of interstate milk shippers, Jan. 1, 1959—Continued

Name and address of shipping station or plant	Type of product	Type of rating		Percent compliance rating				Enforcement rating	Rating agency	Date of rating
		Area	Individual	Raw milk	Receiving station	Pasteurizing plant	Pasteurized milk			
PENNSYLVANIA—continued										
Royale Dairy, Hanover, Pa.	Raw milk, pasteurized milk, and milk products.		X	93.6	------	91.0	91.9	86.0	SDA [1]	Nov. 19, 1958.
Royale Dairy, Lewiston, Pa.	Raw milk		X	90.7	98.0	------	------	93.6	SDA [1]	Aug. 14, 1957.
Rutter Bros Dairy, Inc., York, Pa.	Raw and skim milk		X	90.9	96.0	------	------	90.0	SDA [1]	Feb. 4, 1958.
Sealtest Supplee Division, National Dairy Products, Leaman Pl., Pa.	Raw milk		X	90.3	97.0	------	------	91.3	SDA [1]	May 29, 1958.
Warner's Dairy, Inc., Red Lion, Pa.	do		X	93.0	89.0	------	------	95.0	SDA [1]	Nov. 25, 1957.
Wengert's Dairy, Lebanon, Pa.	do		X	91.6	100.0	------	------	89.3	SDA [1]	Nov. 16, 1957.
SOUTH CAROLINA										
Pet Dairy Products Co., Columbia, S.C.	Raw milk, pasteurized milk, and milk products.		X	90.0	------	98.6	95.7	93.0	SHD	Apr. 2, 1957.
SOUTH DAKOTA										
Brown Swiss Milk Co. Rapid City, S. Dak.	Pasteurized milk and milk products.	X (production)	X (plant)	91.4	------	97.9	95.7	95.0	SHD	July 19, 1958.
Culmane Dairy, Mitchell, S. Dak.	do		X	90.0	------	99.0	96.0	95.0	SHD	Aug. 18, 1958.
Equity Union Cooperative Creamery, Aberdeen, S. Dak.	do	X (production)	X (plant)	92.6	------	93.0	92.9	96.5	SHD	Aug. 4, 1958.
Fairmont Foods Co., Rapid City, S. Dak.	do	X (production)	X (plant)	91.4	------	91.5	91.5	95.0	SHD	July 19, 1958.
Foremost Dairies, Inc., Sioux Falls, S. Dak.	do	X (production)	X (plant)	92.0	------	96.0	94.7	93.0	SHD	Nov. 24, 1958.
Gate City-Sunshine Dairies, Rapid City, S. Dak.	do	X (production)	X (plant)	91.4	------	93.5	92.8	95.0	SHD	July 19, 1958.
Gate City-Sunshine Dairies, Spearfish, S. Dak.	do	X (production)	X (plant)	93.4	------	92.8	93.0	95.0	SHD	July 24, 1958.
Guernsey Dairy, Sioux Falls, S. Dak.	do	X (production)	X (plant)	92.0	------	96.3	94.9	93.0	SHD	Nov. 24, 1958.
Lakeside Dairy, Sioux Falls, S. Dak.	do	X (production)	X (plant)	92.0	------	99.0	96.7	93.0	SHD	Do.
Terrace Park Dairy, Sioux Falls, S. Dak.	do	X (production)	X (plant)	92.0	------	97.9	95.9	93.0	SHD	Do.
TENNESSEE										
Anthony Pure Milk Co., Inc., Nashville, Tenn.	Raw milk, cream, and skim; pasteurized milk and milk products.	X (production)	X (plant)	95.7	------	97.0	96.6	92.5	SHD	Oct. 21, 1957.
Chattanooga Area Milk Producers Association, Chattanooga, Tenn.	Raw milk, cream and skim; condensed skim.	X (production)	X (receiving station).	90.7	95.0	------	------	87.5	SHD	May 15, 1957.
Country Maid Dairy, Nashville, Tenn.	Raw milk, cream and skim; pasteurized milk and milk products.	X (production)	X (plant)	95.7	------	94.0	94.6	92.5	SHD	Oct. 21, 1957.
Foremost Dairies, Inc., Columbia, Tenn.	do	X (production)	X (plant)	91.2	------	96.0	94.4	95.0	SHD	May 19, 1958.
Jersey Farms Milk Service, Inc., Nashville, Tenn.	do	X (production)	X (plant)	95.7	------	100.0	98.6	92.5	SHD	Oct. 21, 1957.
Klinke-Reed Dairies, Inc., Memphis, Tenn.	do	X (production)	X (plant)	94.7	------	98.0	96.9	94.5	SGD	Mar. 24, 1958.
Murfreesboro Pure Milk Co., Murfreesboro, Tenn.	Pasteurized milk and milk products.	X (production)	X (plant)	90.8	------	93.0	92.2	94.5	SHD	Aug. 13, 1957.
Nashville Pure Milk Co. (Sealtest Central Division), Nashville, Tenn.	Raw milk, cream, and skim; pasteurized milk and milk products.	X (production)	X (plant)	95.7	------	98.0	97.2	92.5	SHD	Oct. 21, 1957.
Paris Dairy, Paris, Tenn.	do	X (production)	X (plant)	95.0	------	98.0	97.0	93.0	SHD	Sept. 4, 1958.
Pet Dairy Products Co., Kingsport, Tenn.	do	X (production)	X (plant and station).	92.5	92.0	95.0	94.2	96.5	SHD	Jan. 30, 1958.
Pet Dairy Products Co., Knoxville, Tenn.	do	X (production)	X (receiving station).	91.3	100.0	99.0	96.4	94.0	SHD	Sept. 15, 1957.
Purity Dairies, Nashville, Tenn.	do	X (production)	X (plant)	95.7	------	95.7	95.7	92.5	SHD	Oct. 21, 1957.
Sealtest Central Division, Memphis, Tenn.	do		X	93.0	100.0	98.0	96.3	93.5	SHD	July 8, 1957.
Southern Dairies, Knoxville, Tenn.	do	X (production)	X (plant)	91.3	------	91.0	91.0	94.0	SHD	Sept. 15, 1957.
Stokley's Dairy, Newport, Tenn.	Pasteurized milk and milk products.		X	92.6	------	95.0	94.2	92.0	SHD	Jan. 7, 1958.
Swiss Farm Diary, Nashville, Tenn.	Raw milk, cream and skim; pasteurized milk and milk products.	X (production)	X (plant)	95.7	------	98.0	97.2	92.5	SHD	Oct. 21, 1957.
Walnut Grove Dairy, Clarksville, Tenn.	do		X	92.8	------	98.9	96.9	93.0	SHD	Feb. 7, 1958.
TEXAS										
American Pure Milk Co., Kerrville, Tex.	Pasteurized milk and milk products.	X		94.3	------	92.0	92.8	95.5	SHD	Apr. 11, 1957.
Anderson's Diary Foods, Amarillo, Tex.	do	X		92.8	------	95.0	94.3	94.0	SHD	June 26, 1957.
Baker Dairy, San Antonio, Tex.	do	X		93.0	------	93.9	93.6	94.5	SHD	Feb. 26, 1957.
Baldwin Dairies, McAllen, Tex.	do	X		94.3	------	94.7	94.5	94.2	SHD	Mar. 19, 1958.
Borden Co., Abilene, Tex.	do	X		94.3	------	95.2	94.9	97.0	SHD	Sept. 4, 1957.
Borden Co., Amarillo, Tex.	Raw milk, pasteurized milk, and milk products.	X		92.8	------	95.0	94.3	94.0	SHD	June 26, 1957.
Borden Co., Corpus Christi, Tex.	Pasteurized milk and milk products.	X		93.0	------	95.0	94.4	94.0	SHD	Oct. 16, 1957.
Borden Co., Houston, Tex.	Raw milk, pasteurized milk, and milk products.	X		96.7	------	95.6	95.9	98.0	SHD	Feb. 19, 1958.
Borden Co., Midland, Tex.	Pasteurized milk and milk products.	X		95.3	------	94.9	95.0	82.0	SHD	Nov. 26, 1957.
Borden Co., San Antonio, Tex.	do	X		93.0	------	93.9	93.6	94.5	SHD	Feb. 26, 1957.
Borden Co., Texarkana, Tex.	do	X		97.0	------	99.2	98.4	99.0	SHD	Nov. 20, 1957.
Boswell Dairies Fort Worth, Tex.	do	X		91.6	------	91.6	91.6	95.5	SHD	Apr. 15, 1957.
Brenham South Texas Producers Association, Brenham, Tex.	Raw milk, cream, and skim	X		96.7	95.6	95.6	95.9	98.0	SHD	Feb. 19, 1958.
Carnation Co., Wichita Falls, Tex.	Pasteurized milk and milk products.	X		94.0	------	96.3	95.5	98.5	SHD	Dec. 10, 1957.
Chapman Dairy Wichita Falls, Tex.	do	X		94.0	------	96.3	95.5	98.5	SHD	Do.
Cream Crest Creamery San Antonio, Tex.	do	X		93.0	------	93.9	93.6	94.5	SHD	Feb. 26, 1957.
Bailey's Dairy, Port Arthur, Tex.	do	X		90.0	------	92.3	91.5	77.0	SHD	Oct. 23, 1957.

See footnotes at end of table.

Sanitation compliance ratings of interstate milk shippers, Jan. 1, 1959—Continued

Name and address of shipping station or plant	Type of product	Type of rating		Percent compliance rating				Enforcement rating	Rating agency	Date of rating
		Area	Individual	Raw milk	Receiving station	Pasteurizing plant	Pasteurized milk			
TEXAS—continued										
Farmer's Dairy, El Paso, Tex.	Pasteurized milk and milk products.	X		92.2		96.0	94.8	93.0	SHD	Jan. 29 1958.
Faulk Creamery, San Antonio, Tex.	do	X		93.0		93.9	93.6	94.5	SHD	Feb. 26, 1957.
Foremost Dairies, Abilene, Tex.	do	X		94.3		95.2	94.9	97.0	SHD	Sept. 4, 1957.
Foremost Dairies, Fort Worth, Tex.	do	X		91.6		91.6	91.6	95.5	SHD	Apr. 15, 1957.
Foremost Dairies, Houston, Tex.	do	X		96.7	95.6	95.6	95.9	98.0	SHD	Feb. 19, 1958.
Foremost Dairies, San Antonio, Tex.	do	X		93.0		93.9	93.6	94.5	SHD	Feb. 26, 1957.
Gandy's, Inc., San Angelo, Tex.	do	X		89.0		97.7	94.8	92.5	SHD	July 23, 1957.
Golden Jersey Creamery, Edinburg, Tex.	do	X		92.6		94.0	93.5	94.2	SHD	Mar. 10, 1958.
Gobles Dairyland, Wichita Falls, Tex.	do	X		94.0		96.3	95.5	98.5	SHD	Dec. 10, 1957.
Goldsmith Dairy Foods, Amarillo, Tex.	Raw milk, pasteurized milk, and milk products.	X		92.8		95.0	94.3	94.0	SHD	June 26, 1957.
Goldsmith Dairy, Borger, Tex.	Pasteurized milk and milk products.	X		93.0		91.7	91.7	92.5	SHD	June 23, 1958.
Hanna Goat Dairy, San Antonio, Tex.	do	X		93.0		93.9	93.6	94.5	SHD	Feb. 26, 1957.
Houston South Texas Producers Association, Houston, Tex.	Raw milk, cream, and skim	X		96.7	95.6	95.6	95.9	98.0	SHD	Feb. 19, 1958.
Jersey Isle Dairy, Cleburne, Tex.	Pasteurized milk and milk products.	X		91.9		91.9	91.9	74.0	SHD	Jan. 15, 1958.
Kerr View Farms, Kerrville, Tex.	do	X		94.3		92.0	92.8	95.5	SHD	Apr. 11, 1957.
Knowlton's Dairy, San Antonio, Tex.	do	X		93.0		93.9	93.6	94.5	SHD	Feb. 26, 1957.
La Grange South Texas Producers Association, Houston, Tex.	Raw milk, cream, and skim	X		96.7	95.6	95.6	95.9	98.0	SHD	Feb. 19, 1958.
Lamar Creamery Co., Paris, Tex.	Raw milk, pasteurized milk, and milk products.	X		95.5		98.4	97.4	98.0	SHD	Nov. 7, 1957.
Land O'Pines Dairy, Lufkin, Tex.	Pasteurized milk and milk products.	X		92.2		93.7	93.2	94.0	SHD	June 25, 1958.
Laredo Creamery, Laredo, Tex.	do	X		90.5		91.6	91.2	91.0	SHD	Apr. 4, 1957.
Lucerne Milk Co., Fort Worth, Tex.	do	X		91.6		91.6	91.6	95.5	SHD	Apr. 14, 1957.
Metzger's Dairy, San Antonio, Tex.	do	X		93.0		93.9	93.6	94.5	SHD	Feb. 26, 1957.
Midwest Dairy Products, Texarkana, Tex.	do	X		97.0		99.2	98.3	99.0	SHD	Nov. 20, 1957.
Milam Creamery, San Antonio, Tex.	do	X		93.0		93.9	93.6	94.5	SHD	Feb. 26, 1957.
Model Dairy, Galveston, Tex.	do	X		93.0		90.8	91.5	94.0	SHD	June 19, 1958.
Oak Farms Dairies, Fort Worth, Tex.	do	X		91.6		91.6	91.6	95.5	SHD	Apr. 15, 1957.
Ol' Bossy Dairy, New Braunfels, Tex.	do	X		91.6		93.5	92.8	79.0	SHD	Jan. 31, 1957.
Palestine Creamery, Palestine, Tex.	do	X		95.7		93.7	94.3	95.0	SHD	Sept. 27, 1957.
Plains Creamery, Amarillo, Tex.	do	X		92.8		95.0	94.3	94.0	SHD	June 26, 1957.
Preston Dairy, Burkburnett, Tex.	do	X		94.0		98.0	96.7	94.0	SHD	Jan. 14, 1958.
Price's Creamery, El Paso, Tex.	do	X		92.2		96.0	94.8	93.0	SHD	Jan. 29, 1958.
Rio Vista Dairy, San Antonio, Tex.	do	X		93.0		93.9	93.6	94.5	SHD	Feb. 26, 1957.
Rusk South Texas Producers Association, Houston, Tex.	Raw milk, cream, and skim	X		96.7	95.6	95.6	95.9	98.0	SHD	Feb. 19, 1958.
San Andres Dairy, Laredo, Tex.	Pasteurized milk and milk products.	X		90.5		91.6	91.2	91.0	SHD	Apr. 4, 1957.
Sanitary Farms Dairy, Houston, Tex.	Raw milk, pasteurized milk, and milk products.	X		96.7		95.6	95.9	98.0	SHD	Feb. 19, 1958.
Schulenberg South Texas Producers Association, Houston, Tex.	Raw milk, cream, and skim	X		96.7	95.6	95.6	95.9	98.0	SHD	Do.
Star Dairy, Galveston, Tex.	Pasteurized milk and milk products.	X		93.0		90.8	91.5	94.0	SHD	June 19, 1958.
Townsend Dairy, Port Arthur, Tex.	do	X		90.0		92.3	91.5	77.0	SHD	Oct. 10, 1957.
Vandervoort's Inc., Fort Worth, Tex.	do	X		91.6		91.6	91.6	95.5	SHD	Apr. 15, 1957.
Velvet Jersey Products Co., Kingsville, Tex.	do	X		92.9		96.3	95.0	96.5	SHD	Nov. 1, 1957.
Waco South Texas Products Association, Houston, Tex.	Raw milk, cream, and skim	X		96.7	95.6	95.6	95.9	98.0	SHD	Feb. 19, 1958.
Wallings Dairy, Port Arthur, Tex.	Pasteurized milk and milk products.	X		90.0		92.3	91.5	77.0	SHD	Oct. 10, 1957.
Walter's Dairy, Brenham, Tex.	do	X		94.9		94.7	94.8	94.0	SHD	July 9, 1958.
Wholesome Dairy, El Paso, Tex.	do	X		92.2		96.0	94.8	93.0	SHD	Jan. 29, 1958.
UTAH										
Arden Meadow Gold Dairy, Cedar City, Utah.	do		X	96.0		100.0	98.6	99.0	SDA SHD	May 14, 1958.
Arden Meadow Gold Dairy, Salt Lake City, Utah.	do	X (production)	X (plant)	93.4		100.0	97.8	99.0	SDA SHD	May 6, 1958.
Cache Valley Dairy Association, Smithfield, Utah.	do	X (production)	X (plant)	96.0		100.0	98.7	99.0	SHD SDA	May 23, 1958.
Cloverleaf Dairy, Salt Lake City, Utah.	do	X (production)	X (plant)	93.4		100.0	97.8	99.0	SHD SDA.	May 6, 1958.
Hi-Land Dairy, Salt Lake City, Utah.	do	X (production)	X (plant)	93.4		98.0	96.5	99.0	SHD SDA	Do.
Paramount Dairy & Ice Cream Co., Ogden, Utah.	do	X (production)	X (plant)	88.0		97.0	94.0	97.5	SDA SHD	Oct. 30, 1957.
Safeway, Inc. (milk department), Salt Lake City, Utah.	do	X (production)	X (plant)	93.4		100.0	97.8	99.0	SHD SDA	May 6, 1958.
Weber Central Dairy Association, Ogden, Utah.	do	X (production)	X (plant)	88.0		100.0	96.0	97.5	SDA SHD	Oct. 30, 1957.

Sanitation compliance ratings of interstate milk shippers, Jan. 1, 1959—Continued

Name and address of shipping station or plant	Type of product	Type of rating		Percent compliance rating				Enforcement rating	Rating agency	Date of rating
		Area	Individual	Raw milk	Receiving station	Pasteurizing plant	Pasteurized milk			
VIRGINIA										
Alexandria Dairy Products Co., Inc., Alexandria, Va.	Pasteurized milk and milk products.		X	95.0	96.0	95.0	95.0	92.0	SHD	June 28, 1957.
Augusta Dairies, Inc., Staunton, Va.	Raw milk, pasteurized milk, and milk products.		X	93.5	------	92.0	92.5	94.0	SHD	Apr. 4, 1958.
Birmingham Dairy, Manassas, Va.	Pasteurized milk and milk products.		X	93.4	------	97.0	95.0	92.0	SHD	Aug. 1, 1957.
Birtcherd's Dairy, Inc., Norfolk, Va.	do	X (production)	X (plant and station).	93.0	100.0	93.9	93.6	93.0	SHD	June 5, 1958.
Coble Dairy Products Cooperative, Inc., South Boston, Va.	Raw milk		X	93.3	94.7	------	------	94.0	SHD	Oct. 31, 1957.
Foremost Dairies, Inc., Bristol, Va.	Raw milk, pasteurized milk, and milk products.		X	93.4	------	95.0	94.4	92.0	SHD	Nov. 7, 1957.
Imperial Ice Cream Division of Fairmont Foods Co., Bluefield, Va.	Pasteurized milk and milk products.		X	91.0	------	94.0	93.0	90.0	SHD	Aug. 28, 1958.
Maryland & Virginia Milk Producers Association (Lynchburg Supply), Forest, Va.	Raw milk		X	96.0	96.0	------	------	89.0	SHD	Mar. 26, 1957.
Pet Dairy Products Co., Big Stone Gap, Va.	Pasteurized milk and milk products.		X	92.0	------	95.0	94.0	90.0	SHD	Sept. 10, 1958.
Southern Dairies, Inc., Norfolk, Va.	do	X (production)	X (plant)	93.0	------	94.9	94.2	93.0	SHD	June 5, 1958.
Valley of Virginia Cooperative Milk Producers Association, Harrisonburg, Va.	Raw milk, pasteurized milk and milk products.		X	91.5	------	98.0	95.8	90.0	SHD	Oct. 24, 1958.
WEST VIRGINIA										
Borden's Dairy, Huntington, W. Va.	Pasteurized milk and milk products.	X (production)	X (plant)	86.9	------	97.3	93.5	90.7	SHD	July 31, 1958.
Foremost Dairies, Inc., Welch, W. Va.	do		X	90.7	------	94.4	93.0	92.0	SHD	Oct. 10, 1958.
Greenbrier Dairy Products Co., Beckley, W. Va.	Raw milk, pasteurized milk and milk products.		X	92.8	------	98.5	96.6	91.8	SHD	July 2, 1958.
Guyan Creamery Co., Huntington, W. Va.	Pasteurized milk and milk products.	X (production)	X (plant)	86.9	------	96.2	93.5	90.7	SHD	July 31, 1958.
WISCONSIN										
Abbott's Dairy, Inc., Bruce, Wis.	Raw milk, cream, and skim		X	94.0	100.0	------	------	97.0	SHD	July 23, 1958.
Albion Cooperative Creamery, Albion, Wis.	Raw milk		X	93.0	96.0	------	------	96.0	SHD	Mar. 8, 1957.
Alto Creamery Co., Alto, Wis.	do	X (production)	X (receiving station).	93.7	100.0	------	------	96.0	SHD	June 13, 1957.
Antigo Milk Products Corp., Antigo, Wis.	Raw milk, cream, skim, and condensed.		X	94.0	100.0	------	------	96.0	SHD	Mar. 5, 1958.
Antoin, A. F., Receiving Station (Borden Co., Milwaukee), Belgium, Wis.	Raw milk		X	93.0	100.0	------	------	96.0	SHD	Apr. 30, 1958.
Apple River & Beaver Cooperative, Amery, (Route No. 1), Wis.	Raw milk, cream, and skim		X	95.9	100.0	------	------	97.0	SHD	Oct. 24, 1957.
Baldwin Cooperative, Baldwin, Wis.	do		X	93.7	100.0	------	------	97.0	SHD	May 14, 1958.
Barron Cooperative Creamery, Barron, Wis.	do		X	96.0	94.0	------	------	96.0	SHD	July 18, 1958.
Bancroft Dairy, Madison, Wis.	Pasteurized milk and milk products.	X (production)	X (plant)	91.7	------	93.0	92.6	94.0	SHD	Nov. 27, 1957.
Borden Co., Avalon, Wis.	Raw milk, cream, and skim	X (production)	X (receiving station).	93.7	100.0	------	------	96.0	SHD	June 13, 1957.
Borden Co., Columbus, Wis.	Raw milk and cream		X	95.0	96.0	------	------	96.0	SHD	May 27, 1958.
Borden Foods Co., New London, Wis.	Raw milk		X	95.0	98.0	------	------	96.0	SHD	May 28, 1958.
Bowman Dairy, Brooklyn, Wis.	Raw milk, cream and skim		X	94.0	98.0	------	------	96.0	SHD	July 16, 1958.
Bowman Dairy, Jamesville, Wis.	do		X	90.0	100.0	------	------	96.0	SHD	Do.
Bowman Diary, Monroe, Wis.	Raw milk	X (production)	X (receiving station).	93.7	100.0	------	------	96.0	SHD	June 13, 1957.
Boyceville Farmers Cooperative Creamery, Boyceville, Wis.	Raw milk and cream, pasteurized milk and milk products.		X	97.0	100.0	95.0	95.6	97.0	SHD	Feb. 20, 1958.
Brooklyn Creamery Co., Green Lake, Wis.	Raw milk	X (production)	X (receiving station).	93.7	98.0	------	------	96.0	SHD	June 13, 1957.
Burlington Cooperative Pure Milk Association, Burlington, Wis.	do		X	92.0	100.0	------	------	96.0	SHD	Oct. 10, 1958.
Burlington Sanitary Milk Co., Burlington, Wis.	do	X (production)	X (receiving station).	93.7	100.0	------	------	96.0	SHD	June 13, 1957.
Chippewa County Cooperative Dairy, Bloomer, Wis.	Raw milk, cream, and skim		X	95.0	99.0	------	------	96.0	SHD	July 31, 1958.
Colfax Cooperative Creamery, Colfax, Wis.	Raw milk		X	94.0	------	------	------	97.0	SHD	Sept. 25, 1958.
Colfax Cooperative Creamery, Rusk, Wis.	Raw milk, cream, and skim		X	93.8	98.0	------	------	97.0	SHD	Apr. 18, 1957.
Columbus Milk Producers Association, Astico, Wis.	Raw milk, cream and condensed, skim.	X (production)	X (receiving station).	93.7	100.0	------	------	96.0	SHD	June 13, 1957.
Consolidated Badger Cooperative, Appleton, Wis.	Raw milk, cream, and skim		X	94.0	100.0	------	------	96.0	SHD	Sept. 11, 1958.
Consolidated Badger Cooperative, Seymour, Wis.	do		X	93.0	98.0	------	------	96.0	SHD	Aug. 20, 1958.
Consolidated Badger Cooperative, Shawano, Wis.	do		X	92.0	94.0	------	------	96.0	SHD	Aug. 7, 1958.
Consolidated Badger, Wittenberg, Wis.	do		X	94.6	96.0	------	------	97.0	SHD	July 11, 1957.
Dairyland Cooperative Association, Juneau, Wis.	Raw milk	X (production)	X (receiving station).	93.7	98.0	------	------	96.0	SHD	June 13, 1957.
Dairyland Cooperative Association, Watertown, Wis.	do	X (production)	X (receiving station).	93.7	100.0	------	------	96.0	SHD	Do.

Sanitation compliance ratings of interstate milk shippers, Jan. 1, 1959—Continued

Name and address of shipping station or plant	Type of product	Type of rating		Percent compliance rating				Enforcement rating	Rating agency	Date of rating
		Area	Individual	Raw milk	Receiving station	Pasteurizing plant	Pasteurized milk			
WISCONSIN—continued										
Deerfield Creamery Co., Deerfield, Wis.	Raw milk, cream, and skim		X	93.0	99.0			96.0	SHD	Dec. 3, 1958.
Ellsworth Cooperative Creamery, Ellsworth, Wis.	Raw milk		X	95.0	100.0			97.0	SHD	June 27, 1958.
Eureka Cooperative Creamery, St. Croix Falls, Wis.	Raw milk, cream, and skim		X	95.8	97.0			96.0	SHD	Dec. 10, 1957.
Falls Dairy Co., Sand Creek, Wis.	Raw milk	X (production)	X (receiving station).	93.7	100.0			96.0	SHD	June 13, 1957.
Falls Dairy Co., Stanley, Wis.	Raw milk, cream, and skim	X (production)	X (receiving station).	93.7	100.0			96.0	SHD	Do.
Farmers' Cooperative Creamery Cooperative, Clear Lake, Wis.	Raw milk		X	96.0	97.0			97.0	SHD	Sept. 24, 1958.
Farmer's Cooperative Butter Association, Elizabeth, Wis.	do		X	97.0		100.0	99.0	97.0	SHD	July 17, 1958.
Flambeau Valley Farmers' Cooperative, Ladysmith, Wis.	do		X	95.0	96.0			97.0	SHD	July 31, 1958.
Frigo Bros. Cheese Corp., Lena, Wis.	do		X	97.0	(4)			(3)	SHD	Aug. 21, 1958.
Galloway Co., Neenah, Wis.	Raw milk, cream, and skim		X	94.0	100.0			96.0	SHD	Aug. 7, 1958.
Galloway-West Co., Fond du Lac, Wis.	do		X	92.6	97.0			96.0	SHD	Sept. 26, 1958.
Genoa City Cooperative Milk Association, Genoa City, Wis.	Raw milk	X (production)	X (receiving station).	93.7	100.0			96.0	SHD	June 13, 1957.
Golden Bell Dairy, Inc., Kenosha, Wis.	Pasteurized milk and milk products.	X (production)	X (plant)	93.0		95.0	94.4	96.0	SHD	June 26, 1957.
Golden Guernsey Dairy Cooperative, 2206 North 30th St., Milwaukee, Wis.	do		X	92.3		99.0	96.8	96.0	SHD	June 12, 1958.
Golden Guernsey Dairy Cooperative, 2879 North 30th St., Milwaukee, Wis.	do		X	92.3		99.0	96.7	96.0	SHD	Do.
Golden Guernsey Dairy Cooperative, Waukesha, Wis.	do		X	92.3		97.5	95.4	96.0	SHD	Do.
Hawthorn Mellody Farms, Genes see Depot, Wis.	Raw milk	X (production)	X (receiving station).	93.7	98.0			96.0	SHD	June 13, 1957.
Hawthorn Mellody Farms Dairy, Whitewater, Wis.	Pasteurized milk and milk products.		X	94.7		98.5	97.2	97.0	SHD	Sept. 19, 1957.
Hiawatha Valley Cooperative, Sparta, Wis.	Raw milk		X	92.0	96.0			96.0	SHD	Oct. 3, 1958.
Hillpoint Cooperative Dairy, Reedsburg, Wis.	do	X (production)	X (receiving station).	93.7	100.0			96.0	SHD	June 13, 1957.
Hoard's Creameries, Inc., Fort Atkinson, Wis.	do	X (production)	X (receiving station).	93.7	99.0			96.0	SHD	Do.
Kenosha Milk Producers Associations, Kenosha, Wis.	Raw milk and cream	X (production)	X (plant)	93.0		92.8	92.9	96.0	SHD	June 26, 1957.
Kraft Foods Co. of Wisconsin, Beaver Dam, Wis.	do	X (production)	X (receiving station).	93.7	100.0			96.0	SHD	June 13, 1957.
Kraft Foods of Wisconsin, Hartford, Wis.	Raw cream and condensed skim	X (production)	X (receiving station).	93.7	97.0			96.0	SHD	Do.
Kraft Foods, Omro, Wis.	Raw milk		X	95.2	100.0			96.0	SHD	July 31, 1957.
Kraft Foods Co. of Wisconsin, Wittenberg, Wis.	Raw milk, cream, and skim	X (production)	X (receiving station).	93.7	96.0			96.0	SHD	June 13, 1957.
La Crosse Milk Products Associates, La Crosse, Wis.	Raw milk		X	92.0	98.0			91.0	SHD	Aug. 26, 1958.
Lake-To-Lake Dairy Cooperative, Denmark, Wis.	do		X	95.0	99.0			96.0	SHD	July 11, 1958.
Lake-To-Lake Dairy Cooperative, Kiel, Wis.	do	X (production)	X (receiving station).	93.7	100.0			96.0	SHD	June 13, 1957.
Landgren's Dairy, Kenosha, Wis.	Pasteurized milk and milk products.	X (production)	X (plant)	93.0		94.0	93.7	96.0	SHD	July 5, 1957.
Land O'Lakes Creameries, Inc., Luck, Wis.	Raw milk		X	95.9	100.0			97.0	SHD	Mar. 25, 1958.
Land O'Lakes Dairy, Whitehall, Wis.	Raw milk, cream, and skim; pasteurized milk and milk products.		X	95.0	100.0	96.0	95.6	97.0	SHD	July 23, 1958.
Madison Milk Producers Association, Madison, Wis.	Raw milk		X	92.0	95.0			96.0	SHD	Nov. 27, 1957.
Medford Cooperative Creamery Co., Medford, Wis.	Raw milk, cream, and skim		X	93.0	98.0			97.0	SHD	May 15, 1958.
Outagamie Producers Cooperative, Black Creek, Wis.	Raw milk		X	96.0	100.0			96.0	SHD	Oct. 2, 1958.
Pabst Farms, Inc., Oconomowoc, Wis.	Raw milk, cream, and skim		X	94.4	98.0			96.0	SHD	Nov. 20, 1957.
Pabst Farms, Inc., Paoli, Wis.	do		X	95.6	100.0			96.0	SHD	Do.
Paoli Cooperative-Pabst Farms, Belleville, Wis.	do	X (production)	X (receiving station).	93.7	100.0			96.0	SHD	June 13, 1957.
Pet Dairy Products Co., North Prairie, Wis.	Pasteurized milk and milk products.		X	93.0		97.0	95.6	96.0	SHD	June 6, 1958.
Pet Milk Co., Belleville, Wis.	Raw milk	X (production)	X (receiving station).	93.7	100.0			96.0	SHD	June 13, 1957.
Pet Milk Co., Evansville, Wis.	do	X (production)	X (receiving station).	93.7	100.0			96.0	SHD	Do.
Portage Cooperative Creamery Association, Portage, Wis.	Raw milk, cream, and skim, pasteurized milk and milk products.		X	95.0	98.0	95.0	95.0	97.0	SHD	Sept. 17, 1958.
Pure Milk Association, Kansasville, Wis.	Raw milk, cream, and skim		X	95.0	96.0			96.0	SHD	May 22, 1958.
Pure Milk Association, Lancaster, Wis.	Raw milk		X	93.8	100.0			96.0	SHD	July 18, 1957.
Pure Milk Association, Mount Horeb, Wis.	Raw milk, cream, and skim		X	94.0	94.0			96.0	SHD	May 16, 1958.
Pure Milk Association, Oregon, Wis.	Raw milk	X (production)	X (receiving station).	93.7	100.0			96.0	SHD	June 13, 1957.
Pure Milk Association, Orfordville, Wis.	Raw milk and cream		X	92.0	95.0			96.0	SHD	May 19, 1958.

See footnotes at end of table.

Sanitation compliance ratings of interstate milk shippers, Jan. 1, 1959—Continued

Name and address of shipping station or plant	Type of product	Type of rating		Percent compliance rating				Enforcement rating	Rating agency	Date of rating
		Area	Individual	Raw milk	Receiving station	Pasteurizing plant	Pasteurized milk			
WISCONSIN—continued										
Pure Milk Association, Sharon, Wis.	Raw milk		X	92.0	99.0			96.0	SHD	July 18, 1958.
Purity Cheese Co., Mayville, Wis.	Raw milk, cream, and skim		X	93.2	97.0			96.0	SHD	July 3, 1957.
Richland Cooperative Creamery Association, Richland Center, Wis.	Raw milk	X (production)	X (receiving station).	93.7	100.0			96.0	SHD	June 13, 1957.
Rock Ridge Dairy Cooperative, Dresser, Wis.	do		X	96.2	98.0			96.0	SHD	Feb. 4, 1958.
Russell Creamery Co., Superior, Wis.	Pasteurized milk and milk products.		X	89.0		97.0	94.3	89.0	SHD	Sept. 4, 1958.
Sanna Dairies, Inc., Menomonie, Wis.	Raw milk, cream, and skim		X	93.9	99.0			97.0	SHD	Feb. 26, 1958.
Sealtest Division, National Dairy Co. (Luick), Milwaukee, Wis.	Raw milk, cream, and skim; pasteurized milk and milk products.		X	95.0	97.0	97.0	96.3	96.0	SHD	Nov. 5, 1957.
Slinger Creamery Co., Slinger, Wis.	Raw cream and skim	X (production)	X (receiving station).	93.7	99.0			96.0	SHD	June 13, 1957.
St. Croix Valley Cooperative Dairies, Glenwood City, Wis.	Raw milk and cream; pasteurized milk and milk products.		X	96.2	98.0	98.0	97.4	97.0	SHD	Jan. 8, 1958.
Sunshyne Guernsey Dairy, Kenosha, Wis.	Pasteurized milk and milk products.	X (production)	X (plant)	93.0		99.2	97.2	96.0	SHD	June 26, 1957.
Thiel's Milk Products, Hilbert, Wis.	Raw milk	X (production)	X (receiving station).	93.7	100.0			96.0	SHD	June 13, 1957.
Twin Ports Cooperative, Sanborn, Wis.	do		X	94.0	97.0			89.0	SHD	Sept. 4, 1958.
Twin Ports Cooperative, South Superior, Wis.	Raw milk, cream and skim		X	89.0	95.0			89.0	SHD	Sept. 3, 1958.
Turtle Lake Cooperative, Turtle Lake, Wis.	do		X	95.0	100.0			97.0	SHD	Apr. 11, 1958.
United Milk Products Co., Elkhorn, Wis.	do	X (production)	X (receiving station).	93.7	100.0			96.0	SHD	June 13, 1957.
United Milk Products Co., Johnson Creek, Wis.	Raw milk	X (production)	X (plant)	93.7	100.0			96.0	SHD	Do.
United Milk Products Co., Sharon, Wis.	do	X (production)	X (receiving station).	93.7	100.0			96.0	SHD	Do.
Walther's Dairy, Platteville, Wis.	do		X	97.0	100.0			97.0	SHD	Sept. 3, 1958.
Western United Dairy, Mukwanago, Wis.	Raw milk, cream, and skim	X (production)	X (receiving station).	93.7	94.0			96.0	SHD	June 13, 1957.
Westfield Cooperative Dairy Association, Westfield, Wis.	Raw milk, pasteurized milk, and milk products.		X	94.0		98.0	90.0	97.0	SHD	Mar. 11, 1958.
White Clover Dairy Co., Inc., Kaukauna, Wis.	Raw milk, cream, and skim	X (production)	X (receiving station).	93.7	100.0			96.0	SHD	June 13, 1957.
Wisconsin Creamery Co. Cooperative, Sauk City, Wis.	Raw milk	X (production)	X (plant).	93.7	100.0			96.0	SHD	Do.
Wisconsin Cooperative Creamery Association, Witner, Wis.	do	X (production)	X (receiving station).	93.7	100.0			96.0	SHD	Do.
Wisconsin Cooperative Dairies, Inc., Elmwood, Wis.	do		X	93.0	98.0			96.0	SHD	Oct. 14, 1958.
Wisconsin Cooperative Dairies, Inc. (Chicago shed), Menomonie, Wis.	Raw milk, cream and skim		X	94.0	99.0			96.0	SHD	Nov. 26, 1958.
Wisconsin Cooperative Dairies, Inc., Menomonie, Wis. (Wisconsin shed).	Raw milk		X	95.0	100.0			97.0	SHD	Nov. 5, 1958.
Wrightstown Cooperative, Wrightstown, Wis.	do	X (production)	X (receiving station).	93.7	100.0			96.0	SHD	June 13, 1957.
Wright & Wagner Dairy Co., Beloit, Wis.	Pasteurized milk and milk products.		X	90.0	95.0	95.0	93.0	96.0	SHD	Dec. 13, 1957.

[1] Only State agency engaged in this activity.
[2] Enforcement rating not reported by rating agency.
[3] Preenforcement survey.
[4] Bulk milk tank pickup system.

LSB—Livestock Sanitary Board; USPHS—U.S. Public Health Service.
SDA—State Department of Agriculture of State in which shipper is located.
SHD—State Health Department of State in which shipper is located. When the name of a State precedes the term "SHD" this indicates the ratings were made by the State in which the community having jurisdiction over the supply is located.

U.S. EXPORT CONTROL AND SOVIET TRADE

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, the teeter-totter policies in our trade control procedures, and more particularly the export control program have resulted in uncertainties for our own industries and, more importantly, I believe, they may have been detrimental to our overall national security.

Today, for reasons I shall elaborate on in a moment, I have introduced a resolution calling for a study of our export control program. The emphasis under the resolution would be to determine the effectiveness with which the will of Congress and the best interests of the Nation have been carried out concerning the control over strategic materials flowing to the Soviet bloc.

The resolution reads as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Banking and Currency of the House of Representatives, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, is authorized and directed to conduct a full and complete investigation and study of the administration, operation, and enforcement of the Export Control Act of 1949 (63 Stat. 7), as amended, with a view to assessing the accomplishments under that Act, determining whether improvements can be made in the administration, operation, or enforcement thereof, and improving congressional oversight and guidance over the formation of U.S. policies involved in such Act. In carrying out such investigation and study, the committee shall give particular attention to the following matters:

(1) The problems involved in the control of trade between the United States and foreign countries, particularly the foreign countries comprising the Sino-Soviet bloc.

(2) Present methods and procedures in the formulation of policy with respect to the determination of which articles, materials, supplies, and technical data shall be controlled under such Act, and the extent of such control.

(3) Procedures followed under such Act in obtaining information, advice, and opinions with respect to determinations of which articles, materials, supplies, and technical data shall be controlled under such Act, from departments and agencies of the United States which are concerned with aspects of our domestic or foreign policies and operations which have a bearing on exports.

(4) The extent to which decisions heretofore made under such Act concerning the control of exports have adversely affected the security of the United States.

(5) Whether or not such Act is being administered by the appropriate department of the Federal Government.

(6) The interrelationship between such Act and related Acts (such as the Mutual Defense Assistance Control Act of 1951, and the Trading With the Enemy Act) and other discussions or agreements entered into by the

United States (such as the Coordinating Committee (COCOM) discussions and agreements) which affects or relate to the control of trade between the United States and foreign countries.

For the purpose of carrying out this resolution the committee or subcommittee is authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places within the United States, including any Territory, Commonwealth, or possession thereof, or elsewhere, whether the House is in session, has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, and to require, by subpena or otherwise, the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memorandums, papers, and documents, as it deems necessary; except that neither the committee nor any subcommittee thereof may sit while the House is meeting unless special leave to sit shall have been obtained from the House. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee or any member of the committee designated by him, and may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member.

The committee shall report to the House as soon as practicable during the present Congress the results of its investigation and study, together with such recommendations as it deems advisable. Any such report which is made when the House is not in session shall be filed with the Clerk of the House.

The export control program, established under the Export Control Act of 1949, is administered by the Department of Commerce. Export control is of two basic types: short supply controls and security controls. Under the trade control program, exports are controlled through a licensing system.

I have been following the administration of our export control program for a good many months. Recent actions in this area have caused me to bring these matters to the attention of the House of Representatives.

For example, during a recent liberalization of our export control policies, 7,760 tons of copper and copper-based alloys were licensed for export to the Soviet bloc. Though this decision to liberalize has been rescinded insofar as this item is concerned, other items which were formerly restricted to the Soviet bloc can still be sent.

The liberalization policy, announced August 14, 1958, became effective in November 1958. In the 2 months following, it resulted in approximately $4,185,829 worth of copper scrap and electrolytic copper wire bars being authorized for shipment to the U.S.S.R. and its satellites.

On February 12 Secretary of Commerce Lewis Strauss banned the further export of copper and copper-based alloys to the Soviet bloc. Although I am concerned that the decision did not take effect until February 20, that a 6-month grace period is permitted during which the copper already licensed for export might be shipped to the Soviet bloc, that the Secretary did not completely reverse the former decision, and that even the sending of materials and data for complete industrial plants is still possible, I believe the Secretary deserves the gratitude of the Nation for reversing the policy on this strategic commodity, copper.

Another example of what I believe constituted an unfortunate revision in regard to our export controls concerned a Russian tire factory. Briefly, that story, which I discussed in detail in the House on June 16, 1958, is as follows: The U.S.S.R. decided to build a tire-manufacturing factory capable of increasing its total tire production by 15 percent, and contracted with a British combine for the equipment for the plant. Various American firms were approached by the British combine to supply technical know-how for plant design and layout.

When approached for an export license by the American firms, the Department of Commerce originally prohibited the export of such technical data on the grounds that the information was of a strategic nature and that since tire plant engineering in the United States was considered superior to that available elsewhere its transmission would be detrimental to our national security.

The American firms claimed that technical know-how comparable to that available in the United States existed abroad. These American firms argued that since the Soviets could purchase the data elsewhere, they should not be frustrated by an export ban. This view was accepted by the Department of Commerce and in February 1958 it reversed its earlier position.

It seems to me that this was a very unfortunate decision because I believe there is serious doubt that tire manufacturing engineering equal to that possessed in the United States does exist elsewhere. If indeed it does, why was the British combine so anxious to purchase the know-how from an American firm? It was my view that the decision was detrimental to our security.

In response to my request for an expression of opinion on this matter, the Defense Department in a letter to me dated April 8, 1958, stated that in its opinion, any assistance given to the Soviet tire industry, either in providing production facilities, technology, or export of tires by U.S. firms, would constitute a significant contribution to the Soviet war machine, and from a military point of view would be contrary to the security interests of the United States.

Based on this reply, it is extremely doubtful that much, if any, communication took place between the Defense Department and the Department of Commerce before the latter reversed its original decision and permitted such data to be authorized for shipment.

As this matter turned out, the British combine decided to subcontract with an English firm for the technical data and know-how, but the fact remains that our system of control was weakened by the Commerce Department's decision.

The current copper scrap incident goes back to the summer of 1958, and the Paris meeting of the Coordinating Committee on International Export Controls, known as COCOM. This body consists of representatives from the European NATO countries, Canada, Japan, and the United States. It is of interest that these 15 nations were responsible for almost half of the total 1957 exports to the Sino-Soviet bloc or slightly over $1.5 billion out of combined free world exports which approached $3.1 billion. The 1957 COCOM exports increased a half billion dollars over the 1956 totals, the last 2 years for which information is available.

In the summer of 1958, when Khrushchev was singing a wispy melody for greater trade—especially if the United States extended credits to the Russians—and the tensions were increasing in the Middle East partly caused by the Soviet Premier's more thundering bleats, the United States participated in these Paris meetings. Our delegate was a member of the State Department operating under the direction of Mr. C. Douglas Dillon, Under Secretary of State for Economic Affairs and Administrator of the Mutual Defense Assistance Control Act of 1951, the so-called Battle Act.

According to Secretary of Commerce Weeks, in an August 11, 1958, letter to me, the Commerce Department's role in these discussions was "generally restricted to the supplying of technicians where needed and advising the Administrator of the Mutual Defense Assistance Control Act on the strategic characteristics of individual commodities."

Secretary Weeks added that—

> The COCOM recommendations to governments represent a minimum level beyond which any member government is free to employ additional controls. We are, therefore, at the present time reviewng the problem of what additional effective controls over and above those recommended by COCOM can be employed by the United States under the Export Control Act of 1949, as amended. As you know, the primary responsibility for these decisions rests with this Department.

Three days later, on August 14, Mr. Weeks announced a liberalization of controls over the export of some goods previously banned for strategic reasons. Copper and copper-base alloys could now be shipped to the Soviet Union and its satellites. They have been.

The framework—the external events, domestic pressures, and general criteria—within which decisions were made by the Commerce Department in this period is revealed in a speech given by a high official of that Department.

On November 6, 1958, Mr. Frank W. Sheaffer, Acting Director of Export Supply, Bureau of Foreign Commerce, addressed the American Management Association meeting in New York City. Mr. Sheaffer pointed out that for years "the Russians have been trying to excite free world businessmen and governments with stories about profits to be made by trading with the Soviets."

He also aptly observed that such overtures reach their crescendo during periods when the free world is reviewing its security trade controls. Furthermore, in that expert's opinion, Russia lacked the ability to sell enough goods in the American market to justify Mr. Khrushchev's June pleas for more trade.

An analysis of Soviet bloc trade requests revealed to Mr. Sheaffer that "the United States is looked upon only as a supplier of specialties—of advanced technology, and of such items of equipment that go with this technology that cannot be bought elsewhere."

Sheaffer stated that the inquiries and applications concerned petrochemical

plants, petroleum refineries, tire and tire cord plants, textile-processing plants, synthetic fiber plants, plastics plants—especially polyethylene, and steel-finishing plants, especially high-speed continuous tinning and galvanizing lines.

The Acting Export Supply Director added that the tables of licensing to the Soviet bloc are somewhat misleading "as they show only commodities, and not technical data. Technical data licenses rarely contain any dollar figures, as the specific transactions take a long time to work out, and may involve many complicated, international transactions."

Then he continues:

So far, however, the major technical data licenses issued have been for plants for the production of synthetic fibers; for textile manufacturing plants; and for tinning and galvanizing lines. Among the license applications rejected have been petroleum-refining plants; technical data related to petroleum exploration and production; and certain petrochemicals and plastics which have highly strategic applications.

Even more revealing than the point that technical data approvals do not usually show up in the published table of commodities exported to the Soviet bloc are the two criteria under which applications for both data and commodities are reviewed. In Mr. Sheaffer's own words:

First, does the proposed sale of equipment or technical data involve items of significant strategic importance? And, second, would a denial be meaningful, or would it only result in making it easier for a foreign firm to get the business?

Based on the Department of Commerce's reasoning in the tire factory case, I must express great doubt, Mr. Speaker, as to which of the criteria mentioned in Mr. Sheaffer's New York address—the strategic importance of an item versus the fact that denial of an export license would not be meaningful if the Soviet bloc could purchase such commodities from abroad—outweighs the other. Some reasoned in the tire case that since the Soviets could buy the data in Europe anyway, why should not American businessmen sell it to them first?

If our country were faced with a war of profits and not a struggle for survival, then such reasoning might be at least superficially compelling. However, it is our national security with which we are concerned.

On January 27, I wrote the Department of Commerce requesting information on strategic-type goods, especially technical data and commodities shipped to the Soviet bloc, which would not have been sent under the Commerce Department policy in effect prior to August 14, 1958. A letter of February 9, 1959, from the Bureau of Foreign Commerce, U.S. Department of Commerce, reported that as a result of the August 14, 1958, decision, by then Secretary of Commerce Sinclair Weeks, which followed the liberalization of export controls recommended by COCOM, "a number of licenses have been approved for commodities for export to soviet bloc countries that would not have been approved for such shipment prior to the COCOM review."

The Department said that no technical data had been shipped to date which would not have been shipped prior to the COCOM revision governing the exports of strategic commodities. It is pertinent to remember that we do not have to liberalize our trade restrictions merely because COCOM agrees to do so.

I am including a table in the RECORD at this point which details the commodity, country of destination, value, and stated end use of those materials shipped to the Soviet bloc which would not have been granted an export license prior to Secretary Weeks' decision of August 14:

Approvals August–December 1958 for which presumption was for denial prior to Aug. 15, 1958

Month, 1958	Commodity	Country of origin and/or from which reexported	Country of destination	Value	Stated end use
November	Vacuum pumps [1]	United States	U.S.S.R.	$8,100	Polyester textile plant.
Do	Stainless steel pipe valves.[1]	do	U.S.S.R.	161,750	Do.
Do	Stainless steel pipe [1]	do	U.S.S.R.	407,000	Do.
Do	Electrolytic copper wire bars.	do	Czechoslovakia	59,136	Manufacture of semi-finished products.
Do	do	do	U.S.S.R.	2,564,100	Wire consumer products; manufacture of electrical equipment.
Do	Copper scrap	do	Czechoslovakia	337,400	Production of refined copper.
Do	do	do	East Germany	397,000	Do.
Do	do	do	Hungary	340,765	Copper articles; consumer goods; remelting.
Do	Cold rolled steel sheets	United States via Holland.[2]	East Germany	95	Sample shipment.[3]
Do	Stainless steel pipe	United States	U.S.S.R.	33,000	Polyester textile plant.
December	Electrolytic copper wire bars.	do	Czechoslovakia	34,160	Production of copper products.
Do	do	do	Hungary	34,160	Do.
Do	Copper scrap	do	Czechoslovakia	62,160	Refining.
Do	do	do	East Germany	55,940	Production of rods, wire, sheet.
Do	do	do	Hungary	301,008	Production of copper products.
Do	Tinmill black plate rejects.	do	do	15,820	Manufacture of shoe-polish cans and other packaging containers.
November	Antibiotics	do	Czechoslovakia	99,800	Treatment of disease.
Do	do	United States via Belgium.[4]	do	8,422	Do.
December	do	United States via United Kingdom.[5]	do	4,577	Do.[3]
Do	do	United States via Belgium.[4]	do	24,034	Do.[3]
Do	do	do [4]	Hungary	2,320	Do.[3]
Do	do	United States	do	775	Do.

[1] Transshipment.
[2] Part of a complete synthetic fiber textile plant which was not itself rated.
[3] Transshipment from Holland authorized.
[4] Transshipment from Belgium authorized.
[5] Transshipment from United Kingdom authorized.

I have already mentioned Secretary Strauss' reversal on February 12 of a part of the August 14 decision. This action on his part effectively prevents copper and copper-base alloys from being shipped to the Soviet bloc. However, as I have said before, I fail to see why the order did not become effective until February 20 and that it does not affect those export licenses already issued provided that the shipments are made within 6 months of the decision. Since November 10, 7,760 tons of copper-based metal have been approved for shipment to the Soviet bloc. Its value is estimated at $4,185,829. At last report, only 500 tons have been shipped; the remainder may still be sent provided that it is done within the next 6 months.

There is no question but that free world exports of copper are of significance to the U.S.S.R.

For many years the domestic supply of copper in the U.S.S.R. has been inadequate, and significant quantities have been imported from the free world. Imports reached their highest level under lend-lease agreements during World War II, when the U.S.S.R. received a total of nearly 440,800 tons of copper from the United States alone. During 1944 alone, the United States supplied the U.S.S.R. with almost 60 percent of its copper requirements. These imports enabled the U.S.S.R. to accumulate a large stockpile of copper by the end of the war.

Although Soviet production of copper has tripled since the end of World War II, the demand for copper in the U.S.S.R. probably has quadrupled. To keep pace with this increasing demand, production of copper in the U.S.S.R. has been supplemented by imports from the free world and by withdrawals from the Soviet stockpile. The U.S.S.R. also has substituted other, more plentiful materials for copper in many uses.

Until 1953, Soviet imports of copper were fairly small, averaging less than 11,020 tons annually during 1946–52. During 1953–57, imports of copper from the free world again became an important factor in the Soviet supply, amounting to about 330,600 tons, an average of 66,120 tons per year. In 1958, Soviet imports from the free world probably were at least 88,160 tons.

From August 1950, when copper was put under embargo by COCOM, until August 1954 when copper wire 6 millimeters and less was removed from the embargo list, most of the copper purchased

by the U.S.S.R. was through clandestine channels and was in unwrought form—for example, cathode, wirebar, ingot. This probably was because the unwrought forms are less costly than semifabricated forms, such as wire, and more copper could be purchased for a given amount of foreign exchange.

Since August 1954, most of the U.S.S.R's purchases of copper have been in the form of bare wire, 6 millimeters or less. For example, in the 3 years 1955 to 1957 bare wire represented about 87 percent of the total imports of copper; the remainder consisted of covered wire and cable and a small quantity of unwrought copper. The imported bare copper wire probably was drawn to the smaller sizes needed by the U.S.S.R. Following the removal of COCOM controls on all forms of copper in August 1958, the U.S.S.R. increased its purchases of unwrought copper in the remaining months of 1958.

The U.S.S.R. has released no quantitative information on the use of copper for more than 20 years. In 1955 the U.S.S.R. is estimated to have consumed between 440,800 and 551,000 tons of refined copper, more than half of which would have gone into the production of electrical machinery including wire and cable. It is estimated that the current pattern of use does not differ significantly from that of 1955.

From mid-November 1958 to mid-February 1959, the United States licensed 4,930 tons of copper wirebars and 2,830 tons of copper scrap for export to the Soviet bloc. Virtually all of the wirebar was licensed for export to the U.S.S.R., while virtually all of the scrap was licensed for export to the European satellites. None of the wirebar has been exported to date; but 700 tons of the scrap have been shipped to Hungary. On February 12, copper exports to the Soviet bloc were embargoed by the United States, effective February 20, 1959.

The Secretary's order of February 12 did not include the vacuum pumps, stainless steel pipe valves, stainless steel pipe, cold rolled steel sheets, tin-mill black plate rejects or the antibiotics for which the presumption was for denial prior to August 15, 1958. Of course, we have no objection to sending antibiotics to such nations af Czechoslovakia and Hungary; and the supposed manufacture of shoe polish cans does seem innocent enough; however, I do have reservations about sending pumps, valves, and pipe to build a polyester textile plant which will compete with American exports in this field. I regret that I cannot tell the Congress what firms are selling such materials since such information is classified.

It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that the American public is entitled to know what firms are trading with the Soviet Union. While I can understand why such information would be regarded as confidential during the preliminary stages of a trade negotiation, for reasons of competitive business practice, I fail to see why such information cannot be made public once the contract between the Soviet bloc country and the American firm has been signed and the export license has been granted by the Department of Commerce. At present, the Department is refusing to divulge such information citing section 6(c) of the Export Control Act which reads:

> No department, agency, or official exercising any functions under this act shall publish or disclose information obtained hereunder which is deemed confidential or with reference to which a request for confidential treatment is made by the person furnishing such information unless the head of such department or agency determines that the withholding thereof is contrary to the national interest.

I recognize that some firms might regard the release of such information as detrimental to their so-called public relations. I also recognize that the Department of Commerce which depends to a large degree on the voluntary submission and accuracy of commercial trade statistics by business forms might be reluctant to mar such cooperation. However, part of an investigation might well consider the need for such confidentiality after the negotiation has been completed in terms of our American tradition of freedom of the press and the fundamental assumption that the public must be an informed one if democracy is to be effective.

This brief review of some of the recent actions taken under our export control policy points up a number of problems which I believe require some searching study by the House.

Problem 1. Administration of our export policy: I believe there exists a pressing need for a complete study and evaluation of the Export Control Act and its administration by the Department of Commerce in order to determine the effect on our national security of the decisions made and the policies established in carrying out the act.

Problem 2. Consultation with other agencies: The Export Control Act is administered by the Department of Commerce. The act provides that in determining which exports are to be controlled, the administering agency "shall seek information and advice from the several executive departments and independent agencies concerned with aspects of our domestic and foreign policies and operations having an important bearing on exports."

I have expressed doubt with reference to the tire factory case whether consultation did exist prior to the reversal by the Commerce Department of their previous decision not to export technical data pertaining to tire manufacture. We know that the Defense Department opposed the reversal. I should think that their opinion as to the strategic nature of such data would be relevant and perhaps overriding, especially when this factory could increase Soviet tire production by 15 percent. Study should be given to determine whether the consultation provisions of the act are actually being put into effect.

Problem 3. Coordination of our total export policy: While the Export Control Act is administered by the Department of Commerce, on the other hand the Mutual Defense Assistance Control Act of 1951, which provides for a joint effort with other nations to restrict a potential aggressor through export regulation, is administered by the Under Secretary of State for Economic Affairs. Because these two programs are so similar in purpose, serious evaluation must be given to the consultative procedures existing between these agencies. Possibly overall control and coordination should exist at the White House level as part of the Office of International Economic Security. At least this is a problem which should be thoroughly examined and thoughtfully analyzed.

Problem 4. The conflicting responsibilities that exist within the Bureau of Foreign Commerce: The program of export control under the Export Control Act is carried on in the Bureau of Foreign Commerce in the Department of Commerce. It is significant that the primary function of that division is to work for the promotion of trade. The official description of its duties as described, in part, in the "U.S. Government Organization Manual" is that the Bureau is charged with the promotion of "international trade—broadly construed as including the export and import of goods and services, investment abroad, international travel, and other activities, contributing to the vigor and growth of the foreign commerce of the United States."

Thus, while the Bureau is charged with devoting its utmost effort to encouraging American trade abroad through dispensing information, organizing trade missions, and maintaining direct contact with both American and foreign buyers and sellers, on the other hand, under the Export Control Act, its function is to control and prohibit trade where it would be contrary to U.S. interests to do so.

These two functions do not seem so mutually exclusive or diametrically opposed that it would not be within the realm of possibility to expect them to be administered by the same unit of Government with equal fervor, and determination of purpose. However, it is my impression that the Bureau looks at the Export Control Act trade prohibitions as merely burdensome hurdles to overcome in order to exercise its trade promotion functions.

Problem 5. Should we trade with the Soviet bloc? The basic problem, however, to be faced by any study of our export control program is the consideration of the nature of the struggle in which we are engaged. While we should like to be at peace with every nation, there are some nations which would not have it so. A determination as to what American commodities are strategic or nonstrategic as far as our national security is concerned must be related to our view of the purposes of the Soviet Union and the Communist feudal domain which follows its lead.

It is not new to recognize that we are engaged not only in a political and military contest for survival, but also in an economic one. Mr. Khrushchev might not expect to see the hammer and sickle

flying over our Capitol during his lifetime, but his pink-tinged glasses certainly lead him to the rosy view that someday it inevitably will fly there. Although Khrushchev succinctly reminded us of basic Communist intent when he predicted "We will bury you," this does not necessarily mean under a pile of rubble. His was a sentiment that should not be forgotten as the iceberg policy of the Soviet Union floats now and then into warmer and more thawing waters: A small part of the Communist policy expediently warming and melting, but the hard core safely secure beneath.

The last rites might well be performed from afar, instead of on the crumbled cities of America, following a total loss of our foreign markets and friends. The Soviet Union is engaged in a constant war of economic disruption whenever the opportunity suits its political convenience. Well known are the dumping activities by which the U.S.S.R. invades our markets in order to ruin our industries with products sold below their cost of production.

In late 1958, huge Soviet shipments of platinum caused the price of this precious metal to drop to $52 an ounce which was $51 less than it was in early 1957. The Russians' actions with respect to tin dumping are notorious and have resulted in constant price fluctuations and harmful effects on many of the free world's strongest supporters and traditional suppliers. In addition, the Soviet Union has offered arms to incite unrest in the global tinderboxes in exchange for cotton which is then poured on the world market.

On November 29, 1958, it was announced that the U.S.S.R. had concluded an agreement to sell $13,500,000 worth of benzene to the Dow Chemical Co. The price was 6 cents per gallon lower than the U.S. price. American benzene spokesmen claimed at the time there already was a substantial oversupply in the United States.

Early last month, the Soviet Union sent an initial supply of school scientific equipment. Despite import duties averaging over 40 percent, these items sold at two-thirds less than American products in the same field.

While such bargains seem attractive initially, it is prudent to remember the comparative standard of living and cost of the labor which is involved and the capacity of the Communist-owned state trading monopoly to cut its prices at will. The revealing series of precedents concerning platinum, tin, cotton, and machine tools among others should awaken us to the fact that this is not trade, be it ever so sweet and ever so cheap. This is an economic war.

The Soviet Union also has shown great interest in the latest machines so that it could duplicate them at a lower cost and then outsell us in the very markets which we have created. It is our blueprints and not our yellow corn that they seek.

We must seriously reflect whether or not more trade will lead to a better understanding between the American and the Russian peoples. Is a Communist bureaucrat at the wharf receiving a shipment of American raw materials and manufactured products on behalf of a monopolistic state trading corporation more likely to become our friend?

The driving forces of a totalitarian system are not so easily wooed, subdued, or contained. Pressure should be continued on the Soviet bloc economies not in the belief that this will cause them to reduce immediately their war production, but in the hope that in the long run the so-called revolution of rising expectations will evolve as completely in the U.S.S.R. and its satellites as it has done in the more underdeveloped, but freer, areas of the world.

Believing that eventually even in a totalitarian system some additional response must be granted to consumer demands, we can hope that by economic containment we will prevent outselves from aiding the war preparations of those who would aggress against us. Let us avoid the errors of the thirties when we shipped scrap metal which was later returned to us with compounded interest: a form of interest, I suggest, at which recent history has shown the Communists to be amazingly adept.

HUNGARIAN FREEDOM DAY

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. O'HARA] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks, and further that any Members who so desire may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks in the RECORD following my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, March 15 is Hungarian Freedom Day. For 110 years, the Ides of March have been one of the chief national holidays of the Hungarian people.

On that date in 1848, Hungarian youth, inspired by the revolutionary spirit of the period and the patriotic leadership of Louis Kossuth staged a bloodless revolution, presented a 10-point demand for reforms, and circulated a stirring revolutionary poem which became the Marseillaise of Hungary. March 15 has through the years become the symbol of political reform and the ideals of liberty which the people of Hungary have kept alive in their hearts and minds. Ideals of liberty are still a motivating force among the Hungarian people whether they are in their homeland, or have sought refuge in other lands. It was this spirit which gave them the courage in October 1956 to rebel against Soviet oppression.

We honor ourselves in joining with freedom-loving Hungarians here and throughout the world in paying tribute to March 15, Hungarian Freedom Day.

In paying this tribute, it is proper that we inquire into the place Hungary has earned for herself in Europe and the free world, as well as bring ourselves up-to-date on the present position of Hungary and the lot of Hungarian refugees who have sought asylum in the free world.

HUNGARY'S PLACE IN HISTORY

I. HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

Though Hungary has ever been a small nation set in the middle of Europe and ranged about by various formidable nationalities, it has maintained throughout its history a distinctiveness which can be traced back a thousand years. Neither its origin nor its language bears any relationship to the countries round about it, a conglomerate group, most of them larger in size and usually more powerful politically, over which, however, it for some time claimed leadership. Tongue in cheek, one enthusiast says that, "the whole Hungarian nation claimed descent from the most brilliant barbarian conqueror, Attila the Hun."

To this day, Hungary's intensely proud claim to independence dates from the year 1001, when Pope Sylvester II sent the Holy Crown to St. Stephen. The King of the country was subject to the Pope in religious matters; but not in secular matters to the Emperor of the Holy Roman Empire. Even with the invasion of foreign princes and the extinction of the national dynasty at the beginning of the 14th century, those who succeeded to the rule of Hungary had to pledge that the country would be governed according to its own laws and independently of the laws or interests of other realms which might be under the same rule.

In addition to this basis for independent thinking, the Hungarians, from 1341 to 1382 became the center of a geographical and political triangle in Europe, which at one time touched upon three seas, the Baltic, the Adriatic, and the Black Sea. This Intermarium has been revived in our own century in the Polish political and economic concept promoted between World Wars I and II.

Dominating the history of Hungary for over a thousand years has been the nationalist thought and claim of Hungary as "the center of Europe" geographically. Hence there arose the psychological and political idea of leadership. Much of Hungary's achievement during the centuries has been inspired by this conception. Hungarians claim that their country was the center of "a system—the Hapsburg monarchy—from 1527 to 1918."

When, under the first of the Hapsburgs, Hungary became united with the Kingdom of Bohemia and the hereditary provinces of Austria, it had already been united with Poland, had earlier ties with Bohemia, and been a national dynasty with the greater realm of kings who ruled at once Croatia, Wallachia, Moldavia, and at one time also Bulgaria.

In a Europe which held in high esteem jurisprudence and the theory of positive law, a famous collection of Hungary's laws, known as the "Werboczy's collection," dates from the 16th century. The lord judge of the realm at the time of the Turkish invasion of 1526 had codified the liberties and privileges of Hungary in a form which became "the textbook of

the ruling classes and the framework of the national conscience."

This respect for the law and, still more important, the institution of Christianity, survived the Turkish invasion. Hungary's primary claim to a place in European history was as the "fortress of Christendom."

II. HUNGARIAN INDEPENDENCE IN THE 19TH CENTURY

(a) Kossuth and the Revolution of 1848 to 1849: It was to a Hungary aware of its tradition of ancient values, of historic championing of the individual, of independence, of traditional law, justice, and humanitarian concepts, and a Hungary at its height in art and letters that the colorful figure of Kossuth was born. His excellent letters at the time of the reform movement in Hungary in the middle 19th century developed into an organized parliamentary gazette. Despite efforts of the intrenched government at censorship, he continued to gain popular attention to such an extent that he and several colleagues were thrown into prison on charges of high treason. Indignation at his treatment was so widespread and forceful that the legislature itself refused to pass any government measures until the prisoners were released. Upon his release, Kossuth became a popular and irrepressible leader, continuing his agitation for a free Hungary. With the outbreak of revolution in March 1848, Metternich was driven from power. When, on March 3, 1848, Kossuth demanded parliamentary government for Hungary and constitutional government for the rest of Austria, he at once became the leader of the European revolution.

With the formation of the first responsible ministry in Austria, after the flight of Metternich to England, Kossuth became Minister of Finance. In this capacity he continued his efforts toward an independent Hungary, even to the coining of separate Hungarian coins. In the great patriotic movement of which he was "the soul and head" Kossuth by his devotion to the cause of the Magyars incurred the enmity of the other races in Hungary among whom were the Slavic peoples in the south. Because of the conflict thus precipitated, Austria was able to combat the new order of things in Hungary. The Ministry was dissolved.

After further development, however, Kossuth became head of the Committee of National Defense with dictatorial powers, and prosecuted with extraordinary energy the war both against Austria and against the forces from the south. After some early reverses the Hungarians won a series of brilliant victories, which were due in no small measure to Kossuth's able organization of forces.

(b) Declaration of independence by Hungarian Legislature, 1849: The culmination of Kossuth's efforts came with his persuasion of the Diet—legislature—to declare that the Hapsburg dynasty had forfeited the throne and to proclaim the independence of Hungary, April 14, 1849. The Hungarian Republic was established with Kossuth as Governor.

(c) Russia's part in the fall of the new Republic: Meanwhile Russia had gone to the aid of the Hapsburg dynasty. Kossuth had been disappointed in his hopes of intervention on the part of the Western Powers. Hungary now had to face the full force of Russia's overwhelming might added to that of Austria.

Fighting had continued, Hungarian forces being led by General Görgey. After weeks of decimating fighting, wearying marching, and racking disease, the Hungarians, greatly outnumbered by the united Russian and Austrian forces, were gradually driven to the wall. Finding that further fighting was hopeless, Görgey's army surrendered August 13, 1849. Though the general for this surrender was blamed and charged with treachery, the facts revealed that on the day of surrender his forces numbered 24,000 men with 140 cannons, while five armies with more than 200,000 men and 1,000 cannon were opposing him from all sides.

III. HUNGARIAN REVOLT OF OCTOBER 1956

(a) Background of events: In the national elections held in Hungary immediately after World War II, the Hungarian voters were divided among six political parties. Five of these won seats in Parliament. Four of the major parties formed a coalition; but Communist influence, having gradually asserted itself, had, by 1948, so far repressed all opposition that leaders of the non-Communist groups had all been silenced. Many had been arrested. Some had fled abroad. In 1949, Hungary officially became a people's democracy, with actual control in the hands of a Communist trained in Moscow, Mátayás Rakosi. Hungary soon closely resembled the pattern of the Soviet Union. Individual liberty and free speech ceased to exist. Arbitrary imprisonment became common. Secret police, with methods of terror, made frequent arrests, often followed by charges of attempts to overthrow the democratic regime, and leading ultimately to execution.

When, early in 1956, a relaxation of police rule was encouraged by the Communist Party of the U.S.S.R., the response among Hungarian people was immediate. Traditional independence in Hungary had asserted itself as early as 1955 among Hungarian authors and artists. The scope of protests against the dictatorial regime gradually widened and even became the basis of forum discussion, chiefly among young Communist intellectuals.

An announcement on October 19, 1956, by the Ministry of Education that certain changes would be made as a result of Hungarian student requests precipitated demonstrations at first peaceful but which soon became far-reaching. On the same day, too, news of Poland's move toward greater independence of the U.S.S.R. was received enthusiastically by Hungary. Friendship between the two peoples had been traditional for centuries.

(b) Mass demonstrations, October 22, 1956: Student meetings preceded a planned, peaceful mass demonstration on October 22, 1956, and drew up demands embodying protesting views on national policy. A ban against the demonstration had been announced by the Ministry of Interior, but later withdrawn.

When the demonstration got underway, the people gathered together numbered between 200,000 and 300,000. Justly angered by an episode, the crowd, which had shown no sign of other than a peaceful dispersion, began freely to express resentment. The following day a similar crowd gathered to await the outcome of a delegation being sent to try to broadcast the student demands. Tear-gas bombs were thrown to disperse the crowd and a minute or two later members of the secret police opened fire, killing a number of people and wounding many.

An armed uprising resulted and developed into a 5-day battle in which Soviet troops with mechanized forces took part against the Hungarians. The Hungarian Army disintegrated from the beginning, certain of the units fighting on the side of the insurgents. When Soviet tanks fired on a group of unarmed demonstrators, killing many, the whole nation was aroused. A cease-fire was ordered on October 28. Estimates of the number of dead and wounded vary considerably, as the United Nations Special Committee on the Problem of Hungary state. The minimum number killed, according to this source, is estimated at some 1,800 to 2,000 in Budapest and 2,500 to 3,000 in the whole country, and 11,000 to 13,000 wounded.

Mr. Nehru's figures on this subject, quoted also by this Committee, but thought to be too high, were given thus:

Mr. Nehru said that from such information as he had received, "it would appear that about 25,000 Hungarians and 7,000 Russians died in the fighting."

IV. RESOLUTIONS OF THE UNITED NATIONS GENERAL ASSEMBLY ON THE SITUATION IN HUNGARY

A special session—the Second Emergency Special Session of the United Nations General Assembly—was held from November 4 through November 10, 1956, to discuss the situation in Hungary. Five resolutions were passed: Nos. 1004(ES–II)—1008(ES–II), inclusive. The substance of them is discussed below.

(a) Resolution 1004(ES–II): The General Assembly of the United Nations on November 4, 1956, adopted, without reference to a committee, a resolution—1004(ES–II)—condemning the use of Soviet military forces to suppress the efforts of the Hungarian people to assert their rights; noting the avowed policy of the U.S.S.R. of nonintervention in the internal affairs of other States as stated in the declaration of October 30, 1956; noting the grave loss of life and widespread bloodshed which resulted from the intervention of the Soviet military forces in Hungary; and calling upon the U.S.S.R. to withdraw all of its military forces from Hungary. This resolution also requests the Secretary General to send observers to Hungary to investigate the situation, report on it, and suggest methods of terminating it, in accordance with the principles of the U.N. Charter. It calls upon all U.N. members to cooperate with these

observers, and also to cooperate with the Secretary General in supplying the needs of the Hungarian people which have arisen out of the satuation.

(b) Resolution 1005(ES–II): A few days later, on the 9th of November, the General Assembly passed another resolution—1005(ES–II—calling for free elections in Hungary, under U.N. auspices, as soon as order has been restored, to determine the form of government which the people wish to establish for themselves in their own country.

(c) Resolutions 1006(ES–II) and 1007 (ES–II): On the same day—November 9, 1956—the General Assembly passed two other resolutions regarding Hungary. One of these calls for full cooperation on the part of both Hungary and the U.S.S.R. in efforts of the United Nations, the International Red Cross, and other such organizations, to provide food, medical supplies, and humanitarian assistance to the people of Hungary. It also considers the plight of large numbers of refugees from Hungary; and requests the Secretary General to consult with appropriate agencies—including the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees—to arrange for emergency assistance for them; at the same time urging member States to make special contributions for them.

The other—resolution 1007(ES–II)—of November 9, 1956, resolves to undertake on a large scale immediate aid of the same sort for the affected areas, under the international cooperation provision of the U.N. Charter, article 1, paragraph 3.

(d) Resolution 1008(ES–II): The following day the General Assembly decided—by resolution 1008(ES–II) of November 10, 1956—to place the Hungarian question on the provisional agenda of its next session, the 11th, as a matter of priority.

(e) Resolutions 1127(XI) to 1131(XI): At the 11th session of the General Assembly, which met from November 12, 1956, to March 8, 1957, six resolutions were passed concerning the situation in Hungary. Concerned with the urgency of the situation, they called upon the Soviet Union to suspend immediately deportation measures against Hungarian citizens and to return to their homes those who had been deported—No. 1127(XI); called upon the incumbent Government of Hungary to allow the Secretary-General to enter its territory and circulate freely—1128(XI); requested immediate cooperation from other Governments with the Secretary-General in his efforts to better the situation of the Hungarian refugees—1129(XI); reiterated to the U.S.S.R. the appeal to conform to earlier resolutions, to renounce intervention, and allow the U.N. observers to go into Hungary—1130(XI); and, again reiterating the same appeal, asked that the U.S.S.R. remove its armed forces from the areas where the observers were to be present; and allow the reestablishment of political independence in Hungary.

(f) Resolution 1132(XI): On January 10, 1957, the General Assembly of the U.N. established, by resolution 1132(XI), a special five-nation, factfinding committee to gather information on the Hungarian revolt and its suppression.

(g) Resolution 1039(XI): By a resolution of January 23, 1957, the General Assembly, commenting upon the Report of the U.N. High Commissioners for Refugees, made an urgent plea for funds to determine and relieve the needs, both material and financial, of the Hungarian refugees.

(h) Resolution 1133(XII): In June 1959, the Special Committee reported its findings. On September 14, 1957, the General Assembly, after considering the report of the Special Committee, approved a resolution—1133(XII)—which endorsed the committee's work, condemned action taken by the Soviet Union in depriving Hungary of its liberty and political independence, and requested Prince Wan Waithayakon, as special representative of the Assembly, to do what he could to effect compliance with various Assembly decisions in the case.

(i) Resolution 1166(XII)—All refugees under the U.N.: A resolution of November 26, 1957—1166 (xii)—of the General Assembly dealing with the international refugee program under the United Nations and making new arrangements for it, does not mention the Hungarian or any other group specifically, but does take into consideration "that new refugee situations requiring international assistance have arisen which augment the problem."

(j) Further U.N. activities concerning Hungary: Following an announcement on June 16, 1958, from the Hungarian Ministry of Justice that Imre Nagy and Pál Maléter and two of their associates had been executed, the Special Committee met as a matter of urgency and issued on June 21 a communique deploring these tragic events.

In another resolution reported in January 1959, the General Assembly again denounced the execution of the Hungarian patriots and condemned the continued defiance of the resolutions of the General Assembly.

V. THE PRESENT SITUATION IN HUNGARY AND THE HUNGARIAN REFUGEES

(a) The United Nations and Hungary: The resolutions of the United Nations General Assembly on the situation in Hungary were disregarded, i.e.—"held in contempt." The representatives of other countries there deplore continued repression in Hungary and, in horror, the executions of Hungarian patriots, "whose only crime, they considered, was to try to free their country from foreign control." The Special Committee accordingly held emergency meetings in 1958, and recommended that the Assembly "consider what further action might appropriately be taken by the United Nations" in view of the findings of the Committee. A special report of that Committee, of July 14, 1958, noted that, in spite of Hungarian Government pledges of immunity to leaders of the uprising, there was, in addition to the executions of Pál Maléter and Imre Nagy, a list of 30 death sentences said to have been carried out in the year between June 1957 and June 1958. It also named a hundred persons sentenced to prison terms.

(b) The refugees: As for the Hungarian refugees, in the course of the year 1956 and 1957, some 169,700 of them were transported from Austria and Yugoslavia to countries of second asylum or other countries of resettlement. Other refugees numbering 71,613 had emigrated under the auspices of the Intergovernmental Committee for European Migration.

Considerable attention is being paid to the reunion of families, some members of whom have in the past been rejected on medical grounds. The United States in 1957 made provision to revise its Immigration Act with this problem in mind.

In addition to the refugees settled under the schemes mentioned above, there have been others who have resettled in various European countries under other special arrangements. In some instances, this resettlement was done with aid from the United Nations Refugee Emergency Fund or the U.S. escapee program; in others it was done independently by the receiving Governments.

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, for centuries Hungarians had been under Austrian rule, and during that long period they managed to retain their distinct identity and their burning desire for national freedom. In 1848 when revolutionary waves swept over Europe, and the news of disturbances in Paris and Vienna reached them, they staged a bloodless demonstration in Budapest, presented their just grievances to the government and demanded radical reforms, including freedom. That was done on March 15, 111 years ago. The Government met their demands, and from then on that day is celebrated as Hungarian Freedom Day, and all Hungarians everywhere proudly celebrate it as a national holiday. I gladly join all Americans of Hungarian descent on this anniversary celebration, and naturally wish Hungarians in their homeland similar success in their fight against Communist totalitarian tyranny.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, Hungarians were unhappy during the 18th and 19th centuries under Austrian rule, and they were most unhappy during the first half of the 19th century when the Austrian Government was run by the iron-fisted Metternich. This arch-conservative and foe of freedom for some 50 years of his ascendency did everything in his power to hold down all subject nationalities and stifle all national aspirations among them. But this was not easy to do in the case of the Hungarian people. They were restive; they clamored for reforms, and demanded freedom and independence. They had their chance in the revolutions of 1848.

Hungarians there prepared to stage a revolution of their own, if necessary, for the attainment of their goal. But as the forces of freedom and liberty were gathering momentum, and those of despotism and autocracy were weakening, revolution proved to be unnecessary in Hungary. The startling news from Paris and Vienna reached Hungary. Then a band of youthful idealists in Budapest held a bloodless demonstration on March 15. They presented their grievances to the government, demanding participation in

the government and freedom. Fortunately for the government, as well as for all concerned, these demands were met; freedom was granted, and a new day dawned for the Hungarians on March 15. Since then that day has become a national holiday. I am indeed glad to join in the anniversary celebration of that significant and symbolic event, the Hungarian Freedom Day.

Mr. WALLHAUSER. Mr. Speaker, yesterday was the 111th anniversary of Hungarian Freedom Day. By all that is morally and legally right the anniversary of March 15, 1848, should have been a day of great rejoicing. Instead, and because of the tyrants who rule the Kremlin, it was a day of sad contemplation.

We of the free world observed Hungarian Freedom Day solemnly, while those captive people behind the Iron Curtain looked upon it sadly and yet with great hope and yearning for eventual freedom and independence.

It was in 1848 under the leadership of the famed and great Louis Kossuth that the patriots of Hungary boldly bid for freedom after being tied to Austria for centuries. It brought freedom and national autonomy. There was great rejoicing as there was in many years following even though this nation of freedom-loving people experienced many hard and trying days.

Then in 1945, Hungary found its freedom crushed completely through occupation by war-minded Soviet Russia. Yet, the cruel yoke of the Communists could not crush the desires of the Hungarian people for a free and independent nation. It burned steadily in their hearts and in their minds. In the tragic fall of 1956 the Hungarian people again rebelled against foreign rule.

Once again they demanded freedom and independence and fought courageously for it. This time from the tyrants of the Kremlin. Unfortunately, the freedom day victory of 1848 was not repeated. Soviet tanks and artillery proved too much for these inspired and dedicated people.

However, it was a sad event that freedom-loving people of the world never should forget. The shocking end of the Hungarian uprising of 1956 cannot and must not be forgotten. Although physically and ruthlessly crushed by Russia's hideous disregard for the fundamental aspirations and rights of mankind, the patriots of Hungary gave enduring proof that their yearning for freedom remains unquenchable.

Today, as we commemorate an earlier era of Hungarian freedom, we honor all Hungarians for their gallant and tenacious longing for liberty and pray together that the day soon will come when the light of freedom and independence again will be burning brightly in their beloved land.

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Speaker, in commemoration of yesterday's celebration of that day in the 19th century when Hungary proclaimed its independence from Hapsburg rule, I, under unanimous consent, insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the following observations.

One hundred and ten years ago, the Hungarian Parliament dethroned the Hapsburgs, issued a declaration of independence and elected Kossuth, president. As we pause to commemorate that declaration of freedom, we find our feelings mixed; it is difficult to rejoice when, in Hungary today, there can be no rejoicing. Sadly enough, the short lived period of Hungarian independence which we commemorate today is the only real chance for freedom that the Hungarians have had in the last five centuries. It almost seems that the fluctuating factors underlying the world's history have worked deliberately against the establishment of that freedom which Hungarian peoples have so long desired.

The Magyars, as the Hungarians call themselves, settled in the middle Danube Basin at the end of the 9th century. The holy crown which to this day represents Hungarian sovereignty and tradition was obtained from Pope Sylvester II by King St. Stephen in the year 1000. This crown was not only a symbol of "all things Hungarian," but also represented the highly developed level of civilized western culture which Hungary had attained.

In spite of the Hungarian people's desire for continued peaceful independence, there has been little time since 1453 when Hungary has been free from the sound of clashing arms. This stems from the fact that every great continental power with imperialistic tendencies has attempted, in the early stages of its imperialism to dominate the Danube Valley—in which Hungary is located. The Turks of the Ottoman Empire, after fighting the Hungarians for nearly 100 years, defeated the Magyar army in 1526 and occupied two-thirds of Hungarian territory while the Hapsburg dynasty ruled the rest. After the Turks were defeated in 1683, the Hapsburgs extended their power over all Hungary. When in 1849 the Hungarian peoples proclaimed themselves independent, the Austrian Emperor called upon Czar Nicholas to help stifle the insurrection. The Russian efficiency in this type of work has historical roots, and they were successful in defeating Hungary. The odds against her were just too great.

It was within this forced relationship with the Austrian Empire that Hungary entered the First World War, but revolutionary movements broke out in Hungary during those war years. The Communist regime of Bela Kun resulted from the seizure of power by one of these rebel groups which developed leadership restricted to a circle of Lenin's terrorist henchmen. Yet, even though the Communists controlled the Hungarian Government, they could not dominate the Hungarian people, for these people fought in the only way they could—by effective, passive resistance.

After much upheaval, a freely elected national assembly in 1920 repealed the measures of the Communist regime, reverted to the monarchial constitution and established Admiral Horthy as regent. But, the Treaty of Trianon had been imposed upon Hungary. This was based upon the Allies' belief that a defeated belligerent nation should pay for the war (a philosophy stemming from a lack of understanding of the true causes of war). We are thankful that the Western Powers abandoned such a philosophy after World War II for we see the results of the difficulties in which that type of approach had placed Hungary in 1920. The Treaty of Trianon stripped that country of much of her territory, and created a general air of discontent. Essentially it had sown the seeds of the Second World War.

In spite of this, order was restored in Hungary between the wars. Under the premiership of Stephen Bethen, Hungary joined the League of Nations, signed the Kellogg-Briand Pact and concluded many treaties of conciliation and arbitration. But all was not well—the Russians loomed as an ominous shadow on one boundary and the Germans, after the Anschluss of Austria, touched Hungary not only geographically but economically. Nazi political pressure was great—and the final blow to any further independent action on Hungary's part was the Molotov-Ribbentrop agreement. This established such a friendly relationship between Hungary's neighbors, that she could move in no direction.

Despite German domination, the bulk of the Magyars openly defied Hitler. As the war progressed, Hungary became a haven for increasing numbers of refugees, especially from Poland; but the Nazis began tightening their control and forcing devastation upon the country. As the Nazis left, the Red army came, bringing with it 160 Communists—Hungarian in origin, but all Russian citizens. These men, known as the Muscovites, formed the Hungarian Communist Party from the remnants of the Nazi Party. The outcome was a form of government detested violently by the Hungarian peoples. They demonstrated their distaste by a revolution which shook world communism to its very foundations—revolution so fervent that the U.S.S.R. resorted to outright slaughter to temporarily control the fire of freedom which it demonstrated.

As we look upon Hungary in its historical perspective; as we see it suffering today, we may come close to comprehending the true meaning of the cost of freedom. There is no nation, no group of people, which has paid more dearly for a chance to be free.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, Hungarian Freedom Day commemorates a political event which fills many pages in the book of freedom. No one devoted to liberty and the dignity of man can forget the day 111 years ago when the Hungarian people, under the leadership of Louis Kossuth, recaptured from the Hapsburg dynasty many of their inalienable rights.

Had the Hungarian nation's struggle for freedom ended on March 15, 1848, Hungarian Freedom Day would still be a milestone in mankind's march toward liberty. But the Hungarian people did not long enjoy the victory of 1848. Nor was another victory of the Hungarian nation, the independence it achieved after World War I, its final release from the chains of oppression. Twenty-five years later, the boots of the Red army trampled on and suppressed Hungary's independence.

Thus, Hungarian Freedom Day, 1959, does much more than commemorate the history of a glorious nation. It also

serves notice on the leaders and quislings of communism that the Hungarian people have never in the past and will never in the future surrender to alien governments and alien creeds.

Hungarian Freedom Day is a living symbol for all Hungarian people, wherever they may be. It is a living symbol for all peoples whose backs are bent under the yoke of communism.

As long as there is a Hungarian Freedom Day, every foe of liberty must fear the date, March 15. The Ides of March brought the death of Caesar. Just as surely does the symbol of another March 15, Hungarian Freedom Day, portend the death of Caesarism.

THE POTOMAC RIVER

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, the Nation's Capital is reputedly an extraordinarily beautiful city. This reputation is justly deserved but was not cheaply obtained. Millions upon millions of dollars have been expended for monuments, buildings, broad avenues, and lovely parks. The Lincoln Memorial, Jefferson Memorial, Arlington Cemetery grounds, and many Government buildings all contribute to the beauty of the area. Not only are parkways, bridges and statuary all carefully reviewed by planning commissions, fine arts commissions, and other groups to insure their esthetic suitability to the area, but buildings and other architectural units are also subject to their approval prior to construction.

But what of the historic river that flows here—George Washington's river, along which much of the Capital's attractions are situated? This stream has been termed "a national disgrace" because of the extreme pollution of its waters in the Washington, D.C., metropolitan area. Beautiful parkways and sweeping green lawns border both sides of the river, but anyone picnicking here or driving by on a still summer day would be nauseated by the smell of decomposing sewage and the sight of repulsive floating materials in the stream.

Although there is little industry in this area, sewage and street washings from five separate communities are discharged to the Potomac in large quantities, often with no prior treatment. On the basis of many reliable observations and reports, a Public Health Service official concluded that raw sewage discharges have caused objectionable floating solids, sludge deposits, gas bubbles rising from those sludge deposits, and obvious and objectionable odors along the Washington waterfront from the mouth of Rock Creek down to the Lincoln Memorial and pretty much throughout the entire channel.

Under usual conditions we could expect that this material would be washed downstream promptly so that the National Capital area would be spared the effects of its own sewage. However, this stretch of the river is subject to tidal action that carries sewage upstream as well as downstream. The tidal action is so marked that the Potomac at Washington is almost like a lagoon or a lake during periods of low flow, rather than a normal stream flowing down the slope of the stream bed. This means that a great deal of the pollution from the area is more or less held along the waterfront of the area until it is reduced by natural purification.

This constitutes a health hazard not only for local citizens, but for visitors from all parts of the country and the world. The Joint Committee on Washing Metropolitan Problems recently reported upon the Potomac's condition as a source of danger for all water users, an impedance to the building of new recreational facilities, and a continuing national embarrassment:

The natural features of the Potomac River in the Washington metropolitan area are ideal for various types of water sports. Many persons, in defiance or ignorance of the health hazards, indulge in recreation which brings them into close contact with the polluted waters of this stretch of the river. For years, the National Capital Parks has had plans to construct a number of recreational facilities along the Potomac in and near Washington. A principal factor which has caused these plans to be held in abeyance has been the polluted condition of the river. The National Parks has now tired of waiting for the required antipollution works. In the belief that construction of recreational facilities will increase public demand for, and thereby hasten, pollution abatement. The National Capital Parks, this summer, requested, and on June 4 the Congress approved, an appropriation of $290,000 to build a water sports center on the Potomac at the mouth of Rock Creek. Construction will begin shortly and plans call for the center to be in operation by July 1959. The facility will provide capacity for approximately 40 racing shells and also space for 150 canoes, a large portion of which will be for hire to the public. The center will serve as headquarters for rowing teams of colleges and high schools in the area and all over the Nation. The center will also play host to international racing events. Teams from Russia and South America are planning to race at the center this coming summer.

An example of what users of the sports center may look forward to is shown in * * * photographs taken September 28, 1958, during the President's Cup regatta off Hains Point. This annual regatta continues to brave the contamination in the Potomac. Fifteen to twenty boats capsized during the days' sailing and produced scenes—similar to those shown. The young lady in figure 3 who seems to be swallowing more than her pride upon being hauled out of the water is probably unaware that the routine water sample taken by the District of Columbia Department of Sanitary Engineering on October 1 showed that there were 23,000 coliform organisms, bacteria of sewage origin, present per 100 milliliters of the water. This means that approximately 3,000 sewage bacteria would have accompanied each gulp of the water, assuming that the water quality on September 28 was as "good" as that of October 1. It is frequently far worse. Those yachtsmen skilled or fortunate enough to avoid a dunking are nonetheless exposed to sewage bacteria in the spray and on the oars and wet lines. While there is little scientific data to indicate how many pathogenic bacteria of various types constitute a dose sufficient to produce disease in persons with varying degrees of resistance, it is obvious that a sizable inoculum could be ingested. * * *

From a public-health point of view, canoeing and rowing in these waters should be discouraged. From a public-relations point of view, inviting foreign teams to race in these polluted waters seems equally undesirable.

Although the Washington Suburban Sanitary Commission, which treats the wastes originating in the District of Columbia and Maryland, is improving its established facilities, little action has taken place to separate the combined storm and sanitary sewers in the District, the principal source of the continuing pollution problem. In addition, although Virginia vaguely promised to keep pace with sewage treatment improvements on the other side of the river, it continues to discharge significant quantities of wastes to the river.

Must we erect a fence along this most historic of our rivers marked with large signs "Visitor, go home"?

MERAMEC RIVER BASIN, MO.

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CARNAHAN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include the following Resolution 51 adopted by the House of Representatives, State of Missouri:

HOUSE RESOLUTION 51

Resolution memorializing Congress to initiate plans for the development of the Meramec River Basin

Whereas plans for the development of the Meramec River Basin were submitted to Congress some time ago; and

Whereas these plans are urgently needed (1) to control almost yearly floods, (2) to increase suitable location for industries, (3) to reduce loss of crops, livestock, and dwellings, (4) to eliminate health hazards, and (5) to provide a recreational area within 30 miles of St. Louis: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Missouri, That the Congress of the United States be memorialized to initiate the plans for the development of the Meramec River Basin; and be it further

Resolved, That Missouri Congressmen be urged to impel the activation of these plans; and be it further

Resolved, That a duly attested copy of this memorial be immediately transmitted to the Secretary of the Senate of the United States, to the Clerk of the House of Representatives of the United States, and to each Member of Congress from the State of Missouri.

IMPORTATION OF CRUDE OIL AND RESIDUAL FUEL OIL

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CONTE] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I wish to address myself this afternoon to the far-reaching ramifications of the President's ruling last week imposing drastic curbs on the importation of crude oil and residual fuel oils.

The President acted under section 2 of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1954, as amended, which authorizes him to limit importation of any product when he determines that it is being imported in such quantities as to threaten our national security.

Mr. Speaker, with all due respect for the executive branch, I wish to question the wisdom of this decision. I submit that these limitations on the importation of residual fuel oils and crude oil will not only fail to safeguard our national security; they will also work to the detriment of our overall economic health and our position in the free world.

I submit further that these restrictions on oil importations can have disastrous effects in my home State of Massachusetts, in New England, and in the northeastern United States as a whole. They are a blow to the consumer, both the industrialist and the homeowner.

The Presidential proclamation, Mr. Speaker, deals with several categories of oil importation. We in New England are most concerned with the provision which rolls back the importation of residual fuel oils to 1957 levels. Plainly, our need for imported residual oils has risen steadily for the last decade. By way of clarification, it may be pointed out that such fuel is the residue or distillate remaining when crude oil has been processed into various forms of petroleum. Residual oil is an economical and efficient fuel for heating large buildings, for electrical generating plants, for many industrial and other miscellaneous uses.

The Presidential proclamation also restricts imports of crude oil. These imports, I understand, will drop 15 to 20 percent as a result of the ruling. Also restricted are imports on a variety of other petroleum products, in some instances to a sizable degree.

I contend, Mr. Speaker, that it was not necessary to impose mandatory quotas on these oil imports for national security reasons. I find it difficult to believe that the domestic oil industry is in such weak condition that it needs such additional subsidies to expand and prosper and be ready to produce at record levels in the event of a national emergency.

For years we have been subsidizing this industry through the 27½ percent oil depletion allowance, which, in my opinion, is the biggest and least justifiable loophole in our tax structure. This generous preferential tax treatment creates tremendous profits for the oilmen of the Southwest at the expense of every American. It is but one of a number of generous internal revenue provisions which this industry enjoys. I would suggest that the addition of protectionist tariff barriers amounts to a new windfall for this most generously subsidized industry.

Mr. Speaker, what are the facts about the oil industry? The facts are that this 100-year-old industry has been expanding phenomenally since the close of World War II, in spite of increased demand for imports. Up to 1958, each year's oil production reached record levels. The OCDM report recommending the imposition of mandatory import quotas proves this point statistically. The report also shows a steady rise in the number of wells drilled, through 1956. True, the figures indicate a slight drop in the number of wells drilled, starting in 1957, and a slight drop in the number of barrels produced, starting in 1958. We are asked to conclude that the entire oil industry is therefore in peril, and that we need to restrict imports to protect our oil industry and safeguard our national security.

What about the homeowner and the motorist, Mr. Speaker, and the manufacturer battling soaring production costs? What about inflation and national security?

What of our national security in terms of Western Hemisphere good neighbor relations? Is the erection of import barriers the proper way to advance our international relations?

I am no expert on the economics of the oil industry. But I would like to suggest that the drop in oil production during the 1958 recession year was not primarily due to foreign competition. There were other developments peculiar to the oil industry. A warm winter, as we all know, means less demand for fuel. Further, I suggest that our domestic oil production dropped in 1958 for the same reason that our output of automobiles, of radios and television sets, of boats and chairs and lamps and pencils and soda pop dropped—for the very simple reason that we found ourselves in a recession.

The rest of the economy was adversely affected as the oil industry, perhaps more so. But no special tariff or quota privileges were granted to other industries. Even so, the Congress last year approved the extension of the Trade Agreements Act for 4 years.

Yet now, Mr. Speaker, as the Nation's economy proceeds on an upturn, the oil industry is suddenly in need of special protection in the name of national security. Evidently we are all for trade among the nations of the free world except for imports for the things we produce. What sort of foreign economic policy is this?

As an American, and as a New Englander, I object.

I object as an American because the national security argument is specious. Oil production continues at high levels. The industry already enjoys special tax privileges, in capital gains, intangible drilling allowances and depletion. And the oil industry actually limits its own production in the name of conservation. No one has convincingly shown that our oil industry is unable to compete effectively with foreign producers if it really wishes to do so. Such evidence may exist, but I have not seen it. I do not find it in the proclamation of the President, or in the report of the OCDM to him on this problem, or in the report of his Special Committee on Oil. Nor have I heard it here on the floor, as certain Members have argued for mandatory quotas on oil imports. In fact, the whole purpose of the new order would seem to be to establish a floor for oil prices.

Furthermore, I feel that our real national security may well be served best if we do not continue to push our oil production to ever greater levels. Oil is a wasting asset. We can deplete our reserves. If we ever had a national emergency of the most drastic possible nature—so that we were cut off from all foreign sources of oil—then we would want our own reserves as undepleted as possible. On the other hand, if we face a less serious national emergency, then we will still be able to draw on other Western Hemisphere oil producing countries to supply our strategic needs. I can imagine a multitude of possible national emergencies when we would want to get oil from many different spots on the globe, in order to supply our own domestic needs and also our military requirements at various points in the world. It is difficult to foresee a national emergency resulting from the continued marketing of Canadian and Venezuelan oil in the United States.

This brings me to the matter of foreign sources. A relatively small portion is imported from the Middle East. The great bulk comes from Canada and Venezuela, powers which are near to us and friendly to us. How is the national security of the United States jeopardized if we in Massachusetts buy from Venezuela or Canada, instead of being dependent primarily on a handful of domestic suppliers?

And if we are really concerned with national security, what are we to say of the effect these import quotas will have on our relations with Canada and Venezuela? These nations are our good friends of long standing—but we all know of strained relations with Canada, and none of us will soon forget the unhappy experience of the Vice President in Venezuela on his tour last year. A nation can only be as secure as its friends abroad are good and true friends. I can think of no worse move for our national security than steps which will hurt and offend both Venezuela and Canada.

As individuals, many Americans are investors in enterprises in other Western Hemisphere nations. Are we not jeopardizing these savings and our goal of expanding living standards and markets in the Americas by cutting back their dollar exports?

I might also add that these countries are big customers in the United States. Venezuela buys more than a billion dollars worth of goods from us every year. We all know what a large portion of our export market is filled by Canada. If the oil import order curtails American sales to these two countries, as it undoubtedly will, then American workers will suffer. This is the inevitable result of such shortsighted policies.

Mr. Speaker, I submit that the national security argument simply fails to

hold water in this case. Neither the Presidential proclamation, nor the OCDM findings, nor any other reports issued by the White House answer the two crucial questions. First, why does our national security depend on a larger share of the market for American oil producers? Secondly, is foreign competition the real reason for the drop in American oil production? Both points must be proven to establish the case. As far as I know, neither case has been proven.

I submit that we are entitled to an explanation which amounts to something more than a general conclusion hidden under the pious hoopskirt of national security. We also are entitled to assurances that the U.S. consumer will not face a new round of spiralling price increases.

If we cannot be given a convincing national security explanation, Mr. Speaker, then we may be forced to ask ourselves a most unpleasant question. We may have to ask ourselves if this situation might have been provoked not by legitimate national security considerations, but by the power pressure of the domestic oil producers and their Washington operatives. We may be forced to ask if this policy is really designed for the military security of the many, or whether it is designed for the millionaire security of a few whose influence in the Capital is out of proportion to their numbers.

Mr. Speaker, I am speaking today not only as an American who is profoundly concerned with this situation, but as a New Englander. I am convinced that this latest move is another blow to the consumers of my region. And I would warn colleagues from other consumer regions that they, too, will feel the harsh impact of this barrier to foreign commerce.

For decades New England has been suffering as a result of various national policies. Federal aid to industrialize certain Southern areas has made possible the raiding of industries in the Northeast. Thanks to Uncle Sam's beneficence, the raiders can offer cheap power, plants built with fast tax windfalls as well as lower wage standards. Look what has happened to our soft goods industries.

Significantly, Mr. Speaker, the textile manufacturers have not fared as well as the oil producers in protection from foreign import competition. Importation of cheap textiles from Japan and other countries threatens the livelihood of many Americans. The complaints of the heavy electric equipment producers, who are being underbid by millions of dollars by foreign firms, is another case in point. Why is national security a reason for taking care of oil, but not the other industries?

Mr. Speaker, our national tariff policy has had a deleterious effect on New England's economic health. I am not undertaking to question that policy today. But I will say this—you cannot expect New England to submit to discriminatory tariff treatment. You cannot expect her to survive economically when she finds her own products outpriced by foreign imports, only to discover that the tariff policy in regard to fuel and raw material imports is forcing her operating costs upward with further pressures on profit margins.

Residual fuel is absolutely vital to New England's economy. New England imports more than 60 million barrels of residual fuel oil each year. She uses it for her industries, for heating, for electrical power generation and oil refining. Yet the American oil producers have found that their brands of oil are of such high quality that other products, more profitable than residual oil, may be processed out of crude oil. As a result, American production of residual oil has dropped sharply. At the same time, New England has naturally increased her residual oil imports from abroad, particularly from Venezuela.

But now we are threatened with a barren future. Imports are to be cut back, even while demand grows. The oil-producing States will be able to force up the price on residual oil, with no foreign competition. The free market which we have enjoyed, in the tradition of American enterprise, is now a sheltered market for the producer. The consumer is defenseless.

The Presidential proclamation instructs the Director of OCDM to inform the President if oil prices rise as a result of the new import quotas. Of course, the administration is anxious to prevent any price increases. But, Mr. Speaker, the simplest law of economics tells us that when demand increases—or even holds steady—and the supply decreases, prices will rise. It has always happened that way, and always will. Residual oil, as demand increases, will become scarcer and scarcer. The result will be higher prices on residual oil. We will be given a thousand and one explanations to justify them. But the real cause will be the subsidy in the form of import quotas.

Because of this serious economic picture for New England, I feel compelled to make this solemn warning today. If national economic policy continues to work to the disadvantage of New England in almost every instance, there may be the most serious consequences to pay.

Our first responsibility as lawmakers is to the consumer and the taxpayer. This is not a partisan issue. All of us in New England, Democrats and Republicans alike, are profoundly concerned. We are not asking for special treatment or privileges. All we ask is equitable treatment. Otherwise we face the alarming prospect of becoming the Nation's No. 1 economic problem.

Statement in regard to the plan for direct Government control of petroleum imports into our country, by William Naden, president of Esso Standard Oil Co.:

"We believe a serious mistake has been made in bringing imports of heavy fuel oil under mandatory Government control. Cutting back imports of heavy fuel oil to the 1957 level will leave many consumers with no choice except to curtail activities or to turn to higher-cost sources for heat and power.

"Heavy fuel oil is used to heat apartments, schools and other large buildings and as a source of power by countless large and small factories and electric generating stations. Because of the cost factors involved, oil refineries in our country convert the great bulk of the crude oil they process into gasoline and other light products and historically not nearly enough heavy fuel oil has been made by domestic refineries to satisfy the demand of domestic consumers.

"Supplies of heavy fuel oil are available, however, outside the country, and these have been imported into the United States for decades to meet the need for this fuel, particularly in the heavily industrialized east coast area and New England. Thus imports have served simply to make up the difference between domestic supplies and consumers' demands.

"As for crude oil, we regret that failure of the voluntary program made it necessary for the Government to impose mandatory controls on imports. While the method for allocation of the total quota of crude imports has not been announced, there are reports of an allocation method which in our opinion would be grossly inequitable. It is to be hoped this is not the case and that the allocation method finally announced will be fair to all importers and not discriminatory."

[From the Berkshire (Mass.) Eagle, Mar. 12, 1959]

MAKING A FAKERY OUT OF NATIONAL SECURITY

One bad goof calls for another—that seems to be the reasoning behind the administration's decision to lower the boom on imports of foreign oil.

Vexed by the failure of voluntary reductions in crude oil imports, the Government is compounding its error by making the curbs mandatory. And it is rubbing kerosene into the wound by lowering the import quotas below the levels of the past several years.

The Government's justification for the move is embodied in the catchall phrase of national security. The argument, a familiar one by now, is that imports of cheap oil discourage domestic producers. To keep them happy and operating at full tilt, therefore, it is necessary to protect their market, shield them from tough competition. Only then will the domestic oil industry be vigorous enough to meet any national emergencies that may arise.

There are several flaws in this dubious thesis, but on the way to recounting them it should be remarked that the whole idea of import quotas was politically inspired—a concession to the coal industry and parts of the oil industry when Congress extended the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act in 1955. It is, of course, inimical to the reciprocal-trade philosophy that is supposed to govern our ocean commerce.

For this reason it may well call forth reprisals from the oil-producing countries thus discriminated against. At the least, it will weaken American markets in those lands by shutting off their chief source of the U.S. dollar.

From the regional standpoint, the curbs probably will result in higher oil prices in New England, as oil distributors are forced to rely on the more expensive domestic crude oil and petroleum products. Congressman SILVIO O. CONTE, a liberal Republican himself, put this point forthrightly a few days ago when he warned the administration that the move could have disastrous effects on the struggling New England economy.

Nor is Representative CONTE alone among Republicans arrayed against the curbs. Although the coal industry and the domestic independents in the oil industry support them, the big international oil companies and a good many old-fashioned conservatives see them as unwarranted interference with business. Said a spokesman for the Socony Mobil Oil Co., which has wells all over the world: "We don't see anything in the oil import situation which justifies

putting the industry under such an involved set of extensive Federal controls."

The final rejoinder, though—the one that strikes to the heart of the national security mumbo-jumbo—is the self-evident truth that using up U.S. oil reserves is not the way to strengthen national defense. If new methods must be devised to encourage exploration for oil in this country, well and good; let us by all means adopt them. But let us not simultaneously deplete our own resources and undermine our foreign policy, and then claim we are promoting the national security.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONTE. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate the gentleman from Massachusetts for bringing this subject matter to the attention of the Congress today. It is one that has troubled us for a number of years. We have been able to get along fairly well until this recent directive of the administration. It has saddened us in spite of the fact we are having these difficulties in New England. There is no doubt in my mind and in the mind of anyone who is interested in the subject matter that this will, of course, raise havoc with the industries in our section of the country, the Northeast section.

We have had unemployment trouble and unemployment problems for a long period of time, and there is no doubt in my mind that this is going to add to the unemployment which is now prevalent in New England. The gentleman from Massachusetts in bringing this to our attention and outlining the seriousness of this matter, of course, is to be congratulated for his efforts. I know that this subject matter has been close to his heart since his membership in the Congress here. Since he was sworn in, in January, as one of the new Members from Massachusetts, and ever since his stay here in the Congress, he has at all times been interested in this and many other matters, but this one in particular, because it affects the heart of the industrial section of the country, which is New England. I congratulate the gentleman. I have received many telegrams asking that something be done about this crude oil importation so that we can, as the Member has well said, at least have some quotas.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend as part of my remarks some of these letters and some of these telegrams together with a fine statement by Mr. Thomas G. Dignan, president of the Boston Edison Co., in which he outlines at some great length the need for help and assistance as far as the importation of crude oil is concerned.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

(The telegrams and articles are as follows:)

WELLESLEY, MASS., *March 5, 1959.*

Hon. THOMAS J. LANE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.:

Understand White House presently considering mandatory restrictions on imports of residual fuel oil. At the least, this will be an economic blow to New England due to increased fuel costs. One percent shortage in winter of 1947–48 drove New England fuel costs up at rate of at least $100 million annually. In addition, with domestic oil industry incapable of making up artifically created shortages and oil-burning equipment unable to use substitute fuels, parts of New England may be completely without suitable fuel. Urge your intervention to prevent this action which could seriously damage New England economy.

JOHN P. BIRMINGHAM,
President, White Fuel Corp., Boston, Mass.

WASHINGTON, D.C., *March 5, 1959.*

Hon. THOMAS J. LANE,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.:

On behalf New England Senators, wish to inform letter sent today President Eisenhower urging New England be exempted from mandatory crude oil import quotas or alternately residual oil be exempted. Such restrictions could have adverse economic consequences. You may wish to express position on this important matter. Decision expected soon.

NEW ENGLAND SENATORS CONFERENCE,
CHARLES W. COLSON, *Secretary.*

THE NEW ENGLAND COUNCIL,
FOR ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT,
Boston, Mass., March 4, 1959.

Hon. THOMAS J. LANE,
U.S. House of Representatives,
House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. LANE: It was a real pleasure to meet you on my trip to Washington in January. I have delayed writing in order to include now a recent copy of our policy statements and our 1959 handbook, both of which have just been reprinted. Incidentally, if you have not been getting our New Englander magazine you should be receiving it now. Please do not hesitate to let me know if you have not.

As I indicated in your office, the New England council is very interested in any legislation which has a real impact on our economy. This has always been true, but this phase of our program is being constantly stepped up and I hope you will not hesitate to ask our help in any matter which you feel is of concern to our economy. We are, in fact, eager to work with you on matters affecting our region.

I would like to call your attention to our recent correspondence re residual oil import restrictions. This is a matter which hits at the heart of our economy. Any such restrictions or price rise would have a serious effect on our industries' competitive position. We do hope that you can help in this matter.

Once again, I enjoyed meeting you and I look forward to seeing you on my next visit. In the meantime, please feel free to call upon us.

Sincerely,

ALBERT O. MERRILL,
Manager, Industrial Department.

BOSTON EDISON CO.,
Boston, Mass., February 27, 1959.

Hon. THOMAS J. LANE,
House Office Building, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. LANE: Enclosed are copies of Boston Edison Co.'s statements concerning the importation of residual oil which have been submitted to the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization.

This matter is being studied by the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization and is also the subject of a number of bills pending in the Senate and House. Restriction on the importation of residual oil is, in my opinion, detrimental to national defense and is discriminatory to New England. There will be a severe economic impact to customers of this company and to many direct users of residual oil, such as hospitals, universities, and industrial concerns. Representatives of other areas of the country, particularly the coal industry, have been very active in support of legislation against the importation of residual oil.

I am sure that your office has been aware of this problem, and I thought that it would be desirable to keep you informed of our activity in this matter.

Sincerely yours,

THOMAS G. DIGNAN,
President.

BOSTON EDISON CO.,
Boston, Mass., February 11, 1959.

Mr. LEO A. HOEGH,
Director, Civil and Defense Mobilization,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. HOEGH: Pursuant to notice which appeared in the Federal Register (Document 59–797) January 28, 1959, and in accordance with Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization Regulation No. 4 as amended January 27, 1959, Boston Edison Co. submits the following comments.

It is to be noted that these comments are confined to a discussion of the need to import residual fuel oil, and are submitted by an electric utility which is a large user of imported residual oil, a byproduct of crude oil remaining after other usable products have been removed.

Boston Edison Co. is an investor-owned utility which provides electric service to 475,000 customers in 40 cities and towns in the Greater Boston area and, through bulk sales to other electric systems, to large numbers of consumers outside its own area. Its interest in this matter is to see that customers, including many vital national defense facilities, have a reliable supply of electricity available at all times and at the lowest possible cost.

Boston Edison Co. contends that no restrictions should be placed upon the importation of residual fuel oil. Importation of residual oil is a special problem and should be considered apart from the importation of other petroleum products. This has been recognized during the period of present voluntary controls and it is urged that continued recognition be given to this point of view.

In the opinion of this company, no justifiable purpose will be accomplished by the restriction of residual oil imports, but rather many serious and undesirable economic consequences will result from such a restriction.

Residual oil is the scrap product of oil processing. In 1957, the amount of residual oil imported represented less than 5.1 percent of the total petroleum products used in the United States. Modern refinery design in the United States permits the distillation of many crudes so that there is no residual oil produced in the refining process. Refiners of domestic oil have not produced sufficient quantities of residual oil. Users of residual oil have been forced to import. As the demand for other more valuable petroleum products increases and the production of residual oil decreases, the use of imported residuals is necessary to fill the gap between domestic production and domestic demand.

This company supplies power to a large metropolitan area which includes a large number of national defense facilities and producers of vital defense products. The use of natural gas on a firm basis is not economic and has been discouraged in recent cases by the Federal Power Commission. Substantial curtailment of the supply of residual oil would force this utility and others to rely on an uninterrupted supply of coal. For such a utility to be dependent upon a

single fuel to produce its power is dangerous to the national defense.

Scarcity of residual oil as a fuel will increase the cost of electricity to customers, including military installations and suppliers. Other national defense considerations include the effect of import restrictions on the size of the tanker fleet which would exist for use in times of emergency. The Suez crisis indicated that the entire world oil supply and oil transportation facilities are of direct interest to the United States of America. Also, restriction of this type of fuel will have an adverse effect on the development and maintenance of very critical port facilities.

A further consideration, important to national defense, is that a large percentage of residual oil imports comes from Caribbean countries. It is a major and nearby source of oil and should be in established use for American needs rather than for other, possibly unfriendly, nations. Finally the record of this investigation should indicate that the friendship of these Caribbean countries is of utmost importance to the national defense of the United States.

The east coast uses more than 50 percent of the residual oil consumed in the United States, and of this amount more than 55 percent is imported. Restrictions would severely disrupt the use of fuel in this area and would affect industrial heating, shipping, and public utilities, as well as other phases of industrial activity. A reduction in the supply of residual oil would increase substantially the cost of power in the east coast area.

This is critical in the entire northeastern area, which is already burdened by the high cost of fuel because of the great distances over which such fuel must be transported. The charge for every kilowatt-hour this company sells includes a fuel adjustment which varies with the cost of fuel. On the basis of its present rates and actual fuel costs in December 1958, its customers would have been required to pay more than $1,500,000 additional for the energy they purchased in 1958 if this company had been unable to obtain residual oil.

The continued use of residual oil imports will aid and not impair national security. In addition, restrictions on importation of this product would threaten the ability of the electric industry to provide a reliable supply of electricity and would affect the price of electricity for a large number of users vital to the national security. Such a restriction is particularly onerous and discriminating to the very important northeastern section of this country. Boston Edison Co. urges that special consideration be given to the importation of residual oil and that no restrictions be placed thereon.

Very truly yours,

THOMAS G. DIGNAN,
President.

REBUTTAL BY BOSTON EDISON CO. RELATIVE TO COMMENTS, OPINIONS, AND DATA ON RESIDUAL OIL IMPORTS AS THEY AFFECT NATIONAL SECURITY

This statement is being filed in accordance with OCDM Regulation 4 as amended, and is Boston Edison Co.'s rebuttal to statements, opinions, and data filed by the National Coal Association and others urging that the Director of OCDM certify that residual fuel oil is being imported in such quantities as to threaten to impair the national defense.

In its filing of February 12, 1959, Boston Edison Co. stated that imports were not impairing the national defense and were, in fact, a material aid to the defense effort. It based these conclusions on the following:

1. The present yield of residual fuel oil from domestic refineries is being reduced each year. The use of imported residual is necessary to fill the gap between domestic production and domestic demand.

2. Curtailment of the supply of residual oil would force this utility and others to depend on a single fuel, coal, which is not in the best interests of national defense.

3. Curtailment of residual oil will increase the cost of power to all consumers including military establishments and defense industries.

4. The maintenance of a large tanker fleet is necessary for national defense.

5. Limitation of residual imports would tend to injure friendly relations with Caribbean countries which are important to the national defense.

6. A reduction in the supply of residual oil will severely disrupt the operations of industrial and institutional users of this fuel.

In rebuttal to material filed with the Director, Boston Edison Co. wishes to make the following comments:

There has been no factual data presented to support the contention that the importation of residual oil is discouraging the discovery of oil reserves in the United States. That this contention is not true can be demonstrated by exhibit 1 attached, which shows that the present yield of residuals from crude runs by east coast refineries has dropped from 21.8 percent in 1950 to 16.7 percent in 1957. This represents a drop in yield of over 23 percent. A further substantial drop has been reported for 1958. It is apparent from this that if the incentive to discover new oil reserves was the potential sale of residual, then the oil industry would not have designed its equipment to produce a lesser amount of residual and greater amount of more valuable products.

I

CURRENT CAPACITY OF COAL INDUSTRY

The National Coal Association developed what it considers to be a fairly accurate calculation of the current mining capacity of the bituminous coal industry (p. 29). It does this by multiplying number of employees times output per man per day times 260 days.

For the number of employees, the association used the average number employed in 1958, and not the highest number.

For output, the association used 9 tons per man per day, whereas it has been as high as 11 tons per man per day.

The number of workdays used was 260 whereas in 1944, a war year, 278 days were worked.

On the assumption that not less than 200,000 employees and 278 workdays are available and using a production of only 9 tons per day the current potential for the coal industry is approximately 640 million tons, after allowing 140 million tons from strip mines.

COAL EXPORTS

Exhibit 2 is presented to show the extent to which the electric power industry has increased its use of coal as a boiler fuel from 88 million tons in 1950 to 157 million tons in 1957. Figures for coking coal are also shown because they represent such a large portion of U.S. consumption and a portion which is not affected by residual oil competition. This exhibit also shows the imports of residual oil expressed in thousands of net tons of coal equivalent compared to bituminous coal exports. This shows quite clearly that coal exports more than equal the imports of residual oil. In the event of a national emergency, the 76 million tons of coal exported in 1957 would more than offset the 41 million tons of coal equivalent residual oil which was imported.

FINANCIAL EFFECT ON BITUMINOUS COAL INDUSTRY

The NCA states on page 34 that "during 1958 the bituminous coal industry operated at little, if any, profit. Complete finance figures are not published for that year, but available data indicate that certain fields operated at a deficit."

This is a serious matter and one with which Boston Edison, a large user of bituminous coal, is vitally concerned. It believes that data which is available should be presented and that no hasty conclusions should be drawn as to 1958 results without authentic figures.

Exhibit 3, attached, shows the percent return on net worth for six of the leading bituminous coal companies for the year ending 1957, and the 10-year average. This is the class of producer which large users of bituminous coal deal with and depend on. As a group they represented total sales in 1957 of almost $1 billion. This does not suggest a distressed industry.

FINANCIAL EFFECT ON COAL-CARRYING RAILROADS

A large portion of the cost of coal delivered in Boston is attributable to the freight charges for rail transportation from the mine head to Hampton Roads. The NCA referred to the financial effect of importing residual oil on the coal-carrying railroads (p. 69).

However, exhibit 4 shows a return on net worth for 5 of the principal bituminous coal railroads which varies from 5.3 percent to 15.3 percent in 1957, and a 10-year average which ranges from 5 percent to 9.5 percent.

DISPARITY BETWEEN CAPACITY OF COAL INDUSTRY AND PROJECTED NATIONAL DEFENSE REQUIREMENTS

In developing its preliminary conclusions concerning the disparity between coal capacity and national defense requirements (pp. 50–54), the NCA has erred in using its own figures.

On page 51 of the NCA statement it is alleged that 90 percent of petroleum delivered to district No. 1 in 1957 was received by ocean tanker. This statement is contradicted by their own exhibit, table 9, page 3. This exhibit shows total petroleum products delivered by pipeline, barge, or rail delivery, and local production to be 561,107,000 barrels. The total supply is shown as 1,255,326,000 barrels. The pipeline, etc., deliveries therefore represent 45 percent of the total supply of petroleum to district No. 1. Thus the balance for ocean tanker delivery could not possibly exceed 55 percent, rather than 90 percent as stated. Therefore all calculations based on this incorrect percentage are erroneous.

II

The NCA's other principal argument is that the utilization of imported residual as boiler fuel by electric power utilities and general industrial establishments renders these operations dependent upon the maintenance of fuel supplies that are unusually vulnerable to interruption by enemy action.

The NCA relies to a great extent on its evaluation of tanker routing in World War II and concludes that all reduction in tanker deliveries of petroleum to the east coast during World War II was caused by the submarine menace. This is mentioned many times—pages 18, 20, 26, 53, 55, 57–59.

The principal reason there were limited tanker deliveries of petroleum products to the east coast during World War II was that tankers were required to supply our own armed forces and those of our allies with petroleum products.

Because of this Boston Edison contends that the continued availability of as many tankers as can be economically justified is required to be prepared adequately for wartime emergencies. To the extent that the importation of residual oil keeps an expanded tanker fleet available, national defense is aided.

The NCA refers repeatedly to the submarine menace. However, both coal and oil, which Boston Edison uses in large quantities,

are presently delivered by oceangoing vessels. Therefore whatever risk exists in oil importation must also apply to coal.

Further, as previously pointed out complete blockade of residual oil imports could be more than offset by reduced coal exports.

It is urgently requested that the Director of the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization determine that residual oils are not being imported in such quantities or under such circumstances as to threaten to impair the national security.

BOSTON EDISON CO.—EXHIBIT No. 1

Year	Yield of residual from crude runs, east coast		Total U.S. domestic demand residual oil, million barrels	Total U.S. imports residual oil, million barrels	Residual imports as coal equivalent, million tons	Total U.S. domestic demand petroleum, million barrels	U.S. crude reserves year end, million barrels
	Percent	Thousand barrels per day					
1950	21.8	219	553.8	120.0	28.57	2,375.1	25,268
1951	21.7	242	564.4	118.9	28.30	2,569.8	27,468
1952	21.9	248	555.2	128.4	30.57	2,664.4	27,961
1953	21.4	247	560.5	131.4	31.28	2,775.3	28,945
1954	19.4	220	522.3	129.2	30.76	2,832.4	29,561
1955	18.6	215	557.1	152.2	36.23	3,087.8	30,012
1956	17.4	214	561.7	161.8	38.52	3,205.2	30,435
1957	16.7	217	587.3	173.4	41.28	3,423.3	30,300

Source.—Bureau of Mines; API.

BOSTON EDISON CO.—EXHIBIT No. 2

U.S. consumption and exports, bituminous coal

Year	Electric power utilities	Coking coal	Total U.S. consumption	Coal exports	Residual oil imports as coal equivalent
1950	88,362	103,845	454,202	25,468	28,570
1951	101,898	113,448	468,904	56,726	28,300
1952	103,309	97,614	418,757	47,643	30,570
1953	112,283	112,874	426,798	33,760	31,280
1954	115,235	85,391	363,060	31,041	30,760
1955	140,550	107,377	423,412	51,288	36,230
1956	154,983	105,913	432,858	68,546	38,520
1957	157,398	107,971	413,610	76,342	41,280

Sources: National Coal Association. "Bituminous Coal Facts 1958"; Bureau of Mines.

BOSTON EDISON CO.—EXHIBIT No. 3

Return on net worth of leading bituminous coal producers

Company	Percent return on net worth		Total sales, 1957
	1957	10-year average	
			Millions
Pittsburgh Consolidation Coal Co	9.1	9.5	$365.0
Peabody Coal Co	12.8	8.0	104.0
Pittston Co	14.3	9.5	266.3
Island Creek Coal Co	13.8	14.1	121.3
Truax-Traer Coal Co	8.4	12.2	45.1
West Kentucky Coal Co	10.1	17.6	35.6
Total			937.3

Source: Value Line Investment Survey, Dec. 22, 1958.

BOSTON EDISON CO.—EXHIBIT No. 4

Return on net worth bituminous coal carrying railroads

Railroad Co.	Percent bituminous coal freight revenue to total freight revenue	Percent return on net worth	
		1957	10-year average
Virginian	85	15.3	8.2
Norfolk & Western	68	7.7	6.3
Chesapeake & Ohio	50	11.6	9.5
Western Maryland	40	5.3	5.0
Pittsburgh & Lake Erie	31	7.8	8.3

Source: Value Line Investment Survey, Feb. 9, 1959.

Mr. IRWIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONTE. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. IRWIN. I would like to commend the gentleman from Massachusetts for his remarks. I, myself, introduced something in the RECORD last Friday relating to this matter. At the time this was being considered I sent messages to the White House in regard to the matter. I agree with the gentleman that not only does this affect us regionally, and this is, of course, of great importance to us, but it also affects our foreign policy relationships, as the gentleman has pointed out, with two traditionally friendly nations.

Mr. CONTE. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. MEYER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONTE. I yield to the gentleman from Vermont.

Mr. MEYER. I would like to compliment the gentleman from Massachusetts, just south of me in Vermont. The people of Vermont have long felt that we have paid excessively high prices for petroleum products, and this action will only aggravate the situation.

Mr. CONTE. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, may I take this opportunity to compliment my colleague and neighbor from Massachusetts [Mr. CONTE] for his cogent remarks on the serious economic plight which Massachusetts and the entire New England region faces as a result of the President's order last week imposing mandatory controls on the importation of foreign oil.

The mandatory order limits the importation of residual fuel oil to 400,000 barrels a day for the entire eastern half of the Nation. This mandatory quota will soon lead to a price increase in domestic residual fuel oil, once present reserves are depleted, and New England industries, colleges, electric powerplants, State and municipal institutions will be paying higher fuel bills. Home owners will eventually be digging down into their pockets to pay higher home fuel bills because of the mandatory quotas set on foreign crude oil.

PROTESTS TO PRESIDENT

I wrote to the President on February 24 and strongly protested any recommendation that would curtail the importation of residual fuel oil and crude oil because of the adverse effect this would have upon the economy of our region.

I am very disappointed with the President's mandatory quotas order. This has been a constant problem New Englanders have been fighting since I came to Congress in 1953. In the past we have been successful in maintaining a free flow of foreign oil into New England and the national security was not put in jeopardy.

ASKS PRESIDENT EXEMPT NEW ENGLAND

Mr. Speaker, I implore the President to reconsider his decision and urge him to exempt New England from these mandatory quotas. I have telegraphed my request and concern in this matter to him.

At this time, under unanimous consent, I include my February 24 letter to President Eisenhower, and a sampling of the telegrams I have received protesting the oil import restrictions, printed with my remarks:

FEBRUARY 24, 1959.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I am writing with reference to the investigation currently being made by the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization, at the request of the State Department and the Department of Defense, to determine the effect upon national defense of residual fuel oil importation.

I would strongly protest any recommendation that would curtail the importation of residual fuel oil because of the adverse effect this would have upon New England.

Past experience in import curtailment of oil has demonstrated that such a reduction has resulted in price increases to New England homeowners and industries.

Your thoughtful consideration of the effect of residual oil importation restrictions on New England economy will be deeply appreciated.

With every good wish, I am

Sincerely yours,

EDWARD P. BOLAND,
Member of Congress.

SOUTH HADLEY, MASS., *February 23, 1959.*

Representative EDWARD P. BOLAND,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Trade agreements extension act of 1958, empowering the Office of Civil Defense Mobilization to immediately limit the importation of residuary fuel oil, would adversely affect our cost of operation. Past experience in import curtailment has demonstrated that reduction in imports has resulted in price increases to ourselves and all New England. Would appreciate your assistance in requesting the Director, Mr. Leo A. Hoegh, to delay invoking such powers until this problem can be resolved by Congress.

OTTO C. KOHLER,
Business Manager, Mount Holyoke College.

HOLYOKE, MASS., *February 24, 1959.*

Representative EDWARD P. BOLAND,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.:

We are users of residual fuel oil; we are concerned that the Director of the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization may immediately limit the importation of residual fuel oil. This will undoubtedly cause its price to

rise which would adversely affect our company and its customers. It would also adversely affect the many residual fuel oil users of New England. We are asking the Director to delay making any decision until this problem can be considered by Congress. We would appreciate your help in supporting this request to the Director, Leo A. Hoegh.

ROBERT E. BARRETT, Jr.,
Holyoke Water Power Co.

SPRINGFIELD, MASS., *February 24, 1959.*
Congressman EDWARD P. BOLAND,
Washington, D.C.:

Request Directors of Civilian Defense and Mobilization not to impose import restrictions on crude and residual oil until Congress had had opportunity to examine.

HAMPDEN COAL & OIL CO.,
HARRY HOLSTEIN,
President-Treasurer.

HARMFUL EFFECTS OF TOBACCO AND ALCOHOL AND OTHER DELETERIOUS CONSUMABLES ON AMERICAN SCHOOLCHILDREN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Utah [Mr. KING] is recognized for 45 minutes.

Mr. KING of Utah. Mr. Speaker, it was my opportunity recently to introduce a bill, designated H.R. 5626, which is designed to promote the education of American schoolchildren on the harmful effects of tobacco and alcohol and other deleterious consumables.

If enacted, the legislation will provide Federal funds to match State funds, for the States which desire this assistance, to educate their boys and girls on the health risks entailed in smoking and drinking and in consuming other potentially harmful substances.

I have considered very carefully the historic implications of this bill. Its enactment would assault gigantic commercial interests. It would attack citadels of power. For, if the bill is successful in its objectives, the sales and profits of these interests will inevitably decline.

With full knowledge of these facts, Mr. Speaker, I have nevertheless resolved to move forward into a field which has been too long neglected. My studies of the harmful effects of tobacco and its connection with the fast-growing and terrible menace of lung cancer, as well as the close, firsthand knowledge of the distressing human tragedies which have been wrought by liquor, have left me no choice.

I have introduced this bill in good faith and with the firm intent to do all within the limits of my humble ability to secure its passage.

My resolve is considerably fortified by the knowledge that the same bill has been introduced in the other body by its author, the distinguished Senator from Oregon, the Honorable RICHARD L. NEUBERGER, who has been pushing the cause of national health and fitness for quite some time. I am grateful for his effort, and for the encouragement he gave me to sponsor the same legislation in this body.

I am convinced that history will vindicate our effort.

Legislation of this nature, though bold and in some aspects unprecedented, cannot forever be ignored nor deferred. The health of our youth, the stamina of our Nation, the survival and continued supremacy of the American people, may well be at stake.

The bill has one paramount purpose—to protect the Nation's youth and, in protecting youth, to safeguard in future generations the general health and vitality of the American people.

It is not the primary purpose of the bill to dissuade any of the adult public generally from smoking and drinking. The adult public should, and always will, exercise free agency in such matters.

The bill is designed to counteract the constant bombardment of clever, malicious commercials which our children face on television and radio and in magazines and newspapers. It seeks to give the generation now in school, and the generations which follow, all of the facts—the facts as presented by impartial scientists and doctors, rather than by paid hucksters and word magicians—before they form any habits which may jeopardize either their individual well-being or the general vitality of their Nation.

What are the facts?

When I argue that tobacco is a cause of lung cancer, the tobacco industry will counter that there are, in fact, no facts. The industry will raise its well-worn cry that medical research has failed to produce conclusive evidence that tobacco, or any of the elements of tobacco, is the specific and immediate agent which induces lung cancer.

I find myself a bit impatient with this argument.

To argue that tobacco does not cause lung cancer is like arguing that speed does not cause traffic accidents. In neither instance, it may be argued, have we conclusive evidence. And in both instances, there may be other causes present.

But in each instance, there is conclusive evidence to show association between the two phenomena and the great likelihood of causal connection. And in lung cancer as in highway accidents, the extent of the connection is measured by grim death tolls.

The Nation's highway death toll last year was 37,000. The toll from lung cancer was only slightly smaller—and growing at a much faster annual rate than the traffic toll. An estimate of the 1958 lung cancer toll, as reported in "Today's Health," the American Medical Association's popular magazine, is 35,000.

Any one factor, even though there may be others, which causes destruction, must share responsibility for such destruction.

Tobacco is a cause of rampant destruction of precious human resource, and must therefore share responsibility.

I believe I am correct in saying that even the most rabid champion of the tobacco industry will admit the possibility that tobacco may be a cause of lung cancer. And will anyone who admits such a possibility deny the wisdom of a course which would forcefully impress that possibility on the public mind, especially the young mind?

For the sake of illustration, let us imagine that we are approaching a highway bridge over a great chasm. Highway engineers have reason to believe the bridge to be unsound.

If the engineers believed there was one chance in four that the bridge would collapse beneath the weight of our car, and plunge us to certain death, do you doubt they would warn us of the risk?

Certainly not.

If the chance were one in a million, the engineers would still warn us. The bridge would be posted—posted, in fact, with glaring signs which even the most casual traveler could not fail to see. Every wayfarer would clearly understand that he rode the bridge at his own risk.

This is all that I ask today, and I ask it for American children—a clear warning, and nothing more, the chance to know and understand fully the risk, before they have harnessed themselves with the habit.

With lung cancer, the odds are not one in a million, and not one in four, that tobacco is a cause. The picture is quite the reverse. The evidence, drawn from independent research—and I stress, independent research—has produced evidence of overwhelming odds that cigarette smoke is, or does contain, an agent which induces lung cancer.

Anyone who doubts this need only examine the research reports, and the statistical record.

Lung cancer, which at the outbreak of World War I was a rare affliction in the human family, today stands as the biggest killer among many dread forms of cancer. The alarming rise in the incidence of this terrible disease has closely paralleled a rise in the consumption, both individually and totally, of cigarettes.

In the current March issue of Today's Health, an article entitled "The Growing Threat of Lung Cancer" has quoted Dr. Alton Ochsner, an internationally distinguished chest surgeon, as saying—and I quote:

> It is my firm conviction that every heavy smoker will develop lung cancer—unless heart disease or some other sickness claims him earlier.

And a Danish physician, quoted in the same article, has left no doubt about what he believes to be the principal factor in the soaring incidence of lung cancer. The good doctor sounded this warning:

> Unless young people are prevented from acquiring smoking habits, we will not be able to avoid one of the major catastrophes of medical history.

It is highly significant, I think, that Dr. Ochsner, in saying, "It is my firm conviction that every heavy smoker will develop lung cancer," also added, and I quote again: "unless heart disease or some other sickness claims him."

The sad reality is that smokers not only risk lung cancer, but they show higher mortality rates from many other ailments, including the supreme killer of our civilization, which is heart disease.

Consider, if you will, the study which the National Cancer Institute made of death rates among nearly 200,000 American veterans. This study, reported last July to the Seventh International Cancer

Congress in London, contains some alarming findings.

Among 198,926 veterans holding U.S. Government life insurance policies, the Institute counted 7,382 deaths. Related statistically to the smoking habits of the veterans, the toll showed these facts:

First. The death rate from all causes was 16 per thousand among persons who used tobacco and 13.1 per thousand among persons who did not use tobacco. It was, after an adjustment which accounted for differences in age distribution between the two groups, 32 percent higher for smokers than for nonsmokers.

In other words: the risk of death from all causes, whether the causes be accidental or natural, was 32 percent higher for those who smoked than for those who did not.

Second. For the steady cigarette smokers, the death rate was much higher. It was 58 percent higher than it was for the nonsmokers.

For the cigarette smokers, the death rate from lung cancer was 10 times—10 times—greater than it was for the nonsmokers.

Third. The death rate from coronary heart disease—and this perhaps was the most distressing statistic of all—was 63 percent higher for the cigarette smokers than it was for the nonsmokers. Of the 6,203 smokers whose deaths were counted in this study, nearly two-thirds died of diseases of the heart, blood vessels and kidneys.

The total effect of this study, and of others like it, is to reaffirm a principle which health authorities have recognized for many years. The tobacco habit is not compatible with tiptop physical condition. Smoking does, in fact, impair and weaken the general health.

The rising incidence of lung cancer has given tragic and dramatic new emphasis to this truth.

I regard it as utterly shameful that we, as a nation, countenance in our mass communication media commercials which ignore this fact—commercials which, instead, strongly persuade our children that smoking is a social grace, to be equated to social distinction itself, which the habit, of course, is not.

Maliciously overdrawn and irresponsible advertising is, I think, the gravest abuse of our freedom of the press. It ignores responsibility; more important, it is incompatible with awareness that responsibility is the fortress of that freedom, as it is of every freedom.

I have not overlooked the weakness of statistics. Figures can be framed, I know, to serve either side of any controversy.

At the same time, however, I do not overlook the practical experiences which the Nation's doctors have had, and are having, with lung cancer patients. I have heard chest surgeons, the men closest to the problem, discuss it, and invariably they have given the same story.

In the great majority of cases, the men who develop lung cancer are smokers. And, equally important, the smoker who develops lung cancer has appreciably smaller chances of surviving, and of leading a normal life, than the nonsmoker.

In the surgery which, in hopeful cases, follows a diagnosis of lung cancer, the smoker faces a second threat often as grave as the cancer itself. Will the patient, after surgery, have the lung capacity to survive? Will he be able to get along with one lung—or will he, as the article from Today's Health describes it, "face a gasping suffocation that leads to heart failure?"

An average healthy adult has about eight times the lung capacity he needs for normal, sedentary activity. Thus, the healthy adult who has never smoked can easily survive the loss of one lung. But the smoker may or may not survive such a loss, because steady, prolonged smoking impairs his lung capacity. Smoking wrecks lung tissue.

In a time when the incidence of lung cancer is mounting sharply, this fact alone, this threat of impaired lung capacity, would—in the complete absence of evidence of a cause-and-effect relationship between smoking and lung cancer—justify any effort we made to warn our youth of the risk in smoking.

The smoker will always face a greater risk of death from lung cancer, where lung cancer occurs—even though we may never prove conclusively that tobacco is a specific cause of the disease.

What is the answer to the lung cancer menace? What is our approach to the problem?

It has become my carefully considered view that education, in the broadest sense of the word, offers the only adequate approach, and that education, in the instance of the public schools, offers the best immediate approach. In the classroom children are free—at least momentarily—of the influence which comes from seeing others smoke. In the same atmosphere lies the hope of making them see the full reality, the seriousness, of the problem, and seeing it objectively.

A similar approach has been used effectively to promote traffic safety and to stem the highway death toll. Statistics reflect the success of driver education.

In this decade, the annual highway death toll has been fairly constant, and was lower in 1958 than in any year since 1954. In the same period, the number of automobile registrations has soared by nearly 20 million, and the number of drivers has grown in about the same proportion. We now have nearly 70 million automobiles on the Nation's highways, and some 80 million drivers.

My legislation proposes no radical changes in American education. It would force the program upon no one. There is no specter of Federal control of education or Federal bureaucracy.

The initiative and control would lie entirely with the States. It would be the responsibility of each State individually to frame its own program, and to appropriate funds.

The bill would provide matching funds for the States that desired them. To qualify for the matching funds the State, or States, would present the program in proposal form, and the U.S. Commissioner of Education would be obligated to approve the proposals which met certain standards.

The bill prescribes certain standards for the sole purpose of assuring the Nation that the matching funds would be spent for the work for which they would be provided.

I am convinced that a concerted educational effort to combat this health menace will have easily as much success as the campaign to combat the highway death toll has had. Its success could be appreciably greater.

In the absence of a concerted effort, I will continue to share the Danish doctor's fear—and I repeat his words:

Unless young people are prevented from acquiring smoking habits, we will not be able to avoid one of the major catastrophes of medical history.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD, to include from the American Cancer Society's booklet "1959 Cancer Facts and Figures," the section entitled "Lung Cancer and Cigarette Smoking."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Utah?

There was no objection.

(The matter referred to follows:)

LUNG CANCER AND CIGARETTE SMOKING

Lung cancer is now the leading cause of cancer death in men. In 20 years the disease has increased eight times, the most rapid rise ever reported for a noninfectious disease. This year an estimated 35,000 Americans will die of lung cancer, 30,000 men and 5,000 women.

The American Cancer Society has accepted the evidence that cigarette smoking is a causative factor in lung cancer. As part of its role in the effort of Federal, State, and voluntary agencies to control lung cancer, the society is obliged to make public the known facts derived from research into the causes of this disease.

What are the facts?

1. Twenty-two studies in six countries have shown that lung cancer patients are predominantly cigarette smokers.

2. No evidence of any kind has ever been produced that is inconsistent with the generally held view that excessive cigarette smoking is one of the principal causes of lung cancer.

3. The society's own 44-month study of the smoking habits and fate of 187,783 men from 50 to 70 years old has shown that—

(a) Death from all causes combined rises with the number of cigarettes smoked daily. Rates were more than two times as high for two or more pack-a-day smokers as nonsmokers.

(b) Men who stopped smoking had death rates lower than those who continued to smoke.

(c) Lung cancer death rates were more than 10 times as high among regular cigarette smokers as among men who had never smoked.

(d) Coronary death rates for smokers ranged nearly two and a half times as high for two or more pack-a-day smokers as the rates for nonsmokers.

(e) Deaths from lung diseases other than cancer were nearly three times as high among cigarette smokers as nonsmokers.

(f) Deaths from cancers of sites such as the mouth, esophagus, tongue, and larynx among cigarette smokers were more than five times as high as the rates for nonsmokers.

4. An independent study group on smoking and health composed of seven leading American scientists has reviewed all the available evidence and concluded "The sum total of scientific evidence establishes beyond reasonable doubt that cigarette smoking is a causative factor in the rapidly increasing incidence of human epidermoid carcinoma (cancer) of the lung." The group was organized by the American Cancer Society, the American Heart Association and their Federal counterparts, the National Cancer Institute and the National Heart Institute.

5. The British Government has launched an educational campaign warning of the hazards of cigarette smoking. The action is based on a report by its Medical Research Council that the relationship between cigarette smoking and lung cancer was one of direct cause and effect.

6. The U.S. Public Health Service has declared: "The Public Health Service feels the weight of the evidence is increasingly pointing in one direction: that excessive cigarette smoking is one of the causative factors in lung cancer."

In response to the sharply rising death rate from lung cancer, the American Cancer Society has provided some $2 million for lung-cancer research.

Mr. KING of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. WOLF] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD, as he desires to be associated with me in this matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Utah?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I wish to associate myself with the well chosen and temperate remarks of our distinguished colleague from Utah.

It is now fairly clear that we must take seriously the research work that has been carried out at various universities and research institutions across this country on the relationship of cigarette smoking to certain kinds of cancer and other debilitating diseases. From statistics released by the U.S. Public Health Service, smokers' death rates from all causes were 32 percent higher than those of nonsmokers.

In an independent study carried on by Dr. Hammond and Dr. Horn through the American Cancer Society, 187,783 men between the ages of 50 and 69 were studied and examined. It was found that the death rates were higher among regular cigarette smokers than among men who never smoked, that the mortality ratio increased with the number of cigarettes smoked each day, and that the death rates were higher among pipe and cigar smokers than among men who never smoked. Other careful studies such as this one have proven the necessity of making more readily available such facts to the American people.

The only facts the American people now have are those presented by commercials in the mass media. The American people have been saturated on the necessity of smoking for social status and psychological fulfillment. Usually, one does not have to watch television for more than 15 minutes until he is bombarded with a cigarette commercial which will show a handsome young man in a long and flashy convertible pick up a beautiful girl. Upon her entrance into the automobile both of them commune with each other through the lighting of cigarettes.

Besides the obvious symbolisms in such advertising there is the subtle appeal to youth to begin to smoke cigarettes. No one is trying to deny to the youth the right to smoke—if they want to smoke. However, the youth of this Nation should know that there is another side to the question of smoking which is not presented in cheap, slick television commercials.

In a free society one is, for the most part, guaranteed the right to choose alternative modes of life. This is, however, only meaningful when an individual has pertinent information to make reasoned choices. Today, this information does not exist widely enough for the American public and American youth in relation to the medical reasons for not smoking. I hope that ways will be found, through our schools and the various public health agencies, to make it possible for individuals to judge upon fact, rather than illusion, the question of whether or not they want to smoke.

WE NEED WISER TRADE POLICIES

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include an editorial from this morning's Herald Tribune, March 16.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, I should like to compliment my colleague, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CONTE], on his remarks. At a time when our relations with our friends abroad are of paramount importance, this growing tendency to become restrictive is to be carefully guarded against.

Last week, this body passed a bill designed to drain off waters from Lake Michigan, over the strong and pending protests of the Dominion of Canada. The imposition of mandatory restrictions on oil imports now also serves to irritate and puzzle our neighbor nations to the north. In this connection, I include at this point, Mr. Speaker, an excellent editorial that appeared in this morning's issue of the New York Herald Tribune:

WE NEED WISER TRADE POLICIES

When Prime Minister Macmillan arrives in Washington this week for talks with President Eisenhower, the Berlin crisis will be the most important topic on the agenda, but not the only one. Certain American trade practices are giving the British a good deal of worry. They fear a revival of protectionism in the biggest and richest market in the world.

A number of specific things have aroused this fear. The most annoying to them is the recent rejection of a British company's bid for two turbines for the Greer's Ferry dam project in Arkansas. Although the British bid was 19 percent lower than the lowest American offer—far lower than the ceiling on foreign bids imposed by the Buy American Act—it was turned down for the transparently lame reason that national security was involved. Then, the other day, a conference of the International Civil Aviation Organization in Montreal elected to choose an American air navigation system and reject a British one by standards that Sir David Eccles, the president of the Board of Trade, says were deliberately rigged in the American system's favor. And there is the wool tariff quota, which discriminates against the high-grade woolens Britain produces. In view of the fact that the United States is now the biggest single market for British goods, the anxiety is natural. Furthermore, all this contrasts poorly with our talk of freer trade and economic cooperation.

It is not only Britain. South American countries have long complained that their exports of raw materials cannot find proportionate markets here, and therefore they cannot earn the exchange to develop their economies. The American quotas on lead and zinc are a case in point. Lead and zinc account for almost 15 percent of the export earnings of Peru, and obviously the restrictions are causing economic—and political—repercussions there.

And now there are mandatory restrictions on oil imports, again in the name of national security. The Canadians, whose national security is closely tied in with ours, are especially angry.

There are other examples. But the point is that the United States cannot deprive other countries of markets on which they depend, sometimes for their existence, and still expect these countries to be their friends and allies in every enterprise. And what about the new peoples of Asia and Africa who are struggling against terrific odds to make economically viable nations of themselves? If it is impossible for them to sell their products and buy their equipment in Western markets, and principally in the United States, they will be obliged to do business with the Soviet Union or Communist China, which, whatever their economic mistakes, never pass up a political bargain.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. HENDERSON (at the request of Mr. HOLLAND), from March 13 through March 16, 1959, on account of death in family.

Mr. PORTER (at the request of Mr. SANTANGELO) for the week of March 16, 1959, on account of official business.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. REUSS for 40 minutes on tomorrow.

Mr. POWELL (at the request of Mr. NATCHER) for 60 minutes, on Thursday next.

Mrs. DWYER (at the request of Mr. UTT) for 10 minutes tomorrow.

Mr. PERKINS for 30 minutes on Wednesday next, March 18, 1959.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL

RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. CELLER.

Mr. MCGOVERN.

Mr. SAYLOR and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. ALGER and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. PILLION and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. WOLF and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. PRICE and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. POAGE and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. KASTENMEIER and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. KASEM.

(At the request of Mr. NATCHER, and to include extraneous matter, the following:)

Mr. MCDOWELL in two instances.

Mr. ANFUSO.

Mr. BOGGS.

Mr. DULSKI.

Mr. MULTER.

Mr. KING of California.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 79. An act to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to permit the temporary listing and certification of citrus red No. 2 for coloring mature oranges under tolerances found safe by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, so as to permit continuance of established coloring practice in the orange industry pending congressional consideration of general legislation for the listing and certification of food color additives under safe tolerances.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 3 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, March 17, 1959, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

715. A letter from the Governor, Farm Credit Administration, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend the Federal Farm Loan Act to transfer responsibility for making appraisals from the Farm Credit Administration to the Federal land banks, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Agriculture.

716. A letter from the Governor, Farm Credit Administration, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to clarify the status of the Federal land banks, the Federal intermediate credit banks, and the banks for cooperatives and their officers and employees with respect to certain laws applicable generally to the United States and its officers and employees, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Agriculture.

717. A letter from the Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, relative to reporting that the appropriation for the General Services Administration for "Operating expenses, Public Buildings Service," for the fiscal year 1959, has been apportioned on a basis indicating a need for a supplemental estimate of appropriation, pursuant to section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended; to the Committee on Appropriations.

718. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill for the relief of Dorothy E. Green and Thelma L. Alley"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

719. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill for the relief of the Government of the Republic of Iceland"; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

720. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to provide for the adjustment of the legislative jurisdiction exercised by the United States over land in the several States used for Federal purposes, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Government Operations.

721. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, relative to reporting that an adequate soil survey and land classification of the lands in the San Angelo project, Texas, has been completed as a part of the investigations required in the formulation of a definite plan for project development, pursuant to Public Law 172, 83d Congress; to the Committee on Appropriations.

722. A letter from the Chief Commissioner, Indian Claims Commission, transmitting a report that proceedings have been concluded with respect to the following claim: *The Seneca-Cayuga Tribe of Oklahoma, and Peter Buck, et al., members and representatives of members thereof, Petitioners,* v. *The United States of America, Defendant* (docket No. 341, sixth (general) claim), pursuant to the Indian Claims Commission Act of August 13, 1946 (60 Stat. 1055; 25 U.S.C. 70t); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

723. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the review of Atomic Energy Commission contracts, and the activities under such contracts, relating to the Shippingport Atomic Power Station located near Pittsburgh, Pa.; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

724. A letter from the Deputy Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to provide more adequate numbers of civilian positions required by the Department of Defense to carry out scientific research and development relating to the national defense and to improve the management of the activities of the Department, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

725. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, relative to the case of Liw Jack, A-7873096, involving suspension of deportation, pursuant to the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. MILLS: Committee on Ways and Means. H.R. 5508. A bill to provide for the free importation of articles for exhibition at fairs, exhibitions, or expositions, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 213). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANDERSON of Montana:

H.R. 5701. A bill to provide a termination date for the excise tax on amounts paid for communication services or facilities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BENTLEY:

H.R. 5702. A bill to punish the use of interstate commerce in furtherance of conspiracies to commit terroristic crimes and activities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BREWSTER:

H.R. 5703. A bill to permit the flying of the flag of the United States for 24 hours of each day on the estate known as Terra Rubra, the birthplace of Francis Scott Key, in Carroll County, Md., and at the grave of Key in Mount Olivet Cemetery in Frederick, Md.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CEDERBERG:

H.R. 5704. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that an individual's entitlement to child's insurance benefits shall continue, after he attains age 18, for so long as he is regularly attending high school; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FLOOD:

H.R. 5705. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, the Railroad Retirement Tax Act, and the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act, so as to provide increases in benefits, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 5706. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, the Railroad Retirement Tax Act, and the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act, so as to provide increases in benefits, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HORAN:

H.R. 5707. A bill to amend title 28, entitled "Judiciary and Judicial Procedure," of the United States Code to provide for the defense of suits against Federal employees arising out of their operation of motor vehicles in the scope of their employment, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KASTENMEIER:

H.R. 5708. A bill to promote public confidence in the integrity of Congress and the executive branch; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. KING of California:

H.R. 5709. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to income derived from fishing where the catch is landed in Puerto Rico; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LANGEN:

H.R. 5710. A bill to declare that the United States holds certain lands in trust for the Minnesota Chippewa Tribe; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. LIBONATI:

H.R. 5711. A bill granting the consent and approval of Congress to the Wabash Valley compact, and for related purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5712. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide an additional $2,400 exemption from income tax for amounts received as annuities, pensions, or other retirement benefits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MCINTIRE:

H.R. 5713. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, to exempt homeworkers in rural areas from the minimum wage and maximum hours provisions of that act in certain cases; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. MACDONALD:

H.R. 5714. A bill to amend section 1552, title 10, United States Code, and section 301

of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 to provide that the Board for the Correction of Military or Naval Records and the Boards of Review, Discharges, and Dismissals shall give consideration to satisfactory evidence relating to good character and exemplary conduct in civilian life after discharge or dismissal in determining whether or not to correct certain discharges and dismissals; to authorize the award of an exemplary rehabilitation certificate; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER:

H.R. 5715. A bill to require that at least 50 percent of the passenger and cargo air transportation requirements of the Government of the United States be obtained from civil air operators, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 5716. A bill to protect the right of the blind to self-expression through organizations of the blind; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. MOORE:

H.R. 5717. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, the Railroad Retirement Tax Act, and the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act, so as to provide increases in benefits, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MORRIS of New Mexico (by request):

H.R. 5718. A bill to recognize the authority of the States relating to the control, appropriation, use, or distribution of water within their boundaries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MURRAY:

H.R. 5719. A bill to improve the compensation policies and practices of the Federal Government with respect to civilian personnel thereof, to establish a temporary Commission on Federal Civilian Employees Compensation Policy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. PHILBIN:

H.R. 5720. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to permit the filing of a joint income tax return by a serviceman stationed overseas and his alien wife, and by any other married couple unless both the husband and wife are nonresident aliens; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. REES of Kansas:

H.R. 5721. A bill to improve the compensation policies and practices of the Federal Government with respect to civilian personnel thereof, to establish a temporary Commission on Federal Civilian Employees Compensation Policy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts:

H.R. 5722. A bill to incorporate the Army and Navy Union of the United States of America; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts (by request):

H.R. 5723. A bill to establish a Department of Veterans' Affairs; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. ROOSEVELT:

H.R. 5724. A bill to protect the right of the blind to self-expression through organizations of the blind; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. SCHWENGEL:

H.R. 5725. A bill to amend the National Defense Education Act of 1958 by repealing section 1001(f) thereof; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas:

H.R. 5726. A bill for the relief of Hood County, Tex.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming:

H.R. 5727. A bill to eliminate the fractionated heirship problem on the Wind River Indian Reservation in Wyoming, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ULLMAN:

H.R. 5728. A bill to set aside and reserve Memaloose Island, Columbia River, Oreg. for the use of The Dalles Dam project and transfer certain property to the Yakima Tribe of Indians in exchange therefor; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. WOLF:

H.R. 5729. A bill to establish permanent authorization of a fully adequate nationwide milk-for-children program and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. IKARD:

H.R. 5730. A bill to amend section 270(b) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 relating to limitation on deductions allowable to individuals in certain cases; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. REES of Kansas:

H.R. 5731. A bill to authorize the payments to local governments of sums in lieu of taxes and special assessments with respect to certain Federal real property, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey:

H.R. 5732. A bill to amend the Federal Reserve Act with respect to the number, term of office, and qualifications of members of the Board, to abolish the Open Market Committee and transfer its functions to the Board, and with respect to the qualifications of directors of Federal Reserve banks; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. McCORMACK:

H.J. Res. 310. Joint resolution to authorize the designation of the period October 17 to October 24, 1959 as National Olympic Week; to the Committee on Judiciary.

By Mr. LIPSCOMB:

H. Res. 210. Resolution to authorize the Committee on Banking and Currency to conduct an investigation and study of the operation of the Export Control Act of 1949 and related matters; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. PRICE: Memorial of the 71st General Assembly of the State of Illinois requesting the Congress of the United States to repeal the Federal excise tax now imposed on telephone service; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Arkansas, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to house concurrent resolution No. 24 of the State of Arkansas, and calling for a convention for the purpose of proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States as contained in the resolution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States, relative to imported tuna; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Illinois, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States requesting the repeal of the excise tax now imposed on telephone service; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Michigan, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to repeal the Federal excise tax on motor vehicles; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of New Mexico, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to give favorable consideration relative to the employment of Albert Gallegos as a page in the House of Representatives or the Senate of the United States; to the Committee on House Administration.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of North Dakota, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States, to vigorously legislate to stamp out racketeering in the labor and management fields, and to protect the democratic rights of member control within labor unions; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of North Dakota, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States, to establish as a national park a suitable area of land lying at the confluence of the Yellowstone and Missouri Rivers in northwestern North Dakota and northeastern Montana; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Texas, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to requesting the elimination of grave and wasteful expenses that have been brought to our attention in the foreign aid program; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of West Virginia, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to house concurrent resolution No. 30, of the State of West Virginia, praying for the early recovery of the Honorable John Foster Dulles; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Alaska, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to amend Federal income tax laws relating to Alaskan taxpayers; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Guam, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to extend the benefits of the Small Business Act of 1953, as amended, to the Territory of Guam; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Guam, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to amend the Organic Act of Guam, so as to provide that the Legislature may override with finality, the veto of the Governor of Guam; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BAKER:

H.R. 5733. A bill for the relief of Park National Bank; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FOLEY:

H.R. 5734. A bill for the relief of Angelo DiChio; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANE:

H.R. 5735. A bill for the relief of Joseph Bell, Herman Karp, Hyman M. Oberman, and Abraham Smith; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McDONOUGH:

H.R. 5736. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Jelena Dordevich; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

The Role of the American Citizen in Our Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT W. KASTENMEIER
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 16, 1959

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, the role of the American citizen in the formulation of our foreign policy was clearly outlined in a recent address by a distinguished colleague, the Honorable LEONARD G. WOLF, of Iowa, to the delegates to the Midwest Democratic Conference in Milwaukee, Wis. Mr. WOLF's thought-provoking speech stimulated the conference delegates to a healthy discussion of the foreign policy issues confronting us today. Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by the Congressman from Iowa:

It is a pleasure to be attending the Democratic Midwest Conference here in Milwaukee. As some of you know I was born and raised in Wisconsin. This meant that during my youth, I considered Milwaukee the hub of the universe. My feeling for this city carried over through my undergraduate days at the University of Wisconsin and now I admire Milwaukee and Wisconsin because it is the home of so many truly great liberal leaders in Congress.

I might say in passing that there are no districts in this country that are better represented in Congress than Milwaukee by HENRY REUSS and CLEM ZABLOCKI. There are no more dedicated and effective Members of Congress than Congressmen REUSS, ZABLOCKI, JOHNSON, KASTENMEIER, and FLYNN. There is no better or harder working Senator than BILL PROXMIRE. He has become the conscience of the Senate just as not so long ago Bob La Follette fulfilled this role for his State and Nation. Yes, the Wisconsin Democratic delegation are legislators of whom we may all be proud. They are men of principle fighting for those liberal ideals which we hope and know will become the policy of the new Democratic administration in 1961.

Milwaukee is, of course, a fitting place to talk about the problems of foreign policy. Here, in such plants as Allis-Chalmers, machinery is built which is used around the world. Machinery which has aided the underprivileged of this world to build homes in place of hovels, roads in place of paths, and factories in place of sweatshops: machinery which has resulted in cultivation of crops in areas where there were no crops. The world has much to thank Milwaukee for, and everyone thanks Milwaukee except the old Boston Braves fans.

In the future as a result of the St. Lawrence Seaway, Milwaukee will take on even added significance in its role as a world city similar in importance to Paris, New York, and Rome.

I am here today to talk about one of my favorite topics. And that is, how the average citizen in this country can participate in decision making in an era when it appears that the important decisions of public policy are vested more and more in the hands of a few. This is a tremendous problem and unless we as citizens of this country solve this problem, we will have, through laxness, indifference and irresponsibility, lost the most prized possession that a democracy can bestow on its citizenry—the right to be heard, to be listened to, and to affect the decisions of its Government.

We cannot allow a few men the right to decide the issue of peace or war,

We cannot allow a few men the right to decide the issue of atom bomb testing,

We cannot allow a few men the right to continue outmoded 19th century colonial policies toward the people of Asia and Africa.

In this past year we have gone from brink to brink on the international front. In June of 1958, American troops were sent to Lebanon. In October of last year Mao Tse Tung and Chiang Kai Shek had us trapped in a Chinese puzzle box called Quemoy and Matsu, a box which could have become the world's casket. Now we are involved in an even more difficult crisis—the Berlin question with all of its attendant problems, such as German reunification, the problem of NATO, and the arming of West Germany with nuclear weapons. Any one of these problems can lead to world war. And make no mistake about it, the present Berlin question, if handled carelessly, dogmatically, and without imagination or knowledge of what our objectives are in Europe, could very well involve us in a world war—a war which will not be limited if nuclear weapons are used. A war that could, if not destroy the human race, return humanity to precaveman days. The stakes are high. The issues are great.

No one can disassociate himself from politics. Every citizen in this country must commit himself to politics. That is why it is more important than ever that each and every citizen fight to make his opinion felt in the public arena. That is why rational discussion about public issues is more important than ever. That is why there must be a full scale debate on the floor of both Houses of Congress on issues such as the Berlin crisis and nuclear bomb tests.

But it is not only in those hallowed Halls that there should be fuller discussion—and I am sad to report that there has not been fuller discussion—there should be fuller discussion in our universities, colleges, and churches. Let us for a moment take the Milwaukee area. Milwaukee is blessed with a number of great educational institutions, among them Marquette University and the University of Wisconsin. These universities should hold open debates on the great ideological and moral problems that nuclear science and communism have brought in our time. Thus, in this city could there be the beginning of the great dialog our beloved Adlai Stevenson talks about. These meetings must not be one-shot haphazard affairs; they must be part of a determined campaign by the Milwaukee Journal, the University of Wisconsin, Marquette University, the AFL–CIO, the chamber of commerce, and all church groups to work together jointly to create the atmosphere for debate and discussion. They must be wide-ranging discussions such as the role of the military in our foreign policy, nuclear testing, what should be our attitude toward Communist nations, the question of Red China. These are questions that should be talked about all over this country, not in television commercial terms but in terms of rational, serious comprehensive discussions. I assure you that your representatives in Washington follow all public discussions and public sentiments with interest. It is your job to create something that these men can listen to. Congress not only needs consent from the governed—it needs direction from the governed.

Finally, in considering the citizen's role in foreign policy, we should attract men—and encourage our most brilliant minds to speak out on issues of foreign policy. If possible, we should attract them into government. These men should be allowed to seek truth wherever they think they can find it. And, just as important, they should be allowed to speak the truth as they see it. If any of you have ever been in an organization, you will know how difficult this is to do.

We as citizens must destroy any ill-conceived notions or time-honored prejudices about the people in Asia and Africa.

We as citizens must think of them as fellow human beings who we must aid and accept just as we aid and accept our next door neighbor.

We as citizens must be tolerant of people in other lands.

We must give aid to all emerging nations in their struggle for freedom and material well-being, for if we do not, communism will conquer these areas without firing a single shot.

We as citizens should know that in complicated international situations one side has never had, nor I daresay ever will have, a complete monopoly of the right, and the other side a complete monopoly of the wrong.

We as citizens must encourage greater contacts between people on more than an official level. It is in this way that we will better be able to understand our neighbors.

We as citizens should train ourselves to keep our heads in time of crisis. For if we do not do this during this period of history we shall never have to worry about keeping our heads during any other future period.

The citizen must encourage and demand from his Congressman that he speak out on foreign policy issues.

In this most difficult of times the discouraging fact is that there is no leadership in foreign policy in the administration. This very fact puts a heavy burden on Congress. Because of this lack, you as citizens have the right to demand of your Congress that it take a more creative role in foreign policy. The public is bewildered. It has been stunned into apathy by this administration's futile foreign policy. Therefore, it is incumbent on the Congress to carry a good share of the responsibility for informing the public and offering constructive alternatives to an administration that is completely bewildered and confused. The average Congressman is reticent about speaking on foreign affairs; unless he knows that his constituency demand it of him. The Congressman in foreign affairs is as informed and aware as his constituency demands him to be.

And finally, the citizenry must keep vigilant and demand of its Government that insofar as is possible, and this means almost all the way, the Government take its people into its confidence about the matters of foreign policy. The people should never forget that government is a creature of the people and not the people a creature of the government. Because of this, upon every citizen in this country rests the responsibility of achieving the goal of peace, freedom, and justice. This is the price that a citizen must pay in a free nation. Thank God, that because we have a free Nation, we have the chance to pay such a price.

H.R. 5549, To Amend the Garnishment Laws of the District of Columbia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 16, 1959

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday, March 11, I introduced H.R. 5549, to amend the District of Columbia code of laws relating to attachment and garnishment of wages.

The following is my statement before the House District Committee today in support of this measure:

STATEMENT OF REPRESENTATIVE ABRAHAM J. MULTER, DEMOCRAT, OF NEW YORK, BEFORE SUBCOMMITTEE NO. 3 OF THE HOUSE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA COMMITTEE CONCERNING H.R. 835, H.R. 836, H.R. 2329, AND H.R. 5549, MARCH 16, 1959

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the opportunity to present this brief statement in connection with the amendment of the District of Columbia code of laws relating to attachment and garnishment of compensation of judgment debtors.

H.R. 835, which you have before you, I believe is identical with H.R. 7035 of the 85th Congress. Both bills were introduced by our distinguished chairman, Mr. MCMILLAN, of South Carolina.

H.R. 835 limits attachments of compensation to 10 percent of the judgment debtor's gross earnings. Obviously this is a marked improvement over existing law.

H.R. 836, I think, is the much better statute because it provides for a 10 percent levy on the first $200 a month of earnings, 20 percent on the next $300 of earnings, and 50 percent of any earnings in excess of $500 per month.

H. R. 2329, introduced by our distinguished colleague from Texas [Mr. DOWDY], prohibits attachments on debtors' compensation. This, I hope the committee will agree, would be a step in the wrong direction.

My bill, H.R. 5549, takes all of H.R. 836 and then adds on to it additional provisions. It is my hope that, regardless of whether the committee goes along with the provisions of H.R. 835 or H.R. 836, it will add as an amendment to whichever bill is reported, the additional provisions of my bill.

I have lifted these provisions bodily from the New York State statute which has worked extremely well since the date of its enactment many years ago. Briefly, what it does is simply this. In addition to the statutory provision permitting a garnishment or attachment of up to 10 percent of the gross earnings of a debtor, as permitted by New York law, any judgment creditor may apply to the court for an order requiring the debtor to pay out of his earnings an additional sum over and above the amount of the garnishment. It does more. It permits the court, upon determining the facts, to require payments by a judgment debtor who, while actually working and earning compensation, pretends to be working for nothing or for unreasonably small compensation for an employer who actually is himself under the guise of a corporation or the business of a friend or relative.

At first blush it would appear that this will load the courts down with additional litigation. In practice it has had the opposite effect in New York. Debtors there have learned that they cannot make themselves judgment-proof and prevent the collection of just debts by doing business under corporate names and paying themselves low salaries, nor can they any longer establish in the name of or transfer to friends and relatives businesses which are actually their own. Upon establishment of the facts, the court is permitted to go behind the shell or color of the transaction and fix a sum to be paid by the debtor commensurate with his earnings and his needs. In cases where the debtor is working for substantial compensation the court has a right to determine how much he needs for the maintenance of himself and his dependents and then fix a fair sum payable out of the excess that he earns, to be paid by him to a judgment creditor.

Knowing that the creditor has these judicial proceedings available to him, the debtor invariably works out a fair settlement with the creditor outside of the courtroom.

I respectfully urge the committee to add the provisions of my bill to any bill that it reports.

Thank you for the opportunity to present this statement.

The Steel Companies and Inflation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE S. McGOVERN
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 16, 1959

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I am becoming increasingly alarmed by the so-called administered price practice of leading industrial corporations. This is the practice under which corporations raise prices even in the face of falling demand and reduced output. I am convinced that unreasonable administered price increases by the steel industry, particularly, have been a major cause of both the recent recession and our present inflation. This is the reason for the paradox of recession and inflation.

Following the strike settlement of 1956 which gave steelworkers a wage increase of approximately 19 cents an hour including fringe benefits, the steel companies upped their prices $8.50 per ton. This was done in spite of the fact that wage increase had cost them only about $2.50 per ton. Yet, 6 months later they added another price increase of $5 per ton and followed with a third increase of $6 per ton in July 1957. Thus, a wage increase costing the company $2.50 per ton was used as an excuse to raise steel prices an unbelievable $19.50 a ton.

In 1956 United States Steel sold 23 million tons of steel for a net profit of $348 million, but when their production declined 2 percent in the following year, profits rose to $419 million, an increase of 20.4 percent.

United States Steel's net profit per ton in 1957 was $17.91 compared to $14.56 in the previous year. The tremendous profit increases in the industry are better realized when one considers that in the decade of the 1940's, excluding the war years, the average steel profit was only $6.78 per ton.

Given the brazen price-gouging practices of the big steel companies, it is not surprising to learn that the directors of these great corporations have compenstated themselves in a most handsome manner. In 1955 the 16 directors of Bethlehem Steel voted the tidy sum of $5,683,709 to be divided among themselves. Net profits of the corporation that year were $180 million. The following year, the profits of the corporation dropped by $19 million, but the directors saw fit to increase their own personal share of the take to $6.5 million, an increase of $882,618 over the previous year. Little wonder that of the 18 highest paid men in the Nation, 11 were directors of Bethlehem Steel.

In commenting on this situation, the Senate Judiciary Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly said:

> An average compensation to each officer-director in a steel company of $468,000 in 1 year acts as a challenge, a red flag, to labor unions and individuals to seek all they can. And it is difficult to persuade labor to hold a wage line when it knows the generous manner in which officer-directors compensate themselves.

Mr. Speaker, I am convinced that the basic cause of inflation is the administered prices of the biggest industries combined with the endless round of wage increases which such price practices cause.

It seems to me that Congress and the administration must take effective action to correct this dangerous threat to our economy. I have introduced legislation which is designed to bring the force of public opinion to bear on this problem by requiring huge corporations to justify proposed price increases in public hearings before the Federal Trade Commission.

I am entirely in accord with the suggestion by Senator KEFAUVER that consumers should use every resource including their pencils to urge steel industry and labor union leaders to hold the line against further wage-price increases at this time.

We all know that every time steel prices jump, the cost of automobiles, farm machinery, refrigerators, washing machines, and countless other items also jump. The combine which cost the farmer $4,500 10 years ago now costs $9,000. Labor and management each blame the other for price increases, and the consumer is caught in the middle. In the long run labor and industry cannot profit from this continuous wage-price spiral which has already had the effect of slowing down our rate of production and putting nearly 5 million people on the unemployment rolls.

Inflation is a threat to every family, but it is especially painful to older persons and white-collar workers living on fixed incomes. It has hit hardest of all our farm families who since 1952 have experienced a 20-percent drop in the prices of what they have to sell while the cost of what they buy has gone up $3.7 billion. It is no accident that 4 million people have left the farms of this Nation during the 5 years following 1952.

Thanks to the cost-price squeeze that grips our farm population, net farm income dropped from $15.1 billion in 1952 to $10.8 billion in 1957.

Mr. Speaker, Bernard D. Nossiter, of the Washington Post, has done a remarkable job in reporting on the problems of inflation and administered prices. I call to the attention of the Congress his article appearing in the Washington Post of March 14, 1959, which I include at this point in the RECORD:

INFLATION LAID TO STEEL FIRMS

(By Bernard D. Nossiter)

An investment adviser yesterday blamed the recent inflation and recession on profit-minded executives of steel companies.

Eugene Havas drew this conclusion for the Senate Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee.

His views about the importance of steel price increases have drawn partial or full support this week from a wide spectrum of economists. Among them were Raymond J. Saulnier, chairman of President Eisenhower's Council of Economic Advisers; John Kenneth Galbraith, of Harvard, a key adviser to Adlai Stevenson; Woodlief Thomas, economic adviser to the Federal Reserve Board; Gardiner Means, former New Deal economist and author of the administered price theory; and Ralph Young, Research Director for the Federal Reserve Board.

Havas said:

"The steel companies are overtaxing our economy and are responsible for the 1957–58 recession for choking off demand by their price exactings since 1955–56."

Havas said that holding the steel price line was not enough, that steel prices must be rolled back. This, he said, would revive the choked off consumer demand, would relieve unemployment, and would help to find jobs for most of the unemployed of automation.

Havas said the steel company executives had a vested interest in pushing up prices because this pushed up profits. And, he observed, as profits go up, Wall Street puts higher prices on companies' stock. The executives, Havas noted, cash in on this by giving themselves stock options. Thus, the steelmakers can buy their companies' stock at a price far below its market value, sell it and get taxed no more than 25 percent.

In the case of United States Steel Corp., the industry's price leader, Havas said that net profits divided by total shares of stock jumped from $2 in 1948 to $7.33 in 1957 and fell to $5.13 in the slump last year. Currently, per share earnings of United States Steel are estimated at record levels. Meanwhile, the stock has jumped in price from a low of $10.12 in 1949 to a high this year of $99.87.

According to United States Steel's forthcoming annual report, some 258 executives have this prospect—because of stock options outstanding on January 1: They can make a few calls and divide about $19,300,000. And this income of about $75,000 per man is subject to a top tax rate of 25 percent.

Roger M. Blough, whose option claims are considerably higher than the average $75,000 because he is Steel's board chairman, could not be reached for comment on Havas' analysis. Blough's New York office said he was not available.

Havas suggested lowering top bracket personal income tax rates to 75 percent and introducing a graduated corporate excess-profit tax to dampen the increasingly popular stock option device.

Because stock prices and prices generally are driven up, he observed, investors don't want bonds, including the Government's, with their fixed return and price.

Moreover, in the past 7 fiscal years, Havas said, the Treasury has lost $46 billion in taxes it would otherwise have collected because of tax loopholes for corporations.

All these devices, Havas said, make it virtually impossible for the steel companies and other corporations to resist union requests for wage increases.

However, the harassed steel industry finally came up with a defender at the hearings. He was Simon Whitney, chief economist for the Federal Trade Commission. Whitney decried the emphasis on steel because, he said, it accounted for only 3.5 percent of the Nation's total 1957 output.

Whitney blamed price increases on wages and said big steel and auto corporations should not be broken up. His agency is charged with safeguarding the public from monopoly.

John Blair, chief economist for the subcommittee headed by Senator ESTES KEFAUVER, Democrat, of Tennessee, analyzed the price-profit-wage picture. He noted that—

Between 1953 and 1957, the wholesale price per ton of steel went up 30 percent. But the payroll cost of production workers per ton of steel went up 14 percent or less than half.

So, for United States Steel, after-tax profits per ton jumped from $7.47 in early 1953 to $19.31 at the end of 1958. Moreover, steel production was going full blast in early 1953 and was running at about three-quarters of capacity at the end of 1958. Profits went up nevertheless because the industry has become much more efficient through the use of laborsaving machinery.

From the end of 1957 to the end of 1958, productivity, or tons shipped per worker, has jumped 7 percent. As a result, even though the industry is now nearing full production, it is doing it with far fewer workers.

Commemoration of the 20th Anniversary of Slovak Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN R. PILLION

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 16, 1959

Mr. PILLION. Mr. Speaker, it is a distinct privilege for me to add my small voice to the growing demands for freedom on the part of the millions of Slovaks and other nationalistic groups who are being kept in a captive status under the Soviet Communist rule.

Although Premier Nikita Khrushchev continues to boast of the military strength and the economic advances of the Soviet, he fails to recognize that this apparent strength is based upon a compulsive labor economy that is held together by fear, by military tanks and guns, and by the cloak, spy, and dagger machinations of the select Communist Party membership and leadership.

I am sure that the spirit and the desire for freedom on the part of the Slovak people cannot be quenched and will continue to grow. The nationalistic spirit and the desire for freedom on the part of millions of people under the domination of the Soviet Socialist Republic will continue to be a fatal weakness in the miscalculations of Mr. Khrushchev and his Politburo.

I join with the Slovak League of America in their celebration of the 20th anniversary of Slovak independence on March 15, 1959. I join with the 2 million Americans of Slovak origin in their aspirations for the liberation of the Slovak peoples.

A Congressional Report—Private Enterprise and the "Ruble War"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HALE BOGGS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 16, 1959

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

A CONGRESSIONAL REPORT—PRIVATE ENTERPRISE AND THE "RUBLE WAR"

(By Representative STEWART L. UDALL)

If there is no thermonuclear war, it is likely that the whole future balance of world power will largely depend on what has been called "the ruble war"—the struggle for supremacy between the two dominant economic systems in the world today.

Nearly one-third of the world's people have achieved independence during the last 15 years. Of course, these people want above all to establish stable governments and develop economic systems which will improve their lot.

The Kremlin is already bidding for the minds of these people by ruble loans, offers of trade, and mission of technicians who invariably speak the language of the host country and are ready with resource development programs.

The central question, then, may well be whether these nations believe our way, or that of the Communists, offers the best hope for a decent standard of living and the solution of their problems.

To date, the free world countries are offering economic assistance at two counters: Hard loans through the World Bank; and soft loans (repayable at low interest rates over long periods of time) from the Development Loan Fund administered by our Government as part of the foreign aid program. The Loan Fund, established by the last Congress, has yet to establish a history that will permit us to pass judgment on its adequacy, but it is already clear that insufficient development capital is available to underwrite the bare minimum economic growth rate required.

Some students of history point out that the strength of the British Empire last century was due, in part, to the fact that the British businessmen of that era were adventurous exporters of capital—both within and without the Commonwealth. Some of us have been wondering here whether America should not take a cue from the British, and encourage American private enterprise to carry its know-how abroad and help build up the economies of the underdeveloped areas.

Congressman HALE BOGGS of New Orleans pointed out to Congress this year that our foreign investment policy actually discourages expansion by private enterprise abroad. He believes our tax laws should be reconstructed to encourage foreign risk capital as an essential part of our long run national security program.

Last week I joined with Representative BOGGS in sponsoring a bill designed to drastically revise these laws. This legislation would enable private enterprise to do business in foreign countries on a competitive basis with investors from other countries (through a new class of foreign business corporations). If enacted it should galvanize our business leaders toward meeting the Soviet challenge on the economic front by conferring tax advantages on earnings abroad. Its success would make it possible to substitute private investment for some kinds of foreign aid, and thus encourage a new American program of economic aid.

It seems to me that we have become preoccupied with the military race with the Communists, and have neglected competition in economic fields where the ultimate test may come.

Who can say that our businessmen might not hit a homerun in the "ruble war" if we gave them an inning at bat? Indeed, why not give them a chance now?

American Legion's 40th Anniversary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 16, 1959

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert in the RECORD an address to my fellow Legionnaires on the occasion of the American Legion's 40th anniversary:

Fellow Legionnaires, this occasion marks an important date in the history of our organization. Forty years ago today the American Legion came into being at caucuses of the first American Expeditionary Force held in Paris on March 15–17, 1919. We do not meet here to boast or cast bouquets at ourselves—we leave that to others—but it is only proper that we should remind ourselves, more than a generation and two world wars intervening between the founding of our organization and the present that (I quote from the "Brief History of the Legion" prepared by the national headquarters in Indianapolis) today, 40 years after its inception, the American Legion is "the only major American veterans' association which was formed overseas by fighting men and women. It includes more combat veterans, more disabled veterans, more winners of the Congressional Medal of Honor and other decorations than all other veterans' organizations combined."

There has never been anything like it in American veterans' history save only the Grand Army of the Republic: In its scope and influence the American Legion is to the 20th century what the Grand Army was to the preceding one, but we flatter ourselves that our own legislative history is a bit more savory than that of the older organization which flourished in the heyday of what might be termed the lush era of log-rolling and back-scratching. It reached an all-time high in the first administration of Grover Cleveland when it ran headlong into that formidable and entirely immovable character. Here are two or three examples of the pension bills of Civil War veterans with which Mr. Cleveland had to deal by the hundreds, if not the thousands, back in 1886. One claimant had fallen over a fence with absolutely no injury to his person; but he was a veteran and therefore, on the strength of this shocking calamity, must have a pension. Another demanded a life pension because he had hurt his ankle while intending to enlist. Still another had broken his leg while gathering dandelions long after the war. And so forth and so on. For such claims the Grand Army of the Republic fought with a zeal and valor worthy of a better cause. In contrast to such preposterous goings on, the record of the American Legion in respect to needy veterans offers a bright and lustrous page of solid, enduring achievement. For our legislative record, State and national, we need apologize to none. Our contributions to hospitalization, education, and all manner of public welfare where we can with propriety act, stands, and speaks for itself. But all this is as well known to you as to myself.

It is, however, a great pleasure and satisfaction merely to rise and remind you of that splendid record which first began to be written 40 years ago. May we, one and all, everywhere in this beloved land of ours, continue the good work so proudly begun many years ago and so faithfully and stanchly maintained ever since. May we ever live up to and be worthy of the title of our organization—the American Legion.

The American's Creed: A Summary of the Fundamental Principles of American Political Faith as Set Forth in Its Greatest Documents, Its Worthiest Traditions, and by Its Greatest Leaders

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 16, 1959

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, it is significant that "The American's Creed," selected from more than 3,000 statements submitted by Americans from every walk of life, should have been written by a man who at 13 years of age came to work as a page boy in the Capitol of the United States, and stayed on to serve the Members of the House in increasingly important capacities for 61 years. That man was William Tyler Page. At the time of his death in 1942 he was minority clerk of the House of Representatives.

The story of "The American's Creed," how it came to be our national creed, something of its doctrinal origins, and what Members of Congress have said about it, is fascinatingly told by Myrtle Cheney Murdock in her new book, "The American's Creed and William Tyler Page." The author is the wife of the Honorable John R. Murdock, for 16 years a Member of this body from the State of Arizona. Mrs. Murdock, educator, lecturer and writer, has been an official guide in the Capitol Building since her husband's retirement in 1952. Her knowledge of the Government of the United States, her love and appreciation for the Capitol Building and its history, have made her an invaluable friend of the Members of both House and Senate.

Mrs. Murdock was uniquely fitted to write about the American's Creed. She knew William Tyler Page personally, and had drawn from him the hitherto untold story of how the idea of summarizing our basic principles into a brief 100-word creed unfolded in his thinking. He told her of his pride at having worked in the Capitol Building for so many years. He told her he had set aside 1 day each year, Independence Day, to read and reread our great American documents. This systematic study of the Declaration of Independence, the Constitution of the United States, Washington's Farewell Address, Lincoln's Gettysburg Address, the writings of Jefferson, Madison, Hamilton, and other of our Founding Fathers, made him a profound student of the fundamental principles of American political faith as set forth in these documents.

The late Daniel A. Reed, our beloved colleague from the State of New York, came to Congress soon after "The American's Creed" was accepted in 1917. He sensed the true meaning of Mr. Page's effort when he said:

Crystallized within this patriotic creed is the very spirit of a free people. It breathes freedom in every word. This great document has entered the sacred archives of our Republic as a worthy companion of the Declaration of Independence and the Federal Constitution.

At this point in the RECORD, Mr. Speaker, I should like to quote "The American's Creed" as given to us by Mr. Page.

THE AMERICAN'S CREED

I believe in the United States of America as a government of the people, by the people, for the people, whose just powers are derived from the consent of the governed; a democracy in a Republic; a sovereign Nation of many sovereign States; a perfect Union, one and inseparable; established upon those principles of freedom, equality, justice, and humanity, for which American patriots sacrificed their lives and fortunes.

I therefore believe it is my duty to my country to love it; to support its Constitution, to obey its laws; to respect its flag, and to defend it against all enemies.

Mr. Speaker, our national patriotic organizations have been untiring in their efforts to keep "The American's Creed" alive. We in the Congress of the United States have an opportunity and a responsibility to see that the creed and the inspiring story of its conception is introduced into the schools and libraries of our respective States. Along with many of my colleagues, it has been my practice for some years to present parchment copies of the creed to each graduating student of the high schools in my district. Other Members may have utilized the creed in even more effective ways.

I was gratified to receive a gift copy of Mrs. Murdock's book, "The American's Creed and William Tyler Page," this past week. I am happy to know that she has presented a copy to every Member of the Congress. This and other books written by Mrs. Murdock are on sale in the House stationery room at discount prices to the Members. Her books about Washington are: "Your Uncle Sam in Washington," "Your Memorials in Washington," "Constantino Brumidi, Michelangelo of the United States Capitol," "National Statuary Hall in the Nation's Capitol."

Low Farm Price Supports and Their Effect on Surpluses

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. R. POAGE
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 16, 1959

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, at another point in the RECORD, my friend, Hon. PAUL JONES, has inserted a clipping from the Washington Post, which contained a letter by Mr. Joseph Alsop. I, too, had asked that this article be inserted, but Mr. JONES' request preceded mine. In that letter Mr. Alsop points out his dissatisfaction with policies of the present Secretary of Agriculture and cites his reasons.

While I have, from the very day when Mr. Benson turned his back on Candidate Eisenhower's Kason and Brookings promises, expressed my disagreement with his low support philosophy, it has only been recently that the public has come to realize that this Benson policy has failed completely. Farmers have long realized that it has reduced the average income of farm people to one-half that of nonfarm people even while the Secretary was talking self-righteously about the great increase of per capita farm income in 1958. This was largely due to the great movement of farm families to the cities.

Most people have, however, completely overlooked the fact that Mr. Benson's policies have resulted in cost far and away beyond anything ever experienced under the much higher rigid supports of previous administrations. The public is just now beginning to recognize that flexible supports, which were advanced to save money for the taxpayer and to reduce our surpluses have failed to do either. The cost of operating the Department of Agriculture is today just about four times what it was under Mr. Benson's predecessor, and the surpluses on hand have grown so that the President tells us that it will soon cost a billion dollars a year just to store them.

Mr. Alsop brings out this with his usual clarity. He says:

> I myself was a strong supporter of Secretary Benson when he took office. Like many others, I supposed that he had the determination and the courage to remove the anomalies of the earlier, Democratic farm program. I am only ashamed that it took me so long to notice that Benson's long suit was pious talk rather than positive performance. His efforts to remove past anomalies and extravagances have in fact produced even greater present anomalies and extravagances.

Again he states:

> He has permitted the total cost of the farm program to double and then triple, while prating about economy.

Mr. Speaker, I believe a word of explanation is in order. Mr. Benson's policies seem quite consistent to most people who are not acquainted with farming in one-crop areas—the areas in which most of our surpluses are produced. Mr. Benson says that if you drop the support price on any commodity that farmers will next year quit growing that commodity. That sounds reasonable, but it simply does not work out that way.

Doubtless, Mr. Benson believes his assumption to be true, but I ask you to place yourself in the position of a cotton farmer who has been growing 10 bales of cotton—above the average—and getting $160 per bale—about what he got last year. This meant your gross income from cotton was $1,600. And in most of the Cotton Belt that is no comparable cash crop to which you can turn. Suppose now that Mr. Benson can prove that you as a cotton farmer will, next year, get only $80 per bale. What would you do? I think it is clear that in the absence of controls, you would try to grow 20 bales. This is the only way you have of maintaining income. It is the only way most farmers who grow our basic crops have of supporting their families. Therefore, when confronted with lower supports, farmers grow more, not less.

This is exactly what farmers always try to do. Our largest cotton crop was grown when support prices were only 52 percent of parity. According to the Secretary, we should have imported cotton that year. When cotton supports and prices went up, the pressure was off and farmers grew less, even when there were no controls.

For low prices to reduce production they must be so low and continue so long that they force farmers off the farm.

Mr. Benson seems perfectly willing to use this drastic starvation method of moving farming operations into larger and larger units. Fundamentally, this is the real farm problem. Do we want more farmers forced into town to compete on an already overfilled labor market? Do we want to aggravate industrial unemployment, and place a still further burden on our already overtaxed relief rolls? Do we want our farms to become rural factories owned by absentee corporate operators? Will such a situation help any substantial group of our citizenship? Will it give us cheaper food? Will it give greater purchasing power with which to buy the products of our factories? Will it help us to maintain that unyielding opposition to communism which all over the world has had its roots on the farm?

May it not well turn out to be as poor a long-time investment as Mr. Benson's administration of the Department of Agriculture has turned out to be on a short-time basis? These, Mr. Speaker, are some of the very real questions involved in the farm problem.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, that all may see the record and evaluate it for themselves, I include some tables prepared by the staff of our Committee on Agriculture just about 1 week ago. I believe that it is fair to state that these figures show that never has so little been accomplished with so much:

FARM FACTS AND FIGURES

Total realized net income of farmers after deducting agricultural production expenses from the total cash income from farm marketings:

Last 6 years:	
1953	$13,899,000,000
1954	12,201,000,000
1955	11,470,000,000
1956	12,111,000,000
1957	10,840,000,000
1958	13,060,000,000
Total	73,581,000,000
Six previous years:	
1947	17,304,000,000
1948	16,057,000,000
1949	13,789,000,000
1950	13,185,000,000
1951	15,158,000,000
1952	14,416,000,000
Total	89,909,000,000

During the last 6 years farmers marketed 15 percent more food and nonfood products than in the 6 preceding years, 1947–52 inclusive. Had farmers been paid for the larger volume of food and nonfood products marketed in the last 6 years at the same rate as in the 6 immediately preceding years their net income in the last 6 years would have been $96,700 million, which is $23,109 million above what they actually received. If farm prices, instead of declining, had increased in proportion to all other prices during the last 6 years, then the income of farmers would have been much greater than $96,700 million.

Appropriations for the Department of Agriculture

Last 6 years:	
1954	$1,782,300,000
1955	2,026,500,000
1956	1,601,900,000
1957	3,583,100,000
1958	6,870,900,000
1959	[1] 5,888,600,000
Total	21,753,300,000
Six previous years:	
1948	1,224,500,000
1949	1,183,500,000
1950	1,503,800,000
1951	1,375,900,000
1952	1,817,800,000
1953	1,510,400,000
Total	8,615,900,000

[1] Estimate. Actual expenditures in fiscal 1959 now estimated at $7,341,000,000.

NOTE.—Appropriations are for fiscal years. Appropriation bill of 1952 covered period of July 1, 1952, through June 30, 1953.

Farm price-support losses—(Commodity Credit Corporation)

As of Jan. 1, 1953	$1,064,617,225
As of Jan. 1, 1959	5,853,292,744

NOTE.—The losses in 6 years, from January 1953 through 1958, were more than 4 times the total of losses during the previous 20-year history of Commodity Credit Corporation price-support operations.

20-year loss (1933–52)	$1,064,617,225
6-year loss (1953–58)	4,788,675,519

CCC price-support operations for basic crops only—(wheat, corn, cotton, tobacco, rice, peanuts)

To Jan. 1, 1953 (at end of 20 years) (profit)	$13,011,290
To Jan. 1, 1959 (6 years later) (loss)	2,528,607,297

NOTE.—The CCC price-support program for cotton, over 20 years, showed a profit of $268 million. But this profit has been wiped out, by cotton program losses of approximately $850 million during the last 3 years.

Losses on dairy products

Up to Jan. 1, 1953	$132,523,383
Since Jan. 1, 1953 to Jan. 1, 1958	1,511,038,079
Dairy program total losses	1,643,561,462

CCC investments

Total CCC investments (inventory and loans) as of Jan. 1, 1953	$2,452,000,000
Total CCC investments (inventory and loans) as of Jan. 1, 1959	8,716,071,000

CCC investments in major crops

[Inventory and loans]

Crop	Unit	Amount	Value
Cotton:			
Jan. 1, 1953	Bales	1,097,000	$166,779,000
Jan. 1, 1959	do	6,564,000	1,092,991,000
Wheat:			
Jan. 1, 1953	Bushels	267,847,000	1,081,545,000
Jan. 1, 1959	do	1,250,919,000	3,057,506,000
Corn:			
Jan. 1, 1953	do	368,349,000	587,274,000
Jan. 1, 1959	do	1,416,534,000	2,351,273,000
Rice:			
Jan. 1, 1953	Hundredweight.	168,000	878,000
Jan. 1, 1959	do	13,719,000	92,980,000
Peanuts:			
Jan. 1, 1953	Pounds	192,528,000	22,644,000
Jan. 1, 1959	do	287,208,000	30,647,000
Tobacco:			
Jan. 1, 1953	do	544,067,000	250,373,000
Jan. 1, 1959	do	966,661,000	621,137,000
Dairy products:			
Jan. 1, 1953			8,445,000
Jan. 1, 1959			62,612,000

Farmers (1952 and 1958)

	1952	1958
Farmers' net income (billions)	$14.4	$13.06
Farmers' share of food dollar (cents)	47	40
Prices paid by farmers, index (percent of 1910–14 average)	287	293
Prices received by farmers, index (percent of 1910–14 average)	288	250
Parity ratio	100	85
Number of farms	5,421,000	4,750,000
Farm population	24,283,000	20,800,000

COMPARISONS (1958)

Per capita income

People on farms	$1,068
Nonfarm people	2,034

Hourly earnings

Farm workers	$0.757
Factory workers	2.13

FARM PRICES AND INCOME

Average of farm prices in 1958 down 13 percent from 1952. Net form income in 1958 was 9 percent below 1952.

CONTRAST

Hourly earnings industrial workers in 1958 up 28 percent since 1952. Corporation dividend payments in 1958 up 37 percent since 1952.

Farm prices (as percentage of parity)

	Percent
1942	105
1943	113
1944	108
1945	109
1946	113
1947	115
1948	110
1949	100
1950	101
1951	107
1952	100
1953	92
1954	88
1955	84
1956	83
1957	82
1958	85

Cash receipts of farmers (not including Government payments)

1932	$4,748,000,000
1947	29,620,000,000
1948	30,227,000,000
1951	32,958,000,000
1952	32,632,000,000
1955	29,556,000,000
1956	30,539,000,000
1957	29,757,000,000
1958	33,206,000,000

Net income of farmers (including Government payments)

1932	$1,928,000,000
1947	17,304,000,000
1948	16,057,000,000
1951	15,158,000,000
1952	14,416,000,000
1955	11,470,000,000
1956	12,111,000,000
1957	10,840,000,000
1958	13,060,000,000

National income

1932	$43,049,000,000
1948	210,098,000,000
1951	253,304,000,000
1952	268,805,000,000
1955	302,493,000,000
1956	320,024,000,000
1957	333,856,000,000
1958	333,863,000,000

CONSUMERS

During the quarter of a century the farm program has operated the consumer has gotten better food at an expenditure of a smaller part of his income. Although costs of hauling, processing, handling, and merchandising food have increased substantially in the last few years, the average wage paid to factory workers in the United States would buy in 1958 almost twice as much food as the average hour's pay in 1929.

Consumers: Quantities of foods purchased by 1 hour of factory labor

	In 1929	In 1958
Bread, loaves	6.4	11.0
Steak, pounds	1.2	2.0
Milk, pints delivered	7.8	16.8
Butter, pounds	1.0	2.9
Bacon, do	1.3	2.7
Eggs, dozens	1.1	3.5
Potatoes, pounds	17.7	33.8
Oranges, dozens	1.3	2.8

Source: Agricultural Marketing Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture.

Overhaul of Our Farm Policy Is Needed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEONARD G. WOLF

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 16, 1959

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I am introducing for the RECORD my sentiments regarding a letter that appeared in the Washington Post on March 14, 1959. This letter was written by the distinguished columnist, Joseph Alsop. He points out that the sincerity and religious conviction of Mr. Benson does not change the fact that he has been an inept Secretary of Agriculture who has created a farm surplus problem that is almost insurmountable. Mr. Alsop clearly implies that a complete overhaul of our farm policy is needed under the leadership of a new Secretary of Agriculture. I heartily concur with these remarks.

Reply to American Bar Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 16, 1959

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a letter addressed to the New York Law Journal in reply to a letter from the President of the American Bar Association addressed to me and published in the March 4 issue of the New York Law Journal. The text of my letter follows:

MARCH 10, 1959.

MR. JUDSON F. FALKNOR,
Editor, New York Law Journal,
217 Broadway, New York, N.Y.

DEAR MR. FALKNOR: The March 4 issue of the New York Law Journal carried the text of a letter to me from President Malone of the American Bar Association, in which he challenged my criticism of the recent action by that organization on the report and recommendations of its committee on communist tactics, strategy, and objectives.

Mr. Malone maintains that the action of the house of delegates in approving a number of recommendations calling upon Congress to overrule by legislation certain decisions of the Supreme Court was a responsible expression of professional criticism. He further maintains that since, the house of delegates specifically disclaimed any intention to censure or attack the Supreme Court, my statement condemning the ABA for maligning the Supreme Court was wholly unjustified.

As Al Smith used to say: "Let's look in the record." The recommendations approved by the house of delegates came before it as part of the report of its committee on communist tactics, strategy, and objectives. The essence of that report is that communism is a danger to the United States and that the Supreme Court is soft to Communists, has encouraged Communist activity, and has caused the paralysis of our internal security.

Let me quote directly from the report:

"Many cases have been decided in such a manner as to encourage and increase Communist activity in the United States."

The report goes on to say:

"The paralysis of our internal security grows largely from construction and interpretation centering around technicalities emanating from our judicial process."

Is this the temperate, reasoned, thoughtful approach to difficult problems which we have a right to expect from a convention of lawyers?

I think that it is not and I believe that Mr. Malone agrees with me. Last Friday, he and I appeared over the CBS network on "The Leading Question." I asked Mr. Malone whether he thought the report of the committee represented a fair and justifiable criticism of the Court. Mr. Malone candidly replied that he would not have written the report that way.

Aside from its tenor, the report is objectionable for several other reasons. First and most important, it is unconcerned with the preservation of individual liberties. Here and there lipservice is paid to constitutional

guarantees. But unfortunately the committee on communist tactics, strategy, and objectives, created to deal with the problems of communism, did not allow its thinking to become confused with any real concern for the effect of its solutions on civil liberties.

Secondly, the conclusion of the committee that the decisions of the Supreme Court in the 24 cases discussed in the report have paralyzed our internal security is totally unsubstantiated. Taken either individually or together, it is difficult to see how decisions like *Pennsylvania* v. *Nelson, Watkins* v. *U.S., Gold* v. *U.S., Kent* v. *Dulles* could destroy America from within. Rather, I feel that were it not for some of those decisions we might, in our search for complete security, have put ourselves well on the way to destroying ourselves.

Mr. Malone argues, however, that the ABA cannot be held responsible for the report of its committee, since the action of the house of delegates was only on the recommendations. While this distinction may have some relation to the niceties of ABA procedures, it has none to the realities of the situation. The fact is that it is the report which provides the reasons for the recommendations. It is the report which reveals the level of deliberation which produced the recommendations. And it is the rhetoric of the report which characterizes the ABA's attitude in the public mind and in the press. I believe that the report is no more separable from the recommendations than are the roots from the tree, and that the ABA must accept the unhappy responsibility for both.

Very sincerely,

EMANUEL CELLER, *Chairman.*

One Hundredth Anniversary of Brooklyn School

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 16, 1959

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, not many private schools in the country can boast of an uninterrupted existence extending over a whole century. The Heffley & Browne Secretarial School in Brooklyn is now celebrating the 100th anniversary of its existence. The citizens of Brooklyn are very proud of this institution. On the occasion of this celebration, I have today forwarded the following letter of congratulations to Mr. George A. Klaum, the principal of the school:

MARCH 16, 1959.

Mr. GEORGE A. KLAUM,
Principal, Heffley & Browne Secretarial School, Brooklyn, N.Y.

DEAR MR. KLAUM: I note with a great deal of delight in your letter of March 9 that the Heffley & Browne Secretarial School is now celebrating the 100th anniversary of its existence and that it is the oldest school of its kind in the East.

You most certainly have much cause to be proud of this record of uninterrupted service to the community. Most noteworthy is also the fact that the school has graduated more than 100,000 students, many of whom are serving in important positions in the business world, in government, and in other fields of activity. This, in itself, is an accomplishment which deserves to be recorded on the occasion of your anniversary.

May I take this opportunity to extend to you, your faculty, staff, students, and graduates my congratulations and sincerest wishes for success and continued accomplishments. We in Brooklyn are very proud of this institution, its past achievements, and its influence to the good in the future. May you continue to help raise and to inspire many more generations of young Brooklynites for the task ahead and for the responsibilities required of them by our community. As you enter the second century of existence, may you find the going easier and the rewards greater.

Sincerely yours,

VICTOR L. ANFUSO,
Member of Congress.

Simpson-Keogh Bill, H.R. 10

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 16, 1959

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, among the progressive groups in the medical field are the Cambria County Medical Associations. Their sincere effort to keep themselves not only well informed on the latest advancements in their own field but also in allied fields is to be commended.

At the meeting of the Cambria County Medical Society in Johnstown, Pa., on Thursday, March 12, an invitation was extended to the Honorable RICHARD M. SIMPSON, ranking Republican on the House Committee on Ways and Means, to discuss the major legislation which would be considered by the present Congress.

Representative SIMPSON is the dean of the Pennsylvania Republican delegation and has been the chairman of the Republican congressional committee for several years.

However, Mr. SIMPSON, while a strong party man, has always placed the interest of his country first in attacking any problem. He is a man of strong convictions and one whom I am privileged to call a friend.

In view of the consideration of H.R. 10 by the House of Representatives today, I want to draw attention to the statement made by Representative SIMPSON in Johnstown last Thursday evening, and herewith include it as part of my remarks.

REMARKS OF THE HONORABLE RICHARD M. SIMPSON BEFORE THE CAMBRIA COUNTY MEDICAL SOCIETY, JOHNSTOWN, PA., THURSDAY, MARCH 12, 1959.

I am privileged to express appreciation for the honor that you have extended to me by your kind invitation to visit Johnstown this evening for the purpose of addressing the distinguished membership and honored guests of the Cambria County Medical Society.

When your capable and experienced Congressman, JOHN P. SAYLOR, asked me to come to Johnstown, he had planned to accompany me but other legislative duties have prevented him from being here. As the ranking Republican on the important House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, JOHN SAYLOR'S official duties have placed great demands on his time. You may be assured that if JOHN could have been here tonight, he would have been. He did ask that I convey his regret and he sent to you his warm greetings. As one who knows whereof he speaks, based on personal observation and association, I will categorically state to you that the 22d Pennsylvania District is fortunate to have a man of the stature and dedication to duty that JOHN SAYLOR brings to his responsibilities as your Representative in the Congress of the United States.

In addition to renewing acquaintanceships with the many old friends I have found in your presence and making the acquaintanceship of new friends, my purpose in being here tonight is to discuss with you a legislative subject that is of very genuine interest to all self-employed Americans and their families. Because it represents a matter of tax equity and tax principle, it should also be of interest to every American. I refer to what is presently denominated as the Simpson-Keogh bills, H.R. 9 and 10, legislation to provide deferment of tax liability on earned income from self-employment paid into certain defined retirement programs.

In the next few minutes I would like to present briefly some background information with respect to the proposal and then provide a general outline of the provisions and purpose of the current version of the bill. In parlance of the medical profession I will endeavor an analytical diagnosis as to the identity and then undertake a prognosis as to legislative prospects. I will not endeavor a technical discussion of the bill and I offer that to you as a solemn promise.

The importance of the need for the self-employed to provide for their retirement security is somewhat shockingly demonstrated by a study conducted in the spring of 1958 by the Bank of New York. That study indicated that fewer than 3 of every 10 self-employed taxpayers—by their own admission—now have a planned retirement program of any kind.

The genesis of the Simpson-Keogh proposal can, in my judgment, be traced to two basic causes.

The first of these is the steep progression of the existing individual surtax schedule. If we were blessed with a more modest surtax schedule that did not take one-fifth (20 percent) of a taxpayer's first dollar of taxable income, that did not begin to take one-half (50 percent) of his taxable income at $16,000, and that did not take more than nine-tenths (91 percent) of his taxable income in excess of $200,000, we would not today have the agitation for the type of tax equity proposed in the Simpson-Keogh bills. Thus, the first basic consideration bringing about the creation of this tax deferment idea is the onerous character—the confiscatory character, if you will—of the tax burden that is presently imposed on our citizens.

The second cause on which is based support for the Simpson-Keogh proposal is tax equity—equity that does not exist in the present tax structure with its discrimination against self-employed individuals who by law are not eligible to participate in employer-established qualified pension plans. Under section 404 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 an employer deducts as a cost of doing business amounts he pays into a qualified retirement program; the employee is not taxed currently on what his employer pays into the fund in his behalf, even though it is in the nature of additional compensation for his services. The employee is taxed only when he gets the money at retirement, as and when it is received.

The estimated 10 million self-employed persons in the United States, such as farmers, professional people, and shopkeepers,

cannot benefit from these tax-favored pension plans since technically they are not employees. It is in the interest of achieving tax equity and opportunity to provide for retirement security for these self-employed that we find the second basic cause motivating support for the Simpson-Keogh proposal.

The impact of these two causes—high taxes and tax equity—can be demonstrated by an examination of a hypothetical but not untypical case. Assume the case of a 40-year-old taxpayer who has a taxable income of $13,000 so that the top tax rate applicable is 40 percent. Assume also that he decides to set aside $1,000 each year until he reaches age 65 and assume an interest rate of 4 percent compounded annually.

The $25,000 of out-of-pocket savings which he would accumulate at the rate of $1,000 a year for 25 years on a tax-deferred basis would grow to $41,646 before taxes. If, on the other hand, tax deferment had not been allowed so that he was saving tax discounted dollars, his accumulation would amount to less than half as much, $20,717. The reason for the disparity in tax-deferred accumulation and tax-discounted accumulation is an obvious one. If tax deferment had not been allowed, his original $1,000 of annual saving would have been reduced to $600 that was left for investment; the investment rate is reduced to 2.4 percent instead of the assumed rate of 4 percent. The tax-deferred dollars would be fully employed at the full assumed rate of investment and would have the privilege of tax-free accumulation. Consequently their growth from year to year would be accelerated.

I would like to turn now to a brief examination of the historical development of the Simpson-Keogh proposal. This examination takes us back for its beginning to the early years of the post-World War II period. At that time a small group of lawyers met informally in New York to consider the problem of the self-employed professional people in providing for their retirement. This group met intermittently during the ensuing few years in an attempt to develop a solution to this problem. Concurrently numerous plans for tax deferment on investment in various forms of retirement security were being developed and publicized.

It was on June 7, 1951, during the 1st session of the 82d Congress, that the original version of what is now known as the Simpson-Keogh plan was introduced. The original proposal would have allowed all taxpayers to deduct a portion of their income paid into a restricted retirement fund, with the limitation that the annual deduction could not exceed the lesser of 10 percent or $7,500. In May 1952 this legislation received its first formal congressional consideration in public hearings held by the House Committee on Ways and Means.

With the convening of the 83d Congress this legislation was again introduced in the House of Representatives. In August of 1953 the legislation again received consideration in public hearings by the committee. Subsequently further hearings were held in 1955 and 1958. In May 1958 I joined as a cosponsor of the bill and introduced it in the House of Representatives. Two months later the Committee on Ways and Means finally favorably reported the legislation to the House and it was passed by voice vote in that body. Regrettably the little time remaining in the session and the resulting adjournment rush did not permit Senate consideration of the proposal.

In the current 86th Congress Congressman KEOGH of New York and I have again joined as cosponsors of the legislation and as you know it was favorably reported to the House of Representatives on February 24, 1959.

Before I undertake the prognosis of legislative prospects that I promised you, it might be well if we look briefly to the substantive provisions of the bill in the form in which it was reported by the Committee on Ways and Means.

As I previously indicated the basic purpose of the bill is to allow a deferment of tax liability on limited amounts of net income earned from self-employment. Thus, the coverage of the proposal would be limited to self-employed persons and would not be available to any self-employed person who during the taxable year received an amount any portion of which was attributable to an employer contribution under an employee plan. Furthermore, a special limitation on the lifetime deduction contained in the bill is imposed on individuals who have previously received a payment or acquired nonforfeitable rights to employer contributions under a qualified pension, profit-sharing or stock-bonus plan.

The amount on which tax deferment can be claimed has both an annual limit and a lifetime ceiling. The annual deductible limit is 10 percent of net earnings from self-employment or $2,500, whichever is lower. The maximum lifetime limit is $50,000. There is a stepped-up annual rate of exclusion for individuals who are over 50 years of age on the effective date of the act. For such individuals the limitation on the annual deduction would be increased by one-tenth for each year that his age exceeds 50 on the effective date so that if an individual were 60 years of age on January 1, 1959, the annual limit on his deduction would be 20 percent of self-employment income not to exceed $5,000.

The participant in this self-employed retirement program has certain prescribed alternatives with respect to the disposition of the annual amounts he is setting aside for his retirement For example, he may undertake to invest the proceeds in an annuity or an endowment policy issued by a domestic life insurance company. If life insurance benefits are included in such a policy, the life insurance features may not extend beyond age 70. This policy must be nonassignable. The deduction annually available is limited to so much of the yearly premium as is allocable to the restricted retirement benefits under the policy.

Such a participant may also invest in what is known as a face-amount certificate as defined in the Investment Company Act of 1940.

The participant may alternatively elect to pursue an investment course of placing deposits in a restricted retirement trust fund with the requirement that the trustee must be a bank. There are of course special restrictions placed on all of these investment alternatives so as to assure the validity of the retirement program and to prevent the tax deferment privilege from becoming a short-term avoidance device. I will not undertake to detail these restrictions other than to the extent that I have already referred to them. You may be assured that the savings institutions such as insurance companies, banks, and other activities authorized under the act to be depositories for these retirement funds will have trained experts to advise the individual participant with respect to the necessary procedures he must follow to stay within the limits of the act.

Having considered the questions of individual eligibility and investment alternatives, it is now appropriate that we should examine the aspect of the proposal relating to when and how the proceeds eventually are taxed. The bill provides rules relating to the income tax treatment of such receipts. Generally speaking, amounts received from the fund or policy are included in gross income when received. Special rules are set forth prescribing when income shall be considered as received and special rules prescribe the tax treatment of such income. If the self-employed individual undertakes to make withdrawals from his accumulated fund prior to reaching retirement age, the bill provides that a penalty tax will apply. On the other hand, liberalized rules are provided in the case of the lump-sum withdrawal after reaching retirement age and in the case of a lump-sum distribution to beneficiaries upon the death of the self-employed individual. The retirement income credit under section 37 of the Internal Revenue Code is not available with respect to amounts received from the restricted retirement fund or policy. No tax deferment on payments into a retirement plan is allowed to a taxpayer for any year beginning after the year in which he attains age 70, and it is required that the individual must begin to take withdrawals from the accumulated fund upon attaining age 70.

I have touched on the general principles and highlights of the proposal contained in the House-passed version of this legislation. I trust that I have outlined the principal mechanics of the manner in which H.R. 10 would at least in some measure add to the retirement security of the self-employed.

To this point I have deliberately undertaken to cast this proposal in a favorable light. However, any frank discussion of the subject requires at least a brief recognition of the factors that argue against its enactment. In the interest of brevity I will mention the two most compelling.

The first of these possible objections to the legislation is the fact that while it tends to correct a tax inequity that exists with respect to self-employed individuals—a group numbering approximately 10 million—it purports to do nothing for the 30 million Americans who are employed but who are not covered by a qualified pension and profit-sharing plan. I am referring to such persons as the employed clerks in a small retail store, an employed filling station attendant, and employed persons in similar occupations. This exclusion is an acknowledged serious shortcoming, and it is a matter to which we all must give earnest attention.

Without disregarding the need for taking care of this latter group, there are at least four reasons why it is appropriate to enact H.R. 10 so as to take care of the self-employed group. The first of these reasons is that many of the occupations covered under this proposal are precluded by the respective State laws from practicing their professions in an incorporated form.

A second reason for enacting this measure in its present form is that to do so will encourage the sole proprietor or partner who cannot benefit from a plan under section 401 to establish a 401 plan for his employees in view of the employer's entitlement to make comparable provision for himself under the terms of this bill.

A third reason for the enactment of H.R. 10 in its present form is that the retirement problems of the low income individual do not stem primarily from his tax burden.

A fourth reason supporting this legislation is that it reduces the number of American citizens who under present law are being discriminated against. The fact that it does not go far enough is a point on which we can agree, but at least it represents a step in the right direction.

The second argument against the enactment of H.R. 10 is the revenue loss that would be entailed. The Treasury Department has estimated a revenue loss in excess of $360 million in the first full year of operation. In this day when it has become fashionable to speak about Government finance in terms of billions, such a revenue loss may not seem a formidable obstacle. However, I would point out to you that the Federal budget projected for fiscal year 1960 is in balance only by a margin of $100 million in surplus

and the estimated revenue loss from this bill, assuming all other estimates are correct, would mean another year of deficit financing.

We must also realize that the Congress this year will likely be called upon to provide another increase in the statutory debt limit. This mounting public debt constitutes a deferred tax increase that we are imposing not only on ourselves but also on succeeding generations. When we defer through fiscal policy until tomorrow the bills that we should pay today, we are in effect saying that the taxes of tomorrow will have to be increased to a level in excess of what they would otherwise have to be.

Also, in connection with the consideration of the fiscal implications of this legislation we must realize that if retirement savings are to mean anything in terms of purchasing power, we must protect the integrity of those savings against the onslaught of inflation.

To place this budgetary objection to the enactment of H.R. 10 in some perspective, I would call attention to the fact that the amount of revenue loss is a highly speculative matter. The revenue loss magnitude depends on several variable factors, such as the number of people who will participate, the extent to which they will participate, and the tax brackets in which they find themselves at the time of their contributions. It is my conviction that rather than retain unjustifiable discrimination in our tax structure against any group, we should seek a more equitable apportionment of the tax burden among all the taxpayers.

The revenue loss consequences of this proposal should also be examined in the light of experience with similar measures in other countries of the free world. The previously existing inequity in the position of the self-employed was terminated through legislative action in Great Britain in 1956, and in Canada and New Zealand in 1957. The Honorable Walter Harris, Minister of Finance in Canada, observed in this 1957 budget speech that the annual yield of the income tax could be reduced by as much as $40 million through the enactment of the Canadian plan. The actual Canadian experience was a revenue loss of only $7 million. The English and New Zealand experiences also found the revenue losses less than had originally been projected.

I have mentioned inflation in the context of need to eliminate deficit financing if we were to preserve the integrity of our retirement savings. I would like to mention inflation in another context, this time arguing in support of the enactment of H.R. 10. The distinguished chairman of the Federal Reserve Board, William McChesney Martin, and the distinguished Secretary of the Treasury, Robert B. Anderson, have both expressed the view that inflation is one of our principal concerns. Secretary Anderson has gone on to say that savings by the public must be relied on "to the greatest extent possible" to help stabilize the economy. The chairman of the President's Council of Economic Advisors, Dr. Raymond J. Saulnier, in a speech before the National Press Club on Friday, February 27, also labeled inflation as one of our greatest dangers and stated that one of the factors necessary to combat it would be an adequate accumulation of funds for capital investment. I submit that the necessary efforts to combat inflation and to provide augmented capital funds are entirely consistent with this legislation and would be strengthened by its enactment.

Money is like any other commodity and the price for its use is responsive to the factors of supply and demand. By encouraging thrift we will be increasing the availability of funds for capital investment and thereby tending to depress interest charges. This will serve to reduce the forces of inflation while at the same time increasing business expansion with the resulting greater economic opportunity for all that results from such expansion.

In closing I have promised to express my prognosis as to the legislative prospects of H.R. 10. For what it is worth, I will express the view that this legislation will pass the House of Representatives and the Senate during the 86th Congress. Because it would be inappropriate for me to do otherwise, I will not speculate as to what action the President might take in the event that the legislation reaches his desk for approval or disapproval.

I will observe that budget-busting and unrestrained spending activity by the "Spendocrats" in Congress will seriously jeopardize prospects of Presidential approval. Accordingly, if the Congress will act with restraint during its consideration of money authorizations and appropriations bills, the chances for approval of this legislation will be greatly enhanced.

I can assure you that consistent with my stand on Government economy in the past, I will vote for sufficient economy in Government to more than make possible the enactment of this meritorious proposal. It is my hope that a sufficient number of my colleagues in the Congress will join with me in this effort for economy so as to make possible the realization of the tax equity represented by the Simpson-Keogh proposal.

May I, in closing, thank you for being a wonderful audience and reiterate my appreciation for your thoughtfulness in permitting me to join with you tonight.

Tax Exemptions on Public Housing Bonds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE A. KASEM
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 16, 1959

Mr. KASEM. Mr. Speaker, it has been related to me that some municipal authorities have been concerned over the fact that H.R. 5096, recently introduced by my colleague from California [Mr. GORDON MCDONOUGH], would be a step toward eliminating tax exemptions on other bonds. The bill would remove long standing tax exemptions on public housing bonds.

Ever since I can remember, the Federal Government has made interest on local bond issues nontaxable so that local governments and school districts can issue bonds at lower interest rates.

I heartily endorse this principle as it gives the local taxpayer a break on interest payment and the municipalities and school districts much needed advantages in the money market.

Public housing, as the term implies, is a public undertaking for a purpose equally as desirable as other governmental activities—the providing of a minimum standard of housing for American families.

IMPEDE PUBLIC HOUSING

It is obvious that the bill's purpose is to impede public housing rather than to correct any alleged tax inequity. To allow this device to succeed would open the gate to using the removal of tax exemption, which has become an integral part of all local bond issues, to defeat municipal or local projects that a legislator might oppose when he either cannot defeat or will not attack the project directly.

This would be a very bad precedent to establish.

Washington Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 16, 1959

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following newsletter of March 14, 1959:

WASHINGTON REPORT

(By Congressman BRUCE ALGER, Fifth District, Texas)

Hawaiian statehood was the big debate of a lively week. The Territory consists of eight major islands (six well developed) and many smaller ones stretching 1,900 miles, 2,200 miles southwest of the United States. The present population includes approximately 168,000 military and Federal employees and dependents, leaving 445,000 native population of whom 23 percent are Caucasian, 37 percent Japanese, 17 percent Hawaiian, and the rest Filipino, Chinese, Korean, Puerto Rican, or others. Thirty-five percent of the marriages mix races, accounting for the dwindling number of pure Hawaiians.

Arguments for: (1) If Alaska, then Hawaii; (2) they deserve statehood because they want it, the people believe in our Constitution and form of government, and the islands are economically sound; (3) the House previously passed Hawaiian statehood several times (1947, 1950, 1953) and both parties have pledged support.

Arguments against: (1) Islands are spread out and noncontiguous to the United States (also noncontinental, which Alaska is); (2) 445,000 people will have 2 Senators (and 1 Representative) who can nullify New York's 16 million, California's 14 million, Texas' 9 million, or each of the other States; (3) the International Longshoreman Workers' Union leaders are Communist influenced, if not controlled, and could through strikes cut off and isolate Hawaii, totally dependent on ocean trade (and also our Pacific Fleet Command Headquarters). There were many other able presentations, but these are the basic ones. The bill passed 323 to 89. For my part, the arguments against could not be wished or rationalized away.

The Ways and Means Committee work continues ceaselessly. (1) The minerals depletion hearings ended. I was most critical of the endless litigation of the Treasury Department, whose zeal for collecting revenues transcribed fairness and equity, it seems to me. Additional tax suits were filed repeatedly against minerals industries by the Internal Revenue Service after court cases were lost time after time. This is unfair expense to the Nation's taxpayers and to the businesses sued. (2) The Keogh-Simpson bill (retirement help for self-employed through tax deferment) and temporary unemployment compensation bill will soon be before the House. Our committee agreed to terminate the Federal part of TUC except

for tapering off those who have claims filed. Now it's up to the House and Senate to follow through.

Bills I introduced this week: (1) The Defense Facilities Protection Act of 1959 seeks to protect our own defense effort from the subversive efforts and dangers of Communists. Without this bill the Defense Department cannot rid itself of the Communist-controlled union which handles the Pentagon's own messages, coded or otherwise. Nor can the 2,000 or more identified saboteurs employed in vital defense plants be removed. Surely Congress will take action. (2) The natural gas bill is the same one I cosponsored before. It simply will restore Congress' intent (overturned by the Supreme Court) of the 1938 law, specifically exempting gas production from Federal Power Commission control.

The Defense budget debate, and our military preparedness in view of Berlin and other danger spots, has taken on some very political, and therefore dangerous, overtones. Those who seek to discredit the President's leadership for political gain are playing with dynamite. As to the arguments—obviously we cannot match the enemy in manpower, so a cut in our armed personnel is not the crucial point some are seeking to make it. It's our total destructive potential that deters, because this is what wins wars. For the same reason, we cannot agree to fight "brush fire" type wars with one hand tied behind us, namely, by agreeing not to use our nuclear weapons. On both counts the President deserves our support. Strength not weakness, firmness not vacillation, unity not division, are what are needed now, not political maneuvering for the 1960 election. It's one thing to argue merit of conflicting viewpoints—it's entirely another to criticize loosely or seek political advantage by demanding more expenditures. Forgotten by some is this—our defense strength is no stronger than our economic strength.

Defense needs and their costs come first, completely overshadowing other Federal services, particularly the welfare services so unnecessary by comparison. Here's a partial list of areas where the Democrats are already planning spending beyond the budget, besides defense—housing, airport construction, space, atomic power, public works, school construction and education, depressed areas, water pollution, and educational TV. The total cost—billions beyond the $77 billion budget. Who pays? John Doe. How? Through increased taxes, or, more likely, through Government's deficit financing and a watered dollar, which means less buying power for John Doe. My continuing guidelines: (1) Stop increasing Federal Government size, control and spending; (2) reduce or eliminate Federal Government in places where it has no place being (business operation, for example), (3) return power to States wherever possible; and (4) remember the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution.

Correcting Inequities Applicable to Fishing Catch in Puerto Rico

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CECIL R. KING

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 16, 1959

Mr. KING of California. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, as amended, for the purpose of correcting inequities in existing law applicable in Puerto Rico, which I believe were not the intent of Congress when the law was enacted. It is intended also to encourage the development of fisheries and their allied industries in that great Territorial commonwealth, which has encouragement and backing of our Government.

Under sections 931 and 933 of the Revenue Code of 1954, mainland citizens of the United States who establish bona fide residence in insular possessions such as Puerto Rico are entitled to certain tax exemptions, all designed to promote the industry and welfare of the people of such possessions. As a condition under section 931(a)(2)(B), it is required of the citizen to be entitled to this exemption that "50 percent or more of his gross income—computed without the benefit of this section—for such period or such part thereof was derived from the active conduct of a trade or business within a possession of the United States, either on his own account or as an employer or agent of another."

Usually this condition is entirely fair. In the instance of a fisherman catching fish on the high seas, however, the Treasury Department has ruled that the actual catching of fish, the active conduct of a trade or business is not conducted within the possession. The facts that the citizen is a bona fide resident of the possession, sells his fish in and receives payment therefor within the possession, and in every way contributes the economy of the possession just as though he spent all of his time on shore, are disregarded. The unfair consequences are as follows:

(a) The citizen does not receive the exemption from U.S. Federal taxes in accordance with the intent of the law.

(b) The fisherman is subject to having withholding taxes deducted from his wages, salary, or other compensation both under the Federal income tax law and the tax laws of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico. Although he makes eventual recovery of the Puerto Rico deductions, he is deprived of the use of his own money until reimbursement is made. This makes it difficult for a boatowner to employ such citizens.

(c) Should the fisherman have income from properties on the mainland subject to Federal income taxes, by the inclusion of Puerto Rican income in his tax return he becomes liable for taxes in higher income tax brackets.

(d) Puerto Rican personal income taxes are somewhat lower than Federal income taxes, which again operates to the disadvantage of the citizen.

(e) Should a fisherman catch all of his fish in waters within the 3-mile limit of the possession, he would receive the full benefits of the exemption. If he spends more than 50 percent of his time outside of the 3-mile limit he is deprived of the exemption.

It is submitted that the fisherman is just as important to the economy of Puerto Rico as the one who works in the cannery that buys and packs such fish; in fact, even more so because without his fish the cannery employee would have nothing to do. For all practical purposes the fisherman's income is derived from sources within Puerto Rico, because that is where his fish are delivered and sold.

The amendment to section 933 has been so worded as to make it clear that the exemption applies to a proprietor or partner as well as to an employee, as is the case under section 931. The requirement of bona fide residence remains unchanged.

Section 3401(a)(8)(C) is amended to conform to the amendment to section 933.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks, I include the bill in the RECORD, at this point as a part of my remarks:

H.R. —

A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to income derived from fishing where the catch is landed in Puerto Rico

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 933 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to income from sources within Puerto Rico) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentences:

"For purposes of this section, income derived (either on his own account or as an employee or agent of another) from the conduct of a fishing venture shall be treated as income derived from sources within Puerto Rico, if the catch of fish is landed, sold, or delivered in Puerto Rico. For purposes of the preceding sentence, the term 'fish' means fish, whether in the round, gilled and gutted, filleted, split, salted, iced, or frozen, and includes shellfish and crustacea, whether whole, headed, salted, iced or frozen."

SEC. 2. Section 3401(a)(8)(C) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to withholding tax on wages) is amended to read as follows:

"(C) for services for an employer (other than the United States or any agency thereof) performed by a citizen of the United States within Puerto Rico, or in connection with a fishing venture where the catch of fish (within the meaning of the last sentence of section 933) is landed, sold, or delivered in Puerto Rico, if it is reasonable to believe that during the entire calendar year the employee will be a bona fide resident of Puerto Rico; or."

SEC. 3. (a) The amendment made by the first section of this Act shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1953, and ending after August 16, 1954.

(b) The amendment made by section 2 of this Act shall apply to wages paid on or after the first day of the month after the month in which this Act is enacted.

Columnists Praise Hon. John McCormack's Position

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 16, 1959

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I enclose an editorial entitled "The First Blow,"

written by David Lawrence and appearing in U.S. News & World Report on March 16, 1959. Also, an editorial entitled "Striking the First Blow," which appeared in the Catholic Standard, Washington's archdiocesan newspaper, on March 15, 1959; together with a transcript of certain testimony involving questions by Congressman JOHN W. MCCORMACK, House majority leader, and answers thereto by the Secretary of Defense Neil H. McElroy at hearings held by the House Committee on Science and Astronautics, on March 2, 1959:

[From U.S. News & World Report, Mar. 16, 1959]

THE FIRST BLOW

(By David Lawrence)

The Secretary of Defense, Neil McElroy, at a hearing last week, was asked by Representative JOHN MCCORMACK, Democratic leader of the House, whether it is still the military policy of the United States that "under no conditions will we attack first." Mr. MCCORMACK inquired whether this isn't an untenable position in the event of a grave emergency.

The Secretary agreed that it is a very difficult thing militarily. Then he explained that the policy not to attack first is currently true, and added: "Whether that will always be true, I think, could be something else."

Representative MCCORMACK promptly said he was glad to get such an assurance of possible change. For he believes that America should say it reserves to itself the same freedom of action as the Soviets now enjoy.

Thus, at least, there has come into the open a phase of Communist tactics which is largely responsible for the cockiness of the Soviets in the cold war.

For Moscow has known that the U.S. policy is to accept the first blow and that, indeed, Chicago, or Detroit, or New York, or Washington—or perhaps many of our air bases—could be destroyed before any retaliatory blow would be struck.

What is truly involved is the official strategy adopted by the Soviet Union in 1955 when, through the influence of Nikita Khrushchev, the military policy of attacking a potential enemy first was formally decided upon in the councils of the Kremlin. This was not termed preventive war but preemptive war.

The policy has been fully set forth by high military officers of the Soviet Union in its military journals. Excerpts from these articles and comments by western military men were published in U.S. News & World Report on June 10, 1955, December 13, 1957, and February 7, 1958.

The preemptive war doctrine now should also be adopted by the United States in its own defense. This is perhaps the best way to prevent war from ever happening. The doctrine, as the United States could pursue it, was outlined by Capt. W. D. Puleston, retired naval officer, who, in an article in this magazine on December 13, 1957, wrote:

"Our Government should also make it equally clear to the Soviets that we will not stand idly by and wait to be attacked—that we will not permit any nation to prepare and mount a surprise attack upon this country or any of its allies.

"If Russia—or any other nation—should give positive evidence that it is preparing such an attack, the United States should immediately:

"1. Alert its Armed Forces and deploy them for an instant attack upon the threatening nation.

"2. Serve immediate notice upon the threatening nation that, unless it dismounts the attack preparations within a specific brief period of time, the United States will attack in self-defense, without waiting to be hit first.

"Then, if the Russians or their satellites should defy this warning, the United States would be in a position to get at least an even break. If the enemy should attack, we could attack simultaneously. If the enemy should persist in its preparations to attack, we could—with honor—attack first, and thus gain the initial advantage instead of conceding it."

The frank discussion of this terrifying contingency is a healthy sign. There must be a resumption at once of the international conferences, recently suspended at Geneva, dealing with the subject of "surprise attack." Although the United States has said it would accept the "first blow," it is clear now that our Government may wish to consider a change. This fact—even though no change has as yet been decided upon—at least moves the problem nearer to solution.

For at the moment the Soviets have a free hand. They can bluff us out of Berlin and out of our bases in Europe. They can threaten to destroy our big cities. They can threaten us everywhere with their new missiles. And we are supposed to wait for the first blow, however devastating it may be, and then conduct our massive retaliation with most of what you have left, as Secretary McElroy said to Mr. MCCORMACK.

Mr. McElroy told his press conference last week that preparation for an attack by bombers or missiles in the foreseeable future would be so complex that they would most certainly be discovered by the free world before the blow could get under way.

But what do we do when we discover it?

In self-defense, we should announce now that we will interject or forestall the first blow. We have the same right to apply the doctrine of preemptive force that our adversaries do. To avow this is to hasten the day when an ironclad agreement can be made to insure against the mobilization of missiles and bombers by either side. For such a mobilization itself can be a signal for the outbreak of war, even as it has been in the past. This is the most pressing problem before the world today.

[From the Catholic Standard, Mar. 15, 1959]

STRIKING THE FIRST BLOW

A deadly matter is being discussed these days. Is it morally permissible to strike the first blow in a nuclear war? The recent incisive questions at a hearing, proposed by House Majority Leader JOHN MCCORMACK (whose line of questioning we highly approve) focused attention on this point.

Behind the matter stands the erroneous but generally accepted opinion that the first blow will obliterate the enemy population and perhaps a large segment of the nonbelligerent population. Related to this opinion is the false idea that a war must necessarily involve total surrender.

In relation to these questions, the church has always taught that a nation can use sufficient force to repel an aggressor and that if an aggressor shows clearly his evil intentions adequate measures can be taken for thwarting an aggression. This does not mean, even with nuclear weapons, that it is necessary to obliterate the enemy to forestall an attack and many of our experts have spoken clearly and eloquently on this. Thomas E. Murray has steadily contended that a development of a full graduated system of nuclear weapons would enable us to deal with each situation according to its severity and thus relieve us of the awful predicament of a sudden war of obliteration of the enemy. Total annihilation or unconditional surrender is not and should not be considered the only objective in a war. Furthermore, a graduated use of force would be, it is hoped, a sufficient deterrent since the enemy realizes our full potential for destruction. Henry Kissinger, another expert, has supported in general this thesis. Father John Courtney Murray, S.J., has also written eloquently on it.

The majority leader also indicated at the congressional hearing that it would be better not to inform the enemy that we would never strike the first blow. We feel that this is eminently wise, especially since the first blow need not be total destruction of the enemy but only a stern and adequate warning.

Now is the proper time to think about these grim questions particularly for eradicating the erroneous opinions that a war must be fought to unconditional surrender and must involve, with today's weapons, a holocaust for the enemy.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. MCCORMACK.

Mr. MCCORMACK. Well, Mr. Secretary, what you have said in substance is that our whole military position is predicated upon the policy that under no conditions will we attack first.

Secretary MCELROY. Our policy is that we will not attack, first, Mr. MCCORMACK.

Mr. MCCORMACK. Rather an untenable one from a military angle in case of grave emergency, is it not?

Secretary MCELROY. I think it is a rather difficult one but I think it is the one that would be supported by public opinion in this country.

Mr. MCCORMACK. Well, public opinion is not going to win wars. We are coming down to leadership.

Secretary MCELROY. In any case——

Mr. MCCORMACK. Public opinion is important, but other things win wars.

Secretary MCELROY. I agree that this is a very difficult thing militarily, Mr. MCCORMACK.

Mr. MCCORMACK. Well, we are tied to that.

Secretary MCELROY. That is our policy.

Mr. MCCORMACK. That is described by the President, by the executive branch. That is correct, is it not?

Secretary MCELROY. That is currently true. Whether that will always be true I think could be something else, Mr. MCCORMACK.

Mr. MCCORMACK. Well, I am glad to get that latter now because that is a little relaxation. Could you see conditions under which that would not apply?

Secretary MCELROY. This would again be a matter of national policy which would take quite high review. I think I must begin back where I began, which is, for the present and the indeterminate future our policy is not to attack with the big weapons first.

Mr. MCCORMACK. What do you mean not to attack with the big weapons first, would we attack with other weapons first?

Secretary MCELROY. No, I think we would not attack first even with other weapons.

Mr. MCCORMACK. So no matter how powerful our military might be we are strictly in a defensive posture.

Secretary MCELROY. Yes, because we are not aggressors.

Mr. MCCORMACK. I just want to have that established. Now our main reliance, of course, is SAC. That is correct, is it not?

Secretary MCELROY. Yes, our principal deterrent is the Strategic Air Command. We have other very major elements.

Mr. MCCORMACK. Well, that is true but you have already said on a number of occasions—only in the U.S. News & World Report a few weeks ago, that our principal reliance at this time is on the heavy and medium bomber capacity of the Strategic Air Command, that is certainly number one.

Secretary MCELROY. That is correct, that is true.

Mr. MCCORMACK. Well, suppose they have a defense against our bombers, what then?

Secretary McELROY. Well, of course, if they have a defense against anything that we have then it makes our problem just that much tougher but I think we have some right to judgments on whether or not they can have a defense against our bombers that will keep us out and I think that the belief of our military people is that they will not keep us out any more than we can keep all of their bombers out if they come at us.

Mr. McCORMACK. Well, of course it is not a question of keeping them out, it is a question of the attrition rate.

Secretary McELROY. Yes, there would be some attrition.

Mr. McCORMACK. If the rate is too high there is the question of sustaining the attack?

Secretary McELROY. There would be a question of sustaining but I think in this kind of war you are likely to use most of what you have in your initial strike.

Mr. McCORMACK. We are going to strike after we are hit?

Secretary McELROY. Yes, but you are going to use most of what you have left.

Mr. McCORMACK. You have also stated that within a year or two you expect the Soviet Union to be considerably ahead of us in intercontinental ballistic missiles.

Secretary McELROY. I do not expect that they will. I consistently say that they can be. The intelligence that we have, of course, does not get inside the Russian mind to know what they are going to do. The only thing we can judge is what they could do with their facilities of scientists, facilities of materials, their facilities of production, manpower, and so on. Now then, there is one of the interesting points really that is under discussion in this general debate. We do assume in what we are preparing to do with our own forces that they will make use of their top scientists and their material facilities and their production facilities to make this quantity of weapons but we do not say they will produce these. We say they could produce these if they had the national decision to do so.

Mr. McCORMACK. Well, it is reasonable to assume they are going to do what they think they ought to do.

Secretary McELROY. Yes, but the interesting point in retrospect on that, Mr. McCORMACK, lies in the history of what they did on heavy bombers.

Mr. McCORMACK. I know. You refer to that in this article here. You refer to General Twining's views when he came back from Moscow. Is that what you have reference to?

Secretary McELROY. Yes. General Twining—and he can speak for himself at any point here if you would like him to—came back from Moscow feeling that the Russian capability to manufacture heavy bombers was such that we could expect really to have a superiority of heavy bomber capabilities by Russia over the United States. This was very disturbing to the country. He had this capability but he did not produce it. Why, I do not know. Everybody has his own theory as to why he did not do so. In addition to a capability to do you have to have a national decision to do. The only thing we can say in our intelligence is that he has the capability to do; whether he is going to make the national decision to do we do not know.

Mr. McCORMACK. Might it not be that they concentrated on missiles rather than bombers realizing that the perfecting of missiles would more or less outmode bombers?

Secretary McELROY. The thing that makes that doubtful is our observation of new bombers in the air over there, so they have not given up bomber aircraft. They have an advanced bomber, we believe, in test.

Mr. McCORMACK. I do not want to appear to be in a position of cross-examining any of you gentlemen because we are all Americans, we all want to do the best we can.

Secretary McELROY. Surely.

Mr. McCORMACK. We have our limitations up here. We can appropriate money, but we can't compel it to be spent. We have seen that in the Army and the Marine Corps in the last year.

By the way, do you think the reduction in our Army, in the light of the situation today, was wise?

Secretary McELROY. We think the size of the Army is adequate.

Mr. McCORMACK. That isn't answering my question.

I will leave it there.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. FULTON.

Mr. McCORMACK. No, I have just one or two more questions.

The CHAIRMAN. Excuse me.

Mr. McCORMACK. For the benefit of the people, what is your opinion as to the relationship of the Soviet Union and our own country in the development of the intercontinental ballistic missile? Are they ahead of us?

Secretary McELROY. My judgment is—and when I say "my judgment," let me say that this is a distillation of the views of the intelligence community and of our own scientists, so that I am not talking as an individual, I am simply reflecting a combined view—my judgment in that context is that developmentally we are very close to each other in the development stage of the ICBM.

Mr. Khrushchev announced, I would guess maybe a couple of months ago, maybe not quite that much, that their ICBM was in serial production. This was a term not commonly understood here. It was interpreted by some to mean mass production, and you all may have read recently that a Russian scientist who was in this country explained—and this was reported in the New York Times—that "serial production" is not mass production but is production that is in between prototype production and mass production.

I can read it right here, if the committee would be interested.

This is in the New York Times of Friday, February 13, and this was a meeting of scientists.

The questioning lifted momentarily as Mr. Lebedev explained the "serial production" of the intercontinental ballistic missile. He said this was an intermediary stage—I guess intermediate is what should be here—I hate to correct the New York Times. Maybe I better not do that. He said this was an intermediate stage between the "specimen" or "prototype," and mass production. It means, he said, the production of limited quantities.

Now, of course, the Atlas is in serial production in that kind of sense, because I believe that this committee has visited the production facilities of the Atlas, has it not? I know that you have been down at Cape Canaveral and at Huntsville.

In any case, if you have observed this, the Atlas missiles are moving through on what I would consider in this way serial production, but whether we are in serial production or not doesn't make much difference to me.

I think in answer to your question, sir, that the evidence seems to me to be that there is very little difference in the development stage of their missile and ours from everything that we can judge.

Mr. McCORMACK. Would you express an opinion, either you or General Twining—I know when you express your opinion, it is the collective judgment of many others—as to how long the SAC will be our main reliance so far as retaliatory action is concerned.

Secretary McELROY. Well, in answering this, I think we should make clear that the intercontinental ballistic missiles are being assigned for deployment to SAC, so I think your question has to do with SAC bombers.

Mr. McCORMACK. I am talking about the bombers now.

General TWINING. Well, I think it will be several years, certainly until sufficient quantities of the ICBM's are not only in stockpile but on launchers and of proved dependability. Then it will be a combination of the two. The bombers will stay as the missiles come in. Even though the ICBM's may be perfect, we still want the capability from the manned bombers, for I would say 10 or 15 years, but not just the bomber. It will be the missile too, a combination of both. But SAC will still be the unit, as the Secretary said, that is the deterrent force for the country. It will always maintain the deterrent, with a combination later on of both the missile and the airman.

Mr. McCORMACK. Is it fair to assume that there might be discoveries through tests and a satisfactory bomber might be used more effectively than now; whether there might be a capacity to project a weapon a longer distance than they can now toward the target?

General TWINING. The Hound Dog is an example of that. I am thinking of that when I say the bomber will stay with us 10 to 15 years. The bomber can carry a great load of nuclear power and pinpoint targets, and you will need that capability.

Mr. McCORMACK. The greater the increase in the mileage from the target, the more effective the bomber will be in the future?

General TWINING. It can stand off a thousand miles from a target, keep out of a heavily defended area, and launch a missile from a bomber.

Mr. McCORMACK. Is it reasonable to assume there is a capability of 500 miles?

General TWINING. Definitely. We are encouraged on that.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Secretary, you said a few weeks ago that the danger from the Russian conspiracy is about the same: "I think they intend to destroy us if they can, one way or another."

You remember you said that in the interview with U.S. News & World Report.

Secretary McELROY. Yes.

Mr. McCORMACK. That is still your opinion today?

Secretary McELROY. It is my belief.

Mr. McCORMACK. Have the events of the past week, the visit of the representative of a friendly ally of ours, caused you to change your opinion?

Secretary McELROY. If anything, it has reaffirmed my opinion.

Mr. McCORMACK. Just one more field.

Is there any consideration being given to the establishment of one agency in the field of outer space to take over military and civilian research and development?

Secretary McELROY. There is nothing current in that direction. It is our belief in the Department of Defense that the agency that has been set up, and the Space Council which has been set up to give common direction to the overall program can best do its work along with the military as carrying a portion of this responsibility.

We think that it would be a quite doubtful thing for the military use of space to be assigned outside of the military for development, with all that could mean—not necessarily would mean, but all that it could mean, of difference in point of view on the part of the military and of the other agency as to the importance militarily of certain use of outer space.

Mr. McCORMACK. Well, you have used very guarded language, which I understand, I think.

In other words, you think it would be a great mistake if military research and development was to be transferred to an

agency embracing both military research and development and civilian?

Secretary McELROY. I think the present setup is a good setup and will be workable.

Mr. McCORMACK. Well, there are many twilight zones on some of those questions, I would judge?

Secretary McELROY. Yes, there are, but I don't see why we can't work this out as reasonable men working together, and in the aeronautical field, Mr. McCORMACK, when NACA was the agency, the Department of Defense really had no problem in working out the division of functions as between the two groups.

Mr. McCORMACK. But the powers of the two are different now. You have more power in NASA than in NACA. They are more competitive.

Secretary McELROY. They have somewhat more power, but I think the legislation was very well written to reserve to the military the military use of space.

Mr. McCORMACK. Well, take the twilight zone, don't you think the doubt should be resolved in the world of today on the side of the military?

Secretary McELROY. I think I would prefer to say, Mr. McCORMACK, that the President, as the Chairman of the Space Council——

Mr. McCORMACK. I was chairman of the committee.

Secretary McELROY. I know you were, sir. I think it was a wise conclusion that any doubts that there are as to jurisdiction should be resolvable at the highest executive level through the Space Council, of course, which is chairmaned by the President.

Mr. McCORMACK. We put language in our bill that the Congress further declares that such activities shall be the responsibility of and directed by a civilian agency exercising control over aeronautical space activities sponsored by the United States, except that activities peculiar to or primarily associated with development of weapons systems, military operations, or the defense of the United States, and, in brackets, making it stronger, including the research and development to make effective the defense of the United States, shall be the responsibility of and shall be directed by the Department of Defense, and that determination as to which such agency has responsibility for and direction of such activity shall be made by the President in conformity with section 201(e).

That is pretty strong language there, and we made it just as strong as we could. In other words, if there is a situation that develops in the world of today—tomorrow it might be different, but in the world of today we have to consider these things. What might be military today may not be in a peaceful world, we recognize that, but in case there is any attempt to transfer what is considered to be of vital importance to our country in the military field, are you prepared to fight for the retention by the military of those things you consider to be essential for our preservation?

Secretary McELROY. Without any hesitation, and I think on the other side that I am unlikely to need to fight, because the man who is the head of NASA is a man who is, I think, a very reasonable man and a very good man. I think the point was excellent, and I don't anticipate any problem at all in working these out with Mr. Lanham. But if for some reason or other there is an honest difference between him and me, I would certainly be quite prepared to fight, yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. FULTON.